UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 88th CONGRESS
FIRST SESSION

VOLUME 109—PART 3

FEBRUARY 22, 1963, TO MARCH 14, 1963
(PAGES 2869 TO 4306)

UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE, WASHINGTON, 1963

J
11
.R
v.109,
pt.3

DEPOSITED BY THE
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Congressional Record

United States
of America

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 88th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

SENATE

FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 22, 1963

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, and was called to order by the President pro tempore.

Rev. B. Pascale, minister, Silver Lake Baptist Church, Belleville, N.J., offered the following prayer:

Eternal God, our Father, we call upon Thee to hear our prayer, and answer it according to Thy loving kindness and tender mercy. We acknowledge Thee to be our Creator and the Giver of all things. Grant unto us the disposition of our hearts to work together with pure motive and unselfish purpose for the advancement of righteousness which exalts our Nation. Remove weakness and passion from our hearts and give us Thy infinite wisdom and understanding, that in Thy service we may find perfect freedom and joy.

We remember with gratefulness the former days, when our Founding Fathers, who, by faith, acknowledged Thee in all their ways, and this fair land to be a place of refuge, promise, and hope, and have left us so great a heritage. We today remember the Father of our Country, whose sincere faith and prayer led him to safety and victory. Give us the same grace and dedication to keep America great.

Renew our faith in Thee and in one another, so that in this common bond of divinity, we may rediscover the common tie of humanity, praying and working together for the advancement of peace on earth and good will among all men. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, February 21, 1963, was dispensed with.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, until the reading of the Farewell Address of the Father of our Country, I shall withhold a request in regard to the morning hour.

READING OF WASHINGTON'S FAREWELL ADDRESS

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY], heretofore designated by the Vice President, under the order of January 24, 1901, to read to the Senate today Washington's Farewell Address, will now perform that duty.

Mr. PROUTY advanced to the desk and read the Farewell Address, as follows:

To the People of the United States:

FRIENDS AND FELLOW CITIZENS: The period for a new election of a citizen to administer the executive government of the United States being not far distant, and the time actually arrived when your thoughts must be employed in designating the person who is to be clothed with that important trust, it appears to me proper, especially as it may conduce to a more distinct expression of the public voice, that I should now apprise you of the resolution I have formed, to decline being considered among the number of those, out of whom a choice is to be made.

I beg you, at the same time, to do me the justice to be assured, that this resolution has not been taken, without a strict regard to all the considerations appertaining to the relation which binds a dutiful citizen to his country; and that, in withdrawing the tender of service which silence in my situation might imply, I am influenced by no diminution of zeal for your future interest; no deficiency of grateful respect for your past kindness; but am supported by a full conviction that the step is compatible with both.

The acceptance of, and continuance hitherto in the office to which your suffrages have twice called me, have been a uniform sacrifice of inclination to the opinion of duty, and to a deference for what appeared to be your desire. I constantly hoped that it would have been much earlier in my power, consistently with motives which I was not at liberty to disregard, to return to that retirement from which I had been reluctantly drawn. The strength of my inclination to do this, previous to the last election, had even led to the preparation of an address to declare it to you; but mature reflection on the then perplexed and critical posture of our affairs with foreign nations, and the unanimous advice of persons entitled to my confidence, impelled me to abandon the idea.

I rejoice that the state of your concerns, external as well as internal, no longer renders the pursuit of inclination incompatible with the sentiment of duty or propriety; and am persuaded, whatever partiality may be retained for my services, that in the present circumstances of our country, you will not disapprove my determination to retire.

The impressions with which I first undertook the arduous trust, were explained on the proper occasion. In the discharge of this trust, I will only say that I have, with good intentions, contributed towards the organization and administration of the government, the best exertions of which a very fallible judgment was capable. Not unconscious in the outset, of the inferiority of my qualifications, experience, in my own eyes, perhaps still more in the eyes of others, has strengthened the motives to diffidence of myself; and, every day, the increasing weight of years admonishes me more and more, that the shade of retirement is as necessary to me as it will be welcome. Satisfied that if any circumstances have given peculiar value to my services they were temporary, I have the consolation to believe that, while choice and prudence invite me to quit the political scene, patriotism does not forbid it.

In looking forward to the moment which is to terminate the career of my political life, my feelings do not permit me to suspend the deep acknowledgment of that debt of gratitude which I owe to my beloved country, for the many honors it has conferred upon me; still more for the steadfast confidence with which it has supported me; and for the opportunities I have thence enjoyed of manifesting my inviolable attachment, by services faithful and persevering, though in usefulness unequal to my zeal. If benefits have resulted to our country from these services, let it always be remembered to your praise, and as an instructive example in our annals, that under circumstances in which the passions, agitated in every direction, were liable to mislead amidst appearances sometimes dubious, vicissitudes of fortune often discouraging—in situations in which not unfrequently want of success has countenanced the spirit of criticism, the constancy of your support was the essential prop of the efforts, and a guarantee of the plans, by which they were effected. Profoundly penetrated with this idea, I shall carry it with me to my grave, as a strong incitement to unceasing vows that heaven may continue to you the choicest tokens of its beneficence—that your union and brotherly affection may be perpetual—that the free Constitution, which is the work of your hands, may be sacredly maintained—that its administration in every department may be stamped with wisdom and virtue—that, in fine, the happiness of the people of these states, under the auspices of liberty, may be made complete by so careful a preservation, and so prudent a use of this blessing, as will acquire to them the glory of recommending it to the applause, the affection and adoption of every nation which is yet a stranger to it.

Here, perhaps, I ought to stop. But a solicitude for your welfare, which cannot end but with my life, and the apprehension of danger, natural to that solicitude, urge me, on an occasion like the present, to offer to your solemn contemplation, and to recommend to your frequent review, some sentiments which are the result of much reflection, of no inconsiderable observation, and which appear to me all important to the permanency of your felicity as a people. These will be offered to you with the more freedom, as you can only see in them the disinterested warnings of a parting friend, who can possibly have no personal motive to bias his counsel. Nor can I forget, as an encouragement to it, your indulgent reception of my sentiments on a former and not dissimilar occasion.

Interwoven as is the love of liberty with every ligament of your hearts, no recommendation of mine is necessary to fortify or confirm the attachment.

The unity of government which constitutes you one people, is also now dear to you. It is justly so; for it is a main pillar in the edifice of your real independence; the support of your tranquility at home; your peace abroad; of your safety; of your prosperity; of that very liberty which you so highly prize. But as it is easy to foresee that, from different causes and from different quarters much pains will be taken, many artifices employed, to weaken in your minds the conviction of this truth, as this is the point in your political fortress against which the batteries of internal and external enemies will be most constantly and actively (though often covertly and insidiously) directed; it is of infinite moment, that you should properly estimate the immense value of your national union to your collective and individual happiness; that you should cherish a cordial, habitual, and immovable attachment to it; accustoming yourselves to think and speak of it as the palladium of your political safety and prosperity; watching for its preservation with jealous anxiety; discountenancing whatever may suggest even a suspicion that it can, in any event, be abandoned; and indignantly frowning upon the first dawning of every attempt to alienate any portion of our country from the rest, or to enfeeble the sacred ties which now link together the various parts.

For this you have every inducement of sympathy and interest. Citizens by birth, or choice, of a common country, that country has a right to concentrate your affections. The name of American, which belongs to you in your national capacity, must always exalt the just pride of patriotism, more than any appellation derived from local discriminations. With slight shades of difference, you have the same religion, manners, habits, and political principles. You have, in a common cause, fought and triumphed together; the independence and liberty you possess, are the work of joint counsels, and joint efforts, of common dangers, suffering and successes.

But these considerations, however powerfully they addressed themselves to your sensibility, are greatly outweighed by those which apply more immediately to your interest.—Here, every portion of our country finds the most commanding motives for carefully guarding and preserving the union of the whole.

The *north*, in an unrestrained intercourse with the *south*, protected by the equal laws of a common government, finds in the productions of the latter, great additional resources of maritime and commercial enterprise, and precious materials of manufacturing industry.—The *south* in the same intercourse, benefiting by the same agency of the *north*, sees its agriculture grow and its commerce expand. Turning partly into its own channels the seamen of the *north*, it finds its particular navigation invigorated, and while it contributes, in different ways, to nourish and increase the general mass of the national navigation, it looks forward to the protection of a maritime strength, to which itself is unequally adapted. The *east*, in a like intercourse with the *west*, already finds, and in the progressive improvement of interior communications by land and water, will more and more find a valuable vent for the commodities which it brings from abroad, or manufactures at home. The *west* derives from the *east* supplies requisite to its growth and comfort—and what is perhaps of still greater consequence, it must of necessity owe the *secure* enjoyments of indispensable *outlets* for its own productions, to the weight, influence, and the future maritime strength of the Atlantic side of the Union, directed by an indissoluble community of interest as *one nation*. Any other tenure by which the *west* can hold this essential advantage, whether derived from its own separate strength; or from an apostate and unnatural connection with any foreign power, must be intrinsically precarious.

While then every part of our country thus feels an immediate and particular interest in union, all the parts combined cannot fail to find in the united mass of means and efforts, greater strength, greater resource, proportionably greater security from external danger, a less frequent interruption of their peace by foreign nations; and, what is of inestimable value, they must derive from union, an exemption from those broils and wars between themselves, which so frequently afflict neighboring countries not tied together by the same government; which their own rivalship alone would be sufficient to produce, but which opposite foreign alliances, attachments, and intrigues, would stimulate and embitter. Hence likewise, they will avoid the necessity of those overgrown military establishments, which under any form of government are inauspicious to liberty, and which are to be regarded as particularly hostile to republican liberty. In this sense it is, that your union ought to be considered as a main prop of your liberty, and that the love of the one ought to endear to you the preservation of the other.

These considerations speak a persuasive language to every reflecting and virtuous mind and exhibit the continuance of the union as a primary object of patriotic desire. Is there a doubt whether a common government can embrace so large a sphere? let experience solve it. To listen to mere speculation in such a case were criminal. We are authorized to hope that a proper organization of the whole, with the auxiliary agency of governments for the respective subdivisions, will afford a happy issue to the experiment. It is well worth a fair and full experiment. With such powerful and obvious motives to union, affecting all parts of our country, while experience shall not have demonstrated its impracticability, there will always be reason to distrust the patriotism of those who, in any quarter, may endeavor to weaken its hands.

In contemplating the causes which may disturb our Union, it occurs as matter of serious concern, that any ground should have been furnished for characterizing parties by *geographical* discriminations,—*northern* and *southern*—*Atlantic* and *western;* whence designing men may endeavor to excite a belief that there is a real difference of local interests and views. One of the expedients of party to acquire influence within particular districts, is to misrepresent the opinions and aims of other districts. You cannot shield yourselves too much against the jealousies and heart burnings which spring from these misrepresentations; they tend to render alien to each other those who ought to be bound together by fraternal affection. The inhabitants of our western country have lately had a useful lesson on this head; they have seen, in the negotiation by the executive, and in the unanimous ratification by the senate of the treaty with Spain, and in the universal satisfaction at the event throughout the United States, a decisive proof how unfounded were the suspicions propagated among them of a policy in the general government and in the Atlantic states, unfriendly to their interests in regard to the Mississippi. They have been witnesses to the formation of two treaties, that with Great Britain and that with Spain, which secure to them everything they could desire, in respect to our foreign relations, towards confirming their prosperity. Will it not be their wisdom to rely for the preservation of these advantages on the union by which they were procured? will they not henceforth be deaf to those advisers, if such they are, who would sever them from their brethren and connect them with aliens?

To the efficacy and permanency of your Union, a government for the whole is indispensable. No alliance, however strict, between the parts can be an adequate substitute: they must inevitably experience the infractions and interruptions which all alliances, in all times, have experienced. Sensible of this momentous truth, you have improved upon your first essay, by the adoption of a constitution of government, better calculated than your former, for an intimate union, and for the efficacious management of your common concerns. This government, the offspring of our own choice, uninfluenced and unawed, adopted upon full investigation and mature deliberation, completely free in its principles, in the distribution of its powers, uniting security with energy, and maintaining within itself a provision for its own amendment, has a just claim to your confidence and your support. Respect for its authority, compliance with its laws, acquiescence in its measures, are duties enjoined by the fundamental maxims of true liberty. The basis of our political systems is the right of the people to make and to alter their constitutions of government.—But the constitution which at any time exists, until changed by an explicit and authentic act of the whole people, is sacredly obligatory upon all. The very idea of the power and the right of the people to establish government, presupposes the duty of every individual to obey the established government.

All obstructions to the execution of the laws, all combinations and associations, under whatever plausible character, with the real design to direct, control, counteract, or awe the regular deliberations and action of the constituted authorities, are destructive of this fundamental principle, and of fatal tendency.—They serve to organize faction, to give it an artificial and extraordinary force, to put in the place of the delegated will of the nation the will of party, often a small but artful and enterprising minority of the community; and according to the alternate triumphs of different parties, to make the public administration the mirror of the ill concerted and incongruous projects of faction, rather than the organ of consistent and wholesome plans digested by common councils, and modified by mutual interests.

However combinations or associations of the above description may now and then answer popular ends, they are likely, in the course of time and things, to become potent engines, by which cunning, ambitious, and unprincipled men, will be enabled to subvert the power of the people, and to usurp for themselves the reins of government; destroying afterwards the very engines which have lifted them to unjust dominion.

Towards the preservation of your government and the permanency of your present happy state it is requisite, not only, that you steadily discountenance irregular opposition to its acknowledged authority, but also that you resist with care the spirit of innovation upon its principles, however specious the pretext. One method of assault may be to effect, in the forms of the constitution, alterations which will impair the energy of the system; and thus to undermine what cannot be directly overthrown. In all the changes to which you may be involved, remember that time and habit are at least as necessary to fix the true character of governments, as of other human institutions:—that experience is the surest standard by which to test the real tendency of the existing constitution of a country:—that facility in changes, upon the credit of mere hypothesis and opinion, exposes to perpetual change from the endless variety of hypothesis and opinion: and remember, especially, that for the efficient management of your common interests in a country so extensive as ours, a government of as much vigor as is consistent with the perfect security of liberty is indispensable. Liberty itself will find in such a government with powers properly distributed and adjusted, its surest guardian. It is indeed, little else than a name, where the government is too feeble to withstand the enterprises of faction, to confine each member of the society within the limits prescribed by the laws, and to maintain all in the secure and tranquil enjoyment of the rights of person and property.

I have already intimated to you the danger of parties in the state, with particular references to the founding of them on geographical discrimination. Let me now take a more comprehensive view, and warn you in the most solemn manner against the baneful effects of the spirit of party generally.

This spirit, unfortunately, is inseparable from our nature, having its root in the strongest passions of the human mind.—It exists under different shapes in all governments, more or less stifled, controlled, or repressed; but in those of the popular form it is seen in its greatest rankness, and is truly their worst enemy.

The alternate domination of one faction over another, sharpened by the spirit of revenge natural to party dissension, which in different ages and countries has perpetuated the most horrid enormities, is itself a frightful despotism. But this leads at length to a more formal and permanent despotism. The disorders and miseries which result, gradually incline the minds of men to seek security and repose in the absolute power of an individual; and sooner or later, the chief of some prevailing faction, more able or more fortunate than his competitors, turns this disposition to the purpose of his own elevation on the ruins of public liberty.

Without looking forward to an extremity of this kind (which nevertheless ought not to be entirely out of sight) the common and continual mischiefs of the spirit or party are sufficient to make it the interest and duty of a wise people to discourage and restrain it.

It serves always to distract the public councils, and enfeeble the public administration. It agitates the community with ill founded jealousies and false alarms; kindles the animosity of one part against another; forments occasional riot and insurrection. It opens the door to foreign influence and corruption, which finds a facilitated access to the government itself through the channels of party passions. Thus the policy and the will of one country are subjected to the policy and will of another.

There is an opinion that parties in free countries are useful checks upon the administration of the government, and serve to keep alive the spirit of liberty. This within certain limits is probably true; and in governments of a monarchical cast, patriotism may look with indulgence, if not with favor, upon the spirit of party. But in those of the popular character, in governments purely elective, it is a spirit not to be encouraged. From their natural tendency, it is certain there will always be enough of that spirit for every salutary purpose. And there being constant danger of excess, the effort ought to be, by force of public opinion, to mitigate and assuage it. A fire not to be quenched, it demands a uniform vigilance to prevent it bursting into a flame, lest instead of warming, it should consume.

It is important likewise, that the habits of thinking in a free country should inspire caution in those intrusted with its administration, to confine themselves within their respective constitutional spheres, avoiding in the exercise of the powers of one department, to encroach upon another. The spirit of encroachment tends to consolidate the powers of all the departments in one, and thus to create, whatever the form of government, a real despotism. A just estimate of that love of power and proneness to abuse it which predominate in the human heart, is sufficient to satisfy us of the truth of this position. The necessity of reciprocal checks in the exercise of political power, by dividing and distributing it into different depositories, and constituting each the guardian of the public weal against invasion of the others, has been evinced by experiments ancient and modern; some of them in our country and under our own eyes.—To preserve them must be as necessary as to institute them. If, in the opinion of the people, the distribution or modification of the constitutional powers be in any particular wrong, let it be corrected by an amendment in the way which the constitution designates.—But let there be no change by usurpation; for though this, in one instance, may be the instrument of good, it is the customary weapon by which free governments are destroyed. The precedent must always greatly overbalance in permanent evil any partial or transient benefit which the use can at any time yield.

Of all the dispositions and habits which lead to political prosperity, religion and morality are indispensable supports. In vain would that man claim the tribute of patriotism, who should labor to subvert these great pillars of human happiness, these firmest props of the duties of men and citizens. The mere politician, equally with the pious man, ought to respect and to cherish them. A volume could not trace all their connections with private and public felicity. Let it simply be asked, Where is the security for property, for reputation, for life, if the sense of religious obligation *desert* the oaths which are the instruments of investigation in courts of justice? And let us with caution indulge the supposition that morality can be maintained without religion. Whatever may be conceded to the influence of refined education on minds of peculiar structure, reason and experience both forbid us to expect, that national morality can prevail in exclusion of religious principle.

It is substantially true, that virtue or morality is a necessary spring of popular government. The rule, indeed, extends with more or less force to every species of free government. Who that is a sincere friend to it can look with indifference upon attempts to shake the foundation of the fabric?

Promote, then, as an object of primary importance, institutions for the general diffusion of knowledge. In proportion as the structure of a government gives force to public opinion, it should be enlightened.

As a very important source of strength and security, cherish public credit. One method of preserving it is to use it as sparingly as possible, avoiding occasions of expense by cultivating peace, but remembering, also, that timely disbursements, to prepare for danger, frequently prevent much greater disbursements to repel it; avoiding likewise the accumulation of debt, not only by shunning occasions of expense, but by vigorous exertions, in time of peace, to discharge the debts which unavoidable wars may have occasioned, not ungenerously throwing upon posterity the burden which we ourselves ought to bear. The execution of these maxims belongs to your representatives, but it is necessary that public opinions should cooperate. To facilitate to them the performance of their duty, it is essential that you should practically bear in mind, that towards the payment of debts there must be revenue; that to have revenue there must be taxes, that no taxes can be devised which are not more or less inconvenient and unpleasant; that the intrinsic embarrassment inseparable from the selection of the proper object (which is always a choice of difficulties), ought to be a decisive motive for a candid construction of the conduct of the government in making it, and for a spirit of acquiescence in the measures for obtaining revenue, which the public exigencies may at any time dictate.

Observe good faith and justice towards all nations; cultivate peace and harmony with all. Religion and morality enjoin this conduct, and can it be that good policy does not equally enjoin it? It will be worthy of a free, enlightened, and, at no distant period, a great nation, to give to mankind the magnanimous and too novel example of a people always guided by an exalted justice and benevolence. Who can doubt but, in the course of time and things, the fruits of such a plan would richly repay any temporary advantages which might be lost by a steady adherence to it; can it be that Providence has not connected the permanent felicity of a nation with its virtue? The experiment, at least is recommended by every sentiment which ennobles human nature. Alas! is it rendered impossible by its vices?

In the execution of such a plan, nothing is more essential than that permanent, inveterate antipathies against particular nations and passionate attachments for others, should be excluded; and that in place of them, just and amicable feelings towards all should be cultivated. The nation which indulges towards another an habitual hatred, or an habitual fondness, is in some degree a slave. It is a slave to its animosity or to its affection, either of which is sufficient to lead it astray from its duty and its interest. Antipathy in one nation against another disposes each more readily to offer insult and injury, to lay hold of slight causes of umbrage, and to be haughty and intractable when accidental or trifling occasions of dispute occur. Hence, frequent collisions, obstinate, envenomed, and bloody contests. The nation, prompted by ill will and resentment, sometimes impels to war the government, contrary to the best calculations of policy. The government sometimes participates in the national propensity, and adopts through passion what reason would reject; at other times, it makes the animosity of the nation subservient to projects of hostility, instigated by pride, ambition, and other sinister and pernicious motives. The peace often, sometimes perhaps the liberty of nations, has been the victim.

So likewise, a passionate attachment of one nation for another produces a variety of evils. Sympathy for the favorite nation, facilitating the illusion of an imaginary common interest in cases where no real common interest exists, and infusing into one the enmities of the other, betrays the former into a participation in the quarrels and wars of the latter, without adequate inducements or justifications. It leads also to concessions, to the favorite nation, of privileges denied to others, which is apt doubly to injure the nation making the concessions, by unnecessary parting with what ought to have been retained, and by exciting jealousy, ill will, and a disposition to retaliate in the parties from whom equal privileges are withheld; and it gives to ambitious, corrupted or deluded citizens who devote themselves to the favorite nation, facility to betray or sacrifice the interests of their own country, without odium, sometimes even with popularity; gilding with the appearances of a virtuous sense of obligation, a commendable deference for public opinion, or a laudable zeal for public good, the base or foolish compliances of ambition, corruption, or infatuation.

As avenues to foreign influence in innumerable ways, such attachments are particularly alarming to the truly enlightened and independent patriot. How many opportunities do they afford to tamper with domestic factions, to practice the arts of seduction, to mislead public opinion, to influence or awe the public councils!—Such an attachment of a small or weak, towards a great and powerful nation, dooms the former to be the satellite of the latter.

Against the insidious wiles of foreign influence (I conjure you to believe me fellow citizens) the jealousy of a free people ought to be *constantly* awake; since history and experience prove, that foreign influence is one of the most baneful foes of republican government. But that jealousy, to be useful, must be impartial, else it becomes the instrument of the very influence to be avoided, instead of a defense against it. Excessive partiality for one foreign nation and excessive dislike for another, cause those whom they actuate to see danger only on one side, and serve to veil and even second the arts of influence on the other. Real patriots, who may resist the intrigues of the favorite, are liable to become suspected and odious; while its tools and dupes usurp the applause and confidence of the people, to surrender their interests.

The great rule of conduct for us, in regard to foreign nations, is, in extending our commercial relations, to have with them as little *political* connection as possible. So far as we have already formed engagements, let them be fulfilled with perfect good faith:—Here let us stop.

Europe has a set of primary interests, which to us have none, or a very remote relation. Hence, she must be engaged in frequent controversies, the causes of which are essentially foreign to our concerns. Hence, therefore, it must be unwise in us to implicate ourselves, by artificial ties, in the ordinary vicissitudes of her politics, or the ordinary combinations and collusions of her friendships or enmities.

Our detached and distant situation invites and enables us to pursue a different course. If we remain one people, under an efficient government, the period is not far off when we may defy material injury from external annoyance; when we may take such an attitude as will cause the neutrality we may at any time resolve upon, to be scrupulously respected; when belligerent nations, under the impossibility of making acquisitions upon us, will not lightly hazard the giving us provocation, when we may choose peace or war, as our interest, guided by justice, shall counsel.

Why forgo the advantages of so peculiar a situation? Why quit our own to stand upon foreign ground? Why, by interweaving our destiny with that of any part of Europe, entangle our peace and prosperity in the toils of European ambition, rivalship, interest, humor, or caprice?

It is our true policy to steer clear of permanent alliance with any portion of the foreign world; so far, I mean, as we are now at liberty to do it; for let me not be understood as capable of patronizing infidelity to existing engagements. I hold the maxim no less applicable to public than private affairs, that honesty is always the best policy. I repeat it, therefore, let those engagements be observed in their genuine sense. But in my opinion, it is unnecessary, and would be unwise to extend them.

Taking care always to keep ourselves by suitable establishments, on a respectable defensive posture, we may safely trust to temporary alliances for extraordinary emergencies.

Harmony, and a liberal intercourse with all nations, are recommended by policy, humanity, and interest. But even our commercial policy should hold an equal and impartial hand; neither seeking nor granting exclusive favors or preferences; consulting the natural course of things; diffusing and diversifying by gentle means the streams of commerce, but forcing nothing; establishing with powers so disposed, in order to give trade a stable course, to define the rights of our merchants, and to enable the government to support them, conventional rules of intercourse, the best that present circumstances and mutual opinion will permit, but temporary, and liable to be from time to time abandoned or varied as experience and circumstances shall dictate; constantly keeping in view, that it is folly in one nation to look for disinterested favors from another; that it must pay with a portion of its independence for whatever it may accept under that character; that by such acceptance, it may place itself in the condition of having given equivalents for nominal favors, and yet of being reproached with ingratitude for not giving more. There can be no greater error than to expect, or calculate upon real favors from nation to nation. It is an illusion which experience must cure, which a just pride ought to discard.

In offering to you, my countrymen, these counsels of an old and affectionate friend, I dare not hope they will make the strong and lasting impression I could wish; that they will control the usual current of the passions, or prevent our nation from running the course which has hitherto marked the destiny of nations, but if I may even flatter myself that they may be productive of some partial benefit, some occasional good; that they may now and then recur to moderate the fury of party spirit, to warn against the mischiefs of foreign intrigue, to guard against the impostures of pretended patriotism; this hope will be a full recompense for the solicitude for your welfare by which they have been dictated.

How far, in the discharge of my official duties, I have been guided by the principles which have been delineated, the public records and other evidences of my conduct must witness to you and to the world. To myself, the assurance of my own conscience is, that I have, at least, believed myself to be guided by them.

In relation to the still subsisting war in Europe; my proclamation of the 22d of April, 1793, is the index to my plan. Sanctioned by your approving voice, and by that of your representatives in both houses of congress, the spirit of that measure has continually governed me, uninfluenced by any attempts to deter or divert me from it.

After deliberate examination, with the aid of the best lights I could obtain, I was well satisfied that our country, under all the circumstances of the case, had a right to take, and was bound in duty and interest, to take a neutral position. Having taken it, I determined, as far as should depend upon me, to maintain it with moderation, perseverance and firmness.

The considerations which respect the right to hold this conduct, it is not necessary on this occasion to detail. I will only observe that, according to my understanding of the matter, that right, so far from being denied by any of the belligerent powers, has been virtually admitted by all.

The duty of holding a neutral conduct may be inferred, without anything more, from the obligation which justice and humanity impose on every nation, in cases in which it is free to act, to maintain inviolate the relations of peace and amity towards other nations.

The inducements of interest for observing that conduct will best be referred to your own reflections and experience. With me a predominant motive has been to endeavor to gain time to our country to settle and mature its yet recent institutions, and to progress, without interruption, to that degree of strength, and consistency which is necessary to give it, humanly speaking, the command of its own fortunes.

Though in reviewing the incidents of my administration, I am unconscious of intentional error, I am nevertheless too sensible of my defects not to think it probable that I may have committed many errors. Whatever they may be I fervently beseech the Almighty to avert or mitigate the evils to which they may tend. I shall also carry with me the hope that my country will never cease to view them with indulgence; and that, after forty-five years of my life dedicated to its service, with an upright zeal, the faults of incompetent abilities will be consigned to oblivion, as myself must soon be to the mansions of rest.

Relying on its kindness in this as in other things, and actuated by that fervent love towards it, which is so natural to a man who views in it the native soil of himself and his progenitors for several generations; I anticipate with pleasing expectation that retreat in which I promise myself to realize without alloy, the sweet enjoyment of partaking, in the midst of my fellow citizens, the benign influence of good laws under a free government—the ever favorite object of my heart, and the happy reward, as I trust, of our mutual cares, labors and dangers.

GEO. WASHINGTON.

UNITED STATES,
17th September, 1796.

COMMENDATION OF SENATOR PROUTY

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I wish to commend the distinguished Senator from Vermont for his very fine presentation of Washington's Farewell Address. His reading of the address was most inspiring.

LIMITATION ON STATEMENTS DURING MORNING HOUR

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, under the rule, statements in the morning hour, for the conducting of routine business, be limited to 3 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McINTYRE in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

BILLS AND A JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. MANSFIELD:

S. 898. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Dimitris Kokkitis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DIRKSEN:

S. 899. A bill for the relief of Pericles Ioanis Zombolas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PROXMIRE (for himself and Mr. MAGNUSON):

S. 900. A bill to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act, as reenacted and amended by the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

(See the remarks of Mr. PROXMIRE when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. SYMINGTON:

S. 901. A bill for the relief of William Herbert vom Rath; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DIRKSEN:

S.J. Res. 48. Joint resolution making the 17th day of September in each year a legal holiday to be known as "Constitution Day"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. DIRKSEN when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

RESOLUTION

TWO HUNDREDTH ANNIVERSARY OF U.S. INDEPENDENCE AND A WORLD'S FAIR IN CHICAGO

Mr. DIRKSEN submitted a resolution (S. Res. 94) relative to the 200th anniversary of U.S. independence and a World's Fair in Chicago, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. DIRKSEN when he submitted the above resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

REDUCTION OF DAIRY SURPLUS

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] and myself, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a dairy bill.

Dairy leaders in marketing order areas have been clamoring for the opportunity to pay the actual class I price to their farmer producers for their fluid milk production and a lower class III price for excess production that is generally sold for manufacturing purposes.

These dairy leaders recognize that the present compulsory blend system which requires one flat price for all production gives an explicit incentive for overproduction.

Since 50 percent of all the milk sold is sold in marketing orders, this bill would go a long way toward reducing the dairy surpus.

The bill incorporates a specific request by President Kennedy in his farm message of January 31 to permit producers in Federal milk marketing orders to do exactly what this bill provides.

The principles of the bill have been overwhelmingly approved by Secretary Freeman's Dairy Advisory Committee.

Dairy farm leaders in marketing orders in every section of the country took part with me in preparation of the bill and support it with remarkable unanimity.

As a Senator from Wisconsin, I am very conscious of the impact of this bill on the three-quarters of Wisconsin farmers who are not now producing in a Federal marketing order.

The bill should serve their interests for two reasons: First, it will reduce production of milk, especially manufacturing milk, and therefore tend to improve the income position of those dairy farmers outside marketing orders who produce primarily for manufacturing purposes.

Secondly, the only opposition I have encountered to the principles incorporated in this bill comes from those who fear that dairy farmers now outside of the lucrative marketing order areas might be fenced out through legislation of this kind.

I have drafted the bill to require specific access for new producers into marketing orders. To assure this, my bill provides that dairy farmers now producing under marketing orders can only take advantage of this legislation if provision is first made for access to the marketing order for new producers.

To be sure that this access will be just and certain, the bill specifies that whenever any dairy farmer desires to become a new producer under an order an equitable percentage of total sales shall be allocated to him on such terms and conditions as the Secretary of Agriculture may prescribe on the basis of a hearing record.

The Secretary would be required to make provisions for new producers before the legislation could take effect.

I am convinced that if Congress will pass this bill farm producers in many marketing orders will cast the necessary two-thirds vote to put it into effect.

The result will be good for the dairy farmers—both those inside and those outside marketing orders; and it will be good for the taxpayers, inasmuch as the cost of the dairy program is bound to fall as the dairy surplus falls under an incentive to sharply reduce the one-half of all milk production now produced under Federal orders.

I ask unanimous consent that the bill be held at the desk until Tuesday, in case other Senators wish to join in sponsoring it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will lie on the desk, as requested by the Senator from Wisconsin.

The bill (S. 900) to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act, as reenacted and amended by the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, as amended, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. Proxmire (for himself and Mr. Magnuson), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

DESIGNATION OF SEPTEMBER 17 OF EACH YEAR AS CONSTITUTION DAY

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, on August 16, 1962, I introduced a joint resolution to provide that September 17 in each year shall be a legal holiday to be known as Constitution Day. In connection with that joint resolution, I submitted some observations printed in a report which went with it. As I recall, it came from a very distinguished committee or subcommittee consisting of three members, and I have the honor to be chairman of the subcommittee.

I now reintroduce the joint resolution—in ample time for passage this year; and, in connection with the joint resolution, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record some appropriate portions of the report which was filed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the portions of the report will be printed in the Record.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 48) making the 17th day of September in each year a legal holiday to be known as Constitution Day, introduced by Mr. Dirksen, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The portions of the report presented by Mr. Dirksen are as follows:

The 175th Anniversary of the Constitution of the United States of America

Mr. Dirksen. Mr. President, a little over 175 years ago, the Constitution of the United States of America was concluded in Convention by the unanimous consent of the States present on the 17th day of September in the year of our Lord, 1787, and of the independence of the United States of America the 12th. Unto this document the names of those who participated in Convention were subscribed.

In this world of turmoil and with this constant struggle between freedom and communism, this great document, the Constitution of the United States, becomes more and more significant not only to us in the United States but to freedom-loving people everywhere. On the 175th anniversary of the Constitution, not only are we concerned with serious issues in the Far East, the Near East, the captive nations, and at the Berlin wall, but with the ominous threat to free people which has reached the very doorstep of the United States on Soviet Cuba, an island only 90 miles off our coast. This is not only a threat to our people in the United States of America; it is in violation of one of our basic declarations of freedom, the Monroe Doctrine, since it poses a threat by a foreign nation to the whole Western Hemisphere. The Monroe Doctrine was enunciated December 2, 1823, when President James Monroe stated to the Senate and to the House, as follows:

"We owe it, therefore, to candor and to the amicable relations existing between the United States and those powers to declare that we should consider any attempt on their part to extend their system to any portion of this hemisphere as dangerous to our peace and safety."

Mr. President, this Constitution of the United States of America was written with the blood of the brave men, women, and children who suffered and even died to make this great Nation free. There are others who sacrificed and bled and died to extend her from one ocean to the other, and in the words of Abraham Lincoln:

"The brave men, living and dead, who struggled here, have consecrated it, far above our poor power to add or detract. It is rather for us to be here dedicated to the great task remaining before us—that from these honored dead we take increased devotion to that cause for which they gave the last full measure of devotion—that we here highly resolve that these dead shall not have died in vain—that this Nation, under God, shall have a new birth of freedom—and that government of the people, by the people, for the people, shall not perish from the earth."

Mr. President, although there are times when we feel some people take too much for granted these great sacrifices that gave us this great liberty, it takes occasions such as Constitution Day to reawaken all of us to the many blessings this country has given us and to reemphasize our solemn duty to preserve it for our children and our children's children for ages to come. You will note I have quoted from three documents of freedom in my remarks above and I think it would be fitting and proper on this day to ask unanimous consent that the "Documents of Freedom," as copyrighted by the Freedom Documents Foundation, be placed at this point in the Congressional Record. Included are the Declaration of Independence, the Constitution of the United States of America, the Bill of Rights, the Monroe Doctrine, the Gettysburg Address, November 19, 1863, the "Star-Spangled Banner," and the pledge of allegiance:

"I pledge allegiance to the flag of the United States of America and to the Republic for which it stands, one Nation, under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all."

TWO HUNDREDTH ANNIVERSARY OF U.S. INDEPENDENCE, AND A WORLD'S FAIR IN CHICAGO

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, the people of Illinois and the people of Chicago are extremely forehanded and foresighted. They realize that in 1976 we shall observe the 200th anniversary of our independence, and that that should be a great and felicitous day, with appropriate ceremonies all over the Nation. Because they are forehanded and because they have vision, I wish to assist them in bringing this matter to the attention of the country, in the hope that there in Cook County, on the shores of Lake Michigan, the Committee of '76 can be encouraged to make bold and imaginative plans for a world's fair to be held in the city of Chicago.

You see, Mr. President, that is only 13 years from now. Although many things can happen in that period of time, we must be ready. After all, Mr. President, 13 years is not so long. Recently we have gone through 3 weeks of stress and strain in connection with the attempt to modify rule XXII, in order to accelerate and expedite and push measures through this great deliberative body.

This spirit of acceleration is catching, and it has caught on among the citizens of that great metropolis on the shores of Lake Michigan.

So I submit this resolution. It would be appropriate to commemorate this great event; namely, the 200th anniversary of our independence, in Chicago and Cook County and the State of Illinois. Already the Committee of '76 has selected the city of Chicago as the geographic heart of the country for this celebration. So I respectfully submit this proposal for consideration if, as, and when, in my own committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The resolution (S. Res. 94) was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, as follows:

Whereas in 1976 the United States will commemorate the two hundredth anniversary of its independence; and

Whereas it would be appropriate to commemorate this great event by holding a world's fair where by proper ceremony the history of the Nation from 1776 to 1976 might be suitably depicted; and

Whereas there has been constituted in the State of Illinois a Committee of '76 consisting of public-spirited citizens who are presently engaged in planning such a world's fair; and

Whereas the aforesaid Committee of '76 has selected the city of Chicago, located near the geographic heart of the United States as the proper place to observe this epochal and historic event; and

Whereas the city of Chicago, the county of Cook, and the State of Illinois have all gone on record as encouraging this Committee of '76 to make bold and imaginative plans for such a world's fair in the city of Chicago: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the United States Senate that it looks with favor on this proposal and hereby gives encouragement to the Committee of '76 in its efforts to plan and bring about this two hundredth anniversary commemorative ceremony in the city of Chicago.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILLS

Under authority of the orders of the Senate, as indicated below, the following names have been added as additional cosponsors for the following bills:

Authority of February 14, 1963:

S. 807. A bill to encourage local and State initiative in urban transit development and to preserve the status of privately owned local carriers, and for other purposes: Mr. Anderson, Mr. Saltonstall, and Mr. Williams of Delaware.

Authority of February 19, 1963:

S. 859. A bill to establish a land and water conservation fund to assist the States and Federal agencies in meeting present and future outdoor recreation demands and needs of the American people, and for other purposes: Mr. Douglas, Mr. McCarthy, Mr. McGovern, and Mr. Pell.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

By Mr. DIRKSEN:

Address delivered by Senator Morton to the Georgia Press Institute, at Athens, Ga., on February 21, 1963.

VISIT TO WASHINGTON BY LOUISIANA MARDI GRAS QUEENS

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, on this occasion we are honored by a visit to the Capitol of a number of very beautiful young ladies from Louisiana. First is Miss Maurine Perez, of New Orleans, who is queen of the Mardi Gras ball to be held in Washington. Accompanying her are the young women selected by various festival and fair associations of Louisiana to represent our State at the Mardi Gras ball which the Louisiana State Society sponsors in Washington each year. Tomorrow night, when they appear at the ball, they will be escorted by midshipmen from the U.S. Naval Academy at Annapolis.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the names of these young queens, the members of the king's court, and their traveling chaperons, be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the names were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

QUEENS AND SPONSORING ASSOCIATIONS

1. Elizabeth Azar, Town House Order of the Troubadours, Lafayette, La.
2. Suzanne Bienvenu, Louisiana Fur and Wildlife, Cameron, La.
3. Mariana Broussard, Southwest Louisiana Mardi Gras Association, Lafayette, La.
4. Mary Bush, Bogalusa Paper Festival, Bogalusa, La.
5. Gwendolyn Sue Cooper, Future Farmers of America, Baton Rouge, La.
6. Janet Dautrieve, Chalmette Tomato Festival, Chalmette, La.
7. Sharon Elliot, International Rice Festival, Crowley, La.
8. Joan Fagan, Louisiana Strawberry Festival, Hammond, La.
9. Charlotte Foreman, Vermilion Fair and Festival Association, Kaplan, La.
10. Glenda Hansford, Louisiana Forest Festival, Winnfield, La.
11. Sandy Ann Hebert, Yambilee Festival, Opelousas, La.
12. Rosemary Hudspeth, Cotton Festival, Ville Platte, La.
13. Carol Jackson, Louisiana Gulf Coast Oil Exposition, Lafayette, La.
14. Trudy Johnson, Delcambre Fish Industry Festival, Delcambre, La.
15. Cathy Kornegay, Louisiana Shrimp Festival and Fair Association, Morgan City, La.
16. Virginia LeBas, Louisiana Tournoi, Ville Platte, La.
17. Patsy Lowderback, Holiday in Dixie, Shreveport, La.
18. Sharon McClendon, The Rose Festival, Bogalusa, La.
19. Becky McKenzie, Louisiana Peach Festival, Ruston, La.
20. Jeanne Morris, Louisiana Livestock Show and Festival, Marksville, La.
21. Pamela Munson, Louisiana Farm Bureau Federation, Baton Rouge, La.
22. Kathy Nastasi, American Legion, Bogalusa, La.
23. Diana Mae Nicol, Louisiana Sugar Cane Festival, New Iberia, La.
24. Jane Parks, Louisiana Soybean Festival, Jonesville, La.
25. Betty Powers, Louisiana Dairy Festival, Abbeville, La.
26. Judith Waite, New Orleans Floral Trail, New Orleans, La.
27. Linda Yates, Ozone Camellia Club, Slidell, La.

MEMBERS OF THE KING'S COURT

1. Miss Rosemary Chandler, reigning Miss Catahoula.
2. Miss Donna Lynn Felps, reigning queen, Pine Tree Festival.
3. Miss Claridel Hurst, reigning Miss Wool of Louisiana.
4. Miss Lelone James, reigning queen, Natchitoches Christmas Festival.
5. Miss Jo Elizabeth Ragusa, reigning queen, Baton Rouge Easter Festival.
6. Miss Dianna Smith, reigning Miss Louisiana.
7. Miss Catherine Thompson, Miss Cover Girl, 1962 Louisiana Mardi Gras program.

CHAPERONES

Dr. Gabriel A. Ackal, chairman of arrangements, New Iberia, La.

Mrs. Gabriel A. Ackal, official chaperone, New Iberia, La.

Mrs. Milton H. Knox, official chaperone, Lafayette, La.

Mr. Milton H. Knox, Lafayette, La.
Dr. Paul Azar, Lafayette, La.
Mrs. Paul Azar, Lafayette, La.
Miss Rosemary Azar, Lafayette, La.
Miss Bea Saloom, Lafayette, La.
Mrs. Lucille Amacker, Bogalusa, La.
Mrs. J. A. Fagan, Hammond, La.
Mrs. Frank Diesi, Opelousas, La.
Mrs. Robert Munson, Cheneyville, La.
Mrs. Lee James, Natchitoches, La.
Miss Cecelia Cook, Natchitoches, La.
Mrs. J. Otto Broussard, Lafayette, La.
Mrs. Joyce S. Allen, Denham Springs, La.
Miss Margie Hannaman, Baton Rouge, La.
Miss Charlotte Rielly, Baton Rouge, La.
Mrs. Schaffer Nichal, Golden Meadow, La.

COMMUNIST TAKEOVER OF CZECHOSLOVAKIA

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, on February 24, 15 years will have passed since the Communists took over the government of Czechoslovakia. I should like to speak about that incident and about the Czechoslovakian people.

The modern history of the Czechoslovak people has had an uneven but glorious course. These worthy descendants of the great 14th century reformer Jan Hus and the equally great 17th century educator John Comenius were dauntless and daring, even when subjected to oppressive alien rule in their homeland. They carried on their struggle for freedom against the Austrian-Hungarian monarchy successfully and regained their national independence at the end of the First World War. They then reconstituted their new state, the Czechoslovak Republic, under the unfailing leadership of the late Thomas Masaryk, and in a relatively short time they made it a model democracy, a really effective force in Europe. But the able followers of the great Masaryk—Eduard Benes and Masaryk's son Jan—could not withstand the surging tide of evil and destruction. Even before the outbreak of the last war the Czechoslovak Republic became a victim of Hitler's aggression; and to the end of that world struggle the unhappy Czechoslovak people were held down by Hitler's henchmen.

At the end of the war these people had the right to expect freedom and independence. But they and their leaders were grievously disappointed when they learned that the freedom given them appeared as a gift from the masters in the Kremlin. From then on, from early 1945 until the final takeover of Czechoslovakia Republic by the Communists on February 24, 15 years ago, the Czech people and their helpless leaders worked hard to retain what little freedom they had salvaged, but, just as they were powerless by themselves to deal with Hitler's forces 10 years earlier, so in February of 1948 they were not in position to save themselves and their people from Communist enslavement. They knew and we knew that in spirit, in action, and in words these true heirs of the spirit of Masaryk and Benes have no more in common with deadly and godless communism than have the good people of this great Republic. But fate has been most unkind to Czechoslovakia during the last two decades, and today we find these stout-hearted and stanch champions of democracy in Central and Eastern Europe suffering under Communist totalitarian tyranny. Fifteen years after their enslavement by Russian communism they still hope and work for their freedom. We all join in the fond hope that they will attain their richly deserved goal, freedom and independence.

As we listen to their voices, coming out of the Tatra Mountains, we learn of the hardships they are enduring.

Czechoslovakians, do not give up hope. Have faith in the future. Believe that the day will come when the independence and the sovereignty of the Czechoslovakian people will be restored.

I am sure the people of the United States live in full sympathy with those brave and genuine devotees of freedom. We pray and hope with them that independence will again be their lot.

I personally hope and pray that our country will not forget the brave people of the captive nations, whose governments by compulsion are now Communist, but whose people want to be free. Let our relationship to them be everlastingly allied, and let not the intent of Communist Khrushchev be allowed to dilute the fidelity of those people to us and our responsibility to them.

REFUSAL BY PRESIDENT KENNEDY TO CRITICIZE REPRESENTATIVE POWELL

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the Record an article entitled "President Refuses To Criticize Powell—Gives Committee Pat on Back," written by Warren Rogers, Jr., and published in the Philadelphia Inquirer of February 22, 1963.

I ask unanimous consent also to have printed in the Record an editorial entitled "Anything Goes," commenting on the same subject, and published in today's issue of the Washington Post.

There being no objection, the article and editorial were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Philadelphia Inquirer, Feb. 22, 1963]

Gives Committee Pat on Back—President Refuses To Criticize Powell

(By Warren Rogers, Jr.)

Washington, February 21.—President Kennedy declined Thursday to criticize Adam Clayton Powell, the much-criticized Negro Congressman from Harlem, and instead gave him a pat on the back.

The President's action, at his press conference, came as no surprise.

Powell, dapper and elegant, is one of the Democratic Party's most impressive vote-getters: In 1962, he won 69.8 percent of the vote in his 18th Congressional District (Harlem), polling 58,712 to his Republican opponent's 17,981, with 7,394 left over for an independent Democrat. In 1956, in pique at local Democrats, he sent shivers throughout the party by supporting then President Eisenhower for reelection.

PERSONAL FIEF

Powell is equally powerful on Capitol Hill. The House Education and Labor Committee, which he runs like a fiefdom, controls all health-education-welfare bills except those imposing taxes. President Kennedy verbally genuflected in that direction by commenting:

"What I am most interested in is the passage of legislation which is of benefit to the people. I thought last year that committee did a good job * * * in passing out bills which were very useful.

"I would hope we would have the same kind of record this year.

"I would think that is the best answer to any attacks (on Representative Powell). I hope the chairman (Powell) holds the same view."

WILLIAMS' CRITICISM

The President was responding to a question by Charles Stone, a reporter for the Afro-American, an influential Negro newspaper. Stone's takeoff point was the recent criticism of Powell by Senator John J. Williams, Republican, Delaware.

Stone wanted to know what Mr. Kennedy thought of "the propriety of Senator Williams' attack on Powell," whether Powell's activities were "embarrassing to the White House," and what was the President's assessment of Powell "as a Congressman and as a Negro leader."

The President—smiling, as if at the length of the question—commented that Powell "has proved in his life that he is well able to take care of himself." In reply, he declined comment on the Williams-Powell dispute, declared he has "not been embarrassed by Congressman Powell," and added, "I would not attempt to rank Congressmen."

[From the Washington Post, Feb. 22, 1963]

Anything Goes

It is an appalling standard of morality that Representative Adam Clayton Powell has set forth for congressional conduct. The lowest common denominator of taste and decency appears to be good enough for him. Criticized for night club junketeering abroad on public funds, the Congressman shrugged his shoulders and said only, "I will always do what every other Congressman has done, is doing and will do." Asked if he thought it all right to have relatives on his payroll, Mr. Powell answered, "Yes, as long as more than 100 other members of the House do."

Mr. Powell is a minister of the gospel as well as a Congressman. In reply to his critics, and in particular to Senator John J. Williams, he has successively wrapped himself in the mantle of his religion and in the mantle of his race; but he has provided no refutation of the Senator's charges. It would be just as silly to call Senator Williams antireligious for having criticized a clergyman as to call him anti-Negro for having criticized a colored colleague.

In point of fact, there is something especially distasteful—and especially irreligious—in the spectacle of Mr. Powell, who has over and over again used his pulpit for political purposes, suddenly assuming an aura of sanctity and upbraiding newsmen for coming to his church and asking him some quite reasonable questions.

PRICE SUPPORT PURCHASES OF DAIRY PRODUCTS DROP SHARPLY

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, Mr. A. C. Knudtson, director of the dairy section of the Wisconsin Council of Agriculture Cooperative, has prepared a very persuasive analysis which shows that—contrary to everything we read in the newspapers—the Commodity Credit Corporation has purchased less dairy products this year than it did last year; and the difference is a very sharp one.

The fact is that we are not in such a condition that we have to adopt the kind of drastic dairy legislation which some Senators seem to be proposing.

I ask unanimous consent that this very careful analysis of the purchases by the Commodity Credit Corporation of dairy products be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Price Support Purchases Drop Sharply

(By A. C. Knudtson)

Commodity Credit Corporation price support purchases of butter totaled 8.5 million pounds for December 1962; this level of purchases amounted to only 38 percent of 22.5 million pound purchases recorded in December 1961.

December cheese purchases dropped even more sharply below year earlier levels. The CCC purchased 2.2 million pounds of cheese in December 1962 or 12 percent of the 17.9 million pounds purchased in December 1961.

Nonfat dry milk purchases in December totaled 23.1 million pounds; this was equal to 13 percent of the 165.4 million pounds purchased in December a year earlier.

The sharp declines noted in December CCC price support purchases may in part reflect erratic movements and, taken alone, these figures are not indicative that the surplus burden has eased.

However, a review of price support purchases for the last 6 months of 1962 clearly indicate a favorable trend. During the period July through December of 1962 the purchases of butter were below year earlier levels every month. And, the total butter purchases, July–December 1962, at 82.2 million pounds, were down 39 percent from the same period of 1961.

Similarly cheese purchases for the July–December 1962 period were below the 1961 level by 33 percent. And likewise, cheese purchases monthly for every month from July through December, with the exception of August, were below year earlier levels.

The purchases of nonfat dry milk at 591 million pounds during the July–December 1962 period were approximately equal to the purchases during the same period in 1961. This, however, is a substantial reversal from the situation reported for the first 6 months of 1962. During January through June, nonfat dry milk purchases totaled 709 million pounds, up 18 percent from the 603 million pounds purchased during the first 6 months of 1961.

Thus, in total, substantial evidence is accumulating that a better consumption-production balance is developing.

Undoubtedly regional summer droughts played a part in the declines noted in price-support purchases during the last 6 months of 1962. And, the aftermath of those droughts may be having some continued effect. However, it is very likely that the figures reflect a combination of drought, an adjustment in dairy cow numbers, a brighter consumption picture. Later estimates of dairy cow numbers will tend to confirm or deny this suspicion.

Since developing evidence indicates that a correcting production-consumption adjustment is occurring at 75 percent of parity, lower levels of support which have been introduced as a part of voluntary supply control programs should not be considered necessary or acceptable.

Such voluntary supply management programs should be revised in the light of present evidence and offered on the basis of a 75 percent of parity minimum level of support.

THE PRESIDENT'S TAX MESSAGE

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, yesterday, Mr. Dan Throop Smith, professor of finance at the Harvard Graduate School of Business Administration, and visiting professor at the Stanford Graduate School of Business, who was identified with the Treasury and with the economic

advisers under the Eisenhower administration, appeared before the House Ways and Means Committee and presented some views on the President's tax message. I think it is generally conceded that Dan Throop Smith is one of the real authorities in the tax field in this country. In one small package he has done a rather fabulous job in pointing out the weaknesses and the acceptable portions of the President's tax program. I ask unanimous consent that his statement before the Ways and Means Committee be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Statement Before Ways and Means Committee, House of Representatives, on the 1963 Tax Message, February 21, 1963, by Dan Throop Smith, Professor of Finance, Harvard Graduate School of Business Administration, Visiting Professor, Stanford Graduate School of Business

In the state of the Union message our tax system was properly criticized as exerting "too heavy a drag on private purchasing power, profits and employment. * * * It discourages extra effort and risk. It distorts the use of resources." These were welcome words. They built up hopes that the country would receive a balanced program for tax revision and reform.

The program actually presented in the tax message is a bitter disappointment. It proposes a net cut in revenues of over $10 billion, on top of a prospective current deficit of over $9 billion. This is a dangerous gamble with the country's currency and basic well-being

The great bulk of the revenue loss is in the lower income brackets where the only possible economic stimulation comes from an increase in disposable income. The present bottom rate of 20 percent cannot be said to discourage extra effort or risk or to distort the use of resources. The only stimulation from tax reduction in these rates is, to repeat, through artificial increases in net income.

Stimulation through increased disposable income was tried and found wanting in the 1930's. It is little more than the proverbial shot in the arm. The emphasis on disposable income ignores the fact that our unemployment is concentrated in the relatively unemployable. A surge of spending, even if it did occur, would have to go a long way to bring unskilled older people and young people who have dropped out of school into employment. Before a general boom reached a point where it would provide employment for such people, we would be well on the way up another round of inflationary wage and cost increases.

Specific measures are necessary to increase the employability of those presently unemployed. Deficit spending, to repeat, is likely to be largely ineffective in securing its desired result, while endangering the currency which is the very basis of our whole economic system.

This least effective method of tax relief, through an increase in disposable income, is also the most expensive. As indicated in table 3 of the tax message, rate relief in the bottom brackets is disproportionately large and particularly expensive. Furthermore a large part of the disproportionately small relief in the middle and upper brackets is nullified by structural changes. At the bottom a 28-percent reduction in tax liabilities is increased by structural changes to give a total reduction in tax of 39 percent. But the 22-percent relief in the upper brackets is reduced by structural changes to give a net reduction in taxes of only 9 percent.

At the very least, it would have been expected that tax relief would have been proportional in all income brackets. This point is well recognized in Secretary Dillon's statement concerning the proposed reduction in individual rates:

"The proposed across-the-board reduction in individual rates * * * will reduce tax liabilities by $11 billion (at 1963 levels of income). This reduction will be fairly spread among all income levels" (p. 36, committee print).

On economic grounds alone, the tax reduction should be greatest in the middle and upper brackets where it will increase disposable income and reduce barriers to extra effort and risk. The inappropriateness of the structural changes is demonstrated by the way it distorts the pattern of even proportionate relief. If there are to be structural changes which fall especially heavily on middle and upper brackets, on grounds of fairness as well as economics, this should be a basis for greater proportional relief in the tax rates on those incomes.

The most serious error in the entire tax program is that when the parts are put together they contradict the standard of fairness stated by the Secretary of the Treasury and at the same time nullify much of the economic benefit which might be achieved.

The state of the Union message criticized the corporate tax rate "which gives the Government today a majority interest in profits." This is a valid criticism, but it seems even more applicable to individual incomes. The President recognizes that it is bad for the Government to have a majority interest in the income of an inanimate and unfeeling corporation. But it is even worse for the Government to have a majority interest in the personal income of sentient individuals with deep human feelings. For this reason, the maintenance of a top tax rate of 65 percent is unsound and inconsistent with the rest of the program.

A reduction to a maximum of 50 percent in the individual income tax would have a negligible direct effect on the revenue. But a limit of 50 percent would be an important symbol. It would clear the atmosphere and do more than anything else to remove the tax discouragement to extra effort and risk. It is one of the few changes on which it could confidently be predicted that it would actually increase revenue through expansion of the tax base.

The country cannot risk the effect of so large a net reduction in revenue while Government expenditures are climbing. General relief from income taxation would be desirable, but it can be undertaken only if expenditures are cut or other and less discouraging forms of taxation are adopted as substitutes.

On expenditures, others better informed than I am on the details on the budget, can be more helpful in making specific suggestions. But with the economic advisers in the administration deploring the idea of any reduction in expenditures, it seems likely that proposals for budget outlays have not been as stringently reviewed as they should be.

For alternative sources of revenue, either a broad-based excise tax or a value-added tax would add balance to our entire tax system and would permit reductions in the rates in the income taxes. Even those who favor income taxation on grounds of equity, now recognize that it is the income taxes which are most likely to discourage extra effort and risk and distort personal and business decisions. All forms of taxation have their own distinctive bad effects. But with the continuing need for large total revenues in this country, we would be much better off to have a better balance in our tax system and thereby avoid a concentration on the bad effects of income taxes. This is especially true when economic growth is made a principal objective of the Nation.

Though some of the proposed structural changes are reasonable and even desirable, the combination presented in the tax program is on balance very bad. In the aggregate, the structural changes would go a long way in nullifying those parts of the reductions in tax rates which might otherwise be counted on to be most effective.

Lest these comments be considered entirely unfavorable to the tax proposals, I should like to note several of the proposed structural changes which seem thoroughly desirable. These include the proposal for income averaging for individuals, elimination of the sick pay exclusion, a floor for minor casualty losses, liberalization of the tax rule on moving expenses, the proposed current deduction for the costs of machinery and equipment used in research, the capital loss carryover, a tighter rule on multiple corporate surtax exemptions and elimination of the 2 percent penalty tax on consolidated returns. In conjunction with these last two proposals, it would also seem appropriate to remove the penalty tax on intercorporate dividends.

Much tighter tax treatment of the gains on the sale of depreciated real estate are needed. In my opinion, the changes proposed can be criticized only on the ground that they are not tight enough. Tighter rules are also needed for personal holding companies; though I am not certain of the full implications of the specific changes suggested in this area, they seem to be in the right direction and reasonable. I shall not waste the time of the committee in elaborating on the reasons given by the administration for proposals for the foregoing structural changes.

Furthermore, I believe that some limitation on personal deductions, with a floor comparable to that on medical expenses, would be useful in the interests of simplicity. It might well be acceptable as part of a package involving and making possible substantial reductions in tax rates. A broader tax base, with a lower marginal tax rate would be better than the present system, even if the total dollar tax burden were identical. But—and here I hope my criticism of the proposal is as vigorous as I can make it—if itemized deductions are to be restricted, then the only fair thing to do would be to reduce the optional standard deduction or to give a smaller proportionate reduction in the bottom bracket tax rates where the optional standard deduction is used. The proposed program does just the reverse. It increases the optional standard reduction, while reducing the itemized deductions, thereby adding to the disparity in the entire package, and the feeling of unfairness of those whose extra efforts and risks are supposed to be encouraged.

The denial of the unlimited charitable deduction seems unfortunate. The net cost of giving will be increased for people in the upper brackets through the much needed reduction in the middle- and upper-bracket rates. For those who might still be willing to commit 90 percent of their income to the service of the public, through a combination of compulsory taxation and voluntary contributions, it seems unfortunate to change a technical rule. A too big government should not begrudge the efforts of its citizens to maintain some public services through private charities. On the other hand, the prevention of real abuses, such as through valuation of contributed art objects, probably needs statutory as well as administrative changes.

It is discouraging to note the persistence of the administration in proposing the repeal of the dividend credit and exclusion. The sound arguments against repeal prevailed with this committee in 1961 and do not need to be repeated now. But the fact that the recommendation is made again emphasizes the inconsistency between the avowed desire to encourage extra effort and risk and the specific program presented.

The proposed reduction in the percentage of capital gains included in taxable income is sound. It recognizes the peculiar character of capital gains and the fact that a tax on capital gains is likely to be paid from capital, instead of income to a much greater extent than almost any other form of tax except the estate and gift taxes. The extension of the holding period to 1 year also seems reasonable, in conjunction with the reduction in rates. But the present 25-percent ceiling rate should also be reduced in line with the reduction in the percentage of gains included. A failure to bring the ceiling rate down to 15 percent (which would be in proportion to the reduction in the capital gains rate for lower bracket taxpayers) would be another example of discrimination against the higher brackets in the so-called reforms.

The minimum modification in the capital gains proposal would be to continue the principle of a ceiling rate, with the same proportionate reduction to 15 percent. This would be both fair and sound economic policy.

It would be still better to give a further reduction for really long-term gains. Gains on property held over 10 years might well be included at only 10 percent, or at most taxed at 10 percent. Such gains are especially likely to be reinvested and any tax on them is a capital levy which reduces the country's supply of capital. A low rate would minimize the drain on capital; it would free investment funds; and it would probably increase tax revenue.

The proposed imposition of a capital gains tax at death and on gifts seems peculiarly inappropriate. It would increase the capital levy at death. The idea of the presumptive realization of gains at death is an old favorite among some writers on tax theory, along with the inclusion of the rental value of owner-occupied homes and employers' contributions to pension trusts in the individual income tax base. It should be rejected, as these other theoretical proposals have been rejected. The fact that it is proposed now is doubtless another reason for the sense of frustration and resentment among those who are presently discouraged from extra effort and risk by the tax laws and who had hoped for significant relief.

Though restricted stock options have been abused under the present law, a long-term proprietary point of view by management is so desirable that it justifies some special treatment of options. Several technical changes in the law could be made which would largely eliminate the abuses while maintaining the economic advantages of putting executives in a position where their personal gain coincides with long-term growth in the economy. Repeal would be much too drastic, especially since limited changes are available.

A repeal of the capital gains treatment of cash lump-sum distributions from pension plans seem fair. But the present capital gains treatment of stock of the employer company, whether received in lump-sum withdrawals or in periodic distributions from profit-sharing plans, seems fair and desirable as a matter of economic policy. A change in the law regarding the tax treatment of stock in the employer company would discourage present corporate policies which tie in the personal interests of officers and employees with increased efficiency and long-term growth.

The proposed reduction in the corporate income tax rate is desirable. The corporation income tax is coming to be recognized more and more as a tax which, regardless of its final incidence, peculiarly burdens the efficient producers, in proportion to their efficiency. We can ill afford to continue this tax penalty on efficiency, especially in view of the increasing severity of foreign competition and our continuing problems in the balance of payments.

But the proposal to pull forward the time of payment of the corporate tax will much more than nullify the effects of the rate reduction on available corporate funds during the next 5 years. It would seem much wiser, in any attempt to minimize the revenue loss, to start to substitute in a modest way some other form of tax which falls on the inefficient as well as the efficient. The value-added tax appears to be particularly worthy of consideration as a partial substitute for the corporation income tax.

In summary, the proposed program seems on balance to be a bad one. It is much too expensive, and unnecessarily expensive, in terms of revenue forgone to give the very modest relief which is so vitally needed to reduce the present tax discouragement to extra effort and risk.

By concentrating the overwhelming bulk of the tax reduction on changes to increase disposable income, the program has adopted the most expensive and the least effective way of stimulating expansion. Voluntary increases in the deficit for this purpose is a poor gamble and a dangerous gamble.

Many of the proposed structural changes would work directly counter to the objective of removing tax penalties on enterprise. The combination of reduced deductions in the middle and upper income tax brackets with an increased optional standard deduction serves to shift the balance of relief against those who are most frustrated by the present law. Other proposed changes, most importantly the repeal of the dividend credit, the presumptive realization of gains at death, and the complete repeal of the present stock option provisions, would positively discourage effort and risk and, in the case of the additional tax on death, would reduce the Nation's supply of capital at the very time we are trying to increase capital to speed up economic growth.

In view of the earlier general statements about the objectives of tax relief and tax reform, the specific program is as surprising as it is disappointing. But we should not lose sight of the splendid objectives of tax rate revision and tax reform stated by the administration. These objectives are good. The statement of principle for reliance on the private sector of the economy, though inadequately applied, is good. This committee and the Congress have a great opportunity to make an effective tax reform, which is so greatly needed, at a cost in revenue which will not involve too great a risk. But the development of such a program will require drastic changes in the specific proposals submitted by the administration.

GENERAL DE GAULLE

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I served in the House of Representatives with a very distinguished public servant who later served as our Ambassador to Italy. I refer to the Honorable Clare Boothe Luce, a very perceptive student who diligently follows all matters in the public domain.

She has taken careful account of our relationship with France and the action taken by President de Gaulle; and she has written a number of expository articles on this subject, two of which have already been printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

She has honored me by writing me a letter from Phoenix, Ariz. The letter is dated February 2, and contains further observations by her. In the letter she enclosed an article by Drew Middleton, appearing in the New York Times, western edition, on Saturday, February 2, and still another article, by C. L. Sulzberger, in the same edition.

I ask unanimous consent that her observations and the clippings from the New York Times be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter and the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PHOENIX, ARIZ., *February 2, 1963.*

DEAR SENATOR: The New York Times of February 2, 1963, carried excellent columns by C. L. Sulzberger and Drew Middleton on the position of Charles de Gaulle, in respect of his intention to give France its own nuclear force. They were characterized by a clarity of understanding which certainly is not reflected in Times editorial—"The Aftermath of De Gaulle."

General de Gaulle is a realist. The outcome of the Cuban crisis was surely conclusive proof to him—as it should be to any sensible person—that the U.S.A. and the U.S.S.R. now have a de facto, if undeclared, nuclear peace pact, and that neither will initiate war against the other if this can possibly be prevented, because to do so means mutual obliteration. De Gaulle sees that both the U.S.A. and the U.S.S.R. will seek to limit any conflict over a third country, and that in the end it will become a subject of U.S.A.-U.S.S.R. negotiation. He does not intend, if he can help it, to have France ever become an item of U.S.A.-U.S.S.R. negotiation, like Cuba.

President de Gaulle sees quite well, that because of the U.S.A.-U.S.S.R. nuclear peace pact, the day U.S. divisions are withdrawn from Germany, France and Germany both will become U.S.S.R. "limited war" targets, unless at that time they have the instant nuclear capacity to retaliate. He does not believe that once U.S. divisions leave Europe the Soviets will fail to seek to regulate the German question by military movement. Would the U.S.A. then press the NATO buttons, which lie on the desk of the Pentagon, and initiate a nuclear strike against Russia, which would result in the destruction of the United States, Europe, and Russia? Charles de Gaulle is taking no chances. He thinks France would be safer if it became the third scorpion in the nuclear bottle.

For the rest, it is difficult to see what is Napoleonic about the desire of a President to encompass the security of his nation by securing the most effective deterrent known, the nuclear deterrent. This view, in America, is called patriotism and prudence.

As for Charles de Gaulle's contention (which the Times also calls Napoleonic) that Europe extends from its western coast line to the Urals, this is no more than the recognition of a racial and geographical fact. The U.S. proponents of the longtime U.S. policy of containment have also always asserted this same fact, and indeed it is a cogent reason why the United States should coexist with the U.S.S.R., while patiently waiting for a peaceful evolution of Moscow communism. The United States too, has wished, like Charles de Gaulle, to bring the Iron Curtain down without war. Why De Gaulle should now be vilified for holding the same view that has been held for 17 years by the Department of State, is hard to see. As for trade, European nations have traded with Russia for many years now. Italy has busily sought oil deals with Russia—but has not been publicly insulted for doing so.

General de Gaulle has not sought to break up or discard NATO. He has repeatedly insisted that France, even though it should achieve a nuclear force of her own, will continue to cooperate with NATO, and that France considers herself the faithful ally of the U.S.A.—which **De Gaulle proved** at the time of the U.S.A.-U.S.S.R. Cuban showdown. De Gaulle's crime, then, is that he asserts the national right to hold in France's own hands the command decision if the "Red or dead" question should ever suddenly confront her.

The President of the United States would be impeached if he were ever to hand over the pushbuttons for nuclear war to the French Department of War, or if he were to lay the right to take a decision concerning our national survival in the hands of NATO. Suppose NATO had been given substantial control of nuclear power and U.S. forces at the time of the Cuban crisis. What decision would it have made for President Kennedy? The question is silly, because the very thought of putting the United States in such a position seems preposterous to us. Nevertheless, the United States today, while demanding the right to conduct its own military and economic policies according to America's own self interests, at the same time demands that France shall conduct its national military and economic policies in the way that seems best to Washington and the Pentagon.

The plain fact is that there is no United States of Europe, and that America cannot force unity on the Europeans. Only the Europeans themselves can create a United Europe.

What does recall the Napoleonic concept is the attempt of the White House to conduct from Washington and the Pentagon the economic and military policies of every European nation, by exerting the pressures of its own vast military and economic strength upon them.

The rebellion against this policy began some time ago. The British have for a long time openly resented it. Charles de Gaulle has openly challenged it—and so, most recently, have the Canadians.

If the U.S.A. does not soon begin to treat the sovereign nations of the Western Alliance as though they were indeed sovereign, it may achieve still the unity of Europe. But in the end it may be a Europe united against "nuclear U.S. imperialism."

Sincerely,

Clare Boothe Luce.

[From the New York Times, western edition, Feb. 2, 1963]

De Gaulle Views a Changing Europe—But He Is Said To Believe NATO Indispensable to France for Present

(By Drew Middleton)

Paris, February 1.—Although appearances may be to the contrary, President de Gaulle, in the view of his associates, believes in the indispensibility to France of the North Atlantic Alliance under present conditions.

That does not mean, however, that he has put away his plans for changing the North Atlantic Treaty Organization or that he believes present conditions will last indefinitely.

Europe, in the French Government's view, is defended at present by the U.S. Army in Germany and 10 West German divisions. But France's leader has not abandoned his conviction that the Alliance's dogma of integrated forces must be replaced by complete cooperation among the defense systems of NATO members.

Any renewal of the general's proposals, first put forward in 1958, evidently would meet with a cool reception from other members of the North Atlantic Council. It is felt there that General de Gaulle's proposals would, if accepted, result in the creation of a tripower directorate, the United States, France and Britain, and a sharp decrease in the role of smaller allies.

VIEWED AS IRRELEVANT

French sources also rejected with equal vehemence reports in Britain, Norway and Eastern Europe that the general has approached the Soviet Union on a deal for demilitarization in Central Europe.

Such a move, the source insisted, would run counter to the whole French approach to the Communist bloc at present.

With sardonic emphasis, some diplomats have insisted that whether the French have or have not moved toward the Soviet Union is irrelevant. In their view, the Russians know that power in the West resides in the United States and that only an agreement with Washington would be meaningful for them.

WAR OF FUTURE U.S. ROLE

From the French standpoint, the command structure of NATO is a minor issue. The Government accepts the importance of having an American officer as Supreme Allied Commander. But it believes that if the United States wants her European allies to pull their full weight within the Alliance, then they must be given more responsibility for defense planning.

This, it is argued, will come only if cooperation is substituted for integration; that is, when national governments, not NATO, decide what national defense policy is to be. This is said to be the true starting point for NATO cooperation.

A distinction must be made, however, between what President de Gaulle thinks about Europe and NATO today and his view of what it will be 10 or 15 years hence. This is especially true of the development of American and Soviet policy.

Persons with every reason to know say the President has great confidence in present U.S. defense policy. He regards the maintenance of large U.S. forces in Europe 18 years after World War II as remarkable.

But the General, looking into the future, cannot be sure that 10 years hence the United States will be willing to maintain that army in Europe. He reasons that no country will continue forever to maintain large forces in another, especially if they are not indispensible to the defense of the United States.

This reasoning apparently is behind his belief that France must have an independent nuclear deterrent and his conviction that NATO must be revised to create for the future a European defense force not reliant upon American arms.

This distinction between General de Gaulle's present views and his long-term approach also govern his present attitude toward the Soviets. Much has been made of his remarks about a future Europe stretching from the Atlantic to the Urals as a result of political ties between Western and Eastern Europe.

The feeling in the French Government now is that there is nothing in present relations between Communist China and the Soviet Union to encourage a belief in an enduring split between the two.

President de Gaulle's vision of an East-West rapprochement in the future rests, it was said, upon two factors. One is open national, in addition to ideological, hostility between the two Communist giants. The second is the development within the Soviet Union of definite changes in Russian society that would make both the people and leaders more amiable to improved relations with the West.

Neither of these has happened in the French view. In consequence, General de Gaulle intends to maintain his intractable attitude on any United States or British proposals for a change in the Berlin situation.

This political intransigence, however, does not prevent the French from concluding trade pacts with the Soviet Union like the one signed today in Moscow.

[From the New York Times, western edition, Feb. 2, 1963]

Ruling Out a Western Trade War?

(By C. L. Sulzberger)

Paris, February 1.—Washington and London will probably in the end avoid an internecine Western trade war which some people had foreseen as a consequence of Britain's Common Market exclusion. Tariff barriers against French goods would be provocative and costly because they would invite retaliation. Clearly any economic efforts to bring General de Gaulle to his knees could have boomerang effects.

High quarters have contemplated a temporary trade war with all its inconveniences for the sake of ultimate Western unity goals. It appears, however, that less emotional statesmen are persuading the hotheads that economic measures against France would not help bail England out and would probably be unworkable because France itself could not easily be isolated from its five Common Market partners.

Already some of the clouds of political passion, generated in Brussels, are beginning to dissipate. Cold-blooded logic seems to be prevailing even in those capitals still shaking with fury at De Gaulle.

SHE'S STILL AN ALLY

It would be not only unwise but politically insane to try to penalize France for independent views; furthermore, France remains an ally, as it showed during the Cuban crisis when France stood up to be counted. This should not be forgotten entirely because De Gaulle interprets the shape of alliance quite differently from the rest of NATO and is being tiresome.

More pragmatically, France is booming, on the economic upsurge, while several other continental nations are beginning to slacken off. The French economy burgeons; gold reserves rise; the currency is stable; trade prospers. The temporary Achilles heel, oil, is in the process of being protected by the new trade treaty with Russia.

Nor is it sure the United States is even legally in a position to try and sequester France for retribution. Our new trade act is designed to encourage arrangements with the Common Market as an entity—although we had hoped this would include England—and not with its component members. If we strike at the Common Market in an effort to punish Gaullist policies we dislike, we will place the Benelux countries, Germany and Italy in a difficult position. They are already beaten together in an omelet from which individual eggs cannot be separated. Europe's big business has made plans for years to come on the basis of scheduled interchanges.

Were the United States, out of pique and an honorable wish to help England, to hit at this complex, we would arouse anti-American feelings and commercial resentment. We would wind up by handing De Gaulle continental support he doesn't at this moment have.

The Common Market is way ahead of schedule on tariff reductions. And, until 1966 it is subject to the veto of any single member. Under existing circumstances it obviously won't undertake any new arrangements for some time because anything proposed by the French would be negated by the others; and vice versa. But its arterial stream already pumps.

TRADE WAR FRUITLESS

A trade war would hurt ourselves, the British and their EFTA and the Common Market. It would help the Soviet Union which could hope for nothing better than an opportunity to bargain with rival blocs.

The only sensible approach is that of the so-called "empty chair." In NATO, for some time, the French seat has been but partially occupied. General de Gaulle withdrew his

Mediterranean fleet and has refused to restore divisions originally sent to Algeria. He has spurned our concept of a multilateral nuclear force.

But the alliance has accepted the habit of proceeding to plan without active French participation. In a more closely knit sense, the Common Market must now acknowledge an empty chair at Brussels. The French will veto new market ideas and the other partners will veto new French ideas—for a while. But a while is not forever.

Both the British and their five Common Market friends already tend to this less excitable approach. The five friends even hope their nuclear branch, Euratom, can soon continue discussions with London. And Britain's chief negotiator, Mr. Heath, has pledged that his Government will persevere in its efforts to "join Europe."

Ultimate unity is not to be achieved by temporary disunity. And partial unity is preferable to chaos. There is no sense in trying to cut off De Gaulle's nose to spite our own face.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McINTYRE in the chair). Is there further morning business?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I thought I had other morning business. But, somehow, some of my business gets lost in the great accumulation which is on my desk. However, tomorrow is another day—and tomorrow and tomorrow. What was it that Shakespeare said? "Tomorrow, and tomorrow, and tomorrow"——

Mr. METCALF. "Creeps in this petty pace from day to day."

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes; "this petty pace from day to day, to the last syllable of recorded time."

So, Mr. President, on that basis, I think I shall wait until the next session of the Senate to submit other matters.

ADJOURNMENT TO 11 A.M. MONDAY, FEBRUARY 25, 1963

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, I move, pursuant to the order entered on February 20, that the Senate adjourn until 11 o'clock a.m., Monday, February 25.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 1 o'clock and 10 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned, under the order entered on February 20, until Monday, February 25, 1963, at 11 o'clock a.m.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Address by Senator Morton to Georgia Press Institute

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

Hon. EVERETT McKINLEY DIRKSEN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, February 22, 1963

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a very eloquent and pointed address delivered by the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON] to the Georgia Press Institute, at Athens, Ga., on February 21, 1963.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY SENATOR MORTON TO GEORGIA PRESS INSTITUTE, CONVENED IN ATHENS, GA., FEBRUARY 21, 1963

Your profession and mine have a problem in common these days. We are becoming obsolete. News and legislation are being fully automated. There is a giant new machine that grinds out both commodities; grinds them out, serves them up, ties a bib around your neck, spoon feeds you, and even sends a doctor around to examine you if the diet happens to disagree with you.

The newspaperman is expected to pass the package along to his readers. The legislator is expected to pass the package along to his constituents. The linotype machine and the legislative machine, in this grand design, can both be replaced by rubberstamps.

The machine is the executive branch of the Government. And your old friend Arthur Sylvester, who used to be a newspaperman himself, is one of its chief operators. I'm sure you remember the development of his blueprint. It started in October, when a number of conscientious newspapermen suddenly realized that news of the Cuban crisis was being controlled by a system of censorship tighter even than that of the Second World War. At least during that war newsmen often were taken into the Government's confidence.

Arthur Sylvester had a different view. Remember his classic explanation? "News generated by actions of the Government as to content and timing are part of the arsenal of weaponry that a President has in the application of military force and related forces to the solution of political problems, or to the application of international political pressure. In the kind of world we live in the generation of news by actions taken by the Government becomes one weapon in a strained situation. The results, in my opinion justify the methods we used."

Two months later Sylvester was still sticking to his weapons of news management. This time he made a public statement that should be tacked up in every news room—either as a grim reminder or as a replacement for the usual creed of the journalist. He said that "it would seem to me basic, all through history, that it's an inherent government right, if necessary, to lie to save itself * * *."

On another occasion Sylvester elaborated this truth-strangling policy to the Air Force Association in Nevada. He said that Air Force public relations officers must manage news to keep it in harmony with the actions of the President and his top advisers.

Now I don't question for a moment the right of a government to protect vital military security secrets. We have plenty of laws to cover that and we also have the conscience of your profession. In the Second World War, for instance, many reporters were entrusted with military secrets and they kept them. But a deliberate policy of lying is something else again.

It is also something else again when Government policy, as it did at both the State Department and the Defense Department during the Cuban crisis—and as it still does at Defense—requires officials to check in with the boss every time a reporter drops around.

Arthur Krock, the distinguished correspondent of the New York Times and the respected dean of the Washington press corps, recently had this comment on muzzling by memo:

"There is a basic functional conflict involved. The responsible press is trained to recognize, and will not publish, news inimical to national security. The press knows that international crises do and must enlarge this category. But if and when a government has shown a tendency to inflate the category, and also virtually polices the contacts of officials with news reporters, both press and public are denied the legitimate information which, as the President himself acknowledged * * * 'any administration must depend on as a check on its own actions'."

That's a fine statement and, as Mr. Krock meant it, its quotation of the President is ironic. I can't recall any administration in our history that has seemed less interested in checks on its own actions than this one.

In Look magazine last August another famous newsman, Fletcher Knebel, compiled this bill of particulars. It's an overflowing menu of kingly Kennedy reactions to reporters trying to do their jobs.

Hear the charges:

"Kennedy personally has called down at least six Washington correspondents either for their writings or for their publications."

"Three Kennedy administration officials have threatened to sue newspapers."

"Attorney General Robert F. Kennedy has reproved at least four newspapermen for stories he disliked."

"The Federal Bureau of Investigation questioned six newspapermen in connection with stories concerning policies of the Kennedy administration."

"Pentagon security officials quizzed three correspondents."

"The White House canceled 22 subscriptions to the New York Herald Tribune."

"Administration officials, reporters charge, put 'the freeze' on some reporters who had offended them."

"White House Special Counsel Theodore C. Sorenson has reprimanded some newspapermen."

"White House Press Secretary Pierre Salinger has rebuked about a dozen reporters for their stories."

"White House Aid Arthur Schlesinger, Jr., a Pulitzer Prize historian, called one columnist 'an idiot.'

"Even the Kennedy women have gotten into the act. Ethel Kennedy, wife of the Attorney General, and Mrs. Jean Smith, sister of the President, braced one correspondent for his story about dunkings in the Bob Kennedy swimming pool."

"What amazes many in the huge Washington newspaper fraternity in the Kennedy era is not the fact of White House disenchantment, but the volume, extent, and dexterity of its expression. Never before have so few bawled out so many so often for so little. Says Merriman Smith, of United Press International, the senior White House correspondent, 'Every administration develops Potomac sunburn sooner or later. The main difference with the Kennedy people is that their hypersensitivity developed so early. One reason is the close attention they pay to everything written about them. How they can spot an obscure paragraph in a paper of 3,000 circulation 2,000 miles away is beyond me. They must have a thousand little gnomes reading the papers for them.' "

Its attitude toward the press is just one example, but it covers virtually the whole scale of executive excess. It descends to the pettiness of canceling subscriptions to the New York Herald Tribune when that paper's needle got too sharp. It includes the barrage of pressures we keep hearing about against newspapers in Florida which insist on printing news of the Cuba buildup in the face of White House denials of such a buildup.

It included the ridiculous but actually ominous request some months ago for voluntary self-censorship of the American press, a censorship that was couched in terms so vague that even the comic strips and the advice to the lovelorn columns could be included according to the sensitivity of a bureaucrat's feelings.

And it included what, to me, remains one of the most appalling misuses of government power on record—the incident in which the FBI was sent to rout reporters from their beds in the small hours of the morning to check the sources of their stories on Kennedy's steel crisis.

There is some drama and considerable danger in all of those incidents. There is another example of executive news management, that is far more subtle and every bit as disturbing. It involves the manipulation of facts and figures—the sort of offense for which bookkeepers can go to jail but for which bureaucrats don't seem called upon to pay at all.

As some of us recall rather vividly, there was an election last year. One of the hot issues involved was that of employment, or lack of it. Many a candidate was running on the administration's record in that area. In October, with all the precision of a military maneuver, the Secretary of Labor, Willard Wirtz, released his regular report on employment.

In an election period it was a blockbuster. It said that "over 4,500,000 more Americans have jobs than when this administration took office in January 1961." It said that unemployment was, and again I quote, "over 2 million less than in January of 1961."

No one can accurately count just how many votes those statements were worth. If they were true they were worth votes. They deserved it. If they were true.

Now you saw those figures. A lot of you undoubtedly used them. A lot of legislators used them in considering their positions as well as in appealing for votes. After all, they were Government figures. And we've come to accept Government figures as something just about sacred.

And so we went into the election and you went into your newspapers with that inspiring batch of statistics. After the voting was over, Secretary Wirtz had a little confession to make. It turns out that he hadn't really checked those figures quite as closely as he should have. Just an error, he said. No political motivation. So sorry.

Let's look at the slight errors. Remember that the official certified pasteurized, cauterized, sanitized Government figures showed 4½ million more Americans at work than when the administration took over.

Well, the actual figure turned out to be 1,224,000 almost exactly the sort of labor force increase we have been experiencing right along through normal growth in our population and markets. The little error was a little error of more than 200 percent—that's all.

What about the other figure, of 2 million less unemployed. That was a slight error too. The correct figure, the figure we got on second thought, after the elections were over, turned out to be 784,000—again, nothing startling. Of course, we have to admit that the second figure was pretty near perfect on a relative scale of New Frontier mathematics. It was slightly less than 100 percent wrong.

In Kennedyland, as in Disneyland, a 100 percent slip from reality is scarcely anything to get excited about. We should expect it.

That was an example of rewriting the present. What about rewriting history? That, too, is a function of the well-oiled machine that is attempting to operate a government by handout.

In one case it also involved a clear exposition of the theory that there is one set of rules for the ordinary people and another set altogether for the Kennedys.

You will recall that another of the big stories you weren't permitted to cover was the action in the Bay of Pigs. Four high-ranking officials of the Government were assigned the job of investigating the reasons for its failure. They were pledged to secrecy. Last month one of them broke that pledge. But it was all right, his name was Kennedy, Bobby Kennedy. In the face of an accumulation of evidence that would have impressed a mere mortal, he blandly said that the invasion simply hadn't been promised any air cover. His real thrust, of course, was that story after story pinning the responsibility for withdrawal of air support on Brother Jack's shoulders were all wrong. Kennedys can do no wrong. The invasion fiasco was all the fault of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and the CIA.

The main point here, however, is that Bobby broke the secrecy pledge. His brother backed him up, of course. But the others involved in the investigation are still wearing their muzzles.

When you can control the truth as tightly as that, who can say that the muzzle doesn't fit almost everyone in one way or another? A group of editors who recalled the President mentioning air cover in a private interview have been blandly told that their memories are faulty. No such mention was made. Where can you find truth in a situation like that?

What about the famous Saturday Evening Post article on the Cuban affair. Most of us probably remember it chiefly for its none-too-subtle stabbing of Adlai Stevenson. Personally, I think that was just a secondary matter. The real significance is in who wrote the story and what it was based upon. The authors were Stew Alsop and Charlie Bartlett, the latter being a close friend of the President and the man who introduced him to Jackie. The main burden of the story portrayed the President and his advisers as a magnificent team, operating flawlessly to face down the foe. It included access to information of such a high order of secrecy that other reporters might have reasonably expected a flying call from the FBI. Certainly it involved more sensitive areas than those that brought the FBI to reporters during the Kennedy steel crisis. But not in this case. Kennedys, you must remember, can do no wrong nor, apparently can their friends.

Much of this whole question, it seems to me, involves this kingly concept of right, of always being right, of always appearing right. It's no longer all the news that's fit to print—now it's all the news that fits the Kennedy image.

Part of that image, so far as Bobby is concerned, has been bent under the eight-wheel weight of the Teamster's Union. Brother Jack once said that any competent Attorney General could clap Jimmy Hoffa in jail. But then he appointed Bobby.

This year, in Nashville Bobby was still trying to get the job done. You know what happened. The Nashville Banner obtained a report that an attempt had been made to tamper the jury. The Banner didn't have any more reason than Bobby for wanting to see Hoffa get off the hook. But its journalistic mission and even reputation were directly challenged. Bobby directly applied pressure to keep the Banner from printing its story. The Banner refused.

The point was the same. It was the Kennedy image that was at stake and the facts had to fit.

I said at the outset that our problem was one in common. We both have our troubles in this era of executive excess.

You recall the story of the psychiatrist who admitted a beautiful blond patient into his inner sanctum. After an amorous interlude, he said, "that takes care of my problem—now what's yours?"

Well, I certainly haven't taken care of your problem, but I'd like to touch on mine. Actually it's still your problem because it is a problem in the whole structure of representative government.

Again, executive excess sums it up. The same sort of executive excess that permits bureaucrats to presume to tell you what to print, when to print it, and even how to interpret it.

Until right now there has been pretty general agreement that the success of our form of government rests on the balance of powers between the legislative, executive, and judicial branches of the Government.

But things have changed. We have some fellows in Washington who equate checks and balances with brakes—brakes on their vehicle of executive pride and power.

James McGregor Burns, a biographer of both Franklin Roosevelt and John Kennedy, has just recently called the Congress a stumbling block to democracy.

The President himself insisted that the rules of the House of Representatives had to be changed so as to not interfere with his programs, his powers, his desires.

The Budget Director has told the Congress that its Members can't consider the budget properly because they "fragment" it by dividing it into receipts and expenditures. Only the President, he says, can view the budget properly.

What's that leave for the Congress or the Senate? If the budget is opposed, or trimmed, the Congress and the Senate stand accused of obstructionism. Actually, of course, they should stand complimented for representing their own constituencies and their own consciences.

The administration's education bill is now before us. It's an omnibus bill, a fully packed grab bag of administration plans. Some of its items may be fine, others may not. Senators and Congressmen are supposed to exercise some judgment in these matters. But not in this case. The administration prefers that the bill be considered as a total piece of legislation. Take it or leave it. The Executive has spoken.

When Franklin Roosevelt tried to pack the Supreme Court with men who would bend to his executive will there was an outcry that rocked the country. There should be a similar outcry now against the attempts to pack the executive with so much excessive power that all the other branches of Government are subordinated.

When the Congress refused to pass a bill creating a Department of Urban Affairs, the President tried his best to override their wishes by establishing a department by Executive order. His first attempt didn't work but the pressure is still on, experts are still collecting in the executive offices. Most importantly, it showed a trend or tendency—a trend or tendency away from legislative government and toward executive government.

Rooted in the urban affairs proposal also was another extension of Executive excess—the notion that the great cities of America should be cut away from their State moorings and hauled into the Federal harbor.

Perhaps we could be excused for shrugging off these Executive excesses. One by one they seem relatively innocent. Together they are far from it. And nowhere is this more alarmingly apparent than in the life-or-death matters of our national security.

Key members of congressional committees recently awoke to read newspaper stories describing our negotiations to remove missile bases from Turkey and Italy; negotiations based upon Executive decisions. Just a few weeks earlier Khrushchev's demands that we remove those missiles in return for his removal of missiles from Cuba had been hooted down as another Munich. But suddenly, without consultation and without the opportunity to obtain congressional expressions, the Munich was underway, prettied up with a new set of clothes supposed to represent modernization of our weapons systems. Even if Polaris is considered sufficient, extra insurance in Italy and Turkey won't hurt.

The Nassau agreement with Prime Minister Macmillan was another example of negotiation in sunny secrecy, of decisions which affect us all but which were arrived at quickly, perhaps precipitously by the Executive alone. Perhaps Congress should feel no pain at being left out of that one, however. The President's own Secretary of State, or at least the man who carries the title, wasn't even present. Maybe that was a simple division of labor. The President took on the job of imperiling Mr. Macmillan's government and the Secretary of State was held in reserve to do the same sort of job on Canada's Prime Minister.

When, if ever a disarmament agreement finally is reached, one wonders what razzle-dazzle of public relations will be used to break the news to the American people and their representatives in Congress. What are the guidelines for disarmament? I hope they are clearer, more solid, and more definitive than the shifting sands of the Executive's statements and press releases on the subject.

But where, instead, are the policymolding position papers on disarmament being written? Many of them are coming from the special, private research corporations which, through contracts with the executive branch, are springing up like mushrooms, or toadstools, in Washington today.

The excuse for these groups is simple. Government can't pay the salaries needed to get top rate men, it's said. So the private corporations are founded, with massive Government contracts, to provide the thinkers who wouldn't work for ordinary wages. These policy technicians have become virtually a counterpart government, responsible to no constituency but fully integrated into the Executive's excessive power structure.

This shadow government is just another way around Congress, another way toward an all-powerful Presidency no longer harnessed to Government institutions responsible for their decisions but free to use the whole Nation as the guinea pig for special theories and special interests.

Other Presidents have had their kitchen cabinets, even their shadow cabinets. This one is the first to have a shadow government.

Of course, there are excuses aplenty for this Executive excess. One is that our society has become so complex it can no longer rely on the cumbersome machinery of representative government to get its job done. There seems to be some magic mathematical limit on individual responsibility.

Planning is another magical excuse word. Our society is said to be so interdependent that it can't rely on individual responsibility to accomplish the integrated planning needed to get us moving.

I think those excuses are nonsense. The root of the growing tree of Executive power is simply distrust of the people.

The New Frontier is simply a frontier of fear—fear that people can no longer manage their own lives, fear that they might take some course other than that plotted and planned in the all-wise, all-knowing ivory tower.

Taxes are described in this new philosophy as not merely a means to raise revenues but as a way to distribute income. The free market doesn't do a good enough job. People spend their money on the wrong things. The solution? Simple, let the Government take the money and spend it for you.

It's really ironic. In this period of our history, since the turn of the century anyway, our average incomes have doubled and doubled again. Our individual education has grown from a grade school average to a high school average and is now approaching a full college average.

Nevertheless, we find that the prevailing theory is that we are not smart enough to handle our own affairs. We must be protected from ourselves.

We can't insure ourselves against sickness or old age. The Government must do it and do it all, without options, given its way.

We can't build our own schools in our own communities. The Federal Government must do it for us.

We can't settle our own affairs in business and industry, the Federal Government alone is wise enough.

We can't raise prices, we can't lower prices, we can't work short hours, we can't work long hours. We can't be trusted even to take someone to lunch for a business chat.

That's the nub of it. Mistrust of the people.

One of the administration's economic oracles spelled it out in a book when he wrote that "the marginal tax dollar has currently a much higher social utility than the marginal pay-envelope dollar. The former goes to schools; the latter into tail fins." The author was Alvin Hansen, professor emeritus of political economy at Harvard.

Simple, isn't it? Government is wise. Individuals are foolish.

Nobody denies that some people do act foolishly. Even people in government act foolishly. Even Senators do—although rarely.

But today we see public policy based upon the sweeping assumption that most people would behave foolishly if left to their own devices and not herded by government.

The picture is alarming. Parents would stop sending their children to school and then they'd stop building schools. Everybody over 50 would be ground down under the poverty induced by a misspent youth. Our cities would lie in rubble because the residents wouldn't have enough sense or money to keep them up. The countryside would be a tangle of weeds because there would be no one to tell the farmers what to grow. Detroit would be making cars 50 feet long, costing $50,000 which would be sold in great numbers to the 6 or 7 bloated millionaires who had made billions by merging railroads and forcing everyone to buy high cost steel. Why there might even be some extremists in our midst who would hold meetings to criticize the Soviet Union.

Far fetched? It may sound so, but it is precisely this sort of mistrust of the individual that lies behind every attempt to usurp the power of the people in order to protect the people.

I prefer, and I think most Americans either do or will, when given a clear choice, prefer the sort of government envisioned by the late Supreme Court Justice Jackson when he said, "It is not the function of our Government to keep the citizens from falling into error; it is the function of the citizens to keep the Government from falling into error."

Fortunately, we can still do this. The Congress may be unpopular in some quarters, but it is still there. And you still elect it. You, in particular, are involved, because you still cover those elections and can accord to them the importance they deserve.

This is not a partisan matter. My good friend, the late great Democratic Senator Robert Kerr was alert to it when he said that he honored the President but he honored the wishes of the people of Oklahoma more.

He was sensitive to it also when he obtained a virtually unprecedented unanimous vote from his colleagues to try to prevent the President from administering the public works funds as a tool of political pressure.

Our challenge today is to the structure of our government, its entire system of checks and balances, not just to one party or another. The Presidency is fast becoming a party unto itself, aloof, alone, lordly, and disdainful of the individual. Rule by machine has been a disgrace in some of our major cities. But rule by machine is becoming a crisis in our capital. The population explosion may be a peril elsewhere in the world but it is the power explosion in Washington that is the peril here.

Government of the people, by the people, and for the people is the great goal of our liberty. We must not now, on pretexts of efficiency or new problems and new answers abandon that goal and substitute in its place government of the Executive, by the Executive and for the Executive—or, to put it bluntly, government of the Kennedys, by the Kennedys, and for the Kennedys.

SENATE

Monday, February 25, 1963

The Senate met at 11 o'clock a.m., and was called to order by the Vice President.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father, God, in whose eternal peace, which passeth understanding, our fretful, restless spirits are quieted. The fierce tempests sweeping across our sadly sundered world leave us weary with watching and guarding the ramparts of freedom. These testing times find out our every weakness.

In the midst of our bewilderment and perplexity, we turn to the infinite calm of Thy changeless love, that we may find inner sustenance, wells of living water restoring our souls, and bringing serenity under strain, as in Thy name we battle for the truth.

In these confused times, when so often the props of moral support seem bending with the weight of secular ambitions, make plain to our understanding that legislative enactments alone are futile, and that except they be undergirded with a sustaining strength, not our own, we labor in vain to bring order out of the chaos which threatens to engulf the selfish schemes of willful men who have not Thee in all their thoughts.

We ask it in the Name which is above every name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. Mansfield, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Friday, February 22, 1963, was dispensed with.

CALL OF LEGISLATIVE CALENDAR DISPENSED WITH

On request of Mr. Mansfield, and by unanimous consent, the call of the Legislative Calendar was dispensed with.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the Internal Security Subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Employment and Manpower Subcommittee of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare be authorized to meet during the remainder of the week while the Senate is in session.

The subcommittee is conducting hearings on the Youth Employment Act of 1963, which is S. 1.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, it is my understanding that, under the agreement reached last week, the time limitation begins at 12 o'clock.

The VICE PRESIDENT. That is correct. The order is as follows:

Ordered, That, effective on Monday, Feb. 25, at 12 o'clock noon, debate on the amendments to be offered by the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] (S. Res. 91, 92, and 93) to S. Res. 90, to amend rule XXV, be limited to 2 hours to be equally divided between the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK].

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be a morning hour until 5 minutes to 12, and that there be a 3-minute limitation on statements during that period.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none; and it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

Report on Federal Civil Defense Contributions Program

A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Department on the Federal contributions program, for the quarter ended December 31, 1962 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

Report on Provision of War Risk Insurance and Certain Marine and Liability Insurance for the American Public

A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the provision of war risk insurance and certain marine and liability insurance for the American public, as of December 31, 1962 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Commerce.

Report of Federal Aviation Agency

A letter from the Administrator, Federal Aviation Agency, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Agency, covering the fiscal year 1962 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Commerce.

Amendment of Section 902, Federal Aviation Act of 1958, Relating to Penalties for Falsification of Records

A letter from the Administrator, Federal Aviation Agency, Washington, D.C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 902 of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 relating to penalties for falsification of records, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Commerce.

Additional Authority for Federal Communications Commission

A letter from the Acting Chairman, Federal Communications Commission, Washington, D.C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend paragraph (2) (G) of subsection 309(c) of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, by granting the Federal Communications Commission additional authority to grant special temporary authorizations for 60 days for certain nonbroadcast operations (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Commerce.

Report of Civil Aeronautics Board

A letter from the Chairman, Civil Aeronautics Board, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Board, covering fiscal year 1962 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Commerce.

Report of Office of Coal Research

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the Office of Coal Research, dated February 15, 1963 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Report on Lead and Zinc Mining Stabilization Program

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the lead and zinc mining stabilization program, for the year ended December 31, 1962 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Delivery of Water to Lands in the Third Division, Riverton Reclamation Project, Wyoming

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation permitting the Secretary of the Interior to continue to deliver water to lands in the third division, Riverton reclamation project, Wyoming (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Robert O. Nelson and Harold E. Johnson

A letter from the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation for the relief of Robert O. Nelson and Harold E. Johnson (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Visa Petitions of Certain Aliens

A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, reports concerning visa petitions which that Service has approved, according to beneficiaries of such petitions first preference classification (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Report on Positions Filled in Certain Grades of Classification Act of 1949

A letter from the Chairman, United States Civil Service Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report from the Office of Emergency Planning on positions filled under the Classification Act of 1949, in grades GS-16, GS-17, and GS-18, for the calendar year 1962 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A resolution of the House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Kentucky; to the Committee on Appropriations:

"HOUSE RESOLUTION 8

"Concurrent resolution relating to Devils Jump Dam

"Whereas a condition of intense economic distress and basic regional underdevelopment exists in an area of southeastern Kentucky and northeastern Tennessee; and

"Whereas an intensive total development program is underway in this area in which the efforts of local, State, and Federal interests are devoted more aggressively than ever before to every aspect of area development; and

"Whereas one real opportunity to create the necessary foundation for significant achievement within this overall program exists in the potential of the proposed Devils Jump Dam and Reservoir; and

"Whereas the Devils Jump project would accelerate and expand the success of the development program in this area more than any other factor, and, at the same time, the overall development activity would add to and multiply the benefits of this project far beyond those calculated in establishing the feasibility now recognized by the U.S. Corps of Engineers; and

"Whereas the Devils Jump project, by itself, would create an unusual and outstanding mountain area reservoir in the existing national forest area of unexcelled natural and unspoiled scenic beauty, and this project represents a unique opportunity to establish a major conservation and recreation area; an outstanding fish and wildlife habitat; and a principal tourist mecca, all with great benefit to the economy to this area and the Nation: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Kentucky (the Senate concurring therein)*:

"SECTION 1. That the U.S. Bureau of the Budget is requested to approve appropriation for the planning and developing of Devils Jump Dam and Reservoir.

"SEC. 2. That the General Assembly of the Commonwealth of Kentucky petitions the Appropriations Committees in the U.S. Congress to include the Devils Jump Reservoir in appropriations of the 88th Congress.

"SEC. 3. That the U.S. Corps of Engineers is requested to expedite construction and development of Devils Jump Dam and Reservoir to assist in the economic development of southeastern Kentucky and northeastern Tennessee.

"SEC. 4. That the congressional delegation from the Commonwealth of Kentucky use their good offices to achieve the ends mentioned in section 1 to 3, preceding.

"SEC. 5. That the clerk of the Kentucky House of Representatives be directed to forward a copy of this resolution to the President of the U.S. Senate, the Speaker of the U.S. House of Representatives, Kentucky Members of the U.S. Congress, to the chairmen of the Senate and House Appropriations Committees, to the Director of the U.S. Bureau of the Budget, and to the Chief of the U.S. Corps of Engineers."

Resolutions of the Senate of the State of Alaska; to the Committee on Commerce:

"SENATE RESOLUTION 15

"Resolution relating to the promotion of State commercial fishery research and development projects

"Whereas the several States of the Union have taken the initiative in fishery research and development; and

"Whereas the off-shore fishery resources of the United States are the proper concern of both the Federal and State Governments; and

"Whereas the Federal Government has an obligation to encourage and assist in State research and development programs; and

"Whereas a bold program to assist the States in their efforts to develop their fishery resources is essential to the proper conservation and utilization of this basic resource: Therefore be it

"*Resolved,* That the Congress is respectfully requested to give favorable consideration to S. 627 introduced by the Honorable E. L. Bartlett, U.S. Senator from Alaska, a bill to promote State commercial fishery research and development projects; and be it further

"*Resolved,* That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the Honorable Lyndon B. Johnson, Vice President of the United States and President of the Senate; the Honorable John W. McCormack, Speaker of the House of Representatives; the Honorable Warren G. Magnuson, chairman of the Senate Committee on Commerce; the Honorable Herbert Bonner, chairman of the House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries; and the Members of the Alaska delegation in Congress.

"Passed by the senate February 19, 1963.

"Frank Peratrovich,
"*President of the Senate.*

"Attest:

"Evelyn K. Stevenson,
"*Secretary of the Senate.*"

"Senate Resolution 16

"Resolution relating to the food-for-peace program

"Whereas the Federal Government has embarked on a program of Food for Peace to facilitate the purchase of domestic food surpluses for sale to needy foreign nations; and

"Whereas the use of high-protein value fishery products would contribute to the value of the program; and

"Whereas the development of the offshore fishery resources of the United States can be protected only if expanding domestic and foreign markets are provided and developed; and

"Whereas the untapped offshore fishery resources of the United States are being harvested by foreign powers unconcerned with proper conservation measures: Therefore be it

"*Resolved,* That Congress is respectfully requested to give favorable consideration to S. 702, introduced by the Honorable Warren G. Magnuson with Senators E. L. Bartlett and Theodore Kennedy, a bill which would make a domestically produced fishery product available for distribution under the food-for-peace program to assist that program and the development of the domestic fishery resource; and be it further

"*Resolved,* That copies of this resolution be sent to the Honorable Lyndon B. Johnson, Vice President of the United States and President of the Senate; the Honorable John W. McCormack, Speaker of the House of Representatives; the Honorable Warren G. Magnuson, chairman of the Senate Committee on Commerce; the Honorable Herbert Bonner, chairman of the House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries; and the Members of the Alaska delegation in Congress.

"Passed by the senate February 19, 1963.

"Frank Peratrovich,
"*President of the Senate.*

"Attest:

"Evelyn K. Stevenson,
"*Secretary of the Senate.*"

A resolution of the Senate of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts; to the Committee on Finance:

"Resolution Memorializing the Congress of the United States To Enact Legislation To Reduce Federal Taxes With Tax Reforms

"Whereas an early Federal tax reduction coupled with tax reforms will increase the strength and vigor of our economy; and

"Whereas the stimulus of this proposed Federal tax reduction with tax reforms would release investment capital, create jobs, increase consumer spending and raise profits; and

"Whereas it will release the economy from the shackles of an overly repressive income tax structure so that it can move ahead to full capacity utilization of its human and physical resources; and

"Whereas it would avoid the recurring recessions that have characterized the postwar years; and

"Whereas the Commonwealth as well as every other State will benefit from the new tax program through additional job opportunities and more money to spend: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved,* That the Massachusetts Senate respectfully urges the Congress of the United States to enact legislation to reduce Federal taxes with tax reforms as proposed by the President of the United States; and be it further

"*Resolved,* That copies of these resolutions be transmitted forthwith by the secretary of the Commonwealth to the President of the United States, to the Presiding Officer of each branch of the Congress, and to the Members thereof from this Commonwealth.

"Adopted by the senate February 11, 1963.

"Thomas A. Chadwick,
"*Clerk.*

"Attest:

"Kevin H. White,
"*Secretary of the Commonwealth.*"

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of South Dakota; to the Committee on Finance:

"House Concurrent Resolution 6

"Concurrent resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States and His Excellency, the President of the United States, regarding the lumber industry in the United States

"Whereas there is no shortage of timber for the production of lumber and related items in the United States; and

"Whereas there is a need to increase the cut from overmature forest to prevent excessive loss from decay, disease, and other causes; and

"Whereas U.S. lumber manufacturing firms pay high wages and provide working conditions equal to or better than similar firms in other countries; and

"Whereas lumber manufacturing firms in the United States are losing their home markets to foreign firms, especially Canadian, due to the latter's advantages, including: Depreciated currency, low stumpage rates, noncompetitive bidding, less costly and restrictive forest practices, lower wage rates, high tariff rates on lumber shipped to Canada, low charter rates for coastwise and intercoastal shipping, a cooperative Government; and

"Whereas lumber imports from Canada are increasing yearly at an alarming rate and now constitute about one-sixth of the annual consumption of lumber in the United States; and

"Whereas unemployment in the lumber industry of the United States is increasing with resultant loss of wages to the workers, loss of taxes and income to taxing bodies and communities: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved,* That the House of Representatives of the 38th Legislature of the State of South Dakota (the Senate concurring therein) do hereby memorialize the Congress of the United States and His Excellency, the President of the United States, to give immediate attention to and request action necessary to place the lumber industry of the United States on an equitable and competitive basis with foreign manufacturers through the use of a quota system or other means, including the requirements that imported lumber be marked to show the country of origin, to the end that domestic manufacturers are not placed at a disadvantage with resultant loss of markets, reduction of employment, loss of taxes, and deterioration of communities; and be it further

"*Resolved,* That certified copies of this concurrent resolution be forwarded to the Presiding Officers of both Houses of the Congress, to His Excellency, the President of the United States, and to the Representatives in the Congress from the State of South Dakota.

"Nils A. Boe,
"*President of the Senate.*
"Mills P. Jensen,
"*Secretary of the Senate.*
"Paul E. Brown,
"*Speaker of the House.*
"W. J. Matson,
"*Chief Clerk.*"

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Alaska; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

"Senate Joint Resolution 1

"Resolution ratifying a proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the qualification of electors

"*Resolved by the Legislature of the State of Alaska,* That the following article proposed as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States by the Congress of the United States through the adoption of Senate Joint Resolution 29, 87th Congress, 2d session, is ratified:

" 'Article—

" 'Sec. 1. The right of citizens of the United States to vote in any primary or other election for President or Vice President, or for Senator or Representative in Congress, shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or any State by reason of failure to pay any poll tax or other tax.

" 'Sec. 2. The Congress shall have power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation'; and be it further

"*Resolved,* That the secretary of state of Alaska shall send a certified copy of this resolution to the Administrator of General Services and direct facsimile copies to the President of the United States, the Presiding Officers of the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States, and the Members of the Alaska delegation in Congress.

"Passed by the senate February 1, 1963.

"Frank Peratrovich,
"*President of the Senate.*

"Attest:

"Evelyn K. Stevenson,
"*Secretary of the Senate.*

"Passed by the house February 11, 1963.

"Bruce Kendall,
"*Speaker of the House.*

"Attest:

Patricia R. Slack,
"*Chief Clerk of the Senate.*

"Approved by the Governor February 18, 1963.

"William A. Egan,
"*Governor of Alaska.*"

A resolution of the General Assembly of the State of Rhode Island; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

"HOUSE RESOLUTION 1009

"Resolution ratifying the proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the payment of a poll tax or any other tax as a qualification to voting

"Whereas the House of Representatives of the United States and the U.S. Senate, by the constitutional vote of two-thirds of each House concurring therein, did enact at the 2d session of the 87th Congress of the United States of America in 1962, a proposed amendment of the Constitution of the United States; and

"Whereas said proposed amendment was submitted to the States for ratification and said proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America is in the following words, to wit:

" 'ARTICLE —

" 'SECTION 1. The right of citizens of the United States to vote in any primary or other election for President or Vice President, for electors for President or Vice President, or for Senator or Representative in Congress, shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or any State by reason of failure to pay any poll or other tax.

" 'SEC. 2. The Congress shall have power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation': Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That the General Assembly of the State of Rhode Island and Providence Plantations does hereby ratify the above proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That certified copies of this resolution be immediately transmitted by the secretary of state of the State of Rhode Island and Providence Plantations to the President of the United States, the President of the Senate of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, and the Administrator of General Services of the United States."

A resolution of the House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service:

"RESOLUTION MEMORIALIZING CONGRESS AND THE POSTMASTER GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES TO PREVENT THE AUTOMATION OF OUTGOING MAIL FROM THE POST OFFICES IN THE CITIES AND TOWNS IN BRISTOL COUNTY

"Whereas on January 22, 1963, outgoing mail from the post offices in the cities and towns of Bristol County will be processed at the automated post office in Providence, R.I.; and

"Whereas this new process will result in a job loss as well as a huge dollar loss to said cities and towns, with no guarantee of improved mail service: Therefore be it

"*Resolved*, That the House of Representatives of Massachusetts urgently requests that the Congress of the United States take such action as may be necessary to prevent the automation of outgoing mail in said cities and towns; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the Postmaster General of the United States rescind the order providing for the processing of outgoing mail from said post offices in said cities and towns at the automated post office in Providence, R.I.; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That copies of this resolution be sent forthwith by the secretary of the Commonwealth to the President of the United States, to the Postmaster General, to the Presiding Officer of each branch of Congress and to each Member thereof from this Commonwealth.

"Adopted by the house of representatives, February 12, 1963.

"WILLIAM C. MAIERS,
"*Clerk*.

"Attest:

KEVIN H. WHITE,
"*Secretary of the Commonwealth*."

A resolution adopted by the Board of Supervisors of the County of Hawaii, Hilo, Hawaii, favoring authorization for further and continued work projects and restoration programs in and for the City of Refuge National Historical Park, Hawaii; to the Committee on Public Works.

REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

The following reports of a committee were submitted:

By Mr. SYMINGTON, from the Committee on Armed Services, with an amendment:

S. Res. 79. Resolution to authorize a study by the Committee on Armed Services on strategic and critical stockpiling; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

By Mr. STENNIS, from the Committee on Armed Services with amendments:

S. Res. 75. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Armed Services to investigate certain matters relating to national defense; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. ANDERSON, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

Manuel F. L. Guerrero, of Guam, to be Governor of Guam.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, from the Committee on Armed Services, I report favorably a total of 465 appointments and promotions of general and flag officers in the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Air Force. I ask that these names be printed on the Executive Calendar.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. EDMONDSON in the chair). The nominations will be placed on the Executive Calendar, as requested by the Senator from West Virginia.

The nominations are as follows:

Lt. Gen. Samuel Leslie Myers, Army of the United States (major general, U.S. Army), to be placed on the retired list;

Lt. Gen. John Knight Waters, Army of the United States (major general, U.S. Army), to be assigned to a position of importance and responsibility designated by the President, in the grade of general;

Maj. Gen. Theodore John Conway, U.S. Army, and Maj. Gen. Charles Granville Dodge, U.S. Army, to be assigned to positions of importance and responsibility designated by the President, in the grade of lieutenant general;

Maj. Gen. Albert Watson II, U.S. Army, and Maj. Gen. Harvey Herman Fischer, U.S. Army, to be assigned to positions of importance and responsibility designated by the President, in the rank of lieutenant general;

Robert E. Cushman, Jr., and sundry other officers, for promotion in the Marine Corps;

Brig. Gen. William Joseph Hixson, Jr., and sundry other officers, for promotion as Reserve commissioned officers of the Army;

Rear Adm. Kleber S. Masterson, U.S. Navy, to be Chief of the Bureau of Naval Weapons in the Department of the Navy;

Edwin S. Miller, and sundry other officers, for promotion in the Navy;

Maj. Gen. James C. Jensen (brigadier general, Regular Air Force), and sundry other officers, for appointment in the Regular Air Force;

Rear Adm. George C. Towner, U.S. Navy, to have the grade of vice admiral on the retired list;

Rear Adm. Ephraim P. Holmes, U.S. Navy, to be assigned to a position of importance and responsibility designated by the President, in the rank of vice admiral;

Col. Donald J. Campbell, Air Force Reserve, and sundry other officers, for appointment in the Air Force Reserve;

Maj. Gen. William Henry Sterling Wright, U.S. Army, and Maj. Gen. Ben Harrell, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army), to be assigned to positions of importance and responsibility designated by the President, in the grade of lieutenant general;

Maj. Gen. George Robinson Mather, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army), and sundry other officers, for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States;

Maj. Gen. Alfred Dodd Starbird, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army), to be assigned to a position of importance and responsibility designated by the President, in the rank of lieutenant general; and

Francis Stevens Greenlief, Army National Guard of the United States, for promotion as a Reserve commissioned officer of the Army.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, in addition, I report favorably 21,719 nominations in the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Air Force, in the grade of colonel and below. Since these names have already been printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in order to save the expense of printing on the Executive Calendar, I ask unanimous consent that they be ordered to lie on the Secretary's desk, for the information of any Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The nominations will lie on the desk, as requested by the Senator from West Virginia.

The nominations are as follows:

Jimmie M. Anderson, and sundry other officers, for promotion in the Regular Army of the United States;

Thomas C. Fleury, and sundry other persons, for appointment in the Regular Army;

Harold R. Aaron, and sundry other officers, for promotion in the Regular Army of the United States;

Robert A. Campbell, and sundry other officers, for promotion in the Marine Corps;

Raymond L. Abbott, and sundry other officers, for promotion in the Regular Air Force;

Gene W. Oehlman, and sundry other persons, for appointment in the Regular Air Force; and

Asher D. Abelon, and sundry other Naval Reserve Officers' Training Corps candidates, for appointment in the U.S. Navy.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. JOHNSTON:

S. 902. A bill to provide for further research relating to new and improved uses for farm and forest products and for development of new crops, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

S. 903. A bill for the relief of Anna B. Dreyspring; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COOPER:

S. 904. A bill to provide for an appropriation of a sum not exceeding $175,000 with which to make a survey of proposed national parkway extensions or connection to Blue Ridge Parkway, Great Smoky Mountains National Park, Foothills Parkway, Mammoth Cave National Park, and Natchez Trace Parkway, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 905. A bill for the relief of Jasper Y. Willoughby; and

S. 906. A bill for the relief of Maria Carraro; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FONG (for himself and Mr. Inouye):

S. 907. A bill to provide a method for regulating and fixing wage rates for employees of Pearl Harbor Naval Shipyard in Hawaii; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. FONG (for himself, Mr. Inouye, Mr. Bartlett, and Mr. Gruening):

S. 908. A bill to amend section 305(b) of title 37, United States Code, relating to foreign duty pay; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. LAUSCHE:

S. 909. A bill for the relief of Mrija Lovsin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McNAMARA:

S. 910. A bill to prohibit discrimination on account of sex in the payment of wages by employers engaged in commerce or in the production of goods for commerce and to provide for the restitution of wages lost by employees by reason of any such discrimination; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. McNamara when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. HILL:

S. 911. A bill to increase the opportunities for training of physicians, dentists, and professional public health personnel, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. MOSS:

S. 912. A bill approving a compromise and settlement agreement of the Navajo Tribe of Indians and authorizing the tribe to execute and the Secretary of the Interior to approve any oil and gas leases entered into pursuant to the agreement; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. PASTORE:

S. 913. A bill for the relief of Anthony F. Bernardo and Ambrose A. Cerrito; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. METCALF (for himself and Mr. Mansfield):

S. 914. A bill to provide compensation to the Crow Tribe of Indians, Montana, for certain lands embraced within the present boundaries of the Crow Indian Reservation, for the validation of titles, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. Metcalf when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. CASE:

S. 915. A bill to encourage planning and the programing, on a coordinated basis, of land-use projects in the development of metropolitan areas, and to require, after a reasonable preparatory period, the approval by the Housing and Home Finance Administrator of workable programs as a condition to the granting of Federal assistance in the financing of certain projects; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

(See the remarks of Mr. Case when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. HUMPHREY:

S. 916. A bill for the relief of Elizabeth J. Padilla; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey (by request):

S. 917. A bill to authorize the Housing and Home Finance Administrator to provide additional assistance for the development of comprehensive and coordinated mass transportation systems in metropolitan and other urban areas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

(See the remarks of Mr. Williams of New Jersey when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MONRONEY (for himself and Mr. Edmondson):

S. 918. A bill to authorize the construction, operation, and maintenance of the Canton project, Oklahoma, by the Secretary of the Interior; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. Monroney when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. ANDERSON (for himself, Mr. Yarborough, and Mr. Mechem):

S.J. Res. 49. Joint resolution authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to carry out a continuing program to reduce nonbeneficial consumptive use of water in the Pecos River Basin, in New Mexico and Texas; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. Anderson when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION

JOINT COMMITTEE ON CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE

Mr. SMATHERS submitted a concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 23) to create a Joint Committee on Central Intelligence, which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

(See the above concurrent resolution printed in full when submitted by Mr. Smathers, which appears under a separate heading.)

RESOLUTIONS

FUNDS FOR ADDITIONAL STAFF FOR COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND PUBLIC WELFARE

Mr. HILL submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 95); which was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

Resolved, That the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare is authorized from March 1, 1963, through January 31, 1964, to employ one additional assistant chief clerk, seven additional professional staff members, and nine additional clerical assistants to be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate at rates of compensation to be fixed by the chairman in accordance with section 202(e), as amended, of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, and the provisions of Public Law 4, Eightieth Congress, approved February 19, 1947, as amended.

DESIGNATION OF MAJORITY AND MINORITY MEMBERS ON STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE SENATE

Mr. MANSFIELD (for himself and Mr. Dirksen) submitted a resolution (S. Res. 96) designating majority and minority members on standing committees of the Senate, which was considered and agreed to.

(See the above resolution printed in full when submitted by Mr. Mansfield, which appears under a separate heading.)

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS OF SENATE SELECT COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD (for himself and Mr. Dirksen) submitted a resolution (S. Res. 97) appointing members of the Senate Select Committee on Small Business, which was considered and agreed to.

(See the above resolution printed in full when submitted by Mr. Mansfield, which appears under a separate heading.)

EQUAL PAY FOR EQUAL WORK REGARDLESS OF SEX

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to provide equal pay for equal work, regardless of sex.

This bill is the administration bill. It is similar to a measure which passed both Houses during the last Congress but which died because of the press of business at the end of the last session.

I believe that this bill is absolutely essential if we are to provide the kind of economic structure which I believe a democracy requires. The majority of employers in this country do pay equal wages for equal work.

But all too many employers—unfortunately aided at times by misguided employee representatives—have exploited their female employees by the payment of discriminatory wages.

This exploitation not only creates a severe hardship for the nondiscriminatory employer who must compete with the employer who pays unequal wages, but also contributes to poor morale among workers and substandard living conditions in a large number of families where the woman is the principal wage earner.

I am hopeful that both Houses of Congress will quickly ratify their action of last year by the speedy passage of this measure.

I ask unanimous consent that the bill, along with the accompanying letter and statement of the Secretary of Labor, be printed in the Record.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill, with accompanying letter and statement, will be printed in the Record.

The bill (S. 910) to prohibit discrimination on account of sex in the payment of wages by employers engaged in commerce or in the production of goods for commerce and to provide for the restitution of wages lost by employees by reason of any such discrimination, introduced

by Mr. McNAMARA, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

DECLARATION OF PURPOSE

SEC. 2. (a) The Congress hereby finds that the existence in industries engaged in commerce or in the production of goods for commerce of wage differentials based on sex—

(1) depresses wages and living standards for employees necessary for their health and efficiency;

(2) prevents the maximum utilization of the available labor resources;

(3) tends to cause labor disputes, thereby burdening, affecting, and obstructing commerce;

(4) burdens commerce and the free flow of goods in commerce; and

(5) constitutes an unfair method of competition.

(b) It is hereby declared to be the policy of this Act, through exercise by Congress of its power to regulate commerce among the several States and with foreign nations, to correct the conditions above referred to in such industries.

DEFINITIONS

SEC. 3. When used in this Act—

(a) "Person" means an individual, partnership, association, corporation, business trust, legal representative, or any organized group of persons.

(b) "Commerce" means trade, commerce, transportation, transmission, or communication among the several States or between any State and any place outside thereof.

(c) "Goods" means goods (including ships and marine equipment), wares, products, commodities, merchandise, or articles or subjects of commerce of any character, or any part or ingredient thereof, but does not include goods after their delivery into the actual physical possession of the ultimate consumer thereof other than a producer, manufacturer, or processor thereof.

(d) "Produced" means produced, manufactured, mined, handled, or in any other manner worked on in any State; and for the purposes of this Act an employee shall be deemed to have been engaged in the production of goods if such employee was employed in producing, manufacturing, mining, handling, transporting, or in any other manner working on such goods, or in any closely related process or occupation directly essential to the production thereof, in any State.

(e) "Employ" includes to suffer or permit to work.

(f) "Employer" means any person having twenty-five or more employees in any place of employment and includes any person acting directly or indirectly in the interest of an employer in relation to an employee, including any person having the authority to hire, dismiss, and control the work of such employee, but shall not include the United States or any State or political subdivision of a State.

(g) "Employee" includes any individual employed by an employer.

(h) "Wage" paid to any employee includes the reasonable cost, as determined by the Secretary, to the employer of furnishing such employee with board, lodging, or other facilities, if such board, lodging, or other facilities are customarily furnished by such employer to his employees: *Provided*, That the Secretary is authorized to determine the fair value of such board, lodging, or other facilities for defined classes of employees and in defined areas, based on average cost to the employer or to groups of employers similarly situated, or average value to groups of employees, or other appropriate measures of fair value. Such evaluations, where applicable and pertinent, shall be used in lieu of actual measure of cost in determining the wages paid to any employee.

(i) "State" includes a State of the United States, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, American Samoa, Guam, Wake Island, the Canal Zone, and Outer Continental Shelf Lands defined in the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act.

(j) "Secretary" means the Secretary of Labor.

(k) "Labor organization" means any organization of any kind, or any agency or employee representation committee or plan, in which employees participate and which exists for the purpose, in whole or in part, of dealing with employers concerning grievances, labor disputes, wages, rates of pay, hours of employment, or conditions of work.

SEC. 4. (a) No employer having employees engaged in commerce or in the production of goods for commerce shall discriminate, in any place of employment in which his employees are so engaged, between employees on the basis of sex by paying wages at a rate less than the rate at which he pays wages to any employee of the opposite sex in such place of employment for equal work on jobs the performance of which requires equal skills, except where such payment is made pursuant to a seniority or merit increase system which does not discriminate on the basis of sex: *Provided*, That an employer who, on the date of this enactment, is paying a wage rate differential which would be in violation of the Act on its effective date may adjust the lower wage rate as follows:

(1) On the effective date of this Act, all wage rate differentials shall be reduced by an amount equal to 10 per centum of the higher wage rate in effect on the date of enactment;

(2) One year from the effective date of this Act, remaining wage rate differentials shall be reduced by an amount equal to 15 per centum of the higher wage rate in effect on the date of enactment;

(3) Two years from the effective date of this Act, any remaining wage rate differential shall be removed.

(b) No employer shall discharge, cause to be discharged, discipline, or otherwise discriminate against any employee on account of any action taken by such employee to invoke, enforce, or assist in any manner in the enforcement of the provisions of this Act. No labor organization, or its agents, representing employees of such an employer shall cause or attempt to cause such an employer to discriminate against an individual in violation of this Act.

ADMINISTRATION AND ENFORCEMENT

SEC. 5. (a) The Secretary of Labor—

(1) shall prescribe such regulations and rules as he deems necessary and appropriate for the administration of this Act, including regulations to protect against violation of the wage standards of any other applicable law and to safeguard wage levels in the elimination of wage rate differentials under section 4(a) of this Act;

(2) may investigate and gather data regarding the wages, hours, and other conditions and practices of employment in any industry subject to this Act, and may enter and inspect such places and such records (and make such transcriptions thereof), question such employees, and investigate such facts, conditions, practices, and matters as he may deem necessary or appropriate to determine whether any person has violated any provision of this Act, or which may aid in the enforcement of the provisions of this Act;

(3) if a violation is found to exist, the Secretary may, before taking further action hereunder, by informal methods of conference, conciliation, and persuasion, endeavor to eliminate discriminatory practices prohibited by this Act and to secure restitution of wages which an employee would have received had the employee been paid at the rate paid the opposite sex as required by this Act and reinstatement to employment where an employee has been discharged in violation of this Act;

(4) may enter and serve upon any employer or labor organization found by the Secretary, after notice and hearing in conformity with sections 5, 6, 7, and 8 of the Administrative Procedure Act, to be engaged in or to have engaged in any violation of section 4 or section 7 of this Act, an order requiring such employer or labor organization (A) to cease and desist from such violation, and requiring such employer (B) to pay to each employee who has been adversely affected a sum equal to the amount of the wages due such employee at the rate paid to an employee of the opposite sex, plus up to an additional amount as liquidated damages not to exceed the back wages found to be due; and

(5) may enter and serve upon any employer found by the Secretary, after notice and hearing as provided in paragraph (4) hereof, to have discharged or otherwise discriminated against any employee on account of any action taken by such employee to invoke, enforce, or assist in any manner in the enforcement of the provisions of section 4 or section 7 of this Act, an order requiring such employer to reinstate such employee, or to remove such discrimination, and to pay to such employee a sum equal to the amount of the wages of which such employee has been deprived by reason of such discharge or other discrimination plus up to an additional amount as liquidated damages not to exceed the back wages found to be due.

(b) For the purposes of any investigation or proceeding conducted under this Act, the provisions of section 307 (relating to the attendance of witnesses and the production of books, papers, and documents) of the Federal Power Act of June 10, 1920 (16 U.S.C. 825f), shall be applicable to the jurisdiction, powers, and duties of the Secretary of Labor or any officers designated by him.

(c) The Secretary shall have power to petition any United States district court, within the jurisdiction of which the violation of this Act occurred or such person resides or transacts business, for the enforcement of any order issued under this section and for appropriate temporary relief or restraining order, and shall file in the court the record in the proceedings. Upon filing of such petition, the court shall cause notice thereof to be served upon such person, and thereupon shall have jurisdiction of the proceeding, and shall have power to grant such temporary relief and restraining order as it deems just and proper, and to make and enter a decree enforcing, modifying, and enforcing as so modified, or setting aside in whole or in part the order of the Secretary. No objection that has not been urged before the Secretary or hearing officer, shall be considered by the court, unless the failure or neglect to urge such objection shall be excused because of extraordinary circumstances. The findings of the Secretary with respect to questions of fact, if supported by substantial evidence on the record considered as a whole, shall be conclusive. If either party shall apply to the court for leave to adduce additional evidence and shall show to the satisfaction of the court that such additional evidence is material and that there were reasonable grounds for the failure to adduce such evidence in the hearing before the Secretary or hearing officer, the court may order such additional evidence to be taken before the Secretary or his hearing officer and to be made a part of the record. The Secretary may modify his findings as to the facts, or make new findings, by reason of additional evidence so taken and filed, and he shall file such modified or new findings, which findings with respect to questions of fact, if supported by substantial evidence on the record considered as a whole, shall be conclusive, and shall file his recommendations, if any, for the modification or setting aside of his original order. Upon the filing of the record with it, the jurisdiction of the court shall be exclusive and its judgment and decree shall be final, except that the same shall be subject to review by the appropriate United States court of appeals.

(d) Any person aggrieved by a final order of the Secretary issued under paragraphs (4) and (5) of subsection (a) of this section may obtain a review of such order in any United States district court within the jurisdiction of which the action in question was alleged to have been engaged in or such person resides or transacts business by filing in such court within sixty days of such order a written petition praying that the order of the Secretary be modified or set aside. A copy of such petition shall be forthwith transmitted by the clerk of the court to the Secretary, and thereupon the aggrieved party shall file in the court the record in the proceeding, certified by the Secretary. Upon the filing of such petition, the court shall proceed in the same manner as in the case of an application by the Secretary under subsection (c) of this section, and shall have the same jurisdiction to grant to the Secretary such temporary relief or restraining order as it deems just and proper, and in like manner to make and enter a decree enforcing, modifying, and enforcing as so modified, or setting aside in whole or in part the order of the Secretary; the findings of the Secretary with respect to questions of fact if supported by substantial evidence on the record considered as a whole shall in like manner be conclusive.

(e) When granting appropriate temporary relief or a restraining order, or making and entering a decree enforcing, modifying, and enforcing as so modified, or setting aside in whole or in part an order of the Secretary, as provided in this section the jurisdiction of courts sitting in equity shall not be limited by the Act entitled "An Act to amend the Judicial Code and to define and limit the jurisdiction of courts sitting in equity, and for other purposes", approved March 23, 1932 (47 Stat. 70; 29 U.S.C. 101–115).

SUPERVISION OF WAGE PAYMENTS

SEC. 6. (a) The Secretary of Labor is authorized to supervise the payments of any amounts owing to any employee which have been withheld in violation of this Act. Any sum owed an employee and paid to the Secretary under this Act shall be held in a separate account and shall be paid, on order of the Secretary, directly to the employee. Any such sum not paid to an employee because of inability to do so within a period of three years shall be covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.

(b) No wage restitution shall be required with respect to any violation of this Act for any period which preceded by more than two years the date of commencement by the Secretary of Labor of the first administrative or judicial proceeding relating thereto.

(c) No person shall be subject to any liability for the commission of any action prohibited by this Act if he pleads and proves that the action complained of was in good faith and in conformity with and in reliance on any written interpretation or opinion of the Secretary.

GOVERNMENT CONTRACTS

SEC. 7. (a) Except as hereinafter provided in this subsection, in any contract made and entered into by any executive department, independent establishment, or other agency or instrumentality of the United States, or by the District of Columbia, or by any corporation all of the stock of which is beneficially owned by the United States (all of which are referred to hereinafter as agencies of the United States), for the manufacture or furnishing of any materials, supplies, articles, or equipment, in any amount exceeding $10,000, there shall be included stipulations under which the contractor (1) is required to compensate all persons employed by him in the manufacture or furnishing of such materials, supplies, articles, or equipment, in conformity with the requirements of this Act, and (2) shall be subject to all other provisions of this Act. The Secretary of Labor may, when he deems that special circumstances in the national interest so require, exempt a contracting agency from the requirement of including the provisions of this subsection in any specific contract.

(b) No contract shall be awarded by the United States or any agency thereof to any person finally determined to have violated any of the provisions of this Act or any stipulation entered into in compliance with subsection (a) of this section, or to any firm, corporation, partnership, or association in which such person has a controlling interest, until or unless the contractor has satisfied the Secretary of Labor that he is complying with his obligation hereunder and that he has in good faith established and will carry out wage policies and practices to assure future compliance. The Comptroller General is authorized and directed to distribute to all agencies of the United States a list containing the names of persons ineligible for contract awards under this section. The Secretary of Labor shall cause the names of persons whom he determines to have made a satisfactory showing of present and future compliance with this Act to be removed from this list.

POSTING

SEC. 8. Every employer subject to this Act shall keep a copy of this Act posted in a conspicuous place in or about the premises where any employee is employed. Employers shall be furnished copies of this Act by the United States Department of Labor on request without charge.

APPROPRIATION

SEC. 9. There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act.

EFFECTIVE DATE

SEC. 10. This Act shall take effect one hundred and twenty days after the date of its enactment.

The letter and statement presented by Mr. MCNAMARA are as follows:

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF LABOR,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, D.C., February 14, 1963.
Hon. LYNDON B. JOHNSON,
President of the Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I am transmitting an administration proposal to prohibit discrimination on account of sex in the payment of wages by employers having employees engaged in commerce or in the production of goods for commerce, and to provide for the restitution of wages lost by employees by reason of any such discrimination, and for other purposes. I am also enclosing a summary statement explaining the need for the legislation and the purpose and effect of the bill.

The existing practice of some employers in paying discriminatory wage rates with respect to the same or comparable work has an undesirable effect on many aspects of the life of our Nation. The attached draft is intended to work toward the elimination of these effects in interstate commerce channels. Among other compelling reasons for its enactment is the necessity to utilize fully the skills of women in our labor force. The number of women workers is expected to increase to more than 30 million within the next 10 years.

The proposal is in the nature of new legislation and would not amend any existing law.

Yours sincerely,
W. WILLARD WIRTZ,
Secretary of Labor.

STATEMENT IN EXPLANATION OF A BILL TO PROVIDE EQUAL PAY WITHOUT DISCRIMINATION ON ACCOUNT OF SEX IN ENTERPRISES ENGAGED IN INTERSTATE COMMERCE

This proposal, which is on the legislative program of the Department of Labor, has as its purpose the elimination of discrimination in wage rates based on sex where men and women are performing comparable work for the same employer. Employers having employees engaged in commerce or the production of goods for commerce and Government supply contractors whose contracts exceed $10,000 would be subject to its coverage. "Employer" is defined to mean any person having 25 or more employees in any place of employment.

Those employers would be prohibited from paying a lower wage to one employee than they pay to an employee of the opposite sex in the same place of employment for work of equal character requiring equal skill. The bill would permit employers to adjust these lower wage rates over a period of time, not to exceed 2 years. Further, labor organizations would be prohibited from causing or attempting to cause an employer to discriminate against an employee in violation of the act.

Express provision is made for the Secretary of Labor, who is to administer and enforce the act, to eliminate discriminatory practices through conference and persuasion and to secure voluntary wage restitution. It is contemplated that educational and compliance programs will be emphasized to secure maximum employer and labor organization cooperation.

The Secretary would be vested with the authority to make rules and regulations necessary for the administration of the act. Regulations which might be necessary to protect against any application of the act in contravention of the wage standards of any other applicable law and to safeguard wage rate levels in eliminating differentials would be included in this authority.

When compliance is not forthcoming, the Secretary is authorized to hold administrative hearings with respect to alleged violations. He could issue cease and desist orders and orders for the restitution of wages withheld in violation of the act, plus up to an equal amount as liquidated damages. The Secretary is also authorized to issue orders requiring reinstatement of, and wage restitution to, any employee discharged for assisting in the enforcement of the act. If necessary, the Secretary could seek a court order requiring compliance with his orders.

In addition, an employer would be subject to the sanction of ineligibility for Government contracts after a final determination of violation of the act. This sanction would not be applied and would be immediately discontinued when the Secretary of Labor determined that the employer has come into compliance and would, in all likelihood, continue to comply in the future.

Equal-pay legislation is an essential step toward the administration's goals of economic growth and social justice. The need and justification for a Federal equal pay law, a matter of common knowledge, was well substantiated by the record of testimony in hearings on equal-pay legislation in the 87th Congress.

The burden of the present unfair practice of paying lower wage rates for the same or comparable work to workers of one sex falls most heavily on those least able to bear it, that is, women who do not belong to unions. The large proportion of working women susceptible to this discriminatory treatment is shown by the fact that only 3.5 million of the 24.5 million women presently employed are covered by collective bargaining agreements.

A significant number of employers freely acknowledge payment of wage rates on a double standard basis. When reporting job vacancies to employment offices, many employers in States without equal-pay legislation list vacancies with a single job title but with a higher hiring rate for men than for women. It cannot be expected that discriminatory pay practices will voluntarily be discontinued on any widespread basis in the foreseeable future because these practices are evident in new companies and in new industries.

The present practice of paying discriminatory wage rates on the basis of sex has an undesirable effect on many aspects of the life of our Nation. It tends to affect adversely the general purchasing power and the living standard of workers. It offers an unfair competitive advantage for employers who follow this practice. The resulting low wage levels often prevents the maximum utilization of worker skills to the detriment of morale and, in turn, of production.

The contributions employed women are currently making to our economy are vital to the production of essential goods and services. The demand for these goods and services will grow materially in the next decade when the national population is expected to increase by 28 million persons. Six million more women workers will be required by 1970 to meet growing consumer needs. This means that within 10 years there will be at least 30 million women in the labor force.

To facilitate the effective use of these workers and to encourage the highest development of their skills, widespread application of the equal-pay principle should be promoted by Congress. This principle is of vital importance in times of economic recession when the employment of women at a lower wage rate than men on comparable jobs may be used to undercut the wage rate of men or cause their displacement.

In addition, discriminatory wage practices are inconsistent with the fundamental American principle of justice. The knowledge of their existence reflects on the prestige of the United States in affairs around the world.

It is of great importance that Congress act without further delay to eliminate these practices from the channels of interstate commerce.

COMPENSATION TO THE CROW TRIBE OF INDIANS, MONTANA

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and the senior Senator from Montana [Mr. Mansfield], I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to provide compensation to the Crow Tribe of Indians, Montana, for certain lands embraced within the present boundaries of the Crow Indian Reservation, for the validation of titles, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent that the bill may be printed in the Record.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the Record.

The bill (S. 914) to provide compensation to the Crow Tribe of Indians, Montana, for certain lands embraced within the present boundaries of the Crow Indian Reservation, for the validation of titles, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. Metcalf (for himself and Mr. Mansfield), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) there is hereby authorized to be transferred in the Treasury of the United States, to the credit of the Crow Tribe of Indians, Montana, and expended pursuant to the exclusive decision of the Crow Tribal Council, for its use and benefit, and the benefit of its members, a sum of money as hereinafter provided. Said sum is intended to include both just compensation and other justifiable considerations for terminating and extinguishing all of the right, title, estate, and interest of said Indian tribe in and to the lands of that part of the present boundaries of the Crow Indian Reservation to be determined by a survey to be made, as hereinafter provided.

(b) That the United States shall cause a survey to be made of the perimeter boundaries of the tract of land within the present boundaries of the Crow Indian Reservation, which lies easterly of the lands which were allotted on the Crow Indian Reservation and the one hundred and seventh degree longitude west of Greenwich meridian.

(c) The Secretary of the Interior shall appraise the fair market value of said lands as surveyed, taken by this Act, and said fair market value shall be determined as the effective date of this Act, and shall also appraise the fair rental value of said lands from the year of 1891 to the effective date of this Act; that said appraisals shall be made within ninety days after the effective date of this Act, and offer that sum to the Crow Tribe. The Crow Tribe may also appraise the fair market value of the lands taken by this Act and shall also appraise the fair rental value of said lands from the year of 1891, to the effective date of this Act, and determine whether the appraisal of the Secretary of the Interior is acceptable to the Crow Tribe. If the offer of the Secretary of the Interior is not accepted by the Crow Tribe within sixty days after receiving notice of the appraisal of the Secretary of the Interior, the Crow Tribe is authorized to commence in a court of competent jurisdiction an action for determining the just compensation payable for such taking of said lands.

Sec. 2. All minerals, including oil and gas, on all unentered and vacant lands within the area described in section 1 hereof, are hereby reserved for the benefit of the Crow Tribe of Indians, which shall be leased or otherwise disposed of under the laws and regulations relating to Indian trust lands.

Sec. 3. All patents, trust patents, and conveyances, and other instruments of title, heretofore issued, executed, and made upon said lands by the United States, within the area described in section 1 hereof, are hereby validated, ratified, and confirmed.

Sec. 4. Neither the initial transfer of such funds to the tribe, as provided herein, nor any subsequent per capita distribution thereof, shall be subject to taxation.

Sec. 5. The Secretary of the Interior is authorized to perform any and all acts necessary to carry out the provisions and purposes of this Act.

PROGRAMING OF LAND-USE PROJECTS IN DEVELOPMENT OF METROPOLITAN AREAS

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to encourage planning and the programing, on a coordinated basis, of land-use projects in the development of metropolitan areas.

The bill would accomplish these objectives by requiring:

First. That locally initiated, comprehensive plans for long-range development of individual communities be submitted to the Federal Housing Administrator for his approval as a condition to the grant of Federal financial assistance for public projects in such communities. This requirement would become effective 2 years, after the enactment of the new legislation.

Second. That after 4 years following enactment, locally initiated comprehensive plans of an areawide character be submitted to the Federal Housing Administrator for his approval as a condition to the grant of Federal financial assistance for public projects in individual communities within metropolitan areas designated by the Administrator.

Expanding population and other pressures in the Nation's metropolitan areas often result in public projects which are poorly planned, uncoordinated and wasteful. Projects undertaken without adequate coordination and planning too often serve conflicting purposes or fail to meet future needs.

Where careful, coordinated planning precedes the undertaking of projects, costly mistakes can be avoided and the realization of desirable goals hastened.

The Federal Government assists the States and their localities through a variety of programs in the financing of many public projects. Accordingly, it has a proper interest in seeing that they are soundly conceived and effectively executed. It has a responsibility to ensure, in every possible and appropriate way, that the taxpayer's dollar is wisely spent. It is impossible to justify the expenditure of billions of dollars of Federal funds for highways and mass transportation, intercepting sewers, sewage treatment plants, housing and urban renewal projects, airports, purchase of open land, and a wide variety of other federally assisted works, in the absence of overall plans for the use of private, local, State, and Federal resources in meeting the growing problems of these urban areas.

I am not alone in this view. In 1962, a distinguished panel known as the Municipal Manpower Commission urged this same approach.

The commission, financed by the Ford Foundation at the urging of the American Municipal Association, the American Society of Planning Officials, and the American Institute of Planners, was first headed by James E. Webb, now Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, and, subsequently, by John J. Corson, distinguished management consultant. The commission included such other leaders from the ranks of business, government, and education as William O. Baker, scientist and vice president of research for the Bell Telephone Laboratories; Edward W. Barrett, dean of the Graduate School of Journalism, Columbia University; William H. Draper, Jr., investment banker; Luther H. Gulick, director of the Institute of Public Administration; Ralph Lazarus, president of Federated Department Stores; Robert E. Merriam, author and former White House assistant; Quigg Newton, president of the University of Colorado and former mayor of Denver, and John A. Perkins, president of the University of Delaware.

In its discussion of the relationships of the Federal Government to metropolitan areas, the commission said:

> The impact of Federal activities on metropolitan areas requires better coordination of its programs. The Federal Government must establish some organizational machinery for this purpose. * * * It is patent that the Federal Government either must take immediate steps in this direction or must accept responsibility for accentuating the metropolitan problem even while it strives to resolve segments of the whole problem.
>
> The Federal Government's partnership role should also involve increased incentive for effective State and local action on metropolitan problems. Several actions point the way: (1) Federal grants are available now for metropolitan planning, and (2) local governments must have a program of community improvement (workable program) and must be making progress toward carrying out that program in order to receive grants for urban renewal and community facilities. Similarly, any area receiving aid for mass transportation must have a program for the development of a comprehensive and coordinated mass transportation system. In the new open space program, grants are dependent upon the existence of an areawide plan.

After the commission's report, Congress passed an amendment to the Federal Aid Highway Act requiring the Secretary of Commerce to withhold Federal highway funds in the absence of continuing comprehensive planning for coordination of highway and mass transportation in urban areas of more than 50,000 population.

The commission's report continued:

> The Federal Government can give substantial impetus to local efforts by applying such requirements to other programs of Federal assistance, and by specifying high procedural standards for the conduct of these activities at the local level. In particular, Federal assistance should be conditioned on plans covering the whole metropolitan area, rather than only single units of government. The purpose of Federal grants should be to help communities to do the things they want to do, but to do them better and on an adequate scale. The basic initiative must remain with the local community leaders—both civic and governmental.

In 1954, at former President Eisenhower's urging, Congress made the so-called workable program part of the housing law of the land.

Today, the workable program means that a community which wants Federal dollars for individual urban renewal projects, for mortgage insurance commitments in redevelopment areas and for public housing to relocate families, must show that it has an overall plan for community improvement. Once the plan is approved by the Housing Administrator, Federal funds may be made available on a project-at-a-time basis, consistent with the plan.

Essentially, my bill proposes an extension of this concept. I believe the requirements it imposes for planning in the housing field should be expanded to include other programs where local communities rely on the Federal Government for assistance. And I believe the new requirement should properly emphasize planning on an areawide basis.

As urban life grows more complex, the pressures of population surges compound the efforts of the central city to grapple with the difficult problems left in their wake. But these problems of urban overcrowding, of slums and downtown decay, of depressed business and industrial sections are not the problems of the city core alone. For the problems of growth extend across city lines into suburbia. The older suburbs face the same fate as the downtown cities. The rapid changes caused by the mobility of our population obliterate the old boundaries, and new problems of urban growth are leapfrogging into once rural areas.

The workable program idea was first recommended to President Eisenhower in late 1953 by the President's Advisory Committee on Government Housing Policies and Programs, which included such housing experts as Albert M. Cole, former Administrator of HHFA; Norman P. Mason, his successor at HHFA under Eisenhower; Aksel Nielsen, Denver banker; James W. Rouse, former president of the Mortgage Bankers Association; Richard J. Gray, former head of the Building Trades, AFL, and Alexander Summer of Teaneck, N.J., builder.

On the workable program, excerpts from the report of the President's Committee said:

> During the past three decades the number of Federal programs directly affecting the physical development of our urban communities has steadily increased. With two or three notable exceptions there has been little if any conscious effort on the part of Federal agencies administering these programs to cope with the local problems created by the cumulative effect of the Federal programs upon the communities, and very little concern as to whether the local developments undertaken with Federal financial assistance were in conformity with the general plan for the development of the community as a whole.
>
> There are several Federal programs which vitally affect community development and which to insure most efficient use of Federal funds, if for no other reason, should include as one of the basic requirements the existence of an up-to-date general plan of the community and conformity of Federal or federally aided projects with the general plan.
>
> The accumulative effect of these programs upon the community is such as to place upon the Federal Government the responsibility for actively promoting and encouraging adequate and sustained local planning to insure the coordination of the Federal or federally aided projects with each other and with local plans for future development, as well as to insure the existence and use of a plan and a continuing planning agency as a focal point for consultation and advice in each community with respect to plans for future development of the community.

And the President's Committee found that:

> HHFA is in a position to do more for the orderly and economical development of the urban communities of the country than any Federal agency has done to date. * * * This new coordinated planning approach to the solution of urban problems by the Federal Government would give new and concrete meaning to the national housing policy. No longer would the Federal Government neglect its responsibility to encourage sound local planning and to recognize the integrity of sound local plans locally prepared, a responsibility which is implied but not specifically required by so many Federal aid statutes.

Testifying before the House Banking Committee in 1954 in a successful effort to convince Congress of the need for the workable program concept, then Administrator Cole of HHFA stressed the pragmatic approach to the planning problems of communities which seek Federal assistance.

Mr. Cole said:

> This workable program requirement is intended to stimulate and encourage the community to undertake to develop better and more up-to-date codes and regulations and vigorous, effective enforcement of those codes in an effort to see that its housing is brought within at least minimum decent standards. It is intended to stimulate and encourage the community to undertake positive measures to bring about the conservation and rehabilitation of neighborhoods and areas that are economically sound and worth saving in order to prevent the creation of new slums, and to see that practical steps are taken to assure adequate rehousing and fair treatment for families who may be displaced by subsequent clearance or rehabilitation operations.
>
> There should be no straitjacket applied by reason of the workable program requirement. From those cities more advanced in bettering their conditions we should expect more. From those cities just beginning this long road to removing slums and blight and to preventing it through realistic codes and aggressive enforcement, we should be understanding of the time and effort it takes to develop and put into effect a full-scale local attack. We should take full account of varying local situations and the different circumstances confronting the large and the smaller city. What we are seeking, I think, is a bona fide and practical expression of the community's own projected program to deal with its own problems, presented in good faith and with the firm resolve to carry that program through to accomplishment.

Since enactment of the workable program, the Housing Agency which administers it has followed this practical, step-at-a-time approach. I would like to see the same logic applied to the expanded workable program concept which I advocate for the coordination of all Federal aid programs, particularly as it applies to areawide planning.

The new requirements proposed by my bill, far from slowing the processing of applications from local, State, and regional to Federal agencies would, I believe, speed up the process. For communities and regional agencies would know in advance that coordination of their activities must lead to the kind of comprehensive planning which the Federal Government would require. Differences would be ironed out more promptly than they are today, with more effective utilization of all our resources.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that following my formal remarks there be included in the RECORD editorials from the Newark, N.J., Evening News and the Passaic, N.J., Herald News, as well as a recent newsletter I wrote on the subject for release January 30, 1963.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that following the last-mentioned material the full text of the bill be printed in the Record.

There being no objection the material was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Newark (N.J.) Evening News, Feb. 2, 1963]

GETTING TOGETHER

Senator Case is proposing legislation to bring coordination and commonsense to Federal programs affecting urban and suburban areas. He wants to end especially the present competition for land by Government agencies. His bill would provide that no Federal funds would be made available for any project unless it is consistent with a "locally drawn, long-range workable program."

The "workable program" concept, already the controlling factor in Federal decisions on slum clearance and urban renewal, would be extended to airports, water systems, sewers, and sewage plants and other public works.

Although Mr. Case doesn't mention highways, he implies he wants them brought into his coordination system. For he cites as an example of cross-purpose the original plans for constructing the Essex East-West Freeway as an elevated road. This type of construction, which is all the Federal Bureau of Public Roads would pay for, would have damaged redevelopment programs approved by the Federal Housing Administration.

As another example of lack of consultation, Mr. Case points to the conflicting aims of the Department of the Interior, the Federal Aviation Agency, and the Army Corps of Engineers in plans affecting the Great Swamp in Morris County.

One further difficulty that Mr. Case may want to cover in his bill arises from the fact that highway planning and other projects frequently affect more than one municipality and create serious disagreements among them. Coordination among Federal agencies is necessary, but there should be some machinery for achieving it at the local and regional level as well.

[From the Passaic (N.J.) Herald-News, Feb. 4, 1963]

THIS IS OUR UNCLE SAM

Report of U.S. Senator Case, of New Jersey, on lack of coordination between Federal Government agencies:

"Since September 1960, the Department of the Interior has been acquiring land for its new national wildlife refuge to preserve the great swamp area in its present unspoiled form. But in July 1961 the Federal Aviation Agency publicly testified to the suitability of the great swamp area over other sites for the location of a fourth major airport for the greater New York area. And the Army Corps of Engineers, which is putting the finishing touches on a major flood control plan for the Passaic River Valley, proposes the drainage of the great swamp area and its consequent use for industrial and residential purposes as a partial justification for their proposal to build the Little Falls-Nutley Tunnel to regulate overflow. Has there been consultation between these three separate Federal agencies? None is discernible. Frequently lost sight of, I fear, are the will and the desires of the communities and the larger areas which would be affected by federally assisted public works projects."

Senator Case thinks something should be done about it and has proposed legislation which would require coordination between Federal agencies and "restore the initiative to the community, the county, the urban area and the State for the best utilization of their own resources." It will be a real accomplishment if he can make the agencies pull together in harness, with the community in the driver's seat.

Ever since the Port of New York Authority first announced its preference for a major jetport in the great swamp area of Morris County, N.J., the calm of that conservationists' paradise has been disturbed by almost continuous debate.

On a quieter note, but to me, equally disturbing, is the conflict among several Federal agencies, each with a different interest, as to the use of the great swamp area. The elimination of conflicts of this sort is one of the objectives of a bill I am introducing next week which would utilize existing programs of Federal financial assistance to help promote orderly community and regional growth in urban and suburban areas.

Since September 1960, the Department of the Interior has been acquiring land for its new National Wildlife Refuge to preserve the great swamp area in its present unspoiled form. But in July 1961 the Federal Aviation Agency publicly testified to the suitability of the great swamp area over other sites for the location of a fourth major airport for the greater New York area. And the Army Corps of Engineers, which is putting the finishing touches on a major flood control plan for the Passaic River Valley, proposes the drainage of the great swamp area and its consequent use for industrial and residential purposes as a partial justification for their proposal to build the Little Falls-Nutley tunnel to regulate overflow. Has there been consultation between these three separate Federal agencies? None is discernible.

Frequently lost sight of, I fear, are the will and the desires of the communities and the larger areas which would be affected by federally assisted public works projects.

The legislation which I propose would require the formulation of carefully coordinated, locally initiated community and regional land-use plans on a long-range basis before the Federal Government contributes tax dollars (often in the hundreds of millions) for any specific land-improvement or public works project.

And, by assigning to a single Federal official, the Housing and Home Finance Administrator, the responsibility for determining the extent of Federal financial participation in such locally initiated land-use plans, my bill would put an end to the present uncoordinated competition for land space by competing agencies.

Northern New Jersey residents will recall the controversy over the design of the East-West Freeway across Essex County as another example of lack of coordination between Federal agencies.

In that fight, the Federal Bureau of Public Roads refused to allow an additional several million dollars for the below-grade construction of this vital interstate route through Newark, Orange, and East Orange. But these communities protested the proposed elevated construction of this highway across their boundaries, pointing out correctly, in my judgment, that the extensive slum clearance and housing redevelopment going on in each of these cities—to which the Federal Government is contributing millions through the Housing Agency—would be jeopardized. For elevated structures tend to depress property values and create slums where they pass through already densely populated urban areas.

The freeway will, finally, be built below grade, even as was the Garden State Parkway through this highly urban area. But only an ingeniously devised local solution fought off the threat posed by a divided Federal responsibility—with no thanks due the Federal Government for the happy outcome.

My bill would attack these inconsistencies by expanding the workable program concept, which was initiated by former President Eisenhower. Under existing law, before Federal financial help for slum clearance, urban renewal or public housing is extended to any locality, the community itself must present a workable program for dealing with both the causes and the consequences of slums and urban decay. Once the community has presented an approved workable plan, the Federal Government makes available its various resources for individual projects.

Why confine this sensible requirement for planning to federally aided housing projects alone? Under my bill, after 2 years, no Federal funds would be made available to a community unless the project—whether it be for a new airport, water system, sewage treatment plant, intercepting sewer or other public works projects—is consistent with a locally drawn, long-range workable program.

And after 4 years, the Housing Administrator may, as appropriate, require a workable program for urban areas as a whole.

Not only would the bill encourage coordination of local plans on an areawide basis, help resolve conflicts among Federal agencies and eliminate much duplication of effort and wasteful spending, but it would restore the initiative to the community, the county, the urban area and the State for the best utilization of their own resources.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the editorials, newsletter, and bill will be printed in the Record.

The bill (S. 915) to encourage planning and the programing, on a coordinated basis, of land-use projects in the development of metropolitan areas, and to require, after a reasonable preparatory period, the approval by the Housing and Home Finance Administrator of workable programs as a condition to the granting of Federal assistance in the financing of certain projects, introduced by Mr. Case, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and ordered to be printed in the Record as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That expanding population pressures in many of the Nation's metropolitan areas frequently result in developmental activities which are poorly planned, uncoordinated, and wasteful. Projects undertaken without adequate coordination and planning too often serve conflicting purposes or fail to meet future needs. Where careful planning and coordination between interested agencies precedes the undertaking of projects, costly mistakes can be avoided and the realization of desirable goals hastened. The Federal Government assists the States and their localities through a variety of programs in the financing of many of these projects. It has a vital concern, therefore, in the manner in which they are carried out, and a responsibility to insure, insofar as is possible, that public moneys are expended to best serve the public interest. It is the purpose of this Act to encourage careful and coordinated planning and programing of federally assisted projects in metropolitan areas, and to require, after a reasonable preparatory period, the approval by the Housing and Home Finance Administrator of workable programs as a condition to the granting of Federal assistance in the financing of certain projects.

Sec. 2. For the purposes of this Act.—

(1) The term "Administrator" means the Housing and Home Finance Administrator.

(2) The term "land-use project" means the undertaking of an urban renewal or public housing project, the acquisition of land to be used as open-space land (as defined in section 706 of the Housing Act of 1961), or the construction of any public work or facility, including, without limitation, any

highway, airport, or other transportation facility.

(3) The term "workable program" means an official plan of action, as it exists from time to time, meeting such standards as the Administrator may by regulation require, for the programing and undertaking, on a coordinated basis, of land-use projects within a metropolitan area.

(4) The term "metropolitan area" means an area defined as such for the purposes of this Act by the Administrator.

Sec. 3. Except as provided in section 4, no Federal loan or grant for any land-use project in a locality within a metropolitan area shall be made after the expiration of two years after the date of enactment of this Act (except pursuant to a commitment entered into prior to the expiration of such two-year period), unless (1) there has been prepared and presented to the Administrator a workable program for such area, (2) on the basis of his review of such program, the Administrator determines that such project is in furtherance of, or consistent with, such program, and (3) the Administrator certifies that the assistance requested is in conformity with such program.

Sec. 4. The Administrator shall by regulation designate those metropolitan areas where he determines that the undertaking of land-use projects, on a coordinated basis, requires planning on an areawide or regional basis by an official State, metropolitan, or regional planning agency empowered, under State or local laws or interstate compact, to perform metropolitan or regional planning for the metropolitan area within which any such project is to be undertaken. No Federal loan or grant for any land-use project in any area so designated shall be made, after the expiration of four years from the date on which the regulation designating such area becomes effective (except pursuant to a commitment entered into prior to the expiration of such four-year period) unless (1) there has been prepared and presented to the Administrator by an agency of the type hereinabove described a workable program for the area, (2) on the basis of his review of such program, the Administrator determines that such project is in furtherance of, or consistent with, such program, and (3) the Administrator certifies that the assistance requested is in conformity with such program.

Sec. 5. (a) The Administrator shall cause any certification required to be made under this Act with respect to any Federal assistance administered by an agency other than the Housing and Home Finance Agency to be forwarded promptly to the head of the department or agency concerned.

(b) In the performance of his function under this Act, the Administrator shall maintain close liaison with departments and agencies of the Government administering programs affected by this Act.

Sec. 6. (a) Section 701(a) of the Housing Act of 1954 is amended by inserting in the fifth sentence, after the word "includes", the following: "(1) the preparation of workable programs for the undertaking of land-use projects in metropolitan areas, and (2)".

(b) Nothing contained in this Act shall be construed to affect the requirements of section 101(c) of the Housing Act of 1949.

URBAN MASS TRANSPORTATION BILL

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, the administration bill to assist in the development of comprehensive and coordinated mass transportation systems in metropolitan and other urban areas. I ask unanimous consent that the President's letter of transmittal be printed in the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

The White House,
February 18, 1963.

Hon. Lyndon Johnson,
President of the Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. President: I am submitting with this letter a draft bill, the "Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1963," to establish a long-range program of assistance to urban areas in solving their mass transportation problems. The bill is based on the mass transportation legislation which I proposed last year and which was formally reported—but not brought to a vote of the full membership—in both Houses.

Urban mass transportation is one of the most urgent problems facing the Nation and this Congress. As I said in my recent message on the state of the Union, "Nearly three-fourths of our citizens live in urban areas, which occupy only 2 percent of our land, and if mass transit is to survive and relieve the congestion of these cities, it needs Federal stimulation and assistance."

It is a Federal responsibility, particularly in this field, to encourage balanced use of all modes of transportation to the end that there may be satisfactory service at minimum cost. A long-range program of Federal assistance for mass transportation is urgently needed, so that local communities may freely decide for themselves the proper balance of local public investment in highways and in mass transportation systems, whether rail or bus.

As indicated in the attached letter from the Housing and Home Finance Administrator, language is being prepared dealing with the subject of protecting the rights and interests of employees who might be adversely affected by projects undertaken or assisted by the mass transportation program and will be transmitted to the appropriate committees at the earliest possible opportunity. It is our expectation that the Secretary of Labor will discuss this very important subject in detail in testimony on the bill.

Enclosed also are a section-by-section summary of the bill and an outline of its major features.

Sincerely,

John F. Kennedy.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 917) to authorize the Housing and Home Finance Administrator to provide additional assistance for the development of comprehensive and coordinated mass transportation systems in metropolitan and other urban areas, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. Williams of New Jersey, by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

CANTON RESERVOIR PROJECT

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and the junior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. Edmondson], I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to authorize the construction of the Canton project in Oklahoma.

I ask unanimous consent that a statement relating to that project be printed in the Record.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the statement will be printed in the Record.

The bill (S. 918) to authorize the construction, operation, and maintenance of the Canton project, Oklahoma, by the Secretary of the Interior, introduced by Mr. Monroney (for himself and Mr. Edmondson), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

The statement presented by Mr. Monroney is as follows:

Canton Project

The Canton Reservoir project was authorized in 1938. Construction was started in 1940, was interrupted by the war, and the project completed in 1948. At the time the project was authorized, it was estimated to cost $12,300,000. It actually was completed for $10,300,000, or $2 million less than the estimate.

When the project was planned, the Corps of Engineers recognized the necessity of including conservation storage for irrigation and, as a result of negotiations of the Oklahoma Planning and Resources Board, not only was 100,000 acre-feet of storage, above the flood control requirements, added to the project but the outlet works for release of irrigation water were built into the dam.

A paragraph from the House document, used as a basis of authorization of the project states: "Further analysis in connection with the maximum utilization of the stream flow with respect to its conservation at Canton by storage indicates that the practical efficient limit for this purpose is 100,000 acre-feet. Storage in this amount would insure an annual supply of 156,000 acre-feet needed for domestic use, dilution purposes, and irrigation or other uses."

The Bureau of Reclamation Project report of June 22, 1954 (H. Doc. 445, 83d Cong., 2d sess.) recommends the irrigation of 16,000 acres below the Canton Dam, and using the conservation storage for the project lands. The irrigation project is estimated at about $4,500,000, consisting of the main canals, laterals, and necessary drainage works. The annual charges would be about $72,000 for 70 years. Of the 16,000 acres almost one-third is Indian owned. The benefit-cost ration is 2 to 1.

The Canton Dam, as operated by the Corps of Engineers since its completion in 1948, has reduced flood damages by about $5 million. Other income from the project has been $125,000 from leasing of lands, and over $1,900,000 from leasing of storage space for municipal water supply. Thus, the Federal investment has paid more than 5½ percent per year. Add the return that will come from irrigation and it is easy to see that the annual return may reach 7½ or 8 percent.

In every Congress since 1946, bills have been introduced to bring the irrigation benefits nearer to reality. First there were bills to legislate the necessary storage in the Canton Reservoir, and 69,000 acre-feet of storage has so been designated. Still there remains the job of getting the irrigation project authorized.

The local people are to be commended for their long and determined efforts on this project. Less determined people would have given up years ago, but not so with these. They have cooperated fully with the State and Federal agencies to remove roadblocks.

There was the matter of securing the court adjudication of the water rights, which was completed in the District Court of Oklahoma County in December 1949.

There was the formation of the Canton Irrigation District by an overwhelming vote of the irrigation landowners on December, 15, 1945.

There was the job of getting the Bureau of Reclamation Survey Report to Congress. This was finally accomplished in 1953.

There were negotiations with the Indian Service relating to the 30 percent Indian-owned land in the project, and the tedious task of working out water supply problems with Oklahoma City and Enid.

All of this required leadership of the first order.

The job is not complete. The "climate" in Washington has improved.

Budget A47 with which we wrestled for years has been scuttled, and a more realistic approach has been adopted by this administration. The President in his budget message has said:.

"Natural resources development is a key requisite to the present and future economic growth of the Nation.

"Land, water, and power resources: Most of these expenditures will be to continue construction of projects for flood control, navigation, irrigation, water supply, and hydroelectric power. Related developments of recreational facilities and fish and wildlife resources will be carried forward. These projects represent investments which will yield benefits for years to come.

"With funds requested for 1964 the Corps of Engineers will initiate construction of 32 projects, the Bureau of Reclamation 8 new projects, and the Tennessee Valley Authority 2 new projects."

Here is the new view. We should build such projects as Canton. It fits into the pattern of developing our basic natural resources.

In the President's request for funds is an item of $200,000 for advance engineering and design for the Optima project on the North Canadian River upstream from Canton Reservoir. This project will provide 260,000 additional acre-feet of capacity which should insure the availability of 100,000 acre-feet of storage capacity for irrigation of 16,000 acres of land below Canton. At the same time no adverse effect will be had on flood control and water supply.

With these new developments, I am hopeful for favorable consideration and authorization of the Canton irrigation project as recommended in the bill I am introducing.

PROGRAM TO REDUCE NONBENEFICIAL CONSUMPTIVE USE OF WATER, PECOS RIVER BASIN, NEW MEXICO AND TEXAS

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a joint resolution to provide authority to the Secretary of the Interior to carry out a continuing program to reduce nonbeneficial consumptive uses of water in the Pecos River Basin in New Mexico and Texas.

I am sure the Members of the Senate are well aware of the importance of water in the arid regions of the western part of the United States. The studies of the Senate Select Committee on National Water Resources have shown that water shortage and water quality are not only a problem of the West but are becoming major problems elsewhere. We must therefore use every practical means at our command to solve these problems as quickly as possible if we are to provide water for irrigation, industrial, and domestic uses and for recreation purposes to meet the demands of the population.

We have in the Southwest a menace in the form of certain phreatophytes that is consuming nonbeneficially each year over 25 million acre-feet of our water. The principal culprit is a plant known as Tamarix gallicia, more commonly known as saltcedar. These plants were introduced into the United States from the Mediterranean region, east Asia, or India, where they are indigenous. The climate and other conditions of the West are ideal for the rapid growth of this plant and since 1914 it has spread to nearly all of the streambeds of the West and is spreading rapidly and now covers nearly 15 million acres of bottomlands in the 17 Western States.

We have initiated, through the Bureau of Reclamation and the Corps of Engineers, a program on the Rio Grande above Elephant Butte Lake to remove some of these saltcedar and to build a floodway and channel into the lake. This project was started 11 years ago and during construction, up until 1961, has saved 550,000 acre-feet. The Bureau of Reclamation states that beginning this year they expect to save 100,000 acre-feet annually for Elephant Butte Reservoir. This project has already demonstrated that this type of water salvage work is profitable.

The Pecos River Basin is one of the most heavily infested river basins in the West. From 600 acres found in the McMillan Delta in 1915, the infested area has grown to 43,000 acres in 1957 and is well over that amount now. The National Resources Planning Board reported that the saltcedar in this area is consuming approximately 5 acre-feet of water per acre annually. According to the U.S. Geological Survey, these phreatophytes could consume virtually the entire flow of the Pecos River in this area in 50 years if the growth goes unreined.

Some of New Mexico's chief farming and population centers lie in the Pecos Valley. The economic growth of this area and the Red Bluff area in Texas will be greatly hampered unless we can provide an increased supply of water. Due to drought and the consumption of water by these wasters New Mexico has become indebted in the amount of 60,000 acre-feet to Texas under the provisions of the Pecos River compact. It is hoped that when this project is completed New Mexico will be able to repay its debt with the increased supply of water, and at the same time improve the economy of the entire area dependent upon the Pecos for water.

One thing is certain: Further delay in dealing with this problem will give rise to additional problems and greatly increase the cost of eradication and control work as well as curtail the economic growth of the area.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the text of the joint resolution printed in the Record.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the joint resolution will be printed in the Record.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 49) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to carry out a continuing program to reduce nonbeneficial consumptive use of water in the Pecos River Basin, in New Mexico and Texas, introduced by Mr. Anderson (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Whereas for many years there has been an inadequate supply of water for established uses in the Pecos River Basin of New Mexico and Texas; and

Whereas the growth of saltcedar (tamarix pentandra) and other undesirable phreatophytes in the Pecos River Basin is responsible for the nonbeneficial consumption of tens of thousands of acre feet of water annually; and

Whereas the prolific growth of saltcedar and other nonbeneficial phreatophytes has progressively intensified the water shortage in the Pecos River Basin; and

Whereas in addition to consuming great quantities of water annually, the growth of such nonbeneficial vegetation also interferes with water flow and canal maintenance, clogs stream channels, and creates flood hazards; and

Whereas many water users that have heretofore entered into repayment contracts for the construction of works are now facing hardships in meeting their financial obligations as a result of the water shortage in the Pecos River Basin; and

Whereas the problem of nonbeneficial consumptive use of water by vegetation has become so severe and widespread that State and local interests are incapable of effectively combating it; and

Whereas there is a continuing need for actions to aid in conversion from nonbeneficial to beneficial use of the water; and

Whereas it is estimated that if such vegetative growth in the Pecos River Basin of New Mexico and Texas is not controlled, such growth will consume practically the entire flow of the Pecos River within the next fifty years: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That in order to prevent further decreases in the supply of water in the Pecos River Basin, and in order to increase and protect such water supply for municipal, industrial, irrigation, and recreational uses, and for the conservation of fish and wildlife, and to provide protection for the farmlands in such basin from the hazards of floods, the Secretary of the Interior (hereinafter referred to as the "Secretary") is authorized and directed to take such measures as he deems necessary and appropriate to carry out a continuing program to reduce the nonbeneficial consumption of water in the basin, including that by salt cedar and other undesirable phreatophytes. Such program shall be carried out in the Pecos River Basin from its headwaters in New Mexico to the town of Girvin, Texas: *Provided, however,* That no money shall be appropriated for and no work commenced on the clearing of the floodway authorized by the Act of February 20, 1958 (72 Stat. 17) unless provision shall have been made to replace any Carlsbad Irrigation District terminal storage which might be lost by the clearing of said floodway.

Sec. 2. As a condition to undertaking the program authorized by the first section of this joint resolution, the Secretary shall require the States of New Mexico and Texas to give such assurances as he deems adequate that such States will acquire such lands, easements, rights-of-way, and other interests in lands as the Secretary considers necessary effectively to carry out such program.

Sec. 3. (a) As a further condition to undertaking the program authorized by this joint resolution, the Secretary may, with respect to those beneficiaries in New Mexico and Texas which the Secretary determines to be likely to benefit directly from the results of such program, require such commitments as he deems appropriate that such beneficiaries will repay the United States so much of the reimbursable costs incurred by it in carrying out such program as do not exceed the value of the benefits accruing to such beneficiaries from such program. The Secretary shall not require the repayment of such costs unless he determines that it is feasible (1) to identify the beneficiaries that are directly benefited by the program, and (2) to measure the extent to which each beneficiary is benefited by such program.

(b) Repayment contracts entered into pursuant to the provisions of this section shall be subject to such terms and conditions as the Secretary may prescribe, except that the amount of the repayment installment in the case of any beneficiary shall be fixed by the Secretary in accordance with the ability of such beneficiary to pay, taking into consideration all other financial obligations of such beneficiary.

(c) Any costs of the program which the Secretary determines should be assigned to flood control, recreation, or restoration of stream flow shall not be included in computing the costs properly allocable to the beneficiaries under this section, but shall be considered as nonreimbursable costs.

SEC. 4. Nothing contained in this joint resolution shall be construed to abrogate, amend, modify, or be in conflict with any provisions of the Pecos River compact.

SEC. 5. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this joint resolution.

JOINT COMMITTEE ON CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, just a few days ago I listened with a great deal of interest to the remarks made by the very able and distinguished Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] with respect to certain activities engaged in by the Central Intelligence Agency, and their impact on U.S. security and foreign policy.

The distinguished Senator from Oregon expressed the view that this Agency should be under a measure of congressional control. This is a view I share with him, and, have been of such a mind for a long time.

As far back as the 1st session of the 84th Congress, in 1955, I cosponsored a concurrent resolution introduced by the now majority leader [Mr. MANSFIELD] to create a Joint Committee on Central Intelligence, similar to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, because, I, too, believed that no agency of the Government spending taxpayers' funds should be free to do as it pleases without the Congress maintaining its proper measure of control.

There has been criticism about the Central Intelligence Agency over the years concerning its activities and its failure to make any report to the Congress. It should not necessarily be placed under congressional control, but it should periodically be subjected to congressional scrutiny.

We all realize this Agency annually spends approximately billions. There have been, and will be, those who say this Agency's activities are so secret—no one should know—in the interests of national security. However, this is not a valid argument.

No harm was done from the standpoint of security or in maintaining secrecy in connection with the development of the atomic bomb. A joint congressional committee of the Congress certainly maintained this secret, while at the same time it promoted the best interests of the Nation in maintaining a watchdog setup over the Atomic Energy Commission.

I feel as many other Members of Congress that there should be a congressional watchdog committee to look over the activities of the Central Intelligence Agency. I think it is in the public interest that such a committee be appointed.

To achieve this objective, I am submitting at this time a concurrent resolution which would establish a Joint Committee on Central Intelligence, to be composed of six Members of the Senate and six Members of the House of Representatives; not more than four Members appointed from either the Senate or the House shall be of the same political party.

The measure provides that the committee would make continuing studies of the activities of this Agency and the problems relating to the gathering of intelligence affecting the national security, and of its coordination and utilization by the various departments, agencies, and instrumentalities of the Government.

In turn, the Central Intelligence Agency would be required to keep the joint committee fully and currently informed with respect to all of its activities.

I sincerely trust that the committee to which this resolution is referred will take prompt and favorable action on it.

Mr. President, I ask that the resolution remain at the desk for a period of 3 days so that any of my colleagues who would like to join with me as cosponsors may do so.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The concurrent resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the concurrent resolution will lie on the desk, as requested by the Senator from Florida.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 23) was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there is hereby established a Joint Committee on Central Intelligence to be composed of six Members of the Senate to be appointed by the President of the Senate, and six Members of the House of Representatives to be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives. Of the six members to be appointed from the Senate, three shall be members of the Central Intelligence Agency Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate, and three shall be members of the Central Intelligence Agency Subcommittee of the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate. Of the six members to be appointed from the House of Representatives, three shall be members of the Central Intelligence Agency Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives, and three shall be members of the Central Intelligence Agency Subcommittee of the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives. Not more than four members appointed from either the Senate or the House of Representatives shall be from the same political party.

SEC. 2. (a) The joint committee shall make continuing studies of the activities of the Central Intelligence Agency and of problems relating to the gathering of intelligence affecting the national security and of its coordination and utilization by the various departments, agencies, and instrumentalities of the Government. The Central Intelligence Agency shall keep the joint committee fully and currently informed with respect to its activities. All bills, resolutions, and other matters in the Senate or the House of Representatives relating primarily to the Central Intelligence Agency shall be referred to the joint committee.

(b) The members of the joint committee who are Members of the Senate shall from time to time report to the Senate, and the members of the joint committee who are Members of the House of Representatives shall from time to time report to the House, by bill or otherwise, their recommendations with respect to matters within the jurisdiction of their respective Houses which are (1) referred to the joint committee, or (2) otherwise within the jurisdiction of the joint committee.

SEC. 3. Vacancies in the membership of the joint committee shall not affect the power of the remaining members to execute the functions of the joint committee, and shall be filled in the same manner as in the case of the original selection. The joint committee shall select a chairman and a vice chairman from among its members.

SEC. 4. The joint committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to hold such hearings, to sit and act at such places and times, to require, by subpena or otherwise, the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, to take such testimony, to procure such printing and binding, and to make such expenditures as it deems advisable. The cost of stenographic services to report public hearings shall not be in excess of the amounts prescribed by law for reporting the hearings of standing committees of the Senate. The cost of such services to report executive hearings shall be fixed at an equitable rate by the joint committee.

SEC. 5. The joint committee is empowered to appoint such experts, consultants, technicians, and clerical and stenographic assistants as it deems necessary and advisable. The committee is authorized to utilize the services, information, facilities, and personnel of the departments and establishments of the Government.

SEC. 6. The expenses of the joint committee shall be paid one-half from the contingent fund of the Senate and one-half from the contingent fund of the House of Representatives upon vouchers signed by the chairman. Disbursements to pay such expenses shall be made by the Secretary of the Senate out of the contingent fund of the Senate, such contingent fund to be reimbursed from the contingent fund of the House of Representatives in the amount of one-half of the disbursements so made.

DUTIES ON IMPORTS OF CATTLE, BEEF, AND VEAL—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILL

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, at its next printing, I ask unanimous consent that the name of the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT] be added as an additional cosponsor of the bill (S. 557) to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to impose additional duties on cattle, beef, and veal imported each year in excess of annual quotas, introduced by me, for myself and other Senators, on January 28, 1963.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EDUCATIONAL AND CULTURAL EXCHANGE PROGRAMS—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when there is a reprinting of the bill S. 558 and the Senate Joint Resolution, S.J. Res. 30, which deal with our educational and cultural exchange programs, and which I introduced on January 28 of this year, that the name of the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. Randolph] be added as a cosponsor. During the last meeting of the NATO parliamentary conference in Paris last November the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. Randolph] and I served as members of the American delegation to the NATO parliamentary committee dealing with education and cultural exchange programs. The Senator from West Virginia made some very valuable contributions during the NATO conference. He saw these bills in the Record. I did not confer with anyone before introducing them. The Senator from West Virginia would like to become a cosponsor, and I would be honored and happy to have him join me as a cosponsor of the measures.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PROHIBITION OF USE OF MEASURING DEVICES IN POSTAL SERVICE—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILL

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, at its next printing, I ask unanimous consent that the name of the Senator from Iowa [Mr. Miller] may be added as a cosponsor of the bill (S. 720) to prevent the use of stopwatches, work measurement programs, or other performance standards operations as measuring devices in the postal service, introduced by me on February 6, 1963.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT OF INTERNAL REVENUE CODE OF 1954—ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILL

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at its next printing the names of the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. Nelson] and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. Brewster] be added as cosponsors to the bill S. 736, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to encourage the construction of treatment works to control water and air pollution by permitting the deduction of expenditures for the construction, erection, installation, or acquisition of such treatment works, and to the bill S. 737, to promote water and air pollution control and abatement by authorizing the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to provide certain assistance to small business concerns in obtaining necessary treatment works.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ESTABLISHMENT OF A COMMISSION ON SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY, ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILL

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, at its next printing, I ask unanimous consent that the name of the junior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. Ribicoff] be added as a cosponsor to the bill (S. 816) providing for the establishment of a Commission on Science and Technology, submitted by me on February 18, 1963.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I welcome the distinguished junior Senator from Connecticut as a cosponsor. We are delighted to have his support and are glad to have him identified with this effort to secure legislation.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILLS

Under authority of the orders of the Senate, as indicated below, the following names have been added as additional cosponsors for the following bills:

Authority of February 11, 1963:

S. 774. A bill to amend the Federal Trade Commission Act, to promote quality and price stabilization, to define and restrain certain unfair methods of distribution and to confirm, define, and equalize the rights of producers and resellers in the distribution of goods identified by distinguished brands, names, or trademarks, and for other purposes: Mr. Inouye, Mr. Carlson, and Mr. Randolph.

Authority of February 20, 1963:

S. 869. A bill to authorize the burial of certain news correspondents in national cemeteries: Mr. Bartlett, Mr. Hruska, Mr. Long of Missouri, and Mr. Moss.

Authority of February 21, 1963:

S. 880. A bill to provide under the social security program for payment for hospital and related services to aged beneficiaries: Mr. Bayh, Mr. Brewster, Mr. Byrd of West Virginia, Mr. Hartke, Mr. Kefauver, Mr. Kennedy, and Mr. Nelson.

THE WILDERNESS BILL—ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF AMENDMENT

Under authority of the order of the Senate of February 20, 1963, the names of Senators Bartlett, Bennett, Cannon, Dominick, Fong, Goldwater, Hayden, Jordan of Idaho, Lausche, Mechem, Mundt, Randolph, Simpson, and Thurmond were added as additional cosponsors of the amendment submitted by Mr. Allott on February 20, 1963, to the bill (S. 4) to establish a National Wilderness Preservation System, and for other purposes.

NOTICE CONCERNING CERTAIN NOMINATIONS BEFORE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, the following nominations have been referred to and are now pending before the Committee on the Judiciary:

Robert M. Morgenthau, of New York, to be U.S. attorney, southern district of New York, for a term of 4 years—recess appointment.

Homer Lester Benson, of Indiana, to be a member of the Board of Parole for term expiring September 30, 1968—recess appointment.

On behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, notice is hereby given to all persons interested in these nominations to file with the committee, in writing, on or before Monday, March 4, 1963, any representations or objections they may wish to present concerning the above nominations, with a further statement whether it is their intention to appear at any hearing which may be scheduled.

NOTICE OF HEARINGS ON NOMINATIONS BEFORE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Tuesday, March 5, 1963, beginning at 10:30 a.m., in room 2228, New Senate Office Building, on the following nominations:

William J. Nealon, Jr., of Pennsylvania, to be U.S. district judge, middle district of Pennsylvania—recess appointment.

Carl E. McGowan, of Illinois, to be U.S. circuit judge, District of Columbia circuit, vice Henry W. Edgerton, retiring.

H. Vearle Payne, of New Mexico, to be U.S. district judge, district of New Mexico, vice Carl A. Hatch, retiring.

At the indicated time and place persons interested in the hearing may make such representations as may be pertinent.

The subcommittee consists of the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. Johnston], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. Hruska], and myself, as chairman.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

By Mr. ROBERTSON:

Washington's Birthday address by Senator Stennis, delivered on February 22, 1963, at Richmond, Va., together with the introduction by Senator Robertson.

VISIT BY THE KING OF LAOS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the President and the people of the United States today have the honor of greeting the King of Laos, his Majesty Sri Savang Vatthana. It has been my privilege to know the King of Laos for over a decade, and, I believe, to understand and appreciate the difficulties and the complex problems which have been his, and, quite likely, will continue to confront him in the years ahead.

He is fully aware of the difficulties which face Laos, and is prepared to serve as a catalyst to help solve them. With his dignity, prestige, knowledge, and understanding, he is extremely well qualified to preside over a reunification of his country and to attend to the needs and the wants of his people.

We are indeed happy to have him as our guest, Mr. President; and, on behalf of the Senate of the United States, I extend to him our greetings, our cordial best wishes, and our hope that the friendship between our two countries will continue on the basis of mutual cordiality and understanding, and that the future of Laos will be enhanced and strengthened as a free, independent, and wholly sovereign nation.

FOURTEENTH ANNUAL INTERNATIONAL PANCAKE DAY RACE

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, the 14th annual International Pancake Day Race will be run tomorrow. This great good-will event between the housewives of Liberal, Kans., and Olney, England, is always held on the Tuesday before Ash Wednesday.

This race is sponsored by the junior chamber of commerce of Liberal, for the promotion of international relations between England and the United States. It is based on competition between the young ladies of Olney, England, and the young ladies of Liberal, Kans.

Some years ago the people of Liberal heard of this 500-year event of pancake racing over a 415-yard course from the town pump to the church. The city of Liberal challenged the women of Olney, England, to this race; and the challenge was accepted by Rev. R. C. Collins, the Vicar of Olney.

In old England, it was customary for the housewives to drop whatever they were doing and hurry to the church at the tolling of the bell, to be "shriven" of their sins. In 1445, a wife in Olney, England, started baking her pancakes rather late. They were not quite finished when the church bell rang; but she hurried off to the "shriving," carrying her griddle and pancakes with her. Thus, an annual sporting event was born.

I am inviting the Members of the U.S. Senate and their staffs, the Kansas congressional delegation, and the press to be my guests tomorrow morning, for breakfast in the Senate dining rooms, here in the Capitol, where they will be served the finest pancakes in the world, made from the finest flour in the world, furnished by the Liberal Junior Chamber of Commerce, directly from the "Pancake Hub of the Universe."

Mrs. Vicki Campbell, a Liberal, Kans., housewife and mother of two young children, is in Washington, to help with this breakfast. Mrs. Campbell won the Liberal Pancake Race last year, and is here representing the Liberal Junior Chamber of Commerce.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, is there further morning business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed.

AMENDMENT OF RULE RELATING TO STANDING COMMITTEES

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be laid before the Senate and be made the pending business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered. The resolution will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A resolution (S. Res. 90) amending rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate relating to standing committees.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The absence of a quorum is suggested. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio has asked unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Ohio yield to the Senator from South Dakota?

Mr. LAUSCHE. I yield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio yields to the Senator from South Dakota with the understanding that he will not lose his right to the floor.

UNITED NATIONS AID TO CUBA

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, there has been considerable discussion about the wisdom and justification of the United Nations, through its Special Fund, giving aid to Cuba. Within the last few days I heard a number of comments and read some articles contending that our Government, in objecting to the grant-of-aid out of the Special Fund to Cuba, was making a serious mistake. I do not agree with that view. In my judgment, the United Nations grant-of-aid to Cuba out of the Special Fund would perpetrate a direct affront upon the United States.

My reasons for making that statement are as follows: I recognize that the Special Fund set up in the United Nations is contemplated for use in helping distressed people around the world, keeping in mind that political and ideological leanings should not be considered. Recognizing fully that principle as being in force, I still am of the opinion that the Special Fund should not have been made available to Castro and his communistic government.

I direct the attention of the Senate to a bit of the statistical background of the United Nations Special Fund. It is a voluntary Fund created by the contributions of various nations of the world. From 1959, the date of the establishment of the Fund, down to 1963, the sum of $251 million has been expended from the Special Fund of the United Nations. Of that $251 million, the U.S. Government put up $100,400,000, or 40 percent of the amount.

In the same period all of the Communist nations of the world, including Yugoslavia, pledged the total sum of $8,228,225. Red Russia pledged and put up $5 million. We pledged and put up $100 million. The other Communist nations, consisting of Albania, Bulgaria, Byelorussia, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Poland, Mongolia, Rumania, Ukraine, Cuba, and Yugoslavia put up $8,228,225.

I repeat that the total contributed by all the Communist countries to the special fund was $8,228,225. Our Government alone contributed $100,400,000.

Cuba is a member of the United Nations. It pledged $55,000 for the Special Fund, as follows: $5,000 in 1960, nothing in 1961, $25,000 in 1962, and $25,000 in 1963, making a total of $55,000.

Of the $55,000 pledged, Cuba has not paid 1 penny. It has paid not 1 penny of its obligation to finance the operations in the Gaza Strip and in the Congo. It is in arrears in the payment of its normal assessments for the management of the United Nations. As of this date Cuba is in arrears $496,000 of its obligations to the United Nations. It has paid practically nothing.

Two or three months ago Cuba paid $160,000 of its arrearage in the special operating assessments because it wanted to avoid being expelled.

Let us keep in mind the picture. Cuba is in arrears $496,000, and has paid not 1 penny of its pledges for the Special Fund and not 1 penny for its obligations in maintaining the operations of the United Nations in the Congo and in the Gaza Strip. Cuba wants the benefit of the work of the United Nations and of the funds of the United Nations but does not wish to bear its obligations.

Let us see what is contemplated by way of aid to Cuba. The item which is immediately in controversy is a $1,157,000 grant out of the Special Fund to help the Cuban Communist government solve its agricultural problems. There have also been pledged to the Government of Cuba two other sums. In the 1961–62 financial period, Cuba is programed to receive $445,883 covering 10 projects to be carried out in Cuba by the United Nations Food and Agricultural Organization; the International Labor Organization; the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization; and the World Health Organization. In addition to the sums I have already mentioned—$1,157,000 and the last sum of $445,883—there is programed an additional sum of $405,780. The program to be covered by this third sum envisages $69,000 for an ILO social security project in Cuba, $160,000 for an FAO fisheries project, $54,000 for a UNESCO marine biological project, $13,500 for a UNESCO education project, $17,280 for an ICAO civil aviation project, and $152,000 for the WHO public health work.

As closely as I have been able to figure out, since Castro became the chief of Cuba and since the Communists have taken over, Cuba has paid into the United Nations $160,000 and is in arrears in the sum of $496,000, while Cuba is to receive the sum of $2.2 million. With due respect to some who are trying to justify this action on the part of the United Nations, I must say that what is being done does not reconcile itself with my concept of fairness and decency either to the people of the United States or to the people of the world.

Castro and his Communist government want all of the benefits which can be provided by the United Nations without being willing to bear any of the obligations.

Our Government has put up $100 million, while all of the Communist governments of the world, in 5 years, as I have indicated, have pledged $8,228,000, and, as I have said, Castro is in arrears $496,000.

One can recognize the charter provisions that there should be no decision made on the basis of ideology and politics, but there were grounds to make a decision that Cuba was in arrears, was flouting its responsibilities to the United Nations, and therefore was not entitled to the charity and beneficence of the citizens of the United States.

Finally, this is an affront and an insult to every taxpayer of the United States. In effect, it states to the U.S. citizen, "You give. We will not hold others even morally responsible, but you must continue with your charity and observe your high ethical principles, regardless of the insults perpetrated upon you."

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LAUSCHE. I yield to the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. JOHNSTON. I am very much interested in what the Senator from Ohio is saying and the point he is making at this particular time. I presume the Senator would be in favor of Cuba and the other nations which are in arrears either paying up or getting out.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I want them to make an honest effort to pay their obligations and pledges; not to adopt the position that they shall give nothing and take everything.

Mr. JOHNSTON. I agree with the Senator thoroughly. I think they ought to be given a certain time limit in the near future to pay up. Then, of course, they would be in good standing.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The United Nations now has a provision that if a nation is in arrears for 2 years with respect to a certain category of obligations it must step out, and that is the only reason why the Communist government of Cuba paid the sum of $160,000 recently, while remaining in debt and in arrearage in the sum of $496,000.

Mr. JOHNSTON. Would not the Senator be in favor of nations in arrears not being allowed to receive money out of any United Nations fund until they pay up?

Mr. LAUSCHE. That is the point I am trying to make.

Mr. JOHNSTON. I agree with the Senator emphatically.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MEDICAL CARE AND WYOMING'S LEGISLATURE

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, in regard to the upcoming debate on a federally controlled program of medical care for the Nation's aged, I am proud to report an action by Wyoming's distinguished governor, Clifford Hansen, and the 1963 State legislature, in providing an enabling act for the Kerr-Mills medical care law.

This enabling act was signed into law by Governor Hansen February 14. It had cleared Wyoming's Senate without a dissenting vote, and was passed by the house of representatives with a comfortable 39 to 16 margin.

The Equality State's Kerr-Mills law will provide $570,000 in State funds which will be matched by Federal funds for the first 2 years of the program.

Unlike the proposal backed by the administration, this Wyoming approved Kerr-Mills program will not be under tight or arbitrary Federal control.

It is a voluntary program in which no aged person is forced to participate. I consider the action of Wyoming's Legislature in implementing the Kerr-Mills approach to medical care for its senior citizens an outstanding example of what a State can do to handle its own medical problems with Government assistance but without Government excesses or control.

In the context of this subject, I request unanimous consent to have published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with this statement, an editorial by the noted columnist David Lawrence, who with great candor and fairness points out the pitfalls of a federally dominated, mandatory medical care program.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FEDERAL HAND IN MEDICAL CARE—ADMINISTRATION PLAN CRITICIZED AS LIKELY TO INTENSIFY SHORTAGE OF DOCTORS

(By David Lawrence)

It's going to be harder to get a doctor when you are sick, harder to get into a hospital, and harder to take care of the young as well as the old who become ill in the future—if the Federal Government intervenes in the field of medical care as just recommended to Congress by President Kennedy.

Time was when, if you were sick, you could get a doctor to come to your home. Today most patients have to go to the doctor's office except when gravely ill.

There simply aren't enough doctors now. This is primarily because medical aid is covered in part by private insurance plans that make it less costly. Persons who used to take care of minor ailments themselves often seek medical aid nowadays. The insurance idea, itself, is a good one. But until the shortage of doctors produced by the existing plans is overcome, the proposed intervention by the Federal Government with free medical care for certain age groups will only intensify the problem for almost everybody. Elderly persons require individual care and continuous observation, but if there is a shortage of physicians, these patients will be neglected, no matter how much of the bill the Government is willing to pay.

It's good politics, of course, for any President to champion social-welfare legislation, but free medical attention for millions of citizens will constitute in the field of welfare benefits the biggest single expense imposed on all the people.

Taxes are to be raised to finance the medical plan proposed by the President. Not only will everybody's social security rates go up, but the tax will be imposed on the first $5,200 of salary instead of the current figure of $4,800 a year. The purpose, of course, is to collect about $10 billion more over the next 5 years. Just what this does to the administration program for a "tax cut" is not readily calculated, but it is another example of how the much-talked-about "tax cut" is rapidly turning into a tax rise.

With the objective of the President's plan—to provide medical care for the aged—there will be little dissent. But the question really is whether those families which can afford to take care of their own aged members shall be required to pay taxes to support a plan in which their own relatives—though able to afford the medical care—would get it at Government expense.

The medical care agitation will, moreover, raise false hopes. The proposed plan doesn't cover medical treatment but mostly the charges for hospitalization and related services. The political value, however, of proclaiming "medical care for the aged" will continue to be there, and it's politics that's really back of the whole crusade.

The vast majority of doctors are vehemently opposed to the new plan. They feel it will demoralize the whole system of medical care in America, and they ought to know. They constitute a dedicated profession. They are on call in serious cases at the hospitals or at private homes day and night. They must be precise in their findings, because errors can be fatal.

The members of the profession are men and women who know medical conditions in this country and are familiar also with what "socialized medicine has meant in various other countries. They fear that the new plan some day will result in "socialized medicine"—a scheme in which the Government runs the medical-care program, pays the fees of doctors and standardizes their incomes. The administration denies that its plan will ever bring "socialized medicine," but the doctors know that, if the medical profession is overwhelmed with cases due to the free service programs provided by the Government, the demand on the time of all doctors will be so great that the Government will have to step in to try to bring order out of the chaos that will ensue.

Nobody objects to better medical care for the aged, as, well as for everybody else, but there are serious differences of opinion as to whether those who seek to make political capital of the issue will produce frustration in the medical profession and a lowering of the high standards of medical care which have long prevailed in America.

THE WAR IN SOUTH VIETNAM

Mrs. SMITH. Mr. President, the war in South Vietnam is very remote to most of us and its meaning is limited to what we read in the newspapers or hear about it on television and radio. I have been fortunate enough to be there and thus to realize some of the conditions there.

But none of us here in the U.S. Senate really know what our servicemen are going through there—and I doubt if we really have a true appreciation of what they are doing.

Lt. Douglas Emery, a graduate of the University of Maine, and the son of Mr. and Mrs. Floyd Emery, of Hartland, Maine, is one of our servicemen fighting in South Vietnam.

He has written one of the most unforgettable letters I have ever read. It is a very moving letter about the deep appreciation that the free people of Vietnam have of our aid to them.

I ask unanimous consent that his letter, and an article in the Waterville, Maine, Morning Sentinel of January 31, 1963, be placed in the body of the RECORD at this point—and I urge all Members to read it.

There being no objection, the article and letter were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Waterville (Maine) Morning Sentinel, Jan. 31, 1963]

HARTLAND LIEUTENANT WRITES HOME OF LIFE IN VIETNAM SERVICE

The following letter was received from Lt. Douglass Emery, son of Mr. and Mrs. Floyd Emery, of Hartland.

Lieutenant Emery graduated from the University of Maine in June 1959 when he was commissioned second lieutenant. In November he went to Fort Benning, Ga., for training and in February 1960 he arrived at Fort Dix, N.J. While at Fort Dix, N.J., he received his commission as first lieutenant, and served as company commander until May 1962.

He left for Fort Bragg, N.C., in June for a 4-week training in guerrilla warfare, and then went to Monterey, Calif., to a language school for 5 weeks' training before going to South Vietnam.

From Saigon he went to the northern part of South Vietnam to Quang Tri where the headquarters were located. From there he went to Tabat, an outpost, and then to Ashau, about 20 miles away, which was another outpost. He expects to return to Tabat soon.

The rainy weather makes it necessary to wait for the landing of a plane to pick up the mail where he is located. Also the delivery of mail, which is dropped from a helicopter, brings much delayed correspondence, since in January of this year he has just received some of his Christmas mail.

Lieutenant Emery's period of service in Vietnam is 1 year, and he arrived there about September 1, 1962.

The letter:

"THANKSGIVING 1962.

"DEAREST MUM AND DAD: It's Thanksgiving night of 1962, approximately 8 p.m.—you will be just getting up to prepare for Thanksgiving Day. I have a very beautiful, heartwarming story to tell you, despite all the ironies involved. Please excuse my messy writing, as I can hardly hold my eyes open.

"This afternoon we returned from a 2-day patrol during which we had a pretty rough time. We lived on cold boiled rice balls, and it poured continuously by the buckets; we were getting very discouraged, cold, wet, and hungry.

"My cigarettes were ruined when we swam two rivers, and I shared the bamboo pipe of the fellow whom I mentioned in my last letter. The leeches were clamping onto us by the dozens, and we had to stop often to pull them off each other. We were all bleeding from at least 25 little holes caused by the leeches.

"On our way back, we were ambushed by the Viet Cong. After this deal we continued back with the rifles, grenades, papers, letters, etc., of the enemy dead (whom we buried), and carrying our wounded (and dead).

"When we got back to base, I undressed from my drenched clothing, pulled the remaining leeches off, and wrapped in a blanket, which was the only dry thing around. I lit a dry cigarette, feeling damn sick, scared, and homesick. As I sat there, Lieutenant Liem came and told me that Captain Tung (battalion commander) wanted to see me immediately.

"Still wrapped in my blanket, and wondering what I had done wrong, I ran barefoot through the rain to Captain Tung's hut. As I went in I was greeted by this scene:

"In the middle of the hut, there was a small bamboo table laden with rice, big pieces of deer meat, duck meat, tea, and one tin cup with one swallow of whiskey (all they had) in front of my bowl of rice. Seated around the table were the company commanders, Lieutenant Suu, the battalion intelligence officer, and Lieutenant Liem, the battalion executive (who ran to his seat as soon as I made room in the doorway for him) and Captain Tung, who stood at the head of the table. The whole room was illuminated by one candle made of pig fat and rope.

"I stood with my mouth hanging open (with 2-day's beard plus my moustache), not knowing what to say. Captain Tung put his hand on my shoulder and said: (If I remember correctly, for my head was clouded with joy, and my eyes were clouded with tears. Bear in mind, he speaks only that English he has learned from me, Captain Lynch and Sergeant Sink). 'We learn from history today great holiday in America. Not much hours back, we fight other men like us, and many of them and us die. Possible some of them are family men of us, but they learn wrong. It is very sad we must fight but c'est la guerre' (in French, 'that is war'). Now we have very bad food, but we make this meal to bless you, your father, mother, and family because they give us great American man to help us fight for freedom like America has. We love you, we ask you to forgive our simple ways' (simple ways? Elegant people, only by different culture), 'and we ask you to be blessed by Buddha and Christ, the Lord.'

"Then Captain Tung led me out in the pouring rain where all the troops stood, soaking wet, where they said in unison, something I could not understand.

"Captain Tung interpreted: 'May the seven bright paths of Buddha show you the way to Eternal Life, fellow man.' (The seven paths of Buddha are so much like the Ten Commandments, one can interpret them as the same.) I cried. Then we crawled back into the hut to eat the most beautiful and delicious Thanksgiving dinner I have ever had.

"I did not mean to tell you about the sickening part of death, but it was part of this most beautiful story that I could not keep from you. So, you see, I'm halfway around the world from my loved ones, yet the spirit of love and brotherhood brings us together—at least, by heart. I would like everyone in the family to read this, as I think it is worthwhile to all of us.

"Happy Thanksgiving to all the family, and

"Lots of love,

"DOUG."

ESTONIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, the Estonians form one of the smallest and most distinct ethnic groups in all Europe, numbering slightly more than a million in their historic homeland in a northeastern corner of the continent. These rough and rugged peasants and shrewd traders have always struggled for their individual freedom and national independence. Their struggle did not cease when they were brought under the powerful autocracy of Russian czars early in the 18th century. From then on they were the oppressed subjects of the czars, their chance for freedom coming only after the overthrow of the czarist regime in Russia in 1917. Early the next year they proclaimed their national independence. That historic event of February 24, 1918, marked a turning point in Estonia's modern history, and thus began a new era for its people.

Under the democratic form of government then established in free Estonia the people worked and lived happily for a little over two decades. During that relatively short time they succeeded in making Estonia a progressive, prosperous model democracy. Then came the Second World War, bringing with it misfortune and tragedy. In 1940 the country was invaded and overrun by the Red army, and in August of that year it was made part of the Soviet Union. Since then the people of Estonia have been prisoners of totalitarian tyranny in their homeland. Even under such abominable circumstances they still yearn for their freedom. On this 45th anniversary celebration of their independence day we wish we could be of some aid to them in their struggle. Unfortunately, as I have stated on an earlier occasion, we are not in position to extend them effective aid now. But we ardently hope and pray for these freedom-loving and freedom-seeking people, for their deliverance from Communist totalitarian tyranny.

RESOLUTION OF SOUTH DAKOTA LEGISLATURE TO PLACE LUMBER INDUSTRY ON COMPETITIVE BASIS

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, just in the last few days the lumber industry of the United States was the victim of a decision by the Federal Tariff Commission which is going to result in continued depressive prices for American lumber producers. The decision to which I refer is the one which the lumber industry had brought before the Commission dealing with imports of Canadian lumber and the effect of those imports are having on the prices of our own homegrown lumber.

The Legislature of South Dakota has taken note of this action by the Tariff Commission and has approved a concurrent resolution memorializing the Congress and the President of the United States to initiate action to place our lumber industry on an equal and competitive basis with foreign manufactures through the use of a quota system or other means, including the requirements that imported lumber be marked to show the country of origin, to the end that domestic manufacturers are not placed at a disadvantage with resultant loss of markets, reduction of employment and loss of taxes to the deterioration of our local communities.

Mr. President, I sincerely hope the President will take the necessary steps to protect our great American lumber industry and if he does not that then the Congress will take the steps through enactment of legislation to protect the industry.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in my remarks the entire concurrent resolution as adopted by the South Dakota Legislature.

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 6

Concurrent resolution, memorializing the Congress of the United States and His Excellency, the President of the United States regarding the lumber industry in the United States

Whereas there is no shortage of timber for the production of lumber and related items in the United States; and

Whereas there is a need to increase the cut from overmature forests to prevent excessive loss from decay, disease, and other causes; and

Whereas U.S. lumber manufacturing firms pay high wages and provide working conditions equal to or better than similar firms in other countries; and

Whereas lumber manufacturing firms in the United States are losing their home markets to foreign firms, especially Canadian, due to the latter's advantages, including: Depreciated currency; low stumpage rates; noncompetitive bidding; less costly and restrictive forest practices; lower wage rates; high tariff rates on lumber shipped to Canada; low charter rates for coastwise and intercoastal shipping; a cooperative government; and

Whereas lumber imports from Canada are increasing yearly at an alarming rate and now constitute about one-sixth of the annual consumption of lumber in the United States; and

Whereas unemployment in the lumber industry of the United States is increasing with resultant loss of wages to the workers, loss of taxes and income to taxing bodies and communities: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives of the 38th Legislature of the State of South Dakota (the Senate concurring therein), do hereby memorialize the Congress of the United States and His Excellency, the President of the United States, to give immediate attention to and request action necessary to place the lumber industry of the United States on an equitable and competitive basis with foreign manufacturers through the use of a quota system or other means, including the requirements that imported lumber be marked to show the country of origin, to the end that domestic manufacturers are not placed at a disadvantage with resultant loss of markets, reduction of employment, loss of taxes and deterioration of communities; and be it further

Resolved, That certified copies of this concurrent resolution be forwarded to the Presiding Officers of both Houses of the Congress, to His Excellency, the President of the United States, and to the representatives in the Congress from the State of South Dakota.

PAUL E. BROWN,
Speaker of the House.
W. J. MATSON,
Chief Clerk.
NILS A. BOE,
President of the Senate.
NILLS P. JENSEN,
Secretary of the Senate.

ARE THERE PIRATES IN THE INDIANA DUNES?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, Chicago's American and its extremely capable staff reporter, C. Owsley Shepherd, have just completed a probing independent study of the alleged economic feasibility of the proposed Burns Ditch Harbor.

The American carried last weekend on its front pages a series of three searching articles which Mr. Shepherd based on his study of this question. The series is one of the finest expositions which has appeared on this very complicated subject, both with respect to the question of the economic feasibility of public works projects in general and with respect to Burns Ditch in particular.

The American cannot be praised too highly for its willingness to commit its expert resources to a thorough examination of a difficult and technical subject, even though that subject is severely controversial and any attempt to get at the facts is likely to bring on the wrath of powerful interests. Indiana and the Midwest should be grateful that such fearless and vigorous journalism still is carried on.

Mr. President, all Members of Congress have been in the position of both promoting and opposing public works proposals, so we all know a little of the intricacies which often are part of the economic studies put forward to support public works projects. Knowing this, Mr. Shepherd's exacting work in getting the relevant facts and his lucid presentation of them will be well appreciated. I commend it to the citizens of Indiana and of other States. I believe the press of Indiana would do well to publish more of this material since in general they have not given a full account of all the issues at stake.

These articles speak forcefully for themselves of the very doubtful justifications provided for the harbor which would destroy the irreplaceable Indiana Dunes at great cost for the almost sole benefit of two selfish steel companies. Nevertheless, I would make one addition. While it often appears that the Corps of Engineers have put forward questionable or inaccurate data, the fact is that these data are supplied by the so-called local interests—in this case the Indiana Port Commission, National and Bethlehem Steel, and certain Porter County interests—and the Corps has been made the fall guy because the local interests say "you have to take our word" and "you challenge our sovereignty if you ask for proof." Therefore, while criticisms of information in the Engineers' reports appear to apply to the District Engineer, it should be understood that in large part his hands have been tied by powerful local interests.

While Mr. Shepherd in part discusses questions which the Save the Dunes Council lawyers, other conservationists, and I have raised, his study is truly independent in that he has dug out new and devastating information. For example, he has gone into the question of tug costs, on which crucial alleged benefits have been based, and has acquired expert testimony that the certain development of bow-power thrust will wipe out alleged savings due to tug costs. He has also determined that no commitments exist which assure that the largest source of alleged benefits; namely, the Rail-to-Water Transfer Corp., of Chicago, will in fact be switched to Burns Ditch.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that these three articles which appeared in Chicago's American for February 21, 22, and 23, be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Chicago American, Feb. 21, 1963]

COVERUP OF DUNES HARBOR FACTS?—THE DUNES—HAVEN FOR PIRATES?

(By C. Owsley Shepherd)

(NOTE.—Why has the U.S. Budget Bureau locked up special reports by the Army's Corps of Engineers which might affect the current Dunes Harbor controversy in Indiana? As Congress awaits action by the Bureau on the Burns Ditch Harbor proposal, expected to cost taxpayers more than $25 million in Federal funds if approved, Chicago's American publishes a special analysis of the mysterious engineering reports. This is the first of a series.)

Gov. Matthew E. Welsh, of Indiana, is charged with seeking downstate support for an economic development fund, 71 percent of which would go for a harbor at Burns Ditch, by emphasizing that proposed projects include two Ohio River bridges.

The allegation was made by the Fort Wayne chapter of the Izaak Walton League, whose president, Sam Ropchan, said "this strikes us as a misrepresentation."

The chapter introduced a resolution opposing the development fund at a public hearing in Indianapolis last night conducted by two legislative committees studying Welsh's proposal to double the 3-cent cigarette tax.

DOUGLAS FIGHTS

Under the administration plan, the added revenue from a tax increase would go to the proposed $35,435,800 fund, of which $25.5 million is earmarked for dredging and building outer breakwaters for a dunelands port.

Welsh has said that Indiana would be reimbursed should the Federal Government decide to pay for these portions of the $68 million harbor.

Senator DOUGLAS, Democrat, of Illinois, leader of conservationists in Washington opposed to the Burns Ditch project, charges Welsh is attempting to rush a start on a port to confront dissidents with an accomplished fact before Congress has had an opportunity to vote on the matter.

Although a recommendation for Federal participation was submitted more than a year ago by the U.S. Corps of Army Engineers, it still is being analyzed by the Bureau of the Budget.

The proposed harbor would run between properties owned by the Midwest and Bethlehem Steel Cos. The corps in part bases its economic justification for its recommendation on projected benefits to steel interests if a public port were built instead of their having to build their own.

DOUGLAS CHARGES FAKE

Two savings totaling $270,000, the Engineers say, would result from eliminating vessel delays caused by wave action and storms.

Senator DOUGLAS alleges these estimates "obviously are faked."

DOUGLAS protests that for a year the corps has refused to furnish him with detailed calculations, proof that it studied alternate sites, or copies of secret agreements between the State of Indiana and the steel interests.

The Illinois Senator, who has introduced a bill for the Interior Department to acquire 9,000 acres of dunelands to be preserved in a national park, has appealed to the Budget Bureau to get information from the corps on 12 specific points he challenges.

PIRATE INDUSTRY

In a letter to Elmer Staats, Deputy Director of the Bureau, DOUGLAS demands to know if the Army Engineers and other groups "have conspired to pirate away an Illinois industry in order to justify the Burns Ditch proposal and destroy the dunes."

This reference is to the corps analysis of the alleged effect of the improvement upon the activities of the Rail to Water Transfer Corp., an association of 28 Illinois, Indiana, and Kentucky producers, which transfers coal from rail cars to ships at its docks at East 101st Street and the Calumet River.

The corps estimates the harbor would handle 5 million tons of coal shipments annually, and rail to water is the only concern in this part of the Midwest with access to such sizable supplies.

Douglas says the corps uses this projected coal traffic as the chief anticipated source of revenue with which the State of Indiana could amortize $38 million in bonds to pay for land and facilities it is to provide.

Since economic justification for any such project is a prerequisite to Federal participation, Senator Douglas states in his letter:

"The public is entitled to know whether these alleged benefits are nothing more than a wholesale pirating of coal transfer operations from an existing port to a proposed port which would serve the same area."

Engineers among the membership of the Save the Dunes Council, a group of conservationists, have made their own analysis of the feasibility recommendation issued in January 1962 by the Chicago district of the Army Engineers, as well as comparing it with the district's October 1960 report which was ordered withdrawn a month later.

In 1962, it was concluded shippers of coal, grain, and overseas general cargoes would save $610,000 a year through elimination of vessel delays and tug costs by using Burns Ditch instead of the Calumet River and harbor.

It also was figured that the steel interests would save $700,000 a year by not having to build an alternate private port, as well as $135,000 on each of two other factors. It is the latter two benefits which Senator Douglas says "obviously are faked."

SIX CONCLUSIONS

The corps dealt at length in both reports on results of wave action. It listed six conclusions in the 1960 document and five of these were repeated verbatim in 1962. The one that was omitted read, "A westerly oriented entrance is considered undesirable." Douglas says this is significant.

For purposes of comparison, the Army Engineers describe both the proposed public harbor and a private alternate. In dealing with the first, provision is made for only an easterly entrance. But the private port is depicted as having two entrances—one to the west.

The corps then says that the public undertaking would save $135,000 annually by eliminating lost time in unloading due to wave action in the berthing areas of the smaller port attributable to its westerly opening.

SAKE OF ECONOMY

The corps says it laid out the private project as it did for purposes of economy. The Illinois Senator scoffs at this as a specious claim.

The other $135,000 benefit item is credited to reducing delays in vessels entering the public harbor during storms.

Yet the corps states elsewhere that the port is not designed to provide areas for anchoring of ships that might require refuge because Calumet harbor furnishes such protection.

Besides, the conservationists point out, Bethlehem Steel wants to fill an area east of the proposed harbor and the length of future Great Lakes bulk carriers is expected to increase, which would add to the hazards of entering the port.

RAISE QUESTIONS

Experts for the Save the Dunes Council charge the "corps apparently found it necessary to create some fictitious benefits" in other areas. They raise these questions:

1. Why should an annual maintenance cost of $100,000 be set for each project when the private port would be much the smaller?
2. Why should all the riprap along the base of the breakwater cells be priced at $17 per ton for a private project, but be divided into filter stone at $6 and protection stone at $17 per ton for the public harbor?
3. Why should it take 39,000 tons of stone along the base of the cells for the 2,000-foot north breakwater of the private harbor, but only 34,500 tons for 5,376 feet along the base of the public breakwater?
4. Why should it cost virtually as much per foot of length for a private breakwater in water 27 feet deep as for the public project in a depth of 42.2 feet where a greater diameter of the breakwater cells would be required? The former figure, the Engineers indicate, would be $2,496.50; the latter, $2,594.50 per foot.

ENGINEER REPLY

In computing the ratio of benefits to costs, Col. J. A. Smedile, district head of the Engineers, considers only Federal costs because he deems to be self-liquidating the State's share and the $4.5 million to be invested by steel interests.

The Save the Dunes Council contends there are two items which are not self-liquidating and, therefore, should have been considered in determining the benefit-to-cost ratio. These are:

1. The United States says the State must be responsible for repairing the 27,000 cubic yards of shore erosion expected to result each year from construction of the harbor.
2. The Engineers say that the State must reimburse the Federal Government for any outer harbor dredging costs in excess of $3.7 million.

[From the Chicago's American, Feb. 22, 1963]

Charge Dunes Data Faked

(By C. Owsley Shepherd)

(Note.—As Congress waits action by the Budget Bureau on an inland port for Indiana expected to cost taxpayers more than $25 million in Federal funds if approved, Chicago's American publishes this analysis on the mysterious actions of the Army Corps of Engineers and its reports on the Burns Ditch project. Herewith is the second article in this special report.)

The Great Lakes Towing Co. has told Chicago's American that the Army Corps of Engineers never studied the records upon which it bases certain favorable recommendations for a harbor at Burns Ditch in Indiana.

The corps states that its figures were derived from a "study of actual transit and detention time, 1959 records."

Capt. Donald McGarity, vice president of the towing company's western division, which handles all tug services in the Calumet River, said Army Engineers never requested this information.

And this company is the only source of complete data.

CHECK ON FIGURES

Since Congress is being asked to vote for spending $25.5 million of taxpayers' money for a harbor to chiefly benefit Bethlehem and Midwest Steel Cos., it first should determine if the Army Engineers' figures pass muster.

The Corps says shippers of coal, grain, and general cargo could save $610,000 a year through operating out of Burns Ditch, were a public port to be built there, rather than the Calumet River and harbor.

The Engineers reason that an open port on the lake would save shippers time and money in avoiding the complications of river transit, including the raising of drawbridges, towing costs, and vessel delays.

Senator Douglas, Democrat, of Illinois, who is fighting to save Indiana's remaining dunelands, agrees that this approach is valid, but he charges the corps ballooned its estimates for the purpose of showing economic justification for Federal participation in the harbor project.

COMPLETE STUDY

Since no analysis ever has been published, and the public does not have access to the records, Chicago's American has made a complete study of the corps' 1960 report, which was ordered suppressed, and its 1962 report, which now is being reviewed by the Bureau of the Budget.

A comparison of these and other documents released by Col. J. A. Smedile, head of the Chicago district, Army Engineers, shows a perplexing tangle of jacked-up figures, all of which tend to justify the Burns Ditch plan.

ARMY ESTIMATES LOADS IN FUTURE

In a report on the Calumet Harbor and River issued in December 1961, the corps estimated that over the next 50 years the average load for vessels would be 16,400 tons for coal, 16,600 for grain, and 4,000 for general cargo.

One month later, in a Burns Ditch report, the corps estimated these same loads at $12,500, 9,400, and 3,000, respectively.

Obviously, these discrepancies tend to increase appreciably the number of vessel trips necessary to handle the anticipated traffic.

In 1962 Burns Ditch report doubles the 1960 estimates of vessel delays; it raises the projected average tug cost for coal traffic from $305 to $780, and it hikes the average vessel operation cost per hour for grain traffic from $134 to $191.

Senator Douglas has asked the Bureau of the Budget to press its inquiry into these revisions.

SOME PREDICTIONS BY THE EXPERTS

In view of the fact that the Engineers are dealing with a 50-year projection, and purportedly basing their conclusions on a 1985 estimated average, Chicago's American took a look into the future.

Ken Moreland, of the American Bureau of Shipping, said it is possible there will be no tug movements at all in 25 years, since the Great Lakes fleet by then might be so maneuverable as to not require this service.

Frank Nugent, president of the Freeman Coal Mining Corp., says that within a few years the majority of the ships probably will have bow power thrust (a forward propeller), which would reduce tugs from two into the river and one out to one in and none out—a cut of two-thirds.

E. B. Williams, vice president of American Shipbuilding Co., has prepared a crystal-ball forecast in which he foresees redesigning of the entire ore fleet to eliminate tug usage.

PLAN SWITCHOVER IN 4 YEARS

Howard H. Scott, vice president of the Bird-Johnson Co. of South Walpole, Mass., manufacturer of marine propellers, says "we are rather hopeful that all self-unloading vessels will be equipped with bow thrusters within the next 4 years."

It is reported that all Ford Motor Co. ships soon will be converted to forward propellers, which will allow them to turn under their own power, and Captain McGarity says independent operators will have to change over "to stay in the picture."

The J. R. Sensibar, a coal carrier operated by the Columbia Transportation Co. of Cleveland, is a bow thruster which made 131 trips in the Calumet River from April through September of last year.

This is approximately one-third of the total coal vessel trips made. The Sensibar needed only one tug escort into the river and none on the way out, and its average delay was less than 1 hour.

JUST WHAT DO ENGINEERS MEAN?

So the question is, Where do the Army Engineers get their projection?

In sharpshooting the engineers' 1962 report, one might start at the very beginning—the opening sentence of the syllabus, which reads:

"The district engineer concludes that the proposed Burns waterway harbor is economically justified by anticipated transportation savings on transshipments of grain, coal, and oversea general cargo, and on receipts of iron ore, limestone, and coal for the Midwest Steel Corp."

What receipts of iron ore, limestone, and coal? The report doesn't indicate. Nor is there mention of savings to steel interests if taxpayers should finance a port for them.

It is true that in 1960 the corps based its favorable recommendation on the benefits Midwest would realize if it did not have to ship its incoming supplies by rail from the Calumet or Indiana harbors to its Burns ditch mill.

But this was based on two false presumptions: First, that Midwest in the immediate future would set up an integrated steel plant, to which it still is not committed; second, that there was no alternative but for the company to transship supplies.

Presumption No. 2 was exploded by Midwest's statement at a public hearing in Indianapolis August 30, 1961, that it would construct its own private port at Burns Ditch if the Federal Government didn't come through with a subsidy.

The corps then had to start from scratch and seek an entirely different approach to economic justification for Federal participation.

Thus in 1962 the pitch was that steel interests (including Bethlehem) would benefit by $940,000 a year if they didn't have to build their own harbor.

QUESTION RAISED ON TRANSSHIPPING

In either event, whether the project were public or private, iron ore, limestone, and metallurgical coal would be shipped directly to the docks at Burns Ditch. There would be no transshipment involved.

So what is Colonel Smedile trying to say in his syllabus?

Senator Douglas comments: "Either the Corps of Engineers is confused or they are attempting to confuse the public."

Earlier this month, Chicago's American detailed at length the tremendous political pressure and the motives behind the Burns Ditch project.

But one thing that has not been told is that Indiana taxpayers had absolutely nothing to say about selection of the site and that Indiana politicians dictated the choice to the Corps of Army Engineers.

In Indianapolis on May 3, 1961, a public hearing was conducted by the Indiana Port Commission for the announced purpose of determining the desired location for a deepwater harbor along the Lake Michigan shoreline.

What all of the John Q. Publics and their wives who attended the session did not know was that the Burns Ditch deal already had been signed, sealed, and delivered.

As far back as January 22, 1960, the Indiana Board of Public Harbors and Terminals, the Indiana Department of Conservation and Midwest Steel had entered into a secret agreement to place the port adjacent to the steel company's 750 acres of property at Burns Ditch in Porter County.

[From the Chicago American, Feb. 23, 1963]

Dunes Harbor: Who Pays, Who Profits?

(By C. Owsley Shepherd)

Do you owe any money to Bethlehem Steel Co. or to the Midwest Division of the National Steel Corp.?

Don't be too sure. Taxpayers from Hawaii to Maine and from Alaska to Florida soon may be told to pick up a tab of $25.5 million for a deepwater harbor at Burns Waterway in Indiana.

And if you live in the Hoosier State, you face an additional bite of $38 million—courtesy of Gov. Matthew E. Welsh.

For what? To give the steel companies a readymade port, private slips, terminal facilities, the whole works.

Indiana officials are attempting to convince Congress that they can guarantee repayment of a proposed revenue bond issue to finance the State's promised contribution to the project.

Clinton Green, Governor Welsh's administrative assistant who doubles as Port Commission secretary, testified before a Senate subcommittee:

"You see, we have an organization, for instance, that transfers coal from rail cars to ships. They want to come in and locate."

Green was referring to the Rail to Water Transfer Corp., which operates at cost from its docks on the Calumet River in Illinois.

The Army Corps of Engineers has built its castle in the sand around the theory that Rail to Water will move all of its operations to Burns Ditch. But will it?

Leo M. Geissal, president of the corporation, told the Chicago American that he never has gone beyond the original letter of intent, which stated that the facilities might be switched over if there were economic benefits to its customers.

One of the principal movers of coal that is alined with Rail to Water is the Freeman Coal Mining Corp. Its president, Frank Nugent, and Geissal are extremely disturbed over the rate of 53.7 cents that the Belt railway of Chicago charges per ton for hauling coal 1¼ miles from the Illinois Central yards to the Calumet River transfer point.

They would move in a minute if it were economically feasible. But how can they beat their present rate of 18.5 cents per ton for the transfer from rail cars to ship by moving to Burns Ditch, where their rentals would be the chief hope of Indiana's amortizing its bonds?

CAN'T SEE PROFIT IN DUNES MOVE

Rail to water is hooked on the horns of a dilemma, but neither Geissal nor Nugent believes it will be profitable to move.

This newspaper checked a persistent rumor that a large Chicago brokerage house had expressed interest in underwriting the proposed Indiana bond issue. A partner in the firm said that preliminary examination indicated it might be a sound proposition. He added.

"Why shouldn't it be if it is backed by these two large steel companies?"

This possibility was explored adversely in testimony before the Senate public lands subcommittee:

Senator Clinton P. Anderson, Democrat, of New Mexico—"Do they [Bethlehem and Midwest Steel companies] guarantee in any way the repayment of these revenue bonds?"

Green. "No sir."

NO GUARANTEE ON BONDS CERTAIN

Anderson pursued by asking: "There will be at some stage a financial guarantee by Bethlehem and by Midwest?"

Green. "I am not so sure of that, because there will be a financial guarantee by these other users."

Green introduced "letters of intent" from eight companies, whereupon Senator Anderson remarked that there is a considerable difference between a letter of intent and a firm commitment.

One of Green's letters was from Rail to Water.

The second was from American Oil Co. [of Indiana], which is enthusiastic and seeks an exclusive franchise to sell all petroleum products to users of the port area.

N.Y.C. INTERESTED IN COAL DOCKS

The third is from the New York Central Railroad, which requests first refusal rights [or an option] to coal docks, warehouses, and other concessions.

The others are innocuous, neither saying "yes" nor "no" to anything.

Senator Douglas, Democrat, of Illinois, a bitter opponent of a plan he says will mean using taxpayers' money to wreck the dunes for the convenience of two big steel companies, claims that these letters are window dressing and do not represent one nickel of guaranteed investment.

Nevertheless, the harbor project is being backed to the hilt by nearly all Indiana politicians and by the Army engineers, who in a 1960 report conceded that 97.3 percent of all benefits would accrue to the steel interests.

SUGGEST A SITE IN LAKE COUNTY

This subsidy is opposed by the Save the Dunes Council, a group of 2,400 conservationists; by Senator Douglas, who gave the dissenters a voice in Washington, and by many scientists.

They say they want to see Indiana get a deepwater public harbor, but they insist it should be located where it would spare the dunelands and yet be of maximum economic value to the State. They suggest a site in Lake County, which would connect the Calumet and Indiana Harbors.

It would be politically naive to ask why the steel companies don't end the rumpus by building their own private harbor, since they have expressed a willingness to do so in the absence of Federal aid.

The point is, say critics of the plan, that Governor Welsh has bet all of his chips on this one deal. In one form or another, he has to deliver a public harbor or be dead politically, since, in Indiana, a governor cannot succeed himself.

An interesting sidelight is that eight owners of industrial property fronting on the lake near Whiting sponsored a port feasibility study of the Whiting-Hammond-East Chicago area.

The New York City firm of Parsons, Brinkerhoff, Hall, & MacDonald [now Parson, Brinkerhoff, Quade, & Douglas], of which Morris N. Quade is consulting engineer, was retained to do the work.

The riparian property holders entered into an agreement that only a preliminary survey would be undertaken unless there was unanimous consent to go deeper.

STUDY DUMPED BEFORE REPORT

This condition doomed the project to failure. Two months before the preliminary report was submitted in February 1958, the New York Central was dickering for an option at Burns Ditch and American Oil was worrying about how much it would cost to extend its refinery's water intake and outlet pipes several miles farther out into the lake to reach beyond the proposed harbor.

The engineering consulting firm was told to bow out of the picture.

Quade, however, didn't think his work should go unnoticed. He accepted an invitation to address the Hammond Chamber of Commerce. He then detailed his reasons for deciding that the Tri-City area in Lake County, Ind., would be ideal, meeting all six of his criteria for a deepwater port.

EXTENSION OF PUBLIC LAW 874 NECESSARY

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, I call the attention of my colleagues in the Senate to a situation which, I feel, calls for early action. Across the Nation, at this .season of the year, thousands of school boards and superintendents are wrestling with the problems of estimating budgets, hiring teachers, and planning curricula for the next academic year. As a former educator, I know how difficult these problems can be and how thoroughly they can affect an entire community.

This year, however, some 4,000 school districts face additional uncertainty because of the expiration of certain portions of the federally affected area laws on June 30, 1963. These districts enroll one-third of all public elementary and secondary school pupils in the Nation. The Federal payments to eligible school districts under Public Law 874 during the 1962 fiscal year amounted to 5.2 percent of the total current operating expense budgets of these districts, and in some cases to much more. Many school districts face a serious crisis if they cannot know until June or later whether they have the money to support decisions that must be made in March.

In my State of South Dakota, many educators are troubled and anxious about the future of this legislation. They fear that the attachment of this legislation to an omnibus education bill will mean months of delay and make impossible an early decision on extending Public Laws 874 and 815. They remember the battle of 2 years ago, when they were unable until late summer to hire teachers and buy needed textbooks and teaching supplies. They are most anxious that this rather noncontroversial legislation not become embroiled in the controversy over comprehensive Federal aid to education.

The extension of this legislation is vital to educational planning in my State. In the 71 school districts in South Dakota receiving payments under Public Law 874, a fifth of their operating budgets comes from this source. I ask unanimous consent that a table showing the net entitlement and current expenditures of the 71 school districts in South Dakota receiving aid under this law be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

South Dakota

	Total	$2,425,471	$12,267,467
2	Flandreau Independent School District No. 3	16,740	243,300
3	Hot Springs Independent School District	62,476	316,730
4	Piedmont Independent School District No. 34	6,115	46,500
7	Rapid City Independent School District No. 1	683,357	3,833,920
8	Ravinia and Plain Center Independent School District No. 98, Ravinia	---------	---------
9	Sturgis Independent School District No. 12	92,368	440,753
10	Lake Andes Independent School District	6,725	115,000
14	Todd County Independent School District, Mission	199,834	473,650
201	Pickstown Independent School District No. 96	51,648	68,000
202	Chamberlin Independent School District	36,170	247,000
204	Douglas School District No. 3, Ellsworth Air Force Base	387,665	558,284
205	Newell Independent School District No. 7	8,668	142,800
206	Black Hawk School District No. 45	2,989	11,723
402	Sisseton Independent School District No. 1	15,245	345,875
403	Custer Independent School District	13,199	217,000
404	New Underwood Independent School District No. 23	$14,797	$825,000
405	Whitewood Consolidated School District No. 66	8,967	40,000
406	Wagner Independent School District No. 99	5,978	170,975
407	Rapid Valley Consolidated School District No. 4 Rapid City	14,946	80,000
502	Hill City Independent School District	4,323	96,170
503	Cleghorn Consolidated School District No. 85, Rapid City	5,978	50,000
504	Shannon County Consolidated School District, Pine Ridge	156,340	237,000
701	Dupree Independent School District No. 12	5,081	70,000
703	Blunt Independent School District No. 2	4,035	50,000
704	Harrold Independent School District No. 3	1,943	63,213
705	Big Bend School District No. 32, Rapid City	1,943	7,000
706	Washabaugh Unorganized Consolidated School District, Wanblee	14,788	70,000
708	Eagle Butte Independent School District No. 3	52,910	135,500
801	Rosebud Consolidated School District No. 24	1,793	7,048
802	Gettysburg Independent School District No. 1	15,544	184,884
803	Eastern School District No. 15, Dupree	1,644	9,000
805	Fairview School District No. 3, Dupree	2,481	13,050
807	Interior Independent School District No. 55	3,801	44,506
808	Bennett County I.H. School District, Martin	5,762	100,000
809	White River Independent School District	27,053	85,500
810	Martin Consolidated School District No. 2	11,931	130,000
811	Timber Lake Independent School District No. 2	4,633	138,000
813	Wood Independent School District No. 1	2,391	48,167
814	McLaughlin Independent School District No. 3	28,398	15,000
902	Mobridge Independent School District No. 13	7,473	436,083
903	Nemo Consolidated School District No. 55	2,839	8,970
904	McIntosh Independent School District No. 1	28,547	203,450
1001	Wahehe School District No. 83, Greenwood	19,196	19,469
1002	Smee Independent School District No. 4, Wakpala	34,825	121,175
1003	Boulder Park Consolidated School District No. 14, Deadwood	3,288	11,510
1005	St. Charles Consolidated School District No. 104	8,370	27,000
1006	Elvira Township Independent School District No. 4, Gann Valley	9,117	67,286
1008	Blackpipe Consolidated School District No. 8, Norris	12,256	34,427
1009	North River School District No. 16, Dupree	5,530	33,000
1102	Provo Independent School District No. 36, Igloo	177,722	224,584
1103	Washington Consolidated School District No. 26, Norris	2,690	4,292
1104	Edgemont Independent School District No. 37	19,579	158,983
1201	Victory School District No. 8, Fort Thompson	12,080	23,500
1202	Wall Independent School District No. 58	13,969	80,386
1203	Wasta School District No. 1	4,179	16,950
1204	Keystone Consolidated School District No. 2	5,429	20,000
1205	Martin Consolidated School District No. 3	7,253	38,000
1206	Evergreen Consolidated School District No. 17	5,978	55,000
1207	Pukwana Independent School District No. 1	3,288	15,000
1208	Duncon Consolidated School District No. 2, Keldron	4,483	25,000
1210	Sisseton Consolidated School District No. 4	5,081	84,012
1301	Buffalo Gap Independent School District No. 4	2,690	37,000
1302	Philip Independent School District	5,978	135,114
1303	Spearfish Independent School District No. 4	8,071	268,228
1304	Oral School District No. 34	3,288	23,500
1305	Belle Fourche Independent School District No. 26	---------	---------
1306	Highmore Independent School District No. 1	22,347	120,000
1307	Oacoma Consolidated School District No. 2	4,185	18,000
1308	White Eagle School District No. 18, Rapid City	$2,690	$15,000
1309	Cherry Creek School District No. 2, Dupree	2,391	12,000
1310	Faith Independent School District No. 8	---------	---------

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, I should like to call special attention to the situation that exists in Rapid City, S. Dak., as a result of the uncertainty about this legislation. Mr. Paul C. Stevens, superintendent of the Rapid City public schools, informs me that he is anticipating an increase in enrollment of 800 pupils in the Rapid City school system next fall. This means the hiring of 25 more teachers, the provision of more classrooms, and the purchase of many additional books and supplies. Already the school budget requires a levy of 39.76 mills—the State limitation is 40 mills—and the half-million dollars being received under Public Law 874 accounts for 11 percent of the total budget. About 3,000, or 24 percent, of the 12,500 pupils enrolled in the Rapid City schools are classified as federally connected. Because of the rapid pace in construction of the Minuteman missile projects in the area, this proportion is rising.

And yet Mr. Stevens, like other superintendents across the State, cannot compete for high quality teachers or make commitments for needed supplies, until the fate of this legislation is known. Already I have received urgent letters from superintendents and citizens in Hot Springs, Igloo, Pierre, and other cities expressing their concern. I expect to receive many more.

Why is it, Mr. President, that many of our Nation's educators and school boards already harrassed by mounting problems of school administration, must be subjected to this additional uncertainty? Is it because there is any doubt about the intentions of Congress about this vital legislation? On the contrary, no laws affecting education have received more consistent support than Public Laws 815 and 874. Is it because the President has not recommended the continuation of this legislation? No, in his admirable message on education to the Congress, the President recommended a 4-year continuation of the portions of these laws which expire on June 30, 1963.

What, then, is the problem? Why are our educators and school boards being denied swift action on their plea for continuation of Public Laws 815 and 874? The answer lies in the political deadlock in the Congress which has hamstrung action on comprehensive legislation for many years. The opponents of Federal aid to education are, above all, political realists who recognize the universal popularity of the impacted areas legislation. They will vote for these measures because they know that thousands of educators and parents in their home States are immediately concerned about them. The President, too, is a political realist. He knows that these programs are proven and popular and wishes to make their extension part of a vitally needed comprehensive program of national help to schools. He is right when he says that "the growing demands of modern education which Federal financing is better able to assist make it necessary to expand Federal aid to education beyond the existing limited number of special programs."

But should these schools which desperately need some early decision on this legislation bear the entire burden of our indecisiveness in national policy toward education? May I make a suggestion, Mr. President, that may perhaps be helpful in satisfying the educators' concern and yet preserve the lines in the legislative struggle over this matter?

Can we not agree to a 1-year extension of the present provisions of these laws, without change, and leave the question of the longer extension requested by the President for resolution in the give-and-take of debate on S. 580? Would not this satisfy both parties to the legislative struggle over the future aid to education? Above all, it would enable thousands of educators and school boards to make their decisions now on faculty, classrooms, and supplies in the fall. This seems to me a sensible and practical way out of the biennial pressure to which we subject the teachers and administrators of schools responsible for educating several million American youngsters.

I would welcome an expression of the thinking of my colleagues in the Senate on this important matter. If education, as the President so well put it, is the keystone in the arch of freedom and progress, then it is certainly our duty in the Congress to assist rather than hamper those who are building the arch.

TAX CONSIDERATION FOR THE GOLD MINING INDUSTRY

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, 1 week ago today my senior colleague from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] and I introduced S. 824 for the relief of one of America's most hard pressed industries—the gold-mining industry. I want to call attention to the fact that assistance for this industry is in no sense a partisan matter. In South Dakota informed people are deeply concerned about the future of mining. Most of the commercial gold mining still being done in the United States is conducted in the Black Hills of South Dakota, and the Homestake Gold Mine, once known as the world's largest gold mine, is located at Lead, S. Dak. Yet, this large mine is facing a difficult struggle to remain operative in the face of mounting obstacles.

It is truly ironic that in a time when the Nation is confronted with a rapidly diminishing reserve of gold, some of the most highly productive gold mines within our country have been closed. In actual fact, more than 95 percent of the gold mines in the United States have been forced to close in recent years. As the Senator from South Dakota put it:

> No other industry in this country is compelled by law to sell its product at the price which prevailed in 1933, while at the same time it endeavors to conduct its activities and to pay its costs in terms of the steadily increasing inflationary prices which have prevailed in this country since 1933.

While gold production in the United States continues to decline, the world production of gold rose in 1962 for the ninth successive year establishing a new high estimated at 49.5 million ounces. Since the need for gold is clearly urgent, I submit that it is imperative we do something to stimulate gold mining in the United States. Of all the means readily at hand, I feel that an increase in the gold depletion allowance, as provided in the bill introduced by the two Senators from South Dakota, is the most feasible and would have the most immediate effect.

OVERALL MILITARY POSTURE OF THE UNITED STATES INFORMATION PROGRAM

Mrs. SMITH. Mr. President, last Friday at the military posture hearing of the Senate Armed Services Committee, I asked Secretary of Defense McNamara the question, "What is the U.S. policy on Cuba?" It does not violate security to reveal what his answer was, since on that day the chairman of the committee did reveal his answer, which was that there were two objectives in the policy on Cuba: First, overthrow Castro and eliminate Communist control of Cuba; and second, prevent export of aggression by force from Cuba into other parts of the hemisphere.

I asked the Secretary of Defense other questions, which I request be placed in the body of the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the questions were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

QUESTIONS OF SENATOR MARGARET CHASE SMITH TO DEFENSE SECRETARY MCNAMARA, AT THE 1963 DEFENSE POSTURE HEARINGS, COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES, U.S. SENATE

OVERALL IMPRESSION

1. President Kennedy and General Taylor have said there would be no winners in a nuclear war. You and the President have stressed the growing power of Russia's nuclear forces. Under Secretary Gilpatric has publicly stated that he doesn't know how war can be limited "once you start using any kind of a nuclear bang."

It is reasonable to conclude that the overall impression created by these statements is that the United States is afraid to use nuclear weapons for fear doing so would immediately and automatically escalate to a holocaust war. That's the impression I get—and I think it is probable that it is the impression Khrushchev gets.

Yet, the world knows that the Communists have a vast superiority in combat forces for conventional warfare, including first-rate armored units and the largest tactical air force in the world. Coupled with this they have interior lines of supply and communication—an aggressive attitude to conquer the world—and some pretty weak opponents on their borders, like Iran, Burma, India, Thailand.

If, in view of these facts, Khrushchev decides to challenge the United States and Allied conventional forces on a broad scale, what do you propose to do about it?

2. Is your long term objective to create large enough conventional forces in the free world to cope with major Communist aggressions without resort to nuclear weapons?

3. Or are we really much bolder about nuclear weapons than our public statements would indicate?

4. If so, are we programing sufficient tactical nuclear capabilities to win such a conflict without carrying it to the point of an ICBM exchange?

INFORMATION PROGRAM

1. We have read a great deal about the managed news policy and operation of the Department of Defense. Would you please explain that policy, the reasons for it, and how it works?

2. Is it not a fact that there is a policy, regulation or firm practice in the Department of Defense that news information, particularly notices to Members of Congress, has to be cleared through the Department of Defense by each of the services?

3. What does that clearance consist of? Does it include approval as to the timing of such notices to Members of Congress?

4. I have been told by reliable sources inside the Pentagon that there is a requirement that no notice shall go to Members of Congress by the services until at least 48 hours after such notice has been given to the Department of Defense—is this true? What is the exact situation?

5. I have been told by the same reliable sources that at least 48-hour advance notice must be given to the White House—is this true? What is the exact situation?

6. Although I am a member of this committee—and a member of the Appropriations Subcommittee on Defense—both in 1961 and in 1962 I have had the experiences of information being given on Maine military construction contracts to the junior Senator by the White House and withheld from me. In 1962 on one occasion through a committee staff member I requested information from the Navy Department on a submarine award 2 days prior to the time it was given to the junior Senator from Maine by the White House and the Navy Department refused to provide the information—again within a few minutes after the junior Senator from Maine announced the award and it had appeared on the wire service teletype a request was made on my behalf and again the Navy Department refused to give me the information that the White House had given the junior Senator and which had been announced by the junior Senator—in fact, the Navy Department refused to give me that information until about 3 hours later.

With this having happened annually in the first 2 years of the Kennedy administration—in 1961 and 1962—will this pattern be repeated in this third year of the Kennedy administration, in 1963?

7. For your information, the so-called split-second current timing by Army, Navy, and Air Force officers on notices to members of congressional delegations—when favored Democratic Senators and Congressmen have been given the information by the White House at least hours ahead if not days ahead—has cast them in the degrading role of Gilbert and Sullivan, comic-opera-like military officers and made such scenes as their synchronizing their watches in order to appear in, or contact, each individual office at the same split second, so ludicrous that it has become a topic of ridicule and they have become a laughing stock in such operations—almost like Keystone Cops.

Do you approve of casting them in such degrading messenger boy roles delivering messages that have already been delivered hours or days before by the White House to the favored few Democratic Senators and Democratic Congressmen and even already announced by the favored Senators?

8. Do you think that this is a practice that any administration should tolerate?

9. Do you plan to do anything about it?

10. There was a rare time when I learned in advance—not from the White House, not

from your legislative affairs office, and not from the Army Legislative Liaison Office—that an Army award had been given to a Maine concern. I made the announcement first. Subsequent to that, I was informed by some persons that two investigations had been made to attempt to determine how I got that information—one investigation conducted by the Army Inspector General, another investigation by Army Intelligence—and that persons had been interrogated as to whether they had given the information to me

Apparently it was all right for the White House to give the information to the junior Senator and the Navy deny such information to me even though I asked for it both before and after the White House had given it to the junior Senator—but when I got the information ahead of the junior Senator, such was apparently a crime—enough to prompt what was reported a reaction that was not satisfied with only one investigation on my getting the information but required two investigations.

I would appreciate your supplying me with such information as you can on these investigations.

11. Mr. Secretary, recently on a telecast interview I was asked if I felt that I was getting the information that I should from this administration. My answer was "No" and I referred specifically to my work as a member of this committee and the Appropriations Committee.

I had in mind a very specific example—the request that I made for a percentage breakdown of the planned defense budget for fiscal year 1965 according to the categories of (a) offensive capability weapons, (b) general purpose capability weapons, (c) defensive capability weapons, and (d) research and development. I call your attention to pages 43 and 44 of the printed record of January 19, 1962. While you agreed at that time to furnish information later in response to my question, what followed thereafter was initial great resistance by the Department of Defense, particularly the office of Under Secretary Gilpatric, to provide the information which I requested.

When I confronted Mr. Gilpatric's office with the fact that not only had the information I had requested—but even more—been given to the 9999th Air Reserve Squadron on the Tuesday following your Friday appearance before the committee when I asked for the information, Mr. Gilpatric's office denied that such was the case. In fact, he formalized his denial in a letter dated February 15, 1962, to me and which you will find on pages 43 and 44 of the hearing record. I call your attention to his letter of denial and my reply.

I then called for the visual chart that had been shown to the 9999th Air Reserve Squadron; and when I did Mr. Gilpatric came to my office and brought the chart with him, admitted that his denial was incorrect, that what I had asked for and had previously been denied as a member of this committee, had actually been given to a large group of Reserve officers, most of whom had no connection with this committee and whose rank was as junior as that of lieutenant.

This is what I mean by being denied information as a member of this committee. Will it continue to be necessary for me to attend the meeting of Barry Goldwater's 9999th Air Reserve Squadron in order to receive information that is deliberately withheld from this committee as it was in this instance up to the very end when I confronted your office with identification of the very visual chart displayed to that group?

FEARLESS NEWSMAN

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, all in the Congress—indeed all in our Government and all in our excellent press corps who knew the late Robert W. Richards—deeply mourn his sudden passing.

Bob Richards was the chief of the Washington bureau of the Copley Newspapers. Many excellent Copley publications are located in the State from which I come. I was proud to call Bob Richards a friend; so was my wife. He was highly respected by his colleagues in our free press, and also by all in the Congress who knew him. All of us will miss him greatly.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record an editorial appearing in the San Diego Union for February 13, 1963, commenting on the great loss we have suffered because of the passing of Bob Richards.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Fearless Newsman

The death of Robert W. Richards, chief of the Copley Newspapers Washington bureau, comes as a personal shock to his newspaper and political friends across the Nation.

More importantly, the untimely death silences a man who spoke fearlessly of government regardless of how high the criticism might reach.

Mr. Richards covered an era of almost continual crisis for this country and the world. In his 20 years as a war correspondent and Washington reporter, he won the respect and friendship of top military and political leaders.

Mr. Richards was of the old school of newsmen who covered every phase of government from local through national. His outspoken opinions were respected by White House advisers, Congressmen, military and naval leaders and countless thousands of American newspaper readers.

His wit was a source of pleasure to friends and associates on the Washington scene and wherever he traveled.

Copley Newspaper readers will greatly miss the informative reporting under the byline of Robert W. Richards, a reporter who literally exhausted himself covering the world to bring them facts.

A CURE FOR SICK CITIES

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, in a recent article entitled "A Cure for Sick Cities," which appeared in the February 9, 1963, issue of Saturday Review, our distinguished colleague, Senator Clifford Case, of New Jersey, perceptively and skillfully presented several suggestions which, if adopted, might indeed bring realism to the coordination of the Federal programs which are designed to better the lives of those who dwell in our great urban and suburban areas.

As a Senator from a burgeoning metropolitan State and with a long and deep interest in urban problems, Senator Case's comments should be of particular interest to all who want to bring efficiency and economy to these programs.

There seems to be some question as to the administration's desire to create a Department of Urban Affairs and Housing. Senator Case notes the reasons why the administration's reorganization plan failed in the last Congress. The administration might well want to adopt the Senator's suggestions in any new proposal. The Federal interest in urban affairs includes more than housing; it includes also mass transportation, air pollution, highways, and water pollution to name but a few areas.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to include Senator Case's article, "A Cure for Sick Cities," at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

A Cure for Sick Cities

(By U.S. Senator Clifford Case, of New Jersey)

The years since 1950 in America have brought the revolution of urbanization, as it has been rightly called. About 125 million people and nearly 80 percent of our productive capacity are now located within our 212 metropolitan areas. In the decade ending in 1960, 84 percent of our total population growth was in these areas. In the next quarter century our urban population is expected to increase by another 100 million people.

William Wheaton, of the University of Pennsylvania, recently told the Conference on Urban Life that we will be required to duplicate the size and capacity of all American cities existing in 1940 in order to accommodate our population growth in the next 20 years. To do this will involve an estimated investment of more than $1,000 billion.

With this growth, the problems of urban life confronting us today—in education, employment, housing, recreation, discriminatory practices, open spaces, sewage disposal, urban sprawl, health services, transportation, crime prevention, water and air pollution, slum clearance, and taxation—will become enormously more difficult. The States and local communities have the primary responsibility for meeting these problems. Yet the State and local governments can no longer do the job alone, both because of its increasing magnitude and because many of the problems cross local and even State boundaries.

Each level of government must share the responsibility for seeing to it that we meet the problems of this revolution of urbanization, of technology, of population migration, and of social mobility and fluidity. And there is no escaping the fact that the role of the Federal Government has assumed increasing importance in the affairs of metropolitan areas.

This was recognized by the Kennedy administration in its proposal to the past Congress that a new Cabinet position be created—a Secretary of Urban Affairs and Housing.

Congress failed to approve this plan for two basic reasons, I think:

1. Congress is governed by a loose affiliation of rural-living, rural-oriented, and rural-voting Members of Congress of both parties. That this is the real focus of congressional power has been apparent for years. In the hinterlands, it is still politically popular for the country cousin to flail the city slicker. For the country man, these political scalps on his belt continue to be prime assets at the polls. The importance of this fact of congressional life has rarely been more clearly demonstrated than in the defeat of the administration's reorganization plan this year.

2. The reorganization plan itself was inadequate. Its greatest weakness was its failure to bring all the Federal programs affecting urban development under one administrative roof. All the administration plan proposed was to elevate the Housing and Home Finance Agency to Cabinet level. Yet the jurisdiction of the HHFA by no means covers the range of problems confronting urban and suburban communities.

Because of this the administration was unable to muster the full political support of even those members of Congress who come from our urban and suburban areas. Its plan failed to meet what should be one of the basic objectives of this new department, namely the elimination of waste and duplication through the coordination of the currently fragmented Federal programs affecting our metropolitan areas.

I believe that the President should now seek to determine which of the activities of the Federal Government need to be brought under the jurisdiction of a new Department of Urban Affairs. With this objective in mind, Mr. Kennedy could appoint an advisory commission from within and without Government to study this matter and make recommendations to the President and to Congress as to how best to strengthen the existing—and once-defeated—reorganization plan.

There is no doubt, I believe, of the need for such a new Cabinet post. The report of the Senate Government Operations Committee, in approving the proposed reorganization plan in 1961, said that a Department of Urban Affairs and Housing would assist States and localities emerging from the transformation of the American scene from a predominantly rural society to a vast urban complex. This transformation is moving at an accelerated pace.

Our cities have been caught between two population surges—rural people pressing in on the older cities for jobs, for better educational opportunities, for conveniences, while city residents are moving to the suburbs. Under these pressures, the process of city deterioration sets in. Taxes rise to meet the resulting increased cost of police and fire protection and of other municipal services. As city people, many of them from the relatively prosperous middle class, move to the suburbs, they leave the central city weaker in tax revenue and in many other ways. Further decay of the city core follows.

And, in many areas of the country, our problems go beyond urban overcrowding, beyond slums and downtown decay, beyond the slowdown in transportation, beyond the problems of depressed business and commercial sections, beyond strangling traffic in downtown areas.

Our problems extend far into suburbia itself. They cross city lines. We face the cancer of unplanned and uncontrolled suburban growth. The older suburbs are threatened with the same fate as the downtown cities. Those who move to the suburbs seeking better living and some tax relief must, once again, provide those services, particularly schools, already established in the cities they have left. Our transportation planners confront incredibly difficult problems of moving suburban residents into and out of the cities where they work, handicapped by a transportation system weighted heavily on the side of highway facilities as compared with rail and rapid transit.

Civic, labor, and business groups have joined in many of our cities in a comprehensive effort to reverse this trend. For these groups, it is a matter of good business, of stabilizing downtown property values, and of creating more jobs and better housing. It is a matter of eliminating slums and replacing blight with new buildings and new tax ratables which can eventually lead to real estate tax reduction. But it is more than that—it is a matter of local pride as well.

To further this new civic resolve, the Federal Government has lent a hand. At the urging of both Republican and Democratic administrations, earlier Federal aid, notably mortgage insurance for homeowners, has been expanded over a period of years to include such new programs as urban renewal, loans for home improvements, for public facilities, for public works planning, for housing for the elderly and for college students, and a wide range of other activities.

The Federal Government has recognized that this is not just a problem of the central city. It has properly sought to encourage the solution of urban problems through State and local action, including area-wide regional and interstate cooperation. For example, it provides grants to assist regional and metropolitan efforts toward comprehensive planning.

These programs are under the Housing and Home Finance Agency. But under other agencies, there are activities equally important to urban areas. Under the proposed Reorganization Plan, these would not be brought under the new department. For example, highway planners find their concern is often exclusively with traffic needs while local housing agencies have as their objective the avoidance of new slums and the replacement of existing ones. The clash for space, as each seeks to accomplish its own task, is often inevitable. The Federal Government, through two separate agencies—the Bureau of Public Roads and the Housing and Home Finance Agency—provides funds for each, in cooperation with the States and localities.

There are problems, too, in the urban scheme of things, with regard to the relative place of highways and rapid transit plans. Recently, the White House released a technical report prepared by a group of experts which suggested, in part, that more express buses, operating in reserved traffic lanes, might be mass transit's answer to the growing problem of traffic jams that threaten to strangle our metropolitan areas. Conceivably, legislation proposed by the administration to assist and supplement mass transportation facilities, under the Housing and Home Finance Agency, would result in a significant increase in express buses on our highways. The Federal Government would contribute financially to this end. But regardless of the ultimate fate of the administration's mass transit program, a modest program of mass transportation assistance, already on the books, would also lead to greater utilization of express buses. This program is administered today by the Housing and Home Finance Agency.

There is clearly no objection to locating mass transit programs under the Housing and Home Finance Agency. But a significant increase in the number of buses on the streets would quite obviously affect what another agency of Government is trying to do to combat air pollution. And this is under the jurisdiction of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Today these activities of the Federal Government are unrelated. Nor would they be related under the proposal as submitted by the President to create a Department of Urban Affairs and Housing.

Beyond this, duplication and waste would inevitably follow if mass transit plans are centered in the new department while another Federal agency—the Department of Commerce—continues to guide, finance, and control the construction of urban and suburban roads.

We cannot divide responsibility and expect sound decisions or the most efficient use of the taxpayer's dollar in meeting overall community needs.

Here is where a Department of Urban Affairs and Housing could work to the greatest advantage. It could coordinate Federal programs which have as their purpose the promotion of orderly community planning and growth.

The reorganization plan, as first submitted, can be a start but will not fully meet this purpose. For, as I have stated, it does not now provide for bringing all the Federal programs affecting urban development under one administrative roof.

If the planning problems and fiscal needs of urban centers and of suburbia, too, can be reviewed by one agency, it will not be at the cost of local and State home rule. Rather, I believe, local governments will be stimulated to develop their own comprehensive plans for the solution of areawide problems if we center already available Federal assistance and existing Federal functions in a single agency.

We need to come up with a better plan than the one proposed by the Kennedy administration. It would be my hope that renewed consideration of its deficiencies might lead not only to a better plan, but to one that would draw for the first time the sympathetic support, including political support, of the increasingly important suburbs. One minor improvement that comes readily to mind might be in the name of the new agency itself—why not call it the Department of Urban and Suburban Affairs? But details aside, if we are to have a delay in reconsideration of the need for a new department, we should make maximum use of the time available to us by strengthening the Reorganization Plan.

I do not suggest that all the administrative problems of Federal assistance to metropolitan areas will be solved simply by reallocating functions and organizing a new Cabinet department.

Only by continually strengthening Federal policies and programs that seek to deal with these complexities are we likely to reach our objectives. For there are basic changes in the nature and composition of Federal assistance programs which need to be made, quite apart from the creation of the new department.

For example, I plan to introduce legislation to require the approval by the Federal Government of a unified community plan for all projects to be financed with Federal funds before funds for any single project will be allocated by the Government. In some cases, an areawide plan should be required.

This principle is already applied to urban renewal projects. Today, no city or suburb can receive Federal loans and grants to assist in clearing slums and redeveloping cleared areas without the prior approval of a so-called workable program. In general, a workable program sketches out the community's development pattern for future years. No single urban renewal project today is eligible for Federal financial assistance unless it conforms with the objectives of that community's workable program.

There is no reason why the same prohibition against wasteful spending of the taxpayer's dollar in the pursuit of inadequately planned improvements should not be extended to all Federal programs affecting cities and suburban communities.

And as we attempt to strengthen the capacity of the executive branch of the Federal Government to give more effective help in the solution of metropolitan area problems, we would be well advised to give thought to improving the way Congress itself functions in this area. Today, for example, an agreement between States on resolving problems of water or air pollution would be passed upon, not by the congressional committees which deal with health problems or with urban matters, but by the Judiciary Committee of both House and Senate, good lawyers all. And while, to take another example, programs to build better sewage treatment plants go before the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee for approval, similar programs to aid in the construction of intercepting sewers leading to these treatment plants require the approval of still another committee, the Senate Banking and Currency Committee.

After a new Department of Urban and Suburban Affairs is established in the executive branch by Congress, we should set our own house in order by creating congressional committees on Urban and Suburban Affairs.

I cannot forecast just when these improvements will be made. Soon, I believe, the swift-running currents of urban life will require it. The creation of a new Cabinet department can be a vital first step.

FREEDOMS FOUNDATION AWARD TO BAKERSFIELD PRINCIPALS ASSOCIATION

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, on February 22—Washington's Birthday—the Freedoms Foundation at Valley Forge announced its annual awards. This year the highest award in the community program category went to the Bakersfield, Calif., Principals Association, for their citizenship program which includes the kindergarten through the first eight grades.

Mr. Thomas W. Curran, past president of the Board of Education of Bakersfield City School District, and Mr. Frank Schimandle, principal of the John L. Compton Junior High School, accepted the Thomas Jefferson Medal and $500, as well as the George Washington Honor Medal. The mayor of Bakersfield appropriately declared the day to be Freedoms Day in Bakersfield. I join the many people in California and in the whole country in congratulating the board of education and the administrators, the teachers, and the students of Bakersfield who made this award possible.

SERIOUS ECONOMIC PROBLEMS

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, on Sunday, February 17, our distinguished colleague, the senior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH] appeared with Mr. Howard K. Smith on the American Broadcasting Co. television program, "News and Comment."

In the course of the program, ABC's cameras, correspondents, and Mr. Smith did an excellent job of dramatizing some of the serious economic problems facing our Nation, particularly those in areas of so-called structural unemployment like parts of West Virginia.

May I say, Mr. President, that parts of my State of Montana are experiencing some of these same economic difficulties. I agree with the senior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH], who said during the program that we are not moving vigorously enough in meeting some of our very serious economic problems.

At the end of his program, Mr. Smith came to some conclusions regarding what steps might be taken to stimulate our lagging economy and ease the plight of the 30 to 40 million people who he reports are living in abject poverty.

Mr. President, I concur with many of the opinions expressed by Mr. Smith. But whether we agree or disagree with him, I think we all would acknowledge that he has made a thoughtful contribution to the discussion of the economic problems we face in this age of rapid technological change. I wish to congratulate Mr. Smith for his thought-provoking discussion of alternatives we might consider in attacking and overcoming some of our economic ills. I also believe we should be grateful to ABC and the sponsor, Nationwide Insurance Co., for focusing the Nation's attention on these problems.

Because of the provocative nature and timeliness of Mr. Smith's February 17 program, and because some of my colleagues may have missed the opportunity of viewing it, I ask unanimous consent that the transcript of the program be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the transcript was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From "News and Comment," with Howard K. Smith, Feb. 17, 1963, ABC Television]

WHAT IS WRONG WITH THE AMERICAN ECONOMY?

These films were made in Olcott, W. Va., a State where the unemployment rate is over 11 percent; where 54 percent of the children never reach high school; and where a quarter of a million people out of a total population of less than 2 million receive public assistance.

There are in America's affluent society between 30 and 40 million people who live in abject poverty.

Tonight: News and comments on the Nation's economy and the other America.

* * * * *

Mr. SMITH. Good evening. The cold war, Castro, De Gaulle have all been displaced as America's No. 1 problem. Far the greatest concern to the current session of Congress is, What is really the matter with America's economy?

The Joint Economic Committee and the Ways and Means Committee of the House are daily holding hearings inviting the Nation's leaders and its experts to state what they think wrong.

Though still the richest economy in the world, the American economy has for 10 years been stumbling from recession to recession. President Kennedy expressed fear of a new recession in his news conference 4 days ago. Now at a peak period, nearly 5 million Americans are unemployed. One-fifth of our magnificent industrial plant capacity is idle and useless. We are losing gold at an alarming rate to foreign countries to balance our adverse payments.

Inside America, law enforcement authorities say the slack is partly responsible for a national crime rate that is rising five times as fast as our population. It is at this moment safer to walk in wild jungles than on some of our city streets in America.

It is no exaggeration to say that if we do no better over the next generation at getting our economy moving, the United States will have a hard time remaining in the great power class.

Last year, the administration suggested that passage of the foreign trade bill would help. That was the bill to allow the President to negotiate mutually lower tariffs with other countries to stimulate trade. It is now widely acknowledged that the Foreign Trade Act will do some good—but it will in no degree improve our limping national economy.

This year the administration seeks hope in a tax bill. Taxes will be cut to give people more money to spend; and the tax structure will be reformed to give more incentives to expanding activity. This program believes that playing with taxes will not help much either, as we will argue later.

What is really wrong, and what will really help? This program believes that what is wrong is that some 40 million Americans have been short-circuited, virtually cut out of the American economy. Nearly a quarter of our people in the richest country in the world live in poverty. What has to be done is to convert that huge minority into an effective force in the economy. Then it will hum and our growth rate will rise and our crime rate will fall. We would like to explain what we mean in a moment. But first a message from our sponsor.

* * * * *

Mr. SMITH. What is poverty? Writer Dwight Macdonald defined it recently in the New Yorker magazine:

Mr. MACDONALD. Statistics for a family of four, any income that's less than $4,000 a year. For an individual, $2,000 a year.

Mr. SMITH. How many people live in poverty in America? Herman Miller of the Census Bureau in Washington gives a conservative estimate:

Mr. MILLER. We can estimate from the 1960 census that there were roughly 10 million families, about 30 million or so people, with incomes under $3,000. I would say that most of the poor are in this group. In addition, we have about another 3 million unrelated individuals, people living alone—mostly older people—I'd say, with incomes under $1,000.

Mr. SMITH. Senator JENNINGS RANDOLPH, of West Virginia, perhaps the leading expert on the question in Congress, tells who make up America's huge minority of poverty-stricken:

Senator RANDOLPH. These groups are largely the persons and the families often that are both unemployed and underemployed. There are 800,000 unemployed teenagers in the United States—they comprise in a large part the dropouts from school. They have few skills to contribute to a mechanized America and the unemployment rate in this group of teenagers is above the national average—it's almost three times above it—it's 15 percent. There are then approximately 17 million senior citizens, some call them elderly men and women, and these persons by and large, at least many of them, are living on meager incomes. They have shameful substandards of health and of housing and of nutrition and of recreation. Then we would add that third group, the 2 million migrant farm laborers and their families. They lack decent housing. They lack health conditions as they should be. The educational conditions are not adequate. They are only sporadically or seasonally employed. Then there are those racial minority groups. Some 17 million Negroes—and we must add the new immigrant Puerto Ricans. And then we must not overlook the Southwest and California, where the Mexicans are a large group of this overall group of which I have spoken. The unemployment among these people is 13 percent. And that's more than twice what the unemployment rate is among the white population within the United States.

Mr. SMITH. There's one particular category of people that you know a lot about and these are the people unemployed for what are called structural reasons. Could you tell me about them?

Senator RANDOLPH. Those are the unemployed men and women who are the victims of what we call structural changes in our economy. A cutting machine moves its nose into the coal under a mountainside in West Virginia. And the 100 men who once did that job are unemployed. We now produce almost as much coal as we did 15 years ago. But we produce that coal with approximately one-third of the manpower of the period that I have mentioned. I've been in these coal-mining towns. I've talked with these men who sit there often in idleness on the steps of the once-busy company store, or near the entrance to the mine. They have a home that hangs on a hillside. It is not a mansion, but it is a home. In that home they've reared their children. And their lives—these men—have been spent there in West Virginia.

Mr. SMITH. Typical of the homes described by Senator RANDOLPH is this one in Olcott, W. Va. It is 20 miles from the State capital of Charleston, but removed many times that distance from the comforts most Americans consider normal. The house is occupied by the Fletcher family and is reached by a bumpy dirt road that winds through the valley. Mrs. Fletcher has lived in these hills all her life. Her home is too small for her family and the facilities are primitive. But the rent is cheap, and so they go on living here. Mr. Fletcher used to work as a plasterer, but there are no jobs around now and so he has been assigned to a Government relief project.

Reporter Don Dixon talked to Mrs. Fletcher about what it is like in the mountains:

Mr. Dixon. How many children do you have, Mrs. Fletcher?

Mrs. Fletcher. I have nine.

Mr. Dixon. And your husband gets $165 a month?

Mrs. Fletcher. Yes.

Mr. Dixon. Does he get anything else besides that?

Mrs. Fletcher. No, that's all he gets.

Mr. Dixon. How do you manage to raise a family on $165 a month? Can't be easy.

Mrs. Fletcher. Our rent's not high. We pay rent of $7 a month. Then, there's my electricity—that runs right smart—on account of my stove. We make out pretty good. Just those two bills—my electric and rent.

Mr. Dixon. How about the food?

Mrs. Fletcher. We always have something to eat. It may not be fancy, but we always have something.

Mr. Dixon. What do you miss most out here? What would you most like to have?

Mrs. Fletcher. I'd like to have a lot of the conveniences that people have that live in town. I have to carry my water. We burn coal. And I don't have no automatic washer. I just wash my clothes and dry them outside. But we make out pretty good.

Mr. Dixon. Would you like to leave here if you could?

Mrs. Fletcher. Well, I'd like to live in town, but I'd never leave West Virginia. I'd never go out of the State of West Virginia.

Mr. Smith. This school is half a mile down the road from the Fletcher house. For most of these children, education is their only chance of escape from the poverty which hangs heavy on the hills.

Donna is the oldest Fletcher child and she wants to be a teacher when she grows up.

Mr. Stern. How old are you, Donna?

Donna. Eleven.

Mr. Stern. And how many children are there in your family?

Donna. Nine.

Mr. Stern. Well, there are 11 in your family. How many beds are there in the house?

Donna. Around four or five.

Mr. Smith. The mining areas are not the only ones to have suffered. This is the house of the Allman family on the outskirts of Charleston. For his family of six, Mr. Allman who works on a relief project gets $169 a month and a commodity ration of surplus foods. Mrs. Allman told us how she makes out.

Mr. Dixon. What will you be having for dinner tonight, Mrs. Allman?

Mrs. Allman. Well, I'll fix some beans. We call them pinto beans. And then I'll have some mashed potatoes and gravy and possibly some hamburger, and maybe a green salad. We don't have that every day, but I try to get a salad in once a week.

Mr. Dixon. Do you find it hard to make the money and the commodities stretch?

Mrs. Allman. Yes, I do. I tell you, you have to be a good manager, I think. Of course, sometimes my husband says I'm not—but we do have to stretch it. Every dollar has to be stretched until it almost breaks before we can do anything with it.

Mr. Dixon. Well, you know, this is supposed to be a very rich country. Do you feel any resentment about not having a lot of money in a country like this?

Mrs. Allman. No, I'm not resentful. I'm thankful for what I've got. I'd like to have more, of course, but I'm not resentful to anybody. I'm glad that everybody else has got something.

Mr. Smith. This broken down old building in Charleston used to be a school. But the times change, and now it is a distribution center for surplus food commodities. The food is given out once a month to those who qualify and in West Virginia that number keeps growing. For many of these people, commodities are the difference between starving or not. The menu isn't elaborate—canned meat, rice, dried beans, butter, cheese, flour, dried milk, shortening.

The amount varies, depending on the number of people in the family. But it averages out to about half a pound of food per person per day. Some of the food was packaged to be shipped overseas under the foreign aid program; but the need was found to be greater at home.

People must bring their own boxes or bags to carry the commodities home and sometimes a wagon comes in handy. Reporter Dixon talked to some of the men who receive the commodities.

Mr. Dixon. How long have you been on commodities, Mr. Heffman?

Mr. Heffman. About 3 months.

Mr. Dixon. How much do you get?

Mr. Heffman. I get it for seven which consists of lard, butter, flour, and so on, which it don't last a month, like it's supposed to.

Mr. Dixon. How long does it last?

Mr. Heffman. From 2 to 3 weeks.

Mr. Dixon. What do you do after that?

Mr. Heffman. That's a good question. I can't answer it.

Mr. Dixon. What did you do the last couple of weeks?

Mr. Heffman. Well, my dad helped me some and my mother-in-law helped me some. If it hadn't been for them, we couldn't have made it.

Mr. Ross. I get $85 plus my commodities; $85 covers my room rent, doctor, and medicine. What I have left over, it goes for food.

Mr. Dixon. Is that for you and your wife?

Mr. Ross. That's for me and my wife, yes sir.

Mr. Dixon. Is that enough?

Mr. Ross. Well, sir, it's not enough to live good on, but a man can make out on it if he has to. I pinch a penny and make it last—but sometimes it don't last. Sometimes I run out 3 or 4 days before I get my commodities. My check comes in first of the month. We don't throw anything away. It's all used.

Mr. Dixon. Are there times when you might go 3 or 4 days without food?

Mr. Ross. At times—a couple of days, yes. I'll say that.

Mr. Dixon. Every month?

Mr. Ross. Not every month.

Mr. Dixon. Does it seem things are getting worse in West Virginia, or better, or about the same?

Mr. Ross. It seems to me to be about a little worse than it has been.

Mr. Dixon. Do you get any entertainment at all? Do you ever get to the films, or to buy a magazine or a newspaper?

Mr. Ross. We don't take any of it. We don't even take a paper. I used to, but I quit taking a paper. Just couldn't afford it.

Mr. Dixon. How long have you been on commodities, Mr. McAllister?

Mr. McAllister. Well that will be 2 years the 16th of next March.

Mr. Dixon. Have you tried to look for work in the meantime?

Mr. McAllister. Yes, sir, everywhere I could find a job—I've tried.

Mr. Dixon. There just isn't anything around?

Mr. McAllister. There just isn't anything to find.

Mr. Dixon. What sort of work have you looked for?

Mr. McAllister. Well, sir, I tried commercial house painting, outside painting, inside painting—just take anything I can find. Ditch digging. Anything.

Mr. Dixon. Well, even if a man is willing to work around here, there aren't jobs around, are there?

Mr. McAllister. None at all. Even if you prove yourself here, you don't have much of a chance—not in the State of West Virginia.

Mr. Dixon. What about your kids? Are they going to stay here?

Mr. McAllister. If I have anything to do with it, no.

Mr. Smith. Those are a very few of the forgotten and neglected Americans, the 30 to 40 million people who are permitted neither to receive the benefits nor contribute their labor to the wealth of the world's richest nation. We are doing practically nothing for them. Our generous farm programs dole out billions to well-off farmers, not to the impoverished ones. Our housing schemes build homes for middle-class Americans. For the poor, housing programs simply mean the bulldozer chases them from one slum to a worse-crowded slum to make space for homes for the better off. They are mostly not covered by social security. The President's planned tax cut will not reach them, for they do not make enough money to pay taxes anyhow.

Their existence exacerbates every national problem. Race troubles like those in industrial Birmingham, Ala. are made severe by unemployment and the fear of low-paid white workers that they may be displaced by lower-paid Negro workers.

Crime is made worse. Today crime rises 5 times as fast as our population.

In the Nation's Capital this week, it was announced that crime in January this year is 17 percent higher than it was in January last year.

Typical of dozens of crimes, on this spot on this street, Congressman Harlan Hagen of California was attacked and beaten recently, within half a mile of the Capitol Building.

At this place, after dark last week, an elderly woman arriving at the railroad station was attacked and beaten by a man. This is within 200 yards of the Capitol Building in Washington.

This week, churches in the Nation's Capital announced they were reversing a century's practice and locking doors to stop vandalism which is growing fierce in a society in which teenagers drop out of slum schools and can find no jobs, so they seek both excitement and money in a life of crime.

The quality of American life is in danger. There are two Americas—the rich and rather complacent top three-quarters, and the frustrated, left-out, bottom one-quarter, now growing savage and antisocial. One of their consequences is that they play no affirmative role in our economy. They starve the economy of a vast stimulus of consumer demand for the products of our industry. That is why our growth rate is the lowest in the Western World; why recession follows recession; why manpower and plant are idle and wasted.

What can be done about it? We will offer some answers in a moment. But first another message from our sponsor.

* * * * *

Mr. Smith. What can be done to articulate the silent, idle market of the impoverished who could make our economy boom? One suggestion is that the Federal Government guarantee every family of four a minimum income of $4,000. It was made by writer, Dwight Macdonald:

Mr. MacDonald. I think it should be the right of a citizen just the way we have free public schools. It seems to me that we should not exclude so many of our citizens from our life because, really, to live in poverty is not to be a full-fledged American citizen.

Mr. Smith. Herman Miller of the Census Bureau believes getting the economy going is the first priority.

Mr. Miller. In the first place, the thing that we would have to do, and that would help most people would be to get full employment again. How many of the low-income groups won't be helped by full employment: the aged, your widows, other people who don't work. But for many of the unskilled, if they had regular employment, they would at least have a means of regular source of income and could keep going.

The second thing we have to do is to equalize opportunities for employment and for education. There are very large numbers of people in the United States who are simply never given the chance to get a good job, or to get good training. Many of them are educated and then they go out into the labor market and they can't find jobs. This not only makes people poor, it makes people bitter. And society pays in two ways: it pays because of their low incomes, their poverty; it pays to control them. It pays to put policemen in the schools; to keep them in our jails.

And the third thing we have to do is to stop the transmission of poverty from one generation to the next. And there is much more of this than we realize. So that somehow we must find the best talents that exist within our poor, within our discriminated, and develop them.

Mr. Smith. Senator Jennings Randolph believes in work projects Congress has been stalling on, projects to be supported by Federal Government expenditures.

Senator Randolph. It's not just an expenditure. It is a capital investment. And when I say capital, it's an improvement to that community and the well-being of the people who live there. And I feel that when we employ these people, when we construct that project, we have returned not a hundred cents on that original dollar which is expended, but we have a dividend which is paid in a better America.

I feel that the President must be frankly more vigorous on meeting these so-called homefront problems. Because you know if we're not really a happy people here at home—if we're not a people to a relative degree—are, well, let us say, in an economy that gives us some substance, I don't think we're going to attach ourselves to these other problems international in scope. And I feel the President has not only the personality and the power to do this job, but if today I could spur him to do this by the words I speak—if the viewers and the listeners to this program, if they feel as do I, they might well through their own contacts—indirect and direct in some instances—impress upon the Chief Executive of our Republic the need to move more affirmatively, to act more positively in the areas which I discussed.

Mr. Smith. The rest of this is going to be strictly my own opinion.

The President's tax-cut plan will give the economy a temporary shot in the arm.

But it evades the basic problem of the Nation's economy. No matter how much you stimulate the investing public by cutting their taxes, they will not make many bold investments if the market for their goods remains sluggish.

What is needed is government action on a very large scale long-range plan to get income to the 30 to 40 million Americans who live in poverty. They are so poor that they will pour that money back into the economy as quickly as they get it. With a tremendous spurt in sales, investors will then invest—tax cut or not.

The money should not be just a handout as it often was under the New Deal. It should be paid out to do things in America that will permanently end poverty.

Build more schools to replace overcrowded slum schools. Have a bolder education plan in general. Have urban renewal programs for the very poor and for no one else for awhile.

For the elderly, have a real medicare plan like those in allied Western Europe. In my opinion no American over 65 should pay a dollar for health care.

For youth, the President's youth employment plan sent to Congress last Thursday is good enough as a starter.

There are a hundred other programs that in 5 or 10 years' time would change America greatly for the better, decrease crime, raise our growth rate, and in every way make this Nation unbeatable in the cold war or any kind of competition.

The programs take money—lots of money. Spending, our negative legislators call it; but the proper name is investment, the shrewdest, most profitable investment we can make.

It means forcing the negative men who dominate Congress to become affirmative. And that means that the President will have to do what to date he has been allergic to doing—fight for his legislation. And fighting does not mean speaking a few words on this subject among 30 others at an occasional news conference.

What is wrong with the American economy is—it is being starved of purchasing power some 35 million impoverished American can should have.

What needs to be done is to get that purchasing power to them for projects that will permanently elevate them to first-class American citizenship.

Good night.

GEORGE WASHINGTON'S BIRTHDAY ADDRESS BY SENATOR DODD

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, on Friday, February 22, 1963, I had the pleasure of addressing the New York State Society of the Cincinnati Union Club, an organization which dates back to the Revolutionary War. The first president of this society was George Washington.

My remarks dealt with what I feel are the right ways and the wrong ways for dealing with Communists and other subversives in America.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of my remarks be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Remarks of Senator Thomas J. Dodd at the Annual Washington's Birthday Dinner of the New York State Society of the Cincinnati Union Club, New York City, February 22, 1963

We meet in New York tonight to celebrate the memory of the father of our country.

All who reflect upon the life of Washington will be touched by the feeling that there is something inscrutable, something elusive, something difficult to capture about this great man who is separated from us by a span of two centuries.

The artist who conceived the monument to Washington in our Nation's Capital must have been similarly baffled.

When the Lincoln Memorial was erected, it was Lincoln the man, in all of his humanity, that was immortalized in stone; it was the qualities of the man that were reproduced: his humility, his simplicity, his melancholy, his brooding passion for justice.

When we raised a monument to Thomas Jefferson it was, again, Jefferson, the man, who emerged, standing lifelike, surrounded by engravings of his most famous words, in a beautiful setting which is so in harmony with what we know of Jefferson the artist and statesman.

But there was something about Washington which defied such a representation. He represented to the artist and to succeeding generations of Americans something that could not be captured in a statue, something larger than life, something unnaturally noble and lofty, solid, upright, shining. And so the national monument to his memory took the form of a great and gleaming shaft, soaring skyward, possessing a hint of eternity.

It was what Washington did, what he stood for, what he left to us and to all men that comes to mind when we think of him.

When Washington first took command of the Continental Forces at Cambridge, he found a group of men so undisciplined, ill-equipped, and disorganized as to be unworthy of the name of an army; and through the force of his genius and his character he left it 7 years later, an army victorious in the War for Independence.

Washington found 13 subjugated colonies, under the heel of the world's greatest power, and he left them free and independent States.

He found a group of discordant, disunited States, and through his stature, his counsel, and his patience he provided a unifying force and left a nation united under the noblest of all charters, the Constitution of the United States.

He found a new and untried government, a strange and infant phenomenon on the face of the earth; and he left the Great Republic which, under his leadership and through his example, emerged as a going concern, ready for the long journey envisioned by the Founding Fathers.

What should be our sentiments as we reflect upon Washington? Respect, gratitude, admiration, reverence? Yes, all of these and more. And because his life was inseparably woven into the fabric of our national life, our veneration of Washington is inseparable from patriotism, from respect for our Nation's role in history, from gratitude for its citizenship, from admiration for its achievements, from reverence for its free institutions, which we rightly look upon as the fountainhead of all our manifold blessings.

We are here tonight, then, not only to venerate the memory of a great man; we are here to dedicate ourselves anew to the ideas and the ideals of Washington which live on and flourish in perilous times.

So far as Washington and the Founding Fathers were concerned, the ideals of the American Revolution were self-evident propositions, and they so stated in the Declaration of Independence. Even at that early day, Washington and the others believed that the validity of man's rights and freedoms was a closed issue, something that was forever decided, something that they fought a war over and wrote immutably into the Constitution of the United States.

This concept of eternal, self-evident rights, arising from the nature of man and his relationship to the Creator, is under a mighty challenge today, a twofold challenge.

From without, totalitarianism makes a direct challenge; from within, doubt, disbelief, and indifference make an insidious challenge.

Most of the time this second challenge, like an iceberg, is largely beneath the surface. Occasionally, some controversial event will bring it to the forefront, such as the invitation to Alger Hiss to appear on television, or the public appearance of George Lincoln Rockwell the Nazi leader, and Gus Hall the Communist leader, before highly respected groups.

The public appearances of these warped and discredited figures are not of great importance, in themselves. But the attitudes of loyal Americans who promote and defend these spectacles is significant and it is of this that I shall speak principally tonight.

The fundamental ideal of our Nation is freedom of choice. Upon this principle all of our institutions are founded and from it, all have evolved. Our approaches to government, to economics, to education, to the press—all are fashioned out of this principle of free choice.

In the nature of things, a nation founded upon free choice must indulge freedom to the widest limit possible. There must be not only freedom for the wise and the responsible and the respectable, but freedom for the ignorant, the irresponsible, the ridiculous, even the contemptible. To preserve freedom to be right, we must also preserve freedom to be wrong.

But there is one extreme latitude that even advocates of free choice cannot indulge and that is the freedom to destroy free choice—the dissent which threatens the right to dissent. There is one intellectual position that men who believe in freedom cannot entertain with any feeling other than loathing and contempt, and that is the proposition that men ought not to have freedom.

We in America are tolerant of almost any view but some things we have decided upon for all time; among these things are freedom of religion, freedom of speech, freedom of the press, freedom of the ballot box. These freedoms are so fundamental to our heritage that they are, to use the diplomatic term, nonnegotiable.

Yet there are groups among us which, openly or covertly, challenge these assumptions.

Chief among them is the Communist Party of the United States. I need not labor the point that the Communist Party makes a complete and total challenge to everything we believe about freedom and the nature of man. Where they are able, the Communists impose their ideology by force and terror. Where they cannot do this, as in the United States, they seek our destruction through subversion, through espionage, through poisoning our intellectual and moral climate, through covertly attempting to mold our public opinion and public policy so as to coincide with the interests of the Soviet Union.

This internal challenge of the Communists is of tremendous importance. The threat, in itself, is important and the proof of this is the sorry history of its successful manipulation of Government policy at critical times, its stealing of vital secrets, its misdirection of public opinion. But it is not my purpose to discuss this aspect tonight.

The threat is also important because of the reaction to it of the American people. Our reaction demonstrates what we think of our American heritage; and it is what we think of our heritage that will, in the final analysis, determine whether it shall or shall not survive.

There are three types of mistaken reactions to this threat:

If we react to the Communist challenge by establishing police state methods in this country we begin to build up a machinery of repression which is foreign to our ideals, alien to the Constitution, and which can at any time be turned by unscrupulous or misguided men against legitimate dissent (that is, dissent which accepts the ideal of free choice). I never want to see a law in the United States which would prevent Gus Hall from speaking because under other circumstances, at other times, the same law might be used to silence a future John Kennedy or a future Dwight Eisenhower.

A second misguided reaction is to go to the other extreme, as some are doing today, and contend that our free heritage dictates that we must not only forbear to lock up Communists, but that we must also welcome them on our public platforms, on our campuses, on our school faculties, in radio and television, and in public office. I oppose this just as strenuously as I oppose the first alternative.

Out of respect for our own free institutions and out of concern for their preservation, we permit our sworn enemies to exercise the basic rights of Americans. But I believe it should end there. They are not entitled to any position of authority or influence; to any position of favor or respect or dignity in our country. They must always be singled out for what they are, and that is as sworn enemies of everything good that America has brought to the world.

The third mistaken reaction to the challenge of those who deny the validity of man's freedom is the reaction of indifference.

Some say, or reveal by their actions, that they do not care about an issue which all Americans should and must care about.

Some faculties say, "let our students invite Communist agents to lecture to them. We do not endorse the invitation, but we say it is their business."

A television executive will say, "Let a traitor and a convicted perjurer appear on our network to ridicule the character of a great public servant who has lived by the processes of free debate, free choice, and free elections. We despise the traitor and what he represents," says the executive, "but he is free to use our facilities."

Others will defend the right of known subversives, or those with many subversive affiliations, to occupy Government posts or positions on college faculties.

This is the attitude of indifference to the trampling upon of what ought to be held sacred. Let me illustrate:

Three years ago, when Khrushchev was visiting this country on a state visit there was a considerable movement afoot to bring him onto the floor of the Senate to address that body. When I thought of those great bronze doors to the Senate Chamber, upon which are engraved memorable scenes in the life of Washington, being thrown open to admit the archenemy of everything which Washington and this country represent, I felt sick at heart.

It was not that I feared that Khrushchev would make any conversions or do any direct damage to the country by appearing in a forum hitherto reserved for the friends of freedom. I was depressed not because of this, but because of the mockery involved, because of the desecration. If you saw someone pull down the American flag and trample upon it, you would not fear for the future of the country, but you would feel an inner revulsion and a sickness at heart to see the desecration of something noble and sacred.

This is exactly what happens when a Communist makes a public appearance at a free university. The danger stems not from him but from the indifference and apathy and blindness that our acceptance of these appearances signifies about ourselves.

There is a right way for a free people to deal with avowed enemies of freedom without violating our Constitution, our convictions, or our self-respect. That way is twofold:

First, there are constitutional legal remedies enacted by the Congress and approved by the Supreme Court, for dealing with certain overt acts of treason, acts which violate even the broadest interpretation of the Bill of Rights. So far as the actual forceful repression of Communists goes, it should be left to these laws.

Let the Communists enjoy all the legal protections afforded by our system of justice, not because it is owed to them, but because we owe it to ourselves, to our great past and to our free future.

These laws need to be strengthened in some respects and I favor strengthening them so long as it is done within the spirit of the Constitution. But such laws will always be to a large extent inadequate because the Constitution is designed to protect freedom and not to impose repression.

The larger protection against the spread of totalitarian doctrines must reside in the hearts and minds of the American people. They can react to Communists and other purveyors of twisted doctrines by exercising their freedom to ignore and reject them; by refusing to listen to the unspeakable, by refusing to honor the dishonorable.

Let me illustrate this by recounting to you an event that took place in New Haven, Conn.

A year ago there was an attempt made by some Yale students to bring Gus Hall, the head of the American Communist Party, to the Yale campus to deliver a lecture as he has done at many other American universities and colleges.

This is a significant example because Hall is not merely a suspected Communist or some mooney radical, he is the top Communist in the United States; a hardened conspirator, trained in Moscow in everything from the use of explosives to the use of propaganda. He was convicted under the Smith Act for conspiring to forceably overthrow our Government and has served several years in the Federal penitentiary. He is currently under indictment for further violations of our security laws. He is therefore a conscious agent of a foreign enemy which is attempting to destroy academic freedom and all other freedoms in this country.

The question of whether or not to invite him was openly debated a year ago. Those who opposed the invitation effectively argued that inviting Hall would be a needless debasement of the principle of academic freedom. The end result was that the students exercised their free choice by refusing to invite Hall.

This year another group did invite Hall to speak. Last week he came to the campus and addressed an overflow audience of students and faculty members. According to the New Haven newspapers he was warmly applauded both at the beginning and at the end of his remarks and evoked frequent laughter during his half-hour address.

Thus was a well-known and unmistakable enemy of our Nation's free traditions welcomed at one of the foremost universities in the free world.

Now I do not believe that Hall's greeting at Yale, regrettable though it was, signifies that he made any conversions to communism. I say this despite the fact that the political editor of the Yale Daily News wrote me a letter describing Hall as a "moderate socialist who wants to help man, but is not quite sure how to do it."

We can only hope that the Yale student body is a little more sophisticated than its political editor.

The real tragedy here is that several hundred young men, products of the finest training that free society can give, so forgot their free heritage as to pay tribute and show favor to a man who is the embodiment of everything that free men should shun and abhor.

The Yale Daily News defended Hall's appearance as a vindication of academic freedom by the Yale student body. But there was no question of academic freedom involved.

Their right to invite Hall was not challenged so they need not wear false martyrs robes. They are not in any way denied all the information they want about communism. They have a library full of books about communism, written by Communists and non-Communists alike. They have available to them the Communist newspapers in which they can read Gus Hall's speeches to their hearts' content. They all know this. And they know also that in listening to Hall they are getting no exchange of free ideas. Free speech is impossible for a true Communist. They knew they would hear the party line and they know that if the party line changes tomorrow Hall will change his speeches tomorrow to reflect it.

They had, therefore, other motives:

They were curious to get a look at a real live Communist agent and so they placed their curiosity above their patriotism.

They wanted to lay a wreath before the shrine of nonconformity, so they listened to a speech by the No. 1 conformist in America.

They got a childish psychological kick out of applauding the leading American representative of organized inhumanity, and they were willing to purchase this kick at the price of degrading their own inheritance as trustees of the free heritage of America.

Their reasons are unimportant really, except that they demonstrate that the reverence for freedom is held so cheaply by some that they are willing to trade it in for such trinkets and trivia as I have described.

The students of Yale may further exercise their freedom by inviting George Lincoln Rockwell to lecture them about the virtues of nazism and, in the name of academic freedom, to defend the mass murder of millions of Jews and the glories of tyranny.

The same false logic that prompted them to invite Hall should prompt them to invite Rockwell, and probably will. If it does, so much the worse for them; so much the worse for Yale; so much the worse for our country.

Hall would not have been invited to Yale by men who placed the same value upon liberty as did Washington and the Founding Fathers. And had he appeared uninvited in the midst of such men, he would have been greeted not by a large and friendly audience but by the silence and contempt of an empty hall.

Washington knew that freedom was not an invitation to intellectual anarchy. He knew that freedom carried with it the responsibility for men and for nations to make final decisions about things; to stand irrevocably for some things and to hold certain basic assumptions about freedom to be unchallengeable and incontrovertible, because they were self-evident.

Why is all this important? It is important for this reason:

If our free tradition does not imbue our people with a love for freedom so fervent that it shudders at the thought of the Halls and Rockwells and all the apparatus of slavery, how can we expect them to feel the zeal for preserving and advancing freedom which they must feel if our Nation is not only to survive but to go forward and attain in fuller measure the ideals of freedom and democracy for all men?

Those of us who have in our hands a responsibility for influencing public opinion and guiding the education and development of our young people must look to this problem. We must, through our informational media, through our pulpits, through our schools, through our public forums and through the example of our lives do a much better job than we are doing of portraying the ideals of the American Revolution.

If we succeed in this then we will not have to lament the fact that Communists and Nazis are taking advantage of our American freedoms. For our people will use their freedoms to reject and isolate the wrong and to affirm and embrace the right.

It has been said that the example of a good life is more effective in influencing people than the greatest sermons ever preached. In the end, the example of the lives of Washington and Jefferson and Lincoln and others will do more to inspire a reverence for human freedom than any words of ours.

That is why I am honored to have been invited to take part in this commemoration of the birth of perhaps the greatest of all Americans.

The English poet, Lord Byron, said this of Washington:

> "Where may the wearied eye repose,
> When gazing on the Great,
> Where neither guilty glory glows,
> Nor despicable state?
> Yes—one—the first—the last—the best—
> The Cincinnatus of the West,
> Whom envy dared not hate,
> Bequeath the name of Washington,
> To make man blush there was but one!"

Our presence here tonight is but one unneeded proof that the passage of time has vindicated Byron's judgment.

FEDERAL CONTROL OF CONSUMER CREDIT

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, on February 11, at the sixth annual Alumni Consumer Credit Management Conference at Columbia University, held at Arden House, near New York City, our colleague, Senator EDWARD V. LONG, of Missouri, presented a masterful analysis of the question raised by proposals to use the power of the Federal Government to control and police the extension of consumer credit.

This analysis ranged far beyond the limited proposal contained in S. 750, which is back again before the Senate. I think the statement is very valuable to all Senators, because it puts the so-called credit disclosure bill into focus. I ask unanimous consent that it may be printed in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the analysis was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY SENATOR EDWARD V. LONG BEFORE THE SIXTH ANNUAL ALUMNI CONSUMER CREDIT MANAGEMENT CONFERENCE, COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY, NEW YORK CITY, FEBRUARY 11, 1963

It is a real pleasure to be here today and to participate in your program.

I would like to begin our discussion by posing a question. That is, "When, in what form, and for what purposes should the Federal Government legislate in the field of consumer credit or should the Federal Government directly regulate consumer credit at all?"

In general terms, I believe we can all agree on an answer to this question if directed to the broad field of business. Most of us can agree that regulation by the Federal Government may be necessary in times of war or national emergency and also may be necessary to preserve economic opportunity. We can also agree that legislation designed to regulate business may be necessary when the separate States cannot effectively carry out laws which will promote the economic well-being of individuals. On the other hand, we can also agree that it is difficult and time consuming to change laws once they are enacted and that the administration of some laws leaves much to be desired.

With few caveats we can agree on principle because we have inherited and absorbed essentially the same ideals. We accept a basic belief in freedom with its inherent limitations. Hard as it is to define, each of us has an understanding of the ideas involved.

But having agreed on principle, we are still left a wide area for discussion and disagreement. This disagreement stems from the fact that each of us as an individual has his own set of deep-seated beliefs about economic regulation. Some of these beliefs are well founded. Some beliefs are based on information obtained over the years, some of which is currently applicable and some really irrelevant. These differing beliefs arise in part because we are members of a particular profession, business organization, political party or other group. Being involved in specific pursuits, we not only have deep-seated beliefs but we also have interests which we want protected. Each of us in our own mind develops solutions to problems which arise in the field of consumer credit—or in any other area for that matter.

In particular, each of us is committed to a favorite interpretation of constitutional provisions concerning trade and finance. However, we must face the fact that the Constitution is couched in broad terms—there is a wide area for interpretation. If this were not so, we would find many times 23 amendments. In fact, there have been really only 13 amendments since the first 10 were adopted almost simultaneously with the original document. It is nothing short of a miracle that a written Constitution could provide a sound government for an 18th century agrarian society and a 20th century industrial society without greater change.

As the complexion of business activity has changed over the years, its relationship to the commerce clause and the money clause has changed. This has resulted in a continuous development of the law. It is important that our system of law evolve with changing economic and social conditions. But before change takes place we should establish that the change will result in improvements. For example, we cannot assume that Federal regulation of consumer credit has some very definite advantages over State regulation. It is well to remember that largeness results in increased administrative problems and possible increased costs. As those of you in large companies know—it is a real problem to establish procedures or detailed policy on a companywide basis and have these regulations followed. Even when they are followed there is the danger of destroying individual initiative at all levels. A very similar situation exists with the Federal Government.

Given these preliminary and very general statements, I will try to develop some more specific ideas concerning consumer credit and Federal legislation. My comments will be in the following main directions: (1) The general success of State legislation and some areas that suggest change; (2) the entry of the Federal Government directly into consumer credit regulation; and (3) the effects of general legislation on those who lend to consumers. During the course of this discussion I hope to be able to bring out some ideas that may suggest ways that businessmen and others could be somewhat more helpful in legislative matters—and at the same time obtain at least some of the results they seek.

Consumer credit is an area which to date with the exception of regulation W, has not been subject directly to Federal legislation. The present institutions specializing in consumer credit all came into being early in this century. If you recall, this was the time when the effects of the wage system were being felt on a wide basis. We had reached the stage where money came into real importance for everyday exchanges. Reflecting this monetization of the economy, the Federal Reserve System was brought into being, State legislation governing hours and conditions of work was widespread and State legislation in the consumer credit field began to appear.

The need for consumer credit legislation was well established by the studies of the Russell Sage Foundation. The resulting legislation was supported by social reformers and a considerable segment of lenders. They recognized that wage earners were forced into borrowing for emergencies and had no alternative but to pay whatever was asked. But equally important they saw the need for laws which recognized that there was an economic demand for loans and that to make small loans was a costly proposition. Thus, an important step forward was taken from the age-old concept of usury. The new approach was one of permitting an interest rate which would provide for a sufficient return on capital to encourage legitimate businessmen to enter the field but at the same time would protect the consumer borrower. This concept is still the basis for State regulation and should remain so no matter what government imposes regulations.

Following the enactment of this legislation early in the 1900's two different types of organizations appeared almost simultaneously. Both were able to make charges which were considerably above those previously allowed by law. The uniform small loan law was geared to having business firms supply cash loans. The credit union was adapted from the cooperative approach becoming important in continental Europe—the idea of a group of people with a community of interests helping each other. The Morris plan sprang up about the same time, and subsequently, the commercial banks entered the field of consumer credit. Both the Morris plan and commercial bank lending to consumers were permitted by changing interpretations of the general interest or usury laws.

For some decades no serious thought was given to the Federal Government entering the field of regulating consumer credit. Then came our entry into World War II. It became an important national objective to divert the productive capacity of the country into the production of armaments and war goods and to direct as much as possible of consumer income into financing the war effort. To achieve these objectives, the production of automobiles and other consumer durables was curtailed, and price controls, wage controls, and rationing were instituted. By this time consumer credit had become an important element in the economic picture. At the end of 1941, total short and intermediate term consumer credit was $9.2 billion. These credit obligations amounted to 9.6 percent of the $96.3 billion personal income received during that year. Thus along with other forms of price control and wage control, the so-called regulation W type of selective control of credit was instituted. Essentially, this regulation required all credit grantors to register and specified certain downpayments and contract maturities for each type of durable consumer goods.

This regulation also specified conditions for the renewal and extension of existing credit. In effect, regulation W was instituted as an anti-inflationary device—the idea being that this direct limit on the amount of credit available to consumers would help reduce their demand for goods in short supply. This regulation was retained, again as an anti-inflationary device until toward the end of 1947. It was suspended temporarily, then reimposed for 9 months in 1948–49, was again suspended in 1949 and reimposed late in 1950. Finally an act of Congress as of June 30, 1952, terminated the authority of the Federal Reserve Board to impose the regulation W type of control.

Since that time there has been no direct regulation of consumer credit by the Federal Government. At intervals there have been suggestions that a need exists for the Federal Reserve to have stand-by authority to impose this selective control over consumer credit. Especially was this true during, and immediately following the year 1955, during which installment credit outstanding increased by 25 percent. This very rapid increase in the outstandings of installment credit led the President to request a study by the Federal Reserve Board of installment credit and its impact on the economy. The result of this study was the very imposing six-book "Consumer Installment Credit Study," published in 1957. This study provides an excellent statement of views of individuals on the usefulness of regulations as well as economic analyses of the effects of consumer credit on the economy. It is the source of the most comprehensive and authoritative information available, up to that time, on consumer credit.

Since that time there have been occasions when the subject of selective controls on consumer credit has been considered in Congress. However, there has been a growing awareness that the application of such controls entails often unforeseen difficulties and raises many new problems. William McChesney Martin, Chairman of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, in his letter to me dated January 16 of this year referred to the following statement of the Board's views which summarize these difficulties:

"As indicated above, the selective regulation of the use of credit by consumers raises many problems beyond those implied in the general restraint of credit-financed demands. Such regulation has been vigorously opposed by interested groups whenever it has been proposed. After weighing the many conflicting arguments enumerated in the study submitted by the Board in 1957 (see pt. I, vol. I, ch. 16), the Congress may determine that the balance favors establishment of permanent authority to regulate consumer credit. To be fully effective, such authority would have to cover long as well as short and intermediate term credit and should be permanent, broad, and flexible in character. Application of the regulations should be limited to periods when the need is sufficient to justify the considerable burden such regulation imposes on the businesses directly affected and toleration of the discriminatory aspects which are unavoidable.

"The Board does not feel justified, at this time, in taking the initiative in a recommendation to Congress in this matter. The effectiveness and workability of this kind of selective regulation depends heavily on broadly based acceptance and support. Whether such support exists can best be determined in the forums of the Congress itself."

This is a good summary of the disenchantment with the selective type of control over consumer credit as an effective adjunct to general monetary controls.

Administrative difficulties in implementing selective controls on consumer credit were also commented upon in "The Report of the Commission on Money and Credit" published in 1961. The report on page 74 points up these problems:

"The difficulty of efficient administration of selective controls over consumer credit is a major argument against them. Past experience shows that evasion is a constant problem. A minimum ratio of downpayments on some durable goods, such as automobiles, have been bypassed by changing ostensible trade-in allowances. The growth of leasing could permit consumers to acquire cars on terms which might differ significantly from those being imposed by the credit authorities.

"Regulation of consumer credit terms might contribute to cyclical stability, but it would require a large and complex administration to be fully effective. The benefits to stability promised by such a system might be weighed against the cost and inconvenience of installing and managing it."

The bills before Congress which would require the statement of total finance charges in dollars and as the simple annual rate which the charge bears to the principal amount of credit are different in substance from regulation W. They are based on the dual assumption that the consumer does not know the cost of credit, and if he did he would use less credit, or behave differently. Bills of this type have been introduced in both Houses in the past two Congresses.

The House bills have been referred to committee and then no further action was taken. On the other hand, the Senate bill, in each case, has been referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency and hearings have been held. The first Senate bill was introduced in the 2d session of the 86th Congress. At that time, 1960, it was given the number S. 2755 and the title, "Consumer Credit Labeling Bill." Hearings were held before the Senate Subcommittee on Production and Stabilization, and an 898-page hearing record resulted. In 1961, a very similar bill was introduced in the 1st session of the 87th Congress. It was entitled "Truth in Lending Bill," was assigned number S. 1740, and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency. Hearings were again held before the Subcommittee on Production and Stabilization and a hearing record of 1,388 pages resulted. In 1962, during the 2d session of the 87th Congress, hearings were held on S. 1740 with certain modifications and a hearing record of 416 pages resulted. We now have 2,702 pages of testimony and exhibits relating to the question of whether all credit grantors should be required to state their finance charges as total dollar amount and also as a simple annual rate on the amount financed.

During the course of these hearings, much heat and some light was generated. Governmental agencies testified to the need, or lack thereof, for such a type of bill. Some agencies referred to the administrative difficulties in enforcing the requirements of such a bill and made various other comments concerning this type of legislation. Consumer groups testified to the need for consumers to understand what credit costs them. They also related a number of examples of unfortunate individuals who had been taken in. The affected business groups testified as to the difficulties and even the impossibility of complying with regulations of this type. Retailers produced a massive amount of evidence to suggest that the cost of credit might well be intermingled with the price of goods resulting in a situation where the cash customer would absorb some of the costs of credit and there would be less known about its cost than is true today. The President last year in his consumer message to Congress endorsed in general terms credit disclosure legislation.

As a result of these hearings, there is a wider understanding among the American people of some of the problems involved in the field of consumer credit; there is probably a better understanding of the various trade practices in stating consumer credit charges, and there may be even a better understanding of what various percentages mean. Also, it may well be that some State legislation has been speeded up—legislation to help correct some of the abuses brought out in the hearings. For example, legislation requiring that retail installment contracts spell out the finance charges, fees, delinquency charges, and closing costs is now in effect in 24 States and Michigan will become the 25th on March 28. Along the same line, there is the growing acceptance by the States of the Uniform Commercial Code—14 States have adopted this code since 1953, Georgia and Oregon are scheduled to adopt it this year, and Michigan and New York in 1964.

The question still remains, however, "Would the Douglas-type bill serve to correct problems which face the consumer in the credit marketplace?" This question has not been answered to the satisfaction of all legislators concerned. In fact, I am one who believes it would not correct problems which face the consumer.

Experience with this legislation does illustrate one point that I would like to make today, that is, the need for more effective communication between legislators and those who would be affected primarily by legislation. One of the problems in effective communication is the resort to emotional labels. In its original form, Senator Douglas' bill was entitled the "Consumer Credit Labeling Bill." Somewhere along the line it developed other names. Its sponsors called it the truth in lending bill. Its opponents called it the credit control bill, or the credit proportion distortion bill. This bit of labeling certainly reduced the area of objective consideration of the need or lack of need for this type of legislation. These problems of semantics arise in everything we do, so it may be too much to hope to do away with emotional labeling of legislative bills.

The real question is how to live with this approach at labeling and still solve legislative problems in an equitable manner. One thought is that more attention should be given by those who testify to defining clearly the problem and providing factual evidence to back up the position taken. In the case of business firms, this can be done by having a strong research unit in a trade association with the assigned task of having data as complete as possible on the industry and related areas. Combine this with a definite policy stand and a knowledgeable public relations presentation and there is a tremendous impact on legislators and their constituents. A good example of the results of this combination of efforts—research, policy stand, and public relations—is the volume "The Consumer Finance Industry" which was recently published by Prentice-Hall as one volume in the "Library of Money and Credit." All too frequently, however, there is no well-defined policy stand and too little attention to the establishment of the factual basis.

Before closing, I would like to summarize current legislation which is being proposed or considered and which concerns the field of consumer credit. Senator Douglas has stated that he will again introduce his bill requiring specific forms for the disclosure of finance charges and rates. At least two bills of this sort have already been introduced in the House. Thus the question of disclosure of finance charges and rates and the Federal Government's entry into this field will still be the subject of discussion in the legislative arena this year. Another area of direct interest to consumer credit is that of H.R. 71, commonly referred to as the Celler bill, which is described as "a bill to supplement the antitrust laws of the United States against restraint of trade or commerce by preventing manufacturers of motor vehicles from financing and insuring the sales of their products."

Though not directly related to consumer credit, the Federal bankruptcy law is necessarily of concern to all those who finance consumers. This law, as in previous years, will no doubt be subject to minor changes during this Congress. There appears to be no likelihood of a very comprehensive or widespread revision in this law at this time. As you no doubt know, the consumer bankruptcy committee of the American Bar Association is studying the problem of consumer bankruptcies, including the use of chapter 13, and other specific sections of the Bankruptcy Act having to do with consumer bankruptcies. Also it is studying the problem of State laws with regard to garnishment and other provisions as they are related to the Federal Bankruptcy Act. It will no doubt be some time before these studies are complete and before there are suggestions brought out for a comprehensive revision of the bankruptcy law.

Credit life insurance has become an important aspect in the field of consumer credit. The investigation by the Senate Antitrust Subcommittee of the insurance industry could conceivably at some time in the future have a bearing upon the field of consumer credit. The subcommittee has already investigated aviation and ocean marine insurance and State rating bureaus. It is planned to look into other types this year. It is possible that life insurance will be considered some time in the future and with it the operations of credit life insurance. However, there are no specific plans at this time.

Of much broader scope, but still of interest to every business enterprise are the tax revisions which are coming up before this Congress. Revisions in the corporate income tax are, of course, of concern to the vast majority of private companies. The President in his state of the Union message, budget message, and economic message suggested that the corporate income tax structure should be reformed to eliminate some of the so-called loopholes which have developed in the implementation of the present law. Of all the changes in the corporate tax structure recommended by the President in his tax message of January 24, I believe the one relating to the surtax exemption for subsidiaries is of greatest concern to most of you here. The President in his message said:

"Since the $25,000 surtax exemption and the new 22 percent normal rate are designed to stimulate small business, this reduction should be accompanied by action designed to eliminate the advantage of the multiple surtax exemptions now available to large enterprises operating through a chain of separately incorporated units. I, therefore, recommend that legislation be enacted which, over a transitional period of 5 years, will limit to one the number of surtax exemptions allowed an affiliated corporate group subject to 80 percent common control. This proposal would apply both to affiliated groups having a common corporate parent and to enterprises sharing common individual ownership. It will add $120 million annually to tax receipts.

"On the other hand, if affiliated corporations are treated as an entity for the surtax exemption and other purposes, they should be permitted to obtain the advantages of filing consolidated returns without incurring the present tax of 2 percent on the net income of all corporations filing such returns. The 2-percent tax was removed in 1954 from consolidated returns of regulated public utility enterprises, and I recommend that it be repealed for all corporate enterprises beginning in 1964. This proposal will contribute to a more realistic corporate tax rate structure and reduce the adverse effect of high marginal tax rates on growth—at an annual cost to the Treasury of only $50 million."

These recommendations and the others contained in the message are just beginning their course through the Congress. It is highly probable that many changes will come about as the pros and cons of these recommendations are brought out before the Congress. Some of the recommendations may be deleted entirely.

In actual practice, any tax bill enacted is put together by the House Ways and Means Committee and the Senate Finance Committee. Normally, few significant changes are made in such a bill once it is before the House or Senate for debate. Therefore, I would urge you to bring your suggestions and objections to the attention of the proper committee in time for their study and consideration. This can be done directly or through your Senators and Congressmen.

In conclusion, I would summarize my own views pretty much as follows:

1. From my own experience in State government, I know that State regulation of consumer credit can be effective and think it is in most States.

2. There are already many and diverse regulatory agencies whose policies affect consumer credit. The Federal Reserve through its rediscount and other policies encourages or discourages credit expansion. In this way, the supply of consumer credit and other forms of credit are effectively regulated. Commercial banks are subject to examination and/or various forms of regulation by the Comptroller of the Currency, the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, the Federal Reserve Board, and State banking examiners. Consumer finance companies, since they borrow funds from commercial banks, are indirectly subject to all of these regulatory bodies and directly regulated by State banking departments.

3. If a disclosure bill is passed, and I do not believe it will be, it should be based on the following principles:

(a) Provide for full disclosure in a workable manner.

(b) Be a law which can be easily and equitably administered and one which does not unduly increase the costs of doing business.

(c) Apply only to those consumer credit areas not regulated by State statutes which require disclosure; and

(d) Be limited strictly to the disclosure of the costs of credit.

4. Lastly, any law which is passed should not turn the already overburdened Federal courts into police courts for thousands of infractions which arise from an unworkable law.

Now I will throw the floor open to your discussion of what has been said and will be happy to answer, or try to answer, any and all questions.

COMMUNISM IN CZECHOSLOVAKIA

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, 15 years ago on February 24–26, 1948, the democratic Government of Czechoslovakia was overthrown by means of a bloodless coup and the people of this once free nation were subjugated by a Communist regime which destroyed their liberty and brought them under the control of Soviet Russia. On the anniversary of this tragic event the Czechoslovak National Council of America has prepared a report based on a study of personal letters from Czechoslovak citizens to their relatives in the United States and illustrating what communism has meant to the people of Czechoslovakia.

I ask unanimous consent that this report be printed in the Record along with my remarks.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

A Report on Communism in Czechoslovakia as Told to Americans

Fifteen years ago, on February 24, 1948, Communists took over Czechoslovakia with Soviet assistance, under the personal supervision of Moscow's hatchetman Valerian Zorin, the recent troublemaker at the United Nations. At first, the Communists made an effort to bluff the free world into believing that the seizure had been the act of a free people. Now that pretense is no longer necessary, the Communists brazenly describe how they plotted the overthrow of the democratic government and how much they depended on Soviet help.

What communism has meant to the people of Czechoslovakia and how much it has changed their lives is born out in thousands of letters received by American relatives. The Czechoslovak National Council of

America, an organization of Americans of Czechoslovak descent, with headquarters in Chicago and branches in a number of cities, has made a study of personal mail from Czechoslovakia and on the basis of this information concludes that Christmas 1962 in Czechoslovakia was the worst since 1945, the first postwar Christmas when the country was left bare by the Nazis.

In their letters, Czechoslovak citizens complain: "If one is not young enough and strong enough to queue up for hours from very early morning for a ration of 4 ounces of butter and 1 pound of margarine, there is nothing left within a few hours. Electricity is shut off early. Prague streets are dark. Trains are unheated. There is a fuel shortage. In the mining town of Kladno near Prague, people stood in line for 20 pounds of coal, which they had to carry home in sacks, when and if they got any. Water pipes are frozen, but former plumbers are not allowed to take house calls and repair the damage; instead, people must wait until a government agency assigns a workman to the job. Since industry, farms, business, and professions have all been expropriated without compensation by the government and are government-owned and operated, government agencies alone decide what should be done, by whom, for whom, and when, if at all. Consequently, the average citizen waits for weeks for the repair of pipes, furnace, roof or crumbling wall. Should he wish to repair it himself, he is not given the material with which to do it, not even a bag of cement.

Service to customers is also very poor as there is no business competition and personal initiative. One waits for weeks, even for months, for a suit to be cleaned and shoes to be resoled. The quality of goods is far inferior to what it used to be. Despite the fact that every able-bodied—and not so able-bodied—man and woman are hard at work, there is a scarcity of almost everything and the prices of consumer goods are very high.

The reason for this is Red Czechoslovakia's foreign policy: acting as a spearhead for the Soviet Union, the Prague regime gives considerable economic aid to the underdeveloped and neutralist countries the Soviets are trying to woo to their side. This is why the Prague regime has been supplying Castro with food, considerable technical aid, and arms. In return, Czechoslovakia has received some unwanted Cuban sugar, for Czechoslovakia herself has always been a heavy exporter of beet sugar.

Most of all, people lament the loss of freedom in their letters to American friends: "There is work for everyone, but that is all we have. Nothing is as it used to be. We have only our memories." Families with young children are afraid to attend church in their hometown because their son and daughter would be barred from a higher school of learning and from a better job. The letters reflect the weariness, apathy, and despair of the writer.

American relatives are anxious to send gift packages of American goods to their close of kin. It would be simple for a daughter to send a warm sweater to her mother in Czechoslovakia who writes: "My room is unheated and it is so cold that I stay in bed and cry myself to sleep. A wool sweater is not to be had and a cotton sweater isn't worth anything." The Communists have made it impossible, however, for Americans to send gift packages by placing in 1961 an astronomical duty on new goods and an almost prohibitive duty of 50 crowns on a kilo of used clothing (approximately $7 for 2.2 pounds; hourly wage of average officeworker is 6 crowns; of farmworker as little as 12 crowns a day).

The Red regime has a definite purpose in mind: to squeeze dollars out of Americans. If Americans wish to help their needy Czechoslovak relatives, they must send dollars to the Red regime with which Czechoslovak citizens can then buy Czechoslovak goods, if and when available, in a government store called Tuzex.

The Red regime then has dollars for anti-American propaganda and Communist subversion in Latin America and elsewhere in the world. In view of these facts it is hard to understand why our Government is so careful to observe strictly all the niceties and why it has not restricted the Red government monopoly which bars American goods. After all, we are in a strong position for we have the dollars. We could insist, for instance, on gift packages of American goods (limited in size and value) if we continue to send dollars (unlimited, so far) and to travel to Czechoslovakia with unlimited spending money. In order to curtail the flow of American dollars abroad, the United States limits its citizens on how much they can bring back into this country duty free and exacts other limitations on its citizens as well. Why not set up reciprocity regulations or limitations when dealing with the Reds?

So far, Americans of Czechoslovakia have been asking this question in vain.

DISAGREEMENT ON MAJOR DEFENSE DECISIONS

Mrs. SMITH. Mr. President, this morning at the military posture hearing of the Senate Armed Services Committee, I asked General Taylor, the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff two questions.

I ask unanimous consent that those questions be placed in the body of the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the questions were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

QUESTIONS OF SENATOR MARGARET CHASE SMITH TO THE CHAIRMAN OF THE JOINT CHIEFS OF STAFF, 1963 DEFENSE POSTURE HEARINGS, COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES, U.S. SENATE

1. General Taylor, I would appreciate it if you would tell this committee on what major decisions of the Secretary of Defense—or the President—with respect to national defense and weapons systems, a majority of the Joint Chiefs of Staff are in disagreement with the Secretary of Defense or the President—or were at any time in disagreement with either of them—and the reasons for any such disagreement.

2. I was prepared to ask you many questions just as I directed many questions to the Secretary of Defense, but before coming to the hearing this morning I read the current issue of U.S. News & World Report—specifically the article entitled " 'Whiz Kids' Versus Military Men: Who Is Shaping Defense?" at pages 46 and 47.

I would appreciate your reading that article if you have not already done so—and giving this committee in written form your appraisal of the article as to whether it is accurate or inaccurate—and if it is inaccurate in what specific respects—before these hearings are closed.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EULOGIES OF DECEASED SENATORS ON MARCH 1

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, for the information of the Senate, let me state that Friday, March 1, will be devoted to eulogies of our late departed colleagues, Senator Dworshak, Senator Kerr, and Senator Chavez. I ask unanimous consent that on that sad occasion there be a limitation of 1 hour on remarks, speeches, and eulogies on each of our departed colleagues.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT OF RULE RELATING TO STANDING COMMITTEES

The Senate resumed the consideration of the resolution (S. Res. 90) amending rule XXV of the standing rules of the Senate relating to standing committees.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, is the time now under control?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The hour of 12 o'clock noon having arrived, the order of February 20 becomes effective; and debate on the so-called Clark amendments, as set forth in Senate Resolutions 91 to 93, to the so-called Mansfield-Dirksen resolution, Senate Resolution 90, will now proceed under a 2-hour limitation, in controlled time.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I yield myself 1 minute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana is recognized.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I desire to modify further Senate Resolution 90, by transposing to page 17, line 23, after the word "Operations," the following language, preceded and followed by a comma, beginning on line 25, namely: "as well as any Senator who is appointed temporarily to fill any vacancy arising out of this proviso."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The modification will be made.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, in connection with that modification, I wish to emphasize again and again the word "temporarily."

I also wish to make the following routine corrections in subsection numbers, due to arrangement of committees in alphabetical order, namely:

On page 6, in line 16 strike out "c" and insert "d". On page 15, in line 24, and on page 16, in line 5, strike out "n" and insert "o".

On page 17, in line 22, after "Sciences," strike out the word "and" and insert the word "or".

On page 4, in line 1, amend section "2" to read as follows:

2. The Department of Defense, the Department of the Army, the Department of the Navy, and the Department of the Air Force generally.

Strike out section "3.", and renumber succeeding sections accordingly.

On page 4, in line 9, amend section "7." to read as follows:

Size and composition of the Army, Navy, and Air Force.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The modifications will be made.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I reserve the balance of my time.

I suggest the absence of a quorum, with the time required for it to be chargeable to both sides.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that further proceedings under the quorum call may be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, may I ask whether the Senate is under controlled time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate is under controlled time.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, in the absence of the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], who is acting as floor leader for his amendments, I yield not to exceed 2 minutes to the Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNAMARA].

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Illinois for yielding.

MEDICAL CARE FOR THE AGED

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, human life is too high a price to pay for the empty propaganda of the American Medical Association. I am certain that every Member of Congress will be as shocked as I have been over a tragedy which we might have prevented.

Shortly before Christmas, two older Americans, Henry and Irene Jaggi, committed suicide in Hallandale, Fla., because, according to an editorial I have in my hand, they were overwhelmed with hospital and medical expenses and could not see any way of coping with them.

This tragedy was the subject of a compassionate editorial in the Daytona Beach Sunday News Journal. I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"SUFFICIENT UNTO THE DAY"

Shortly before the holiday which preceded the one the Christian world will observe Tuesday, there was an occurrence in Florida which put a pall of depression over the reason for thanksgiving.

In an apartment at Hallandale, north of Miami, a man and wife were found dead—her body sprawled across a bed, his found crouched on the floor, his hands still clasped around her lifeless feet.

His position indicated that in the last moment of their lives, he was trying to give her comfort and assurance.

The couple had comfort—material comfort—but they did not have assurance.

Otherwise, surely, they would not have entered into a suicide pact.

Their story is a harsh one to be telling in the Christmas season because Christmas is celebrated as a symbol of life, not death. It is a time of rejoicing, of forgetting care and sorrow momentarily, of bright lights and shining young faces.

But it is a story which needs to be told when it can be shocking—told now in order to get its message through before Congress reconvenes next month.

That Congress, yet an unknown quantity because it is a new one, could act at least to wipe out the cause for the Hallandale tragedy. At least, it should be used to offset the great pressure that is to be used by one organized group to prevent Congress from acting on the problem.

Why did the couple in Hallandale decide to quit this world via the medium of taking an overdose of sleeping pills?

They left notes which poignantly gave the reason, some stated, some read between the lines.

Beside the notes was a mass of accumulated doctor and hospital bills, some paid, some unpaid. In fact, the major paid ones among them were for the services of doctors; the biggest unpaid one was for the wife's most recent stay in a Fort Lauderdale hospital. Canceled checks also recorded payments for quantities of drugs used to ease the pain of illness.

The notes, addressed to their daughter, asked forgiveness for their act. But, the notes indicated, the step simply had to be taken because they could not meet those unpaid bills now, and they could not see their way to do it in the future and still pay for the other essentials of life.

Police didn't reveal whether the notes—from both the husband and the wife—also said they did not want to be a burden on their daughter and granddaughter, also an adult. Quite possibly the parents had rationalized their suicides thus, else they would have been living with their daughter now that her own child was grown and married.

As you can see, these people are a cause for the administration's projected medicare program—a plan that would take care of society's neglect of its nearly 17 million elderly people in their last days on earth. The Hallandale couple affords stark and dual evidence of the need to give the elderly help in their loneliness and despair.

Will it be done in 1963?

The question is necessary because just south of Hallandale lives Dr. Edward Annis, president now of the American Medical Association, and the organization's leading spokesman in opposition to such assistance—to any kind of medical help that would not include the purchase of private medical insurance.

AMA put on a big drive in November to defeat all candidates who indicated they might approve of medicare or were solidly for it. Mostly, the political campaign failed. Too many people have become weary of the kind of opposition being used by organized doctors, and they failed to heed the fear ridden arguments.

A postelection survey of the cause of failure led Annis to this explanation: "The siren songs of the politicans were more appealing than the voices of reason and experience." And: "Although the AMA's public relations reserves were substantial, they were not sufficient."

He addressed a meeting of the Public Relations Society of America in Boston last month, and he said AMA is planning a massive "public relations war" in advance of Congress being asked again to pass medicare as part of the social security program. So still more money will be poured into the coffers of AMA in order to have a "sufficient" amount with which to conduct a still more subtle war against "politicians."

(The Nation sorely needs more doctors to quicken the competition and to hold down their cost. But it also needs politicians—it is the politician who interests himself in government and keeps our free political system going. Would Dr. Annis dispense with them—or only those willing to bow to certain lobbying and pressure groups?)

Christians—in fact, all Floridians—can hope Dr. Annis stumbles across the story of the tragedy in Hallandale, and, pondering it, question whether he is giving AMA proper leadership.

Will he think of the couple's loneliness in those last hours of life, and wonder at the thoughts of the husband as he pressed his lips to the feet of his dying wife?

On Tuesday, particularly, we only can hope Dr. Annis may find a new definition of the word "sufficient" as he thinks of the debt-ridden couple who did not want to be a burden to the young, but whose hopes for future relief had been dashed by pressure on the last Congress by a special interest group.

Perhaps, then, Dr. Annis would use the word along these lines: "Sufficient unto the day is the evil thereof." And the new Congress would not feel the pressure from money spent on a public relations war to perpetuate a great social evil in America.

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, a great nation cannot countenance such tragedies and retain its self-respect. We cannot delay any longer. We must enact, now, a program of hospital and related benefits under social security, a program such as would be provided under my bill, S. 65, or the administration's bill, S. 880, introduced last week by our colleague the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON].

AMENDMENT OF RULE RELATING TO STANDING COMMITTEES

The Senate resumed the consideration of the resolution (S. Res. 90) amending rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate relating to standing committees.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may suggest the absence of a quorum and that the time for the call of the roll be charged to both sides. If the sponsor of the amendments is not on the floor shortly, I shall have to ask, unfortunately, for a live quorum and give up a lot of my own time in the process.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana? The Chair hears none; and, without objection it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, if I may have the attention of the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], I request that the Senator from Pennsylvania speak first and that I may be permitted to conclude this debate.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, of course, that is the privilege of the majority leader. My understanding is that, under the unanimous-consent agreement, the Senate is to vote at 2 o'clock.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Not later than 2 o'clock.

Mr. CLARK. How much time does the majority leader desire to speak at the end?

Mr. MANSFIELD. We each have 42½ minutes left, I believe, and I would like 42½ minutes, or 40 minutes, or even 35 minutes, in order that I may yield for questions. I would like all that time because I have some remarks to make. When I get through with them, I would like to yield for questions.

Mr. CLARK. Does the Senator desire to utilize the whole time himself?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Yes.

Mr. CLARK. The Senator will excuse me if I ruminate, will he not, because I had not anticipated this position.

Mr. MANSFIELD. While the Senator from Pennsylvania ruminates, I may state to him that, so far as the majority leader is concerned, it is not his intention to ask for a rollcall on any of the Clark resolutions in the nature of amendments or the resolution itself.

Mr. CLARK. I think the majority leader will understand what I have in mind when I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Will it come out of the time of the Senator from Pennsylvania?

Mr. CLARK. Yes.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Senator from Pennsylvania suggested the absence of a quorum.

Mr. CLARK. I yield to the Senator from California.

Mr. KUCHEL. I wish to address a question to the able Senator from Pennsylvania before he suggests the absence of a quorum.

Mr. CLARK. The Senator would like to have it come out of my time?

Mr. MANSFIELD. It looks as if it is coming out of the time of both of us.

Mr. KUCHEL. Two or three of us are going to be absent who would like to be recorded if there is to be a yea-and-nay vote. Under those circumstances, on the vote, if the roll is to be called at 2 o'clock, I would like to have a little time.

Mr. CLARK. It was in order to accommodate to that situation, having come to the floor for the first time from an important committee meeting, that I wanted to suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana may state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Whose time is this coming out of?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Out of the time of the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. MANSFIELD. How much time does the Senator from Montana have?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana has 44 minutes.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I thank the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, how much time have I remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania has 31 minutes remaining.

Mr. CLARK. I yield 10 minutes to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I understand that the resolution before the Senate is Senate Resolution 93, which would increase the membership of the Committee on Finance from 17 to 21. I rise in support of that resolution.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield so that I may propound a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. CLARK. What is the pending business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The three amendments proposed by the Senator from Pennsylvania are before the Senate, with the right of the Senator from Pennsylvania to withdraw any one or all of them.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I call up Senate Resolution 93, dealing with the Committee on Finance, and I ask that the first vote be on that resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. In Senate Resolution 90, on page 7, line 12, it is proposed to strike out "seventeen" and insert in lieu thereof "twenty-one."

Mr. CLARK. I yield 10 minutes to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, the amendment carries with it also the implicit assumption that the membership of the committee will be composed of 14 Democrats and 7 Republicans, instead of the present composition of 11 Democrats and 6 Republicans.

The first argument for increasing the membership is that the membership of the various committees should reflect the approximate distribution of the parties in the Senate itself.

There are now 67 Senators on the Democratic side of the aisle and 33 on the Republican side of the aisle. Therefore the party ratio, as officially declared, is slightly in excess of 2 to 1. However, the composition of the Finance Committee under the proposal advanced by the Senator from Montana and the Democratic steering committee would not be 2 to 1, but 11 to 6. Therefore it seems to me that a very strong case can be made for enlarging the membership to 21, so that the parties may be represented on the committee in proportion to their membership on the floor of the Senate and that we may avoid having an even numbered committee, which may result in deadlocks; and, instead, produce an odd-numbered committee, so that the committee can come to definite decisions.

A little mental arithmetic shows that 14 to 7, with a total of 21, is the only figure which meets these two requirements.

Therefore, I believe a conclusive case can be made for enlarging the membership of the Finance Committee from 17 to 21.

Of course this is not all of the story. As I tried to point out in my remarks of last Thursday, in reality, there are in the Senate, not two political parties, but four. First, there are the liberal and progressive Democrats of the North and West, who try to be loyal to the national platform of the Democratic Party and to the general program of the President, although reserving the right to disagree on certain issues.

The second party is that of the conservative Democrats, who certainly disagree with the platform of the party on civil rights, and generally on economic and financial matters, as well.

The third political party is that of the conservative Republicans—they form the overwhelming mass of the Republican Party in both the Senate and House.

Finally, there is the small but gallant band of liberal Republicans.

These are the four political parties. I should think that certainly on the question of civil rights the liberal Democrats plus the liberal Republicans probably comprise a majority of the Senate, and I believe that on basic economic issues they also comprise a majority of the Senate.

But the Senate has been dominated for a great many years in the past by a coalition of the conservative Democrats and the conservative Republicans. This has been possible because of the very close cooperation between the two groups. As the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] brought out in his very able and commendable address of last week, the machinery of the Democratic Party in the Senate is almost entirely in the hands of the conservative Democrats.

The Committee on Finance will be perhaps the most important committee in the Senate during this Congress. Through it will pass the tax measures. Through it will pass proposals for hospital and medical care for the aged. These are the two most important issues at present scheduled for action.

I have been a member of the Committee on Finance for some 7 years. I have been treated with conspicuous courtesy and fairness by the chairman of that committee, the distinguished senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD]. I have had pleasant associations with others upon that body. At times, our disputes became quite heated, but I have enjoyed my associations on that committee. I have appreciated the personal treatment which I have received.

However, it is an open secret that the Republicans on the Committee on Finance present a virtually solid front, and that on virtually every basic and fundamental issue enough of the Democrats side with the Republicans so that they hold a secure majority in the committee itself.

It is always ungracious to classify people. I do not like to be classified myself. I like to think that I judge individual issues on their merits. I certainly do not charge every member of the Committee on Finance with having fixed and unalterable opinions. There is always hope. But I think it is fair to say that of the present composition of the committee, there are at a very minimum four Democratic votes which on virtually all occasions will side with the six Republicans. I may be wrong in that belief, but I think that is a conservative estimate, giving the benefit of the doubt to one or two individuals. So I should say that the vote on these basic matters of principle will be at least 10 to 7, possibly 11 to 6, and that on this decision really hangs whether the program of the President will be enacted.

We all know the prestige which a report from the committee has upon Members of the Senate.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. The time of the Senator from Illinois has expired.

Mr. **CLARK**. Mr. President, I yield the Senator from Illinois 2 additional minutes.

Mr. **DOUGLAS**. There is always a given percentage of Senators who will accept the decisions of the majority of a committee, and those who oppose the decision of the committee start from an extremely disadvantageous position. So we face an issue not merely as to whether the composition of the committee is to conform to the party position of the Senate. The basic issue we face is whether the program of the National Democratic Party and of the President of the United States will be put into effect, or whether it will be smothered to death, asphyxiated, crippled, and enfeebled in the Committee on Finance. That is the issue; we cannot avoid it or disguise it.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the Record an article entitled "Democrat Joe," written by James Reston, and published in the Philadelphia Sunday Bulletin of February 24, 1963; an editorial entitled "Unrepresentative Senate," published in the Washington Post of February 20, 1963; and an editorial entitled "For History's Sake," published in the Washington Post of February 22, 1963.

There being no objection, the article and editorials were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Philadelphia Sunday Bulletin, Feb. 24, 1963]

Democrat Joe

(By James Reston)

Washington, February 23.—One of the most attractive things about Washington is that every once in a while somebody stands right up and tells the truth, just to see what will happen.

Take Joe Clark. He's a Senator from Pennsylvania. As such, he's supposed to accept the rules of the club, respect the leaders of the Senate establishment, and defend the Senate as "the greatest deliberative body in the world."

But not Joe. He got right up in the Senate the other day and attacked the whole system. He even suggested that the Democrats in the Senate ought to introduce a little democracy into their proceedings, and what he said about "the establishment" was even more daring.

QUITE UNRESPONSIVE

"The Senate establishment, as I see it," said Joe, "is almost the antithesis of democracy. It is not selected by any democratic process. It appears to be quite unresponsive to the caucuses of the two parties, be they Republican or Democratic. It is what might be called a self-perpetuating oligarchy with mild, but only mild, overtones of plutocracy."

Of course, this is very largely true and it helps explain why President Kennedy won a victory in the Senate races last November but hasn't got anything out of the Senate since.

The facts are clear enough. In the last election, the Democrats increased their liberal wing in the Senate—Nelson, of Wisconson; McGovern, of South Dakota; Bayh, of Indiana; Kennedy, of Massachusetts—and now outnumber the Republicans, 68 to 32.

This was a net gain of four Democrats, and Clark had the original idea that the liberal gains should be reflected in the Democratic steering committee, which has the immense power of recommending committee assignments for all Democratic Members of the Senate.

In 1961 and again at the start of the present 88th Congress in January, the Democratic Members of the Senate, meeting in conference, approved a statement by the Senate Democratic leader, Mike Mansfield, that "the composition of the Democratic steering committee should reflect both the geographical distribution and the ideological views of the Members of the Senate.

This, however, was not done.

Clark estimates that there are 28 conservative Democrats and 40 liberal Democrats in the Senate, and that northern and western Democratic Senators outnumber southern Democratic Senators. But 7 of the 15 members of the powerful steering committee are southerners, and with the addition of 2 conservative Democratic members from elsewhere, the conservatives dominate the steering committee, 9–6.

Efforts to change this situation failed in a vote of all the Democratic Senators, and "they failed largely, I think," said Clark, "because the leadership announced against it and spoke against it in conference and threw the full impact of its undoubted moral authority against what, to me, at least, seems to be this badly needed reform."

It is not hard to analyze why the liberal Democratic leaders, Mansfield and Humphrey, rejected the reform. Seven of the nine conservatives on the steering committee are also chairmen of other key Senate committees:

Senator Bible, of Nevada, is chairman of the District of Columbia Committee; Senator Ellender, of Louisiana, Agriculture and Forestry; Senator Hayden, of Arizona, Appropriations; Senator Johnston, of South Carolina, Post Office and Civil Service; Senator McClellan, of Arkansas, Government Operations; Senator Robertson, of Virginia, Banking and Currency; and Senator Russell, of Georgia, Armed Services.

The other two conservatives on the steering committee are Smathers and Holland, both of Florida.

Clark didn't want to kick any of these eminent gentlemen off the steering committee; he just wanted to make the committee larger to get a better break for the northern liberals. But he was voted down and he's still growling.

He even went so far as to look into the committee assignments recommended by the steering committee, and came up with these interesting statistics: Of 8 nonfreshman Senators who voted against changing the present filibuster rule in the Senate, 6 were assigned to the Senate committee of their first choice, but of the 14 nonfreshman Senators who voted to liberalize the filibuster rule, only 1 got the committee of his choice.

PUT INTO THE RECORD

Of course, Clark didn't say that the conservatives were being rewarded by the steering committee or the liberals punished, but all the same, he thought the figures were interesting enough to go into the Congressional Record.

This is what adds spice to the capital—somebody always fighting for lost causes.

Politics was first defined as "the art of preventing people from minding their own business" and then as "the art of forcing people to decide things they don't understand." Joe Clark is less cynical. He persists in thinking that democracy should have a chance, even in the Democratic Party in the Senate.

[From the Washington Post, Feb. 22, 1963]

Unrepresentative Senate

Majority Leader Mansfield's impatience over the continued wrangling in the Senate is quite understandable and will be widely shared. After 5 weeks of filibustering, maneuvering, and quarreling over committee assignments, the Senate ought to settle down to its legislative business. It would be a mistake, however, merely to sweep under the rug the deficiencies which Senator Clark and some of his colleagues have brought to light.

No doubt the majority leader is right in saying that these weaknesses cannot be corrected now. Nevertheless, Senator Clark has made a powerful case for changes in the Senate's control mechanism with the object of making it a more responsible legislative body. Despite the overwhelming preponderance of Democrats, and the liberal leanings of a substantial majority of them, the Senate is still dominated in large measure by a loose coalition of conservative Democrats and Republicans. The liberals have not yet succeeded in making their influence felt in proportion to their numbers.

Mr. Clark's analysis of the situation in the Democratic steering committee was very enlightening. This 15-man leadership committee of the dominant party consists of seven members from the South, three from the Northeast, three from the Pacific, and Mountain States, and two from the Midwest. By Senator Clark's classification, nine of these steering committee members are conservatives and only six liberals who can be generally counted on to support measures sponsored by the Kennedy administration. Since there are about 40 "Kennedy Democrats" in the Senate, this makes the steering committee, which assigns Senators to all the legislative committees, highly unrepresentative of the Democratic Senate membership. "I suggest in all candor," Mr. Clark said, "that * * * the present membership of the steering committee accordingly does not fairly represent either the geography or the ideology of the Democratic membership of the Senate."

The Senator's other prize example of the Senate's unresponsiveness to what happened at the polls last November is the Finance Committee. This most powerful committee of the Senate has 11 Democrats and 6 Republicans, a ratio slightly more favorable to the minority than is justified by its membership of 33 out of the 100 Senators. There is also a disproportionate number of southern Democrats on the committee. Mr. Clark was not exaggerating when he charged that the Finance Committee lineup does not reflect the views of the entire Senate but rather those of the "well-known conservative bipartisan coalition opposed to the President of the United States."

It was for this reason that Senator Clark proposed, and is still fighting for, the addition of two members to the Finance Committee. His proposal is entirely reasonable, but the cards are stacked against him. Apparently the only hope for achievement of the basic reforms that Mr. Clark and his colleagues are seeking lies in the creation of a new committee or commission on the organization of Congress to make a detailed study aimed at moderation of both the Senate and the House. This is the project toward which the major efforts of the liberal forces should be directed.

[From the Washington Post, Feb. 22, 1963]

FOR HISTORY'S SAKE

In his major complaint over the obsolescence of the Senate's operations, Senator CLARK made a commendable effort to open some of that body's secret files. Why, he asked, should the minutes of the Senate's Democratic steering committee remain indefinitely under lock and key? Why should the members of even Senate staffs be denied access to the proceedings of the Democratic conferences? Senator CLARK made clear that he is advocating, not open meetings of the steering committee and the party conferences, but only a relatively mild relaxation of the present secrecy.

These records, the Senator rightly said, are a part of the history of our times. Mr. CLARK was especially perturbed because he had to go to the office of the secretary of the majority and get the books unlocked before he could read what happened in the days of Woodrow Wilson. Even the State Department discloses its confidential documents after a reasonable lapse of time. Certainly it would not be unreasonable for the congressional party groups which meet behind closed doors to open their records to the public as well as to senatorial staffs after a reasonable interval. Senator CLARK suggested from 3 months to a year.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I yield 3 minutes to the Senator from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, this has been a very interesting controversy over committee places, mainly because we have been engaged in an unusual review of the internal activities of the majority party. It is a fact that the total Senate must vote upon the number of places and upon the designations to these places, but this rarely is in practice too meaningful to Senators other than those of the majority, because the majority agrees and is then at one and can work its will. This is respected as normal party function.

However, we are confronted with an unusual situation, in which members of the majority have come forward with some very interesting revelations. The most interesting and important, so far as I am concerned, is the one relating to the factual analysis which, as the Senator from Pennsylvania points out, demonstrates that Senators who favored a rule XXII change—and that includes me—suffered the most seriously in the reshuffling of committee places, as compared with Senators who did not favor such a rules change.

I understand perfectly the attitude of the Senator from Pennsylvania in reading no motives into anything, because he has no evidence, beyond what he experienced in his party's deliberations, on which to do so. I naturally have even less than that, not having participated in those deliberations. Hence I have taken the position that these are the vicissitudes of political and public life. Although there were other ways to realine committees, those ways were not chosen. We cannot refrain from taking cognizance, first, of the fact that those who were in the rules fight suffered; and, second, of the natural feeling of confusion on the part of people in my State about what occurred. The Governor of my State issued a statement on February 15, commenting on this matter, setting forth how displeased the State was that one of its Senators was dropped from the Committee on Appropriations by virtue of the reduction in numbers in the Republican membership on the committee, and then stating:

> I believe the people of New York State will join with me in protesting this arbitrary, politically motivated discrimination against them.

Under these circumstances, taking these two facts together, it seems to me that I must take my position with those who seek to change the conditions which brought about this situation, in which those who were advocating a rules change allegedly felt the heavy hand of adverse selection in their committee places, as compared with those who were not advocating a rules change. It seems to me that simply the spirit of cooperation with those who worked with me in the rules fight, which we considered to be in the Nation's interest, dictates that I stand together with those who would change those conditions.

Hence, I shall support the motion of the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK].

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, how much time have I remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania has 16 minutes remaining.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I yield myself as much of the time remaining to me as I may require.

On Tuesday, Wednesday, and Thursday of last week I undertook to make my case on the floor of the Senate with respect to the need to change the size of three Senate committees, in order to enable Senators who support, in general, the program of the President, and who, in particular, were denied seats on these committees, to which, in my opinion, in equity and justice they were entitled, to join those committees.

I shall now very briefly summarize the case I attempted to make.

My proposal, which is pending, is to increase the size of the Finance Committee from 17—consisting of 11 Democrats and 6 Republicans—to 21, 14 Democrats and 7 Republicans. I believe this change to be highly desirable, for three reasons:

First, to bring the ratio between the Republican members and the Democratic members more nearly into line with the more than 2-to-1 majority which the Democrats presently have in the Senate—that is to say, 67 Democratic Senators and 33 Republican Senators.

Mr. President, what valid excuse can there be for leaving the ratio on the Finance Committee 11 to 6, or substantially less than 2 to 1? This committee is one of the most important of the Senate's committees. It will have before it most important proposals recommended by the President. The committee presently is controlled—as was so well pointed out by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS]—by a conservative coalition composed of southern Democratic Senators and western and northern Republican Senators, so that it does not represent the will of the majority of the Senate, nor will it, in my opinion, honest and able though each of these Senators is. I do not challenge the integrity of any Senator, nor do I challenge the sincerity of any Senator's economic views, but this committee does not represent the country or the majority of the Senate. For that reason, to maintain the present ratio with the present membership of that committee is, in my opinion, unsound and unwise.

My second reason is to make additional seats available to Senators who are entitled to them on the basis of their records in the Senate—whether by seniority or otherwise. Seniority was ignored nine times in the assignments made by members of the Democratic steering committee, who themselves rule by seniority. Yet, Mr. President, when it seemed to them desirable to ignore seniority, they did so.

I do not challenge the motivation or impugn the good faith of anyone. All I say is that those who live by seniority should be prepared to die by it, if as a result their own position is going to be adversely affected. I suggest they should allow others to live by the same rule which they have so often invoked in support of their own position.

Let me say that, on other occasions, the size of the Finance Committee has been substantially larger than it presently is—and, indeed, larger than my proposal would make it. As recently as 1937, the Finance Committee consisted of 21 members—in other words, the same size I now propose to make it. So in this body, so devoted to precedent, there is excellent precedent for changing the size of the Finance Committee.

My third reason is to open the committee's membership to Senators who will support the programs of the President, particularly his programs with respect to taxes and medicare. I believe the power of the Executive should be increased to the extent necessary to make it possible for the legislature to give the Executive fair consideration of all measures which the Executive sends to the legislature—in short, Mr. President, that, in effect, the President should be entitled to a hearing on all the bills he favors before the appropriate committees, and before committees which properly represent the membership of the Senate, and whose membership is not based solely and alone upon the power of such a coalition as that referred to to control these important committees.

The Senate establishment opposed this proposed change. If the Senate establishment wins—and I am under no illusion in regard to this matter—I submit that the present sterile, ultraconservative control of the Finance Committee will be continued, and that the programs of the President will be crippled, if not actually destroyed.

Mr. President, let me ask how much time remains available to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Ten minutes.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, the great historian, Arnold J. Toynbee, in his massive study of history, has pointed out that a civilization advances when it is under the control of a creative minority, and that civilization decays when the minority—which to date has controlled all civilizations, and, indeed, controls ours today—is not creative, but merely is dominant, when it supports the status quo, when it is intent only on preserving power, not on advancing a forward-looking civilization, which must advance with its time.

Mr. President, I submit that today there is in the Senate a creative majority which must sooner or later wrest control from the dominant minority, if the Senate is to play its proper constitutional part in our Government's efforts to keep America moving forward in a world of change and crisis. I submit that the Senate cannot afford to stand still while every other governmental institution in the world is moving ahead to meet the challenges of our time.

Something has been said about "packing" a committee. I have said before, and I repeat now, that neither I nor any of the Senators who support the position I take is attempting to engage in a "packing" movement. This is an effort to "unstack" the committee, which presently is "stacked" against the President's supporters in the Senate.

I hope Senators will vote against keeping the clock turned back to suit the wishes of a small minority which is out of touch with the facts of modern life.

Mr. President, this controversy may seem to some to be a mere haggle over procedure. But I submit that procedure is the heart of liberty and the heart of freedom; and I submit that until the Senate frees itself from the outmoded and archaic procedures under which it is governed, there can be little hope for the enactment of a meaningful legislative program.

I call the attention of Senators and the attention of the press and the attention of the public generally to what I regard as a very pertinent quotation from one who has thought deeply about the survival of Western civilization. I refer to Sir C. P. Snow, of England. In his brilliant Reed lecture entitled "The Two Cultures and the Scientific Revolution," after expressing his grave concern that the Western democracies were not moving ahead fast enough to meet the challenges of our time—not fast enough to deal with the problem of nuclear warfare, and not fast enough to bridge the gap in their alliances and to move forward in the interest of freedom—he said:

> More often than I like, I am saddened by a historical myth. Whether the myth is good history or not, doesn't matter; it is pressing enough for me. I can't help thinking of the Venetian Republic in their last half-century. Like us, they had once been fabulously lucky. They had become rich, as we did, by accident. They had acquired immense political skill, just as we have. A good many of them were tough-minded, realistic, patriotic men. They knew, just as clearly as we know, that the current of history had begun to flow against them. Many of them gave their minds to working out ways to keep going. It would have meant breaking the pattern into which they had crystallised. They were fond of the pattern, just as we—

In the Senate—

> are fond of ours. They never found the will to break it.

Mr. President, may the Senate find the will to break the pattern before it is too late.

I shall not ask for a yea-and-nay vote on the motion before the Senate to increase the size of the Committee on Finance. The majority leader has indicated that he does not desire a yea and nay vote on either the change that he has proposed in the rule or any of mine. Unless some other Senator forces it, I am not willing to put Senators into what essentially would be an embarrassing position. I know there is no chance of victory.

Mr. President, this is the first Battle of Bull Run. Those of us who wish to modernize the Senate and make it capable of performing its constitutional obligations in a time of great stress, in a time of constant change, and in a time of recurring crises, are going to get licked. But the fight will continue. It will continue until it is won.

The reception in the press and with the public has been far more favorable toward my efforts and those of my colleagues than is the case in the Senate. I shall continue to press, with those who desire to update and streamline the Senate, for the changes of the rules which are now pending in the Committee on Rules and Administration, on which I now have the honor to serve. From time to time we shall bring before the Senate Senate Resolution 9 in order to shock the conscience of the Senate into a realization that it is unethical, wrong, and immoral to deny the right to vote to 56 Senators who desire to change our own rules.

Mr. President, the fight will go on, and one day it will be won.

I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I am delighted that the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania has indicated that he will not ask for a yea-and-nay vote. I would ask the Senate to concur in that suggestion because I feel that the sooner we face the business now before the Senate and decide it one way or the other, the better off we shall be.

Let me say at the outset that the Senator from Pennsylvania has acted entirely within his rights in pursuing the matter which he has been discussing on the floor for the past week. He has been doing what any Senator may do and many have done when they are obsessed with one of the many issues which lie within the purview of the Senate.

I am sure the Senator's intentions are of the best and that there was no thought in his mind of attacking the Senator from Montana. Nevertheless, his remarks, in some respects, constitute a reflection direct or indirect on the caliber if not the intent of the leadership. For that, I bear him no rancor. He is entitled to his views. He is entitled to express them in caucus, on the floor of the Senate or wherever his discretion may lead him to express them.

Insofar as the Senator's remarks of the past week concern the rules of the Senate, I reiterate what I have said on a number of occasions: There is nothing sacrosanct in the rules. They are not beyond discussion or change. They have been changed before and, indeed, we are about to amend a rule, today, one way or another.

The Senator from Pennsylvania has performed a useful service by suggesting from time to time, in the past, reforms which he believes will render more efficient and more responsive the operation of the Senate. His election to the Rules Committee, which I was delighted to support in the steering committee, offers him an opportunity to pursue this matter in the most appropriate forum and I hope, most sincerely, that he will do so.

In fact, I know that he will. But the Senator's remarks in the past week were not primarily directed at the rules—the written rules—which however wise or foolish, however antiquated or modern, apply equally to all Members. To be sure, the Senator touched on these matters in passing, but only in passing. He aimed his fire at the organization of the democratic majority of which he is a member and he tilted his lance at something which he termed the "Senate establishment."

Since I do not know what the Senator from Pennsylvania means by the Senate establishment—although I followed his remarks most carefully—I can neither join him in criticism of it or rise to defend it. I can only say, as I have said many times, one Senator, one voice, one vote. We are all equal here, and insofar as the majority leader is concerned, he has operated in good conscience, under that principle. There is only one establishment in the Senate which the majority leadership seeks to foster. That is an establishment of 51 votes on behalf of the President's program. And whenever the Senator from Pennsylvania can assure him of 51 votes for that purpose, the Senator from Montana will be only too happy to support him for the presidency of the 51 club.

Mr. President, the Senator from Pennsylvania is within his rights when he tilts his lance and charges at the windmills of evil which he perceives in the Senate. But so, too, is the Senator from Montana when he objects to finding himself, his leadership and his party, at the end of the charge, impaled upon the point. For what is the burden of the Senator's attack if it is not his disapproval of his own party? If I interpret his remarks correctly, he makes two principal points:

First, that the organization of the Senate, which is controlled by the Democratic majority in the caucus, has been carried out in a deliberately inequitable, if not a vindictively inequitable, pattern against what he would term the liberal group of Democrats;

Second, that it would be feasible to organize the majority and the Senate in a pattern much more conducive to the passage of the President's program and that in failing to do so the leadership has failed the President.

May I say to the Senator that he is right on both counts and he is wrong, very wrong on both counts. Each Democratic Senator defines the needs of the Democratic Party in terms of his own dictionary. The Senator from Pennsylvania has his dictionary and according to his dictionary he is right. But I remind the Senator that he is not using the same book as the Senator from Missouri or the Senator from Texas or the Senator from Georgia. Yet all are Democrats, and their States helped to elect a Democratic President. According to the Senator from Pennsylvania, the organization of the majority in the Senate is inequitable. According to these other Members it may also be inequitable in another way.

According to the Senator from Pennsylvania, the organization is equitable when he is elected to the Committee on Rules and Administration but it is inequitable when it does not place him on the Foreign Relations Committee. The organization is equitable when it places the majority leader or the whip on the Appropriations Committee but it is not equitable when it places the Senator from Alaska on the same committee.

The organization is not equitable when it does not change the total membership of the Foreign Relations. But it would be equitable if it added several members to the committee and, I presume, accommodated the wishes of the Senator from Pennsylvania as regards his membership on it. It is inequitable when it follows the principle of seniority or ignores the principle of seniority in an appointment of which the Senator does not approve. And it is equitable either way if the result is an appointment of which he does approve.

I would say to the Senator that the decisions in these matters are never easy. What is meat for one Senator is another's poison. But the decisions have to be made. In the last analysis, the responsibility rests with the conference to see that equity is done for the steering committee and the leadership are but its creatures.

May I say that the Senator from Pennsylvania has had every encouragement from the leadership and every opportunity to test his concepts of equity. His concepts have been rejected time and again, in the steering committee and by the conference.

That is not to say that the concepts are wrong in an historical sense. The Senator from Pennsylvania may have some mysterious wisdom which enables him to determine what is right for the Democratic Party—a wisdom which is denied to ordinary Democrats. But wise or not, his concepts of equity are clearly not applicable in this Senate of the 88th Congress, not because an establishment has ordained it but because the votes of his colleagues deny their applicability.

As for his concepts on committee reorganization, again I would point out that the Senator from Pennsylvania has had every opportunity to test his proposals time and again in caucus and in steering committee, and repeatedly they have been rejected.

Yet, one cannot study the remarks of the Senator from Pennsylvania without gaining the impression that he believes these tests were unfair to him, and, in particular, that the leadership was unfair. It is as though he believes that if the majority leader had but waved his baton in the direction of the good and the true according to the doctrine of the Senator from Pennsylvania, the results would have been different. The Senator from Montana has his views on the matters at issue. Sometimes they agree with those of the Senator from Pennsylvania and sometimes they do not.

But whether they agree or disagree, it would be well to get straight what is involved in the baton which rests in the hands of the majority leadership. I can assure the Senator that there is no magic in it. I cannot recall that the Senator from Pennsylvania once suggested strengthening this baton, in the steering committee or in the caucus. I cannot recall his proposing, for example, that the majority leader be assigned full authority for deciding the majority party position on organization or on committee assignments. Yet somehow he suggests that the majority leader has this authority in his baton. Well, Mr. President, what is the power in this baton that the majority leader is supposed to wave on organizations and assignments? In specifics, it is the power of appointment, after consultation with the other members of the leadership and with the concurrence of the caucus, to fill vacancies on the steering committee and the policy committee. It includes, too, one vote—I reiterate—one vote on each committee. That is all that there is in this baton in connection with the question at issue. How has the Senator from Montana used these great powers in his 2 years of tenure as majority leader?

He has used it to appoint the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] to the steering committee. I know these appointments pleased the Senator from Pennsylvania but I cannot in all honesty claim that I made them for that purpose. They were made solely for the purpose of carrying out the instructions of the conference to which the majority leader is answerable. But pleased though he may be with the appointments, still the Senator from Pennsylvania is not satisfied. What more would he have the Senator from Montana do? Since there are no mysterious powers of which I am aware in the leadership, what else is there for him to do? Would he have the majority leader make campaign speeches or deals for the doctrine according to the Senator from Pennsylvania? In the first place, the majority leader is not much of a speaker and not a dealer for any group in the Senate—neither for the old establishment or the Clark establishment. The Senator from Montana has a responsibility not only to the Senator from Pennsylvania but also to all the members of the Democratic conference, and he has a responsibility to the President as President and as head of the Democratic Party. The majority leader has to choose his own course and his own words in terms of what is feasible and fair to both responsibilities. He may make mistakes, and he does, mistakes of judgment—but he makes them not out of malice, not to support one establishment as against another, but solely within the framework of an effort to discharge his twin responsibilities to all Democrats and to the President, as best he knows how.

The Senator from Montana is by choice as well as necessity, a Democrat, nothing more, nothing less.

I, for one, do not think that a position of support for the President is maintained by depreciation of Democratic Members of the South or West, and the record of the 87th Congress bears this out. Let me go over a few of the key votes during that time, with an eye to what would have happened to that program if Senators from the South, and Senators HAYDEN, BIBLE, and CANNON—whose names are frequently linked together—had voted against the measures concerned.

The 1-year emergency feed grains program, which carried 58 to 31, would have been defeated without 13 southerners and Senators HAYDEN, BIBLE, and CANNON.

The Bush amendment to cut $150 million from NIH appropriations would have carried without 15 southerners and the 3 westerners.

The Scott substitute for the Area Redevelopment Act would have carried without 16 southerners and the 3 westerners.

On aid to education, the Goldwater loan substitute would have carried without 20 southerners and Senators HAYDEN, CANNON, and BIBLE. The authorization for the program by $252 million would have carried without them. The bill itself would have been defeated without eight southerners and the three westerners.

The Capehart amendment to cut the foreign aid development loan authority in half, which was defeated by a vote of 50 to 45, would have carried without 11 southerners and the westerners.

The Prouty amendment to require all economic aid projects to be referred to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee would have carried without 16 southerners and the westerners.

The Capehart amendment to cut public housing units to 37,000 would have passed without the votes of 11 southerners and Senators BIBLE and CANNON. His amendment to cut urban renewal by $700 million would be law today except for the votes of 10 southerners and the westerners.

The Prouty amendment to cut the term of the manpower retraining program, which was defeated 44 to 43, would have carried without 10 southerners and the westerners.

The first farm bill of 1962 was passed by a vote of 42 to 38. Without the aid of southerners and the westerners it would have been lost. The same is true of the second farm bill.

The standby Public Works Act of 1962 would have been defeated without the votes of nine southerners, and Senators HAYDEN, BIBLE, and CANNON.

I must say that the approach of the Senator from Pennsylvania, insofar as it involves allegations of discrimination and the so-called Senate establishment, as distinct from his advocacy of rules changes which are certainly in order, have tended to be, in my opinion, both presumptuous and divisive. In my opinion, they have not helped the Democratic Party. In my opinion, they have not helped the President's program.

But leaving aside matters of opinion on which differences are to be expected, there are certain allegations of fact which the Senator from Pennsylvania has raised with regard to committee reconstitution and assignments and it is time to set them straight. For they have not come straight in either his remarks of the past few days or in the debate which accompanied them.

The Senator from Pennsylvania has presented three amendments to rule 25 which would, if adopted, increase the size of the Finance Committee, the Appropriations Committee, and the Foreign Relations Committee. And the majority leader must and will oppose these amendments. In the eyes of the Senator from Pennsylvania this will undoubtedly constitute evidence that the majority leader is not only opposed to the President and the Democratic Party but is also a member in good standing in the establishment.

But the cruel facts of life concerning the Finance Committee are well known to the Senator. It is his contention that we should fly in the face of them. He knows that the Senator from Montana originally supported the increase, which in the first instance, as far as the Finance Committee was concerned, was initiated by the Senator from Pennsylvania. He knows the Senator from Montana sought an estimate of support in the Senate for it, and that his best information was that the move would fail by a substantial majority if it were contested, as it would be, on the Senate floor. He was told that Senators on the Finance Committee had promised that the President's tax bill would not be bottled up in committee.

I have informed the steering committee that the Senate would stay in session all this year and into next January 3, if need, so we will consider a tax bill on the floor of the Senate. And yet the Senator from Pennsylvania chose—as was his right—to make the fight in the steering committee; and having lost there by a vote of almost 3 to 1, he has chosen to prolong the matter by bringing it onto the Senate floor.

The Senator also knew that there was firm resistance to enlarging the Appropriations Committee on the part of the chairman. Already 27 Senators serve on the Appropriations Committee. The Senator would increase it to 29. His purpose, I believe, is to preserve for the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] a seat on the committee. No matter that many great and esteemed Members of this body in the past—liberal and conservative, northern and southern—lost their positions on the Appropriations Committee, when the power balance shifted in the Senate; the Senator from Pennsylvania insists that the present case is one in which vengeance was had upon the Senator from New York by the steering committee. That charge was not specifically made by the Senator from Pennsylvania, although the inference of his remarks was that a calculated job of "bumping" the Senator from New York had been done.

I have said on the floor that had the minority leader been prepared to favor enlarging the Finance Committee, the majority leader would have been prepared to support the enlargement of the Appropriations Committee so that the Senator from New York might have kept his seat. So if there has been any bumping, the responsibility does not rest on this side of the aisle.

Lastly, the Senator from Pennsylvania proposes to make the Foreign Relations Committee a 21-man group, divided 14 and 7. I am at a loss to understand how this increase would serve the interest of a "bipartisan foreign policy" supporting the President, as the Senator contends, although it would offer our Republican friends the opportunity to place two additional members on the committee. I can understand the Senator's opinion that the addition of two Democrats, chosen from the "modern, forward-looking" segment of our party—as defined by the Senator from Pennsylvania—would benefit the committee and the country generally.

And now, since the Senator has to a considerable degree opened up the deliberations of the steering committee, I shall undertake a brief examination of the committee assignments we made. I may say that I was struck by the Senator's opinion that freshman Senators had been unduly favored over those of the class of 1958. We have indeed come full circle from the days when freshmen were given the leftovers after their seniors had feasted on the choice assignments. Now, we learn, we are force feeding them like prize livestock.

I think it is strange that the Senator, who received initial assignments to the Banking and Post Office and Civil Service Committees, and subsequently to the Labor Committee, on all of which his contributions to his State and country have been considered, should be exercised about freshman committee assignments.

But let us take up the nominations that seem to be most in controversy.

For the Aeronautics and Space Committee, the steering committee chose the junior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. EDMONDSON]. The chairman of that committee during the 87th Congress was the former senior Senator from Oklahoma, Mr. Kerr. If geography should be a consideration in assigning Members, as the Senator from Pennsylvania thinks it should be, the steering committee acted wisely in choosing Mr. EDMONDSON to fill the vacancy. And, judging by his record as Governor of Oklahoma, no more wholehearted support of the President can be found in the Senate than Senator EDMONDSON.

May I say he was put on the second major committee, the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, because agriculture is, in his State, the No. 1 industry, because he is a rancher, because he knows farm problems, and because he is interested in agricultural legislation.

For the Armed Services Committee, Senator INOUYE was chosen. Mention has been made of the fact that Senator INOUYE voted against amending the cloture rule of the Senate, and consequently received choice committee assignments from his grateful colleagues. Oddly, the assignment of other freshman Senators, who received their choice of committees, and who voted 7 to 2 for liberalization of the cloture rule was not mentioned. And yet all but two of these nine Democratic Senators received at least one of the major committees of their choice, and most of them received both. Obviously an attack on the freshman committee assignments, based on the cloture vote, will not stand up in court—in any court. But little defense of the Inouye assignment is required. DAN INOUYE knows the military service as few men in the Senate can claim to know it. He knows military service in his body; and he knows it in his spirit. He knows what it means to fight for freedom even when freedom itself lapses into temporary injustice. Add to these considerations the fact that the State he represents is as heavily dominated by military problems as any other in the Union. Add to it, his experience in the House. If there is any decision of the steering committee which was wise and beyond reproach on any count, it is this one. And I salute him as the noblest American of us all.

Senator GEORGE MCGOVERN was assigned to the Agriculture Committee. The Senator from Pennsylvania spoke of "shanghaiing" members to serve on that committee. I can testify that if any "shanghaiing" was done, the Senator from South Dakota did it himself, and he did it with great vigor and determination.

He wrote to me and to other Senators immediately following his election and requested assignment to the committee having jurisdiction over his State's largest industry. I am glad to say he received it.

The nomination of Senator RIBICOFF to Finance meets the criteria of geography and experience and I trust no one will question his allegiance to the Democratic administration.

I cannot understand the criticism which the Senator from Pennsylvania has leveled at the practice of assigning new Members to at least one committee of their choice wherever possible or of the equity of the assignments which were made under the practice. The assignments have been equitable beyond any reasonable doubt and the practice itself has done an immense amount of good for the vitality of the Democratic Party in the Senate. The Senator from Pennsylvania or any other Member of the Senate can criticize until he is blue in the face, but I shall stand by this practice and the assignments which have been made under it in the present Congress.

But to proceed, Mr. President, to the other appointments by the steering committee, which have been criticized.

The Appropriations Committee assignment has excited some controversy. I am grateful that the steering committee gave me one of the available seats on the committee.

I wrote a letter to every member of the committee asking for his support. Senator BARTLETT, of Alaska, was given the other assignment. This committee is perhaps the most heavily balanced on the southern side. Some suggestions were made that another southern or southwestern Senator be named. On geographical terms, this made no sense. I voted for the Senator from Wisconsin to fill the vacancy. A majority of the steering committee chose the Senator from Alaska. It was a good choice. Neither of our new States has had representation on the Appropriations Committee, and it is about time that they were given such consideration.

The nomination of Senator Smathers, secretary of the Democratic conference, to the Foreign Relations Committee was based on seniority. Geographically, it was also a fact that the last four Senators to go on that committee were from the Midwest, the Far West, and the East. As a matter of fact, I should say the last five Senators, including the distinguished assistant majority leader, the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. Humphrey].

Those who initiated this discussion suggest that the so-called Senate establishment is anticivil rights, against the change in the Senate rules, and rewards or punishes those Senators accordingly, by committee assignments, depending upon their position on rules or cloture votes.

On page 2842 of the Congressional Record the Senator from Pennsylvania inserted a list of 21 so-called preferred Senators, preferred because they hold 3 major committee assignments, allegedly bestowed by the so-called establishment.

Yet of this very list of establishment-favored Senators, a majority of Senators, 11, voted for cloture in the recent rules debate. What kind of pattern of bias does this fact indicate? I submit it indicates there is no pattern.

The charge is made that the establishment controls the steering committee, and prevented its enlargement to reflect the true desires of all Democratic Senators.

This is also quite patently untrue. The Democratic Senators voted on this question in the Democratic caucus by secret ballot at the suggestion of the majority leader, and they voted to keep the size of the committee as it was by over 2 to 1. Who is better able to reflect the true desires and philosophy of all the Democratic Senators than all the Democratic Senators? It seems to me the answer should be obvious. We must grant Senators at least the intelligence and integrity to vote their own convictions.

The Senator from Pennsylvania placed in the Record last Wednesday another table showing the assignments given Senators who supported the present cloture rule, and those who voted to liberalize it. The purpose of this table, it was said, was to enable Senators to determine whether a pattern of favoritism or discrimination emerged from the new assignments, based on the recent rules controversy. I shall not attempt to explain away each assignment—as Senators know that a group of 15 men may be guided by many considerations. But the following should be made a part of this Record, as to the treatment Senators have received during their tenure in the Senate at the hands of the steering committee.

Of those who voted to liberalize the cloture rule, Senator Burdick asked for the Agriculture Committee when he came to the Senate, and received it. This time he asked for Judiciary; but the available seats were filled by Senators Kennedy and Bayh.

Senator Clark was elected to the Rules Committee; the majority leader, may I say, voted for him twice.

Senator Engle, when he first came to the Senate, requested Armed Services, and got it; he sits on the Commerce Committee. Senator Bartlett, who came to the Senate with him, received the Appropriations seat this year.

Senator Hart was originally assigned to Judiciary and Agriculture and has now relinquished the latter in favor of Commerce.

Senator Lausche, who requested the Finance Committee vacancy, had received an assignment to Foreign Relations during his first term.

Senator Long of Missouri applied for Finance and Appropriations. His first preference when he came, the Judiciary Committee, had been given to him.

Senator Moss requested Appropriations and Space; his first preference when he came, the Interior Committee, had been given to him.

Senator Muskie informed the leadership this year that he would be interested in moving to the Foreign Relations Committee.

The single vacancy on that committee went to Senator Smathers, although I voted for Senator Pell. I am happy to say, since I am speaking of the distinguished Senator from Maine, that he will be chairman of the legislative review committee for this year and the next.

Senator Neuberger was to have been assigned to the Interior Committee, but lost that seat upon Senator Hayden's request for it.

Senator Pell was placed on the Government Operations Committee, to comply with the rule assuring each Senator two major committee assignments.

Senator Proxmire had received his choice of assignments within a year after coming to the Senate. I supported him for both Finance and Appropriations, to neither of which he was assigned.

Senator Yarborough, a present member of the Commerce and Labor Committees, requested appropriations. I have described the circumstances which I believe brought about the nomination of Senator Bartlett.

In three cases where Senators who supported the present cloture rule were given a major committee assignment—Senator Cannon on Commerce, Senator Hayden on Interior, and Senator Jordan on Public Works—the Members affected were clearly entitled to a second major committee when the Rules Committee became a minor committee. In two other cases where Senators supporting the present cloture rule received their first choice of assignments—Senator McGee on Post Office and Civil Service, and Senator Smathers on Foreign Relations—they were the senior applicants for the vacancies.

So far as Post Office and Civil Service is concerned, there were only two vacancies on that committee. There were two applicants, and Senator McGee was one of the two applicants.

These, then, were the principal appointments of the steering committee. As I have said, the practice of assigning new Members to committees of their choice and the assignments thereunder were wise and any honest examination of them, it seems to me, reveals no pattern except a reasonable and equitable one, which is for the good of the Senate, for the good of the party, and for the good of the Members concerned.

As for the rest of the appointments, they are not perfect as each Member may interpret perfection. It might have been better in some eyes if I had not been appointed to the Appropriations Committee or the Senator from Pennsylvania to the Rules Committee or the Senator from Florida to the Foreign Relations Committee, and so on. Certainly I differed with some of the choices.

But I do not question the motives behind anyone's vote on the steering committee. I do not insist that I alone know what is good for the party, the Senate, the President's program, or the Nation.

It is never easy to balance such factors as geographic distribution, seniority, Member interest. There are bound to be disappointments and disagreements. But in the framework in which the steering committee functions I have no criticism of the results. The Members did a conscientious job, and there is no instance in which I do not wholeheartedly approve of the assignments which were finally made, even though I did not vote with the majority on all of the selections.

Now I have about done. I think it is time we got down to work. The Senator from Pennsylvania has had his day on this matter, I hope, for this session; he had two votes by the Democratic membership in the caucus on enlarging the steering committee, and several more in the steering committee itself. The judgment of the caucus and that of the steering committee was that his dissent, while courageous, was not well taken, under the circumstances.

I dislike bringing the names of Senators and the process of choices onto the Senate floor in patches and dribs and drabs. I would prefer to have this whole process of caucus and steering committee in the open if the alternative is the leak, the rumor, or the half-fact. What ought to be brought to the floor is legislation. The committees are waiting to organize and to hold hearings.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the Record a statement of prospective committee activity.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Statement of Prospective Committee Activity

Senate Agriculture has the omnibus farm message before it and had hoped to hold hearings on the dairy program the week of February 25; however, due to the delay in committee assignments, the committee has not yet had its organizational meeting.

> Senator MORSE has announced he intends early hearings on the omnibus education bill now before Senate Labor Committee. The committee started hearings today on the youth employment bill; mental health bills and the general health bills are ready for hearings if and when the subcommittees are properly organized to function with full memberships.
>
> Senate Banking has the all-important mass transit bill, the bill to revise the silver policy, and the measure to extend the life of the Export-Import Bank—due to expire—and would like to schedule hearings as soon as the committee can have its organizational meetings.
>
> Senate Armed Services is holding briefings and hearings on military posture and procurement; in addition it has before it bills introduced by Senator RUSSELL to extend the Selective Service Act, due to expire, to increase the compensation of the military, to provide for the civil defense fallout shelter program—all ready for committee consideration.
>
> Senate District of Columbia Committee, when properly organized, has the very important measure increasing the existing authorization governing appropriations to the District of Columbia—our Federal City.
>
> Senate Public Works, when it has a chairman, would like to schedule hearings on the air and water pollution control bills, amendments to the highway program, and other measures.
>
> Due to the emergent times, the Senate Foreign Relations Committee has been holding hearings, briefings, has reported nominations, but it has numerous important bills before it affecting disarmament, the establishment of a National Academy of Foreign Affairs, a Foreign Service bill, all waiting consideration of a properly organized committee.
>
> Senate Interior Committee has held hearings and are ready for final action on the water resources research program, the outdoor recreational opportunities program—with hearings scheduled on the wilderness bill, the comprehensive water resources planning program.
>
> The House will soon send over the temporary public debt increase for finance considerations. Senate Appropriations has scheduled hearings on our appropriation bills to begin early in March.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, in my opinion it is time for all Senators to begin their examinations of substantive measures. It is time for Democrats to get down to the work they were sent here to do. I know of no group of men better qualified to do it. We are a diverse, active, and aggressive party; there are many divisions of opinion among us; and the fact is that at no time in our history have we been able to make progress without reconciling ourselves to those differences and capitalizing on that which holds us together.

What I believe those who complain of an "establishment" are, in the final analysis, complaining against is the ever-present fact of frustration, the frustration of working in this body, the frustration of half a loaf, the frustration of compromise that of necessity is always with us. Who among us does not feel this heavy cloak of dissatisfaction? Less than absolute power to achieve one's will is the essence of frustration. Yet less than absolute power to achieve one's will is also an essential of democracy. The practice of democracy is therefore frustrating, and let us be sure that when it ceases to be so for any group or faction, at that same time there will also have ceased to be a democracy. That same principle pervades all we do here, and we should thank God it does.

Now let us begin the substantive debates of the 88th Congress. I urge the Senate to get off the business of the Senate and get on with the business of the Nation.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Montana yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. In view of the rather extraordinary comments just made by the Senator from Montana, I wonder whether he would join with me in a unanimous consent request that I may have not more than 3 minutes in which to speak before the vote is taken.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I so request.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator from Montana yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Reserving the right to object—and I shall not object—have the yeas and nays been ordered?

Mr. MANSFIELD. No. We hope the yeas and nays will not be ordered. I hope that no Senator will ask for the yeas and nays.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. This subject has been holding up the Senate for more than a week. It is certainly entitled to a yea-and-nay vote.

Mr. President, on this question, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I am sorry that the yeas and nays have been ordered. I had hoped that the Senate might vote without having the yeas and nays; but the will of the Senate must be observed.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may speak for not more than 3 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator from Pennsylvania is recognized for not more than 3 minutes.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I shall not attempt to reply in detail to the Senator from Montana; I am content to rely upon the pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for what I said and for what can be fairly implied from what I said.

There is no vindictiveness in my heart.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, may we have order, please?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. NELSON in the chair). The Senate will be in order.

Mr. CLARK. There was no vindictiveness in my words. My effort has been, and will continue to be, to democratize the procedures of the Senate, so that the Senate can play its part in our constitutional framework of government in the modern world.

The majority leader is entitled to his opinion. He has stated it most forcefully. Senators who are interested can see my views set forth in the pages of the RECORD last Tuesday, Wednesday, and Thursday. Those purposes and the case I made in support of them can all be summarized in a quotation from a report.

I should like to conclude by saying that my purpose and that of the small band who followed me, and who have fired the first shot of what has now become the "First Battle of Bull Run," is a purpose which was well stated in a report of the Democratic steering committee made in March 13, 1913, just before the Senators of the Wilson administration organized the Senate of the United States so as to make possible the passage of legislative measures of the New Freedom. I quote:

> We propose that this great body shall be democratic, not only in name but in practical reality, and that the charge so often made that it is controlled by a few men through committee organization, and otherwise, shall no longer have any basis in fact.

Mr. President, that is my continuing purpose. So long as there is breath within me and I am a Member of the U.S. Senate, I shall fight that good fight.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, how much time have I remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana has 1 minute remaining.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may have 3 minutes altogether.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I honor the Senator from Pennsylvania for the courage, tenacity, determination, and devotion he has shown. However, I only express the hope that some of the statements which have been made on the floor of the Senate during the past week will not come back to haunt some of the Democrats who will be running for reelection next year. I think we ought, at least, to look after our own. I think we ought to use a little discretion. I think we ought to help our colleagues, no matter from what part of the country they come.

I have noted some of the statements made in the course of this debate, statements not made by the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania in this instance, wherein civil rights and the oil depletion allowance are tied together. I think I have a pretty good record on civil rights. It is not a perfect one, but it is a fairly good one. So far as oil depletion allowances are concerned, I believe in the depreciation law, because I come from an oil-producing State.

Then I find a further statement, one which I shall quote this time:

> Sometimes, Mr. President, in my sardonic moments, I wonder whether this is also a part of the plan—to discredit the party, to defeat the Senators from the North and the Senators from the West who otherwise might threaten the supremacy of the bipartisan alliance, and then to emerge with an even tighter control over the Senate than before, with the bipartisan coalition swollen in numbers and the liberal opposition diminished.

This is something about which we Democrats had better do a little thinking, if we are going to come back in sizable numbers following the elections in the years ahead. So I plead with all Senators—not only with the Senator from Pennsylvania—to try to get together on this side of the aisle and try to help one another—because from now on the races will be tough—to do what we can, instead of creating divisiveness within the party, to bring the party together and to bring about an amalgamation or amelioration of the views which divide us at this time. The old saying, "In unity there is strength," applies to all Democrats, and I hope the Democrats will live up to their responsibility.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Montana yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Montana yield to the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Since the Senator from Montana has quoted from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, although he did not state which Senator spoke the words he quoted, let me say that those words which he quoted were mine. I wondered then; I wonder now.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the Senator from Illinois still adheres to his opinion, in connection with which he stated:

> Sometimes, Mr. President, in my sardonic moments, I wonder whether this is also a part of the plan—to discredit the party, to defeat the Senators from the North and the Senators from the West who otherwise might threaten the supremacy of the bipartisan alliance.

And so forth and so on.

Certainly the Democrats will not get very far, with such language.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Georgia will state it.

Mr. RUSSELL. What is the pending question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] to Senate Resolution 90.

Mr. RUSSELL. Which one is it, Mr. President? There are three of them. Are they to be voted on en bloc?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment as found in the language of Senate Resolution 93.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] to Senate Resolution 90. On this question, the yeas and nays have been ordered.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Illinois will state it.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Will the distinguished occupant of the chair state the resolution or motion now before the Senate?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The effect of the pending amendment is to strike out "17" and insert "21", as the membership of the Committee on Finance.

On the question of agreeing to this amendment, the yeas and nays have been ordered; and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, on this vote, I have a pair with the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON]. If the Senator from New Hampshire were present and voting, he would vote "nay." If I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "yea." I withhold my vote.

The rollcall was concluded.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I announce that the Senator from Nevada [Mr. CANNON], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. MCCARTHY], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. MCGEE], and the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] are absent on official business.

I further announce that the Senator from Maine [Mr. MUSKIE] and the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH] are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Nevada [Mr. CANNON], the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. MCGEE], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], and the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. MCCARTHY] would each vote "nay."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Delaware [Mr. BOGGS] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON] is absent because of illness in his family.

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] is absent to attend the funeral of a friend.

If present and voting, the Senator from Delaware [Mr. BOGGS], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], and the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS], would each vote "nay."

The pair of the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON] has been previously announced by the Senator from Oregon [Mrs. NEUBERGER].

The result was announced—yeas 17, nays 68, as follows:

[No. 24 Leg.]

YEAS—17

Anderson
Burdick
Case
Clark
Douglas
Engle
Hart
Javits
Keating
McNamara
Morse
Moss
Nelson
Pell
Proxmire
Yarborough
Young, Ohio

NAYS—68

Aiken
Allott
Bartlett
Bayh
Beall
Bennett
Bible
Brewster
Byrd, Va.
Byrd, W. Va.
Carlson
Cooper
Curtis
Dirksen
Dodd
Dominick
Eastland
Edmondson
Ellender
Ervin
Fong
Fulbright
Goldwater
Hartke
Hayden
Hickenlooper
Hill
Holland
Hruska
Humphrey
Inouye
Jackson
Johnston
Jordan, N.C.
Jordan, Idaho
Kennedy
Kuchel
Lausche
Long, Mo.
Long, La.
Mansfield
McClellan
McGovern
McIntyre
Mechem
Metcalf
Miller
Monroney
Morton
Mundt
Pastore
Pearson
Prouty
Ribicoff
Robertson
Russell
Scott
Simpson
Smathers
Smith
Sparkman
Stennis
Symington
Talmadge
Thurmond
Tower
Williams, N.J.
Young, N Dak.

NOT VOTING—15

Boggs
Cannon
Church
Cotton
Gore
Gruening
Kefauver
Magnuson
McCarthy
McGee
Muskie
Neuberger
Randolph
Saltonstall
Williams, Del.

So Mr. CLARK'S amendment was rejected.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I call up my amendment embodied in Senate Resolution 91, which would increase the membership of the Committee on Appropriations by two.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. In paragraph (b) (dealing with the Committee on Appropriations) of subsection 1 of rule XXV, it is proposed to strike out the word "twenty-seven" and insert in lieu thereof "twenty-nine".

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Pennsylvania, which would have the effect of increasing the membership of the Appropriations Committee by two members. Under the unanimous-consent agreement, no debate is in order. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HART (when his name was called). On this vote I have a pair with the senior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON]. If he were present, he would vote "nay"; if I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "yea." I therefore withhold my vote.

Mr. MANSFIELD (when his name was called). On this vote I have a pair with the distinguished senior Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS]. If he were present, he would vote "yea." If I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "nay." I therefore withold my vote.

Mr. McNAMARA (when his name was called). On this vote I have a pair with the distinguished junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. MCCARTHY]. If he were present and voting, he would vote "nay." If I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "yea." I therefore withhold my vote.

The rollcall was concluded.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I announce that the Senator from Nevada [Mr. CANNON], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. MCCARTHY], and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. MCGEE] are absent on official business.

I further announce that the Senator from Maine [Mr. MUSKIE] and the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH] are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Nevada [Mr.

CANNON], the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. MCGEE], and the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH] would each vote "nay."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Delaware [Mr. BOGGS] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON] is absent because of illness in his family.

The Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] is absent to attend the funeral of a friend.

If present and voting, the Senator from Delaware [Mr. BOGGS], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], and the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] would each vote "nay."

The pair of the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON] has been previously announced by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART].

The pair of the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] has been previously announced by the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD].

The result was announced—yeas 12, nays 70, as follows:

[No. 25 Leg.]

YEAS—12

Case
Clark
Douglas
Engle
Keating
Morse
Moss
Nelson
Neuberger
Proxmire
Scott
Yarborough

NAYS—70

Aiken
Allott
Anderson
Bartlett
Bayh
Beall
Bennett
Bible
Brewster
Burdick
Byrd, Va.
Byrd, W. Va.
Carlson
Cooper
Curtis
Dirksen
Dodd
Dominick
Eastland
Edmondson
Ellender
Ervin
Fong
Fulbright
Goldwater
Hartke
Hayden
Hickenlooper
Hill
Holland
Hruska
Humphrey
Inouye
Jackson
Johnston
Jordan, N.C.
Jordan, Idaho
Kennedy
Kuchel
Lausche
Long, Mo.
Long, La.
McClellan
McGovern
McIntyre
Mechem
Metcalf
Miller
Monroney
Morton
Mundt
Pastore
Pearson
Pell
Prouty
Ribicoff
Robertson
Russell
Simpson
Smathers
Smith
Sparkman
Stennis
Symington
Talmadge
Thurmond
Tower
Williams, N.J.
Young, N. Dak.
Young, Ohio

NOT VOTING—18

Boggs
Cannon
Church
Cotton
Gore
Gruening
Hart
Javits
Kefauver
Magnuson
Mansfield
McCarthy
McGee
McNamara
Muskie
Randolph
Saltonstall
Williams, Del.

So Mr. CLARK's amendment was rejected.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, pursuant to the authority vested in the unanimous-consent agreement, I withdraw Senate Resolution 92 from consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment is withdrawn. The question recurs on agreeing to the pending resolution, as modified.

The resolution (S. Res. 90), as modified, was agreed to.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which Senate Resolution 90, as modified, was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, on page 10 of Senate Resolution 90, under "Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs," line 25, item No. 7, the following is stated:

> Measures relating generally to Hawaii, Alaska, and the insular possessions of the United States, except those affecting their revenue and appropriations.

I move that the words "Hawaii, Alaska, and" at the bottom of page 10 be deleted.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Montana.

The amendment was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question recurs on agreeing to the resolution, as modified and amended.

The resolution (S. Res. 90), as modified and amended, was agreed to.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the resolution was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the motion to reconsider.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Illinois to lay on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. MANSFIELD subsequently said: Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senate Resolutions 91, 92, and 93, submitted by the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], now on the table, increasing the membership of certain mittees, be postponed indefinitely.

Mr. CLARK, Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. My understanding is that Senate Resolutions 91 and 93 were defeated, and that Senate Resolution 92 was withdrawn.

Mr. MANSFIELD. They were defeated as amendments to Senate Resolution 90, but they are still on the table.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ASSIGNMENTS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], I submit a resolution containing a list of both the majority and minority members of the standing committees of the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be stated, for the information of the Senate.

The resolution was read, as follows:

Resolved, That the majority and minority members on standing committees of the Senate shall be:

MAJORITY MEMBERS

AERONAUTICAL AND SPACE SCIENCES

Mr. Anderson, chairman; Mr. Russell, Mr. Magnuson, Mr. Symington, Mr. Stennis, Mr. Young of Ohio, Mr. Dodd, Mr. Cannon, Mr. Holland, and Mr. Edmondson.

AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY

Mr. Ellender, chairman; Mr. Johnston, Mr. Holland, Mr. Eastland, Mr. Talmadge, Mr. Proxmire, Mr. Jordan, Mr. McCarthy, Mrs. Neuberger, Mr. McGovern, and Mr. Edmondson.

APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. Hayden, chairman; Mr. Russell, Mr. Ellender, Mr. Hill, Mr. McClellan, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Magnuson, Mr. Holland, Mr. Stennis, Mr. Pastore, Mr. Kefauver, Mr. Monroney, Mr. Bible, Mr. Byrd of West Virginia, Mr. McGee, Mr. Humphrey, Mr. Mansfield, and Mr. Bartlett.

ARMED SERVICES

Mr. Russell, chairman; Mr. Byrd of Virginia, Mr. Stennis, Mr. Symington, Mr. Jackson, Mr. Ervin, Mr. Thurmond, Mr. Engle, Mr. Cannon, Mr. Byrd of West Virginia, Mr. Young of Ohio, and Mr. Inouye.

BANKING AND CURRENCY

Mr. Robertson, chairman; Mr. Sparkman, Mr. Douglas, Mr. Clark, Mr. Proxmire, Mr. Williams of New Jersey, Mr. Muskie, Mr. Long of Missouri, Mrs. Neuberger, and Mr. McIntyre.

COMMERCE

Mr. Magnuson, chairman; Mr. Pastore, Mr. Monroney, Mr. Thurmond, Mr. Lausche, Mr. Yarborough, Mr. Engle, Mr. Bartlett, Mr. Hartke, Mr. McGee, Mr. Hart, and Mr. Cannon.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. Bible, chairman; Mr. Morse, Mr. Hartke, and Mr. McIntyre.

FINANCE

Mr. Byrd of Virginia, chairman; Mr. Long of Louisiana, Mr. Smathers, Mr. Anderson, Mr. Douglas, Mr. Gore, Mr. Talmadge, Mr. McCarthy, Mr. Hartke, Mr. Fulbright, and Mr. Ribicoff.

FOREIGN RELATIONS

Mr. Fulbright, chairman; Mr. Sparkman, Mr. Humphrey, Mr. Mansfield, Mr. Morse, Mr. Long of Louisiana, Mr. Gore, Mr. Lausche, Mr. Church, Mr. Symington, Mr. Dodd, and Mr. Smathers.

GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS

Mr. McClellan, chairman; Mr. Jackson, Mr. Ervin, Mr. Humphrey, Mr. Gruening, Mr. Muskie, Mr. Pell, Mr. McIntyre, Mr. Ribicoff, and Mr. Brewster.

INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS

Mr. Jackson, chairman; Mr. Anderson, Mr. Bible, Mr. Church, Mr. Gruening, Mr. Moss, Mr. Burdick, Mr. Metcalf, Mr. Hayden, Mr. McGovern, and Mr. Nelson.

JUDICIARY

Mr. Eastland, chairman; Mr. Kefauver, Mr. Johnston, Mr. McClellan, Mr. Ervin, Mr. Dodd, Mr. Hart, Mr. Long of Missouri, Mr. Kennedy, and Mr. Bayh.

LABOR AND PUBLIC WELFARE

Mr. Hill, chairman; Mr. McNamara, Mr. Morse, Mr. Yarborough, Mr. Clark, Mr. Randolph, Mr. Williams of New Jersey, Mr. Burdick, Mr. Pell, and Mr. Kennedy.

POST OFFICE AND CIVIL SERVICE

Mr. Johnston, chairman; Mr. Monroney, Mr. Yarborough, Mr. Randolph, Mr. McGee, and Mr. Brewster.

PUBLIC WORKS

Mr. McNamara, chairman; Mr. Randolph, Mr. Young of Ohio, Mr. Muskie, Mr. Gruening, Mr. Moss, Mr. Metcalf, Mr. Jordan, Mr. Brewster, Mr. Inouye, Mr. Bayh, and Mr. Nelson.

RULES AND ADMINISTRATION

Mr. Jordan, chairman; Mr. Hayden, Mr. Cannon, Mr. Pell, Mr. Clark, and Mr. Byrd of West Virginia.

Minority Members

AERONAUTICAL AND SPACE SCIENCES

Mrs. Smith, Mr. Case, Mr. Hickenlooper, Mr. Curtis, and Mr. Keating.

AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY

Mr. Aiken, Mr. Young of North Dakota, Mr. Hickenlooper, Mr. Cooper, Mr. Boggs, and Mr. Mechem.

APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. Saltonstall, Mr. Young of North Dakota, Mr. Mundt, Mrs. Smith, Mr. Kuchel, Mr. Hruska, Mr. Allott, Mr. Cotton, and Mr. Case.

ARMED SERVICES

Mr. Saltonstall, Mrs. Smith, Mr. Beall, Mr. Goldwater, and Mr. Case.

BANKING AND CURRENCY

Mr. Bennett, Mr. Tower, Mr. Javits, Mr. Simpson, and Mr. Dominick.

COMMERCE

Mr. Cotton, Mr. Morton, Mr. Scott, Mr. Prouty, and Mr. Beall.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. Beall, Mr. Prouty, and Mr. Dominick.

FINANCE

Mr. Williams of Delaware, Mr. Carlson, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Curtis, Mr. Morton, and Mr. Dirksen.

FOREIGN RELATIONS

Mr. Hickenlooper, Mr. Aiken, Mr. Carlson, Mr. Williams of Delaware, and Mr. Mundt.

GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS

Mr. Mundt, Mr. Curtis, Mr. Javits, Mr. Miller, and Mr. Pearson.

INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS

Mr. Kuchel, Mr. Allott, Mr. Jordan of Idaho, Mr. Simpson, Mr. Mechem, and Mr. Dominick.

JUDICIARY

Mr. Dirksen, Mr. Hruska, Mr. Keating, Mr. Fong, and Mr. Scott.

LABOR AND PUBLIC WELFARE

Mr. Goldwater, Mr. Javits, Mr. Prouty, Mr. Tower, and Mr. Jordan of Idaho.

POST OFFICE AND CIVIL SERVICE

Mr. Carlson, Mr. Fong, and Mr. Boggs.

PUBLIC WORKS

Mr. Cooper, Mr. Fong, Mr. Boggs, Mr. Miller, and Mr. Pearson.

RULES AND ADMINISTRATION

Mr. Curtis, Mr. Cooper, and Mr. Scott.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the resolution containing the membership of the committees.

The resolution (S. Res. 96) was agreed to.

MEMBERSHIP OF SELECT COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], I submit a resolution containing the majority and minority members of the Select Committee on Small Business.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be read for the information of the Senate.

The resolution (S. Res. 97) was read as follows:

> *Resolved*, That the following be members of the Select Committee on Small Business:
>
> Mr. Sparkman (chairman), Mr. Long of Louisiana, Mr. Humphrey, Mr. Smathers, Mr. Morse, Mr. Bible, Mr. Randolph, Mr. Engle, Mr. Bartlett, Mr. Harrison A. Williams, Jr., of New Jersey, Mr. Moss, Mr. Saltonstall, Mr. Javits, Mr. Cooper, Mr. Scott, Mr. Prouty, and Mr. Cotton.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution (S. Res. 97) was considered and agreed to.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT TO THURSDAY NEXT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 12 o'clock noon on Thursday next.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

EULOGIES ON FRIDAY NEXT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, for the information of the Senate, and after discussion with the distinguished minority leader, I should like to announce—and this will cause some difficulties—that the Senate will meet next Friday to do honor to three of our departed colleagues, the late Senator from Idaho, Mr. Dworshak, the late Senator from Oklahoma, Mr. Kerr, and the late Senator from New Mexico, Mr. Chavez. It has been agreed that not more than 1 hour will be allocated to eulogies and speeches for each of those Senators. So I hope that on Friday next, March 1, which is the date agreeable to Mrs. Kerr, Mrs. Chavez, and Mrs. Dworshak, the Senate will meet to do honor to those three former colleagues of ours, who contributed so much to the welfare of their States and the country.

CATTLE PRICES AND AGRICULTURAL IMPORTS

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, complaints are coming in about cattle prices, as well as many other agricultural prices. These complaints are based not only on present prices, with their recent declines, but they involve the prospect as to future agricultural prices.

Agriculture is facing serious trouble because of the lack of realism and clear thinking on the part of the Government and because of unsound policies being followed with respect to world trade. Agriculture suffers also because it does not have a champion in the Department of Agriculture. Too many of the Department of Agriculture's decisions are based upon erroneous State Department policies and a political eye is focused upon the heavy consumer vote in our cities. Added to all of this are a few people in the Agriculture Department whose first love is a desire to change our traditional agricultural economic system and impose more paternalism. As a result, there has been no dynamic leadership exerted in behalf of the families who live on our farms and whose sole business is agriculture.

Mr. Dave Grasmick, a qualified radio commentator in the field of agriculture in the Middle West writes me as follows:

> In the past year, if you will check the records, you will find that our import over export of meat products will be roughly 4½ to 5 percent. If the United States were called upon to produce this extra 4½ to 5 percent import of meat over export, it would require 44,600,000 acres of American production of grass and feed crops to produce that extra 4½ to 5 percent of meat imported over export.
>
> In the meantime our Federal Government tells us farmers that it has become necessary to retire 50 million acres of food production to bring production in balance with consumption. And here, and here alone, on this extra meat tonnage, we would have an opportunity to set aside—or utilize rather—44,600,000 acres to produce the extra 4½ to 5 percent of meat which is imported over our exports.

I have always spoken out in behalf of the European Common Market. I believe it is an excellent thing for Europe. It will bring political unity. It will be a bulwark against communism and it is based upon private enterprise. I do not believe that the trade policies of the United States are based upon an adequate understanding of what the Common Market really is. People have been told that it is a free trade movement. It is not; it is a protectionist movement. It involves the same principles as were followed by the United States in the founding of our Republic and which gave us a strong economy.

When the trade bill was before the Senate, I supported a number of agricultural amendments that would have been helpful to the American farmer. They were all defeated primarily because of administration opposition. I offered one amendment which would have provided a guideline for our negotiators. It would have set as a goal the holding of agricultural imports to not to exceed the 1957 level.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks an article by Mr. Eldon Griffiths which appeared in the Washington Post on February 23, 1963. It was written from Topeka, Kans.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TRANSATLANTIC FARM WAR

(By Eldon Griffiths)

TOPEKA, KANS.—It was the biggest thing in sight on the flat Kansas horizon, a gargantuan building the size of the *Queen Mary*. At first sight it looked like a cathedral, and in a sense it was. With its half dozen tall towers strapped together by soaring walls and concrete buttresses, the building was an American cathedral of plenty—one of those huge grain elevators used to store the surplus grain of the Middle West.

All told, America's elevators contain just under $5 billion of grain that the Nation cannot eat or feed to its animals. Simply to keep it from spoiling costs the taxpayer $1.4 million a day. Yet in spite of every effort to cut down farm acreages and sell—or give away—the surplus food, America's farmers are in danger of being drowned in a flood of their own golden grain.

Another big concrete building I visited last month in Rotterdam gave proof that this danger is growing. This was the headquarters of a Dutch firm that specializes in scalding the holds of oil tankers so as to make them clean enough to carry grain. Given the recent slump in tanker earnings it had become highly profitable to transform surplus tankers into bulk grain carriers for the North Atlantic trade.

Today, however, the Dutch firm is running into trouble. Its owners, looking ahead, have concluded that the mass transport of American grain to Europe is likely to fall off rapidly as European output increases. French wheat farmers in particular are expanding their production by consolidating tiny peasant holdings into factory farms big enough to use the same multiple plows and combine harvesters one sees in the Middle West. And French President Charles de Gaulle is determined to help them by insuring that the Common Market's external tariff wall is used to keep out competing grain from the prairies of America and the Commonwealth lands, leaving French agriculture the master of Europe.

De Gaulle's drive to restore French farming to the position it held before the First World War—as Europe's granary—is easy to understand. But in the process America's farmers, not to speak of those in Argentina and the Commonwealth lands, are going to get hurt. For if France, with the support of the West German farming lobby, succeeds in maintaining high Common Market tariffs against oversea farm products, the United States alone stands to lose more than 30 percent of all its exports to Europe.

This figure is taken from a report prepared for the U.S. Department of Agriculture. The report predicts that between now and the late 1960's the U.S. wheat farmers will suffer the complete loss of their European market, that U.S. exports of oats, barley, sorghum, and rye will level off, then drop sharply, and that in the long run the whole of the European market for imported meat and poultry will be lost by the United States.

What these losses are likely to mean to the U.S. balance of payments is not hard to see. Farm sales now account for 32.4 percent of all U.S. exports to Europe, and if only half of them are lost, Washington will find that its presently favorable balance of trade with Europe is rapidly turned into deficit. Pressure on U.S. currency reserves inevitably would increase. The stability of the dollar once again might be called into question.

The more immediate—and noisier—result of the Common Market's closing its doors to American farm products would be a howl of rage from the farmers. Middle western farmers, already had been pressing to keep up the payments on their farm mortgages, their air-conditioning units, their TV sets, and their cars, are apt to reach for their political pitchforks if they see their incomes shrinking because of Europe's tariff walls. The farmers' attitude is that the United States "liberated Europe" in 1945, "fed Europe" under the Marshall plan, and "defended Europe" under NATO. If Europe now responds by shutting out U.S. products—"the height of rank ingratitude," as the farmers see it—the United States will have no alternative but to close the American market to European products, e.g., French wines and Volkswagens.

Unfortunately for its farmers, the United States is not well placed to get tough with the Common Market on the economic front. America sells to Europe not only more farm products but more industrial goods than Europe sells the United States. A tariff war might well hurt America more than Europe.

The administration may therefore be driven to protect its balance of payments—as well as its political rear in the key farm States—by cutbacks in other fields. For the American farmer, quite likely with the support of many of his urban compatriots, is determined that Europe shall not have it both ways. No longer can Europe expect the United States to go on spending tens of billions to defend it if Europe—led by France—moves toward an autarchy that excludes cheaper, better, and more plentiful American grain.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, great opportunities for the use of our agricultural products in industry are available. It cannot be brought about without a sincere, dynamic, and determined effort on the part of the Government. The recommendations of the bipartisan Commission, appointed by President Eisenhower, to recommend new industrial uses for farm surpluses, has never received sympathetic effort toward its implementation by the Washington bureaucracy. At another time I expect to speak at some length on the question of industrial uses.

There is one other matter that I would like to mention in reference to farm prices and especially in reference to prices of cattle and hogs. Today the largest buyers of meat are our chain grocery stores. Their economic power exceeds the power of cattlemen, feeders, farmers generally, and the packing industry combined.

I am reliably told that meat buyers for large chain grocery concerns approach packing companies, both large and small, and inform them how much they will pay for meat. The question is not asked, what is the seller's price. If the price offered by the chains does not appeal to the packer, the potential buyer merely walks out and the chainstore features something else as its leader in the retail business. This in turn, forces the packers to beat down the price to the farmers, ranchers, and feeders, or the business will be lost to imports or other protein products.

What I have said about the power of chainstores in the buying market for meat has been reported to me, not by one or two sources, but by many sources over a period of many months. It is not a charge made by radical individuals or radical groups. It is an opinion held by many well-qualified conservative individuals who know the picture and have the interests of agriculture at heart.

It might be well for the Congress to investigate the marketing of meat and the impact of the chainstores on the same. It would be interesting to know what the Department of Agriculture is doing about it. Thousands of our farm families would welcome such an investigation.

BUREAUCRATIC TYRANNY

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, the very essence of the liberty which we not only highly prize, but which has built for us a strong economy and a strong Nation, is the right of choice. Individual citizens have the right to choose. They have the right to choose with whom they will affiliate, where they live, where and how they worship, where they spend their money, and where they want to work.

Our workers should have a right to choose whether or not they have a union and have that union represent them in bargaining. If their right to decide whether or not they want a union at all is in any way infringed or hampered, unionism then becomes compulsory.

Government should not be antiunion or prounion. Government should not be antimanagement or promanagement. Government should protect the rights of all and the right of the individual to make choices.

This philosophy is totally alien to the National Mediation Board. Its action in regard to the proposed organizing of United Air Lines employees amounts to nothing less than tyranny. The Board proceeds from a paternalistic notion that it is duty bound to so conduct its proceedings as to give the United Air Line workers what the Board thinks is good for them.

In this United Air Lines case the Board is denying the men and women involved as employees of United Air Lines the right to make a clear and understandable choice as to whether or not they want a union as their bargaining agent. The law places no such mandate on the National Mediation Board. It is a usurpation of power and it not only violates American tradition and principles, but it is grossly unfair. The Board proposes to force these workers to decide between two unions which are anxious for the business of serving as bargaining agents for the employees in question. The proposed ballot does not give any clear and understandable opportunity for the employees to first decide whether or not they want to organize.

These workers in question should have an opportunity to vote in two elections. The first one would be a sort of a primary election. It would decide whether or not they want a union. If a majority want a union, then there should be a subsequent election so that they could express their right of choice as to what union they wanted. I hope that the Board will reverse its position, abandon its tyrannical procedure, and preserve the right of choice for these splendid American citizens involved.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to include in my remarks an article which appeared in the Omaha World Herald on February 15, 1963, entitled "No-Union Vote Space is Asked," and also a brief editorial from the Wall Street Journal of February 21, 1963, entitled "Land of Opportunity."

There being no objection, the editorial and article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Wall Street Journal, Feb. 21, 1963]

LAND OF OPPORTUNITY

Cleaning women in the employ of United Air Lines learned the other day that America is, indeed, still the Land of Opportunity. The opportunity is being provided by the National Mediation Board, which ruled that the women, along with a wide assortment of United's ticket agents, clerical, and passenger service employees, may vote to join one of two unions, the Brotherhood of Railway Clerks or the International Association of Machinists.

There's a catch, to be sure. As United noted when it appealed to a court to prevent the vote, the employees won't have a chance to vote for no union at all. In other words, they'll have to give up a little freedom. But all that aside, where else could Cinderella be magically transformed into a railway clerk, not to mention a machinist?

[From the Omaha World-Herald Feb. 15, 1963]

"NO UNION" VOTE SPACE IS ASKED

WASHINGTON.—A group of nonunion United Air Lines employees asked Thursday to be given a chance to stay that way.

In a unique petition to the National Mediation Board, the group requested that a no-union vote space be placed on the ballot in a coming union representation election involving 13 thousand workers.

"We are not antiunion, but we are happy the way we are," said Donald McIntosh, a passenger agent in Chicago. "If a union becomes our bargaining agent we will no longer be on a merit system for pay raises."

Backing Mr. McIntosh was James K. Lamona, a San Francisco passenger agent, who gave this explanation for the move:

"We feel we can plead our own case individually—with the management—rather than through collective bargaining."

IF GEORGE WASHINGTON WERE ALIVE TODAY

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, last Friday it was my high honor and privilege to read George Washington's Farewell Address on the floor of the Senate. Many persons have asked me what would be our first President's reaction to the problems posed in his Farewell Address if he were alive today.

Any answer, of course, must be in the realm of conjecture. But, in my opinion, logic would suggest that if Washington were President in this year of our Lord 1963, he would:

First. Be steadfast in his devotion to the principles inherent in our Constitution.

Second. Vigorously oppose various pressure groups whose chief objectives are to secure for themselves certain advantages and emoluments which may be detrimental to the general welfare.

Third. Insist on sound fiscal policies, knowing full well that failure to implement these could result in the destruction of everything Americans hold precious and dear, including liberty itself.

Fourth. Bitterly condemn any suggestion that the President should constantly seek more and more power for himself under the guise that this would be in the national interest.

Fifth. Recognize that in today's world the luxury of isolationism which we as a nation enjoyed for many years is no longer possible, but fully comprehend that in formulating our relations with other nations the question must always be asked: Is this in the best interest of the United States of America?

SPIRES OF THE SPIRIT—CONSTANTINO BRUMIDI

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, each Sunday morning I look forward to reading "Spires of the Spirit" from the gifted pen of the beloved Chaplain of the Senate, Dr. Frederick Brown Harris and carried in the Washington Star. The Spires are always informative, eloquent, and challenging. The Spires in yesterday's Star beautifully and inspiringly told the story of Constantino Brumidi who is most appropriately acclaimed as the Michelangelo of the U.S. Capitol. I ask unanimous consent that yesterday's Spires so truly captioned Walls That Speak may be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From "Spires of the Spirit," by Dr. Frederick Brown Harris, Chaplain of the U.S. Senate]

Walls That Speak

Many years ago from the land of Mona Lisa an Italian immigrant came to the United States. For him freedom beckoned in this blessed land of room enough. His name was Brumidi (pronounced Brew-meed-dee). He was nearly 50 years of age. For years he had steeped himself in the mural glories of the Vatican and had helped to restore the faded Raphael frescos.

With that background he yearned, somehow with his art, to express his growing gratitude for the vast benefits he found waiting in his adopted land. He had personally felt the spell of the miracle of form and color which comes to pass when, as one has put it, "there is a lump of greasy pigment at the end of Michelangelo's bristle brush and by the time it has been laid on the stucco there is something there all men with eyes recognize as divine." This artist immigrant had as his ruling passion the humble desire to express the divine that for him with his brush glimmered through the greasy pigment, the hog bristle and the stucco.

Once in America his gifted brush and soaring imagination were dedicated to sacred subjects. He was asked to paint altar pieces of the crucifixion in New York and Philadelphia churches. During a visit south of the border he tried his skill at beautifying a cathedral in Mexico. Shortly after he was given his great chance when he was commissioned to embellish the expanding Capitol of the United States. This opportunity thrilled him. His toiling hands began their long tryst with beauty before Lincoln entered the White House to face the heartbreaking task of saving the Union. When a tragic accident, as he fell from the dome of the rotunda, snatched him from his unfinished task and sentenced him to end his life as an invalid, Hayes had succeeded Grant as President of the Republic.

Wherever Brumidi toiled in the vast Capitol the walls began to speak. In spite of detracting criticism and a lack of appreciation he kept patiently at his task for almost a quarter of a century. At 72 this neglected and unapplauded master of paint and fresco closed his weary and saddened eyes and was buried in an unmarked grave in the Capital City he adored. Less than a week after his death a prophecy was uttered on the floor of the U.S. Senate, "One day Brumidi will be crowned by the gratitude of succeeding generations." But, alas, the long years passed and a preoccupied Government allowed his memory to gather dust on the high shelves of oblivion.

This was in spite of the fact that it is no exaggeration to say that this adopted son of America is worthy to be acclaimed, as he is today, as the Michelangelo of the monumental edifice which is the shrine of each patriot's devotion. Millions of pilgrims, from all parts of the Nation and the globe, now gaze with admiration on the speaking walls where Constantino Brumidi breathed on them the haunting beauty that burned in his poetic soul. His loving signature to his grateful I O U for his loved America is written in heroic depictions, in human portraits, and for good measure in romantic landscaped etchings, as well as in birds and flowers and fruits. Out of his artistic cornucopia, across the years as he kept patiently on, came varied forms and figures clinging to the walls and ceilings in gorgeous colors and rich designs.

Perhaps the climax of all his Capitol treasures is what is known as the President's Room on the Senate side. For more than 6 years he toiled terribly on that jeweled ceiling from which human eyes follow one in all parts of the room. But the bequest he left there has given it the distinction of being called the most exquisitely decorated room in America.

Republics are notoriously ungrateful. It seems to be an unfortunate trait of democracy that often its most shining servants and saints are those who are cannonaded while alive and canonized only long after death has removed them beyond the reach of praise and blame.

At long last it was a determined woman, her great heart shamed by such flagrant ingratitude, who was destined to lift Brumidi to his rightful niche in the Westminster Abbey of our Nation's remembrance. That elect woman, Dr. Myrtle Cheney Murdock, is the cultured wife of a former congressional legislator. By persistent research and the gathering of historical facts she burnished anew the annals of this immigrant's inspiring achievements. In her beautifully adorned volume, "Constantino Brumidi, Michelangelo of the United States Capitol," a lovely example of the bookmaker's art, she has reproduced in glorious colors the immortal frescos for all to see and admire. This that she has done deserves to be told in all the land now that largely through her efforts Brumidi has come into his own.

At a great gathering in the rotunda almost a dozen years ago, in the presence of an admiring throng, there was dramatically lifted up the artist's worn copy of the Bible. In it the hand that adorned the Capitol has entered the date of his arrival on the shores of this new sweet land of liberty as he fled from the thraldom of the old. In the sacred book he had inscribed, "Presented to me by the American Bible Society." It was in the inspiration from that Book of Books that he put upon the walls of the historic Capitol his offering to the God of Liberty and of Beauty from whom his genius was a golden gift. With what moving emotion this Italian refugee declared, "My daily prayer is that I may live long enough to make beautiful the Capitol of the one country in the world in which there is liberty." In the beauty of those speaking walls Brumidi still lives.

Under the white dome on a mammoth mural in simple eloquence, with his brush, he signed himself in this opulent manner, "C. Brumidi, artist, citizen of the United States."

THE PROGRESS OF AGRICULTURE UNDER THIS ADMINISTRATION

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, recently there has been some pessimism with respect to the progress of the farm program under this administration. A survey I have just made does not justify this pessimism. In that regard, the following facts are of interest:

FARM INCOME

In 1961 farm income was $12.8 billion.

In 1962 farm income was $12.9 billion.

The 1962 farm income is 10 percent higher than 1960, and the highest since 1953.

AVERAGE FARM INCOME

Average farm income is up 18 percent from 1960. In 1960 it was $2,960; in 1961 it was $3,360; and in 1962 it was $3,500.

HOURLY FARM INCOME

In 1960 it was 87½ cents; in 1961 it was $1.05; and in 1962 it was $1.05.

BUSINESS ACTIVITY IN FARM STATES

Bank deposits and business activity in 20 major farm States are 41.6 percent above that of 1960.

The following facts are also of interest:

The 1961 and 1962 programs will cut feed grain surpluses 28 percent. Note, the 1962 crop year ends October 1, 1963.

The 1961 program reduced corn surpluses 368 million bushels, and the 1962 program is reducing corn surpluses 340 million bushels.

The wheat programs enacted will reduce wheat surpluses to their lowest level since 1957.

Further, as a result of these programs the cost of storing and handling wheat has been cut approximately $215 million.

Feed grain stocks can be reduced to needed reserve levels by 1965.

In wheat stocks, 1,400 million bushels can be cut in half by the midsixties.

In summary, Mr. President, it is clear that under this administration the American farmer is making steady and significant progress, and I believe the American people will be interested in the above facts.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SYMINGTON. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Did the Senator say how much interest income has increased over 1960?

Mr. SYMINGTON. No; I did not refer to that. If the Senator from Louisiana wishes to insert that figure, I shall be glad to have him do so.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I thought perhaps the Senator from Missouri referred to that point. It is my impression that interest income is far greater than it was in 1960.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I thank the Senator for his contribution.

CASTRO-COMMUNIST SUBVERSION AND THE ALLIANCE FOR PROGRESS—COMMUNIST ATTACKS ON VENEZUELA

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, it is important for us and for all citizens to give our attention not just to headlines about developments in Cuba, but to the problems, challenges and opportunities of the whole Caribbean and Latin American areas.

This past weekend, at a United Jewish Appeal dinner in Palm Springs, Calif., I spoke on some of the continuing problems and challenges relating to the security and progress of the Western Hemisphere and in particular, the countries of Latin America.

I ask that excerpts of my address, titled "Castro-Communist Subversion and the Alliance for Progress," be printed in the RECORD at this point, along with a statement I issued to the press on February 18, titled, "HUMPHREY Warns of Communist Attacks on Venezuela."

There being no objection, the excerpts from the address and press release were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CASTRO-COMMUNIST SUBVERSION AND THE ALLIANCE FOR PROGRESS

(Excerpts of remarks by Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, United Jewish Appeal dinner, Palm Springs, Calif., February 23, 1963)

Tonight I wish to speak to you about an area of the world which now demands much of my attention as a member of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee and which should command your attention as interested citizens.

I speak of Latin America, which for so many decades was given low priority by our Government, and thought of in terms of a "land of mañana"—"tomorrow"—by most of the people of the United States.

Our national mood and our Government's policy has changed. In the past few years, the United States has recognized the critical needs of Latin America, the tender balance in which it hangs—between freedom and communism—and the need for new policies and programs now exemplified by the Alliance for Progress.

The objectives of our foreign policy have remained constant in Latin America as they have around the world. Our desire is to assist our friends and allies in maintaining national independence and in building progressive democratic governments. This requires the creation of a viable economy and a capability for self-defense. When these have been achieved within a country, that country can then share its achievement, can then assist other countries in building stable free societies. This has been done in Europe in the decades following the war. It is now being done in Israel. It must be done in future decades in Latin America.

ISRAEL CONTRIBUTES TO AFRICA, ASIA, AND LATIN AMERICA

Many of the problems confronting Latin American countries today are those faced by Israel during the past 15 years. Before Israel could begin building a viable economy and a democratic government, she was forced to fight for her life—for her very existence as an independent state. Once her independence as a nation was secured, she turned to making the desert bloom, to building a model progressive democracy in the Middle East.

Israel has achieved this by a truly remarkable mobilization of her own resources, and by generous outside capital assistance. Israel has encouraged private investment, while using the power of government to improve the social and economic welfare of her people.

Having achieved this remarkable economic vitality and political stability within the framework of a democratic government, Israel is now sharing her abundance.

Israel during the past 5 years has extended technical assistance to almost 80 countries in Africa and Asia. It is now accelerating its aid to Latin American countries. Specifically, Israel plans to train about 200 Latin American students in the field of agriculture during the next year.

Israel has already shown what a small country with limited funds can do in the field of foreign aid. Her foreign aid program is very similar to our old point 4 programs—which concentrated on extending technical assistance to underdeveloped countries, rather than on large loans or grants for economic development. Israel is favored with a large pool of trained experts in the fields of agriculture, health, and education. The expertise that made the desert bloom in Israel will now be extended—by the Israelis themselves—to Latin America.

This new program for training agricultural specialists is not the first Israeli activity in Latin America. Already Israeli technicians are working on projects in Brazil, Ecuador, Bolivia, and Venezuela.

In all of these activities, Israel is again demonstrating the value of human resources in developing less-developed countries. It is once again demonstrating that trained manpower is as essential to the economic and social development of a country as the large development loans which are now being given by larger countries and international lending institutions.

LATIN AMERICA MUST MOBILIZE ITS RESOURCES

If our Latin American neighbors are to achieve political stability and economic progress, they must mobilize their own resources as Israel has mobilized hers. They must install efficient, honest governments. They must overhaul their tax and agrarian systems. They must encourage private enterprise. They must devote more resources to education and health. Yet even if they do all of this, this will not be enough.

There will still remain a threat from the outside, a threat which will doom all other attempts to failure unless it is resisted. I refer to the threat of Castro-Communist aggression from Cuba.

We have heard far too much about the military threat of Castro to the United States and far too little about the Castro-Communist threat to the countries of Latin America.

This threat to Latin American nations, particularly those in the Caribbean, is not mythological. It is real. What are the facts?

The fact is that Red Cuba has become a base for the subversion of the hemisphere. It is now a base for the indoctrination and training of hundreds of Latin Americans, who have become experts in sabotage, terrorism, and guerrilla tactics. Cuba supplies covert material support, largely financial, to subversive groups. It is the base for an intensive propaganda campaign using printed materials, news services provided by Prensa Latina and powerful radio transmitters. In disseminating this propaganda, it cooperates with front organizations in Latin American countries in the form of friendship socetles or committees for the defense of the Cuban revolution.

CASTRO-CUBA'S SUBVERSION

This systematic attempt to subvert democratic governments in Latin America is best seen in the case of Venezuela. Venezuela has become the No. 1 target of Communist attack in Latin America. The Communists have concentrated their attacks on Venezuela because the Alliance for Progress is succeeding in that country and giving it a chance for real progress under freedom. It has become the key target because President Rumulo Betancourt, who has just visited this country this week, has given the country 4 years of progressive democratic government.

From Cuba, the Communists have unleashed a continual torrent of intimidation, violence, and terror in Venezuela. It is no surprise that of the 1,500 persons from Latin America trained in Cuba in 1962, the largest number have been Venezuelans. These young men have received a heavy dose of indoctrination in Castro-Communist ideology and guerrilla warfare. They have reported that they go through simulated offensive and defensive guerrilla exercises, are taught how to survive in the jungles, are given map and weapons instruction, as well as other training that every good guerrilla should have. The recent burning of the Sears Roebuck warehouse, the sabotage of the Maracaibo oil refineries, and the pirating of a Venezuelan ship are all a part of this pattern of violence and subversion.

Venezuela has withstood attacks from Communist conspirators because its democratic government has been capable of defending itself against armed attack from within. It has equipped itself, with generous support from the United States, to combat armed attacks, dynamiting, street riots, assassination, bombings, and plain murder. All of this violence is part of the strategy announced by Che Guevara, the Cuban Minister of Industries, in a recent interview with the Havana correspondent of the London Daily Worker: "The Cuban revolution has shown that in conditions of imperialist domination such as exist in Latin America, there is no solution but armed struggle." Both the Betancourt government and the U.S. Government have realized that to cope with such attacks, to cope with repeated attempt at armed insurrection, surplus soybeans are not of much help.

THE DEFEAT OF COMMUNIST SUBVERSION

The control and defeat of Communist subversion requires men trained in riot control, counterguerrilla operations and tactics, intelligence and counterintelligence, public information, psychological warfare, and counterinsurgency units. The United States is assisting Venezuela and other Latin American governments by training selected Latin American personnel at U.S. military schools at Fort Bragg, N.C., and in the Canal Zone. Special U.S. counterinsurgency units are on 24-hour alert in Panama at this very moment. We are assisting through AID programs in public safety. We are helping through civic action programs designed to contribute to economic and social development and to establish a closer rapport between the military and the civilian population.

All of these programs are designed to provide a shield of security behind which the Alliance for Progress can develop. They are essential to preserve the stability and internal security which are necessary to carry the Alliance for Progress forward.

We have heard many suggestions recently for improving the Alliance. Some are justified. The administration of AID should be improved. The Washington bureaucracy should be shaken up. Latin American development plans should be more carefully developed and documented. Latin American reforms should be more rapidly implemented.

But even if all of these were accomplished, the threat to the Alliance for Progress would still remain so long as the Soviet-armed, Communist government governs Cuba and uses it as a base for subversion. The Alliance will remain endangered until the Communist government is removed.

U.S. POLICY ON CUBA

The United States must make it clear to all that our policy on Cuba is firm. Our policy is to remove Castro and communism from the Caribbean. This Red satellite will never be permitted to gain the status of an eastern European satellite—tolerated for the time being. Here the commitment itself is more important than the particular means and methods chosen to enforce the commitment. But the commitment must be enforced. The first step in enforcing it must be the removal of Soviet troops from Cuba. So long as the Soviet troops remain, Red Cuba can terrorize its Caribbean neighbors without fear.

The United States must make clear to the Soviet Union that the presence of her troops in the Western Hemisphere will no longer be tolerated. I am encouraged by recent indications that this lesson is beginning to sink home in the minds of Soviet policymakers. I am encouraged by the report that Premier Khrushchev will withdraw some of the Soviet troops in the next few weeks. But if our current diplomatic efforts fail, then the United States must forthrightly, if reluctantly, impose any measures necessary to insure the speedy achievement of this essential goal.

Once the Soviet troops have been removed, the United States and its partners of the OAS must decide on what further steps are needed to restore a government responsible to the Cuban people, a government genuinely dedicated to the welfare of its subjects. They must decide then which methods are most appropriate to pry loose the iron grip of communism on Cuba—whether economic pressure, a progressively stringent blockade of Cuba, or other measures.

In pursuing this aim of removing the Communist government from Cuba, we must allow our leaders wide latitude in choosing the means suitable to achieve this end. We must permit them considerable leeway in determining the timing and tactics in negotiations with the Soviet Union. Calm resolute leadership can often achieve the same results through patient negotiation as through belligerent threats.

In making this commitment we must make it unmistakably clear that the Castro-Communist tyranny will be replaced with a progressive government. A Cuban government dedicated to political liberty and economic and social reform will have the firm support of the United States, just as the progressive Government of Venezuela does today.

Those countries in the Caribbean most directly threatened by Cuba might consider special measures to counteract Communist subversion. The Central American countries might consider the formation of a regional police force to preserve the security of the area. This should be considered next month when President Kennedy meets in San José, Costa Rica, with the presidents of the Central American Republics.

Our policy must make certain that the Alliance for Progress succeeds. The Cuban-Communist government must be removed not so much because it is an immediate threat to the security of the United States, but because it threatens directly the independence, the security and freedom of the Alliance. Merely removing Castro's Marxist-Leninist regime will not make the Alliance succeed. The U.S. Government has already made clear that it will generously support any government carrying out the social and economic development programs prescribed by the Alliance Charter. We are supporting Venezuela. We are supporting the Colombian 10-year-development plan through the international consortium. We are committed to helping President-elect Bosch transform the Dominican Republic into a model progressive democracy in the Caribbean.

With the removal of the Communist government in Cuba, the wholehearted support of progressive governments in Latin America, the Alliance for Progress will succeed.

Humphrey Warns of Communist Attacks on Venezuela

Senator Hubert H. Humphrey, Democrat of Minnesota, said yesterday that the government of President Romulo Betancourt in Venezuela has become the number one target of Communist attack in Latin America.

Humphrey issued the statement in advance of the scheduled arrival in Washington tomorrow (Tuesday) of President Betancourt, who plans to meet with President Kennedy during his visit to the United States.

"The Communists have occupied Cuba," Humphrey said. "Now they seek to conquer Venezuela. The battle is on.

"Operating from Castro's Cuba, the Communists have unleashed a continual torrent of intimidation, violence, and terror in Venezuela.

"The recent burning of the Sears Roebuck warehouse, the sabotage of the Maracay oil refineries, and the pirating of a Venezuelan ship all are part of a pattern of violence and subversion."

Humphrey said that the Communists have aimed their attacks on Venezuela because the Alliance for Progress is succeeding in that nation and is giving it a chance for real progress under freedom.

"The attack is motivated also," the Senator added, "by designs on Venezuela's huge resources of oil and iron ore. Those resources could provide the economic base of Communist penetration of the entire South American Continent. They are part of a Communist goal of converting the Caribbean into a Communist sea."

Humphrey urged that the United States give the strongest support to the present Government of Venezuela headed by President Betancourt.

"Venezuela is now a progressive democracy," he said. "It is open and friendly to the United States and vigorously supports us in all international councils.

"President Betancourt's government respects private property and private investment. At the same time, it sponsors the broadest social welfare programs for its people."

The Senator added a call for a clear pronouncement by the United States that an attack of any type on Venezuela will not be tolerated.

"We should make it clear," he said, "that any attack will be repelled, regardless of the cost.

"The Betancourt government has made progress despite the torrent of terror from the extreme left and economic harassment from the extreme right.

"With the help of the United States, it will survive the current external Communist attack and continue to represent a beacon of democracy in the troubled Caribbean area."

SPACE SCIENCE AND ECONOMIC PROGRESS IN THE MIDWEST

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the Minneapolis Morning Tribune editorial of Thursday, January 31, tells the story of a most important development in the upper Midwest. The editorial said:

> There are some occasions, in the life of a community or of a region, which have about them an air of history in the making. One senses that a milestone is being passed, that momentous beginnings are being made, that the occasion will be long remembered. Such an air of history being made could be sensed Tuesday night at a dinner meeing in Minneapolis when plans for an upper Midwest research organization were unfolded. This will be called the North Star Research & Development Institute.

The editorial goes on to comment on the address of Mr. James Webb, Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. In this remarkable address Mr. Webb demonstrated the intimate relationships between research and economic development and progress. Mr. Webb emphasized the importance that a great university can have to the economic development of an area. This is particularly true in this age of scientific and technological specialization.

I ask unanimous consent that at this point in my remarks the full text of the editorial be printed.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Minneapolis (Minn.) Morning Tribune, Jan. 31, 1963]

A Historic Occasion

There are some occasions, in the life of a community or of a region, which have about them an air of history in the making. One senses that a milestone is being passed, that momentous beginnings are being made, that the occasion will be long remembered.

Such an air of history being made could be sensed Tuesday night at a dinner meeting in Minneapolis when plans for an upper Midwest research organization were unfolded. This will be called the North Star Research & Development Institute. It will be sponsored by the Midwest Research & Development Council and the University of Minnesota, at the same time remaining an autonomous operation.

It would be difficult to exaggerate the potential impact of this institute on the upper Midwest's growth and development.

James Webb, head of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, gave a clue to what might be expected when he told his Minneapolis audience that those regions and businesses which are quickest to comprehend scientific and technological change "will be in the forefront of progress and prosperity during the years ahead."

The research to be carried on through this institute is expected to attract new industries to the region and to encourage the retention—and development—of present industries.

To the institute, as it becomes increasingly recognized as a center of scientific talent, there should come a growing allocation of federally financed research and development work to the upper Midwest.

The area served by the institute should act as a magnet to research specialists. Trained men and women whom the region now exports should be encouraged to remain here.

It would be impossible to list here the many public-spirited citizens who have pushed to success the plans for this research institute. The raising of funds—the institute gets under way with assets in excess of $3 million—was in itself a remarkable achievement. But we feel that special mention should go to J. Cameron Thomson for the tireless and dedicated zeal with which he has worked to make the institute a reality.

Yes, Tuesday night's meeting was indeed a historic occasion. And the kind of history which this institute will make for the upper Midwest, in due time, should make very pleasant reading.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the establishment of the North Star Research & Development Institute, working in cooperation with the University of Minnesota and other Midwest colleges and universities, represents a dramatic and significant development in the long-range economic progress of the upper Midwest area. This area is blessed with an abundance of modern, competent, energetic business management; highly trained and skilled workers; an ever-increasing number of scientists and technicians; and many colleges and universities that are recognized for their high academic standards.

The meeting of January 29 at Minneapolis, Minn., was opened by Mr. J. Cameron Thomson, former chairman of the board of the Northwest Bank Corp. and presently president of the Upper Midwest Research & Development Council. The address of Mr. Thomson outlines the broad scope of activity of the Research & Development Council. Mr. Thomson presented to his audience the summaries of the economic studies that have been made by the upper Midwest.

Those in attendance at the dinner meeting of the Upper Midwest Research & Development Council represented the financial, industrial, agricultural, labor, and scientific and educational resources of the upper Midwest area. The speeches of Mr. James Webb, Administrator of NASA, and Mr. J. Cameron Thomson, the president of the Upper Midwest Research & Development Council, outlined a program of economic and scientific development that will have a far-reaching effect upon our Nation.

I ask unanimous consent that the addresses of Mr. J. Cameron Thomson and Mr. James Webb be printed at this point in the RECORD.

I also ask unanimous consent that a list of the officers and directors of the North Star Research & Development Institute be printed in the RECORD, along with a press release of the Upper Midwest Research & Development Council, dated December 26, 1962.

There being no objection, the addresses, list, and press release were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS BY J. CAMERON THOMSON, PRESIDENT, UPPER MIDWEST RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT COUNCIL, AT A DINNER MEETING OF THE COUNCIL IN MINNEAPOLIS, JANUARY 29, 1963

The upper Midwest, thanks to you, thanks to the generosity of the Minneapolis Area Development Corp., the Hill Family Foundation and the area's business leaders, and particularly to the University of Minnesota for its splendid cooperation, is definitely going to have a regional research and development institute. I predict that it is going to be a source of invaluable service to our economy and of pride to all of us.

The organization meeting of its board of directors, including the election of the initial slate of officers, was held this noon. Its name is the North Star Research & Development Institute. The institute is a major breakthrough for our economy; its establishment will effectively symbolize that our part of the country is on the move.

The present decade has witnessed highly significant developments, all part of an adjustment process leading to new growth, and now the institute adds a new dimension to our economy. The $250,000 pledge of the Hill Family Foundation and $500,000 from businessmen, together with the stock of the Minneapolis Area Development Corp., assures us of getting off to a sound financial start.

The institute results from the organization of the Upper Midwest Research & Development Council by business leaders of the area in 1959. The following factors, affecting our economic growth rate, were the principal basis for the businessmen's concern and their determination to develop sound means to change the trend:

A decline in agricultural employment of 27 percent in the decade between 1950 and 1960.

A higher than average dependence on agriculture as a source of income and a lower than average percent of employment in manufacturing.

A per capita income in the region for 1960 roughly 13 percent lower than the U.S. average of $2,223.

A growth in nonagricultural employment during the decade of 13 percent as compared to the national increase of 18.2 percent.

The resulting outmigration of 392,000 persons during the 1950's—this net outmigration was concentrated among the younger age groups, and resulted in increasing the dependent nonlabor force members (persons under 15 and over 65 years of age).

Two basic factors in developing the program were these: First, that we must have the understanding and cooperation of leaders in government, education, agriculture, labor, and business in general; and, second, that we must find a basis for agreement on what needs to be done to promote economic growth. At this point an arrangement was made whereby the University of Minnesota and the Council went into partnership to provide an economic study of the major sectors of our economy.

This study is independent of the council's supervision and is being carried forward under a research committee headed by Frederick L. Deming, president of the Federal Reserve Bank of Minneapolis, and Dr. James M. Henderson, research director, with the aid of qualified scholars. Up to date the upper Midwest economic study has issued the following study papers: "Upper Midwest Agriculture: Structure and Problems"; Migration and Population Growth in the Upper Midwest: 1950–60"; "Employment and Earnings in the Upper Midwest: 1950–60"; "Upper Midwest Agriculture: Alternatives for the Future."

Three technical papers also have been issued: "Upper Midwest Agriculture: Structure and Problems (Statistical Supplement)"; "The Geographic Impact of the Federal Budget"; and "Upper Midwest Commodity Flows, 1958."

Succeeding reports will deal with other major phases of the economy of the Ninth Federal Reserve District. This should facilitate open-minded consideration by the diverse elements in our economy because they can all approach the subjects from the same objective, competent analysis.

The study develops the facts as to the significance, history, and status of each major sector of the economy. It includes projections as to the probable status of each sector in 1975, based on present trends, and it will provide a summary of the alternative courses of action available in each sector to accelerate our economic growth rate. Dr. Henderson reports that the balance of the research material will be in the hands of the research committee by June 30, this year, where it will be reviewed, edited if necessary, and approved for publication.

Summaries of the economic study reports, as well as the reports themselves, are available to those requesting them and are distributed to a broad, representative list of citizens throughout the area.

The council's program is not simply a research project but is designed to aid in accelerating the economic growth of the Ninth Federal Reserve District. Based on the reports developed by the study, and further consideration by the council's action report committee and its coordinating committees dealing with agriculture, urban planning, and industrial development, the council will develop a tentative action program. This will be used as a basis for discussions with members of our advisory committees, other leaders throughout the area, and representative State groups. It is hoped that responsible consensus of opinion can be developed, which will reflect the broad public interest, rather than that of any particular group, industry, or political party.

The action report committee is headed by Joyce A. Swan, executive vice president of the Minneapolis Star & Tribune Co., with Julian B. Baird, retired chairman of the First National Bank of St. Paul, and Allen S. King, president of Northern States Power Co., serving as vice chairmen, and a generally representative committee from the area and different economic sectors. The specific coordinating committees are headed by the following people: Agriculture, Dean McNeal, executive vice president of the Pillsbury Co.; industry, Goodrich Lowry, president of Northwest Bancorporation, and Granger Costikyan, president of First Bank Stock Corp.; urban planning, C. David Loeks, director of Twin Cities Metropolitan Planning Commission.

The industry committee will develop suggested programs which will take into account the distance from major markets, the resulting increased transportation costs, the relatively small purchasing power developed in the area, automation and its effect on employment opportunities generally, and specific effects on agriculture, mining, and transportation in our area. It will consider the continuing decline in agricultural employment and the resulting outmigration.

In the Department of Agriculture's booklet, "Food and Agriculture, a Program for the 1960's," the following statement relating to the decline in agriculture was made: "About 60 percent of the Nation's farms produce only about 13 percent of the agricultural output. New economic opportunities must be found for these people."

The booklet further states: "These larger commercial farms ($5,000 annual sales and above) make 87 percent of all farm product sales, but they represent only 39 percent of all farms. Most income from farming is earned by these larger farms." And again it says: "These two important goals—improving income and reducing costs—can be achieved together only if farm output can be reduced below needs for several years and then be allowed to increase over the long run at a rate equal to the rate of growth in demand."

According to one of the Department of Agriculture's own economists, John A. Schnittker, the administration's supply management approach is not designed to cope with all the complex problems of agriculture. Schnittker says the administration's program can help stablize markets but "it cannot provide good incomes to farmers on small, inadequate units. It cannot stop the trend to larger and larger farms. And it cannot provide managerial ability where that capacity is lacking."

The action report committee's basic objective will be to formulate policies which will enable the efficient farmer, meeting competition in the market, the opportunity for a reward equal to that in other sectors of the economy.

Consideration will have to be given to the effect of the Common Market's increase in tariffs that may limit the ability of farmers to sell their products in Europe on a competitive basis. Certainly the committee will give special consideration to the interest of efficient producers of hard spring and Durum wheat which are generally not in surplus. They should be permitted to continue to produce on a competitive basis without being subject to overall quota reductions on wheat which include those varieties in large surplus.

Consideration will be given to improving the position of our dairy farmers in their right to compete for a share in major metropolitan markets without artificial restrictions. Attention will be given to means for encouraging constant improvement in agricultural production and to the development of broader markets for our agricultural products.

I am sure the agriculture committee is interested and qualified and will welcome the cooperation of agricultural leaders in developing its tentative program for consideration.

As to urban planning—we are living in an urban age. In the Ninth Federal Reserve District 51 percent of the nonfarm population lives in 29 urban centers. Half of the total population of the State of Minnesota lives in the Twin Cities metropolitan area. The problems of the relation of thousands, and even millions of people living closer together are continuous. They include congestion of traffic in population centers, unplanned suburban growth, the problem of unforeseen rapid growth in some localities as well as necessary urban renewal projects in declining areas, and the overlapping units of government serving metropolitan areas. It is quite evident that the urban planning study is an essential part of the upper Midwest economic study. If these problems are not adequately dealt with, they affect the cost of doing business and, therefore, our ability to compete in the market.

We are fortunate in being able to avail ourselves of the excellent staffs of the Twin Cities Metropolitan Commission and the University of Minnesota which will facilitate the study and development of an action program.

Consideration must be given by the action report committee to the possibility of additional development of natural resource industries and to increasing the processing of materials produced in the area.

The effect of taxes, particularly those on property, will be studied. Recently I was advised of the tax situation affecting a major national industry which has its headquarters and manufacturing facilities in Minnesota, but also manufactures an identical product in a number of other States. Their total taxes, real, personal, franchise and income, reduced to a cost per hundred units, were 15 percent higher in Minnesota than in the next highest State and over four times as high as in the lowest competitive State. If we are to increase the employment possibilities in our area, with the resulting benefits to all citizens, we must make sure that efficient local manufacturers of products which are sold in the national markets are not handicapped by materially higher tax costs for similar goods and services than their competitors in other States.

Before considering the relationship of the research institute to the providing of additional job opportunities, I want to cite several favorable instances of progress in recent years.

The percentage of successful farms in the Upper Midwest has grown steadily in the past decade, and in 1959 more than one-fourth of all farms in the region had cash receipts in excess of $10,000. The percentage of farms in this "over $10,000" category is above the national average.

The per capita personal income of the farm population in the Upper Midwest remains somewhat above the U.S. average.

The upper Midwest has far fewer farms in the noncommercial (less than $2,500 cash receipts category) than any other region in the Nation.

Percentage growth rate, 1950–60

	Upper Midwest	United States
Oil and gas production	98.9	17.9
Electrical machinery	91.3	45.9
Machinery, except electrical	50.1	21.6

After another successful year of growth, the Minnesota electronics companies total 159, employing approximately 47,000 people with an estimated payroll of $260 million.

In terms of education and the quality of the labor force which the region has available, the upper Midwest fares better than the national average on several counts. The illiteracy rate is considerable lower than nationally, the percent of selective service registrants failing the mental ability test has been less than half the national average, and the per capita expenditure on education is higher than in the Nation as a whole. While the region loses some of its better trained people through outmigration, the residual adult population in upper Midwest urban areas is particularly well-trained when compared with urban areas in most other parts of the country. Among the urban adult population, the upper Midwest has a higher percentage of persons who have completed grade school than any other major region in the Nation. In terms of the percentage of those who have finished high school or college, the upper Midwest is exceeded only by the West.

Early research reports developed the major reliance of the area's economy on agriculture and the less-than-average employment in industry with agricultural employment continuing to decline. In seeking sound opportunities for new employment it is obviously necessary to think in terms of growth industries that are not particularly affected by freight rates and that are geared to the talents and skills of the area's people. The scientific-technological development affecting both defense and civilian employment and the growth possibilities in that type of industry suggested that we would add to the attractiveness of our area if it were fully equipped to compete in the production of scientific-technological products. It was noted that the areas showing the greatest growth in these fields had important research facilities and in some cases outstanding research institutes. Therefore, after consideration of the general question of accelerating our employment opportunities in the scientific and technological fields and consulting with leaders in industry, research and Government, we established the Research Institute Committee with Otto A. Silha, vice president of the Minneapolis Star & Tribune Co., as chairman. Without exception, those consulted concurred in the desirability of establishing a research institute. The committee recommended and the council approved the establishment of an institute, assuming we could have the cooperation of the University of Minnesota and the project could be soundly financed. The regents of the university joined in the plans which were developed to create an autonomous research institute which has just been incorporated. The requisite finances have now been assured, and the research institute is now in being. It is the first specific achievement of the council's action program.

The institute should enable the area to obtain its share of contract research from Government and Government agencies, from industry in the area, and from others seeking to utilize the skills that will be available through the research institute. It will aid the university in retaining desirable talent through affording its staff people opportunities for participation in research projects at the institute at their option. It will aid business generally by providing for research beyond the ability of an individual company to develop such research facilities, and by taking temporary overload projects for industries maintaining their own research staffs. It will add to the number and broaden the base of scientific-technological talents in the area. Through its direct and indirect benefits, it should be a major factor in stepping up our economic growth rate.

The research institute project could not have been completed without the enthusiastic support of those directly connected with the Upper Midwest Council; the services of the Research Institute Committee, the University of Minnesota and Government officials; the financial support developed by the council; and the major contribution by the Minneapolis Area Development Corp. The latter's gift and its potential, realizable value has materially strengthened and insured the research institute's ability to provide much of the capital that will be required for buildings and equipment.

The Upper Midwest Council's program, including the research institute, is in the interest of all Midwest citizens because it aims to increase their economic opportunities and their standards of living. It is by and for the people. It is challenging in its scope and its objectives. It is sound in attempting to accelerate our economic growth rate by objective study, analysis of opportunities and seeking cooperation in translating opportunities into more and better jobs. In so doing, it may merit the comment made by Henry Heald, president of the Ford Foundation, that: "Those who have organized the upper Midwest economic study have acted in the best of the American tradition. They have combined energy and intellect to understand the sweeping forces which are industrializing and urbanizing our exploding population, and by understanding them, to direct, shape, and if possible, master them."

Address by James E. Webb, Administrator, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, to Upper Midwest Research and Development Council, Minneapolis, Minn., January 29, 1963

As many of you know, this is not the first occasion on which I have participated with the business, civic and educational leaders of this area in discussions of the scientific potential of the upper Midwest. I have met on several occasions, here and in Washington, with many of you and with your Senators and Representatives, to consider ways in which this region could participate more fully in our national space effort and utilize the scientific and technological advances to assist in solving your upper Midwest regional problems of development.

I am happy, therefore, to have this opportunity to participate in this meeting tonight because it represents, in essence, the fruition of a long period of effort on the part of many dedicated people. It is a significant occasion not only because of the contribution which the Upper Midwest Research Center can make to economic and other areas of progress in this region—something of concern to all of you—but because of what it can contribute to the success of our expanding national effort to achieve enduring preeminence in space.

My primary objective tonight is to discuss with you the effects of our space program—of our total national effort in scientific research and technological development—on the economic development of the Nation, and the means by which the business and industry of this or any other region can contribute to and participate in the benefits inherent in this effort.

First, however, I think it might be useful to examine what we are doing in space, why we are doing it, how we are doing it, and with what result.

Let me begin with a discussion of the major considerations which make it clear that an understanding of the space environment, and development of the technology which will enable us to operate in space, are an imperative of our times.

President Kennedy has said that "our leadership in science and industry, our hope for peace and security, our obligations to ourselves as well as to others, all require us to make this effort * * * and to become the world's leading spacefaring nation.

"We set sail on this new sea," the President said, "because there is new knowledge to be gained, and new rights to be won, and they must be won and used for the progress of all people. For space science, like nuclear science and all technology, has no conscience of its own.

"Whether it will become a force for good or ill depends on men, and only if the United States occupies a position of preeminence can we help decide whether this new ocean will be a sea of peace, or a new terrifying theater of war."

You will note that the President did not say that our national goal is that of landing the first man on the moon, or, for that matter, of being first with respect to any single achievement in space. We have done many things first, and we will do many other things first—including, we feel confident, sending the first explorers to the moon—but this is not the objective which the President stated.

Rather, he forcefully declared our determination to attain "a position of preeminence" in space and to "become the world's leading spacefaring nation."

It is essential that this distinction be clearly understood. The mastery of space, and its utilization for the benefit of mankind, will not be determined by any single achievement. Superiority in the space environment will be won and held by that nation which first accumulates all of the scientific knowledge, all of the technology, all of the experience, all of the space testing, launching, and terminal facilities for massive space machines, and all of the aids to space navigation required for safety and regular service.

These are the capabilities and resources which the United States is now engaged in bringing together and using in our national space effort.

President Kennedy's eloquent description of the urgency of our space activity might be more specifically defined by citing four major motivations for the effort now underway:

First, the rocket engine, which can operate in the vacuum of space by carrying its own supply of oxygen, has given us and other nations the means to explore and utilize the space medium. Given this ability, and the spectacular achievements already made, our citizens and those of other nations assuredly will not remain confined to this small planet. We and they will explore space, and knowing this, we, as Americans, can settle for nothing less than a position at the forefront of that pioneering effort.

Second, the first Soviet sputnik, and further demonstrations of Soviet advances have made it evident that the United States cannot retain its position as leader of the free world—that, in fact, there may be no free world to lead—if we forfeit to any other nation the opportunity for preeminence in this important new field of science and technology.

Third, it is apparent that our national defense—perhaps even our national survival—demand that we act to insure that no hostile force will be permitted to use space as an unchallenged avenue of aggression against us.

The fourth and most important of the major reasons for undertaking a broad national program of space research and development—the one which promises the greatest rewards for mankind—is the certainty that the basic scientific knowledge gained, and the technological applications which will flow from it, will offer vast returns on our space investment here on earth over many years ahead.

How do we use the capability which the rocket engine has given us—the capability that has enabled us to discard such ancient maxims as "what goes up must come down," or "the sky is the limit"?

For our program in the space sciences we use more than a hundred sounding rockets a year to speed outward from the earth, take measurements near the earth and out to a distance of one earth radius, and fall backward to the earth's surface.

For measurements over longer periods of time and outward to greater distances, we use larger rockets to send out satellites carrying a wide variety of scientific instruments which orbit the earth, some in circular orbits at a few hundred miles, some in elliptical orbits that reach outward several hundred thousand miles. These scientific satellites pass time and again through the various regions of space surrounding the earth, taking continuous measurements and monitoring such phenomena as the radiation in the Van Allen belts, which is caught by the earth's magnetic fields and held in the regions surrounding the earth.

You are probably familiar with some of these scientific satellites such as our own orbiting solar observatory, and the two international satellites, Ariel and Alouette, which were launched as cooperative ventures with Great Britain and Canada.

To explore space beyond the reach of satellites, we use deep space probes like Mariner II which we sent within 21,600 miles of the planet Venus, which measured important features of the planet and transmitted great quantities of data back to earth across 36 million miles of space.

Probes such as Mariner II permit the taking of measurements far out from the earth and the correlation of these with measurements taken near the earth and on the surface of the earth. The ability to measure energy streaming from the sun out millions of miles, then again just above the earth's atmosphere, and again as it reaches the surface of the earth, is expanding our knowledge in many areas related to the earth's atmosphere and weather.

In addition to the data obtained, the flight of Mariner II gave us important experience. The successful use of the highly complicated midcourse correction maneuver, and the very long range tracking and transmission of data—which lasted until January 4 when Mariner was about 54 million miles from the earth—will help to insure the success of future missions.

Even larger spacecraft are required for manned exploration of space. Learning from the Mercury spacecraft which first circled the earth under automatic control and then again carrying Enos the chimpanzee, and then under the control of man as John Glenn circled the earth, we now have designed and are building the two-man Gemini spacecraft. This will give us experience with the weightless condition and other factors in space for a week or more. And beyond this, the three-man Apollo spacecraft which we have under contract will have a capability to orbit the earth a month or two and later will serve as the basic mother craft for manned landing and exploration of the moon.

Parallel with the use of sounding rockets, scientific satellites, deep space probes, and manned spacecraft goes the development of those specialized spacecraft which already are performing useful functions. The Tiros weather satellite has been launched successfully six times and has vastly expanded our understanding of the weather and of the amount of energy absorbed by the earth and reradiated by the earth—knowledge essential to improvements in our capability for understanding the weather and using it most effectively.

The experimental communications satellites, Telstar and Relay, have proved the usefulness of satellite relay stations in space and have begun to lay a foundation on which the ability of man to communicate by telephone, other types of messages, and by television, can be vastly expanded. The world's international communications network bids fair to undergo a revolutionary period of progress as a result of our new knowledge about how to use satellites.

All of the activities which I have described, and additional ones we will undertake in the future, form the basis for a continuing driving U.S. effort to achieve preeminence in space.

The efforts in space of the United States and the Soviet Union have attracted widespread attention throughout the world, not only because of the expansion of knowledge of the universe but because achievements in space have come to be taken as a measure of a nation's scientific leadership, technological capacity, and industrial strength. As we in the United States proceed to carry out our own space program, we are without doubt being judged on our ability to make decisions, concentrate effort, and manage vast and complex technological programs.

The road to preeminence in space may be a long one. It certainly will not end on the moon, regardless of which nation lands the first explorers there.

To achieve and maintain preeminence we must conduct scientific investigations on a broad front. We must demonstrate a continuously advancing technology which enables us to utilize increasingly large vehicles in orbit around the earth and to send both robot and human explorers to the moon and the planets. We must substantially improve our propulsion systems. We must devise reliable means for supplying large amounts of internal electrical power for spacecraft. We must develop instruments and life-support systems that will operate unattended and without maintenance for long periods. And we must improve our equipment and techniques for transmitting and receiving great quantities of data over vast distances.

The success of our space program is dependent upon rapid advances in increasingly efficient use of energy; the development of new materials, metals, fabrics, and lubricants which can withstand wide ranges of temperature, vibration, radiation, and vacuum; the most advanced electronics; and the marriage of all of these with the life sciences.

Important for you, who are leaders in the upper Midwest, is the fact that all of these are the very same forces which underlie and determine economic growth.

But also worthy of your attention is a new situation, so new it is little understood, related to the developments of the past decade. Today this new situation involves the radically new concept that the inventions and innovations which make the best use of the newest advances in these new physical science areas can come only from intellects which have acquired a sophisticated, complete understanding of the basic laws of nature as they have unfolded at such a rapid rate. This means a research-oriented, university-trained, and frequently a university-based mind.

And just ahead of us is yet another new area. This comes from the situation that the new frontiers of knowledge in the physical sciences have laid a foundation for the same type of rapid advance in the life sciences. I am told that just ahead is a breakthrough in understanding of the life processes, just as we now understand the atomic processes.

What this means to you, to me, to all of us, is that the full development of the possibilities inherent in the application of scientific and technical advances can usher in, has the potential for, a period of economic growth that will bring a flowering of human progress, education, and culture. But because the application of this new knowledge must be more sophisticated than it has been before, the university, one of the few powerful continuing institutions in our society, which by its nature must do research and must prepare the graduate and postgraduate trained minds for this new period, must also somehow find a closer relationship with the business community.

It is more important than ever to preserve and foster the concept that in our society it is the entrepreneurial mind of the practical businessman that provides the means for the application and realization of these benefits. Innovation in this new field of industrial-university relationships can, I have no doubt, be pioneered on the science-technology-engineering frontier of the upper Midwest if you who are leaders of this community really desire to apply foresight to the most pressing problems of your region and participate in the development of widely shared goals.

In the past, many of our Nation's largest programs in research and development have either been of a defense or atomic nature, and therefore classified for national security reasons.

Now much of our space program, under the National Aeronautics and Space Act of 1958, is unclassified. Under this law, NASA is required to consult with the scientific community, which largely means the university community, in the design of its program and experiments, and to report not only to this scientific community, but also to the general public on the agency's activities and the results thereof. Further, the fullest measure of cooperation with other nations and with scientists from all the world is specified in this basic act of Congress that established the space policy of the Nation.

Under these circumstances, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration is not building up large classified Government laboratories, but is contracting as much as possible of its advanced research and development to qualified industrial firms, private research organizations, and to colleges and universities. Our policy is to place research contracts and grants at those universities where the scholars themselves, the consensus of the faculty, and the administration of the university are interested in having the work progress on a broad interdisciplinary basis, drawing together creative minds, knowledge, and resources from many fields such as mathematics, physics, astronomy, chemistry, biology, sociology, management, economics, and medicine for widely shared participation. Under this policy, NASA research proceeds within the university in the closest association with graduate and postgraduate education, thereby replenishing and augmenting the supply of highly qualified scientists, social scientists, engineers, and technical experts.

It is an important fact to education, to industry, and indeed, to all persons and groups interested in economic, social, and political growth, that the technical fields in which most of our advanced work is done embody the very forces with which regional and community leadership are concerned. These are the forces with which regional leadership must work for progress, improvement, and greater efficiency.

It is also true that the institutions through which citizens and regional community organizations and leaders cooperate to utilize these forces are not as yet strong and reliable. It is our hope that the policies underlying NASA's contracts and grants with universities, its contracts with industry, and the new means we are creating to bring these groups into closer working relationships will make for a widespread strengthening of these institutions of local and regional cooperation, as well as understanding and capability for applications yielding benefits beyond the scope of the specific instruments and devices in our space program.

These policies can, we believe, increasingly create situations within which the interdisciplinary groups working with us in the universities, if joined with other forces for progress and growth in the community, lay the base for even more rapid assimilation and use.

Today, it is accepted that growing industries tend to concentrate in regions where research facilities are best. No part of the country can afford to neglect investments in advanced scientific and engineering education and in first-class research facilities.

Modern industry, too, has much to gain from regional cooperation in support of the universities and associated research efforts. Industrial leaders are beginning, more and more, to look to the universities of their region for the most important resource of the age—ideas, scientific brainpower, and advanced technological skill, experience, and judgment.

It is not a question today of whether a region can already qualify—can now offer the human and natural resources required—for a particular industrial plant or Government facility.

The question is whether the region is creatively doing what it can to equip its citizens to serve their area and their Nation in a period when our prosperity and our very existence as a free people depend on scientific and technological leadership.

This discussion implies that a corporation, or even a regional area, will remain competitive, and prosper in this new age, only through the closest coordination between educational institutions and business and industry, with the institutional scientists finding a more clear-cut role in feeding into the industrial stream the new knowledge which flows from a vast research and development effort.

But, in my view this would be quite incomplete and skewed dangerously in one direction unless this process also encompasses an effective means for a feedback into the more powerful and intellectually oriented institutions from the entrepreneurial mind of the practical businessman, the man who under our system must take the risk for profit or loss, and his associate, the experienced engineer who must see that things—even new things—work and give service.

As this becomes more fully realized, those regions and businesses which are quickest to comprehend the significance of this tide of change, and move with this tide will be in the forefront of progress and prosperity during the years ahead.

How, then, does all this relate to the establishment of a research center to serve the upper Midwest region?

I have indicated that we in the National Aeronautics and Space Administration consider it essential that, to the extent possible, our contracts for basic research be placed with universities. Thus, while achieving our research objectives, we also contribute to the development of a continuing supply of highly trained scholars who know how to use brainpower, the most critical resource in this new age of science and technology.

Meanwhile, however, we regard most seriously our responsibility to try to assure that the results of this research are available for use by the industrial community, for the benefit of every American.

Since 1955, the Federal investment in scientific research and development has grown fivefold—from slightly over $3 billion to almost $15 billion included in President Kennedy's budget for fiscal year 1964. Industry is expending an additional $5 billion a year for the same purpose.

As a result of this tremendous research effort, there are published each day, worldwide, scientific papers in quantity sufficient to fill seven complete sets of the Encyclopedia Brittanica—60 million pages throughout the world each year.

Because of this vast research and development effort, scientists and engineers are compressing into one 10-year period—this decade of the 1960's—an intensified research and development program that would normally take 50 years.

In the space program, the principal incentive is the fact that we must learn to understand and operate in a new and hostile environment, under conditions which man has not encountered before: very high vacuums, cosmic rays, ionized gases, tremendous accelerations, great extremes of temperature, violent stress of vibration and shock.

Coping with these conditions has resulted in lighter materials, increasing use of chemicals for applications heretofore considered impossible, new electronics systems, new coatings, new materials capable of withstanding the temperature of liquid hydrogen, 423° below zero, as well as rocket thrust chamber temperatures ranging almost to 5,000° above.

The businessman, it has been said, needs to know more about these new materials than his father knew about steel. The executive whose understanding of materials is limited to the difference between a metal and a plastic may find his competitor passing him by. And the same may be said for the new processes and manufacturing techniques developed in space research.

But how can the businessman know what he needs to know about this great mass of research in an era in which, for example, a young chemist who decided to spend his life reading the literature of chemistry would fall 10 years further behind during each year of effort?

The answer may lie, as I have suggested, in the development of close relationships between university-based scientists and the industrial community, with evolving but differing ratios of attention to basic research, and to the development of applied research to convert basic knowledge to practical applications.

It is for this reason that the memorandum of understanding announced today running parallel with a grant of about $700,000 to the University of Minnesota for the construction of research facilities, provides that the university "will undertake, in an energetic and organized manner, to create a broadly based multidisciplinary team to explore mechanisms whereby the progress and research results achieved in space science and technology may be fed into the industries and segments of the economy with which the university normally has close relations."

This memorandum of understanding also specifies that "research is to be encouraged on ways and means to expand and search for practical applications and in the economic and social impact of our national involvement in space exploration. Furthermore, the university will undertake to make the scientific community, as well as the industrial and business communities, aware of new opportunities for application of specific developments or processes stemming from the space program."

Supplementing these efforts of the university, your Upper Midwest Regional Research Center can make a great contribution to the area which it serves. And, if you will permit me to make a suggestion, to the business and industrial representatives here, one way to start in your pioneering of new approaches, would be to consider a reciprocal arrangement to the one I have just described—one in which you reach out to the universities of the region in the manner that the University of Minnesota has just agreed to reach out to you.

An outstanding example of what can be accomplished is the Midwest Research Center in Kansas City, Mo. Over the past 18 years this nonprofit institution has worked with about 900 industrial firms and 200 State and Federal agencies, performing some 2,500 different research assignments.

Recently, under contract with the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, this research institute has explored the problem of effecting industrial application of space research in several Midwestern States. Although only a pilot project, conducted on a limited scale, many potential applications of space research results have already been uncovered. Perhaps the most spectacular example was that of a firm which was about to build a $4 million facility to manufacture a new product. Midwest Research Institute acquainted them with an explosive metal forming process which the firm now plans to use. It is estimated that it will reduce the firm's construction costs by $1½ to $2 million.

There is no doubt that the Midwest Research Institute has been of great value to the area which it serves, and I have no doubt that the research center planned here can be of equal value to you, particularly because of the close association which it will enjoy with the universities of the region.

I strongly believe, as my presence here indicates, that it is a project which deserves support, not in competition with, but as an addition to university activity in the region. May I suggest, however, that those who support it, should do so only while recognizing their continuing obligation to support the basic research programs of the region's universities, which are, after all, the heart of progress in the fast-moving age in which we live.

May I close by congratulating all of you for the progress which you have made in the development of this research center during the period since I first became aware of your interest in it, and by expressing my confidence, and that of my associates in NASA, that it will fulfill not only your, but our, hopes for it.

NORTH STAR RESEARCH CHOOSES OFFICERS

Officers of the North Star Research and Development Institute were elected at a luncheon meeting Tuesday.

Chairman is O. Meredith Wilson, president of the University of Minnesota.

Other officers include J. Cameron Thomson, president of the Upper Midwest Research & Development Council, vice chairman; Philip H. Nason, president of First National Bank of St. Paul, treasurer; Wendell T. Burns, executive secretary of the Upper Midwest Council, secretary.

Vice presidents will be Philip B. Harris, senior vice president of Northewestern National Bank of Minneapolis; Lloyd A. Hatch, vice president, Minnesota Mining & Manufacturing Co.; A. A. Heckman, executive director, Hill Family Foundation, and Otto A. Silha, vice president of the Minneapolis Star & Tribune Co.

The officers are also directors of the institute. Other directors include:

Prof. Neal R. Amundson, department of chemical engineering, University of Minnesota; Dwayne O. Andreas, executive vice president, Farmers Union Grain Terminal Association, St. Paul; Julian B. Baird, retired chairman, First National Bank of St. Paul; Charles H. Bell, chairman, General Mills, Inc.; Judson Bemis, president, Bemis Bros. Bag Co.; Prof. Sherwood O. Berg, department of agricultural economics, University of Minnesota.

Christian F. Beukema, president, Oliver Iron Mining Division, United States Steel Corp., Duluth; James H. Binger, president Minneapolis-Honeywell Regulator Co.; H. William Blake, president, Northwestern National Bank of St. Paul; Prof. John R. Borchert, Department of Geography, University of Minnesota; Herbert P. Buetow, president, Minnesota Mining & Manufacturing Co.; Francis E. Butler, St. Paul; Prof. John A. Buttricfl, Department of Economics, University of Minnesota.

Dr. Edgar M. Carlson, president, Gustavus Adolphus College, St. Peter, Minn.; Frank G. Chesley, president, Central Research Laboratories, Inc., Red Wing, Minn.; Prof. Preston E. Cloud, Jr., Department of Geology, University of Minnesota; J. E. Corette, president, Montana Power Co., Butte, Mont.; H. H. Corey, chairman, Geo. A. Hormel & Co., Austin, Minn.; Granger Costikyan, president, First Bank Stock Corp., John Cowles, president, Minneapolis Star & Tribune Co.

Dean Bryce Crawford Jr., Graduate School, University of Minnesota; Richard E. Crawford, president, Minnesota Valley Natural Gas Co.; Thomas M. Crosby, president, Northwest Growth Fund, Inc.; Harold J. Cummings, president, Minnesota Mutual Life Insurance Co., St. Paul; Albert H. Daggett, president, Gould-National Batteries, Inc., St. Paul; John Daniels, president, Archer Daniels Midland Co.

Provost Raymond W. Darland, University of Minnesota, Duluth; Prof. Emeritus Edward W. Davis, Silver Bay, Minn.; Donald C. Dayton, president, Dayton Co.; Frederick L. Deming, president, Federal Reserve Bank of Minneapolis; Robert Faegre, president, Minnesota & Ontario Paper Co.; L. E. Felton, president, Green Giant Co., Le Sueur, Minn.; Daniel C. Gainey, Josten Manufacturing Co., Owatonna, Minn.; Frederick R. Gamble, vice president, Montana-Dakota Utilities Co.

Paul S. Gerot, president, Pillsbury Co.; Dean Paul V. Grambsch, School of Business Administration, University of Minnesota; F. Peavey Heffelfinger, chairman, F. H. Peavey & Co.

Robert E. Hess, Minnesota AFL–CIO, St. Paul; Prof. Leonid Hurwicz, Department of Economics, University of Minnesota; A. B. Jackson, president, St. Paul Fire & Marine Insurance Co.; St. Paul; E. F. Johnson, president, E. F. Johnson Co., Waseca, Minn.; A. J. Jordan, Jr., president, Jordan Millwork Co., Sioux Falls, S. Dak.; David G. Kelly, Grand Forks, N. Dak.; Allen S. King, president, Northern States Power Co.

David M. Lilly, president, Toro Manufacturing Corp.; Chester C. Lind, president, First National Bank of Aberdeen, Aberdeen, S. Dak.; Goodrich Lowry, president, Northwest Bancorporation; Prof. Walter O. Lundberg, Hormel Institute, Austin, Minn.; Laurence R. Lunden, vice president, University of Minnesota; Robert S. Macfarlane, president, Northern Pacific Railway Co., St. Paul; Dean Harold Macy, Institute of Agriculture, University of Minnesota; Dr. C. W. Mayo, Mayo Clinic, Rochester, Minn.

Adrian O. McLellan, president, Merchants National Bank, Fargo, N. Dak.; Donald G. McNeely, president, McGill-Warner Co., St. Paul; Arthur C. Melamed, president, Coast-to-Coast Stores Central Organization, Inc.; D. C. Minard, president, Trane Co., La Crosse, Wis.; John A. Moorhead, president, Northwestern National Bank of Minneapolis; Gerald T. Mullin, president, Minneapolis Gas Co.; Gordon Murray, president, First National Bank of Minneapolis; Leonard H. Murray, president, Soo Line Railroad Co.; John M. Musser, vice president, Weyerhaeuser Co., St. Paul.

Prof. Will M. Myers, Department of Agronomy and Plant Genetics, University of Minnesota; Prof. Alfred O. C. Nier, Physics Department, University of Minnesota; William C. Norris, president, Control Data Corp; Donald Nyrop, president, Northwest Airlines, Inc.; Jay Phillips, president, Ed Phillips & Sons Co.

John S. Pillsbury, Jr., president, Northwestern National Life Insurance Co.; Ed W. Rawlings, president, General Mills; B. H. Ridder, Jr., publisher, St. Paul Dispatch & Pioneer Press; Paul Schilling, chairman, Waldorf Paper Products Co., St. Paul; the Right Reverend Monsignor James P. Shannon, College of St. Thomas, St. Paul; Prof. W. G. Shepherd, Department of Electrical Engineering, University of Minnesota.

Dean Athelstan Spilhaus, Institute of Technology, University of Minnesota; Francis C. Sullivan, attorney, Duluth; Dean W. T. S. Thorp, College of Veterinary Medicine, University of Minnesota; Prof. Maurice B. Visscher, Department of Physiology, University of Minnesota Medical School; Dr. Cecil J. Watson, Mayo Memorial, University of Minnesota.

Stanley J. Wenberg, vice president, University of Minnesota; Paul B. Wishart, chairman, Minneapolis-Honeywell Regulator Co.; R. G. Woodworth, senior vice president, Cargill, Inc.; Cyrus G. Wright, chairman, Otter Tail Power Co., Fergus Falls, Minn., and Willis D. Wyard, First American National Bank, Duluth, Minn.

MINNEAPOLIS, MINN.—Minnesota, excluding the Twin Cities, gained 56,325 nonagricultural jobs during the decade from 1950 to 1960.

Employment growth in out-State towns and cities was a substantial 13.3 percent but 4.9 percent less than the national average, according to the Upper Midwest economic study report on "Employment and Earnings Growth" prepared by R. Stephen Rodd and Dr. James M. Henderson with the assistance of John S. Adams.

The study is being jointly sponsored by the Upper Midwest Research & Development Council and the University of Minnesota. Results of the research are to be used in the council's action program aimed at accelerating the economic growth of the region.

The report treats the Twin Cities metropolitan area and the remainder of the State as to two separate economic areas, "with different structures and patterns of change."

Employment growth in Hennepin, Ramsey, Anoka, Dakota, and Washington Counties, included in the Twin Cities metropolitan area, was 101,475 or 20 percent, 1.8 percent above the national average for the decade.

Nonmetropolitan Minnesota is dominated by the farming economy but to a lesser degree than other States in the Upper Midwest, the report states. Manufacturing provides almost 17 percent of all nonagricultural employment; iron mining accounts for 3.3 percent. Railroads, retailing, and local government have comparatively high shares in total employment.

Although employment rose less rapidly than nationally, manufacturing grew by 15.5 percent, one-third faster than the U.S. average. Growth was especially strong in dairy products, paper, chemicals, fabricated metals, machinery, and instruments. Most service activities showed less rapid gains than in the Nation, the exception being Federal Government employment.

Almost all of the decade's growth took place in the first 5 years of the decade, when an 11.9 percent growth slightly exceeded the national rate. The latter 5 years were a period of decline in construction, retailing, and railroads, offset by expansions in manufacturing and local government.

For the region as a whole the gain in nonagricultural jobs during the decade was reported as 211,000. Job losses and gains were distributed among the areas as follows: Minnesota (as a whole) 157,800; Montana 20,700, North Dakota 20,174, South Dakota 23,698, northwestern Wisconsin −5,142, and Upper Michigan −6,809.

National average earnings per employee in 1960 were $4,764 and in Minnesota were only $106 less than this amount. For the other areas the earnings per employee were: South Dakota $3,798, Montana $4,330, North Dakota $4,026, northwestern Wisconsin $4,148, and Upper Michigan $4,346. The report explained that these below average levels of earnings were partially the result of "weighting toward relatively low earnings sectors—trades, services, and State and local governments."

Manufacturing employment for the region grew by 8.3 percent, contrasted with the national growth of 9.8 percent. Percentages for each area: Twin Cities 13.8, other Minnesota 15.5, South Dakota, 12.7, Montana 8.7, South Dakota 4.6, northwestern Wisconsin −3.2, Upper Michigan −32.1.

The report concluded, "Mining, trade, services, government and railroads are of greater than average relative importance in the Upper Midwest—manufacturing less important." The region's historical ties are becoming less apparent with passage of time. With the exception of northwestern Wisconsin, the employment distribution more closely resembled the national distribution in 1960 than in 1950.

ADEQUATE HOUSING IN LATIN AMERICA

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, on January 30, 1963, at the International Housing Workshop here in Washington, two major addresses were delivered which illuminate the critical problem of the development of adequate housing in Latin America. One address was by the distinguished chairman of the Senate Housing Subcommittee, the Honorable JOHN SPARKMAN, and the other was by the Honorable Joseph P. McMurray, Chairman of the Federal Home Loan Bank Board.

I commend both of these addresses to those who are interested in accelerating the construction of housing in Latin America.

Housing is unquestionably one of the priority needs throughout all of Latin America, and unquestionably the growth of the savings and loan movement, and the interest of American builders in constructing in Latin America are promising developments. Both should be strongly encouraged by our Government, in addition to the self-help cooperative and public housing programs.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at the conclusion of my remarks an address by the Honorable JOHN SPARKMAN and an address by the Honorable Joseph P. McMurray to the International Housing Workshop on January 30, 1963, in Washington, D.C., entitled "The Savings and Loan Movement in South America."

There being no objection, the addresses were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SPEECH DELIVERED BY SENATOR JOHN SPARKMAN BEFORE THE INTERNATIONAL HOUSING WORKSHOP, JANUARY 30, 1963, NATIONAL HOUSING CENTER, WASHINGTON, D.C.

I am pleased to have been invited to make the keynote address at this morning's workshop session on international housing.

There is gathered here today a small but select group of housing and foreign aid experts and representatives from the home building industry all interested in oversea housing. An all-day meeting of such a group, representing the points of view of both the hardheaded businessmen and the more theoretical internationalist, should come up with some practical recommendations for improving our housing assistance programs abroad.

Some of you builders who have had experience in building abroad have come here to discuss existing aid programs and to make recommendations for improving them. Some of you who are new to this subject are anxious to learn about the programs and what the prospects are for the future. These are worthwhile objectives but I understand that the organizers of this meeting want to broaden the discussion as wide as possible to answer the question—how can housing become a more effective instrument of U.S. foreign policy?

It is indeed gratifying to see on all sides so much interest being generated in the subject of international housing. Only last week in Lima, Peru, a large number of U.S. housing and savings and loan experts met in conference with representatives from practically all the Latin American countries to promote the expansion of thrift and home ownership in those countries. Also last week in New York, the United Nations held a meeting of the new Housing Committee of the Economic and Social Council. Concurrent with that meeting, the National Association of Housing and Redevelopment officials conferred on international housing.

I only hope that meetings like these will crystallize the interest in international housing into specific recommendations for action. I say this because our accomplishments to date are not particularly noteworthy and we need the benefit of the thinking and support from groups like these to get the program off the ground.

In talking to you about foreign aid housing, I am sure there is no need to dwell on the housing problem in the foreign countries. The United Nations published a report recently stating that two billion people, or two-thirds of the human race, live in countries where dire poverty and deprivation prevail. Of this number, about one-quarter billion live in countries which are underdeveloped and friendly to the free world and desirous of our help for advancing their economic well-being.

In past centuries, the people of these countries have been content to live in their squalid condition. Today, through improved communication and transportation, these people have learned that the world has better things to offer than the inevitable hunger, disease, and slums of the past. They are no longer content. They want something better and they intend to get it one way or another.

The United States has committed itself to help these people. President Truman's point 4 program was the first recognition of our responsibility to the people of the underdeveloped countries of the world. Much has transpired since then and many hundreds of millions of dollars have been spent by our Government in its effort to stabilize the world through economic and social assistance programs.

Assistance for housing, however, was never considered very important and nothing of any great consequence was accomplished up until 1960 when the Development Loan Fund was first used to finance the purchase of homes.

The first big breakthrough in the legislative front occurred in 1961 when the Congress appropriated $394 million for the social progress trust fund to be administered by the Inter-American Development Bank to make loans for housing and other activities for the social development of the Latin American countries.

Also the 1961 act initiated a program of investment guarantees for housing. This, the so-called all-risk guarantee, was to insure U.S. investors against loss up to 75 percent of the investment in pilot or demonstration private housing projects of the FHA type in Latin America. This provision was welcomed by the homebuilders at first as a most attractive device for getting the mortgage money to finance homes to be built in Latin America. But the program did not click. The 75-percent guarantee was not acceptable to our institutional lenders which meant that the sponsors would have to deposit assets to cover the other 25 percent in order to get a loan.

In recognition of the difficulty, the 1962 Foreign Assistance Act was written to authorize the U.S. Government to guarantee the investor against all losses provided there was an appropriate participation by the investor in the risk. This very liberal guarantee applied not only to housing loans for Latin America, but for all the less-developed countries participating in our foreign-aid program. A new ceiling of $180 million of guarantees was established under the 1962 act for the all-risk provision under section 221(b), and $60 million was earmarked specifically for Latin America housing under section 224.

As of now, we have had one project approved. This is for a housing project of 2,000 homes for middle-income families in Cali, Colombia. The financing arrangements as you would expect, are somewhat complex, involving a $7 million long-term loan by a U.S. firm to a Colombian institution. Our Government, under section 224 of the 1961 Foreign Assistance Act, will cover 75 percent of the loan, or $5¼ million. The

Colombian Government is joining our Government in guaranteeing the U.S. investor against loss, either due to normal economic factors or currency devaluation. The downpayments by the purchasers will comprise 20 percent of the purchase price and monthly payments over a 10-year amortization period. The houses sell for about $5,500.

I understand that one other project is ready for approval under this provision, and several others are in the final stages of approval. No more applications are being accepted at this time because the Agency says that applications on file are for amounts well over the statutory limit. There is some criticism of this because none of the section 221 money has been committed for housing. The statutory limit referred to by the Agency is the $60 million under section 224.

There are many questions about this program which I am sure you will raise today. This is not an easy program to administer. Builders have objected to the slowness of the application approvals and some of the so-called redtape involved not without justification. However, there have been many difficult problems faced by the small staff assigned to this. Considering its international aspects, I should think that FHA underwriting would be relatively simple compared to this type of underwriting, and I hope in your discussions today that you will keep this fact in mind and that your comments will be of a constructive nature to help the Agency improve its processing.

As you know, I sponsored the 1962 amendments on investment guarantees for housing because I saw the great need and opportunity to get U.S. builders and American capital together to get the international housing program underway. At the same time, I realized the risks involved and cautioned the Agency on its administration of the program. I proposed that an advisory committee of well-qualified mortgage and homebuilding experts be established to help the Agency formulate policy. I was told by Mr. Hamilton, the AID Administrator at that time, that it was a good idea but, as of today, nothing has happened. The last time I checked, I was told that the President was about to name the committee. I do not wish to scold the Agency but its performance under this program has not been very satisfactory.

The other active program of the Agency for International Development is the promotion of savings and loan associations in the less-developed countries. Thrift and homeownership are concepts which have been deeply instilled in our American tradition and we are proud of the part that the savings and loan associations have played in making our country the best housed in the world. This accomplishment is shared by our great homebuilding industry. But these groups could never have done the job unless there was a ready market financially capable of purchasing the house.

It is this combination of economic forces that needs to be brought together in the less developed countries to insure an adequate production of housing.

As of today, the U.S. Government is helping, through technical and financial assistance, to start savings and loan systems in Peru, Chile, Ecuador, Venezuela, the Dominican Republic, and one African country, Ethiopia.

The most successful has been the Chilean program. Let me tell you about it because it can well represent a model on which other countries can build.

In 1958, a team of U.S. technicians made recommendations for the establishment of a savings and loan system with a central bank to operate on a quadruple capacity as supervisor, an insurer of mortgage loans, a guarantor of deposits, and a secondary mortgage facility. In addition, because of the inflation problem, a maintenance of value system was recommended to solve the problem of currency devaluation.

The first charter for a savings and loan association was issued in 1961. Today there are 20 associations chartered and accumulating savings at a rate of $1 million a month.

Savings per person are small—only about $300—but this is not bad considering that the average wage paid to workers is about $1 a day. As of August, about 2,000 mortgages had been approved by the board of directors of the associations.

One of the features of the Chilean system is the maintenance of value provision. This is an extremely intriguing device to counteract the effect of inflation. By its terms all savings accounts and all outstanding mortgage loan balances are adjusted annually in accordance with the changes in the index of salaries and wages.

There were many critics of these provisions who doubted that an adjustment formula would ever work. It was said that savers would not mind because they received an upward adjustment in their account, but the borrowers would complain bitterly if their unpaid balance were to be increased significantly by the adjustment.

This is a problem and I would not want to discount its possible impact on certain nonwage earning people, but all I can say is that the Chile experience has survived its first year. On June 30, 1962, the system applied its first adjustment—12 percent to both savings and lendings. For savers, the 12-percent increase was added on top of a dividend paid, amounting to 3 to 4½ percent.

There have been many problems in creating the Chilean system and in watching over it as it grew. There is one feature which I think may have initially accounted for the Chilean success whereas other countries have failed. Our Government has followed through in Chile by retaining an outstanding technician to work along with the new organizations and to help them in every way. This necessity for follow through, I strongly feel, cannot be stressed enough. Like golf or bowling, the game may be lost if accuracy is marred by failing to follow through.

All of this leads me to the current bill before our committee to establish an International Home Loan Bank. The bill, introduced by Senator SMATHERS and cosponsored by me, has two purposes—first, to accumulate capital and, secondly, to provide trained technicians for the establishment of mutual thrift systems in underdeveloped countries. I consider these two purposes of equal importance. One cannot function without the other. U.S. dollars alone, flowing into these countries, would be worthless unless accompanied by technicians trained in how to use these dollars to create a self-supporting thrift system within the recipient country. Likewise, technical assistance would be worthless without U.S. dollars backing it up and acting as a "big stick."

The bill would limit the investment of a U.S. savings and loan association to 1 percent of its assets, so certainly no one can say that this is a profiteering activity even if the rate of return might be somewhat higher than for domestic loans. In Chile and Venezuela, the maximum interest charged the buyer is 7 percent on these loans.

The bill would provide for ex officio representation on the Board of one person from Treasury Department and one from State Department in order to avoid the criticism leveled at an earlier bill that the Board may act independently of our foreign policy in making dollar loans to foreign governments. This charge was the most serious one raised against the bill and will be probably the most difficult hurdle to overcome in getting administration support. Whether the ex officio representation will answer the objection will not be known until we have a chance to hear from the State Department.

We also heard questions about how the International Bank would be assured of its repayment in U.S. dollars by foreign governments. I assume that some guarantee will need to be given by the recipient government, but I am not sure what would happen in case of a change in the government or if the government had such a dollar shortage that it could not possibly repay the Bank in dollars.

Although we do not hear much about it in the open discussion, I believe that another objection to the bill involves the feeling of some that a big savings and loan program would be a lopsided one in accord with the need. Its beneficiaries would be mainly middle-income rather than the low-income families, where the greatest need exists.

There are many answers to this objection, but I think most important of all, the program is not proposed as a Government subsidy program. It is a private enterprise activity seeking Government acquiescence to carry out the intent of our foreign aid program to help these countries in their economic and social development.

Regarding the economic level reached by such housing, I recall an interesting observation made by several Latin Americans that communism is fired up more by frustrated intellectuals than by the uneducated poor. These people, many of whom have white-collar jobs, feel their lack of housing just as badly as the poor peon. They know that much of the housing shortage is unnecessary and can cause a lot of trouble. A middle-income program of home financing, therefore, is critically needed for this group.

There is not much question but that a good comprehensive program should be concerned about housing for all levels of family income. Cooperative housing has had some success in providing housing for the middle-income families. Self-help housing and Government-owned housing seem to be the most common method suggested to take care of the great masses of ill-housed low-income people. But our Government can do relatively little here, other than to provide some technical assistance, because of the very magnitude of the problem.

This leads me to tell you about a study currently being undertaken by our subcommittee on the subject of international housing.

The purpose of this study is to review our programs of housing assistance in the less developed countries and to consider proposals for improvements. We invited 36 scholars and housing experts to submit papers on a number of topics relevant to this subject. Those papers are on their way to the printer and should be available sometime this month.

In addition to the papers, we have requested reports from the Agency for International Development, the Organization of American States, the Housing and Home Finance Agency, and the Inter-American Development Bank.

Among the topics in the study, one of the most important is the relationship between housing and economic development. As you know, many economists have claimed that housing as a consumer good should be a low priority item in our foreign assistance program. They have said that U.S. dollar assistance should be given or loaned to less developed countries only for productive enterprises which would result in earning foreign exchange for the recipient country. Otherwise such assistance would be inflationary.

We have received several excellent papers on this subject which provide support for an entirely new point of view. After reading these papers, I feel that there will be a great deal more understanding, not only of the economics involved, but also of the sociopolitical factors in housing assistance, both of which are of important consideration in our foreign assistance program.

I am sure that this subject is bound to come up today in your discussions, and I shall look forward to the conclusions you might reach on it.

We also have requested papers on topics involving organizational problems, that is, what agency (AID, the U.N., IADE, OAS, etc.) should do what. The jurisdictional issue is always a matter for discussion at meetings of this kind.

Other papers raise questions about where private enterprise fits into the program. We also asked what the city planners could do and how the building materials industry could be stimulated in the foreign aid countries.

Also how does our Government insure that proper community facilities are installed as a prerequisite to construction of homes financed with U.S. funds.

Aided self-help, cooperative housing, slum clearance, and public housing are covered.

We also have papers on what can be done to train the people of these countries to do the job themselves. We wanted to know what new educational devices should be developed. Is our OAS school in Bogotá doing an efficient job and should such a school be expanded further? Should similar training schools be established in other parts of the world?

We tried to cover all facets of the subject and we are very pleased with the responses. The papers represent a lot of hard work on the part of the writers and the committee is very grateful to them.

Many of these same topics will be discussed here today because they are fundamental to the issue and our Government is still searching for answers in order to establish policy. I understand there are some Government people here today so you can be assured that your discussions will not go unnoticed. Furthermore, the subcommittee would be very happy to receive from you any resolutions that might result from this meeting.

THE SAVINGS AND LOAN MOVEMENT IN SOUTH AMERICA

(By Joseph P. McMurray [1])

It is truly a privilege of a high order to say a few words today on the savings and loan movement in Latin America.

The very fact that it is now possible to refer to such a movement in that part of our hemisphere which lies to the south of us speaks volumes. Until quite recently, accuracy would have permitted no more than references to surveys, proposals, or beginnings.

It is not so today. The existence of such a movement is attested by the number of countries in which the legal foundations have been laid for systems of these institutions, by the progress which has attended their establishment in a number of those countries, and by the enthusiastic support which was given to the first Inter-American Savings and Loan Conference, held last week in Lima, Peru, and attended by my colleague on the Federal Home Loan Bank Board, Mr. Joseph J. Williams, Jr., who has given me most favorable reports of its success.

Most of you are not directly connected with savings and loan associations, and I think I should give at least a very brief background statement about them.

The typical savings and loan association is a privately owned, operated, locally organized and managed thrift and home financing institution. It holds itself open to receive savings from members of the public, to whom it pays earnings on those savings periodically, and it invests those funds in long-term loans on homes and other residential properties, including construction loans. The ability with which it performs these functions is illustrated by the fact that the approximately six thousand savings and loan associations in this country presently hold such savings in the amount of some $80 billion, their total assets exceeding $93 billion.

While privately owned, and privately operated by their own boards of directors and managers, they are, like banks, examined and supervised by State officials or bodies, or, in the case of those which are federally chartered, by the Federal Home Loan Bank Board, of which I am Chairman. That Board also supervises the Federal home loan banks, which are credit facilities for all Federal associations and for such State-chartered associations as become members. It likewise directs the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation, which insures, up to the statutory limit, the savings of members of the public in all Federal associations and in State-chartered associations which avail themselves of this insurance.

No one who attends this workshop will, I am sure, leave without a keen awareness of the appalling lack of adequate housing in Latin America. Two primary causes of this situation have been, first, the absence of modern techniques in housing construction, and, second, and not least, the dearth of long-term home-mortgage financing for the building and purchase of homes. At the root of this shortage of available financing has been the lack of such a group of financial intermediaries as the savings and loan associations which we have here.

Experience both in the United States, with its savings and loan associations, and in Britain and the British Commonwealth, with their similar institutions known as building societies, has given impressive demonstration for many years of the way in which institutions of the savings and loan type can serve the small saver, the home builder, and the ultimate home buyer and owner.

The belief that such institutions can fill a similar role in Latin American countries has been a natural outgrowth of that demonstrated success. It has been fostered by the experience in the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, where ethnic backgrounds and other factors have been similar to those in Latin America and where, in approximately a decade savings and loan associations have been established and now have approximately $115 million in assets, they have fully proved their viability both in the savings and in the home financing field.

With this background of experience in this country and elsewhere, a number of the leading personalities in the savings and loan industry of this country, beginning at least as far back as 1958, made surveys of greater or lesser depth in some 12 Latin American countries to sound out the feasibility of the establishment of savings and loan associations in those countries. They did this quite generally under the auspices of the International Cooperation Administration and its successor, the Agency for International Development, although in some cases on their own initiative. Outstanding contributions of time and effort were also made to this work by executives and staff of leading savings and loan trade organizations.

Passing from the survey stage, comprehensive legislation has been drafted for many of these countries, and in some five of them there are now associations in operation.

In Chile, within approximately 2 years, according to information received through channels which are unofficial but which I believe to be reliable, there have been established 21 associations with over $16 million in savings and some 22,000 investors, and with approximately 3,000 mortgages approved or in process. In Peru, according to information similarly received, eight associations are underway, and these associations have generated approximately $2 million in savings and have granted more than 800 loans.

The types of facilities provided have generally paralleled those in this country, with the addition of a facility similar to the Federal Housing Administration.

They have, therefore, generally included four distinct elements. The first is a facility to charter and supervise savings and loan associations. In our country these functions are performed by the Federal Home Loan Bank Board, or, in the case of State-chartered institutions, by the State authorities. The second is a facility with functions similar to those of the Federal home loan banks, to provide funds for the associations for seasonal and emergency needs, as well as additional funds for home lending. The third is a facility similar to the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation to insure the savings placed in the associations. The fourth is a facility to insure residential mortgages in a manner similar to the Federal Housing Administration.

With the passing of the survey stage, the primary need in the area of what I may call human assistance, as distinguished from financial assistance, is first, for aid in developing sound patterns of law and regulations; and, second, but second only in point of time, for assistance in the training of executive and operating personnel.

The Federal Home Loan Bank Board, along with other governmental agencies and the savings and loan associations and their trade organizations, has been happy to be of help in this field.

Thus, the Board provided a member of its legal staff to assist in the development of legislation and regulations in El Salvador. It made available its Director of Federal Home Loan Bank Operations as a member of a two-man team of consultants for the Agency for International Development in connection with the establishment of a savings and loan system in the Dominican Republic.

Later, it provided a staff member of its division of supervision to serve, with a vice president of one of the Federal home loan banks, in a consultant capacity in the drafting of regulations to implement the newly enacted savings and loan laws in that country. The other Board members and I have made ourselves freely available for consultation by savings and loan officials of interested countries, and have encouraged our staff to do so.

I would not have you conclude that the Federal Home Loan Bank Board has been the sole or even the major source of such assistance. The desire to aid our Latin American friends in this respect has been a real grassroots project in the savings and loan industry. The associations themselves and their trade associations, together with the Agency for International Development and the Inter-American Development Bank, have responded ably and enthusiastically to the need and have sent trained savings and loan personnel on mission after mission to the south, and several associations have opened their offices to on-the-job training of Latin American personnel in the United States.

Perhaps the most dramatic measure has been the recent joint action of the Peace Corps, the Agency for International Development, and one of the national savings and loan industry organizations in sponsoring a group of some 30 Peace Corps volunteers who, after a period of training in this country, will assist in the establishment and operation of savings and loan associations in Peru. I am proud to say that one of the members of our examining staff has taken leave from his work with us to become a member of that group and thus contribute the benefit of his specialized skill as an examiner of savings and loan associations.

---

[1] Chairman, Federal Home Loan Bank Board, Washington, D.C., before the International Housing Workshop, National Housing Center, Washington, D.C., Wednesday, Jan. 30, 1963, 12:30 p.m.

There is, however, great need in this field not only for human assistance but also for financial assistance, in the form of "seed capital" to aid in the establishment of these new associations. The Inter-American Development Bank and the Agency for International Development have supplied some $40 million in loans for this purpose, but there is need for much more.

For some time now there has been a view on the part of responsible persons, both within and without the savings and loan industry, that the savings and loan associations of this country could themselves provide at least a part of the funds needed for this purpose.

Among other recommendations, it has been felt that such a course would provide an additional element of good will as a people-to-people approach and would afford a just measure of recognition to the savings and loan associations of this country in their furnishing of the technical aid and specialized knowledge which is such a vital part of the operation.

A number of bills were introduced in the last Congress with the general object of providing such assistance through an International Home Loan Bank which would be under the supervision of the Federal Home Loan Bank Board but would be operated through its own board of directors.

This bank would have authority to sell its shares to savings and loan associations and to savings banks in this country and to provide assistance for the development of similar institutions in underdeveloped countries, either by making direct investments in such institutions or by making its funds available to the central savings and loan facilities in those countries, which in turn would make them available to the individual associations.

While the administration reached the conclusion that it would not favor the enactment of such legislation at that time, it was made clear that the Federal Home Loan Bank Board was expected to continue its study of the situation and to continue its cooperation in the rendering of advice and technical assistance in this area, which it has done.

In the present Congress legislation of this nature has been introduced both in the Senate and in the House. In the Senate, sponsorship has been from both sides of the aisle, in the form of a bill by Senator SMATHERS, cosponsored by Senator SPARKMAN, and a bill by Senator DIRKSEN. In the House the sponsorship has been of an equally distinguished nature, including bills by Representative PATMAN and by Representative MULTER, of my own State of New York.

I would suggest that these bills deserve the careful study and consideration of all who feel, as I do, that the interests of this country would be aided by the development of a strong element of savers and homeowners in the underdeveloped countries, and particularly in Latin America, and by the emergence of an efficient and effective home construction industry in those countries.

A beginning has been made If we want this movement to flourish it will need the interest and enthusiastic support of people like yourselves and the organizations which you represent. But all our efforts and all your efforts, in my opinion. will not do the job unless there is set up some sort of an international organization for this specific purpose. I suggest to you that the International Home Loan Bank, or some similarly organized institution, may do the job. The administration and the Congress will be studying it and I respectfully suggest that it also deserves your careful study, deliberation and action.

PROPOSED COMMISSION ON SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, on Monday of this week I was necessarily absent from the Senate on official business. I understand that at that time the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Government Operations, the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN], introduced a bill to create a Commission on Science and Technology. It is S. 618.

It is a privilege for me to join with the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Government Operations in sponsoring the proposal to create a Commission on Science and Technology. As chairman of the Subcommittee on Reorganization and International Organizations, it has been a great source of satisfaction to me to work along with the chairman in conducting studies and holding hearings on various proposals which were directed toward bringing about more efficiency and economy in the operations of the numerous scientific research and development programs being carried on or supported by the Federal Government, which is the objective of the bill.

As the chairman has pointed out, the cost of these Federal activities has risen from less than $5 billion in 1956 to a budget estimate of approximately $15 billion for fiscal year 1964. Beginning early in 1958, the Committee on Government Operations and the Subcommittee on Reorganization began hearings on various Federal activities in the field of science, directed primarily to the deficiencies in the Federal science information processing programs. At these hearings, held in the 85th and succeeding Congresses, the committee developed much information on the need for reorganization and better coordination of Federal science activities. The bill being introduced by the chairman is therefore the culmination of nearly 5 years of study by the committee and its staff, during which period a number of reports and documents have been submitted to the Senate for the information of Members of Congress.

These studies developed a pressing need for constructive action by the Congress in effecting essential reorganizations in the administration of the Federal research and development programs, in order to eliminate unnecessary duplication of activities, thus effecting economies of operation and insuring better utilization of funds made available for these programs and, even more important, the conservation of our limited number of highly qualified scientific and technical personnel.

The committee, in attempting to draft and submit legislation to the Senate directed toward eliminating existing deficiencies and effecting necessary reorganizations of Federal science programs, was unable to develop agreements among the scientists, technologists, educators, and other officials concerned with these activities, and after hearings directed toward these objectives in the 86th and 87th Congresses, concluded that there was an urgent need for a coordinated study of the problems involved by those who were best qualified to recommend remedial legislative action. Therefore, the committee recommended the creation of a Hoover-type commission to conduct such a study and to submit appropriate recommendations for action by the President and the Congress. The Senate approved, by unanimous action, a bill—S. 2771—late in the 87th Congress, which failed of final approval in the House of Representatives last year.

The subject bill is identical to the committee's proposal which passed the Senate on August 8, 1962. I assure the chairman that I shall give him my wholehearted cooperation and support of the measure he is introducing on behalf of the committee, so that it can receive early consideration by the Senate and the House in the present Congress.

Mr. President, I believe Members of the Congress will be interested in extracts from a Summary of Activities of the Subcommittee on Reorganization and International Organizations of the Committee on Government Operations, of which I am chairman, during the 87th Congress, as it relates to scientific research and development and, specifically, to scientific information and communication.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that these extracts be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the extracts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IMPROVED INTERAGENCY COOPERATION ON BUDGET PLANS

In the subcommittee's review of Federal budgeting for research and development, it found that there was inadequate exchange of long-range plans and programs, involving literally billions of dollars of Federal expenditures.

A principal focus of the hearings was on the need for fuller exchange of budget forecasts and plans between, on the one hand, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, and, on the other hand, the many other Federal agencies which contribute to research and development in the Nation's civilian space program. These other agencies include the Department of Defense, Department of Commerce, National Science Foundation, and others.

In the wake of the subcommittee's interest, Deputy Secretary of Defense Roswell Gilpatric and James Webb, Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, for the first time, in July 1962, exchanged letters providing for review by each agency of the other's long-range program for space research.

This type of mutual review had been a principal goal of the subcommittee's hearings.

B. COOPERATION ON SCIENCE INFORMATION

As a result of the subcommittee's efforts in the field of interagency coordination of information, numerous further improvements in information systems are being made throughout the executive branch. The principal such changes are occurring in the Agency with the largest single research and development program, the Department of Defense. The Secretary of Defense has issued an important new directive for a "vigorous, well-organized, thoroughly coordinated, comprehensive technical information program."

In addition, in the Defense Department, as in all principal Departments and Agencies, a single individual is, for the first time, being made responsible for direction of programs of scientific information. This action, long suggested by the subcommittee, is a major step forward toward increased efficiency.

In the near future, a report from a panel on information of the President's Science Advisory Committee is expected to be issued. The establishment of this high level, expert group and of an information committee in the Federal Council for Science and Technology, represent direct results of this subcommittee's efforts.

Recognizing that the taxpayer's interests could best be served by apprising the Appropriations Committees of the Congress, the Reorganization Subcommittee has made available special analyses. Thus, within a 3-month period the chairman of the subcommittee submitted four separate mimeographed reports to the Senate and House Appropriations Committees. Each of these reports documented serious weaknesses in information programs of major agencies, which were at the time asking for funds for the 1963 fiscal year.

Subsequently, both the Senate and House Appropriations Committees utilized judgment expressed within these Reorganization Subcommittee reports in the course of reports on fiscal year 1963 fund bills.

Throughout its endeavors, this essential fact has been stressed by the subcommittee, the American taxpayer continues, unfortunately, to suffer serious losses because of shortcomings in Federal information programs. The yield from billions of dollars of taxpayer-supported research and development effort is lowered; scientific manpower is often squandered in needless, unintentional duplication of effort. A regrettable fact is that literally tens of thousands of federally sponsored scientific and other reports have been "lost" or "buried." A single report may cost the American taxpayer $1,000 or $1 million or more. Conversely, its location and timely use may save incalculable sums and man-years.

C. COOPERATION ON DRUG RESEARCH AND REGULATION

Among the many results of the subcommittee's efforts in the field of interagency coordination of drug research and regulation, are the following:

(1) The Director of the Office of Science and Technology, Executive Office of the President, Dr. Jerome B. Wiesner, has asked interested Federal agencies, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Department of Defense and the Veterans' Administration, to review the coordination of their respective drug programs.

(2) Efforts toward increased coordination are under way within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, as for example, between the Food and Drug Administration and the National Institutes of Health.

(3) The World Health Organization has been encouraged to improve international cooperation in exchange of drug information.

D. COOPERATION ON TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE ABROAD

As a result of the subcommittee's efforts in the field of oversea technical assistance, increased coordination is under way between: (1) the Agency for International Development, and (2) those domestic departments of the U.S. Government which are technically competent to render technical assistance to the emerging nations. These domestic departments include the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, the Department of Agriculture, the Department of Labor, etc.

Specifically, a series of new agreements between the Agency for International Development and the domestic departments has been and is being negotiated. Under these agreements, the domestic agencies will take over an increasing share of the workload abroad.

FORMER SENATOR BENTON'S ARTICLE POINTS UP SCIENTIFIC CHALLENGE OFFERED BY U.S.S.R.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, it is clear that the 88th Congress will make some of the most important scientific decisions in American history.

As we are all aware, the President's budget proposes a little under $15 billion for support of scientific research and development, testing, and evaluation.

This is more than one out of every $6 in the Federal budget.

This is big money, but it is for big purposes—national security, national growth, national health. None of these goals is obtained at the "bargain basement."

In connection with our future scientific policies, I commend now to the Congress an important article by one of our former colleagues, the Honorable William Benton, president of Encyclopedia Britannica.

He brings to bear upon this as on other issues an encyclopedic knowledge, drawn from the experiences of a remarkably varied career.

Businessman, educator, former high official of the State Department, political scientist, Bill Benton knows how to extract from specialists the best of their insight and to communicate it to the Nation.

In a notable article which he wrote for the Saturday Evening Post, former Senator Benton cited his observations at one of the most significant locations on the face of the earth, namely: Novosibirsk, in western Siberia. The article was entitled, "Inside the Siberian Science City."

The fact is that Bill Benton, who has covered much of the world, including the Soviet Union on four occasions, was the very first American to see in operation this remarkable center of Soviet research. Up until that time, Novosibirsk had been "off limits."

In that city, as elsewhere, he astutely recognized the larger implications of what he was permitted to see. He recognized, for example, the meaning of the Soviets' "big push" in applied science. He noted, too, the significant facts of Soviet scientific education.

Thus, "In the basic Soviet primary-secondary school, every student is required to take 10 years of mathematics, 5 of physics, 4 of chemistry, and 2 of biology."

Meanwhile, Soviet scientific efforts are concentrated, he noted, not in universities, but in research institutes directly related to the industries which they are intended to serve.

Bill Benton has, of course, neither suggested nor implied that we slavishly imitate the U.S.S.R. But he, like other keen students of East-West competition, stresses in effect that we keep our eyes and ears and minds open. He emphasizes that we understand what the U.S.S.R. is doing, why, and how well or poorly Soviet means are working. We will then be in a better position to come to our own decisions for our own purposes in our own way.

We as a Nation do not ever propose to be "second best" in science or technology. Former Senator Benton's article helps to make sure that we keep informed on this scientific race.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of his vital article be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Inside the Siberian Science City

(By William Benton)

Deep in the forests of Siberia, near a vast manmade lake, the Soviets are building one of the most extraordinary scientific centers in the world. Its implications can be ominous for us. The only way to suggest an American counterpart would be to imagine the U.S. Government merging the theoretical-research departments of Harvard and the University of Chicago with the applied research divisions of General Electric & Bell Telephone Laboratories—and establishing them all in a new headquarters on the outskirts of Detroit. This is roughly what the Soviets are planning for their science city outside the industrial center of Novosibirsk in Siberia.

The new establishment, just now nearing completion, is a striking symbol of the Soviet intellectual challenge to the West. It is a complex of 15 separate scientific institutes designed to house 50,000 research workers. It is dedicated not merely to theoretical research of the highest order but to solving practical problems in fields ranging from hydraulic mining to the translation of ancient languages. And this new science city is only the first of several that the Soviets plan to build across Siberia.

Since Novosibirsk is closed to most foreign visitors, only a handful of Americans have seen even the site of this science city. Among them are former Vice President Richard Nixon, Vice Adm. Hyman Rickover, and Ambassador Adlai Stevenson. What they saw was largely a blueprint. It was only recently, when I visited Russia, as a guest of the newly created Institute of Soviet-American Relations, that an American first saw the science city actually in operation. Perhaps I should add that I had told the Russians that I had no training in science and that I wouldn't recognize a secret if my nose were rubbed in it.

CEREMONIAL AT DAWN

It was 5:20 a.m. when I landed in Novosibirsk, 1,750 miles east of Moscow, together with Mrs. Benton and our 20-year-old son, John. A representative of the mayor, plus the chief learned secretary of the Siberian department of the Soviet Academy of Sciences, and a third official welcomer were on hand to meet us and drive us to our hotel. Our suite there, according to our escort, was indisputably the most luxurious hotel suite in the entire Soviet Union. It had ceilings at least 20 feet high, beautiful oriental rugs, a piano in the living room, and stiff, uncomfortable furniture.

Like the rest of Siberia, Novosibirsk scarcely corresponds to the Western image of a cold slave-labor prison. For one thing, it was hot when I was there, as hot as any town in Iowa. A village of a few thousand at the turn of the century, Novosibirsk was originally used as a camp for construction workers building the Trans-Siberian Railroad. Its big growth came during World

War II, when the Soviets brought in great industrial plants evacuated before the Nazi push into western Russia. Today it is an industrial city of 1 million, roughly comparable to Detroit or Cleveland, a producer of turbines and steel and mining machinery. Its paved central square is about the size of four or five New York City blocks, without greenery of any kind, and its opera house is the biggest in the U.S.S.R. Across the tops of the buildings on the main square are four great electric signs saying "Peace to the world, glory to the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, long live Leninism, long live the Soviet people." Most of the city's buildings are a drab gray. In winter the temperature falls to 50 below zero. All things considered, it is not surprising that the president of the Soviet Academy of Sciences originally opposed the plan to build a costly academic center there.

"You won't be able to persuade top scientists to move to Novosibirsk," he said.

"We can get the brilliant young ones," Khrushchev reportedly answered, "and we can train them there. The young scientists do the creative work."

HOW THE CITY BEGAN

When Khrushchev decided to go ahead with the science city 4 years ago, it was only part of a regional plan for the development of the whole area. One of the first steps was to dam the mighty Ob River, creating the Sea of Ob, 125 miles long, and providing enough power, heat, and light for both Novosibirsk and the science city. Then teams of construction workers arrived, and 12,500 of them are still at work on the project.

When we reached the science city—a 12-mile drive along a broad and modern but nearly empty highway from Novosibirsk—our car pulled up in front of the Institute of Geology. Waiting to greet us was Mikhail Lavrentiev, chairman of the Siberian department of the Soviet Academy of Sciences and head of the science city. He is a tall, stooping man with friendly eyes, and an eager host.

The 15 new institutes occupy great squat 3- and 4-story buildings somewhat resembling Soviet "efficiency apartment" houses. The unadorned facade of each institute faces a wide Avenue of the Institutes. Two main buildings have been in use for 3 or 4 years. Others were incomplete, still encased in scaffolding. None of these massive oblong structures had yet acquired the red stars or statutes of Lenin that typify many public buildings in the U.S.S.R. Virgin forests behind the institutes provide room for expansion while shielding them from bitter Siberian winter winds. "We tried to preserve as much of the forest as possible," said Lavrentiev.

The names of the institutes give an idea of the scope of these drab new scientific palaces. Squarely in the center of the compound is the Institute of Geology and Geophysics. Next door is the Institute of Automation and Electrical Measuring Techniques. Then comes the Institute of Genetics, then the Institute of Experimental Biology and Medicine, then Hydrodynamics, Kinetics and Combustion, Applied Mechanics, and so on. I asked about nuclear reactors but was told this particular science city had no need of one.

The layout makes each institute an autonomous unit. Yet the institutes depend horizontally on each other for support—as shown by their locations. The Institute of Inorganic Chemistry, for example, stands next to the Institute of Thermophysics so that the scientists in one can work closely with those in the other.

Not far away from the institute buildings, on newly cleared forest land, workmen have already completed the first big physics and chemistry building of the new University of Novosibirsk, begun at the same time as the science city. The university already has 1,000 students, and the enrollment will increase to 4,000. The students will work at the institutes in research projects.

What goes on in this remote research center? As one example, which seemed rather strange in the middle of Siberia, the Soviets report that their computers have deciphered a Mayan Indian script which philologists had worked on for decades. Sergei Sobolev, head of the Institute of Mathematics, proudly presented me with a three-volume account of the work. Another group, the Geology Institute, has 92 survey teams investigating Siberia's wealth of iron, sulfur, copper and oil. "There is so much unknown and so much to be discovered," said the group's director, Andrei Trofimuk, a solidly built man of about 40. "Siberia has every mineral that exists."

"BETTER THAN MOSCOW"

The most spectacular demonstration that I saw was the use of a mining machine called a water-pressure cannon, developed by the Hydrodynamics Institute. It looks like a bundle of pipes, perhaps 10 feet in circumference and 8 feet long. From a safe distance we watched while the cannon fired at a 3-foot-thick chunk of granite. There was a loud bang. The granite splintered into a dozen fragments. In the same laboratory we saw a piece of copper about 8 inches thick with a hole shot through its center by one of these water cannons. Lavrentiev boasted of the machine as "15 times better than Moscow has been able to do." We in the United States have nothing comparable to this for our mining industries.

The opportunity to work and get ahead in such laboratories—along with the comparative luxury of a house and garden of one's own—has indeed brought young scientists to Novosibirsk, as Khrushchev predicted. By now there are 12,500 of them (as well as 11 members of the Soviet Academy of Sciences). Arnold Romanov, for example, at the age of 29, is the head of a key section in the Institute of Automation and Electrical Measuring Techniques. A fascinating young man who has read widely in English literature and speaks our language well, Romanov sparkles with enthusiasm about his work. Here, he says, a gifted man "gets a bigger job quicker." "The scientists are not alone," Lavrentiev added. "They have wives and children and grandchildren, and we take care of them."

The scientists don't spend all their time in laboratories. After our first morning at the center we lunched at the clubhouse for the institutes' top research scholars. There was a lavish array of 30 or more dishes—red and black caviar, tomatoes, cheeses, meats, bottles of wine and vodka. The next day we joined Lavrentiev and four colleagues in a 50-foot motor launch and chugged across the Sea of Ob to a camp run by the Academy of Sciences.

The camp, in a forest of tall, aromatic pines, consisted of three or four substantial log houses, together with half a dozen tents and small cabins. We saw a number of women and children—though we got little chance to talk to them. A rotund, tanned, bearded individual greeted us with a load of fish he had caught that morning. By the time we had all taken a swim, the bearded man had prepared a steaming fish soup with a chunk of pike floating in it. With that came caviar, salad, cheese, wine and vodka, all served as a picnic beneath the tall white birches near the water. It made me think of some fantasy—portrayed by Manet, described by Tolstoy, and catered by Brillat-Savarin.

I wanted to find out more about how the Soviet scientists viewed their own role in the world. I asked Lavrentiev whether he didn't feel that many sciences were getting so specialized that a scientist found himself learning more and more about less and less. Lavrentiev thought not—at least in his own case. As a boy of 11, he said, he had fallen in love with a mathematical puzzler called the four-color problem. The problem is this—how many different colors would you need to use on any map so that no two adjoining states are the same color, no matter how many states there are or what their shape? Lavrentiev said mathematicians had proved that five colors would be enough for any possible map, and that three would not be enough, but nobody had been able to prove mathematically that four would suffice. He named a Swedish scientist who had devoted a lifetime to this problem, but, as for himself, he had gone on to other things.

We agreed that there should be more exchange of information between our countries, but I mentioned the problem of the Soviets' unwillingness to abide by international rules of copyright and royalties. Sobolev, head of the mathematics institute, asked whether Russian writers got any royalties in the United States. When I said they did, he remarked that a publisher asked his permission to publish two of his mathematical works but there had been no royalties. He couldn't remember who the publisher was, and I never found out what had happened to the books in the United States. I said that books of this sort sold on such a small scale that there were few royalties.

As for more popular writers, I recalled that I first heard of the American ex-Communist novelist, Howard Fast, when I learned some years ago of his great popularity in the Soviet Union. I added that he had become better known in the United States since he abandoned communism in 1957. "It's exactly the reverse here," laughed Sobolev. And in fact I no longer found Fast's books on sale in the U.S.S.R.

I asked the members of the group to speculate on the future. What did they foresee?

"How can we foresee the future?" Sobolev asked. "All we know is that there will be more changes in the next 50 years than have been created in all the past history of the world put together."

I asked whether he agreed with the assertion by some experts that 90 percent of all the scientists who have ever lived are alive today. He thought a moment and then nodded in agreement. But not everyone accepted the implication that many scientists means great scientists. "There is no Newton alive today," said Academician Ilya Vekhua, rector of the University of Novosibirsk.

In their conversation, as in their work, the scientists of Novosibirsk revealed an important difference in the way scientific training is organized east and west of the Iron Curtain. In the basic Soviet primary-secondary school, called the 11-year school, every student is required to take 10 years of mathematics, 5 of physics, 4 of chemistry, and 2 of biology—in addition to such humanistic studies as history, literature, and a foreign language. On the basis of this broad background the student is encouraged to specialize as soon as he has finished the 11-year school. Since the tuition at all levels is free, a gifted student, no matter how poor, can develop his talents for the benefit of both himself and the state. Nor are these talents trained independently of the nation's industrial growth. There is no sharp division, as in the West, between the applied science of industry and the more prestigious theoretical science of the university.

"The graduates of the university must be as close as possible to industry," Lavrentiev told me. "You look to your universities to train your scientific personnel and to do your basic theoretical research. In the U.S.S.R. the really great scientific achievements do not develop within the walls of the universities but within the walls of the research institutes like this one."

The reality of the Soviet scientific achievements can scarcely be disputed. It is obvious not only in their space triumphs but in less spectacular fields such as surgery, oil drilling and oceanography. Judging from what I saw at Novosibirsk, there will be further achievements at the new Siberian science cities (the next such center will be at Irkutsk near the Mongolian frontier). Today the Kremlin is systematically developing all its science and education according to its current view of what Soviet society needs.

If the Russians have sacrificed butter for guns, they have sacrificed meat for education and research. Are we Americans making similar sacrifices?

The U.S. Government is indeed pouring massive amounts of money into the scientific programs at our universities and elsewhere. It is encouraging more applied research as part and parcel of the theoretical investigations to which our great scientists have been traditionally devoted. Our corporations, too, are intensifying projects to bridge the gap between theoretical and applied research. Some are building research laboratories near the campuses of our universities.

If the Soviets forge ahead of us in science it will not be because their highly coordinated system is necessarily better than our system. Prof. Robert Marshak, a University of Rochester physicist who has been appraising recent advances in Soviet science, believes the United States will continue to lead in pure and theoretical science for some time to come because our system is more ideally suited to such research. But he warns that we should expect the Russians—because of their greater stress on applied research, their expanding budgets and their ability to focus almost unlimited resources on selected problems—to make "numerous short-range breakthroughs in applied science." A case in point is the Soviet lead in booster rockets for space capsules.

Shortly before leaving Novosibirsk I commented to Lavrentiev that the Soviet educational system was designed not for the individual but for the state. He did not disagree. As for myself, I told him I once had been the only young man in the United States to get 100 percent in the comprehensive college-entrance examinations in mathematics. Following my own inclinations, I have led a widely varied life as an advertising executive, a U.S. Senator, a top State Department official, a trustee of several universities and head of the Encyclopaedia Britannica. In the Soviet Union the Communist system would inevitably have directed me toward a career in science.

With the calm confidence of the new Soviet scientific elite, Lavrentiev said, "Perhaps you would have been better off in mathematics."

Like most other Americans, I certainly want to go on deciding such questions for myself.

ESTONIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, Sunday was the 45th anniversary of the birth of a new nation. On February 24, 1918, the Estonian National Council proclaimed the independence of the small Baltic Republic of Estonia. More than a formal proclamation, however, was needed to transform the Estonian declaration of independence into reality. For nearly 2 years—in the midst of one of the bitterest and most savage conflicts in the history of modern Europe—the Estonians fought for and won their de facto independence. We should pause to pay homage to those patriots who gave their last measure of devotion in this struggle.

Sometimes it is difficult for an American to conceive of the turmoil, the anarchy, the indescribable sufferings which accompanied these battles on the eastern marches of Europe. Contrary to the widespread impression, the last shots of World War I were not fired on November 11, 1918. The Estonian War of Independence lasted long after the armistice on the Western Front. It coincided with the incredibly brutal conflicts of the Russian Civil War and the Soviet-Polish War. At one point it appeared that bolshevism was destined to spread to the heart of Western Europe. Thanks to the bravery of the Baltic populations and other peoples, this disaster was avoided for many years. We who are dedicated to freedom owe these peoples a debt of gratitude.

The Estonian freedom fighters were engaged, in effect, in a two-front war: one against the Red army, which was trying to restore Imperial Russia's domination of the Baltic states, and another against a corps of German volunteers, who sought to turn Estonia into a German colony. These were turbulent times, but still one is struck by the cost of the war in terms of human life and property. Out of an Estonian army of more than 80,000 men, 3,588 were killed and 13,755 were wounded. This is a casualty rate of almost 30 percent, exclusive of the ravages inflicted upon the civilian population. Yet all this suffering was not in vain: the Soviet-Estonian Peace Treaty was signed on February 2, 1920, and the Estonians' struggle for independence was crowned with success.

During the 1920's the young republic continued to be the target of Communist subversion and infiltration. Indeed, in 1924 the Soviet Union openly prepared and directed a coup d'etat in the Estonian capital of Tallinn, in an effort to overthrow the existing democratic regime. Soviet troops were massed near the frontier ready to march into Estonia at the expected "invitation" or "appeal" of an insurgent government. Soviet designs, however, were frustrated. The Estonian Government suppressed the uprising and outlawed the Estonian Communist Party. Not until 1940, under the umbrella of the infamous Nazi-Soviet pact, were the Soviets able to impose their will on this small Baltic State. Since World War II, Estonians have lived unwillingly but helplessly under the direct rule of the Soviet Union. Only charlatans could expect us to swallow the myth that this was a "voluntary" act of union with the U.S.S.R. The facts speak differently.

It is important to recall these events on the occasion of the 45th anniversary of Estonian independence, for they remind us of the unfulfilled aspirations of the Estonians and millions of other Baltic citizens for freedom and national self-determination. We were tragically mistaken to think that the struggle for these goals ended with the proclamation of Woodrow Wilson's Fourteen Points and the establishment of the post-Versailles political order in Europe. To the contrary, the struggle against political, economic, and cultural subjugation continues. Of all oppressors in the past, the Soviet Union has offered the most obdurate and hypocritical resistance to the just demands of the Estonians and scores of other peoples. What is theirs by right is the opportunity to decide their own destinies in freedom.

KEATING URGES MORE REALISTIC BIPARTISAN CUBA POLICY

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, it would be unfortunate if the debate on Cuba degenerated into a name calling, political brawl.

What the United States does or refrains from doing in regard to the Soviet base in Cuba may determine the peace and security of the whole world. We must consider this issue as Americans, not as Republicans or Democrats. And our goal must be to find solutions, not to develop campaign fodder for the coming elections.

Let it be conceded that the mistakes in Cuba go back many years to periods of Republican as well as Democratic administrations and that both parties bear a heavy responsibility for the tragic conditions which now exist in Cuba. Let it also be conceded that there are men and women in both parties equally dedicated to the task of ridding this hemisphere of its first Communist military base.

If there is a concerted campaign to exploit the present situation in Cuba for partisan purposes, I refuse to be, as I have refused to be, a participant in any such course. In fact, I have consistently refused to discuss the Cuban problem in political terms, although efforts have been made to goad me into that position. In January 1960, under the Eisenhower administration, I said:

> It is high time for a massive reappraisal of American policies toward Cuba.

In February 1960 I frankly declared:

> Cuba is Russia's and Red China's most noteworthy victim in the Caribbean.

By the same token, I hope that those who put the national interest first now will also repudiate any partisan campaign to discredit every suggestion for dealing with the Communist takeover in Cuba which does not emanate from the White House.

In recent weeks, I have had an opportunity to discuss the Cuban situation with both the Secretary of State and Director of the Central Intelligence Agency. I believe it is correct to say that we all share basically the same view as to the objectives of U.S. policy in Cuba. The real challenge, however, is how to achieve those objectives. My recommendations for a course of action have been transmitted to the President, and I have every reason to believe that they are being given serious and sincere consideration. But in an area such as this, there is no one right course or plan and in my judgment it is very much in the national interest for many alternatives and proposals to be made and considered. That should be the function of the Senate's dialog on Cuba; and if this debate is carried on and viewed in that spirit, I am confident that it will enhance rather than undermine bipartisanship and strengthen rather than weaken our national resolve.

My own judgment is that Cuba is now the No. 1 testing ground in the struggle between international communism and the free world. This is not because of any fear of an invasion of the United States from Cuba, as some have said in an effort to belittle concern with the problem of Cuba. Did anyone fear an invasion of the United States from South Korea if it fell to the Chinese Reds? Does anyone now fear an invasion of the United States from South Vietnam if it should fall to the Communists? We have recognized in these areas and in such places as Greece and Turkey and Lebanon as well as in Berlin, that you cannot appease a tyrant, that the appetite of the Communists is insatiable, and that the only way to prevent the Communists from swallowing up the world piece by piece is to make sure they get indigestion every time they reveal their hunger pains.

Churchill was not acting the part of a warmonger when he uttered his prophetic warnings about Munich. Neither was Harry Truman when he committed the United States to the defense of South Korea, or Dwight D. Eisenhower when he ordered Marines to land in Lebanon, or John F. Kennedy when he took us to the brink of nuclear war during the October missile crisis. These men on those occasions recognized that retreat in the face of danger would increase the danger and multiply the likelihood of an eventual catastrophe. The real warmongers are not those who are determined to forestall aggression at every turn, but those who are ready to surrender to fear in every crisis.

No two situations are entirely alike and there are elements in the Cuban situation which certainly are unique. The Soviet takeover of Cuba was accomplished not by an invasion but by subversion. Obviously, this is a more difficult tactic to detect and forestall, but its consequences are no less grave or menacing. Hitler had his Quislings, and the Communists have their Castros not only in Cuba, but in many areas of the world. We cannot blind ourselves to conquest by subversion or covert aggression, anymore than we can to conquest by overt and naked aggression. The same loss of freedom and expansion of communism is involved in both cases and neither can be tolerated without imperiling world peace. If we condone what has happened in Cuba, how can we possibly prevent the same pattern from repeating itself in British Guiana, after it achieves independence, or in Venezuela or Brazil or Mexico, or in any other country in which Communist agents are busily at work?

It seems to me that the first ingredient of any effective policy with regard to Cuba is that we recognize the nature of the threat. There is no possibility of success in efforts to eliminate the Soviets and their military equipment from this hemisphere if we downgrade the implications of the Cuban takeover. Our allies cannot be expected to join in the kind of concerted action which is necessary to deal with this situation, if important figures in our own country portray the problem merely as an irritant or a nuisance, and indicate a readiness to accept the status quo. Our leaders must make clear, not only to all Americans, but to the whole world, that the Soviet takeover in Cuba presents, at the very least, the same threat to the peace, security, and freedom of the world as the attempted Red takeovers of South Korea, South Vietnam, and the Congo.

We have acted boldly and with great determination in all of those areas, and there is no reason for us to respond with any less vigor to a threat in our own hemisphere just off our own shores. I believe that our partners in the struggle against international communism would fully understand our concern with the Soviet base in Cuba if our views were effectively articulated and skillfully conveyed.

Mr. President, no effort to silence those who want to express their concern about the situation in Cuba today can possibly serve the national interest. The public will not be deceived by charges that Members of Congress are "hectoring"—one spokesman used that word, but I do not know exactly what he meant—the administration or that public discussion of the facts about Cuba gives aid and comfort to the Communists. They will no more be influenced by opportunist cries of "McCarthyism" than by an Izvestia's polemic against "rabid men" sitting in the U.S. Senate. No matter what slurs or insinuations are spread against those speaking out on the Communist menace in Cuba, and I am confident that they will continue to discuss the facts and problems involved in this critical area.

Mr. President, this is in no sense a repudiation of bipartisanship in foreign affairs. The truth is that there is no coherent and consistent policy toward Cuba to which to give bipartisan support. And the truth also is that members of both parties have joined in the criticism of efforts to downgrade the Communist threat in the Caribbean Sea.

I believe it would be more constructive to discuss the merits rather than the motives of this controversy, and that is what I intend to do today.

The dissatisfaction and uncertainty which are evident throughout the Nation today with regard to what is going on in Cuba and what it really means do not stem from congressional statements on the subject. The real cause for the crisis of confidence, the credibility gap, that exists widely throughout the Nation, lies in the complete failure of our Government leaders to articulate a clear and firm policy toward the Soviet takeover in Cuba. This is not a partisan issue or an attempt to lay the blame at anyone's door. As I have said, our mistakes in Cuba go back many years. When Castro came to power, many were unable to decide whether Castro was a Robin Hood or a Mao Tse-tung, whether we should greet him officially or see him privately, whether we should continue the Cuban sugar quota or cut it, or what exactly we should do.

Whatever reason there may have been for hesitation when Castro first came to power, surely events since the end of 1959 have made clear that Castro has sold out the Cuban people and has converted that island into a Soviet military base. It is clear, too, that Khrushchev is prepared to stay in Cuba as long as his position is tolerated. We would do well to put wishful thinking aside, and to face the facts as to what Communist Cuba means today.

The present crisis of confidence with respect to Cuba can be traced directly to an increasing disillusionment with the zigzag policy of improvisation which has characterized the executive branch's pronouncements on this subject. At times, the improvisation has been good, as it was last October, when our Government acknowledged that strategic missile systems were in Cuba, and responded with determination and boldness. At other times, such as the Bay of Pigs, our improvisation was disastrous. In the long run, this policy has inevitably tended to undermine national confidence.

Our zigzag policy over Cuba has left the people in doubt at times as to whether the Communist threat in Cuba was ever regarded as serious by Government officials. There is no need to dwell on past history. But it is interesting to recall that one of the principal reasons given for the Bay of Pigs invasion at the time was the arrival and imminent deployment of a great supply of Soviet weapons, including among them Mig's. In other words, in the early months of 1961, our Government officials were sufficiently concerned over the presence of Mig's in Cuba to proceed with a plan for even military action against Castro. Yet, today we are told that the same Mig's—in fact, even later and better models than those available to Castro in April 1961—are no cause for concern and no threat whatsoever to the United States or to our Latin American friends.

After the Bay of Pigs invasion, the significance of these and other Soviet weapons in Cuba was strongly downgraded. Our policy shifted abruptly. Instead of being a terrible menace, Soviet forces in Cuba were said to be merely a nuisance, and it was said that Castro would wither on the vine if the United States simply ignored him. As a result, for nearly a year after the Bay of Pigs, there was no genuine attempt to put economic pressure on Castro. There was no trade embargo, and there was very little effort to discourage anyone else from aiding or trading with Castro. Our Cuba policy was no policy; we were just to wait and see what would happen next.

Requests for State Department guidance during that period received polite replies indicating that the matter of trade restrictions was being studied, but conclusions were never reached. The standard reply went something like this letter to me, dated July 7, 1961:

> The Department [of State] appreciates your continuing interest in this matter and, as you know, shares your concern that the hostile Castro regime continues to derive benefits from trading with the United States, although on a greatly reduced scale. I can assure you that the administration has the question of Cuban-United States trade relations under intensive study. A final decision on this matter, however, has not been reached at this writing.

Mr. President, the United States did not lift a finger to put an embargo into effect until February of 1962.

The next important development was the intensive Soviet military buildup which began in July of 1962. When I indicated, in a very conservative way, the extent of this buildup and the threat which it offered, I was confronted by a barrage of denials and attacks from various Government spokesmen. These included a written denial from the State Department, dated August 30—I repeat that its date was August 30—stating:

> We have no information that any Soviet bloc troops have landed in Cuba.

To confuse the issue even more, at the same time when we were thus told that there was no evidence "that any Soviet bloc troops have landed in Cuba," other Government sources were claiming, in so-called background press briefings, that the buildup had already been fully revealed. Now, of course, it is admitted that the Soviet buildup was increasing steadily during that period.

I indicated during the same period that Soviet amphibious vehicles were in Cuba. This also was promptly denied by official sources, only to be later confirmed.

When it was suggested that the Soviets might be attempting to link Cuba and Berlin, and devise some kind of a deal to offer the United States in this regard, a virtual tirade of criticism was unleased; but in due course these same critics were contending that the United States must take a more moderate position in Cuba, lest we invite a retaliation on the Western position on Berlin. This new line of reasoning, publicly endorsed by the President, lasted for only about 1 month, at which time it became undeniably clear that the Soviets were putting missiles in Cuba, and did, indeed, hope to gain in Berlin by threatening us from Cuba.

On October 10, when I disclosed information which I had received regarding the construction of medium range missile bases, there were again vigorous denials—not only by public affairs officers, who probably did not know any better, but also by top Government officials, who should be presumed to have known the facts.

In a forthcoming book about Cuba, the statement is made:

> From early August [the Director of the Central Intelligence Agency, Mr. John] McCone had been warning the administration that the Kremlin might try to plant offensive missiles in Cuba.

It is my understanding that this book, which will be published shortly, was cleared with the White House, Department of Defense, and Central Intelligence Agency.

And only now are we publicly told by Secretary McNamara that these missiles arrived on the island of Cuba as early as the middle of September, but without being perceived or reported by American intelligence sources, and that intermediate range bases were also under construction.

When the President finally confronted the Nation with the Soviet missile threat in Cuba, the entire country united behind him and applauded his firm action in forcing withdrawal of the missiles and Ilyushin bombers. The country stood 100 percent behind the President's policies in this crisis and the Soviets backed down.

I well remember where I was on the night of October 22. I was addressing the largest meeting that had ever been held in the city in New York State where I was then speaking. I was addressing a partisan crowd. I had released an address. I scrapped it entirely and devoted my entire effort that evening to a speech in support of the President of the United States in the great crisis which our Nation faced.

Unfortunately, we failed to press our advantage and were unwilling to insist on on-site inspection to make certain that the Soviets were living up to their agreement. As a result of this improvisation of policy, there is doubt again as to just what the Soviets are doing in Cuba.

It is not hard to understand why the American people are confused when they are first told that on-site inspection is essential and then that no such inspection is needed. Let me quote a statement made by the Deputy Secretary of Defense, Roswell L. Gilpatric on November 11, 1962. When he was asked how the United States could be certain that the Soviets left no missiles behind without on-site inspection, Mr. Gilpatric replied:

> We never knew how many missiles were brought into Cuba. The Soviets said there were 42. We have counted 42 going out. We saw fewer than 42. Until we have so-called on-site inspection of the island of Cuba, we could never be sure that 42 was the maximum number that the Soviets brought into Cuba.

Contrast with that statement Secretary McNamara's unqualified assurance that our security is being fully safeguarded without on-site inspection. In his nationwide television presentation, Secretary McNamara declared:

> I am satisfied that there are no major elements of offensive weapons systems in the caves of Cuba. It is unlikely beyond any reasonable doubt that offensive weapons systems equipment could not (sic) have been unloaded and moved into caves without our detection.

And yet he did not deny that the Government had no record of the number of missiles originally brought to Cuba. And it is a fact even now that U.S. knowledge of the cargo of certain vessels landing in Cuba is considerably less than we would like. The Director of the CIA made his position clear when he admitted that without on-site inspection, we can have no absolute assurances that these missiles have been completely removed.

The changing winds of an inconsistent policy also have blown the shipping question in every direction. First, as I have noted, there was an inordinate delay in the imposition of an embargo on U.S. trade with Cuba. As the Soviet military buildup proceeded through the months of August, September, and October of last year, some informal efforts were made to alert our NATO friends or the rest of the free world that this shipping was a threat to the security of the United States and our Western Hemisphere allies. Prior to the imposition of the quarantine in late October, it was widely reported that Government regulations were being drawn up to restrict these shipments, but nothing was done until the beginning of February. Finally, a limited order was announced applying only to the shipping of U.S. Government cargoes from the United States in ships which have visited Cuba since January 1, 1963. This was a step in the right direction, but it is far too early to assess the results now. High officials have said that none of the 12 free world ships which stopped in Cuba in January picked up any U.S. goods—but since the east coast shipping strike did not end until January 26, the fact is not very significant. Shipping data for February, not yet available, should be more revealing. It is, of course, my hope that none of those ships coming in February to supply Castro have been able to profit by taking back cargo from the United States.

Moreover, if our Government really wishes to make shipping more difficult for the Soviet Union and to put a tight economic squeeze on Soviet efforts in Cuba, it should welcome the cooperation of such groups as the International Longshoremen's Association. Our officials should throw their arms around these public-spirited union members who are prepared to sacrifice a measure of their own economic well-being for the sake of a firm U.S. move against communism. The cooperation of the longshoremen is invaluable, but instead of seeking such cooperation, the Department of State is in the peculiar position of berating and restraining a union for attempting to carry out in a determined manner a policy that the State Department is itself carrying out with apparent timidity.

Another area of doubt and uncertainty has been created because of the announced withdrawal of land-based American missiles from Turkey and Italy. When this decision was publicly announced, after a few unfortunate leaks had appeared in the press, it was officially stated that these missile bases were becoming obsolete and that they would be more than replaced by an increase in the Polaris fleet of missile-bearing submarines. This may be sound but it does not jibe with statements made by the Defense Department officials before the Cuban crisis was resolved. For instance, on November 11, Deputy Secretary of Defense Gilpatric declared:

> We don't contemplate closing down any of our foreign bases or oversea bases. I consider all bases we have today as important to us. Our whole NATO base structure is the foundation of our planning both as a—as our national forces and the NATO forces and therefore we have no thought of giving up any of our oversea bases. As of now we need all the weapons we have deployed.

These very strong statements were followed by articles reputedly detailing the inside story of what went on in the White House during the week of the Cuban crisis. These stories criticized Government officials for "Munich" like suggestions that the Turkish and Italian bases be traded in exchange for a Soviet missile withdrawal from Cuba. Naturally, I have no personal knowledge of what went on there, but against this background, is it surprising that doubts have been raised about the proposed withdrawal of missiles from Turkey and Italy? The whole sequence of events raises questions which cannot be avoided.

Let us consider finally the question of Castro-based subversion throughout the Western Hemisphere. First, let us recall the statement made in a fine and stirring speech by the President of the United States directly following the Bay of Pigs invasion:

> The message of Cuba, of Laos, of the rising din of Communist voices in Asia and Latin America—these messages are all the same. The complacent, the self-indulgent, the soft societies are to be swept away with the debris of history. Only the strong, only the industrious, only the visionary can survive. No greater task faces this Nation or this administration. No other challenge is more deserving of our every effort and energy. Too long we have fixed our eyes on traditional military needs, on armies prepared to cross borders or missiles poised for flight. Now it should be clear that this is no longer enough—that our security may be lost without the firing of a single missile or the crossing of a single border.

Again I characterize that as a fine speech and statement by the President of the United States.

On January 31, I declared on the Senate floor:

> What the Soviets are planning to do—in fact they are already doing it—is mount an increasing wave of sabotage, terrorism, political subversion, and agitation throughout Latin America. Already riots in Venezuela, Peru, Brazil, clearly and demonstrably are the work of Communists training and armed in Cuba.

Shortly after my statement, on February 6, Defense Secretary McNamara, in a nationally televised appearance witnessed by millions, was asked specifically about the use of Cuba as a training base for subversion or sabotage. At that time, he made the incredible reply:

> I have no evidence that Cuba is being used as a base for subversion directed against other Latin American countries.

Yet barely a week later, my statement was fully supported and amplified in a 58-page report presented by the Assistant Secretary of State for Inter-American Affairs to the House Foreign Affairs Committee.

And then compare the categorical assurances of the Secretary of Defense—that there was no evidence of the export of subversion or sabotage—also with the testimony of the Secretary of State, and the Director of the CIA, further detailing Cuba's attempts to subvert other Latin American countries. Until Secretary McNamara repudiates his statement and admits that he was wrong, confusion and doubt are bound to continue.

When the nations of this hemisphere first met at Punta del Este 1 year ago, the United States did take the lead in pressing for an embargo between Cuba and the other nations of this hemisphere. Our effort to win Latin American cooperation at that time petered out into a mere statement of condemnation.

And the Punta del Este Conference was generally recognized as not having accomplished very much. But one of the achievements that can be traced to that Conference—practically the only one of substance—was the creation of a committee within the Organization of American States to study the problem of subversion and to make recommendations for action. Now the report has been prepared. The report finally was released last Friday. Ironically, however, it now appears that the United States discouraged the full release of this report, an act which raises the most serious questions about our present confidence and support for the OAS.

Last year, the OAS was criticized for not taking a stronger stand against Castro before the missile crisis.

Those of us who were urging a stronger stand were constantly told, "You can't take a stronger stand because the Latin American countries will not back you up." When the crisis came in October and November, OAS support for the United States was strong and unanimous. Now, a hesitant U.S. policy over this report, over the shipping question, and over the matter of subversion, and other incidents, has weakened the resolve of the OAS. What we should be following is a consistent U.S. policy of mobilizing OAS cooperation in meeting the peril in Cuba, and this is not helped at all by any downgrading of the Cuban threat.

The significance of the 17,000—which is the figure given by the Government officials—Soviet military personnel in Cuba has also been the subject of conflicting interpretations. At first, it was denied that there were any Soviet troops in Cuba. Only after 5,000 had been withdrawn was it conceded that over 22,000 military troops and technicians were known to have been in Cuba at the time of the missile crisis. This is a figure far beyond any figure ever used by me or by others, so far as I know.

In his press conference on February 14, the President suggested that the Soviet technicians or military or paramilitary people in Cuba may be participating in training programs, training other Latins for subversion. It has also been suggested that the Soviet troops may still be in Cuba for the purpose of training Cubans in the operation of some of the weapons systems which remain in that country. For some reason—unknown to me—this is regarded as less of a danger than other activities which they might be undertaking. Yet, throughout the missile crisis, we were told that at least we could take some comfort from the fact that the Soviet retained the medium and intermediate missile facilities completely under their own control. We were told to take comfort from the fact that Khrushchev was a reasonable man who would not plunge the world into nuclear warfare. Now, we are being told to take comfort from the fact that the Soviets have remained in Cuba not to man the new weapons but to train Cubans in their operation and maintenance. Frankly, I cannot take comfort in anything but a complete withdrawal of the Soviets from this hemisphere.

Moreover, I cannot take much comfort from the new effort some Government officials are now making to silence criticism again on the grounds that Khrushchev has already promised to withdraw some of his troops and that continued discussion of the situation may lead him to change his mind. To my mind, this is a complete misreading of events. If Khrushchev has actually promised to withdraw several thousand troops—and we cannot be sure until the text of the note is published and the troops are actually back in the Soviet Union—it will be because of vocal American objections and outrage, not in spite of it. Khrushchev retreats only when he feels the pressure upon him is becoming intolerable. A determined American Nation, vocal in criticism of Soviet imperialism and strong in pressure for action, has always carried more weight with Khrushchev than diplomatic notepassing.

Khrushchev and his emissaries may well say that the present discussion of the Cuban situation makes it difficult for him to withdraw. That is what we would expect of him. But how can anyone familiar with recent history accept this line? Since when has Khrushchev or any other dictator yielded to a policy of appeasement? It is not what we do not say or do not threaten to do that makes an impression on him; it is what he sees we actually mean and will do that persuades him to move, either backward or forward, depending on his interpretation of our intent.

What we have lacked most in Cuba is a long term, consistent, and effective policy for ridding this hemisphere of Soviet conquest. When such a policy is enunciated, it will not lack support from either side of the aisle in this Chamber, or from any segment of the American people. Until that time, however, disunity and national concern are unavoidable. Suggestions by Government spokesmen that the Government has the right to lie on certain occasions of course shake public confidence and aggravate our uncertainty. Assistant Secretary of Defense Sylvester would perform a great service to the Government and American people if he would repudiate this managed news philosophy and restore faith in what our Government's spokesmen say.

To date, some Government officials appear to be more intent in demonstrating that the Assistant Secretary's cynicism was justified. The news has been managed, not only in the moment of crisis, when secret preparations may at time be necessary, but in the weeks and even months before and following the crisis. This management has been obvious even though sometimes indirect. A variety of so-called inside facts are planted designed to play up the drama of events and to play down the inaccurate assessments that made 11th hour action necessary. All the while, there is an attempt to belittle those warning of the continuing Communist threat in Cuba.

I strongly believe in a bipartisan foreign policy. My whole record in this body and the other body demonstrates that. And when the President takes action, either successfully as in October or unsuccessfully as at the Bay of Pigs, he can expect bipartisan support without recriminations of any kind. But there has to be a policy before anyone can complain about a lack of bipartison support. When no action is taken, when no policy is followed other than wait and see, there is absolutely no basis for criticizing Members of Congress of either party for offering their views on this issue.

One Senator who now loudly complains about bipartisanship had this to say in 1961:

> The possibility of Soviet missile bases and jet aircraft bases in Cuba is frequently noted. I suppose we would all be less comfortable if the Soviets did install missile bases in Cuba, but I am not sure that our national existence would be in substantially greater danger. Nor do I think that such bases would substantially alter the balance of power in the world.

Another senatorial critic of the critics said this on September 11, 1962:

> So I do not want the people of my State to lose a night's sleep worrying about the might of Cuba. It is misleading and mischievous to say that Cuba represents a military threat to the United States. Castro can triple or quadruple his imports of Soviet technicians and arms without requiring us to assign a single additional destroyer or fighter squadron to our Caribbean forces.

This was a month and 11 days before October 22, when the President spoke out.

I hope that the Cuba debate will continue. I believe that it will offer enlightenment to those who will listen whether or not they agree with all that they hear. Of course, we must weigh our words with care and do whatever possible to strengthen the President's hand. That is the course I have followed in the past and the course I shall continue to follow until I am convinced that the Communist threat to the peace and security of this hemisphere has been removed.

Whatever our differences in the means to be used, the American people are united in the end to be achieved—peace. But we do not want the peace of communism, the peace of the totalitarian state, the peace of the grave; we want a peace where freedom can flourish and where men can differ without the need to silence their differences by bringing in thousands of troops and establishing missile bases.

The best way to achieve that peace, as we saw only too well from the dismal efforts of the 1930's, is not by appeasement, and not by a policy of retreat that can only encourage the Soviets to attack us elsewhere. Certainly, one of the big lessons of the Cuban crisis of October, for Berlin, and for the rest of the world, is that a strong and determined stand by the United States can ultimately ease tensions. It can show the Soviets that we mean what we say. It can show them that they have nothing to gain by belligerent activities.

In the long run it is paradoxical, but true, that the real peacemakers of this world are not the Neville Chamberlains and the Pierre Lavals who try to make accommodations with an unscrupulous aggressor, but the Winston Churchills, who see the danger in time.

Peace is not something that the Soviets are ever going to give us. It is something that we and the whole free world have to win, through policies which prove to the Soviets beyond doubt that they have nothing to gain by hostility or provocation.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KEATING. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I listened with great interest to the speech of the Senator from New York, as I always do to the speeches he makes on any subject, and most especially in recent months to what he has had to say relative to the Cuban situation.

I am glad that he states he believes in a bipartisan foreign policy, and, of course, I take him at his word, and I know when he says he believes the President's hand should be strengthened he will do what he can in that respect to give him his support.

I did not hear all the Senator's speech, although I was in the Chamber most of the afternoon, but I believe in the beginning he said something about this administration's improvising in the field of foreign policy——

Mr. KEATING. In the Cuban situation. I was dealing only with that facet of foreign policy.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I accept the correction. But I would point out to the Senator that it is pretty hard to lay down a hard and fast policy as to any part of the world where we have difficulties; there are areas in the world which call for discernment on the part of the President, and demand action along various lines from time to time.

The Senator knows better than I do that, in addition to the cancer of Cuba, there is the question of unrest and dissatisfaction, and revolutions of sorts, in Latin America. He knows the situation in Africa is far from settled. He knows the Western alliance is going through some agonizing reconsiderations at the moment.

He knows the situation in the Middle East is quite difficult, especially in view of the recent revolts in Yemen and that country's tie-ups with Egypt. He knows of the more recent revolt in Iraq and the possibility of a tie-up between that country and Egypt. He knows of the delicate situation in south Asia, where we find the Pakistanis and the Indians meeting over the question of Kashmir. He knows of the situation between the Indians and the Chinese, resulting from the Chinese aggression of last fall.

We see the situation in southeast Asia, where we have something like 12,000 troops in South Vietnam.

We know of the precarious situation in Laos, whose King, Sri Savang Vatana, honors us with a state visit today. We know of the ever-present danger in the Formosan Straits, to Taiwan, and the ever-present danger in Korea, where we have two military divisions stationed this side of the 38th parallel.

These are matters which the President—not merely President Kennedy, but any President—must contend with during his tenure of office. These are problems no President can throw back on his predecessor, nor should he, because once he assumes office he assumes full responsibility.

But it is difficult to lay down a hard-and-fast policy in one area in view of the way conditions in the world are changing today.

While the Senator from New York may not have said so, he indicated that there was a question raised at a time subsequent to the Cuban crisis of a "deal" which would cover both Cuba and Berlin. I say that, to the best of my knowledge, there never was any deal. I say also—and I am glad to see the assistant minority leader, the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL], in the Chamber—that when we met with the President on October 22 at his request, and came back here from all parts of the country—the Senator from California, I believe, came back from the Pacific coast—the leadership was then told what the facts were, and there was a strong possibility raised that the reaction might well be against Berlin. We understood that perfectly. We understood all the implications involved. We understood that if anything happened at Berlin, this country would almost certainly be engaged in nuclear war. The people knew it, too.

Most important, Mr. Khrushchev knew it. And because of that, these missile sites were destroyed and the IRBM, the medium-range ballistic missiles, were withdrawn.

I note that the Senator stated—and I hope I am not taking too much of his time, because I did not hear all of his speech—that on October 10 he warned of the IRBM's on Cuba and that the information was not given to the American people or to the leadership until 12 days later—which is correct; but I would point out that when the leadership was called back to Washington on the 22d of October, we were told by the President that on the preceding Tuesday, when he had received his information from the Director of Central Intelligence, Mr. John McCone, he had ordered more photo reconnaissance, flown at lower levels, to make absolutely certain that the initial information given to him was accurate.

When he was absolutely sure in his mind, he sent out a call to both the Republican and the Democratic leadership. We did not know what it was all about. We came back to Washington and we were told the facts at that time.

I am sure that even though the Senator from New York made the statement, as he says, on October 10, that there were ICBM's on the island of Cuba——

Mr. KEATING. May I interrupt the Senator at that point?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Yes.

Mr. KEATING. I did not say that there were missiles there. I said there were medium-range missile sites under construction.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Medium-range missile sites under construction. I accept the correction. If I remember correctly, the 22d was Monday. Therefore Sunday was the 21st, Saturday the 20th, Friday the 19th, Thursday the 18th, and that it was on the 16th of October that the President received his first information from Mr. McCone. It was on the following Sunday, the 21st, that he finally corroborated that information and was absolutely certain in his own mind that it was correct.

It was on that day that he sent out the call for the leadership to come to Washington.

On the next day he laid the story before us, and that evening he laid it before the American people.

In the meantime, when he received his first information on October 16, he immediately ordered the Strategic Air Command on an ever-ready alert. He also ordered the embarkation of marines at Pendleton, Calif. When the leadership met with the President on Monday, those marines, if my memory serves me correctly, were at sea for 4 days on the way through the canal, and from there, of course, they would go to the Caribbean.

The Director of Central Intelligence, a man for whom I have great admiration and respect, did notify the President at the first chance and did bring to him all available information he had at his disposal.

I mentioned the fact that on the 22d the leaders on both sides were called in by the President.

The leadership on both sides was called in many times before October 22, and the latest time we were called in, from both sides, was one day last week.

The Senator from New York said, in effect, that Mr. Gilpatrick and Mr. McNamara made certain statements about onsite inspections; that Under Secretary Gilpatrick is supposed to have said, "We are never sure," and that Secretary McNamara was quoted as having said he was "reasonably satisfied."

I see nothing wrong with these statements attributed to Mr. Gilpatrick and Mr. McNamara. They, too, depend on the same kind of information upon which the President depends, and that is furnished by Mr. McCone as coordinator of all intelligence activities. That means that the intelligence activities of the Defense Department are brought to Mr. McCone's attention.

I wonder who is ever sure that he is right about such things. I wonder if Secretary McNamara, in stating he was "reasonably satisfied" was not in fact making an accurate and honest statement. I am sure he was. Unfortunately, it is true that onsite inspection has not come about, but I believe it is also true that on a daily basis further reconnaissance is taking place, and we are as well aware of what is going on on the island of Cuba as we can be, minus onsite inspection.

The Senator from New York mentioned the longshoremen embargo on certain ships.

I invite the Senator's attention to a fact which I learned in the civics course, namely, that the conduct of the foreign policy of this country is in the hands of the President of the United States, who delegates that authority on occasion to the Secretary of State, and is not in the hands of a labor union. I think that ought to be kept in mind.

There are limits as to what should and should not be done. The President and the Secretary of State conduct American foreign policy.

The Senator also mentioned something about the withdrawal of missiles from Turkey and Italy, and said that such withdrawal is at odds with previous Defense Department statements. Of course it is. The matter of withdrawing Jupiter missiles from Italy and Turkey was considered long before the Cuban crisis of last October. Certainly nothing was to be said at that time which would indicate that the Jupiter missiles were to be withdrawn, just as the Thor missiles were to be withdrawn from England, and were to be replaced by the Polaris missile. I believe the administration acted in good faith at that time and that the Defense Department made the only kind of statement that could have been made. Very likely because of the Cuban crisis the Jupiter missiles were maintained, in Italy and Turkey especially, longer than they would have been, because of the critical situation which arose.

The Senator also mentioned something about the note which Mr. Khrushchev sent to the President, and he indicated, not some doubt about it, but that he had not seen its contents. The text of the Khrushchev note, not to the President, but to the State Department, was read in part at the leadership meeting last week. It was read several times. It was indicated in that note that it was the intention of the Soviet Union to withdraw "several thousand" of the Soviet troops and technicians in Cuba.

Mr. KEATING. If the Senator will permit me to inquire at that point—and I would not want him to answer me at all if he feels he should not—I should like to ask whether Khrushchev's statement was that they intended to withdraw them or that they promised to withdraw those troops?

Mr. MANSFIELD. That question I could not answer definitely, to be honest about it. I do not believe it was a hard and fast promise. As I recall, it was something pretty close to that.

I would not even be mentioning this today, and I know the Senator would not be either, if the news story had not appeared the next day after this so-called secret meeting. I must confess in all honesty that I cannot specifically answer the question of the Senator in that respect.

The Senator says that we lack a long-term consistent policy in Cuba. It is hard to develop a long-term consistent policy in any part of the world. Events make the most careful policies of little use to us. As I indicated in the earlier part of my remarks, I wish it were possible to lay down a pat policy, to operate it on a checks-and-balance basis, and to be sure that the policy, in spite of changing situations, would be successful.

I point out—and the Senator knows this better than I—that the United States has become the leader of the free world, not from choice, not because it sought the role, but because of necessity—in other words, it had no choice.

We shall make some mistakes as we go along. We have made plenty so far, and we will make some in the future. However, I believe we are learning, too.

Of course I agree with the Senator that there should be no appeasement and no retreat. I agree with him on the fine words he has to say about one of the world's great statesmen, Winston Churchill. However, I would also say that in the Presidency we have a man of courage, tenacity, and understanding, a man who is learning a good deal about some of the problems the hard way, a man who will make mistakes on occasion, but a man who always has the interest of the United States at heart first.

He is the man who will look after the best interests, the security, and the well-being of not only the 185 million Americans who live in this country, his own fellow citizens, but also of the people who live in countries which are dependent, through alliances and other arrangements, on the United States.

So I hope that the Senator from New York will continue to be constructive in his statements. I am glad he has said that he believes in a bipartisan foreign policy. I am sure he does. I am glad he has said he will do what he can to strengthen the President's hand. I believe we ought to think of our own country first, and never America last. I believe that all of us—Democrats and Republicans alike—have that thought in mind. If we criticize, as Democrats have done under a Republican administration, and as Republicans have criticized, and will continue to criticize, under a Democratic administration, I hope that the criticism will be constructive and that where fault is found, alternatives will be offered. I feel, deep down in my heart, that that will be the attitude of the Republican critics; and I feel also that they will not attack the President or his policy in Cuba, or elsewhere, merely for the sake of criticizing.

I thank the distinguished Senator from New York for yielding to me and giving me the opportunity to make this statement at this time.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I express my gratitude to the distinguished majority leader for his comments. I am sure he does not need to be told that at no time in any of my comments on the Cuban situation was one word ever uttered impugning the motives, the patriotism, or the sincerity of the President of the United States or any other Government leader who might differ with my position.

Furthermore, I am sure the Senator from Montana, who is familiar with my record both in the Senate and in the other body, knows that I am completely sincere when I say that I believe in and have always supported a bipartisan foreign policy. No one has ever suggested, however, that a bipartisan foreign policy requires us to refrain from all discussion of our foreign policy and I have not hesitated to criticize when a Republican President was in the White House, if I felt criticism was justified—and there were times when I felt it was; and I think it is proper to criticize now when criticism is justified. Of course, many Senators on the other side of the aisle have, in deed and in fact, criticized certain aspects of our present policy. The distinguished majority leader himself has been critical of the lack of a sound, long-term policy in southeast Asia, to give one example.

I agree that at times, we must, improvise. I pointed out in my speech—and I call this to the attention of the Senator from Montana, because he said he did not hear all that I said—instances in which I considered the improvisation good, and instances in which I thought it was bad.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I recall the Senator doing that. I was speaking in general terms.

Mr. KEATING. But I also think we need basic guidelines of policy. We need to know how we plan to deal with particular problems on a long-range basis, whether to ignore them or devise long range and immediate means to combat them. Frankly, I think some of our efforts to gain the support and cooperation of our allies in Latin America and of our NATO allies in a long-range policy with respect to the Cuban situation have been disappointing. I believe that concerted action at the very least should be vigorously attempted. I hope it will succeed.

I believe it will succeed if it is properly presented. In doing so, the worst thing in the world is to try to downgrade the crisis and downgrade the Soviet buildup in Cuba. If the news with reference to the crisis in Cuba is to be managed, it might better be done by building up the Soviet menace rather than downgrading it, but there is no need to exaggerate any of the facts to convince the world of the serious implications of the present situation.

The Senator from Montana referred to alternatives. I agree with him that those who are critical of a particular policy, normally should be prepared to advance constructive alternatives. That is exactly what the junior Senator from New York has done. My recommendations for dealing with this crisis have been presented to the Director of the Central Intelligence Agency, who stated he came to me at the request of the President.

I have given him my recommendations—which certainly are not infallible—for dealing with this situation. None of these recommendations involves military action against Cuba. Last Wednesday I received a call from the Director of the Central Intelligence Agency, indicating that the President felt that at this time it might be harmful to the national interest to have those recommendations made public. When the Commander in Chief makes a statement like that to a Senator, I believe it is entitled to respect. Therefore, I have not made public the recommendations which I have transmitted to the President.

Most of the other points made by the distinguished Senator from Montana are dealt with in my remarks. One point I would like to emphasize, however, is that there is no desire on the part of the junior Senator from New York to belittle a crisis anywhere in the world or to indicate that the resolution of any of these problems is easy. It is not easy; it is difficult. But in my judgment, firm action in Cuba is more likely to prevent such crises than a position of weakness. I believe the results of the October confrontation proved this conclusively.

I now wish to say a word concerning the reference to the Longshoremen's Union. I agree with the distinguished Senator from Montana that we cannot leave the determination of our foreign policy to a labor union.

But when a labor union takes what it believes to be a public-spirited position in regard to the handling of Communist cargo, I believe that instead of being pilloried and attacked, it might be more in the interest of our country if the union were called in, and if the matter were discussed with the union. Certainly it was voicing general sentiment among many of the people of this country.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield at this point?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HRUSKA in the chair). Does the Senator from New York yield to the Senator from Montana?

Mr. KEATING. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Relative to the attitude of the Longshoremen's Union, I would agree with the latter part of the Senator's statement; namely, that there should be discussion of these matters, there should be consideration of the foreign policy of our country, and there should also be recognition as to where the responsibility for the conduct of our foreign policy lies.

As for the Longshoremen's Union being pilloried, I had not heard of that; this is the first indication I have had that anything of that sort was happening to the Longshoremen's Union. As a matter of fact, it seems to me that I have heard more praise of the union than anything else.

But let me point out the difficulty: If a Longshoremen's Union or any other union can operate on this basis, what is there to prevent a businessman's union or a housewives' union, or some other union from operating in the same way? Is a businessman's union or a housewives' union to conduct the foreign policy of our country? The Constitution clearly states that the President of the United States is the one who has that responsibility; and the one who acts for him is the Secretary of State.

Even Senators are circumscribed to some extent, because the power of the Senate in the field of foreign policy was set forth quite clearly in the Constitution. Although that power of the Senate has been broadened in recent years, it has been broadened, not because of what the Constitution states or does not state, but because of the fact that our country has become the world's major power, and also because of the fact that, as the years pass, control of the purse strings is becoming more and more important in connection with foreign policy.

So, Mr. President, although I would not wish to disagree with the statement the Senator from New York has just made, I would point out that too many foreign-policy cooks can spoil the broth, and the result of that would not be beneficial either to our country or to the rest of the free world.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I agree that we could not have a labor union or a businessman's group or any other group of private individuals determine our foreign policy. But my recollection of the position taken by the longshoremen is that it was in accordance with our announced policy to discourage other nations from supplying Castro. I believe that voluntary organizations can do a great deal of good in support of an announced policy.

The announced policy of our Government was not being wholeheartedly carried out by our Government. Perhaps the longshoremen went too far; but they "picked up the ball," which seemed to many to have been dropped by the Government in carrying out its own policy. Sometimes the Government announces a policy, but then is not too careful about enforcing it.

I know that the Senator from Montana would—as would almost any other Senator—recognize that when Congress passes a foreign aid bill which contains some of the "sense of the Congress" amendments, we mean that we expect that they will be lived up to, although we are not tying the hands of the administrators of the program. But many times, Mr. President, after a policy of that sort has been announced, after the measure has been signed by the President, and after it is said that that is the announced policy of the Government, still what is done could not be recognized as a part of that Government policy. Such instances have occurred during previous administrations—namely, that after Congress passes a foreign aid bill containing certain "sense of the Congress" provisions, it is found that that is the end of any action on that score.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield for a brief comment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BAYH in the chair). Does the Senator from New York yield to the Senator from California?

Mr. KEATING. I yield.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I rather like the phrase "loyal opposition," which is used in the Government of the United Kingdom to describe the party out of power. I think it actually means about the same as the old American axiom that "politics stop at the water's edge." For, Mr. President, the liberty which you and I enjoy in this country is not partisan in nature, and the responsibility to defend it must be exercised by all our countrymen, Republicans and Democrats, and all others.

Mr. President, the junior Senator from New York has served this country in peace and in war. He has spoken out firmly and honorably, time and time again, in regard to the grave and dangerous problem in Cuba and elsewhere, as he has seen the light. Today, once again, he has made a great contribution in the comments which have been made by him on this floor.

I, myself, hope to speak later on some of these problems; but at this time I wish to refer briefly to my colleague's comments. I speak as an American, not as a partisan. My comments would be exactly the same if I sat on the side on which my friend the Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNAMARA] sits.

The distinguished Senator from New York recalls the comment made last November by a responsible, able, patriotic member of the executive branch of the Government; namely, a comment in regard to missile bases maintained for a lengthy period of time overseas, by agreement with the European countries involved, because the maintenance of those bases was deemed to be in the interest of the defense of those countries and also in the interest of the defense of our own country. The comment made by a very able American—the Deputy Secretary of Defense—was, "Those bases are not going to be closed down." But shortly thereafter, Mr. President, we were told that they were going to be closed down.

I am no military expert. I come here as a lay Senator. But it is difficult for me, and, I think, for the American people to understand an abrupt change of that sort; and I congratulate my friend, the Senator from New York, for talking about it.

I returned to the capital of our country last October when the White House asked me to. I was asked to do so because I have been permitted by my Republican colleagues to be their whip. There was then a magnificent exhibition by Americans representing the legislative branch of the Government of the United States, both those who belong to the Democratic Party and those who belong to the Republican Party. Our people stood together in time of danger.

Mr. President, certainly no one in this country has any greater bitterness than does this Senator when he recalls that the Foreign Minister of the Soviet Union told our President a falsehood in the White House, when he told the President of the United States, "We do not have in Cuba any weapons that are offensive in character, and we do not contemplate having in Cuba any weapons offensive in character." He made a false statement—indeed, several—to our President.

When the junior Senator from New York comments in his speech that the leader of our Government is the President of the United States, whether he belongs to one party or the other, he is eternally correct. We need to weigh our words with care. We must do whatever is possible to strengthen the hand of the President. For that reason, a year ago the distinguished Senator from New York indicated in the Senate that the time had come to write into law a prohibition against American trade and shipping with the infamous Castro regime, so far as it lay within the power of the American people through their Congress to prevent it. The Senator from New York was on the floor of the Senate last year, fighting for proposed legislation which is now the law of our land in the amendments that were written into the Mutual Security Act to prevent such shipping.

The Senator from New York was on the floor of the Senate, acting not as a partisan, but as an American when the resolution relating to Cuba passed the Congress, stating to the American people and to the world that the legislative branch of the Government of the United States was behind the commander in chief of our country in a policy of firmness, indicating that the American people and the American Government would not and will not tolerate any attempt to convert that unhappy and disgraced Communist island into a launching pad for nuclear weapons. Communism must be extirpated from this hemisphere.

I share the inward pride of every Senator and every other American in our country when I recall that the President of the United States, in his message last October, said with firmness that our country would hold the Soviet Union responsible if missiles were launched from Cuba against any part of the Western Hemisphere.

There will not be any carping criticism in the Senate on this side of the aisle. At any rate, there should not be. There will be constructive criticism, I hope and believe.

I have listened with great interest to the vigorous and searching comments that the Senator from New York has made today. I want particularly to point out the almost nonsequitur with respect to one of our defense policy decisions—or announcements—only to see it, apparently, overruled a short time thereafter. We want our country strong so that it may remain free. I trust my Government to act as it believes is in the best interest of our people, but the missile base situation in Europe, the seeming switch is most puzzling. I salute the Senator from New York for getting up and saying so—to indicate that we share an apprehension caused by statements which are made on one day to indicate a certain course of action and to find subsequently that a diametrically opposed course of action is to be followed.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I thank my friend the distinguished Senator from California for his comments.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KEATING. I yield to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. COOPER. It was my good fortune to be present in the Senate Chamber last August, when the distinguished junior Senator from New York [Mr. KEATING] made his speech notifying the Senate, and I think the Nation, of the presence of Soviet troops and offensive weapons in Cuba. Others have spoken on the subject since that time.

Because the statement of the Senator from New York at that time turned out to be correct, I have followed everything he has said with great interest and confidence. I believe that the facts have demonstrated that when the Senator from New York has spoken, he has done so on the basis of careful study and of knowledge.

I have said here and in other places that I thought the Senator has always spoken responsibly and I think that responsibility is necessary. I pay my tribute to the Senator because he has spoken with a desire to be responsible and constructive.

The Senator from New York has spoken of bipartisanship. There is always debate about what bipartisanship means. Opinion in the country has been aroused in this case, I believe, because of the obvious fact of Cuba's proximity, the missile threat last fall, and the continuing uncertainty aroused by the presence of Soviet troops.

Bipartisanship can bear upon this situation, and be helpful in strengthening policy and supporting the President in his decisions. The first condition of bipartisan support is the responsibility of the administration to provide to the people, and to the Congress, the greatest amount of information possible within the limits of security. I always feel better if the information comes directly from the President of the United States, the Secretary of State, and the Secretary of Defense, rather than from news articles based on information perhaps supplied by the administration. Not knowing the source, we cannot really say that it is correct or incorrect.

So I believe the first responsibility for bipartisanship is that of the administration. Then I believe responsibility attaches to all of us.

There is great temptation to speak on the subject of Cuba, because we know that it is a serious situation. But there is also a responsibility to be constructive about it.

I believe a policy could be developed to deal with the problem of Cuba. Two weeks ago today, in one of the few speeches I have made on the subject, I suggested that for the immediate future the crux of policy is to urge the withdrawal of the Soviet troops and this the President is doing. Then, I suggested we should develop a policy in relation to the hemisphere, which would exclude Soviet bases.

We know the means for the implementation of policy are in the hands of the Executive. And thus another important element of bipartisanship comes into play. The President must have elbow room, as the majority leader said the other day. He must have the elements of maneuverability, so that the United States will not be forced into a position in which it could find no alternative except war, unless our security is absolutely at stake. Today, I believe the Congress must afford the President such room to conduct foreign policy, and to make decisions—decisions respecting Cuba.

These are great issues. The Senator from New York has contributed effectively to the discussion of the problem of Cuba. I know that such will be his course in the days to come.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I wish to express my deep gratitude to the distinguished Senator from Kentucky. There is no one in this Chamber, on either side of the aisle, who has more universal respect for his views and his innate good intentions than the Senator from Kentucky.

I am sure that his views and mine as to the necessity for responsible discussion are the same. Whether we would reach exactly the same conclusion as to the method of dealing with the situation is neither here nor there, nor is that question before us today.

I read the remarks made by the distinguished Senator from Kentucky with great interest. I know he has made a distinct contribution to this discussion and that he is capable of making more contributions in the future, particularly in the field of foreign relations. He has had a wealth of experience not only as a Senator but also as a distinguished ambassador.

No commendatory words would mean more to the junior Senator from New York than those just uttered by my friend from Kentucky.

ROBERT LEROY COCHRAN

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, death this past weekend claimed one of Nebraska's most distinguished citizens, the Honorable Roy Cochran.

Governor Cochran was the first chief executive in Nebraska's history to serve three consecutive terms. He came to the Governor's office after an outstanding career as its chief highway engineer.

Upon his retirement as Governor, he continued his public service, first as an Army colonel and commander of Fort Leonard Wood, Mo., then as a consultant on highway matters to the Federal Bureau of the Budget, a position which recognized his eminence in his field. And even during his term here in Washington, he was called to still further service when the late Dwight Griswold, one of our former colleagues, prevailed upon him to take a leave of absence to assist the Greek Aid Mission, which Governor Griswold headed.

It would have been reasonable to expect that upon retirement from these Federal positions, Governor Cochran would have considered his obligation to public service more than fulfilled.

But that was not the case. Governor Cochran responded to a call to return to his old position as Nebraska highway engineer when a particularly difficult situation arose there about 3 years ago.

Those of us who were privileged to know and work with Governor Cochran were not surprised at this evidence of the deep feeling he held toward serving the people of his State, in whatever way he could. There is no previous record of a former Governor returning to work in a subordinate position in State government.

But this was characteristic of Governor Cochran. So long as he was able, he was willing to serve. I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD the article from the February 23, 1963, issue of the Omaha World-Herald, together with an editorial from the Lincoln Journal of the same date, entitled, "Nebraska's Loss," describing the distinguished career of one of Nebraska's finest public servants.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COCHRAN DIES; WAS GOVERNOR—HAD 45 YEARS OF PUBLIC SERVICE

Robert LeRoy Cochran who went from a sodhouse on Nebraska's plains to the Governor's mansion in Lincoln, died at 5 a.m. Saturday in a Lincoln hospital.

He was 77, having observed his last birthday on January 28.

Mr. Cochran, who became Nebraska's 24th Governor in 1935, also for many years was Mr. Highway of Nebraska. He was Nebraska State engineer for 12 years, starting in 1923. In 1959 he returned to the position.

SUFFERED STROKE

In all, he logged 45 years of public service.

Mr. Cochran, in a hospital since last December 20 when he suffered a severe stroke, had been active until last October, when he suffered a slight stroke.

Born in Cass County, Roy Cochran, after his mother's death, traveled across the State by covered wagon with his father and grew up on a Lincoln County farm between Brady and North Platte.

He got his early schooling in a small sod shanty near his home. Graduating from Brady High School, he sold his pony for $70, walked 20 miles to a railroad depot and boarded a train for Lincoln and the University of Nebraska.

SERVED OVERSEAS

Working his way through school, he was graduated with a bachelor's degree in civil engineering in 1910.

After two terms as Lincoln County surveyor, he was appointed a State bridge inspector and 2 years later was promoted to deputy State engineer.

After time out for World War I service overseas, Mr. Cochran returned, was married, and in 1923 was appointed State engineer by Gov. Charles W. Bryan.

In 1934, after considerable urging Mr. Cochran entered the gubernatorial arena. Running as a Democrat, he won the nomination over a field of nine candidates.

He was elected Governor by about 22,000 votes over Dwight Griswold. He was to defeat Mr. Griswold once more and then serve a third term after defeating Charles J. Warner and Charles W. Bryan, who was running by petition.

He sought election to the U.S. Senate in 1940 but lost to Hugh Butler.

After leaving the Governor's mansion, Mr. Cochran returned to Army service as a colonel and for a time was commanding officer at Fort Leonard Wood, Mo.

In October 1945, he was summoned to serve the Federal Government. He held various jobs for 10 years with the Bureau of the Budget, except for a 7-month stint when he responded to a request by old friend Dwight Griswold to be Deputy Greek Aid Administrator.

HIGHWAY WORK

Mr. Cochran was twice chairman of the Conference of State Governors and was former president of the Council of State Governments.

He was the father of Nebraska's modern highway system.

And he was largely responsible for getting Nebraska out of the mud. In 1923, when he became State engineer, there were fewer than 100 miles of surfaced roads in Nebraska, including gravel.

When he left office as Governor in 1941, Nebraska had 3,500 miles of concrete and oil-topped roads and nearly 5,000 miles of gravel.

GREAT GOVERNOR

Later, as State engineer at 73, he was to help direct interstate highway work.

Saturday Governor Morrison said: "The State has lost one of its great Governors and outstanding public servants, a distinguished Nebraskan who contributed much to his State and country."

Mr. Cochran was a member of St. Matthew's Episcopal Church in Lincoln and the Masonic Lodge.

Survivors include his wife, Aileen, a son, Robert L., Jr., Lincoln; a daughter, Mrs. Lee Grimes, Oxnard, Calif., and seven grandchildren. Services will be at 10 a.m. Tuesday at St. Matthew's Church in Lincoln.

NEBRASKA'S LOSS

As it must to all men, death has come to former Gov. Roy Cochran. Nebraskans in all corners of the State will feel a touch of sadness. Mr. Cochran, though he held many important jobs in the National Government, was a Nebraskan, first, last, and always.

He was a symbol of rugged individualism. He had known the hardship of the earlier days. He was a builder and a believer in the future of Nebraska and Nebraskans. He served 12 years as State engineer and 6 years as Governor.

When he retired from Federal service, he came back to Nebraska to make his home.

At a time when he could have sat back and enjoyed the fruits of his long and successful life, he consented to return to State government as State engineer in the Brooks administration. When he found himself out of tune with that administration he resigned with dignity.

Few men were more widely known and affectionately regarded than Mr. Cochran. He was a man of deep convictions, sometimes out of tune with the latter-day policies of his Democratic Party.

Most of all he was a man of the people, a man who respected the dignity of all men.

RECOGNITION OF WAR CORRESPONDENTS

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, I am pleased to join in the sponsorship of S. 869, which has been introduced by the junior Senator from Oregon [Mrs. NEUBERGER]. This measure authorizes the burial of war correspondents in national cemeteries.

I ask unanimous consent that my name be added as a cosponsor on the next printing.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the name of the Senator from Nebraska will be added as a cosponsor on the next printing of S. 869.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, this seems to me to be an appropriate, if somewhat inadequate, recognition of the brave men and women who exposed themselves to the same dangers, hardships, and sacrifices as our fighting men, in order that they could send their eyewitness accounts of the war to our newspapers, magazines, and radio.

When we hear the term "war correspondent" we may be inclined to think of a dashing fellow in a trenchcoat and what the Air Corps called a 50-mission cap, dashing off cables on the big picture of the war. There were, indeed, such men.

But by far the greater number were in the mold of the late Ernie Pyle, dressed in a wrinkled and muddy wool uniform, sharing a foxhole with a scared and lonely infantryman from a little town most of us never heard of.

The war correspondent's life was never so glamorous as the movies would have us believe. This was especially true in the island-hopping campaign in the Pacific where mere survival was a task and getting one's copy filed next to impossible.

In approving S. 869, the Congress will be recognizing the war correspondent for what he was—a soldier, a sailor, an airman—who contributed a great deal to the writing of history and keeping the public informed.

THE COST-PRICE SQUEEZE ON THE AMERICAN FARM FAMILY

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, the value of a legislator's mail is often talked about. In spite of its heavy volume and the sometimes tedious nature of assembly line or generated mail, it serves as an indispensable link between the legislator and the people he represents.

Every once in a while there comes to our desk a message which is especially clear and effective—striking at the very core of a situation and expressing the innermost concern of the author.

The other day such a letter came to me, registering in simple but heartfelt words the distress of a farm wife who is part of a team on a midwestern farm, courageously battling with hard work and constant optimism, but with disappointing progress. This is the life of a Nebraska farm family.

The letter treats of a theme which has become tragically familiar; namely, the financial beating being taken by today's farmers. For the past 10 years farm commodities have brought about the same price, but the things the farmer must buy have gone up so terrifically. For example, to quote from this letter:

> When beginning to farm (1951) our tractor cost $1,500; now the same size tractor costs $4,500.

And a little later on:

> Maybe the surplus farm products would be used up if groceries would be down in line with what farmers get for their products * * * what seems so unfair is this for example—we get 20 to 30 cents a dozen for eggs and in grocery stores they charge 40 to 50 cents.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be set out at this point in the RECORD the entire text of this letter from Mrs. Edwin Krepel, of Howells, Nebr.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

> HOWELLS, NEBR.,
> *February 12, 1963.*
>
> DEAR SENATOR HRUSKA: First let me introduce myself, Mrs. Edwin Krepel, from Howells, Nebr. We had the privilege of seeing you in Howells on its 75th jubilee celebration last June. This letter will be far from a formal one for which I apologize but this letter is more a person-to-person chat.
>
> My husband and I live on a 235-acre farm which we rent. Let me begin this way—farmers are taking a terrific financial beating. Ever since we started farming (1951) farm commodities are quite the same price—corn $1 to $1.30—hogs $15 to $20 (and $20 is gotten very seldom); cattle never got over $30 and that price was obtained by few, very few farmers, for only a short time did that price hold. But take things farmers buy—for instance tractors. When beginning to farm our tractor cost $1,500—now the same size tractor costs $4,500. This goes all the way down the line of machinery. Maybe the surplus farm products would be used up if groceries would be down in line with what farmers get for their products. If meat, eggs, etc., would be priced lower then city people could afford to buy more. I believe in this theory very much. What seems so unfair is this—for example—we get 20 to 30 cents a dozen for eggs—and in grocery stores they charge 40 to 50 cents. This spread on farm to grocery price goes on down the line of products farmers sell. What would help farmers is to have the price of machinery down. Then more farmers could buy more.
>
> I don't think it's right for professional men—lawyers, doctors, etc.—to buy cattle and farms for investments. They make more money than the farmers and don't give the farmers a chance. The farmers don't pry in their businesses—why should they? If they buy farms, they should be taxed double. Maybe this letter won't be given any consideration, but we're urged to write our Representatives and Senators. Please try your hardest to help the farmer out of this plight by getting some legislation started to help us—maybe by suggesting some of the things I did.
>
> Thank you for taking time out of your busy life to read my letter.
>
> Sincerely,
>
> MRS. EDWIN KREPEL.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, such a letter is difficult to answer. What indeed is the answer to her appeal—

> Please try your hardest to help the farmer out of this plight by getting some legislation started to help us.

There are two developments since the first of the year which are deserving of comment.

PRESIDENT ABANDONS COMPULSORY FEED GRAIN CONTROLS

A year ago at this time, the Congress and all of the farm world were in something of an uproar about the compulsory feed grains program proposed by Secretary Freeman. It was defeated. The Congress rejected it. That was good.

In the President's farm message delivered to Congress on January 31 of this year, it was gratifying to note the abandonment of that objectionable and unworkable compulsory feed grains program approach. In its place, the President calls for legislation authorizing a voluntary program, flexible enough to meet varying conditions and needs, and based upon the same basic principles which have proven successful in the past 2 years.

This change in concept is a distinct gain in the farm legislative picture. It makes much more sense. If care is taken in drafting the farm bill, we will have much more workable and acceptable legislation.

INFLATION CAUSES ARE CONTINUED

It can be seen from Mrs. Krepel's letter that the very basis of the complaint is one-sided inflation applying to things the farmer must buy. The tractor which cost $1,500 in 1951 and now costs $4,500 shows how disastrously the purchasing power of the dollar has shrunk.

The largest single cause of inflation is heavy Government spending and continued deficits.

The budget proposed for next fiscal year calls for $99 billion in spending. This is $18 billion more than the amount recommended for spending by President Eisenhower in his last budget message only 2 years ago. This $18 billion difference represents an increase of over 20 percent.

The deliberately planned deficit—the shortage betwen spending and Government revenues—is $12 billion. The President has indicated that there will not be a balanced budget sooner than about 1967. There are many competent economists who believe it will not be balanced for another 10 years under the course of financing which the President outlined in his budget message. If the President's spending-taxing plan is adopted, the Nation will face a decade of deficits.

This is very disheartening, indeed. It means the further encroachment and advance of the inflation about which Mrs. Krepel and her many millions of fellow farm wives complain.

This is a frightful fate to visit upon the Nation's farmers, as well as the rest of America. Consider the testimony of the President's Budget Director, Mr. Gordon, who testified recently that a balanced budget would actually be harmful to the Nation. The senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], a Democrat and chairman of the Finance Committee, has called for the immediate discharge of Mr. Gordon as being one who has fiscal ideas dangerous and unsuitable for the post which he holds.

Mr. President, Nebraskans generally will be found in accord with the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD]. They will be found in accord with the idea that the proper approach is an effort to really reduce Government spending and to make every effort to approximate a balanced budget as soon as possible.

But the administration turns a deaf ear to those who cry for fiscal responsibility. It persists in doing the very things which will defeat continued ravages of that ruinous inflation about which Mrs. Krepel complains.

Mr. President, only a year ago, almost to the day, I stood in this Chamber and attempted to point the way in which our farm policies must be directed. I remain convinced that we shall never really come to grips with the problem until we accept some basic truths about American agriculture:

The first truth is that there is great competition within the industry we call farming. Only highly restrictive and repressive measures that farmers themselves will not accept will dull the edge of this competitive sword. That is to say that, in the ultimate, any attempts to control total farm output is foredoomed to failure.

Second, modern science and technology has committed us to an irrevocable course of abundant production. Progress lies in the direction of that abundance being used effectively, not in its atrophy.

Third, the laws of economics are as immutable as the law of gravity and Ohm's law. We cannot repeal laws of economics any more than we can the physical laws. They were not passed by man. They are the result of human behavior in a free society. And the only way they can be amended is by enslavement.

A recognition of these truths would force us to aim our farm planning toward less control, not more. Managed abundance is a favorite slogan with a slogan-happy administration. Compulsory programs can create only mismanaged scarcity and the destruction, perhaps forever, of real opportunities for progress in agriculture.

We are only a step away from making of agriculture a public utility with a Washington bureaucracy issuing licenses and franchises. If we adopt that we may as well prepare to create a new alphabetical regulatory agency. We will rename the Department of Agriculture the "Rural Office of Planned Economics"; its initials provide the "ROPE" with which the farmer is invited to hang himself.

Fortunately, there are alternatives. One is to set for ourselves the same goals proposed by the President in his message to us, but to start in precisely the opposite direction; that is, toward fewer, not more, Government controls. Let us decide on a transition with order and equity.

We should begin by taking the farmer from the precipice where the Kennedy-Freeman schemes put him with an order of jump, or else, and lead him gradually to the safety of the free and open market.

We should develop a long-range program which each year sees the Government withdrawing more and more, as farmers adjust to the changing situation. During the transition period, the farmer must be assisted financially, and, even more important, he must be supported with sensible programs of research which finds new uses for his products, new markets, and new approaches to reducing his cost of doing business.

The direction toward a solution to our difficulty has already been pointed out. Its ingredients include an effective land retirement program which profits from mistakes of the past and avoids them in the future; elimination of the vicious competition between the farmer and the Government with its hoards of Commodity Credit Corporation stocks; an orderly cutoff of wheat allotments and marketing quotas; a relationship between the support price for wheat and that for corn; limitation of agricultural conservation payments; export payments in kind; support of the parity concept.

Mrs. Krepel's plea—expressed by farm wives and their husbands the Nation over—for "getting some legislation started to help us" cannot be answered wholly by any farm bill, however good it may be. It would be of very little use to increase the farmer's income if concurrent steps were not taken to assure that his costs will not soar to even greater heights.

There should also be restored financial commonsense, fiscal responsibility. That will mean a stable dollar. It will mean greater progress the country over.

I am indebted to Mrs. Krepel for writing so sincerely to remind us of these fundamental truths.

U.S. WHEAT HELPS TO BUILD SCHOOL IN PAKISTAN

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I would like to invite the Senate's attention to an important event which has demonstrated the effectiveness and future potential of the U.S. food for peace program. Surplus wheat supplied the village of Gangu Bahadur in Pakistan by the United States assisted the villagers in the construction of a school building where formerly classes were held in an open courtyard. Villagers donated the funds for the building material, the Pakistani Government made a grant, and 976 bushels of U.S. wheat were given to the village council for labor costs.

The potentialities of this program are enormous. The use of surplus American commodities to assist in the construction of educational facilities in Pakistan and in other countries as well would be of benefit to both ourselves and those countries so aided. The present program in Gangu Bahadur village is a pilot project and is expected to provide information as to the feasibility of expanding donations of food for peace products.

The dedication ceremonies for the school took place at Gangu Bahadur October 29, 1962, while concurrent ceremonies were held in Washington.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in my remarks a press release issued by the Department of Agriculture and the remarks of Secretary of Agriculture Freeman on the occasion of the joint ceremonies.

There being no objection, the release and remarks were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEDICATION CEREMONIES MARK COMPLETION OF SCHOOL U.S. WHEAT HELPED TO BUILD

Ceremonies in Washington and Pakistan today marked completion of a school which U.S. wheat has helped to build for Pakistani children.

While the school was being dedicated in Gangu Bahadur village, Pakistan, there was similar observance of its completion at a U.S. Department of Agriculture ceremony in which Secretary of Agriculture Orville L. Freeman, His Excellency, Aziz Ahmed, Ambassador of Pakistan, and many others participated.

The building of the school, initiated by Secretary Freeman, has shown how U.S. food-for-peace wheat can help provide educational facilities in developing countries.

The Secretary toured the village of Gangu Bahadur, a village near the historic Khyber Pass. He was so impressed with the village and the strong desire to improve the village that he found in his talk with villagers and village officials, especially Malik Mohammed Shafli (chairman of the village council) that the Secretary asked the mayor what the village needed most and he was told a school. The Secretary then told the chairman that if American wheat could help build that school he would try to make the wheat available. That conversation a year ago started a chain of events which resulted in the fine new school of today.

The project was turned over to Wheat Associates, Inc., a major cooperator with the Foreign Agricultural Service in foreign market development. Chairman Shafli, Pakistani cooperator, and Ivan Packard, Pakistan country director of Wheat Associates—U.S.A. Inc., with headquarters in Karachi, Pakistan, gave leadership to the project. The Government of Pakistan and the United States cooperated wholeheartedly.

Approximately 1,000 bushels of U.S. wheat was released from Pakistan Government storage to help pay labor costs. Villagers donated the funds for building material, and their contributions were augumented by a Pakistani Government grant. The school building will accommodate 100 children from six different villages.

Construction and operation of the school is expected to provide information as a pilot project that will prove useful in expanding school construction in Pakistan and possibly other countries.

The Gangu Bahadur School serves six villages in an area about 25 miles from Rawalpindi, the capital of Pakistan and near Taxila, which was an important seat of learning in the second century B.C. Fifteen villages in all comprise the area governed by the Union Council Usman Khattar. The aggregate population is 10,000.

Before the new school building was constructed, classes were held in an open courtyard.

The building covers 1,960 square feet, and includes a kitchen and toilet facilities. Wheat Associates, Inc., will soon institute a school lunch program here in cooperation with the village council.

Total cost of the building was 23,500 rupees ($4,971). The local villagers provided 57 percent of this cost. U.S. wheat, 976 bushels, was given to the village council for labor costs. Total market value of the wheat was $2,114.

Wheat Associates-USA, Inc., is an organization representing U.S. wheatgrowers in Asia, in cooperation with the USDA's Foreign Agricultural Service.

STATEMENT BY SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE ORVILLE L. FREEMAN, AT CEREMONIES IN THE U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE, OCTOBER 29, 1962, HELD IN OBSERVANCE OF THE DEDICATION OF AN ELEMENTARY SCHOOL U.S. WHEAT HELPED TO BUILD IN PAKISTAN

This is a happy occasion, Your Excellency, for us and others assembled here today to rejoice in the completion of the school in Gangu Bahadur village.

I offer you and the people of the village my heartiest congratulations on this day of dedication of your new school. How well I recall my visit to your village just a year ago when I met Malik Mohammed Shafli, and he pointed out to me your need for a school building. This school, which you have built with your own materials and with the help of the people of the United States who have sent U.S. wheat to help pay labor cost, is truly an example of a cooperative effort to fill a community need.

A school is a place of learning. This school has taught us things long before the first student has entered its doors. We see here the results of combining Pakistan's capable manpower, your own voluntary contributions and U.S. agricultural abundance.

Your country places great emphasis on education. One of our early statesmen, Thomas Jefferson, said: "A democracy is based on an enlightened public." Thus we, as well as you, who believe in the dignity of man, have come to realize the essential importance of schools—to enlighten the minds of men.

I sincerely hope that the success of this project will inspire the people of other communities to strive for similar objectives; so that more of the needs of the people of Pakistan can be satisfied through cooperative efforts between our two countries.

May this be only one of many schools built because our two countries who share common goals also are learning to share our common resources to the benefit of the free world.

SOVIET FARMS IN RED—AMERICA PLOWS AHEAD

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I would like to take this opportunity to comment on an article by Julius Duscha which appeared in the Washington Post and Times Herald on Sunday, November 25, 1962. The article describes the extraordinary difference between the Soviet and American agricultural systems.

A comparison of the two systems provides a quite remarkable commentary on the effectiveness of the Soviet and American efforts to mobilize agricultural resources. During the past 10 years, surplus farm production has been one of the principal concerns within our agricultural economy while the Soviets have been plagued by continuing crop failures. Since 1950 average U.S. crop production per acre has increased by 33 percent while that of the Soviet Union has remained constant or even declined. This growing disparity in production has occurred at the same time that the amount of land in the United States devoted to crop production has declined and the absolute number of farmers has also decreased.

In the Soviet Union, on the other hand, the amount of land being developed for agricultural production has been constantly increasing and the proportion of the population working on the land is 25 percent compared to 8 percent in the United States.

There are a number of reasons for the startling differences between the agricultural economies of the two countries, but certainly an important, if not primary one, is that of individual incentive. The Soviet farmer is regimented by strict bureaucratic controls and suffers from wholly inadequate incentives to produce. His American counterpart has been free to make his own decisions and has substantial incentives to produce.

American success in agricultural productivity compared to Soviet difficulties is a fine tribute to the American agricultural community and sadly underlines the failure of a totalitarian regime to effectively mobilize its agricultural resources.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this article from the Post be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SOVIET FARMS ARE IN THE RED WHILE AMERICA PLOWS AHEAD

(By Julius Duscha, staff reporter)

In the Soviet Union another effort was made last week to increase Russia's lagging farm production. In the United States farmers were completing the harvest of another bumper crop.

Nowhere else are the differences between the results of the Soviet and American economic systems so pronounced as they are in agriculture.

While the Soviet Union has had disappointing crops for 4 successive years, farm production in the United States has set records in each of the last 5 years.

American farmers have produced an agricultural economy of unparalleled abundance. But no matter how the Russians organize and reorganize their farm program they cannot seem to meet Soviet food needs.

Why does American farm production keep increasing while Soviet crops lag?

This is a question that Soviet Premier Nikita S. Khrushchev might have asked himself as he prepared the speech he delivered to the Soviet Communist Party's policymaking Central Committee last week in Moscow.

In his 5½-hour address Khrushchev announced a reorganization of Soviet controls over industry as well as farming. It was the second time within a year that Khrushchev revamped the Soviet farm system.

His latest effort was to order Communist Party officials to set up a hierarchy of industrial and agricultural committees to replace the single party committees that have been concerned with all aspects of the country's economy and life.

Last March Khrushchev reversed the Soviet trend toward decentralization of economic activities and ordered tighter controls over agriculture, particularly over collective farms.

Khrushchev's moves this year were typical of the reaction of Communist officials to the lagging farm production that has plagued the Soviet Union since the Russian Czar was overthrown in 1917.

Soviet agriculture has suffered from bureaucratic controls and meddling as well as from brutal purges, a serious shortage of capital for machinery and fertilizer, wholly inadequate incentives for the farmers themselves and extreme weather conditions.

And why are American farmers the agricultural success story of the world?

There are many reasons, but the principal ones are:

U.S. farmers have been able to make their own decisions, within the limits of Government controls that have imposed restrictions on acreage planted to crops in surplus but not on the ways in which farmers can operate their farms.

The Federal Government has helped farmers by encouraging efficient farming practices through research programs and by rewarding farmers with minimum price supports and other subsidies.

American farmers have had adequate incentives to produce more so that they could buy tractors and other farm machinery, automobiles, washing machines, refrigerators, and other household appliances as well as many other consumer goods.

The Government has not controlled the U.S. economy and plenty of capital has been available to develop farm machinery, fertilizers, pesticides and all of the other aids to modern and highly efficient farming.

So spectacular has been the success of American agriculture that for the last 10 years surplus production has been the No. 1 farm problem in the United States while crop failures have been the big story in Soviet agriculture.

Since 1950 crop production per acre in the United States has increased by more than one-third. In the last 5 years alone per acre production has gone up 21 percent.

Corn yields, for example, have mounted in the last 5 years from 48 to 61 bushels to the acre. By contrast, Soviet corn yields are less than 40 percent of the U.S. average.

"Many factors," the Agriculture Department has noted, "contributed to the greater yields, including shifts to higher yielding crops, better seed, more fertilizer, wider use of pest controls and improved tillage practices."

Government controls over acreage of such surplus crops as wheat, corn, and cotton were another factor contributing to an increase in production per acre.

When acreage is cut back farmers inevitably seek to increase yields on their remaining acreage. Also, poorer land is always taken out of production first.

Only 74 percent of all the land in the United States suitable for the production of crops is now being used for crops. And only 8 percent of the total population still lives on farms.

In the Soviet Union new land is still being put into production and farmers make up almost a fourth of the total Russian population.

In the United States output per man-hour on farms has doubled since 1950, as fertilizer and machinery have replaced both land and labor. In the meantime, Soviet farm output has stagnated.

And Americans are eating better than ever, with meat production alone having increased 10 percent since 1950.

The Soviet diet continues to be drab and meat is still in short supply as Khrushchev struggles with Russian agriculture.

However spectacular the American farm success story may be, all is not yet well with U.S. agriculture.

Per capita farm income in the United States increased from $960 in 1955 to $1,430 this year, but is still about 40 percent below the figure for the rest of the population.

Farmers now depend on nonfarm sources for almost a third of their income, and more and more small- and medium-sized farmers are having difficulties keeping up with their highly efficient competitors on larger farms.

Nevertheless, there is no comparison between American and Soviet agriculture or between the productivity of the two systems.

American experts on farming as well as U.S. specialists on Soviet agriculture agree that the Russian farm system can be made to work only if farmers are given adequate incentives and if agriculture is provided with plentiful amounts of capital.

Khrushchev himself must know this, but he continues to place higher priorities on industrial rather than farm production because he obviously believes that an evergrowing industrial plant is far more important.

But even if enough capital were alloted to Soviet agriculture and to the production of consumer goods for Russian farmers to buy it is doubtful that the Soviet system of collective and state farms would work.

American farmers have demonstrated time and again that the agricultural system which works best is the one that leaves basic decisions to the highly individualistic, independent, and hard-working men who are farmers.

But the Soviet Union has never been willing to let farmers run their own farms.

POPULARITY OF FOREIGN AID WITH AMERICAN PUBLIC

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I should like to call attention to a recent Gallup Poll released which indicated that, contrary to a widespread mythology, foreign aid is more popular with the American public today than 5 years ago. According to this poll the foreign aid program today has the support of 58 percent of the public as compared to 51 percent 5 years ago. The percentage of those recorded against the foreign aid program has declined from 33 percent in 1958 to 30 percent in 1963.

I would attribute much of this to the interest of the American people in the Alliance for Progress, a program dedicated to the economic, social, and political well-being of our neighbors in the Latin American area.

In general, the statistics cited by this Gallup Poll confirm once again the American public's support of the foreign aid program which has been enthusiastically endorsed by three successive administrations—the Truman administration, the Eisenhower administration, and the Kennedy administration—and which has consistently won the support of the U.S. Congress.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this release be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the release was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SUNDAY'S GALLUP POLL SHOWS PUBLIC SUPPORTS FOREIGN AID IN PRINCIPLE

The Gallup Poll release for February 3 stresses that "foreign aid, in principle, has the endorsement of a substantial majority

(6 out of 10) of the American public." It adds, however, "many persons who support foreign aid in principle voice criticism of certain aspects of the current program."

The latest poll shows greater popular support for aid today than 5 years ago, and it points to majority approval in all regions of the Nation and by Republicans, Democrats and Independents. The exact question follows:

"In general, how do you feel about foreign aid—are you for it or against it?"

	For	Against	No opinion	Total
1958—March	51	33	16	100
1963—February	58	30	12	100
Republicans	54	35	11	100
Democrats	59	28	13	100
Independents	61	28	11	100
East	60	27	13	100
Midwest	58	33	9	100
South	55	29	16	100
Far West	59	32	9	100

CRITICISMS

"One theme running through many of the comments," says the Gallup release, "is that the United States should be a little more discriminating in its dispersal of foreign aid funds—to insure, in effect, that we get our money's worth." The release adds: "Of particular irritation to some Americans are cases where countries receiving such aid have turned against us in international disputes."

AMOUNT OF AID

The release reports widespread misinformation about the amount of money the United States spends annually on foreign aid—with a tendency to inflate the proportion of the budget such aid constitutes. Only 9 percent of the public cited a figure that was close to $4 billion, and only 9 percent know that this is 5 percent or less of the budget. As many as 49 percent think the proportion is greater—ranging up to one-fourth and even half of the Nation's yearly outlay.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL THURSDAY

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I move, under the order previously entered, that the Senate stand in adjournment until 12 o'clock noon on Thursday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 29 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned, under the order previously entered, until Thursday, February 28, 1963, at 12 o'clock meridian.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 25, 1963

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Psalm 112: 6: *The righteous shall be held in everlasting remembrance.*

Almighty God, we thank Thee for that great day in our national life when we are again united to commemorate the birth of George Washington, whom we reverently and affectionately call the "Father of his Country."

Our hearts expand with gratitude and pride as we think of his intrepid spirit of adventure, his fortitude in times of hardship, and his fidelity to the principles of righteousness and justice which inspired him to champion the cause of the oppressed colonists.

We rejoice that he bore witness to a lofty idealism when he urged his fellow men to keep alive within their breasts that little spark of celestial fire called "conscience."

Above all we are thankful for his humble and devout faith which sent him down upon his knees in prayer at Valley Forge in order that he might know how to march and keep in step with the eternal will and wisdom of God.

Grant that the memory of his life may strengthen and sustain the soul of our Republic and constrain us to labor in faith and faithfulness for the blessedness of all mankind.

Hear us in the name of the Prince of Peace. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, February 21, 1963, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. McGown, one of its clerks, announced that the President of the Senate, pursuant to section 1(a)(1) of Public Law 87–586, had appointed Mr. Holland and Mr. Smathers to be members of the St. Augustine Quadricentennial Commission.

SUPPLEMENTAL FUNDS FOR PUBLIC LAW 480 AND COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION OPERATIONS

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it shall be in order to consider on Wednesday, February 27, a special resolution and report from the Committee on Appropriations which will provide supplemental funds for Public Law 480 and Commodity Credit Corporation operations for the balance of the fiscal year 1963.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, what was the date?

Mr. WHITTEN. Wednesday of this week, February 27.

Mr. GROSS. Is this an emergency situation?

Mr. WHITTEN. It is an emergency situation. The Corporation is just about out of funds, and unless these funds are made available they will have to notify the Nation that no more funds for the commodities now supported will be available unless action is taken in the next week or 10 days. What we are doing here is bringing forward from next year's budget request funds to enable them to operate at the present time and not have to stop all price supports. There has been talk about reducing price supports on certain classes of cotton. Then, in regard to corn, they have on hand about 400 million bushels which they could sell, but at the present time, to dump it on the domestic market would have a depressing effect on the market.

In effect it is bringing forward into this fiscal year some of the funds which were requested for the coming fiscal year so as not to have all of this chaos in regard to it.

Mr. GROSS. If the gentleman will yield further, does this bill in any way deal with pending special privilege legislation relating to cotton?

Mr. WHITTEN. No; no, this is directed to the Commodity Credit Corporation in order for it to have funds with which to operate for the balance of this fiscal year.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, I would like to ask a further question: Is not this advance or transfer of funds that would be due for price-support purposes for agricultural products in fiscal year 1964 to be used in this fiscal year 1963 because the Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Freeman, found it impossible to make good on the very glorified promises he made the American people and the American farmers about a year ago as to how he was going to reduce the cost of farm price supports? Is not that correct?

Mr. WHITTEN. I would have to say that there are other factors involved.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Is that one of the factors involved?

Mr. WHITTEN. Certainly the situation is not as good as I had hoped it would be, and as the gentleman from Ohio hopes, but in actuality the Congress last year reduced the budget request by some $800 million, and that is about $300 million more than is being restored here.

There are a good many factors that enter into it. We tried to hold it down. However, unless we give them some relief, we will have chaos throughout the country.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Is it not a fact that the Secretary of Agriculture certainly did not properly estimate his needs for price-support money last year, and did not inform the Congress properly; is not that correct?

Mr. WHITTEN. I will have to say this: That the Department and the Bureau of the Budget erred on the side of too much, because they requested $800 million last year and the Congress approved. And, may I say the Congress approved the amount I recommended. We tried to hold it down. But the request was far more than we permitted. This restoration will leave them with $300 million less than the Bureau of the Budget requested last year.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. But it is still more than the Secretary pledged the American people it would be, is it not?

Mr. WHITTEN. Certainly there are many places where I do not think it has worked out as many people hoped. As the gentleman from Ohio recalls, I did not vote for the farm bill because I did not see soundness of paying cash, when we had surplus commodities. I also differed in other respects.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, the facts are that millions of farmers have a contract with Uncle Sam which Uncle Sam must honor. The only way Uncle Sam can keep his word and make that contract good in this instance is for Uncle Sam to pay the bill which he promised to pay; is not that right?

Mr. WHITTEN. Certainly, we have to honor the contracts. May I say in this situation as far as the Commodity Credit Corporation is concerned, on the one hand the law says they have mandatory obligations. They have to support prices as fixed by law. Then they have another statute which says if they do support them and they do not have the money, then they violate that law.

Mr. JENSEN. I am receiving letters from many farmers saying that Uncle Sam has not delivered the checks to them that were promised under contract.

Mr. WHITTEN. We will have to carry out those contracts.

Mr. JENSEN. It is an obligation, and if Uncle Sam makes a contract with 1 American or 1 million Americans, it is our duty as Representatives in the Congress to see that Uncle Sam does keep his word.

Mr. WHITTEN. That is right. Under the conservation reserve the Government entered into a contract, and it is an obligation that must be honored.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

OAS AWAITS U.S. LEADERSHIP BEFORE ACTING ON CUBA

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, only yesterday on a national television network the Chairman of the Council of the Organization of American States, Dr. Gonzalo Facio, reiterated his plea for U.S. leadership before the OAS can act on the Cuban problem. The OAS leader said that the OAS can only play a role secondary to the United States in relations with Cuba.

In addition to these encouraging statements, the OAS President stated that growing dissatisfaction with the Cuban military and civilian establishment makes anti-Castro moves particularly timely. He recommended internal action as an adjunct to concerted action by the nations of this hemisphere.

As a further indication of OAS receptiveness for U.S. initiative, Dr. Facio stated that in his judgment the hemispheric organization would even go as far as supporting a total U.S. blockade of Castro's island, thus placing Cuba in solitary confinement in this hemisphere.

Mr. Speaker, in the more than 3 years of Castroism in Cuba, we have seen this island reinforced almost daily under our very noses. There have been heightening cries for action from the Congress and other areas of prominence such as the press throughout the Nation. However, this is the second time this year that the president of the international organization has called for solid U.S. initiative.

I reiterate my call that the United States close its seaports to ships calling in Cuba as a first act of U.S. leadership. After so doing, this Government should then turn to the OAS quickly, proposing that the hemispheric body adopt the following U.S. recommendations:

First. Close the seaports of this hemisphere to ships calling in Cuba.

Second. Close the airports of this hemisphere to airlines with flights into Cuba.

Third. Ban relay of telecommunications messages to and from Cuba.

Fourth. Impose a travel curb on movement of Castro agents and propaganda throughout Latin America.

Fifth. Freeze all Cuban Government funds now on deposit in Latin American financial institutions.

Mr. Speaker, Latin America awaits U.S. initiative while we engage in a debate of semantics as to whether or not Russian military strength in Cuba is offensive or defensive. One Soviet soldier in Cuba is one too many. Whenever the question comes up of whether Soviet missiles, rockets, jet fighter planes, tanks, rifles, and troops in Cuba are offensive or defensive, we would do well to recall the incident of last week when the Cuban Mig's fired on the unarmed U.S. shrimp boat *Ala*. The sting of that incident is still with us.

Should such an attack happen again, "Remember the *Ala*" should be the signal for blistering U.S. retaliation.

CHICAGO, FISK UNIVERSITY AND LEONTYNE PRICE

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, this is the story of a great city, a great university and a great singer. It is a story in Americania that projects the true image of our beloved country. It was related, 92 years after its inception, by Mayor Richard J. Daley, of Chicago.

The occasion was Leontyne Price's triumphant appearance in the vast auditorium in McCormick Place before the largest and perhaps the most wildly and enthusiastically applauding audience in Chicago's musical history. Leontyne Price had come to sing at a benefit to raise money for Fisk University. The response was recordbreaking. It followed the pattern in the many foreign countries and in the American cities where a public admiration and adoration of Leontyne Price reflected the universal sentiment of millions. The needed money raised for Fisk University also was recordbreaking as the proceeds from a single concert.

But this was the climax of a story that started 92 years ago, a story told by Mayor Richard J. Daley as he spoke briefly at the concert, welcoming Leontyne Price. In 1871, the year of the great fire in Chicago, the Fisk Jubilee Singers sang their first concert. Every cent of their fee, $50, they sent to the then Mayor Joseph Medill to help out the homeless, suffering people of the metropolis that fire had all but wiped out.

And when Leontyne Price came to the city that had been rebuilt from the ashes, came to raise money for Fisk University, that in the intervening years like Chicago had been growing and expanding and servicing mankind, Mayor Daley paid back the $50 gift of the Fisk Jubilee Singers of 1871, with interest. This is Americania.

Mr. Speaker, by unanimous consent I am extending my remarks to include the following review of Leontyne Price's triumphant appearance in Chicago by Claudia Cassidy in the Chicago Tribune:

LEONTYNE PRICE'S FISK BENEFIT LURES $41,000 GROSS AND A DIVIDEND FROM MAYOR DALEY

(By Claudia Cassidy)

Leontyne Price came back with honey in the mouth and fire in the heart, an enticing combination. She enticed a capacity audience and a gross of $41,000 to the Fisk University benefit in the big house in McCormick Place yesterday afternoon, when there also was a visit, a brief speech, and a dividend from Mayor Daley.

The mayor said that back in 1871 the Fisk Jubilee Singers sang their first concert. It was in Chillicothe, Ohio, and their total, inclusive fee was $50. Then they heard of the Chicago fire and they sent every penny of it to Mayor Josep Medill, to help out. Mayor Daley returned the gift, with interest, but he did not say how much, and neither did Edward W. Beasley, who thanked him for the check. On inquiry, it turned out to be $500.

No one had quite known in advance what even a singer of Miss Price's potency would make of a song recital in a theater seating 5,000. At least where I sat on the fifth row it worked out surprisingly well. The gray steel curtain had been lowered, the piano pushed out front, and a kind of "Aida" or "Cleopatra" effect set up by five tall pillars in muted fireglow, with discreet lighting for shadows. Except for occasional slight huskiness in the low voice—it blurred the Mozart trill—Miss Price was singing superbly, and the quality projected even when she spoke.

If you thought, as some did, that you never had heard her to better advantage, it was partly because in opera she so often sings dramatic soprano roles, while in recital she could cling to her true realm of the lyric or lirico spinto. It was also an advance in musicianship, in presence, in ease before a large audience, but primarily it was voice. This is one of the loveliest voices in the world, in its luster, its purity, its soaring excitement, its sudden depth of feeling, and the way it can wrap opera right around its little finger.

That last happened when she invaded Renata Tebaldi's domain for the two caressing arias from Cilea's "Adriana Lecouvreur"—for even poison caresses Adriana before it kills her. Here for just a second Miss Price turned into the tiger cat coaxed out when Hervert von Karajan conducts. Her Donna Anna was more stately than when she does the role with him, but no less beautiful.

Her program was rather a brave one for a benefit performance, Schubert, with "An die Leier," "Liebesbotschaft" and "Die Allmacht" outstanding; an interesting group of Poulenc songs programed before his death and sung in his memory and to do him honor; four Samuel Barber songs set to poems by James Joyce, "Nuvoletta" in particular done with a special and capricious skill.

At the back of the house for the spirituals, acoustics backfired. What had been David Garvey's dull piano sounded fresher, but you would not have recognized Miss Price.

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, it is a matter of pleasure and of pride to all the Members of this body when one of our colleagues, regardless of the side of the aisle he occupies, is accorded editorial commendation all must regard as richly deserved.

Roman Pucinski was an Air Force pilot. He led his bomber group in the first B-29 bombing raid over Tokyo. In all he flew 48 combat missions over Japan. Now as a distinguished Member of the Congress he was called upon that wartime experience to render a service that well may result in the giving of greater safety to travel by air and the minimizing of the number of plane crashes.

I include in my remarks the editorial from the Chicago Sun-Times of February 23, 1963, that tells the story and pays to the Honorable Roman C. Pucinski, a tribute in which I am sure the Members of the House will join.

Pucinski Commended

Representative Roman C. Pucinski, Democrat, of Illinois, is to be highly commended for winning his long fight to establish crashproof tape recorders in commercial airliner cockpits. The installation of such devices should go a long way toward clearing up the mystery of the last few moments in any future air tragedy.

Pucinski is a former Air Force pilot who led his bomber group in the first B-29 bombing raid over Tokyo. He flew 48 combat missions over Japan and holds the Distinguished Flying Cross and Air Medal with clusters. Pucinski has been fighting to install such tape recorders in airline cockpits since 1959. He maintains, and his judgment as a flyer is sound, that in the last few moments preceding an air tragedy the cockpit crew is far too busy trying to save their aircraft and passengers to make formal reports to a ground station. A crashproof tape recorder, operating automatically during flight will preserve a record of everything said in the cockpit for the investigators.

Australia has already made such an instrument mandatory for their airliners. The United States should follow swiftly and it is to be hoped that no airlines resistance is encountered. This measure is for the best interests of the traveling public.

ESTABLISHMENT OF THE SLEEPING BEAR DUNES NATIONAL LAKESHORE IN MICHIGAN

Mr. STAEBLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. STAEBLER. Mr. Speaker, I introduce today a bill to establish the Sleeping Bear Dunes National Lakeshore in Michigan. This is a companion bill to the one recently introduced in the Senate by Senators McNamara and Hart.

We in Michigan pride ourselves on being known as the "Water Wonderland." Outstanding among our natural assets are the water resources available for recreation along our shorelines.

The Sleeping Bear Dunes area, because of its many unique features, has been designated as an area worthy of national preservation. Here there are sand dunes, scenic islands, unexcelled stretches of Lake Michigan shoreline, examples of natural history reaching back across the ice ages, and scenic vistas across inland lakes unequaled in beauty anywhere in the Great Lakes region.

It is the objective of this legislation to preserve and develop this natural beauty while at the same time providing for continued private ownership of the existing homes and cottages within the suggested boundaries.

The bill proposes that Congress, building on the experience already gained in the establishment of national seashore areas on the Atlantic, gulf, and Pacific coasts, provide a law under which both the public and private interests will be adequately protected in the preservation and development of the Sleeping Bear Dunes area.

I am confident that, with the growing support evident in Michigan and throughout the Nation for the prevention of this segment of our fourth shoreline, sound and reasonable legislation can be enacted by this Congress. I will work toward this end with my colleagues in the House and with the Senators who have spent so much time in recent months giving leadership to the effort to find solutions to the many complex problems which always arise when we consider the establishment of new national park areas.

We, in Michigan, have another very real interest in bringing this Federal investment to the northwest corner of our State. There is an increasing tendency for tourists and summer vacationers to seek out the most scenic and remote spots for their trips. The system of interstate highways today brings these parts of our country, and even of Canada, within a few hours drive of most Midwestern cities.

The economic importance to Michigan's tourist industry of this national development at Sleeping Bear has been estimated as equalling that gain from the establishment of 10 average-size Michigan industries within the area. A thriving tourist industry is of the greatest importance to the total economy of Michigan.

We seek, then, the dual objective of preserving a unique corner of America for ours and future generations, and obtaining for Michigan this Federal investment in park and recreation land so sorely needed in our populous area of the Nation.

RECIPROCAL TARIFF TREATMENT OF BREAD IMPORTS

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a proposal to provide reciprocal tariff treatment of bread imports. It applies specifically to pan loaf bread or pan-type loaf bread made with the use of yeast, whether sliced or not, and imposes a duty of 7½ percent on these imports.

For many years, bakers in the Buffalo area have suffered because of bread imports from Canada. I understand other areas along the Canadian border have been faced with this problem also.

This imported bread has sold at lower prices than bread produced in Buffalo. While our country grants duty-free treatment to bread imported from Canada, Canada maintains a duty on U.S. bread amounting to 7½ percent last year. I do not think this is fair and if Canada continues the tariff on this product, then certainly we should not hesitate to place the same tariff rate on their bread.

My bill would also provide that the 7½-percent duty would not apply during any period that Canada may extend duty-free treatment for U.S. bread.

SUPERVISORS AS EMPLOYEES UNDER NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS ACT

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, today I am again reintroducing a measure which will permit supervisors in private industry to be considered as employees under the provisions of the National Labor Relations Act. My bill would strike out the definition of "supervisor" which is depriving the foremen in American industry of all the benefits provided by this law to other employees.

Today we have strong representation for management at the top. We have strong representation for the rank and file worker at the bottom. In the middle, we find a group of foremen who have no representation at all.

There is no reason why the foremen of America should be denied the right of collective bargaining. They deserve equal status with all the rights and privileges accorded to the rank and file worker. Correction of this injustice is long overdue, and I urge speedy enactment of this legislation.

TAX REFORMS CONCERNING EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTIONS

Mr. POFF. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. POFF. Mr. Speaker, I would like to address myself to those proposed tax reforms in the President's message which I fear will have an adverse impact upon charitable contributions to educational institutions. Essentially, they are three in number.

First. The President proposes a so-called 5-percent floor under itemized deductions, that is, itemized deductions will be authorized only to the extent that they exceed 5 percent of the taxpayer's adjusted gross income. This 5-percent floor will have the effect of reducing the amount deductible on the average of 20 to 30 percent. In other words, in the average case, more than one-fifth of the taxpayer's charitable contributions will be disallowed as a tax deduction. The overwhelming majority of substantial contributions to educational institutions comes from taxpayers who itemize their deductions. The 5-percent floor will significantly curtail the incentive which the present law offers.

Second. Present law authorizes certain individual taxpayers in high income brackets to take unlimited deductions for charitable contributions. The President proposes to erect a so-called 30-percent ceiling on deductions for contributions made by such taxpayers which he says would increase Government revenue by some $10 million. That revenue figure illustrates the magnitude of the total charitable contributions which might be lost to colleges and other institutions if the ceiling is imposed.

Third. Present law authorizes taxpayers to take an additional 10-percent deduction over and above the basic 20-percent limitation if the charitable contribution is made to an educational institution, a church or a medical facility—as distinguished from other types eligible charitable organizations. The President recommends that this preference be discontinued and that all types of charitable organizations stand on the same 30-percent footing. Congress authorized this bonus deduction and granted this preference for a specific, legitimate, legislative purpose; namely, to encourage citizen support of institutions regarded as most essential to the Nation's growth and welfare. If the President's proposal is adopted, it will have the effect of diverting donations heretofore received by educational institutions into other charitable channels such as, in the President's own words, "symphony orchestras and the work of community chests and cultural centers."

One final point needs to be made. To the same extent that these three tax reform proposals will curtail citizen support of our educational system, they will intensify our educational system's dependence upon governmental appropriations. Philosophically, some may view this as a desirable objective. I do not. On the contrary, I view the converse as the best goal. Tax deductions, and/or tax credits, for educational purposes should be increased, rather than decreased, in order that the people might be encouraged to finance their own educational system and thereby retain control over its curriculums, its standards and its performance.

MONROE DOCTRINE

Mr. HARSHA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARSHA. Mr. Speaker, with continued deep concern for the welfare and security of our Nation, I have today introduced a resolution calling for the restatement and full implementation of the Monroe Doctrine. The resolution calls upon the United States, bilaterally or unilaterally, to take whatever steps are necessary to rid the hemisphere of the Castro Communist threat.

The proof is in the pudding. Surely, after the shrimp boat incident, even the eggheads in the State Department should be convinced that whether a weapon is offensive or defensive is determined solely by the state of mind or intent of the individual controlling the weapon.

The evidence is conclusive that Cuba is a Communist outpost from which dedicated efforts are being effected to subvert the Western Hemisphere.

At a recent meeting of the Supreme Soviet, Khrushchev stated:

> Socialist Cuba exists. Cuba remains a beacon of Marxist, Leninist ideas in the Western Hemisphere. The impact of her revolutionary example will grow. The Government of the United States has given a pledge not to invade Cuba.

The United States is spending hundreds of millions of dollars and risking American lives daily in an effort to halt communism in Vietnam, yet our effort to combat that same menace within throwing distance of our own shores is very feeble.

The recent OAS Security Committee report indicates that Russia, through its bastion of operation in Cuba, has given orders for unremitting subversive pressure against Latin America. The presence of approximately 14 training camps for saboteurs, subversive and infiltration agents is confirmed in the report.

This all constitutes a very grave threat to the security of the United States and the entire Western Hemisphere. My resolution clearly restates the Monroe Doctrine as being the policy of the United States and any attempts on the part of a Communist country to extend its system to any portion of this hemisphere is dangerous to our peace and safety. The resolution urges the President to take jointly with other free nations or unilaterally, such political, diplomatic, economic or military action as may be necessary to fully implement and enforce the Monroe Doctrine throughout this hemisphere.

The American people are fed up with the futile policy of spending billions of dollars in foreign aid, ostensibly to defeat and combat communism throughout the world and, at the same time, assuring the Communists of a base of operations in Cuba from which to enhance their activities.

If the defeat of communism is a valid reason for spending billions in foreign aid, then certainly that same reason is ample justification for implementing the Monroe Doctrine, to say nothing of the protection of our own freedom.

MR. TRUMAN ON THE CUBAN SITUATION

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Speaker, we have now heard from the oracle of Independence, Mo., on the subject of Cuba.

In a syndicated newspaper article published yesterday, Harry S. Truman essayed the double role of history teacher and prophet of hope.

On both counts he was a dismal flop.

He would have rendered a far greater service by silence.

In this article, believe it or not, Mr. Truman undertook, among other things, a dissertation on the Platt amendment.

One provision of this Platt amendment, incorporated in the Cuban Constitution on our insistence after we liberated Cuba from Spain, asserted:

> The Government of Cuba consents that the United States may exercise the right to intervene for the preservation of Cuban independence [and] the maintenance of a government adequate for the protection of life, property, and individual liberty.

Having called attention to this provision, Historian Harry offered this comment in yesterday's article:

> It seems to me that when it appeared that the situation in Cuba was getting out of hand and that a threat to the security of this hemisphere was clearly in the making, we should have considered that the basic implications of the Monroe Doctrine were at stake, as well as the reservation imposed by the Platt amendment, which anticipated precisely such a development. These provisions, the Monroe Doctrine, and the Platt amendment, were there as much for the welfare and protection of Cuba as for the security of all the other nations of this continent.

But Mr. Truman overlooked, or chose not to mention, one other historical fact. The Platt amendment was not there in 1959, when Castro took over in Cuba. It had not been there for a quarter of a century.

The Platt amendment was abrogated by the United States in May 1934, at the specific behest of Democratic President Franklin D. Roosevelt.

And one of the direct effects of this action was a downgrading, in both national and hemispheric respect, of any unilateral dedication of the United States to the Monroe Doctrine.

I happen to believe that the Eisenhower administration is open to criticism in its handling of the Cuban situation and the Castro takeover. I have been saying so publicly since October 1959. I deplore its overhasty recognition of Castro, its disregard of clear evidence of his Communist ties, and its tardy declaration that the United States would not permit establishment of a regime dominated by international communism in the Western Hemisphere.

Yet this declaration was made by President Eisenhower in July 1960. And I do not now propose to accept Mr. Truman's Monday morning quarterbacking invocation of the Platt amendment as the basis for action we ought to have taken—the selfsame Platt amendment which Mr. Truman's immediate predecessor in the Presidency consigned to the ashcan and which fact Mr. Truman conveniently forgot to mention.

I might add that Mr. Truman's evaluation of much more recent history is equally deficient.

He declared:

> The Cuban crisis provided the United States with an opportunity to make clear to the Communist aggressors that once the line is drawn we stand firm.

Stand firm? By a declared willingness to give a no-invasion pledge? Stand firm? By a complete backdown on our on-site inspection demand? Mr. Kennedy, in his February 7, 1963, press conference, acknowledged that this demand is "now a dead letter."

Stand firm? What has happened to the President's repeated pledge that "Communist domination in this hemisphere can never be negotiated?" The record is abundantly clear that this, too, is another "dead letter."

As much a dead letter, Mr. Truman, as the Platt amendment.

And what of Mr. Truman's attempted role, in his syndicated article, as a prophet of hope? His contribution on this score also leaves a great deal to be desired—alike by the American people and the tragic people of Cuba:

> Somehow we must seek a way of helping the Cuban people to liberate themselves once and for all.

Not only are there no specifics offered toward this desired goal but there is an aura of hope deferred, of fantastic resignation, of larger problems which must first be solved—again with not specifics offered. Mr. Truman wrote:

> Cuba has become a colony again—a colony of Communist Russia.

Unmistakably true—but hardly a solution.

Mr. Truman also said:

> The Cuban people are now pretty much in the same fix as the Hungarians.

This assessment brings to mind President Kennedy's equally glum and negative appraisal of the situation in his February 7, 1963, press conference—a sequel to the October "triumph" of "firmness":

> I couldn't make any prediction about the elimination [of communism in Cuba]. I am quite obviously hopeful that it can be eliminated, but we have to wait and see what happens. I remember a good deal of talk in the early 1950's about liberation, how Eastern Europe was going to be liberated. Then we had Hungary, Poland, and East Germany and no action was taken. The reason no action was taken was that they felt strongly if they did take action it would bring on another war.

Mr. Truman did go one step beyond President Kennedy's wait-and-see policy:

> It is my opinion that until the sources of all the world's tensions and dangers are overcome within those nations that constitute the centers of the Communist conspiracy; namely, the police states of Russia and China, there is little chance for the occupied satellites to settle matters for themselves.

How ironical that it was the let-the-dust-settle variety of a wait-and-see policy, in President Truman's own administration, that saw China lost to the free world. On December 1, 1961, President Kennedy told his press conference:

> I always have felt that we did not make a determined enough effort in the case of China.

Belatedly, Mr. Truman has identified the real enemies, even though he seems to persist in the illusion that the internal revolt which will not work in Hungary—or Cuba—will somehow accomplish miracles in Soviet Russia and Red China.

But there is still a strange reluctance to suggest specific policies of firmness and bold action from without.

His statesmanship of victory—the same statesmanship which first hamstrung and then fired MacArthur—consists of the plaintive litany:

> We, of course, continue to hope that someway, somehow.

BIPARTISANSHIP IN FOREIGN POLICY

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Speaker, because of the use of the term "bipartisan foreign policy" I believe there is a great misconception in the minds of many people, including some Members of Congress. I have asked for a special order for today, and immediately after the regular order of business and the special orders heretofore entered I intend to discuss what I believe to be bipartisan foreign policy, or my idea of it. I want the RECORD to be straight because when I take the floor, as I did a couple of weeks ago, I do not want anyone to say I am violating bipartisan foreign policy or bipartisanship in our foreign policy. If any Members want to participate in this discussion, I shall be glad to yield them time during that special order.

EIGHTY-EIGHT MEMBERS OF HOUSE SIGN JOINT LETTER OPPOSING EXPORT-IMPORT BANK INCREASE IN OBLIGATIONAL AUTHORITY BY BACK-DOOR METHOD

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to include a letter over the signature of 88 Members of the House.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, the House Committee on Banking and Currency is holding committee hearings today and tomorrow on H.R. 3872. This bill would increase the lending authority of the Export-Import Bank of Washington and likewise would extend the period within which the Bank may exercise its functions.

Since this legislation would provide $2 billion additional authority to expend from public debt receipts or, as it is generally called, by the back-door spending method, a group of 88 Members of the House are urging that instead, any additional financial provisions found necessary for the Bank be made through the normal traditional appropriations procedure.

For the general information of the Congress, I include at this point the text of a joint letter to the chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee expressing our opposition to the back-door spending provision and listing the names of the 88 Members of the House whose names are appended to this letter.

FEBRUARY 23, 1963.

Hon. WRIGHT PATMAN,
Chairman, Committee on Banking and Currency, House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: This letter is in opposition to the financing provisions contained in H.R. 3872 and represents the views of 86 Members of the House of Representatives whose names are appended below. We are hopeful that your committee will give consideration to our views and make this letter a part of the record of the hearings which we understand are being held on February 25 and 26.

We understand that the only significant recommendation from the President in the pending budget for new obligating authority through the so-called back-door procedure is the $2 billion additional authority for the Export-Import Bank to expend from public debt receipts, for which provision would be made in H.R. 3872 now pending in your committee. We strongly recommend that any additional financial provision found necessary for the Bank be made through the traditional congressional appropriations process.

After some years of debate and contention about the dimensions and undesirable characteristics of the various back-door practices, the last session of the 87th Congress produced the most significant results from past efforts to alert the Congress and the country to this diffusive method of legislating the finances of the Government. According to available tabulations, only 2 such bills were enacted, to the amount of about $437 million, in sharp contrast to the year before when the Executive requests in 11 such bills totaled $28,670 million plus; some $19,673 million plus was enacted into law.

Discontinuance of the practice, it seems clear, undeniably enhances the opportunities to legislate for functions of Government in a more responsible and orderly manner within a framework of competitive priorities. Especially is the question important to the maintenance by the House of its prerogatives and supremacy in money matters. As you doubtless know, the other body has indulged heavily in some recent years in the origination of back-door bills.

It is of course true, as in the case of some other going programs no longer funded through back-door methods, that the borrowing and lending authority for the Bank has heretofore been furnished through public debt authorization carried in legislative, rather than the regular appropriation, bills.

But there is recent parallel for the change we now urge. Last year the President was supplied, through the usual legislative authorization (Public Law 87-490) and appropriation method (Public Law 87-872), with $2 billion additional for subscription to the International Monetary Fund; U.S. participation in the Fund had theretofore been furnished by public debt expenditure authority carried in a legislative bill. In fact, as you know, this change in method of funding for the IMF was recommended by the executive branch and the Committee on Banking and Currency. We are not aware of any hindsight dissatisfaction with the change. Nor can we perceive of any valid objections to a similar change for the Export-Import Bank. The Bank's operating budget is already subject to annual review and approval in regular appropriation bills—as are virtually all other Government corporations—and in the last two, limitations on certain expenditures, as was contemplated might be done when the corporation budget law was adopted, have been written into the bills by the Committee on Appropriations and approved by the House without objection or without apparent adverse results to necessary operations of the Bank.

A similar example is the Small Business Administration; additional loan capital is supplied as necessary through the regular appropriation bills.

With the recent significant progress made by the House in the matter, we believe it especially important that the pending bill authorize the necessary appropriation in lieu of a direct public debt expenditure authority and we earnestly hope that your committee will see it that way.

Sincerely,

Thomas M. Pelly,
Representative in Congress.

The following Members of the House have authorized the use of their names as cosigners of this joint letter:

Hon. Homer E. Abele, 10th District of Ohio.

Hon. John B. Anderson, 16th District of Illinois.

Hon. James C. Auchincloss, Third District of New Jersey.

Hon. William H. Avery, Second District of Kansas.

Hon. Walter Baring, Congressman at Large, Nevada.

Hon. William H. Bates, Sixth District of Massachusetts.

Hon. James F. Battin, Second District of Montana.

Hon. Frank J. Becker, Fifth District of New York.

Hon. E. Y. Berry, Second District of South Dakota.

Hon. Jackson E. Betts, Eighth District of Ohio.

Hon. Bill Brock, Third District of Tennessee.

Hon. James E. Bromwell, Second District of Iowa.

Hon. James T. Broyhill, Ninth District of North Carolina.

Hon. Elford A. Cederberg, 10th District of Michigan.

Hon. J. Edgar Chenoweth, Third District of Colorado.

Hon. William C. Cramer, 12th District of Florida.

Hon. Steven B. Derounian, Third District of New York.

Hon. Edward J. Derwinski, Fourth District of Illinois.

Hon. Samuel L. Devine, 12th District of Ohio.

Hon. W. J. Bryan Dorn, Third District of South Carolina.

Hon. John Dowdy, Seventh District of Texas.

Hon. Thomas N. Downing, First District of Virginia.

Hon. Robert F. Ellsworth, Third District of Kansas.

Hon. Gerald Ford, Fifth District of Michigan.

Hon. J. Vaughan Gary, Third District of Virginia.

Hon. Milton W. Glenn, Second District of New Jersey.

Hon. H. R. Gross, Third District of Iowa.

Hon. Charles S. Gubser, 10th District of California.

Hon. Edward J. Gurney, 11th District of Florida.

Hon. James A. Haley, Seventh District of Florida.

Hon. Durward G. Hall, Seventh District of Missouri.

Hon. William Henry Harrison, Congressman at Large, Wyoming.

Hon. William H. Harsha, Sixth District of Ohio.

Hon. Ralph Harvey, 10th District of Indiana.

Hon. Charles B. Hoeven, Sixth District of Iowa.

Hon. Walt Horan, Fifth District of Washington.

Hon. Frank J. Horton, 36th District of New York.

Hon. Craig Hosmer, 32d District of California.

Hon. Charles R. Jonas, Eighth District of North Carolina.

Hon. Clarence E. Kilburn, 31st District of New York.

Hon. Carleton J. King, 30th District of New York.

Hon. John C. Kunkel, 16th District of Pennsylvania.

Hon. John Kyl, Fourth District of Iowa.

Hon. Melvin R. Laird, Seventh District of Wisconsin.

Hon. Glenard P. Lipscomb, 24th District of California.

Hon. Robert McClory, 12th District of Illinois.

Hon. Clifford G. McIntire, Second District of Maine.

Hon. Robert T. McLoskey, 19th District of Illinois.

Hon. Clark MacGregor, Third District of Minnesota.

Hon. Charles McC. Mathias, Sixth District of Maryland.

Hon. Catherine May, Fourth District of Washington.

Hon. William E. Miller, 40th District of New York.

Hon. Ancher Nelsen, Second District of Minnesota.

Hon. Hjalmar C. Nygaard, First District of North Dakota.

Hon. Harold C. Ostertag, 37th District of New York.

Hon. Otto E. Passman, Fifth District of Louisiana.

Hon. John R. Pillion, 39th District of New York.

Hon. Alexander Pirnie, 32d District of New York.

Hon. Richard H. Poff, Sixth District of Virginia.

Hon. Albert Quie, First District of Minnesota.

Hon. Charlotte Reid, 15th District of Illinois.

Hon. Ben Reifel, First District of South Dakota.

Hon. John J. Rhodes, First District of Arizona.

Hon. R. Walter Riehlman, 34th District of New York.

Hon. Howard W. Robison, 33d District of New York.

Hon. Richard L. Roudebush, Sixth District of Indiana.

Hon. Henry C. Schadeberg, First District of Wisconsin.

Hon. Herman T. Schneebeli, 17th District of Pennsylvania.

Hon. Fred Schwengel, First District of Iowa.

Hon. Don L. Short, Second District of North Dakota.

Hon. Eugene Siler, Fifth District of Kentucky.

Hon. M. G. Snyder, Third District of Kentucky.

Hon. Bill Stinson, Seventh District of Washington.

Hon. Robert Taft, Jr., Congressman at Large, Ohio.

Hon. Charles M. Teague, 13th District of California.

Hon. Vernon W. Thomson, Third District of Wisconsin.

Hon. Thor C. Tollefson, Sixth District of Washington.

Hon. William M. Tuck, Fifth District of Virginia.

Hon. James B. Utt, 35th District of California.

Hon. William K. Van Pelt, Sixth District of Wisconsin.

Hon. J. Ernest Wharton, 28th District of New York.

Hon. William B. Widnall, Seventh District of New Jersey.

Hon. John Bell Williams, Third District of Mississippi.

Hon. Bob Wilson, 36th District of California.

Hon. John W. Wydler, Fourth District of New York.

Hon. J. Arthur Younger, 11th District of California.

Hon. John M. Ashbrook, 17th District of Ohio.

Hon. Joe D. Waggonner, Jr., Fourth District of Louisiana.

NUCLEAR HELP FOR COMMUNISTS

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, it has come to my attention that the United Nations Special Fund is planning a project in Communist Yugoslavia that would use American tax dollars to strengthen a nation dedicated to a bloc that says it wants to bury us.

The project has been approved by the Governing Council of the U.N. Special Fund and calls for a Federal center—in Yugoslavia—for nuclear research.

I have studied a publication of the U.N. Special Fund in which I find these statements, and I have pursued development of the project by checking with the U.S. Department of State, Department of Agriculture, and Atomic Energy Commission.

This proposed 3-year U.N. project is planned for a total cost of $1,752,400 with

$546,000 of that coming from the Special Fund, and the rest from Yugoslavia. As has been widely noted in the past few days in this House, the Special Fund receives 40 percent of its funds from U.S. contributions.

Even more shocking is the fact that this provision for nuclear assistance to a Communist-bloc nation apparently has been neatly disguised as only an agricultural project.

The project, which will be administered by the International Atomic Energy Agency if final details are agreed to by that Agency, Yugoslavia and the Special Fund, is designed in the words of the Special Fund to:

> Assist in extending research and training facilities at the Institute for Application of Nuclear Research in Agriculture, Forestry, and Veterinary Sciences at Zemun, near Belgrade.

However, in the first sentence of its project analysis—which interestingly enough is marked by the United Nations for "Restricted" distribution—the Special Fund calls not only for the application of nuclear research to the field of agriculture, but also for a Federal center for nuclear research and training at the Zemun Institute.

The plans of the Special Fund call for financing which would increase the staff of the nuclear research Institute from 32 resident scientists to 90 by 1965. It also calls for an expansion of buildings, more equipment, 12 research fellowships, and for providing of a "phytotron" to Yugoslavia.

A phytotron is an uncommon instrument for plant research used in connection with radioactive isotopes in creating artificial environments.

My colleagues, even if the American taxpayers were not being asked to pay in large part for a nuclear center in a Communist nation, it is highly unclear to me why they should be asked to subsidize solution of agriculture problems which, if solved, will enable one of our enemies to grow stronger.

The Special Fund itself notes that the Yugoslav plan is to increase from output by 41 percent within just 4 years, mainly in production of grain and livestock.

We have a quite unbelievable farm subsidy program right here at home. If the United States has any extra money left in these deficit days, it would be well for us to apply it to our own agriculture problems—not to give it to the U.N. for use in alleviating Communist problems.

This Yugoslav project would concentrate in its agricultural phases on soil fertility and plant nutrition, plant breeding, and animal husbandry. But the project plan leaves a loophole whereby agriculture may not be the only goal of this research.

I note that the educational program under the project calls for training of about 25 Yugoslav nuclear research specialists at the graduate level. Presumably these graduates, once trained, could work on things other than farm problems.

Here is a breakdown of the moneys programed by the United Nations Special Fund for the Yugoslav project:

Experts, $180,900. Fellowships, $60,000. Equipment, $258,700. Miscellaneous, $10,900. Overhead of the International Atomic Energy Agency, $32,500. Preliminary investigations, $3,000.

The American officials with whom I have checked about this project tell me they presume that the agricultural research under this program would involve the use of radioactive isotopes, but they remain uncertain about just where these isotopes for Yugoslavia will come from.

As this House knows, I am a doctor. As a doctor I am familiar with the many uses for isotopes in medical research. I know also that such tracer isotopes are equally valuable in plant and animal research and in work with fertilizers.

Most of the isotopes used in the United States are produced by the Atomic Energy Commission's Oak Ridge, Tenn., Laboratories. But I have been told by the AEC that it is highly unlikely that a license could be issued and American isotopes provided to a Communist bloc nation.

However, isotopes are available from any nation that can produce them via nuclear reactors or electron accelerators. The United Kingdom sells some commercially, I understand, and the Soviet Union and Czechoslovakia also have reactors.

Yugoslavia also has a small research reactor, but it is not certain whether that reactor can produce the isotopes necessary for this United Nations program.

It must be noted here that isotopes once provided have many other uses than agricultural research. They can be used, for instance, to trace the flow of liquids and gases in pipelines, and to test and measure strengths and dimensions of metals and other materials. Isotopes also can be used in studies of insecticides and other biological and chemical materials including materials for chemical and bacteriological warfare.

In short, these radioactive, nuclear isotopes are not the sort of thing which American taxpayers should be helping to provide or to buy for the use of the Communist bloc.

The Members of this House may be assured that I am continuing my investigation into this vital matter concerning nuclear research in Red Yugoslavia subsidized by the American taxpayer. One would think that even our oneworldly State Department would have learned the lesson of experience long ago—that there no longer is any justification for wooing or trying to purchase the loyalty of another sovereign nation, particularly a Communist nation.

Mr. Speaker, in connection with the uses of radioactive isotopes, I am including at this point in my remarks portions of an article from a special report of the U.S. Atomic Energy Commission listing a number of the uses for these isotopes in industry, medicine and agriculture:

AGRICULTURAL USES OF ISOTOPES

In agriculture, radioisotopes are an important tool that is helping scientists to unlock secrets of the growth of plants and animals and the pests and diseases that injure or destroy them. They are contributing to increasing productivity and better economy. They have been applied in a variety of research on plant nutrition, crop diseases, fertilizer application and effectiveness, soil conditions, animal diseases, milk production, insect eradication, and development of new plant varieties through mutations. Over $5 million per year of agricultural research is performed with radioisotopes.

Agricultural research often requires years to mature because of crop cycles, and additional time which elapses before results can be applied on the farms. Except in a few instances, the agricultural benefits of isotopes lie chiefly in the future.

MEDICAL USES

Following the discovery of radium in 1898, medical researchers soon recognized the possibilities of using radioactivity.

The supremacy of radioactive elements as tracers to define physiological processes is readily apparent in medical and biological fields. The tracers correspond in size and kind to the thing they trace. They are not foreign or chemically different—they are the material or a true part thereof. Some disease processes that have been studied are cancer, leukemia, heart malfunctions, arteriosclerosis, virus infections, multiple sclerosis, arthritis, anemia, gout, and nutritional deficiencies.

In addition to such universal use of tracers for biomedical research, radioisotopes have made possible some advances in medical diagnosis. Dynamic tracer diagnostic tests of the functions of organs in patients have been developed for thyroid, heart, liver, kidney, bone marrow, and spleen. Tracer tests are used routinely for the total volume of plasma, blood or water in the body, for lifetime of blood cells, and for localization of tumors, particularly of the brain. Over 2,000 hospitals or medical groups use isotopes for diagnosis.

In the area of radiation treatment, radioisotopes found early applications in medicine. Many of the therapeutic uses, particularly in cancer treatment, follow the principles established with X-rays and radium. Radioisotopes have greatly extended these treatments. At the end of 1959 over 300 radioisotope teletherapy units were licensed for use in the United States alone. These units may contain as much as several thousand curies of either cobalt 60 or cesium 137.

INDUSTRIAL USES

Most of the widespread applications of radioisotopes that industry has developed use very little radiation and fall into two categories: radioisotopes for tracing, and small radiation source for gaging or testing.

Radiotracing applications now in use include: wear and lubrication tests to find best lubricants and conditions of operation, involving piston rings, gears, and machine parts; wear tests on paints, varnishes, wax coatings, and other protective agents; study of detergents and various cleaning agents on cloth and fabrics; finding leaks inside complicated systems and underground gas storage depots; tracing flow in pipelines, streams, catalytic crackers, chemical processing plants, and fluid or slurry systems.

In the area of radioinspection, industry has expanded radioisotope radiography as an efficient and cost-saving way of meeting the higher quality and greater safety specifications required for many products today—both for civilian and military use. Welds are routinely radiographed with radioisotope cameras on ships, tanks, pipelines, and containment vessels. Such radioeyes also are used to tell whether the fuel in rockets meets the rigid requirements of uniformity so necessary for successful operation. Construction of a single ship often requires the radiographing of as many as 10,000 welds. The savings in rejects and elimination of destructive tests for welds, casts, and other fabricated products, is significant. Even more important is the greatly reduced chance of failures and accidents. Another important factor is radiation beam inspection of rapidly moving packages, cans, sheet material, metal strip, and fluid products. Isotope gages have been developed to penetrate through or reflect from material to measure levels, content, thickness, or density of a number of kinds of products.

A broad scope of products now is controlled and improved by isotope gages. Since they permit products to be made much more uniform and of higher quality, the user or consumer benefits directly as well as indirectly through the assistance isotopes can give to improved efficiency and productivity to aid segments of the economy.

High intensity radiation is starting to receive its first routine uses, but its full development depends on considerable research. The intense radiation from large quantities of fission products may ultimately find use as a new industrial process reagent and create new products. Some types of grafted plastics, such as selective ion exchange membranes used in desalting sea water, can best be produced by irradiation.

DEVELOPMENT OF RADIATION INSTRUMENTS

Since the human senses cannot detect nuclear radiations except at extremely high levels, the development of systems of detection and measurement of radiation has been essential to development of the practical applications of radioisotopes. The design and manufacture of such instruments was the first branch of the private atomic energy industry established. Many instruments originally were designed and manufactured in the Government's atomic laboratories, but immediately after the war the Commission supported development of commercial manufacture. Significant advances have been made by industry in the development of more stable and sensitive circuits for radioisotope measuring applications. By 1959 some 120 companies were manufacturing a variety of instruments, detectors, special components, and accessories.

Nuclear radiation detectors developed to date may be classified according to several types.

In pulse systems, the output of the detector consists of a series of signals, each of which represents the interaction of a nuclear particle or gamma ray with the detector. The well-known Geiger counter is an example of a pulse detector. Another is the proportional counter which is able to identify different radioisotopes according to their characteristic radiations. Still another example is the scintillation counter which operates on the principle that when ionizing particles pass through certain crystals, liquids, or organic polymers, flashes of light (scintillations) are emitted. An electron multiplier phototube picks up the faint scintillations and amplifies the resulting pulses to be detected and identified by the measuring apparatus.

In nonpulse detection systems, the output is the average of the cumulative effects due to many interactions of radiation with the detector; no attempt is made to resolve the individual events. The current-producing ionization chamber is a good example; the output is proportional to the total ionization current produced within the detector. Another example is the photographic system. When a piece of film is exposed to radiation, the emulsion reacts in the same way as when struck by visible light. The amount of radiation can be estimated from darkening of the film. Colorimetric detection is another example. When radiation reacts with certain chemicals containing chlorine (i.e., trichlorethylene and water, or chloroform and water), hydrochloric acid is formed. This causes a change in color of certain dyes, and the degree of color change produced is dependent upon the amount of radiation received.

Several other detector systems have been used for specialized problems. These include cloud chambers for laboratory studies, nuclear-track photographic emulsion plates, crystal conducting counters, chemical detectors, and colorimetric devices for detection of large doses of radiation. In addition, a number of systems have been designed to detect and measure neutrons. Most of these have used boron, lithium or cadmium, in conjunction with one of the detector types discussed (except colorimetric), to detect the secondary radiation resulting from neutron capture by these materials.

In the field of low-level counting, university work on radiocarbon dating of archeological materials was important in early developments. Noteworthy in this field was the pioneering research on the screen wall counter by W. F. Libby at the Universities of California and Chicago. Libby's technique involved placement of the sample inside a counter that operated on the sensitive and simple Geiger principle.

In more recent years, some investigators have substituted acetylene gas synthesized from radiocarbon samples used in proportional counters for the screen wall counter. Other techniques are based on a variety of liquid scintillators that respond well to soft beta radiation when the sample is mixed with the liquid scintillators.

These developments in low-level counting are pointing a way for applying these techniques to industrial processing. Present-day instrumentation is suitable only for laboratory needs, and designs must be modified to meet the rigid requirements of industrial applications.

THE STRANGE CASE OF PEREZ JIMENEZ

Mr. RIEHLMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the body of the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. RIEHLMAN. Mr. Speaker, there is tremendous interest among some of my constituents about the plight of Perez Jimenez, former President of Venezuela, now in Florida, who is involved in extradition proceedings brought by the U.S. Government.

One of my constituents has sent me an article dealing with this subject from the Wanderer of January 10, 1963, with the request that it be printed in the RECORD.

I have also studied the State Department paper on this subject and, although I may not agree entirely with either treatment of the matter, I think it will serve a useful purpose to place them here side by side.

The article follows:

THE STRANGE CASE OF MARCOS PEREZ JIMENEZ

(Condensed from an account in Popular, Miami Spanish-language weekly, December 30, 1962.)

Certain legal cases, due to a strange series of incidents, coincidences and paradoxes, tend to become famous in the annals of jurisprudence. The case of Marcos Perez Jimenez has all the indications of becoming one of these cases. The former President of Venezuela is now languishing in a Dade County jail, held virtually incommunicado, and subjected to the treatment usually accorded highly dangerous convicted felons.

Why?

No person in authority can give, or dares to give, a reasonable answer.

Has the ex-President violated any U.S. law?

No.

Has the ex-President been convicted in Venezuela?

No.

Has the ex-President, holder of the U.S. coveted Legion of Merit, with the rank of commander in chief, broken any conditions imposed upon political exiles in the United States?

Again, no.

Then why is he imprisoned and denied benefit of bond? There are many apparent answers. For one thing, his arch-enemy, President Betancourt of Venezuela, has hired a very influential law firm in Washington in an effort to satiate his vengeance on Perez Jimenez. The law firm is headed by Presidential Adviser Dean Acheson.

Perez Jimenez has been denied the right to post bond. Spies and saboteurs are granted this right in the United States. Why is it denied in this case?

Betancourt of Venezuela wants it that way.

As a former Communist leader, Betancourt can do no wrong. He's even the darling of most of the U.S. press which consistently views Communist dictators as "premiers" or "chairmen," never as bloody autocrats. This name is only reserved for the rightist dictators friendly to the United States. As the Turkish Ambassador recently said in Washington: "Americans love their enemies and despise their friends."

Every believer in the sacred principles of the U.S. Constitution, its Bill of Rights and what used to be a government of laws and not of personalities would do well to study the strange pattern of the Perez Jimenez case.

BACKGROUND

Who: Gen. Marcos Perez Jimenez, President of Venezuela, 1952–58, now behind the bars of Dade County jail.

Age: Forty-eight.

Family: The former Venezuelan President lived at 4609 Pine Tree Drive, Miami Beach, Fla., with his wife, the former Flor Chalbauld, and four daughters: Margot, 17; Florangel, 14; Maria Sol, 10; and Flo de Maria, 6.

"It is my hope and desire that the U.S. Government will continue to allow me to live peacefully and quietly here with my family, as I have done the last 3 years, in order that my daughters may continue their American education, and that my wife and I may be a part of this community," said Gen. Perez Jimenez.

Church: The entire family regularly attends St. Patrick's Catholic Church, Miami Beach.

Friendship with the United States: Gen. Perez Jimenez, was one of the United States of America's stanchest supporters in this hemisphere.

In 1954 he was awarded the highest rank of the Legion of Merit by the United States for "his sound foreign-investment policies," and his government was cited by the late Secretary of State Dulles as "an example to other countries in Latin America."

Under his administration, American companies and individuals found Venezuela an ideal business climate for investment and operation. According to the Encyclopedia Britannica, those investments were drastically cut back in 1957 after Romulo Betancourt came into power. The country went from a policy of encouragement to one of discouragement where essential foreign investment was concerned.

Anti-Communist record: Not only was communism outlawed under the administration of Perez Jimenez, but members and sympathizers left Venezuela and their activities were practically nonexistent. The general severed relations with Russia and other satellite countries.

During this period the Accion Democratica and Communist parties entered into a coalition to overthrow the anti-Communist Perez Jimenez government.

It is interesting to note that the Communist Party had been officially recognized during the years 1945–48 after Betancourt headed a seven-man ruling junta. With Betancourt's return to head of the government in 1958, communism again became legal in Venezuela and is flourishing there right now. The Encyclopedia Britannica reports that the number of Communists in Venezuela jumped from 20,000 in 1957 to 35,000 in 1959 and to 40,000 in 1960.

Status in the United States: Perez Jimenez entered the United States with a valid visitor's visa. Subsequent events in Venezuela made it impossible for him to return to that country. Consequently, he overstayed his temporary visa. Deportation proceedings were instituted and then deferred pending action on his application for permanent residence in the United States.

Perez Jimenez also applied for stay of deportation in formal proceedings provided by law on the ground that he would be subject to political persecution if deported to Venezuela. All immigration proceedings have been deferred pending outcome of the extradition matter. The Immigration Service had never required that the general be placed under bond, nor were his actions substantially restricted.

Attempts to extradite: General Perez Jimenez and his family came to the United States in 1958; thereafter sought political asylum. The general remained unmolested until August 25 of that year when extradition proceedings were formally instituted by the Betancourt regime. It is ironic that while the country seeks the return of Perez Jimenez, his wife and children are political exiles and are not permitted to return to Venezuela. It is also ironic that during Perez Jimenez' regime his government prepared for the extradition of Romulo Betancourt as a result of an assassination attempt upon the general's life; Perez Jimenez halted the proceedings to avoid involving the United States in his country's internal politics.

The Venezuelan Government has charged Perez Jimenez with complicity in the alleged murder of four persons and alleged misappropriation of funds. Upon completion of extradition proceedings in June 1961, U.S. District Judge George W. Whitehurst found that Perez Jimenez had no connection with the alleged murders but found probable cause as to the alleged financial charges. Evidence in the proceedings has been forwarded to the U.S. State Department. A petition for writ of habeas corpus was filed by counsel for Perez Jimenez which was predicated upon, among other things, a statement by Judge Whitehurst that he had in fact not read the evidence in the financial charges.

Appeal to U.S. court of appeals: The habeas corpus petition was denied on August 23d by U.S. District Judge William A. McRae, Jr. An appeal was made. A $100,000 bond was posted by the general.

The general, in a recent press conference, announced his intent to use every legal remedy at his disposal to remain in the United States.

Military career: Perez Jimenez graduated from military school in Caracas in 1933 as the most prominent student during 3 years of studies. He was given the rank of sublieutenant on July 5, 1933; entered the artillery division. He was then made professor of ballistics, professor of armaments, and professor of military information at the military institute and served at the school as staff officer until 1939. He went to Peru and continued his military studies; received his diploma as an officer of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. He has received decorations from Venezuela, Guatemala, Ecuador, Bolivia, Argentina, and the United States.

Political career: Following the 1945 revolution which deposed President Medina Angarita, Perez Jimenez launched his political career by opposing the seven-man junta headed by Romulo Betancourt. He continued to oppose the Gallegos regime of 1947, and the Leftist Accion Democratica. In 1948; when the Accion Democratica government was forced to retire, he became Defense Minister and a member of the military junta that ruled the country and which later became the Independent Electoral Front. In December of 1952 he became Provisional President of Venezuela; was elected Constitutional President in 1953. He held office until January 1958, when the Government was overthrown by a coalition opposition which included Accion Democratica and the Communist party.

Prosperity under his administration: Venezuela experienced astonishing material progress under the Perez Jimenez regime; reported a surplus in the national budget in 1954 of $64 million. Petroleum production in that year was at a high of 2,112,000 barrels of oil per day. Fifty-seven percent of the national income was used to build highways, housing projects for workers, schools and hospitals. The Venezuelan Treasury at Perez Jimenez' resignation contained $750 million.

According to the Encyclopedia Britannica: "The Perez Jimenez regime concentrated on the development of cities, stimulating the growth of an urban middle class * * * during this period the Nation boasted the highest per capita income among the Central and South American countries."

According to the New York Times: Perez Jimenez was "a man with a mission" who had "dedicated himself to make Venezuela, a tropical underdeveloped country of 6 million inhabitants, the economic and social center of Latin America."

According to Life magazine: The economy under Perez Jimenez "enabled many Venezuelan workers, whose average wages have doubled in 10 years, to replace their ropesoled sandals with shoes, buy canned goods in the supermarkets and satisfy a craving for chicken and ice cream."

According to Collier's encyclopedia: "The spectacular economic boom continued unabated. After earmarking an additional $23 million for public works in 1957, the richest country in Latin America looked around for impressive projects on an international scale. The Government pledged money at the United Nations for the proposed Special U.N. Fund for Economic Development * * * it gave credit to Paraguay estimated at $30 million and another $15 million loan for development went to Ecuador."

According to the National City Bank of New York: Venezuela was in sound financial condition, and it distributed to its depositors a report that recommended the country for foreign investments.

According to the Book of Knowledge: "Venezuela (under Perez Jimenez) was never more prosperous. It has new iron mines, manufacturing, a steel mill, oil refinery, new railroads, highways, and ports. The Government enjoys more than a billion dollars a year in revenue from the oil industry alone. This wealth has permitted a spectacular public works program."

PUBLIC WORKS

According to Collier's encyclopedia: "The multimillion-dollar income from the foreign petroleum companies completely transformed Caracas and other cities with the largest program of public works ever undertaken anywhere in Latin America. Old buildings were torn down by the hundreds to make way for wide avenues and skyscrapers. Hillside slums were being cleared away and occupants were moving into modern apartments bought on easy terms. Superhighways were carved through the mountains to connect seaports with interior industrial cities. In 10 years, Venezuela quadrupled its highway mileage and had more good roads than Brazil, a country nearly 10 times as large."

Because slums were created by the sudden influx of agricultural workers to the industries in the cities, "the Government organized Banco Obrero, built 10 low-rental apartment houses in 1954 and transferred 30,000 families from shacks into new quarters. Construction was started in 1955 for about 30 more blocks to accommodate 15,000 more people.

According to the Book of Knowledge: "In April 1953, Venezuela adopted a new constitution * * * 2 days later, Marcos Perez Jimenez was elected President. He launched a program of countrywide improvements. In the 1950's, for instance, Venezuela invested hundreds of millions of dollars in public projects such as housing, waterworks, schools, highways, harbor improvements, churches, buildings, and agriculture. Income from petroleum furnished the money for almost all of the projects. Huge housing projects have changed the living habits of thousands of people in the northern highlands. Many people have moved from tiny shacks into comfortable Government-built apartment buildings."

Venezuela encouraged immigration, and more than 340,000 immigrants came from Italy, Spain, Portugal, France, and Austria.

Relations with Betancourt: Shortly after Perez Jimenez assumed the Venezuelan presidency, former President Romulo Betancourt started an 8-week tour of South America, making protests and charges against the new regime. Simultaneously, the Accion Democratica and Communist Parties commenced agitation, and this resulted in decrees that outlawed both and made their political activities illegal. The two parties had fomented strikes in the oil industry with a view to crippling it and creating economic crisis. The strikes were accompanied by acts of sabotage and violence on a nationwide basis. Colonel Delgado Chalbaud had been killed in ambush in 1950; there were four attempts on the life of Perez Jimenez in the period from 1952 to 1954.

THE EXTRADITION CASE OF MARCOS PEREZ JIMENEZ

BACKGROUND

Mr. Marcos Perez Jimenez served as President of Venezuela from 1952 to 1958.

He fled from Venezuela to the Dominican Republic early in 1958 when his government was overthrown. He applied for admission to the United States on March 28, 1958, as a visitor. He entered the United States in a parole status pending determination of his eligibility for admission. On January 7, 1959, he was admitted to the United States as a visitor until February 15, 1959, and that visit was extended to March 13, 1959. Further requests for extension were denied and, when he failed to leave the United States within a reasonable time after expiration of his lawful stay, deportation proceedings were instituted against him. After full hearings, Mr. Perez Jimenez was ordered deported and that determination by the Immigration and Naturalization Service was affirmed on appeal by the Board of Immigration Appeals on September 8, 1959.

EXTRADITION REQUEST

While the deportation proceedings were pending before the Board of Immigration Appeals, the Government of Venezuela, on August 25, 1959, filed a formal complaint in extradition under the United States-Venezuela Extradition Treaty of 1922 and section 3184, title 18, United States Code, seeking the return for prosecution of Mr. Perez Jimenez for alleged complicity in 4 homicides and for approximately 15 financial crimes such as embezzlement and fraud by which he allegedly obtained in excess of $13 million. He was arrested at Miami pursuant to a warrant issued by the U.S. district court at Miami and was immediately released on bond.

PROCEEDINGS IN U.S. COURTS

The extradition hearing before a U.S. district judge sitting as an extradition magistrate extended over a period of almost 2 years and resulted on June 16, 1961, in the determination by the extradition magistrate that probable cause of Mr. Perez Jimenez' guilt of the financial crimes had been established but that his responsibility for or complicity in the homicides had not been shown. Pursuant to section 3184, title 18, United States Code, the extradition magistrate certified his finding and the record of the extradition hearing to the Secretary of State and ordered the commitment to jail of Mr. Perez Jimenez. He was immediately released on bond pending a decision on his petition for habeas corpus challenging the finding of the extradition magistrate.

Hearings on the habeas corpus petition were heard before a U.S. district judge on August 23 and 24, 1961. At the conclusion of the hearings the district judge found that the extradition proceedings had been conducted in accordance with law, that due process had been accorded Mr. Perez Jimenez, that the evidence presented showed probable cause to believe Mr. Perez Jimenez committed the financial crimes charged, that the crimes charged were crimes enumerated in the treaty between Venezuela and the United States which, had they been committed in this country, would be offenses against our laws and that the offenses were not political in character and thus not exempt from extradition. Accordingly, the petition for habeas corpus was dismissed. Mr. Perez Jimenez was again released under bond pending further order of the court.

Appeal was taken by Mr. Perez Jimenez to the U.S. court of appeals. In a lengthy opinion released on December 12, 1962, the court of appeals affirmed the district court's judgment. Immediately upon such affirmance and on the same day that the decision was announced, the district court, on its own motion, entered an order revoking the bond under which Mr. Perez Jimenez was at liberty and he was taken into custody. No doubt the action of the court was based, in part, on the consideration that his continued liberty on bond would enable him to flee which might result in this Government being unable to fulfill its treaty obligations should the final decision in the case be that extradition should be granted.

BAIL

The laws of the United States make no provision for bail in an international extradition case. The Supreme Court of the United States has stated that a court's discretion to grant bail in such cases should be exercised only in unusual and extraordinary circumstances prior to the holding of the extradition hearing and that allowance of bail after a finding of probable cause is inconsistent with the extradition laws of the United States. Nevertheless, Mr. Perez Jimenez was at liberty on bail not only before but after the extradition magistrate found that a proper case for extradition had been made out under the treaty and U.S. law and remained at liberty on bail until first the U.S. district court and then the U.S. court of appeals, on habeas corpus proceedings, had reviewed the case and rendered their decisions which, in effect, affirmed the finding of the extradition magistrate.

POLITICAL ASYLUM

The admission into the United States and the continued presence in the United States of aliens is governed by the laws of the United States, principally the Immigration and Nationality Act. These laws contain no provision according an individual a right to remain in this country because he claims "political asylum." Whether a person in this country is subject to extradition to a foreign country where he is accused of crime is unrelated to his status under the immigration laws or his status as an alleged "political asylee" or whether he has committed a crime in this country but is dependent upon the application of the extradition treaties and related laws of the United States.

EXTRADITION TREATIES AND LAWS

In the extradition treaties the countries agree to surrender, on a reciprocal basis, persons found in one country who are charged in the other country with any of the crimes enumerated in the treaty. These treaties and laws prescribe the procedure which must be followed and the requirements which must be met to obtain the extradition of an alleged fugitive from justice. Under these treaties and U.S. laws the alleged fugitive, whether alien or U.S. citizen, has the opportunity to resist extradition in the courts to the full extent of the law with, in accordance with traditional standards of American justice, the assurance of equal treatment under the law. Among the issues the alleged fugitive may raise in opposition to the request for his extradition is that the offenses charged are political in character and thus not a proper basis for extradition. This was among the issues raised by Mr. Perez Jimenez at the extradition hearing and in the habeas corpus proceedings. The courts found against Mr. Perez Jimenez.

Under the laws of the United States the extradition of an alleged fugitive may be granted only for those offenses for which the extradition magistrate has found probable guilt has been shown. Under the extradition treaties of the United States, including the United States-Venezuela Treaty, a person extradited may be tried only for those offenses for which extradition has been granted. In addition, like most extradition treaties of the United States, the United States-Venezuela Treaty prohibits the punishment for political offenses of persons extradited under the treaty. In the case of Mr. Perez Jimenez, he can be extradited and tried in Venezuela only for the financial crimes for it was only with respect to these crimes that the extradition magistrate, the U.S. district court and the U.S. court of appeals found that the probable guilt of Mr. Perez Jimenez had been shown.

DECISION ON EXTRADITION

Mr. Perez Jimenez may petition the U.S. Supreme Court for review of the decision of the court of appeals. In the event that the final decision of the courts is that extradition is warranted under the laws and the treaty, the determination as to whether Mr. Perez Jimenez' extradition is required under the United States-Venezuelan Treaty will rest with the Secretary of State. In making that determination careful consideration will be given to every aspect of the case.

MR. PEREZ JIMENEZ' ANTICOMMUNIST POSITION

It has been noted that many of the individuals expressing sympathy or support for Mr. Perez Jimenez have pictured him as a stanch anti-Communist. From the standpoint of objectivity, it should be noted as well that Mr. Perez Jimenez, while President of Venezuela from 1952 to 1958, headed one of the most brutally repressive and corrupt dictatorships in recent Latin American history.

While the record clearly shows that Mr. Perez Jimenez' government undertook action against many leaders of the Venezuelan Communist Party, it was even more severe in its harassment of democratic opposition groups. Moreover, there were indications in the final years of the Perez Jimenez dictatorship that it was coddling Communists in organized labor, the press, and in education. It apparently did this to make of them a counterfoil to the dominance of democratic opposition political groups in those key fields whom it considered a greater threat to itself than it did the Communists.

As a result of infiltration during the Perez Jimenez dictatorship, which became apparent after the overthrow of that regime in January 1958, the Communist Party of Venezuela emerged more strongly entrenched in labor, journalism, and education than ever before.

Since 1959, under a representative government, democratic political groups have managed to restore their position of dominance in labor, journalism, and education and greatly reduce Communist strength in these fields.

POLITICAL COMPLEXION OF THE VENEZUELAN GOVERNMENT

It has also been noted that many of the persons expressing sympathy for Mr. Perez Jimenez have done so in apparent belief that the present Government of Venezuela is Communist and pro-Communist and seeks to have him extradited to wreak its vengeance on him for his purported anticommunism. The similarity of their allegations suggests that they may be responding to solicitations from an organization or organizations conducting a campaign to discredit the Government of Venezuela and its President, Romulo Betancourt. Their allegations about the present Venezuelan Government are not supported by the facts and are at considerable variance with accurate information which has reached the Department of State from numerous reliable and competent close observers of Venezuela for many years.

The present Venezuelan Government is a coalition of the Democratic Action (AD) Party of President Betancourt, the Social Christian (Christian Democratic or Catholic) COPEI Party and political independents who are among the democratic leaders of the professional and business community.

The former Communist affiliation of President Betancourt during the beginning of his political career in the early 1930's has been common knowledge for many years. However, it is equally well known that he severed his connections with communism more than a quarter of a century ago, subsequently organized his own political movement, the AD Party, and formulated a political program based on democratic concepts of social reform related to the unique character of Venezuela's national problems.

The AD Party in its formative years was influenced by Marxist ideas and some of its leaders have been avowed radical Marxists of the extreme left. However, the leftwing extremist leadership has been expelled from the party or has bolted from it. As presently constituted, the AD, under President Betancourt's leadership, is a nationalistic mixture of moderate social democrat and liberal. It advocates political, social, and economic changes through representative democratic means and does not seek to abolish the free enterprise system or private property. It is a "polyclass" party which stands for basic reforms by constitutional means which permit the participation of all democratic groups in the political process. It does not advocate revolution through class struggle.

Since its founding 23 years ago, the AD Party under Mr. Betancourt has been a bitter political adversary of the Venezuelan Communists and a target of international Communist attack. Mr. Betancourt's firm stand against communism in general and particularly against its most recent manifestation in this hemishpere, as represented by Fidel

Castro, has been clearly and forcefully demonstrated many times during his Presidency.

Mr. Betancourt's government has been subjected to severe and continuing attacks by the Communist Party of Venezuela and an allied left-extremist group which had been expelled from the AD Party. Since late 1961 the Communist Party and its ally, the Movement of the Revolutionary Left, have embarked on an all-out campaign of terrorism, sabotage, crime, and guerrilla warfare to overthrow the Venezuelan Government.

As a result, the Venezuelan Government in May 1962 banned the activities of these two subversive, conspiratorial groups. More recently, the Government petitioned the Supreme Court to declare them illegal on the basis of evidence which it has supplied; and has undertaken increasingly severe and energetic security measures to counter Communist insurgency.

During the recent Cuban crisis, the Venezuelan Government strongly supported the U.S. position and contributed two warships to the naval quarantine of Cuba. In reprisal, Venezuelan Communists severely sabotaged some of the petroleum installations which are Venezuela's economic mainstay. The Venezuelan Government brought this Communist-directed sabotage, on behalf of the Communist Cuban regime, to the attention of the Organization of American States.

Indicative of the opinion of the resident U.S. citizen in Venezuela (about 30,000 in number), the English language Daily Journal of Caracas, Venezuela, whose publishers include several leaders of the U.S. community, carried the following editorial on November 7, 1962, which stated in part:

"North Americans all over the world can expect, these days, to be in the front line, and should not be surprised if Fidelistas and Communists attack them. Their answer should be compounded of composure and commonsense and appreciation of the fact that the vast majority of Venezuelans are with them.

"They can also remember that the President of Venezuela has said that attacks on American companies are attacks on the economy of Venezuela, no more and no less.

"North Americans have good reason to hold their heads high. Their country has been the symbol of the fight against tyranny. And Venezuela has joined it in that fight."

The Communist Cuban regime has been carrying on a propaganda campaign against the Venezuelan Government, and particularly against President Betancourt, that is exceeded in its ferocity and provocation only by the Castro Government's vilification of the United States. The Communist Cuban regime has clearly sided with the terrorist insurrection of the Venezuelan Communists.

A recent communique of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Venezuela stated that "the principal enemy of the Venezuelan people today is the government of Betancourt, through which U.S. imperialism and its allies, the local privileged classes, effect their rule. The plenary session of the central committee calls for joint action with all opposition groups against Betancourt." This theme is being echoed by the propaganda organs of international communism.

PRESIDENT BETANCOURT'S VISIT TO THE UNITED STATES

Venezuela was the first Latin American country which President Kennedy visited after his inauguration. He went there in December 1961, as a guest of President Betancourt to dramatize the cooperative effort being made by the United States, Venezuela, and the other Latin American countries to accelerate their economic and social development under the Alliance for Progress. The President's trip demonstrated the intense concern of the United States for the programs of the Venezuelan Government aimed at improving the welfare of the greatest number of its people.

President Kennedy recently invited President Betancourt to visit the United States. President Betancourt has accepted this invitation and will come to Washington on February 19 and 20. This visit will enable President Kennedy to reciprocate the hospitality of the visiting chief of state of a country with which the United States has formed so many close and cordial ties. It will also afford the two Presidents an opportunity to exchange views on matters of mutual interest.

The Venezuelan Government of President Betancourt has demonstrated a firm desire to maintain the traditional friendly relations between our countries. Our friendly cooperation has furthered our mutual interest in the following objectives which are the antithesis of international communism: (a) extension of representative democracy, (b) accelerated economic, social, and cultural development within a framework of free institutions, and (c) inter-American cooperation in the defense of the security of this hemisphere against aggression or subversion.

The Government of Venezuela, under President Betancourt, has demonstrated its active interest in assuring economic and social progress with political stability and with freedom. It apparently is making strong efforts to meet the needs of the Venezuelan people and to strengthen democratic institutions. And it seems firmly determined to maintain the political independence of Venezuela. Such independence, of course, is contrary to the objectives of international communism.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I have three unanimous-consent requests. First, that the distinguished Speaker may extend his remarks at this point in the body of the RECORD on the subject of Estonian Independence Day.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

ESTONIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, Estonia is one of the three Baltic countries in northeastern Europe, and the Estonians constitute one of three Baltic peoples. With an area of about 18,000 square miles, and a population of not much more than 1 million, Estonians have always figured as one of the smallest nationality groups in all of Europe. But to these gallant and gifted people mere size in numbers has not been of any real account. They have always faced their far more powerful enemies, invariably many times their size, with courage and determination, convinced that theirs has been a righteous and sacred cause. They have fought courageously against all their foes, and even in defeat they have made themselves glorious and great. In the course of their eventful history, when it was impossible for them to maintain their national independence, they refused to bow their heads to their conquerors and overlords. During the two centuries before 1918 they were subjected to cruel treatment at the hands of Russia's callous agents. They were fiercely persecuted for some of the beliefs they held and the ideas they advocated, but these dauntless champions of freedom and liberty could neither be silenced nor subdued. They clung to their ideals until the time came for their freedom. In 1917 when the czarist regime in Russia was overthrown, they saw their chance, seized upon it, and proclaimed their national independence on February 24 of 1918.

Since then world-rocking events have brought about many revolutionary changes everywhere. But the disheartening change brought about in the first years of the last war ushered in a new tragedy to many peoples. Unfortunate Estonians could not defy their fate. Early in 1940 Estonia was invaded by the Red army, occupied, and soon it was made part of the Soviet Union. In the course of the war the Estonians exchanged their Communist overlords for Nazi invaders, but that did not change their lot; they suffered equally under both. Toward the end of the war the Communists returned with more force and unbridled fury, and there they remain to this day. They have turned once independent and free Estonia into a large prison camp where all Estonians work for their taskmasters in the Kremlin. They are completely cut off from the free world, and we really know little of their actual status. Without any personal and political freedom, under abominable conditions, they lead a miserable life. But they have not lost heart, and they still hope for their deliverance from misery and servitude, from Communist totalitarian tyranny. On this 45th anniversary celebration of their independence day we ardently hope and fervently pray for their freedom and independence.

COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

Mr. ALBERT. Second, Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN], I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking and Currency may sit during general debate on February 25, 26, 27, 28, and March 1, 4, and 5.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, what is going to be the business of the House on those days? Does the gentleman have any idea whether there will be important legislation before the House on those days?

Mr. ALBERT. There may well be important legislation on some of those days, but I would like to advise the gentleman the reason for this request, as I understand it, from the Committee on Banking and Currency is to do just exactly what the gentleman wants done, and that is to process the committee part of legislation and get it to the floor so that we can proceed with the business of the House.

Mr. GROSS. Of course, we all want to proceed with the business of the House, but not at the expense of Members being in committees and not on the floor of the House when important legislation is being considered.

Mr. ALBERT. The gentleman recognizes that this permission for the committee to sit extends only to such time as the House is engaged in general debate and not while the House is considering legislation in Committee of the Whole on amendments under the 5-minute rule or during the consideration by the House of any other matter pertaining to the actual processing of bills and other legislative matters.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I will not object to this request but later when the legislative machinery starts to roll, the gentleman from Iowa will be constrained to object to projecting unanimous consent requests of this nature into the unknown future.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, I understand from the press reports that the matter to be taken up by the Committee on Banking and Currency is this so-called mass transportation bill that is to cost a minimum of $500 million to take care of some of the transportation problems of some of the large cities at the cost of all the taxpayers of the Nation. Is that the bill to be considered?

Mr. ALBERT. If the gentleman will yield, I am not prepared to advise specifically what legislation will be involved here, but like the gentleman, and like the party of the gentleman, we are all concerned with the problems of the city as we are concerned with the problems of other elements of our society.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Some of us are concerned just a little bit with the budget situation and the situation of the Federal Treasury too. There are some of us who may not be quite as inspired with the idea that we ought to pay for mass transportation of the great cities as some of the rest of you. I am just wondering if this is an attempt to speed up consideration of legislation of this type, and whether or not it should not follow the orderly procedure of handling legislation here in the House so that Members would have an opportunity to attend hearings and know exactly what is going on. Does the gentleman know?

Mr. ALBERT. I am not prepared to answer the specific question of the gentleman.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Then I will object, Mr. Speaker, at this time.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman does not press the other consent request?

Mr. ALBERT. I renew the request made on behalf of the gentleman from Texas, [Mr. PATMAN].

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I object to the latter request until I know what the committee is going to take up and discuss during the time the House is in session on other important legislation.

The SPEAKER. Objection is heard.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. When that information is furnished me I will discuss the withdrawal of the objection.

ADDITIONAL PROGRAM FOR WEEK OF FEBRUARY 25

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to announce to the House that the several bills out of the Committee on Ways and Means which were scheduled for today are being put over until tomorrow at the request of the distinguished chairman of the committee. I may add that two of these bills will come at a later date, H.R. 2862 and House Resolution 57.

Mr. Speaker, I desire also to advise the House that the first order of business on Wednesday will be the supplemental appropriation bill, commodity credit, Public Law 480, and also that on Wednesday the Committee on House Administration will bring up several resolutions, including the following:

House Resolution 239, Agriculture.

House Resolution 146, Armed Services.

House Resolution 204, Banking and Currency; Housing.

House Resolution 202, District of Columbia.

House Resolution 243, Foreign Affairs.

House Resolution 80, Government Operations.

House Resolution 165, House Administration.

House Resolution 135, Interior and Insular Affairs.

House Resolution 226, Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

House Resolution 35, and House Resolution 100, Judiciary.

House Resolution 30, Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

House Resolution 152, Post Office and Civil Service.

House Resolution 236, and House Resolution 237, Public Works.

House Resolution 177, Science and Astronautics.

House Resolution 222, Small Business.

House Resolution 249, Un-American Activities.

House Resolution 74, Veterans' Affairs.

House Resolution 227, Ways and Means.

There may be some additional resolutions from this committee which will meet in executive session on Tuesday. If more are added they may be programed for Wednesday and the balance of the week also.

I may advise, Mr. Speaker, that these resolutions may not necessarily be called up in the order in which I have announced them, and I would like also to advise the House again that any further program for the week will be announced later.

Mr. Speaker, I note the presence of the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency, and I suggest that he submit the request which I attempted to make earlier and to which the gentleman from Ohio objected.

COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking and Currency be allowed to sit during general debate in addition to the time already granted, on February 25, 26, 27, 28, and on March 1, 4, and 5.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I wonder what bills are coming up?

Mr. PATMAN. We have the Export-Import Bank hearings going on now. We will also take up mass transportation Wednesday.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Wednesday of this week?

Mr. PATMAN. Yes. That will go over to the end of this period. This is just for afternoons.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. What length of time will the gentleman have on the mass transportation bill?

Mr. PATMAN. We will have probably a week of hearings.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Is that a statement we can depend on?

Mr. PATMAN. We will finish the hearings on March 5.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Yes. Will the chairman arrange for an opportunity to be given to those persons who oppose this proposition?

Mr. PATMAN. Yes. This morning one came in and wanted to be heard.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. This will not be a hearing in which the proponents alone will have the opportunity to be heard?

Mr. PATMAN. No. We have fair hearings in our committee, and we hear both sides. We give every witness an opportunity to be heard.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. How much money is involved?

Mr. PATMAN. I do not know about the terms of all the different bills. There are several bills. It is quite a sum.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I understand that the amount mentioned is $500 million to start the program.

Mr. PATMAN. Yes. But I think it is contemplated that only a small part will be available the first year.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. For the first year. Then the total cost will run into millions?

Mr. PATMAN. The $500 million is the outside figure. Only about $10 million will be taken up the first year. I would not like to be committed to that, however.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. It will run into the millions of dollars?

Mr. PATMAN. It will run into millions of dollars, yes.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. If the chairman wants to have the hearing and will assure the House there will be at least 1 week of hearings, with an opportunity for opponents to be heard also, I have no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. I so assure the gentleman.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON SCIENCE AND ASTRONAUTICS

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Science and Astronautics may be allowed to sit during general debate in the afternoon session of the House for the balance of the week.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

SPACE PROGRAM—ANYTHING GOES?

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, news coverage in recent days, which states that NASA has failed to entice away from the Air Force two of its top space aces with hefty pay increases, fails to give a true picture of what is happening. There is another word for this. It is called pirating. NASA has unlimited funds and too little concern for cost. This action must be called disregard for the American taxpayer. Military space programs are, in the opinion of many, even more important than NASA's programs. Bidding by Government agencies against each other for personnel is a bad practice for all the Government. When that takes place, the only answer is for each agency or service to try to outbid the other and to do so each must constantly justify to Congress higher grades and bigger salaries. We, in the United States, seem to have gotten ourselves into a dangerous attitude over space efforts. Anything goes as long as it is for space. This is not conducive to sound accomplishment and it plays havoc with budget problems. Someone upstairs needs to talk to the space people about realism.

ESTONIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

Mr. BELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DERWINSKI] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, the 24th day of February, the Estonian Republic would have celebrated its 45th anniversary.

I use the term "would have celebrated" since obviously, the Estonian people now held in bondage by the Soviet Union are not free to celebrate the legitimate anniversary of their freedom. Certainly, they are no longer a free people but do look forward to the day when their legitimate desire for self-determination will once again produce a free and independent Estonia.

However, it is noteworthy that Estonian refugees from Soviet persecution scattered around the continents of the world continue to observe this anniversary and remain a vigorous, forceful, and effective voice in the maintenance of the spirit of the captive Estonian people. Their heroic struggle for freedom and their perseverance equip them well to continue the struggle; their militant anticommunism and their desire to be free from Soviet Russian oppression make them one of the leading voices calling for restoration of freedom to all the peoples of the captive nations.

In the United States, the Estonian National Committee serves as a very effective spokesman for Estonian groups, and their counterparts in other lands are equally effective.

In paying my respects to the 45th anniversary of the independence of the Estonian Republic, I voice the hope and the prayer not only of the Estonian people but of all freedom-loving peoples throughout the world, that the people of Estonia and the other nations which suffer tyranny under Communist rule, will soon see the day when their freedom is restored. To this end they and we pledge ourselves.

PARTISANSHIP IN SUMMER STUDENT EMPLOYMENT

Mr. BELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WIDNALL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, the disclosure last week that the White House was considering applying a patronage clearance system to summer student employment has evoked considerable newspaper comment by impartial observers.

Foremost among these are three articles which under unanimous consent I will include following my remarks. The first of these is the original story on the patronage clearance operation appearing in the Washington Star of Wednesday, February 20, and written by Joseph Young. The second is an editorial condemning the proposed practice which appeared in the February 21 Washington Star. Finally, there is an excellent column by John Cramer, which was published in the Washington Daily News of Friday, February 22.

In his column, Mr. Cramer calls attention to the need for a complete reevaluation of summer employment practices within the Federal Government. He contends that of the 10,000 or 12,000 positions available, the majority are make-work jobs which benefit neither the student nor the agency. The disclosures of last week, and Mr. Cramer's comments, have led me to several conclusions.

First, there is a need to take as many of these summer jobs out of the patronage pie as possible, placing them under a merit hiring system within civil service, with greater cooperation between the hiring agents and school placement officers. I am certain that the number of partisan policy making positions open to summer employees is rather limited in number.

Second, an evaluation of the reasons for hiring summer help should be made. If Mr. Cramer's observations are correct, and I have occasion to believe they are, a majority of the present jobs are unjustifiable, unless simply excused as a patronage tool or a madework project. I would assume that an investigation by the General Accounting Office would be appropriate if the executive branch does not put its own house in order. To my knowledge, no appropriations measure has ever passed this body which authorized any agency to set up a summer version of the Youth Conservation Corps or the WPA.

There are legitimate reasons, of course, for some hiring. One obvious reason is to take up the slack left by vacationing employees. Another is a commendable effort to interest young people in a Government career, through an internship approach. Some agencies plan their work in such a way that with respect to routine matters a backlog is built up which is erased by summer staff members.

Third, there is a need to provide the serious minded student with opportunities to enrich his knowledge of the process of Government and the science of politics and administration. White House seminars, filled with 1,500 students, with famous New Frontiersmen as speakers, are inadequate substitutes for informal, small, seminar sessions under the guidance of an objective organization such as the American Political Science Association or the younger member section of the Federal Bar Association. The number of students motivated to participate in such seminars would be small in relation to the past White House program participants, but the rewards both for the student and, ultimately, the country, would be infinitely greater.

That is why in December of last year, I suggested such an approach to the American Political Science Association. The association has expressed a lively interest in the possibilities. I hope that this program would not be limited to those participating in the White House program, but would include summer students working with Congress, the political parties, and private associations with an interest in Government. However, cooperation by the White House personnel, particularly Mrs. Dorothy Davies, is essential if the program is to have a chance at success.

There are some who may wonder at the amount of response students would show for such an activity. Those who participated in last year's program, while interested in some phases, did not find it entirely to their liking. Even the so-called representatives from among the students in each department who were asked to evaluate and make suggestions in reports to Mrs. Davies, I am sure, were not completely happy with the program as their reports would disclose.

I should like to call attention, furthermore, to the cocurricular programs of seminars and speakers within our colleges and universities. Many of them, such as the Yale Law School Forum and the UCLA public administration seminar program, are student run. They all suffer from two obstacles: first, the difficulty of getting speakers who are not, generally, in close proximity to the campuses; and second, the competition with regular school work for the intellectual interests and time of the student.

A summer program in Washington, D.C., nearly eliminates these obstacles. The availability of participants is obvious. As the excitement of the first contact with government work wears off, and routine becomes the rule rather than the exception, there are many students who would welcome voluntary, informal, intellectual opportunities in the evening which are missing during the rest of the week.

Hopefully, the White House will see fit to cooperate in this educational experiment. Those who have instituted the spoils system with respect to summer jobs should be warned that no amount of cooperation with impartial outside groups will cover up this disgraceful partisanship. The American college student is not so insensitive that such a cynical display will go unheeded. Indeed, I can think of no better way to discourage qualified graduates from seeking Government employment in the future.

The articles follow:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Star, Feb. 20, 1963]

White House To Control Student Job Patronage—Civil Service Not Told of Meeting Which Set Up Clearance System

(By Joseph Young)

The White House has taken control over the patronage of the more than 10,000 student summer jobs in Government.

At a White House meeting last week, which was held without the knowledge of the Civil Service Commission, some of President Kennedy's aids met with the political appointees of various agencies who are involved in patronage work.

A clearance system was set up whereby the names of all students who have filed applications for summer employment in Government agencies will be sent to the White House.

The State from which the student hails, plus the college he is attending (if any), will be included in the information sent to the White House.

WASHINGTON JOBS

The jobs mainly are in Washington and last from June through August.

Mrs. Dorothy Davies, a White House staff assistant, who was in charge of the meeting, said the purpose of the new system was to assure "coordination" in order that the agencies could make best use of the student's talent.

Mrs. Davies did not deny that political patronage is one of the aims of the White House clearance system, but declared that the Kennedy administration's primary concern is that the student talent be put to the best use possible and groomed for regular Federal employment when they graduate.

Civil Service Commission officials have privately expressed dismay at the latest turn of events.

While there has always been quite a bit of personal patronage involved in summer Government jobs, applicants have had to pass civil service exams for clerical, typists, and stenographer jobs. And in the case of student trainee jobs, in which college students take Federal summer employment in connection with what the Government hopes will be their Federal professions after graduation, they are selected from civil service registers.

TOP YOUTHS CERTIFIED

The feeling among Government career personnel officers is that it is wrong to play politics where young people are concerned, particularly among college students who are the Government's hope for the future as far as filling key career jobs are concerned.

It's no secret that a goodly portion of the summer student jobs are filled on a personal patronage basis each year. Government officials—political and career—have hired their own sons and daughters as well as the children of friends or Members of Congress. However, the Civil Service Commission has been careful to certify only the top qualifiers on the student trainee exam.

The White House job clearance system may be an effort to channel these jobs in a more political patronage area, whereby more sons and daughters of Democratic Members of Congress and key Democratic supporters and contributors may get summer jobs in Government.

Congress has shown increased interest in these summer jobs. Last year the House approved a bill to apportion these jobs on a State-by-State basis. This would have the effect of giving most of these jobs to students outside of the Washington area. However, the Senate failed to act on the bill before adjournment.

This year a half-dozen bills have been introduced in Congress to achieve the same objective.

In discussing the White House job clearence system, Mrs. Davies said it was a move to channel the best possible talent to the places in Government where it could be used most effectively.

She said that, for example, if an agency finds that its summer job vacancies are all filled up, a place for a bright student could be found in another Government agency through a coordinated placement system set up in the White House.

Mrs. Davies refused to answer directly whether the program also involved political patronage, other than saying that there always has been some patronage in summer student jobs in Government.

Presumably, students still will have to pass an exam to get the summer jobs.

Last year's Government summer job program for students was given great emphasis by the administration, with President Kennedy and other top Government officials addressing the students.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Star, Feb. 21, 1963]

Patronage At a Price

"The Democratic administration will establish and enforce a code of ethics to maintain the full dignity and integrity of the Federal service and to make it more attractive to the ablest men and women" (1960 Democratic platform).

Now, the above is a passel of mighty pretty words which, canned in July 1960, may become downright indigestible in July 1963. That's the time of year when Washington is invaded by all those bright young students who spend the summer picking up a few bucks working for, and learning about, their Government.

This summer, Federal Columnist Joe Young tells us, they are going to learn more than they bargained for. They are going to be indoctrinated into the political boss system, known otherwise simply as patronage. And their lessons are coming from the very Olympia of plum dispensaries, the White House.

Somebody there, we are told, is going to save the Civil Service Commission the trouble of deciding what students will work where. Being set up at the White House level is a sort of superemployment service, unhampered by rules and regulations, to which agency personnel officials have been told they should channel all job applications. Avowedly, this system will guarantee that the talents of each applicant will be used to best advantage. But it doesn't take a political genius to perceive that the talents of a worthy Democrat's son may just happen to be more worthy than those of a misguided outsider.

No exception in the White House lottery is planned for a select group of student trainees who expect to make Government their careers. These are the young men and women the Government hopes to attract "to maintain the full dignity and integrity of the Federal service." But it wouldn't be too surprising if the trainees, after learning the true facts of political life, packed up their shattered ideals and departed forever.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Daily News, Feb. 22, 1963]

Clearance Plan on Jobs Is Scored

(By John Cramer)

As might be expected, there's outcry against the word that the White House plans to clear the youngsters appointed next summer to temporary, student-type jobs in the Washington area.

The first cry comes from Representative **William B. Widnall**, Republican, of New Jersey.

He's most concerned about the impact on the so-called summer interns, graduate students and serious undergraduates contemplating Government as a career.

He calls the White House move an attempt to "brainwash the American college student." He says the loss to "students, faculty, and the nation will be incalcuable."

INSTRUMENTAL

Representative **Widnall** goes on to say that he, personally, was instrumental in getting the American Political Science Association interested in conducting after-hours seminars next summer for student interns.

The APSA, he says, was ready and eager. The White House, he says, didn't show much interest.

He said:

"Although this is not the first time that such a political clearing house operation has been employed by the administration in terms of summer jobs, it is the first to be enacted openly and on an overall scale."

Mr. **Widnall** can be nothing but right.

The clearance program obviously is the invention of White House people with time on their hands. Nothing better to do and little judgment.

NOT PLEASANT

The truth about summer, student-type jobs in the Washington area—about 11,000 last year—isn't pleasant.

The truth is that about 5,000 jobs may be justified. The rest are padded and made jobs.

For years, Federal agencies have made it a practice to save up routine tasks, and unencumbered funds, so as to be able to provide summer employment to the sons and daughters of agency bigshots and others favored.

There is excuse for hiring summer replacements for necessary employees who are on vacation.

There's no excuse for the summer job racket which has grown up, or for the ill-advised White House attempt to take advantage of it.

BECKWORTH BILL

The worst solution of all has been offered by Representative LINDLEY BECKWORTH, Democrat, of Texas.

Representative BECKWORTH has Congress all set to vote a Texas millionaire bill to control the summer jobs.

Under it, the jobs would be allocated to the various States on the basis of population.

Members of Congress find it hard to vote against such a proposition.

But what they'll be voting for is a proposal that the summer jobs be restricted to the sons and daughters of the wealthy youngsters whose parents can well afford to pay their college bills—kids who think a work-play vacation in Washington would be a lot of fun.

Many could find equally well-paying summer Government jobs in their own localities. In the longrun, happily, the White House clearance program is all to the good. It focuses attention on a messy situation which needs cleaning up.

AMENDMENT OF CIVIL SERVICE RETIREMENT ACT

Mr. BELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. NYGAARD] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. NYGAARD. Mr. Speaker, today I am reintroducing legislation to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act and the Federal Employees Health Benefits Act of 1959 so as to eliminate discriminations against married female employees.

Under present law, the widower of a deceased female Government employee must be dependent upon her for his support in order to receive an annuity in the event of her death. However, the widow of a deceased male employee can receive such an annuity regardless of need.

Similarly, under the Employees Health Benefit Act, a married female employee with nondependent husband must pay a greater share of her health insurance premium than the male employee, regardless of his wife's need. For instance, a married woman whose husband is self-employed pays a monthly premium of $13.42 for her family plan health insurance, while a male employee pays only $10.70 for the same insurance, regardless of his wife's need.

I hope favorable consideration will be given to this legislation to eliminate the present discrimination that has existed since the enactment of this legislation.

THE DEATH OF A PEACE CORPS MAN

Mr. BELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CONTE] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I am sure my colleagues in this distinguished body will be moved, as I have been, with an article from the Quincy, Mass., newspaper written by Nicholas Gage.

The article describes in detail the personality and devotion of Peace Corps Volunteer Dave Mulholland who died in the Philippines while working for the Corps.

Dave's death was a tragic occurrence coming as it did at such an early time in his life. Yet, it is amazing, Mr. Speaker, to reflect upon what he accomplished in this short time.

Shortly before his death, as Mr. Gage relates, he wrote to a Filipino friend and urged him to "Try someday to do something that is immortal, and perhaps then everything will seem worth while."

This Peace Corps man, Mr. Speaker, did do something that was immortal, and I pause here today to pay tribute to this courageous young man who did not, indeed could not, give up the battle of decency, charity, and genuine human fellowship among men.

As one of the earliest and most active supporters of the Peace Corps, I sincerely hope that every Member of this body will read the moving story of David Mulholland's life.

For this reason, Mr. Speaker, I am placing in the RECORD, this article about his life from the Quincy, Mass., Patriot Ledger of December 21, 1962:

PEACE CORPS WORK IS QUINCY MAN'S EPITAPH

(By Nicholas Gage)

(NOTE.—Nicholas Gage, author of this article, was a close friend of the late David Mulholland's when both of them worked for the Worcester Evening Gazette. He worked with him just a year before Mr. Mulholland died in the Philippines as a member of the Peace Corps. Mr. Gage gathered much of the material for this article from the personal letters and mementos of the Mulholland family in Quincy.)

"Try someday to do some little thing that's immortal," Dave Mulholland wrote a Filipino friend. "Perhaps then everything will seem worth while."

REACHED GOAL

In an abbreviated life Dave Mulholland found his immortality and purpose in a novel experiment called the Peace Corps. He was the first to sacrifice his life to this idea in the Philippines and became a "martyr to peace" and a symbol of quiet heroism and dedication.

He was among the first to join the Peace Corps and was sent to a "hardship post" in southern Philippines in October of 1961 as an educational aid. When schools closed for the summer in April of this year, he refused the vacation due him to help start the first free summer camp for children in the Philippines and head a journalism seminar for high school teachers.

The unrestrained energy he poured into these and other projects began to undermine his health and he was offered a less strenuous position at Peace Corps headquarters at Manila. He refused to abandon his work. Shortly after, he contracted amoebic dysentary and died June 10 in a Manila Air Force Hospital from a resulting liver infection. He was 23.

Just a year before, Dave was working with me on the reporting staff of the Evening Gazette in Worcester, Mass. He was lanky and boyish but his character embodied a mature sensitivity and perceptiveness that touched those who knew him.

He had seldom left Massachusetts—he was born and grew up in Quincy and joined the Worcester paper following graduation from Tufts University in Medford—but he had a hungry concern for the whole world.

SHY, BUT STRONG

He was basically shy, despite his strong convictions, but was quickly and deeply moved by sincerity and friendship. We would often have lunch at a Greek restaurant where Dave was always enthuastically received by the Greek immigrants who frequented it. They would joke with him uninhibitedly, offer him wine or coffee, teach him Greek card games. Such spontaneous gestures never ceased to delight and amaze him.

But what marked Dave Mulholland was a rare combination of two qualities—an anger at things wrong and a drive to do something about them. He singlehandedly took on John Birch Society supporters in Worcester County when he was with the paper. The group sponsored weekly discussions in the county on anti-Americanism based on Birchite invectives. Dave attended every meeting, never allowing any point of extremism to pass unchallenged. "The Mulholland Crusade," we called it in the cityroom.

He took the first Peace Corps exams and was accepted in late July of 1961. "I feel like I've been in prep school for 22 years, and I'm finally getting acceptance to life," he said.

He left for special training at Pennsylvania State University July 27; the 6-week course was an academic nightmare he told his parents, Mr. and Mrs. Henry Mulholland of 29 French Street, Quincy, when he returned home for 10 days in late September. There were classes from morning to evening, 7 days a week. Those who didn't wash out were notified during the home visit.

"David was so anxious," his mother told me, "he never left the house until the acceptance telegrams came."

RECALLED WELCOME

With 218 other volunteers, he arrived in the Philippines October 12 after a long plane trip and was greeted by a vicious rainstorm and "the wildest, most wonderful reception ever imagined. All along the route," he wrote home, "school kids were lined up, waving flags, shouting 'Mabuhay' (welcome) and shoving school notebooks at us for autographs. All this in a rainstorm."

He was assigned as an educational aid at the elementary school in Ilog, an isolated barrio (small town) surrounded by a river, about 350 miles from Manila, at Negroes Occidental Province in southern Philippines. "I have been told this is a poor, depressed, disease ridden and generally undesirable 'hardship post,' " he wrote. "I have found only sincerity and unbelievable hospitality."

But the misery was there. Shortly after arriving, a group of volunteers found a young girl on the road, dead from malnutrition. As they placed her on the bier for the funeral, her jaw swung open and her mouth released a mucous ball packed with worms.

CHILDREN MOVED HIM

"It was the children that got David," his mother said. "He would ask his classes about a missing student. "Oh, he died," they would tell him. "It pains me to watch these kids come to school shoeless and pale with hunger," he wrote in one of the four letters he sent me from the Philippines.

"I have to travel 3 miles to get to school," he said. "I ride a bike to the river, put it in a banca (dugout canoe with outriggers), cross the river and ride through sugarcane fields to school. For someone whose only communion with nature was the Boston Common, this is quite an adventure.

"I am teaching at the elementary school in Ilog, assisting native teachers under conditions less than ideal. The reader I use in one of my classes was published in 1923.

Students are provided only desks in schools here and must furnish their own chairs."

He started a chair-building campaign to alleviate the shortage, volunteer John Lagomarsino, who was one of Dave's closest friends, reports from the Philippines. There were 7 teachers instructing 300 students in the crowded school. Dave taught part of his sixth grade class in the schoolyard to avoid the congestion.

He reached the children from the first. "Call me Dave" he told his pleasantly shocked students, forged in the rigid protocol of Philippine schools. "He delighted them by going to their desks and sitting near them while he taught," a friend wrote his parents.

When Dave arrived at the school the day before Christmas vacation began, each class presented him with a gift. "I received from one class a cellophane bag of four soda crackers, a face cloth from another, five pearl eggs, a handkerchief, a bar of soap. That little bag of soda crackers from grade 5 is among the most precious gifts I have ever received."

With the arrival of Christmas, Dave became the town hero. It is the custom of Filipinos in towns and villages to build a nativity scene at Christmas time for display in the plaza. Judges travel from town to town and give prizes to the best efforts.

The nativity scene in Ilog never won a prize. It was traditionally carved from wood and therefore small. Dave suggested this time they make a big one by using papier mache figures. Everyone agreed and placed him in charge of the project.

"In my enthusiasm, I forgot I didn't know anything about papier mache," he wrote his mother. "Fortunately, I had an old science text which gave instructions. * * *"

When the project was finished, he was asked to lead the dedication procession. The judges gave it third prize for the area. Ilog was ecstatic and so was Dave. "Unlike the United States," he wrote, "where a town decorates by buying the latest plastic materials and hires workmen to put them up, here everyone contributes and everyone takes pride. One can say, 'I made Joseph's lantern;' another, 'I painted the donkey;' 'That's my star.' "

RECOGNIZED PROBLEMS

Dave recognized the particular qualities of the Filipinos and fought their weaknesses. When the parent-teachers group which virtually controls progress in Philippine schools, showed little energy in improving conditions in Ilog, he called the local group together.

"Today you face not the challenge of an invading army," he told them in terms they understood, "not the fury of a raging river, but a challenge perhaps less obvious, but every bit as threatening * * * the threat of complacency, the temptation to resign to defeat." They responded.

As the school year came to a close (in April at the Philippines because of early hot weather), Dave prepared for completion exercises. The salutarian in his sixth grade class missed rehearsals for a week and Dave went looking for him. He found him working in a sugarcane field covered with ashes from the waste fire he was tending in 110° temperature.

The boy told him he had to work if he wanted to go on in school. Dave knew his family would not accept his personal help. ("They are painfully proud here"), so he set up a scholarship fund for the boy. He did the same for others, sending one to a university and hoping to send others to America.

"He saved what little we could send him to give the scholarships," his mother told me. "It only costs $35 for a boy to go to college for a year in the Philippines." With contributions from friends, his parents are expanding the scholarship program Dave established.

When school ended in April, he dismissed all suggestions of rest and exhausted his strength in two new projects.

With 17 volunteers, he helped establish Camp Brotherhood—the first free summer camp in the Philippines. "The Government gave us a plot of land by the site of a volcano and left the rest to us." The volunteers built a mess hall and swimming pool, set up tents for the boys, shelters for nature study and handicrafts, and quarters for the staff.

MATURE JUDGMENT

While working at Camp Brotherhood, he also taught journalism to high school teachers at a summer seminar at La Salle College. "Though he had a boyish look," a student remembered, "he was respected. His judgment was mature."

The endless work he put into Camp Brotherhood, the journalism seminar, and his scholarship program soon began to have its affect on Dave's health. But when he was offered a less demanding post at Peace Corps headquarters, he quickly refused. "I have decided," he wrote a friend, "I would rather stay at my assignment. I have projects and commitments I would not cancel."

Soon after he contracted dysentery and was rushed to Clark Air Force Base in Manila. His parents flew to him. He began to show signs of improvement, but his condition suddenly turned and he died at noon on June 10.

Two hours before his death, he asked his doctors when he could return to his work in Ilog. "I have much to do there," he told them.

In one of his last letters he wrote prophetically: "Maybe I will die in the Philippines. It seems a good place to die."

His death was felt by everyone who knew him and many who recognized the significance of his sacrifice, including President Kennedy, Peace Corps Director R. Sargent Shriver, U.S. Ambassador to the Philippines William E. Stevenson, Philippines President Macapagal, and Vice President Emannueal Palaez, who offered Dave Mulholland's most fitting epitaph:

"He was a martyr to the cause of winning the peace."

EXECUTIVE-LEGISLATIVE CLASH OF IDEAS

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. CUNNINGHAM] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, for 30 years the clash of ideas between the executive branch and the legislative branch has dominated our political history. Thinking back over this period, one remembers best the Supreme Court packing, growth of executive initiative in legislative programs, the constant battle between the legislator and the bureaucrat for control of the Government and the direction government is to take.

Mr. Speaker, it is also apparent that in this battle of ideas and approach to government, the legislative branch is badly outnumbered and outfought in getting its ideas to the people. Consider the multitude of executive agencies, the wealth of funds available to them, the organization at national and lower levels and the ability to concentrate this tremendous organization to attain the goals of the executive leaders.

I think it is safe to say that over 100,000 employees in the executive branch are in the business of supplying information to the public, perhaps twice that number. I do not say that they are all public relations and mass media experts. Far from it. But they are there, and they are in business, and they constitute a powerful and frighteningly large force for propaganda.

We are faced under this administration—even more than in previous administrations of either party—with an admitted view that managed news is here to stay. This admission has caused concern among the American people.

We find the Inter-American Press Association's executive committee condemning the concept of "managed news and news as weaponry." According to press reports, this group finds such practices "endanger the very foundations of a free and responsible press."

The president of the American Society of Newspaper Editors, Lee Hills, said Friday that the administration should end the debate over "managed news" by disavowing publicly its use as part of national policy. And Arthur Krock of the New York Times, writing in the March issue of Fortune magazine, accuses the President, of whom he is "absolutely personally fond," of managing the news with "cynicism, boldness, and subtlety unmatched in peacetime history."

There is concern in Congress also over this managed-news policy. It carries one step further the practices of earlier administrations to promote and publicize the administration position to the exclusion of all others. And for the first time, it now uses not only top political appointees here in Washington, but tries to force career civil service employees to promote the party line.

Some may shrug this off as part of the art of politics, and to a degree that is the case. But under this administration I fear it has been carried to new lengths and is being extended to "friendly" members of the press to the exclusion of "uncooperative" reporters.

It is also being carried to new lengths in the degree to which various Government agencies through their press releases, statements, and leaks to the press mimic the New Frontier approach to economic, legislative, or other areas.

Indeed, as the senior Senator from Wisconsin, Mr. PROXMIRE, has said:

> The American taxpayer is the victim of the greatest publicity snow job of our time.

Douglass Cater in his book, "The Fourth Branch of Government," wrote in 1960 about congressional efforts to investigate and expose secrecy in the executive branch. But, he commented:

> A more fruitful course for government would be to consider how the flow of information may be better timed and coordinated so that the public receives a balanced story. Too often the real damage caused by public disclosures comes from the fact that the information is partial and biased.

Cater also wrote:

> More and more in recent years the Washington correspondent has been aware of the managed news event which he is expected to report without paying attention to the props and staging devices.

It could well be argued that all publicity efforts by executive agencies are illegal, for we find in title 4, United States Code, this language:

> No money appropriated by any act shall be used for the compensation of any publicity expert unless specifically appropriated for that purpose (sec. 54).

Congress has concerned itself from time to time about these activities, as found in these comments from "Secrecy and Publicity" by Francis E. Rourke, written in 1961:

> Over the years Congress has used a variety of techniques in an effort to curb what it regards as improper activitiy on the part of executive agencies in the field of publicity, including prohibitions upon the employment of publicity experts, legislation forbidding certain Government agencies from sending information through the mail except in response to specific requests from the public, and restrictions upon the use of appropriated funds for public relations activity. None of these barriers to executive publicity has been altogether effective as is evident from the fact that it has proven necessary to reenact such restrictions so frequently over the past half-century, and no one has ever been prosecuted for violating any of these statutes. The ban on the employment of publicity experts, for example, has been commonly evaded by giving these employees somewhat different titles, including information specialist, director of public relations, and chief educational officer.

The first Hoover Commission studied this area, faced facts, and reached the conclusion that no matter what you call it, Government information is controlled. To quote from the Hoover Commission:

> All programs of education by the Government tend eventually to reflect official thought, official opinion and official aims. In these circumstances, the function of education inevitably is diluted by the pressures of politics and propaganda.

Mr. Speaker, thoughtful reporters and commentators of all shades of political thought have examined this situation. We are presently faced with a President who has the know-how, personality, family and staff to dominate national publicity. James Reston of the New York Times summed up this situation in these words:

> It is not a situation that promises to maintain a political balance of power in the United States.

Reston pointed out that Congress has been overshadowed by the Executive in the news field. He expressed concern for the views of the loyal opposition. It is an opposition which received 48 percent of the votes cast in the recent congressional elections and within a hair of 50 percent of the votes for President. Yet it is an opposition that is up against a well-planned, well-financed—by tax dollars—and well-executed publicity and propaganda program of benefit solely to the legislative and economic goals of the executive branch.

David Lawrence comments that "criticism was never more important to the administration and to the country" and states what we all must certainly agree with—that voters want to know "the real impact of national and international policies on their own lives and on the future of their children."

It is impossible to determine just how many persons are involved in the publicity apparatus of the executive branch. Estimates in recent years as to the size of the information and/or publicity staffs in executive agencies range from 1,400 to over 100,000. It is difficult to determine, because each survey has its own guidelines.

But as I have said, in my judgment there are at least 100,000 tax-supported Federal employees who spend at least a portion of their time propagandizing the voters, and the vast majority of them are propagandizing in such a way as to try and make a favorable impression for the executive branch and its programs.

Now I do not stand here and claim for 1 minute that each day President John F. Kennedy now or any other President in the past issues his secret orders for the day's publicity campaign, and that hundreds of mimeograph machines, teletypes and eager messengers then spread the word throughout official Washington and to the far reaches of the executive empires. Far from it.

My point, and it has been made by those much closer to the news business than I am, is that there is this huge propaganda information publicity apparatus in being; I do not think there is argument about that. And it can be and is being used consciously or otherwise to promote the legislative program, economic and political theories, and odd ideas in some cases of the top echelon in the executive branch.

Let me refer to Thomas J. Bennett, who spent some time on this matter and devoted his doctoral thesis to the subject of Government publicity. Dr. Bennett wrote just last year in his thesis:

> Most of those interviewed agreed that two factors contribute to the de facto uniformity of administration public pronouncements. First of all, although there is little or no coordination of public information officers, there is close consultation among their superiors, at least in the case of the agencies that are properly part of the executive. It makes little difference whether Webster at Agriculture is in touch with Manning at Treasury, if their immediate superiors, from whom they take their orders, and upon whose pleasure their positions depend, meet regularly.

Dr. Bennett put it on the line for us later in his thesis:

> It would seem from this that the testimony of the newsmen and the publicists interviewed, which indicated a lack of formal centralization of Federal publicity, was correct in adding that such centralization is unnecessary in view of the localization of issues within a few agencies. It no longer seems unreasonable to speak of the single voice of the Federal Government.

And he winds it up this way:

> It must be concluded, therefore, that the publicity operation of the National Government is big enough, active enough, and important enough to warrant concern by the critics.

Let me refer now to the New Leader. In an article in 1960 concerning interservice rivalry, the comment was made in its pages:

> What is more, the chief consequence of successfully stifling all public demonstrations of interservice controversy would be the exposure of a single administration view of national security policy. In an area of governmental activity where the executive holds all the trump cards, where the requirements of security classification can be used to bury legitimate opposition within the Government, where there is no pressure group that can make a meaningful impact on the policy process without help from the executive departments, and where such a tremendous part of national resources are being devoted, democratic controls over executive power would become weaker than they are already.

A responsible opposition is necessary in this country, as it is in every country and under any form of government where the people decide their course, directly or indirectly through their representatives. It is the constitutional duty of Congress as a full partner in the Federal Government to explore and develop the alternatives, to present them to the people, and to cause and encourage full discussion of such matters. When only one side is present, when the alternatives are stifled, when one view is preached from all sides, there is not the choice available for the people. Yet one of the most common expressions in this country is that there are two sides to every story.

There might be little we in Congress can do, no matter what party we belong to or what party controls the administration, to effectively and truly cut back the executive's information-publicity-propaganda staffs and activities.

But certainly we should allow full debate in our own processes, full development of alternatives by the minority, full exposure to the people of the two or even more sides to every story. To do otherwise is an indication that the majority is afraid of the other side, that the minority has right on its side.

And I must remind my colleagues on both sides of the aisle that there are other battles than those between the parties, or between major blocs in the Congress. There is this constant battle, pulling and tugging, between the executive and legislative branches. In this battle all in Congress need to be alert to what is happening to the constitutional rights of this equal partner.

The people are being brainwashed by the Executive's tremendous power of publicity, propaganda, and persuasion to believe that it is time to change the historic proposition that the President proposes and Congress disposes.

How important is this presentation of both sides? It has been called the basis of representative government by a former Senator:

> An informed citizenry is the basis of representative government. Democracy—as we know it—cannot exist unless the American people are equipped with the information which is necessary if they are to make the informed political choices on which the proper functioning of the democracy depends. An informed people—able to examine, and when necessary, to criticize, its government—is the only guarantee of responsible democracy.

So said Senator John F. Kennedy in 1960.

In his new book, "Washington Cover-Up," Clark Mollenhoff assesses the importance of information about government:

> No single factor is more important to the strength of our democracy than the free flow

> of accurate information about the government's operation. The citizen in a democracy must know what his government is doing, or he will lack the soundest basis for judging the candidates and the platforms of our political parties.

A recent issue of the Economic Council Letter was addressed to the problems of Congress in this tug of war with the executive branch. It commented:

> As we have said repeatedly, the executive branch of the American Government has been operating, since 1933, at an accelerating rate, above the Constitution and the law. The only power in the Nation which can stand against a militant executive establishment with unlimited resources of men and money, is the Congress.
>
> A great many arguments can be raised against this statement, but they have no validity. When all is said and done, the only political force which can oppose the growth of governmental absolutism is the body directly representing the people not in government.
>
> It is possible Congress may not be able to stand against the increasing pressure of big government. The answer to that is known to no living man. It is true Congress cannot stand alone. It must have the support of the people. But the people cannot come to Washington and tell the bureaucrats what to do. From election to election the voters are dependent on their representatives to speak for them.
>
> We said in our last council letter that the planners (who do control executive policymaking) are making a revolutionary change from limited to unlimited government without our knowledge or consent. Of necessity, the planners are engaged in a war against Congress. But Congress does not yet realize it is engaged in a war with the planners.
>
> It is good for responsible political leaders to avoid factionalism, or anything that smacks of it, as long as possible. But if the planners do not desist from their attacks, someone must come to grips with them. They refuse to settle the issue by open and free debate.
>
> How can a Congress made up of two Houses and nearly 600 Members come to grips with a hierarchical executive branch which operates under a command structure not unlike an army, and supported by a propaganda machine and militant pressure groups equal to those of wartime?

While we fight our legislative battles in these Halls, while our own district interests operate to put us in one group or another at various times, let us remember that we are always engaged in another battle.

We are for better or for worse, in economic sickness and health, wedded to the executive and judicial. But each member in this three-sided marriage must be independent. When the legislative branch fails to exert its independence, it is the people who lose their voice in day-to-day government. The courts remain, but there is no remedy there such as that which the people have in Congress, with its great controls and grants of authority to set policy.

BIPARTISAN FOREIGN POLICY

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. Becker] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Speaker, I, like millions of Americans, have been listening for many years over our news media, in the press and in statements made by Members of Congress, and people in political life, about a bipartisan foreign policy.

The phrase "bipartisan foreign policy" is one of the greatest misnomers that could possibly be used. Everyone knows our foreign policy is strictly and solely in the hands of the President under the Constitution of the United States.

The term "bipartisan foreign policy" implies in my mind, and I am sure it implies in the minds of many of our citizens, because of letters I have received and questions I have been asked, that the President of the United States when he is discussing the matter of a particular policy in our foreign affairs, would call in not only his own Cabinet members, not only the congressional leaders of his own party, but leaders of the opposition party. And this applies to previous administrations as well as this one.

Now, to my knowledge, the President just does not do this. I have written a report this week which I am going to read. I sent this to all of my weekly newspapers, because of recent letters I have received, in which I have been asked: Were the Republican Members of Congress a party to the foreign policy announced in respect to Cuba, in respect to Canada, in respect to the Skybolt, England, and with respect to our policy insofar as France is concerned?

My report reads as follows:

> BIPARTISAN FOREIGN POLICY?
>
> I receive many letters in which people ask: "What is meant by bipartisan foreign policy."
>
> The Cuban fiasco again has pointed up the complete fallacy of what the Kennedy administration likes to put on a sanctimonious pedestal in the guise of "bipartisan foreign policy."
>
> Believe me, there is no such thing.
>
> Certainly, when the President of the United States, who has sole constitutional authority for our foreign policy, makes an irrevocable agreement, even though it may be dangerous, as he did with Castro, all Americans, regardless of politics, back him up.
>
> But, that doesn't mean that his errors are the result of what some of the eggheads like to call bipartisan foreign policy.
>
> What the President does is to make his decisions and then call in the responsible people of both parties and say, in effect: "Well, I've done this. Now, you must be good Americans and go along with me."
>
> This may imply that the opposition sit back and say and do nothing. Well, as an American and as an elected Representative of the people, I never have and never will do that.
>
> The Cuban mess is a good example. So are southeast Asia, Katanga, etc. The President set a policy; then he told us what he had done and expected us to say amen.
>
> Finally, in October of last year, he did what I and others had recommended—he blockaded Cuba. It should have been done long before that, but anyway he finally did it. So, we pledged our full support to a measure which was overdue, but to which there was no alternative. In the pitifully inadequate measures which followed, we were told nothing—not even the real facts about the Russian buildup in Cuba.
>
> What, then, would have been the result if some of us had swallowed the high-sounding philosophy of "bipartisan foreign policy" and said nothing.
>
> The thousands of Russian troops which are still there would have gone unnoticed. Castro would have gone blithely along, uninterrupted to set up, with Russian help, the Communist base from which to infiltrate all of Latin America, which is his real aim, all the time prepared to protect himself against any U.S. interference because he had missiles which could devastate our cities and the Russian technicians who knew how to operate them.
>
> This, in truth, would have completed the Communist lease of Cuba which President Kennedy all but signed when he pledged that the United States would not invade Cuba.
>
> Certainly, there was no bipartisan approach to that noninvasion policy. The President simply did it and then told us so.
>
> So, there is no such thing as a bipartisan foreign policy. There shouldn't be and I'll never be a party to any such arrangement.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is high time that we, as Members of the House of Representatives, particularly those on the Republican side, who believe in a sound foreign policy, should be told what is going on, if our foreign policy is to be bipartisan in its preparation and in its actual conduct. I know that under the Constitution, both past and present, this has not been done. I am not asking that it be done. But, at least what we should understand and what our people should be told, is that these decisions are the decisions of the President. The President has full and complete responsibility.

But, Mr. Speaker, a few weeks ago a statement was issued by the State Department pulling the props out from under the Prime Minister of Canada, Mr. Diefenbaker, by insisting that nuclear warheads go into Canada.

Now, I understand that the President was furious about that statement when he was apprised of it in the press. Yet, I did not hear that anyone lost his job. I did not hear that Secretary of State, Dean Rusk, who stated that he would accept the full responsibility for the statement, discharged anyone. I did not hear the President denounce anyone or deny the validity of the statement. Nor did I hear that anyone was discharged who was responsible for preparing or releasing the statement.

Certainly, Mr. Speaker, the Secretary of State had every means to find out who was responsible for it.

The decision was made at a meeting, or prior to a meeting down in Bermuda, between the President and the Prime Minister of Great Britain, Mr. Macmillan. It was decided to stop the production of the Skybolt missile, a missile that England was preparing its bomber force to use. No one I know of who had Republican Party responsibility, was called in, prior to that decision, and I am not sure that anybody with Republican responsibility was called in after the decision or informed that the decision was being made.

Mr. Speaker, for the good of our country we should as Members of Congress advise our constituents just what this so-called bipartisan foreign policy means. I am not, at this moment, just talking about the present administration. The term seems to be used almost every day. Only last week I read in the press about 'Kennedy pledges leaders at secret session at the White House."

And down further in the article there is one very significant paragraph:

> There was some speculation at the session * * * was an effort by Mr. Kennedy to slam the door on any charges that his foreign policy was more partisan than bipartisan.

I am not in agreement with that paragraph because I do not charge the President and his foreign policy with being just a political foreign policy in that it is partisan politically. I merely say it is a fact that he makes the decisions. It is his responsibility and the decision is not bipartisan. There is no basis for the implication that Republican leadership as well as Democratic leadership of the Congress had agreed to that policy before the decision was made. This is the point I am trying to make. It is the point I am going to insist upon. It is the point I am going to constantly and continuously advise the people in my district about whenever and wherever I can get the information across.

Mr. Speaker, that is about the gist of what I have to say. I want that to get in the RECORD just the same as the statements I shall issue from time to time.

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. BECKER. I would be happy to yield to my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ALGER].

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to join with the gentleman from New York in his discussion and his definition of the use and misuse of the word "bipartisan." My question is this: Does the gentleman not feel first of all that it is the prerogative, indeed, the duty of Members of Congress to be critical of foreign policy and, secondly, not to be shut off by the use of the word "bipartisan" as though they are not supposed to be critical of the foreign policy which affects all of us?

Mr. BECKER. This is exactly the intent of my remarks today. I believe that we would be irresponsible—irresponsible to the *n*th degree—if we attempted to roll over and play dead every time the President makes a mistake, whether it be our domestic or foreign policy.

The mistakes that have been made during the past 2 years, from the time of the Bay of Pigs invasion right on down the line to Laos—keep occurring. What happened recently during the so-called blockade of Cuba as to whether missiles were or were not in Cuba? What happened in the situation with reference to Canada? These things create a responsibility on the part of Members of Congress to let the American people know that we are not parties to that decision. I assure the gentleman I would not have been a party to them myself.

Mr. ALGER. If the gentleman will yield further, does the gentleman feel that some of the concern expressed now by the administration is the fear indeed of congressional criticism of policies that do not reflect the will of the people?

Mr. BECKER. I am quite sure of that. Permit me to call the attention of the gentleman to this: You know when the situation with the administration had become very, very critical and bad in recent months and when the people were catching up with it, you know what happened. They pulled a 50-mile hike out of the bag in order to get front-page publicity. They got important news off the front pages and off the radio and television. Instead we heard and read about 50-mile hikes. The minds of the people are supposed to be taken off the real problems confronting us. This is the type of thing that is going on, and I think we should make the people understand why.

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, may I comment further and ask another question of him?

Mr. BECKER. I am happy to yield.

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, I have been asked by very dedicated Americans who are sincerely concerned, and who are also worried about criticism of the Commander in Chief if, indeed, we are weakening his posture and the posture of our Nation today when we are critical; so I want to ask the gentleman, Is there not even greater danger that if we stifle and eliminate freedom of speech in this country in order to defeat the enemy, we have actually adopted the enemy's techniques and have already been defeated by him, so that there does not need to be any party or parties, except one party and a dictatorship?

Mr. BECKER. The gentleman is absolutely correct. I might call the gentleman's attention to an article that appeared yesterday in the Washington Star, "Krock Calls Kennedy Policy Cynical on News." I suggest the gentleman read that article. I intend to put it in the RECORD.

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. BECKER. I yield.

Mr. ALGER. Do I understand that the gentleman speaking to us at this time will include the article just mentioned as part of his remarks?

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Speaker, I intend to include, after my remarks, the article by Arthur Krock which appeared in yesterday's Washington Star, the title of which I have just read.

Mr. Speaker, may I add this? The gentleman has hit on the most salient point of my discussion and what I am trying to do. It is simply this: Our people, by a virtually controlled press, it would seem, or news media, on news and information not only from the White House but from our departments of Government, including the State Department and the Department of Defense, are no longer being apprised of the facts and the truth of what is happening throughout the world. If we are going to let this go by under the guise of what is called bipartisan foreign policy then I say that we are subject justly to the wrath of the people. We should be condemned not only as individual Members of Congress but as individual citizens because we are not living up to our responsibility and to the oath that we have taken on this floor in every session since we became Members.

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BECKER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Speaker, I should like to return for just a moment to the reference that was made to the article in the Washington Star of yesterday by Mr. Krock. I think first it should be made clear in the RECORD at this point that Mr. Krock himself states that he is a personal friend of the President and has been a personal friend of the family for many years. So certainly this very pointed criticism by Mr. Krock should not be viewed as a partisan comment. This was an observation of a highly respected and senior member of the Washington press corps. I think it should be pointed out in connection with this that apparently Mr. Krock's article drew some attention from the administration, because it is my understanding from an article in the Washington Post of Saturday morning that the administration now, under the direction of Mr. Sallinger, has proposed a "retreat" from spokesman for the administration and the press corps, so that either the press corps may better understand the administration, or else the administration may better understand the press corps.

I would hope however that whatever transpires at this retreat near Warrenton, Va., that representatives of the press will carry out the historic responsibility of that profession in America to defend their right to speak out and keep the public entirely informed.

Mr. BECKER. I certainly agree with the gentleman. I would hope the press would resume its responsibility from the publishers to the editors to the newsmen in publishing the news, in publishing and reporting as they always did the news and the facts as they see them, and not accept the brainwashing when they get down to this retreat.

Mr. AVERY. I think we ought to point out now that this controversy should not be confused with the Moss committee's 5-year project to guarantee the "right to know." As I understand the objective of the Moss committee, it is not the management of the news but relates to the Executive privilege of not making available to the press such information that is classified. The objection to making classified information available is entirely separate from the management or misrepresentation of the news as described by Mr. Krock.

Mr. BECKER. I agree with the gentleman.

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BECKER. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. YOUNGER. In regard to Cuba, it seems to me as though we miss the point when we take so much time arguing about whether they have missiles or whether they have cannons or airplanes. It makes little difference whether they have those or whether they have slingshots. The Communists want a base of operations. Their technique and their method of operation is not military but is intrigue, infiltration, and sabotage. As long as any one Russian is there that danger exists. Is that not true?

Mr. BECKER. May I say to the gentleman that I do wish the American people had been better informed as to our objectives in imposing a blockade last year in Cuba, not merely to protect the security of the people of the United States from a missile attack but because this was a kickoff base not only to infiltrate subversively in all the countries of Latin America and South America but to help formulate guerrilla forces in those countries, to induce guerrilla operations and revolution in those countries from a Communist base in Cuba. This is what we tried to do all last year and are still trying to do, but we still cannot get the show on the road, so to speak.

I might refer the gentleman to an article by a great and knowledgeable lady, which appeared in U.S. News & World Report. The author I refer to is a distinguished former Member of the House, Clare Booth Luce. The article last week deals with this very effectively. I am inserting the article in its entirety in the Record.

Mr. YOUNGER. The gentleman further realizes that a submarine base there is far more important than some of the missiles and other things?

Mr. BECKER. I agree with the gentleman, but we get into the area now of asking: Do we have proof the submarines are there? We do not have proof the submarines are not there. Do we have proof that missiles are there? We do not have proof missiles are not there. In other words, we have no proof. We tried to get it on the demand of the President last fall when he set up the blockade of Cuba. He should have stuck to his guns and insisted upon on-site inspection. If we were not strong enough to do it then, we ought to give up.

Mr. YOUNGER. I thank the gentleman, and congratulate him on his remarks and upon bringing this subject to the attention of the House.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BECKER. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. PELLY. The gentleman has addressed the House on the subject of bipartisan foreign policy. I think the Record should show that the father of the bipartisan policy, Senator Vandenberg, made it very clear that he expected that foreign policy should be debated fully. I think his words actually were that it should be debated totally down to the water's edge. I think we should all remember that we do have a responsibility as a minority to discuss this subject fully but not to go out of our way to try to use any partisanship in our arguments.

Mr. BECKER. I appreciate the gentleman's contribution referring to the late Senator Vandenberg, because that was his position. I want to make this abundantly clear, that when the President made the decision on October 22 to blockade Cuba, we backed him up, but that does not mean we should roll over and play dead when he did not follow through.

Mr. STINSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BECKER. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. STINSON. It would be a serious act on our part to sit here and do nothing. That is what I think the gentleman from New York was trying to bring out. Does the gentleman think there is any correlation between the timing of the announcement on the Cuban crisis, which happened just before the election, and the possibility this might have been done for a political reason or a party reason?

Mr. BECKER. Far be it from me to charge President Kennedy with politics. Actually, I think he is one of the most astute politicians on the American scene in many, many a year.

While I do not know the President's intent it was certainly in my mind at the time and it did have its political effect.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent at this time to insert in the Record with my remarks an article concerning Arthur Krock in the Washington Star of yesterday and an article by Claire Boothe Luce, former Member of this House and a great lady and former Ambassador to Italy.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. Hagan of Georgia). Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BECKER. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. HALL. With reference to the last point raised by our colleague about the timing and the political implication of the Cuban quarantine, or blockade, or whatever you want to call it, has the gentleman considered what a reversal of 2 weeks might have done to the November 1962 election—if instead of bringing out the Cuban situation 2 weeks before November 6 and the $7.8 billion deficit 2 weeks after, if those 2 items had been reversed? I wonder what the complexion of this House would have been today in such an event. I wonder if the gentleman has given consideration to those two alterations of simple facts and timing from the political point of view?

Mr. BECKER. Let me assure my colleague, the gentleman from Missouri who is very astute, that I am never averse to considering political consideration and statements made and the timing of them. Certainly, I will say with all the sincerity at my command that I believe the President of the United States waited until the most dangerous time in all history to order the blockade of Cuba on October 22. This should have been done months before—not when we knew all these missiles were in there—and launching pads were being built. And as to the great distortions of facts, the question is going to come up in the next couple of weeks as to the time when we knew these missiles were in there, when photographs were taken. I am sure some factual material will come out in the next couple of weeks. As to the other part of your question, the $7.8 billion deficit that was announced 2 weeks after election, I do not know whether in the minds of the people this would have had as much offsetting effect—I am talking about the political effect—as the Cuban blockade announced on October 22 because we all as American citizens were forced to make statements backing up the President's action at that time. We could not have done otherwise.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. BECKER. I am happy to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HALL. I would like to say I was among the first to back the President and say that the die had been cast and we should rally and not let partisanship interfere with us or go beyond our shoreline at that particular point. Of course, I expected we would finish the job when we "drew the mark," and had everything in our favor. But I think if history is to be objective and to describe where the error was made, it will not be on this question of elections of last year, but will go clear back to the Bay of Pigs, April 17, 1961. Finally, I would say it takes more than a bad cold in Chicago to make one change the course of history and come back from the campaign trail and invoke a quarantine. It takes the feeling of the American people, and I would hope that just as the gentleman in the well of the House, my esteemed colleague from New York, is today bringing up the question of the amorality of not debating foreign policy, be it good, bad or indifferent, so would history in its objectivity point out when you expect to have a $500 million excess in the budget as predicted in the state of the Union message and in the campaign message and in the 2d session of the 87th Congress budget message, then suddenly it turns into a $7.8 billion deficit, announced like this—afterward instead of before the election—it has its moral or lack of moral implication. I commend the gentleman on his exposé and his expertise today in the well of the House.

Mr. BECKER. I appreciate the comments of the gentleman from Missouri. We sit on the same committee and I know how well he does on that committee. Let me point this out. You have brought out something which is most important, when the President—and this talk goes on all the time—about bipartisanship—particularly in this administration—I wonder what he called it during the campaign of 1960 and prior. Senator John F. Kennedy went from one end of this land to the other bemoaning a missile gap, day after day—one of the most dangerous things that any Member of this or any other body could do. He was telling our enemies that we were not prepared with missiles and that there was a great missile gap between what we had and what they had. And the then Senator John F. Kennedy was going from one end of the land to the other constantly harping about our loss of prestige and about how low our prestige was in the world.

Well, I say to President John F. Kennedy: If you felt that way about our prestige at the time of the election how do you feel about our prestige today? You do not have to take any poll to know how low our prestige is now. If that was bipartisanship, Mr. Speaker, then I am right in what I am saying about bipartisanship today and that is why I think more of our Republicans must make their voices heard so the American people will have no doubt as to the facts. I want to call these facts to the attention of the American people, for it is badly needed.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BECKER. I yield.

Mr. CLEVELAND. I would like to compliment the distinguished gentleman on his cogent remarks on bipartisanship. During the course of the gentleman's remarks the question of "news management" suggested itself. I had prepared for delivery in the House today some remarks on news management. They include the article about Mr. Arthur Krock, the distinguished New York Times correspondent which has been referred to by the gentleman. Also an Associated Press article regarding the Cuban news situation reporting the views of my esteemed colleague, the gentleman from Washington [Mr. PELLY]. Finally, a statement from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by the distinguished gentleman from Maryland [Mr. MATHIAS]. I wonder if their relationship to news management would not be a little more effectively presented if the three articles were set out in the RECORD at one place?

Mr. BECKER. The gentleman wishes to insert it following my remarks?

Mr. CLEVELAND. Yes; if it can be done at this time.

Mr. BECKER. I am about finished. I have no objection.

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may I understand what the gentleman is attempting to do? Is he attempting to spread his remarks among those of the gentleman from New York, or afterward?

Mr. BECKER. After.

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Hampshire.

There was no objection.

[From the Washington Star]

KROCK CALLS KENNEDY BOLD, CYNICAL ON NEWS

(By the Associated Press)

Arthur Krock, prize-winning newsman, accuses President Kennedy of managing the news with a cynicism, boldness and subtlety unmatched in peacetime history.

But, the veteran newsman says: "If Mr. Kennedy has achieved any success in these efforts, the principal onus rests in the printed and electronic press itself."

Mr. Krock, for 21 years chief of the Washington bureau of the New York Times and more recently a Times Washington columnist, levels his indictment in the March issue of Fortune magazine.

He cites, as an affront to Jeffersonian principles of a free press, "the 'information directives' prescribed for the Pentagon and the Department of State when the crisis over Cuba began to harden." He said that "weapon" of news management has been improperly used to inflate success or gloss over error "in the aftermath of half-won showdowns—such as President Kennedy's with respect to the Soviet rearmament of Cuba."

HITS "SOCIAL FLATTERY"

Mr. Krock says Mr. Kennedy and high subordinates indirectly manage news by "social flattery of Washington reporters and commentators," and by "selective personal patronage."

In the latter category he included exclusive interviews, attributable to the President, which he says have ceased to be a rarity.

"But Mr. Kennedy," he writes, "prefers the intimate background briefings of journalists, and their publishers, on a large scale, from which members emerge in a state of protracted enchantment evoked by the President's charm and the awesome aura of his office.

"The success of his efforts is attested by a continent-wide glow in news reporting, editorializing, and comment, which otherwise might register the lower temperature of impersonal objectivity."

Mr. Krock accuses Mr. Kennedy also of spreading "a false first impression" last year that a budget balance was in prospect. And he charges administration officials with anonymous prevarication on such subjects as the balance-of-payments problem which, Mr. Krock said, "is visibly growing worse."

There was no immediate White House comment on Mr. Krock's article. At his news conference last Thursday, the President said in response to a question: "Let me say we have had very limited success in managing the news, if that is what we have been trying to do."

LONGTIME FRIEND

Mr. Krock has been a longtime friend of the Kennedy family, and he told an Associated Press reporter that he is "absolutely personally fond" of President Kennedy.

In his Fortune article, Mr. Krock says that on the strength of almost 50 years as a newsman, he would make two judgments on what he calls "management of the news" by Mr. Kennedy and administration officials:

"1. A news management policy not only exists but, in the form of direct and deliberate action, has been indorsed more cynically and boldly than by any previous administration in a period when the United States was not in a war or without visible means of regression from the verge of war.

"2. In the form of indirect but equally deliberate action, the policy has been much more effective than direct action in coloring the several facets of public information, because it has been employed with subtlety and imagination for which there is no historic parallel known to me.

OUTLINES KENNEDY METHODS

"In the narrow twilight zone between the direct and indirect methods, the administration incessantly resorts to three ways to push its news product that work deplorably well with the press. Vulnerable and/or discreditable acts in foreign policy—such as forcing the Dutch to surrender West New Guinea to Indonesian blackmail, promoting U.N. Charter violation in the Congo, etc.—are explained on the purely assumptive ground that they were necessary to 'prevent a confrontation with Soviet Russia likely to result in nuclear war.' Executive decisions sure to be unpopular are explained as in line with or compelled by policies adopted by the Eisenhower administration."

"And when the White House is the center of such revelations of ineptness in the Kennedy regime as our public intrusion in the Canadian parliamentary debate on nuclear policy, his subordinates make oath that the President, though daily represented as omniscient, knew nothing about it and is 'furious.' (But nobody gets fired.)"

In conclusion, Mr. Krock says:

"But it is the indirect methods * * * by which 'management of the news' is chiefly accomplished by the Kennedy administration. This is a public-relations project and the President is its most brilliant operator. Since the immediate objectives of this selling job are the news reporters in general (most definitely including the TV and radio broadcasters), widely read commentators and flattered editors, publishers, and network moguls in particular, the project is much more accurately identified by the phrase 'managing the purveyors of the news.' And for any degree to which this project has been successful the principal onus rests on the printed and electronic press itself."

[From U.S. News & World Report, Feb. 18, 1963]

CUBA CRISIS AND NUCLEAR ARMS—WHY DE GAULLE GOES HIS OWN WAY

(By Clare Boothe Luce)

The President was asked in his press conference [on January 24] what he thought of the theory put forward in Europe that the outcome of the Cuban crisis was linked in General de Gaulle's mind with his determination to have his own nuclear deterrent force, because Cuba showed that the United States would not defend Europe.

The President replied that this charge had, indeed, been directly made, and he indicated that some Europeans had deduced from the fact that the naval blockade had ended with Moscow in unchallenged control of Cuba that, "since the Soviet developed their own nuclear capacity there is a balance between the United States and the U.S.S.R. and neither would use it, and, therefore, Europe cannot rely on the United States." This he called peculiar logic.

But, after Cuba, not only "some, in some parts of Europe," but also many in many parts of America, and in Latin America, no longer believe in the U.S. commitment to defend other countries from communism, if to do so should mean to initiate a nuclear war with Soviet Russia.

And, the President's remarks notwithstanding, there is much recent evidence that Mr. Khrushchev himself is now thoroughly convinced that, once the 400,000 American troops in Germany are withdrawn, America's nuclear commitment will then extend no farther than its own coastline.

If memory serves, after the disastrous Bay of Pigs invasion Mr. Kennedy repeatedly warned Mr. Khrushchev that communism in this hemisphere was "not negotiable." Mr. Khrushchev, strongly suspecting that this warning was merely for U.S. domestic political consumption, boldly seized the opportunity to put it to the acid test: Fully aware that he would be detected in the end, he sneaked nuclear weapons into Cuba, and zeroed them in on the White House.

When the President found this out—quite a long while after Cuban intelligence sources had told him it was happening—his reaction was immediate. He called out the Navy, which called Mr. Khrushchev's brilliantly and carefully calculated bluff.

This was probably precisely what Mr. Khrushchev intended. Mr. Khrushchev had long been in the position of having to lose his face in order to save it. He wanted to lose his ugly nuclear "mug"—the face of the "nuclear aggressor." He was anxious to show the world that he was not the man to start a nuclear war against anybody over a third country, and he certainly wanted to have it made plain that Mr. Kennedy wasn't the man either. A solid basis for negotiations of all kinds—and popular fronts of all kinds—could be built on the foundations of a U.S.-U.S.S.R. nuclear-peace pact.

One can only imagine Mr. Khrushchev's satisfaction when his theory vis-à-vis the U.S. military position was proven correct. But he could hardly have been prepared for the next surprise. No sooner had he agreed to remove all the nuclear hardware U.S. air surveillance had spotted than Mr. Kennedy at once referred to him as a "great statesman" and, to show that there needn't be any hard feelings over the little episode, gave him Cuba.

Mr. Khrushchev did not naturally bother to return the President's compliment. He realized, of course, that it had been made to gentle him—Mr. Khrushchev is as easy to gentle as a king cobra.

A few weeks later at the East Berlin World Communist Congress Mr. Khrushchev was bragging to the world that his missile play in Cuba had achieved its real objective—to scare Mr. Kennedy into giving up Cuba. After accepting the thunderous applause of the 2,500 Communist Party delegates present from 70 nations, Mr. Khrushchev vowed all over again to "bury us," this time with his 100-megaton bombs, but only if we were ever so rash as to initiate a nuclear attack on him.

Ever since Cuba, Mr. Khrushchev has worked hard on his new image. Each passing day he sounds more and more like John Foster Dulles: He will never launch missiles at the United States, or Europe, but he will—if attacked—produce "massive retaliation."

The fact is that Mr. Khrushchev had long ago opted for nuclear peace with the U.S.A. Since Cuba, he knows that the United States has also opted for nuclear peace with Soviet Russia. There is today an undeclared nuclear-peace pact between the U.S.S.R. and the United States for the simple reason that the initiation of nuclear war is not to the best interests of either.

The United States press, following the President's lead, is currently taking a benign view of Mr. Khrushchev's new nuclear posture. Besides, it feels so good since he stopped poking his Cuban missiles into our solar plexus. The vials of their wrath have been saved up for Gen. Charles de Gaulle, who has had the gall to say, since Cuba, that he thinks France would now certainly be more safe under its own nuclear umbrella than under America's.

FRANCO-RUSSIAN DEAL? "PREPOSTEROUS"

Because of this, General de Gaulle's "image" is being rapidly worked over, with the enthusiastic help of the American left, to resemble a half-mad Napoleon, or an Abominable No-man. It is even being suggested that General de Gaulle wishes France to become a nuclear power in order to make a deal over Germany with Russia. This is to suggest that France desires to have Russia on her own borders, instead of Germany's, which is, of course, preposterous. If either France or Germany falls to the Reds, all Europe falls with them, and every European knows it.

It is interesting to inquire what General de Gaulle was doing the first tense hours of the United States naval blockade, while Soviet missiles were being leveled by Russian troops on American cities.

Was he threatening to pull out of the grand alliance if the United States invaded Cuba?

Was he begging us to throw the whole business into the U.N.?

Was he reminding us that the French feel that the United States let France down in Indochina, Algeria, and Suez, so France couldn't be expected to sympathize with our troubles about Cuba?

Was he advising President Kennedy to make a deal with Khrushchev about Cuba fast, because if the United States invaded Cuba Khrushchev might retaliate by striking at West Berlin and thus trigger world war III?

He was not. The general was offering to fight by the side of the United States if we felt our vital interests required us to kick Castro and Khrushchev both out of Cuba. And by this very fact he was pledging France to take all the nuclear risks we felt we might be incurring.

The President, in his recent press conference, acknowledged that General de Gaulle "responded when we were in difficulty in Cuba." "But" he added, with some extraordinary peculiar logic of his own, "I would hope that our confidence in him would be matched by his confidence in us."

This whole sentence must have been a typographical error.

The President had just admitted a period back that, when we were in difficulties, President de Gaulle had shown the ultimate in confidence by his willingness to risk nuclear war—if risk there was—by the side of America.

What the President really meant to say, of course, was that, whereas President de Gaulle had shown confidence in us at the time of the naval blockade, the final U.S. political capitulation to Khrushchev and Castro had diminished that confidence, and that the President hoped that somehow it could be restored.

The hope is an idle one. The fault is by no means entirely the President's. France has grown economically strong enough to stand on her own legs. It would follow naturally, in any case, that she should desire sooner or later to stand on her own legs militarily.

The significance of the two Kennedy backdowns over Cuba is that what was a desire now seems—or at least to General de Gaulle—to be an urgent necessity for France's own survival.

The character of the U.S. nuclear commitment made in 1946 changed in the 1950's when Russia became itself a nuclear power. Today, as in 1946, that commitment is to launch a nuclear attack on Soviet Russia if she moves against Germany.

But in 1963 the same commitment means a willingness to destroy the United States for the sake of Europe. When the matter is put in this blunt fashion, how many Americans are for it?

Khrushchev took the full measure of President Kennedy and U.S. public opinion in the Cuban crisis. So did Charles de Gaulle. His conclusion: If the war chips should ever go down in Europe, the United States will not initiate nuclear war on Russia until Russia wages nuclear war on America—and vice versa. The effect of this undeclared nuclear pact is to subtract both U.S. and U.S.S.R. nuclear forces from the European military equation.

Europe is today, without its own nuclear force, a limited war area. Consequently the outcome of any European conflict would then be decided by Russia's 125 divisions and NATO's 23—or a negotiation.

Militarily Europe is Germany and France. Their choice today is as plain as the nose on General de Gaulle's face. It is to get their own nuclear umbrella or to trust the United States, if they are attacked by Russian conventional weapons, to launch her missiles at Russia, knowing that she would get Russia's 100-ton megaton bombs right back.

General de Gaulle has made the only choice a patriotic Frenchman could possibly make. Like the rational Frenchman he is, he chooses to build up his own nuclear establishment.

He knows that the day U.S. troops are pulled out of Germany, France will be unable to defend itself without its own nuclear force.

In his youth, President Kennedy wrote a book called "Why England Slept." It described how England, in 1939, was caught militarily napping by the Germans, and its very sound thesis was that no nation can afford to wait until it is attacked to prepare its own defenses, and that, above all, it cannot rely on the military or economic strength even of its allies to save it from destruction.

IF UNITED STATES PULLS OUT OF EUROPE

Charles de Gaulle has paid the author of "Why England Slept" the compliment of taking his advice. He does not intend to be caught napping if at some future date the United States, in order to prevent a world holocaust—and its own destruction—yanks its nuclear umbrella away from Europe.

It is hard to see what is "Napoleonic" about a Frenchman's desire to protect France, or why the desire to remove France from the category of a limited war area should be considered a folie de grandeur. What is much more a folie de grandeur is the desire of the United States to keep Europe a United States nuclear colonial area and to keep Great Britain, France, and Germany forever in the United States nuclear nursery.

Mr. BELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ALGER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, in my view bipartisanship in foreign affairs is wrong. Agreements may indeed occur between members of both parties inasmuch as Americans do indeed stand together as a Nation in a hostile world. The ties that bind Americans are far greater than the divisive forces at work in the world today that separate us from Socialist-Communist societies. Our Republic and our people, blessed with freedom are a world apart from Communists and those dictatorships that deny freedom and self-determination to their people.

But agreements that result in bipartisan harmony must never preclude, foreclose or in any way or to any degree limit freedom of speech. Most of all, in foreign affairs we must freely express our views. More heads are better than a few. Our free criticisms result in a final policy which Americans will support as we have many times. But these decisions and policies were amalgams of many and various views, sometimes highly critical. Our Republic's strength is in our differences and contrasts of views that result in thorough analysis. If now we must abandon our right to speak freely and criticize then indeed our constituents are voiceless, are not represented and we have a dictatorship—the very form of government we abhor the most. Let us not adopt the enemy's views in order to discredit and defeat him.

Indeed, our very lack of policy today—the so-called no-win policy, the bewildering conflicts of U.S. sovereignty and U.N. decisions, the countless forms of aid to the enemy that we give in many kinds of foreign aid, the suicidal acceptance of Monroe Doctrine violation, the supine refusal to stand up for U.S. sovereignty as we back down in concessions to countless demands by Communists—these and more partially demonstrate, I believe, our error in having adopted a posture of so-called bipartisan foreign policy.

As the gentleman from New York [Mr. BECKER] said, the unilateral decisions of President Kennedy are not the policies and decisions of Republicans. The mistakes under this administration in foreign policy are not, therefore, Republican mistakes. Nor should mistakes—and there are now many—be whitewashed or buried from view by blocking criticism by accepting a policy of bipartisan agreement.

Indeed, on the contrary, the administration should right now be championing a foreign policy so firm, so clearly understood by all, so protective of U.S. sovereignty, that it could withstand all Republican criticism—or if it cannot—then the valid criticisms of Republicans should be recognized, analyzed, and adopted.

It is at this point that this administration's lack of policy breaks down so clearly. The lack of overall policy and the fitful reacting without a basic policy to the various threats to freedom and peace as they arise in the world are now the reason, apparently, for the President calling for bipartisanship—so that the mistakes will be glossed over and the blame not cast on him. The President cannot escape this responsibility but more important—the countless mistakes of Cuba, Vietnam, Laos, the Congo, France, Canada, and Latin America must be corrected. So it is that the President's only hope, as I see it, is to call on the Republicans—correct the continuing mistakes and protect our Nation and her people. Not dodge, delay, or sidestep the continuing errors that need correction now.

As a starting point let me suggest that we reimpose the Monroe Doctrine, clarify the Vietnam war where Americans are being killed in a war that is not a war, eliminate the foreign aid that goes to the enemy, the Communists, and stop supporting the United Nations aid to the enemy.

There are other solutions available to troublesome problems if the President would first not worry about covering up criticism by bipartisan appeals; second, contradict those in the administration who say it is proper for government to lie to her people; third, get about really protecting U.S. sovereignty instead of apologizing for U.S. determination to protect freedom, justice, and decency, and finally stop managing the news, preferring at last to confide in the people, telling them and us, their representatives, what world situations really are, so that we can all join in protecting ourselves and our beloved land.

NEWS MANAGEMENT

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, expanding means of communication have created a promise of better news coverage for Americans. From a technical viewpoint, we must applaud such achievements as Telstar.

However, in the age of Telstar, Mazors, and the like, a new phenomenon has arisen known as news management. Some aspects of news management are reminiscent of George Orwell's 1984.

My distinguished colleague from Maryland called attention to this phenomenon in a statement on the House floor February 21, 1963.

The reprint of the statement follows:

WASHINGTON "CON" MEN

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, the Attorney General is ignoring a confidence game being played in Washington and so we must warn the public about it. The object of the game is to use the people's money to bamboozle them on a national scale. The scheme is simple. An administration tipster calls a political favorite who has played no prior part and breaks the news of the award of a Government contract in his State. The favorite then calls the news media at home and releases the glad tidings with at least the implication that he is making a personal benefaction to his constitutents.

Honest citizens who are familiar with complex Government procurement procedures are not impressed. Reporters, editors, and newscasters are not fooled by this hocus-pocus. Let us hope that they will expose it for the deception that it is.

On Sunday, February 24, 1963, the Washington Post and Times Herald printed the views of the distinguished columnist, Mr. Arthur Krock, concerning news management. It says:

KROCK CHARGES CYNICAL NEWS MANAGEMENT, DISTORTION TO KENNEDY

Arthur Krock, prize-winning newsman, accuses President Kennedy of managing the news with a cynicism, boldness, and subtlety unmatched in peacetime history.

But, the veteran newsman says, if Mr. Kennedy has achieved any success in these efforts, "the principal onus rests on the printed and electronic press itself."

Krock, for 21 years chief of the Washington bureau of the New York Times and more recently a Times Washington columnist, levels his indictment in the March issue of Fortune magazine.

He cites, as an affront to Jeffersonian principles of a free press, "the 'informational directives' prescribed for the Pentagon and the Department of State when the crisis over Cuba began to harden." He said the "weapon" of news management has been improperly used to inflate success or gloss over error "in the aftermath of half-won showdowns, such as President Kennedy's with respect to the Soviet rearmament of Cuba."

Krock says Mr. Kennedy and high subordinates indirectly manage news by social flattery of Washington reporters and commentators, and by "selective personal patronage."

In the latter category he included exclusive interviews, attributable to the President, which he says have ceased to be a rarity.

"But Mr. Kennedy," he writes, "prefers the intimate background briefings of journalists, and their publishers, on a large scale, from which members emerge in a state of protracted enchantment evoked by the President's charm and the awesome aura of his office.

"The success of his efforts is attested by a continent-wide glow in news reporting, editorializing, and comment, which otherwise might register the lower temperature of impersonal objectivity."

Krock accuses Mr. Kennedy also of spreading "a false first impression" last year that a budget balance was in prospect. And he charges administration officials with anonymous prevarication on such subjects as the balance-of-payments problem, which, Krock said, "is visibly growing worse."

There was no immediate White House comment on Krock's article. At his news conference last Thursday, Mr. Kennedy said in response to a question: "Let me say we have had very limited success in managing the news if that is what we have been trying to do."

When the questioner, correspondent May Craig, remarked that she doesn't believe in managed news at all and thinks "we ought to get everything we want," the President brought a laugh by replying: "Well, I think that you should, too, Miss Craig; I am for that."

Krock, 76, first covered the National Capital during the administration of William Howard Taft. As chief of the Times Washington bureau, 1932–53, he won two Pulitzer Prizes and a citation equivalent to third.

He has been a long-time friend of the Kennedy family, and he told an Associated Press reporter that he is "absolutely personally fond" of President Kennedy.

In writing that quotable exclusive interviews with the President no longer are rare, as they formerly were, Krock recalls the protests that arose from the Washington press corps when President Franklin D. Roosevelt gave one in 1937, and President Harry S. Truman gave another in 1950. Both interviews were obtained by Krock.

Asked whether he believes those Presidents did wrong in giving the interview and whether he feels that he should not have participated in them, Krock said:

"Not at all. It served their (the Presidents') purpose and they were doing me no favor."

He said the two Presidents felt that "the best and most effective medium" of publicizing what they had to say was the New York Times.

In his Fortune article, Krock says that on the strength of almost 50 years as a newsman, he would make two judgments on what he calls "management of the news" by Mr. Kennedy and administration officials:

1. A news management policy not only exists but, in the form of direct and deliberate action, has been enforced more cynically and boldly then by any previous administration in a period when the United States was not in a war or without visible means of regression from the verge of war.

2. In the form of indirect but equally deliberate action, the policy has been much more effective than direct action in coloring the several facets of public information, because it has been employed with subtlety and imagination for which there is no historic parallel known to me.

"In the narrow twilight zone between the direct and indirect methods, the administration incessantly resorts to three ways to push its news product that work deplorably well with the press.

"Vulnerable and/or discreditable acts in foreign policy—such as forcing the Dutch to surrender West Guinea to Indonesian blackmail, promoting U.N. charter violation in the Congo, etc.—are explained on the purely assumptive ground that they were necessary to prevent a confrontation with Soviet Russia likely to result in nuclear war.

"Executive decisions sure to be unpopular are explained as in line with or compelled by policies adopted by the Eisenhower Administration.

"And when the White House is the center of such revelations of ineptness in the Kennedy regime as our public intrusion in the Canadian parliamentary debate on nuclear policy, his subordinates make oath that the President, though daily represented as omniscient, knew nothing about it and is 'furious' (but nobody gets fired)."

In conclusion, Krock says:

"But it is the indirect methods * * * by which 'managements of the news' is chiefly accomplished by the Kennedy administration. This is a public relations project and the President is its most brilliant operator.

"Since the immediate objectives of this selling job are the news reporters in general (most definitely including the TV and radio broadcasters), widely read commentators and flattered editors, publishers and network moguls in particular, the project is much more accurately identified by the phrase 'managing the purveyors of the news.' And for any degree to which this project has been successful the principal onus rests on the printed and electronic press itself."

On the same page of the Washington Post and Times Herald, there appeared a story entitled "Representative PELLY Says State Misled Congress, Press."

The statement is herewith inserted in the RECORD:

REPRESENTATIVE PELLY SAYS STATE MISLED CONGRESS, PRESS

> A Republican Member of Congress charged the State Department yesterday with deliberately misleading Members of Congress and the press last fall on the Cuban situation.
>
> Representative THOMAS M. PELLY, of Washington, registered his complaint in a letter to Assistant Secretary of State Frederick G. Dutton.
>
> Last September 25, PELLY said, the State Department informed Members of Congress that there was no evidence of any organized combat force in Cuba from any Soviet-bloc country. On the same day he received his summary, PELLY said, Assistant Secretary of Defense William Bundy was telling a House Military Appropriations Subcommittee in secret session that missile sites of an offensive nature were being constructed in Cuba.
>
> "I believe the facts regarding the offensive military buildup in Cuba were in the possession of the Department of State when you issued the summary stating there was no evidence of Cuban offensive capabilities, including offensive ground-to-ground missiles under Soviet direction or guidance," PELLY said in his letter to Dutton.

FIFTIETH ANNIVERSARY OF SIXTEENTH AMENDMENT

The SPEAKER. Under the previous order of the House the gentleman from Washington [Mr. PELLY] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter and a table.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, 50 years ago today the State of Wyoming became the 36th State of the Union to ratify the 16th amendment to the Constitution of the United States. Thereupon, three-fourths of the several States had acted favorably in pursuance of a joint resolution of the Congress to authorize a Federal income tax. The U.S. Senate had passed this resolution on July 5, 1909, and by a vote of 318 to 4, the House had passed it a week later.

Mr. Speaker, little did the Members of Congress of that day realize the extent to which their action would change Government and the Federal system. Little did Cordell Hull and other supporters of this tax realize its ultimate effect. Actually, it was believed the tax would never exceed 2 percent.

Today, Mr. Speaker, our House Committee on Ways and Means is holding hearings on proposed reduction and reform of the income tax, and for me, as for my colleagues and the taxpayers we represent, it is a time for us to decide as to what is best in the way of lowering and improving the tax structure.

In this connection, I have been reading the proceedings of the 61st Congress, 1st session, and have reviewed the debate on the resolution to amend the Constitution, which was Senate Joint Resolution 40.

Actually, the issue was not one of taxing incomes of individuals equally, but rather to overcome a U.S. Supreme Court decision which held that under the then language of the Constitution, Congress was not authorized to levy a tax on corporations, because that would not be apportioning the taxes equally as between States.

Mr. Speaker, the 16th amendment, according to its advocates, was to be a war power that could be vital to the existence of the country. But it was not to be a peacetime tax.

I want to read today to the House in commemoration—if that is a proper term—and in any event in sadness, certain excerpts from the House debate on Senate Joint Resolution 40, but I point out first, Mr. Speaker, that this was a tax measure which originated in the Senate, contrary to the Constitution. Most of our fiscal problems, in my opinion, have originated in the other body. If only the House had originally been given sole and exclusive power by the Constitution over taxes and expenditures, there would be no national debt of any consequence today, nor any need for such a burdensome system of taxation, requiring at the moment admittedly much in the way of reduction and reform.

However, Mr. Speaker, then as now, there were some wise heads in the House. Listen to what Mr. McCall, of Massachusetts, said on July 12, 1909. Compare the vision and views of this erstwhile Member of the House with the opinions and political foresight of some of Massachusetts' sons and political leaders of today.

Here are Mr. McCall's words as to equal taxation and representation in regard to the proposed change in the system of taxation:

> In the Constitutional Convention, States having only one-third of the population of the country were in a majority; but today States having only one-sixth of the population elect a majority of the Senate, and yet it is proposed to throw away incontinently this important safeguard of the Constitution, this great democratic feature, and the Democratic Party proposes to take a hand and throw the rule of apportionment to the winds. I submit that if you are going to give up the rule of apportionment, you should confer upon the representatives of the people some compensating power to take the place of the safeguard you take away. You should at least provide that the House and the Senate should not amend them; that its power should be confined either to vetoing or accepting them—the power which the House of Lords in Great Britain has in reference to all tax bills.

Mr. Speaker, again let me quote Mr. McCall, of Massachusetts. His arguments made against the income tax amendment are interesting:

> So, Mr. Speaker, while they say that they desire this power for time of war, we see today in time of peace the attempt to exercise the power to its utmost extent. And why not, then, limit it expressly to time of war? Why not, for the just protection and the equal rights of the people of New York and of the other great States of this Union, five of which probably will pay nine-tenths of an income tax, although they will have only one-ninth of the representation in the Senate—why not preserve the limitation upon the power of the Central Government? Why drag every governmental power to Washington so that a vast centralized government may devour the States and the liberty of the individual as well? I say this amendment should be more carefully considered than it has yet been considered.
>
> It is liable to go into the Constitution of the United States and be forever a part of the organic law in the form of which it has been. I may almost say, extemporized or improvised. The character of the argument which has been made, that this tax is for use in time of war, leads me to observe that the chief purpose of the tax is not financial, but social. It is not primarily to raise money for the State, but to regulate the citizen and to regenerate the moral nature of man. The individual citizen will be called on to lay bare the innermost recesses of his soul in affidavits, and with the aid of the Federal inspector, who will supervise his books and papers and business secrets, he may be made to be good, according to the notions of virtue at the moment prevailing in Washington. And, incidentally, since every business secret in the country can be had access to by the authorities at Washington, the citizen may be made to see his political duty if you happened to have a President who confused the attainment of his ambition with the highest good of the universe and was willing to abuse his power in order to coerce the citizen. You are creating here an ideal condition for corruption and for the political Jack Cade of the future to levy blackmail.

A statement by a Member from Connecticut, Mr. Hill, is worth reading. In his remarks, he said:

> I am a firm believer that in times of peace the revenues of this country should be derived from customs duties and internal-revenue taxes, and that if these are not sufficient, as prudent people we ought to reduce our expenses to a point where they will be covered by such revenues.

Mr. Speaker, I want to read also from the remarks of Representative Harrison, of New York. He favored the bill, but listen to this wishful bit of thinking. Mr. Harrison said:

> If the resolution prevails, it should be incumbent on the conferees upon the tariff to drop immediately from consideration the proposed corporation tax put into the bill by the Senate. This resolution now before the House provides for the taxing of incomes from whatever source derived. That means taxes upon incomes of corporations as well as individuals. In my opinion the corporation tax as it passed the Senate is unconstitutional; but if this resolution prevails, and the States give us the constitutional right to pass a law taxing the incomes of corporations as well as individuals, such doubts will be at once removed. Moreover, as it now stands, alone, without an individual income tax, the corporation tax is the most grossly unfair impost ever levied by motion of either Chamber of Congress. It is unfair because it will allow one man with a $100,000 income to go free, while another man who may get $10,000 in income must pay the tax because his business is incorporated. It allows the man conducting a grocery business upon one corner of the street to go scotfree, while another man that carries on the same business on the next corner of the same street is obliged to pay a tax because he has incorporated his business. It thus violates the fundamental principle of taxation, namely, that its burdens should be equally distributed.

Mr. Harrison's remarks bring to my mind, Mr. Speaker, that an inequitable and heavy burden of taxes such as constitutes the income tax today was one of the major objectives of the Communist Manifesto. Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels wrote their guidebook to communism in 1848, and one of their key points was to tax the middle class into submission. In his directive to the proletariat, Marx flatly said a heavy progressive or graduated income tax was essential to destroy capitalism.

Mr. Speaker, frankly, it must be recognized that under the cold war conditions and continuing world crises, the Treasury of the United States needs revenue. However, when we hear the advocating of tax cuts without any spending curtailment in order to increase the employment and stimulate business, I keep thinking of Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels. Would not all this massive spending with no tax revenues to provide for it delight those two masters of mischief?

On this 50th anniversary of the income tax, let me show the progress in the direction urged by those two men. Here is a tabulation of per capita Federal tax receipts showing the changes in tax rates in selected fiscal years from 1789–1962. This table is from "Facts and Figures on Government Finance," published by Tax Foundation, Inc. It indicates the trend toward Marxism:

Per capita Federal tax receipts

Year	*Per capita*
1789–91	$1.12
1800	1.92
1810	1.22
1820	1.61
1830	1.75
1840	.81
1850	1.75
1860	1.73
1870	9.72
1880	6.31
1890	6.03
1900	7.07
1910	6.89
1920	54.81
1930	29.78
1940	43.56
1941	59.28
1942	101.16
1943	168.54
1944	314.63
1945	334.04
1946	308.53
1947	285.71
1948	295.72
1949	278.60
1950	268.32
1951	342.22
1952	431.67
1953	454.60
1954	447.78
1955	415.15
1956	461.64
1957	484.30
1958	474.93
1959	466.69
1960	527.17
1961	530.97
1962	550.64

In discussing the results of the income tax, I think mention especially should be made as to its effect on Government. On this subject, let me quote from an address of Alfred J. Schweppe before the North Carolina State bar on October 26, 1962. Listen to this:

> Actually the first big step in the direction of unlimited Federal power was the 16th amendment adopted in 1913 authorizing Congress to levy, without limit, a tax on incomes from whatever source derived. Those persons who at the time strongly objected to this unlimited taxing power were soothed with the pious declaration that it was inconceivable that the tax on incomes would ever go over 2 percent. Congress passed the first Income Tax Act in 1916. Within 2 years during World War I it went up to 85 percent on the highest incomes, and is today, and for many years last past, has been in the same general area. So far as the 16th amendment is concerned, it permits a 100-percent confiscation of all incomes and the reduction of the American people to the status of recipients of Government doles.
>
> The 16th amendment authorizing an income tax without limit was, in the judgment of many, a great mistake. But all efforts to impose a limitation belatedly have proved and will probably continue to prove abortive, because governments do not give up powers, particularly taxing powers, once deferred; rather they stretch the powers they already have.

Mr. Speaker, I think the caliber of the present members of the House Committee on Ways and Means is very high. The comments I receive from my constituents on the President's tax proposal are far from favorable. I hope and I believe the House Committee on Ways and Means will not report out such a bad bill as has been proposed. Rather, my fear is that Congress may not reduce Federal expenditures sufficiently to justify any tax cut.

It seems to me the very desirable objective of stimulating business and increased prosperity can only come through a combination of reducing both taxes and Government spending. I would favor about $5 billion cut in each.

If, however, this Nation really wanted to improve employment and step up the economy, the corporation tax is the place to do it.

When, Mr. Speaker, the 16th amendment to the Constitution was adopted, the deterrent to business and industrial expansion and growth by killing profit incentive began. I suggest that if the current movement to repeal the 16th amendment should prevail, the machinery of business in this country would start to hum and employment would increase as never before in the lifetime of any of us.

Meanwhile, Mr. Speaker, a substantial cut in the corporation tax, with a reduction in nonessential Federal Government spending will help a great deal.

Yesterday the Washington Post printed an article, "Stifled Cheers Will Hail Income Tax 50th Year," by Harry Gabbett.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include this article as a rather fitting conclusion to my comments:

STIFLED CHEERS WILL HAIL INCOME TAX 50TH YEAR

The Internal Revenue Service marks a big milestone Monday—and if the printer should make that "millstone" he won't be changing the meaning very much.

On February 25, just 50 years ago, the State of Wyoming became the 36th to ratify the 16th amendment to the Constitution.

That was the income tax amendment and by its authority last year the Internal Revenue Service collected almost $100 billion from you, yew, and y'all. The rousing success of last year's drive has inspired IRS to conduct it again this year and it takes no seer to suggest that this will be another banner year.

IRS concedes that it will be entirely fitting that this year's milking should outproduce all others. It will impart that much more significance to the golden anniversary of the process.

It is probably no accident that nobody is known as the "father of the income tax." The idea had long smoldered in a variety of legislative breasts, but Abraham Lincoln was the first President to use it on anything like a grand scale. He considered it the only way the Civil War ever would get paid for, and when that crisis eased, the income tax was allowed to expire without much fanfare in 1872.

During the next several years the Government was able to keep its financial head above water with the proceeds from excise taxes on alcohol and tobacco and customs duties from tariffs. But advocates of the income tax still believed it the more equitable means of meeting the country's growing financial obligations.

Congress finally took a shot at it in 1894, enacting an income tax as part of a tariff law passed during Grover Cleveland's administration.

Levied was a flat 2-percent tax on individual incomes in excess of $4,000 and on corporate incomes in excess of $5,000, but the Supreme Court held in 1895 that the tax was illegal and it never was collected.

The landmark decision held that an income tax was a direct tax and as such could be levied only by apportionment among the States on a basis of population.

In 1907, however, President Theodore Roosevelt observed publicly that "most great civilized countries have an income tax and an inheritance tax. In my judgment, both should be a part of Federal taxation."

Two years later supporters of the tax launched a congressional drive to have the 1894 law reenacted and President William H. Taft called for the constitutional amendment which would get around the Supreme Court's apportionment objections.

Taft's suggestions were incorporated into the Payne-Aldrich Tariff Act of 1909—a piece of legislation which served mightily to cloud paternity of the income tax as it operates today.

Alabama ratified the proposed amendment the same year and with Wyoming's "yes" 3 years later the United States was in most everybody's business.

Corporations were taxed 1 percent on net incomes in excess of $5,000 and the Supreme Court in 1911 called it an excise tax on the privilege of doing business. Individuals were allowed a $3,000 exemption—$4,000, if married—and there was a graduated surtax on incomes over $20,000. At those prices, less than 1 percent of the population was affected, however, and it wasn't until World War II that everybody began to feel the bite.

In 1939 only 4 million individuals paid an income tax, but in 1945, 43 million out of 50 million filed returns were taxable. About 62 million personal income tax returns were filed last year.

Progressive rates of taxation, a key feature of the 1913 legislation, have been retained through the years, making the income tax—in the words of an early champion of the tax, Senator Joseph W. Bailey, Democrat, of Texas, the only tax ever devised that "rose or fell with a man's ability to pay it." Current individual tax rates, changed but little from World War II, range from 20 to 91 percent.

By 1965, IRS expects to be coping with the annual flood of income tax paperwork completely on a pushbutton basis. High-speed computers, electronic memory systems, and magnetic tape will be calling the painful shots each spring and IRS offices are abuzz with not-so-incredible rumors of wonders to come.

High school teachers are pretty much in agreement that the 16th amendment to the

Constitution presents a consistent stumbling block for pupils who somehow are able to identify the rest of them with little or no trouble.

They are also pretty much in agreement that there is no accounting for this blind spot, especially in view of the fact that no other amendment to the Constitution has done more for or to so many citizens of this country in the 50 years since Wyoming put it on the books.

LEGISLATION TO REGULATE SALE OF SECURITIES IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill to provide for the regulation of the business of selling securities in the District of Columbia and for the licensing of persons engaged therein, and for other purposes.

The District of Columbia has, for a considerable time, needed such legislation. Questionable practices by a small minority of dealers in securities has made this legislation necessary.

May I say that by and large the great majority of the stock securities dealers in the District of Columbia have been honest and above reproach. However, the number of complaints that have come to the members of the District of Columbia Committee in the past few years has been considerable. Let it be to the credit of the National Association of Credit Dealers that they have filed complaints in many cases in an attempt to give some kind of self-enforcement and intergrity to the responsible securities dealers in the District. In 1960, this association filed complaints against 25 percent of the District members. This is considerably above the national average of only 8 percent. This gives some idea of the necessity of adequate legislation to govern the industry in the District. In view of this large percentage of complaints filed by the National Association, it certainly behooves the District of Columbia to take some action which is legally enforceable and will protect the investors within the District of Columbia.

Almost all of the States of the Union have "blue sky" laws. It is unfortunate that the District of Columbia itself has not had this legislation in the recent past. The lack of this legislation has made it possible for many unscrupulous dealers in securities to operate within the District. Many investors in the small, medium, and large fields have been bilked by these unscrupulous people.

There ought to be legislation on the books which will make regulation possible and correct this unfortunate situation. The Commissions of the District of Columbia have submitted a draft bill and that is the one that I have introduced today.

I think as a result of hearings on this bill we could bring out more fully the situation as it has existed in the District in the past few years. Through those hearings, I am sure we can bring forward some kind of legislation that will be helpful and will protect the investing public in the District of Columbia. This is the purpose of the legislation.

WALTER KRAWIEC, EDITORIAL CARTOONIST, CHICAGO'S MAN OF THE YEAR

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PUCINSKI] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, last Saturday evening Walter Krawiec, editorial cartoonist for the Chicago Polish Daily News was honored by that newspaper and the people of Chicago and Illinois as the Man of the Year for 1962.

In an elaborate banquet in the grand ballroom of the Sherman House in Chicago, Mr. Krawiec was presented the annual Veritas et Caritas Medal by the Polish Daily News for his 50 years of work as an editorial cartoonist for this fine newspaper.

Mayor Richard J. Daley, speaking for the people of Chicago, and Gov. Otto Kerner, speaking for the people of Illinois, by personally appearing at this magnificent tribute, in their own messages described the depth of gratitude and respect which all of the people in our community hold for Walter Krawiec.

He indeed exemplifies the spirit of truth and charity.

In receiving this highly coveted award, Mr. Krawiec joins the ranks of former famous Men of the Year selected by the Polish Daily News who include President John F. Kennedy and Mayor Richard J. Daley.

It is fitting that Walter Krawiec, an editorial cartoonist, should be selected as the Man of the Year. During the span of five decades this man, through his unique grasp and understanding of world events, has been able to bring to the people of Chicago a quick understanding, in his daily editorial cartoons, of those complexities in our society which authors of books and papers frequently require volumes to describe.

The editorial cartoon has played a singularly important role in civilization's efforts to better understand the complex nature of our society. Walter Krawiec exemplifies the very essence of his noble profession. Even though he is an accomplished artist in his own right and is recognized as one of the great illustrators of the modern circus, he has earned world renown for his oil portraits.

Walter Krawiec has won numerous awards as a frequent exhibitor at the Corcoran Gallery in Washington, D.C.; the National Academy in New York; the Chicago Art Institute, and museums throughout the country.

I prefer, however, to honor him as a chronicler of world events. Soft spoken by nature, he is transformed at the easel into a veritable crusader; pen and ink, brush and paint become weapons which he wields forcefully and courageously against evil in the world. The downtrodden and oppressed find in him a champion, while the evildoers feel the full force of his struggle for truth and justice.

Walter Krawiec is a deeply religious man and he employs his art for the noble enrichment of life. He does not permit man or society to be disillusioned, substituting purely material progress for Christian perfection. Yet as a great poet or musician would, Walter Krawiec has the unique capacity to settle into artistic serenity when there is no need for a crusade; when critical times pass, painting, and drawing with warmth and understanding the persons and places of everyday living.

In the five decades that he has served as editorial cartoonist for the Polish Daily News, Mr. Krawiec has recorded the most spectacular half-century in the development of our Nation.

We Americans are that much richer for having the panorama of American and world progress recorded for posterity by men such as Walter Krawiec. We as a Nation are that much wiser and better equipped to understand the great challenges of a complex world because men like Walter Krawiec are able to reduce this complexity through the use of a few bold strokes of the pen to an understanding which even those with a very limited education can grasp.

His editorial cartoons in my very humble judgment have helped translate the very essence of democracy to the people of the Midwest.

Mr. Speaker, perhaps the brief but meaningful remarks delivered by Mr. Krawiec in accepting this award will describe this ingenious man better than anything I might say. In his brief acceptance speech, Mr. Krawiec demonstrates at once a lifetime of fruitful contributions to society and a humility which has made his work a testament to his life.

His speech can serve as an example to students of speech because its depth of thought is nurtured in a concept of brevity. Mr. Walter Krawiec's remarks follow:

REMARKS OF WALTER KRAWIEC IN ACCEPTING VERITAS ET CARITAS AWARD IN CHICAGO FEBRUARY 23, 1963

Mr. Toastmaster, Father Provincial, very reverence and reverend Fathers, distinguished guests and friends, there was a time more than half a century ago that the seed of this eventful day was sown. It was a day in which my career took a formal step at the suggestion of some firemen, who watched me sketch some horses on rough cardboard at the firehouse.

These good men urged me to go to the Art Institute where I could develop a talent they thought I had. Maybe because I saw them jump to action so often that I too that afternoon followed their advice promptly.

Somewhat antecedent to today's "hike" craze, I walked from Chicago and Milwaukee Avenues and up to the art institute. Up to this moment, I was all determination, all courage. But standing barefooted in what seemed a different world, I experienced that frightful feeling that I didn't belong. It was long, but a friendly hand touched my shoulder. You know something—that same frightful feeling is back again here, at a speaker's rostrum.

For the man who by habit has expressed himself through pictures all of his life, I find this spotlight too bright. Yet, the aura of this spot is somewhat dispelled by the realization that I am surrounded by friends. You must be true friends to give me an evening like this.

If I had my easel at hand, I would sketch a cartoon something like. I would picture myself in a little world of my own, standing with my mouth wide open in amazement as people of great stature and noble hearts came to me as if from another planet and they brought with them the friendly handshake, good wishes, honors and appreciation, and as they passed, I would murmur, "Thank you for your kindness."

Yes, thank you to the Resurrection Fathers and their great newspaper for this signal honor of the Man of the Year, and thank you, friends, for this warm gathering.

I have no regrets this evening, only a humble satisfaction that I have tried to use whatever talents God gave me to add, however small the contribution, to a better world. In my 50 years with the Dziennik Chicagoski, I have been a privileged spectator in watching the world change from a horse and buggy existence into a space age of rockets.

I spoke in pictures to each generation as best I knew how; particularly did I speak to my own ethnic group as it slowly transformed from a small band of immigrants into a powerful group, loving their fatherland, but putting their shoulders to the plow of the great American way, until they have emerged into dutiful sons and daughters of America.

In this growth of our people, I remember sad moments as my editorial cartoons went on page 1—sharp, critical, and at times denouncing—because a sin is not to be covered but exposed and eradicated. But then what a pleasure it was to present persons and groups as they progressed to goodness and greatness.

On my board I saw the rise of the great fraternal and charitable organizations, the magnificent churches and schools, the men in politics and other services. To all these, I spoke and I say the privilege was mine.

So this evening as I accept the Truth and Charity Award, grateful to all of you who made this possible, I cannot forget the great men and women who give substance to my work. Thank you all very much.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana (at the request of Mr. BELL), for 10 minutes, on Tuesday, February 26.

Mr. WEAVER, for 30 minutes, on Tuesday, February 26, 1963.

Mr. PELLY, for 1 hour, today.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend his remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. PELLY and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. DULSKI.

Mr. BOLAND.

Mr. MCCORMACK (at the request of Mr. ALBERT) and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. BRADEMAS (at the request of Mr. WAGGONNER) and to include extraneous matter, notwithstanding the fact that it exceeds two pages of the RECORD and is estimated by the Public Printer to cost $270.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. BELL) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. CUNNINGHAM.

Mr. ALGER.

(The following Member (at the request of Mr. WAGGONNER) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. DINGELL.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 17 minutes p.m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, February 26, 1963, at 12 o'clock noon.

OATH OF OFFICE, MEMBERS AND RESIDENT COMMISSIONER

The oath of office required by the sixth article of the Constitution of the United States, and as provided by section 2 of the act of May 13, 1884 (23 Stat. 22), to be administered to Members and Delegates of the House of Representatives, the text of which is carried in section 1757 of title XIX of the Revised Statutes of the United States and being as follows:

> "I, A B, do solemnly swear (or affirm) that I will support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic; that I will bear true faith and allegiance to the same; that I take this obligation freely, without any mental reservation or purpose of evasion; and that I will well and faithfully discharge the duties of the office on which I am about to enter. So help me God."

has been subscribed to in person and filed in duplicate with the Clerk of the House of Representatives by each of the following Members and Resident Commissioner of the 88th Congress, pursuant to Public Law 412 of the 80th Congress entitled "An act to amend section 30 of the Revised Statutes of the United States" (U.S.C., title 2, sec. 25), approved February 18, 1948:

ALABAMA

At large

George Grant.
George W. Andrews.
Kenneth A. Roberts.
Albert Rains.
Armistead I. Selden, Jr.
Carl Elliott.
Robert E. Jones, Jr.
George Huddleston, Jr.

ALASKA

At large

Ralph J. Rivers.

ARIZONA

1. John J. Rhodes.
2. Morris K. Udall.
3. George F. Senner, Jr.

ARKANSAS

1. E. C. Gathings.
2. Wilbur D. Mills.
3. James W. Trimble.
4. Oren Harris.

CALIFORNIA

1. Don H. Clausen.
2. Harold T. Johnson.
3. John E. Moss.
4. Robert L. Leggett.
5. John F. Shelley.
6. William S. Mailliard.
7. Jeffery Cohelan.
8. George P. Miller.
9. Don W. Edwards.
10. Charles S. Gubser.
11. J. Arthur Younger.
12. Burt L. Talcott.
13. Charles M. Teague.
14. John F. Baldwin, Jr.
15. John J. McFall.
16. B. F. Sisk.
17. Cecil R. King.
18. Harlan Hagen.
19. Chet Holifield.
20. H. Allen Smith.
21. Augustus F. Hawkins.
22. James C. Corman.
23. Clyde Doyle.
24. Glenard P. Lipscomb.
25. Ronald Brooks Cameron.
26. James Roosevelt.
27. Everett G. Burkhalter.
28. Alphonzo Bell.
29. George E. Brown, Jr.
30. Edward R. Roybal.
31. Charles H. Wilson.
32. Craig Hosmer.
33. Harry R. Sheppard.
34. Richard T. Hanna.
35. James B. Utt.
36. Bob Wilson.
37. Lionel Van Deerlin.
38. Patrick Minor Martin.

COLORADO

1. Byron G. Rogers.
2. Donald G. Brotzman.
3. J. Edgar Chenoweth.
4. Wayne N. Aspinall.

CONNECTICUT

1. Emilio Q. Daddario.
2. William L. St. Onge.
3. Robert N. Giaimo.
4. Abner W. Sibal.
5. John S. Monagan.

At large

Bernard F. Grabowski.

DELAWARE

At large

Harris B. McDowell, Jr.

FLORIDA

1. Robert L. F. Sikes.
2. Charles E. Bennett.
3. Claude Pepper.
4. Dante B. Fascell.
5. A. Sydney Herlong, Jr.
6. Paul G. Rogers.
7. James A. Haley.
8. D. R. (Billy) Matthews.
9. Don Fuqua.
10. Sam Gibbons.
11. Edward J. Gurney.
12. William C. Cramer.

GEORGIA

1. G. Elliott Hagan.
2. J. L. Pilcher.
3. E. L. (Tic) Forrester.

4. John J. Flynt, Jr.
5. Charles L. Weltner.
6. Carl Vinson.
7. John W. Davis.
8. J. Russell Tuten.
9. Phil M. Landrum.
10. Robert G. Stephens, Jr.

HAWAII

At large

Thomas P. Gill.
Spark M. Matsunaga.

IDAHO

1. Compton I. White.
2. Ralph R. Harding.

ILLINOIS

1. William L. Dawson.
2. Barratt O'Hara.
3. William T. Murphy.
4. Edward J. Derwinski.
5. John C. Kluczynski.
6. Thomas J. O'Brien.
7. Roland V. Libonati.
8. Dan Rostenkowski.
9. Edward R. Finnegan.
10. Harold R. Collier.
11. Roman C. Pucinski.
12. Robert McClory.
13. Donald Rumsfeld.
14. Elmer J. Hoffman.
15. Charlotte T. Reid.
16. John B. Anderson.
17. Leslie C. Arends.
18. Robert H. Michel.
19. Robert T. McLoskey.
20. Paul Findley.
21. Kenneth J. Gray.
22. William L. Springer.
23. George E. Shipley.
24. Melvin Price.

INDIANA

1. Ray J. Madden.
2. Charles A. Halleck.
3. John Brademas.
4. E. Ross Adair.
5. J. Edward Roush.
6. Richard L. Roudebush.
7. William G. Bray.
8. Winfield K. Denton.
9. Earl Wilson.
10. Ralph Harvey.
11. Donald Cogley Bruce.

IOWA

1. Fred Schwengel.
2. James E. Bromwell.
3. H. R. Gross.
4. John Kyl.
5. Neal Smith.
6. Charles B. Hoeven.
7. Ben F. Jensen.

KANSAS

1. Robert Dole.
2. William H. Avery.
3. Robert F. Ellsworth.
4. Garner E. Shriver.
5. Joe Skubitz.

KENTUCKY

1. Frank A. Stubblefield.
2. William H. Natcher.
3. M. G. (Gene) Snyder.
4. Frank Chelf.
5. Eugene Siler.
6. John C. Watts.
7. Carl D. Perkins.

LOUISIANA

1. F. Edward Hébert.
2. Hale Boggs.
3. Edwin E. Willis.
4. Joe D. Waggonner, Jr.
5. Otto E. Passman.
6. James H. Morrison.
7. T. A. Thompson.
8. Gillis W. Long.

MAINE

1. Stanley R. Tupper.
2. Clifford G. McIntire.

MARYLAND

1. Rogers C. B. Morton.
2. Clarence D. Long.
3. Edward A. Garmatz.
4. George H. Fallon.
5. Richard E. Lankford.
6. Charles McC. Mathias, Jr.
7. Samuel N. Friedel.

At large

Carlton R. Sickles.

MASSACHUSETTS

1. Silvio O. Conte.
2. Edward P. Boland.
3. Philip J. Philbin.
4. Harold D. Donohue.
5. F. Bradford Morse.
6. William H. Bates.
7. Torbert H. Macdonald.
8. Thomas P. O'Neill, Jr.
9. John W. McCormack.
10. Joseph W. Martin, Jr.
11. James A. Burke.
12. Hastings Keith.

MICHIGAN

1. Lucien N. Nedzi.
2. George Meader.
3. August E. Johansen.
4. Edward Hutchinson.
5. Gerald R. Ford.
6. Charles E. Chamberlain.
7. James G. O'Hara.
8. James Harvey.
9. Robert P. Griffin.
10. Elford A. Cederberg.
11. Victor A. Knox.
12. John B. Bennett.
13. Charles C. Diggs, Jr.
14. Harold M. Ryan.
15. John D. Dingell.
16. John Lesinski.
17. Martha W. Griffiths.
18. William S. Broomfield.

At large

Neil Staebler.

MINNESOTA

1. Albert H. Quie.
2. Ancher Nelsen.
3. Clark MacGregor.
4. Joseph E. Karth.
5. Donald M. Fraser.
6. Alec G. Olson.
7. Odin Langen.
8. John A. Blatnik.

MISSISSIPPI

1. Thomas G. Abernethy.
2. Jamie L. Whitten.
3. John Bell Williams.
4. Arthur Winstead.
5. William M. Colmer.

MISSOURI

1. Frank M. Karsten.
2. Thomas B. Curtis.
3. Leonor K. (Mrs. John B.) Sullivan.
4. Wm. J. Randall.
5. Richard Bolling.
6. W. R. Hull, Jr.
7. Durward G. Hall.
8. Richard H. Ichord.
9. Clarence Cannon.
10. Paul C. Jones.

MONTANA

1. Arnold Olsen.
2. James F. Battin.

NEBRASKA

1. Ralph F. Beermann.
2. Glenn Cunningham.
3. Dave Martin.

NEVADA

At large

Walter S. Baring.

NEW HAMPSHIRE

1. Louis C. Wyman.
2. James C. Cleveland.

NEW JERSEY

1. William T. Cahill.
2. Milton W. Glenn.
3. James C. Auchincloss.
4. Frank Thompson, Jr.
5. Peter Frelinghuysen, Jr.
6. Florence P. Dwyer.
7. William B. Widnall.
8. Charles S. Joelson.
9. Frank C. Osmers, Jr.
10. Peter W. Rodino, Jr.
11. Joseph G. Minish.
12. George M. Wallhauser.
13. Cornelius E. Gallagher.
14. Dominick V. Daniels.
15. Edward J. Patten.

NEW MEXICO

At large

Joseph M. Montoya.
Thomas G. Morris.

NEW YORK

1. Otis G. Pike.
2. James R. Grover, Jr.
3. Steven B. Derounian.
4. John W. Wydler.
5. Frank J. Becker.
6. Seymour Halpern.
7. Joseph P. Addabbo.
8. Benjamin S. Rosenthal.
9. James J. Delaney.
10. Emanuel Celler.
11. Eugene J. Keogh.
12. Edna F. Kelly.
13. Abraham J. Multer.
14. John J. Rooney.
15. Hugh L. Carey.
16. John M. Murphy.
17. John V. Lindsay.
18. Adam C. Powell.
19. Leonard Farbstein.
20. William Fitts Ryan.
21. James C. Healey.
22. Jacob H. Gilbert.
23. Charles A. Buckley.
24. Paul A. Fino.
25. Robert R. Barry.
26. Ogden R. Reid.
27. Katharine St. George.
28. J. Ernest Wharton.
29. Leo W. O'Brien.
30. Carleton J. King.
31. Clarence E. Kilburn.
32. Alexander Pirnie.
33. Howard W. Robison.
34. R. Walter Riehlman.
35. Samuel S. Stratton.
36. Frank J. Horton.
37. Harold C. Ostertag.
38. Charles E. Goodell.
39. John R. Pillion.
40. William E. Miller.
41. Thaddeus J. Dulski.

NORTH CAROLINA

1. Herbert C. Bonner.
2. L. H. Fountain.
3. David N. Henderson.
4. Harold D. Cooley.
5. Ralph J. Scott.
6. Horace R. Kornegay.
7. Alton Lennon.
8. Charles Raper Jonas.
9. James T. Broyhill.
10. Basil L. Whitener.
11. Roy A. Taylor.

NORTH DAKOTA

1. Hjalmar C. Nygaard.
2. Don L. Short.

OHIO

1. Carl W. Rich.
2. Donald D. Clancy.
3. Paul F. Schenck.
4. William M. McCulloch.
5. Delbert L. Latta.
6. William H. Harsha.
7. Clarence J. Brown.
8. Jackson E. Betts.
9. Thomas L. Ashley.
10. Homer E. Abele.
11. Oliver P. Bolton.
12. Samuel L. Devine.
13. Charles A. Mosher.
14. William H. Ayres.
15. Robert T. Secrest.
16. Frank T. Bow.
17. John M. Ashbrook.
18. Wayne L. Hays.
19. Michael J. Kirwan.
20. Michael A. Feighan.
21. Charles A. Vanik.
22. Frances P. Bolton.
23. William E. Minshall.

At large

Robert Taft, Jr.

OKLAHOMA

1. Page Belcher.
2. Ed Edmondson.
3. Carl Albert.
4. Tom Steed.
5. John Jarman.
6. Victor Wickersham.

OREGON

1. Walter Norblad.
2. Al Ullman.
3. Edith Green.
4. Robert B. Duncan.

PENNSYLVANIA

1. William A. Barrett.
2. Robert N. C. Nix.
3. James A. Byrne.
4. Herman Toll.
5. William J. Green, Jr.
6. George M. Rhodes.
7. William H. Milliken.
8. Willard S. Curtin.
9. Paul B. Dague.
10. Joseph M. McDade.
11. Daniel J. Flood.
12. J. Irving Whalley.
13. Richard S. Schweiker.
14. William S. Moorhead.
15. Francis E. Walter.
16. John C. Kunkel.
17. Herman T. Schneebeli.
18. Robert J. Corbett.
19. George A. Goodling.
20. Elmer J. Holland.
21. John H. Dent.
22. John P. Saylor.
23. Leon H. Gavin.
24. James D. Weaver.
25. Frank M. Clark.
26. Thomas E. Morgan.
27. James G. Fulton.

RHODE ISLAND

1. Fernand J. St Germain.
2. John E. Fogarty.

SOUTH CAROLINA

1. L. Mendel Rivers.
2. Albert W. Watson.
3. W. J. Bryan Dorn.
4. Robert T. Ashmore.
5. Robert W. Hemphill.
6. John L. McMillan.

SOUTH DAKOTA

1. Ben Reifel.
2. E. Y. Berry.

TENNESSEE

1. James H. (Jimmy) Quillen.
2. Howard H. Baker.
3. W. E. (Bill) Brock.
4. Joe L. Evins.
5. Richard Fulton.
6. Ross Bass.
7. Tom Murray.
8. Robert A. Everett.
9. Clifford Davis.

TEXAS

1. Wright Patman.
2. Jack Brooks.
3. Lindley Beckworth.
4. Ray Roberts.
5. Bruce Alger.
6. Olin E. Teague.
7. John Dowdy.
8. Albert Thomas.
9. Clark W. Thompson.
10. Homer Thornberry.
11. W. R. Poage.
12. Jim Wright.
13. Graham Purcell.
14. John Young.
15. Joe M. Kilgore.
16. Ed Foreman.
17. Omar Burleson.
18. Walter Rogers.
19. George Mahon.
20. Henry B. Gonzalez.
21. O. C. Fisher.
22. Bob Casey.

At large

Joe R. Pool.

UTAH

1. Laurence J. Burton.
2. Sherman P. Lloyd.

VERMONT

At large

Robert T. Stafford.

VIRGINIA

1. Thomas N. Downing.
2. Porter Hardy, Jr.
3. J. Vaughan Gary.
4. Watkins M. Abbitt.
5. William M. Tuck.
6. Richard H. Poff.
7. John O. Marsh, Jr.
8. Howard W. Smith.
9. W. Pat Jennings.
10. Joel T. Broyhill.

WASHINGTON

1. Thomas M. Pelly.
2. Jack Westland.
3. Julia Butler Hansen.
4. Catherine May.
5. Walt Horan.
6. Thor C. Tollefson.
7. K. W. (Bill) Stinson.

WEST VIRGINIA

1. Arch A. Moore, Jr.
2. Harley O. Staggers.
3. John M. Slack, Jr.
4. Ken Hechler.
5. Elizabeth Kee.

WISCONSIN

1. Henry C. Shadeberg.
2. Robert W. Kastenmeier.
3. Vernon W. Thomson.
4. Clement J. Zablocki.
5. Henry S. Reuss.
6. William K. Van Pelt.
7. Melvin R. Laird.
8. John W. Byrnes.
9. Lester R. Johnson.
10. Alvin E. O'Konski.

WYOMING

At large

William Henry Harrison.

PUERTO RICO

Resident Commissioner

Antonio Fernós-Isern.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

459. A letter from the Adjutant General, United Spanish War Veterans, transmitting the proceedings of the 64th National Encampment of the United Spanish War Veterans, held in Peoria, Ill., September 9 to 13, 1962, pursuant to Public Law 249, 77th Congress (H. Doc. 73); to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs and ordered to be printed with illustrations.

460. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense, transmitting the report of Federal contributions for the quarter ending December 31, 1962, pursuant to the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950, as amended; to the Committee on Armed Services.

461. A letter from the Acting President of the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to utilize volunteers for active police duty"; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

462. A letter from the Acting President of the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to provide for the regulation of the business of selling securities in the District of Columbia and for the licensing of persons engaged therein, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

463. A letter from the Chairman, Civil Aeronautics Board, transmitting the Annual Report of the Civil Aeronautics Board for fiscal year 1962, pursuant to the Federal Aviation Act of 1958; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

464. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting the 1963 Report of the Office of Coal Research, on coal research activities, pursuant to Public Law 86-599; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

465. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting the first annual report of the lead and zinc mining stabilization program for the year ending December 31, 1962, pursuant to Public Law 347 of the 87th Congress; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

466. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill permitting the

Secretary of the Interior to continue to deliver water to lands in the Third Division, Riverton Reclamation Project, Wyoming"; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

467. A letter from the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill for the relief of Robert O. Nelson and Harold E. Johnson"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

468. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a report relating to the providing of war risk insurance and certain marine and liability insurance for the American public as of December 31, 1962, pursuant to title XII of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, as amended; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

469. A letter from the Chairman, U.S. Civil Service Commission, transmitting a report from the Office of Emergency Planning relating to positions in grades GS-16, 17, and 18, which has been received since transmitting our annual report under a letter dated January 29, 1963, pursuant to the Classification Act of 1949, as amended; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

470. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to remove restrictions on charges for forms, copies, and certifications"; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolution were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ADDABBO:

H.R. 4147. A bill to withhold Federal aid from schools which discriminate between students by reason of their race, color, religion, ancestry, or national origin; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. ASHLEY:

H.R. 4148. A bill to provide under the social security program for payment for hospital and related services to aged beneficiaries; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ASPINALL (by request):

H.R. 4149. A bill to provide for the satisfaction of claims arising out of scrip, lieu selection, and similar rights; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BALDWIN:

H.R. 4150. A bill to designate the Veterans' Administration Hospital at Martinez, Calif., as the Charles C. McGonegal Memorial Hospital; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BARING:

H.R. 4151. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain public lands in the State of Nevada to the county of Lincoln, State of Nevada; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BENNETT of Michigan:

H.R. 4152. A bill to authorize the addition of certain donated lands to the administrative headquarters site, Isle Royale National Park; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BROCK:

H.R. 4153. A bill to amend section 601(a) of the Legislative Reorganization Act (relating to compensation of Members of Congress) to provide for a method of incentive pay increases for Members of Congress, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. BUCKLEY (by request):

H.R. 4154. A bill to amend section 104(b) (3) of title 23, United States Code, relating to the apportionment of funds for extensions of the Federal-aid primary and Federal-aid secondary systems within urban areas; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BURKHALTER:

H.R. 4155. A bill to amend chapter 79 of title 10, United States Code, to provide that certain boards established thereunder shall give consideration to satisfactory evidence relating to good character and exemplary conduct in civilian life after discharge or dismissal in determining whether or not to correct certain discharges and dismissals; to authorize the award of an exemplary rehabilitation certificate; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 4156. A bill to provide for the representation of indigent defendants in criminal cases in the U.S. district courts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CELLER:

H.R. 4157. A bill to enact part II of the District of Columbia Code, entitled "Judiciary and Judicial Procedure," codifying the general and permanent laws relating to the judiciary and judicial procedure of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4158. A bill to enact title 5, United States Code, "Government Organization and Personnel", codifying the general and permanent laws relating to the organization of the Government of the United States and its civilian officers and employees; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr DERWINSKI:

H.R. 4159. A bill to amend titles I, II, and III of the Immigration and Nationality Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H.R. 4160. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to increase the minimum benefit payable thereunder to $75; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DORN:

H.R. 4161. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to provide that men who have attained the age of 62 may retire on a full annuity thereunder upon completion of 30 years of service; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DULSKI:

H.R. 4162. A bill to amend the National Labor Relations Act in order to permit supervisors to be considered as employees under the provisions of such act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 4163. A bill making the 12th day of October in each year a legal holiday to be known as Columbus Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4164. A bill to amend section 610 of title 38, United States Code, to authorize the furnishing of hospital care at Veterans' Administration facilities for Gold Star Mothers; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 4165. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 with respect to the duty treatment of certain bread; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FARBSTEIN:

H.R. 4166. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4167. A bill to provide under the social security program for payment for hospital and related services to aged beneficiaries; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FINO:

H.R. 4168. A bill to provide that cigarettes sold in interstate commerce shall be packaged and marked so as to show the nicotine content and the tar content of the cigarettes in each package; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. FRASER:

H.R. 4169. A bill to provide under the social security program for payment for hospital and related services for aged beneficiaries; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 4170. A bill to amend the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 to provide for more effective evaluation of the fiscal requirements of the executive agencies of the Government of the United States; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. GIAIMO:

H.R. 4171. A bill to amend section 501 of title 38, United States Code, to provide that under certain conditions, service on the Mexican border before World War I may be included in determining whether a veteran meets the service requirements applicable to the payment of pension; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mrs. GREEN of Oregon:

H.R. 4172. A bill to provide under the social security program for payment for hospital and related services to aged beneficiaries; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 4173. A bill to provide under the social security program for payment for hospital and related services to aged beneficiaries; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. GRIFFITHS:

H.R. 4174. A bill to continue until the close of June 30, 1964, the suspension of duties for metal scrap, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HERLONG:

H.R. 4175. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 as it relates to clinical thermometers; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 4176. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KARTH:

H.R. 4177. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Army to convey to the city of St. Paul, Minn., all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to certain lands heretofore conveyed to such city; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. LLOYD:

H.R. 4178. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Dixie project, Utah, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 4179. A bill to amend section 2276 of the Revised Statutes in order to extend the right of selection granted therein to the States to unsurveyed unappropriated public lands; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MACDONALD:

H.R. 4180. A bill to amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 so as to clarify the status of air freight forwarders as air carriers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 4181. A bill to amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 in order to provide for the certification of air freight forwarders; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MULTER:

H.R. 4182. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code, act of February 10, 1939; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. O'KONSKI:

H.R. 4183. A bill to declare a policy as to the existence of public domain in Wisconsin in lands erroneously meandered and lying between the original meander line and the lakeshore, and to protect the rights of landowners whose title to water-fronting property has been brought into question by reason of errors in the original survey; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 4184. A bill to amend the Federal Trade Commission Act, to promote quality and price stabilization, to define and restrain certain unfair methods of distribution and to confirm, define, and equalize the rights of producers and resellers in the distribution of goods identified by distinguishing brands, names, or trademarks, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 4185. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for the payment of pensions to veterans of World War I and their widows and dependents; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. OLSEN of Montana:

H.R. 4186. A bill to amend the National Housing Act, as amended (48 Stat. 1246; 12 U.S.C. 1701), to require the use of domestically grade-marked lumber and wood products in the construction of housing federally financed and/or federally insured, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 4187. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 so as to impose a duty upon the importation of montan wax produced in Communist-dominated or Communist-occupied areas of Germany; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PEPPER:

H.R. 4188. A bill to assist in the development of new or improved programs to help older persons, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. PERKINS:

H.R. 4189. A bill to amend the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 4190. A bill to provide for the establishment of a fish hatchery in the State of Kentucky; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H.R. 4191. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act to increase from 2 to 2½ percent the retirement multiplication factor used in computing annuities of certain employees engaged in hazardous duties; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 4192. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that full benefits (when based upon the attainment of retirement age) will be payable to both men and women at age 60; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PIRNIE:

H.R. 4193. A bill to prevent the use of stopwatches, work measurement programs, or other performance standards operations as measuring devices in the postal service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mrs. REID of Illinois:

H.R. 4194. A bill to amend the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 to provide for more effective evaluation of the fiscal requirements of the executive agencies of the Government of the United States; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. RHODES of Arizona:

H.R. 4195. A bill relating to the reclassification and sale of certain desert land on which entries have been made; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. ROOSEVELT:

H.R. 4196. A bill to provide under the social security program for payment for hospital and related services to aged beneficiaries; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SHELLEY:

H.R. 4197. A bill to amend section 203 of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 to provide that upon request made by a State or political subdivision thereof, surplus real property will not be disposed of until such State or political subdivision has had not less than 2 years to perfect a plan of use for such property; to the Committee on Government Operations.

H.R. 4198. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to provide for the free importation of soluble and instant coffee; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SICKLES:

H.R. 4199. A bill to provide under the social security program for payment for hospital and related services to aged beneficiaries; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SPRINGER:

H.R. 4200. A bill to provide for the regulation of the business of selling securities in the District of Columbia and for the licensing of persons engaged therein, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. STAEBLER:

H.R. 4201. A bill to establish in the State of Michigan the Sleeping Bear Dunes National Lakeshore, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 4202. A bill to provide under the social security program for payment for hospital and related services to aged beneficiaries; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TUPPER:

H.R. 4203. A bill to amend the act of June 12, 1960, for the correction of inequities in the construction of fishing vessels, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H.R. 4204. A bill to amend the Saltonstall-Kennedy Act so as to establish an additional fund for fishery research programs and fisheries rehabilitation and development projects, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. ULLMAN:

H.R. 4205. A bill to provide under the social security program for payment for hospital and related services to aged beneficiaries; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. VINSON:

H.R. 4206. A bill to authorize the extension of certain naval vessel loans now in existence; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. WYMAN (by request):

H.R. 4207. A bill granting the consent and approval of Congress to the northeastern water and related land resources compact; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. GIAIMO:

H.J. Res. 277. Joint resolution designating the week of May 20–26, 1963, as National Actors' Equity Week; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HARSHA:

H.J.Res. 278. Joint resolution expressing the determination of the United States with respect to the situation in Cuba, to restate and implement the Monroe Doctrine, and to encourage adherence to the principles of self-determination and human freedom; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HORTON:

H.J. Res. 279. Joint resolution designating the 6-day period beginning April 15, 1963, as "National Harmony Week," and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MONTOYA:

H.J. Res. 280. Joint resolution authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to carry out a continuing program to reduce nonbeneficial consumptive use of water in the Pecos River Basin, in New Mexico and Texas; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. OLSEN of Montana:

H.J. Res. 281. Joint resolution requesting and authorizing the President to impose an immediate 6-percent emergency quota on all imports of softwood lumber; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. OSTERTAG:

H.J. Res. 282. Joint resolution designating the 6-day period beginning April 15, 1963, as "National Harmony Week," and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HARRIS:

H. Res. 263. Resolution amending the rules of the House of Representatives to permit the broadcasting and telecasting of public hearings of committees of the House under certain circumstances; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By Mr. BERRY: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of South Dakota to give immediate attention and request action necessary to place the lumber industry of the United States on an equitable and competitive basis with foreign manufacturers through the use of a quota system or other means, including the requirements that imported lumber be marked to show the country of origin, to the end that domestic manufacturers are not placed at a disadvantage with resultant loss of markets, reduction of employment, loss of taxes, and deterioration of communities; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Alaska, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to ratifying a proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the qualification of electors; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Alaska, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to the promotion of State commercial fishery research and development projects; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to the ratification of an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, proposed by the Congress of the United States, relating to the qualifications of electors; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Colorado, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to directing the Bureau of Land Management to withhold any adjustments in domestic livestock grazing fees prior to the holding of the requested congressional hearings in the affected State; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Idaho, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to being opposed to all legislation similar to H.R. 7640 of the 87th Congress, relating to imposing further Federal controls in the field of unemployment insurance; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Kentucky, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to requesting approval of appropriation for the planning and developing of Devil's Jump Dam and Reservoir; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Massachusetts, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States and the Postmaster General of the United States relative to presenting the automation of outgoing mail from the post offices in the cities and towns of Bristol County; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Massachusetts, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to enacting legislation to reduce Federal taxes with tax reforms; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Rhode Island, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to ratifying the proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the payment of a poll tax or any other tax as a qualification to voting; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of South Dakota, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United

States relative to requesting congressional action necessary to place the lumber industry of the United States on an equitable and competitive basis with foreign manufacturers through the use of a quota system or other means including the requirement that imported lumber be marked to show the country of origin, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BALDWIN:

H.R. 4208. A bill for the relief of M. Sgt. Leandro Pastor; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CELLER:

H.R. 4209. A bill for the relief of Salvatore Pugliese; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COLLIER:

H.R. 4210. A bill for the relief of Joseph Wielkosz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DORN:

H.R. 4211. A bill to provide for the conveyance of certain mineral interests of the United States in property in South Carolina to the record owners of the surface of that property; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. EDWARDS:

H.R. 4212. A bill for the relief of Surender Lal Berry; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. GREEN of Oregon:

H.R. 4213. A bill for the relief of Stephen Lee (also known as Lee Fung Yew and Lee Shiu Keong); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HALL:

H.R. 4214. A bill for the relief of Stella Reorganized Schools R-I, Missouri; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MURPHY of New York:

H.R. 4215. A bill for the relief of Barbara Bukowska; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WALLHAUSER:

H.R. 4216. A bill for the relief of Takeshi Morozaki; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PEPPER:

H.J. Res. 283. Joint resolution declaring Sir Winston Churchill to be an honorary citizen of the United States of America; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

51. The SPEAKER presented a petition of Margaret M. Kaaua, county clerk, Hilo, Hawaii, requesting Congress to authorize further and continued work projects and restoration programs in and for the City of Refuge National Historical Park, which was referred to the Committee on Public Works.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Washington's Birthday Address by Senator Stennis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. WILLIS ROBERTSON

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 25, 1963

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, the Virginia Chapter, Sons of the Revolution, all members of which are descendants of officers in the Army of George Washington, celebrated the anniversary of the birth of the Father of our Country last Friday evening in Richmond, and the distinguished junior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS] was the guest speaker. I was privileged to introduce Senator STENNIS and I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD my introduction and the brilliant speech he made on that occasion.

There being no objection, the introduction and address were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INTRODUCTION OF SENATOR JOHN STENNIS, DEMOCRAT, OF MISSISSIPPI, BY SENATOR A. WILLIS ROBERTSON, DEMOCRAT, OF VIRGINIA, AT DINNER MEETING OF SONS OF REVOLUTION, RICHMOND, VA., FEBRUARY 22, 1963

Nearly 16 years ago, JOHN STENNIS promised the people of Mississippi that if they elected him to the U.S. Senate, he would "plow a straight furrow right down to the end of the row."

As we all know, Mississippians elected this former State legislator, district attorney, and circuit judge, in 1947 to represent that State in the Senate and we have all benefited because he has kept his plow deep and his furrow straight.

In the Senate, he has compiled a record of diligent, dedicated, and devoted public service, and has honored the seat which Jefferson Davis occupied, when he was a Senator from Mississippi.

Your speaker tonight is a ranking member of the Armed Services, Appropriations, and the Space Committees of the Senate. Two years ago, he was given the key assignment as chairman of the powerful Preparedness Investigating Subcommittee, the "watchdog" committee that oversees our national defense program. At the present time, he is conducting hearings on the conflicting reports about the buildup of Soviet military forces in Cuba to determine the true facts about that threat to our national security. He is the most qualified man I know for that vital assignment.

While the name STENNIS is synonymous with national defense and military preparedness, he is also an authority on constitutional law. He serves as permanent captain of one of the three southern teams organized in the Senate to lead the fight to protect the sovereign rights of the States and to preserve southern traditions and constitutional government. Last year, he played a key role in the defeat in the Senate, after weeks of debate, of vicious legislation to abolish the literacy test established by Mississippi and 20 other States as one of the qualifications for voting. An encroachment on the rights of the States to determine these qualifications. Only a few weeks ago, he was one of those leading our successful battle to preserve rule 22 and the right to engage in extended debate in the Senate, thus assuring our right to be heard and to protect our people against vicious and ill-advised legislation. He was one of three authors of the southern manifesto, and this declaration of constitutional principles, signed by more than 100 Members of the Congress, remains unchallenged as the most forceful statement of the position of the South.

He has been frequently mentioned as a future Justice of the U.S. Supreme Court. Former President Eisenhower named him as one of three Democrats qualified to serve as President of the United States.

JOHN STENNIS is esteemed and respected by his Senate colleagues on both sides of the aisle—Republicans and Democrats.

And I am proud to say that Virginia had a major role in the career of JOHN STENNIS, for it was in our State that he obtained his legal education and spent 3 key years of his life. Anyone elected to membership in the University of Virginia chapter of Phi Beta Kappa has earned that honor. Senator STENNIS is truly Virginia's third Senator.

It is with gratitude and pride that I present to you a truly great American, a distinguished statesman, U.S. Senator JOHN STENNIS.

GEORGE WASHINGTON

(By Senator JOHN STENNIS, of Mississippi)

It is a special pleasure for me to be with you tonight in celebration of the 231st anniversary of the birth of Gen. George Washington.

The tributes paid to George Washington are legion. Perhaps the best known is that expressed by Gen. Henry Lee when he characterized his beloved fellow Virginian as "First in war, first in peace, first in the hearts of his countrymen."

Having spent some fond years at the university at Charlottesville, I developed a great admiration for the wisdom of the Sage of Monticello. The keen insight of Thomas Jefferson into men and governments has helped shape the destiny of this country. It was he who fought to preserve the integrity of the States in our Union—and would that there were more modern-day Jeffersons to help regain that measure of respect for the sovereignty of the States that he struggled so hard to establish in the founding days of this Republic.

And it was Thomas Jefferson, who, to my way of thinking, paid the highest tribute of all to his friend, George Washington. Jefferson said:

"His integrity was most pure, his justice the most inflexible I have ever known, no motives or interest or consanguinity, or friendship or hatred, being able to bias his decision."

This observation indicates the sensitive regard of Washington to the public trust implicit in the office of the President. He abhorred any possible violation of this trust by the suggestion of interest or bias in the administration of this office. This fine example set by our first President should be closely followed by Chief Executives of our time and future times.

Jefferson continued:

"He was indeed, in every sense of the words, a wise, a good, and a great man. * * * On the whole his character was, in its mass, perfect * * * in nothing bad, in few points indifferent; and it may truly be said, that never did nature and fortune combine more perfectly to make a man great, and to place him in the same constellation with whatever worthies merited from man an everlasting remembrance."

Certainly it is most fitting and proper that we meet together tonight to consider this great man of history. He is indeed a man of history, for he, like all history, teaches great lessons to succeeding generations.

I want to speak to you tonight about Washington as a symbol—a symbol of liberty—and a symbol of the fundamentals of our democratic way of life. When we speak of Washington as a symbol, however, we must never lose sight of his very human qualities. He was no god—but a humble servant of humanity and the country which he helped to establish. He was no military genius, though he was one of the ablest field commanders and army administrators in all history. He was no intellectual, but a man of simple, yet methodical judgment.

As a symbol of liberty, Washington is best seen as the commander in chief of the Continental Army. Through his inspired leadership of this ill-equipped, ill-trained, but magnificently motivated Army, he wrenched from the most powerful military force of that day the victory which gave us our liberty.

When I think of Washington as the leader of the Revolutionary Army, I see in my mind's eye two great paintings. The one showing General Washington at the bow of a boat on a bleak night, his jaw firmly set and a determined gaze fixed upon the objective, crossing the Delaware River. A picture portraying with all of the artist's power the determination and courage of this great leader. And then I see the magnificent study in compassion, showing Washington at Valley Forge. These two paintings show us the full measure of George Washington as a military commander.

All of the greatness of this man cannot be seen on the battlefield, however, or even on the great field of honor at Yorktown. His service to his country did not end with the surrender of Lord Cornwallis. To my mind, it had just begun.

As commander in chief of the Continental Army, he held the balance of power in this emerging Nation. His success in gaining victory firmly fixed him in the minds and hearts of his countrymen. With a discontented army still in arms and with no real government in existence, Washington was the only source of authority and law that had anything more than a local influence. There was the matter of the long overdue pay for the Army and the adjustments to peaceful ways, both fermenting unrest among the men in arms. Early in 1783, petitions were circulated by the officers denouncing the constituted authorities and expressing the impatience of the young officers for their just rewards. As the feelings reached the fever pitch, General Washington appeared before his assembled officers and received their petitions. He took from his uniform a letter just received from a Member of Congress explaining the delays of the young Government and its good faith. He started to read the letter, but faltered. He paused, reached into his pocket, took out his new spectacles, and put them on. "Gentlemen," he said, "you must pardon me for I have grown gray in your service and now find myself growing blind." How petty must the problems of that group seemed by comparison. This simple observation quelled what might have been a mutiny within the Continental Army against the newly formed Government.

Repeatedly, Washington was suggested as the head of a monarchy to be established in the place of a republican government. Col. Lewis Nicola, leading a group of the staff officers of the Continental Army, proposed this idea to their commander in chief. When he heard this, he expressed pain that such an idea existed among his colleagues. He said:

"I am much at a loss to conceive what part of my conduct could have given encouragement to an address which to me seems big with the greatest mischief that can befall my country. * * * Let me conjure you, if you have any regard for your country, concern for yourself or posterity, or respect for me, to banish these thoughts from your mind."

Isn't it ironic that the man who became our first President could have become a king? There is a real lesson in humility in this—one which all his successors to this high office might well ponder. The greatness in a man is best seen when he refuses to assume power which would be detrimental to the best interests of those he serves.

As he shrank in distress from the idea of ruling his fellows as a monarch, so did Washington recoil from acceptance of lesser emolument pressed upon him by grateful contemporaries. A good example is a gift to him by his native State of Virginia in gratitude for his services to the State and the Nation. The gift was 100 shares of James River Co. stock. Washington donated this canal company stock to Liberty Hall Academy in the heart of the valley of Virginia, which thereupon bestowed upon him the title of "Patron of the arts and literature." This donation is significant in showing his attitude toward education and significant in the history of the small school which eventually became Washington and Lee University. This donation was the first large gift of securities to a college in the United States. It sustained the college through some of its most difficult years, and it inspired other gifts to this and other schools.

The university still derives annual financial support from George Washington's gift, which, in 1928, was merged with the university's general endowment and reinvested, and now yields over $2,000 per year.

Washington and Lee University's historian, Dr. Ollinger Crenshaw, writes of Washington's gift:

"Perhaps the gift of George Washington to Liberty Hall Academy in 1796 was exceeded in importance to the school's development only by the appointment of Gen. R. E. Lee to its presidency in 1865. Not only did the income from President Washington's donation come as a godsend to an institution which had desperately striven to maintain itself, but the academy's future became interwoven with the name of the father of his country."

We in the United States have a rich heritage in the institutions of our Government, beginning with the Declaration of Independence * * * an indictment against a despotic monarchy, but yet we see in this document the aspirations of a people determined to govern themselves. This will of the people for self-government is manifested in that greatest of all charters of freedom, our Constitution, which established the framework of a form of government unparalleled in the long history of mankind.

The stamp and thread of Washington can be seen in these two great instruments of freedom. Indeed, it was Washington who presided over the Convention in Philadelphia which gave us the Constitution. He used his great influence to bring about its ratification, writing many letters and even engaging in debate with the opponents of ratification. In a letter to Thomas Jefferson, James Monroe made this sharp appraisal of the role Washington played in the ratification of the Constitution:

"Be assured [General Washington's] influence carried this Government."

In my opinion, Washington never rose to greater heights than he did in certain remarks at the Constitutional Convention in 1787.

The suggestion was that as an adequate part would be rejected anyway, that an extreme makeshift proposal should be quickly adopted.

He said: "Too probable that no plan we propose will be adopted. Perhaps another dreadful conflict is to be sustained. If to please the people we offer what we ourselves disapprove, how can we afterwards defend our work? Let us raise a standard to which the wise and honest can repair. The event is in the hands of God."

History's brightest pages record no achievements more illustrious than those of the Founding Fathers of our Nation, and none more calculated to instill pride and patriotism. How often do we turn for inspiration to the men of those troubled Revolutionary times, replete with example after example of rarest courage. They wrote and proclaimed the Declaration of Independence with no army and pitiable resources. Indeed, when they fired the first shot at Lexington, they had no army. And after victory at Yorktown, and for a good number of years thereafter, they had no effective government. Yet with foresight and fortitude they wrote the Constitution of the United States, founded on high principle but adopted with doubt and apprehension that its noble purposes might never be achieved. Thus, a feeble nation of free people embarked on its uncertain course, but on the way to growth and development beyond their highest dreams and beyond precedent.

What made the difference? What was it that set the ship of state off on its magnificent voyage to greatness and achievements unmatched in all history? Many fearless and determined patriots contributed, but we are mindful that it was the leadership and great spirit of George Washington that made the difference.

Having fought to gain freedom from the oppression of George III and nurtured the establishment of a republican government through the Constitution, it was only natural that Washington should counsel Congress upon leaving the Office of President. His farewell address is not only a stirring valedictory of our first President, but it carries many profound truths in it which are applicable even today.

In its contemporary setting, the address was made at a time when our Nation was still in the stage of its early development. Each of the Thirteen Colonies had been a political entity. They had joined together in a common cause * * * the war for their independence. Under the Articles of Confederation, the separate status of each State was preserved and they delegated only certain areas within which Congress could act for their collective good. There had to be a great deal of blending and compromise to weld these 13 sovereignties into a union. It required all of the statesmanship imaginable to accomplish this feat. We are indeed fortunate that destiny provided that statesman in the person of our first President.

But now the Father of our Country was relinquishing the helm of the ship of state.

What was the counsel of this great American?

First, he set the pattern by clearly stating the bedrock principle of our Government. "The basis of our political system," he said, "is the right of the people to make and to alter their constitutions of government." He had led many men into the supreme sacrifice that Americans might be the arbiters of their political institutions. He did not lightly regard the role of the individual citizen, through his freely elected representatives, to determine the course that his country should take.

Washington strongly advised his people as follows:

"Toward the preservation of your government and the permanency of your present happy state, it is requisite, not only that you steadily discountenance irregular opposition to its acknowledged authority, but also that you resist with care the spirit of innovation upon its principles, however specious the pretext. One method of assault may be to effect, in the forms of the Constitution, alterations which will impair the energy of the system; and thus to undermine what cannot be directly overthown."

Heeding this advice of George Washington, Senator Robertson and I, together with many of our colleagues in the Senate, have recently fought to preserve the tradition of debate in the Senate. This rule was invoked to assure protection for minorities in this country; but those who would impose cloture to this body say that it stifles not only the President's program, but legislation sought in behalf of minority groups. Is this not a specious pretext for an innovation which George Washington sagely counseled against?

He further speaks of caution in making changes with this admonition:

"In all the changes to which you may be invited, remember that time and habit are at least as necessary to fix the true character of governments, as of other human institutions; that experience is the surest standard by which to test the real tendency of the existing constitution of a country; that facility in changes, upon the credit of mere hypothesis and opinion, exposes to perpetual change from the endless variety of hypothesis and opinion."

How do you think the hypothetical economic theories concocted in the Harvard traditions of Messrs. Heller and Schlesinger would fare in the light of Washington's admonition here? If there has ever been a more graphic illustration of the very thing which Washington cautions us against it is the theoretical approach of these two intellectuals to solving our country's economic dilemma. Somehow I feel that the American public will be intelligent enough to see through the fiscal mania which has been proposed for our consideration at this session. Your distinguished Senator and my good friend, Harry Byrd, has not been taken in by this scheme. And I am proud to say that there are many of our colleagues who also will act to resist this unproven and highly dangerous change in the fiscal affairs of the country.

Washington emphasized the vital importance of the defined powers of government and pointed to the departmentalization of powers in our own constitutional government. He said:

"It is important likewise, that the habits of thinking in a free country should inspire caution in those intrusted with its administration, to confine themselves within their respective constitutional spheres, avoiding in the exercise of the powers of one department, to encroach upon another."

Chief Justice Warren would have been better advised to give due regard to these pointed words from our first President, rather than the opinion of the Swedish sociologist, Gunder Myrdal, in his leading of the Supreme Court in its unprecedented legislative decision in the case of *Brown* v. *Board of Education*. Even Chief Justice Marshall with his rather liberal view would have reeled at the usurpation of the prerogative of Congress in the school desegregation decision.

Thus, George Washington counseled an infant nation—a nation which he helped to establish, a nation which he led as its first President for two terms. He was a man of true greatness. His first thought was always of his duty to his country. This principle motivated him to become the great commander in chief of the Continental Army—to reluctantly assume the Office of President and to decline a third term in this high office. His greatness lay in his selfless adherence to that which he knew to be right.

Let us apply some of these principles to the Cuban situation. We all know that this is one of the more critical and crucial problems of our time.

We all welcomed the announcement that the Soviets would withdraw several thousand troops from Cuba. This is only as a limited step in the right direction. Neither this withdrawal nor any other partial withdrawal should be considered as a final solution of the basic Cuban problem and threat.

The basic problem, and the real threat to the Americas, lies in the fact that international communism now has a firm foothold in the Western Hemisphere. The "Made in Moscow" government is in Cuba for the primary purpose of increasing and spreading communism's influence and power in Latin America. We know that it is here to stay—if we permit it to do so.

Public debate during the past few weeks has focused largely on whether Khrushchev has or has not withdrawn his offensive weapons from Cuba. Certainly, this is important. None of us can afford to be unconcerned about the threat of missiles and planes which can rain nuclear death and destruction on us in a matter of minutes. However, we must not allow our attention to be preoccupied entirely by an overly meticulous concern about whether the military threat to us has been increased or decreased fractionally by the introduction or withdrawal of certain types or numbers of weapons. If we do we may very well fail to face up to the proposition that, regardless of how many or how few troops support it, the alien and antidemocratic government now being maintained in Cuba by Russian armed soldiers is in and of itself the real and basic threat to the peace and security of the American Republics. International communism at our very doorstep, without regard to the supporting weaponry, is offensive to me, and, I believe, to a majority of my fellow Americans.

I am not primarily concerned over the exact number of troops Khrushchev has in Cuba. Even ten would be too many. I believe that it is the fact that the Russian Bear now stands astride the unhappy island of Cuba which most troubles the average American. The American people are disturbed and uneasy because they know that we cannot live with this menace indefinitely.

Therefore, they want to be assured that our responsible officials recognize the problem and recognize also that it will not just disappear with the passage of time. They want to be convinced that we have the national will and purpose to do everything within our power to wipe out all Soviet-dominated governments in this hemisphere and that we have a firm and hard plan and policy to accomplish this.

In short, I believe that our people take the same position which the Congress itself took when it adopted Senate Joint Resolution 230 last October 3. In adopting this resolution we in Congress expressly reaffirmed the Monroe Doctrine and declared that we were "determined to prevent by whatever means necessary, including the use of arms, the Marxist-Leninist regime in Cuba from extending, by force or the threat of force, its aggressive or subversive activities to any part of this hemisphere." The resolution declared we were "determined to prevent in Cuba the creation or use of any externally supported military capability endangering the security of the United States."

The American people ask only, I believe, that we adhere to this resolution and that we demonstrate once again that the historic Monroe Doctrine is still an integral part of our national policy and that we do, in fact, consider any attempt by foreign powers "to extend their system to any part of this hemisphere as dangerous to our peace and security."

When these things are done—and when our people are convinced that our Nation is still strong, resolute, vigorous, determined, and above all, unafraid—I know that the patriotic people of this Nation will unite four square behind the Government as they have always done in times of national crisis.

The Preparedness Investigating Subcommittee, in the real course of its inquiry, will develop all of the facts and I hope that it can make a real and tangible contribution in shaping a hard and firm policy which will finally rid the Americas of this cancerous communistic growth.

This is no time for despair. Fear has no place in our thinking. We have every reason to face the future with faith in our form of government and in our ability to make it work. Endowed as we are with individual liberty and our national resources, with faith in a Higher Power and a determination to do our part, we shall meet and conquer the problems of our time. May God sustain us as we go.

Washington Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 25, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following newsletter of February 23, 1963:

Washington Report

(By Congressman Bruce Alger, Fifth District, Texas)

TIMID AND FEARFUL LEADERSHIP COSTING U.S. PRESTIGE

The week's news is frightening to every American citizen concerned with the future of the United States. More and more the American people are becoming deeply concerned with the timidity and almost childish fear of the President to make decisions. The result is that the prestige of the United States has never been lower. Our allies are losing confidence in us because they are not sure they can depend on us. Some results of the President's confused policies, or rather lack of policy: (1) De Gaulle's insistence on Europe going it alone without depending on the United States; (2) the collapse of the Diefenbaker government in Canada and a rise in anti-American feeling which is jeopardizing our entire defense perimeter in the north; (3) increased unrest in Latin America with more bold action by Communists openly swearing allegiance to Castro and the Soviet Union; (4) the hesitancy of Italy and Spain to renew our bases or to permit the establishment of bases for Polaris submarines; (5) a tougher attitude by Khrushchev and renewed arrogance on the part of the Soviet Union in the nuclear test ban treaty talks and in its cynical offer to remove several thousand Russian troops from Cuba sometime.

The President's cautious reaction to the Mig attack on an American boat is not what this world so badly needs. A strong policy statement, dealing from strength, that we will protect American lives, property, freedom, and way of life from any and all encroachments—that any attack on us will result in instant and deadly retaliation. Such a position is our only hope to stop aborning the "war by miscalculation"—some other nation miscalculating the American people by thinking the weak posture of our President represents the people. I say we are not weak, not afraid, nor cautious, nor watchfully waiting when it comes to our way of life. We know we are right, and will brook no opposition. "Give me liberty or give me death," is not an old-fashioned homily, but a present, vibrant truth. So it is that we can reasonably question our future conduct when our own leadership confuses and bewilders us. Think how uncertain other nations must be as they see us successfully attacked; as we fail to make any attempt to follow up the shot across the bow of a ship that disregards us; when we let a dictator who threatens to bring us ruin keep a military and subversive bastion in our hemisphere; see him get a promise from our leader of no attack; and watch him work to subvert other Latin and South American countries, some of which will fall in future months if we do nothing now. So we see the Keynesian socialism continue its course toward full subjugation of our economy at home and communism continue to advance abroad.

The failure of President Kennedy to act is increasing the danger to the United States. At a time when bold, brave leadership is needed, our country finds itself headed by a party machine whose energies are being spent in political maneuvering, reckless domestic experiments, and complete refusal to enunciate a foreign policy to protect our country and preserve freedom. The one ray of hope is that the people, from my observation across the country, are far ahead of the administration and it may be that public opinion will force the administration into a role of national leadership in spite of itself. In the meantime, it is up to Congress to do all possible to strengthen the country and preserve our free institutions.

PRESIDENT CALLS FOR INCREASE IN DEBT CEILING

Here we go again. As expected and as I predicted last year, President Kennedy is now calling upon Congress for a further increase in the debt ceiling. So long as Federal spending is uncurtailed, there will be no limit to the debt ceiling as America continues on its reckless course toward fiscal collapse and national suicide. The temporary increase in the public debt limit, as enacted during the last Congress, and which I opposed, provides as follows: (1) $308 billion to March 31, 1963; (2) $305 billion April 1 to June 24, 1963; (3) $300 billion June 25 to June 30, 1963. The administration has requested that the ceiling of $308 billion be extended to June 30, 1963. Otherwise, the administration will be confronted with a decrease of $9 billion in the debt ceiling on April 1 and another decrease of $5 billion on June 24. In effect, an extension of the $308 billion ceiling beyond April 1, 1963, is the equivalent of a $311 billion ceiling on an annual basis. An extension of the $308 billion ceiling beyond June 25, 1963, is the equivalent of a $316 billion ceiling on an annual basis. Hearings on the President's request will begin before my Committee on Ways and Means next Wednesday, February 28. This is just another example of the failure of the Kennedy administration to face fiscal facts. I warned last year when I voted against increasing the debt ceiling that we would be called upon to push it higher unless the President made some effort to cut spending. We know now, too, that another debt increase will be requested by J.F.K. later this year. Instead, he has presented us with the biggest peacetime budget in history, $98.8 billion. His refusal to even attempt to practice some discipline in spending the peoples' money can only result in bigger deficits, continued pressure for an expanding public debt, and the inevitable climax, national bankruptcy.

PRESIDENT'S TAX PLAN CONTRADICTORY AND SELF-DEFEATING

In hearings this week before the Ways and Means Committee on the President's tax scheme, one of the Nation's top tax experts confirmed my charge that the Kennedy plan is contradictory and self-defeating. Dan Throop Smith, tax expert of the Eisenhower administration, denounced the Kennedy tax proposals as a "bitter disappointment." He said, "by concentrating the bulk of tax cuts in the lower brackets to increase disposable income, the program has adopted the most expensive and the least effective way of stimulating expansion." Mr. Smith also condemned President Kennedy's plans for increasing the Federal deficit. "The proposal for a net $10.3 billion cut in revenues on top of a prospective current deficit of $9 billion is a dangerous gamble with the country's currency and basic well-being," Smith said, bearing out my prediction that if we follow President Kennedy's fiscal policies we will devalue our currency. Smith concluded his testimony with this damaging statement in pointing up the complete fallacy of President Kennedy's tax proposals: "The most serious error in the entire program is that when the parts are put together they contradict the standard of fairness stated by the Secretary of the Treasury and at the same time nullify much of the economic benefit which might be achieved."

In my opinion the President's tax proposals could be likened to a doctor who prescribes the wrong prescription (his unworkable tax proposals) after making a wrong diagnosis (that the American economy needs more government). In a bland statement the President then says, "those who oppose the program must take the responsibility for any deterioration in the economy which might come about over the next months." In other words, the doctor, having prescribed the wrong prescription for the wrong illness, now says that if the patient dies it will be because he refused to take the medicine. What is really needed for economic growth is less government, less spending, and tax cuts in stable dollars.

JUNKETING MEMBER'S ACTIVITIES NOT REPRESENTATIVE OF CONGRESS

Under the protocol procedures of Congress, Members of one body are not supposed to criticize those of the other body. Indeed, Members of the House are not supposed to note by name another member or to question his integrity or honesty. However, Members of Congress have a responsibility to the people to maintain the integrity of the Congress of the United States. Under the Constitution, Congress is the sole judge of the conduct of its membership. It is our duty to call attention to known indiscretions so that unethical practices are stopped by the House or Senate, or the people be given the facts so that they may properly discipline a Senator or Representative who abuses the power of his office. In recent weeks, the newspapers have reported the activities of one Member of the House and attention has been called to some of his practices by a Member of the Senate. He is now attempting to discredit all Congressmen by his own indiscretions. Fortunately, he is the exception, not the rule—nor can there be any excuse or justification for misuse of public funds by Members of Congress. The vast majority of the Members of Congress are extremely conscientious in doing their work and in discharging their responsibilities as representatives of the people. To charge them all with irresponsible action and mishandling of the people's money is to seriously impair the image of Congress and of the American people because a Congressman usually represents the people who elect him, and fortunately, for our system of government, Congress and the people are morally strong, honest, and dedicated. The danger in the twin policies of a weak administration which refuses to stand up to international gangsters, and in downgrading the image of Congress by unworthy deeds, is that it encourages the lawless and criminal element within our country. Hoodlums, seeing the success of Khrushchev and Castro and being given the impression that disregard of honesty and integrity is the rule in Congress, are made bold in defiance of our conventions and laws. Strict adherence by Congress and the people to our moral codes of ethics is the only hope this free Nation will survive these times of peril.

Local Communities and the States Must Meet School Needs To Avoid Federal Education Octopus

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS M. PELLY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 25, 1963

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, President Kennedy put 24 separate proposals dealing with everything from elementary to graduate school Federal aid to education into one big omnibus request. The President thus issued an open invitation to the Congress, with his message giving the program a label of high priority, for an immediate creation of a new bureaucratic octopus to cost during the first 3 years a total of $4.6 billion.

Since the President's Federal aid to education request was received by the Congress I have tried to point out in my own State that we must adequately support our schools on the local and State level or the Federal Government will take over the function of financing education with the inevitable creation of a bureaucratic octopus similar to the powerful and ever-growing Agriculture Department that regiments our farmers.

Mr. Speaker, under previous permission to do so, I include at this point the text of a letter dated February 21, 1963, to members of the Washington State Legislature urging adequate local and State support of schools to avoid having them under the control of a Federal agency:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., February 21, 1963.

To the Members of the Washington State Legislature, Olympia, Wash.

DEAR FRIENDS: The purpose of this letter is twofold; first, to express my keen appreciation for the courtesies afforded me when in Olympia recently, and second, to expand and point up more specifically the views that I offered in addressing the senate and house of the State legislature on that occasion.

As to the first point, it was certainly gratifying to observe firsthand the conscientious, objective, and responsible way in which members of the State legislature are fulfilling their responsibilities. Certainly, Washington State's public interest should have priority over partisan advantage in the conduct of political duties.

Now, as to the second point—you will recall that my remarks to the legislature took notice of Federal preemption of major sources of money and the upset in National-State equilibrium which the Supreme Court of the United States vested in the States such as our State of Washington, when, contrary to earlier interpretation of the U.S. Constitution, in 1937 in a series of decisions, the Federal Government obtained unlimited power to tax and spend for the general welfare. Thereby, we created a grey area of responsibility with subsequent Federal legislation requiring matching funds, which often added to our State's financial difficulty in meeting normal public service needs.

In other words, often the Federal Government, by intervening in such important areas as education, has increased rather than provided relief for your difficulty.

You may recall my saying to the Washington State Legislature, in all frankness, that in my view government is best which is closest to the people. I spoke for retaining on the State and community level the control and management of our schools.

The U.S. Department of Agriculture is the best example of what happens when a Federal agency takes over local and State problems. In 1933 the Federal Government began a new program of assisting our farmers. The resultant Federal control and regimentation is generally understood. To maintain the Federal Government octopus of bureaucracy in fiscal 1964, the administration has said it will need 121,583 Government employees and the cost to the taxpayers of the agricultural program is estimated as $8.4 billion. This is nearly five times the amount required to operate the Department of Agriculture 10 years ago and 49 times the amount when the farm program began.

Meanwhile, the number of farmers has been diminishing and, as I say, the program indicates what might happen if the Federal Government under the general welfare clause of the Constitution, takes over the major responsibility for public education.

Certainly, as I said, State financing problems will increase if local communities fail to vote special school levies when, from time to time, there are crises due to population growth and special local education needs. In turn, then, if the States fail to provide regularly through adequate budgetary appropriations for schools, then the pressure for the Federal Government to take over this responsibility will increase, and thereby the danger of centralized Federal control over the schooling of American children is increased.

People laugh when some of us suggest that we could have a situation here in America such as with Adolph Hitler in Germany through thought control over young people. But rather than recite history or speculate over the future, it is easier to point up the present, such as with the Federal agricultural program.

However, I never fail to point out the importance of local communities meeting their school needs, as with the 9.8-mill school levy decision that the voters of Seattle face on Tuesday, March 12.

As for the State legislature, I have not studied the current budget, but I would be hopeful that enabling legislation to expand the community college program is being considered favorably.

I know the Legislative Interim Committee on Education in its 1962 report recommended "that the numerical limitations on community colleges be eliminated" and bills to accomplish this have been introduced. Frankly, this strikes me as extremely important. In the First Congressional District, in the Shoreline School District, there are plans for such a project and I believe the necessary financial measures for it were voted a year ago. So, please count me as being in strong support of removing the limit on the number of such colleges which can be established.

Reverting again to the general subject of education, let me emphasize again my belief that if the citizens reject extra tax burdens when and wherever local school boards find it necessary to go to the people for additional funds, there will inevitably evolve more pressure for more money at higher levels of government. Furthermore, as you know, in such event, and wherever the Federal Government is called upon to expend funds, it must, under a Supreme Court decision, look to the way that such expenditures are made. In other words, if the parents of our schoolchildren, through their local school boards, desire to preserve their power of decision over the education of their children, and not turn the management over to a bureaucrat in Washington, D.C.—similar to the farm program—then the local community, and of course the State, also, must support their schools adequately.

Again, expressing appreciation for your courtesy in allowing me to address the House and Senate of the Washington State Legislature to outline my understanding of our community of interests between our respective legislatures, I remain,

Respectfully yours,

THOMAS M. PELLY,
Member of Congress.

Fifteenth Anniversary of Communist Takeover of Czechoslovakia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GLENN CUNNINGHAM

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 25, 1963

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, we have just passed another milestone in the history of the Soviet Russian colonial empire. Yesterday marked the 15th anniversary of the takeover of Czechoslovakia by the Communists. They remain in control today, backed as always by Russian troops.

The Czechoslovak National Council of America continues to keep alive the spirit of Czech freedom for Americans with their heritage in Czechoslovakia and others throughout the free world who share their concern over the plight of the people in Czechoslovakia.

The council has called attention to the tragic situation in which unreasonably heavy duties are placed on packages sent from America to Czech people. For example, the council reports that there is a duty of 50 crowns—approximately $7—on a kilo of used clothing, about 2.2 pounds. This duty of 50 crowns is in a society where the average office worker receives 6 crowns an hour and farmworkers as little as 12 crowns a day.

The council asks why American authorities allow this blackmail to continue, for it is a pure and simple device to secure American dollars for use in international trade.

Indeed, many in this country wonder about the present policies toward all the captive nations in the Soviet colonial empire. What is behind the reluctance and even opposition to congressional resolutions to establish a Special Committee on Captive Nations? What is behind the weak proclamations during Captive Nations Week? Why are we afraid to assert ourselves in our position as leader of the free world?

Many of us in the Congress hope that the executive branch will move ahead in this field. It is the executive that is charged with foreign policy, but it becomes increasingly apparent that foreign policy toward the captive nations question is being handled with no more ability than our foreign relations with Canada, Portugal, Britain, and other old friends.

On this occasion, when we mark the Czech people's 15th year under Communist rule, we all hope that future U.S. actions will inspire the Czech people and the peoples of all the captive nations to continue their opposition to Russian communism. We hope they can find in our foreign policies some ray of hope and encouragement for their cause. We hope they will continue to find reason to believe that this Nation—now and in the future—believes that the people of each country on the earth should be allowed free and open elections and determination of their own destiny.

Hospital Care for Gold Star Mothers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 25, 1963

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing a bill which would authorize hospital care for Gold Star Mothers at Veterans' Administration hospitals. It is my feeling that it is our Government's obligation to care for those who have suffered in battle, and also for their dependents and survivors which they have left behind.

These brave mothers raised sons and daughters to be good citizens and to give their lives, if necessary, to defend this great country of ours. We ought to do more for them than to pay honor and tribute on special holidays.

Many of these Gold Star Mothers are in need. My bill in permitting them to avail themselves of such medical care would not jeopardize the availability of facilities for the furnishing of hospital care to veterans.

The 45th Anniversary of Lithuania's Declaration of Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 25, 1963

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, in my insertion of remarks, I am pleased to include for the information of the House a very timely and informative speech delivered by the Honorable Joseph Kajeckas, Chargé d'Affaires ad interim of Lithuania at a commemoration of the 45th anniversary of Lithuania's Declaration of Independence. His talk was delivered in Los Angeles, Calif., on February 10, 1963:

Mr. Chairman, distinguished members of the consular corps, other distinguished guests, ladies, and gentlemen, it is an honor and a great pleasure for me to be with you today, and I must begin by thanking you most sincerely for the kind invitation which brought me here. Several times in the past few years I had wanted to visit Lithuanians and their friends on the west coast, and finally I have the great happiness of being with you as we commemorate the 45th anniversary of Lithuania's Declaration of Independence.

For just a moment, I would like to share with you the thoughts that strike me as a first-time visitor to Los Angeles. One of the things that affects my imagination most deeply is the vast energy and dedication whereby the American frontier was extended from the east coast, where I have lived for some years now, to this City of Angels on the shores of the Pacific Ocean. The thought of a pioneer toiling bravely to reach the Rocky Mountains, the Sierra Nevadas, the desert, pausing in a lonely clearing uninhabited by men—all this thrills the imagination. This kind of initiative and self-possession, however, is familiar to me and to you in a different way, because these traits of boldness and courage are part of the story of Lithuania; and it is that story which has gathered us here today.

The American pioneer, as has often been pointed out, pursued a dream on the western horizon with an almost relentless passion. Even before the gold rush years, the eminent French visitor, Alexis de Tocqueville, was amazed by the speed with which this westward migration was taking place, and he said:

"It would be difficult to describe the avidity with which the American rushes forward to secure this immense booty that fortune offers. * * * He is unimpressed by the silence of the woods; the approach of beasts of prey does not disturb him, for he is goaded onwards by a passion stronger than the love of life. Before him lies a boundless continent, and he urges onward as if time pressed and he was afraid of finding no room for his exertions."

One of the principal characteristics of this relentless drive westward is particularly important, and many authors have commented on it at length. Briefly, it seems that the American pioneer, alone in the silence and challenge of the frontier, could easily imagine that he was leaving the east entirely behind him, and that a literally new world lay ahead. His ancestors, who had originally reached the eastern United States from their native Europe, had never ventured as far as this pioneer, and he could well imagine that he no longer had any ties left with the Europe whence his ancestors sprang. He was, he could assume, a new man, the so-called American Adam who no longer had a historical past or a geographical origin. There was only the future, and the far horizon to conquer; everything lay ahead.

This was, no doubt, a splendid dream, and it brought vast numbers of settlers to the shores of the Pacific. The boundless continent of which De Tocqueville had spoken was finally circumscribed. But the content of that dream of historical and geographical detachment, if I may twist a few Shakespearean words, was "such stuff as dreams are made on," and that dream soon vanished "into thin air." Already when I was a little boy in Pennsylvania shortly after the turn of the century, the children of the American pioneers were learning that they could not entirely divorce themselves from European events. And even though, for several years following the First World War, America could still attempt to avoid the "foreign entanglements" against which George Washington had warned, the outcome was inevitable. One of the most graphic illustrations of that outcome is the fact that the United Nations was formed on this very west coast of the United States, a west coast which was once thought by its settlers to be at the farthest possible removed from Europe.

The world has grown even smaller in the years since the Second World War. Anyone who lives on this west coast today knows that, farther to the west, there lie Korea, Vietnam, Laos, China, India—and the list could be expanded. There is not an area of the world west of Los Angeles that does not bear directly upon the happiness of every inhabitant of Los Angeles. And if we look back far to the east, whence came the ancestors of the men who settled this west coast, we see a Europe confronted with a new and ever more terrible enemy, with Berlin as one focal point of that conflict. If we try to see what lies in the future, inevitably we focus on the menace of imperialistic world communism, which threatens that very pursuit of happiness within a free society which led to the establishment of this great city of Los Angeles. And those of us in this room today can add one further dimension of experience to that glance eastward and westward: if we look to the east, we see our homeland of Lithuania, cruelly subjugated for over 20 years by the ruthless tyrants of the Kremlin; if we look to the west, we see Siberia, land of deportations and genocide, a terribly tangible demonstration of that disregard for the dignity of the human person which is central to the Communist credo. There is, in other words, no escape from the struggle in which all freedom-loving peoples are involved; the struggle surrounds us on all sides. The protagonists in the struggle are all peoples who believe in human liberty, peace and justice and are willing to dedicate their efforts to the attainment of those ends. The struggle against deceit and treachery, however, is a long and arduous one, and this can easily be seen if one reviews for a moment the events surrounding the barbarous absorption of Lithuania into the control of the Soviet Union.

Lithuania became a sacrifice to an infamous accord between Hitler and Stalin. When Soviet treachery materialized in the aggressive act of occupation, the first to protest were Lithuania's representatives abroad, while the first foreign reaction was the condemnation of the aggression by U.S. Acting Secretary of State Sumner Wells. Thus, the Lithuanian cause was from the very beginning projected into an international arena. From that time on, the Soviets have repeatedly attempted to present the supposed incorporation of Lithuania as a free choice of the people. It has thus become part of the Lithuanian struggle to regain freedom and independence that such a clumsy lie be unmasked, and that the facts behind the Soviet occupation of Lithuania be accurately revealed as an ill-concealed act of criminal aggression on the part of the Kremlin. The efforts of Lithuanians living in the free world have long been dedicated to a full and accurate presentation of the facts, and their efforts were saliently supported when a U.S. congressional committee under the direction of Congressman Kersten of Wisconsin investigated the Soviet aggression in the Baltic States and came to this conclusion:

"The evidence is overwhelming and conclusive that Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania were forcibly occupied and illegally annexed by the U.S.S.R. Any claims by the U.S.S.R. that the elections conducted by them in July 1940 were free and voluntary (or that the resolutions adopted by the resulting parliaments petitioning for recognition as a Soviet Republic were legal) are false and without foundation in fact."

In the light of all the evidence, the Soviet action in the Baltic States has become one of the clearest examples of Soviet aggression and neo-colonialism. Even though the Soviets have tried to achieve recognition of the status quo in the Baltic States, the free world has seen their attempts as only a continuation of the series of clumsy lies to which the free world is now accustomed. Other nations of the free world have joined with the United States in refusing to recognize the forcible incorporation of the Baltic States, realizing that the expression of any such sanction, whether directly or indirectly, would be tantamount to the awarding of a prize for unprecedented disregard of international agreements and the principles of justice and peace among nations. This position has great political and legal significance, for it enables Lithuanian representatives to continue their duties and the defense of Lithuanian rights and interests.

Even a Soviet representative such as Litvinov did not fail to note the significance of the nonrecognition policy, for he said:

"It would be quite wrong * * * to assert that resolutions on nonrecognition are in themselves devoid of any particular value. While such resolutions have in every case a certain moral significance, and give satisfaction to public opinion, they also cause the aggressor some preoccupations and inconveniences, as is evident by the efforts which aggressors usually make to obtain recognition of their conquests, if only in an indirect way. But, according to circumstances, nonrecognition may be of vast importance, not only morally, but also politically—particularly when the victim of aggression itself continues to fight for its independence and for the integrity of its territory. In such cases, the recognition of the results of violent aggression or the abandonment of the policy of nonrecognition, would be equivalent to abbetting the aggressor directly, and to stabbing his victim in the back by discouraging and demoralizing it." (League of Nations Official Journal, 1938, pp. 340–341.)

Finally, I might note in this respect that the refusal of Western nations to recognize the illegal annexation of the Baltic States conforms to an old principle of law, namely that unjust actions do not have just consequences. Ex injuria jus non oritur. It is with regard for this principle, as well as for the other considerations I have mentioned, that the Lithuanian diplomatic representatives maintain the just aspirations of Lithuania to freedom and independence. And part of their task has repeatedly been that of combating Soviet attempts to achieve indirect recognition of the illegal situation in Lithuania and the other Baltic States. This task has been carried on in conjunction with the Supreme Lithuanian Committee of Liberation and the American Lithuanian Council, as well as other organizations which perform special functions related to the common task confronting Lithuanians living in the free world.

In this struggle for justice, the Lithuanian people have many good friends, and it is my pleasure to mention some of them here. I speak first of all of Mayor Samuel Yorty of Los Angeles, who has often demonstrated a keen awareness of the effort involved in combating Communist propaganda and treachery. We are most grateful to him for his official proclamation in connection with this commemoration, and for the ceremony whereby the Lithuanian flag was raised in honor at city hall this morning. We also cherish the presence here today of the distinguished dean of the Los Angeles Consular Corps, Dr. Mong-ping Lee, the Consul General of China; and the Consul General of Canada, the Honorable George R. Paterson and Mrs. Paterson. Lithuanians everywhere are particularly grateful for the friendship of the Chinese people, who are also engaged in a struggle to regain their rightful freedom and territorial sovereignty. We deeply appreciate the numerous occasions on which the Chinese representative at the United Nations has espoused the Lithuanian cause, at a time when the official voice of the Lithuanian people is silenced in that body. And Lithuanians are also grateful to the government and people of Canada for having made possible the reestablishment of an Acting Consul General in Canada. We are also very happy to have with us today the last American Minister to Lithuania before the forcible Soviet occupation, Dr. Owen J. C. Norem and Mrs. Norem. I happened to be the first person to greet Dr. Norem officially when he arrived in Lithuania, and so I am very happy, during this visit, to renew an acquaintance of long standing. In days when such travel was difficult, Prof. Malbone Graham twice visited Lithuania, and has always been a great friend of our country; he has also dedicated much effort to numerous scholarly writings on Lithuania. He is not able to be with us today because of illness, and I know that I express the desire of all of us in wishing him a speedy recovery.

In other words, ladies and gentlemen, the Lithuanians who gather here today do not stand alone; they have friends who share their aspirations for a better world in which justice will be the cornerstone of individual and national liberty. This kind of alliance is a natural one by virtue of our goals, but it can never be taken for granted. The solidarity that the free world is ever seeking to strengthen is the result, not of idle maxims chanted, but of difficult lessons clearly learned. Just as the descendants of the American pioneer learned through bitter experience that freedom-loving peoples must stand together, so too have freedom-loving peoples learned that mere noble desires and aspirations do not guarantee peace and happiness. The tragic fate of Lithuania is one of the clearest examples of his. Even where dedicated men gave of all their energies to build a free and independent Lithuania, their noble work was overwhelmed by treachery and ruthless greed. And the reason is simple: evil men have an unlimited number of means available whereby to achieve nefarious ends, whereas seekers after justice have but a narrow path of principle and faith to follow.

Yet in spite of this, all of us gathered here are determined to believe in justice, and to work for it. It is only the strong of mind and heart who are able to believe perseveringly in justice—who are able to set aside doubts and fears, and to see truly that mankind's yearning for peace and freedom is rarely rewarded overnight. And even when peace and freedom are achieved, they cannot be maintained without courage and hard work. As Erasmus once said, "God indeed preserves the ship, but the mariner conducts it into harbor." And it is above all faith in a just cause which enables men to persevere, in spite of obstacles, in the noble quest for a better world.

Neither the Hitlerite nor the Soviet occupation has dimmed the Lithuanian people's bright hope of freedom. History teaches that tyrants may have temporary success in defeating just aspirations, but in the end they fall to very low depths indeed. Such, even in our own time, is the paradoxical fate of Josef Stalin. His removal from honored interment to an obscure grave by the Kremlin wall shows quite well that justice has a habit of burying its own undertakers. And this pattern will persist as long as men are willing to fight and die for the freedom which is synonymous with life for them—whether at Thermopylae or Bunker Hill or Budapest or the Berlin wall or the forests of Lithuania.

This is a year of anniversaries. Not only do we mark the 45th year since Lithuania's Declaration of Independence in modern times, but also the 710th anniversary of the foundation of the kingdom of Lithuania under King Mindaugas. And at the same time that we commemorate the 100th anniversary of the Emancipation Proclamation, we commemorate the 100th anniversary of the great Lithuanian uprising against czarist domination. The pattern of liberty and justice is woven firmly into the lives of Lithuanians. Though they now experience "the perilous night," as did Francis Scott Key, they know that the day will come and that, "with the dawn's early light," their flag will still be there. Long may it wave.

In closing, I would like to read to you the text of a letter for which Lithuanians everywhere will be grateful. It speaks for itself. It is in connection with this anniversary, and I am happy that it reached me in time for me to read it to you:

THE SECRETARY OF STATE,
Washington, February 8, 1963.

"DEAR MR. CHARGÉ D'AFFAIRES: Permit me to convey, in the name of the Government and the people of the United States, the warm regard of this country for the Lithuanian nation on the occasion of its 45th anniversary of independent statehood. Americans remain strongly convinced that your people, like all other nations, are entitled to freedom and national self-determination. For this reason our Government continues not to recognize the forced incorporation of Lithuania in the Soviet Union. We are confident that the proven devotion of Lithuanians to liberty and justice, with which many of them have enriched our own shores, will serve their nation well in its efforts to achieve the eventual restoration of its rights.

Sincerely yours,

DEAN RUSK.

Estonian Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 25, 1963

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, February 24 marks the 45th anniversary of Estonian independence, and I am honored to join my fellow Americans in observing this important milestone in the life of a brave captive nation.

It was on February 24, 1918, that the Estonian National Council declared that "as of today Estonia within its historical and ethnic boundaries, is proclaimed an independent, democratic republic." Since 1710 when Peter I conquered their homeland the Estonians had been living under the Russian yoke. Independence came after many uprisings and brutal reprisals, including the important 1905 revolution.

After Estonia's liberation the Russians tried to restore their control of the new Republic. The Communists staged an unsuccessful coup in 1924 and were outlawed. They went underground, however, to continue their subversive propaganda and espionage. The Soviets aggressive designs were finally realized in 1940 when they seized control of Estonia in violation of their pledges to respect Estonian sovereignty and to abstain from interference in the internal affairs of the country. Shortly Estonia was invaded by Nazi Germany and then reoccupied by the Red army in 1944. Since then the Estonians have been forcibly maintained as a constituent republic of the U.S.S.R.

During its 20-year period of independence Estonia developed a stable and well-balanced economy, founded on the principles of private enterprise and initiative. But the expropriation and sovietization policies of the Kremlin destroyed the economic structure of independent Estonia and forced it into the economic mold of the Soviet Union. Estonia's farms were collectivized and its workers subjected to a 20th-century version of medieval serfdom.

The forcible annexation of Estonia and her Baltic neighbors is a bitter reminder of the dangers of Soviet totalitarianism. Although Estonia has fallen victim to Communist tyranny, the Estonian people are determined to resist their oppressors. On this anniversary we reaffirm our refusal to recognize the Soviet annexation of the Baltic peoples and express our faith in their ultimate victory over tyranny.

Estonian Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 25, 1963

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, the observance of an anniversary of the declaration of independence is an occasion for festivities and celebrations in most countries throughout the world. Yesterday we observed the 45th anniversary of the gaining of independence by the small Baltic country of Estonia. It is unfortunate that we cannot join in a celebration of this occasion with all our Estonian friends. The observance of this day serves more as a reaffirmation of the hope that Americans, and free Estonians everywhere, have of seeing the reemergence of a free independent Estonia. It will only be then that we would join our Estonian friends in a joyful and glorious celebration.

Being a small nation Estonia has, for most of its modern history, been subjected to foreign rule. Its domination by Sweden was only replaced by Russian czarist rule. The realization of the national goal, nurtured throughout the centuries in the hearts of all Estonians, was finally achieved when Russia was in the chaos of a revolution. The Estonians proclaimed their independence on February 24, 1918. With the attainment of independence the Estonians undertook the responsibilities as citizens of a free nation and succeeded in not only rebuilding their devastated and ruined country, but also in advancing in all phases of national activity. However, the ever present Russian threat, now in the clothing of Soviet imperialism, brought about the annexation of Estonia by the U.S.S.R. in 1940.

In spite of all the odds against them, these hearty and valiant people, mindful of the hardships their ancestors went through to achieve independence, have not given up hope that their country will again be free. We admire this persevering hope and on this anniversary we reaffirm our determination never to recognize the Soviet annexation of the Baltic nations and express our hope and prayer for their liberation.

Addresses Given on Occasion of Presentation of 1962 Freedom Award to Jean Monnet, January 23, 1963: Roscoe Drummond, Walter Lippmann, Christian A. Herter, George W. Ball, Jean Monnet, and a Letter from President John F. Kennedy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN BRADEMAS
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 25, 1963

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, the 1962 Freedom Award, which is presented annually by Freedom House, was presented on January 23, 1963, to Jean Monnet of France.

Because of present discussions of the state of the Western alliance and because of the great contributions which Jean Monnet has made to the building of that alliance, I believe that Members of Congress will find particularly interesting the speeches which were delivered by a number of distinguished Americans on this occasion.

I, therefore, under unanimous consent, include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the texts of the addresses made by Roscoe Drummond, Walter Lippmann, Christian A. Herter, George W. Ball, and by Jean Monnet together with the text of a letter to Mr. Monnet from President Kennedy.

I should like first, however, to include at this point an editor's note concerning the Freedom House dinner which was published in the February 1963 issue of the journal, Freedom and Union. This issue of Freedom and Union carries the texts of these several addresses.

FULL TEXT OF FREEDOM HOUSE DINNER—MONNET, GAINING FREEDOM AWARD, UPHOLDS HIS PLAN FOR UNITED KINGDOM JOINING SIX AND ATLANTIC UNITY AGAINST DE GAULLE—BALL GIVES HIM J.F.K.'S BACKING

High drama marked the presentation of the 1962 Freedom Award to Jean Monnet by Freedom House in New York City January 23. Only 9 days before its long-announced dinner for him, the basic strategy for European and Atlantic unification he had long led in developing was jeopardized by President de Gaulle at his press conference in Paris January 14, whose text we give on page 9. Most jeopardized were such essential parts as British entry into the Common Market and the concepts embodied in President Kennedy's Trade Expansion Act and Atlantic partnership speech July 4.

The upheaval was basic and world shaking indeed, for reasons we seek to clarify in our editorial on page 1. Mr. Monnet almost canceled his trip to New York for the dinner, but ended by coming there to make his most important public statement after the upset—answering De Gaulle without naming him.

All this served to magnify the already great interest in his speech, and the preceding ones by George Ball, Under Secretary of State (who read a letter to Mr. Monnet from President Kennedy), former Secretary of State Christian Herter, now the President's Special Representative for Trade Negotiations, and columnist Walter Lippmann. To hear them, a distinguished crowd of some 1,400 packed the ballroom of the Waldorf-Astoria; and press and TV-radio widely reported them. There follows the text of these speeches, in the order made. On page 25 we add a much fuller exposition of the views of Mr. Herter, a key figure in the coming acts in this drama * * *.—EDITORS.

ROSCOE DRUMMOND, CHAIRMAN, FREEDOM HOUSE, PRESIDING

I welcome you to the company of Freedom House and thank you for joining us in doing honor to the foremost European of our time, a great citizen of France who, more than any of his compatriots, strides with the tide of history.

I offer a brief word about Freedom House itself. In the dark days before Pearl Harbor, Freedom House grew out of the organizations of citizens who were deeply concerned about the mood of Americans who tended to regard Hitler and the Nazi threat to freedom as something about which we could be neutral. And we are not neutral today, when freedom is under more deadly attack than ever before.

Freedom House is an educational and service organization created to help preserve and strengthen our free society. Through the commitment of the time and talent of its board of directors and a contributing membership throughout the country, Freedom House has managed to carry its message to the American people in many ways—its message that today the real enemies are those who would bury freedom, and that in this struggle there is no alternative to the proposition—and the goal—that freemen shall prevail.

Liberals and conservatives, Republicans and Democrats are comfortable under the roof of Freedom House, because within the framework of divergent judgments of how our ends can best be achieved, there is fundamental agreement.

The freedom award has been presented each year since 1943. Its first recipient, Walter Lippmann, will follow me soon on tonight's program in honor of Jean Monnet. Others on this platform who have previously received the freedom award are Gen. Lucius Clay, Dr. James Conant, Paul Hoffman, and David Lilienthal. The roster of previous recipients also includes Gen. Dwight Eisenhower, Dean Acheson, Bernard Baruch, Gen. George Marshall, Edward R. Murrow, Sir Winston Churchill, and Mayor Willy Brandt. Tonight, Jean Monnet honors us by his visit and his acceptance of the freedom award, symbolizing our recognition of his great contribution to freedom.

MONNET TO PREVAIL

(By Walter Lippmann)

My friendship with Jean Monnet goes back to the early days of the League of Nations. Even then he was already launched on his great career. Amidst the violence and the tumult of the 20th century he stands out as the most constructive of the peacemakers.

He has spent his life in a persevering and persistent, in an ingenious and resourceful, labor of planning and negotiation and persuasion. In all his projects and enterprises there has been one central theme, which is how to induce and cajole men to work together for their own good. He has not asked men to be angels and saints, he has asked them to be sensible. He has not preached to them and he has never allowed himself to use the resounding generalities about peace and the unity of mankind. But he has been and he is now, at the summit of his career, the most effective planner and engineer of human unity whom we have known in our time.

I am presuming on a long friendship when I say a few words, not about what he has done, but about what he represents.

The principle of his work has been that peace and prosperity will come as men become enlightened in the pursuit of their interests. This is, I believe, the first article of the democratic credo—that enlightenment is possible and will produce the good life. The democratic credo does not say that men are born to govern themselves. It says that they can learn to govern themselves. And then, when education has enlightened the people, most of them will see that they can realize their own best private interest by working with and not against the enlightened public interest. This may be, as many think it is, a naive faith. I myself have wondered about it in some of the dark times we have lived through, and it may be that the good society can be realized on this earth only if mankind is reborn.

Jean Monnet has been a witness to the democratic faith—which is that there is a rational order in human affairs wherever and whenever men listen to reason and obey it. This faith in the paramountcy of reason is the source of that dauntless optimism which has made Jean Monnet so persevering—many of us would at times have said so stubborn—but so remarkably able to get done what he wants to do.

I am only too well aware that these are anxious days for all who are concerned with the great projects which he has initiated. This country is most concerned with them and with the unanswered questions of how the European Community will come to terms with its partners and allies in the Western World, and beyond them with its rivals in the Eastern World. All will depend, I imagine, on whether in the negotiations across the channel, and then across the Atlantic, those who will make the decisions can conceive the future as closed and restrictive or as open and inclusive.

Enough of the faith and stubbornness of Jean Monnet has rubbed off on me so that I venture to say that there is no doubt as to whether the open conception will prevail over the closed. In the end it will prevail.

What we are anxious about these days is when and how soon it will prevail, whether we are to be set backward into separatism and division with all the wastes and the dangers that go with them or whether we can move forward toward greater unity in a progressively free world.

Partnership Cannot Remain Final Objective of Europe and America—Deeper Tie Ahead

(By Christian A. Herter)

We have come here tonight to welcome and to honor a man who symbolizes for us in a very special way the new Europe that is coming into being.

Jean Monnet is in a real sense one of the principal founding fathers of this Europe. He is, at one and the same time, the foremost private citizen of the European community and also an undisputed son of France. In this dual citizenship he embodies a quality which is essential for everyone of us who wishes to contribute to strengthening the free world. Those of us who are on this side of the Atlantic must learn to live in the same moment as genuine Americans and also as citizens of the whole Atlantic area in our cares and outlook.

We are accustomed to welcoming distinguished French gentlemen to our shores, but seldom have we extended a warmer welcome than we do tonight to Jean Monnet. Many of his predecessors in the 17th and 18th centuries helped to bring a new world into being in North America, and some of them contributed decisively to the establishment of this Republic. But Monnet has dared to undertake a far more formidable task than was ever undertaken by even the most distinguished of his predecessors. They explored and settled a virgin continent unbound by the traditions of the past, while he has called a new world into being in an old world bound by centuries of tradition.

It is an ironic and impressive fact that, if one looks for the newest frontier in the Western World, he will find it not in North America but in Western Europe. Jean Monnet is the most authentic new frontiersman of our time. He, more than most other men, understands the secret of how the miracle of remaking Europe was wrought.

What Jean Monnet has done, if he will permit me to say so, was to recognize and take advantage of one of those rare moments in history when it is possible to recreate society and build institutions better adapted to the requirements of the 20th century. He would be the first to recognize that his achievement has been possible only because the tides of human affairs were running in the direction of what he wanted.

After World War I it was evident that Europe must unite or run the risk of decline. The chance to unite came after World War II. That chance was seized and success appears probable.

But the forces of history are working over a wider area than Western Europe. What has been true of the Continent since 1918 is now true of the whole North Atlantic area. We have learned our lesson. The Atlantic area must achieve greater unity or we will be progressively weakened until eventually we lose our freedom. Unity of free men and of free societies is the price of survival as well as of liberty.

There is, of course, nothing inevitable about our achieving the unity necessary for survival. We know, however, that centuries of human struggle and suffering have produced the unique opportunity that now lies before us. Further, we believe that the achievement of this unity is in the nature of things and that the forces of history are working toward this end. We also know that the moment of opportunity could pass and that Western society could succumb once more to the barbarians hammering at our gates if people like ourselves in America and Western Europe are not equal to the task.

Progress has been made. There is an operating military alliance, though a good deal remains to be done if it is to become as effective as it should be.

On July 4 last, the President defined the relationship between the new Europe that is coming into being and the United States as one of active partnership. The practice of partnership involves, as a first major step, the establishment of trade relations between the two partners that will serve their common interests, as well as the interests of each, to the maximum degree possible.

Partnership, however, good as it is, can never remain the ultimate and final objective of Europe and America. The forces of history are working toward a broader and deeper relationship than that. We are all (Europeans and Americans alike) heirs of the same great cultural heritage with similar views about the nature and destiny of man and the character of human society. In other words, we already belong to each other. Our task in the years ahead is to find out how to express the reality of this fact in institutional terms.

Some of us in this country prefer to talk about the future in terms of an Atlantic Community. I know that our European friends shy away from this phrase because for them the word "community" has already acquired a clear and precise meaning—technical, economic, and political—as the emerging structure of their continent. In short, they feel that the use of the word has already been preempted by Europe and that its use here to describe our ultimate goal merely produces confusion of thought and intention.

ATLANTIC COMMUNITY—GOAL TOWARD WHICH JEAN MONNET LEADS

At the same time, for many Americans, "community" is such a good word to describe relationships between people that I suspect some of us will continue to use it. I am a New Englander. In New England we say "community" when we are thinking about a society in which people live together as good neighbors, with a common recognition of the supremacy of law, and sharing the benefits of varied economic and political institutions while united by their common cultural heritage and by their feeling of a common destiny. It is in this sense that I speak of the Atlantic community—a goal toward which Jean Monnet's path leads.

The path to that community or partnership, if you prefer, will at times be steep and hazardous. The road upon which we have embarked will not be easy. Setbacks of the kind we are now witnessing are perhaps to be expected. It is inherent in a free society that men should differ on matters of policy between those who see their proper interests or the interests of their respective nations in different terms. At times these differences may well appear to be irreconcilable but I am confident that with the momentum already achieved we will overcome these differences.

History does not consist of a stream of events flowing at the same rate of speed. History unfolds by fits and starts. In the course of our human pilgrimage, sometimes centuries have passed by without there existing much possibility of creative change. Then a moment comes when change is possible if men are at hand who are willing to take advantage of it. Such a moment, thanks to Jean Monnet, is now with us.

Mr. Europe Can Become a Majority

(By George W. Ball)

First of all, I am serving as a courier to deliver a letter from the President of the United States to Jean Monnet, and I would like to read this letter [printed at end of speech].

And now, if I may, let me add a few personal observations about a man whom it has been my great fortune to know for 20 years. All who have enjoyed the close friendship of Jean Monnet—and our number is legion—can recount innumerable incidents to illustrate his qualities as a friend—his generosity and compassion, his warmth and thoughtfulness, his genuine concern for the problems of others.

But Jean Monnet would be impatient with me were I to pursue this theme tonight. No man has ever cared less for personal adulation and he has not come here for that purpose. Jean Monnet has not flown across the Atlantic at a time of crisis to receive personal honor but rather to participate in honoring and explaining those ideas of which he is a symbol in the hope that they may be even better understood.

ATLANTIC TIE MOST SIGNIFICANT

So tonight I shall not speak of Jean Monnet, that warm, gallant, and modest friend from Cognac. Neither shall I seek to expound his ideas, for he will do that much better himself. Rather I shall say a few words about that almost legendary figure of epic stature who has become known to an admiring world as Mr. Europe.

Jean Monnet has become Mr. Europe, it seems to me, because he is preeminently a modern man. More deeply than any of us he has perceived the central discord of our complex time—the discord between our technology on the one hand, with its rapid pace of advance and its requirements of scope and scale, and, on the other hand, the institutional arrangements under which we live, so slow to change and so often parochial in character. The consequences of this discord are familiar to all of us. They are evident in the problems we deal with every day—the problems of our cities, of our schools, and of our transportation systems—not to mention our newspapers. But they find their most significant expression in the relations between the peoples of the Atlantic world, where defense is indivisible, where economic life is interdependent, and where the major political decisions must of necessity be taken in concert if the full strength of the free world is to be effectively mobilized against a common danger.

OBSOLETE, FIERCELY HELD IDEAS

Because Jean Monnet has seen this fact with crystal clarity he has striven to transform the nation states of Europe into a new unity, not merely to end forever the frictions that more than once have embroiled the whole world in sanguinary conflict but to enable Europe to contribute its full potential to the shaping of a better world. And at the same time he has sought to promote between Europe and the United States that close cooperation which can give real content and meaning to the Atlantic partnership.

These objectives have represented no utopian dream. Jean Monnet is indubitably hardheaded and pragmatic, but he recognizes a compelling logic in world affairs.

I have called Jean Monnet a modern man, but this does not mean that he is unaware or disdainful of the past. Indeed he has, I think, a profound sense of the meaning of history and of the deep forces it has generated. He has had the insight to recognize that history is not a static affair, not the constant replaying of old themes, but a flow of events which, if man is to survive, must be channeled in directions that meet the requirements of an evolving new age.

He has, therefore, never been tempted into the unhappy error—induced by a nostalgic longing for a world that never was—of seeking to recapture the past. He has not sought to unfurl ancient banners, reinstate old forms, revive the vanished symbols that beglamored the centuries gone by. Instead he has pursued the more relevant purpose of bending men's efforts toward a nobler future.

It is because Jean Monnet so clearly perceives the nature of the great tidal forces at work in the world that he is sturdily immune to transient disappointments. I have been with him on more than one occasion when the movement of new ideas has seemed to many of us irrevocably halted by the abrupt intrusion of obsolete—yet fiercely held—ideas that echoed a distant and earlier age. Invariably—and sometimes almost alone—Jean Monnet has remained undismayed. At such moments of crisis his reaction is always the same. "What has happened, has happened," he is inclined to say, "but it does not affect anything fundamental. The important point is for us not to be deflected, not to lose momentum. We must go forward. We may alter our tactics but never our main objectives."

MONNET AN INCORRIGIBLE OPTIMIST

It is because of this apparent imperturbability that Jean Monnet is known—to the admiration of his friends and the exasperation of his opponents—as an incorrigible optimist. This attitude of mind does not stem from any panglossian idea that all is the best in the best of all possible worlds, but rather from a dauntless faith in the logic of events and the essential rationality of man—a faith in the ineluctable direction of deeply moving forces. Jean Monnet is an optimist because he is a practical man with a passionate desire to get things done—and for such a man optimism is the only useful working hypothesis.

As a practical man he pursues his purposes in a most practical way—a way that is peculiarly his own. Mr. Walter Lippmann has just spoken of him as a man who can "induce and cajole men to work together for their own good." To say it in other words, Jean Monnet is the supreme practitioner of the art of personal diplomacy. And he practices that art with unfailing perception of the loci of power and with an extraordinary singlemindedness.

Optimism works for him because he accepts opponents but not defeat. I still remember a book he once gave me—the story of an Arab prince who, in a time of troubles, went out to the desert to find the wisdom of the ages. The prince returned from his sojourn with this motto:

May God bless even my enemies.
For they too are a means to my end.

[Applause.]

It is by the vital force of his deep convictions, in short, that Jean Monnet has become Mr. Europe—the keeper of the conscience of a continent. And he has demonstrated anew the ancient adage that a resolute man, plus the truth, can become a majority.

ESSENTIAL UNITED KINGDOM JOIN MARKET

(By Jean Monnet)

I am moved and embarrassed by what Mr. Lippmann, Mr. Herter, and Mr. Ball have said. I shall not try to answer them.

I am very honored to receive from the board of trustees of Freedom House the Freedom Award at your hands today. That you are giving this award to a European is a proof of the deep community of mind and feeling that unite the people of Europe and North America.

I am convinced this feeling is rooted in our common civilization, the essence of which is its tradition of freedom. This freedom truly is the main issue between the two ways of approaching life that compete for men's minds today.

So many people have written and spoken about liberty more thoroughly than I can that I want to limit myself to what seems to me the most important and urgent practical problem confronting the West and its tradition of freedom, the one that requires action from us today.

The worst enemies of freedom have been, and still are, the spirit of domination and its consequences, the threat of war.

While within our frontiers we have organized liberty and, by mutual consent, maintained the rule of law that largely eliminates the spirit of domination, internationally we are still maintaining peace by force.

Now we must go beyond national frontiers and create new forms of relationships between countries.

The next step ahead of us must clearly be to complete the unity of Europe including Britain [applause], and gradually develop a strong partnership of equals between the United States and Europe. [Applause.]

PEACE AND FREEDOM

These are essential for the organization of peace in the world and the maintenance of freedom.

For, as we progress toward the unity of the West, we will create the conditions favoring a lasting peace between the West and the Soviet Union.

Naturally, the process of putting these great aims into practice involves great changes in the form of relationships now existing between our nations. This brings us up against difficulties.

I would like to talk of the one that looms largest over us all at this moment. It is more than important, it is essential that Britain should join our European Community under the same conditions as the present members. The negotiations have been going on too long but they can be rapidly concluded.

We must remember that on fundamental issues, as two world wars have proved, Britain is part of Europe.

People in Britain and on the Continent must free their minds of the obsolete and static idea that Britain, because an island, is bound to be insular, that she does not belong to Europe and that her commercial policies and interests will keep her forever apart from the natural trend toward European unity.

Entry into Europe would be good for Britain, for Europe, for the West and for world peace. [Applause.]

I still hope and believe, like most people in the Six, that the negotiations on Britain's entry into Europe will succeed.

Those who have had anything to do with European unity known from their own experience that the difficulties encountered at any moment do not matter so long as the objective is kept clearly in view.

EUROPEAN ECONOMIC UNITY

The world has recently become aware of the success of European economic unity, and people everywhere see political unity emerging in Europe. But this sudden awareness has concealed the 12 years of work, and often of serious trouble, that lie behind the achievement.

When the treaty for the European Defense Community was rejected in 1954, most competent observers thought unity in Europe was dead and buried. And yet the progress we have made during the last 12 years shows that, despite all the difficulties, we are on the way.

The countries of continental Europe—France, Germany, Italy, and the Benelux—are uniting in a European Economic Community of nearly 200 million people.

Germany and France, which have struggled to dominate one another for centuries, are now coming together, accepting the fact that they have the same destiny. In the European Economic Community they are pursuing a common course of action which is gradually transforming their mutual relations and the outlook of their peoples. They have even been considering closer cooperation in all fields. I have no doubt that France, which has been, from the start, a founder of European unity, will follow this course. [Applause.]

Why is this profound change taking place?

It is because the countries of the European Community have agreed that their economic problems which, in the past, were national responsibilities, have now become common responsibilities and being common, unite them instead of dividing them.

It is because they have established common rules and common institutions that they can do the job.

It is because each of the steps they have taken one after another, as circumstances allowed, have been designed to further the same objective.

The European Coal and Steel Community which was the beginning of all this enterprise, was not set up just to pool coal and steel, but as a first step on the way to European union.

THE COMMON MARKET

The Common Market has not been created just to build a better system of exchanging goods, or to create a new power. We have had, and have, as our objectives, essentially the creation of a united Europe and the elimination between nations and their peoples of the spirit of domination that has brought the world close to destruction many times.

To produce such a change, it was essential to eliminate the feeling of discrimination between nations that was the inevitable consequence of the many European wars.

To begin to unite Europe only 5 years after the war, it was vital that everyone should see that there were no more victors or vanquished, but only partners equal before the common law.

The institutions of the Common Market work in such a way that discrimination between European nations has now been ended.

The independent European Commission is the authority empowered to propose the economic policies of the Community. The national governments whose representatives sit in the Council of Ministers, decide on the common policies proposed by the Commission according to the rules and spirit of the Rome Treaty. In a widening field its decisions no longer require unanimity.

The attitudes of the people of Europe are rapidly changing. The peoples of these Community countries, the producers, the farmers, labor and the members of the professions, have become partners in change and are taking on the same Community outlook.

In fact when you look at it, they are the same people as they have been for centuries, but their attitudes toward one another have changed.

This is the process of civilization itself. This process is taking us faster and further than anyone would have dared to hope after the war.

Britain's request to enter the European union is one sign of it.

Another is your President's speech on the last 4th of July, where he called for a partnership of equals between the United States of America and the European Community. You are now preparing to negotiate new trade links across the Atlantic which must serve the interests of the world as a whole.

AMERICAN SUPPORT FOR EUROPEAN UNITY

Ever since the Marshal plan, and the Schuman plan, American support for European unity has never faltered.

I can testify from my own experience that this support has been invaluable in bringing European unity to the point where it is today. For once, the most powerful country in the world has helped others to unite instead of adopting the old principle of divide and rule.

But during all those years, the United States took her decisions alone. Now the partnership means a new form of relations.

Let me read to you what the Action Committee of the United States of Europe said on this matter in its joint declaration of June 26 last:

"The partnership between America and a united Europe must be a relationship of two separate but equally powerful entities, each bearing its share of common responsibilities in the world. This partnership is natural and inevitable because the peoples of Europe and America share the same civilization based on freedom and conduct their public life in accordance with common democratic principles."

I think this has implications for defense which, with the entry of Britain into the Common Market, is the main problem that looms over the great debate in the West.

We must recognize in this nuclear age, that while making every effort to disarm, we must pursue and improve our common defense with all its political implications on both sides of the Atlantic.

Europe and America must both acknowledge that neither of us is defending a particular country, that we are all defending our common civilization. [Applause.]

You, in the United States, must realize that the claims of Europe to share common responsibility and authority for decisions on defense, including the nuclear weapons, is natural since any decision involves the very existence of the European peoples.

EUROPE'S SHARE OF DEFENSE

On the other hand, I think the Europeans must understand that the nuclear terror is indivisible and that they too must shoulder an adequate share of the common defense.

Today, however, the countries of the Atlantic Alliance have such divergent views of their immediate interests that a common approach to the problem has to be developed if agreement is to be achieved.

To achieve the partnership between Europe and America, we must create an increasingly common interest by acting in common on a growing number of questions. When sufficient points of common interest have been created, a degree of community in defense will be accepted that today appears utopian.

In my opinion, while progress on defense must be sought continuously, the field where results can be most promptly obtained is the economic one.

There are urgent problems which neither Europe nor America can settle alone. These are, to my mind, the monetary stability of the West, the organization of agriculture in an increasingly industrial world, help to the developing countries to speed their growth and, of course, the freeing of trade to be negotiated between yourselves and the Common Market.

I realize that economic partnership will not automatically lead to a partnership for defense. In Europe too, the Common Market alone is not enough to create political union. But without the Common Market, political union would never have been raised as a practical issue. Similarly, the creation of the rules and institutions needed to build up the economic partnership between the United States and Europe will change the context for dealing with defense. It will then appear in a new light on both sides of the Atlantic.

The unity of Europe and its partnership with the United States will not only change the relationship between us, it will fundamentally change the relationship of the West with the Soviet Union.

As long as Russia believes the West can be divided, it will be tempted to upset the balance of power in its favor.

As we organize new forms of relationship between the Western nations, we will be showing ourselves, the Soviet Union and the rest of the world, that as a result of the union of Europe and its partnership with the United States, the West cannot be divided.

The conditions will then exist for establishing the basis of lasting peace between the Soviet Union and ourselves.

I believe this development can come much faster than we imagine today. My hope is based on my experience of European unity. This experience has been that once people are convinced a new situation is inevitable, they adapt themselves to it spontaneously and by doing so, hasten the process itself.

This is the most helpful road to the creation of peace today, and to the consolidation of freedom. [Ovation.]

UNITED STATES, EUROPE DEFEND COMMON CIVILIZATION

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, January 22, 1963.

His Excellency JEAN MONNET,
President, Action Committee for the United States of Europe.

DEAR MR. MONNET: I am delighted to join my friends at Freedom House in doing honor to your great achievements. You come at a moment of high importance—and you come as the exemplar of disinterested service to Europe and to the Atlantic world.

For centuries, emperors, kings, and dictators have sought to impose unity on Europe by force. For better or worse, they have failed. But under your inspiration, Europe has moved closer to unity in less than 20 years than it had done before in a thousand. You and your associates have built with the mortar of reason and the brick of economic and political interest. You are transforming Europe by the power of a constructive idea.

Ever since the war the reconstruction and the knitting together of Europe have been objectives of United States policy, for we have recognized with you that in unity lies strength. And we have also recognized with you that a strong Europe would be good not only for Europeans but for the world. America and a united Europe, working in full and effective partnership, can find solutions to those urgent problems that confront all mankind in this crucial time.

I have been happy, therefore, to read your statement of January 16 in which you call attention to the responsibility of Europe to share with the United States in the common defense of the West. I believe, with you, that "Americans and Europeans must recognize that neither one nor the other is defending a particular country, but that the ensemble is defending a common civilization." The United States will be true to this conviction, and we trust that it will have the support of Europeans too.

Your practical wisdom, your energy in persuasion, your tested courage, and your earned eminence in Europe are the reasons for this celebration in your honor. They are also a great resource for freedom, and I wish you many years of continued strength in your service to our cause.

Sincerely,

JOHN F. KENNEDY.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 26, 1963

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Nahum 1: 7: *The Lord is good, a stronghold in the day of trouble; and He knoweth them that trust in Him.*

Eternal God, our Father, grant that daily we may be lifted by the mighty tides of Thy gracious spirit into the glad assurance that Thou art able and willing to help us meet faithfully all our tasks and responsibilities.

Grant that we may be inspired to put the various problems of life in the right perspective for we are frequently far more conscious of our perplexities than we are of Thy divine power which we may appropriate by faith.

May it be our highest wisdom to trust in Thee and go forth with a firm and calm reliance that we shall be guided by Thee in the high adventure of building a nobler civilization.

Hear us in Christ's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

UNITED STATES MUST FIND WAY TO LIBERATE CUBANS

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, Russian occupation of Cuba, a nation of the Western Hemisphere, has sounded an alarm in every city, village, and hamlet of the New World. The voices of concern raised in the United States are many. One voice raised Sunday merits the careful study and, in my judgment, the support of every straight-thinking American. I refer to that great man from Independence, Mo., the Honorable Harry S. Truman.

Former Presidents of our country by tradition are properly regarded as the elder statesmen and their counsel in times of crisis has much significance. The man from Independence is known throughout the world as the man of decision. In the stormy days of his administration when our Nation carried almost singlehanded the great burden of freedom's cause against the imperial tyranny of the Russians, it was he who stemmed the tide of Communist aggression and launched programs to buttress the frontiers of freedom throughout the world. When the chips were down he acted with a resolute will and determination which rallied our Nation and the friends of freedom on farflung fronts. Harry S. Truman has won a special place in the hearts of his countrymen by the boldness of his vision and the determination of his purposes.

Now, when the frontiers of freedom are many, when the United States has strong and able allies in common cause, when the Russian empire shows strong signs of internal conflict which the masters in the Kremlin cannot control, when the security of the entire Western Hemisphere is directly challenged by the new imperialism of Moscow—the man from

Independence, Mo., has spoken out in the Washington Post in a thoughtful article entitled "United States Must Find Way To Liberate Cubans."

By leave obtained, I insert this article in the RECORD and commend this guidepost to action to all who share the responsibility for the future of freedom's cause:

UNITED STATES MUST FIND WAY TO LIBERATE CUBANS

INDEPENDENCE, MO., February 23.—Along with everyone else, I have been concerned about the situation in Cuba. The Cuban people have been beset with internal problems almost from the time Cuba was discovered by Columbus. One set of tyrants seems to be succeeded by another in guise of liberators.

In an open society such as ours it is natural for people freely to express their opinions, or in other words to sound off. This tendency is particularly apparent in times of crisis. There is now much talk about Cuba. There are those who read and talk about it—and there are those who tell those in charge what to do and how to do it.

That is all right, as far as it goes, but it does no good and could do much harm if we get into a political hassle about it. Foreign policy should never be an issue between the great political parties. The United States should agree on and have but one approach to dealings with other nations.

Is there no hope for Cuba? Is Cuba now doomed to become the Balkan satellite of the American continent? Are the Cuban people without hope of becoming a genuinely free and independent people? These and many other questions are being raised.

The one thing that history teaches us over and over again is that no system of government that defies the will of its people can long endure and, while modern weapons in the hands of a new crop of quislings make the task of liberation more formidable, it is as true today as it ever was that the will of a people to be free is irresistible.

Any government that imposes its will from the top will be overthrown in time. This happens when the people reach that certain point of loss of patience and the congealment of their will to resist.

Cuba, historically, has suffered a long series of misfortunes, from its rulers and their depredations, greed, and corruption. From the time in 1898 when the United States intervened in Cuba to set her free and to help her establish and maintain a free government for the benefit of all of her people, she has experienced one failure after another.

We have always been sympathetic toward the Cuban people, but for one reason or another things never seemed to work out so that the affairs of Cuba could be administered by honest and devoted patriots rather than the greedy, selfish, grafting dictators that kept succeeding one another.

The present situation in Cuba defies all reasoning. Castro, as a revolutionary leader fighting to unseat dictator Batista, attracted sympathetic support from many quarters in this hemisphere, and from the United States in particular. There was some reason to hope that here at long last there may have arisen a true patriot and able leader, who would devote his energies to the establishment of representative government and put through necessary reforms for the benefit of all the Cuban people.

But again our hopes were doomed to disappointment. The man, Castro, became inflated and power mad—and incapable of the kind of leadership Cuba needed in her period of reconstruction.

Instead of applying his energies to the solution of the needs of Cuba, Castro betrayed his revolution by delivering the Cuban people to the political imprisonment of a Russian-made Communist dictatorship. He thus committed Cuba to a life of crisis, aggression, oppression and intrigue.

PUT OFF RESPONSIBILITY

We admit that our policies toward Cuba, and I would include my own administration as well, have left something to be desired. For some reason we have put off for too long our responsibility to put pressure on the Cuban leaders to institute badly needed reforms.

The situation in Cuba today is not unlike that of the plight from which many satellite nations are suffering, except that the tragedy of Cuba could have been prevented by us.

Somehow we must seek a way of helping the Cuban people to liberate themselves once and for all. The world situation today is vastly different from what it was at the time we liberated Cuba from Spain. We now have the United Nations, which could have been helpful and perhaps could be in the future. We have the Organization of American States and other cooperative agencies that also could have been enlisted in dealing with that situation. But all of that is water over the dam.

MODERN WEAPONS

There is one thing we cannot do and must not do and that is to abandon Cuba to her self-imposed tyrants and new conquerors. For as long as these people enforce their will by the use of modern weapons the Cuban people will be compelled to undergo prolonged suffering, before they can hope to restore themselves by the process of spontaneous popular uprising.

The Cuban people are now pretty much in the same fix as the Hungarians who found that they could not liberate themselves by attempting to meet mechanized Russian divisions with rifles and home made explosives.

But Cuba is in our own frontyard where we have a direct responsibility to make her people free again. The first time we "remembered the *Maine*"—now we should never forget to "remember the missiles." Now we must seriously consider the Communists and their Asian and Eastern European ideas.

IN DIFFERENT CATEGORY

It is my opinion that until the sources of all the world's tensions and dangers are overcome within those nations that constitute the centers of the Communist conspiracy, namely, the police states of Russia and China, there is little chance for the occupied satellites to settle matters for themselves.

But I repeat that the Cuban situation is in a different category and should not be confused with the other satellite victims within the Russian-Chinese orbit. Cuba was delivered to Communist control and domination by a betrayal of a modern-day Quisling, Castro. He perpetrated this act of treason against Cuban people and even his revolutionary followers in the name of liberation from "colonialism." But instead of winning her freedom from her own dictatorship, Cuba has become a colony again—a colony of Communist Russia.

I think that it is well that we take a look at the record of our past relations with Cuba. From early 1899 to mid-1902, while Cuba was under temporary U.S. military rule following her liberation from Spain, most of the offices were placed under Cuban nationals. During that period much was done to build public works, strict measures of sanitation were put into effect, the civil service was reformed and public education significantly improved. Yellow fever, which had been plaguing Cuba for centuries, was eradicated.

At the same time a constitutional convention was called to establish a system for self-government. The first Cuban Continental Congress met on May 5, 1902, and we turned over control of the government to the people of Cuba.

In restoring Cuba to self-government the so-called Platt amendment was accepted by Cuba on June 12, 1901, as a part of its constitution.

AMENDMENT PROVISIONS

Among the several provisions of the Platt amendment were these:

1. The sanitation measures set up by the military were to be maintained.

2. Naval stations were authorized to be leased to the United States.

3. The United States reserved the right to interfere in the affairs of the island if it became necessary.

It seems to me that when it appeared that the situation in Cuba was getting out of hand and that a threat to the security of this hemisphere was clearly in the making, we should have considered that the basic implications of the Monroe Doctrine were at stake, as well as the reservation imposed by the Platt amendment, which anticipated precisely such a development. These provisions, the Monroe Doctrine and the Platt amendment, were there as much for the welfare and protection of Cuba as for the security of all the other nations of this continent.

FAR FROM EXHAUSTED

The situation is clear, the problem is obvious, the solution not so apparent. But, like the bubonic plague of cholera, quarantining is one remedy that every public health authority knows must be imposed until a virulent epidemic abates.

As a nation devoted to peace, we have had to suffer much abuse and provocation at the hands of the Communists, but we have been patient. And our patience, though often sorely tried, is far from exhausted. We, of course, continue to hope that someway, somehow, the Cuban people will see to it that these latter-day quislings are overthrown and that freedom and the needed reforms are established for the benefit of all the Cuban people.

A former President, much as he might try, cannot detach himself from events, even long after he is out of office. On one of my walks a thought kept going through my mind on how I might have dealt with Castro if it had been mine to do. This is how I saw it: Immediately after the conclusion of the revolution in Cuba, I would have invited Castro to the White House. This is the way I might have put it to him:

"Mr. Castro, your revolution is over and now you have the responsibility and the big job of reconstruction. You have made a great many promises to your people in enlisting their support. How are you going to make good in those promises? You don't have the resources of your own in Cuba, and there are no means in sight to enable you to perform the things you promised the Cuban people.

"Now, there are only two places where you might get the necessary economic support to put over your program of reforms. We are close to Cuba and we have historic ties with your country. All we would expect in return for our support would be that you keep the Cuban institutions free, and the Cuban people free, and that you get rid of corruption. This is all we would ask, this is all we would expect, and Cuba would enjoy complete sovereignty and independence as a nation. But if you should elect to go the other way—the Communist way—you will become a puppet and that can only lead you to more trouble and bloodshed."

WE STAND FIRM

I would have hoped that after some such exchange we should have come to an understanding and I think we might have reached a friendly agreement. All this, of course, needed to have been quietly negotiated within the privacy of the White House. With that out of the way I might have closed our meeting with a friendly suggestion, perhaps something like this:

"Now that we understand each other, Fidel, let us get to work and do all we can for the cause of your people."

The Cuban crisis has served one useful purpose—it again smoked out the Russian capacity for bluff and their hit-and-run type of international piracy. And it provided the United States with an opportunity to make it clear to the Communist aggressors that once the line is drawn we stand firm.

A NATIONAL LOTTERY

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, if anyone had any doubts about the gambling spirit of the American people such doubts should have been removed as the result of the activities last night at Yonkers Raceway in New York.

Not only did we witness 28,732 legal bettors going through the turnstiles to wager over $2 million but we saw how this instinctive universal human trait was unruffled by inclement weather. This tremendous crowd of decent citizens braved the snow and 30° temperature to enjoy an evening of relaxation, pleasure, and recreation.

Mr. Speaker, last night was the earliest opening of horse racing in New York State not because of the State's interest in the improvement of breeding horses but because of the State treasury's need for additional tax revenue.

Last night's activities, profitable to the State and the National Government as well, clearly indicated that the urge to gamble is deeply ingrained in most human beings and that neither snow nor cold weather will stop people from gambling—legally or illegally.

Mr. Speaker, if we had the courage to recognize and accept the obvious, we could easily, painlessly, and voluntarily pump into our Federal treasury over $10 billion a year in additional income through a national lottery. A national lottery would provide the answer to our Government's great need for more revenue and the American taxpayers' demand for tax relief.

MANAGED NEWS

Mr. STINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include an article from the Evening Star.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. STINSON. Mr. Speaker, during the session yesterday there was much said about the management of the news. The American Society of Newspaper Editors are also very much concerned over this situation, as is indicated by the following article appearing in the Washington Evening Star on Saturday, February 23, 1963:

EDITORS IRKED ON MANAGED NEWS POLICY

ATHENS, GA., February 23.—The President of the American Society of Newspaper Editors says the Kennedy administration should end the debate over managed news by disavowing publicly its use as part of national policy.

Lee Hills, executive editor of Knight newspapers, told the Georgia Press Institute yesterday that such a disavowal might restore public confidence and end the managed news debate.

"Manipulation of the news is the Soviet way of manipulating people, and this manipulation of human beings is the biggest difference between communism and our system," Mr. Hills said.

Mr. Hills noted that while he was in Russia last summer as head of a group from the newspaper editors society, one of his Russian hosts mentioned that the Russian press is a weapon in the ideological struggle.

"Is it any wonder then, that there was an outcry in America when a U.S. spokesman said that managing the news was part of the weaponry of our national policy in the Cuban crisis last October?" Mr. Hills said.

"When this was followed by the astonishing statement that it is all right to lie—to practice news deception—a crisis of confidence was created that even Secretary McNamara's remarkable TV briefing didn't dispel."

The American people do not want to be told security secrets, Mr. Hills added, but neither do they want to be misled.

PUBLIC WORKS BUILDING PROGRAM

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I take this occasion to call attention to a public works building program that was proposed by the Post Office Department and approved by the General Services Administration some time last fall. Members of Congress were furnished copies of the proposal December 11, 1962.

The proposed program contemplated the acquisition of sites, design and construction of 145 small public buildings, ranging in cost from $115,500 to $399,400, for use of the Post Office Department and/or other Federal agencies. The total estimated maximum cost of the 145 projects was placed at $32,064,200 at that time. The justification of this program was, quoting from the prospectus:

In many cities throughout the United States there is a serious shortage of Federal office and postal space and an urgent need to provide adequate space and facilities in which Federal agencies can carry out their programs. At least two major factors are responsible for this situation. For a period of 20 years, from immediately prior to World War II to the late 1950's, there was virtually no public building construction to provide adequate space. Secondly, in the period following the war there has been a phenomenal growth and shifting in the population of the United States. There is every reason to believe that this growth will continue in the foreseeable future.

Traditionally the Congress has authorized and appropriated funds for the construction of public buildings to accommodate postal and other governmental operations throughout the United States. Recognizing the urgent need for public buildings construction, the Congress by enactment of the Public Buildings Act of 1959 authorized and directed the Administrator of General Services to make a continuing investigation and survey of the public buildings needs of the Federal Government and provided a procedural charter for securing authorization for such urgently needed construction. GSA's initial efforts under the act have emphasized the public building needs in the larger communities and urban centers where there are greater concentrations of Federal activities. However, there is an equally urgent need for public building construction in the smaller communities.

Post Office facilities are totally inadequate to meet the requirements of the postal service for the efficient handling of a constantly increasing volume of mail. Substantial growth of Federal agency programs has forced agencies to house their operations in whatever privately owned space could be made available. There is an urgent need to provide a public building in the smaller community which will offer better service to the general public doing business with the Federal activities located in the community for carrying out local programs. In addition to providing adequate and efficient workspace for the Government's programs, such public buildings are the symbol of the Government of the United States to the people in the communities they serve.

I was in Washington attending a subcommittee meeting of the House Committee on Agriculture on the day that this prospectus reached my office. Out of curiosity I examined the report to see if any projects were proposed for the State of Missouri. There were three—located in towns and villages ranging in population from 658 to 1,887. The three projects were estimated to cost respectively $187,200, $190,300, and $245,000. Each of these buildings was to be used primarily as a post office building with 750 square feet to be reserved for other agencies. Being more or less familiar with each of these communities, and also being aware of the fact that several adequate and attractive post office buildings had been built in communities of the 10th Congressional District under the lease arrangement that has been in effect for the past several years, I began making a comparison of cost in communities of similar size. For instance, in communities of approximately 1,250 population, buildings have cost in the neighborhood of from $25,000 to $35,000; and in one small city of more than 5,000 population in my home county, a most attractive modern, air-conditioned building located on a large lot with adequate parking facilities for the public and postal employees, was constructed at a cost of approximately $75,000 including the cost of the site.

Less than a week after I had questioned the justification of many of the buildings on this list, I was advised that I was correct in my conclusion to the extent that the one building which was proposed to be built in a small town of less than 750 population in the 10th Missouri District at an estimated cost of $187,200 could not be justified and therefore was being removed from the list of proposed projects.

However, out of fairness, I must say that this was not the only project removed, for in a revised prospectus under date of January 31, 1963, only 84 projects of the original 145 proposed projects were retained and 2 new projects added, and the estimated cost was cut from $32,064,200 down to $20,543,800. This does not mean, however, that all of the 86 projects can be justified because under no stretch of the imagination can an expenditure of $245,000 be justified for a post office building in a community of approximately 2,000 people. Particularly is this confirmed when we see beautiful buildings with every modern facility and of adequate size being built in towns of more than 5,000 population at a cost of approximately $75,000.

I appreciate the fact that all of these buildings are proposed for communities that have been designated as eligible for area redevelopment projects. I am not opposed to the purposes of the accelerated programs, but I am opposed to programs that waste public funds by spending five times as much for a facility as has been found necessary to spend on comparable projects.

I hope that the members of the House Committee on Public Works will examine this program very carefully before giving the General Services Administration the go-ahead sign.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON ELECTIONS OF THE COMMITTEE ON HOUSE ADMINISTRATION

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Elections of the Committee on House Administration may be permitted to sit today during general debate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

CREDIT AGAINST ESTATE TAX FOR TAP ON CERTAIN PRIOR TRANSFERS

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H.R. 780), to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1939 to provide a credit against the estate tax for Federal estate taxes paid on certain prior transfers in the case of decedents dying after December 31, 1947, which was unanimously reported favorably by the Committee on Ways and Means.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 814 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1939 is hereby amended—

(1) by striking out in subsection (a) of such section "December 31, 1951" and inserting in lieu thereof "December 31, 1949";

(2) by striking out "within two years" wherever appearing in subsections (a) and (b) of such section and inserting in lieu thereof "after December 31, 1947, and within three years"; and

(3) by adding at the end of subsection (c) of such section the following new paragraph:

"(3) REDUCTION OF CREDIT IN CERTAIN CASES.—If the transferor predeceased the decedent by more than two years, the credit shall be 80 percent of the amount determined under subsections (b) and (c) (1) and (2)."

SEC. 2. A timely claim based upon a deduction for property previously taxed under section 812(c) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1939 may be deemed to be a claim based upon a credit for prior taxed property under section 814 of such Act as amended by the first section of this Act.

SEC. 3. No interest shall be allowed or paid on any overpayment resulting from the enactment of this Act.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BYRNES] and I may extend our remarks in connection with the bills that may be passed by unanimous consent.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of H.R. 780, which was introduced by our colleague on the Committee on Ways and Means, the Honorable EUGENE J. KEOGH, of New York, is to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1939 to provide a credit against the estate tax for Federal estate taxes paid on certain prior transfers in the case of decedents dying after December 31, 1947.

Section 812(c) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1939 provided a deduction in computing estate tax, as distinguished from a credit, for the value of property left to a decedent within 5 years of his death if such property had been taxed as a part of the estate of the donor-decedent or had been subject to gift tax. However, because of difficulties presented by the interrelationship of section 812(c) and the marital deduction provided by section 812(e), no deduction for prior-taxed property was allowed to the extent that property in question exceeded 50 percent of the decedent's estate and had been acquired from the decedent's spouse. As a result, double taxation resulted where more than 50 percent of a decedent's estate was acquired from his spouse, because no marital deduction had been allowed to the extent of the excess over 50 percent.

Because of this double taxation where the property passing to a spouse was in excess of the amount for which a marital deduction could be taken, as well as other features of the deduction for property previously taxed which were found objectionable, Congress in the 1954 code substituted a credit for this deduction. Under the 1954 code provision, a credit is allowed against the decedent's tax for all, or a portion, of any estate tax previously paid with respect to property transferred to the decedent within 10 years prior to his death—or 2 years after. Moreover, this credit takes into account any estate tax previously paid with respect to property which had been included in the estate of a predeceased spouse, to the extent the transfer to the current decedent was in excess of the amount for which a marital deduction could be taken.

The credit under the 1954 code, however, applied only in the case of decedents dying after the effective date of the 1954 code, that is, August 16, 1954. In 1956, the Congress recognized that hardship ensued from limiting this credit to cases coming under the 1954 code and enacted Public Law 417—84th Congress—which extended the credit to estates of decedents dying after December 31, 1951, and before August 16, 1954.

The Committee on Ways and Means agrees with the action taken previously to prevent the diminution of estates of husbands and wives who die within a short time of each other, but is of the opinion that the provision is too narrow in its application. The committee believes that there is an equal justification for allowing a credit in such cases where the spouses died within 3, instead of 2 years of each other, so long as the credit allowed is reduced, where the deaths occur more than 2 years apart, to 80 percent of the credit otherwise allowable—the rule presently applicable under the 1954 code in such cases. Moreover, hardship cases have come to the attention of the committee where the decedents died before December 31, 1951, and the committee has concluded that the provision should be extended to cases where the decedents died after December 31, 1949, but only in those cases where the prior decedent died on or after January 1, 1948, the date the marital deduction first became effective and the deduction for property previously taxed under the 1939 code became inapplicable in the case of transfers between spouses.

Accordingly, H.R. 780 would amend section 814 of the 1939 code to make it applicable to estates of decedents dying after December 31, 1949, to make the credit available where the death of the first spouse to die occurred within the 3 years prior to that of the decedent in question but after December 31, 1947, and by providing that, where the deaths of the husband and wife occurred more than 2 years apart, the credit for prior estate taxes is to be 80 percent instead of 100 percent.

The pending bill is the same as a bill reported by the Committee on Ways and Means and unanimously passed by the House of Representatives in the 87th Congress—H.R. 7859—and the committee is unanimous in again recommending its enactment.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the bill H.R. 780 would amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1939 to provide that a credit would be available against the estate tax for estate taxes paid on certain prior transfers in the case of decedents dying after December 31, 1947.

The amendment is designed to remove an inequity which arose in connection with the disallowance of a deduction for property passing to a spouse of the decedent under the 1939 code. Originally, section 819(c) of the 1939 code provided for a deduction from the gross estate for the value of property passing to a decedent within 5 years of his death. No deduction for property previously taxed was allowed, however, where the property was received from the decedent's spouse. This was based upon the presumption that such property would constitute a part of the marital deduction and not be previously taxed. This was not always the case. Therefore, in the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, the Congress substituted a tax credit for this deduction in order that the full amount of any tax on property previously taxed might be reflected in the estate tax liability of the decedent. This credit applied only to decedents who died after the effective date of the 1954 code; namely, August 16, 1954.

The effect of this bill is to make the credit applicable to estates of decedents dying after December 31, 1949, so that the credit would be available where the death of the first spouse occurred within 3 years prior to the death of the surviving spouse but after December 31, 1947. In addition, the bill would provide that where the deaths of the husband and wife occurred more than 2 years apart, the credit for prior estate taxes would be 80 percent instead of 100 percent.

This legislation was approved by the Committee on Ways and Means and passed by the House in the last Congress. It is appropriate that it should pass the House at this time.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TAX TREATMENT OF REDEEMABLE GROUND RENTS

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H.R. 1597) to amend the Internal Revenue Code to provide a deduction for payment of redeemable ground rents, which was unanimously reported favorably by the Committee on Ways and Means.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 163 (relating to deduction for interest) is amended by redesignating subsection (c) as subsection (d) and by inserting after subsection (b) the following new subsection:

"(c) REDEEMABLE GROUND RENT DEDUCTION.—Annual or periodic payments with respect to a redeemable ground rent (but not payments in redemption of a ground rent) shall be treated, with respect to the payor, as interest to which subsection (a) applies."

SEC. 2. EFFECTIVE DATES.—(a) The amendment made by section (1) of this Act shall be effective with respect to interest paid or accrued after December 31, 1961.

Amend the title so as to read: "A bill relating to the tax treatment of redeemable ground rents."

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

"That (a) section 163 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to deduction for interest) is amended by redesignating subsection (c) as subsection (d) and by inserting after subsection (b) the following new subsection:

"'(c) REDEEMABLE GROUND RENTS.—For purposes of this subtitle, any annual or periodic rental under a redeemable ground rent (excluding amounts in redemption thereof) shall be treated as interest on an indebtedness secured by a mortgage.'

"(b) Part IV of subchapter O of chapter 1 of such Code (relating to special rules for determining gain or loss on disposition of property) is amended by redesignating section 1055 as section 1056 and by inserting after section 1054 the following new section:

"'SEC. 1055. REDEEMABLE GROUND RENTS.

"'(a) CHARACTER.—For purposes of this subtitle—

"'(1) a redeemable ground rent shall be treated as being in the nature of a mortgage, and

"'(2) real property held subject to liabilities under a redeemable ground rent shall be treated as held subject to liabilities under a mortgage.

"'(b) APPLICATION OF SUBSECTION (a).—

"'(1) IN GENERAL.—Subsection (a) shall take effect on the day after the date of the enactment of this section and shall apply with respect to taxable years ending after such date of enactment.

"'(2) BASIS OF HOLDER.—In determining the basis of real property held subject to liabilities under a redeemable ground rent, subsection (a) shall apply whether such real property was acquired before or after the enactment of this section.

"'(3) BASIS OF RESERVED REDEEMABLE GROUND RENT.—In the case of a redeemable ground rent reserved or created on or before the date of the enactment of this section in connection with a transfer of the right to hold real property subject to liabilities under such ground rent, the basis of such ground rent after such date in the hands of the person who reserved or created the ground rent shall be the amount taken into account in respect of such ground rent for Federal income tax purposes as consideration for the disposition of such real property. If no such amount was taken into account, such basis shall be determined as if this section had not been enacted.

"'(c) CROSS REFERENCE.—For treatment of rentals under redeemable ground rents as interest, see section 163(c).'

"(c) Section 163(d) of such Code (as redesignated by subsection (a) of this section) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"'(5) For treatment of redeemable ground rents and real property held subject to liabilities under redeemable ground rents, see section 1055.'

"(d) The table of sections for part IV of subchapter O of chapter 1 of such Code is amended by striking out

"'SEC. 1055. Cross references.'

and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"'SEC. 1055. Redeemable ground rents.

"'SEC. 1056. Cross references.'

"SEC. 2. The amendments made by subsection (a) of the first section of this Act shall take effect as of January 1, 1962, and shall apply with respect to taxable years ending on or after such date. The amendments made by subsection (b) of the first section of this Act shall take effect on the day after the date of the enactment of this Act and shall apply with respect to taxable years ending after such date of enactment."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, the bill H.R. 1597, which was introduced by our colleague, the gentleman from Maryland, the Honorable SAMUEL N. FRIEDEL, as reported by the Committee on Ways and Means, in effect deals with the tax treatment in Maryland of both the buyer of a home subject to a redeemable ground rent and the person selling this real property subject to the redeemable ground rent. For the home buyer the ground rent paid would be treated as a mortgage interest payment and, therefore, deductible by him for tax purposes. The seller of the real property subject to the redeemable ground rent is treated under the bill as if he had sold the property subject to a mortgage in a face amount equal to the redemption price of the redeemable ground rent. As a result, the redeemable ground rent is taken into account in determining his sale price for the property and, therefore, is reflected in any gain—or loss—recognized to him. Under the bill, as reported, the deduction of the ground rent would be available for 1962 and subsequent years. In the case of the seller of the property, however, the new treatment in general would apply only in the case of transactions occurring after the date of enactment of the bill.

Mr. Speaker, for over 30 years the Treasury Department took the position that a ground-rent arrangement was analogous to a mortgage. This meant that the seller of property subject to a ground-rent arrangement would be required to include the capitalized value of the ground rent in the proceeds he realized on the sale of property for the purpose of determining the gain or loss he realized on such sale. Consistent with this position, the Treasury Department also permitted ground rents paid by homeowners to be deducted as mortgage interest.

Certain court decisions, however, in cases involving the tax liability of the sellers of property subject to a ground-rent arrangement, have held that such an arrangement is, in effect, a lease of the property rather than a mortgage with the result that the sellers of such property were not required to include the capitalized value of the ground rent in their sale proceeds for tax purposes. Consistent with these decisions, the Treasury Department felt constrained to reverse its longstanding position regarding the deductibility of payments of ground rents as mortgage interest and to take the position that these payments were rent which would be deductible only by business taxpayers. This reversal of the Treasury's position, which would adversely affect a large number of homeowners, was made effective January 1, 1962.

The Committee on Ways and Means is of the opinion that the result obtained under the court decisions in practice is the wrong result. It sees no reason why the home buyers in Maryland should receive smaller deductions for tax purposes with respect to payments made on their homes than is true of taxpayers elsewhere with respect to similar payments made on their homes. On the other hand, there also appears to be no justification in permitting the seller of the property in these cases to reduce the gain at the time of his sale below that which would be realized in other States merely by making use of the redeemable ground rent device available in Maryland, rather than a purchase money mortgage which generally would be used in most other States to achieve substantially the same results.

Accordingly, the pending bill, as reported by the Committee on Ways and Means, would restore the old rules and regulations of the Treasury Department. First, the code is amended to provide that annual or periodic rentals under a redeemable ground rent—except the amounts paid in redemption of this rent—are to be treated as interest paid on a mortgage indebtedness. Second, the special rules of the code dealing with gain or loss on the disposition of property are amended to treat a redeemable ground rent as a mortgage and to provide that real property held subject to liabilities under a ground rent is to be treated as being held subject to liabilities under a mortgage. Transition rules are provided to deal with those situations where homes have been sold in earlier years.

H.R. 1597 is substantially the same as a bill which was reported by the Committee on Ways and Means and unanimously passed by the House of Representatives in the 87th Congress—H.R. 8754—and the committee is unanimous in again recommending its passage. Enactment of this legislation as reported by the committee is also favored by the Treasury Department.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, this bill, H.R. 1597, will allow the home buyer to treat ground rent paid in the State of Maryland as a mortgage interest payment, and, therefore, will allow him to deduct it for tax purposes. As to the seller of the real property, the property will be treated as if sold subject to a mortgage in a face amount equal to the redemption price of the redeemable ground rent. As a result, the redeemable ground rent will be taken into account in determining his sale price for the property and will be reflected in any gain or loss recognized to him.

In the State of Maryland private homes are often sold subject to ground rents. The ground rent is an obligation by the home buyer to pay a fixed amount per year on the property. Under Maryland law, 5 years after the creation of ground rent, any holder of the property may redeem the ground rent by paying an amount computed by capitalizing the rental payment at 6 percent. From 1921 until recently, the Treasury Department treated ground rents as mortgages in every respect. As described above, the annual rents under Treasury rules and regulations were deductible as interest by the homeowner with the seller of the home including the redemption price of the ground rent in his sale price in the same manner as the face amount of a purchase money mortgage.

As a result of two court decisions, the Treasury Department, as of January 1, 1962, has taken the position that the obligation for Maryland ground rents is not the equivalent of mortgage.

The bill would reinstate the Treasury's original rule. It is only fair to accord Maryland home buyers and sellers the same treatment with respect to the so-called ground rents as home buyers and sellers in other States would receive with respect to mortgages. The bill, as amended, is substantially the same as **H.R. 8754**, which was passed by this body in the last Congress. I, therefore, urge passage of this bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill relating to the tax treatment of redeemable ground rents."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

INCOME TAX DEDUCTION FOR CHILD-CARE EXPENSES IN CASE OF WOMAN DESERTED BY HUSBAND

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H.R. 2085) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that the deduction for child-care expenses shall be available to a wife who has been deserted by and cannot locate her husband on the same basis as a single woman, which was reported favorably by the Committee on Ways and Means.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 214(c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to determination of marital status for purposes of the deduction for child care expenses) is amended by inserting "(1)" after "if" and by inserting before the period at the end thereof the following: ", or (2) she has been deserted by her husband, does not know his whereabouts (and has not known his whereabouts at any time during the taxable year), and has applied to a court of competent jurisdiction for appropriate process to compel him to pay support or otherwise to comply with the law or a judicial order, as determined under regulations of the Secretary or his delegate".

SEC. 2. The amendments made by the first section of this Act shall apply only with respect to taxable years ending after the date of the enactment of this Act.

With the following committee amendments:

On page 1, line 6, strike out "(1)" and insert in lieu thereof "(A)".

On page 1, line 7, strike out "(2)" and insert in lieu thereof "(B)".

The committee amendments were agreed to.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of H.R. 2085, as reported by the Committee on Ways and Means, is to amend the Internal Revenue Code so as to make the $600 child-care deduction available, on the same basis as for widows, to women who have been deserted by their husbands.

The provision of present law relating to the deduction of child-care expenses do not cover the type of situation dealt with under the pending bill, in that a woman who is married is required to file a joint return with her husband in order to claim this deduction. Present law also places a limitation on the deduction allowed a married couple by requiring that the maximum $600 deduction be reduced on a dollar-for-dollar basis to the extent that the joint incomes of husband and wife exceed $4,500. No comparable restriction is imposed in the case of widows or unmarried women. For purposes of this provision, a woman is not considered as married if she is legally separated from her husband under a decree of divorce or of separate maintenance.

The Committee on Ways and Means is of the opinion that where a woman has clearly been deserted by her husband, she should be eligible for the child-care expense deduction in the same manner as a widow. Under present law, a deserted wife cannot obtain this deduction because of the requirement that a married woman must file a joint return with her husband, since obviously a wife who has been deserted by and cannot locate her husband is patently precluded from filing a joint return with him. Moreover even apart from this restriction, the deduction under present law would be of limited value because of the income limitation imposed in the case of a married couple.

For the treatment provided by the pending bill to be available, a woman must not know of the husband's whereabouts nor have known of his whereabouts at any time during the taxable year, also, she must have applied to a court of competent jurisdiction to compel him to pay support or otherwise comply with the law or judicial order governing such matters.

H.R. 2085, which was introduced by our colleague on the Committee on Ways and Means, the gentleman from Pennsylvania, the Honorable WILLIAM J. GREEN, JR., is the same as a bill reported by the committee in the 87th Congress—H.R. 12470, which was passed unanimously by the House of Representatives. The committee is unanimous in again recommending enactment of this legislation.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 2085 places a woman, whose husband has deserted her, in the same category as a single woman for purposes of determining the deduction for child care. Under existing law, a married woman cannot obtain a deduction for child care unless she files a joint tax return with her husband. In such case, the deduction is reduced dollar for dollar by the amount by which the combined income of the husband and wife exceeds $4,500.

In adopting the original child-care provision in existing law, the committee did not take into account the fact that a woman who has been deserted by her husband should be, as a practical matter, in the same category as one who is divorced, or is a widow. The woman who has been deserted must normally work and provide for child care.

This bill, as amended, is the same as H.R. 12470 which was passed by the House in the last Congress. I urge your support of this bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MARKING REQUIREMENTS FOR ARTICLES IMPORTED IN CONTAINERS

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H.R. 2513) to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to require new packages of imported articles to be marked to indicate the country of origin, and for other purposes, which was unanimously reported favorably by the Committee on Ways and Means.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) the first sentence of subsection (a) of section 304 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (19 U.S.C. 1304), is amended by striking out "subsection (b)" and inserting in lieu thereof "subsection (b) or (e)".

(b) Subsection (b) of such section 304 is amended by striking out the first sentence and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "Whenever an article is excepted under subdivision (3) of subsection (a) of this section from the requirements of marking, the immediate container (if any) of such article, or such other container or containers of such article as may be prescribed by the Secretary of the Treasury, shall be marked in such manner as to indicate—

"(1) to an ultimate purchaser in the United States the English name of the country of origin of such article, and

"(2) to any person who repackages such article, that subject to penalties of law the new package must be marked as described in subdivision (1), subject to all provisions of this section, including the same exceptions as are applicable to articles under subdivision (3) of subsection (a) of this section. The Secretary of the Treasury may by regulations authorize the exception of any article from the requirements of subdivision (2) of the preceding sentence if such article is not usually repackaged before delivery to an ultimate purchaser."

(c) Such section 304 is further amended by relettering subsection (e) as subsection (f), and by inserting after subsection (d) the following new subsection:

"(e) MARKING OF NEW PACKAGES.—When any imported article the container of which is required to be marked under the provisions of subsection (b) is removed from such container by the importer, or by a jobber, distributor, dealer, retailer, or other persons, and offered for sale, or used as the container for other goods offered for sale, or repackaged, and offered for sale in the new package, such article, container, or new package shall be marked in such manner as to indicate to the ultimate purchaser in the United States the English name of the country of origin of such article. This subsection shall not apply in cases where the Secretary of the Treasury finds that compliance with the marking requirements of this subsection would necessitate such substantial changes in customary trade practices as to cause undue hardship and that repackaging of the article in question is otherwise than for the purpose of concealing the origin of such article. Subsection (d) of this section shall not apply in respect of the marking requirements of this subsection unless the articles are repackaged before release from customs custody."

(d) Subsection (f) (as relettered by subsection (c) of this section) of such section 304 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentences: "Any person who violates subsection (e) shall, upon conviction, be fined not more than $5,000 or imprisoned not more than one year, or both. Any article offered for sale [by the person repacking such article] in violation of subsection (e) shall be subject to seizure and forfeitures under this subsection shall be that the duties with respect to seizures and forfeitures under this subsection shall be performed by such officers, agents, or other persons as may be authorized or designated for that purpose by the Secretary of the Treasury."

SEC. 2. The amendments made by the first section of this Act shall apply only with respect to articles entered for consumption or withdrawn from warehouse for consumption on or after the sixtieth day following the date of the enactment of this Act.

With the following committee amendments:

On page 2, line 10, strike out "subdivsion" and insert: "subdivision".

On page 2, line 21, strike out "PACKAGES." and insert: "PACKAGES, ETC.—".

On page 2, beginning in line 25, strike out "persons" and all that follows down through "package" in line 3 on page 3 and insert: "person, and offered for sale for use as (or used as) the container for other goods offered for sale, or repackaged and offered for sale in the new package, such container or new package".

On page 3, line 10, strike out "and that repackaging of the article in question" and insert: "and, when the article is repackaged, that the repackaging".

On page 3, lines 18 and 19, strike out "Any person who violates subsection (e)" and insert: "Any person who, with intent to conceal the country of origin of any article, violates any provision of subsection (e) with respect to such article".

On page 3, lines 21 and 22, strike out "Any article offered for sale [by the person repacking such article] in violation of subsection (e)" and insert: "Where any container or package which is required to be marked in accordance with subsection (e) is not so marked, such container or package and the contents of such container or package".

The committee amendments were agreed to.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, the bill H.R. 2513, which was introduced by our colleague on the Committee on Ways and Means, the gentleman from Florida, the Honorable A. S. HERLONG, JR., would amend section 304 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, with respect to the marking requirements in the case of articles which are imported in containers required to be marked to show country or origin.

It is the purpose of the bill—

First, to provide, when such articles are repackaged in the United States and offered for sale, that the new packages be marked to show the country of origin of their contents;

Second, to require that the containers in which such articles are imported be marked—in addition to the country-of-origin marking—to indicate to any person who repackages such articles that subject to penalties of law the new packages must be marked to indicate to an ultimate purchaser the country of origin of their contents; and

Third, to require, when such articles are sold for use as—or used as—containers for other goods offered for sale, that such containers be marked to indicate to an ultimate purchaser of the goods offered for sale in such containers the country of origin of such containers.

The report of the committee spells out in more detail the specific background which gave rise to this bill, as well as a more detailed description of the manner in which it will apply. The committee was of the opinion that the bill is necessary and that the amendments which would be made by it will strengthen the marking requirements contained in the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended.

This bill is similar to the bill which was reported by the Committee on Ways and Means in the last Congress and which passed the House unanimously, except for certain changes which expand the bill in some degree. The report makes clear these additional amendments. The Committee on Ways and Means is unanimous in recommending enactment of H.R. 2513.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the bill H.R. 2513 would amend the customs provision of the Tariff Act of 1930 so as to protect the American public by requiring more adequate marking of repackaged imported articles.

Information has been presented to the Committee on Ways and Means that articles imported into the United States and repackaged often are not designated as imported on the new package. The repackaging process results in the deletion of the designation of the country of origin. The failure to include the country of origin on a package often results in the conclusion that the contents therein are of American origin. The failure to reveal the source of an article results in the failure of a potential American purchaser to be fully informed prior to the time he makes a purchase.

H.R. 2513 would make three substantive changes in existing law to correct this problem. First, it would be required that articles removed from a container be marked to show the country of origin on the repackaging. Second, containers for articles for export to the United States must be marked to indicate that in the event of repackaging, such repackaging must contain the designation of the country of origin. Third, when such articles are themselves used as containers, they must be marked so as to indicate the country of origin. Moreover, there is a penalty provision for failure to comply with these marking requirements with intent to conceal the country of origin.

It was the view of the committee in unanimously approving this legislation that the provisions of H.R. 2513 would further serve to protect the consumer by informing him as to the origin of articles he may purchase. This bill would aid in the fulfillment of the basic purpose of existing marking requirements as presently contained in the law, and I therefore urge its favorable consideration.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. HERLONG] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. HERLONG. Mr. Speaker, our distinguished chairman of the committee has described the overall purposes of H.R. 2513. I would simply like to add a few words concerning this legislation.

The Committee on Ways and Means has been advised that practices have developed under existing law under which articles, imported in containers marked to show the country of origin, are removed from the containers and then either first, repackaged and sold without noting on the new packages the country of origin of the contents or the fact that the same are of foreign origin, or second, sold for use or used as containers for other goods offered for sale without marking such containers to show their country of origin. Understandably, these practices have created confusion in the minds of certain purchasers as to the origin of the articles inside the new packages or as to the origin of the containers. In some cases, the absence of any indication of foreign origin has caused purchasers to assume that the package or container and the contents were of American origin. Thus, one of the purposes of our marking laws—namely, to give the purchaser information as to country of origin—is thwarted in these cases.

Subsection (b) of section 304, as amended by the bill, would continue without change the existing requirement that the immediate container—if any—or such other container or containers as may be prescribed by the Secretary of the Treasury, of any article excepted from the marking requirements by subdivision (3) of section 304(a), be marked in such a manner as to indicate to an ultimate purchaser in the United States the English name of the country of origin of such article. The bill would add a requirement that any such container or containers shall also be marked in such manner as to indicate to any person who repackages such article that, subject to penalties of law, the new package must be marked to indicate to an ultimate purchaser the English name of the country of origin of its contents. The marking requirements of subsection (b), as amended by the bill, are subject to all the provisions of section 304, including the same exceptions as are applicable to articles under section 304(a)(3). With respect to the requirement that the containers of certain imported articles must be marked to indicate to any person who repackages such articles that the new package must be marked to show the English name of the country of origin of its contents, the bill authorizes the Secretary of the Treasury to except any article from this requirement if such article is not usually repackaged before delivery to an ultimate purchaser.

A new subsection (e) would be added by the bill to section 304 of the Tariff Act. The new subsection applies with respect to imported articles the containers of which are required to be marked to show the country of origin of such articles. When such an article is removed from such a container and either first, is offered for sale for use as—or used as—the container for other goods offered for sale, or second, is repackaged and offered for sale in the new package, new subsection (e) requires the container—the imported article—or the new package to be marked in such manner as to indicate to the ultimate purchaser in the United States the English name of the country of origin of the imported article. The new subsection would not apply in cases where the Secretary of the Treasury finds first, that compliance with the marking requirements of the subsection would necessitate such substantial changes in customary trade practices as to cause undue hardship, and second, when the article is repackaged, that the repackaging is otherwise than for the purpose of concealing the origin of the article.

Mr. Speaker, the bill contains other provisions which include certain safeguards with respect to the operation of the basic provisions of the bill.

Without any intention to be all inclusive, the following are examples of the types of situations which would be covered by the basic provisions of the bill: repackaging of woodscrews that are brought into the United States in bulk containers; repackaging of tomatoes which are brought into the United States in bulk containers; the importation of glass containers in bulk where such containers are sold for use as, or used as, containers for other goods offered for sale, such as Coca-Cola bottles.

Mr. Speaker, this is not a new subject, as has been indicated by the statement of our distinguished chairman, since a similar bill passed the House of Representatives by unanimous consent last year, and a bill on this subject also passed the House of Representatives in the 86th Congress. I believe this legislation will serve a good purpose.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FREE IMPORTATION OF WILD BIRDS AND WILD ANIMALS

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H.R. 1839) to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to provide for the free importation of wild animals and wild birds which are intended for exhibition in the United States.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I should like to ask the gentleman whether this provides for the importation of any wild bovine or wild hog meat since the bill deals with wild animals.

I ask this question because in 1962 there was imported into this country a record of 1,700 million pounds of dressed meat. I am told that this displaced the consumption of some 500 million bushels of corn necessary to feed out the beef, mutton, lamb, ham, pork, and other meat products representing these imports. Do I understand that this does not permit further importation of edible meats?

Mr. MILLS. It does not. This applies only to the importation of wild animals and wild birds such as are imported specifically for exhibit, or for sale for exhibit, in zoos and places of that sort. It could not be used for the purpose the gentleman mentions.

Mr. GROSS. Would the gentleman think it is a highly contradictory position for the House to pass a trade expansion act which permits this heavy inflow of dressed and edible meats and at the same time subsidize the farmers who produce corn, and then these farmers not be able to feed half a billion bushels of surplus corn to meat animals in this country? Would the gentleman think there was something highly contradictory about this kind of situation?

Mr. MILLS. The gentleman from Iowa is well aware of the statements made in connection with the presentation of the Trade Expansion Act, and he is well aware that there is nothing in the legislation itself that causes tariffs to be reduced.

We were giving the President the authority in connection with other countries of the free world to enter into trade agreements if they were willing and it was possible to accomplish that purpose of mutual lowering of duties. We were not saying to him that he reduce the duty with respect to any meat products, and the gentleman knows the procedure that is available under that act for hearing and discussion on any article that may be selected for purposes of the lower duty consideration.

I would like to point out to the gentleman if he would yield further——

Mr. GROSS. I am glad to yield.

Mr. MILLS. That he is aware, I am sure, of the fact that the duty on Polish ham, for instance, has never been the subject matter of a trade agreement during all the history of the trade agreements program—I repeat, during all the history of the trade agreements program—so that the hams that may come in in competition with those fine hams that are produced here in the United States come in under the rate of duty that has been in effect since 1930.

Mr. GROSS. The able chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, the committee which handles the legislation dealing with tariffs, could be of immeasurable help to the gentleman from Iowa if he would give him some help toward imposing tariffs that would shut off at least a substantial part of these meat imports from foreign countries so that we would not be confronted with the situation of paying subsidies to the farmers who are unable to feed

500 million bushels of corn because the equivalent in meat products have been supplied by foreign farmers.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That paragraph 1607(b) of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1201, par. 1607(b)) is amended to read as follows:

"(b) Wild animals and wild birds imported specially for exhibition, whether intended to be used by the importer or for sale for such purpose."

SEC. 2. The amendment made by the first section of this Act shall take effect on the tenth day following the date of the enactment of this Act.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of H.R. 1839, which was introduced by our colleague the Honorable CHARLES M. TEAGUE, of California, is to amend paragraph 1607(b) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, to permit the free importation of wild birds and wild animals imported specially for exhibition, whether intended to be used by the importer or for sale for such purpose.

At the present time, paragraph 1607 (b) of the Tariff Act of 1930 permits the free importation of wild animals and birds intended for exhibition in zoological collections for educational or scientific purposes, and not for sale or profit. The pending bill would extend this duty-free treatment to wild animals and wild birds imported by any importer for exhibition for any purpose and also such animals and birds imported by a person or firm who in turn would sell the animals or birds for ultimate use in exhibitions for any purpose.

Wild animals which would most likely be imported under the provisions of paragraph 1607(b), as amended by this bill, would include monkeys, elephants, leopards, lions, and snakes. Wild birds which most likely would be imported would consist principally of plumage birds, such as ostriches, parrots, flamingoes, and so forth.

In the light of the noncompetitive character of the imports in question, the Committee on Ways and Means is of the opinion that all animal and bird exhibitors should be able to purchase directly or from dealers those live specimens which they believe enhance the quality of their exhibitions without having to pay import duties directly or indirectly on such specimens. The bill would also serve to eliminate certain customs procedures which surround dutiable importations, and thereby would permit rapid customs clearance of specimens which could be damaged by delayed customs clearance.

H R. 1839 is identical to a bill reported by your committee and unanimously passed by the House of Representatives in the 87th Congress—H.R. 7678—and the Committee on Ways and Means is unanimous in again recommending enactment of this legislation.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 1839 would amend the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, so as to permit the free importation of wild birds and wild animals imported for exhibition whether intended to be used by the importer or to be sold by him for exhibition purposes.

Present law now authorizes the free importation of wild animals and birds that are to be exhibited in zoological collections for educational or scientific purposes provided they are not intended for sale or profit. The bill would extend the duty-free treatment to such animals and birds imported by an importer for exhibition for any purpose as well as animals and birds imported by an individual who in turn would sell the animals and birds for exhibition purposes.

The animals and birds to be imported under this legislation would essentially be of a noncompetitive character with anything available domestically. In addition, the bill would eliminate certain custom procedures which make the importation of such animals and birds a difficult practice.

This legislation, which was cosponsored by our distinguished colleagues, the gentlemen from California [Mr. UTT and Mr. TEAGUE], in the 87th Congress, was unanimously passed by this body in that Congress. The present bill is identical to that legislation, and I, therefore, urge its enactment.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TEMPORARY SUSPENSION OF DUTIES ON CORKBOARD INSULATION AND ON CORK STOPPERS

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H.R. 2053) to provide for the temporary suspension of the duty on corkboard insulation and on cork stoppers, which was unanimously reported favorably by the Committee on Ways and Means.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may I ask the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means whether it is necessary to import cork for stoppers in flasks and other such devices? The report does not say whether these are water or liquor glasses. Cannot stoppers for flasks be made in this country?

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, the domestic industry is the one asking for this particular legislation, because the cork insulation and cork stoppers dealt with in this bill are no longer produced in the United States. This is a request from the industry itself.

Mr. GROSS. I do not doubt that, and I am sure the gentleman is aware of the rash of bills introduced in this session of Congress that are going to his committee, many of them in the nature of special privilege, to protect certain industries in this country against the inroads of foreign imports due to low tariffs. So that I am not surprised that an industry would want treatment of this kind.

Mr. MILLS. This is the industry that produces these articles here in the United States. The gentleman knows that cork itself is not produced in the United States but is imported from abroad.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, effective with respect to articles entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption, during the three-year period beginning on the day after the date of the enactment of this Act, and with respect to articles covered by entries the liquidation of which has not become final on the date of enactment by virtue of the provisions of section 514 of the Tariff Act of 1930, no duty shall be imposed upon articles described in paragraph 1511 of the Tariff Act of 1930 as—

(1) "cork insulation, wholly or in chief value of cork, cork waste, or granulated or ground cork, in blocks, slabs, boards, or planks";

(2) "stoppers, over three-fourths of one inch in diameter, measured at the larger end, wholly or in chief value of natural cork bark"; or

(3) "stoppers, three-fourths of one inch or less in diameter, measured at the larger end, wholly or in chief value of natural cork bark".

With the following committee amendment: Page 2, line 5, after the semicolon, insert "or".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of H.R. 2053, which was introduced by our colleague on the Committee on Ways and Means, the Honorable HERMAN SCHNEEBELI, of Pennsylvania, is to suspend for a 3-year period the duties imposed under paragraph 1511 of the Tariff Act of 1930 on cork insulation and certain cork stoppers.

The Committee on Ways and Means has been informed that cork insulation and cork stoppers dealt with in the pending bill are no longer produced in the United States. In fact, the former domestic producers of these products support this legislative proposal to temporarily suspend the duties on these products.

Cork insulation is a material particularly suitable for low-temperature applications, such as cold storage rooms, refrigerator cars and trucks, refrigerated warehouses, ice cream hardening rooms, fur storage vaults, and so forth. After cutting and fitting, cork insulation is also used for pipe coverings in U.S. Navy vessels, for ammunition plugs for guns on naval cruisers, and other slow-fire ammunition used by the Navy.

Cork stoppers are cylinders of cork which are used for closing the apertures of bottles, jars, flasks, and similar containers.

The pending bill will be effective with respect to articles entered or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption, during the 3-year period beginning on the date after the date of enactment, and also with respect to articles covered by entries the liquidation of which has not become final on the date of enactment by virtue of the provisions of section 514 of the Tariff Act of 1930.

The bill is similar to a bill—H.R. 12213—which was reported by the Committee on Ways and Means and unanimously passed by the House of Representatives in the 87th Congress, on which favorable reports were received by the committee from the Departments of State, Treasury, Commerce, and Labor. The Committee on Ways and Means is unanimous in recommending enactment of this bill.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the bill H.R. 2053 would temporarily suspend for a 3-year period the duties imposed on cork insulation and certain cork stoppers under the Tariff Act of 1930. Cork insulation and stoppers have a variety of domestic uses, including use by our Navy with respect to naval guns and ammunition. It is my understanding that similar materials are no longer produced in the United States and that former domestic producers are supporting this legislation. This bill was unanimously passed by this body in the last Congress and I strongly urge that we again act favorably upon it.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DUTY TREATMENT OF CERTAIN BREAD AND TARIFF TREATMENT OF CERTAIN ELECTRON MICROSCOPES

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, it has been our purpose to call up two additional bills, H.R. 370 and H.R. 2874, both of which passed the House by unanimous consent in the last session; but because the chairman has been notified by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. Reuss] that he would object to H.R. 370 being called up today, that bill will not be called up; and because the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. Sibal] has advised the chairman he would object to H.R. 2874 if it is called up, that bill likewise will not be called up by unanimous consent at this time.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLS. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Why should not those bills be called up today?

Mr. MILLS. Because the present chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, as the gentleman from Iowa knows, has on numerous occasions in the past, where any Member of the House notified him ahead of time he would have to object to one of these bills being called up, has refrained from calling the bills up for unanimous-consent passage and has made the statement that the chairman has made today.

Mr. GROSS. Well, is this because the sponsor or the author of the bill is not present?

Mr. MILLS. That has nothing to do with it.

Mr. GROSS. Then, what is the reason?

Mr. MILLS. I do this to be considerate of Members. It is not necessary for the individual Member even to be present, in cases where he has notified me that he finds the bill objectionable at this point. It is merely for the purpose of trying to be considerate of the Members of the House.

Mr. GROSS. Is there something going on today that obstructs the business of the House?

Mr. MILLS. No. If the gentleman from Iowa would suggest to me in any way, in connection with any bill that was voted out of the committee by unanimous consent, that he had some question about it, some reservation, and that if I called it up today, for unanimous-consent passage, he would have to object to it today, then I would agree with the gentleman that I would not call it up. It would not even be necessary for the gentleman to make his objection to the bill under those circumstances.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, if he is offering me this privilege and opportunity, let me say to him that I will object every day to bringing up bills providing for an increase in the debt ceiling or a continuation of the Trade Expansion Act.

Mr. MILLS. I may assure the gentleman that I will not undertake to do that by unanimous consent.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLS. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I will say to the chairman of the committee and the gentleman from Iowa that what the chairman of the committee in this instance is doing is perfectly proper. This is a Consent Calendar operation. How silly it would be to call up bills that he knows would be objected to.

Mr. GROSS. Why not? Let us dispose of them.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Arkansas has expired.

REPORT ON MISSISSIPPI

Mr. DIGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record and include the text of a report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. DIGGS. Mr. Speaker, a Mississippi Advisory Committee has just submitted to the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights "Report on Mississippi," dated January 1963. This is a summary of documented cases and findings concerning legal developments in the State of Mississippi constituting a denial to Negro citizens of equal protection of the laws under the Constitution.

Mr. Speaker, I want to call this report to the attention of the U.S. Congress. I hope that through the reprinting of this full summary report in the Congressional Record, it will come to the attention of citizens of this country everywhere. It remains fearfully true that good men of good nations lose themselves their freedom, their liberties, opportunities, dignity, and all they hold sacred as they stand silent in the face of great evils suppressing and violating the rights of some.

In its preface to this report, the Advisory Committee has this to say:

> All of us are Mississippians and some of us have lived all our lives in Mississippi. Yet the extent and the manner of apparent denials of equal protection of the law on the basis of color, as revealed in these meetings, has been a profound shock to us. We are alarmed at the direction our society seems to be taking, and we believe that the overwhelming majority of Mississippians will share this alarm as the facts become known to them.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that the overwhelming majority of all the membership of the U.S. Congress and the overwhelming majority of all the citizens of this Nation will share this alarm as the facts become known to them and they will respond to a national emergency as perilous to the safety of this Nation as a new Pearl Harbor or Cuban missile buildup.

This is a shocking report of brutalities and terror of Nazi regime type. I have had occasion to read other official Government reports on Mississippi which make the Advisory Committee's summary I wish to place on the Record a pale tale in contrast. Yet no one can read this report without full realization that there exists in the United States of America a full-scale regime of legally sanctioned police terror, violence, and oppression.

Not even those of Mississippi who perpetrate this regime can obscure this report by the usual charge that these are the exaggerated tales of troublemaking outsiders from the North. The Mississippi Advisory Committee which submitted "Report on Mississippi" is one of the 51 committees established in every State and the District of Columbia by the Civil Rights Commission pursuant to section 105(c) of the Civil Rights Act of 1957. It is composed of Mississippians, people living in that State—"interested citizens of standing who serve without compensation." Those persons making up the nine member Advisory Committee are:

Mrs. Wallis I. Schutt, chairman, Jackson, Miss., vice president, Mississippi Church Women; secretary, Mississippi Council on Human Relations, member, various church organizations and of various women's organizations.

Dr. James Lucius Allen, vice chairman, Columbus, Miss., pharmacist; trustee, Okolona Episcopal College; vice president, Security Life Insurance Co.; director, Tri-State Bank of Memphis, Tenn.

Dr. A. D. Beittel, secretary, Tougaloo, Miss., educator and president of Tougaloo Southern Christian College; chairman, Mississippi Council on Human Relations; national secretary, united Negro college fund, former president, Talladega College, 1945–52; and former chairman, the Alabama division, Southern Regional Council, 1945–52.

Adm. Robert P. Briscoe, Liberty, Miss., retired naval officer; former NATO Commander of Southeastern Europe.

Dr. Albert B. Britton, Jackson, Miss., physician; member, board of directors of the YMCA; secretary, the legislative assembly of Mississippi's Medical and Surgical Association.

Very Rev. Robert C. Hunter, Bay St. Louis, Miss.; Catholic clergyman; provincial superior of the Society of the Divine World, directing southern province—Arkansas, Louisiana, Mississippi, and Texas; director of southern province, 1958–62; director of eastern province, 1946–55; high school principal, 1955–58; teacher and prefect of studies, 1933–38.

Rev. Thomas E. Johnson, Jackson, Miss., missionary with the American Sunday School Union, working with Negro people in the State of Mississippi; member, Mississippi Psychological Association.

Rev. Charlemagne P. Payne, Sr., Jackson, Miss., Methodist minister; member, Mississippi Conference, 1943–61; chairman, Conference Board of Missions of Board of Ministerial Training; delegate and member, executive committee of the Human Relations Conference, 1959.

Dr. George E. Powers, Pass Christian, Miss., dentist; secretary-treasurer of the Gulfport, Miss., Dental Society, 1957–59.

Of the nine members of the Mississippi Advisory Committee, one is a Negro citizen.

Mr. Speaker, I present what this committee reports:

REPORT ON MISSISSIPPI

PREFACE

This report was submitted to the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights by the Mississippi Advisory Committee. The Mississippi committee is 1 of the 51 committees established in every State and the District of Columbia by the Commission pursuant to section 105(c) of the Civil Rights Act of 1957. Its membership consists of interested citizens of standing who serve without compensation. Among the functions and responsibilities of the State Advisory Committee, under their mandate from the Commission on Civil Rights, are the following: (1) To advise the Commission of all information concerning legal developments constituting a denial of equal protection of the laws under the Constitution; and (2) to advise the Commission upon matters of mutual concern in the preparation of its final report. The Commission, in turn, has been charged by the Congress to investigate allegations, made in writing and under oath, that citizens are being deprived of the right to vote by reason of color, race, religion, or national origin; to study and collect information regarding legal developments constituting a denial of equal protection of the laws; to appraise Federal laws and policies with respect to equal protection; and to report to the President and to the Congress its activities, findings, and recommendations.

REPORT OF THE MISSISSIPPI ADVISORY COMMITTEE TO THE U.S. COMMISSION ON CIVIL RIGHTS

This is a summary report of the activities of the Mississippi Advisory Committee to the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights during the 14-month period ending in January 1963. The Advisory Committee held six open meetings in this period, in Jackson, Greenville, Clarksdale, and Meridian, and received approximately 150 complaints of alleged denial of equal protection of the law.

The procedure followed by the Committee in holding open meetings may briefly be described as follows: A public announcement was made of our intention to hold a meeting, and the press and the public were invited to attend. Persons desiring to submit pertinent information or complaints were invited to appear. The Committee has been gratified by the response of many of the citizens of the State to these meetings. Attendance increased with nearly every meeting and as many as 29 persons have testified at a single meeting. In some instances, citizens were unwilling to voice their complaints in open session because they feared violent reprisals. Such complainants were heard in executive session. Whenever the Committee had an indication that certain law enforcement agencies or officials were to be involved in a complaint, advance notice was sent to such agencies or officials together wtih an invitation to participate. Although we usually received no response to these invitations, sheriffs have occasionally attended meetings as spectators, though declining to participate. The press has usually been in attendance and has, on the whole, reported our proceedings fairly and objectively.

Our purpose in holding open meetings was to collect factual information regarding possible denials of equal protection of the law in Mississippi. We believe this purpose has been accomplished to the extent that we have established beyond doubt that a formal inquiry into alleged civil rights denials in this State is an urgent necessity. We have also been able to forward to the Commission specific complaints which involved infractions of existing Federal statutes.

All of us are Mississippians and some of us have lived all our lives in Mississippi. Yet the extent and the manner of apparent denials of equal protection of the law on the basis of color, as revealed in these meetings, has been a profound shock to us. We are alarmed at the direction our society seems to be taking, and we believe that the overwhelming majority of Mississippians will share this alarm as the facts become known to them. It is our hope that the open meetings have been useful in making these facts known.

The Committee regrets to report that its factfinding efforts were actively opposed by agents and instrumentalities of the State government. It might be assumed that equal protection of the laws, particularly as it applies to the administration of justice, is such an intrinsic part of the American system, or of any true democracy, that officials would be eager to demonstrate their respect for this basic concept. Unfortunately, such is not the case at this time in Mississippi. State officials advised other officials and private individuals who were questioned by the Committee in 1961 to refuse to provide information. In 1960, the Mississippi Legislature passed an act designed, we believe, to intimidate persons who might wish to assert their rights as citizens by appearing before this Committee. This act alters the requirements of proof for prosecutions of perjury solely in cases where the defendant has testified before this Committee, Commission on Civil Rights, the FBI, or another U.S. agency on the subject of deprivation of rights guaranteed by the Constitution of the United States or of Mississippi.[1] The act contains the following remarkable wording:

"Corroboration or proof by more than one witness to establish the falsity of testimony or statements under oath is not required in prosecutions under this act. It shall not be necessary to prove, to sustain, or charge under this act, that the oath or matter sworn to was material, or, if before an executive, legislative, or judicial tribunal committee or commission had jurisdiction." (The full text of the act, enacted as secs. 2155.4–2155.6 of the Mississippi Code, is appended to this report.)

The Committee has also learned, in at least one case, of the intimidation of a witness who appeared before us.

The Committee's investigations have indicated that in all important areas of citizenship, a Negro in Mississippi receives substantially less than his due consideration as an American and as a Mississippian. This denial extends from the time he is denied the right to be born in a nonsegregated hospital, through his segregated and inferior school years and his productive years when jobs for which he can qualify are refused, to the day he dies and is laid to rest in a cemetery for Negroes only. This Committee could have chosen to concentrate on any aspect of discrimination and found a plethora of examples of denial of equal protection of the law. This includes the denial of the fundamental right to vote and have that vote counted in elections. Sixty-five sworn voting complaints from 13 Mississippi counties have been received by the Commission. This is third highest in the Nation.[2]

In spite of the seriousness of the inequities in these areas of citizenship, this report is concerned with another subject which recurred constantly in the testimony at our meetings. It is a subject that has implications even more damaging to the principles of the American way of life than denial of the right to vote. That subject is police brutality. The following incidents are illustrative of the alarming number of complaints on this subject received by this Committee.

A word of caution and explanation is in order. In view of its lack of adjudicative power, the Committee was at first hesitant to delve too deeply into this sensitive area. Our Committee can offer no relief to individual complainants and is not in a position to make final determinations regarding the validity of the complaints it receives. Yet, it soon became apparent that no conscientious group that is concerned with constitutional rights could ignore the innumerable charges of police mistreatment in our State. The complaints are too numerous; too many of them are made under oath; too many complainants have corroborative evidence; and only too rarely have we seen any indication that the State is eager or even willing to punish those who, in its name, engage in the terrorization of the innocent and the defenseless.

We name no names in this report, and reach no final conclusions in individual cases. We do, however, believe that a pattern exists in our State that leads to the denial of constitutional rights and, in some instances, to brutality and terror. From the moment a Negro adult is hailed as "boy" or "girl" by a police officer, through his arrest, detention, trial—during which his Negro lawyer is treated with contemptuous familiarity by the judge and other officers of the court—and eventual imprisonment, he is treated with a pernicious difference. This difference is incompatible with Christian ideals about the dignity of man and with the principles of Anglo-Saxon criminal law.

How often this atmosphere produces actual terror and brutality is a question that demands further investigation. We feel strongly that we have probable cause to believe that police brutality is a continuing problem in at least certain sections of our State, and that a formal investigation into this problem must be undertaken. The cases that follow give some indication of the severity of the problem. The names, places and dates have been omitted to protect the witnesses. All incidents reportedly occurred in Mississippi in the last three years. Unless otherwise indicated, all of the statements that are included in this report were made under oath.

---

[1] The ordinary rule of perjury in Mississippi is that conviction of perjury is not sustained by the uncorroborated evidence of a single witness (*Lee* v. *State*, 105 Miss. 539, 62 So. 360 (1913)).

[2] The voting problem remains serious in the State. Activity by the Justice Department in Mississippi promises some slow relief in counties where suits have been initiated. Yet the State Government continues to erect all possible barriers to equal access to the franchise by our Negro citizens. In 1962, the Mississippi Legislature enacted a new law requiring the publication of the names and addresses of all new voting registrants for 2 weeks in a newspaper of general circulation. This law is ostensibly designed to facilitate challenges of registrants on moral grounds. In fact, it can be used to facilitate reprisals against Negroes who seek to register.

Example A: A Negro boy

"On * * * at approximately 11:40 p.m., I along with several other Negro boys of my community were walking along highway * * * in * * * when someone on the opposite side of the street started throwing rocks at a carload of white people.

"About 10 minutes later a police car with two policemen in it pulled up near us and started shooting; my friend and I did not know what had happened so we started running toward our homes on * * * Street; one policeman came behind the house where we were and hit my friend; at that time he did not hit me; he then told us to 'get in the car' and drove down to a short street where he stopped the car and told us 'get out' and asked the other policemen 'should I put the dog on them?' He replied 'yes' at that time the dog, which they called 'Rex' was sicked on us; we were cursed and told to 'run.' We then ran back to * * * Street; I ran up on my porch where the dog 'Rex' caught me, the officer then grabbed the dog, while I was being put in the police car and asked 'do you belong to CORE, or the NAACP' to which I replied 'no,' and the officer then called me a 'liar' and asked me if 'I had attended their meetings' and I told him 'I had attended some of them.'

"At that time my mother came out on the porch and asked 'if the dog had bitten my son' and the policeman said 'no, and get back in the house,' and asked 'what has he done' when the policemen did curse and told her 'none of your * * * business. * * * I've been looking for him for 3 months.'

"Following that they drove to the home of a friend of mine on * * * Street, where they told my friend's father to 'bring your son to the jail when he comes home.'

"I was then taken to the city jail, questioned, and cursed; at that time I was asked to identify a friend of mine, which I did; I was then questioned again and taken up to the second floor where my belongings were taken and the jailer then placed me in a cell.

"I was held in jail from 12:30 a.m. until 4 p.m., when I was released after my parents paid $100; I was charged with 'mischief.'

"Although I did see someone throw at a car, I do not know why police brutality was taken out on me. I would like an investigation into this matter, because my mother was also taken to jail and charged with 'interfering with the law' and had to pay a fine of $25. Please help me."

Example B: A Negro woman

The following incident was not received under oath. The account is based on recorded testimony at one of the open meetings.

A 53-year old Negro woman told the committee that she had been arrested on the street after walking home with a female visitor. The police gave no reason for forcing her into their car. When they stopped the car to check a disturbance in the neighborhood, the alleged victim got out of the car and continued on her way home. The police again apprehended her and put her back in the police car. One of the police then allegedly hit her in the face with his fist causing her eye trouble for which she is still under treatment. She was kept in jail overnight and released.

Example C: A Negro boy

This incident was related to the Advisory Committee on behalf of the complainant by one of his teachers. The complainant permitted the teacher to appear for him, but would not come forward in public himself because of fear of retaliation upon himself and his family. The incident was told as follows:

"On * * * about 10 o'clock in the evening, four male students and another young man who lives in the community were returning from * * * to * * * by car. When they turned from the highway into the road leading to * * * they saw a car parked near the railroad track which appeared to be a car belonging to a police officer.

"On the short stretch of road between * * * and * * * the car was stopped by the police car in which were two men presumably deputy sheriffs. The driver of the car containing the students got out immediately and went to the car of the deputy sheriffs.

"Asked by one of the men whether he had been drinking, the student answered no. Asked whether he was a freedom rider, he said he was not. All five occupants of the car were lined up and frisked by the two deputy sheriffs.

"The driver of the car was asked to produce his driver's license. When he did so, neither deputy sheriff seemed interested in seeing it.

"Without provocation, one of the deputies hit and kicked the driver of the car. The other deputy drew his gun and threatened to blow his brains out.

"One of the deputies then told the driver of the car that he was under arrest, put handcuffs on him, and let the rest of the occupants go.

"On the way to the sheriff's office, one of the deputies talked about his intense hatred for Negroes, saying they were being ruined by white people from the North. The student was promised a good deal of abuse on the way to * * *.

"When they reached the sheriff's office, the deputy in the office was told by the other deputies that the student was a prizefighter. The handcuffs were removed and the student was told to put up his fists for fighting. He did not do this. He said he was not a boxer.

"Then all three of the deputies beat him on the arms and head with blackjacks. They aimed to hit him on the head but he warded off as many blows as possible with his arms. This violence continued for 8 or 10 minutes, interrupted with snatches of conversation among the deputies.

"The student was taken to the office of the jailer who was asked whether he had a cell that would hold a boxer. The jailer gave him a blow which knocked him against the wall. The jailer examined his wallet carefully, took it from the student, and threw him into the cell insisting that he was a freedom rider.

"On the docket that evening, he was charged with drunken driving. This charge was changed to reckless driving the next morning.

"The student's parents paid $45 to have the young man released. The student does not know how this amount is divided between fine and cost."

The teacher then described his activity on behalf of the students.

"Later, I went to the office of the sheriff of * * * to inquire about this case. I discovered that the deputies who made the arrest were * * *.

"According to the records in the sheriff's office, the case was disposed of by a justice of the peace, named * * *.

"The sheriff was not available when I called at the sheriff's office so I talked with officer X. Officer X told me that the student was charged with reckless driving and resisting arrest. He told me that he was charged $45, but * * * was not able to tell me how much of this was fine and how much costs.

"Apparently no formal hearing was held before the justice of the peace. The student did not see the justice of the peace nor go to his office at any time. His parents went to the office of the justice of the peace, paid $45, and arranged for the release of their son.

"I called at the office of the justice of the peace, who was not in at the time I called. I talked with his secretary who told me that the charges had been originally reckless driving, drinking, and resisting arrest. The secretary informed me that the drinking charge was dismissed and the student was charged simply with reckless driving and resisting arrest. I asked for a breakdown of the $45 between costs and fine and the secretary was unable to give me this.

"After getting information from officer X concerning the officers who made the arrest, I asked officer X how much violence deputy sheriffs were permitted to use against a person when they were bringing them to the sheriff's office. He was obviously not pleased with the question, and told me quickly that they could use as much violence as necessary by cracking the prisoner on the head or killing him if necessary if any resistance is offered."

Example D: A Negro woman

"On * * * at approximately 1:30 a.m., a policeman in * * * stopped the car in which I was riding; he asked the driver of the car to get out and also, 'what have you been drinking?' the driver replied 'beer' after which they went around to the back of the car and talked.

"The policeman then returned to the car, told me to 'open your purse' and I did not do so, and he then repeated 'open your purse' then I handed it to him, and he threw it back in the car to me, and then told me to get in the police car.

"When I asked him 'what are the charges?', he replied, 'for being a nigger.'

"The other lady in the car and I were taken to jail, and on the way she asked the policeman 'may I make a phone call?' He replied, 'Shut up, before I knock you out.'

"After arriving at the jail, we went upstairs, the jailer asked me my name, and I replied * * * and the same policeman who had arrested me, slapped me, knocked me down and kicked me twice, which caused me to tussle with him."

Example E: A Negro man

"On * * * about 11:30 a.m., I * * * was trailed about 3 miles by a highway patrolman, immediately after leaving. Knowing that I was being followed, I took extreme caution in my driving.

"When the officer decided to stop me he blew his siren, and I pulled to the side of the road and stopped.

"At this point the officer got out of his car, walked to the rear of my car and demanded that my friend remain in the car and I come to the rear. When I approached the officer he asked me for my license. As I began looking through my belongings for my license, I asked the officer what were the charges. The officer replied 'nigger you keep your damn mouth shut, I'll ask the questions.' At which time the officer raised his blackjack and began hitting me on the head and the shoulders. In an attempt to protect myself from him I threw my arms up. The officer still trying to hit me on the head demanded that 'you move them damn arms boy,' 'move them god-damn-it.'

"Because I did not move my arms from around my head, the officer drew his gun and declared 'damn you, nigger, I'm going to kill you.' I begged him not to shoot me and he told me to 'shut up nigger' and hit me, with his gun on me, declared 'I will make you move them arms nigger, put your arms out here' at which time he handcuffed me, and hit me several more times, pushed me to the side of his car, opened the door, pushed me in, hit me on the head and told me to 'sit there you black b * * * and shut up.' The officer then walked over to my car, where my friend was sitting. With his pistol in his hand, he pulled the door open and demanded that he get out and get in the car. When the officer got in his car, I informed him that I had dropped my wallet, and asked him could I get it. At that moment, again he began hitting me as he was saying, 'I thought I told you to shut your damn mouth.' 'Move your hands you damn nigger, god-damn-it, I'm going to kill you.' After he had finished beating me, he placed his gun under his left leg and proceeded to drive.

"On our way to the police station he asked me 'where were you going boy?' I told him we were just riding. Then he asked me 'what are you going this way for boy?' I told him I had planned to visit some friends, where he said, 'you are telling me a damn lie boy' and then asked my friend where he was going. My friend said he just came along with me, then the officer asked 'you mean you just go along with people, without knowing where in the hell you are going?' In reply my friend said, 'he is my friend—I don't have to ask him where he is going; if he was a stranger I would have.'

"When we reached the station he demanded us to get out of the car and head for those two doors on the right, he was walking behind us. Upon entering the building, he demanded my friend to sit down in the hall and continued to trail me into the clerk's office.

"Before we had reached the center of the room he began hitting me with his blackjack on my head and arms, as he was saying 'boy I am going to kill you'—'this damn nigger scratched me'—'I'm going to kill this nigger.'

"There were eight or nine other men in the room and I pleaded with them to stop him from hitting me, but not a one said a word, as the officer continued his inhuman attack.

"When the officer did stop, I asked to use the phone and was told by the officer, 'you ain't using nothing. The desk clerk, wearing glasses, took a leather strap out of a drawer (a brown strap about 4 or 5 inches wide and about 2½ or 3 feet long) and said, 'let's take him down.' When my friend got up to come along he was told to stay there.

"The officer that brought me in, the desk clerk, with the glasses on, the warner (sic) and two other men escorted me to a little room in the building where the cells were.

"With the five men standing around me the clerk said, 'drop your pants nigger.' I did as he said and some of the other men began instructing me, how to lay across a chair. My hands were handcuffed around the foot of the chair as I lay across the back of it.

"After I was in a position to please them the clerk said 'If you holler, nigger, we will kill you.' The officer said 'nigger we are going to tear your * * * off,' and hit me again on the head with his blackjack. 'As all of them took turns beating me with the strap I could hear statements as, 'let's kill this nigger.' 'This nigger knows what he has done wrong—a nigger going to hit an officer.'

"This beating continued while two men held my legs and one my hand.

"The officer asked the jailer did he have anything to keep me from swelling? In reply the jailer stated he had some whiskey and poured some over my back and legs.

"During that time the clerk said 'get up nigger, you are lucky you are not dead.' As the other men began leaving the room the officer said 'What is your name nigger?' When I told him my name he said 'Wipe the whiskey on your * * * nigger and pull your pants up.'

"After I had dressed, the jailer carried me to a cell. I again asked to use the telephone, but he said 'No, not now, maybe later.'

"During my 28½ hours in jail I asked the jailer for four times, each time he brought my meals, to let me use the phone, and he said 'later'."

Example F: A Negro serviceman

"On * * * two of my mates * * * were on liberty and we were at a township not far from the * * *. We approached, and attempted to enter an establishment, which by its display signs indicated that it was a restaurant. There existed no display to indicate as to whether this place was designated for the exclusive use of colored or white patrons * * * upon our attempt, was forcibly evicted by one white man. After being evicted, the man * * * pointed out a store and directed us to it; at the same time asserting that this store was an establishment for colored people. We departed to the store, and the man * * * followed us there. We were then shown where the colored restaurant was. No sooner than we arrived at the restaurant another white man arrived (after events of the day it was alleged that he was Constable * * *). Some white persons had proceeded to the colored restaurant, and they identified me. I, at about this point, had become very uneasy and was in fear of my bodily safety.

"At this point the man who later alleged that he was constable approached me and asked, 'Boy, did you go into a white restaurant?' I replied, 'Yes, I did and if it is such a sin I am sorry.'

"After this exchange he drew a revolver on me and ordered me to come with him. During this period of incidence, I had not been informed that I was under arrest, nor had the man identified himself as an officer of the law. At this instant, seeing all of these white men around, I began to think of the mob violence that I had heard and read of that existed in Mississippi, and I really began to feel fear for my safety. Just about this time the man. * * * made an inquiry, employing words to this effect, 'Boy, where is your smart friend?' The man who was later alleged to be the constable then said, 'Yes, where is he?' Notwithstanding the foregoing, no one had identified himself as a law enforcement official. Sensing the predicament that I found myself in, I told these men that * * * was out in the back and that I would lead them to him. When I got out of the back door I slammed it behind me and fled, leaving * * * on the scene, without having identified him. We were both wearing civilian clothing. In my flight I heard shots, which only caused me to attempt to increase the rate of my speed. There were some flat cars parked on a nearby railroad track, loaded with pulpwood, and I jumped over the couplings between two of them. After hurdling the couplings, I noted two cars loaded with white men coming down the side road approaching U.S. Highway * * *.

"After attempting to hurdle the couplings in the railroad car, I fell and before I could continue my flight, one was running toward me with a chain. He reached me first and began to kick. I rolled, got to my feet and by this time two other men subdued me. I was steadily being pummelled by fists, and was using all of my energy to continue my flight. The man who, I later was told, was a constable, hit me on the head with a pistol at least twice. I was not unconscious, but naturally I was dazed as a result of the physical violence being inflicted upon me. I was handcuffed above the ankle and at the wrists. They tried to make me get into a car, but I was still afraid, not knowing what was going to happen. I put up a struggle, and was subdued.

"At no time did I strike anyone, because under the apprehension that existed, and numerical strength opposing me, I knew it would be futile; therefore, I remained as peaceful as is possible under such circumstances.

"I advised medical attendants at * * * how these injuries were sustained. There I was given an X-ray and a test for drunkenness. The drunkenness test was negative."

Example G

"I was arrested by * * * on Thursday at about 5 a.m. The charge was stealing cattle. The officers admitted that they did not have any evidence.

"I was taken to * * * and placed in the * * * jail at about 10:00 a.m. the same day. Witnesses to my arrest were my wife and * * *.

"I was placed in a cell which was small, unventilated, no windows, dark, and extremely hot. One of the other prisoners who had been in this cell referred to it as a hot box.

"The only food I was given was one piece of cornbread on Thursday, two pieces on Friday, and two pieces on Saturday. The only water I received was one glass on Thursday, two on Friday, and two on Saturday. I was sweating a great deal and very thirsty. I asked for more water but the trustee would not give me any more because he had been instructed not to.

"On Saturday night, I was taken from the hot box about 10:00 p.m. I was questioned again by deputy * * * and * * * for about 1 hour. I could not give any more information so they told the jailer to put me back in the box and they made like they were leaving. I was put back in the box for about 15 minutes. I was then taken out and returned to my home.

"While in this hot box the only air I could get was the air coming through a crack under the door. If it had not been for my laying on the floor and getting this air from under the door I believe that I would have died.

"I am afraid that if this information comes to the attention of the local authorities I will lose my life. When I bought my auto tags in October, the sheriff, * * * told me that I am one nigger he wants but he can't get any proof. I better never had to come after you.

"I cannot understand his attitude because I have only been in jail once about 11 years ago for fighting. This was long before the sheriff ever had any position with the sheriff's office."

FINDINGS

1. The first finding of this Committee is that justice under law is not guaranteed for the Negro in Mississippi in the way that it is for the white man. This is true to the extent that much of the basic meaning of being an American citizen is denied to nearly half the citizens of the State. The idea of the dignity and worth of every individual is fundamental to the American way of life and to the Christian code of ethics on which our system is based. These concepts are systematically violated and an injustice done to us all when 42.3 percent of the citizens of this State must either accept an inferior station in life and an attitude of servility or endanger themselves and their families by protesting. All Mississippians are thereby denied the privilege of living under the best and fairest form of government yet devised. We find that terror hangs over the Negro in Mississippi and is an expectancy for those who refuse to accept their color as a badge of inferiority; and terrorism has no proper place in the American form of government.

2. The second finding of this Committee is that the State government of Mississippi is not sufficiently concerned with the task of protecting the rights of all the citizens of Mississippi. Even if police brutality were less severe and widespread than we have be-

lieved, a responsible State government would take energetic steps to ascertain the facts and punish the wrongdoers. A firm position on this matter by the State government would reduce the tendency of lesser officials to abuse their authority and would enhance the respect of the people for the State government. As matters stand today, we are forced to report that the attitude of the State government, rather than being one of protection, has been one of obstruction of the realization of the rights of our citizens. Sections 2155.4–2155.6 of the Mississippi Code are an indication of the current official attitude. These sections make a conviction for perjury in a civil rights case easier to obtain than in any other perjury case. Since Negroes represent the overwhelming majority of persons likely to be forced to make sworn statements in order to secure basic rights, this 1960 legislation seems designed to intimidate or punish those of the Negro race who would assert these rights.

3. While this Committee feels that the accounts of its meetings in the press of the State have usually been fair and objective, we find that in general the press is failing to meet its obligation to our society. When an element of government exceeds or neglects its proper role in a free society it is the duty of the press to alert the people to the situation. The people of Mississippi are largely unaware of the extent of the problem of illegal official violence and the press is partly to blame. It is a zealous crusader against governmental injustice when the Federal Government is believed to be at fault, but closes its eyes to State or local official mistreatment of Negro citizens.

4. This Committee finds that the Federal Government has not provided the citizens of Mississippi the protection due them as American citizens. The Department of Justice has acted in good faith, but the present interpretation of the function of the Civil Rights Division of the Justice Department is unduly and unwisely narrow and limited. This may be due to the inadequacy of funds available to the Division for staff and the like, and it may be due to a reluctance to bring cases to trial under existing Civil Rights Acts in view of the prospect of facing an all-white jury likely to return a verdict in favor of a white law enforcement official accused by a Negro. Whatever the reason, the fact that police officers are rarely tried on civil rights charges has led the public to believe that few serious charges are ever made, and has reinforced the belief among offending peace officers that they may treat or mistreat Negroes as their whims direct them.

5. We also find that the Commission on Civil Rights itself continues to have an unfulfilled obligation in regard to Mississippi. It is our opinion that a formal civil rights hearing, such as only the Commission can conduct, is more urgently needed in Mississippi than in practically any other State of the Union. Yet the Commission has never met in this State in the course of its 5-year existence.

RECOMMENDATIONS

As individuals and as members of the Mississippi Advisory Committee we believe the powers reserved to the States in the United States Constitution must be zealously guarded. They can only be guarded if they are fairly and responsibly exercised by the State administrations. When a State disregards the constitutional rights of a large segment of its population, the Federal Government is compelled to intervene in behalf of the victims. The rights of the State under the 10th amendment were reserved because it was thought necessary to protect individual rights from suppression by an all powerful Federal Government. The important concept in the 10th amendment is the protection of individual rights of the people. However, if these individual rights, which are further guaranteed by the 14th and 15th amendments, are denied by the State to a segment of its citizenry, these citizens have no choice but to turn to the Federal Government for protection. This is the dilemma we face when we find, as we have above, that Negro citizens of Mississippi are denied the equal protection of this State's laws. Equal protection of the laws is a right of all citizens of the United States. The country was founded on the principle of liberty and equality for all, and that principle will not permit the rights of over 40 percent of the people of the State to be neglected simply because the State administration chooses to neglect them. It is our belief that the situation revealed by the work of this committee could and properly should be corrected by the State government of Mississippi. But it is our finding that the State government is not sufficiently concerned about the denial of equal protection of the laws for Negroes. We therefore recommend:

That the President direct the Department of Justice to investigate every allegation of physical abuse of authority by State or local officials in Mississippi, and institute criminal proceedings in all cases in which such action appears to be warranted, regardless of the prospects for conviction;

That the Commission on Civil Rights hold formal public hearings in Mississippi on charges of denial of equal protection of the law on account of race, and that these hearings be held periodically so long as the present situation exists and the Commission remains in force; and

That the Commission on Civil Rights make recommendations to the Congress for the passage of further legislation designed to protect American citizens from being physically abused by persons acting under the color of governmental authority at any level.

Respectfully submitted,

The Mississippi Advisory Committee to the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights: Mrs. Wallis I. Shutt, Chairman, Jackson, Miss.; Dr. James L. Allen, vice Chairman, Columbus, Miss.; Dr. A. D. Beittel, Secretary, Tougaloo, Miss.; Adm. Robert P. Briscoe, Liberty, Miss.; Dr. Albert B. Britton, Jackson, Miss.; Rev. Thomas E. Johnson, Jackson, Miss.; Rev. Charlemagne P. Payne, Sr., Jackson, Miss.; Dr. George E. Powers, Pass Christian, Miss.

(NOTE.—Rev. Murray Cox, of Gulfport, and Rev. Richard Ellerbrake, of Biloxi, were our chairman and secretary, respectively, during the period covered in this report. Reverend Cox died in November 1962, and Reverend Ellerbrake moved out of the State during the summer of 1962. Rt. Rev. Robert C. Hunter, of Bay Saint Louis, Miss., was appointed to the committee in December 1962.)

APPENDIX

1960 cumulative supplement to Mississippi Code, 1942 annotated

SEC. 2155.4. False statements to federal authorities as to denial of constitutional rights by the state or its agents

1. It shall be unlawful for any person or persons to wilfully and knowingly, whether orally or in writing, make or cause to be made, to any agency, or board, or commission, or member, or officer or official, or appointee, or employee, or representative thereof, of the Executive, or the Legislative, or the Judicial Department, of the United States or any subdivision thereof, which may be now in existence, or who may be now appointed, or hereafter created or appointed, including but not limited to any commissioner, or referee, or voting referee now appointed or who may be hereafter appointed by any court of the United States or any Judge thereof, and further including but not limited to any member of the Federal Bureau of Investigation and any agent or representative, or investigator, or member of the Commission on Civil Rights of the United States, or the Advisory Committee or Board of the Commission on Civil Rights of the United States appointed in and for the State of Mississippi, any false or fictitious or fraudulent statement or statements, or to use any false writing or document asserting or claiming, that such person, or persons, or any other person or persons have been, or are about to be denied or deprived of any right, or privilege, or immunity granted or secured to them, or to any of them, by the U.S. Constitution and Laws, or by the Mississippi constitution and Laws, by any officer, or agency, or employee, or representative, or board, or commission, or any member thereof of the State of Mississippi, or of any county or municipality, of the State of Mississippi, or of any other political subdivision of the State of Mississippi, or by the State of Mississippi and any person or persons violating the provisions of this act shall be guilty of the crime of making a false statement, which is created by this act, a felony and upon conviction thereof shall be punished by imprisonment in the county jail for not less than 6 months nor more than 5 years in the penitentiary, or by a fine of not less than $100, nor more than $1,000, or by both such fine and imprisonment.

2. If any paragraph, sentence, or clause of this act shall be held to be unconstitutional or invalid, the same shall not affect any other part, portion, or provision of this act, but such other part shall remain in full force and effect.

Sources: Laws, 1960, ch. 263, secs. 1, 2.

Cross references: Secs. 2155.5, 2155.6, this title.

SEC. 2155.5. False swearing—false sworn statements to Federal authorities as to denial of constitutional rights by the State or its agents.

1. It shall be unlawful for any person or persons to willfully and knowingly make any oral or written sworn false statement, or affidavit, or attestation, or complaint, or allegation before any individual or officer authorized to administer oaths, to any agency, or board, or commission, or member, or official, or appointee, or employee, or representative thereof, of the executive, or the legislative, or the judicial department, of the United States, or any subdivision thereof, which may be now in existence, or who may be now appointed, or hereafter created or appointed, including but not limited to any member of the Federal Bureau of Investigation and any agent, or representative, or investigator, or member of the Commission of Civil Rights of the United States, or the Advisory Committee or Board of the Commission on Civil Rights of the United States appointed in and for the State of Mississippi, that such person, or persons, or other persons have been or are about to be deprived of any right, or privilege, or immunity granted or secured by the U.S. Constitution and laws or by the Mississippi constitution and laws, by any officer, or agency, or employee, or representative, or board, or commission, or any member thereof of the State of Mississippi, or of any county or municipality, of the State of Mississippi, or of any other political subdivision of the State of Mississippi, or by the State of Mississippi, and any person or persons violating the provisions of this act shall be guilty of the crime of false swearing which is created by this act, a felony, and upon conviction thereof, shall be punished by imprisonment in the county jail for not less than 6 months nor more than 5 years in the penitentiary, or a fine of not less than $100, nor more than $1,000, or by both such fine and imprisonment.

2. Corroboration or proof by more than one witness to establish the falsity of testimony or statements under oath is not required in prosecutions under this act. It shall not be necessary to prove, to sustain or charge under this act, that the oath or matter sworn to was material, or, if before an executive, legislative or judicial tribunal committee or commission that the tribunal committee or commission had jurisdiction.

3. If any paragraph, or sentence, or clause of this act shall be held to be unconstitutional or invalid, the same shall not affect any other part, or portion or provisions of this act, but such other part shall remain in force and effect.

Sources: Laws, 1960, ch. 256, secs. 1-3.

Cross references: Secs. 2155.4, 2155.6, this title.

SEC. 2155.6. False swearing—false sworn statements to Federal authorities as to denial of constitutional rights by the State or its agents with intent or purpose to deceive or cause investigation.

1. It shall be unlawful for any person or persons to wilfully make any oral or written sworn false statements or affidavit or attestation or complaint or allegation before any individual or officer authorized to administer oaths, that such person or persons or other persons have been or are about to be deprived of any right or privilege or immunity granted or secured by the U.S. Constitution and laws, or either, or by the Mississippi constitution and laws, or either, knowing the same, or any material part thereof to be false, with the intent or purpose to cause or encourage an investigation or which causes or contributes in any way to causing an investigation thereof, or any other action to be taken as a result thereof by any executive or legislative or judicial department, officer or agent, or representative of the United States, including but not limited to any member of the Federal Bureau of Investigation or member or representative or employee of, the Commission on Civil Rights created by an act of the Congress of the United States, or the State Advisory Group or Council, or Committee of the Commission on Civil Rights appointed in or for the State of Mississippi, and any person or persons violating the provisions of this act shall be guilty of the crime of false swearing which is created by this act, a felony, and upon conviction thereof, shall be punished by imprisonment in the county jail for not less than 6 months nor more than 5 years in the penitentiary, or a fine of not less than $100, nor more than $1,000, or by both such fine and imprisonment.

2. Corroboration or proof by more than one witness to establish the falsity of testimony or statements under oath is not required in prosecutions under this act. It shall not be necessary to prove, to sustain any charge under this act, that the oath or matter sworn to was material, or, if before an executive, legislative, or judicial tribunal, committee, or commission that the tribunal, committee, or commission had jurisdiction.

3. If any paragraph, or sentence, or clause of this act shall be held to be unconstitutional or invalid, the same shall not affect any other part, or portion or provisions of this act, but such other part shall remain in force and effect.

Sources: Laws, 1960, ch. 255, secs. 1-3.

Cross references: Secs. 2155.4, 2155.5, this title.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

The U.S. Commission on Civil Rights owes a profound debt of gratitude to the dedicated Americans throughout the Nation who serve on its advisory committees without compensation. We recognize that our debt is particularly great in the case of the Mississippi Committee. This selfless group of Mississippians has served the cause of constitutional principles in the face of official and unofficial hostility, as well as serious abuses, amounting—in some instances—to violence. In the circumstances, the Mississippi Advisory Committee might well have decided that the climate was too hostile to permit it to conduct an active program. Instead, the Committee chose to hold open meetings in various parts of the State to gather facts, and at least to give a hearing to citizens who consider themselves not only deprived of their constitutional rights, but wholly excluded from American citizenship as we know it.

The organization of the Mississippi State Advisory Committee was not completed until December 1959, when Rev. Murray Cox of Gulfport accepted the chairmanship. Reverend Cox guided the Committee ably and courageously until his death in November 1962. His unswerving dedication, his gentle but firm idealism, and his willingness to sacrifice all personal interests to that idealism made a profound impression on all of us.

The Committee's work was difficult from the first. In addition to official obstacles put in their part by the State government, and described in this report, the Committee members were in some instances subjected to personal abuse from private sources. They encountered social ostracism in some cases, and received numerous derogatory letters and telephone calls. One member reluctantly relinquished his pastorate of two churches rather than permit them to be split by dissension over his association with the Committee. Another member was threatened by a sheriff, who was also the president of the local White Citizens' Council, and was hit in the face by a neighbor; his children have been taunted and teased at school at the instigation of adults because of the father's religious work and membership on the Committee. Recently, an incendiary device of the Molotov cocktail type was thrown into the home of the Committee's vice chairman.

Despite these obstacles, the Committee has carried on an active program, culminating in this report. The Commission recognizes with profound appreciation the selfless devotion of the Mississippians who have served and are now serving on the Advisory Committee. Their firm and unswerving dedication to constitutional principles is eloquent proof of the continued vitality of our Nation's ideals.

JOHN A. HANNAH,
Chairman,
U.S. Commission on Civil Rights.

F-111—TFX—CONTRACT AWARD, FEBRUARY 26, 1963

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Speaker, on January 23, 1963, I asked the Secretary of Defense to provide the Congress with a full report on the bases for the Department of Defense decision to award a multibillion-dollar contract to the General Dynamics Corp. for development of the F-111-TFX—tactical fighter.

My request to the Secretary was made after Drew Pearson in his column, "Washington Merry-Go-Round," published on January 14, 1963, made certain allegations indicating that "for the first time, the civilian chiefs ignored the recommendations of their military boards on a major contract." Mr. Pearson's column also reported that political strings had been pulled in Washington to get the contract for General Dynamics.

Needless to say, I received many letters from constituents of mine who were understandably disturbed, as was I, over the implications that politics may have been a major factor in the awarding of an important defense contract. Therefore I asked the Secretary of Defense to provide me with the facts in this matter in order that I could reply responsibly to my constituency. That was on January 23, 1963, and it was not until yesterday, February 25, 1963, that I received an answer to my inquiry from the Office of the Secretary.

Mr. Speaker, it is most unfortunate that a Member of Congress must wait for more than 30 days to get a reply to such an inquiry as I made of the Secretary of Defense. It is even more shocking and disturbing that when the reply did arrive, it did not irrevocably refute the allegations made by Mr. Pearson.

Instead I was informed that since the matter is under review by a congressional committee it would not be appropriate to "comment in any further detail on this matter."

It seems to me that such allegations as the pulling of political strings to get a defense contract would be factually refuted at every opportunity. There is no room for politics when the defense and security of the United States is involved. There is no room for politics when it comes to spending the taxpayers' money for procurement of the complex and expensive weapons systems which we must have to preserve our freedom.

It is urgent that the American people, and their representatives in Congress, have their confidence in the integrity of our Defense Department restored through the hearings which have begun today regarding the awarding of the F-111—TFX—tactical fighter development contract.

Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks and include extraneous matter, I ask that the "Washington Merry-Go-Round" column of January 14, 1963, and my letter to the Secretary of Defense, dated January 23, 1963, be printed along with the reply which I received February 23 and which was dated February 22, 1963, from David E. McGiffert, Assistant to the Secretary of Legislative Affairs:

[From the Wichita (Tex.) Eagle & Beacon, Jan. 14, 1963]

HOW GENERAL DYNAMICS GOT CONTRACT

(By Drew Pearson)

WASHINGTON.—Senate Rackets Chairman JOHN MCCLELLAN, who has been investigating labor racketeers, has turned to the probe of a $62 million research contract to General Dynamics. He has even asked the Defense Department to hold up the contract until his investigators can lay their cards on the table.

At stake is far more than the original $62 million. The contract calls for the development of a supersonic fighter both the Navy and Air Force can use, and in the end should lead to contracts worth more than $5 billion to General Dynamics.

This column which has done its own investigating of the General Dynamics deal, can describe the cards McCLELLAN holds:

For the first time, the civilian chiefs ignored the recommendations of their military boards on a major contract. Secretary of Defense McNamara, Secretary of the Navy Korth, and Secretary of the Air Force Zuckert spent less than 3 weeks reviewing the intricate paperwork, then arbitrarily overruled the findings of an elaborate evaluation process which had taken 18 months.

Their decision will rescue General Dynamics from the financial rocks where it has been floundering for 2 years as the result of a $425 million blunder. The loss has been blamed upon mismanagement. This is not reassuring to the taxpayers, who will have to pay the bill on any further mismanagement.

General Dynamics' biggest stockholder, Chicago Financier Henry Crown, who took charge of an emergency committee to save the ailing corporation, pulled political strings in Washington. Effective in the backrooms, Crown is credited with hooking the desperately needed contract.

Only a few insiders knew how desperately General Dynamics needed the fighter plane contract to bail its stockholders out of the red. The great corporation lost $425 million on jet airliners, an ill-considered venture that exposed shockingly bad management and poor organization.

Meanwhile, the alarmed directors set up a seven-man, emergency committee which shook up the management and sought a financial transfusion.

The biggest transfusion, more than enough to save the stockholders from additional losses, is coming from Uncle Sam.

How General Dynamics got this contract, potentially the biggest ever offered by the Kennedy administration, is a story of high-powered negotiations.

The details aren't supposed to be known outside the Pentagon, but this column can summarize what transpired.

Early in 1961, Secretary of Defense McNamara invited airplane manufacturers to submit proposals for a supersonic fighter that could be used by both the Navy and the Air Force.

Designs came in from most of the big manufacturers and were processed through the Air Force's procurement machinery. However, Navy representatives sat on all the boards to make sure the best plane was selected for carrier operations.

The first joint evaluation board, headed by Col. Charles Gayle, concluded after 4 months that Boeing had submitted the best design. Boeing had been the first, for instance, to develop the variable wing, which could be pulled in for supersonic flight and spread out for slow landings on carriers.

But the Navy was not satisfied with the Boeing model. The studies went through the Air Force Source Selection Board, were then bucked up to the Air Council. Rear Adm. F. L. Ashworth, who represented the Navy on the Board, and Vice Adm. Robert Pirie, who sat on the Council, objected to the Boeing design.

As a result, Secretary McNamara decided to ask the top two competitors, Boeing and General Dynamics, to go back to their drawing boards. Each company was given a million-dollar grant to redesign a plane that would satisfy the Navy.

Both companies came back with blueprints and cost studies that were processed through the same machinery. Again, the Joint Evaluation Board recommended the Boeing plane.

The Selection Board and the Air Council, after their own painstaking reviews, also selected Boeing. But this time, the Navy representatives went along with the decision.

What was handed up to Secretary of the Air Force Zuckert was a unanimous recommendation, based upon 18 months of careful study, that Boeing should get the contract. This was then reversed at the very top.

What part political wirepulling played in the final decision is the $62-million question.

JANUARY 23, 1963.

Hon. ROBERT S. McNAMARA,
Secretary, Department of Defense,
The Pentagon, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: Within the past week I have received many letters from constituents of mine who are quite disturbed by the implications of allegations made by Drew Pearson on January 14, 1963, in the enclosed column. I share the concern of my constituents in this matter.

It is imperative that the Congress be given a full report regarding the basis for the decision on this contract. It has been my understanding that defense awards are based on merit and the capability of a contractor to provide a quality product at an economical price. The integrity of the Defense Department is severely challenged by the charges made by Mr. Pearson.

Mr. Secretary, I would appreciate hearing from you in this matter in order that I can reply responsibly to my constituency, and to assure myself of the integrity of our Government in its procurement policies.

Sincerely yours,

GARNER E. SHRIVER,
Member of Congress.

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE,
Washington, D.C., February 22, 1963.

Hon. GARNER E. SHRIVER,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. SHRIVER: You inquired in a letter to Secretary McNamara on January 23 about the recent selection of the General Dynamics Corp. as prime contractor for the development of the F-111 (TFX) tactical fighter.

The decision to select General Dynamics was reached only after a long and careful evaluation of the two proposals submitted indicated that the General Dynamics proposal offered the best chance of developing an airplane that would not only be operationally acceptable to and compatible with the requirements of both the Navy and the Air Force but would also have the maximum feasible degree of commonness between Air Force and Navy versions.

As you may know, the circumstances surrounding the award of the TFX contract are presently under review by a congressional committee. While this review is in progress, I believe it would be inappropriate to comment in any further detail on this matter.

Sincerely,

DAVID E. McGIFFERT,
Assistant to the Secretary, Legislative Affairs.

SCHOOLS OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, during recent days there has been a great deal of discussion with reference to the situation in the schools of the District of Columbia. From what I have observed in the press and heard from witnesses appearing before the Committee on the District of Columbia, it appears to me that the time has arrived for Congress to take positive action to improve conditions in the schools of the District.

Because of this conviction on my part I am today introducing two measures which I believe will bring order out of the chaos which seems to exist. One of these bills would permit corporal punishment of pupils by principals and teachers in the public schools, and the other would permit the expulsion or dismissal of unruly students by the principal of a particular school.

There is nothing new about the proposition that a schoolteacher or principal should have authority to inflict reasonable corporal punishment upon unruly students. As a matter of fact, most of us attended public schools in the days when reasonable corporal punishment was inflicted upon nonconforming students. Few of us can honestly say that we ever saw abuse of this authority by the school authorities. I am sure that the authorization of the use of corporal punishment in the schools of the District of Columbia will not be abused if all doubt is removed as to the right of the school authorities to exercise their discretion in punishing children under their care and tuition. The Superintendent of Schools of the District of Columbia has recommended this procedure but seems to be thwarted in his efforts by tenuous contentions made by certain members of the Board of Education.

I have been very much interested in some of the unusual statements as to the law which appeared in the press as quotations from members of the Board of Education regarding corporal punishment of school pupils. In order to give my colleagues the general law on the subject I call to their attention the treatment of this subject in 47 American Jurisprudence, 427 and the following, and 79 Corpus Juris Secundum, section 502, schools and school districts.

In 47 "American Jurisprudence" we find the following:

> Section 175. Corporal punishment: A teacher is responsible for the discipline of his school, and for the progress, conduct, and deportment of his pupils. It is his duty to maintain good order and to require of his pupils a faithful performance of their duties. To enable him to discharge such a duty effectually, he must necessarily have the power to enforce prompt obedience to his lawful commands. For this reason, in proper cases, he may inflict corporal punishment on refractory pupils, this authority extending generally to all subordinate teachers who have charge of classes and are responsible for discipline, as well as to those who, although not teachers by legal appointment, are teachers in fact at the time.
>
> While teachers are clothed with a discretionary authority with respect to the infliction of corporal punishment on their pupils, the punishment must be reasonable and confined within the bounds of moderation; that is, it must not be cruel or excessive, and the teacher must not act wantonly or

> from malice or passion. This rule has been made the subject of statutory enactment in some jurisdictions. However, no precise rule can be laid down as to what is excessive or unreasonable punishment. Each case must depend on its own circumstances. The punishment should be proportioned to the gravity of the offense, the apparent motive and disposition of the offender, and the influence of his example and conduct on others. Consideration must be given to the age, size, sex, and physical strength of the pupil to be punished, and the instrument used must be one suitable and proper for the purpose.
>
> The legitimate object of chastisement is to inflict punishment by the pain which it causes, as well as the degradation which it implies. It does not follow, therefore, because pain is produced that a chastisement is either cruel or excessive. Teachers exceed the limits of their authority when they cause lasting mischief, but act within the limits of it when they inflict temporary pain.

To the same effect is 79 Corpus Juris Secundum, section 502 dealing with corporal punishment, where it is said:

> Section 502. Corporal punishment: As a general rule a schoolteacher, insofar as it may be reasonably necessary to the maintenance of the discipline and efficiency of the school, and to compel a compliance with reasonable rules and regulations, may inflict reasonable corporal punishment upon a pupil for insubordination, disobedience, or other misconduct, even though he is over school age, and may take him away from the school and outside the school grounds to chastise him, but he cannot assault and beat the pupil on the school playground merely because they differ in opinion on a play in the game in which the teacher takes part with the pupils on equal terms. A teacher is not justified in inflicting corporal punishment to enforce an unreasonable rule, to compel a pupil to pursue a study forbidden by his parent, or to compel him to do something which his parent has requested that he be excused from doing. The infliction of corporal punishment by a teacher is largely within his discretion; but he must exercise sound discretion and judgment in determining the necessity for corporal punishment and the reasonableness thereof, under the varying circumstances of each particular case, and must adapt the punishment to the nature of the offense, and to the age and mental condition and personal attributes of the offending pupil, using an instrument suitable to the purpose, and, considering the circumstances and conditions of the particular offense and pupil, the punishment must not be inflicted with such force or in such a manner as to cause it to be cruel or excessive, or wanton or malicious. The fact that a child appears unsubdued does not in itself justify a continuance of the punishment; but, on the other hand, punishment is not necessarily excessive because the pupil suffers pain or bruises.
>
> Where a statute in express terms confers on the teacher the authority to inflict corporal punishment, a school superintendent has no such authority, nor does he derive any such authority from usage. A school principal may, however, inflict punishment on a pupil for violation of school rules under a statute permitting a teacher to use force to restrain or correct a pupil and may determine the nature and extent of the punishment, it being necessary only that it be reasonable in manner and moderate in degree. The teacher's right to inflict corporal punishment is not limited to pupils in the teacher's own classroom.

Mr. Speaker, I realize that there will be some who will immediately say that I am recommending cruel and unusual punishment to pupils in the District of Columbia when I propose and support the legislation on that subject which I am today introducing. Let me put this contention to rest immediately by saying that my own children attend the public schools of North Carolina under the supervision and direction of principals and teachers who have the identical authority to inflict corporal punishment as would be given to the principals and teachers of the District of Columbia under the language of the bill which I have introduced.

As a matter of fact, the language of my proposal, insofar as the authority sought to be vested in the principals and teachers is concerned, is identical to the language contained in the "General Statutes of North Carolina," section 146, chapter 115. The language contained in the bill that I have offered is not a hangover from the remote past in school management in North Carolina. It was enacted into law by the general assembly of my State in 1959 and has not brought any unfortunate results in our State so far as I know.

With reference to the other measure I am offering, giving to principals the authority to expel and suspend pupils who violate the rules of the school or otherwise constitute a menace to the school, I do not believe that such legislation is necessary as a matter of law. In view of the confusion that has been generated in the District of Columbia by some rather bizarre statements of law that have appeared in the press as coming from persons having law licenses, I do believe, though, that we can clarify the atmosphere by the enactment of legislation making it crystal clear that school authorities do have the authority to suspend and expel students.

The contention has been made that because of the compulsory attendance law in the District that it is not within the authority of school principals and superintendents to remove undesirable students from the classroom. It has always been my understanding of the law that school authorities have the inherent power where the interests of the school require it, to suspend or expel a student, notwithstanding the existence of a compulsory school attendance law. This proposition finds support in "Corpus Juris Secundum" and in "American Jurisprudence." I see no basis for any contention between individuals having responsibility for the administration of the public schools in this jurisdiction having any difference of opinion as to the rights of the authorities to promote the general welfare of the educational program in the District by ridding the schools of undesirable student characters.

Realizing, though, that the situation is so critical that we cannot tolerate the creation of a debating contest between the Superintendent of Schools and the Chairman of the Board of Education on this subject, I believe that the Congress in the exercise of its legislative jurisdiction should promptly remove any possibility of argument about this subject. For that reason I have offered legislation which would spell out the authority of the school authorities in connection with the removal of unsavory students from the rolls of the schools. In my bill I have provided ample safeguards to protect students from abuse by the school authorities.

Mr. Speaker, I know of no more important subject that could come before this Congress insofar as legislating for the District of Columbia is concerned. I hope that it will be possible to act promptly and favorably upon the two measures I am introducing today.

EDUCATION AND LABOR COMMITTEE FUNDS SHOULD BE CUT

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ASHBROOK] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter and tables.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, one of the first things that a new Member of Congress learns is the so-called rule of congressional courtesy. Bluntly stated, these rules and precedents make it virtually impossible to criticize the conduct of another Member of this body without subjecting the criticizing Member to a point of order which could result in loss of the floor and thereby bring an abrupt end to the speech at that point. It is said that these rules are necessary to prevent abusive references to one another on the floor. Others have calmly noted that these rules of courtesy have probably prevented duels, fist fights, and other breaches of gentlemanly conduct which would have reflected on the decorum of the House. Congress is virtually a law unto itself. There are no loyalty checks, no behavior checks, no rules of decorum which are enforceable for all intents and purposes, no standards which are set the breach of which can be said to be an affront to the other Members of the House. The wrath of constituents is the only check on a Member. Almost anything is tolerated under the heading of "Congressional Courtesy."

It can be said that the House has done relatively well through the years laboring under these supposed handicaps. The answer to this would probably be yes, but then, on the other hand, it cannot be rebutted when one states that the Congress of the United States does not, by and large, carry the same respect that it did through the first 150 years of our Republic.

Yes, the rules of the House probably prevent abuse. Undoubtedly, some lives have been saved because of a remark that was never made on this floor. Outbursts of temper have probably been kept to a minimum because of the rules which are so stringent in this area. The rules have done all of this but, I humbly submit, a lot more. Congress is the final authority in many ways and pretty much a law unto itself. Being the final authority, if the Members are not allowed to speak out on abuses then who can? Surely the press does from time to time but is this enough? Couple this inability to speak out in debate here on the floor with a tendency on the part of the entire body of Congress to refrain from sufficient self-discipline and a searching investigation of its own affairs and you have what I feel is an untenable situation. Under practice, any expense that a committee chairman certifies is paid as long as the appropriations have not been depleted and the date of the invoice does not patently show it to be without authorization under current appropriation. Couple this with another practice of the House whereby the Committee on House Administration has ruled that we, as Members of this body, cannot examine vouchers which have been paid at the order of the chairmen of the various committees and I believe you can readily see why so little is known about the financial transactions of this House. In my own State of Ohio, we are always speaking in terms of transactions being a matter of public record. State legislators and other officials from the statehouse to the courthouse have been far more zealous in putting their transactions, audits, hearings, and so forth, out where public scrutiny can be reckoned with than have their fellow legislators in Washington.

We consistently denounce waste and duplication in the executive branch of the Government. Oratory abounds concerning the proliferation of bureaucratic agencies, their expensive habits, and so forth, ad infinitum. A cloak of secrecy covers all too much of what we do in this branch of government. Do we have waste? Expensive habits? Nepotism and favoritism? If we do, under the rules of congressional courtesy it better be someone other than a Member of Congress who discusses it.

I am not impetuous enough to think I could change the rules. I will abide by them and not willingly abuse them because the essence of our representative system is that we obey the rules and work for the change of those rules and regulations which we feel are improper or cumbersome. The rules of the House, to say the least, are not conducive to a public airing of our own dirty linen—in fact, they practically preclude such inquiry. This makes it even more imperative that we exercise stern self-discipline and vigilance over wasteful practices and abusive conduct on our own part since, if we do not, no one will. This we can do but it requires the efforts of every Member of the House. We cannot simply throw this in the laps of the Committee on House Administration. I appeared before their Subcommittee on Accounts today to protest our $697,000 budget for the House Committee on Education and Labor and cited areas where I feel we have had abuse. We all must do this when we see such practices.

In the 87th Congress, the Committee on Education and Labor expended the following amounts, not including miscellaneous expenses of approximately $15,000:

Telephone	$7,402.54
Travel expenses	48,902.38
Investigation staff salaries	550,496.30
Contracts	13,135.00
Total	619,936.22

It is my judgment that far too much of the taxpayer's money has been expended by this committee and I would urge the Committee on House Administration to trim at least $200,000 from the chairman's request for the 88th Congress which is $697,000. In the 85th Congress, under the chairmanship of former Representative Graham Barden, this same committee had an appropriation of $125,000 and did not expend $10,405 of this amount. In the 86th Congress, during Representative Barden's last 2 years as chairman, the committee was authorized a total of $328,000 and had $53,649 left over at the end of the session, a net expenditure in 4 years of $388,000. Now in just 2 years of the 87th Congress, spending by this committee increased to $633,000 and the current request, as I said before, is for $697,000. One can readily ask: Why?

Any perusal of the expenditures will tell you very quickly that increased payroll has brought about the big hike in the cost of operating this committee. In 1954, the last year the Republicans controlled the committee, eight employees were on the staff. In 1960, at the close of Representative Barden's chairmanship, there were 16 employees as follows:

Committee on Education and Labor, July 1 to Dec. 31, 1960

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Russell C. Derrickson	Chief investigator	$8,772.00
Charles M. Ryan	General counsel	8,772.00
Melvin W. Snead	Minority clerk	8,772.00
Charles T. Lane	Assistant clerk	8,772.00
Levi K. Alderman, Jr.	Chief clerk	8,772.00
Kathryn Kivett	Assistant clerk	3,917.22
Jeanne F. Thomson	do	3,917.22
Gladys M. Rafter	do	3,917.22
Ida S. Miller	do	3,917.22
James B. Wells	do	4,118.82
Olive M. Gibbons	Stenographer (July 1 to 10, inclusive).	130.54
Colie V. Williamson	Field investigator (July 1 to 10, inclusive).	185.39
Elizabeth W. Adams	Stenographer (through Sept. 10)	1,009.04
Harry V. Barnard	Research assistant (through Aug. 31).	1,612.90
Reva Beck Bosone	Legal counsel	6,733.38
Mary M. Callaway	Stenographer	2,691.84
Ruth P. Ebersole	Assistant subcommittee clerk.	1,347.66
Mary Sue Leonard	Secretary	3,301.17
Robert E. McCord	Subcommittee clerk	5,325.00
John D. Messick	Assistant to director	6,982.20
J. Noble Richards	Staff assistant (minority).	5,378.16
Russell H. Riggs	Clerk (through Sept. 15).	1,578.92
W. Wilson Young	Counsel	6,733.37
Jane L. Wilson	Stenographer (effective Aug. 22).	2,115.38
Charles E. Wilson	Clerk (effective Sept. 1).	2,668.84

The 1961 report filed with the House in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 107, part 10, pages 13125–13126, details the tremendous growth of the Committee on Education and Labor.

The first 6 months looked like this:

Committee on Education and Labor, Jan. 1 to June 30, 1961

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Louise M. Dargans	Chief clerk	$8,726.69
Russell C. Derrickson	Staff director	8,726.69
Wray Smith	Education chief	5,853.16
Howard G. Gamser	Chief counsel for labor-management.	8,726.69
Livingston L. Wingate.	Associate counsel for labor-management.	7,418.92
Teresa Calabrese	Administrative assistant to the chairman.	4,945.14
Richard T. Burress	Minority clerk	7,339.30
Melvin W. Sneed	Minority staff assistant.	8,202.48
Louise M. Wright	Administrative assistant.	3,855.11
Cabell Waller Berge	do	2,041.73
Anne K. Fernbach	Administrative assistant (to Mar. 22, 1961).	1,208.37
Charles E. Wilson	Staff assistant (Feb. 1–28, 1961).	1,470.70
John H. Young III	Administrative assistant (to Jan. 31, 1961).	1,372.74
J. Noble Richards	Administrative assistant to the minority (Jan. 4–31, 1961).	806.72
Jeanne E. Thomson	Administrative assistant for the minority (to Jan. 31, 1961).	652.87
Charles T. Lane	Assistant clerk (to Jan. 2, 1961).	97.47
Charles M. Ryan	General counsel (to Jan. 2, 1961).	97.47
Ida S. Miller	Assistant clerk (to Jan. 2, 1961).	43.52
Levi K. Alderman	Clerk (to Jan. 2, 1961).	97.47
Kathryn Kivett	Assistant clerk (to Jan. 2, 1961).	43.52
Melvin W. Sneed	Minority clerk (to Jan. 2, 1961).	97.47
Russell C. Derrickson	Chief investigator (to Jan. 2, 1961).	97.47
Gladys M. Rafter	Assistant clerk (to Jan. 2, 1961).	43.52
James B. Wells	do	56.96

INVESTIGATING STAFF

General Subcommittee on Education, Representative Cleveland M. Bailey, chairman:		
Reva Beck Bosone	Legal counsel (to Mar. 15, 1961).	$2,166.94
Ruth P. Ebersole	Assistant subcommittee clerk.	2,950.77
Robert E. McCord	Subcommittee clerk	7,377.24
General Subcommittee on Labor (Representative Carl D. Perkins, chairman):		
Peggy Lia Amburgey.	Secretary	250.46
Joe Lee	Counsel (to May 31, 1961).	3,033.58
Hartwell Duvall Reed, Jr.	Counsel	583.51
Jeanne F. White	Secretary (to Mar. 31, 1961).	350.00
Marian Ruth Wyman.	Secretary (to May 31, 1961).	455.56
Special Subcommittee on Education (Representative Edith Green, chairman):		
Betty R. Pryor	Subcommittee clerk	3,501.64
Nicholas H. Zumas	Counsel	3,501.64

Committee on Education and Labor, Jan. 1 to June 30, 1961—Continued

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Special Subcommittee on Labor (Representative James Roosevelt, chairman):		
Doris G. Smith	Secretary	$2,751.68
W. Wilson Young	Counsel	7,377.24
Select Subcommittee on Labor (Representative Herbert Zelenko, chairman):		
Harvey B. Cohen	Counsel	833.45
Mollie D. Cohen	Administrative assistant.	3,168.40
Joseph I. Paper	Counsel (to May 31, 1961).	3,751.14
Select Subcommittee on Education (Representative Frank Thompson, chairman):		
Mary E. Corbin	Secretary	2,237.40
William P. Gerberding.	Counsel	4,500.64
Ad Hoc Subcommittee on Unemployment and the Impact of Automation (Representative Elmer Holland, chairman):		
Walter Buckingham.	Director of automation study.	2,744.56
Olive M. Gibbons	Secretary	1,983.85
Ad Hoc Subcommittee on the Impact of Imports on American Employment (Representative John H. Dent, chairman):		
Barbara Dash	do	1,983.85
Stanley D. Metzger	Subcommittee counsel.	2,500.76
Ad Hoc Subcommittee on the National Labor Relations Board (Representative Roman Pucinski, chairman):		
James McConnell Harkless.	Counsel	5,001.52
Laurine Pemberton	Secretary	1,500.39
Full committee staff:		
Donald F. Berens	Administrative assistant.	2,333.61
Patricia Bergman	Secretary	1,350.86
Cabell Waller Berge	Administrative assistant.	233.39
Adrienne Fields	Receptionist	1,400.90
Mary Sue Leonard	Secretary (to Jan. 31, 1961).	484.29
Mary D. Pinkard	Administrative assistant.	2,448.34
Charles E. Wilson	Assistant education chief.	3,157.75
Anne K. Fernbach	Administrative assistant (to Mar. 22, 1961).	458.35
Investigative task force:		
James E. Branigan	Counsel	4,375.02
Ilene Tena Bushman.	Clerk-receptionist (to June 30, 1961).	1,116.96
Olga Cano	Administrative assistant (to June 30, 1961).	1,875.06
Odell Clark	Assistant chief investigator.	4,167.25
Marvin R. Fullmer	Chief investigator	4,751.44
Ann I. Jordan	Secretary	1,500.39
Waldo E. Parrish	Administrative assistant.	1,500.39
Jose Lumen Roman	Investigator	3,333.80
Ludwig Teller	Consultant	3,751.14
Minority staff:		
Walter P. Kennedy	Clerk (to Mar. 31, 1961).	201.26
Beverly Pearson	Minority secretary	2,741.15
Jeanne E. Thomson	do	3,585.00

The CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 108, part 1, pages 800–801, discloses the statistics for the last 6 months of the 1st session of the 87th Congress.

Committee on Education and Labor, July 1 to Dec. 31, 1961

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Louise Maxienne Dargans.	Chief clerk	$8,824.74
Russell C. Derrickson	Staff director	8,824.74
Wray Smith	Education chief	8,824.74
Howard G. Gamser	Chief counsel for labor-management.	8,824.74
Livingston L. Wingate.	Associate counsel for labor-management.	7,502.28
Teresa Calabrese	Administrative assistant to the chairman.	5,000.70
Richard T. Burress	Minority clerk	8,807.16
Melvin W. Sneed	Administrative assistant.	8,504.04
Louise M. Wright	do	4,251.36
Cabell Waller Berge	do	3,833.66
INVESTIGATING STAFF		
General Subcommittee on Education (Representative Cleveland M. Bailey, chairman):		
Salig L. Bendit	Assistant subcommittee clerk (July 19–Dec. 31, 1961).	$1,802.41
Ruth P. Ebersole	Assistant subcommittee clerk.	3,000.78
Robert E. McCord	Subcommittee clerk	7,502.28
General Subcommittee on Labor (Representative Carl D. Perkins, chairman):		
Gertrude L. Moser	Secretary (from Sept. 18, 1961).	1,717.11
Hartwell Duvall Reed, Jr.	Counsel	7,502.28
Peggy Lia Amburgey.	Secretary (June 13–Aug. 31, 1961).	834.86
Special Subcommittee on Education (Representative Edith Green, chairman):		
Betty R. Pryor	Subcommittee clerk	5,252.46
Nicholas Zumas	Counsel (Mar. 1–Oct. 24, 1961).	3,326.56
Special Subcommittee on Labor (Representative James Roosevelt, chairman):		
Carolyn A. Latimer	Secretary (Aug. 1–Dec. 7, 1961).	2,334.68
Don Lowe	Director (from Sept. 1, 1961).	5,001.52
Doris G. Smith	Secretary (Apr. 1–Aug. 7, 1961).	719.86
W. Wilson Young	Counsel (Jan. 3–Oct. 31, 1961).	3,751.14
Select Subcommittee on Labor (Representative Herbert Zelenko, chairman):		
Harvey B. Cohen	Counsel	5,000.70
Mollie D. Cohen	Administrative assistant.	4,959.35
Select Subcommittee on Education (Representative Frank Thompson, chairman):		
Mary E. Corbin	Secretary	3,502.02
William P. Gerberding.	Counsel (Mar. 1–Aug. 31, 1961).	2,250.32
John D. Hawke, Jr.	Counsel (from Sept. 1, 1961).	3,333.80
Ad Hoc Subcommittee on the Impact of Imports and Exports on American Employment (Representative John H. Dent, chairman):		
Barbara Dash	Clerk (Mar. 2–Dec. 31, 1961).	3,000.78
James L. Gallagher	Counsel (from July 17, 1961).	5,470.33
Stanley D. Metzger	Counsel (May 1–July 10, 1961).	416.79
Mary Orndoff	Clerk (from Nov. 27, 1961).	378.28
Ad Hoc Subcommittee on the National Labor Relations Board (Representative Roman Pucinski, chairman): James McConnell Harkless.	Counsel (Mar. 1–July 18, 1961).	$750.23
Full committee staff:		
Donald F. Berens	Administrative assistant.	4,251.36
Patricia Bergman	Secretary	2,251.44
Adrienne Fields	Receptionist	2,251.44
Corrine Annette Huff.	do	1,500.80
Mary D. Pinkard	Administrative assistant.	3,750.12
Jeanne Thomson	do	4,302.00
Charles E. Wilson	Assistant education chief (Feb. 1–Aug. 31, 1961).	1,334.42
Investigative task force:		
Leon Abramson	Assistant counsel (from July 15, 1961).	6,918.77
Ida P. Bailey	Secretary (from Dec. 1, 1961).	325.34
James E. Branigan	Counsel	8,750.04
Odell Clark	Assistant chief investigator.	6,250.08
Marvin R. Fullmer	Chief investigator	7,502.28
Olive M. Gibbons	Secretary	2,392.48
Johnnie L. Graves	Secretary (from June 26–Aug. 25, 1961).	801.10
Ann I. Jordan	Secretary (from Apr. 1–Sept. 30, 1961).	1,500.39
Waldo E. Parrish	Administrative assistant.	3,000.78
Jose Lumen Roman	Investigator (from Mar. 1–July 31, 1961).	833.45
Minority staff:		
Beverly Pearson	Minority secretary	3,289.38

The pattern was the same for 1962 as shown in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 108, part 11, page 14805:

Committee on Education and Labor, Jan. 1 to June 30, 1962

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Standing committee:		
Louise Maxienne Dargans.	Chief clerk	$8,824.74
Russell C. Derrickson.	Staff director	8,824.74
Wray Smith	Education chief (ending Feb. 28, 1962).	2,941.58
Deborah P. Wolfe	Education chief	5,883.16
Howard G. Gamser	Chief counsel for labor-management.	8,824.74
Livingston L. Wingate.	Associate counsel for labor-management.	8,604.33
James E. Branigan	Counsel (ending May 14, 1962).	5,055.58
Marvin R. Fullmer	Chief, investigative task force (effective May 15, 1962).	2,255.21
Teresa Calabrese	Administrative assistant to the chairman (ending Feb. 15, 1962).	1,250.17
Richard T. Burress	Minority clerk	8,807.16
Melvin W. Sneed	Administrative assistant (ending Jan. 31, 1962).	1,417.34
Louise M. Wright	Administrative assistant.	4,240.26
Cabell Waller Berge	do	4,251.36
Donald F. Berens	Administrative assistant (effective Feb. 16, 1962).	3,188.52

Committee on Education and Labor, Jan. 1 to June 30, 1962—Continued

INVESTIGATING STAFF

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
General Subcommittee on Education (chairman, Representative Cleveland M. Bailey):		
Robert E. McCord	Subcommittee clerk	$7,502.28
Ted Ellsworth	Special assistant (Mar. 1, 1962, to June 30 1962).	5,001.52
Ruth P. Ebersole	Assistant subcommittee clerk.	3,000.78
General Subcommittee on Labor (chairman, Representative Carl D. Perkins):		
Hartwell Duvall Reed, Jr.	Counsel	7,502.28
Gertrude L. Moser	Secretary	3,000.78
Special Subcommittee on Education (chairman, Representative Edith Green):		
John F. Morse	Director (effective Mar. 1, 1962).	5,883.16
Betty R. Pryor	Subcommittee clerk	5,252.46
Mary June Wall	Administrative assistant (effective Feb. 1. 1962).	3,336.05
Muriel Greenhill	Assistant director (effective Apr. 16, 1962).	2,083.62
William O'Hara	Counsel (effective Apr. 15, 1962).	1,901.90
Joanne M. Clark	Secretary (effective Apr. 22, 1962).	1,074.61
James B. Harrison	Counsel (Jan. 1 to 31, 1962).	833.45
Special Subcommittee on Labor (chairman, Representative James Roosevelt):		
Edmund D. Edelman.	Counsel (effective Feb. 19, 1962).	5,501.67
Adrienne Fields	Secretary	3,000.78
Don Lowe	Director (ending Feb. 18, 1962).	2,000.61
Select Subcommittee on Labor (chairman, Representative Herbert Zelenko):		
Harvey B. Cohen	Counsel	5,000.70
Mollie D. Cohen	Administrative assistant.	5,000.70
Edmund Smythwick.	Staff assistant (Jan. 1 to 31, 1962).	400.55
Select Subcommittee on Education (chairman, Representative Frank Thompson)		
John D. Hawke, Jr.	Counsel	6,250.08
Mary E. Corbin	Secretary	3,502.02
Carla Otten	Assistant clerk (Jan. 1 to Feb. 14, 1962) effective June 25, 1962.	166.40
Susan Liela Gordon	Assistant clerk (effective June 13, 1962).	155.03
Ad Hoc Subcommittee on Impact of Imports and Exports on American Unemployment (chairman, Representative John H. Dent):		
James L. Gallagher	Counsel (ending Feb. 28, 1962).	2,001.34
Mary A. Orndoff	Clerk (ending Feb. 28, 1962).	1,000.26
Barbara Dash	Secretary (Feb. 15 to Mar. 31, 1962).	766.87
Ad Hoc Subcommittee on Integration of Federally Assisted Education (chairman, Dominick V. Daniels):		
Aurora Harris	Secretary (Mar. 1 to May 31, 1962).	1,500.39
Barbara Freygang	Secretary (Mar. 12 to May 31, 1962).	1,317.01
Lillian M. Kelley	Secretary (May 7 to 24, 1962).	300.08
Carla Geraghty	Secretary (Feb. 16 to Mar. 7, 1962).	366.77
Full committee staff:		
Jeanne Thomson	Administrative assistant.	$4,302.00
Tamara J. Wall	Assistant counsel (effective Jan. 1, 1962).	4,001.58
Johnnie L. Graves	Administrative assistant (effective Feb. 22, 1962).	2,687.59
Mary D. Pinkard	Administrative assistant (ending Apr. 15, 1962).	2,312.88
Deborah P. Wolfe	Education chief	2,255.21
Corrine Annette Huff.	Receptionist	2,253.63
Donald F. Berens	Administrative assistant (ending Feb. 15, 1962).	1,062.84
Nancy L. H. Hastings.	Secretary (Jan. 1 to Mar. 8, 1962).	680.36
Marcia Sue Nathanson.	Receptionist (Apr. 4 to 30, 1962).	292.81
Patricia Bergman	Secretary (ending Mar. 31, 1962).	208.20
Judith Matheny	Receptionist (Mar. 17 to Apr. 3, 1962).	198.77
James Saxon	Assistant clerk (effective June 18, 1962).	94.09
Investigative task force:		
Leon Abramson	Chief counsel	7,502.28
Odell Clark	Chief investigator	6,250.08
Marvin R. Fullmer	Chief investigator (ending May 14, 1962).	5,585.03
Ludwig Teller	Consultant (ending Mar. 31, 1962).	3,751.14
Waldo Parrish	Administrative assistant.	3,167.86
Olive Gibbons	Secretary	2,669.98
John Young	Consultant (effective Apr. 1, 1962).	2,500.35
Edward J. Drum, Jr.	Assistant investigator (Jan. 1 to Mar. 31, 1962).	2,500.35
Alfredo Vidal	Investigator (effective Apr. 1, 1962).	2,500.35
Zelda E. McNeal	Clerk (effective Apr. 1, 1962).	1,500.30
James E. Branigan	Counsel	1,458.34
Ida Bailey	Secretary (ending Mar. 15, 1962).	813.36
Arnold Block	Investigator (effective May 1, 1962).	650.68
Minority staff:		
Beverly Pearson	Minority secretary	3,289.38

The payroll of the last 6 months of the 87th Congress is published in the January 24, 1963, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on pages 1032–1033:

Committee on Education and Labor, July 1 to Dec. 31, 1962

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Louise Maxienne Dargans.	Chief Clerk	$9,082.14
Russell C. Derrickson	Staff Director	9,082.14
Deborah P. Wolfe	Education chief	9,082.14
Howard G. Gamser	Chief counsel for labor management.	9,082.14
Livingston L. Wingate.	Associate counsel for labor-management (ending Dec. 16, 1962).	8,401.72
Marvin R. Fullmer	Chief, investigative task force.	9,082.14
Richard T. Burress	Minority clerk	9,064.04
Donald F. Berens	Administrative assistant to the chairman.	4,375.36
Louise M. Wright	Administrative assistant.	4,375.36
Cabell Waller Berge	do	4,375.36

Committee on Education and Labor, July 1 to Dec. 31, 1962—Continued

INVESTIGATING STAFF

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
General Subcommittee on Education (chairman, Representative Cleveland M. Bailey):		
Robert E. McCord	Subcommittee clerk	$7,721.08
Ruth P. Ebersole	Assistant subcommittee clerk.	3,088.30
General Subcommittee on Labor (chairman, Representative Carl D. Perkins):		
Hartwell D. Reed, Jr.	Counsel	7,721.08
Gertrude L. Moser	Secretary	3,088.30
Special Subcommittee on Education (chairman, Representative Edith Green):		
John F. Morse	Director	9,082.14
Betty R. Pryor	Subcommittee clerk	5,921.40
William T. O'Hara	Counsel	4,891.22
Muriel Greenhill	Assistant director (ending Sept. 15, 1962).	2,083.62
William F. Gaul	Assistant director (effective Sept. 16, 1962).	3,062.92
Mary June Wall	Administrative assistant.	4,120.03
Joanne M. Clark	Secretary	2,885.07
Special Subcommittee on Labor (chairman, Representative James Roosevelt):		
Edmund D. Edelman.	Counsel	7,721.08
Adrienne Fields	Secretary	3,088.30
Select Subcommittee on Labor (chairman, Representative Herbert Zelenko):		
Harvey B. Cohen	Counsel	5,146.55
Mollie D. Cohen	Administrative assistant.	5,146.55
Loriece Hackney	Staff assistant (Sept. 1 to 30, 1962).	616.58
Denis A. Weinstock	Staff assistant (Aug. 1 to Sept. 30, 1962).	1,060.44
Select Subcommittee on Education (chairman, Representative Frank Thompson):		
John D. Hawke, Jr.	Counsel (ending Dec. 15, 1962).	5,875.08
Mary E. Corbin	Secretary	3,604.17
Susan Liela Gordon	Assistant clerk (ending Oct. 15, 1962).	904.33
Carla Otten	Assistant clerk (ending Aug. 31, 1962).	646.08
Full committee staff:		
Jeanne Thomson	Administrative assistant.	4,427.48
Corrine Annette Huff.	Receptionist	2,577.63
Tamara J. Wall	Assistant counsel (ending Dec. 31, 1962).	4,635.90
H. Roy Partridge, Jr.	Assistant clerk (Aug. 6 to 31, 1962).	180.95
Johnnie L. Graves	Administrative assistant (ending Nov. 25, 1962).	3,079.27
James J. Saxon	Assistant clerk (ending July 31, 1962).	217.14
John M. Henshaw	Assistant clerk	220.35
Investigative task force:		
Leon Abramson	Chief counsel	7,721.08
Arnold F. Block	Investigator	2,008.97
Manuel Casiano	do	2,160.20
Odell Clark	Chief investigator	6,432.38
Olive M. Gibbons	Secretary	3,088.30
E. Zelda McNeal	Clerk	3,085.02
Charles L. Mitchell	Special investigator (effective Aug. 1, 1962).	3,359.65
Ruben I. Ortz	Investigator (effective Sept. 1, 1962).	1,742.77
Waldo E. Parrish	Administrative assistant.	3,604.17

Committee on Education and Labor, July 1 to Dec. 31, 1962—Continued

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Investigative task force—Continued		
Herbert Ratner	Special investigator (Oct. 1 to 31, 1962).	$634.66
Alfredo Vidal	Investigator	5,146.55
John M. Young	Consultant (ending July 31, 1962).	833.45
David Hepburn	Investigator (effective Dec. 1, 1962).	615.50
Stanley E. Michels	Special counsel (Oct. 1 to 31, 1962).	952.74
Minority staff:		
Beverly Pearson	Secretary	4,120.03

It can readily be seen that in only one area was any real economy exercised as far as the committee payroll was concerned—that of reducing the number of minority employees. At the start of the session the minority had 4 employees out of a total staff of 16. A very short time after the new chairman assumed the leadership of the committee, the Republicans found themselves with only 2 employees, 2 regular employees being taken to serve on the majority side. Employees came and employees went—many stayed but it is safe to say that the total payroll of the Education and Labor Committee had zoomed to a level of anywhere from 35 to 50 at any given time. Curiously enough, although the minority needed all of the assistance it could get from a competent staff, it was confined to but two full-time employees although Republicans constituted almost 40 percent of the House membership. The ratio under the new committee averaged out at about 35 or 40 to 2, hardly a fair situation to say the least.

From our standpoint, this was not the only problem. We were met with persistent demands to vacate our minority suite. It is not an exaggeration to say we were harassed. There is talk of increasing the minority appropriation to $110,000 in the 88th Congress but few of us are much impressed with this proffer. It is no secret that this committee is coming under heavy fire and many of us are rather skeptical of what may seem to be generous at the time of need—need of our support, that is.

The Congress is always talking about economy. It could well turn its attention on this committee through its proper controlling overseer, the Committee on House Administration. Close scrutiny of the payroll, consultant fees, contracts, telephone and travel expenditures would, in my judgment, lead this committee to cut Education and Labor some $200,000 and bring its expenditures down to a realistic figure. Expenditure on contracts which were let by our committee were cut in half by the action of the House Committee on Administration, from $28,000 to $13,000.

In the same manner, this committee was one of the most freely traveling groups in the entire Congress. While a good case can be made for the oversea travel of anyone for just about any cause any more, on the face of it the Committee on Education and Labor would seem to have less reason to travel than most other committees of the Congress. Such was not the case as the figures clearly reveal. Our expensive domestic travel was matched by our oversea travel. In the Congressional Record, volume 108, part 5, pages 6422–6423, the report of the expenditure of foreign currency and appropriated funds was printed. It indicates that $21,272.99 was spent by committee members and staff for the year 1961. Last year's figures are not yet available. I will not be so unkind as to refer to these travels as junkets since many items appear to be worthy such as attending international commissions and conferences.

In my judgment one typical example of a questionable trip, however, was made by John Young, 3d, New York press agent, who made a 30-day cultural survey in South America as a special consultant for the Committee on Education and Labor. Mr. Young spent approximately $2,000 for hotel, meals, and taxis, et cetera, and about $1,000 for transportation. His report tells very little that any Member of Congress could not obtain on a straight request for information from the Library of Congress. In addition, he was paid well over $1,000 for contract or consultant services as a special investigator. The Committee on House Administration could determine whether or not we have received adequate value for these expensive services.

Incomplete details at this point make it necessary to postpone until a later date more instances of junket travel by staff members of the Committee on Education and Labor. These details will be forthcoming as soon as the intricate process of checking expenditures is complete. The difficulty in gaining access to information relative to the expenditure of Federal funds and counterpart funds is enough to deter anyone with ordinary vigor.

With an interest in economy and cutting down unnecessary expenditures I would suggest that the Committee on House Administration take a close look at what seems to me to be inordinately high expenditures in New York City. Vouchers on file in the Committee on House Administration indicate the following expenditures for telephone services in New York City:

Voucher No.	Date	Payee	Amount
1008	July 7, 1961	New York Telephone Co.	$356.08
783	Aug. 2, 1961	do	164.65
2920	Nov. 13, 1961	do	80.57
4525	Jan. 17, 1962	do	19.00
5338	Feb. 9, 1962	do	177.17
7532	May 3, 1962	do	94.54
8440	June 6, 1962	do	228.85
8441	do	do	123.17
8950	July 19, 1962	do	222.98
2843	Nov. 1, 1962	do	122.85
2844	do	do	180.80
2845	do	do	190.64
2846	do	do	215.32
3297	Dec. 6, 1962	do	113.25

As can be seen, this amounts to no small sum—approximately $2,500. In addition to this, the records of the Committee on House Administration indicate that numerous services were performed by the General Services Administration for which they were reimbursed out of our committee funds. These should be thoroughly checked also.

In the area of travel, I believe we could live on a much smaller budget. Travel items to New York City and Puerto Rico constitute an undue expenditure of funds. Excessive expenditures in these areas lead to the very natural conclusion that the same practices exist in the huge payroll, the largest single item of our committee expense. The best way to correct these abuses is to turn off the money spigot so this committee will be required to live within a reasonable budget.

Only a thorough investigation will disclose the total picture in this field. My original interest in this area was whetted last year when I saw an employee of the Committee on Education and Labor purchase tickets at the airport. The machine ran off more than a dozen blank tickets which were charged to this committee. I asked an airline employee if this was customary practice and got a terse reply:

> We don't question what the Government does although we don't generally issue no-name tickets.

By the same token, employment of consultants and investigators in New York City seemed to receive major emphasis during the past 2 years. The effective action of Chairman Omar Burleson, of the Committee on House Administration, has been credited with cutting the contract expenditures from about $28,000 to the $13,000 sum actually expended. Last September, Chairman Burleson cited the employment of Herbert Hill who was concurrently employed by the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, an organization which lobbys before the Congress. Mr. Hill had contracted for services as a consultant at a rate which could have brought him as much as $10,000 per year although he received only $2,415 up to the time of his resignation. Close study of the payroll and contract lists will disclose an overwhelming majority of people working in the New York City area as against the rest of the entire country.

Also, sound economy would dictate trimming the expense of trips to Puerto Rico. Checking the airline bills, I find that taxpayers have paid for over 30 trips to Puerto Rico for members and staff. Next to New York City, the problems of Puerto Rico seemed to call for the largest single outlay of our travel funds. At a time when we are mortgaging the future and maybe the hereafter, too, it would seem wise to limit our studies and trips to that island. As I pointed out earlier, the rules of the Committee on House Administration make it impossible for me to study the vouchers for traveling expenses incurred since

July 1, 1961, even though these vouchers will be printed in sketchy detail in the next month by this same committee. Vouchers for the first 6 months of the 87th Congress have already been printed. They disclose the following information regarding the reimbursed travel of our chairman:

Voucher	Date	Payee	Purpose	Amount
5001	Mar. 20, 1961	Adam Clayton Powell.	Reimbursement per diem to Puerto Rico Jan. 16–21, 1961, on minimum wage. Authorized by the Committee on Education and Labor.	$132.00
5226	Apr. 24, 1961	____do____	Reimbursement for transportation to Puerto Rico, Jan. 16–21, 1961. Authorized by Committee on Education and Labor.	90.56
5227	____do____	____do____	Reimbursement per diem and transportation to Puerto Rico, Mar. 10–13, 1961, for official business of Committee on Education and Labor.	88.80
5266	Apr. 26, 1961	____do____	Reimbursement for per diem in lieu of subsistence on official business for the Education and Labor Committee in San Juan, P.R., Mar. 31–Apr. 5, 1960.	96.00
5542	May 31, 1961	____do____	Reimbursement round trip to New York by auto, per diem, May 18–20, 1961, in connection with official business of Committee on Education and Labor.	97.50
5596	June 13, 1961	____do____	Reimbursement per diem in the Virgin Islands, May 12–15, 1961. Official travel for the Committee on Education and Labor.	60.00
152	July 7, 1961	____do____	Per diem and calls, June 2 and 3, June 23 and 24; place not known.	171.00
499	July 25, 1961	____do____	Per diem, July 5–8, place not known	40.00
536	July 26, 1961	____do____	Mileage and tolls, June 3–24, place not known	123.00
3586	Dec. 13, 1961	____do____	Per diem, Nov. 13 to Dec. 6, place not known	112.00
4280	Jan. 5, 1962	____do____	Per diem, Dec. 13–15, place not known	48.00
4668	Jan. 19, 1962	____do____	Per diem, Jan. 6–8, place not known	72.00
5517	Feb. 23, 1962	____do____	Per diem, Feb. 13–19, place not known	168.00
8648	June 12, 1962	____do____	Per diem, Apr. 19–26, place not known	192.00
2652	Oct. 25, 1962	____do____	Per diem, Oct. 9–13, place not known	120.00
2653	____do____	____do____	Per diem and taxi, place not known	105.00
2882	Nov. 14, 1962	____do____	Per diem, taxi, etc., Oct. 27, place not known	25.00
2960	Nov. 19, 1962	____do____	Per diem, taxi, Nov. 3, place not known	25.00
3298	Dec. 6, 1962	____do____	Per diem and taxi, Nov. 19–24, place not known	89.00
4566	Jan. 30, 1963	____do____	Miscellaneous and per diem, Dec. 3–15, place not known.	178.00
4567	____do____	____do____	Per diem Jan. 1–3, place not known	90.00

I would further urge that the House Committee on Government Operations take a close look at the arrangements that exist relative to a $250,000 grant which the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare has made to a nonprofit organization in Harlem. The administrative head of this organization is Livingston Wingate who has been on the staff of the Education and Labor Committee but now is reportedly on leave. According to reports, the organization will set up a domestic peace corps to deal with the problems of juvenile delinquency in Harlem. HEW claims that their allocation of funds is authorized under the Juvenile Delinquency Control Act which was reported out of the Education and Labor Committee and became law in the last Congress.

This domestic peace corps vanguard is quartered at 197 West 137th Street, New York City, which backs up to 132 West 138th Street, the Abyssinian Baptist Church. It is reported that 197 West 137th Street is owned by the Adam Clayton Powell Foundation, named after the father of the Representative from New York and chairman of our Committee on Education and Labor. The reported rent is $2,000 per month which may or may not be fair, based on the prior rental history of this building and the general rent level of the neighborhood. Under House rule XI establishing committees, the House Committee on Government Operations is charged with the responsibility of investigating and studying "the operation of Government activities at all levels with a view to determining its economy and efficiency."

Chairman POWELL in his February 20 press conference publicly praised Mr. Cecil Holland for the article which he wrote in the February 17, 1963, issue of the Washington Sunday Star. Representative POWELL is a director of the organization which received this grant. I ask unanimous consent that this article be included in the RECORD following these remarks. As the House Committee on Government Operations is now organized, the Subcommittee on Intergovernmental Relations has jurisdiction over the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and an investigation on their part could either clear any cloud on this venture or establish the presence of wasteful operation or possible unauthorized or unwise use of funds.

I have mentioned the press conference of the gentleman from New York, Mr. POWELL, which was held last Wednesday. I certainly do not question his right to make any of the statements that he made. It is clearly his right. I do not impute his motives in any manner. In my own defense, however, I would like to say that the impression was given that Mr. POWELL was only doing what every Member of Congress does and in my case at least I would hasten to say that this is not correct. Regarding oversea trips and visits to Paris nightclubs paid out of counterpart funds, Chairman POWELL told reporters:

> I wish to state very emphatically that I will always do just what every other Congressman and committee chairman has done and is doing and will do.

I do not frown on useful oversea trips. Quite frankly, I think that it is a good investment for our country every time Representative OTTO PASSMAN goes overseas to see how our foreign aid dollars are being spent or squandered, whichever is the case. When Mr. PASSMAN returns, it always seems that the American taxpayer gets a break when he takes the knife to foreign aid requests. I reject, however, the idea that all of us would do what Representative POWELL would consider proper. People differ and I would certainly reserve the right to differ in my conduct from my chairman just as he would surely want to differ from what I do.

The interview contains the following colloquy:

> Reporter. Mr. POWELL, do you view any of these things such as the use of counterpart funds for attending nightclubs or going to resorts as abusive of congressional privilege?
>
> Representative POWELL. No, because it's done by all of them.
>
> Reporter. You mean whether it is right or wrong.
>
> Representative POWELL: Well, there is no right or wrong in it, its nonprohibitive. It was set up that way.
>
> Reporter. Was it set up to go to nightclubs?
>
> Representative POWELL. Well, I am sure that you don't go to Paris and stay all the time in Notre Dame.
>
> Reporter. But is that part of committee business?
>
> Representative POWELL. Of course it is part of it. You are going abroad, travel is a very broadening kind of education and I wish to assure you that it is practiced by every Member of the House and the Senate. I think you ought to talk to some of my colleagues and ask them where they were when I was over there. You know there were a lot over there when I was there.

Mr. Speaker, again I reiterate my point. I object to the reference that we all practice this type of activity. I certainly would not nor would many Members of the House and yet the impression is given, accidentally or otherwise, that this is the standard routine for all of us. Representative POWELL should respect our right to courteously disagree with these practices as far as our personal beliefs are concerned and it is an affront to the dignity of the House to categorically state that we all have done or will do these things.

I believe that the reputation of this august body is at stake. We should look with penetrating concern at the expenditures of this committee and every other committee of Congress. At a time of grave fiscal crisis we cannot afford to neglect the duty of making sure our own house is in order. A conscientious effort to do this will lessen the hostile attitude of the taxpayer toward his Government. As one person told me recently while I was back in my district in Ohio:

> I sometimes feel like the crows are guarding our corn.

Let us show them otherwise. Unless the Committee on House Administration and this body cuts this appropriation request or sets out some more distinguishable standards we will all in effect be ratifying the actions of this committee and its chairman in the 87th Congress and be further indicating we will be glad to have 2 more years of the same thing.

Appendix A

Adam Clayton Powell Press Conference, February 20, 1963

Representative Powell. O.K., it's 4 p.m. You ladies and gentlemen know Mr. Derrickson, who is staff director. I just asked him to drop by. What I have to say, will be mimeographed—it is being mimeographed and will be distributed before we break off. I have called this press conference today not to answer any charges nor because I, nor my family are the slightest bit disturbed by anything that has appeared in the press. I also am calling this conference with the firm knowledge that none of the facts which I will now present will receive the same publicity as the statements, inaccuracies, and lies which have appeared recently. I am also calling this conference without immunity. I would like to interrupt and say that as I came down this paper was just delivered, which is typical of what is happening. It says, "Hundreds of aids payless as Powell balks."

Reporter. What paper is that?

Representative Powell. This is Roll Call, sir; and when you read the article it says, that because of the fact that I balked at appearing before Mr. Burleson's committee yesterday, hundreds of aids are payless. Now, I didn't balk at all, I was scheduled to appear yesterday at 2 p.m. and was ready, but at 2 p.m. the Attorney General of the United States was scheduled to appear before Mr. Perkins' subcommittee and in a Democratic caucus held yesterday morning where—by the way I'd like to announce, all the Democrats are now in favor of the omnibus bill in the Federal aid to education—at that caucus, they all said they would like to hear Mr. Kennedy and they all wanted to go and which is customary with the chairman to the hearing on the budget. We called up Mr. Burleson and asked him if he could move us up to 1 p.m. Mr. Burleson said it was impossible due to a tight schedule of committee hearings already arranged. We then asked him when it would be possible to hear our committee at the earliest opportunity and he said next Thursday. I didn't balk at all—it is a total lie. In the second place, I only have—Mr. Derrickson, how many people on the payroll at this present moment who are payless?

Mr. Derrickson. There are 16 of them. They are all aware of the situation and know that it is not your fault that they're not paid——

Representative Powell. And also they know that they can borrow money from you or myself. We've told them that before.

Reporter. Mr. Powell, wasn't the appearance of the Attorney General scheduled after you had scheduled the House appearance?

Representative Powell. Correct, sir. Afterwards and that's why the conflict arose.

Reporter. Mr. Powell, you did not meet with the Attorney General.

Representative Powell. I know that, but I said my committee members wanted to go with the chairman, which is customary to the hearing on the budget and they were the ones that asked that it be postponed in the Democratic caucus yesterday morning.

Reporter. Sir, would you say that 16 members of your committee are payless now?

Representative Powell. Are what?

Reporter. Are payless?

Representative Powell. That's right, 16 now.

Reporter. Well, where do you get this money to take care of them if they want to borrow some money from you?

Representative Powell. Out of my pocket.

Reporter. Just out of your own pocket?

Representative Powell. Yes, hoping they'll pay me back. Now I'd also like to point out that now that factually that 2 years ago when Congress was organized, the resolutions of approval of pay for all the employees on this Hill, were not adopted until February 28.

Mr. Derrickson. They were heard on February 22. It was February 28 before it passed the House.

Representative Powell. February 28, this is nothing unusual. This is an aside though, but it is just typical.

Reporter. Congressman, have you any bills left over from last year?

Representative Powell. Yes, we have left over from last year that were blocked in the Rules Committee 16 bills. I'd like—16.

Reporter. How about unpaid committee bills?

Representative Powell. I don't know. I don't know. The chief clerk wouldn't know it either. Oh, I'm sure there is.

Reporter. You're all paid up as far as last year?

Representative Powell. I don't know, I don't know. I'm sure December bills haven't been paid yet.

Reporter. December bills?

Representative Powell. I'm sure. I don't know. The chief clerk does that.

Reporter. Well, she says you have.

Representative Powell. Well, she's wrong.

Reporter. Mr. Powell, do you have any controversy with the House Administration Committee relative to whether your bills will or will not be paid?

Representative Powell. Not that I know of.

Reporter. Not that you know of?

Representative Powell. Mr. Derrickson, do you know, he has this, he handles this by the way.

Mr. Derrickson. All vouchers that were to pay expenditures have been forwarded to the Disbursing Office and if they have not been paid yet, it is not the committee's fault, but because the Disbursing Office has not yet paid them. To my knowledge, they haven't got any question to this committee or to the chairman as to why they haven't been paid.

Representative Powell. May I proceed and as I said we'll have this all ready for you as you leave, mimeographed. Now I want to thank the Washington Evening Star in its Sunday edition of February 17, for its very fair and objective story and its writer, Mr. Cecil Holland, whom I do not know if he's here, thank him personally. I want to thank also Newsweek which I just saw for trying to be objective in their story. I also wish to thank the entire Negro press of this Nation from coast to coast for their 100-percent unsolicited support. Now I am breaking this conference down into five subdivisions with a preamble. The preamble you have in your hand. Now as regards the first two parts of the conference. There will be absolutely no questions now or any more answered by me nor no comments now or anymore. The matter is completely closed as far as I am concerned. As regards the preamble, I know it is a little lengthy, but I don't have immunity and I therefore would like to state this without immunity.

Now the gentleman from Delaware purchased property prohibiting sale for use by people other than Aryans, an old Hitler concept. August 29, 1952, Senator John J. Williams and his wife Elsie Williams purchased from William D. Brasure, et ux., lots 25, 26, 27, 28, block 38, subdivision Rehoboth Heights at Rehoboth Beach, city of Rehoboth, Sussex County, Del., so forth and so forth, recorded you have it before you. The last sentence in that "said property not to be sold, conveyed, leased or mortgaged to premises or permitted to be occupied by any person not of the Aryan race," etc. I don't know what that means, the Aryan race, etc. Voting record: on all these issues affecting civil rights—housing, confirmation even on President Eisenhower's appointees, changing of the rules of the Senate—Senator Williams has opposed them.

At the opening of the 87th Congress, an attempt was made to liberalize the filibuster rule. He opposed Javits' amendment to desegregate the airport facilities. He opposed Senator Clark's amendment to extend the life of the Civil Rights Commission, opposed Senator Javits' amendment to give the Attorney General the right to protect civil rights by injunctive action, opposed Senator Keating's Federal assistance to school desegregation amendment, opposed rule and change XXII again, he opposed the reorganization plan which would have made Dr. Robert Weaver member of the U.S. Cabinet, February 20, 1962. He opposed a civil rights bill offered by Senator Dirksen, August 9, 1960; he opposed Javits again on Federal funds airport segregated facilities. He opposed the cloture petition on March 10, 1960. He opposed part 3 of the civil rights bill.

Reporter. What has this got to do with the——

Representative Powell. It has got to do a lot and I'd like an opportunity to be heard without immunity. He opposed the establishment of the Commission on Equal Job Opportunity under Government contracts without racial discrimination. He opposed that; then he opposed Senator Keating again; amendment to give technical assistance to areas desegregated. He opposed Javits on antipoll tax. He opposed rule XXII again; 85th Congress, he opposed rule XXII again, civil rights bill again, he opposed item No. 18, he opposed the confirmation of the appointment of W. Wilson White as head of the Civil Rights Division, Mr. Eisenhower's appointee for the Civil Rights Division, Department of Justice, on and on we go. Item 22, he opposed President Eisenhower nominating Solicitor General Sobeloff to be a circuit court judge. Sobeloff represented the Department of Justice in opposing school segregation before the Supreme Court. On and on we go. He opposed item 25, Senator Lehman's sponsoring amendment which would have made violence against servicemen punishable as a Federal crime. Item 26, when Vice President Barkley gave a ruling that would make it easy to break a filibuster, he opposed Mr. Barkley's ruling.

Reporter. Congressman Powell, today on the Senate floor Senator Williams said that he had never made any charge relative to race or religion.

Representative Powell. Well, I didn't either.

Reporter. Or anything like this and that he contended that you had tried to cloud the issue by bringing up what he considers to be an immaterial point, now——

Representative Powell. When did I, this is the first time I have said anything.

Reporter. Well, I wondered if, yesterday you said something relative to the group that was involved in one of these housing operations or in your youth program in New York was composed of white people, Negroes and others——

Representative Powell. Yes; an integrated board of directors.

Reporter. And that he stated that he felt you were trying to cloud the issue by bringing a race problem in. I wondered if you felt you have done that or are doing that?

Representative Powell. Yes, yes, very definitely. Yes, and as I proceed, but the record there without immunity is before you: restrictive covenant in opposition to public housing, Robert Weaver, civil rights right through the years. Now, may I proceed? Under me as the new chairman, incoming chairman, the Committee on Education and Labor in 2 years produced laws and more legislation, than any other major committee in the House: 19 laws, 43 bills were passed out of the committee. Not one newspaper mentioned this. I can assure you that after caucusing with my subcommittee chairmen and with the Democratic majority, this session we are ready, willing, and able to duplicate this again in these 2 years of this Congress. Now——

Reporter. Well, Mr. Chairman, on that particular point, you'd made some point yesterday of a trip that you'd made abroad with two young ladies——

Representative Powell. Two staff members.

Reporter. Two staff members studying a problem of equal opportunity for women and that this had resulted in passage of some legislation, was that correct?

Representative Powell. I said that the women in charge of the group had brought about the passage through her efforts as the counsel was hired just for that purpose. For the first time in 25 years in the attempts by Republican and Democratic administrations, the passage in the House of equal pay for equal work——

Reporter. Well, Senator Williams made the point that the trip was made after the legislation had been passed in the House.

Representative Powell. Correct.

Reporter. And, he couldn't see how the trip would have helped pass the legislation if it came after.

Representative Powell. Because the Senate had no equipment for this at all and the result was it did die in the Senate.

Reporter. Your trip was to help——

Representative Powell. My trip was not that trip, sir.

Reporter. Well, the trip which the young ladies made——

Representative Powell. The trip that the staff members took; yes, sir.

Reporter. The young lady staff members was for the purpose of helping the Senate in its deliberations.

Representative Powell. Its purpose of bringing before us and not on our side because we were finished, the truth about equal pay for equal work in other parts of the world.

Reporter. Mr. Chairman.

Representative Powell. Now wait. I'm going to finish this first. Then we're going to ask questions.

Reporter. Well, Congressman, may I ask——

Representative Powell. You're my dear friend, so you may.

Reporter. Are you saying that Senator Williams is criticizing your expenditure of Federal funds because you are a Negro?

Representative Powell. I am saying, as I will develop here, that I haven't spent any Federal funds. That's what I am going to say. I have not spent one penny of Federal funds.

Reporter. Well, just his charges are motivated because you are Negro.

Representative Powell. Yes, sir, yes, sir.

Reporter. Mr. Chairman, I am from the Denver Post. I have a question. What report did you file regarding the impact of the Common Market on the United States. What form did this report take?

Representative Powell. This report—is Mr. Gamser here? Please step forward please, Mr. Gamser is chief counsel for labor. This report was printed and it's the only report, and I develop it in my remarks here, the only study made by the Senate or the House on the impact of the European Common Market on the U.S. economy was made by me. It was collated by my chief counsel, Mr. Gamser, and it ran 109 pages and it was a bestseller because the first day it came out, every print was exhausted. I had to order others, in fact Barratt O'Hara of the Foreign Affairs Committee personally ordered 100 copies for use of the Foreign Affairs Committee. May I proceed and I'll be glad to answer any questions. Now as regards section 1 which it deals with the counterpart and section 2, relatives on payrolls, I wish to state very emphatically that I will always do just what every other Congressman and committee chairman has done and is doing and will do. In the House of Representatives, six other committees—Appropriations, Armed Services, Government Operations, Judiciary, and Banking and Currency—spent much more money than the Committee on Education and Labor on counterpart funds. Now may I repeat again for my beloved friend from "Meet the Press," not one penny of committee funds and not one penny of taxpayers' dollars was or could even have been used by the Committee on Education and Labor.

I have had a report prepared by the Library of Congress who assigned Mr. Vladimir Pregel, analyst in International Trade and Finance Economics Division. And he explains in two sentences what counterpart funds are and I think that this is very important because one of my very dear friends of the press yesterday didn't understand. The U.S. Foreign Currency Accounts is the title of this paragraph. Within the scope of this report to me, this is counterpart, are only those foreign currency accounts which have been acquired without the expenditure of dollars. Foreign currency is derived from some specified sources which may be used without reimbursement in appropriated dollars. These are the funds used for congressional foreign travel. Not one penny of dollar funds used in any congressional travel.

Reporter. Mr. Chairman, Chairman Smith, of the Rules Committee, wrote into your resolution a prohibition against your committee using any counterpart funds on any travel out of the United States. Is that going to inhibit the action of your committee this year? Will your committee adhere to that decision?

Representative Powell. Well, let's get that when the time arrives, but I do say that not only my committee, but there were several other committees. Right? Now, I say that when the House assumed second-class status and forbids the committees of the House not to travel although the Senate can travel freely and the Senate does not disclose its itemized expenditures, when the House assumed second-class status, I had a further analysis made.

Reporter. Mr. Congressman, are you opposed to disclosures?

Representative Powell. No, but I think the Senate should do it. I am opposed to the House being second class.

Reporter. You don't want to lead the way on what you think is a good thing.

Representative Powell. No, I'd love to lead the way and we are doing it in the House.

Reporter. Well, now there was some question raised, I think in the House Administration Committee about the use of the term "miscellaneous" to cover large amounts. Now, do you feel that you have done a good job in breaking that down?

Representative Powell. Surely.

Reporter. Do you feel the committee was rather arbitrary in criticizing you and the members of that committee?

Representative Powell. Much better than my colleague Mr. Lankford.

Reporter. Well, do you think he is a pattern you should follow?

Representative Powell. No. What the trouble is, the trouble is there are no standards. The standards have just been adopted for the first time. But only for the House——

Reporter. But do you object?

Representative Powell. I object to the House being made second-class status.

Reporter. But do you think this is a good thing, wouldn't you be leading the way, rather than making the House second class?

Representative Powell. The Senate has never followed the House in these things, we led the way a long time ago on itemizing by Members. The Senate hasn't done it.

Reporter. Getting right down to the point, Are you willing at this time to make your spending on counterpart funds available for general scrutiny just to show everyone how?

Representative Powell. On March 1, I will, that's the date due.

Reporter. In detail, there will be no miscellaneous this time?

Representative Powell. No, sir.

Reporter. It's going to be right out on the line in every respect.

Representative Powell. Correct, I promise you that. But will the Senate do it? No. The Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. Dillon, told Congressman Jerry Cohelan, of California, when asked, what would happen to counterpart funds now that the House had stopped the use of them. He said the only thing there is to do is to put a match to them.

In 1961, $24 million of counterpart funds were unused and never will be. In 1962, $14 million unused. This is given to me by the U.S. Agency for International Development.

Reporter. Mr. Congressman, are you making the point here that you think, you agree with Mr. Dillon that these should just be done away with or are you in favor of a little loose spending, more loose spending to get rid of them.

Representative Powell. No; I am in favor of equal status with the Senate. That's all.

Reporter. Well, are you making the point here that you shouldn't limit the use of counterpart funds?

Representative Powell. No; but I say that they should be used.

Reporter. They should be used, but accounted for.

Representative Powell. Yes, sir. Mr. Derrickson will testify that in March of last year, I became the first chairman in the history of the Congress, House or Senate, to limit the expenditure of counterpart funds in a written memorandum to him. No other committee chairman in the House or the Senate has ever done this. Nobody allowed to spend more than—the top was $40, right, $40.

Mr. Derrickson. Fifty dollars in some places—to every penny accounted for.

Representative Powell. The only chairman that limited the expenditures on counterpart funds. That was in March.

Reporter. You limited members of your committee to a maximum of $50 a day on the travel.

Representative Powell. I think it was $40—he says $50. I take Mr. Derrickson's word.

Mr. Derrickson. In some cases, but every bit accounted for.

Representative Powell. Accounted for.

Reporter. This applies to the chairman as well as the members?

Representative Powell. Oh, yes, I've always lived on lower than that. Now, and under Mr. Graham Barden, who as you know was not my boon friend. Every year Mr. Barden gave me counterpart funds. Every single year. And he gave it to all of them.

Reporter. Mr. Congressman, may I go back one moment, to the trip in September of 1961 or 1962. Will that trip be reported in your report?

Representative Powell. Yes, sir, in detail, in detail, itemized.

Reporter. That involved the use of counterpart funds.

Representative Powell. Yes, sir, and not one penny of committee funds and not one penny of Federal funds. Must emphasize that.

Reporter. Mr. Chairman, if they are not Federal funds, they belong to the people of the United States.

Representative Powell. No, they don't. You see it is one of the peculiar things of the act as I point out, these are funds in foreign currency that cannot be utilized and as Mr. Dillon said, all we can do is stick a match to them.

Reporter. Couldn't Congress, by an act of both Houses signed by the President, order——

Representative Powell. No, sir, because it is foreign currency. Mr. Gamser, will you give me a list of——

Reporter. Mr. Chairman, aren't those spent, they're spent now by the Embassy, aren't they?

Representative Powell. No, sir.

Reporter. They are not spent by the Embassy, not at all?

Representative Powell. No sir. This is money going right down the drain.

Reporter. They can't be used for military?

Representative Powell. Yes, they can, now I want to point out something——

Reporter. I thought there were a number of ways they could be spent.

Representative Powell. Surely, I want to point out something very interesting, while you mention that point. The General Accounting Office lists disclosed last year that the Pentagon spent $7 million sending people overseas by commercial airliners while the Military Air Transport Service were going over with plenty of empty seats and while they had unused counterpart funds totaling $14 million unused.

Reporter. Do you think you should crack down on the military?

Representative Powell. I think crack down on anyone that does a thing like that. Another cute one, I don't know how you fellows missed this. The General Accounting Office also in its report to Congress last year pointed out the Department of Agriculture on public lands had operated for 4 years a house of prostitution. On public land.

Reporter. You're not making any suggestion about counterpart funds to——

Representative Powell. Well, there ought to be some solution there.

Reporter. Are we talking about the degree of magnitude of the sin or the sin itself here?

Representative Powell. No.

Reporter. Aren't the counterpart funds used by the USIS to combat Communist propaganda?

Representative Powell. Correct, may I go ahead?

Reporter. Will more be available for that?

Representative Powell. Surely, now let us look at counterpart a little more. The Senate with 100 Members and the House with 433, the past 2 years has sent more staff members than the House and spent more money than the House in counterpart funds. To show how much further the House becomes second class, in 1961, the average amount of money spent by a House Member counterpart was $850 and by the Senate in excess of $2,000. I would also like to point out all this comes from the report of the Library of Congress. I would also like to point out that in 1959 President Eisenhower, that is, there was appropriated to the President $688,000 and in 1961, President Kennedy $680,000 in counterpart. In other words the executive branch spent more than combined totals of the Senate and the House.

Reporter. Well, now on specifics do you feel that you have gone second class?

Representative Powell. I always travel tourist.

Reporter. Well, I just wondered, with regard to your own operation do you feel you haven't been treated in a second-class manner? Do you feel that you have spent enough counterpart funds to be first class?

Representative Powell. I would say, I don't know what you mean first class, the House has reduced itself to second class on this counterpart issue.

Reporter. They didn't spend as much on the over all?

Representative Powell. Correct.

Reporter. Do you feel that you have kept up with the Senators on the——

Representative Powell. No, indeed, indeed no, no—why the night that the press said I was in a nightclub in Paris, Senator Estes Kefauver was in the same nightclub at the same time with 10 guests. And the—wait a minute, may I proceed—and the reservations for his party had been made by the U.S. Embassy. And he was provided with counterpart funds to pay for all of the 10.

Reporter. Did you have guests that night?

Representative Powell. No.

Reporter. Did you use counterpart funds?

Representative Powell. Me, surely at $40 a day I couldn't take 10 people to the Lido.

Reporter. Well, how many did you have with you that night?

Representative Powell. Never more than $40 per day. Yes sir, never more. Now, let's go to the question of relatives on payroll. Mr. Vance Trimble did a story on this and got a prize for doing it. Over 100 Members of the House of Representatives have their relatives on payrolls that we know about. There are many others on payrolls in other areas of the legislature and executive branches. The House is again reduced itself to second-class status, publishes in detail the names, while the Senate refuses to do this. But we do know there are innumerable relatives on the payroll on the Senate side either in their offices or in the committees, including wives.

Reporter. Well, now on this point here, the Senate does make available the payroll of——

Representative Powell. Not like the House.

Reporter. Well, probably not like the House, but it is a payroll made available periodically that shows—do you think that having relatives on the payroll is a good thing?

Representative Powell. Yes, very good, very good.

Reporter. You think it should——

Representative Powell. As long as 100 plus Members of the House and "X" numbers of Senators, then I am going to do it.

Reporter. Well, you're not criticizing the 100 Members—what you're really doing is complimenting them.

Representative Powell. I compliment all my colleagues. Now, now let's get down to section 3 on my agenda and that regards housing. No loans have been made by the HHFA because the FFHA does, insures mortgages. Statement 2: No insurance of mortgages by any agency of the Federal Government has ever been made to me. The Adam Clayton Powell Foundation was established by me in honor of my father, who was a pioneer in housing for senior citizens in Harlem when in 1926, backed by the church, the Adam Clayton Powell Home for the Aged was opened at 732 St. Nicholas Avenue, Manhattan, the first one of its kind. That's my heritage. I set up the Adam Clayton Powell Foundation in honor of my father and resigned from that foundation almost a year ago. I do not even know the new board members, I haven't met with them. I do know the board is interracial and I will continue to help them and any other group in the United States of America to establish nonprofit housing for senior citizens or any other form of housing for those who desperately need it in the lower income bracket.

Reporter. Well, on this point, Mr. Congressman could you tell us just exactly what you did to help this group in their application for insurance for loans.

Representative Powell. Nothing.

Reporter. You did absolutely nothing?

Representative Powell. Nothing.

Reporter. Did you do anything to help them obtain——

Representative Powell. Except I did find out that one of the obstacles, and I am not going to release his name today, but I have already informed the appropriate officials, one of the obstacles to them achieving certain justifiable insurance was that the chief executive in this particular branch of the Federal Housing Authority, after the President had issued his no-bias order had a restrictive covenant on his own house. When I did call this to the attention of his boss, he was then promoted to be a regional director.

Reporter. Do you criticize the Kennedy administration for having promoted him?

Representative Powell. No, I just found out, talking to the White House this week that they didn't know about it.

Reporter. Well, you criticized the man; you do not feel that he should have been kept on that kind of job.

Representative Powell. Absolutely. How can a man have restrictive covenants on his house and this one not only excluded Negroes but Jews and Orientals and try to put through the President's no-bias housing order and then be promoted in honor of it.

Reporter. Have you made any suggestions to the President relative to this particular matter?

Representative Powell. No, but I have discussed it with appropriate officials of the White House.

Reporter. Do you plan on taking any further action?

Representative Powell. Yes, sir, I do. I am not going to give the name now; no, I am not even going to whistle if you call his name. Now, let's get to the question of ACT; there has been established in Harlem, where it is desperately needed, a project to help teenagers, young people in our community, under the group called the Associated Community Teens or ACT. I do not know the members of the board of directors. I have never attended a board of directors meeting. I do not know the staff members; I have never attended a staff meeting. I do not know what the project looks like, having never entered the building since the project began, but I do know from a survey made by the Attorney General and the director of the project, Mr. Hackett, that it is one of the best. I do know in a statement made by the gentlelady from Oregon, Mrs. Green, the authoress of the bill, yesterday morning that it is the only one in the United States with an action program, and I do know from Mr. Holland's article in the Sunday Star, which, I believe, is a Republican paper, where he spent 3 days surveying it. That the rental being paid is, quote, "reasonable" and that the salaries being paid, quote, "are not out of line," in fact, quote, "they are less than some of the other projects in this particular act." A veteran New York social worker, Mr. James E. McCarthy, said, and I quote again, "we look favorably upon it," and that Mr. Chester S. Page, the director of the Red Cross, New York, said to Mr. Holland, and I quote, "this is the best idea that has ever happened here." And now, last, yes, sir.

Reporter. In both of these projects, the housing and the ACT, you seem to have been active in instigating it but immediately withdrew.

Representative Powell. Correct.

Reporter. Would you explain what your function was and why you withdrew so rapidly?

Representative Powell. The reason why I withdrew was because there would not be any conflict of interest. That's why I withdrew.

Reporter. Well, how would that be a conflict of interest of your remaining active in this teenage project.

Representative Powell. Because without being active in it, I have been accused of being involved in a conflict of interest. With being active, so if I had been active——

Reporter. Because of the use of Federal funds.

Representative Powell. I guess that would be it, yes, sir. And may I point out that the amount of money appropriated for ACT with the only action program in the United States, $250,000, while right down the street on the lower east 57th side, Mobilization for Youth now has $12 million.

Reporter. Senator Williams today stated that he has received correspondence from HEW in this particular case and it did identify you as an official of ACT.

Representative Powell. Yes.

Reporter. And that this correspondence was as of last November, in which that was the information which came to him. When did your status change?

Representative Powell. I have not resigned from the board of directors of ACT. But I never attended a meeting.

Reporter. You're still on the board of directors.

Representative Powell. Twenty-five-member board, yes, sir.

Reporter. You have not been active?

Representative Powell. Have not been to a board meeting.

Reporter. Did you do anything to contact HEW to help this along?

Representative Powell. Oh, yes, yes, indeed, of course, the whole concept.

Reporter. What did you do?

Representative Powell. The concept of the Domestic Peace Corps was mine and this was the concept that I sat and talked with Mr. David Hackett, the director of the program, and they said this is the concept that they were thrilled over. And it was on the basis of that they drew up the contract establishing for the first time in the United States of America a Domestic Peace Corps which has been praised, as I have said already by these objective people, and which I think is going to make a major contribution.

Reporter. Do you feel that you are the father of the Domestic Peace Corps then?

Representative Powell. If you want to make me a father—my wife talks about—well, never mind. Now as regards taxes, I always pay my taxes promptly. It is amazing for a U.S. Senator to ask the head of the Internal Revenue what my taxes were for 1962 when none of us file them until April 15 of 1963. There has been nothing dilatory on the part of the Federal Government concerning my taxes. In fact, I think I have been the victim of both the Eisenhower and Kennedy administrations in this area. I was tried under the Eisenhower administration for criminally evading taxes. You do not pay taxes in excess on years that you are being tried for until the trial is over. I beat that trial and when the trial was over, my attorney, Edward Bennett Williams went to work with the Government which then was the Kennedy administration on what they claimed was owed and what we claimed was owed, which is a perfectly normal way of always conducting tax settlements. No agreement was reached and my lawyer, Edward Bennett Williams, then entered the matter into the tax court, the United States Tax Court, and you can check, is 3 to 4 years behind in the cases in its docket. It'll probably be there for a year or more before my case is reached in due order, unless again, the Government wants to be unduly harsh with me and put my case ahead of those that have been pending. Also, may I point out that the vast majority of the excess taxes which the Government claims is owed to them is not mine, but because of joint returns—my former wife, Miss Hazel Scott.

Reporter. Mr. Powell, on that particular point you said you always paid your taxes promptly and Senator Williams was making the point today in the Senate, he said that he was informed by the Internal Revenue Service that you are delinquent in your taxes for 1949, that the Internal Revenue Service states to him in a letter that you are delinquent in your taxes for 1949, 1950, 1951 and so forth, that they filed a letter with, a 90-day letter, in which they stated that you must pay up or else, that was also due with regard to this civil fraud penalties of 50 percent. In other words, the present administration has made the findings that there is a delinquency due to them plus civil fraud penalties.

Representative Powell. Correct.

Reporter. Now, do you feel that the administration is all wrong as well as Senator Williams?

Representative Powell. No, my lawyer says they're all wrong, Edward Bennett Williams.

Reporter. How do you feel about it personally, you spent the money?

Representative Powell. I feel that my lawyer is correct and that's why we are going into Tax Court.

Reporter. But you feel that you do pay your taxes promptly and there is no justification——

Representative Powell. Yes, sir. There has not been a single year in my life that my taxes have not been paid on time. This is a dispute between the Government and my lawyer on whether it is a correct amount or not for those years. And you must recognize also, sir, that today there is no one in the United States who makes in excess of $25,000 whose tax return is not audited and ofttimes there is the Government claims that more is owed and they sit down at table and try to reach a compromise on this. And you can pick up the papers which you write and see that a person owes "X" amount of money and it was settled between them and the Government by a much, much less sum. In this case they won't do it.

Reporter. Didn't the administration in its filing of the 90-day letter with you contend that there was a willful evasion of tax?

Representative Powell. Surely, that's why we went to court, it was on that basis.

Reporter. But they contended that it was a willful evasion not because——

Representative Powell. I didn't willfully evade—no, no.

Reporter. Didn't they contend that?

Representative Powell. I don't know what they contended on that, all I can say is that on the advice of Mr. Williams who received the letter that day that he says we should go to court on this because they are wrong.

Reporter. Well, didn't they assert a civil fraud penalty?

Representative Powell. Correct and that's what we were going to——

Reporter. And didn't they assert then also that it was this administration and the past administration assert that it was willful evasion?

Representative Powell. The past administration asserted criminal fraud.

Reporter. But isn't the present administration asserting that it was civil fraud?

Representative Powell. Oh, yes. That's why I say that the present administration has not been dilatory.

Reporter. Then it isn't Senator Williams, it is the administration really that is wrong.

Representative Powell. Yes, but I say Senator Williams is wrong when he blames the Kennedy administration for being dilatory. I'm proving that they're not. Not dilatory.

Reporter. You're proving they're doing a good job.

Representative Powell. Proving it with my aching back.

Reporter. Mr. Chairman, yesterday you were asked why you thought you were being made a target and you said you thought perhaps that some people in the Congress were jealous. Today you say it is because you are a Negro, would you——

Representative Powell. Yes, I say unequivocally, it was because I am a Negro. Unequivocally, unequivocally, against the background especially of this record of Senator Williams. I say unequivocally. This Congress and you gentlemen know it, the House and the Senate are filled with men and women who have done and are doing the same things. Using counterpart funds, relatives on the payroll, getting projects for their districts, you know that, in fact, projects that aren't of any value they're getting. Yes, sir.

Reporter. I believe you said that there were some December bills still due which would go beyond your budget——

Representative Powell. No, I didn't say that, I didn't say anything about going beyond my budget.

Reporter. Then there are no outstanding bills——

Representative Powell. I don't know, I imagine that a bill, that anything you contract for in December cannot be paid until January. I imagine that, that is usual bookkeeping.

Reporter. Then your report filed at the end of January is complete——

Representative Powell. Complete as far as the committee is concerned. Mr. Derrickson, who is the old pro on the committee and Miss Dargens, they handle that.

Reporter. Nothing owed for the last 2 years?

Mr. Derrickson. If there is, I don't know anything about it, they haven't told us. These vouchers are sent to the disbursing office by our committee. They make the payments. If there has been a delay or any question about a payment, it exists between the disbursing office and the person that which I am to pay. As far as I am, the committee is concerned, payment has been authorized. The committee does not make direct payment they are made through the disbursing office.

Reporter. Mr. Chairman, do I understand that you will name some names of other people who are doing this?

Representative Powell. No, sir. That's Vance Trimble's job. That's obvious, let's not talk about the obvious, all you fellows know.

Reporter. You said that you didn't know anyone on the ACT board, isn't Mr. Wingate on the board?

Representative Powell. I said I did not know the board of directors, meaning I did not know the 25 people on the board. I just found out, for instance, from Mr. Holland's article about the superintendent of schools. You must tell me which one you mean.

Reporter. Well, the Senator Williams from Delaware.

Representative Powell. OK, I am just kidding you.

Reporter. Senator Williams made the point today that the Eisenhower administration, that you felt that the Eisenhower administration also had been what he called soft on you and that particularly he made reference to some reports that you had received some large amounts of money in 1956 in connection with some political campaign for political support. I am sure you are aware of the general contentions at that time. Could you tell us something about that whole matter. Did you receive any large amount of money in connection with political support?

Representative Powell. I didn't receive one penny in campaigning that year, that money was given by the Republican National Committee to this fellow married to Harvey Firestone's daughter, Charles Willis, and he operated this entirely from a check account. I had no access to it, whatsoever and do not know how much it was or what was spent—me personally.

Reporter. Was it used for your benefit?

Representative Powell. My benefit, no indeed, it was used——

Reporter. Well, now did you support the Eisenhower administration in 1956?

Representative Powell. You know well I did, you know that.

Reporter. Well, I just wondered why did you feel compelled to do that at that stage when there was no monetary consideration involved.

Representative Powell. Will you stop beating your wife, you're going back to 1956.

Reporter. No, no, I am just asking——

Representative Powell. It has already been told, it is a matter of record.

Reporter. Well, I thought that since it came up again you could straighten the whole record out for us.

Representative Powell. October 1954 Reader's Digest will tell you why I supported Eisenhower. I wrote an article, the late Dr. Stanley High, who was a dear friend of mine. We sat together one day and he said why don't you put in an article and I wrote it in October 1954, what Eisenhower had done detail by detail, date by date, in the field of civil rights. I tried to get a commitment from Mr. Stevenson, and Carmine DeSapio couldn't get me to see him. Bill Green, of Philadelphia, whose man was Stevenson's campaign manager, said Stevenson refused to see me. All I wanted Stevenson to do was to make a certain statement on civil rights and here was the choice, between a man who wouldn't make it, wouldn't see me and a man who had a record which I had already detailed in October 1954 Reader's Digest. I came up Eisenhower.

Reporter. Mr. Chairman, you apparently are going to ask the committee for about $65,000 more as I recall it, for the next 2 years of operation.

Representative Powell. Well, I don't want to go into that at all because that's the committee's province, but I will say that since it's $65,000 more you're worth, I'm giving the Republicans on the committee $80,000 more and giving the subcommittee chairmen of the committee $120,000 more which means I'll be cutting down the full committee by approximately $150,000.

Reporter. Mr. Powell, the Republicans say that 2 years ago in your proposal you had $42,000 for the minority, the minority only got $22,000, they don't believe that they'll get the $110,000.

Representative Powell. Well, if they don't believe, well that's their choice. I keep my word when people keep theirs. It so happens that Mr. Kearns did not keep his word with me. Mr. Frelinghuysen and I have discussed this. I have given him my pledged word. I have put it in writing to him and I intend to keep my word and I am sure he will keep his.

Reporter. What ratio of minority staff employees will that lead to?

Representative Powell. That's up to him, he can take the $110,000 and spend it any way he wants. Whatever voucher he brings to me, he can't go over the limit which is $18.895. But as many people as he wants to employ or whatever he wants to spend it for, I'll sign any voucher Pete Frelinghuysen has up to $110,000.

Reporter. One Hundred and ten thousand dollars is the amount; is that right?

Representative Powell. That's correct—plus two people on the standing committee getting paid $18,895 and what does Beverly get—$8,000 to $50,000 more for 2 years—that makes $160,000 altogether. The largest amount of money that any minority has received in the history of Congress and that's for salaries only, we pay expenses for them in addition, I think that's very fair. No committee chairman has ever done this.

Reporter. Mr. Chairman, I'd like to ask you a question on this civil rights. There's been some suggestion that all of this publicity and criticism to which you have been subjected, has been somewhat unfavorable to the cause of civil liberties for Negroes in the United States, what would you say?

Representative Powell. I would say that that might be the effect of it. Especially when you view that the man who's doing it, is a man who is 100 percent opposed to civil rights. But I am sure that when the chips are down that people will vote as they always have, will vote their conscience.

Reporter. Mr. Chairman, in the light of your feelings along this line, do you feel that you would have any obligation at all to lean over backward to avoid criticism so these people wouldn't be picking on you?

Representative Powell. No, no, first thing, it doesn't matter. It doesn't bother me.

Reporter. Do you feel as an individual, that there is any problem relative to the civil rights cause and so forth——

Representative Powell. No, that's the view, you see, that a lot of people say, the minorities have got to be twice this as compared to others, I take the view that equality is equality and I take the view that I am a Member of Congress as good as anybody else. As long as it is within the law it's not wrong—violating the law, then its wrong. If the law is wrong—change the laws, but I resent the House being made a second-class body. I think everything that the House has done is good and should be adopted by the Senate but, until the Senate adopts it, I don't think we should practice it.

Reporter. Mr. Powell, do you view any of these things such as the use of counterpart funds for attending nightclubs or going to resorts as abusive of congressional privilege?

Representative Powell. No, because it's done by all of them.

Reporter. You mean whether it is right or wrong?

Representative Powell. Well, there is no right or wrong in it, it's nonprohibitive. It was set up that way.

Reporter. Was it set up to go to nightclubs?

Representative Powell. Well, I am sure that you don't go to Paris and stay all the time in Notre Dame.

Reporter. But is that part of committee business?

Representative Powell. Of course it's part of it. You're going abroad, travel is a very broadening kind of education and I wish to assure you that it is practiced by every Member of the House and the Senate. I think you ought to talk to some of my colleagues and ask them where they were when I was over there. You know there were a lot over there when I was there. Senator Maurine Neuberger was there, oh, Senator Frank Moss was there, by the way, and in a private plane of the U.S. Air Force with two full colonels all by himself. All the way from Washington, all over Europe and back. Paid for by your dollars, not counterpart. Otto Passman was there, Vic Anfuso, what did you say, am I going to run again?

Reporter. In 1964?

Representative Powell. Most assuredly now, you of the press have just put me in an untenable position, I've got to run whether I want to or not.

Reporter. Are you serious about this or is that kidding?

Representative Powell. About running again? Sure I'm going to run again; if I didn't run again, it would look like I am running out.

Reporter. Was there any doubt in your mind before?

Representative Powell. Yes, very definitely, very definitely.

Reporter. Why?

Representative Powell. Why wouldn't I run again? They've got too many old people to begin with around here now, not including you, Mae Craig. You're as young looking now as when I first knew you 20 years ago. But I resent the chairmanship system by senility—by seniority is all right, but senility, no.

Reporter. You don't anticipate any problems?

Representative Powell. Of senility?

Reporter. No.

Representative Powell. I might, I might.

Reporter. I would have thought that perhaps you were moving to Puerto Rico.

Representative Powell. That's what I would really like to do; I'm 55 years old this year—retirement age, you see.

Reporter. And become Puerto Rican?

Representative Powell. Become Puerto Rican? A Puerto Rican is a citizen of the United States.

Reporter. I said become Puerto Rican.

Representative Powell. You can't become Puerto Rican, you got to have ethnic background and Spanish descent and so forth. I could become Puerto Rican by osmosis and it is working pretty good.

Reporter. What reaction is there in your district now because of the charges of Senator Williams?

Representative Powell. Well, I think—I don't know whether it is Time magazine or Newsweek this week which has the headline from the leading Negro newspaper in New York. Right across the top of the headline was "Ho Hum, They're After Adams Again."

Reporter. What about your mail from constituents?

Representative Powell. Oh, the constituents—100 percent.

Reporter. They're right in back of you 100 percent? Do you know of any Negro or Negroes or group of Negroes, who do not support you wholeheartedly?

Representative Powell. As I said to you, Mr. Stone, earlier, that every paper in this country—they're here before me, Republican and Democrat Negro—20 million Negro people. Their press—100 percent.

Reporter. Mr. Powell, don't you feel any personal urgency I gather in your plans to draw a bill of your own that might curb some of this excess gallivanting around Europe by other people?

Representative Powell. No, no; that's Judge Smith's province.

Reporter. I would think you'd feel probably that you want to crusade on this—you've talked about it so much.

Representative Powell. I haven't talked about it, you talked about it.

Reporter. You're here to explain, I was just asking questions.

Representative Powell. Frankly, I don't know what I came to explain for, but as I said I am not here to answer charges, I just wanted to clear up a few misstatements, inaccuracies.

Reporter. I am sure that none of this disturbs you, does it not bother you to be called an adult delinquent?

Represenative Powell. No, no; not at all,

Reporter. What effect within the committee, Mr. Chairman?

Representative Powell. Well, I think one of the nicest things happened, was when I saw President Kennedy with regards Federal aid to education. I went to the White House directly from a caucus of the Democrats where unanimously they said they were against the omnibus Federal aid to education bill. I told the President that I was in favor, but politically a realist I was—it didn't have a chance. But I would let the hearings go along for 2 or 3 weeks and then in the language of the President, and I can't quote the President, I would take a second look. We took a second look yesterday morning and the committee now is 100 percent in back of me. That is, Democrats—100 percent in back of the omnibus approach. What the final shape of the omnibus bill is it will not be the same. No, I don't know what that'll be.

Reporter. You said that Senator Williams had been 100 percent opposed to civil rights. Isn't it right that he voted for each of the major civil rights bills that have come out?

Representative Powell. Yes, after he had voted against every amendment.

Reporter. Thank you.

Appendix B

[From the Washington Star, Feb. 17, 1963]

Peace Corps in Harlem Toils To Get Off Ground

(By Cecil Holland)

New York, February 16.—There's bustle and excitement—and also some concern—in a building up in central Harlem here.

This is the headquarters of a fledgling domestic peace corps which is struggling to get off the ground despite a bombardment of senatorial criticism.

The project is the acknowledged brainchild of Adam Clayton Powell, New York Representative. But its leaders vehemently deny charges by critics that it was the Kennedy administration's tender concern for the Negro Democratic Congressman that led to a $250,000 Federal grant for an opening attack on Harlem's surging juvenile delinquency.

"It's a fact that Adam Clayton Powell negotiated this grant," said Livingston L. Wingate, the project's director. "His influence was used to get it."

"How in the hell does a community get a grant if not through its Congressman? If he didn't negotiate it, he should be run out."

Mr. Wingate, a Harlem lawyer on leave as associate counsel of Mr. Powell's House Education and Labor Committee, rattled off reasons why Harlem, suffering from social and economic stagnation should receive Federal assistance.

The sprawling Negro community in upper Manhattan, he pointed out, has the highest delinquency rate in New York. In admissions to mental institutions, infant mortality, arrests for narcotic violations and other indices of social ills it also ranks at the top.

"This is the worst juvenile delinquency spot in America," Mr. Wingate continued. "How could they refuse to give us a grant?"

Senator John J. Williams, Republican, of Delaware, recently cited the project as one of several examples of "the loose manner in which the administration has been shoveling the taxpayer's money" out to Mr. Powell.

But Mr. Wingate pointed out that the grant was made not to the Negro Congressman, but to an organization known as Associated Community Teams, Inc.—ACT, for short. The agency, he emphasized, is run by a 16-member board representing a cross-section of the community.

"Adam hasn't interfered and practically couldn't," Mr. Wingate went on. "He would have to sell the board, and as a consequence he doesn't try."

Members of the board include Dr. Charles Shapp, superintendent of schools for the Harlem district; Andrew Tyler, president of the Harlem Bar Association, and a number who were described as not friendly to Adam.

The Negro Congressman is one of the incorporators of ACT and one of the directors. But Mr. Powell, who was vacationing in Puerto Rico at latest reports, has never attended a meeting of ACT's board and has "never been over the premises since we opened up," Mr. Wingate says.

"He's done his job and doesn't need to interfere," the director went on. "All he needs is for it to be clean and work. Assuming he is a practical politician, he can leave it alone and have the gratitude of Harlem. You can't get his mark off this project."

SECOND GROUP AIDED

If it were not for Mr. Powell's connection with it, the project might have escaped national attention. Two blocks away from its offices there is another organization known as Harlem Youth Opportunities, Inc., with which Mr. Powell is not personally identified.

Haryou, as it is called, has received a Federal grant of $230,000 for mapping out a broad-scale program attacking Harlem's delinquency. It has received little or no attention.

As now contemplated, the two organizations eventually will merge their efforts and seek multimillion-dollar Federal and other assistance for a major Harlem project. In purpose it would be similar to the $12.6 million, 3-year program now underway, with great acclaim, in New York's lower East Side with Federal, city and private funds.

Whether this comes about for Harlem will depend, to a large extent, on the success of Mr. Powell's peace corps under the eyes of a critical Congress.

ON ITS OWN

With its present $250,000 grant and the expectation of getting $125,000 more, ACT is very much on its own. Peace Corps officials in Washington said it has no connection whatever with the Kennedy administration's foreign showpiece. And those working on President Kennedy's projected domestic program for youth disclaim any connections with it and deny that it is a "pilot project."

It is an orphan as far as New York City is concerned, too. Mayor Wagner's staff currently is drafting recommendations it will present to the Kennedy administration about its own proposed domestic organization.

"In general, we think ACT is a very interesting idea," said one of the city's administrators. "But we have nothing to do with it."

ACT received its $250,000 grant last August from the Health, Education, and Welfare Department under authority of the Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Offenses Control Act of 1961. More than 30 similar grants have been made throughout the country.

The law requires that recipients contribute money, facilities or services for carrying out the project. An HEW official said $9,000 had been contributed to the Harlem project by the Adam Clayton Powell Foundation, but this, it was learned here, seemed to be in error.

Mr. Wingate said it was planned to raise $9,000 by public subscription, but no campaign so far had been launched.

ACT has been slow in getting underway, receiving its first trainees only last month. They numbered 28 college students—16 men and 12 women—and they came from 21 States. Seven are from the Harlem area itself.

Mr. Wingate said it was planned to have at least a third of the trainees white, but arrangements could not be completed in time for them to leave their schools. Applications are pending, he added, from white students at Harvard, Radcliffe, and Bennington. ACT hopes to start a second class in June.

PAID $75 A MONTH

The students will undergo 2 months of intensive training and then will be assigned to social agencies and hospitals for a year's work in Harlem.

The peace corps men will receive travel pay, subsistence, a $2-a-day spending allowance and $75 a month, to be paid to them at the end of their service.

As outlined by Mr. Wingate and others, ACT's program includes three features: The Peace Corps, the use of the corpsmen to train and direct an urban service corps, and a third goal, which is not yet designed, aimed at aiding adults.

Mr. Wingate and others said they hoped the undertaking would pull together "under one umbrella" all the groups working in the Harlem area, as has been done in the lower East Side project.

Senator Lausche, Democrat, of Ohio, has questioned the administrative costs of the project, including rent and staff salaries.

NEAR POWELL CHURCH

ACT occupies 7,694 square feet on two floors of a building on 137tn Street, just off Seventh Avenue, and backing up against the Abyssinian Baptist Church of which Mr. Powell has been pastor for many years. The building is owned by Adam Clayton Powell Center, Inc., named for Mr. Powell's father and the church's former pastor, and is, it was explained, in effect an extension of the church.

ACT pays a rental of $2,000 a month or about $3 a square foot. According to an appraisal Mr. Wingate had made before the lease was signed, the rate is in line with other rental properties, and the building was the only one in the Harlem area where such an amount of space was available.

Others in New York described the rate as reasonable. "Even in the depressed areas space is at a premium and rental rates are not low," one man familiar with the situation said.

At present the Harlem "peace corps" has a staff of 26 and 3 part-time consultants. It has contracted with New York University for two-fifths of the teaching services of Dr. Jeanne Noble, an expert on community relations, and 20 days of consulting time at a total cost of $3,400. In addition, Dr. Wingate said, Dr. Nable is doing research free for the agency.

SALARIES COMPARED

Staff salaries range down from a top of $16,000. A source not connected with ACT said this is not out of line. The lower East Side project known as mobilization for youth has 192 on its staff with salaries ranging up to $21,000. Haryou, the other Harlem project, employs 16 persons. A spokesman declined to say what the salaries are.

James E. McCarthy, director of the lower East Side project and a veteran of New York social work, commended the Harlem project as a step in meeting a community need.

"We look favorably upon it," he said. "We think it will work."

The trainees and the agency itself received an unexpected lesson in community work in a recent Harlem apartment fire which left several hundred homeless.

Under Mr. Wingate's direction the new agency tried its wings by helping out at the fire scene and later by finding homes and organizing a clothing drive for the victims. They brought a response from all over New York.

According to Chester F. Page, director of Red Cross disaster services in New York and formerly of Kensington, Md., the corps did "a very good job" in mobilizing community resources.

"This is the best idea that has ever happened here," Mr. Page said. "They are working toward developing a do-it-yourself program."

If it succeeds, Mr. Page said ACT will become a part of the New York's disaster relief program.

But just where the Harlem organization goes from here depends not only on itself, but on what Congress will do in providing additional funds for a long-range program. Here is an area where everyday living is in itself a problem, if not something of a disaster.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ASHBROOK. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, my experience in the House is limited to 2 years and, consequently, I have not attended too many special orders, but I would like the Record to show that this special order just concluded was very well attended by Members of the House who gave it their very close attention. Mr. Speaker, that fact speaks for itself.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ASHBROOK. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. CURTIS. I listened attentively to the gentleman's remarks. I want to commend him for doing something that many Members have felt needed to be done on the floor of the House. I think there is no question but that this House is going to have to do something toward establishing proper ethics and rules of conduct for its Members so that the kind of statement referred to by the gentleman from Ohio cannot be made unchallenged by any Member of the House. I think these actions are improper. I think they are probably illegal. I have not researched to that extent. Certainly, they are not the ordinary practice of the Members of the House, and unless I am in error overwhelmingly, the Members of the House regard this as improper practice and something that they would not indulge in. I could not agree with the gentleman more, that the entire reputation of the Congress is at stake and the reputation of the House and of the Senate has been lowered in the eyes of the people because of these inaccurate and untrue remarks that have been made according to the press release. I do not know whether the statements actually were made, but if the press releases are accurate, and I know the gentleman has the press releases and read those accurately, but if the press releases are accurately reported, and I think they undoubtedly are, then I would say those are untrue statements, that this is not done by every Member of the House. Most Members do not condone it. They are opposed to it. I do not want to interject partisan remarks, but I must make this remark: This Congress is under the control of the Democratic leadership. I think that there is a responsibility of the leadership to do something about this.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ASHBROOK. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I want to add my commendation and say to the gentleman that he has said some things that badly needed to be said. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ASHBROOK. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ALGER. I, too, want to join with the gentleman and thank him for having the courage as well as the forthrightness to say what needed to be said. And so that my colleagues understand, even as each of us, of course, is responsible for his own conduct, and I have the honor as has each other Member to represent some mighty fine people, I put my views on this in the Record yesterday at page 2987 with reference to the expenditures made by one of the Members of this body when he was overseas.

It is my further contention that there are times when the Members of this body not only must travel the world but should travel all over the world when we have so many commitments abroad, but there are many trips that might very well be curtailed. I am going into my ninth year here. I have not been called upon to travel abroad. I hope some day if I can make any contribution to the matter then under consideration I may have the opportunity, but I do not intend to be reckless.

I am sure there are many others who will say that the conduct of one of our colleagues does not speak for the rest of us in this body. Certainly it does not speak for the Member from the Fifth District of Texas. I join with others who feel that we should do whatever housecleaning is necessary when this body is not properly represented, as the representatives of the people not only of Texas but throughout the United States.

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ASHBROOK. I yield.

Mr. McCLORY. I want to commend the gentleman from Ohio on his statement here this afternoon during his special order, and particularly with reference to the attempted setting up of a peace corps without any legislative authority and the expenditure of funds which is reported without any proper appropriation by the House and Senate, a measure of questionable wisdom in the first place, but one which is certainly without any legislative sanction. As a member of the Committee on Government Operations of the House, I am hopeful that the chairman of the committee will see fit to have this subject investigated as suggested by the gentleman from Ohio, so that we can determine ways and means by which greater economy can be developed.

Mr. ASHBROOK. I am sure that in the matter of setting up this particular group the gentleman will remember that during the debate last year covering this juvenile delinquency act it was stressed that there would be cooperation with the State and local groups. It was also stated that the latter groups would make expenditures on their own part. As to this point, no contribution has been made by this particular group in Harlem. I think it is a subject that should be studied carefully.

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ASHBROOK. I yield.

Mr. YOUNGER. I, too, want to commend the gentleman from Ohio for bringing up this matter on the floor. Recently on a trip home the one question that was presented to me by more people than any other one question was: "What is the matter with the Members of Congress? You are all tarred with the same brush. Why do you not do something about the actions of this Member of the House?" And I want to say frankly that we are all tarred with exactly the same thing which he accuses us of; and I, for one, resent being accused of that because I have not committed those things which he says we all did. I think it is incumbent upon the Members of this House and especially upon the majority party to do something to curb this type of operation, because it has brought the House and the Members of the House into disrepute everywhere.

In my district that is the one burning question: "Why do you not do something about it?" And I certainly am delighted that a Member on our side has brought this matter before us. I hope that our own Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce will take unto itself some investigation as to the use of the HEW fund on this private so-called operation of a domestic peace corps in Harlem.

REPORT OF UNITED NATIONS CONFERENCE ON SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY FOR THE BENEFIT OF THE LESS DEVELOPED AREAS, GENEVA, SWITZERLAND, FEBRUARY 4–20, 1963

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Weaver] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. WEAVER. Mr. Speaker, it was a privilege for me to serve with the gentleman from Georgia, Congressman John W. Davis, as an observer for the Congress of the United States at the recent U.N. Conference on Science and Technology for the Benefit of the Less Developed Areas in Geneva.

I should like to present to you and the House of Representatives a report of my views concerning this Conference.

First, I must state that the U.S. delegation under the direction of Prof. Walsh McDermott and with the guidance of Ambassador Jonathan B. Bingham and Ambassador Roger W. Tubby was exceptionally well qualified for the task. The daily detail work of David Tilson and Thomas W. Wilson as well as all members of the staff was commendable.

THE CONFERENCE

The purpose of the Conference was stated by President Kennedy that we should have a decade of development for underdeveloped nations. This would help to disseminate acquired scientific and technological knowledge to all nations.

Nearly 2,000 delegates from 87 countries were represented at this Conference. The contrasting viewpoints of the Western World with the Soviet bloc of nations was secondary to science and technology in the minds of the less developed nations of Africa, Asia, and the Middle East. An attempt to inject politics on the first day of the Conference was made by the chief Soviet delegate when he stated:

> The ridiculous circumstances which bring about the absence of such peace-loving countries as [Communist] China, North Vietnam, North Korea and People's [East] Germany.
>
> We cannot and will not consider those people who do not actually represent anybody as representative of the great Chinese people and its science—

He said, gesturing toward the Nationalist Chinese delegation.

He also expounded at length on the merits of Soviet technical aid to developing nations.

Jerome B. Wiesner, Mr. Kennedy's scientific adviser, spoke immediately after the Soviet delegate, Mr. Fedorov, but did not respond to his theme. Instead he confined his speech to the reasons why the United States feels the Conference is of supreme importance:

> Mr. President, it is an honor for me to come to this United Nations Conference to discuss pure science. [Long pause.]

This brought spontaneous applause, and was a master stroke which set the tempo for the entire Conference.

The mechanics established by the U.N. for this Conference were formal, rigid and often stiffling to the viewpoints of the undermanned representatives of the less developed nations. One description of the Conference likened it to the sterility of outer space with the familiarity of the mating cry of the whooping crane. Problems developed conducive to political exploitation by speakers concerned with the cold war.

However, the temperament of the delegates determined that science and technology was to be the language of the meeting, and not political ideology. The U.S. delegation acted accordingly and with proper restraint.

Simultaneous translation through five languages helped to expedite the speeches. The U.S. initiation of specialized conferences on particular technological and scientific subjects outside of the rigid format of the Conference was most productive. The personal communications between delegates of all nations occurring during mealtimes and evening hours was probably productive of more U.S. good will than the rigid formalized speeches.

The following are my comments on the respective delegations:

I. SOVIET BLOC DELEGATES

Led by the U.S.S.R. representatives, their speeches contained a constant theme song mostly overt but often subtle, emphasizing state planning. This theme was that the underdeveloped nations can do it better under communism than the Western World has done under democracy. This was an attempt to identify development in the U.S.S.R. since World War I with the problems to be met by underdeveloped nations.

Often the example of the central Asian provinces and their so-called development was placed before the delegation. Emphasis was placed on the success of state planning when there was an elimination of the profit system, which included the removal of land ownership. Underdeveloped nations were encouraged by the U.S.S.R. to believe that they must all have heavy industry, extensive agriculture, general medical, and research programs for their people.

This utopia with the sugar coating of the 7-hour workday with increased wages was placed before these countries, in my opinion, to encourage them toward unobtainable goals. Such goals if not reached under free enterprise with governmental cooperation could leave a vacuum of financial and moral bankruptcy for the Communists to step into.

I felt the Soviet bloc presented for these nations a wonderful menu, but with very little to eat.

II. U.S. DELEGATION

Over 100 highly talented delegates of all branches of science and technology filled every breach that occurred or could have occurred during this meeting. Chairman McDermott held early morning briefings at which an assessment was made of the previous day's progress, and considered the new day's problems. Delegates were then selected according to their talent and experience to appear and speak where their knowledge was needed.

The cooperation of all was outstanding, especially in view of the fact that many were serving at their own expense, and through their desire to be of service to the United States. The energy of these men was such that they initiated many small meetings at the request of the delegates from the less developed nations for the purpose of discussing both scientific and technological problems. These were held at dinners, panel discussions, and through person-to-person communication. This was truly the great strength of the Conference which I feel will result in future benefit to the United States.

The cooperation of the other nations of the Western World, particularly the United Kingdom, Canada, Australia with the United States was wonderful to behold.

The French delegation was the largest with over 200 present. There seems no question that the French intend to assume leadership of a third power; namely, the Continent of Europe.

III. LESS DEVELOPED NATIONS

Unfortunately, these nations were overwhelmed by the massive delegations from the larger countries. They were often undermanned scientifically and technologically and unable to cope with the vast amounts of material presented to the Conference. Many of them from their own experiences gave knowledge and occasionally propaganda to the more developed nations, but for the most part they were restless observers. Often there were sparks of brilliance exhibited by many of these delegates, and occasionally a blowing off of steam through unrelated speeches. This, however, only illustrated to me the vast hunger and desire of these people to work cooperatively in advancing their own countries through science and technology. The U.S. delegation constantly placed at their service its members for consultation and aid.

This was greatly appreciated and so expressed by many of their delegates. Incidentally it was a pleasant surprise to find such a large number of these leaders from the newer nations who were graduates of universities in the Western World. Many of these delegates spoke English, and astonishingly enough so did many of the Soviet-bloc representatives. I express some concern whether the few scientific and technological leaders will be politically potent enough in their governments to transform this information into practical development programs.

The population explosion is a problem which many of these nations are unprepared to face. There are many approaches that are being explored so that these nations can adjust to these increases.

The development of an educational system in many less developed nations is most obvious not only to us, but to them. They crave teachers to educate their people so that they might have a work force capable of modern agriculture and industry. One called it developing a happy people.

IV. PERSONAL RECOMMENDATIONS

First. The United Nations should be reevaluated as to the effectiveness of the existing Economic and Social Council. It did not appear to me that they are now able to serve properly in this particular field. The gaps now present must be filled by this council or it should be replaced.

It seems that the devotion of the United Nations to the assistance of poor nations in their development might prove more effective than some of their attempts to settle political disputes.

This Conference is a challenge to the United Nations to coordinate and develop economic, technological and scientific information for all nations to mutually share.

Second. Less developed nations should have local motivation based on evaluation surveys to establish either crash or long-term programs. When they are willing to participate in the development of these plans then we should consider giving the aid that is necessary for rapid national development through modern technology and science.

Each of these nations must have individualistic priorities in the fields of education, agriculture, industry, science, and health. It is obvious that they will have to be tailored to the particular needs of the country.

However, I reemphasized that I feel that there must be a sincere motivation with sensible planning by these nations prior to extended help.

Third. The United States should continue to offer technological and scientific consultation to these nations. The guidance of the United States may lead to private enterprise with enlightened governmental aid becoming predominant in their philosophy rather than the centralized governmental philosophy advocated by the Soviet bloc. Our consultation can lead to multiple plans with alternatives and decentralized planning which can be adjusted to the economic needs of these countries.

Fourth. The U.S. role of offering teachers and scientists for their education systems is commendable. In this respect the Peace Corps teachers have done a notable job in such countries as Nigeria.

Fifth. The harnessing of nuclear energy—atomic—for industrial purposes should be a priority for the United States and can be a great guidance factor in the future of the world.

Sixth. The intriguing prospect of improved diplomatic relations with other countries was always present. It was suggested that the discriminate use of social scientists as members or observers at all international conferences might help the United States to better develop its viewpoint and to anticipate its opponents' attacks. Social scientists proved their knowledge and their value in the help they gave to the direction of the U.S. delegation in Geneva. It might be well to consider the use of such social scientists at other conferences to evaluate the nature of our friends and opposition to help to better our viewpoints.

CONCLUSIONS

Mr. Speaker, I wish to thank you and the gentleman from Indiana, Minority Leader Halleck, for the opportunity of being an observer at this United Nations Conference. It was a privilege to have had an opportunity to give a speech before this Conference.

This Conference can be the first step toward a new era for the development of these nations through science and technology. I feel that we should continue communications through the men of the delegation and diplomatic channels so that these nations may feel free to call upon us for the help they need.

It is also my feeling that the Congress of the United States should continue to be represented at such U.N. meetings to receive knowledge concerning specialized fields. Thus we shall be better prepared to legislate effectively and humanely for the best interests of the United States.

Again I express commendation for Prof. Walsh McDermott, the staff and the 100 U.S. delegates who served so untiringly and unselfishly in the interests of their country.

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Pennsylvania yield?

Mr. WEAVER. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, I want to compliment the gentleman from Pennsylvania for a very thorough and informative report which the gentleman has made as a delegate from this body to the Conference of the U.N. in Geneva.

In my opinion it has been most helpful to us and I can readily see that the gentleman has utilized his knowledge and experience in portraying a correct image of the United States at this Conference. I am also pleased to note that the gentleman traveled to and from Geneva on an economy round trip ticket and defrayed his own oversea expenses over and above the $15 per day allowance which was insufficient to meet the ordinary expenses.

Mr. Speaker, I have been extremely interested in the gentleman's remarks. I understand that a speech was delivered at this Conference by the gentleman from Pennsylvania, and I am hopeful that that speech will be made a part of the Congressional Record of today.

Mr. WEAVER. I thank the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. WEAVER. Mr. Speaker, as the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. McClory] has expressed interest in my speech before the delegates attending the U.N. Conference, I include it as part of my remarks. It was my privilege to address the delegates on February 12 as follows:

Coordinated Health Programs

Mr. Chairman, fellow delegates, it is my privilege to have this opportunity to discuss briefly some experiences and ideas that have been put into effect in relation to coordination of public health programs. I speak as a private family doctor on this subject. The emphasis in the past has been upon acute diseases. During the past few decades preventative medicine has come to the fore and received its just consideration. With these two fields now approaching their proper perspective the field of chronic disease is being further evaluated in our country. Our aim has been to have coordinated health programs under local control, that is, the region, or State involved.

The combination of private endeavors both by qualified individuals and qualified organizations such as voluntary health bodies has been brought into the total program under the guidance and partnership of the governmental public health departments.

SOLUTIONS

1. Surveys

We consider the Federal or National Public Health Department as being the consultant. The State, or one might call it provincial health department, is the partner and the regional or county health department one might call the boss subject to the will of the people.

Surveys are encouraged on the local level utilizing fully the State and Federal public health agents to discover needs and overlaps of existing problems or services. It is obvious that surveys in different areas will vary due to differing economic factors such as mining areas or farming areas. Other variables are the dietary factors which lead to what Mr. Dubois called environmental. Many other variables such as industrial health and urban life problems could be elaborated. Further, there are geographical differences, and these make possible an emphasis on specific problems and diseases which might require specialized research. Again I refer to the problems of the coal miners with pneumoconiosis or farmers with problems of fungus infections. Thus we find the surveys differ in the needs and the emphasis that must be placed. There is a disease selectivity which varies with our areas depending on climate, and, therefore, no overall selection of needs covers each survey equally.

2. Selection of priority needs

Priority needs are determined through statistical findings of the area both as to environmental and communicable factors. If the major problem is receiving attention, then priority is placed upon other public health needs. Preventative medicine is emphasized in the survey. The list is then compiled according to importance and plans are made to attack the particular problems as economic and manpower factors will permit. Thus the survey in the selection of needs is tailored to the area involved.

3. Public and provincial education

The many obvious problems often are already apparent to the professional community. The solutions to some of the problems may entail pioneering of new procedures and new methods. To this extent it is necessary first, we find in our experience, to be sure that the professions (doctors of medicine, nurses, dentists, and paramedical associates) are fully aware of the planned solutions and have a part in determining it. Once this is concluded, then we proceed through modern public relations methods to inform the public by individual contact, organizational contacts, or exposure to newspaper, radio, and television information.

4. Coordination of efforts

The teamwork then begins between the private citizen as an individual, the voluntary bodies on an organizational basis and the public through public health governmental efforts.

5. Results

The teaming of the above factors of survey for determination of needs and overlaps, proper selection of priority needs, public and professional education, then consideration of efforts can result in success or failure. We have found out that these key factors entail local participation with motivation in conjunction with enlightened governmental aid. This system may be attacked but has proven to be a successful one and we as private citizens and governmental officials are working together to see that it is constantly improved.

CONCLUSIONS

It has been my purpose to present to you the team action that we have used in the United States not in criticism of other systems but only to tell you what has worked best with us and how we are constantly seeking to improve our public health. If all of us will lend of our experiences in the fields of science freely and openly to each other we will be able to mutually move forward. The challenge of the coming decades means accentuation of not only acute and preventive disease measures but the development of new solutions for chronic diseases and other public health problems. We use local motivation with proven needs for joint private efforts with enlightened Federal support without control.

Thank you Mr. Chairman for this opportunity to present some basic views on coordinated public health programs.

TRADE EXPANSION ACT OF 1962

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. Rhodes of Pennsylvania). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Harvey] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for an additional 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, on October 11, 1962, the Trade Expansion Act became law. I voted against the bill. In my opinion it was a very bad bill. A number of us who voted against the bill felt that aside from the many bad provisions, that action if merited at all was premature. We contended that Congress could not intelligently deal with the question of the Common Market until we knew what countries would comprise the Common Market. Specifically we pointed out that it was not known whether or not Great Britain would be a Common Market member. We urged that the bill be allowed to go over to this year. We were shouted down. The bill was passed and signed by the President.

Even though the bill contained mostly undesirable provisions as far as many of us were concerned, it did contain one good provision, that is, section 231. This section required that the products of Yugoslavia and Poland pay the same full duty rates as the other Communist countries. What could be more sensible than that? Why should we treat the products of the Communist countries on the same favored basis as the products produced in the countries of the free world?

Let me read the precise language of section 231. It provides as follows:

> The President shall, as soon as practicable, suspend, withdraw, or prevent the application of the reduction, elimination or continuance of any existing duty or other import restriction, or the continuance of any existing duty-free or excise treatment, proclaimed in carrying out any trade agreement under this title or under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, to products, whether imported directly or indirectly, of any country or area dominated or controlled by communism.

Please note that the provision states that the President shall deny most-favored-nation treatment to all Communist countries. Under the former law, which denied most-favored-nation treatment to countries which were members of the international Communist conspiracy, it was ruled that since Yugoslavia and Poland were so-called independent Communist countries that the products of these countries were entitled to most-favored-nation treatment or in other words reduced tariff rates. Therefore, recognizing this to be wrong, our able and most distinguished chairman of our Ways and Means Committee, the Honorable WILBUR MILLS, proposed and his committee adopted this amendment which logically would require all Communist countries, including Yugoslavia and Poland, to have their products dutiable at the full duty rate.

Of course all of you know the difference between the full duty rate and the reduced duty rate. The full duty rates were those established by the Tariff Act of 1930, but those duty rates have been reduced on an average of 80 percent under our trade agreements program through international negotiations. These reduced duty rates are applicable to the products of all countries which are not members of the international Communist conspiracy.

There are two principles involved here which I believe run very deep. One is why should we treat any Communist country on the same favorable trading basis as countries of the free world? Does it serve to build our friendships in the free world if they know that Communist Yugoslavia and Poland receive the same tariff treatment as they receive?

Secondly, this country always has been the foundation for private enterprise, although in recent years many have attempted to shake and shatter this foundation. Under the private enterprise system, costs are vital in determining selling prices. Under Communist governments, the government may determine the price without regard as to whether a particular product is sold in the United States at a profit or whether it is sold at a loss. This makes the most unfair competition for American private enterprise. I can say that business and employees engaged in manufacturing in my district are being seriously injured by these unfair imports from Communist Yugoslavia.

I think every American owes a debt of gratitude to the chairman of our Ways and Means Committee, the distinguished gentleman from Arkansas, who is responsible for having had this amendment inserted. Although the amendment was taken out in the Senate Finance Committee, upon the urging of our State Department which frequently takes strange positions on many issues, the conference committee of the two Houses in its wisdom, restored this provision. It is true that the administration and especially the State Department vehemently objected to the amendment and pleaded with the conferees not to have it included. The conferees, of course, listened and considered these pleadings, but in the end decided that it should not be the policy of the United States to grant the same low tariff treatment to Communist Yugoslavia and Poland as is extended to the free countries of the world. You know the result. The conference report was adopted both by the House and the Senate and the President signed the bill. He could have vetoed it. If he had vetoed it on balance I am convinced he would have done a good thing for America. But he did not veto it. He elected to sign it, but he has not taken the action which this provision clearly requires him to take.

It is reported that the State Department contends that an 1882 treaty between the United States and Serbia requires that either country give the other country at least 1 year's notice before any tariff increase is established. Now first we all know that Serbia no longer exists. However, the geographical area which once was Serbia is now a part of Yugoslavia. It is questionable at best whether this 1882 treaty with Serbia is controlling, particularly in this case because the United States would not be raising its duty in the legalistic sense. We would be simply withdrawing most-favored-nation treatment which is a unilateral benefit which we have extended inasmuch as neither Yugoslavia nor Poland are members of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade. However, even if we were bound in this instance by this 1882 Serbian treaty, why does not the President give the 1-year notice which the administration contends is required? In any event it is not applicable in the case of Poland.

Let me emphasize, the law states that the President "shall" act "as soon as practicable." He has now had more than 6 months and to my knowledge he has done nothing to implement this provision of law and has not indicated that he is contemplating action. If there ever was a government of men rather than a government of law, this is it. Are we Members of Congress going to let the President openly flout the requirements of the statute? I say we should not and should not give the President any additional power until he acts in accordance with the provision of section 231 of the Trade Expansion Act and requires Yugoslavia and Poland to pay the same full duty rates as the other Communist countries.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. BAKER. I was a member of the conference committee, and of course of the Committee on Ways and Means, which considered this amendment. There can be no question that the gentleman has stated accurately what transpired. The section in previous law was that it was determined that neither Yugoslavia nor Poland was a Communist nation. This amendment provided that a nation under Communist domination in effect was a part of the international Communist conspiracy and should not be accorded most-favored-nation treatment. That made it clear beyond any peradventure of a doubt.

After this amendment was adopted by the Committee on Ways and Means and this body the other body reached its position and the matter went to conference. The managers on the part of the House repeatedly refused to recede. There can be no doubt as to the intent of the Congress nor can there be any doubt as to the express language of the Trade Expansion Act of 1962 that most-favored-nation treatment shall not be accorded to Poland and Yugoslavia, neither of which nations is a member of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade.

I compliment the gentleman on his forthright statement and join with him in his strong insistence that the President of the United States take all necessary steps to carry into effect this language of the Trade Expansion Act of 1962; and I might go further and say this mandate, for that is what it is, of the Trade Expansion Act of 1962.

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. I thank the gentleman.

May I say in conclusion that having to arise to make this statement on the floor of the House is not a task that I have enjoyed. First of all, I am very reluctant to have to scold the President, as I have had to do in this instance. Secondly, it was my privilege to visit Poland and Yugoslavia, particularly Yugoslavia, shortly after it disaffiliated with Communist Russia. I was assured by them that they were going to work directly into the orbit of the free nations of the world. Certainly I think they have failed to do that. Much of the assistance that we have given them has met with a very unappreciative response on their part.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to compliment the gentleman. I think he has made a very accurate and forthright speech today. I have in mind that in last Sunday's paper, there was an article which indicated that Tito and the Kremlin are getting very much closer together again. In my opinion, our hopes of drawing Yugoslavia out of the Communist orbit have been futile. I also would like to indicate the recollection I have that our Secretary of State last year in testifying on the export control act did indicate very definitely the position of our administration, that Poland is in the

Communist bloc and I think the gentleman in saying what he has said today has made a very valuable contribution toward what our policy should be and I compliment him.

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. I thank the gentleman. I would just like to say in conclusion that over my desk this morning there came a report from the Secretary of Commerce entitled "Export Control." This is a very elaborate presentation on the subject of export control. I would like and appreciate very much if a similar attention would be given to import control.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. (Mr. Rhodes of Pennsylvania). The time of the gentleman has expired.

WHY CAN'T THE BRITISH FIGHT COMMUNISM IN THIS HEMISPHERE TOO?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. Rogers] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, the American people would like to know.

In the past 6 weeks a total of nine British merchant vessels representing some 120,000 gross tons put into Cuba. Thus it is business as usual for our partner in the Anglo-American alliance, as British trade with Communist Cuba continues.

A number of our allies have suspended their practice of allowing merchant vessels to aid the Soviets in Cuba. They have cooperated because their allegiance to the free world means more to them than the few rubles which come from the cargo runs between Russia and Cuba.

But the principal offender, namely, our ally Great Britain, seems to value rubles more than American friendship.

Hopefully, British trade with Cuba will just come to a quiet end. But signs seem to be in the other direction. The British shipowners association is reported by United Press International today as being wholly opposed to the U.S. position against allied shipping to Cuba. This association, known as the Chamber of Shipping of the United Kingdom, did concede that the temporary interruption of the British cargo runs to Cuba during the October missile crisis was, in their words, "readily understandable."

Mr. Speaker, relations with Cuba have not improved one iota since last October. In fact, they have worsened. Is the British shipping industry unable to sense the inroads of communism in this part of the world, and its continuing contribution to it?

I urge that the United States close its seaports to all nations which allow their flags flown in commerce with Cuba.

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. I am very glad to yield to the distinguished gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. WAGGONNER. I would like to say to the gentleman, I concur in the statement he has just made, that relations with Cuba have not improved since last October and they have worsened. I concur with not only what the gentleman has had to say today with regard to our relationships with Cuba, and Great Britain's refusal to help us in this instance, but I concur as well with the statements he has made in recent days and in recent weeks with regard to the problem in Cuba and I want to endorse wholeheartedly his recommendations to help solve this ever-growing problem.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. I appreciate the remarks of the gentleman and I want to say his continuing interest in this fight to get rid of communism in this hemisphere, certainly, is a contribution toward bringing communism to an end more quickly.

Also, I think it is well to point out that it is a strange thing that here we are now continuing to build up the military strength of Great Britain with Polaris missiles; and I also read in the paper today that they are contemplating now a sale of airplanes to Red China which could be converted to military use. It is not a very logical policy, I think, to continue this course to help allies who are not willing to help in this fight on communism all over the world.

Furthermore, I think our State Department needs to make more explicit the great concern of the American people with this problem, and very decidedly make it clear that we want Allied shipping to Cuba stopped and stopped quickly.

Mr. WAGGONNER. May I say further the gentleman is absolutely correct.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman and yield back the balance of my time.

THE COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY EXPECTS TO BECOME REVITALIZED—HAS PENDING PERHAPS THE FULLEST LIST OF BANKING PROPOSALS EVER PLACED BEFORE A LEGISLATIVE SESSION—IS ASKING FOR FUNDS WITH WHICH TO CARRY OUT ITS DUTIES

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 10 minutes and to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, the Committee on House Administration is now considering funds for the committees of the House, funds which the various committees have requested in order to carry out their duties assigned under the rules of the House.

On February 11, I addressed a letter to the gentleman from Maryland, the Honorable Samuel N. Friedel, chairman of the Accounts Subcommittee of the Committee on House Administration, concerning the budget request of the Committee on Banking and Currency of the House.

The reason I wrote that letter was that, just looking at the figures, the budget request for the Committee on Banking and Currency might seem out of line in relation to requests for previous years, although not out of line as compared to the funds requested and made available to the other committees.

The truth is that both the minority and majority members of the committee recognize that the committee has been somewhat dormant for a decade or more, and the committee is now to become more active. In order to do so it needs the additional sums of money that are requested in the budget.

Indeed, the march of events now requires us to become more active, because we now have facing us a very large accumulation of legislation within our jurisdiction. This is well recognized throughout the financial community.

To illustrate, on January 9, the day Congress convened, the American Banker reported, in an article by its Washington bureau chief, as follows:

> The 88th Congress, convening today, faces perhaps the fullest list of banking proposals ever to be placed before a legislative session.
>
> Every major trade group within the banking and financial community, including representatives of the mutual savings bank and savings and loan industries, have programs. So do most of the Federal supervisory authorities which control these industries. In addition, several Members of Congress have indicated their intention of introducing legislation affecting the financial community in one form or another.

SCOPE OF COMMITTEE'S JURISDICTION

My letter to the chairman of the Accounts Subcommittee, the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. Friedel], is self-explanatory. Attached to the letter is a statement of the jurisdiction of the Committee on Banking and Currency. Our committee has to do not only with banking generally, including the Federal Reserve banks and the national banks, and the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, and reserve requirements of banks and bank holding companies, and mergers, consolidations, and conversions of insured banks, and the branches of national banks, but also coins, and coinage, Commodity Credit Corporation, creation of Government corporations, currency, economic stabilization and defense production measures, export controls, Federal credit unions, Government lending, housing, insurance, international finance, including the Bretton Woods Agreements Act, the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, the International Monetary Fund, the International Finance Corporation, the International Development Association, the Inter-American Development Bank, the International Wheat Agreement, mass transit, monetary policies, including gold, silver, and Government bonds, the price level, the operation of the Federal Open Market Committee, credit terms, the National Monetary Commission, interest rates on bank deposits, residential mortgage credit, savings and loan associations, silver, small business, the Small Business Act, the Small Business Investment Act, and many related subjects.

It is believed that our committee has as much to do as any committee of the entire Congress, House or Senate.

FUNDS REQUEST IS MODEST AND JUSTIFIED

We have asked for a modest amount as requests go. The last 2 years special and other committees have asked for more than we are now asking for including the Committees on Appropriations, Education and Labor, Government Operations, Interstate and Foreign Commerce, Public Works, the Select Committee on Small Business, the Committee on Inter-American Activities, but also many others. They have spent much more, in some cases 100 percent more than the amount requested in the budget for the Committee on Banking and Currency.

We believe the amount is modest, we believe the amount is justified, we believe it will be spent in a very prudent and careful way and that the Congress will benefit by reason of these expenditures if the committee and the Congress grant this request. The letter to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. FRIEDEL] along with the attachment showing the jurisdiction of the committee are as follows and I hope these will receive careful consideration by Members of the House:

FEBRUARY 11, 1963.

Hon. SAMUEL N. FRIEDEL,
Chairman, Accounts Subcommittee, Committee on House Administration, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Please let me express to you the reasons why there is now a budget request for the Committee on Banking and Currency, although for many years the committee has not made a budget request.

You will find, I believe, general agreement among both the majority and minority members of the committee that this committee has, in effect, been dormant for a decade or more. I would amplify by saying, without meaning any criticism of any past chairmen, that we have not for many years undertaken the studies, investigations, and hearings that were needed to keep up to date with even the pressing matters under the committee's jurisdiction.

The consequences are illustrated by the fact that several private, semiofficial and executive groups have recently been making investigations and studies into the legislative needs of the Nation's public and private financial institutions. One private group, the Commission on Money and Credit, has recently completed a study that took almost 3 years and cost almost $2 million, and has filed a report making 85 legislative recommendations. The Comptroller of the Currency has similarly appointed a private study group which has made 50 legislative recommendations. In addition, the President has had at work for many months three Presidential Inter-Agency Groups who are supposedly taking a new look at matters under the committee's jurisdiction.

The committee also has pending an exceptionally large volume of legislative proposals. The FDIC, the Home Loan Bank Board, the Comptroller of the Currency, and the Federal Reserve Board have all made recent recommendations for legislation, and we expect to have shortly the reports and recommendations of the Presidential interagency groups.

Twelve of the thirty-one members of the committee are new. I have been told, furthermore, that every new Democratic Member of the House requested assignment to the Committee on Banking and Currency and that the committee was similarly popular with the new Republican Members of the House. The new Members have asked to be assigned to this committee because they are expecting activity and, indeed, I believe that all Members desire the committee to become more active.

The kind of hearings, studies and investigations I have in mind—and other members of the committee have in mind—are aimed at objective factfinding investigations and reports of a high scholastic order. Certainly, it is not intended that we will undertake any investigation calculated to embarrass any person, group, or political party. Similarly, the committee's activities will be nonpartisan; the staff will be nonpartisan. Indeed, I expect that most of the staff assistants will be drawn from distinguished experts in the academic community who will serve the committee only briefly during its investigation and study of a particular subject in their field of expertise.

In short, all I am proposing is to carry out section 27 of rule XI of the rules of the House which commands that:

"Each standing committee of the House shall exercise continuous watchfulness of the execution by the administrative agencies concerned of any laws, the subject matter of which is within the jurisdiction of such committee; and, for that purpose, shall study all pertinent reports and data submitted to the House by the agencies in the executive branch of the Government."

Matters under the jurisdiction of the committee according to section 4 of rule XI are as follows:

4. Committee on Banking and Currency:

(a) Banking and currency generally.

(b) Control of price of commodities, rents, or services.

(c) Deposit insurance.

(d) Federal Reserve System.

(e) Financial aid to commerce and industry, other than matters relating to such aid which are specifically assigned to other committees under this rule.

(f) Gold and silver, including the coinage thereof.

(g) Issuance of notes and redemption thereof.

(h) Public and private housing.

(i) Valuation and revaluation of the dollar.

To be more specific, there is attached an appendix A setting out in more detail the areas of legislation under the committee's jurisdiction.

The budget which has been requested is for $530,000 to cover the 2 years of the 88th Congress, an amount which I believe is not excessive in relation to the volume of important work the committee must undertake.

Appropriations for the committees of the House in the 87th Congress were as follows:

Committee on Agriculture	$75,000
Committee on Appropriations	600,000
Armed Services	150,000
Banking and Currency	[1] 205,000
District of Columbia	10,000
Education and Labor	633,000
Foreign Affairs	155,000
Government Operations	1,040,000
House Administration	30,000
Interior and Insular Affairs	60,000
Interstate and Foreign Commerce	585,000
Judiciary	250,000
Merchant Marine	75,000
Post Office and Civil Service	125,000
Public Works	1,100,000
Science and Astronautics	300,000
Small Business	580,000
Un-American Activities	681,000
Veterans' Affairs	150,000
Ways and Means	25,000

[1] $200,000 appropriated to Subcommittee on Housing.

Please accept my assurance that the funds appropriated to the Committee on Banking and Currency will be expended only in a most careful manner and for purposes which we believe will serve the public interest.

Sincerely,

WRIGHT PATMAN,
Chairman.

APPENDIX A

Banks and banking:

National Bank Act.

Federal Reserve Act.

Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation Act.

Reserve requirements of Federal Reserve member banks.

Bank holding companies.

Mergers, consolidations, and conversions of insured banks.

Chartering, regulation, conservation, and liquidation of national banks.

Insurance of bank deposits.

Examination of national banks, insured banks and Federal Reserve member banks.

Investments by national banks.

Branches of national banks.

Unclaimed deposits in national banks.

Capital requirements of State banks for membership in Federal Reserve System.

Coins and coinage:

Commemorative coins.

Denominations, value, and weight of coins.

Metals used in coinage.

U.S. mints.

Commodity Credit Corporation.

Creation of Government corporations:

Federal National Mortgage Association.

International Finance Corporation.

Federal Minerals Corporation.

National Disaster Relief Corporation.

War Damage Corporation.

Currency:

Denominations, value, and design.

Issue and redemption.

Printing.

Economic stabilization and defense production measures:

Redevelopment of economically distressed areas.

Encouraging maximum employment.

Price controls on commodities and services.

Wage controls.

Rent controls.

Credit controls: Consumer and installment credit terms; and real estate credit terms.

Allocations and priorities.

Government requisition and condemnation of commodities and facilities.

Rationing.

Dispersal of defense plants.

Hoarding.

Guarantee of bank loans.

Business loans.

Government purchase or resale of metals, minerals, and other raw materials.

Installation of Government-owned equipment in private plants.

Subsidy payments.

Voluntary agreements regarding prices, wages, service, or credit.

Export controls.

Federal credit unions:

Chartering, regulations, examination, and supervision.

Insurance of share accounts.

Government lending:

Flood and catastrophe loans.

Housing loans in Alaska.

Slum clearance and public housing loans.

Loans to small business.

Export-Import Bank loans.

Defense production loans.

CCC loans.

Municipal loan program.

Loans for community facilities.

Loans for prefabricated housing.

Loans for college housing.

Housing:

FHA insurance of single family, and multiple unit rental projects.

FHA insurance of repair and improvement loans.

FHA insurance of disaster housing.

FHA insurance of servicemen's housing.

FHA insurance of housing in urban renewal areas.

FHA insurance of defense housing.

FHA insurance of military and atomic energy installation housing.

FHA insurance of cooperative housing.

FHA insurance of equity investments in rental housing.

FHA insurance for elderly family housing.

Construction, operation, and disposition of Government-owned permanent and temporary war and defense housing.

Low rent public housing.

Prefabricated housing.

Trailers and trailer camps.

Veteran preferences in housing occupancy.

College housing.

Alaska housing program.

Farm housing.

Housing census.

Housing research.

Moderate income housing.

Slum clearance and urban renewal.

Construction warranties.

Insurance:

Of deposits in national banks.

Of share accounts in savings and loan associations.

Of share accounts in Federal credit unions.

By Export-Import Bank against loss caused by war or expropriation of U.S. commodities stored abroad.

Against property damage caused by floods.

International finance:

Bretton Woods Agreements Act.

International Bank for Reconstruction and Development.

International Monetary Fund.

International Finance Corporation.

International Development Association.

Inter-American Development Bank.

International Wheat Agreement.

Mass transit.

Medals: Issuance and striking.

Monetary policies:

Valuation and revaluation of the dollar.

Gold and gold standard.

Support of Government bonds.

General price level.

Bank reserves.

Operation of Federal Open Market Committee.

Federal Reserve rediscount rates.

Issue of, and reserves behind, Federal Reserve notes.

Gold payments and ownership.

Credit terms.

Establishment of a National Monetary Commission.

Interest rates on bank deposits.

Residential mortgage credit, insurance, and guarantee:

FHA insurance programs.

Government secondary mortgage market (FNMA).

National bank real estate loans.

Voluntary home mortgage credit program.

Savings and loan associations:

Federal Home Loan Bank System.

Chartering and supervision of Federal savings and loan associations.

Insurance of accounts in savings and loan associations.

Savings and loan holding companies.

Silver: Coinage, value, and use.

Small Business:

Small Business Act.

Small Business Investment Act.

Tin:

Texas City tin smelter.

Government purchase and sale.

THE WHEAT CERTIFICATE PLAN

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 20 minutes and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, no one can deny that in recent weeks the American wheat farmer has been subjected to an intensive and expensive barrage of publicity and propaganda from administration officials urging him to approve its wheat certificate plan in the forthcoming referendum. Neither can it be denied that an all-out effort to garner a favorable vote on this unfair and inequitable wheat program is the order of the day.

The Department of Agriculture has erected a wall of propaganda between the farmer and the facts in opposition to this plan and is telling the wheat farmer only what it thinks he ought to know. I have not found where this administration has even attempted to point out how adversely the certificate plan contained in the referendum would affect our small wheat producers. Nowhere have I found the administration acknowledging that the referendum's alternative proposal of price supports at 50 percent of parity was also a part of its bill containing the certificate plan and that they take full responsibility for it.

No one would deny that the small wheat farmers of America ought to be fully informed on both sides of this issue. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I take this time to point out some of the many adverse effects which this wheat certificate plan will have on our small wheat farmers. I am particularly concerned as we have approximately 152,000 wheat farms in Ohio—more than any other State in the Union. Of these wheat farms, 121,000, or 81 percent, have allotments of 15 acres or less. About 105,000 farms have allotments of 10 acres or less.

Mr. Speaker, being familiar with the problems of these small wheat farmers, and after having listened to all the testimony presented in support of and against this certificate plan, I voted against this proposal when it was before the House. I was as convinced then as I am now that it does not provide equity to the small family-size wheat farmers of Ohio and the other States in which some 1.2 million of them live.

Undoubtedly, Mr. Speaker, many other Members of the House felt as I did on this subject, as it passed the House by a scant 5 votes, the vote being 202 yeas and 197 nays.

I opposed this new law for several reasons:

First, it will further reduce the already low incomes of our small wheat producers.

Second, it permanently repeals their 15-acre exemption.

Third, it permanently repeals the 30-acre wheat for feed exemption which will preclude farmers from growing wheat outside the program for use on their own farms.

Fourth, the method used for establishing allotments and quotas for producers under this new law is unfair. By using the 3-year average of 1959, 1960, and 1961, rather than the highest plantings, it further reduces the acreage these small farmers can plant. In practice, since most of our 15-acre farms produce Soft Red Winter wheat, it further restricts the production of a class of wheat which has not been significantly adding to our surpluses.

Fifth, it requires farmers to take a percentage of their land out of production after 1965 without payment and in such amounts as may be set by the Secretary of Agriculture under the provisions of the act.

Sixth, it closes the door on future wheat producers and on those farmers who for some reason did not plant wheat during the base years.

Seventh, in a cleverly disguised but well calculated effort to keep the small wheat farmers from voting, the Department of Agriculture has put more restrictions on him for voting in a referendum than are placed on the larger producers.

Let us examine some of these reasons in a little more detail.

In 1963, any wheat producer could plant up to 15 acres. Beginning in 1964, however, this 15-acre exemption will be terminated permanently. Instead, farmers with allotments of 15 acres or less will be permitted to plant the smaller of the 1959–61 average planted acreage, or 15 acres. For example, a farmer previously operating under the 15-acre exemption but having only an average of 9 acres for these 3 years, can plant only 9 acres in the future—not up to 15 acres—without a penalty.

Thus, the first move to lower the income of this particular wheat farmer is made by this reduction in his acreage from 15 to 9 acres. There are, of course, thousands who will be cut more than the amount indicated by my example.

Second, if the farmer in my example plants the 9 acres, he will not be eligible for the wheat certificates valued at 70 cents per bushel. He will not be eligible for any price supports, nor will he receive any land diversion payments. He will be required to sell his production at a feed-wheat price based on the $1.30 per bushel noncertificate support price.

Formerly, these farmers operating under the 15-acre exemption could sell their wheat at market price. I want to reemphasize this unfair treatment of the small producer. First, he takes a sharp acreage cut and, second, if he then plants his permitted acreage, he is not eligible for the wheat certificates necessary to bring his price into line with the larger producers. This shabby treatment can only result in reduced incomes for these small wheat farmers and their families. Mr. Speaker, I would think that this reduction in income would be of some concern to this administration, but apparently it is not. I would, however, point out that this is no small matter as it will affect two out of every three wheat producers in the United States, and four out of every five in our State of Ohio.

It is certainly possible that many Members were not aware of the adverse effect this legislation would have on the incomes of so many of our small family farmers at the time they supported it. This being the case, I would suggest that each Member of the House request the Department of Agriculture to furnish him with information on the number of farmers in his State or district having allotments of less than 15 acres. This information might just shock a sufficient number of the Members into supporting remedial legislation forthwith to restore some semblance of equity and equality among the wheat producers of this Nation.

Let us go a step further and examine another facet of this legislation. The Department of Agriculture's January 1963 pamphlet entitled "Wheat: The Program for 1964," states on page 9:

> Participating growers will be assured of price support at $2 as a national average for wheat representing the farm share of the national marketing allocation. This will be about 80 percent of the normal production on the farm acreage allotment.

We all understand, of course, that small wheat growers can become eligible for the $2 per bushel if they take the further cut in acreage and divert about 10 percent of the base to conserving uses. This means that if the small farmer takes a double cut in his acreage—which could be in terms of percentage several times greater than that required for the larger wheat producers—he can secure wheat certificates necessary to bring his price to $2 per bushel on 80 percent of his crop. Can anyone defend the fairness of this proposal requiring the small producer to take a greater percentage cut than the larger producer?

Let us examine what this will mean with respect to the price received by Ohio wheat farmers for their 1964 crop. When you take into consideration the amount of wheat grown by the cooperators and estimate an average return of $1.85 per bushel for all their wheat sold—remembering that even cooperators will be required to sell some 20 percent of their wheat at the noncertificate price of approximately $1.30 per bushel—and the fact that the noncooperating small wheatgrowers will get only $1.30 for their wheat, one arrives at an average price, including the value of the certificates, of approximately $1.50 per bushel for all wheat produced in Ohio.

I have checked the wheat prices in Ohio and one is required to go back to 1945 to find the time when our farmers received as little as $1.50 per bushel for wheat. If this certificate program goes into effect, our Ohio farmers' income will be reduced between $15 and $20 million per year. All this at a time when farmers' costs are up about 65 percent from 1945 and reached an alltime high about a week ago.

Aside from the income losses to our farmers under this program, there is another facet which particularly disturbs me. Under the law a farmer with an allotment of less than 15 acres cannot vote unless he elects in writing on a form and within the time prescribed by the Secretary to be subject to the farm acreage allotment and marketing quota.

In the informational material issued by the Department of Agriculture, it has gone one step further by insisting that the small wheat farmer who wishes to vote in the wheat referendum, must so indicate prior to the balloting. This could well mean that a farmer would be required to make an additional trip to town to indicate his desire to vote. Personally, I do not see why the Secretary or the Department should make it so difficult for these small wheat farmers to vote. Certainly it cannot be that he is fearful that they will vote against his program?

Why not, in accordance with the law, have the small farmer sign a form indicating his desire to vote at the same time he secures his ballot? By so doing, he would be more apt to vote and the voting procedure would be less expensive to the Government, as well as to the farmer. In addition, the same treatment and opportunities would be afforded the small producers as are given to the larger producers.

However, if there is some special reason why the Secretary of Agriculture should so discriminate against these small producers, he should advise them as well as the Congress. Otherwise, I suggest that the Secretary eliminate this prior intent provision from the voting procedure for our small producers.

Mr. Speaker, I cannot urge too strongly that every small wheat farmer study carefully the issues presented in this referendum and, even though the Department is making it unusually difficult for him to do so, to register and vote. For many years these referendums have been decided by the large wheat producers of the Nation who represent only a small percentage of the total number. This year, however, the small producer has a chance to voice his opinion. He will have the opportunity of saying whether or not he wants any part of supply-management for agriculture. He may not have this opportunity again.

Mr. Speaker, should this certificate plan be defeated, it will then be in order for this Congress to enact a sensible and equitable wheat bill for 1964.

HUMAN VALUE AGAINST MATERIAL VALUE AND HOMELAND AGAINST FOREIGN NATIONALITY

Mr. BELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SILER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. SILER. Mr. Speaker, as we continue to consider one of the serious and major problems of our Nation, the one pertaining to the importation into our country of foreign residual oil, we may always ask ourselves this basic, simple question, Is it right or is it wrong? Now such a thing as this foreign importation cannot be both right and wrong, but it must be either the one or the other. So, just what are the chief arguments for the importation or against it. The arguments seem to line up about as follows:

FOR IMPORTATION

First. Saves money—a material value—for many fuel users and consumers up in the New England area of our country.

Second. Helps Venezuela—a foreign nationality—by giving that country a rich outlet for its product, residual oil.

AGAINST IMPORTATION

First. Preserves and stimulates jobs—a human value—for many coal miners, putting bread on their tables and making them self-sustaining citizens of high morale and justifiable pride in themselves.

Second. Helps America—our own homeland—by enabling one of its great industries, coal, to keep operating as a vital part of the overall economy of this great free nation of ours.

Therefore, it appears that President Kennedy and the Congress are merely confronted with a problem of human value against material value and of Americanism against a foreign nationality. The answer should be quick and direct. Human value should come first and Americanism should be first, last, and always.

NATIONAL HARMONY WEEK

Mr. BELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. OSTERTAG] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. OSTERTAG. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced a joint resolution (H.J. Res. 282) in the House to designate the week of April 15 to 20 as National Harmony Week, in recognition of the 25th anniversary of the founding of the Society for the Preservation and Encouragement of Barber Shop Quartet Singing in America. The resolution requests the President to issue a proclamation to this effect, and inviting the people of the United States to join in observance of such week with appropriate ceremonies and activities.

The SPEBSQSA is a nonprofit, fraternal organization dedicated to the preservation and promotion of the unique American art form known as the barbershop quartet style of close harmony singing. Through its 650 chapters and 30,000 members, the society has made an important contribution to America's native culture by its programs to preserve this traditional American music and to keep America singing.

This traditional American singing has long been a favorite in my area and we are proud and pleased that the present international president of the society, Mr. S. Wayne Foor, is from Rochester, N.Y. Mr. Foor came to the Capitol yesterday to be on hand for the introduction of this resolution, and he was accompanied by the Wanderers, a leading barbershop quartet from Arlington, Va.

Barbershop singing has nationwide appeal and interest, and I hope that my colleagues in the Congress from all over the country will lend their support to this resolution so that we may show our encouragement and appreciation for this uniquely American artistry.

NEED FOR EARLY WHEAT REFERENDUM

Mr. BELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from

Kansas [Mr. Dole] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced a bill today which would require the Secretary of Agriculture to proclaim the 1964 national acreage allotment and set the date for the wheat referendum on the 1964 wheat program not later than May 15, 1963.

Under existing law the referendum could be held as late as June 15, 1963, or earlier, depending upon the Secretary. The 1961 wheat referendum was not held until August 24 and in 1962 not until August 30. Under existing law the referendum could be held earlier—within 60 days after proclaiming the national acreage allotment which could be done any time but which must be done prior to April 15.

There can be no reasonable excuse this year for not holding the referendum prior to May 15, for the 1964 wheat program was enacted and signed by the President on September 27, 1962, some 5 months ago.

Farmers complain, with justification, particularly in winter wheat areas, that the wheat referendum comes too late to permit them to do any prior planning. This year an early referendum would also give Congress adequate time to pass other wheat legislation should the referendum fail, and if it passes farmers will have time to make necessary decisions.

Many farmers have indicated a late referendum will have a strong bearing on the final outcome of the referendum in winter wheat areas. I do not believe any wheat producer eligible to vote, regardless of his views, should be subjected to this unnecessary indirect pressure. The farmer should be permitted to cast his vote, yes or no, freely without being confronted with unnecessary obstacles.

I have written Secretary of Agriculture Orville Freeman suggesting the Secretary act promptly. If the Secretary responds accordingly, and I hope he does, no legislation would be necessary.

By May 15, or before, the American wheat producer will have had time to determine his position and, in my opinion, to delay the referendum beyond that date will do a disservice to the wheat producer. An early referendum would also save the taxpayer a large chunk of the money now being expended by Freeman in efforts to sell, not explain, the program.

USDA ACTS TO BREAK GRAIN PRICE IN 12 STATES

Mr. BELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Latta] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, an article which appeared last month in the Feedstuffs publication has just come to my attention. I am certain that portions of it are now of particular interest to some of my colleagues. I submit the article for inclusion in the Congressional Record:

USDA Acts To Break Grain Price in 12 States

(By John Cipperly)

Washington.—This week in a controlled news announcement, the U.S. Department of Agriculture acted to break the feed grain price in 12 States of the Southeast from Maryland and Delaware south to Florida.

USDA set a price for Commodity Credit Corporation corn stocks at 25 cents a bushel over the Chicago cash market price for 5 or more jumbo freight cars or 10 or more ordinary freight cars. In quantities of one through four jumbo cars or two through nine ordinary cars, the f.o.b. price will be 27½ cents above the Chicago cash market price.

The sales program is facilitated by use of reduced rail rates under section 22 of the Interstate Commerce Act.

This means nothing less than flat pricing by areas in this Nation.

It rejects flatly any recognition of free markets wherein high regional prices would accelerate imports of a commodity. This would bring prices down to the economic value of the commodity from an interior terminal plus freight to the consuming deficit area.

This sudden price decision on the part of USDA follows the same pattern of last year when USDA used a section 22 freight rate to break the local market or perhaps to satisfy local politicians—who seem to dominate USDA price policy.

Most observers here are aghast at the arbitrary action by USDA. The pricing policy for CCC corn was quietly announced by a single posted notice on a bulletin board during market trading hours without any prior discussion of the action with the grain industry.

One may only describe this type of administrative procedure as arbitrary, capricious, and possessing political connotations. The ASCS office of USDA and the front office are now dominated by southeastern officials who have a local interest in feed grain shipments from the midwest producing areas to key States such as North Carolina and adjacent States.

In short, the slide-rule experts here in control of USDA repudiate the free market and are deciding what the price of corn should be in the 12 States.

DEFENDS ACTION

To the astonishment of this reporter, one leading USDA economic official said that his study of USDA data pertaining to this matter showed that the CCC price reflected an adequate return to the exporter of grain to the southeastern deficit area.

But the shippers of grains into that area who had already moved supplies into the States would be penalized to the extent that CCC had later capriciously fixed a price for its corn.

However, that is the situation, and the grain trade must live with it and with the uncertainty about how long this punitive situation can exist—a situation in which an individual or a group of politically minded individuals slip the slide rules and push buttons to determine what is a fair price in any area of the Nation.

TRADE FACES CATASTROPHE

The grain trade stands on the brink of catastrophe. The trade, with some significant exceptions, is revealed as an utter failure in anticipating and fighting the towering wave of administered prices as now appear inherent in the Orville Freeman-USDA philosophy.

The free, competitive markets are slowly being strangled by the Lilliputians of the USDA. The grain trader is a fallen foe.

The announcement of administered pricing by CCC is nothing less than the forerunner of catastrophe for the independent grain merchant as well as a danger signal to the processing industry, which prices its products on the basis of competitive buying of raw materials.

The U.S. Government can raise merry hell with the U.S.S.R. and its centralized control, but it will take a long week of Sundays to explain away the distinction between Nikita's fiats and those which are now being reached pricewise by USDA in commodities.

This decision for the southeastern price of corn can be merely the first step in a Government-price dominating program all over the country. Officials here are now saying that prices have been too high. Consequently, using their leverage of huge surplus stocks, they intend to break prices into line with their ideas of what they should be.

The trade is dealing with a tough, intelligent and determined group at USDA. It is about time that they took off the kid gloves and started fighting with no holds barred.

COMMITTEE STAFFING

Mr. BELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. Cleveland] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, the importance of good committee staffing to the work of this House is an acknowledged fact. The imbalance between staff members responsible to the minority and the majority parties has caused increasing concern and not a little comment. Because of the importance of this question I would like to insert herewith a cogent and excellent column on this subject by Roscoe Drummond appearing in the Washington Post, February 26, 1963:

Committee Staffing

(By Roscoe Drummond)

Well, well, what should happen but that the most powerful Democrat in the House of Representative, Speaker John W. McCormack, says right out that he is downright annoyed that the Republicans think the minority party should have the right to a better proportion of the professional staffs of congressional committees.

Maybe that's a little too strong. He didn't quite say the Republicans shouldn't think about correcting the egregious imbalance in professional committee staffing. Speaker McCormack allows they could think about it as long as they didn't try to do anything about it.

Doing something about this injustice, he said, was just foolishly "stirring things up," making a "nuisance" of themselves—almost un-Democratic (at least with a capital D); anyway, he is against it.

The fact is that a number of Democrats recognize that an adequate staff for the minority party (whether Republican or Democratic) will make a more effective Congress and better legislation.

The purpose of this column is to report that progress that is being made, to clarify the real issue behind this reform and to indicate the roadblocks and prospects ahead.

The Republican reformers have not yet broken into a clear field, but, they have gained strength and momentum.

Two years ago Representative THOMAS CURTIS, of Missouri, and one or two others were prescient voices pointing out how the 12-to-1 imbalance in committee staffing was handicapping the minority party. They weren't even getting an audience with their own party colleagues.

In less than 2 months this year—that is, since the party activists under the leadership of Representative GERALD FORD, of Michigan, took over the Republican conference—here is what has happened:

Staffing reform has become an active objective of the whole party. Last week the Republican conference voted overwhelmingly to press until they win for the right of the minority party to have the services of up to 40 percent of the professional staff of House committees whenever the minority so votes.

The conference has put a seven-member subcommittee, headed by Representative FRED SCHWENGEL, of Iowa, to work continuously to generate action.

For nearly 2 weeks, the House Administration Subcommittee on Accounts has been reviewing the committee budgets. For the first time such able Republicans as Representatives CHARLES GOODELL, of New York, and JOHN KYL, of Iowa, have made a detailed case for proper minority staffing. They have won a handful of isolated victories.

How near did they come to a big victory—to getting 40 percent allocation of professional staff to the minority? When the issue came before the whole House Administration Committee, the Republican motion lost by only a 10-to-9 vote.

What is the issue behind this urgent reform? It has nothing to do with hiring Republican experts to work for Republicans. It has only to do with allocating to the minority membership of each House committee a fair proportion of objective, competent, professional specialists and investigators so that the minority can discharge its own responsibility.

One serious roadblock the Republicans still face is that some of their senior committee members are so unaware of what needs to be done that they are themselves blocking action.

The case for staffing reform is irrefutable. The need is great and the demand for reform is growing continuously.

AMERICAN HISTORY MONTH

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. LEGGETT] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. LEGGETT. Mr. Speaker, the Glenn County chapter of the Daughters of the American Revolution has drafted a resolution designating February as American History Month. I think that this is a commendable interest. The people of this area are very interested in the heritage of this great country of ours. For example, most counties have historical societies which study the origins of the region. The old missions and landmarks of California are cherished by all of her citizens. And most recently, this interest in history is reflected in the launching of a new nuclear powered Polaris submarine at Mare Island Naval Shipyard in Vallejo, Calif., Solano County. This great ship was christened the *Woodrow Wilson* and the date of its launching was February 22, 1963, the birthday of our first President, George Washington.

In respect to the proud tradition of American history, we join the Daughters of the American Revolution in the observance of February as American History Month.

HEMISPHERIC FREEDOM

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. FASCELL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, last week Marshal Rodion Malinovsky, Russia's Minister of Defense said:

> We would like to warn the aggressive circles of the United States that an attack on the Cuban Republic would mean the third world war.

Although this statement can be somewhat discounted as rocket rattling, it might some day again be made by Khrushchev. Therefore, we should take this opportunity to make it clear that this is a Communist move which must not and will not deter or neutralize U.S. efforts to protect itself in the freedom of this hemisphere.

Our answer to Russia and the Communists is:

That they are the ones who imperil the peace of the world;

That they have violated the peace and security of this hemisphere and threatened the security of the United States;

That it is the Communists who maintain a dangerous and hostile government in Cuba;

That it is the Communists who introduced a substantial offensive military threat in Cuba and although removed, continue their military operations in that country;

That it is the Communists who support and encourage acts of aggression by the Communist government in Cuba against the United States and its citizens;

That it is the Communists who are using Cuba as a base for exporting subversion and have embarked on a campaign of subversion with violence and terror to destroy all democratic institutions in this hemisphere;

That it is the Communists who, by their actions, continue to threaten the peace and security of the United States.

Therefore, the United States has made it clear, and must continue to do so, that—

The existence of a Communist government in Cuba is incompatible with our inter-American system and a threat to the security of the United States and all our policies will be and are directed toward the eradication of this threat;

Force will be met with force;

The United States will take all military action determined necessary to protect itself against acts of aggression, including pursuit into the territory of Communist Cuba;

We will take all action, military or otherwise, together with Latin American governments to meet and prevent the Communists' hemispheric plan of violent subversion.

PRESIDENT KENNEDY'S SPEECH BEFORE AMERICAN BANKERS ASSOCIATION

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GONZALEZ] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, I have read with great interest the text of President John F. Kennedy's speech and responses to questions before the American Bankers Association's symposium on economic growth yesterday. This is a remarkable record, and it tells us much about our President, in addition to being most informative on the economic matters discussed. In my opinion, there have been few such occasions when the fiber and caliber of the President have been so clearly shown as they were on this occasion yesterday. When one considers the substance of the President's answers to questions that were penetrating and difficult, it is clear that he has a profound group of the intricacies of these problems, even in his off-the-cuff statements.

I confess I am impressed by the President's abilities in this regard. They reflect much study and very mature reasoning on some of the most perplexing questions before this Congress. They are our problems, and it is my hope that we can match the wit and ability of the President in dealing with them. This is a challenge and an opportunity. We have been given the proposals of a strong leadership, and now our task is to demonstrate the same maturity and wisdom in responding to those proposals.

I ask that the RECORD include herewith the complete transcript of the President's speech to the American Bankers Association, as it appeared in the Washington Post today, and I respectfully call the attention of the Members to this and his answers to questions from the bankers:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Feb. 26, 1963]

TRANSCRIPT OF PRESIDENT'S SPEECH TO BANKERS AND QUESTION PERIOD

(NOTE.—The following is the text of President Kennedy's speech yesterday as delivered to the American Bankers Association symposium on economic growth at the Mayflower Hotel here, with the question and answer period after the President's speech.)

The **PRESIDENT.** Mr. (David) Rockefeller (symposium chairman), Mr. Secretary (Treasury Secretary C. Douglas Dillon), Mr. (Walter) Heller (chairman, President's Council of Economic Advisers), Dr. (Per) Jacobsson (managing director, International Monetary Fund), gentlemen, a 100 years ago today, in the darkest domestic crisis this

Nation has ever known, the national banking system was founded. It was a farsighted act and provided for a sound basis for the extraordinary economic expansion which has brought the United States to its present unrivaled position.

Today, many Americans tend to think of developing underdeveloped countries in terms only of faraway nations, but in 1863, even measured by 1963 dollars, our own per capita income—and this should be a source of encouragement to many who are laboring with the problem of underdevelopment in far-off countries—our own per capita income was less than $1 a day, approximately the same as Chile's.

Nearly 60 percent of our labor force was engaged in agriculture, the same percentage as is today engaged in the Philippines. An estimated 20 percent of our population was illiterate, the same percentage of the population of Ceylon.

Only one-fifth of our 34 million people lived in towns or cities of over 5,000 in population, as is roughly true now of Turkey. In 1863, this Nation had fewer railroad tracks laid than India has today, and its children had a shorter life expectancy than a child born this year in Thailand or Zanzibar.

ECONOMIC GROWTH

What can be summed up in the past 100 years, I think, the history of it, can be summed up in two words, and that is "economic growth." No nation in the history of the world has ever experienced a century of economic growth comparable to that of the United States in the last 100 years.

In 100 years, the growth of our free-enterprise economy under a free political system, and under the development effectively of our national and local and State educational systems, has brought our citizens to an unprecedented standard of living.

It has brought to our Nation an unparalleled position in the world, as the world's foremost banker, merchant, manufacturer, and consumer. It has demonstrated the power of freedom for all to see, and sustained the cause of freedom through hot wars and cold, at home and abroad.

All this and more has been made possible by economic growth, and yet we have heard in recent times that economic growth is too abstract a concept; that it is too academic for politicians and voters; that it is too theoretical a basis for proposals to the Congress.

I do not see anything abstract or academic about economic growth. It means finding 1.2 million additional jobs every year for the men and women pouring into our labor market, half of them below the age of 25. It means preventing the periodic recessions which have hit our Nation, three times in the last 10 years.

It means ending the persisting slack which has kept our unemployment rate at 5 percent or above for 62 out of the last 63 months. It has kept output $30 billion to $40 billion below our productive capacity and kept corporate investments in 1962 actually below the levels of gross retained earnings. There is nothing theoretical about that.

CONCRETE FIGURES

There is nothing academic about pushing our economy to 4 percent instead of 3 percent, which might total over the next 10 years in today's prices $400 billion more in output of goods and services, with all that this would mean to family incomes, wages, profits, and governmental revenues.

These are the concrete, not abstract, figures that growth represents. That is why I am pleased that the American Bankers Association has devoted this conference to that subject. And that is why I believe the most urgent piece of business before the Congress this year is Federal tax revision.

Last year, a year of recovery and prosperity for most Americans, unemployment averaged the same high 5.6 percent of the labor force as it did in the recession year of 1954. Business spending on new plant and equipment was at a lower level last year than it was in 1957, although total output and profits were much higher. These are deeply disturbing statistics, and yet there is nothing deeply wrong with our economy.

We have the most productive skilled workers in the world, and the most ample national resources, and a respected currency. We have no lack of savings or technicians or mass markets or price stabilities, such as hampers economic progress in so much of the world today. We have, in short, no basic obstacle to growth, and we have opportunities for greater growth.

I do not believe that any thoughtful American could look at the statistics and impartial facts about this Nation's economy over that period and not conclude that we need to step up our growth. But it will not be stepped up by political slogans or homely analogies. It will not be stepped up by canceling defense contracts or lowering the debt ceiling.

In my opinion, it will be stepped up only by lightening the repressive rate of wartime tax rates which put a damper on private purchasing power and profits.

PROGRAM UNDER ATTACK

The tax program I have put forward to meet this need is now under attack from the left and the right. I do not say it is a perfect program that cannot be changed by the Congress or will not by changed by the Congress, or which will satisfy the desires of all groups, or which will achieve all the growth we need as fast as we need it. But those who admit the problem, but oppose the proposed solution, of a $10 billion top-to-bottom tax revision, are under some obligation to put forward some proposals of their own.

Would they expect the Congress to accept, instead, $10 billion increase in Federal spending, or a $20 billion Federal deficit? Would they propose, instead, a $10 billion injection of credit at lower rates of interest without regard to the balance of payments?

At a time of record profits, would they increase tax reductions solely for corporations or investors who received a $2.5 billion tax cut last year and thereby attempt to stimulate new capacity without increasing the purchasing power of the American consumer who cannot afford to buy enough now to make use of our existing capacity? Do they feel that tax concessions, loopholes, and deductions are preferable to lower tax rates as a spur to economic growth?

These are the questions which must be answered if we Americans mean business about boosting American business. Tax reduction will not be passed if each group continues to treat growth as a crop to be divided, or if each group examines what is available through the wrong end of the telescope.

Of course, if the low-income man looks at the dollar amounts of the cut, he will decide the rich are getting all the breaks, and if the high income looks at the percentage cuts, he will decide the opposite. Meanwhile, those in the middle, hearing all this, will be convinced that they will get less than either the rich or the poor.

FAIR DISTRIBUTION SEEN

The facts of the matter are that the reduction is fairly distributed through all income brackets, and I would hope that all groups would put national interest first and recognize that the prospects for tax reduction and economic growth must not be endangered by squabbles over who is going to get what, for it is the Nation that will benefit most from the passage of the program, and the Nation that will suffer, and all the people who make up the Nation, if the program is defeated.

The tax program we have submitted is, in fact, consistent with all legitimate ends. It is designed to expand demand among both investors and consumers, to boost the economy, in both the short run and the long run, and to achieve in time both a balanced full employment economy and a balanced Federal budget.

Heated talk about budget increases should not obscure the fact that civilian expenditures under the proposed budget will be decreased, an accomplishment which has occurred only four times in the last 15 years. Partisan talk about swollen Federal payrolls should not obscure the fact that this budget calls for fewer Federal employees to serve every 100 people in this country than there were only a few years ago.

Exasperated talk about increasing the deficit should not obscure the fact that the enactment of the proposed tax program would add only $2.7 billion to next year's deficit, but if we slide into another recession, pulling annual gross national product down by as little as 3 percent, the deficit would be increased twice as much.

In other words, the deficit, without a tax cut, would then be far higher than the projected deficit we face with a tax cut higher even than the record deficit of $12.4 billion which followed the recession of 1958, only a few months after the President of the United States had submitted a budget which provided for a surplus of a half-billion dollars. That is how quickly a deficit can unbalance a budget.

NO RECESSION PREDICTION

I am not predicting a recession for 1963, but we cannot escape the fact that the period of expansion between the first and second postwar recessions lasted 45 months. The period between the second and the third lasted 35 months. The period between the third and the fourth lasted 25 months and the American economy is now in its 24th month of recovery from the fourth postwar recession.

Finally, rash talk about a crushing debt burden should not obscure the fact that by every meaningful measure, that burden under the proposed budget and tax cut will actually decline.

It is true that our current national debt would be a crushing burden for an economy less vigorous than ours. It would have been a crushing burden for the U.S. economy in 1923, or 1863, but as a proportion of our gross national product, our debt burden is not only manageable, but is steadily declining. Its weight as a proportion of our gross national product has been cut more than in half since 1947, and it will continue to fall in the years ahead.

Bankers understand better than most people that a debt, prudently undertaken, for gainful purposes, by one whose income is capable of carrying it, can greatly strengthen the debtor. Corporate debt has increased over 200 percent in the last 15 years, compared to an increase in the Federal debt of 15 percent, not because our business enterprises are wasteful or irresponsible or swollen of profit, but because they believe in growth.

A transitional Federal deficit now, as a result of a tax cut, reflects a prudent investment in this Nation's future growth, but the chronic deficits, produced by a lagging economy, and the record deficit produced by a new recession would surely increase the real burden of any debt and set back that future growth.

PLEDGES ARE MADE

Let me make clear the framework of fiscal prudence and economic necessity in which this tax program is submitted by making the following predictions and pledges if the full tax reduction program I have submitted is enacted this year:

First, that this program will, in a short time, result in increased tax revenues, as did the 1954 tax cut, and a substantial portion of that increase will be used each year to reduce the deficit until the budget is once again balanced.

Second, that any increases in the Federal debt resulting from these transitional budget deficits will be kept proportionately lower than the increase in our gross national product, and thus the real burden of the Federal debt can be reduced.

Third, that any necessary increases in Federal employment will be kept proportionately lower than the increase in the national population, the increase in State and local government employment, and, through efficiencies in management and operation, the increase in the Federal workload required to serve the Nation.

Fourth, that every effort will be made to continue the present downward trend in our balance-of-payments deficit, and the present stable levels of our wholesale and consumer prices, levels more stable in the past 2 years, in fact, than any major industrialized country, with the sole exception of Canada.

As one of your distinguished guests here this morning, Dr. Jacobsson, has said, our problem since 1959, in his speech he made in that year, prophesying that the end of the great inflationary spiral had come about at a time when most of us were still talking about the dangers of inflation, in 1959, 1960, 1961, and even 1962, our problem is not inflation, providing we use prudence in the management of our wages and prices and in our monetary policy; our problem is to maintain our economy against the pressures of deflation in the free world.

Fifth, that no budget will be submitted by this administration which does not continue a persistent and surprisingly unpopular program of cutting costs, increasing efficiency, and weeding out obsolete activities.

DIFFERENT PREDICTIONS

I realize that all such economic prophesies and commitments in these times are subject to being displaced by national and international crises, but subject to the same allowances, if no tax cut is enacted, I would be willing to venture a wholly different set of predictions:

First, that tax revenues will continue, year in and year out, to be insufficient to balance the budget, no matter how tight the administration and Congress control expenditures.

Second, that the country will, in the not too distant future, be struck by its fifth postwar recession, with a heavy loss of jobs and profits, a recordbreaking budget deficit, and an increased burden of national debt.

Third, that unemployment and unused business capacity will remain at or above their present high levels, creating a lack of investor confidence at home, and a lack of confidence in the dollar abroad.

Fourth, that the pressure for a 35-hour week, for restrictions on imports and automation, and for large quickie tax cuts, and sharply increased Federal spending, will all grow beyond manageable limits.

Fifth, that this Nation's rate of economic growth will not match over the next 10 years the record of most other industrial powers, or our own record in this century.

WARNING IS SOUNDED

I hope the members of this association and the delegates to this conference on growth will carefully weigh these alternate sets of predictions. If the first set is borne out by the facts, we will have established in this country a brisk climate, for business, investment, and confidence; but if the second is set upon us by the failure of the Congress to enact an adequate tax program this year, the consequences will be with us for some years to come.

This symposium, I know, is dedicated to the proposition that such serious issues must not be decided by rules of party politics, public-opinion poles, and prejudices. Your awareness of the facts and the alternatives uniquely enables you to bring objectivity and reality to a discussion now too often obscured by superficial details, and too often conflicting claims and interests.

As bankers who lend to both consumers and investors, to both management and labor, to rich and to poor, to middle-income groups, you recognize the needs of all, for you have witnessed in your own enterprises that the businessman's greatest need is new market demand, and the wage earner's greatest need is expanding business activity. The Nation's greatest need is a tax bill that will help fulfill both of these objectives.

Tax revision, may I say in conclusion, is not the only ingredient in a policy for growth. Education—I would certainly put that up near the top of those things which, if well invested in, can provide a substantial return. Investment in education yields a substantial return in new research, new products, new techniques, in higher wages and purchasing power, and a greater supply of college-trained manpower.

Unfortunately, a staggering 40 percent of all young people are dropping out before graduating from high school. Only 16 percent are completing college, and only about one-half of 1 percent are achieving the Ph. D. degrees upon which the advance of knowledge depends. We must improve the quantity and the quality of our education if we are to have growth.

There are other steps we must take if we are to step up economic growth to improve the knowledge and mobility of our labor force, to encourage the development of new technology, to support the growth of basic science, to make the most of our national resources. But today there is no more single fruitful or urgent business than tax revision in the interest of fiscal responsibility, equity, and efficiency, but above all, in the interest of the United States in 1963.

Thank you.

BUDGET BALANCE

David Rockefeller. Thank you very much, Mr. President.

The President has very kindly said he would answer some questions from the floor for a few moments.

Question. I am in the manufacturing business, heavy industry, in Milwaukee. I believe all of us in business are sold on a tax reduction, providing it is of the type that will stimulate business, but the question I should like to ask the President is: After all, the sanctity of the dollar is the basis of free enterprise and the basis of commerce in the free world. We have lost $12 billion in gold in the last 12 to 15 years, largely by virtue of our giveaway and by virtue of not insisting that our military allies carry their share.

I ask the question whether in order to restore a stable economy and bring about growth in private industry, whether it isn't as essential that the Government budget is balanced as it is in my business or in the banking business or in any business?

The President. Well, to go through the number of questions—at least the number of answers, which your statement and question suggests, in the first place, I don't think you have explained fully why we have lost gold. The fact of the matter is that private industry in this country has invested about $2½ billion a year over the last 10 years, and that is a dollar drain. Now, it is matched against equity in the country involved.

If Chrysler spends $65 million for Simca a month ago, that is a $65 million loss for us. That dollar can end up as a potential drain on our gold. As France keeps 75 percent of its reserves in gold, that is what 75 percent of that investment will end up as, a gold loss. If Ford Motor Co. spends $350 million 2 years ago to buy Ford in Great Britain, that can end up as a dollar loss and can end up, as Britain keeps nearly 100 percent of its reserves in gold, that can end up as a gold loss.

ASSETS AGAINST GOLD

There are assets against that gold. They are not liquid in the sense that the dollar claim upon it is liquid, but there is an asset, there is a Simca Co., there is a Ford Co., there are dividends. Great Britain conducted for years investments overseas which brought them and maintained their balance of payments between the wars, so that I am not adverse to these investments overseas, but I do not think we should point out—in fact, they bring back nearly $2,500 million. But in pointing out the losses in dollars, it seems to me you oversimplify.

We lose a billion dollars in tourists every year. There is no asset in that loss, but it is a billion dollars, and represents a dollar which can be cashed against us in gold.

We have attempted to tie our purchases as much as possible, our military expenditures—we now tie about 80 percent of our aid to expenditures here in the United States, and we are trying to do even better. So that we hope to cut that dollar loss, gold loss, and we are attempting to tie our military expenditures, as much as we can, and persuade our allies to pay a greater share of the burden, which they are well able to do.

We have done that most recently with Italy, which is offsetting whatever expenditures we make in Italy. We have done it in Germany, under the Gilpatric-Strauss equipment, whereas Germany pays to us for new equipment for their army what it costs us in dollars to maintain our six divisions in Western Germany.

We still lose some in Spain, we still lose some in France, and some in Great Britain, and we lose about $300 million in Japan for military reasons, and some in Vietnam and other places.

So I agree with you that this is a matter which deserves our closest attention. We do have, however, $50 billion of assets of the United States overseas in these investments which are against the dollar. We still do have substantial gold reserves. We still have a Western economy which is dependent upon the dollar.

If you didn't have the dollar, then you would have solely an economic system based on gold, and you would have a system which is so restrictive that you would have no economic development in the United States or trade in any other country.

THE BUDGET MOVES UP

So I think it is a serious problem, and one that we have to give a good deal of attention to. Now, your last point is that you seek a balanced budget, and so do I. But we spend about $52 billion for our Defense Department. We spend about $2 billion of our foreign aid also going to our Defense Department to buy surplus military equipment, so we are not giving away quite as much as you think.

We spend about $2.5 billion for our atomic energy, which is tied up with our national security. We spend $10 billion for interest on the debt. Some of you may even hold some of that debt. So that begins to move us up.

Then we spend $5.5 billion for our veterans. Then we spend $6.5 billion for agriculture. But when we suggested last year that those who benefit from this program in agriculture—at least they should put some restraints upon their production, I heard many speeches made by manufacturers from Wisconsin and other places saying this was an unfair interference by the Federal Government in free enterprise.

So the result is that you buy all that they can produce at 75 percent of parity, and they can outproduce us as far as what our demands would be every year in agriculture, as really we could in any other commodity, if we made up our mind. So that the economy, the budget, moves up.

DEBT REFINANCED

Now, we have submitted a budget which provides for a reduction in expenditures with the exception of defense, space, and interest on the debt. Interest on the debt has to be refinanced at a higher rate than it was originally years ago and is obviously an increased cost. Space is also important to our security, and defense.

The rest of the budget, even though we have an increase in population of several million, even though we are distributing, for example, in the post office, a million and a half new addresses a year, even though we have many more children in school, and from 1960 to 1970 you are going to double the number of children trying to get into colleges, so that means you will have to build as many buildings in 10 years as you did in 150 years, we are still attempting to keep our economy under restraint.

Our budget would be in good condition if our economy grew as fast as it ought to. I accept your view that a balanced budget is desirable, but what I am saying is that my opinion is that unless you get a tax cut this year, you increase the chances of a recession which will unbalance your budget to a far greater extent.

I already mentioned in my speech about President Eisenhower's 1958 experience, a half-billion surplus and within a few months it was a $12.5 billion deficit. If you have another recession, with the deficit we have, then I think you would be in a far more serious position.

So I don't think, sir, that your alternative is as you would hope, between a balanced budget and an unbalanced budget. My opinion is that the alternative today is between keeping this economy moving ahead and a recession, and in my judgment, the best medicine for that recession is a tax reduction.

AN ALTERNATIVE

Question. Mr. President, you mentioned in your remarks that increased expenditures of the Government would constitute one alternative to the tax reduction. I think it would be interesting if you would give us your reason for that choice, sir.

The President. Well, there are many people who feel that that is what we ought to do, that cities and towns have a good many problems. In fact, in the Washington Post this morning I saw the National Housing Conference, which is meeting in Washington, is charging the White House is lagging in its development of urban renewal, housing for the elderly, and passed, almost unanimously, I believe, 10 resolutions, 7 of which would result in an increase in Government expenditures of $4 million.

So if you run into a recession, you are going to have a good many people who feel that Government expenditures will be needed. People aren't going to—you are not going to have 6 million, 7 million, 8 million, or 9 million people out of work in this country without somebody thinking something should be done about it.

Something is going to be done about it. You are going to have either the Government spending the money to keep them at work, or somebody else is going to. You are not going to have them around unemployed, and have the United States, in these years, as leader of the free world, accept it.

The fact of the matter is if you take this action in time—I don't oversell it—I think we will have a lot of economic problems anyway. This is a very complicated economy, at a particular point in its development, and I am not overstating the desirability of the tax cut, but I think it is most useful at this time.

But I do think that if we fail, and if we have a recession, which is prolonged, then you will have a great number of people out of work, and you will have a good many remedies put forward, some of those that I suggested—increased governmental expenditures, a 35-hour week, which has already been advanced by the AFL–CIO, and other proposals which I don't think are in our interest.

A 35-hour week at today's cost would increase your cost about 14 percent, and that would just about price us out of the international market. So I am against the 35-hour week. The thing to do is to take the action as I have said.

TEN-BILLION-DOLLARS

Question. Mr. President, I believe you said that you did not predict a recession in 1963, and you say that without a tax cut we are liable to have a recession. Now, with a tax cut, tied so closely to tax reform, isn't it possible that the tax reform angle might delay this to the point where the tax cut might be lost?

The President. Yes, and I would be opposed to that. What we suggested was a tax cut of over $13 billion, and reforms which would bring in about $3 billion, roughly, of revenues, giving us a total tax cut of $10 billion. We felt that, therefore, the goal is the $10-billion tax cut in the length of time which we have recommended.

If we cannot get the reform, then quite obviously you are going to have to rewrite the package. It might be possible to send up, or for the Congress to pass, a $10-billion tax cut without the reform, but that would mean changes, of course, in the rate reduction structure. So it was our feeling that from the national interest, even though I realized that some taxpayers may find it more desirable to have the simple $10-billion cut with consequent adjustments of all the rates, than they would the $13-billion cut, with the reform, it may be that Congress will come to that conclusion.

That isn't our judgment of the best action. But I quite agree that what we need is the bill this year, and nothing should stand in its way. Our feeling is that the best bill that can be gotten will be the one we recommended. But I would say the first priority is a bill. We have to realize that if we don't get the reform, then, of course, the tax bill would have to be rewritten, unless the Congress made a judgment that it would accept a tax cut of $13 billion.

Our concern is that they might take a tax cut of less than $10 billion, which would be, I think, a mistake. If we are going to do this, we might as well do it right or not do it at all. But that is the choice. But to answer your question, I would say the important thing is to get the bill this year. Whatever is necessary to get that bill, I would support.

PRODUCTIVITY

Question. Mr. President, doesn't the prospective deficit, as well as the continuing deficit in our international balance of payments, make it even more important than previously to prevent wage rates from increasing faster than productivity?

The President. I would think that wage rates would follow—I hope they would follow the general guidelines which have been suggested on several occasions, which are tied to the principle which you just described, that wage rates should be tied to productivity increases. The difficulty, of course, is arguing that productivity increases and also discussing how increases in productivity should be divided. But I think the general principle is one we certainly support and continue to support.

The fact of the matter is that it represents that, and the other point would be a real concentration by American corporations on the export market. We have never really given it—some companies have—the attention it deserves as a nation. But there are these markets throughout the world, and I would hope that every American corporation—that is the greatest contribution they could make.

In my earlier answer, the American businessmen benefits, as well as our security benefits from the dollar as an international mechanism. I would hope that they would concentrate as a national service as well as one that would bring them a private return, that they would concentrate their energies on developing their export market. That can make a great difference to us. If management and labor can be responsible in the next year or two, and there is a concentation on export markets, I think we have a much better chance to lick the problem.

OTHERS AFFECTED

One of the points that I think is worth making is that there are these dollars overseas which represent a call on our gold. If our economy is doing well, then I think that people will have confidence in the dollar, and that serves the whole Western community.

If we were dependent only on gold, and gold which, after all, increases by what—$700 million a year, probably, how could you possibly finance the tremendous movements of trade which we now have in the world unless you have sterling and the dollar which gold supports? If you just use gold, we would be back to 1929, and you would have the most restrictive effect on our economy, our free flow of trade and, therefore, the defense of the Western World.

What we are really talking about is not only the national security, but if the United States does not maintain its economy in good position, then Great Britain cannot afford to take those steps to provide a stimulus to her economy at home, and in addition, those countries of Latin America, particularly, which sell their raw materials to us, would be depressed, so everything hangs upon us.

Everything hangs upon our maintaining our economy effectively and maintaining the kind of discipline which your question suggests.

Can I have one more? I know you have other speakers.

STIMULATIVE

Question. Mr. President, you have commented on the potential or possible recession and its magnitude, referring back to 1958. Would you care to comment, if your tax proposal is enacted, what the magnitude of the potential might be with regard to economic stimulation?

The President. Well, I think we have talked about the three or four times stimulus which a $10 billion tax cut would have, which would be $30 billion, three times, 300 percent, which we would hope, and also, of course, that it would also bring a return in revenues.

That is why we feel that the combination of the stimulation on our economy of the multiplication factor of three times, and also the additional returns this would bring to Federal revenues, makes us feel that the proposed tax cut is fiscally responsible.

As I said at the beginning, if we were going to err, I would certainly err on the side of a large enough tax cut, not to go through this laborious, painful procedure which we are all going through and then bring forth a mouse. I would hope that we would bring forth one that would do the job.

Thank you very much.

A FEDERAL BANKING COMMISSION

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. Multer] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced a bill today, H.R. 4253, to create a Federal Banking Commission. This is a most important bill and I trust that action can be taken on it during this Congress.

The proposed Banking Commission would gather together in one agency all of the bank supervisory and insurance powers presently exercised by the Federal Government. The experience of the past 30 years has shown that the multiplicity of Federal banking supervisory agencies has resulted in conflict, duplication, and in a general vagueness about which agency does what.

Under this bill the FBC will take over the functions and powers of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation and the Comptroller of the Currency; it will assume jurisdiction over charters, branches, mergers, holding companies, and fiduciary and foreign banking operations. It will relieve the Federal Reserve Board of the administrative functions it now has and allow the Board to devote its time to its primary function, monetary policy.

I would like to point out that the bill makes no substantive changes in the law and does not add any new powers; that is, it does not increase the Federal Government's regulatory power, only its efficiency.

If, during the course of hearings on this bill, it is thought that substantive changes in the law must be made, then this should be done with separate legislation.

H.R. 4253 is necessary for the effective and efficient regulation of our banking system. The Government owes the banking community the best possible service and it owes the public the best possible protection that the regulatory function of the Federal Government can provide.

This bill will strengthen the dual banking system.

It is my opinion that this bill, together with my bill, H.R. 729, should be set for hearing at the same time. If the Congress agrees with the principle set forth in my bill, H.R. 729, then we will combine in one agency all of the insuring functions of the Federal Government and then add a separate banking commission which will devote itself to all banking functions other than insurance. Obviously, if the latter principle prevails, H.R. 4253 will be amended accordingly.

OMINOUS OUTBURST BY CUBAN REFUGEES IN MIAMI EXPOSES DANGEROUS MOUNTING TENSIONS

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. Fascell] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I wish to again draw the attention of the House to the ominous outburst by Cuban refugees in Miami last Thursday—February 21—during which exiled Cubans engaged in street rioting accompanied by threats and imprecations against local police authority and the American way of life.

So dangerous was this situation, so disruptive of the usual quiet life of a peaceful community, that it was headlined in the responsible Miami News of that date in these words: "350 Howling Cuban Exiles Battle Police, Pickets Here—Officers Stoned—Rioters Arrested."

And Milt Sosin, reporter of the Miami News, placed the tragic and ugly incident before the public in his following news story, part of which I shall now read:

> A howling, rock-throwing mob of more than 350 Cuban exiles battled with Miami police today in front of the Cuban Revolutionary Council headquarters in protest against picketing by four members of a nationwide pacifist organization.
>
> The rioting, which lasted about 30 minutes, attracted several hundred spectators to the scene at 17th Street and Biscayne Boulevard and resulted in the arrest of 13 Cubans on charges of disorderly conduct and breach of the peace.
>
> At one point the angry, screaming exiles, many of them women, hurled rocks weighing 2 to 5 pounds into the ranks of some 100 police and fire department officers who were rushed to the scene.
>
> At the height of the brawling, police received word that friends of the arrested Cubans were threatening to storm the Miami Police Station at 1145 Northwest 11th Street.
>
> Immediately 20 patrol cruisers surrounded the station and 25 helmeted officers, many leading police dogs, blocked entrances to the station. The mob failed to show up.
>
> The crowd at the Revolutionary Council headquarters first became restive when Donald D. Pomerleau, city of Miami public safety director, showed up and asked the Cuban leaders to break up the demonstration.
>
> This apparently put the exiles in an ugly mood, for they began surging toward police lines, and across the street from council headquarters a handful of exile women shouted "Fuera, Fuera" (go away) and began tossing rocks.
>
> The situation reached its peak at 10:02 a.m. when the pickets, three youths and an elderly woman, appeared on Biscayne Boulevard walking south with placards.
>
> The signs said, "Oppose Military Solutions." Thou Shalt Not Kill," and "Peace Corps, Not Marine Corps, in Latin America."
>
> The pickets turned west on 17th Street and were met headlong by the now wildly infuriated crowd. Rocks, bottles, and eggs rained down on the heads of police who were trying to force the Cubans back behind heavy ropes on private property lines.
>
> Pomerleau and Assistant Police Chief Glenn Baron called for more reinforcements, including three pieces of fire department equipment.
>
> A hook-and-ladder truck arrived and plugged a hose into a corner fire hydrant and stood by in readiness.
>
> A husky 225-pound Cuban broke loose from the lines and rushed police who threw him to the ground in the median parkway strip of 17th Street.
>
> Several times the screaming exile knocked five officers off his back, until finally he was overpowered, handcuffed, and led to a patrol wagon.
>
> The five pickets from the Committee for Nonviolent Action were finally hustled into a patrol wagon and taken to police headquarters where they were interrogated, but not booked.
>
> Pomerleau said the four promised they would not picket again in the city of Miami adding they planned to leave after their release by police.
>
> Pomerleau also issued a statement saying he had warned the picketers they would be arrested if they stage any future demonstrations within the city.
>
> Police said efforts to place Spanish-speaking officers in the crowd to calm them down had failed, and apparently only served to further enrage the exiles.
>
> About 50 policemen remained at the scene where a handful of Cubans appeared with a sign reading, "Enemies protected by democracy kill freedom."
>
> This was interpreted to mean the Cubans felt the arrest of their own people and the freeing of the pickets was unfair.
>
> At one point, about 10:20 a.m., all available Miami police except those who were needed on key assignments, were at the riot.
>
> Police were under orders not to draw guns, and relied mainly on their numbers and the threat of using nightsticks to battle back the infuriated mob.
>
> The elderly woman who led the pacifist pickets was not identified by name but told police intelligence officers she had come here from New York to lead the demonstration.
>
> Leaders of the Cuban Revolutionary Council had been advised 5 days ago of the pickets' intentions of demonstrating, but apparently declined to try to keep exiles from the scene.
>
> Several members of the Cuban Invasion Brigade 2506 were among the rioters, wearing their combat uniforms and urging the exiles on.
>
> The Committee for Nonviolent Action has its national headquarters in New York City and is dedicated to the banning of nuclear weapons, and a halt to military conscription in this country.
>
> The arrested Cubans are scheduled to appear in municipal court at 9 a.m., February 27.
>
> A small crowd of spectators still were hanging around the riot scene at noon, but police had dispersed the Cubans and reopened 17th Street to vehicular traffic.
>
> At the peak of the rioting, three men believed to be Federal agents were spotted atop a building about a block away. An investigator for the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee was on the scene making photographs of the mob members.

Mr. Speaker, so shaken was the Miami community by the danger signals raised by this Cuban refugee outburst that the respected Miami Herald of February 22, 1963, carried an editorial which I would like to read into the record:

> ### No Right To Riot
>
> It was an ugly business at the Cuban Revolutionary Council where yesterday a group of refugees reacted violently to a group of peace pickets.
>
> The damage was more than some bruised heads. The refugees resisted police who sought to impose order and some arrests were made.
>
> Our Cuban guests must understand that picketing is a legal expression of free opinion in this country. We do not need violence to register dissent, which is also an inherent right.
>
> But this in no way excuses the pickets who exercised their right in what was clearly a

provocative manner. The kind of peace these pickets appear to seek is strange indeed.

It is apparent, Mr. Speaker, that the fears for the safety and the future of the Miami community which I have so often and for so long expressed are here drastically revealed as based in fact and that these disrupters of the peace and quiet of Dade County have fallen prey to those who would add fuel to the Communist propaganda line.

So ominous do I consider the present situation, Mr. Speaker, that I wish to reiterate my statement in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of February 21 in which I referred to the following newspaper reports from Miami:

From the Associated Press, Thursday, February 21—

> At 10 a.m. this morning four pacifists carrying picket signs began to picket the Cuban Revolutionary Council at 17th and Biscayne Boulevard, Miami. A riot began. One of the revolutionary council officials, with a loudspeaker, asked all to be calm. Thereupon, some 200 or more Cubans entered the foray with bottles, eggs, stones, and other items.
>
> The police were called. The riot squad of police and dogs tried to break up the gathering. Six policemen were seen fighting with one Cuban in an effort to get him under control. Thirteen Cubans were picked up by the Miami police, four of whom are reportedly members of the 2506 Brigade. Firetrucks were called to the scene ready to use water hoses to disperse the crowd. Attempts by members of the Cuban Revolutionary Council to quell the violence were responded to by jeers and catcalls by their fellow Cubans. During the riot, Cubans were heard screaming:
>
> "Even Castro does not permit this," followed by denunciatory statements to the effect that they did not like nor did they want "this kind of democracy," the kind that would let this type of people run around loose. The rioters fighting the police screamed and denounced them as "Communists."

The same day the following was carried on the wires of the United Press:

> Violence erupted today when a group of pacifists attempted to picket the headquarters of the Cuban Revolutionary Council. Club-wielding police quickly broke up the demonstration when 200 angry Cubans clashed with the pickets. About half a dozen exiles were arrested by police, who entered the headquarters of the council, prepared for what looked like the beginning of a street riot. The police were denounced violently by the Cubans, many of them members of the Cuban invasion brigade, who shouted, "Communists—even Castro doesn't do this in Cuba." Three firetrucks moved into a side street and prepared to douse the area with water if necessary. Police, under command of Miami Safety Director Col. Don Pomerleau, broke up the disorders within 10 minutes. Trouble started even before the arrival of the pickets when Spanish-speaking police, using a portable loudspeaker, requested the Cubans to remain inside the property limits of the council grounds.
>
> Jose A. Hernandez, a spokesman for the council's labor organization, speaking to the Cubans through a microphone from the headquarters porch, urged them to go home peacefully and not play into the hands of the Communists who want to cause disorder here.
>
> The exiles reacted violently against the request and denounced Hernandez and shouted epithets at him. Another council representative, Raul Mendez, then appealed over the microphone for the crowd to go home.
>
> His petition was greeted with loud boos and angry shouts. For a few minutes, it looked like some members of the crowd were going to attack the two council representatives. At this point, the police, who originally posted about 15 men, summoned reinforcements including about 15 motorcycle officers.
>
> A few minutes later, the pickets, men and women, apparently Americans, arrived carrying signs bearing pacifist slogans such as "War will end man or man will end war" and "We oppose military service."
>
> The pickets massed on a grassy mall directly in front of the council headquarters entrance, and then suddenly violence erupted when one Cuban darted across the street and ripped a sign out of a picket's hands. Stones and bottles were hurled at the police by the Cuban exiles.
>
> Police roped off the property of the council and refused to let anyone in or out.
>
> Later, a group of about 100 Cubans, most of them members of invasion brigade 2506, set out on a protest march to police headquarters.

The citizenry of Miami, Fla., has long borne with patience the burden of an onslaught of dispossessed Cubans—a burden which should long ago have been shared by the entire United States.

Valiant efforts have been made by our President, the Federal and State agencies, our churches, business institutions, and individual citizens, to assist in every way possible.

Arriving in Miami penniless and with just the clothes they were wearing, almost all of these Cuban refugees had been forced to give up their homes, their businesses, their life savings, and all their personal property.

To help them meet the basic needs of existence, the Federal Government has made financial and other assistance available to them until they can become self-supporting.

Employment opportunity in Miami is limited. There simply are not enough jobs to accommodate both local residents and refugees. There arose open competition and economic conflict between the permanent citizenry and the incoming refugees. The balloon had to burst.

I have noted the ever-increasing frustrations, stresses, strains, and economic ills imposed on the people of my area. For this reason, I have for over 2 years fought for a more realistic approach to this long-festering situation.

I have repeatedly advocated—to two Presidents and Government officials—that Dade County and Florida had reached a saturation point on the acceptance of Cuban refugees.

Long ago I urged, and have continued fighting for, the establishment of an additional port of entry and reception center.

Long ago, and many times since, I urged extension and amplification of the resettlement program under which the Government—through January 25, 1963—has resettled 53,974 Cubans, not quite one-third of the 157,525 persons entering and registering from Cuba. Again I reiterate, no community the size of metropolitan Dade County could conceivably be expected to absorb such a shock.

Time and time again, I have met with the Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and other top echelon governmental officials concerned with the Cuban refugee programs, to discuss the need to reevaluate the overall program. Long ago, it was obvious that this was no longer a temporary situation; the facts demanded that priority attention be devoted to resettlement—to opening a reception center elsewhere.

Admirable efforts have been made by this administration and the agencies of the Federal Government in their attempts to alleviate this situation. While the programs instituted have been highly successful, we have to do more.

On February 5 of this year, I addressed myself to reports that a so-called Cuban GI bill was being considered. At that time, I publicly stated my opposition before top echelon officials of executive agencies having jurisdiction of the Cuban refugee program. I told all that I felt that the present programs are more than adequate and that I am opposed to any new or additional benefits. I am grateful that no more has been heard of this proposition.

I again respectfully submit that Cuban exiles must be allocated to communities all over the United States and not concentrated in one already greatly overburdened area, and no further flow should come to the Miami area.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to spread on the RECORD a letter which as recently as February 15 I directed to Mr. John Frederick Thomas, director of the Cuban refugee program:

> I am quite concerned over the Cuban refugee program in my district. The residents of Dade County have been extremely patient and understanding of the problems of these refugees and have cooperated to the fullest. However, as I have emphasized many times before, Dade County has long ago reached the saturation point.
>
> I have been deluged with mail from my constituents indicating their dissatisfaction with the rate of resettlement of these refugees (the latest official figures indicate a severe drop in resettlements) and their strong opposition to any additional benefits to the Cuban refugees. I am in full agreement with these views, and I might add that I believe the present programs to be more than adequate and I am opposed to the establishment of broad new programs for any Cuban refugees. I fully support the previously granted authorization for qualified Cuban refugees to serve and be trained in the U.S. Armed Forces, but not to be granted any special benefits or privileges for this service.
>
> I would respectfully request, first, that if any additional Cuban refugees are to be permitted to enter the United States in the future, they be assigned to a port of entry and processed through a reception center other than Dade County or the State of Florida; second, that additional emphasis be placed on the resettlement program and that it be accelerated and implemented to the fullest degree; and third, that I be notified at the earliest practicable moment if any new programs or broadening of present programs are being contemplated.

I respectfully go on record, Mr. Speaker, urging the immediate attention of the House to this most urgent request. The situation in the Miami area is dangerous and explosive. It is made for those who would deliberately attempt to set citizen against refugee—yes, even refugee against refugee—and to utilize the pent-up emotions of American and Cuban alike to supply the fuel of the Communist propagandist.

I submit, Mr. Speaker, that now is the time for us to act on some conclusive solution for this problem which will relieve all possibilities of a further attempt to exploit the frustrations and stresses of residents of the Miami area. The need is not tomorrow, but right now.

It is imperative that action be taken to permanently alleviate the economic and psychological ills that have beset the long-suffering Miami community. We must expeditiously implement the humanitarian and intelligent programs which will relocate large numbers of Cuban exiles immediately—until such day as they can be returned to a free, democratic Cuba.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to advise that, partially in response to my letter to Mr. Thomas, a meeting was held between officials of the U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and four national voluntary agencies which have major responsibility for carrying out the Cuban resettlement program. Dr. Ellen Winston, Commissioner of HEW's new Welfare Administration, told the group that the resettlement program has her full support and the full support of the Department and the Federal Government. She said:

> We want to secure the best possible resettlement of the refugees in the least possible time so that the fathers and mothers and children in Miami, who so urgently need new homes and new jobs, can begin new lives. In the case of the refugees, the path to independence and self-support can follow only one major route—resettlement.

It is a source of deep satisfaction to me to note that the good work of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare will be continued—that relocation is to be immediately accelerated and diligently pursued. This is one constructive step toward the ultimate solution.

I have received the following letter from Mr. John F. Thomas, director of the Cuban refugee program, in response to my February 15 letter, to which I have referred earlier in this statement, in which I called his attention to the urgency for an immediate solution of the Cuban refugee resettlement problem:

FEBRUARY 22, 1963.

Hon. DANTE B. FASCELL,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. FASCELL: Thank you very much for your letter of February 15. Although I have only been on the job for a few weeks I have also noted a change in the tenor of opinion with regard to the Cuban refugees. These reports have served to stimulate in my office an already existing sense of urgency to accelerate our resettlement program. To that end I have met, individually and collectively, the top ranking staff of the voluntary agencies with whom the Government holds contracts for resettlement purposes. I can assure you that we will have their full support in our drive to resettle the refugees to areas of the country other than the Miami/Dade County area.

I hope that I will have the opportunity of meeting you personally to discuss my observations on this refugee problem and to review with you my plan of approach toward resolving it as humanly and as expeditiously as possible.

In closing may I add my word of praise for the generous, warmhearted, democratic attitude of the people of Dade County toward the Cuban refugees. It will go down in history in the book that records great deeds on the part of people for persons caught in the whirlpool of persecution.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN F. THOMAS,
Director, Cuban Refugee Program.

This is indeed encouraging information, Mr. Speaker. But again I must stress, with all the force of which I am possessed, the need is not tomorrow, but right now.

THE ROSE AS NATIONAL FLOWER

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. DULSKI] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, I am today submitting a joint resolution designating the rose as the national flower of the United States.

The rose is representative of the beauty that is America. Horticulturists have given us purple, silver, gold, yellow, pink, white, lavender, and orange roses along with varigated ones to add to the red rose. Roses today are of almost every hue and tint and shade, practically covering the spectrum.

Roses are well known and as well loved in Europe, China, and Japan as they are in America. They have been known and cultivated from earliest times, having been planted by the Persians in their gardens along the Tigris and Euphrates. The Hanging Gardens of Babylon reportedly contained roses. The Island of Rhodes is named after the rose, and King Midas in all his wealth cherished roses, so history relates.

There is a worldwide love of roses. They appeal to persons of all ages, all races, all countries. The rose has very often been called the "queen of flowers." It is also referred to as "everybody's flower."

Most of them can grow in almost any climate and under almost any reasonable condition. In our country, roses thrive from Alaska to Florida, and from Hawaii to Maine. No other flower in the United States begins blooming in spring and continues right up to the first hard frost. Only a few flowers when planted continue to live year after year like the rose without being replaced.

The beauty of roses is soothing on the eyes and the wafted perfume a sedative to the nerves. Roses have greater versatility than any other flower—some grow 12 inches tall and others climb 12 feet. There are roses that can be grown outdoors, others than can be grown indoors; there are roses that produce masses of color in the landscape; roses that can be planted in borders, in beds, as hedges, as fences, as screens to hide undesirable places, as ground covers, and even screens against the weather.

For centuries, roses have been used to make rose wine, rose sachet, rose water, rose perfume, attar of roses, rose honey, candied rose petals, rose soap, and so forth. All flowers are beautiful and all contribute to our enjoyment of them. But many people hold that the rose is a flower that stands alone—apart from and distinguished from all others.

The rose is known to men and women everywhere as the symbol of peace and hope, and it is recognized as the badge of courage, loyalty, and devotion.

Mr. Speaker, we are the only major nation that does not have an officially designated national flower. Nearly all of the principal countries of the world have a national flower or floral symbol, and the rose is the most frequent one chosen to honor a country. England, Iran, Turkey, Bulgaria, Czechoslavakia, Rumania, and Honduras have all chosen the rose to be identified as their national flower. Most other major countries apparently have a national flower.

Bills to adopt an official flower for our country have been introduced in Congress before. But to date no national flower has been adopted mainly because there is lack of agreement as to which flower and as to just what should constitute the requirements of a national flower. There is no question in my mind but that the rose meets every requirement. What single flower can boast of so many varied employments and enjoyments? The rose can be said to be, indeed, the queen of flowers. It can be readily understood why, and I am hopeful that this Congress will soon adopt the rose as our national flower.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. ROGERS of Florida, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. ASHLEY (at the request of Mr. SISK), for 60 minutes, on February 27, to revise and extend his remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. HORTON.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. BELL) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. SCHWENGEL.

Mr. CURTIS.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. SISK) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. POOL.

Mr. STEPHENS.

Mr. TOLL.

Mr. FRIEDEL.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 48 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, February 27, 1963, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

471. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the audit of the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation for the year ended December 31, 1961 (H. Doc. No. 74); to the Committee on Government Operations and ordered to be printed.

472. A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to amend the joint resolution providing for U.S. participation in the International Bureau for the Protection of Industrial Property"; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

473. A letter from the Acting Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to authorize appointment of the Director and Deputy Director of the Coast and Geodetic Survey from civilian life, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

474. A letter from the Administrator, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, transmitting a report to the Committee on Science and Astronautics of the House of Representatives pursuant to section 3 of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration Authorization Act for the fiscal year 1963 (76 Stat. 382, 383); to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

475. A letter from the Administrator, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, transmitting a report to the Committee on Science and Astronautics of the House of Representatives pursuant to section 3 of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration Authorization Act for the fiscal year 1963 (76 Stat. 383); to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. WHITTEN: Committee on Appropriations. House Joint Resolution 284. Supplemental appropriations for the Department of Agriculture, 1963 (Rept. No. 35). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BETTS:

H.R. 4217. A bill to provide full indemnities for sheep slaughtered in connection with the scrapie slaughter program; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 4218. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to reduce the highway use tax in the case of certain motor vehicles used primarily to haul unprocessed agricultural products; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 4219. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a credit for amounts paid for tuition or fees to institutions of higher education or for occupational training or retraining, to allow a credit for taxes paid for public education, and to exempt from income tax certain scholarships, fellowships, and student assistantships and certain earnings by undergraduate college students; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BONNER:

H.R. 4220. A bill to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, to provide for marketing quotas on Irish potatoes through establishment of acreage allotments; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BRAY:

H.R. 4221. A bill to amend the Federal Trade Commission Act, to promote quality and price stabilization, to define and restrain certain unfair methods of distribution and to confirm, define, and equalize the rights of producers and resellers in the distribution of goods identified by distinguishing brands, names, or trademarks, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BURLESON:

H.R. 4222. A bill to authorize the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia to request the assignment of U.S. marines to assist in law enforcement in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. CELLER:

H.R. 4223. A bill to provide for audit of accounts of private corporations established under Federal law; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CLARK:

H.R. 4224. A bill to extend the benefits of the Panama Canal Construction Service Annuity Act of May 29, 1944, to certain additional civilian officers and employees; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. COHELAN:

H.R. 4225. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to initiate a program for the conservation, development, and enhancement of the Nation's anadromous fish in cooperation with the several States; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. DADDARIO:

H.R. 4226. A bill granting the consent and approval of Congress to the northeastern water and related land resources compact; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. DEROUNIAN:

H.R. 4227. A bill to provide that the retailers excise tax on jewelry and related items shall not apply to articles sold at retail for less than $5; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 4228. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to repeal the excise tax on communications; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 4229. A bill to terminate the retailers excise tax on cosmetics and other toilet preparations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DERWINSKI:

H.R. 4230. A bill to provide for the transfer of income taxes to the States for use for educational and other purposes without Federal direction, control, or interference; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 4231. A bill to provide for the discontinuance of the Postal Savings System; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. DIGGS:

H.R. 4232. A bill to prohibit discrimination in employment in the District of Columbia because of race, religion, color, national origin, or ancestry; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. DOLE:

H.R. 4233. A bill to require the national referendum on wheat to be held prior to May 15, 1963; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. DORN:

H.R. 4234. A bill to provide for the establishment of the Old Ninety-six Star Fort National Park in the State of South Carolina; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 4235. A bill to amend section 2112 of title 28 of the United States Code to require that certain proceedings must be instituted in the judicial circuit where the controversy arose; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DULSKI:

H.R. 4236. A bill to amend the Federal Deposit Insurance Act and title IV of the National Housing Act to increase the amount of insurance applicable to bank deposits and savings and loan accounts to $25,000; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. EDWARDS:

H.R. 4237. A bill to provide for the District of Columbia an appointed Governor and secretary, and an elected legislative assembly and nonvoting Delegate to the House of Representatives, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H.R. 4238. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FINO:

H.R. 4239. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that an individual's entitlement to child's insurance benefits shall continue, after he attains age 18, for so long as he is regularly attending school; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. HANSEN:

H.R. 4240. A bill to authorize the establishment of a Youth Conservation Corps to provide healthful outdoor training and employment for young men and to advance the conservation, development, and management of national resources of timber, soil, and range, and of recreational areas; and to authorize pilot local youth public service employment programs; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. HÉBERT:

H.R. 4241. A bill to repeal section 262 of the Armed Forces Reserve Act, as amended, and to amend the Universal Military Training and Service Act, as amended, to revise and consolidate authority for deferment from, and exemption from liability for induction for, training and service for certain Reserve membership and participation, and to provide a special enlistment program; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. HENDERSON:

H.R. 4242. A bill to provide for the release and transfer of all right, title, and interest of the United States of America in and to certain tracts of land in Pender County, N.C.; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HUDDLESTON:

H.R. 4243. A bill to clarify paragraph 4 of section 15 of the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942 (56 Stat. 368); to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. JOELSON:

H.R. 4244. A bill to provide under the social security program for payment for hospital and related services to aged beneficiaries; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KARSTEN:

H.R. 4245. A bill to provide under the social security program for payment for hospital and related services to aged beneficiaries; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KEITH:

H.R. 4246. A bill to extend for 2 additional years the temporary provisions of Public Laws 815 and 874, 81st Congress; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. KING of New York:

H.R. 4247. A bill to provide for the medical and hospital care of the aged through a system of voluntary health insurance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KYL:

H.R. 4248. A bill to establish a land and water conservation fund to assist the State and Federal agencies in meeting present and future outdoor recreation demands and needs of the American people, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. LEGGETT:

H.R. 4249. A bill to provide that those persons entitled to retired pay or retainer pay under the Career Compensation Act of 1949 who were prohibited from computing their retired pay or retainer pay under the rates provided by the act of May 20, 1958, shall be entitled to have their retired pay or retainer pay recomputed on the rates of basic pay provided by the act of May 20, 1958; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. LONG of Maryland:

H.R. 4250. A bill to amend title 37, United States Code, to increase the rates of basic pay for members of the uniformed services, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. MONAGAN:

H.R. 4251. A bill to amend section 162 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to legislative proposals; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 4252. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on maleic hydrazide; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MULTER:

H.R. 4253. A bill to establish a Federal Banking Commission to administer all Federal laws relating to the examination and supervision of banks; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. MURRAY:

H.R. 4254. A bill to change the name of the lake formed by Kentucky Dam; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. NEDZI:

H.R. 4255. A bill to establish the U.S. Academy of Foreign Affairs; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H.R. 4256. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4257. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to repeal the manufacturers excise taxes on automobiles and on parts and accessories, and to reduce the manufacturers excise tax on trucks and buses to 5 percent; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. NYGAARD:

H.R. 4258. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act and the Federal Employees Health Benefits Act of 1959 so as to eliminate discriminations against married female employees; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. PHILBIN:

H.R. 4259. A bill to promote public knowledge of progress and achievement in astronautics and related sciences through the designation of a special day in honor of Dr. Robert Hutchings Goddard, the father of modern rockets, missiles, and astronautics; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RANDALL:

H.R. 4260. A bill to confer jurisdiction in certain cases on the Secretaries of the military departments to authorize payment from appropriated funds of the military departments of amounts determined to be owing to contractors under armed services housing contracts; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. RODINO:

H.R. 4261. A bill to amend the Clayton Act to prohibit restraints of trade carried into effect through the use of unfair and deceptive methods of packaging or labeling certain consumer commodities distributed in commerce, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. ST. GEORGE:

H.R. 4262. A bill to amend title 23 of the United States Code relating to highways, in order to permit States having toll and free roads, bridges, and tunnels designated as part of the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways to designate other routes for inclusion in the Interstate System; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. SHELLEY:

H.R. 4263. A bill to amend the Davis-Bacon Act to require compliance with the provisions thereof in the performance of certain agreements, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 4264. A bill to amend section 8(b)(4) of the National Labor Relations Act, as amended; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 4265. A bill to amend the prevailing wage section of the Davis-Bacon Act, as amended; and related sections of the Federal Airport Act, as amended; and the National Housing Act, as amended; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. SHORT:

H.R. 4266. A bill to amend the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 to provide for more effective evaluation of the fiscal requirements of the executive agencies of the Government of the United States; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. SIKES:

H.R. 4267. A bill to establish a land and water conservation fund to assist the States and Federal agencies in meeting present and future outdoor recreation demands and needs of the American people, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. TEAGUE of California:

H.R. 4268. A bill to designate the Veterans' Administration Hospital at Martinez, Calif., as the Charles C. McGonegal Memorial Hospital; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey:

H.R. 4269. A bill to prohibit discrimination on account of sex in the payment of wages by employers engaged in commerce or in the production of goods for commerce and to provide for the restitution of wages lost by employees by reason of any such discrimination; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. TOLLEFSON:

H.R. 4270. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to extend the head of household benefits to all unremarried widows and widowers and to all individuals who have attained age 35 and who have never been married or who have been separated or divorced for 3 years or more; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. VINSON:

H.R. 4271. A bill to amend and clarify the reemployment provisions of the Universal Military Training and Service Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. WAGGONNER:

H.R. 4272. A bill to create a commission on the establishment of a Council of Free Nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. WHITENER:

H.R. 4273. A bill to amend section 207, title 31, of the District of Columbia Code of 1961, as amended; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H.R. 4274. A bill to amend section 103, title 31, of the District of Columbia Code of 1961, as amended; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. WHITENER (by request):

H.R. 4275. A bill to amend section 2(a) of article VI of the District of Columbia Revenue Act of 1947 relating to the annual payment to the District of Columbia by the United States; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H.R. 4276. A bill to provide for the creation of horizontal property regimes in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H.R. 4277. A bill to authorize an increase in the borrowing authority for the general fund of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. WHITTEN:

H.J. Res. 284. Joint resolution making supplemental appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. DERWINSKI:

H.J. Res. 285. Joint resolution designating the 8-day period beginning on the 12th day of October of each year as Patriotic Education Week; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOWDY:

H.J. Res. 286. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing for the election of President and Vice President; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DULSKI:

H.J. Res. 287. Joint resolution designating the rose as the national flower of the United States; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. HALL:

H.J. Res. 288. Joint resolution requesting and authorizing the President to impose an immediate 6-percent emergency quota on all imports of softwood lumber; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MORRIS:

H.J. Res. 289. Joint resolution authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to carry out a continuing program to reduce nonbeneficial consumptive use of water in the Pecos River Basin, in New Mexico and Texas; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. POOL:

H.J. Res. 290. Joint resolution authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to carry out a continuing program to reduce nonbeneficial consumption of water in the Pecos River Basin, in New Mexico and Texas; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. RIVERS of Alaska:

H.J. Res. 291. Joint resolution requesting and authorizing the President to impose an immediate 6-percent emergency quota on all imports of softwood; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GROSS:

H. Con. Res. 101. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that any variation in the traditional interpretation of the treaties between the United States and the Republic of Panama may only be made pursuant to treaty; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII,

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts presented a memorial of the General Court of Massachusetts protesting against the processing of outgoing mail from Bristol County, Mass., communities by the automated post office at Providence, R.I.; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ASHMORE:

H.R. 4278. A bill to amend the act of June 29, 1960 (Private Law 86–354); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOLLING:

H.R. 4279. A bill for the relief of Charles A. Duffy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BURKE:

H.R. 4280. A bill for the relief of Bernardo Colella; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BURKHALTER:

H.R. 4281. A bill for the relief of Regine Irene Calef, Marion Calef, and Monica Calef; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COHELAN:

H.R. 4282. A bill for the relief of Amrik Singh; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DELANEY:

H.R. 4283. A bill for the relief of Bela Daszkal; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4284. A bill for the relief of Chrysanthos Kyriakou; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DIGGS:

H.R. 4285. A bill for the relief of Estrellita Tongco; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOWDY:

H.R. 4286. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Tomasa Martinez de Pina; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHNSON of California:

H.R. 4287. A bill for the relief of certain retired officers of the Army, Navy, and Air Force; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LEGGETT:

H.R. 4288. A bill for the relief of Mrs. M. Orta Worden; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4289. A bill to waive the statute of limitations in a certain case; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LESINSKI:

H.R. 4290. A bill for the relief of Armenouhi Eghiazarian; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'HARA of Illinois:

H.R. 4291. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Cecilia (Cecylia) Bonkowski Ruminska; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'NEILL:

H.R. 4292. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Tsai Shai Goon; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RIVERS of Alaska:

H.R. 4293. A bill to authorize the admittance of the vessel, *City of New Orleans*, to American registry and to permit the use of such vessel in the coastwise trade between the State of Alaska and the State of Washington; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. ROGERS of Colorado:

H.R. 4294. A bill for the relief of Dr. Rene A. Arcilla; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROONEY:

H.R. 4295. A bill for the relief of Gaspare Terranova; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROYBAL:

H.R. 4296. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Nora Gomez Dagan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. SULLIVAN:

H.R. 4297. A bill for the relief of the John V. Boland Construction Co.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

52. By Mr. HOEVEN: Petition of residents of Graettinger, Spencer, Emmetsburg, and Terril, Iowa, urging the Congress to give full and public consideration to any Presidential guarantee which might in effect abrogate the Monroe Doctrine by permitting Soviet Communist influence and control to continue in Cuba; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

53. By Mrs. ST. GEORGE: Petition of Miss Elizabeth Mould and 18 others, to preserve the Monroe Doctrine; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

54. Also, petition of Mrs. Louise H. Harrison and 105 others to preserve the Monroe Doctrine; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

55. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Ohio Bell, Chicago, Ill., relative to a redress of grievance relating to being denied certain inherit birthrights, to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Excerpts From an Address by Congressman William Jennings Bryan Dorn in Atlanta, Ga.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT G. STEPHENS, JR.

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 26, 1963

Mr. STEPHENS. Mr. Speaker, one of the outstanding speakers of the House, the Honorable WILLIAM JENNINGS BRYAN DORN, of the Third District of South Carolina, made a timely and thought-provoking address in Atlanta, Ga., at a joint meeting of the Alabama-Florida, Carolinas, and Georgia Cotton Ginners Associations and the Southeastern Gin Suppliers Exhibit at the Biltmore Hotel on February 11.

Because of the clarity with which the statements are made expressing the problems of agriculture in the Southeast and in America, I recommend to all Members the excerpts from the address set out hereafter:

ADDRESS OF CONGRESSMAN DORN

Mr. President, I could not do justice to any occasion in Atlanta or anywhere in Georgia without paying tribute to Senator RICHARD B. RUSSELL. He is not just Georgia's Senator, but the South's leader and spokesman. He is our Senator, and we are equally proud of his guidance and able leadership. I know of no delegation to the Congress superior to that of Georgia in both the House and the Senate.

Georgia's illustrious junior Senator, HERMAN E. TALMADGE, has from time to time introduced the nationally known Talmadge farm bill. The farm bill of Senator TALMADGE warrants the earnest consideration of Congress and the American people. Senator TALMADGE's bill has much merit. It is far superior to the farm programs of the past which resulted in forcing the family-size farmer from the land and making the American farmer less competitive in the markets of the world. Senator TALMADGE advocates a completely "fresh start" in the field of farm legislation. He is convinced his farm plan could reach the following desired objectives: (1) Let the farmer farm; (2) guarantee the farmer his proportionate share of the national income; and (3) place American agricultural commodities back on the world markets at competitive prices.

The farm problem is this Nation's No. 1 domestic headache. The situation is bad and gradually gets worse. In a comparatively few short years, we have seen our farm population, nationwide, go from 40 percent to a dangerously low today of approximately 11 percent—dangerous because I know of no great civilization in the history of the world with only 11 percent of its population living on the farm. Where have these people gone? Many of them are receiving welfare in the great cities of this Nation. Juvenile delinquency and crime have skyrocketed. The stage is being set for socialism and Government regulation of every act of the individual. Federal Government farm programs which have sponsored mass exodus from the land, surpluses, scandals, and big corporation farming were born in the minds of a strange assortment of young, theoretical attorneys namely: Alger Hiss, Nathan Witt, Frank Shea, Rex Tugwell, Lee Pressman, Henry A. Wallace, and Felix Frankfurter. These gentlemen wrote the first Agricultural Adjustment Act in the 1930's. These brilliant young eggheads launched this Nation into the farm mess we are in today—a farm program where industrialists, corporate farms, and even foreign combines get Federal price supports to the detriment of the family-size farmer.

In considering any farm program in the United States, we should remind ourselves of the fact that every single country in the world is increasing its farm acreage. Farmers are encouraged in the rest of the world to grow more and more. In many countries, such as Rhodesia and Turkey, farmers are extended tax advantages and tax exemptions to grow more and more; while the farmers in the United States are regimented, controlled, harassed, and denied the privilege of growing and expanding. I am reliably informed that Soviet Russia has increased her cultivated acres more than a hundred million acres in the last few years. Red China is desperately, relentlessly, expanding its farm acreage. Someday we will be faced with Communist farm products invading the markets of the world at fantastically low prices. This is not a bright picture; however, it must be faced.

Our farm problems cannot be solved by subsidizing our farmers to go out of business while we subsidize other segments of our economy to stay in business and to expand.

The family-size farmer is the backbone of America. The family-size farm philosophy is one of independence, individual initiative, and opportunity. This philosophy has been the foundation stone of our American way of life. Upon this foundation we built the highest standard of living in all history.

I still believe there is a future in agriculture in the Southeast. I believe there is a future in cotton. I believe there is a future for the family-size farmer in the Southeast.

The future of cotton in the South is inevitably tied in with cattle and pine trees. We must resist control of our infant cattle industry by resisting feed grain controls. If the Secretary of Agriculture controls feed grains, he can and will limit our growing cattle industry. Likewise, if the Secretary of Agriculture is given the power to confiscate farmland for recreation and is given dictatorial power over every action of the farmer, he can and will control the production of pine trees. In order to grow cotton profitably in the Southeast, we must have a free hand in cattle and tree farming. With this diversified approach, we can stay in the cotton business.

The Talmadge plan could well be the solution to our farm problem, and failing of enactment, I see no alternative as a solution but the gradual elimination of acreage controls and price supports. We must in some way eliminate the two-price cotton system so that our great textile industry will continue to buy and consume cotton. The greatest consumer of the American farmer's cotton is the American textile industry. This industry cannot continue to consume 70 percent of all cotton grown in the United States under the present two-price cotton system. This system hurts both the farmer and causes unemployment in the mills.

We must accelerate our research program on boll weevil control and weed and grass control. This in turn will reduce production costs and will put cotton in a more competitive position. Cost of producing cotton has always been high and shortage of labor continues to increase production costs.

The "grassy cotton" program for loan rates to farmers should be continued.

As long as we continue to have allotments, farmers should be provided with a reasonable floor under the price of cotton.

We should endorse and support the program of the National Cotton Council of America. I know they will continue to find new ways of using cotton and cottonseed products. They have made much progress in their research program designed to lower the cost of cotton production. It is predicted that the present program of the National Cotton Council will decrease the cost of producing cotton by 10 to 30 percent. They are making fantastic progress to control boll rot, insects and disease, chemical control of grass, and so on. If their program is fully realized, then we can gradually eliminate controls and price supports, and cotton will be competitive in the world market.

Two-thirds of our cotton crop used to be exported abroad. We must recapture our foreign market. The program of the National Cotton Council will, in a few years, permit our cotton farmers to compete in the world market.

We should vigorously oppose any proposed revisions to existing law with respect to allocation of cotton acreage to States that would cause the Southeast to receive any less percentage of the national allotment than it received in 1962 under the existing law.

House Joint Resolution 279: National Harmony Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. FRANK J. HORTON

OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 26, 1963

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced in the House of Representatives a resolution (H.J. Res. 279) to designate the 6-day period, beginning April 15, 1963, as National Harmony Week. Further, the resolution would authorize and request the President to issue a proclamation inviting the people of the United States to join in the observance of National Harmony Week with appropriate ceremonies and activities.

In offering this resolution, I wish to pay tribute to the 25th anniversary of the founding of the Society for the Preservation and Encouragement of Barber Shop Quartet Singing in America, Inc. This nonprofit, fraternal organization is dedicated to the preservation and promotion of the uniquely American art form known as the barbershop quartet style of close harmony singing. Its more than 650 chapters in all 50 States and most of the Provinces of Canada comprise over 30,000 members.

I am proud to note that this year's international president of the Society for the Preservation and Encouragement of Barber Shop Quartet Singing in America, Inc., S. Wayne Floor, is a resident of my home community of Rochester, N.Y. and a constituent of the district I am privileged to represent in Congress.

I hope my colleagues will give favorable consideration to the resolution.

Hopeful Trends in Employment of the Handicapped

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 26, 1963

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, a subject of great concern to me has always been employment opportunities of our handicapped workers. I was pleased, therefore, to see a U.S. Department of Labor news release of November 1962 indicating that the placement of handicapped workers showed a 15-percent increase in October.

In spite of these advances, there is a continuing need for employers to discard their common prejudices against the handicapped and recognize the useful contribution which they can make in our society.

Because of my interest in this area, I wrote to Secretary Wirtz and requested additional information on handicapped jobseekers. The Secretary's reply shows that the job still to be done in this area is immense. As a matter of public interest, under unanimous consent, I insert the original Labor Department press release, my letter to Secretary Wirtz, and his reply, in the RECORD at this point:

PLACEMENTS OF HANDICAPPED WORKERS SHOW 15 PERCENT INCREASE IN OCTOBER

Public employment service placements of handicapped workers in October showed a 15-percent increase over the previous month, largely as a result of the annual observance of National Employ the Physically Handicapped Week, the U.S. Labor Department's Bureau of Employment Security announced today.

State employment services affiliated with the Bureau's U.S. Employment Service reported a total of 29,800 job placements of workers with physical handicaps in October, of which 10,518 represented placements of disabled veterans. This is a 6.3-percent increase over October 1961, when such placements totaled 28,068, of which 10,064 were placements of disabled veterans.

The U.S. Employment Service said that during the first 10 months of the current year the public employment offices made 240,276 placements of handicapped workers, an increase of 26,272 over the same period last year. Each month showed an increase over the corresponding month in 1961.

Robert C. Goodwin, Administrator of the Bureau of Employment Security of which the U.S. Employment Service is a part, said that he attributed the continuing improvement in job placements for handicapped workers to the overall step-up in placement activity by the local State employment offices and the growing acceptance by employers of the value of such workers.

JANUARY 9, 1963.

Hon. W. WILLARD WIRTZ,
Secretary of Labor,
Department of Labor,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: Thank you for sending me U.S. Department of Labor–5523, release for Wednesday, November 28, 1962, entitled "Placements of Handicapped Workers Show 15 Percent Increase in October."

I am interested in obtaining additional data regarding the subject and would appreciate receiving your answers to the following questions:

1. How many handicapped persons are registered for placement service?
2. How many applications from newly handicapped persons are received each year?
3. Number of deaths versus those newly handicapped.
4. How many are rehabilitated?
5. How many are being rehabilitated at the present time?
6. What is the percentage of those who could be rehabilitated, but are not being rehabilitated?

Thank you very much for any information and advice you are able to provide me regarding the above.

Sincerely,

THOMAS B. CURTIS.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF LABOR,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, D.C., January 21, 1963.

Hon. THOMAS B. CURTIS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN CURTIS: This is in reply to your request of January 9, 1963, for additional information on handicapped jobseekers. Your questions are answered below in the order listed:

1. A count of active applications on file in public employment service offices is taken twice a year. The November 1962 file count indicated that there were 227,168 applications of the handicapped jobseekers on file with the local public employment service offices throughout the Nation.

2. During calendar year 1962, there were 461,156 new applications filed by handicapped jobseekers.

3. Information on total number of deaths of handicapped persons is not available. However, the National Vital Statistics Division of the Public Health Service reports there were 1,454,000 deaths during the period from January through October 1962. The National Health Survey Division produced the figure on newly handicapped for the fiscal year ending June 1960, indicating that during this period there were 2.1 million persons of all ages who were physically limited in their major activity for 1 year. They estimate that there are some 13.6 million persons in the United States with some form of permanent disability. (Reference: Health Statistics Series B, No. 31, published by Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.)

4. The Office of Vocational Rehabilitation reports that during fiscal year 1962 there were 102,400 persons rehabilitated.

5. The Office of Vocational Rehabilitation further reports 34,400 persons were rehabilitated during the 5-month period (July–November 1962) of fiscal 1963. Their scheduled goal for 1963 is 110,400 rehabilitants.

6. According to the Office of Vocational Rehabilitation, approximately 2.5 million persons in the Nation need some form of rehabilitation. Based on their scheduled goal for fiscal 1963, the number of rehabilitants represents only 5 percent of the total number of persons that could be rehabilitated.

I trust that this is the information you need. Please let me know if I can be of further service to you.

Yours sincerely,
W. Willard Wirtz,
Secretary of Labor.

Homeowner Protection for Maryland Residents

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. SAMUEL N. FRIEDEL

OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 26, 1963

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, this bill, H.R. 1597, as I originally introduced it, would merely have continued a right which hundreds of thousands of Maryland homeowners have enjoyed for decades.

I realize that the Maryland ground rent system is a subject which is unfamiliar to most of my colleagues, and this is understandable since only five States have ground rent arrangements. But it is a way of life to most of the citizens of my great State of Maryland.

Briefly stated, it is a system whereby the home buyer defers paying a portion of the purchase price of his property. Instead of paying for the land, he pays interest on it at the rate of 6 percent annually. As a result of this system, Baltimore and Maryland have one of the largest percentages of homeowners in the country.

Because the ground rent is interest, the Treasury Department has always regarded it as such for income tax purposes and the Maryland homeowners paying it have been permitted to deduct such payments for Federal income tax purposes.

On the other side of the coin we have the homebuilder who usually creates the ground rent, and defers paying taxes on that portion of the purchase price on which the homeowner defers payment, until such time as he actually receives his money.

In recent years the Treasury Department objected to this practice and attempted to collect taxes from the builder on the full amount of the purchase price of the property, including that portion deferred by the homeowner and paid as ground rent. A suit was filed on at least two occasions and the courts in both instances sustained the builders.

Having been thwarted in its attempt to tax the builder at the time of sale, the Treasury Department then attempted to tax the small homeowner—in contradiction of its own longstanding policy.

It was because of this action that I introduced H.R. 1597 to protect the small homeowners of Baltimore and Maryland. Unfortunately, the Treasury Department was opposed to my bill and succeeded in having it amended to require the builders to pay taxes on the full amount of the purchase price of the property, including the deferred amount, at the time of the sale.

Thus, in effect, the Treasury Department seeks to accomplish by legislation what it was unable to do by the judicial process.

As much as I deplore the injustice done to the builders by this bill as amended, the alternative injustice to the homeowners would be even worse. For this reason I am supporting H.R. 1597 as it was amended by the Ways and Means Committee—but I am doing so in the hope that the Senate will restore the original language to my bill so that we in Congress will not take away from the builders what they have already won in the courts.

With this understanding, I urge my colleagues to support this measure—and I would like to stress again that it only affects the citizens of Maryland. Incidentally, this bill is identical to the one passed by the House last year.

The Candy Twins: LaVona and LaVelda Rowe of Iowa City, Iowa, Please Capital's Sweet Tooth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. FRED SCHWENGEL

OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 26, 1963

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to tell my colleagues about the Candy Twins, two constituents and longtime friends of mine who visited the Nation's Capital recently. They are Misses LaVona and LaVelda Rowe, identical twins born and raised in Iowa City, Iowa.

The lovely Rowe sisters, who were my guests here in Washington several years ago, are representing the Candy, Chocolate, and Confectionery Institute on a 6-month tour of the United States. They have already visited some 30 cities from San Antonio to Boston. Being somewhat familiar with always-on-the-go political campaigns, I sympathize with and congratulate the girls for the useful work they are doing.

To give you some idea of the tour, I would like to point out a few of the things the Candy Twins did in Washington when they were here. They visited such places as Junior Village, the Metropolitan Police Boys' Club, homes for the aged, children's, veterans' and general hospitals—and dispensed candy everywhere they went. Valentine candy was presented at the White House to the First Family.

LaVona and LaVelda also appeared on radio and television interviews to discuss questions concerning candy and health. They pointed out the growing popularity of the "candy break" for plant and office workers, and the recognition of candy's quick-energy value by athletic coaches, medical authorities and military leaders. Candy's ability to promote alertness has been recognized by the National Safety Council as a safety factor in preventing highway fatigue. Incidentally, exhaustive research is currently being conducted on this question by the Institute of Traffic and Transportation Engineering, Los Angeles, under a grant from the Candy, Chocolate, and Confectionery Institute.

The twins discussed how candy can be utilized in a weight-control plan, noting that confections often do not add many calories—a hard candy, for example, provides but 14 calories. The girls also suggested ways in which homemakers can create chocolate and candy centerpieces for luncheons, dinners, holidays, and parties.

In conjunction with the twins' visit here, a local group calling itself the Capital Candy Twins Committee sponsored a twin contest. Five-pound boxes of fine chocolate candy were awarded to parents of twins born during the visit of the Candy Twins; to date six twice-blessed prizewinners have received their sweet awards.

Candy, of course, is one of our most familiar foods. In addition to tasting mighty good, candy satisfies the biological need to provide energy-giving nutrients quickly and easily. Thanks to technological achievements and a sound agricultural base, the United States is the largest candy producer in the world.

Many ingredients are used to make confectionery products. The candy industry draws upon exotic fruit and nut trees, cacao tree plantations, roots and herbs, dairy lands, sugar fields, and corn for its raw materials. Raised in and representing an agricultural area, I am well aware of the close relationship between the candy industry and agriculture.

For example, many of my constituents grow corn, and a portion of their crop eventually finds its way into all kinds of confections. Corn wet millers located in and around my district process corn kernels into corn starch, corn sirups, and sugars, all of which are important ingredients in candy. As a matter of fact, products from corn comprise 20 to 30 percent of the total weight of confectionery products.

And so the Candy Twins are telling the story of candy from one coast to the other. From a personal point of view, I can think of no one I would rather hear that story from than LaVona and LaVelda. Not only are they charming and intelligent, but they also qualify for their task by virtue of having had nurses training as well as experience at retail candy counters as salesgirls.

By way of background information, the Rowe sisters attended Iowa City grade and high school and then enrolled in the State University of Iowa, both taking a premed course. They were, incidentally, classmates of my daughter Dorothy. But after 2 years of study the girls decided they were simply not cut out to be doctors and turned their efforts for 3 additional years of study to a new field—news photography.

Their first photographic assignment was as Iowa City correspondents for WMT-TV, Cedar Rapids, and United Press-International News, Davenport. Other jobs followed with Iowa newspapers and television stations. Before their present candy tour began the girls, fully accredited members of the National Press Photographers Association, were staff photographers for the Chicago Daily News.

That the twins look very much alike is apparent to anyone who has had the pleasure of meeting them. Some years ago a professor of zoology concluded from a series of tests that the Rowe sisters were one of America's most identical set of twins. I recall that back in 1960 these young ladies were chosen as "Miss Iowa City"—a neat trick that resulted from the inability of the beauty contest judges to tell them apart.

I salute the Rowe twins for their efforts in behalf of candy, and I wish them success in their careers.

Committee on Un-American Activities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE R. POOL

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 26, 1963

Mr. POOL. Mr. Speaker, I had the pleasure, as a newly appointed member of the House Committee on Un-American Activities, to be in attendance and testify this forenoon at a meeting of the House Rules Committee which met in public session to receive testimony relating to the proposed resolution offered by Messrs. ROOSEVELT, LINDSAY, and FARBSTEIN, to abolish the House Committee on Un-American Activities and to transfer its functions to the Committee on the Judiciary. I am pleased to learn that following the public hearing, the Rules Committee agreed to table the resolution. Because of the limitation of time, I was not in a position to extend my remarks in opposition to the proposed resolution. I now avail myself of the opportunity to state my views.

I have long since reached the conclusion that it is of the utmost importance to continue the House Committee on Un-American Activities as a standing committee. The evidence indicates that this view is shared by the overwhelming number of the Members of Congress and of the American people.

During the past 3 months, I am advised by the staff of the committee, countless petitions have been received at its office—presented by many, many thousands of American citizens expressing to Congress their great concern as to the action that might be taken pursuant to the proposal of a small minority to weaken the committee by altering its composition as a standing committee. Indeed, on the morning of the hearing—in just 1 day—the committee received from all parts of the country more than 500 telegrams expressing this same concern and urging the Congress in its wisdom to continue the House committee as a standing committee.

In the overall picture of the fight against communism, as we assess it in the world today, the most significant change is that Communist power has grown tremendously, reaching into all corners of the earth and threatening new conquests by daily aggressions. In the years that have passed since the adoption of the Reorganization Act of 1946, which established the House Committee on Un-American Activities as a standing committee, hundreds of millions of people, and nation after nation, have fallen under the Communist yoke. This is the situation as it exists beyond the boundaries of the United States.

At the same time, within the United States, there has been a significant decrease in Communist strength. Needless to say, the United States would be in a most difficult position today if a weakening of this internal grouping of the world Communist conspiracy had not taken place.

What has brought about this change—the weakening of the party within the United States while, at the same time, its power has increased beyond our borders? Various factors—some external, such as the Korean war, the cold war, the Hungarian revolution, and the exposure of Stalin's crimes; certain internal developments, such as the prosecutions of the Communist Party leaders under the Smith Act, and proceedings against the party and its members before the Subversive Activities Control Board—have undoubtedly played a role in reducing the party's strength within the country.

At the same time, serious students of the problem and well-informed observers have agreed that the Committee on Un-American Activities through its investigations and hearings, and the legislation it has devised—such as the Internal Security Act—the information it has given to the Congress and the American people, have played a major, though by no means the sole, role in bringing about this decline in Communist strength within our own country, so that we can meet our responsibilities with united and concerted strength.

This is concrete evidence of the quality of the committee's work. It would seem to me to be most unwise at the very time we are confronted with such strong evidence of the committee's effectiveness in combating communism, to abolish the committee and turn its functions over to a newly created subcommittee lacking the experience, background, and know-how on this subject. Is it logical to dump a winner and pin our hopes on an unknown? Quite obviously the House Rules Committee, after hearing the testimony, has reached a sound conclusion. I commend them for their decision.

Moreover, it is most important that we approach the problems involved in subversion as a united Congress and a united people. The House Committee on Un-American Activities is a bipartisan committee. It is not constructed—as is the Committee on the Judiciary—to reflect the requirements of partisan politics. The membership on the Committee on Un-American Activities is divided equally between the members of both the Republican and Democratic Parties, with the exception of the chairman who represents the majority party. The committee has functioned as a bipartisan committee and it can function as such only by maintaining its independence as a standing committee of the Congress. As such it has met its responsibilities and commands the confidence of the Congress and the American people. Created by a far-sighted Congress, extended today by the decision of the Rules Committee, its existence continues unimpaired. This decision will be applauded throughout the entire Nation.

Child-Care Expenses

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERMAN TOLL

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 26, 1963

Mr. TOLL. Mr. Speaker, I am glad to support the bill—H.R. 2085—introduced by my distinguished colleague, Congressman WILLIAM J. GREEN, JR., to allow income tax deduction for child-care expenses in cases of women deserted by their husbands. A similar bill passed the House in the 87th Congress but did not get through the Senate.

The Internal Revenue Code, as now worded, requires a "legally separated" status to justify such a deduction by a mother who has been deserted by her husband. Some mothers who did take deductions for their children are required to refund the money to the tax office. There are a good many such cases in the country where mothers are employed to support themselves and their children, and the whereabouts of their husbands are unknown.

The bill imposes certain suitable conditions in order to give proper status to the mother. She must have been deserted by her husband; not know his whereabouts at any time during the taxable year, and must have applied to a court to compel him to pay support.

I am pleased that the bill passed the House today, and I hope that the Senate takes early action. This amendment to the Internal Revenue Code will do justice to many deserving citizens.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 27, 1963

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Lamentations 3: 40: *Let us search and try our ways, and turn again to the Lord.*

Most merciful and gracious God, whose amazing compassion and love we cannot comprehend, we thank Thee for Ash Wednesday, ushering in the solemn and sacred Lenten season, when we are enjoined to cultivate self-examination and self-discipline.

We penitently confess that in our hearts there are sins and transgressions which only Thy mercy can forgive and hidden splendors and potentialities which only Thy grace can bring to fulfillment and fruition.

Grant that we may be filled with the spirit of humility and hope as we daily turn to the cross to meditate upon the suffering and sacrifice of the Great Captain of our salvation.

Hear us through the merits and mediation of our blessed Saviour. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

REDUCING GOVERNMENT EXPENDITURES

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, during our childhood days most of us have heard the lyric, "A man of words and not of deeds is like a garden full of weeds." Words have been flying incessantly of late in regard to Government expenditures. Everyone seems to be outwardly for cutting of expenditures, balancing the budget, and reducing taxes. It is obvious to me that many either do not know where and how to go about reducing expenditures or do not care to put forth the necessary effort to be effective.

For those who are really interested, I am detailing for you one case which I am today presenting to the Departments of Defense and Justice and to the General Accounting Office. This case, as you will see, is outlined in every detail so that any question of authenticity or propriety is completely eliminated.

I am sure you will find it interesting reading and that after it reaches the Secretary of Defense today, a savings of approximately 50 percent can be effected on this one item of defense procurement. It has taken long hours of hard work to develop this particular case and develop it before the fact in order that this money can be saved.

Almost daily from now on for awhile I will be presenting additional cases. I hope those who are interested in saving the taxpayers' money will read this one case very carefully, and assist me in my efforts to stretch the defense dollar.

The Secretary of Defense has been quoted as saying he can save $2.5 billion in defense costs this year. I am going to show a way today in which much more can be saved, and I hope to prove that a Navy officer has made a false certification of fact that will cost the taxpayer 50 percent more for a small piece of equipment than necessary. There ought to be some red faces in Navy today after the way in which false pretenses are used by Government servants to waste national defense money by the billions is exposed. There also ought to be a full investigation and punishment for any people found guilty of wrongdoing in the case I am about to describe.

The case I plan to cite today is typical of much larger examples of bureaucratic waste, mismanagement, and questionable action. There are many more, and I will be bringing them to the attention of the House very soon.

Stating this case in simple A, B, C, D terms would enable the Members of this House to understand the waste that is being perpetrated in the name of national defense. Simplification, however, is not possible when you are talking about defense purchasing. The procurement picture is as tangled a can of fishing worms as you have ever seen. It has been wrapped in a shell of directives, policies, regulations, restrictions, exceptions, amendments, and procedures that protects it like the shell protects the armadillo. To understand how wasteful the purchasing policies of our defense people are, you must strip away the shell piece by piece. There is no shortcut.

If a detailed examination of one small purchase is difficult to understand, consider how difficult it is to understand the larger, more complicated and costly procurements. Think how many more avenues exist for waste and worse in these larger purchases.

The bureaucrats of Government and the slicksters in industry count on the fact that you and I will be drowned in details and technicalities. When this happens, they have a blank check and operate with impunity.

The sharp operators in industry can continue to buy lunches and dinners, arrange for various forms of social entertainment, buy gifts and manifestations of good will for the Government bureaucrats who accept them as favors to set the stage for Government contracts.

Let me make it clear that I am not speaking here of the admirals and generals, the secretaries of the services, the line and fleet commanders, the second echelon officers and the enlisted men on our ships, planes, and fronts of the world. I speak of the middle-grade civil and military servants who are wined and dined and much more to set the stage for contracts to favored companies.

Eighty percent of the purchasing done by these people for our national defense is done without open competition. As a result of what is called sole-source buying, the Navy now proposes to make a purchase of an equipment identified as the AT–948/U—radar—antenna. This is a simple piece of electronic equipment consisting of a 50-inch vertically polarized omnidirectional antenna with an overhead coverage to fill the cone of silence. It operates between 400 and 500 megacycles and can be installed on ship or shore. It is not a sophisticated piece of equipment. Scores of industries can manufacture it.

Under a negotiation numbered 269–63–Q, dated February 1, 1963, by the Navy Purchasing Office, a buy of 90 of these antennas was authorized on a sole-source basis from Chu Associates, Inc., Post Office Box 387, Littleton, Mass. The Navy estimated the equipment will cost about $1,500 each with a total cost of $135,000.

This is a small purchase when compared to the $55 billion defense budget that the chairman of the Appropriations Committee called "staggering" and stated could be cut intelligently and prudently. But it is typical of so many other procurements. In it is the ingredient for saving money on defense buying. To do this, however, you cannot talk generalities. You have to fight the bureaucrats in their own redtape, and understand the gobbledygook language and deal in specifics.

Here is the way it works: The Navy wants to spend $135,000 under negotiation 269–63Q. Due to a recent change in Armed Services Procurement Regulations which I have detailed in the past, the Navy was required to make a public announcement of this purchase. In this publication it listed a February 15 closing date, giving the industry only 8 working days to secure bid forms, analyze the equipment, prepare and submit a bid. This time span would not be sufficient, even had the door to competition not been closed beforehand.

This whole transaction was approved as sole-source. The last man to sign the papers was Capt. C. A. Appleby, in charge of the naval purchasing office here in Washington. He signed a document stating that only Chu Associates possesses the necessary manufacturing drawings and data required to make the antenna.

Mr. Speaker, that certification is false. There are drawings and microfilms which should be made available to other manufacturers in this case as in countless others. They exist right now in Washington, but Captain Appleby says they do not. I think you will agree that a Navy captain who spends a large part of the $55 billion defense budget should know what he is talking about when he signs a paper. If he does not—if he just signs what is laid on his table—then this is unconscionable bad management, and he should be removed. If he does know the facts put in front of him to be wrong but proceeds anyway, then other action by the Government is clearly indicated.

How do I know drawings exist? During my study of this case, I decided to get at what I considered to be the crux of this whole matter—drawings. If drawings exist, then Captain Appleby's one reason for sole-sourcing this purchase evaporates and we have another example of bureaucratic bungling and wanton waste of tax money.

Mr. Speaker, at 1 p.m. on February 26, I had made the sixth in a series of phone calls tracing the drawings for this equipment—drawings which Captain Appleby says only Chu Associates have. At that time, Lt. Comdr. Francis McCord, Bureau of Weapons, section head of RN Weapons Control No. 54—telephone OXford 6-1524—said over the telephone that his section had the drawings for this equipment. He further said the microfilms for it were located in another area where a woman named Mrs. Frieda Kripp—telephone Oxford 6-1262—is the section head of a group known as RREN 63—a group that deals in microfilms of drawings. Lieutenant Commander McCord's statements were repeated back to him to obviate any chance of error.

There you have it. Captain Appleby says only one firm has the necessary data, but Lieutenant Commander McCord says manufacturing information is in Navy files—the very files that are supposed to exist to help encourage competition for defense work.

The plans were delivered under terms of an earlier contract—62-0975—dated June 22, 1962. It called for $1,072 each and a total price of $83,616. An earlier contract was for 136 antennas at a unit price of $1,451.29, and a total price of $197,375.44.

After buying this antenna twice at unit prices of $1,451 and $1,072 via the sole-source route, one might expect a lower price the third time around. Instead, the price is going to jump 50 percent according to Navy estimates. I will tell you today that when this antenna is bought via competitive bidding the price will fall by almost 50 percent.

There you have the pattern. A false certification by a responsible Navy official sets the stage for a 50-percent waste of the taxpayers' dollar—only this time he has been caught before the contract is let. This is just a small contract, and it is not as complicated as many of the larger ones I have studied. It does graphically portray in understandable fashion the way in which our money is being poured down the drain.

Mr. Speaker, every ounce of my being rebels at this false certification by this Navy capain, whose action makes the American taxpayer sweat just a little more to pay a heavier tax for defense.

Actions such as Captain Appleby's contribute to the severe financial problems of our Nation, but he is only one of many officials—civilian and military—who have been riding the gravy train aboard the sacred cow of national defense.

Mr. Speaker, I have today made an official protest to the General Accounting Office to halt this current procurement and to reschedule it for competitive bidding. The drawings are available and can be given to industry to introduce the force of competition into this purchase.

I am also referring this matter to the Secretary of Defense with the hope that there will be, at the least, some severe reprimands forthcoming. I hope a full investigation is made, but if, as in the past, the Navy refuses to clean its own house and tries to sweep the drawings under the rug to protect its own, then the time may have come when substantial, across-the-board cuts should be made in its appropriations by this Congress. Maybe that will force it to institute economies that will stop this flushing of our tax dollars down the drain. In addition, I am referring this entire file to the Justice Department for its perusal.

It is my hope that this typical example will spur other Members of Congress to take a longer, harder look at this sacred cow and see where some more fat may be cut from its diet.

TAX REDUCTION AND TAX REFORM

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Speaker, on Monday of this week I asked for a special order of 1 hour and utilized part of it, and many Members participated in the discussion. I have just asked for a special order on Monday next. At that time I intend to take about 15 minutes myself to discuss why President Kennedy asked last June at Yale University for a dialog on the economy of the United States. I think with the great discussion going on now on taxes and tax reduction and tax reform and unemployment in many areas, this House should be concerned about what is happening and what will happen in the future. On Monday it will give us an opportunity, and I invite all Members on both sides of the aisle to participate in the discussion and find out what we can come up with ourselves in this House.

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE, 1963

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, under the unanimous-consent agreement entered into on Monday, February 25, I call up the resolution (H.J. Res. 284) making supplemental appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the resolution be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I shall not object, what will be the nature of the parliamentary procedure this afternoon?

Mr. WHITTEN. It is my understanding that under the rules, the resolution will be considered under the 5-minute limitation on debate. I would trust and hope that, if Members wish to use more time than that, within reason that they will be permitted to use such extra time as they might wish to have. I certainly hope that Members will have the opportunity to discuss the items involved in this resolution. It will be my purpose to go along with that approach. I do think we are faced with a great emergency and that we should move ahead with the resolution.

Mr. HORAN. I certainly concur in that. I want to point out to the House that this is a matter of picking up the check for a half billion dollars and I trust that any Member who has anything to say this afternoon will receive consideration and that the House will be lenient in allowing such Member to receive additional time.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, namely:

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Foreign assistance programs

Public Law 480

For an additional amount for "Public Law 480", to restore the capital impairment of the Commodity Credit Corporation due to expenses and costs of sales of surplus agricultural commodities for foreign currencies pursuant to title I of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, as amended (7 U.S.C. 1701–1709), $508,172,000, to remain available until expended.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Speaker, the Commodity Credit Corporation was organized as a corporation so that it would have corporate powers and be able to buy and sell commodities. The Commodity Credit Corporation is charged with the responsibility among others of financing the price support system, which has been in existence, if I recall correctly, since 1933 or 1934. This corporation has three means of financing the obligations which it is directed to carry out by the Congress. One is to increase the borrowing authority. The second is to restore capital impairment, and the third is from the returns which they get from the sale of commodities. The present financial situation is such that the corporation is down to about $100 million so far as its financial ability to meet the obligations of price supports plus the many other things that the Congress has directed the corporation to do. Last year the corporation asked the Congress to do something that we have been accustomed to doing in the last number of years, namely, to restore the capital impairment in considerable amount. The Congress, on the recommendation of our subcommittee, reduced the amount requested by some $800 million. We were in hopes that the funds we appropriated to the corporation would be ample to meet their needs. It has developed in recent months that they are inadequate.

I would like to explain to my colleagues the reasons for this that have been given to us, and which I subscribe to. First, the corporation has about 1 billion bushels of corn which it has authority to sell. If the corn were sold, the proceeds would be usable by the corporation to meet its other obligations. However, it is believed that to force that corn on the domestic market at this time would force the price down to the point where it would cost the Government and the producers much more money than would otherwise be the case if this corn was not forced on the market at the present time.

In addition to that, in recent weeks there has been much agitation about reducing the price of cotton. No action has been taken in that regard, but because of discussions and the press releases on this subject nobody has been buying cotton. Where it was believed by the corporation that much of it would go into the domestic trade, the trade has been holding off in hopes of a lower price. The farmer having no market has had to turn to the Corporation for a loan so that the Corporation has a great deal more money invested in cotton on loan than anticipated.

What we have done here is to bring forward about half a billion dollars from the request for the next fiscal year into this fiscal year so the Corporation will have funds with which to operate and with which to carry out its price support obligations for the rest of the current fiscal year.

I would like to point out here that if the Congress should not act favorably on this resolution—and I hope it will—it would leave the Corporation in a deficit position possibly within a week or 10 days.

They find themselves in this difficult position because of the wording of the very act itself. The law says they shall support prices and make loans, but it also says that if they do so and do not have the money they also violate the law. The Secretary told us that, should this money not be appropriated, he would have to send out notices that it would be impossible to carry out further price supports and make further loans on agricultural commodities. This the Secretary said would result in chaos.

I repeat again, the Corporation has commodities to which they have title and can sell. It also has others which are securities for loans and which cannot be sold until the loan is due.

In this resolution we have brought forward funds from the next fiscal year to this fiscal year to the extent of half a billion dollars. I do not see that anybody on either side of the aisle can do anything but go along with this resolution in view of the emergency facing the Corporation at the present time.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Speaker, I am sort of reminded of a couplet today as we bring up this bill for over half a billion dollars for repairment of the Commodity Credit capital structure.

There was a dachshund once so long it had
not any notion
Of how long it took to notify his tail of his
emotion;
And so it happened that one day while his
eyes were filled with woe and sadness
That his little tail went wagging on because
of previous gladness.

Today we are picking up a check for money that has already been spent. It is difficult for us to ride herd on such an expenditure. I am aware that those of us on the Appropriations Committee are not apt to win any popularity contest any place, but we do have a responsibility to check on items that come out of the Federal Treasury, and this is one of them.

At a time when our national debt is over $300 billion, at a time when we are talking about tax reductions and controlled deficits, this half billion dollars will be added to the already large deficit of fiscal year 1963. I just want to serve notice on those in control of the Commodity Credit Corporation that they have a job to do as well as the Congress, and that is to see that our Federal moneys are not squandered. Commodity Credit began as a comparatively small corporation; now it is a $14.5 billion corporation. It began as a means of making price supports effective. It has already added $20 billion to the national debt. I might add that since we started repairing its capital structure we have added commodity export items to the Commodity Credit responsibility; part of our supply and farm purchase program is added to the Commodity Credit responsibilities. A good share of Public Law 480 is now being added to the Commodity Credit liabilities. The International Wheat Agreement is in the same category as are bartered materials. Through investigations by the General Accounting Office we know that there have in the past been loose practices under this enormous operation, and at this time I want to serve notice as a member of our subcommittee that we will expect the internal audit of the Commodity Credit Corporation to do a better job.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Speaker, that a critical financial problem exists in the Commodity Credit Corporation cannot be denied. If Congress fails to approve this appropriation, the Commodity Credit Corporation will have to choose among several courses of action, all of them undesirable. But this is the appropriate and proper place to ask why the Commodity Credit Corporation is today in trouble. One would think that $14.5 billion is enough money for anybody to play with.

From reading the documents and the testimony in the hearing report on this bill, one might conclude that this is the result of inexorable forces that have moved against Secretary Freeman, that the blame belongs at the door of Congress and at the door of the weatherman and marketplace conditions over which Mr. Freeman can have no control.

I invite your attention in the committee hearings to the repeated use of the expression "mandatory obligations."

On page 3 of the report, the Secretary's written report says the appropriation is needed so the Corporation "can meet its mandatory price support obligations." Again, on the same page, it is stated the borrowing authority of the Commodity Credit Corporation has dropped "to such a low level that its ability to finance the mandatory price support programs has been seriously impaired."

In the next paragraph the phrase "mandatory obligations" is repeated. It appears again near the top of page 4.

The report does not disclose who established the level of supports which led to these mandatory obligations. Was it Congress? It was not. Was it the farmer? It was not.

The responsibility for the financial plight of the Commodity Credit Corporation should be laid at the door of Orville L. Freeman, the Secretary of Agriculture.

Time after time, in his conduct of his office, he has used discretionary authority to set price supports at unrealistic levels.

In dairy, he increased the level of supports in 1961 to an unrealistic level, causing an accumulation of dairy inventories in Commodity Credit about a half a billion dollars higher than when he took office.

In 1962 he begged the Committee on Agriculture to take him off the hook for this unwise action by passing a resolution fixing dairy supports at this unwise level. The committee quite properly refused to do so, and the Secretary in a belated, too late effort to meet the problem, lowered the support level. But the damage was done, and this unwise action by Secretary Freeman contributed to the financial crisis now before the House.

In cotton, he increased the level of price supports to 32.5 cents a pound, more than 8 cents a pound above world levels. More and more, the Commodity Credit Corporation has become the market for American cotton, and today about $200 million more in Commodity Credit Corporation funds are tied up in cotton inventories than when Mr. Freeman took office.

The Commodity Credit Corporation supplies about 40 percent of the needs of American cotton today, and if we continue to move in the present direction, we can expect a greater and greater demand on the funds of the Commodity Credit Corporation.

Worse is yet to come in cotton. The inventory of Government cotton is expected to reach 10 million bales by August 1 of this year—an unprecedented level.

Of course, this will tie up still more of Commodity Credit Corporation funds.

The Committee on Agriculture has been considering the cotton problem. It is still considering this problem. Cotton is in a critical condition today, the worst in its history, due mainly to the unrealistic level of price supports in recent years.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FINDLEY] has expired.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Freeman set the level last year at 32.5 cents a pound, despite growing inventories and the relatively low level of world markets. On the day before the Committee on Agriculture was expected to take final action on this cotton bill Mr. Freeman had the gall to announce that the support level for cotton would again this year be at the same unrealistically high level; it would stay at 32.5 cents a pound. Mr. Freeman had authority to set cotton supports at 30 cents a pound or 28 cents a pound or 26 cents a pound and he could have thereby helped to relieve the critical financial problem which is now before us. But he did not. He left the level at 32.5 cents a pound—the level which has caused such a heavy buildup of Government stocks.

I invite your attention to law which should govern the action of the Secretary in setting the level of price supports for cotton. I refer to section 401, page 137 of the compilation of statutes relating to the Department of Agriculture. It lists the factors which the Secretary is supposed to take into account in determining the level of cotton support. No. 3 is "the availability of funds."

Less than a month ago the Secretary of Agriculture, obviously with full knowledge of the critical financial plight of the Commodity Credit Corporation, still took the unwise action of once again fixing the level of cotton support at 32.5 cents a pound, ignoring the requirement spelled out in the statute.

In wheat, Mr. Freeman again used discretionary authority when he took office to jack up the level of supports to $2 a bushel, once more inviting excessive production. As a result of this unwise action on the Secretary's part, about a half a billion dollars more is tied up in wheat inventories than when he took office.

In soybeans, the wonder crop of the farm belt, a commodity that was healthy and in good condition and selling well at home and abroad when Mr. Freeman took office, he took the unwise action of raising price supports for soybeans and today we have about $50 million tied up in soybean inventories.

In corn the Secretary had the same latitude in fixing price supports.

Is the feed grains program a success? I invite your attention to the reasons given by Secretary Freeman in requesting over half a billion dollars more for the Commodity Credit Corporation. Each of the four reasons he gives—and they are listed on page 4 of the committee hearings—indicate a failure of the feed grains program, and failure of other supply management programs about which he speaks so highly.

For 2 years we have heard about cotton and tobacco as being success stories in supply management, the pattern after which we should plan control of corn and wheat and other commodities.

I invite your attention once more to the committee hearings, page 10. The fact is brought out there of the highest takeover in years by CCC of flue-cured tobacco; about 17 percent of all the production was brought under loan, which means once more increased tieup of CCC funds.

The problem which we have before us today could properly be labeled "made by Secretary Freeman." It is true we have these obligations which we must meet but it is important that we know where the responsibility lies.

In this same hearings record there are listed several alternative courses of action if the Congress should fail to pass this bill. And, as I said earlier, all of them are undesirable. I would like to suggest one other course of action which might help, and that is to have a new Secretary of Agriculture.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

Mr. Speaker, first I want to commend the gentleman from Illinois who just a moment ago, spoke so eloquently in developing the true facts of this matter. He is a very studious member of the House Committee on Agriculture and his knowledge, ability, and hard work has won him the respect of Members on both sides of the aisle. Those of us from Illinois are especially proud to claim him as a member of our State delegation.

Mr. Speaker, we are talking today about a half billion dollars—$508 million, to be exact. This is an item which we cannot treat lightly.

The able chairman of our subcommittee would say that what we are doing is taking an appropriation for the fiscal year 1964 and juggling it back to the year 1963, so this is not really too much to be concerned about. But, I just want to remind you that later on in the year we are going to be coming out with the Department of Agriculture appropriation bill of a specific figure, and I wonder if next year, at this very same time, we will not be back here picking up the tab again for a supplemental bill in the neighborhood of half a billion dollars. It cannot be treated lightly. We are simply switching it from one fiscal year to another.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MICHEL. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. HORAN. I think if you take the total amount obligated now and the fact that $20 billion has been appropriated to repair that capital structure, you will find you will wind up with obligations that total $34 billion. That is more money than I ever expect to have in my life, I will tell you that.

Mr. MICHEL. I thank the gentleman.

It has been true that in the last several years we have used the mechanism of restoring the capital impairment of the Commodity Credit Corporation by direct appropriations. The question was raised as to whether it might not be wise to raise the statutory limit of borrowing authority of $14.5 billion. This kind of legislation would have to come from the Committee on Banking and Currency. It may not be a bad idea for that committee to take a look into the operations of the Commodity Credit Corporation. Maybe a good ventilating of the problem would benefit all of us.

I do not appreciate the Secretary's attitude of referring to all of this increase as being attributed solely to the denial of funds by Congress for the foreign assistance program. By his own admission, for some time he has withheld corn and feed grains from the home market. I might say to those Members who come from the consuming areas of the country, when you go to buy steak and hamburger and pork chops and the price is pretty high, bear in mind that the Secretary says, "One of the reasons I am withholding corn and feed grains from the market is that livestock production is running about 4-percent above last year. If we put more feed on the market it might increase production even more." You and I know the law of supply and demand says the more there is the cheaper the price is going to be. Is this foreign assistance or is it a fictitious manipulation by the Secretary of Agriculture to get more funds to keep feed off the market and prices high at home? You folks from the consuming areas ought to be concerned about this. The same scheme applies to cotton and the prices you pay for its products.

Our good chairman of the subcommittee said that 562 million bushels of corn were in the Commodity Credit Corporation's stocks. I think to get the real impact of this we ought to talk about it in terms of dollars and cents. Currently, as of February 15, we have in the Commodity Credit Corporation corn valued at $999,623,000; wheat, $1,911,450,000. Cotton is valued at $810,583,000, and grain sorghums at $521,082,000, as of the date of February 15.

As our subcommittee chairman has indicated and our ranking minority member from Washington [Mr. HORAN] has said, at this juncture there is very little we can do but simply go along, but let's keep the record straight as to who is responsible and why. We ought to bear in mind also that there are going to be some other measures coming before this House both from the legislative committees and our Appropriations Committee. Now is the time to start some serious thinking about what we are going to do for the long haul.

One other thing we ought to bear in mind. You remember those acreages we put into the conservation reserve some years ago, and for which we paid farmers—well, 1,300,000 of those acres came out of the reserve as of December 31, 1962. In this current calendar year 6 million acres will come out of that reserve. The question presents itself, Now what do we do? Does it go back into production of more stocks for Commodity Credit Corporation or do we pay them again not to grow something in a so-called conservation area?

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. MICHEL was given permission to proceed for 5 additional minutes.)

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MICHEL. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. HALEY. The gentleman is a member of the committee and of the subcommittee that held these hearings. Would the gentleman kindly comment on cheese and butter? We seem to have got into a situation here where the increase in the Commodity Credit Corporation holdings in 1 year have increased approximately $75 million in butter alone, and in the cheese program, as I understand it. Would the gentleman comment a little on that?

Mr. MICHEL. Yes, and I must refer back to the debate during consideration on the bill when an amendment was being offered on the floor and I pointed out that the cost was going to be in the neighborhood of $300 million and would have to go up. So we see it at the half billion mark today.

Currently, as of February 15, we have in the Commodity Credit Corporation butter valued at $202,869,000; cheese, $16,233,000; and dried milk $78,149,000. In total these products alone represent an increase of $117,467,000 over last year.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MICHEL. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, on page 7 of the committee hearings, there is a conversation reported between the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. Whitten] and Secretary Freeman in which it is indicated, and I quote:

> Once the cotton picture settles down pricewise, this cotton will either be redeemed or title will go to the corporation, so you (meaning the Department) in turn can sell it.

Now my question is, Where do we sell these 10 million bales of cotton? I point to the fact that American cotton is already priced so high that domestic mills are no longer choosing it but are swinging instead to manmade fibers.

Second, I point to the fact that American cotton despite the heavy export subsidy of 8.5 cents per pound is losing its world markets. So when the Commodity Credit Corporation does get title to this cotton, I am wondering what we are going to do with it—are we going to sell it to the Smithsonian Institution or what?

Mr. MICHEL. I think the gentleman has raised a very good question. It is a question which I have asked of a number of people including the department, and some of my colleagues. I do not think anyone has come up with a satisfactory answer where we have a picture of the budget proposal by the department with the very optimistic view that, oh, well, there is no problem and we are going to take it over now but we will get rid of it next year.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MICHEL. I am glad to yield to my chairman because as knowledgeable as he is in these affairs, particularly with respect to the cotton producing situation, we will be most happy to have his comment.

Mr. WHITTEN. I appreciate the generous statement of my colleague. I just want to point out that during the preceding administration, once our subcommittee got the department to offer cotton on the world market in world trade, they sold in excess of 7 million bales in 1 year. I would also point out that the law requires that it be sold in world trade.

Further, in reference to the export subsidy which was mentioned, that was determined to be the best way to move this cotton some several years ago. But nothing in the law requires that approach. Cotton will move in world trade any time it is offered at world prices.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, may I inquire further why it is then that American cotton is no longer going to this world market?

Mr. WHITTEN. The reason for it is that the Department has been offering it at a fixed amount of loss, what is called PIK payments. That is not required by law. And the minute the Department will do what I think it should do and what we have been trying to persuade the Department to do, in my opinion, and they offer this commodity in world trade where they have the authority, it will move. The record shows that it will move.

Mr. FINDLEY. Can the gentleman suggest what then can be done with the 10 million bales of cotton owned by the Commodity Credit Corporation?

Mr. WHITTEN. I think quite clearly that some 5½ to 6 million bales can move in world trade if it is offered at prices that are competitive, but if the prices are not competitive, then you cannot sell anything.

Mr. FINDLEY. Does the gentleman then anticipate that it will not be offered at competitive prices?

Mr. WHITTEN. Well, at this same hearing the Secretary committed himself to carry out the law and agreed that the law required him to.

Mr. MICHEL. I appreciate the colloquy between the two gentlemen because obviously there will be some legistion to come before us later and we will be able then to refer to this exchange of views.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman be allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MICHEL. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman spoke of the high price, if I understood him correctly, of wheat to consumers? I am sure he is aware that choice cattle prices have dropped about $7.25 per hundred pounds very recently.

Mr. MICHEL. That is true. We have not seen it reflected, however, in the shops and stores around the country.

Mr. GROSS. That is right. I should like to repeat what I said yesterday on the floor of the House that last year we imported into this country and the Government permitted to come into this country 1,700 million pounds of edible meats of all kinds. That is dressed meat. This displaced the necessity for 500 million bushels of corn alone in this country to feed out the animals represented by this 1,700 million pounds of meat. How do you expect to cure that sort of situation and the question of surpluses of that kind?

Mr. MICHEL. Perhaps the gentleman from Iowa would supply for the Record who is responsible for the importation of these vast quantities of these commodities?

Mr. GROSS. The people who are responsible for that are those people who advocate free trade and those people who advocate the taking off of all tariffs. They are the people who are responsible.

Mr. BEERMANN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MICHEL. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BEERMANN. It seems that we are being asked to be a party to the crime here. Price supports on corn were set at $1.02 with an 18 cent payment in kind. Part of this supplemental appropriation is for that 18 cents a bushel on corn. If the Secretary sold the corn for $1.20 a bushel, which was the support rate, we would not be asked to carry this part of the burden.

In addition, if the Secretary is selling corn at $1 a bushel, it encourages more cattle feeders and builds up the number of cattle in the feed yard and reduces the price of beef on the hoof that the gentleman from Iowa just spoke about.

I might say that as long as Congress permits the Secretary of Agriculture to sell commodities for less than the Government pays there is always going to be difficulty.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has again expired.

(By unanimous consent and at the request of Mr. Pelly, Mr. Michel was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MICHEL. I yield.

Mr. PELLY. Can the gentleman say how much of this $508 million impairment was due to shipment of surplus commodities to Communist Poland and to Communist Yugoslavia?

Mr. MICHEL. There is no way to break this supplemental request down in that manner; however, I can say to the gentleman that since the program began in 1954 around $900 million worth of commodities have been supplied to Yugoslavia under this program, and some $590 million worth of commodities have been supplied to Poland.

Mr. PELLY. Could the gentleman indicate as to whether he would support a limitation on this appropriation to prevent this business of selling to these Communist countries?

Mr. MICHEL. I would support such a limitation at the appropriate time. At a time when we are dealing with an emergency supplemental, it is impractical.

Mr. McINTIRE. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the gentleman from Mississippi a question in relation to the use of section 32 funds. On page 12 of the report there is a paragraph in connection with section 32 funds. I note that Mr. Grant, who, I understand, was the representative of the budget officers, makes a statement that in connection with section 32 funds, they shall be used principally for parity. My question is directed to the extent section 32 funds are also being used in connection with the disposition of commodities which are under price support and in the hands of the Commodity Credit Corporation.

Mr. WHITTEN. May I say to the gentleman that some years ago the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HORAN] and I first insisted as members of the subcommittee that these funds be used primarily for parity. Later that was incorporated in basic law.

It is my understanding that the Department has held in prior years that if they spend as much as 51 percent on parity they have met the requirements of the act and that they can use the rest on quite a wide number of things. One is the farmers' purchasing power from which the cranberry people benefited a few years ago. Presumably they would be available for other commodities with the limitation that not over 25 percent could be used on any one commodity.

Mr. McINTIRE. Some of us would like to establish the principle that the Department should advise the proper congressional committee of any proposed use which the Congress had not authorized in the preceding year. We think the appropriate committee of Congress should be put on notice.

Would it be a proper inference to draw from the gentleman's statement that this fund has been used to relieve losses which otherwise have been borne by the Commodity Credit Corporation?

Mr. WHITTEN. It would be. But as the Secretary points out here, if this bill should not be signed in time to permit the Commodity Credit Corporation to discharge its functions, a chaotic situation would result. If this bill is not enacted into law in time and the Secretary had to send out notices cutting all price supports by using section 32 funds, chaos would result.

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment in order to ask the gentleman from Illinois, if, in connection with the question of the gentleman from Washington for information, he would also include figures not only of goods that were shipped to Communist countries, but also the part of this deficit which is caused by foods being included in the so-called foreign aid program.

Mr. MICHEL. Yes, and at this particular point, to the credit of the American farmer, we ought to make it absolutely clear how much of this in total dollars and cents is going abroad in the name of foreign assistance rather than payment to American farmers.

Since 1954 about $9 billion worth of foreign currencies has been generated by Public Law 480 agreements. Of this amount around $7 billion has been or will be loaned back to the countries involved for economic development and mutual defense purposes. It can be said, therefore, that our regular foreign aid program has been augmented by this amount through the Public Law 480 program.

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. I thank the gentleman, because that is the point I had in mind.

I would like to ask the gentleman from Washington: Am I correct in judging from the gentleman's remarks, as well as the hearings of the committee, that he does not agree with the statement of the committee at the bottom of the page where it says:

> These factors are expected to correct themselves in the next fiscal year.

Does the gentleman see anything in the future, based on his knowledge, which would lead him to that conclusion?

Mr. HORAN. Not right now. I think there is room for an awful lot of improvement in this operation. I think the gentleman will find our subcommittee agrees to that. I know we are going to go into this thing fully when we have the Commodity Credit Corporation bill before us. We have certain findings by the General Accounting Office in connection with a study of Public Law 480 which the General Accounting Office is making. I hope that will be available at the time we have our hearings on the Commodity Credit Corporation, because somebody has to use discipline in connection with the expenditure of these funds.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. FINDLEY. I would like to ask the gentleman, if this summer we dump some 10 million bales of Government cotton on the world market at whatever price might be selected, would that be in accord with the administration's avowed goal of promoting friendly relations abroad? I ask this in light of the fact that a number of undeveloped countries are trying to develop a cotton-producing industry of their own.

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. The gentleman knows well that I cannot speak for the administration.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask a question of the chairman. Secretary of the Treasury Dillon, and the Director of the Budget, Mr. Gordon, have just testified before the Committee on Ways and Means this morning. I asked the question whether this $500 million item had been included in the 1964 budget as presented—the recent budget message. The statement was that this would be an amendment to the budget as submitted to us a couple of weeks ago. I want to confirm that. Is that the gentleman's understanding?

Mr. WHITTEN. It is my understanding from the presentation made by the Department that these funds will be withdrawn from the budget estimate for the coming fiscal year. It is expected that they will get cash from sales in the coming fiscal year to replace the funds made available now. In effect this is an amendment or a supplemental request for this year's budget, and the coming year's budget will be reduced in the same amount.

Mr. CURTIS. Then the obligational authority for fiscal year 1964 would be reduced?

Mr. WHITTEN. Yes, that will take place.

Mr. CURTIS. I thank the gentleman.

Now, on another point, Secretary Dillon said in his remarks that the reason for this situation came from the fact that the Congress failed to pass the request of the administration in connection with the agriculture program; but in reading your committee report I do not see that that is the reason. Will the gentleman comment on that? Possibly he did heretofore.

Mr. WHITTEN. Our subcommittee recommended to the Congress that we reduce last year's request for funds by $800 million plus. It was our thought then and the thought of the Congress that they could get through the year on the amount recommended. They have not been able to do so. In our hearings, since we worked with appropriations for this Corporation, the necessity for the funds at this time was so clear and apparent, that we had to take this action. We did not attempt to develop the whole story as to what the effect of the last farm bill has been dollarwise, productivewise, and acreagewise.

May I say to the gentleman that we will develop those facts later. There probably will be some differences of opinion on the two sides about the matter. But those facts will be developed in our regular hearings on next year's appropriation bill. We did not do it here, because it was so clearly apparent that these funds had to be made available.

Mr. CURTIS. I thank the gentleman. Also you say, "However, due to unforeseen circumstances which have developed in recent months, the Corporation has felt it unwise to place on domestic markets its stocks of corn and feed grains."

That would appear to be something that developed in recent months. The other item that the committee seems to itemize is that dairy product inventories are much higher than a year ago. Was that something that a law would have changed?

Mr. WHITTEN. As the gentleman knows, there are many folks on his side of the aisle who say that the increase in price supports was the major factor; there are others who say that that might not have been the factor. Others might say that it is the declining use of milk and butter. I doubt that I am in a position to say what the sole cause is. I just stated, as chairman, in the report, that it is the fact. From that anybody can draw his own conclusions as to what might have been the causes. Probably there were several.

Mr. CURTIS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to this program which I think sets up abuses both of counterpart funds and certainly in perpetuating the creation of surpluses of our commodities.

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Speaker, having exhausted billions of dollars, the Department is now asking for an additional $508 million due to what it calls "unforeseen circumstances."

There is no point in our cutting appropriations in the first place if the various governmental agencies feel that they can come back for supplemental appropriations if they run short.

I might add that the entire agricultural program gives a planned economy to the farmers. It is strange to hear some Congressmen who oppose all social legislation as socialistic and alien argue the merits of the price-support program.

It seems they champion free enterprise for everyone except the farmer; the rugged individualists are not so rugged or individualistic when it comes to themselves.

Mr. ADDABBO. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this legislation. Normally, representing a district of consumers, I would vote against any appropriation for subsidies which would in turn create greater costs for consumers. However, today I rise in support of this legislation as this is an appropriation for the Commodity Credit Corporation whose activities are governed by legislation passed by the Congress and this appropriation is needed to fulfill the obligations of legislation previously passed. In addition, the 1963–64 budget is reduced by the amount we appropriate today.

As a member of the Committee on Appropriations, in questioning the Secretary of Agriculture, he specifically set forth that unless this money is appropriated the Government would not be able to meet its commitments to the people and this would affect the economy not only of the farmers but of the entire Nation.

I will continue to work for the benefit of the consumers and the reduction of subsidies to the end result that one day subsidies may be entirely eliminated. This, I believe, will be to the benefit of all, consumers and farmers.

Mr. WATSON. Mr. Speaker, there are reservations in my mind as to the necessity or propriety of supporting this particular measure.

After listening to the compelling arguments of the subcommittee chairman from Mississippi and the admission by the Republican leadership that we have no alternative at this time but to approve the requested appropriation, I am reluctantly supporting the resolution.

Everyone seems in unanimous accord that Congress has ordered that the Commodity Credit Corporation perform a certain job and that adequate money for the performance of this congressional order is not available because of factors beyond the control of the Corporation itself. Additionally our failure to appropriate the needed funds now would result in serious hardship, even chaos as one suggested, to many of our farmers who are already facing difficult financial circumstances.

I am supporting this supplemental appropriation because the subcommittee chairman has assured us that it is his full expectancy that the amount presently being appropriated under this resolution will be deducted from the proposed budget of this Department for the next ensuing fiscal year. Nevertheless, it is wise for us to serve notice on this agency and others similarly situated that we shall expect them to operate within their budgets and, that in the absence of a real national emergency, this body will not resort to such promiscuous supplemental appropriations.

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, my opposition to House Joint Resolution 284, supplemental appropriations for the Department of Agriculture, is very basic. Public Law 480 has become not just a means of disposing of surplus foods, but a reason for continuing the piling up of surpluses. The tail is wagging the dog. An emergency program has become self-perpetuating. Further, this program is really a foreign aid program, yet has seldom been so considered except incidentally in totaling yearly aid. The abuse or misuse of taxpayers' money is best seen on those many occasions when we have shipped these foods to Communist countries.

Nor is there much to commend the generating of counterpart funds. We get no pay, except in local currency that must be used locally, and which has been subject to much abuse.

Finally, the Federal Government is not intended to be in the business of feeding people. It is unconstitutional.

The SPEAKER. The question is on engrossment and third reading of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution was ordered to be read a third time and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on passage of the joint resolution.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, on that I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 254, nays 154, not voting 27, as follows:

[Roll No. 5]

YEAS—254

Abbitt
Abernethy
Addabbo
Albert
Anderson
Andrews
Ashley
Ashmore
Aspinall
Avery
Barrett
Bass
Battin
Beckworth
Belcher
Berry
Boggs
Boland
Bolling
Bolton, Frances P.
Bonner
Bray
Bromwell
Brooks
Brown, Calif.
Burke
Burkhalter
Burleson
Byrne, Pa.
Cameron
Cannon
Carey
Celler
Chelf
Clark
Cohelan
Colmer
Cooley
Corman
Daddario
Daniels
Davis, Ga.
Davis, Tenn.
Dawson
Delaney
Dent
Denton
Diggs
Dingell
Donohue
Dowdy
Downing
Doyle
Dulski
Duncan
Edmondson
Edwards
Elliott
Everett
Evins
Farbstein
Fascell
Finnegan
Fisher
Flood
Flynt
Fogarty
Forrester
Fountain
Fraser
Friedel
Fulton, Tenn.
Fuqua
Gallagher
Garmatz
Gary
Gathings
Giaimo
Gilbert
Gill
Gonzalez
Grabowski
Grant
Gray
Green, Oreg.
Green, Pa.
Gross
Hagan, Ga.
Hagen, Calif.
Hanna
Hansen
Harding
Hardy
Harris
Harvey, Ind.
Hechler
Henderson
Hoeven
Holifield
Holland
Horan
Huddleston
Hull
Ichord
Jarman
Jennings
Jensen
Johnson, Calif.
Johnson, Wis.
Jones, Ala.
Jones, Mo.
Karsten
Kastenmeier
Kee
Keogh
Kilgore
King, Calif.
Kirwan
Kluczynski
Kornegay
Kyl
Laird
Landrum
Langen
Lankford
Leggett
Lennon
Lesinski
Libonati
Long, La.
Long, Md.
McDowell
McFall
McIntire
McMillan
MacGregor
Mahon
Marsh
Martin, Nebr.
Matsunaga
Matthews
May
Miller, Calif.
Mills
Minish
Monagan
Montoya
Moorhead
Morgan
Morris
Morrison
Morton
Moss
Multer
Murphy, Ill.
Murphy, N.Y.
Murray
Natcher
Nedzi
Nelsen
Nix
Nygaard
O'Brien, N.Y.
O'Hara, Ill.
O'Konski
Olsen, Mont.
Olson, Minn.
O'Neill
Passman
Patman
Patten
Pepper
Perkins
Philbin
Pilcher
Pirnie
Poage
Poff
Powell
Price
Pucinski
Purcell
Quie
Rains
Randall
Reifel
Reuss
Rhodes, Ariz.
Rhodes, Pa.
Rivers, Alaska
Rivers, S.C.
Roberts, Ala.
Roberts, Tex.
Rodino
Rogers, Colo.
Rogers, Tex.
Rooney
Roosevelt
Rosenthal
Roush
Roybal
Ryan, N.Y.
St Germain
St. Onge
Schwengel
Scott
Selden
Senner
Shelley
Shipley
Short
Shriver
Sickles
Sikes
Sisk
Skubitz
Slack
Smith, Iowa
Smith, Va.
Springer
Staebler
Staggers
Steed
Stephens
Stratton
Stubblefield
Sullivan
Thomas
Thompson, La.
Thompson, Tex.
Thomson, Wis.
Thornberry
Toll
Trimble
Tuck
Tuten
Udall
Ullman
Van Deerlin
Vanik
Vinson
Watson
Watts
Weltner
White
Whitten
Wickersham
Williams
Willis
Wilson, Charles H.
Winstead
Wright
Young
Zablocki

NAYS—154

Abele
Adair
Alger
Arends
Ashbrook
Auchincloss
Ayres
Baker
Baldwin
Baring
Barry
Bates
Becker
Beermann
Bell
Bennett, Fla.
Bennett, Mich.
Betts
Bolton, Oliver P.
Brock
Broomfield
Brotzman
Brown, Ohio
Broyhill, N.C.
Bruce
Burton
Byrnes, Wis.
Cahill
Casey
Cederberg
Chamberlain
Chenoweth
Clancy
Clausen
Cleveland
Collier
Conte
Corbett
Cramer
Cunningham
Curtin
Curtis
Dague
Derounian
Derwinski
Devine
Dole
Dorn
Dwyer
Ellsworth
Feighan
Findley
Fino
Ford
Foreman
Frelinghuysen
Fulton, Pa.
Gibbons
Glenn
Goodell
Goodling
Griffin
Griffiths
Grover
Gubser
Gurney
Haley
Hall
Halleck
Halpern
Harrison
Harsha
Harvey, Mich.
Hays
Herlong
Hoffman
Horton
Hosmer
Hutchinson
Joelson
Johansen
Jonas
Keith
Kelly
Kilburn
King, N.Y.
Knox
Kunkel
Latta
Lindsay
Lipscomb
Lloyd
McClory
McCulloch
McDade
McLoskey
Mailliard
Martin, Calif.
Martin, Mass.
Michel
Miller. N.Y.
Milliken
Minshall
Moore
Mosher
Norblad
Osmers
Ostertag
Pelly
Pike
Pillion
Pool
Reid, Ill.
Reid, N.Y.
Rich
Riehlman
Robison
Rogers, Fla.
Roudebush
Rumsfeld
Ryan, Mich.
St. George
Saylor
Schadeberg
Schenck
Schneebeli
Schweiker
Secrest
Sibal
Siler
Smith, Calif.
Snyder
Stafford
Stinson
Taft
Talcott
Taylor
Teague, Calif.
Tollefson
Tupper
Utt
Van Pelt
Waggonner
Wallhauser
Weaver
Westland
Whalley
Wharton
Whitener
Widnall
Wilson, Bob
Wilson, Ind.
Wydler
Younger

NOT VOTING—27

Blatnik
Bow
Brademas
Broyhill, Va.
Buckley
Fallon
Gavin
Hawkins
Healey
Hébert
Hemphill
Karth

Macdonald
Madden
Mathias
Meader
Morse
O'Brien, Ill.
O'Hara, Mich.
Quillen
Rostenkowski
Sheppard
Teague. Tex.
Thompson, N.J.
Walter
Wyman

So the joint resolution was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Hébert for, with Mr. Gavin against.

Mr. Rostenkowski for, with Mr. Morse against.

Mr. Hemphill for, with Mr. Wyman against.

Mr. Fallon for, with Mr. Quillen against.

Until further notice:

Mr. O'Brien of Illinois with Mr. Meader.

Mr. Buckley with Mr. Broyhill of Virginia.

Mr. Brademas with Mr. Mathias.

Mr. Macdonald with Mr. Bow.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded. A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to extend their remarks on the joint resolution just passed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

ELECTION TO COMMITTEE

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. RES. 264

Resolved, That JAMES E. BROMWELL, of Iowa, be, and he is hereby elected a member of the standing Committee of the House of Representatives on Veterans' Affairs.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZATION OF U.S. COAST GUARD APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H.R. 79) to amend title 14, United States Code, to require authorization for certain appropriations.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That after December 31, 1963, funds may not be appropriated to or for the use of the Coast Guard for the construction of shore or offshore establishments, or for the procurement of vessels or aircraft, unless the appropriation of such funds has been authorized by legislation enacted after that date.

SEC. 2. Chapter 17 of title 14, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"§ 656. Use of appropriations to restore, replace, establish, or develop facilities

"(a) The Secretary may use any funds appropriated to or for the use of the Coast Guard for other construction purposes to restore, repair, or replace facilities that have been damaged or destroyed, including acquisition of sites.

"(b) The Secretary may use any funds appropriated to or for the use of the Coast Guard for other construction purposes to acquire, construct, convert, extend, and install at Coast Guard installations and facilities, needed permanent or temporary public works, including the preparation of sites and the furnishing of appurtenances, utilities, and equipment, but excluding the construction of family quarters, costing not more than $200,000 for any one project.

"(c) The Secretary shall report every six months to the Committee on Commerce of the Senate and the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries of the House of Representatives on the administration of this section."

SEC. 3. The analysis of chapter 17 of title 14, United States Code, is amended by adding the following new item at the end thereof:

"656. Use of appropriations to restore, replace, establish, or develop facilities."

Amend the title so as to read: "A bill to require authorization for certain appropriations for the Coast Guard, and for other purposes."

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended to read: "A bill to require authorization for certain appropriations for the Coast Guard, and for other purposes."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXPENSES OF COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I call up the resolution (H. Res. 146) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That effective from January 4, 1963, the expenses of the investigation and study to be conducted pursuant to H. Res. 84, by the Committee on Armed Services, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, not to exceed $150,000, including expenditures for the employment of special counsel, consultants, investigators, attorneys, experts, and clerical, stenographic, and other assistants appointed by the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized by such committee or subcommittee, signed by the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, and approved by the Committee on House Administration.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the committee amendments.

The Clerk read as follows:

Line 1, strike out "January 4" and insert "January 3".

Line 5, strike out "$150,000" and insert "$75,000".

Line 13, add the following new paragraph:

"SEC. 2. No part of the funds authorized by this resolution shall be available for expenditure in connection with the study or investigation of any subject which is being investigated for the same purpose by any other committee of the House, and the Chairman of the Committee on Armed Services shall furnish the Committee on House Administration information with respect to any study or investigation intended to be financed from such funds."

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, there are 20 resolutions to be considered today. The other resolutions carry the same provision as appears in this amendment, that the chairman of any committee that receives funds must report to the chairman of the Committee on House Administration before initiating any study or investigation, in order to avoid duplication and conflict of jurisdiction with other committees. This amendment was adopted by a unanimous vote.

I may say that all the other resolutions we will be considering today are limited to 1 year.

Mr. SCHENCK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRIEDEL. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. SCHENCK. May I inquire of the gentleman from Maryland if it will be the policy of the gentleman from Maryland to allot one-half of the time for debate to this side of the aisle?

Mr. FRIEDEL. The rules of the House give the manager of the bill control of the time. If the gentleman desires any time I will gladly yield to him, or anyone else on his side who wants some time. However, if we take an hour on each one of these 20 resolutions it will take 20 hours to consider them.

Mr. SCHENCK. I should like to request the gentleman from Maryland to yield our side 30 minutes on each of these resolutions, not that we expect to use the time in each instance but there are some statements that should be made. As a matter of well-established precedent, I believe that the same procedures as followed by the Committee on Rules and the Committee on Appropriations should be followed in the considerations of these measures here today and that we, the minority, should be allotted half the time on this side of the aisle.

Mr. FRIEDEL. I think the gentleman from Ohio knows I have been very fair on all these resolutions. I do not intend to yield him 30 minutes, but I will yield to him if he wants to make a statement.

Mr. SCHENCK. We would like to be on record as saying that we feel deeply that the time should be equally divided, and that this is an important principle. However, if the gentleman will yield further, I have a statement to make.

Mr. FRIEDEL. How much time does the gentleman want?

Mr. SCHENCK. Ten minutes.

Mr. FRIEDEL. I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. SCHENCK. Mr. Speaker, the Committee on House Administration has given very careful consideration to these several resolutions that are before us today. There has been a question discussed at some length as to the division of the committee staff between the majority and the minority members of each of these legislative and investigative committees.

It seems to us on our side of the aisle, Mr. Speaker, that perhaps the wrong impression has been allowed to become widespread and therefore our efforts have become misunderstood. In the first place, the minority feel that the staff members should be appointed without regard to any political affiliation, as is provided under rule 11 of the Reorganization Act for the statutory professional staff of the committees. Secondly, we feel that the staff members should be appointed on the basis of their professional competency and ability to serve the committee and best public interest.

We also feel, however, that it would serve a better purpose and be of greater value if the minority professional staff people who are to be paid from the contingent funds, were assigned to the supervision and responsibility of the minority side. This would enable the minority to have any needed research work done properly. It would also greatly assist the minority to prepare such minority reports as may be required from time to time and so on.

So, Mr. Speaker, while we have made efforts in each instance in the Committee on House Administration, which have been refused, to amend these resolutions along these lines, it is my hope to correct any impression, if such exists, that we were attempting to do it on a partisan, political basis. Our efforts have been entirely upon the basis of responsibility and control as to the work of the minority staff members and which we believe is in the best interest of the Nation.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of the 10 minutes allotted to me.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman, of course, has been yielded 10 minutes, but the gentleman cannot reserve the balance of his time under the rule and the custom of the House. The principle of the rule in question has existed from time immemorial. Therefore, if the gentleman from Ohio desires to yield to another Member while the gentleman from Ohio has time remaining within his 10 minutes, he may do so.

Mr. SCHENCK. Will the Speaker advise the gentleman from Ohio the amount of time left?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Ohio has 6 minutes remaining.

Mr. SCHENCK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman cannot yield a specific amount of time, but he may yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state the parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. HALLECK. As I understand it, the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. FRIEDEL] has said that he would yield time to Members on the minority side, and that is what we want. If there is another minority Member who wants to be recognized at this time, it would be in order under the rules for that Member to be granted time in order that he might make such statement as he might want to make.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will state that under the rules of the House and pursuant to custom that has existed from time immemorial, on a resolution of this kind the Member in charge of the resolution has control of the time and he, in turn, yields time. The gentleman from Maryland [Mr. FRIEDEL] in charge of the resolution has yielded 10 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio. If the gentleman from Ohio desires to yield to some other Member, he may do so but he may not yield a specific amount of time. The net result, of course, is probably the same but nevertheless there is a clear distinction so that the custom is observed and the rule is preserved.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Ohio yield and, of course, I will request that the gentleman be given an additional minute.

Mr. SCHENCK. I am glad to yield to the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. ALBERT. Following the statement of the distinguished Speaker of the House, the gentleman from Ohio made the statement that he is in favor of the principle involved here. Of course, the principle is well established under the rules of the House and has been observed by both parties from time immemorial, that the Member recognized to call up the resolution has control of the time under the 1-hour rule. But, I would like to advise the gentleman, as the gentleman from Maryland has, I am sure the gentleman from Maryland will yield at least half of the time to the minority.

Mr. SCHENCK. I thank the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. KYL].

Mr. KYL. Mr. Speaker, as the resolutions authorizing committee expenditures were considered in the Committee on House Administration, the minority sought to amend them in one particular. The amendments had as their purpose, adequate staffing for both the majority and minority members of the various committees. There has been considerable discussion of this purpose, most of it irrelevant or misdirected. Therefore, I seek to define exactly what we are trying to do. The thought is not revolutionary. It should not be disturbing. We seek to enforce the rules of the House. These rules make the following provision:

> Each standing committee (other than the Committee on Appropriations) is authorized to appoint by majority vote of the committee not more than four professional staff members in addition to the clerical staffs on a permanent basis without regard to political affiliations and solely on the basis of fitness to perform the duties of the office; and said staff members shall be assigned to the chairman and ranking minority member of such committee as the committee may deem advisable. Services of professional staff members may be terminated by majority vote of the committee.
>
> The clerical staff of each standing committee, which shall be appointed by a majority vote of the committee, shall consist of not more than six clerks, to be attached to the office of the chairman, to the ranking minority member, and to the professional staff, as the committee may deem advisable. The clerical staff shall handle committee correspondence and stenographic work, both for the committee staff and for the chairman related to committee work.

Mr. Speaker, we are simply trying to return to the spirit and the letter of House rules.

The gentleman from Iowa recognizes that in some committees of this House, the chairmen have been guided by the essence of the rules. They have supervised and administered their committees in exemplary fashion, making every effort to provide adequate staff assistance for both the majority and minority. In some cases the spirit of the rule has been ignored and in some instances the rule has been violated. There are occasions when members of the majority party have been just as frustrated as have minority members as they seek the kind of staff assistance which is so necessary when subjects of legislative discussion concern matters ranging from the human needs of an individual to the most sophisticated scientific materials.

This certainly is not a partisan concern. Sometimes, the minority seeking assistance of staff members is made up of both Democrats and Republicans who are outnumbered in final determinations on specific pieces of legislation. The rules indicate that professional staff members are to be nonpartisan. We do not want partisan staffing. We represent a need for staff members who are responsible to the minority regardless of who constitutes that minority. We endorse the principle of a truly professional staff.

Perhaps the technique we have selected to secure adequate staff assistance is not the most feasible or proper. At the present time, it is the only alternative afforded. It is my hope, and the hope of my colleagues who have been pursuing this vital proposition, that we will be assisted by all Members of this body and those who govern our operations under the rules of the House. Improvement of legislative procedures is a subject worthy of our best talents and our time. We earnestly ask your assistance in this proposition.

Mr. SCHENCK. Mr. Speaker, I would like to make this very short statement, that the committee in considering these resolutions has placed a limitation of 1 year on each. This will permit the chairmen of committees to return to the Committee on House Administration for further adjustment of their requests if, as, and when such need arises and they will receive full, complete, and careful consideration from the entire committee. Making these resolutions on a 1-year basis, however, does give the Committee on House Administration a better and continuing opportunity to exercise its proper responsibilities.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlemen from Maryland for yielding to me.

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRIEDEL. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Speaker, I address myself to the matters referred to by my able colleagues, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SCHENCK] and the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. KYL] with respect to the views of the minority and particularly the amendment offered in the committee dealing with this matter of a division of staff or a division of funds to pay for the employment of people assigned solely to the minority.

I am not certain that this is the time to argue the merits of this proposition; on the other hand, as I understand the parliamentary situation, this being a privileged resolution and the opportunity, shall I say, not given to offer amendments, the "day in court" would come on either a motion to recommit or a vote on the previous question. Should either motion be carried the matter would then be open to whatever action the House desired by way of amendments. In this event debate would occur on the merits of the issue.

Should circumstances develop causing debate on the direct issue of the charges proposed by the minority, I feel it in order to refer to what I consider to be the principal factors involved. Mr. Speaker, I wish to quote a portion of a letter from the distinguished and able chairman of the Judiciary Committee, who has been many years a Member of this House and is respected by all. I know of no better opinion on this subject. The gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER] wrote to the distinguished Speaker on February 11, 1963, as follows:

> What is needed are professional staffs which are nonpartisan in nature and which provide assistance to all of the members of their respective committees regardless of political affiliation. For this we need no resolutions, and no new legislation. The Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 contemplates the appointment of professional staffs on a permanent basis without regard to political affiliation and solely on the basis of fitness to perform the duties of the office.

Mr. Speaker, we should listen to these words and be reminded of the provisions of the Reorganization Act in order that we may have a refreshed memory of the responsibility which rests upon us all.

We have heard remarks about amending the rule. I do not attempt to argue with my able and respected colleague, the gentleman from New York [Mr. GOODELL], who offered an amendment in the House Administration Committee to carry out the idea of dividing funds for the majority and the minority. The gentleman performed well and responsibly. I disagreed with the method, leaving less emphasis on the merits of this proposition. The better procedure would be to introduce a resolution, have it referred to the Rules Committee and if cleared for floor action, that it be brought here for debate on the direct issues and not presented as an amendment to an appropriation resolution.

In this same letter the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER] had this to say:

> It seems to me that the proposal to divide staffs along political lines is not only unnecessary and unrealistic, but I think would result in creating built-in obstruction to the legislative processes by establishing duplicate staffs that can produce only incentives for needless disagreement. Each staff—Republican or Democrat—will feel the need to justify itself by differing with its counterpart. Each staff member will consider himself an adversary of his opposite number. If we want the work of the Congress to bog down in a continuing series of skirmishes, this is the way to do it.

Mr. Speaker, this seems to be excellent advice. The chairman indicates all these things are either inequitable, unjustifiable, or costly. The distinguished chairman of the Judiciary in analyzing this question, expresses the opinion that three alternatives are available should the system of allotting 60 percent of funds appropriated to committees go to the majority and 40 percent to the minority.

> The first of these is to discharge incumbent staff members to make room for those who are to be responsible to the minority—

He says.

To further quote:

> This, I submit, would be to deprive ourselves of the services of people who, over the years, have become acknowledged experts in their particular areas. Beyond that, on a personal basis, I think that we would also consider it grossly unfair to treat, in this fashion, people who have served ably and devotedly.

Mr. Speaker, I believe it obvious that this system, if adopted, would be extremely awkward and unworkable.

In his letter the chairman describes his practices of both the majority and minority of the committee he heads.

May I say here, Mr. Speaker, the assumption is, with such a directive on the part of the House of Representatives, it would certainly evidence the intent of the mandatory nature of the arrangement. Exceptions might or could be made, but once that principle is established, it would doubtless in most instances be the practice of each committee to inaugurate this system of division.

The result of this will be that within a given area, either the majority staff or the minority staff will have exclusive responsibility. Thus, in the place of a nonpartisan, professional staff serving all members impartially, we would create two partisan staffs, one with responsibility in specified areas but only to the majority, and the other with responsibility in the remaining areas, but responsible only to the minority. This is plainly unworkable.

Mr. Speaker, under these circumstances it seems obvious that the proposal such as may be presented in some form or other is unworkable, is impracticable, and will add people to the payroll of the committees. It will take away a responsibility of the committee chairmen. I should say, it would take away authority for which he has a responsibility. I know of nothing worse than to have a responsibility and not have commensurate authority. That is exactly what would happen under any similar proposal however it may be worded.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURLESON. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. FORD. I think it should be made perfectly clear that what a vast number, if not all, of the Republicans have in mind is not a violation of the intent or spirit of the Reorganization Act of 1946, but, rather, that a fair portion of the professional staff be assigned to the minority, so that the minority can be certain and positive they have members of the committee staff in whom they can place trust and give direction to in the preparation of studies or legislative recommendations.

May I compliment the gentleman from Maryland and the gentleman from Texas on the way the hearings have been held this year by the Accounts Subcommittee. The record shows that because the hearings were in greater depth there has been substantial progress made in the number of positions available to the minority. That has been worked out in agreements between the chairman and ranking minority member of most of the committees. This has produced some salutary results which will be beneficial to the House as a whole.

Second, I think it is a great step forward for the committee to have decided that all committees of the House should have only 1-year appropriations. This means that a year from now your committee can take an honest look to see whether progress has been made, whether agreements have been abided by; and if they have not then the House in its wisdom can take what action is necessary to remedy any violation of agreements or action which was not in accordance with the committee's recommendations.

Frankly, there were people on our side of the aisle who felt that specific action ought to be taken today to try and have a 40 to 60 split in committee staffs. On the other hand, there was a feeling among some, that under the circumstances, since progress had been made, that it was not the proper floor tactic to do it today.

Because of the progress that has been made in a number of instances where the minority are better off staffingwise, and also because of the fact that we are dealing with only 1-year availability of committee funds I am willing to see how it works for the next 12 months. It seems to me that in the long run or over the long haul the better procedure is to go to the Committee on Rules. This I believe the gentleman from Iowa and his committee intend to do with the full support of the Republican leadership.

Then may I conclude by saying that I want to compliment the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SCHWENGEL] and others, as well as those on the gentleman's committee, for bringing this matter, which I think is very important, to a head, and for the progress which has been made.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. BURLESON. I yield to the majority leader.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, first of all I want to compliment the committee upon the manner in which these resolutions have been brought to the floor. I want to compliment the distinguished chairman of the committee for reading into the RECORD extracts of a letter—and I hope he will put the entire letter into the RECORD—written by the distinguished chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary who has drawn on his experience over a long and brilliant career in preparing a scholarly essay on this subject.

Mr. Speaker, the language of the Legislative Reorganization Act was considered by one of the most outstanding joint committees that ever served in the Congress. That joint committee held hearings for a period of over 5 months. They listened to over a hundred witnesses. More than 60 Members of Congress testified. If there was anything that joint committee intended to do that is clear from the debates on that bill it is that the staffs of the committees of the Congress of the United States should not be partisan or under partisan control, but should be nonpartisan. Any arbitrary requirement, without reference to the considered judgment of each committee separately, making it necessary that a certain percentage of staff members be put under the jurisdiction of either party, would change the concept of the role of committees as contemplated by the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 and would be a step backward, not forward. It would be progress in reverse.

Mr. Speaker, I think those who advance this subject—and I am glad they are not pressing it today—find themselves supporting either one of two proposals. First, that we are going to return to the patronage system under which Republicans or Democrats as parties select employees; and it was that very thing that brought about staffing provisions of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946. If that is not the purpose, then the only other purpose, as outlined in the opening statement of the gentleman from Ohio, would be to enable them to do research in various areas and to prepare documents for the minority.

Just who is the minority, in committee after committee, on bill after bill? Is it the Republican or the Democratic Members? Is it the conservative or the liberal Members? Is it the isolationists or the internationalists? Is it the reciprocal-traders or the protectionists? Just who is the ideological minority and majority on many of these bills? Do those who hold a point of view have the right through staff assignments to them to pursue a certain point of view?

I think, Mr. Speaker, it is clear that a partisan application of this rule would be wrong; that an application of this rule on the basis of ideological differences would be unworkable and impracticable. This thing must fall on both grounds. I think, Mr. Speaker, it would be a step backward to say that we were going to change the concept of the Reorganization Act and make the staffing of committees of Congress a partisan matter or a matter which tends to splinter us when most of the legislation we consider is of a national rather than of a partisan or an ideological character.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRIEDEL. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. At one time the gentleman from Maryland was the chairman of the Subcommittee on House Administration on which I served. I do not know how many Republicans there were on the committee at that time, but I remember I was at the foot of the class.

Apropos of the statement just made by the majority leader, I should like to make an observation or two on my responsibility as minority leader.

First of all, as has already been pointed out, as I understand the views of the people on my side of the aisle, and I think they are rather unanimously held, it is not that there should be some sort of completely partisan arrangement in respect to committee staffs, it is rather that there should be an arrangement by which the minority can have people on the various staffs to whom they can go with complete confidence insofar as there arise occasions when such service would seem to be indicated.

I think it also should be pointed out that the suggestions which have been made for a division have been qualified by language to the effect that only if a majority of the minority voted for such an arrangement would it be invoked.

To go back to the Reorganization Act of 1946, and I voted for it, it became my duty as the majority leader of the 80th Congress to implement that act. We cut the committees from some 40 down to 19. There were provisions in that act heralded as great accomplishments. I think I might say with some degree of humor that there were some people who said at the time that the principal support for the Reorganization Act of 1946 was that it was going to raise our pay, and, as a matter of fact, this did happen, although I doubt that it was a factor in our deliberations.

One provision in that act stated that by February 15 the Ways and Means Committee and the Appropriations Committee of the House and the Finance Committee and the Appropriations Committee of the Senate should make a determination about the money that we would be able to collect for the Federal Government and then determine as to how we should spend it. In the 80th Congress we tried to comply with that and did comply with it, but nobody has heard about it since.

As far as the arrangement about staffs is concerned, I want to say this, Mr. Speaker. It is fair to say that many of the committees have followed the concept of the Reorganization Act and there have been no real, fundamental differences insofar as staff matters are concerned between the majority and minority. I think that fact has been brought out in the hearings recently held before the Committee on House Administration. But I should like to point out to my colleagues here in the House that there have been committees here that have violated the concept to the rankest degree, and when that is done it is only natural that the minority would seek to protect their rights in some of these very important areas where partisanship has been injected, not on the minority side but on the majority side, with respect to the appointment of these staff members. The subcommittee appointed by our conference has been working diligently and effectively on this matter and I commend them.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. ALBERT. May I state to the gentleman with respect to two of the main points he has made, committees controlled by his party launched the Reorganization Act in the 80th Congress when the gentleman was majority leader. I think on the whole the gentleman's side of the aisle did a splendid job. So far as I can recall not one word was said on this side of the aisle with respect to the manner in which committee staffs were selected. We made no demands for minority staff members, and we have made no such demands since so far as I know.

May I state further to the gentleman that some of the outstanding staff members of this House were hired during the 80th Congress. They have been kept on for Congress after Congress and are still in the service of the House at this time.

On the last point, Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield for just one further observation, there may have been committee staff members who have been partisan and arrogant and who have not lived up to the spirit of the Reorganization Act, but should we for that reason repeal the Reorganization Act? I would admonish the House that we should not upset the applecart every time we find a rotten apple in the barrel.

Mr. HALLECK. That is the difficulty around here, we cannot take the bad apples out and leave the good ones in. We have to take them all or none.

In response to the gentleman, this first resolution has to do with the Committee on Armed Services. One of the members of that staff was appointed by Ham Andrews, of New York. Another was appointed by Dewey Short, of Missouri.

Mr. VINSON. If the gentleman will yield, to keep the record straight, the two members that have been with the staff for 17 years, both belonging to the minority party at this time, were appointed by Mr. Andrews.

Mr. HALLECK. Let me say further with respect to the Committee on Armed Services, from what I can find out here from the 17 members on the minority side, as far as the staff is concerned, they are going along very well.

Mr. VINSON. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. HALLECK. I am glad to make that statement. But again might I say that there have been committees where on the majority side in the last few years, the purpose and intent of the Reorganization Act with respect to committee staffs have been honored in its breach. I think those situations have been flagrant. I think such situations are completely wrong. All I can say is that as far as I am concerned, unless these arrangements which have heretofore existed can be straightened out, we are going to have to fight to do something about it. We want the spirit of the Reorganization Act to be honored and we intend to see that it is honored. Now that is not to say that you are going to be asked to change the armed services situation. There are many other committees that I can name. I do not want to be asked to specify which ones I have in mind when I say that there has been flagrant disregard of the purpose of the Reorganization Act. But what I am saying is that in those instances the minority have been run over roughshod. Yes, and as pointed out by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Brown] on yesterday, too many times we have had staff reports that are highly critical of many situations in the country and our people on the committees have never had a chance to see them. I think that is a bad practice that has developed. There are a great many things here that need to be investigated and as far as I am concerned, I hope at the proper time this will be done.

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRIEDEL. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Speaker, the distinguished majority leader has suggested that the letter of the chairman of the Judiciary Committee be made a part of the RECORD. I ask unanimous consent to have the letter, from which I quoted, inserted in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Speaker, may I refer again to the majority leader's statement with reference to the fact that there is, of course, no claim made by anyone that the conduct of committee chairmen is perfect in carrying out the provisions of the Reorganization Act or that complete consideration in matters of staffing committees is accorded the minority. Perhaps, in his enthusiasm to do a job, let us say, a chairman may not give complete consideration to every aspect of this matter which the minority may think it is entitled to. On this matter of majority and minority I would again refer to the majority leader's statement, "What is a minority?" I know that on the other committee on which I serve, no one at times could be any more in the minority than I have been. But I did not need 40 percent of the staff to help me get out of something or get further into something or to do whatever it was that I was trying to do. So it seems to me, it just does not make much sense to think of it in these terms.

We have a sound, workable and fair rule as it is under the Reorganization Act. Certainly, the responsibility is on the majority to see that it works. I want to admit that freely. I say to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD] who spoke earlier and I want to express appreciation for his comments very much. They were eminently fair and I agree with practically everything he said. But it is a principle involved and an existing provision of law which only needs compliance. What we have is workable. I repeat it is the responsibility of the majority to see that the rule and the principle is fairly applied. The machinery is there and if the proper buttons are pushed and the proper levers are pulled, it is going to work. I do not think we will have too many complaints if we assume the responsibility that is ours.

The letter of the chairman of the Judiciary Committee follows:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, UNITED STATES, COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY,
Washington, D.C., February 11, 1963.
Hon. JOHN W. MCCORMACK,
Speaker, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. SPEAKER: During the past few weeks we have all heard a great deal about proposals to place committee staffs on a partisan basis with 60 percent of a staff responsible to the majority and 40 percent to the minority. As you now, I have been a Member of Congress for the past 40 years and I have served as chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary for over 11 of those years. In view of this experience, I thought it might be appropriate for me to comment upon these proposals.

First of all, it seems to me that proposals such as these proceed upon the fallacious assumption that the business of Congress is conducted as a running war between the Republicans and the Democrats. This view is totally unrealistic. The fact is that the great preponderance of legislative activity proceeds upon unanimous consent. What is more, where there is disagreement, it is not a disagreement which follows party lines. This becomes apparent merely from the scope of legislation dealt with by the Congress. Consider, for example, the Committee on the Judiciary. It handles legislation dealing with bankruptcy, patents, copyrights and trademarks, State and territorial boundary lines, Federal penal institutions, judicial proceedings, holidays and celebrations, and codification of the laws. It is hard to conceive of how one can draw partisan political lines in matters like these. Indeed, it has been my experience that it is not done.

There are, of course, some areas which have political overtones. In the Committee on the Judiciary these are normally civil rights and antitrust. But even here, divisions of opinion do not follow party lines. Who can accuse either the Democratic Party or the Republican Party of a solid front on issues like civil rights? It has been my experience that differences among Members are far more likely to follow individual philosophies or sectional attitudes rather than the strict categorizations of Republican or Democrat. While it is no doubt desirable for there to be staff assistants for every Member who holds a view different from that held by the majority on a particular issue, the division of staffs into Republicans and Democrats is obviously not the answer.

What is needed are professional staffs which are nonpartisan in nature and which provide assistance to all of the members of their respective committees regardless of political affiliation. For this, we need no new resolutions and no new legislation. The Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 contemplates the appointment of professional staffs on a permanent basis without regard to political affiliations and solely on the basis of fitness to perform the duties of the office.

It has been the policy of the Committee on the Judiciary to adhere to this principle in its staff appointments. There are at least five members of the professional staff of this committee who have served continuously under both Republican- and Democratic-controlled Congresses. I believe that both Democratic and Republican members of the committee will attest to the fact that every member of this staff will provide assistance to all Members on a professional, nonpartisan basis. While I cannot speak for other committees, I am sure that the policy and experience of this committee are hardly unique.

It seems to me that the proposals to divide staffs along political lines are not only unnecessary and unrealistic, but that they would result in creating built-in obstructions to the legislative process. By establishing duplicate staffs they can produce only incentives for needless disagreement. Each staff—Republican or Democrat—will feel the need to justify itself by differing with its counterpart. Each staff member will consider himself an adversary of his opposite number. If we want the work of the Congress to bog down in a continuing series of skirmishes, this is the way to do it.

There are three alternatives available in going over to a 60 to 40 or similar system. All are either inequitable or unjustifiably costly. The first of these is to discharge incumbent staff members to make room for those who are to be responsible to the minority. This, I submit, would be to deprive ourselves of the services of people who, over the years, have become acknowledged experts in their particular areas. Beyond that, on a personal basis, I think that we would also consider it grossly unfair to treat, in this fashion, people who have served ably and devotedly.

The second possibility is that we make 40 percent of the incumbent staff members responsible to the minority. Today, on the Committee on the Judiciary, and on other committees as well, it takes the entire staff to handle the legislative responsibilities of the committee. Assigning 40 percent to the minority and 60 percent to the majority can only result in greatly increasing the size of the staffs. One of two things will happen. The first possibility is that both the majority and the minority staffs will range over all subjects, duplicating each other's work. In that event, neither the majority staff nor the minority staff will be able to handle effectively the work which now requires 100 percent of the existing staff.

The second possibility is that subjects within the committee's jurisdiction will be distributed on a 60–40 basis between the majority and minority staffs. The result of this will be that within a given area, either the majority staff or the minority staff, will have exclusive responsibility. Thus, in the place of a nonpartisan, professional staff serving all Members impartially, we would create two partisan staffs, one with responsibility in specified areas but only to the majority, and the other with responsibility in the remaining areas, but only to the minority. This is plainly unworkable.

Under the circumstances, it is obvious that should a proposal for proportionate political staffing be adopted, the committees and the House will be under irresistible pressure to increase the staffs sufficiently to maintain the current volume and quality of work. This would require an additional 40 percent to replace those assigned to the minority. However, if the minority is to maintain a ratio of 40 percent of the staff, the staff will have to be increased by 67 percent rather than 40 percent.

The final alternative for achieving 60 to 40 proportionate political staffing would be simply to increase the size of existing staffs. However, as I have just indicated, this would entail not an increase of 40 percent, but an increase of 67 percent in the size of committee staffs. Furthermore, the cost of such an increase is not limited to the salaries of professional personnel. We must also add in the cost of additional secretaries, typewriters and similar equipment, telephones, etc., and beyond this, there is the ever-present problem of office space—where are we going to put the men?

The Congress constantly scrutinizes and frequently criticizes the personnel expenditures of executive agencies. Where these are excessive, the criticism is well justified. It seems to me that if we adopt a proposal for proportionate political staffing, we, too, would be guilty of an unjustifiable use of the taxpayers' money. By continuing to insist upon adherence to the principles of the Legislative Reorganization Act we can best assure staffing which will provide competent, nonpartisan services to all Members. Staff members should continue to be technicians; we should not turn them into politicians.

I do hope, Mr. Speaker, that in deliberating this matter you will bear these considerations in mind.

Sincerely yours,
EMANUEL CELLER,
Chairman.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I am in favor of this resolution as a member of the Armed Services Committee, as a Republican, as a member of the minority, and as a partisan, of all I am also proud. I have no quarrel with how inequitable staffing is corrected in the interest of the American people be they majority or minority of voters. I even still believe in majority rule while respecting the rights and duties of the minority. I deeply respect the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BURLESON] but question the lengthy document he has read here as proving that any one person is the epitome of judiciousness or the final oracle or authority on matters of justice, or the judiciary.

Mr. Speaker, I would recall to the minds of our colleagues who were here in the 87th Congress the colloquy of April 19, 1961, wherein we were discussing the new Federal judgeships and their selection. Many of us recall a remark from the chairman of the House of Representatives Committee on the Judiciary to the effect that the then majority party—Democrats—had gambled for 6 years on these appointments and vacancies and having now won the Presidency and appointments plus confirmation expectancy in the Senate—with a majority of Democrats 2 to 1—the Democrats certainly could be expected to capitalize thereon.

Mr. Speaker, such statements cannot be interpreted as rubies of justice or pearls of wisdom from any man—much less an oracle of justice or sine quo non of dependability and reference.

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRIEDEL. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Subcommittee on Accounts, I have listened attentively as we have heard these requests for these funds for the respective committees and we have heard these arguments with regard to committee staffing and their assignments. I yield to no man in this House so far as nonpartisanship is concerned, but for the life of me I cannot see how, in time to come, a provision such as this could be put into effect without it eventually involving partisanship. I think that would be most disastrous to the operation of all these committees. Admittedly, there have been some few abuses, but abuses that we have no control over. If we go out here on the streets of Washington and consider the fact that this afternoon some individual commits a crime, we are not going to require that the police lock up everyone on the streets because some one individual did something wrong. Similarly, we cannot attempt to penalize the operation of this Congress and all its committees by saying that somebody has done something wrong. Partisanship is sure to result by adopting a proposal such as this. I am glad to see that the minority is not going to push this further. Then, too, I raise the question which has been raised before today and that is "Who is the minority?"

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield me a little time?

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Speaker, I have listened very carefully to this colloquy here this afternoon and I think there is fairness generally in what has been said. I noted that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BURLESON] and the majority leader, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ALBERT], directed their remarks primarily toward the professional staff aspect of this discussion, and in that regard I believe I could not take too much issue with what they have said.

I think, however, the most basic objection on this side of the aisle is not so much the professional staff as it is the special investigatory staffs that are authorized from time to time. I would only hope with all the admonitions and propriety that have been expressed this afternoon, that when the various committees come before the Committee on House Administration that the committee will admonish the chairman to proceed with the same nonpartisan approach to staff selection to the special committees that they have expressed here this afternoon in regard to the professional staff of the legislative committees.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman from Iowa 1 minute. How much time would the gentleman like?

Mr. SCHWENGEL. I would like at least 10 minutes. One minute is entirely inadequate.

Mr. FRIEDEL. We have 17 minutes remaining. I need about 10 minutes on the Democratic side. But in the spirit of fairness I yield the gentleman 3 minutes.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I want to say first of all that my interest in this question and this problem extends over several years and is based upon serious study and experience. I agree with what has been said on the minority side and that is that we do not want to do anything but to implement the spirit of the Reorganization Act that was passed in 1946. If it had been observed we would not be here on the proposition to change the act.

Now, just a word or two about the proposition that has been introduced, and let me say that this is the result of serious study and consultation with serious and I think good students of government. They are in agreement that this is the right approach and this approach will assure that the minority and majority will live up to the spirit of the Reorganization Act of 1946.

The Reorganization Act provides, I would point out, that 40 percent, or rather up to 40 percent of the staff be allotted to the minority when a majority of a minority acts on that question and only then—and states that in the case you indicate where many committees have never acted—but in the committee where the spirit of the act has been violated it would give the minority a chance to make a constructive contribution. I want to point out that. Much more could and needs to be said about this.

First of all, after serious consideration the Republicans in the conference assembled this year made this a policy question, and they appointed a subcommittee of which I have the privilege of being chairman. The subcommittee has been working diligently on the problem. We have made some progress and I think we have made some contributions by way of suggestions and in the way of propositions that can be looked into, and suggested ways and means not only to make the voice of the minority more effective but the Congress more effective; and I want to point out and make it very clear, something that everybody ought to appreciate, that the very essence of representative government demands the right of effective opposition and that it should not only be preserved, but it should also be actively fostered by both sides. I think with the situation as it now prevails that is not true. The most significant assurance of the basic health and growth and the adequacy of a representative system of government is the existence of a vital dynamic opposition party.

Perhaps this is not the time to make the issue on the floor here today, but I want to assure the majority that the committee will be prepared to appear before the Rules Committee in behalf of the proposition that we believe will make a constructive contribution to the legislative processes of this great body.

Mr. Speaker, the fact that since we of the minority have made the question of adequate staffing a policy and a part of this program for a more effective Congress, the majority has recognized the problem also by granting the minority, according to statements by both the majority and minority, at least 22 additional staff members.

This will help attain some of the goals that the minority has in mind.

The Subcommittee on Staffing is grateful for these gains. It whets our appetite, because it confirms our position, and it also serves to give us encouragement to carry on this very necessary activity.

Mr. Speaker, in order to further clarify the problem of adequate staffing I include the following:

REMARKS ON STAFFING MADE IN IOWA AND ELSEWHERE DURING WEEK OF LINCOLN RECESS

(By FRED SCHWENGEL)

Before legislation is voted on by Congress, it is shaped into final form by a congressional committee. Each of these committees is in itself a repository of statistics and information about past legislation and activities it has handled.

You are not getting your money's worth out of these committees today. Due to the application of the spoils system by the Democratic majority in Congress, your voice, the voice of fiscal responsibility, of free flow of information, is not being heard.

During the last congressional election, the Republican Party got 48 percent of all the votes cast for Congressmen. Due to Democratic gerrymandering, we elected only 40 percent of the Congressmen. It required 137,000 votes to elect a Republican to Congress, while the Democrats averaged only 100,000 votes per congressional seat.

Naturally, we could not expect to have the same number of staff employees as the Democrats, for they are statistically the majority party. However, your interests are not served by the fact that there are 461 Democratic staff members and only 43 Republican staff members on House committees.

A more equitable staffing of these committees in no way would swell the public payrolls. A greater percentage of staff employees responsible to Republican Members would be advantageous in detecting and cutting waste out of the administration's spending proposals that come up to Congress. It would assist us in presenting sound Republican legislation to Congress. Men who are knowledgeable in their fields would be retained to ferret out the cleverly concealed payroll padding and uneconomic projects which abound in any New Frontier legislation. At present, we don't have the manpower to do the job you deserve.

For instance, the Judiciary Committee, which handles civil rights legislation, has 45 Democratic staff members. We Republicans have just one. This one man must serve 177 Republican Congressmen. Nearly all of them, sometime during the year, will need information on some phase of civil rights. The minority staff of the Judiciary Committee is the logical place to go for this information. You can understand that no matter how diligent this one employee may be, he cannot do the thorough job that should be done on each request. It is you, the taxpayer, who is being deprived of the service your Congress should be giving you.

There are many controversial facets in the proposal to give Federal aid to education. A mistake in the legislation could do irreparable damage to our Nation's educational system. The Democrats have 45 staff members on the House Committee on Education and Labor, all working vigorously to justify Federal intervention in the affairs of your local school district. We have two staff members, one of them a secretary, to assemble the information which accurately pictures the needs of our schools.

There are eight joint Senate and House committees. The Democrats have 70 people on the staffs of these committees. We Republicans have two.

This inequity is being attacked by a special committee of Congressmen headed by Representative Fred Schwengel of Iowa. These men believe that a healthy two-party system is good for America. They believe that Republicans should have the same percentage of committee staffing as they have members. Mr. Schwengel has introduced H.R. 570, which would correct the imbalance between majority and minority congressional staffs.

You can help us with this fight. You and your friends can write your local papers, calling attention to the fact that the waste in the President's staggering $98.9 billion budget may well get by Congress because 10 out of every 11 committee staff people are trying to add to Federal expenditures.

The House of Representatives is your direct liaison with the Federal Government. It is responsive to your wishes. By making yourselves heard, you can help right a wrong that is not only politically immoral, but actually dangerous to the future of our Nation.

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, I do not care to prolong this further.

I think the Committee on the Armed Services has justified the appropriation for 1 year of $75,000.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the committee amendments.

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROVIDING FUNDS FOR THE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I call up House Resolution 100, with a committee amendment, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That effective January 3, 1963, the expenses of conducting the studies and investigations authorized by H. Res. 36 of the Eighty-eighth Congress, incurred by the Committee on the Judiciary, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, not to exceed $200,000 including expenditures for the employment of experts, special counsel, clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, and all expenses necessary for travel and subsistence incurred by members and employees while engaged in the activities of the committee or any subcommittee thereof, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized by such committee signed by the chairman of such committee and approved by the Committee on House Administration.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 1, after line 13, insert:

"Sec. 2. No part of the funds authorized by this resolution shall be available for expenditure in connection with the study or investigation of any subject which is being investigated for the same purpose by any other committee of the House, and the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary shall furnish the Committee on House Administration information with respect to any study or investigation intended to be financed from such funds."

The SPEAKER. The question is on the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

THE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY UNDER PUBLIC LAW 86-272

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I call up House Resolution 35, with a committee amendment, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That, effective January 3, 1963, the expenses of conducting the studies authorized by Public Law 272 of the Eighty-sixth Congress, as amended, incurred by the Committee on the Judiciary, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, not to exceed $113,000 including expenditures for the employment of experts, special counsel, clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, and all expenses necessary for travel and subsistence incurred by members and employees while engaged in the activities of the committee or any subcommittee thereof, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized by such committee signed by the chairman of such committee and approved by the Committee on House Administration.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 1, after line 13, insert the following:

"Sec. 2. No part of the funds authorized by this resolution shall be available for expenditure in connection with the study or investigation of any subject which is being investigated for the same purpose by any other committee of the House, and the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary shall furnish the Committee on House Administration information with respect to any study or investigation intended to be financed from such funds."

Mr. SCHENCK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRIEDEL. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. SCHENCK. Mr. Speaker, as I understand both the preceding resolution, House Resolution 100 and House Resolution 35 were approved in the amounts requested?

Mr. FRIEDEL. Yes, for 1 year.

Mr. SCHENCK. For 1 year.

Do I understand that House Resolution 35, which is currently under consideration, is for a special subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary, which will complete or is expected to complete its work this year?

Mr. FRIEDEL. That is my understanding.

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRIEDEL. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Speaker, I would like to say that the subcommittee studying the impact of State taxes on goods and services moving in interstate commerce has one of the most important tasks of any subcommittee in the House of Representatives. What it does or fails to do might well affect the economy of this country for the foreseeable future.

The subcommittee is chairmaned by that able colleague of ours, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. Willis]. He has been most careful in the use of funds by this subcommittee, in a most important work.

I hope the resolution will be adopted.

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXPENSES OF STUDIES AND INVESTIGATIONS, COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I call up the resolution (H. Res. 226) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That effective January 3, 1963, the expenses of conducting the studies, investigations, and inquiries authorized by H. Res. 17, Eighty-eighth Congress, by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, not to exceed $491,900 including expenditures for employment of experts, clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the

House on vouchers authorized by such committee, signed by the chairman of such committee, and approved by the Committee on House Administration.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the committee amendments.

The Clerk read as follows:

Line 5, strike out "$491,900" and insert "$245,950".

Line 11, insert the following new paragraph:

"SEC. 2. No part of the funds authorized by this resolution shall be available for expenditure in connection with the study or investigation of any subject which is being investigated for the same purpose by any other committee of the House, and the chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce shall furnish the Committee on House Administration information with respect to any study or investigation intended to be financed from such funds."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

STUDIES AND INVESTIGATIONS, COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I call up the resolution (H. Res. 239) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That effective January 3, 1963, the expenses of conducting the studies and investigations authorized by H. Res. 38, Eighty-eighth Congress, incurred by the Committee on Agriculture, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, not to exceed $50,000, including expenditures for the employment of accountants, experts, investigators, attorneys, and clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House, on vouchers authorized by such committee, signed by the chairman of such committee, and approved by the Committee on House Administration.

SEC. 2. The official committee reporters may be used at all hearings, if not otherwise officially engaged.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the committee amendments.

The Clerk read as follows:

Line 5, strike out "$50,000" and insert "$25,000".

Line 14, insert the following new paragraph:

"SEC. 3. No part of the funds authorized by this resolution shall be available for expenditure in connection with the study or investigation of any subject which is being investigated for the same purpose by any other committee of the House, and the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture shall furnish the Committee on House Administration information with respect to any study or investigation intended to be financed from such funds."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

STUDIES AND INVESTIGATIONS, COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I call up the resolution (H. Res. 204) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That, effective January 3, 1963, the expenses of conducting the studies, investigations, and inquiries authorized by H. Res. 153, Eighty-eighth Congress, incurred by the Committee on Banking and Currency, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, not to exceed $150,000, including expenditures for employment, travel, and subsistence of accountants, experts, investigators, and clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House, on vouchers authorized by such committee or subcommittee, signed by the chairman of such committee or subcommittee, and approved by the Committee on House Administration.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the committee amendments.

The Clerk read as follows:

Line 5, strike out "$150,000" and insert "$100,000".

Line 13, insert the following new paragraph:

"SEC. 2. No part of the funds authorized by this resolution shall be available for expenditure in connection with the study or investigation of any subject which is being investigated for the same purpose by any other committee of the House, and the chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency shall furnish the Committee on House Administration information with respect to any study or investigation intended to be financed from such funds."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

STUDIES AND INVESTIGATIONS, COMMITTEE ON THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I call up the resolution (H. Res. 202) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That, effective January 3, 1963, the expenses of the studies and investigations to be conducted pursuant to H. Res. 142 by the Committee on the District of Columbia, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, not to exceed $50,000, including expenditures for the employment of investigators, attorneys, and experts, and clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, and all expenses necessary for travel and subsistence incurred by members and employees while engaged in the activities of the committee or any subcommittee thereof, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized and signed by the chairman of such committee and approved by the Committee on House Administration.

SEC. 2. The chairman, with the consent of the head of the department or agency concerned, is authorized and empowered to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any other departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 3. The official committee reporters may be used at all hearings held in the District of Columbia, if not otherwise officially engaged.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the committee amendments.

The Clerk read as follows:

Line 5, strike out "$50,000" and insert "$25,000".

Page 2, line 11, insert the following new paragraph:

"SEC. 4. No part of the funds authorized by this resolution shall be available for expenditure in connection with the study or investigation of any subject which is being investigated for the same purpose by any other committee of the House, and the chairman of the Committee on the District of Columbia shall furnish the Committee on House Administration information with respect to any study or investigation intended to be financed from such funds."

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRIEDEL. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. CURTIS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, while we are talking about committee staffing, may I say this is one of the committees about whose staff there are questions. No effort will be made at this time to do anything further on this, but I thought it would be appropriate to make it clear that some of us feel that a great deal needs to be done in this particular committee and its staffing in order to abide by the spirit and intention of the Reorganization Act of 1946.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the committee amendments are agreed to.

There was no objection.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I call up House Resolution 243 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That, effective January 3, 1963, the expenses of conducting the studies and investigations, authorized by H. Res. 55, Eighty-eighth Congress, incurred by the Committee on Foreign Affairs, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, not to exceed $225,000, including expenditures for the employment of such experts, clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized by such committee or subcommittee, signed by the chairman of the committee, and approved by the Committee on House Administration.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the committee amendments.

The Clerk read as follows:

Line 5, strike out "$225,000" and insert "$112,500".

Line 6, strike out "such".

Line 12, insert the following new paragraph:

"SEC. 2. No part of the funds authorized by this resolution shall be available for expenditure in connection with the study or investigation of any subject which is being investigated for the same purpose by any other committee of the House, and the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs shall furnish the Committee on House Administration information with respect to any study or investigation intended to be financed from such funds."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I call up House Resolution 80 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

> *Resolved*, That effective January 3, 1963, the expenses of conducting the studies and investigations authorized by rule XI(8) incurred by the Committee on Government Operations, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, not to exceed $750,000 including expenditures for employment of experts, special counsel, and clerical, stenographic and other assistants, which shall be available for expenses incurred by said committee or subcommittees within and without the continental limits of the United States, the authority and jurisdiction of said committee and subcommittees in such areas being hereby confirmed, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized by said committee and approved by the Committee on House Administration.
>
> SEC. 2. The official stenographers to committees may be used at all hearings held in the District of Columbia, if not otherwise officially engaged.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. Albert). The Clerk will report the committee amendments.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Line 5, strike out "$750,000" and insert "$600,000".
>
> Lines 9, 10, and 11, strike out "the authority and jurisdiction of said committee and subcommittees in such areas being hereby confirmed,".
>
> Page 2, line 1, after "committee" insert "signed by the chairman thereof".
>
> Page 2, line 6, insert the following new paragraph:
>
> "SEC. 3. No part of the funds authorized by this resolution shall be available for expenditure in connection with the study or investigation of any subject which is being investigated for the same purpose by any other committee of the House, and the chairman of the Committee on Government Operations shall furnish the Committee on House Administration information with respect to any study or investigation intended to be financed from such funds."

Mr. SCHENCK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRIEDEL. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. SCHENCK. Mr. Speaker, this resolution is one where our committee reduced the request by $150,000. I believe the distinguished chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Dawson], is here. I should just like to say that his committee did present a very fine statement to our Committee on House Administration. They also indicated by their statements that they had in various investigations saved a considerable sum of money for the taxpayers of this Nation.

In that connection, and the distinguished gentleman from Illinois can correct me if this is not true, the chairman assured the Committee on House Administration that his Committee on Government Operations makes available to all other committees of the House, including legislative and appropriation committees, information which his committee has developed in its various investigations, in an effort to implement the economies that the gentleman's committee claims it has been able to develop. Is that true?

Mr. FRIEDEL. That is true. That has been testified.

Mr. SCHENCK. The Committee on Government Operations is one of the committees, also, Mr. Speaker, where there can easily be a certain amount of overlapping of jurisdiction and investigation in some of the very same questions being properly considered in other committees, so the amendment placed in this resolution, and included in all the other similar resolutions today is the same language which was included in the authorization resolutions adopted heretofore as proposed by the Committee on Rules, requiring that the chairman clear with the Committee on House Administration as to any possible conflict of jurisdiction and/or duplication of efforts. Is that not true?

Mr. FRIEDEL. That applies to all these resolutions today.

Mr. SCHENCK. Mr. Speaker, I thought it would be well that this be emphasized at this point. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRIEDEL. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. CURTIS. I want to thank the gentleman and to take this time to point out, as I did before, that this is another committee concerning which considerable evidence developed as to whether the spirit of the 1946 act is being carried out, as so ably expressed I might say by the majority leader, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. Albert]. I think probably with this kind of notification and later discussion with the chairman of a committee and others on this committee, perhaps these alleged abuses, and they may not be abuses, but at least the allegations and difficulties experienced in the past will be worked out. This is particularly important because under the rules of the House this is the main investigating committee of the House and has a great deal of responsibility. Here is where partisanship is apt to creep more readily, I say that not in the way of criticism but as comment. The function of the committee is such that it has a more difficult job trying to abide by the spirit of the 1946 act.

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, I would like to point out to my colleague that the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Dawson] and the ranking minority member [Mr. Riehlman] appeared to be in perfect agreement as to the use of minority staff employees on subcommittees. Although Chairman Dawson would not pin himself down to percentages, they seemed to be in agreement as to the matter of representation of the minority.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRIEDEL. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. CURTIS. I appreciate that and that is one reason that nothing further is being pushed here at this time. However, I do point out, I think anyone reading the Record and looking into this matter in the past, will find abuses. Incidentally, one reason we established an ad hoc committee here was to take off the shoulders of the individuals who might be on these particular committees the onus of seemingly having to criticize their own committee. These converts here, perhaps, will bring about a healthier relationship. I do call attention to the fact that there have been abuses here in the past and I am very hopeful that this will be cleared up and carried through as I think it will.

Mr. SCHENCK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. FRIEDEL. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. SCHENCK. Mr. Speaker, I want to express my appreciation to the chairman of our full committee, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Burleson], and also the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. Albert], the distinguished majority leader, when they indicate to the House that the majority party does assume and will assume the responsibility for the proper administration of these various staffing questions.

Mr. FRIEDEL. I would like to say further that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Dawson], the chairman of the Committee on Government Operations, appeared before our committee and made a very good case. He stated before the committee that $1,300 million has been saved for the Government as a result of his committee investigations.

I think that is very good business. Of course, if the distinguished chairman of the committee wants to come back, and if the committee feels that they need more funds, and if they can justify the request before our committee, of course, our committee will be very glad to listen to the request.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. Albert). The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROVIDING FUNDS FOR THE COMMITTEE ON HOUSE ADMINISTRATION

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I call up the resolution (H. Res. 165) providing funds for the Committee on House Administration, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

> *Resolved*, That, effective January 3, 1963, in carrying out its duties during the Eighty-eighth Congress, the Committee on House

Administration is authorized to incur such expenses (not in excess of $10,000) as it deems advisable. Such expenses shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized and approved by such committee, and signed by the chairman thereof.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the committee amendment:

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 1, line 4, strike out "$10,000" and insert "$5,000".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. FRIEDEL].

Mr. SCHENCK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRIEDEL. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. SCHENCK. Mr. Speaker, I would just like to express my deep appreciation to the chairman of our full committee and to the chairman of the subcommittee and to all the members of both the subcommittee and the full committee, and especially my colleagues on the minority side for the fine cooperation and work that our committee has done. I believe the committee has been completely conscientious and very hardworking and that it has tried to do a good job. I personally think they have succeeded. I feel the leadership of our committee and the members of our committee staff are to be commended and I am happy to congratulate and express my appreciation to each and all of them.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I call up House Resolution 135 with committee amendments and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That effective January 3, 1963, the expenses of investigations and studies to be made pursuant to H. Res. 79 by the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs acting as a whole or by subcommittee, not to exceed $60,000, including expenditures for the employment of stenographic and other assistants, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized by such committee, signed by the chairman of such committee, and approved by the Committee on House Administration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the committee amendments.

The Clerk read the committee amendments, as follows:

Line 4, strike out "$60,000" and insert "$30,000".

Line 10, insert the following new paragraph:

"SEC. 2. No part of the funds authorized by this resolution shall be available for expenditure in connection with the study or investigation of any subject which is being investigated for the same purpose by any other committee of the House, and the chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs shall furnish the Committee on House Administration information with respect to any study or investigation intended to be financed from such funds."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMITTEE ON MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration I call up House Resolution 30, with committee amendments, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That, effective January 3, 1963, the expenses of the studies and investigations to be conducted pursuant to H. Res. 29 by the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, not to exceed $75,000, including expenditures for the employment of investigators, attorneys, and experts, and clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, and all expenses necessary for travel and subsistence incurred by members and employees while engaged in the activities of the committee or any subcommittee thereof, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized and signed by the chairman of such committee and approved by the Committee on House Administration.

SEC. 2. The chairman, with the consent of the head of the department or agency concerned, is authorized and empowered to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any other departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 3. The official committee reporters may be used at all hearings held in the District of Columbia, if not otherwise officially engaged.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the committee amendments.

The Clerk read the committee amendments, as follows:

Line 5, strike out "$75,000" and insert "$37,500".

Page 2, line 11, insert the following new paragraph:

"SEC. 4. No part of the funds authorized by this resolution shall be available for expenditure in connection with the study or investigation of any subject which is being investigated for the same purpose by any other committee of the House, and the chairman of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries shall furnish the Committee on House Administration information with respect to any study or investigation intended to be financed from such funds."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMITTEE ON POST OFFICE AND CIVIL SERVICE

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration I call up House Resolution 152, with committee amendments, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That, effective from January 3, 1963, the expenses of conducting the investigations and studies pursuant to H. Res. 151, by the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, not to exceed $125,000, including expenditures for the employment of investigators, attorneys, and clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized by such committee or subcommittee, signed by the chairman of such committee, and approved by the Committee on House Administration.

SEC. 2. The official committee reporters may be used at all hearings held in the District of Columbia if not otherwise officially engaged.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the committee amendments.

The Clerk read the committee amendments, as follows:

Line 5, strike out "$125,000" and insert "$62,500".

Line 14, insert the following new paragraph:

"SEC. 3. No part of the funds authorized by this resolution shall be available for expenditure in connection with the study or investigation of any subject which is being investigated for the same purpose by any other committee of the House, and the Chairman of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service shall furnish the Committee on House Administration information with respect to any study or investigation intended to be financed from such funds."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROVIDING FUNDS FOR THE EXPENSES OF THE STUDIES, INVESTIGATIONS, AND INQUIRIES AUTHORIZED BY HOUSE RESOLUTION 56

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I call up House Resolution 236, with committee amendments, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That, effective January 3, 1963, the expenses of the studies and investigations to be conducted pursuant to H. Res. 56 by the Committee on Public Works, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, not to exceed $975,000 including expenditures for the employment of investigators, attorneys, and experts, and clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, and all expenses necessary for travel and subsistence incurred by members and employees while engaged in the activities of the committee or any subcommittee thereof, as the chairman deems necessary, shall be paid out of the contigent fund of the House on vouchers authorized and signed by the chairman of such committee and approved by the Committee on House Administration.

SEC. 2. The chairman, with the consent of the head of the department or agency concerned, is authorized and empowered to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any other departments or agencies of the Government.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the committee amendments:

Line 4, strike out "$975,000" and insert "$450,000".

Page 2, line 8, insert the following new paragraph:

"SEC. 3. No part of the funds authorized by the Committee on Post Office and Civil penditure in connection with the study or investigation of any subject which is being investigated for the same purpose by any other committee of the House, and the chairman of the Committee on Public Works shall furnish the Committee on House Administration information with respect to any study or investigation intended to be financed from such funds."

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRIEDEL. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I am a member of the subcommittee that investigated highways and that is what this matter concerns.

I want to observe that I have some very serious complaints about the way the subcommittee has been functioning. There have been violations of both the spirit of the act and the act itself, in my opinion.

One of reasons that makes necessary the type of legislation the committee is studying comes from this.

I want to say to the House we will be pressing for an improvement of this situation so that the minority may have an opportunity to fully and properly function and to make contributions and be recognized. It has been inadequate, in some ways unfair. There has been a certain kind of arrogance here also that makes necessary some attention by the House to this subcommittee.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRIEDEL. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. This is the first of two resolutions dealing with the Public Works Commission. Each of the two resolutions is on a 1-year basis, providing a total of more than a half-million dollars for the purpose of investigations, is that correct?

Mr. FRIEDEL. For 1 year it will be $475,000.

Mr. GROSS. I said over a half-million dollars.

Will the gentleman tell me why these two were not brought in together in one resolution? Why do we have two resolutions from the same committee providing an expenditure for investigative purposes?

Mr. FRIEDEL. One is for real property acquisition. That is a subcommittee. The other was for the full committee and highway investigation.

Mr. GROSS. One is for real property acquisition?

Mr. FRIEDEL. Yes.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman means through this process the committee is acquiring land?

Mr. FRIEDEL. Yes; acquiring land through legislation, including rights-of-way.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman is dealing with the title of a subcommittee, is he not?

Mr. FRIEDEL. This is a special subcommittee of the Public Works Committee that deals with real property acquisition.

Mr. GROSS. That is different. This does not deal directly with the acquisition of land?

Mr. FRIEDEL. No.

Mr. GROSS. This is for the purpose of financing a subcommittee which is investigating the acquisition of land?

Mr. FRIEDEL. Yes.

Mr. GROSS. Why could not these have been brought in together?

Mr. FRIEDEL. Because one is a select subcommittee.

Mr. GROSS. I do not understand why the appropriation of this money is not brought in or called for under one resolution.

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRIEDEL. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. I should like to make an explanation. This select committee came at the request of many Members of this House and from the Budget Bureau, as well as the Executive Office of the President.

It will be remembered that I explained the purpose of it 2 years ago.

This committee was authorized unanimously by the Committee on Public Works to come after these other committees had been constituted. I am delighted to say to the gentleman from Iowa and to the membership of the House that this is purely a bipartisan committee. We have selected able people. We have borrowed capable people from the Bureau of Public Works and the Corps of Engineers. It is a real factual study. It is a laborious study, and we hope to finish it this year.

Mr. GROSS. I do not care to prolong this discussion, but I still do not have an answer to the question of why this money is not being provided through the process of one resolution. Why do we have two resolutions to finance two investigations by the same parent committee?

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. This was a select committee. I can say to my distinguished friend and colleague that this select committee is delighted to stand on its own feet.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I do not question that, I will say to my friend from Tennessee, I do not question the committee or its jurisdiction. The question I would like to have answered is, Why do we have two resolutions calling for money for two investigating committees? Why do we not have one resolution covering both of them?

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. This covers only the Committee on Real Estate Acquisition. But if you put both of them together, all you have to do is add the two figures.

Mr. GROSS. I wonder if that is the reason, since this would total more than half a million dollars—if it would look smaller in two resolutions.

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. This committee was constituted after the other committees and I am delighted to repeat that this committee is proud to stand on its record of accomplishment of real work and pure bipartisanship. The gentleman from New York [Mr. ROBISON], the ranking minority member, and I can tell you that there have been no politics there whatsoever. We have worked that happily together.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRIEDEL. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. CRAMER. Of course, the Public Works Committee has a Highway Investigating Subcommittee, and then there is this Rights-of-Way Acquisition Subcommittee and there is the full committee. I think for the purpose of the record it should be stated that this happens to be a situation that relates back to the remarks of the distinguished minority leader, and is somewhat of a unique situation, although I understand it applies also to certain other committees. That is a situation where the caucus of the minority members of the committee itself asked for additional staffing. I might say that I do not think it was on a partisan basis that the request was made, but was rather an attempt to carry out the spirit and intent of the Reorganization Act which I do not think can ever be construed to mean that the minority shall not have adequate tools with which to work to do the job that has to be done under our two-party system in America. So the minority in this instance specifically asked the majority, and it was brought up in the full committee, for an additional staff member for the Investigating Committee on Highways and an additional staff member for the full committee. The majority did agree to one additional staff member to be assigned to the full committee as a member of that full committee staff, but also assignable to the Subcommittee on Highways.

I will say that I think the request of the minority was reasonable, for one additional member on the Investigating Committee for Highways and one for the full committee. I do not think it was on a partisan basis, because I think this House well knows that there have been many instances where there were differences of opinion on policy matters and on basic issues; and it so happens that it was largely that the minority was in disagreement with the majority. We could enumerate many issues, many bills that came before the House on which minority reports were filed. The position of the minority has been that in order to carry out the duty of providing the facts and to do proper research on both sides of these issues it is essential that the minority have available an adequate staff to do research on these questions, to write or to help write minority reports, and so forth. So I think the RECORD should clearly show that the minority did ask for two, the majority did permit one. So some headway is being made. And I am hopeful that an additional staff member will be forthcoming in the near future.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the committee amendments.

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration I call up the resolution (H. Res. 237) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the further expenses of the investigation and study authorized by H. Res. 56 of the Eighty-eighth Congress incurred by the Committee on Public Works acting as a whole or by subcommittee, not to exceed $150,000, including expenditures for the employment of experts, and clerical, stenographic, and other assistance, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized by such committee, signed by the chairman thereof and approved by the Committee on House Administration.

Sec. 2. The official stenographers to committees may be used at all meetings held in the District of Columbia unless otherwise officially engaged.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the committee amendments.

The Clerk read as follows:

Line 1, following "That" insert "effective January 3, 1963,".

Line 4, strike out "$150,000" and insert "$125,000".

Line 13, insert the following new paragraph:

"Sec. 3. No part of the funds authorized by this resolution shall be available for expenditure in connection with the study or investigation of any subject which is being investigated for the same purpose by any other committee of the House, and the Chairman of the Committee on Public Works shall furnish the Committee on House Administration information with respect to any study or investigation intended to be financed from such funds."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMITTEE ON SCIENCE AND ASTRONAUTICS

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I call up House Resolution 177 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That effective January 3, 1963, the expenses of the studies, investigations, and inquiries authorized by H. Res. 143, incurred by the Committee on Science and Astronautics, acting as a whole or as a duly authorized subcommittee, not to exceed $300,000, including expenditures for employment, travel, and subsistence of attorneys, experts, and consultants (including personnel of the Library of Congress performing services on reimbursable detail) and clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized by such committee, signed by the chairman of such committee, and approved by the Committee on House Administration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the committee amendments.

The Clerk read as follows:

Line 5, strike out "$300,000" and insert "$150,000".

Line 13, insert the following new paragraph:

"Sec. 2. No part of the funds authorized by this resolution shall be available for expenditure in connection with the study or investigation of any subject which is being investigated for the same purpose by any other committee of the House, and the chairman of the Committee on Science and Astronautics shall furnish the Committee on House Administration information with respect to any study or investigation intended to be financed from such funds."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I call up House Resolution 222 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That effective January 3, 1963, the expenses of the study and investigation to be conducted by the select committee created by H. Res. 13, not to exceed $614,000, including expenditures for the employment of investigators, attorneys, and clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized by such committee, signed by the chairman thereof, and approved by the Committee on House Administration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the committee amendments.

The Clerk read as follows:

Line 3, strike out "$614,000" and insert "$275,000".

Line 10, insert the following new paragraph:

"Sec. 2. No part of the funds authorized by this resolution shall be available for expenditure in connection with the study or investigation of any subject which is being investigated for the same purpose by any other committee of the House, and the chairman of the Select Committee on Small Business shall furnish the Committee on House Administration information with respect to any study or investigation intended to be financed from such funds."

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. McCulloch].

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Speaker, the Select Committee on Small Business of the House is one of the few House committees that has no legislative authority. In view of that fact, that part of the requested appropriation approved by the Committee on House Administration is a very substantial one.

I am pleased to say I have discussed this matter with the chairman of this committee and there is a definite commitment that we will have three minority staff members, together with one additional minority staff member, if it be necessary, under conditions we experienced in the last session of Congress, when proposed reports came to us near the end of the session in great number and in great length.

I notice the chairman of the committee is at the committee table. I hope he will verify the statement I have made.

Mr. EVINS. The gentleman and I have discussed this matter. Three members will be assigned to the minority, and the full staff of the committee will be available to all members of the committee at any time. The staff will serve all members of the committee. In the past staff members have been assigned to the members of the minority and they have not used those staff members. So the staff will serve all members of the committee.

Mr. McCULLOCH. The gentleman from Tennessee agrees that the report I have made is correct, that there will be three staff members to be selected by and responsible to the minority, together with what other additional staff people may be necessary if conditions warrant it?

Mr. EVINS. Yes, whatever is justified and needed and is justified before the Committee on House Administration. As I said to the gentleman, three members will be assigned to the minority and the full staff of the committee will always be available to serve the committee at any time. If justification and need for additional staff members for the minority is shown, we will certainly take that matter into consideration. We want the staff to serve all members of the committee.

Actually, we have been trying to reduce the staff somewhat and make it more economical in its operation. But the reason the funds were increased this time is because of the request of the minority. I say again to the gentleman that the services of the full staff will always be available, of course.

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRIEDEL. I yield 1 more minute to the gentleman.

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Speaker, of course, a part of the cost of operation of this committee is by reason of the request, or demands if you please, of the minority. As of this time, Mr. Speaker, those requests or that demand was for three staff members for that committee.

Mr. EVINS. That is correct.

Mr. McCULLOCH. I want the Record to reflect that fact. We have not asked, at this time, for more than three members and we make contingent request for additional minority staff now so that the House may know if conditions develop as they developed last year, additional minority staff will be needed, and will be available.

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York [Mr. Lindsay].

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for this time in order to compliment the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. McCulloch] who is the ranking minority member both of the Committee on the Judiciary of which I am a member and the Committee on Small Business. I am also a member of the Schwengel Committee on Minority Staffing. In general, and I think the point has to be made again and again, what we are seeking to do is to see to it that there are adequate professional staffs, adequate in the sense that all members, including those on the minority, have adequate professional help whenever it is necessary for us to use the services of professionals to do our jobs as members of the minority.

I would like to compliment the gentleman from Ohio for his cooperation and for the pressure that he has exerted to see to it that the staff is up to snuff. He has done so on the Committee on the Judiciary and on the Committee on Small Business—with results in both cases.

I think the point should be made also that those of us who are members of the committee chaired by the distinguished gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Schwengel] are putting the House on notice that we do not intend to let up on this subject. We are going to be watchdogs on the subject of staffing and staffing practices. We will continue to insist upon our rights. We intend to report on this subject from time to time and our special committee will be a continuing committee. We will point out weaknesses where they exist and ask for improvements where improvements are desirable.

I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRIEDEL. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, what the gentleman from Ohio, the ranking minority member of our committee [Mr. McCulloch] has said with respect to the allocation of three staff members to the minority is true and accurate. There has been a definite understanding and agreement as to it and as to this I agree. But I am a little bit taken by surprise when he now says that there was a promise or an agreement or a definite commitment for another appointment. I did say to the gentleman, if it could be justified and needed and if it could be shown that it was necessary, we would try to work the matter out and that the staff of the full committee would always be available to serve the gentleman and all members of the committee. But I have not gone so far as to make a definite commitment for an additional minority staff appointment and I wanted the record to be clear on that point.

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRIEDEL. I yield 1 minute to the gentleman.

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to convey the opinion or the theory or the fact that there was a definite commitment for an additional minority staff employee, at this time. But I do mean to imply and I reiterate the implication that there was a definite understanding so far as I remember the understanding, and I am sure my memory is accurate, that if we ran into the same conditions that we ran into last fall when it took us into the third day of January 1963, when staff people were working 10 and 12 and 14 hours a day, that there would be need for and additional minority staff help, would be forthcoming. That was my understanding then and it is my understanding now. If it be not accurate, then I would be in opposition to the resolution now before the House.

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I call up House Resolution 249 with committee amendments and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That, effective January 4, 1963, expenses of conducting the investigations authorized by section 18 of the rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives, incurred by the Committee on Un-American Activities, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, not to exceed $360,000, including expenditures for employment of such experts, special counsel, investigators, and such clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, and which shall also be available for expenses incurred by said committee or subcommittees outside the continental limits of the United States, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized by said committee and signed by the chairman of the committee, and approved by the Committee on House Administration.

Sec. 2. That the official stenographers to committees may be used at all hearings, if not otherwise officially engaged.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the committee amendments.

The Clerk read the committee amendments, as follows:

Line 1, strike out "January 4" and insert "January 3".

Line 6, strike out "such".

Line 7, strike out "such".

Line 8, strike out all after the word "assistants", and strike out all of line 9 and through "States" in line 10.

Page 2, line 7, insert the following new paragraph:

"Sec. 3. No part of the funds authorized by this resolution shall be available for expenditure in connection with the study or investigation of any subject which is being investigated for the same purpose by any other committee of the House, and the chairman of the Committee on Un-American Activities shall furnish the Committee on House Administration information with respect to any study or investigation intended to be financed from such funds."

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. Roosevelt].

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous material.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, along with several of my colleagues, I appeared before the Rules Committee in support of my resolution, House Resolution 69, to eliminate rule XI, which provides for the Committee on Un-American Activities, and to transfer its legitimate jurisdiction over matters involving the security of our Nation to the Committee on the Judiciary. In going before the Rules Committee, my ardent hope was that it would act favorably by reporting out House Resolution 69 so that its merits or demerits could be debated by the full membership of the House. In my judgment, this is the only place such a resolution should be considered in view of the fact that it is so vitally important to a number of us here and a large number of the people that we represent. However, my resolution, and two similar resolutions presented by my colleagues, were tabled, thereby preventing their consideration by the full House membership.

At the outset, I want to make it explicit that I do not consider the appropriations of the House Un-American Activities Committee the real issue. Every legally constituted committee of the House must have appropriations to function, though I have always felt that in the case of House Un-American Activities Committee, it received a great deal more than it could possibly use without excessive waste. In my mind, the real issue was to get my resolution favorably reported by the Rules Committee so that the full House could act in the manner it deemed necessary. I reiterate that by tabling the resolutions before it, the Rules Committee did not allow the House to take action. Therefore, for the record, I must use the occasion for consideration of House Un-American Activities Committee's appropriations to make my position clear.

I also call to the attention of my colleagues an excellent editorial which appeared in the February 26 Washington Post, the text of which reads as follows:

Orderly Procedure

The House Rules Committee is to hold hearings today on a resolution introduced by Representative John V. Lindsay, a Republican, and cosponsored by Democratic Representatives Roosevelt and Farbstein, to transfer the functions of the House Committee on Un-American Activities to the House Committee on the Judiciary. We hope that the Rules Committee will give the House itself a chance to vote on the issue promptly, with provision for full and free debate.

The proposal is a reasonable and serious one, advocated by House Members of the highest integrity and urged for many years by respected students of congressional procedure. It deserves to be considered and discussed on its merits. Unfortunately, however, the chairman of the House Un-American Activities Committee, Representative Francis Walter, is not willing to keep the debate on this level. This is the way he opened a recent attack on the proposal:

"At the direction of Moscow, one of the most intense Communist drives to destroy the House Committee on Un-American Activities that has ever been waged is now in

> full swing. * * * It is to demand outright abolition of the committee by amending the House rules. Knowing, however, that there is no possibility of achieving this at present, the party is concentrating on a half-a-loaf strategy. It has called for the transfer of the committee's functions to a subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee and, failing that, a large cut in the committee's appropriation. Either move would drastically impair the committee's operations and, the party hopes, pave the way for its complete destruction."
>
> This is really unworthy of a Member of the House of Representatives. Whatever the hopes of the Communists may be, there is an abundance of sound, practical reasons for making the House Un-American Activities Committee subordinate to the Judiciary Committee.
>
> With its present independent status, the House Un-American Activities Committee roves all over the congressional domain, intruding into all sorts of matters—foreign affairs, communications, criminal law, immigration, labor, education—which lie within the jurisdiction of regular, established legislative committees. The principal legitimate focus of the House Un-American Activities Committee interest is in the devising of criminal statutes to counter subversive activities in the United States. The Judiciary Committee ought to have exclusive control over all criminal statutes, assigning to a subcommittee on subversive affairs whatever may belong there.
>
> In a letter to this newspaper, September 13, 1955, Mr. WALTER himself wrote as follows: "I have advocated * * * altering the status of the committee to make it a part of the Committee on the Judiciary. I believe that both Houses of Congress should have committees to investigate subversion and un-American activities. The Senate established the Internal Security Committee as a part of the Judiciary Committee with results that are well worth studying. I have proposed this change * * * solely in order to achieve the best possible coordination of the present investigative role of the Committee on Un-American Activities and the legislative purposes of the Committee on the Judiciary, the source of all our major antisubversive legislation."
>
> If this be communism, or pro-communism, let Mr. WALTER make the most of it.

So wrote the Washington Post, and in the same spirit the words I speak today are not said as a personal attack upon the members of the Committee on Un-American Activities. Rather I speak in a positive and hopeful spirit to urge the reestablishment of full and meaningful freedom of speech, press, and assembly in our land, while retaining a committee with jurisdiction over actual threats to our Government, such as sabotage and espionage.

I cherish our democracy with all my heart, and I believe with Mr. Justice Black that the "very foundation of a true democracy and the foundation upon which this Nation was built is the fact that government is responsive to the views of its citizens, and no nation can continue to exist on such a foundation unless its citizens are wholly free to speak out fearlessly for or against their officials and their laws." Black, J., dissenting in *Braden* v. *United States*, 365 U.S. 890, 1961; 81 Supreme Court 584, 592.

This fundamental concept of democracy is enshrined in the first amendment to the Constitution, which declares:

> Congress shall make no law * * * abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press; or the right of the people peaceably to assemble, and to petition the Government for a redress of grievances.

I urged a transfer of the jurisdiction of the House Committee on Un-American Activities to the Committee on the Judiciary because it has, for many years, made a mockery of the fundamental right of our people to "be wholly free to speak out fearlessly for or against their officials and their laws." It has done this by effectively and falsely correlating many legitimate causes, such as the quests for peace, civil rights, and civil liberties with communism and un-American activities. By misusing the authority of Government to thus define what is politically American or un-American, the committee has suppressed the constitutional rights of many people with diverse and anti-Communist views. Many such persons are now afraid to speak out on the great issues of the day for fear they will be labeled as "Communists," "dupes," or "pinks." Many also fear that by taking an unpopular, but perhaps correct, stand, they will lose their jobs, or, worse yet, someday be hauled before a congressional inquisition, with all its dread implications.

However, the personal damage to witnesses and the fear it strikes into the hearts of many others is not the full extent of the havoc the committee has wreaked on our democratic system of government. More important is the fact that its effect of silencing criticism has created a dangerous situation whereby our Government may undertake stupid or perilous policies, and only a few, brave, ineffective voices may be raised in opposition. We cannot allow such an intolerable situation to persist. We cannot do so not only on the ground of upholding our oaths to uphold the Constitution, but also on the practical and crucial ground that in an age when, as President Kennedy has warned, a "nuclear sword of Damocles" hangs over mankind, we cannot let Government make life and death decisions without the citizenry being able to criticize and help to determine them. We, as a body charged with the sacred constitutional duty to protect our land and its people must, therefore, end those functions of the Un-American Activities Committee which prohibit our people from fully and fearlessly exercising their constitutional rights of freedom of speech, press, and assembly.

Lest there be any doubt as to what the committee actually probes, for the most part it investigates the lawful expression of lawful ideas, peaceful and constitutionally protected activities such as petition campaigns, rallies, picket protests, and so forth, or it simply asks friendly and unfriendly witnesses for names of other alleged Communists. Thus, most of the committee's investigations fall within the areas of speech and peaceful assembly, activities protected against Government interference by the first amendment.

Nor do I need to emphasize that many of the inquisitions conducted by the committee are unrelated to the only legitimate purpose of a congressional investigating committee, the gathering of information for possible legislative use. As Chief Justice Warren warned Congress in the case of Watkins against United States:

> The power of the Congress to conduct investigations is inherent in the legislative process. That power is broad * * *. But, broad as is this power of inquiry, it is not unlimited. There is no general authority to expose the private affairs of individuals without justification in terms of the functions of the Congress. * * * Nor is the Congress a law enforcement or trial agency. These are functions of the executive and judicial departments of Government. No inquiry is an end in itself; it must be related to, and in furtherance of, a legitimate task of the Congress. Investigations conducted solely for the personal aggrandizement of the investigators or to punish those investigated are indefensible. *Watkins* v. *United States,* 354 U.S. 178, 187, 1957.

The committee members and staff have made all too clear many times that their primary purpose is exposure, rather than gathering evidence for legislation. Since the Watkins decision, their language has been somewhat more circumspect about their real purpose. However, that primary purpose of exposure of recalcitrant witnesses still exists, no matter how cleverly concealed by failure to state it baldly.

There are a number of other unanswerable counts against the committee, as presently constituted. First, the committee has become an agency for the destruction of human dignity and constitutional rights other than those embodied in the first amendment. The committee is notorious for its contempt for the legal rights of its victims. It bears a large share of the blame for the unfortunate and dangerous public contempt for the fifth amendment's vital protection of the accused against self-incrimination. The committee has all too thoroughly and disastrously destroyed the real meaning of that immunity; namely, that it protects the innocent as well as the guilty against such abuses as forced confessions and proof of guilt by clever cross-examination.

We have become inured to thinking of those called to testify by the Un-American Activities Committee as victims, rather than as witnesses. They are endlessly dragooned before the committee and accused. Secret sources, arrogance, rudeness, maximized defamation, and the threat of prosecution for perjury or contempt if the witness does not cooperate are constant ingredients in this spectacle. Those willing to testify about themselves are then coerced into accusing others, and thus become agents of further havoc.

Second, despite the existence of the police and prosecuting agencies of the United States, the 50 States, and thousands of localities, and their effectiveness, the committee has commissioned itself as a roving police and prosecution agency to haul persons and groups before it, accuse them, and force them to either answer under oath or claim their constitutional rights. Yet it acts with the aid of immunities, such as that which protects it against libel and slander suits, and with powers which we would never dream of giving to the police or public prosecutors.

Third, the committee also wrongly acts as a court, for it judges and severely punishes those persons and groups who refuse to cooperate. The punishments of loss of the ability to earn a living and the worse punishment of being labeled as a "Red" are often meted out by the committee. Yet, again it is not subject to the restraints of fairness and impartiality which we require of our courts.

Fourth, there is no longer any need or justification for the committee, if ever there was. The committee, contrary to what it would have us believe, is not this Nation's major shield against domestic communism. On the contrary, it is the Federal Bureau of Investigation and other counter-espionage agencies of the Federal Government which have the basic responsibility for guarding us against those who would commit sabotage, espionage, or other such overt acts aimed at our destruction. State and local officials and police also have important roles in defending us against such acts.

Let us face facts—the committee does not catch spies or saboteurs. For example, when Harry Gold, who was involved in the Rosenberg case, was arrested, his name was not among the thousands of names contained in the committee's ubiquitous files. Nor was it the committee which exposed the master Soviet spy, Rudolph Abel. Neither can the fact that 12 years ago the committee unmasked Alger Hiss be used as proof of a current need for its continued existence as it presently functions. In fact, about all the committee really produces these days is embarrassing confrontations with women seeking a peaceful world, phony movies about student opposition to its hearings, and the usual lists of alleged Reds. These alleged Communists are almost all already well-known to the FBI, the agency charged with apprehending criminals, for most committee evidence is simply a repetition of the tales of FBI undercover agents or disillusioned ex-Communists who are cooperating with the FBI. Thus, the titillating revelations about newly uncovered alleged Communist Party members is pretty old hat by the time the committee dramatically reveals its latest findings. We all remember the absurd situation a couple of years ago when the committee traipsed about the country and repeatedly had a customs official open the same mail sack containing foreign Communist propaganda to the surprise and shock of the committee.

Occasionally, of course, the committee does obtain a contempt of Congress conviction against a recalcitrant witness, when the appellate courts do not reverse the decision. However, I cannot recall the committee's investigations resulting in the conviction of anyone for sabotage, espionage, the unconstitutional denial of a qualified southern Negro's right to vote, or any other crime directed against our form of government.

It is partly because the committee has no real role in guarding us against internal threats to law and order that the committee tends to stray over into other jurisdictions, and has repeatedly shown its inability to mind it own business. It appears to have an uncontrollable urge to encroach upon the jurisdiction of other committees and governmental agencies, including the police, the Justice Department, the courts, and other levels of Government. A shameful example of this was the 1959 incident when it tried to pressure local California school boards into firing certain teachers. However, this House never committed such policing functions to the committee.

It is also difficult for me to find any rational correlation between the fact that the committee received an appropriation for $50,000 in 1945, when there were 64,500 known Communists, and $665,178.36 for 1961 and 1962, when there were fewer than 10,000 Communists in a population of 180 million. Not even inflation and the higher costs of Government can justify that increase. Of course, when I refer to the excessive cost of the committee's operations, I have not included its staff payroll nor the additional appropriations which we regularly make to cover the costs of additional printings of its invaluable reports.

To criticism that funds for the committee are disproportionately high, the committee and its supporters will probably respond that while it is true that the number of hard core Communists has reached its lowest point in history, the number of dupes has increased. Thus the danger is greater than ever and we must continue the committee with even higher appropriations. Does this mean that by some weird process of diminishing numbers, when we have no Communists we shall still have a great danger of internal subversion? To me, this argument of the committee is absurd.

We also face the fact that our bipartisan attempt to transfer the jurisdiction of the Un-American Activities Committee to the Judiciary Committee again met with the charge that the Communists are behind the campaign.

As I have said before, we are obviously living in a hostile, dangerous world in which communism poses a grave international threat. But that does not mean we must make all of our decisions by reaction—by determining on which side of every question the Communists lie, and then automatically voting the opposite way.

Of course, I do not care if the Communists do or do not applaud my efforts to seek the transfer of the jurisdiction of the House Un-American Activities Committee. I am not doing it for them or for any other group. I speak only for those who like myself believe we can fight communism without discarding basic and fundamental American rights. I do it to help our citizens once again feel free to fully use their constitutional rights without fear. I also propose the transfer of jurisdiction to strengthen the good reputation of this House.

Lastly, the new Members of Congress may be surprised to know that among those who favor the transfer of the jurisdiction of the Un-American Activities Committee is its present chairman, the distinguished FRANCIS E. WALTER, of Pennsylvania. In sworn testimony during 1960, yes, 1960, in the case of *United States* v. *Yellin*, Criminal No. 3023, U.S. District Court, Northern District of Indiana, Hammond division, Chairman WALTER stated:

> Answer. No. If you want my personal feeling about the matter, I am 1 of the 42 men who voted against creating the committee. I thought that its function should be within the framework of the Judiciary Committee, just as it is in the Senate, where this work is done by a subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee.
>
> Question. Do you still feel that way?
>
> Answer. Of course.

I hope I am not too severe when I say to Mr. WALTER that he should not change his mind now just because the Communists have come around to his way of thinking. I refer, of course, to Mr. WALTER's article in the January 31, 1963, newsletter of the American Security Council, entitled "To Still Freedom's Voice."

Mr. Speaker, again I must declare that it is an unfortunate thing that we have continued such a committee and lent it our powers and prestige. However, we can end its course and regain our powers by transferring its legitimate jurisdiction to the House Committee on the Judiciary. The Supreme Court has upheld the bare legality of what we have done in establishing and continuing the Committee on Un-American Activities. However, the mere fact of bare legality should not be the test for this Congress. The Court did not say we have a duty to continue the committee. We have no mandate to continue the abrogation of the constitutional rights of our people, nor are we obligated to profane ourselves any longer in the eyes of the rest of the world. Nor should we be too proud to recognize that we have made a mistake and now rectify our error.

I urge my colleagues to have courage. This issue is not communism versus anticommunism, but as Justice Black has so eloquently declaimed in his dissent in *Barenblatt* v. *United States*, 360 U.S. 109, 1959:

> Ultimately all the questions * * * really boil down to one—whether we as a people will try fearfully and futilely to preserve democracy by adopting totalitarian methods, or whether in accordance with our traditions and our Constitution we will have the confidence and courage to be free.

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. RYAN].

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, once again we are asked to sanction the activities of the House Un-American Activities Committee by providing it with the largest appropriation in its 25-year history—$360,000 for 1963. When I opposed the appropriation 2 years ago, I pointed out that the committee was not only costly to the taxpayers but was violating fundamental rights guaranteed by the Constitution and stifling freedom of dissent. That assessment was confirmed during the 87th Congress.

During its existence the committee's demand for funds has steadily increased. Today it is asking for an appropriation of $360,000 for this one session of Congress alone.

In the 87th Congress, of the 19 standing committees that received appropriations, only 2 were given more than the Committee on Un-American Activities. The $681,000 appropriated for it during the 87th Congress was considerably more than twice the sum allocated to the Banking and Currency Committee—$250,000. It received more than three times as much money as the Foreign Affairs — $155,000 — and Armed Services—$150,000—Committees, and more than nine times as much as Agriculture—$75,000. And today the $360,000 in House Resolution 249 is the third largest appropriation before the House.

For many years the committee's staff has been one of the largest in the House. According to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of January 24, 1963, page 1036, the committee's 50-member staff is exceeded in size only by the staff of the Appropriations Committee. It is roughly three times as large as the staffs of the Committees on Foreign Affairs—15—Banking and Currency—16—and Armed Services—17—and over four times the size of the Agriculture Committee staff—12.

By any test, this committee has been an expensive operation. During the 87th Congress its printing costs, for example, exceeded the appropriations figures of seven standing and two select committees. Indeed, the $126,493.50 expended on printing, which was in addition to the $681,000 appropriation, was $1,493 more than the sum of the appropriations for the District of Columbia, Ways and Means, House Administration, and Interior and Insular Affairs Committees.

Exact figures are difficult to come by, but the printing bill for the committees' reports, consultations, and hearings for the 87th Congress was within a few thousand dollars of equaling the total cost of printing for all other committees in the House.

Traditionally, a committee has been judged by its contributions to legislation. Tested by this criterion, the output of the House Un-American Activities Committee has been notably unimpressive.

Of the 13,420 public bills that were introduced in the 87th Congress, 59 were referred to the committee. Among the 59 bills, there were 20 separate legislative proposals. Among the 20 separate bills, 6 were combined in an omnibus bill—H.R. 6. Five bills were actually brought to the floor of the House. Of these five, one—H.R. 11363—was defeated for failure to obtain the two-thirds vote required for passage. Three others—H.R. 4469, H.R. 5751, and H.R. 12082—passed the House and were quietly interred in the Senate. The fifth—the sole legislative product of 2 years of investigations, reports, speeches, and a $681,000 appropriation—passed both the House and Senate and was signed by the President.

What was the character of this bill? H.R. 9753 amended a provision in the committees' own Internal Security Act of 1950 that had required the Defense Department to publish a list of strategic defense facilities at which members of Communist organizations were barred from employment. This requirement, according to a witness from the Department of Justice, "created a situation dangerous to the national defense, and jeopardized the national security, since that list could be used as a guidebook for sabotage and for the selection of military targets by any potential enemy." This correction of the committee's own mistake was highly desirable. Whether so high an appropriation and so large a staff was needed to amend the law is a question the taxpayers may well ask.

Although the primary business of any standing committee should be legislation, this record of lack of legislative activity is typical.

Increasingly sensitive to the criticism that it has not served a useful legislative purpose, the committee in 1958 requested the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress to prepare a list of the legislative recommendations made by the committee since 1941. The report, entitled "Legislative Recommendations by the House Committee on Un-American Activities," deserves close attention. It contains every legislative recommendation by the committee from 1941 to 1958.

Of the 79 recommendations listed, 34 are identical, having been made in more than one session of Congress.

Of the 45 separate recommendations, 30 were relevant to six statutes: The Internal Security Act of 1950; the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952; the Espionage and Sabotage Act of 1954; the Immunity Act of 1954; the Communist Control Act of 1954—amending the Internal Security Act of 1950—and the Act of August 1, 1956, providing for the registration of individuals trained in foreign espionage schools. Only the first and fifth statutes were reported out as bills by the committee. The remaining four were referred to the Judiciary Committee. Five other recommendations concerned either statutes of limitation or penalties for various criminal offenses and were, accordingly, considered by the Judiciary Committee.

An examination of the 20 legislative proposals, which were referred to the committee in the 87th Congress, will show that the subject matter, with equal or greater propriety, could have been referred to other committees if this committee did not exist at all.

In fact, 12 were identical with, or closely similar to, bills under consideration by other committees of Congress. Only eight had not been taken up by any other committee. It hardly follows, however, that no other committee had jurisdiction over these eight bills. At least four of the bills might have been referred to the Committee on the Judiciary. The remaining four bills fell within the jurisdiction of such varied committees as Merchant Marine and Fisheries, Ways and Means, Education and Labor, and Post Office and Civil Service. In no case did the House have unique jurisdiction—or competence—to deal with the bill.

For example, H.R. 7914 provided that individuals who refused to testify before a Federal agency with respect to subversive activities would lose their rights, privileges, and benefits under the Constitution and, for good measure, under any law of the United States. As I have pointed out previously, legislation denying an individual's rights under the Constitution and all laws of the United States is a textbook illustration of a bill that belongs in the Judiciary Committee. The same comment applies to H.R. 13398, a bill which set forth the finding that the Communist Party of the United States operates under the control of the Soviet Union and would permit actions in district courts to enjoin the activities of such organizations, with absolute priority and precedence to be given to trials involving Communist activities. H.R. 4469, which would have prohibited employment at a waterfront facility or aboard a merchant vessel to any person who willfully failed or refused to appear before a Federal agency when subpenaed or refused to answer questions concerning Communist Party membership, was a matter for either the Judiciary or the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee.

The Ways and Means Committee might have been expected to consider H.R. 4700, a bill providing that no Communist organization should be allowed any deduction or exemption for Federal income tax purposes and that no deduction should be allowed for contributions to a Communist organization. H.R. 596 would have established penalties for labor organization representatives who interfered with the movement of defense materials in foreign commerce during a national emergency. This would seem to fall within the jurisdictions of the Education and Labor Committee. And either the Judiciary or the Post Office and Civil Service Committees were fully qualified to assume responsibility for H.R. 12082, which would have added a new title to the Internal Security Act of 1950 to establish personnel security procedures for the National Security Agency.

There remain two bills, H.R. 9481 and 9944, both amending the Subversive Activities Control Act of 1950 in certain respects. This act, as I have pointed out, is one of the three pieces of enacted legislation for which the committee has itself been responsible. Presumably, then, the two proposed amendments do fall within the jurisdiction of the committee. Yet even in these instances the committee possesses no unique competence to deal with the issues they raise. Inasmuch as the first establishes rewards for persons furnishing information leading to convictions under the Subversive Activities Control Act and the second pertains to procedures for determining whether an organization is a Communist organization, they would seem to be matters within the jurisdiction of the Judiciary Committee.

It is no accident that virtually every bill before the committee equally or more properly belongs under the jurisdiction of some other House committee. Usually, the enabling legislation for a standing committee spells out with some precision the committee's intended jurisdiction. But the House Un-American Activities Committee is charged with investigating activities that are "un-American"—a vague term capable of indefinite expansion. If the search for "un-American" activities has led the committee into areas specifically assigned to the Committees on the Judiciary, Foreign Affairs, Ways and Means, Education and Labor, and Post Office and Civil Service, we must blame not only the committee but also its mandate.

In summary, Mr. Speaker, the committee has been singularly unproductive of legislation and its ill-defined mandate has repeatedly led it into areas better reserved for other committees of the House.

When we realize that in 24 years the House Un-American Activities Committee has been responsible for just three public laws, we may be tempted to ask: What does the committee do with its money? A significant clue, I believe, lies in the $126,493.50 printing bill—a bill which is, of course, entirely separate from the committee's appropriations. The committee appears to be most in its element when holding hearings and publicizing the results. A glance at the record of its printed reports is accordingly instructive.

Reports on hearings, together with research by the committee's staff and reprints from earlier years, brought to 25 the number of publications issued during the 87th Congress. Here again a rough method of classification is useful. Thirteen of the publications are essentially reports on the results of legislative hearings, staff research, and consultations. Five are written as a defense of House Un-American Activities Committee activities. Seven others present the results of investigations into the beliefs of individuals and organized groups.

A conspicuous feature of the reports on staff research and consultations is that they deal preponderantly with the nature of Soviet and world communism. Typical of this group are such titles as: "Facts on Communism—Vol. II: The Soviet Union, From Lenin to Khrushchev"; "The Kremlin's Espionage and Terror Organizations"; "Communist Psychological Warfare—Brainwashing"; "The Ideological Fallacies of Communism"; "World Communist Movement—Selective Chronology, 1918–1957, Vol. I"; "Soviet Total War—Historic Mission of Violence and Deceit." These subjects would seem to be the proper concern of the Central Intelligence Agency, the State Department, and the Foreign Affairs Committee.

As I have already suggested, five of the reports appear to have been written explicitly in response to public criticism of the committee. This practice is understandable—but hardly a justifiable use of the taxpayers' money.

The remaining seven reports record committee investigations of individuals and organizations suspected of harboring un-American beliefs. This notoriously vague and pliable term has sanctified the use of the subpena, the technique of cross-examination without judicial protection, and the contempt citation in a manner calculated to intimidate and discredit, and the publication of committee proceedings are vital to this purpose.

To disseminate information of dubious validity on foreign policy questions; to defend the committee against all critics; and to discredit the beliefs and patriotism of these critics—this, I believe, is the melancholy but not unfair summary one must make of the ends advanced by the publication of the reports.

Up to this point, Mr. Speaker, I have mainly discussed the financial costs of maintaining this committee. But the most serious costs of supporting the committee arise from the damage it has done, and is doing, to our constitutional liberties. These are, ultimately, the costs that we shall have to face.

The primary purpose of the committee's hearings is not to gather information for legislative purposes but to expose and thereby to punish individuals whose opinions the committee considers to be un-American. Mr. Justice Black has demonstrated this in the appendix to his opinion in *Barenblatt* v. *U.S.* (360 U.S. 109, 163–166). Mr. Justice Black notes:

> The chief aim, purpose, and practice of the House Un-American Activities Committee, as disclosed by its many reports, is to try witnesses and punish them because they are or have been Communists or because they refuse to admit or deny Communist affiliations (360 U.S. 109, 153).

Examples are legion of the committee's use of exposure to intimidate dissent. I shall choose only one.

Last December when we were commemorating the 171st anniversary of the Bill of Rights, the committee subpenaed a number of women who had expressed their concern for peace through the Women Strike for Peace. Whether we agree or disagree with the goals of Women Strike for Peace is immaterial. They have an absolute right under the Constitution to gather together, express themselves, to campaign for their ideas. Thousands of housewives all across the country have taken part in the Women Strike for Peace program. But the committee presumably selected specific women upon whose loyalty the committee would cast doubt. The effect would be to discredit the Women Strike for Peace movement, intimidate people from taking part, stifle dissent, and induce conformity of thought and action.

Let us face this issue squarely. We cannot underestimate the threat of international communism. Never before have our democratic principles been in such jeopardy. However, in the struggle to preserve our freedom, we must not lose our freedom. Those who would erode our civil liberties have lost faith in America and the overpowering logic of the words which Thomas Jefferson spoke in his first inaugural address. He said:

> If there be any among us who would wish to dissolve this Union or to change its republican form, let them stand undisturbed as monuments to the safety with which error of opinion may be tolerated when reason is left free to combat it.

Mr. Speaker, in the last Congress, the House contributed over two-thirds of a million dollars to assaults on civil liberties. For how long are we going to underwrite the undermining of the Bill of Rights?

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRIEDEL. I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Speaker, I want to support the resolution to continue to give funds to the Committee on Un-American Activities of the House for the next year.

I do not know of any committee of this House that has a more important task to render to the people of this country than the Committee on Un-American Activities of the House. During the past 20 years that committee has performed a faithful service by calling the attention of the people of this Nation to the dangers and inroads of communism.

The people who take advantage of the fifth amendment, a part of the U.S. Constitution they intend to destroy, desire to take away all liberties from the American people.

I say, Mr. Speaker, that the Committee on Un-American Activities of the House has done a commendable job, and wish to commend the members of that committee, under the chairmanship of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER] during the past years.

I sincerely hope that the House will vote unanimously for adoption of the resolution.

Mr. Speaker, let me say that I am not one of those who is in accord with the killing of the other resolution in the Rules Committee yesterday. I would rather have that brought on the floor here and let the Members vote on it, and let the people of the country know where the Members stand.

Transferring the Committee on Un-American Activities of the House to another committee would, in effect, destroy the committee. The proof of this is the fact that the people who propose this, oppose the House Committee on Un-American Activities.

Mr. Speaker, I support this resolution wholeheartedly

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. WILLIS].

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Speaker, I jotted down three or four points on what the gentleman who spoke to you said in opposition to this committee.

First, it was indicated that the price of the committee was high. That was an issue before the Committee on House Administration. The committee reported out this resolution after full discussion of the situation, and reported it unanimously.

Second, he claimed that the functions of the Committee on Un-American Activities of the House could possibly be better performed by the Committee on the Judiciary. That question was an issue before the Rules Committee yesterday, and that committee voted 12 to 1 against his claim and in favor of retaining this committee as presently set up.

He also claimed a lack of legislation coming from the committee, and stated, as I recall it, that over the years this committee had been responsible for the enactment of only three laws. The actual fact is—for we should keep the record straight—that 42 laws have been passed by the Congress, and signed by the several Presidents over the years, based on the recommendations of the Committee on Un-American Activities.

The committee, I wish to point out, did not report out all these bills—because their subject matter was something within the jurisdiction of other committees—but these bills were based on the committee's recommendations which in, turn, were based on its investigations and hearings. The committee was ultimately responsible for them.

Finally, the gentleman said that the price is high. Well, the price of internal security and national defense will never be cheap. So I should hope that this resolution will be adopted by an overwhelming vote, as usual.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have permission to extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I strongly support adequate appropriations for the Un-American Activities Committee of the House this year as I have each year of my membership in this body. This committee is doing a vital job for our country and I urge the Members of this House to vote favorably for adequate funds for this committee.

Mr. POOL. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the resolution authorizing the appropriation of funds to the House Committee on Un-American Activities so that it may continue its important work in these critical days of our history. It having been decided by the will of the House—and indeed, I believe it is the sentiment of the entire Nation that the House committee continue to function—it follows that the appropriation be adequate to conduct the work which has been authorized and directed. This is a mere act of consistency. That means should be adequate to the end, would seem to admit of no controversy.

The sums requested are truly modest in contrast with the magnitude of the task imposed upon the committee; namely, to inform the Congress and thereby the American people as to the facts and operation of a secret conspiratorial apparatus which has already enslaved a great portion of God's earth. The sums requested are perhaps too modest when we consider the billions being expended by the Communist conspiracy to confuse, degrade, and enslave the world. We must not be pennywise and pound foolish. Let us cheerfully and unanimously authorize this appropriation, in God's name and in the name of every American who has died in the cause of liberty and constitutional government. We cannot, we dare not, do less.

Many years ago a wise English philosopher said: "Knowledge is power." And it is the wisdom of the ancient patriarchs that only the truth shall make us free. We support this appropriation in the interest of knowledge, and in the interest of truth, so that we may be armed with the power of knowledge, to chart our course wisely and effectively as we now grapple with the power of a worldwide conspiracy, which would strangle and suffocate the liberties won for us by generations of noble forebears.

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Speaker, I shall support the appropriation for the House Un-American Activities Committee because I feel it to be a legitimate function of Congress to investigate internal subversion and the need for legislation to combat it.

It would be as unsound to deny the committee funds because of disapproval of some of its acts as to refuse to vote funds to our courts because of disagreement with some of their decisions.

However, I think that the very name of the committee encourages some of the members to impose a subjective test of the term "un-American." It is very tempting to brand as "un-American" anyone with whom we disagree.

It is to be hoped that the committee in the future will not attempt to set itself up as a censor of American political thought and expression, but will confine itself to investigation of internal subversion.

Mr. SCHADEBERG. Mr. Speaker, it has been suggested that the work of the Committee on Un-American Activities is costly. May I remind the Members of this House that freedom never comes cheaply. It certainly would be sheer idiocy to spend 50 billion of the taxpayers dollars each year for military defense of the front door of our Nation and count it too costly to spend $360,000 a year to defend the back door against subversion that could as easily cost us our freedom as loss in military action against the enemy. This appropriation is modest indeed when one considers what would happen to our freedoms if our enemies were allowed to sow the seeds of rot unchecked and uncontested.

The gentleman from New York has attacked the Committee on Un-American Activities for its publications. I want to state for the record that I am very proud of the committee publications and make no apologies for them. I am so proud of them, in fact, that I will now provide him with some statistics about these publications which he, if he so desires can try to use in further attacks against the committee.

In its almost 25 years of existence, the committee has published 497 separate volumes of hearings, reports and consultations. They occupy about 11 feet of shelf space. Over 7 million copies of these publications have been distributed.

The Communists, some not-so-principled liberals and, I regret to say, some Members of this House would have you believe that the information contained in these publications is unrealiable, or actually misleading and false, and that the release of these documents is, therefore, not only a waste of the taxpayers' money, but has done more harm than good.

The truth of the matter, of course, is that the information contained in these publications is factual, reliable and most valuable. Not only Members of the Congress, but educators, clergymen, civic leaders, businessmen, officials of the executive branch, writers, and newsmen use the committee's publications as sources of material for public addresses and articles on communism. The committee's documents are also used as texts and as supplemental reading material in high schools and colleges, seminars, Government training books and even by foreign governments.

Most significant, I believe, is the fact that recognized authorities and scholars, in writing books on the subject of communism, use the committee's hearings and reports as source material. I will not burden the RECORD with a list of all or most of the authors of works on communism who have done this, but I do believe it appropriate to mention a dozen or so at this point.

The late David Dallin, in his book, "Soviet Espionage" published in 1955 by the Yale University Press. The author of about a dozen works on the Soviet and world communism, Dallin was recognized as an outstanding authority on these subjects not only in this country but abroad.

J. Edgar Hoover, in his book, "Masters of Deceit," published by Henry Holt & Co., 1958.

Harry and Bonaro Overstreet, "What We Must Know About Communism," W. W. Norton & Co., Inc., 1958.

David J. Saposs, "Communism in American Unions," McGraw-Hill Book Co., Inc., 1959.

Max M. Kampelman, "The Communist Party Versus the CIO," Frederick A. Praeger, 1957.

Theodore Draper, "American Communism and Soviet Russia," the Viking Press, 1960.

James Burnham, "The Web of Subversion," the John Day Co., 1954.

Robert F. Delaney, "The Literature of Communism in America," the Catholic University of America Press, 1962.

Ralph de Toledano and Victor Lasky, "Seeds of Treason," Funk & Wagnalls Co., 1950.

Donald Drew Egbert and Stow Persons, "Socialism and American Life." Princeton University Press, 1952.

Sanche de Gramont, Pulitzer Prize-winning foreign correspondent for the New York Herald Tribune, "The Secret War," G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1962.

Dr. Anthony T. Bouscaren, "A Guide to Anti-Communist Action," Henry Regnery Co., 1958.

Louis F. Budenz, "Men Without Faces," Harper & Bros., 1948; and "The Techniques of Communism," Henry Regnery Co., 1954.

The Foundation for Religious Action in the Social and Civil Order was formed to unite men and women of all faiths in a great spiritual counteroffensive against world domination by communism. Among the leaders of this organization are such prominent Americans as Thomas E. Murray, Henry Luce, Gordon Gray, William Yandell Elliott, Rev. Billy Graham, Rabbi Norman Gerstenfeld, Rev. Dr. Frederick Brown Harris, Chaplain of the Senate, Rev. Dr. Ralph W. Sockman, Rev. Dr. Norman Vincent Peale, Rev. Theodore M. Hesburgh, president of University of Notre Dame, George Meany, president of AFL–CIO, Herbert Hoover, and Albert J. Hayes, president of International Asociation of Machinists.

In 1960, the foundation decided to compile a basic reading list of the best books available in paperback editions on the struggle between democracy and communism.

The foundation called on outstanding educators and clergymen to work with four representatives of the Department of Defense. Among those who aided in the selection of the 19 books finally chosen on the list were Merrill F. Hartshorn, Executive Secretary of the National Council for Social Studies; Dr. B. E. Powell, librarian of Duke University and past president of the American Library Association; Rev. John F. Cronin, assistant director of the National Catholic Welfare Conference; Dr. Stefan T. Possony of Stanford University's Institute on War, Peace, and Revolution, and former special adviser to the Air Force on strategic intelligence; Col. William E. Kintner of the Foreign Policy Research Institute of University of Pennsylvania, and formerly of the Special Warfare Division of the Department of the Army.

The documents published by the House Committee on Un-American Activities were included in the list of 19 books finally selected by the Foundation for Religious Action. The selection committee rated these two committee documents with the works of such well-known writers as George Orwell, Arthur Koestler, Alexis de Tocqueville, Alan Moorehead, J. Edgar Hoover, and David Shub.

Through the Foundation for Religious Action in the Social and Civil Order, this bookshelf on communism has been shipped to many countries throughout the world where it is playing an important role insuring victory for the forces of democracy and freedom in the battle for men's minds.

On October 16, 1959, the Soviet Union accused Russell A. Langelle, chief security officer of the U.S. Embassy in Moscow, of espionage and ordered him to leave the Soviet Union. The State Department immediately rejected the accusation and sent a note of protest to the Soviet Foreign Ministry. It stated that five Russians had threatened Langelle and his family and then had tried to bribe and blackmail him into becoming a Soviet espionage agent.

On October 26, 1959, after Langelle had returned to the United States, the State Department held a press conference at which he answered questions for 75 newsmen. Langelle had been our chief security officer in Moscow for over a year and a half. He denied the Soviet charges and expressed his conviction that Moscow officials had provoked an incident and then expelled him because he had thwarted their efforts to spy on the Embassy. Many of the questions asked him naturally concerned the security problems he faced in Moscow. Referring to Soviet espionage efforts directed against the American Embassy, one reporter asked:

> Has this been an unusually active period in this field or are they more active now than they had been. Can you give us some idea of the kind of activities that one could expect at the Embassy in Moscow?

Langelle replied:

> I think the description of the type of activities and the scope of activities were set forth pretty much in detail in a House Un-American Activities report of January of this year.

He was referring to a committee study entitled "Patterns of Communist Espionage." There are, of course, many people who would have you believe that the Committee on Un-American Activities produces no useful or reliable information. But here we have a case of the chief security officer of what is probably the most difficult security assignment of the Foreign Service telling the press that if they want to find out what is going on in Moscow in the field of Soviet espionage directed at our Embassy, they should read the report of the committee.

I might point out that shortly after this report was published, the State Department ordered 500 copies of it to assist in the instruction of its Foreign Service personnel and to acquaint them with techniques used by Communist agents in their efforts to compromise and subvert Western diplomats. The Military Assistance Institute, which trains our military attachés for service with our embassies and consulates abroad, also uses this committee document as a text. In addition, the British and West German Governments have also purchased quantities of it for the enlightenment of their diplomatic personnel.

This same report, at the time it was published, contained up-to-date information on Soviet espionage operations in this country, particularly as they were directed against Americans of foreign birth who have close relatives behind the Iron Curtain. One of the best television documentaries on espionage, "The Spy Next Door," presented on the Armstrong Circle Theater, used this report for source material.

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, J. Edgar Hoover tells us that the Communist Party in the United States is not out of business, not dead, not even dormant. He has warned that those who try to minimize the internal activities of the Communist Party within the United States are either uniformed, or have a deadly ax to grind. We are terribly conscious of the 90 short miles which separate us from Communist troops in Cuba. We cannot forget nor ignore the internal menace from the Communist Party, which is directed from and by the Kremlin just as certainly as are the Soviet soldiers in the Caribbean.

One of our best insurance policies against internal subversion is the House Un-American Activities Committee. Undaunted by vilification and slander, it continues to show its mettle, not only in revealing cases of espionage and infiltration, but by educating the American public to methods of Communist infiltration.

I wholeheartedly approve and will vote for the full appropriation requested by the committee for its activities during this session.

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, through unanimous consent granted this day for members of the committee to revise and extend their remarks on the subject of House Resolution 249 relating to the annual appropriation of the House Un-American Activities Committee, I wish to include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD herewith the text of my statement at the opening meeting of the House Rules Committee in opposition to the Roosevelt resolution, House Resolution 69:

> Mr. Chairman and members of the Rules Committee, the committee is presently considering House Resolution 69, introduced by the gentleman from California, Mr. ROOSEVELT, which would abolish the Committee on Un-American Activities and, it is alleged, transfer its functions to the Judiciary Committee. Two other resolutions—House Resolution 42, introduced by Mr. FARBSTEIN, of New York, and House Resolution 140, introduced by Mr. LINDSAY, of New York, are identical with the resolution introduced by the gentleman from California.
>
> It is my belief, and the belief of all members of the Committee on Un-American Activities, that these resolutions should not be approved. Our reasons are as follows:
>
> First, we must give the most careful consideration—beforehand—to the legal and constitutional complications and implications inherent in any fundamental change in the nature of the committee charged with investigating activities which are designed to bring about the violent destruction of our constitutional form of government. The House of Representatives certainly should not create constitutional problems for itself whenever it can be avoided.
>
> For 25 years now, the House has been investigating Communist activities through its Committee on Un-American Activities, which has operated with an authority spelled out in rule XI, paragraph 18(b) which has stood unchanged during all these years. Despite the derogatory insinuations made by some persons about the vagueness of the committee's resolution, the fact of the matter is that there is no question today about its constitutionality and the basic jurisdiction and powers of the committee.
>
> Over and over again during these years, the Supreme Court, as well as other courts, has carefully weighed the basic constitutional issues involved in the committee's mandate and operations and has found for the committee. Moreover, it has done this in the face of the most persuasive arguments against the committee on real, as well as contrived, constitutional issues which the most ingenious lawyers of the Communist Party have been able to devise. Moreover, too, the Court has done this whether it has been generally considered as conservative, middle of the road, or liberal in nature.
>
> In the vital Barenblatt decision of June 8, 1959, the Supreme Court found that "in the domain of national security, the House has clothed the Un-American Activities Committee with pervasive authority to investigate Communist activities in this country."
>
> In the same decision, the Court also found that "it can hardly be seriously argued that the investigation of Communist activities generally, and the attendant use of compulsory process, was beyond the purview of the committee's intended authority under rule XI."
>
> If the House were to create a new committee or subcommittee at this time with a differently worded resolution and authority, as the resolutions the Rules Committee is now considering provide, it would immediately open up for Communist exploitation a whole new area of litigation. Twenty-five years of deliberation on the part of the committee, the Department of Justice, and

courts of this land could be rendered useless. The newly created committee would find itself operating with an authority, and in an area, characterized by great uncertainty. The proper scope and limitations of the committee would be clearly defined only after many additional years of courtroom struggle.

Mr. Chairman, I am sure all of us will agree that it would be most unwise for the House at this time to throw away a clearly defined power which it knows it possesses beyond all doubt—and then attempt to continue exercising the same power under a resolution that may be open to constitutional challenge and rejection by the courts of the land.

This issue is most important, Mr. Chairman, because the three resolutions being considered would change the mandate under which the House would continue—or try to continue—its investigations of communism. They would change the mandate by eliminating it completely, by utterly destroying it. As a substitute, they would merely add the words "un-American activities" to the jurisdiction of the Judiciary Committee and provide that "the Judiciary Committee shall establish a Subcommittee on Un-American Activities."

The resolutions provide not a word in definition of un-American activities. They delete paragraph 18(b)—which defines the jurisdiction and duties of the Committee on Un-American Activities—from rule XI and substitute for it absolutely nothing.

The designation of the proposed Judiciary Subcommittee's jurisdiction and powers under these resolutions is the very essence of vagueness. In effect, these resolutions give the proposed subcommittee no power whatsoever. It is my conviction that if these resolutions should be adopted, no court in this land would ever sustain them or the work of any subcommittee performed under their authorization.

It seems strange to me that the resolution of the gentleman from California should be so worded, inasmuch as he has so often complained about the alleged vagueness of the Committee on Un-American Activities present mandate.

Why has he stripped from his resolution the committee's court-tested mandate, whose constitutionality is unquestioned, whose delineation of jurisdiction is clear—and substituted for it no more than the very three words about which he has been complaining for so long? Perhaps it was just an oversight on his part. I hope that's all it was.

There is one other important point about these resolutions which should be emphasized. They do not give to the proposed Judiciary Subcommittee the power of subpena which the Committee on Un-American Activities has always had. Do the authors of these resolutions believe that any committee of the Congress could investigate communism, subversion, un-American activities—without the power of subpena? Do they honestly believe that any Communist would voluntarily appear before a committee to testify about the operations of the conspiracy of which he is a member and whose goal is the destruction of our Government?

By failing to grant the proposed subcommittee the power of subpena, the authors of the resolutions have guaranteed that it will be stillborn, having no effective life or vitality. They have taken away from the Congress a power that has been universally recognized as essential in this area.

This glaring defect in these resolutions, coupled with the one concerning the subcommittee's mandate—or complete lack of mandate—which I mentioned previously, makes me wonder whether these resolutions are truly designed to transfer the work of investigating subversion to the Judiciary Committee, or whether they are designed to end all such activity on the part of this House.

On this matter, there is an additional question to which the most careful consideration should be given. It is this: What would be the implication for the courts and the people of this country if these resolutions were adopted after being amended so that they conferred upon the proposed subcommittee the very same mandate the Committee on Un-American Activities has had for 25 years?

The implication would be all too clear, I am afraid, that despite the findings of the courts upholding its actions, the House has actually had serious misgivings, has been subject to doubts and uncertainty, as to the correctness of what it has been doing for the past 25 years. Implicit in the act of transfer would be a kind of confession of years of guilt and wrongdoing and a belated—very belated—effort to correct it.

I say this, because it has yet to be argued on the floor of the House that this transfer should be made in the interest of better administration or economy, or for any other reason unrelated to the quality of work the Committee on Un-American Activities has done. To the contrary, the arguments advanced for transfer have uniformly implied that the Committee on Un-American Activities—for years and years—has operated in an irresponsible, highhanded manner, disregarding individual rights and engaging, to a great extent, in no more than character assassination and intimidation. This has often been hinted and implied rather than stated openly—but never in my many years in the House have I heard such gross impugning of the motives and actions of so many Members of this body as has been expressed in the past by the gentleman from California who has introduced House Resolution 69.

Will the Members of the House go along with—can they be expected to support—this not too subtle condemnation of themselves and their colleagues, past and present? I think not.

A second reason—and these facts concern the Judiciary Committee itself:

During the debate on the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER] then, as now, chairman of the Judiciary Committee protested that the reorganization bill would reduce the members on the Judiciary Committee from 27 to 25, even while imposing more work on the committee by giving it jurisdiction previously exercised by four standing committees.

He pointed out that as a result of its "avalanche of business", the Judiciary Committee had already been divided into five subcommittees and all five were then behind in their work because of a "tremendous number of bills" which were continually referred to the Committee on the Judiciary. He enumerated the additional duties being imposed on the committee, their complexity, the hundreds of additional bills it would have to consider each year because of them, and then stated: "How we are going to do all that work with 25 members is beyond my comprehension."

That, gentlemen, was almost 20 years ago. What is the situation today as far as the Judiciary Committee is concerned? The committee has had its membership enlarged to 35. Despite this, everyone knows that it is the most overworked committee in the House. It now has 19 subjects within its jurisdiction. I can say without fear of contradiction because it is known to everyone that it is having difficulty—and has always had difficulty—keeping up with all the work that is assigned to it.

Imposing on the already overworked Judiciary Committee the numerous problems associated with the operations of the Committee on Un-American Activities would mean either one of two things: that much less would be done in the field of countering subversion, or that other vital matters which are already within the province of the Judiciary Committee would be neglected.

Would it be advisable to add to the Judiciary Committee, which is now the third largest in the House, nine new members—the number now on the Un-American Activities Committee? This would give it 44 members—more than any other committee except the Appropriations Committee. This, I believe, is too large and unwieldy a number to have on a committee that has so much important day-to-day work before it throughout both sessions of each Congress. The problems of the Appropriations Committee, which has 50 members, are, as you all know, quite different and it can operate effectively with so large a number. The Judiciary Committee is in a completely different situation.

I believe there can be no question about the fact that, from the viewpoint of getting vital work done efficiently and well in both the legislative and investigative fields in this most important area, shifting the functions of the Committee on Un-American Activities to the Judiciary Committee would be a disastrous and most unwise move.

Mr. Speaker, here is the text of my opening statement at the hearings of the women for peace movement:

Everyone in the world, every nation in the world—if you can believe their words—wants peace. The cry is universal. It comes from neutralists, from Communists, from anti-Communists. Yet there is no peace because certain persons, groups and nations in the world—even while they cry peace—foment war and unrest. They plot and carry out military attacks on neutralist India, on anti-Communist South Vietnam. They plot sabotage in the United States. They dynamite electric power stations in Venezuela. In every nation, in small and in big ways, they disrupt peace or make it impossible of attainment.

There is good reason, unfortunately, to doubt Communist claims that they desire peace, as others understand the term. Late in 1948, Stalin launched a spectacular peace offensive. It was marked in major nations of the world by so-called peace conferences and congresses, which were supported and attended by the cream of the Communist and fellow traveling intellectual crop in those nations. A Moscow-directed World Peace Council, still operating in Vienna, was born of these gatherings. In June 1950, however, even as Stalin was directing the creation of this so-called World Peace Council (which was formally established about 5 months later), he launched a military attack on South Korea. That attack marked the beginning of 3 years' undeclared war between the forces of communism and freedom. Over 33,000 Americans were killed in battle in that Communist peace action. More than 123,000 other Americans were casualties of it—20,000 of them also losing their lives.

These facts alone indicate that we must give careful consideration to just what the word "peace" means to Communists. Studying what they say about war will help us determine what they mean by peace.

A pamphlet on basic Communist doctrine prepared by the National Education Department of the U.S. Communist Party and sold in Communist Party bookstores in the United States at the very time Stalin's peace offensive was at its peak—and during the Korean war—made the following doctrinal statement: "Wars do not occur through accidents of history or the mistakes of statesmen. They are the inevitable result of capitalism and its contradictions."

Volume 8 of the Large Soviet Encyclopedia (Bol'shaia sovetskaia entsiklopedia), published in 1951, defines war as follows (p. 570): "War is a social phenomenon inherent in a society containing classes and antagonism."

Two pages later, in its discussion of war, the encyclopedia states: "Wars will cease only with the destruction of capitalism and the victory of the Socialist system in all the world."

Again, the Small Soviet Encyclopedia (Malaia sovetskaia entsiklopedia), third edition, volume 2, published in 1958, states: "The basic cause for contemporary wars is the capitalist economic system and the irreconcilable internal contradictions in it."

In other words, according to fundamental Communist doctrine, there will be wars—there can be no real peace—as long as capitalism exists. To end wars, to achieve peace, capitalism must be destroyed.

According to their own words, Communists believe that there can be no real peace until they have conquered the world, eliminating all other systems. They say to one another, and to those who will make an effort to study their doctrine, that they really do not believe in peace in our time.

Why then do they talk of peace? Because it serves Communist interests in two ways:

(1) The initiated Communist, understanding his Marxist-Leninist doctrine, knows that a Moscow call to intensify the "fight for peace" means that he should intensify his fight to destroy capitalism and its major bastion, the United States. This is the way to peace—according to his Communist doctrine. Thus Communist peace propaganda is a call to action for all Communists, spurring them to increased activity and effort aimed at achieving the Communist goal of world conquest—by war or any other means.

(2) As events have proved, peace propaganda and agitation have a disarming, mollifying, confusing and weakening effect on those nations which are the intended victims of communism. Moreover, throughout history, aggressors, dictators, and governments bent on conquering others, or the whole world, have known that pacifism or an unrealistic and exaggerated desire for peace on the part of their intended victims is a tremendous asset to ultimate victory for the aggressor. Excessive concern with peace on the part of any nation impedes or prevent adequate defense preparation, hinders effective diplomacy in the national interest, undermines the will to resist and saps national strength. For this reason, in today's world, intense peace propaganda and agitation in non-Communist nations obviously serves the aggressive plans of world communism.

In 1917, Lenin wrote: "We are not pacifists. We are opposed to imperialist wars for the division of spoils among the capitalists, but we have always declared it to be absurd for the revolutionary proletariat to renounce revolutionary wars that may prove necessary in the interests of socialism."

This is still Communist doctrine. It was restated in only slightly different words in a declaration unanimously adopted by 81 of the world's Communist Parties which met in Moscow in November–December 1960 to devise the strategy they hope will bring them world victory.

This same unanimously adopted statement had other things to say which are vitally important to all Americans and which touch on the purpose of these hearings. I quote: "Today, as never before, it is important to fight perseveringly in all countries to make the peace movement thrive and extend to towns and villages, factories and offices."

On January 6, 1961, shortly after this meeting, Khrushchev made a major strategy speech directed to Communists in all parts of the world. He said, in part: "Every day bigger sections of the population should be drawn into the struggle for peace * * *. The banner of peace enables us to rally the masses around us. By holding aloft this banner we will be even more successful."

Following Khrushchev's cue and also the declaration of the 81 Communist Parties, U.S. Communist Party Leader Gus Hall, in a major report to the party's national committee on January 20, 1961, made the following statement:

"It is necessary to widen the struggle for peace, to raise its level, to involve far greater numbers, to make it an issue in every community, every people's organization, every labor union, every church, every house, every street, every point of gathering of our people.

"It is imperative to bring everyone—men, women, youth and yes, even children—into the struggle.

"It is essential to give full support to the existing peace bodies, to their movements and the struggles they initiate, to building and strengthening their organizations.

"It is also necessary to recognize the need for additional peace organizations.

"Above all Communists will intensify their work for peace, and their efforts to build up peace organizations."

These very blunt Communist statements make one thing very clear: Present Communist strategy gives No. 1 priority to peace agitation and propaganda in the United States and all other non-Communist nations. It calls for Communist infiltration of and support for existing peace organizations, Communist or non-Communist. It calls for the creation of new peace organizations, controlled or infiltrated and manipulated by Communists. It calls for assemblies, picket lines, marches, delegations, walks—every possible kind of demonstration for so-called peace.

Basically, it is because of the Communist directives I have just quoted that these hearings are being held. Preliminary investigation by the committee indicates that Communists, in carrying out these directives—as they would be expected to do—have both infiltrated existing peace groups and created or infiltrated newly formed organizations.

For reasons already discussed, this Communist activity intensifies the security problems faced by this Nation. This is internal psychopolitical warfare directed by Moscow and waged within our own borders. The aim of this activity is not peace, but the undermining and sabotage of the United States.

The questions of peace, disarmament, nuclear weapons testing and related matters are the gravest issues confronting the United States today. It is vital that the Congress be informed whether, and to what extent, concealed agents of a foreign power are attempting to influence the decisions which must be made on these questions—and to influence the decisions so they will serve not the interests of the United States but a foreign power dedicated to the destruction of freedom everywhere.

The subject of this inquiry is to determine the extent of Communist infiltration in peace organizations, particularly in the Metropolitan New York area and with special reference to the women strike for peace—and also to determine the degree to which Communists have responded to the previously quoted directives that they engage in such activity. Such information, as the resolution authorizing these hearings indicates, is relevant to certain legislative proposals now pending before the committee.

The committee wishes to emphasize these points before the hearings begin: The fact that Communists are active in peace agitation does not mean that everyone who agitates for peace is a Communist or fellow traveler.

The fact that Communists have created and infiltrated peace organizations does not mean that all peace groups are Communist or that all members of them, or even a majority of them, are Communists, Communist sympathizers, or fellow travelers.

As I stated in the opening of these remarks, the cry for peace is universal. There is no reason to doubt the sincerity of many people who are today agitating and calling for peace, even though we may have reason to doubt the wisdom of some of the actions and statements made by these people.

The subject and legislative purpose of these hearings are set forth in a resolution adopted by the committee on August 2, 1962. That resolution reads as follows:

"*Be it resolved*, That hearings by the Committee on Un-American Activities, or a subcommittee thereof, be held in Washington, D.C., or at such other place or places as the chairman may determine, on such date or dates as the chairman may designate, relating to Communist conspiratorial techniques and propaganda used in implementing Soviet and U.S. Communist Party directives within the United States, with special reference to the so-called united front tactics of the Communist Party, and the Communist Party tactics of infiltration of non-Communist organizations; the legislative purpose being to determine the need for amendment of the Internal Security Act of 1950, so as to make its provisions applicable to persons engaged in such activities, and for the additional legislative purpose of obtaining information designed to aid the committee and Congress in determining whether the Internal Security Act of 1950 should be amended in a manner to make unlawful membership in the Communist Party of the United States, as proposed in H.R. 9944, referred to this committee on the 30th day of January 1962: Be it further

"*Resolved*, That any subcommittee appointed pursuant to this resolution be authorized to hear any other matter within the jurisdiction of the committee."

The order for appointment of this subcommittee, for the record, reads as follows:

NOVEMBER 9, 1962.

To FRANCIS J. MCNAMARA,
Director, Committee on Un-American Activities.

Pursuant to the provisions of the law and the rules of this committee, I hereby appoint a subcommittee of the Committee on Un-American Activities, consisting of Hon. CLYDE DOYLE as chairman, and Hon. WILLIAM M. TUCK and Hon. DONALD C. BRUCE as associate members to conduct a hearing in Washington, D.C., Tuesday, December 11, 1962, at 10 a.m., on subjects under investigation by the committee and take such testimony on said day or succeeding days, as it may deem necessary.

Please make this action a matter of committee record.

If any member indicates his inability to serve, please notify me.

Given under my hand this 9th day of November 1962.

FRANCIS E. WALTER,
Chairman,
Committee on Un-American Activities.

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, I intend to vote "no" on H.R. 249, not with any thought that it will be defeated and with no personal aspersions intended, but to express my opposition, first, to the failure of this House to define properly and in meaningful terms the scope of the committee's authority; second, to the deficiencies in the procedures of this committee to which attention has been repeatedly called; and third, to the increase in the committee's budget while many of the other committee budgets are either being held constant or cut.

I support the right—indeed the duty—of this Body to conduct investigations for legislative purposes in this area which involves the very survival of the Nation. I would support the transfer of this function to the Judiciary Committee under a redefined statement of authority and have so voted this day on procedural questions as to try to accomplish this purpose. I am sorry that House Resolution 69 was not brought to the floor by the Rules Committee so that Members could express themselves on this aspect of the problem.

I twice in the Oregon Legislation voted to kill proposals to establish committees with general and undefined investigatory power. I feel now as I did then, that the rights of the individual must be protected in this country of ours. My vote is thus not a vote in favor of un-Americanism but rather a vote in favor of orderly American constitutional procedures in this very critical and controversial area.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I have heretofore supported appropriations for the House Un-American Activities Committee because I believed that as long as it was a standing committee of this House it should receive appropriations with which to function.

I have also indicated my strong belief that this committee could better operate as a subcommittee of the House Judiciary Committee. I have made that claim without impugning the motives or opinions of any one who has served on the House Un-American Activities Committee.

I still believe that its jurisdiction should be transferred to the House Judiciary Committee. If the resolution to accomplish that purpose would have come to the floor, I would have voted for it. The Rules Committee having refused to report that resolution to the House, we will have no opportunity to vote thereon.

I am going to vote against this appropriation today, not because I have changed my mind in any way but so as to register a protest against those who have insinuated and inferred that "Communists and their buddies" are seeking to destroy the committee by transferring its jurisdiction to the Judiciary Committee.

Although not a member of the Judiciary Committee, I resent the implication that that committee would not do its duty if this jurisdiction were transferred to it, more than that I resent the implication that those of us who seek to effect the transfer are one whit less patriotic or less pro-American or less anti-Communist than any other Member of this House.

I think the best way to register my protest is to vote against this appropriation.

SERVICE ON THE COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES IS NO SINECURE

Mr. TUCK. Mr, Speaker, I rise in favor of the resolution offered by the gentleman from Maryland. Many years ago the Committee on Un-American Activities, by resolution, abolished the practice of conducting one-man subcommittee hearings. A number of years later this action was incorporated into the rules of the House. Hearings are now conducted by subcommittees composed of three members with at least one appointed from the minority party, and with the right to function with a quorum of two members present.

The added work that the three-man subcommittee rule imposes upon the small number of members of this committee, is more than compensated for by the public confidence that such a procedure inspires in the quality and character of the work performed. With a membership of only nine, the appointment of standing subcommittees is impracticable, so each member is required to spread himself very thin, in order that there be proper representation at the numerous hearings held during a session of Congress. The enormity of the work required is indicated by the fact that actual hearing sessions vary from 25 to 50 in number over the period of a year.

Diligent attention is required of the members to the study of results of preliminary investigations in areas concerning which the committee believes that Congress should be informed and remedial legislation appears desirable. Some of such investigations do not get beyond a preliminary stage. In those instances in which preliminary investigations mature into hearings, committee members must inform themselves regarding the subject of the hearing, consider the need and adequacy of legislation dealing with the subject of inquiry, and study with discrimination remedial legislative proposals.

I was pleased to learn of my appointment to a subcommittee which took me to California during the Easter recess of the last session. I anticipated that there would be some time afforded for relaxation from my arduous duties in Washington. The Members generally may be surprised, as was I, that our subcommittee was in the Federal Building at 8 o'clock each morning, where, except for the noon hour, we remained until 6 o'clock every afternoon, for the purpose of hearing witnesses. There were also a number of night sessions. I returned to Washington utterly exhausted, but satisfied in the assurance that this was another instance of extremely productive results.

I have been impressed with the dedication and ability of the members of the committee and its staff. The chairman is a lawyer of national repute and one who has no peer among the very able and distinguished Members of this body. He exercises control over and strictly supervises the activities of the staff and he enjoys the full confidence and loyalty of the staff, consequently, the committee and the staff operate as a team.

I think the committee and Congress is fortunate in having a professional staff of extended experience in the field of this committee and one which has demonstrated its restraint and sound judgment in the handling of many sensitive and difficult problems facing the committee.

You will be interested to know that the director of the committee with his B.A. from St. John's University and his M.A. from Niagara University, has had a long and distinguished record in the military service, as major in military intelligence, and is the recipient of the Army, Navy, and Air Force Medal by the Republic of China for meritorious service in the northern Burma campaign, as well as having served in important posts as editor and research analyst with favorably recognized publications; the general counsel of the committee, with an M.A. degree in constitutional and international law at Princeton University, an LL.B. degree at the University of Virginia, and an honorary doctor of laws degree from Roanoke College, has served the Government as U.S. attorney for the western district of Virginia, for a period of 15 years, acting chief of counsel during the defense phase of the trial of Tojo and others before the International Tribunal in Japan, and counsel for this committee for almost 14 years.

I do not believe there is a better equipped investigative staff to be found than that of this committee. Three of the six investigators have been with the committee for more than 15 years and are experts in their field, one of whom had served with the FBI and one with the U.S. Secret Service.

It was said by the friends of Grover Cleveland that he was loved because of the enemies he made. The diligent work of the members and the staff of this committee likewise has earned the love of countless numbers of people for the enemies that they have made.

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Speaker, as we discuss today the appropriations requests of the House Un-American Activities Committee, I want to lend my full and unqualified support to this committee and the appropriation which it has requested.

It has been pointed out that the appropriation is large. That may be so, but the price of freedom is not cheap. And I consider the work of this committee to be among the most important of the functions of the Congress.

Year after year we see the committee attacked, we see those who would see it abolished, but this in my opinion would be a serious mistake.

The expressed purpose of world communism is that we be enslaved. There are no limits that they will not go to, there are no devious means that they will not attempt to meet this goal. This Nation has never faced more perilous times—both within and without our great Nation.

We seek to ward off armed aggressors with the force of arms, assembling the most powerful war machine for defense that the world has ever seen. And the Congress has sought and is seeking to keep this Nation militarily strong.

But there is the threat from within which is just as serious. That is of complacency on the one hand and subversion on the other.

We cannot afford either. And perhaps this is the great boon that this committee has given to this Nation, that it has helped to awaken our people to the threat which communism poses, that here in this great land of ours there are those forces at work which would crumble this Nation from within.

And so I believe that this is the task of the House Un-American Activities Committee, to continue to alert America to the threat which godless communism poses from within our own land by those who unwittingly and also those who deliberately support the force of communism. This committee has also brought to light other problems of equal import, organizations which if allowed to flourish without the light of truth being focused upon them, would ultimately lead to possible deterioration of this land of ours.

I want to add my vigorous support of the committee, not only for the funds which it needs to carry on its work, but my full support in all facets of the Congress to allow them to carry on their work.

This Nation needs such a committee. We will not crumble from within so long as our people are informed, but a duped nation can become the victims of such insidious ideologies of communism just as so many lands and countless millions of humans have fallen before its onslaught.

I believe America needs the House Un-American Activities Committee, I commend it for its work, and support fully their request for funds to carry on this needed and vital work.

Mr. WATSON. Mr. Speaker, it should shock the conscience of every patriotic Member of this body to see this determined effort being made by the handful of our colleagues to abolish or weaken the effectiveness of the Un-American Activities Committee. In my humble judgment this committee is performing one of the most valuable services not only to the Congress but to the entire Nation.

I was amazed to hear the argument of one of the opponents of this committee when he based his opposition upon the cost of the operation of the committee and further that its activities "assaulted our civil liberties."

May I respectfully remind the gentleman from New York that freedom and its preservation are always costly matters. While he is speaking in terms of dollars and cents may I remind him of the fact that many of our American sons and daughters did not complain about paying the supreme cost during prior wars in order to preserve our way of life.

As to his argument that the activities of this committee "assaulted our civil liberties," I have no sympathy for those who would hide behind the fifth amendment or some constitutional guarantees in order to continue membership in some organization which has as its avowed if not published purpose the destruction of our freedom and the enslavement of our citizens. Let me say to him and those who would complain about having their civil liberties assaulted by the Un-American Activities Committee that they can easily escape the questioning eye of that committee by disassociating themselves with those organizations and groups who sympathize with or embrace the Communist philosophy of government.

Mr. Speaker, those who now seek to abolish or weaken this committee are the same ones who always seem to take the lead in the parade of bleeding hearts in defense of those who hide behind the protection of our constitutional guarantees when charged with attempts to overthrow the Government of the Nation it founded.

Fortunately for America, Mr. Speaker, their voices are loud today but their number is small. I am proud to give my wholehearted support to the Un-American Activities Committee, which is so ably led by our distinguished colleague from Pennsylvania.

Although I would not question the sincerity of those attacking this patriotic committee they must face up to the reality that they are without question aiding the Communists and their sympathizers. May it never be said that we as a legislative body would do anything to stymie any effort to expose and combat those elements seeking to subvert and undermine our democratic way of life.

Mr. GILL. I am happy to join with 19 other Members of the House in a vote expressing a protest and concern over the functions and procedures of the House Committee on Un-American Activities. Many other Members of the House who, in the final analysis, voted for the appropriation, share my distaste for the reputation the committee has gathered over the years.

One thing should be made clear: I believe the Congress has a right to investigate matters related to the internal security of the Nation. It has the right to legislate on these matters so it certainly has the right to inform itself. I, along with many others, would be in favor of transferring the functions of the Un-American Activities Committee to the Committee on the Judiciary, with the hope that the Judiciary Committee would exercise its powers in a far more judicious and less sensational manner. I understand that the chairman of the Un-American Activities Committee himself favored this solution until very recently.

However, today we were not given a chance to vote on this issue. The floor managers of the funding resolution would not recognize any motion which could put this issue before the House. Nor would they allow any motion which would merely reduce the appropriation for the committee, currently among the highest in the House. It was apparently their desire to force an all-or-nothing vote.

The obvious result is that those who voted against the total appropriation can now be attacked by partisans of the committee as soft on communism or as somehow being unpatriotic. This I understand and expect, but I have faith that the people of Hawaii are smart enough to see the motives behind any such idiotic attacks.

A free democratic society is not protected or developed by adopting any part of the methods of the Soviet police state. The right of confrontation of accusers, of cross-examination, of security against vilification by innuendo are part of the lifeblood of our free society; destroy them and you destroy America. I hope the Committee on Un-American Activities will, in this coming session, take these truths to heart.

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, in voting against an increase in appropriations for the Committee on Un-American Activities today, I wish to again make it clear, as I did 2 years ago, that I do not question the existence of a congressional committee to conduct investigations of internal security matters and Communist activity. These are proper areas of congressional concern, and the Congress should not deny itself the power to conduct inquiries relevant to proposed legislation. However, such inquiries demand the highest degree of responsibility and objectivity. When a committee of the Congress abuses its power and exceeds its authority, it is our duty to bring it to account. The long history of notoriety and controversy surrounding this committee is well known to all.

Today's vote is not, to my mind, the ideal method of dealing with the problem of the committee's activities; it would be preferable to transfer the committee to the Committee on the Judiciary, as in the Senate. This is a proposal which Committee Chairman WALTER himself supported in 1955. But the Rules Committee yesterday declined to permit the House to vote on this question. Instead, we are presented with a "yes" or "no" choice—to approve or to reject the request for increased appropriations of $360,000. Therefore, in order to express my strong reservations about the committee, my only alternative is to oppose its appropriations. This I do.

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, it has long been my conviction that the legislative process would be better served if jurisdiction over the criminal statutes now assigned by the rules of the House of Representatives to the House Committee on Un-American Activities were transferred to the House Committee on the Judiciary. The Judiciary Committee has jurisdiction over all other criminal statutes contained in the U.S. Criminal Code. There is no logic in a number of congressional committees having responsibility for separate parts of the code.

The Judiciary Committee has a tradition of fairplay. A subcommittee concerned with the statutes in question would have the review of the full committee, the members of which are all lawyers conversant with the principles of due process.

Consistent with this view, I introduced some weeks ago into Congress a resolution, House Resolution 1140, to transfer jurisdiction over these statutes to the House Judiciary Committee.

If this resolution had been reported by the Rules Committee and adopted by the Congress, it would, of course, mean that the Committee on Un-American Activities would have been abolished as a separate standing committee, and the jurisdiction that it now has over several criminal statutes taken over by a subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary. This is the structural arrangement in the Senate where Internal Security is a subcommittee of the Senate Judiciary Committee.

Mr. Speaker, yesterday I testified before the Rules Committee in support of my resolution. I asked that the House be given the chance to vote on it. I regret that by a vote of 12 to 1 the Rules Committee declined to give us that opportunity. As I pointed out to the members of the Rules Committee in my testimony, the chairman of the House Committee on Un-American Activities, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER], as recently as 1960, was in favor of transferring the functions of the House Un-American Activities Committee to the Committee on the Judiciary.

In my testimony I further stated that I did not favor an attack upon the appropriations of the House Un-American Activities Committee. Such a tactic is misdirected. It serves no useful purpose and accomplishes nothing. To deny the committee funds to pay for stationery, clerk help and other housekeeping matters in no way changes the committee's basic jurisdiction or mandate. The committee still will have jurisdiction over several important criminal statutes, including the Internal Security Act of 1950 and the Subversive Activities Control Act. In fact there is nothing in the Rules of the House of which I am aware that prevents a standing committee from raising money from the outside to finance its activities. Therefore, until we reorganize the basic structure by the means I have proposed we will not solve this problem. I will continue to support a resolution of transfer, but for the reasons which I have given I shall vote against an attempt to deny the committee the appropriations authorized for it by the Committee on House Administration.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that the Rules Committee voted 12 to 1 for the continuance of the Un-American Activities Committee, I believe that it is necessary for the committee to have adequate funds to carry on its functions.

At this particular time, it seems to me that it is important to maintain the investigatory powers of Congress so far as subversive activities are concerned. As long as we are engaged in a cold war, basically the battle of the ideologies, it is necessary to keep an effective means of informing Congress on the activities of our enemy.

A move to abolish the committee or limit its activities has been branded as part of the Communist plot. I do not see it as a plot and I also see no purpose to be served by transferring the powers of the committee to the Judiciary Committee. It is a matter of determining what is the most effective manner of carrying on the battle against totalitarian ideology.

The greatest criticism against the committee has been its purported action in violation of specific constitutional rights. I do not consider the movement to support the committee with adequate funds an endorsement of any action to abuse the civil liberties of individuals.

So again I say that since it is the judgment of the Rules Committee to continue the Un-American Activities Committee, then it should be implemented with funds to make its work effective.

Mr. FRASER. Mr Speaker, I vote "No" today to express my concern about both the philosophy from which this committee springs and its operation. I regret that my disappointment in the House Un-American Activities Committee should first be expressed for the record by a vote against the appropriations for that committee. I would have preferred an opportunity to vote in favor of the proposed rules change heard yesterday by the Rules Committee. Under this change the House Un-American Activities Committee would in effect have become a subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee, just as is now provided in the Senate. This opportunity being denied by adverse action of the Rules Committee, I would have chosen next to be permitted to vote for an amendment to the resolution now pending which would have given more direction to the use of the money being authorized. This opportunity too was denied.

A secure America is not just an America strong in arms and united with its allies against Communist imperialism. A secure America needs also to build its defenses against those who either knowingly or unknowingly would cut down and restrict our freedoms here at home. Our defenses must be positive ones. They must reject the notion that due process can be too cumbersome, or that freedom of thought is only permissible to the extent acceptable to our neighbors.

We have passed laws which seek to deal with communism at home. Whether these laws are wise or not, once a law is passed the role of enforcement under the separation of powers doctrine falls to the executive and judicial branches. The House Un-American Activities Committee may properly review these laws, consider others, and review enforcement procedures.

My objection is not to this role but to the further activities in which this committee seems to be engaged; namely, that of exposure.

Our U.S. Supreme Court has said that mere exposure is not a proper role of Congress and I agree. If citizens are guilty of a crime they should be prosecuted If not, they should be left alone.

No matter how well intentioned Government or any of its agencies may be, the oppressive power which it can exert over our citizens is far too great to be left unrestrained. The damage which can be done to the free expression of ideas by a committee operating as this one has far outweighs, in my opinion, the good which it may do. Law enforcement should be left to the highly trained enforcement officials in our Government who must bring their charges before the courts—and freedom of thought and expression should be left to our people.

One of the most powerful forces for our survival is the exercise of the right of free expression. In closed societies such as the Soviet Union, the expression of ideas which are in opposition to Government policy is discouraged or prohibited. Thus that Government denies itself the criticism which may set erroneous policies right, or expose improper or even unintended exercise of authority.

Here in America we traditionally have debated alternatives freely, and have subjected the views of Government to searching criticism and analysis. In recent years, however, with the external threat of communism looming so large, there has been an increasing tendency to avoid discussion of policy alternatives which may not follow the hard line. Whenever freedom of expression is impaired, to that extent we endanger the security of our country. Policies of our Government which are detrimental to our safety or welfare may continue uncorrected because those who might offer constructive alternatives are silenced by the fear of expressing unpopular ideas. In my judgment the House Un-American Activities Committee in some of its work contributes to that fear, and is therefore detrimental to our national interest.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I am supporting this resolution which provides funds for the operation of the House Un-American Activities Committee. I cannot emphasize too strongly the vital role which this committee has played in America's fight against communistic infiltration. Its work is necessary and vital.

Fighting communism at home is as important as opposing its threats from beyond our shores.

Some Congressmen and a few organizations have attacked the committee on the ground that it has engaged in smear campaigns and has invaded constitutional rights of persons investigated. Such a position is difficult for me to understand. The American Bar Association, for example, commented on this point, saying it was impressed with the fairness with which hearings before the committee have been conducted.

We must recognize communism as a fight of truth versus falsehood, of freedom versus bondage, and of Christian belief versus atheism.

We must recognize it as a force seeking to degrade the dignity of man, rob him of his individualism, and deprive him of his God-given right to justice and the pursuit of happiness.

About 2 years ago, I purchased, at my own expense, a copy of the film "Operation Abolition," showing Communist-inspired rioting in San Francisco before the committee in 1960. Before it was finally worn out, this film was shown nearly 200 times in western North Carolina to church, civic, social, and veteran organizations. Reaction to the film was almost 100 percent favorable.

I intend to continue to seize every opportunity to speak out and act against communism. I believe this to be the duty of every American.

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, I join with those voting "No" on House Resolution 249, and I associate myself with most of their remarks as to the reasons for this action—admittedly an unsatisfactory method of expressing our views.

I do not believe that public exposure before the Committee on Un-American Activities—with the consequent inescapable implication that certain individuals and organizations are un-American—should be used as a punishment for ideas.

I do not believe that ideas of any sort are ever destroyed or weakened by punishment. This can be accomplished only by the power of better ideas.

I believe America is weakened if we place our primary reliance for security upon the suppression of ideas by force or coercion, including the ideas of communism.

In the struggle for a peaceful, free, and democratic world, which is America's primary goal, victory can only be won by the aggressive expression of superior ideas backed to the hilt by programs aimed at carrying out those ideas.

The committee's purposes and methods, in my opinion, have reflected in certain instances a contrary philosophy which is of limited value within this country and which is of positive harm to our goals when applied to the vast developing areas of the world—the major battlefield for freedom and democracy today.

In that battlefield no victories are won by declaiming that a philosophy or a program is un-American, but only by demonstrating that there is an American philosophy or program which is far better.

I fully support the Committee on Un-American Activities insofar as it investigates and recommends legislation for control of subversive activities. At the same time I am acutely sensitive to the constitutional protections of the Bill of Rights involving the free expression of thought and opinion.

My vote is intended to reflect these views.

Mr. MARSH. Mr. Speaker, those who express concern about the Committee on Un-American Activities of this House often seem to be insisting that it is undemocratic and unconscionable for a democracy to post guards against its subversion. The great responsibility of service on the committee carries with it a willingness to endure a succession of unwarranted attacks on joint and individual integrity—and a determination to persist in the assigned task in spite of these perverse sallies.

It is to the eternal credit of the committee members that they have borne the onslaughts with firm resolve, and the Nation is in their debt. Where better than among the representatives of the people, duly elected, should there be an active concern for the persistent threat of subversion, and an instrumentality to assist in its exposure?

As we prepare to vote our conviction as to the continuing need for the committee, Mr. Speaker, we might recall the significant service it has rendered in spotlighting laxity in the enforcement of personnel security procedures within highly sensitive agencies of Government concerned with the national defense. I should like to recall to the notice of the House the committee's investigation of disgraceful and dangerous security looseness in the secret National Security Agency and read into the RECORD the following editorial which appeared on August 15, 1962, in the Richmond (Va.) News Leader:

Investigating the National Security

Those who persistently maintain that the House Committee on Un-American Activities is misdirected sound and fury should gage their outrage by the report issued Monday. This document cites 22 distinct corrective actions taken by the National Security Administration following the House Committee on Un-American Activities investigation into the defection to Russia of the homosexual security risks Bernon F. Mitchell and William Martin. NSA has since cooperated fully in tightening its lax security procedures; but if the House Committee on Un-American Activities had not existed, or had been abolished before it began its 13-month investigation, the Nation's most critical and most secret agency of defense would still be wide open to Communist penetration.

The Mitchell-Martin story was an ugly one. Both men worked as mathematicians in the cryptology section of NSA. Both were hired and given access to top secret information before security checks had been completed. Both were eventually given clearance despite Mitchell's admission of sexual aberrations and Martin's association with Communist party members, even after becoming an NSA employee. On August 5, 1960, the two disappeared, apparently with top-secret information about NSA activities; on September 6 they turned up at a Moscow press conference.

The National Security Agency is so sensitively secret and so vital to the country's defense that no outsiders can describe its activities. Not even the Civil Service Commission, which regularly audits all Government jobs, is allowed to know what NSA employees do. Yet the House Committee on Un-American Activities investigation discovered that the Agency had made a regular practice of hiring employees before security checks were completed—ever since the Korean war had given the pretext of an emergency. One of the major revisions of NSA policy was the correction of this incredible practice.

Under another strange policy, the NSA placed almost complete reliance on checking security clearances through lie detector tests, without coordinating information received from the FBI and other agencies. The lie detector or polygraph, useful as it is, charts only chemical and psychological reactions. An innocent but nervous subject comes off badly; a guilty, calm subject may get through without suspicion. J. Edgar Hoover has warned many times that the polygraph can give no more than hints, even to an operator experienced at reading the graphs. Yet the NSA allowed security clearances to be given on the strength of a junior officer's interpretation of the polygraph.

The irregularities in hiring extended to the NSA's director of personnel himself. House Committee on Un-American Activities investigators, working with the FBI, turned up falsifications in the personnel director's background file; the director, who of course had complete access to his own file, then attempted to thwart the committee by forging a form with the correct information and substituting it for incorrect statements. This man has been fired for his forgery.

Since the House Committee on Un-American Activities investigation, NSA security has been tightened in all fields. Greater emphasis is put on pyschological and medical investigations of prospective employees. Guards and watchmen have been increased. The clearances of all employees have been reviewed, and 26 known homosexuals have been dropped from the rolls.

Both the Secretary of Defense and the Director of NSA have been active in the housecleaning, but it was the House Committee on Un-American Activities that devoted more than 2,000 hours to the investigation. This effort has resulted not only in the practical cleanup of the present mess, but in a bill now about halfway through Congress which will forestall a loosening of security practices. The men who are hired to guard a special trust for the country must submit to greater tests of loyalty. Were it not for the House Committee on Un-American Activities we would have no way of knowing whether these tests were being applied or not.

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ASHLEY].

Mr. ASHLEY. Mr. Speaker, I am constrained to vote against this resolution because I am again drawn to the conclusion that the committee in question frequently has gone beyond its proper scope of authority and in so doing has trespassed upon fundamental rights of individual citizens secured by the Constitution itself.

I am sure that all of us conceive it to be the responsibility and the duty of every American to defend the United States from enemies which seek our destruction. But I submit that it is no less the responsibility or the duty of every American, and especially those of us who serve in this body, to protect against encroachment upon our individual freedoms and to preserve the sanctity of the civil rights for which so many millions of Americans have given their lives.

I resent very deeply, Mr. Speaker, the implication that it is something less than respectable to question whether a congressional committee has operated in such a way as to trespass upon the rights which are guaranteed to every citizen.

Even more bitterly do I resent the suggestion that only Communists or Communist sympathizers seek a review of the activities of the committee in question.

The plain fact of the matter is that the Bill of Rights and the rest of our Constitution can be emasculated or lost by our own action or inaction, just as they can be destroyed by an alien adversary.

It seems to me that the preservation of these rights, Mr. Speaker, depends upon our ability to recognize that they are subjected to internal as well as external pressures, and upon our willingness to curb abuses of Government power wherever such abuses are found to exist.

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. JOHANSEN].

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Speaker, as the ranking minority member of the House Committee on Un-American Activities, and in behalf of the minority members of that committee, I want to express my appreciation to the chairman of the Subcommittee and the full Committee on House Administration—as well as the ranking minority member—for the committee's action in voting this authorization of committee funds. Some remarks have been made here today regarding alleged violation of the rights of witnesses and of citizens by the committee. I direct the attention of the House simply to the statement made by the Special Committee on Communist Strategy, Tactics, and Objectives of the American Bar Association, about a decade ago, in which they emphasize the finding that the committee operates with fairness, that the witnesses called to testify before the committee are treated fairly and properly in all respects; and that they also feel satisfied that each witness is accorded fullest protection so far as constitutional or other legal rights are involved.

Since the time of that bar association statement these safeguards and protections have been enhanced by the strengthening of the rules of the committee itself, a committee, by the way, which was the first one to inaugurate and to adopt rules of this type.

Mr. Speaker, I concur in the views of the chairman of this committee and the ranking majority member who is here today representing him in his absence, and my colleagues on the committee, in supporting this resolution.

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. Doyle].

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, I want to call the attention of the House to the fact that the resolution before us today is authored by the distinguished chairman of this standing, regular committee of the House, the House Committee on Un-American Activities, the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Mr. Francis Walter. I know every Member of the House joins me in expressing regret that he is not able yet to be here on the floor with us, but I am pleased to tell you that he is on the improve and we are all hoping for his speedy return. Meantime, I have the responsibility for doing, as acting chairman on this occasion, what he would so ably be doing if he were here today. I know you will bear with me.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. Ryan], who read his paper criticizing the committee and opposing this appropriation today, also read substantially that same paper in toto a few days ago before the House Administration Committee. He was the only Member who appeared before the House Administration Committee in opposition to our appropriation request. The House subcommittee voted unanimously for our appropriation and so did the full Administration Committee. I think this House is perfectly familiar with these specious arguments and I wish to state that some of the alleged facts he again read to the House a few minutes ago are mistaken on his part, and are not accurate.

I wish to say only this, that this committee is not going to take much time of the House today to reply to his repetitious statements. The House is familiar with them already over a term of years. However, because it might occur that some of the new Members of this great body have not yet heard of any justification for our committee's annual appropriation, I will state it as follows below. First, on behalf of my distinguished chairman and all our members of the committee of nine, I wish to thank the House Administration Committee for its favorable, unanimous report to this House on House Resolution 249 which is before you today.

And whereas the gentleman from California [Mr. Roosevelt], a few minutes ago, called attention of the House to the fact that yesterday the House Rules Committee had voted against the Roosevelt resolution to abolish our committee and transfer its duties to the House Judiciary Committee, I think this House should be informed by me that the announced vote, supporting the work of this committee, on the Roosevelt resolution was 12 to 1 against the same. Therefore, I wish now to thank the House Rules Committee for its almost unanimous expression of renewed confidence and respect for the work of more than 20 years of the House Committee on Un-American Activities.

Inasmuch as this is the largest appropriation the committee has requested, I believe that, in fairness to the Members of this House who are being asked to approve it, I should explain why the committee has asked for this sum.

Some of you may wonder why the committee today needs more than double the amount of money it operated on years ago—in the 80th Congress, for example, when it expended only $300,000 for the 2 years.

The principal factors involved in the committee's increased operating costs are the following:

First. An increase of well over 100 percent in congressional staff personnel pay since 1945. To illustrate: A congressional employee who earned $7,000 in 1945—even if he has never received a promotion or personal raise in pay during all the years—today earns $15,349.65.

Inasmuch as about six-sevenths of the committee's expenditures are for salaries, it is obvious that by far the largest single element in the committee's increased operating needs is the general pay raises granted all congressional employees over the years.

Second. The Committee on Un-American Activities, unlike most other committees, is an investigating committee. This means not only that it must employ full-time investigators, but that it must pay their investigative expenses as well as their salaries. It now has six investigators, by the way, two of them ex-FBI agents and one a former agent of the Secret Service.

Here, too, costs have risen considerably. The per diem allowance for traveling congressional employees was once $7. Then it went to $9. Now it is $12. The mileage allowance has gone up similarly, from 9 to 12 cents per mile.

These facts, combined with the fact that investigators generally have to spend more time in the field than in years past, mean that the committee's investigative costs—even though it has fewer investigators than formerly—are now much higher than before.

Why must our investigators spend more time in the field? Primarily because the Communist Party has gone successively deeper and deeper underground since the days of the 80th Congress.

There was a time when hundreds, even thousands, of known Communists operated more or less above ground in numerous fields. Those days are gone—I hope forever. But the more dangerous secret Communists are still with us in significant numbers, the danger they pose is far from gone, it is very real—and with each passing day it becomes harder and harder to ferret them out. Longer and more intense investigative effort must be made for the committee's hearings. This is another reason its costs have gone up.

Third. Over the years, the committee has given some salary increases to its higher bracket personnel, the purpose being to obtain—and retain—qualified professional staff members in more important positions. This, however, has been a relatively minor factor.

Fourth. The number of staff employees, over the years, have been increased from 40 to 50. This has been brought about by the increased workload of the committee. Let me give you an example of this.

Unlike other committees, the Committee on Un-American Activities is charged with retaining its files from year to year. They are not turned over to the House. In its 25 years of operation, it has accumulated a mass—and a wealth—of data of communism, Communists, and party and front operations in this country. Filing and indexing this material is a tremendous job—and one that must be done if the data is to have any value.

This work and the work of preparing information based on this data for Members of Congress, and for the committee's investigative staff occupies the full time of over 20 percent of the committee's employees. This is an expense that no other committee in the House—or the Senate—has.

How important is this data? In Executive Order No. 9835 of March 21, 1947, the so-called loyalty order, President Truman directed that the names of all applicants for Federal employment be checked against these files of the committee. This was continued during the administration of President Eisenhower and is still being done today in the administration of President Kennedy. These files are used by the FBI, the Civil Service Commission, and various other security agencies. Representatives of such executive agencies made more than 2,000 visits to the committee last year for this purpose.

And what about the Members of Congress?

During the 5-year period, 1958–62, the number of requests for information from Members of Congress handled by the committee's files and reference section almost doubled—and here are some figures on the last 3 years:

In 1960, the committee received 2,200 requests for information from Members, an increase of 27 percent over the previous year.

In 1961, the committee received 3,200 requests from Members, an increase of 45 percent over 1960.

In 1962, the committee received 3,800 requests from Members, an increase of 19 percent over 1961.

In 1960, the committee prepared 1,945 reports for Members of Congress in response to requests received; in 1961, 2,500 reports; in 1962, 3,747 reports—an increase of 50 percent over the previous year.

Mr. Speaker, that is a lot of reports. And that is what I have in mind when I say that the committee's workload has increased.

I could go on, Mr. Speaker, but I believe that the facts I have cited are sufficient to justify the committee's appropriation request and the action of our fine colleagues of the Administration Committee in approving it.

This request for the $360,000 for our annual expenses comes to you with the unanimous approval by the expressed vote of all of the members of the committee.

I wish also to say that on inquiring of my distinguished chairman [Mr. WALTER] as to what his wish was about a yea-and-nay vote on final passage, he sent word to me that if he were on the floor he would think it would be very unfortunate not to have a yea-and-nay vote on final passage of this resolution. So I am notifying the House now that on final passage of this resolution, on behalf of my chairman and with the unanimous approval of my committee, I am going to ask for the yeas and nays.

Mr. DEROUNIAN. If the gentleman will yield, will the gentleman answer these questions: The gentleman from New York [Mr. RYAN] stated that the committee had pilloried the Women Strike for Peace organization in the action of the chairman at the hearings. Is it not true that one Mrs. Lyla Hoffman, of Great Neck, Long Island, said she had been a member of the Communist Party 5 years previously, but refused to say whether or not she was a member now?

Mr. DOYLE. That is correct. Some of the women we subpenaed to come before those hearings reportedly had Communist Party membership or affiliation and pled the fifth amendment which was their constitutional privilege so to do. We expected these women to do that but because the gentleman from New York [Mr. RYAN], who was not present at the hearings, by the way, just now insinuated that these hearings were unfair and unjust and therefore without worthy foundation or justification. I will include in the closing of my remarks today the text of the opening statement which I made as subcommittee chairman on December 11, 1962, before we questioned any witnesses. The hearings we held were almost exclusively devoted to the fact of infiltration of this movement in and about the city of New York from which the gentleman emanates. My opening statement at the hearings will, I believe, clearly show that we did not imply or indicate that all the women, or most of the women in this movement for peace, were Communist affiliated, or subversive. His insinuation that the hearings were conducted for the purpose of lessening or weakening the movement for world peace is, of course, ridiculous on its face.

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Is it not a fact that Mrs. Dagmar Wilson, the president of this organization, openly welcomes Fascists, Communists, and Nazis into this group?

Mr. DOYLE. In the closing moments of the hearings, she said she would welcome Communists into her group even though they were known Communists but we did not charge or infer that Mrs. Wilson was herself a Communist. I wish to make that argument crystal clear. I think I told her that to her face during the hearings and publicly, but I also stated that I thought her willingness to welcome known Communists into the leadership of the Women for Peace organization resulted in a disservice to this movement. Mrs. Wilson is not from New York, but is a resident of Washington, D.C., and she made it clear in her testimony that she did not claim to have any control over these groups in the New York area.

Mr. DEROUNIAN. That is correct.

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the previous question.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. ROOSEVELT) there were—ayes 167, noes 22.

So the previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the committee amendments.

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 386, nays 20, not voting 29, as follows:

[Roll No. 6]

YEAS—386

Abbitt
Abele
Abernethy
Adair
Addabbo
Albert
Alger
Anderson
Andrews
Arends
Ashbrook
Ashmore
Aspinall
Auchincloss
Avery
Ayres
Baker
Baldwin
Baring
Barry
Bass
Bates
Battin
Becker
Beckworth
Beermann
Belcher
Bell
Bennett, Fla.
Bennett, Mich.
Berry
Betts
Boggs
Boland
Bolling
Bolton,
  Frances P.
Bolton,
  Oliver P.
Bonner
Bray
Brock
Bromwell
Brooks
Broomfield
Brotzman
Brown, Ohio
Broyhill, N.C.
Bruce
Burke
Burkhalter
Burleson
Burton
Byrne, Pa.
Byrnes, Wis.
Cahill
Cameron
Cannon
Carey
Casey
Cederberg
Chamberlain
Chelf
Chenoweth
Clancy
Clark
Clausen
Cleveland
Cohelan
Collier
Colmer
Conte
Cooley
Corbett
Corman
Cramer
Cunningham
Curtin
Curtis
Daddario
Dague
Daniels
Davis, Ga.
Davis, Tenn.
Dawson
Delaney
Dent
Denton
Derounian
Derwinski
Devine
Dole
Donohue
Dorn
Dowdy
Downing
Doyle
Dulski
Dwyer
Edmondson
Elliott
Ellsworth
Everett
Evins
Fascell
Feighan
Findley
Finnegan
Fino
Fisher
Flood
Flynt
Fogarty
Ford
Foreman
Forrester
Fountain
Frelinghuysen
Friedel
Fulton, Pa.
Fulton, Tenn.
Fuqua
Gallagher
Garmatz
Gary
Gathings
Giaimo
Gibbons
Gilbert
Glenn
Goodell
Goodling
Grabowski
Grant
Gray
Green, Pa.
Griffin
Griffiths
Gross
Grover
Gubser
Gurney
Hagan, Ga.
Hagen, Calif.
Haley
Hall
Halleck
Halpern
Hanna
Hansen
Harding
Hardy
Harris
Harrison
Harsha
Harvey, Ind.
Harvey, Mich.
Hays
Hechler
Henderson
Herlong
Hoeven
Hoffman
Holifield
Holland
Horan
Horton
Hosmer
Huddleston
Hull
Hutchinson
Ichord
Jarman
Jennings
Joelson
Johansen
Johnson, Calif.
Johnson, Wis.
Jonas
Jones, Ala.
Jones, Mo.
Karsten
Karth
Keith
Kelly
Keogh
Kilburn
Kilgore
King, Calif.
King, N.Y.
Kirwan
Kluczynski
Knox
Kornegay
Kunkel
Kyl
Laird
Landrum
Langen
Lankford
Latta
Leggett
Lennon
Lesinski
Libonati
Lindsay
Lipscomb
Lloyd
Long, La.
Long, Md.
McClory
McCulloch
McDade
McDowell
McFall
McIntire
McLoskey
McMillan
MacGregor
Madden
Mahon
Mailliard
Marsh
Martin, Calif.
Martin, Mass.
Martin, Nebr.
Mathias
Matsunaga
Matthews
May
Miller, Calif.
Miller, N.Y.
Milliken
Mills
Minish
Minshall
Monagan
Montoya
Moore
Moorhead
Morgan
Morris
Morrison
Morton
Mosher
Moss
Murphy, Ill.
Murphy, N.Y.
Murray
Natcher
Nelsen
Nix
Norblad
Nygaard
O'Brien, N.Y.
O'Konski
Olsen, Mont.
Olson, Minn.
O'Neill
Osmers
Ostertag
Passman
Patman
Patten
Pelly
Pepper
Perkins
Philbin
Pike
Pilcher
Pillion
Pirnie
Poage
Poff
Pool
Price
Pucinski
Purcell
Quie
Quillen
Rains
Randall
Reid, Ill.
Reid, N.Y.
Reifel
Reuss
Rhodes, Pa.
Rhodes, Ariz.
Rich
Riehlman
Rivers, Alaska
Rivers, S.C.
Roberts, Ala.
Roberts, Tex.
Robison
Rodino
Rogers, Colo.
Rogers, Fla.
Rogers, Tex.
Rooney
Roudebush
Roush
Rumsfeld
Ryan, Mich.
St. George
St Germain
St. Onge
Saylor
Schadeberg
Schenck
Schneebeli
Schweiker
Schwengel
Scott
Secrest
Selden
Senner
Shelley
Shipley
Short
Shriver
Sibal
Sickles
Sikes
Siler
Sisk
Skubitz
Slack
Smith, Calif.
Smith, Iowa
Smith, Va.
Snyder
Springer
Stafford
Staggers
Steed
Stephens
Stinson
Stratton
Stubblefield
Sullivan
Taft
Talcott
Taylor
Teague, Calif.
Thomas
Thompson, La.
Thompson, Tex.
Thomson, Wis.
Thornberry
Toll
Tollefson
Trimble
Tuck
Tupper
Tuten
Udall
Ullman
Utt
Van Deerlin
Vanik
Van Pelt
Vinson
Waggonner
Wallhauser
Watson
Watts
Weaver
Weltner
Westland
Whalley
Wharton
White
Whitener
Whitten
Wickersham
Widnall
Williams
Willis
Wilson, Bob
Wilson,
  Charles H.
Wilson, Ind.
Winstead
Wright
Wydler
Young
Younger
Zablocki

NAYS—20

Ashley
Brown, Calif.
Diggs
Dingell
Duncan
Edwards
Farbstein
Fraser
Gill
Gonzalez
Green, Oreg.
Kastenmeier
Multer
Nedzi
O'Hara, Ill.
Roosevelt
Rosenthal
Roybal
Ryan, N.Y.
Staebler

NOT VOTING—29

Barrett
Blatnik
Bow
Brademas
Broyhill, Va.
Buckley
Celler
Fallon
Gavin
Hawkins
Healey
Hébert
Hemphill
Jensen
Kee
Macdonald
Meader
Michel
Morse
O'Brien, Ill.
O'Hara, Mich.
Powell
Rostenkowski
Sheppard
Teague, Tex.
Thompson, N.J.
Walter
Wyman

So the resolution was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Hébert with Mr. Jensen.

Mr. Hemphill with Mr. Wyman.

Mr. O'Brien of Illinois, with Mr. Meader.

Mr. Rostenkowski with Mr. Bow.

Mr. Walter with Mr. Morse.

Mr. Brademas with Mr. Gavin.

Mr. Fallon with Mr. Broyhill of Virginia.

Mr. Sheppard with Mr. Michel.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, again the House of Representatives has expressed its overwhelming approval of the work of the Committee on Un-American Activities. I was delighted to give it my support because I think this committee has alerted the American people to subversion in the United States.

Opponents of this committee have stated that reputations of American citizens have been besmirched. I have never seen a list of these injured parties, although in almost 11 years of service in the House of Representatives I have waited for these names.

It is interesting to note, and I am proud to state, that not one Republican Member of this House opposed appropriation of necessary funds to the Committee on Un-American Activities, today.

COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I call up House Resolution 74 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the expenses of the investigation and study authorized by H. Res. 73 of the Eighty-eighth Congress incurred by the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, not to exceed $150,000, including expenditures for the employment of experts, and clerical, stenographic, and other assistance, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized by such committee, signed by the chairman thereof and approved by the Committee on House Administration.

SEC. 2. The official stenographers to committees may be used at all meetings held in the District of Columbia unless otherwise officially engaged.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the committee amendments.

The Clerk read as follows:

Line 1, following "That" insert "effective January 3, 1963".

Line 4, strike out "$150,000" and insert "$60,000".

Line 13, insert a new paragraph as follows:

"SEC. 3. No part of the funds authorized by this resolution shall be available for expenditure in connection with the study or investigation of any subject which is being investigated for the same purpose by any other committee of the House, and the chairman of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs shall furnish the Committee on House Administration information with respect to any study or investigation intended to be financed from such funds."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I call up House Resolution 227 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That, effective January 3, 1963, in carrying out its duties during the Eighty-eighth Congress, the Committee on Ways and Means is authorized to incur such expenses (not in excess of $25,000) as it deems advisable. Such expenses shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized by such committee, signed by the chairman thereof, and approved by the Committee on House Administration.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the committee amendments.

The Clerk read as follows:

Line 4, strike out "$25,000" and insert "$12,500".

Line 9, insert the following new paragraph:

"SEC. 2. No part of the funds authorized by this resolution shall be available for expenditure in connection with the study or investigation of any subject which is being investigated for the same purpose by any other committee of the House, and the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means shall furnish the Committee on House Administration information with respect to any study or investigation intended to be financed from such funds."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks in the RECORD on the resolutions considered today.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

PROGRAM FOR THE REMAINDER OF THIS WEEK

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to inquire of the majority leader as to the program for the rest of the week, if he can tell us, because I have had a number of inquiries on my side, as I am sure he has had on his side, as to what we may expect.

Mr. ALBERT. If the gentleman will yield, we have finished the legislative business of the week. There will be no legislative program tomorrow. There is a possibility we may have a message from the White House, but I know of no other matter that might require the presence of Members.

Mr. Speaker, it will be the purpose tomorrow to ask unanimous consent that the House adjourn over until Monday.

Mr. HALLECK. I thank the gentleman.

ARE WE CONDONING PIRACY

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, how much are our actions influenced by what Russia thinks?

Recently the United States has condoned piracy on the high seas, apparently because this piracy was sanctioned by Russia.

On February 17 an act of piracy was committed against a Venezuelan ship, the *Anzoateguy*. On the same day Russia praised the act of piracy, calling it:

> Another brilliant page to the heroic struggle. The banner of liberty has waved in the Caribbean Sea and the Atlantic Ocean.

Aside from firing across the bow of the pirate ship we did nothing. Only the naive would question that we could have captured the ship if we had desired.

In January 1961 a murderous assault was committed on the Portuguese ship *Santa Maria*. Members of the crew were murdered, and although American warships could easily have captured the ship, they were not allowed to do so apparently because Russia was loudly crying that this action of piracy was right because Russia was against Portugal.

Both of these actions clearly were acts of piracy, a crime so heinous that it is one of the few crimes specifically mentioned in our Constitution. The Congress at an early date authorized the President to instruct the commanders of our armed vessels to subdue, seize, take, and send into any port of the United States, any vessel or boat, the crew whereof shall be armed and which shall have attempted or committed a piratical aggression.

The warships of the world were not limited to merely seizing those who committed piratical acts against ships owned by their country, for a very early Supreme Court ruling stated:

> Pirates may, without doubt, be lawfully captured on the ocean by the public ships of every nation, for they are, in truth, the common enemies of all mankind.

The courts of the world also ruled that the definition of piracy need not depend on the motive of private gain. Under international law the warships of the United States or any nation have the right to seize ships held by pirates, bring them into port and try those guilty of piracy.

The Geneva Sea Conference, which was ratified by our Senate, stated:

> All states shall cooperate to the fullest possible extent in the repression of piracy on the high seas.

The refusal of our Government to capture the pirates of the Portuguese ship *Santa Maria* is in large part responsible for the bitterness which exists against us in Portugal today. This is particularly sad because Portugal has been our friend since the Colonies first sought freedom from England.

Undoubtedly American ships could have seized the crews who committed the acts of piracy on both of these ships; but the pirates claimed they were Communist and Russia jumped to their defense. We should keep in mind that being Communist does not allow people to commit piracy with legal immunity. America must do what is right regardless of whether or not the wrongdoers are Communist.

I recently heard the remark: "It is a shame that Captain Kidd was born two centuries ago—he could have claimed he was a Communist and been given a haven instead of being hanged."

The United States must do what is right and not condone wrong just because the Communists try to force us.

MEXICAN FARM LABOR

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. TEAGUE] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Speaker, Public Law 78, which authorizes the existing arrangement between the United States and the Republic of Mexico, whereby Mexican nationals legally are brought to this country as a supplemental farm labor supply, will expire this year.

I have introduced H.R. 1836 to extend the program in its present form for 2 years.

I know of no subject on which there is more misunderstanding and misinformation. For this reason, Mr. Speaker, I have asked unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD at this point an article entitled "Grapes of Wrath Rot in the Sun," by Victor Riesel, which appeared in the Los Angeles Times of October 16, 1962. It seems to me to answer the charge that our farmers do not need the Mexican labor, and I commend it to the reading of every Member of Congress:

GRAPES OF WRATH ROT IN THE SUN

(By Victor Riesel)

MODESTO.—Grapes of wrath is the only crop being harvested the year round in this valley and for hundreds of miles south. Word of the farmers' revolt in the Midwest has stirred the growers, the fruit and vegetable ranchers in California.

I heard over in San Francisco that there was talk here in the lush San Joaquin Valley—among the operators of the fields which are the food factories, the vegetable baskets of the land—talk of revolt and letting the stuff rot.

If this revolt develops among the growers who sink their hearts and money into the ground, your food shopping bill at home will skyrocket.

Remembering well the days I covered farm and ranchers' and growers' revolts—the spilled milk, the rotting vegetables and melons and beans and lettuce—and aware that the growers here are avidly watching the National Farmers Organization revolt 1,500 miles east, I drove into the valley.

Let me tell you about Modesto. Small cities such as this one some 110 miles east of San Francisco will swing into the news if the fruit and vegetable growers make good their private angry warnings. If labor can strike, so can they, they say. Modesto is the county seat of Stanislaus County, in one of the most sprawling, fertile, productive valleys in the land. When I arrived there was peak harvesting of tomatoes.

The growers had been short 12,000 workers for more than a week. The losses can't be calculated. Some of the fruit which should have been harvested that week was finally picked—but a week too late. Much of it was overripe. One grower alone had $2,300 worth of tomatoes rejected by the cannery in a single day after he was able to start picking. The fruit was spoiled. Fewer tomatoes will reach far-off markets. The fewer the fruit, the higher the prices in the big cities.

Pickers are scarce for many reasons in the tomato fields, as well as in the more difficult asparagus and melon fields. Stanislaus County, for instance, needs 5,000 to 6,000 pickers for peaches early in the season. At the height of the season the growers need 11,000 men. Then, at the end virtually no hands are needed.

Mexican labor is eager to work. But the law says that there must be no U.S. workers available before the Mexicans—braceros—can come in. The U.S. workers can take their pick of picking. They wait and see where the work is less backbreaking.

So you can have the crisis of fruit suddenly ripening in the field. The crop must be picked or it rots. But many of the domestics are in one part of a county waiting for a peach crop while a melon crop is near ruin.

Then your sentiment all depends on where you sit. If you are a farmworker you just don't want to do "stoop labor." You don't want to go out into the higher paying melon fields in 110° heat picking melons and slinging them into a heavy bag over your aching shoulders. So you wait for the $1.10-an-hour peach-picking harvest.

But if you're a grower and your investment is out in that sun-baked field and a year's income may melt in that sun, you want help immediately. And you don't want to wait for the bureaucratic farmworkers referral offices or the other official agencies to decide at the last minute whether you can have Mexican help.

If you're a grower you're ready to pay—and I was startled at how much. I have just gone over wage costs in some fields. Mexican melon pickers, willing to work in the sun, have earned from $20 to $30 a day, while U.S. pickers have waited for the lower paying though less brutal peach crop, giving them $10 a day.

I have checked and rechecked payroll records on a melon ranch—and found that at the height of the season some packing shed workers have earned as much as $600 a week. Women in other shed operations have taken home over $200 a week. This happens during a period of 15 weeks. Some average $4,000 for that period. Others take $6,500. Then the crop runs out and they do get unemployment relief ranging up to $55 a week.

These are the steady workers. They lay off from the second week in October to late April. They start then in El Centro. They work the crop there and then swing onto a circuit—from El Centro to Yuma, Ariz., and on to the San Joaquin Valley in this general area.

The growers say they're ready to pay. But they want workers. They say that they are forced to take any itinerants who come along, though they may not be farmworkers, but want a few days pay and then drift on.

They report that in a batch of workers sent them not so long ago, just 1 man out of 1,798 domestic workers worked more than 4 weeks. All the others quit in a short time. In Salinas, America's vegetable basket, during one harvest season, only 63 out of 1,193 U.S. workers completed a job for which they were hired.

Small wonder one grower told me: "You folks in the big cities better take notice. One of these days the vegetable basket will be empty. We can strike, too. The unions do it. The farmers do it. We will, too."

SHALL THIS UNION OF STATES BE PRESERVED?

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. HALL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, recently Mr. Bonner Fellers, chairman of the Citizens Foreign Aid Committee, sent me a copy of a speech by the Honorable Samuel B. Pettengill before the Missouri House of Representatives in Jefferson City on March 27, 1946. Believing Mr. Pettengill's remarks to be more pertinent now than they were 17 years ago, I insert them in the RECORD. One cannot help but state the conclusion that we have traveled a long way down the road cited by Mr. Pettengill.

SHALL THIS UNION OF STATES BE PRESERVED?

Missouri's share of the Federal debt is twice the assessed value of all your taxable property. Missouri has used its blood and treasure to save the United States from foreign foes. Will Missouri now show an equal resolution to save itself from being swallowed up by the Federal Government?

On our steady progress toward the centralization at Washington of both political, financial, and economic power over the lives of men, I ask this question: Between where we are now and where Hitler took the German people, at what point do you propose to stop?

It is very clear that we are moving away from "an indissoluble Union of indestructible States" toward a consolidated bureaucracy—a Europeanized America.

The first great breach in the dike of the American Constitution was the adoption of the 16th amendment authorizing the taxation of incomes without limit. The Federal Government, in time of peace, should have no more absolute power over your property than it has over your life or liberty. Many States have constitutional limits upon the power to tax and the power to go into debt. The Federal Government has none. But without such a restriction, then, as Governor Lehman of New York said, "The States may be deprived of the means of financing themselves and their local governments. They would become vassal States and as units of government, would disappear."

The second great breach in the dike was the Supreme Court decision in the second AAA case giving the general welfare clause, for the first time in judicial history, an interpretation which Thomas Jefferson held would remove the essential landmark dividing the Nation from the States. It held that Congress can spend money for purposes not specifically granted in the Constitution.

A prime purpose of the Constitution was to place limits on governmental power. But we now have vested in the Federal Government the unlimited power to tax and the unlimited power to appropriate. As a result, the Federal Government taxes away from Missouri the wealth, created by its citizens, and then by gift, loan, subsidy, and grants in aid, feeds Missouri money—less the political brokerage—back to Missouri. This makes Missouri and her officials suppliants to Federal power for the right to use the wealth which they create. Missouri and all other States now live by Federal grace and not by ancient right.

The third great breach in the dike came with the fantastic folly that the Federal Government can "create purchasing power," or as stated by Mr. Roosevelt, that it should "provide customers for business," by oiling up its printing press. This idea was taken straight from Mussolini and Hitler. With it goes the excuse that debt is of no importance because "we owe it to ourselves."

This has given the green light to the Rake's progress of easy money, the soft way out of difficulty. The degrading effect of this immoral doctrine upon the character of the American citizen is manifest on every hand. It is making America a nation of moochers and panhandlers. It invites to the Nation's Capital vast pressure groups which carry on a sort of civil war against each other for this corrupting flood of unearned dollar bills.

This is the moral cancer at the political heart of the Republic. It is destroying the unity of the Nation and the fraternal association of its people. It has led to 16 consecutive years of "charging it on the cuff," with no end in sight, and any end proposed by such men as Senator HARRY BYRD is bitterly opposed. It is leading to inflation and the dilution, if not the destruction, of the savings of the people. It is taking from their hands the power over the purse, the strongest weapon freemen have ever devised to prevent government from destroying them. It is substituting the gravy train for the American eagle as our national symbol.

It should be plain to all but rakes and thieves that the Federal Government cannot create wealth, cannot create purchasing power in any honest use of words. If the Government taxes Peter to pay Paul, it simply forces the transfer of wealth from one to the other; it does not create new wealth or enrich the Nation by a dime. The same is true when it sells its bonds to Peter to give the money to Paul. It is equally true when it prints money or sells its bonds to commercial banks. This also transfers wealth by diluting the value of every dollar earned by honest toil and saved by homely thrift.

It is as dishonest as pouring water into milk. Having taken value out of good dollars, as thieving kings once clipped the edges off gold coins, the Federal Government, through OPA is now trying as desperately to give value to its watered money in order to conceal its fiscal crimes, as when men were guillotined for refusing to give up wheat and wine for the diluted paper currency of the Government of France when it began to issue counterfeit money to pay its bills.

This process not only strengthens the Executive and weakens Congress by making it possible (for awhile) to carry on vast socialistic programs without resort to taxation and the brake on spending which taxation always exerts, but it is a sword in the vitals of the States of the Union.

This is so because States and cities are forbidden to print or coin money to pay their debts. They cannot make the money markets their creatures nor depreciate interest rates at their caprice. When States, counties, cities, and towns undertake to borrow money, they have to pay interest rates established in a free market, and must satisfy the lender that the loan is sound. To pay interest and principal of debt, States and municipalities have to get the cash the hard but honest way—by taxing the people. This puts some brake on their borrowings, some resistance to socializing the business of their taxpayers. You see this force at work in every municipal ownership election.

The Federal Government, however, is under none of these restrictions. It can force interest rates down, borrow huge funds cheaply, pay its obligations of interest and principal by converting more of its promises into Federal Reserve notes, or by devaluing its gold and silver hoards—"clipping the coins" to pay its bills—or by outright greenbacks.

The Federal Government has a printing press; the States do not. This easy money route promotes the growth of Federal power and subtracts from State and local self-government, which we thought for centuries to be necessary to prevent the return of Caesars, or dictators.

It is high time to recall the words of the great British statesman, William Pitt: "No civilization * * * can be accepted as secure in which expenditure is greater than revenue." It is imperative that the Octopus on the Potomac be made to balance its budget.

There must be no Missouri compromise with the principles for which our fathers died.

SAMUEL B. PETTENGILL.

GRAFTON, VT.

IMPORTATION OF AGRICULTURAL COMMODITIES ALREADY IN SURPLUS

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. LANGEN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Speaker, I have today proposed legislation which I feel is of great importance to the future of agriculture in the United States. That future at the moment is clouded with the uncertainties of decreasing markets, uncertain prices, surpluses, subsidies, and Government control. This bill deals with but a part of the agricultural situation, a part that is sometimes overlooked but that nevertheless must be dealt with if we ever hope to arrive at a lasting solution to the overall problems facing American agriculture. The particular situation to which I refer is that of the importation of agricultural commodities which are already in surplus.

It has always been a source of amazement to me that we explain our surpluses strictly in terms of the farmer. That misunderstood man in overalls has been maligned again and again as the cause of our surpluses, simply because he became the best farmer in the history of mankind. But we must look deeper for the total reason for our surpluses.

We are presently importing, and have been for a number of years, several agricultural commodities, already in surplus, in such large quantities that these imports are, in effect, being placed in storage. The taxpayer pays the storage costs, prices are edged higher through support payments, the resultant higher prices attract further imports, and the American farmer is left literally holding the feedbag, watching his market disappear into the oversea sunset. It should be obvious that we must reexamine our position on imports.

My colleagues will recall that I have noted on other occasions a number of specific crops where our imports far exceeded our surpluses. For instance, in a 10-year period we imported twice as much barley as our surplus grew during the same period. We imported over four times as much oats in that same 10 years as our surplus grew. Rye is another example. Meat products have experienced similar evidence of injury to American producers because of excessive imports.

Permit me to state at this point that I am not against all imports of agricultural products. Nor do I feel that imports alone are the only and complete solution to the agricultural problem. But I do think that it is unreasonable to propose or request that American farmers curtail their production of certain commodities which are in surplus, and at the same time make no effort to at least control the imports which have played such a large part in creating many of the surpluses.

We gathered in this House today to consider a supplemental appropriations bill, which was most essential under the circumstances. There are many reasons why we had to consider it at this time. One reason, while not a major one, was that Government purchases and stocks of dairy products were much higher than anticipated. This alerts us to problems on the import scene that have come about in recent months, and in particular, a real problem for the future of the dairy industry.

While this Government buys our surplus dairy products, increased shipments of cream arrive at our ports from overseas. The National Milk Producers Federation, in its February 21, 1963, news bulletin, notes that "continuing imports of foreign cream as of February 2 totaled some 500,000 pounds since January 1, according to a midmonth report by the Bureau of Customs." The same bulletin reports that 2 million additional pounds are reported en route to eastern ports.

This can only serve to further aggravate the whole agricultural scene. In fact, it could result in our being asked to appropriate additional funds to purchase dairy products under existing laws.

The bill I have introduced today, however, provides that the President should call for an investigation by the U.S. Tariff Commission in such cases as these when any agricultural commodity which is in surplus is being imported. It does not order anyone to do anything. It does not close the door on imports. But it does make possible a determination of the facts regarding imports of such commodities, and will provide a solid basis on which realistic approaches and decisions can be made.

I respectfully urge the prompt consideration of this bill.

IMPACTED AREA ASSISTANCE

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. KEITH] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEITH. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I introduced a bill to extend the temporary provisions of Public Laws 815 and 874 for 2 years. It is my sincere hope that the Congress will act favorably on this legislation early in the session and thus avoid the chaotic situation we faced 2 years ago.

In the 1st session of the 87th Congress, we allowed these laws to expire because there were hopes of passing a general education bill which would include impacted area assistance. But, as you well know, Mr. Speaker, general education did not pass—we only succeeded in delaying and postponing the issue of impacted area aid until the closing hours of the session.

We imposed considerable hardship upon communities dependent on Federal funds. Local budget planning was extremely difficult. In many small towns, education constitutes a sizable portion of the budget. If Federal funds were not forthcoming, the tax rate would have to be raised. Not knowing whether they would receive Federal funds, they obviously could not estimate expenditures or tax rates for the coming year.

Mr. Speaker, this year we must avoid such a situation. Local communities look to the Congress for prompt, responsible action. The question of impacted area aid should be considered on its own merits and not tied to an omnibus education bill.

The need for Public Laws 874 and 815 is well established. Across the Nation, some 4,065 educational agencies are eligible for operation and maintenance aid, some 217 for construction assistance. To the 12th Congressional District of Massachusetts, for example, this aid totals about $1.5 million.

Recently I have received many letters from superintendents of schools, school boards, and interested citizens urging my support for early extension of Public Laws 815 and 874.

Harvard H. Broadbent, superintendent:

> The Barnstable School Committee adopted a resolution requesting that you support an early extension of Public Laws 874 and 815 in their present form.

Sandwich School Commission:

> Request immediate consideration and passage of renewal of Public Laws 874 and 815 in their present form.

John J. Rolfe, Wareham superintendent:

> Support the continuance of section B of Public Law 874. In its present form Wareham receives $35,000 each year under section B.

Albert F. Hunt, superintendent:

> Bridgewater School Committee favor extension of Public Laws 874 and 815 in their present form.

William Ripley, Jr., superintendent:

> We are particularly interested in continuing the B section of Public Laws 874 and 815. During the past 4 years Cohasset has received an average of $13,220.37 per year under Public Law 874. The loss of this money would mean approximately $1 per thousand on the tax rate on real estate.

F. Edward Nicolas, superintendent:

> To the town of Plymouth in dollars, it means a loss of $22,000 which is computed as a budget figure for 1963–64. * * * Urgently request you to support an early extension of Public Laws 874 and 815 in their present form.

Everett L. Handy, superintendent:

> I am writing to ask your continued support of Public Laws 874 and 815 in their present form. During the past several years Duxbury has benefited considerably by payments under Public Law 874 and with this money has been able to extend a number of areas of the school program which it would have been difficult to do had this money not been available. Although Duxbury does not qualify under Public Law 815 in my judgment there are many communities so located that the assistance of this law is most deserving.

Sydney G. Pierce, superintendent, Eastham-Orleans-Wellfleet regional school:

> Urge you to support an early extension of Public Laws 874 and 815.

Donald Fisher, superintendent, West Bridgewater:

> Aware of the great burden our larger school budget places on the local property taxpayers we recognize the Federal allocation of funds and the State reimbursement money have aided greatly in giving our children worthwhile educational program.

Leonard G. Palopoli, assistant superintendent:

> The school authorities of Abington will be most grateful for any efforts which you may exert in behalf of favoring the continuance of all the provisions of Public Laws 874 and 815.

Wilfred H. Graves, superintendent, Bourne:

> I sincerely hope that I may have a great deal of help from you * * * to initiate early consideration of renewal of these programs. If this drags out, I am afraid we can expect a long hard pull, that may extend well through the summer.

Mr. Speaker, I repeat for emphasis, the need for impacted area legislation is well established—local schools expect responsible, early consideration from the Congress—we cannot let Public Laws 815 and 874 expire—the question should be considered on its own merits—I urge the Congress to act expeditiously on this legislation.

UNITED NATIONS SPECIAL FUND: ANALYSIS CONTINUED

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. Hall] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, in my continuing investigation into the workings—may I say the amazing workings—of the United Nations Special Fund, I have come across a United Nations declaration that points out candidly that this Fund is a foreign aid program designed to strengthen nations.

Now, strengthening nations may be all well and good. Particularly, in view of the 40-percent contribution which the United States makes to the Special Fund's finances, it may be good for the American taxpayers if friends of the United States are strengthened.

But, can there be any possible sane reason for America's overwrought taxpayers subsidizing the building up of nations committed to the burying of the free Western civilization?

I commend the following article, provided by Mr. Philip Deane, Director of the U.N. Information Center here in Washington, to the attention of my colleagues, and I wish to point out two particular statements within it:

First. In the eighth paragraph Mr. Deane tells us that the Special Fund is not "charity," saying:

> The country that receives nearly always gives more than it receives.

Mr. Deane might just as easily have pointed out that the United States always gives far more than it receives. That is not hard when you are receiving nothing. However, he does not note that Poland, Yugoslavia, and Cuba have contributed to the Special Fund far less than they have received from the Fund. That must be some sort of charity.

It appears that the United Nations by the use of fuzzy argument is deliberately attempting to mislead the American taxpayers who are footing most of the bill.

Second. May I direct your attention now to the ninth paragraph of the accompanying U.N. statement. There we are told that the United States pays only 17 cents for every dollar's worth of Special Fund project. That, of course, depends upon the amount of contribution to the project made by the receiving nation. That rate varies from project to project.

As I have pointed out before, the value to the United States of these local contributions is limited by currency-convertibility restrictions imposed by the benefiting nations—especially Communist nations who benefit. They provide that almost none of their funds may be spent in the United States or for U.S. equipment or experts.

Finally, I ask the Members of this House to note the title of the U.N. statement: "United Nations Special Fund—A No-Frills, Low-Cost Approach to Self-Help for Underdeveloped Countries."

This tells us that it is not a "frill" to delve into the mating habits of the desert locust and not a "frill" to provide for nuclear research in Communist Yugoslavia. These cannot be frills because the U.N. Special Fund says they are not. Did anybody ask the American taxpayers?

This title tells us, for instance, that Communist Poland and Yugoslavia are underdeveloped because the U.N. Special Fund says they are—not because the American taxpayer says they are.

Again, this title tells us that the Special Fund is a low cost arrangement.

Well, certainly it is low cost for the Communist bloc which makes a token contribution and never increases it as I have shown this House. Certainly it is low cost for the U.N. which has no money of its own to spend anyhow. Certainly it is low cost for the Red nations of Cuba, Poland, and Yugoslavia which are getting back dollars for every nickel they contribute to the Special Fund.

Just as certainly, this Special Fund is not low cost to the American taxpayer, who is footing 40 percent of the Special Fund bill and who has generously increased his contributions to the Fund 300 percent in 5 years while the U.S.S.R. has not increased contributions at all.

It becomes obvious that we Americans are finding out that there is far more to this U.N. Special Fund iceberg than is evident above the surface of the United Nations propaganda.

It is time we got the shivers about this thing and got busy chipping away the frosty excesses of a foreign aid program paid for chiefly by Americans—who already are paying for their own aid to places they at least can decide whether or not to aid.

UNITED NATIONS SPECIAL FUND: A NO-FRILLS, LOW-COST APPROACH TO SELF-HELP FOR UNDERDEVELOPED COUNTRIES

1. Help, sometimes, is no help. A gift, a loan or an investment in a developing country might be largely wasted if that country does not have trained people to put to work the help they get. Even if there are trained people, they will not make the best use of the help they receive if they don't know what resources their country has, what can be developed and what cannot; white elephants and castles in Spain can waste a lot of money. Moreover, unless a developing country can show it has resources ripe for development, that country will not attract investment; businessmen—local as well as international—don't launch into the unknown with their shareholders' money.

2. This vital preinvestment work—producing technical and managerial skills, proving resources, stimulating investment—is the main business of the United Nations Special Fund.

3. The Special Fund runs surveys that reveal what wealth exists in a nation's land, water, minerals, oil, forests.

4. The Special Fund helps set up programing units of experts who can put first things first on the priority lists of developing countries.

5. The Special Fund helps set up schools for administrators, managers, technical experts, foremen and ordinary craftsmen even.

6. The Special Fund helps with teachers' colleges because without high school graduates, no country can beat poverty.

7. All this is essential preinvestment work. Its cost, like seed money, is little. It yields rich and indispensable harvests.

8. The Special Fund is not charity. The country that receives nearly always gives more than it receives—to the project on its own soil and to projects in other less fortunate lands. Further, the Special Fund mobilizes additional resources from European and other industrialized countries, some of whose contributions are substantial.

9. As a result, for every dollar's worth of project completed with Special Fund participation, the United States pays only 17 cents. Other forms of economic aid often cost the United States a full hundred cents to the dollar. The contribution of the United States to the Special Fund's 246 projects thus far approved will reach $84 million.[1] The total cost of these projects is $496 million [1] and their yield is incalculable.

10. Every Special Fund operation is a telling lesson in the no-nonsense, no-frills, self-help approach to economic development.

11. The Special Fund is welcome wherever it works.

SEPARATION OF CHURCH AND STATE

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SILER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. SILER. Mr. Speaker, I notice that one of the great departments of our Federal Government, Health, Education, and Welfare, has allotted a sum of $250,000 to the gentleman from New York [Mr. POWELL] for aiding him in trying to solve the problem of juvenile delinquency. The gentleman from New York [Mr. POWELL] is pastor of a large Baptist Church in New York City and part of the allotted fund is to be paid to his own church as rent for the basement of the church building that will be used as a site for this work, a total of $17,000 being earmarked for such rent.

Now as an active Baptist myself, I know how zealously and jealously we Baptists always try to guard against any breach whatsoever in the wall of separation between church and state. If the Powell church had been a Catholic Church, instead of a Baptist Church, we Baptists and many others of similar conviction would have been up in arms because of this use of public tax money indirectly for a sectarian purpose. We would have decried the use of sectarian property for governmental functions, especially at what appears to be a very lavish outlay of rental consideration. And I certainly think we would have been amply justified in our criticism of this kind of public tax money and of this manner of governmental use of a specific church building. If these things might have been considered out of place in relation to a Catholic Church, then they are equally out of place in relation to a Baptist Church. I think we should be fair, unprejudiced, and always quick to condemn in our very own circle that which we might readily condemn if it involved another circle down the street from us. Therefore, I would like to put myself on record as a stringent and uncompromising critic of the use of this public tax money through the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare for rent of a Baptist Church basement at $17,000, both because of the public tax money involved and the governmental function to be pursued in the church mentioned. Doubtless there are 1,000 suitable places in New York City that are neither sectarian nor of any religious relationship whatever which might have been used for the money and purpose involved in this instance. Why not avoid the very appearance of evil? Shades of Roger Williams, the original Baptist leader in America, let us have a completely free church or churches in a completely free state—not a tax-subsidized or tax-sustained church in some kind of sectarian state here in our country.

CUBA

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, the news today carries a story that a top Communist in Cuba, Raul Castro, admits only Russian help keeps the Cubans alive. Thus, the Communist government in Cuba becomes one of the few countries in the world in which there has been food rationing, and now clothing rationing has been added to their problems. All of which indicates that the pressures which have been applied to the Communist government of Cuba are having some desired effects from the U.S. standpoint.

There are some who continue to engage in what I call the numbers game, how many Russians and Chinese in Cuba; or who continue to engage in a game of having intelligence information which is better than that of the United States about what is going on with respect to the Communist movements in Cuba or other places around the world. I have two observations to make for people who are still interested in the past or determining exactly Russian actions in Cuba. One is that we have enough congressional investigations going on now—one man or otherwise—to satisfy the most partisan and the most meticulous on those questions.

The second observation is, as our President has said, the danger is not in whether there is one soldier or not in Communist Cuba—the danger is the fact that communism exists in Cuba and it is the base for subversion in the entire hemisphere, therefore all of our policies must be directed to the eradication of that Communist government and that cancer. With this, all of us can agree.

The time has come for us to take those additional actions which would hasten that day of deterioration and final eradication of the Communist government in Cuba. It is heartening, Mr. Speaker, to know that the Cuban problem will be on the agenda of the next conference of the American governments that will take place at Costa Rica.

It is also encouraging, Mr. Speaker, to know that the Organization of American States continues its keen awareness of the Communist offensive in the Western Hemisphere. By resolution of the eighth meeting of Consultation of Ministers of Foreign Affairs held at Punta del Este, Uruguay, in January 1962, a special consultative committee on security was created. This advisory body, made up of experts, was deemed necessary to advise member governments which might require and request assistance in the common goal of fighting the subversive action of international communism and preserving democracy in the Americas.

---

[1] These figures were true as of several months ago; they should now read $98 million and $589 million.

That committee has made several reports and important recommendations for the consideration of the American governments. In light of the coming meeting, and because of their very nature, these recommendations are important. In its initial general report of 1962, the special consultative committee on security recommended as follows:

V. RECOMMENDATIONS

The recommendations set forth below are the recommendations that the committee, in this first stage of its work, has considered pertinent with respect to resolution 112(c) of the eighth meeting of consultation of ministers of foreign affairs. The first recommendations are restricted to the measures that the American states should take to counteract the subversive action of international communism; the second, to other aspects of the problem contemplated in Resolution II of Punta del Este.

A. MEASURES TO COUNTERACT SUBVERSIVE ACTIVITIES

First. According to resolution II of the eighth meeting of consultation, the committee is to submit to the Council of the Organization in this report any general recommendations it considers pertinent in this initial stage of its work regarding measures that should be taken with respect to the subversive action of international communism. To that end, the committee carefully examined the efforts that have been made in the past to combat and to eradicate from this hemisphere subversive activities directed, assisted, or instigated by extracontinental powers, designed to replace our democratic institutions with totalitarian ideologies and forms of government.

Second. This almost uninterrupted struggle against subversive action has now entered its third decade. When the activities of the Axis agents were involved, the system of security against subversion functioned satisfactorily and gave satisfactory results. The first three meetings of consultation recommended the various kinds of internal measures that each state should take to prevent and punish espionage, sabotage, propaganda, and the other subversive activities, and those that should be taken to insure the degree of international cooperation required for the effective operation of the system. The earnestness with which the governments adopted measures and cooperated with each other made it possible to check Nazi-Fascist subversive action in the Western Hemisphere effectively.

3. Unfortunately, the situation has been, and continues to be, entirely different in the matter of the fight against the subversive action of the international Communist movement. It cannot be denied that not only have the results obtained in World War II not been obtained in this matter, but the Sino-Soviet powers have been able to carry on their offensive largely unimpeded in several countries, and a beachhead has been established in American territory, which constitutes a very grave threat to the security of the hemisphere. This development of the Communist offensive is contrary to the objectives and decisions that have appeared in resolutions adopted by the Inter-American Conferences and Meetings of Consultation since 1948. For purposes of the recommendations stated below, the committee deems it advisable to pause here in order to quote the pertinent sections of the abovementioned resolutions.

4. When the problem of the preservation and defense of democracy against the threat of subversive action by international communism was presented for the first time at the Conference of Bogotá (1948), the American republics resolved:

1. To reaffirm their decision to maintain and further an effective social and economic policy for the purpose of raising the standard of living of their peoples; and their conviction that only under a system founded upon a guarantee of the essential freedoms and rights of the individual is it possible to attain this goal.

2. To condemn the methods of every system tending to suppress political and civil rights and liberties, and in particular the action of international communism or any other totalitarian doctrine.

3. To adopt, within their respective territories and in accordance with their respective constitutional provisions, the measures necessary to eradicate and prevent activities, directed, assisted, or instigated by foreign governments, organizations, or individuals tending to overthrow their institutions by violence, to foment disorder in their domestic political life, or to disturb, by means of pressure, subversive propaganda, threats, or by any other means, the free and sovereign right of their peoples to govern themselves in accordance with their democratic aspirations.

4. To proceed with a full exchange of information concerning any of the aforementioned activities that are carried on within their respective jurisdictions.

5. The Fourth Meeting of Consultation of Ministers of Foreign Affairs (Washington, 1951), convoked specifically because "the growing threat of international Communist aggression has demonstrated the urgent necessity that the free nations of the world determine the most effective methods for preserving their freedom and independence," and "the need for adopting measures to insure the economic, political, and military defense of this hemisphere is urgent and of common interest to the American Republics," resolved:

1. To recommend to the Governments of the American States:

(a) That, mindful of their unity of purpose and taking account of the contents of Resolution VI of the Second Meeting of Consultation in Havana and Resolution XXXII of the Ninth International Conference of American States in Bogotá, each American Republic examine its respective laws and regulations and adopt such changes as it may consider necessary to assure that the subversive activities of the agents of international communism, directed against any of them, may be adequately prevented and punished;

(b) That, in accordance with their respective constitutional provisions, they enact measures necessary to regulate in the countries of America transit across international boundaries of those foreigners who there is reason to expect will attempt to carry out subversive acts against the defense of the American Continent; and

(c) That, in the application of this resolution, they bear in mind the necessity of guaranteeing and defending by the most efficacious means the rights of the human person as well as their firm determination to preserve and defend the basic democratic institutions of the peoples of the American Republics.

For the purpose of facilitating the fulfillment of the objectives of this resolution, it was recommended that the Pan American Union prepare technical studies on certain aspects of subversive action. In accordance with the recommendation, the Department of Legal Affairs prepared a report on "Strengthening of Internal Security," which was submitted to the governments and published in 1953.

6. In the "Declaration of Solidarity for the Preservation of the Political Integrity of the American States Against the Intervention of International Communism," the Tenth Inter-American Conference (Caracas, 1954), again insisted on the need to adopt and carry out measures to counteract the subversive activities of the international Communist movement, recommending that the American governments, without prejudice to such other measures as they might consider desirable, should give special attention to the following steps for the purpose of counteracting such activities within their respective jurisdictions:

(a) Measures to require disclosure of the identity, activities, and sources of funds of those who are spreading propaganda of the international Communist movement or who travel in the interests of that movement, and of those who act as its agents or in its behalf; and

(b) The exchange of information among governments to assist in fulfilling the purpose of the resolution adopted by the inter-American conferences and meetings of ministers of foreign affairs regarding international communism.

7. In view of the foregoing, the committee has not considered it necessary, in this initial stage of its work, to examine the measures intended to counteract subversive activities. It considers that, at least for the moment, it has the vast experience acquired through the measures adopted during World War II. However, the committee does consider it desirable—and an unavoidable duty—owing to the nature and scope of its terms of reference, to point out to the Council of the Organization the urgent need for each and every one of the American governments to give the greatest possible application to the measures that have been adopted since 1948 by the Inter-American Conferences and Meetings of Consultation. As stated above, in the fight against the subversive action of international communism, the American governments in general have not, unfortunately, demonstrated the same zeal and earnestness that they manifested during World War II in fighting Nazi-Fascist subversive action, and perhaps this is one of the reasons for the degree of development of Sino-Soviet and Castro activities in these past few years.

8. In connection with the foregoing, it should be noted that, in Resolution VIII, the Fourth Meeting of Consultation (1951) explicitly stated:

Since the said subversive action recognizes no boundaries, the present situation requires, in addition to adequate internal measures, a high degree of international cooperation among the American Republics, looking to the eradication of any threat of subversive activity which may endanger democracy and the free way of life in the American Republics.

It is obvious, therefore, that owing to the methods employed by international communism, the lack of cooperation of one State can render inoperative the measures adopted by a contiguous State; and when several States fail to cooperate, the system for defense against subversion as a whole becomes ineffective. The interdependence of the measures to counteract subversive action is such that if any government fails to apply them, the system is weakened and its entire effectiveness is undermined. This is the impression one receives from surveying the American scene over the past few years.

9. Along the same line of thought, the committee would also like to recommend that, in adopting and applying internal

measures, the governments act with the necessary vigor which is required to combat subversive action. In making this recommendation, the committee has kept in mind especially two fundamental considerations: the first is that the agents of international communism, as the fourth meeting of consultation stated, are attempting to destroy the democratic institutions, "utilizing for this purpose the exploitation and the abuse of these selfsame democratic liberties"; and secondly, that the measures adopted by the competent authorities to counteract the subversive action, whatever its nature and scope, are not, by any means, inconsistent with the internal and international obligation of the state to respect human rights and fundamental liberties.

10. In connection with this second consideration, the committee wishes to add that the subversive action of international communism presupposes the performance of acts directed, assisted, or instigated by foreign powers or governments, and that therefore, they constitute grave acts against the public order and the security of the state, especially when the agent carrying out the subversive action is a national or citizen of that state. Under the laws of all the countries of the world, and the international instruments governing the matter, the enjoyment of human rights and fundamental liberties is subject to the limitations and restrictions that the state is expressly authorized to impose for reasons of internal security or other reasons that are considered vital to the welfare of the nation. It can be easily understood, therefore, what a legal and political mistake it would be to tolerate subversive activity or fail to combat it adequately, out of fear that human rights and fundamental liberties would not be respected.

11. The above recommendations and considerations, therefore, are completely consistent with the aim, already expressed in Resolution VIII repeatedly quoted, that in applying the measures referred to, the states should bear in mind "the necessity of guaranteeing and defending by the most efficacious means the rights of the human person as well as their firm determination to preserve and defend the basic democratic institutions of the peoples of the American Republics." On this point, the above-mentioned Pan American Union report states that in its conclusions care was taken to guard against the possibility that such ways and means be used to obstruct or suppress genuinely democratic expressions of opinion, activities, or political aspirations, completely foreign to international communism." The same legitimate concern appears again in Resolution I4(c) of the Eighth Meeting of Consultation as one of the basic political principles set forth in that resolution:

"The repudiation of repressive measures which, under the pretext of isolating or combating communism, may facilitate the appearance or strengthening of reactionary doctrines and methods which attempt to repress ideas of social progress and to confuse truly progressive and democratic labor organizations and cultural and political movements with Communist subversion.

"B. Vigilance for the Purpose of Warning Against Acts of Aggression, Subversion, or Other Dangers to Peace and Security, and Self-Defense."

In establishing this Committee, the Eighth Meeting of Consultation resolved:

1. To request the Council of the Organization of American States to maintain all necessary vigilance, for the purpose of warning against any acts of aggression, subversion, or other dangers to peace and security, or the preparation of such acts, resulting from the continued intervention of Sino-Soviet powers in this hemisphere and to make recommendations to the governments of the member states with regard thereto.

In the preamble to Resolution II, it is stated "it is advisable, therefore, to make available to the Council of the Crganization of American States a body of an advisory nature * * *. In this connection, the committee takes the libery of offering its technical services to the Council for the purposes outlined in the paragraph cited above. To this effect, the committee also takes the liberty of submitting to the Council for consideration its recommendation that the member States be invited to furnish the Council with any information that they may exchange between themselves, pursuant to the resolutions mentioned above, as well as any evidence they obtain regarding Communist deception that can be added to the evidence contained in this report. This information would be examined by the committee from the purely technical standpoint, in accordance with whatever directives the Council might issue to it, in order that general studies and pertinent recommendations might be submitted to the Council for consideration.

The Committee makes this recommendation having in mind the fact that Communist deception and techniques vary constantly, and that only by studying them in a determined, continuous, and comparative manner can conclusions be reached and suggestions made that would be of great utility in more effectively combating communism. In all this, the committee is fully aware that it is the governments and peoples of America who have the right, capacity, and interest to counteract the subversive action of the international Communist movement.

The eighth meeting of consultation also resolved:

"3. To urge the member states to take those steps that they may consider appropriate for their individual or collective self-defense, and to cooperate, as may be necessary or desirable, to strengthen their capacity to counteract threats or acts of aggression, subversion, or other dangers to peace and security resulting from the continued intervention in this hemisphere of Sino-Soviet powers, in accordance with the obligations established in treaties and agreements such as the Charter of the Organization of American States and the Inter-American Treaty of Reciprocal Assistance."

In view of the nature and scope of this paragraph of Resolution II, the committee considers that it would be highly desirable for the General Secretariat to prepare a study of the background of the exercise of individual and collective self-defense, especially with reference to the threats and acts referred to in the said paragraph.

The committee also deems that it would be very useful to the general objectives of Resolution II if the General Secretariat would issue a new, up-to-date edition of the report on "Strengthening of Internal Security," published in 1953.

Manuel Campos Jiménez,
Chairman of the Committee.
Julio César Doig Sánchez,
Vice Chairman of the Committee.
Francisco Marcelo Ramírez.
Thomas D. White.
Joaquim Canuto Mendes de Almeida.
Julio César Vadora Rozier.
Joaquín Zaldívar.
April 30, 1962.

Mr. Speaker, in a recent additional report, the committee has made other recommendations to the American Governments. Among these are:

First. The effective control of travel to Cuba, including both national and international procedures.

Second. Exchange of information between governments on known Communist subversive agents and persons who travel to Cuba.

Third. Plan to counteract, weaken, or cancel out Communist propaganda carried on through any medium.

Fourth. Enact measures which might control the transfer of funds for subversive purposes. Also to exercise strict control over national procedures used by Communists to obtain funds.

Fifth. Improving the intelligence services of each country to coordinate and carry out effective action against Communist subversion.

Sixth. Establish real and effective collaboration of those agencies in each country charged with action against Communist subversion.

Seventh. Transmit all information on subversive activities to the central committee.

These and other stringent measures which have been recommended are only the forerunner of the joint action which can and must be taken by the members of the Organization of American States to meet the Communist threat in all of Latin America and to help bring about the elimination of the Communist base in Cuba.

Mr. Speaker, as I have maintained for several years, the American states must take all cooperative action, military, economic, and ideological to deal with the menace of communism in the Western Hemisphere, and particularly the problem of Cuba. As our President has stated, the existence of a Communist government in Cuba is incompatible with the inter-American system and all our policies are directed toward its elimination.

I would hope, as we all do, that effective joint action of the American countries will be successful in meeting the threat of Communist subversion in Latin America and in eliminating the Communist government in Cuba. However, in the final analysis, as I have repeatedly maintained for several years, the existence of a Communist government in Cuba is a direct threat to the peace and security of the United States and failing all else, the United States must, in its own security interests, take whatever action necessary, military or economic, to eradicate that government.

FREIGHT RATES

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Ashley] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. ASHLEY. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced a bill to amend section 22 of the Interstate Commerce Act to provide a means by which freight rates established under that section for the U.S. Government may be set aside if they are unjustly discriminatory or unduly prejudicial.

Contrary to common belief, Mr. Speaker, there are two sets of rules in public ratemaking.

The rules for private industry are set forth in the Interstate Commerce Act and various other transportation statutes and regulations. These rules require shippers to govern themselves in such a way as to insure equality for all in regard to transport rates and services.

The rules for the Federal Government are set forth in section 22 of the Interstate Commerce Act, which states clearly that rates on Government traffic are exempt from Government regulation.

The paradox is clear. The Government, which is the largest shipper in the world, is charged by law with the responsibility of maintaining fair and impartial freight charges. However, this largest shipper easily avoids the controls and restrictions with which all other shippers must comply by legally obtaining unregulated rates concessions under section 22 of the Interstate Commerce Act. Even more ironic—and dangerous—is the fact that there is presently no procedure by which an interested party can question the fairness of these unregulated rates, nor does ICC have authority to determine whether they are discriminatory.

It is to this point that my bill is directed. It does not seek to abolish section 22 but simply to establish a procedure which will assure that rates, fares, and charges under this section are fair. It does this by prohibiting any Federal agency from quoting or tendering a section 22 rate to the U.S. Government which subjects any particular locality, port, port district, gateway, region, district, or territory to any unjust discrimination or any undue or unreasonable prejudice or disadvantage. Agencies or departments of the Federal Government would be required to file any rate which they intend to accept under section 22 with the ICC at least 15 days before such rate is accepted and the Commission would receive complaints and hold hearings to determine whether such rates are discriminatory or prejudicial. Under the bill, if a rate was found to be discriminatory, the Commission would then issue such order or orders as might be necessary to remove the unreasonable preference or advantage.

Before directing attention to the Government's present use of section 22, I would like to review briefly the history of this section. It is most interesting and is also relevant to the legislative proposal under discussion.

Section 22 was incorporated in a bill enacted in 1887, popularly known today as the Interstate Commerce Act, the purpose of which was to bring order out of the freight-rate chaos which existed at that time.

In the early years of rail transportation, Federal assistance was given to various railroad companies in the form of land grants amounting to over 140 million acres—an area equal in size to all of Michigan, Wisconsin, Illinois, Indiana, and nearly half of Ohio. At that time the land was valued at approximately $130 million. In return for the railroad grants the Government received compensation in the form of reduced transportation charges on mail, troops, and Government property as required by the land-grants acts.

However, there were many rail lines which were not the beneficiaries of land grants from the Federal Government. These lines were under a competitive disability as far as movement of Government traffic was concerned. The act of 1887 recognized this and section 22 was added to bring about equalization of land-grant and nonland-grant railroads by exempting all carriers from the regulated freight rate controls which the act established, insofar as Government traffic was concerned.

In the years that followed, military and nonmilitary traffic moved over the land-grant railroads at substantial savings to the Government. Nonland-grant railroads that wished to compete for this traffic equalized their rates through section 22. It was not until 1945 that Congress finally relieved the land-grant railroads from any further obligation to transport persons and property for the military at reduced rates. However, section 22 was allowed to remain in the act in its original form and it became the only mechanism through which the Government, without any control at all, could receive lower rates than those available to commercial shippers. It is not surprising that it quickly became a competitive weapon among regulated carriers.

Since 1945 the use of section 22 to secure reduced rates on Government freight has grown to astronomical proportions and the consequences have been correspondingly serious. The filing of section 22 rates with the Defense Traffic Management Service alone grew to such proportions that in June of 1962 the agency announced that it was proposing the use of computers for handling these quotations due to the receipt of over 10,000 new section 22 rates per week.

By 1962 the situation had become so critical that Rupert Murphy, Interstate Commerce Commission Chairman, stated to the Senate Commerce Committee:

> A large percentage of the traffic transported for the Government now moves at reduced rates under section 22 which are not available to the commercial shipper. This preferential treatment has a strong tendency to increase the cost of transportation services to commercial users who, when their rates become too high, resort to private carriage. Such diversion of traffic to private carriage is obviously detrimental to the maintenance of a sound common carrier system. Moreover, the preferential treatment accorded the various levels of government is, in our view, inconsistent with the national transportation policy which has among its objectives to foster sound economic conditions in transportation.

What kind of situations did Chairman Murphy have in mind when he repeatedly referred to "preferential treatment detrimental to the maintenance of a sound carrier system"?

Perhaps the answer can best be illustrated by citing three examples. One involves a recent price quotation on surplus corn by the Department of Agriculture on a special delivered basis to 12 Southeastern States. The basis was the Chicago cash price plus 25 cents regardless of the point of destination. Obviously these quotations completely disregarded the costs of transportation in excess of 25 cents a bushel. If the Department of Agriculture used the published commercial rates, the differential was paid by the Department and ultimately by the taxpayer. If reduced rates were offered by a carrier under section 22, as appears likely, then the differential was either absorbed by the carrier or passed on to private shippers in the form of higher charges.

A second example occurred several years ago in June when carriers quoted the Government a $1.50 rate per hundred pounds to move shirts from Anderson, S.C., to Memphis, Tenn. The following March the rate was cut to $1.10 in May to 90 cents, in June to 80 cents, and in July to 75 cents. In 13 months the rate was cut in half while the commercial rate stood higher than the initial rate.

This is the same kind of destructive practice which was involved in the movement of aluminum pigs from a point in Texas to Hammond, Ind. In May the railroads established a commercial rate of $16.24 per ton. The General Services Administration had a sizable shipment about a year later, so to match the public barge rate of $12.71 a ton, the railroads quoted a section 22 rate of $12.71 or $3.53 per ton less than their published commercial rate. The water carriers then quoted $12.45 a ton or 26 cents per ton less than their published rate. In less than 2 years each mode of transportation made four further reductions and when the railroads finally reduced their rate to $9.45 a ton, the bargelines refused to be a party to a further reduction and consequently abandoned the tonnage to the railroads.

The third situation presented itself recently and involved the movement of tanks from Centerline, Mich., to a port of embarkation for shipment abroad. The published commercial rates from Centerline to Newport News—792 miles—were $1.37 per hundredweight, and to Toledo—50 miles—52 cents. The carrier, which I believe was the New York Central, offered a section 22 rate from Centerline to Newport News of 50 cents but offered no comparative section 22 rate to Toledo or any other available port and none was requested by the Defense traffic people.

Obviously, if anything in the nature of a comparable section 22 rate had been offered to Toledo or any other port less distant from point of origin than Newport News, the result would have been reduced freight charges to the Government.

Mr. Speaker, if all of the preferences and discriminations implicit in the use of section 22 were to be eliminated, it would be necessary to repeal the section outright. By definition, section 22 makes it possible for the Federal Government to accept freight rates and charges which are preferential to those available to private industry under section 15. From the standpoint of national security and in certain other respects, I believe the position of the Federal Government to be different in character from that of private commercial shippers and that therefore there is legitimate reason for retaining section 22. But I emphatically suggest that the use of this section should be legitimate and I would suggest further that history has demonstrated that this can never be achieved so long as the determination is left to the very governmental agencies that seek reduced rates, with no recourse to any impartial regulatory agency.

In essence my bill does nothing more than provide a day in court for those who claim that rates made available to the Federal Government under section 22 discriminate against one locality in favor of another. It would not eliminate the preference which this section offers to the Government but it would put a halt to one form of discrimination which is disruptive of our entire transportation system and which clearly represents an added and unconscionable charge to the taxpayer.

It is true that the ICC takes the position that it is not precluded from "prescribing" reasonable, maximum section 22 rates. It is equally true, however, that a prescription from the Commission has never been nor ever will be effective enough to deter a carrier or Government agency from using section 22 as they wish regardless of the consequences to private shippers, the national transportation system, or for that matter, themselves. Only a court decision can enforce the ICC recommendations and since any and all section 22 rate quotations are automatically within the law, the courts cannot very well hand down a decision against a defendant when there has been no violation. Such is the incongruity of section 22. It is a law against the law and yet exempt from all laws.

Finally, I want to point out that the provisions of the bill would not apply if the President or the head of any agency or department certifies in writing to the Commission that the disclosure of information with respect to section 22 rates would endanger the national security.

Mr. Speaker, the weakened condition of our national transportation system is a matter of grave concern to all of us. It is plain that a major contributing factor of ever-growing proportions is the failure of carriers to offer—and failure of the Government to insist upon—comparative section 22 rates. No budgetary purpose is served by this practice—quite the contrary—and we know from experience that it only promotes ruinous competition which inhibits modernization of equipment and otherwise helps to destroy the common carrier system.

For the Government to have played this ignominious role as long as it has is little short of a national disgrace. We cannot allow congressional inaction to further the destructive process.

Mr. Speaker, I ask prompt committee consideration of the bill I have offered and urge its support by my colleagues on both sides of the aisle.

URGENT NEED FOR CONGRESSIONAL JOINT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE AGENCIES OF GOVERNMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the previous order of the House the gentleman from Florida [Mr. Rogers] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, particularly disturbing are the reports that no conclusive photographs of Soviet intermediate range ballistic missiles in Cuba were made available to the President until the task of aerial reconnaissance was transferred from CIA to the Air Force. In its March 4 issue published this week, Newsweek magazine states that Presidential Security Adviser McGeorge Bundy transferred responsibility for these flights from CIA to the Strategic Air Command. Newsweek then states that the very first flight thereafter produced the evidence that triggered the face-down crisis of last October. Mr. Speaker, the implication clearly exists that CIA may have been the stopgap which accounted for the timelag of some 2 weeks in which the Russians almost completed their missile installation.

In addition, the Central Intelligence Agency has also caught the public eye with the recent statements of former Director Allen Dulles. In his remarks, Mr. Dulles said that the Kremlin had raised the art of espionage to an unprecedented height, and for that reason CIA should be exempt from any continuing congressional scrutiny. In short, Mr. Dulles argues, CIA should be left alone to continue its unparalleled role as the Nation's No. 1 untouchable Government agency.

It may be argued that the secretiveness of the CIA precludes the possibility of its successes coming to light; that its nature does not allow its ratio of success versus failure to be known. However, responsible Americans have begun to view the CIA differently. The Hoover Commission recommended that a congressional committee be set up to oversee the CIA. I have introduced legislation to establish such a committee—House Joint Resolution 211. And just last week, two of the Nation's leading newspapers, the Washington Post and the Evening Star, both editorially voiced their concern over the supersecret agency and, under unanimous consent, I include those editorials in the Record at this point:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, Feb. 20, 1963]

Congress and the CIA

As a former director of the organization, Allen Dulles writes with authority in his article declaring that there should be no further congressional curbs on the U.S. Central Intelligence Agency. This supersecret enterprise, of course, embraces some of our Government's most delicate and most dangerous operations, and it therefore bears vitally on the security of the Nation. That is why Mr. Dulles argues that it must be exempted from controls normally exercised by either the House or the Senate, or both working together in the form of a joint committee. As he has put it, "we are faced by an antagonist [the Kremlin] that has raised the art of espionage to an unprecedented height," and in such circumstances there is need to put a bridle on the American inclination "to talk too much about matters that should be classified."

These matters, according to Mr. Dulles, most certainly include the CIA's operations, which could be greatly hampered—and perhaps washed out altogether—if subjected to constant congressional gossip, scrutiny, and badgering of a sort that could let out all the secrets. This strikes us as a solid point, but Democratic Senator Morse, of Oregon, has firm views to the contrary. He believes that the CIA exercises police-state powers that should be taken away from it forthwith, and he intends to speak at length on the issue in the next week or so. The event will be awaited with interest, especially in view of the Senator's formidable capacity to speak at length. Meanwhile, it must be hoped that there will be no politicking in this exceedingly sensitive area.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Feb. 20, 1963]

Checking Intelligence

The opinion of Allen Dulles, former Director of the Central Intelligence Agency, that there is no need for more controls on this country's intelligence effort, carries a great deal of weight, because of his personal integrity and his long professional experience.

Nevertheless, his exhaustive and capable discussion of the work of the CIA, in the Encyclopedia Britannica, will not eliminate anxiety about the role of the Agency. It is true that the CIA operates under the President, the Secretary of Defense, and the Secretary of State, and that its work is under the scrutiny of the President's Board of Consultants on Foreign Intelligence Activities which meets several times a year, and that its appropriations pass through the Budget Bureau and the congressional Appropriations Committees. None of these devices provides a day-to-day check on operations and all of them together have not been sufficient to prevent CIA operations at cross-purposes with those of persons supposed to be carrying out American policy abroad.

There have been instances in Egypt, in southeast Asia, in South America, and even in Europe, in which such conflicts have been exhibited. Ambassadors have been hindered and embarrassed by the spooks who have been attached in times past to their Embassies but who have operated almost entirely outside their direction.

Nor is it completely reassuring to say that CIA agents never get involved in policy. The decision to seek information by clandestine means often is, in itself, a policy decision. The failures of intelligence gathering operations sometimes shape policy itself, in wholly unplanned ways. The U-2 episode in the Soviet Union is only the most dramatic illustration of the impact of intelligence activities on policy. And even where the primary intelligence mission is successful—diplomatic risks and costs are involved that may be disproportionate to the intelligence gain.

The congressional watchdog committee recommended by the Hoover Commission was decisively rejected by Congress in 1956 and it may not be the answer now. The other checks enumerated by Mr. Dulles, are not the whole answer, either. The President and members of his Cabinet can give only infrequent and crisis attention to the task. The Budget Bureau can give fund allocation close scrutiny but it is hardly in position to criticize actual field operations, or even to criticize appropriations when its experts turn out to be former CIA officials. The appropriation procedures of Congress afford no administrative control of day-to-day enterprises.

No objective person could read Mr. Dulles' formidable defense of the CIA without acquiring the conviction that the organization is of the greatest importance to the country's survival. Many will be convinced that it is so important that it cannot be left to carry out espionage, subversion and information functions all over the world without more continuous direction from the very highest level of the Government apparatus.

Mr. Speaker, truth does exist in Mr. Dulles' statement that the Kremlin is an accomplished antagonist. An agency charged with the operations such as those conducted by the CIA is vital to the security and tactics of America if we are to be successful in the cold war. However, the advantages of the CIA being exempt from continuing scrutiny of a permanent joint congressional committee are far outweighed by the disadvantages.

What happens, for example, when any Government bureau is allowed to go unchecked? The lack of congressional review results in inefficiency, needless and many times wasteful expenditures, as well as the pursuit of policies which may be completely contrary to national goals. If the principle of congressional review were not extended to every U.S. Government agency think of the uncoordinated duplication and damage which would result to this Nation. Consider as well the benefits which have accrued to America by a free press questioning the unclassified actions of the U.S. Government.

It is for the benefit of the Nation that Congress does police Government agencies. Where else but in the Congress, with legislative and appropriation review, can the entire spread of the U.S. Government be better coordinated and evaluated. And where else but in the Congress can the will of the American people be more directly interpreted?

Although CIA is subjected to some review each year when its budget is examined annually by the Bureau of the Budget and the Appropriations Committees of both Houses of Congress, such review can only provide hindsight—not daily checks or recommendations as they might be needed.

Mr. Dulles fears that congressional review of the CIA would produce security leaks and thereby destroy the effectiveness of the agency. If this were true, why is classified material now made available to congressional leaders by the President? Members of Congress are regularly given highly sensitive intelligence data pertaining to foreign affairs and defense matters, and the Nation's security is not jeopardized in the least. On the contrary, this Nation's well-being is enhanced when executive sessions are held by the congressional committees having jurisdiction in the military and international fields.

And Congress can keep a secret. When the United States was developing the atomic bomb during the closing days of World War II, it was felt that the Congress was entitled to know about the project. A top secret briefing was held on February 18, 1944, and seven congressional leaders of both Houses were advised of U.S. efforts in the nuclear field. Two of those distinguished leaders are still serving this Nation as Members of this House.

One year later, on February of 1945, five more congressional leaders were briefed on the development of atomic weapons.

Mr. Speaker, I know of no better kept secret.

The evidence of recent months shows that the CIA might not be the instrument it was designed to be. The U-2 incident of the Eisenhower administration caused serious implications in our foreign policy. The Bay of Pigs fiasco as well as the collection of intelligence data surrounding Cuba suggests there may well be some serious kinks in our intelligence system.

Thus, Mr. Speaker, the Central Intelligence Agency is once again involved in a new controversy respecting our foreign operations. How do we know the operations of this agency? What evidence is there to show that the agency's personnel is not delinquent in effecting a smooth transmission of vital intelligence data? And what proof have we that this agency, which in many respects has the power to preempt foreign policy, is not actually exercising this power through practices which are contradictory to the established policy objectives of this Government?

Mr. Speaker, in these days when the Nation is engaged in a struggle for its very survival, Americans and particularly the Congress, would do well to ask some searching questions about this supersecret organization. Such questions could be answered in the review provided by the Joint Committee as proposed in my bill, House Joint Resolution 211.

Mr. STINSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. STINSON. Mr. Speaker, I want to compliment the gentleman from Florida on the excellent job he has done in exposing some of the situation that has been going on down in Cuba and for bringing out the information about the fact missiles were not discovered until after the CIA was taken off the particular project.

Could the gentleman tell me from whence the information came that there were 42 medium or intermediate range missiles in Cuba?

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Actually, I think these reports were made by the Defense Department to the State Department.

Mr. STINSON. Is it not true that this information originally came from Khrushchev that there were 42 missiles, because we have no checks that might possibly be gathered in Cuba while CIA was in charge of the project?

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. I think we do have some reports from the exile groups that first started out checking the missiles. As to the exact number, I am not sure where the first reports came from, but it is my impression they have been verified in statements by our own Government.

Mr. STINSON. To my knowledge, and perhaps the gentleman can amplify this a little bit, there never has been any actual identification that there were 42 missiles brought into Cuba. We have not seen them. We do not know that there were 42 brought into Cuba.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. That could well be. We will not know the true story until we have on-site inspection.

Mr. STINSON. This information that 42 were there was actually received from Mr. Khrushchev, who has proven to be extremely unreliable in relaying information to the United States.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. I appreciate the point that the gentleman makes, but I think too we have had some verification from our own intelligence sources, including some of the exile groups. They have forwarded many of those reports. I have received some. I have turned these over to our Government agencies for checkout. It is a problem that cannot possibly be solved until we have some on-site inspection.

OVERCROWDED RAIL COACHES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. CAHILL] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. CAHILL. Mr. Speaker, I have taken this time to call to the attention of the Members of the House an omission in the Interstate Commerce Act relative to the transportation of passengers on railroad coaches in interstate commerce. This matter was brought to my attention indirectly as a result of an experience I personally encountered at 30th Street Station in Philadelphia on the evening of February 24, 1963. On that occasion a train operated by the Pennsylvania Railroad between New York and Washington stopped as scheduled in Philadelphia. The train consisted of some 13 railway coaches in addition to a diner, and so forth. When the train stopped the crew notified the several hundred passengers waiting to board the train at 30th Street Station that no seats were available and my personal investigation indicated to me that this condition prevailed from the time the train departed from New York. As a result of this announcement there was a mad rush of several hundred passengers and great danger of serious personal injury, particularly to many older passengers was created. No effort was made by the crew of this particular train to limit the number of passengers boarding the coaches and I personally observed several coaches that were so crowded that no one could move in the aisles. A very dangerous hazard was thereby permitted to exist by the railroad. I have in the past personally sympathized with the plight of the railroads, recognizing as I do the problems confronting them. I now think, however, that a great deal of their problems are of their own doing and that the service for passengers between Washington and New York is a good illustration of the failure of railroad management. I have personally observed the deterioration of this service during my 5 years in the Congress.

I find the coaches are many times unkempt, the service often is discourteous, and the equipment used by the railroads is generally of ancient vintage. The passengers who boarded this particular train in Philadelphia were charged a fare for a seat by the railroad and then were herded like a bunch of cattle into overcrowded coaches and forced to stand for approximately 2 hours. The management of the railroad with the knowledge that no seats were available from the time the train left New York made no provisions for any additional sections on this train and made no announcement to the passengers awaiting the train in Philadelphia of the unavailability of seats. Recognizing the dangers inherent with the overcrowding of railroad coaches, I contacted a representative of the Interstate Commerce Commission for the purpose of determining what regulation covered the number of passengers riding in railroad coaches in interstate commerce. I was informed that the Interstate Commerce Commission had no authority under the law to issue any such regulation. As of now, therefore, the railroads have the perfect right to carry as many standees in a railroad coach as they wish without regard to the safety of the passengers. The railroads, particularly the Pennsylvania, have been doing this for some time. I am convinced that the safety and welfare of the citizens of this country demand that some limitation be placed upon the number of passengers riding in these railroad coaches and I have, therefore, prepared and have today introduced a bill granting the Interstate Commerce Commission authority to provide by regulation such limitation. It is my sincere hope that this legislation will pass and that the Interstate Commerce Commission will be authorized and will in fact enact regulation limiting the number of passengers who will be permitted to stand while traveling on any railroad coach while that coach is in interstate commerce. I urge the Members of the House to support this legislation. Unless something is done to remedy these conditions that are now existing we may have in the near future, because of this overcrowding, a serious loss of life. The responsibility for regulation properly belongs with the Interstate Commerce Commission and this Congress should give such authority to this Commission. I sincerely hope, therefore, that the Members will support this bill.

MARINES FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 3 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, on yesterday the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. BURLESON] introduced a bill, H.R. 4222, to authorize the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia to request the assignment of U.S. Marines to assist in law enforcement in the District of Columbia.

I want to take this occasion to commend the distinguished gentleman from Texas for having offered the bill, and I assure him I support his bill 100 percent.

Never in the history of the Marine Corps has there been a greater need for the services of the marines than there is in the city of Washington today. Never before has there been an opportunity for so few—he asks in his bill for two companies of marines—to do so much good for so many people.

My prayerful hope is that the marines will soon land in the District of Columbia and have the situation well in hand.

We all know that at this time it is unsafe for people to be on the streets of Washington at night. Every kind of crime known to man is being committed here in the District. It is unsafe for high school groups to come and visit the Nation's Capital. Men and women are being mugged, stabbed, assaulted, and raped within the shadow of the dome of the Capitol. There is no place on earth where human life is more in danger after the sun goes down than in Washington, D.C. The marines, in my opinion, are overdue. I believe that two companies of marines can do a good job.

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDREWS. I am delighted to yield to the gentleman from Texas, the author of the bill.

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate what the gentleman has had to say. It is needless to assure him of the concern of the representatives of the board of trade in Washington about this matter, a story on which appeared in one of the local papers the other day, regarding their feeling about the economic effect of such a situation. Certainly it is going to have an economic effect. As the gentleman has pointed out, some communities in our country do not want their high school and college boys and girls to come here, for fear that something unfortunate will happen to them.

The situation is a disgrace. I should like to ask the gentleman if he would agree, if our Government officials find it necessary or desirable to send troops to other places to enforce the law of this land, why should they not be willing to send them to a Federal territory to protect the people here?

Mr. ANDREWS. The gentleman is eminently correct. I would say that conditions are no worse in Vietnam today than they are in certain areas of Washington, D.C. I am sure the gentleman read the story recently of two busloads of school kids who came down from Massachusetts and, lo and behold, someone stole one of the buses. How much worse can conditions get?

Mr. Speaker, I certainly hope the gentleman's bill becomes law.

DECISIONS BY SUPREME COURT SOMETIMES FRUSTRATING

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. WATSON] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. WATSON. Mr. Speaker, is there any way to predict the actions of the Supreme Court? Obviously, it is not governed by the well established legal principle of "stare decisis." In the case of *Roth* v. *United States* (354 U.S. 476), the Supreme Court held "obscenity is not within the area of constitutionally protected speech or press" and may therefore be regulated by the States.

Nevertheless, on February 18, 1963, the Supreme Court of the United States, in the case of Bantam Books, Inc., et al. against Joseph A. Sullivan, et al., found the activities of the Rhode Island Commission To Encourage Morality in Youth to be in violation of the Constitution of the United States. The commission sought to remove from public sale publications tending to the corruption of youth. By its action, the Court frustrated an attempt by a State of this Union to combat the problems of juvenile delinquency.

While I recognize and endorse the primary responsibility of the family for encouraging morality among our youth and for guidance in the choice of literature that youth should read, it is inconceivable to me that, in an allegedly intelligent society, we can expect the family to exercise this primary responsibility and then at the same time allow society to engulf our children with trashy literature when they leave the portals of home.

Unless such groups as the commission created by Rhode Island are permitted to encourage good works and to condemn bad ones, then we as a government and as a society are working in opposition to the home and the training we expect to be given there. We cannot expect our youth to feel that the home is giving them proper instruction when at the same time society seems to say that anything goes.

Freedom of speech is a liberty which I cherish and for which I will stand second to no man in defending. But the Supreme Court has laid the basis here for a subsequent approval of the conduct of a man who stands up in a crowded theater and yells "Fire." This decision is deserving of more than passing notice. The trend indicated portends consequences which should cause all parents who love and hope for the best in their children to shudder.

Mr. Speaker, this decision will do incalculable harm to those patriotic and concerned groups, such as the one in Richland County in my district, which are conscientiously trying to cope with a serious juvenile problem. Instead of encouraging juvenile decency by preventing the sale, distribution, or display of indecent and obscene publications to youths under 18 years of age, the Court has in effect told our States and local communities to stop all preventive measures and start building bigger jails.

It is high time for the Supreme Court to return to its intended role of giving legal continuity and stability to our laws rather than disrupting all judicial processes and public spirited efforts by vacillating back and forth with the will and caprice of every sociologist.

ESTABLISHMENT OF A YOUTH CONSERVATION CORPS

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Flood] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced a bill to establish a Youth Conservation Corps which would provide useful employment and training for unemployed young men and women age 16 through 21.

Such a program would be established for the purpose of performing needed conservation and natural resources work under the supervision of both Federal and State conservation agencies.

There are similarities between the Youth Conservation Corps and the Civilian Conservation Corps that existed during the 1930's. As the Civilian Conservation Corps succeeded in providing opportunities for our youth three decades ago, I am confident the proposed Youth Conservation Corps can fulfill successfully a similar need in the 1960's.

My congressional district, which comprises all of Luzerne County, Pa., suffers from historic structural unemployment due to the depressed conditions of our heretofore prosperous No. 1 major industry—anthracite coal. Such a situation as exists in my district only serves to aggravate the prospects for employment of the youth in my area because employers will naturally hire the heads of households to sustain families rather than hire the younger persons. At the present time there are some 20,000 men out of work in my district. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, it is readily apparent that the youth of my district find it most difficult in obtaining gainful employment there due to conditions of many years duration. That is one of the reasons why I feel such a program as the YCC would be a great benefit to our young people, not only from my experience and observation over the years as a Representative of Pennsylvania's 11th District, but from discussions I have had with other Members of this body having such employment problems in their districts.

It should also be pointed out that our youth have the further problem of not being able to find jobs because employers are reluctant to hire them if they have not completed their military obligation and, moreover, they have the added problem of finding employers reluctant to go to the expense of training them, only to subsequently lose them to the military services.

The establishment of Youth Conservation Corps would permit the utilization of our young people to work on certified projects of great value to the local communities under the supervision of local organizations such as educational and welfare groups and committees, urban redevelopment committees and boards, many of whom have performed truly outstanding jobs for the betterment of their immediate localities.

I have introduced a bill for the redevelopment of the Susquehanna River basin throughout the States of Pennsylvania, New York, and Maryland. A 6-year survey was begun last year by the Army Corps of Engineers for this purpose. The establishment of a Youth Conservation Corps would be ideal in carrying out many of the features of the Susquehanna River redevelopment program, such as assisting in the revival of the once-prosperous lumber industry, the construction of recreational centers to encourage tourism which in itself would be a great boon in providing jobs for our unemployed. Tourism as an industry has been neglected in my area of Pennsylvania where it has immense potential in greatly improving the economy of the region.

So that the principal provisions of the bill to establish a Youth Conservation Corps might be made readily available, the following is a summary of the bill I introduced today and I would like to include it as part of my remarks and have it inserted at this point in the Record:

Principal Provisions of the Youth Employment Act of 1963

This legislation contains two titles—the first establishes a Youth Conservation Corps, the second a local area youth employment program. Both programs are designed to provide useful employment and training to unemployed young men and women 16 through 21 years of age. Authorized appropriations for the program are included in the President's budget for fiscal year 1964. The legislation carries the full endorsement of the White House and the Bureau of the Budget.

TITLE I—YOUTH CONSERVATION CORPS

1. A Youth Conservation Corps (YCC) is established to perform needed conservation and natural resource work under the supervision of Federal and State conservation agencies.

2. The YCC will be located within the Department of Labor. The Director of the YCC (appointed by the President with the advice and consent of the Senate) will perform such functions as prescribed by the Secretary of Labor. The Secretary of Labor will consult with the Secretaries of Agriculture, Interior, and Health, Education, and Welfare regarding the operation of the YCC. A National Advisory Council (appointed by the Secretary of Labor) will advise on the operation of the YCC.

3. Enrollment in the YCC will be open to young men 16 through 21 years of age. Minimum enrollment period will be 6 months with a maximum enrollment of 2 years. Enrollees will receive $60 per month in wages and receive board, lodging, clothing, tools and equipment, medical care, and other necessities. It provides for a YCC not to exceed 15,000 enrollees during the first fiscal year of its operations; the size of the YCC for the succeeding 4 years will be determined by Congress through appropriations but may not exceed 60,000 at any one time. No specific termination date is included in the legislation.

4. Technical training and other educational skills will be provided after work periods through arrangements made by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and local educational authorities.

5. An allotment formula provides that 50 percent of the enrollees are to be selected from the States on the basis of population figures and 50 percent allocated in such manner as determined by the Secretary of Labor, with special preference given to areas of substantial unemployment. Selection of enrollees will be made by the respective State employment services.

6. Two-thirds of the YCC will work on lands of the national forests, national parks, and other Federal conservation agencies. One-third of the YCC will be available for work on State forests and parks on a 50-50 matching basis.

7. Congress is authorized to appropriate such funds as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of title I.

TITLE II—LOCAL AREA YOUTH EMPLOYMENT PROGRAM

1. Through the use of 50-50 matching grants, local public or private nonprofit agencies will be permitted to pay the wages of youngsters for useful full-time or part-time work not currently being performed by regular employees.

2. Unemployed young men and women 16 through 21 years of age will be eligible for jobs under the program.

3. The program is designed to depend on local initiative. Local groups, such as educators, welfare and employment service officials, and private agencies will formulate a local employment program proposal. This program proposal will be submitted to the Secretary of Labor for approval. A National Advisory Council (appointed by the Secretary) will advise the Secretary on the approval of such specific programs and on the operation of the program in general.

4. In order to be approved, the local programs must increase the employability of the enrollees or enable student enrollees to resume or maintain school attendance, permit a public undertaking or service that would not otherwise be provided, and not result in the displacement of regular workers, etc. Testing, counseling, job development, and job referral services will be provided for every enrollee.

5. Local employment opportunities would include jobs in schools, hospitals, libraries, welfare agencies, courts, children's homes, etc., in public programs relating to park improvement, playgrounds, etc., and in private community activities such as the Visiting Nurses Association, Boy Scouts, etc.

6. The legislation authorizes the Congress to appropriate sufficient funds to support a program not to exceed 50,000 enrollees at any one time during the first fiscal year and thereafter such numbers as Congress may maintain through appropriations. Authority for this program terminates on June 30, 1966.

(Note.—The provisions of the Youth Employment Act, should not be confused with the National Service Corps—the so-called domestic peace corps. The purpose of the Youth Employment Act is to establish programs that can begin to cope with the problem of youth unemployment while also making a significant contribution to the conservation of natural resources and the achievement of general public needs. Enrollees will be unemployed young men and women, many of them school dropouts, who join to obtain job training and experience. The National Service Corps will be a vehicle for those public-spirited persons already possessing considerable training and skills to contribute their time and talent in the service of less fortunate members of society.)

NEED FOR COMMITTEE ON CAPTIVE NATIONS

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Flood] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, last week I learned from a statement made by our able Assistant Secretary of State for African Affairs, G. Mennen Williams, that the U.S. Government was supporting the right of Angolans to self-determination and that its attitude had been clearly demonstrated at the United Nations. It was not surprising. Our championship of self-determination rights is of long standing. It is known throughout the world, both the free world and the slave world.

Hence, Mr. Williams stated what we all espouse. He also gave correct interpretation to President Kennedy's views. Addressing the United Nations General Assembly on September 25, 1961, President Kennedy put himself unequivocally behind the universal application of the principle of self-determination. He said:

> Let us debate colonialism in full and apply the principle of free choice and the practice of free plebiscites in every corner of the globe.

However, the State Department does not follow it "in every corner of the globe." It does not apply the principle of self-determination to Russia—the only colonial empire left on the globe. The question why has been recently answered in a lucid manner by the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Feighan]. In the keynote address delivered at the Political Forum of American Friends of Anti-Bolshevik Bloc of Nations, Inc., in New York, on February 9, 1963, he subjected to penetrating criticism the State Department's double standard in dealing with the captive nations problem in various corners of the globe. I wish to include the keynote address with my remarks.

I also wish to dwell for a few moments on the peculiar reason for the State Department's opposition to the application of the self-determination principle to Russia. As stated in Mr. Dean Rusk's well known letter of 1½ years ago to the distinguished chairman of the House Rules Committee, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. Smith], the State Department would not apply such a principle, for example, to the Ukraine, Armenia, and Georgia because they were considered as "parts of historical Russia."

Mr. Speaker, I could not subscribe to this policy because it, first, utterly contradicts our fervent desire, so succinctly expressed by President Kennedy in his United Nations address, that the tide of self-determination does not stop before submerging the Communist empire after it already has cleansed Asia and Africa. Second, such policy is distasteful to every American because it shows the State Department using a double standard also in this case.

It was between 1792 and 1795 that Russia annexed a part of what today is known as the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic. Subsequently, however, she lost a large segment of her acquisitions to Poland between the two world wars and again to Germany in the last war. Galicia and the Carpatho-Ukraine never belonged to Russia before 1944–45. Nevertheless, the State Department does not exclude either Galicia or the Carpatho-Ukraine from its concept of a "historical Russia."

The northern portion of Armenia was annexed to Russia in 1828, while her southern portion did not come under Russian sovereignty until 1878. Moreover, Armenia became independent in 1918 and managed to stay independent until 1921.

Georgia's annexation to Russia was accomplished by a unilaterial imperial proclamation in 1801. The Georgians responded with passive resistance and frequent open clashes, always drowned in blood and followed by deportations and less and less freedom. Like Armenia, Georgia proclaimed her independence in 1918 and lost it under tremendous odds in 1921.

These are relatively brief and often interrupted periods of Russian supremacy in the Ukraine, Armenia, and Georgia.

Mr. Speaker, is this not a double standard the State Department is employing to assess Russia's historical rights to their colonies? I do not condone Russia's colonial rule over some 100 million non-Russians in the Soviet Union.

Mr. Speaker, is it not high time that Congress take a hard look at the State Department's pro-Russian—I am not saying pro-Communist—policy, and at its obstinate refusal to implement the noble principles that are embodied in Public Law 86–90? And who could do it better than a Committee on Captive Nations, the establishment of which I again proposed in House Resolution 14? I am proud that the resolution has received so much gratifying support on both aisles of the House.

Mr. Speaker, I hereby urge the distinguished chairman of the House Rules Committee to report favorably House Resolution 14.

The New York address of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Feighan] follows:

U.S. Policy Toward the Captive Nations

(Address of Hon. Michael A. Feighan, U.S. Representative, 20th District of Ohio, at political forum of American Friends of Anti-Bolshevik Bloc of Nations, Inc., New York, N.Y., February 9, 1963)

Mr. Moderator, distinguished members of the panel, and friends, the great challenge of our times is the new colonialism, the new imperialism of Moscow. This challenge poses a clear and present danger to representative self-government, to individual liberty, to the basic freedoms cherished by all mankind and to a peaceful world in which justice, charity, tolerance, and brotherhood govern the relations between nations. For the ideology which motivates the new imperialism holds that all civilizations must be purged of the past and be transformed into colonies subservient to the materialistic will of Soviet Russia. And those, past and present, who man this drive to world empire, leave no doubts about their fanatical dedication to those objectives.

Hence in the vortex of American foreign policy are the captive nations. They are the victims of the new imperialism, the new colonialism of Moscow. What we do or fail to do in restoring to them their rightful place in the community of civilized nations is the surest test of our intentions and the honest measure of our dedication to the cause of peace with justice.

Yet we do not have a uniform and clearly defined policy toward the captive nations. This vital area of our foreign policy is beset by dangerous contradictions, prejudice, and self-defeating doctrines. The extent of this disarray at the vortex of our foreign policy is observed best by an examination of the term "captive nation" and its application to our Nation's commitments.

If we turn to the Congress of the United States for such a definition we find an official expression of directness and clarity in Public Law 86–90, the Captive Nations Week law. That law identifies the captive nations by name, not only the so-called satellites and Baltic States, but the non-Russian nations of the Soviet Union—including several whose names have been purged from the great book of history by the Russian imperialists and one that has been partitioned by the Muscovites into five so-called Soviet republics. Also one finds in that law the names of the Asian nations whose national integrity has been subverted by the Red banner of modern day Russian imperialism, and those three nations which have been partitioned by Communist aggression and Red army occupation. But equally important to the findings of that Federal statute is its identification of Russian communism as the despoiler of national independence and master of the techniques of national servitude. Finally, Public Law 86–90 finds that the aspirations of the people in the captive nations for freedom and national independence constitutes a powerful deterrent to war and one of our best hopes for a just peace.

I believe, therefore, it is proper to conclude Congress is not responsible for the dangerous contradictions and prejudices which attend our Government's approach to the central issue of captive nations versus imperial Russian communism. Truth and objective fact on this central issue, established by the 2-year official inquiry of the Select Committee To Investigate Communist Aggression of the 83d Congress, guided the language and intent of Public Law 86–90. It is worth noting in this connection that the validity of the voluminous reports, basic findings, conclusions and recommendations of that select committee remain unchallenged to this day. As is known, the Moscow propaganda organs reacted violently to the work of that select committee, but Russian governments, whether under the czars or the commissars, have always worked in the shadows where truth is a stranger and objective fact is an unwelcome lamp.

Under our Constitution, Congress does not set our foreign policy anymore than it has authority to execute it. That authority and the responsibility which accompanies it rests with the President and he is free to select those whom he wishes to share either or both with him. Congress can exercise regulatory authority where public funds are involved in the execution of foreign policy, in matters of foreign trade, and the Senate must ratify treaties with foreign powers. Congress reserves the exclusive right to declare war, which invariably results from a failure of foreign policy, yet has very little real authority over its formulation or execution. Nevertheless, Congress, as the voice of the people, possesses ways and means to exercise an influence on foreign policy—not the least of which are the "sense of Congress" resolutions such as were passed on the Berlin crisis, the Cuban crisis, the Middle East crisis and on the captive nations. So we must look elsewhere for the source of the dangerous contradictions and prejudices which attend our policy toward imperial Russian communism.

The most obvious place to turn next is to Secreatry of State Dean Rusk because his greatest claim to fame in this critical policy area arises from an ill-conceived letter bearing his name and addressed to the chairman of the House Rules Committee in connection with a pending resolution to establish a Special Committee on Captive Nations. That letter expressed opposition to the establishment of such a House committee and defended the legitimacy of Russian colonialism in Ukraine, Georgia, and Armenia on the grounds those nations were traditional parts of the Soviet Union. While stating that our Government has consistently upheld the right of subjugated people in the Soviet Empire to national independence, governments of their own choosing and to human rights and freedom, Rusk then restricts these rights to formerly independent nations.

The tragic comedy of the Rusk letter is that it exposes a profound official ignorance of the fact that Ukraine, Georgia, and Armenia all were independent nations in the wake of World War I and that their independence was subverted in the first wave of imperial Russian communism. He then compounds his comedy of errors by claiming that our Government's support for the right of formerly independent nations is weakened by any action which confuses the rights of formerly independent peoples or nations with the status of areas such as the Ukraine, Armenia, or Georgia because this would put us in the position of seeming to advocate the dismemberment of a historic state. Such tortured reasoning as this is common to Russian thinking and mythology, particularly when the political principle of self-determination must be abused and perverted to defend modern day Russian colonialism. Moreover, it parallels the irrational thinking found in the "Lenin-Stalin Solution to the National Question"[1] which, by the way, the ideological organs of Moscow are now using to argue their case for a permanent partition of Germany and the strangulation of Berlin.[2] The greatest fantasies of history are those based solely upon "Russian truths" which crawl out from the shadows of despotism where, as is well known, truth is a stranger and objective fact an unwelcome lamp.

In a spirit of fair play, I suggest all the blame for this tragic comedy of errors does not rest solely on Secretary Rusk. He is not generally regarded as an authority on Russian colonialism or the supporting tactics of imperial communism. Moreover, experience in recent years has taught us that Secretaries of State are seldom masters of the Department over which they serve and more often than not the entrenched bureaucracy are in sure, if subtle, command of policy.

Now we turn to the Department of State, to that entrenched bureaucracy of Russian experts, who, somewhat like Ole Man River, just keep rolling along their erroneous course despite changes in national administrations and growing protests of an aroused electorate. There we find concentrated the disciples of a mythical doctrine—Russia the Sacred Cow—an untouchable Russia whose ruthless imperialism they now find to be exercising a mellowing influence on the highly civilized non-Russian nations imprisoned behind the Iron Curtain. Unmindful of the fact that imperial Russian power has posed a constant threat to Europe, the Near and Middle East, and Asia for many centuries they defend the divine right of empire claimed by an unbroken line of imperial ambitions centered in the Kremlin.

That same group in the State Department produced the doctrine of nonpredetermination toward the non-Russian nations of the Soviet Union which haunted the Eisenhower adminstration. In brief, that doctrine holds that if the unbridled right of self-determination was extended to the non-Russian nations of the Soviet Union this would result in a prejudgment on the political future of the Eurasian land mass now under control of Moscow. The implied admission is clear. The non-Russian nations of the Soviet Union would choose the course of national independence which would mean the end of imperial Russian power. Rights to national independence, to self-government, to basic human rights and freedom are thus withheld from millions of peoples inhabiting that darkened area of the world. Like the current ideological elite of the Kremlin, who defend the Lenin-Stalin theories on self-determination through K. Ivanov in the Communist Party organ Pravda,[3] the Russian experts in our State Department sap the lifeblood of self-determination by forbidding its application to the heartland of the Russian empire.

Such massive discrimination against some submerged nations held in colonial bondage by Moscow does severe damage to the honesty of our intentions with regard to imperialism and colonialism. We have demonstrated our support for national independence movements in south and southeast Asia, in the Middle East, and in Africa, despite what it cost us in our relations with some of our NATO allies. But we have demonstrated an unwillingness to support national independence movements which would reduce the power of aggression held by those who would destroy us. It is little wonder that so-called neutralism has become popular and profitable in recent years or that the concept of a European third force now threatens the stability of our NATO shield. Principles must be applied to all without fear or favor if they are to be regarded as the hallmark of American foreign policy.

Let me make it clear that I am not engaging in a blanket charge against all the area desks and divisions of the Department of State. I am speaking about the entrenched bureaucracy of Russian experts in the Department who backstopped the Rusk letter, who authored the doctrine of nonpredetermination, and whose thinking is allied with the "Lenin-Stalin Solution to the National Question." There are many within the Department who reject policy based upon Russian myths and who are informed of the facts on Russia, the Russians, and their empire. Ambassador Adlai Stevenson, for example, is informed on the facts about the formerly independent status of Ukraine, Georgia, Armenia, and the other non-Russian nations forcibly incorporated into the Soviet Union. He made this clear in a United Nations debate on colonialism when he reviewed the history of Soviet Russian imperialism, charging the Russians with subverting the national independence of those nations, among many others. This defense of historical truth by Ambassador Stevenson, took place in the United Nations a short while before Secretary Rusk assumed the indefensible position as protector of Russian colonialism in his letter to the House Rules Committee. This episode underscores what I mean by the dangerous contradictions and prejudice which logjam the vortex of American foreign policy.

Let us now turn our examination of this vital issue to the constitutional source of American foreign policy—the President of the United States. The public statements, addresses, published papers, and public commitments of President Kennedy serve as the basis for this examination. Here the record is clear, devoid of contradictions and limitations on governing principles, and deeply rooted in our American political heritage. In his address before the General Assembly of the United Nations on September 25, 1961, President Kennedy analyzed the new colonialism of Moscow and called for the unfettered, universal application to the principle of self-determination in these words:

"But colonialism in its harshest forms is not only the exploitation of new nations by old, of dark skins by light—or the subjugation of the poor by the rich. My Nation was once a colony, and we know what colonialism means; the exploitation and subjugation of the weak by the powerful, of the many by the few, of the governed who have given no consent to be governed, whatever their continent, their class, or their color.

"And that is why there is no ignoring the fact that the tide of self-determination has not reached the Communist empire, where a population far larger than that officially termed 'dependent' lives under governments installed by foreign troops instead of free institutions, under a system which knows only one party and one belief, which suppresses free debate and free elections and free newspapers and free books and free trade unions, and which builds a wall to keep truth a stranger and its own citizens prisoners. Let us debate colonialism in full and apply the principle of free choice and the practice of free plebiscites in every corner of the globe."

In an address at Buffalo, N.Y., on September 14, 1962, before a Pulaski Day observance, President Kennedy called out for an active policy toward the captive nations. He said:

"What policies can we pursue to encourage what Thomas Jefferson called the disease of liberty? It is not enough to make speeches about liberations. Our Government must pursue an active policy which holds out the promise of freedom behind the Iron Curtain."

Those who hide behind the fear of nuclear war or use the so-called nuclear stalemate argument to kill political action in the cause of peace with freedom will find no comfort in this commitment by President Kennedy. And those who are informed on the realities of the Russian problem must redouble their efforts to bring about the implementation of policies calculated to encourage the "disease of liberty" behind the Iron Curtain. For the nurtured seeds of liberty bring forth the sturdy trees of national independence. The time is long overdue for a full-scale political confrontation with Russian imperialism. Here the prospects of escalation into world peace with freedom are practically unlimited. Alternative choices now open to us, including political inaction, could well railroad us to defeat—with or without a nuclear war.

But a few weeks ago, in his state of the Union message, President Kennedy again displayed his keen perception of the growing political storm within the empire of Moscow when he observed:

"The disarray of the Communist empire has been heightened by two other formidable forces. One is the historical force of nationalism—and the yearning of all men to be free. The other is the gross inefficiency of their economies. For a closed society is not open to ideas of progress—and a police state finds that it cannot command the grain to grow."

Basic to the Berlin crisis is the issue of unfettered application of the political principle of self-determination. And the crisis of Berlin is tied irrevocably to the broader issue of captive nations because it cannot be separated from the larger question of a free, united, and democratic Germany. President Kennedy announced our policy on that issue as follows:

"The U.S. Government continues to believe that there will be no real solution to the German problem, nor any real tranquillity in central Europe, until the German people are reunited in peace and freedom on the basis of the universally recognized principle of self-determination."[4]

The dangerous conflict between the policies of President Kennedy and those expressed by Secretary Rusk in his letter to the House Rules Committee heralds the need for immediate and far-reaching changes to bring State Department policies with regard to self-determination, the rights of nations, colonialism, and imperialism in line with those annunciated by the President. If the entrenched bureaucracy of Russian experts in the State Department are allowed to work their will against the policies of the President of the United States, representative self-government in the United States is doomed. Meanwhile, we will continue to suffer the pains of national frustration and economic dissipation until that "Gordian knot" on our political ideals is severed.

---

[1] See Lenin-Stalin, "Solution to the National Question," Foreign Languages Publishing House, Moscow.

[2] See "The German Demand for Self-Determination," German Information Center, New York, N.Y.

[3] See Pravda, Dec. 20, 1961, issue, article by K. Ivanov, pp. 4–5.

[4] See President Kennedy's reply to the Russian Aide Memoire on Berlin and Germany, July 17, 1961.

It is fair to say that so long as these dangerous contradictions and prejudices continue to logjam the vortex of American foreign policy we may not claim a policy toward the captive nations. And all the rest of our foreign policy which of necessity must take its direction and strength from the vortex is immeasurably weakened.

What is needed if we are to win our goal of peace with freedom is a new horizon of ideals to which the foreign policies of our Government can be firmly attached and against which we can make reliable evaluation on the rate of our progress. President Kennedy has made a strong start in illuminating a horizon of ideals, based upon our American political heritage and toward which he endeavors to move the future of the world. But we cannot accomplish this monumental task alone. And his efforts are retarded by the old frontiers of reaction and discrimination within our Government which as I have indicated, continue to exist and to exert an unhealthy influence on our attitude toward the captive nations.

The old frontiers of prejudice and discrimination toward the non-Russian nations of the Soviet Union still existing in the Department of State are no less a formidable barrier to peace than is the Berlin wall. In some respects those old frontiers are more formidable. It is quite reasonable to conclude that had our foreign policy been free of those prejudices during World War II we would not have the problem of captive nations today—at least not its present magnitude. But we can be sure the Berlin wall will not come down so long as the old frontiers of a Russian beachhead on our policies remain in force. We can hardly expect to accomplish in Berlin, surrounded as it is by the Red army, what we have failed to accomplish within our own Government, free as it is to take corrective actions.

It is not difficult, in the light of this examination of the forces and counterforces at work in the crucial area of American policy toward imperial Russia, to understand the hidden barriers erected against establishment of a House Committee on Captive Nations. A special congressional committee by nature is a probative body, it seeks the views of all who want to be heard on great public issues, it works in the open marketplace of public opinion and it delights in the techniques of sifting fact from fiction. The public spotlight of Congress is harsh on those who function best in the shadows of special privilege, but is kind to those who work openly to serve the common good and the safety of their fellow Americans. This explains the fervor in support of such a committee by those who know the realities of Communist imperialism by personal experience and the lack of such fervor by those who man the barriers of opposition.

The stalemate which now applies to this public issue must be broken. Involved is the question whether the new horizon of ideals opened up by President Kennedy shall prevail as our policy toward the captive nations or whether the old frontiersmen entrenched in the State Department shall continue to buck the rising tide of self-determination in the non-Russian nations of the Soviet Union.

I am confident you share with me a determination to help build the new horizon of ideals to guide us to our goal of peace with freedom.

FORESTRY RESEARCH NEEDED

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Montana [Mr. OLSEN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. OLSEN of Montana. Mr. Speaker, for many reasons we must make a more efficient and beneficial use of our forests and forest lands. Our population expansion demands greater productivity from the forests. Likewise, that same population expansion, together with the fact that more leisure time is available to our people, brings more outdoor activity into the great forested areas. Of course, our Federal Government is a great landlord and should be a good housekeeper; but what is more, our Federal Government should be a leader in the field of forest resource management.

My congressional district, the western district of Montana, contains one of the largest national forest reserves in the Nation. Therefore, it is proper that within that district research be sponsored and fostered. Mr. Speaker, today I am presenting to my colleagues here on the floor the same program that I have urged upon the Committee on Appropriations.

FORESTRY RESEARCH PROPOSALS FOR MONTANA, FISCAL YEAR 1964

This proposal outlines the need for strengthening forestry research at Bozeman and Missoula, Mont., in the following amounts:

Laboratory construction, Missoula	$400,000
Accelerated research programs:	
Forest engineering, Bozeman	100,000
Forest fire research, Missoula	250,000
Forest products utilization, Missoula	50,000
Total	800,000

RESEARCH LABORATORY CONSTRUCTION

Forestry Sciences Laboratory, Missoula: This laboratory, which is needed now and should not be delayed, would house four important forestry research programs: First, silviculture and management of larch and spruce forest types; second, wood utilization aimed at broadening marketability of lumber and other products; third, improved methods of wildlife habitat management, especially big-game ranges; and fourth, forest recreation. The structure would be built on a site provided by Montana State University on the campus adjacent to the proposed new State forestry school. Forest Service research scientists presently working on these projects are now housed in very crowded rooms in the Missoula post office where no laboratory facilities exist.

RESEARCH PROGRAM EXPANSION

Forestry research projects underway at Bozeman and Missoula, Mont., are not being financed at the levels needed to keep on top of the many problems requiring research for their solution and necessary to the proper management and utilization of timber resources. The increase would represent reasonable progress toward the 10-year program needs developed by the Forest Service and strongly supported by forestry and forest products interests in Montana and other Western States.

FOREST ENGINEERING RESEARCH

A forest engineering research project by the Forest Service is underway at Bozeman on a very small scale to improve methods for harvesting timber from steep, erodable mountain slopes. Initial studies of improved engineering systems, such as transporting pulpwood from mountain to mill in chipped form through pipelines, show promise. What is needed now, is an accelerated attack that will lead to low unit harvesting costs and methods to lessen the impact of logging on soil and watershed values. Some steep, erodable areas cannot be logged at all under conventional methods because costs of logging roads would be high and damaging also to the watersheds. We need to open up more of our forests to profitable timber harvest but must first find a practical way of doing it economically and at the same time safeguarding the watersheds from damage by logging. Proposed additional appropriation: $100,000.

FOREST FIRE RESEARCH

Forest fires continue to require huge annual expenditures for control in the United States and particularly in the mountainous West. Some of the best opportunities to reduce the firefighting bill, which runs over $100 million annually, lie in research such as is underway at the Missoula Forest Fire Laboratory. A much stronger attack will result in early dividends on this research investment. Research should be stepped up on Project Skyfire to prevent lightning-caused fires which are among the most costly fires to control because they often occur in large numbers and in roadless areas. We also need new methods of fire detection as by infrared airborne devices, improvement of chemical fire retardants to make aerial attack more effective, and fire ignition and rate-of-spread studies to increase intelligence on which firefighting is based. These and related studies would require an additional $250,000.

FOREST PRODUCTS UTILIZATION RESEARCH

The timber industry has been suffering from many problems including loss of markets to substitute materials. There is a great need for research on problems peculiar to our forest products industries in Montana and adjacent States that will result in product improvement and diversification that would extend and improve markets for wood products. This Forest Service project would work with and be a field arm of the Forest Products Laboratory of the Forest Service at Madison, Wis. Such research would include development and evaluation of improved seasoning practices to produce a more stable product; research to improve production of plywood through greater plant efficiency; methods of handling, seasoning, and preserving poles and other round products; development of new uses for wood; and improvement of practices in the use of wood in structures, leading to longer life and greater acceptance. Amount needed is $50,000.

U.S. AID TO POLAND

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MORRIS). Under previous order of the House, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Delaware [Mr. McDOWELL] for 30 minutes.

Mr. McDOWELL. Mr. Speaker, many times the American people become very much bewildered when they read articles written by authors who express their own private views as though they were the last word in authority on their subject matter. This has been true over the past several years with regard to U.S. aid to Yugoslavia and Poland.

In the spring of 1962 I made a special trip to Poland for the Foreign Affairs Committee for the purpose of studying our foreign aid program in that country since 1957. Upon returning I wrote a report on my findings. It was published as House Document No. 1968, 87th Congress, 2d session, titled "Special Study Mission to Poland and Austria."

For those who are still in doubt as to whether or not we should continue foreign aid to Poland, I recommend both my report and the following article which appeared in the New Yorker magazine February 9, 1963:

Letter from Warsaw

(By Joseph Wechsberg)

From the window of my room in the Hotel Europejski, I can see Victory Square, where military men of one nationality or another have been parading for centuries. "Particularly famous were the reviews of the guards by Napoleon I during his stay in Warsaw," says a folder that I picked up in the lobby. Along the sides of the square, one can see something of Warsaw's past and something of its future. On the north is the immense unfinished Warsaw opera house (hammering starts at half past 6 in the morning), and on the west stands a fragment of the colonnade of the 18th-century Saxon Palace, which was demolished during the Second World War. Under the colonnade is the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier. The first morning I was here, I happened to be looking out of my window just before 10 o'clock, and I saw four military trucks pull up in the square. A company of soldiers and a brass band poured out and lined up in front of the tomb. Exactly at 10, several limousines arrived, a large wreath materialized, and a guest of honor, flanked by Polish officials, strode solemnly toward the colonnade. The guest, I learned later, was the newly accredited Ethiopian Ambassador. The band played his national anthem, and then, after a bit of marching that incorporated something very like the goosestep, it played the "Warszawianka," a stirring revolutionary hymn written during the Polish uprising of 1830, or 1863, or some other year—nobody I've spoken to seems to know which. Finally, the diplomats disappeared into their limousines and the soldiers into their trucks, and the tomb was left with only the customary guard on each side. On the second morning, the same thing happened, only this time the guest of honor was a dignitary of the United Arab Republic.

On the third morning, it happened again, and I hurried down into the square for a closer view. When I got there, I asked a man who the guest of honor was, but he didn't know; probably somebody from Ruanda or Burundi, he said, and added pleasantly that Africans were always coming and going these days. After the ceremony, I walked over to the colonnade, and inside it I saw six black marble plates engraved with the names of all the battles that Polish soldiers had taken part in, officially or unofficially, over the last quarter of a century. The list went from Madrid and Guadalajara, in 1937, to Berlin and Warsaw, in 1945, and included Britain, Tobruk, Arnhem, and many others, but perhaps the most impressive was Partyzantka—the long and desperate struggle of the Polish partisans against the Nazis. As I stood there, a class of 7- and 8-year-old boys and girls arrived, with their teacher. The children formed a semicircle around the tomb and stared in awe at the two guards while the teacher spoke in a low voice about the soldier who was buried there. The children listened gravely and in complete silence. Though it does not appear in the curriculum, patriotism is the most important subject taught in any Polish school.

Patriotism is, indeed, one of the unquestioned facts of Polish political life. There aren't many others. In this Communist state, very few people are Communists. Of 30 million Poles, slightly more than a million have joined the party, but even of these the vast majority are far from being doctrinaire Marxists. To all kinds of doctrinaire politicians, East and West, Poland presents an untidy lot of paradoxes. It is not a police state, for instance, and no one is afraid to criticize the government, but it is not a free country, either; occasionally—and, it would seem, capriciously—certain people are called in by the police and advised not to see such-and-such a visiting westerner.

Moreover, though most Poles dislike communism—and I've heard it said that 95 percent of them, which obviously would include a good many party members, dislike it—they don't seem to fancy our style of capitalism. On the whole, they would probably prefer a form of democratic socialism, like Sweden's. Actually, the people maintain some sort of loyalty to a regime that they basically have little use for—largely because the regime stands for peace and for Polish independence. There is plenty of evidence in everyday life that the Poles are a people who can't be pushed around—many citizens are arrested for resisting the police in matters that have nothing to do with politics—and they would certainly fight for their territory and their independence. When the Poles start worrying about their territory and their independence, the threat they have in mind is Germany. One Pole, in the course of telling me about his country's attitude toward the rest of the world, said, "We foolish Poles love France with a hopeless, unrequited love. We admire America for its civilization and technical progress. We feel superior to the Russians. But we are suspicious of the Germans, and even a little afraid of them." Most Poles make no distinction between East and West Germans, though the regime does. The other day, I fell into conversation with an official of the Polish United Workers (that is, Communist) Party in a coffeehouse, where he and his wife were having a glass of punch, and when he tried to explain to me that one must differentiate between good (East) and bad (West) Germans, his wife expressed disagreement. "East or West, it's just the same," she said with feeling. "A German is a German."

Poles are still seriously concerned about the future of the "returned territories"—the land on the eastern side of the Oder-Neisse line, which Germany had annexed piecemeal over the years and which was tentatively put under Polish administration at the Potsdam Conference, pending the signing of a German peace treaty. The United States, and the West generally, does not yet officially recognize Poland's claim to the territories, and there are elements in West Germany that reject it altogether, but the countries behind the Iron Curtain have all accepted it. The issue is an important one, and the regime keeps it alive, because on this point it has public support (something that the regime needs from time to time) and also because the dispute stirs up anti-American feeling (something that the regime doesn't seem to mind). "We know the Germans better than you Americans do," I was assured a couple of days ago by a Pole who is not a party member. "If you don't want to support German revanchism, why don't you recognize the Oder-Neisse boundary line?" Few Poles spend much time lamenting the fate of the East Germans, and the building of the Berlin wall created little excitement in Warsaw, except among some housewives, who stormed the stores, as their mothers and grandmothers had also done in uncertain times, to lay in sugar, flour, and salt. The general opinion is that the wall may have prevented an explosion—that it probably solved more problems than it raised. "After all," a Pole said, "those people in East Berlin had 16 years to go to the nearest subway station and get out. It's hard to feel much sympathy for them."

In any case, Germans from both West and East come here, some of them on business and others as tourists, and, considering how many Poles were killed by the Nazis, they seem to be treated politely. Naturally enough, the Germans have had a lingering influence in Poland. Everybody in Warsaw, as in Prague and Bucharest and Sofia and Budapest, has spoken at least a little German ever since the occupation, and officials from the various satellite countries often converse in German, though they are supposed to use Russian. Indeed, German has become the lingua franca of the once occupied countries—"the People's Democratic Latin," I heard one Pole call it. And the black Mercedes 220, a product of West Germany, is very much in evidence, for it seems to be the favorite car of the Communist Party and the security police.

The two most powerful men in Poland are Wladyslaw Gomulka, the first secretary of the Communist Party, and Stefan Cardinal Wyszynski, who heads the country's Catholic Church. In certain ways, many of the supporters of each man have at least a sneaking respect for the other. The non-Communists generally admit that Gomulka is a Polish patriot, and even that, for a Communist, he is quite tolerant. He is probably doing all he can, they say, in a country that is wedged between Russia and Germany. In October of 1956, when Gomulka, who had just become first secretary after 5 years in jail on a charge of Titoism, defied the Russians by addressing the Hungarian freedom fighters as "our brothers," he was positively admired here, and even non-Communist intellectuals had high hopes for his regime. Now, I should think, the most that can be said is that he is neither liked nor feared. As for the cardinal, the Communists admit that he is a realist. Between them, the cardinal and the first secretary have managed to keep Poland alive and going. In a way, each is faced with the same problem: how to make his faith more attractive to the younger generation. The cardinal, in his baroque palace, and Gomulka, in his simple paneled office in the central committee building, are both working to make their organizations intellectually interesting, and the methods of both are questioned by many of their own followers.

The Polish Constitution of 1952 proclaims the separation of church and state, and adds that the question of religion is "the private affair of each citizen." At present, church and state may be separate, yet they are very much aware of each other, and are watching each other and waiting. The regime harasses the church, but with kid gloves. Last June, for instance, on the holiday of Corpus Christi, when a hundred and fifty thousand of the faithful (12 percent of Warsaw's population) came out to follow the Blessed Sacrament from St. John's Cathedral to St. Ann's Church, where the cardinal spoke, the state authorities did not try to suppress the procession. Instead, they took two rather waspish measures. First, they forbade the use of loudspeakers during the cardinal's sermon (the cardinal got around this by speaking into a microphone that was tied to his crosier while priests spread among the crowd carrying small receiving sets), and, second, they put on a bicycle race, which, as it happened, meant closing off two of the three bridges across the River Vistula, which bisects Warsaw, thus forcing many Catholics to make long detours to reach the cathedral. The church, for its part, is not actively fighting the regime. The cardinal and other priests speak out against materialism and atheism, to be sure, but there was no violent reaction among Catholics in the autumn of 1961, when Gomulka's regime, which had decided in the friendly days of 1956 to permit religious instruction in the schools, decided to stop it again. "It makes little difference to us," a man said. "I'm sending my children to catechism classes in our church. I don't think the regime will stop those classes. It doesn't want serious trouble."

Neither the Catholics nor the atheists can be quite happy about the present situation. A few months ago, the Polish Association of Atheists and Freethinkers held its second congress, and afterward a prominent member wrote in the magazine Argumenty, "It is obvious that the traditional form of the religious cult continues to predominate among the broad masses of our society." The churches of Poland are still crowded every Sunday, and it is no secret that even some party officials show up at mass. ("Why are the trolleys so crowded on Sunday mornings?" a Warsaw joke goes. "Because they're full of party people who have left the Mercedes at home and are on their way to another part of town to attend mass.") But the composition of the crowds in the churches has changed. During the Stalinist era, when priests were constantly being jailed, going to church was an act of political protest, and many young people went to church as a way of defying the regime. Now the Government doesn't interfere openly with church going, and most young people don't go any more. On the whole, they feel that both the church and the state have failed them. "Poland has three religions," a thoughtful man told me the other day. "Catholicism, communism, and a third one." He added that the third one is hard to define; all one can say is that it is against communism and against Catholicism, though it may borrow elements from each. For many people, it is something called "social liberalism"; for others, it is a mixture of Marxist economics and democratic politics, with an overlay of undogmatic religious faith; and for still others, who appear to have become overwhelmed by the complexities of modern thought, it is "the meaning of truth." A young poet I met one night had perhaps the most haunting description of this new religion; he called it Sehnsucht—the German word for "desire."

If these various hints, trends, and yearnings amount to a third religion, Poland has a fourth. Before the war, there were 3 million Jews in the country. Now no one knows exactly how many there are; estimates run from 25,000 to 50,000. Some Polish Jews no longer practice Judaism, and a number have changed their names and attempted to pass as Gentiles, for although the regime officially condemns anti-Semitism, anti-Semitic feeling exists in Poland, even among loyal party members. Warsaw, which used to have dozens of synagogues, now has just one. It escaped destruction by the Germans because the members of the congregation hastily converted it into a stable. It is in an old Jewish slum district near the center of town, and to reach it one has to walk past tenement houses and a couple of lots where ruins are overgrown with weeds. Finally, in a depressing courtyard, one sees the synagogue—a gray, dark building with broken windowpanes and a dilapidated facade. It is a melancholy sight from the outside, but inside one finds all the essentials—the curtain with Hebrew signs, and the Torah, and the voices of men praying. The day I visited the synagogue, most of the worshippers were old and weary looking, but there were two or three in their twenties, and these had the hard, tough faces that are so often to be seen in Eastern Europe—the faces of young people whose early years were spent in concentration camps. A gray-haired man with a scholar's face, who wore a new trenchcoat and spoke excellent German, told me that this synagogue had been built in the latter half of the 19th century by a family called Nosik, and had been known as the Nosik Synagogue. "Nowadays, we often have trouble finding 10 men for a minyan," he said. "That little man over there lived for 45 years in Birobidzhan, the Jewish Republic in Russia. The man next to him is the only one of us who has been in Warsaw the whole time." He was silent for a moment. "You know what it means when I say that he has been here the whole time? He lived through the invasion in 1939, the insurrection in the ghetto in 1943, and the 63 days of the Warsaw uprising the following year. The other day, he told me he cannot believe now that it all really happened."

These Jews could probably leave Poland if they wanted to, and many Jews have left. Poland is the only Communist country that permits large-scale emigration. Every week, people set out for Israel, Canada, Australia, or the United States. Last year, America's quota for Polish immigrants, which, at 6,488, is the fourth largest—after Great Britain's, Germany's, and Ireland's—was completely filled, and at the start of this year there was a long waiting list. The Polish authorities create no major difficulties for emigrants. There is some overpopulation on the farms and some underemployment in the towns, and the only Poles who are refused passports are men who have recently finished their military service and are subject to recall; technicians and highly skilled workers; and a small category of people whose applications are turned down "for reasons of state." Many emigrants leave to join members of their families who emigrated in the old days or escaped during the war. Some are young couples with children, and quite a few of these come into Warsaw from the farm and get straight on a plane for America. Each emigrant is permitted to take along only his personal effects and the equivalent of $5 in cash. A few of those who go to America come back after a year or two, usually complaining that they could not stand the climate; the real reason is probably that they had trouble with the American branch of the family or that they expected too much. Many Poles, especially in the rural regions, think of America as a land of easy, unlimited opportunity. A considerable number of Poles travel to the West as tourists, and, surprisingly, almost all of them return. Back when Poland was still living in its dreary Stalinist epoch, 60 members of a group of 100 Poles visiting Stockholm defected; that would not happen today. Tourism, incidentally, works both ways. Last year, nearly 10,000 Americans, many of whom had been born in Poland, came here for a visit. And there was another category of American travelers—old men and women who were returning to their native villages to die.

In other ways, too, Poland is more closely attached to the United States than one might expect a Communist country to be. For one thing, English has become the most popular Western language in Poland. It is taught—as an optional course, naturally—in high schools and colleges, and in addition 7,000 adults study it at a school in Warsaw run by Polish Methodists. For another thing, more than 500 Poles visit the library of the American Embassy every month, to study up on some aspect of American life or literature. Ever since 1957, the Embassy has been conducting an exchange-of-persons program, and it has expanded steadily; recently a number of professors, technicians, and sportsmen have gone to the States, and so have the Ministers of Foreign Trade and Agriculture. American exhibitions attract considerable attention here. About a year ago, the collection of Edward Steichen's photographs called "The Family of Man" was shown in six Polish cities, and, from all that I hear, large and voluble crowds went to see it. Last summer, a "Plastics U.S.A." exhibition was on view in the main exhibition hall of Warsaw's Palace of Culture and Science; the biggest drawing cards were a Corvette sports car and an experimental Firebird II, both with plastic bodies.

People who follow such matters can always tell the exact temperature of official Polish feelings toward the United States simply by reading the Government-controlled Polish press—drawing conclusions both from what the papers say and from what they don't say. Those feelings can fluctuate drastically. At the time of our atmospheric nuclear tests, for instance, and during our blockade of Cuba, the Polish regime, like all the other Communist governments, looked upon us with a very chilly eye. On other occasions, the attitude has been more cordial—especially when economics has been involved. Over the past 5 years, the United States has signed five separate agreements with Poland, providing, in toto, for the sale (on credit) and shipment to Poland of $486 million worth of surplus agricultural commodities, nonstrategic equipment and materials, and medical supplies. (Some of the foodstuffs were distributed by CARE, which has a program for aiding children in summer camps; widows with children; old people; war invalids; and persons whose income is less than $20 a month.)

In the spring of 1962, a special congressional study group, headed by Representative HARRIS B. MCDOWELL, JR., of Delaware, visited Poland and concluded that "these commodities reach the people in need [and] persons in Poland benefiting from them are aware of their American origin." So far so good, many of the aid program's supporters in both countries felt. On June 6, however, the U.S. Senate voted to deny aid to "any country known to be dominated by Communists or Marxists." The Poles were furious. Six days later, the Senate voted to permit the shipment of surplus agricultural commodities to Poland and Yugoslavia, after all. Half a year has passed, but the Poles are still somewhat baffled by the double turnabout.

Many aspects of the Polish economy appear rather hazy, but one thing is certain: the people have enough to eat. American aid is one explanation, but there is another, which is probably more important, and that is that 87 percent of the farmland is under private ownership. There are 5,300 "state farms," occupying 12 percent of the farmland, and 1,600 collective farms, occupying 1 percent. After Gomulka came to power, the Government permitted farmers to break up about 8,000 collective farms, on the reasonable ground that they were producing relatively little food. To some extent, the collectives have been replaced by "agricultural circles"—

cooperatives, more or less, for which the Government subsidizes the purchase of fertilizers and tractors, and markets some of the produce as well. So far, about 20 percent of the owners of private farms have chosen—and there is a choice—to join these circles. In any case, Poland seems to prove that private ownership of the land still works best. In neighboring East Germany and Czechoslovakia, whose farms are almost completely collectivized, there are serious food shortages, and the Soviet Union, of course, has severe agricultural problems. But in Poland, rice, flour, sugar, and even meat are plentiful and cheap. There are occasional snarls in the distribution of fresh fruit and vegetables, but there is no rationing.

At any of the expensive restaurants in Warsaw, the customer is handed a large, tempting menu, and, as in all Communist countries, the menu tells him exactly how much of every dish he is going to get. In the dining room of the Grand Hotel, for instance, he can have 132 grams of pike in aspic, or 102 grams of egg, with smoked salmon, or 180 grams of borsch with small pastries, and he can even have a slice of lemon—a great luxury—weighing exactly 20 grams. When I had dinner there, I found the roast chicken à la polonaise (310 grams) very good, and I also enjoyed the conversation of my waiter, a white-haired man with exquisite manners, who told me about the wonderful dishes, like sautéd goose stomachs, that he used to serve to Paderewski in the old days, when no one counted the grams.

In the state-managed delicatessens, I have seen many imports—Swiss chocolates, French pâté, Maxwell House instant coffee, and plenty of pineapple from Cuba. Warsaw's latest shopping sensation is the state-run Super-Sam ("sam" is the Polish word for "oneself," and "Super-Sam," translated roughly, means "super-self-service"), where delighted shoppers, carrying metal baskets, make their way past pyramids of Russian canned fish and large refrigerators packed with bottle milk and American-style cold cuts. Prices are controlled, but they tend to creep upward; sometimes the authorities will decide, for instance, that what was formerly classed as "ordinary" butter is now "quality" butter, and the price tag is revised accordingly. "Socialist inflation" is the popular term for the process. Not far from the Super-Sam is the Polna free market, to which, in the appropriate seasons, farmers come at dawn in their horse-drawn carts loaded high with produce and fresh fruit. Price controls are fairly dim at the Polna. A Polish economist has said that the country "is in a transitional stage, part way between the old-fashioned peasant market and a modern food-distribution system," but at the moment it would be truer to say that the old system and the new exist side by side, and in the old-fashioned peasant market the capitalistic law of supply and demand still regulates the price.

If Poland's agriculture is getting along quite well, so is its industry. The annual increase in industrial production is officially said to be 10 percent, and even skeptics concede that it is at least 8 percent. The country has a brandnew copper industry and an excellent aluminum plant (built with Russian help), and is intensively exploiting the second largest sulfur deposits on earth. The Poles have been exporting as much as they can—coal and rolling stock to the Soviet Union, machine tools to Japan and Italy, bicycles and ham to the United States, and bacon, ham, and eggs to England and West Germany. All the same, Poland has a chronic foreign-trade deficit, which in 1961 amounted to $180 million, and, like some other countries, it looks with trepidation on the Common Market, which threatens to reduce drastically Polish trade with the six.

At the official rate of exchange, 4 Polish zlotys are worth $1. Tourists, however, get Zl24 for a dollar, and Polish citizens get Zl72. (Approximately $2 million a year is paid to Poles who once lived in the United States by the Veterans and Social Security Administrations, the Civil Service Commission, and the Railroad Retirement Board, and a good many Poles receive dollars from American relatives.) The black-market rate is even higher—between Zl80 and Zl90 to the dollar. The best customers for black-market dollars are farmers (who love to keep a few greenbacks under their mattresses, the way French farmers used to keep gold coins), people hopefully saving up for a trip to Paris, and shady operators who buy such goods as perfume and watches in the West and sell them here at exorbitant prices. The average Polish wage is Zl400 a week. In the state-owned stores, a pair of good shoes costs Zl800, a sports jacket Zl1,000, a shirt Zl500. Word may get around that a state store suddenly has a supply of Italian ties for Zl35 apiece, and everybody will rush over and buy a few, because such ties cost four times that in the small private-initiative stores clustered around the Palace of Culture. (The Poles call the section "Our Rue de la Paix.")

The consumer passion runs high in Poland, and Warsaw has its crop of status seekers eager to keep up with the Michalskis, who have a white telephone, spend their weekends in the country, and last spring reached the pinnacle by making a 3-week trip to London, Paris, and Rome. Even in the Polish villages, once hives of illiteracy and poverty, there have been many changes. TV antennas can be seen on quite a few roofs, and the people talk about—and some even have—refrigerators and washing machines. Nevertheless, there is a widespread feeling here that the standard of living is improving too slowly, and everywhere in Poland one hears complaints about how hard it is to find certain things—notably, apartments and cars.

Eighty-five percent of all the buildings in Warsaw were destroyed during the war, and other towns and villages fared just as badly. Although the Poles are rebuilding at an impressive rate—apartment houses with a total of more than 72,000 rooms went up in Poland during the first half of last year—they are still a long way from catching up. The state is doing most of the building, and it provides apartments at very low rentals, but in order to get one a family has to meet a large number of requirements, having to do with such things as wages, number of children, and health, and besides, there is always a long waiting list. Just about the only alternative is to get an apartment in a cooperative. A man I know has made a downpayment of Zl18,000 on a one-room apartment priced at Zl75,000. He will have to wait 2 years to move in, and then he will pay Zl250 a month, which includes mortgage payments and upkeep. He considers himself lucky.

In Poland, architects and town planners are among the elite, and the country could use more of them. At present, there are 4,200 architects, 1,600 of whom work in Warsaw. These have all but finished their task of reconstructing the historic parts of the city, and they have definitely given up monumental building in the Stalinist style, so today most of them are concentrating on new apartment houses. This means coping with shortages of materials, a lack of skilled labor, and other problems—among them, the problem of density. "Warsaw is not as bad as Manhattan, but it is getting close," an architect who recently spent 6 months in the United States said the other day. The building program makes no provision for one-family houses here in the city, and the architects do the best they can with large buildings. "I believe our new apartment houses look a good deal better than the ones that were put up before 1956," my architect friend said. "We are trying to build a little as the Italians and the Dutch do, with large windows and sunny balconies. But we can't do everything we want. We lack the proper window frames. We lack," he shrugged, and added, "I always find these things hard to explain to Americans. You people can do anything." Polish architects feel that there is "great social value" in the appearance of a city. They do not design the kind of depressingly uniform, blocklike structures that one sees in Kiev and Prague, in Dresden and Bucharest. Warsaw's new houses have bright colors and pleasant individual touches. Besides apartment houses, the city urgently needs schools and hospitals, and ambitious plans are being drawn up for a new public library, a new railroad station, and two more bridges across the Vistula. Architects are also discussing what to build in the "wild west"—a large, desolate area near the Palace of Culture and Science, that monument to Stalinist pomposity at its worst. Some optimists look forward to the day when the palace will be surrounded—and hidden—by skyscrapers. Another thing that the architects are discussing is whether the 14th century Royal Castle, which was blown up by the Nazis and is still a heap of ruins, should be rebuilt exactly as it was. Some of them say that the expense would be frightful and that a great many useful buildings could be put up for that amount of money. Others reply that something must be put into the large hole and that the historic character of the city would be destroyed if a modern building was put up there. "Knowing my fellow citizens, I expect the Royal Castle to be rebuilt exactly as it was, at enormous expense," one architect has told me.

The Poles want gadgets, clothes, and houses, but when it comes to private vehicles they are downright avaricious. In Poland, a car is more than a means of transportation or a symbol of Western comfort; it is a nationwide obsession. Everybody wants a car, and many people put in years of saving for one. There are now only 800,000 motorcycles in Poland and only 200,000 automobiles, yet during the rush hour it is dangerous to cross a city street. A folder distributed by LOT, the Polish airline, says, "In Warsaw, vehicles do not stop at bus and tram stops or at pedestrian crossings, they only slow down." Poland has its own hierarchy of motor vehicles. At the bottom is the Polish-made Junak motorcycle, which costs Zl7,000 or between 15 and 20 weeks' wages. Next comes a motor scooter, made in Russia or Poland, that looks almost like a Lambretta and costs Zl17,000, or close to a year's wages. By the time a man owns one of these, he has begun to dream of a Syrena (Mermaid), a hard-knocking, two-cylinder Polish automobile that costs Zl72,000. So many people want a Syrena that a prospective customer generally has to wait 6 months for delivery. From the Syrena, one ascends to a Czech Skoda (Zl90,000), a Polish Warszawa (Zl120,000), a Volkswagen (Zl160,000), and finally a Mercedes 220 (Zl300,000). The question is, who can afford to pay so much money for a car? Plenty of people, I'm told—film stars, prominent writers and architects, engineers with more than one job, professors who serve as consultants to industry, medical specialists who combine unlucrative public practices with lucrative private ones, people who own private-initiative stores, and a few big lawyers.

Poland has long been an extremely litigious country, and in prewar times the lawyer and the factory owner were usually the richest men in town. In Communist countries, of course, the legal profession is looked down upon, and a few of the lawyers who used to make a good living by keeping people out of jail now have one foot in jail themselves.

In Poland, lawyers are organized in cooperatives, and the cooperatives assign individual cases to them. A law passed last year specified the fees that lawyers were permitted to demand, and the fees were very low. As it works out, however, some clients see fit to reimburse their lawyers more lavishly than the law specifies. Last week, I dropped into a Warsaw courtroom where a criminal case was being tried, and I noticed that the defense lawyer wore an elegant Italian-style suit (Italian, not British, fashions are now the sine qua non of the fastidious Warsawian), while the public prosecutor—a feared man in Poland—and the judge wore shabby suits of undistinguished cut which could only have come from the state-run Central Department Store. After the trial, the defense lawyer drove off in a Warszawa car. The prosecutor boarded a crowded trolley and rode home for half a zloty. The defense lawyer may have had his worries, though; many prosperous lawyers are now being investigated for alleged tax frauds or black-market operations, and some have been tried and convicted.

Last year, there were over a million court cases in Poland—1 for every 30 inhabitants, including children—and another half million cases were settled out of court. A good many of the lawsuits apparently stemmed from fights after country weddings and other rural celebrations. (Though the government's Central Statistical Office is reticent about the matter, Poles take pride in being one of the hardest-drinking nations in the world.) Many peasants have money saved up, and if they get into trouble, they are able to pay their lawyers generously. About 10 percent of the court cases have to do with theft, and 40 percent deal with "economic crimes against the state"—an area in which there are so many laws, decrees, and special regulations that some lawyers handle only cases involving the textile industry, others only building-trade cases, and so on. (The builder of a house has about 1,200 laws to cope with.) Some of the best-publicized crimes against the state are "crimes of negligence." The manager of a state enterprise is personally responsible for what his employees do or fail to do; if a factory worker illegally takes something home with him, for instance, not only the worker but the manager is liable to arrest. A manager may also be arrested if his workers don't fulfill "the plan"—something that often happens, because workers are likely to be saving their strength for a second, and private job. (A comparable thing occurs in Western Europe, where masons, bricklayers, and plumbers frequently earn more from a weekend of freelancing than they do from a week's work at their regular jobs.) Recently, the director of a Polish state enterprise was arrested for paying a special bonus to his men to make them work harder and finish a job on time. Many able men avoid managerial jobs here, and it is not hard to see why.

Intellectually and artistically, Poland is certainly the liveliest country in Eastern Europe—perhaps in all of Europe. Practically everything of a cultural nature that is done or not done here is the subject of controversy. The opera house now being built in Victory Square is an example; though it is only about half completed, it has already cost half a billion zlotys, and, to judge from what one hears on the streets and in the cafes, that is a lot more than most Poles think should be spent on an opera house. Poles will gladly spend millions on the restoration of anything connected with Frédéric Chopin or their 19th-century poet Adam Mickiwicz, not to mention John III Sobieski and the other great Polish kings, but they have never been much interested in opera, and today the younger generation considers it somewhat passé. Still, opera does have its adherents, and one of them, as I discovered when I went to take a look at the partly finished building, is Dr. Arnold Szyfman, an 80-year-old impresario, who ran Warsaw's famous Teatr Polski for 40 years, and who is now in charge of rebuilding the opera house.

Warsaw's old opera house—the Teatr Wielki, or Great Theater, which was built in 1832—was destroyed, except for its facade, during the Second World War. In 1950, the Polish Government decided to rebuild it, and though the design was contributed by an architect named Bogdan Pniewski, the true hero of the reconstruction, and the target of much criticism as well, has been Dr. Szyfman. The actual work of reconstruction started in 1956, and is expected to be finished by 1964. When Dr. Szyfman took me on a guided tour of his domain, the place was so crowded with workmen that if I had been on my own I couldn't have got much of an idea of what it would be like, but as the doctor talked I could almost visualize it on opening night.

The auditorium, Dr. Szyfman told me, will have only two thousand seats; he thinks that that is the best size for an auditorium, and also that Warsaw probably could not fill a bigger one. But everything else in the house will be, to use Dr. Szyfman's favorite word, enormous. Certainly the various stages—the main stage, the side stages, the back stage, and a circular, revolving stage—are to be large by any standard. The layout of stages, Dr. Szyfman thinks, will permit a production of "Boris Godunov" in which all its nine sets can be prepared before the beginning of the performance—a feat that no other opera house on earth has ever achieved. But the real sensations, I soon found out, are hidden ones. They include a large orchestra rehearsal room under the auditorium, another one under the stage, and a rehearsal auditorium—almost a small opera house in itself—on the fifth floor. "Instead of rehearsing on the main stage and using 50 or 60 technicians, we will rehearse up there on the fifth floor and do the same job with 8 or 10 men," Dr. Szyfman said proudly. "The savings will be enormous. We will also have a rehearsal room for the chorus, and four rehearsal rooms—two big and two small—for the ballet. The main stage will be used only for the performance—a revolutionary innovation. We're going to have a museum of the theater here, too, and a hostel for singers and dancers in an adjoining building. I don't think there's anything quite like this opera house in the world."

At this thought, Dr. Szyfman took a deep breath. Then he said, "Opera has a great history in this city. In the old days, all the world-famous artists came here. Chaliapin stopped off at least once a year. Since the last war, there has been a decline. We've been performing on a makeshift basis in the Palace of Culture and Science, and we've had too many management changes. During the 1961 season, we had only 14 weeks in the repertory, and the performances were mediocre. But at the end of that season, the prominent conductor Bogdan Wodiczko was appointed director of the Warsaw Opera, and since then things have been perking up. It's been a real renaissance. Wodiczko has conducted Stravinsky's 'Perséphone' and 'Oedipus Rex,' and we've had fine productions of Gluck's 'Iphigénie en Aulide,' Honegger's 'Judith,' and a stage version of Debussy's cantata 'L'Enfant Prodigue.' No Wagner, though."

Before I left, Dr. Szyfman showed me the dressing rooms, which had recently been completed, and the ones for soloists were the largest, brightest, and most elegant I have ever seen. "The Warsaw opera house has 10 bathrooms for its soloists, each situated between 2 dressing rooms," Dr. Szyfman said. "No other opera house in the world can make such a claim. It took the present regime in Poland to authorize such a project. It's enormous." He paused, and then said, "I hope I'll be around for the opening."

I spent the other evening with a Polish friend and a visiting Russian girl. We were sitting in a coffeehouse called Pod Gwiazdami (Under the Stars), which is situated on top of a skyscraper, and below us we could see Warsaw's streets, bright with fluorescent light. The girl described herself vaguely as "a student from an institute that is like your MIT," but we didn't talk much about technology, because she was so excited about Warsaw. She had been here a week, and had seen some avant-garde plays, heard some acid criticism of the government, looked at books about expressionism and cubism, and danced the twist. She was going to go back to Moscow the next morning, she said, but she would never, never forget this trip. I'm sure she meant it.

One doesn't have to come from a Communist country to be stimulated by Warsaw. It is one of the most talkative cities in the world. I heard Poles talking in such clubs as the SARP (the Association of Polish Architects) and the ZAIKS (the Society of Authors, Composers, and Publishers), and, most notably, in the coffeehouses, which are crowded day and night, and which make the coffeehouses of Vienna (where the coffeehouse originated) seem dull. Conversation is practiced as an art here, and the joys of discussion are deeply appreciated. People talk politics at fever pitch, but with surprising tolerance. One recent evening, I dined with five men—a party member, a revisionist, a poet who is fed up with Gomulka, a practicing Catholic, and a "straight Westerner." We argued widely and constantly but never nastily. A lot of vodka flowed, but its only effect was to make my companions talk even faster.

There are also as many bookstores in Warsaw as there are banks in Zurich. New books are issued in paper covers, as in France, and they cost no more than two packs of cigarettes. Consequently, even first novels may sell 10,000 copies in a few days, and sales of 50,000 are far from uncommon. The annual bookfair at the Palace of Culture and Science attracts as many people as a major soccer game. And the Poles not only read; they write. Writing poetry is the great national pastime, and there are probably more poets per square mile here than anywhere else in the world. Many American and Western European films are shown here, though American films seem to arrive years late. (The big show in town right now is "It Happened in Rome.") The Polish film industry is quite lively, though it suffered a great loss 2 years ago when the immensely gifted Andrzej Munk—whose films "The Blue Cross" and "Eroica" presented bitter views of the occupation and the Warsaw uprising—was killed in an accident. Warsaw's 16 legitimate theaters show a cross section of the best plays of both the East and the West. In the last few months, plays by Brecht, Sartre, Sagan, Dürrenmatt, and Max Frisch have been presented, along with a couple of Polish plays, a new Soviet play ("The Dragon," by Evgeny Schwarz), and an old American play ("Harvey").

This is one Communist city where members of "the milieu"—as the artistic world is known—are important, influential, and close to the heart and the pulse of the nation. The milieu even exercises a definite attraction on snobbish party members—an attraction that does not work both ways. "In Prague and Budapest, the intellectuals would be delighted to have the party hierarchy join their circle," a Polish writer who had just visited those cities told me, "but we want as little to do with our hierarchy as possible. Some of my friends in Czechoslovakia and Hungary long to come here and breathe the exhilarating air of intellectual freedom, so they can know they are still alive, but they can't get passports. Obviously, the Communists there are afraid we would corrupt their artists, and we probably would. Poor creatures—they kept me up all night answering their questions about new French paintings, Swiss plays, and American films. It was pathetic. The poorest Pole is a rich Westerner compared to a Czech or a Hungarian—or a Russian, for that matter. We like to see people from the West here. We don't have the defensive arrogance that the Russians display toward foreigners. Our mission is to be a cultural bridge between East and West—to bring Western ideas and Western culture to the East."

For all their exuberance, Polish artists do have to proceed with care, for their position is full of ambiguities and dangers, small and large. A typical ambiguity appears in the case of a painter I have met. He does some realistic drawing and a great deal of abstract painting. The state-run museums buy his drawings, but don't bother to show them. They show his paintings—on loan from the artist—but don't dare to buy them. The reason is that abstract painting, which is much more popular than realism here, is still officially taboo; a museum director may very well get away with showing an abstraction, but he might lose his job for buying one. Polish literary men face comparable problems. A writer who too clearly criticizes the regime probably won't be thrown out of his apartment or lose his job, but he will have difficulty getting published. The state publishing house, unlike its counterparts in other Communist countries, does not seem to work hand in glove with the censors of the ministry of culture or of the central committee; it sometimes takes a bold chance with a book, and sometimes the book in question is banned. Pressure to increase conformity is always there. "We Poles rejoice in what freedom we have," one writer told me, perhaps summing up not only the state of the intellectuals but that of the nation as a whole. "However, we never know what's coming next. We can't take anything for granted, and, believe me, we don't."

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. O'Hara of Michigan (at the request of Mr. Nedzi) on account of illness.

Mr. Healey (at the request of Mr. Keogh), for Wednesday, February 27, 1963, on account of illness.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. Becker, for 2 hours, on Monday, March 4, 1963.

Mr. Rogers of Florida, for 20 minutes, today.

Mr. Cahill, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. McDowell (at the request of Mr. Gonzalez), for 30 minutes, today, to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. Cooley (at the request of Mr. Gonzalez), for 60 minutes, on February 28, to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the Congressional Record, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. Becker and to include a speech.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. Derounian) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. Glenn.

Mr. Horan.

Mr. Sibal in two instances.

Mr. Findley.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. Gonzalez) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. McDowell.

Mr. Pike.

Mr. Burke.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 29 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, February 28, 1963, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

476. A letter from the Associate Administrator, Foreign Agricultural Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture, transmitting a report on title I, Public Law 480 agreements concluded during January 1963, pursuant to Public Law 85–128; to the Committee on Agriculture.

477. A letter from the President of the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to amend the Street Readjustment Act of the District of Columbia so as to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to close all or part of a street, road, highway, or alley in accordance with the requirements of an approved redevelopment or urban renewal plan, without regard to the notice provisions of such act, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

478. A letter from the President of the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to increase the partial pay of educational employees of the public schools of the District of Columbia who are on leave of absence for educational improvement, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

479. A letter from the President of the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to amend the act entitled 'An act to provide for compulsory school attendance, for the taking of a school census in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes', approved February 4, 1925"; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

480. A letter from the President of the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to amend the act entitled 'An act to create a Board for the Condemnation of Insanitary Buildings in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes', approved May 1, 1906, as amended"; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

481. A letter from the President of the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to amend the act entitled 'An act to provide for a mutual-aid plan for fire protection by and for the District of Columbia and certain adjacent communities in Maryland and Virginia, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

482. A letter from the President of the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to sell a right-of-way across a portion of the District Training School grounds at Laurel, Md"; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

483. A letter from the President of the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to authorize certain expenses in the government of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

484. A letter from the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to amend the Vocational Rehabilitation Act to assist in providing more flexibility in the financing and administration of State rehabilitation programs, and to assist in expansion of services and facilities provided under such programs, particularly for the mentally retarded and other groups presenting special vocational rehabilitation problems, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

485. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the review of unnecessary deterioration of unused rubber tracks for Army combat vehicles; to the Committee on Government Operations.

486. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Power Commission, transmitting a copy of a publication entitled "Statistics of Electric Utilities in the United States, 1961, Privately Owned"; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

487. A letter from the General Manager, U.S. Atomic Energy Commission, transmitting a report that the Atomic Energy Commission took no affirmative actions under the authority of Public Law 85–804 during the calendar year ending December 31, 1962, pursuant to Public Law 85–804; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. HARRIS: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. Report on investigation and study of aircraft noise problems (Rept. No. 36). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. FRIEDEL: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 146. Resolution to provide for the expenses of the investigation and study authorized by House Resolution 84; with amendment (Rept. No. 37). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. FRIEDEL: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 100. Resolution to provide funds for the Committee on the Judiciary; with amendment (Rept. No. 38). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. FRIEDEL: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 35. Resolution to provide funds for the Committee on the Judiciary under Public Law 86–272; with amendment (Rept. No. 39). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. FRIEDEL: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 226. Resolution providing funds for the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce; with amendment (Rept. No. 40). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. FRIEDEL: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 239. Resolution to provide funds for the expense of studies and investigations authorized by House Resolution 38; with amendment (Rept. No. 41). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. FRIEDEL: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 204. Resolution to provide funds for the expenses of the studies, investigations, and inquiries authorized by House Resolution 153, with amendment (Rept. No. 42). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. FRIEDEL: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 202. Resolution to provide funds for the expenses of the studies and investigations authorized by House Resolution 142; with amendment (Rept. No. 43). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. FRIEDEL: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 243. Resolution providing for expenses of conducting studies and investigations authorized by House Resolution 55; with amendment (Rept. No. 44). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. FRIEDEL: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 80. Resolution providing for the expenses of conducting studies and investigations authorized by rule XI(8) incurred by the Committee on Government Operations; with amendment (Rept. No. 45). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. FRIEDEL: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 165. Resolution providing funds for the Committee on House Administration; with amendment (Rept. No. 46). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. FRIEDEL: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 135. Resolution to provide funds for the expenses of the investigations authorized by House Resolution 79; with amendment (Rept. No. 47). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. FRIEDEL: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 30. Resolution to provide funds for the expenses of the studies and investigations authorized by House Resolution 29; with amendment (Rept. No. 48). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. FRIEDEL: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 152. Resolution to provide funds for the expenses of the investigations and studies authorized by House Resolution 151; with amendment (Rept. No. 49). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. FRIEDEL: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 236. Resolution to provide funds for the expenses of the studies, investigations, and inquiries authorized by House Resolution 56; with amendment (Rept. No. 50). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. FRIEDEL: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 237. Resolution to provide for the further expenses of the investigation and study authorized by House Resolution 56; with amendment (Rept. No. 51). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. FRIEDEL: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 177. Resolution to provide funds for the expenses of the studies, investigations, and inquiries authorized by House Resolution 143; with amendment (Rept. No. 52). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. FRIEDEL: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 222. Resolution to provide funds for the study and investigation authorized by House Resolution 13; with amendment (Rept. No. 53). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. FRIEDEL: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 249. Resolution to authorize the expenditure of certain funds for the expenses of the Committee on Un-American Activities; with amendment (Rept. No. 54). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. FRIEDEL: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 74. Resolution to provide for the expenses of the investigation and study authorized by House Resolution 73; with amendment (Rept. No. 55). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. FRIEDEL: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 227. Resolution to provide funds for necessary expenses of the Committee on Ways and Means; with amendment (Rept. No. 56). Ordered to be printed.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ASHLEY:

H.R. 4298. A bill to amend section 22 of the Interstate Commerce Act so as to assure that rates, fares, and charges established under that section for the United States Government are free from undue prejudice and preference; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BATTIN:

H.R. 4299. A bill providing that certain privately owned irrigable lands in the Milk River project in Montana shall be deemed to be excess lands; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BONNER:

H.R. 4300. A bill to amend the inland and western rivers rules concerning anchor lights and fog signals required in special anchorage areas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 4301. A bill to provide under the social security program for payment for hospital and related services to aged beneficiaries; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CAHILL:

H.R. 4302. A bill to authorize the Interstate Commerce Commission to limit the number of standees on railroad cars; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CEDERBERG:

H.R. 4303. A bill to amend section 102(a) of title 28 of the United States Code to transfer certain counties from the northern division to the southern division of the eastern district of Michigan, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4304. A bill to amend the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 to provide for more effective evaluation of the fiscal requirements of the executive agencies of the Government of the United States; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. DENT:

H.R. 4305. A bill to amend the Housing Act of 1959 to provide a 1-year moratorium on Federal Housing Administration insured and certain other guaranteed and insured mortgages, with the Federal Government assuming the mortgage payments (both principal and interest) and certain other mortgage costs, for mortgagors in areas of substantial unemployment who are unemployed and unable to make such payments through no fault of their own, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 4306. A bill to prohibit advertising in commerce of articles produced in any foreign country unless the advertisement clearly states that fact; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 4307. A bill to provide under the social security program for payment for hospital and related services to aged beneficiaries; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H.R. 4308. A bill to provide under the social security program for payment for hospital and related services to aged beneficiaries; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FLOOD:

H.R. 4309. A bill to authorize the establishment of a Youth Conservation Corps to provide healthful outdoor training and employment for young men and to advance the conservation, development, and management of natural resources and recreational areas; and to authorize local area youth employment programs; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. GILL:

H.R. 4310. A bill relating to the income tax treatment of cost-of-living allowances received by certain caretakers and clerks employed by the National Guard outside the continental United States, or in Alaska; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GLENN:

H.R. 4311. A bill to provide for the procurement and installation of mechanism for recording and counting votes in the House of Representatives; to the Committee on House Administration.

H.R. 4312. A bill to amend the Federal Trade Commission Act, to promote quality and price stabilization, to define and restrain certain unfair methods of distribution and to confirm, define, and equalize the rights of producers and resellers in the distribution of goods identified by distinguishing brands, names, or trademarks, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 4313. A bill to authorize a study of methods of helping to provide financial assistance to victims of future flood disasters; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 4314. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act so as to remove the limitation upon the amount of outside income which an individual may earn while receiving benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GRABOWSKI:

H.R. 4315. A bill to provide under the social security program for payment for hospital and related services to aged beneficiaries; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. GRIFFITHS:

H.R. 4316. A bill to amend sections 1231, 272, and 631 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to iron ore royalties; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HALPERN:

H.R. 4317. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, to provide that accumulated sick leave be credited to retirement fund; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 4318. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act to authorize the retirement of employees after 30 years of service without reduction in annuity; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. KILGORE:

H.R. 4319. A bill to permit persons who suffered damage to their lands or other private property by reason of flooding along the Arroyo Colorado and North Floodway in October of 1958 due to the diversion of flood waters of the Rio Grande to file claims under the act of August 27, 1935, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KUNKEL:

H.R. 4320. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to eliminate the restriction on the period during which an application for a determination of disability is granted full retroactivity, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LANGEN:

H.R. 4321. A bill to amend the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. McMILLAN:

H.R. 4322. A bill to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to utilize volunteers for active police duty; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. MARTIN of Nebraska:

H.R. 4323. A bill to amend the act of May 18, 1956, in order to provide for payment for rights-of-way used for the Ainsworth unit, Missouri River Basin project, being constructed by the Bureau of Reclamation; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. NATCHER:

H.R. 4324. A bill to provide for the establishment of a new fish hatchery on or near the Cumberland River in the eastern part of the State of Kentucky; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. OLSEN of Montana:

H.R. 4325. A bill to set a definite limit on the number of employees supervised by a foreman of mails; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. PERKINS:

H.R. 4326. A bill to amend section 9(b)(3) of the National Labor Relations Act so as to eliminate the provision thereof prohibiting the certification, as bargaining representative of persons employed as guards, of a labor organization which admits to membership, or is affiliated with an organization which admits to membership, employees other than guards; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. RANDALL:

H.R. 4327. A bill to amend Public Laws 815 and 874, 81st Congress, to extend for 2 years the provisions thereof which would otherwise expire; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. ROOSEVELT:

H.R. 4328. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide a 20-percent across-the-board benefit increase, to reduce from 72 to 70 the age at which deductions cease to be made from benefits on account of outside earnings, and to provide that the Federal Government shall contribute one-third of the additional cost of such changes (reducing the additional contributions required of workers and employers accordingly); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin:

H.R. 4329. A bill to amend the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 to provide for more effective evaluation of the fiscal requirements of the executive agencies of the Government of the United States; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. WHITENER (by request):

H.R. 4330. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Business Corporation Act; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. BOLAND:

H.R. 4331. A bill granting the consent and approval of Congress to the northeastern water and related land resources compact; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. CLEVELAND:

H.R. 4332. A bill to amend section 560 of title 38, United States Code, to permit the payment of special pension to holders of the Congressional Medal of Honor awarded such medal for actions not involving conflict with an enemy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. DOWDY:

H.R. 4333. A bill to authorize the Board of Parole of the District of Columbia to discharge a parolee from supervision prior to the expiration of the maximum term or terms for which he was sentenced; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. FISHER:

H.R. 4334. A bill to require each person hired by a Member of the House of Representatives to perform compensated services in the District of Columbia and the district represented by the Member; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. HARVEY of Michigan:

H.R. 4335. A bill to amend title 28 of the United States Code to transfer the counties of Genesee and Shiawassee in the State of Michigan from the northern division to the southern division of the eastern judicial district; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PEPPER:

H.R. 4336. A bill to provide under the social security program for payment for hospital and related services to aged beneficiaries; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 4337. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina:

H.R. 4338. A bill to amend title 37, United States Code, to authorize travel and transportation allowances for travel performed under orders that are canceled, revoked, or modified, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. SAYLOR:

H.R. 4339. A bill to increase from $600 to $750 the personal income tax exemptions of a taxpayer (including the exemption for a spouse, the exemption for a dependent, and the additional exemption for old age and blindness); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 4340. A bill to provide for fair representation of all areas of the United States in the House of Representatives; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4341. A bill to establish quota limitations on imports of foreign residual fuel oil; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. STAGGERS:

H.R. 4342. A bill to amend the Federal Employees Health Benefits Act of 1959 to provide additional choice of health benefits plans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 4343. A bill to increase the personal income tax exemptions (including the exemptions for dependents and the additional exemptions for old age and blindness) to $1,000 for 1963 and succeeding year; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 4344. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to reduce from 65 to 60 the age at which old-age and other monthly insurance benefits shall be payable thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas:

H.R. 4345. A billl relating to the distribution of the Year Book of Agriculture; to the Committee on House Administration.

H.R. 4346. A bill for the establishment of a Commission on Science and Technology; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

H.R. 4347. A bill to limit the authority of the Veterans' Administration and the Bureau of the Budget with respect to new construction or alteration of veterans' hospitals; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. UDALL:

H.R. 4348. A bill to provide for the relocation and reestablishment of the members of the Papago Indian Tribe inhabiting the village of Sil Murk, which adjoins the Gila Bend Indian Reservation; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. GONZALEZ:

H.J. Res. 292. Joint resolution to establish a Joint Committee on Foreign Information and Intelligence; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. KILGORE:

H. Con. Res. 102. Concurrent resolution expressing the determination of the United States with respect to the matter of general disarmament and arms control; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. TAFT:

H. Con. Res. 103. Concurrent resolution to request the President of the United States to urge certain actions in behalf of Lithuania, Estonia, and Latvia; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. COLLIER:

H. Res. 265. Resolution amending clause 2(a) of rule XI and clause 4 of rule XXI of the Rules of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. DENT:

H. Res. 266. Resolution authorizing investigation of effects of foreign trade on American economy; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. GLENN:

H. Res. 267. Resolution to amend the Rules of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Rules.

H. Res. 268. Resolution to amend clause 3 of rule XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives to require that committee reports include an estimate of the cost of bills, as reported to the House; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. GUBSER:

H. Res. 269. Resolution creating a select committee to conduct a study of the fiscal organization and procedures of the Congress; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. KUNKEL:

H. Res. 270. Resolution to amend rule XXII of the Rules of the House of Representatives to permit Members to introduce jointly public bills, memorials, and resolutions; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ASHMORE:

H.R. 4349. A bill for the relief of Robert O. Nelson and Harold E. Johnson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BAKER:

H.R. 4350. A bill for the relief of Reeder Motor Co., Inc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BROOMFIELD:

H.R. 4351. A bill for the relief of Marietta C. Bibeau; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CAREY:

H.R. 4352. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Filomena Daria Mannarella; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SIBAL:

H.R. 4353. A bill for the relief of Asher Dzialoschynski, his wife, Lilly Ida Dzialoschynski, and their minor son, Jeschua Dan Dzialoschynski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CAREY:

H.R. 4354. A bill for the relief of Bianca Viola; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4355. A bill for the relief of Muriel Agatha Gauntlett; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CASEY:

H.R. 4356. A bill to provide transportation for molten sulfur in an amount not to exceed 100,000 long tons in the vessel SS *Etude* and SS *Pochteca* from U.S. ports on the gulf coast to other points in the United States along the gulf coast and the eastern seaboard until December 31, 1963; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. CLANCY:

H.R. 4357. A bill for the relief of Robert Wilkes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DANIELS:

H.R. 4358. A bill for the relief of Jacob Attias; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HALPERN:

H.R. 4359. A bill for the relief of Estela Colobong; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4360. A bill for the relief of Stojan Pavesic; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KORNEGAY:

H.R. 4361. A bill for the relief of the estate of Paul F. Ridge; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McDOWELL:

H.R. 4362. A bill for the relief of Ie Liang Pouw, his mother, Tenglan Ong Pouw, his wife, Bie In Ijiang Pouw, and his minor children, Jennee Pouw and Sien Wie Pouw; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MILLER of New York:

H.R. 4363. A bill for the relief of Dr. Wei-Tsung Chin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NORBLAD:

H.R. 4364. A bill to provide for the free entry of one mass spectrometer for the use of Oregon State University; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. O'HARA of Illinois:

H.R. 4365. A bill for the relief of Henryk Lazowski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. OSTERTAG:

H.R. 4366. A bill for the relief of Domenico De Marco; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POWELL:

H.R. 4367. A bill for the relief of Estena Adella Grant; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PUCINSKI:

H.R. 4368. A bill for the relief of Rose Babaian; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4369. A bill for the relief of Nicholaus Iatridis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4370. A bill for the relief of Demitrios Karonis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROONEY:

H.R. 4371. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Sofia Mazzella di Regnella; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RYAN of Michigan:

H.R. 4372. A bill for the relief of Miss Najiba Antone; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RYAN of New York:

H.R. 4373. A bill for the relief of Hugo Beretvas, his wife, Veronica Beretvas, and their minor son, Andrew Beretvas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WALTER:

H.R. 4374. A bill to proclaim Sir Winston Churchill an honorary citizen of the United States of America; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POFF:

H.R. 4375. A bill to proclaim Sir Winston Churchill an honorary citizen of the United States of America; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CHELF:

H.R. 4376. A bill to proclaim Sir Winston Churchill an honorary citizen of the United States of America; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MOORE:

H.R. 4377. A bill to proclaim Sir Winston Churchill an honorary citizen of the United States of America; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

56. The SPEAKER presented a petition of Doris M. Hyde, secretary, Catholic Evidence Guild of New York, New York, N.Y., relative to the position of the President's educational aid program insofar as it pertains to elementary and secondary schools is discriminatory against those who choose to exercise their constitutional rights in practicing their religion and in the education of their children in private schools, which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

A Day With Their Congressman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OTIS G. PIKE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 27, 1963

Mr. PIKE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues a praiseworthy program developed a year ago by the Suffolk County, Long Island, N.Y., Boy Scout organization, whereby the hardest working Eagle Scout in the county was rewarded with a trip to Washington to spend a day with his Congressman. This was an extension of their town and county scouts in government program to the Federal level, and so far as I know is the first Boy Scout group in the country to develop this program.

It was such an enjoyable and rewarding experience for the young man, Eagle Scout John Weiner, of Huntington, N.Y., and for me, that when I was asked again this year whether I would be willing to take another Eagle Scout under my wing for a day, I looked forward with the greatest of pleasure to his arrival. Two Eagle Scouts, James Boardman, of Aquebogue, N.Y., and Ernest Trubig, of Lindenhurst, N.Y., arrived on February 19 for a day with their respective Representatives.

Into a single day we crowded visits to the Smithsonian, the FBI, the Supreme Court, the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier, luncheon at the Capitol, and a tour of the House and Senate.

Along the way we squeezed in a quick briefing on how our laws are made, and let our Eagle Scouts absorb as much as they could of the flavor of the Nation's Capital.

Although the boys only expected to have 1 day, their plane was grounded that night and they had to remain in Washington another 24 hours. Their host, Mr. Harry Jones, of the national Boy Scout organization, was able to take them to the luncheon for Astronaut John Glenn given by the Washington Board of Trade, and to the assignment of his famous space capsule to the Smithsonian Institution, and to meet President Kennedy and the President of Venezuela. I think I can safely say that Eagle Scouts James Boardman and Ernest Trubig have had an unforgettable experience, and one that should be made available to the most distinguished Eagle Scout in each congressional district in the years to come.

The concept of a day in Washington with their Congressman for outstanding Eagle Scouts is one I shall continue to foster, and it has already caught the imagination of the national Boy Scout organization. I hope its worth and possibilities will so impress my colleagues in the House that they will want to make similar arrangements with the Boy Scout organization back home, and in 1964 guide an outstanding Eagle Scout through the mazes of the National Government just as the two Members representing Suffolk County, Long Island, N.Y., had the privilege of doing last week.

A Quality Stabilization Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MILTON W. GLENN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 27, 1963

Mr. GLENN. Mr. Speaker, independent retailers in all fields are being relentlessly liquidated by monopoly producing price cutting known as customer-bait pricing.

There are a number of reasons for the decline of independent retailing. But I think the inability of the small storekeeper to sell, at a fair profit, the famous brand-name products which are his bread and butter, must come at, or near, the top of these reasons.

The quality stabilization bill which I introduce today will not cure customer-bait pricing, but its enactment most assuredly will help curb it.

The quality stabilization bill reflects free enterprise at its enlightened best. It enables the manufacturers, if they wish, to guard the reputation of their brand names. It would restore fair, yet competitive, pricing to the marketplace, and would cost neither the Government nor the consumer a single penny.

Government Takeover in Grain Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL FINDLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 27, 1963

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, to understand more fully why the USDA's Commodity Credit Corporation needs still more money beyond its present $14.5 billion fund, I present here statistics showing the degree to which Uncle Sam has taken over feed grain merchandising in recent years.

Twenty-five years ago, the entire feed grain carryover of the United States was owned privately—on farms, in country elevators or terminal markets.

Today—an alltime high—88.5 percent of feed grain carryover is handled by Uncle Sam.

Here is the shocking story of Government takeover of what historically has been a private enterprise activity. It naturally follows that, as Government assumes greater responsibility for grain merchandising, more cash is needed.

The attached table shows the total feed grain stocks over the past 25 years, the stocks owned by CCC and other stocks. Feed grain stocks are counted, in this case, as of October 1 for corn and sorghum and as of July 1 for oats and barley:

Total feed grains carryover at the beginning of marketing year

Year beginning—	Government stocks [1]	Other stocks	Total	Government stocks as a percentage of total
	Million tons	*Million tons*	*Million tons*	*Percentage*
1937	(2)	3.8	3.8	0
1938	1.3	13.0	14.3	9.1
1939	7.2	13.5	20.7	34.8
1940	13.2	9.6	22.8	57.9
1941	11.3	11.8	23.1	48.9
1942	5.5	13.0	18.5	29.7
1943	.4	17.4	17.8	2.2
1944	.2	11.4	11.6	1.7
1945	.3	14.6	14.9	2.0
1946	(2)	10.9	10.9	0
1947	.3	13.5	13.8	2.2
1948	(2)	7.8	7.8	0
1949	15.3	15.1	30.4	50.3
1950	20.9	9.6	30.5	68.5
1951	14.8	13.8	28.6	51.7
1952	9.0	11.1	20.1	44.8
1953	16.6	10.4	27.0	61.5
1954	22.6	9.1	31.7	71.3
1955	29.7	9.4	39.1	76.0
1956	34.7	8.5	43.2	80.3
1957	40.8	8.0	48.8	83.6
1958	49.7	9.3	59.0	84.2
1959	58.0	9.5	67.5	85.9
1960	65.7	8.9	74.6	88.1
1961 [3]	74.7	10.0	84.7	88.2
1962 [4]	60.5	10.5	71.0	88.5

[1] Owned by CCC and old crop grain under loan.
[2] Less than 50,000 bushels.
[3] Preliminary.
[4] Source: FDS-196.

Source: Grain and feed statistics through 1961, Statistical Bulletin No. 159, revised June 1962.

Full Military Honors for 11 Americans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES A. BURKE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 27, 1963

Mr. BURKE. Mr. Speaker, today a group burial service with full military honors for 11 young Americans who died in the crash of a B-25 bomber during World War II in New Guinea was held at the Arlington National Cemetery. Protestant, Catholic, and Jewish services were conducted in the Fort Myer chapel and the services then moved to the gravesite at section 34, Arlington National Cemetery. The three chaplains officiating were Lt. Col. Harry P. Henderson, U.S. Air Force, Protestant; Capt. Thomas J. Moran, U.S. Air Force, Catholic; and Capt. Ervin Preis, U.S. Army, Jewish.

Taking part in the ceremony were: A one-platoon honor escort from the 1st Battle Group, 3d Infantry—The Old Guard—Fort Myer, Va.; music by the U.S. Army Band; two caissons drawn by horses; three volleys by seven-man firing party; the playing of "Taps" by bugler.

The names of men are as follows: Sgt. Jack E. Beals, West Hollywood, Fla.; S. Sgt. Marvin Culbreth, Dearing, Ga.; Sgt. Harold B. Davis, Zanesville, Ohio; Lt. Angelo C. Dellisante, Corning, N.Y.; Sgt. Charlie L. Fann, Murfreesboro, Tenn.; Lt. Walter R. Gerry, East Providence, R.I.; Sgt. Raymond F. Greene, Norwood, Mass.; Cpl. Edward R. Howard, Hingham, Mass.; Capt. Rudolph W. Johnson, Jr., Muskegon, Mich.; Sgt. Milton S. Miller, Bridgeport, Conn.; and Capt. Lamar S. Russell, Goldhill, N.C.

Members of the families who attended are: Mrs. Mildred E. Thomas, mother of Jack E. Beals; Mr. Elbert D. Culbreth, brother of Marvin E. Culbreth; John B. Davis, father of Harold B. Davis; Philip B. Dellisante, brother of Angelo C. Dellisante; Mr. Houston Fann, father of Charlie L. Fann; Walter R. Gerry, father of Walter R. Gerry; Maude R. Greene, mother of Raymond F. Greene; Carol Robinson, sister of Edward R. Howard; Rudolph W. Johnson, Sr., father of Rudolph W. Johnson, Jr.; Minna B. Miller, sister of Milton S. Miller; and Beulah S. Russell, mother of Lamar S. Russell.

Also in attendance were: Mr. and Mrs. Richard Greene of Norwood, Mass., and Mr. Leslie Greene of Racine, Wis.

These brave young Americans gave their full measure of devotion to our country. Their remains are in two caskets buried in the same grave. Protestant, Catholic, and Jewish boys who died together that this Nation of ours might live. One headstone bearing the name of each young man will mark the final resting place in the Arlington National Cemetery. No words of mine could adequately send out the message or lesson to our countrymen that has been laid down by these fine young Americans. I know the entire Nation mourns their loss.

The 15th Anniversary of the Communist Takeover of Czechoslovakia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABNER W. SIBAL

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 27, 1963

Mr. SIBAL. Mr. Speaker, February 24th was the 15th anniversary of the Communist takeover of Czechoslovakia. The wretchedness of life under the Red regime needs no particular review at this time. It is well known, and Czechoslovakia is not alone among the nations of the world who suffer life under communism. She is but one of a tragic list of oppressed nations, all of which stand as cruel illustrations of the harshness, moral bankruptcy, and utter inability of the Communist system to meet the economic or spiritual needs of mankind.

An example of the complete callousness of the Red regime in Prague is its current practice of extorting American dollars from American citizens who have relatives in Czechoslovakia. This is a practice which Members of Congress should know about and which, in my opinion, our Government should stop.

Because of the economic misery in Czechoslovakia, American relatives are anxious to send gift packages of American goods to their close of kin. The Communists are making this impossible, however, by placing an astronomical duty on new goods and an almost prohibitive duty on used clothing.

The purpose is to extort dollars out of Americans. If Americans wish to help their needy relatives and friends, they must send dollars with which Czechoslovakian citizens can buy Czechoslovakian goods, if and when available, in a government store called Tuzex.

Through this process, the Red regime accumulates dollars which it uses to spread anti-American propaganda and to promote subversion in Latin America and elsewhere in the world.

Our balance-of-payments problems are so severe that we restrict the amount of goods our own citizens can bring back duty free. It is folly, Mr. Speaker, to tolerate this open leak of dollars, which not only further weakens the international position of the dollar, but directly fills the coffers of our enemies. Let us put a stop to this either by sending the direct transfer of American dollars to the Communist regimes or by insisting that gift packages of American goods be allowed to go directly to needy citizens of those countries.

The Berlin Wall Is a Barrier to the Exchange of Ideas, Trade, and People—And the Exclusion of American Poultry From the Common Market Is a Violation of the Principle of Free Trade

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRIS B. McDOWELL, JR.

OF DELAWARE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 27, 1963

Mr. McDOWELL. Mr. Speaker, the exclusion of American poultry products from the Common Market is no less a violation of the principle of free trade than the Berlin wall.

I include herewith for the information of my colleagues an editorial from the Wilmington (Del.) Evening Journal of February 25, and a recent press release of mine on this subject:

DELMARVA BIRDS NEED TO TRAVEL

A major tenet of the European Common Market has been that agriculture in the six nations needs tariff protection if it is to reach its full potential for feeding Western Europe. One of the imports saddled with a stiff duty is poultry. Delmarva broiler growers are therefore unhappy.

After a conference that U.S. Representative McDOWELL and Congressmen from other poultry States had with the President, word came that Mr. Kennedy would see that an American complaint was lodged with the Common Market's Council of Ministers in Brussels.

Negotiations on matters of this kind are important to the Common Market as well as to U.S. agriculture. Those European countries have a stake in trade with the United

States. They cannot hope to be so self-sufficient in all important commodities and manufactures that they can risk raising unnecessary barriers against any single import.

Certainly the broiler industry in the Delmarva Peninsula must protest any new action that puts more of a squeeze on profits. Growers cannot well stand the kind of prices—as low as 16 cents a pound live weight—that have been afflicting the industry for a long time here.

In this country, of course, there is the internal trouble of overproduction. You'd think the huge American market would insure profits for the American poultry industry, with all the promotional means at its disposal. But the overproduction in chickens is a hard fact. While it continues, the export of poultry is critically important.

We'll say this for the Delmarva poultry industry: It has taken a stanch position against U.S. artificial controls of production. Since tariffs are another kind of artificial control, there is a genuine consistency in the present effort for lowered Common Market tariffs on poultry.

It is not as if European poultrymen can really compete with Delmarva growers. Mr. McDowell has told of taking a good look at the kind of birds raised in Europe. They weren't much to look at, running loose around the farmer's yard, the way they used to do in Delaware. On the table they just couldn't compare with a Sussex County bird that goes 3 pounds at 8 or 9 weeks of age.

The point is that Europeans would learn to eat more poultry if they could buy better quality birds.

The farm-raised Senator Boggs has also voiced concern about the Common Market's poultry tariffs. What does Senator Williams think about it? As another farm-bred delegate in Washington, as a feed dealer in Millsboro, he has often fought a good fight for the Delmarva poultry industry especially when it comes to purchases by the U.S. Government for the Armed Forces.

Monday, February 18, 1963, Washington, D.C.—Congressman Harris B. McDowell, Jr., Democrat, of Delaware, in a meeting with President Kennedy at the White House today expressed great concern with the Common Market restrictions designed to exclude U.S. poultry, including Delmarva poultry, from the European market.

Congressman McDowell told President Kennedy that: "Any curtailment of our poultry export markets because of trade restrictions imposed by the Common Market will certainly have undesirable effects on the Delaware poultry industry and the Delaware economy in general."

Congressman McDowell told President Kennedy: "While our trade representatives now appearing before the European Economic Commission in Brussels are trying to make a case for our poultry industry, our position in this matter should be forcefully set forth so as to insure reasonable access for our agricultural products to the European Common Market area."

Congressman McDowell's complete statement follows: "Since August 1962, when nation members of the European Economic Community implemented its common agricultural policy, I have observed with serious concern the effect of this policy on certain U.S. agricultural exports. Our poultry and wheat flour exports have been adversely affected and there will be important impacts therefrom as to our feed grain and rice exports.

"Of immediate concern to me which I emphasized in a meeting with President Kennedy this morning is the restrictive effects of this policy as it relates to the export of Delaware poultry products.

"A new array of import charges and tariffs, applicable only to imports from nonmembers of the Common Market have clearly been unfavorable to the U.S. poultry industry. In West Germany, our major poultry market, the new import charges, even omitting any charges between the invoice and gate price which might be levied, amounts to more than 30 percent ad valorem, as compared with a previous duty of 15.9 percent. Other restrictive policies, including the gate or minimum price arrangements have been equally onerous.

"I explained to President Kennedy that the export market is a valuable market for Delaware and for Delmarva broilers. This export market has been developed despite numerous barriers against U.S. poultry such as import bans, often under the disguise of sanitary or disease control measures, and the restricting of dollars for the purpose of buying U.S. poultry. However, it was my feeling that aggressive promotion by the U.S. poultry industry, and the fact that U.S. poultry is of superior quality, attractively packaged and available at prices often below that of domestic poultry, has made possible a growing export market for the United States.

"In 1955, U.S. exports of poultry meat amounted to only 28 million pounds; this has grown to over 135 million pounds in 1962. Any curtailment of our poultry export markets because of trade restrictions imposed by the Common Market will certainly have undesirable effects on the Delaware poultry industry and the Delaware economy in general.

"While our trade representatives now appearing before the European Economic Commission in Brussels are trying to make a case for our poultry industry, I urged President Kennedy today to have our position in this matter forcefully set forth so as to insure reasonable access for our agricultural products to the European Common Market area.

"The obvious effect of these Common Market restrictions is to exclude U.S. agricultural exports and to preempt unto the Common Market countries themselves as much of the market as they choose despite the competitive position of our products or the uneconomic nature of their domestic production.

"The Common Market, by these proposals, intends to exclude competition and create a captive market rather than expand trade. Through the combination of actions which restrict our current poultry exports, I view this matter as the bellwether which may symbolize other actions by the EEC in the agricultural field.

"The Berlin wall symbolizes the barrier which exists today and which prevents the exchange of free ideas, free trade, and the movement of freemen; a tariff wall among free nations endangers the spirit of Western unity which we have encouraged as the goal of the Common Market. The issue involved here is one of principle and a reasonable and fair solution must be reached promptly if our relationship with the Common Market is to grow and flourish."

Lithuanian Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABNER W. SIBAL

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 27, 1963

Mr. SIBAL. Mr. Speaker, February 16 was the 45th anniversary of the founding of the independent Republic of Lithuania. This heroic people was first formed into a nation 710 years ago. In the long history of Lithuania, the succession of tyrants from both East and West which she has endured has only fanned her desire for liberty. Oppression and brutality have been their almost daily companions. So has their love of freedom and their readiness to die in its defense. Lithuania stands as an inspiring example to all of us who are charged with leading the fight for freedom. It is fitting that we salute her and give her our assurances that we have not forgotten.

Dispelling Some Fog

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALT HORAN

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 27, 1963

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted me to extend my own remarks in the Congressional Record, I am pleased to include an article written by my colleague, the Honorable Jack Westland, of Washington State's Second District.

We who represent districts in which the American softwood lumber industry is sick and in real trouble are trying to help prevent the demise of that industry.

For one thing we seek a quota on imports from Canada. By quota we mean a 6-percent limit based on the total imports of 1960–61 and 1962. It should be pointed out that Canada now imposes a tariff averaging 10 percent on any lumber imported into Canada from the United States.

We do not mind sharing our good market but not to the extent of killing off our producers.

The article follows:

DISPELLING SOME FOG

(By Hon. Jack Westland, of Washington)

After his death, Argus' eyes were transferred to the peacock's tail and his name was given to the Pacific Northwest's magazine of news, comment, opinion, and occasional mythology.

It isn't difficult to find each in the stimulating January 25 issue, including a bit of mythology on page 1 headlined "Sound Lumber Industry Explodes Myth of Woe, Chaos."

The unidentified author of the article should ask for a bonus from Argus Publisher Thomas H. Meadowcroft, who is also listed as a director of MacMillan, Bloedal, & Powell River, Ltd., one of Canada's largest timber producers.

The Argus said, among other things, that "lumber industry profits in 1962 have risen sharply, and are exceeded by only 1 year in the past 6." Well, now I find that the latest figures from the quarterly reports of the Federal Trade Commission and the Securities and Exchange Commission show that corporate net profits as a percentage of sales after income taxes in the lumber and wood products industry amounted to 2.1 percent in 1962. The comparable figure for all manufacturing industries was about 4.6 percent.

Profits in the lumber industry in 1961 were 2 percent, in 1960 they were 1.7 percent, in 1959 were 4.1 percent, in 1958 ran 3.1 percent and in 1957 were 2.3 percent. To suggest that there were sharp increases in profits for the timber industry in 1962 or that it was a good profit year is not supported by the facts.

Also, the Argus reflects considerable confusion concerning the composition of the lumbermen's economic survival committee, which was formed under the leadership of the Dwyer Lumber Co., and the Simpson Timber Co.—not Georgia-Pacific Corp., mentioned in the article.

Contrary to the Argus statement, no petitioners before the U.S. Tariff Commission withdrew their names from the petition. Several lumber industry associations which were included on the mailing list of the lumbermen's economic survival committee clarified their relationship with the committee in a statement before the Commission.

Every major association representing softwood producers in the United States appeared and testified before the Tariff Commission. This included the Southern Pine Association. The Argus article erroneously said that the Southern Pine Association was "conspicuous by its absence."

According to the article, "The Portland-based lumber associations, representing only 1.5 percent of U.S. sawmills but financially dominating the National Lumber Manufacturers Association through the weight of its [sic] production and its dues, succeeded in getting National's money at the tariff hearing to support the lumbermen's economic survival committee." It is true that the Western Pine Association and the West Coast Lumbermen's Association have their offices in Portland, Oreg. What the article failed to indicate is that these two associations represent mills in every lumber-producing State west of the Mississippi River, and whose members account for at least 60 percent of all production of softwood lumber in the western region of the United States.

Contrary to the impression created by the Argus, the National Association of Home Builders did not appear before the Tariff Commission. It did file a statement with the Commission several weeks after the hearings ended, thereby avoiding interrogation on the assertions made in the statement. The article also suggested that the distributors of lumber in America appeared in force before the Commission in opposition to the domestic lumber producers' position. Nothing could be further from the truth.

A small group of lumber wholesalers from the New York-New England area did appear, but concentrated its testimony on lumber consumed in the United States which moves by water. The vast majority of wholesalers in the United States did not express their views at the Tariff hearings, except as they coincided with the views of the manufacturers.

The Argus said "Prices in December were higher than at any time in the past 3 years." Let's look at the facts. The wholesale price index for lumber, reported by the Bureau of Labor Statistics, shows that the price index for 1962 on softwood was 95.5, while the preliminary December figure reached only 95.1. This compares to the 1958 index of 96.6, the 1959 index of 105, a 1960 index of 98.6 and a 1961 index of 93.5.

The most significant indication of whether or not domestic producers of lumber could supply all domestic softwood lumber needs is the fact that in 1959 domestic manufacturers of lumber produced 30.5 billion board feet of softwood lumber. In 1961 the United States used 30 billion board feet of softwood lumber and in 1962 used 30.9 billion board feet. It is only fair to assume that the mills producing lumber in 1959 could have supplied all the domestic needs for lumber in 1960, 1961, and 1962, without Canadian importation of softwood lumber into the United States. Consequently, the Argus statement, "We need natural resources and Canada needs manufacturers. Our lumber industry and lumber users need heavy Canadian supply if conservation plans are to work," is not supported by the evidence.

I want to point out that in 1962 consumption of softwood lumber in the United States increased by approximately 850 million board feet. Canadian shipments of softwood lumber into the United States captured 680 million board feet of this increase, or 80 percent.

How has waterborne shipments of lumber from British Columbia hurt west coast lumbermen? In 1952, 82.59 percent of the timber shipped to the U.S. Atlantic coast came from Oregon, California, and Washington, while 17.41 percent came from British Columbia. During 1962, shipments from the west coast amounted to about 38 percent compared to 62 percent for British Columbia. The British Columbia percentage was up from 57 percent in 1961.

The increase in British Columbia waterborne shipments between 1952 and 1962 was 629 million board feet, and means a gain to British Columbia over the 10-year period of 6,290 direct lumber industry jobs. This constitutes the direct employment opportunity loss to the Pacific Northwest. If you add service and community employment, British Columbia gains in the U.S. east coast market means a lost opportunity for 15,735 jobs and income equivalent of a city of more than 60,000 persons.

Canadian lumber can be shipped in foreign bottoms at a much cheaper rate than lumber from Washington State. This is one of the reasons British Columbia has captured so much of our east coast market. To help remedy the situation, I have introduced H.R. 3124 which would amend the Jones Act to allow shipments between the west coast and the east coast in foreign-flag ships if the industry can show it is losing a substantial portion of its business to foreign competitors because of the difference in shipping costs between foreign and American ships.

I believe that all the American lumberman asks is a chance to compete on an equal basis. I think my bill would help give him this opportunity.

Even though I disagree with the Argus in this instance I defend its right to publish the article even though the publisher's father-in-law and brother-in-law are also listed as directors of MacMillan, Bloedel & Powell River Ltd. a $300 million a year Canadian lumber concern. But I would suggest changing the masthead from the Argus to the Cyclops. One eye in focus might be more effective than 100 out of focus.

This Nation Under God

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK J. BECKER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 27, 1963

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday evening, February 21, 1963, I had the good fortune to attend a meeting held in the Bethesda-Chevy Chase High School to discuss the issue of the Supreme Court decision of June 24, 1962, barring prayer in the New York State schools.

The speaker at that particular meeting was our colleague, the Honorable HENRY C. SCHADEBERG, of Wisconsin. The title of his address "This Nation Under God."

I sat during the course of Mr. SCHADEBERG's address completely enthralled and greatly informed. It was the finest talk I have ever heard on this subject.

Believing that every Member should have the opportunity of at least reading this address, I am taking the liberty of inserting it herewith in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

THIS NATION UNDER GOD

It was just last week that our Nation paused briefly to pay tribute to one of its greatest leaders and 16th President, Abraham Lincoln. It was just a short distance from where we are meeting tonight that this loved and honored man delivered a short memorial known as the Gettysburg Address. It has become one of humanity's greatest utterances, not merely because it was brief and simple in style but because each phrase portrays a truth that is lasting and significant. From this immortal speech, which lasted but a brief 2 minutes, I quote from the last few lines:

"It is for us, the living, rather to be dedicated here to the unfinished work which they who fought here have thus far so nobly advanced. It is rather for us to be here dedicated to the great task remaining before us; that from these honored dead we take increased devotion to that cause for which they gave their last full measure of devotion; that we here highly resolve that these dead shall not have died in vain." (End of quote.) And what, ladies and gentlemen, was the task to which Mr. Lincoln insisted they were to dedicate themselves? It was this, and I now use his closing words, "That this Nation, under God," not merely a nation of men believing only in themselves or in some material ideal, but that "this Nation under God shall have a new birth of freedom; and that government of the people; by the people; for the people shall not perish from the earth."

When Mr. Lincoln said, "This Nation under God shall have a new birth of freedom," he was not trying to be rhetorical. It was not a religious gesture (a tipping of his hat, so to speak) to Almighty God. He illustrated quite clearly his belief in the origin and meaning of life—namely that it was conceived by God and that, to find fulfillment, life must be lived under God.

He was saying to the people he so deeply loved and who had borne so heavy a burden that life is not meaningless; that the universe is not like a ship without a rudder, left to move aimlessly over the sea, but that there is a divinity that shapes our ends, roughhew them how we will. In these immortal words Lincoln reveals that he had a deep and abiding knowledge and understanding of truth.

Lincoln lived in a period of history in which communications and transportation were rather primitive compared to the communications and transportation of our day. In his day Lincoln, living in Springfield, Ill., approximately 1,000 miles from Washington, said, "This Nation cannot survive half slave and half free." Today we live in a community of nations in which our most remote enemy is closer to us in time and in terms of transportation and communication than Washington was from Springfield, Ill., in Lincoln's day and it is as true of our community of nations as it was then of the sovereign States of this Nation, that "this community of nations cannot survive half slave and half free."

It is no secret to you, I am sure, that we are today engaged in a worldwide struggle which will decide the destiny of civilization for the next thousand years. We are at war, sometimes hot (though we prefer not to call it war), and sometimes cold, meaning simply that there is no military action, but it is war, nonetheless. We are engaged in a war to decide whether the people of the world shall be free, as certainly is the intention of God, the Creator, or whether they shall be enslaved to some degree under a Marxist, atheist philosophy that translated into political expression is what is variously called the welfare state or the Socialist state or the Communist state.

Every political decision made in Washington by the President; every decision made by State Department; by the Members of the House of Representatives and of the Senate; and nearly every decision handed down by the Supreme Court of our land, either directly or indirectly, and if indirectly, very seldom remotely, is related to the basic issue before us. All people of the world who love freedom—which means all but the selfish few who seek the prestige of personal power—have an intense interest, if not understanding, in the decisions that are made.

It was Thomas Payne in 1776 who said, "These are times which try men's souls." Nothing could better describe the times in which we live in 1963 and in which our children will be forced to mature in the next few decades and in which many of us will be living out our sunset years. These days—these years—this decade is indeed a time that "tries men's souls." It is because we are in a very present period of decisionmaking, of worldwide importance; being forced to deal politically with men representing governments, not of the will of the people, but forced upon them by brute power—men who have no sense of right or wrong, who have no basis for moral judgment—men who live by the law of the jungle, kill or be killed—that it is imperative that we as a nation understand our privileged position among nations; that we understand our responsibilities as spokesman for the free world.

As a people of a nation whose economic and social and political life historically has reflected the philosophical position that God is the Creator of all things and all life, it is imperative that we understand three things:

(1) It is imperative that we understand that man's peculiar relationship to his Creator as the one creation in all of God's marvelous creations—made in God's image—sets man apart from the rest of the animal world and gives to man certain unquestionable rights. This is clearly stated in the Declaration of Independence. "We hold these truths to be self-evident: that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights."

These rights referred to in the Declaration of Independence are not just social or political conveniences granted to us by the State. They are neither a favor nor a mutually arrived at contract. They are basic premises upon which men accept the authority of government. And they are arrived at not as a result of discussion or barter, but as a result of faith in a God who is Creator.

I insist that there is a lot of nonsense today about rights. In speaking to people throughout the Nation I come across some who say that faith in God has nothing to do with our rights; that there were among certain of our early political forefathers those who had no faith in God. With this I disagree. The truth is that while some of our early forefathers may not have accepted the theological position of a particular denomination of the church or of an ecclesiastical order, they were definitely convinced and convicted in their faith in Almighty God.

Our rights as a people of a free nation come to us even as science comes to us, in what I call a theological frame. It is our peculiar relationship to God as a creature, created, if you will, in His image—and incidentally it is a spiritual relationship, because God is a spirit and being created in His image, we are spiritual creatures—which endows us with unalienable, intangible, irrevocable rights. Unless we believe we are created by God and thus endowed by God with rights, our rights become a mere social utility, or a political commodity to be given to us or taken from us at the whim and passion of those who happen to control the state.

We of the Judeo-Christian tradition believe in the cherished doctrine of the sanctity and sacredness of personality, simply because we are God's creation.

Several years ago I drove from Wisconsin to Colorado. I came through a community in which I saw a rather poorly written sign posted along the side of the street where considerable trash and debris had been dumped. This sign read, "No more trespassing allowed." The owner of the property had had his fill. He could stand no more. He saw the results of those who had run roughshod over his property.

When the philosophers of the 16th and 17th centuries expressed the concept of rights as that given by God, and not by man, they were not discovering a new truth. They were simply restating the truth of Scripture; namely, that because man is a child of God, no one dare trespass on human personality without trespassing on God. I am of the firm conviction that in these trying days in which we are engaged in a worldwide war for keeps with atheistic communism, it is high time we as a nation put a sign to be read by all throughout the world, "No more trespassing on human personality." The sign must also be clearly visible to all in America for it is useless to try to save freedom throughout the world if by default or indifference or ignorance or misdirected tolerance we should lose it here, for we are as yet the home base of freedom for all.

I know of no more confusing and dangerous detour we could take than that of imposing upon this Nation, and especially upon this Nation's schools, a legalistic demand which emanates from a purely legalistic interpretation of our Constitution, that the mention of the name of God and the right to pray in public or outside of the church shall be denied our people. Criminals and gangsters are sometimes set free because of some legalistic interpretation of a law or a ruling. To free such men, clearly and unquestionably guilty of committing crime, may defy all sense of justice and run counter to all the intent of those who framed the law and all who abide by it but because it is legal it becomes an established fact. What I am trying to say is that just because an act is legal it becomes an established fact. What I am trying to say is that just because an act is legal it does not make that act moral or desirable. This is the danger of creating a world community under law devoid of basic moral foundations to undergird that law.

Now this is in a sense what is happening to our freedom.

Because there has developed in the past few decades among some who would be leaders of our Nation an assumption that constitutional government is out of date and cannot meet the needs of our society, catapulted overnight into a space age which demands answers today for tomorrow's questions, we hear rather strange and frightening suggestions being spread among us falsely as irrefutable fact. Suggestions, such as:

(a) Our Constitution is outmoded because it was written for an agrarian age, or

(b) Our Constitution is not adequate to meet the challenge of the sixties.

This kind of talk indicates a growing tendency to repudiate the influence of God in human affairs and to replace it by human knowledge of the physical sciences which we are told is the key to all progress.

We are witnessing before our very eyes, and it is so brash in its efforts we will not believe what we see, a coldly calculated attempt to destroy the importance and effectiveness of one of history's greatest documents of freedom—the Constitution of the United States. Over the years the basic intent of our Constitution is being: (1) circumvented out of authority by Executive order; (2) legislated out of authority by the legislative branches of our Government; interpreted out of authority by the judicial branch—our Supreme Court. The late ruling by the Supreme Court on the issue of prayer in the public schools of New York is but one of many examples. The decision could have been conveniently delayed because so many important matters are pending before the Court. Though legally, and perhaps technically, correct the decision was most unfortunate coming as it did in this time when we are so bitterly engaged in this worldwide struggle for the minds of man. Freedom is on the scaffold. It is most important that careless and itchy fingers, no matter how nobly guided by high ideal, not be allowed to trip the trap to bring freedom to an untimely death.

I return you to my initial statement that it is imperative for our survival that we understand man's peculiar relationship to his Creator as God's crowning creation, that gives the individual his unquestionable or unalienable rights.

Second, it is imperative that we as a people of this free Nation under God understand clearly that with these rights we have received from God we have also a moral responsibility. It is precisely because God created us in His image to be free—to be individuals with free choice—that no man dare live carelessly or indifferently. No man has a moral right to squander his life with impunity, for if he toys with his freedom, then he may very well lose it. Our freedom does not exempt us from life. He who claims a right, must also accept his responsibility to destiny. There are many in our day who jump at the idea of possessing these rights, but who are not willing to accept responsibility commensurate with these rights.

One reason freedom finds itself today in its present plight is that we have developed in our Nation a philosophy which is certainly foreign to us and would have been extremely repulsive to our forefathers—that is that there is no such thing as individual responsibility. We have come to a period in history in which we are evading our individual responsibility by placing the blame for all our difficulties on the collection group, either as the community, society as a whole, or government. So, we look for government to provide us with all the answers to our difficulties.

Before his death in 1910, William Graham Sumner, while serving as professor of political and social science at Yale, edited an almanac entitled "The Forgotten Man's Almanac." In it appears this statement:

"The social and political philosophy which has been spread abroad has nourished a doctrine that if a man wants anything which he has not got it is the fault of somebody else who ought to be found and compelled to give it to him."

To many people today, and this certainly is true for those in our Federal Government agencies, no one person is ever at fault. The guilt is society's and therefore nobody's. All blame can be traced to our economic system, or to bad plumbing, or to a defective school system, or to an inadequate home situation, or to unemployment, or to bad teeth, or to greedy businessmen, or to crooked labor leaders, or what have you. So the Government must spend and spend, ever taking more from your paycheck and mine and charging the rest off to our children, in order to provide more and more things for people because the individual is never to blame for any of his problems.

We have come to a period in our history—tragic as it is—in which we assume that individuals are more to be pitied than to be challenged or blamed. Whenever a man finds himself in trouble, it is because he is a victim of poverty or bad companions or of a traumatic experience at birth or the sinister powers of the unconscious over which he has no control. Our solution is to forgive all, make it impossible for him to fail, and thus impossible for him to learn by experience, and then to pour his neighbors' wealth into his coffers so he can continue to involve himself in more trouble. Our philosophy seems to be that since we cannot really know all the factors that enter into a man's life, no one should ever be blamed for anything.

You see this is all tied up with our basic faith in God and our willingness or unwillingness to accept the premise that He created us in His image. By our failure or unwillingness to make the individual responsible for his own destiny and by our insistence that impersonal government shall assume these responsibilities, we are saying, in effect, that man far from being created in the image of God is nothing more significant than tumble weed blown helplessly about by every wind or influence. If we continue on our present course that exiles us as individuals from responsibilities, the future holds nothing for us but a collectivism that will drag all men down to a common level—a level below which we, as children of God, believe is reserved not for man, created in the image of God, but for the animal of the field.

We are not puppets of fate or victims of vast impersonal forces beyond human control. The politician in office, who many times cannot adequately handle his own affairs is certainly not in a better position to give adequate answers to problems of the people—problems that vary in the different segments of our society and physical geography. We as individuals are endowed with the creative freedom of God, our Maker. We are free to take a hand in determining our own destiny—whether for good or evil.

I like the words of the poet who wrote these simple lines which summarize so clearly this thought:

Life is a jig saw puzzle
  Its pieces are jagged and torn.
We piece it together with weeping
  'till sometimes it's faded and worn.

A bright bit of sunset we fashion
  A home where wee children wait;
Where flowers are blooming and twinning
  And love meets with love at the gate.

Some pieces are drab, unenticing.
  How gladly we fling them away.
But there's a place for each fragment
  And the picture is needing the gray.

No extra pieces are given,
  The rose and the gray interlace
And lovely the picture presented
  When each finds its proper place.

Sometimes there's a storm on the ocean
  And the ships are all wearied with gale.
But storms have their beauty completed
  When met with firm courage and sail.

Life is a jig saw puzzle
  Cut by the Master's hand
And each little turn and each corner
  Is a part of the love He has planned.

So please put it together with patience
  Why should we whimper or wail?
If we blindly mix up the pattern
  Should we blame the Lord if we fail?

It is imperative that we understand that with the acceptance of unalienable rights we must also accept moral responsibility.

And, third, it is imperative that we understand that it is immoral to surrender basic freedoms and fundamental rights. If God has clothed us with dignity—created us in His own image—set us in the world with the ability and with an innate will to grapple with life's problems, then, to abdicate or to transfer these freedoms and rights to the group or to government is immoral. It is in a sense to forfeit the soul.

There are those in our day in high places and low who are so presumptuous as to assume for themselves the rights God has given to each individual man. They play at being God, but because they have neither God's wisdom nor insight, they in time bring only misery and failure. This is the threat of the totalitarian state. This is the threat in the earliest form of the socialist state or the welfare state. Once man relinquishes his individual God-given rights and responsibilities to government for any reason at all, he is on the road to abdicating his heritage as the crowning creature of God's creation—he is on the road to allowing himself, as the mere cattle in the field, to be fed and milked.

Many in our Nation seem to think that the totalitarian state is something for Europe or Asia or South America—that we here in the United States have some kind of a natural immunity to it—no matter what we do or fail to do or what course we take. There is, however, only one thing that stands between us and a totalitarian government and that is the concept of the meaning of life under God, of which I have been speaking. This is why it is so very important that we as a free people do not allow to go by unnoticed or unchallenged the vicious, howbe-it, well-meaning attempts, under the guise of protecting the rights of a small minority, to take from the vast majority the right to instill in society at every level, the basic concept of God as Creator and Giver of life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness. This is why it is so important that we do not allow ourselves as free people to fall victim to those who believe that men and the physical sciences have all the answers to our problems. If we lose our grasp on the concept of God as Creator; of man possessing dignity and unalienable rights; of individual responsibility for his own destiny—if we are willing to try to substitute some synthetic creation of government for the fundamental rights of man or to insist that government assume what are our individual responsibilities we shall surely lose our freedom. The time has come for us to obey the command given to the Galatians, "Stand up and be ye separate, thus saith the Lord."

It is a fact worth pondering as we study history that when men of evil design contemplated and succeeded in enslaving a people, faith in God and the church were the first and bitterest points of attack and that in the struggle to remain free the main resistance to totalitarian evil came not from the universities, the centers of science, not from corporations, the centers of profit, not from trade unions, dealing solely with the material aspects of society, but from the churches, the centers of faith, and more directly from men of faith themselves. Faith and freedom are inseparable. They are codefendants. Destroy faith in God and you destroy freedom as we know it. Destroy freedom and you destroy the faith in God out of which we have our concept of the dignity of man.

I opened my remarks with words from Lincoln and I close my remarks with a paraphrase of the last sentence of Lincoln's Gettysburg Address. It is my fervent prayer that, "This Nation under God"—and I hasten to add "this world under God"—"shall have a new birth of freedom for unless we do, government of the people, by the people, and for the people will perish from the earth."

SENATE

Thursday, February 28, 1963

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, and was called to order by the President pro tempore.

Rev. Emory Stevens Bucke, D.D., book editor of the Methodist Church, Nashville, Tenn., offered the following prayer:

O God of love and power, we pray that Thy spirit may be in us. May men of all nations and stations be bound together in Thy family of man.

Grant Thy blessing on those who seek it, and make our wills sturdy enough to do Thy will. Give us grace enough to be humble, and help us to admit and correct our own errors before we seek to correct the errors of our brothers.

Lead us, Heavenly Father, that we may follow Thy way and know Thy truth. This we pray for life.

Through Jesus Christ, our Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. Mansfield, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, February 25, 1963, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

CIVIL RIGHTS—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 75)

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the President has transmitted to the Congress today a message relating to civil rights. I am informed the message has been read in the House of Representatives. I therefore ask unanimous consent that its reading in the Senate be waived, and that the message be appropriately referred.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The message was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(For President's message, see House proceedings of today.)

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the following bills and joint resolution, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 79. An act to require authorization for certain appropriations for the Coast Guard, and for other purposes;

H.R. 780. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1939 to provide a credit against the estate tax for Federal estate taxes paid on certain prior transfers in the case of decedents dying after December 31, 1947;

H.R. 1597. An act relating to the tax treatment of redeemable ground rents;

H.R. 1839. An act to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to provide for the free importation of wild animals and wild birds which are intended for exhibition in the United States;

H.R. 2053. An act to provide for the temporary suspension of the duty on corkboard insulation and on cork stoppers;

H.R. 2085. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that the deduction for child care expenses shall be available to a wife who has been deserted by and cannot locate her husband on the same basis as a single woman;

H.R. 2513. An act to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to require certain new packages of imported articles to be marked to indicate the country of origin, and for other purposes; and

H.J. Res. 284. Joint resolution making supplemental appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, and for other purposes.

HOUSE BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED

The following bills and joint resolution were severally read twice by their titles and referred as indicated:

H.R. 79. An act to require authorization for certain appropriations for the Coast Guard, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce.

H.R. 780. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1939 to provide a credit against the estate tax for Federal estate taxes paid on certain prior transfers in the case of decedents dying after December 31, 1947;

H.R. 1597. An act relating to the tax treatment of redeemable ground rents;

H.R. 1839. An act to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to provide for the free importation of wild animals and wild birds which are intended for exhibition in the United States;

H.R. 2053. An act to provide for the temporary suspension of the duty on corkboard insulation and on cork stoppers;

H.R. 2085. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that the deduction for child care expenses shall be available to a wife who has been deserted by and cannot locate her hubsand on the same basis as a single woman;

H.R. 2513. An act to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to require certain new packages of imported articles to be marked to indicate the country of origin, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

H.J. Res. 284. Joint resolution making supplemental appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

LIMITATION OF STATEMENTS DURING MORNING HOUR

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, statements during the morning hour were ordered limited to 3 minutes.

COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. CURTIS, on behalf of Mr. MCCLELLAN, the Investigations Subcommittee of the Committee on Government Operations was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business, to consider the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States submitting several nominations, which were referred to the Committee on Commerce.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. ROBERTSON, from the Committee on Banking and Currency:

Philip N. Brownstein, of Maryland, to be Federal Housing Commissioner.

By Mr. ELLENDER, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

Roland R. Renne, of Montana, to be an Assistant Secretary of Agriculture; and

Roland R. Renne, of Montana, to be a member of the Board of Directors of the Commodity Credit Corporation.

Mr. ROBERTSON subsequently said: Mr. President, last Tuesday the Banking and Currency Committee considered the nomination of Philip N. Brownstein to be Federal Housing Commissioner. The committee approved the nomination without objection, and it has been reported today. I ask unanimous consent that a biography of Mr. Brownstein and copies of the letters which the committee received in support of the nomination be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the biography and letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Philip N. Brownstein, whom the President announced today he intended to appoint as Commissioner of the Federal Housing Administration, has had long experience in Government and housing.

Mr. Brownstein, who is presently Chief Benefits Director of the Veterans' Administration, was born February 14, 1917, at Ober, Ind. He attended high school at Knox, Ind., and George Washington University. He began his Government career with the Federal Housing Administration in 1934. During his early years with FHA he attended law classes at Columbus University in Washington, D.C. He received his LL.B. degree in law in 1940 and his LL.M. degree in 1941. He was admitted to the District of Columbia bar in 1940. In 1944 he entered the U.S. Marine Corps and served until 1946. From the Marine Corps he entered the Veterans' Administration and began a 17-year record of increasing managerial responsibility in the Veterans' Administration.

After service as Assistant Chief of the Loans and Claims Division and Chief of the Claims and Liquidation Division, he was appointed in 1954 to the position of Assistant Director for Loan Policy and Management of the Loan Guaranty Service. In March of 1958 he was named Director of the Loan Guaranty Service, in full charge of the program which has insured 7 million home loans to veterans.

As Chief Benefits Director, a position he has held since March 15, 1961, Mr. Brownstein is in charge of the entire VA benefits program, including claims service with its compensation, and pension departments, the rehabilitation program for disabled veterans, the vocational training and education program that has already furnished schooling or training to more than 10 million veterans, and the loan guaranty program. Mr. Brownstein holds the highest honor the Veterans' Administration can bestow, the Exceptional Service Award.

Mr. Brownstein and his wife, Esther, make their home at 620 Sheridan Street, Hyattsville, Md. Their son, Michael, is now a student at Columbia University in New York.

UNITED STATES SAVINGS &
LOAN LEAGUE,
Chicago, Ill., January 23, 1963.

Hon. JOHN SPARKMAN,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR SPARKMAN: As president of the United States Savings and Loan League, representing almost 5,000 members and over 95 percent of the assets of the savings and loan business, I want you to know that we wholeheartedly endorse the appointment of Philip N. Brownstein to be Commissioner of the Federal Housing Administration.

The Nation's savings and loan associations have an active interest in the national housing industry, and we feel that Mr. Brownstein is eminently qualified to take on the duties and responsibilities of FHA Commissioner. His long, loyal, and able service in the field of housing makes him the ideal choice to continue his service to the public, the Federal housing agencies, and the housing industry in its entirety.

I would appreciate it if you would see fit to make this a part of the hearings on Mr. Brownstein's nomination.

Sincerely,

F. B. YEILDING, Jr.,
President.

MORTGAGE BANKERS
ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA,
Washington, D.C., January 18, 1963.

Hon. A. WILLIS ROBERTSON,
Chairman, Banking and Currency Committee, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR ROBERTSON: It is my understanding that the nomination of Philip N. Brownstein to be Commissioner of the Federal Housing Administration is before your committee for consideration.

May I say that the Mortgage Bankers Association of America supports Mr. Brownstein's appointment without qualification and with enthusiasm. We know from many years' experience that Mr. Brownstein is admirably qualified for this position, and we are confident that he will administer the affairs of this great agency with competence.

It is our hope that because of the urgent business now before FHA, hearings on Mr. Brownstein's nomination can be scheduled by the committee without delay, and I would request that this letter be placed in the record in support of his appointment as Commissioner.

Sincerely yours,

SAMUEL E. NEEL,
General Counsel.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., January 17, 1963.

Hon. WILLIS ROBERTSON,
Chairman, Banking and Currency Committee, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CHAIRMAN ROBERTSON: I have known Philip N. Brownstein over the years and know him to be an extremely capable man. I am delighted to hear of his nomination as FHA Commissioner and I am sure the committee will act favorably.

Best regards.

Sincerely,

DANTE B. FASCELL,
Member of Congress.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. If there be no further reports of committees, the nominations on the Executive Calendar will be stated.

GUAM

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Manuel F. L. Guerrero, of Guam, to be Governor of Guam for a term of 4 years.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

U.S. MARINE CORPS

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Marine Corps.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that these nominations be considered en bloc.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination will be considered en bloc; and, without objection, they are confirmed.

U.S. NAVY

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Navy.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that these nominations be considered en bloc.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nominations will be considered en bloc; and, without objection, they are confirmed.

U.S. AIR FORCE

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Air Force.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that these nominations be considered en bloc.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nominations will be considered en bloc; and, without objection, they are confirmed.

U.S. ARMY

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Army.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the nominations in the Army be considered en bloc, with the exception of the nomination of Brig. Gen. Paul Leonard Kleiver.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nominations referred to will be considered en bloc; and, without objection, they are confirmed.

THE AIR FORCE, THE ARMY, THE NAVY, AND THE MARINE CORPS

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Air Force, the Army, the Navy, and the Marine Corps, which had been placed on the Secretary's desk.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that these nominations be considered en bloc.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nominations will be considered en bloc; and, without objection, they are confirmed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of the nominations the Senate has confirmed.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

RANKING OF SENATOR STENNIS ON COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that for the remainder of the 88th Congress the junior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS] be listed, following the chairman, as the ranking majority member of the Committee on Armed Services.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

REPORT ON CONSTRUCTION OF A SATURN V GROUND SUPPORT EQUIPMENT TEST FACILITY AT MARSHALL SPACE FLIGHT CENTER, HUNTSVILLE, ALA.

A letter from the Administrator, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, Washington, D.C., reporting, pursuant to law, on the construction of a Saturn V ground support equipment test facility at the Marshall Space Flight Center, Huntsville, Ala.; to the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences.

REPORT ON EXPANSION OF CITY OF COCOA, FLA., WATER PLANT

A letter from the Administrator, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, Washington, D.C., reporting, pursuant to law, on the expansion of the city of Cocoa, Fla., water plant to provide adequate water supply for the manned lunar landing program area at Merritt Island, Fla.; to the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences.

REPORT ON TITLE I AGREEMENTS UNDER AGRICULTURAL TRADE DEVELOPMENT AND ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1954

A letter from the Associate Administrator, Foreign Agricultural Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on title I agreements concluded during January 1963 under the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

APPOINTMENT OF DIRECTOR AND DEPUTY DIRECTOR OF THE COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY

A letter from the Acting Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize appointment of the Director and Deputy Director of the Coast and Geodetic Survey from civilian life, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Commerce.

PUBLICATION ENTITLED "STATISTICS OF ELECTRIC UTILITIES IN THE UNITED STATES, 1961, PRIVATELY OWNED"

A letter from the Chairman, Federal Power Commission, Washington, D.C., transmitting, for the information of the Senate, a publication entitled "Statistics of Electric Utilities in the United States, 1961, Privately Owned" (with an accompanying document); to the Committee on Commerce.

PROPOSED LEGISLATION RELATING TO DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to sell a right-of-way across a portion of the District Training School grounds at Laurel, Md., and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for compulsory school attendance, for the taking of a school census in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved February 4, 1925 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize certain expenses in the government of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the act entitled "An act to create a Board for the Condemnation of Insanitary Buildings in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved May 1, 1906, as amended (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Street Readjustment Act of the District of Columbia so as to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to close all or part of a street, road, highway, or alley in accordance with the requirements of an approved redevelopment or urban renewal plan, without regard to the notice provisions of such act, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to increase the partial pay of educational employees of the public schools of the District of Columbia who are on leave of absence for educational improvement, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for a mutual-aid plan for fire protection by and for the District of Columbia and certain adjacent communities in Maryland and Virginia, and for other purposes" (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to promote safe driving and eliminate the reckless and irresponsible driver from the streets and highways of the District of Columbia by providing that any person operating a motor vehicle within the District while apparently under the influence of intoxicating liquor shall be deemed to have given his consent to a chemical test of certain of his body substances to determine the alcoholic content of his blood, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

A letter from the Acting President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide for the regulation of the business of selling securities in the District of Columbia and for the licensing of persons engaged therein, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

A letter from the Acting President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to utilize volunteers for active police duty (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

U.S. Participation in International Bureau for the Protection of Industrial Property

A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the joint resolution providing for U.S. participation in the International Bureau for the Protection of Industrial Property (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Audit Report on St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report on the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation, Department of Commerce, calendar year 1961 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

Report on Review of Unnecessary Deterioration of Unused Rubber Tracks for Army Combat Vehicles

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the review of unnecessary deterioration of unused rubber tracks for Army combat vehicles, dated February 1963 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

Report on Review of Programing, Delivery, and Utilization of Selected Missile System Equipment Delivered to European Countries Under Military Assistance Program

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a secret report on the review of the programing, delivery, and utilization of selected missile system equipment delivered to European countries under the military assistance program (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

Report on Review of Unnecessary Planned Procurement of Generators by Department of the Army

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the review of unnecessary planned procurement of generators by the Department of the Army, dated February 1963 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

Report on Contracts To Facilitate the National Defense

A letter from the General Manager, U.S. Atomic Energy Commission, Washington, D.C., reporting, pursuant to law, that the Commission had taken no affirmative actions under authority of the act to make contracts to facilitate the national defense, during the calendar year ended December 31, 1962; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Report on Audit of National Fund for Medical Education

A letter from the executive vice president, National Fund for Medical Education, New York, N.Y., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the audit of that fund, for the year ended December 31, 1962 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Financial Statement of Boys' Clubs of America

A letter from the president and national director, Boys' Clubs of America, New York, N.Y., transmitting, pursuant to law, an audited financial statement of that organization, for the year 1962 (with an accompanying statement); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Vocational Rehabilitation Act Amendments of 1963

A letter from the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Vocational Rehabilitation Act to assist in providing more flexibility in the financing and administration of State rehabilitation programs, and to assist in expansion of services and facilities provided under such programs, particularly for the mentally retarded and other groups presenting special vocational rehabilitation problems, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

Disposition of Executive Papers

A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the Archivist of the United States on a list of papers and documents on the files of several departments and agencies of the Government which are not needed in the conduct of business and have no permanent value or historical interest, and requesting action looking to their disposition (with accompanying papers); to a Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Papers in the Executive Departments.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore appointed Mr. JOHNSTON and Mr. CARLSON members of the committee on the part of the Senate.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Colorado; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

"House Joint Memorial 1

"Joint memorial memorializing the Congress of the United States to direct the Bureau of Land Management to withhold any adjustments in domestic livestock grazing fees prior to the holding of the requested congressional hearings in the affected State

"Whereas the Secretary of the Interior has proposed to raise livestock grazing fees on Bureau of Land Management lands; and

"Whereas the economy of many communities and counties in the State of Colorado is dependent upon the grazing of domestic livestock on the Federal lands; and

"Whereas from studies conducted by universities and State and national agencies it has been determined that the average rate of return to stockmen is substantially less than that allowed regulated industries, so that any increase in fees would cause many livestock operations dependent on Federal range lands to become unprofitable or marginal; and

"Whereas use of the Federal range held for grazing purposes results in the production of a major raw material resource of these lands; and

"Whereas the tax base of many areas in Colorado and other Western States is dependent upon and affected by the permanency, security and value of grazing rights: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the House of Representatives of the 44th General Assembly of the State of Colorado (the Senate concurring herein)*, That this general assembly hereby petitions the Members of the Congress of the United States to direct the Bureau of Land Management to withhold any adjustments in domestic livestock grazing fees prior to the holding of the industry-requested congressional hearings in Colorado and in each of the affected States; and be it further

"*Resolved*, If after these requested congressional hearings have been held in Colorado and other Western States and if it is determined that an adjustment in grazing fees is justified and necessary then such an adjustment be based only on the presently used livestock price index formula; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That copies of this memorial be sent to the President of the United States, the President of the Senate of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, the Members of Congress from the State of Colorado, the chairman of the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, the chairman of the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and the Secretary of the Interior.

"JOHN D. VANDERHOOF,
"*Speaker of the House of Representatives.*
"DONALD H. HENDERSON,
"*Chief Clerk of the House of Representatives.*
"ROBERT L. KNOUS,
"*President of the Senate.*
"MILDRED H. CRESSWELL,
"*Secretary of the Senate.*"

Two joint resolutions of the Legislature of the State of California; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

"Senate Joint Resolution 1

"Joint resolution relative to the ratification of an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, proposed by the Congress of the United States, relating to the qualifications of electors

"Whereas the 87th Congress of the United States of America has adopted Senate Joint Resolution 29 (two-thirds of each House concurring therein) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, in the following words, to wit:

"'JOINT RESOLUTION PROPOSING AN AMENDMENT TO THE CONSTITUTION OF THE UNITED STATES RELATING TO THE QUALIFICATIONS OF ELECTORS

"'*Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled (two-thirds of each House concurring therein)*, That the following article is hereby proposed as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which shall be valid to all intents and purposes as part of the Constitution only if ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States within 7 years from the date of its submission by the Congress:

"'*Article —*

"'SECTION 1. The right of citizens of the United States to vote in any primary or other election for President or Vice President, for electors for President or Vice President, or for Senator or Representative in Congress, shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or any State by reason of failure to pay any poll tax or other tax.

"'SEC. 2. The Congress shall have power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation.', and

"Whereas said proposed amendment will be valid as part of the Constitution of the United States when ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the Senate and the Assembly of the State of California, jointly, a majority of all the members elected to each house of said legislature voting in favor thereof*, That the proposed amendment be and the same is hereby ratified by the Legislature of the State of California; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That certified copies of the foregoing preamble and resolution be forwarded by the Governor of the State of California to the President of the United States, the Secretary of State of the United States, the President pro tempore of the Senate of the United States and the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States.

"GLENN M. ANDERSON,
"*President of the Senate.*
"JESSE M. UNRUH,
"*Speaker of the Assembly.*
"Attest: "FRANK M. JORDAN,
"*Secretary of State.*
"WALTER C. STUTLER,
"*Assistant Secretary of State.*"

"ASSEMBLY JOINT RESOLUTION 2

"Joint resolution relative to the ratification of an amendment to the Constitution of the United States proposed by the Congress of the United States, relating to the qualifications of electors

"Whereas the 87th Congress of the United States of America has adopted Senate Joint Resolution 29 (two-thirds of each House concurring therein), proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, in the following words, to wit:

"'JOINT RESOLUTION PROPOSING AN AMENDMENT TO THE CONSTITUTION OF THE UNITED STATES RELATING TO THE QUALIFICATIONS OF ELECTORS

"'*Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled (two-thirds of each House concurring therein)*, That the following article is hereby proposed as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which shall be valid to all intents and purposes as part of the Constitution only if ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States within seven years from the date of its submission by the Congress:

"'*Article —*

"'SECTION 1. The right of citizens of the United States to vote in any primary or other election for President or Vice President, for electors for President or Vice President, or for Senator or Representative in Congress, shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or any State by reason of failure to pay any poll tax or other tax.

"'SEC. 2. The Congress shall have power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation.', and

"Whereas said proposed amendment will be valid as part of the Constitution of the United States when ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the Assembly and the Senate of the State of California, jointly, a majority of all the members elected to each house of said legislature voting in favor thereof*, That the proposed amendment be and the same is hereby ratified by the Legislature of the State of California; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That certified copies of the foregoing preamble and resolution be forwarded by the Governor of the State of California to the President of the United States, the Secretary of State of the United States, the President pro tempore of the Senate of the United States, and the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States.

"JESSE M. UNRUH,
"*Speaker of the Assembly.*
"GLENN M. ANDERSON,
"*President of the Senate.*
"Attest:
"FRANK M. JORDAN,
"*Secretary of State.*
"WALTER C. STUTLER,
"*Assistant Secretary of State.*"

A resolution of the Legislature of the Territory of Guam; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service:

"RESOLUTION 67

"Resolution relative to respectfully requesting and memorializing the President's Committee on Equal Employment Opportunity to support the people of Guam in their efforts to require an end to the highly discriminatory dual wage system practiced in this territory

"*Be it resolved by the Legislature of the Territory of Guam:*

"Whereas the dual wage system practiced among the Federal employees residing on Guam is discriminatory on its face in that one's wage rate and perquisites depend not on skill and experience but on place of origin, the locally hired employees receiving both a much lower wage and much fewer privileges than the equivalent off-island hire doing exactly the same work and having the same responsibilities; and

"Whereas the Governor of Guam, including both the executive and legislative branches thereof, has done all within its power to bring this highly unfair and inequitable system to the attention of the Department of Defense and the Civil Service Commission with the ultimate goal of abolishing this colonial vestige of Guam's former status as a dependency of the Naval Department, but little has been so far accomplished toward this end; and

"Whereas the legislature is advised that the President's Committee on Equal Employment Opportunity is vested with the authority to end discrimination in the defense activities of the United States Government, and it would therefore have a legitimate interest in discriminatory wage practices in the defense activities on Guam; now therefore be it

"*Resolved*, That the Seventh Guam Legislature does hereby on behalf of the people of Guam respectfully request and memorialize the President's Committee on Equal Employment Opportunity to support the people of Guam in their efforts to put an end to the discriminatory dual wage system, thereby permitting all the citizen employees of the Federal Civil Service on Guam to be treated equally in their wages; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the speaker certify to and the legislative secretary attest the adoption hereof and that copies of the same be thereafter transmitted to the Secretary of Interior, to the Secretary of Defense, to the Chairman, President's Committee on Equal Employment Opportunity, Washington 25, D.C., and to the Governor of Guam.

"Duly adopted on the 26th day of January 1963.

"A. B. WON PAT,
"*Speaker.*
"V. B. BAMBA,
"*Legislative Secretary.*"

A resolution adopted by the House of Delegates of the American Bar Association, Chicago, Ill., favoring the enactment of legislation to establish an Administrative Conference of the United States; to the Committee on Government Operations.

A resolution adopted by the Belen, N. Mex., Chamber of Commerce, favoring the establishment of a memorial library in Belen to honor the late Senator Dennis Chavez; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

PROPOSED REVISION OF IMMIGRATION AND NATIONALITY ACT OF 1952—RESOLUTION

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, the Haddassah, Women's Zionist Organization of America, has adopted a resolution pertaining to the current proposals to revise the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be printed following my remarks.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AMERICAN AFFAIRS RESOLUTION ADOPTED AT MIDWINTER CONFERENCE, NEW YORK, N.Y., FEBRUARY 1963, ON IMMIGRATION

Whereas the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952, often referred to as the McCarran-Walter Act, provides for a national origins quota system which places discriminatory limitation on immigration from many countries; and

Whereas under the foregoing immigration law the needs of refugees are not met, thereby necessitating special legislation to meet each emergency as it arises: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That Hadassah, the Women's Zionist Organization of America, assembled in midwinter conference, urges the Congress of the United States to enact legislation providing for reforms to eliminate the discriminatory practices of the national origins quota system, and to include permanent provisions for the allocation of quotas for refugees.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. ANDERSON, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, with amendments:

S. 20. A bill to promote the coordination and development of effective Federal and State programs relating to outdoor recreation, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 11).

By Mr. ROBERTSON, from the Committee on Banking and Currency, with amendments:

S. Res. 14. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Banking and Currency to make certain investigations (Rept. No. 10); to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

By Mr. SPARKMAN, from the Committee on Banking and Currency, with amendments:

S. Res. 15. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Banking and Currency to investigate matters pertaining to public and private housing (Rept. No. 12); to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION FOR DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE (S. REPT. NO. 9)

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on Appropriations, to which was referred House Joint Resolution 284, making supplemental appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for fiscal 1963, I wish to report the joint resolution at this time favorably, and to state for any Senators who may be interested, that there are Thermo-Fax copies of the committee report now available for anyone who may request one, because we hope to take up the measure in the shortest possible time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McGovern in the chair). The report will be received and printed, and the joint resolution will be placed on the calendar.

TO PRINT AS A SENATE DOCUMENT A COMPILATION OF MATERIALS RELATING TO THE HISTORY OF THE COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. ROBERTSON, from the Committee on Banking and Currency, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 99), which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

Resolved, That there be printed, with illustrations, as a Senate document a compilation of materials relating to the history of the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency, in connection with its fiftieth anniversary (1913–1963); and that there be printed for the use of that committee one thousand additional copies of such document.

REVISION AND PRINTING OF SENATE MANUAL FOR 88TH CONGRESS—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 101); which was placed on the calendar, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Rules and Administration be, and it is hereby, directed to prepare a revised edition of the Senate Rules and Manual for the use of the Eighty-eighth Congress, that said Rules and Manual shall be printed as a Senate document, and that one thousand six hundred and fifty additional copies shall be printed and bound, of which one thousand copies shall be for the use of the Senate, two hundred copies shall be for the use of the Committee on Rules and Administration, and the remaining four hundred and fifty copies shall be bound in full morocco and tagged as to contents and delivered as may be directed by the committee.

HELEN M. JOHNSON—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 102); which was placed on the calendar, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate hereby is authorized and directed to pay, from the contingent fund of the Senate, to Helen M. Johnson, widow of Curtis E. Johnson, an employee of the Senate at the time of his death, a sum equal to ten and one-half months' compensation at the rate he was receiving by law at the time of his death, said sum to be considered inclusive of funeral expenses and all other allowances.

SON RANKINS—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 103) to pay a gratuity to Son Rankins, which was placed on the calendar, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate hereby is authorized and directed to pay, from the contingent fund of the Senate, to Son Rankins, widower of Ella M. Rankins, an employee of the Senate at the time of her death, a sum equal to one year's compensation at the rate she was receiving by law at the time of her death, said sum to be considered inclusive of funeral expenses and all other allowances.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

Bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. GOLDWATER:

S. 919. A bill for the relief of Flora and William Bisof; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GOLDWATER (for himself, Mr. Allott, Mr. Bartlett, Mr. Bayh, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Boggs, Mr. Curtis, Mr. Hayden, Mr. Hruska, Mr. Lausche, Mr. Metcalf, Mr. Moss, Mrs. Neuberger, Mr. Randolph, Mr. Scott, Mr. Sparkman, Mr. Tower, Mr. Yarborough, Mr. McIntyre, Mr. Dominick, Mr. Clark, Mr. Humphrey, and Mr. Fong):

S. 920. A bill to amend sections 303 and 310 of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, to provide that the Federal Communications Commission may, if it finds that the public interest, convenience or necessity may be served, issue authorizations, but not licenses, for alien amateur radio operators to operate their amateur radio stations in the United States, its possessions, and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico provided there is in effect a bilateral agreement between the United States and the alien's government for such operation by U.S. amateurs on a reciprocal basis; to the Committee on Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. Goldwater when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

S. 921. A bill to amend section 22 of the act of August 24, 1935, as amended (49 Stat. 773, 7 U.S.C. 624), to require the Secretary of Agriculture to include lumber and wood products as an agricultural commodity under the act; and

S. 922. A bill to establish in the Department of Agriculture an office for two additional Assistant Secretaries, one of whose prime responsibility shall be forest resources and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

S. 923. A bill to amend the National Housing Act, as amended (48 Stat. 1246, 12 U.S.C. 1701), to require the use of domestically grade-marked lumber and wood products in the construction of housing federally financed and/or federally insured, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

S. 924. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to require the marking of lumber and wood products to indicate to the ultimate purchaser in the United States the name of the country of origin; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. Magnuson when he introduced the above bills, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MAGNUSON (by request):

S. 925. A bill to amend section 203(b)(6) of the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, so as to limit the application of the exemptions provided therein, and for other purposes; and

S. 926. A bill to repeal section 303(b) of the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, relating to the water-carrier bulk commodity exemption, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. Magnuson when he introduced the above bills, which appear under separate headings.)

S. 927. A bill to amend title 12 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, in order to remove certain limitations with respect to war risk insurance issued under the provisions of such title; and

S. 928. A bill to amend section 802 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, to provide that owners of vessels requisitioned by the United States shall be accorded preference toward reacquiring these vessels when they can be released by the Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. Magnuson when he introduced the above bills, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. KEATING:

S. 929. A bill for the relief of Maggiorina Magnante; and

S. 930. A bill for the relief of William Miller; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MILLER (for himself and Mr. Hickenlooper):

S. 931. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Army to pay fair value for improvements located on the railroad rights-of-way owned by bona fide lessees or permittees; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BIBLE:

S. 932. A bill relating to age limits in connection with appointments to the U.S. Park Police; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BIBLE (by request):

S. 933. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Practical Nurses' Licensing Act, and for other purposes; and

S. 934. A bill to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to utilize volunteers for active police duty; to the *Committee on the District of Columbia.*

By Mr. ERVIN (for himself, Mr. Johnston, Mr. McClellan, and Mr. Hruska):

S. 935. A bill to protect the constitutional rights of certain individuals who are mentally ill, to provide for their care, treatment, and hospitalization, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. Ervin when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. YARBOROUGH:

S. 936. A bill to provide transportation for molten sulfur in an amount not to exceed 100,000 long tons in the vessels S.S. *Etude* and S.S. *Pochteca* from U.S. ports on the gulf coast to other points in the United States along the gulf coast and the eastern seaboard until December 31, 1963; to the Committee on Commerce.

S. 937. A bill to amend the act of August 16, 1957 (71 Stat. 372), authorizing the construction of the San Angelo Federal reclamation project, Texas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. Yarborough when he introduced the last above-mentioned bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. METCALF:

S. 938. A bill relating to the provision of facilities and services for the accommodation of visitors in the national parks, monuments, and reservations, authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to guaranty the obligations of concessioners incurred for such purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. TALMADGE:

S. 939. A bill for the relief of Dr. and Mrs. Charles Edward Cunningham; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 940. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Edward V. Amason; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TALMADGE (for himself, Mr. Pastore, Mr. Saltonstall, and Mr. Muskie):

S. 941. A bill to amend section 301 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended; to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I am pleased to join my distinguished colleagues, Senators Talmadge, Muskie, and Pastore, in the introduction of legislation designed to tighten a loophole in the Tariff Act of 1930 which allows large imports of so-called waterproof cloth.

Section 301 of the Tariff Act permits the duty free importation of goods containing not more than 50 percent of foreign materials on a value basis, from the insular possessions of the United States. Loopholes in this provision have had an adverse effect on many of our domestic industries.

I understand that under present procedures, large quantities of Italian-produced woolen fabrics are being imported into the Virgin Islands. There the goods are given an inexpensive waterproofing treatment before being shipped to the United States where they enter duty free. In many instances the resulting fabric is used in the manufacture of skirts and trousers so that the waterproofing is of little or no value and is, in such cases, merely a device to enable the importers to take advantage of the duty free provisions of section 301.

The Department of Commerce has published figures which indicate that a total of more than 6 million square yards of these waterproofed cloths was imported during the first 7 months of 1962. This amounted to nearly 20 percent of the regular woven fabric imports during this same period. The waterproofing operations employ very few people and do little to add to the economy of the Virgin Islands. However, the loss of duty to the U.S. Treasury resulting from this procedure was more than $4 million during the first 7 months of last year.

The legislation that we are introducing today will put an end to this artificial practice and will help to eliminate at least one of the problems being faced by our domestic woolen textile manufacturers. Massachusetts is the leading wool manufacturing State in the Nation and its economy is therefore especially vulnerable to these increasing import pressures from foreign manufacturers. I am particularly hopeful that this legislation will provide some relief for these people.

By Mr. KEFAUVER (for himself, Mr. Mansfield, Mr. Metcalf, Mr. Humphrey, Mr. Church, Mr. Yarborough, Mr. Douglas, Mr. McCarthy, Mr. Morse, Mr. Bible, and Mr. Burdick):

S. 942. A bill to amend section 7 of the Clayton Act to give effect to the operation of the provisions of that section applicable to certain railroad consolidations and mergers until December 31, 1964, and for other purposes; ordered to lie on the desk for 10 days.

(See the remarks of Mr. Kefauver when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. LAUSCHE:

S. 943. A bill to provide for denial of passports to supporters of the international Communist movement, for review of passport denials, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

(See the remarks of Mr. Lausche when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. KUCHEL (for himself, Mr. Morse, Mr. Gruening, Mr. McGee, Mr. Yarborough, Mr. Javits, Mr. Goldwater, Mr. Mechem, Mr. Tower, and Mr. Engle):

S. 944. A bill to provide for the presentation by the United States to the people of Mexico of a monument commemorating the independence of Mexico, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

(See the remarks of Mr. Kuchel when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. KUCHEL (for himself and Mr. Humphrey):

S. 945. A bill to amend the Davis-Bacon Act to extend its application to contracts for the maintenance of Federal installations; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. Kuchel when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. FULBRIGHT (by request):

S. 946. A bill to amend the Foreign Service Buildings Act, 1926, to authorize additional appropriations, and for other purposes;

S. 947. A bill to amend the International Claims Settlement Act of 1949, as amended, to provide for the timely determination of certain claims of American nationals settled by the United States-Polish Claims Agreement of July 16, 1960, and for other purposes;

S. 948. A bill to amend the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended, and for other purposes; and

S. 949. A bill to amend the United Nations *Participation Act, as amended (63 Stat. 734–*736); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

(See the remarks of Mr. Fulbright when he introduced the above bills which appear under separate headings.)

By Mr. LONG of Missouri:

S. 950. A bill for the relief of Dr. Dunet Francois Belancourt; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LONG of Missouri (for himself and Mr. Symington):

S. 951. A bill for the relief of Dr. William M. Yen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORSE:

S. 952. A bill for the relief of Joo Yon Ohm Cederberg; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HART:

S. 953. A bill to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act, as reenacted and amended by the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

(See the remarks of Mr. Hart when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. TOWER:

S. 954. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to provide for reform of personal and corporate income tax rates, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 955. A bill to amend the antitrust laws to prohibit certain activities of labor organizations in restraint of trade and commerce, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. Tower when he introduced the above bills, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. CASE:

S. 956. A bill providing a program of financial assistance to the States for the construction of public community colleges; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. Case when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. JORDAN of Idaho:

S. 957. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to require the marking of lumber and wood products to indicate to the ultimate purchaser in the United States the name of the country of origin; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 958. A bill to amend the National Housing Act to provide that only lumber and other wood products which have been produced in the United States may be used in construction or rehabilitation covered by Federal Housing Administration insured mortgages; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

(See the remarks of Mr. Jordan of Idaho when he introduced the above bills, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. RANDOLPH (by request):

S. 959. A bill to amend section 104(b)(3) of title 23, United States Code, relating to the apportionment of funds for extensions of the Federal-aid primary and Federal-aid secondary systems within urban areas; to the Committee on Public Works.

(See the remarks of Mr. Randolph when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. CASE:

S. 960. A bill to establish the Joint Committee on Defense and Space Contracts, and for other purposes; and

S. 961. A bill to require public disclosure of certain information concerning the award of contracts entered into by the Armed Forces and by the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

(See the remarks of Mr. Case when he introduced the above bills, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. JORDAN of Idaho:

S. 962. A bill to amend section 22 of the act of August 24, 1935, as amended (49 Stat. 773; 7 U.S.C. 624), to require the Secretary of Agriculture to include lumber and wood products as an agricultural commodity under the act; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

(See the remarks of Mr. Jordan of Idaho when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

S.J. Res. 50. Joint resolution requesting and authorizing the President to impose an immediate 6-percent emergency quota on all imports of softwood lumber; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. Magnuson when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. GOLDWATER (for himself, Mr. Beall, Mr. Cannon, Mr. Dominick, Mr. Holland, Mr. Inouye, Mr. Miller, Mr. Case, Mr. Fong, Mr. Clark, Mr. Moss, Mr. Symington, Mr. Thurmond, Mr. Allott, and Mr. Curtis):

S.J. Res. 51. Joint resolution to authorize the presentation of an Air Force Medal of Recognition to Maj. Gen. Benjamin D. Foulois, retired; to the Committee on Armed Services.

(See the remarks of Mr. Goldwater when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. TOWER:

S.J. Res. 52. Joint resolution directing the Secretary of Agriculture to submit proposals to the Congress for the gradual termination of unnecessary Federal controls on farming; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

S.J. Res. 53. Joint resolution to establish the Joint Committee on Foreign Trade; to the Committee on Finance.

S.J. Res. 54. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to the balancing of the budget; and

S.J. Res. 55. Joint resolution to establish rules of interpretation governing questions of the effect of acts of Congress on State laws; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. Tower when he introduced the above joint resolutions, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. JORDAN of Idaho:

S.J. Res. 56. Joint resolution requesting and authorizing the President to impose an immediate 6-percent emergency quota on all imports of softwood lumber; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. Jordan of Idaho when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

CONCURRENT RESOLUTIONS

EXPRESSION OF SENSE OF CONGRESS THAT THE PURPOSE OF U.S. FOREIGN POLICY IS VICTORY OVER COMMUNISM

Mr. TOWER submitted a concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 24) to express the sense of Congress that the purpose of U.S. foreign policy is victory over communism, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

(See the above concurrent resolution printed in full when submitted by Mr. Tower, which appears under a separate heading.)

OBSERVANCE OF SIGNING OF THE DECLARATION OF INDEPENDENCE

Mr. RIBICOFF submitted a concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 25) favoring observance on July 4 of each year by the ringing of bells throughout the United States, of the anniversary of the signing of the Declaration of Independence, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the above concurrent resolution printed in full when submitted by Mr. Ribicoff, which appears under a separate heading.)

RESOLUTIONS

CONTINUANCE OF AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS TO MAKE CERTAIN INVESTIGATIONS

Mr. MANSFIELD submitted a resolution (S. Res. 98) continuing the authority of the Committee on Government Operations through March 31, 1963, to make certain investigations which was considered and agreed to.

(See the above resolution printed in full when submitted by Mr. Mansfield, which appears under a separate heading.)

TO PRINT AS A SENATE DOCUMENT A COMPILATION OF MATERIALS RELATING TO THE HISTORY OF THE COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

Mr. ROBERTSON, from the Committee on Banking and Currency, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 99) to print as a Senate document, with additional copies, a compilation of materials relating to the history of the Committee on Banking and Currency, which, under the rule, was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

(See the above resolution printed in full when reported by Mr. Robertson, which appears under the heading "Reports of Committees.")

INVESTIGATION OF GOVERNMENT COMPETITION WITH PRIVATE BUSINESS

Mr. TOWER submitted a resolution (S. Res. 100) to provide for an investigation of Government competition with private business, which was referred to the Committee on Government Operations.

(See the above resolution printed in full when submitted by Mr. Tower, which appears under a separate heading.)

REVISION AND PRINTING OF SENATE MANUAL FOR 88TH CONGRESS

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 101) authorizing the revision and printing of the Senate Manual for the use of the 88th Congress, which was placed on the calendar.

(See the above resolution printed in full when reported by Mr. Jordan of North Carolina, which appears under the heading "Reports of Committees.")

HELEN M. JOHNSON

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 102) to pay a gratuity to Helen M. Johnson, which was placed on the calendar.

(See the above resolution printed in full when reported by Mr. Jordan of North Carolina, which appears under the heading "Reports of Committees.")

SON RANKINS

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 103) to pay a gratuity to Son Rankins, which was placed on the calendar.

(See the above resolution printed in full when reported by Mr. Jordan of North Carolina, which appears under the heading "Reports of Committees.")

AMENDMENT OF SECTIONS 303 AND 310 OF COMMUNICATIONS ACT OF 1934

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I send to the desk a bill, on behalf of myself and other Senators, which will amend the Communications Act of 1934 and allow the Federal Communications Commission to authorize amateur radio operators from other countries visiting in this country to operate their amateur gear while in this country. It would be not a license, but merely a permit.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 920) to amend sections 303 and 310 of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, to provide that the Federal Communications Commission may, if it finds that the public interest, convenience or necessity may be served, issue authorizations, but not licenses, for alien amateur radio operators to operate their amateur radio stations in the United States, its possessions and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico provided there is in effect a bilateral agreement between the United States and the alien's government for such operation by U.S. amateurs on a reciprocal basis, introduced by Mr. Goldwater (for himself, Mr. Allott, Mr. Bartlett, Mr. Bayh, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Boggs, Mr. Curtis, Mr. Hayden, Mr. Hruska, Mr. Lausche, Mr. Metcalf, Mr. Moss, Mrs. Neuberger, Mr. Randolph, Mr. Scott, Mr. Sparkman, Mr. Tower, Mr. Yarborough, Mr. McIntyre, Mr. Dominick, Mr. Clark, Mr. Humphrey, and Mr. Fong), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

IMPORTS OF CANADIAN LUMBER

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, last fall the Senate Commerce Committee held a series of hearings in Washington, Oregon, Idaho, and Alaska, in regard to the lumber situation as it directly relates to imports of lumber from Canada and their effect on the U.S. market and U.S. lumber producers. As a result of the hearings, several actions were taken by the President of the United States and by certain Government agencies; but the principal objective was to attempt—on petition by the lumber interests—to have the Tariff Commission establish a temporary quota or at least an increase in the tariff on Canadian lumber entering the United States and its markets, particularly the eastern market.

Over a period of many weeks the Tariff Commission held numerous hearings and heard many witnesses. Recently the Tariff Commission finally ruled. It denied that the President or various governmental groups had a right to take action in connection with that tariff.

The Senate Commerce Committee has had ready for many days, following the hearings, certain bills, for introduction, in lieu of the desired action by the Tariff Commission. The bills cover many of the facets of this very serious problem.

Mr. President, on behalf of the Senators who held the long hearings which culminated in the preparation of these bills, I introduce them at this time, for appropriate reference.

Let me say that I believe that the Senator from Idaho [Mr. Jordan] is about to introduce some other bills which relate to this matter. Those of us who sponsor the bills I am introducing at this time wish to join the Senator from Idaho in his efforts, and we hope he will join us in ours. The bills I am introducing are the result of the committee's hearings and consideration. I believe it well that both those of us who sponsor these bills and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. JORDAN] proceed at this time to call attention in this way to this very serious problem. I assure him that the members of the Commerce Committee are wholeheartedly with him. Some of the bills may involve duplication; but, if so, we shall work out that situation.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the Record, in connection with my introduction of these bills, an editorial from the Seattle Times of February 18.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bills and joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the editorial will be printed in the Record.

The bills and joint resolution, introduced by Mr. MAGNUSON, were received, read twice by their titles, and referred, as indicated:

To the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

S. 921. A bill to amend section 22 of the act of August 24, 1935, as amended (49 Stat. 773, 7 U.S.C. 624), to require the Secretary of Agriculture to include lumber and wood products as an agricultural commodity under the act; and

S. 922. A bill to establish in the Department of Agriculture an office for two additional Assistant Secretaries, one of whose prime responsibilities shall be forest resources, and for other purposes.

To the Committee on Banking and Currency:

S. 923. A bill to amend the National Housing Act, as amended (48 Stat. 1246, 12 U.S.C. 1701), to require the use of domestically grade-marked lumber and wood products in the construction of housing federally financed and/or federally insured, and for other purposes.

To the Committee on Finance:

S. 924. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to require the marking of lumber and wood products to indicate to the ultimate purchaser in the United States the name of the country of origin; and

S.J. Res. 50. Joint resolution requesting and authorizing the President to impose an immediate 6-percent emergency quota on all imports of softwood lumber.

To the Committee on Commerce:

S. 925. A bill to amend section 203(b)(6) of the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, so as to limit the application of the exemptions provided therein, and for other purposes; and

S. 926. A bill to repeal section 303(b) of the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, relating to the water-carrier bulk commodity exemption, and for other purposes.

The editorial presented by Mr. MAGNUSON is as follows:

OTHER MEANS TO LUMBER RELIEF

West coast lumbermen have lost their battle for mandatory quotas on Canadian lumber imports. But at least the rejection of the American lumbermen's plea by the Tariff Commission was not unexpected.

The challenge now is to seek relief for the hard-pressed lumber industry in other directions.

What we said in these columns last October 1 is more than ever applicable today. The Times said then of the case before the Tariff Commission:

"It would be a mistake either to count upon a favorable decision or to assume that if the decision is favorable, efforts on other governmental fronts to ease lumber's plight can be relaxed.

"The pressure must be maintained both in Congress and on the executive branch."

The Tariff Commission heard that factors other than American trade policy are responsible for the decline of the softwood lumber industry in the West.

Industry officials have been saying all along that domestic laws and regulations imposed by their own Government are among the key factors.

These include the Jones Act requirement that American west coast lumbermen who ship their products to the Atlantic market by sea must use costly American ships while the Canadians can invade the same market in less-costly foreign vessels.

The unfavorable Tariff Commission decision increases the responsibility of President Kennedy to take meaningful action on the lumber aid program he promulgated with great fanfare last July.

We would hope that the President is eager to refute the cynics who viewed his lumber aid program as an election year gesture.

One facet of the Kennedy program consists of efforts to convince the Canadians that they should impose a voluntary quota on their lumber exports to this country. The surplus of marketable lumber caused by the October 12 windstorm has created speculation that the Canadians might now be interested in a voluntary quota as a means of self-protection.

Certainly the administration should seek further Canadian-American talks on the lumber import problem at the earliest possible date.

And new efforts should be made in Congress to solidify and strengthen the lumber bloc that was created in the 1962 congressional session. This union of western and southern Congressmen can be effective both as a legislative team and as a means of influencing the White House and the executive departments.

It should be kept in mind that the lost case before the Tariff Commission was but one of a number of approaches to the problem of lost lumber markets in the East.

PROPOSED LEGISLATION TO AMEND THE MERCHANT MARINE ACT OF 1936

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I am introducing, by request of the Nation's subsidized steamship lines, two bills which were before the Committee on Commerce during the 87th Congress, were reported favorably by the committee and passed by the Senate, but too late in the session for final action by the House.

One bill would permit U.S. owners of vessels built with construction subsidy to secure Government war-risk insurance coverage in the same amounts available to foreign owners of comparable vessels built in foreign yards without subsidy. Present law is unduly restrictive in such respect, U.S. ship operators contend.

The other bill would give owners of U.S.-flag vessels requisitioned for use by the Government in time of war or emergency priority toward reacquiring their vessels when the Government no longer has need of them. The many new vessels being put into service now by U.S. operators generally are built to serve the needs of particular trade routes. The owners believe, therefore, that the interests of our country's shipping and commerce would be best served by having the vessels in the hands of operators serving the particular routes for which the vessels were designed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bills will be received and appropriately referred.

The bills, introduced by Mr. MAGNUSON, by request, were received, read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Commerce, as follows:

S. 927. A bill to amend title 12 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, in order to remove certain limitations with respect to war-risk insurance issued under the provisions of such title; and

S. 928. A bill to amend section 802 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, to provide that owners of vesels requisitioned by the United States shall be accorded preference toward reacquiring these vessels when they can be released by the Government, and for other purposes.

PROTECTION OF CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS OF CERTAIN INDIVIDUALS

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, the leadership which President Kennedy showed in his message to Congress several days ago concerning the administration's program for the mentally ill was most gratifying. There is much to recommend his bold action in this neglected area. However, there is another facet of the problem not mentioned by the President that the Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights has been considering for some years. This study concentrated on the constitutional rights of the mentally ill rather than their treatment as such.

The subcommittee's preliminary investigation has now been completed; and during the last session I offered a bill, S. 3261, to protect the rights of the mentally ill in the District of Columbia. Although the measure would apply only to commitment procedures for St. Elizabeths Hospital here in Washington, I should hope that, if adopted, it would serve as a model for the States. Unfortunately, hearings on the measure were not completed, and no action was taken on the bill due to other pressing business of the Senate.

Today I am introducing what is essentially the same bill because I feel that the need for legislation to protect the rights of the mentally ill grows increasingly important as increasingly large numbers of persons are afflicted with emotional illnesses.

The National Institute of Mental Health annually reports increases in mental hospital admissions; and, according to medical prognosticators, the mounting stresses of our modern society portend even greater increases in the future. This forewarning is applicable to every American household.

Mental illness does not choose its victims by social class, religious affiliation, or racial origin. In that respect, it is the same as any physical ailment. It differs in that it often renders one incapable of rational judgment and of conforming of the discipline patterns of society. This difference has been reason enough to physically separate the mentally ill from society; but this difference should not be reason enough for society to separate them from fundamental ideals of justice and from their inalienable rights as citizens.

Fortunately our society has been experiencing a revolution in attitude respecting the mentally ill. This revolution, for the most part, has been brought about by the great advances made in medical science. This success has offered us the promise that one day we shall consider emotional illnesses and cures for them with the same regard as the physical illnesses.

Just as we are in a period of revolution respecting medical treatment of mental illnesses, we are likewise experiencing a revolution respecting the social status of the mentally ill. For too many years they were treated as creatures to be feared because of the lack of understanding of their malady. Knowledge of the mind is providing us with this understanding, and the fear is being removed.

Unfortunately, but understandably, the old fears were reflected in the laws governing the mentally ill. They were shut away in institutions similar to our penal institutions. Prevailing attitudes caused them to be treated as criminals in most respects. They were picked up by arresting officers, transported in a paddy wagon used for criminals, charged with mental illness, retained in jail, then committed to an institution. Once inside the institution, ostensibly for treatment, they were immediately deprived of most of their rights—often locked up, straitjacket, regimented, and silenced. When cured, they were paroled, then released and had to apply to the courts in order to regain their legal rights.

Upon being institutionalized, it was generally assumed that the individual was incapable of caring for himself and even less so of handling his property and other affairs. Consequently, individuals were automatically divested of their rights respecting their property and were considered total incompetents. We know now that the variety of mental illnesses requires less rigid standards in order to achieve fair and just administration of the laws that may be necessary to assure protection of their property.

It is now necessary to reform our commitment laws to reflect our new understanding of the nature of mental illness. The fact of mental illness should not reduce our responsibility to see that every individual's rights are fully protected according to the intent and spirit of our Constitution.

Therefore, Mr. President, on behalf of myself and my colleagues, Senators JOHNSTON, MCCLELLAN, and HRUSKA, I introduce for appropriate reference this bill to bring the mental illness laws of the District of Columbia in line with modern scientific and legal knowledge in order to better protect the constitutional rights of the individuals involved.

During the subcommittee's hearings in 1961, a wealth of valuable information and recommendations were received. It was on the basis of these recommendations and others obtained from various organizations that this bill is drafted.

I would hope that with the passage of any new legislation, Congress will expressly repeal those sections of the Code that would no longer apply to our commitment procedures, and collect and carry over with this legislation the remaining consistent provisions.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the text of the bill, an analysis of it, and a comparison of it with titles 21 and 32, the pertinent titles of the District of Columbia Code, reprinted at this point in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill, analysis, and comparison will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 935) to protect the constitutional rights of certain individuals who are mentally ill, to provide for their care, treatment, and hospitalization, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. ERVIN (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SHORT TITLE

This Act may be cited as the "Hospitalization of the Mentally Ill Act".

DEFINITIONS

SEC. 2. As used in this Act—

(1) the term "mental illness" means any psychosis or other disease which substantially impairs the mental health of an individual (but shall not include epilepsy, alcoholism, drug addition, or mental deficiency);

(2) the term "mentally ill individual" means any individual who has a mental illness;

(3) the term "physician" means an individual licensed under the laws of the District of Columbia to practice medicine;

(4) the term "private hospital" means any nongovernmental hospital or institution, or part thereof, in the District of Columbia, equipped to provide inpatient care and treatment for any individual suffering from a physical or mental illness;

(5) the term "public hospital" means any hospital or institution, or part thereof, in the District of Columbia, owned and operated by the Government of the United States or of the District of Columbia, equipped to provide inpatient care and treatment for any individual suffering from a physical or mental illness; and

(7) the term "administrator" means an individual in charge of a public or private hospital or his delegate.

VOLUNTARY HOSPITALIZATION

SEC. 3. (a) Any individual who has a mental illness, or who has symptoms of a mental illness, may apply to any public or private hospital in the District of Columbia for admission to such hospital as a voluntary patient for the purposes of observation, diagnosis, or care and treatment of such illness. The administrator of a private hospital may, and the administrator of a public hospital shall, upon the request of any such individual twenty-one years of age or over (or in the case of any individual under twenty-one years of age, upon a request made by his spouse, parent, or legal guardian), admit such individual as a voluntary patient to such hospital for observation, diagnosis, or care and treatment of such illness in accordance with the provisions of this Act.

(b) Any voluntary patient admitted to any hospital pursuant to this section shall, if he is twenty-one years of age or over, be entitled at any time to obtain his release from such hospital by filing a written request with the administrator thereof. The administrator shall, within a period of forty-eight hours after the receipt of any such request (unless such period shall expire on a Saturday, Sunday, or legal holiday, then not later than noon of the next succeeding day which is not a Saturday, Sunday, or legal holiday), release the voluntary patient making such request. In the case of any voluntary patient under the age of twenty-one years, the administrator shall immediately release such patient upon the written request of his spouse, parent, or legal guardian. The administrator may release any voluntary patient hospitalized pursuant to this section whenever he determines that such patient has recovered or that his continued hospitalization is no longer beneficial or advisable.

EMERGENCY HOSPITALIZATION

SEC. 4. (a) Any duly accredited officer or agent of the Department of Public Health of the District of Columbia, or any officer authorized to make arrests in the District of Columbia, who has reason to believe that an individual is mentally ill and, because of such illness, is likely to injure himself or others if he is allowed to remain at liberty may, without a warrant, take such individual into custody, transport him to a public or private hospital, and make application for his admission thereto for purposes of emergency observation and treatment. Such application shall reveal the circumstances under which the individual was taken into custody and the reasons therefor.

(b) Subject to the provisions of subsection (c) of this section, the administrator of any private hospital may, and the administrator of any public hospital shall, admit and detain for purposes of emergency observation and treatment any individual with respect to whom such application is made, if such application is accompanied by a certificate of a physician on duty at such hospital stating that he has examined the individual and is of the opinion that he has symptoms of a mental illness and, because of such illness, is likely to injure himself or others unless he is immediately hospitalized. Not later than twenty-four hours after the admission pursuant to this section of any individual to a hospital, the administrator of such hospital shall serve notice of such admission, by registered mail, to the spouse, parent, or legal guardian of such individual and to the Commissioners of the District of Columbia.

(c) No individual admitted to any hospital for emergency observation and treatment under subsection (b) of this section shall be detained in such hospital for a period in excess of twenty-four hours from the time of his admission unless the administrator of such hospital has, within such twenty-four hour period (unless such period shall expire on a Saturday, Sunday, or legal holiday, then not later than noon of the next succeeding day which is not a Saturday, Sunday, or legal holiday), filed a written petition with the United States District Court for the District of Columbia for an order authorizing the continued hospitalization of such individual for emergency observation and treatment.

(d) The court shall, within a period of twenty-four hours after the receipt by it of such petition (unless such period shall expire on a Saturday, Sunday, or legal holiday, then not later than noon of the next succeeding day which is not a Saturday, Sunday, or legal holiday) either order the hospitalization of such individual for emergency observation and treatment for a period of not to exceed ninety-six hours from the time such order is entered, or order his immediate release. In making its determination, the court shall consider the testimony of the agent or officer who made the application under subsection (b) of this section requesting the hospitalization of such individual, and the certificate of the examining physician which accompanied it.

(e) The administrator of any hospital in which an individual is hospitalized for emergency observation and treatment under a court order entered pursuant to subsection (d) of this section shall, within forty-eight hours after such order is entered, have such individual examined by a physician. If the physician, after his examination, certifies that in his opinion the individual is not mentally ill to the extent that he is likely to injure himself or others if allowed to remain at liberty, the individual shall be immediately released. The administrator shall, within forty-eight hours after such examination has been completed, send a copy of the results thereof by registered mail to the spouse, parents, attorney, legal guardian, or other nearest known adult relative of the individual examined.

(f) Notwithstanding any other provision of this section, the administrator of any hospital in which an individual is hospitalized for emergency observation and treatment under this section may, if judicial proceedings for his hospitalization have been commenced under section 5 of this Act, detain such individual therein during the course of such proceedings.

HOSPITALIZATION UPON COURT ORDER

SEC. 5. (a) Proceedings for the judicial hospitalization of any individual in the District of Columbia may be commenced by the filing of a petition with the United States District Court for the District of Columbia by his spouse, parent, or legal guardian, by any physician, duly accredited officer or agent of the Department of Public Health, or by any officer authorized to make arrest in the District of Columbia. Such petition shall be accompanied (1) by a certificate of a physician stating that he has examined the individual and is of the opinion that such individual is mentally ill, and because of such illness, is likely to injure himself or others if allowed to remain at liberty, or (2) by a sworn written statement by the petitioner that (A) the petitioner has good reason to believe that such individual is mentally ill and, because of such illness, is likely to injure himself or others if allowed to remain at liberty, and (B) that such individual has refused to submit to examination by a physician.

(b) Within three days after the receipt by it of any petition filed under subsection (a) of this section, the court shall (1) send a copy of such petition by registered mail to the individual with respect to whom it was filed, and (2) appoint two qualified physicians who shall, within seven days after their appointment, examine, independently of each other, the mental condition of such individual. The examinations may be conducted at a hospital or other medical facility, at the home of the individual to be examined, or at any other place designated by the court. Each such physician shall, on the basis of his examination, report to the court his determinations and findings as to the mental condition of the individual examined and his need for custody, care, or treatment in a hospital.

(c) If the reports of the designated physicians are both to the effect that the individual examined is not mentally ill to the extent that he is likely to injure himself or others if he is allowed to remain at liberty, the court shall immediately terminate the proceeding and dismiss the petition. If either of such reports is to the effect that such individual is mentally ill to the extent that he is likely to injure himself or others if allowed to remain at liberty, the court shall fix a date (which shall not be less than five days nor more than fifteen days after the date such reports are filed) for a hearing on the petition, and shall give notice of such hearing to such individual and to his attorney, legal guardian, spouse, parent, or other nearest known adult relative.

(d) Any hearing held pursuant to a petition filed under subsection (a) of this section shall be conducted in as informal a manner as may be consistent with orderly procedure and in a physical setting not likely to have a harmful effect on the mental health of the individual named in such petition. In conducting such hearing, the court shall receive all relevant and material evidence which may be offered and shall not be bound by the rules of evidence. Any individual with respect to whom a hearing is held under this section shall be entitled, in his discretion, to be present at such hearing, to testify, and to present and cross-examine witnesses, but in no event shall any such hearing be concluded without the judge who is conducting such hearing first having personally observed such individual.

(e) Any individual with respect to whom a hearing is held under this section shall be represented by counsel at such hearing, and if he fails or refuses to obtain counsel, the court shall appoint counsel to represent him. Any counsel so appointed shall be awarded compensation by the court for his services in an amount determined by the court to be fair and reasonable. Such compensation shall be charged against the estate or property of the individual for whom such counsel was appointed, or against any unobligated funds of the Department of Public Health, as the court in its discretion may direct. The court shall, at the request of any counsel appointed to represent an individual in any hearing held pursuant to a petition filed under subsection (a) of this section, grant a recess in such hearing (but not for more than five days) to give such counsel an opportunity to prepare his case.

(f) If, upon completion of the hearing and consideration of the record, the court finds that such individual is mentally ill to the extent that he is likely to injure himself or others if allowed to remain at liberty, it shall order his hospitalization for an indeterminate period. However, if the court finds that such individual is not mentally ill to the extent that he is likely to injure himself or others if allowed to remain at liberty, it shall order his immediate release.

PERIODIC EXAMINATION AND RELEASE

SEC. 6. (a) Any patient hospitalized pursuant to a court order obtained under section 5 of this Act, or his attorney, legal guardian, spouse, parent, or other nearest adult relative, shall be entitled, within three months after such order and not more frequently than every six months thereafter, to request, in writing, the administrator of the hospital in which he is hospitalized, to have a current examination of his mental condition made by one or more physicians. If the request is timely it shall be granted. The patient shall be entitled, at his own expense, to have any duly qualified physician participate in such examination. In the case of any such patient who is indigent, the Department of Public Health shall, upon the written request of such patient, assist him in obtaining a duly qualified physician to participate in such examination in the patient's behalf. Any such physician so obtained shall be compensated for his services out of any funds available to such department in an amount determined by it to be fair and reasonable. If the administrator, after considering the reports of the physicians conducting such examination, determines that the patient is no longer mentally ill to the extent that he is a danger to himself or others, he shall order the immediate release of the patient. However, if the administrator, after considering such reports, determines that such patient continues to be mentally ill to the extent that he is dangerous to himself or others, but one or more of the physicians participating in such examination reports that the patient is not mentally ill to the extent that he is dangerous to himself or others, the patient may petition the United States District Court for the District of Columbia for an order directing his release. Such petition shall be accompanied by the reports of the physicians who conducted the examination of the patient.

(b) In considering such petition, the court shall consider the testimony of the physicians who participated in the examination of such patient, and the reports of such physicians accompanying the petition. After considering such testimony and reports, the court shall either (1) reject the petition and order the continued hospitalization of the patient for an indeterminate period, or (2) order the administrator to immediately release such patient.

(c) The administrator of a public or private hospital shall as often as practicable, but not less often than every six months, examine or cause to be examined each patient admitted to any such hospital pursuant to section 5 of this Act and if he determines on the basis of such examination that the conditions which justified the involuntary hospitalization of such patient no longer exist, the administrator shall immediately release such patient.

RIGHT TO COMMUNICATION AND VISITATION—EXERCISE OF CERTAIN RIGHTS

SEC. 7. (a) Each patient hospitalized in a public or private hospital pursuant to this Act shall be entitled (1) to communicate by sealed mail or otherwise with any individual or official agency inside or outside the hospital, and (2) to receive uncensored mail from his attorney or personal physician. All other incoming mail or communications may be read before being delivered to the patient, if the administrator believes such action is necessary for the medical welfare of the patient who is the intended recipient. However, any mail or other communication which is not delivered to the patient for whom it is intended shall be immediately returned to the sender.

(b) Each patient hospitalized in any public hospital for a mental illness, shall, during his hospitalization, be entitled to medical and psychiatric care and treatment. Within five days after the end of each calendar month the administrator of each public hospital shall submit to the Commissioners of the District of Columbia a report giving a detailed account of the type of medical and psychiatric care and treatment which, during such month, has been provided by such hospital to each patient hospitalized therein for a mental illness.

(c) No mechanical restraint shall be applied to any patient hospitalized in any public or private hospital for a mental illness unless the use of restraint is prescribed by a physician, and if so prescribed, such restraint shall be removed whenever the condition justifying its use no longer exists. Any use of a mechanical restraint, together with the reasons therefor, shall be made a part of the medical record of the patient. The Administrator shall make written quarterly reports to the Commissioners of the District of Columbia or their delegate of each use of a mechanical restraint, the reason for such use and the duration thereof.

(d) No patient hospitalized pursuant to this Act shall, by reason of such hospitalization, be denied the right to dispose of property, execute instruments, make purchases, enter into contractual relationships, and vote, unless such patient has been adjudicated incompetent by a court of competent jurisdiction and has not been restored to legal capacity. If the Administrator of the public or private hospital in which any such patient is hospitalized is of the opinion that such patient is unable to exercise any of the aforementioned rights, the Administrator shall immediately notify the patient's attorney, legal guardian, spouse, parents, or other nearest known adult relative of that fact.

VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION FACILITIES

SEC. 8. Nothing in this Act shall be construed to require the admission of any individual to any Veterans' Administration or military hospital facility unless such individual is otherwise eligible for care and treatment in such facility.

UNWARRANTED HOSPITALIZATION OR DENIAL OF RIGHTS—PENALTIES

SEC. 9. Any individual who willfully causes or conspires with or assists another to cause (1) the unwarranted hospitalization of any individual under this Act, or (2) the denial to any individual of any right accorded to him under this Act, shall be punished by a fine not exceeding $5,000 or imprisonment not exceeding three years, or both.

MISCELLANEOUS

SEC. 10. Any Act or part of an Act which is inconsistent with any provision of this Act shall, to the extent of the inconsistency, cease to apply on and after the date of enactment of this Act.

The analysis and comparison presented by Mr. ERVIN are as follows:

ANALYSIS OF S. 3261

Analysis of the bill to protect the constitutional rights of certain individuals who are mentally ill, to provide for their care, treatment, and hospitalization, and for other purposes.

This bill brings up to date the District of Columbia statutes dealing with the hospitalization of the mentally ill in the areas of admission to the hospital, patient examination and release procedures and enumeration of personal rights of the patient.

Section 1 is the title for this proposal.

Section 2 defines some of the terms used in this act. The principal definition in this section is of the term "mental illness." The object of the definition is to correlate the legal meaning and the precise medical condition of the patient.

Section 3 provides that a private hospital may, and a public hospital must, admit any individual, over 21 years of age, who applies for observation, diagnosis, or care and treatment for a mental illness. It further provides that any individual who has voluntarily applied for admission should be released within 48 hours after submitting a written request for same.

This is a significant improvement over the existing procedure for admitting voluntary patients, in that it eliminates the cumbersome conditions that unduly restrain the categories of persons accepted for hospitalization. Some of these conditions are: sufficient mental competency to make an application; certification and approval of application by the Department of Public Health; a guarantee that the hospital will be reimbursed for cost of care; residential requirements and the ever-present threat of revocation of certification by the Department of Public Health.

Section 4 (a) and (b) permits an authorized arresting officer to seize any individual believed to be mentally ill to the extent that he may cause injury to himself or others, and to transport him to a public or private hospital for observation and treatment. Such admissions must be accompanied by the officer's statement of circumstances and reasons for the seizure; a certificate from the admitting physician stating that an immediate examination has been made and that the patient needs hospitalization to prevent injury to himself or others. Notice of admission is required to be by registered mail to the nearest relative within 24 hours of the hospitalization.

Section 4 (c) and (d) spells out the conditions and the time regulation by which a hospital may detain an individual for emergency observation. It specifies that within 24 hours of admission the Administrator must file a petition with the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia for an order authorizing the continued hospitalization of the individual. Following receipt of the petition, the court, within 24 hours, is required to reply with an order of detainment for not more than 96 hours or an order for immediate release.

Section 4 (e) and (f) concerns the disposition of the individual following the court order of detainment. Requires medical examination within 48 hours of the court order for detainment. If found not to be mentally ill he is released immediately. If found to be mentally ill, the patient's nearest relative, guardians, etc., must be notified within 48 hours. Continued detention of the individual may be effected only if proceedings for judicial hospitalization are initiated.

Section 5 deals with procedures for hospitalization upon court order which may be commenced by the filing of a petition by: the spouse, parent, legal guardian, any physician, officer or agent of the Department of Public Health, or officer authorized to make arrest. The petition must be accompanied by physician's certificate of examination and by petitioner's sworn written statement that the individual is mentally ill and likely to injure himself or others if released and that he has refused examination by a physician.

Section 5 (b) and (c) requires the court to send, within 3 days, a copy of the petition to the individual concerned and appoint two physicians to examine independently of each other the mental condition of the individual at a court approved site. Each physician is required to report to the court the findings of his examination. If each report shows the individual not to be dangerous to himself or others, the court must terminate proceedings. If, however, either report indicates the individual is dangerous, the court shall fix a date, within 5 to 15 days of the report, for a hearing. It provides also for notice to the appropriate individuals.

Section 5 (d), (e) and (f) outlines the conduct of the hearings. It provides for: (1) a proper setting for the hearings; (2) permits the court to receive evidence; (3) permits the individual to be present at hearings to testify, to present and cross-examine witnesses; (4) requires the judge to personally observe the individual; (5) requires representation by counsel and directs the court, upon findings, to order hospitalization for an indeterminate period or order release of the individual in accordance with the findings in the proceedings.

Section 6 (a), (b), and (c): This section entitles the patient to request a mental examination within 3 months after the order and each 6 months thereafter with his personal physician participating in the examination. If the reports of the physicians are favorable, the Administrator, after considering each report, shall order the release of the patient. If any of the reports indicate the continued existence of the illness, but one or more indicates the illness no longer exists, the patient may file a petition in District Court for his release based on the favorable report of the examination. The court may reject the petition and order the continued hospitalization of the patient, or order the Administrator to immediately release such patient.

The Administrator shall examine each patient not less often than every 6 months and when it is determined that the patient is no longer ill, he may order his release.

Section 7 enumerates for the first time in the District of Columbia law, the personal rights of the patient.

Section 7(a) entitles the patient to communicate, by sealed mail, with individuals and officials and to receive uncensored mail from his attorney and physician. All other mail is subject to the scrutiny of the Administrator. However, any mail that is forbidden the patient, must be returned immediately to the sender.

Section 7(b) entitles the patient to adequate medical and psychiatric care and treatment, and requires that a record be kept of the type of medical and psychiatric care and treatment administered. These records are to be filed monthly with the Commissioners of the District of Columbia.

Section 7(c) forbids the use of mechanical restraints except as prescribed by a physician, whose reasons therefore shall be made a part of the patient's medical record to be forwarded quarterly to the Commissioners of the District of Columbia.

Section 7(d) gives the patient the right to dispose of property, execute instruments, make purchases, enter into contractual re-

---

COMPARISON OF PROPOSED BILL WITH TITLES

I. COMMITMENT PROCEDURES

A. Voluntary

SEC. 3(a). The Administrator of a public hospital must, and of a private hospital may, admit patient for observation on his request. For individual under 21 years of age, the request must be made by spouse, parents or guardian.

SEC. 3(b). Voluntary patient must be released within 48 hours of filing written request. If individual is under 21, such request must be made by spouse, parent, or legal guardian, and release is immediate. Administrator may also release when he considers hospitalization no longer necessary.

B. Involuntary

1. Emergency

SEC. 4(a). Arrest without warrant may be made by agent of Department of Public Health or any officer authorized to make arrests in the District of Columbia if he believes the person likely to injure himself or others. Arresting officer must transport to the hospital and make application for admission of patient, stating circumstances of custody.

SEC. 4(b). Physician on duty at time of application has to certify that he thinks the person is likely to injure himself or others if not immediately hospitalized. Within 24 hours of admission notice must be given by registered mail to spouse, parent, or legal guardian.

SEC. 4(c). To detain more than 24 hours a petition must be filed during this period with the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia.

SEC. 4(d). Within 24 hours of receiving this petition, the court must either order the person's release or order a period not exceeding 96 hours for emergency detention and observation.

SEC. 4(e). Within 48 hours of the court order, the individual must be examined by a physician. If the physician certifies that the patient is likely to injure himself or others, the administrator must within 48 hours of this send notice by registered mail to the patient's spouse, attorney, legal guardian, or nearest relative.

SEC. 4(f). If commitment procedures have been initiated, the hospital can detain until hearings take place as under section 5.

lationships, and vote, unless the patient has been adjudged by a court to be incompetent.

Section 8 exempts application of this act to admissions of individuals, unless otherwise eligible, to Veterans' Administration or military hospitals.

Section 9 provides for fine and imprisonment of any individual who willfully causes or assists in an unwarranted hospitalization of another individual.

Section 10 provides that any inconsistency of present laws with the provisions of this act no longer applies after enactment of this act.

---

21 AND 32 OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CODE

D.C.C. 32-412: There must be written application by a patient competent to make such application. If person is under 21, the application must be made by parent, legal guardian, or legal representative. (1948 act.)

D.C.C. 32-417b: Superintendent of St. Elizabeths may at his discretion admit such a person for a period not exceeding 30 days (1949).

D.C.C. 32-413, 32-417b: A voluntary patient must be released within three days after filing written application with Administrator. (If under 21, application by parent, legal guardian, or legal representative.) However, if during this period a petition for commitment is filed or if the Board of Public Welfare files such a petition or writ de lunatico inquirendo accompanied by notice from the Superintendent of St. Elizabeths Hospital that the patient is of unsound mind and should not be allowed to remain at liberty, he may be detained until final judgment by the court. The notice and petition from the Board of Public Welfare shall be referred to the Commission on Public Health and shall be sufficient to start proceedings before the Commission (1948).

D.C.C. 21-326: Any officer in the District of Columbia can arrest without warrant any person in a public place that he believes to be of unsound mind. Arresting officer must immediately file an affidavit with police that he believes that the individual is incapable of taking care of himself and that he will jeopardize the public peace or render the commission of crime probable. The police have the duty to notify a responsible person or the spouse of the individual about the detention (1904).

D.C.C. 21-327: Provides for arrest without warrant at other than public places of indigent persons alleged to be of unsound mind or of any insane person with dangerous or homicidal tendencies. Two District of Columbia residents must file affidavits with the police saying that the individual is incapable of managing his own affairs, jeopardizes the public peace and makes commission of crime probable. Two physicians must also examine the person and certify him to be insane or of unsound mind (1904).

D.C.C. 21-332 permits such persons to be discharged upon bond payable to the United States with condition to restrain and take care of patient not charged with a breach of peace until the patient is restored to sanity (1936).

D.C.C. 21-310: Provides for starting commitment procedures or applying for a writ de lunatico inquirendo by the person making the arrest as above, or by parent, spouse, brother, sister, committee, officer of hospital or Board of Public Welfare. Petition is to be filed with the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia (1948).

D.C.C. 21-311: After petition as in 21-310 alleging dangerous tendencies is filed, the court may order detention for a 30-day observation period. He must be given an examination within 5 days of admittance to St. Elizabeths Hospital. Persons arrested as provided in 21-326 and 21-327 shall be detained at Gallinger Municipal Hospital until the petition is filed as provided in 21-310. Petition must be filed within 48 hours of original arrest; otherwise individual must be discharged. On basis of petition, the court may order detention for a period not exceeding 30 days. (Compare with D.C.C. 32-417 below.)

If a petition for commitment or a writ de lunatico is filed with the equity court, it shall be referred to the Commission for report and recommendation within a period not exceeding 7 days; but this time can be extended if the court finds it necessary. In its hearings on the individual's sanity, the Commission shall listen to the alleged insane and other competent witnesses. The individual has the right to counsel during these hearings. If the Commission finds him not sane, it shall apply to the court for a hearing. The Commission is responsible for giving written notice of the hearing to the individual at least 5 days before the hearing. Such notice is also to be sent to the applicant or spouse or nearest relative if applicant is not spouse or relative. Right to jury and counsel will be discussed below (1938, amended 1948).

D.C.C. 21-315: If alleged insane is then found to be insane, the judge may commit him as he believes is in the best interests of the public and of the insane person (1939).

D.C.C. 21-310: Petitions are filed as discussed above.

D.C.C. 21-311: Hearings are held by the Commission in accordance with this section as discussed above.

D.C.C. 21-312: A copy of the report and recommendation of the Commission is to be served on the alleged insane, his guardian or attorney with notice that he has 5 days to demand a jury trial (see VII below). If jury trial is demanded, trial is calendered for hearing not more than 10 days after demand (1939).

D.C.C. 21-314: If there is no demand for jury trial, sanity is determined by the judge and the judge may commit according to D.C.C. 21-315 (1939).

D.C.C. 21-316: Recommendations of the Commission (see D.C.C. 21-312 above) must be unanimous by the three members sitting. If they cannot agree, a report is filed with the court, and a hearing is held for judicial determination of sanity. Recommendations must be in the form of either (1) advice to dismiss petition; (2) further temporary confinement; or (3) confinement with recommendations as to payment of expenses according to results of investigations of patient's background (1939).

D.C.C. 32-417: (Compare with 21-326 and 21-327 above.) Provides for commitment by specially designated commissioners of the U.S. District Court after a hearing with testimony of two witnesses that person is of unsound mind and two physicians, one of whom is skilled in diagnosis of mental disorders. The doctors must certify that the person is of unsound mind and should be restrained for his own safety and for the preservation of the peace. Such confinement shall not exceed 30 days. The head of the agency where the person is apprehended must notify the person's spouse or near relative if the address is known (1939).

D.C.C. 32-417a: If an immediate hearing as in 32-417 cannot be had, the person can be detained for 72 hours pending the hearing. Upon certification of the superintendent that it would be unsafe to hold the hearing elsewhere, such hearing shall be at St. Elizabeths Hospital (1949).

COMPARISON OF PROPOSED BILL WITH TITLES 21 AND 32 OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CODE

B. Involuntary—Continued

2. Hospitalization on court order

SEC. 5(a) For confinement there is still the requirement that the person be likely to injure himself or others. The Petition must be filed with the U.S. District Court for the District of of Columbia by the spouse, parent, guardian, officer of the Department of Public Health or authorized arresting officer. The petition must be acompanied (1) by the certificate of the physician that the individual is dangerous or (2) by a written statement by the petitioner that he believes such person likely to injure himself or others and that the patient has refused to submit to examination by a physician.

SEC. 5(b). Within three days after receipt of this petition the court shall send a copy to the person by registered mail. The court shall also appoint two physicians who then examine the person within seven days and report their findings to the court.

SEC. 5(c). If both physicians report the person not likely to injure himself or others, the petition is to be dismissed. If one report states he is dangerous, the court shall set a date for the hearing 5-15 days after the filing of the reports. Notice shall be given to the individual, his attorney, guardian, spouse, parent, or nearest known relative.

SEC. 5(d). The hearings are to be held in a setting not likely to be adverse to the patient's mental health. The court shall not be bound by rules of evidence. The individual is permitted to be present, testify, present and cross-examine witnesses. The judge must observe the individual before the conclusion of the hearings.

SEC. 5(e). Right to counsel. (See below section VIII.)

SEC. 5(f). If after the hearing the court finds the person likely to injure himself or others, he shall be committed for an indeterminate period. Otherwise he shall be immediately released.

COMPARISON OF PROPOSED BILL WITH TITLES 21 AND 32 OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CODE

B. Involuntary—**Continued**	
	D.C.C. 32-417d: If the superintendent of St. Elizabeths finds the person to be of sound mind, he shall immediately release him. If he finds him to be of unsound mind, he shall return the patient to his State or relatives if practicable. Provides for judicial determination of sanity and appointment of committee for patient upon application of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare or any interested party (1949, amended 1953).
II. PERIODIC EXAMINATION AND RELEASE	
SEC. 6(a). Patient is entitled upon his, his sponsor's, attorney's, and nearest adult relative's written request to have an examination of the patient's mental condition by a physician within 3 months after the order of hospitalization and as frequently as every 6 months thereafter. The patient may in addition have his own physician participate in the examination. If the patient is indigent, the Department of Public Health, after written request for it, shall assist in obtaining and shall pay the fee for this extra physician. If on the basis of the physician's report the administrator no longer believes the patient dangerous, he shall order the patient immediately released. If the administrator still believes the patient dangerous, but one of the physicians' reports is to the effect that he is no longer dangerous, the patient may petition the U.S. district court for his release. The petition shall be accompanied by the reports of the physicians. SEC. 6(b). The court shall consider the testimony and reports of the examining physicians. The court shall then order either the continued hospitalization or release of the patient. SEC. 6(c). The administrator of the hospital shall see that the patient has an examination at least every 6 months. If from these reports he believes the patient no longer dangerous, he shall order his immediate release.	D.C.C. 21-325: Provides that none of these statutes shall deprive the alleged insane person of existing remedies for release or proof of sanity (1939). D.C.C. 21-320: Provides procedure for restoring to the status of sound mind a person paroled or released from the hospital. There are no provisions corresponding exactly to those of the proposed act (1939).
III. RIGHTS TO COMMUNICATIONS AND VISITATION	
Exercise of certain rights SEC. 7(a). Entitles each patient to (1) communicate by sealed mail with any individual or official agency, and (2) to receive uncensored mail from his attorney or physician. SEC. 7(b). Entitles each patient to medical and psychiatric treatment. Each month a report of treatment shall be submitted to the Commissioners of the District of Columbia. SEC. 7(c). Allows the use of mechanical restraints only when prescribed by a physician. Any use of mechanical restraint must be described in quarterly reports to the Commissioners of the District of Columbia. SEC. 7(d). Entitles each patient to dispose of property, execute instruments, make purchases, contract, and vote unless patient has been adjudicated incompetent by the court and has not been restored to legal capacity. If the hospital administrator believes the patient incapable of exercising these rights, he shall notify the patient's attorney, guardian, spouse, parents, or nearest known adult relative.	No specific provisions defining rights. Processes for commitment are interwoven with those for filing writ de lunatico inquirendo, leaving the situation extremely unclear.
IV. VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION FACILITIES	
SEC. 8. Provides that nothing in this act shall be construed to require the admission of any individual to any VA or military hospital facility unless such individual is otherwise eligible for care and treatment in such facility.	D.C.C. 21-315: The judge may commit to a Veterans' Administration facility if the administration files a certificate with the Commission stating that he is eligible for admittance. D.C.C. 21-316: Provides for recommendation of the Commission to the court on the basis of the certificate from the Veterans' Administration (1939).
V. UNWARRANTED HOSPITALIZATION OR DENIAL OF RIGHTS—PENALTIES	
SEC. 9. Provides a penalty of up to $5,000 and/or 3 years imprisonment for any person willfully causing or conspiring to cause the unwarranted hospitalization or denial of any right to any individual under this act.	
VI. MISCELLANEOUS	
SEC. 10. Provides that any act or part of any act which is inconsistent with any provision of this act shall, to the extent of the inconsistency cease to apply on and after the date of enactment of this act.	
VII. RIGHT TO JURY TRIAL	
No specific mention of jury trial is made. Therefore, sections 21-311, 21-312, and 21-313 of the D.C. Code continue in effect.	
VIII. RIGHT TO COUNSEL	
SEC. 5. (e) In hearings on judicial hospitalization the alleged insane shall be represented by counsel. If the individual does not obtain counsel, the court shall appoint counsel for him. Provides for granting of recess in hearings not to exceed 5 days to allow appointed counsel to prepare his case. Counsel is to be compensated out of the individual's estate or out of the unobligated funds of the Board of Public Welfare, at the court's discretion.	

A BILL TO AMEND THE TWIN BUTTES RESERVOIR ACT

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill relating to the Twin Buttes Reservoir, near San Angelo, Tex.

Mr. President, this bill will amend the act authorizing the construction of the Twin Buttes Reservoir near San Angelo, Tex., in respect to the recreational facilities to be built there. Under this amendment, the Secretary of Interior is authorized to acquire lands and construct public recreational facilities at the reservoir at a cost not in excess of $1,700,000, the cost to be shared with the San Angelo Water Supply Corp. I am pleased to join with the distinguished Representative from the 21st Congressional District of Texas in sponsoring this legislation.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 937) to amend the act of August 16, 1957 (71 Stat. 372), authorizing the construction of the San Angelo Federal reclamation project, Texas, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. YARBOROUGH, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

D.C.C. 21-324: Provides a penalty not exceeding $500 and/or 3 years' imprisonment for knowingly submitting false petition or affidavit (1939).

No specific comparable provision found.

D.C.C. 21-311: If demand for jury trial is made, the hospital superintendent shall see that the patient has the opportunity to appear at the hearings either personally or by attorney. However, if the superintendent certifies that it would be unsafe or prejudicial to the patient's health, the patient's presence shall not be required (1938).

D.C.C. 21-312: The alleged insane person, his guardian ad litem, or his attorney has 5 days after the receipt of the Commission's report to demand a jury trial (1939).

D.C.C. 21-313: Provides for the jurors to be impaneled from those in attendance upon U.S. District Courts for the District of Columbia (1939).

D.C.C. 21-308: The court has the power to appoint an attorney or guardian ad litem who will be compensated out of the alleged insane person's estate or out of the funds of the Commission, as the court directs. This applies to hearings before the Commission as well as before the court (1938, amended 1939, 1948, 1949).

D.C.C. 21-311: Makes the same provision for counsel as above in D.C. 21-308 (1938).

D.C.C. 21-312: If commitment is sought wholly or in part at public expense and the person is not represented by counsel of his own choice, he shall be represented by the Corporation's counsel (1939).

MORATORIUM ON RAILROAD MERGERS

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I send to the desk, for appropriate reference, on behalf of myself and Senators MANSFIELD, HUMPHREY, METCALF, CHURCH, YARBOROUGH, DOUGLAS, McCARTHY, and MORSE, a bill to amend section 7 of the Clayton Act to give full force and effect to the operation of the provisions of that section applicable to certain railroad consolidation and mergers until December 31, 1964, and for other purposes.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, will the distinguished Senator yield?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield.

Mr. CURTIS. I wish to point out that the distinguished minority leader, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], is unable to be here at this moment. He has no objection to the introduction of the bill, of course. He wanted to be heard on the matter of reference to committee.

I wonder if the distinguished Senator from Tennessee would have any objection to having his bill lie on the desk until the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] can be present at a later time and make his statement on reference?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I ask unanimous consent that the bill lie on the desk for 1 week so that other Senators who may wish to do so may cosponsor it, and to give the Senator from Illinois an opportunity to discuss the matter of reference.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CURTIS. I thank the Senator.

Mr. KEFAUVER. The bill seeks a limited moratorium on major rail merger decisions so that the Congress, the administration, and the Interstate Commerce Commission can have the necessary time to continue their investigations and studies into the impact of this proposed concentration in the rail industry, and can have the opportunity to consider new legislation establishing the degree to which competition and economic balance should be preserved in the railroad industry. In addition, it is my intention that this bill would give further time for a more intensive investigation into what I believe to be the demonstrated inability of the Interstate Commerce Commission to render adequate legislative judgments with respect to these great social and economic issues.

What I propose is an amendment to section 7 of the Clayton Act, and the same language which was approved by a majority of the Senate Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee last year, except that it extends the moratorium period to December 31, 1964. Very briefly, the bill would provide for a temporary prohibition of rail merger approvals by the Interstate Commerce Commission involving any railroad with total assets of more than $200 million and which was not in involuntary bankruptcy, where such merger would substantially lessen competition or tend toward monopoly, except where the merger is necessary and essential to the maintenance of adequate railroad transportation facilities.

Thus, under this bill smaller railroads would not be denied the opportunity to merge into stronger, more competitive systems, and any railroad would be permitted to merge if the merger met the tests of section 7 of the Clayton Act. Furthermore, any road in bankruptcy reorganization could merge without delay under the bill.

Mr. President, this is a reasonable bill. It permits the strengthening of smaller roads whose efficiencies may be improved by combining; it takes care of those railroads in dire financial trouble; and it prevents our moving ahead too rapidly on the larger monopolistic mergers before we find out where we are going.

Now, why do we need this legislation? What is happening with respect to this field of regulation which demands immediate congressional inquiry and a halt to the present proposed restructuring of our rail plant?

In the first place, over 75 percent of the assets of the American railroads are involved in merger transactions of one kind or another. As you know, Mr. President, the roads are permitted under present law to come in voluntarily with their own merger plans for approval by the Commission—there is no positive governmental planning, as such. Instead of merging the smaller railroads into the existing competitive trunklines, and thereby strengthening our rail network into balanced competitive systems, the industry has presented the Commission with a series of monopolistic plans which combine the profitable and wealthy roads and ignore the weak and unhealthy ones, and in particular, reduce to a shadow rail competition in vital industrial and agricultural areas of the country. The admitted purpose of these monopolistic plans is to scrap facilities, lay off workers, abandon and eliminate trackage, reduce schedules, and in general contract our rail network to a point which may seriously endanger our economic growth.

By way of example, I need only mention the proposed New York Central-Pennsylvania merger which will create a multibillion-dollar rail empire controlling over half the rail traffic in the East, and interlocked with major industrial and investment companies to the extent that competition among shippers may be seriously affected. For those of my colleagues who come from the great Northwest, I point out that the proposed amalgamation of the Northern Pacific, the Great Northern, and the Burlington, whose legal right to merge without specific congressional approval has been challenged, will create virtually a one railroad territory and the destruction of thousands of miles of track and millions of dollars of facilities and services.

To my colleagues in the South, I direct their attention to the proposed Atlantic Coast Line-Louisville & Nashville-Seaboard combination eliminating a choice in rail service through much of the Southeast, and also to the possibility of an Illinois Central-Gulf, Mobile & Ohio merger which would seriously reduce rail competition in Mississippi and Alabama. Finally, in the West and Southwest, the attempts by the Southern Pacific to control the Western Pacific and to enlarge its system to include the Union Pacific and the Rock Island could result in substantial competitive detriment to the Atchison, Topeka & Sante Fe.

I wish to emphasize that none of these big roads mentioned above are in any serious financial difficulty as the railroad industry public relations people would have us believe. The roads which are in precarious positions are the lesser-size lines serving areas of declining growth, such as the New Haven and other New England roads, the Erie-Lackawanna, the Lehigh Valley, the Milwaukee, the Chicago & North Western, and certain southwest roads, and it is these roads which have been ignored by the industry plans. Thus the cry of financial insecurity as justification for present merger proposals is not supported by the directions in which the industry has chosen to aline new systems. The industry pattern is to merge the strong with the strong, create monopolies, shrink capacity, and squeeze out increased profits, leaving the poorer roads to their own demise and loss of service to the communities affected.

This is negative business thinking, and it is dangerous to a growing country. It is a type of planning which is not in the public interest. It is a long step in the direction of concentration of private, economic, social, and political power. It is inimical to our basic concepts of competitive enterprise and business freedom. But most important of all, if these industry plans are allowed to be consummated, there will be no turning back to try it a better way. The pattern and policy of surface transportation for the future will be irrevocably determined by the type of reorganization presently contemplated by the rail industry. That pattern is monopoly, and that policy is railroad dominance to the detriment of other modes of transportation. It is time now for Congress to alert itself to what is going on in this vital area of the economy.

Mr. President, I would not be so alarmed at these rail merger issues if I thought that the body delegated to make the vital decisions—the Interstate Commerce Commission—was adequately empowered and sufficiently knowledgeable to effectuate a reorganization of the Nation's railroads.

However, the hearings before the Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary, of which I am chairman, made it shockingly clear to me that the Commission lacks necessary planning initiative to cope with the present situation, and has done virtually nothing to inform itself, independent of the claims of the rail industry, concerning facts and issues involved in these vast cases.

It has admitted that it has made no studies or investigation as to who control and influence the policy of railroads or how the roads are interrelated by stock interests or board representation.

It has only recently begun a study of traffic flow in order to determine the effects of traffic diversion at interchange points and what routes and areas can support rail competition.

It has no objective reports as to the degree of intermodal competition along major routes. It does not know whether increased railroad size through merger will bring serious diseconomies which will have to be offset by undue contraction of rail plants. It has made no investigation of the poverty myth being propounded by the railroad industry.

Its own staff has criticized present methods and patterns of the Commission's testing of public interest criteria.

It has yet to complete a staff study into merger problems, and it has made no suggestions, or indicated any directions, in connection with what mergers might be acceptable in the public record.

Instead, the Commission has chosen to make these vital legislative decisions affecting our economy and our lives based only on such judicial testimony as may come before it, relying upon what adversary testing of the evidence there may be under restrictive rules of procedure.

Although bulky in support of the proposed mergers, these case records appear virtually devoid of any adequate testing of applicants' positions, primarily because the litigants with the real capacity to challenge the facts—the major railroads—choose not to oppose—because of their own merger plans—or raise only limited opposition with the hope of obtaining certain protective conditions of questionable merit. The burden of testing applicants' cases has been thus left to certain public interest groups and labor representatives who have not the money or expertise to set the record straight.

Only in two extraordinary situations has the Commission ordered its own experts into a case, and such participation thus far has been insubstantial. The Department of Justice has been forceful on briefs, but except in one case, virtually silent during the development of crucial testimony. Only recently has the Commission recognized the need for independent challenge on behalf of the public interest, and it has asked for funds to set up a special staff to appear in major transportation merger cases. It has asked $65,000, an amount so infinitesimal to afford adequate challenge to the million-dollar legal presentations of applicants, as to make the whole idea of Commission participation virtually worthless.

However, despite these gross inadequacies of testing the public interest criteria, the Commission continues to allow its major cases to be closed, and examiners' decisions to be rendered. One such case, the Chesapeake & Ohio's control of the Baltimore & Ohio, has even reached the stage of full Commission approval. Nevertheless, in that case, the first major rail merger decision of the Commission, the dissenting opinion of Commissioner William Tucker, joined in by Commissioner Charles Webb, laid open for public inspection the critical situation which exists in the Commission.

Recognizing that these rail merger decisions, "irrespective of their nature, predetermine to a great degree the future of the American railroad system", the Tucker-Webb dissent began by striking at the heart of the Commission's incapacity to render proper decisions in the public interest—a matter which could end in reversible error in the courts, and certainly should be of immediate alarm to Congress. It states:

> There can be little argument, however, concerning the general nature of the expert testimony upon which the finding of consistency with the public interest is grounded. That evidence consists essentially of impressive post hoc rationalizations prepared by a corps of engineers, economists, accountants, and traffic and financial experts employed or retained to justify a prior managerial decision. Neither the examiner nor any interested party to the proceeding, public or private, was endowed with the peculiar knowledge and the ample resources required to challenge evidence of this character. The question thus arises as to whether the necessary findings could have been made if the general public had been represented by members of the Commission's staff and by consultants retained by the Commission. We shall never know the answer to that question because the Commission's role in this proceeding has been passive from beginning to end.

It aggressively criticizes the majority's intention to determine this Chesapeake & Ohio-Baltimore & Ohio case, piecemeal, when the merger is being generally represented as a part of a "package" of three eastern mergers which includes approval of the highly controversial Pennsylvania-New York Central amalgamation. On this point, the dissent stated:

> If the Commission is going to open the gates on all eastern merger applications so each successive one becomes one of the basic reasons for requiring approval of the next, and realistically, I can see no other course of action from the decision in this case, we may end up as the creators of another Frankenstein's monster far more ruinous than its fictional counterpart.

The dissent then attacks the majority's decision that this control transaction is necessary to alleviate a deteriorating financial condition of the Baltimore & Ohio on the ground that whatever financial downturn existed for this road in 1961—a particularly bad year for most eastern roads—has been offset by the fact that the Baltimore & Ohio has reported that it is operating in the black for 1962 and forecasts even greater improvement ahead, as a result of its new programs directed toward reducing costs, improving service, and modernizing its operations.

However, one of the most vivid challenges to the majority's handling of the evidence in the Chesapeake & Ohio-Baltimore & Ohio case came with respect to the allegation that Chesapeake & Ohio's control would rehabilitate the Baltimore & Ohio. Recognizing that controlled railroads had been used in the past as sources of profits from stock manipulations, and "left to sink into bankruptcy," the dissent stated:

> An inordinate reliance has been placed by the majority throughout this report on the self-interest of the Chesapeake & Ohio in rehabilitating the Baltimore & Ohio if control is approved. Notwithstanding the particular issues and facts presented in the instant application, which reveal the glaring lack of a single solid commitment by Chesapeake & Ohio to render specific aid to Baltimore & Ohio and the economic impracticability of Chesapeake & Ohio's assistance in the modernization programs, the self-interest assertions of a controlling railroad do not stand the test of our experience.

The dissent then went on to expose the apparent neglect on the part of the majority to recognize the crucial effect of traffic diversion which this control transaction would have on the New York Central, the Norfolk & Western and other roads, if allowed to go forward at this time, and particularly how the setting up of this diversion would lead the Commission into a state of entrapment in deciding other eastern mergers whose applicants would cite the Chesapeake & Ohio-Baltimore & Ohio diversion as justification for their own mergers. It stated that the majority's conclusion that no undue amount of traffic would be diverted was "a groping, meaningless generalization," and that such an important subsidiary finding by the majority would not "withstand the effects of close judicial scrutiny." It went on to warn the Commission, and in fact all of us in government who are concerned with this issue, that "the decision to isolate this case from others is going to haunt this Commission for many days to come." It continued as follows:

> If even 10 percent of the Central's traffic is diverted by the approval of this application and it is not allowed to merge, the Central will collapse. The catastrophic disaster which would befall New England, New York, and the smaller railroads dependent on the Central for traffic could then only be alleviated by Government ownership of, or subsidies to, the Central. A possibility of either of these courses would obviously militate against disapproval of the Pennsylvania Railroad-Central merger, which I am sure the majority, as much as I, does not want to prejudge at this time. Unfortunately, under the case-by-case method we have no way of knowing at this moment if this transaction will create undesirable results to the eastern transportation system. Trapped into approving all three cases one by one, this Commission may be placed in the hapless position of robbing Peter to pay Paul not once but thrice.

Mr. President, this has been only a brief description of the crisis which I see in the Commission's handling of these merger issues. A majority of the members of the Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee has recently approved a detailed report on these and many other vital evidences of the dangers which the present movement toward rail concentration will work on our national transportation system. That report should be printed within the next 10 days. I sincerely urge every Member of Congress to read it in detail, and then to consider the issues which it raises in connection with the future rail transportation policy and growth in your own State and constituency.

This bill must be passed this session, and soon. Time is running out. The Commission has ignored the warnings of knowledgeable Members of Congress to stop its rapid case-by-case processing of merger applications, and take on a role of leadership and investigation into these matters. But this bill alone is not enough. Permanent antitrust and public interest criteria must be invoked, and Congress should move toward a thorough investigation of the financial conditions of the railroads and the means short of merger which can be employed to keep these roads balanced and healthy in every region of the country. Likewise, the problem of passenger transportation should be explored. I am presently considering these avenues of legislation with a view toward introducing some new bills in this regard at a later date.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and will lie on the desk, as requested by the Senator from Tennessee.

The bill (S. 942) to amend section 7 of the Clayton Act to give effect to the operation of the provisions of that section applicable to certain railroad consolidations and mergers until December 31, 1964, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. KEFAUVER (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and ordered to lie on the desk.

PASSPORT LEGISLATION—DENIAL OF PASSPORTS TO SUPPORTERS OF THE INTERNATIONAL COMMUNIST MOVEMENT, ETC.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to provide for the denial of passports to supporters of the international Communist movement; for review of passport denials; and for other purposes.

I wish to call attention to the very unsatisfactory situation which exists with respect to the passport law of the United States. I do so because the subject is important and urgent.

The present situation is full of confusion and, in my opinion, danger.

It is necessary to review some history in order to judge the problem which faces the Congress. The passport statute now on the books was enacted in 1856. Conditions then were, of course, very different from conditions now. During most of the history of our country, a passport was not required upon entering the country or leaving it.

During the later part of World War I, for military reasons, the law was changed to require a passport for entry or exit from the United States. World War II again necessitated such a requirement and, under legislation which still exists, Presidents Truman, Eisenhower, and Kennedy have continued the requirement that a passport is necessary for entry or exit by making determinations that a "national emergency" continues.

Existing passport laws are quite brief and many questions of interpretation and policy have arisen. Some of these questions have been settled by the courts but others remain in doubt. During World War II and following, the Department of State claimed that it had complete discretion in the issuance of passports. That is, it claimed the right to decide which American citizens might travel abroad and where they might be allowed to go.

This claim of complete discretion was narrowed down by the courts in several cases but there began to arise charges and denials that the discretionary authority claimed by the Department of State was from time to time abused. In fact, in 1957, the Committee on Foreign Relations held several hearings to look into some of these charges of abuse of discretion.

Mr. President, this already confused legal situation on passports was thrown into turmoil in 1958. On June 16, 1958, in the case of Kent against Dulles, the Supreme Court held that the Department of State could not, in the absence of express statutory authorization, without a passport on the ground that an applicant refused to sign a non-Communist affidavit. The Court in that same case indicated that under existing statutes, a passport may be denied if the applicant is not a citizen, or is engaging in criminal conduct, or is a member of a Communist organization under a final order to register issued by the Subversive Activities Control Board.

As soon as the Supreme Court decision in Kent against Dulles was handed down, President Eisenhower sent a bill to the Congress which would have, in effect, enacted into law the Department of State passport regulations as they existed before the Supreme Court decision. President Eisenhower stated at that time that every day that passed without the legislation which he proposed left the country in great peril. At about the same time other bills, based on the opposite philosophy of passport policy, were also introduced. They would have prohibited the denial of passports, or the imposition of geographical restrictions on travel of Americans abroad, except in time of war. A bill representing a middle ground—comprehensively advising passport law and laying down specific and narrow grounds for denying passports—was introduced by Senator FULBRIGHT.

On September 8, 1959, the House passed H.R. 9069 which dealt only with the questions of denying passports to supporters of communism and of general geographical restrictions on travel. The House bill left the rest of passport legislation untouched.

The Committee on Foreign Relations had been active in the passport field even prior to the Supreme Court decision of 1958. The committee held hearings on passport legislation in 1957, in 1958, and in 1959. In 1960, a number of executive meetings were held by the committee to discuss passport bills. Some members of the committee supported each of the three main approaches to the problem which I have just described. It was obvious that it was going to be difficult to work out an agreed committee bill.

Incidentally, Mr. President, among others who testified before the committee were representatives of the Communist Party, of the Daily Worker, and of Americans for Democratic Action.

With the change of administrations in January of 1961, the committee decided that the subject of passport policy should continue to have a high priority. The committee decided, however, that a reasonable delay, until the new administration could review the subject of passport legislation and submit a bill or policy statement, would be appropriate.

Since January 1961, the chairman of the committee has informally and formally requested the administration to expedite its consideration of passport legislation. It seems to me that a reasonable time has now passed. The administration should come forward with its proposals on passport law.

Mr. President, in the absence of congressional action on passport law, the present confusion is dangerous. It may be that from a theoretical legal point of view, the Department of State can continue to claim whatever discretion to deny passports may be left after the Supreme Court decision. There would seem to be quite a broad area for the denial of passports which has not been tested in the courts. The Department of State has not, however, chosen to test its discretion further. It has issued passports to many persons who previously would have been unable to sign non-Communist affidavits and who, on that ground, before the Supreme Court decision, would have been denied passports.

There is no doubt that many hard-core Communist Party members are now able to travel abroad on U.S. passports. Can anyone seriously doubt but that these people intend to do harm? Let me quote Secretary of State Rusk when he appeared before the Foreign Relations Committee in 1961 in support of the President's foreign aid program:

> While economic penetration by aid and trade are new weapons in the Communist arsenal, the old weapons of force in all its manifestations not only continue to exist, but are daily visible. In Cuba, for example, what appeared to be a people's revolution against oppression has been stolen from the people and has become an instrument of oppression. In Laos, cadres of outsiders, hardened invaders masquerading as local revolutionaries, have been attempting to dominate the country. In Vietnam invaders from the north are waging a campaign of terror and assassination to capture the country.
>
> Elsewhere, both on the borders of the Communist bloc and half a world away, Communist agitators, infiltrators, and guerrillas are at work or moving into chosen positions. Within the bloc itself, there remain huge nuclear capability and expanding delivery systems as well as formidable conventional forces.

Mr. President, as I heard these words of the Secretary of State, my thoughts turned to the chaotic situation pertaining to passports. Because the law is unclear, Communist subversives or agitators may freely move back and forth across our borders. The facts as to the extent of harm which they may be doing have not yet been brought out by the appropriate congressional committees.

Mr. President, a Council of the Organization of American States, Pan American Union, in a report made February 20, this year, recognized the seriousness of unrestrained international travel by those engaged in promoting communism. On page 17 of its report, the Council said:

> It is clear that Cuba is being used as a base for training in communism and its spread in America.
>
> That activity of international communism, and particularly on the part of the Cuban Government, is greatly facilitated by the lack of suitable measures, and of cooperation among the American countries, to check the constant and heavy stream of travelers to and from Cuba. The importance of this problem makes it necessary to devote a special section to it.
>
> The nations that maintain normal and friendly relations recognize that it is desirable and even necessary to facilitate travel by their nationals across their borders as a means of strengthening cultural and economic ties, becoming better known, and becoming qualified and ready to support one another in the solution of their problems.
>
> For this reason the documents necessary for crossing international borders have become less in number, the period of validity of entry and departure permits has been extended, procedures for obtaining passports and other travel documents have been simplified, the obligation to secure visas has been removed, the securing of foreign exchange has been facilitated, and so on.
>
> These facilities are used by communism so that its agents may circulate freely and in this way introduce propaganda and move the money needed in planning, encouraging and carrying on subversion. It has already been pointed out in this connection that it is of public knowledge that many individuals of antinational and communistic tendencies travel to Cuba for various reasons connected with subversion. Cuba is also utilized as the point of departure for trips to the Communist countries of Europe or Asia for the same reasons.

Mr. President, it is time for the Congress to get down to work. This situation must be studied. The dangers involved must be carefully appraised. The constitutional questions must be gone into thoroughly.

I do not say that I have any easy answers on passport legislation. There are many troublesome questions of fact and policy. However, it seems to me long past time for the Congress to grasp these questions and to come to a decision so that this loophole in our security may be closed.

To provide a basis for this action, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to provide for the denial of passports to supporters of the international Communist movement; for review of passport denials; and for other purposes.

I strongly urge, Mr. President, that the Committee on Foreign Relations address itself to this problem as a matter of urgent priority.

I ask unanimous consent that the bill may be printed in the Record.

Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent that the bill may lie on the table until 1 week from today. If other Members of the Senate would like to join with me in sponsorship of the bill I specifically request that they do so.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will lie on the table, as requested, and the bill will be printed in the Record.

The bill (S. 943) to provide for denial of passports to supporters of the international Communist movement, for review of passport denials, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. Lausche, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

TITLE I—DENIAL OF PASSPORTS TO SUPPORTERS OF THE INTERNATIONAL COMMUNIST MOVEMENT

Section 1. The Congress finds that the international Communist movement of which the Communist Party of the United States of America is an integral part, seeks everywhere to thwart United States policy, to influence foreign governments and peoples against the United States, and by every means, including force and violence, to weaken the United States and ultimately to bring it under Communist domination; that the activities of the international Communist movement constitute a clear, present, and continuing danger to the security of the United States, and seriously impair the conduct of the foreign relations of the United States; that travel by couriers and agents is a major and essential means by which the international Communist movement is promoted and directed; that a United States passport requests other countries not only to permit the holder to pass freely and safely but also to give all lawful aid and protection to the holder and thereby facilitates the travel of such holder to and in foreign countries; and that in view of the history of the use of United States passports by supporters of the international Communist movement to further the purposes of that movement, the issuance of a passport to, or the possession of a passport by, persons described in section 2 is inimical to the security and to the conduct of the foreign relations of the United States and therefore passports should not be issued to or held by such persons.

Sec. 2. (a) In accordance with the findings in section 1, the Secretary of State is authorized to refuse to issue a passport, or to revoke a passport already issued, to any person as to whom it is determined on substantial grounds that he knowingly engages in activities for the purpose of furthering the international Communist movement, unless such person demonstrates to the Secretary, by clear and convincing evidence, that his activities abroad would not further the purposes of such movement.

(b) The Secretary shall consider as evidence of activities in furtherance of the international Communist movement, within the meaning of subsection (a)—

(i) present membership in the Communist Party or former membership terminated under circumstances which reasonably warrant the conclusion that the person continues to act knowingly in furtherance of the interests and under the discipline of the Communist Party;

(ii) activities under circumstances which reasonably warrant the conclusion that a person, regardless of the formal state of his affiliation with the Communist Party, is knowingly acting under the discipline of the Communist Party, or as a result of the direction, domination, or control exercised over him by the international Communist movement;

(iii) other facts which reasonably warrant the conclusion that the person is going or staying abroad to conduct activities for the purpose of furthering the interests of the international Communist movement.

Sec. 3. The Secretary of State may require, as a prerequisite to the issuance, renewal, or extension of a passport that the applicant subscribe to and submit a written statement duly verified by his oath or affirmation as to whether he is or has been within ten years prior to filing his application a member of the Communist Party.

Sec. 4. The provisions of this title shall continue in effect until the termination of the national emergency established by Presidential Proclamation Numbered 2914, December 16, 1950 (64 Stat. A 454).

TITLE II—PROCEDURE FOR PASSPORT DENIAL AND REVIEW THEREOF

Sec. 5. Upon application therefor, duly completed, and upon compliance with any requirement under the provisions of section 3 of title I of this Act, a passport shall be issued to any person qualified under section 4076 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (22 U.S.C. 212), or the applicant shall be informed in writing of a denial thereof, within ninety days after the receipt of such application. If a passport is denied, revoked, or restricted for any reason other than noncitizenship or geographic restrictions of general applicability, the passport applicant or holder shall be informed in writing of the reason, as specifically as is consistent with considerations of national security and foreign relations, and of the right to a hearing before the Passport Hearing Board in accordance with the provisions of this title. Notice of the denial or revocation of a passport under the terms of title I of this Act shall specify the paragraph or paragraphs of section 2(b) of title I on the basis of which the passport is denied or revoked.

Sec. 6. There shall be established within the Department of State a Passport Hearing Board consisting of three officers of the Department to be designated by the Secretary of State. This Board shall have jurisdiction in all cases wherein a hearing is requested in writing within thirty days after notification of the denial, revocation, or restriction of a passport, for any reason other than noncitizenship or geographical restrictions of general applicability. The Board shall hold a hearing within ninety days after the receipt of the request unless such time limit is extended at the request of the party. The officers who present the case of the Department of State to the Board shall not otherwise participate in the deliberations or recommendations of the Board.

SEC. 7. (a) The Secretary shall establish and make public rules which shall accord to the individual in proceedings before the Board the following rights:

(1) To appear in person and to be represented by counsel;

(2) To testify in his own behalf, present witnesses, and offer other evidence;

(3) To cross-examine witnesses appearing against him at any hearing at which he or his counsel is present and to examine all other evidence which is made a part of the open record;

(4) To examine a copy of the transcript of the open proceedings or to be furnished a copy upon request.

(b) In order to protect information, sources of information, and investigative methods, disclosure of which would have a substantially adverse effect upon the national security or the conduct of foreign relations, the Board may at any time consider oral or documentary evidence without making such evidence part of the open record. Prior to completion of its proceedings, the Board shall furnish to the individual a résumé of any such evidence, and shall certify that it is a fair résumé. The Board shall take into consideration the individual's inability to challenge information of which he has not been advised in full or in detail or to attack the credibility of sources which have not been disclosed to him.

SEC. 8. Within sixty days after completion of its proceedings, the Board shall make written findings, conclusions, and recommendations, which shall be transmitted with the entire record to the Secretary of State who shall make the final administrative determination. If the recommendation of the Board is adverse to the individual, a copy of the recommendation and of the findings and conclusions which are based upon the open record or upon the résumé of any evidence not made part of the open record, shall be furnished the individual, who may within twenty days following the receipt thereof submit to the Secretary written objections thereto. The Secretary shall base his determination upon the entire record submitted to him by the Board, including all findings and conclusions, and upon any objections submitted by the individual. In appropriate cases, the Secretary may remand a case to the Board for further proceedings. In the event he takes action adverse to the individual, the Secretary shall make appropriate written findings and conclusions.

SEC. 9. The United States District Court for the District of Columbia shall have jurisdiction to review any final determination of the Secretary of State under section 8 of this Act to determine whether there has been compliance with the provisions of this Act and of any regulations issued thereunder. In any such proceedings the court shall have power to determine whether any findings which are stated to be based upon the open record are supported by substantial evidence contained in that record, or, in the case of a résumé of evidence which was not made part of the open record in conformity with section 7(b) of this Act, are supported by the résumé of such evidence, duly certified by the Board under said section 7(b).

SEC. 10. The provisions of the Administrative Procedure Act, as amended (5 U.S.C., ch. 19), shall not apply to proceedings under this title.

TITLE III—REGULATIONS

SEC. 11. The Secretary of State is authorized to prescribe regulations to carry out the provisions of this Act.

TITLE IV—SEPARABILITY

SEC. 12. If any provision of this Act is held invalid, the remaining provisions shall not be affected.

TITLE V—EFFECTIVE DATE

SEC. 13. This Act shall take effect immediately upon its enactment.

A MONUMENT TO MEXICAN INDEPENDENCE

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, the city of Washington is beautiful for many reasons. One of them is the plethora of beautiful statues, many of them being gifts from foreign countries.

Mr. President, I am privileged to introduce once again on behalf of myself and the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. MCGEE], the Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH], the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. MECHEM], the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER], and my colleague from California [Mr. ENGLE], a bill to provide for the presentation by the United States to the people of Mexico of a monument commemorating the independence of Mexico.

This bill was approved during previous Congresses by both the Department of State and the Bureau of the Budget. On September 5, 1961, the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations favorably reported this measure, and soon thereafter it passed the Senate. The House failed to act upon it.

I have been informed that the Mexican Government would be pleased to accept a statue of our great President Abraham Lincoln. This is especially fitting because of the high regard in which Lincoln is held by the Mexican people and because of Lincoln's crucial support of Benito Juarez, the outstanding Mexican patriot.

Senators will recall, Mr. President, that in the spring of 1864 Napoleon III, of France, was preparing to establish a Mexican empire under Archduke Maximilian, of Austria. The struggling young Mexican Republic faced an uncertain future. Yet, in that hour of crisis, disregarding European hostility, Lincoln and his Secretary of State, William Seward, provided encouragement and, later, active support for the brave new Government of Mexico.

The Mexican Minister to the United States in gratitude proclaimed:

> Our common interest, political as well as commercial, will give us a common continental policy which no European nation would dare disregard.

It is fitting, then, that we present Mexico with a statue of Lincoln, to remind ourselves, as well as the Mexican people, of the common ideals of the two statesmen, Lincoln and Juarez, and of the continuing Mexican-United States bonds of history, geography, commerce, and love of freedom.

As I stated when I introduced this bill in 1960:

> Today, we share with Mexico a great deal more than our 1,935 miles of a common border. We have entered upon a new era of mutual cooperation and respect. The visit of President Eisenhower to Mexico and the official visit of Mexico's distinguished President, Lopez-Mateos, to the United States are indicative of this era. The forms of our cooperation may take many guises. It may involve a joint commission to wipe out a destructive hoof-and-mouth disease or any other hindrance which distresses both peoples. It may take the form of that unique and enduring monument to Mexican-United States cooperation, the mighty Falcon Dam, constructed and built by the two governments on the Rio Grande, 75 miles downstream from Laredo. Or it may take the form of a cultural exchange program. But whatever the nature of cooperation between our two countries, we labor toward a common goal: To advance the cause of peace with honor among all peoples of the world.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an excerpt from the report of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations be printed at this point in my remarks and that the text of the bill be set forth in full in the RECORD, and that the bill be held at the desk until tomorrow before being printed in the event that any others of my colleagues desire to join in sponsoring it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will lie at the desk, as requested, and the bill and excerpt will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 944) to provide for the presentation by the United States to the people of Mexico of a monument commemorating the independence of Mexico, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. KUCHEL (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of State is authorized and requested to procure a statue of Lincoln to commemorate appropriately the independence of Mexico, and present the same, on behalf of the people of the United States, to the people of Mexico. Such monument shall be prepared only after the design, plans, and specifications therefor have been submitted to and approved by the Commission on Fine Arts.

SEC. 2. There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act, including payment of the cost of such statue, the design and construction of a suitable pedestal therefor, transportation, including insurance, erection of the statue in Mexico, and traveling expenses of persons delegated by the Secretary of State to present such statue, on behalf of the people of the United States, to the people of Mexico.

The excerpt from the report presented by Mr. KUCHEL is as follows:

PURPOSE

This bill authorizes the Secretary of State with the approval of the Commission of Fine Arts to procure a statute of Lincoln for presentation to Mexico. The cost involved in S. 653 is estimated by the Department of State at $150,000, which include expenses of transportation, insurance, predestal, erection, and of the presentation itself. If a copy of an existing statue of Lincoln can be procured, the cost will be lower.

BACKGROUND

In 1960, Mexico celebrated its 150th anniversary as well as the 100th anniversary of the triumph of Benito Juarez. These occasions were commemorated with appropriate ceremonies in which the United States took part.

The Committee on Foreign Relations, in August 1960, considered a bill (S. 2827) which was similar to S. 653 but took no final action. On January 30, 1961, Senator Kuchel for himself and Senators Chavez, Engle, Goldwater, Gruening, Javits, Morse, and Yarborough, introduced S. 653, which was considered by the committee in open and executive sessions on July 31, August 9 and 29. On September 1, the committee voted to report S. 653 favorably to the Senate with amendments. These amendments merely strike out references to the two anniversaries that took place in 1960 since their celebration is now at an end.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

Although the ceremonies are over, the Committee on Foreign Relations recommends enactment of S. 653 as a gesture of friendship and good will for the Mexican people. It was the consensus of the committee, moreover, that the U.S. Embassy in Mexico should explore with appropriate officials of the Mexican Government the possibility of providing an attractive setting for the statute. It was felt that the gift would have greater meaning for, and bring more enjoyment to, the Mexican people if a way could be found to make a park around it.

The Department of State has no objection to enactment of S. 653. Its comments on the bill state that "if the Congress should enact such a bill * * * the Government of Mexico would graciously accept a statue of Lincoln."

A statue of Lincoln is considered to be most appropriate because the memory of Lincoln is cherished by the Mexican people for his sympathetic concern for them during the period that Mexico was struggling to regain its independence from European domination. The committee, therefore, recommends S. 653 to the Senate for favorable action.

EXTENSION OF THE DAVIS-BACON ACT TO MAINTENANCE WORK

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, on behalf of myself and the assistant majority leader, the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], a bill to extend the Davis-Bacon Act to include contracts for work performed on Federal public works and buildings.

Mr. President, in 1931, a historic act authored by a Republican Senator from Pennsylvania, James Davis, and a Republican Representative from New York, Robert Bacon, was adopted by Congress and signed into law by President Hoover. In passing the Davis-Bacon Act, Congress wisely determined that when Federal tax dollars were being used for construction, the wages paid for a particular type of labor must be those prevailing in the locality for work on projects of a similar character. The purpose in passing this law was to prevent cheap labor from geing imported into an area and thus undercutting the going wages in the local labor market. Effective administration of this act has meant more job opportunities for both local workers and local contractors.

I have long worked for the extension and improvement of the Davis-Bacon Act. In 1956, as a member of the Senate Committee on Public Works, I helped attain the adoption of an amendment which applied the Davis-Bacon principle to the construction authorized under the multibillion-dollar 41,000-mile interstate highway program. In urging that amendment almost 8 years ago, I noted what the application of the prevailing wage law would mean to the people of California and all other States, as follows:

> Our local working people will be given the statutory assurance by the Congress that, in working on a public construction job, they would have the same level of income or salary which they would have if they are working in similar enterprises in that locality. It also means that the local contractor who had local people working for him would not be subject to the hazard that some contractor from another part of the country might underbid him on the basis that he could import cheap labor into that area and could underbid the local contractor, and depress the local economy.

In the last Congress, my counterpart, the assistant majority leader [Mr. HUMPHREY] and I offered an amendment to the administration's Urban Mass Transportation Act, S. 3126, which would apply the Davis-Bacon principle to that program. This amendment was agreed to by the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency and is section 11(a) of the new bill (S. 6) in this Congress.

We also coauthored another Davis-Bacon amendment, S. 1360, which we originally introduced on March 15, 1961, and which we have reintroduced on January 23, 1963, as S. 450 in this Congress. Our measure would amend the Davis-Bacon Act to require the Secretary of Labor to take into account in his determination of the prevailing wage the contractor payments to various types of health, welfare, unemployment, retirement, and apprenticeship funds. The great growth of these funds was unforeseen three decades ago when the original legislation was framed. With 70 percent of the workers in the construction industry now covered by negotiated agreements which provide for some welfare and pension benefits such a revision is long overdue. California has had such a provision in the State prevailing wage law since 1959. If we are to bring the Davis-Bacon Act into conformity with the practices of modern labor-management relations, it is now time for Congress to act.

Additional revision, however, is also sorely needed. The Davis-Bacon concept should be extended to the maintenance contracts—such as those dealing with the replacement, modification, reconstruction, and demolition of a structure or project—which are made after the original construction has been completed. At this time on military and other Federal installations in my own State and throughout America we have the strange zig-zag pattern where prevailing wages—and thus protection for local contractors and local workers—are honored during the construction phase but ignored when maintenance work—including replacement, modification, reconstruction or demolition—occurs. Whole crews of out-of-State workers are brought in to perform such work below prevailing local wages while our local contractors and workers are literally standing outside the fence looking in. This is not fairplay.

The Federal Government should not condone that which is not fair play and should not through inaction encourage such substandard working conditions. Interestingly enough, in California, if it is a State public works project, alteration, demolition, or repair work as well as construction has been covered since the "little" Davis-Bacon Act was adopted by the California Legislature in 1937. The State act has worked successfully and has had the support of contractors and workers in the areas involved. I hope that this Congress will amend the Davis-Bacon Act in the two ways that have been indicated. Such revision is long overdue.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a copy of the resolution in favor of extending the Davis-Bacon Act to include maintenance work on Federal projects, which was adopted by the 41st Convention of the State Building and Construction Trades Council of California in San Francisco on July 24-27, 1962, be printed at this point in the RECORD, as well as the text of the bill to which I have alluded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill and resolution will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 945) to amend the Davis-Bacon Act to extend its application to contracts for the maintenance of Federal installations, introduced by Mr. KUCHEL (for himself and Mr. HUMPHREY), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 7 of the Act entitled "An Act relating to the rate of wages for laborers and mechanics employed on public buildings of the United States and the District of Columbia by contractors and subcontractors, and for other purposes," approved March 3, 1961, as amended (40 U.S.C. 276a-6), is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 7. A contract for maintenance work on a public building or public work, including the replacement, modification, reconstruction, and demolition thereof, shall, for the purposes of this Act, be deemed to be a contract for the construction, alteration, and/or repair thereof."

The resolution presented by Mr. KUCHEL is as follows:

RESOLUTION ON GOVERNMENT MAINTENANCE WORK

(Resolution adopted at 41st convention of State Building and Construction Trades Council of California, San Francisco, July 24-27, 1962)

Whereas the Federal Government has adopted a policy of placing much of the maintenance work on Government installations out for competitive bids; and

Whereas such work does not fall under the scope of the Davis-Bacon Act and the prevailing wage rate is not applicable; and

Whereas under these conditions nonunion employers very often are successful in securing this work at a wage rate detrimental to our members and organization; and

Whereas organization of such work on Government installations is not easily accomplished; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That this 41st convention of the State Building and Construction Trades Council of California endorse inclusion under the Davis-Bacon Act all construction maintenance work, i.e.: alteration, repair, replacement, modification, reconstruction, and demolition on Government installations to be let for competitive bids; and be it further

Resolved, That the officers and executive board members contact the Senators and Congressmen of our State to secure a sponsor to introduce such legislation in the coming legislative session; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to the building and construction trades department of the AFL–CIO requesting their aid and cooperation in securing this legislation.

TO AMEND THE FOREIGN SERVICE BUILDINGS ACT

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, by request, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to amend the Foreign Service Buildings Act, 1926—title 22, United States Code, sections 292–300—to permit continuation of the program for the acquisition, maintenance, and operations of real property required abroad by diplomatic, consular, and other activities of the United States operating in foreign countries.

The proposed legislation has been requested by the Secretary of State, and I am introducing it in order that there may be a specific bill to which Members of the Senate and the public may direct their attention and comments.

I reserve my right to support or oppose this bill, as well as any suggested amendments to it, when the matter is considered by the Committee on Foreign Relations.

I ask unanimous consent that the bill may be printed in the Record at this point, together with the letter from the Secretary of State dated February 1, 1963, to the Vice President in regard to it and a table showing authorizations and appropriations for the Foreign Service building program.

I might add that this is substantially the same bill as H.R. 11880 which passed the Senate last year but was not finally enacted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill, letter, and statement will be printed in the Record.

The bill (S. 946) to amend the Foreign Service Buildings Act, 1926, to authorize additional appropriations, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. Fulbright, by request, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 4 of the Foreign Service Buildings Act, 1926, as amended (22 U.S.C. 295), is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(d) In addition to amounts authorized before the date of enactment of this section, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary of State—

"(1) for acquisition, by purchase or construction (including acquisition of leaseholds) of sites and buildings in foreign countries under this Act, and for major alterations of buildings acquired under this Act, the following sums—

"(A) for use in Africa, not to exceed $8,400,000, of which not to exceed $3,600,000 may be appropriated for the fiscal year 1964;

"(B) for use in the American Republics, not to exceed $6,100,000, of which not to exceed $4,100,000 may be appropriated for the fiscal year 1964;

"(C) for use in Europe, not to exceed $7,650,000, of which not to exceed $2,440,000 may be appropriated for the fiscal year 1964;

"(D) for use in the Far East, not to exceed $2,900,000, of which not to exceed $2,200,000 may be appropriated for the fiscal year 1964;

"(E) for use in the Near East, not to exceed $2,800,000, of which not to exceed $2,100,000 may be appropriated for the fiscal year 1964;

"(F) for facilities for the United States Information Agency, not to exceed $1,850,000, of which not to exceed $760,000 may be appropriated for the fiscal year 1964, and

"(G) for facilities for agricultural and defense attaché housing, not to exceed $800,000, of which not to exceed $400,000 may be appropriated for the fiscal year 1964;

"(2) such additional sums as may be necessary to carry out the other purposes of this Act.

Sums appropriated pursuant to this authorization shall remain available until expended. To the maximum extent feasible, expenditures under this Act shall be made out of foreign currencies owned by or owed to the United States."

Sec. 2(a). Section 2 of the Foreign Service Buildings Act, 1926 (22 U.S.C. 293), is repealed.

(b) The first section of such Act (22 U.S.C. 292) is amended—

(1) by striking out ", subject to the direction of the commission hereinafter established,";

(2) by striking out "under such terms and conditions as in the judgment of the commission may best protect the interests of the United States,";

(3) by striking out ", to the extent deemed advisable by the commission,"; and

(4) by striking out ", which buildings shall be appropriately designated by the commission, and the space in which shall be allotted by the Secretary of State under the direction of the commission" and inserting a period and the following: "The space in such buildings shall be allotted by the Secretary of State".

(c) Section 3 of such Act (22 U.S.C. 294) is amended—

(1) by striking out ", subject to the direction of the commission," and "in the judgment of the commission,"; and

(2) by inserting immediately before the period at the end thereof the following: "and without regard to section 3648 of the Revised Statutes of the United States (31 U.S.C. 529)".

(d) Section 4 of such Act (22 U.S.C. 295) is amended by striking out ", subject to the direction of the commission,".

(e) Section 9 of such Act (22 U.S.C. 300) is amended—

(1) by striking out "with the concurrence of the Foreign Service Buildings Commission,"; and

(2) by striking out ", as in the judgment of the Commission may best serve the Government's interest".

(f) Section 1(c) of Reorganization Plan Numbered II of May 9, 1939 (53 Stat. 1432), is repealed.

(g) All references to the Foreign Service Buildings Commission, originally established by the Foreign Service Buildings Act, 1926, in all laws of the United States are hereby repealed.

The letter and table presented by Mr. Fulbright are as follows:

February 1, 1963.

Dear Mr. Vice President: The Department encloses, and recommends for your consideration, proposed legislation to amend the Foreign Service Buildings Act, 1926 (22 U.S.C. 292–300), to permit continuation of the program for the acquisition, maintenance, and operations of real property required abroad by diplomatic, consular, and other activities of the United States operating in foreign countries.

Authorizations of appropriations to implement the provisions of the Foreign Service Buildings Act from 1926 to date amount to $251,625,000, of which $235 million has been authorized in the last 15 years. The appropriations request for the buildings program for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, aggregates $27 million and is dependent upon enactment of the proposed legislation.

Thus far the Department of State has acquired under its Foreign Service buildings program office buildings, residences, and staff housing which are valued far in excess of their cost of approximately $200 million. The Department has developed a 2-year program to meet its most urgent needs, especially in Africa and Asia, which contemplates an expenditure in the period from July 1, 1963, through June 30, 1965, of an estimated $30,500,000, exclusive of normal operating expenses, for which we are asking continuing authority.

Acquisition of real properties under the Foreign Service Buildings Act has been financed largely in the past by U.S. Treasury holdings of foreign currencies generated through lendlease, surplus property and other agreements. However, many of the Department's most urgent and compelling buildings needs are now in countries where credits or local currencies are not held by the United States in sufficient amounts. U.S. dollars must be expended in those areas. In view of the high concentration of local currency holdings of the U.S. Treasury in a relatively few countries, and the recurring need in areas in which local currency holdings do not exist, the proposed legislation does not specify a definite amount to be used solely to acquire local currencies or credits. However, under regulations of the U.S. Treasury, the Foreign Service buildings program is required to utilize foreign credits and currencies owed to or owned by the United States before it can acquire needed foreign exchange from any other source.

During the 87th Congress, the House Foreign Affairs Committee reported favorably H.R. 11880 to amend the Foreign Service Buildings Act of 1926. This bill was passed by the House and also by the Senate but with several amendments. No final action was taken by the Congress prior to adjournment. The enclosed draft bill includes all the provisions of H.R. 11880 as passed by the House, with certain modifications in limitations which the Department considers essential.

The Department of State has been informed by the Bureau of the Budget that there is no objection, from the standpoint of the administration's program, to the presentation of the draft bill for the consideration of the Congress.

A letter similar to this is being sent to the Speaker of the House.

Sincerely yours,

Dean Rusk.

(Enclosures: (1) copy of draft bill; (2) copy of Department of State "Authorization and Appropriations for the Foreign Buildings Program".)

Authorizations and appropriations for the foreign buildings program, since the Foreign Service Buildings Act, 1926

[Thousands of dollars]

Public law	Authorizations[1]		Appropriations[1]			Unappropriated balance
	Minimum use of U.S. Treasury foreign currency	U.S. dollars	Fiscal year	For purchase of U.S. Treasury foreign currency	For U.S. dollar obligations	
186, 69th Cong., May 7, 1926		$10,000				
			1926		$435	$9,565
			1927		700	8,865
			1928		1,300	7,565
			1929		2,700	4,865
			1930		1,700	3,165
			1931		2,000	1,165
			1934		1,165	0
145, 74th Cong., June 15, 1935		300				300
260, 74th Cong., Aug. 12, 1935		1,325				1,625
			1935		1,625	0
543, 75th Cong., May 25, 1938		5,000				5,000
			1940		750	4,250
			1941		300	3,950
			1942		450	3,500
			1943		275	3,225
			1944		144	3,081
			1945		220	2,861
			1946		1,000	1,861
			1947		1,000	861
547, 79th Cong., July 25, 1946	$110,000	15,000				125,861
			1948	$50,000	1,500	74,361
			1949	35,000		39,361
			1950	13,000		26,361
			1951	2,950		23,411
			1952	7,500		15,911
399, 82d Cong., June 19, 1952	90,000					105,911
			1953	6,500		99,411
			1954	[2] 3,316		96,095
			1955	[3] 3,000	1,000	92,095
			1956	7,500	1,000	88,595
			1957	14,000	5,000	64,595
			1958	15,000	3,500	46,095
			1959	15,000	3,000	28,095
			1960	16,739	633	10,723
			1961	10,495	228	None
86-723, Sept. 8, 1960		10,000				10,000
			1962	9,100	900	None
87-843, Oct. 18, 1962	7,000	3,000	1963	7,000	3,000	None
88——, ——, 1963 [4]	36,000	18,000				54,000
			[5] 1964	[4] 19,000	[4] 8,000	27,000
Total	243,000	62,625		235,100	43,525	27,000

[1] Data are exact, since both authorizations and appropriations have been enacted in even thousands of dollars.

[2] Transferred from "Government in occupied areas" pursuant to Public Law 83-207.

[3] Of this amount, $1,000,000 was transferred from "Government in occupied areas" pursuant to Public Law 83-663.

[4] The 1964 appropriation is dependent upon the enactment of authorizing legislation, expected to be introduced early in the 88th Cong. in the amount shown.

[5] Estimated.

TO AMEND THE INTERNATIONAL CLAIMS SETTLEMENT ACT OF 1949, AS AMENDED

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, by request, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to amend the International Claims Settlement Act of 1949, as amended, to provide for the timely determination of certain claims of American nationals settled by the United States-Polish Claims Agreement of July 16, 1960, and for other purposes.

The proposed legislation has been requested by the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission, and I am introducing it in order that there may be a specific bill to which Members of the Senate and the public may direct their attention and comments.

I reserve my right to support or oppose this bill, as well as any suggested amendments to it, when the matter is considered by the Committee on Foreign Relations.

I ask unanimous consent that the bill may be printed in the RECORD at this point, together with a letter from Edward D. Re, Chairman of the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission, of recent date, and also the Commission's section-by-section analysis of the bill which were sent to the Vice President in regard to it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill, letter, and analysis will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 947) to amend the International Claims Settlement Act of 1949, as amended, to provide for the timely determination of certain claims of American nationals settled by the United States-Polish Claims Agreement of July 16, 1960, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. FULBRIGHT, by request, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the International Claims Settlement Act of 1949, as amended, is further amended as follows:

(1) Subsection (f) of section 4, title I, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"(f) No remuneration on account of services rendered on behalf of any claimant in connection with any claim filed with the Commission under this title shall exceed 10 per centum of the total amount paid pursuant to any award certified under the provisions of this title, on account of such claim. Any agreement to the contrary shall be unlawful and void. Whoever, in the United States or elsewhere, demands or receives, on account of services so rendered, any remuneration in excess of the maximum permitted by this section, shall be fined not more than $5,000 or imprisoned not more than twelve months, or both."

(2) Section 6, title I, is amended by inserting "(a)" after the section number and adding at the end thereof the following subsection:

"(b) The Commission shall complete its affairs in connection with the settlement of United States-Polish claims arising under the Polish Claims Agreement of July 16, 1960, not later than March 31, 1966."

(3) Subsection (b) of section 7, title I, is amended by inserting "(1)" after the subsection letter, and adding at the end thereof the following paragraph:

"(2) The Secretary of the Treasury shall deduct from each payment into the Polish Claims Fund created pursuant to section 8, 5 per centum thereof as reimbursement to the Government of the United States for the expenses incurred by the Commission and by the Treasury Department in the administration of this title. The amount so deducted shall be covered into the Treasury to the credit of miscellaneous receipts."

(4) Paragraph (1) of subsection (c), section 7, title I, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"(1) if any person to whom any payment is to be made pursuant to this title is deceased or is under a legal disability, payment shall be made to his legal representative, except that if any payment to be made is not over $1,000 and there is no qualified executor or administrator, payment may be made to the person or persons found by the Comptroller General to be entitled thereto, without the necessity of compliance with the requirements of law with respect to the administration of estates."

(5) Section (c) of section 8, title I, is amended by inserting the phrase "paragraph (1) of" after the phrase "pursuant to" and before the words "subsection (b)".

(6) Section 8, title I, is hereby further amended by adding at the end thereof the following subsection:

"(e) The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed out of the sums covered into the Polish Claims Fund, to make payments on account of awards certified by the Commission pursuant to this title with respect to claims included within the terms of the Polish Claims Agreement of 1960 as follows and in the following order of priority:

"(1) Payment in the amount of $1,000 or in the principal amount of the award, whichever is less;

"(2) Thereafter, payments from time to time on account of the unpaid principal balance of each remaining award which shall bear to such unpaid principal balance the same proportion as the total amount in the Polish Claims Fund available for distribution at the time such payments are made bears to the aggregate unpaid principal balance of all such awards; and

"(3) Thereafter, payments from time to time on account of the unpaid balance of each award of interest which shall bear to such unpaid balance of interest, the same proportion as the total amount in the Polish Claims Fund available for distribution at the time such payments are made bears to the aggregate unpaid balance of interest of all such awards."

(7) Section 302, title III, is amended by inserting "(a)" after the section number and adding at the end thereof the following subsections:

"(b) The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to transfer the unobligated balance in the Italian Claims Fund into the War Claims Fund created under section 13 of the War Claims Act of 1948, as amended.

"(c) The Secretary of the Treasury shall cover into each of the Bulgarian, Hungarian, and Rumanian Claims Funds, such sums as may be paid by the Government of the respective country pursuant to the terms of any claims settlement agreement between the Government of the United States and the Government of such country."

(8) Section 303, title III, is amended by striking out the word "and" at the end of paragraph (2), and by striking out the period at the end of paragraph (3) and inserting in lieu thereof a semicolon and immediately thereafter, the word, "and".

(9) Section 303, title III, is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(4) pay effective compensation for the nationalization, compulsory liquidation, or other taking of property of nationals of the United States in Bulgaria, Hungary, and Rumania, between August 9, 1955, and the effective date of the claims agreement between the respective country and the United States."

(10) Section 306, title III, is amended by inserting "(a)" after the section number and adding at the end thereof the following subsection:

"(b) within thirty days after enactment of this subsection or the enactment of legislation making appropriations to the Commission for payment of administrative expenses incurred in carrying out its functions under paragraph (4) of section 303 of this title, whichever date is later, the Commission shall publish in the Federal Register the time when and the limit of time within which claims may be filed under paragraph (4) of section 303 of this title, which limit shall not be more than six months after such publication."

(11) Section 310, title III, is amended by adding at the end of subsection (a) thereof the following paragraph:

"(6) Whenever the Commission is authorized to settle claims by the enactment of paragraph (4) of section 303 of this title with respect to Rumania, or by the execution of a claims settlement agreement with Bulgaria or Hungary, no further payments shall be authorized by the Secretary of the Treasury on account of awards certified by the Commission pursuant to paragraphs (1), (2), or (3) of section 303 of the Bulgarian, Hungarian or Rumanian Claims Funds, as the case may be, until payments on accounts of awards certified pursuant to paragraph (4) of section 303 with respect to such Fund have been authorized in equal proportion to payments previously authorized on existing awards certified pursuant to paragraphs (1), (2), and (3) of section 303."

(12) Section 316, title III, is amended by inserting "(a)" after the section number and adding at the end thereof the following subsection:

"(b) The Commission shall complete its affairs in connection with the settlement of claims pursuant to paragraph (4) of section 303 of this title not later than eighteen months following the date of enactment of such paragraph, or following the enactment of legislation making appropriations to the Commission for payment of administrative expenses incurred in carrying out its functions under paragraph (4) of section 303 of this title, whichever date is later."

The letter and section-by-section analysis presented by Mr. FULBRIGHT are as follows:

FOREIGN CLAIMS SETTLEMENT
COMMISSION OF THE
UNITED STATES,
Washington, D.C.

HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON,
President of the Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Transmitted herewith in behalf of the executive branch for the consideration of the 88th Congress is the draft of a proposed bill entitled, "A bill to amend the International Claims Settlement Act of 1949, as amended, to provide for the timely determination of certain claims of American nationals settled by the United States-Polish Claims Agreement of July 16, 1960, and for other purposes."

On July 16, 1960, the Governments of the United States and the Polish People's Republic entered into an en bloc settlement of claims of nationals of the United States against Poland for the nationalization or other taking by Poland of property and rights or interests therein; the deprivation of use or enjoyment of property; and debts of nationalized enterprises. The Polish Government agreed to pay to the U.S. Government an aggregate of $40 million in 20 equal annual installments. Three such installments have been paid to the U.S. Treasury.

A total of 9,873 applications have been received to date, some having been received after the close of the filing date, March 31, 1962. It is anticipated, of course, that the number of valid claims will be considerably less. Nevertheless, all claims filed with the Commission, whether valid or invalid, must be examined and decided by formal opinions.

The Commission started work on the Polish claims program on September 1, 1960, pursuant to title I of the International Claims Settlement Act of 1949, as amended, which established the procedures for the administration of such a claims program by the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission. Title I, however, makes no provision with respect to limiting the time within which the Commission must bring about the timely and orderly completion of the Polish claims program.

As indicated, 9,873 claims have been filed. In relation to programs previously administered by the Commission this one is more than six times the size of the Yugoslav program, equal to the size of the title III program, and more than twice the size of the title IV program. Four years were allowed for the completion of each of those programs. Accordingly, the Commission proposes that the period for processing claims against Poland be no greater than 4 years from the last day for filing claims.

Eight other proposals are contained in the draft measure:

(a) A proposal to relieve the Commission of the burden of determining attorneys' fees and to make title I consistent with the attorney fee provisions of titles III and IV of the International Claims Settlement Act.

(b) A proposal to relieve the Treasury Department of extensive administrative burdens in deducting the Commission's administrative expenses from the fund instead of from each award by the Commission.

(c) A proposal to transfer the unobligated balances in the Italian Claims Fund to the War Claims Fund.

The following proposals are designed to provide for the implementation of the United States-Rumanian Claims Settlement Agreement of March 30, 1960.

(d) A proposal to enable the Secretary of the Treasury to cover the payments by governments with which the U.S. Government concludes en bloc claims settlement agreements into the respective claims fund.

(e) A proposal to provide for a new category of claims against the Rumanian Claims Fund.

(f) A proposal requiring the Commission to publish notice of the program in the Federal Register.

(g) A proposal providing for equitable payments on awards.

(h) A proposal providing for the orderly completion of the Rumanian program.

The items covered in the draft proposal will involve little, if any, cost. In any event, the cost of effectuating any of the proposals would be borne by the claims fund concerned and not the U.S. Government.

The Commission cannot proceed in the orderly administration of the Polish and Rumanian claims programs unless the items pertaining to them are enacted. With respect to the remaining items, these are considered good administrative housekeeping which should not be left at loose ends. Moreover, it is important that this legislation be enacted promptly because installment payments of $2 million each have been made by the Government of Poland on January 11, 1961, January 10, 1962, and January 10, 1963. On July 1, 1960, the Government of Rumania made its first installment payment of $500,000 under the terms of the agreement of March 30, 1960. Subsequent installment payments of the same amount were made on July 1, 1961, and July 1, 1962.

For these reasons the Commission urges early and favorable action on the proposed bill.

Accompanying the draft bill is a section-by-section analysis of its provisions.

The Bureau of the Budget advises that it has no objection to the presentation of this proposal for consideration by the Congress and its enactment would be consistent with the administration's objectives.

Sincerely yours,

EDWARD D. RE,
Chairman.

INTERNATIONAL CLAIMS SETTLEMENT ACT AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED BY THE FOREIGN CLAIMS SETTLEMENT COMMISSION IN BEHALF OF THE EXECUTIVE BRANCH—SECTION-BY-SECTION ANALYSIS

Paragraph 1: (The enacting clause unnumbered.)

Section 4(f) of title I of the International Claims Settlement Act of 1949, as amended, presently provides for a limitation on attorney's fees of 10 percent of any payment on an award made by the Commission, but it also provides machinery authorizing the Commission to set the amount of such fee within the 10 percent limitation. Further provision is made for deduction by the Secretary of the Treasury of the amount of the fee and for payment directly to the attorney.

Because of the additional administrative burdens imposed upon the Commission and the Treasury Department through such procedures the attorney fee provisions have been considerably simplified in legislation enacted subsequent to title I of the act, namely, titles III and IV. The latter two titles provide simply that such fees shall not exceed 10 percent of any payment made on an award by the Commission, and leaves the settlement thereof to attorney and client.

Paragraph 1 of the proposed bill is designed to repeal present section 4(f) of the title I, and to substitute therefor the attorney fee provisions contained in section 414 of title IV of the act.

Paragraph 2: While title I of the International Claims Settlement Act of 1949, as amended, made provision for the initiation of claims programs such as that contemplated under the Polish Claims Agreement of July 16, 1960, and authorized the Commission to set a claims filing period, it did not make provision for establishing the time limit within which the Commission should wind up its affairs in completing the program.

Accordingly, the Commission, having received nearly 10,000 claims during the filing period, recommends in the measure that the windup date be set 4 years from the last day for filing claims. The date thus recommended is March 31, 1966.

Paragraph 3: The various claims funds administered by the Commission have all been charged with financing the administrative expenses of the Commission. Section 7(b) of title I of the International Claims Settlement Act of 1949, as amended, presently provides for the deduction of 5 percent of any payment made on an award for this purpose. Legislation enacted subsequent to title I, i.e., titles III and IV, instead provides for a direct deduction of 5 percent from the respective funds for this purpose. This latter method lifts an extensive administrative burden from the Treasury Department.

It is recommended, therefore, that the cumbersome procedure of section 7(b) be repealed and provisions comparable to those of title IV be substituted.

Paragraph 4: Section 7(c)(1) of title I of the International Claims Settlement Act of 1949, as amended, presently provides that payment of awards be made only to the persons entitled thereto except in cases involving legal disability or death. Where the award does not exceed $500, requirements with respect to the appointment of a qualified executor or administrator may be waived and payment made to the person or persons found by the Comptroller General to be entitled thereto.

This proposal raises the limit from an award not in excess of $500 to any payment not in excess of $1,000. This will provide for a more orderly and efficient disposal of claims falling within the provision of the act. A similar change was made regarding claims under title IV of the act against the Government of Czechoslovakia.

Paragraph 5: This proposal involves technical changes in the language of subsection C of section 8 of the act which would retain the present payment procedures with respect to claims against the Yugoslav Claims Fund in the event future prorated payments are made. This is accomplished by including a reference to paragraph (1) of subsection (b) of section 8, under this amendment.

Paragraph 6: This new subsection authorizes the Secretary of the Treasury to make payments on account of awards certified by the Commission with respect to claims included within the terms of the Polish Claims Agreement of 1960, and provides payment in the order of priority as follows: (1) payment in the amount of $1,000 or in the principal amount of the award, whichever is less; (2) thereafter payments on a prorated basis on account of the unpaid principal balance of each remaining award. This proration will be made on the basis of the total amount remaining in the Polish Claims Fund and available for distribution after initial payments have been made; (3) payments on account of the unpaid balance of each award of interest under the same proration provisions.

Under these provisions it is possible for claimants having awards less than $1,000 to receive payment in full, excluding awards of interest. Claimants who receive awards in principal amounts over $1,000 would receive additional payments on a prorated basis.

Paragraph 7: New subsection (b), section 302, title III, of the act would provide for the ultimate abolition of the Italian Claims Fund, the Italian claims program having been completed, and provide for the transfer of the unobligated balance in the fund ($1,088,623.53), into the War Claims Fund. The rationale for this proposal is that after World War II the Italian Government paid to the U.S. Government the sum of $5 million under the Lombardo agreement, August 14, 1947, in settlement of property damage claims not covered under the peace treaty. No reverter clause was included in the agreement.

Under the War Claims Act of 1948, as amended, among other things provision was made to compensate members of our Armed Forces who were detained as prisoners of war. These benefits were paid out of the War Claims Fund, comprised of blocked and vested German and Japanese assets.

Commission records disclose that approximately 20,000 members of our Armed Forces were detained in or by Italy, and who received prisoner of war compensation at an average of $1,500 each. Thus, roughly, $30 million of German and Japanese assets were utilized to compensate prisoners of Italy. Accordingly, it is recommended that such balances as remain in the Italian Claims Fund be utilized to reimburse, in some measure, the War Claims Fund.

Upon completion of the claims program against the Government of Rumania on August 9, 1959, the Commission had issued 498 awards in the aggregate of $84,729,291 including interest, against a fund in the amount of about $22 million. On March 30, 1960, the Governments of the United States and the Rumanian People's Republic executed an en bloc settlement of these claims of U.S. nationals upon the provisions that Rumania pay to the United States an additional $2.5 million in five equal annual installments.

Inasmuch as the statute now provides that the Rumanian fund shall be comprised only of sums blocked, vested, and transferred by the Attorney General, the additional sums paid by Rumania cannot be covered into the Fund. New subsection (c) provides the vehicle for accomplishing this purpose.

Paragraphs 8 and 9: Paragraph 8 involves technical changes in the language of section 303, title III of the act to permit the addition of a new paragraph "(4)" as contained in the amendment under paragraph 9. The proposal under paragraph 9 makes provision for disposition of a small number of claims against Rumania, included within the agreement of March 30, 1960, which have arisen since August 9, 1955, as well as any additional similar claims which may be included within agreements the United States may make in the future with Bulgaria and Hungary. Negotiations are currently underway with Bulgaria.

Paragraph 10: This proposal requires the normal publication of the claims filing period in the Federal Register.

Paragraph 11: This proposal revamps the award payment provisions with respect to claims against Rumania or by the execution of a future claims settlement agreement with Bulgaria or Hungary in order to insure that new awardees will not obtain a pecuniary advantage over previous awardees. Awardees under the Rumanian program have received approximately 35 cents on the dollar in payments on their awards. This proposal would limit payments on new awards to a like extent, and then permit the residual balance to be distributed proportionately among all awardees.

Paragraph 12: This proposal requires the Commission to wind up its affairs in the Rumanian claims program within a period of 18 months.

TO AMEND THE FOREIGN SERVICE ACT OF 1946, AS AMENDED

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, by request, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to amend the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended, and for other purposes.

The proposed legislation has been requested by the Department of State, and I am introducing it in order that there may be a specific bill to which Members of the Senate and the public may direct their attention and comments.

I reserve my right to support or oppose this bill, as well as any suggested amendments to it, when the matter is considered by the Committee on Foreign Relations.

I ask unanimous consent that the bill may be printed in the Record at this point, together with the letter from Assistant Secretary of State Frederick Dutton, dated February 18, 1963, to the Vice President, and also the Department of State's explanation of the bill and the cost estimates of the proposed legislation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill, letter, and explanation will be printed in the Record.

The bill (S. 948) to amend the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. Fulbright, by request, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Foreign Service Act Amendments of 1963".

Sec. 2. Section 571 (a) and (c) of such Act are hereby amended as follows:

(a) Section 571(a) is amended by changing the final period to a colon and adding "*Provided,* That in individual cases when personally approved by the Secretary further extension may be made."

(b) Section 571(c) is amended by inserting in the first sentence following the word "terms" the phrase "of paragraph (b)" and deleting the second sentence.

Sec. 3. Section 625 of such Act is amended by substituting in the first sentence the words "the same numerical" for the words "a given"; by substituting the words "fifty-two calendar weeks or more, shall, at the beginning of the next pay period" for the words "nine months or more, shall, on the first day of each fiscal year"; and by substituting in the second sentence the words "a Foreign Service officer or a Reserve" for the words "any such".

Sec. 4. (a) Section 911 of such Act is amended by adding a comma and the phrase "including prepayment on a commuted basis" after the word "pay" in the introductory sentence.

(b) Section 911(1) of such Act is amended by inserting after the word "Secretary" the phrase "authorizing annual leave at their home upon reassignment to the United States after service abroad or".

(c) Section 911(2) of such Act is amended to read as follows:

"(2) the travel expenses of members of the family of an officer or employee of the Service when proceeding to or returning from his post on duty; accompanying him on authorized travel to his home on annual leave when he is reassigned to the United States or on authorized home leave; accompanying him for representational purposes on authorized travel within the country of his assignment or, at the discretion of the Secretary, outside the country of his assignment; or otherwise traveling in accordance with authority granted pursuant to the terms of this or any other Act;"

(d) Section 911(8) of such Act is amended to read as follows:

"(8) the cost of preparing and transporting to their former homes, or to such other place in the United States as may be determined to be the appropriate place, or to a place not more distant than their former homes, for interment the remains of an officer or employee of the Service who is a citizen of the United States and of the members of his family who may die while the officer or employee is in the Service."

Sec. 5. Section 921(d) of such Act is deleted, restated in a new section 914, and a new heading thereto is added as follows:

"USE OF GOVERNMENT-OWNED OR LEASED VEHICLES

"SEC. 914. Notwithstanding the provisions of section 5 of the Act of July 16, 1914, as amended (5 U.S.C. 78) the Secretary may authorize any principal officer to approve the use of Government-owned or leased vehicles located at his post for transportation of United States Government employees and their dependents when public transportation is unsafe or not available."

SEC. 6. A new section 1051 and part F under title X of such Act are hereby added as follows:

"PART F—CLAIMS

"SEC. 1051. The Secretary may, under such regulations as he shall prescribe, settle and pay claims arising after date of enactment of this section against the United States Government for damage to, or loss of, personal property incident to his service of any officer or employee of the Service in a sum not to exceed $6,500 for a single claim, or replace property in kind: *Provided*, That a claim may be allowed under this section only if: (i) the officer or employee of the Service establishes that insurance was not obtainable at reasonable cost or was unobtainable at reasonable cost or was unobtainable for the risk from which the damage or loss resulted; (ii) it is presented in writing within two years after the damage or loss occurs; (iii) it did not occur at quarters occupied by the claimant within the fifty States or the District of Columbia that were not assigned to him or otherwise provided in kind by the United States; and (iv) such loss or damage occurs without fault or negligence on the part of the claimant or member of his family. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, a settlement of a claim pursuant to this section shall be final and conclusive."

SEC. 7. A new section 1081 and part I under title X of such Act are hereby added as follows:

"PART I—GRANTS TO SCHOOLS

"SEC. 1081. Notwithstanding any other law, the Secretary is authorized to make grants of funds in lieu of or as supplementary to education allowances, for assistance in the establishment, construction, expansion, maintenance, and operation of schools outside the United States, whenever he determines such grant of funds is necessary in order to provide suitable education for children of employees stationed in a foreign area."

The letter and explanation presented by Mr. **FULBRIGHT** are as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, D.C., February 18, 1963.

Hon. LYNDON B. JOHNSON,
President of the Senate.

DEAR MR. VICE PRESIDENT: We are enclosing herewith draft amendments to the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended, that the Department of State considers urgently needed for the improvement of the administration of the Foreign Service. In substance, these proposed amendments would:

1. Modify provisions limiting the period officers or employees of the Service may be assigned for duty in any Government agency (including the Department of State) or in any international organization, international commission, or international body. At the present time such assignment is limited to periods of 4 years which may under special circumstances be extended by the Secretary for a period of not more than 4 additional years. The proposed amendment will authorize the Secretary to make further extensions of such assignments on an individual case basis (sec. 571(a)).

Change by making more restrictive the provisions with respect to the payment of salary differentials to Foreign Service personnel assignment to duty in the United States (sec. 571(c)).

2. Simplify payroll procedures by making the effective date of within-class salary increases for Foreign Service officers and Reserve officers at the start of a pay period and equalize their application by making them effective after 52 weeks in class rather than at the beginning of each fiscal year (sec. 625).

3. Grant the Secretary authority to simplify existing procedures incident to Foreign Service travel:

(a) Permitting payment or prepayment of travel expenses on commuted basis (sec. 911).

(b) Providing authority for the travel of officers and employees of the Service and their families for annual leave in connection with rotation assignments to the United States after service abroad (sec. 911(1)(2)).

(c) Providing authority to enable members of the families of officers and employees of the Service to accompany officers or employees for representational purposes within the country of their assignment or at the Secretary's discretion, outside the country of their assignment (sec. 911(2)).

(d) Providing authority to transport the remains of officers or employees of the Service and members of their families to appropriate places of interment anywhere in the United States (sec. 911(8)).

4. Increase the Secretary's authority to use Government-owned and leased vehicles for transportation of Government employees and their dependents abroad when public transportation is unsafe or not available (sec. 914).

5. Simplify procedures to permit quick settlement and payment by the Secretary of legitimate property loss claims incident to service abroad when they do not exceed $6,500 (sec. 1051).

6. Provide the Secretary with authority to grant funds in lieu of or supplementary to educational allowances for the purpose of making available educational services for children of Government employees stationed in foreign areas whenever he determines such a grant of funds to be necessary (sec. 1081).

These proposals provide authority in the administrative field, which we believe are essential for more effective administration of the Foreign Service.

It is hoped that they may be given early consideration during the current session of Congress and that they may receive your support.

The Department has been informed by the Bureau of the Budget that there would be no objection, from the standpoint of the administration's program, to the presentation of the draft legislation to the Congress for its consideration.

Sincerely yours,
FREDERICK G. DUTTON,
Assistant Secretary
(For the Secretary of State).

Estimated cost of proposed Foreign Service Act amendments

Item 1: Broadening provisions relating to length of assignments in the United States (sec. 571(a)), first year cost__ 0

COMMENT

There will be no additional cost to retain employees for longer periods in the United States.

Item 2: Change in provisions relating to U.S. salary differentials (sec. 571(c)), first year cost__________________ (—$41,000)

COMMENT

The reduction in the area of applicability of the U.S. salary differential under this proposal would result in a saving in the amount of $41,000.

Item 3: Change in provision relating to within-class increases for Foreign Service officers and Reserve officers (sec. 625), first year cost__ $80,000

COMMENT

Most officers are promoted during the months of February, March, or April. Thus they would receive their first within-class increase 3 or 4 months sooner under this proposal than they do under present legislation. The cost of this provision can be estimated by multiplying the average number of officers promoted by one-third of the average within-class increase. This amounts to $80,000. Changing the date from July 1 to the beginning of a pay period will reduce administrative costs.

Item 4: Commuted travel plan (sec. 911), first year cost_______________________ 0

COMMENT

There will be no additional costs in connection with this plan, the purpose of which is to permit an eventual substantial reduction in administrative costs.

Item 5. Substitution of annual leave for home leave prior to home assignment (secs. 911 (1) and (2)), first year cost_ 0

COMMENT

This section would not result in any increase in costs and would result in a saving to the Government by virtue of the earlier entrance on duty of personnel assigned to Washington after a tour of duty abroad.

Item 6: Travel expenses for members of families in connection with representation (secs. 911(2)), first year cost_______________________ $40,000

COMMENT

Cost of travel for members of family to accompany officers and employees on official travel for representational purposes is estimated at $40,000.

Item 7: Shipment of remains to place other than official residence (sec. 911(8)), first year cost____________ $1,200

COMMENT

The increased cost of shipping the remains of officers and employees and members of their families to the family burial place is estimated to be $1,200.

Item 8: Use of Government-owned or leased vehicles (sec. 914), first year cost _______________________________ 0

COMMENT

The proposal authorizes increased use of existing vehicles so the only cost would be a minor increase in fuel expenses which is not possible to estimate.

Item 9: Settlement of employee claims for property damage abroad (sec. 1051), first year cost_______________ 0

COMMENT

Between June 1950 and June 1961, 266 claims, averaging $1,804, were settled by private laws at a total cost of $479,994. The average annual cost for claims settled during this period was $43,636. It is not anticipated that there wil be any increase in this amount.

Item 10: Grants to schools (sec. 1081), first year cost____________ $150,000

COMMENT

A preliminary estimate indicates that grants might be made to 10 schools averaging $15,000 each.

Total estimated cost______________	$271,200
Savings_____________________________	41,000
Net cost__________________	230,200

PART H—ASSIGNMENT OF FOREIGN SERVICE PERSONNEL

ASSIGNMENT TO ANY GOVERNMENT AGENCY OR INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATION

Existing legislation

SEC. 571. (a) Any officer or employee of the Service may, in the discretion of the Secretary, be assigned or detailed for duty in any Government agency, or in any international organization, international commission, or international body, such an assignment or combination of assignments to be for a period of not more than four years, except that under special circumstances the Secretary may extend this four-year period for not more than four additional years[.]

(c) If the basic minimum salary of the position to which an officer or employee of the Service is assigned pursuant to the terms of this section is higher than the salary such officer or employee is entitled to receive as an officer or employee of the Service, such officer or employee shall, during the period such difference in salary exists, receive the salary and allowances of the position in which he is serving in lieu of his salary and allowances as an officer or employee of the Service. Any salary paid under the provisions of this section shall be the salary on the basis of which computations and payments shall be made in accordance with the provisions of title VIII. [No officer or employee of the Service who, subsequent to the date of enactment of the Foreign Service Act Amendments of 1960, is assigned to, or who, after June 30, 1961, occupies a position in the Department that is designated as a Foreign Service Officer position, shall be entitled to receive a salary differential under the provisions of this paragraph.]

Proposed legislation

SEC. 571. (a) Any officer or employee of the Service may, in the discretion of the Secretary, be assigned or detailed for duty in any Government agency, or in any international organization, international commission, or international body, such an assignment or combination of assignments to be for a period of not more than four years, except that under special circumstances the Secretary may extend this four-year period for not more than four additional years: *Provided,* That in individual cases when personally approved by the Secretary further extension may be made.

(c) If the basic minimum salary of the position to which an officer or employee of the Service is assigned pursuant to the terms of paragraph (b) of this section is higher than the salary such officer or employee is entitled to receive as an officer or employee of the Service, such officer or employee shall, during the period such difference in salary exists, receive the salary and allowances of the position in which he is serving in lieu of his salary and allowances as an officer or employee of the Service. Any salary paid under the provisions of this section shall be the salary on the basis of which computations and payments shall be made in accordance with the provisions of title VIII.

Section 571(a) is amended to broaden the provisions which limit the period that the Secretary may assign or detail an officer or employee of the Service for duty in any Government agency or in any international organization, international commission, or international body, so that in individual cases the Secretary may extend such assignments for periods beyond 8 years.

It is proposed to repeal the provisions of section 571(c) with respect to payment of differentials except in cases of appointment by the President. The provisions of existing section 571(c) relating to payment of salary differentials after June 30, 1961, resulted from changes made by the Foreign Service Act Amendments of 1960. The Department sought at the time of enactment of those amendments to eliminate the requirement that an officer or employee of the Service assigned or detailed to duty with any Government agency (including the Department of State) receive the difference, if any, between his salary as an officer or employee of the Service and the basic minimum salary of the position to which he was assigned. It was pointed out that there was no longer any justification for this so-called Washington salary differential for officers of the Service assigned to positions in the Department since the integration of the Department and Foreign Service had made the interchange of officers between oversea and Washington asignments a normal procedure. Accordingly, since Washington is, in effect, a post of duty similar to any post abroad the payment of a salary differential was not believed justified.

The Department believes that all officers of the Foreign Service should be treated alike and that no Washington salary differential should be paid to any officer assigned to a position in the United States. By policy determination the Secretary can designate any and all positions in the Department that are occupied by officers and employees of the Foreign Service as Foreign Service officer positions thus eliminating the possibility of the payment of differentials to such persons who are assigned by him to the Department. Secretarial and clerical positions could not justifiably be designated as Foreign Service officer positions, nor could the Secretary designate positions in other agencies, missions, international organizations, international commissions, or other international bodies as Foreign Service officer positions in order to eliminate salary differentials when officers and employees of the Service are assigned to such positions.

The only exceptions to the provision eliminating all salary differentials would be in cases when Foreign Service officers and employees are appointed by the President alone or by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, as described in section 571(b). Such officers would receive the salary of the position to which appointed by the President or their Foreign Service officer salary, whichever is greater.

WITHIN-CLASS SALARY INCREASES OF FOREIGN SERVICE OFFICERS AND RESERVE OFFICERS

Existing legislation

SEC. 625. Any Foreign Service officer or any Reserve officer, whose services meet the standards required for the efficient conduct of the work of the Service and who shall have been in [a given] class for a continuous

Proposed legislation

SEC. 625. Any Foreign Service officer or any Reserve officer, whose services meet the standards required for the efficient conduct of the work of the Service and who shall have been in the same numerical class for

WITHIN-CLASS SALARY INCREASES OF FOREIGN

Existing legislation—Continued

period of [nine months or more, shall, on the first day of each fiscal year], receive an increase in salary to the next higher rate for the class in which he is serving. Without regard to any other law, the Secretary is authorized to grant to [any such] officer additional increases in salary, within the salary range established for the class in which he is serving, based upon especially meritorious service.

The purposes of the proposed amendments to section 625 are: (1) to simplify the payroll procedures for processing within-class increases for Foreign Service officers and Foreign Service Reserve officers by making such increases effective at the beginning of a pay period; (2) to equalize the application of such increases by making them effective immediately following the expiration of a specified period in class rather than on July 1 of each year; (3) to permit the use of service in the same numerical class either as an FSR or an FSO toward an increase in the class in which the officer is serving at the time the increase would be due; and (4) to clarify the language relating to increases for meritorious services.

When within-class increases are made effective on July 1 of each year, a pay period is nearly always split, unnecessarily complicating the payroll operation. Under present law, when an officer is promoted to a higher class in October of a given year, he would not have 9 months in class by the following July 1 and would therefore not be eligible until July 1 of the second year following class

---

PART B—TRAVEL AND RELATED

Existing legislation

SEC. 911. The Secretary may, under such regulations as he shall prescribe, pay—

The purpose of the proposed amendment of the first sentence of section 911 to add the phrase "including prepayment on a commuted basis" is to grant the Secretary authority to simplify existing procedures incident to Foreign Service travel. Present laws and related regulations pertaining to the travel of personnel and the transportation of their effects do not allow the adoption of simplified procedures which would result in lower costs to administer the Foreign Service travel and transportation system.

To achieve its goal of streamlining administrative operations, the Department must thoroughly revamp its present travel system to eliminate the excessive number of obligating, vouchering and auditing actions generated by Foreign Service travel. The man-hours spent in providing travel assistance to employees, obtaining and evaluating bids for packing and shipping services, issuing Government bills of lading, supervising shipments being sent and received, collecting from employees for excess weights shipped and settling claims represent undue effort and expense which can be curtailed sharply or, in some cases, eliminated by adoption of the commuted travel program.

Approval of the required legislation would permit the Department to prepay on a commuted basis, all costs in connection with fares and shipments of unaccompanied air and surface baggage, as well as household effects, thus overcoming the prohibition on advance of public moneys contained in 31 U.S.C. 529. The cost of each trip would be computed in advance and a single voucher would be processed to effect payment to the

SERVICE OFFICERS AND RESERVE OFFICERS

Proposed legislation—**Continued**

a continuous period of fifty-two calendar weeks or more, shall, at the beginning of the next pay period, receive an increase in salary to the next higher rate for the class in which he is serving. Without regard to any other law, the Secretary is authorized to grant to a Foreign Service officer or a Reserve officer additional increases in salary, within the salary range established for the class in which he is serving, based upon especially meritorious service.

---

promotion. By providing for increases after a specified period of 52 calendar weeks, each officer serves the same length of time in class before his first within-class increase. For example: an officer was promoted to FSO-4, on October 8, 1962; under the present system he would not be eligible for within-class increase on July 1, 1963, but would receive a within-class increase on July 1, 1964; under the proposed system he would receive the within-class increase on October 14, 1963.

Under present interpretation, service as an FSR is not credited toward a within-class increase in an FSO class. This has resulted in unjustified delay for an FSR when later appointed as an FSO. Substitution of the phrase "a Foreign Service officer or a Reserve" for the word "such" in existing language is a technical clarification that relates the granting of meritorious service increases directly with Foreign Service officers and Foreign Service Reserve officers. This change eliminates the unintended implication in the present language that such increases relate to those officers who have been in class for a specified period of time.

EXPENSES—GENERAL PROVISIONS

Proposed legislation

SEC. 911. The Secretary may, under such regulations as he shall prescribe, pay, including prepayment on a commuted basis—

---

traveler prior to the commencement of the journey. Provision would be made for a supplemental payment to cover unusual circumstances such as strikes and acts of God affecting travel beyond the control of the traveler. The traveler would be responsible for making arrangements for his personal travel and for the transportation of his effects, in accordance with pertinent laws and regulations concerning the use of American-flag carriers, American airlines, and other American companies.

The isolated location of many Foreign Service posts, inadequate packing and transportation facilities in some areas of the world, as well as other factors having a direct bearing on a worldwide program of this kind, will cause implementation of the commuted travel plan to proceed slowly. It is estimated that, because of abrupt and unannounced changes in tariffs, unstable rates of exchange and other variables, this plan would not be usable for 20 percent of the transfer cases involving Foreign Service personnel. On the other hand, it is quite possible that it would be valid for the other 80 percent of transfer cases and the potential savings in terms of reduced paperwork would be sizable. These savings, which are not definitive and must be projected over a period of several years, could result in a cumulative reduction in costs to the Government. The initial effort would concentrate on those areas where costs can be established and verified readily.

Approval of legislation permitting establishment of a commuted travel program for Foreign Service travel would result in more effective utilization of available manpower and simplified transportation management.

Existing legislation	*Proposed legislation*
SEC. 911. (1) the travel expenses of officers and employees of the Service, including expenses incurred while traveling pursuant to orders issued by the Secretary in accordance with the provisions of section 933 with regard to the granting of home leave;	SEC. 911. (1) the travel expenses of officers and employees of the Service, including expenses incurred while traveling pursuant to orders issued by the Secretary authorizing annual leave at their homes upon reassignment to the United States after service abroad or in accordance with the provisions of section 933 with regard to the granting of home leave;

The purpose of this amendment is to permit travel to a place of residence in the United States for annual leave when an officer or employee is to be assigned to duty in the United States following duty abroad. Current authority provides for transportation to a place of residence, under such circumstances, only for home leave.

At present an officer or employee is granted home leave after a foreign assignment and before an assignment in the United States if he has completed 18 to 36 months, depending upon his post of assignment, continuous service abroad. Such leave is not necessary from the viewpoint of acquainting the officer or employee with circumstances in his own country to make him a better representative abroad. His assignment in the United States will accomplish that purpose. It is the Department's belief, however, that an employee is entitled to earned home leave after a tour of duty at certain hardship posts and that he should be given an opportunity for such leave before entering on duty for a departmental assignment. On the other hand, an officer or employee who has not served at a hardship post may upon return to the United States need a shorter period of leave in order to refresh himself and his family and to attend to private affairs (putting children in college, visiting aged parents, settling estates, etc.) before taking on a Washington assignment. For such purposes a relatively brief period of annual leave will normally be granted personnel returning from nonhardship posts.

It is therefore proposed that transportation for visits to the home leave address following a foreign assignment and before entering upon a U.S. assignment be paid for by the Government, but that the period of leave be shortened by allowing only annual leave for those on transfer to the United States from posts where living and working conditions have not imposed any particular hardship. Annual leave would be charged for the officer or employee's absence from the time he would have arrived had he made a direct journey from his post to Washington or from the time he arrives at his home leave address which ever is sooner until the time he actually arrives in Washington. However, he will be entitled to actual or constructive travel costs and to per diem for the time that would have been spent in travel status on direct travel to his home leave address. Home leave upon return to the United States for assignment in the Department will normally be granted only after an officer or employee has completed a tour of duty at a post which has been designated a hardship post for rest and recuperation purposes.

Existing legislation	*Proposed legislation*
SEC. 911. (2) the travel expenses of members of the family of an officer or employee of the Service when proceeding to or returning from his post of duty; accompanying him on authorized home leave; or otherwise traveling in accordance with authority granted pursuant to the terms of this or any other Act;	SEC. 911. (2) the travel expenses of members of the family of an officer or employee of the Service when proceeding to or returning from his post of duty; accompanying him on authorized travel to his home on annual leave when he is reassigned to the United States or on authorized home leave; accompanying him for representational purposes on authorized travel within the country of his assignment or, at the discretion of the Secretary, outside the country of his assignment; of otherwise traveling in accordance with authority granted pursuant to the terms of this or any other Act;

Section 911(2) is being amended with respect to travel on annual leave when an officer is reassigned to the United States to conform with the proposed amendment in section 911(1). Further, a new provision is being added to section 911(2) to authorize dependents of Foreign Service officers and employees to accompany them for representational purposes on authorized travel within the country of their assignment or at the discretion of the Secretary outside the country of their assignment.

Experience has shown that representation is frequently conducted more successfully by a man-and-wife team than by an officer alone, and in the case of single or widowed officers, when accompanied by a sister or other adult relative who normally acts as hostess. This has become increasingly significant with the improving status of women in societies throughout the world. In the past, when members of an officer's family have accompanied him on official trips the representational benefit to the United States has frequently been pronounced. The Department does not believe officers should be required to bear this additional expense when the travel of members of family is in the public interest.

Existing legislation	*Proposed legislation*
SEC. 911. (8) [the cost of preparing and transporting to their former homes in the continental United States or to a place not more distant, the remains of an officer or employee of the Service who is a citizen of the United States and of the members of his family who may die abroad or while in travel status:]	SEC. 911. (8) the cost of preparing and transporting to their former homes, or to such other place in the United States as may be determined to be the appropriate place or to a place not more distant than their former homes, for interment the remains of an officer or employee of the Service who is a citizen of the

Existing legislation—Continued

Proposed legislation—Continued

United States and of the members of his family who may die while the officer or employee is in the Service.

The current provision relating to the transportation of remains of officers and employees of the Service and members of their families is limited to transportation to their former homes or to a place not more distant. Experience has shown that the family burial plot and the place of residence is not always the same. When the cost of the shipment of the remains to such a place is in excess of the cost of shipment to the former home, the difference in cost cannot be paid by the Government. The proposed amendment would permit in appropriate cases the transportation of such remains at Government expense to former homes or to any other place considered appropriate, such as a family burial plot or national cemetery anywhere in the United States.

The proposed amendment will also correct an inconsistency in existing authority relating to the transportation of remains of employees and members of their families. When an employee or dependent dies abroad or while in travel status, the remains, the family, and their effects are transported to their place of residence in the United States; if an employee or dependent dies while in the United States but not in travel status, the family and effects may be transported but not the remains. This amendment will make it possible to transport the remains of employees or dependents who die while in the Service, wherever stationed, to an appropriate place of interment anywhere in the United States.

PART B—TRAVEL AND RELATED EXPENSES

Existing legislation

See part C, section 921(d).

Proposed legislation

Use of Government-owned or leased vehicles

SEC. 914. Notwithstanding the provisions of section 5 of the Act of July 16, 1914, as amended (5 U.S.C. 78) the Secretary may authorize any principal officer to approve the use of Government-owned or leased vehicles located at his post for transportation of United States Government employees and their dependents when public transportation is unsafe or not available.

The basic langauge in new section 914 is being taken from existing section 921(d) which is being deleted because reference to use of Government-owned vehicles for the transportation of employees or dependents does not belong under the heading "Commissary services." The existing provisions in this section make it possible for the Secretary to authorize any principal officer to approve the use of Government-owned vehicles located at his post for the transportation of U.S. Government employees who are American citizens and their dependents to and from recreation facilities when public transportation is unsafe or is not available.

The provision authorizing the use of Government-owned transportation to and from recreational facilities has been a useful one but there are many instances over and beyond this need where, in the interest of the safety of the adult and minor dependents of Foreign Service personnel, Government transportation must be used. In many of the newly opened posts in Africa, in certain Asian posts and in the curtain countries, public transportation facilities, if they exist, cannot be considered a safe means of travel for women and children. In fact, in some areas it is not considered safe for an unescorted woman to drive herself or her children on the public thoroughfares, whatever may be the purpose of the travel. Further, in these difficult areas there are certain social functions which for representational purposes our officers and employees and their wives must attend. In many instances, in addition to the absence of safe public transportation privately owned vehicles cannot be left unattended on the streets.

Moreover, in some Foreign Service posts where adequate schools exist for providing elementary and secondary educational services for dependents of U.S. Government employees public transportation facilities to and from such schools are not available or are inadequate.

Government-owned vehicles are available at all posts abroad. They are not necessarily in use constantly for official transportation yet they must be maintained and held in readiness for such use. The principal officer at a post where transportation facilities are unavailable or unsafe should be able to use, in his discretion, facilities that are available to him for whatever purpose they may be needed to provide transportation for employees and their dependents. It is for this reason that the Department seeks the broader authority provided in the new section 914. This section also has been changed to authorize the use of leased vehicles as well as Government-owned ones since there are posts where it is more economical for the Department to lease a few vehicles on a part-time basis rather than to purchase and maintain a full quota of Government-owned vehicles.

PART C—COMMISSARY SERVICE

Existing legislation

SEC. 921. [(d) Notwithstanding the provisions of section 5 of the Act of July 16, 1914, as amended (5 U.S.C. 78) the Secretary may authorize any principal officer to approve the use of Government-owned vehicles located at his post for transportation of United States Government employees who are American citizens, and their dependents, to and from recreation facilities when public transportation is unsafe or is not available.]

Proposed legislation

Section 921(d) is repealed since this section has been revised and restated as new **section 914.**

Existing legislation

No existing legislation.

The purpose of this amendment is to simplify the procedure for reimbursing, within limits, Foreign Service personnel who suffer property loss incident to service abroad.

The lack of political stability in a number of areas of the world where Foreign Service personnel are stationed, and the incidence of civil disturbance, riot, arson and sundry threats to the property of such personnel have made it certain that the U.S. Government will be presented from year to year with legitimate claims.

Past experience indicates that hasty evacuation of a post in the face of hostilities leads almost inevitably to personal property losses. When Seoul was evacuated in 1950, 24 hours ahead of its takeover by the advancing North Korean Army, American Embassy personnel were evacuated by plane and saved only what they wore and what they could put into one suitcase.

At the present time the Department's Foreign Service Claim Board, operating under administrative regulations, considers

---

Existing legislation

No existing legislation.

The Department is requesting the authority contained in new section 1081 because over and above existing general authority for aid to education abroad, the Secretary needs to be able to supplement the existing channels of assistance to schools in those instances where none of the existing statutory authorities enable him to insure adequate education for the children of Government employees abroad.

There is existing legislative authority for several types of aid to education abroad. First, two useful and far-reaching programs, but ones that are not designed to meet the needs of children of Government employees abroad, are those which provide demonstration centers in foreign countries to display American educational techniques primarily

Proposed legislation

Part F—Claims

SEC. 1051. The Secretary may, under such regulations as he shall prescribe, settle and pay claims arising after date of enactment of this section against the United States Government for damage to, or loss of, personal property incident to his service of any officer or employee of the Service in a sum not to exceed $6,500 for a single claim, or replace property in kind: *Provided*, That a claim may be allowed under this section only if: (i) the officer or employee of the Service establishes that insurance was not obtainable at reasonable cost or was unobtainable for the risk from which the damage or loss resulted; (ii) it is presented in writing within two years after the damage or loss occurs; (iii) it did not occur at quarters occupied by the claimant within the fifty States or the District of Columbia that were not assigned to him or otherwise provided in kind by the United States; and (iv) such loss or damage occurs without fault or negligence on the part of the claimant or member of his family. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, a settlement of a claim pursuant to this section shall be final and conclusive.

---

claims for noninsurable losses incurred by Foreign Service employees as a result of emergency conditions and recommends approved cases to the Congress for settlement under private bills. For losses sustained since the evacuation of personnel from Seoul, Korea, in June 1950, 15 claims have been approved by the Claim Board, 11 of which have been settled under four separate private laws approved by the 83d, 85th and 86th Congresses. Four of the fifteen cases were recommended to the 2d session, 87th Congress, for reimbursement. No action was taken on these claims prior to adjournment of that session of the Congress.

The proposed amendment would provide a permanent vehicle for the quick settlement of legitimate claims, thus enabling personnel who have suffered losses to replace them, at least in part.

This proposal would be similar to authority presently vested in the Secretary to settle tort claims abroad involving State Department operations.

Proposed legislation

Part I—Grants to Schools

SEC. 1081. Notwithstanding any other law, the Secretary is authorized to make grants of funds in lieu of or as supplementary to education allowances, for assistance in the establishment, construction, expansion, maintenance, and operation of schools outside the United States, whenever he determines such grant of funds is necessary in order to provide suitable education for children of employees stationed in a foreign area.

---

for the benefit of the local population. The programs are under the direction, respectively, of State's Bureau of Educational and Cultural Relations and of AID. Although in some few instances these programs provide benefits to children of Government employees abroad when no more suitable arrangement can be made, the use for such purposes is extremely limited.

Legislative authority exists for two kinds of aid to schools attended primarily by dependents of Government employees. These, however, are primarily of benefit to the dependents of military and AID personnel. One is the military dependents' school system which is concentrated in areas where troops are stationed. The other is the new authority in section 636 (c) and (d) of the AID legislation which authorizes assistance to schools for dependents of Government employees in areas where the AID program is operating.

A third major kind of assistance in education is that provided in 1955 through which educational allowances may be granted to parents to defray the costs of obtaining an adequate education for their children. Valuable as this program is, it is not the complete answer. It is dependent upon the existence of adequate educational facilities and the willingness of local educators and the officials of the host government to cooperate. Where no adequate facilities exist or where there is opposition to the participation of the dependents of U.S. Government employees in existing systems, educational needs can be met best by capital grants.

With the requested new authority in the Foreign Service Act, the Secretary will be able to supplement the existing channels of assistance to schools in those instances, as in Iron Curtain countries, where none of the existing statutory authorities can meet the need.

The Secretary of State needs authority to supplement existing educational facilities or to provide new ones where they are not available through the grant of funds over and above existing legislative authority which cannot meet the needs for educational services to dependent children in certain areas. This amendment will provide stopgap legislation to be used only on a very limited basis until total legislation can be developed on aid for education for dependents of employees of all civilian agencies overseas.

TO AMEND THE UNITED NATIONS PARTICIPATION ACT, AS AMENDED

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, by request I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to amend the United Nations Participation Act of 1945, as amended by Public Law 341, 81st Congress, October 10, 1949, to grant the President wider discretion in the assignment of top level personnel of the U.S. mission to the United Nations, including their rank and status as ambassadors or ministers, and to give the U.S. representative discretion to assign these top representatives to the various organs of the United Nations in accordance with workload and other considerations; to authorize the President to appoint a U.S. representative to the European office of the United Nations and other international organizations; and to authorize payment of a housing allowance to certain officers assigned to the U.S. mission to the United Nations.

The proposed legislation has been requested by the Secretary of State, and I am introducing it in order that there may be a specific bill to which Members of the Senate and the public may direct their attention and comments.

I reserve my right to support or oppose this bill, as well as any suggested amendments to it, when the matter is considered by the Committee on Foreign Relations.

I ask unanimous consent that the bill may be printed in the RECORD at this point, together with the letter from the Secretary of State dated February 12, 1963, to the Vice President in regard to it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill and letter will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 949) to amend the United Nations Participation Act, as amended (63 Stat. 734–736), introduced by Mr. FULBRIGHT, by request, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That subsections (a), (b), and (d) of the United Nations Participation Act of 1945, as amended by Public Law 341, Eighty-first Congress, October 10, 1949, are hereby further amended to read as follows:

"(a) The President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, shall appoint a representative of the United States to the United Nations who shall have the rank and status of Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary and shall hold office at the pleasure of the President. Such representative shall represent the United States in the Security Council of the United Nations and may serve ex officio as representative of the United States in any organ, commission, or other body of the United Nations other than specialized agencies of the United Nations, and shall perform such other functions in connection with the participation of the United States in the United Nations as the President may, from time to time direct.

"(b) The President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, shall appoint additional persons with appropriate titles, rank, and status to represent the United States in the principal organs of the United Nations and in such organs, commissions, or other bodies as may be created by the United Nations with respect to nuclear energy or disarmament (control and limitation of armament). Such persons shall serve at the pleasure of the President and subject to the direction of the representative of the United States to the United Nations. They shall, at the direction of the representative of the United States to the United Nations, represent the United States in any organ, commission, or other body of the United Nations, including the Security Council, the Economic and Social Council, and the Trusteeship Council, and perform such other functions as the representative of the United States is authorized to perform in connection with the participation of the United States in the United Nations. Any deputy representative or any other officer holding office at the time the provisions of this Act, as amended, become effective shall not be required to be reappointed by reason of the enactment of this Act, as amended.

"(d) the President may also appoint from time to time such other persons as he may deem necessary to represent the United States in organs and agencies of the United Nations. The President may, without the advice and consent of the Senate, designate any officer of the United States to act without additional compensation as the representative of the United States in either the Economic and Social Council or the Trusteeship Council (1) at any specified session thereof where the position is vacant or in the absence or disability of the regular representative or (2) in connection with a specified subject matter at any specified session of either such Council in lieu of the regular representative. The President may designate any officer of the Department of State, whose appointment is subject to confirmation by the Senate, to act, without additional compensation, for temporary periods as the representative of the United States in the Security Council of the United Nations in the absence or disability of the representatives provided for under section 2 (a) and (b) or in lieu of such representatives in connection with a specified subject matter."

SEC. 2. Section 2 of such Act is hereby further amended by redesignating subsections (e) and (f) to be subsections (f) and (g) respectively; and by adding after subsection (d) the following new subsection:

"(e) The President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, shall appoint a Representative of the United States to the European Office of the United Nations with appropriate rank and status who shall serve at the pleasure of the President and subject to the direction of the Secretary of State. Such person shall, at the direction of the Secretary of State, represent the United States at the European Office of the United Nations, and perform such other functions there in connection with the participation of the United States in International Organizations as the Secretary of State may, from time to time, direct."

SEC. 3. Such Act is hereby amended by inserting after section 8 the following new section:

"SEC. 9. The President may, under such regulations as he shall prescribe and notwithstanding the provisions of sections 1765 and 3648 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (5 U.S.C. 75; 31 U.S.C. 529), grant certain officers having important representation responsibilities as determined by the Representative of the United States to the United Nations, an allowance adequate to defray the additional housing costs necessitated by such representational responsibilities during the period such officer is assigned for duty in the continental United States as a member of the United States Mission to the United Nations."

The letter presented by Mr. FULBRIGHT is as follows:

FEBRUARY 12, 1963.

DEAR MR. VICE PRESIDENT: I submit herewith a proposed draft amendment to the United Nations Participation Act of 1945, as amended by Public Law 341, 81st Congress, October 10, 1949, to grant the President wider discretion in the assignment of top level personnel of the U.S. mission to the United Nations, including their rank and status as ambassadors or ministers, and to give the U.S. representatives discretion to assign these top representatives to the various organs of the United Nations in accordance with workload and other considerations; to authorize the President to appoint a U.S. representative to the European Office of the United Nations and other international organizations; and to authorize payment of a housing allowance to certain officers assigned to the U.S. mission to the United Nations.

The United Nations Participation Act now authorizes a representative and a deputy representative of the United States at the United Nations, both of whom shall have the rank and status of Envoy Extraordinary and Ambassador Plenipotentiary. In addition, another deputy representative to the Security Council is authorized and the President also may appoint, from time to time, such other persons as he may deem necessary to represent the United States in the agencies of the United Nations including the Economic and Social Council and the Trusteeship Council.

Ambassador Stevenson has found this to be unnecessarily rigid and it is proposed that the provisions specifying the number and the role of the deputies and their diplomatic titles be deleted. In lieu thereof, the proposed amendment would authorize the President to appoint such additional persons with appropriate title, rank, and status as he deems necessary to represent the United States in the principal organs of the United Nations. In addition, these officers would, at the direction of the U.S. representative to the United Nations, represent the United States in any organ, commission, or other body of the United Nations including the Security Council, the Economic and Social Council, and the Trusteeship Council and perform such other functions as the U.S. representative is authorized to perform.

These changes will permit the U.S. representative to organize his staff and assign their duties as he deems necessary to accomplish his mission effectively. In the case of the two deputy representatives, Ambassador Stevenson has in mind that they should be alter-egos of the U.S. representative and available to represent the United States in any way in which he himself is able to do so. Although the proposed amendment gives the U.S. representative greater flexibility in determining assignments, it remains appropriate for an individual who was to be appointed, for example, to spend most of his time on the Economic and Social Council, to be appointed as representative to that Council, and that the Senate in advising and consenting on his appointment would consider primarily his ability and qualifications to fulfill those duties. This, however, would be on the understanding that if the U.S. representative to the United Nations found it desirable to utilize him temporarily as representative to one of the other organs, he would be in a position to do so.

The amendment also provides that persons who would represent the United States in the principal organs of the United Nations, including bodies that may be created by the United Nations with respect to nuclear energy or disarmament would be appointed subject to the advice and consent of the Senate. Persons appointed to represent the United States in other organs, commissions, and bodies of the United Nations would not require the advice and consent of the Senate.

It is not intended that enactment of this amendment would necessitate the reappointment of any person holding office at the time of its enactment.

The United States maintains a mission to the European office of the United Nations and other international organizations at Geneva. Geneva has become increasingly important as the site of many international conferences and organizations, and the responsibilities of our mission there have increased commensurately. Therefore, it is proposed in this amendment that the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, shall be authorized to appoint a representative of the United States to the European office of the United Nations with appropriate rank and status who shall serve at the pleasure of the President and subject to the direction of the Secretary of State. In addition to representing the United States at the European office of the United Nations, such person shall perform such other functions in connection with the participation of the United States in international organizations as the Secretary of State may direct.

The proposed amendment to provide a housing allowance for officers of the U.S. mission in New York is to remove the anomaly resulting from the location in the United States of the United Nations. The functions performed by the officers are identical to those performed by officers in similar positions in our Foreign Service missions abroad. However, the quarters allowances authorized by law to our representatives to foreign countries and to international organizations whose headquarters are located outside the United States are not paid to members of the U.S. mission to the United Nations.

The United States, as the host nation, can expect and must respond to the many opportunities for the effective social intercourse of representational activities. Foreign delegations look upon the U.S. mission to the United Nations as bearing a special responsibility in this area, and they expect to be invited to the homes of the members of the mission. Officers assigned to the U.S. mission are expected to maintain private living quarters in the vicinity of the United Nations in order to discharge their representational responsibilities more effectively for the convenience, and in the interest, of the Government. These representational duties are for the most part discharged outside office hours, this being an obligation not imposed on other Federal Government officers stationed in New York.

The expansion of the United Nations to the present total of 110 countries has greatly increased our responsibilities as host government. The problem of making known our Government's policies and determining the policies of the other governments has become of paramount importance. One of the most effective means of doing this is at small social gatherings; but in the past our contacts with other delegates have tended to be largely limited to public meetings, to corridor encounters and hasty restaurant luncheons. It is my firm belief that the personal type of representation, which is least expensive in the long run, brings about a greater understanding between our officers and their colleagues. It allows for creation of a family interest and an exchange of divergent views in the relaxed surroundings of a private American home, which make a pleasant and sympathetic atmosphere for diplomacy. Such entertainment creates good will and does not leave the impression that we are only concerned with immediate and pressing problems in the United Nations. Unfortunately, most of our officers assigned to the mission in New York have not generally been able to carry out their duties in such atmosphere. The reason is that they would be subjected to considerable personal expense in maintaining quarters adequate for such representational purposes.

A major portion of the representational functions in the past have been held in public places, with the exception of those held in Ambassador Stevenson's apartment at the Waldorf. His quarters are, as you know, rented by the Government. Although he is able to bring together the mission's officers and delegates of the foreign missions at representational functions at his suite, it is not the same as these officers entertaining their counterparts in their own homes. A very limited number of our officers, using their personal funds, have been financially able to consider this problem of representation in renting adequate apartments in Manhattan. On the other hand, most of our officers have not been able to assume this added expense and either rent small apartments in Manhattan of inadequate size for representation activities, or have found it necessary to live in the suburbs where such activities are very difficult. For this reason, some of the effectiveness of these officers is lost to the mission. They themselves are placed at a disadvantage with respect to their opposite numbers in other delegations who are receiving rental allowances and the other additional compensations usually enjoyed by diplomats serving abroad.

There is need for a new allowance to defray the added costs which certain officers of the U.S. mission are forced to incur if they are to obtain and maintain housing that is adequate for the proper discharge of their representational duties. The amount of this allowance would represent the difference between cost of adequate representational housing and the cost of housing which an officer concerned would have if he had no representational responsibilities. We intend to limit eligibility to those officers having more than usual representational responsibilities, and the total cost for their housing allowances would be approximately $60,000 per annum.

The submission of this proposed legislation has been approved by the Bureau of Budget as being consistent with the administration's objectives.

Sincerely yours,

DEAN RUSK.

AMENDMENT OF AGRICULTURAL ADJUSTMENT ACT

Mr. HART. Mr. President, I send to the desk and ask for its appropriate reference a bill to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act.

This bill would authorize, but not make mandatory, the assignment of class I bases among dairy farmers within a Federal milk marketing order in a manner reflecting the actual utilization of fluid milk within the given market. The essential purpose of this proposal is to authorize the producers within a marketing order to receive payment for their class I fluid milk in line with their actual base and a surplus price for production in excess of their base.

Under the present Federal order program unfortunately there is an incentive to the producer to continue expansion of his production because he is rewarded through a blend price for milk production which goes into manufacturing uses. Thus surplus milk from the Federal order markets floods the manufacturing markets and eventually results in substantial surplus accumulation under the support program.

I realize that this proposal leaves substantially unanswered one of the difficult problems regarding this class I base plan, namely a means of orderly sale or transfer of bases from one producer to another. Hearings on this and related proposals will be necessary to develop sound answer to this problem. It is possible that such a plan could operate for 1 or 2 years before we find the best manner in which to provide for such transfers or sales. I am hopeful that all concerned with the future wellbeing of the dairy producer will contribute to perfecting this proposal during the hearings in order that Congress can enact sound legislation before the close of the present session.

The bill which I introduce today is essentially the proposal suggested by the National Milk Producers Federation, which proposal has received the endorsement of the Michigan Milk Producers Association.

I ask unanimous consent that there be printed at this point in my remarks a copy of the resolution adopted by the Michigan Milk Producers Association, the text of the bill, a memorandum explaining the bill, and comments which I made on this subject at the annual meeting of the Michigan Allied Dairy Association in Detroit on February 13.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill, resolution, memorandum, and comments will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 953) to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act, as reenacted and amended by the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, as amended, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. HART, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Agricultural Adjustment Act, as reenacted and amended by the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, as amended, is further amended by adding at the end of section 8(c)(5) the following new subparagraph (H):

"(H) Allocating, or providing a method for allocating, to each producer under a marketing order a percentage of total sales, as defined in the order, in any one or more use classifications higher than the lowest priced use classification which percentage shall be determined by relating total deliveries of milk accounted for under the order made by each such producer during a representative period, as determined in the order, to such total sales during such representative period, due allowance being made, in the provisions of the order, for abnormal conditions, hardship cases, and new producers, including new producers thereafter entering the market. Such allocations may be adjusted from time to time, or new allocations may be made, by amending the order. The provisions of this subparagraph may be applied notwithstanding subparagraphs 8c(5) (B) and 8c(5)(G). Regulations and order provisions under this subparagraph shall be applied equitably among producers and among handlers and may provide for the effective application of such allocations to such sales made by any handler. All of the remedies available to handlers under section 8c(15) shall be available to producers for the purposes of this subsection. Order provisions under this subparagraph shall not become effective in any marketing order unless separately approved by producers in the same manner provided for the approval of marketing orders. Disapproval of order provisions under this subparagraph shall not be considered disapproval of the order or of other terms of the order. Order provisions under this subparagraph may be terminated by separate vote in the same manner provided for the termination of marketing orders. In the case of marketing orders calling for individual handler pools under subparagraph 8c(5)(B)(i), the allocations provided for herein may be applied to each handler and to the producers delivering milk to such handler."

The resolution, memorandum, and comments presented by Mr. HART, are as follows:

RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY MICHIGAN MILK PRODUCERS ASSOCIATION

GOVERNMENT FARM PROGRAMS

(a) National milk production quotas administered by the Federal Government provide no assurance of any improvement in dairy farmers' net income. They would be regid and inflexible and would deprive dairy farmers of any voice in their administration or interpretation to meet local conditions. We, therefore, oppose national production quotas.

(b) We believe dairy farmers' net income can best be protected by continuation of the present price support program providing for not less than 75 percent of parity. We direct our association to vigorously support retention of this program as provided by the Agricultural Act of 1949.

(c) We favor amending the Agricultural Marketing Act to permit the use of transferable class I bases administered under the Federal milk order program. We believe that such class I base programs should be made effective only after separate producer referendum.

Sincerely yours,

GLENN LAKE,
President.

DAIRYMEN'S CLASS I BASE PLAN

The proposed legislation further amends the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, as amended. This bill in no way changes the presently authorized provisions of Federal milk marketing orders, nor does it change the statute as applied to other commodities.

The bill authorizes, but does not require, the assignment of bases reflecting an allocation of fluid-milk utilization among dairy farmers supplying any given market under a Federal order.

The purpose of the bill is to make it possible for a fluid-milk producer, upon his own option, to deliver his allocation of the market's requirements (plus necessary reserve) and to receive a price for such deliveries closely related to the class I price.

Under present methods of pooling returns among farmers, each dairy farmer receives an average or blend price for all his milk deliveries with no distinction made between the part representing fluid-milk sales at the class I price and the part representing surplus milk at the manufacturing milk price. Under this system the actions of any dairy farmer to balance his production with market requirements for class I fluid milk are thwarted by the fact that his production is only a very minor part of the total market purchases and the loss of his production in total would not affect the market statistics.

This bill would not increase consumer prices for milk. It would encourage reduction of the national milk surplus, and thus serve to reduce the cost of supporting prices paid dairy farmers. Of greatest significance, however, the provisions of this bill would permit a dairy farmer to sell fluid milk at a price closely related to the class I price without forcing him to take an average price because other dairy farmers increased production or continued to market surplus milk.

Base plans which have been used under Federal orders are intended only to effect a leveling of production on a seasonal basis over a single year period. Such bases are established on production history alone, usually for a short period (few months), and are not related to market requirements. To the extent that the total of such bases exceeds market requirements, as is often the case, base prices paid become average prices and are subject to the same objections as market blend prices. This bill is intended to relate the total of bases to the market's requirements—production leveling would be a resultant byproduct, not the primary objective.

The dairymen's class I base plan provides opportunity for a new method for distributing the money in the producer pool as defined in a particular order to the producers eligible to receive payment from that pool under the terms of that order. The amount of money in the producer pool of any order is determined by the specific terms of that order as to class prices, pool plant qualification, producer definition, and use allocation—not by producer base rules.

Any base established entitles the holder of such base to a pro rata share of class I sales upon which he can rely and to which he can adjust his individual production. Such base becomes an approximate limit upon the amount of milk for which the producer can expect to receive a price above the surplus price. It is, however, a limit upon that portion of his production on which he may receive the higher price—it is not a limit upon his total production. The effect upon production of such a program would be to eliminate the incentive which blend pricing affords by offering the blend or average price for additional milk which has only a surplus value. The blend price exerts a direct effect upon the supply of milk. This is the price the producer receives for any and all deliveries. This plan is designed to change such an effect. It is intended to reflect to producers the class prices which the market returns as the value for the various uses of milk. The producer would then make production decisions based on two different prices—free of the effects of actions which other producers may take. It is designed to let supply and demand work, without the obscuring effects of blend pricing.

In some markets milk supplies in relation to fluid milk requirements are in better balance than in other markets. This bill makes the adoption of the base plan permissive on an individual market order basis. Adoption of a base plan may necessitate a review of the interpretation of the pricing standards under the act, and place a different emphasis upon other terms of the act.

1. What are the objectives of this plan?

The principal objectives are to (1) eliminate the basic defect of blend pricing which returns to milk producers a price higher than the manufacturing milk price for deliveries in excess of the requirements for fluid milk products, (2) permit individual producers to produce in line with market requirements for fluid milk products without having their prices reduced by present surplus or increased production of other producers, (3) provide individual producers an opportunity to increase net income, and (4) reduce the national dairy surplus and the cost to taxpayers of the dairy support price program.

2. Is this plan production control?

No. It does not limit any producer to any maximum quantity of milk he is allowed to produce or sell. It does not place any physical limitations on the number of cows he may keep. It does not limit in any way any factor of production or sale of milk. It allows producers in a given market, at their own option, to receive a price for base milk related to the class I price, and a lower price related to manufacturing milk value for any milk in excess of base sold, instead of a single blended price for all milk.

3. How can this plan be expected to reduce the dairy surplus?

Reduction of the national dairy surplus is one of the principal objectives of the dairymen's class I base plan. The plan can be expected to accomplish this in a number of ways:

(a) By reducing the incentive to produce surplus milk under the Federal order program. Approximately half of the milk produced in the country is marketed under Federal milk orders. Under some of these orders there is now a high degree of surplus. Under others there is only a moderate amount. Under still others there is no surplus. The base plan would allow each market to establish surplus reducing incentive in line with the degree of surplus existing in each respective market—be it a lot or a little. Several Federal order markets now have a surplus of 10–25 percent or more and have blended prices of $4 per hundredweight or more and a surplus class price of approximately $3. The base plan would discourage production of surplus by reducing the price paid for surplus production from $4 or more per hundredweight to about $3.

(b) By relieving producers of the pressure they are now under to continually produce more milk, hence, more surplus, as the only available means of maintaining the size of their milk checks to keep up with increasing production costs. The single blend price system we have now penalizes a producer who might try to keep production in line with his share of the class I market. The penalty is in the form of a lower blended price caused by the increased surplus production of other producers. His only recourse is to engage in a surplus production race with his neighbor. The base plan, by treating each producer as an individual relative to his production and his market, frees each producer from this penalty and the incentive to produce unneeded surplus milk. The result should be a reduction in surplus.

(c) By using the order to build into the market price structure incentives to adjust supply in line with class I demand. This is done by a number of interrelated factors, all of which aim in the general direction of supply-demand balance. Such incentives should operate toward a reduction of the Nation's dairy surplus.

4. What effect will base plans have on the cost of the national dairy support program?

Since the dairymen's class I base plan provides voluntary incentives to reduce production, it should reduce the surplus and in this way should reduce the cost of the support program. Such plan should result in reduced expenditures by the Congress.

5. What will this plan cost to administer?

The Federal order administrator's offices are set up and functioning. Many of them are already administering seasonal base plans. Administration of Federal milk orders has been competent and efficient since its inception. It is supported by the industry at no cost to the taxpayer as will be this program.

6. How does this plan avoid being a trade barrier?

First we must clarify the term "trade barrier." On the production side of the dairy industry the class I price for milk in any given milk market is never high enough to permit dairy farmers in every other part of the country to compete. This is because milk's natural characteristics result in high cost of transportation, thereby giving a natural advantage to dairy farmers nearby a given market. This is why class I prices decrease with distance from the market center and why class I prices vary among markets.

Reflection of natural characteristics of production and marketing through geographic variations in milk prices does not constitute a trade barrier. The dairymen's class I base plan is not a trade barrier. Only if a base plan in a particular order contained features which kept out milk from other supply areas to preserve an artificially high class I price or an artificially low surplus price would it be a trade barrier within the meaning of section 8c(5)(G) of the act, and such an effect is not intended.

7. Does the plan require any changes in language or interpretation of class I pricing standards of the act (sec. 8c18)?

Language—no; interpretation—yes. The pricing standards are as follows:

"The prices which it is declared to be the policy of Congress to establish * * * shall reflect the price of feeds, the available supplies of feeds, and other economic conditions which affect market supply and demand for milk or its products in the marketing area to which the contemplated marketing agreement, order, or amendment relates, insure a sufficient quantity of pure and wholesome milk, and be in the public interest (and) thereafter, as the Secretary finds necessary on account of changed circumstances, he shall, after due notice and opportunity for hearing, make adjustments in such prices."

The dairymen's class I base plan is designed to improve the application of supply-demand pricing now provided in the act. The phrase "other economic conditions" in the present standard makes it sufficiently broad to be properly applied to the base plan without change in language.

Certain changes in interpretation of the present standard from its past application to single blend pricing would be necessary. For example, the pricing standard has been interpreted to require automatic supply-demand adjusters in class I pricing formulas. The base plans provide incentives and opportunities to individual dairy farmers which are designed to improve upon this application of supply-demand pricing. For this reason, if a base plan is introduced, the necessity of retaining the supply-demand factor in the orders present class I price formula needs to be reevaluated.

With the task of obtaining a supply-demand balance in the order given over to some extent to the base plan, the general level of the class I price can reflect other objectives such as an equitable income goal for producers, changes in production costs, and costs of available alternative supplies of milk from other supply areas all of which may properly be considered encompassed in the phrase in the present pricing standard, "* * * other economic conditions * * *."

The various incentives among producers set in motion by a base plan particularly with respect to the market's milk supply, necessitate reinterpretation of the class I pricing standards of the act because supply-demand forces under the order will be influenced in a different manner than under present operations. For this reason they must be taken into account in a proper determination of what the class I price should be in conjunction with a base plan.

8. Does the plan require any changes in pricing milk used for manufacturing under Federal orders?

No. Under the plan milk marketed in excess of fluid milk requirements will be priced on the same basis as under the current orders. The lowest use class price must be at a level at which milk will be accepted for processing, and in line with nationwide values of manufactured dairy products. This class price in Federal orders now reflects national competitive forces affecting the supply of milk of dairy farmers delivered to manufacturing plants not regulated by Federal orders and the consumer demand for dairy products (butter, cheese, ice cream, evaporated milk, etc.) including the level of the price-support program. To the extent that the base plan becomes an inducement to producers to market less excess milk, thereby reducing the national dairy surplus, there might be some impact on prices in the manufacturing milk market. This in turn automatically would be reflected in the surplus class price under orders. This effect would be indirect. No amendments to surplus class price formulas should be required as a result of the base plan.

9. What effect would this plan have on the dairy price-support level?

In orders where the plan is adopted bases will be related to market requirements for fluid milk products, and the undesirable effects of blend pricing eliminated. The result should be a closer alinement of market supplies with market requirements. The plan does not provide for positive reduction in total supplies; but with closer adjustment to market requirements on a market-by-market basis, the pressure to reduce support prices will be relieved.

10. How would bases be applied?

There are a number of details involved in applying the necessary individual producer bases required by the plan.

There are a number of different ways that bases could be applied. One way would be to establish for each producer under an order a base expressed in pounds per day or per pooling period. These bases would be predicated upon deliveries during a prior representative period, adjusted to reflect the total fluid milk utilization of milk allocated to producers, plus a reasonable necessary reserve. These bases then could be projected 1 year in advance from a specified beginning date, which would be the first day of a given month. Then each month the Market Administrator would compute, as separate totals, all base milk and all milk in excess of base delivered to handlers by all producers under the order. He would first assign milk used in the lowest class to excess milk, and compute a blend price for base milk consisting of the weighted average class use value of the remaining milk in the pool. Each producer would be entitled to this base price for his base milk, and the lower class price for any excess.

Another way would be to have the plan optional in the sense that producers under a given order who so wished could apply for bases for their share of class I only, without other producers being required to have bases. Those who applied would have the market's class I milk assigned to their base first, and milk in the lowest price class assigned to their excess first. They would then be entitled to the class I price for base milk and only the lowest class price for their excess. For producers who did not apply for bases a single blended price would be computed from the remaining class uses of milk remaining unassigned to base or excess.

For orders where the plan is applied by requiring all producers to have a base, the bill allows for the inclusion within base of a reserve above actual sales of fluid milk products to cover the day-to-day and weekend variations in sales. This is expressed as a percentage above monthly average of sales. The percentage of reserve considered necessary is variously estimated among markets at between 10 and 25 percent of actual sales in the month of lowest production seasonally. The reserve milk is actually used for manufacturing in the lowest price for lack of a market in a higher priced class. The price for base milk where reserves are thus included in base will reflect some milk at the manufacturing price class ranging from the defined percentage of reserve in the shortest production month to higher proportions in the flush season to the extent of the seasonal range in the particular market.

The pooling procedure must also allow for the eventuality of all producers together delivering less base milk than the volume of class I sales, but with some individual producers delivering some excess.

11. What is the base period?

The representative period for determining bases should be a period preceding the date that the plan, ending as close to the start of the plan as possible. It may include all or portions of more than 1 year. Each market need not have the same base period years nor the same length of period. Factors which should guide the Secretary in his selection of the period for a given market should include local customs regarding any current base plan, desires of producers affected, past trends in market supply, abnormal conditions, shifts in supply sources, availability of data, etc. The computations necessarily require time which can be provided only by some lag between the base period and the time of application of bases.

12. How are bases determined and changed?

The bill provides for making due allowance for abnormal conditions and hardship cases.

These terms are meant to apply to the base period. If a producer's total deliveries in the base period were low due to an abnormal condition, he might be entitled to an adjustment in his base to offset the effect of the abnormal condition.

The allocation concept also includes the opportunity to adjust all bases periodically in line with changes in sales of the products on which the initial base allocations were made.

Another way that a given plan might allow all bases to be changed periodically (such as annually) would be the use of a 2-, 3-, 4-, or 5-year moving or rolling average base according to deliveries or a new base every year in the case of a 1-year base plan. In this way a producer's increase, or decrease, in deliveries each year would have an effect on his next year's base to the extent of 100 percent, 50 percent, 33⅓ percent, 25 percent, or 20 percent of the change depending on whether the base period is 1, 2, 3, 4, or 5 years long. If this type of automatic adjustment were allowed, it would also be necessary to refigure every year the percentage of total market deliveries to normal supply requirements and apply this percentage to prevent automatic base adjustment from getting the sum total of the market's bases out of line with normal supply requirements.

Another way that an individual producer could change the size of his base would be to obtain part or all of the base of another producer. (See more detailed explanation of this under "To what extent would bases be transferred.")

In summary the bill would provide for bases to be changed in a number of ways depending on the circumstances of individual producers and market conditions, with considerable flexibility allowed on each market to provide for changes to best meet its needs.

13. How does a new producer obtain a base?

The bill specifies that the sales allocation (base) must make "due allowance" for "new producers including new producers thereafter entering a market." This means that the plan must provide some means for new producers to obtain a base. This is one of the safeguards provided which would prevent any base plan under this bill from becoming a trade barrier. The particular procedure or basis for granting bases to new producers would depend on the particular local market situation, as developed in the required hearing. A number of different methods of accommodating new producers could be used, and should be allowed consideration, such as:

1. A small percentage of the total market's base to be set aside out of which new producers could be granted bases according to some prescribed performance rules.

2. A new producer to be allowed average market value (or some specified percentage thereof) for a period equal to the base period, after which he is given a base according to his deliveries.

3. New producers allowed to earn a base according to deliveries but required to take the excess price while earning a base.

4. New producers allowed to obtain bases from other producers.

14. To what extent would bases be transferable among producers?

The bill specifies no particular degree of transferability. All past experience with any type of base plan, for whatever purpose, and whether privately operated or under Government auspices, indicates a need for some degree of transferability. The tighter the base in terms of limitation of opportunity for adjustments, the greater the need for freedom of transferability and vice versa.

This is for the purpose of preventing a tight base plan from freezing producers to their production at some point in time in such a way that they are hampered from making future shifts in resource allocation to improve efficiency.

There is a need for limiting transfer of base to milk producers to avoid the abuse of their being acquired and hoarded for coercive purposes by anybody, particularly persons who are not milk producers.

On this detail of a base plan, as in any other described above, there is need for flexibility among orders.

15. To what extent would bases be transferable among markets?

Base allocations are claims upon the class I returns from a market to the producer milk delivered in that market. Ownership of a base on a particular market is of on value unless the holder delivers milk to that market. Individual producer bases are determined by deliveries of such producer during a predetermined representative period. The terms of each of the individual orders could recognize deliveries of producers transferring between markets.

16. In what way would a base plan affect intermarket movements of milk?

Base plans are not intended to encourage either more or less intermarket movements of milk. Intermarket class prices relationships, rules for pool participation and type of pool are the features of orders, along with the natural characteristics of milk production and marketing, which determine intermarket movements of milk. Since base plans are to be applied only to the producer milk under an order, any inshipments of other milk would not be affected by the base plan. Shifts of producers from one market to another would be affected by whatever rules the base plan provided for allowing new producers in a given order to obtain base, as explained in the answer to the question concerning transferability of bases.

17. Does the plan provide any maximum or minimum on individual bases?

No. The average size of producers varies among Federal order markets from less than 500 pounds of milk per day in some areas of highly diversified farming to more than 13,000 pounds per day in other markets where dairying is characterized by a few large feedlot type of milking herds. Because of these wide variations in production conditions, any base ceiling to be prescribed by the law would have to be so high as to be meaningless or else it would work a hardship and discriminate against the normal pattern of family farms in some areas. If any performance standard with respect to base sizes is needed, it could be considered in the hearing for a base plan for a given market.

18. What effect would this plan have on other farm crops or livestock products?

The effect of this plan on other farm crops or livestock products would be limited to the release of production resources from dairying to the extent that dairymen adjusted production to meet market requirements.

19. How will this plan affect producer-handlers?

To the extent that acquisition of base becomes another requisite in expansion of operations as a producer, producers could turn to the exempt status of producer-handlers to facilitate expansion. This may become one more reason for eliminating producer-handler exemptions or, at least, limiting the size of producer-handlers' operations to which exemptions may apply.

20. What would be the effect of this plan on producers of manufacturing grade milk?

The plan's purpose is to eliminate the payment of any part of the money derived from class I sales for surplus milk delivered by order producers in excess of market requirements. In effect, it says to manufacturing milk producers, "You may still have to compete with producers under Federal orders, but you have the assurance that those producers will be receiving the manufacturing price for their surplus milk."

21. What effect can the plan be expected to have on negotiated marketwide premiums?

If the surplus in a market is reduced the incentive for premium prices may be lessened.

22. Can the plan work satisfactorily in one market without being in effect in all other markets?

Yes, but producers who adopt this program and reduce production to meet market requirements may require some assurance, by way of order provisions, that the results of their efforts will not be undermined or eroded by contrary actions of other handlers or groups of producers outside the program.

23. What advantage does this plan have over national dairy supply management proposals involving allotments, bases or quotas?

Base plans as features of Federal orders would have the advantage of being tailored much more closely to local market conditions and customs. Great variation exists among markets in the degree of surplus, all the way from some which have no surplus above normal reserve requirements to some with as much as 40 percent of such surplus. It would be most difficult if not impossible to fit any single national adjustment program to the varying conditions which exist among markets. The base plan has the further advantage of being introduced on a market-by-market basis with much better chance of approval by local referendum.

24. What would be the effect of this plan on fluid markets which are not regulated under Federal or State controls?

1. The rules for the movement of milk from plants in unregulated areas are established under other order provisions, allocation, pool plant qualification, etc. The base plan would place no added burden on such movement.

2. For producers in currently unregulated markets who wished to become producers in an order market having a base plan, the acquisition of a base by purchase or performance would be a requisite.

3. All markets, regulated or not, feel the effects of national surpluses. To the extent that the plan removes some of the pressure for increased production, all markets will benefit.

The dairy surplus problem is still with us and it appears that dairy legislation will receive considerable attention during this session of Congress. I'm sure you are all aware that the cost of dairy price support through purchase of surplus dairy products has almost doubled the past 2 years. Program expenditures are running over $500 million and there is little prospect of these costs declining unless some action is taken to reduce milk supplies. This is a situation which demands attention and the chairman of the Senate Committee on Agriculture has indicated dairy legislation will be the subject of early hearings.

I realize it will not be easy to develop new dairy legislation which will meet the immediate problems of reducing surpluses and at the same time be acceptable to all of the diverse interests of the dairy industry. Dairying is one of the most extensive commodity interests in U.S. agriculture and in many ways one of the most complex. There are major differences in the way manufactured dairy products and fluid milk are marketed and on the fluid milk side there is a separate market for almost every major city or metropolitan center. Each of these fluid-milk markets has its own supply-demand and pricing characteristics. Yet at the same time, what happens in each of these markets affects our national surplus situation and in turn, every other market. The challenge is to find an approach which will alleviate our national surplus problems and at the same time meet the needs of the various individual markets.

A year ago the administration proposed a national allotment program to reduce dairy surpluses and improve dairy farm income. This proposal received little support from the dairy industry and was rejected by Congress. Hearings were held on this proposal in both the Senate and the House of Representatives, giving dairy organizations opportunity to suggest alternative programs for meeting the surplus problem. But at that time few constructive suggestions were made.

I am pleased to note that the situation appears to be changing somewhat. A number of dairy organizations have indicated they will propose program changes this year. I expect there will be differences of opinion between these organizations on the approach to be taken. But the willingness of these groups to make constructive proposals at least indicates an awareness that something must be done to reduce the surpluses that jeopardize the continued existence of the dairy price support program.

What are the principles of a sound dairy program?

1. The program should contribute to a reduction of excessive supplies of dairy products which threaten the entire dairy industry—including fluid markets, and create huge price support costs.

2. The program should protect the income of dairy farmers.

3. The program should not increase consumers milk prices.

4. The program should not involve direct Government controls over individual producers' cow numbers or output of dairy products.

5. The program should reduce Federal expenditures for dairy price-support programs.

6. The program should allow flexibility, expansion of production by efficient producers, and not constitute barriers to trade or prohibit entry of new producers.

The present dairy program clearly does not meet the first and fifth principles. The present Federal order program was not designed as an income protection program. When, however, it was combined with a price-support program for manufactured products it becomes almost impossible for all concerned. First, the payments of a blend price in excess of the value of the surplus milk results in a built-in expansion in the fluid markets, encouraging them to produce milk which goes into manufacturing uses. Thus, surplus milk from the Federal order markets floods the manufacturing markets and eventually results in substantial surplus accumulation under the support program. Moreover, the present Federal order program requires that a producer maintain his relative market share in order to maintain his absolute fluid milk base. This provides another incentive to increase output.

I have agreed to sponsor the class I base plan for Federal milk marketing orders developed by the National Milk Producers Federation. I believe this approach of seeking to reduce the incentive to produce surplus milk in fluid milk markets is a step in the right direction. Some Federal order markets have twice as much surplus as can be justified for meeting their fluid milk requirements. These surpluses not only depress prices in their immediate markets, but add to the surpluses acquired by the Commodity Credit Corporation.

But I don't believe bases in Federal orders alone will be adequate to solve the problem. Producers in Federal order markets are not going to reduce the marketings enough under this type of base plan to cut CCC purchases of butter in half. At best we might expect this plan to curtail expansion on the part of the producers under Federal orders who produce only 50 percent of our total milk production. Some way must be found to reduce total milk supplies at least 3 or 4 percent if we are to avoid adding to the almost 400 million pounds of butter already in CCC inventory.

The dairy industry must be realistic in facing its responsibilities if dairy price supports are to be continued. Other commodity groups have had to adjust their marketings downward as a condition of price support as surpluses warranted and program expenditures increased. An increasingly urban Congress will not continue to sanction large budget expenditures to support an industry which does not assume this responsibility. Nor will other farm groups who have adjusted, assist in maintaining dairy price supports if dairy producers are not willing to assume a like degree of restraint.

The President has proposed in his agricultural message that the possibilities of a voluntary dairy adjustment program be explored. In view of the satisfactory experience with this voluntary program on feed grains this approach would appear to have some promise. I am hopeful that the dairy producer organizations will give this suggestion constructive thought and that it will be possible to find an acceptable way of reducing our surplus of dairy products.

AMENDMENT OF SECTION 104(b)(3) OF TITLE 23, UNITED STATES CODE

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, at the request of the Under Secretary of Commerce, a bill to amend section 104(b)(3) of title 23, United States Code, relating to the apportionment of funds for extensions of the Federal-aid primary and Federal-aid secondary systems within urban areas.

In this connection, I request that a letter addressed to the President of the Senate by the Under Secretary of Commerce be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the letter will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 959) to amend section 104(b)(3) of title 23, United States Code, relating to the apportionment of funds for extensions of the Federal-aid primary and Federal-aid secondary systems within urban areas, introduced by Mr. RANDOLPH, by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Works.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE SECRETARY OF COMMERCE,
Washington, D.C., February 15, 1963.
The Honorable PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: The Department of Commerce has prepared and submits herewith as a part of its legislative program for the 88th Congress, 1st session, a draft of a proposed bill "To amend section 104(b)(3) of title 23, United States Code, relating to the apportionment of funds for extensions of the Federal-aid primary and Federal-aid secondary systems within urban areas."

Section 104(b)(3) of title 23, United States Code, provides for the apportionment among the States of funds authorized for extensions of the Federal-aid primary and Federal-aid secondary systems within urban areas in the following manner:

"In the ratio which the population in municipalities and other urban places, of five thousand or more, in each State bears to the total population in municipalities and other urban plaecs of five thousand or more in all the States as shown by the latest available Federal census. For the purpose of this paragraph, Connecticut and Vermont towns shall be considered municipalities regardless of their incorporated status."

The foregoing provision of law was originally enacted as section 4(c) of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1944 (58 Stat. 838). At the time of its enactment it was understood that its purpose was to place Connecticut and Vermont on an equal basis with other States in the apportionment of urban funds. The term "town" in the New England States usually refers to a political subdivision of a State which may contain incorporated or unincorporated places which are urban in character. As used by the Bureau of the Census for the 1940 Federal census, "urban population" did not include population of unincorporated areas unless those areas met certain population-density standards. At the time of the 1944 Act it was indicated that much of the population of these towns was urban in fact although population density standards adopted by Census had not been met. However, the Bureau of the Census has since revised the definition of "urban population" to include as nearly as possible the population of all places which have urban characteristics regardless of their incorporated or unincorporated status.

Under 23 U.S.C. section 104(b)(3) as presently worded, the population of each town in Connecticut and Vermont with 5,000 or more inhabitants is included in the population data used as the basis for apportioning Federal-aid urban highway funds and, in addition, is included as appropriate in the rural population data upon which apportionment of Federal-aid secondary funds is based.

The report by the Comptroller General to the Congress of the United States dated August 15, 1962, entitled "Review of Apportionments of Federal-aid Highway Funds, Bureau of Public Roads, Department of Commerce for Fiscal Years 1956–63" pointed out that:

"In the apportionment of Federal-aid urban highway funds for the fiscal year 1963, the duplication in the population counts resulted in Connecticut's receiving about $810,000 more and Vermont about $73,000 more than would have been received if the population had been considered in these two States in the same manner as in all other States. These amounts represent 18.2 and 22.6 percent, respectively, of the Federal-aid urban highway funds apportioned to the two States for fiscal year 1963."

The report included the following recommendation to the Congress:

"In view of the changed Bureau of the Census definition of urban population, which appears to place the States of Connecticut and Vermont on an equal basis with all other States, we recommend that the Congress consider amending section 104(b)(3) of title 23, United States Code, to eliminate or otherwise modify the special provision applicable to these two States in the apportionment of Federal-aid urban highway funds. The Bureau of Public Roads agrees that this matter should be brought to the attention of the Congress."

Under these circumstances and particularly in view of the fact that distinctions once used by the Bureau of the Census and originally forming the basis for this provision have been revised as described, it is recommended that the last sentence of provision quoted above be deleted. The enclosed draft bill would carry out this recommendation, and its enactment would remove the preference to Connecticut and Vermont towns thus affording a more equitable basis for the apportionment of Federal-aid urban funds.

The Bureau of the Budget advises that there would be no objection to the submission of this report from the standpoint of the administration's program.

Sincerely yours,

EDWARD GUDEMAN,
Under Secretary of Commerce.

S. 959

A bill to amend section 104(b)(3) of title 33, United States Code, relating to the apportionment of funds for extensions of the Federal-aid primary and Federal-aid secondary ssytems within urban areas

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That paragraph (3) of section 104(b) of title 23, United States Code, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"(3) For extensions of the Federal-aid primary and Federal-aid secondary systems within urban areas:

"In the ratio which the population in municipalities and other urban places of five thousand or more in each State bears to the total population in municipalities and other urban places of five thousand or more in all the States as shown by the latest available Federal census."

PRESENTATION OF AIR FORCE MEDAL TO MAJ. GEN. BENJAMIN D. FOULOIS, RETIRED

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, today, on behalf of a number of cosponsors and myself, I am introducing a joint resolution to authorize the presentation of an Air Force medal of recognition to Maj. Gen. Benjamin D. Foulois, retired.

The beginning of General Foulois' extraordinary and distinguished aviation career was literally one and the same with that of U.S. military aviation. Enlisting in the Army in 1898, he was an 18-year-old private in the Spanish-American War, was later commissioned, and then transferred to the aviation section of the Army Signal Corps in 1908, where he obtained the distinction of being placed in charge of the first airplane owned and used by the Army.

The general's earliest flying training consisted of 54 minutes of impromptu instruction from Wilbur Wright in 1909, followed by a solo flight at Fort Sam Houston in 1910, when he recalls logging four "firsts":

> It was my first solo flight, takeoff, landing, and crackup.

The accident knocked the airplane's tail off, but he was flying again a week later, this time accompanying his efforts with what could be called a correspondence course from the Wrights.

While mastering flying techniques, then Lieutenant Foulois designed more that 20 mechanical improvements, all of which were built into later Army aircraft. One of his most important inventions was the seatbelt.

As Captain Foulois, he commanded the first Aero Squadron during the Punitive Expedition into Mexico in 1915, then served as Chief of the Air Services of the American Expeditionary Forces in France during World War I, and climaxed his military career as Chief of the Army Air Corps, retiring December 1935.

It is not strange that General Foulois was the man the Army chose to take charge of its budding Air Corps. While taking a Signal Corps course in 1907, he wrote what was the first military article about airplanes, a thesis on the "Tactical and Strategic Value of Aerodynamic Flying Machines". His sources were Jules Verne, the Bible, and Army Field Service Regulations.

The general's dedication to aviation has not lessened during his years of retirement, and today at a young 84 years, his hobby is telling high school groups throughout the country about the earliest days of the Air Force.

I ask that this joint resolution lay on the table so that other Senators may join in this legislation to provide suitable recognition to an outstanding American who has dedicated so many years of his life toward furthering the development of military aviation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the joint resolution will lie on the desk, as requested by the Senator from Arizona.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 51) to authorize the presentation of an Air Force Medal of Recognition to Major General Benjamin D. Foulois, retired, introduced by Mr. GOLDWATER (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

LET FREEDOM REALLY RING

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, on July 4, 1776, the Liberty Bell, tolling in Philadelphia, proclaimed the independence of the Thirteen Colonies from British rule. That infant Nation endured; indeed, in 187 years, it has become the leader in man's good fight against tyranny and oppression.

In earlier days, the anniversary of our birth of freedom was actively observed by young and old. While our Nation was growing, while her people were new immigrants, they had fresh memories of tyranny. They were intensely aware that they had something to celebrate on the Fourth of July. It was an occasion to remember and observe.

Lately, unfortunately, this same spirit seems lacking. True, a national holiday is proclaimed; true, speeches are made; but the Fourth of July is not the same.

That is why the idea advanced by two citizens of Connecticut—Eric Hatch of Warren and Eric Sloane of Litchfield—appealed to me so much. They have suggested that on July 4 each year, all church bells, all bells in Government buildings, and all carillon bells in colleges and universities ring for 4 minutes in every part of the land. Radio stations would also broadcast the sound of bells for 2 minutes, followed by a reading from the Declaration of Independence.

The bells would ring at 2 o'clock in the afternoon, eastern daylight time, to remind all citizens that this was the precise moment when the liberty bell tolled in Philadelphia 187 years ago, proclaiming to all who heard it that a new nation had been born. Would it not be invigorating for democracy now if, for 4 minutes on our great national holiday each year, the attention of every American was directed to that moment of our country's birth? As they are reminded by a great chorus of bells of the principles of freedom on which the Nation was founded, perhaps they will rededicate themselves to preserving those principles—not only here at home, but also throughout the world.

To encourage this, Mr. President, I today submit, for appropriate reference, a concurrent resolution calling for the ringing of bells throughout the United States each year on the anniversary of the signing of the Declaration of Independence.

I ask unanimous consent that the concurrent resolution be permitted to lie on the desk for 10 days so that any of my colleagues who wish to do so may join as cosponsors. I also ask unanimous consent that the resolution be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks, together with an article from This Week magazine for February 17, 1963, entitled "Make Freedom Really Ring." The editors of This Week are to be congratulated for their interest in this proposal.

We all owe a debt of gratitude to Mr. Hatch and Mr. Sloane; they have reminded us of a duty shirked and given us the opportunity to do something constructive about it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The concurrent resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the resolution will lie on the desk, as requested, and the resolution and article will be printed in the RECORD.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 25) was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, as follows:

Whereas the tolling of the Liberty Bell at Independence Hall, Philadelphia, Pa., at 2 o'clock in the afternoon of the 4th day of July, 1776, proclaimed the signing of the Declaration of Independence; and

Whereas the adoption of this historic document marked the birth of our country as a free and independent nation; and

Whereas it is fitting that the anniversary of this great event should be appropriately observed in each year at the same moment throughout the United States: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Congress hereby (1) declares that the anniversary of the signing of the Declaration of Independence should be observed each year by the ringing of bells throughout the United States at the hour of 2 o'clock, eastern daylight time, in the afternoon of the 4th day of July, and (2) calls upon civic and other community leaders to take appropriate steps to encourage public participation in such observance.

The article presented by Mr. RIBICOFF is as follows:

MAKE FREEDOM REALLY RING

This is the story of two This Week readers and an idea which we believe can sweep the country, stir a new wave of patriotic feeling and turn this Fourth of July into the most inspiring celebration in our Nation's history. We are sure all This Week readers will be interested in it. Here is the idea:

On July 4, 1963, and each year thereafter, all church bells, all bells in Government buildings, and all carillon bells in colleges and universities will ring for 4 minutes in every part of the country. Every radio station will broadcast the sound of bells for 2 minutes, followed by a reading from the Declaration of Independence.

The idea's proponents are a pair of Connecticut Yankees with a lifelong interest in the American heritage—Eric Hatch, a distinguished writer, many of whose stories have appeared in This Week, and Eric Sloane, a meteorologist, artist and writer who is an expert on early American barns, covered bridges and tools.

HEARTBEAT OF THE NATION

Since it is fitting that the Nation's birthday be celebrated where it began, Hatch and Sloane suggest that a special ceremony be televised from Philadelphia, in front of the Liberty Bell in Independence Hall, and that across the Nation the bells ring out at this same moment.

As the great chorus of bells swells across the land, it will be heard by families at home, on the lakeshore, in the mountains, wherever Americans gather on the Fourth. The sound will come as a thrilling reminder of what the Fourth of July stands for, challenging each of us to remember the heroic resolve formed by the men who pledged their lives, their fortunes and their sacred honor 187 years ago.

July of 1776 saw the Declaration of Independence, democracy's greatest manifesto, approved by the Continental Congress. Delegate John Adams went to his Philadelphia boardinghouse and penned a letter to his wife Abigail, in Massachusetts:

"I am apt to believe," he wrote of the great event in which he had taken part, "that it will be celebrated by succeeding generations as the great anniversary festival. It ought to be commemorated as the day of deliverance by solemn acts of devotion to God Almighty. It ought to be solemnized with pomp and parade, with shows, games, sports, guns, bells, bonfires, and illuminations from one end of this continent to the other, from this time forward forevermore."

Perhaps a little of the noble grandeur that John Adams felt has been dulled in our hearts by the passage of time. The Fourth of July has evolved into more of a summer holiday than a patriotic festival and games and sports have taken over perhaps a little too much of the stage. The "illuminations," or fireworks, were a dominant Fourth of July sound for decades, but have largely disappeared. The bells, which John Adams also mentions, Sloane and Hatch now propose reviving as a uniting feature of the whole day—much like the national observance of two minutes of silence at 11 a.m. on Veterans Day.

SPIRIT OF THE FIRST FOURTH

Adams wrote of an independent celebration "from one end of this continent to the other," at a time when the newborn Republic scarcely penetrated beyond the Appalachian Mountains, when the whole West was a wilderness whose title was in the hands of Britain and Spain. Alaska belonged to Russia, and Hawaii had not even been discovered. Today, the grandeur of the Independence Day he envisioned should certainly be remembered.

What can you do to help bring about a truly reverent and patriotic Fourth?

Writers Sloane and Hatch appointed themselves a committee. They obtained the endorsement of Gov. John N. Dempsey and Senator ABRAHAM RIBICOFF of Connecticut. Here's how you can get the project started in your community:

1. Write to or call on your State and city officials. Show them this article—ask them to sponsor the observance. Then organize a committee of volunteers who share your enthusiasm, and go out after community support. Contact groups that would be especially interested.

2. Make a survey of the bells in your town—the church bell, the bell on the county courthouse, the college chapel bell, the firehouse bell—how many more are there? Find out who rings them and who gives the order to ring them and sign them up for July 4. Does your community have an ordinance against bellringing? It can surely be waived for a special observance like this one, but be sure your town officials have handled the necessary technicalities well in advance of Independence Day.

3. Write letters—and get friends to write—to your local newspapers, radio and TV stations. Ask editors to give their support on the editorial pages. Give them all the information they need, both to take part in a national ceremony and to publicize the program in advance.

LET US HEAR YOUR IDEAS

If you need assistance in organizing your committee, Mr. Sloane and Mr. Hatch are anxious to help. Write "Let Freedom Ring," Box 4140, Grand Central Station, New York 17, N.Y. We'll share your questions and ideas in future progress reports.

In the pealing of the bells across the land, we will have, every year, on our Nation's birthday, a fitting reminder of the exalted words and heroic decision that founded America.

INVESTIGATIONS SUBCOMMITTEE OF COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I submit a resolution for which I request immediate consideration. This has been cleared with the acting minority leader.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be read.

The resolution (S. Res. 98) was read, as follows:

Resolved, That the investigative authorizations provided by S. Res. 250 of the Eighty-seventh Congress are hereby continued through March 31, 1963, inclusive.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request for the present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the resolution was considered and agreed to.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I have been happy to call up the resolution at this time, at the request of the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Government Operations, although I should like to state that, to the best of my knowledge, insofar as this committee and other committees are concerned, even though the expiration date is today, these committees and other committees would be allowed to continue their work, and action taken subsequently on this matter would be retroactive. However, I am glad to have this action taken today, because of the importance of the investigative work of the committee.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Montana. Of course, we have been proceeding in the expectation that the committee would be adequately and fully organized, although—because of delays for which the majority leader certainly is not responsible—we have not been able to do so. Therefore, I appreciate his courtesy in submitting the resolution today, so that the committee's work may proceed without interruption.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I appreciate the remarks of the distinguished Senator from Arkansas, for whom all of us have an extremely high regard. I am just as happy as he is that this matter has been attended to, so there will be no question as to the continuing authority of the committee.

NAVAJO ROADS IN UTAH—AMENDMENTS

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment which would authorize the construction of an important and much needed road, and bridge, from Bluff, Utah, to Mexican Water, Ariz., traversing approximately 30 miles within the Navajo Indian Reservation. The amendment is being submitted by me, on behalf of myself, the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER], and the Senator from Utah [Mr. MOSS]. The amendment is offered to S. 95, which authorizes construction of certain highways on the Navajo and Hopi Indian Reservations in the Four Corners area, which I have the privilege of cosponsoring with Senator GOLDWATER. S. 95 amends the act of April 19, 1950, relating to the rehabilitation of the Navajo and Hopi Tribes of Indians.

As introduced, S. 95 adds an additional 709 miles of principally north-south roads on the two reservations in Utah, Arizona, New Mexico and Colorado, broken down as follows: Arizona, 459 miles; New Mexico, 200 miles; Utah, 39 miles; and Colorado, 11 miles. Routes 1 and 3 in the area have gone a long way toward providing the Four Corners area with east-west routes, but we need adequate highways to allow north-south travel.

The 30-mile stretch of highway proposed in my amendment would connect Utah State Highway 47 just west of Bluff, Utah, with Navajo Route 1 at Mexican Water, Ariz., thus completing one of the major north-south highways of the Southwest, directly crossing the Navajo Reservation. It also provides for construction of a bridge and approaches to span the San Juan River near Bluff, Utah.

The area south of Bluff is a seriously neglected area on the Navajo Reservation. It has the barrier of the San Juan River on the north for a distance east and west of approximately 60 miles to a bridge crossing. Many additional miles must be traveled over sand trails to get in and out of the area. There are many Navajo families in this isolated spot trying to eke out an existence. Giving these Utah Navajos highway access to schools and possible work opportunities, as well as medical and welfare assistance, is in perfect accord with the original intent of the act of April 19, 1950. It will also aid in fulfilling Utah's legal obligation to educate the Navajos of the Utah area south of the San Juan River.

Utah's attorney general has ruled that San Juan County must provide equal opportunities for schooling to the Navajo people residing in the county. He has also ruled that they must administer the welfare program equally to these people, who have a great need for the program. San Juan County has taken this responsibility seriously. It is fulfilling this obligation very well throughout the county, with the exception of the Navajo people in the area described above. The road proposed in my amendment would do more than anything else to facilitate the carrying out of this program.

Until 1960 the Bluff Elementary School did not have a single Indian student. Then a Navajo girl, who had attended Government schools, enrolled, and the word got around that the Navajo children were welcome there. Today half the enrollment of the school is Navajo, and it is estimated that the school's enrollment would triple if there were a means of getting all of the Indian children in the area into school. Mrs. Merial Goforth, a teacher at the Bluff Elementary School, describes her Navajo students as "bright, clean-cut youngsters, who want to learn and, in some instances, are setting the pace for the white children." These children, she points out, have the advantage of living at home while attending a public school. This way the family is kept intact while the children are integrated into our society. The community of Blanding has fully supported the integration of its Indian children into school and community affairs.

As one small, but touching and important, example of the need for the bridge and route south, I am advised that one of the Navajo families who lives on the mesa just across the river sends their son to the school at Bluff. Each day the father fords the San Juan with his son on horseback. During the extreme cold recently, they crossed on the ice. During the thaw that followed and breaking up of ice, he missed school. He will miss more school this spring during runoff, when the river is too deep. Looking to the immediate future, we want this young man in school, and all of his brothers and sisters and cousins, too. We want them to be educationally equipped to live in the world into which they are slowly moving. These Navajo young people cannot wait indefinitely for us to build bridges and highways. They are growing up right now.

With the increased emphasis that is being placed on scenic development in southeastern Utah, tourism is another factor that must be considered in connection with this important, north-south road link. As I have already pointed out, it would complete the most direct scenic highway from Utah through the Navajo Reservation to southern Arizona, west Texas, and Mexico, thus opening up new recreational horizons as well as new economic possibilities for the entire area. It would provide a major interconnecting highway between the existing national parks and monuments of southeastern Utah and northeastern Arizona, and would provide close access for the planned development at Canyonlands and possible future park development of Poncho House Ruins in Utah.

The tourist industry is becoming a vital factor in the economic rehabilitation programs being administered by the Bureau of Indian Affairs. With this important road link across their reservation, the Navajos could benefit greatly from the new emphasis on scenic development in southeastern Utah. Visitors en route to the parks and monuments would have the added advantage of seeing these colorful Indian lands.

In conclusion, Mr. President, I sincerely hope the Senate will adopt my amendment to S. 95 to include in the bill this additional vitally needed road.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendments will be received, printed, and appropriately referred.

The amendments were referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

EXTENSION OF TIME TO FILE REPORT

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Joint Economic Committee be granted an extension of time from March 1, 1963, to March 15, 1963, to file a report of its findings and recommendations with respect to the Economic Report of the President, as required by section 5(b) (3) of Public Law 304, 79th Congress.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, Senate bill 622, pertaining to personnel policies on the federally owned Alaska Railroad, was introduced on January 31 and was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. An identical bill, S. 2593, was introduced in the last Congress, was referred to the Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee, and hearings were held on that identical bill by that committee.

Under the circumstances, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare be discharged from further consideration of S. 6222 and that the bill be referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILLS

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the name of the senior Senator from Nevada [Mr. BIBLE], be added to the sponsors of S. 2, the water resources research bill,

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, on behalf of the junior Senator from Delaware [Mr. BOGGS], I ask unanimous consent that at the next printing of Senate bill 108, the name of the senior Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] be included as a cosponsor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I would like at this time to ask unanimous consent to have my name added as a cosponsor of S. 424, for the relief of Mr. Venson Chu and his family, introduced by the senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE], and I ask that my name appear on the bill on its next printing.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at the next printing of the bill, S. 580, the name of the distinguished Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] be added as a cosponsor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the junior Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART] may be listed as a cosponsor of S. 650, to create the Indiana Dunes National Lakeshore, which 17 other Senators and I introduced on February 4; and I ask unanimous consent that his name may be added at the next printing of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to add the name of the senior Senator from Vermont, to the sponsors of the land and water conservation bill, S. 859, and that his name be included in the list on the bill at the next printing.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when there is a second printing of S. 880, the Hospital Insurance Act of 1963, that the names of the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. Morse] and the junior Senator from Michigan [Mr. Hart] appear as cosponsors of the bill. The Senator from Oregon and the Senator from Michigan expressed the desire to be cosponsors at the time the bill was introduced but through an error their names were omitted on the original printing.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, at its next printing, I ask unanimous consent that the names of Senators Hartke and Jackson be added as additional cosponsors of the bill (S. 900) to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act, as reenacted and amended by the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, as amended, and for other purposes, introduced by me on February 22, 1963.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Under authority of the orders of the Senate, as indicated below, the following names have been added as additional cosponsors for the following bills:

Authority of February 4 and 14, 1963:

S. 666. A bill to further secure and protect the rights of citizens to vote in Federal elections: Mr. Allott, Mr. Anderson, Mr. Beall, Mr. Cannon, Mr. Douglas, Mr. Fong, Mr. Gruening, Mr. Hartke, Mr. Inouye, Mr. Lausche, Mr. Long of Missouri, Mr. McCarthy, Mr. Metcalf, Mr. Miller, Mr. Morton, Mr. Mundt, Mr. Muskie, Mr. Nelson, Mrs. Neuberger, Mr. Pastore, Mr. Pearson, Mr. Pell, Mr. Prouty, Mr. Randolph, Mr. Saltonstall, and Mr. Scott.

Authority of February 18, 1963:

S. 829. A bill to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, to provide for marketing quotas on Irish potatoes through establishment of acreage allotments: Mr. Allott, Mr. Clark, Mr. Engle, Mr. Ervin, Mr. Jordan of North Carolina, Mr. Long of Missouri, and Mr. Mansfield.

Authority of February 19, 1963:

S. 855. A bill to provide for more effective utilization of certain Federal grants by encouraging better coordinated local review of State and local applications for such grants: Mr. Humphrey, Mr. Mundt, and Mr. Williams of New Jersey.

Authority of February 20, 1963:

S. 865. A bill to provide for the establishment of the National Academy of Foreign Affairs, and for other purposes: Mr. Bayh, Mr. Boggs, Mr. Byrd of West Virginia, Mr. Clark, Mr. Engle, Mr. Gruening, Mr. Humphrey, Mr. Inouye, Mr. Long of Missouri, Mr. Mansfield, Mr. McGee, Mr. Moss, Mrs. Neuberger, Mr. Randolph, Mr. Ribicoff, Mr. Smathers, Mr. Williams of New Jersey, and Mr. Yarborough.

Authority of February 21, 1963:

S. 894. A bill to provide for Federal assistance on a combination grant and loan basis in order to improve patient care in public and other nonprofit hospitals and nursing homes through the modernization or replacement of those institutions which are structurally or functionally obsolete; and for other purposes: Mr. Pell.

NOTICE OF HEARINGS ON S. 387, RELATING TO USE OF UNFAIR AND DECEPTIVE METHODS OF PACKAGING OR LABELING

Mr. HART. Mr. President, the senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. Kefauver] is the chairman, as we all well know, of the Subcommittee on Antitrust and Monopoly of the Committee on the Judiciary. The Senator from Tennessee [Mr. Kefauver] has designated me to preside over hearings to be held on S. 387, a bill introduced to amend the Clayton Act to prohibit restraints of trade carried into effect through the use of unfair and deceptive methods of packaging or labeling certain consumer commodities distributed in commerce, and for other purposes.

Mr. President, I wish to give notice of the schedule of the forthcoming hearings in connection with this bill. Hearings are scheduled for March 6 and 7; March 12 and 13; and March 19, 20, 21, and 22. Should there be a need to modify the schedule, prompt notice will be given.

Mr. President, it is the desire of the subcommittee to have testimony offered by all persons concerned and interested in S. 387. I would ask that any person who desires to testify notify my office.

The bill was introduced by me on January 21, in association with other Senators. At that time, through inadvertence, the name of the distinguished present occupant of the chair (Mr. Ribicoff in the chair) was omitted from the list of cosponsors. As Secretary of HEW, and earlier as Governor of Connecticut, the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. Ribicoff] has given leadership in efforts to insure consumer protection. I ask unanimous consent that the name of the distinguished Senator from Connecticut [Mr. Ribicoff] may be added as a sponsor of S. 387.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

NOTICE OF HEARINGS ON SENATE BILL 859

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I announce for the information of the Senate that hearings have been scheduled by the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs on S. 859, a bill to establish a land and water conservation fund to assist the States and Federal agencies in meeting present and future outdoor recreation demands and needs of the American people, on March 7.

The hearing will begin at 10 a.m. in room 3110, New Senate Office Building. People wishing to testify should contact the committee.

NOTICE CONCERNING CERTAIN NOMINATIONS BEFORE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, the following nominations have been referred to and are now pending before the Committee on the Judiciary:

Ray H. Hemenway, of Minnesota, to be U.S. Marshal, district of Minnesota—recess appointment.

James A. Carr, Jr., of Massachusetts, to be a member of the Board of Parole for the term expiring September 30, 1968, vice Edward J. Donovan—term expired.

On behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, notice is hereby given to all persons interested in these nominations to file with the committee, in writing, on or before Thursday, March 7, 1963, any representations or objections they may wish to present concerning the above nominations, with a further statement whether it is their intention to appear at any hearing which may be scheduled.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

By Mr. RANDOLPH:

Address by Secretary of Commerce, Hon. Luther H. Hodges, at 61st annual convention of American Road Builders' Association, February 25, 1963, Chicago, Ill. Also, speech by himself at opening session of A.R.B.A. convention.

By Mr. McNAMARA:

Address by Representative Frank Thompson, Jr., of New Jersey, delivered at the University of Illinois on February 26, 1963, dealing with medical care for the aged.

EDITORIAL TRIBUTE TO SENATOR WILLIAMS OF NEW JERSEY

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the other day an editorial in the Washington Post described one of the many good works of the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. Williams]. In this case, it concerned the Senator's personal efforts, with the help of a few others, to fix up a few hazard-ridden, dilapidated shacks near Mount Vernon, to postpone the imminent eviction of three destitute families who had no other place to go.

Let me say that this humble act of service is typical of the Senator from New Jersey, who is as modest as he is able. Pete Williams is not much for talk, but in his own quiet way he does a great deal to benefit the people of his State and the Nation. There is no more able and respected and capable Member of this body.

His act the other day dramatizes his deep interest in the welfare of all Americans, including the poor and inarticulate, who all too frequently are overlooked in this affluent society of ours. This simple act of human concern comes from a man who has worked with his heart as well as his head to do something to improve the lot of this country's migratory workers, to give our cities better transportation, and to preserve and extend the parks and open spaces in our communities.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this highly deserved editorial tribute to Senator Williams be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, Feb. 25, 1963]

Senator Williams' Example

Senator Harrison Williams' Good Samaritan venture in the downtrodden community of Gum Springs, near Mount Vernon, brought a hearty response from many different groups. The spectacle of a U.S. Senator laboring with a half-dozen coworkers to save three destitute families from eviction because of the fire hazards in their ramshackle homes proved to have an inspirational quality. It set in motion forces that may well carry far beyond the stopgap improvements which these volunteers were able to make on George Washington's birthday.

The Senator's example came at an opportune moment. Events of the last few weeks have demonstrated that thousands of Washingtonians are bursting with energy and grasping for straws of adventure. Many of them have taken to the trails and highways on foot in seemingly passionate gestures to test their fitness and to break away from the routine of their lives. How much more exciting and useful their ventures might be if they turned their footsteps and their energies to the slums instead of the trails.

Washington is at once afflicted with a curse of idleness and with mountains of work to be done to make its dark corners more habitable. Of course, volunteer crews could not replace insanitary hovels with the model low-cost housing that is so urgently needed, but they could render an immense service by cleaning up yards, removing fire hazards and rat nests, repairing and painting old homes, planting grass and flowers, lifting up spirits, and cultivating a new sense of cooperation and of community pride. This newspaper suggests, with all seriousness, that the armies of hikers who are taking to the trail divert at least part of their energies into the type of community service that Senator Williams has popularized at Gum Springs.

Organization of any large-scale efforts will be necessary, and this is where President Kennedy's proposed Domestic Service Corps comes into the picture. But cleanup squads and flower-planting task forces could be organized on a neighborhood basis, with experts and other volunteers drawn from all parts of the city. With a genuinely cooperative effort in the spirit of the Williams demonstration, the physical blight of this city could be amazingly transformed, with corresponding amelioration of its moral and psychological blight.

RESOLUTION OF NORTH CAROLINA LEGISLATURE MAKING SIR WINSTON CHURCHILL AN HONORARY CITIZEN OF NORTH CAROLINA

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, on behalf of my colleague [Mr. Jordan] and myself, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the Record a resolution of the Legislature of North Carolina making Sir Winston Churchill an honorary citizen of North Carolina. I also ask consent to have printed in the Record the accompanying document.

There being no objection, the resolution and the document were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

To All Whom These Presents Shall Come, Greeting:

I, Thad Eure, secretary of state of the State of North Carolina, do hereby certify the following and hereto attached (four sheets) to be a true copy of Resolution 11, general assembly of 1963, a joint resolution honoring the Right Honorable Sir Winston Churchill, K.G., the original of which is now on file and a matter of record in this office.

In witness whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and affixed my official seal.

Done in office, at Raleigh, this 21st day of February in the year of our Lord 1963.

Thad Eure,
Secretary of State.

Resolution 11

Joint resolution honoring the Right Honorable Sir Winston Churchill, K.G.

Whereas the Right Honorable Sir Winston Churchill, K.G., distinguished and illustrious son of an American mother and an English father, writer and maker of history, eloquent champion of the free world, still lives among us in the flesh, symbolizing those attributes of honor, loyalty, courage, and magnanimity, which have been cherished for generations by the English-speaking peoples; and

Whereas due to fortuitous circumstance and his own will to greatness, he stood in the breach and through his eloquent pen and tongue rallied the democracies of the world to stand with him and hurl back the threat of dictators who would have crucified humanity and suppressed the love of freedom wherever it existed; and

Whereas Sir Winston is close to the heartbeat of Americans who admire this Englishman's love of fairplay and decency, as well as his stubborn courage where the liberties of freemen are concerned; and

Whereas North Carolinians whose history goes back to England and to Magna Carta honor and revere this son of freedom who has attained immortality while he yet lives: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the house of representatives (the senate concurring):

Section 1. That the Right Honorable Sir Winston Churchill, K.G., is the most eloquent champion of liberty not only throughout the English-speaking world, but among all free nations and free peoples; that his superb leadership in civilization's darkest hour helped to save mankind from the tyranny of dictators; and that he continues to symbolize in his life the great attributes of integrity and honor that are the basis of our civilization.

Sec. 2. That the Right Honorable Sir Winston Churchill, K.G., is hereby declared to be an honorary citizen of North Carolina.

Sec. 3. That a copy of this resolution be spread upon the minutes of the respective journals of the house and senate, and that a duly certified copy be forwarded through proper channels to the British Ambassador in Washington with the request that it be transmitted to the Right Honorable Sir Winston Churchill, K.G., together with the good wishes of the General Assembly of North Carolina for many more years of health, happiness, and service to mankind.

Sec. 4. That this resolution shall become effective upon its adoption.

In the general assembly read three times and ratified, this the 21st day of February 1963.

Clarence Stone,
President of the Senate.
H. Clifton Blue,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

Examined and found correct.

George R. Uzzell.

(For committee.)

DR. ELLEN WINSTON, U.S. COMMISSIONER OF WELFARE

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, recently, Dr. Ellen Winston, of North Carolina, was appointed U.S. Commissioner of Welfare.

For many years, Dr. Ellen Winston has served her native State of North Carolina with distinction, building up within our State one of the finest welfare departments in the Nation. In recognition of her achievement, she has now been called upon by the Federal Government to organize and direct a welfare administration in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Dr. Winston brings to her new post the competence, the skill, and the sound judgment that will set our long-needed welfare administration on a steady and progressive course. She understands the problem of chronic dependency which has developed in our country despite our general prosperity. She knows how to attack this problem constructively by getting at the root causes. She will give wise and practical leadership to the Nation in developing welfare programs that are genuine investments in human resources, rather than mere systems for maintaining the poor in their poverty.

A welfare administration directed by Dr. Winston will not only help us to find better answers to the problem of poverty in the midst of plenty; it will also help us to improve the services needed by people in all income brackets, particularly children and the aged. To Mrs. Winston, welfare means more than financial aid to the needy; it means providing the facilities and services that prevent an individual from becoming lost in the increasingly mechanized and impersonal milieu of modern society. North Carolina's loss of a great lady and a wise welfare commissioner is the Nation's gain.

In order that others may know more about Dr. Winston and her achievements, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the Record the following items:

First. A biographical sketch of Dr. Winston, prepared by the North Carolina Department of Public Welfare;

Second. An article by Mrs. Bernadette W. Hoyle, information officer, North Carolina Department of Public Welfare, entitled: "Dr. Winston Reviews 18 Years in Public Welfare";

Third. A statement made by Dr. Winston at her swearing-in ceremonies on January 28, 1963;

Fourth. A feature article from the January 27, 1963, edition of the Sunday Sun, Baltimore, Md., entitled: "New U.S. Welfare Chief—Iron-Beneath-Velvet Southerner Seeks To Halt Dependency Before It Gets Started"; and

Fifth. Editorials from several North Carolina newspapers concerning Dr. Winston; they are as follows: "A Woman of Vision Goes to HEW," Twin City Sentinel, Winston-Salem, December 21, 1962; "Tar Heels Will Be Proud," Sanford Herald, Sanford, December 21, 1962; "A Quality Appointment That Honors North Carolina," Kinston Daily Free Press, December 20, 1962; "Tar Heel Tapped for Post," the Wilmington Star, Wilmington, December 21, 1962; "Fine Ladies to Washington," Lexington Dispatch, Lexington, December 21, 1962; "Deserved Promotion," Hickory Daily

Record, Hickory, December 20, 1962; "Dr. Winston Qualified To Realine National Welfare," High Point Enterprise, High Point, December 20, 1962; "Dr. Winston Can Contribute Much," Greenville Reflector, Greenville, December 21, 1962; and "Dr. Winston Takes a New Job," Durham Herald, Durham, December 21, 1962.

There being no objection, the biographical sketch, statement, articles, and editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH OF DR. ELLEN WINSTON

Dr. Ellen Winston has served as commissioner of public welfare for the State of North Carolina for the past 18 years. She was named to that post in 1944 after 4 years as head of the department of sociology and economics at Meredith College, Raleigh, N.C.

During this period of long service to her home State, Dr. Winston worked extensively with both National and State social welfare agencies and has achieved wide recognition for her contribution to the public welfare field.

After early teaching experience she served as social economist and technical editor for various Federal agencies from 1934 to 1940. She was a member of the technical committee on long-range work and relief policies for the National Resources Planning Board, 1940–43.

Author of numerous books and articles in the fields of sociology and social welfare, Dr. Winston did extensive research in these fields for the National Economic and Social Planning Association, the Carnegie Corp. of New York, and the Federal Government.

A native of North Carolina, Dr. Winston was born in Bryson City, in the western part of the State. She received her early education in North Carolina public schools and was graduated from Converse College, Spartanburg, S.C. In 1930, she received a Ph. D. in sociology from the University of Chicago. Honorary doctoral degrees have been awarded to Dr. Winston by the Women's College of North Carolina, Converse College, and the University of North Carolina.

Among the State and National posts she has held are: President, American Public Welfare Association, 1957–59; member of the Fact-Finding Committee for the Midcentury White House Conference on Children and Youth and the National Committee for the 1960 White House Conference on Children and Youth; member of the Slum Clearance Advisory Committee of the U.S. Housing and Home Finance Agency, 1951–54; member of the Board of Directors of the Council on Social Work Education, 1958–60; cochairman, Income Maintenance and Public Assistance, Fifth International Congress of Gerontology, 1960; member of the U.S. Committee of the International Conference of Social Work, 1960; member of the ad hoc Committee on Welfare appointed by HEW Secretary Abraham Ribicoff in 1961. She served on the 12-member National Council on Child Welfare established by the Congress in 1958, and was a member of the Federal-State Committee on Aging, 1957–60.

For the past 10 years she has been a member of the executive committee of the National Council of State Welfare Administrators; since 1956 has served as chairman of the North Carolina Governor's Coordinating Committee on Aging; and since 1959 has been a member of the Governor's Committee on Migrant Labor.

She is presently a member of the board of directors of the Child Welfare League of America, Inc., and chairman of the league's ad hoc committee on public agency relationships. In 1962 she was appointed to a 2-year term on the Advisory Committee on Problems of the American Community (Brookings Institution) and to membership on the Advisory Committee on Housing for Senior Citizens of the Housing and Home Finance Agency. She is chairman of the division on social welfare manpower for the 1963 National Conference on Social Welfare.

Dr. Winston is the wife of Dr. Sanford R. Winston, author and lecturer and head of the department of sociology and anthropology at North Carolina State College.

DR. WINSTON REVIEWS 18 YEARS IN PUBLIC WELFARE

(By Bernadette W. Hoyle)

Dr. Ellen Winston, who took the oath of office as the first U.S. Commissioner of Welfare on January 28, left North Carolina after 18½ years as State commissioner of public welfare.

In reviewing the North Carolina program during her administration, which began on June 1, 1944, it is interesting to note that public welfare legislation enacted by the Congress in 1962 is a reiteration of the North Carolina emphasis on preventive, protective, and rehabilitative services for many years. Shortly after her tenure of office in Raleigh began, Dr. Winston delivered a speech titled "Prevention: The Final Test of Public Welfare." Only in the past year has this emphasis been adopted through legislation at the national level.

An expanded program of old-age assistance, aid to dependent children, and aid to the permanently and totally disabled has been in progress during Dr. Winston's nearly two decades as administrator of the North Carolina program. Provision for payment of hospitalization of recipients and the medically indigent has been added to the program.

In discussing additions to the North Carolina program during her term of office, Dr. Winston points with pride to community services, which has a staff member who works with local communities and organizations to further the utilization of available community resources. Two projects of the North Carolina Federation of Women's Clubs were initiated by Dr. Winston. These are the Children's Clothing Closet, through which local clubs secure clothes for children such as layettes, school clothing, graduation dresses and other items for which tax funds are not available. The help-a-home project collects furniture and household articles which are given to needy families to help lift their level of living. "The women's clubs have in many ways been interested in and supported the public welfare program," stated Dr. Winston. "Working with these clubs has also been an excellent means of interpreting the program to the people of our State."

She pointed out the good relationship with the State bar association. "We have worked with this association for many years on legal aid service for the legally indigent—persons who need legal advice but cannot pay for it. County bar associations have set up county committees which work with county departments of public welfare."

She added, "We have several programs which we have been pushing for a number of years. One of these is a program through which we provide special assistance to aid to dependent children to help them go on for further training or education. Each year county departments of public welfare help a number of bright boys and girls obtain scholarships, as well as summer jobs, and often a community group is contacted to help supplement the scholarships awarded these young people."

The aid to dependent children policy has been revised so that a child with a part-time job may use the money he earns for present educational purposes or save it for his future education. "This was made possible by a reinterpretation of Federal law," stated Dr. Winston. "We took advantage of it because of the incentive it offered to young people. Another facet of this emphasis is that it is one way to break the cycle of dependency. The young people become self-supporting, take care of their families and their parents, pay taxes, and so forth."

The program of day care for preschool age children of working mothers has been built during Dr. Winston's administration. "We have stressed the importance of standards for these facilities," she stated, "and we license over 350 day care facilities. At present we have set up day care projects in two counties with Federal money to demonstrate how counties can help families become self-sufficient or prevent the need for assistance by having children cared for during the day while their mothers work. These demonstration projects establish a program, so that we will have had experience with policies and procedures in order to know the best way to proceed on a statewide basis when Federal funds become available in 1963." When Dr. Winston became State commissioner one person on the State office staff handled this program as an extra job in addition to other regular duties. At present there are three full-time staff members in day care and three more will be added in the near future.

In the program of foster boarding home care for children there has been considerable expansion. The State board of public welfare licenses all foster boarding homes for children. "We require a semiannual report on each child in order to know that there is continuing supervision of the children and planning for them as their needs change. North Carolina was one of about 15 States that took immediate advantage in 1961 of legislation that under special circumstances permitted payment for care of children in foster boarding homes with AFDC funds," she said.

In the program of adoption there has been great expansion in the past 18 years. During Dr. Winston's first year in office, 309 adoptions were completed. In the year 1961–62, 2,111 adoptions were completed. The majority of the adoptions in the State are handled by county departments of public welfare, and all adoptions are registered with the papers filed for safekeeping in the State board of public welfare.

A program developed during Dr. Winston's administration is that of licensing of all agencies which solicit funds for charitable purposes. "We have a law as strong as that in any State for licensing these agencies," she stated. Because licensing protects both the agencies and the citizens from fraudulent solicitations, there is good cooperation in the administration of the policies.

"Here in North Carolina we have placed much emphasis on nonfinancial services in public welfare," stated Dr. Winston. "We believe that a broad program of social services should be available to all people who seek them, regardless of their economic status. North Carolina has a population of 4½ million people. During the past year some type of public welfare service was given to 600,000 men, women, and children, that is, 1 out of every 8 persons in the State. Over half of these services were nonfinancial. They included adoptions, planning for the care of aged relatives, work permits for minors, and other services."

One of the most significant programs is that of homemaker service through public welfare. At present 15 counties employ 45 homemakers who go into homes to help families raise their level of living. They teach low income families how to use money wisely, they teach young mothers without training in elementary housekeeping how to care for their children, how to cook and how to clean house. The program began with demonstration projects in a few counties, which built the foundation for a statewide program that has received national recognition.

"We have a large program of services to the aging," added Dr. Winston. "We first became concerned over old people in rural counties who should not be living alone, who were not sick, yet needed a protective program of domiciliary care. Now we have over 500 licensed facilities for the aged and infirm. About 300 of these are family care homes, licensed for two to five persons. These homes are much like the homes of a generation ago where there were one or more aged relatives in a family. They keep aged persons in a home atmosphere when they do not desire or cannot for some reason remain in their own homes, yet can remain in their own communities near their churches and friends and lifelong ties. In essence this program is not too different from the foster boarding home program for children. At present over 6,000 persons in North Carolina live in licensed facilities for the aged and infirm."

Increasingly the public welfare program in North Carolina has stressed services to older people in their own homes in order to make it possible for them to remain there. Homemaker service has been the answer in many cases, where a homemaker may visit a number of homes for several hours a week and help with the necessary chores. "Now we have a new policy which makes it possible for us to pay for an attendant, where it is necessary for the person to have care for a longer period of time than is practical in the use of homemaker service. We have a long list of possibilities, so that we may have a particular service available at the time when a person needs it," added Dr. Winston. "In order to have a comprehensive public welfare program, there must be a wide range and variety of social services and policies available to meet different types of needs and the changing needs of the same individual."

The inspection of jails has long been a responsibility of public welfare in North Carolina. "We also approve plans for new jails and renovations and we are proud of our progress in this area. We are always concerned over the health and safety of people. We are interested in keeping mental patients and children out of jails. Actually for the entire State we have fewer children in jails in a year than many States have in one county in that period of time," said Dr. Winston. "Public welfare has to be concerned about people who need some kind of special protection as these are the most vulnerable persons in our society.

"To promote the exchange of ideas and keep open the lines of communication between the public welfare program and the citizens of the State, there are a number of advisory committees from special interest groups such as heads of child caring institutions, day care operators, juvenile judges, medical advisory committee, and other areas of interest in which public welfare plays a major role in helping people," added Dr. Winston.

"The concern for helping people, whether their need is financial or nonfinancial, has been the primary focus of public welfare in North Carolina," she declared. "With the enactment of new Federal legislation in 1962, it will be possible to continue this emphasis with the implementation of broader policies and more effective procedures."

Statement by Dr. Ellen Winston at Swearing-In Ceremonies in Washington, January 28, 1963

This day, January 28, 1963, is of great significance to all who are interested in or have any direct connection with the social welfare field. The Secretary's decision to establish a new Welfare Administration to encompass the major welfare responsibilities of the Federal Government offers a tremendous challenge, a tremendous opportunity. By this action the role of public welfare in the total economy, the place of social services in our complex society, have been dramatically emphasized.

This new Welfare Administration will require close cooperation among its constituent units, while they carry out their own special responsibilities. It should lead to increasingly closer working relationships in Federal-State-county welfare programs, between welfare and other governmental services for people, between public and private social welfare agencies, and between public welfare and a host of community organizations.

Goals for this new Welfare Administration, dedicated as it is to preventive and rehabilitative services, must be clearly defined and stated again and again. Success in their attainment will be measured by the opportunities given to children to rise above the handicaps of deprivation and neglect, to the disabled fully to utilize their capabilities, to the ill to receive needed treatment, to the aged in all walks of life to live without fear or loneliness, to families to obtain needed help and guidance in resolving a wide range of special problems, to untold numbers to be spared dire poverty and personal disaster through effective preventive measures. Such services can only be rendered where the people are and so welfare's responsibility stretches to every city, town, and open area of our Nation. We know, too, that it is not just what is done but how it is done so that welfare services truly promote human dignity and independence and self-respect.

In working toward these ends, to improve and strengthen the broad pattern of welfare services, I pledge you that I shall do my best.

[From the Baltimore Sun, Jan. 27, 1963]

New U.S. Welfare Chief—Iron-Beneath-Velvet Southerner Seeks To Halt Dependency Before It Gets Started

(By Cherrill Anson)

When Ellen Winston is sworn in tomorrow afternoon as head of the newly created Federal Welfare Administration, official Washington will acquire a choice example of that celebrated feminine subspecies, the iron-beneath-the-velvet southerner.

Dr. Winston, a slight, 59-year-old North Carolinian, has served her State as commissioner of the board of public welfare for the past 18 years. During that time she has fought determinedly and successfully to give North Carolina a progressive welfare program which attempts to stop dependency before it starts, tries to get people off the welfare rolls and back onto their own feet, and stresses a variety of nonfinancial services rather than cash handouts.

The identical emphasis on prevention, rehabilitation and protection was written into Public Law 87–543, the set of amendments which represents the most important changes in the public welfare provisions of the Social Security Act in that act's history.

"I have approved a bill," President Kennedy commented after signing the legislation in July, "which makes possible the most far-reaching revision of our public welfare program since it was enacted in 1935."

TERMED OUTSTANDING

The assembling of all welfare functions in one administration was the recommendation of a task force appointed by the President before his inauguration. The head of this task force and the guiding intelligence behind the new welfare amendments was Wilbur J. Cohen, Assistant Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare for Legislation.

Mr. Cohen, who has known Dr. Winston for 20 years, calls her "the country's outstanding State welfare administrator." Her salary will be $20,000 a year.

The new administration, which will become the sixth major operating agency of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, was formed by HEW Secretary Anthony J. Celebrezze by bringing together three activities formerly under the jurisdiction of the Social Security Administration: the Children's Bureau, the Bureau of Family Services, and the Cuban refugee program. To these he added the special staff on aging and the juvenile delinquency and youth development staff.

These five activities embrace the principal Federal-State programs of the Department which through services, research, and grants are directed to the interests of older persons, families, children, and youth.

FIRST MAJOR REALINEMENT

The establishment of the administration marks the first major realinement of welfare functions since HEW came into being in 1953. Mrs. Winston's appointment is considered the culmination of a trend toward reappraisal and reorientation which was hinted at in a group of welfare amendments passed in 1956. These put emphasis on services rather than money and on the strengthening of family life. But, according to Cohen, they were permissive and offered little in the way of financial encouragements to the States.

The new legislation, on the other hand, offers considerable financial rewards to States which are willing to spend some of their own money to become eligible for Federal cost-sharing. Starting in September, States which appropriated $25,000 for certain welfare services or for the cost of training staff members could count on an additional $75,000 in Federal funds.

These new laws and certain administrative actions in the same spirit which were taken by ex-Secretary Ribicoff in 1961 and 1962 will involve the expenditure in the fiscal year 1962–63 of nearly $300 million in addition to the amounts authorized by earlier law. During this period, Federal payments to States under public assistance programs to which the Federal Government makes grants will reach $2,600 million. This money will benefit some 7 million persons.

OUNCE OF PREVENTION

The idea behind the new welfare measures is that by spending more now, we will eventually spend less. Cohen does not look for a cut in the welfare bill, but he is hopeful that the new emphasis on prevention and rehabilitation will head off an increase. "Our population is growing at the rate of 30 million every 10 years," he explains, "and we find ourselves forced to run faster just to stay in the same place."

Mrs. Winston's concern with services which would prevent dependency was expressed as long ago as 1945, shortly after she took office in her own State. "We recognize the fact," she said then, "that it is cheaper not only in terms of well-being but also in terms of actual money to prevent ills rather than to try to remedy them after they have been allowed to develop. In public welfare as in health an ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure. It is far better to prevent than to have to try to rehabilitate. The preventive approach requires more service, more effective leadership, and harder work than the traditional approach to the public welfare program. At the same time it is a far more challenging approach."

An excellent example of the preventive approach is the program of day care for the children of working mothers.

LIVING LEVELS RAISED

When Dr. Winston took over as State commissioner there were 18 licensed day-care facilities in North Carolina. Now there are 350, and demonstration projects involving use of Federal funds have been set up in 2 counties. (The 1962 legislation called for $5 million in the fiscal year 1962–63 and $10 million in succeeding fiscal years to be earmarked for the encouragement of day care under State child welfare service plans.)

Because of the availability of day care, a young North Carolina woman was able to get a stenographic job which enables her to support herself and her two small children, although she cannot afford to pay for their supervision during working hours. This family never went on the relief rolls.

Another aggressive program which Dr. Winston started was the use of homemakers to help recipients of relief raise their level of living by showing them how to manage their homes and their funds better. These homemakers are resourceful, mature women who visit seven or eight families a week, working closely with the county welfare department caseworkers.

They teach AFDC (aid to families with dependent children) recipients to stretch their grants over the month, demonstrate the use of surplus foods, instruct them in sewing and mending, help them to make simple home repairs, and encourage and aid them to improve their personal appearance.

A homemaker may show a mother how to make a vase out of a bleach bottle or bring a group together for instruction. By contributing her own set of plastic dishes and helping the hostess to bake a few cookies, she may turn the instruction session into a party. "One of the problems of destitute people is that they are isolated," Dr. Winston explains. "In working with public assistance families it is important to push up from the bottom. You must give them goals they can reach."

MORE FOSTER HOMES

A childless woman with a great feeling for children, Dr. Winston found in 1944 that North Carolina had fewer than 100 licensed foster boarding homes for children. These homes provide individual motherly care for children who would otherwise be institutionalized or left to grow up in improper environments. Today there are 1,500 such homes which care for 2,700 children in a given month.

The adoptive program, under Dr. Winston's guidance, has undergone a similar expansion. During her first year as commissioner, there were 309 adoptions. Last year, 2,111 were completed.

For both children and the aged, her goal has been to have available a whole series of possibilities. Some elderly people have been enabled to stay in their own homes by the services of a homemaker or attendant; others have been placed in licensed boarding homes. The majority of these are small facilities caring for two to five persons in a noninstitutional atmosphere. Such special care homes keep elderly people in their own communities, near their lifelong ties.

Dr. Winston has been particularly successful in marshaling community support. Under her encouragement, the State bar association has come forth with aid for the legally indigent. The Federated Women's Clubs help to furnish homes of families living on welfare grants and contribute layettes and graduation dresses. Other community groups help with scholarships for bright youngsters.

Since without education one welfare generation breeds another, Dr. Winston has pushed a program to encourage AFDC recipients, whose grants stop when they become 18, to go on for special training after high school. Scholarships and summer jobs help. Recently North Carolina revised its AFDC policies to allow a child to save some of the proceeds of a part-time job for future educational needs without having the family's grant diminished. This change was made possible by a reinterpretation of Federal law.

"This is the way you break the cycle of dependency," Dr. Winston says. "They go on from here to supporting their families, helping younger sisters and brothers, and paying taxes."

In addition to initiating strong programs, Dr. Winston has seen that these programs and their positive results have been brought to the attention of North Carolina's taxpaying public. These taxpayers are spread over a primarily rural State divided into 100 counties which stretch horizontally more than 500 miles, from the Atlantic coast through the Great Smoky Mountains.

MANY SUCCESS STORIES

A series of articles titled "For the People," written by the board's public information officer and appearing in more than 50 small weekly papers, is devoted to spelling out the details of the welfare programs and relating success stories about recipients of public assistance.

Among these stories are those of a child who was born a spastic and now supports herself as a beautician; a girl who is attending nursing school on a scholarship; a young woman who is a member of the Peace Corps; and another who became the first child from her rural elementary school ever to go to college.

In a centrally located county which has six high schools, three of the six valedictorians in the recent graduating classes came from families which had been assisted through aid to families with dependent children.

Among the young men who were once the recipients of AFDC are the principal of a county school, a sheriff, a minister, and a business man who was named Young Man of the Year in his community.

NONFINANCIAL HELP

Then there was the mother with three small children to support. Although she had finished high school, the only work she could find was as a domestic. A caseworker got her a scholarship at the local junior college, which she attended at night after working all day. There was no 4-year college in town. When she had finished the 2-year curriculum at the junior college, a sister-in-law offered to care for her children so that she could finish her studies at an out-of-town college which offered her a work scholarship. This fall, at the age of 32, she drew her first paycheck as a primary schoolteacher and became a taxpayer instead of a tax taker.

Dr. Winston has always emphasized welfare services which do not involve the giving of money, and she is proud of the fact that of the 600,000 people helped last year, half were extended counseling or other nonfinancial services. Nevertheless, North Carolina's welfare budget (including Federal funds) has grown during her service from $7 million to $70 million. (Seventy million dollars for North Carolina's 4,500,000 residents is proportionately almost the same as Maryland's expenditure of $50 million for 3,100,000 inhabitants.)

In a State in which per capita income is less than 70 percent of the national average, the money has not come easily. The history of Dr. Winston's relations with the North Carolina General Assembly is a stormy one. Her quest for the State money needed to call forth matching Federal funds has led, time and time again, to clashes with legislators.

Most of the time she has gotten what she wanted. One gallant legislator attributes this to a combination of southern womanly graces and brains. Another observer describes the Winston technique less elegantly but not unchivalrously as "flapping her eyes around and politely submerging those men with facts."

"She has had differences with practically everybody in the house and senate," a State representative reports, "but she is still liked and respected."

Dr. Winston has been described as a past master at championing public welfare programs. To those who suggested that most of the illegitimate children in North Carolina were getting help from public welfare, Dr. Winston pointed out that only 9 percent of these children were receiving public assistance. Furthermore, she noted, the proportion of families with illegitimate children in the caseloads of county departments of public welfare had dropped from 20 percent to 16 percent.

CITES LONG-RANGE COST

To others who insisted that some women were turning out illegitimate babies almost as a business, she answered that it was ridiculous to assume that $10 a month would constitute an incentive to a woman to continue to have illegitimate children.

Cutting off aid to illegitimate children, she said, might effect a sharp reduction in immediate expenditures, but there would be a staggering long-range cost in terms of expenditure for crime, juvenile delinquency, and medical costs if these children were allowed to grow up in squalor.

On the topic of welfare "chiseling," Dr. Winston has said that "a common complaint against public welfare is fraud; yet, in terms of income tax evasions, racketeers who defraud the Government of billions of dollars each year, and deception in the day-to-day business world, this problem is indeed minor."

Critics of aid to families with dependent children have been informed that the average person in a North Carolina AFDC household, considering all sources of money, must manage on one-quarter of the average per capita income for the State. Typically, she points out, a family receives such assistance for only 2 years before finding other means of support.

WIFE OF AN EDUCATOR

Dr. Winston was born in Bryson City, a small town in the western mountains of North Carolina. Her father, Stanley Warren Black, was a lawyer and a southerner. Her mother was from Illinois. In consequence, the commissioner says, she finds herself endowed with "two sets of colloquialisms midwestern and southern."

She received her early education in public schools and was graduated from Converse College in Spartanburg, S.C. In 1930 she received a Ph. D. in sociology from the University of Chicago.

She went on to teach and to serve as social economist and technical editor for Federal agencies from 1934 to 1940. At the time she was named State commissioner, she had served for 4 years as head of the department of sociology and economics at Meredith College in Raleigh, the State capital.

The wife of Dr. Sanford R. Winston, head of the department of sociology and anthropology at North Carolina State College, the commissioner has written numerous books and articles in the fields of sociology and social welfare and has done extensive research in these areas.

Dr. Winston has been president of the American Public Welfare Association, one of 12 members of the National Council on Child Welfare established by Congress in 1958, and a member of the Federal-State Committee on Aging. She also served on a special advisory committee whose recommendations were incorporated in the Kennedy administration's welfare legislation.

BUILT-IN INCENTIVES

That legislation, designed to remedy the deficiencies of laws passed over a quarter of a century ago, has built-in incentives for self-care and self-support and is "by far the most useful we have ever had," Dr. Winston says. "It offers opportunities to give help which is constructive, not palliative."

In addition to the provisions for day-care expenditures, stepped-up aid to States for training enough skilled personnel to reduce caseloads to reasonable levels, and liberalized payments for the needy aged, the blind, and the disabled, it allows for protective payments to be made to a competent party if a child's parent is found to make unwise use of welfare grants. It makes possible the use of public assistance funds to maintain a child in a foster care home if its own environment is completely unsuitable.

Another change is designed to assist the States in encouraging the conservation of existing work skills and the development of new ones. Federal financial participation is authorized in State expenditures for aid to families with dependent children made in the form of payment for work performed by the child's parent or other relative. States which wish to take advantage of Federal money in these work or don't eat programs must provide facilities for training or retraining in preparation for regular employment.

HER VIEW OF NEW JOB

Another change recognizes family neediness when both parents are in the home and deprivation to a child results from a parent's incapacity or unemployment. Previously only one parent was included in aid to families with dependent children.

The provision for children of unemployed parents was enacted in 1961 as a 14-month temporary measure. It was extended for 5 years by Public Law 87–543. Before this a father could desert his family and see them taken care of, but could not lose his job, stick with them, and have them receive the same benefits.

Dr. Winston assumes her new position as the States are just beginning to participate in the new welfare program. Fourteen States, for instance, are extending aid to deprived children of the unemployed. Another 14 are taking advantage of Federal sharing in expenditures for foster care.

The Commissioner can be expected to give the Welfare Administration the same firm, able, and imaginative leadership for which she is known in North Carolina and to run the same sort of "tight office." "I am exchanging 100 counties for 54 jurisdictions," she says, "and the general assembly for Congress."

[From the Twin City Sentinel, Dec. 21, 1962]

A Woman of Vision Goes to HEW

Last February, Dr. Ellen Winston, State commissioner of public welfare in North Carolina, appeared before a congressional committee to speak for the American Public Welfare Association in support of the administration's proposed welfare changes. According to reports, she handled the complicated subject knowledgeably and in language the nonsociologist Congressmen could understand.

A short time later, Chester Davis, writing in the Journal and Sentinel of the State's welfare program, called Dr. Winston a thorough-going pro. She had not always been personally popular in and around the Capitol, he wrote, largely, perhaps, for her enthusiasm for keeping welfare free from political entanglements. But, he went on, her associates respected her as a crack administrator and a woman of vision who retains her sense of the practical.

Thus, while the announcement of Dr. Winston's appointment as the Federal Government's first Welfare Commissioner came as more or less of a surprise, her appointment is not itself surprising.

The Welfare Administration is a new division in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, bringing under one head a number of bureaus and functions that heretofore have operated under other departmental supervision. Furthermore, revisions in the welfare program made by the last Congress both enlarge the Federal stake in public welfare and put new emphasis on the rehabilitative and preventive services.

What better qualifications could Secretary Celebrezze have asked for in the new administrator of this program than precisely those with which Dr. Winston is endowed? Someone who is on record as knowing, supporting, and being able to interpret the new program of public welfare—a crack administrator, a person of vision who retains a sense of the practical, indeed, a person with enthusiasm for keeping welfare free from political entanglements.

Dr. Winston had been nationally recognized long before this; Secretary Celebrezze has simply translated that recognition into service at a higher level. North Carolina is nevertheless newly honored by her new honor, and we wish her well in the wider responsibilities to which she has been called.

[From the Sanford (N.C.) Herald, Dec. 21, 1962]

Tar Heels Will Be Proud

Dr. Ellen Black Winston, 18 years the State's welfare commissioner, has been appointed U.S. Welfare Commissioner. She will have the responsibility of putting into effect a new reorganizational move that places welfare on an equal basis with health and education in the U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

In this important assignment she will join a few other notable Tar Heels in Washington. Dr. Winston is quite an addition and hers is a real assignment.

Tar Heels are of many schools of thought on our State welfare administration. Party affiliation has little to do with it. There are Democrats and Republicans who soundly cuss the welfare and others who realize its farflung and varied services. However, all who have had any dealing with Dr. Winston realize that here is an administrator who is truly competent, who knows and understands her field of work. Legislators who have heard her testify at committee hearings come away with admiration for the way she can field the answers, quote the statistics and information she has at her fingertips.

Regardless of whether everyone agrees with all welfare policies, North Carolinians can be proud to have such a woman as Ellen Winston in Washington. She is a graduate of Converse College, a liberal arts college, has a knack for statistics, holds a Ph. D. from the University of Chicago in sociology. She worked for many Government bureaus and agencies in Washington prior to World War II. She has also headed the department of sociology at Meredith College where her students can testify she was a stimulating and brilliant teacher.

In the new Federal set up she will direct the Bureau of Family Services, the Children's Bureau, and Cuban refugee program. Special staffs on aging, juvenile delinquency, and youth development which presently report to Secretary Anthony J. Celebrezze will report directly to Dr. Winston.

The position pays $20,000 a year as contrasted to the $12,000 Dr. Winston was paid by North Carolina, but the magnitude of the task would frighten a lesser official. We predict that Dr. Winston will greet the new assignment with the enthusiasm and verve North Carolinians have come to expect from her.

The agency Dr. Winston heads will mark the first major realinement of Federal welfare agencies since the Federal welfare program was enacted in 1934. As North Carolina commissioner, Dr. Winston has heard her share of complaints of too much Federal regulation in this field. She already knows the Federal program is under fire. Here is an unparalleled opportunity to do something about removing opportunity of abuse in the Federal program. The eyes of the Nation will be upon her and her decisions.

[From the Kinston (N.C.) Daily Free Press, Dec. 20, 1962]

A Quality Appointment That Honors North Carolina

Appointment of Dr. Ellen Winston of Raleigh, commissioner of public welfare in North Carolina for the past 18 years, to a new post as Federal Commissioner of Welfare, comes as an honor to North Carolina as well as the appointee.

Dr. Winston will get a year's leave of absence to take the post, which has been created by a reorganization of the Federal Welfare Administration. Her salary will be $20,000 a year, compared with her present post, which pays $12,000. R. Eugene Brown, assistant welfare commissioner, will become acting commissioner and director of the State Department of Public Welfare.

The new Federal agency which Dr. Winston will direct will comprise the Children's Bureau of Family Services. It also will include Cuban relief, the special staff on the aging, as well as the juvenile delinquency and youth development staff. These five agencies make-up the principal Federal-State programs operated by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. It constitutes a $3 billion per annum program.

Dr. Winston is peculiarly fitted for her new post after 18 years of experience with the administration of North Carolina's public welfare program. She has been closely associated with the details of the matching services programs and knows where there is need for improvement and flexibility. North Carolina will miss her services, but it is good that the Federal agency can have the benefit of her long and valuable experience.

Congratulations to HEW Secretary Anthony J. Celebrezze on his selection and to Dr. Winston on the honor and responsibility that have come to her.

[From the Wilmington (N.C.) Star, Dec. 21, 1962]

Tar Heel Tapped for Post

The Kennedy administration has tapped another North Carolinian for service with the Federal Government, with the announcement that Dr. Ellen Winston, State welfare commissioner, will head a new Federal agency.

The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare is shifting the major welfare functions of social security to the new unit, in a move to strengthen both programs. It is the agency which Dr. Winston will take over as administrator. It is an agency handling welfare for children, the aging, and the needy.

A spokesman for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare said that social security and welfare had become too big and too diverse to be handled by a single administration. The split apparently is being made with a minimum of extra personnel and cost.

It is not surprising that social security and welfare have grown to larger proportions. In fact, it is to be expected that such would happen. Thus, it is well that steps are being taken now to strengthen the two programs by changing the administrative procedures and dividing the duties.

North Carolina has reason to be proud that our own Dr. Ellen Winston was chosen for this new and important post in the Federal Government. Dr. Winston not only is well known throughout North Carolina in welfare work, but also is nationally prominent for her work in juvenile delinquency and child welfare.

She is certainly eminently suited and qualified for the new post. This is evident, of course, by the fact that she was chosen for the job, doubtless from a field which included many well-qualified persons.

We feel sure she will establish an outstanding record of service, and one in which all Tar Heels can take pride.

[From the Lexington (N.C.) Dispatch, Dec. 21, 1962]

Fine Ladies to Washington

As the Mona Lisa, the world's most treasured painting, arrived in Washington on Wednesday it was announced there that another fine lady is coming to the Nation's Capital to help administer one of the most important Government programs.

Dr. Ellen Winston, who has served as North Carolina State commissioner of welfare for the past 18 years, will become National Commissioner of Public Welfare. This is a new post established by Congress in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and the new Commissioner will receive a salary of $20,000. And she'll be worth it.

Another fine lady, Mrs. W. T. Bost, was the State's first commissioner of welfare, and did a great job as did her successor who is now stepping higher. Mrs. Bost was the wife of that ace of North Carolina newspaperman, Tom Bost. Dr. Winston's husband, Sanford, is a professor at State College.

The great lady from Paris is an honored visitor. Dr. Winston will remain as a national asset.

[From the Hickory (N.C.) Daily Record, Dec. 20, 1962]

Deserved Promotion

The selection of Dr. Ellen Winston, head of the North Carolina State Welfare Commission for the past 18 years, to have charge of the Nation's reorganized $3 billion welfare program, is a deserved promotion.

We doubt if there is another person anywhere in the United States, who has a better record of capability in this field than Dr. Winston. We congratulate Health, Education, and Welfare Secretary Anthony J. Celebrezze on his excellent choice for the important assignment.

It will be the job of Dr. Winston to bring together all of the Department's major welfare programs in the new setup effective January 28.

R. Eugene Brown, this State's assistant welfare commissioner, will be named acting commissioner by Governor Sanford, and North Carolina Welfare Board Chairman Howard Manning has announced that Dr. Winston has been granted a 1-year leave of absence to take the Federal post.

Dr. Winston is recognized as one of the outstanding State welfare administrators in the country.

The reorganization which she will now undertake, is the first major realinement of U.S. welfare functions since the Department was established in 1953, and will make the Welfare Administration the sixth major operating agency of the Department.

Secretary Celebrezze said the new agency reflects the magnitude and importance to the Nation of the new welfare amendments, which President Kennedy called the most far-reaching revision of our public welfare program since it was enacted in 1935.

Dr. Winston is author of numerous books and articles for the National Economic and Social Planning Association, the Carnegie Corp., and the Federal Government. She is 59 and was born in Bryson City, N.C. She was graduated from Converse College in Spartanburg, S.C., and received a Ph. D. in sociology from the University of Chicago.

[From the High Point (N.C.) Enterprise, Dec. 20, 1962]

Dr. Winston Qualified To Realine National Welfare

Auspiciously does the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare launch its own Welfare Administration by calling Dr. Ellen Winston, who has directed ably North Carolina's welfare program these past 18 years, to head that significant new operation.

Emphasis of this new division underscores the Kennedy administration's objective of making certain that services to children, families and the aged will be built into the Nation's relief programs. The Social Security Administration is being stripped of its Children's Bureau as well as the Bureau of Family Services, which hitherto has operated all federally supported relief programs.

Indeed, gathering of those bureaus, together with the Cuban refugee program, the special staff on aging and juvenile delinquency and youth development creates such a complexity of five welfare agencies as only one of Dr. Winston's broad understanding, executive capability and tireless energy could superintend.

The development is described by Washington officials as the first major realinement of welfare functions since the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare was set up a decade ago. HEW Secretary Anthony J. Celebrezze says it reflects magnitude and importance of the new welfare amendments approved earlier this year by Congress.

President Kennedy, who has called it the most far-reaching revision of our public welfare program since it was enacted in 1935, has chosen well a director. Dr. Winston, despite criticisms leveled at handling of an almost impossible task, has done a great work in the difficult development of a welfare agency which, for efficiency, ranks with the best of the Nation.

The administration, of course, is patently clearing the decks of Social Security to make way for medical care if and when that next objective is loaded upon social security. The procedure is something that is wholesome irrespective of when and how the following development occurs, for Dr. Winston can be counted upon to make her significant new Welfare Administration a creditable contribution to the national well-being.

[From the Greenville (N.C.) Reflector, Dec. 21, 1962]

Dr. Winston Can Contribute Much

Dr. Ellen Winston's appointment as head of the new Welfare Administration of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare is a compliment to her ability and the program she has formulated and administered as head of North Carolina's department of welfare.

During the 18 years Dr. Winston has directed the activities of the welfare department of the State, she has moved the program steadily in the direction of preventive and rehabilitation measures rather than merely assisting in the care of persons in unfortunate circumstances. The State program has broadened far beyond the care status to assure that youngsters in particular will be able to make their own way economically in their later years.

By placing emphasis on helping families help themselves, the program in North Carolina has meant a great deal more to the State than would have been the case if emphasis has been on merely providing financial assistance to indigent citizens.

The leadership Dr. Winston has given the program in the State will stand the Federal program in good stead as she goes to the new post in Washington. The experience she has gained in emphasizing preventive and rehabilitation programs in North Carolina may well be reflected in the new administrative agency under the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. If that supposition proves correct, it will bring about important constructive changes in Federal policies toward the entire welfare program.

[From the Durham (N.C.) Herald, Dec. 21, 1962]

Dr. Winston Takes a New Job

Dr. Ellen Winston's appointment to head the Federal welfare program in the reorganization of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare is a deserved tribute to a remarkably able lady and a merited compliment to North Carolina's welfare program.

No person engaged in public welfare work is more thoroughly familiar with Federal welfare legislation than is Dr. Winston. Not only does she know in detail what has been enacted and how it is applied and have that knowledge readily available for explanation, but she also keeps alert to every development on the welfare legislative front.

As important as such knowledge is in the administration of the welfare program, it is not Dr. Winston's only strong point. She is not only knowledgeable but she is also imaginative in applying the public welfare principle to human needs. Thus she will bring to her new work the knowledge of the welfare program and policy, and she is well equipped to give creative leadership in the field of public welfare at the national level.

In her new job, Dr. Winston will be in charge of the various welfare programs, such as old age assistance, medical aid to the aged, aid to dependent children, aid to the blind, and aid to the totally and permanently disabled in the Bureau of Family Services; the Children's Bureau, which administers the Federal programs of child welfare and maternal and child health, and services to crippled children; the Cuban refugee program; and the Federal programs on aging, juvenile delinquency, and youth development.

North Carolina may well mingle regret with pride in Dr. Winston's new appointment. She has administered a difficult program well, and her leadership is in no little part responsible for the good public welfare program the State has. Since Dr. Winston has been given a leave of absence and her assistant has been named acting commissioner, the natural expectation would be that she will return to her post as head of the welfare program in North Carolina. The prevalent view, however, is that her move to Washington is more or less permanent. Her ability and experience forecast continued service and perhaps promotion in the National Government.

FEDERAL DEBT CEILING

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, the interest that will be paid on the national debt in the current fiscal year will be more than twice the total expenditures of the Government when I was first elected to the House in 1932. Deficit spending in a big way was started with the passage by the House of a so-called relief and recovery bill of $8,400 million. Only nine Members of the House, including myself, voted against that bill. In speaking against that bill, I predicted that if Congress embarked upon a spending program of that magnitude, we would live to see a national debt of $50 billion and that such a debt would not only involve backbreaking taxes but be a grossly unfair mortgage upon the opportunities of generations yet unborn.

Next Monday, I will have completed 30 years of service in the Congress—14 on the House side, and 16 on the Senate side. In the life of any nation that is a brief span, but in that span I have seen our national debt rise from $19,487,002,444 in 1932 to $307 billion. The permanent limitation as of July 1, 1963, upon the size of the debt is $285 billion but the temporary ceiling is $308 billion. We know now, of course, that it is not possible for the debt to go back to $285 billion because it is now over $300 billion and instead of being decreased it will, between now and next June 30, be measurably increased. The administration, not knowing exactly what the deficit will be for the current fiscal year, wishes to be on the safe side by having the Congress authorize a temporary debt limit of $308 billion. And, if we authorize all of the proposed spending schemes and then add a $10 billion tax cut, the next jump in the debt ceiling will have to be in the neighborhood of $320 billion.

At an appropriate time, I intend to discuss the danger not only to a stable dollar, but likewise to our Democratic institutions of a deliberate policy of a deficit financing and at that time indicate the grave necessity of curtailing the spending program which has been presented to us which will necessitate a debt limit of $320 billion and a still larger debt limit in the succeeding year. In the meantime, I wish to call attention to a thoughtful article on increasing the debt ceiling, from the Wall Street Journal of Wednesday, February 27, entitled "Administration Braces for Real Battle Over Increasing Federal Debt Ceiling." Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that that article may be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RAISING THE ROOF—ADMINISTRATION BRACES FOR REAL BATTLE OVER INCREASING FEDERAL DEBT CEILING

(By Henry Gemmill)

WASHINGTON.—How far the management of U.S. finances may be veering from ordinary logic—anyone's logic, liberal or conservative—can perhaps be indicated by this fact:

Never has any administration approached Congress for the frequent ritual of elevating the Federal debt ceiling with so much nervousness, so little confidence, as Mr. Kennedy's team exhibits at this moment.

The White House finds it wildly illogical for the Capitol to show signs of balking. Congress votes the appropriations; Congress legislates the tax rates; when the fruit of these is deficits, how can Congress decline to recognize by law the inevitability of an upsurge in Federal borrowings?

Influential conservatives on the Hill agree this complaint has some validity. "Trying to stop the debt rise by holding down the legal ceiling seems about like trying to stop an elevator by grabbing the indicator arrow," remarks one of them. Yet he does emphatically intend to attempt it—and in powerful company—as a last resort against what he considers madly illogical grand designs for deficit spending.

So the debt ceiling question, from whichever side it is examined, seems to have its roots in irrationality. Yet, after years of stirring up little more than political noise, it is rather suddenly emerging as an issue which henceforward may have to be taken seriously. Though Mr. Kennedy may well get the debt roof raised to his specifications this year, he must return to the fray in 1964.

The rise of this issue is, of course, propelled by the historic rise of the debt, yet one must glance also at the history of the debt ceiling itself, which is by no means identical.

A WARTIME INNOVATION

Though congressional authority to control Federal indebtedness stems from the Constitution, for more than a century legislators created no ceilings but instead voted carefully specified obligations for particular purposes. Two World Wars sired the ceilings; in 1917 general-purpose borrowing was authorized but specific limits were set on the amount of bonds, certificates, notes, and bills issued; in 1941 the permitted levels were lumped under an all-inclusive maximum.

There could be no great argument over lifting this higher and higher during World War II, and in early postwar years the ceiling seemed academic because actual debt was left drifting billions below. During that relaxed time Harry Truman could have slipped through Congress legislation abolishing the ceiling or making it infinitely elastic, some Treasury officials believe, and they could kick him for not doing it. By the time Dwight Eisenhower took charge the debt was piling high enough to make the ceiling sticky—not so much because of congressional obstinancy as because of his conservative fiscal commitments. Embarrassed by having to jack up the ceiling in 1954, Ike's administration actually encouraged two reductions, then found itself heading again to new heights. And Mr. Kennedy continued this course.

So, though it may seem longer, the economy bloc in Congress has been hitching its crusade to the debt ceiling issue for less than a decade. And most of that time many have thought they were conducting mere mock battles—little dramas useful perhaps in keeping alive the dream of black ink, but certain of failure. Not until last year—and it came as a surprise and a shock—did the administration almost suffer defeat. An $8 billion ceiling boost squeaked through the House by only 210 votes to 192; it got through the Senate Finance Committee with a one-vote margin.

It would be unsophisticated to suppose that conservatives could block a ceiling rise this year simply by converting 10 Members of the House who voted for last year's boost. The election has filled many seats in Congress with new men; nobody knows for sure how their votes will split. More importantly, a fair share of the votes traditionally cast against ceiling hikes has come from Congressmen who are not economizers, who back nearly every spending bill that comes along. These flexible fellows vote against cranking up the ceiling only to balance their record with constituents, and will perhaps continue to do so only if confident their votes won't pile up into a majority. "Our greatest risk is that these gentlemen will miscalculate," says one administration expert.

REASONS FOR FEAR

Nevertheless, the administration has reasons to fear even fiercer opposition this year.

Before Congress now is the Kennedy tax-cut program; in combination with his spending budget it has alerted the public to prolonged planned deficits—and so far the populace doesn't seem to like it. By the end of this session, to be sure, Congress will have rewritten the tax measure and at least altered much of the tax reform which contributes to the mood of aversion; by then it is possible the public will be eager for tax cuts—deficits and all. But the debt ceiling issue will not wait until then.

On the contrary, the administration insists it must have one round of legislation passed before April; hearings before the Ways and Means Committee begin today. And then it must trot back for a second hike—a big one—before July. This seems an open invitation for Congress to pour all its current disgruntlement onto the debt ceiling issue.

In detail, the picture grows sharper. Congress passed last year's ceiling increase in precise conformity with a Presidential budget forecasting that the current fiscal year ending June 30 would end up in balance, with no net rise in debt. The calculation was that the ceiling needed to be lifted to $308 billion just to meet a midwinter seasonal peak; in line with this Congress voted the boost but provided that the ceiling should drop to $305 billion in April, and back to $300 billion on June 25.

Now, however, the administration is forced to base its first ceiling plea to the new Congress on a flat contradiction of last year's logic. Its current case is that the roof must be lifted to $308 billion for the remainder of the fiscal year, because its own budget forecast turned out to be nonsense, because the Government has slipped into a multibillion-dollar deficit not just seasonally but for sure.

And while they are voting on that, Congressmen will have in mind that by June they'll be voting on a far fancier hike. Naturally enough, tacticians of any administration would be unwilling to let the matter rest on such uneasy ground.

"What would happen if we simply refused to raise this ceiling on the Federal debt?" a senior Senator once inquired in committee session.

"The first thing we'd do is stop your paycheck, Senator," roared the Secretary of the Treasury.

A SPECTACULAR DRAMA

That short story dates back to Eisenhower days, but the question has gained pertinence and Kennedy men still respond in the same spirit. The consequences of a debt ceiling crackdown are described as disasters, vivid enough to scare most any Congressman—or citizen.

A spectacular drama of the near-future can be—and is—written around the following set of assumptions:

Mr. Kennedy asks Congress to lift the ceiling for the fiscal year beginning July 1, to a figure in the neighborhood of $320 billion.

Congress wrangles right through June and passes no ceiling legislation whatever; thus the legal debt roof drops to its "permanent" level, $285 billion.

Outstanding debt, which has been riding along well above $300 billion, stands clearly in excess of the legal maximum.

Now let the cameras roll.

The first and hasty action of Treasury Secretary Douglas Dillon is to dispatch telegrams frantically requesting a halt to savings bonds sales. Thousands of telegrams, not just to banks and other places of public sale but also to all the employers who run payroll deduction plans. Mr. Dillon's lawyers have told him that any bonds that slip through after June are not Government obligations at all; they are his personal debt.

Next the weekly rollover of short-term Treasury bills is stopped. No replacements can be issued for around $2 billion of outstanding bills coming in for repayment each week. These alone are enough to suck up within 3 weeks the $5 billion or so which the Treasury usually keeps in cash. Governmental pockets are empty.

CAN'T MEET PAYROLLS

By this time the Government begins missing payments on its missiles and other purchases. It can't meet its payrolls, nor if it fires Federal workers can it give them severance pay due. Such checkwriting, which normally runs around $2 billion a week, can be done belatedly and in a trickle from any tax revenues that come in. But no payment priorities based on hardship or necessity can be set up; legal opinion holds that bills must be paid in chronological order of presentation.

Worse yet, the Treasury begins missing interest payments on existing debt, and fails to redeem bonds that mature. Securities markets fall into turmoil which makes all past panics look pale. Foreigners launch the great run on U.S. gold, and the dollar is done for.

At this point the official script ends, but one is left with the feeling that the Congressmen don't get reelected.

Though it's a lively drama, its chief defect is that it could only happen in real life by accident. Accidents can happen; Mr. Kennedy himself flew off to Mexico last year without signing a bill boosting the ceiling; for most of 1 day the U.S. debt stood at an illegal level. (It was a Sunday, no harm done). But the fact of the matter is that conservative congressional leaders have no slightest intention of establishing a ceiling lower than outstanding debt.

The strategy they outline is entirely different. They would aim to set a ceiling high enough to avoid pushing the Government into any sudden crisis of bankruptcy—but low enough so that within a few months the administration would have to cut back some of its deficit spending, hopefully in an orderly and selective fashion. Measured in money, their objective would be to cut the ceiling below administration desires not by a magnitude of $35 billion, as in the sensational script, but by whatever smaller sum seemed safe and feasible—$1 billion, $2 billion, perhaps a bit more.

If that were the game, argue administration men, it would produce results precisely the opposite of what the congressional economy bloc desires. The Kennedy government could not—or at least would not—cut back its spending but instead would do what the Eisenhower government did when squeezed by the debt ceiling several times during the fifties. It would resort to costly gimmickry.

One gimmick employed in Eisenhower's time of pinch was to have the Federal National Mortgage Association sell directly to the public some of its own notes, which technically do not count as part of the national debt, instead of drawing funds from the Treasury. Another trick was to have the Commodity Credit Corporation raise more of its money for agricultural price-support loans by selling to the public certificates of interest, similarly outside the legal debt, instead of pulling money from the Treasury. These agencies had to offer investors a slightly higher return than would have been required through normal Treasury borrowing; by one calculation the Government ended up paying an extra $18 million in interest.

COULD DUMP MORTGAGES

Besides repeating the old tricks, the Government could try plenty of new ones. Officials suggest, for instance, that the Veterans' Administration could raise some money by dumping its foreclosed mortgages on the market—but only at discount prices, and at the risk of drying up investment money needed to sustain private construction.

Leaders of the congressional economy bloc are aware the Government could and probably would seek this escape from a ceiling squeeze; they agree that it would promote no true economy. But some of them do have an answer: "We'll just wait for the next round of ceiling legislation—and then we will nail 'em."

This double-dose technique could conceivably be applied by Congress rapidly, since the administration must seek its two ceiling boosts before July. Tactics are still fluid, however; economy leaders could aim at just one squeeze this year, and wait till 1964 for the second. At any rate, the theory is that if the administration responded to a first tight ceiling with no more than gimmicks, the legislators could insist upon an official commitment on spending cuts before setting the next ceiling. Failing to get it, they could try making the second squeeze tight enough to exhaust the possibilities of gimmickry and still force a reduction in expenditures.

Suppose—and it is a large supposition—Congress did eventually shove the administration into real spending slashes. Would legislators find themselves much happier over the outcome than officials downtown? Very likely not.

ABDICATION OF POWER

The cutbacks would be chosen by the administration, not by Congress. Legislators who have raised "merry Ned" over past administration refusals to spend appropriated money—uproar over the B-70 bomber is the classic case—could silently choke on resentment as their pet projects were maimed or buried. In the attempt to assert control over the executive branch, legislators would find they had in practice abdicated much of their present power.

It is obvious enough that a Congress really set on curbing spending could devise a half-dozen better ways of doing it. But Congress is not devising them, nor likely soon to do so. If an argument can be made for converting the debt ceiling issue from a talking point into a sharp tool of economy, it must rest on this: Risky and awkward though it may be, it is conveniently at hand.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I am very glad to have been present and to hear the presentation of the distinguished Senator from Virginia. I understand that in the past 2 years the Congress has lifted the debt ceiling three times. It is obvious that the next request will be that the debt ceiling be raised to $320 billion.

Mr. ROBERTSON. The Senator is correct, if we adopt all the proposed spending schemes. But in the near future I shall make a speech in which I shall indicate that we need not adopt some of the proposed spending schemes, and the ceiling may not have to be increased to that point.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I recall the statement made by the colleague of the Senator from Virginia that our present national debt embraces the value of all buildings, equipment, and land within the United States. With that situation we are confronted with a proposal to enter upon a spending program and a tax-reduction program that would make mandatory the authorization of a debt limitation of $320 billion. I suggest that such action would lead us toward economic suicide.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I am sure my distinguished colleague is correct.

SECRETARY DILLON DENIES CONGRESSMAN POWELL'S STATEMENT CONCERNING THE VALUE OF COUNTERPART FUNDS

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, on February 20, 1963, in a press conference a Member of Congress whom I have been asked to refer to as a "friend of the Kennedy administration" while defending his expenditures of counterpart funds quoted Secretary Dillon as follows:

> The Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. Dillon, told Congressman JEFFERY COHELAN, of California, when asked, what would happen to counterpart funds now that the House had stopped the use of them. He said the only thing there is to do is to put a match to them.

I was confident that the Secretary had made no such statement, and I was concerned that anyone would suggest that any responsible official—especially the Secretary of the Treasury—could ever have spoken so lightly concerning the value of these foreign currencies which belong to the American taxpayers.

To clarify this point, I wired Secretary Dillon on February 22 asking for a denial or an explanation.

I have just received a reply from the Secretary in which he emphatically denies that he ever made any such statement. Secretary Dillon said:

> On the contrary I consider that counterpart funds belonging to the United States require the same prudent management and careful handling as any other moneys of the Government.

At this point I ask unanimous consent that both my telegram of February 22 and the Secretary's reply of February 26 be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the telegram and reply were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FEBRUARY 22, 1963.

Hon. DOUGLAS DILLON,
Secretary of the Treasury,
Washington, D.C.:

In Congressman POWELL's press conference of the 20th he quoted you as having told him that counterpart funds were valueless and his direct quote was quote we might as well put a match to them end of quote. I would appreciate either an emphatic denial that you made such a statement or an explanation.

JOHN J. WILLIAMS,
U.S. Senator.

THE SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY,
Washington, D.C., February 26, 1963.

Hon. JOHN J. WILLIAMS,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR JOHN: In answer to your telegram about the remark attributed to me on counterpart funds, let me assure you that I have no recollection of any such conversation referring to counterpart funds, or their value, or having said that we might as well put a match to them. On the contrary, I consider that counterpart funds belonging to the United States require the same prudent management and careful handling as any other moneys of the Government.

With best wishes.

Sincerely,

DOUGLAS DILLON.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I join Secretary Dillon in emphasizing that these foreign currencies—counterpart funds—do belong to the taxpayers of the United States, and I am sure that most Members of Congress recognize this point.

I am not criticizing official trips by Members of Congress when such visits to foreign countries are connected with their official duties. Such trips properly conducted can be constructive and of considerable benefit both to the Congress and to the American people.

In making these trips most Members of Congress recognize that they are in effect goodwill ambassadors of our Government and that the foreign currencies or dollars used to defray the expenses of their trips are taxpayers' money and should be accounted for accordingly.

It was never intended that these taxpayers' funds be used to finance a tour of the nightclubs of Europe.

However, as an example of the loose manner in which the State Department has made these foreign currencies, which belong to the American taxpayers, available to this friend of the administration, I will insert the cablegram sent by the State Department last summer to our embassies in connection with the trip then being planned.

Since a claim had been made by this individual that he had done only what other Members of Congress had been doing, I checked with the State Department to verify the accuracy of this cablegram, and I also asked that I be furnished with copies of any other similar cablegrams that had been sent for other Members of Congress. I said I would include all of them in the RECORD at this point. None were furnished.

At this point I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the cablegram sent last summer by the State Department.

There being no objection, the cablegram was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Congressman ADAM C. POWELL, chairman, Committee on Education and Labor, accompanied by Mrs. Tamara J. Wall and Miss Corrine Huff, staff members, traveling Western Europe accordance following itinerary:

August 8 sailing *Queen Mary* arriving Southampton, August 13; Paris, August 16; Venice, August 20; Rome, August 23; Athens, August 27; Delphi, August 30; sailing *Leonardo de Vinci*, September 15 from Gibraltar. Arrival times and flights forwarded when firm.

Provisions handbook congressional travel apply. Codel and party authorized use local currencies 19FT561 funds. Meet assist appoint control officers.

Request one single and one double with bath as follows: London-Cumberland Marbel Arch Hotel; Paris Hotel San Regis; Venice Royal Denieli; Rome (1) Excelsior (2) Flora (3) Victoria which ever has special embassy rates; Athens beachhouse at Astir Hotel Delphi new government hotel name unknown. Confirm Department soonest.

London, request three tickets August 14 and 15, best shows playing, except Broadway plays.

Paris-Codel desires use U.S. Army car and chauffeur. Reserve three for first show and dinner best table Lido August 16.

Southampton-Codel requests be met at *Queen Mary* Cherbourg with $100 U.S. equivalent in local currencies for each member party.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Other equally serious questions which have been raised concerning the tax delinquencies of this individual as well as the propriety of certain loans, guaranteed mortgages, and outright grants of Government money which have been made to companies with which he is associated, are all discussed more fully in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of February 5 and February 20.

Before concluding I want to commend the Members of the House for the steps which they proposed last Tuesday as a start toward correcting this situation.

Congress cannot afford to let any Member conduct himself in a manner which will cast a reflection upon the entire Congress; nor can Congress sit back and allow the administration to open the doors of the Federal Treasury to a favored Member of Congress who may hold a key position in regard to their legislative program or who may be in a position to control an important block of votes in the general election.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD an article entitled "Because He Is a Negro?" published in the New York Times, issue of February 23, in which comment is made on the subject.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BECAUSE HE IS A NEGRO?

After a soul-searching self-inquiry into why in the world he should be under criticism, Representative ADAM CLAYTON POWELL, JR., has come up with the complete answer: It is "unequivocally" because he is a Negro.

Nobody would be objecting to his long, outrageous record as a congressional absentee; no one would have noticed his nightclubbing junkets to Europe; the presence of his wife on the congressional payroll at over $13,000 while resident in Puerto Rico, would have been ignored, as would POWELL's own desertion of responsibility as a House committee chairman in the midst of important hearings. All these possible explanations for displeasure by his colleagues and other critics including ourselves have no validity, Mr. POWELL states. His only mistake is that he is not white.

It is not unexpected that Mr. POWELL has chosen such a convenient and demagogic refuge. An appeal to race and the drumming up of charges of bigotry have long been his political stock in trade. The fact is that a Negro in high office usually—rightly or wrongly—receives favored treatment, and is nearly exempt from criticism, in the press and elsewhere, unless his faults are so obvious that silence becomes intolerable. There is a general and laudable desire to see a Negro succeed when he has attained a position of public trust. Criticism is avoided for the very reason that it might be mistaken for prejudice. Now Mr. POWELL has again raised the racial issue in a desperate gesture of self-defense.

He is not alone in being criticized for junketing around the world on flimsy missions at the taxpayer's expense. He is not unique in being criticized for having a member of the family on the payroll—although it must be admitted that such employees usually have the good grace to stay on the mainland, at least.

His philosophy of "everybody else is doing it, why shouldn't I?" is, we suppose, a commonplace reaction of the most commonplace of politicians. It is disappointing, however, to see POWELL—a spiritual as well as a political leader—not setting a better example. The tragedy of the long Powell career in office is that he, unusually gifted with intelligence, talent and personality, has chosen to be equal with the least conscientious in Congress rather than the most.

So, to vindicate himself and not be accused of running out under attack, POWELL said he has changed his mind and will not retire but instead will seek another term.

This is really bad news, for New York and for Congress.

ONE HUNDRED AND FIFTIETH ANNIVERSARY OF "STAR-SPANGLED BANNER"

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, next year will mark the 150th anniversary of the composition of "The Star-Spangled Banner." The occasion of its composition, at the height of the British attempt to invade Baltimore City by sailing up the bay and overwhelming the defenses at Fort McHenry, gives to this anniversary a special significance for citizens of the Free State.

The Metropolitan Civic Association of Baltimore is taking the lead in arranging for appropriate activities in Maryland. This organization has adopted a resolution calling upon the President to appoint a special national commission to arrange for a nationwide celebration marking this 150th anniversary.

I ask unanimous consent that this resolution be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas 1964 will mark the passage of 150 years since Francis Scott Key saw our flag flying over Fort McHenry "in the dawn's early light" on September 14, 1814, and then penned the immortal "Star-Spangled Banner": Therefore be it

Resolved, That the President be requested to appoint a special national commission to begin formulating and arranging for a nationwide "Star-Spangled Banner" celebration in 1964 so that all citizens may point with pride to Francis Scott Key's unique contribution to the Nation, as exemplified by our national anthem and its 150th anniversary.

SENATOR DOUGLAS FIGHTS FOR PUBLIC

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the distinguished Mr. Irving Dilliard, a very fine correspondent, has written a remarkable tribute to the senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] on his several endeavors in the public interest. I ask unanimous consent that the tribute be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DOUGLAS STUBBORNLY FIGHTS FOR PUBLIC

(By Irving Dilliard)

CHICAGO.—Thank to his persistence, two of Senator PAUL H. DOUGLAS' bills to benefit the rank and file of the American people stand a greatly improved chance of passage in the new Congress. One is to require lending agencies to tell borrowers the annual rate of interest on loans. The other is to preserve a modest portion of the Lake Michigan sand dunes as a national park.

Both bills are outstandingly meritorious. Up to now both have been blocked by strong commercial interests which either profit (as in the case of the money lenders) or stand to profit (as in the case of those who are hungry to despoil the dunes area) through their opposition.

The "little people" are fortunate to have a champion so unrelenting in his devotion to their welfare as is Senator DOUGLAS, of Illinois. For this is the third Congress in which he has introduced his truth-in-lending bill. For 6 years he has refused to take rejection for an answer.

Ample testimony has been heard. Witnesses have stated under oath that grossly exorbitant interest rates are packed into many loans.

FOR HOW LONG?

A borrower in financial need, perhaps dire extremity, goes to a money lender. The lender says the rate is 6 percent. That does not sound too high and the loan goes through. But it would sound a lot higher if the lender was required by law to say that this 6 percent was not 6 percent a year but 6 percent a month and then quoted the higher annual rate.

Some greedy lenders often charge all the traffic will bear. Some regularly get 42 percent while more unscrupulous lenders have run the annual rate to 100 percent and even higher.

After having milked countless adults, some credit extenders are now going to work on teenagers. They say that this credit can be had for "pennies a week." What they do not say that these "pennies a week" charges can run as high as 80 percent of the most of the article bought.

Last year the honest interest bill was defeated in a Senate Banking Subcommittee by vote of 5 to 4. The rejecting majority consisted of one Democrat (Robertson, of Virginia) and four Republicans (Capehart, of Indiana; Bush, of Connecticut; Bennett, of Utah; and Beall, of Maryland). Capehart and Bush were not reelected and so they cannot again oppose the bill. Nor is it likely that their two successors will take the side of the gougers.

RECREATION NEEDS

The other Douglas bill that has aroused the exploiters is so sound that it is hard to see how the opposition is bold enough to declare itself. Our population is now 187 million. Soon it will be 200 million. With the rise in population goes the need for more recreational areas—particularly adjacent to large metropolitan centers.

Yet certain industrial interests seem to have determined on destroying the heart of the Indiana duneland shore. They reckoned without considering Mrs. James H. Buell, who 11 years ago formed a save-the-dunes council which in turn enlisted Senator DOUGLAS's support.

In the short time that he has been in office, President Kennedy has taken strong stands before Congress for preserving a part of the dunes shore and for the truth-in-lending legislation. On the latter he said, "Excessive and untimely use of credit arising out of ignorance of its true cost is harmful both to the stability of the economy and to the welfare of the public."

The exploiters have had their way on these issues long enough. Let's pass both Douglas bills so President Kennedy can sign them for the people's benefit.

A REPORT ON COMMUNISM IN CZECHOSLOVAKIA AS TOLD TO AMERICANS

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, Sunday was the 15th anniversary of the day the Communists took over Czechoslovakia. This dark event in modern history brought the tragic death of the great Czechoslovak patriot, Jan Masaryk, and the tragic death of a free nation which was born among Czechoslovak exiles living in the United States during World War I.

In bitter observance of this anniversary, the Czechoslovak National Council of America has prepared a statement on life today in their homeland. It is a revealing picture of life in a Communist country, a Soviet satellite. It contains a proposal which we, as Members of the Senate and the Congress of the United States, might well consider. More than anything else, it reminds us of the great love which the Czechoslovak people bore for their free nation and their longing to rid themselves of their Communist overlords and enjoy the light of freedom once again.

I ask unanimous consent that it be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A REPORT ON COMMUNISM IN CZECHOSLOVAKIA AS TOLD TO AMERICANS

Fifteen years ago, on February 24, 1948, Communists took over Czechoslovakia with Soviet assistance, under the personal supervision of Moscow's hatchetman Valerian Zorin, the recent troublemaker at the United Nations. At first, the Communists made an effort to bluff the free world into believing that the seizure had been an act of a free people. Now that pretense is no longer necessary, the Communists brazenly describe how they plotted the overthrow of the democratic government and how much they depended on Soviet help.

What communism has meant to the people of Czechoslovakia and how much it has changed their lives is borne out in thousands of letters received by American relatives. The Czechoslovak National Council of America, an organization of Americans of Czechoslovak descent, with headquarters in Chicago and branches in a number of cities, has made a study of personal mail from Czechoslovakia and on the basis of this information concludes that Christmas 1962 in Czechoslovakia was the worst since 1945, the first postwar Christmas when the country was left bare by the Nazis.

In their letters, Czechoslovak citizens complain: "If one is not young enough and strong enough to queue up for hours from very early morning for a ration of 4 ounces of butter and 1 pound of margarine, there is nothing left within a few hours. Electricity is shut off early. Prague streets are dark. Trains are unheated. There is a fuel shortage. In the mining town of Kladno near Prague, people stood in line for 20 pounds of coal, which they had to carry home in sacks, when and if they got any. Water pipes are frozen, but former plumbers are not allowed to take house calls and repair the damage; instead, people must wait until a government agency assigns a workman to the job. Since industry, farms, business, and professions have all been expropriated without compensation by the government and are government owned and operated, government agencies alone decide what should be done, by whom, for whom, and when, if at all. Consequently, the average citizen waits for weeks for the repair of pipes, furnace, roof, or crumbling wall. Should he wish to repair it himself, he is not given the material with which to do it, not even a bag of cement.

Service to customers is also very poor as there is no business competition and personal initiative. One waits for weeks, even for months, for a suit to be cleaned and shoes to be resoled. The quality of goods is far inferior to what it used to be. Despite the fact that every ablebodied—and not so ablebodied—man and woman is hard at work, there is a scarcity of almost everything and the prices of consumer goods are very high.

The reason for this is Red Czechoslovakia's foreign policy: acting as a spearhead for the Soviet Union, the Prague regime gives considerable economic aid to the underdeveloped and neutralist countries the Soviets are trying to woo to their side. This is why the Prague regime has been supplying Castro with food, considerable technical aid, and arms. In return, Czechoslovakia has received some unwanted Cuban sugar, for Czechoslovakia herself has always been a heavy exporter of beet sugar.

Most of all, people lament the loss of freedom in their letters to American friends: "There is work for everyone, but that is all we have. Nothing is as it used to be. We have only our memories." Families with young children are afraid to attend church in their hometown because their son and daughter would be barred from a higher school of learning and from a better job. The letters reflect the weariness, apathy, and despair of the writer.

American relatives are anxious to send gift packages of American goods to their close of kin. It would be simple for a daughter to send a warm sweater to her mother in Czechoslovakia who writes: "My room is unheated and it is so cold that I stay in bed and cry myself to sleep. A wool sweater is not to be had and a cotton sweater isn't worth anything." The Communists have made it impossible, however, for Americans to send gift packages by placing in 1961 an astronomical duty on new goods and an almost prohibitive duty of 50 crowns on a kilo of used clothing (approximately $7 for 2.2 pounds; hourly wage of average office worker is 6 crowns; of farmworker as little as 12 crowns a day).

The Red regime has a definite purpose in mind: to squeeze dollars out of Americans. If Americans wish to help their needy Czechoslovak relatives, they must send dollars to the Red regime with which Czechoslovak citizens can then buy Czechoslovak goods, if and when available, in a government store called Tuzex.

The Red regime then has dollars for anti-American propaganda and Communist subversion in Latin America and elsewhere in the world. In view of these facts, it is hard to understand why our Government is so careful to observe strictly all the niceties and why it has not restricted the Red government monopoly which bars American goods. After all, we are in a strong position for we have the dollars. We could insist, for instance, on gift packages of American goods (limited in size and value) if we continue to send dollars (unlimited, so far) and to travel to Czechoslovakia with unlimited spending money. In order to curtail the flow of American dollars abroad, the United States limits its citizens on how much they can bring back into this country duty free and exacts other limitations on its citizens as well. Why not set up reciprocity regulations or limitations when dealing with the Reds?

So far, Americans of Czechoslovakia have been asking this question in vain.

A $12 BILLION DEFICIT WILL NOT PROMOTE GROWTH

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, there is nothing in the country's long experience with deficits to suggest that the administration's proposed $12 billion deficit will significantly stimulate economic growth or even forestall a recession.

In our $550 billion economy, even the $12 billion deficit programed by the administration will be swamped by the impact of private economic forces.

In the past 32 years, this Nation has become thoroughly experienced in Federal deficits. Deficits have been a continuous way of life for our National Government almost throughout this period.

These deficits have been so immense that the national debt has exploded twentyfold since 1930: from $16 billion to over $300 billion.

But except in World War II when deficits were astronomical, there is no evidence that continuous deficits have promoted economic growth. The evidence is all to the contrary.

The biggest growth in peacetime Federal debt, for example, was in the decade of the thirties and in the period since 1957. The thirties period was characterized by disastrous economic stagnation and record unemployment coinciding with 10 years of such heavy deficits that they would be equivalent to $20 billion annually today.

From 1957 to date, Federal deficits have averaged a heavy $6 billion per year. And yet, economic growth has been the slow-moving despair of current economists during this very period.

Advocates of the deficit route point to the impressive economic progress in Europe during the past decade to support the deficit stimulus theory.

The economic situation in European countries during the past 10 years is so vastly different from ours—particularly in terms of demand—that the comparison is not a valid one.

But even here what does the record show? The industrial star of Europe, West Germany, enjoyed a mammoth 92-percent growth in industrial production in the 8 years between 1953 and 1961—most recent years for which figures are available—compared to 20 percent in this country; but its deficit averaged one-tenth of 1 percent of gross national product during this period compared to an average deficit of four-tenths of 1 percent of gross national product in the United States of America. In terms of gross national product, Germany had one-fourth the deficit and four times the growth of this country.

JESSE LEE WARD, SR.

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. Mr. President, at its organizational meeting on February 27, 1963, the Committee on Rules and Administration took official cognizance of the death last November of Jesse Lee Ward, Sr., who for many years, both individually and through his commercial reporting firm, rendered competent and valuable service to the committee in connection with its legislative hearings. It is my understanding that Mr. Ward demonstrated the same type of personal concern and interest in the quality of service he supplied to other Senate committees, making apparent his dedication to the highest principles of his profession. Moreover, in many instances his working relationships with Members of the Senate over a long period of years developed into close personal friendships—a point emphasized at the meeting by none other than the dean of the Senate, the Honorable CARL HAYDEN.

Mr. President, in view of his contribution to our work and the esteem in which he was held, at the direction of the Committee on Rules and Administration I ask unanimous consent to insert a short biographical statement of Mr. Ward at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JESSE LEE WARD

> Jesse Lee Ward was born on a farm near Enterprise, Miss., August 23, 1886, the son of Horace R. and Semele M. Ward. Working on the farm until his late teens, he then went for a brief time to Mississippi A. & M. College, but left to find work to support himself. He then became a telegrapher for a period of time, during which time he studied shorthand and court reporting techniques. He worked as a substitute court reporter until a vacancy occurred in the circuit court at Meridian, Miss., where he began his life's work as a shorthand reporter.
>
> He served under Judge W. W. Venable as a court reporter until the judge ran for Congress, being elected to the 64th Congress in 1916. When Judge Venable came to Washington to assume his congressional duties, he brought with him his court reporter as secretary, which position Mr. Ward held for the two terms Judge Venable served in Congress.
>
> During the period of time Mr. Ward was secretary, he became familiar with the official committee reporters of the House, and when his work as secretary was terminated, he commenced reporting House and Senate committees as a free lance reporter. During the late twenties he also served as campaign manager and secretary for the late Senator Pat Harrison, of Mississippi, but returned to his first love, stenographic reporting, just prior to the depression in 1929, and continued reporting or directing his company of reporters, formed by a partnership with another secretary-reporter, Alfred C. Paul, until the time of his death November 3, 1962.
>
> He was a Mason, a member of the bar of Mississippi, a member of the Civitan Club, deacon in the Calvary Baptist Church, and an active supporter of many charitable enterprises.
>
> Throughout his life he maintained a firm insistence on accuracy, honesty, courtesy, and devotion to the ethics of the shorthand reporting profession, and this heritage he leaves behind him with many who worked with him to become masters of their, and his, profession.

THE INTER-AMERICAN HIGHWAY—IS THERE A SCANDAL?

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, yesterday's Washington Daily News carried a most disturbing story by Seth Kantor concerning the Inter-American Highway entitled: "Dream Highway a Nightmare" with a subhead: "$227 Million for a 3,142-Mile Inter-American Jolting." The article indicates that the highway on which the United States has spent so many millions is anything but a success. To whatever extent its allegations are substantiable, it constitutes a shocking indictment.

Last January, as a member of a subcommittee of the Public Works Committee of the Senate, under the chairmanship of our able colleague from West Virginia, JENNINGS RANDOLPH, he and I went to Central America on an inspection tour of the highway. Our report on the progress of the Inter-American Highway made to the Senate and presented to the Public Works Committee by its then chairman, the late Senator Dennis Chavez, expressed our concern at "the lack of any signs along the Inter-American Highway indicating that the construction of the highway was a joint undertaking, of which the United States has paid two-thirds of the cost besides providing expert engineering and other services without which the highway could not have advanced to its present status." That, according to the article by Seth Kantor has not yet been remedied, although we were promised it would be.

Our report to the Senate continued:

> No adequate explanation was given as to why such markings have not been installed. This is more than a matter of pride. It seems to the members of the subcommittee that such markers would serve as constant daily reminders to the users of these highways of the interest of the people of the United States of America in the economic betterment of the people of the Central American countries.

The subcommittee, composed of Senator RANDOLPH and me, were likewise distressed to know that with the exception of Salvador the one-third cost contribution which the six Central American Republics were supposed to pay under the law establishing the joint financial responsibilities for the Inter-American Highway, Public Law 77-375 were largely derived from various types of foreign aid funds. In other words they are paying us with our own money. They included loans from the World Bank, from AID, from the Development Loan Fund, from the Export-Import Bank, and from the Inter-American Development Bank, and they totaled $153,355,780. The specific items of aid are found on pages 63 to 70 inclusive of our report.

Another matter which should give the Congress concern is that the cost estimates given it by the responsible officials of the Bureau of Public Roads seem never to have been accurate. The article refers to this, and our committee report likewise quoted the specific testimony of government officials indicating that the highway could be completed for the sums then appropriated. Yet the Congress is still being asked to contribute more millions to complete the highway.

I ask unanimous consent that the subcommittee's comments on this aspect of the question, as well as the article by Mr. Seth Kantor and the tables showing how money from our foreign aid program has been substituted for the required contributions of these Central American countries, be printed at the conclusion of my remarks.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. GRUENING. I am further distressed that plans seem to be underway to have the United States, after the completion of this highway, provide, in substantial part, funds for its maintenance.

We do not permit our own States, under our Federal aid highway program, to use Federal funds for the maintenance of these highways. It seems fantastic that we should extend this generosity abroad when we deny it to ourselves at home. It would seem to me unthinkable that, after we have spent some 15 years in association with the highway agencies of these six Central American countries, demonstrating to them our presumed skills and know-how in highway construction, we should not have been able to inculcate upon them the ability and know-how thereafter to maintain these roads. I think this is a very serious matter and deserves the attention of the Congress.

Exhibit 1

Dream Highway's a Nightmare—$227 Million for a 3,142-Mile Inter-American Jolting

(By Seth Kantor)

The United States has pumped more than $227 million and 33 years of engineering and construction into a crazy quilt of laziness, mistakes, landslides and floods, known as the Inter-American Highway.

Laid out from Panama to Laredo, Tex., the 3,142-mile road formally will open in May. Just back from a bone-rattling ride on it, the U.S. Bureau of Public Roads' chief expert on the highway described parts of it this way to the Washington Daily News today: "discouraging as hell."

WORSE

Spending 4 January and February weeks riding the highway that pierces six Central American nations and Mexico, the bureau's expert, Deputy Director of Engineering and Operations A. F. Ghiglione, said "sections of the highway are worse than they were 3 years ago." He said:

"Road directors don't make repairs, I traveled through water-filled ditches that have crawled across the road like giant lizards. They could have been stopped by peon labor, but weren't.

"Stuff is going on down there that would make a highway engineer sick at his stomach."

Mr. Ghiglione isn't a squeamish man. He spent 25 years in Alaska—10 of them as the Territory's commissioner of roads—fighting ice and snow. Chiefly, two things turned his stomach, he will tell Commerce Department bosses in a report he's preparing on his trip:

"I asked the public roads ministers of the Central American states to ride with me in my standard sedan. Some hadn't been on the highway—hadn't even looked at it—in more than a year."

"In one 95-mile stretch, in northern Guatemala, jostling ruts and bumps were covered by dust so thick that it was like riding on flour. We ate our own car's dust, through closed windows."

MONEY

For this, the United States has spent $227 million since 1930. Thirteen years ago, Congress was asked to approve $64 million "for completion of the highway." It did, with sighs of relief.

Since then, Congress has allotted four more whopping sums, totaling $16.9 million "for completion of the highway."

The American Automobile Association, just completing test rides of the highway, agrees with the U.S. Bureau of Public Roads' expert: "It's nowhere near complete." The AAA is fearful the highway's grand opening in May will bring out many vacationing families this year, looking for a romantic excursion from Texas to Panama. Said Mr. Ghiglione:

"The road is passable. But that's all. For little children and the elderly, it's tortuous in places. I wouldn't recommend it, except for the adventurous."

Bureau of Public Roads estimates are that the span of long-standing trouble "may be ready in 4 to 6 years," in a realistic appraisal.

Mexico is no problem, everyone seems to agree. Mexico had started its own section of the road before the official route was agreed on, 30 years ago. Mexico has not used U.S. funds and the Mexican section is considered in good driving shape.

THE REST

That leaves 1,555 miles of the highway running bumpety-bump down through Guatemala, El Salvador, Honduras, Nicaragua, Costa Rica, and Panama. A report being prepared by the U.S. Bureau of Public Roads for "The Grand Opening" shows 515 of those miles—a third of the Central American span—in a state of neglect or in need of completion.

Another report is being prepared by a Texan, behind scenes in Congress, which will show the Inter-American Highway has been in the hands of various incompetents for years.

Since 1930, when the Hoover administration first started dropping U.S. taxpayer dollars into it, the highway in the six Central American countries has been like a bag developing holes faster than patches.

The six little countries have paid $63 million toward the grand opening in May.

Representative Jim Wright, Democrat, of Texas, will report to colleagues on the House Public Works Committee that the public roads ministers of Latin American nations should "be relieved" of control of the highway.

OAS PLAN

Based on firsthand travels over the road, he will suggest next month that "a responsible body should be created to maintain the highway." He will urge an Inter-American Highway Authority be established, under the Organization of American States, to:

"Keep the road from falling apart in places, as it has been."

"Establish a means of repair revenue, such as taxes from gasoline stations along the route and franchised motels and restaurants."

Representative Wright also is disturbed about "lack of salesmanship by the United States." In 22 years, since heavy construction began in earnest on the highway, there hasn't been so much as one sign put up to show "the road is an example of teamwork among the Americas."

The United States has been putting up most of the money, but Representative Wright has discovered "most people down there don't realize we've had a thing in the world to do with their road."

Where the United States has been "most lax," Mr. Ghiglione said, is in not enforcing original agreements with the six nations.

WALLPAPER

"Panama, Costa Rica, Nicaragua, Honduras, El Salvador and Guatemala originally agreed in writing that U.S. construction aid would be held up at any time that they didn't maintain the road as it was built.

"Well, you could paper the walls with their agreements, for all the paper is worth. We now have wised up. Last October, Congress appropriated another $32 million to help bring the highway to a reasonable conclusion. This time, the money won't get into their hands unless we see them taking care of the highway."

The two biggest blights on the dream that was first envisioned by Pan American delegates as a railroad, in 1884, are in:

Costa Rica, where rock slides make an obstacle course out of one 133-mile stretch.

Guatemala, where the first 95 miles south of Mexico turn to gumbo in the 5-month-long rainy season and a haze of dusty ruts the rest of the year.

Honduras and El Salvador have the fewest problems. But combined, their stretch of highway is shorter than any of the other four countries where the big problems are.

Comments—Loan and Grant Programs and Estimates of Cost

The subcommittee has noted the report made recently on Latin American policies by a committee of which the senior Senator from Arkansas was chairman, and having as its members the majority leader, Senator Mansfield, and Senators Hruska, Bible, and Smith of Maine. It is noted with special interest that paragraph in the the report, which our majority leader asked to be printed in the Congressional Record, volume 108, part 2, page 2077, and which reads as follows:

"We must face up to the enormous duplication of sources of help for Latin America which already exist. These are not yet used in any integrated pattern. We can ill afford to waste either the funds or the talents that are involved in this duplication. Moreover, it is likely that more sources of aid will continue to be piled on top of existing sources and, beyond great cost, there will be such cumbersomeness, confusion, rivalry, and redtape that effective followthrough under the Alliance for Progress will become next to impossible."

This astute observation is especially true with respect to aid for the construction of highways in Central America. The record indicates that, in addition to funds appropriated directly by the Congress for the Inter-American Highway ($138,703,000), various grants and loans have been made by various lending agencies for the total highway program in Central America since 1955.

A breakdown of these loans appears at the end of these comments.

The statute under which the Inter-American Highway was authorized provides with respect to matching the following:

"Not to exceed one-third of the appropriation authorized for each fiscal year may be expended without requiring the country or countries in which such funds may be expended to match any part thereof, if the Secretary of State shall find that the cost of constructing said highway in such country or countries will be beyond their reasonable capacity to bear. The remainder of such authorized appropriations shall be available for expenditure only when matched to the extent required by this section by the country in which such expenditure may be made (23 U.S.C. 213(a)).

Thus the intent of the statute was that the United States of America would pay no more than two-thirds of the cost of the Inter-American Highway and the Central American country involved would pay one-third of the cost.

The subcommittee is concerned at the extent to which loans granted by the Export-Import Bank have been used to meet the matching requirements of the statute. At the time the funds authorized for this project were increased in 1955, in response to a question by Senator Kerr as to whether there was a "satisfactory basis to assure us that the affected countries will be ready to put up their one-third of the cost," Mr. Henry F. Holland, Assistant Secretary of State for Inter-American Affairs, replied:

"Senator, we have conferred with each of the governments affected and each is delighted to accelerate its own contribution to carry out this program."

Yet, Mr. Holland, in his prepared text, inserted into the record, indicated that only Guatemala and Costa Rica required loans and that the remainder of the countries involved were able and willing to put up their shares of the costs of completing the Inter-American Highway.

However, the record indicates that all the nations involved, with the exception of El Salvador, have borrowed either from the World Bank or the Export-Import Bank to meet their matching shares. The program has thus become one in which the United States has granted to the nations involved (other than El Salvador) two-thirds of the cost of building this highway and has lent to them, other than El Salvador, the remaining one-third.

The concept of self-help involved in this project, therefore, has been diminished by the availability of loans from the United States and the World Bank to enable these nations (other than El Salvador) to meet their shares of the costs. To the extent that payment for the cost of constructing the highway has been deferred, the burden in the future of repaying both the loan and current maintenance costs will be the greater. The danger is that needed maintenance costs will be deferred—since they bear no due date—and the roads will be permitted to deteriorate to the point where there will be a need for high reconstruction expenditures.

COST ESTIMATES

The subcommittee hopes that estimates presented to it by the Bureau of Public Roads as to the amounts needed to complete the Inter-American Highway will be more accurate than those presented in the past. The subcommittee reminds the Bureau of Public Roads that when it appeared before the committee in 1955 requesting an additional authorization of $25,730,000 to complete the Inter-American Highway, assurances were given at that time the highway could be completed with such a sum. The following colloquy took place at that time:

Senator Gore. I would like, Mr. Chairman, to inquire either of Mr. Curtiss (Commissioner of Public Roads) or Mr. Turner (Assistant to the Commissioner of Public Roads), as to the reliability, in their opinion, of the cost estimates?

"Mr. Curtiss. We think they are reliable, and that the work can be done for that amount.

"Senator Gore. Did you arrive at the recommended amount through detailed study or is it a so-called educated guess?

"Mr. Curtiss. Mr. Turner was in charge of the work of making the estimates. I think it was a careful estimate.

"Senator Gore. Do you say so, Mr. Turner?

"Mr. Turner. Yes."

However, in 1957, the Bureau of Public Roads was before the Congress again requesting an additional authorization of $10 million and admitting that its previous estimates had been incorrect. Such increased authorization was voted by the Congress.

Now we are told that a request for the authorization of an additional $32 million will be made to the Congress, again for the purpose of completing the construction of the Inter-American Highway.

Thus, the Bureau's estimate in 1955 that the expenditure of the sum of $25,730,000 would complete the Inter-American Highway turns out to be incorrect by $42 million—an error of close to 200 percent. No one now can say what the reaction of the Congress would have been in 1955 if it had been told that it would take $67,730,000 to complete the highway rather than $25,730,000. Congress is entitled, if it is to legislate intelligently, to more accurate estimates than have hitherto been furnished it with respect to this program.

Loans made by the various lending and grant agencies for road construction to the Central American Republics

The World Bank	$64,100,000
AID (Foreign Assistance Act)	21,055,780
Development Loan Fund	24,900,000
Export-Import Bank	40,800,000
Inter-American Development	2,500,000
Total	153,355,780

Aid under the Foreign Assistance Act to Guatemala for highway construction

REPUBLIC OF GUATEMALA

Fiscal year 1955:	
Pacific slope	$3,675,000
Seminar	1,100
Fiscal year 1956:	
Pacific slope	1,700,000
Atlantic Highway	3,205,000
Quetzaltenango-Retalhulen	950,000
Pacific slope, east and west sections	1,206,000
Fiscal year 1957:	
Atlantic Highway	6,043,000
Pacific slope	1,700,000
Project access roads	700,000
Fiscal year 1958: Project access roads	675,000
Fiscal year 1959	None
Fiscal year 1960: Bridge construction—reobligation	204,000
Fiscal year 1961	None
Total	20,059,100

Current credit and loans extended to Guatemala by the Export-Import Bank for use on completing construction of Inter-American Highway

REPUBLIC OF GUATEMALA

Credits authorized		Undisbursed balance	Status of loans			Interest	Repayment terms
Date	Amount		Disbursed	Repaid	Outstanding		
						Percent	
Dec. 16, 1960	$3,000,000	$3,000,000				5¼	24 semiannual payments beginning July 31, 1964.

Statement of loans made by the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development (the World Bank)

GUATEMALA—ROADS

Fiscal year report	Year made	Maturities	Interest rate including commission	Original principal amount	Partial cancellation	Effective loans sold or agreed to be sold	
						Total sales	Portion matured
			Percent				
June 30, 1957	July 29, 1955	1959-70	4⅝	$18,200,000		$576,000	
June 30, 1958	do	1959-70	4⅝	18,200,000		576,000	
June 30, 1959	do	1959-70	4⅝	18,200,000		576,000	
June 30, 1960	do	1959-70	4⅝	18,200,000		576,000	$576,000
June 30, 1961	do	1959-70	4⅝	18,200,000		576,000	576,000

	Principal repayments to Bank	Effective loans held by banks	Principal amount disbursed
June 30, 1957		$17,624,000	
June 30, 1958		17,624,000	
June 30, 1959		17,624,000	$17,618,443
June 30, 1960	$1,192,000	16,432,000	17,963,303
June 30, 1961	2,440,000	15,184,000	18,199,066

No loans have been made to Guatemala under the following lending programs: International Development Association, Inter-American Development Bank, and Development Loan Fund.

Aid to the Republic of El Salvador for road construction under Foreign Assistance Act

Fiscal years 1955 through 1958	(1)
Fiscal year 1959: Highway training	$6,000
Fiscal years 1960-61	(1)

[1] No grants.

No loans were made under the following programs: Development Loan Fund, International Development Association, Inter-American Development Bank, and the Export-Import Bank.

Statement of loans made by the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development (the World Bank)

EL SALVADOR—ROADS

Fiscal year report	Year made	Maturities	Interest rate including commission	Original principal amount	Partial cancellation	Effective loans sold or agreed to be sold: Total sales	Effective loans sold or agreed to be sold: Portion matured
			Percent				
June 30, 1957	1955	1959-66	4½	$11,100,000		$250,000	
June 30, 1958	1955	1959-66	4½	11,100,000			
June 30, 1959	1955	1959-66	4½	11,100,000		250,000	$250,000
June 30, 1960	1955	1959-66	4½	11,100,000		250,000	250,000
June 30, 1961	1955	1959-66	4½	11,100,000		250,000	250,000
June 30, 1959	Jan. 7, 1959	1963-74	5¾	5,000,000			
June 30, 1960	do	1963-74	5¾	5,000,000		300,000	
June 30, 1961	do	1963-74	5¾	5,000,000		300,000	

	Principal repayments to Bank	Effective loans held by banks	Principal amount disbursed
1957		$10,850,000	
1958		10,850,000	
1959	$334,000	10,516,000	$10,692,467
1960	1,542,000	9,308,000	10,829,036
1961	2,804,000	8,046,000	11,042,218
1960		4,700,000	380,998
1961		4,700,000	1,405,677

Loan to Republic of Honduras for road construction under International Development Association

Date: May 12, 1961.

Amount: $9,000,000.

Period: 50 years.

No interest.

Amortization after 10 years; 1 percent for 10 years, 3 percent for 30 years.

Repayable in foreign currency.

Aid under the Foreign Assistance Act program to the Republic of Honduras for highway construction

REPUBLIC OF HONDURAS

Fiscal year 1955: Consultation on highways	$9,600
Fiscal year 1956: Consultation on highways	39,076
Fiscal year 1957: Consultation on highways	32,000
Fiscal year 1958: Consultation on highways	$37,000
Fiscal year 1959: Consultation on highways	47,000
Fiscal year 1960: Consultation on highways	29,000
Fiscal year 1961: Equipment and management operation	71,000
Total	264,676

Loan from the Development Loan Fund to Republic of Honduras for road constructions

REPUBLIC OF HONDURAS

Made in fiscal year 1958.

Amount approved: $5,000,000.

Paid back $440,661.

Repaid $25,000.

Interest 3.717 percent.

Repaid in lempiras.

Loan from Inter-American Development Bank to Republic of Honduras for road constructions

REPUBLIC OF HONDURAS

Project: Roads.

Date of loan: May 12, 1961.

Amount: $2,500,000, of which $500,000 is a grant and $2,000,000 is loan. Up to $750,000 for local costs.

Repayable in 2 years, at an interest rate of 4 percent.

Repayment of principal in Honduras currency (lempiras) and payment of the interest will be made in dollars.

Repayment begins 4⅓ years from date of contract.

Statement of loans made by the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development (the World Bank)

HONDURAS ROADS

Fiscal year report	Year made	Maturities	Interest rate including commission	Original principal amount	Partial cancellation	Effective loans sold or agreed to be sold: Total sales	Effective loans sold or agreed to be sold: Portion matured
			Percent				
June 30, 1957	Dec. 22, 1955	1955-64	1½	$4,200,000		$872,000	$483,000
June 30, 1958	do	1955-64	1½	4,200,000		872,000	483,000
June 30, 1959	do	1955-64	1½	4,200,000		872,000	802,000
June 30, 1960	do	1955-64	1½	4,200,000		872,000	872,000
June 30, 1961	do	1955-64	1½	4,200,000		872,000	872,000
June 30, 1957							
June 30, 1958	May 9, 1958	1961-78	5⅜	5,500,000			
June 30, 1959	do	1961-78	5⅜	5,500,000		200,000	
June 30, 1960	do	1961-78	5⅜	5,500,000		299,000	
June 30, 1961	do	1961-78	5⅜	5,500,000		299,000	97,000

	Principal repayments to Bank	Effective loans held by banks	Principal amount disbursed
June 30, 1957		$3,328,000	
June 30, 1958			
June 30, 1959	$185,000	3,143,000	$3,750,392
June 30, 1960	643,000	2,685,000	3,988,063
June 30, 1961	1,195,000	2,133,000	4,140,549
June 30, 1957			
June 30, 1958			
June 30, 1959		5,201,000	422,214
June 30, 1960		5,201,000	2,356,041
June 30, 1961		5,201,000	4,064,606

Current credit and loans extended to Honduras by the Export-Import Bank for use on Inter-American Highway construction

REPUBLIC OF HONDURAS

Credits authorized		Undisbursed balance	Status of loans			Interest	Repayment terms
Date	Amount		Disbursed	Repaid	Outstanding		
						Percent	
Jan. 17, 1957	$1,810,000	$510,000	$1,300,000	$110,000.99	$1,189,999.01	5¾	30 semiannual payments beginning Feb. 1, 1960, except advances in excess of $1,100,000 payable 30 semiannual payments beinning Aug. 1, 1962.

Loans made to Nicaragua for highway construction by the various lending agencies of the U.S. Government

NICARAGUA

Development Loan Fund	(1)
Inter-American Development Bank	(1)
Aid under the Foreign Assistance Act:	
1956: Public roads	$17,644
1957: Transportation, highways	14,000
1958: Transportation, highways	5,000
1959: Transportation, highways	$7,000
1960: Transportation, highways	6,000
1961: Transportation, highways	5,000
Total	54,644
Export-Import Bank: Dec. 12, 1956—Loan, 5¾ percent interest. Repayable 30 semiannual payments beginning Aug. 1, 1959. Purpose, construction of Inter-American Highway	$2,000,000
The World Bank—International Bank for Reconstruction and Development. (See attached sheet for breakdown.)	

[1] No loans.

Statement of loans made by the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development (the World Bank)

NICARAGUA—ROADS

Fiscal year report	Year made	Maturities	Interest rate including commission	Original principal amount	Partial cancellation	Effective loans sold or agreed to be sold	
						Total sales	Portion matured
			Percent				
June 30, 1957	June 7, 1951	1954–61	4⅛	$3,500,000		$29,000	$29,000
June 30, 1958	do	1954–61	4⅛	3,500,000		29,000	29,000
June 30, 1959	do	1954–61	4⅛	3,500,000		29,000	29,000
June 30, 1960	do	1954–61	4⅛	3,500,000		29,000	29,000
June 30, 1961	do	1954–61	4⅛	3,500,000		29,000	29,000
June 30, 1957	Sept. 4, 1953	1957–63	4¾	3,500,000			
June 30, 1958	do	1957–63	4¾	3,500,000			
June 30, 1959	do	1957–63	4¾	3,500,000			
June 30, 1960	do	1957–63	4¾	3,500,000			
June 30, 1961	do	1957–63	4¾	3,500,000			

	Principal repayments to bank	Effective loans held by banks	Principal amount disbursed
June 30, 1957	$1,213,000	$2,258,000	
June 30, 1958	1,680,000	1,791,000	
June 30, 1959	2,167,000	1,304,000	$3,500,000
June 30, 1960	2,673,000	798,000	3,500,000
June 30, 1961	3,200,000	271,000	3,500,000
June 30, 1957	214,000	3,286,600	
June 30, 1958	657,000	2,843,000	
June 30, 1959	1,121,000	2,379,000	3,417,942
June 30, 1960	1,606,000	1,894,000	3,500,000
June 30, 1961	2,116,000	1,384,000	3,500,000

Current credit and loans extended to Nicaragua by the Export-Import Bank for use on construction of Inter-American Highway

REPUBLIC OF NICARAGUA

Credits authorized		Undisbursed balance	Status of loans			Interest	Repayment terms
Date	Amount		Disbursed	Repaid	Outstanding		
						Percent	
Dec. 12, 1956	$2,000,000	$245,509.36	$1,754,490.64	$113,342	$1,641,148.64	5¾	30 semiannual payments beginning Aug. 1, 1959.

Aid under the Foreign Assistance Act to the Republic of Costa Rica for highway construction

REPUBLIC OF COSTA RICA

Fiscal year 1955: Highway planning, construction, and maintenance improvement project	$2,400
Fiscal year 1956: Highway improvement project	27,960
Fiscal year 1957: Highway improvement project (training personnel)	$14,000
Fiscal year 1958	None
Fiscal year 1959: Ministry of Public Works—highway planning	7,000
Fiscal year 1960: Ministry of Public Works—highway planning	5,000
Fiscal year 1961: Ministry of Public Works—highway planning	$5,000
Total	61,360

Under the Development Loan Fund, Inter-American Development Bank, and World Bank, no loans were authorized for road construction.

Current credit and loans extended to Costa Rica for use on Inter-American Highway construction by the Export-Import Bank

REPUBLIC OF COSTA RICA

Credits authorized		Undisbursed balance	Status of loans			Interest
Date	Amount		Disbursed	Repaid	Outstanding	
						Percent
Nov. 3, 1955	[1] $14, 540, 000	$2, 964, 977. 51	$11, 575, 022. 49	$2, 671, 342. 00	$8, 903, 680. 49	4½
Apr. 22, 1942	[2] 7, 000, 000		6, 985, 000. 00	2, 552, 062. 61	4, 432, 937. 39	3½
Apr. 15, 1960	[3] 3, 000, 000	3, 000, 000. 00	None	None	None	5¾

[1] The above loan or balance of $9,540,000 is repayable in 30 semiannual payments beginning May 1, 1957.

[2] This loan of $7,000,000 was for materials and services for the Inter-American Highway, repayable in 80 quarterly payments beginning Jan. 1, 1951 ($15,000 of it not used).

[3] This loan is repayable in 30 semiannual payments beginning Sept. 1, 1962.

Statement of loans made by the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development (the World Bank)

PANAMA—ROADS

Fiscal year report	Year made	Maturities	Interest rate including commission	Original principal amount	Partial cancellation	Effective loans sold or agreed to be sold	
						Total sales	Portion matured
			Percent				
June 30, 1957	July 12, 1955	1959–64	4¼	$5, 900, 000		$1, 700, 000	
June 30, 1958	do	1959–64	4¼	5, 900, 000		1, 700, 000	
June 30, 1959	do	1959–64	4¼	5, 900, 000			
June 30, 1959, Panama repaid 3 loans				7, 390, 000	$542, 574	1, 700, 000	$1, 700, 000
June 30, 1960	July 12, 1955			7, 390, 00	542, 574	1, 700, 000	1, 700, 000
June 30, 1961	do		4¼	7, 390, 000	542, 574	1, 700, 000	1, 700, 000
Do	Aug. 19, 1960	1964–75	5¾	7, 200, 000		457, 000	
Repaid 3 loans				7, 390, 000	542, 574	1, 700, 000	1, 700, 000
Total				14, 590, 000	542, 574	2, 157, 000	1, 700, 000

	Principal repayments to Bank	Effective loans held by banks	Principal amount disbursed
June 30, 1957		$4, 200, 000	
June 30, 1958		4, 200, 000	
June 30, 1959	$5, 147, 426		$6, 847, 426
June 30, 1960	5, 147, 426		6, 847, 426
June 30, 1961	5, 147, 426		6, 847, 426
Do		6, 743, 000	

Aid under the Foreign Assistance Act to the Republic of Panama for highway construction

REPUBLIC OF PANAMA

Fiscal year 1955	None
Fiscal year 1956	None
Fiscal year 1957	None
Fiscal year 1958	None
Fiscal year 1959	None
Fiscal year 1960:	
Training and operating of heavy equipment	$75, 000

***Aid under the Foreign Assistance Act to the Republic of Panama for highway construction*—Continued**

REPUBLIC OF PANAMA—continued

Fiscal year 1960—Continued	
Reobligation—training and operating of heavy equipment	$103, 000
Fiscal year 1961:	
Training and operation of heavy equipment	117, 000

***Aid under the Foreign Assistance Act to the Republic of Panama for highway construction*—Continued**

REPUBLIC OF PANAMA—continued

Construction of farm-to-market roads	$315, 000
Total	610, 000

No loans were made to Panama from the Development Loan Fund or the Inter-American Development Bank for highway construction.

Current credit and loans extended to Panama by the Export-Import Bank for use on construction of Inter-American Highway

REPUBLIC OF PANAMA

Credits authorized		Undisbursed balance	Status of loans			Interest	Repayment terms
Date	Amount		Disbursed	Repaid	Outstanding		
						Percent	
June 14, 1957	$12, 850, 000	$6, 749, 579	$6, 100, 421		$6, 100, 421	5¼	60 quarterly payments beginning July 31, 1962.

ADMINISTRATION'S TAX PROGRAM

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, for many months now I have had a suspicion that there existed along the reaches of the New Frontier a very serious and fundamental misunderstanding of the American enterprise system and the Nation's economy. If I ever had any doubts about this, they have certainly been laid to rest by recent developments in connection with the administration's program for tax reduction and tax reform. I doubt if there ever has been so much confusion over a plan for changing the tax system than exists today over the program sent up by President Kennedy. And, Mr. President, we have only the Chief Executive himself to blame for this confusion. Frankly, I no longer know what to think about the official attitude of our Government—and I doubt if the American people know what to think about it.

Consider what we were told, Mr. President, when the administration's tax program was submitted to the Congress just 1 month ago. As I remember it, the President in his special message said it was needed to promote economic growth, to provide more employment, and to put our unused production capacity to work. He spoke in terms of long-term improvement of the economy and said,

> My recommendation for early revision of our tax structure is not motivated by any threat of imminent recession.

Now, those words were spoken at a time when it appeared that the administration's tax program would encounter little difficulty in the Congress. I am sure everyone remembers the support which at that time was coming from all areas in general acceptance of the premise that the Federal tax system had become burdensome and needed to be revised. Organized labor as well as business groups appeared to be closing ranks behind the President's request, and there was no great need for the administration to engage in pressure tactics and propaganda broadsides to press its point.

But now all that has changed. Strong public opposition has arisen to the whole idea of slashing taxes without a corresponding reduction in Government spending. Strong opposition has arisen to the whole idea of deliberately planned deficits and continued fiscal irresponsibility on the part of the Federal Government. In addition to this, great differences of opinion have arisen over how and where taxes should be reduced.

So what happens? Now we find the President speaking darkly about a recession and saying that if it comes those who oppose his tax program must bear the responsibility. Less than 5 weeks after the President told us that his tax recommendations were not motivated by any threat of imminent recession, he tells the American Bankers Association that, if there is no tax reduction, the country will be struck with its fifth postwar recession in the not-too-distant future. And after insisting that any tax reduction must be accompanied by tax reform in his message to Congress, the President tells the bankers that he is willing to scrap his reform proposals to get a $10 billion tax cut.

Mr. President, what goes on with this administration? Are we expected to believe that the economic situation has changed so radically since January 24, when the special tax message came up to us, that the Nation is now threatened with recession? Are we to believe that the need for consumer purchasing power, which so bemuses the New Frontier as a means for spurring the economy, has increased in that period? If so, the administration is trying to sell a phony package. Only 2 days ago the Wall Street Journal reported that in a time of record spending, public savings have risen an amazing 20 percent since 1960. In the period since 1957, they have increased 41 percent.

And let me list here the conclusions the Journal draws from these phenomenal figures. It says:

> The large savings supply forms a money cushion in public hands if a recession occurs.
>
> It provides fuel for still greater spending in the months ahead and, possibly, for renewed inflation.
>
> It suggests consumer demand, for the time being, is lagging behind ability to buy and casts doubt on the degree to which a tax cut can spur consumer spending.
>
> It exerts downward pressure on interest rates.

Mr. President, if there is a fifth postwar recession in the not-too-distant future, it will not be for lack of consumer purchasing power; it will be for lack of confidence in the administration's handling of fiscal affairs.

The President, in his talk to the bankers, challenged the critics of his program to put forward a solution of their own. Most of those critics have been putting forward a solution—and a sound solution—ever since talk of an administration-sponsored tax reduction program first began. And that solution is to reduce Government spending, not increase it, in concert with a program designed to lower taxes which have the effect of depressing capital investment.

It is more than obvious that when the President asks for alternate solutions, he wants only those that fit his preconceived formula of what will help the American economy. His trouble is that he will not entertain the idea that his whole formula is faulty. He is wedded to the idea that the way to solve the unemployment problem is to increase consumer purchasing power through both tax reduction and Government spending. He holds the economically naive belief that this will increase demand and guarantee the full utilization of America's presently unused production capacity. If this is a valid belief, then why is there so much consumer purchasing power presently residing in the time deposits at the banks, in savings bonds, in short-term Government securities, in savings and loan shares, in postal savings? If the need is for more purchasing power why has there been an extraordinary, record pileup of savings of 20 percent since 1960 against only a 3-percent increase in consumer credit?

And even if there was a need for increased consumer purchasing power—which there obviously is not—the filling of this need would not guarantee the full utilization of the Nation's production capacity. It is not enough merely to say that some of this capacity is unused because demand is lacking and that by increasing consumer purchasing power the necessary demand will be provided.

Let us take an example. When the New Frontiersmen speak of unused plant capacity in the United States, the steel industry is often cited as a case in point. Figures are produced to show that the steel industry is operating at only 60 percent of capacity. Then it is argued that if the steel industry produced at 90 percent of capacity the gross national product would increase and more people would be employed. The argument rests on a belief that if people had more money to spend they would spend a lot of it for products in which steel is used. This, in turn, would supposedly increase the demand for steel and bring about capacity or near-capacity production in American mills.

The trouble with this argument is that it overlooks the fact that steel-producing capacity is of many varieties, and some of that capacity is for a kind of steel that is no longer wanted. A large part of the 40 percent unused steelmaking capacity will never be used again, no matter how much consumer purchasing power is expanded.

If things were as simple as the President and his economic advisers would like us to think, why was it that the steel industry spent a billion dollars last year to increase capacity? Why did not the steelmakers merely use some of the 40 percent of idle capacity the administration talks about?

The reason is easy to understand. An industry operating at only 60 percent of its total capacity had a need for a different kind of production capacity. It needed a new capacity to produce this sheet steel so that it could compete better with the producers of other kinds of materials, such as plastics and aluminum. In short, it had to increase capacity for reasons of advancing technology and in recognition of the fact that a great deal of its existing, but unused, capacity would not fill the bill.

If demand stemming from consumer purchasing power was the answer to unused capacity in the steel mills, it would be difficult to understand why 1962 was not a capacity year for steel. Just consider the automobile industry, perhaps the largest single user of steel in America, and consider the fact that 1962 was one of the biggest years the automakers ever enjoyed. General Motors, for example, had the biggest year of any corporation in American history. Steel demand also was high in the fields of construction, highways, industrial plants, housing, schools, and military hardware.

Mr. President, the need today is not for utilization of old and obsolete plant capacity, but for the building of new kinds of plant capacity. There is need for the kind of tax reduction that will increase the capital investment needed to build this kind of capacity. There is need, too, for greater research and development and for more retraining of manpower for new tasks. I do not care how much this administration increases consumer purchasing power; it will not put unemployed coal miners back to work. It is about time the President begins to realize that our present problems are not the kind that lend themselves to easy answers such as deficit spending combined with tax reduction.

In closing, Mr. President, let me take note of the President's complaint that his tax program has become the target of "heated, partisan, exasperated, and rash assaults." I believe these assaults are fully justified and stem from a better understanding of how the American economy works than is presently held at the White House or in the Treasury Department. They are based on a distrust of printing-press money and overwhelming deficits. They are based on justified fear of ruinous inflation and further aggravation of our adverse balance of international payments.

In short, they are a nationwide protest against the New Frontier's policy of deliberately planned deficits, fiscal irresponsibility, and distrust of the enterprise system.

RATIFICATION BY THE STATES OF ALASKA AND OHIO OF THE PROPOSED POLL TAX AMENDMENT TO THE CONSTITUTION

Mr. HOLLAND. At this time, Mr. President, I am happy to announce that two more States have ratified the anti-poll-tax amendment which the 87th Congress submitted to them last year. They are the States of Alaska and Ohio.

The Alaskan Senate took affirmative action on February 1, by a vote of 19 to 0 and the Alaskan House on February 11, by a vote of 27 to 8; thus completing the necessary action for ratification by that splendid new State.

According to an Associated Press dispatch appearing in this morning's Washington Post, the Senate of the Ohio Legislature unanimously approved ratification of the amendment yesterday. I have since been notified by our distinguished colleague, the senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE], that the Ohio House overwhelmingly approved the amendment on February 6 by a vote of 119 to 3, and the Senate's unanimous action of yesterday, 31 to 0, completes ratification by that great State.

This brings to 13 the number of States which have thus far ratified the amendment, the others being California, Illinois, Indiana, Maryland, Michigan, Montana, New Jersey, New York, Oregon, Rhode Island, and West Virginia. There are several other State legislatures presently considering ratification of the anti-poll-tax amendment where it has been approved in one of the two houses and is now pending before the other.

Mr. President, I am delighted to express my deepest appreciation to my distinguished colleagues from Alaska, Senators BARTLETT and GRUENING, and from Ohio, Senators LAUSCHE and YOUNG, all of whom cosponsored and supported the measure to passage last year and who lent their effective assistance this year in bringing the matter to the attention of the legislatures of their States.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. KEFAUVER. As a cosponsor of the joint resolution resulting in the submission of this proposed constitutional amendment to the States, I wish to commend the Senator from Florida for the leadership he is taking in bringing the matter of the importance of ratification of the proposed amendment to the attention of the legislatures of the various States, and in keeping Members of the Senate and Congress in general informed as to the progress the amendment is making.

I wish to have the Senator know that I am hopeful that the Legislature of Tennessee, which is now in session, will before it adjourns approve the resolution embodying the amendment, which I hope will be the 24th amendment to the Constitution.

Mr. HOLLAND. I appreciate the kind remarks of the distinguished Senator from Tennessee. No one has been more devoted in pressing this matter than he has. I hope that he will be successful in his very sincere efforts in his own State. No one would be happier than the Senator from Florida to hear about the successful culmination of his efforts.

Mr. KEFAUVER. We hope to have good news for the Senator soon.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, as the Senator from Florida knows, I supported the joint resolution when it was before the Senate. After it was passed by Congress, I contacted the Governor of Ohio, the majority leaders in the senate and the house in the State, and the minority leaders in the Ohio Legislature. The gratitude which the Senator from Florida is expressing today should go to these men, namely, the Governor of Ohio, and the leaders of both the majority and the minority in both Houses, because it was they who did the work which led to so expeditious approval by the State of Ohio of this important matter.

Mr. HOLLAND. I express again my appreciation to the Senator from Ohio. I believe that he is overmodest. His own efforts counted very heavily in the ratification by the State of Ohio of the proposed amendment. I appreciate his placing this information in the RECORD, because it shows again that this effort is a bipartisan effort.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Gov. James A. Rhodes is a Republican. The Republicans are the majority party in both houses of the Ohio Legislature, and the Democrats are in the minority.

Mr. HOLLAND. Again, that shows that we are proceeding in a bipartisan way in this matter.

Mr. President, I am happy to yield to the distinguished Senator from Alaska.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, I wish to congratulate the distinguished Senator from Florida on the progress which the anti-poll-tax amendment to the Constitution is making. I congratulate him upon his leadership and enterprise in presenting this important issue to the Nation.

The people of Alaska are extremely grateful to Senator HOLLAND for his important part in assisting them to secure statehood, for without his assistance Alaska might not have become a State and would not have been able to cast a vote to ratify this amendment. Thus virtue brings its own reward.

The senior Senator from Florida was one of the Senate leaders in helping us to achieve statehood in the days when the achievement of statehood did not look too promising. With not too much prospect of success, his help was particularly valuable, for he came from a region in which relatively few of the Members of Congress favored statehood. Therefore, his support was perhaps more important than that of almost any other Member of this body.

I am very happy to pay him this tribute and to express on behalf of myself and the people of Alaska our deep appreciation.

Mr. HOLLAND. I assure the distinguished Senator from Alaska that I deeply appreciate his comments. It is a source of pleasure and pride to the Senator from Florida to recall always that he was one of the many Senators who strongly sponsored the admission of Alaska to statehood. I like to think that the vote which has just been cast by the Legislature of Alaska indicates a rather strong justification of the hopes and the strong convictions which so many Senators had that Alaska would live up very fully to the responsibilities of statehood.

Mr. GRUENING. I thank the Senator from Florida.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I am glad to yield to the distinguished senior Senator from Alaska.

Mr. BARTLETT. It is interesting to note that the resolution which was adopted by the Alaska Legislature, to which the senior Senator from Florida has referred, was Senate Joint Resolution 1. It was introduced by the State affairs committee. As the Senator has already noted, the resolution was approved unanimously by the Alaska Senate. I only wish the same had been true in the house, notwithstanding the fact that the vote in the house was overwhelmingly in favor of the resolution.

I, too, am happy that the Alaska Legislature has acted so promptly and affirmatively. I join with my colleague from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING] in commending the senior Senator from Florida for making it possible for the Legislature of Alaska, the Legislature of Ohio, and the legislatures of other States in the Union to act upon this amendment. I hope it will soon become the 24th amendment to the Constitution of the United States. I also commend the Senator from Florida for his bold leadership in this endeavor.

Thinking back to another time, I also wish to join with my colleague from Alaska in expressing gratitude and admiration to the Senator from Florida for his wonderful leadership in the cause of Alaska statehood.

Mr. HOLLAND. I express my very deep appreciation to the Senator from Alaska. It is always a pleasure for me to remember that, along with some 76 other Senators, it was possible for us to submit the resolution. I think we are all entitled to equal credit in that respect.

So far as statehood for Alaska is concerned, a great many of us were working in that cause. I was happy to be among those who were in the ranks.

Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, while I fully appreciate the sincerity of the Senator from Florida and the efforts which he made not only to pass this constitutional amendment through the Senate, but to have it ratified by the States, as a matter of information I should like to inquire what States, if any, of the 11 States of the Confederacy have ratified the anti-poll-tax amendment.

Mr. HOLLAND. I am sorry to say that as of this date there have been none. The Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] has just advised us that both Houses of the Tennessee Legislature, which is now in session, have had presented to them resolutions of ratification, and that he is hopeful of their passage.

As I have already stated to the distinguished Senator from Illinois, the Governor of Florida will recommend to the April session of the Florida Legislature that it, too, ratify the amendment; and the two Senators from Florida are doing everything in their power, including the making of personal appearances, to secure that ratification. Further than that, the Senator from Florida has no information at this time.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I thank the Senator from Florida. If I may be permitted to continue, while I voted for the adoption of the constitutional amendment, I felt that it was inferior to legislation to eliminate the poll tax, because it will be necessary to have three-fourths of the States ratify it; therefore, the failure of 13 States to ratify will mean that the amendment will not go into effect.

I am disappointed that none of the 11 States of the Old Confederacy have ratified the amendment as yet. I expressed my doubt at the time whether many of them would. I think this has been the strongest objection against the method of a constitutional amendment. I only hope that we may get ratification from the Southern States as well as from the Northern and Western States.

Mr. HOLLAND. I appreciate the apprehension of the Senator from Illinois. I think I should add that while I have no information about what the great State of Texas may do about ratification, I have been advised by one of the Senators from Texas that the present Governor of Texas, Governor Connally, has recommended to the legislature of that State that it abolish the State poll tax for all purposes. I think that is one of the results we may attribute, in part at least, to the submission of the amendment last year.

I am sure the Senator from Illinois knows that the Senators from Florida are working in every way they know how to bring about the ratification of the amendment, not only in their own State, but elsewhere, as well. I hope that the Senator from Illinois will continue his efforts in that direction.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Illinois, I think, was the first State to ratify the amendment.

Mr. HOLLAND. That is correct. Illinois was the first State to ratify the amendment. I was happy to name the two Senators from Illinois in my first comments on this subject, shortly after the convening of the 88th Congress. I was happy to pay my respects and express my compliments and appreciation to both Senators from Illinois, who, I understand, actively worked for the ratification of the amendment by their State.

PRESIDENT KENNEDY'S MESSAGE ON CIVIL RIGHTS

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I warmly applaud the President's message on civil rights, which was submitted to Congress today.

Although there are some notable omissions, this is the President's strongest message on civil rights to date. I welcome and applaud it. His eloquent words will have to be matched by determined leadership if any of his legislative proposals, and others which are needed, are to see the light of day. A major opportunity to lay the groundwork for meaningful civil rights legislation was forfeited by yielding to the filibusterers last month. But I am certainly ready to join in whatever bipartisan efforts are now needed to make significant progress in this field.

SECONDARY MATERIAL INDUSTRIES

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, on March 15, representatives of an important, but little recognized industry will meet in New York City to celebrate their 50th anniversary.

The National Association of Secondary Material Industries represents a vast industry that is comprised of generators, processors, and consumers of metals, paper stock, textiles, rubber and plastic scrap. In all, this industry represents an annual volume of approximately $5 billion. It provides vital raw materials to practically every segment of the American economy. And, perhaps of greatest importance of all to the American people, the activities of this industry provide raw materials that assure the manufacture of quality and yet economically priced end products. To many this industry has meant the difference between "have" and "have not."

Perhaps many will best remember this industry, and the association that represents it, for their industrial contributions in World War I, World War II, and the Korean conflict. "Scrap" was literally a household word, and it was this industry, through its farflung collection system and its processing plants, that brought the needed raw materials for our defense effort to the marketplace.

This industry had a great wartime record. Moreover, it has achieved an equally impressive peacetime place in our economy. Its metals segment markets almost as much copper scrap as that mined in this country, and similar statistics can be cited in the use of other metals. In paper stock it accounts for almost a third of the raw material used by the consuming mills. The industry's importance in the textile, rubber, and plastic fields also is most startling.

There is yet another significant—and unique—attribute to recognize. Here is a conservation industry in the truest form. Here are enterprising businessmen who throughout our 50 States process the industrial, office, and household materials for reuse in our economic cycle. The actually perpetuate this cycle and, in so doing, play a mighty role in keeping our forests and other resources of limited supply from dangerous depletion.

The story of the National Association of Secondary Material Industries is a fine American story, since many of this association's member companies have transcended three generations. From humble beginnings they have become vital cogs in our industrial economy and leaders in our communities.

Thus, on this occasion of the 50th anniversary of the National Association of Secondary Material Industries, we should proudly pay tribute to an industry that has given real meaning to an age-old adage: "Waste Not—Want Not."

TRIBUTE TO SENATOR HICKENLOOPER

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, a little more than a year ago, J. C. Moore, editor of the Winterset Madisonian, wrote a highly complimentary and much deserved article about my colleague, the senior Senator from Iowa [Mr. Hickenlooper]. In view of my colleague's reelection to the Senate, last fall, for a fourth term, I think it most appropriate that the article by Mr. Moore be printed in the Record; and I so request.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Hickenlooper for President

(By J. C. Moore)

Well, why not? Barry Goldwater says that there should be more than three names available. Barry is working and willing but is too much on the conservative side to carry a presidential election. Nixon says that if elected he will serve 4 years as Governor of California. Rockefeller says that his first consideration is to be elected Governor of New York. So we submit Hick as a compromise middle of the road candidate for the Presidency.

Last year at the Republican National Convention, Hickenlooper, the chairman of the delegation, was given a courtesy vote by the delegates. At the next convention, to be held in 1964, we'd like to see the Iowa delegation instructed for Iowa's leading Senator. We served with Hick in the Iowa Legislature, we have visited with him in the statehouse in Des Moines while he was Governor. We have called on him a couple of times in Washington, D.C., and we have never met a man who was more qualified to serve as a leader in the United States.

After serving in World War I as an artillery officer, he then graduated with a B.S. degree at Ames after which he acquired a degree in law at the University of Iowa. After serving two terms in the Iowa House of Representatives, he served two terms as Lieutenant Governor until he was elected Governor in 1942. Since then he has been elected three times to the United States Senate. No other Iowan has such a record, and only two Republican Members of the Senate outrank him in length of service.

In the Senate he was the first Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission, of which he is still the first ranking member. He is the second ranking Republican on the Foreign Relations Committee, and third ranking on the Agricultural Committee. He is also on the Committee of Aeronautical and Space Sciences.

While in the Senate he served on the Committees for Rules and Administration and Expenditures of the Executive Department, was a member of the Smith-Mundt committee, has represented our country at Vienna at the International Atomic Energy Agency, was a Senate consultant at the Atomic Ban Conference in Geneva and is a Senate consultant on the Inter-American Development Bank.

Besides these major committee assignments he has served on committees to investigate oversea information programs, disarmament, foreign aid and foreign policy study. In 1958 President Eisenhower appointed him as U.S. Representative to the United Nations General Assembly.

Recently he was accorded the highest honor that he could receive from his fellow Republican Senators in Washington when he was elected as chairman of the Republican Senate policy committee.

At present he is a candidate for his fourth term in the Senate. We assume that he will be elected without too much trouble. Iowans (Democrat or Republican) are too smart to throw away such a wealth of experience, such seniority and such old fashioned American integrity as they have in Senator Bourke B. Hickenlooper.

Now back to the Presidency again. No State ever went down the drain supporting a favorite son. Hickenlooper because of his service to the State and Nation deserves the honor. If nominated and elected President then there would be a vacancy in the U.S. Senate for some other deserving Iowan. If nominated and then defeated by Kennedy, he would still have 4 years of his term yet to serve in the Senate and the party would be in an excellent position for the 1963 campaign.

Of course we are going to do our utmost in the forthcoming campaign to send Hick back to the Senate, but at the same time we are going to work on the Presidential angle too. This trial balloon, if it can be called that, is completely unsolicited, unauthorized, and for all we know unwanted, but we think our reasoning is sound.

RELEASE OF OUTDATED PUBLIC PRESTIGE POLLS

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, the release of certain outdated public prestige polls is an additional example of the mismanagement of the news. Later on, I may have more to say about this matter; but at this time I call attention to the fact that the 2-year timelag in making these polls available to the public makes it possible for us to learn only at this time, for the most part, about what happened during the past administration; and I point out that the 2-year lag seems to have an obvious purpose, in that the public will be free to learn on October 22 or 23, 1964—several weeks before the next presidential election—of the status of American prestige and executive prestige on what I suppose is a purely coincidental date—October 22, 1962. At that time the actions of this Government received the united support of the people and the bipartisan support of all Members of Congress, representing both political parties, and there can be no question whatever that our prestige and our standing were then at a very high point.

I see no particular reason for the release of the polls for political purposes 2 weeks before the 1964 election, although the polls might just as well be released at the present time.

Moreover, the 1-year lag in making available some of these polls to less than one-tenth of the Members of Congress, under a seal of secrecy, and not making them available to the Congress generally or to the people also means that information furnished at that time in secret will itself be outdated; and, as I have said, the 2-year lag prevents any consideration of polls which may have occurred between the first week of November 1962 and the first week of November 1964. In other words, the public is to be excluded from the knowledge of what was contained in these so-called prestige polls, not only in the past, but also in the future. Anything that happens tomorrow or next month or next year will automatically be barred by the 2-year lag, because it imposes a virtual curtain on the greater part of the information; and the 1-year lag means that anything that happens after the first of November 1963 cannot then be made public to the country, although it will be released to certain selected Members of Congress, and will perhaps in one way or another find its way to public attention in a manner less gratifying than if it had been given openly to the press.

Mr. President, I deplore this type of news management. The proper thing to do would be to release at least the substance of such prestige polls—which I am convinced can be done without either compromising the sources or imperiling the national security, both of which phrases are used to conceal things the public is entitled to know. The excuses are flimsy and will not hold water.

ELDERLY HIT HARDEST BY TAX CUT

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, on February 15, 1963, the Treasury Department released a fact sheet showing that of the 18 million Americans 65 years old and over, 14½ million, or 80 percent, have such low incomes that they pay no Federal income tax now.

This means that four out of every five old persons could not possibly receive any benefit from an income tax cut. Since the overwhelming majority of the 20 percent of oldsters who do pay income taxes pay very little, the benefit would in aggregate be very small, indeed.

On the other hand, many of these older people are debtors. Interest is a heavy cost to them. The rising interest rates, which seem to be the certain companion of the income tax cut, will come out of their already pitifully inadequate incomes.

Indeed, both the Secretary of the Treasury and the Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board told the Joint Economic Committee this month that the economic stimulation flowing from the tax cut would be accompanied by rising interest rates.

Since these two men are the most powerful of the Nation's money managers, and since their policy decisions largely determine the course of interest rates, climbing interest costs seem sure if the tax cut is passed.

Even more sure and cruel, rising prices—another companion of any Federal deficit stimulation of the economy—would diminish what these older people buy with their modest incomes.

TAX CUT CANNOT INCREASE TAX REVENUES

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, on Monday the President of the United States spoke at a meeting of the American Bankers Association in Washington. At that time he said that in a short time his tax reduction program would result in increased tax revenues.

I vigorously disagree with the President on that point on the basis of the testimony of witnesses before the Joint Economic Committee, including the Council of Economic Advisers, the Secretaries of the Treasury, Commerce, Labor, Agriculture, and a number of economists who favor the tax cut. Their testimony indicates the contrary.

I ask unanimous consent that a letter which I have written to the President of the United States on this issue be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Hon. John F. Kennedy,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. President: Last June, in your superb speech at the Yale University commencement, you called for an economic debate. In the spirit of that challenge, and because I disagree so strongly with an assertion you recently made that is of central importance in the whole controversy over the tax cut, I write you this letter.

In your speech to the American Bankers Association Monday you said that if the full tax reduction program which you have recommended this year is enacted, it will "in a short time, result in increased tax revenues."

As a Senator who sat through virtually every minute of hearings held by the Joint Economic Committee this year and listened to the testimony of the strongest administration supporters of your tax program, your statement that tax revenues will increase following your recommended tax cut seems to me to be wholly unjustified.

The total, long-term effect of the tax cut on eventual revenues is determined by how much the tax cut, which initially reduces revenues, later may restore some of those lost revenues or even increase revenues by the stimulation it may bring to the economy.

To my knowledge, there is no evidence in the testimony of any witness before the Joint Economic Committee that the tax cut would actually increase revenues. I remind you that the witnesses included your Council of Economic Advisers, the Secretaries of the Treasury, Commerce, Labor, Agriculture, and a number of economists who enthusiastically favored the tax cut.

As a matter of fact, none of the witnesses called before the committee opposed the tax cut.

But even among these tax cut supporters, the general consensus was as follows:

1. A tax cut would increase the gross national product 2 to 2½ times. A $10 billion tax cut was expected to increase the GNP by $20 to $25 billion depending on monetary policy. A restraining monetary policy was expected to reduce the stimulating effect of tax reduction. The threefold increase in the gross national product suggested by the Council of Economic Advisers (after the hearings) was the highest multiplier suggested by any witness.

2. Most of the economists who testified on the share of the increase in the GNP which would be picked up by the Federal Government in revenues estimate that it would be about one-sixth. This is close to the relationship between Federal revenues and GNP. The Council of Economic Advisers took the extremely optimistic assumption that 30 percent of the GNP increase might flow to the Federal Government in increased revenues.

3. With a multiplier of two, a tax cut of $10 billion, the one-sixth relationship between Government revenues and increased GNP, would mean an increase in the GNP of $20 billion and with a one-sixth recovery of tax revenues, $3⅓ billion would be regained of the $10 billion tax cut—for a net loss of $6⅔ billion.

If the most favorable assumptions for the tax cut made by any witnesses are applied—that the stimulation is three and the Federal Government increases its revenue by 30 percent—with a $10 billion tax cut, the GNP would be increased to $30 billion. Federal revenues would be 30 percent of this or $9 billion. Result: with a $10 billion tax cut the loss would be $1 billion. That seems to be the minimum revenue loss on assumptions that are most favorable to tax reduction.

You cite the 1954 tax cut as an example of a tax reduction which resulted in increased tax revenues. This is a post hoc, ergo propter hoc argument. As such, it doesn't stand up. All kinds of factors were at work to stimulate the economy and therefore increase revenues in 1955 through 1957, including especially a pent-up investment demand and a strong consumer demand for automobiles.

There is not a shred of evidence that the tax cut per se stimulated the economy sufficiently to actually cause a net increase in revenues. One could just as well argue that it was not the tax cut but a very sharp reduction in Government spending in 1954 that reduced the deficit and gave the business community the kind of confidence it needed to invest in and stimulate the economy.

A tax reduction may be wise or unwise. It may or may not significantly stimulate the economy and reduce unemployment. But on the basis of the testimony by the Nation's top advocates of a tax cut before the Congressional Joint Economic Committee: it will not increase Federal tax revenues; it will not help balance the budget; it will not reduce the national debt.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM PROXMIRE.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The impact of the President's tax proposal on various income groups was dramatically shown in a table submitted to the Joint Economic Committee by Dr. Leon Keyserling. This table eloquently dramatizes the regressive effect of the proposed tax cut. I ask unanimous consent that the table be printed at this point in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. RIBICOFF in the chair). Is there objection?

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

President's proposed tax structure in 1965 compared with present structure (1962), at various tax levels for married couple with 2 children

(1) Taxable income level	(2) Present tax[1]	(3) Present income after tax	(4) Proposed tax[2]	(5) Proposed income after tax	(6) Percent tax reduction	(7) Percent increase in after-tax income	(8) Percent tax to income	
							Present	Proposed
$3,000	$60	$2,940	0	$3,000	100.0	2.0	2.0	0
$5,000	420	4,580	$280	4,720	33.3	3.1	8.4	5.6
$7,500	877	6,623	663	6,837	24.4	3.2	11.7	8.8
$10,000	1,372	8,628	1,068	8,932	22.2	3.5	13.7	30.7
$15,000	2,486	12,514	2,076	12,924	16.5	3.3	16.6	13.8
$25,000	5,318	19,682	4,605	20,395	13.4	3.6	21.3	18.4
$35,000	9,037	25,963	7,814	27,186	13.5	4.7	25.8	22.3
$50,000	15,976	34,024	13,837	36,163	13.4	6.3	32.0	27.7
$100,000	44,724	55,276	38,542	61,458	13.8	11.2	44.7	38.5
$200,000	115,224	84,776	95,072	104,928	17.5	23.8	57.6	47.5

[1] Assuming 10 percent deduction for taxes, interest, contributions, medical, etc.

[2] Assuming President's proposal, as revised by Dillon's testimony, of $400 minimum deduction for married couple and $100 for each child; 10 percent for incomes between $6,000 and $10,000; $1,000 flat deduction between $10,000 and $20,000; and 5-percent deduction for $20,000 and up.

NOTE.—Actual slight deviations from these workable assumptions would not in the slightest change the general import of the analysis.

U.S. BASES IN SPAIN—LET US NOT BE BLACKMAILED

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, several Members of the Senate, including our able and distinguished senior Senator from Georgia, have raised a warning flag that in the negotiations pending for the continuation of our bases in Spain—if it seems in our national interest to continue them—the U.S. representatives conducting these negotiations should be careful to avoid being high-pressured into increasing the very generous largesse we have been giving Spain and its dictator, Francisco Franco, for a decade. The Washington Post, in an editorial which I inserted in the RECORD 2 weeks ago, even sounded a note warning of possibly impending blackmail.

It is well to keep this issue before the American public. U.S. administrations have been altogether too soft in their dealings with foreign nations in connection with our aid program and particularly so with dictators.

Pertinent is an editorial from a recent issue of the Christian Science Monitor entitled "Castles in Spain," which likewise urges that we should not again yield to extortion. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CASTLES IN SPAIN

Some of the most flagrant abuses of foreign aid were in Spain. As usual they were caused by the military, not the economic side of the aid program. In return for the eagerly sought—or dearly bought—American bases in Spain, huge dollar sums were simply handed over to the Madrid Government to spend as it pleased. No wonder Spain has demanded more of the same, now that the base agreement is up for renewal.

But the bargaining terms have changed.

In the earlier postwar years, any military man in Washington who studied the economic and political reports out of Madrid would turn pale. They read as if the whole Spanish house of cards was about to collapse, and the obvious sequel would be communism. Well into the late 1950's the same panic reaction continued in Washington. Withdraw American support, funneled through the bases program, and what looked to the military like the safest bastion in Europe might go over to the enemy.

These fears were exaggerated. But the American response, which was to give Madrid far too much of what it imperiously demanded, simply confirmed the confidence of Spanish officials who thought they had the United States over a barrel.

Now Spain is easing its more extreme economic rigidity and groping its way into the modern period. It is still deep in economic trouble but the likelihood of Communist takeover and the exaggerated fear of it have been eased. And Washington, now gives the impression of really wanting to avoid a give-away and being willing to negotiate rigorously. It is shopping elsewhere in the Mediterranean for Polaris bases, and everywhere withdrawing its vulnerable and obsolete land missiles.

The United States need not yield to extortion this time.

Mr. GRUENING. Recently Members of Congress have been recipients of a Spanish Newsletter, obviously a fairly recent propaganda development, since it is only in its second volume. No. 2 of that volume, dated February 1, carries a commentary entitled "New Pact on U.S. Bases Sought." A careful reading of it would indicate that the above-voiced fears are not without some foundation.

The article points to "the need for adaptation to present realities in a world which has undergone rapid radical changes of all kinds." Could this mean more money from Uncle Sam? On the other hand, it might mean that fashions in weaponry had so changed that the air bases were no longer necessary in Spain—or at least not at an increased price.

I ask unanimous consent that the extract from the Spanish Newsletter, entitled "New Pact on U.S. Bases Sought," be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the extract was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEW PACT ON U.S. BASES SOUGHT

Under 10-year defense agreements between Spain and the United States signed in 1953, joint Spanish-American military bases have been established on Spanish soil. The agreements provided for automatic extensions of two successive 5-year periods, unless either government notifies the other it wants to cancel the pact. Spain has notified the United States that it wants to revise the agreements, which expire this year, and to renegotiate new terms for the naval base at Rota, near Cadiz, and joint use of the three major air bases. Here is a statement by a Spanish foreign office spokesman on the reason for his country's action:

Three events of international politics have coincided, but although the coincidence is unrelated in timing or intention, it has confused news media and may mislead public opinion. The three events are the expiration after 10 years of the Spanish-American agreements of 1953, the crisis in the European Common Market about Great Britain's application for membership, and the satisfactory evolution and intensification of Spanish-French relations made evident by the presence in Madrid of French Minister of Interior Frey and by the announcement of other important visits by members of the French Government.

Negotiations for renewal of the Spanish-American agreements were foreseen in the agreements. In conformity with article 5 of the defense agreements, Spanish Foreign Minister Castiella in a letter sent January 14 to U.S. Ambassador Woodward in Madrid officially announced his intention to invoke the renewal procedure. The decision derives from the need, in a true spirit of friendship and cooperation, for adaptation to present realities in a world which has undergone rapid radical changes of all kinds.

The need to preserve the spirit of the agreements while giving their content required revision, as well as to profit from

> experience in carrying out the agreements, made the Spanish Government believe its decision will serve, through discussion leading to knowledge of respective viewpoints, to find a formula adequate to common objectives, thereby intensifying and strengthening the excellent relations between the two countries. * * *

CONFERENCE IN GENEVA TO HELP BACKWARD NATIONS ILL TIMED—REPORT OF OBSERVER

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, I was honored by being appointed by the Vice President to serve along with my colleague, the distinguished junior Senator from Kansas [Mr. PEARSON] as an observer for the Senate of the United States at the recent United Nations Conference at Geneva, Switzerland, on the application of science and technology to help backward nations.

As I reported to the Senate recently, we were disappointed, disillusioned, and disgusted that this Conference was arranged and convened before proper planning and preliminary hearings were held within all the backward nations, and intelligent cooperation shown in selecting a few delegates from each nation. Frankly, I considered it a terrible waste of taxpayers' money to hold this Conference before briefing sessions had been held in every backward country and intelligent delegates carefully selected.

However, although my stay in Geneva was a waste of time, I believe that if the criticisms I have to report will be accepted by officials of the State Department and corrected in the future, our time and effort spent there as observers will not have been completely in vain. It is in this sense that I speak again today.

May I say at the outset that I hold Dr. Walsh McDermott, chairman of the U.S. delegation, in high admiration for his industry and for his valiant efforts to salvage something from this Conference. He is a man of intense enthusiasm and great industry. I feel that he did his best to conceal his disappointment at the failure of the Conference to make any real accomplishment and in the failure of many backward and emerging nations to have even one delegate at the Conference. With the assistance of Ambassador Jonathan B. Bingham and Ambassador Roger W. Tubby, both very able Americans, he did an outstanding job under extremely difficult circumstances. Dr. McDermott has recently been appointed as a consultant with the Agency for International Development, and I am sure that he will prove to be an effective—in fact, an outstanding—public servant.

It was most unfortunate that officials of the State Department promoted, or even permitted, this Conference to be held without adequate planning and preparation. It was a shameful waste of the time and talent of the more than 100 delegates from the United States. Of course much to the disappointment of our State Department officials many underdeveloped nations sent no delegates whatever. They should have anticipated this.

It is a good thing that the Vice President appointed two observers from the U.S. Senate to attend this Conference. It did not take us long to observe that the cart was hitched before the horse; that there was a lack of preliminary planning; that American taxpayers' money was thrown away on a futile conference.

The more developed nations of the world had large delegations present. The main purpose of this so-called Conference was to help the underdeveloped, emerging nations of the world. For the most part, the delegates of backward nations did not have the background and knowledge to enable them to cope with and to understand the extremely technical nature of the material presented by the delegations from the more scientifically advanced nations. It was evident that AID and State Department officials had failed to brief the nationals of these countries in their respective countries, to have motion pictures shown to groups there, and to assist in selecting a few delegates from each country. The attendance from the emerging nations was very disappointing. Many did not send even one delegate. The delegates from those nations which did were obviously uninterested or unable to understand the technical content of the multiplicity of speeches delivered.

Mr. President, I am informed that the Agency for International Development spent almost $400,000 for the expenses of our delegation alone. That was in addition to the $2 million authorized by the United Nations from its regular budget to which the United States contributes over 32 percent. Frankly, it was a complete waste of taxpayers' money. In all candor may I state that the emerging nations of the world are not yet ready for this type of conference. A great deal of background work must be done in their countries if conferences of this sort are to be successful in the future.

A State Department spokesman reported that 237 scientists and technicians submitted papers. Very likely, that many speeches or more were made throughout the 16 days of the United Nations Conference on the Application of Science and Technology to help backward nations. Practically the entire cost of this so-called Conference was paid directly or indirectly by our taxpayers. This was most unfortunate.

Scientists and physicists of the United Kingdom, Soviet Union, and the United States may have understood the technical papers prepared by their fellow scientists, but it was a fantastic idea on the part of some State Department and AID publicity men to believe that representatives of Nigeria, Sierra Leone, and emerging nations could understand and carry back to their countries the information given in a multiplicity of papers read or speeches made. State Department officials should make no such claim.

Let us not fool the American people. Does any State Department bureaucrat have the effrontery to claim that Nigeria and other African nations sent delegates first class at the sole expense of that new nation, recipient of millions of dollars of foreign assistance money from the United States? The same situation is true regarding other backward nations.

The excuse for holding this Conference was to help backward nations by giving their delegates scientific and technological information of which they had no knowledge.

It evidently never occurred to State Department officials that U.S. officials in AID, the Peace Corps, the Foreign Service, and so forth, are running all over the place in every country in Africa, Asia, and South America. Before similar conferences are held, these Americans who are already in these countries could do the proper preliminary work and enlist the cooperation of intelligent men and women of those countries. Local conferences could be held for the benefit of 200 or 300 nationals of each nation, with our technicians stationed there acting as advisers. Educational films could be shown as well as understandable scientific and technical literature illustrating the advances made in these fields by the United States and other more scientifically advanced nations of the world.

After a complete briefing and after thoroughly discussing the very complex subjects involved—after doing the necessary spadework—there could then be a selected group of people from each country, interested in the problems, sent to regional conferences within a few hundred miles' distance, and within the same area, instead of to a European city. Some delegations at Geneva from the emerging nations were composed for the most part of relatives of the rulers and political leaders of these nations. They seemed more interested in the parties and receptions than they were in the Conference itself, according to my observation and information.

Let me make it crystal clear that I do not advocate hiring any more bureaucrats to do the planning and work I have suggested. I am positive that American officials presently working abroad in our foreign assistance program and in various agencies can handle this additional duty without any difficulty whatever. If backward nations are to send competent delegations to international conferences, their delegates should be somewhat informed ahead of time. There is much preliminary work that should be done.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, may I have an additional 2 minutes?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, I express the hope that high officials in the State Department will curb and prevent this sort of thing in the future and stop this waste of hundreds of thousands of dollars. The millions of poverty-ridden people in the many new nations of the world are far more in need of instruction on improved methods of agriculture, on how to bring water to their villages, on how to build highways, on how to perform a multitude of vitally needed functions, than they are in sending delegates to hear speeches about computers, airplanes, pure science, and other subjects beyond their comprehension.

This conference, precisely as stated by a congressional colleague in attendance as an observer, was often undermanned scientifically and technologically and unable to cope with the vast amounts of material presented to the conference.

He further stated:

> Unfortunately these nations were overwhelmed by the massive delegations from the larger countries.

The net result was that members of the United Kingdom, Soviet Union, and U.S. delegations rose and read papers possibly of interest to their fellow members only. Yet a tremendous expenditure was incurred to bring delegates from the new underdeveloped African nations and from various countries of Asia and Latin America. These delegates came first class. Our taxpayers, who have been sweating and paying too much for foreign assistance, really paid for this extravaganza. It was shameful that eminent American scientists and physicists were given economy class tickets for this conference. More shameful that they were taken from important work in our country to spend a week or more attending this so-called conference.

Two U.S. Senators appointed as observers to render a public service were given economy class tickets. When we disembarked, some delegates were met as they emerged from the first-class section of the plane. If local officials wondered how it came that two U.S. Senators on a mission for their country were traveling economy class, that did not embarrass either of us, I am sure.

I am sorry that the time of the American delegates—many of whom were involved at home in very important work—was wasted along with hundreds of thousands of dollars of taxpayers' money because of a decision of some bureaucrats in the State Department. In the future such incompetence must not be permitted.

Mr. President, it is my feeling that the Senate of the United States should continue to be represented at international meetings of this kind. Perhaps by the presence of our observers we can prevent a recurrence of what happened at Geneva earlier this month.

I attended every conference morning and afternoon throughout the 4 days I was in Geneva, and my colleague, the distinguished Senator from Kansas [Mr. PEARSON] did likewise. We did no sightseeing. We avoided the parties and receptions held each evening, but according to hearsay, delegates from backward nations—not conspicuous in attendance at conference sessions—attended these receptions and parties. I was invited to five receptions and banquets but did not attend even one.

I also again wish to express my high regard for Dr. McDermott and the other American delegates who gave of their time untiringly and unselfishly in the interests of their country. I am sorry that so much of their time was wasted. It must have been a frustrating experience for most of them.

RESIDUAL OIL IMPORTS

Mrs. SMITH. Mr. President, we have often heard the comparison made between talk and action. We have often heard the term of "paying lipservice" to a principle or objective but taking no action.

Recently the Emergency Planning Director issued a report with respect to the residual oil import situation that may have given courage to New Englanders that the present policy of the administration discriminating against them on this was admittedly unjustified.

The report of the Emergency Planning Director is dangerous if it only gets the hopes of New Englanders up falsely—only to be let down by the President failing to do anything about the matter.

Until the President takes the action in the matter that is long overdue—an action which he pressed his predecessor on when he was a Senator from Massachusetts—until he acts, the report of the Emergency Planning Director is nothing more than the well-worn technique of merely "paying lipservice," of only talking but doing nothing about the situation.

It was in this spirit that I wrote the President of the United States day before yesterday—on February 26, 1963—urging him to do what he had urged his predecessor to do. I ask unanimous consent that my letter of that date to the President be placed in the body of the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. SENATE,
Washington, D.C., February 26, 1963.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Earlier this month I wrote you urging you to keep your commitment to the workers at the Kittery-Portsmouth Naval Shipyard to issue an executive order equalizing their pay rates with that of the Boston Naval Shipyard.

This time I want to urge you to do what you urged your predecessor in the White House to do. As a Senator from Massachusetts, you joined with your New England colleagues in petitions to President Eisenhower to remove the restrictions on residual oil imports. You urged not only a relaxation but a complete termination of the quotas which were ordered by the Eisenhower administration 4 years ago.

In this connection I invite your attention to an excellent article by Donald R. Larrabee in the February 20, 1963, issue of the Bangor Daily News. It is good reading.

Sincerely yours,
MARGARET CHASE SMITH,
U.S. Senator.

MANAGEMENT OF NEWS

Mr. FONG. Mr. President, I have just returned from a visit to my home State of Hawaii where I was able to meet with many of my constituents. On more than a few occasions I was asked about the policy of managing the news being practiced by the White House and the executive branch of our Government.

There is growing concern and criticism that the practice of managing news is injurious to our national welfare and seriously undermines the freedom of the press.

The people are rightfully dismayed by the calculated manner in which news is manipulated by the executive branch. They are wondering aloud whether the information passed on through controlled channels is the truth and nothing but the truth—or whether it is carefully "managed" to tell only what the administration wants, even if it means tailoring the news to only the partial truth, or even less. The press and the public insist that the administration practice candor and forthrightness in handling the news.

No less an authority in newspapering than Arthur Krock, the distinguished columnist of the New York Times, has accused President Kennedy of managing the news with what he calls a cynicism, a boldness, and subtlety unmatched in peacetime history. This sharp accusation comes from a Pultizer-Prize-winning newsman who for 21 years was chief of the Washington bureau of the New York Times and more recently a Times Washington columnist. Mr. Krock has documented his charges in an article he has written for the March issue of Fortune magazine.

Just as the complaints against the administration's manipulation of news are mounting throughout the country, we find in Hawaii a vigorous critic in the editorial columns of the Honolulu Star-Bulletin. This is not the first time that this courageous newspaper has assailed the mishandling of news by this administration, and I predict that it will not be the last—so long as the White House, the Department of Defense, and other agencies pursue their practice of managing the news, without regard to the right of the people to know the truth about their Government.

A most timely and meritorious editorial on this subject was published in the Star-Bulletin on Tuesday, February 19.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed at this point in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Honolulu Star-Bulletin, Feb. 19, 1963]

A RATHER SOUR SITUATION

Many quotations would fit the occasion. Best of all, perhaps, is one from Longfellow:

"Pride goeth forth on horseback, grand and gray,
But cometh back on foot, and begs the way."

There was arrogance, too—("the boast of arrogance soon turns to shame")—and not a little ignorance:

"Blind and naked ignorance
Delivers brawling judgments, unashamed,
On all things all day long."

The references are to the Kennedy administration's handling of news of the Cuban crisis.

"We," said Arthur Sylvester, Assistant Secretary of Defense for Public Relations, "managed the news. We used the news as a weapon. A government has an inherent right to lie."

These aren't Mr. Sylvester's exact words, but they are a faithful paraphrase of what he said and meant. He meant that at a critical time such as that existing during the

Cuban crisis a government, as the representative of the people, has a right to twist the truth if this will aid its survival.

Conceded. If the government, in order to deceive the enemy on a critical issue, finds it unavoidably necessary to deceive its own people as well, truth becomes a casualty. But a government in a democratic country ought to have the wisdom to know that no stone should be left unturned, once the crisis is over, to repair the damage, for damage will surely have been done to the people's confidence in their government.

Instead of so doing, Mr. Sylvester—and Mr. Sylvester in this regard is Mr. Kennedy; Mr. Sylvester doesn't talk on such weighty matters without the boss' approval and prior authorization—was not only unmoved by protests but boastful.

His attitude was, it was necessary. So what of it? What's all the fuss about?

We concede that under the circumstances then obtaining it was necessary. But it was outrageous for Mr. Sylvester or anyone else to brush off inquiries and protests as though he and the administration big shots had a patent on what was good for the country.

Now their chickens are coming home to roost. Gone is the pride of yesterday (We Americans "ought to be rather pleased with ourselves this Christmas," said President Kennedy December 17), and if Mr. Sylvester is saying anything louder than a mumble about managing the news it is impossible to hear it.

The reason is that, though the Kennedy administration is terribly anxious to have the country believe what it now says of the situation in Cuba, too many people remember Mr. Sylvester's smug declaration about the Government's right to lie when it thinks necessary.

The administration is sweating even more because the same critics who were saying the right things last fall while the administration was denying them—the administration was later proved to have been wrong—are again criticizing the administration and the administration is denying.

Since Senator Keating was right in August and September, and the administration was wrong, who is more likely to be believed now, especially in view of Mr. Sylvester's defense of lying?

We give you three guesses. First two don't count.

FEDERAL JUDGE R. E. THOMASON, OF EL PASO, FORMER CONGRESSMAN, HONORED AS HUMANITARIAN

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, among the many fine public officials who have served both the Nation and my home State of Texas, none has shown a greater devotion to public duty and the public interest and welfare than U.S. District Judge R. Ewing Thomason, of El Paso.

Like many other great Texans, including Sam Rayburn, Davy Crockett, Sam Houston, and Jesse Jones, R. Ewing Thomason was born in Tennessee. He was brought to Texas by his parents at an early age. He served as speaker of the Texas House of Representatives, like Speaker Sam Rayburn before him, and was an impressive candidate for the governorship of Texas, losing mainly because of geography, he being then from El Paso, in the far western corner of the State.

When I went to El Paso as a young lawyer in 1927, R. E. Thomason was the newly elected mayor. His law office was in the building in which my office was located. His encouragement and kindness meant so much to me that later I asked him to sponsor my admission to the U.S. Supreme Court, which he did.

R. E. Thomason served with distinction for nine consecutive terms in the House of Representatives of the United States and as an able member of the Committee on Armed Services all during World War II, was a strong and able advocate of measures which helped bring about victory in World War II.

On July 31, 1947, Judge Thomason resigned from the Congress, on being appointed U.S. district judge for the western district of Texas. He serves there now with fidelity and distinction, with a kindness and humanity and humility not always found in lifetime-appointed judges.

Judge Ewing Thomason has recently been paid a rare tribute in El Paso. The new R. E. Thomason General Hospital at El Paso has been named in his honor, in tribute to his broad humanitarianism and kindness.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to print at this point in the Record the dedicatory speech by Ellis O. Mayfield, past president of the El Paso Bar Association, delivered on February 16, 1963, at the hospital dedication, and the two articles from the El Paso Times of February 17, 1963, entitled "New General Hospital Dedicated as Memorial to Judge Thomason" and "Happy End of an Era: New Thomason Hospital To Be Open Sunday."

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the Record as follows:

The Dedication of R. E. Thomason General Hospital, February 16, 1963, Ellis O. Mayfield, Past President, El Paso Bar Association, and Past President, El Paso Chamber of Commerce

Judge Thomason, Mrs. Thomason, Dr. Holcomb, distinguished guests and fellow Thomasonites, with all sincerity, to be asked to speak on this occasion is the greatest privilege ever extended to me—and I am truly honored.

While the exact occasion is a relatively new idea—the fact that R. E. Thomason would someday be honored by El Paso in some manner has been an accepted fact for almost 40 years.

Now, there has always been a question as to whether history makes the man or whether man makes the history—but I suspect that in the case of Robert Ewing Thomason it is a mixture of both, for it seems that wherever he has stood—whether as the mayor of his city—the speaker of the Texas Legislature—a national figure in the Congress of the United States—or as a leader in his profession, both at the bar and on the bench—history has been written. Moreover, your presence here today on this occasion attests to the fact that, in each case, he has stood the test of greatness—and the honor which was his has reflected to the great benefit of the people of this community, of this State, and of this Nation. While within his record of service are recorded the passing of some of the great moments of history, yet (and I admit I may be prejudiced) it seems to me that his service at the bar of justice must be, to a man of his qualities, his greatest source of satisfaction. For in that great, solemn courtroom this man sits as a living symbol of the fundamental guarantee of our Nation of laws that all who stand before him—both the great and the small—will receive equal justice under the law. There—in great dignity—is tested the rights of the individual against the welfare of the Nation and all who have witnessed this—have experienced a great source of satisfaction and a renewed confidence in the American way of life. There, then, is the personification of the law of this land—applying its concepts to human beings—in each case a different soul to which a separate set of facts necessarily applies and the balance which has been achieved between governmental and human rights is, I am sure, the fruition of a lifetime of public service by Robert Ewing Thomason.

Thus, over the years, the people of this community have wondered how we might best honor and remember our friend. His die has been cast and, in wonder, we remark: "How large is the mold."

From the beginning of recorded time, people have sought to perpetuate the record of greatness of their leaders—the early primitive stone pictures and carvings—the colossal pyramids—the Greek statues—faces perpetuated in rock on the sides of mountains—bronze castings in the public square. Which of these would be appropriate to this occasion?

It seems to me that any symbol should truly reflect the spirit of that which is symbolized—and while granite and bronze alone may perpetuate the physical features of the person—the genius of our friend is his inner warmth and friendship for his fellowman. He is the unique leader who can lead without turning his back on those who follow in his steps.

Therefore, there could be no more fitting tribute to this great man than the dedication to his name and to his service of this living memorial—a house of hope and mercy which exists but for one purpose—to help mankind.

This great hospital, then, the citizens of El Paso here dedicate to the everlasting honor of Robert Ewing Thomason.

[From the El Paso Times, Feb. 17, 1963]

New General Hospital Dedicated as Memorial to Judge Thomason

(By Ramon Villalobos)

El Paso's ultramodern $6.2 million R. E. Thomason General Hospital, described as one of the finest if not the best of is size in the United States, was officially dedicated Saturday "as a fitting memorial to a man who has dedicated his life to the service of his city, State, and National Government."

The brief ceremonies were held at the entrance of the imposing structure and before a large gathering of personal friends of the U.S. district judge, and city, State, and military authorities.

From the opening dedicatory prayer by the Reverend B. M. G. Williams, who also delivered the invocation at the ground-breaking ceremonies, to the last speaker, the honors and praise were paid to Judge Thomason, the people of El Paso, and particularly to the hospital's Women's Auxiliary and El Paso County Medical Association.

Dr. Dysart E. Holcomb, chairman of the board of managers of El Paso Hospital district, who served as master of ceremonies, praised the combined efforts of the many persons, public officials, and the newspapers, for their contribution to the successful realization of the modernistic hospital.

In his dedicatory speech Attorney Ellis O. Mayfield, in a tribute to Judge Thomason, said, "We are here today to honor our friend and we all know it."

"Now there has always been a question as to whether history makes the man or whether the man makes history—but I suspect that in the case of Robert Ewing Thomason it is a mixture of both, for it seems that wherever he has stood—whether as the mayor of his city, speaker of the Texas Legislature, a national figure in the Congress of the United

States, or as a leader in his profession, both at the bar and on the bench—history has been written.

"Moreover, our presence here today on this occasion attests to the fact that in each case he stood the test of greatness—and the honor which was his has reflected to the great benefit of the people of this community."

Mayfield said there could be no more fitting tribute to this "great man" than the dedication to his name and to the service of this hospital.

"This great hospital, then, the citizens of El Paso here dedicate to the everlasting honor of Robert Ewing Thomason," he said.

Taking the speaker's rostrum, Judge Thomason told those present, "This is the greatest honor that has ever come to me.

"I regret I do not have the words to adequately express my appreciation for the honor you do me and my family in the naming of this hospital. * * * I have tried, to be a good citizen but no man deserves extra praise or recognition for that. I thank all of you gentlemen for your very kind and generous remarks."

Judge Thomason then went on to congratulate the hospital board, the commissioner's court, and the medical society, and all who had a part in making the hospital possible. He also paid special tribute to the doctors, nurses, and the hospital's women's auxiliary who have given of their services freely and without hope of reward to the charity cases in the hospital and who will continue to do so in the new building.

"To them I extend the thanks of a grateful community," Judge Thomason said.

"My hope and prayer today is that this magnificent and modern hospital will live and prosper throughout the years to come—to bless, comfort, and heal the sick and suffering of El Paso and the Southwest."

Dr. W. R. Gaddis, president of El Paso County Medical Society, said that his group was proud to have been coagitator for construction of the hospital which, he said, "symbolizes the desire of man to care for the needs of his neighbor."

"It should be noted that medical care of all people has come to its present exalted status as a voluntary contribution of the practitioners and researchers in medicine, not the result of legislation.

"We owe no fealty to the higher-ups for this hospital, it is the will of the people," he said.

Dr. Gaddis then congratulated the people of El Paso and pledged El Paso County Medical Society's aid to the unfortunate sick to the best of "our ability."

"We join the people of El Paso in giving this accolade to our great outstanding public-spirited citizen, Judge R. E. Thomason, as a fitting tribute to his life of public service," he said.

County Judge Glenn Woodard, another speaker at the ceremonies commended the work of the hospital board whose members worked without compensation for more than 3 years.

"To them we owe our most sincere gratitude," the judge said.

He also praised Judge Thomason and said the naming of the hospital was a dedication to a man who has spent most of his life for the betterment of the people.

After the ceremonies, guests, which included representatives of all the local hospitals, and United States and Mexican military authorities, were taken on a special guided tour of the hospital.

[From the El Paso Times, Feb. 17, 1963]

HAPPY END OF AN ERA—NEW THOMASON HOSPITAL TO BE OPEN SUNDAY

(By Barbara Funkhouser)

The new R. E. Thomason General Hospital will be open for public inspection between 10 a.m. and 6 p.m. Sunday and every taxpayer in El Paso County should go see what he bought.

When all the bills are paid it will have cost the $6.2 million available which includes $3.7 million from the issuance of bonds approved by El Paso taxpayers and $2.5 million in Federal Hill-Burton funds contributed by every taxpayer in the United States.

Expenses are approximately $5.2 million for construction by R. E. McKee General Contractors, Inc., $346,000 to Garland & Hillis Architects, $450,000 for furnishings and supplies and the remainder for land acquisition.

These are the figures but the new hospital represents more than money. It reprepresents a decade of crusading by those cognizant even then of the desperate conditions in the old hospital which will be vacated March 1 and razed immediately. It represents a year's work in creation of El Paso Hospital District, 2 years on the drawing board, and 2 years in construction.

GENEROUS TAXPAYERS

It represents the generosity of taxpayers toward the indigent residents of El Paso County in need of medical attention, and their interest in raising health standards of the community.

It represents the blood, sweat, and tears of those who have laughed and wept and continued to work toward building the finest hospital in the Southwest.

The new Thomason General Hospital is a fine building. It is sleek and modern in appearance, colorful yet restful in its furnishings, and fully equipped.

The project has had its stormy moments. The psychiatrists did not like fourth-floor plans and will continue to use Gilbert Annex. There was not enough money for the proposed chronic-care unit so the would-be psychiatric floor may be used for this purpose. The dentists didn't like the furnishings of the dental suite so these were changed. Furnishings and equipment had to be bid twice to stay within the funds available and, finally, some of the floors had deflected too much but the building has been declared safe and some floor area has been leveled.

However, through all of this there has not been a hint of corruption, graft, dishonesty, insincerity, or inability connected with the project—a large and public project.

It is perhaps unfortunate that those attending Sunday's open house cannot first tour the old building of narrow halls, inadequate lighting and heating, almost no plumbing, rattletrap equipment, and crowded wards.

The new building is vastly different. The main entrance off Alameda Avenue is approached around the memorial fountain given by Judge and Mrs. R. E. Thomason as an indication of their interest in the hospital.

Doors lead into the lobby area, open in the front with a large information booth to the left behind which is an attractive row of cubicles and offices composing the admitting department.

The southwest corner of this floor, behind admitting, is devoted to business offices, medical records, the library and other facilities surrounding a small courtyard.

The southeast corner is the outpatient department designed to accommodate 60,000 patients per year; the eye, ear, nose, and throat and neuropsychiatric treatment departments and occupational and physical therapy facilities.

Between these two sections of the first floor is the seating area of the lobby, gift shop, first floor pharmacy, chapel, classrooms and offices, and the glass walls through which hospital visitors may overlook the large inner courtyard complete with sprays of water, evergreen plantings and a live oak tree.

The east half of the first floor is perhaps the most important part of the hospital. On the west end are the entrances for hospital employees and doctors and the emergency entrance through which probably 25,000 emergency patients will move in the remainder of this year.

Three large operating rooms and six large treatment rooms make up the emergency department which is adjacent to the recovery and intensive care units of two isolation rooms and a large ward accommodating at least 10 beds and a nurses' station.

EMERGENCY DEPARTMENT

Next to recovery is surgery, with six major operating rooms. Then comes a row of urology examination and treatment rooms adjacent to the radiology department of four major X-ray rooms completely equipped with almost everything available in this field.

Finally, in the northeast corner is the extensive laboratory.

The arrangement of this half of the first floor is a point of pride with the designers because, unlike most other hospitals, they have achieved what appears to be the logical sequence of emergency, intensive care, recovery, surgery, X-ray, and laboratories.

Also leading from this floor are the glass-enclosed walkways to Gilbert Annex and the tuberculosis annex.

While this will be the busiest public door, the key to the operation of the entire hospital is the basement or ground floor below.

Here is the nerve center for the pneumatic tube-conveyor and trayveyor systems by which supplies and drugs will be moved to every area of the hospital after ordered, cleaned, sterilized, packaged or whatever is needed.

COLORFUL CAFETERIA

Here, too, on the east side is the kitchen and cafeteria equipped to accommodate thousands of persons. Colorful tables and chairs are arranged to overlook the large inner courtyard. It will be a pleasant place to eat and the food at Thomason General Hospital is excellent even in the old building.

On the west side is an unfinished area which one day will become a large dining room and to the west is the auditorium where students or other persons may view surgical procedures by closed circuit TV or hold meetings.

There is much more on this floor which would be of primary interest to mechanically minded persons or those interested in systems in the name of efficiency. It is also connected by tunnels through which food, supplies and equipment will be moved to the annexes.

But taking one of several swift elevators upward, the second floor is the administrative area plus some of the air control equipment.

Here are the offices of the administrator, personnel director, director of nursing and her assistant; bedrooms for doctors and technicians while on call but not busy in the hospital, various other staff facilities and the hospital board conference room.

Above this floor are the five floors composing the patient room tower. Here are 250 new beds, 50 on each floor divided into single, double, and 4-bed rooms.

Each room includes at least one floor-to-ceiling window with colorful blue and green drapes and a bathroom with dressing table and large mirror, lavatory, commode, shower and communication system to the nurses' station.

PRIVACY PREVAILS

Each bed may be separated off for privacy by drawing a yellow curtain and each has a pillow speaker through which the patient may speak directly to the nurses' station and receive an answer, turn on the radio and, if he can pay for it, turn on the television set.

The theory behind the pillow speaker is that it will save many unnecessary trips by the nurse into the patient room and nurses are in short supply at Thomason.

In the center core area of each floor is the central nurses' station, classrooms, preparation and storage rooms, offices, public restrooms, and a host of other facilities. Dayrooms are at each end.

The third floor is for obstetrics, nurseries, and maternity nursing. Here will be born approximately 100 babies each month and for a change, it is hoped that each will have his own crib and there will be enough incubators to house the premature infants.

In normal operation, this floor is designed for 34 adult beds and 46 bassinets and another of those nice "gizmos" to be found in the new Thomason is the speaker system between the corridor and nursery so that the proud parent and nurse need not lipread or shout through the plate glass separations.

The fourth floor, designed as the neuropsychiatric nursing unit, will be used when needed as a chronic care unit or a regular nursing floor. The only differences between this and other tower floors are the windows have security screens and elevator lobby areas and exits can be locked.

The pediatrics department will be on the fifth floor which is designed for use, more or less, in sections whereby beds and rooms not occupied by children can, if necessary, be used for adult medical-surgical patients.

Sixth and seventh floors are regular medical-surgical nursing units.

As a building, the new Thomason General Hospital will be the finest county hospital anywhere. It is a physical plant capable of fulfilling the dream of a community health center.

It is a tribute to the man for whom it is named. It is a monument to those who have been responsible for its construction. It is a decent place in which to work for those who serve humanity. It is a place you and I can go for emergency treatment.

It requires several hours to tour the entire hospital, but the open house Sunday provides an opportunity to see whatever part of it is desired.

SPENDING AND TAXATION

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, in a period of our history not too long ago, referred to by some as the thwarted thirties, there were those who proclaimed that the way out of a depression would be to spend and spend, and tax and tax. Now, currently, in the not so roaring sixties, there is a new school of thought that the way to get the country moving again is to spend and spend, but not to tax and tax. Indeed, these are times that try men's souls—and their pocketbooks.

Mr. President, Mr. J. S. Seidman, of a prominent firm of New York City certified public accountants, has written a very thought provoking article entitled "How Do We Sober Up Our Intaxicated Nation?" In order that members of the Congress and others may have an opportunity to read the article by Mr. Seidman, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the body of the Record as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

How Do We Sober Up Our Intaxicated Nation?

(By J. S. Seidman)

In the thwarted thirties, the administration in office proclaimed that the way out of a depression is to spend and spend, and tax and tax.

In these not so soaring sixties, the administration in office says that the way to get the country moving again is to spend and spend, but not tax and tax.

What was said when the Nation was struggling to be born is just as applicable today: These are the times that try men's souls—and their pocketbooks.

It's natural for everyone to want a tax cut. It's natural for everyone to want a Government handout of one sort or another. What's unnatural is not to face up to the fact that we can't have it both ways without ultimately falling on our face.

Hence, this clarion call to restraint and sobriety. Let's all look at both sides of the ledger. To me, here are the answers that emerge:

1. To have a tax cut unmatched by an expenditure cut is to endanger the economy, not improve it. We don't get stronger by depleting the Treasury. If budget deficits were the way out, we should now be enjoying economic paradise, since we have had sizable deficits in 25 of the last 31 years. But we know from history what happens to nations that persist in living beyond their means.

2. Spending more than we take in does put more dollars into the economy. But that is not the equivalent of more purchasing power, or more purchases. A deep-rooted anxiety, reaching out to the entire Western World, is not about the quantity of our dollars, but their quality. Quantity without quality places in jeopardy the savings bonds, life insurance policies, bank balances, and pension benefits of our own people. Adding deficit on deficit may get the country moving again—but in the wrong direction.

3. The road to tax reduction is in expenditure reduction. Expenditure reduction requires determination and forthrightness by each of us. Lipservice and pious resolutions won't do it. Every one of us must recognize that expenditure reduction may curb or eliminate advantages that some of us, or certain groups, areas, or parties now unwarrantedly enjoy.

4. The President properly put it to the Nation when, at his inauguration, he said it is time for the people to ask: "What can we do for the Government?" There are many things we can do if we are serious about having our economy advance. For one, we must stop calling for, or condoning, the spending of money that we don't have.

5. We must realize that today's promises become tomorrow's taxes. We must therefore turn a deaf ear to rosy pictures of lavish welfare programs, and other spending that we just can't afford.

6. We must recognize that nothing impoverishes us, as a nation, more than to pay out a dollar without getting a dollar's worth in return. Featherbedding, or sloughing off of any sort, comes at a high cost to all of us.

7. We must therefore instill or restore in ourselves an interest in work, a pride in work, a sense of responsibility about work. We must stop trying to get the most and give the least. Otherwise our economy and our jobs are imperiled.

8. By the same token, we must insist that our elected representatives scrutinize every public program or activity, and measure it by dollar's worth in results and efficient administration. The same rigid analysis, support, and yardsticks must be applied to public expenditures, as is expected of business in its expenditures.

9. Furthermore, priority must be assigned to the different expenditure requests by Government, to permit postponements or eliminations as need be.

10. We must not only welcome, but also insist upon, tax reform. We must get rid of punitive and outmoded tax laws. In the process we must correct the excessive reliance on the income tax. We must bring to whatever income tax we do have, simplicity, equity, certainty, and administrability. More important, we must get away from the present situation under which taxes, rather than commonsense or good judgment, run our personal and business lives. The cost to the Nation in time and moral fabric consumed by taxes, instead of production, is too great.

These 10 commandments may keep us off the shoals of intaxication. Otherwise, we will stagger more with taxes that stagger less.

WILLIAM C. DOHERTY, AMBASSADOR TO JAMAICA

Mr. BREWSTER. It is with great pride that I report to you that a distinguished American, Mr. William C. Doherty, of Bethesda, Md., has established himself as one of our most effective ambassadors.

When President Kennedy announced his selection of Mr. Doherty as our first Ambassador to Jamaica, I think every Member of this body was confident that the choice was both brilliant and inspired.

In his capacity as president of the National Association of Letter Carriers for 21 years, Mr. Doherty became an acknowledged expert in the international labor movement. He was one of the most stalwart and articulate advocates of freedom and the democratic process in the labor world.

It gives me great pleasure to state at this time that Mr. Doherty is obviously living up to our expectations as a diplomat in a very difficult post. The current issue of Newday, the monthly magazine of the West Indies, published in Jamaica, carries a glowing tribute to Ambassador Doherty. I ask unanimous consent to have this tribute printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Mailman Making Good

He arrived on Grace Line's *Santa Rosa* November 24. Even before he presented his credentials to the Governor General 2 days later at King's House, William C. Doherty, 60, first U.S. Ambassador to Jamaica, was winning friends and influencing Jamaicans in typical Dale Carnegie fashion.

Early December he met Prime Minister Bustamante and some of his Cabinet in the Prime Minister's office. A keyhole listener reported: "They all got along like old buddies." Underscoring his earlier endorsement, Bustamante's later said: "I like Mr. Doherty. He speaks the same language that I and my Government speak." Bustamante's language is pro-Jamaican development, pro-Commonwealth, pro-American, pro-West, in that order.

Doherty's stout, well-tailored figure has since become familiar to thousands of Common Joes; no longer does anyone need to point him out to them; his common touch is paying off in rapidly mounting popularity.

His revelation that he once edited the house magazine of the National Letter Carriers Association (from whose presidency he resigned to accept the ambassadorship) has made him one with the Jamaican press boys. When the afternoon tabloid Star misinterpreted that portion of his speech to the American Men's Club in which he quite correctly said the stability of Jamaica's Government was due in large measure to the English traditions inherited by a first-rate civil service, he generously accepted a reporter's assurance that it was a genuine mistake.

Wherever he has spoken, he has struck the same warm, inspiring note: Jamaica is a wonderful, hospitable little island on the threshold of great achievement as an independent nation, which the U.S. Government stands ready to assist in every possible way.

His concern for Jamaica's No. 1 problem, unemployment, is as deep and sincere as that of the country's leaders. Says he: "There is no shortcut solution to unemployment in any country. I think Jamaica is following the right course toward a long-term solution."

First ever. Christmas week he pulled a big surprise on the embassy staff: an all-staff party at the embassy residence on Long Lane, S.A. For the native members, it was the first such party ever; it left them glowing.

To the same venue week later he invited members of both sides of Parliament and leaders from other sections of the Jamaican community to view the now-famous film in which President Kennedy, interviewed by a top team of three TV men, gives gloves-off answers to questions on America's domestic and foreign policy on a wide range of subjects, and straightens the record on the gigantic role his country plays in bolstering or stabilizing weak economies and keeping world peace.

Quicker than he probably thought or hoped he would, the ex-mailman from the United States has earned in Jamaica a new name which signifies acceptance: "Ambassador Bill."

U.S. TRAVEL SERVICE IN JAPAN: A SMALL OFFICE DOES A BIG JOB

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, recently I visited Japan as an observer, for the Senate Commerce Committee, at the International North Pacific Fisheries Commission meeting in Tokyo. While there I visited the Far East office of the U.S. Travel Service of the Department of Commerce. This visit produced two firsts: I was the first Member of the Senate to inspect this office; and this office was the first U.S. Travel Service office I have had the pleasure of visiting. My visit was pleasant and informative. I am extremely impressed with the efficient and effective job that has been done in the promotion of travel to the United States of America—both by this office in Tokyo and by the Travel Service generally.

The Travel Service office in Tokyo is a small one. It is located in the heart of the Tokyo business district. It is handsomely decorated and well equipped. There are only four employees—two local travel specialists, a general services clerk, and an American director. The director is Mr. Martin B. Pray who, in a short period of time, has done an excellent job.

The office maintains a reference library of pamphlets and materials describing tourist facilities and commercial opportunities for each of our 50 States. In the Alaska files I found over 75 pamphlets describing the attractions of our 49th State. The library is in constant use both by Japanese businessmen and by Japanese tourists planning their vacations.

The office maintains up-to-date mailing lists of each and every travel agency in Japan, Korea, Taiwan, Hong Kong, and the Philippines. Mailings on travel developments in the United States are made twice a month to this list.

Although this travel office has not been open long, I understand that more and more Japanese travel agencies are making use of its facilities. In the month of January alone, representatives of 53 travel agencies, 61 booking offices and 239 tourists visited this U.S. Travel Service office. This, of course, does not include the many mail and telephone inquiries that the office receives.

Senators may not be aware that last year 17,972 Japanese visitors toured the United States. These figures do not include the many students and Government officials who also visited our country from Japan in 1962. This is indeed an impressive number when we consider that Japan currently maintains relatively strict currency exchange controls. It is my understanding that the International Monetary Fund has suggested to the Japanese Government that these controls be relaxed in the future and it is possible that within the next 18 months there will be such a relaxation. This would undoubtedly result in a large increase of Japanese travel to the United States. I was told that one major travel agent in Tokyo has predicted that relaxed currency controls would mean, for example, that as many as 10,000 honeymooners a year would visit Hawaii alone.

Not only has travel from Japan increased since the opening of the Tokyo U.S. Travel Service office but there has been a corresponding increase in travel to the United States of America from the other areas of the Orient served by the Tokyo office. A total of 8,869 Philippine visitors visited the United States last year, an increase of 20 percent over the year before. The number of U.S. visitors from Hong Kong likewise increased by 27 percent.

These travel service offices which have been established overseas to encourage foreign visitors to come to America are anxious to receive the publications and advice of travel and convention bureaus within our own cities and States. I urge the State and local travel bureaus to take full advantage of the publicity and promotion skills available to them at the U.S. Travel Service offices throughout the world.

While I was visiting the office I was pleased to speak to several reporters Mr. Pray had called together. I told them of the tourist attractions of my State of Alaska. As a result, articles outlining the attractions of Alaska appeared in many of the local Japanese papers; articles which would never have been printed without the existence of the U.S. Travel Service. These articles are but a small part of the services rendered by the Tokyo office. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a representative article entitled "Alaska Eagerly Seeking More Tourists," taken from the Shipping and Trade News, Saturday, February 9, 1963, be printed in the RECORD at this point. This article was written by an outstanding and responsible newsman, Mr. Peter T. Sum.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ALASKA EAGERLY SEEKING MORE TOURISTS—SENATOR LENDS HAND IN TOURISM PROMOTION

(By Peter T. Sum)

One portion of the United States, the name of which often exists, it seems, in dreams only, is offering a new aspect in tourist attractions.

The largest State in the United States, the 49th in the Union currently has in this country its own ambassador of goodwill.

The ambassador is Senator E. L. (BOB) BARTLETT, a "more than 50-year resident" of Alaska and a Democrat lawmaker on the floor of the Senate since 1959.

Senator BARTLETT's presence in this country, officially speaking, is in connection with the International Fisheries talks currently being conducted in Tokyo among the Governments of the United States, Canada, and Japan.

Senator BARTLETT is an adviser to the U.S. delegation to the talks.

The Senator, however, managed to take time out from his principal work yesterday to do some promotion for his home State.

He called on the Far East regional office of the U.S. Travel Service (USTS) where he conferred briefly with Martin B. Pray, regional director, USTS, on how to get more foreign tourists to Alaska.

While at the USTS office, Senator BARTLETT also met Jack Moss, Japan sales manager, Northwest Orient Airlines, and Bill Glaza, NWA's PR-manager.

The Senator later was introduced to members of Tokyo's English-language Press by Pray.

In what was described as an informal chit-chat in the spacious reception office of USTS, the U.S. lawmaker said that while there were increases in the flow of American tourists to his State within the past few years, the outcome was still far from satisfactory in the State government's view.

He said that the State was now earnestly trying to promote tourism through the good offices of its board of tourism under the directorship of Morris Ford.

"The State is pursuing a very active campaign (for the promotion of tourism) though small in scale at the moment," the Senator expressed.

He said that funds for the campaign came from Government appropriations.

Geographically speaking, the Senator thought that the State he represented offered a new aspect in tourist travel.

"We have the wilderness," declared the Senator pointing out that the largest State in the Union had a population of only a quarter of a million.

He said that any visitor arriving at Anchorage, the main gateway to the State of Alaska, needed only a few minutes' time by car in order to be with the wilderness.

"We also have the few glaciers in the world that are accessible by road," the Senator from Alaska said.

He thought that visitors from the Far East, Japanese in particular, would enjoy touring Alaska where recently the weather was warmer and more pleasant than Tokyo.

The Senator pointed out that the State had one drawback in its attempt to have more visitors.

He said, "We have no passenger steamship services. What we had were contributed by the Canadians."

The Canadians suspended the services some time in 1954 after which, Senator BARTLETT said his government introduced a ferry service system for the conveyance of people between the other States of the Union and Alaska.

Communications and hotel facilities within the 49th State were up to date, however.

Senator Bartlett disclosed that Alaska alone has six regional airlines with the Consolidated Airlines well known for its package-tour services.

"The airline even packages your (fishing) catch and sends it home for you," contributed Pray.

The USTS executive thought that "for 5 years to come Alaska and Hawaii will be the two most popular destinations for Far East tourists."

Asked why he had thought so, the American travel promoter attached to the Department of Commerce replied that he had based his thoughts on two factors.

Proximity of Alaska and Hawaii.

Both Alaska and Hawaii offer the greatest variety of things to do.

However, statistics thus far showed that there had been far too few passengers landing at Alaska than other U.S. States.

Things might look better for Alaska, however, what with Pray already coining the sales slogan:

"Hawaii—presold package; Alaska—tomorrow's discovery."

And, with Northwest Orient Airlines saying that it takes only 6½ hours' nonstop scheduled flying time between Haneda Airport and Anchorage.

Thus, in a way, Alaska is not only a name in dream after all. For it is still nearer to Tokyo than traveling by train (for the time being) from this city to Osaka.

REVISION OF NASA PATENT WAIVER REGULATIONS

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, recently one of our most distinguished Representatives, Mrs. Edith Green of Oregon, joined a group of Representatives and Senators who are vigorously opposing the revision of NASA patent waiver regulations. Her statement of January 28, 1963, was so forceful and enlightening that I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Statement by Mrs. Green of Oregon

At the outset I want to pay tribute to the role of the National Space and Aeronautics Administration and also to its capable leadership whose efforts have garnered the attention and admiration of the American people and their allies. I have had occasion from time to time to contact James Webb, the NASA Administrator, and his staff, and have found them helpful and knowledgeable at all times.

Therefore, in the context that there can be disagreement among friends, let me aline myself with my distinguished colleagues, Senator Gruening and Representatives Holifield and Ryan on the matter before you today—a proposed change in the NASA patent waiver regulations.

It is my view that in cases where the National Aeronautics and Space Administration sponsors and pays for research and development in fields within its statutory jurisdiction, the ensuing inventions and discoveries should be the property of the Federal Government for the benefit of the general public and not for the benefit of only a particular contractor involved.

Inventions resulting from Government contracts are the products of expenditures of public funds. These inventions are developed for a public purpose and are a means to a Government purpose, assigned by statute as refined by regulations, and take on a public character thereby. The public, the American taxpayers, has therefore paid for the invention.

The admirable and fruitful technological research conducted and financed by the Federal Government, including NASA, a constituent agency, represents a vast national resource—a resource in my view that is a counterpart to the great public domain lands of our West of the 19th century.

This, I believe, is the position of the Atomic Energy Commission. This, I suggest, should be the position of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

At this point I shall quote from a Department of Justice report signed by the then Attorney General, Tom Clark, and issued in 1947, I believe:

"Where patentable inventions are made in the course of performing a Government-financed contract for research and development, the public interest requires that all rights to such inventions be assigned to the Government and not left to the private ownership of the contractor. Public control will assure free and equal availability of the inventions to American industry and science; will eliminate any competitive advantage to the contractor chosen to perform the research work; will avoid undue concentration of economic power in the hands of a few large corporations; will tend to increase and diversify available research facilities within the United States to the advantage of the Government and of the national economy; and will thus strengthen our American system of free, competitive enterprise."

My recollection is that the Justice Department during the administration of General Eisenhower in effect reiterated this policy.

The policy as laid down by the Atomic Energy Commission, and endorsed by the Justice Department, it seems to me, has avoided this very hazard—the one of granting of special privileges and the establishment of preferred positions by contractors.

The Mitchell subcommittee of the House Science and Astronautics Committee reported in March of 1960, during a review of proposed patent revisions, the solicited views of Prof. Seymour Melman of Columbia University.

Professor Melman made this valid observation based on a study he had prepared for the Senate Subcommittee on Patents: "It was found that where knowledge is treated—where the production of knowledge is treated as an end in itself, the pace of inquiry moved the more rapidly, as against criteria which see the production of new knowledge from the vantage point of a special section or group or agency in society."

That doughty Frenchman, Clemenceau, once said that war is too important to be left to the generals. I suggest that the patent system is too valuable an apparatus to be left to its friends.

Now it is natural to raise the point—and it has been raised by my colleagues in the House—"you think it's something immoral in an inventor retaining the fruits of his labor—the system under which we became the greatest industrial country in the world?"

Well, Byron R. White, now an Associate Justice of the Supreme Court, replied in this fashion when Deputy Attorney General: "The individual inventor doesn't enjoy the patent rights himself in any case and they go, instead, to his employing company, which, in the situation we are describing, is the Government contractor. And, of course, the present patent system of NASA, which some are now trying to change, was established by Congress itself in the 1958 Space Act.

It seems to me the proposed waiver regulations are objectionable on a number of scores, one of which I shall mention. The initial statement of the waiver policy, which, I believe, is section 1245.103, appears to suggest that waiver, rather than Government retention as contained in title 42, United States Code, section 2457(f), is to be the rule rather than the exception. The statute requires a determination that the waiver serve the interests of the United States—Government title generally is the result of Government-financed inventions. But the proposed regulations change places emphasis on the prompt working of inventions and assumes that such prompt working will ordinarily be fostered by the private retention of exclusive rights in the inventions concerned.

The core of the NASA patent matter is section 305 of the 1958 Space Act. It requires the Federal Government to take title to NASA contractor inventions unless the Administrator determines the interests of the United States require waiving such title. Now on two occasions since passage of the 1958 act, there have been two attempts to change this provision by means of legislation. This legislation did not pass. I think that this very hearing raises the question of whether an attempt is being made to accomplish by regulations that which in legislation form failed to secure congressional approval.

I suggest that advocates of a change in patent section 305 return to the committees of the Congress for a fair and open hearing on the merits and demerits of their proposed patent change.

This seems to be a proper and equitable means of settling the matter which is of the utmost importance for the economic wellbeing of the American people.

AMERICAN AGRICULTURAL POLICY—SPEECH BY R. K. DOERK, INTERNATIONAL HARVESTER CO., MADISON, WIS.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, in the February 1963 newsletter distributed to the vocational agriculture teachers of my State, there appeared portions of a speech by Mr. R. K. Doerk, of the International Harvester Co., which was delivered at a luncheon during a convention attended by many Oregon agriculture teachers.

During the course of his remarks, Mr. Doerk pointed out many important facts which are sometimes lost sight of in debate upon agricultural policy. I think it is important to stress as he did that:

> Financially, agriculture is also America's largest single industry. The value of the farm plant—$206 billion—exceeds the plant value of any other industry in this country. And gross total farm income—$40 billion annually—exceeds the income of any other industry on the American scene. By contrast, the gross income of the farm equipment industry last year was close to $2 billion, or about 5 cents per dollar of gross farm income; and it will probably be nearly the same for 1962.

It is important, too, Mr. President, for us to recall the fact that although our food supply is coming from fewer farms now as compared to the past it does not diminish the importance of our farms for the people who operate them. Actually, Mr. Doerk points out, the importance of our farm production is best gaged by the need for farm products which in turn is a function of the number of customers our farmers serve.

So, too, is Mr. Doerk's reminder that the people in agriculture in our country are the largest single gainfully employed group in our national economy. It will be helpful to us, in my judgment, in the days ahead as we consider legislation which affects either directly or indirectly American agriculture that we remind ourselves of these points which Mr. Doerk has developed so concisely. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that his article be printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Is Agriculture Important?

No one acquainted with the facts questions the great importance of American agriculture to the well-being of our Nation. With the assignment of providing the daily needs of food and fiber for more than 168 million people, agriculture must be recognized as the most important business in our country. American agriculture has no competitor, and any possible foreign competition is not foreseeable for the future. Each morning there are 6,000 more youngsters to feed on the basis of the present birthrate, and what that figure will be in 1975 or 1980 is anybody's guess. So, American agriculture's market here at home is assured, and it is growing daily.

The fact that our food supply is coming from fewer farms now as compared to the past doesn't diminish the importance of our farms or the people who operate them. Actually their importance is gaged by the need for farm products which in effect is the number of customers they must accommodate: and on this basis the importance of our farms increases daily. This, of course, is based only on our peacetime requirements of farm products and does not reflect the greatly increased load which would be placed on our farms in the event of an emergency.

Also, even though the number of farms has declined and is still continuing to decline at a lesser rate than in the past, the need for manpower in agriculture is continually increasing due to the constant growth of the agricultural service professions and industries. This includes all the specialists in animal and crop sciences, those going into farm products processing and marketing fields, and those entering the farm equipment and farm supplies business and occupations. This means that, rather than shrinking manpowerwise, American agriculture is constantly growing. This statement is borne out by the fact that of the 68 million people employed in the United States, 40 percent or 27 million are at work in the nine major areas of modern agriculture of which farming is one area. The people in agriculture are the largest single gainfully employed group in our national economy.

Financially, agriculture is also America's largest single industry. The value of the farm plant—$206 billion—exceeds the plant value of any other industry in this country. And gross total farm income—$40 billion annually—exceeds the income of any other industry on the American scene. By contrast, the gross income of the farm equipment industry last year was close to $2 billion, or about 5 cents per dollar of gross farm income; and it will probably be nearly the same for 1962.

We must recall that 95 percent of all American farms are family owned and operated enterprises. This certainly speaks well for the success of the free enterprise system in our economy. If there were no money to be made in farming, independent operators, which is what our farmers really are, would obviously not be in farming. The results also reflect favorably on the efficiency of the family-type farm because each American farmer now feeds himself and 26 others, which is phenomenal efficiency as compared to farming efficiency in other lands. In comparing our farming with Russia's farming for example, according to recently released figures, our farmers, even on a curtailed production basis, produce 60 percent more farm produce on 40 percent less cropland than Russia. This is done by only 8 percent of our population as contrasted with 40 percent of the Soviet population engaged in agriculture. Moreover, I am sure we will all admit that the total production potential of American agriculture has never really been tested. A former top official of the U.S. Government recently stated that, if we would really farm the Mississippi Valley intensively, we could feed the population of the world now and in the foreseeable future. Such potential production of farm products certainly weighs heavily in our favor as a power in relationship with the rest of the world.

So, to put it in a nutshell, the importance and value of American agriculture—(1) as a source of essential products for us and others, (2) as a factor in our overall economy, (3) as a factor of the free enterprise system, and (4) as a bulwark of strength in the free world—can be characterized as a giant of preponderant strength which no amount of doom and gloom philosophy can overcome. It is a very much alive, vital, vibrant force. So, why not conserve it and foster it, and use it to the greatest value of the American people and the peoples of the free world?

MEANING OF EUROPEAN COMMON MARKET TO AMERICAN FARMERS

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, on a related point, I wish to direct the attention of Senators to the lead article in the January 1963 issue of the Farm Journal, entitled "Wake Up or Be Walled Out," which appeared under the byline of Mr. Claude W. Gifford, economics editor of that publication.

There are those who would not agree with Mr. Gifford's analysis but, in my judgment, he has touched upon one aspect of our policy toward the Common Market which deserves our attention since it reflects the view of a growing number of farmers in the United States. Certainly, for every Senator whose State lists agriculture among its major industries, the tariff walls being erected against agricultural products, particularly wheat, seed grains, poultry, rice, tobacco, fruits, and vegetables are a matter for concern and careful evaluation. In view of the thought-provoking character of this article and the editorial relating to it which appears in the same issue, I ask unanimous consent that both be printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Wake Up or Be Walled Out

(By Claude W. Gifford)

"You Americans had your chance. When you could have pressured the European Common Market to keep its doors open to American farm products, you did very little. Now the trade doors are closing in Europe—and farmers in the United States are going to get hurt."

That is how one of Europe's largest grain importers sums up the meaning of the European Common Market (EEC) for U.S. farmers.

This importer reflects the private opinion of many important Europeans whom I interviewed recently in a 3-week tour of the Common Market countries—the second such trip that I have made for Farm Journal in the last 2 years.

My latest mission: Find out whether Great Britain (England, Wales, Scotland, and North Ireland) is going to enter the Common Market. And size up what this and other late developments in the Common Market mean to U.S. farmers.

What I have to report from this survey made in the capitals of five European countries is not good news for American farmers—as things now stand. The consensus is that unless the United States wakes up soon and fights harder for its trade in Europe:

We'll see a shrinking market for U.S. farm goods in the part of the world where we ship two-thirds of the farm exports that we sell for dollars;

Our international monetary exchange balance, already in trouble, will suffer—since farm products account for $1 out of $4 of our exports;

Common Market countries will also be hurt in the long run.

The trouble is this: Western Europe is building one big tariff wall around the outside of the Common Market. Meantime, they're tearing down the tariff walls between the countries inside (Germany, France, Italy, Belgium, the Netherlands, and Luxembourg). They'll trade freely with one another—but buy less from the outside.

They seem more determined than ever to build an abnormally high tariff wall around the outside to keep out certain farm goods, including ours.

For us, it means that it will be harder to vault farm stuff over the wall—particularly wheat, feed grains, poultry, rice, tobacco, and fruits and vegetables. We suspected this when we printed an article last February entitled "You'll Pay for the Common Market." It looks even more likely now. And the harm doesn't stop there.

Great Britain is loosening her age-old ties with the Commonwealth and is rushing headlong into the Common Market—after centuries of standing aloof from continental Europe. Now her government is working hard to find a way to join what is intended to be a United States of Europe.

Great Britain feels that she can't stand idly by and be shut out of the rich industrial market at her front door while European nations trade freely with each other. Already the EEC economy is humming while Great Britain does little more than tread water. And unless Great Britain joins the Common Market, she will have less and less "say" about how European political matters will be decided in the future.

When Great Britain joins, this will make the Common Market an economic giant with even more people than in the United States. It will be by far the world's biggest importer of raw materials and export trader. And it will slide the world's largest single food importer—Great Britain—behind that same high Common Market tariff wall.

The countries slated for the Common Market import more than half of the world's exports of corn, butter, barley, wool, vegetable oil and fats, cheese and meat; and just under half the world's exports of eggs and tobacco.

These same countries now buy 52 percent of our U.S. exports of feed grain, 43 percent of our poultry exports, 37 percent of our oversea sales of wheat and flour, and 28 percent of our tobacco exports, all for dollars, all of which will be hurt.

As this happens, it seems that every country affected—except the United States—is fighting tooth and nail for the interest of its farmers, and is yelling bloody murder.

I was in London during the historymaking meeting of the Commonwealth Prime Ministers. They were probably presiding over the breakup of the historic British Commonwealth. The Prime Ministers from one Commonwealth country after another took turns pounding the table demanding that their farmers be protected when Great Britain enters the Common Market.

The Commonwealth representatives explained how they now ship most of their farm stuff into Great Britain at lower tariff rates than other countries must pay (including the United States). They are deathly afraid that their trade preferences will be shut off when Great Britain joins the Common Market.

"Duties on our goods would shoot up, and the European countries behind the tariff wall would then have first call on the big British food market," one of the representatives told me.

"We are fighting for our very lives," says New Zealand's Prime Minister K. J. Holyoake, himself a farmer. "We sell 91 percent of our exported butter and 94 percent of our cheese and mutton exports to Great Britain." New Zealand has 9 million acres in pasture, and the land is little suited for other use. Their economy depends on cows and sheep. And 60 percent of all their nation's exports go to the protected market in Great Britain.

Australia is also up in arms. "A third of our trade with Great Britain would be seriously affected (wheat, beef, lamb, butter, and sugar) and another third (canned and dried fruits) would be grievously disrupted," says Australia's Deputy Prime Minister J. McEwen.

U.S. farmers need to be just as concerned. We supply nearly one-half of Great Britain's feed grain imports, more than half of her lard imports, and about one-sixth of her wheat imports.

We also have a stake in the big food exports that New Zealand, Australia, and Canada send to Great Britain. If the British outlet is closed down to them, these exports from the Commonwealth countries—mainly dairy products, mutton, beef, and fruit—will come banging on our door to get in. They've got to go somewhere.

The Commonwealth countries are asking that they be guaranteed a quota of imports into the expanded Common Market—based on what they have been selling to Great Britain. "This may be the best solution for us, too," says a U.S. official. "It would be better to have these Commonwealth exports going into the Common Market than to have them pounding on our door or competing with us in markets around the world."

Nor do our troubles stop there. I called on Karl Skytte, Minister of Agriculture for Denmark. "What will Denmark do if Great Britain joins the Common Market?" I asked.

"We will press to get in immediately," he said, explaining why: Denmark is an agricultural nation, and a good one. She not only takes care of her own food needs, but exports two-thirds of her output—mostly livestock and poultry products. She has tripled her poultry meat production in the last 5 years, and expects to produce substantially more of this and other products in the future. Four-fifths of this goes to Great Britain and the six continental Common Market countries.

Naturally, she wants behind the tariff wall; it doesn't pay to be on the outside if you want to sell food to Western Europe.

Norway also will surely press for membership when Great Britain joins. "These two countries, Denmark and Norway, probably will be accepted with little fuss or trouble," says Dr. Sicco L. Mansholt, vice president of the Common Market, and head of its agricultural affairs. Ireland probably will be taken in, too.

That, then, is the last-minute picture I brought back of what the entry of Great Britain means to U.S. farmers.

The second important part of the picture is this: There is a determined drive within the Common Market to (1) build that outside wall unreasonably high; and to (2) set abnormally high price supports on their farm production.

"This is fraught with danger for us—unless we do something about it, and soon," says one of our trade specialists.

Two years ago, I found that the Common Market was at least talking a good game of keeping its doors open to American farm products. But when the chips were down this summer—as they set their first common tariff rates for that outside wall—Common Market officials hiked several farm tariffs. And they were high before as an aftermath of recovery from World War II.

Here's what happened late this summer: They shoved up tariffs on our broilers so that the rates in West Germany, our biggest outlet, jumped from 4.8 cents a pound to 13 cents on 30-cent birds. They hiked fruit tariffs in the six by 36 percent. They pushed up duties on grain and flour—in the Netherlands the duty on flour shot up from $13 a ton to $40. And tobacco tariffs that averaged 19 percent of value in 1958 are now 28 percent.

Another important test is at what level the Common Market will place farm price supports. They are moving toward one common price level across all countries for each farm commodity supported. They'll complete this by 1970, or earlier, and if they follow the present trend they'll push these support levels higher than the present average in the six.

Why does this matter to us? Simply because (1) high supports over there mean high tariffs raised against us, and (2) more farm production over there, with less need of our imports.

Why is the Common Market going in this direction? People there say it is because they have a "small farm" problem—more than half of the farms in the six countries are 12 acres or less in size. Naturally, farm income is low.

A loud and influential cry has gone up for what appears to be an easy solution: Clamp down on food imports; raise the tariff wall; push up farm price supports; and raise more themselves.

They propose to do it with a "variable duty"—which will always be slightly more than the difference between the fluctuating world price of farm goods outside the wall, and the support price inside the wall. That way, nothing can come in at less than the effective support level.

"But this is a Frankenstein that will hurt them in the long run," says one of our officials on the scene. He explains that high supports will simply bring more retaliation from the rest of the world. It will raise food prices inside the Common Market, which in turn will raise wages, since negotiations there are based directly on the cost of living.

Higher wages will raise the cost of Common Market industrial goods and make it harder for them to export. And these countries must rely on heavy industrial exports to stay prosperous.

Moreover, higher farm supports won't help Europe's small farms much—their volume is too small to benefit greatly.

Abnormally high price supports are shadowed by the specter of overinflated land values; overmechanization that can't replace itself profitably; Government controls that will interfere with healthy adjustments of their small farms; high tax costs; and depressed prices when surpluses spill over at home and on world markets.

In short, thinking Europeans admit that the Common Market's best future does not lie in high price supports to protect an inefficient agriculture—an agriculture whose efficiency U.S. farmers can beat with one hand tied behind them.

The Common Market's future lies in its industrial efficiency, which can now match the best in the world, including ours.

"What the Common Market really needs is an overall program to reverse centuries of political, social, family, and legal customs that have led to smaller and smaller farm holdings," says one official.

Top Common Market technicians see this, but they are bucking a strong tide at home.

The economic fact of life is that the European mind is still trade restrictionist. And the political fact of life is that the European farm population that is affected by these agricultural policies is abnormally high—as high as 30 percent of the total population in some countries, compared with 9 percent here. And most of these European farms are small.

These numerous, small farmers are politically potent—even more powerful than their numbers suggest.

This is exactly why many European government officials privately hope that the United States will wake up—before it's too late—and use its vast prestige, power, and leadership to help lead the Common Market into a more reasonable farm trade program.

Some people, especially in our State Department, say that we have been putting on the pressure. After all Secretaries Benson and Freeman have both gone to Europe to talk to the Europeans about their tariffs. We have competent professional people representing our viewpoint in Brussels, the Common Market capital. In many ways, we've made our views known.

But what has been noticeably lacking, a well known and highly placed European told me, "is a consistent, day-after-day, strong, unrelenting pressure built on a studied policy that would convince the Europeans that the United States means business."

A case in point: The 18-month Geneva conference on GATT tariff negotiations was closed this year before we got satisfactory terms from the Common Market on farm matters. President Kennedy signed the document consenting to end the conference. This tipped off the astute Europeans that our Government—at the top level—wasn't as serious as we'd been talking.

A second case in point: Only after the German poultry duty skyrocketed did President Kennedy write a letter to Chancellor Adenauer protesting the move. This kind of "we're serious" pressure should have come before, not after, the duty was hiked. The letter coming as it did after the deed had been done, caught the Germans by surprise, embarrassed them, made them angry—and so far the duty hasn't been changed.

A third case in point: Our State Department is calling most of the shots in Common Market negotiations—and the State Department is so engulfed in political considerations in Europe that U.S. farm considerations are buried.

If we're going to save the day in Europe, say those close to the scene, we need a yell to go up—and a purpose to set in—in Congress, at the State Department, and at the White House; places where these have been most noticeably lacking up to now.

Will We Fight for U.S. Farmers?

It's not surprising that American farmers, busy with their daily affairs, have been largely oblivious of a threat to their livelihood that now looms in Europe. That's why we shout in page 24 of this issue: "Wake Up or Be Walled Out." Walled out of a large share of your foreign market for wheat, feed grains, poultry, rice, tobacco, and some fruit and vegetables. Not only do you need to wake up, but our Government needs to, and it's up to you to do the arousing. Your Senators and Congressmen happen to be at home right now.

Farm Journal thinks this important enough that twice within the year we have sent our economics editor to Europe to see how the Common Market is shaping up. Claude Gifford's article gives you the straight dope.

What's happened, in a nutshell, is that countries which once warred with one another are now forming a Western European Club designed to advance trade with each other, promote peace in Europe and raise their standard of living. They are abolishing tariffs against each other; later they hope to achieve actual political federation.

We've applauded all this. It's good for our friends, the Western Europeans, and it could be good for us. If Europe prospers she can be an even better customer of ours. And she can put a powerful block in the path of communism. The danger is that in their understandable zeal to help themselves they may pay scant regard to the damage they do the rest of the world—including us. They appear headed toward raising the highest tariff wall against us seen in modern times. "The Six"—France, Germany, Belgium, Holland, Italy and Luxembourg—are currently indicating that they may be pretty tough about it.

At which point, to use that old Missouri expression, this gives us every right to rise and say: "Now just a darned minute!"

We've had a good deal of regard for other countries in our trade relations—too much sometimes. The very word "trade" indicates a two-way deal. We've traded concessions at the GATT meetings (General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade). We've refrained from dumping our farm surpluses. Even in our vast giveaways we've been careful not to harm farmers of other countries. We've taken in a lot of foreign food, even when it hurt. Last year, according to USDA, we exported $5 billion worth, of which only $3½ billion was sold for a full cash price. We imported $4 billion worth, and more than half of that was in products that compete with ours. The figure does not include noncompetitive agricultural stuff such as coffee, tea and rubber.

What can we do about it? Well, any farmer who ever got into a tough dicker knows that you don't start out with threats. You try to sell, persuade and show the other fellow that the trade would be to his advantage. (In this case it actually would be. High tariffs over there would mean high food prices, higher wages and hence a poorer competitive position for the industrial goods Europe wants to export.) But it's also essential in a dicker to have a good bargaining position and let the other fellow know that you certainly intend to use it. He respects you for it.

Secretary Freeman did some of this in Paris the other day when he reminded the Europeans that the last Congress passed a law "which directs the President to take all appropriate steps * * * including retaliation if necessary." What he meant was that Europe can't sell industrial stuff here if we can't sell farm stuff there. This game can work two ways if, unhappily, that should be the way Western Europe wants it.

The question now is whether the President, the State Department and—most of all—Congress, will fight for American farmers the way every other nation fights for its farmers.

We've been pretty wishy-washy so far, but it's not too late if farmers get aroused enough. That's why we say "Wake up!"—and wake your Government up.

PROPOSED CHANGE IN MALLORY RULE

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, this morning's Washington Post contains an editorial which I consider to be an unanswerable argument against any change in the Mallory rule. I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Nullifying the Law

It is a misfortune that the House and Senate District Committees chose to meet in secret on Monday to consider modification of the Mallory rule. One result of the secrecy is that only garbled and unverifiable versions of what took place are available. It is reported that there is agreement among law enforcement officials and the District Commissioners that the Mallory rule should be changed. But the character of the change on which they have agreed has not been disclosed.

Let us look at what it is they propose to change. There is a law in the District of Columbia—and State laws similar to it exist everywhere else in the United States—declaring that when the police arrest someone they must take them before a judicial officer "without unnecessary delay." If such laws did not exist, policemen would themselves be the judges of their own arrests and could hold suspects in police stations for as long as they pleased.

Now, the Mallory rule is nothing more than a rule of evidence laid down by the Supreme Court of the United States holding that a confession obtained in violation of this District law may not be introduced in a Federal prosecution. The aim is simply to require the police to obey the law they are supposed to enforce and to prevent a situation in which the rights of a defendant may be violated.

Congress cannot substantially alter the Mallory rule without effectively nullifying its own earlier enactment. To nullify the Mallory rule, in short, is to invite the police to ignore an act of Congress.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I also wish to emphasize that I shall strenuously oppose any change whatsoever in the Mallory rule. The Mallory rule constitutes a protection of a basic freedom in this Republic and I do not intend, under the pressure of a police department, to support any modification of it whatsoever.

I look upon the Mallory rule unanimously established by the Supreme Court as a vital protection of the American people against the ever-present danger of police abuses.

One of the reasons for our forefathers' insurrection against the British Crown was the police-state methods that the so-called law enforcement officers of the British Crown came to apply in highly tyrannical fashion.

As one who has worked for years in surveying of law-enforcement practices in the United States, I warn again that police departments must always be subjected to constant vigilance. We have learned over and over again in the history of our country that unchecked practices exercised by police departments result in the loss of personal, individual freedom.

There is no reason at all why anyone arrested for crime should not be taken forthwith to a committing magistrate for commitment or for freedom from commitment.

All the Supreme Court ruled in the Mallory case was that free Americans are entitled to be taken before a committing magistrate by arresting officers without delay.

In my judgment it would be a serious mistake in this session of Congress to seek to change the Mallory rule in any way whatsoever.

I congratulate the Washington Post for what I consider to be the unanswerable editorial published in this morning's paper.

While I am on the subject of law enforcement problems in the District of Columbia, let me also make clear that I shall strenuously oppose any attempt in the District of Columbia to authorize arrests for investigation or other unjustified purposes.

This, too, smacks of political tyranny. As I said earlier this year, it is clearly unconstitutional and the time is long past for the District Commissioners of the District of Columbia to follow and not flout the Constitution of the United States.

RECONSTRUCTION OF FEDERAL TAX SYSTEM

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, the subject of Federal taxation is presently before Congress, and the best information available from well-established sources is necessary to our proper consideration of all current proposals.

Tax Foundation, Inc., is an independent, nonpartisan, nonprofit organization engaged in research and study in the field of government at all levels—Federal, State, and local.

Within the past few weeks the foundation has published a study entitled "Reconstructing the Federal Tax System—A Guide to the Issues." I am privileged to have received both the original and a condensation of this study.

In order that other Members of Congress and the public may have the benefit of this study, I ask unanimous consent to have the condensation published in the Record.

There being no objection, the study was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Reconstructing the Federal Tax System—A Guide to the Issues

The present period is probably unique in the history of Federal taxation. There have been few times when the deficiencies of the Federal tax system have been as vigorously discussed. Seldom have hopes for tax reduction run as high. Never has the discussion of tax changes ranged over so many aspects of tax and fiscal policy.

While there is widespread agreement that substantial changes need to be made in the Federal tax system, there are important differences of opinion as to the measures that should be undertaken to improve it. To many the problem is simply one of reducing rates. Others would seek merely to make certain revisions or reforms in the present methods of taxing individual incomes. Still others believe that a basic overhaul of the entire system and the adoption of new forms of Federal taxation are needed.

NEED FOR TAX REVISION

The need for tax revision is compelling. The present tax structure is in large part a legacy of the depression of the 1930's and of World War II. Since then economic conditions have changed profoundly, and the objectives of public policy have been modified. Yet there has been little adaptation of the tax system. Some of the major developments in the past three decades which have not yet been reflected in tax laws may be summarized:

1. The economy has moved from deep depression and yet retains tax provisions adopted, not necessarily wisely, to meet depression emergencies.

2. Drastic increases in tax rates, reductions in exemptions, and other elements enacted to pay for a big war remain in effect 17 years after the end of fighting.

3. Inflation has gradually increased the burden of taxes, but more so for some people than for others; these burden increases and shifts have not yet been considered explicitly as part of tax legislation.

4. State and local taxes have gone up.

5. Defense cost remains heavy. The tax system was not designed to meet such apparently endless strains. There is small margin for meeting the added revenue needs which would grow out of a serious, but not inconceivable, turn for the worse in foreign relations.

6. The continuation of an adverse balance of payments calls for attention in Federal tax policy.

7. The desire to speed economic growth, coupled with the inevitability of tax burdens which will greatly influence growth, make up a relatively new and compelling reason for modernizing Federal taxes.

Aside from the changes in economic conditions and policy objectives which make the need for tax revision compelling, there are some overall characteristics of the Federal tax system which in themselves should be critically examined.

1. The system imposes heavy burdens. The Federal tax bill in 1963, including social insurance and highway user taxes, will amount to over $100 billion, or about one-fifth of net national product.

2. The laws and regulations, especially those taxing incomes, estate, and gifts, have become increasingly complex.

3. Yields are unstable over the cycle and rise automatically with, but at a more rapid rate than, national income.

4. The revenue system exerts a stabilizing effect on the economy but one which slows down economic expansion before full employment is reached. The major taxes, those on income, bear relatively heavily upon income which would be saved and thereby become available for investment. The tax system favors some types of investment over others, with results which may well hurt, rather than benefit, the national interest.

5. The total Federal tax burden is progressive, sharply so in the income ranges over about $10,000; the highest rates do actually apply.

6. Special provisions have unequal effects on taxpayers in about the same circumstances. Some of the results are sometimes unfair.

CRITERIA FOR TAX REVISION

Most complaints about the tax system could be removed to a large degree by reduction in tax rates. A rate cut would reduce total burdens. It would also make the special provisions, the so-called loopholes, of less practical importance. The most effective tax reform possible would be achieved by reducing tax rates.

In judging proposals for tax change, several basic principles should be considered as guides:

1. The system should bring at least enough revenue to pay expenses, except in periods of recession, without burdening business so heavily as to keep the economy below full employment. Over the long run the budget should at least be kept in balance.

2. The total tax burden ought to be distributed to meet generally accepted concepts of fairness. To do so, it will tax equally those who are similarly situated. It will vary the burdens on those whose conditions differ; the differences in tax will be related reasonably—not arbitrarily, capriciously, or maliciously—to circumstances which occasion the differences in burden.

3. The tax laws should be devised to keep at a minimum obstacles to the efficient operation of the economy.

4. Tax changes ought to seek to reduce the costs of administration and compliance.

5. Tax provisions which are least likely to impede economic growth may well be preferred.

6. Finally, as indicated previously, the changes which will do most to help achieve most objectives are cuts in high tax rates.

THE INDIVIDUAL INCOME TAX

Differences of opinion are extensive as to the character and extent of the changes in the individual income tax which would best serve the public interest. Proposed changes in the individual income tax include revising the rate and bracket structure singly or in combination with broadening or narrowing the tax base.

The rate and bracket structure can be examined from two main points of view: equity and economic effects. On both grounds there is good reason for substantial revision. The present rate structure was never justified by a reasoned calculation of the relative tax burdens at different income levels needed to meet the most widely accepted standards of equity. As with rates, there is no clearly accepted basis for arriving at a more or less ideal bracket structure. Some guides are available, however.

Steeply progressive rates cannot be justified on grounds of equity or their economic effects on the whole country. High tax rates influence the pattern of personal investment; the allocation of capital can hardly be as productive as if investment decisions were governed by economic factors alone. From a revenue standpoint, drastic cuts in the most extreme rates would cost little revenue, and substantial moderation throughout the whole progressive rate structure would involve surprisingly little revenue loss.

Growth of national income will enlarge the tax base, but the size of the base will also depend upon what Congress says shall be included. Some of the hardest choices of tax revision will be between broadening the tax base to get bigger rate reduction and meeting special needs in ways that narrow the tax base and thereby restrict the opportunities for rate reduction. Among the issues involved in considerations of modifying the tax base are: the treatment of fully excluded forms of income (social insurance benefits, the retirement income credit, imputed income, unrealized gains and losses, and income in kind); interest from State and local bonds; capital gains and losses—the difficulty of distinguishing capital gains and losses from income; issues involved in taxing the income element of capital gains; personal deductions; personal exemptions; and tax credits.

The tax base is broad in part because the personal exemption has remained fixed in dollar terms for 15 years. Many observers believe, however, that in some respects the base is too narrow. Various types of receipts are excluded from gross income; payments representing certain uses of income are deductible. Almost every exclusion and deduction is criticized on one ground or another; and each is defended. Any change should take account of the circumstances which led to the adoption of the practice and also to the commitments and adjustments which taxpayers have made over the years.

THE CORPORATION INCOME TAX

One of the most important facts about the tax on corporation earnings—the distribution of its burden—is unknown. There is uncertainty about the extent to which the tax rests finally on stockholders, or is shifted to consumers in the prices of products, or is somehow passed backward to workers or other suppliers of factors of production. This uncertainty seems to add to the tax's political appeal because few people are aware of what they may be paying.

The economic effects of the tax are also uncertain. Even when the general characteristics seem reasonably clear, their quantitative significance cannot be determined with any high degree of confidence.

The corporation tax consists of a normal tax of 30 percent on all net income plus a surtax of 22 percent on income over $25,000. Although the normal tax was scheduled to fall to 25 percent in 1954, the reduction has been postponed every year, most recently in 1962. The 52-percent rate is four times as high as in the 1920's, three times as high as in the 1930's, and significantly above the World War II rate.

The seriousness of the need for rate reduction depends partly upon what is done with the tax credit at the stockholder level. Some general rate reduction will have high priority among measures for tax revision. A reduction in the normal tax, unlike a cut in surtax, would aid all profitable corporations, but would be relatively favorable to small corporations. It would reduce the marginal tax rate that bears upon the decisionmaking of most corporations.

When tax revision is considered, dozens of problems will arise in connection with the corporate tax base—the provisions for loss carryovers, tax depreciation policy, the treatment of depletion, and provisions for travel, entertainment, and related expenses.

Some time will be required to appraise the workings of the 7-percent investment credit provided by the Revenue Act of 1962, and to compare it with other alternatives. It adds more complexities, affects some companies and types of investment more than others, and in general adds to the unwelcome combination which makes tax, rather than more basic productivity, considerations influential in investment decisions.

Many more problems involving the corporation income tax warrant congressional attention. Most are technical. Most are of significant importance to only a relatively small percentage of businesses in any one year.

In considering revision in the corporation income tax, some very fundamental issues are at stake:

1. This country has the heaviest, or almost the heaviest, of the world's taxes on corporate profits distributed to stockholders.

2. Everyone's economic interest is served by conditions which enable businesses to operate efficiently and which require them to compete vigorously.

3. The interjection of tax considerations into business decisionmaking will to some extent distort decisions—and produce results which on fundamental economic grounds are not best but which become best for the company when the tax effects are taken into account.

4. Taxes on business make difficult the acquisition of capital to use in producing larger output and producing with greater efficiency.

5. As choices about tax change are made, they should take account of the fact that taxes which add to business costs will make the balance-of-payments problem more difficult while tax changes which cut business costs will aid in competing abroad.

CONSUMPTION TAXES

Most national governments rely considerably more heavily upon consumption-based taxes than does the U.S. Federal Government.

Taxes on income are taxes governed by the value of contributions to society; taxes based on expenditure are levies governed by what a person withdraws or uses up from the stream of production. There are no clear grounds for saying which basis is to be preferred.

Traditional types of consumption taxes do not lend themselves to progression. Nevertheless, exemptions (such as food and housing) and rate differentials on various commodities may be used to get a distribution of the burden with some rough adjustment to popular concepts of "ability to pay."

Proposals for change in the present U.S. system are numerous. They include: (1) the scrapping of the selective excise system (generally except for the liquor, tobacco, highway user, and miscellaneous regulatory taxes) and its replacement with a fairly general manufacturers' excise tax applied at a uniform rate, supplemented by provision for a tax on services; (2) a Federal retail sales tax, integrated with sales tax systems of the States; and (3) a comprehensive expenditure tax. These proposals can be examined on the basis of size and stability of their revenue yield, costs of administration and compliance, equity, Federal-State fiscal relations, the tax-consciousness they create on the part of the taxpayer, and their effects on individual saving and longrun economic growth.

ESTATE AND GIFT TAXES

Consideration of both reduction in rates of the estate and gift taxes and a widening of brackets will belong in a program of broad tax revision. The present rates are those enacted during World War II. At the upper levels, they appear excessive. The steepness of the rise—to 30 percent at $100,000—seems sharper than is appropriate for a tax on capital. If rates were cut and brackets widened, reduction of the opportunities for avoidance would perhaps have greater chance of success. The problems are complex, and the chances which would best serve the public interest can be defined only after extensive study.

PAYROLL TAXES

Payroll taxes are a large and growing part of the total Federal tax bill. They include taxes for old-age and survivors insurance to which disability insurance was added in 1957; for Federal unemployment insurance; and for retirement and unemployment benefits of railroad employees.

The distribution of the total tax burden, the economic effects of the tax system, the problems and opportunities of tax revision, all require careful and explicit consideration of present and prospective payroll taxes.

These levies unquestionably use up tax-paying capacity. They do so for transfer payments, not for the purchase of services to meet public needs. The ability of an economy—and of a social system—to finance transfers is limited, though the boundaries of the limits are not clear. The payroll taxes now on the books leave no doubt that workers and employers face increasing burdens.

TAX CHANGES AND THE BUDGETARY AND ECONOMIC OUTLOOK

In attempts to reconstruct the Federal tax system, serious consideration should be given to the relationship of tax changes to the budgetary and economic outlook.

Most observers agree that tax reduction which is not matched by expenditure reduction can provide a temporary stimulus for an economy which has idle productive capacity. The shot-in-the-arm effects to be gained, however, can scarcely justify permanent tax reduction accompanied by large and persisting budgetary deficits.

What is needed for the longer run is substantial tax reduction based on the kind of tax changes which will reduce the existing depressants on capital accumulation, incentive, and efficiency and thus help the market operate with greater freedom from tax considerations. Such carefully devised tax changes would contribute to responsible budgetary policy. They are not, however, a substitute for wisdom in restraining expenditures.

PROPOSED INCREASE IN FEDERAL DEBT CEILING

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, a bill is now pending in the House of Representatives to continue the statutory limit on Federal debt at $308 billion through June 30, 1963.

It has been indicated in the President's budget message that another request to increase the limit again will be made before June 30.

An interesting article on this general subject, written by Henry Gemmill, appeared in the Wall Street Journal of February 27, 1963. I ask unanimous consent to have this article published in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RAISING THE ROOF—ADMINISTRATION BRACES FOR REAL BATTLE OVER INCREASING FEDERAL DEBT CEILING

(By Henry Gemmill)

WASHINGTON.—How far the management of U.S. finances may be veering from ordinary logic—anyone's logic, liberal or conservative—can perhaps be indicated by this fact:

Never has any administration approached Congress for the frequent ritual of elevating the Federal debt ceiling with so much nervousness, so little confidence, as Mr. Kennedy's team exhibits at this moment.

The White House finds it wildly illogical for the Capitol to show signs of balking. Congress votes the appropriations; Congress legislates the tax rates; when the fruit of these is deficits, how can Congress decline to recognize by law the inevitability of an upsurge in Federal borrowings?

Influential conservatives on the Hill agree this complaint has some validity. "Trying to stop the debt rise by holding down the legal ceiling seems about like trying to stop an elevator by grabbing the indicator arrow," remarks one of them. Yet he does emphatically intend to attempt it—and in powerful company—as a last resort against what he considers madly illogical grand designs for deficit spending.

So the debt ceiling question, from whichever side it is examined, seems to have its roots in irrationality. Yet, after years of stirring up little more than political noise, it is rather suddenly emerging as an issue which henceforward may have to be taken seriously. Though Mr. Kennedy may well get the debt roof raised to his specifications this year, he must return to the fray in 1964.

The rise of this issue is, of course, propelled by the historic rise of the debt, yet one must glance also at the history of the debt ceiling itself, which is by no means identical.

A WARTIME INNOVATION

Though congressional authority to control Federal indebtedness stems from the Constitution, for more than a century legislators created no ceilings but instead voted carefully specified obligations for particular purposes. Two world wars sired the ceilings; in 1917 general-purpose borrowing was authorized but specific limits were set on the amount of bonds, certificates, notes and bills issued; in 1941 the permitted levels were lumped under an all-inclusive maximum.

There could be no great argument over lifting this higher and higher during World War II, and in early postwar years the ceiling seemed academic because actual debt was left drifting billions below. During that relaxed time Harry Truman could have slipped through Congress legislation abolishing the ceilings or making it infinitely elastic, some Treasury officials believe, and they could kick him for not doing it. By the time Dwight Eisenhower took charge the debt was piling high enough to make the ceiling sticky—not so much because of congressional obstinancy as because of his conservative fiscal commitments. Embarrassed by having to jack up the ceiling in 1954, Ike's administration actually encouraged two deductions, then found itself heading again to new heights. And Mr. Kennedy continued this course.

So, though it may seem longer, the economy bloc in Congress has been hitching its crusade to the debt ceiling issue for less than a decade. And most of that time many have thought they were conducting mere mock battles—little dramas useful perhaps in keeping alive the dream of black ink, but certain of failure. Not until last year—and it came as a surprise and a shock—did the administration almost suffer defeat. An $8 billion ceiling boost squeaked through the House by only 210 votes to 192; it got through the Senate Finance Committee with a 1-vote margin.

It would be unsophisticated to suppose that conservatives could block a ceiling rise this year simply by converting 10 Members of the House who voted for last year's boost. The election has filled many seats in Congress with new men; nobody knows for sure how their votes will split. More importantly, a fair share of the votes traditionally cast against ceiling hikes has come from Congressmen who are not economizers, who back nearly every spending bill that comes along. These flexible fellows vote against cranking up the ceiling only to balance their record with constituents, and will perhaps continue to do so only if confident their votes won't pile up into a majority. "Our greatest risk is that these gentlemen will miscalculate," says one administration expert.

REASONS FOR FEAR

Nevertheless, the administration has reasons to fear even fiercer opposition this year.

Before Congress now is the Kennedy tax-cut program; in combination with his spending budget it has alerted the public to prolonged planned deficits—and so far the populace doesn't seem to like it. By the end of this session, to be sure, Congress will have rewritten the tax measure and at least altered much of the tax reform which contributes to the mood of aversion; by then it is possible the public will be eager for tax cuts—deficits and all. But the debt ceiling issue will not wait until then.

On the contrary, the administration insists it must have one round of legislation passed before April; hearings before the Ways and Means Committee begin today. And then it must trot back for a second hike—a big one—before July. This seems an open invitation for Congress to pour all its current disgruntlement onto the debt ceiling issue.

In detail, the picture grows sharper. Congress passed last year's ceiling increase in precise conformity with a Presidential budget forecasting that the current fiscal year ending June 30 would end up in balance, with no net rise in debt. The calculation was that the ceiling needed to be lifted to $308 billion just to meet a midwinter seasonal peak; in line with this Congress voted the boost but provided that the ceiling should drop to $305 billion in April, and back to $300 billion on June 25.

Now, however, the administration is forced to base its first ceiling plea to the new Congress on a flat contradiction of last year's logic. Its current case is that the roof must be lifted to $308 billion for the remainder of the fiscal year, because its own budget forecast turned out to be nonsense, because the Government has slipped into a multi-billion-dollar deficit not just seasonally but for sure.

And while they are voting on that, Congressmen will have in mind that by June they'll be voting on a far fancier hike. Naturally enough, tacticians of any administration would be unwilling to let the matter rest on such uneasy ground.

"What would happen if we simply refused to raise this ceiling on the Federal debt?" a senior Senator once inquired in committee session.

"The first thing we'd do is stop your paycheck, Senator," roared the Secretary of the Treasury.

A SPECTACULAR DRAMA

That short story dates back to Eisenhower days, but the question has gained pertinence and Kennedy men still respond in the same spirit. The consequences of a debt ceiling crackdown are described as disasters, vivid enough to scare most any Congressman—or citizen.

A spectacular drama of the near future can be—and is—written around the following set of assumptions:

Mr. Kennedy asks Congress to lift the ceiling for the fiscal year beginning July 1, to a figure in the neighborhood of $320 billion.

Congress wrangles right through June and passes no ceiling legislation whatever; thus the legal debt roof drops to its permanent level, $285 billion.

Outstanding debt, which has been riding along well above $300 billion, stands clearly in excess of the legal maximum.

Now let the cameras roll.

The first and hasty action of Treasury Secretary Douglas Dillon is to dispatch telegrams frantically requesting a halt to savings bonds sales. Thousands of telegrams, not just to banks and other places of public sale but also to all the employers who run payroll deduction plans. Mr. Dillon's lawyers have told him that any bonds that slip through after June are not Government obigations at all; they are his personal debt.

Next the weekly rollover of short-term Treasury bills is stopped. No replacements can be issued for around $2 billion of outstanding bills coming in for repayment each week. These alone are enough to suck up within 3 weeks the $5 billion or so which the Treasury usually keeps in cash. Governmental pockets are empty.

CAN'T MEET PAYROLLS

By this time the Government begins missing payments on its missiles and other purchases. It can't meet its payrolls, nor if it fires Federal workers can it give them severance pay due. Such checkwriting, which normally runs around $2 billion a week, can be done belatedly and in a trickle from any tax revenues that come in. But no payment priorities based on hardship or necessity can be set up; legal opinion holds that bills must be paid in chronological order of presentation.

Worse yet, the Treasury begins missing interest payments on existing debt, and fails to redeem bonds that mature. Securities markets fall into turmoil which makes all past panics look pale. Foreigners launch the great run on U.S. gold, and the dollar is done for.

At this point the official script ends, but one is left with the feeling that the Congressmen don't get reelected.

Though it's a lively drama, its chief defect is that it could only happen in real life by accident. Accidents can happen; Mr. Kennedy himself flew off to Mexico last year without signing a bill boosting the ceiling; for most of 1 day the U.S. debt stood at an illegal level. (It was a Sunday, no harm done.) But the fact of the matter is that conservative congressional leaders have no slightest intention of establishing a ceiling lower than outstanding debt.

The strategy they outline is entirely different. They would aim to set a ceiling high enough to avoid pushing the Government into any sudden crisis of bankruptcy—but low enough so that within a few months the administration would have to cut back some of its deficit spending, hopefully in an orderly and selective fashion. Measured in money, their objective would be to cut the ceiling below administration desires not by a magnitude of $35 billion, as in the sensational script, but by whatever smaller sum seemed safe and feasible—$1 billion, $2 billion, perhaps a bit more.

If that were the game, argue administration men, it would produce results precisely the opposite of what the congressional economy bloc desires. The Kennedy government could not—or at least would not—cut back its spending but instead would do what the Eisenhower government did when squeezed by the debt ceiling several times during the fifties. It would resort to costly gimmickry.

One gimmick employed in Eisenhowers time of pinch was to have the Federal National Mortgage Association sell directly to the public some of its own notes, which technically do not count as part of the national debt, instead of drawing funds from the Treasury. Another trick was to have the Commodity Credit Corporation raise more of its money for agricultural price-support loans by selling to the public certificates of interest, similarly outside the legal debt, instead of pulling money from the Treasury. These agencies had to offer investors a slightly higher return than would have been required through normal Treasury borrowing; by one calculation the Government ended up paying an extra $18 million in interest.

COULD DUMP MORTGAGES

Besides repeating the old tricks, the Government could try plenty of new ones. Officials suggest, for instance, that the Veterans' Administration could raise some money by dumping its foreclosed mortgages on the market—but only at discount prices, and at the risk of drying up investment money needed to sustain private construction.

Leaders of the congressional economy bloc are aware the Government could and probably would seek this escape from a ceiling squeeze; they agree that it would promote no true economy. But some of them do have an answer: "We'll just wait for the next round of ceiling legislation—and then we will nail 'em."

This double-dose technique could conceivably be applied by Congress rapidly, since the administration must seek its two ceiling boosts before July. Tactics are still fluid, however; economy leaders could aim at just one squeeze this year, and wait till 1964 for the second. At any rate, the theory is that if the administration responded to a first tight ceiling with no more than gimmicks, the legislators could insist upon an official commitment on spending cuts before setting the next ceiling. Failing to get it, they could try making the second squeeze tight enough to exhaust the possibilities of gimmickry and still force a reduction in expenditures.

Suppose—and it is a large supposition—Congress did eventually shove the administration into real spending slashes. Would legislators find themselves much happier over the outcome than officials downtown? Very likely not.

ABDICATION OF POWER

The cutbacks would be chosen by the administration, not by Congress. Legislators who have raised "merry Ned" over past administration refusals to spend appropriated money—uproar over the B–70 bomber is the classic case—could silently choke on resentment as their pet projects were maimed or buried. In the attempt to assert control over the executive branch, legislators would find they had in practice abdicated much of their present power.

It is obvious enough that a Congress really set on curbing spending could devise a half-dozen better ways of doing it. But Congress is not devising them, nor likely soon to do so. If an argument can be made for converting the debt ceiling issue from a talking point into a sharp tool of economy, it must rest on this: Risky and awkward though it may be, it is conveniently at hand.

BULGARIA—85TH ANNIVERSARY OF LIBERATION FROM THE OTTOMAN EMPIRE

Mr. HART. Mr. President, March 3 marks the 85th anniversary of the liberation of Bulgaria from the rule of the Ottoman Empire.

Today, we wish we could rejoice in the freedom of the Bulgarian people. But we cannot. Today, the brave Bulgarian people suffer under another tyranny. At the end of the Second World War the freedom of Bulgaria was smothered under a complete police state imposed by the Soviet Army.

But it is clear that the will to resist lives strongly in the hearts of all Bulgarians. They are an ancient people with a long history of struggle for freedom and independence. Today, reports emanate from Bulgaria that despite the repressions of the state, the people of Bulgaria continue to look to the West for ideas and inspiration.

It is proper that we join today with Americans of Bulgarian background in pledging that one day Bulgaria shall be free once again, and that the Bulgarian people will once again join the Western democratic nations as people of an independent nation.

KALEWALA DAY, FEBRUARY 28, FINNISH HOLIDAY

Mr. HART. Mr. President, every nation develops out of its history and its language an epic which embodies the virtues and the values and the high principles which have borne that nation through history and led it to greatness.

The national epic of Finland is the Kalewala, and the Finnish people rightfully take pride in this classic work for it reflects the character and the personality of the Finnish nation and its people. There are recorded the heroic deeds of the legendary and historical figures in the long and glorious history of the Finnish people.

For centuries these songs and verses were handed down from generation to generation by oral means. But then they were collected and set down in writing and on February 28, 1835, the first fairly complete collection of verses was published in Finland—the Kalewala.

Mr. President, ever since that happy day, February 28 has been celebrated by Finns throughout the world as a national holiday. We in Michigan have been fortunate that many Finnish people chose our State when they came to the United States. Michigan's history and institutions show clearly the strength, independence, and courage of these people and their descendants.

I join my Finnish friends today in celebrating the 128th anniversary of the publication of Kalewala.

ESTONIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY—FEBRUARY 24

Mr. HART. Mr. President, 45 years ago the ancient nation of Estonia gained its independence, established a democratic form of government and thrived in peace until the Second World War.

Today, Estonia does not exist as an independent nation. She has been brutally incorporated against her will into the Soviet empire. All attempts to preserve the Estonian heritage are suppressed by agents of the Kremlin.

However, today the spirit of the Estonian people remains strong. Hope and determination lives strongly in the hearts of the Estonian people that one day Estonia will again be free and independent.

It is fitting that we here once again express the continuing regard of America for the aspirations of the Estonian people, and that we join with all persons of Estonian background in renewing our pledge that all shall be done to assure that Estonia will one day walk in freedom.

PUBLIC SERVICE BY RADIO STATIONS

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I am confident that there are many radio stations throughout the country that accept their responsibility, under their license, "to be of public service." There are some that take this pledge with a sense of positive dedication far beyond legal requirement. This is the case with station WAQE whose facilities are located in my home county in Maryland.

Mr. Charles S. Gerber, station manager of WAQE, has chosen Howard Cottage at the Maryland Training School for Boys as the station's community public service project for 1963.

Every Monday night, the staff and management of WAQE, on a voluntary basis, visits with the boys at Howard Cottage.

WAQE hopes to bring to public attention the fine work that Maryland Training School is doing and the desperate need for private citizens to take an interest in these boys, who have been judged juvenile delinquents.

The need for help is not only while they are at the training school, but after their period of training has been served. To help arouse public interest, a series of programs, presenting Maryland Training School will be broadcast beginning January 26, through June 29. These programs will be heard at 12:30 p.m., every Saturday.

Today in Maryland, one out of every five boys comes in contact with the police. Therefore, it is imperative that the citizenry of our State become alerted to the problems and how each individual can play a part in helping to stamp out juvenile delinquency and to help the delinquent. By working with the boys, it is hoped that the staff of WAQE will be more qualified to perform the public service so desperately needed to help these boys.

In addition to the Monday night visits, plans are being made to take the boys bowling, to sports events and other special entertainment.

It is with great pride that I rise today to bring this fine example of public service to the attention of my colleagues in the Senate.

SIOUX FALLS EDITOR SUPPORTS PRESIDENT'S CUBA POLICY

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, at a time when some Americans appear to be urging the President to follow an extreme policy in Cuba that might involve us unnecessarily in a war, it is encouraging to note a thoughtful editorial in the Sioux Falls, S. Dak., Argus-Leader supporting the wise policy of restraint now being pursued by the President.

There are those who would shoot first and learn the facts later. The President has very wisely resisted such temptations.

I commend to my colleagues an editorial from the Argus-Leader of Saturday, February 23, which I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

SENSIBLE RESPONSE BY THE PRESIDENT

President John K. Kennedy has issued shoot-if-necessary orders against any plane or other sorties from Red Cuba.

This followed the news that two Mig fighter planes from Cuba fired rockets in a flight over a U.S. shrimpboat in the Florida Straits earlier this week.

The President refrained, pending further information, from pinning any blame on the Soviet Government for the attack on the *Ala*. The small craft and its two crewmen were not hit.

"These planes came from Cuba and flew under a Cuban flag and, therefore, unless the Soviet Union should claim they were flying them, we would hold the Cubans responsible," the President said.

The President said that he had given orders "to insure that action will be taken against any vessel or aircraft which executes an attack against a vessel or aircraft of the United States over international waters in the Caribbean."

The President declined to proclaim a policy of hot pursuit, as advocated by some Members of Congress. Under this policy, attacking planes or ships would be pursued back to their Cuban bases if necessary to destroy them.

Details of the United States reaction might well wait, the President said, until it is seen whether the attack on the shrimpboat was an isolated incident, the result of a pilot's decision, or was the deliberate decision by the Cuban Government which forecasts other attacks.

Meantime, it looks like the Russians are heeding the President's warnings and American public opinion, in their move to take some more of their troops out of Cuba. Patience is indicated in this situation, rather than a trigger-happy response.

We think President Kennedy has taken a sensible course. He has the responsibility.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record yesterday's Washington Post report of a recent Gallup poll demonstrating the overwhelming opposition of the American people to sending our Armed Forces into war with Cuba under present circumstances.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

OPPOSITION TO INVASION OF CUBA RISES IN UNITED STATES

PRINCETON, N.J., February 26.—Although they see Premier Fidel Castro's Cuba as a serious threat to world peace, the American people at this point are opposed to a U.S. invasion of the island.

Americans, in fact, are slightly less invasion-minded about Cuba today than they were last fall before President Kennedy's decision to blockade the Communist outpost in the Caribbean.

Some persons point out, moreover, that the results of the quarantine action are a factor in their current belief that the Cuba dilemma can be solved without a hot war.

With the controversy over Cuba continuing, the public was asked a question last put to them shortly before the blockade decision last October:

"Some people say that the United States should send our Armed Forces into Cuba to help overthrow Castro. Do you agree or disagree?"

The vote today and last fall:

	Percent
Today:	
Agree	20
Disagree	64
No opinion	16
October 1962:	
Agree	24
Disagree	63
No opinion	13

To further determine just how real a danger the people feel Cuba constitutes today, the public was then asked:

"Do you think the Cuba situation is a serious threat to world peace at this time, or not?"

The vote:	*Percent*
Yes, is	59
No, is not	31
No opinion	10

Despite the partisan controversy involved in the overall Cuba question, virtually identical majorities of Republicans, Democrats and Independents indicate their opposition to a U.S. invasion of Cuba at this time.

On the question of Cuba as a threat to world peace, however, Republican voters display more concern than either Democrats or Independents.

The vote on this question by party preferences:

	Percent
Republicans:	
Yes, is	65
No, is not	27
No opinion	8
Democrats:	
Yes, is	59
No, is not	31
No opinion	10
Independents:	
Yes, is	57
No, is not	35
No opinion	8

NEWSPAPER ADVERTISING IN AMERICAN LIFE—ADDRESS BY PALMER HOYT

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record a speech delivered by Mr. Palmer Hoyt to the Advertising Federation of America and the Advertising Association of the West. His subject was "Newspaper Advertising in American Life," and the address was delivered on February 6, 1963. In the address, Mr. Hoyt, the editor of the Denver Post,

pointed out very graphically the relationship between advertising and the free news media in this country, and showed how important the free press is to this country. His address is an extremely thoughtful and analytical one, and I recommend it very much to all Senators.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEWSPAPER ADVERTISING IN AMERICAN LIFE

Mr. Chairman and distinguished guests, without shocking the eggheads and egg peddlers too much, I would today like to stress a simple truth.

That truth is this: The much maligned institution of American advertising is really a solid cornerstone of our freedom.

An abundant flow of advertising has a special relationship to our free way of life for two very important reasons:

First, and I believe foremost, it is the financial warranty of free electronic communication, and it is the guarantee of our free press.

Second, advertising is an active partner in our burgeoning economy and a vital component of our free enterprise system, without which system we could not enjoy freedom as we know it.

But even if advertising did not have a special economic role as the mover of goods and services, the fact that advertising is the basic guarantee of a free press would make it worthy of our protection and preservation.

I do not, of course, mean to argue that all advertising is beyond reproach, but I do defend it overall as a necessity because of its essential relations to a free press.

As you are aware, by the term "free press", I mean a press that is not controlled by government, party, or faction. This type of independent press has been emphasized as a necessity by our greatest political thinkers from the earliest days of our country.

This principle is guaranteed by the first amendment to the Constitution, which says: "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press; or the right of the people peaceably to assemble, and to petition the Government for a redress of grievances."

The first amendment is in itself a remarkable document. Particularly is the phrase "or abridging the freedom of the press" a strong and exact statement.

It is hard to imagine a free people without a free press. It is hard to imagine because it simply could not be.

Thomas Jefferson recognized the vital importance of newspapers when he said in a letter to Col. Edward Carrington on January 16, 1787: "The basis of our Government being the opinion of the people, the very first object should be to keep that right; and were it left for me to decide whether we should have a Government without newspapers, or the newspapers without government, I should not hesitate a moment to prefer the latter."

To this distinguished audience my remarks up to this point may sound like copybook maxims.

On the subject of maxims and of hearing from a speaker only what you expect to hear, I recall a speech by James Conzelman, one of the all-time greats of American football, later a fine coach, and now a distinguished advertising man.

Several years ago, I introduced Jim to a Rotary Club audience in Denver, most of them older and serious minded. I might say that James Conzelman, in addition to being a great athlete, was also a fine actor. Jim sat beside me at the head table and did a pretty fair job of looking dumb so that he could score a touchdown with his opening remarks.

When I introduced him, I said, "Jim was a great football player and a great coach, but whether or not he can make a speech, I wouldn't know."

Jim rose to his feet, ran his fingers through his shock of white hair and to an audience prepared for the worst, started as follows:

"You men are rich. I can see that. But let me tell you. Money isn't everything. Money won't buy you friends. Money won't buy you love. Money won't buy you position."

At this point, Jim paused. His audience by now was sure they were going to listen to a real do-gooder. Boredom was on every face.

And then Jim Conzelman, after a long pause, said: "Of course, I was talking about Confederate money."

Like Jim Conzelman and his audience, I know you men are rich. If not in money, then in wisdom and experience. So I want to urge that I am not talking about Confederate money.

The late, great Mr. Justice Oliver Wendell Holmes often observed that it was more than passing strange that so many brilliant minds overlook the obvious. In the chance that the Justice may have been right, I am here stressing the obvious. The obvious that brilliant minds sometimes overlook.

No. 1: It is obvious the continuation of a free press is vital to our continuation as a free nation. We must have a source independent of government, party, and faction, to provide people with the information they need to guide those governments, parties, and factions.

No. 2: It is obvious that the press can only remain free, and keep us free, if it is not subsidized by any special interest.

No. 3: It is obvious that advertising has an all-important role in guaranteeing this free and unsubsidized press. Advertising keeps the press financially strong with income from a number of sources, so that no one source becomes dominant. And often we forget that advertising is in itself genuine news of business and industry. As economic news, it is a vital attraction to gain the readership that keeps papers alive.

No. 4: It is obvious that there are only three ways to finance a newspaper, a very expensive product: (1) Sale of the product, which we call circulation; (2) sale of advertising; (3) direct subsidy, from somewhere.

The history of the American press shows that newspapers depending on circulation income alone can't succeed. The relatively brief life of PM is a good example. PM was born in response to a charge that advertisers exercise an undue influence on the news columns and editorial opinions. So PM did not accept advertising.

But PM failed to make its point. It built up its own prejudices and was far less objective than most newspapers operating on the basis of both advertising and circulation support. And it just couldn't get enough income from circulation alone to stay in business.

Only through a combination of circulation and advertising revenues can newspapers operate and remain truly free. Only truly free newspapers can take an independent view of government. And only free newspapers can provide the people with objective news.

Let me digress to say again that I do not maintain that all newspapers are perfect, that all advertising is exceptional, that news is never slanted, or that advertising is never misleading. Of course there are imperfections but not, I truly believe, so great as to cast in doubt the general principles about which we are talking.

The general principle of a press maintained as an independent force in our society by a combination of advertising and circulation revenue actually antedates our free Government by somewhat more than 50 years.

The tradition of the free press dates back at least to 1737 when the John Peter Zenger trial established the legal protections under which newspapers can criticize political leaders or movements without facing charges of seditious libel.

Other basic protections for a free press were developing throughout the colonial era. So the press was actually a fairly well-grown midwife attending the birth of the Constitution in 1787 and the formalization of our present style of Government on March 4, 1789.

On through the years the free press and free Government developed together into the special relationship we have today. And repeatedly the courts have reemphasized the vital necessity to our way of life of keeping newspapers strong and independent.

There are today, as there have always been, a number of important criticisms of this special status of the press. I would like to note briefly some of these challenges, and since several of them are bromides, perhaps we can put them back in their bottles, at least temporarily.

First, there is the charge that our press is not free.

Answer: We do have a free press in the United States, the freest in the world.

Our press is as free as the men who operate it want it to be. Can you imagine any news story or opinion, decency considered, that couldn't, or wouldn't be published in the United States somewhere in the range of publications between the Daily Worker and the John Birch Society? Maybe you can imagine this, but I can't.

Second, there is a charge that big advertisers control the newspapers.

Answer: As one who has operated at policy level at three newspapers, I have yet to know of a single advertiser saying, "Kill it or else," to any news story or editorial. As a matter of fact, it has been my experience that big advertisers take far too little interest in the news of the day, or the comment thereon.

Actually, the greater number of advertisers a paper has the less chance there is of any one being able to rule the press, as the critics would have it.

Third, there is another bromide that big business and big government are in conspiracy to throttle news sources and cover up vital facts.

Answer: There are men, I'm sure, in both big business and big government, who would like to do just that. But so far, there is nothing so hidden but that a few good city editors and reporters cannot uncover it, if they really go to work.

Recently, an able reporter, Clark Mollenhoff, wrote a book called "Washington Cover Up," about official attempts at concealment. I would, generally speaking, accept the facts presented in the book but point out that this type of coverup has gone on ever since George Washington moved to this great Capital on the Potomac.

But I would also like to say that as long as there are reporters like Mollenhoff, we are still free.

The free press does face many dangerous threats—rising costs; unwise mergers; a destructive pattern of unionism; and insensitive management.

But advertiser domination is not one of these threats, in fact, advertising support enables the free press to meet the real threats. In 1962, advertisers spent $12 billion in all media not only as a sales and promotion fund for our gross national product, but also as the basic support of our free communications system.

We can gain some understanding of where we would be without this by noting the economic and social impact of newspaper strikes. As I speak here the great cities of New York and Cleveland are without newspapers, their people without a great deal of vital information that they need.

Does it matter? Yes, it matters. For example, it matters economically. As only one example, it is estimated by the Federal Reserve Board that department store sales in Newark, with newspapers, are running 10 percent better than the corresponding figures in neighboring New York City. And in the suburban metropolitan area where the press is flourishing, department store sales figures are 18 percent better than in the big city.

There is no total price tab on the economic loss this lack of newspapers means in New York, but we know that the 116-day strike in Minneapolis and St. Paul cost that area $58 million in lost consumer spending.

And it matters more than in economics. Lack of newspapers also represents a great social loss. Think of the hundreds of different categories of information that only a newspaper provides—local news in detail; classified advertisments that do everything from selling the home to bringing back the lost dog; theater, movie, sports, and book news that guides recreation—indeed the list is endless and need not be belabored.

I would like to quote James S. Fish, vice president and director of advertising of General Mills at the end of the recent strike in Minneapolis. Mr. Fish, "Apparently nothing is able to replace fully the daily newspapers. Not just as a disseminator of news and the carrier of advertising, but as a dynamic force in the well-being of our community."

If you want to use a Madison Avenue term and talk about impact, what is the real impact of newspapers?

There is no regular, continuous impact in the world like the impact of 59 million newspapers hitting the streets of America every weekday.

Or of 48 million Sunday newspapers banging on front porches the country over every Sunday morning.

Or of 23 million copies of weekly newspapers that keep their reads up to date on home affairs. This is real grassroots impact.

When I was younger and a little more naive than now, I used to advocate making the guaranteed free flow of news between nations a part of all treaties made by the United States.

I still believe that such a course would help bring peace to this troubled world; because the truthful, unprejudiced news of the day is a powerful prophylactic.

For example, there are many views of what is or will be happening in Russia.

Will there be a revolution against imperial communistic tyranny?

I would say there will be no revolution in our sense of the word.

But as the Russian people become more informed, there will be changes. In other words, Russia will change in exact ratio to the flow of factual news to and in Russia.

Because the greatest enemy that communism has or can have, is the free flow of information, and the greatest ally that any kind of totalitarianism has is to have news as its servile handmaiden.

And free flowing news implies abundant advertising.

In summary then, I hope I have suggested at least some of the reasons why advertising is much more than a nonessential source of materialism. That's the image some of its detractors try to create.

Instead, advertising has a vital role in our way of life—as the necessary news of goods and services which lubricates our whole economic system. And, even more importantly, as the basic revenue source which allows a wide range of electronic communication and an independent press.

These are truths that need to be looked at again—they are the obvious facts which are often overlooked—they are not in the words of Jim Conzelman, "Confederate money."

If these truths be copybook maxims, let me paraphrase Patrick Henry and urge you to make the most of them.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. If there is no further morning business, morning business is concluded.

SAFEGUARDS TO BE OBSERVED IN DISARMAMENT NEGOTIATIONS

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, for many months I have been disturbed over the apparent attitude of our Government in reference to disarmament. Today I want to talk about that subject in some detail. My remarks relate to Senate Concurrent Resolution 21, submitted by me, which can be found in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for February 20, 1963, page 2604, column 3.

The information that caused me to submit this resolution, and which is embodied in what I will say today, comes from public sources that were published in 1962 or before. My remarks are not related to any information imparted to a senatorial committee, because I have had no opportunity to receive such information.

I have submitted Senate Concurrent Resolution 21 to provide a bare minimum of congressional guidance to our negotiators now meeting with the Soviets to discuss arms control and disarmament. This guidance is not only necessary, but also mandatory, in view of the growing concern of the American people in this vital and complex subject.

This concern has been aroused by several developments in recent weeks:

First. A statement by Secretary of Defense Robert McNamara in which he expresses the belief that we can deal more realistically with the Soviet Union if that nation were soon to develop an invulnerable second-strike missile force.

Second. Acceptance of this position by the State Department in a speech by an arms control adviser at Ann Arbor, Mich.

Third. A study released by the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency which states, in effect, that the United States should consider seriously dropping its demand for on-the-spot inspection to insure compliance with any arms control or disarmament agreements.

Coincident with these developments has been an extremely grave new pronouncement of Soviet policy from Moscow—little read and little understood.

This publication is called Voyennaya Strategiya, which I understand is interpreted to mean "military strategy." It was prepared under the direction of Marshal Sokolorsky, by 14 Soviet generals, and published last year. For the first time since 1926 the Soviet Union has formally changed its strategic concept. The new strategy, as explained in the Soviet document, involves total war, total destruction, and total nuclear annihilation. Of course, this is their ultimate strategy and cannot succeed unless or until the Soviet Union acquires the kind of nuclear superiority over the free world which the United States now holds over the Communists.

As I said, these developments are in themselves grave and leave with us serious implications. Perhaps the most serious of all implications is the possibility that these statements and developments can or will be misinterpreted at home, among our allies or, most importantly, by a potential enemy.

That this new approach of American policy is subject to misinterpretation is conceded by Mr. McNamara himself in his now-famous interview with Stewart Alsop in the Saturday Evening Post of December 1, 1962.

I would like to quote in full at this point the paragraph from the interview which has caused so much concern. That they are important to the subject at hand can best be demonstrated by the words themselves. In that interview, Mr. McNamara was asked if it were not wise to assume that the time will come when the other side would have a sure second-strike capability. His response:

> Yes, and that raises an interesting point. I believe myself that a counterforce strategy is most likely to apply in circumstances in which both sides have the capability of surviving a first strike and retaliating selectively. This is a highly unpredictable business, of course. But today, following a surprise attack on us, we would still have the power to respond with overwhelming force, and they would not then have the capability of a further strike. In this situation, given the highly irrational act of an attempted first strike against us, such a strike seems most likely to take the form of an all-out attack on both military targets and population centers. This is why a nuclear exchange confined to military targets seems more possible, not less, when both sides have a sure second-strike capability. Then you might have a more stable "balance of terror." This may seem a rather subtle point, but from where I'm sitting it seems a point worth thinking about.

As Secretary McNamara says, this does, indeed, seem to be a subtle point, and it most certainly is a point worth careful examination. It is obviously open to interpretation, and it has been variously interpreted by various people. One obvious connotation was placed on this "subtle" point by the State Department. In a speech on December 19, just a few weeks after the McNamara interview appeared in print, Robert E. Matteson, an adviser to the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency—a branch of the State Department—gave what must be considered the official departmental view of the McNamara interview.

I might point out here that all such speeches are carefully screened by the Department and cannot be made without highest possible clearance from the Department.

In his speech, Mr. Matteson had this to say:

> It is even possible as Secretary McNamara intimated in the Alsop interview in the Saturday Evening Post that it would be a good thing if the Soviets were to achieve soon an invulnerable second-strike capability. My own feeling is that it might enhance the prospects of an early arms control-disarmament agreement.

If this is the official view of a high-ranking State Department official, what then can the American people think?

Following by less than a month came a report from the Woods Hole Summer

Study, sponsored by the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, on the problems of verification and response. This comparatively new study was released a short time ago. It was written by a group of scientific and legal experts who gathered at Woods Hole, Mass., last summer to discuss the many facets of the problem.

They come to the conclusion that inspection is not really the answer but emphasize, rather, what they term "verification." They even admit in their study that complete verification is not possible nor, they say, is it desirable in some instances. They draw the rather unique conclusion that some violations of disarmament agreements could go by unnoticed and not change the situation very radically.

Again, this study is subject to interpretation. It contains many sophisticated subtleties which may escape the average person here and abroad. One interpretation, that placed upon the study by the press, is that the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency has abandoned or is in the process of abandoning the requirement of on-the-spot inspection as a prerequisite for any arms control or disarmament agreement.

This interpretation is that inspection can be replaced by verification. As any knowledgeable nuclear physicist will tell one, there is no little box, whether black, white, pink, or orange, that can possibly give adequate verification of the kind of violation about which we are most concerned. The Soviets know that we have an enormous stockpile of nuclear weapons. We know that they have a large stockpile of such weapons—between us, enough to destroy all life on this planet.

The problem is not so much one of nuclear weapons or nuclear explosions as such, but is rather that of delivery vehicles. No matter how many little boxes were spread over the face of the earth there would be no method of detecting the production in either the United States or the Soviet Union of the vehicles with which to deposit nuclear terror anywhere in the world.

There has been a proposal at Geneva that a so-called neutral inspection team be created with the right of entry into both the Soviet Union and the United States. This cannot be considered seriously by either party. In a struggle between slavery and freedom there can be no real neutrals. I do not think for a moment that the American people can or should trust their security, their future and their freedom in the hands of so-called neutrals like Nkrumah or Sukarno.

Because not only American freedom but civilization itself is at stake in these perilous times, we cannot afford any hint or tinge of uncertainty in the American position on disarmament and arms control. We cannot permit an interpretation of official statements which might in the future cause a potential enemy—or even one of our friends—to make that one awful mistake which would plunge the world inevitably on its course of complete and terrible destruction.

For this reason and because of the uncertainties which have been created in the minds of many persons—both here and in foreign lands—I have drafted a concurrent resolution. This resolution has three principles:

First. All arms control or disarmament agreements will provide for full and free inspection, and Members of the Congress of the United States shall be included on the inspection teams.

Second. The President will keep the appropriate congressional committee chairman advised at all times of any measures he may take which would affect the arms ratio between East and West.

Third. There shall be no informal or tacit arrangements between heads of state. All agreements with respect to arms control and disarmament will be in treaty form, subject to the constitutional right of the American people, speaking through the U.S. Senate, to approve or reject.

I believe that all of us are concerned about the workability of any treaty on arms control or disarmament, whether it involves a ban of nuclear testing or a destruction of germ warfare facilities. There is only one way in which this kind of arrangement can function properly and that is through a thoroughly grounded confidence on the part of each party that he knows all there is to know about the arms production and delivery capability of the other.

Each party must be confident that, when he lays down his arms, when he abandons any weapon or weapons system, he is not opening himself to utter ruin and chaos because of some unseen or unheralded weapons development on the other side.

Only through constant and complete inspection can this confidence be gained.

In this connection, it would be wise, I feel, that Members of each House of Congress be included on any team created to carry out inspection. Members of the Armed Services Committees or the Joint Atomic Energy Committee would, I think, be best fitted for this assignment.

May I say here that there are veteran members of these committees, and perhaps other committees, who have served in that capacity through several administrations. They are experts in these matters.

At a time when public pronouncements have become suspect due to the manipulation of news, the confidence of the Congress and the American people can be maintained only through complete and objective reporting. Such reporting can best be done by the people's representatives in the legislative branch working as observers on inspection teams.

As to the second point in the operative part of my resolution, I feel it is most essential that the President be advised of Congress' desire that no unilateral measures be taken by the President in his capacity as Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces or otherwise that might alter the existing arms ratio between the United States and its allies on the one side and the Soviet Union and its allies on the other. For this reason, the resolution provides that the President, prior to taking such measures, shall advise the appropriate congressional committee chairmen of any steps he contemplates with respect to the size, composition, and disposition of the Armed Forces and particularly their weapons systems.

I bring up the third point in this resolution—Senate ratification of any agreement—for two reasons:

First. The all too frequent references in current documents to such matters as "tacit arrangements" and "informal agreements" in referring to potential arms control and disarmament proposals.

Second. A matter such as this is of such vital importance to the world that it must be clearly understood that not only our Executive but also the representatives of all our people support any disarmament program. Only through a formally approved treaty can such an assurance be given to the world.

We have seen, during the course of recent history, that informal arrangements, regardless of how seriously taken they may be, cannot long endure. As you recall, there was an informal arrangement not too long ago in which the Soviet Union and the United States agreed to ban further nuclear testing. At will, the Soviets violated that arrangement. They did so knowing that our anguished outcry would impress nobody since no treaty was involved.

These informal or tacit arrangements just cannot work.

It is also my feeling that the American people and the people of the world would rest much easier if they knew that any arms control program or disarmament arrangements had the full force and being of international law, solidly supported by all institutions of government. Only through this kind of assurance can we hope to gain and expand the kind of confidence in such an instrument which is inherently necessary for it to bear fruit.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution, which is already at the desk, be held until Monday of next week for additional cosponsors. I wish to express my gratitude to the many Senators who have already expressed their willingness to cosponsor this legislation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CURTIS. I request unanimous consent, Mr. President, to insert in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks an article by Charles Burton Marshall, member of the State Department's policy planning staff from 1950 to 1953 and presently a research associate of the Washington Center for Foreign Policy Research of the Johns Hopkins University. Mr. Marshall clarifies the meaning of some of the jargon being bandied about in the discussion of arms control and disarmament, and he points up some of the obstacles to meaningful arrangements in this area.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New Republic, Nov. 24, 1962]

HIDE AND SEEK—SOME DOUR THOUGHTS ON INSPECTION

(By Charles Burton Marshall)

Some key terms relevant to arms control and disarmament—a field of endeavor overburdened with ambiguities—have been mauled about by Government spokesmen, news analysts and editorial writers since the onset of our troubles over missiles in Cuba. I feel prompted to offer, on behalf of rigor, some simple definitions. I begin with the generic term, "verification."

One kind of verification can be carried out without the acquiescence or cooperation of the Government subject to check. Certain information is explicit in, or inferable from, open sources within the country, from covert operations within or over the domain concerned, and from observations from adjacent territory. An appropriate term for this kind of verification is "monitoring."

A second kind of verification requires grant of access by a government whose actions or capabilities are assessed. The operations divide into two classes.

One sort of access is that conceded by a government for a specific limited occasion. Outside authority is permitted to enter an area to confirm that the inviting government has done what it claims to have done (e.g., dismantled a missile pad). The visitors have no warrant to ferret out unreported matters. In effect the government is host, the outside authority is guest. An appropriate term here is "authentication."

A contrasting sort of access is exercised when a government vests an outside authority with power not merely to check matters admitted by the subject government but also and essentially to determine, within limits of relevance, what may have been left undone or done covertly. The correct term here is inspection. Such is its sense in official parlance generally—in banking, postal operations, military outfits, and so on. An inspector comes around, welcome or not, with warrant to poke and to raise issues—not merely to nod through a prearranged checklist.

The general concept, verification, is what was alluded to in Chairman Khrushchev's offer to take his missiles out of Cuba—concurred in at once by President Kennedy, subject to a proviso for continuing U.S. monitoring in an interim. U.S. spokesmen immediately began calling the prospective operation inspection. But by any feat of imagination, the essential attributes of inspection were lacking. Nevertheless U.S. officials, having espoused inspection through drudging years of talks on test bans and arms limitation, appeared anxious to nudge arangements toward at least nominal or symbolic conformity to this standard. With equal alertness to record and precedent, the Soviets set out to attribute an invitational and pro forma character to whatever, if anything, had been agreed to.

For an outsider, an analysis of the ensuing exercise in tactical diplomacy revolving around these opposed themes is highly difficult—much like trying to comprehend a merry-go-round by glimpsing it in motion through a fence crack, or a score of counterpoint by hearing gust-borne sounds of a distant orchestra. Who and what prompted U Thant to the pilgrimage that resulted in establishing a U.N. absence in Havana? On the basis of what estimates did the U.S.S.R. propose and did the United States hasten to accept the impeccably humanitarian International Committee of the Red Cross as a verifying agent on matters of war technology outside its familiarity? Were Castro's dissents at the instance, by leave, or in defiance of Moscow? Perhaps the explanations of these and many other mysteries will never be known.

One matter seems fairly evident, however: Both sides have been doing their cagey utmost to avoid precedents and to minimize compromising basic positions on verification. As an augury for the 18-nation disarmament conference scheduled to resume soon in Geneva, this maneuvering is probably much more significant than the fervent pieties about disarmament exchanged between Chairman Khrushchev and President Kennedy at the peak of the crisis.

Here, at risk of elaborating what is evident, I want to emphasize that the main parties to negotiation at Geneva are the governing groups in the United States and the U.S.S.R. Their views do not necessarily coincide—and in some aspects are not at all likely to coincide—with the views found in literature on arms control. This literature is written by psychiatrists and sociologists intent upon resolving policy conflicts by dismissing them as aberrant, by physicists disposed to evaluate an adversary government's aims from sentimentalities uttered over cocktails at a Pugwash meeting, by psychologists seeking clues to the weapons riddle by analyzing chitchat of train attendants and of concierges met during a Russian tour, and by various other sorts of imaginative but nonresponsible authors.

The governing groups in the United States and the U.S.S.R. are aware of the chances for calamity. A shared desire to get armaments under control may be assumed without arguing, for on any other premise the negotiations consist of subterfuge and fall beyond rational analysis. Arms control and disarmament, however, are not absolute and discrete aims. They overlap and interact with a great range of other considerations. The rub is—or at least has been up to now—with respect to these other matters.

A bargain, if and when arrived at, must be a political one, in the broadest sense. Each party is under constraint to insure terms which will preserve the order of values basic to its polity. As a test of their providence, the terms must have convincing marks of being provident—convincing to constituents and allies whose concurrence is necessary as a condition to giving the terms effect. While still in position to give or to withhold consent, each party is constrained to seek terms consistent with other purposes reflecting its relevant order of values.

This gets close to the heart of the inspection issue. Each side—with reason—attributes to the other ultimate desires and preferences incompatible with its own. Each side—again with cause—suspects that the other, given opportunity, would bring its more remote desires and preferences into its pattern of immediate actions. This reciprocal anxiety is nothing to puzzle about. Authentic spokesmen for the U.S.S.R. articulate international goals entirely incompatible with the U.S. order of values. Spokesmen on our side articulate world goals which could be realized only after a frustration of the U.S.S.R. amounting to historic defeat. That the articulated goals of both parties may lie beyond reach is beside the point. Each side makes plain enough what preferences it would establish as purposes of policy if it could.

In analyzing the interplay between inspection and the basic conflict of purposes, it is important to recognize that individuals may accept, draw upon and apply orders of values prevalent within their culture even while ignoring or renouncing beliefs underlying them. One may act on monotheistic postulates while professing agnosticism. In this respect, hopes for a detente between the United States and the U.S.S.R. founded on Khrushchev's indifference or even cynicism—often alleged but never demonstrated—regarding Marxist-Leninist tenets are probably like fantasies that a Borgia pope, because inconstant on finer points of practice, might have been flexible on matters in controversy with Luther.

NATURAL LAW AND INSPECTED TRUTH

The mode of thought underlying the U.S. approach, whether or not recognized and acknowledged, rests on ideas of natural law. A unified creation, with a pattern of right reason inherent, is postulated. Good is identified with it. Principles are held as reflections of this good. What opposes good is ascribed to aberrant free will. Interests are seen as colored with such aberrant imperfections associated with misguided free will. Principles thus transcend interests. Social good inheres in upholding principles impartially. The concept of authority—which is to say, power to bind in conscience—is based on devotion to principles unswayed by interests, impartially applied. Facts are items of information developed impartially by authority and are an objective basis on which to apply principles. Such are the justifying, if not always reigning, concepts in state life.

In the U.S. view, an inspectorate in connection with arms control comprises institutional arrangements for projecting onto the world scene, and especially onto the U.S.S.R., a fact-finding function based on the conception of authority described above. It must be above interests, impartial in endeavor—its authority acknowledged, permitted scope, facilitated in operations, submitted to without cavil or hindrance. Its existence and functions, thus serving as both a substantive and symbolic substitute for trust between the great adversaries, would gradually evolve a basis for confidence. It would serve to assemble and to verify facts to bolster assurance or to confirm doubt. In extremity—that is, in event of the need to abrogate an agreement in face of unacceptable violations by others—the system would provide warrant and vindication. In sum, the U.S. plan for a disarming or disarmed world is congenial to the U.S. view of legitimacy.

The U.S.S.R. view is different. The U.S.S.R. asserts a total claim on the future, based on its dialectic concepts of history. An essential aspect of this claim is that history progresses by inherent momentum toward a final perfection perceivable only through Communist doctrine. Concepts of legitimacy are derived from the law of history which ordains eventual universal triumph for Communist interests and purposes. All other interests and purposes are deemed deviant and devoid of legitimacy. The ruling Communist Party is considered sole interpreter and custodian of legitimacy. Bearers of party authority are constrained not to concede legitimacy to any authority beyond their control.

INTRUSION AND INSPECTION

No thread, I contend, has been more consistent in Communist conduct than this sensitivity to making any concessions to external authority—manifested in the World War II period by the Soviet's obduracy against the scheduling by the Western allies of chain bombing out of Russian airfields, stiffness over timing of lend-lease convoys, and impingements on UNRRA operations. The instances often cited as countervailing turn out to be unconvincing under examination. Russia's acceptance of inspection in post World War II occupation agreements, for example, pertained to domains not yet brought to heel. Soviet agreement to inspection in Antartica involved no Communist area. Communist accession to inspection in North Korea under armistice terms has proved nugatory in real effect. According to a notion persistent within the so-called disarmament community, the U.S.S.R. did once offer concessions on inspection in test-ban discussions. But should we construe a martini recipe as an offer of a drink?

An index to this attitude is the Soviet practice of linking inspection with the term intrusion. All too often, Americans echo the linkage, using "intrusive inspection" for inspection proper and "nonintrusive inspection" for monitoring. A standard definition of intrusion is "forcing of oneself into a place without right of welcome, the act wrongfully entering onto property of another." Inspection is defined in lexicons as "the act of examining officially"—and officially means "with authority, with sanction." "Intrusive inspection" is a contradiction in terms and "nonintrusive inspection" a tautology. Both expressions should be banned from U.S. discourse.

Soviet willingness to invite in an authenticating agency on occasion is quite conceivable but has no bearing on submitting to inspection. The U.S.S.R. persistently says inspection is out—a stand consistent with Communist dogma. In face of this, it is difficult to explain lingering U.S. hopes that the U.S.S.R. really does not mean it, and that obduracy can some day be overcome by adjusting details. The United States may indeed exaggerate the efficacy of inspection. In this connection, the notion that inspection has a potential for guiding the U.S.S.R. toward becoming an open society may be laid aside as inherently too marginal and speculative for serious consideration. The point of inquiry is whether inspection could do the job for which designed. I am not in a position to state definitive views. I can only raise questions.

One question pertains to inspection as a way of insuring compliance with any agreement. For the moment, and for argument, formal acceptance of inspection terms by the U.S.S.R. and other Communist regimes may be assumed. But formal acceptance does not necessarily mean cooperation. The Korean armistice pattern might well be repeated—continuous frustration, postponement, avoidance, and administered ambiguity. The level and quality of information afforded might well be less than attainable through monitoring—that is, verification by means available to the United States irrespective of Soviet cooperation. The international inspectorate would probably provide small, if any, assurance of compliance.

A second question concerns the qualities of an international inspectorate. To gain necessary respect and credit even under favorable conditions, such an inspectorate would have to have high motivation and technical competence. Yet presumably an inspectorate would have to draw heavily on people from uncommitted countries. Most of these countries are—and will remain for a long time—short on technicians. They will need to keep their best men at home.

Third, a question is in order concerning the integrity of findings by an international inspectorate. U.S. expectations are based on the assumptions that everyone can divorce truth from its consequences. The United States envisages an international inspectorate disciplined and constrained to rigorous, exacting attitudes toward empirical data, irrespective of preconceptions and preferences. Yet the United States doubts the detachment of Communists in an inspectorate; in the event neutrals may prove equally self-interested.

U.S. expectations overlook a disposition, basic in the cultures of many of the neutralist countries, to view magisterial functions as intended not so much to forward the triumph of good over evil as to keep contention between them from getting out of hand. This calls for temporizing, mitigating, hoping always to work out arrangements to save something all around, but in a pinch favoring concessions to the more intransigent. F. S. C. Northrop's "Philosophical Anthropology and Practical Politics" reflects good insights into this attitude.

I recall an illustrative instance. Representing the Government of the United States at an International Red Cross Conference during 1952 I was forced to the limit of my patience in trying both to avoid a donnybrook and to preserve national prestige in the face of outrageous attacks from Chinese Communist delegates. At intermission, a delegate from a leading neutralist country, after praising me for reasonable forbearance, added, "These men are mad dogs. You should have let them have their way"—a non sequitur to me but obviously plausible to him.

To expect unequivocal findings by an international inspectorate which has neutrals in the swing position—especially with respect to crucial considerations likely to precipitate renewed competition on armament—is probably too much. Should the United States ever find itself constrained to abrogate a disarmament treaty, it would probably have to do so, and to face consequences, on its own sole sovereign discretion—without any international certificate.

It could be—who can say for sure?—that inspection would not raise the level of technical surety over that achievable by monitoring. Some experts say this. Perhaps also the United States has not realistically appraised factors of feasibility in regard to plans for an inspectorate. These negative considerations, however valid, do not dispose of the matter. It is necessary also to take account of the political acceptability of an agreement within the United States—an aspect bearing on the juridic character of an agreement.

So systematic and far reaching a venture as a formal agreement on arms control and disarmament should be an act of state of a most solemn character—to be undertaken only on a basis of firm and demonstrated concurrence between the executive and the coordinate political branch. It should commit the nation beyond the term of the administration launching it, with a status above party contention. It should contract other parties to obligations equally durable and deep. A treaty seems appropriate, even indispensable, as an instrument for any such formal agreement.

In this perspective, limits, difficulties, and doubts regarding inspection recede to academic import. Questions of confidence and dependability are not merely technical. They never were. They might conceivably have become so if at some juncture relationships between the United States and the Communist imperium had turned onto a basically better course. Then armaments might conceivably have been tethered without all the paraphernalia of inspection. But this hypothesis is based on fantastic rather than realistic imagination. Whatever the theoretical possibilities under dreamed up conditions, one now must take account of the autumn missile crisis. I have heard hopeful speculations regarding its effect, as if fellowship might grow out of a shared crisis, as if wrestling a bear to the brink were a mutually endearing experience. I am skeptical. I see little in recent events to nourish the mystique of trust. An uninspected arms control compact seems out for the calculable future. The outlook is dour—indefinite impasse on formal terms, with abatement of the problems restricted to unilateral steps and to informal and tacit agreements, with or without more such crises as the one over Cuba.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CURTIS. I am delighted to yield to the distinguished junior Senator from Colorado.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, I wish to congratulate the Senator from Nebraska not only for submitting the resolution itself, but also for the statesmanlike method of the presentation he has adopted, and on the very progressive and constructive thoughts which he has given in his speech. I wish the Senate to know that I, among others, fully support the principles and the details of the Senator's concurrent resolution.

It adds to our deliberations a needed safeguard of realism and reason, and would provide a deterrent against the sort of ill-conceived and dangerous suggestions currently being espoused by some of our Federal agencies charged with the conduct of our affairs in world councils. I share the Senator's concern that there appears to be a pellmell rush to weaken this Nation's historic position as the champion and protector of the weaker nations in this free world.

On September 19, 1961, when the House passed the original legislation establishing the disarmament agency, I took the floor of the other body, of which at that time I was a Member, and said, among other things:

> We have just seen the Soviet Communists explode their 13th nuclear blast with testing renewed by their own unilateral action. Free countries have been threatened with annihilation by Soviet rockets. Mr. Khrushchev has said that our grandchildren would exist only under Communist rule. We have tried for years to obtain an agreement on nuclear disarmament and each meeting has been deliberately stalled and broken up by the Soviet Communists. From a handful of fanatics in 1916, international communism now tyrannizes over one-third of the population of the world and it continues to grow not by the force of argument and principle, but by force of arms and terror.

We should remind ourselves of the warnings given to the Congress by the eminent nuclear scientist Dr. Edward Teller. Although discussing the dangers to our strength which would result from a test ban, he pointed out that a test ban might strike a fatal blow to our defense of the free world through NATO, while at the same time building the free world's enemies. Certainly his warning that test bans, or for that matter, disarmament, would not restrain the Communist government of Red China, and might be considered a slap to France, is an acute observation. Recent events suggest the bold truth of that analysis. Dr. Teller, we may recall, drew a parallel of present conditions with our abandonment of Czechoslovakia at Munich which history shows was a major factor which brought on World War II, and he concludes that had the Munich Pact also banned fighter planes and radar the inevitable consequence would have been the fall of Great Britain. There is reason in his view to suggest that the Soviets even now are seeking to maneuver this Nation into another Munich. I share the concern of the distinguished senior Senator from Nebraska and others in the light of the recent developments that we tend to blind ourselves to the true ideology of the Communists, seeking to interpret their actions within the framework of our own principles and beliefs. We ignore their statements, such as those made by Lenin and often repeated:

> To continue an undeclared war or to launch an open war no casus belli is needed, only fresh breath and favorable circumstances.

The war itself has been decreed by Communist history and was declared by Marx once and for all in 1848 when he wrote:

> The Communists scorn to conceal their aims, the forcible overthrow of all existing conditions, a world to win.

Their philosophy contends that:

> In this war, although armistices and temporary agreements are necessary, the essence of any agreement is that it is temporary, not that it is an agreement. The struggle may have to be continued by other means for a shorter or longer period. But war itself is only the continuance of the politics of peace, and peace the continuance of the politics of war, by other means.

This, I repeat, was the credo of Lenin. It has not changed. We must understand it. We must remind ourselves continuously that "negotiate" and "agree" have different meanings for them and for us. To them lulls cannot conceivably or decently be preliminaries to all-out peace as we understand it, nor are specific "hot spots" really separate except in the sense that they have been separated out for strategic or tactical convenience from the general context of struggle. Every negotiation, every issue, even every day's session as we have seen in the apparent fruitless 5-year negotiations in Geneva are regarded primarily as a move in an irreconcilable conflict. Khrushchev himself has reiterated this, the very same credo, as recently as 1959 when, before the Foreign Ministers Conference in Albania, he is reported to have said:

> They say [meaning the United States] that with the U.S.S.R. you must negotiate in the following fashion concession for concession. But that is a huckster's approach. We do not have any concessions to make, because our proposals have not been made for bartering. [Their] proposals do not contain a single element for negotiation. They are not based on a desire to find a correct solution.

It is thus obvious that Khrushchev's solution remains the same as that stated by Marx:

> The forcible overthrow of all existing conditions—a world to win.

We too must recognize that we have a world to win, but for a different purpose—to advance the cause of freedom of all mankind. It is in this light that many of us are concerned that our present path is following the ivory tower thinking that recently characterized a group of study papers produced for certain Democratic Members of the House and published under the title of "The Liberal Papers." I should like to read into the Record a portion of "The Liberal Papers" which suggest the actual time table of unilateral concessions, many of these concerning disarmament.

Although suggested as purely hypothetical, this timetable nevertheless brightly illuminates the sort of over reliance on Communist good will against which the resolutions of the senior Senator from Nebraska seeks to guard. Here is the timetable of unilateral concessions as suggested by "The Liberal Papers." This, I may say for the benefit of Members of the Senate, is a hypothetical timetable, one which could occur in any year, depending upon when the particular agency desired to begin to put it into effect.

> April 1: We announce that, as of May 1, we intend to make public all medical information we have been gathering concerning man in space; reciprocation invited from all nations; nature of general policy indicated (A–1).
>
> May 1: We announce that, as of May 15, all discriminatory trade and travel restrictions with respect to Communist China will be lifted, and we will entertain diplomatic exchange; reciprocation in kind is invited and general policy stated (B–1).
>
> (A–1 reciprocated by Russia and most other countries.)
>
> May 20: We announce a unilateral test ban that will be continued indefinitely and invite reciprocal announcement from Russia, England, and France (C–1); we also announce that we are making technicians and professionals in various fields of specialization available to the U.N. for work in the Congo and other areas; reciprocation from other "have" nations invited and general policy again stressed (D–1).
>
> (B–1 not reciprocated by Communist China.)
>
> June 1: We announce that at the next convening of the General Assembly of the U.N. (June 20) we will move the seating of Communist China; we again indicate our willingness to entertain diplomatic exchange and the general nature of our policy (B–2).
>
> (C–1 reciprocated by Russia, England, and France; D–1 reciprocated by England, France, and others, but not Russia.)
>
> June 15: We announced, as of July 15, one of our oversea bases in Japan will be publicly denuclearized, and we invite U.N. and Russian inspection; reciprocation is invited but left open ended, and our general policy is again stressed (E–2).
>
> (On June 16 bombardment of Quemoy and Matsu increases abruptly and invasion preparations are observed; U.S. naval power concentrates and firm warnings about what our policy does and does not imply are given; Russia makes nuclear threat; on June 20 we nevertheless move seating of China in U.N.; one invasion attempt is repulsed [but no counterattack on Chinese mainland occurs]; Russo-Chinese conferences are followed by Chinese delegation seated in U.N.; Quemoy-Matsu hostilities peter out; D–1 reciprocated by Russia.)
>
> August 1: We announce that, as of the next September, student exchanges will be offered in proportion to the populations of the countries involved; reciprocation is invited generally (A–2). We announce that, as of August 20, the DEW line (early warning system) will be made bidirectional (warning of our flights toward Russia as well as vice versa), and we invite the Soviets to "plug in" (Note: I am told this is technically feasible; it emphasizes our reliance on second-strike rather than first-strike strategy; if we have no intention of suprise attack, there is no reason why this shouldn't be done); reciprocation in kind invited (C–2).
>
> Russia announces that, as of September 1, its armed forces in East Germany will be reduced by one-third and reciprocation in form of denuclearization of West Germany invited; we interpret this as indirect reciprocation of E–2; an envoy from Peiping arrives in Washington for talks.)
>
> August 15: We announce that, with agreements from some of the major mass media, beginning September 1, material on contemporary world affairs prepared by Russian sources may appear on Sundays in special newspaper sections and certain TV and radio programs without censure; reciprocation in kind invited (D–2).
>
> (We announce that, as of September 1, NATO forces are being reduced in West Germany but that no denuclearizing is contemplated at this time; East Germany announces relaxation of transit regulations between West Germany and West Berlin; B–1 reciprocated by Communist China.)
>
> September 1: We announce that, of January 1, we will be prepared to have all launchings of flights into outer space supervised by a new agency of the U.N. which we propose be established (A–3).
>
> (Russia announces an expanded program of inviting scholars and scientists for advanced study in Soviet institutes [which we intepret as indirect reciprocation for A–2]; Communist China invites joint teams of Russian and American scientists to Peiping for conferences on technical problems; C–2 and D–2 still not reciprocated by Russia.)
>
> September 15: We announce that, as of October 15, the islands of Quemoy and Matsu will be publicly demilitarized and turned over to proper authorities from the mainland, and clear statements about the unchanged status of Taiwan are made (B–3); we announce that surpluses of several grain crops will be made available at adjusted prices to countries needing them during the winter (D–3); reciprocations left open ended.
>
> (Russia proposes that, beginning January 1, the conquest of space be made a joint human enterprise on the model of the International Geophysical Year (IGY) and invites international cooperation through the U.N. (we interpret this as reciprocated for A–3); C–2 and D–2 still not reciprocated by Russia; Nehru urges that she do so.)
>
> November 20: We announce that, as of the next meeting of the U.N. (December 1), we will move the substitution of Communist China for Nationalist China on the Security Council—reciprocation in the form of recognition of Taiwan as a sovereign country with representation in the General Assembly requested (B–4); we announce that, as of February 1, we will open this country unilaterally to inspection and monitoring by authorized U.N. teams, as further evidence that we have no intention of surprise attack—reciprocation in kind is invited from all countries (C–4).
>
> (The demilitarization and evacuation of Quemoy and Matsu accomplished without major incident (Chiang Kai-shek's threats of retaliation countered by large nonmilitary spending program in Taiwan); Russia has reciprocated, in part, on C–2, but not D–2; under strong urging from Great Britain, plans for full-scale disarmament negotiations under U.N. auspices are being prepared.)

Mr. President, what do we actually have? This is a theoretical timetable, prepared by prominent Democratic Members of the other body. We have here the U.S. program for general and complete disarmament in a peaceful world, published as Department of State Publication No. 7277. Obviously, I shall not read the entire document. I shall, however, read some of the general principles which are set forth in it.

The general principle is complete disarmament. I read from page 3, as follows:

> The disbanding of all national armed forces and the prohibition of their reestablishment in any form whatsoever other than those required to preserve internal order and for contributions to a United Nations peace force.

That is one of the methods by which this program would be accomplished. Next:

> The elimination from national arsenals of all armaments, including all weapons of mass destruction and the means for their delivery, other than those required for a United Nations peace force and for maintaining internal order.
>
> The institution of effective means for the enforcement of international agreements, for the settlement of disputes, and for the maintenance of peace in accordance with the principles of the United Nations.
>
> The establishment and effective operation of an International Disarmament Organization within the framework of the United Nations to insure compliance at all times with all disarmament obligations.

Mr. President, I suggest that there is no series of proposals which, if they should be adopted at this time and with the situation as it exists in the world today, would more adversely or sharply affect the security and safety of this country.

Certainly every Member of this body would like to see the great burden of our existing weapons reduced. However, in the present day and age and in the dangerous situation in which we find ourselves, I share the concern of the distinguished junior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS] that this is a field in which all people of the free world are justifiably interested; that it is of paramount importance to all people in this country; and that the impact of any agreement in the field of disarmament is so intense that any such agreement should be entered into only after joint review and agreement on the wisdom of such a course by both the executive branch and by the representatives of the people, as expressed through the membership of the U.S. Senate.

Again, I express appreciation to the distinguished Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. CURTIS. I thank the distinguished Senator from Colorado for his important contribution to the discussion of a problem which I am sure worries every thoughtful American.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nebraska yield?

Mr. CURTIS. I am delighted to yield.

Mr. ALLOTT. I wish to compliment the distinguished Senator from Nebraska both upon his resolution and upon his excellent statement in support of it.

Also, I believe my distinguished colleague from Colorado [Mr. DOMINICK] has performed a real service for the Senate in pointing out the muddleheadedness and the muddleheaded type of thinking which seems to be going on, even in Congress, with respect to some of the fundamental issues which affect this country.

I am happy to support the concurrent resolution on arms control and disarmament, submitted by the junior Senator from Nebraska. I endorse particularly that part of the resolution calling upon the President of the United States to report to the appropriate congressional committees "any and all steps taken by him which would tend to alter existing ratios of weapons and their effectiveness between this Nation and its allies, and the Soviet bloc of nations."

Recent alterations in our defense posture underscore the importance of this proviso.

All of us recall, I am sure, Khrushchev's demand, made at the height of last October's Cuban missile crisis, that the United States dismantle its intermediate range ballistic missile sites in Turkey, as a quid pro quo for dismantling the Soviet missile sites in Cuba. Such a demand struck a few responsive chords in this country, we will further recall, for only 2 days earlier a distinguished pundit suggested such a swap as a way out of the crisis. But thankfully our President rejected the proposal out of hand.

What happened subsequently? The administration announced in January, less than 3 months after Khrushchev agreed to withdraw his missiles from Cuba, that the United States would dismantle its missile sites, not only in Turkey, but also in Italy as well. That the announcement came as a surprise was indicated by the complaint of the Italian Government that it was not consulted prior to the decision. Why the sudden change in American policy? "Weapons modernization," it was explained. The Jupiters have become obsolescent and are, therefore, no longer effective, we are told. The Polaris submarine—which, incidentally, is more and more asked to assume the burden of solving all of America's problems—will patrol the Mediterranean. Of course, a minor difficulty concerning where those Polaris submarines will be based has cropped up, but this should not hinder the dismantling of our Jupiter sites in Turkey and Italy. As a result, meanwhile, it appears that we are soon to be confronted with—if you will excuse the slogan, Mr. President—a "missile gap" on the southern flank of the NATO area, at least for a while.

Forgive me, Mr. President, for being facetious; but as an interested layman observing some of our recent diplomatic and defense moves, I cannot resist some sarcasm. Certainly there is little evidence here of the long-range planning of which this administration, with its bevy of blue-ribboned task forces, boasts. But that is not my main point. Why, Mr. President, was the Congress not consulted before this decision was announced? I am sure that my good friends who serve devotedly and conscientiously on the Armed Services Committee and its Special Preparedness Subcommittee would have expressed keen interest in this initiative. Certainly it was of more than passing interest to the distinguished chairmen of these two panels. Yet, to my knowledge, Mr. President, these Senators and their counterparts at the other end of this building were not informed of the decision to dismantle these sites, prior to its announcement, nor was their advice solicited.

This is a matter of grave concern to me, Mr. President, for we are talking about an act that, in the words of the concurrent resolution under discussion, "would tend to alter existing ratios of weapons and their effectiveness." This I believe to be true, regardless of the reason for the decision, whether it be weapons modernization or a gesture aimed at Khrushchev and the amorphous body called world opinion, to demonstrate for the *n*th time how reasonable and peace-loving we are.

Perhaps I would not be so much concerned if this decision were an isolated event. But when considering other alterations in our defense posture that have been announced in recent weeks, I become worried. Let us take the Skybolt incident, Mr. President. We are told that the manned bomber has become passé, despite expert opinion to the contrary from the Chief of Staff of the Air Force and his colleagues in the Pentagon. We are told that cost-effectiveness studies run in the Department of Defense have shown that further development of this missile would be unnecessarily wasteful.

Perhaps the Secretary of Defense is correct. But when, in the aftermath of the October missile crisis, with its uncertain denouement, we see, first, the junking of Skybolt, and then the announcement of the dismantling of our missile sites in southern Europe, I become puzzled. Are these decisions being taken for the technical reasons cited by the administration; or are they perhaps measures to persuade Khrushchev of our good will and fervent desire for peace? I do not know, Mr. President; I merely raise these questions.

In this connection, Mr. President, the junior Senator from Arizona recently dealt with this matter in some brief remarks on the floor of the Senate. He asked:

> What goes on here? First—

He said—

> we hear about the dismantling of missile bases in Turkey and Italy. Next we read that plans are afoot to reduce our troop strength in Europe by some 40,000 men. Then we are told about the gradual deactivation of the 850 B–47 bombers in American combat units.

Other alterations in our defense posture questioned by the Senator are:

> B–58 supersonic medium bombers, production halted; RS–70 bombers, development halted; the Dyna-Soar manned spacecraft bomber system, development funds cut back; B–47 bombers, scheduled for deactivation; B–52 bombers, out of production, no new bombers either scheduled or planned.

The purpose of my remarks, Mr. President, is to endorse the concurrent resolution under discussion here, and to raise questions about some recent alterations in our defense posture that seem to me to have an effect upon the balance of military power. Perhaps there are good reasons for these moves. Perhaps, on the other hand, they could, in light of the wishful thinking evidenced in some quarters of the executive branch, unwittingly jeopardize this Nation's security. The point I want to make in raising my questions today is the need for close and continuous liaison, consultation, and genuine exchange of views and ideas on these vital matters between the executive and legislative branches. This the resolution seeks to bring about;

and, for this reason, it deserves the support of all Senators. Mr. President, I urge adoption of this resolution.

Mr. CURTIS. I thank the distinguished Senator very much for his important contribution.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, with the free world's eyes focused on the arms buildup in Cuba, political developments in Canada, and the French veto of Britain's entry into the European Common Market, as well as the continuing war in Vietnam, it is my concern that the United States-Soviet negotiations on nuclear testing will proceed without receiving warranted attention. It is not my purpose to here argue the number of onsite inspections that are necessary to insure compliance with any test-ban treaty. But it does appear to me to be a bit odd that in 1958, leading experts, including those from the Soviet Union, agreed that 21 manned inspection stations in the U.S.S.R. were necessary; yet today the Soviet is offering two to three onsite inspections. Surprisingly enough, the United States is now demanding only seven. My surprise at these developments is compounded, especially when I hear that there are many hundreds of seismic events in the Russian landmass each year, any one of which, I am told, could be the result of a nuclear explosion.

Has our technology advanced to such an extent that unmanned seismic stations can keep a test-ban honest? I do not know. But I do know that Mr. William C. Foster, the director of the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, said on January 14:

> There is no way at present to distinguish certain natural underground occurrences from nuclear explosions.

Mr. Arthur Dean, Chairman of the U.S. delegation to the conference of the 18-nation Committee on Disarmament, said on the same day:

> No one, including the Soviet Union, has been able to demonstrate scientifically that natural underground events like earthquakes can be consistently differentiated from manmade nuclear explosions.

So, Mr. President, here are two spokesmen for the administration who contend that scientific surveillance in the art is not sufficiently advanced to be able to detect all nuclear explosions.

Lewis L. Strauss, the former Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission, is concerned over our reaching, with the Soviets, a compromise that will endanger our national security, as is Dr. Edward Teller, one of the Nation's foremost nuclear experts. It is difficult for me, Mr. President, to understand how the administration could recommend entering into an honor-system type of agreement with a country that within the past 6 months deliberately lied to our Chief Executive concerning the arms buildup in Cuba. The Soviet world and much of the free world must retire, in the evening, wondering what type of schizophrenic agreement the administration will enter into.

Of course, we are all for peace. We are all for the avoidance of nuclear war. But an agreement which would allow the Soviet to violate its very principles would not only disappoint our peaceful desires; it would also undermine the very existence of our country. The 1961 Russian violation of the test moratorium should be ever present in our mind. Assuming that, for once, the Russians were sincere, which is hard to believe, what of the Chinese? Has their activity in the field of nuclear research been taken into consideration? Reports are persistent that they have the potential to create an atomic explosion this year.

Mr. President, it is my hope that satisfactory agreement on nuclear testing can be reached; but it must be more than an agreement just for the sake of agreement. Since the termination of World War II, time after time we have been reminded that the Russian leadership cannot be trusted, either in the field of nuclear testing or in the field of the conventional type of strategic maneuvering. Based upon information supplied by experts, it is difficult for me to believe that the Soviets can be relied upon to carry out the terms of an agreement, when such an agreement is based upon an honor-system type of understanding. On January 28, Nelson A. Rockefeller, Governor of the State of New York, addressed himself to the matter of a nuclear test ban; and I ask unanimous consent that the statement by Governor Rockefeller be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY GOV. NELSON A. ROCKEFELLER

In light of the long record of broken promises and other bitterly disillusioning experiences with the Soviet Union, including the Soviet's violation of more than 50 international agreements, I am deeply concerned by two recent developments:

First, President Kennedy's announcement of the U.S. suspension of underground testing of nuclear devices; and

Second, the apparent weakening of our requirements for a nuclear test ban treaty.

In connection with the cessation of underground testing, experience should have taught the administration that unilateral suspension of testing in advance of negotiations not only does not improve the atmosphere but on the contrary removes any incentive for agreement on the part of the Soviets.

This was proved in the fall of 1961 when the Soviets resumed nuclear testing after a voluntary test ban had been in effect for nearly 3 years, during which we had been fruitlessly negotiating to achieve a permanent test ban.

While the United States was observing this test ban, the Soviets had been preparing a test series for at least a year, thus making it possible for them to achieve major progress in nuclear weapons development in relation to the United States.

While a truly effective test ban treaty with adequate inspection is desirable, I think it is imperative that our new voluntary test ban not be extended through any protracted negotiations. We must remember that the Soviet Union broke the last moratorium only 4 weeks after solemnly assuring us that it would never be the first to do so.

As to the second problem; namely, the weakening of the U.S. position on a test ban treaty, I have three basic concerns with respect to developments since the advent of the Kennedy administration:

First, that the United States has given up the concept of manned inspection stations on Soviet territory altogether;

Second, that the administration has accepted unmanned stations in spite of statement by responsible administration officials casting doubt on their effectiveness; and

Third, that the administration has progressively reduced the number of onsite inspections we demand from 20 a year to 8 to 10 a year.

My reasons for these concerns are as follows:

With respect to manned inspection stations:

1. The 1958 Geneva Conference of Technical Experts, including the Soviets, agreed on a worldwide system of 170 to 180 manned inspection stations, of which 21 were supposed to be located on Soviet territory. The Soviets have now entirely withdrawn their agreement to a system of manned control posts on Soviet territory, and the present administration has accepted this.

2. At the time that the inspection system was supposed to be based on manned stations, the United States insisted on 20 onsite inspections a year as the minimum number required for safety against evasion.

3. When the Kennedy administration came into office, it still insisted on 19 manned inspection stations within the Soviet Union, and from 12 to 20 onsite inspections a year. Only last March 4, William C. Foster, Director of the U.S. Agency for Arms Control and Disarmament, said that these inspection requirements, if anything, might have to be increased in the national interest.

As to unmanned inspection stations:

1. This concept was first advanced in 1959 by the Berkner Panel, which estimated that unmanned stations should be located 170 kilometers apart to be effective, which would mean that 200 such stations would be required to cover the seismic area of the Soviet Union and 600 would be necessary to cover the entire Soviet Union.

2. Only last night, on the "Meet the Press" program, Secretary of State Dean Rusk revealed the ineffectiveness of U.S. unmanned testing devices in these words: "The Soviets claim that they have instruments which are fully effective in scrutinizing tests; if they have them, we don't have them."

But in the latest exchange of secret letters between President Kennedy and Premier Khrushchev, as released by Khrushchev, the Soviet Premier was talking of only three unmanned inspection stations, in the Soviet seismic area only (in contrast with the Berkner Panel recommendation of 200), and only 2 or 3 on-the-spot inspections a year, while President Kennedy in his letter to Mr. Khrushchev expressed the feeling that the Soviet proposal on inspection stations "does not go far enough" and the number of on-the-spot inspections should be 8 or 10 a year (in contrast with the 12 to 20 the Kennedy administration previously demanded).

This apparently is the current basis of negotiations.

Concerned Americans must therefore ask the following questions:

1. Why is it that, 3 months after the demonstration of Soviet duplicity in installing missiles in Cuba, we are again instituting an unpoliced moratorium on nuclear testing?

2. What gave us the confidence, 2 months after the demonstration of Soviet duplicity in Cuba, to reduce inspection requirements which were still considered basic a year ago?

3. If there is new scientific evidence warranting our reduction of inspection requirements, why has the American public not been told about it?

4. What incentive do the Soviets have to accept any American proposal, or to behave responsibly, if as a result of their intransigence they receive evermore favorable U.S. offers?

5. Is it wise to engage in bilateral, secret negotiations with the Soviets at a time when we are asserting the indivisibility of the Atlantic NATO alliance, and on issues which basically affect the security of our allies?

The American people are entitled to answers to these questions before irrevocable decisions are made which may seriously prejudice the future security of the United States and the whole free world.

All in all, it seems to me that in this critical area the administration is trending toward a Cuba-type inspection plan. One of these is dangerously more than enough.

Mr. BENNETT. Madam President, will the Senator from Nebraska yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. Neuberger in the chair). Does the Senator from Nebraska yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. CURTIS. I yield.

Mr. BENNETT. In the headlines of today's issues of the two leading Washington newspapers, I think we see a very dramatic demonstration of what the Senator from Nebraska and the Senator from Utah fear.

The headline in this morning's Washington Post reads as follows: "K Warns United States on Cuba: Invasion Means H-War."

The following article states the details of how Mr. K spells that out.

In the face of that blast, I think it ironic that we find in this afternoon's Washington Star the following headline: "United States Drafting New A-Test Treaty—Changes Ease Requirements for Inspection."

Khrushchev rattles the saber—perhaps with no real connection between the two; but ironically, in terms of the time relationship, we move backward another step in our attempts to obtain inspection and control by means of any nuclear test ban, to which subject the Senator from Nebraska has addressed himself.

I suppose we cannot blame the people of the world for coming to believe that the more Khrushchev shouts, the faster we shall step back. We have already come to the point where we say we are going to be satisfied with seven inspections; and now, apparently, there is to be offered a new treaty which would take us closer to the time and the situation in which we might say we would be satisfied with no inspections. Madam President, I think this most ironic.

Mr. CURTIS. I thank the distinguished Senator from Utah.

Mr. HART. Madam President, I listened with attention to the remarks of Senators following the interesting remarks of the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. Curtis]. I was struck by the comment made by the Senator from Utah [Mr. Bennett], who read two headlines from today's issues of the two principal Washington newspapers, the first of which announced again that Khrushchev would view very dimly any military action on our part to invade Cuba; and then the Senator from Utah pointed out that this afternoon's Washington Star states that we are drafting a new test ban treaty, and the Senator from Utah read the headline: "United States Drafting New A-Test Treaty—Changes Ease Requirements for Inspection."

I believe the Senator from Utah was conscious of the concern to which I now address myself, and he may well have so indicated on the record. But I wish to make very sure that there is no reader of the Congressional Record, here or elsewhere in the world, who would be able, as a result of this afternoon's session, to stand up and say that there is an opinion in the Senate that would support the proposition that when Khrushchev barks, we back down. I ask the Senator from Utah if he does not agree that that would be a most unfortunate implication.

Mr. BENNETT. I think it is unfortunate that those two events happened as they did, but one would not need to read the Congressional Record. We merely have to read the headlines in the two newspapers to which I have referred.

I make the point, too, that apparently there has been no response from the President or his advisers to Khrushchev's saber rattling, indicating that we were going to let him get away with it. So the combination of events leaves us in a very weak position. I am sure that neither the Senator from Michigan [Mr. Hart] nor I desire the world to get the impression that we are backing all the way down. But, unfortunately, in the juxtaposition of those two events, that impression can well be created.

Mr. HART. Would the Senator from Utah be happier if the President of the United States should announce that we are going to invade Cuba? Is anything short of that course backing down?

Mr. BENNETT. That is the kind of question with which the Senator from Utah was faced during his campaign for reelection last year. But the Senator from Utah would be greatly heartened if the President of the United States would today, in the face of the kind of blustering which we have witnessed, take the same kind of firm position that he took on October 22. He has left the American people wondering how far Khrushchev can go before we announce a firm program. That firm program need not be a direct invasion of Cuba. It could well be a reimposition of the blockade or some satisfactory substitute.

Mr. HART. Is the Senator from Utah satisfied that a blockade at the present juncture would be legal under international law? Or should we not concern ourselves with that question?

Mr. BENNETT. The American people are eagerly looking for the day when the President will take some kind of step which would indicate his firm determination not to let Khrushchev continue to press us in Cuba. I am not presuming to say what that course should be. I do not think it is the responsibility of the minority to decide what it should be or when it should happen. I am merely expressing the feeling that I get from the people back home. Those people were happy last October when the President took a firm stand. They are now greatly disturbed to see that there is no followup in the face of the kind of blustering we have had from Khrushchev.

Mr. HART. Madam President, I am grateful to the Senator from Texas for permitting me, in a sense, to intrude. I should like to conclude by making clear my own reaction to those two headlines. As an American and as a Member privileged to serve in this body I am proud of my country and the fact that it continues to seek that which actually is the common aspiration of all mankind—to achieve an adequate resolution of the A-test question. This effort in my mind demonstrates no weakness at all. It demonstrates a sensitivity and a recognition of our obligation as a power possessed of an instrument that can incinerate mankind.

If we are not working toward a solution of the problem 24 hours a day, then I would say that we are wrong on everything.

I share with the Senator from Utah the conviction that Cuba represents a constant irritant. I know how the people at home feel. I know the expression about which he is speaking. I am not sure that the kind of discussion that sometimes goes on here does not do us all a disservice because it inclines us to miss the real threat in Cuba at the moment. The real threat is not whether there are 10,000 or 15,000 Russian troops, good, bad, or indifferent, frontline or rearline troops. I cannot believe that troops in those numbers represent a threat to our physical integrity or survival. There is an ultimate problem, yes. But the immediate problem is not to get lost in the swamp of debating how many troops are there or whether a gravel pit or a cement block that was or was not bulldozed last night was rebuilt today. The problem is to recognize that Cuba is a center of subversive activity in our own hemisphere and at our own back door. It is the instruction given to the young Venezuelans and the Chileans in Havana that disturbs me to an infinitely greater degree than what amounts, in total numbers, to a division of troops, but not organized as a division.

Second, we are likely to be diverted from a recognition of the fact that we must become hardheaded about aid to Latin America. We should make sure that conditions are attached to the grants we make which will reverse the conditions, political and economic, which give rise in all Latin America to the great potential of a takeover similar to the one we see in Cuba.

Having intruded to raise some questions, I desired to make clear my own feeling at the moment.

Mr. BENNETT. Madam President, I, too, appreciate the patience of our friend the Senator from Texas [Mr. Tower]. The question that concerns the Senator from Utah is not the question of gravel pits or a nose count of Russians. It is the direction in which the situation is proceeding. The Senator from Utah greatly fears that, as far as the position of the United States vis-a-vis the Russian power in Cuba is concerned, it is weakening rather than strengthening. That is the point that concerns me.

I hope that someday the administration will come forth with a program which will reverse that trend so that all Americans may feel that we are making progress against the kind of thing that appeared in the headlines of this morning's newspaper: "K. Warns United States on Cuba—Invasion Means H-War."

Mr. HART. I do not believe I shall ever see the formula developed which will enable us to write Khrushchev's speeches.

Mr. BENNETT. Madam President, may I again thank my friend the Senator from Texas for the opportunity of the present interchange.

A COMPREHENSIVE, CONSERVATIVE PROGRAM FOR CONGRESS

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a legislative package consisting of eight bills and resolutions designed to offer a comprehensive, conservative program for this session.

These bills are substantially the same as those which I introduced in the last Congress. Altogether they make up a comprehensive, conservative legislative program. While I do not anticipate action on this program in the present Congress, I believe the time is drawing near when the American people shall have had their fill of New Deal, Fair Deal, and New Frontier paternalism, and therefore will send to Congress a conservative majority. When that time comes, legislation of this type will be given full consideration.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a summary of my bills and resolutions be printed in the Record at this point in my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McIntyre in the chair). The bills and resolutions will be received and appropriately referred and, without objection, the summary will be printed in the Record as requested by the Senator from Texas.

The bills, joint resolutions, concurrent resolution, and resolution, introduced and submitted by Mr. Tower, were received, read twice by their titles, and referred, as indicated:

To the Committee on Finance:

S. 954. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to provide for reform of personal and corporate income tax rates, and for other purposes; and

S.J. Res. 53. Joint resolution to establish the Joint Committee on Foreign Trade.

To the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

S.J. Res. 52. Joint resolution directing the Secretary of Agriculture to submit proposals to the Congress for the gradual termination of unnecessary Federal controls on farming.

To the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. 955. A bill to amend the antitrust laws to prohibit certain activities of labor organizations in restraint of trade and commerce, and for other purposes;

S.J. Res. 54. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to the balancing of the budget; and

S.J. Res. 55. Joint resolution to establish rules of interpretation governing questions of the effect of acts of Congress on State laws.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 24) submitted by Mr. Tower, was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, as follows:

Whereas the foreign policy of the United States appears to omit the possibility of complete and clear-cut victory over Communist imperialism; and

Whereas this is a policy which places human survival above human dignity, which fears random manifestations of opinion more than it nurtures the hope of freedom; and

Whereas the Congress has not consented, nor can it consent to such a policy; and

Whereas the mission of the United States must be to secure victory over tyranny, the end of man's enslavement of man, and the ultimate impotence of all concentrations of power which may now or hereafter threaten the peace of the world and the freedom of its peoples; and

Whereas this purpose should be enunciated in such a way that whatever enemies we face cannot mistake it, so that the people we represent may determine their own support, and so that the enslaved peoples of the earth may find hope for a future in which their freedom, and the whole cause of freedom, is not sacrificed for safety but instead is consecrated as the central cause of our time and all times: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That it is the sense of the Congress that the purpose of the United States in its relations with other nations of the world should be—

(1) victory over Communist tyranny;

(2) to oppose by all effective means the growth of any power dedicated to aggression or the denial of freedom to its own or any other peoples;

(3) to oppose communism's worldwide efforts to subvert nations and peoples by the most effective means available;

(4) to support for all nations submitted to Soviet, Communist Chinese, or other Communist control since 1939, the right of free choice of government, after proper preparation and under appropriate electoral supervision;

(5) to press by all diplomatic means for the withdrawal of Soviet, Communist Chinese, or other Communist forces, both uniformed and covert, from all areas entered by them since 1939;

(6) to reduce Communist war machines, and the economies which support them, to levels at which they can no longer threaten the peace of the world;

(7) to fully arm, both in material and morally, ourselves for these tasks;

(8) to support and fully defend those whose freedom is threatened;

(9) to support and assist those whose aspirations for freedom are challenged by internal or external forces whose ultimate path would lead to tyranny;

(10) to counsel and assist those who, untried in freedom, are tempted by the promise of rapid growth to embrace coercive economic systems, that they may be preserved instead on the path of the only proven progress to freedom—that of individual dedication, dignity, initiative, and responsibility in a free capitalistic economy;

(11) to enjoin all nations to a course of full commitment to self-determination; to discourage attitudes of benevolent neutrality which, when men are not free, debase all men, weaken all freedom, and work not for peace but for the advantage of aggressors; and

(12) to remind a world often fearfully unsure, that peace in our time depends not upon the concessions of free nations but upon their determination and upon the enemy's assessment of that determination, that life itself is no more dear than the conditions of that life, and that freedom is the only tolerable human condition for the people of these United States and for a world at peace.

The resolution (S. Res. 100) submitted by Mr. Tower, was referred to the Committee on Government Operations, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Government Operations, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdiction specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to make a full and complete study for the purpose of determining—

(1) the extent to which departments and agencies of the Government are engaged in the production or furnishing of goods and services which can be supplied by private enterprise;

(2) the extent to which necessity or the national security require that such goods and services be produced or furnished by departments or agencies of the Government; and

(3) the means and methods by which the function of producing or furnishing such goods and services may be transferred at the earliest practicable time and to the greatest practicable extent to private competitive enterprise within the United States.

Sec. 2. For the purposes of this resolution, the committee, from February 1, 1963, through January 31, 1964, is authorized to (1) make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) employ upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided*, That the minority is authorized at its discretion to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than $1,200 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

Sec. 3. The committee shall report its findings upon the study and investigation authorized by this resolution, together with its recommendations for such legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1964.

Sec. 4. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed $125,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

The summary presented by Mr. Tower is as follows:

The package includes measures in the following fields:

1. A balanced Federal budget: This is a proposed constitutional amendment making a balanced Federal budget mandatory except in case of war or other grave national emergency.

2. Taxes: A bill identical with H.R. 265 introduced in the House of Representatives by Representatives Herlong, of Florida, and Baker, of Tennessee. This is a comprehensive proposal calling for across-the-board reductions in tax scales, both individual and business. In addition it includes new depreciation provisions applied to new acquisition of business plant and equipment. This measure would make statutory provision for tax-free transfer of capital by individuals, but not by corporations, from one investment to another within a taxable year when the investments have been held at least 6 months. Finally, the bill would establish a new formula for setting tax rates on estates and gifts with a top rate of 47 percent.

3. Foreign trade: A resolution to establish a Joint Committee on Foreign Trade to exercise congressional oversight of all foreign trade programs.

4. Government competition with private business: This is a resolution authorizing a Senate Committee on Government Operations to make a full and complete study to determine the extent of Government competition with private enterprise, and to determine means and methods by which such functions can be transferred to private enterprise.

5. Foreign policy: A resolution expressing "the sense of Congress" that the purpose of the U.S. foreign policy is: (1) Victory over communism; (2) to oppose by all effective means the growth of any power dedicated to aggression or the denial of freedom to its own or to any other people; (3) to oppose and end communism's worldwide efforts to subvert nations and people; and (4) to support and secure the right of free choice of government for all nations submitted to Communist control since 1939.

6. A resolution to establish rules of interpretation governing questions of the effect of Federal laws on State laws: The resolution would provide that no future act of Congress would be construed as indicating an intent on the part of Congress to preempt State laws on the same subject matter, unless Congress expresses such intent.

7. Labor antitrust law: The purpose here is to prohibit certain types of union activity intended to lessen competition or to establish monopolies in the marketplace for products or commodities. For example, efforts by the unions to prevent the installation of preglazed windows or factory-painted kitchen cabinets. It has no application whatsoever to the supply or price of labor.

8. Agriculture: This is a resolution to gradually move the Government out of the field of farm controls. Within a period of 6 years the level of price supports would be gradually reduced while increasing acreage allotments and marketing quotas.

NEED FOR VIGOROUS PROSECUTION OF COMMUNISTS

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, last year, I made a speech in the Senate calling for more vigorous prosecution of Communists by the Justice Department. I am even more convinced now than I was then that more intensified prosecution is necessary.

Aside from their activities in the political and military fields, Communists continue to subvert and to do violence to other institutions and aspects of American life. Recent events in my own hometown of Wichita Falls, Tex., provide a dramatic and sorry example. Let me tell the story from the beginning.

In the summer of 1960, a committee of the board of directors of the Civic Playhouse of Wichita Falls, a little theater group of which I was a member, met in my home and interviewed Mary Lee Maxine, whom we subsequently employed, with her husband, Willis Henry Maxine, on a full-time basis to direct and manage the Civic Playhouse.

As professional employees of the playhouse, they performed the functions of stage direction, set construction, business management, and general supervision of the theatrical activities of the playhouse. In this connection, they also engaged in some theatrical work at Sheppard Air Force Base, but were subsequently barred from the base as security risks.

It was learned by a local attorney, Mr. John Mogan, a former FBI agent, that the Maxines were Communists. On learning this from reliable sources, Mr. Mogan, together with his wife—both active members of the playhouse organization—made this information known to the board of directors of the Civic Playhouse in April of 1961, and they were discharged.

In February 1962, a $106,000 slander and defamation of character suit was brought by Willis and Mary Maxine of Wichita Falls, Tex., against Frank G. Logan and John and Barbara Mogan charging that the defendants publicly called the Maxines Communists. Logan was subsequently dismissed as a defendant in the case.

According to the Wichita Falls Times of September 11, 1962, testimony began the previous day in the $106,000 slander suit of the Maxines against John and Barbara Mogan. It was indicated that the Maxines were former employees of the Civic Playhouse and the defendants were members of the playhouse board of directors in April 1961. The Maxines were asking $75,000 exemplary damages, $6,000 actual damages and $25,000 punitive damages.

In September 1962, Mrs. Maxine took the stand and testified. Mrs. Maxine admitted attending Communist-front schools but denied knowing the schools were on the national subversive list at the time she was attending them. She denied being a Communist although she admitted she had been asked to join the Communist Party—CP—at one time in New York but had refused.

Willis Maxine took the stand and stated that he had never, to his knowledge, met a Communist although he admitted he had met some who seemed to think socialism would be a "great way to run America."

The September 13, 1962, issue of the Wichita Falls Times quoted Willis Maxine as stating:

> I was not a Communist * * * and I have never distributed the Daily Worker.

Willis Maxine testified, in his slander suit against the Mogans, for nearly 2 hours and admitted he had associated in the past with persons in the Minneapolis, Minn., area who allegedly were members of the Communist Party in the United States. The newspaper reported that Maxine emphatically denied membership in this Communist organization. The newspapers revealed that the Maxines contended in their suit they were discharged as employees of the Wichita Falls Civic Playhouse because of the reports to the playhouse board of directors by the Mogans that they were Communists.

The September 24, 1962, issue of the Wichita Falls Times revealed that a self-admitted former member of the Communist Party had identified Mr. Maxine as "a hard-working member of the Communist Party, one highly trusted by Communist officials, and one who would be considered a 'revolutionist'."

Mrs. Ruth Gordienko, of Minneapolis, Minn., testified on the witness stand in the slander suit and repeatedly contradicted earlier testimony of Willis Maxine. She identified Willis Maxine as the "distributor of the Communist Daily Worker newspapers in the Minneapolis area." Mrs. Gordienko related her personal relationship with Maxine during the years 1952 and 1953, a relationship which allegedly carried the two into several meetings and social functions with top-ranking members of the Communist Party in the United States. She testified:

> Max [the name she used in referring to Maxine] was a member of the Communist Party. I saw him at several of the meetings and he told me he was a Communist. In fact at one time he told me how much he hated stoolpigeons, spies, and persons who worked undercover for the FBI and informed on Communist activities. He said if the Communist Party ever asked him to spy on persons to help the party, he would be glad to do it.

Mrs. Gordienko stated that she was working during the above period as an informant for the FBI. She claimed to have been a member of the Communist Party in Minneapolis in 1948 and 1949 and continued her membership after moving to Winnipeg, Canada. While in Canada, she broke with the party and thereafter worked for the FBI until 1954. When asked whether she knew if Maxine was still a member of the Communist Party, she replied:

> I don't know if he is still a member but he definitely was a member the last time I heard. I understand he did remain in the party.

Mrs. Gordienko's testimony took place on September 14, 1962.

The Wichita Falls Record News of September 15, 1962, reported that the plaintiffs appeared stunned by the defense move of calling Mrs. Gordienko as a witness and when court resumed following the noon recess, George Schatzki, Dallas attorney for the Maxines, filed motions for a mistrial and a continuance, both of which were overruled.

The Wichita Falls Times of September 17, 1962, revealed that the $106,000 slander libel trial of Maxine and his wife against the Mogans ended abruptly on September 17, 1962, when the plaintiffs' motion for dismissal of the suit was granted.

Before moving to Texas in 1960, Willis Maxine was engaged in Communist Party youth work in the Minneapolis area. It was understood that he was to take an active part in organizing a Communist Party youth group in the Minneapolis area which would function along singing or dramatic lines. The original plans did not materialize and it was shortly thereafter that Maxine and his wife moved to Wichita Falls, Tex.

In July 1959, Maxine attended the annual picnic of the Minnesota Freedom of the Press Committee—MFOPC—held at Hastings, Minn. The principal speaker was George Morris, labor editor of the Communist weekly newspaper, "The Worker." The MFOPC was organized in 1952 for the purpose of continually agitating against closing Communist Party offices, arrest of Communist Party leaders and to fight any measures that would stop circulation of the Worker.

On May 2, 1960, Maxine attended a May Day celebration in Minneapolis which was sponsored by the Communist Party. Sam Davis, acting secretary of the Minnesota-Dakotas district of the Communist Party, delivered the principal address.

While living in Minneapolis, Maxine was a frequent visitor to the residence of Sam Davis and worked with him in connection with Communist Party activities.

In June 1957, Maxine attended a "smelt fry" sponsored by a Communist Party club which was held in Glenwood Park, Minn.

In October 1957, Maxine attended the opening of the North Star Book Shop in Minneapolis at which Hy Lumer, national educational director, CPUSA, was the main speaker.

In December 1955, Maxine attended a "welcome home" party for Martin Mackie, district organizer of the Minnesota district of the Communist Party. Maxine also attended a New Year's Eve party at the residence of Martin Mackie on January 1, 1956.

In May 1956, Maxine attended a May day rally sponsored by the Freedom of the Press Committee, a Communist group, at which the featured speaker was Sam Kushner, labor leader of the Illinois edition of the Worker.

In January 1955, Maxine was observed in St. Paul, Minn., delivering handbills relating to the 31st birthday of the Worker.

In connection with Mary Lee Maxine, nee Mott, she was also associated with Sam Davis with respect to assisting her husband in Communist Party youth activities in Minneapolis area.

Mr. President, these things I have related, along with other unimpeachable information which I have received, produces convincing evidence that Willis Henry Maxine is a dangerous Communist of revolutionary inclinations who is prepared to follow the bidding of Moscow in the conduct of subversive activities, including espionage.

Many good and well-intentioned people—some very conservative and avidly anti-Communist—came to the defense of the Maxines when they were charged with being Communists. If I had not been familiar with the circumstances I may have defended them myself. It seemed highly unlikely that people simply engaged in little theater work should be Communists. Indeed, Mr. President, I was partially responsible for hiring these people and I think my record against communism is well known. It never occurred to me that Communists would seek to subvert an organization that functioned to produce amateur theatricals. This has been a tremendous embarrassment to these good people who defended the Maxines. The intrusion of Communists into my hometown has divided a community. It has placed the existence of a fine cultural organization, the Civic Playhouse—the only outlet for local theatrical talent in my community—in jeopardy. The organization has declined in membership. It is in financial straits. I am hopeful that the people of Wichita Falls will not allow the Communists to secure even such an apparently minor victory by destroying a worthwhile community institution. Now more than ever before they should rally to its support.

The Mogans—public spirited citizens—have incurred heavy legal fees as a result of the Maxines litigation. The Maxines, as late as yesterday were still living in Wichita Falls, still at large, spreading dissension and imposing themselves on innocent people.

What has happened in Wichita Falls is just one example of how Communist Party members can be a destructive force in this country. It is another example that gives the lie to the arguments raised by some that the existence of the Communist Party, because it is small in number, constitutes no threat to the peace and security of our country.

Again, Mr. President, I implore the Justice Department to initiate a program of vigorous rooting out and prosecution of Communists in the United States.

BENEFITS FOR COLD WAR VETERANS

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I am pleased to join with the senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] and the senior Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT] in cosponsoring the bill to provide benefits for cold war veterans. I represent a well-deserved step in the direction of recognition for those American servicemen who are serving in areas of cold-war danger throughout the world. Although we are certainly not engaged in a worldwide hot war today, there is equally no doubt that Americans are being killed around the globe, but particularly in South Vietnam, in the course of conflicts which are essentially activities of warfare. In increasing insurance and other benefits, this bill provides for a wider recognition of the service these men are giving their country today.

Mr. President, I would, however, like to make the point that this bill would appear to apply only to areas or parts of the world that are designated as "areas of hostility." Personally, I would be inclined to think that in some branches of the service, such as SAC or Polaris submarine duty, the nature of the service is so much a part of the cold war and the dangers faced are so exceptional that some provision should be made for these men even though they may not be technically in an "area of hostility." I would certainly hope that in further consideration of the bill, this matter would also be considered and possibly some amendments adopted.

GOVERNMENT AND BUSINESS TODAY: DOES THE REALITY CONFORM TO THE MYTH?—ADDRESS BY CLARK M. CLIFFORD

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Congressional Record a speech made recently at Washington University by one of the university's distinguished alumni, one of the Nation's most prominent citizens, Clark M. Clifford.

Mr. Clifford, who served so ably as Counsel to President Truman, who has helped in many other governmental capacities, and who understands the Government as well as anyone I know, in or out of Government, has devoted his very logical mind to an analysis of big government, big business, and big labor, resulting in this fine and thoughtful speech which in my opinion merits the attention of the Congress.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Government and Business Today: Does the Reality Conform to the Myth?

(Address by Clark M. Clifford to the Washington University assembly on the occasion of Founders Week, celebrating the 110th anniversary of Washington University, St. Louis, Mo.)

It is with a sense of deep satisfaction and gratification that I return to my alma mater on the occasion of her 110th anniversary. I pay homage to those who have gone before who have brought her to her present high estate, and to those present here who shall carry on her sacred traditions and cherish her honor and renown.

During World War II and the tense years which have followed, Americans have come to understand how prophetic was Winston Churchill's comment that the West was faced with "long-drawn trials of vigilance and exertion." Our trials indeed have been long drawn. They have seemed in fact almost interminable, as crisis has followed crisis in unending and unrelieved succession.

We find ourselves committed to a titantic struggle with communism, nonetheless mortal because both sides seek to avoid resolving the issue by resort to mutual cremation. We are confronted by nations and ideologies committed to imperialism, constantly probing for weaknesses, constantly encroaching, seeking every means to expand their control over the world's human and material resources.

Even though we are preoccupied with foreign relations and our national defense, more and more thoughtful people have come to recognize that the outcome of this struggle will ultimately depend to a great extent upon our economic strength. For the foreseeable future, our economy must sustain the burden of an armament budget exceeding $50 billion a year. It must provide employment for a labor force growing in size, skill, and expectation. It must support a technology which will produce not only superior weapons but also commercial products which are competitive with those of foreign countries with lower cost labor.

Thus we are entering a period when our economic system will be subjected to its greatest strain. Because I believe so deeply in our free enterprise system, I consider its preservation a vital part of the victory we must win in our contest with communism. Yet I know that if we cannot find the means to make that system equal to our Nation's needs, the American people will change the system.

So we must do more than compete with communism. We must win with our techniques, not with theirs, or the victory will be hollow indeed. We must rely on the efforts of free men, working together to solve their problems. And in no area does that joint effort confront more challenging problems than in the relationship between government and business.

THE BUSINESS VIEW OF GOVERNMENT

To understand fully that relationship, we must consider some myths which surround it. No aspect of our society today is the subject of more superstition, oversimplification, or sloganizing. While those in government and those in business are almost equally guilty, let us first consider the beliefs of businessmen about government; how they regard it; what they expect of it.

There is today in the American business community a classical orthodoxy, accepted by many, which includes a familiar litany on government. It runs something like this:

"Government is at best a nuisance; at worst a menace.

"At best it is a nuisance because it is operated by bureaucrats, a class congenitally dense, arrogant, slow, meddling, ignorant, and composed of men who have never met a payroll.

"It is a nuisance because it is expensive, returning little for its cost; a luxury because many of its activities, if necessary at all, could be conducted better and more cheaply by business.

"At worst, government is a menace because of its natural tendency to regulate for the sake of regulating. It is staffed by ambitious men full of impractical, socialistic ideas, bent upon obtaining more and more power.

"Most damning of all, it is antibusiness, and thus opposed to the free enterprise system—foundation of the American way of life."

The essence of this antagonistic view of government is most often expressed as a resentment of government interference in business affairs. It assumes that the dominant aspect of the relationship is the initiative of government, aggressively thrusting itself into the world of business. It is interpreted as unilateral and unprovoked aggression.

Our analysis would be incomplete if we failed to note that many businessmen think they detect the transition of government from nuisance to menace simultaneously with a change from a Republican to a Democratic administration. It is particularly a Democratic administration which is expected to be antibusiness, with the least understanding of business problems, and inclined to the wildest of Socialist experiments. Since we have just completed 2 years of a Democratic administration, let us consider the extent to which the reality of government conforms to this myth.

MYTH VERSUS REALITY

The major legislative undertaking to date by the Kennedy administration was the Trade Expansion Act of 1962, designed primarily to equip the Government to secure the reduction of foreign tariffs and the removal of quantitative restrictions which inhibit the sale of American goods abroad.

It would be difficult to conceive of any endeavor more essential to the future health of American business. Already more than 8 percent of our total output of manufactured and semimanufactured goods is sold abroad. Twelve percent of our total agricultural production is exported, so that 1 out of every 6 acres is producing for oversea consumers. In the case of many industries, the dependence on foreign markets is even more pronounced. As examples, over half of our production of locomotives and a third of all construction, mining, and oilfield machinery and equipment are sold abroad.

For most major industries in the United States the development of foreign markets represents the best hope for substantial increases in production and employment. Rising personal incomes and higher standards of living all over the world are creating an explosion of demand for consumer goods similar to the one we have experienced in this country since World War II.

* * * * *

A second major task which confronted the Government during the last 2 years was establishing a communications satellite system, involving the basic question of whether this system should be owned and operated by the Government or by private industry.

The Kennedy administration, against violent opposition, proposed and vigorously supported ownership of the satellite system by a private corporation. It is to be subject to the normal regulation of a public utility, and the Government is to provide the facilities for launching the satellite on a reimbursable basis.

* * * * *

The third major way in which the present administration demonstrated its attitude toward business was in a series of proposals for changes in the tax laws and related changes in tax regulations.

In 1962 the administration liberalized the rules concerning depreciation and secured legislation providing substantial tax credits for business expenditures for new equipment. It is estimated that these measures are saving business over $2 billion a year in taxes, and significantly increasing the net return on capital investment.

Last month President Kennedy proposed more sweeping changes in the tax laws, calling for a "top-to-bottom reduction in personal and corporate income taxes in 1963—for reducing the tax burden on private income and the tax deterrents to private initiative that have for too long held economic activity in check." In his economic report, the President continued: "Only when we have removed the heavy drag our fiscal system now exerts on personal and business purchasing power and on the financial incentives for greater risk taking and personal effort can we expect to restore the high levels of employment and high rate of growth that we took for granted in the first decade after the war."

I suggest that it would be difficult to express a more concise summary of the view which the business community has advanced since World War II, regarding the effect of high levels of taxation on business and economic growth.

* * * * *

These are examples of a 2-year pattern of major governmental actions which I submit is at complete variance with the orthodox view of government. Is this departure from the expected norm the result of the fact that our country has again produced in a time of crisis a great President, unusually perceptive in dealing with the Nation's problems? Is it the result of the unusual competence and perspicacity of the members of his administration? I believe this is part of the answer, but I suggest that the difference between myth and reality is deeper and more significant.

THE NEW INTERDEPENDENCE

I believe that the relationship between government and business has undergone such changes that the orthodox business view of government is now archaic and inadequate. It does not do justice to, nor is it worthy of, the scientific, financial and managerial brilliance of the American business community.

One hundred and ten years ago, when our university was founded, the scope of governmental activity and the effect of governmental action were still very limited. At the same time, the scope and effect of a decision by any single business enterprise were also strictly limited. Ours was still a nation of small farms, of small towns, of small industries, of self-sufficiency, of great numbers of sources of almost every product the consumer used.

It should hardly be necessary even to comment on how changed is the world in which we live today. It is true that government has a greater role in the affairs of business, but this is the result not of aggression, but of necessity, arising out of the complex interdependence of modern society.

The orthodox business ideology on the relationship of government and business sees the growing role of government as a trend to be reversed. I submit that the trend is inevitable and irreversible, and a political or propaganda program to get the Government out of business is foredoomed to fail. Its goal is as hopeless of achievement as would be a decision by politicians to end the Government's dependence on business for the accomplishment of critical national objectives. The two are permanently wedded in a partnership of necessity.

THE RESPONSE OF BUSINESS

If, as evidence of the past 2 years suggests, government is displaying a responsible and constructive concern for the problems of business; if it is consciously pursuing policies designed to enlarge business opportunities and insure business growth, what response is our society justified in expecting from business?

We ask primarily that the cobwebs of past folklore be brushed away; that the cliches be buried, once and for all, in order that we may solve the problems of our common survival. We fear that "like the army which plans the next war with the weapons of the last," business is today "in danger of facing its future armed only with the slogans of its past."[1]

An appropriate beginning to a more constructive relationship between government and business would be to explore the area of agreement on revision of our tax laws. It is an appropriate place to start because taxation is the governmental activity which exerts the broadest effect upon business decisions and business prospects.

Is the subject of taxes one about which government and business are doomed to disagree? One might assume that the President's current tax proposals would sweep away at a single stroke much of the suspicion and antagonism of business toward government, but apparently some in the business community are not so easily persuaded.

How much evidence of good faith does business require of government before it will join in a common effort to reach an agreed objective? Wise revision of our tax laws can be accomplished only with the constructive advice and counsel of the business community, offered in an atmosphere of mutual understanding, trust and forbearance. No proposals for broad changes in our tax laws could be made which would not include controversial elements, but differences over details must not be permitted to prevent our achieving the agreed objective.

I recognize that some businessmen oppose tax reduction if it results in a larger national deficit. But since we apparently face a deficit, regardless of the decision on tax revision, this is essentially a question of the level of Government spending. It is a problem which, at least for the time being, must be dealt with separately because of the traditional organization of the Congress. Expenditures are determined in the appropriation process, handled by entirely different committees than those which write the tax laws. It is the appropriation committees to whom business should present its proposals for reducing spending.

AREAS OF CHALLENGE

I hope that I do not leave the impression that the barriers to a constructive relationship have been erected entirely by business, for this is not the case. Government, too, must contribute reason and effort to remove antagonism and friction, particularly that engendered by government's role as a regulator of business activity.

The need for a better relationship between government and business is nowhere more urgent than between regulated businesses and the regulatory commissions. An indispensable element of such improvement is for government to encourage a more open and frank exchange of views between industry and these agencies. We must also reconsider the traditional exclusion of the regulatory commissions from the formulation of proposed national policies by the executive branch of Government. The commissions must be exposed to ideas, to expertise, to experience, for wise policy cannot be made in a vacuum. There is no reason that consultation with either the regulated industry or other Government departments should compromise in any way the independence which Congress has sought to confer upon the regulatory commissions.

---

[1] This warning was originally addressed to labor. Joseph A. Beirne, "New Horizons for American Labor" (Washington, D.C., 1962), p. 16.

The more sweeping and significant regulatory power of the Government is that which touches all business, restraining certain types of conduct by any business enterprise. The primary area of such regulation is that established by our antitrust laws.

As our economy becomes more complex, there is increasing conflict between business and the agencies responsible for antitrust enforcement and trade regulation. Many have become convinced that our present antitrust laws are outmoded and inconsistent.

This legislation was the product of a different age. The Sherman Antitrust Act was passed in 1890, for a nation of 63 million people, producing annually goods and services worth less than 14 billion of today's dollars. This is a total national product that is less than the sales of the General Motors Corp. last year.

The original act was broadly designed to protect competition and forbid monopoly. Experience under the Sherman Act led to the Clayton Act of 1914, which was intended to prevent monopoly in its incipiency by preventing practices which might lead to an end to competition.

These laws are basically consistent in purpose, however unfortunate may have been their application in a particular case. But beginning with some provisions of the Robinson-Patman Act of 1936, we began a system of government regulation wholly inconsistent with the belief in competition.

Why then have not these conflicting provisions been reconciled? Why has not this whole body of law been rationalized and modernized? Because, unfortunately, there exists in government a hard core subscribing to an orthodoxy no less rigorous than that of business; and the antitrust laws constitute its bible. This orthodoxy is not really antimonopoly so much as it is antibigness.

There is an urgent need for recognition of the chaotic state of our present laws, and for a willingness to reconsider the purposes and methods of antitrust policy.

I believe that the President of the United States could render an invaluable contribution toward removing a major area of antagonism and misunderstanding between Government and business if he would appoint a broadly constituted commission to study the antitrust laws and recommend to the Congress new standards of antitrust policy designed to meet the radically different problems of the mid-20th century.

GOVERNMENT, INDUSTRY, AND LABOR

Another major source of antagonism between government and business is government's role in labor-management relations. Business has traditionally resented the intrusion of Government into this field, and more recently labor has become almost as sensitive to it. The time has now come when both industry and labor must seriously consider the changes in our society which have radically altered the impact of labor-management decisions.

Government is concerned both with labor peace, and with the broader question of the effect of wage and price decisions on the economy. Its activities, therefore, involve efforts, first, to secure a settlement of disputes without work stoppages which would seriously damage the Nation; and second, to influence the terms of such a settlement so that they are in accord with broad economic policy objectives. These two types of governmental intervention raise entirely different problems.

Secretary of Labor Wirtz has rightly concluded that "public tolerance for strikes is diminishing rapidly." He further stated: "It is more frequently true now, than it used to be, that a shutdown will hurt the public badly before it hurts one party to it or the other enough that someone has to cry 'uncle'."[2]

A far-sighted labor leader predicts: "If it becomes impossible to seal off an area of dispute, then government must exercise its sovereignty in the interest of the whole."[3]

Under existing laws, after the parties have bargained without settlement, after the dispute has been mediated without success, after a strike has been enjoined while tempers cool and the facts of the dispute are determined and aired—if after all this, no settlement has been reached—we have no means to prevent a strike or lockout.

What would be our response to a strike by a single union that would stop all rail or truck or air transportation overnight? How long could we last before we faced acute shortages of food and fuel and raw materials? Before plants closed down? Before all construction stopped? Do we not need a new law to give the President a wider range of alternatives in dealing with critical labor disputes that affect our welfare and security? Have we not reached the point where, if all else fails to resolve such disputes, one of the weapons available must be binding arbitration of the issues?

Industry and labor could still insure primary reliance on the private decisionmaking process. They can do so by a more imaginative effort to prevent their problems from reaching the stage that necessitates governmental intervention.

Entirely different issues are presented by the Government's concern over the broader effects upon the Nation's economy of wage and price decisions in basic industries. This issue may arise in labor-management disputes over wages, or in management decisions on prices.

Government must not lose sight of the fact that we have no standards other than opinion as to what wage and price policies best serve the Nation's economic interests. These are matters on which capable men differ widely, and on which we now have no means to arrive at even a definitive consensus, much less ultimate truth. I submit that for this reason the intervention of the Government to affect decisions on wages and prices, and not the fact of settlement, must remain for the foreseeable future a matter of persuasion only, and not of compulsion.

But to reject compulsion should not preclude an interest by government in the negotiation between management and labor over wages. Neither should it preclude an interest by government in price decisions in basic industries.

There is a need for government, business, and labor to create a mechanism for consultation in an effort to reach a consensus on wage and price policies in a calm atmosphere rather than one of crisis. The impact of such decisions on our own economy, and perhaps more urgently, on our ability to compete in world markets, is constantly enlarging the common interest in this area.

THE BASIS FOR COOPERATION

There is every reason to believe that businessmen and public officials can find a meeting ground of mutual purpose. In their contacts, both the government official and the businessman will usually find the other to be a man of integrity and dedication. But more than this, each will find a high percentage of extremely competent individuals in both government and business—with no greater proportion of political hacks than of corporate nephews and cousins.

THE FINAL TEST

In all our efforts to overcome the attitudes and antagonisms of the past, and to forge new, more constructive relationships between government and business, we must recognize that our success or failure would matter very little, were these but petty arguments among ourselves, affecting only the transient efficiency of our economy. Even their setting in a time of economic and military competition with other nations imparts to our problems no cosmic significance. We have given them meaning because of the rules we have imposed upon ourselves, because of the standards by which we choose to judge success.

We have dedicated this Nation not only to being prosperous and powerful, but to being free. We have chosen a democratic society, seeking first the blessings of liberty. We have committed ourselves to the belief that the common good can be achieved without resort to dictation by government.

Our real challenge is whether such a society can, through voluntary restraint and reason, reconcile private and public interests without resort to the harsh restrictions and compulsions of an alien ideology.

Our argument with communism is not over the organization of the means of production, but over the worth and dignity of man. We would have him unfettered, to create, to experiment, to improvise—certain that only thus will we realize the full measure of our potential.

It is this contest the world watches. It is this contest which we can win, but only as free men working together to demonstrate to all mankind that this Nation, so conceived and so dedicated, can indeed endure.

FLORIDA YANKEE SPARKS QUIET LATIN REVOLUTION

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article written by James Russell, business editor of the Miami Herald. This article clearly demonstrates the fallacy of the arguments of those who claim that the economic rehabilitation of Latin America is a hopeless cause.

Furthermore, it clearly demonstrates the great good which can be accomplished in this field by individual initiative and private enterprise. These American virtues which helped to build this country and make it strong are not passé, contrary to much that we hear on the subject.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Miami (Fla.) Herald, Feb. 10, 1963]

BATTLING INFLATION TO CREATE HOMES—FLORIDA YANKEE SPARKS QUIET LATIN REVOLUTION

(By James Russell)

The slow-moving Alliance for Progress might learn a lesson from a virtually unheralded U.S. advisory program that, in less than 5 years, has changed the spending and saving habits of thousands of people in Chile.

---

[2] Address before the National Academy of Arbitrators, Chicago, Ill., Feb. 1, 1963.

[3] Joseph A. Beirne, "New Horizons for American Labor" (Washington, D.C., 1962), p. 17.

But more than that, it has helped arrest one of the wildest inflations in the Western Hemisphere and has made homeowners of Latin Americans who previously had little or no hope of ever owning the place they lived in.

No U.S. Government bureaucrat engineered this feat. Practically the whole program is the brainchild and the achievement of an outspoken Miami Beach savings and loan executive who takes a curious delight in pursuing ambitious projects that pay him nothing more than standard Government consultants' fees.

The Yankee sparkplug of Chile's new savings and loan system is Arthur Courshon, 41, a World War II bomber pilot who is chairman of the board of directors of Washington Federal Savings & Loan Association.

This impressive title would suggest that Courshon spends all his working hours in the big cushioned chair of his paneled office on Miami Beach or in a board room conferring about lofty economic matters.

Instead, much of his time is spent touring Latin American countries, writing voluminous reports for congressional committees, and serving on such unlikely boards as the Sam Rayburn Foundation and the St. Augustine Quadricentennial Commission—to which President Kennedy recently named him.

But Courshon's pet project is the Chilean savings and loan system. He started it in 1958, acting as technical adviser to the U.S. Operations Mission in Santiago.

What he found on his first trip to Chile would have discouraged many a man, however noble his purpose.

"Chile was still in the grip of a runaway inflation," Courshon wrote in a report to a Senate subcommittee. "It destroyed any incentive on the part of the people to save in Chilean currency and destroyed any business incentive to make long-term loans for housing or any other purpose."

The average interest rate then, on a 1-year loan, was 17 percent a year, of which 11 percent was aimed at covering the erosion of the currency by inflation. Houses just weren't being built. Nobody could borrow money on a long-term basis.

Courshon, working with Chileans, devised a plan that tied dividend rates on savings and interest rates on home loans to an inflationary index, much in the way some unions in the United States have escalator clauses in wage contracts.

This provided the incentive needed to make Chileans put money in savings accounts, which, in turn, built up a supply of mortgage money for home loans. The plan actually worked—and worked well.

Since its start from scratch less than 5 years ago, 22 savings and loan associations have sprung up in Chile. Last year they loaned out more than $10 million that financed more than 3,100 homes. Some mortgage loans were made for 20 years and interest rates ran around 6 percent—which is what they are in the United States.

It is not the wealthy class that is doing most of the borrowing. The average borrower and home buyer earns less than $200 a month. Through the savings program and other measures, Chile's rampant inflation has slowed to a more respectable level.

Direction of the program was done on the spot by a Washington Federal executive, Marlo Schram, who next month will complete a 2-year stay in the South American Republic. Courshon still shuttles back and forth between Miami and Chile keeping tabs on the project. He also brings Chileans to Miami to train them in U.S. savings and loan techniques. Six of them are doing that very thing here this week.

The program has been no easy task. Courshon had to overcome a traditional Latin mañana (wait until tomorrow) attitude as well as an inflation problem.

He used a method that many an American businessman in Latin America is reluctant to follow for fear of ruffling the Latins' feelings. Courshon is direct, determined, and doesn't mind sacrificing a little tact and diplomacy to get action.

When a Chilean savings and loan official suggested that Chile not be called an underdeveloped country in a Courshon report to Washington, he stood his ground.

"That's a word they understand in Washington," he explained. "If I substituted something else, it might serve the cause of diplomacy, but it wouldn't get my point across to the people who have the authority."

Having proved by deeds that privately financed homeownership is feasible in Chile, Courshon now is urging similar programs for other nations the United States is helping.

His latest comprehensive report to a congressional committee, this one to Senator JOHN SPARKMAN's Subcommittee on Housing, asks for creation of an International Home Loan Bank that would help create savings and loan firms in other underdeveloped countries of the world.

GOOD CITIZENSHIP GOLD MEDAL AWARDED TO DR. FREDERICK BROWN HARRIS

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, as a member of the Sons of the American Revolution, I am much pleased to announce to the Senate that this year the Philadelphia-Continental Chapter of the Sons of the American Revolution awarded to the Chaplain of the Senate, Dr. Frederick Brown Harris, the annual gold Good Citizenship Medal.

I am sure every Member of the Senate will share my pleasure in making this announcement, because I think there is no question about the fact that the Chaplain is truly beloved by all Members of the Senate.

I ask unanimous consent that a letter to Dr. Harris from Earl M. Richards, president of the Philadelphia-Continental Chapter of the Sons of the American Revolution, dated November 28, 1962, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

It is this letter that announces the plan that the Philadelphia-Continental Chapter is to make the award of the gold Good Citizenship Medal to Reverend Harris.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a statement of the citation from the chapter setting forth the reasons for selecting Dr. Harris as the recipient of the award, dated February 23, 1963.

There being no objection, the letter and citation were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PHILADELPHIA-CONTINENTAL CHAPTER,
SONS OF THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION,
Philadelphia, Pa., November 28, 1962.

DR. FREDERICK BROWN HARRIS,
Chaplain, U.S. Senate, The Westchester, Washington, D.C.

DEAR DR. HARRIS: As you probably know, the Sons of the American Revolution is composed of men whose forefathers fought and died to make our country free. Our chapter, the Philadelphia-Continental Chapter, is located at the spot where the Declaration of Independence was signed, the Constitution was written, the first Capital of the United States—Philadelphia.

The outstanding event of the year of our chapter is our Washington's Birthday luncheon. On this occasion it has been our privilege to have as our guest speaker an American citizen who has rendered an outstanding service to our country in protecting the liberty so dearly won by our forefathers. At this time we present the speaker with our gold Good Citizenship Medal.

This medal has been presented to President Hoover, General Bradley, and General Patton, Admiral Byrd, and Admiral Halsey, to mention only a few.

For our luncheon scheduled for Saturday, February 23, our chapter has instructed me, as the newly elected president, to ask you to be that speaker and, in turn, to present you with the medal.

If you can arrange to be with us we would appreciate it if you would advise us promptly so that we can make the appropriate preparations.

Sincerely yours,
EARL M. RICHARDS,
President.

PHILADELPHIA, PA.,
February 23, 1963.

DR. FREDERICK BROWN HARRIS,
Chaplain of the Senate of the United States:

Under authority granted me by the board of management of the Philadelphia-Continental Chapter of the American Revolution, it is my privilege to present to you our highest award, our gold Good Citizenship Medal. We do this in recognition of the following:

1. Your outstanding service for 18 years as the spiritual leader of one of the most distinguished legislative bodies in the world—the Senate of the United States of America.

2. Your leadership and participation in furthering the word of God.

3. Your prominence as a lecturer and an author as exemplified by the four volumes of prayers published as an official document of the Senate and by your syndicated newspaper column "Spires of the Spirit."

4. Your deeds that brought international recognition such as when President Eisenhower chose you as his special representative at the inauguration of Syngman Rhee in Korea and as when the three leading political parties in Great Britain gave a luncheon in your honor at the House of Commons.

5. "Your significant utterances on freedom" for which you have been accorded the unusual honor of six awards from the Freedoms Foundation of Valley Forge.

6. Your immeasurable contributions and untiring efforts toward furthering the principles upon which our Nation was founded. Your deeds and actions are outstanding examples of the objectives of this society, which is dedicated to the purpose of perpetuating and inspiring the active practice and demonstration of those ideals and principles which influenced and guided the founders of this Republic and upon which the future of our Nation depends.

With this Good Citizenship Medal we bestow upon you our admiration and esteem and through it we express tangibly our regard for the outstanding quality of your citizenship.

EARL M. RICHARDS,
President, Philadelphia-Continental Chapter, Sons of the American Revolution.

REPORTS OF ACQUIRING BY FRENCH GOVERNMENT OF U.S. OBLIGATIONS PAYABLE IN GOLD

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, several days ago I placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an inquiry I had sent to Treasury Secretary Dillon concerning reports that the French Government was acquiring

U.S. obligations for which it could demand payment in gold.

I have now received a reply from Secretary Dillon, and I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the RECORD at this point, together with the article by Charles Coombs, of the New York Federal Reserve Bank, to which Mr. Dillon's letter makes reference.

There being no objection, the letter and article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY,
Washington, D.C., February 26, 1963.

The Honorable WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR WAYNE: In answer to the questions in your letter of February 14, in which you refer to news reports of increasing French holdings of U.S. Government securities and of French efforts to encourage demands on our gold reserves, I am happy to give you the facts.

As a consequence of French balance of payments surpluses in recent years, French reserves have risen to $3,744 million, of which $2,626 million is in gold and $1,118 million in foreign exchange, mostly in dollars. In turn, as is the case with virtually all foreign governmental and central bank holdings of dollars, the French holdings are almost entirely invested in short-term Treasury securities. These U.S. Government obligations give foreign governments both the liquidity they need for their reserves and some earnings in the form of interest.

These French holdings of dollar claims can be converted into gold for legitimate monetary purposes, as can those of other governments and central banks. This readiness of the U.S. Government to back its international obligations with gold, which has long been established policy and has been reaffirmed without qualification by President Kennedy, is the basis for the position of the dollar as the leading reserve currency of the international financial mechanism.

This special position of the dollar has been recognized by the major countries of the free world, and they have shown themselves ready and willing to help maintain the soundness of the gold-exchange system of international payments. France, like the other major countries, has played a full and responsible part in making this system work. Despite rumors and reports, every indication we have had is that the French will continue to do so.

In 1962, it should be noted, the French balance-of-payments surplus was about $1.3 billion. With these funds, France made debt prepayments to the U.S. Government totaling $470 million, converted $460 million into gold, and added $205 million to foreign exchange reserves. The remainder was used largely to prepay outstanding indebtedness to Canada and the World Bank.

At the time of the most recent French debt prepayment to the United States last December, in the amount of about $117 million, I noted our appreciation for that action and stated my view that France was again demonstrating acceptance of its responsibilities as a creditor country and further evidencing the spirit of international financial cooperation among the major nations of the free world which is contributing so much to the strengthening of the free world's international financial system. That statement is equally as valid today.

While the basic problem posed by the accumulation of claims on our gold stock in the hands of foreigners cannot be fully resolved until our balance of payments is freed from the persistent deficits of the past few years, the U.S. Government, in cooperation with the governments and central banks of other nations having convertible currencies, has put into effect a number of arrangements to deal with the effects of short-term flows of capital, any speculative disruptions in the market, or other events that might possibly lead to sudden calls on our gold stock. I believe you will find that these arrangements, which have been discussed in the enclosed article by Mr. Coombs of the New York Federal Reserve Bank, constitute an impressive bulwark to defend the dollar, as well as other currencies.

With best wishes.

Sincerely,

DOUGLAS DILLON.

[From Federal Reserve Bulletin, September 1962]

TREASURY AND FEDERAL RESERVE FOREIGN EXCHANGE OPERATIONS

(NOTE.—This joint interim report reflects the Treasury-Federal Reserve policy of making available additional information on foreign exchange operations from time to time. The Federal Reserve Bank of New York acts as agent for both the Treasury and the Federal Open Market Committee of the Federal Reserve System in the conduct of foreign exchange operations. This report was prepared by Charles A. Coombs, vice president in charge of the foreign department of the New York Reserve Bank. It covers the period March 1961–August 1962.)

The resumption of foreign exchange operations by the U.S. Treasury in March 1961 and by the Federal Reserve System in February 1962 has been part of a cooperative effort by Treasuries and central banks on both sides of the Atlantic to create a first line of defense against disorderly speculation in the foreign exchange markets. Recognizing that the dollar is the cornerstone of the entire international currency system, this cooperative effort has mainly taken the form of arrangements between the United States and other leading industrial countries adapted to the special needs of the countries involved. Continuous, close consultation among all of the Treasuries and central banks concerned has avoided any conflicts of policy or operations within the group as a whole.

BACKGROUND TO OPERATIONS

Under fair weather conditions, speculation can and does play a highly useful role in the foreign exchange market by helping to correct temporary deviations of spot and forward rates from the levels appropriate to underlying payment trends. Thus a decline in the spot or forward rate of one currency resulting from a temporary market imbalance may stimulate new demand for that currency by alert traders expecting a rebound in the rates.

On the other hand, when the exchange markets become seriously unsettled by political or economic uncertainties, normally beneficial speculation may quickly become transformed into a perverse, and sometimes even sinister, force. The latter type of speculation may be motivated, on the one hand, either by a natural desire to protect capital values or, on the other hand, by the prospect of a quick capital gain. In such periods of market anxiety, abrupt declines in the spot or forward rate for a given currency may take on a grossly exaggerated significance, the exchange market may become a prey of purely imaginary fears, and selling or buying pressures on the exchanges may quickly acquire cumulative force. Even minor speculative squalls may have disturbing effects upon the normal flow of trade and payments, while very severe attacks have on occasion forced governments into unwanted changes of currency parities.

Official foreign intervention in markets: Although foreign central banks have for many years intervened in their foreign exchange markets to protect their currencies against speculative disturbances, the United States had refrained from such operations from the end of World War II until early 1961. This difference of approach goes back to the Bretton Woods Agreements. Under the Articles of Agreement of the International Monetary Fund, member countries agreed to establish par values for their currencies in terms of gold or the U.S. dollar and to limit fluctuations in their exchange rates to no more than 1 percent above or below the par value. In many cases, foreign countries have fulfilled their obligation to the International Monetary Fund by purchasing or selling U.S. dollars against their own currencies in order to keeep their exchange rates from rising above the "ceiling" or falling below the "floor." Foreign central banks may also operate in the exchange markets between the margins, and many central banks do so to prevent sharp movements in the rates. As the exchange rate moves upward (or downward) a country may buy (or sell) dollars against its currency to slow the rate movement, or even to halt it completely at some point within the official margins. Such purchases and sales, by ironing out sharp fluctuations in rates, help to maintain orderly conditions in the exchange markets, thereby facilitate the flow of trade and payments and contribute materially to the maintenance of confidence in currencies.

Foreign official intervention on the exchanges is generally conducted through purchases and sale of U.S. dollars, the principal reserve currency. Such exchange intervention results in changes in official holdings of dollars, increasing them when the demand for the foreign currency is strong and reducing them when demand is weak. Most major countries hold only a part of their reserves in dollars—sometimes a very small part; the rest are held mainly in gold. If exchange intervention is undertaken on a large scale, such countries may acquire more dollars than they wish to hold; if so, they will convert their excess dollars into gold. Conversely they may have to sell gold to acquire the dollars necessary for support operations.

Role of dollar convertibility into gold: The willingness of foreign central banks to acquire and hold dollars as part of their reserves depends on the assured convertibility of such dollars into gold at a fixed price. As part of the Bretton Woods system, this assurance is provided by the United States, which undertakes to maintain a fixed par value for the dollar by standing ready to buy or sell gold against dollars at a fixed price of $35 per ounce in whatever amounts may be requested by foreign monetary authorities. This system of defining and maintaining the parity of the dollar in terms of gold, while the parities of other currencies are maintained by buying and selling dollars, has greatly encouraged the development of an international gold exchange standard. Under this system the United States serves as banker for the dollar exchange reserves, now more than $11 billion, of 82 countries throughout the world.

As banker for the international currency system, the role of the United States until recent years has been largely passive. Although foreign central banks resisted declines in their currency rates toward their floors, they had no obligation or incentive to resist similar declines in the dollar against their own currencies. As the dollar came under pressure from time to time in world exchange markets, the dollar rate therefore tended to slip to the floor. At this point foreign central banks would then fulfill their obligation to take the surplus supply of dollars off the market. If they wished, they would then convert part or all of these dollars into gold.

Currency crisis of 1960: This passive stance by the United States, in which both the rates for the dollar against foreign currencies and the accumulation of dollar reserves by foreign central banks were left entirely to market forces, and to the unilateral decisions of foreign monetary authorities, gave rise to no serious problems for many years after the war. By 1960, however, successive U.S. balance-of-payments deficits had brought about both heavy gold losses and sizable increases in our dollar liabilities to foreigners. At this point, the dollar became subject to rumors of impending changes in U.S. international financial policy, with widespread doubts developing abroad as to whether the U.S. Government could and would maintain the $35 price for gold.

The resultant wave of speculation against the dollar was effectively stemmed in early 1961 by a Presidential pledge to maintain the gold price, to make our entire gold reserve available to defend the dollar, and, if necessary, to draw upon the IMF as a supplementary source of reserves. Most fundamental of all, of course, was announcement of action to correct the balance-of-payments deficit, and this program has subsequently shown gradual but solid results.

Effects of revaluation of mark and guilder: Meanwhile, the recovery of confidence in the dollar remained vulnerable to sudden shocks, and these were not long in coming. On the weekend of March 4, 1961, the German Government announced the upward revaluation of the mark by 5 percent. Shortly after that the Netherlands Government announced a similar change in the guilder parity.

However, effective these moves may ultimately prove to be as a contribution to international balance of payments equilibrium, their immediate effect was a shattering blow to market confidence in the system of fixed currency parities. All major currencies immediately became labeled as candidates for either revaluation or devaluation, and an unparalleled flood of speculative funds swept across the exchanges.

Speculation on a revaluation of the Swiss franc became particularly intense, with the result that more than $300 million flowed into that country in 4 days. Most of the dollars acquired by the Swiss National Bank and other continental financial centers were the counterpart of a major speculative attack on sterling, with the Bank of England suffering heavy reserve losses.

At this critical juncture, the central bank governors attending the monthly meeting of the Bank for International Settlements in Basle announced that their central banks were cooperating in the exchange markets. The scale of this cooperation in credits to the Bank of England reached a total of more than $900 million and played a vital role in providing a breathing space during which more fundamental measures could be taken by the British Government.

TREASURY INTERVENTION IN THE MARKET

Although the dollar emerged relatively unscathed from the first speculative attacks, the massive reshuffling of foreign-owned funds resulted in heavy accumulations of dollars by certain foreign central banks, with the possible consequence of sizable drains upon U.S. gold reserves. Anticipations of a second revaluation of the German mark generated a continuing heavy flow of funds to Frankfurt, with the result that the dollar reserves of the German Federal Bank rose to $4.1 billion by March 31 as compared with its gold reserves of $3.2 billion.

Operations in German marks: The disruptive effect of such speculation on the normal flow of German trade and payments was reflected in a scramble by non-Germans with contractual liabilities in marks to anticipate their requirements. Meanwhile German residents sought to hedge against contracts payable to them in dollars or other foreign currencies. The forward exchange market could hardly cope with such an abrupt swing in expectations, with the result that the premium on the forward mark or, viewed the other way, the discount on the forward dollar, rose to nearly 4 percent. At that exaggerated level it tended to reinforce expectations of a further revaluation of the mark.

The limited availability of forward cover, even at such expensive rates, diverted commercial hedging demands into foreign purchases of spot marks to cover future mark contracts and German borrowing of dollars, both in New York and in the Euro-dollar market, as a hedge against dollar receivables. The resultant shift of the leads and lags in commercial payments against the dollar and in favor of the mark created a potentially dangerous situation. This situation became the subject of conversations on Friday, March 10, 1961, among officials of the German Federal Bank, Federal Reserve Bank of New York, and U.S. Treasury. There emerged the decision to undertake on the following Monday, March 13, forward sales of marks in the New York market by the New York Federal Reserve Bank as agent of the U.S. Treasury, with the dual objective of providing an ample supply of forward marks as an alternative to anticipatory purchases of spot marks by foreigners and dollar borrowing by Germans, and in the process, of driving down the forward premium on the mark as closely as possible to the 1 percent level.

These forward sales of marks by the U.S. Treasury were undertaken under a parallel arrangement, generously suggested by the German Federal Bank, which agreed to supply the U.S. Treasury with marks (should they be needed), at the time the contracts matured, at the same rate as that at which the marks had been sold by the U.S. Treasury. In effect, the U.S. Treasury's forward commitments were entirely protected against any risk of loss. Forward operations undertaken under this arrangement were later supplemented by forward sales by the U.S. Treasury on the basis of $100 million equivalent of German marks obtained by the United States under the $587 million German debt repayment in April 1961.

Table 1 illustrates the scope and pattern of the Treasury's forward mark operations. From March 13 to the end of the month, the Treasury forcefully resisted the speculative inflow to Germany by selling over $118 million equivalent of marks for delivery in 3 months. Market demand for forward marks then gradually declined, perhaps partly owing to the reassuring effect of official operations on so sizable a scale. But by mid-June the outstanding forward mark commitments of the U.S. Treasury had risen to $340 million.

TABLE 1.—*Treasury forward operations in German marks, March–December 1961*

[Dollar equivalent, in millions]

Month	Future commitments (beginning of month)	New sales (during month)	Maturing contracts not renewed (during month)	Future commitments (end of month)	Premium on 3-month forward mark (percent per annum, end of month)
March		118.7		118.7	1.47
April	118.7	104.4		223.1	1.59
May	223.1	78.4		301.5	1.39
June	301.5	52.8	−86.5	267.8	2.21
July	267.8	32.9	−98.1	202.6	1.45
August	202.6	12.7	−89.3	126.0	1.02
September	126.0	.3	−76.6	49.7	.88
October	49.7		−35.5	14.2	.76
November	14.2		−14.0	.2	.80
December	.2		−.2		1.04

As the first of the forward contracts began to mature, the tide turned and the spot dollar rate gradually rose off the floor to which it had been pinned for many months. The improvement in the spot dollar rate was attributable in part to a market demand for dollars required to pay the U.S. Treasury for the forward mark purchases previously contracted for. Coordinated intervention by the German Federal Bank and the U.S. Treasury in the spot mark market also helped to strengthen the dollar rate.

With the crisis of confidence more or less weathered, it seemed desirable to allow the forward premium on the mark to rise somewhat, thereby increasing the cost of forward cover and further dampening commercial hedging demand. As a consequence, the Treasury's outstanding balance of the forward mark commitments declined rapidly after mid-June as the daily rate of new sales fell far below maturing contracts. In September, in a market also strongly influenced by the Berlin crisis, forward sales were discontinued entirely as a normal flow of forward marks from private sources reappeared. By early December the Treasury's forward mark commitments had been fully liquidated.

By thus offsetting a large-scale flow of speculative funds that proved to be reversible within 9 months, the U.S. Treasury operations in forward marks clearly helped both the United States and Germany. The short-term capital outflow from the United States was held down, and the U.S. payments deficit thereby reduced, while the German Federal Bank could restrain its dollar accumulations from becoming too large and also prevent the German money market from being flooded with a heavy volume of liquid funds. More generally, the forward mark operation apparently calmed a badly shaken exchange market, which needed time and the assurance of intergovernmental cooperation to recover confidence.

As previously mentioned, the U.S. Treasury had acquired, in April 1961, $100 million in marks as part of a German Government debt payment totaling $587 million. While about half of this mark balance was used to settle forward contracts maturing in the fall of 1961, the remainder was converted into dollars in September to make final payment to the U.S. lending agencies concerned.

The experience with the forward mark operation had proved sufficiently encouraging, however, to suggest that the U.S. Treasury might usefully acquire moderate amounts of spot marks when that currency temporarily weakened late in 1961. These mark acquisitions by the U.S. Treasury reached a total of approximately $55 million equivalent and have been employed in several operations during the first half of 1962 to support the dollar rate during periods of temporary pressure. These operations have not only proved useful in producing the desired firming of the dollar rate but have also proved reversible. Later strengthening of the dollar rate has permitted replenishment of earlier drafts on the Treasury's mark balances.

Operations in Swiss francs: The second major exchange operation initiated by the U.S. Treasury during 1961 was in forward

Swiss francs. The March 1961 revaluations of the German mark and Dutch guilder resulted in a burst of speculation on a similar revaluation of the Swiss franc and a heavy flow of short-term speculative funds to Switzerland. This influx created a serious problem of excessive liquidity on the Swiss money market while also raising the dollar exchange reserves of the Swiss National Bank far above traditional levels.

These dollar acquisitions by the Swiss National Bank could have been converted immediately into gold by purchases from the U.S. Treasury. But in the interests of international financial cooperation, the Swiss National Bank refrained from effecting such conversions in order to loan back to the Bank of England a large proportion of the dollar inflow to Switzerland.

There was in near prospect, however, the likelihood of a massive British Government drawing from the International Monetary Fund which would result in a liquidation of the short-term credits received by the Bank of England from the Swiss National Bank and other European central banks. Accordingly, the Swiss National Bank seemed likely to convert large amounts of surplus dollar holdings into gold unless some means could be found to stimulate an outflow of private funds from Switzerland.

The basic obstacle to such an outflow of private funds from Switzerland came from the lingering fears and hopes of many private individuals that the Swiss franc would somehow or other provide a safer haven than other currencies against a wide range of political, military, and financial risks. But it had become quite clear to both Swiss and U.S. central bank officials that the hot money inflow into Switzerland was disguising a significant deterioration in the basic balance of payments of Switzerland and that, when some recovery of confidence in currency parities reappeared, a cessation of this hot money inflow would result in a strengthening of the dollar against the Swiss franc and in drains on the gold and dollar reserves of the Swiss National Bank. Thus, the piling up of hot money in Swiss commercial banks was essentially a temporary, reversible phenomenon that might properly be dealt with by compensatory action by the two central banks concerned.

After extensive discussions among officials of the U.S. Treasury, the New York Federal Reserve Bank, and the Swiss National Bank, it appeared that a useful start could be made in offsetting such temporary inflows of hot money by providing adequate incentives to the reexport of private investment funds from Switzerland on a hedged, or covered, basis. Partly because of speculative fears or hopes of a revaluation of the Swiss franc, the premium on the forward Swiss franc had risen to roughly 1⅞ percent at which levels it was prohibitively costly to cover short-term placements in New York, London, or other financial markets abroad.

Consequently, in July 1961 the U.S. Treasury agreed to supply through the agency of the Swiss National Bank forward Swiss francs to the market at rates sufficiently attractive to induce the Swiss commercial banks and other short-term investors to move funds into the dollar market. These forward operations were begun in a limited, experimental fashion on the basis of relatively small Swiss franc balances previously acquired by the U.S. Treasury.

With the emergence of the Berlin crisis in August 1961, however, the problem was complicated by a renewed flow of hot money to Switzerland, and the Treasury accordingly enlarged the scope of its forward operations. To provide a broader base for such operations, the Swiss National Bank agreed to provide a sizable line of credit in Swiss francs to the U.S. Treasury which could be drawn upon by issuance of 3-month certificates of indebtedness carrying a rate of 1¼ percent and denominated in Swiss francs. As the Treasury's forward commitments rose rapidly, it availed itself of its drawing rights to the extent of 200 million Swiss francs ($46 million equivalent) in October 1961. By the end of November the Treasury's forward sales had reached $152.5 million equivalent, which meant a roughly corresponding reduction in the dollar reserves of the Swiss National Bank and in Swiss gold purchases from the U.S. Treasury.

During December the Treasury's forward commitments declined somewhat ($15 million of maturing contracts were paid off by the Treasury rather than renewed). This happened largely because Swiss commercial banks wanted to increase their franc assets for yearend window dressing. New contracts of $9 million equivalent were undertaken at the end of January 1962. And in January and February all contracts were rolled over at maturity, so that by the end of February the Treasury's outstanding forward franc market commitments amounted to $146.5 million equivalent.

In February 1962 the Swiss franc began to weaken, as had been expected with Switzerland's large current-account deficit and the tapering off of the short-term capital inflow. In these circumstances, the Swiss National Bank had to supply dollars to the market and, by the end of May, the New York Federal Reserve Bank as agent of the U.S. Treasury had sold $139 million to the Swiss National Bank.

If the U.S. Treasury had elected to meet these dollar requirements of the Swiss National Bank by accepting Swiss francs in payment, the resultant increase in the Treasury's franc balances would have been adequate to liquidate nearly all of the forward Swiss franc market contracts outstanding. But a rapid liquidation of these forward contracts would have tended to recreate too much liquidity on the Swiss money market. Accordingly, the Swiss National Bank suggested that the U.S. Treasury might accept gold rather than Swiss francs in payment of part of the Swiss dollar requirements. Swiss gold sales to the U.S. Treasury amounted to $74 million. The remaining $65 million required by the Swiss were paid for in Swiss francs.

The Swiss franc balances were gradually used to liquidate $55 million of maturing forward contracts, which by the end of May 1961 were less than $91.5 million equivalent outstanding. The $46 million certificates of indebtedness issued to the Swiss National Bank in the autumn of 1961 were also fully liquidated, as the Treasury found its forward position could be sustained on a smaller cash reserve. In effect, the program of forward sales of Swiss francs, initiated by the U.S. Treasury in July 1961, proved to be a self-liquidating operation, as the swing developing in the Swiss payments position would have permitted nearly complete liquidation of the forward operation within a matter of 10 months. And the forward operations helped both the United States and Switzerland by damping U.S. gold losses from speculative money movements while relieving the Swiss market of too much liquidity.

Unfortunately the pendulum began to swing back. During the latter part of May 1962, capital funds again flowed to Switzerland in response to speculation caused by the Canadian devaluation and by the subsequent sharp decline of the New York stock market. But meanwhile, the financial resources and market techniques available to the U.S. Government had been strongly reinforced by the entrance of the Federal Reserve System into the foreign exchange field. As subsequently outlined, a coordinated program involving the U.S. Treasury, the Federal Reserve System, and the Swiss National Bank succeeded in minimizing the impact of potentially dangerous speculative pressures.

Operations in Netherlands guilders: After the revaluation of the Netherlands guilder on March 7, 1961, the premium on the 3-month forward guilder rose to well over 2 percent and remained there until the end of April. The premium encouraged a further inflow of short-term funds into the Netherlands and deterred any covered outflow.

In this context, early in May the United States and Netherlands authorities discussed whether the United States should intervene in the forward guilder market to reduce the guilder premium to levels more consistent with interest rates on dollar and guilder investments. These discussions between the United States and Netherlands authorities produced their first tangible results in July, when the Netherlands Bank, whose dollar reserves were to be depleted by a large British IMF guilder drawing (for conversion into dollars) in August, agreed to sell spot guilders to the United States and to provide for U.S. investment of these guilders in Dutch Treasury bills. It was agreed that it would be useful for the Treasury to acquire modest guilder balances for possible use in exchange operations in the future. Accordingly, the Netherlands Bank sold $15 million equivalent of guilders to the U.S. Treasury during September.

As expectations of another revaluation of the guilder withered away, the forward guilder premium declined to more normal levels. But toward the end of 1961, rumors questioning the stability of exchange parities and the beginning of continental commercial bank repatriations of funds for yearend window-dressing operations induced a renewed rise in both spot and forward guilder rates. By December 20 the premium on the 3-month forward guilder was again over 2 percent (though moving erratically) and was clearly out of line with comparative interest rates.

Although the premium declined somewhat after the turn of the year, the U.S. Treasury concluded that it might usefully test the market by a small offering of forward guilders which might succeed in nudging the rate down to a more normal level. After further negotiations it was agreed that the Netherlands Bank would sell forward guilders in the market for the Treasury's account.

The sales were first made in January 1962 and reached $20.8 million equivalent by early February. As the availability of forward cover stimulated Netherlands investment demand for short-term placements in New York and other financial markets, the spot guilder rate weakened to about par and, in the process, enabled the U.S. Treasury to acquire more spot guilders from the Netherlands Bank against dollars.

The forward operations were terminated on February 13 as the Netherlands money market had become less liquid, and the U.S. Treasury later liquidated each contract at maturity. The remaining guilder balances of the U.S. Treasury were used to intervene occasionally in the market to slow down a strong rise of the guilder spot rate during the spring months as a result of a tightening of liquidity in the Netherlands financial market. Also a sizable foreign exchange inflow was expected as a result of the Philips Lamp stock issue.

Operations in Italian lire: A continuing surplus in Italy's balance of payments has made the Italian lira one of the strongest continental currencies. From mid-April 1961 until the present the lira has usually remained at its upper limit against the dollar.

In these circumstances, in late 1961 discussions began on the possibility of U.S. Treasury operations in the lira market. In January 1962 it was agreed that the Treasury would take over a substantial block of forward lire contracts from the Italian foreign exchange office and that the Bank of Italy would simultaneously extend to the Treasury a $150 million line of credit in lire to support such spot as well as forward operations in lire as might appear desirable.

The Treasury made the first drawing on this line of credit on January 26, 1962, when it issued a 3-month certificate of indebtedness for the equivalent of $25 million in lire. It made a second drawing of $50 million in March, and a third drawing of $75 million in August.

Both spot and forward operations by the U.S. Treasury in lire are continuing and have lessened the accumulation of dollar reserves during the recent seasonal inflows to Italy.

BEGINNING OF FEDERAL RESERVE OPERATIONS

While the exchange operations undertaken by the Treasury with the limited resources of its Stabilization Fund had yielded encouraging results, Federal Reserve officials—with the full concurrence of the Treasury—considered whether it might not also be desirable to reactivate Federal Reserve exchange operations. After many months' study, the Federal Open Market Committee on February 13, 1962, authorized open market transactions in foreign currencies.[1]

Currencies involved: Under this authorization, the special manager of the open market account for foreign currency operations received committee approval to inaugurate operations by purchasing from the stabilization fund at market rates the following foreign currencies in order to open accounts with the central banks responsible for these currencies and develop procedures for future operations (table 2).

TABLE 2.—*Federal Reserve purchases of foreign currencies from the U.S. Treasury*

Currency	Dollar equivalent (in millions)
German marks	32.0
Swiss francs	.5
Netherlands guilders	.5
Italian lire	.5

Accounts had previously been opened, and maintained for some years with more or less nominal balances, with the central banks of Canada, Great Britain, and France.

With the authorization of the Committee, the special manager proceeded to negotiate a series of reciprocal credit, or swap, facilities with seven foreign central banks and with the Bank for International Settlements. The amounts and dates of these swap arrangements are shown in table 3.

TABLE 3.—*Federal Reserve reciprocal currency agreements*

Other party to agreement	Amount (in millions of dollars)	Term (in months)	Date (of original agreement)
			1962
Bank of France	50	3	Mar. 1
Bank of England	50	3	May 31
Netherlands Bank	50	3	June 14
National Bank of Belgium	50	6	June 20
Bank of Canada	250	3	[1]June 26
Bank for International Settlements [2]	100	3	July 16
Swiss National Bank	100	3	July 16
German Federal Bank	50	3	Aug. 2
Total for all banks	700	--------	

[1] Announced on Sunday, June 25.

[2] In Swiss francs.

Mechanics of swap arrangements: The details of the swap arrangements varied somewhat from agreement to agreement, reflecting differing institutional arrangements and operational procedures among the central banks. However, certain general principles ran throughout all of the agreements. They may be summarized as follows:

1. A swap constitutes a reciprocal credit facility under which a central bank agrees to exchange on request its own currency for the currency of the other party up to a maximum amount over a limited period of time, such as 3 months or 6 months.

2. If such a standby swap between the Federal Reserve and the Bank of England, for example, were to be drawn upon by the Federal Reserve, the Federal Reserve would credit the dollar account of the Bank of England with $50 million at a rate of, say, $2.80 to the pound while obtaining in exchange a credit on the books of the Bank of England of about £18 million. Both parties would agree to reverse the transaction on a specified date, say, within 3 months, at the same rate of exchange, thus providing each with forward cover against the remote risk of a devaluation of either currency.

3. The foreign currency obtained by each party as a result of such cross credits to each other's accounts would, unless disbursed in exchange operations, be invested in a time deposit or other investment instrument, earning an identical rate of interest of, say, 2 percent and subject to call on 2 days' notice.

4. After consultation with the other, each party would be free to draw upon the foreign currency acquired under the swap to conduct spot transactions or meet forward exchange obligations.

5. Each swap arrangement is renewable upon agreement of both parties.

Use of swaps: Use of these various swap arrangements has followed a varied pattern. The $250 million swap with the Bank of Canada was immediately drawn upon through a cross-crediting of Canadian and U.S. dollars as part of a Canadian stabilization program. The Canadian Government also received financial assistance from the International Monetary Fund, the Export-Import Bank, and the Bank of England.

In the swaps with the Bank of France, the Bank of England, and the National Bank of Belgium, in amounts of $50 million each, the standby facility was immediately drawn upon by the Federal Reserve in order to test communications, investment procedures, and other operational arrangements. In both the French and British swaps, no occasion has arisen for either party to use the proceeds of the swap in exchange operations. Consequently, after one renewal on June 1, the swap with the Bank of France was liquidated in advance of maturity on August 2 and placed on a standby basis. The swap with the Bank of England, which matured on August 30, was similarly placed on a standby basis.

The swaps of $100 million each with the Swiss National Bank and the Bank for International Settlements were negotiated as standby facilities but with anticipation of an early necessity for their use to mop up a speculative flow of hot money to Switzerland in June and early July of 1962. Similarly, a standby swap with the Netherlands Bank has been actively utilized to mop up temporary flows of funds to the Netherlands. Finally, the $50 million swap with the German Federal Bank was negotiated as a standby facility and no drawings have been effected to date.

Swiss francs: As previously noted, the standby swap arrangements of $100 million each negotiated in mid-July by the Federal Reserve with the Swiss National Bank and the Bank for International Settlements anticipated an early drawing on these swaps to mop up surplus dollars taken in by the Swiss National Bank. Under these swap arrangements, the Federal Reserve drew, during July and August, $60 million of Swiss francs under its swap arrangement with the Bank for International Settlements and $50 million equivalent in Swiss francs under the swap with the Swiss National Bank. The total proceeds of $110 million in Swiss francs were immediately employed to buy back an equivalent amount of dollars on the books of the Swiss National Bank.

During the same period, the U.S. Treasury enlarged somewhat its forward operations in Swiss francs and thereby absorbed an additional amount of dollars held by the Swiss National Bank. As a result of these operations, the dollar holdings of the Swiss National Bank were substantially reduced, and the Bank purchased no more than $50 million of gold from the United States during a period of intense speculation following the June decline in the New York and other stock exchanges.

Federal Reserve drawings under the Swiss franc swaps also indirectly served to absorb excess liquidity on the Swiss money market since the Swiss francs supplied under the swap by the Bank for International Settlements came from deposits of Swiss commercial banks. The Swiss National Bank similarly absorbed Swiss francs from the market by various forward operations involving investments by Swiss commercial banks in U.S. Treasury bills on a covered basis. Subsequently, the speculative fever subsided, the dollar strengthened significantly against the Swiss franc, and the Federal Reserve has already begun to acquire Swiss franc balances in anticipation of an eventual liquidation of the drawing under these two swaps.

Netherlands guilders and Belgian francs: Similarly, a heavy influx of funds into the Netherlands following the stock market declines in June was absorbed by drawings upon the Federal Reserve swap with the Netherlands Bank, combined with a resumption of Treasury forward operations in Dutch guilders. Sizable foreign payments for certain special purposes by the Netherlands have since reduced the dollar holdings of the Netherlands Bank and thereby enabled the Federal Reserve to completely repay drawings under the swap, which has now reverted to a standby facility.

Here again, U.S. Government exchange operations have succeeded in dealing with what proved to be a reversible flow of funds and, as a result, the Netherlands Bank refrained entirely from purchases of gold from the United States during this difficult period. Intervention on a small scale in Belgian francs by drafts upon the swap with the National Bank of Belgium has served a similar purpose, with subsequent repurchases of Belgian francs by the Federal Reserve as the dollar strengthened.

Canadian dollars: The $250 million Federal Reserve swap with the Bank of Canada on June 25, 1962, played an important role in a broad program of international financial cooperation designed to reinforce the Canadian Government's efforts to defend the Canadian dollar. Between January 1 and June 25, about $900 million, or 44 percent of Canada's gold and dollar reserves of $2,056 million were swept away by a mounting balance-of-payments deficit which threatened to force the Canadian dollar off its newly established parity. If this had happened, it would have been an extremely serious setback, not only to Canada but to the entire international financial system of fixed parities, and might easily have touched off a worldwide burst of speculation against other currencies, including the U.S. dollar.

In this atmosphere of emergency, a combined program of $1,050 million was put together within 4 days. This included a $300 million Canadian drawing upon the Fund, a $250 million swap between the Federal Reserve and the Bank of Canada, a $100 million credit to the Bank of Canada from the Bank of England, and a $400 million standby credit to the Canadian Government by the Export-Import Bank. Announcement of financial assistance on this massive scale coupled with a Canadian Government announcement of fiscal and other measures of restraint, immediately broke the speculative wave. Between June 25 and the end of August, Canada recovered more than $500 million of its earlier reserve losses. Once again, the potentialities of central bank and intergovernmental financial cooperation in defending currency parities against essentially reversible flows of speculative funds was demonstrated.

---

[1] The text of the authorization appears in the Appendix, pp. 1150–1153.

The great bulk of the exchange operations undertaken by the Federal Reserve for its own account have involved transactions directly with foreign central banks, rather than in the exchange market. The foreign central banks have continued their policy of active direct participation in the market, and their activity has been supplemented from time to time by appropriate Treasury operations. The Federal Reserve has not thus far undertaken any forward operations in the exchange markets for its own account. Spot operations in support of the dollar in the markets have so far been limited to moderate sales of German marks, sometimes accompanied by similar sales of marks by the Treasury. These transactions have proved fully reversible, with both the Federal Reserve and Treasury subsequently replenishing their mark holdings as the dollar strengthened.

COORDINATION OF TREASURY AND FEDERAL RESERVE EXCHANGE OPERATIONS

Treasury and Federal Reserve exchange operations are continuously coordinated by frequent telephone communications each day between Treasury and Federal Reserve officials concerned with market operations. At 2:30 p.m. each day the foreign exchange trading desk in the Foreign Department of the Federal Reserve Bank of New York provides a full and detailed report over a Treasury and Federal Reserve telephone conference circuit, of exchange rates, market conditions, and operations undertaken during the day by both the Federal Reserve and the Treasury stabilization fund. The very fact that the special manager of the system account is an officer of the Federal Reserve Bank of New York which also conducts exchange operations on behalf of the Treasury eliminates, insofar as is humanly possible, any risk of an inadvertent clash of operations by the two agencies and greatly facilitates the task of insuring a coordination of both Federal Reserve and Treasury operations with the foreign central banks concerned.

With both agencies pursuing identical policy objectives and employing a single instrument of operations, it has proved possible during recent months to carry out an effective meshing of Federal Reserve and Treasury operations in several European currencies.

APPENDIX

AUTHORIZATION REGARDING OPEN MARKET TRANSACTIONS IN FOREIGN CURRENCIES

Pursuant to section 12A of the Federal Reserve Act and in accordance with section 214.5 of regulation N (as amended) of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, the Federal Open Market Committee takes the following action governing open market operations incident to the opening and maintenance by the Federal Reserve Bank of New York (hereafter sometimes referred to as the New York bank) of accounts with foreign central banks.

I. ROLE OF FEDERAL RESERVE BANK OF NEW YORK

The New York bank shall execute all transactions pursuant to this authorization (hereafter sometimes referred to as transactions in foreign currencies) for the System open market account, as defined in the regulation of the Federal Open Market Committee.

II. BASIC PURPOSES OF OPERATIONS

The basic purposes of System operations in and holdings of foreign currencies are:

(1) To help safeguard the value of the dollar in international exchange markets;

(2) To aid in making the existing system of international payments more efficient and in avoiding disorderly conditions in exchange markets;

(3) To further monetary cooperation with central banks of other countries maintaining convertible currencies, with the International Monetary Fund, and with other international payments institutions;

(4) Together with these banks and institutions, to help moderate temporary imbalances in international payments that may adversely affect monetary reserve positions; and

(5) In the long run, to make possible growth in the liquid assets available to international money markets in accordance with the needs of an expanding world economy.

III. SPECIFIC AIMS OF OPERATIONS

Within the basic purposes set forth in section II, the transactions shall be conducted with a view to the following specific aims:

(1) To offset or compensate, when appropriate, the effects on U.S. gold reserves or dollar liabilities of those fluctuations in the international flow of payments to or from the United States that are deemed to reflect temporary disequilibrating forces or transitional market unsettlement;

(2) To temper and smooth out abrupt changes in spot exchange rates and moderate forward premiums and discounts judged to be disequilibrating;

(3) To supplement international exchange arrangements such as those made through the International Monetary Fund; and

(4) In the long run, to provide a means whereby reciprocal holdings of foreign currencies may contribute to meeting needs for international liquidity as required in terms of an expanding world economy.

IV. ARRANGEMENTS WITH FOREIGN CENTRAL BANKS

In making operating arrangements with foreign central banks on System holdings of foreign currencies, the New York bank shall not commit itself to maintain any specific balance, unless authorized by the Federal Open Market Committee.

The bank shall instruct foreign central banks regarding the investment of such holdings in excess of minimum working balances in accordance with section 14(e) of the Federal Reserve Act.

The bank shall consult with foreign central banks on coordination of exchange operations.

Any agreements or understandings concerning the administration of the accounts maintained by the New York bank with the central banks designed by the Board of Governors under section 214.5 of regulation N (as amended) are to be referred for review and approval to the Committee, subject to the provision of section VIII., paragraph 1, below.

V. AUTHORIZED CURRENCIES

The New York bank is authorized to conduct transactions for System account in such currencies and within the limits that the Federal Open Market Committee may from time to time specify.

VI. METHODS OF ACQUIRING AND SELLING FOREIGN CURRENCIES

The New York bank is authorized to purchase and sell foreign currencies in the form of cable transfers through spot or forward transactions on the open market at home and abroad, including transactions with the stabilization fund of the Secretary of the Treasury established by section 10 of the Gold Reserve Act of 1934 and with foreign monetary authorities.

Unless the bank is otherwise authorized, all transactions shall be at prevailing market rates.

VII. PARTICIPATION OF FEDERAL RESERVE BANKS

All Federal Reserve banks shall participate in the foreign currency operations for System account in accordance with paragraph 3G(1) of the Board of Governors' statement of procedure with respect to foreign relationships of Federal Reserve banks dated January 1, 1944.

VIII. ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEDURES

The Federal Open Market Committee authorizes a subcommittee consisting of the Chairman and the Vice Chairman of the Committee and the Vice Chairman of the Board of Governors (or in the absence of the Chairman or of the Vice Chairman of the Board of Governors the members of the Board designated by the Chairman as alternates, and in the absence of the Vice Chairman of the Committee his alternate) to give instructions to the special manager, within the guidelines issued by the Committee, in cases in which it is necessary to reach a decision on operations before the Committee can be consulted.

All actions authorized under the preceding paragraph shall be promptly reported to the Committee.

The Committee authorizes the Chairman, and in his absence the Vice Chairman of the Committee, and in the absence of both, the Vice Chairman of the Board of Governors:

(1) With the approval of the Committee, to enter into any needed agreement or understanding with the Secretary of the Treasury about the division of responsibility for foreign currency operations between the System and the Secretary;

(2) To keep the Secretary of the Treasury fully advised concerning System foreign currency operations, and to consult with the Secretary on such policy matters as may relate to the Secretary's responsibilities;

(3) From time to time, to transmit appropriate reports and information to the National Advisory Council on International Monetary and Financial Problems.

IX. SPECIAL MANAGER OF SYSTEM OPEN MARKET ACCOUNT

A special manager of the open market account for foreign currency operations shall be selected in accordance with the established procedures of the Federal Open Market Committee for the selection of the manager of the System open market account.

The special manager shall direct that all transactions in foreign currencies and the amounts of all holdings in each authorized foreign currency be reported daily to designated staff officials of the Committee, and shall regularly consult with the designated staff officials of the Committee on current tendencies in the flow of international payments and on current developments in foreign exchange markets.

The special manager and the designated staff officials of the Committee shall arrange for the prompt transmittal to the Committee of all statistical and other information relating to the transactions in and the amounts of holdings of foreign currencies for review by the Committee as to conformity with its instructions.

The special manager shall include in his reports to the Committee a statement of bank balances and investments payable in foreign currencies, a statement of net profit or loss on transactions to date, and a summary of outstanding unmatured contracts in foreign currencies.

X. TRANSMITTAL OF INFORMATION TO TREASURY DEPARTMENT

The staff officials of the Federal Open Market Committee shall transmit all pertinent information on System foreign currency transactions to designated officials of the Treasury Department.

XI. AMENDMENT OF AUTHORIZATION

The Federal Open Market Committee may at any time amend or rescind this authorization.

MEDICAL COVERAGE FOR THE AGED—RESOLUTION OF WASHINGTON COUNTY POMONA GRANGE

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a resolution adopted by the Washington County Pomona Grange of my State on the subject "Medical Coverage for the Aged."

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MEDICAL COVERAGE FOR THE AGED

Whereas the problem of medical care for the aged is becoming more and more serious to the aged and to society as a whole; and

Whereas nearly all public opinion polls show that the public generally favors broadening the social security program to include medical care for the aged within the social security program: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Washington County Pomona Grange No. 2 reiterate and strengthen its support for a prepaid medical coverage program to be included in the social security program.

Approved by Washington County Pomona Grange No. 2 in regular session this 23d day of January 1963.

HENRY HENRICKSON,
Master, Washington County Pomona.
KATHLEEN SIMMONS,
Secretary, Washington County Pomona.

WANTED: A BUSINESS ALLIANCE FOR PROGRESS—ADDRESS BY PETER R. NEHEMKIS, JR.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD an address by Peter R. Nehemkis, Jr., of the Whirlpool Corp., on the subject "Wanted: A Business Alliance for Progress."

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WANTED: A BUSINESS ALLIANCE FOR PROGRESS

(Address by Peter R. Nehemkis, Jr., Whirlpool Corp., before the 13th Annual Conference on the Caribbean, School of Inter-American Studies, University of Florida, December 7, 1962)

Dean Page, Professor Wilgus, distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen, turning points in history are usually marked by the professional historian long after the event. This 13th Conference on the Caribbean meets when the pages of history are still wet with printer's ink.

The School of Inter-American Studies is to be congratulated for having selected Venezuela as the focus of attention for this annual meeting of distinguished scholars, government officials, and men of business. Venezuela is a microcosm for all of the burning issues of Latin America. But it is something more. Venezuela is the beacon light of hope for democracy in Latin America. If the lights go out in Venezuela, one of the richest prizes in the Western Hemisphere will have been won by the Castristas.

Tonight, our dialog concerns a crisis in the confidence of capitalism in Latin America. In the Western Hemisphere all roads once led to Havana. We, too, begin at Havana.

U.S. private investment in Latin America has been one of the major casualties of the Cuban revolution. With no more formality than a TV harangue, Dr. Castro successfully wiped out $1 billion of American investments in the Pearl of the Antilles. Expropriation hangs like a sword of Damocles over the remaining $8 billion of U.S. investment scattered throughout the southern continent.

The meaning of Dr. Castro's deepening shadow is apparent from these simple figures. In 1957, the flow of U.S. direct investment to Latin America was over $1.5 billion. In the second quarter of 1962, it was precisely zero. Not only has investment in Latin America been arrested, but some companies are bringing their capital home. What this implies, in a word, is that U.S. business has lost confidence in Latin America.

The cessation in U.S. investment means that Secretary of the Treasury Dillon is shy some 30 percent of his $1 billion Punta del Este commitment. Of this amount, $300 million was to be provided through U.S. private investment. Now if only a shortage of $300 million were involved, this would be small change to the U.S. Government. Belatedly, however, the Washington policymakers have come to the realization that, without a continued flow of new U.S. private capital, the Alliance for Progress is a stick of dynamite without a percussion cap.

Some in the business community believe the loss of confidence in Latin America results largely from shrinking profit margins. Superficially, the statistics appear to support this contention. In 1960, the average return on investments in Latin America (after U.S. taxes on remittances) was 9.2 percent—just about the same average return as the 9.1 percent from the United States. In short, by staying home, without incurring any risks or losses from currency devaluation, you could, statistically speaking, do just as well as in Latin America. On the other hand, the after-tax return from investments in the European Common Market was almost 14 percent. The more than $7½ billion of U.S. direct investment which had moved into West Europe by the end of 1961 is clear evidence of the magnetic attraction of the European Common Market.

These statistics, however, tell only part of the story; perhaps not even the most significant part at that. It is Latin America's political instability—more than any other element in the investment equation—which has sapped investment confidence.

Political instability in Latin America is endemic. Oue hundred and fifty years after the breakup of the Spanish and Portuguese empires representative government is still an elusive aspiration. Democratic constitutional trappings and parliamentary edifices are largely theatrical stage props, "Potemkin Villages." Latin America has a three-beat political rhythm: dictatorship, revolution, dictatorship. In the service of truth let it also be said that, if democracy is conspicuous by its absence in Latin America, the Colossus of the North is not without some blame. U.S. history of support for the status quo has scarcely been consistent with the democratic cause.

Contemporary events in South America's major countries are profiles of political instability. Since the resignation of Jânio Quadros from the Presidency there has been for all practical purposes no functioning government in Brazil. One of Brazil's best-known economists, Dr. Celso Furtado, characterizes Brazil as in a prerevolutionary state. If and when the Northeast explodes, Cuba will seem like a firecracker.

In Argentina, the seizure of power by the military under a thinly disguised civilian regime completed the economic and political bankruptcy of the nation begun by Perón. A civil war between clashing generals was narrowly averted. Like Banquo's ghost the Peronistas continue to haunt the stage. Nor has the end of this unhappy chapter been reached.

The military coup in Peru ripped the props from under the Alliance for Progress. The junta functions in a political vacuum; provides a surface calm; and allows business as usual to flourish.

Venezuela is Dr. Castro's primary target. After his abject humiliation at the hands of the Russians, Dr. Castro must destroy Betancourt in order to redeem himself as Latin America's No. 1 revolutionary. If by its disruptive tactics the extreme left can succeed in creating a situation of anarchy which will force the Venezuelan military to take over, the Communists are poised in the wings prepared to take eventual control.

Still in prospect elsewhere on the continent are additional golpes de estado to preserve the status quo by politicians who wear the uniform of generals. Or Nasser-like seizures of power by younger officers who want social reforms under a directed democracy.

In the coming election in Chile for the first time in the Western Hemisphere we may witness a democratically elected President who represents the Marxist alternative.

From the Rio Grande to the Tierra del Fuego where Argentina like a pointing finger reaches into the Atlantic waters rushing to join the Pacific, the continent is wracked by political violence, if not outright anarchy.

In one of the great tragic dramas of our time an entire continent is hemorrhaging from its internal economic and political wounds. For at least another generation, Latin America is bound to undergo a vast convulsion.

This is the context in which U.S. investments will have to be made, if they are made at all.

Since many American companies have managed to get along for a good number of years in this environment of political turbulence, Why at this late date, it may be asked, are they beginning to close up shop? Companies with long experience in Latin America are not leaving. A United Fruit in Central America or an Anaconda Copper in Chile might wish that it could take its cash and come home. But they can't. For all practical purposes they are frozen into their investments. Others have no intention of departing. Who is pulling out? Mainly the newcomers to Latin America.

Paradoxically, investors from other countries do not appear to share the adverse reaction of U.S. capital to Latin America. Japanese businessmen are swarming over the hemisphere in search of deals. The West German Krupp empire finds Brazil's chaos and Argentina's political and economic bankruptcy promising soil for the future. Swedish, Italian, and French firms continue to probe for profitable investment opportunities.

The explanation for this continuing interest as against the American withdrawal lies, I suspect, in an emotional predisposition toward Latin America, and in long experience with foreign investments. Neither political instability nor the absence of certainty seems to worry the non-American entrepreneur. Moreover, he appears to have a greater capacity for environmental adaptation. In a word, the non-American investor has the knack of being able to live in the mouth of an active volcano.

Practical and dramatic solutions to the current crisis in capital require joint action by U.S. business and the U.S. Government. It cannot be solved by Government or business acting alone. Our inability to resolve this painful dilemma paralyzes effective action.

In part, the difficulty in reaching a rapport with the governmental administration is of our own doing—or, more precisely, our lack of doing. How often and when has the story been told of what U.S. business really looks like in Latin America?

Whatever may have been its historic shortcomings, U.S. business now in Latin America is not exploitive leech, the insensitive tool of Yankee imperialism, which the Castro-Communist propaganda would have the Latin American masses believe.

With its powerful thrust for expanding consumer markets, U.S. business now in Latin America is, in its own right, a revolutionary force. U.S. business is, in fact, the salesman for the revolution of rising demands. The hot dreams in the heads of Latin America's urban slum dwellers and middle groups are not stimulated by Karl Marx' "Das Kapital," but by the shop windows bulging with refrigerators, ranges, TV and radio sets. Indeed, American business makes Khrushchev look like a piker. History will record as one of the consummate ironies of our time that the grave digger of the feudal societies was the American business presence in Latin America.

Nevertheless, myths die hard. The image of a buccaneering, greedy, socially atrophied American business lingers on. In numerous layers of Washington officialdom there is little or no knowledge of the socially constructive and creative role being played by many U.S. companies in Latin America—Creole Petroleum Co.; Sears, Roebuck & Co.; Kaiser Industries; Deltec Corp.; International Basic Economy Corp., to mention but a few. Scarcely a handful of the Members of Congress have any knowledge of what a score of U.S. companies have accomplished to identify themselves genuinely with the aspirations of the people of Latin America—for instance: The Chase Manhattan Bank with its development of a cattle industry in Panama; or the Whirlpool Corporation, through its sponsorship of a Technical Institute at Medellín, Colombia, for the training of high school graduates in the disciplines of middle management.

There is no patent medicine which is guaranteed overnight to bring the business and governmental communities into an effective, working relationship. If joint action is not feasible, why can't that sector of the business community, which is concerned over the plight of Latin America, act on its own? Why not business Alianza para el Progreso?

If American business is prepared to "roll its own" Alliance, there must be cleared away some of the underbrush which contributes to misunderstanding. As a first step, we should jettison the notion that there are no profits to be made in Latin America. There are, and will continue to be, profitable business opportunities in a number of Latin American countries. For it must be remembered that the fallacy of the statistical average lies in its concealment of the profitable individual investment.

American business can take advantage of these profitable opportunities if it will forgo the will-o'-the-wisp pursuit of political stability as a condition to doing business. Political stability presupposes a static society. Latin America is a volatile, diverse, and changing society. It is a society powered by three revolutions all moving at the same time: an industrial revolution; an agrarian revolution; and a social revolution. In Latin America, the 20th century is in headlong collision with the 13th.

As a second step, we might tear a page out of the book of our international competitors. How do they do it? The answer is: An ability to adapt. Actually, in adapting to a revolutionary environment little more is required from U.S. business than that it do those things in Latin America which are accepted as a matter of course here at home: support of education; training of nationals for responsible supervisory and managerial positions; sharing of profits; bona fide collective bargaining; opening up stockownership to the people of the country. In short, to do those things which encourage a better standard of living and a better distribution of income, if for no other reason than the inability to sell to a poorhouse. We should be willing to share the benefits of our own enlightenment not through motives of paternalism, but for the same reasons which prevail here at home: it makes good sense.

As a third step, the upper reaches of management in the United States must recognize that effective environmental adaptation requires some changes in mental attitudes on the part of some of the local managers in Latin America. Honorary membership in the Jockey Club ought not to transform an ordinarily decent American, with all of the instincts for democracy, into a Spanish grandee. Nor does it seem necessary in the exchange of the social amenities for the good American to adopt the obsolete social and political philosophies of the oligarchy.

Latin America—as does the United States—has a mixed, private, and governmental economy, only more of it. Latin America intends to keep it that way. Latin Americans do not look with favor on the U.S. business representative who seeks to impose on his operation in Latin America a doctrinaire brand of U.S. capitalism which has long ceased to exist in the United States except as a myth invoked at the annual trade association banquets. While Adam Smith may be a saint before whom North American businessmen sentimentally genuflect, it is downright silly to attempt to include him in the already heavy roster of Latin America's celestial hierarchy.

At a time when the winds of nationalism are reaching gale proportions in some parts of Latin America, U.S. business needs a strong anchor to the windward. The wholly-owned subsidiary does not provide the requisite security. Probably no other aspect of U.S. business is more irritating to the scab of nationalism than the totality of control of the wholly-owned subsidiary. Nor is the irritant confined solely to Latin America's intellectuals and bureaucracy: it is shared by Latin America's businessmen. What Latin Americans resent—and not without justification—is the U.S. manager who can't make decisions without first obtaining the approval of his home office. From any point of view this bespeaks a boy sent to do a man's job. From the peculiarly Latin American view it smacks of economic colonialism.

In passing, it might be noted that this is not an idiosyncrasy of Latin Americans. The Canadians have expressed their version of "Yanqui-go-home" by their sensitivity to Canadian subsidiaries of American firms. Among the European Common Market countries the French, for instance, take exception to the wholly owned U.S. company. Both the French governmental administration and the French business community believe that basic economic decisions laid down, say, in New York or Detroit may be inimical to the national investment objectives attained through joint government-industry planning.

In short, effective environmental adaptation requires that U.S. business become a Colombian, an Argentinian, a Brazilian company instead of being a foreign appendage of its American parent.

The key to successful environmental adaptation is the instinct for what makes other people tick. One of the truly great illusions of the American mind is the assumption that other people—meaning the natives—will react to our policies in the same way as we would react, if we stood in their bare feet. We might spare ourselves a good deal of frustration if we first took a look at the feet and then shaped our policies accordingly.

Successful adaptation necessitates abandonment of the American compulsion to play missionary to the world. It is a delusion to believe that there is a magic pill which will convert Latin America's shockingly mismanaged societies into neat replicas of the United States of America. Or that the inherited Spanish passion for individualism and the dispersive nature of the Spanish character (unique in the Western World) can be transformed into the American obsession for collective action. Or that there will soon be a change in the fatal Spanish characteristic of producing the perfect blueprint which is never put into operation. Latin Americans sometimes mock themselves with an old Spanish proverb (which, incidentally, illuminates why the Alliance for Progress has experienced difficulty in getting off the ground). It goes: Se obedece pero no se cumple. We obey but we do not fulfill.

If U.S. business can stand a bit of mental house cleaning so, too, can Latin American business. If I am critical of Latin America's capitalists, it is, however, in the spirit of a friend who asks his colleagues to look again at the hands of the clock: they are now perilously close to midnight. Time is running out for all of us—the Alliance for Progress; Latin America's business elite; our own business leadership.

The trouble with the Latin American capitalist is that he is a hundred years behind the times. Too many Latin American capitalists retain the mental baggage of an itinerant peddler: buy and sell quickly; always have your luggage packed for a fast getaway. He looks upon investment as a treasure to be plundered instead of an expectation to be nurtured. He has yet to recognize that the return on an investment must be reasonable; that profits must be plowed back into the business and not siphoned off for safekeeping abroad. If it is to be employed usefully, capital can't be put into idle land because ownership of land is a status symbol or a hedge against inflation. He has yet to understand that payment of taxes to the state is not a form of feudal tribute—tributo and tributario, it might be recalled, are the Spanish equivalent for taxes and taxpayer. As a footnote, I should add that, throughout Latin America the very idea of handing over tax moneys to government functionaries who would steal it, is a grim jest, peculiar to the Yankee sense of humor.

The Latin American capitalist is not sufficiently aware that the real security base of capitalism rests on the people's identification with and confidence in the capitalist system. Identification results from jobs, good wages. But this is not enough. More important is the feeling of confidence. Confidence exists when the workers themselves believe that the patrón—their own boss—is himself associated with social progress.

There is no future for Latin American capitalism if, in the eyes of the people, it is linked with a closed, feudal, aristocratic society.

If Latin American capitalism is to be accepted, if it is to prosper, if it is to play a creative role in the development of the hemisphere, it must become the champion of an expanding and egalitarian society.

It would be a gross distortion of reality—a caricature—if the impression were left that all Latin American capitalists were part of a feudal backwash. Eugenio Mendozo and Gustavo Vollmer in Venezuela; the Klabin and Byington families in Brazil; Luis Echavarria in Colombia; Eugenio Heiremans in Chile; Francisco de Solo in El Salvador—these businessmen with others like themselves throughout the continent are members of that select company of men who are part of the mainstream of a 20th century capitalism.

One thing which the existing crisis in capital should make abundantly clear is that there is no holy writ which says U.S. capital must go to Latin America. The plain truth of the matter is that U.S. investment capital doesn't need Latin America.

The American economy still exerts the first claim on the competitive demands for the investment dollar. Most American companies are more deeply committed to supplying capital funds for product development and improvement, or in being associated with the glamour of a shot to the moon, than with the discovery of investment opportunities in Latin America.

Lenin's celebrated dictum—now a universal article of Communist faith—that finance-capital must invest in the underdeveloped lands because it has no other place to go simply doesn't hold water. The European Common Market—as was previously noted—has attracted almost as much new U.S. investment since the midfifties as our entire existing investment in Latin America. Today, to paraphrase from the "Communist Manifesto," a specter is haunting communism—the specter of the European Common Market.

If Latin America really wants American private capital, its own private capital has to stand up and be counted. It is immoral for Latin America's businessmen to expect U.S. business to assume the risks which they themselves are unwilling to take.

Latin America is not as capital poor as it would have us believe. There is now probably as much or more private Latin American capital squirreled away in New York, Paris, London, and Zurich as the Alliance for Progress proposes to export over the entire decade. Until this refugee capital is repatriated, we are just whistling in our teeth about a decade of development in Latin America.

In some major Latin American countries expatriated private capital may have exceeded the total amount of U.S. foreign aid. Nor can this vacuum conceivably be filled by foreign aid when it is recalled that many of the Latin American countries have sustained losses from the decline in commodity prices which are two to three times as great as the amounts supplied through public moneys from the United States.

In recent months, some prominent U.S. and Latin American leaders have sought to dismiss the problem of flight capital or have defended its incidence. Dr. Felipe Herrera, president of the Inter-American Development Bank, believes that focusing attention on fugitive capital "harms the standing of the hemisphere abroad."

Do Latin America's leaders believe that it is politically realistic for the President of the United States to continue to ask his fellow citizens to help Latin America when Latin Americans themselves have so little confidence in their own countries?

Do Latin America's leaders believe that it is politically realistic to expect the Congress to continue to appropriate tax moneys for the benefit of Latin America when Latin Americans act like strangers in their own lands?

The vast majority of the American people are weary with the whole business of foreign aid. Nevertheless, Latin America holds a unique place in their affections. The American people will support their government's efforts to assist Latin America with greater generosity than for any of the other poor lands of the world.

One guaranteed way by which to make Americans indifferent to Latin America's fate is for Latin America's leaders to tell us that the migration of capital is a mere peccadillo which we ought not to take seriously.

Private capitalism as a competing system with the state capitalism of the Soviet Union (for that is essentially what Soviet communism is) can't take itself for granted, least of all in a transitional society. In Latin America, especially, private capitalism has to justify itself, for it is on trial. It has to provide tangible evidence that it can produce more at lower prices and that its cumulative impact is good for the country and for the people.

Ask any baker's dozen of ordinary Latin Americans whom you might encounter on the streets of Mexico City, Lima, São Paulo, Buenos Aires, or any of the other urban conglomerations in Latin America, what they think of the capitalist system in their country. The answer will be a loud and resounding Bronx raspberry. The reason is not hard to find: Latin American capitalism simply hasn't delivered for the masses. And the propaganda of the extreme left never lets up in driving home this fact.

A classic illustration of the point is the Mexican industrialization. A mixed bag of public and private investment, it has by all odds been spectacular. Between 1945 and 1957, Mexico doubled its gross national product. No other Latin American country during the same period was able to achieve that record. In this same period per capita production increased 44 percent. In the United States it was 6.5 percent.

Yet with this remarkable rate of growth the Mexican people are not any better off than they were 15 years ago. A report of the U.S. Department of Commerce states: "There appears to have been a considerable increase in the real per capita income since 1939. However, most of the increase was in the form of commercial and industrial profits, and large sectors of the population apparently derived little if any benefit from the enlarged national product."

The Mexican economist, Manuel Germán Parra, finds a greater inequality in the distribution of income in 1955 than in 1940. He comments that, ironically after 45 years of struggle for social justice by the Mexican Revolution, the distribution of income in Mexico is so lopsided as to make the most conservative British or U.S. capitalist blush.

In the Mexico of Don Adolfo López Mateos is a far cry from the Mexico of Don Porfirio Díaz (when it was "the mother of foreigners and the stepmother of Mexicans"), there is, nevertheless, a deadly parallel. Don Porfirio's cientificos (that brilliant group of young lawyers and economists who worshipped at the shrine of Progress and ruled as benevolent despots) have been replaced after 20 years of industrialization by revolucionarios adinerados—rich revolutionaries—who have siphoned off the lion's share of the increase in national income. Qué revolucíon. Qué adelanto. Some revolution. Some progress.

Since that fateful evening in late October when President Kennedy informed the world of America's determination to counter the Soviet missile thrust into the Western Hemisphere, there has been discernible in Latin America a new climate, a different ambiente.

American diplomacy had exerted itself—decisively and massively. Latin America was eager to follow—and it did. Overnight, as it were, the turgid atmosphere full of recriminations and bickerings, which had hung over the continent, has been replaced by a clear sky.

Dr. Castro is discredited as a social revolutionary. Today, he is revealed as a paranoiac incendiary—an exporter of terror and destruction. His erstwhile admirers are disenchanted by the confirmation of Cuba's status as a Soviet lackey. After almost $1 billion in economic aid from the Soviet bloc, Cuba is a failure as a Communist showcase.

New opportunities beckon for American diplomacy and for American business. May not this be the beginning of a new dawn for U.S. investments in Latin America? May not this be the decisive hour for U.S. business leadership to lead? Are not the tides right for the launching of a Business Alliance for Progress?

The embryonic Central American Common Market offers an unparalleled opportunity for U.S. business leadership to make a spectacular contribution to modernization. It can do this by organizing a series of mixed private and governmental ventures to supply capital and consumer goods for a potentially viable regional economy. West European, Canadian, United States, Japanese, and Central American capital (both private and governmental) could be mobilized.

Perhaps the most significant and far-reaching contribution—for both the immediate Common Market undertaking and for the future of U.S. investments throughout Latin America—would be for the coventurers to propose to and negotiate with the Central American Common Market Authority a charter of the rights, duties, and obligations of the investors and of the respective governments.

The charter could spell out, among other things, that this international consortium did not intend to preserve its investment over the indefinite future; and that its financial stake could be bought out by local investors or governmental bodies. It could be made crystal clear that the whole sweep of the idea was to light the fuse, to help detonate an explosion of economic growth—and then get out.

What is good for the Central American Common Market can also be good for the larger Latin American Free Trade Association (LAFTA). Latin America's best hope for economic progress lies in the early development of these two regional markets.

In a world divided into enormous trading blocs, unless Latin America's fragmented economies are regionally integrated, they are doomed to permanent stagnation.

It cannot be emphasized too often that for its own psychological sake and for its own political future, Latin America must think and act as a continent. A century and a half of Balkanization is enough.

Latin America's forced-draft industrialization has of necessity created artificial, hothouse industries. They are sustained by their ability to exact high prices for their products. Their underpinning depends upon protective tariffs and other import restrictions.

Regional integration now offers the unique opportunity for industrial rationalization.

Regional integration can provide the elbowroom for North American, European, and Japanese technology, distribution, and consumer financing to accelerate economic growth. This can be accomplished initially by reorganizing and consolidating those existing enterprises whose technology is largely obsolete, whose materials handling is costly and wasteful, and whose business efficiency leaves much to be desired.

The experience of the United States common market and the emergent European Common Market is that the small unit cannot compete effectively. Big consumer markets require big businesses with strong engineering, manufacturing, and financial resources.

The sweep of history may bypass LAFTA if it fritters away a decade on conventional tariff jockeying to the neglect of regional consolidation and merger of industries; and if it fails to supply imaginatively conceived regional mechanisms to support economic integration.

I venture to suggest that there may never again be present a more propitious moment for the LAFTA countries to reevaluate whether its regional structure may not be too unwieldy. And whether initially a more simplified series of regional groupings would not be more manageable for trade and political administration.

Latin America is at an historic moment of truth: unless its governing and business elite heeds Macauley's injunction to reform if you would preserve, they might just as well sign their own death warrants. For, comes the revolution, there will be precious few of this class who will hold a safe-conduct pass.

A democratic capitalism, which is part of the mainstream of the 20th century, can strike a lethal blow at Latin America's real enemy: the people's lack of hope and the bitter despair which consumes their hearts.

A 20th century democratic capitalism can offer to the people of Latin America something much better than the Marxist alternative: a stake in the future under freedom.

Which will it be?

If a revitalized Alliance for Progress and the hemisphere's enlightened business leaders will now act with reassuring swiftness, it could be the beginning of a new era in the New World.

AMERICAN COUNCIL ON EDUCATION—HIGHER EDUCATION AS A NATIONAL RESOURCE

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, Dr. Logan Wilson, president of the American Council on Education, has recently brought to my attention the publication of that organization entitled "Higher Education as a National Resource."

The American Council on Education, which was founded in 1918, is a council of educational organizations and institutions whose purpose is to advance education and educational methods through comprehensive voluntary and cooperative action on the part of American educational associations, organizations, and institutions. The officials and directors of the organizations are drawn from our great higher education institutions, both private and public, from every section of the country. As an Oregonian I am particularly proud of the fact that Dr. Richard H. Sullivan, president of Reed College in Portland, Oreg., serves as a member of the board of directors.

The American Council on Education has in the past given most valuable advice and counsel to the Education Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare concerning its various proposals, particularly those relating to higher education which have been brought before the subcommittee.

In the weeks ahead, as we consider the National Education Improvement Act of 1963 (S. 580), I know I speak for the members of my subcommittee when I say that we shall welcome the testimony of this great educational organization.

Although as I have indicated, the American Council on Education is primarily concerned with the problems of higher education, I was most pleased to find contained in its recommendations one paragraph which states:

> The council recognizes the need also to strengthen elementary and secondary education and believes that the Federal Government has significant responsibilities on those levels. The American Council on Education, however, represents higher education. Our proposals are concerned accordingly with the need to strengthen colleges and universities.

It would be helpful, in my judgment, for Senators to have readily available the recommendations of the American Council on Education, and for that reason I ask unanimous consent that the brief statement to which I have referred be printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HIGHER EDUCATION AS A NATIONAL RESOURCE

American higher education is a priceless asset fundamental to the national purpose. It cannot be spoken of simply in terms of the value of buildings and equipment, the total number of persons served, the teachers involved, or the research performed. The Nation's colleges and junior colleges, universities, research institutes, and professional schools are all of these things, but something more. Broadly conceived, higher education constitutes a precious national resource essential to the achievement of great national goals and to the achievement of worthy aspirations of individual citizens. It is a resource also in the sense that, given favorable conditions, it is as capable of self-renewal as is a properly conserved forest.

As students, young men and women look to colleges and universities to help them fulfill their aspirations. Parents look to these institutions to help them realize the ambitions they have for their children. More significantly, the American people look to colleges and universities for a continuing supply of increasingly capable citizens. They expect institutions of higher education—especially universities and their associated professional schools—to explore new fields of knowledge and to apply this knowledge to the problems of business and industry, human development, and government.

Nor is it the American people alone who place a high value on their institutions of higher education. The governments and peoples of emerging nations are turning more and more for advice and assistance to our colleges and universities. There can be little doubt that American higher education must help meet the expectations not just of the Nation, but of the world as well.

Like any other resource, colleges and universities must be used wisely lest they be exploited and their values diminished. Thus far, American higher education has served without substantial impairment of its teaching and research functions. But as we approach the 1970's, it is quite clear that colleges and universities will be subject to pressures that could weaken their usefulness as national resources. To prevent such a possibility, and to develop further higher education's strength as a resource for the future, action must be taken now. Appropriate action involves individual citizens and private philanthropy, but it also involves local, State, and National governments.

The heaviest pressure on our colleges and universities—and one certain to increase—is the steadily rising number of persons who want to enter college. Not only are there vastly more individuals in the college-age group, but also more of them find it necessary and desirable to get a higher education.

Opening enrollment for the current academic year (4,175,000 in fall of 1962) shows a 17-percent increase over 1960, the start of the present decade. By 1965, it is estimated that the figure will have increased 46 percent over 1960. An opening enrollment of almost 7 million is projected for 1970—an increase of 94 percent over 1960.[1] To meet this situation, institutions of higher education, even with the most effective use of the staff and plant they now have, must enlarge their faculties and expand classroom and student housing facilities.

In addition, though more difficult to measure, the pressure of new knowledge on colleges and universities requires new and expensive research facilities and equipment. Our Nation cannot afford to let its institutions fall behind in the search for new and better knowledge. To move ahead, we must expand and strengthen graduate education, including postdoctoral study, for the purpose of advancing knowledge of all kinds as well as for advancing learning on all levels. Throughout our educational system, in brief, we shall have to do a bigger and a better job. Achieving this objective will be costly; falling short of it will be even costlier.

The American Council on Education believes that the problems confronting higher education transcend State and local concerns, and thus have become an urgent national concern. We believe that, to maintain and develop higher education as a national resource, the Federal Government must supplement other sources of support. The Federal Government should do this, not to aid higher education, but to meet a national obligation to conserve and strengthen a national resource.

The council therefore proposes a broad program of Federal action to help expand and improve American higher education.

Although American higher education is unified in purpose, it is varied in its forms. We can think of it as a single entity when visualizing the impact of enrollment increases and sensing the obligation this places upon colleges and universities. But this concept of unity blurs the variety and complexity which must be considered in formulating a viable program. Such a program should meet the needs of institutions ranging in complexity from small colleges to large universities comprising many divisions and professional schools, in size from a few hundred students to many thousands, and in control from private to public.

The council believes it is well within the capacity of the American people, acting through their elected Representatives in Congress and in response to leadership from the President, to implement a program of adequate support for higher education as a national resource.

This assertion, we are aware, proposes the use of Federal funds for private institutions as an integral part of the American system of higher education. This is nothing new, however, in either principle or practice. Historically, the Congress and the Federal Government have drawn no line of demarcation between public and private institutions of higher education when utilizing them in the national interest. The Federal Government has repeatedly called upon both public and private institutions to perform research and to serve as training centers for military officers. The Federal Government has provided grants to both public and private institutions for construction of research facilities. The Federal Government has granted funds to both public and private institutions for graduate education under the National Defense Education Act. In these and other ways, ample precedent exists for a program designed to develop both public and private institutions of higher education as a vital national resource.

For more than a 100 years the United States has supported and taken pride in a dual system of higher education which affords our youth the freedom to choose how and where they are to pursue their advanced learning. The American Council on Education believes in the soundness of this educational tradition and urges the American people, through their Federal Government, to support and develop it to meet the Nation's growing needs.

---

[1] The conservative estimates of the U.S. Office of Education reflect the general increase in population aged 18–21, and assume that the present ratio of 38 college students per hundred in the 18–21 age group will rise to 48 per hundred by 1970. The increase in enrollment is not a temporary bulge, but a more permanent increase which will require even greater expansion in the 1970–80 decade. The 18–21 age group in 1980 (already born and approaching kindergarten) will be approximately 3 million larger than the equivalent group in 1970.

The proposals here set forth were recommended by the American Council's Commission on Federal Relations, and approved by the council's board of directors. By its nature, higher education is diverse and comprises institutions of many different traditions and views. As may be expected there are individual differences of opinion. Nevertheless, our recommendations represent a thoughtful consensus of representatives of all segments of American higher education. They take into account the views of the council's 1,000 member institutions and 175 member organizations.

The council recognizes the need also to strengthen elementary and secondary education and believes that the Federal Government has significant responsibilities on those levels. The American Council on Education, however, represents higher education. Our proposals are concerned accordingly with the need to strengthen colleges and universities.

THE PROPOSALS

I. Physical Facilities

The Federal Government should take appropriate steps to assist colleges and universities in the construction of physical facilities for instruction, research, and student housing.

Instructional facilities: The council believes the need justifies a commitment by the Federal Government averaging $1 billion annually for a program of matching grants and low-interest loans for construction of academic facilities in both public and private institutions.[2]

Classrooms, laboratories, and libraries are essential to any soundly conceived academic program. The institution which overcrowds these facilities or tries to make do with obsolete facilities risks serious impairment of the quality of its academic program.

Research facilities: Federal agencies which support research in colleges and universities should be authorized and encouraged to provide appropriate support for construction of the physical facilities and for acquisition of the equipment required for such research. Additional appropriations should be provided as needed for these purposes.

Student housing: The basic legislative authorization of $300 million annually for the college housing loan program runs until 1965. The Government is urged to make full use of its authority to make college housing loans and, if the demand for loans should exceed available funds, to seek additional lending authority.

II. Faculty

The Federal Government should expand programs that will help to increase the supply of college teachers and improve the quality of instruction and research in colleges and universities.

Supply of college teachers: Two principal sources of Federal support for individuals enrolled in graduate programs which would qualify them for college teaching are the National Science Foundation and the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. The programs of these agencies are restricted for the most part to the natural sciences. Moreover, they are directed primarily to research and only incidentally to college teaching. The NSF and NASA fellowship programs should be expanded as the number of qualified candidates increases. Nevertheless, it must be recognized that expansion of these programs does not necessarily insure that the participants will go into college teaching rather than research

The quality of college education also depends on an adequate supply of well-prepared teachers in disciplines other than the sciences, for example, in English, history, political science, and economics. The Federal Government should support expansion of graduate education in such a way as to redress the present imbalance in favor of science, and to encourage the preparation of college teachers in many, instead of few, fields of learning.

The only Federal program specifically intended to increase the supply of college teachers in fields other than science is that authorized in title IV of the National Defense Education Act, supplemented by the National Defense Education Act, title VI, scholarships to prepare researchers and teachers in modern foreign languages not commonly taught in the United States. To make the National Defense Education Act a more effective instrument for adding to the supply of college teachers, it should be amended as follows:

1. Increase the total number of fellowships available under the National Defense Education Act from 1,500 to 5,000, distributed in these categories:

(a) Up to 2,000 in the existing new or expanded category.

(b) Up to 2,000 in programs of graduate instruction in institutions which can make a major contribution toward meeting the pressing need for college teachers.

(c) Up to 1,000 1-year awards for college teachers who are within a year of completing the requirements for the doctorate.

2. Provide each institution a flat grant of $3,000 a year for each graduate student enrolled under the National Defense Education Act fellowship program with the stipulation that the institution waive all tuition and other fees, other than room and board, normally required of graduate students.

Improvement of quality of instruction: A prime factor in the improvement of academic instruction obviously is the improvement of faculty competence. In the scientific field, Federal programs presently afford faculty members opportunities for postdoctoral research as well as for carrying out research projects on their own campuses. Similar benefits to teachers in fields other than the natural sciences should be provided through amendments to the National Defense Education Act.

New legislation to support the operation of college and university libraries would also reinforce faculty research and scholarship. In many scholarly disciplines the library is a major research facility, comparable in importance to the laboratory.

The program suggested above for 1,000 1-year National Defense Education Act fellowships for college teachers within a year of completing the doctorate would add to the supply of fully qualified college teachers and, because it is directed to persons already in college teaching, would improve the competence of these persons.

In addition, the National Defense Education Act institutes in modern foreign language should be extended to college teachers of modern language without any distinction between teachers from public and private institutions. These modern language institutes should be authorized to include the teaching of English.

Finally, there should be increased use of existing legislative authority for exchanges of faculty members with foreign countries and for grants to actual and prospective college teachers to study abroad. The council believes that Federal agencies administering these programs should consult with the academic community in developing fresh approaches that will win support for needed and substantial increases in appropriations for international educational exchanges.

III. Students

There is need for appropriate Federal action to lower the financial barriers to higher education for qualified students.

The predicted enrollment increase of 2.8 million students between 1962–63 and 1970–71 places a high priority on the need for academic facilities and college teachers. Realization that enrollments will rise by one-fourth between 1962 and 1965 alone emphasizes the urgency of this need. Without adequate facilities and qualified teachers, our colleges and universities will have to resort to expedients detrimental to educational quality. Thus the council believes first priority should go to Federal programs designed to assure the coming generation of college students of classrooms, laboratories, and libraries in which to leran, and qualified persons to each them.

All evidence indicates that charges to students for tuition, fees, and room and board in both public and private institutions are continuing to rise sharply. This upward trend in costs has forced the student, his family, and the institution to plan more realistically the share of the cost that should be borne by grant assistance, loans, and student employment. But dangers lie ahead, since a study of trends also indicates that scholarships and institutional loan funds, even when augmented by Federal loan funds available under the National Defense Education Act, are not keeping pace either with the increase in number of students or with the upward cost trend. Furthermore, while the loan program of the National Defense Education Act has helped many families in the middle-income brackets, qualified students from the very low income levels are finding it more and more difficult to finance a college education.[3]

With National Defense Education Act assistance, State programs of testing and counseling, with special emphasis on early identification of talented students, have either been initiated or expanded. But it is not enough to identify the talented student who comes from a low-income family unless some hope of grant assistance can be offered by the time he must make the decision to go to college. In short, if equality of educational opportunity is to be more than an abstract slogan, the Federal Government must help colleges and universities provide grant assistance as well as loan assistance to able but needy students.

Student loans: The ceiling of $250,000 on Federal contributions to any one institutional loan fund should be removed so that institutions may request funds in proportion to the predictable demand for them. The National Defense Education Act student loan program should be made a permanent program, with the Federal capital contributions granted to the institutions as permanent revolving loan funds. From time to time additional appropriations should then be made for grants to institutions to reimburse them for the portion of loans forgiven for recipients who entered teaching, to meet the needs resulting from increasing enrollments, and to establish loan funds for instiutions new to the program.

---

[2] The magnitude of what the Federal commitment should be is suggested by the projections of facilities needs published by the U.S. Office of Education in 1962 as ch. 11 of "Economics of Higher Education." These projections show an average annual cost of construction for needed facilities of $2.21 billion in the years between 1961 and 1975. Average annual expenditures for construction are now approximately $1.25 billion. This rate can be sustained only if all present and anticipated sources of institutional financing of facilities are fully utilized.

Another estimate of the probable magnitude of the required Federal commitments is found in the results of a November 1960 survey of council membership. Reports from 582 institutions, representing about half of total student enrollment at that time, indicated that, over a 5-year period, they would expect to request a total of $2.9 billion under a program of grants and loans. Of this amount, it was anticipated that about $2.1 billion, or 72 percent, would be for grants, and $800 million, or 28 percent, would be for loans.

[3] The statements in this paragraph are based on "Financial Aid to the Undergraduate: Issues and Implication," by Elmer D. West, to be published by the American Council on Education.

As a matter of equity to student borrowers, the 50 percent "forgiveness" of loans should be extended to all teaching, including college teaching in recognized public and private, nonprofit institutions of education.

Student grant assistance: With due regard to the priority needs for a Federal program of assistance for construction of academic facilities and for expansion of the National Defense Education Act fellowship program for training college teachers, a new Federal program of 4-year undergraduate scholarships should be provided to supplement the National Defense Education Act student loan program. This scholarship or grant assistance program should have as its primary objective the seeking out and assisting of students of academic promise and great financial need.

International student exchanges: In the Mutual Education and Cultural Exchange Act of 1961, Congress recognized the need to increase the number of undergraduate and graduate student exchanges with foreign countries and to provide special services to foreign students enrolled in American colleges and universities. Congress should appropriate adequate funds to support these programs realistically if international exchanges of students are to be extended effectively to emerging nations, and if the foreign student is to obtain maximum benefit from study in an American institution.

IV. Other proposals and considerations

The focus of Federal action to sustain and develop American higher education as a national resource must be on programs to assist institutions to meet the demand for better higher education for an increasing number of students. Thus the construction of academic facilities and the recruitment and preparation of qualified college teachers must have first priority for the academic community, and should have first priority in the thinking of Congress and the Executive. The need for more student financial assistance holds a second priority.

The council will continue to support other proposals for Federal action in the field of higher education. The list below is by no means inclusive, but among the proposals for which the council intends to provide appropriate support are these:

Federal assistance for construction of teaching facilities in medicine, dentistry, and other health professions.

Payment of full costs of federally sponsored research.

Equitable reimbursement to colleges and universities for expenses incurred in providing facilities and instruction for ROTC units.

Federal assistance to programs for college-level technician education.

Extension of the urban renewal program with annual authorizations sufficient to maintain benefits to the colleges and universities at least at current levels.

Amendments to the National Defense Education Act (a) to authorize preparation of persons to teach English as a second language, (b) to permit institutions and agencies undertaking National Defense Education Act-supported research to publish the results of such research, and (c) to authorize guidance institutes for training college student personnel workers.

Implementation of international agreements providing for tariff-free importation of books and scientific equipment.

Appropriations for Federal educational programs commensurate with the known demands for such programs. Particular emphasis will be placed on adequate appropriations for the salaries and expenses of the Office of Education, for the program of the National Defense Education Act, for the National Science Foundation, for grants in support of educational television, and for international educational exchanges.

In the interest of providing better coordination and focus for Federal programs in support of education, the American Council on Education believes there should be appropriate revision of Federal organization and administration to strengthen the U.S. Office of Education, and to bring the U.S. Commissioner of Education into a closer relationship with the President.

In addition the council is convinced that the Federal Government has an immediate responsibility to assess all of its present relationships with higher education and to take such steps as may be necessary to make these relationships more conducive to the long-term strengthening of the Nation's educational resources. In such an endeavor the council pledges its full cooperation and assistance.

The Urgent Need for Decision

On December 15, 1962, President Logan Wilson of the American Council wrote the President of the United States:

"The crisis long predicted in the capacity of our institutions to meet the demands upon them is no longer something in the future. It is now."

It takes time to enact new Federal legislation and then to get it into effective operation. It also takes time to plan and then to build new buildings, and to complete the graduate education of a college teacher. Prompt action in the 1st session of the 88th Congress might result in a few new instructional buildings ready for use in the middle of the academic year 1963–64 and many more ready for use at the beginning of the 1964–65 academic year. The full effect, however, of a new Federal program for construction of academic facilites would not be felt until 1965–66 and beyond.

Similarly, assuming that Congress acts promptly in its 1963 session, expanded graduate programs for training college teachers would not make a significant difference in the supply of college teachers until 1965 and after.

The crisis cannot be averted, but it can be met without resorting to hastily devised "crash" programs. The decision lies both with Congress and with the President and his advisers. The American Council on Education is convinced that it speaks not only for organized higher education but for a much broader American consensus when it asserts that the opportunity for quality education beyond the high school should be widened and deepened through Federal action. With wise and effective Federal assistance, higher education can be maintained as an important national resource for generations to come.

RESOLUTION BY McNARY POOL PORTS ASSOCIATION

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have appear in the Record a resolution sent to me by the McNary Pool Ports Association of Walla Walla, Wash., expressing its opposition to the proposed user tax on fuel used by inland waterways carriers.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Whereas the McNary Pool Ports Association is comprised of the ports of Benton, Kennewick, Pasco and Walla Walla, all located in the State of Washington and the port of Umatilla located in the State of Oregon; and

Whereas the association represents port districts having an area of approximately 6,627 square miles, including some of the most productive agricultural and industrial land in the Pacific Northwest, having an assessed valuation in excess of $213,435,004; and

Whereas the above-mentioned port districts are charged with the responsibility of the development of the overall transportation complex in their respective districts; and

Whereas in excess of 1 million tons annually have passed the McNary lock and dam and upon completion of the Lower Snake River Dams, including Ice Harbor, Lower Monumental, Little Goose and Lower Granite, will increase very substantially; and

Whereas this development will aid the shipper and consumer of the McNary Pool area and beyond due to a very large dependence upon inland waterways transportation; and

Whereas the President of the United States on April 5, 1962, sent to Congress contained in his transportation message a recommendation for a user tax of 2 cents a gallon on all fuel used by inland waterways carriers; and

Whereas this proposal contains dangers readily recognized by all who are familiar with waterways transportation: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, by the McNary Pool Ports Association and the port districts belonging thereto, both individually and collectively, That this association is unalterably opposed to the enactment of any user charge proposal on our inland waterways; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the Northwest congressional delegation and other appropriate Government agencies.

RESOLUTION BY FRATERNAL ORDER OF EAGLES

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record a resolution from the Fraternal Order of Eagles, Portland Aerie No. 4, Portland, Oreg., received from Chester E. Capon.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Whereas many areas of the world are confronted with the threat of domination by those whose policies are repugnant to the principles long cherished by a democratic society; and

Whereas it is vital that means of communication be established throughout the free world whereby all people would be better informed and educated and thus be given an opportunity not only to guide their own destiny, but be better able to cope with the moral, religious, economic and political problems of an ever changing universe; and

Whereas the United States of America has an abundance of technical equipment such as television receivers, television signal repeaters and electrical generators, some of which it is believed should be made immediately available without charge to any country desiring the same for the purpose of the dissemination of information and education consistent with the precepts of a democratic society; and

Whereas the Fraternal Order of Eagles subscribes to the democratic principles of truth, justice, liberty and equality and seeks every opportunity to promote those programs and to adopt those principles designed for the social betterment of man: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Fraternal Order of Eagles, Portland Aerie No. 4, requests that the United States of America proceed with all reasonable vigor to seek the establishment of free educational television within the boundaries of those countries desiring or requesting the same for the purpose or purposes indicated herein; and be it further

Resolved, That President J. F. Kennedy, Senators Wayne L. Morse and M. B. Neuberger, and Representative Edith Green, be forwarded a copy of this resolution; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the appropriate office of the Grand Aerie, Fraternal Order of Eagles, with a request that every other aerie within its jurisdiction support this resolution.

Attest:

CHESTER E. CAPON,
Secretary.

CIA PROBLEMS

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an item from the Insider's Newsletter, dealing with some of our CIA problems, about which I shall speak at some length next week.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SAY CIA AGENTS IN CONTACT WITH DE GAULLE'S FOES—U.S. EMBASSY FROWNS ON MEETINGS WITH FORMER OAS LEADERS

NEW YORK, February 18.—Agents of the United States, presumably of the Central Intelligence Agency, have resumed contact with former OAS leaders since President De Gaulle's bid for French supremacy in Europe, the Insider's Newsletter reported today.

American Embassy officials in Paris are, according to the Newsletter, disturbed over U.S. agents' meetings with the Georges Bidault-Jacques Soustelle group which advocates a pro-Atlantic alternative to De Gaulle, whom they say will eventually hand France and Western Europe to the Communists.

Diplomats say the U.S. agents have met the anti-De Gaullists frequently during the past month in Central Europe where the former backers of the French underground move around constantly with the aid of forged passports.

The Embassy officials deplore, the Newsletter says, what they call another example of hamhandedness on the part of the cloak-and-dagger men who "see politics purely in terms of whom you can get to throw out the guy you don't get along with."

They emphasize that the last thing the U.S. Government wants to do is to be shown intriguing with people who have no backing in France except from a mixed bag of fascists, cashiered army officers, and gunmen.

ADDRESS BY CLARK R. MOLLENHOFF

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, recently the Editorial Association of the State of Oregon made a very wise decision. It invited one of our most able correspondents, Clark Mollenhoff, to go to Oregon and address the national convention of the Editorial Association. It is a memorial lecture that is given each year known as the Eric W. Allen memorial lecture.

Eric Allen was for many years the distinguished dean of the Oregon School of Journalism. I need not tell the Senate that any lecture given by Mr. Mollenhoff deserves reading and deserves being made of historical record.

I therefore ask unanimous consent that Mr. Mollenhoff's lecture of February 15, 1963, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the lecture was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ERIC W. ALLEN MEMORIAL LECTURE

(By Clark R. Mollenhoff, Washington bureau, Cowles Publications, February 15, 1963)

Much has changed in the newspaper world in the 50 years since Eric W. Allen founded the department of journalism at the University of Oregon. Reporters and editors are better educated than in the period of even 25 or 30 years ago. There has been a specialization on many of our larger newspapers that is regarded by some observers as a tremendous step in giving the public a better understanding of such fields as education, science, and labor. Certainly, most local newspaper staffs are better equipped today to report and analyze the activities of local and State government than they were in 1912. Much credit for this progress belongs to men like Eric Allen.

However, there is real reason for asking if the newspapers are keeping pace with the national and international problems that confront our society. These problems involve both bigness and complexity. They are best illustrated by a simple reference to the tremendous increase in Federal responsibilities and Federal expenditures.

In 1912, Federal expenditures were less than $1 billion—$689,881,000 to be exact. Recently, President Kennedy has proposed a budget of $98.8 billion, and it could easily soar over the $100 billion mark. More than $50 billion of the Federal spending will be for defense. This means it will be spent behind a heavy curtain of military security that will prevent the press and the public from examining many of the decisions of Defense Secretary Robert S. McNamara.

There can be little doubt, we have reached the point where it is impossible for any newspaper reporter, or any group of reporters, to engage in a comprehensive analysis of government spending. The size of the spending is staggering. The complexity of the laws and regulations is overwhelming. The powers assumed by the executive branch are almost unbounded.

Yet, somehow, we must manage to examine and criticize this mammoth Federal Government if we are to carry out our assignment in the American democracy. Somehow, we must find the means to expose corruption or favoritism even if it involves areas where the Defense Department may seek to use false claims of military security for a shield. Somehow, we must oppose the arbitrary and arrogant use of authority within the huge bureaucratic agencies. Somehow, we must keep all channels of information open unless the real military security of our Nation is at stake. And even in those areas where genuine military security can be claimed, we must assure ourselves that the Congress has provided an effective check on the use of arbitrary power by the executive branch.

Bound up in these press responsibilities is the most vital issue of our time: Can the United States fight effectively in the long-range cold war, and also continue to function as a real democracy?

The newspapers of the United States must carry a heavy responsibility, if not the major responsibility, in the determination of how that question will be answered in the next 10 to 20 years ahead of us. Newspaper editors and reporters must be able to understand the problem of obtaining information from Government. They must know all the avenues for obtaining information, and must recognize when those avenues are being barricaded. They must recognize when a false claim of military security is used to cover up matters that are simply embarrassing to the executive branch.

It is not enough for our editorial pages to shout "freedom of information" or "news management" with a fervor. It can be relatively easy to deplore the news managers on a well-publicized Federal case where others have led the way. However, it is more important that you be able to do your own analysis of Government operations to expose the unjustified secrecy that slips into Government agencies under many different guises.

Many journalism schools and many professional newspaper organizations are doing a laudable job of trying to promote a greater interest in depth knowledge of Government information problems. However, the effort is still far from successful.

It is unfortunate that deep splits have developed in the ranks of the working newsmen that tend to hurt the entire cause. One group tends to scoff at the resolutions passed by freedom of information committees as being ineffective. This group may point to an enthusiastic resolution supporter who does not follow through in his daily operations. There is the claim that all that is needed is good reporting to break through any of the information barriers.

Such feuding tends to weaken the newspapers on an issue upon which they should be united. There is no doubt that good aggressive reporters and editors can do a great deal to break through news barriers. However, when the problem becomes national in scope, there is also the need for strong and unified support from other newspapers and from professional organizations. It is seldom that one reporter or one newspaper can break through a secrecy wall on the national level if there is not general newspaper support. It is even more difficult if there is active opposition from well-known but poorly informed national columnists.

Fortunately, most of the columnists are reasonably well informed on this issue, but some are not. One well-known columnist screamed about "news management" but a short time later supported a total arbitrary secrecy in a claim of "executive privilege."

How could he complain that an administration was engaged in news management by putting out favorable press releases, and then defend that administration for arbitrarily barring Congress from investigating behind the self-serving declarations in the news releases. Some might contend that the man was forsaking journalistic principles to promote the things he felt were expedient.

He was not dishonest. It was worse than that. He simply does not know Government operations. He writes the big picture, second-guessing the President, the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of State on all types of broad policy issues. Yet, I know from considerable personal experience that he is unfamiliar with the detailed little pictures that are necessary if one is to draw sweeping conclusions on the so-called big picture.

This columnist had no understanding of the laws, regulations, or court decisions involved in the problem of executive privilege. Secrecy was wrong one week because it interfered with a story he was pursuing. Broader secrecy was acceptable the next week because it seemed to bar information from a Senator he did not like.

Over a period of years, I believe that the activities of our journalism schools and our professional newspaper organizations can do a lot to eradicate or minimize such misleading commentary.

As far as the overall information picture is concerned, I do not want to be an alarmist. However, I do want to express concern over a number of actions in the Kennedy administration that deal with the information policy. Some are mere extensions of the Eisenhower administration's policies, and some seem to carry the New Frontier stamp.

I do not believe we are faced with public officials who want to interfere with the rights of a free press or the proper operations of our democracy. However, this does not mean that I believe we can count on the good intentions or the self-serving statements of any administration. The President and others charged with the responsibility for military defense can easily rationalize steps to bar the press or Congress from embarrassing information. The political aspirations of nearly every high official in the executive branch tend to make it easy to justify press releases that give an overly optimistic picture of how well Government is being administered.

The men heading our Government may have the best interests of the press at heart, but it is cause for concern when Assistant Secretary of Defense Arthur Sylvester starts to talk of an inherent right to lie about defense matters. This is particularly troublesome when it is accompanied by a directive which makes it necessary for all civilian and military officials at the Pentagon to report all conversations with reporters before the close of business each day.

Take such pronouncements in context with other developments in recent years, and it is apparent why newsmen should be giving more serious study to the laws and practices on Government information. Just review some examples:

When an Air Force navigator was crippled for life in a bomber crash, the Air Force denied him Government records he needed to press a damage claim.

When a Government investigator displeased his superiors with a report on misuse of U.S. foreign aid to Cambodia, the State Department refused him access to his own personnel records which, he claimed, would show he was railroaded out of his job.

The Defense Department refused to allow a Senate committee to question Defense censors on their official actions.

The State Department refused Congress access to records containing evidence of fraud in foreign-aid spending in Laos and Peru.

The Atomic Energy Commission and the Budget used an arbitrary secrecy ruling to hide a conflict of interest which made a multimillion-dollar power contract illegal.

A State Department official refused to give the Senate Foreign Relations Committee a copy of a controversial foreign relations planning paper.

High State Department officials accused a foreign government representative of bribery, but refused to produce documents or testimony to support the charge.

Even a Government agency, the General Accounting Office, was denied access to official Navy, Air Force, and State Department records despite a specific law giving GAO such right of access.

These are not examples of what might happen in the United States under an all-powerful authoritarian executive branch of Government. These are only a few of the cases demonstrating what has happened in the American Democracy in recent years under an arbitrary claim of a right to unlimited secrecy.

This unlimited secrecy has been promoted under the term executive privilege. Through a simple self-serving declaration that the public interest is involved, officials of the executive branch have pulled down the broad secrecy curtain. The public, the press, the Congress and even the courts are barred from records of testimony from Government officials or records of official acts.

President Eisenhower claimed his administration could bar Congress and the GAO from any records or testimony containing advice of high level officials.

President Kennedy has taken the Eisenhower thesis and extended it to declaring that he will not allow the questioning of subordinate officials of our career service on their official acts.

Executive branch officials admit there is hardly a paper of importance in any Executive agency that does not include the opinions, conclusions or recommendations to qualify for an executive privilege secrecy stamp.

The result is a doctrine that disregards the law, flies in the face of court decisions, scoffs at the right of the public to be informed and arrogantly rejects the processes of Congress.

In its simplest form, it is a proclamation that the executive branch cannot be challenged in its invocation of total secrecy. It strips away, or diminishes, the constitutional right of the Congress to investigate the administration of laws.

Neither the Eisenhower administration nor the Kennedy administration has used the ultimate power inherent in the executive priviledge doctrine. Total application of this doctrine would create a public uproar for it would be executive tyranny. Both administrations have made much information available that might have been hidden by executive privilege, and in some cases information was revealed that was against the political interests of the administration in power. However, in many of these cases, the executive branch officials had no real choice for there was already enough information in the public domain to make a coverup impractical.

It would have been poor politics for the Kennedy administration to have tried to use executive privilege to pull down the secrecy curtain on the Billie Sol Estes case. When the McClellan committee started its investigation of Estes in April there had already been an exposure of large segments of the Estes case by a Texas newspaper and by Texas attorney general Will Wilson.

Use of executive privilege at that point would have meant political disaster for Agriculture Secretary Orville Freeman. Pulling down a secrecy curtain in the fact of strong evidence of fraud would have been similar to claiming the fifth amendment. Freeman couldn't afford secrecy in the face of evidence indicating fraud or favoritism. The Kennedy administration couldn't afford to face a charge of coverup on the first major scandal problem.

The Kennedy administration opened the records for Chairman MCCLELLAN, and for a House subcommittee headed by Representative L. H. FOUNTAIN, Democrat, of North Carolina. Investigative reports were made available to the press and to the Senate and House investigators. High-level officials testified on their opinions, conclusions, and recommendations in the cotton allotment decisions that favored Billie Sol Estes, and on the decisions that resulted in Estes being named to the National Cotton Advisory Board.

Low-level officials testified in detail on their dealings with Estes. Nothing was withheld, the administration claimed.

The open Government policy in the Estes case was a complete reversal of form for the Kennedy administration. Less than 2 months earlier, President Kennedy had given his approval to a Defense Department decision to refuse to allow a Senate armed service subcommittee to question Defense censors on their official actions.

Defense Secretary Robert S. McNamara used the secrecy of executive privilege to block the Stennis subcommittee from questioning the censors on specific changes in speeches of high ranking military officers.

On February 8, 1962, President Kennedy wrote to McNamara:

"I have concluded that it would be contrary to the public interest to make available any information which would enable the subcommittee to identify and hold accountable any individual with respect to any particular speech that he has reviewed.

"I therefore direct you, and all personnel under the jurisdiction of your department, not to give any testimony or produce any documents which would disclose any such information."

President Kennedy did not contend that the national security of the country might be jeopardized in the questioning of the censors. He did not contend that defense or state secrets of a highly classified nature might be involved. This would have been ludicrous.

So, the President simply gave his view that it was "in the public interest" and the secrecy of executive privilege was claimed.

It was politically practical to assert a claim of unlimited secrecy in the censors' hearings, because Senator STROM THURMOND, Democrat, of South Carolina, was the major opposition. Senator THURMOND held a position on racial and economic matters which had little national appeal, and he was regarded as a symbol of extreme right-wing thinking. It was Senator THURMOND who contended that the Pentagon and State Department censors were watering down the speeches of generals and admirals, and were in essence pursuing a no-win philosophy. The Defense and State Departments denied the allegation, and the Armed Services Subcommittee, under Chairman JOHN STENNIS, Democrat, of Mississippi, was established to do a full investigation of the controversial blue penciling.

The Defense Department made copies of the public speeches available, and McNamara and others testified on the general policy under which censors operated. However, the important question was how the policies were interpreted and applied by the actual censors. That question was never answered, because the claim of executive privilege was used to avoid pinpointing of responsibility for specific actions.

This was not a wild and free-swinging investigation under an irresponsible chairman. This was not a committee operating outside of its jurisdiction, and engaging in abusive treatment of witnesses. It was a properly authorized subcommittee of the Senate Armed Services Committee; it was operating within its jurisdiction, asking for Government records and asking questions that were pertinent to the inquiry.

McNamara declared that the Congress would have to content itself with his self-serving declaration—his high-level handouts—and would be prevented from going behind his assertions. Amazingly, the editorial cheers for McNamara were deafening. He was cheered because he was defying Senator THURMOND.

The question of whether Senator THURMOND was right or wrong in his conclusions on the censors was not important. He had the right to be wrong, as long as he conducted himself in a proper manner, and asked pertinent questions in a legitimate investigation. He had fully as much right to ask questions as any member of the press, and he had a right to expect answers that were truthful.

The press should examine its performance in this case as it considers that information policies that were adopted later by McNamara and Sylvester. The press forgot principles for the moment in the interest of kicking a Senator who held an unpopular view. The press also forgot its own long-time self interest.

McNamara was arbitrary, he was defiant of the power of Congress, and he was crowned a hero. Was it any wonder that he and

Sylvester were confident in seeking the maximum in their more recent news managing ventures in connection with the Cuban affair? Was it any wonder Pentagon officials and the White House believed it was possible to adopt the Sylvester directive to control press contacts at the Pentagon?

Pentagon reporters have characterized the Sylvester directive on press contacts as a "Gestapo" tactic. They comment that they feel the Sylvester directive, if implemented, will have the potential for shutting off legitimate dissent on policy matters that have nothing to do with national security. Even if the order is not fully implemented, it is felt it will be a club over the heads of military and civilian personnel. It is a formal order, and can be used as a basis for disciplinary action at the times when the McNamara team wants to use it to curb dissent.

Defense Secretary McNamara may want to run the Defense Department in the best and most efficient manner. We can credit him with wanting to achieve the maximum military strength for the minimum expenditure. We can assume that he believes his policies are in the best interests of the Nation. However, the same thing could have been said for most of our past Secretaries of Defense and their military chiefs.

The present administration did not accept the Eisenhower administration's assessment of its achievements. In fact, President Kennedy and Gen. Maxwell Taylor, the present Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, were sharply critical of the defense policies of President Eisenhower. Since assuming office, they have stressed that the Eisenhower administration policies resulted in what they believed to be serious military weaknesses. They have assured us that Defense Secretary McNamara and General Taylor have been working feverishly and have repaired many of the weaknesses in our defense armor.

The men who are now leading our Nation did not want us to accept the self-serving declarations of the Eisenhower administration on our defense posture. Now they contend that what they found demonstrated the former policies were wrong.

Are we now to assume that we have finally found that infallible team composed of men who will instinctively know what is best for us? Are we to assume that McNamara, only 2 years in the job, can produce the right answers on complex problems of defense without the benefit of dissent or public debate?

The press should be insistent that the Sylvester directive is wiped off the books. The effectiveness of the press in opposing the directive will depend upon its persistence. While it has been encouraging to see the Nation's press genuinely irritated over the Sylvester order and the attitudes that surround it, it is doubtful that this fury will continue.

If there is sharp and continued criticism, I have no doubt the Sylvester order will eventually be modified or withdrawn.

However, if the Nation's newspapers follow a characteristic pattern, the fury will soon give way to a few mild protests, and these will in turn give way to a whimpering acceptance of the chains. The short attention span of many newspapers will mean that the Sylvester directive will be forgotten, and the high-level handout collecting that goes with it will become an accepted part of the Washington news-gathering picture.

The press has an obligation to rip the Sylvester directive apart at every opportunity, not only because it is bad, but because it can become the pattern for further similar directives if it survives.

Past history should pretty well demonstrate that the executive branch does not do a good job of investigating itself. This is particularly true of the Military Establishment. It was the Congress that revealed the scandals involving Gen. Benny Meyers. It was the Congress that pulled loose the scandals involving Harry (the Hat) Lev and the New York procurement office. It was the Congress that produced the "Chamber of Horrors" on military buying practices generally. It was the Congress that revealed the details of the classic military corruption and mismanagement in the construction of an airstrip at Fort Lee, Va.

These scandals were actually being hidden or disregarded by the Pentagon until the Congress stepped in and forced aggressive action. Our thinking on future problems should be keyed to these documented studies of the past.

We should remember that the Symington Armed Services Subcommittee has demonstrated that several billions of dollars were wasted in the stockpiling of strategic and critical material. A vast curtain of secrecy covered the stockpile purchasing and the political letters and questionable decisions that went into the creation of that $9 billion stockpile.

By now the lesson should be clear. Government secrecy has been used to hide corruption, mismanagement, and arbitrary abuse of power.

However, we must accept some secrecy as necessary to cover some military matters and some diplomatic negotiations. (Also, some secrecy is provided by law, such as in the income tax field.)

Our job is to see that the secrecy is limited to the areas clearly defined by laws and regulations. Even in the areas of military security and diplomatic negotiations there must be an avenue for review by proper committees of Congress and by the General Accounting Office.

Today we have four basic information problem areas:

1. The common news management in which an administration releases information that is most favorable to its activities, and makes it difficult to obtain contrary facts.

2. Such special directives as the Sylvester order of October 27, 1962, to control all press contacts at the Pentagon.

3. The misuse of military security classifications to cover up mistakes of judgment, malfeasance, and incompetence on the part of an incumbent administration.

4. The arbitrary and unlimited secrecy claim inherent in the executive privilege doctrine as stated by President Eisenhower and carried on by President Kennedy.

Of all these problems, I am least concerned about simple news management as it is usually defined. Usually this term refers to the timing and wording of Government press releases to put the best foot forward for the incumbent administration. I am concerned only when the administration insists we accept these self-serving declarations, and then refuses to allow us to go behind them.

I am most gravely concerned about the executive privilege doctrine. This doctrine is a naked claim to unlimited secrecy on the whim of the executive branch. It has been used to bar the press, the public, the Congress and the General Accounting Office from examining Government business. It has been used to hide scandals and mismanagement in our regulatory agencies, in the foreign aid program and in the Defense Department.

There is one thing that every citizen can do, and that every newspaper should do, in opposing the Washington coverup:

Give full support to Congress in asserting its right to investigate Government activities and Government spending.

I am not advocating that you should agree with the conclusions that any or all committees of Congress may reach in an investigation. I do suggest that you support the full right of Congress to call for documents and testimony in properly authorized investigations of Government activities.

The executive branch of the Government has grown more powerful year after year, and it seems unlikely that this power will be cut. It may be that a powerful Executive is needed in dealing with the problems of the cold war.

However, I do not believe that many of us would suggest that this great power that is lodged in the President and his official family should go unchecked. If that power is unchecked then we will have lost one of the most important aspects of our form of government—the checks and balances.

The Congress represents the only effective check on the executive branch. All legislative power resides in the Congress, and this means the power to pass laws, to investigate to see how the laws are being administered, and to investigate to determine if new laws are needed.

Every curtailment of the right of Congress to investigate is a curtailment of the right of the press to learn about the operations of Government. This is a curtailment of the public's right to know.

Congress may have its scoundrels, its scandals, and its abuses. But it is well to remember that Congress is a bipartisan body. It has within it the representatives of every shade of political thinking in our society from extreme liberal to extreme conservative. This diversity of thought is the strength of our Congress, and it is the real strength of our system of government. It is our only protection against the arbitrary and unauthorized use of power by the powerful executive branch that exists today.

In the last few weeks, I have read all of the earlier Eric Allen memorial lectures. They covered a wide range of interests, as diverse as were the interests of the men who gave them. However, it did seem to me that through them all ran one dominant theme—one basic belief:

Freedom of the press exists only to provide for reporting and commentary on public affairs. We are true to our profession only as we work to provide the light that makes the democratic process more effective.

It cannot be emphasized too often that our basic responsibility is governmental affairs. It was encouraging to see that all of your past Eric Allen speakers were in agreement on this point. In one way or another, each of them sought to demonstrate that the comics, gossip columns, fashions, sports and the puzzles—necessary as they may be in making mass appeal—are not the press activities the framers of our Constitution had in mind in guaranteeing a free press.

I believe Eric Allen would have found something of value in each of those earlier lectures, and I am sure he would have found the compiled lectures carried an inspiration greater than any single one.

We need a full measure of inspiration, as well as perspiration, to handle our responsibilities in these days of $100 billion budgets. We need a persistent devotion to our tasks if we are to understand and control the high cost of government secrecy at the city, county, State, or Federal level.

The future of democracy is contingent upon whether we can subordinate political partisanship and petty differences for basic principles. This is the least we can do to honor the memory of men like Eric Allen.

NATIONAL EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT ACT OF 1963—POSITION OF NEA

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the National Education Association Division of Federal Relations provides a most interesting and informative report to its membership through a publication entitled "Washington Outlook on Education."

The February 1, 1963, issue is devoted to the National Education Improvement Act of 1963, which I had the honor to introduce as S. 580.

Since this brief statement contains not only an excellent summary of the bill but, in addition, the official position of the NEA as voiced by Dr. William G. Carr, executive secretary of the NEA, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HILL GETS NATIONAL EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT ACT

President Kennedy on January 29 called for a comprehensive program to help overcome shortcomings in American education. The 24-point program was wrapped up in a single bill (S. 580) (MORSE, Democrat, of Oregon) providing Federal aid to education from the elementary through the postgraduate level. Companion bills were introduced in the House by Representative POWELL, Democrat, of New York; PERKINS, Democrat, of Kentucky; GREEN, Democrat, of Oregon; ROOSEVELT, Democrat, of California; and SICKLES, Democrat, of Maryland.

PSYCHOLOGY OF THE COMPREHENSIVE APPROACH

Mr. Kennedy told Congress that he is not the first but "I hope to be the last" President to call the Nation's attention to its needless shortcomings on education. Outlining his 24-point program in a special message to Congress, the President explained the single-bill approach, saying:

"To enable the full range of educational needs to be considered as a whole, I am transmitting to the Congress with this message a single, comprehensive education bill—the National Education Improvement Act of 1963. For education cannot easily or wisely be divided into separate parts. Each part is linked to the other. The colleges depend on the work of the schools; the schools depend on the colleges for teachers; vocational and technical education is not separate from general education. This bill recalls the posture of Jefferson: 'Nobody can doubt my zeal for the general instruction of the people. I never have proposed a sacrifice of the primary to the ultimate grade of instruction. Let us keep our eye steadily on the whole system.'

"In order that its full relation to economic growth, to the new age of science, to the national security, and to human and institutional freedom may be analyzed in proper persepective, this bill should be considered as a whole, as a combination of elements designed to solve problems that have no single solution.

"This is not a partisan measure—and it neither includes nor rejects all of the features which have long been sought by the various educational groups and organizations. It is instead an attempt to launch a prudent and balanced program drawing upon the efforts of many past Congresses and the proposals of many Members of both Houses and both political parties. It is solely an educational program, without trying to solve all other difficult domestic problems. It is clearly realistic in terms of its cost—and it is clearly essential to the growth and security of this country."

THE NATIONAL EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT ACT OF 1963

The bill carries—with some notable concessions—nearly every education request Kennedy has made since taking office. The legislation would help pay for new classrooms, laboratories, libraries, and shops; provide higher pay for better training for teachers; and open new sources of funds for college students.

Unofficially, its total cost over 4 years would be about $5 billion. The comprehensive program calls for new obligational authority of $1.2 billion and actual spending of $143.6 million—above present levels—in the 1964 fiscal year.

The program was tailored to meet some of the congressional obligations that have "dogged" school aid proposals from both Democratic and Republican Presidents. President Kennedy made it clear that he regarded Congress as duty bound to face and solve the religious dispute as well as others facing the school aid proposals. The President emphasized:

"We can no longer afford the luxury of endless debate over all the complicated and sensitive questions raised by each new proposal on Federal participation in education. To be sure, these are all hard problems—but this Nation has not come to its present position of leadership by avoiding hard problems. We are at a point in history when we must face and resolve these problems."

A summary of the major proposals in the National Education Improvement Act follows:

Student loans: Raise the ceiling of $90 million on annual Federal appropriations for college student loans to $135 million and eliminate the yearly ceiling of $250,000 on loans to students at any one institution.

Loan insurance: Supplement direct college student loans by insuring commercial loans to students who could not meet the criteria for direct Federal help. Insured loans would be limited to $2,000 a year.

Work study: Appropriate $22.5 million to pay half of the wages for student campus employment of an educational character of up to 15 hours per week.

Fellowship: Increase the National Defense Education Act graduate fellowship program from 1,500 to 10,000 annually for the next 3 fiscal years, plus 2,000 additional summer session fellowships. These fellowships now pay from $2,000 to $2,400 a year.

Construction: Authorize $1 billion over 3 years of Federal loans to public and private colleges for the building of acedemic facilities.

Junior colleges: Appropriate $50 million for fiscal 1964 and such sums as are necessary for two succeeding years for grants to states to construct community junior colleges.

College libraries: Appropriate $40 million for the first year of a 3-year program to help colleges and universities build libraries and acquire books. Construction grants would be on a 50–50 matching basis, with Federal funds going for only 25 percent of book and material costs.

Graduate schools: Appropriate $40 million to start a similar grant program to expand graduate schools.

Languages: Extend for 2 years existing laws aiding public and private institutions of higher learning in the study of foreign languages with an increase in funds from $8 million annually to $13 million for fiscal 1964.

Teacher institutes: Expand authority for teacher institutes financed by the Office of Education to admit teachers of English, humanities, social sciences, and library personnel; increase funds from $14.5 million to $37.5 million.

Specialized training: Finance, with an initial appropriation of $7.5 million, a 3-year program to help train teachers for the mentally retarded and other handicapped children, of gifted, or culturally deprived children, and of adult literacy.

Teacher preparation programs: Project grants to colleges and universities to strengthen departments and programs which prepare elementary and secondary school teachers. Emphasis will be on subject matter courses, $7.5 million for fiscal year 1964 and necessary sums for next 2 years. Public and private nonprofit education institutions eligible.

Vocational education: Expand such programs to meet the needs of individuals in all age groups for training in occupations where they can find employment in today's diverse labor markets. By increasing Federal expenditures from $50 million to $73 million for the 1964 fiscal year, and necessary sums for each of the succeeding 4 years.

Extension, adult courses: Provide $14 million for grants to States to expand university extension courses in land-grant colleges and State universities and to provide classes for illiterate adults in public schools.

STRENGTHENING PUBLIC ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION

In the area of elementary-secondary school aid, the President recommended instead of a general aid approach that could at best create a small wave in a huge ocean, our efforts should be selective and stimulative, encouraging the States to redouble their efforts under a plan that would phase out Federal aid over a 4-year period.

The President recommended strengthening elementary and secondary education by:

Selective and urgent improvement of public elementary and secondary education: 4-year $1.5 billion program of Federal grants to States for teacher salary improvement; i.e., increasing maximum salaries, raising low starting salaries, raising low average salaries in economically disadvantaged districts; support for critical classroom construction needs such as overcrowding, fire and health hazards; support for special projects to improve educational quality particularly in disadvantaged rural and urban areas. Appropriation would be authorized so as to phase out Federal support by the end of program. Public schools only.

Acquisition of science, mathematics, and modern foreign language instruction equipment (amendments to title III of the National Defense Education Act): Extends for 2 years title III of the National Defense Education Act for purchase of equipment needed in science, math, and modern foreign language instruction in elementary and secondary schools. Grants to public schools—loans to private nonprofit schools as in present law.

Guidance, counseling and testing (amendments to title V of the National Defense Education Act): Extends counseling and guidance title of the National Defense Education Act for 2 years and increases authorization from $15 million to $17.5 million for fiscal year 1964 and succeeding years. Authorizes testing program for all seventh- and eighth-grade students. Public schools only, except for testing in private nonprofit schools.

Federally affected areas (amendments to Public Law 815 and Public Law 874): Extends all expiring provisions for 4 years; no modifications in payment formulas for first year, with some reduction in the formulas beginning the second year and standardization of the eligibility conditions at 5 percent in the third year; and inclusion of the District of Columbia. Public schools only as in present law.

NEA REACTION

Commenting upon President Kennedy's comprehensive program outlined in his special message on education, Dr. William G. Carr, NEA executive secretary, stated:

"The association welcomes this clear and courageous reaffirmation of the President's concern for education, hails the comprehensive aspects of the program, and is encouraged by the proposals to strengthen American education at the points of most urgent national need. The association will seek the widest possible civic and professional cooperation to secure the enactment of the program as a whole."

Analysis of new obligation authority and expenditures

[In thousands of dollars]

U.S. OFFICE OF EDUCATION

	1962 enacted		1963 estimated		1964 estimated	
	New obligation authority	Expenditures	New obligation authority	Expenditures	New obligation authority	Expenditures
National Defense Education Act:						
Elementary and secondary	72,750	53,644	72,750	54,600	72,750	61,350
Higher education	103,407	96,794	118,700	114,800	118,650	118,650
Other aids to education	34,470	30,900	38,000	34,000	38,220	36,000
Total	210,627	181,358	229,450	203,400	229,620	216,000
Federally affected areas:						
Operation	247,000	226,419	282,322	260,000	320,670	297,901
Construction	61,942	56,490	63,686	59,945	61,784	63,042
Total	308,942	282,909	346,008	319,945	382,454	360,943
College aid (other than NDEA):						
Land-grant college:						
Morrill	2,550	2,550	2,550	2,550	2,550	2,550
Bankhead-Jones	8,194	8,194	11,950	11,950	11,950	11,950
Total	10,744	10,744	14,500	14,500	14,500	14,500
Vocational education:						
Smith-Hughes Act	7,161	7,147	7,161	7,161	7,161	7,161
George-Barden Act	33,672	33,032	34,716	33,800	34,756	34,100
Total	40,833	40,179	41,877	49,061	41,917	41,261
Handicapped teaching:						
Mentally retarded	1,000	916	1,000	997	1,000	997
Deaf	1,575	32	1,500	1,502	(1)	1,500
Total	2,575	948	2,500	2,499	1,000	2,497
Other educational programs:						
Cooperative research	5,000	3,697	6,985	5,740	17,000	11,670
Foreign language training and area studies	---------	---------	---------	---------	2,500	1,600
Library services	7,500	8,197	7,500	7,625	7,500	7,500
Educational research (foreign currency program)	---------	6	400	17	800	685
Total	12,500	11,900	14,885	13,382	27,800	21,455
Salaries and expenses, Office of Education	11,594	11,158	12,899	12,435	16,261	15,574
New educational program (proposed legislation)	---------	---------	---------	---------	1,215,170	143,600
Total, Office of Education	597,815	539,196	662,119	607,122	1,928,722	815,830

OTHER GOVERNMENT UNITS

	1962 enacted		1963 estimated		1964 estimated	
	New obligation authority	Expenditures	New obligation authority	Expenditures	New obligation authority	Expenditures
National Science Foundation	263,041	182,689	322,488	238,000	589,000	343,000
Educational television	---------	---------	2,000	1,000	7,000	4,200
Juvenile delinquency and youth offenses	8,200	1,386	5,810	7,139	13,200	8,431
School milk program	---------	---------	109,997	97,497	102,000	102,000
School lunch program	170,000	169,112	169,993	169,493	182,000	182,000
Educational exchange:						
Mutual educational and cultural exchange	26,999	26,925	41,947	34,000	56,420	42,000
International educational exchange (foreign currency program)	7,400	11,450	(2)	13,000	(2)	10,000
Center for cultural interchange (East-West)	3,300	6,617	8,340	8,000	5,690	6,500
Total, educational exchange	37,699	44,992	50,287	55,000	62,110	58,500
Vocational Rehabilitation, Office of:						
Grants to States	64,450	63,330	72,940	71,754	88,700	86,650
Research and training	20,250	18,875	25,500	24,776	36,830	35,250
Research and training (foreign currency)	1,372	282	2,000	1,310	3,000	2,128
Salaries and expenses	2,325	2,227	2,480	2,456	2,905	2,869
Total, Office of Vocational Rehabilitation	88,397	84,714	102,920	100,296	131,435	126,897
Peace Corps	30,000	11,409	58,550	47,000	108,000	80,000
Surplus property	862	840	891	856	950	937

[1] Legislation expires, included in proposed new legislation.

[2] New obligational authority for 1963–64 included in mutual educational and cultural exchange program expenditures to continue until present funds exhausted.

A BALANCED BUDGET FOR THE U.S. POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, as recently as October 8 of this past year, I called to the attention of the Senate certain facts upon which I concluded that, following the enactment of the postal rate and pay bill of 1962, the Post Office Department would have a balanced budget by 1965.

Members of this body will recall that in setting forth these data last October, I explained in detail the adjustments which would achieve a balanced postal budget within 3 years. I still believe this possible. Certainly, as the costs of operating our great Postal Establishment reach $5 billion on an annual basis, we should take every precaution to assure the people who foot this bill that they shall have maximum, efficient service at the lowest possible cost. I, for one, hope we shall be able to provide such service for many years to come within the framework of an appropriation of this size. I need not remind this body that the cost of our entire Federal Government just 30 years ago was only $5 billion per year.

In reviewing the President's budget for 1964, the first full year in which our recent postal rate hikes will be in effect, I find that the postal deficit has been pared to $104 million.

I should like to call to the attention of the Senate the fact that there was pending an increase in the fourth class rates, which are regulated by the Interstate Commerce Commission, not by Congress, which would amount to approximately $100 million, which would balance the budget. Furthermore, the President in his message states:

> Additional net revenues are expected to reduce this revenue deficiency in later years as successive stages of the postal rate increases enacted in 1962 become effective.

This, in my opinion, is full verification of the statement I made to the U.S. Senate on October 8, 1962.

As responsible legislators, we owe the American people the responsibility of taking whatever steps are necessary to achieve a balance in our $5 billion postal operation and at the same time improve the service to the people. Certainly, it is my intention that the committee in the near future will undertake studies dealing with postal costs, improvement of mail classification, and the greater use of machinery, for the purpose of achieving this kind of balance. As I have said many times before, our U.S. postal service should be the best in the world—not the most expensive. I firmly believe that we can achieve this balance without detriment to our loyal postal employees.

Any businesslike approach to the problem of this enormous cost should provide ways and means for our employees to cope with the growing volume of mail through more modern methods and equipment and gain for themselves greater rewards in the matter of postal pay and benefits. The key to this, of course, is "productivity."

In his budget message, the President supported this goal as follows, and I quote:

> Furthermore, we shall maintain pressure on each department and agency to improve its productivity and efficiency. Through improved management techniques, installation of modern equipment, and better coordination of agency programs, important productivity gains have already been realized, and further advances will be forthcoming. I mean to insure that in each of the various Federal programs, objectives are achieved at the lowest possible cost.

It seems to me that the executive and legislative branches working in harmony on this can realize economy goals that will keep the postal service within the reach of all the people.

THE PROBLEMS OF THE SOFTWOOD LUMBER INDUSTRY

Mr. JORDAN of Idaho. Mr. President, when I took my oath of office as U.S. Senator last August, one of the first requests I made of my office staff was for a complete study of what had been done to alleviate the growing problems of the softwood lumber industry in my State of Idaho, the whole Pacific Northwest, and throughout the country. Most of these problems over the past 2 years are a direct result of the fact that Canadian softwood lumber has been imported into this country in sufficient quantities to cause hardship on our own producers. It is significant I think when, by the end of 1962, 17 percent of our total domestic consumption of softwood lumber was Canadian. Throughout the country, but particularly in the Northwest and in my State of Idaho, mills are closing and putting people out of work because the market that was formerly available to them is now being taken over more and more by the Canadians.

The Canadian producers have certain definite advantages over our domestic producers. Among them are: First, the devaluation of the Canadian dollar; second, the Canadian Government's practice of allotting timber concessions without competitive bidding at low stumpage rates; third, lower wages; fourth, less costly and restrictive forest practices, such as setting minimum road standards and low slash disposal rates; fifth, high tariff rates on U.S. lumber shipped to Canada; and sixth, low charter rates for coastwise and intercoastal shipping.

These create a combination of circumstances favoring the Canadian producers against which our domestic producers cannot compete.

For many months Members of Congress have been concerned over this problem of Canadian imports, but until now most of us have preferred to see what relief could be given the American lumber industry by various Government agencies, without resorting to legislation. Many avenues have been tried.

When appeals were initially made to the Federal Government, its first reaction was to recommend a study. Finally, an Intergovernmental Committee was established by the Departments of State, Commerce, Agriculture, and Interior last spring to make recommendations for action. So far, no definite recommendations have been forthcoming from this committee. Last spring the Senate Commerce Committee also held hearings on the problems of the American lumber industry. These hearings included field hearings at which hundreds of lumber-based communities had an opportunity to express their viewpoints. But no major legislation resulted from these hearings.

After other meetings had been held, the next big hurdle which the lumber industry had to cross was that of the U.S. Tariff Commission. At the President's request, after he had expressed great concern for the American lumber industry and had handed down his six-point program, the lumber industry took its case to the Tariff Commission. But, despite the President's expressed concern, and in the face of the facts and figures presented to the Commission by the industry during public hearings on the matter last fall, the Tariff Commission on February 14 sent to the President a report that would deny our lumbermen necessary and needed import relief.

Mr. President, I want to make it clear at this point that I do not intend to be partisan in my remarks today. Here in the Senate the States most concerned with the forest products industry are represented by both Democrats and Republicans.

I will be the first to say that this problem of Canadian imports is one which we must try to solve jointly, as representatives of our various States and not as members of either major political party. This problem transcends party labels.

Furthermore, I do not think that we can sit back and let the Tariff Commission's decision be the end of the matter. This Congress, this Government, this administration, can and should act positively to help the fourth largest industry in this country—the lumber industry—in alleviating one of its major problems.

Mr. President, the February 14 decision of the Tariff Commission was a historic one in two respects: First, it is the largest case ever considered by the Tariff Commission in terms of dollars involved in an industry and employees concerned, and second, this decision was the first rendered by the Tariff Commission under the Trade Expansion Act of 1962. The Commission did acknowledge the validity of the major portion of the lumber industry's claim for relief, but refused to grant relief by referring to the requirements of the Trade Expansion Act which say that the petitioner must prove injury resulting in major part from trade agreement concessions.

I wish to reiterate that point: The Tariff Commission ruled in agreement with the lumber industry that the increased Canadian imports, for various reasons, are making the American lumber industry suffer. But the Tariff Commission maintained that these increased imports were not due "in major part" to prior tariff concessions, thereby ruling out the Commission's right to help the industry through the Trade Expansion Act.

However, I believe that the Tariff Commission's report may have been worth more to the lumber industry than they at this moment realize. The Commission's report made this statement:

> The Commission observes further that while international commitments may deter Congress from legislating in conflict therewith, these commitments do not prevent Congress from so legislating. Congress may, if it so elects, legislate in conflict with any international commitments.

I therefore feel that the Tariff Commission has passed the responsibility to Congress, and I feel that it is our duty to pick it up and to assume the burden for correcting some of the disadvantages under which the U.S. lumber industry is forced to operate and over which it has no control.

The lumber industry—this country's fourth largest industry and one of the top three in Idaho—has worked hard in its appeal to the Government for help in solving the problems created by the inequitable import situation. The industry has even gone so far as to make many practical recommendations and to offer several sound solutions both to Congress and the executive agencies. Believe me, this industry has not merely been sitting back, asking for a Government handout. Its people have been working diligently and hard to put the lumber industry back on its feet. I believe the time has come for Congress to lend them a helping hand in their fight.

Today, I wish to introduce a package of measures which, if enacted, will do much to help the lumber industry. These measures are essentially the same as some which have just recently been introduced into the House of Representatives by various Members of Congress from both parties.

First, I propose the imposition of an import quota of 6 percent, based on the average quarterly domestic softwood consumption in the United States during the calendar years 1960, 1961, and 1962.

Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference, a Senate joint resolution to that effect, which I ask unanimous consent to have printed as part of my remarks at this point.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, will be printed in the RECORD.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 56) requesting and authorizing the President to impose an immediate 6-percent emergency quota on all imports of softwood lumber, introduced by Mr. JORDAN, of Idaho, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

> Whereas on the 12th of October 1962, a disastrous windstorm caused excessive damage to the forests of the Pacific Northwest; and
>
> Whereas an estimated eleven billion six hundred million board feet of timber was blown down which, if not harvested within the next two years, may result in serious insect damage; and
>
> Whereas this timber must be harvested in order to prevent a greater loss of our country's major renewable natural resource; and
>
> Whereas lumber producers in the Northeast, the Southwest, the Midwest, the Southeast, and the Northwest will be adversely affected by the marketing of an additional two billion board feet of lumber over the next three years from the downed timber; and
>
> Whereas many factors adversely affecting the competitive position of the American lumber producer cannot be solved without Government assistance and cooperation: Now, therefore, be it
>
> *Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That the President is hereby requested to impose an emergency temporary quota of 6 per centum on the import of softwood lumber for the period of three years. This emergency quota to be determined on the basis of 6 per centum of the average quarterly domestic softwood consumption in the United States during the calendar years 1960, 1961, and 1962.

Mr. JORDAN of Idaho. Mr. President, this joint resolution is a bit broader than a similar one introduced in the House of Representatives. In addition, it takes into account that the lumber industry throughout the whole country, not just the lumber industry of the Pacific Northwest, will be hurt by the marketing of an additional 2 billion board feet of lumber over the next 3 years as a result of the harvesting of the timber downed by windstorm in the Northwest on October 12, 1962.

Second, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to require the marking of lumber and wood products to indicate to the ultimate purchaser in the United States the name of the country of origin. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be printed at this point in the Record.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the Record.

The bill (S. 957) to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to require the marking of lumber and wood products to indicate to the ultimate purchaser in the United States the name of the country of origin, introduced by Mr. Jordan of Idaho, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That subdivision (J) of section 304(a)(3) of the Tariff Act of 1930, amended (19 U.S.C. 1304 (a)(3)(J)), is amended to read as follows:

"(J)(1) Such article is of a class or kind with respect to which the Secretary of the Treasury has given notice by publication in the weekly Treasury Decisions within two years after July 1, 1937, that articles of such class or kind were imported in substantial quantities during the five-year period immediately preceding January 1, 1937, and were not required during such period to be marked to indicate their origin: *Provided,* That this subdivision shall not apply after June 1, 1963, to sawed lumber and wood products.

"(2) No trade agreement or other international agreement heretofore or hereafter entered into by the United States shall be applied in a manner inconsistent with the requirements of this section."

Mr. JORDAN of Idaho. Mr. President, people in Idaho have been worrying about the situation of the lumber industry in our State for over 2 years. In January 1961 the State Legislature of Idaho passed a joint memorial urging the President and the Congress to take some action to alleviate the problems of the lumber industry.

All segments of our economy in Idaho are vitally concerned about this situation. The businessmen have been, and still are, quite concerned. Last fall, during the months of October and November, I received various letters and resolutions from chambers of commerce throughout the State, particularly in the north, relative to the problem of Canadian imports of softwood lumber. On November 19 the board of directors of the Idaho State Chamber of Commerce unanimously approved a resolution calling upon the President of the United States "to impose fair quotas on Canadian lumber imports and to take whatever action is necessary to insure the survival of the American lumber industry by removing every impediment which makes it impossible for the American lumber industry to compete on an equal basis with other countries."

Just a few weeks ago, because the lumber situation has not been eased but, in fact, has grown worse since 1961, the Idaho State Legislature again passed a joint memorial, House Joint Memorial 1, calling upon Congress and the President to establish controls to regulate the flow of foreign lumber by a quota system and that such lumber be marked to show the country of origin. These first two pieces of proposed legislation which I have today introduced implement this joint memorial of the State legislature.

In addition to the joint memorial passed by the Idaho State Legislature, the Legislatures of Colorado, Montana, and Washington have approved joint memorials calling upon Congress and the President to impose limitations on the import of Canadian softwood lumber; and the Legislatures of Oregon, Texas, and Arizona have similar memorials under consideration.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that House Joint Memorial 1 of the Idaho Legislature be printed in full at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, House Joint Memorial 1 of the Idaho Legislature was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

House Joint Memorial 1

To the Honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the United States in Congress Assembled and to the Honorable Secretary of the Treasury of the United States:

We, your memorialists, the members of the House of Representatives and the Senate of the Legislature of the State of Idaho, assembled in the 37th session thereof, do respectfully represent that:

Whereas there is no shortage of timber for the production of lumber and related items in the United States, and

Whereas there is a need to cope with the large volume of blowdown timber on the Pacific coast and to increase the cut from overmature forests to prevent excessive loss from decay, disease, and other causes, and

Whereas U.S. lumber manufacturing firms pay the highest wages and provide working conditions equal to or better than similar firms in other countries, and

Whereas lumber manufacturing firms in the United States are losing their home markets to foreign firms, especially Canada, due to advantages such as (1) depreciated currency; (2) low stumpage rates; (3) noncompetitive bidding; (4) less costly and restrictive forest practices; (5) lower wage rates; (6) high tariff rates on lumber shipped to Canada; (7) low charter rates for coastwise and intercoastal shipping; (8) a cooperative government; and

Whereas lumber imports from Canada are increasing yearly at an alarming rate and now constitute about one-sixth of the annual consumption of lumber in the United States, and

Whereas unemployment in the lumber industry of the United States is increasing with resultant loss of wages to the workers, loss of taxes and income to taxing bodies and communities, and

Whereas there is no longer any justification by reason of a trade agreement between Canada and the United States for exempting Canadian lumber from the requirement that all foreign imports be marked, and

Whereas without foreign imports being marked it is difficult to be certain that the executive orders requiring the use of domestic lumber in certain installations will be obeyed: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the 37th session of the Legislature of the State of Idaho, now in session (the house of representatives and the senate concurring), That the Congress, the President, and the Secretary of the Treasury of the United States of America, be respectfully petitioned to give immediate attention to and request action necessary to place the lumber industry of the United States on an equitable and competitive basis with foreign manufacturers through the use of a quota system or other means, including the requirements that imported lumber be marked to show the country of origin, to the end that domestic manufacturers are not placed at a disadvantage with resultant loss of markets, reduction of employment, loss of taxes, and deterioration of communities; and be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of state of the State of Idaho be, and he hereby is authorized and directed to forward certified copies of this memorial to the President, Vice President, and Secretary of the Treasury of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress, and the Senators and Representatives representing this State in the Congress of the United States.

Pete T. Cenarrusa,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.
W. A. Drevlow,
President of the Senate.

Mr. JORDAN of Idaho. Mr. President, there has also been introduced into the Idaho Legislature a proposed National Products Preference Act. This bill would require that a preference be given to domestic forest products in any State-supported construction when the price quoted for the same is not more than 20 percent in excess of the lowest bid or price.

These actions by the Idaho State Legislature clearly indicate the statewide concern in Idaho with the problems of our lumber industry.

Since February 1, several resolutions have come into my office from the lumber workers of Idaho themselves. So far, a total of 2,300 lumber workers in my State have signed the resolutions which I have received. These men are perhaps more vitally concerned than any other group. This is affecting their bread and butter—their very livelihood.

Their resolutions ask this:

That the Congress and President of the United States of America be respectfully petitioned to give immediate attention to and request action necessary to place the lumber industry of the United States on an equitable and competitive basis with foreign manufacturers through the use of a quota system or other means, including the requirements that imported lumber be marked to show the country of origin.

Incidentally, one lumber company in my State of Idaho feels so strongly about the necessity of marking lumber with its country of origin that it has voluntarily taken the lead in this practice and at this time is so marking its lumber.

Last year, another avenue which the lumber industry tried for relief was asking for assistance under section 22 of the Agriculture Adjustment Act. The Solicitor of the Department of Agriculture at one point informed the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry that, in his opinion, lumber, or actually trees, is an agriculture commodity. But later the Secretary of Agriculture said that section 22 of the act could not be applied for relief of the lumber industry. Also, the Department of Justice has informally advised lumber officials that they do not look with favor upon this plea. So it appears that we must again resort to legislation to have trees included as an agriculture commodity.

The third measure I introduce today for appropriate reference would amend section 22 of the Agriculture Adjustment Act so that the Secretary of Agriculture can include lumber and wood products as an agricultural commodity under the act, enabling the lumber industry to get protection from competition from foreign imports. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be printed at this point in my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, will be printed in the Record.

The bill (S. 962) to amend section 22 of the act of August 24, 1935, as amended (49 Stat. 773; 7 U.S.C. 624), to require the Secretary of Agriculture to include lumber and wood products as an agricultural commodity under the act introduced by Mr. Jordan of Idaho, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 22 of the Act of August 24, 1935, as amended (49 Stat. 773; 7 U.S.C. 624), is hereby amended by adding to the end of subsection (a) the following language: "For purposes of this section, 'agricultural commodity or products thereof' shall be deemed to include lumber and wood products."

Mr. JORDAN of Idaho. Mr. President, in connection with the bill requiring that lumber be marked with the country of origin, I introduce for appropriate reference a fourth bill, requiring that only lumber and other wood products which have been manufactured in the United States may be used in construction or rehabilitation covered by FHA-insured mortgages.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be printed at this point in my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the Record.

The bill (S. 958) to amend the National Housing Act to provide that only lumber and other wood products which have been produced in the United States may be used in construction or rehabilitation covered by Federal Housing Administration insured mortgages, introduced by Mr. Jordan of Idaho, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That title V of the National Housing Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"Sec. 517. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, no mortgage or loan shall be insured by the Commissioner under any provision of this Act after the date of the enactment of this section unless he receives satisfactory assurances that all lumber and other wood products used in the construction or rehabilitation of the structure covered by the mortgage or loan will have been produced (and processed) in the United States; except that the Commissioner may, under rules and regulations promulgated by him, permit the use in any such construction or rehabilitation of lumber or other wood products which were produced (or processed) in a foreign country if he determines that neither the species of tree yielding the wood involved nor any species of tree yielding wood which is equivalent for the intended purpose is grown in the United States."

Mr. JORDAN of Idaho. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent that all four measures and the resolution be held at the desk for 1 week, for additional sponsors. Senators of both parties have indicated to me their desire to cosponsor these bills with me, to do their part to help bolster a declining American lumber industry.

Something must be done to correct some of the disadvantages under which the U.S. lumber industry has been forced to operate in recent years. I believe that these bills offer a fair and reasonable solution to some of the problems confronting the lumber industry over which it has no control, and I am hopeful that they will receive speedy consideration. People all over the country, directly or remotely connected with the lumber industry, from the lumberworkers and the millowners to the storekeepers who serve them and the consumers who buy wood products, are now looking to the Congress for action.

Mr. President, I assure the Senate that I am willing to cooperate with all persons who are interested in the plight of the softwood lumber industry in the United States. If other bills of a similar nature are introduced, I hope we shall work together to achieve the enactment of constructive legislation which will relieve this basic industry of some of the troubles which beset it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the bills and joint resolution will lie on the desk, as requested by the Senator from Idaho.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I want to take this opportunity to congratulate the Senator from Idaho [Mr. Jordan] on the excellence of his maiden speech on the floor of the Senate and on the proposals which he is advancing here today in behalf of the lumber industry which is, as all of us know, so depressed economically. I am happy to join the Senator from Idaho in support of the resolutions which he is offering today with the hope they will be promptly considered and approved by the Congress so that the lumber industry can look forward to the future with hope.

Mr. President, all of us from lumber-producing States are deeply disturbed at the long-range effects of the decision of February 14 which was handed down by the U.S. Tariff Commission in the case brought before it by the softwood lumber industry. This is the first decision handed down by the Commission since the Trade Agreements Act of 1962—which I voted against—and it very dramatically points up the ineffectiveness of the so-called protective feature of this act for American industries. The Tariff Commission in effect ruled that though the Canadian lumber imports have risen significantly and the domestic lumber industry has suffered greatly, the increased imports cannot be directly related to a prior tariff concession, which is required by the 1962 act. Thus, while the Commission recognizes that a great industry is being economically depressed, small business operations made inoperative, and the breadwinners of families forced on to the unemployment rolls this Commission is unable under existing law to take any action to assist these American taxpayers and citizens. All the Tariff Commission can recommend is for the small businessman engaged in lumbering to go bankrupt or to close down his mill and for the man unemployed by such action all they can offer is the right to draw unemployment compensation. This, Mr. President, is not the American way or the American dream.

Mr. President, I hate to say "I told you so" but last September 21 in a speech on this Senate floor, I predicted that the Trade Agreements Act of 1962, which we at that time had just enacted, would not meet the needs of our various agriculture industries.

Consequently, I reluctantly voted against the act although I favored the objective of expanded international trade toward which it moved without the necessary safeguards for American industry, especially the agricultural and natural resources sectors of it.

In fact, in the Congressional Record, volume 108, part 15, page 20347, I stated:

> I wish I could believe that the bill which the Senate passed this week, the Trade Expansion Act of 1962, contains provisions which will provide for protective measures for this great segment of our agriculture industry. I fear that it does not. I fear that agriculture and my great area of our Nation may be in for some increasingly difficult times because of the action of the Senate.

Mr. President, my fears have been increased by the decision of February 14 by the Tariff Commission.

Mr. President, as we look back down the road where we have been we can see that we do not have on the books the needed protective provisions of law in this area. When we have an industry such as the lumber industry where mills are closing and people are being unemployed because the market is being taken over by imports from another country, I think it is time we in the legislative halls take another look at where we have been and decide where we are going if we are going to legislate so that American industry can look to the future with hope for success. The first decision of the Tariff Commission brought before it under the provisions of the act of 1962 points up very dramatically that the Tariff Commission has virtually ceased to exist as an effective agency to which any suffering domestic industry or its employees can turn for relief. Therefore, in order to restore effectiveness to the Tariff Commission and to offer to American industry and the working men and women of this country, some semblance of hope for their economic future, this Congress should take the action proposed in the legislation which my colleague from Idaho has introduced here today. While these proposals are not the complete answer to the problem they are certainly an affirmative step in the direction of guaranteeing the right of American industries to survive and provide jobs for American citizens.

Mr. President, may I remind the Senate once again of a statement made by President Kennedy in Salem, Oreg., on September 7, 1960, in which he said to a timber-based community:

> It is time for a fresh and imaginative program to resolve the problem of our Nation's timber industry and in 1961 we are going to put such a program into action.

This was an excellent statement of intention. Unfortunately the implementation of it has been most unrewarding. It is now 1963—almost 2½ years since that statement was made and yet no definitive action has been taken which will bring economic relief to the timber industry. In fact, the only action taken through the Trade Agreements Act has added to the plight of the industry.

Therefore, Mr. President, I urge the Senate and the administration to support the proposals which are advanced here today so that we can resolve the problem of our Nation's timber industry and bring a ray of hope to the economic future of the men and women who depend on the success of this industry for their livelihood.

FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE TO STATES FOR CONSTRUCTION OF PUBLIC COMMUNITY COLLEGES

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill which provides a program of financial assistance to the States, for the construction of public community colleges. I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill and an analysis of the bill be printed in the RECORD, following my remarks. I also ask unanimous consent that the bill be held at the desk for 5 days, so that additional Senators may sponsor the bill if they so desire.

Mr. President, many factors point to the continued growth of these unique educational institutions. The time is rapidly approaching when community colleges should become as general in our country as central high schools. The growing need for skilled technical and professional workers means that we must extend our range of general education beyond the high school and must carry it into at least 2 years of college.

During the 1950's there was a 58-percent increase in the number of skilled technical and professional workers. In the 1960's, the indications are that this tremendous growth will spurt even higher as the pressures of automation and other technological progress make their impact on our employment situation.

Higher education is no longer a luxury. Parents throughout the country recognize that unless their youngsters are equipped with adequate education, they will be among the job leftouts who seek the good jobs, but find they are not qualified for them.

In addition, the complexity of public problems which every citizen must face makes it essential that the young people of today become alert and informed adults capable of understanding and participating in the resolution of the great issues of tomorrow.

Throughout the Nation there have been encouraging signs that the value of community colleges is being recognized. Several States have made audits of their higher education facilities and have measured them against the steadily increasing pressure of demand for college training. In evaluating these studies, numerous States have come to the conclusion that the community colleges offer tremendous advantages in meeting present and anticipated needs.

The community college is indeed a community institution. Within its facilities there is the capability for meeting a wide range of needs in the community, and to do so economically.

The community colleges provide a 2-year terminal program for students not going on to a 4-year college course, a transfer program for those who do wish to complete a college training program of 4 or more years, technical training for those who desire to enter skilled vocational and subprofessional careers, and continuing education for adults who want to further their education while working.

On the fiscal side, they are economical to establish and they are economical to attend. Community colleges do not include expensive dormitory and eating facilities, and, therefore, do not require the tremendous sums involved in such structures. Student expenses are usually low, because, for the most part, junior colleges are within commuting distance, and thus make it possible for students to live at home and, if need be, to work part time in their own communities.

In New Jersey, these community colleges have received a great impetus through the enactment of legislation to assist counties in establishing colleges. The very presence of these colleges within sight of high school students who are thinking about their future is bound to make the difference between having many qualified youngsters go on to college or having them write "the end" to their education at the high school exit doors.

In the past session of Congress, one of the most bitter disappointments was the defeat of higher education legislation. At first, all of us were encouraged when the House passed a bill by a vote of 319 to 79, and later the Senate passed a similar bill by a vote of 69 to 17. Then the bills went to conference, and finally the conferees found a way to work out an agreement on the proposed legislation. But a majority of the House of Representatives voted to recommit the measure, and it died.

My proposal for Federal aid to community colleges was a part of the Senate-passed bill, and was included in the conference recommendation. In fact, there was no opposition to this program, either in committee or on the floor of the House or on the floor of the Senate. The disagreements about provisions of the higher education legislation dealt with other parts of the program. It is clear that we need such legislation.

My bill, which is in the form passed last year by the Senate, would provide a 5-year program of matching grants to public colleges, with $50 million a year indicated as the Federal share. The administration's omnibus education bill adopts my bill for a 3-year period.

The demand for the development of facilities for adequate training grows stronger each year. In our State of New Jersey, for example, the high schools will graduate over 15,000 more seniors 4 years from now than they did last June, and the percentage of seniors who want to go to college has been steadily rising. It is estimated that by 1966, 40 percent will want to go on.

Numerous States, including my own, have been export States in the higher education field, sending forth each year numerous boys and girls who must look elsewhere for college opportunities. The program which I offer in this bill will help thousands of youngsters obtain a higher education. This will be useful to them and useful to the Nation, for unless we realize the fullest potential of our young people, we shall not be able to realize the fullest potential of our Nation's most important resources.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill and analysis will be printed in the RECORD, and the bill will be held at the desk, as requested by the Senator from New Jersey.

The bill (S. 956) providing a program of financial assistance to the States for the construction of public community colleges, introduced by Mr. CASE, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Emergency Public Community College Construction Act of 1963."

STATEMENT OF FINDINGS AND PURPOSE

SEC. 2. The Congress recognizes that the Nation faces a severe shortage of college facilities for the training of qualified young men and women. It also acknowledges the steady growth in need for semiprofessional and technical workers who require more preparation than high school, but less than four years of college.

It is therefore the purpose of this Act to assist in—

(1) supplying the greatly increasing need for college training facilities, and

(2) solving the problem of increasing costs for such training,

by providing a five-year emergency program of financial assistance to the States in constructing public community college facilities in such locations as will make such facilities accessible to the homes of as many individuals as may be possible.

AUTHORIZATION OF FUNDS

SEC. 3. For the purpose of this Act there is authorized to be appropriated $50,000,000 for each of the five successive fiscal years beginning with the fiscal year beginning on July 1, 1963.

ALLOTMENTS TO STATES AND FEDERAL SHARE

SEC. 4. (a) The sums appropriated pursuant to section 3 shall be allotted among the States on the basis of the income per person and the number of high school graduates of the respective States. Such allotments shall be made as follows: The Commissioner shall allot to each State for each fiscal year an amount which bears the same ratio to the sums appropriated pursuant to section 3 for such year as the product of—

(A) the number of high school graduates of the State, and

(B) the State's allotment ratio (as determined under subsection (c))

bears to the sum of the corresponding products for all the States.

(b) The allotment to any State under this section for any fiscal year shall be available until the end of the succeeding fiscal year for payment to it of the amounts certified, not later than the end of the fiscal year for which the allotment was made, by the State agency as the Federal share of the cost of constructing public community college facilities under the State plan approved pursuant to section 6.

(c) For purposes of this Act—

(1) The "allotment ratio" for any State shall be 1.00 less the product of (A) .50 and (B) the quotient obtained by dividing the income per person for the State by the income per person for all the States (not including Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, American Samoa, and Guam), except that (i) the allotment ratio shall in no case be less than .25 or more than .75, (ii) the allotment ratio for Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, American Samoa, and Guam shall be .75, and (iii) the allotment ratio of any State shall be .50 for any fiscal year if the Commissioner finds that the cost of school construction in such State exceeds the median of such costs in all the States by a factor of 2 or more as determined by him on the basis of an index of the average per pupil cost of constructing minimum school facilities in the States as determined for such fiscal year under section 15(6) of the Act of September 23, 1950, as amended (20 U.S.C. 645), or, in the Commissioner's discretion, on the basis of such index and such other statistics and data as the Commissioner shall deem adequate and appropriate; and

(2) The allotment ratios shall be promulgated by the Commissioner as soon as possible after enactment of this Act, and annually thereafter, on the basis of the average of the incomes per person of the States and of all the States for the three most recent consecutive calendar years for which satisfactory data are available from the Department of Commerce.

MATCHING REQUIREMENT

SEC. 5. Payment of the full Federal allotment to a State shall be contingent upon the matching of Federal funds by State or local funds, or both, as follows: Each State shall match the Federal allotment by an amount equal to the product of (1) the number of high school graduates in the State and (2) the difference between the national base and the Federal allotment to the State per high school graduate of the State: *Provided,* That in no case shall the State matching payment be more than twice the Federal allotment. To the extent that a State's matching payment falls short of the matching requirement, its Federal allotment shall be proportionately reduced.

STATE PLANS

SEC. 6. (a) Any State desiring to accept the benefits of this Act shall submit a State plan for carrying out the purpose of this Act. The Commissioner shall approve any such plan which—

(1) designates the State agency responsible for administering the plan throughout the State;

(2) contains satisfactory evidence that such State agency will have authority to carry out such plan in conformity with this Act;

(3) provides fiscal control and fund accounting procedures as may be necessary to assure proper disbursement and accounting for Federal funds under this Act and to assure proper applicaton of non-Federal funds used in connection therewith;

(4) provides for the establishment of standards, in accordance with the purpose of this Act, for locating, planning, and constructing public community college facilities;

(5) provides for affording to every applicant, whose application for funds for a construction project under the State plan is denied, an opportunity for a hearing before the State agency; and

(6) provides that the State agency will make such reports to the Commissioner, in such form and containing such information, as are reasonably necessary to enable the Commissioner to carry out the provisions of this Act.

(b) The Commissioner shall not finally disapprove any State plan submitted under this Act, or any modification thereof, without first affording the State agency submitting the plan reasonable notice and opportunity for a hearing.

(c) Whenever the Commissioner, after reasonable notice and opportunity for hearing to the State agency, finds that—

(1) the State plan submitted by such agency and approved under this section has been so changed that it no longer complies with the provisions of subsection (a); or

(2) in the administration of such plan there is a failure to comply substantially with any such provision, the Commissioner shall withhold further payments under section 7 to the State or withhold further payments for any project designated by the Commissioner as being directly affected by such failure, as the Commissioner may determine to be appropriate under the circumstances, until he is satisfied that there is no longer any such failure to comply, or if compliance is impossible, until the State repays or arranges for the repayment of Federal moneys which have been diverted or improperly expended; except that the foregoing provisions of this subsection shall not apply to payment of any amount already reserved under section 7(a) with respect to any public community college facilities project not directly affected by such failure. After notice as provided in this subsection to any State, the Commissioner may suspend the making of further reservations of funds under section 7(a) for projects in such State pending the making of the findings under this subsection.

PAYMENTS TO STATES

SEC. 7. (a) Upon a certification by a State agency—

(1) listing a public community college facilities project (or projects) approved by it during a fiscal year under a State plan approved under section 6; and

(2) setting forth the estimated cost of each such project, the amount of the Federal share of such cost, and such further description of such project as may be required by the Commissioner in order to carry out the provisions of this act,

the Commissioner shall reserve, subject to the requirements of section 5, an amount equal to such Federal share of such cost out of the State's allotment for such fiscal year. Payment of such amount shall be made by the Commissioner to the State, upon request of the State agency, through the disbursing facilities of the Department of the Treasury and prior to audit or settlement by the General Accounting Office, at such time or times and in such installments (in advance of the incurring of cost or otherwise) as the Commissioner may determine. Such payments shall be used exclusively to meet the cost of construction of the project (or projects) for which such amount has been reserved. The Commissioner shall change any amount so reserved upon request of the State agency and receipt of an amended certification from such agency, but only to the extent such change is not inconsistent with the other provisions of this act.

(b) If any project with respect to which payments have been made under this section is terminated or abandoned or not completed within such reasonable period as may be determined in accordance with the regulations of the Commissioner, the State which certified such project shall be liable to repay to the United States, for deposit in the Treasury of the United States as miscellaneous receipts, the amount of such payments or such lesser amounts as the Commissioner deems reasonable under the circumstances.

FEDERAL ADMINISTRATION

SEC. 8. (a) The Commissioner may delegate any of his functions under this Act, except the making of regulations, to any officer or employee of the Office of Education.

(b) In administering the provisions of this Act, the Commissioner is authorized to utilize the services and facilities of any agency of the Federal Government and of any other public or nonprofit agency or institution in accordance with appropriate agreements, and to pay for such services either in advance or by way of reimbursement, as may be agreed upon.

JUDICIAL REVIEW

SEC. 9. (a) If any State is dissatisfied with the Commissioner's final action with respect to the approval of its State plan submitted under this Act, such State may appeal to the United States court of appeals for the circuit in which such State is located. The summons and notice of appeal may be served at any place in the United States. The Commissioner shall forthwith certify and file in the court the transcript of the proceedings and the record on which he based his action.

(b) The findings of fact by the Commissioner, unless substantially contrary to the weight of the evidence, shall be conclusive; but the court, for good cause shown, may remand the case to the Commissioner to take further evidence, and the Commissioner may thereupon make new or modified findings of fact and may modify his previous action, and shall certify to the court the transcript and record of the further proceedings. Such new or modified findings of fact shall likewise be conclusive unless substantially contrary to the weight of the evidence.

(c) The court shall have jurisdiction to affirm the action of the Commissioner or to set it aside, in whole or in part. The judgment of the court shall be subject to review by the Supreme Court of the United States upon certiorari or certification as provided in title 28, United States Code, section 1254.

LABOR STANDARDS

SEC. 10. (a) The Commissioner shall not reserve any amount for a grant under this Act except upon adequate assurance that all laborers and mechanics employed by contractors or subcontractors in the performance of work on construction assisted by such grant will be paid wages at rates not less than those prevailing on similar construction in the locality as determined by the Secretary of Labor in accordance with the Davis-Bacon Act, as amended (40 U.S.C.

276a—276a-5), and will receive compensation at a rate not less than one and one-half times the basic rate of pay for all hours worked in any workweek in excess of eight hours in any workday or forty hours in the workweek, as the case may be.

(b) The Secretary of Labor shall have, with respect to the labor standards specified in subsection (a) of this section, the authority and functions set forth in Reorganization Plan Numbered 14 of 1950 (15 F.R. 3176; 64 Stat. 1267), and section 2 of the Act of June 13, 1934, as amended (40 U.S.C. 276c).

(c) The Commissioner may waive the application of subsection (a) in cases or classes of cases where laborers or mechanics, not otherwise employed at any time in the construction assisted by such grant, voluntarily donate their services for the purpose of lowering the cost of construction.

METHOD OF PAYMENT

Sec. 11. Payments under this Act may be made in installments, and in advance or by way of reimbursement, with necessary adjustments on account of overpayments or underpayments.

ADMINISTRATIVE APPROPRIATIONS AUTHORIZED

Sec. 12. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary for the cost of administering the provisions of this Act.

FEDERAL CONTROL NOT AUTHORIZED

Sec. 13. Nothing contained in this Act shall be construed as authorizing a department, agency, officer, or employee of the United States to exercise any direction, supervision, or control over, or impose any requirements or condition with respect to, the personnel, curriculum, methods of instruction, or administration of any educational institution.

DEFINITIONS

Sec. 14. As used in this Act—

(1) the term "Commissioner" means the Commissioner of Education, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

(2) The term "public community college" means an educational institution, or branch thereof, in a State, which (1) is under public supervision and control, (2) is organized and administered principally to offer educational programs, of not more than two years' duration, beyond the high school level, (3) has as one of its major purposes the provision of a two-year program which is acceptable for full credit toward a bachelor's degree upon the student's transfer to an institution of higher education, and (4) if a branch of an institution offering four or more years of higher education, is located in a community different from that in which its parent institution is located.

(3) The terms "construct", "constructing", and "construction" include the preparation of drawings and specifications for public community college facilities, erecting, building, acquiring, and expanding public community college facilities, and the inspection and supervision of the construction of such facilities.

(4) The term "public community college facilities" means classrooms and related facilities, initial equipment, machinery, utilities, and land (including interests in land and land improvements) necessary or appropriate for the purposes of a public community college, but shall not include athletic stadiums or structures or facilities intended primarily for the purpose of athletic exhibitions, contests, or games or other events for which admission is to be charged to the general public.

(5) The term "high school graduate" means a person who has received formal recognition (by diploma, certificate, or similar means) from an approved school for successful completion of four years of education beyond the first eight years of schoolwork, or for demonstration of equivalent achievement. For the purposes of this Act the number of high school graduates shall be limited to the number who graduated in the most recent school year for which satisfactory data are available from the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. The interpretation of the definition of "high school graduate" shall fall within the authority of the Commissioner.

(6) The term "national base" means with respect to any fiscal year, an amount equal to three times the quotient of (A) the amount appropriated for such year under the authorization in section 3, divided by (B) the number of high school graduates.

(7) The term "State agency" means the agency designated by a State in its State plan in accordance with section 6(1).

(8) The term "State" includes, in addition to the several States, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, Guam, and American Samoa.

The analysis presented by Mr. Case is as follows:

A Brief Analysis of S. 956 by Senator Clifford P. Case

Section 1: The bill provides a program of financial assistance to the States for the construction of public community colleges.

Section 2: Congress recognizes that the Nation faces a severe shortage of college facilities for the training of qualified young men and women. It also acknowledges the steady growth in need for semiprofessional and technical workers who require more preparation than high school, but less than 4 years of college.

Defines the purpose of the act to assist in (1) supplying the greatly increasing need for college training facilities, and (2) solving the problem of increasing costs for such training, by providing a 5-year emergency program of financial assistance to the States in constructing public community college facilities in such locations as will make such facilities accessible to the homes of as many individuals as may be possible.

Section 3: Authorizes appropriation of $50 million for each of the 5 successive fiscal years beginning on July 1, 1963.

Section 4: Outlines the method for apportionment of funds among the States. Consideration will be given under this formula to the income per person in the State and the number of high school graduates of the respective States.

Section 5: Requires that each State shall add to the Federal allotment an amount equal to the product of the number of high school graduates and the difference between the national base and the Federal allotment to the State for high school graduates of the State.

Section 6: Requires that any participating State submit a plan to the Commissioner of Education, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, for carrying out the purposes of the act. The Commissioner may not fully disapprove any State plan or modification thereof without first affording the State agency reasonable notice and opportunity for hearing. The Commissioner may withhold payments if he finds the State has not been in compliance with the provisions of this act, after reasonable notice and opportunity for hearing to the State agency.

Section 7: Payments shall be made by the Commissioner of Education to the State through the Department of the Treasury, and subject to the audit of the General Accounting Office.

Section 8: The Commissioner is authorized to delegate to any officer of the Office of Education any of his functions under the act except the making of regulations.

Section 9: If any State is dissatisfied with the Commissioner's final action with respect to the approval of its State plan submitted under this act, such State may appeal to the U.S. court of appeals for the circuit in which such State is located. The court shall have jurisdiction to affirm the action of the Commissioner or to set it aside, in whole or in part.

Section 10: Labor standards: Applies provisions of Davis-Bacon Act to any construction under this act.

Section 11: Defines method of payment.

Section 12: Authorizes administrative appropriations.

Section 13: Prohibition against Federal control: Nothing contained in this act shall be construed as authorizing a department, agency, officer, or employee of the United States to exercise any direction, supervision, or control over, or impose any requirements or condition with respect to, the personnel, curriculum, methods of instruction, or administration of any educational institution.

Section 14: Defines the terms used in the act.

POLITICS, INFLUENCE, AND GOVERNMENT CONTRACTS

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, the President's new budget recommends the expenditure of more than $60 billion for national defense and space activities. This means that more than half of all the Federal Government's expenditures in the coming fiscal year would be earmarked for these two important activities, and indications are that these amounts will tend to increase even further in the next few years.

Some of these expenditures involve individual contracts running into millions and millions, even billions, of dollars. In the 1962 campaign they were the subject of much political attention by various candidates and the President himself. I shall cite several examples.

Government defense contracts are big business. In the past fiscal year, the Defense Department awarded more than $28 billion in contracts. Approximately 35 percent of these were on the basis of competitive bidding.

The remaining 65 percent—almost two-thirds of the total—were made in the category of negotiated contracts. With such huge sums involved and with decisions made in the private way in which negotiated contracts are developed, it is more important than ever that the national interest be the sole criterion in awarding Government contracts; that we get a dollar's worth for each dollar spent. The scale of space and defense commitments calls for unusual measures to safeguard the integrity of the contract award system, to make sure that awards are made on the basis of merit—and that politics, influence, or any other extraneous interest is ruled out.

These contracts are of such substantial amounts, as many Senators well know, that in some cases success or failure in winning a particular contract may well mean making or breaking a particular firm. They have heavy impact on the welfare of hundreds of thousands of people—employees, management, and stockholders. They affect vitally the interest of entire communities and, indeed, the interests of many States, including my own.

The Defense Department's official policy is plain:

> Our first and paramount objective is to acquire weapons and materiel which fully meet our qualitative, quantitative and delivery requirements—at the lowest overall cost. To this end we must stress full and free competition, with equal opportunity to all interested qualified suppliers, and we must continuously seek to minimize sole-source procurements for end items, major subsystems, spare parts and supplies. Whenever our specifications are sufficiently precise, we must obtain competition through formal advertised bidding procedures as required by law.

The Defense Department policy is eminently clear. Anything less than this is contrary to the national interest and is obviously unfair to the honest bidders who put their faith in their own ability and efficiency, in the confidence that the decision will be made only on the merits, without any interference or string pulling through political channels.

But recent actions and statements in high official circles—indeed, in the highest—raise doubts as to whether what actually goes on conforms with official policy.

A major project in the scientific world is the so-called Mohole project, to drill a hole in the bottom of the sea, as a part of a great geological project, being undertaken by the National Science Foundation, to pierce the earth's crust and sample its hot interior. This has been termed "man's greatest geological project," and the 5-year contract is estimated to cost $43,600,000. Brown & Root, Inc., of Houston, Tex., was awarded this plum, despite the fact that one NSF panel rated this firm third best in a field of three, and another NSF panel rated four firms as better qualified.

Initial progress reports on this project indicate an eventual cost of $70 to $85 million—almost double the original estimate—and that the contractors are behind schedule.

A similar topside reversal of evaluation panels is apparently involved in a major Defense Department aircraft contract award, part of which is to be performed in Fort Worth, Tex. The Senate Permanent Investigations Subcommittee began hearings on the award this week.

The final decision in either or both these cases may have been completely sound. But under present limited disclosure practices, it is impossible for the public to judge.

A full disclosure of all relevant facts would benefit everybody. An informed public opinion would exert irresistible weight in support of decisions which are soundly based, and against those which are not. It would reduce to a minimum improper pressures on Government officials. It would restore public confidence in the integrity of Government.

I have been deeply concerned by statements during the 1962 political campaign, as well as recurring press reports, which tend to confirm this feeling that politics, influence, and other extraneous considerations are involved in the selection of contractors. Unfortunately, the President himself, in several statements he made in the heat of last fall's campaign, has done nothing to dispel this concern.

Appearing in West Virginia, the President, in urging the reelection of a Congressman, said that four times as much defense money was being spent in West Virginia as in 1960. In a subsequent speech in Pennsylvania, in behalf of a candidate for Governor, the President said:

> In fact, military prime-contract awards to Pennsylvania for fiscal year 1962 were nearly 50 percent higher than they were in 1960—and this is the kind of progress and collaboration which Dick Dilworth (nominee for Governor of Pennsylvania) can continue as Governor.

The next day, again the President said:

> Working with Governor Lawrence since 1960, we have increased by 50 percent the number of prime defense contracts that come to Pennsylvania—job retraining, cleaning our rivers, area redevelopment, increasing our food supplies for those on relief—all these measures which can be brought about with a progressive, Democratic Governor. So I am hopeful that you are going to elect in this State Dick Dilworth.

These statements were made in the heat of a campaign; but such statements by candidates and party leaders have lowered the standard for campaigning to the point that from Massachusetts, on the Atlantic, to Washington, on the Pacific, the cry, "I can do more," has been made respectable.

What specifically can we do to provide better protection for the integrity of our contracting system? I propose legislation to carry out a three-point program based on my experience on the Armed Services, Space, and Appropriations Committees.

First. Require that a record be maintained, open to public inspection, of all ex parte communications, whether written or oral, in regard to a defense or space contract by anyone, including Members of Congress or the executive branch, other than the bidder.

Second. Require full, complete, and prompt public disclosure of the basis on which a negotiated contract award is made, except for information classified for security provisions, or where forbidden by existing law.

Third. Establish a special joint House-Senate committee authorized to review defense and space contract awards, with primary attention to negotiated contracts. This watchdog committee would consist of a Democrat and a Republican appointed from each of the following committees: the Senate and the House Armed Services Committees, the Senate and the House Appropriations Committees, the Senate and the House Government Operations Committees, and the Senate and the House Space Committees.

This joint committee would have its own continuing staff, as well as assistance from the General Accounting Office. I would suggest that the chairman of the committee be a Republican, during a Democratic administration, and a Democrat, during a Republican administration.

Timely disclosure is important for several reasons. From the point of view of the Government, if there has been an error or favoritism in an award, it can be corrected before funds are committed or before work for which the Government is obligated to pay has been started. From the point of view of both the Government and the contractors who lost out, review after the point of no return, as it were, has been reached may be helpful for the future, but does nothing to right the immediate wrong. In short, disclosure at the time when the selection is made makes it possible to do something about it, if the facts so warrant.

On the matter of full disclosure, some progress has been made. As a result of my discussions with the Defense Department, the Department has amended its regulations on armed services procurement so as to provide that the contracting officer shall give written notice to the unsuccessful offerers, relaying such information as the number of prospective competitors solicited, the number of proposals received, the items, quantities, and unit prices of each award, and, in general terms, the reason why the offerer's proposal was not accepted. This moves in the direction I have urged, but it still does not include the key information necessary in order to permit the public to evaluate the decisionmaking process in the selection of the successful contractor. The complete and prompt disclosure which I have urged would let the public know who had a hand in the contract award and what cards he played in that hand.

One immediate benefit, I am confident, would be that Members of Congress and the executive branch would be in a better position to resist pressures from contractors who seek political help in obtaining contract awards. Their argument that they need this help because a competitor is receiving the same sort of under-the-table assistance from his Government friends is difficult, if not impossible, to answer in the present situation. The knowledge that any outside intercession would become publicly known would serve as a warning, and, I believe, would be the strongest possible deterrent to those who would seek improper intervention.

I recognize that some of these proposals sound revolutionary, even utopian, and depart from customary procedures; but the size of our Federal budget—now approaching a hundred billion dollars a year—makes unusual steps necessary. Doubt and suspicion have no place in Government contracts, and this applies most emphatically to our defense program. Full disclosure and active surveillance are the best safeguards against them.

The only consideration in selecting a contract recipient should be what makes sense for the program itself. If improper interference with the contracting system adds even $1 to the cost of our expensive space and defense programs, it is waste; and we may be sure that if it adds a dollar, it will probably add a great deal more than that in the lifetime of a negotiated contract. This is everybody's problem.

The public business, particularly that involving billions and billions of dollars, for a virtual handful of firms, should be transacted in the open. There is no room for back-door approaches or hidden influences in the selection of contract awards. Morally bad in any situation, it is intolerable when it affects our vital interest. The people do not want political spoils—Democratic or Republican—diminishing our national security.

Mr. President, I now introduce, for appropriate reference, two bills which embody the proposals I have described. I ask unanimous consent that the text of both bills be printed at this point in the Record; and I also request that the bills be held at the desk for 5 days, for additional sponsors. I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record, following the text of the bills, an article on this subject which was published in the Chicago Daily News.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bills will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bills and article will be printed in the Record, and the bills will lie on the desk, as requested by the Senator from New Jersey.

The bills, introduced by Mr. Case, were received, read twice by their titles, referred to the Committee on Armed Services, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

S. 960. A bill to establish the Joint Committee on Defense and Space Contracts, and for other purposes.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Defense and Space Contract Review Act".

ESTABLISHMENT OF THE JOINT COMMITTEE ON DEFENSE AND SPACE CONTRACTS

Sec. 2. (a) There is hereby established a Joint Committee on Defense and Space Contracts (hereinafter referred to as the "Joint Committee") which shall be composed of eight Members of the Senate and eight Members of the House of Representatives, selected as follows:

(1) Two members of the Joint Committee shall be members of the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences of the Senate, and two members of the Joint Committee shall be members of the Committee on Science and Astronautics of the House of Representatives;

(2) Two members of the Joint Committee shall be members of the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate, and two members of the Joint Committee shall be members of the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives;

(3) Two members of the Joint Committee shall be members of the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate, and two members of the Joint Committee shall be members of the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives; and

(4) Two members of the Joint Committee shall be members of the Committee on Government Operations of the Senate, and two members of the Joint Committee shall be members of the Committee on Government Operations of the House of Representatives.

(b) Members of the Joint Committee selected from each such standing committee of the Senate or the House of Representatives shall be designated by the chairman of that standing committee and shall include one member thereof who is a member of the majority party of the House of the Congress of which he is a Member, and one member of such standing committee who is a member of the minority party of the House of the Congress of which he is a Member.

(c) The Joint Committee shall select a Chairman and a Vice Chairman from among its members at the beginning of each Congress. The Vice Chairman shall act in place of the Chairman in the absence of the Chairman. The Chairmanship shall alternate between the Senate and the House of Representatives with each Congress. The Chairman shall be chosen by the Members from the House which is entitled to the Chairmanship, and the Vice Chairman shall be chosen from the House other than that of the Chairman by the Members from that House. No member of the Joint Committee may serve as Chairman if he is a member of the political party of which the President of the United States is a member. No member of the Joint Committee may serve as Vice Chairman if he is a member of the political party of which the Chairman is a member.

(d) Vacancies in the membership of the Joint Committee shall not affect the authority of the remaining members to execute the functions of the Joint Committee, and shall be filled in the same manner in which original appointments thereto are made.

INVESTIGATIVE DUTIES

Sec. 3. (a) It shall be the duty of the Joint Committee to conduct a continuing study and investigation of all major contracts entered into for the procurement of property or services by the Department of Defense (including the military departments thereof and the armed forces administered thereby), the Department of the Treasury or the Coast Guard for or on behalf of the Coast Guard, and the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. Particular attention shall be given to such contracts entered into by negotiation. Such study and investigation shall be conducted for the purpose of ascertaining as to each such contract—

(1) the facts and circumstances leading to the formation of that contract;

(2) the basis upon which award of that contract was made; and

(3) the considerations which were determinative in the selection of the contractor to whom that contract was awarded.

(b) On or before January 31 of each year, the Joint Committee shall transmit to the Senate and to the House of Representatives a report which shall—

(1) state the results of its studies and investigations during the preceding calendar year;

(2) describe fully the facts and circumstances of any such contract award which the Joint Committee considers to have been made contrary or without due regard to the interest of the Government in procuring property and services of maximum utility upon the most advantageous terms available; and

(3) include such recommendations for legislative or other measures which the Joint Committee may deem necessary or advisable to improve in the public interest practices and procedures of departments, agencies, and armed forces of the Government in the procurement of property and services.

(c) Each department, agency, and armed force referred to in subsection (a) shall—

(1) keep the Joint Committee fully and currently informed as to the policies, practices, and procedures of that department, agency, or armed force with respect to the procurement of property and services; and

(2) furnish to the Joint Committee any information requested by the Chairman thereof as to such policies, practices, and procedures, or with respect to action taken by that department, agency, or armed force relative to the formation of any major contract or proposed major contract.

(d) As used in this section, the term "major contract" means any contract under which the United States, or one or more of the departments, agencies, or armed forces thereof, may be obligated to expend or pay $500,000 or more.

LEGISLATIVE DUTIES

Sec. 4. (a) All bills, resolutions, and other measures in the Senate or the House of Representatives relating primarily to the procurement of property or services by any of the departments, agencies, or armed forces referred to in section 3(a) of this Act shall be referred to the Joint Committee.

(b) The members of the Joint Committee who are Members of the Senate shall from time to time report to the Senate, and the members of the Joint Committee who are Members of the House of Representatives shall from time to time report to the House, by bill or otherwise, their recommendations with respect to matters within the jurisdiction of their respective Houses which are referred to the Joint Committee or otherwise within the jurisdiction of the Joint Committee.

POWERS

Sec. 5. (a) In carrying out its duties under this Act, the Joint Committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to hold such hearings or investigations, to sit and act within or outside the United States at such places and times, to require, by subpena or otherwise, the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, to take such testimony, to procure such printing and binding, and make such expenditures as it deems advisable. The Joint Committee may make such rules respecting its organization and procedures as it deems necessary. Except as otherwise specifically provided by this Act, no measure or recommendation shall be reported from the Joint Committee unless a majority of the committee assent.

(b) Subpenas may be issued over the signature of the Chairman of the Joint Committee or by any member designated by him or by the Joint Committee, and may be served by such person or persons as may be designated by such Chairman or member. The Chairman of the Joint Committee or any member thereof may administer oaths to witnesses.

STAFF AND ASSISTANCE

Sec. 6. (a) The Joint Committee may appoint and fix the compensation of such experts, consultants, technicians, and staff employees as it deems necessary and advisable.

(b) The Joint Committee is authorized to utilize the services, information, facilities, and personnel of the General Accounting Office and of any department, agency, or armed force of the United States, on a reimbursable basis or otherwise, with the consent of the head of such office, department, agency, or armed force. With the consent of any standing, select, or special committee of either House of the Congress, or any subcommittee thereof, the Joint Committee may utilize the facilities and the services of the staff of such committee or subcommittee whenever the Chairman of the Joint Committee determines that such action is necessary and appropriate.

EXPENSES

SEC. 7. (a) The expenses of the Joint Committee shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate from funds appropriated for the Joint Committee, upon vouchers approved by the chairman. The cost of stenographic service to report public hearings shall not be in excess of the amounts prescribed by law for reporting the hearings of standing committees of the Senate. The cost of stenographic service to report executive hearings shall be fixed at an equitable rate by the Joint Committee.

(b) Members of the Joint Committee, and its employees and consultants, while traveling on official business for the Joint Committee within or outside the United States, may receive either the per diem allowance authorized to be paid to Members of the Congress or its employees, or their actual and necessary expenses provided an itemized statement of such expenses is attached to the voucher.

CLASSIFIED INFORMATION

SEC. 8. (a) The Joint Committee may classify information originating within the committee, in accordance with standards used generally by the executive branch of the Government for classifying defense information.

(b) Upon request made by the Chairman of the Joint Committee, the eligibility of any employee or consultant of the Joint Committee for access to defense information shall be determined in the same manner in which such determination is made with respect to employees within the executive branch of the Government. Any employee or consultant of the Joint Committee who has been so determined to be eligible to have access to defense information of any classification shall be entitled to have access to such information of that classification to the extent required for the performance of his duly assigned duties as an employee or consultant of the Joint Committee as certified by the Chairman of the Joint Committee.

RECORDS

SEC. 9. (a) The Joint Committee shall keep a complete record of all committee actions, including a record of the votes on any question on which a record vote is demanded.

(b) All committee records, data, charts, and files shall be the property of the Joint Committee and shall be kept in the offices of the Joint Committee or such other places as the Joint Committee may direct under such security safeguards as the Joint Committee shall determine to be required in the interest of the national defense and security.

S. 961. A bill to require public disclosure of certain information concerning the award of contracts entered into by the Armed Forces and by the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, and for other purposes.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) chapter 137 of title 10, United States Code (relating to procurement generally), is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"§ 2315. Public disclosure of certain contract information

"(a) There shall be established—

"(1) within the Department of Defense a contract information file in which there shall be deposited forthwith each contract communication received by that Department, any military department thereof, or any armed force administered thereby with regard to each proposed major contract of any such department or armed force;

"(2) within the Department of the Treasury a contract information file in which there shall be deposited forthwith each contract communication received by that Department or by the Coast Guard with regard to each proposed major contract of the Coast Guard when it is not operating as a service in the Navy; and

"(3) within the National Aeronautics and Space Administration a contract information file in which there shall be deposited forthwith each contract communication received by that agency with regard to each proposed major contract of that agency.

"(b) Whenever any major contract is awarded by or on behalf of a department or agency named in subsection (a) or any armed force administered thereby, there shall be forthwith prepared and deposited in the contract information file of that department or agency a contract information memorandum which shall contain a full, complete, and accurate statement of (1) the facts and circumstances leading to the formation of that contract, (2) the basis upon which award of that contract was made, and (3) the considerations which were determinative in the selection of the contractor to whom that contract was awarded.

"(c) All communications and memorandums deposited in the contract information file of any such department or agency shall be available for public inspection within such department or agency during all regular business hours, and shall be arranged, classified and indexed in such manner as to facilitate rapid inspection of all communications and memorandums which relate to each proposed contract or contract. All communications and memorandums deposited in the file shall be retained therein for not less than three years. The head of the department or agency concerned may excise from any contract communication or contract information memorandum to be placed in the contract information file of that department or agency any portion of the contents of that communication or memorandum if he determines that publication thereof would result in the public disclosure of (1) information theretofore duly classified for reasons of national security as information which may not be publicly disclosed, or (2) information the public disclosure of which is specifically forbidden by any Act of the Congress. Authority to excise any portion of any such communication or memorandum may not be delegated by the head of any department or agency to any other individual. The head of the department or agency concerned shall promulgate appropriate regulations to carry into effect the requirements of this section. All regulations promulgated under this section shall be published in the Federal Register.

"(d) In this section the term—

"(1) 'Contract communication', with respect to any proposed major contract, means the original copy of any written communication, and a written memorandum which identifies by name and official or business affiliation the maker and contains a full, complete, and accurate statement of the substance and purport of any oral communication, received by the department or agency concerned, or by any officer or employee thereof, relating in any way to any proposed major contract award, except that such term does not include any communication receive from a potential contractor under that proposed contract or from a contractor representative of any such potential contractor.

"(2) 'Major contract' means any purchase of property or services and any contract or agreement for the procurement of property or services which may result in the expenditure or payment of $500,000 or more by one or more of the departments, agencies, and armed forces referred to in subsection (a).

"(3) 'Proposed major contract' means any proposed or contemplated purchase, contract, or agreement, and any commitment or declaration of intention, which, if entered into or carried into effect, would result in the formation of a major contract.

"(4) 'Potential contractor', with respect to any proposed major contract, means any individual, and any corporation, partnership, or other business entity, who has submitted or who has been invited by advertisement or otherwise to submit to the department, agency, or armed force concerned a bid for that proposed major contract, or who has entered into any discussion with the department, agency, or armed force concerned in contemplation of entering into that proposed major contract by negotiation.

"(5) 'Contractor representative', with respect to any proposed major contract, means any officer or partner of any corporation, partnership, or other business entity which is a potential contractor under that proposed major contract, and any individual who is a regularly employed sales or technical representative of any potential contractor under that proposed major contract. Such term does not include (A) any officer, employee, or agent of the United States or any department, agency, or armed force thereof, (B) any Member of or Delegate to the Congress, or (C) any individual who is an officer or employee of the Congress or any agency within the legislative branch of the Government, either House of the Congress, any committee of the Congress or either House thereof, any subcommittee of any such committee, or any Member of or Delegate to the Congress."

(b) The sectional analysis of chapter 137 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new item:

"2315. Public disclosure of certain contract information."

SEC. 2. (a) Chapter 93 of title 18, United States Code (relating to public officers and employees), is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"§ 1916. Default of obligation to disclose contract information

"Whoever, being an officer, employee or person acting for or on behalf of the United States or any department or agency thereof who has any obligation under section 2315 of title 10, United States Code, or any regulation duly promulgated thereunder, to file, record, prepare, preserve, transmit, maintain, or grant access to any contract communication or contract information memorandum or to cause any such communication or memorandum to be filed, recorded, prepared, preserved, transmitted, maintained, or made available for public inspection, by any act or omission fails to fulfill that obligation with intent to prevent, evade, delay, or obstruct the prompt public disclosure of (1) the identity or affiliation of the maker of any such contract communication or full, complete, and accurate information concerning the contents, substance, or purport of that communication or any part thereof, or (2) full, complete, and accurate information concerning any fact, circumstance, or consideration required by subsection (b) of section 2315 of title 10 of the United States Code to be stated in any contract information memorandum, shall be fined not more than $5,000 or imprisoned not more than two years, or both."

(b) The sectional analysis of chapter 93 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new item:

"1916. Default of obligation to disclose contract information."

SEC. 3. The amendments made by this Act shall take effect on the first day of the fourth month beginning after the date of enactment of this Act.

The article presented by Mr. Case is as follows:

[From the Chicago Daily News, Nov. 17, 1961]

DEFENSE PRESSURE A ONE-WAY ROAD—NOBODY LEADS FIGHT TO REDUCE SPENDING

(By James McCartney)

Washington.—Political pressures on the defense program flow in a relentless tide—one way.

There, in a nutshell, lies the problem.

Congressmen and Senators seek defense contracts and installations for their districts or States, striving to keep employment high.

Defense contractors, understandably, seek all of the defense business they can engender and get.

The Army, Navy, and Air Force seek, in great sincerity, larger military budgets, better weapons systems.

Frequently these three great forces, with immense resources to influence spending policies as well as public opinion, operate in concert.

But * * *.

There is no lobby for lower defense spending—no lobby actively seeking to hold the $50-billion-a-year defense machine in check.

Former President Eisenhower described the problem as saying that pressures for defense spending—from each of the three primary sources—were "all in one direction."

Deputy Defense Secretary Roswell L. Gilpatric, who is fully aware of the dangers, agrees.

"In effect," says Gilpatric, "the burden of containing the pressures rests on the civilian Secretaries of the Defense Department and on the President."

But few applaud if their answer to a spending request is "No."

The stakes in this game are high.

Mr. Eisenhower warned that "unwarranted influence" by the "military-industrial complex" could "endanger our liberties or democratic processes."

"The potential for the disastrous rise of misplaced power exists and will persist," he said.

Gilpatric says this was the most significant message Mr. Eisenhower ever delivered to the American people, and wonders only why he waited until 3 days before he left office to deliver it.

"It's a very great risk," Gilpatric adds. "But I think our system is capable of dealing with it."

Gilpatric, a former Wall Street lawyer with a Phi Beta Kappa key from Yale, believes that only a strong executive in the White House, backed by an informed public opinion that understands the nature of the pressures, can adequately do battle.

He also believes that the pressures are inevitable in a democracy in which defense industries operate in the private sector.

But he does not believe that the pressures are sinister—although he can recall exceptions—and he does not believe that they have gotten out of control.

"Pressures on the other side—opposing spending—are more generalized," he says.

"They come from the President, the budget people, the Treasury Department and sometimes, generally, from the business and financial community."

"But," he adds, "this never translates into much support."

"The question," says Gilpatric, "is whether the counterbalancing forces, particularly the civilian Secretaries of the Defense Department, are strong enough."

"It all depends on the quality of the people."

Have we had strong enough men—do we have them now?

It is difficult to answer with certainty.

Today's civilian leaders have loosened up the defense purse strings to the extent of $6 billion this year to strengthen the Armed Forces generally and to prepare for the Berlin crisis.

But they are finding that even this sum has not satisfied many military leaders.

The three military services have reportedly requested an additional $11 billion in defense spending in next year's budget.

This would mean a defense budget of upward of $60 billion—which Gilpatric says "is out of the question." President Kennedy has said, however, that he will ask for at least some additional defense funds next year.

Stories of political influence in the Defense Department are a dime a dozen in Washington.

All a reporter has to do is talk with almost any contractor who has lost out on a contract—and there are usually several losers for every winner. Proving their charges—usually passed out on a confidential, not for attribution basis—is something else.

There are documented cases where contracts have changed hands after political pressure was exerted—but none in which the Defense Department will admit that pressure was the reason for the switch.

A midlevel official at the Pentagon says: "Political and economic pressures play at least some role in the awarding of almost every major contract. We don't live in a vacuum."

Members of a Senate-House subcommittee on defense procurement, headed by Senator Paul Douglas, Democrat, of Illinois, believe that the doors to the Pentagon are wide open to pressure because 60 percent of all defense contracts are awarded without competition.

Says Ray Ward, a procurement expert on the subcommittee's staff, "When a contract is negotiated, without competition, no one on the outside can tell what factors may have influenced the contract award."

To this Senator Douglas adds, "the negotiated contract opens the door to all kinds of political abuses, to pressures from contractors, from local communities, from the military services, as well as to parochial pressures placed on Members of Congress from communities."

Defense Department officials insist, however, that there are so many checks and balances in the contract awarding system that the exercise of "influence" is nearly impossible.

Perhaps the most agonizing aspect of the entire struggle between opposing forces is that no one can be sure—least of all a civilian outsider—precisely what is necessary to guarantee national survival.

No one quarrels with need for a strong defense program in a world in which the Nation's survival is threatened.

But some want to spend more. Others believe we have already gone too far in building an economy which depends so strongly on military expenditures.

The simple and yet incredibly complex equation—how much defense equals adequate protection—is under constant review by the administration.

On a recent CBS–TV program, Mr. Eisenhower summed up his feelings about overall problems posed by the existence of the military-industrial complex.

He mentioned each of the principal kinds of pressure—those from manufacturers, the military and from Congress.

"Now this brings together," he said, " a tremendous economic unit producing for one thing * * *

"The thing we must do," he said, "is to use our commonsense * * * not to give way to these pressures * * * except as we need to.

"I'm not saying there is anything venal here. I'm just saying it's a natural influence that is created by this enormous munitions industry and by all of the people that are pushing in that direction.

"And this means that it takes strong men to stand against it if it goes too far."

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PRESIDENT'S TAX PROPOSAL

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. Douglas], our distinguished colleague and nationally known economist, has written a debate in support of the President's tax proposal.

The portion of the debate which appeared in the Washington Post on February 24 is the most succinct argument for the layman that I have read. I especially appreciate its ability to cut through the involved presentations that I have read and studied in other publications.

For instance, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. Douglas] writes:

> To put it simply, tax cuts would increase monetary purchasing power which in turn would put idle men to work on idle machines producing goods which would otherwise not be produced.

I agree with the Senator that the tax reforms are as important as the tax cuts, although, as a true political realist, the Senator from Illinois realizes that the compound package may not be palatable to the Senate and so he suggests an alternate proposal if, as he says, "the reforms are junked."

A table which illustrates the multiplier effect was a part of the original article but was deleted from the Post article probably for space purposes.

I ask unanimous consent that the article and table be printed following my remarks.

There being no objection, the article and table were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

> Congress and the public should support President Kennedy's proposals for tax cuts and tax revisions because they would stimulate the economy and make our tax system more equitable.
>
> At the present time 5.8 percent of the labor force is fully unemployed. Unemployment has exceeded 5 percent in every month except one since 1957. It has averaged almost 6 percent for the past 5 years. When the full-time unemployment effect of those who work only part-time is taken into account, unemployment is now at least 7 percent.
>
> This is an intolerable situation.
>
> In addition, our idle industrial resources amount to about 17 percent of capacity. Our sluggish rate of economic growth is considerably below our potential.

Furthermore, in periods of recovery or economic upswing, the present tax system tends to take a larger and larger share of the marginal increase in our economic growth. The tax structure prevents us from reaching full employment or the full use of our human and productive resources.

Therefore, the time to act has come.

MULTIPLIER EFFECT

To put the problem in economic terms, there is not enough purchasing power in the economy to buy the goods and services which our labor force and industry can produce at the prices charged.

There are at least two general ways to attack this problem. One of them, and perhaps the preferable one, is to reduce the prices charged to the level of monetary purchasing power. This could be done by an all-out attack on monopoly, semimonopoly, and administered prices, and the structural defects that prevent competition.

The second way to attack the problem is to increase the monetary purchasing power in the economy to the level of the prices that are charged. This is what a tax cut would do.

To put it simply, tax cuts would increase monetary purchasing power which in turn would put idle men to work on idle machines producing goods which would otherwise not be produced.

But the amount of purchasing power released would not merely be the size of the tax cut. It would be, in fact, from three to four times more than the tax cut. This effect can be called the "multiplier effect" which is the shorthand term for describing the increases in both consumption and investment arising from a tax cut to individuals.

The best estimates presented to the Joint Economic Committee are that an $8 billion personal tax cut would increase the gross national product by from $24 to $32 billion more than it would otherwise be.

In turn, the additional funds generated in the economy would themselves be taxed—at the new lower levels—and ultimately about one-fifth of the total increase in the gross national product would be returned to the Treasury.

Thus, an $8 billion tax cut with a multiplier of three to four times would increase the gross national product by $24 to $32 billion. Taxes at 20 percent would bring in added revenues of from $4.8 to $6.4 billion. The net cost of an $8 billion cut would be only from $1.6 to $3.2 billion.

An increase of these magnitudes in the gross national product would produce about 2 million new jobs.

The importance of the "multiplier" effect cannot be exaggerated and is the key to understanding how a tax cut would stimulate the economy.

CUTS NOT INFLATIONARY

All kinds of objections are raised against a tax cut. Here I will answer only the more general ones.

It is charged that tax cuts would be inflationary. With almost 6 percent full-time unemployment and 17 percent of our industrial capacity idle, such a charge is nonsense. At full employment, pumping monetary purchasing power into the economy would merely bid up prices. But at a time of excessive plant capacity and unemployment, added monetary purchasing power can put idle men to work on idle machines without appreciable price rise.

It is argued that we should not cut taxes until the cut is matched by a reduction in expenditures. Frankly, this policy would bring disaster. There are places where the budget can and should be cut. Because of the power of special-interest groups, it will not be cut where it probably should be cut.

But if we were to try to balance the budget by cutting essential functions by $10 to $12 billion, this would have a reverse multiplier effect. The gross national product would be reduced by from $30 to $40 billion. But this expenditure cut would not bring a balanced budget. The deficit would increase by from $6 to $8 billion just from the drop in personal and corporate incomes which would be caused by the initial $10 billion cut in expenditures.

Under the depressed conditions that would be created, Budget Director Kermit Gordon estimated that it would take a cut of about $20 billion in Federal expenditures to bring a balanced budget next year. I agree with the general magnitude of his estimates. Such a cut would bring with it an intolerable rate of unemployment and depression conditions. It would be self-defeating and would bring chaos and catastrophe in its wake.

The tax reforms in the President's program are as important as the tax cuts, both to stimulate the economy and for equity reasons.

If the reforms are junked, I would favor the substitution of a program to increase the personal exemptions from say $600 to $800, or to cut taxes on the first $1,000 and $2,000 of income to a much greater degree than the President's program would do.

Otherwise, the proposed rate cuts, without the revisions, would lack both equity and adequate economic stimulus.

TABLE I.—*Net cost of $8,000,000,000 tax cut with multiplier effect of 3 to 4 times*

[Dollars in billions]

Tax cut (1)	Multiplier (2)	Increase in GNP (3)	Average tax rate (4)	New taxes collected (4×3) (5)	Net cost (1−5) (6)
			Percent		
$8	3	$24	20	$4.8	$3.2
$8	4	32	20	6.4	1.6

THE AL SARENA STEAL—AFTER 8 YEARS

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, as we meet here today, the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs is hearing testimony on very important proposed legislation which would affect the present and future generations of our country. It has to do with conservation of some of our remaining wilderness. One of the main threats to the preservation of beautiful areas in many parts of the United States is a result of a flaw in our mining laws which allows mining in wilderness areas. I am reminded of a situation in my State which has not been corrected, even though attention was first called to it during the senatorial campaign in 1954, of my late husband. I call it the Al Sarena steal. I should like to report to the Senate on that question after 8 years of watching developments in that area.

On February 15, 1954, the then Secretary of the Interior granted patents to 475 acres of the Rogue River National Forest to Al Sarena Mines, Inc.

A joint hearing was held by the House Government Operations Committee and the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee and, thereafter, they issued a report.

In these 8 long years, certainly there has been ample opportunity for those who obtained patent to proceed to mine. They got a free, clear, unencumbered title to the entire 475 acres they sought.

Not once since 1954 has there been the slightest evidence of mining claim development or mining activity. Not one cupful of ore has been processed.

Nor can it be still argued that the so-called miners lacked an opportunity or the financial resources to proceed to mine.

During the last 8 years over 6½ million board feet of timber, with a value in excess of $100,000, have been mined in the form of "green gold." Under our tax laws, the so-called miners could get a capital gains tax treatment on their timber. If they are in the lower tax bracket of 20 percent this means but a 10-percent tax and in no event a tax of more than 25 percent.

Since the claim cost them only $2,375—or $5 per acre—the profit opportunity is quite clear.

Without a patent the Al Sarena group could have gone on to explore, develop—yes, and even mine—their claims. But without a patent they could not reap the value from the timber.

The minority reports at the time made the point that—

> If the claimants' objectives were to secure timber, they could have purchased 20 to 25 times as much timber for the money that was merely invested in the claims and in the pilot mill.
>
> The charge that the claims were filed originally as a subterfuge for securing timber is not supported by any evidence and, in fact, is insupportable.

Mr. President, history has its own way of leading the truth out into the light.

Al Sarena could not be defended in 1954. It cannot be defended today. Al Sarena stands etched for all time as a monumental fraud perpetrated on the people of the United States by inept people in positions of public trust—people unwilling to see the facts as they stood and blind as to their duty to the public interest.

MANAGED NEWS

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, we hear a great deal of talk about managed news. As a Democrat and as a supporter of President Kennedy's program, it is not unfair to say that any charges of excesses or mistakes made by the administration are equally matched by the editorial comments of the overwhelmingly Republican press of the country.

Yesterday I was asked to answer a series of questions by the magazine U.S. News & World Report. On the whole I think that is a good magazine and any remarks I wish to make now should not be taken as a general criticism of it.

However, the questions I was asked to answer must either have been drafted by someone in a partisan moment or by the Republican National Committee.

In fact, they are not unlike the congressional polls we see from time to time where a Republican Congressman asks a loaded question such as, "Would you be in favor of cutting $5 billion of waste from the President's budget" and where he reports replies in the order of 99 percent "yes" and 1 percent "undecided."

In order that my Democratic colleagues may be forewarned, I want to put the proposed questions from the U.S. News & World Report in the RECORD. There is no reason for me to comment further on them for even a cursory or hasty reading will show, I think, that they are really loaded questions.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the questions which I was asked to answer and which I refused to answer be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the questions were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

1. Why is President Kennedy, as a Democrat, able to exert so little influence over a House and Senate that have majorities heavily Democratic?

2. White House messages and ideas go to Congress and seem to disappear. As far as anyone can see they generate no response out in the country. Why?

3. Has the President failed to get into tune with the mood of the country?

4. Is there a feeling that the President's plans do not command wide support among the voters?

5. Is there distrust of the White House advisers who generate ideas and write messages?

6. Has the President, himself, lacked some element of leadership—an ability to create confidence and attract loyalty?

7. Or: Are many Members of Congress simply wary about the political future and willing to trust their own political judgment more than that of the President?

WERE DUNES JOBS FIGURES PADDED?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, the irreplaceable Indiana Dunes may be destroyed by a proposed Burns Ditch Harbor and a Bethlehem Steel plant if certain interests have their way. The principal justification advanced by those who would destroy one of the Midwest's finest gifts of nature is the claim that 60,000 to 100,000 new jobs would be created.

An extraordinary letter bearing directly on these claims from the Bethlehem Steel Co., to Governor Welsh has been obtained by Chicago's American and was discussed in an article which appeared in that paper on February 26. I have now obtained a copy of this letter. It is remarkable in showing that the claims which were made of the alleged new jobs which would be created were simply not founded on fact.

This American article in part points out that the letter specifically states that—

First, 200 to 250 supervisory employees will be moved to the Indiana plant from Bethlehem plants outside Indiana; second, by 1965 there would be employed a maximum of only 2,100 to 2,300 employees; not 10,000 or 20,000 as sometimes claimed; third, if—and there is absolutely no commitment on this—a basic steel mill is ever put in, there will be employed only a maximum total of 8,000 to 10,000 employees; and fourth, Bethlehem will make no commitment on when or whether it actually will put in an integrated steel mill.

The figures given for maximum production employment in the indefinite future of only 8,000 to 10,000 workers, some of which will be imported, contrast markedly with the claims being made that 100,000 jobs will result from the destruction of the Indiana dunes. It takes more than naive optimism to think one production worker will support 10–12 service employees.

This letter also contains unusual and even ominous statements with respect to the question of whether organized labor is to be welcomed at the proposed Bethlehem plant. I will leave to the reader of the American article and the letter any interpretation as to the meaning of Bethlehem's comments on this question, but when it is recalled that some of the chief port promoters are also leaders of right-to-work forces, this letter becomes very significant.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this letter, dated February 18, 1963, which was apparently released to the press about a week ago, be printed in the body of the RECORD following my remarks along with the article discussing the disclosures made by this letter and their significance which was written by C. Owsley Shepherd and which appeared in Chicago's American on February 26, 1963.

There being no objection, the letter and article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BETHLEHEM STEEL CO., INC.,
Bethlehem, Pa., February 18, 1963.

Hon. MATTHEW E. WELSH,
Governor of Indiana,
Indianapolis, Ind.

DEAR GOVERNOR WELSH: From time to time during the past several years we have written to you concerning our plans for the development of our plant site in the industrial district adjacent to the Burns Waterway Public Harbor tract. On December 3, 1962, Bethlehem Steel Co. announced that it had commenced construction of a new steel mill at this location. You have received a description of this project which, in general terms, will consist of three finishing mills to be constructed over a period of 3 years at an estimated cost of $250 million. This new plant of ours has been given the name Burns Harbor Plant.

Our currently authorized program consists of the first three steps of a long range six-step plan for the development of this site. The sixth step will be the construction of facilities which will make the Burns Harbor Plant a fully integrated steel mill. For the sake of clarity we will hereinafter refer to the current project, the first three finishing mills, as the 1962 program.

You have asked a number of specific questions concerning the 1962 program. Many of the answers require estimated figures. We believe the figures contained in several of the following answers to be conservative and as accurate as is practicable at the present time.

(a) The 1962 program will require the employment of building trades employees approximately as follows:

Number of employees:	*Estimated monthly payroll*
Sept. 1, 1963: 400 to 500	$270,000
Sept. 1, 1964: 2,500 to 3,000	1,650,000
Sept. 1, 1965: 400 to 500	270,000

(b) We assume, but do not know, that our contractors will employ union building trades labor.

(c) We assume that our contractors will, to the extent practicable, give preference to local building trades labor.

(d) The first production employees will be employed about October 1, 1964.

(e) The employment figures for production employees will be approximately as follows:

Number of employees:	*Estimated monthly payroll*
Dec. 1, 1964: 600 to 650	$387,500
July 1, 1965: 1,700 to 1,800	1,085,000
Dec. 1, 1965: 2,100 to 2,300	1,364,000

(f) We have no way of knowing whether our production employees wil elect to be represented by a union.

(g) The nature of any labor agreement we may have will have a bearing on whether the local labor supply, where qualified, will be given preference.

(h) We anticipate that some supervisory employees, numbering 200 to 250 for the 1962 program, will be moved to the Burns Harbor plant from other Bethlehem plants located outside the State of Indiana.

(i) It is obvious that we cannot now predict, with any degree of accuracy, when we will reach step VI, which will be the fully integrated steel mill. We hope that steps IV and V, which consist of further refinements of steps I to III and additions to finishing mill capacity, will be completed during the period 1966–72.

(j) When step VI is completed the production force at the Burns Harbor plant should be in the range of 8,000 to 10,000 employees. Our very long-range plan contemplates a Burns Harbor plant with an annual capacity of 10 million tons. It is too early to judge how many employees will be required if and when this ultimate objective is reached.

Although you did not ask for it, I think it would be appropriate here to restate the Bethlehem position with respect to a public harbor at this location. Because the State has worked so long for an adequate public harbor and because the great majority of the citizens of the State want such a harbor, we have supported and will continue to support your efforts to construct the Burns Waterway Public Harbor. It is true, however, that neither our 1962 program nor our long-range plan of development is dependent upon the construction of a public harbor at the Burns Waterway location. If your efforts to construct the public harbor are successful we will contribute toward its cost and make use of its facilities in the manner provided in our July 25, 1962, agreement with the State and the Indiana Port Commission. If a public harbor is not in being or under construction at the time when we will need harbor facilities, we necessarily will have to construct a private harbor by ourselves or in cooperation with other private interests. Within 2 years we will be moving very large quantities of semifinished steel to our Burns Harbor plant from plants in the East. If harbor facilities were available in 1965, a substantial portion of this semifinished tonnage could move into the plant, and a smaller quantity of finished products could move out of the plant, by water transport. We could make good use of a harbor in 1965 and we must have one when we reach step VI of our development program. We sincerely hope that the State of Indiana can have its public harbor at Burns Waterway, but until such a harbor is assured beyond reasonable doubt we must, in our forward planning, assume that our Burns Harbor plant will be served by a private harbor.

Very truly yours,

B. D. Broeker,
Secretary.

[From the Chicago American]

Steel Firms Give Data—Politicians Padded Dunes Job Figures

(By C. Owsley Shepherd)

Bethlehem Steel Co., in a letter to Gov. Matthew E. Welsh, of Indiana, has dispelled any hope that construction of a public harbor at Burns Ditch would create jobs for from 60,000 to 100,000 Hoosiers, Chicago's American has learned.

Secretary B. D. Broeker of the steel firm said that when and "if" a fully integrated mill is built to turn out raw steel and finished products, the production force would range from 8,000 to 10,000 employees.

Such a long-range plan is not even contemplated before 1972, the letter states.

NEARLY 2,300 JOBS BY 1965

Meanwhile, Bethlehem is preparing to construct a steel rolling and finishing mill on its Burns Ditch site which Broeker says would employ from 400 to 500 workers this year; 2,500 to 3,000 next year, and 400 to 500 in 1965.

When the mill is complete, he continues, the number of production employees is expected to reach a peak of 2,100 to 2,300 late in 1965.

Midwest Steel, which would share the benefits of a harbor built at taxpayers' expense, has a finishing mill in operation which engages 1,100 employees. It never has committed itself to build an integrated plant.

These official employment figures are in sharp contrast to the estimates made public by Indiana politicians.

Lt. Gov. Richard O. Ristine has said the port and steel mills would open up 100,000 new jobs, while Governor Welsh has trimmed his prediction to 60,000 positions.

He says he bases this estimate on the steel mills employing 35,000 persons and the U.S. Chamber of Commerce calculation that every 100 new manufacturing jobs produce 65 additional nonmanufacturing openings.

Joseph Germano, director of district 31, United Steelworkers of America, contends news mills at Burns Ditch would create no new jobs, but merely result in the rehiring and relocation of steelworkers forced out of jobs in other northern Indiana plants.

NONUNION FACTOR

Germano says that the steel industry has been operating at only 70 percent of capacity for several years, and that the construction of new plants does not create either more orders or more jobs.

Although Governor Welsh campaigned for office as a friend of organized labor, the Bethlehem letter explores the possibilities of the company's hiring nonunion workers. It says, in part:

"We have no way of knowing whether our production employees will elect to be represented by a union.

"The nature of any labor agreement we may have will have a bearing on whether the local labor supply, where qualified, will be given preference."

IMPORT STEEL AIDS

In addition to this implied threat to import labor is the direct statement that:

"We anticipate that some supervisory employees, numbering 200 to 250 for the 1962 program (this embraces the first 3 years of the overall project), will be moved to the Burns Harbor plant from other Bethlehem plants located outside the State of Indiana."

The steel interests are seeking $25.5 million in Federal funds for dredging and construction of outer breakwaters and $38 million from Indiana State tax money for port facilities. The two companies would put up $4.5 million, and the harbor would be 90 percent or more for their benefit.

The question of Federal participation now is stalled in Washington in the Bureau of the Budget, which is analyzing a favorable recommendation by the Corps of Army Engineers.

SENATE CHANGES PLAN

In an effort to get an immediate start on the harbor, Governor Welsh has proposed doubling the State's 3-cent cigarette tax so that Indiana can go ahead with what was to have been the Federal end of the project.

But in Indianapolis yesterday, the senate passed, 47 to 0, and sent to the House a radically revised plan for financing these preliminary stages.

Instead of the State spending $25.5 million for the outer breakwaters in lieu of Federal aid, private industry would be authorized to advance the funds and operate through the port toll free until their investment is returned with interest.

SENATOR JOHN A. CARROLL'S MAJOR CONTRIBUTIONS TO CIVIL LIBERTIES AS A MEMBER OF THE U.S. SENATE

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, John A. Carroll of Colorado was one of the finest men who ever served in this body. His record was one of honor and usefulness and was marked by great courage in defense of principles in which he deeply believed.

I ask unanimous consent that a brief monograph entitled "Carroll's Contribution in the Senate in the Field of Civil Liberties," written by Miss Helene C. Monberg, a writer for a number of newspapers in the West, be printed in the body of the Congressional Record at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the monograph was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Carroll's Major Contribution in the Senate in the Field of Civil Liberties

Washington.—Senator John A. Carroll's major legislative accomplishment during his 6 years of service in the Senate was in the field of civil liberties and constitutional rights, according to veteran Capitol Hill observers.

He played a decisive role in the battle in the Senate in 1958 to preserve the independence of the courts.

For 5 years Carroll, a Colorado Democrat and a liberal, served on the Senate Judiciary Committee heavily weighted in favor of southern and midwestern conservatives The Colorado Senator fought a rearguard battle, first in committee, then on the Senate floor, against legislation which, to a civil libertarian such as Carroll, appeared to be an encroachment on an individual's constitutional rights and an assault on the independence of the judiciary by the U.S. Congress.

His most important battles were defensive. He used the procedural rules in the Senate and tactics of delay to stop Senate approval of what he considered to be unwise anticourt legislation. But he also fought in the Senate Judiciary Committee in favor of extension of civil rights to all Americans, particularly the right of Negroes to register and vote in the South.

Carroll's major legacy in the field of constitutional rights and separation of the powers of government came in 1958. During that year he was instrumental in stopping several bills whose purpose was to curb the powers of the U.S. Supreme Court and to nullify several of its unpopular decisions.

COURT UNDER ATTACK

As Walter F. Murphy, a political science professor at Princeton University, points out in his book, "Congress and the Court," published in 1962, the U.S. Supreme Court has been under attack intermittently throughout American history after it has rendered decisions unpopular with either liberals or conservatives. The present decade has been an era of attack on the High Court because a number of its recent decisions have displeased conservatives, particularly the southerners.

After Earl Warren, of California, became Chief Justice of the U.S. Supreme Court in 1953, the Court began to hand down a series of decisions which had the most profound effect on particularly sensitive areas of American society. Most of these decisions were rendered by the Court in the years 1954–57. The first was the unanimous decision written by Warren and announced on May 17, 1954, ruling racial segregation unconstitutional in the public school systems in 21 States and the District of Columbia which operated segregated schools. The Court thus outlawed the separate but equal doctrine that it had enunciated in 1896. During the period 1954–57 the Court handed down important decisions in such vital areas as race relations, loyalty security programs, conduct of congressional investigations, admission to the bar, and prosecution of subversives.

Many of these Court decisions sorely troubled certain Members of Congress. "Stirred sometimes by resentment against judicial policymaking, sometimes by pressures from interest groups and newspapers whose goals had been thwarted by the Court, sometimes by fear of the effects of the Court's decisions on national security or racial peace, and sometimes by a combination of these causes, many Congressmen supported proposals to reverse various facets of judge-made policies and even to curb the Court's basic authority, in the mid and late 1950's," Murphy stated.

The showdown on such anticourt legislation came in Congress in 1958.

COURT CURB BILLS

The battle in the Senate revolved around several key measures.

One was a comprehensive bill by former Senator William E. Jenner, Republican, of Indiana, to strip from the U.S. Supreme Court appellate power in five categories of cases. A brief hearing was held on the Jenner bill in the Internal Security Subcommittee on August 7, 1957. On February 3, 1958, an attempt was made to push it through the parent Judiciary Committee. Senator Thomas Hennings, Democrat of Missouri, fought the attempt and it failed on a 6-to-6 tie vote. Carroll, who had been appointed to the committee only 4 days earlier, argued at length against committee action on the bill without more complete hearings. He cast the decisive vote to keep the bill from being reported pending further hearings. As a result, lengthy hearings were held on the bill during March and April of 1958.

The Jenner bill was too far reaching to be approved by the Senate Judiciary Committee. So it was extensively modified in committee by a series of amendments proposed by Senator John Marshall Butler, Republican, of Maryland. As the bill was reported to the Senate on May 15, 1958, it barred the Supreme Court from reviewing State bar admission rules, the only restriction on appellate jurisdiction carried over from the original Jenner bill. It also modified or nullified several recent Supreme Court rulings by legalizing State sedition laws, spelling out the legislative intent of certain provisions of the 1940 antisedition Smith Act, and stating that the two Houses of Congress would be the judge of their own congressional committee investigations.

Carroll was one of a minority of six committee members who voted against the Butler amendments to modify the Jenner bill, and he was one of a minority of five who voted against the modified Jenner-Butler bill when the committee voted 10 to 5 to report it as amended on April 30, 1958. After this vote, Carroll made a motion to refer the bill back to subcommittee for further hearings, but his motion was tabled by a vote of 10 to 5.

A minority report on the new Jenner-Butler bill signed by four committee members including Carroll pointed out that much new language had been added to the highly complex measure since hearings had been held on the original Jenner bill, so additional hearings should be held to determine the impact of the new provisions. The minority report was critical of each provision of the Jenner-Butler bill, and the four signers, Carroll, Hennings, Senators Estes Kefauver, Democrat of Tennessee, and Alexander Wiley, Republican of Wisconsin, stated they opposed the entire bill.

ANTISEDITION BILL

The next anticourt bill which cleared the Senate Judiciary Committee on August 1, 1958, was a measure (S. 654) to permit States to pass antisedition laws, thereby nullifying a 1956 Supreme Court ruling. In that decision the Supreme Court had held that under the 1940 antisedition Smith Act the Federal Government had, by implication, preempted exclusive jurisdiction in the field of sedition. The ruling held invalid provisions of a Pennsylvania sedition act punishing attempted subversion of the Federal Government within the State.

Carroll was 1 of 4 committee members to vote against S. 654. Carroll noted that no hearings had been held on the measure in the 85th Congress. "This is not responsible legislative procedure," he stated. Emphasizing that sedition is a national problem, he added, "If enacted, this bill would revitalize approximately 42 State statutes directed against overthrow of the Federal Government." The State laws were widely diverse, both in their substantive and procedural provisions, and "some have provisions plainly at variance with the Federal legislation (i.e., the Smith Act). Others are vague and lack basic procedural safeguards. Many contain provisions which raise sharp constitutional questions. Yet this bill (S. 654) would in one swoop revitalize all these measures. The problem of subversion against the Government of the United States is a national rather than a local problem. All these factors emphasize the need for a uniform national standard and an integrated centralized program in combating subversion," Carroll stated.

FEDERAL PREEMPTION DOCTRINE

The third bill which cleared the Senate Judiciary Committee, on August 5, 1958, with one dissent, was the so-called preemption bill (S. 337). It was of far-reaching importance to the courts. It provided that no Federal law precluded the enactment and enforcement of a State statute on the same subject unless the Federal statute expressly preempted a certain area or the State law was irreconcilably in conflict with the Federal law. The doctrine of Federal preemption is based on a provision of article 6 of the U.S. Constitution making Federal law the supreme law of the land, and it had been broadly interpreted by the U.S. Supreme Court to apply by implication or inference. S. 337 barred use of the doctrine of Federal preemption by implication.

Carroll was the lone dissenter to S. 337 in the Senate Judiciary Committee. He filed a minority report on S. 337 on August 11, 1958, in which he stated why he opposed the bill. "It is being used as a device to whip the Supreme Court for decisions with which some Members of this body (i.e., the Senate) disagree even though those decisions relate only incidentally or not at all to the constitutional doctrine of preemption * * *. If the proponents of this bill are correct in assuming that the Supreme Court has failed in its task of interpreting the will of Congress—an assumption often repeated and little demonstrated—they still have not made a case for this type of 'shotgun' legislation. They are like doctors who, having concluded the patient needs an operation, proceed to perform it with a rusty meat ax," Carroll stated.

THE MALLORY RULE

The final key anticourt bill cleared the Senate Judiciary Committee on August 8, 1958. This was a House-passed bill known as the "Mallory rule bill." The Supreme Court had ruled on June 24, 1957, that a confession obtained by the Washington, D.C., police from Andrew Mallory, a criminal assault suspect, after his arrest but before his arraignment could not be used in Federal court as evidence because there had been illegal and unnecessary delay (about 21 hours) between the time that Mallory was arrested and the time when he was arraigned. The court ruled that since Mallory's confession was made during a period of illegal detention, it could not be used as evidence in Federal court.

As the Mallory rule bill had passed the House on July 2, 1958, it provided that otherwise valid confessions should not be barred as evidence solely because of delay in arraignment.

As the bill was reported out of the Senate committee it was amended to insert the word "reasonable" before the word "delay." The addition of the word "reasonable" materially changed the effect of the legislation.

The Mallory rule bill was referred to the Subcommittee on Improvements in the Federal Criminal Code, of which Carroll was a member, and this subcommittee held hearings on the Mallory rule bill in July of 1958.

Carroll expressed grave doubts about the bill during these hearings. He conceded that the State and local police now have and perhaps should have a lesser degree of accountability in arresting a man because they are not required to establish probable cause in making an arrest. But Federal law enforcement officers may only arrest for probable cause because they are required to operate under the fourth amendment to the Constitution which protects citizens against unreasonable search and seizure, he pointed out.

Although Carroll was willing to modify the Mallory ruling as it applied to common-law crimes handled by the local police in Washington, D.C., he demurred against a broader modification. "We forget we are opening the door to Federal police in all States of the Union to give them a power that they have never had before in American history," Carroll stated at the hearings. "Shall we permit the Federal police * * * to utilize the interim period between arrest and arraignment to elicit information from a witness to be used against him before arraignment? That has never been permissible under Federal law * * * I want to take a long look at such legislation before we place the stamp of approval upon a Federal police practice of such far-reaching importance," Carroll stated. Legislation modifying the Mallory rule might aid law enforcement officers in their work, Carroll said, but it might also "open the door to abuses in another area" affecting the individual's civil rights vis-a-vis the Federal Government.

LIBERALS GIRD FOR BATTLE

Senate liberals were appalled at the prospect that so much anticourt legislation was being reported to the Senate during the final weeks of the 85th Congress. They decided to put up a last-ditch battle against these bills. In his book, "Congress and the Court," Murphy detailed how the Senate liberals girded for battle, as follows:

"The procourt faction (in the Senate) was also coalescing. Paul Douglas, of Illinois; Thomas Hennings, of Missouri; Frank Church, of Idaho; William Proxmire, of Wisconsin; John Carroll, of Colorado; Jacob Javits, of New York; Joseph Clark, of Pennsylvania; Wayne Morse, of Oregon, and Hubert Humphrey, of Minnesota, formed the core of this group, with perhaps another dozen Senators strongly sympathetic. Liberal leadership was divided among three men, Carroll, Hennings, and Humphrey. Hennings, and more particularly, Carroll, assumed responsibility for keeping the group united around a minimum plan of action, while Humphrey was to maintain liaison with the majority leader.

"Choice of leadership of a Senate faction is an informal affair, more a matter of gravitation than official election. But in this instance, at least, the selection had been quite rational, however informal. Humphrey, as a close personal friend of Lyndon Johnson, of Texas, was the obvious man to work with the (Senate) majority leader. Both he and Hennings were accepted and established members of the Senate's inner club; and, although Carroll was only serving his freshman term, he had already managed to impress his liberal colleagues, as well as the majority leader, without having yet alienated the older conservatives. By pressing for a change in Senate rules to curb filibustering and by opposing the jury trial amendment to the 1957 Civil Rights Act, Carroll immediately established a reputation as a fighting liberal.

"Carroll and Hennings were on the Judiciary Committee, where they had been able to watch much of the enemy's battle plan develop," to pass the anticourt bills, "and Hennings was also secretary of the Democratic Policy Committee, a vantage point from which he could try to block floor consideration of the court bills," Murphy stated.

CARROLL CALLS STRATEGY MEETINGS

"In the second week of August, Carroll began calling the (liberal procourt) group together for occasional strategy conferences. These meetings were held in the basement of the Old Senate Office Building, and Paul Douglas commented that the liberals were beginning to look like the Christians in the catacombs. At one of these gatherings some 15 Senators showed up, but usually only 5 or 6 were present. Yet, no matter how small or large the conclave, it was obvious that the liberals—like the anticourt faction—were divided in their degree of opposition to the court bills as well as in their ideas of how best to cope with the legislative situation. They could agree on only the most general and obvious plan of battle," Murphy related.

The liberals worked out a plan of strategy at these meetings. According to Murphy's account, "the first liberal tactic would be to charge haste and panic, and to plead for postponement until the next session. The second tactic agreed upon tied in with the first; to talk at great length on the floor, to be ready to talk at greater length, and then to press for motions to table or to recommit rather than allow a vote on final passage. When their quasi-filibuster was going on, the liberals could approach the majority leader and caution him not to bring up more court bills lest the Senate never adjourn. If all of this failed, they agreed to resort to dentistry, and by amendment, to try to pull some of the teeth of the anticourt measures," Murphy stated.

The procourt group also had some powerful allies. The Attorney General was certain to prevail on then President Eisenhower to veto most of the anticourt bills, and he had so stated. Lyndon Johnson, the then Senate majority leader, had grave doubts about the anticourt measures, particularly from the aspect of their upsetting the balance of power among the three branches of Government, and Johnson quietly determined to use his great legislative skill to shelve most of these measures.

LIBERALS THROW DOWN GAUNTLET

Murphy said that the procourt group decided to make their first concentrated public move about 2 weeks before the end of the congressional session. Murphy's account is as follows: "On the 12th of August, the liberals put their opposition to the court bills in writing. Hubert Humphrey personally delivered a letter to Johnson signed by himself and nine other Senators, Paul Douglas, John Carroll, Wayne Morse, Joseph Clark, Thomas Hennings, Pat McNamara, Richard Neuberger, William Proxmire, and John Kennedy."

Their letter stated: "We are deeply concerned that, in the last-minute rush to adjourn, one or more decisions of the U.S. Supreme Court may be overruled by hasty legislation enacted without adequate consideration. A great debate on the recent decisions of the Supreme Court has much to recommend it, but we do not believe that the last days of the Congress are the appropriate time for such a debate. We urge you to announce this great debate for the next session of Congress rather than bring up legislation to reverse isolated decisions in this last stage of the Congress," the liberals stated.

To try to placate the anticourt group pressing for action on the court bills, Johnson decided to bring up the least controversial of the anticourt measures, the House-passed Mallory rule bill. It passed the Senate on August 19, 1958, by a vote of 65 to 12, after the Senate agreed to a committee amendment by a 41 to 39 rollcall vote which added the word "reasonable" before the word "delay." The liberals supported the committee amendment, but split on the bill's passage. Carroll supported both. Carroll was also named a conferee to the Senate-House conference committee to compromise differences in the two versions of the bill.

JENNER-BUTLER BILL DOWN DRAIN

The following day, on August 20, 1958, Jenner sought to add the Jenner-Butler bill as a rider to a minor court bill. But the Jenner-Butler bill went down the drain when Hennings' motion to table or kill it was agreed to 49 to 41. All of the liberals including Carroll coalesced behind the Hennings motion, and they were jubilant with the demise of the Jenner-Butler bill.

But their jubilation was short lived. The anticourt group regrouped behind an amendment by Senator John L. McClellan, Democrat, of Arkansas, to add the text of a House-passed bill similar to S. 337 banning Federal preemption by implication to S. 654, the Senate bill permitting States to enact laws barring subversive activities. A motion by Hennings to table the McClellan amendment was rejected 46 to 39 on August 20, 1958, although all of the liberals voted for the Hennings motion and the Eisenhower administration supported it.

The procourt group sought final passage of the amended S. 654 immediately. Carroll sought to make a motion to recommit the bill to the Senate Judiciary Committee, thereby killing it for the session. Johnson decided to postpone a showdown on the bill until the next day. He asked Carroll to yield the floor to him to adjourn the Senate until noon of August 21. Carroll did so, with the understanding that he would be able to make his motion to recommit the bill when it was again taken up in the Senate.

CARROLL RECOMMITAL MOTION

Frantic lobbying went on nearly all day on August 21, 1958, as both the procourt and anticourt groups sought to swing undecided Senators to their side. Early in the afternoon, according to Murphy's account, Johnson's tally indicated that Carroll's motion would be defeated by a vote of 42–40 if it were brought up at that time. Johnson played for more time, primarily to try to get several Senators who might favor the anticourt bill to stay off the Senate floor and withhold their vote.

Murphy's account of this tense period in the Senate, just prior to a major test on curbing the powers of the U.S. Supreme Court, read as follows: "Carroll waited for word from Johnson when to take up his recommittal motion again. He expected it at 1 p.m., but Johnson sent him a message to hold a while longer. A little after 2 p.m., when Carroll was eating lunch, the AFL–CIO called his office to tell him that they thought they had swung the necessary votes to carry his motion. Carroll checked with Johnson, but the majority leader was not sure. It was not until just before 5 p.m., that Johnson was willing to go ahead. When the clerk began calling the roll on Carroll's motion to recommit the anticourt bill, the majority leader was nervously pacing around the Senate chamber. He knew the vote was going to be close, and to add to the drama and suspense, Senator Wallace F. Bennett, Republican of Utah, was off the floor when his name was called.

"While the voting was going on, Bennett had come onto the floor and was counting the roll. After the pairs were announced and the last name ticked off, the count stood at 40–40. * * * The clerk read Bennett's name again. In a steady voice the Senator from Utah called out 'Aye'," Murphy related.

Carroll's motion had carried by 1 vote, 41 to 40, thereby killing the major anticourt bill on its key test in the Senate, on August 21, 1958. Carroll was toasted as the hero of the procourt group that August night. Neuberger paid the ultimate compliment to Carroll after the vote. The Oregonian told the Coloradan that if he never did another thing in the Senate, he had earned his place in history that night.

MALLORY RULE BILL SHELVED

The final anticourt bill still alive at that point was the Mallory rule bill, which was in conference committee. The five Senate conferees, of whom Carroll was one, and the five House conferees spent 2 days haggling over the addition of the word "reasonable" to the House-passed bill.

Finally, on August 23, 1958, just on the eve of adjournment, the joint Senate-House conference agreed to a bill which was different from both the House version and the Senate version, but was much closer to the House version. As reported by the conference committee, the bill provided that reasonable delay in arraignment would not, of itself, invalidate a confession obtained during such a delay; that no confession or statement would be admissible unless, prior to interrogation, the suspect had been advised of his right to silence and warned that anything he said might be used in evidence; and, finally, that "such delay is to be considered as an element in determining the voluntary or involuntary nature of such statements or confessions." Chairman Emanuel Celler, Democrat, of New York, of the House Judiciary Committee, Carroll, and Wiley refused, as conferees, to sign the conference report.

Carroll told Senator Wayne Morse, Democrat, of Oregon, who has a keen interest in Washington, D.C., as a long-time member of the Senate District of Columbia Committee, that the procourt conferees had lost their battle on the Mallory rule bill in conference. A fighting liberal of the last-ditch variety who is one of the Senate's champion filibusterers, Morse suggested to Carroll that they organize a group of liberal Senators to filibuster the conference report to death. Carroll agreed, and the two Senators recruited several others, including Douglas, and went into the marble room off the Senate floor to rest up, thereby gathering strength for their potential filibuster. All of the Members of the Senate were dog tired, it was the eve of adjournment, and this mere threat to filibuster was a trump card.

As the long hours of adjournment night dragged on, a member of the Javits staff pointed out to Carroll that under the rules of the Senate a point of order might be successfully raised and sustained against the conference report because Senate rules forbid the insertion of new matter in a conference report. If a point of order were sustained, the conference report would be recommitted to conference, which would bury it for the session, as the Senate was at the point of adjournment.

Carroll checked out the point-of-order proposal with the Senate parliamentarian and also with the then Vice President Richard M. Nixon, to be sure that it would be sustained. Nixon took the matter under advisement, then told Carroll that he would sustain the point of order if Carroll made it. Faced with the prospect of a potential filibuster and Carroll's raising a point of order against the conference report on the Mallory rule bill, the Senate Democratic policy committee threw in the towel on the last anticourt bill still before the Senate.

When the conference report was brought up as the last matter of business in the 85th Congress, Carroll and Morse read into the Record statements made in the meetings of the conference committee to prove that new matter had been added to the bill in conference.

Carroll then made his point of order, and Johnson "asked for a ruling from the Chair," Murphy related. "At 10 minutes past 4 a.m. in the morning the Vice President played his role properly by sustaining Carroll's motion. The Senate adjourned at 4:11 a.m. Sunday, August 24. The attack on the Warren Court which had come in with a thunderclap went out with a sham battle over a point of order," Murphy stated.

Carroll had made a great contribution to the cause of preserving the independence of the judiciary and to the preservation of constitutional liberties as the Senate adjourned early that Sunday morning. Within a period of 3 days he had successfully killed two anticourt bills, one on a motion to recommit and another on a point of order. The back of the congressional drive to curb the U.S. Supreme Court had been broken by Carroll's and Hennings' procedural motions. It never built up steam again.

Douglas, the leading liberal in the Senate, called Carroll "the real hero" of the battle to preserve the jurisdiction of the U.S. Supreme Court and to preserve constitutional rights.

Clark Foreman, director of the Emergency Civil Liberties Committee, praised Carroll's work on the Mallory rule legislation, first by watering down the bill in committee and then by shelving it in the Senate. The civil liberties committee regarded the bill as "a very serious attempt to weaken constitutional guarantees of the fourth amendment," Foreman said.

CARROLL ON CIVIL RIGHTS

Throughout his 6-year Senate career, Carroll was always active in the perennial drive to liberalize Senate rules to improve the chances for enactment of civil rights bills in the Senate and in the recent drive to extend Federal protection to Negroes who want to vote in the South, but who are presently disenfranchised in many areas because of State laws and local custom.

It became apparent as soon as Carroll joined Senator Gordon Allott, Republican, of Colorado, in the Senate in 1957 that these Colorado Senators were both more civil rights minded than the old Colorado Senate team of former Senator Ed C. Johnson, Democrat, of Colorado, and the late Senator Eugene D. Millikin, Republican, of Colorado.

In 1957 Carroll and Allott voted against a motion by Lyndon B. Johnson, Democrat, of Texas, then the Senate Democratic leader, to table, or kill, a motion by Senator Clinton P. Anderson, Democrat, of New Mexico, to adopt new Senate rules to ease the method of limiting Senate debate, and thereby improve the chances for passage of civil rights legislation. Johnson's motion was agreed to 55 to 38 on January 4, 1957, but the Colorado Senators set a new pattern in both voting against it.

Also in 1957 Carroll and Allott lined up with a bipartisan coalition of moderates and liberals from the North and West to oppose a point of order raised by Senator Richard B. Russell, Democrat, of Georgia, against a move to refer a House-passed civil rights bill directly to the Senate, thereby bypassing the Senate Judiciary Committee. Russell's point of order was rejected by a vote of 45 to 39, on June 20, 1957.

In voting against the Russell point of order, Carroll said at the time: "I have been fighting for civil rights and civil liberties for a long time, for about 25 years. I am tired of watching civil rights bills blocked by legislative committees in Congress. No civil rights bill has ever passed the Senate. It always has been tied up by committee. After the House passed the civil rights bill with an overwhelming majority, and the Senate Judiciary Committee sat on a civil rights bill for 5½ months without reporting a measure, it just seemed to me there was nothing to do but remove the roadblock of the Senate Judiciary Committee and place the House bill on the Senate Calendar for Senate debate."

THE 1957 CIVIL RIGHTS BILL

As the civil rights bill passed the House on June 18, 1957, it created a six-member Civil Rights Commission to investigate deprivations of the right to vote and ordered it to report its findings to the President within 2 years. It authorized the President to name an additional Assistant Attorney General to head a new civil rights division in the Justice Department. It authorized the Attorney General to seek injunctions in Federal courts in the name of the U.S. Government against any person who has "engaged or is about to engage" in acts which would deprive a citizen of his voting rights or other civil rights. It granted Federal courts jurisdiction over such civil rights cases "without regard to whether the party aggrieved shall have exhausted" State administrative or judicial remedies. Finally, the House-passed bill made it unlawful for a private individual to interfere or attempt to interfere with a citizen's right to vote.

Carroll was one of a small band of liberal Democrats in the Senate who fought in vain to keep the House bill intact.

This group literally lived civil rights legislation night and day during the month-long debate in the Senate. Both as a civil libertarian and as an attorney, Carroll was fascinated with the subject. He pored over law books and sought out cases from the American Law Division of the Library of Congress to bolster his arguments. He deplored the lack of figures on voting statistics and he sought data from the Department of Justice on voting infringements in the South. He distributed from his office a book based on a series of articles which had appeared in a national magazine relative to the South's decision to oppose the 1954 Supreme Court school desegregation decision.

The first critical test in the Senate was on an amendment by Senator Anderson and Senator George D. Aiken, Republican of Vermont, which eliminated a key provision in part III of the House bill permitting the Attorney General to institute civil action for preventive relief in civil rights cases. The Anderson-Aiken amendment had the effect of limiting the bill to the enforcement of voting rights only. The amendment was agreed to by a vote of 52 to 38 on July 24, 1957, in the Senate, with both Colorado Senators voting against it.

Carroll strongly opposed the amendment because it prevented the Attorney General from seeking an injunction in Federal court to enforce school integration and other civil rights. He told the Senate there were many infringements on the civil rights of minorities throughout the country which could be rectified only by keeping intact part III of the House-passed bill.

"I represent 150,000 Spanish-speaking citizens in Colorado," Carroll told the Senate. "I am not afraid to have the Attorney General assert their constitutional rights in the Federal court of Colorado as the need arises," Carroll said.

JURY-TRIAL AMENDMENT

Carroll fought even more strongly against the key jury-trial amendment which was finally added to the bill in the Senate. After many changes in final form this amendment guaranteed jury trials in all cases of criminal contempt, not only those arising out of the civil rights bill, and it provided for uniform methods of selecting Federal court juries. The jury-trial amendment finally was agreed to in the Senate by a vote of 51 to 42 on August 2, 1957. Carroll was one of only nine Democrats who voted against it.

The amendment was bitterly fought by this little band of Senate liberals including Carroll, by many top legal experts, and by pro-civil-rights groups for many reasons. These reasons included its far-reaching effect on Federal statutory law, the likelihood that the jury-trial amendment would delay action on voting rights violations and the likelihood that southern juries would not convict defendants in civil rights cases.

Carroll denounced the amendment on the Senate floor. He told the Senate, "It is not a question of whether we are going to protect the right of trial by jury. That is sheer nonsense. Never in the history of the Nation has such a right been granted in this type of case." He proposed a three-judge court to determine a criminal contempt case arising out of a voting rights violation as an alternative to the jury-trial amendment, but his proposal never got anywhere.

The badly outnumbered Senate liberals lost the battle but those who voted against the jury-trial amendment were heroes in the eyes of the pro-civil-rights group. In addition to Carroll, they were Douglas, Humphrey, McNamara, Hennings, Morse, Neuberger, Clark, and Senator Stuart Symington, Democrat of Missouri.

As the bill finally cleared Congress, it established a commission to investigate allegations of voting rights violations and set up a new civil rights division in the Department of Justice. It empowered the Attorney General to seek an injunction when an individual's voting rights were in jeopardy, and it empowered Federal district courts to take jurisdiction over such cases. It entitled a defendant in any major criminal contempt case involving voting rights or other rights to a jury trial, and it gave Negroes the right to serve on juries in Federal cases tried in the South.

The 1957 civil rights bill was not all that Carroll wanted or fought for. But he said, "It is not all we desire, but I believe it represents a step forward. We have established a beachhead, I believe that at least we are on the trail of civil rights legislation. We must move forward and never relax our efforts until we have provided genuine protection of civil rights" to all Americans, as civil rights are "the heritage of every American."

In 1959 the Senate moved a step closer to an effective curb on filibusters. Once again Anderson made a motion to consider the adoption of more liberal Senate rules, and once again Johnson successfully tabled Anderson's motion by a vote of 60 to 36 on January 9, 1959. Carroll and Allott voted against the Johnson motion. The liberals, including Carroll, then got behind a proposal by Douglas to limit Senate debate by the affirmative vote of 50 Senators 15 days after 16 Senators filed a cloture motion. Douglas' proposal was rejected 67 to 28 on January 12, 1959.

A slight modification was made in 1959 in the Senate cloture rule for the first time in 10 years when Johnson and Senate Republican leader Everett M. Dirksen, Republican, of Illinois, offered a proposal to limit Senate debate by a two-thirds vote of the Senators voting, instead of two-thirds (then 66) of the total Senate membership. The Johnson-Dirksen resolution was adopted 72 to 22 on January 12, 1959, with the support of both Colorado Senators. The vote indicated that the Senate as a whole had permanently shifted away from its traditional do-nothing position on civil rights.

CARROLL FORMULA

By now Carroll was up to his eyebrows in civil rights legislation, both as a member of the Senate Judiciary Committee and as a member of its Constitutional Rights Subcommittee. He fought in subcommittee for all legislative proposals to extend civil rights, but he also was intent on getting some type of bill through committee and to the Senate floor for debate. In July 1959, he presented what he called "the Carroll formula," which he defined as an attempt to bring "a barebones bill" to the Senate floor from committee with the hope that some meat on the bones of the bill could be added by amendment on the Senate floor.

The bill which was approved by the Constitutional Rights Subcommittee on July 15, 1959, fit the "Carroll formula." It extended the life of the Civil Rights Commission for 2 years and required that election officials must preserve voting records for 3 years and make them available for inspection by Federal law enforcement officers. Carroll called the bill "a skeleton," but he was optimistic that it could clear the Senate Judiciary Committee despite the opposition of the southern members.

The key provision of civil rights measures under study by the subcommittee was scrapped on June 17. At that time the subcommittee voted 5 to 3 to remove from the measure under study a provision which would have empowered the Attorney General to initiate civil rights suits to safeguard all civil rights, not merely voting rights which had been covered in the 1957 Civil Rights Act. Carroll was one of the three subcommittee members to vote against omission of the key provision.

But even with this omission, the 1959 civil rights bill failed to clear the Senate Judiciary Committee. In order to keep the Civil Rights Commission alive, a rider had to be added to an appropriation bill in the closing days of the 1959 session. Carroll supported the rider.

THE 1960 CIVIL RIGHTS BILL

When it became apparent that the liberals on the Senate Judiciary Committee could not muster the votes to report out even a skeleton bill, Johnson on February 15, 1960, called up a minor House-passed bill and invited Senators to offer civil rights amendments to it. This precipitated a southern filibuster. The liberals resumed their strategy meetings and had to stand duty on the Senate floor throughout the filibuster. Carroll was one of those to stand duty.

Finally, on March 8, 1960, a bipartisan group of 31 liberal and moderate Senators, including both Coloradans, offered a petition to limit debate, despite leadership opposition. Two days later, on March 10, 1960, Douglas and Javits made a motion to limit debate and thereby choke off the filibuster. It was rejected by a vote of 53 to 42, both Colorado Senators voting for it.

The House on March 24 passed a civil rights bill, and the Senate immediately adopted a motion by Johnson referring the House-passed bill to the Senate Judiciary Committee with instructions to the committee to report the bill back to the Senate no later than midnight of March 29, 1960. There was feverish activity in the committee. It held hearings on March 28–29, and it reported out an amended bill to the Senate on March 29. The Senate took up the bill on March 30, 1960, on a motion by Johnson agreed to by a vote of 71 to 17.

REFEREE CONTROVERSY

As the bill had passed the House, it provided for court-appointed referees to help Negroes register and vote when the court found that a pattern of discrimination existed. The bill also made a crime the obstruction of court orders to carry out school desegration. And it required the preservation of court records.

In committee Carroll offered an amendment to give courts the authority to waive the requirement that a Negro must prove to the referee that he was refused registration by a State official. His amendment was rejected by a vote of 10 to 4, on March 29, 1960.

Kefauver offered an amendment that was agreed to on March 29 by a 7 to 6 vote in the Senate Judiciary Committee. It struck out language in the bill insuring that a Negro's appearance before a voting referee would be ex parte (without cross examination by opponents). The Kefauver amendment also added a provision that hearings would be held in a public office, that the referee must give the local registrar 2 days' written notice of the time and place of the hearing, and that the registrar or his counsel might appear and make a transcript of the proceedings.

Carroll voted for the Kefauver amendment in committee, but he later had misgivings about it. Although the purpose of the Kefauver amendment was said to be to avoid a star chamber proceedings, opponents claimed it would have the effect of intimidating southern Negroes from seeking their voting franchise.

So on April 1, 1960, Carroll offered on the Senate floor a substitute for the Kefauver amendment. Carroll's amendment was agreed to by a vote of 69 to 22. It restored the House language requiring that the hearing before the referee be held ex parte, and it allowed the court to set the time and place of the hearing. It was a key amendment to the House-passed civil rights bill, and one of only two accepted on the Senate floor. Carroll was also cosponsor of the other amendment which was offered by Dirksen and agreed to by the Senate on April 7, 1960, on a 79 to 12 rollcall vote; it provided if a Negro's application to register were challenged, the court could allow him to vote provided that he "shall be qualified to vote under State law." There were varying interpretations of the effect of the Dirksen-Carroll amendment. Carroll claimed it would circumvent delay, and that it would be unlikely that proceedings would be brought to test a Negro's registration application until after the election.

VENUE AMENDMENT

Carroll also offered an amendment to the civil rights bill considered by the Senate prior to action on the House-approved bill. His amendment, agreed to by the Senate by voice vote on March 14, 1960, amended a provision making bombing a church or school a Federal crime by providing that the offender could be prosecuted either in the Federal judicial district in which the crime was committed or in which he was held in custody before fleeing. The purpose of the amendment was to provide for orderly judicial procedure in conformity with the Constitution.

One of Carroll's Senate floor amendments was tabled or killed on a rollcall vote of 62 to 32 on April 6, 1960. It provided that the court could have discretion to waive the requirement that a Negro seeking a voting certificate under the referee plan must prove that he had tried to register with State officials and had been refused even after a pattern of discrimination had been found by the court.

As the bill passed the Senate on April 8, 1960, by a vote of 71 to 18, and as it finally cleared Congress on April 21, this second civil rights bill since 1875 provided that obstruction of all Federal court orders was a crime. It outlawed all bombings and bomb threats, required preservation of voting records and provided for court registration of Negroes.

Carroll and Allott voted for the 1960 civil rights bill as the only alternative to no legislation at all, but Carroll predicted, "even with a voting procedure provided for in the bill, it will take 20 or 25 years before it will come into full fruition."

The 1960 civil rights battle indicated that although Carroll was a liberal in good standing in the Senate on the question of civil rights, he was not an extremist. "I'm a realist as well as a civil rights advocate," he stated. He, therefore, became a kind of "bridge" between the southerners on the Senate Judiciary Committee and his liberal allies who did not serve on the committee.

Following the national political conventions on September 1, 1960, Carroll joined with Democratic Presidential Nominee John F. Kennedy and 22 other Democratic Senators to pledge action in the next Congress on legislation in all fields of civil rights "to assure an American his full constitutional rights and to make equal opportunity a living reality for all Americans."

KENNEDY ADMINISTRATION

The high hopes of the liberals for speedy action on civil rights in 1961 did not materialize, however, primarily because the closeness of the 1960 election indicated that Mr. Kennedy would have to take measured steps in this field to keep his party intact.

At the beginning of the 87th Congress in 1961 Carroll favored proposals advanced by liberals to shut off debate in the Senate either by a simple majority after reasonable debate, as Clark advocated, or by a vote of three-fifths of the Senators present and voting, as proposed by Anderson.

Both Colorado Senators voted against a motion by the new Senate majority leader, Mike Mansfield, Democrat, of Montana, and Dirksen to refer Anderson's proposal to the Senate Rules Committee for study. The Mansfield-Dirksen motion was agreed to, however, by a 50-to-46 vote on January 11, 1961. Carroll commented at the time that the action put "old King Filibuster back in the saddle in the Senate," thereby dooming any civil rights legislation for 1961.

One measured advance on the civil rights front was made by the Senate on March 27, 1962, when it approved a constitutional amendment barring the imposition of a poll tax and its payment as a qualification for voting in Federal elections and primaries. The resolution was approved by a vote of 77 to 16, with both Carroll and Allott voting for it.

But the administration-backed bill to require that anyone with a sixth-grade education must be passed in a literacy test for voting in Federal elections went down the drain on May 14, 1962, when Mansfield and Dirksen were unable to limit debate on the measure. Their motion to limit debate was rejected by a vote of 52 to 42. Carroll voted for it. Carroll was appalled at some of the technical and complicated literacy tests given Negroes in the South when the tests were under study before the Senate Constitutional Rights Subcommittee in March and April 1962. "In my State," Carroll noted at the literacy test hearings, "if only 100 people were denied the right to vote, why there would be sort of a political revolution."

WIRETAPPING

Carroll's final major contribution to the civil rights battle in the Senate, from a civil libertarian point of view, was his successful battle to keep a wiretapping bill from being reported by the Senate Judiciary Committee until it was too late to permit enactment of wiretapping legislation in the 87th Congress.

The Kennedy administration wants Congress to enact legislation to permit legalized, controlled wiretapping by Federal law enforcement officers and the right to use information thus obtained in court in certain cases involving national security, organized crime, and certain serious crimes. It also would authorize State wiretapping and use of evidence thus obtained in court in a limited category of crimes, under Federal regulation.

Wiretapping is done by local police and by State and Federal enforcement officers although the status of information obtained through wiretapping to be used as evidence is very much clouded by conflicting court decisions and by conflicts in Federal and State laws. The central issue in wiretapping is how to balance the need for better tools for law enforcement in these days of high-speed communications as against the individual citizen's right to privacy and personal liberty.

Carroll recognizes that legislation is needed in the field of wiretapping, but he is sorely troubled as to how this is to be accomplished. At hearings held on the subject in May 1961, before the Senate Constitutional Rights Subcommittee, Carroll stated, "I recognize there is a need for change under the present law and the present Supreme Court decisions. The real question is, How far do we go? I recognize that in the State of New York they have different problems than we have in Colorado. * * * I know in my own State when the FBI moves in to help we get cooperation from the local police, from the law enforcement officials, and sometimes even from the phone company. This might not strictly conform to the law. There is a vacuum here, and in operating our system of government, we just can't deal in a vacuum," he stated.

CONTRA TO CONSTITUTION?

Carroll is greatly concerned about the constitutional question posed by new legislation to legalize wiretapping. "It is one thing to keep track of what the criminal is doing, but I think it is quite another thing to put wiretapping in the same category as search and seizure in the fourth amendment—to make wiretapping evidence admissible in court. Once we extend the concept of interception and divulgence and the admissibility of evidence by wiretap, isn't the next step the electronic device, the bugging, the spike in the wall, the microphone planted along the windowpane? How far are we going to permit this invasion of privacy?" he wondered aloud in committee.

Carroll is particularly sensitive about this general subject because when he was district attorney of Denver (1937–41) he prosecuted a case[1] in which a microphone was planted in a grandfather clock in the executive chambers of the Governor. Carroll tried the case under a 300-year-old common law crime of eavesdropping. The defendants were found guilty and the Colorado Supreme Court upheld the conviction and the lawyers responsible for the bugging were disbarred. On the basis of this famed case, Carroll states, "Colorado takes a very dim view of wiretapping."

Carroll held out for the most exhaustive type of study on this subject before Congress takes final action on a wiretapping bill. But as no other member of the subcommittee showed such marked concern about assuring that it would not encroach on constitutional guarantees and as Carroll will round out his Senate career in January 1963, informed observers believe that a fairly comprehensive wiretapping bill will pass in the next Congress.

TRIBUTE TO SENATOR A. WILLIS ROBERTSON, OF VIRGINIA

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, a noteworthy development of recent years has been that Members of Congress have been meeting with parliamentarians from the NATO countries, from Canada and Mexico, from Latin America, and from the British Commonwealth, as well as from other parliamentary bodies around the world.

Of these interparliamentary bodies the oldest is the Interparliamentary Union, whose origin dates back to 1889. The Union, which now has some 65 member countries, brings together parliamentarians representing different ideologies and countries for the objective study of political, economic, social, juridical and cultural problems of international significance. For this purpose, two important sessions are held each year. They function as a grand forum where the tribunes of the people from every continent and country can exchange views on all international problems suitable for settlement by legislative action. They also serve as a center for the comparative study and development of parliamentary institutions so as to improve their operations and enhance their prestige.

At its 51st Conference last October in Brasilia the Interparliamentary Union showed once again its independence and vitality. This was demonstrated both by the high quality of its debates and by the resolutions which were adopted appealing to the great powers for peace, calling for the reestablishment of freely functioning parliaments in all countries, supporting the role of international trade in promoting balanced economic and social progress in developing countries, and setting forth methods and prerequisites for general disarmament.

The meeting of the IPU in Brasilia last fall coincided with the sudden emergence of the Cuban crisis and added much tension and drama to its debates. Delegates of the United States—six Senators and six Representatives—participated actively in all these debates. Senator A. WILLIS ROBERTSON served as chairman of the U.S. delegation and was its eloquent spokesman in the general debate on the Cuban crisis and on the subject of arms control.

Other Senators who served ably and with credit were the Senator from Hawaii, Mr. Long; the Senator from South Carolina, Mr. Thurmond; the Senator from Georgia, Mr. Talmadge; the Senator from Texas, Mr. Yarborough; and the former Senator from New Hampshire, Mr. Murphy. I also had the honor of serving as a member of the Senate delegation.

Members of the House of Representatives who served, with great distinction, were Representative W. Robert Poage, of Texas; Representative Paul C. Jones, of Missouri; Representative Dale Alford, of Arkansas; Representative Phil Weaver, of Nebraska; Representative Thomas N. Downing, of Virginia; and Representative Lucien N. Nedzi, of Michigan.

The vigorous defense by the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON] of the President's Cuban policy was received with warm applause by all the delegates except those of the Soviet bloc. I have been informed, Mr. President, by other members of our delegation to the conference at Brasilia that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON], was our star performer there, and that he brilliantly arose to the occasion during the emergency at a crucial moment.

Upon their arrival in Brazil the delegates of the United States to the Union Conference received a very instructive and informative briefing on economic and political conditions in that country from our able Ambassador, Lincoln Gordon, and his staff. After the Conference, Ambassador Gordon sent a telegram to our delegation which I would like to read to the Senate. He said:

> I want the delegation to know that I have followed the deliberations in Brasilia with great interest and appreciation. I am most impressed with the dedication exhibited not only in faithful attendance, but in serious deliberation and exercise of leadership in Interparliamentary Union activities. It causes considerable satisfaction, though certainly no surprise, to receive numerous reports of the good will and support your delegation has gained for the United States of America as a nation and as leader in mankind's constant efforts to maintain peace, retain his freedom, and improve his lot.

Mr. President, I want to offer my sincere congratulations to the Senator from Virginia for his distinguished leadership of the congressional delegation to the IPU meeting in Brasilia last October. I am sure that I speak for the entire Senate in congratulating the junior Senator from Virginia for his successful guidance and his inspiring leadership of the U.S. delegation, as well as all the other members of the delegation whose performance at Brasilia won so many compliments there. The full text of their speeches and of the resolutions that were adopted by the Conference will be found in the forthcoming report of our delegation to the 51st Conference of the Interparliamentary Union.

Mr. President, in the rush of news concerning the Cuban crisis last October, the news of the achievements and accomplishments of this delegation, headed by the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON], was crowded out of the more conspicuous channels of news media in the United States; and I believe the full impact of their efforts and activities there has not been fully realized, and should certainly be further publicized, in addition to our extending congratulations for their achievements.

There was introduced at that Conference of the Interparliamentary Union during the Cuban crisis a resolution which was presented by the Yugoslav delegation concerning the Cuban crisis. It certainly was not leaning in our favor. In fact, it was critical of our position.

I ask unanimous consent that the resolution as originally introduced by the Yugoslav delegation be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INTERPARLIAMENTARY UNION 51ST INTERPARLIAMENTARY CONFERENCE, BRASILIA, OCTOBER 24–NOVEMBER 1, 1962

DRAFT RESOLUTION PRESENTED BY THE YUGOSLAV DELEGATION

The 51st Interparliamentary Conference,

Deeply disturbed by the sudden increase in international tension and by the dangerous consequences which the blockade of Cuba entails for world peace;

Convinced that it should be possible to settle all international disputes without resort to force through direct negotiations between the parties concerned or through the procedures provided for this purpose in the Charter of the United Nations;

---

[1] *People* v. *Ellis* (101 Colorado Reports 101; 70 pp. 2d 346).

Convinced that all possibilities of an equitable agreement on existing problems in the Caribbean region have not yet been exhausted;

Appeals urgently to the Governments of the United States and the Soviet Union to avoid any action which might lead to catastrophe and a general conflict for the peoples of the world;

Invites the United Nations to take urgently, in the spirit of the charter, all appropriate measures which would contribute to the maintenance of peace and the settlement of the present dispute.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, due to the skillful operations, diligence, great earnestness, and sincerity of our delegation attending the Conference, that resolution was amended—drastically amended—in such a manner as to totally defeat its original purpose.

Under the circumstances this was a worthy achievement indeed.

I ask unanimous consent that at this point in the RECORD I be permitted to insert a draft of the revised resolution as passed by the Interparliamentary Union.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INTERPARLIAMENTARY UNION, 51ST INTERPARLIAMENTARY CONFERENCE, BRASILIA, OCTOBER 24–NOVEMBER 1, 1962

DRAFT RESOLUTION PRESENTED BY THE YUGOSLAV DELEGATION

The 51st Interparliamentary Conference, deeply disturbed by the sudden increase in international tension and by the dangerous consequences which the recent events in Cuba and the Indo-Chinese border entail for world peace;

Convinced that it should be possible to settle all international disputes without resort to force through direct negotiations between the parties concerned or through the procedures provided for this purpose in the Charter of the United Nations;

Convinced that all possibilities of an equitable agreement on existing problems have not yet been exhausted;

Appeals urgently to the Governments concerned to avoid any action which might lead to catastrophe and a general conflict for the peoples of the world;

Invites the United Nations to take urgently, in the spirit of the charter, all appropriate measures which would contribute to the maintenance of peace and the settlement of the present dispute.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, as further reflecting the activities of the chairman, the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON], as well as our other esteemed and valuable members of the delegation, I ask unanimous consent that there be included in the RECORD at this point a copy of the remarks made by Senator ROBERTSON at the Conference on October 30, 1962.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

METHODS AND PREREQUISITES FOR GENERAL DISARMAMENT: MEASURES FOR LESSENING INTERNATIONAL TENSION

(Speech by Senator A. WILLIS ROBERTSON, chairman of the U.S. delegation to the 51st Interparliamentary Union Conference, Brasília, October 30, 1962)

In an age characterized by strife and discord, when many feel that we are suspended between two worlds—the one dead, the other not yet capable of being born—the delegation of the United States of America points with pardonable pride to the record of our country in behalf of peace.

We have participated in two World Wars, both of which have been defensive wars for the preservation of personal freedom and a democratic way of life. In neither of those wars in which we were victorious, did we ask for the territory of any nation or for booty. On the contrary, at the end of World War II, we were so distressed over the misery and suffering that had resulted from that conflict that we promptly proceeded to aid in the rehabilitation, first of our Allies, later of those who had fought against us, and still later, of needy nations elsewhere in the world. In that undertaking, we have expended more than one hundred billion dollars. Never before in recorded history has any nation ever poured out its wealth in such a prodigal manner for the cause of the future peace of the world.

In addition to that program of rehabilitation on a worldwide basis, we have repeatedly, first at the United Nations in New York, and later at Geneva, Switzerland, made proposals for world peace which have been vetoed by the Soviet Union. Today we stand on that record. Today we still hope that a nuclear war that would destroy civilization as we have known it, can be avoided.

Ever since the end of the last World War, as evidenced by our joining in sponsorship of the United Nations, we have been, and still are, ready to support a program of arms control based upon full and adequate measures of inspection. The objectives of such a program must be the maintenance of the security of all free nations and the preservation of their honor, dignity, and self-respect. Concessions inconsistent with these objectives will never be acceptable to us. On the contrary, we hope all free nations of the world will join with us in reaffirming the traditional attitude of our country expressed by Patrick Henry of Virginia. Prior to the Declaration of Independence in 1776, he said:

"Is peace so sweet or life so dear as to be purchased at the price of chains and slavery? Forbid it, Almighty God."

Mr. STENNIS. Further, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a copy of the additional remarks made by the chairman of the delegation, Senator ROBERTSON, also be included in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS OF SENATOR A. WILLIS ROBERTSON, CHAIRMAN, U.S. DELEGATION TO THE INTERPARLIAMENTARY UNION

Mr. President, on behalf of my entire delegation, I want to express our appreciation to our Brazilian hosts for the cordial hospitality with which we have been received here and for the excellent arrangements which have been made for this Conference. It is a particular pleasure to be meeting in this magnificent new city of Brasília which surely ranks as one of the modern wonders of the world.

I would like also to compliment the Secretary General on his annual report which meets the high standards we have come to expect. It is in every way a first-rate document.

I had hoped to talk today about some of the responsibilities and opportunities we have as legislators to strengthen representative political institutions. But the attention of all of us has been diverted by the gravest threat of nuclear war since the Communist invasion of the free Republic of Korea more than a decade ago.

Now, as then, it is international communism, founded in deceit and backed by ruthless power, which is responsible.

Two elements have been added, so that in the present crisis we are dealing with a threat of a new magnitude and a new dimension. Technology has rapidly given the world more awful weapons. And these weapons have now been introduced into a part of the world which had hitherto been spared their presence.

This lends a new urgency to that topic of our agenda which deals with disarmament. Yet at the same time, it casts something of an aura of unreality over the millions of words which have been said on the subject. A large number of those words unfortunately have been untruthful and deceptive. The representatives of international communism have been talking peace and preparing for war.

It is significant that there is no Cuban delegation among us today. There is no Cuban parliament. It will be recalled that when Mr. Castro was embattled in the Sierra Maestra, he promised his people free elections. But once he came to power, it was a different story. Elections, he said, were not necessary. The will of the Cuban people and the spirit of their revolution, he said at one of his mass meetings, could be amply expressed without elections, through public assemblies such as he was then addressing. In any event, he added, popular support of him and his revolution was such that there was really nothing to have an election about.

Mr. Castro was well aware, of course, that a freely elected Congress would no doubt hinder his already well-advanced plans to deliver his long-suffering country into the hands of the international Communist movement.

That delivery has long since been completed, and Mr. Castro has publicly boasted of it.

So long as this was all, it was a tragedy for the Cuban people and a cause of concern to all free nations, especially in the Western Hemisphere, but it was not a threat to world peace.

But international communism was not content with enslaving the Cuban people. No. It wanted also to use their island as a base for furthering its aggressive intentions against the remaining free nations of the Western Hemisphere, including the United States.

While the spokesmen for international communism repeatedly proclaimed their purely defensive intentions, they were in fact hurriedly installing a capacity to deliver nuclear warheads to the north as far as Canada and to the south as far as Brazil. There is no doubt about this. My Government has incontrovertible proof. This is why the President of my country, as he himself explained so eloquently and forthrightly Monday night, has taken the measures of which we are all aware.

Now, we hear it said, Mr. President, that what the Soviet Union is doing in Cuba is no different from what the United States is doing in Turkey and in other free countries on the periphery of the Soviet bloc. This is silly. Let me, at this point read the pertinent portions of a couple of paragraphs from the President's speech of Monday night:

"For many years, both the Soviet Union and the United States have deployed strategic nuclear weapons with great care, never upsetting the precarious status quo which ensured that these weapons not be used in the absence of some vital challenge. Our own strategic missiles have never been transferred to the territory of any other nation under a cloak of secrecy and deception."

When, referring to the buildup in Cuba the President said,

"But this secret, swift and extraordinary buildup of Communist missiles—in an area well known to have a special and historical relationship to the United States and the nations of the Western Hemisphere, in violation of Soviet assurances, and in defiance of American and hemispheric policy—this sudden clandestine decision to station strategic weapons for the first time outside of Soviet soil, is a deliberately provocative and unjustified change in the status quo which cannot be accepted by this country, if our courage and our commitments are ever to be trusted again by either friend or foe."

No, Mr. President, if a parallel exists at all, it is not between Cuba and Turkey but between Cuba and a member of the Warsaw Pact, for example Poland whose representative we heard earlier. If the Government of Poland were to undergo a change, and if Western nuclear missiles were to be installed on Polish territory, that would represent a change in the deployment of such weapons comparable to what has occurred in Cuba. It would, I think, be a provocative change, and it would obviously heighten world tensions.

But this is a far cry from what the United States and its allies have done in Turkey, which was never an ally of the Soviet Union, but which on the contrary is an ally—and a stanch one—of the United States. Furthermore, when Western missiles were installed in Turkey, and also in Italy, it was publicly announced as a decision taken by the North Atlantic Council.

Mr. President, let us hear no more of these fatuous comparisons which do not compare but serve only to confuse.

In conclusion, Mr. President, let me make these final points, briefly and clearly:

First, the United States has no quarrel with the people of Cuba. It has, on the contrary, the deepest sympathy for the agonies through which they are passing, and it looks forward to the day when they will once again take their rightful place in the family of free nations.

Second, the United States had no quarrel with the present Government of Cuba until it became clear beyond peradventure that this Government was betraying the promises of reform which bore it to power. Let it be recalled that when Mr. Castro first came to power in 1959, he was offered the hand of friendship and economic aid by the United States.

Third, the United States intends not only to protect its own vital interests but also to honor its international commitments, one of which is the commitment of hemispheric defense contained in the Rio Treaty of 1947. Only yesterday the action of the United States was approved by 19 nations of this hemisphere including Brazil.

Fourth, and finally—and let there be no mistake about this—the people of the United States and their elected representatives are united on this question.

There is no division among us, regardless of political party affiliation. Nor should there be any division among free nations.

Peace is not divisible. With respect to the present crisis in Cuba, or wherever a new threat to world peace may subsequently be presented, it is our earnest hope that all freedom loving nations will courageously stand together in defense of the fundamental principles of human rights.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

DEATH OF JUDGE FRANK PICARD

Mr. HART. Mr. President, in the last few minutes I learned of the death in Michigan today of a Michigan citizen who over many years has contributed effectively to the strength and vitality of our community. I refer to the Honorable Frank Picard, who some years ago retired from the U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of Michigan after many years of effective service there.

Frank Picard first came to attention in Michigan as a baseball player. He reflected in his baseball career those attributes which later distinguished him as a trial lawyer, as a devoted Democrat, but a wholly responsible partisan. Additionally, and as suggestive of the uniqueness of the man, he and his brothers were celebrated high wire performers. Finally, even in the robe of a Federal judge, Frank Picard never lost that spark and quality which set him apart from most of us.

I have long known Judge Picard, but the day I was permitted to assume responsibility as U.S. attorney for eastern Michigan I came to know him more intimately. I should not want at this late moment to suggest that he was a Government judge. He was anything but that. As a matter of fact, I think everybody who went to court before him felt that he was the other fellow's judge. The truth of it is that he was his own judge, subject to his own conscience, which was a brilliantly perceptive one.

Judge Picard was honored by our party many years ago by its nomination of him to be a candidate for the U.S. Senate. Had he been successful in that campaign, there would be many Senators on the floor at this moment who would be expressing, as I now do, sorrow at news of his death.

There is no corner of life in Michigan that did not, at one time or another, feel the influence of this remarkable man. I can only add that I have hope his family will understand that, while he will be missed, his imprint on Michigan will never be forgotten so long as those books which record history are available.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. HART. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I move that the Senate adjourn until noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 3 o'clock and 36 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, March 1, 1963, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate February 28, 1963:

COMMUNICATIONS SATELLITE CORPORATION

The following-named persons to be incorporators of the Communications Satellite Corporation:

Leo D. Welch, of New York.
Joseph V. Charyk, of California.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate, February 28, 1963:

GOVERNOR OF GUAM

Manuel F. L. Guerrero, of Guam, to be Governor of Guam for a term of 4 years.

U.S. MARINE CORPS

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps for permanent appointment to the grade indicated:

To be major generals

Robert E. Cushman, Jr.
Richard G. Weede
Leonard F. Chapman, Jr.

To be brigadier generals

John C. Miller, Jr.
Louis B. Robertshaw
Rathvon McC. Tompkins
John H. Masters

U.S. NAVY

Rear Adm. Kleber S. Masterson, U.S. Navy, to be Chief of the Bureau of Naval Weapons in the Department of the Navy for a term of 4 years, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate.

The following-named officers of the Navy for permanent promotion to grade indicated:

LINE

To be rear admirals

Edwin S. Miller
Bernard M. Strean
Francis J. Blouin
Arthur R. Gralla
John J. Hyland
Henry L. Miller
John M. Lee
Robert E. McC. Ward
Rhodam Y. McElroy, Jr.
John O. Miner
Theodore A. Torgerson
Edward A. Ruckner
Odale D. Waters, Jr.
Harry L. Reiter, Jr.
Joseph C. Wylie, Jr.
Earl R. Eastwold
William A. Stuart
George R. Luker
William H. Groverman, Jr.
George W. Pressey
Francis E. Nuessle
Robert B. Moore
Magruder H. Tuttle
Harold G. Bowen, Jr.
Edgar H. Batcheller
William A. Brockett
Levering Smith
Edward J. Fahy

MEDICAL CORPS

To be rear admirals

Harold J. Cokley
Robert B. Brown

CIVIL ENGINEER CORPS

To be rear admiral

Lewis C. Coxe

DENTAL CORPS

To be rear admiral

Frank M. Kyes

Rear Adm. George C. Towner, U.S. Navy, to have the grade of vice admiral on the retired list, pursuant to title 10, United States Code, section 5233.

Having been designated, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 5231, for commands and other duties determined by the President to be within the contemplation of said section, the following-named officer, for appointment to the grade indicated while so serving:

To be vice admiral

Rear Adm. Ephraim P. Holmes, U.S. Navy.

U.S. AIR FORCE

The following-named officers for appointment in the Air Force Reserve, to the grade indicated, under the provisions of chapter 35 and section 8373, title 10, of the United States Code:

To be brigadier generals

Col. Donald J. Campbell, AO726745, Air Force Reserve.

Col. Joseph J. Lingle, AO395663, Air Force Reserve.

Col. James H. McPartlin, AO438109, Air Force Reserve.

Col. Roger W. Smith, AO291671, Air Force Reserve.

Col. John A. Lang, Jr., AO569020, Air Force Reserve.

Col. Charles E. Heidingefelder, Jr., AO500072, Air Force Reserve.

The following-named officers for appointment in the Regular Air Force, to the grades indicated, under the provisions of chapter 835, title 10, of the United States Code:

To be major generals

Maj. Gen. James C. Jensen, 1042A (brigadier general, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Von R. Shores, 1236A (brigadier general, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Sam Maddux, Jr., 1561A (brigadier general, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Glen R. Birchard, 1623A (brigadier general, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Maj. Gen. William K. Martin, 1697A (brigadier general, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Henry Viccellio, 1728A (brigadier general, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Maj. Gen John K. Hester, 1870A (brigadier general, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Charles M. Eisenhart, 1957A (brigadier general, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Maj. Gen. George B. Dany, 1061A (brigadier general, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Chester W. Cecil. 1298A (brigadier general, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Maj. Gen. John W. Carpenter III, 1647A (brigadier general, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Maj. Gen. James B. Knapp, 1668A (brigadier general, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Jack G. Merrell, 1687A (brigadier general, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Marvin L. McNickle, 1721A (brigadier general, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Arthur C. Agan, Jr., 1759A (brigadier general, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Horace M. Wade, 1872A (brigadier general, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Austin J. Russell, 1980A (brigadier general, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Robert H. Warren, 1987A (brigadier general, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Theodore R. Milton, 2026A (brigadier general, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Maj. Gen. James W. Wilson, 1711A (brigadier general, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Maj. Gen. John K. Cullen, 19068A (brigadier general, Regular Air Force, medical), U.S. Air Force.

To be brigadier generals

Brig. Gen. Kenneth R. Powell, 1614A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Loren G. McCollom, 1632A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. William S. Radar, 1636A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Andrew J. Kinney, 1661A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Richard D. Curtin, 1666A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Thomas B. Whitehouse, 1677A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Milton B. Adams, 1712A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Frederic C. Gray, 1729A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. William E. Elder, 1772A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Edgar W. Hampton, 1805A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Robert R. Rowland, 1806A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. James B. Tipton, 1854A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. William W. Veal, 1902A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Tarleton H. Watkins, 1910A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Eugene B. LeBailly, 1920A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Charles R. Bond, Jr., 1937A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Gilbert L. Meyers, 1958A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Alvan C. Gillem II, 2025A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Rollen H. Anthis, 2053A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Joseph A. Cunningham, 2054A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Horace A. Hanes, 2060A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. John B. McPherson, 2068A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Carroll W. McColpin, 3514A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Oran O. Price, 3563A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Thomas K. McGehee, 3809A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Gerald F. Keeling, 3827A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Fred J. Ascani, 4036A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Gordon T. Gould, Jr., 4040A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. John B. Henry, Jr., 4129A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Robert W. Burns, 4142A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. John W. O'Neill, 4155A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Richard O. Hunziker, 4164A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Earl C. Hedlund, 4170A (colonel, Regular Air Force, U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Arthur G. Salisbury, 4224A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Winton R. Close, 4343A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Jamie Gough, 4511A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. James C. Sherrill, 4910A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Abe J. Beck, 5831A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Gordon M. Graham, 7761A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Samuel C. Phillips, 8981A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Alonzo A. Towner, 19158A (colonel, Regular Air Force, Medical), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Kenneth E. Pletcher, 19136A (colonel, Regular Air Force, Medical), U.S. Air Force.

The following-named officers for temporary appointment in the U.S. Air Force under the provisions of chapter 839, title 10, of the United States Code:

To be major generals

Brig. Gen. Robert S. Brua, 19063A, Regular Air Force, Medical.

Brig. Gen. Theodore C. Bedwell, Jr., 19101A, Regular Air Force, Medical.

Brig. Gen. Robert F. Worden, 1510A, Regular Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Edward G. Lansdale, 2534A, (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Reginald J. Clizbe, 2004A, Regular Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Robert N. Smith, 3783A, Regular Air Force.

Brig. Gen. George S. Brown, 4090A, Regular Air Force.

Brig. Gen. John C. Meyer, 4496A, Regular Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Jack J. Catton, 4719A, Regular Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Andrew J. Kinney, 1661A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Richard D. Curtin, 1666A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. James B. Tipton, 1854A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Eugene B. LeBailly, 1920A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Charles R. Bond, Jr., 1937A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Alvan C. Gillem II, 2025A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Rollen H. Anthis, 2053A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Joseph A. Cunningham, 2054A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Thomas K. McGehee, 3809A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. John B. Henry, Jr., 4129A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Force.

Brig. Gen. Earl C. Hedlund, 4710A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Jamie Gough, 4511A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. J. Francis Taylor, Jr., 1583A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

To be brigadier generals

Col. William F. Cook, 19117A, Regular Air Force, Medical.

Col. Emmett M. Tally, Jr., 1312A, Regular Air Force.

Col. John L. McCoy, 1705A, Regular Air Force.

Col. Eugene L. Strickland, 1856A, Regular Air Force.

Col. Robert L. Delashaw, 1913A, Regular Air Force.

Col. Richard S. Abbey, 1992A, Regular Air Force.

Col. Robert W. Strong, Jr., 2010A, Regular Air Force.

Col. Roy W. Nelson, Jr., 2016A, Regular Air Force.

Col. Glenn A. Kent, 3701A, Regular Air Force.

Col. John L. Zoeckler, 3724A, Regular Air Force.

Col. Woodrow P. Swancutt, 3729A, Regular Air Force.

Col. Wendell E. Carter, 3848A, Regular Air Force.

Col. Howard A. Davis, 3860A, Regular Air Force.

Col. Thomas G. Corbin, 4097A, Regular Air Force.

Col. William B. Martensen, 4113A, Regular Air Force.

Col. Fratis L. Duff, 19188A, Regular Air Force, Medical.

Col. Joseph S. Bleymaier, 3883A, Regular Air Force.

Col. Andrew J. Evans, Jr., 4072A, Regular Air Force.

Col. William A. Tope, 4287A, Regular Air Force.

Col. Harrison R. Thyng, 4414A, Regular Air Force.

Col. Olbert F. Lassiter, 4445A, Regular Air Force.

Col. Richard A. Yudkin, 4480A, Regular Air Force.

Col. Timothy F. O'Keefe, 4608A, Regular Air Force.

Col. Richard C. Neeley, 4609A, Regular Air Force.

Col. William H. Brandon, 4712A, Regular Air Force.

Col. Delmar L. Crowson, 4954A, Regular Air Force.

Col. Anthony T. Shtogren, 4956A, Regular Air Force.

Col. William C. Lindley, 4976A, Regular Air Force.

Col. Lawrence S. Lightner, 5219A, Regular Air Force.

Col. Archie A. Hoffman, 19222A, Regular Air Force, Medical.

Col. Clarence J. Galligan, 4772A, Regular Air Force.

Col. John L. Martin, Jr., 7556A, Regular Air Force.

Col. William D. Dunham, 8097A, Regular Air Force.

Col. Lawrence F. Tanberg, 8286A, Regular Air Force.

Col. Royal N. Baker, 8315A, Regular Air Force.

Col. Jewell C. Maxwell, 8393A, Regular Air Force.

Col. Chesley G. Peterson, 9383A, Regular Air Force.

U.S. Army

The following-named officers, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 3066, to be assigned to positions of importance and responsibility designated by the President under subsection (a) of section 3066, in grade as follows:

To be lieutenant generals

Maj. Gen. William Henry Sterling Wright, O18129, U.S. Army.

Maj. Gen. Ben Harrell, O19276, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army).

The following-named officers, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 3066, to be assigned to a position of importance and responsibility designated by the President under subsection (a) of section 3066, in rank as follows:

To be lieutenant general

Maj. Gen. Alfred Dodd Starbird, O18961, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army).

The Army National Guard of the United States officer named herein for promotion as a Reserve commissioned officer of the Army, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 593(a) and 3385:

To be brigadier general

Francis Stevens Greenlief, O1291268, Infantry.

The following-named officers, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 3066, to be assigned to positions of importance and responsibility designated by the President under subsection (a) of section 3066, in rank as follows:

To be lieutenant generals

Maj. Gen. Albert Watson II, O18105, U.S. Army.

Maj. Gen. Harvey Herman Fischer, O18832, U.S. Army.

The following-named officer to be placed on the retired list, in the grade indicated, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 3962:

To be lieutenant general

Lt. Gen. Samuel Leslie Myers, O17180, Army of the United States (major general, U.S. Army).

The following-named officers under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 3066, to be assigned to positions of importance and responsibility designated by the President under subsection (a) of section 3066, in grades as follows:

To be general

Lt. Gen. John Knight Waters, O18481, Army of the United States (major general, U.S. Army).

To be lieutenant generals

Maj. Gen. Theodore John Conway, O19015, U.S. Army.

Maj. Gen. Charles Granville Dodge, O18072, U.S. Army.

The following-named officers for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States, to the grades indicated, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3284, 3072, 3306, and 3307:

To be major generals

Maj. Gen. George Robinson Mather, O18696, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army).

Lt. Gen. Alfred Dodd Starbird, O18961, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. William Jonas Ely, O18974, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Harold Keith Johnson, O19187, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Ben Harrell, O19276, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Alden Kingsland Sibley, O18964, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Alvin Charles Welling, O18983, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. David Warren Gray, O18988, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. James Hilliard Polk, O19028, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Frederick Robert Zierath, O19211, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. William Beehler Bunker, O19402, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Berton Everett Spivy, Jr., O19479, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Robert George MacDonnell, O19361, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Austin Wortham Betts, O19373, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. William Hutcheson Craig, O19526, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army).

To be major general, Medical Corps

Maj. Gen. Howard William Doan, O20057, Army of the United States (brigadier general, Medical Corps, U.S. Army).

To be brigadier general, Judge Advocate General's Corps

Col. Harry Jarvis Engel, O39840, Judge Advocate General's Corps, U.S. Army.

To be brigadier generals, Medical Corps

Brig. Gen. Henry Schuldt Murphey, O19338, Army of the United States (colonel, Medical Corps, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Floyd Lawrence Wergeland, O19599, Army of the United States (colonel, Medical Corps, U.S. Army).

The officers named herein for promotion as Reserve commissioned officers of the Army, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, secs. 593(a) and 3384.

To be major generals

Brig. Gen. William Joseph Hixson, Jr., O302021.

Brig. Gen. Michael Bernard Kauffman, O364438.

Brig. Gen. Ernest Louis Massad O302186.

Brig. Gen. Raymond Forrest McNally, Jr., O294487.

Brig. Gen. John Chester Monning, O337254.

Brig. Gen. de Lesseps Story Morrison, O302989.

Brig. Gen. Robert Fulton Sikes, O291193.

To be brigadier generals

Col. Bodley Booker, Jr., O376560, Infantry.

Col. John Lewis Boros, O405754, Transportation Corps.

Col. Carl Leslie Burk, O410902, Infantry.

Col. Prentiss Courson, O1173570, Artillery.

Col. Rowland Falconer Kirks, O337691, civil affairs.

Col. William Percival Levine, O1055895, Artillery.

Col. John Francis Linehan, Jr., O1313261, Infantry.

Col. William Francis McGonagle, O325282, Artillery.

Col. Robert Roy Owen, O468688, Infantry.

The Army National Guard of the United States officers named herein for appointment as Reserve commissioned officers of the Army, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 593(a) and 3385:

To be major generals

Brig. Gen. Claude Feemster Clayton, O322985.

Brig. Gen. Benjamin Franklin Merritt, O244836.

Brig. Gen. Cecil Lee Simmons, O360399.

To be brigadier generals

Col. David Combs Baum, O534933, Infantry.

Col. Robert Stickney Dale, O378584, Artillery.

Col. Charles Watts Fernald, O1287651, Infantry.

Col. Donald Nielsen Moore, O372591, Armor.

Col. Paul Joseph Mozzicato, O371323, Artillery.

Col. Louie Charles Wadsworth, O260016, Armor.

The Army National Guard of the United States officers named herein for appointment as Reserve commissioned officers of the Army, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 593(a) and 3392:

To be major general

Brig. Gen. George Oliver Pearson, O253334.

To be brigadier general

Col. Marshall Edgar Bush, O298635, Infantry.

IN THE AIR FORCE

The nominations beginning Raymond L. Abbott to be captain, and ending Robert L. Woodward to be first lieutenant, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on February 11, 1963.

The nominations beginning Gene W. Oehlman to be major, and ending David D. Thomssen to be second lieutenant, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on February 18, 1963.

IN THE ARMY

The nominations beginning Alfred Dodd Starbird to be lieutenant general, and ending Lloyd H. Yoshina to be second lieutenant, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on January 15, 1963.

The nominations beginning Harold R. Aaron to be lieutenant colonel, and ending Eddi Z. Zyko to be second lieutenant, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on January 25, 1963.

IN THE NAVY AND THE MARINE CORPS

The nominations beginning Robert A. Campbell to be colonel in the Marine Corps, and ending Ronald M. Zobenica to be second lieutenant in the Marine Corps, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on February 5, 1963.

The nominations beginning Asher D. Abelon to be ensign in the Navy, and ending Walter F. Hudiburg, Jr., to be second lieutenant in the Marine Corps, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on February 19, 1963.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 28, 1963

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rabbi Jacob Pressman, Temple Beth Am, Los Angeles, Calif., offered the following prayer:

O God in Heaven: Look down upon Thy world, so marvelously wrought at the dawn of time for man's delight—so torn and tormented now by ancient grudges and newborn fears.

Look at this land, so fertile and broad, and yet so far from domestic tranquillity and fraternal love.

Look at this historic Chamber, echoing with patriots' dreams from less complicated times, now charged with awesome choices bearing on lives, not here alone, but everywhere on this earth and beyond this earth; not for this day alone, but for generations still to come.

Look at Thy children assembled here to fulfill the sacred trust placed in their hands by hopeful citizens, while human frailty, great temptations, and bitter disappointments whittle down the idealism and zest of younger days.

Look within us all, created in Thine image, and tell us quietly if we have polished or tarnished that image.

Look at Thy world, and pity us, O Lord; and teach us what to say and what to do to rise above ourselves and the demands of today to take the long, historic view—to bring peace and tranquillity, love and justice, beauty and order into our lives—what to say and do this very day, so that when it ends each of us will be able to examine himself honestly, face Thee unashamed, and sleep the sleep of innocence that comes to those who, while imperfect, have listened for Thy voice, and done their very best. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

OPENING PRAYER DELIVERED BY RABBI JACOB PRESSMAN

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, it is an honor and privilege for me to announce that the opening prayer of today's session was delivered by my dear friend and constituent, Rabbi Jacob Pressman, of Temple Beth Am in Los Angeles.

Rabbi Pressman is truly a model of what is generally considered the ideal religious leader. His heartfelt concern for his fellow man is well evidenced through the excellence of his service not only to members of his congregation but to the community as a whole.

His leadership and devotion have justifiably earned him the respect, admiration, and affection of all who know him.

JOINT ECONOMIC COMMITTEE

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Joint Economic Committee be granted an extension of time from March 1, 1963, to March 15, 1963, to file a report of its findings and recommendations with respect to the Economic Report of the President, as required by section 5(b)(3) of Public Law 304, 79th Congress.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

Mr. HALLECK. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, and I shall not object, in recent times this has been a kind of customary procedure, pretty much necessitated by the circumstances under which the joint committee operates?

Mr. BOLLING. The gentleman is entirely correct.

Mr. HALLECK. I withdraw my reservation of objection, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

ILLINOIS EDITORS VISIT PRESIDENT KENNEDY

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include a newspaper article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday, February 14, 20 Illinois newspaper publishers and editors were luncheon guests of President Kennedy at the White House. One of these distinguished journalists was the Honorable Robert L. Kern, publisher of the News-Democrat, of Belleville, Ill., in my congressional district.

I am certain my colleagues in the House will enjoy Mr. Kern's observations made during his White House visit.

Accordingly, I include Mr. Kern's article which appeared in the News-Democrat Tuesday, February 19, 1963:

LUNCHING WITH THE PRESIDENT

(By Robert L. Kern)

"About your visit with the President, write what you wish without reservation, but do not attribute any statement directly to him." In substantially these words, Presidential Press Secretary Pierre Salinger ticked off the ground rules for 20 Illinois newsmen who came to Washington at President John F. Kennedy's request, to be his guests at luncheon on Valentine's Day.

Like the rest, this journalist's invitation came in the form of a telegram a few days prior to February 14. It read: "It would be useful to me to have an exchange of views with you on State, regional, and National problems. Therefore I would be most pleased to have you as my guest at luncheon Thursday, February 14th at 1 p.m. (Enter the northwest gate on Pennsylvania Avenue). I hope it will be possible for you to attend. It would be appreciated if you would kindly reply to Press Secretary Pierre Salinger. (Signed) John F. Kennedy."

The reply goes out quick, short and affirmative.

THROUGH THE GATE

So here you are in the Nation's Capital at a few minutes past noon on the 14th, approaching the small gatehouse on Pennsylvania Avenue where uniformed officers monitor all traffic to the front door of the White House.

The iron gate is closed, and since the day is overcast and chilly, the three guards are inside where it's more comfortable. You enter the cubicle and hand over the telegraphed invitation. An officer scans a typewritten list posted on the wall, searching for your name. For a moment yours doesn't seem to be there, but a second guard peers toward the list and stabs his finger at the right place. Good—you're on the list.

With a courteous gesture you are waved ahead toward the curving sidewalk that terminates at the famous north portico about a quarter of a block away. This is the front porch where Presidents step out to greet certain visiting heads of state and personages of lofty prominence in world affairs.

The winter has been pretty rough in Washington and the White House lawn looks ravaged and dead, much like yours at home. There are a number of pigeons waddling about on the dried grass, looking too fat to fly. Several gray squirrels, too, and one pure white, like the breed found in the city park over in Olney. Contrasted with the pigeons they look miserably skinny. Wonder how come?

WHERE YOU'LL SIT

A friendly butler meets you at the door with such an air of respectful consideration that you begin to feel important. You enter the great marble entrance hall where one attendant takes your coat and hat while another leads you across the room to a side table. Something resembling a game board reposes on the table. But this is not parcheesi. It is a diagram or plan of the table for today's luncheon and the seating arrangement will be determined here by the drawing of numbers from a silver bowl. Mr. Kennedy will occupy the center seat along one long side of the table. Mr. Salinger will be directly opposite him in the middle of the other long side. Disposition of the guests is left to chance.

You select a card from the bowl, and turn it over. No. 19. You will be facing the President from across the table, four chairs to Mr. Salinger's left. Not bad.

WHAT YOU SEE

This formality concluded you are conducted into the Red Room. Here you learn that while you are an early bird, two others are earlier. The Red Room gets its name from the color of its silk damask walls. The shade is richly brilliant but not overpowering owing to the great number of huge paintings that adorn the walls. All are portraits of past presidents, and the full-length canvas of Thomas Jefferson over the marble mantel looks 10 feet high. The magnificent pieces of furniture are large, antique, and perfectly maintained. The elegant patina on desk and tables speaks of a little wax and a lot of elbow grease. There are also two settees and several fine upholstered chairs, almost too beautiful to use.

An expanse of tall windows across the room reveals a vista of several acres of lawn, which you anticipate will be green in time for the traditional egg-rolling debacle at Easter. It is gray today.

SECLUDED SWING

Peering upward to your left you catch a view of the south porch where Harry Truman installed his mezzanine. He got the devil for that from some architectural purists who deplored his taste. Republicans, no doubt.

You stand high above the ground and until now you missed the tiny secluded patio nestled against the building directly beneath the window. Thick shrubbery affords an effective screen and there are several rather large trees, too. The day is not pleasant, and the place is unoccupied. You note an old-fashioned rope swing dangling from a high tree branch. It is a stout child's swing of the practical, old-fashioned kind, and you have an idea who swings there sometimes.

By the time you turn around guests have begun flocking in. They stand around in small groups engaging in small talk. Drinks are passed around on a silver tray: Bourbon, Scotch, cocktails, sherry, tomato juice.

Almost precisely at 1 o'clock the President enters the room confident and smiling. He moves from person to person shaking hands and exchanging greetings. He stands erect, handsome and fit in a medium gray business suit. He seems completely relaxed and at ease. Thank goodness that bad back is improving. Sore backs can be hell. Someone mentions a rocking chair and there is unanimous agreement that rocking chairs make bum backs feel better.

FAVORITE PORTRAIT

The President shows keen interest in the portraits on the walls. Some are historic gems. His first choice, it seems, is for a more recently acquired portrait of Woodrow Wilson painted in France while the World War I President was attending sessions of the Versailles Conferences.

After a short time the President moves toward the state dining room, and the double doors swing open. The large room is as sumptuous as a Hollywood set, but in elegant good taste. A long table, perhaps 25 or more feet in length extends down the center of the room, its mahogany top gleaming. It seems 6 or 7 feet wide with both ends semicircular. As expected, the President takes his place at the center of the long side, facing the door, with his back to the immense marble fireplace.

The guests quickly settle into their high-backed gold-upholstered chairs without confusion. Gilt-edged placecards, with names of individuals hand engraved, are at each plate beside menus typed in script on embellished parchment bearing the Presidential seal.

Plates are the whitest of white porcelain, gold bordered, with small blue stars and the Presidential crest in the center. Knives, forks and spoons are in gold finish, of antique design, with the knife handles of gleaming mother-of-pearl.

TEMPTATION DEFIED

There are individual gold ashtrays at each place. What a souvenir. This fleeting thought, supplanted by the vision of No. 19 tearing down Pennsylvania Avenue with the Secret Service in hot pursuit, shatters the dream. You settle thankfully for a book of matches, completely white, lettered simply in gold: "The President's House."

Six waiters start serving with the circumspect, swift efficiency gleaned through long service. They offer you a portion of Maryland surprise, which turns out to be individual pieces of fish dipped in batter and baked. This is followed by roast sirloin of beef (in thin slices), Yorkshire pudding (instead of bread), braised endives, puree of broccoli and a red Burgundy wine; Chateau neuf-du-Pape La Bernardine 1957. The windup consists of tarte aux poires normande, a light baked dessert, and coffee.

The cigar humidor is passed and you pluck a Corona Corona in what appears to be the 35-cent size. Flame will not sully yours. It will be another souvenir to go with the white matchbook.

But the more sophisticated newsmen light up, and so does the President. His cigar, however, is lighter in shade and smaller in size. Before the party breaks up he will have consumed two, rekindling each several times because of frequent neglect.

PRESIDENTIAL TALENTS

With removal of the last plate the President clears the deck and gets down to business. Questions from the visitors begin to flow on every subject in the news today touching on national and international crises. The President listens attentively, then replies in detail.

As he goes on you settle back to witness the most brilliant display of skillful fielding it probably ever will be your pleasure to see.

The President is wonderfully articulate, never groping for a word. His mastery over the art of lucid communication must be one of the better blessings of good Irish ancestry.

What astonishes you most is the fantastic store of pertinent facts and figures he is able to summon up instantly on every conceivable phase of Federal Government as it touches his job.

The Illinoisans often preface their questions with openers like "Folks in our area would like to know," or "people out in the Illinois wonder about." The questions themselves actually aren't so unusual as to be earthshaking. What the questioners try to do is open the blinds a bit to let in a little more light.

SPELLS OUT ANSWERS

Somebody asks about whether it makes sense to cut taxes while the country is going to sink deeper and deeper into debt. The President answers, showing his great concern for the Nation's overall economy. Can the Nation afford to pay farmers more to produce less? What's making General deGaulle kick over the traces? What about the current political hubbub over Cuba? Is our position in Berlin better today than a year ago? Would you care to comment on rumors that Presidential brother-in-law Sargent Shriver is interested in running for Governor in Illinois?

Each question draws a frank informative reply. The questions are not new. They have been asked before. And they have been answered by the President or his spokesmen, and the replies have been faithfully and fully recorded in the press and over the airwaves.

But this time it is different, somehow. This time the answers come direct from the top, bearing an aura of authority they never had before. You sense that you are in the presence of a true leader—keen, strong, great.

It is 3 o'clock and time to leave. The President rises and reluctantly his guests follow suit. They have been having a ball. But their host has a televised press conference scheduled in less than an hour—an appearance before the Nation during which he again must be at his best, replying to every conceivable query with sound logic, cold facts and good humor. What frightful responsibilities are these that must be borne by the leader of the world's greatest nation.

In some quarters it is a thankless unappreciated effort. Not everybody loves Jack Kennedy. You pray that Someone up there does. A President needs all that kind of help he can get.

SIR WINSTON CHURCHILL

Mr. FULTON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include a resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. FULTON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, on the 26th day of February 1963, the Honorable Frank G. Clement, Governor of the State of Tennessee, affixed his signature to Senate Joint Resolution No. 20, acts of 1963, of the Tennessee General Assembly, making Sir Winston Churchill, resident of London, England, an honorary citizen of the State of Tennessee, United States of America.

The resolution reads as follows:

A Resolution of the State of Tennessee

To All to Whom These Presents Shall Come, Greeting:

I, Joe C. Carr, Secretary of State of the State of Tennessee, do hereby certify that the annexed is a true copy of Senate Joint Resolution 20, acts of 1963, the original of which is now on file, and a matter of record in this office.

In testimony whereof, I have hereunto subscribed my official signature and by order of the Governor affixed the Great Seal of the State of Tennessee at the Department in the city of Nashville, this 27th day of February A.D. 1963.

Joe C. Carr,
Secretary of State.

Senate Joint Resolution 20

Resolution to make Sir Winston Churchill an honorary citizen of Tennessee

Whereas a resolution has been introduced in the Congress of the United States to confer honorary citizenship upon Sir Winston Churchill, of England, subject to the legal requisite that he be first and also an honorary citizen of a State of the Union comprising the United States of America; and

The mother of Sir Winston having been a Virginian; and

His services while Prime Minister of Great Britain being of inestimable value not only to all English-speaking peoples but to the whole free world; and

Since never in its glorious history has England brought forth a son so well equipped by force of character and an unusual combination of powerful abilities to lead and direct his nation and assist its Allies in the gravest crisis that has as yet imperiled them; and

Whereas his voice and pen have left a legacy enhancing the literature of our mother tongue with passages that stir and lift the spirit as none other of his time, and with never-to-be-forgotten thoughts that illumine like a beacon the dark turmoil of life; and

As multitudes throughout this country and along its farflung battlelines—in homes that had given husbands, fathers, sons to war, and in fields and foxholes, and on the ensanguined seas—have heard that memorable voice and fed upon his high-hearted courage, valor, sympathy; and

Since none more than he has contributed to that greatest of all victories, the sign of which he kept always before us in that night of time before the dawn; and

Since God has spared him still to remain among us into the 89th year of his immortal life: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate of the 83d General Assembly of the State of Tennessee (the House of Representatives concurring), That Sir Winston Churchill, resident of London, England, hereby be made an honorary citizen of the State of Tennessee, United States of America.

Adopted February 19, 1963.

JAMES L. BOMAR,
Specker of the Senate.
WILLIAM L. BARRY,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

Approved, February 26, 1963.

FRANK G. CLEMENT,
Governor.

Mr. Speaker, Tennessee is the first State to be recorded in the Journal of the House conferring honorary State citizenship on Sir Winston Churchill. We are all aware of this great man's service to not only his nation but to the cause of freedom, human dignity, and constitutional government throughout the world and I will not reiterate this history here.

In addition, Sir Winston, whose mother was a native Virginian, has close personal ties with our great United States of America.

For some time efforts have been underway to confer upon Sir Winston honorary citizenship of the United States of America. I am informed that the Department of Justice has found no legal reasons as to why this cannot be done, that Sir Winston would cherish and esteem such an act and that Hon. FRANCIS E. WALTER of the House Judiciary Committee has introduced a new bill granting honorary citizenship to Sir Winston.

The State of Tennessee has given clear proof that our people support this act of high regard for Sir Winston and I therefore urge the support of my distinguished colleagues in making this great man an honorary citizen of the United States of America.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute for the purpose of inquiring of the majority leader as to the program for next week.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, we have no legislative business, as I advised the House yesterday, for the balance of this week.

The program for next week is as follows:

Monday is Consent Calendar day.

Tuesday is undetermined—Baltimore primary.

Wednesday: House Resolution 228—A resolution to provide funds for investigations and studies, Banking and Currency Committee.

Thursday and the balance of the week: House Resolution 254—A resolution to provide funds for investigations and studies, Education and Labor Committee.

This, of course, is subject to the usual reservation that any further program may be announced later.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to advise the House there are at least two important measures, and perhaps three, that may be reported from legislative committees. Of course, I do not want to anticipate the action of the committees or of the Committee on Rules, but I would like to advise that probably the week after next we will have at least three major proposals from three of the committees.

ADJOURNMENT OVER TO MONDAY

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

DISPENSING WITH BUSINESS IN ORDER ON CALENDAR WEDNESDAY

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order under the Calendar Wednesday rule may be dispensed with on Wednesday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

LET'S TAKE A GOOD LOOK

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, the time is near when we shall consider the foreign aid authorization bill. It is no secret that this bill will raise more questions this year than it has raised in the past. Its reception will depend upon the character of its presentation by the executive branch. If there is a willingness to admit errors and to change faulty procedures and policies, the legislation may win reasonable support. On the other hand, if the executive branch attempts to gloss over the defects and treats the problem as if we were in 1948 instead of 1963 the program will be in serious trouble indeed.

President Kennedy, early this year, appointed a committee to review the foreign aid program and to make recommendations. Gen. Lucius D. Clay was named chairman of the committee and the other members are distinguished gentlemen, indeed. This committee has the opportunity to save the good portions of the foreign aid program by recognizing its problems and treating them in a forthright manner.

Unfortunately, dispassionate review has not characterized Foreign Aid Study Committees in the past. As the distinguished political commentator, Peter Edson, points out this will be the fourth time in the last 10 years that the Government has gone through what he calls "this same aid reform exercise." He goes on to say:

> U.S. and free world security was the theme of the Mutual Security Administration which administered foreign aid at the end of the Truman administration. This is what it will apparently be once again if the Clay idea prevails.
>
> When the Eisenhower administration came to town, it recruited a lot of big business executives to survey foreign aid. The result was that MSA was changed into the more businesslike Foreign Operations Administration.
>
> Then former President Herbert Hoover's Commission on Reorganization of Government surveyed foreign economic operations in 1955. FOA was changed to International Cooperation Administration. President Eisenhower then appointed another commission under Gen. William H. Draper to survey foreign aid again in 1959. It is reminiscent of the Clay committee.

If the committee merely goes through the motions of rubber stamping the aid program, it might as well have never been born. I have set forth my views in a letter which I wrote to General Clay on January 28, 1963, and I append this letter herewith.

JANUARY 28, 1963.

Gen. LUCIUS D. CLAY,
Chairman of the Committee To Strengthen the Security of the Free World, Department of State, Washington, D.C.

DEAR GENERAL CLAY: I was interested to learn that President Kennedy had named a committee to review and make recommendations concerning our program of foreign assistance and that you had agreed to be Chairman of this committee.

As a Member of Congress serving on the House Committee on Foreign Affairs and the Foreign Operations Subcommittee of the House Committee on Government Operations, I read of the formation of your committee with mixed feelings.

First of all, there is a history of independent committees in the past. In many cases, they have been appointed to support existing programs and have done so without substantial qualification or criticism.

Secondly, the atmosphere under which your committee was appointed led to the description in the Wall Street Journal of its formation as "a hurry-up move to disarm congressional opponents of foreign aid."

I am not an opponent of foreign aid, in fact I have always voted for foreign aid bills, but I have seen enough of the operation of these programs to know that their continuance will not be furthered by an uncritical approach. Their failures and shortcomings have gradually filtered into the public consciousness and the necessary popular support will not continue unless substantial steps are taken to assure the public that these programs are properly staffed and adequately administered.

Thirdly, since people who have had a responsibility in its past operation have been selected to do the vitally important preparatory work for the committee, one could conclude that yours might very well constitute an exercise in self-examination—which is self-defeating.

In the areas of self-help, of fiscal reform, of increased contributions by allies whom we have restored to viability, in the propping up of oppressive regimes and in the support of pro-Communist governments, there are questions which must be examined and properly settled if foreign aid is not to dwindle and expire.

The committee can perform a useful function if it causes our administrative agencies to recognize that problems do exist and that change is essential if public and congressional support is to be continued.

You have served our country in an outstanding manner in the past in war and in peace and you have a great opportunity to strengthen the necessary elements of our program of foreign assistance by a dispassionate and empirical examination by your committee.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN S. MONAGAN,
Member of Congress.

General Clay responded to my letter on February 7, 1963, as follows:

COMMITTEE TO STRENGTHEN THE
SECURITY OF THE FREE WORLD,
DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, D.C., February 7, 1963.

Hon. JOHN S. MONAGAN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN MONAGAN: I am most appreciative of your letter of January 28. I want to assure you that our committee has spent hours in cross-examination and is determined to form its own conclusions and recommendations.

From what I have seen and heard from its members, they are keenly aware of the need for a critical approach.

I shall call you when our work has progressed somewhat further to ask for the opportunity to let you know what we are thinking.

Sincerely yours,

LUCIUS D. CLAY.

For the sake of the valuable portions of the foreign aid program, I sincerely hope that General Clay's assurance that the committee members are aware of the need for a critical approach will be demonstrated by their actions.

Otherwise, the future of the foreign aid program is dubious, to say the least.

Let us take a good look.

SPECIAL ORDER FOR 2 HOURS ON WEDNESDAY NEXT TO DISCUSS RECORD OF COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR IN 87TH CONGRESS

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, I have just received permission to address the House on a special order on next Wednesday for 2 hours. The purpose of this request is to enable the majority members of the Committee on Education and Labor to present to the House what we believe to be the factual record of the Committee on Education and Labor in the 87th Congress and to answer certain allegations which have been made on the floor of the House concerning the record of that committee.

I would also like to say we will allot a good portion of the second hour of this special order to any Members of the minority who wish to discuss the matter with us at that time.

CAMPAIGN CONTRIBUTIONS

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, I am again today introducing a bill which would prohibit campaign contributions from crossing State lines—campaign contributions to influence elections for the National House, the U.S. Senate, the Presidency, and presidential electors.

Mr. Speaker, there is no reason under the sun for money to be poured from one State during political campaigns into another. Members of Congress are supposed to be the representatives of a particular State. The sovereign people of each State elect their own representatives to represent them. Under no circumstances should they be influenced by money gotten together in some smoke-filled hotel room in Chicago, Detroit, London, England, or even Caracas, Venezuela.

Pressure groups with tremendous campaign funds are on the march. They are determined to control the Congress. Much progress is being made in that direction with huge campaign treasuries.

This Congress must take some action to restore the confidence of the American people. The prestige of Congress is at an alltime low with nepotism, counterpart hayrides, and irresponsible shenanigans by some Members in the nightclubs of London and Paris. This is doing more damage to the cause of representative government in the United States than Communist subversion.

Campaigns for Federal office are largely campaigns of who can raise the most money. We hear reports of $100,000 being spent in races for the House of Representatives, and $1 million in Senate races. This makes a mockery of real democracy as much of this money often comes from pressure groups a thousand or more miles away and sometimes even abroad. If Federal public office is open to only the highest bidder, then indeed we have fallen upon evil days, and this Republic cannot long endure.

Mr. Speaker, I do not believe it is too late. This Congress can and must take positive action to restore the prestige of this great institution. The cause of freedom everywhere rides on the outcome of our own integrity, our prestige, and our principles and ideals.

RIDE HERD ON AWARD OF ALL NEGOTIATED CONTRACTS

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill which will, if enacted, establish a joint congressional committee to ride herd on the award of all negotiated contracts. This committee will include Republican and Democrat members from the Appropriations, Armed Services, Government Operations, and Space Committees of both the House and Senate and will be 100 percent bipartisan in nature; compel complete public disclosure of the reason for awarding a negotiated contract, except where such information is classified; require that a public record be kept of all persons other than the bidder who have communications with the Government about negotiated contracts. This would include Members of Congress and the executive branch.

Some of my proposals may sound revolutionary, but the awesome size of our budget makes unusual steps necessary. The current budget calls for spending over $60 billion for space and defense and 80 percent of all defense contracts are negotiated or sole source without open competition. The Secretary of Defense is on record as stating we must continuously seek to minimize sole source procurements.

I think it is time the Congress took hold of the reins of all this spending and helped the Secretary achieve his goal. This is what I have been doing for 18 months in a lengthy study, and this is what my legislation is designed to do.

GOP NUCLEAR TEST PANEL RELEASES SECOND REPORT

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include a report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, the Republican House conference committee on nuclear testing has prepared a summary of arguments pro and con regarding the wisdom of entering into any test ban agreement with the Soviet Union at this time. Assistance in preparing the compilation was obtained from such diverse organizations as the American Security Council and the Committee on Sane Nuclear Policy. Most of the arguments pro and con listed in the report were contained in nine "expert's papers" submitted to the committee during the past 3 weeks by nationally known scientific and geopolitical experts.

The committee objective in its second report is to provide a fair statement of the issues as a guide for widespread and informed public discussion of the question of nuclear test bans in general. In its first report, the committee called on all Members of Congress to assume responsibility for encouraging such a public discussion, declaring "vital questions of U.S. national security are involved and Americans have a right to make their voices heard." It also called upon the Kennedy administration to declassify and disseminate seismic detection and other data pertinent to overall examination of the test ban issue.

The nuclear testing committee will continue to examine evidence before it and issue reports from time to time on the progress of the Geneva test ban negotiations.

These reports will be fair, but the constant retreats and concessions by Disarmament Administration Chief William C. Foster at the negotiating table must be expected to become the subject of the committee's very critical comment.

The second report is as follows:

Second Report to the Republican Conference by Its Committee on Nuclear Testing

In its first report your commitee described the prime U.S. objective of national survival as in direct conflict with communism's goal of worldwide domination. We expressed the valued judgment that a superior U.S. nuclear weapons arsenal capable of instant and deadly retaliation is required to deter the Communists from initiating nuclear war to gain their objective quickly.

From this background the first report began examining whether the proposition of a nuclear test ban treaty could reduce the world's risks inherent in present conditions without creating new or different risks which would leave matters in a state worse than before.

Because Communists cannot be trusted to keep their treaty commitments the first report specified certain minimum safeguards which must be contained in any nuclear test ban treaty. These are: (1) reasonable machinery to detect possible violations; (2) reasonable opportunity to inspect to determine if cheating has occurred; and, (3) consequences not fatal to the victim if either cheating or surprise abrogation occurs.

The basis of present test ban negotiation between the United States, U.S.S.R. and United Kingdom were examined by the first report, found wanting in these safeguards, and demand was made upon the administration to upgrade the U.S. negotiating position. So far, this has not been done. On the contrary, more concessions to Soviet demands have been announced.

Demand also was made for declassification and dissemination of all seismic and other data required for informed public discussion of the test ban question. The basis for this demand was that the security and future of the Nation is concerned and, therefore, the people have a right to be informed and make their voices heard.

The Joint Committee on Atomic Energy has scheduled public hearings early in March at which administration officials will testify concerning seismic detection. Whether this will amount to "a quick peek under the clean side of the rug" or forthright disclosures of limitations as well as capabilities in seismic detection remeains to be seen.

On the general question of whether any test ban treaty at all at the present time is in the national interest, the first report recommended Members of Congress of both parties assume responsibility to encourage widespread public discussion. It so recommended because test ban negotiations have dragged on for 5 listless years during which the Soviets twice have gained substantial advantages by surprise resumption of testing.

If Americans decide a treaty is in the national interest, it will facilitate achieving one. If they decide otherwise, it will facilitate breaking off negotiations. Informed, widespread public discussion is required to reach a decision.

As a guide for leading public discussion your committee promised to Members of Congress a summary of the arguments for and against a test ban treaty. It is set forth below. In compiling these arguments, your committee gratefully acknowledges the assistance and cooperation of the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, the Committee on Sane Nuclear Policy, the American Security Council, and the nine scientific and geopolitical experts who submitted expert's papers to your committee.

In evaluating test ban "pro" and "con" positions it must be kept in mind they pertain not to the inadequate and dangerous range of treaty terms now under negotiation, but to a hypothetical "enforceable" treaty—that is, one under terms of which cheating is less likely to occur than compliance. If such a treaty is achieveable it must be assumed the Soviet Union agrees to it because it finds it in its own national interest to do so. The reasonableness of such an assumption is not here examined. But respecting it, two relevant questions should be in mind while evaluating the "pro" and "con" arguments: (1) In what respects do Soviet national interests in this subject differ from our own?; (2) under what circumstances, if at all, does Marxist-Leninist dogma permit Communist leaders voluntarily to forgo a means of achieving worldwide domination?

The compilation of "pro" and "con" positions follow:

I

Test ban treaty will slow the proliferation of nuclear weapons to other countries

Pro: Eleven nations in addition to those already possessing nuclear weapons (United States, U.S.S.R., United Kingdom, and France) have the necessary economic base, industrial capacity, and skilled manpower to launch at least a primitive program for nuclear weapons "in the near future," according to a recent study by Christopher Hohenemser. Among them are China, East Germany, and West Germany. The spread of nuclear weapons to any additional nations multiplies the chances of accidental war, tends to undermine existing military strategies, and increases the number of parties that must be satisfied before workable arms control agreements can be reached. Nuclear testing is necessary before a nation can produce these weapons without outside assistance. While a test ban would not automatically prevent other nations from testing, the provision that additional governments should adhere to the agreement gives the original parties an opportunity to exert pressure at least on their own allies.

Con: The magnitude of present difficulties between the United States and France illustrates the naivete of any belief that one nation can handle another which is determined to achieve nuclear weapons. Red China amply has demonstrated its absolute refusal to be handled by the U.S.S.R. Attempts by the United States to handle its European allies by exerting pressure on them could strain NATO to the breaking point. The only practical way to control the danger of accidental war is to prevent the proliferation of nuclear warhead delivery systems. If a nuclear power is forced to develop its own characteristic national delivery system, then a mischiefmaking attacker may be identified and the attacked nation need not respond on the assumption general war has been initiated. This discrimination cannot be made from the explosion of a warhead—it can be made very quickly from the characteristics of the delivery vehicle which carried it. Similar reasoning applies to matters of military strategies and achieving arms control agreements.

II

Test ban treaty will slow down the development of nuclear weapons

Pro: According to Disarmament Administrator William C. Foster: "Without a treaty and with continued unlimited testing on both sides, there would be further increases by both in the efficiency of weapons at the higher yield end of the scale. Our advantage in small-weight, high-yield weapons would most probably diminish. Both sides would enhance their knowledge of weapons effects. In the field of tactical weapons, the Soviets would eventually be able to match our more diversified and numerous arsenal. Overall, the trend would be toward equality between the United States and the U.S.S.R.

"With a treaty, improvements in yield-to-weight ratios would come more slowly through laboratory work alone. The U.S. advantage in smaller weapons would persist over a longer time. Some weapons effects phenomena would remain unsettled or undiscovered by both sides. The development of antimissile systems would be slowed down on both sides. Our tactical weapon superiority would persist longer. In general, our present nuclear advantages would last for a considerably longer period."

Con: There is no real assurance the United States has superiority in usable tactical weapons and Mr. Foster does not claim it for high-yield weapons. The Soviets have announced solution of the missile defense problem. Thus a test ban runs the risk of freezing U.S. technology in a position of inferiority. As the potential defender against an aggressor's first strike, U.S. national security can be based only on superiority in weaponry, particularly in anti-ICBM defense, which has not been achieved and can only be achieved by further coordinated development of both antimissile warheads and rockets to carry them.

If, as Mr. Foster argues, the United States presently has weapons superiority, then it exists because U.S. laboratories are able to win over U.S.S.R. laboratories in open competition. Mr. Foster's statement that under conditions of nontesting "our present nuclear advantages would last for a considerably longer period" implies that Soviet laboratories would move faster than our own under a test ban. Thus inevitably at some time the United States will become "second best." What happens then?

III

Test ban treaty will "open up" Soviet society and establish an invaluable precedent

Pro: A test ban which includes provision for some detection machinery and onsite inspection in the Soviet Union has potential significance for progress in other areas of arms control and disarmament and for future relations between the United States and the U.S.S.R. It would give both sides experience with inspection and permit us to appraise their cooperation, and, in the light of that appraisal, to estimate the cooperation which might be forthcoming in the verification of more significant agreements. It might also serve to "open" the Soviet Union to some extent and to help diminish the Soviets' fear that effective control is another name for espionage. It could lead to the development of a basis for confidence in other agreements.

Con: It is idle to think that a small number of stations and inspections on Soviet soil will have any significant impact upon the structure or attitudes of Soviet society. Certainly what the U.S.S.R. now seems to have in mind is considerably less than the United States originally had envisaged—and too little to accomplish this purpose. What is more, if the United States, in the interest of pious hopes now accepts a diluted, token version of international inspection to save face as it enters upon a treaty, the precedent which it will set will not be at all valuable, but highly dangerous and prejudicial to free world security in the future. Further, freezing present seismic detection technology into treaty terms will kill off development of detection devices which could be the future basis of a treaty in which genuine confidence could be placed.

IV

Test ban treaty will eliminate additional fallout

Pro: A test ban treaty should lead to the elimination of whatever danger exists from fallout from United States and U.S.S.R. nuclear weapons tests in the atmosphere.

Con: Only a treaty banning atmospheric testing is required to accomplish this end. The United States stands ready to enter such a treaty, but the U.S.S.R. refuses—until it agrees, fallout from testing is the inevitable price for avoiding fallout from war.

V

Test ban treaty will create international good feeling and promote arms control and disarmament

Pro: In democratic countries, one of the main factors producing a sense of helplessness on the part of citizens has been the magnitude of the arms race. To people throughout the world who have passively observed the years of deadlock in disarmament negotiations a nuclear test ban agreement would restore a measure of confidence in the ability of governments to solve the complex problems of the nuclear-missile age. This confidence, once established, will facilitate the achievement of broader arms control and disarmament agreements. The test ban treaty is the significant first step toward resolution of nations' differences without war.

Con: Conclusion of a treaty in the near future almost certainly would lead to a popular overestimation of its political benefits and an underestimation of the strategic-military dangers which might lurk within it. It would likely generate euphoric pressures for speedy progress on disarmament schemes involving control arrangements which fall below the threshold of reliability required by national and international security interests. Western nations have learned to their regret that in a world divided by profound political ideological differences the manufacture of artificial good will can be productive of the most unwholesome consequences. Communists will enter no agreement which does not give them a net advantage in their unremitting campaign to destroy the non-Communist world.

VI

Test ban treaty risk from surprise abrogation is small

Pro: Secret preparations and surprise abrogation by the Soviets after a few years might leave us as much as 18 months behind in our readiness to test. However, we can and will avoid this by a national policy to maintain readiness to test and to provide the funds necessary for this and for the incentive program necessary to keep competent scientists at work in the laboratories. This will minimize any possibility of a long Soviet headstart if the treaty breaks down.

Con: This is dangerously wishful thinking. There simply are no incentives our society can offer which will cause our creative scientists to stay with a dead end program. The Soviet society can arbitrarily assign its most creative minds to secret nuclear research and stimulate them with the reminder that article 49–o of the Soviet Constitution authorizes abrogation of any international agreement or treaty at any time unilaterally. The Soviets would gain a long lead, lengthened further by delays inherent in a democracy's decisionmaking machinery for test resumption.

VII

Test ban risk from possible cheating is small

Pro: Many important nuclear weapons principles can be studied with explosions of less than 3 kilotons and larger ones can be muffled by favorable underground formations or artificial decoupling. Such explosions may go undetected by the test ban treaty detection machinery.

However, such clandestine underground testing would be unsatisfactory for learning the kind of things which might change the military balance against us. According to Disarmament Administrator William C. Foster, little improvement in yield-to-weight ratios can be expected and pure fusion weapons would not be a great advantage to us because primarily they constitute only a cheaper substitute for weapons already in our stockpile. Moreover, testing in natural formations which muffle explosions is risky because it may produce a detectable surface depression, while artificial decoupling is time consuming and expensive.

Con: As stated by Mr. Foster, pure fusion weapons could be developed by clandestine underground testing below detectable yields. This would give the Soviets overwhelming nuclear superiority in both tactical weapons and antimissile warheads which can be used safely over their own country because they do not produce fallout. Yielding effective antimissile capability to the Soviets would nullify our retaliatory capacity and drastically change the military balance against us. The same is true with respect to fallout-free tactical weapons.

Additionally, unless and until we achieve fallout-free tactical pure fusion weapons, we do not possess weapons which are feasible and effective to use for the defense of our NATO and other allies against invasion of their homelands. Abandoning development of such weapons, when its drastic self-defense implications are realized, will surely place unbearable strain on the NATO alliance.

VIII

Miscellaneous arguments against test ban

The committee found the following additional arguments against a test ban treaty at the present time among the expert's papers which were not subject to classification under the preceding "Pro" and "Con" headings:

1. Defense Secretary McNamara recently testified to Congress that the Soviet Union is engaged on a large scale "hardening" program for its missile bases. This can only be met by U.S. retaliatory weapons of much greater yield than we now possess. We must test and achieve them, otherwise our retaliatory capacity will be too weak to deter the Kremlin.

2. Nuclear weaponry is a new science. So far it has produced weapons which are incapable of discrimination in their deadly effects. The field of weapons development ahead is toward discrimination in both yield and effects. Although war, if it should ever come, can never be made humane, it can be made considerably less inhumane if refinement of nuclear weapons is allowed to proceed.

3. Should cheating under a treaty be really known to occur, but not be provable according to treaty terms, resultant tensions and apprehensions would create conditions more unstable and dangerous than the absence of any treaty at all.

4. Nuclear technology is here to stay. No treaty can foresee or limit future technological developments in nuclear physics. They cannot be frozen through the legal device of a treaty any more successfully than were earlier attempts to outlaw the science of medicine by dictatorial fiat. Nuclear technology is wedded to delivery systems and to defense systems. These stand at an early point on the development curve. No nation can afford for long to observe inhibitions on its national security interests, therefore no test ban treaty can be expected long to survive.

5. The operators of any system of detection or inspection will tend to become dominated by one or the other parties to the treaty, or just plain sloppy in their work, so the achievement of an enforceable treaty is no more than a dangerous illusion.

6. As a general proposition no treaty will cause the Soviets to do what they would not do in the absence of a treaty. The history of treaties entered into with the Soviet Union demonstrates that they bind, inhibit, or deter only the non-Soviet signatories. The Soviets, therefore, want and will sign a test ban treaty only if they calculate that it will give them a net advantage in their unremitting campaign to destroy the non-Communist world.

CRAIG HOSMER,
Chairman.
LESLIE C. ARENDS.
WILLIAM E. MILLER.
MELVIN R. LAIRD.
CHARLES E. GOODELL.
Ex officio:
CHARLES A. HALLECK.
JOHN W. BYRNES.
GERALD R. FORD.

OPERATION OF UNITED NATIONS SPECIAL FUND

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter and a table.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, in connection with my continuing investigation into the operations of the United Nations Special Fund, which we find is providing aid to Communist nations at the expense of the American taxpayer, I have requested the unanimous consent of the House to have published at this point in the RECORD a detailed table.

This table will provide ready reference for my colleagues about a number of projects undertaken by the Special Fund, and others approved, but not yet started.

The facts in this table are taken from a U.N. Special Fund publication of December 1962, which received only limited distribution. The table lists the projects of the Fund by country or territory, the date of approval by the Governing Council of the Fund, the executing agency of the U.N., the total cost of the project and the Special Fund contribution to that cost.

The above mentioned follows:

Status of individual projects approved by the Governing Council of the Special Fund: May 1959–May 1962, as of Oct. 31, 1962

[NOTE.—Throughout this annex, the figures under "Special fund contribution" indicate gross project costs, i.e., including the recipient Governments' cash contributions to the project budgets]

Project by country or territory	Approved by Governing Council	Executing agency	Duration of project (years)	Costs of individual projects (U.S. dollar equivalents)			Plan of operation signed (date)	Authorization to commence execution (date)
				Total	Special fund contribution	Estimated Government counterpart contribution		
AFGHANISTAN								
Land and water survey and agricultural station	December 1959	FAO	3 5	$1,996,400	$1,404,000	$594,400	June 29, 1960	Aug. 15, 1960
ARGENTINA								
Electric power survey [1]	May 1959	IBRD	½	337,500	287,500	50,000	Sept. 14, 1959	[1] Sept. 14 1959
Management development and training of supervisory and skilled personnel.	December 1959	ILO	5	1,723,500	1,132,500	591,000	Oct. 11, 1960	Oct. 18, 1960
Transport study [2]	May 1960	IBRD	1½	1,045,000	520,000	525,000	Sept. 30, 1960	[1] Oct. 5, 1960
Petroleum Institute	December 1960	UNESCO	5	5,113,100	1,110,100	4,003,000	Aug. 23, 1962	
Study of nutritional diseases and deficiencies in cattle	do	FAO	5	1,009,800	661,200	348,600	Feb. 7, 1962	Feb. 16, 1962
Forestry and Watershed Management Training Institute, Buenos Aires.	May 1961	FAO	5	1,155,100	599,100	556,000	Apr. 12, 1962	Apr. 13, 1962
Study of land reclamation of the Viedma Valley	May 1962	FAO	4	1,385,600	761,600	624,000	----------	
BOLIVIA								
Precolonization survey	December 1959	FAO	2–3	429,500	312,500	117,000	Oct. 25, 1960	
Agricultural training	do	FAO	3	489,000	375,000	114,000	Aug. 16, 1960	Aug. 23, 1960
Pilot Mineral Survey of the Cordillera and Altiplano	May 1961	UN	4	1,607,000	922,000	685,000	Oct. 30, 1961	Nov. 14, 1961
BRAZIL								
San Francisco River Basin survey	December 1959	FAO	5	2,021,000	[3] 1,533,500	487,500	Oct. 7, 1960	Oct. 12, 1960
National Forestry School, Vicosa	May 1961	FAO	5½	2,241,100	1,265,100	976,000	Dec. 29, 1961	Feb. 13, 1962
Survey of rock salt deposits	January 1962	UN	2½	945,100	595,100	350,000	Aug. 21, 1962	Aug. 29, 1962
Survey of hydroelectric resources in Minas Gerais	do	IBRD	3	1,295,000	735,000	560,000	Oct. 23, 1962	Oct. 26, 1962
BURMA								
Survey of lead and zinc mining and smelting	May 1961	UN	2	823,400	590,400	233,000	Nov. 3, 1961	Nov. 3, 1961
Mineral and ground-water survey	January 1962	UN	4	3,382,600	1,068,600	2,314,000	----------	
Expansion of meteorological and hydrological services	do	WMO	3	1,126,600	525,600	601,000	----------	
Forest Research Institute	May 1962	FAO	4	2,697,800	954,800	1,743,000	----------	
Mu River irrigation survey	do	UN	3	1,504,400	1,054,400	450,000	----------	
CAMBODIA								
Center for technical staff training and productivity, Phnom Penh.	January 1962	ILO	4	2,038,500	947,500	1,091,000	----------	
CAMEROON								
Secondary School Teacher Training Institute, Yaoundé.	May 1961	UNESCO	6	2,692,800	1,174,800	1,518,000	Nov. 2, 1961	Nov. 2, 1961
CEYLON								
Establishment of a small industry service institute, Velona.	January 1962	ILO	5	2,263,300	942,300	1,321,000	May 23, 1962	June 20, 1962
CHILE								
Hydrometeorological stations	December 1959	WMO	4½	1,815,650	633,500	1,182,150	May 27, 1960	June 13, 1960
Mineral exploration	do	UN	2½	1,719,000	1,080,500	638,500	June 24, 1960	Aug. 3, 1960
Institute for the Development of Forest Resources and Industries.	December 1960	FAO	4	2,168,800	1,268,800	900,000	Aug. 2, 1961	Aug. 30, 1961
Faculty of Engineering, University of Concepcion	do	UNESCO	3	1,478,600	1,043,000	435,600	Nov. 7, 1961	Nov. 8, 1961
Instructor and Foreman Training Center, Santiago	May 1961	ILO	5	1,805,100	1,140,100	665,000	----------	
Fisheries Development Institute	January 1962	FAO	5	4,408,700	1,448,700	2,960,000	----------	
Institute of Occupational Health and Air Pollution Research, Santiago.	May 1962	WHO	5	1,215,000	404,000	811,000	----------	
CHINA								
Hydraulic development project [2]	December 1959	UN	1	520,075	342,000	178,075	Sept. 20, 1960	[2] Oct. 17, 1960
Telecommunication and Electronics Training and Research Center.	May 1960	ITU	3	566,100	296,100	270,000	Mar. 7, 1961	Apr. 18, 1961
Auto technician and instructor training, Taipei	May 1962	ILO	4	1,204,700	695,700	509,000	----------	
COLOMBIA								
National Vocational Training Service (SENA)	December 1959	ILO	4	1,726,500	561,500	1,165,000	Sept. 1, 1960	Sept. 13, 1960
Soil survey	do	FAO	3	690,050	401,500	288,550	do	Oct. 27, 1960
Institute for Technological Research	December 1960	UN	4	1,071,700	558,700	513,000	June 28, 1961	July 6, 1961
Training of engineers, Industrial University of Santander.	do	UNESCO	4	4,008,700	1,509,700	2,499,000	Nov. 30, 1961	Dec. 8, 1961
Agricultural training and research, Cauca Valley	May 1961	FAO	4	1,565,700	931,700	634,000	Oct. 20, 1961	Oct. 23, 1961
Institute for Training and Research in Agricultural Marketing, Bogotá.	May 1962	FAO	4	1,817,900	807,900	1,010,000	----------	
National Vocational Training Service (SENA)	do	ILO	4	1,955,300	793,300	1,162,000	----------	
Survey of the Cauca Valley coal deposits	do	IBRD	¾	336,500	216,500	120,000	----------	
CONGO (BRAZZAVILLE)								
Secondary School Teacher Training Institute, Brazzaville.	January 1962	UNESCO	6	2,960,200	1,185,200	1,775,000	Oct. 31, 1962	
Survey of the water resources of the Niari Valley	May 1962	FAO	3	778,700	631,700	147,000	----------	
CUBA								
Central Agricultural Experimental Station, Santiago de las Vegas.	May 1961	FAO	5	3,035,600	1,157,600	1,878,000	----------	

See footnotes at end of table.

Status of individual projects approved by the Governing Council of the Special Fund: May 1959–May 1962, as of Oct. 31, 1962—Con.

NOTE.—Throughout this annex, the figures under "Special fund contribution" indicate gross project costs, i.e., including the recipient Governments' cash contributions to the project budgets]

Project by country or territory	Approved by Governing Council	Executing agency	Duration of project (years)	Costs of individual projects (U.S. dollar equivalents)			Plan of operation signed (date)	Authorization to commence execution (date)
				Total	Special fund contribution	Estimated Government counterpart contribution		
CYPRUS								
Agricultural Research Institute, Nicosia	May 1961	FAO	5	$1,944,000	$787,100	$1,156,900	Feb. 23, 1962	Apr. 2, 1962
Survey of ground-water mineral resources	May 1962	UN	5	2,935,000	1,340,000	1,595,000		
ECUADOR								
Fisheries Institute	December 1959	FAO	4	1,307,000	693,000	614,000	June 2, 1960	Nov. 4, 1960
Hydrometeorological stations	do	WMO	4	1,204,300	423,500	780,800	June 27, 1960	July 27, 1960
Precolonization survey	do	FAO	2	289,500	168,000	121,500	Aug. 26, 1960	Nov. 22, 1960
National Polytechnic School, Quito	May 1961	UNESCO	5	3,021,400	1,321,400	1,700,000	Jan. 5, 1962	Mar. 1, 1962
Faculty of Agriculture and Veterinary Medicine, Quito.	May 1962	FAO	5	2,540,800	1,240,800	1,300,000		
Survey of hydrological resources of Manabi Province	do	UN	2	740,600	487,600	253,000	Oct. 5, 1962	Oct. 19, 1962
EL SALVADOR								
Groundwater resources survey	May 1960	FAO	2	910,800	348,300	562,500	Apr. 4, 1961	Apr. 17, 1961
ETHIOPIA								
Awash River Basin development survey	do	FAO	3	1,257,100	930,100	327,000	Feb. 7, 1961	Feb. 21, 1961
School for Veterinary Assistants	December 1960	FAO	5	722,700	432,700	290,000		
FEDERATION OF MALAYA								
Productivity Center	do	ILO	5	805,400	525,400	280,000	Dec. 20, 1961	Feb. 27, 1962
Telecommunications Training Center, Kuala Lumpur	May 1961	ITU	5	3,327,600	896,100	2,431,500	Dec. 23, 1961	Feb. 24, 1962
GHANA								
Volta River flood plain survey	May 1959	FAO	3	540,000	385,000	155,000	Dec. 9, 1959	Jan. 8, 1960
Institute of Public Administration, Accra	May 1961	UN	5	1,845,700	523,700	1,322,000	July 18, 1961	July 27, 1961
Land and water surveys in the upper and northern regions.	January 1962	FAO	3	1,181,700	806,700	375,000	Sept. 28, 1962	Oct. 24, 1962
GREECE								
Ground-water development	May 1959	FAO	3	408,000	298,000	110,000	Dec. 3, 1959	Feb. 3, 1960
Economic survey of the western Peloponnesus	December 1960	FAO	2	942,600	503,600	439,000	May 23, 1961	July 11, 1961
Preinvestment survey of selected forest areas	May 1962	FAO	3	1,077,200	394,200	683,000		
GUATEMALA								
Survey of hydraulic resources for electrification and irrigation.	December 1960	IBRD	2	883,500	633,500	250,000	July 28, 1961	Aug. 31, 1961
GUINEA								
General development survey [4]	May 1959	UN	1	425,000	425,000		Jan. 7, 1960	[4] Feb. 25, 1960
HAITI								
Animal husbandry demonstration project, Plaine des Cayes.	May 1961	FAO	3	588,800	338,800	250,000	June 6, 1962	June 15, 1962
Land and water surveys in the Gonaives Plain and the Northwest Department.	January 1962	FAO	3	1,136,100	665,800	470,300		
HONDURAS								
Survey of pine forests	May 1961	FAO	3	1,002,300	422,300	580,000	Dec. 11, 1961	Jan. 23, 1962
INDIA								
Industrial Instructors Training Institute	May 1959	ILO	3	3,173,500	1,033,500	2,140,000	Feb. 26, 1960	Apr. 4, 1960
Regional Labour Institute	December 1959	ILO	3	1,544,546	381,500	1,163,046	Oct. 6, 1960	Dec. 28, 1960
Mechanical Engineering Research Institute	do	UNESCO	3	1,666,200	725,000	941,200	Jan. 15, 1960	Feb. 16, 1960
Power Engineering Research Institute	do	UNESCO	3	4,698,700	1,981,500	2,717,200	do	Mar. 4, 1960
Public Health Engineering Research Institute	May 1960	WHO	4	4,115,000	525,000	3,590,000	May 16, 1961	May 18, 1961
Fisheries Training Institute	do	FAO	3	1,340,300	610,300	730,000	May 28, 1962	July 17, 1962
Mining research station	do	ILO	5	1,535,900	695,900	840,000	Dec. 20, 1960	Jan. 16, 1961
Potential hydropower sites survey	do	UN	3	7,361,400	2,361,400	5,000,000	June 4, 1962	June 29, 1962
Water supply resouces of Greater Calcutta survey	do	WHO	2	480,000	324,100	155,900	Sept. 17, 1962	
Central scientific instruments organization	December 1960	UNESCO	3	3,135,500	935,500	2,200,000	Sept. 1, 1962	Oct. 5, 1962
Cavitation Research Center	do	UN	3	574,100	364,100	210,000	Oct. 16, 1962	
National aeronautical research laboratory	do	ICAO	5	8,239,700	1,439,700	6,800,000	June 29, 1961	July 17, 1961
Vocational training scheme for industrial trades including a central instructors training institute in Kanpur.	do	ILO	4	2,740,100	1,050,100	1,690,000	June 7, 1961	Aug. 18, 1961
Central Instructor Training Institute, Madras	May 1961	ILO	3	2,302,000	612,000	1,690,000	Oct. 17, 1961	Jan. 5, 1962
Institute for Petroleum Exploration	do	UN	3	1,834,000	790,300	1,043,700	June 18, 1962	July 30, 1962
National Institute for Training in Industrial Engineering, Bombay	January 1962	ILO	5	2,289,000	669,000	1,620,000		
Central Instructor Training Institute, Hyderabad	do	ILO	3	2,302,000	612,000	1,690,000		
Rajasthan Sheep and Wool Institute	do	FAO	5	5,016,000	744,000	4,272,000	Oct. 4, 1962	Oct. 26, 1962
Central Instructor Training Institute, Ludhiana	May 1962	ILO	3	2,353,100	663,100	1,690,000		
INDONESIA								
Building Materials Research Laboratory	May 1960	UN	6	1,245,400	550,900	964,500	May 24, 1961	Nov. 17, 1961
Statistical Research and Development Center, Djakarta	January 1962	UN	5	2,236,400	997,400	1,239,000	Apr. 28, 1962	July 23, 1962
IRAN								
Teheran Polytechnic	December 1959	UNESCO	5	2,582,500	1,432,500	1,150,000	Jan. 31, 1960	Mar. 10, 1960
Soil fertility survey	May 1960	FAO	5	1,613,100	545,100	1,068,000	Nov. 7, 1960	Jan. 3, 1961
Geological Survey Institute	December 1960	UN	5	3,566,300	1,566,300	2,000,000	Jan. 16, 1961	Apr. 27, 1961

See footnotes at end of table.

Status of individual projects approved by the Governing Council of the Special Fund: May 1959–May 1962, as of Oct. 31, 1962—Con.

[NOTE.—Throughout this annex, the figures under "Special fund contribution" indicate gross project costs, i.e., including the recipient Governments' cash contributions to the project budgets]

Project by country or territory	Approved by Governing Council	Executing agency	Duration of project (years)	Costs of individual projects (U.S. dollar equivalents)			Plan of operation signed (date)	Authorization to commence execution (date)
				Total	Special fund contribution	Estimated Government counterpart contribution		
IRAN—continued								
Animal Health Institute	December 1960	FAO	5	$1,413,500	$873,500	$540,000	Apr. 29, 1962	Aug. 27, 1962
Vocational Instructor and Foreman Training Center	May 1961	ILO	4	1,737,400	762,400	975,000	Jan. 31, 1962	Apr. 10, 1962
Forestry and Range Institute and Forest Ranger School, Karaj.	May 1962	FAO	6	2,479,900	979,900	1,500,000	----------	
IRAQ								
Technical Training Institute	May 1960	UNESCO	5	4,834,500	934,500	3,900,000	Feb. 8, 1961	Feb. 16, 1961
Animal Health Institute	December 1960	FAO	5	1,321,700	493,700	828,000	Feb. 19, 1962	May 17, 1962
Management Development and Supervisor Training Center, Baghdad.	May 1961	ILO	5	1,027,100	604,100	423,000	Sept. 28, 1961	Oct. 19, 1961
Conservation and development of the lesser Zab Basin	January 1962	FAO	5	1,337,800	837,800	500,000	----------	
Telecommunication Training Center, Baghdad	do	ITU	5	2,974,700	909,700	2,065,000	----------	
ISRAEL								
Watershed management	May 1959	FAO	5	725,000	375,000	350,000	Dec. 29, 1959	Feb. 7, 1960
Meteorological Institute	December 1959	WMO	4	798,513	319,500	479,013	Apr. 19, 1960	Apr. 21, 1960
Experimental coastal groundwater collectors	May 1960	FAO	2½	1,429,000	341,800	1,087,200	Sept. 5, 1960	Sept. 6, 1960
Training centers for vocational instructors, technicians and foremen.	December 1960	ILO	5	2,196,400	816,400	1,380,000	Sept. 4, 1961	Sept. 22, 1961
Ceramic and Silicate Industries Laboratories, Haifa	May 1961	UN	3	665,100	301,200	363,900	Dec. 22, 1961	Jan. 3, 1962
Underground water storage study	May 1962	FAO	3	2,173,300	489,300	1,684,000		
IVORY COAST								
Secondary Schoolteacher Training Institute, Abidjan	May 1961	UNESCO	6	3,150,400	1,034,800	2,115,600	Nov. 2, 1961	Dec. 1, 1961
JAPAN								
International Institute of Seismology and Earthquake Engineering.	January 1962	UNESCO	5	1,676,800	702,500	974,300	Oct. 31, 1962	
JORDAN								
Groundwater survey of the Azraq Area	May 1961	UN	3	1,228,800	811,300	417,500	Nov. 2, 1961	Nov. 13, 1961
LAOS								
Technical training	May 1960	UNESCO	5	1,338,900	583,900	755,000	Dec. 14, 1961	Feb. 15, 1962
LEBANON								
Technical Training Institute	do	UNESCO	5	2,473,800	723,800	1,750,000	Nov. 8, 1960	Dec. 29, 1960
Animal Health Institute	December 1960	FAO	5	1,066,200	598,200	468,000	Feb. 9, 1962	May 17, 1962
Forestry education, training, and research	January 1962	FAO	5	2,260,700	844,700	1,416,000	----------	
Flight Safety Center, Beirut	May 1962	ICAO	5	4,421,700	2,288,700	2,133,000	----------	
Ground-water survey	do	UN	5	1,966,600	816,600	1,150,000	----------	
LIBERIA								
Agricultural training and research	December 1960	FAO	6	1,756,900	1,006,900	750,000	Sept. 18, 1961	Oct. 25, 1961
LIBYA								
College of Advanced Technology	December 1959	UNESCO	5	3,063,950	1,116,000	1,947,950	Sept. 16, 1960	Oct. 3, 1960
Radio and Telecommunications School	December 1960	ITU	5	1,183,600	523,600	660,000	July 5, 1961	July 14, 1961
MALI								
Secondary Schoolteacher Training Institute, Bamako	January 1962	UNESCO	6	3,668,900	1,019,900	2,649,000	Oct. 17, 1962	
Improvement and expansion of rice cultivation	May 1962	FAO	5	1,463,000	1,013,000	450,000	Oct. 31, 1962	
MEXICO								
National forestry inventory	May 1960	FAO	4	1,461,900	417,900	1,044,000	Apr. 27, 1961	May 4, 1961
Civil Aviation School	December 1960	ICAO	5	2,201,600	844,600	1,357,000	June 30, 1961	July 3, 1961
Survey of metallic mineral deposits	January 1962	UN	3	2,746,600	896,600	1,850,000	July 6, 1962	July 18, 1962
National Center for Technical Teacher Training, Mexico City.	May 1962	UNESCO	5	1,698,600	915,600	783,000	----------	
MOROCCO								
Engineering School	May 1960	UNESCO	5	2,751,500	751,500	2,000,000	Oct. 8, 1960	Dec. 1, 1960
Rif region development survey	do	FAO	2	1,882,800	702,800	1,180,000	Nov. 1, 1960	Jan. 2, 1961
Civil Aviation School	December 1960	ICAO	5	1,772,200	624,200	1,148,000	June 29, 1961	July 28, 1961
Institute for Instructor Training for Leather and Textile Workers.	January 1962	ILO	4	2,472,800	934,800	1,538,000	Oct. 11, 1962	
Secondary School teacher Training Institutes, Rabat	May 1962	UNESCO	5	2,743,900	884,900	1,859,000	----------	
NEPAL								
Hydroelectric development of the Karnali River	May 1961	UN	3	1,199,400	974,400	225,000	Jan. 16, 1962	Feb. 7, 1962
NETHERLANDS: SURINAM								
Mineral survey	May 1960	IBRD	2	1,462,000	770,000	692,000	Oct. 19, 1960	Oct. 21, 1960
NICARAGUA								
Survey o agricultural and forest resources	May 1962	FAO	4	1,290,900	851,900	439,000	----------	
NIGERIA								
Niger River Dam survey [5]	December 1959	IBRD	1	2,425,000	735,000	1,690,000	Mar. 7, 1960	Mar. 10, 1960
Federal Higher Teacher Training College	December 1960	UNESCO	5	2,852,200	1,052,200	1,800,000	Feb. 15, 1962	Mar. 29, 1962
Soil and water resources survey of the Sokoto Valley	May 1961	FAO	4	2,272,300	1,552,300	720,000	Feb. 23, 1962	Mar. 30, 1962
Vocational training program	do	ILO	4	1,507,500	1,002,600	504,900	----------	
Fisheries survey in the Western Region	do	FAO	4	829,000	564,000	265,000	----------	
Secondary School Teacher Training College, Northern Region	January 1962	UNESCO	5	3,730,200	930,200	2,800,000	----------	
Forestry faculty, University College, Ibadan	May 1962	FAO	6	1,551,800	876,800	675,000	----------	

See footnotes at end of table.

Status of individual projects approved by the Governing Council of the Special Fund: May 1959–May 1962, as of Oct. 31, 1962—Con.

[NOTE.—Throughout this annex, the figures under "Special fund contribution" indicate gross project costs, i.e., including the recipient Governments' cash contributions to the project budgets]

Project by country or territory	Approved by Governing Council	Executing agency	Duration of project (years)	Costs of individual projects (U.S. dollar equivalents)			Plan of operation signed (date)	Authorization to commence execution (date)
				Total	Special fund contribution	Estimated Government counterpart contribution		
NIGERIA—continued								
Secondary School Teacher Training College, Eastern Region.	May 1962	UNESCO	5	$3,688,500	$1,055,500	$2,633,000		
PAKISTAN								
Mineral survey	December 1959	UN	3	1,933,000	1,643,000	290,000	Sept. 22, 1960	Oct. 31, 1960
Soil survey	do	FAO	4	2,729,950	754,500	1,975,450	Dec. 8, 1960	Jan. 17, 1961
Management Development, Supervisory, and Instructor Training Center East Pakistan.	May 1960	ILO	5	2,239,000	1,039,000	1,200,000	Sept. 7, 1960	Sept. 22, 1960
Training of engineering and other technical personnel	do	UNESCO	5	3,424,400	2,294,400	1,130,000	Nov. 12, 1960	Feb. 10, 1961
Hydrological survey in East Pakistan	December 1960	FAO	5	3,845,700	1,645,700	2,200,000	Nov. 18, 1961	Dec. 4, 1961
National forestry research and training program	May 1961	FAO	5	4,589,800	1,061,800	3,528,000		
Polytechnic Institute, Chittagong	January 1962	UNESCO	5	3,512,500	856,500	2,656,000		
Manpower planning	do	ILO	5	868,100	695,100	173,000		
Management development and industrial training scheme for West Pakistan.	May 1962	ILO	4	2,656,000	1,494,000	1,162,000		
PARAGUAY								
Technical Standards Institute	do	UN	5	908,900	543,900	365,000		
PERU								
Marine Resources Research Institute	December 1959	FAO	4	1,766,500	790,500	976,000	Apr. 21, 1960	June 2, 1960
Precolonization survey	do	FAO	2	426,689	219,000	207,689	Feb. 13, 1961	Mar. 1, 1961
Vocational Instructors Training Institute	do	ILO	4	734,066	514,500	219,566	Nov. 25, 1960	Dec. 22, 1960
Hydrometeorological services	May 1960	WMO	4	1,862,300	788,300	1,074,000	Jan. 5, 1961	Jan. 16, 1961
Institute of Agricultural Engineering, National School of Agriculture.	December 1960	FAO	5	985,500	633,500	352,000	Sept. 28, 1961	Oct. 2, 1961
Resources surveys in central Peru (Peru Via)	May 1961	IBRD	4	2,507,000	1,277,000	1,230,000		
Veterinary Institute for Tropical and High Altitude Research.	January 1962	FAO	4	2,247,900	902,900	1,345,000		
Irrigation of the Pampas de Olmos	do	FAO	3	1,752,700	785,700	967,000		
Forestry research and training	May 1962	FAO	5	1,289,800	751,800	538,000		
PHILIPPINES								
Telecommunications Training Institute	May 1961	ITU	5	1,631,300	968,600	662,700	June 5, 1962	June 13, 1962
Dairy Training and Research Institute	January 1962	FAO	5	1,699,000	756,000	943,000	Sept. 19, 1962	Oct. 16, 1962
Institute of Applied Geology, Manila	do	UN	5	1,403,000	704,000	699,000	July 6, 1962	July 11, 1962
POLAND								
Training Center for Supervisory Personnel in Industry.	May 1959	ILO	3	3,317,000	817,000	2,500,000	Feb. 1, 1960	Mar. 7, 1960
Research and extension services for food production, processing, and utilization.	January 1962	FAO	4	4,651,500	1,020,500	3,631,000		
REPUBLIC OF KOREA								
Tidal land reclamation survey	December 1960	FAO	3	1,022,000	586,200	435,800	Sept. 12, 1961	Sept. 28, 1961
Agricultural survey and demonstration in selected watersheds.	May 1961	FAO	5	936,100	563,100	373,000	Oct. 5, 1961	Nov. 14, 1961
Productivity Center, Seoul	January 1962	ILO	5	1,608,500	778,500	830,000	Aug. 15, 1962	Aug. 16, 1962
Telecommunications Training Center, Seoul	May 1962	ITU	5	2,291,600	1,288,600	1,003,000	Oct. 1, 1962	
REPUBLIC OF VIETNAM								
Mineral survey	December 1959	UN	3	421,400	268,500	152,900	Dec. 14, 1960	Jan. 24, 1961
SAUDI ARABIA								
Land and water surveys in the Wadi Jizan	December 1960	FAO	2	1,512,100	431,600	1,080,500	Oct. 24, 1961	Nov. 27, 1961
Higher Institute of Technology, Riyadh	May 1961	UNESCO	5	3,002,500	965,500	2,037,000	Aug. 28, 1962	
Pilot Experimental Farm and Agricultural Center	May 1962	FAO	5	1,371,600	680,600	691,000		
SENEGAL								
Instructor and Foreman Training Center	May 1961	ILO	4	1,625,500	486,600	1,138,900	Feb. 14, 1962	Mar. 28, 1962
Secondary School Teacher Training Institute, Dakar	January 1962	UNESCO	6	3,179,700	1,144,700	2,035,000	Oct. 5, 1962	
Rural vocational training program	do	ILO	4	2,680,200	1,408,200	1,272,000		
SOMALIA								
Agricultural and water surveys	December 1960	FAO	4	1,218,800	928,800	290,000	Sept. 30, 1961	Nov. 3, 1961
Iron ore survey	January 1962	UN	4	874,300	594,300	280,000		
SUDAN								
Animal Health Institute	December 1960	FAO	4	459,900	264,900	195,000	Mar. 31, 1962	May 17, 1962
Hides, skins and leather: Development and training project.	do	FAO	4	868,600	521,000	347,600	May 3, 1961	June 14, 1961
Forestry Research and Education Center, Khartoum	May 1961	FAO	5	1,222,600	832,600	390,000	Dec. 19, 1961	Dec. 21, 1961
Land water use survey of Kordofan Province	do	FAO	6	1,389,900	889,900	500,000	Oct. 10, 1961	Nov. 20, 1961
Secondary Schoolteacher Training Institute, Khartoum.	do	UNESCO	5	3,015,400	1,074,400	1,941,000	Dec. 31, 1961	Jan. 12, 1962
Post and Telegraph Training Center, Khartoum	January 1962	ITU	5	1,936,900	486,900	1,450,000		
Electric power survey	May 1962	IBRD	1	141,200	115,200	26,000		
Land and water use and resources survey in the Jebel Marra area.	do	FAO	4	3,056,100	1,136,100	1,920,000	Sept. 23, 1962	
SYRIAN ARAB REPUBLIC								
Ground-water resources survey	December 1959	FAO	3	1,045,500	507,000	538,500	Sept. 29, 1960	Dec. 28, 1960
Food processing project	December 1960	FAO	5	896,300	568,300	328,000	Apr. 30, 1961	May 16, 1961
Damascus Agricultural Research Station	January 1962	FAO	5	1,243,200	663,200	580,000		
Higher Polytechnic Institute, Damascus	May 1962	UNESCO	5	3,611,300	1,121,300	2,490,000		
Planning the integrated agricultural development of the Ghab region.	do	FAO	4	1,457,500	766,500	691,000		

See footnotes at end of table.

Status of individual projects approved by the Governing Council of the Special Fund: May 1959–May 1962, as of Oct. 31, 1962—Con.

[NOTE.—Throughout this annex, the figures under "Special fund contribution" indicate gross project costs, i.e., including the recipient Governments' cash contributions to the project budgets]

Project by country or territory	Approved by Governing Council	Executing agency	Duration of project (years)	Costs of individual projects (U.S. dollar equivalents)			Plan of operation signed (date)	Authorization to commence execution (date)
				Total	Special fund contribution	Estimated Government counterpart contribution		
THAILAND								
Siltation study of Bangkok Port	May 1959	IRBD	3½	$1, 365, 000	$1, 015, 000	$350, 000	July 10, 1961	July 24, 1961
Civil Aviation Training Center	May 1960	ICAO	5	3, 027, 400	1, 339, 600	1, 687, 800	Apr. 10, 1961	Apr. 18, 1961
Productivity Center, Bangkok	May 1961	ILO	5	779, 900	567, 300	212, 600	Jan. 18, 1962	Feb. 14, 1962
Technical Institute, Thonburi	do	UNESCO	5	3, 035, 700	1, 081, 700	1, 954, 000	------	
Research and Training Center for rice protection	January 1962	FAO	5	1, 124, 300	606, 300	518, 000	July 20, 1962	Sept. 8, 1962
Expansion of Meteorological Services	do	WMO	3	581, 300	330, 300	251, 000	------	
TURKEY								
Middle East Technical University	May 1959	UNESCO	4	9, 831, 287	1, 664, 000	8, 167, 287	Dec. 14, 1959	Jan. 30, 1960
Antalya region development	May 1960	FAO	3	832, 600	359, 600	473, 000	Oct. 21, 1960	Feb. 7, 1961
Poplar Institute	January 1962	FAO	4	1, 919, 600	644, 600	1, 275, 000	May 2, 1962	June 27, 1962
UGANDA								
Aerial geophysical survey	May 1960	UN	1	453, 500	313, 500	140, 000	Nov. 30, 1960	Dec. 15, 1960
Kampala Technical Institute	January 1962	UNESCO	6	5, 112, 500	1, 159, 500	3, 953, 000	------	
UNITED ARAB REPUBLIC								
Drainage of irrigated land	May 1959	FAO	3	1, 365, 000	365, 000	1, 000, 000	Dec. 27, 1960	Feb. 21, 1961
Soil survey from aerial photographs	do	FAO	4	827, 500	327, 500	500, 000	Mar. 10, 1960	May 24, 1960
Civil Aviation Training School	May 1960	ICAO	5	1, 860, 500	1, 063, 400	797, 100	Apr. 17, 1961	May 18, 1961
Cotton Research Laboratory	December 1960	FAO	4	1, 465, 300	687, 300	778, 000	Dec. 26, 1961	May 31, 1962
Animal Health Institute	do	FAO	4	1, 005, 000	668, 000	337, 000	Aug. 8, 1962	Oct. 4, 1962
Vocational Instructor Training Institute	do	ILO	4	1, 447, 100	888, 100	559, 000	Aug. 20, 1961	Oct. 5, 1961
National Institute of Standards	May 1961	UNESCO	5	4, 973, 700	973, 700	4, 000, 000	------	
Central Agricultural Pesticides Laboratory, Cairo	do	FAO	4	986, 000	616, 000	370, 000	May 5, 1962	Sept. 12, 1962
Establishment of an Institute of Small Industries, Kubba.	January 1962	ILO	4	1, 298, 600	600, 600	698, 000	------	
Mansoura Institute for Higher Education	May 1962	UNESCO	5	4, 870, 400	1, 756, 400	3, 114, 000	------	
TOGO								
Land and water use survey	May 1960	FAO	3	963, 000	700, 000	263, 000	Dec. 23, 1960	Jan. 11, 1961
Survey of groundwater and mineral resources	January 1962	UN	3	1, 793, 500	1, 273, 500	520, 000	Aug. 21, 1962	Sept. 4, 1962
TUNISIA								
Agricultural Research, central Tunisia	May 1960	FAO	5	2, 457, 200	897, 200	1, 560, 000	Sept. 13, 1960	Sept. 23, 1960
Civil Aviation School	December 1960	ICAO	5	1, 787, 500	640, 500	1, 147, 000	Sept. 19, 1961	Sept. 27, 1961
Research and training on irrigation with saline water	January 1962	UNESCO	5	1, 817, 800	971, 800	846, 000	------	
Vocational Training and Productivity Institute, Radés.	do	ILO	5	2, 644, 700	1, 018, 700	1, 626, 000	------	
UNITED KINGDOM: BRITISH GUIANA								
Siltation study, Georgetown Harbour	December 1959	IBRD	2	421, 500	278, 000	143, 500	Apr. 8, 1960	Apr. 15, 1960
Soil survey	May 1960	FAO	3	879, 000	491, 000	388, 000	Nov. 9, 1960	Dec. 8, 1960
Survey of Canje Reservoir scheme	May 1961	FAO	1½	605, 600	352, 600	253, 000	Dec. 30, 1961	Jan. 11, 1962
Aerial geophysical survey	January 1962	UN	3	1, 340, 800	640, 800	700, 000	June 14, 1962	June 14, 1962
UNITED KINGDOM: COLONY OF NORTH BORNEO								
Surveys of the Labuk Valley	December 1960	UN	3	1, 559, 900	769, 900	790, 000	Aug. 11, 1961	Aug. 30, 1961
UNITED KINGDOM: FEDERATION OF RHODESIA AND NYASALAND								
Multipurpose survey of the Kafue River Basin	May 1961	FAO	4	1, 375, 100	786, 100	589, 000	Feb. 23, 1962	May 16, 1962
Lake Fariba Fisheries Research Institute	January 1962	FAO	4	1, 107, 200	555, 200	552, 000	------	
UNITED KINGDOM: KENYA								
Training of engineers for East Africa	May 1962	UNESCO	5	1, 756, 600	832, 600	924, 000	------	
The Kenya Polytechnic, Nairobi	do	UNESCO	6	2, 308, 100	1, 428, 100	880, 000	------	
Survey of the irrigation potential of the Lower Tana River Basin.	do	FAO	3	1, 297, 100	974, 100	323, 000	------	
UNITED KINGDOM: MALTA								
Polytechnic Institute	May 1960	UNESCO	5	1, 501, 200	601, 200	900, 000	Mar. 22, 1961	May 9, 1961
UPPER VOLTA								
Agricultural Training Center, Bobo-Dioulasso	May 1962	FAO	5	1, 840, 900	1, 040, 900	800, 000	------	
URUGUAY								
Vocational Instructor Training Institute, Montevideo	January 1962	ILO	4	1, 585, 200	874, 200	711, 000	------	
VENEZUELA								
Agricultural survey of selected watersheds in the northwest.	December 1960	FAO	3	1, 778, 700	778, 700	1, 000, 000	June 30, 1962	Aug. 13, 1962
National Polytechnic Institute	January 1962	UNESCO	5	4, 899, 700	1, 254, 700	3, 645, 000	------	
School of Industrial Engineering, Central University, Caracas.	May 1962	UNESCO	5	4, 753, 300	1, 038, 300	3, 715, 000	------	
YUGOSLAVIA								
Training of vocational instructors	May 1959	ILO	4	7, 511, 500	1, 044, 000	6, 467, 500	Dec. 31, 1959	Jan. 21, 1960
Pilot land reclamation project	December 1960	FAO	4	3, 932, 100	1, 037, 100	2, 895, 000	May 19, 1962	May 22, 1962
Nuclear research and training in agriculture	May 1962	IAEA	3	1, 752, 400	546, 400	1, 206, 000	------	

See footnotes at end of table.

Status of individual projects approved by the Governing Council of the Special Fund: May 1959–May 1962, as of Oct. 31, 1962—Con.

[NOTE.—Throughout this annex, the figures under "Special fund contribution" indicate gross project costs, i.e., including the recipient Governments' cash contributions to the project budgets]

Project by country or territory	Approved by Governing Council	Executing agency	Duration of project (years)	Costs of individual projects (U.S. dollar equivalents)			Plan of operation signed (date)	Authorization to commence execution (date)
				Total	Special fund contribution	Estimated Government counterpart contribution		
REGIONAL: THE AMERICAS								
Industrial Research Institute [6]	May 1959	UN	5	$2,238,000	[7] $2,238,000		May 10, 1960	May 10, 1960
Engineering faculty, University of the West Indies [8]	December 1959	UNESCO	5	3,426,940	904,000	$2,522,940	Aug. 25, 1960	Aug. 30, 1960
Inter-American Institute of Agricultural Sciences [9]	December 1960	FAO	5	8,212,000	4,001,000	4,211,000		
Latin American Development Institute [10]	January 1962	UN	5	4,188,500	3,068,500	1,120,000	June 8, 1962	June 18, 1962
Study for development of telecommunications in Central America [11]	May 1962	IBRD	1	895,000	770,000	125,000		
REGIONAL: ASIA AND THE FAR EAST								
Mekong tributary survey [12]	December 1959	UN	4	1,793,700	1,469,000	324,700	May 4, 1960	(13)
Hydrographic survey of the lower Mekong [12]	December 1960	UN	2	667,000	347,000	320,000	May 31, 1961	July 24, 1961
Laos and Thailand: Survey of minerals and mineral processing industries	May 1961	UN	2	569,300	424,300	145,000	Oct. 20, 1961	(14)
Cambodia and Republic of Vietnam: Mekong River delta model study.	do	UNESCO	3	758,800	642,800	116,000	May 2, 1962	May 25, 1962
INTERREGIONAL								
Desert locust [15]	December 1959	FAO	6	3,866,000	[16] 3,866,000		Apr. 9, 1960 [17]	June 8, 1960
Total				497,047,716	210,254,900	286,792,816		

---

[1] Project completed in June 1960.

[2] Project completed in February 1962.

[3] "Special fund contribution" includes, in addition to cash payments by the Government for local costs, a cash counterpart contribution equivalent to $405,000.

[4] Project concluded in March 1961.

[5] Project completed in April 1961.

[6] Participants: Costa Rica, El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras, and Nicaragua.

[7] Cash counterpart contributions by the participating governments totaling the equivalent of $1,300,000 included under "Special fund contribution."

[8] Participants: Jamaica, Trinidad and Tobago, and the United Kingdom on behalf of British Guiana and its non-self-governing territories in the Caribbean.

[9] Participants: All member countries of the Inter-American Institute of Agricultural Sciences.

[10] Requesting Governments: Bolivia, Brazil, Chile, Colombia, and Venezuela.

[11] Participants: Costa Rica, El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras, Nicaragua, and Panama.

[12] Participants: Cambodia, Laos, Republic of Vietnam, and Thailand.

[13] Laos and Thailand, July 14, 1960, Cambodia, Dec. 8, 1960, and Republic of Vietnam, June 14, 1961.

[14] Thailand, Nov. 3, 1961, and Laos, Sept. 21, 1962.

[15] Participants: Cameroon, Chad, Ethiopia, France and the French Community, Ghana, India, Iran, Iraq, Israel, Jordan, Kuwait, Lebanon, Libya, Mauritania, Morocco, Niger, Nigeria, Pakistan, Saudi Arabia, Sierra Leone, Somalia, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Tunisia, Turkey, United Arab Republic, Yemen, and the United Kingdom for and on behalf of Aden Colony and Protectorate, British Trusteeship Territory of the Cameroons, Gambia, Kenya, Tanganyika, Uganda, and the Gulf States.

[16] Cash counterpart contributions by the participating governments totaling the equivalent of $1,390,850 included under "Special fund contribution."

[17] Operations limited to those countries whose governments have completed their initial obligations.

NEW RESIDUAL OIL IMPORT QUOTA ALLOCATIONS

Mr. NYGAARD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. NYGAARD. Mr. Speaker, this morning I delivered a letter to the Secretary of the Interior, Stewart L. Udall, requesting the Department withhold publication of new residual oil import quota allocations until the projected schedules have been reviewed by key interested Members of the House of Representatives.

In view of the statements made on this floor by many of my colleagues, expressing concern over the increase in the quotas for foreign residual oil, I believe they will be interested in the request I have made to the Secretary of the Interior.

FEBRUARY 27, 1963.

Hon. STEWART L. UDALL,
Secretary, Department of the Interior,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: Since it is customary, I believe, for your office to announce a month in advance the oil import allocations for the year beginning April 1, it is likely that such an announcement is now in preparation.

It would logically be assumed that, because of the disastrous economic losses incurred by coal mining and oil producing regions as a consequence of the present high levels of oil imports, a reduction in shipments of foreign oil to this country will be ordered for the year beginning April 1. Since conditions of high unemployment in this country have not thus far been taken into consideration in the administration of the oil import control program, however, there does exist the grave possibility that those charged with the responsibility of setting the quota limitations will permit incoming oil shipments to be increased rather than reduced. For this reason I urgently request that you postpone any action on the new schedule until it is discussed with Members of Congress whose constituencies are affected.

As representative of lignite mining communities whose very existences are imperiled by the waves of foreign residual oil inundating the Nation's fuel markets, and as a member of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, I would, of course, appreciate an opportunity to preview the projections and to discuss them with designated authorities in your office. Because, however, you may prefer to limit further the number of those so favored, I would suggest that the matter could be handled satisfactorily by the chairmen and senior ranking members of these committees: Interior and Insular Affairs, Foreign Affairs, Ways and Means.

Obviously, the senior members of the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee are familiar with the impact of foreign oil on the domestic fuel industries. Foreign Affairs members are in better position to ascertain to what extent commitments might have been made to President Betancourt of Venezuela during his visit to Washington last week. Members of the Ways and Means Committee are cognizant of the promises made to Congress on limiting oil imports from the time that the national security amendment to the Trade Agreements Act was first adopted.

I am confident that my colleagues here named would make an objective analysis of the proposed new import schedules and could, with more than a fair degree of accuracy, indicate to your office the probable reactions on the part of the House should the revised schedule again prove to be as offensive to the American economy as in the past year.

I shall appreciate your notifying all interested parties that the publication of new imports schedules will be delayed as long as is necessary for adjustments that will be in keeping with the will of Congress and the welfare of the United States.

Copies of this letter are being sent to Members of the House indicated above, and I shall ask that a copy of my letter to you be placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Thank you for your kind attention.

Sincerely,

HJALMAR C. NYGAARD,
Member of Congress.

MR. KHRUSHCHEV AND CUBA

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, the lead story in the Washington Star last night, and I assume all of the Associated Press papers across the Nation, told a most interesting story and one which should send cold chills down the spine of most Americans.

It told of a big political speech made by Mr. Khrushchev in his one-party election campaign. He said the Soviet Union "would come to the aid of its friends" should the West launch any attack on Cuba or Red China.

This, Mr. Speaker, is the first real proof we have had that Mr. Khrushchev and Mr. Kennedy consider Cuba as Soviet territory. It is the first real proof we have had that the President has abandoned "our friends"—the free people of Cuba to the Communist dictatorship.

This brings the American people face to face with facts. Where do we stand? Have we actually abandoned the principles of freedom? Have we completely abandoned the Monroe Doctrine? Has this administration turned its back on the men who gave their lives in every war this Nation has fought to make the world or at least the Western Hemisphere safe for democracy?

When Mr. Khrushchev says he will go to the aid of his friends in Cuba is he referring to anyone other than Castro and a few of his hierarchy? What about the Cuban people? We fought one war to free them; do we now stand by and watch them ground under the slave heel of the Kremlin?

The American people want some answers. They want some facts and they want them now. Just what deals has this administration made and who has been traded off to whom?

THE NEW YORK NEWSPAPER STRIKE

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, the New York newspaper strike long since ceased serving any useful purpose. No one has benefited; everyone has been irreparably hurt.

The chief damage has been done to the public. The public has been deeply prejudiced by this strike. And, for that reason the Federal Government should have moved on this long ago. The former Secretary of Labor, Mr. Goldberg, established a precedent of intervention in crisis strikes. He went up to New York during the Metropolitan Opera strike and forced the parties together. And yet it is argued now that the Federal Government cannot intervene in a local strike.

I do not know of a strike that has more serious overtones and undertones than does this one. The news blackout means that Government is operating in camera. It is the process of daily public scrutiny that keeps governments acting honestly and in the public interest. The public right to know is one of the most important rights ingrained in any democracy. It is important because governments will not long remain free and honest in the absence of a public press.

In my view Government and governmental processes have abandoned the public in this case.

Mr. Speaker, recently Mr. Robert G. Spivack, a distinguished newspaperman, published three articles on the subject of the New York newspaper strike. They are well worth reading, and I am taking the liberty of inserting them in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point:

THE LONELY METROPOLIS

Lively, lovely, exciting New York—Baghdad-on-the-Hudson—is today a mute, paralyzed, crippled city. She is like a helpless creature, unexpectedly stricken dumb and deaf. Dazed and staring vacantly, she is obviously in distress and yet so powerless to summon help.

People still rush about, the subways are crowded, the lights blink on Broadway. There are a handful of tradition-breakers who snatch a Philadelphia or Newark paper, or one of the half-dozen makeshift dailies, hastily patched together. The early morning gazers still stand outside the NBC studios watching the Today show. There are the curious in Pennsylvania station who pick up a clipboard to which has been clamped the latest UPI copy.

Superficially not much is different—until you start to talk to New Yorkers. Then you realize that nothing is the same and the full impact of what has happened starts to become apparent.

A great sadness has descended on the city, such as marked the passing of a beloved friend like, if you remember, Franklin D. Roosevelt.

Are the newspapers missed? Has television filled the news gap?

I have never seen the big town or its inhabitants so glazed or so lonely or reacting so inadequately. At one moment it is as if some nerve gas has quietly seeped over the city and asphyxiated its residents. At other times you get the feeling that Manhattan Island has been set adrift from the mainland and silently floated out to sea.

The New Yorker feels cut off from America and the visitor from Washington is earnestly questioned about the outside world. There is probably no other American city where this would be quite so true, where the newspapers play such a vital role. The New York press is the heart of the big town through which its lifeblood flows. Without its papers the city is half-dead.

The printers' strike has been a catastrophe and it was unnecessary from the outset.

I say this as a union man.

I am a member of the American Newspaper Guild, have been for most of my adult life. There have been numerous strikes which, I felt, were justified. I intend to remain a member of the guild.

But I have taken no loyalty oath to Mr. Bert Powers of the ITU. Nor do I feel obliged to remain silent when a union leader makes a fool of himself.

Mr. Powers and a small clique in the New York locals of the ITU are primarily responsible for the strike. He may wrap himself in a mantle of rectitude. But Mr. Powers is no hero to organized labor, nor to the unorganized layman.

There is not a union leader in New York with whom I have spoken who has had a good word to say for the course Mr. Powers has charted. But they do their grumbling in silence or within "the club." This is unfortunate, because a word from a responsible union leader would carry weight.

What has happened, though, is that many who grew up in the thirties find themselves entrapped by their own rhetoric. There must always be labor unity. The boss, or in this case the publishers, must always be wrong.

This is one time when neither slogan is adequate. With all the publishers' shortcomings and all the rigidity of other years, most union leaders in New York say privately that Powers' bargaining methods and demands were outrageous, that no publisher in this economically distressed industry could acquiesce and no paper could continue to publish in the manner to which New Yorkers have grown accustomed.

Perhaps Powers' greatest error has been that he has demonstrated such poor generalship. He left no room to maneuver. He provided no escape hatches for either the publishers or the ITU. He took a desperate gamble in December when, before the Christmas advertising was over, he decided to strike. It was a massive miscalculation.

When it did not pay off, when the nonstruck papers also shut down, a mature labor leader would have left other courses of action open for himself. In all his grandiose planning, Mr. Powers overlooked this elementary fact of all warfare, whether it is political or military or labor. Instead he boxed himself in and thus far has not figured a way out.

WHO HAS BEEN HURT BY THE NEWSPAPER STRIKE?

New Yorkers are a special breed and, as a result, they are often misunderstood by those who live in other parts of the country.

To a visitor New York is an exciting town, but its people are strange. They hardly ever smile. Some seem fierce and withdrawn. Others act as if their mission in life is just to separate you and your cash. Frequently New Yorkers seem to look down on the outlander, regarding him as uncultured, uninformed, and a hick.

That, in part at least, is the background of the well-known comment, "New York is a nice place to visit but I wouldn't want to live there."

As one who came east from Ohio and grew to know and love New York, I believe this picture is a distortion. It is worth considering, though, why New Yorkers are different.

There are 8 million people from divergent backgrounds. If one does not wish to become involved with anyone else's interests and problems, the easiest way is to be withdrawn. The tendency for each man to become an island unto himself is not hard to understand. It is a protective defense against invasion of privacy.

Sometimes it is overdone. Some New Yorkers are so withdrawn they do not know their neighbor's name. Others do not start the day by saying, "Good morning." This is sad. It is one more reason why every New Yorker ought to be required to visit west of the Hudson, at least before he can be considered well educated.

But as their substitute for traveling, New Yorkers turn almost instinctively to the newspapers. As a result the city has been compelled to develop the best newspapers in the country; their readers are critical and demanding.

There are other towns with one good newspaper. But New Yorkers support seven of which at least six possess unusual qualities. Half the city's inhabitants read at least one newspaper daily. These reading habits have developed over the years. The morning newspaper is as important to start the day as that first cup of coffee.

So when Mr. Bert Powers of the International Typographical Union pulled what has turned out to be his disastrous printers' strike, the first victim was the newspaper reader. Shutting down the New York press was like ripping a delicate fabric. In this case the unseen damage done is not likely to be easily or quickly repaired.

Perhaps that is why for over 80 years the ITU has not gone on strike in New York. The union's earlier leaders were no less tough than Mr. Powers. They may have been wiser. In any event they were part of the newspaper tradition and the city's social structure.

If you have not lived in New York it may be difficult to understand the unique role that the press plays. But everyone can understand the economic damage of the strike. It has virtually bankrupted the Newspaper Guild and many individual newspapermen. But it has also vitally affected others.

The small businessman who advertises in the big papers hoping to get someone to his shop or to get orders by mail has been acutely injured. He cannot afford the more costly advertising on radio or television, which is also too fleeting. He has no facilities for compiling direct mail lists and anyhow that cannot be done overnight.

The big department stores have also been damaged. Hardly anyone knows what they have to offer. Book publishers and authors have been cruelly affected. A man spends a year writing a book. If it came out during the strike, who would know it? It is not reviewed in any New York newspaper.

For the theaters and movie houses the winter has been bleak. There is a cheaply printed yellow sheet of what's playing called the "emergency list," available in the hotels. But if you do not live in a hotel, what then?

But those who have been most seriously injured of all are those who are out of work. The city's vast army of jobless do not know where to turn. Shall an unemployed man first travel to Brooklyn, or to Queens? Is there something opening in the garment center? Does a law firm need a young typist? For the unemployed page 1 is the page that lists job opportunities.

There are vast areas from one end of the big city to another. It's expensive to get around at 30 cents a round trip on the subway if you do not know which spots to hit first. If you try to telephone, you soon discover that others are doing the same. The line is always busy.

It's ironic that those who are already spiritually wounded and so badly demoralized by unemployment should now find themselves further injured by a strike nobody wanted.

Losers All

One day, of course, the strike ends in a compromise. The combatants feel a bit foolish, like two old friends who have been in a brawl. The victims try to pull themselves together. Everybody hopes it won't happen again.

If the newspaper strike in New York had been an ordinary strike, let us say of bus drivers, or coal miners, or building maintenance workers, life would go on after the settlement pretty much as before the conflict. This Nation has survived many strikes and the damage is usually not permanent.

Certainly these are times when workers, through their unions, must strike.

But the newspaper strike was entirely different and the lessons to be drawn from it are different. It is difficult to figure out what, if anything, has been gained by the strike. There is no problem about figuring out what has been lost.

First there was the tearing of the social fabric of New York. The newspaper readers were the innocent bystanders in a fight that basically did not concern them. Then there was the loss of income for the newspaper employees, the publishers, and the advertisers.

Estimates vary, but probably $40 to $50 million was lost, some of it never to be regained. Then there were unmeasurable losses. How do you figure how badly hurt New York's unemployed were by their inability to obtain a daily listing of job opportunities?

Aside from all this is the damage done to the New York press at a crucial point, when the very survival of certain publications is jeopardized.

As everyone knows, newspaper publishing has been an economically sick industry. But at a time when responsible unions and publishers should be engaging in a joint effort to see what might be done to nurture it back to health, some hotheads in the New York locals of the International Typographical Union decided to start a brawl.

This strike was comparable to kicking the patient out of bed, using a meat ax on his medicine chest, pounding him senseless, and then asking why he does not get up and do his job.

If the newspapers are to regain their strength and if the printers' union is to regain its prestige, then it is important to think about where we go from here. Some changes in union leadership would probably be salutary. But for now let's examine the broader issues.

Even though the New York printers' chief bungled it and scarcely bothered to make a public case, there is something that has worried the ITU for many years. It is a matter of legitimate concern: How automation will affect the printers' craft. There is no doubt that the newspapers will eventually automate. To survive they must modernize.

But if that is what really underlay this explosion, then it was the ITU's job to start working with the publishers to see how modernization could take place without dislodging those now working and how to make the transition with a minimum of joblessness.

In fairness to the union, it must be acknowledged that this will not be easy, nor the negotiations simple. Other industries have not set a very good example and other unions have also been asleep on the job. But to adopt a head-in-the-sand approach helps neither unions nor publishers.

Next we should consider future relations between the unions. The New York strike has virtually bankrupted the Newspaper Guild, which has mortgaged itself for what is probably the normal lifetime of its present membership. On the other hand, the ITU is building up a national strike fund estimated at somewhere from $17,500,000 to $20 million.

If the ITU expects future cooperation, then the least it could do would be to repay the Newspaper Guild and the other newspaper unions all the funds that they laid out in strike benefits. Unfortunately no one will be in a position to reimburse the employees for what they lost in pay or the employers for their loss in revenue.

But even more important, there must be a complete reexamination of how a newspaper strike can be called. So long as there is not one big newspaper union but a conglomeration of small unions, then no strike should be called until there is substantial agreement among the rank-and-file as well as the leaders on whether there is to be a strike.

The least that ought to come out of this strike is a greater degree of union democracy. No one, newspapermen least of all, wants to be part of a union of sheep.

GOVERNMENT COPYRIGHT PRACTICES NEED INVESTIGATION

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, in the last Congress I introduced a resolution that would authorize an investigation into the practices of Government copyrights.

That this issue remains a current problem is evidenced by the exchange of letters I am appending for the consideration of my colleagues:

Mr. Abram Chayes' Letter to Professor Charles Foster Regarding Government Copyrights

Department of State,
Washington, D.C., February 5, 1963.

Mr. Charles R. Foster,
Assistant Professor of Political Science, DePauw University, Greencastle, Ind.

Dear Professor Foster: I have been asked by the Secretary to reply to your letter of January 24, 1963, questioning the permissibility of publication by Beacon Press, Inc., of a selection of his official statements and speeches in a book entitled "Winds of Freedom." You also express the view that the publication may be a violation of the Copyright Act.

The Department of State authorized Beacon Press to undertake this publication in order to obtain a more widespread public awareness of the foreign policy positions of the U.S. Government than would normally be available through use of the Government Printing Office. Beacon Press was, and is, able to bring to bear its machinery for promotion and publicity to achieve this end. It undertook this project in a spirit of public service with no intention of recovering more than its costs. Moreover, the Department of State itself has sought no profit from the agreement, nor will the Secretary or Mr. Lindley receive any royalties or other compensation from the publication of the book.

Beacon Press has informally assured the Department that its procurement of a copyright on the book was a regrettable inadvertence, and that it is taking steps to remedy the situation. In any event, the Department has reason to conclude that at least the format of the material may be copyrighted, whatever else may not be. However, the provisions of the Department's arrangements with Beacon Press make it very clear that the material is available to other publishers on the same terms as it has been made available to Beacon Press.

You may feel certain that access to those materials through official channels of the Government is still open to you and all other Americans. Indeed, it is our hope that publication of the book will stir enough interest so that many other Americans will be led to avail themselves of this and related material through those channels.

Sincerely yours,

Abram Chayes,
The Legal Adviser.

Mr. Charles Foster's Letter in Reply

February 15, 1963.

Mr. Abram Chayes,
The Legal Adviser, Department of State, Washington 25, D.C.

Dear Mr. Chayes: I greatly appreciate your letter of February 5, but I find myself puzzled about a number of points you mention with regard to the private publication and copyrighting of Secretary Rusk's official speeches in an officially prepared book entitled "The Winds of Freedom."

You state that "The Department of State authorized Beacon Press" to publish the book in question. By what statutory authority does the Department have the right to do this? So far as I know no such authority exists in law. Indeed the only statute relating to private publication of official documents, the Copyright Act, expressly forbids copyrighting of such material. Section 8 of this law states: "No copyright shall subsist in any publication of the U.S. Government, or any reprint, in whole or in part thereof" (17 U.S.C. 8).

Moreover, according to an official statement by the Copyright Office, "Any work produced by a Government employee within the scope of his employment is not copyrightable, even though produced by a private publisher" (Report of the Register of Copyrights to the House Committee on the Judiciary, 87th Cong., 1st sess., 1961, p. 131).

It will interest you to know that in opposing extension of copyrights, Deputy Attorney General Nicholas Katzenbach, recently defined copyrights as "forms of monopolies" which should be restricted "from the viewpoint of the public."

You state that private publication was authorized by the State Department "in order to obtain a more widespread public awareness of the foreign policy positions of the U.S. Government." I fail to see how this can possibly be attained through the means authorized by your agency.

As you know, the book in question is being privately sold, under authorization of the State Department, at $4.95 a copy. However, I understand that the same material, if issued by the Government Printing Office, as it should have been, could be made available to the public at about 60 cents a copy.

I note that advertisements promoting the private sale of the book refer to it as "indispensable for understanding the position of the Kennedy administration on intricate world problems and for its perceptive, carefully articulated analysis of the nature of the world struggle." If it is indeed so indispensable it should be available to my students—as well as to everyone else—at the low prices charged by the Government Printing Office for official publications, not at the high prices private publishers charge for commercial works.

You state that private publication of Secretary Rusk's speeches was motivated by "public service." I fail to see what public service is rendered when a compilation of official documents is furnished to a preferred publisher for copyrighted publication at $4.95 a copy when it could have been made accessible to the public, without copyright restrictions, at 60 cents a copy.

You state that private publication of the book was "authorized * * * in order to obtain a more widespread public awareness of the foreign policy positions of the U.S. Government than would normally be available through use of the Government Printing Office." In view of what you imply in this regard permit me to call your attention to the following:

(a) The Government Printing Office was established by Congress and is supported by the taxpayer for the very purpose the State Department has disregarded—printing and distribution of official publications appropriately and inexpensively.

(b) It is a matter of record—and, I might add, considerable pride—that some publications of the Office have achieved circulations of several hundreds of thousands via purchase at low cost by the public in general.

(c) The resources of the Federal Government for promotion and publicity are far, far greater than those of any private publisher.

(d) In publicizing the publications of the Government Printing Office, the Superintendent of Documents distributes millions of promotional circulars every year. Incidentally, Government Printing Office publications are frequently the subject of publicity and reviews in leading newspapers and magazines.

You state that copyrighting of the work is due to "regrettable inadvertence." I fully agree that use of this restrictive device is "regrettable" but I find it difficult to believe that the Department did not know that it is quite customary for all private published material to be copyrighted. Nor can I persuade myself that the Department was unaware that publications of the Government Printing Office cannot be copyrighted.

Prior to joining the State Department's staff Mr. Ernest Lindley, Special Assistant to Secretary Rusk and editor of the book in question, was a prolific author of works published under copyright arrangements. As he must know, such arrangements are a basic requisite of all private publishing.

Moreover, I find "inadvertence" a very inadequate explanation in that it is common knowledge that other copyrighting of official material has been the subject of a great deal of attention in the press in the past few years. For specifics, permit me to call your attention to the criticisms set forth in last year's Congressional Record as follows: July 18, 1962, page A5501, daily Record; October 11, 1962, pages A7590 and A7611, daily Record; also in volume 108, part 12, pages 16050–16052; volume 108, part 13, pages 17648–17649; volume 108, part 15, pages 20592–20593; and volume 108, part 17, page 22659.

It will interest you to know that "inadvertence" has been the explanation proffered when other glaring instances of copyrighting of official material have come to light. For details about one of the most important recent instances I refer you to a New York Times article of January 5, 1962, entitled "Copyright Erred on Kennedy Book."

You state that "at least the format of the material may be copyrighted, whatever else may not be." According to the Copyright Act and the Copyright Office the format in and of itself cannot be copyrighted. What can be copyrighted is genuine creativity and originality by a private individual. If there is any genuine creativity and originality in the book in question it is in the editing done by Mr. Lindley in his official capacity as Special Assistant to Secretary Rusk, but such work is not copyrightable because, as the Copyright Office has stated, "Any work produced by a Government employee within the scope of his employment is not copyrightable."

Incidentally, I understand that it is no secret in Washington that Mr. Lindley, a former Newsweek correspondent, is one of the State Department's ablest ghostwriters. I daresay that at least some of the speeches he wrote for Secretary Rusk are included in the book Mr. Lindley edited for the State Department as part of his official duties. I do not, of course, mean to imply any criticism of official ghostwriting; it's an unavoidable necessity in modern government. Secretary Rusk wouldn't have had much time for fulfilling his duties as the head of the State Department if he had to take time off to write all of the speeches appearing in the copyrighted book ascribed to his authorship.

You suggest that although the Secretary's speeches have been published under private copyright at $4.95 a copy the official press releases in which they originally appeared are accessible to the public "through official channels of the Government"—meaning, I suppose, that every citizen is free to deprive himself of the right to obtain all of the speeches in conveniently compiled, indexed, and printed form unless he is willing to pay $4.95 to a private publisher because the State Department has found it expedient to extend preferential treatment to that publisher instead of complying with the obligation of a Government agency to furnish the public with the full benefit of official work and official material through the proper official channels.

It will interest you to know that I originally became acquainted with the existence of "Winds of Freedom" when it was called to my attention by a friend. Despite the fact that its publication by Beacon Press was supposed to be a means of making it available to the public, it was not until the other day that I was finally able to obtain a copy. My previous efforts to locate the work in several cities, including Washington, D.C., were fruitless. Moreover, although Beacon Press is the publishing house of the Unitarian denomination I have not found the book accessible, for examination or purchase, at any of the Unitarian churches I have visited.

Since, as the ads of the book state, it is "indispensable for understanding the position of the Kennedy administration on intricate world problems and for its perceptive, carefully articulated analysis of the nature of the world struggle", I take it that the State Department and its affiliated agencies have purchased many copies for official distribution. As a taxpayer I should like to know how many such copies have been paid for through public funds.

In conclusion, permit me to emphasize that although I hold Secretary Rusk in highest esteem, I feel I should speak up frankly and freely in this connection.

Sincerely yours,

Charles R. Foster,
Assistant Professor of Political Science,
DePauw University.

CIVIL RIGHTS—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 75)

The **SPEAKER** laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

"Our Constitution is colorblind," wrote Mr. Justice Harlan before the turn of the century, "and neither knows nor tolerates classes among citizens." But the practices of the country do not always conform to the principles of the Constitution. And this message is intended to examine how far we have come in achieving first-class citizenship for all citizens regardless of color, how far we have yet to go, and what further tasks remain to be carried out—by the executive and legislative branches of the Federal Government, as well as by State and local governments and private citizens and organizations.

One hundred years ago the Emancipation Proclamation was signed by a President who believed in the equal worth and opportunity of every human being. That proclamation was only a first step—a step which its author unhappily did not live to follow up, a step which some of its critics dismissed as an action which "frees the slave but ignores the Negro." Through these long 100 years, while slavery has vanished, progress for the Negro has been too often blocked and delayed. Equality before the law has not always meant equal treatment and opportunity. And the harmful, wasteful and wrongful results of racial discrimination and segregation still appear in virtually every aspect of national life, in virtually every part of the Nation.

The Negro baby born in America today, regardless of the section or State in which he is born, has about one-half as much chance of completing high school as a white baby born in the same place on the same day; one-third as much chance of completing college; one-third as much chance of becoming a professional man; twice as much chance of becoming unemployed; about one-seventh as much chance of earning $10,000 per year; a life expectancy which is 7 years less; and the prospects of earning only half as much.

No American who believes in the basic truth that "all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights," can fully excuse, explain, or defend the picture these statistics portray. Race discrimination hampers our economic growth by preventing the maximum development and utilization of our manpower. It hampers our world leadership by contradicting at home the message we preach abroad. It mars the atmosphere of a united and classless society in which this Nation rose to greatness. It increases the costs of public welfare, crime, delinquency, and disorder. Above all, it is wrong.

Therefore, let it be clear, in our own hearts and minds, that it is not merely because of the cold war, and not merely because of the economic waste of discrimination, that we are committed to achieving true equality of opportunity. The basic reason is because it is right.

The cruel disease of discrimination knows no sectional or State boundaries. The continuing attack on this problem must be equally broad. It must be both private and public—it must be conducted at National, State, and local levels—and it must include both legislative and executive action.

In the last 2 years, more progress has been made in securing the civil rights of all Americans than in any comparable period in our history. Progress has been made—through executive action, litigation, persuasion, and private initiative—in achieving and protecting equality of opportunity in education, voting, transportation, employment, housing, government, and the enjoyment of public accommodations.

But pride in our progress must not give way to relaxation of our effort. Nor does progress in the executive branch enable the legislative branch to escape its own obligations. On the contrary, it is in the light of this nationwide progress, and in the belief that Congress will wish once again to meet its responsibilities in this matter, that I stress in the following agenda of existing and prospective action important legislative as well as administrative measures.

I. THE RIGHT TO VOTE

The right to vote in a free American election is the most powerful and precious right in the world—and it must not be denied on the grounds of race or color. It is a potent key to achieving other rights of citizenship. For American history, both recent and past, clearly reveals that the power of the ballot has enabled those who achieve it to win other achievements as well, to gain a full voice in the affairs of their State and Nation, and to see their interests represented in the governmental bodies which affect their future. In a free society, those with the power to govern are necessarily responsive to those with the right to vote.

In enacting the 1957 and 1960 Civil Rights Acts, Congress provided the Department of Justice with basic tools for protecting the right to vote—and this administration has not hesitated to use those tools. Legal action is brought only after voluntary efforts fail—and, in scores of instances, local officials, at the request of the Department of Justice, have voluntarily made voting records available or abandoned discriminatory registration, discriminatory voting practices or segregated balloting. Where voluntary local compliance has not been forthcoming, the Department of Justice has approximately quadrupled the previous level of its legal effort—investigating coercion, inspecting records, initiating lawsuits, enjoining intimidation, and taking whatever followup action is necessary to forbid further interference or discrimination. As a result, thousands of Negro citizens are registering and voting for the first time—many of them in counties where no Negro had ever voted before. The Department of Justice will continue to take whatever action is required to secure the right to vote for all Americans.

Experience has shown, however, that these highly useful acts of the 85th and 86th Congresses suffer from two major defects. One is the usual long and difficult delay which occurs between the filing of a lawsuit and its ultimate conclusion. In one recent case, for example, 19 months elapsed between the filing of the suit and the judgment of the court. In another, an action brought in July 1961 has not yet come to trial. The legal maxim "justice delayed is justice denied" is dramatically applicable in these cases.

Too often those who attempt to assert their constitutional rights are intimidated. Prospective registrants are fired. Registration workers are arrested. In some instances, churches in which registration meetings are held have been burned. In one case where Negro tenant farmers chose to exercise their right to vote, it was necessary for the Justice Department to seek injunctions to halt their eviction and for the Department of Agriculture to help feed them from surplus stocks. Under these circumstances, continued delay in the granting of the franchise, particularly in counties where there is mass racial disfranchisement, permits the intent of the Congress to be openly flouted.

Federal executive action in such cases, no matter how speedy and how drastic, can never fully correct such abuses of power. It is necessary instead to free the forces of our democratic system within these areas by promptly insuring the franchise to all citizens, making it possible for their elected officials to be truly responsive to all their constituents.

The second and somewhat overlapping gap in these statutes is their failure to deal specifically with the most common forms of abuse of discretion on the part of local election officials who do not treat all applicants uniformly.

Objections were raised last year to the proposed literacy test bill, which attempted to speed up the enforcement of the right to vote by removing one important area of discretion from registration officials who used that discretion to exclude Negroes. Preventing that bill from coming to a vote did not make any less real the prevalence in many counties of the use of literacy and other voter qualification tests to discriminate against prospective Negro voters, contrary to the requirements of the 14th and 15th amendments, and adding to the delays and difficulties encountered in securing the franchise for those denied it.

An indication of the magnitude of the overall problem, as well as the need for speedy action, is a recent five-State survey disclosing over 200 counties in which fewer than 15 percent of the Negroes of voting age are registered to vote. This cannot continue. I am, therefore, recommending legislation to deal with this problem of judicial delay and administrative abuse in four ways:

First, to provide for interim relief while voting suits are proceeding through the courts in areas of demonstrated need, temporary Federal voting referees should be appointed to determine the qualifications of applicants for registration and voting during the pendency of a lawsuit in any county in which fewer than 15 percent of the eligible number of persons of any race claimed to be discriminated against are registered to vote. Existing Federal law provides for the appointment of voting referees to receive and act upon applications for voting registration upon a court finding that a pattern or practice of discrimination exists. But to prevent a successful case from becoming an empty victory, insofar as the particular election is concerned, the proposed legislation would provide that, within these prescribed limits, temporary voting referees would be appointed to serve from the inception to the conclusion of the Federal voting suit, applying, however, only State law and State regulations. As officers of the court, their decisions would be subject to court scrutiny and review.

Second, voting suits brought under the Federal civil rights statutes should be accorded expedited treatment in the Federal courts, just as in many State courts election suits are given preference on the dockets on the sensible premise that, unless the right to vote can be exercised at a specific election, it is, to the extent of that election, lost forever.

Third, the law should specifically prohibit the application of different tests, standards, practices, or procedures for different applicants seeking to register and vote in Federal elections. Under present law, the courts can ultimately deal with the various forms of racial discrimination practiced by local registrars. But the task of litigation, and the time consumed in preparation and proof, should be lightened in every possible fashion. No one can rightfully contend that any voting registrar should be permitted to deny the vote to any qualified citizen, anywhere in this country, through discriminatory administration of qualifying tests, or upon the basis of minor errors in filling out a complicated form which seeks only information. Yet the Civil Rights Commission, and the cases brought by the Department of Justice, have compiled one discouraging example after another of obstacles placed in the path of Negroes seeking to register to vote at the same time that other applicants experience no difficulty whatsoever. Qualified Negroes, including those with college degrees, have been denied registration for their inability to give a reasonable interpretation of the Constitution. They have been required to complete their applications with unreasonable precision, or to secure registered voters to vouch for their identity, or to defer to white persons who want to register ahead of them, or they are otherwise subjected to exasperating delays. Yet uniformity of treatment is required by the dictates of both the Constitution and fairplay—and this proposed statute, therefore, seeks to spell out that principle to ease the difficulties and delays of litigation. Limiting the proposal to voting qualifications in elections for Federal offices alone will clearly eliminate any constitutional conflict.

Fourth, completion of the sixth grade should, with respect to Federal elections, constitute a presumption that the applicant is literate. Literacy tests pose especially difficult problems in determining voter qualification. The essentially subjective judgment involved in each individual case, and the difficulty of challenging that judgment, have made literacy tests one of the cruelest and most abused of all voter qualification tests. The incidence of such abuse can be eliminated, or at least drastically curtailed, by the proposed legislation providing that proof of completion of the sixth grade constitutes a presumption that the applicant is literate.

Finally, the 87th Congress, after 20 years of effort, passed and referred to the States for ratification a constitutional amendment to prohibit the levying of poll taxes as a condition to voting. Already 13 States have ratified the proposed amendment and in 3 more 1 body of the legislature has acted. I urge every State legislature to take prompt action on this matter and to outlaw the poll tax—which has too long been an outmoded and arbitrary bar to voting participation by minority groups and others—as the 24th amendment to the Constitution. This measure received bipartisan sponsorship and endorsement in the Congress—and I shall continue to work with Governors and legislative leaders of both parties in securing adoption of the anti-poll-tax amendment.

II. EDUCATION

Nearly 9 years have elapsed since the Supreme Court ruled that State laws requiring or permitting segregated schools violate the Constitution. That decision represented both good law and good judgment—it was both legally and morally right. Since that time it has become increasingly clear that neither violence nor legalistic evasions will be tolerated as a means of thwarting court-ordered desegregation, that closed schools are not an answer, and that responsible communities are able to handle the desegregation process in a calm and sensible manner. This is as it should be, for, as I stated to the Nation at the time of the Mississippi violence last September:

"Our Nation is founded on the principle that observance of the law is the eternal safeguard of liberty, and defiance of the law is the surest road to tyranny. The law which we obey includes the final rulings of the courts, as well as the enactments of our legislative bodies. Even among law-abiding men, few laws are universally loved—but they are uniformly respected and not resisted.

"Americans are free to disagree with the law but not to disobey it. For in a government of laws and not of men, no man, however prominent or powerful, and no mob, however unruly or boisterous, is entitled to defy a court of law. If this country should ever reach the point where any man or group of men, by force or threat of force, could long defy the commands of our courts and our Constitution, then no law would stand free from doubt, no judge would be sure of his writ, and no citizen would be safe from his neighbors."

The shameful violence which accompanied but did not prevent the end of segregation at the University of Mississippi was an exception. State-supported universities in Georgia and South Carolina met this test in recent years with calm and maturity, as did the State-supported universities of Virginia, North Carolina, Florida, Texas, Louisiana, Tennessee, Arkansas, and Kentucky in earlier years. In addition, progress toward the desegregation of education at all levels has made other notable and peaceful strides, including the following forward moves in the last 2 years alone:

Desegregation plans have been put into effect peacefully in the public schools of Atlanta, Dallas, New Orleans, Memphis, and elsewhere, with over 60 school districts desegregated last year—frequently with the help of Federal persuasion and consultation, and in every case without incident or disorder.

Teacher training institutes financed under the National Defense Education Act are no longer held in colleges which refuse to accept students without regard to race, and this has resulted in a number of institutions opening their doors to Negro applicants voluntarily.

The same is now true of Institutes conducted by the National Science Foundation.

Beginning in September of this year, under the aid to impacted area school program, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare will initiate a program of providing onbase facilities so that children living on military installations will no longer be required to attend segregated schools at Federal expense. These children should not be victimized by segregation merely because their fathers chose to serve in the Armed Forces and were assigned to an area where schools are operated on a segregated basis.

In addition, the Department of Justice and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare have succeeded in obtaining voluntary desegregation in many other districts receiving impacted area school assistance; and, representing the Federal interest, have filed lawsuits to end segregation in a number of other districts.

The Department of Justice has also intervened to seek the opening of public schools in the case of Prince Edward County, Va., the only county in the Nation where there are no public schools, and where a bitter effort to thwart court decrees requiring desegregation has caused nearly 1,500 out of 1,800 school-age Negro children to go without any education for more than 3 years.

In these and other areas within its jurisdiction, the executive branch will continue its efforts to fulfill the constitutional objective of an equal, nonsegregated, educational opportunity for all children.

Despite these efforts, however, progress toward primary and secondary school desegregation has still been too slow, often painfully so. Those children who are being denied their constitutional rights are suffering a loss which can never be regained, and which will leave scars which can never be fully healed. I have in the past expressed my belief that the full authority of the Federal Government should be placed behind the achievement of school desegregation, in accordance with the command of the Constitution. One obvious area of Federal action is to help facilitate the transition to desegregation in those areas which are conforming or wish to conform their practices to the law.

Many of these communities lack the resources necessary to eliminate segregation in their public schools while at the same time assuring that educational standards will be maintained and improved. The problem has been compounded by the fact that the climate of mistrust in many communities has left many school officials with no qualified source to turn to for information and advice.

There is a need for technical assistance by the Office of Education to assist local communities in preparing and carrying out desegregation plans, including the supplying of information on means which have been employed to desegregate other schools successfully. There is also need for financial assistance to enable those communities which desire and need such assistance to employ specialized personnel to cope with problems occasioned by desegregation and to train school personnel to facilitate the transition to desegregation. While some facilities for providing this kind of assistance are presently available in the Office of Education, they are not adequate to the task.

I recommend, therefore, a program of Federal technical and financial assistance to aid school districts in the process of desegregation in compliance with the Constitution.

Finally, it is obvious that the unconstitutional and outmoded concept of "separate but equal" does not belong in the Federal statute books. This is particularly true with respect to higher education, where peaceful desegregation has been underway in practically every State for some time. I repeat, therefore, this administration's recommendation of last year that this phrase be eliminated from the Morrill Land Grant College Act.

III. EXTENSION AND EXPANSION OF THE COMMISSION ON CIVIL RIGHTS

The Commission on Civil Rights, established by the Civil Rights Act of 1957, has been in operation for more than 5 years and is scheduled to expire on November 30, 1963. During this time it has fulfilled its statutory mandate by investigating deprivations of the right to vote and denials of equal protection of the laws in education, employment, housing, and the administration of justice. The Commission's reports and recommendations have provided the basis for remedial action by both Congress and the executive branch.

There are, of course, many areas of denials of rights yet to be fully investigated. But the Commission is now in a position to provide even more useful service to the Nation. As more communities evidence a willingness to face frankly their problems of racial discrimination, there is an increasing need for expert guidance and assistance in devising workable programs for civil rights progress. Agencies of State and local government, industry, labor, and community organizations, when faced with problems of segregation and racial tensions, all can benefit from information about how these problems have been solved in the past. The opportunity to seek an experienced and sympathetic forum on a voluntary basis can often open channels of communication between contending parties and help bring about the conditions necessary for orderly progress. And the use of public hearings—to contribute to public knowledge of the requirements of the Constitution and national policy—can create in these communities the atmosphere of understanding which is indispensable to peaceful and permanent solution to racial problems.

The Federal Civil Rights Commission has the experience and capability to make a significant contribution toward achieving these objectives. It has advised the executive branch not only about desirable policy changes but about the administrative techniques needed to make these changes effective. If, however, the Commission is to perform these additional services effectively, changes in its authorizing statute are necessary and it should be placed on a more stable and more permanent basis. A proposal that the Commission be made a permanent body would be a pessimistic prediction that our problems will never be solved. On the other hand, to let the experience and knowledge gathered by the Commission go to waste, by allowing it to expire, or by extending its life only for another 2 years with no change in responsibility, would ignore the very real contribution this agency can make toward meeting our racial problems. I recommend, therefore, that the Congress authorize the Civil Rights Commission to serve as a national civil rights clearinghouse providing information, advice, and technical assistance to any requesting agency, private or public; that in order to fulfill these new responsibilities, the Commisison be authorized to concentrate its activities upon those problems within the scope of its statute which most need attention; and that the life of the Commission be extended for a term of at least 4 more years.

IV. EMPLOYMENT

Racial discrimination in employment is especially injurious both to its victims and to the national economy. It results in a great waste of human resources and creates serious community problems. It is, moreover, inconsistent with the democratic principle that no man should be denied employment commensurate with his abilities because of his race or creed or ancestry.

The President's Committee on Equal Employment Opportunity, reconstituted by Executive order in early 1961, has, under the leadership of the Vice President, taken significant steps to eliminate racial discrimination by those who do business with the Government. Hundreds of companies, covering 17 million jobs, have agreed to stringent nondiscriminatory provisions now standard in all Government contracts. One hundred and four industrial concerns, including most of the Nation's major employers, have in addition signed agreements calling for an affirmative attack on discrimination in employment; and 117 labor unions, representing about 85 percent of the membership of the AFL–CIO, have signed similar agreements with the Committee. Comprehensive compliance machinery has been instituted to enforce these agreements. The Committee has received over 1,300 complaints in 2 years, more than in the entire 7½ years of the Committee's prior existence, and has achieved corrective action on 72 percent of the cases handled—a heartening and unprecedented record. Significant results have been achieved in placing Negroes with contractors who previously employed whites only—and in the elevation of Negroes to a far higher proportion of professional, technical and supervisory jobs. Let me repeat my assurances that these provisions in Government contracts and the voluntary nondiscrimination agreements will be carefully monitored and strictly enforced.

In addition, the Federal Government, as an employer, has continued to pursue a policy of nondiscrimination in its employment and promotion programs. Negro high school and college graduates are now being intensively sought out and recruited. A policy of not distinguishing on grounds of race is not limited to the appointment of distinguished Negroes—although they have in fact been appointed to a record number of high policymaking, judicial, and administrative posts. There has also been a significant increase in the number of Negroes employed in the middle and upper grades of the career Federal service. In jobs paying $4,500 to $10,000 annually, for example, there was an increase of 26 percent in the number of Negroes during the year ending June 30, 1962, over three times the rate of increase for all employees in those grades during the year. Career civil servants will continue to be employed and promoted on the basis of merit, and not color, in every agency of the Federal Government, including all regional and local offices.

This Government has also adopted a new executive policy with respect to the organization of its employees. As part of this policy, only those Federal employee labor organizations that do not discriminate on grounds of race or color will be recognized.

Outside of Government employment, the National Labor Relations Board is now considering cases involving charges of racial discrimination against a number of union locals. I have directed the Department of Justice to participate in these cases and to urge the National Labor Relations Board to take appropriate action against racial discrimination in unions. It is my hope that administrative action and litigation will make unnecessary the enactment of legislation with respect to union discrimination.

V. PUBLIC ACCOMMODATIONS

No act is more contrary to the spirit of our democracy and Constitution—or more rightfully resented by a Negro citizen who seeks only equal treatment—than the barring of that citizen from restaurants, hotels, theaters, recreational areas, and other public accommodations and facilities.

Wherever possible, this administration has dealt sternly with such acts. In 1961, the Justice Department and the Interstate Commerce Commission successfully took action to bring an end to discrimination in rail and bus facilities. In 1962, the 15 airports still maintaining segregated facilities were persuaded to change their practices, 13 voluntarily and 2 others after the Department of Justice brought legal action. As a result of these steps, systematic segregation in interstate transportation has virtually ceased to exist. No doubt isolated instances of discrimination in transportation terminals, restaurants, restrooms, and other facilities will continue to crop up, but any such discrimination will be dealt with promptly.

In addition, restaurants and public facilities in buildings leased by the Federal Government have been opened up to all Federal employees in areas where previously they had been segregated. The General Services Administration no longer contracts for the lease of space in office buildings unless such facilities are available to all Federal employees without regard to race. This move has taken place without fanfare and practically without incident; and full equality of facilities will continue to be made available to all Federal employees in every State.

National parks, forests and other recreation areas, and the District of Columbia Stadium, are open to all without regard to race. Meetings sponsored by the Federal Government or addressed by Federal appointees are held in hotels and halls which do not practice discrimination or segregation. The Department of Justice has asked the Supreme Court to reverse the convictions of Negroes arrested for seeking to use public accommodations; and took action both through the courts and the use of Federal marshals to protect those who were testing the desegregation of transportation facilities.

In these and other ways, the Federal Government will continue to encourage and support action by State and local communities, and by private entrepreneurs, to assure all members of the public equal access to all public accommodations. A country with a "color blind" Constitution, and with no castes or classes among its citizens, cannot afford to do less.

VI. OTHER USES OF FEDERAL FUNDS

The basic standard of nondiscrimination, which I earlier stated has now been applied by the executive branch to every area of its activity—affects other programs not listed above:

Although President Truman ordered the armed services of this country desegregated in 1948, it was necessary in 1962 to bar segregation formally and specifically in the Army and Air Force Reserves and in the training of all civil defense workers.

A new Executive order on housing, as unanimously recommended by the Civil Rights Commission in 1959, prohibits discrimination in the sale, lease, or use of housing owned or constructed in the future by the Federal Government or guaranteed under the FHA, VA, and Farmers Home Administration program. With regard to existing property owned or financed through the Federal Government, the departments and agencies are directed to take every appropriate action to promote the termination of discriminatory practices that may exist. A President's Committee on Equal Housing Opportunity was created by the order to implement its provisions.

A Committee on Equal Opportunity in the Armed Forces has been established to investigate and make recommendations regarding the treatment of minority groups, with special emphasis on off-base problems.

The U.S. Coast Guard Academy now has Negro students for the first time in its 87 years of existence.

The Department of Justice has increased its prosecution of police brutality cases, many of them in Northern States, and is assisting State and local police departments in meeting this problem.

State employee merit systems operating programs financed with Federal funds are now prohibited from discriminating on the basis of race or color.

The Justice Department is challenging the constitutionality of the separate but equal provisions which permit hospitals constructed with Federal funds to discriminate racially in the location of patients and the acceptance of doctors.

In short, the executive branch of the Federal Government, under this administration and in all of its activities, now stands squarely behind the principle of equal opportunity, without segregation or discrimination, in the employment of Federal funds, facilities, and personnel. All officials at every level are charged with the responsibility of implementing this principle and a formal interdepartmental action group, under White House chairmanship, oversees this effort and follows through on each directive. For the first time, the full force of Federal executive authority is being exerted in the battle against race discrimination.

CONCLUSION

The various steps which have been undertaken or which are proposed in this message do not constitute a final answer to the problems of race discrimination in this country. They do constitute a list of priorities—steps which can be taken by the executive branch and measures which can be enacted by the 88th Congress. Other measures directed toward these same goals will be favorably commented on and supported, as they have in the past—and they will be signed, if enacted into law.

In addition, it is my hope that this message will lend encouragement to those State and local governments—and to private organizations, corporations, and individuals—who share my concern over the gap between our precepts and our practices. This is an effort in which every individual who asks what he can do for his country should be able and willing to take part. It is important, for example, for private citizens and local governments to support the State Department's effort to end the discriminatory treatment suffered by too many foreign diplomats, students, and visitors to this country. But it is not enough to treat those from other lands with equality and dignity—the same treatment must be afforded to every American citizen.

The program outlined in this message should not provide the occasion for sectional bitterness. No State or section of this Nation can pretend a self-righteous role, for every area has its own civil rights problems.

Nor should the basic elements of this program be imperiled by partisanship. The proposals put forth are consistent with the platforms of both parties and with the positions of their leaders. Inevitably there will be disagreement about means and strategy. But I would hope that on issues of constitutional rights and freedom, as in matters affecting our national security, there is a fundamental unity among us that will survive partisan debate over particular issues.

The centennial of the issuance of the Emancipation Proclamation is an occasion for celebration, for a sober assessment of our failures, and for rededication to the goals of freedom. Surely there could be no more meaningful observance of the centennial than the enactment of effective civil rights legislation and the continuation of effective executive action.

JOHN F. KENNEDY.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *February 28, 1693.*

CIVIL RIGHTS

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the body of the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, the level attained by a democratic civilization is revealed in important part by the state of those rights which protect the citizenry from oppressive action.

Many of our civil rights were wrung from past governments by our ancestors.

Mr. Speaker, precious indeed is the American right to vote. This is the wellspring of opportunity in our society. Yet, as long as any American is denied the right to vote because of race or color, our civilization will not attain full development.

The President's message on civil rights, received today by the Congress, sets forth several practical proposals in this important area and in other areas of civil rights.

Furthermore, Mr. Speaker, I think it should be pointed out at this time, that the many Executive actions taken in the last 2 years in the area of civil rights have been important contributions. I applaud the President for his many Executive achievements. No other administration in our times has a comparable record in this important area.

CIVIL RIGHTS OR CIVIL WRONGS

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the body of the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, I firmly believe the constitutional rights of all Americans should be guaranteed and protected. I am afraid, however, that the question of civil rights has become such a political football that what is developing is a set of civil wrongs practiced on the majority in the zeal to win the votes of minorities. We cannot guarantee civil rights to minorities by riding roughshod over the Constitution, by setting race against race, by throwing States rights out the window, and dispensing with all traditions of a system under which all people of every race, color and creed have made greater advances than in any other country in the world.

There are none who will deny the Negro has suffered abuses. There are none so base as to deplore the excesses which have occurred, but why is it so necessary for the Kennedy administration in trying to prove its every point to downgrade the United States? Nowhere in the President's message does he recognize the progress the Negro has made in America. He does not point out how far we have moved ahead in opening up new educational opportunities, new employment opportunities. He ignores the many fine neighborhoods everywhere in this Nation where people of many races who have the initiative and the willingness to sacrifice and build have created beautiful homes and enjoy the best of living conditions. This is not to say we should not constantly strive to do better, to maintain a national climate which affords greater opportunity for all our people.

We will not create this climate, we will not really help the Negro through force, through the use of Federal troops, through thought control, through court edicts. The Negro can only suffer setbacks in the progress he is steadily making if we continue to make a political football of civil rights. Unless we protect the civil rights of all Americans, not just the minorities, we cannot guarantee the civil rights of any group.

Just for a moment let us consider some aspects the President conveniently overlooks. There is a constant cry for more Federal jobs for Negroes. Yet, what are the facts? The latest available figures I have been able to secure are from the Department of Labor, Committee on Equal Employment Opportunity. This report shows Negroes in the Federal service make up 13 percent of the total working force. The Post Office Department had 15 percent, Veterans' Administration, 19 percent, and General Services Administration, 16 percent. Negroes represent about 10 percent of the population of the United States. Certainly no one can claim they are being discriminated against in Federal employment, where we find competent Negroes in jobs at every level of government.

The South has been made the whipping boy of the civil rights question and completely ignored are the great strides made in the improvement of the lot of the Negro in the South. Those liberals who scream loudest for integration and complete civil rights in the South will have no part of it in the North. Minor racial incidents in the South are banner headlines in newspapers throughout the world, but there is a strange silence over major race riots in Chicago, New York, and here in Washington, D.C., on last Thanksgiving Day. And what of the segregation practices of many of the labor unions who will deny acceptance of the Negro in their organization, but will demand that all the rest of society accept him?

Negro leaders, too, must alter their thinking if they truly believe in the cause of improving conditions for their race. In the millions of words in the newspapers, magazines and over radio and TV, calling for more civil rights for the Negro, greater opportunity for the Negro, better homes for the Negro, rare it is indeed for any prominent Negro leader to remind his fellows that with rights there is also responsibility. There must be some effort on the part of people to help themselves. People cannot move ahead by absolving themselves of all responsibility for every irresponsible action by claiming that all Negro lawlessness is caused by lack of job opportunity, lack of recreational facilities, lack of good homes. Granted that environment is a contributing cause to delinquency in many cases among all races, there are too many crimes committed by Negroes from good homes with good opportunities to make this a blanket excuse for every delinquent and criminal belonging to a minority.

We cannot call it civil rights when the President issues Executive orders, which in my opinion are unconstitutional, taking away the rights of the owners of private property by making it illegal for them to rent or sell to persons of their own choice in a free market.

Mr. Speaker, the best way we can help the Negro and all minority groups is for all of us to pull together to return this Nation to constitutional limited Government so that the people at the State and local level can settle many of the problems we now face. I am still of the firm belief that the good that is in the hearts and minds of most Americans will furnish the prescription for justice for all people if friends and neighbors can attack their problems without Federal interference and agitation by those who, for political gain or other reasons, find it advantageous to stir up unrest and racial tensions. Patience, courage, goodwill, a belief in the American dream and the ideals which inspired the founding of this great Nation will solve the problems for the minorities. Political pressure, the subverting of the Constitution in order to build a political dynasty, the appeal to racism in the mad quest for power can only slow the progress which is already being made in behalf of minorities.

While we are on the subject of civil rights, how about the civil rights of the millions of workers of this country who are being deprived of their rights by ruthless and autocratic labor leaders? How about the civil rights of the people of Cleveland and New York who have been denied their newspapers for months because of the action of a small group of labor leaders? How about the civil rights of hundreds of thousands of workers who were thrown off their jobs and other countless thousands of our citizens whose rights were ignored by the reckless action of the recent dock workers' strike? If we believe in civil rights, let us be for civil rights all the way. As a part of these remarks I would like to include editorials by David Lawrence in the U.S. News & World Report:

ANARCHY

(By David Lawrence)

Moral decay in our political system is responsible for the anarchy that prevails today in labor-management relations.

We prate about civil rights. We send Federal troops to coerce a State university to admit a student. We file suits in the courts to make sure that certain citizens are not denied voting rights. But we shut our eyes when the whole governmental system is used to blackmail an employer into accepting the exorbitant demands of labor unions.

The longshoremen's strike was settled by Government intervention, but can it be said that "free" collective bargaining characterized the settlement?

The newspaper strikes in Cleveland and New York have been frowned upon by public opinion in both cities and in the Nation wherever the facts have been revealed. But the right of a dictator in one union—backed by other unions—to hold out until some of the employers are tottering on the edge of bankruptcy has not been challenged in the courts. No "inherent" powers are invoked by the Attorney General to sustain an employer's civil right—the opportunity to survive.

Isn't there a civil right which says that no citizen can conspire with another to destroy a man's business?

Isn't there a civil right which says that nobody can conspire with someone else to prevent another citizen from crossing a picket line either to take a job or to buy goods from a company involved in a strike?

Isn't there a civil right which says that a union having a bare majority of the employees in a bargaining unit has no right to represent other citizens who refuse to join such a union?

Isn't there a civil right which says that a man cannot be forced to accept the tenets of any church or organization or political party? So why must he be fired from his job because he will not join a union?

Isn't there a civil right which says that a citizen who is physically threatened or attacked in a labor dispute may obtain redress?

Yet, writing in the January 21 issue of this magazine, J. Mack Swigert, of Cincinnati, Ohio, one of the foremost authorities on labor law in the country, says:

"Labor-violence cases, when presented in police court, are customarily continued until the strike is over and then dismissed. The reluctance of many courts to issue and to enforce injunctions against unions is well known to lawyers.

"Police assigned to strike duty often look the other way when union violence occurs. Even the FBI is reluctant to intervene in labor disputes. Many States have statutes forbidding or limiting the use of State highway police in such disputes. A tendency to lean in the direction of the union when the question is a close one is observed throughout almost the entire hierarchy of public officials.

"Favorable treatment of unions is particularly marked in the case of State and Federal administrative officials and employees who deal directly with labor problems.

"State departments of labor, workmen's compensation commissions, unemployment commissions, industrial commissions, mediation boards, and labor boards are almost uniformly staffed with union members or former union officials or persons otherwise closely associated with and sympathetic to the union movement. This is true even though these agencies are charged with the protection of all workers, including the great majority who are nonunion.

"Similarly, the U.S. Department of Labor, the National Labor Relations Board, and, to a considerable extent, the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service, as well as other agencies dealing with labor problems, are staffed largely with union members or sympathizers.

"Since the advent of the Kennedy administration, the National Labor Relations Board has openly moved in a direction very helpful to organized labor.

"The unions now have a clear majority of union sympathizers on the Board.

"During the past 2 years, under the leadership of the new Chairman of the Board, numerous precedents have been overruled and discarded, and the labor law has been substantially changed without legislation.

"Largely because of public sympathy and effective political action, unions not only benefit from favorable legislation, but also are singled out for special and favorable treatment from courts, arbitrators, law officers, and other public officials.

"As politicians make laws and enforce them, this idea that unions can influence the direction of thousands or even millions of votes leads politicians who want to keep their jobs or advance in their profession to bend in the union direction when a union issue is before them."

How can we shut our eyes to the true meaning of this indictment? On these issues, we seem to have experienced a moral deterioration as we drift into a state of anarchy in the national economy.

A BILL TO CREATE A JOINT COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET

Mr. BELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. LANGEN] may extend his remarks at this point in the body of the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Speaker, I have today submitted a bill to create a Joint Committee on the Budget. We have discussed the possibility of such a joint committee in the past, but we have not acted. The time has come, however, when we can no longer ignore the pressing need for the greater cooperation and efficiency that would result from the work of such a group.

A Joint Committee on the Budget would consider the President's messages on the state of the Union and Economic Report, would inform itself on all matters relating to the annual budget of the agencies of our Government, and would report its findings to the House and Senate Appropriations Committees with recommendations that would expedite the handling of appropriations requests.

Thus far this session we have received a request from the President for appropriations in the next fiscal year in the amount of more than $98 billion, the largest peacetime budget ever submitted. While we attempt to analyze this budget request, we must also consider the possible effects of proposed tax cuts and reforms. The Appropriations Committees of the House and the Senate must each wade through volumes of information, often duplicating activities, and resulting in needless delays.

Last year's budget message predicted a surplus of $500 million by the reasoning that revenues would exceed expenditures. It is now conceded that when June rolls around we will have a deficit of at least $8 or $9 billion. This represents an error in judgment comparable to 10 percent of the total expenditures of the Government for the year. This clearly indicates the need for further checking, evaluation, examination, and closer cooperation between the two Houses of Congress.

With the complexities and size of modern-day budgets, the American people expect and should get the most efficient evaluations and considerations possible when we appropriate their money.

A Joint Committee on the Budget would greatly improve the surveillance over the expenditures of public funds and would be a positive step toward the elimination of extravagance, waste, and needless or excessive appropriations.

We need harmony and cooperation between the respective Appropriations Committees of the two Houses of Congress. This bill would provide a climate conducive to such cooperation. It is only reasonable that we all will benefit when the two groups work together, get the same information, to enable them to more intelligently evaluate the many requests before them.

We already have a precedent for such a joint committee. The Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation has been in operation for a number of years and has demonstrated how much efficiency can be effected through cooperation.

These same efficiencies can be effected in the area of the budget, and I respectfully urge the adoption of this measure to bring such a joint committee into being.

BULGARIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

Mr. BELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts[Mr. CONTE] may extend his remarks at this point in the body of the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, March 3d, it will have been 83 years since the Bulgarian people received their independence from the imperial Russian Government and the Ottoman Empire; ending a 500-year struggle.

Bulgarian liberation followed the self-sacrificing struggle led by such patriots as George Rakovski, Vasil Levski, and Christo Botev and was preceded by a national uprising which won the sympathy of the world.

The liberation of Bulgaria was followed by the election of a freely elected national assembly which adopted the Tirnovo Constitution, one of the great liberal doctrines of all times.

Ignored by the present Communist regime, the constitution has always been the rallying point for democratic forces opposing communism in Bulgaria.

The Bulgarian people, Mr. Speaker, have remarkably demonstrated what can be done in a free country.

September 8, 1944 was a sad day for freedom loving people throughout the world. Bulgaria was invaded by Russian armies and the Bulgarian democratic government coalition of the National Agrarian Union and the democratic party was overthrown. A Communist controlled government was established and Bulgaria became another satellite to Communist Russia.

The story since that time has been the usual tragic one. We can only hope as we reflect upon the misery that ensnarls Communist Bulgaria today, that the great and unconquerable will that the Bulgarian people have demonstrated in the past will reassert itself, and freedom will again encompass the country.

CUBAN CAVES

Mr. BELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. CLEVELAND] may extend his remarks at this point in the body of the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, the presence of a Soviet bloc satellite 90 miles off our shores is sufficient cause for alarm from the standpoint of its possible use as a base for subversion. Given the attitudes of Fidel Castro and his Communist friends, it would be improvident to think otherwise. By the same token, we cannot overlook the possibility of Castro's Soviet and Chinese Communist allies using Cuba for similar purposes.

However, the presence of intermediate range missiles capable of delivering either a nuclear or chemical attack upon the United States would pose an even graver problem for this Nation—one requiring steel nerves and costly countermeasures.

FORTY-SIX MISSILES IN CUBA?

The U.S. News & World Report of February 4, 1963, has an item on page 38 entitled "Eyewitness: '46 Medium-Range Missiles Still on the Island.' " According to this item, the Soviets originally sent 88 medium-range missiles to Cuba, of which only 42 were withdrawn last fall. The complete item is as follows:

> An authoritative source who has just left Cuba reported this:
>
> My people counted 88 medium-range Soviet missiles in Cuba, of which only 42 were taken out, by Russian count. That leaves 46 missiles still on the island.
>
> There are 10,000 Russian troops and 12,000 non-Russian Communists in "international brigades."

> Why did the United States stop its pressure after the week of confrontation over missiles?
>
> On the Saturday night before the agreement with Russia, October 27, 1962, there was panic in the upper circles of the Castro government.
>
> Officials were running for cover. They were quietly asking diplomats for asylum, trying to get into embassies. They were trying to get places for themselves and families on ships leaving Havana.
>
> Now that the United States has permitted Castro to demobilize, morale has gone back up. My judgment is that the winners of the showdown in October were the Russians and Castro, and that the loser was the United States.
>
> The average Cuban now says, "I hate the Communists, but I also hate the United States." His hatred is for being let down twice, in the invasion at the Bay of Pigs, and last October.
>
> The economy and administration of Cuba are a catastrophe. Housing projects are falling apart. There are no new shoes. But the police state and the Communist military forces make an uprising from the inside impossible.

I have no knowledge as to the accuracy of the above item. However, if there are in fact 46 missiles left in Cuba, they have to be somewhere. Caves are the most likely storage area, barring the possibility of a form of camouflage not yet detectable by our current air surveillance techniques.

LEGISLATIVE REFERENCE REPORT

So far as I know, little information has been published recently about the size and number of caves in Cuba. On February 7, 1963, I asked the Legislative Reference Service to search the Library of Congress for references to Cuban caves. On February 19, 1963, I received the following reply:

> THE LIBRARY OF CONGRESS,
> LEGISLATIVE REFERENCE SERVICE,
> *Washington, D.C., February 19, 1963.*
>
> To: HON. JAMES C. CLEVELAND.
> From: Natural Resources Division.
> Subject: Number and sizes of the caves in Cuba.
>
> Response is made to your inquiry of February 7, 1963 relative to caves in Cuba.
>
> Inquiry was made of the Geological Survey concerning caves in Cuba. The Survey indicated it had no specific knowledge as to the number and sizes of the caves. However, they reported that Dr. Charles Park, Jr., Dean, Earth Sciences, University of Stanford, Stanford, Calif., might have information, since he carried out a limestone study in Cuba.
>
> A search was made of material available in the Library of Congress. This search did not reveal any recently published material indicating the number and sizes of the caves in Cuba. However, materials are available which discuss various aspects of caves found in Cuba. The source of listed articles in Spanish is the "Handbook of Latin American Studies," volumes 14–24, 1948–62. The following pertinent materials are enclosed:
>
> "A Guide to the Cave of Bellamar," E. Guiteras. A travelog of the cave is presented.
>
> "Caves in World History," National Speleological Society; Bulletin No. 5, October 1943, page 11. Caves in Cuba and locations.
>
> Eigenmann, Carl H. "Cave Vertebrates of America." Washington, D.C., 1909, pages 188–201. References to caves in Cuba.
>
> "The Idol of the Cave," M. R. Harrington. Natural history, vol. 60, No. 7. September 1951, pages 313–318, 335. Account of exploration of a cave at La Patana Cabo Maisi Cuba.
>
> "La Espeleologia en Cuba," JNAE/R. Junio 1960, pages 39–103. Summary of cave explorations. Greater portion devoted to role of caves and of speleology in the recent revolution.
>
> · "La Caverna del sol," Antonio Munez Jimenez. INRA, 2:3, Marzo 1961, pages 58–67. Pictographs from the Cueva de Garcia Robion in Havana province—location is secret—military installation.
>
> In addition you may wish to refer at some later date to the following magazine articles which is currently in the bindery and consequently not immediately available.
>
> "El archiepelago de las," Cavernas, INR, 1:5, Mayo 1960, pages 46–55. Discusses painted pictographs on the roof of the Cueva de la Isla, Punta del Este, Isla de Pinos; also Cueva de Ramos in Punta de Caguanos, north of las Villas.
>
> The following is a listing of articles reportedly relating to caves in Cuba but which are not a part of the permanent collections of the Library of Congress.
>
> Alvarez Conde, Jose:
>
> Las cavernas funerarias de Cayo. "La Agriada." Habana, 1952, 34 pages. Account of discovery of burial caves off north coast of Cuba.
>
> "Fomento: nuevo centro de hallazgos arqueologicos indigenas." Tremestre, volume 3, No. 2. Abril-Junio, pages 209–226. Cave burial in central Cuba.
>
> "Revision indo-arqueologica de la provincia de Las Villas." Habana, Junta Nacional de Arqueologia y Etnologia, 1961, 175 pages. Detailed summary of the sites and excavations in Las Villas Province, municipality. Includes hitherto unpublished work by the author.
>
> Herrera Fritot, Rene and Manuel Rivero de la Calle. "La cueva funeraria de Carbonera, Matanzas." Contribucion de la sociedad Espeleologica de Cuba al Decimo Congreso Nacional de Historia. Habana, 1954, 45 pages. Excavations of a Ciboney cave on the north coast of Cuba in 1950.
>
> "Rivera de la Calle," Manuel and Antonio Nunez Jimenez. Excursiones arqueologicas a Camaguey (Santa Clara), Cuba. Universidad Central de las Villas. Departmentos de Investigaciones Antropologicas e Investigaciones Geograficas, 1958, 62 pages. Visit to a cave in Cerro de Tubaquey and to a village site in the Lomas de Guaney both in north central Cuba.
>
> ERNEST PAPPAJOHN.

As may be seen from the foregoing, there are a number of references to Cuban caves in the Library of Congress material. In addition, I have written to Dr. Charles Park, Jr., dean of earth sciences, University of Stanford, asking him for any information he may have available on this subject.

One of the references I found very interesting in the Library of Congress compendium was a booklet entitled "Guide to the Cave of Bellamar" by Senor Eusebio Guiteras, published in 1863. This cave is located 1 mile from the Bridge of Bailen on the San Juan River near Mantanzas Bay.

Senor Guiteras describes one portion of the cave called the Galleries of the Fountains as being "2,400 feet long." It runs from "west to east, the greatest depth is 360 feet, the ground is dry, and the temperature is 80° F."

Unfortunately, the overall dimensions of the vault are not given. He goes on to say, "In principal places there are fixed lights; good paths have been opened, bridges thrown over and steps placed wherever the passage required it."

Although few measurements are given in the booklet, an unmistakable impression of hugeness is given. For example, the first hall in the cave is called the Gothic Temple. There are several others having names equally suggesting spaciousness.

Another very interesting reference to caves in Cuba appears in a book, "Cave Vertebrates of America," by Prof. Carl H. Eigenmann, professor of zoology, Indiana University. It was published in June 1909 by the Carnegie Institute of Washington, D.C. On page 189 of this work there is a diagram of the Cave of the Insurrectos, which looks rather large indeed. On page 192 Professor Eigenmann describes the Caves of Cañas in these terms:

> The caves about Cañas differ from those of the Carboneira and Alacranes. They are cistern-shaped sink-holes rather than caves in the ordinary sense of the word, but on account of the absence of soil there are no funnel-like depressions on the surface to indicate their presence. There is absolutely no general surface indication that one is in a cave country in traveling through it, and it is not until standing at the very brink of one that the presence of a cave may be suspected.

The magazine, INRA, of March 1961 has an article on "The Cave of the Sun," on page 59 with illustrations. These illustrations show possible storage for large weapons of war.

The letter I received from the Legislative Reference Service indicated that the U.S. Geological Survey has little or no information concerning caves in Cuba. The Geological Survey is a fine service and this fact in no way reflects discredit upon it.

In retrospect, it seems obvious we should have collected information concerning Cuban caves. For over 50 years prior to the Castro takeover, we had the freedom to acquire this information.

All of this suggests that our information-gathering programs in the past have sometimes lacked selectivity and impetus.

WHAT INFORMATION IS NEEDED?

Knowing what information to gather is a difficult problem. I am sure this Government has improved its information-gathering techniques since World War II. However, can anyone ever be certain as to just what will be needed in the future. I found an illustrative example of this problem in Col. Maurice Buckmaster's book "They Fought Alone." It is an example drawn from British experience at the outset of World War II. Colonel Buckmaster was charged with forming a secret British service called SOE with the mission of sabotaging French factories. The following passages show how difficult it is to foresee information needs:

> On reflection, it seemed to me that the best thing I could do was to try and remember what I could about French factories which I had visited when I was working, during 1932 to 1936, for the Ford Co. of France. My information might be out of

date, but at least it was information. I drew a pile of typing paper toward me.

Day after day, for 3 weeks, I dredged my brain for knowledge, noting down every conceivable thing I could about the potential, the staff and the layout of French industry. In spite of my hard work, however, I could not conceal from myself the haphazard and incomplete nature of my notes. There was no system, save a vague geographical ordering from north to south. If only there were an alphabetical list.

"The 'Bottin'," I said, aloud. "Of course, the 'Bottin'." It was exactly what I had been looking for—an alphabetic thesaurus of French industry and commerce, department by department, from A to Z. It only remained to get hold of a copy. I telephoned confidently to my chief.

"I'd like a copy of the 'Bottin'," I told him.

"You are our 'Bottin'," I was reminded.

"Somebody must have one."

"That may be; I haven't managed to get hold of it."

"Do I have your authority to try and get a copy?" I demanded.

"Certainly, but it won't do you any good."

I got through to my colonel in the intelligence corps.

"Bottin? Haven't got one in the place, old boy," he announced cheerfully.

"Do you mean to say that in the whole length and breadth of military intelligence there's no copy of the 'Bottin'?"

"If there is, I haven't seen it," the colonel said, putting down the receiver.

I thought of getting through to De Gaulle's people, but my earlier experiences of them, together with my instructions not to do anything to upset them, dissuaded me. I tried the booksellers: nothing. With some hesitation I rang through to General Templer's office. I explained my difficulty in procuring a copy of the "Bottin" and was given another extension in the war office where it was thought they might help me.

"Colonel Denvers here."

"Oh, this is Major Buckmaster, French section of SOE."

"Of what?"

I explained roughly the nature of SOE insofar as I knew it myself and then said: "I need a copy of the 'Bottin' very badly if I'm to get on with my work."

"Who told you that we had a copy?"

"General Templer suggested I ring you."

"We're not allowed to release any of our secret material."

"Why should the 'Bottin' be secret material? The Germans have got as many copies of it as they want. What's the point of keeping material from your own side that's freely available to the enemy?"

"Look, old man, that's not my worry."

"Well, it is my worry. Your name was given me and I really would be most grateful if you could help me."

"My instructions are not to let my copy of the 'Bottin' out of my sight."

"You have got a copy then?"

"Possibly, possibly."

"Well, sir, can I come round to your office and use it there? It would still be in your sight."

"M'm, that's a thought."

I went round to the war office and managed to present myself to Colonel Denvers.

"I can't have you working actually in the room with me, Buckmaster," he told me. "I've put you in the little office my secretary uses for keeping her coat."

"Thank you very much, sir," I replied. He showed me into the fawn partitioned office. It was quite bare except for a desk and a chair, but on the desk was a copy of the 'Bottin.' I sat down and began to go through it; to my delight I discovered, as I had hoped, a preface to each chapter which detailed the industries of the département with which it dealt. The first which really interested me was the Timken ball bearing factory, Quai Aulagnier, Asnieres, Seine. I happened to know that particular factory well.

Each day I returned to the colonel's secretary's cloakroom in order to pursue my researches, comparing them with the notes I had already made and adding new details of which the names of various manufacturers and factories reminded me. After I had been working in this manner for some weeks, undisturbed either by inquiries from my commanding officer or liaison activities from other members of the SOE organization, I chanced to meet a man I knew who had something to do with the War Office library.

"Are you working here now?" he demanded.

"I have to," I complained, and went on to tell him about the "Bottin."

"What do you mean you can't take it out of the building?"

"I gather it's the only copy in the place."

"Come along with me." I followed him to a large and dusty storeroom which was piled high with various out-of-date handbooks and French guides. Under the windowsill was a stack of "Bottins." "Help yourself," he suggested.

I helped myself.

That was the end of the only work I ever did in the War Office. I thanked Colonel Denvers for his kindness, informed him deferentially where he might replenish his slender stock of "Bottins" and repaired to Baker Street. As usual, things seemed pretty quiet there. In spite of my industrious tabulation, I was still unable fully to understand what SOE was all about or when it was going to start doing whatever it was supposed to do. Patiently, I continued my study of the "Bottin"; I had reached "P" by now.

During last fall's Cuban crisis the administration released aerial photographs of missile sites. These photographs set a praiseworthy precedent of releasing information to the American public during a crisis.

It is possible that photography of known cave entrances may exist. If available, these photographs might show any recent unusual use of such cave entrances.

If such photography exists, I suggest it would be appropriate for the administration to release it now. The precedent has been set and no one can deny the situation continues to disturb many thoughtful Americans.

Finally, if there are any private persons residing in this country who possess information on Cuban caves, I ask that they send it to the Library of Congress. Tourists, campers, cave explorers, and businessmen who spent time in Cuba may have information of this type. They should send it to:

Dr. Hugh Ellsbree, Director, Legislative Reference Service, Library of Congress, Washington 25, D.C.

A SELF-DEFEATING SUGAR POLICY

The SPEAKER. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include tables.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I shall not consume all the time allotted to me, but in an extension of remarks I will discuss at great length the unfortunate situation in which we find ourselves at the present time because of the 1962 amendments to the Sugar Act which I am sure all the Members will recall, and which resulted in the members of my committee being vilified and abused as never before in my memory during my 28 years of service here.

Mr. Speaker, during the past several weeks, as our sugar situation has steadily deteriorated, there have been numerous suggestions from every quarter of the sugar community that I, as chairman of the House Agriculture Committee, take some stand on this matter. This I have thus far refused to do because it seemed to me that those officials charged with the responsibility of administering this inept parody of a sugar law had a hard enough job on their hands without those of us who had opposed its global quotas and premium recapture theories from the very first standing on the sidelines shouting "I told you so."

Now, however, it is apparent that the Department of Agriculture has lost control of the situation—that sugar prices are out of hand, and that the existing law provides no mechanism which will permit the Department of Agriculture to regain effective control of sugar prices. In fairness to the forgotten man of the 1962 Sugar Act—the American consumer—I think it is time for some plain speaking.

In New York day before yesterday the spot price of raw sugar was 6.90 cents per pound. This is 0.15 cent per pound more than 2 weeks ago; it is 0.31 cent per pound higher than it was 2 months ago; and it is 0.50 cent per pound more than refiners had to pay for raw sugar on July 13, 1962, when the Sugar Act now in effect was signed by the President. It is the highest price that American refiners have been forced to pay for raw sugar since 1924.

Speculators, apparently, do not think that, under the circumstances, this price is too high, for Tuesday, in New York on the coffee and sugar exchange, the price of futures in domestic sugar for September delivery closed at 6.90 cents per pound.

If the price of sugar should continue at the latest announced wholesale price for the remainder of 1963—and there is no assurance that it will not go higher—American consumers will pay at least $110 million more for their sugar in 1963 than they paid in 1962.

What has happened? Why do we find ourselves in this situation? The answer is relatively simple. On July 13, 1962, when the President signed the sugar law under which we are now operating, we chose to cancel the sugar insurance policy which for 30 years had assured American consumers of ample sugar supplies at a stable and reasonable price. With the enactment of that legislation we chose, figuratively and literally, to stop paying the premium on our sugar supply-price insurance and to take our chances on the world market.

When that legislation became law, the world market price of sugar was approximately 2.86 cents per pound and the proponents of the "no premium," "global quota" policy that is written into our new law apparently assumed it was going to stay forever at that low level.

On Tuesday, however, the price of world sugar was 6.2 cents per pound, f.o.b. Caribbean ports. This is 0.3 cent per pound above the New York price, when freight and import duty amounting to about 1 cent per pound are added. This means that when present shipping commitments are fulfilled, the only way for the United States to obtain additional supplies of sugar is for our price to follow the world price upward. I have no idea how far it may go.

TO PROTECT THE WELFARE OF CONSUMERS OF SUGAR

The title of the Sugar Act describes its basic purposes:

> To regulate commerce among the several States, with the territories and possessions of the United States, and with foreign countries; to protect the welfare of consumers of sugar and of those engaged in the domestic sugar producing industry; to promote the export trade of the United States; and for other purposes.

It has become painfully apparent that the Sugar Act, as it was revised last summer, and as the Committee on Agriculture warned might be the case, is no longer capable of carrying out one of its most basic objectives—"to protect the welfare of consumers of sugar." The upward surge in sugar prices is not yet fully reflected in the 5-pound bag the housewife buys at the local market. But the commercial and industrial users of sugar, who use about two-thirds of all we consume and who must fit the price of sugar into the price of their own end products, are understandably alarmed.

Their alarm is even greater, Mr. Speaker, when they realize that we have canceled our sugar price insurance, that the Department of Agriculture has lost control over U.S. sugar prices, that the present law gives it no tools with which to reestablish that control, and that from now on, as long as this sugar policy remains on the books, U.S. consumers will be at the mercy of world prices whenever those world prices go above the U.S. price level.

This is exactly the situation which the Committee on Agriculture warned against last summer when it refused to accept the administration's global quota proposal and reported to the House a bill continuing the sugar price and supply insurance which had operated so well for some 30 years.

OUR SUGAR INSURANCE POLICY

Let me be specific about what I am referring to when I discuss the insurance features of our sugar program. It is not a matter of conjecture or theory, but is written into the act itself. Section 202(d) of the Sugar Act reads:

> (d) Whenever in any year any foreign country with a quota or proration thereof of more than ten thousand short tons, raw value, fails to fill such quota or proration by more than 10 per centum and at any time during such year the world price of sugar exceeds the domestic price, the quota or proration thereof for such country for subsequent years shall be reduced by an amount equal to the amount by which such country failed to fill its quota or proration thereof, unless the Secretary finds that such failure was due to crop disaster or force majeure or finds that such reduction would be contrary to the objectives of this Act. Any reduction hereunder shall be prorated in the same manner as deficits are prorated under section 204.

In plain language, this says to sugar suppliers who are enjoying the benefits of the U.S. market that they must continue to make their regular quota shipments, at our price, during periods when the world market price is higher than the U.S. price, or they will forthwith lose that part of their quota which they do not fill. This is the insurance contract for which we have been paying the premium and which we have canceled by the premium recapture provision of the 1962 amendment.

As early as June 6, 1960, in reporting out a temporary extension of the Sugar Act, the Committee on Agriculture pointed to this basic insurance feature of our Sugar Act and warned against the "penny wise but pound foolish" policy of trying to get our foreign sugar supplies at a somewhat cheaper price on an unregulated and undependable world market.

Because of the then uncertain situation in Cuba, the 1960 bill merely extended the existing provisions of the Sugar Act for 1 year without change. The committee felt, however, that the Cuban situation might require a complete reappraisal of our sugar program and, in order that Members of Congress and the public generally might have the information on which to reach a sound judgment, it devoted 39 pages of the committee report on the bill to a detailed history and analysis of the Sugar Act and related matters.

The report pointed out and documented the supply and price insurance features for which we had been paying the premium under our Sugar Act. With respect to price it said:

> An outstanding feature of the U.S. sugar program is the price stability it has brought to our domestic sugar market. Although there are fluctuations, they are within a rather narrow range—reducing uncertainties and inventory problems for consumers. Industrial users of sugar are not compelled to carry excessive sugar stocks as a hedge against a sudden large price rise, nor do they fear that the value of the working stocks they have on hand will suddenly shrink. Similarly, the American housewife can reach for sugar on her grocer's shelf with confidence not only that it will be there but also that the cost will continue to be a negligible item in the family food budget. Both the industrial user and the housewife know that the price of sugar in the United States is not only stable, but it is also reasonable by any fair standard of measurement.
>
> This has not always been the case, as is demonstrated by table 5, which shows the retail price of refined sugar from 1913 until shortly after the effective date of the 1937 Sugar Act. In June 1920, sugar reached a price of 26.7 cents per pound, and the whole period 1913–20 was marked by steady increases in sugar prices, combined with violent fluctuations. Fluctuations continued during the 1920's with a generally descending trend in prices but with prices for the first 7 years substantially above a reasonable level, as compared to the general price structure and the price of other foods. It will be noted also that even in the depression years of the early 1930's, sugar prices did not respond downward along with all other prices and the price of sugar was relatively high compared both to the general price level and consumer income.

Since the enactment of the 1937 Sugar Act, the report pointed out, the price of sugar in the United States remained remarkably stable. Although it increased gradually from 1949 to 1959, the rate of increase was far less than that of other foods and of prices in general, and had been remarkably free from periodic fluctuation. Related to the price of all foods, the report pointed out, sugar was 4.82 cents per pound in 1939 and only 4.17 cents per pound in 1959. Related to disposable personal income in the United States, sugar was 4.57 cents per pound in 1938 and was only 2.48 cents per pound in 1959—the lowest relative price of any country in the world. It quoted a study by the United Nations showing that the retail price of sugar in the United States was nearly 5 cents per pound below the median price in 121 nations around the globe.

STABILITY OF SUPPLIES

With respect to the effect of our insurance policy on supply, the report pointed out that our insurance premium had guaranteed an adequate supply of sugar, at our own price, during three specific periods when the world price of sugar was above the U.S. price.

The first of these three periods was the 6 years during and immediately following World War II, during all of which time we obtained our foreign supplies at less than the world price, and in the full amount required. During 14 months of the Korean war the world price was above our price but our offshore sugar supplies continued to come into the United States without interruption, at our domestic price, although the world price at one time was 1.85 cents per pound above the U.S. price. Again, during 6 months of the Suez crisis we received an uninterrupted flow of sugar at our price, although the world price was higher and in April 1957, was 1.34 cents per pound above the U.S. price.

In view of this stability of price and supply which we had obtained under the program of statutory foreign quotas embodied in the Sugar Act and involving, at times, the payment of a quota premium, the committee contrasted and warned against the risk of depending for our foreign sugar supplies on an uncertain and volatile world market. With respect to the world market, the committee report of June 6, 1960, said:

> The very use of the terms "world price" and "world market" are a misleading use of words. Only about 12 percent of the world's sugar production is traded on the misnamed "world market." This is essentially unwanted sugar and the trading in this small part of the world's sugar supply cannot and does not establish a true world price or reflect the actual value of sugar. However, because of the very character of this so-called world market, it is an extremely volatile market reacting violently to international tensions or to changes in supply and de-

> mand. The assumption, therefore, that the United States could buy its sugar cheaper on the world market than it is obtaining it under the Sugar Act is not necessarily valid. Not only would American consumers be the victims of the wild price fluctuations and supply uncertainties of the world sugar market, but that market might very well be higher than the existing American price under our quota system.

With respect to the quota premium—the price we pay for our sugar insurance—the report said:

> The difference between the so-called world price and the U.S. price has on occasions been called the quota premium, or more popularly, the subsidy in our sugar program. This approach is carried even further to say that the amount of protection or subsidy involved in the American sugar program is the amount of the difference in the two prices, multiplied by the amount of sugar purchased. This is an exaggerated statement of the protection afforded by the Sugar Act and is such an oversimplification of a basically complicated economic situation as to be misleading. It is obvious that the amount of quota premium or subsidy, if one exists, is not the difference between the U.S. price and the so-called world price with the Sugar Act in effect, it is the difference between the price received by supplying areas for their sugar now and the price they would receive if we had no sugar program.

In May 1962 the committee issued and gave wide distribution to a document called "History and Operations of the U.S. Sugar Program," in which it updated and slightly revised, for the information of the Congress and the general public, the material which had appeared in the 1960 committee report.

Again, the committee warned against abandoning the price and supply assurance provided by the statutory quotas of the Sugar Act for the dangers and uncertainties which it felt were inseparable from a program based upon a global quota at world market prices.

HOW STATUTORY QUOTA SYSTEM WORKED

Why did our statutory quota system work and how did it provide us with price and supply insurance? The answer is very simple. The United States offers the largest and most stable sugar market in the world. Ordinarily the price of sugar in the United States, established and controlled under the provisions of our Sugar Act, is somewhat above the so-called world price. Year in and year out, whether our price is above or below the world market, it offers sugar producers a certain market for a specific quantity of sugar at a stable and assured price.

Sugar is a long-term crop. It takes from 18 months to 3 years between the planting of the cane and the harvesting of the sugar. It is an expensive crop to produce. Clearly it is to the economic advantage of a sugar producer to know at the time he plants his cane where he will be able to sell his sugar and approximately how much he will receive for it, rather than to take his chances on an uncertain and unknown world market. In order to maintain his right to ship into this stable U.S. market, he will continue his regular quota shipments to us at our price even at times when the world market price may be substantially higher than the price he will receive in New York. It is simply sound long-range economics for him to do so and it is also sound long-range economics for the U.S. consumers of sugar to have this kind of price and supply insurance.

The first indication that the executive branch of the Government might be succumbing to the momentarily attractive but basically unsound idea of obtaining our foreign sugar supplies on an open world market came in an article in the New York Times in August 1961 quoting an unnamed person at the State Department to the effect that when the Sugar Act was extended, serious consideration should be given to abandoning the system of foreign country quotas and obtaining our sugar from foreign sources on the basis of a "global quota" and without payment of the so-called quota premium.

Casual inquiry at the State Department failed to turn up the author of any such statement and brought, instead, denial on the part of several officials that such a proposal was under consideration.

Notwithstanding these denials, members of the Committee on Agriculture, well aware of the value to U.S. consumers of the insurance we had been purchasing with our quota premium, were disturbed by the newspaper story. So that there could be no misunderstanding of the committee's position on this matter, the committee unanimously adopted on September 7, 1961, the following resolution, which was transmitted to the Secretaries of Agriculture and State:

> Whereas it has come to the attention of this committee that certain officials in the executive branch of the Government are reported to favor the adoption of a "global quota" system for the importation of sugar into the United States; and
>
> Whereas the existing system under which specific import quotas are established by law has for many years operated effectively to protect domestic sugar production, assure consumers of ample sugar supplies at fair and stable prices, and to promote the export trade of the United States: Therefore be it
>
> *Resolved*, That this committee would regard with extreme disfavor any action or statement by any representative of the United States at the conference in Geneva, Switzerland, on the International Sugar Agreement which would commit the United States or imply, either directly or indirectly, any commitment on the part of the United States to adopt any system of sugar importation other than fixed statutory quotas as have heretofore operated so effectively under the Sugar Act of 1948 and previous laws.

Having delivered itself of this pronouncement with respect to global quotas and having, so it assumed, made it quite clear to the executive branch that if there were any inclinations in this direction they had better be abandoned, the committee sat back with some complacency to wait the recommendations of the executive branch, in connection with the upcoming revision and extension of the Sugar Act, as to how the foreign country quotas should be allocated.

GLOBAL QUOTAS EMERGE

Apparently, however, the advocates of the global quota theory did not read the committee's resolution for they continued their activities and succeeded in having written into the President's budget message of January 18, 1962, the following statement:

> The Sugar Act expires on June 30, 1962. Legislation will be proposed extending it with substantial revisions to bring this program into line with the greatly changed world sugar situation. Under this legislation the difference between the domestic and world price of sugar, which is currently received by foreign suppliers of sugar, will be retained by the United States to the extent permitted by existing international agreements, with an estimated increase in 1963 budget receipts of $180 million.

Although the President did not mention global quotas but only recapture of the quota premium, the two are inseparable. A country quota is of no value, either to the supplying country or to the United States, if there is no incentive to fulfill that quota by steady shipments of sugar into our market in foul weather as well as in fair. Recapture of the so-called quota premium would have removed this incentive. It would cancel the insurance.

On February 15, 1962, the Director of the Department of Agriculture's Sugar Division, in a major speech before the Sugar Club of New York, disclosed the details of the proposed global quota and premium recapture scheme. The members of the Committee on Agriculture and the whole sugar community of the United States were shocked, not so much by the proposal itself, as by the flimsy arguments which were advanced in its support.

This plan, it was said, would provide greater flexibility of supply and greater assurance of price, when the speaker well knew that the world sugar market is one of the most undependable markets in the world.

With Cuba out of the supply picture, it was said, there was no other country to which we could turn with assurance for our 3 million tons of foreign sugar—in spite of the fact that in the crop year 1961–62 Western Hemisphere countries outside of Cuba and the United States produced 11,749,000 tons of sugar and one country alone, Brazil, more than 4 million tons.

Premium recapture and global quotas, it was stated, would give us greater assurance of supplies, although the sugar would have to be procured from the very same countries which might expect country quotas, and at a price offering no incentive to ship to the United States instead of to some other country.

It implied that American consumers would be saved the quota premiums which were really "foreign relief expenditures by American consumers" although there was nothing in the proposal which would reduce the price of sugar to American consumers by even $1 of the premium recapture and there was the great danger—as we have now discovered—that the scheme might prove extremely costly to consumers.

Before the 1st session of the 87th Congress adjourned in the fall of 1961, I had announced that, in order to give the Congress ample time to consider new sugar legislation before the expiration of the existing law on June 30, 1962, the Committee on Agriculture would begin hearings on sugar legislation as soon as possible after the convening of the 2d session of the 87th Congress in January 1962. In furtherance of this objective, I asked both the Department of Agriculture and the domestic sugar industry to have their recommendations ready for the committee before the convening of the 2d session of the 87th Congress.

The Department agreed to have its recommendations in our hands by December 1, 1961, then postponed the date to the end of December, then told us they would have their recommendations to us by the time Congress convened, but when that time arrived indefinitely postponed the submission of their recommendations on sugar.

The speech of the Director of the Sugar Branch in New York on February 15, 1962, at least served to explain the long delay by the Department in submitting its recommendations. It was apparent from that speech that a struggle had been going on within the administration between the proponents of the premium recapture, global quota theory and those who wanted to retain the basic insurance features of our then existing sugar law, and that the global quota advocates had won out.

PRESSURE FOR GLOBAL QUOTAS

Thereafter, while the committee waited impatiently for recommendations from the Department of Agriculture, there followed a long series of meetings between representatives of the Department of Agriculture and of the Department of State, and representatives of the domestic sugar industry—both producers and consumers. The basic purpose of these meetings was to try to persuade the domestic sugar industry to back the global quota, premium recapture theory to which the administration had by that time apparently committed itself. In spite of all the inducements which could be held out by the Government spokesmen, the industry representatives refused to lend their support to a proposal which they considered to be essentially unsound.

Finally, about May 1, when there was still no recommendation forthcoming from the Department of Agriculture with respect to sugar, I announced that hearings on sugar legislation would start on May 15, whether the recommendations of the Department had been received or not.

Faced with this deadline, the Department finally submitted its recommendations on May 14. The Department's recommendations were that the existing foreign country quotas, with the exception of the Philippines and Cuba, should be continued at the low level provided in the old law but that even these quotas should be eliminated over a period of 5 years by applying an import fee at the cumulative rate of 20 percent per year on the difference between the world market and the U.S. price for raw sugar. Thus, at the end of 5 years all of these quotas, including that for Cuba, would be rendered completely ineffective because sugar would be purchased under them only at world market prices, giving the United States no preference in the exports of such country. The Philippine premium was not to be reduced because this is protected by treaty.

The Cuban quota would have been continued at its existing level of somewhat more than 3 million tons except for a reduction of about 600,000 tons which was allocated to domestic producers. As long as Cuba remained in Communist hands, the Cuban quota would have been withdrawn and put on a global quota basis with recapture of the entire difference between the world market price and the U.S. price.

This meant, in effect, that as long as diplomatic relations with Cuba remained as they were, the approximately 2.6 million tons of sugar allocated to Cuba would be bought on the world market at world market prices. This would be accomplished by issuing import permits within the limitation of the global quota but collecting on each pound of sugar an import fee established by the Department of Agriculture as the difference between the world market price and the domestic price for raw sugar.

Under this proposal there would be no more inducement for a foreign sugar producer to sell his sugar to the United States than to any other country in the world. It was a proposal which might operate successfully during periods of sugar surplus, when the world market price was seriously depressed, but which placed our sugar supplies at the mercy of world markets and speculators in periods when, for any reason, the world price of sugar was above the U.S. price.

It abandoned completely the principles of price and supply insurance which the Sugar Act had established and which had operated so beneficially for almost 30 years.

EXPERTS OPPOSE GLOBAL QUOTA

In the subsequent hearings on the proposed legislation, every sugar expert who appeared before the committee warned of the dangers inherent in this proposed policy. At the conclusion of the hearings, the first action taken by the committee in executive session was to vote unanimously to reject the global quota, premium recapture proposal and to continue the price and supply insurance embodied in statutory country quotas regulating our foreign sugar supplies.

Accordingly, this committee reported a bill reducing the Cuban quota to 1.5 million tons and assigning larger quotas to the domestic beet and cane areas, to the Philippines, and to other sugar producing countries, chiefly in the Western Hemisphere, which assured the committee that they were able and willing to provide sugar under our quota system regardless of the level of world prices. The Cuban quota was withheld from that country as long as we are not in diplomatic relations and was assigned on a year-by-year basis to other Western Hemisphere countries able to provide the sugar.

In protection of American sugar consumers, and in order to maintain price stability regardless of the level of world prices, sugar shipped to the United States under both the permanent and temporary quotas would be paid for at the U.S. price, regardless of the level of world prices.

The House approved the bill as reported by the committee. The Senate, on the other hand, swallowed the global quota proposal hook, line, and sinker, and adopted a bill exactly as recommended by the administration. In conference, the House was forced to accept a compromise with which it thoroughly disagreed, which it felt to be dangerous and unworkable, in order to have any sugar act at all. Due to the administration's delay in submitting its recommendations, the old law was within 2 days of expiring at the time the conference was held and it was unthinkable that we should be without any sugar act, for the domestic sugar industry cannot exist without it.

THE COMPROMISE BILL

The compromise bill adopted most of the permanent foreign country quotas established in the House bill but provided that the so-called quota premium should be recaptured at the cumulative rate of 10 percent per year, rendering these quotas valueless at the end of 10 years, and provided further that the quota withheld from Cuba, established in the conference bill at 1,635,000 tons, should be obtained from any supplier with full recapture of the so-called quota premium, in other words on the world market and at the world market price.

As Members of the House will recall, even before this hybrid bill became law, the administration realized part of the unwisdom of its position and got the Senate to add on to a House bill relating to honeybees a provision restoring 150,000 tons of the country quotas which had been provided in the House bill and deleted in the conference.

The evil of the premium recapture and the global quota remained, however, and we are now beginning to reap the harvest of this ill-advised action.

No sooner had the 1962 Sugar Act been signed by the President on July 13—marking the entry of the United States into the world sugar market for approximately 600,000 tons—than world sugar prices started an upward spiral which has continued virtually without interruption since that time.

The following table shows for the period beginning January 1, 1962, the weekly average spot price of raw sugar on the domestic market and the world market, the weekly average wholesale price of refined sugar in the northeast area of the United States, and the monthly average retail price of refined sugar. In order to compare the world price of raw sugar with the domestic price, it is necessary to add to the world price approximately 1 cent per pound for transportation, insurance, handling, and tariff duty, and then to add to this figure the amount of the import fee established by the Department of Agriculture. This fee was originally set at 2.4 cents per pound.

1962 average weekly and monthly spot prices for domestic and world raw sugar, and wholesale refined sugar in Northeast; average monthly U.S. retail prices for refined sugar

[Cents per pound]

Week ending—	Raw sugar		Refined sugar	
	Domestic spot price	World spot price	Wholesale Northeast	Retail United States
1962				
Jan. 6	6.45	2.43	9.30	
13	6.45	2.43	9.30	
20	6.46	2.30	9.30	
27	6.46	2.16	9.50	
Month of January	6.45	2.30	9.37	11.62
Feb. 3	6.40	2.14	9.50	
10	6.40	2.32	9.50	
17	6.36	2.34	9.50	
24	6.35	2.38	9.50	
Month of February	6.37	2.36	9.50	11.70
Mar. 3	6.37	2.53	9.50	
10	6.40	2.64	9.50	
17	6.42	2.62	9.50	
24	6.45	2.65	9.50	
31	6.45	2.74	9.50	
Month of March	6.43	2.65	9.50	11.68
Apr. 7	6.45	2.78	9.60	
14	6.47	2.70	9.60	
21	6.44	2.69	9.60	
28	6.39	2.60	9.60	
Month of April	6.43	2.69	9.60	11.64
May 5	6.38	2.51	9.60	
12	6.42	2.58	9.60	
19	6.42	2.68	9.60	
26	6.46	2.64	9.60	
Month of May	6.43	2.60	9.60	11.64
June 2	6.49	2.60	9.60	
9	6.50	2.54	9.60	
16	6.47	2.64	9.60	
23	6.43	2.66	9.60	
30	6.38	2.70	9.60	
Month of June	6.45	2.63	9.60	11.68
July 7	6.37	2.84	9.60	
14	6.40	2.86	9.60	
21	6.40	2.96	9.60	
28	6.36	2.97	9.60	
Month of July	6.39	2.92	9.60	11.72
1962—Continued				
Aug. 4	6.44	3.03	9.60	
11	6.48	3.11	9.60	
18	6.56	3.27	9.60	
25	6.60	3.35	9.60	
Month of August	6.54	3.24	9.62	11.72
Sept. 1	6.59	3.35	9.70	
8	6.40	3.35	9.70	
15	6.35	3.17	9.70	
22	6.45	3.08	9.70	
29	6.50	3.17	9.70	
Month of September	6.43	3.18	9.70	11.76
Oct. 6	6.52	3.19	9.70	
13	6.54	3.19	9.70	
20	6.53	3.20	9.70	
27	6.53	3.42	9.70	
Month of October	6.52	3.28	9.70	11.76
Nov. 3	6.41	3.49	9.70	
10	6.40	3.50	9.70	
17	6.44	3.55	9.70	
24	6.45	3.72	9.70	
Month of November	6.44	3.65	9.70	11.78
Dec. 1	6.50	3.82	9.70	
8	6.50	4.05	9.70	
15	6.53	4.22	9.70	
22	6.55	4.34	9.70	
29	6.60	4.72	9.83	
Month of December	6.54	4.29	9.72	11.76
1963				
Jan. 4	6.62	4.85	9.90	
11	6.69	5.20	9.90	
18	6.72	5.43	10.02	
25	6.72	5.66	10.05	
Feb. 1	6.72	5.80	10.05	
8	6.72	5.99	10.05	
15	6.77	6.05	10.05	
22	6.82	6.05	10.05	

Source: New York Coffee and Sugar Exchange spot prices for raw sugar, No. 7 contract domestic and No. 8 contract for world price. Trade sources for wholesale refined prices and U.S. Department of Labor for retail price.

As will be noted from the table, at the time the bill became law and the Department of Agriculture announced its global quota and established an import fee of 2.4 cents per pound, the world spot price was 2.86 cents per pound and the domestic price was 6.40 cents per pound. Adding to the world price the 1 cent charge for transportation and duty and the 2.4 cents charge for the import fee, brought the world price up to 6.26 cents per pound, New York basis. This gave foreign suppliers an incentive of 0.14 cent per pound to sell on our market and made, for the moment, a workable program.

OPERATIONS UNDER THE NEW LAW

Under the procedure used by the Department of Agriculture, having announced the quantity to be permitted entry under the global quota, it accepted advance commitments from foreign suppliers for delivery prior to a specified date and required that these commitments be accompanied by a binder of 0.5 cent per pound—this amount to be forfeited if the sugar was not imported into the United States within the specified time limit.

Under the import fee of 2.4 cents per pound, the Department succeeded in obtaining commitments for the full quantity of approximately 600,000 tons of sugar in the global quota for the balance of the calendar year 1962.

It is to be remembered, however, this commitment to ship to the United States does not include any commitment as to the price at which the sugar will be sold in the United States. As will be noted from the table, the world price continued to advance, particularly late in the year as predictions of a short Cuban sugar crop and of unfavorable growing conditions affecting beet sugar production in Europe and both beet and cane sugar in the United States, indicated an even shorter world supply situation in 1963 than had been assumed at the time of our hearing. The sharp increase in the world price—from 2.86 in the week ending July 14 to 4.72 in the week ending December 29—was, therefore, reflected by a smaller but substantial increase in the U.S. price—from 6.40 in the week ending July 14 to 6.60 in the week ending January 29.

By the time in late November when the Department of Agriculture had to announce its intentions with respect to total consumption figures and quotas for 1963, it was apparent that the import fee of 2.4 cents per pound which had been set for 1962 represented far more than the difference between world prices and desirable U.S. prices, and would not result in any sugar being shipped to the United States under the global quota. In the late November announcement, therefore, the Department of Agriculture set the proposed import fee for 1963 at 1.8 cents per pound.

In the 2 weeks that intervened between the time of this preliminary announcement and the issuance of the official quota proclamation with respect to 1963 on December 7, 1962, it became apparent that the 1.8 cents import fee was also too high and would not bring in the global quota sugar we required. Therefore, in the official announcement of December 7, 1962, the import fee on global quota sugar for 1963 was established at 1.4 cents per pound. At the same time, the Department announced a global quota of 750,000 tons for the first 5 months of 1963.

In spite of the Department's optimistic estimates, by mid-January 1963 it had succeeded in obtaining commitments for only 115,000 tons of the 750,000 tons of global quota sugar we will require during the first 5 months of 1963, and U.S. consumers were faced with an actual sugar shortage if the situation remained unchanged.

Accordingly, on January 23 the Department eliminated altogether the premium recapture it had so strongly advocated and reduced the import fee to zero. World sugar could now be shipped into the United States without the payment of any import fee.

NO ASSURANCE OF PRICE

The significant things about this action, Mr. Speaker, are: First, that instead of the optimistic predictions of the great amounts of money which would be collected by sugar import fees and might be used in foreign aid programs, the Department had collected from mid-July to mid-January a total of only $39.5 million and they had done this at a cost to American consumers of more than $17 million in the last 5 months of 1962; second, and of even greater significance is that in reducing the import fee to zero, the United States had played its last free card in the game to stabilize U.S. sugar prices.

From this point on, there is little, if anything, that the Department of Agriculture can do under the existing law to maintain a stable level of sugar prices in the United States. From this point on, our prices are tied irrevocably to the world market price; and in order to obtain sugar supplies we will have to pay whatever fantastic price may be commanded on the world market.

On January 31 the Department of Agriculture added 350,000 tons to the global quota for delivery prior to September 30—at the full domestic price and without the imposition of any import fee. It has obtained commitments for all of this 1.1 million tons of global quota sugar, and this fact is being pointed to with great glee by some advocates of the global quota, premium recapture theory as proof that this system is working.

What they neglect to point out, Mr. Speaker, is first, these commitments were obtained only after the premium recapture idea was abandoned and we agreed to pay foreign suppliers the full U.S. premium price; second, the commitments to deliver sugar contain no assurance whatever as to price.

Similar commitments were obtained in July 1962 with respect to global quota deliveries during the balance of that year, but this did not prevent the New York price from going up from 6.35 in the week ending September 15 to 6.60 in the week ending December 29. Likewise, the commitments now made with respect to 1963 will not prevent foreign suppliers from selling this sugar in New York for the highest possible price they can get for it.

Third, these commitments do not even assure us that the sugar will be shipped to the United States. The suppliers have put up a binder of 0.5 cent per pound to assure delivery, but this is the only assurance we have. If, by any chance, we should succeed in keeping the U.S. price of sugar more than 0.5 cent per pound below the world market price, it would clearly be to the advantage of the foreign sugar suppliers to sell their sugar elsewhere and forfeit the binder they have put up with the United States.

WHO GETS THE BENEFITS?

During the hearings and the debate on this sugar bill last summer, the fallacious argument was made that the payment of our insurance premium on foreign sugar was a form of foreign aid, that there was no assurance this premium payment was reaching the workers in the canefields and the small sugar planters but that, in fact, it might be benefiting only the large mills and exporters. It should have been clear to anyone that there was far more chance of benefit to small cane producers and the workers in the fields from a steady, guaranteed price and market such as is afforded under the statutory country quota system than from a world market at the depressed price level where these same persons assumed we would be able to buy sugar permanently, and where the price has to stay in order for the premium recapture scheme to work.

It would be interesting to hear now from those whose hearts bled so copiously for the canefield worker, who they think is getting the profits from this uncontrolled increase in sugar prices. They can be assured that none of this price increase is going to the worker in the canefield, probably very little of it to the small cane grower, and in many instances not even to the foreign millowner and producer of raw sugar. Instead, much of the tremendous profit being reaped from these high sugar prices is going to traders and speculators and downright gamblers.

Activity on the New York sugar futures market has increased tenfold since the 1962 Sugar Act became law. Prior to that, under our stabilized country quota system, there was very little need for hedging by legitimate sugar interests and almost no profit to be had in speculation. Since the enactment of that law trading in sugar futures has mushroomed and much of it is downright gambling speculation.

Just as an example of what has occurred, I asked a Government expert in futures market operations to calculate the paper profits which would have been made by a speculator who bought one sugar future contract on the New York market at the time the 1962 Sugar Act was passed and then pyramided this speculative holding each time the price went up sufficiently for him to buy a new contract. The answer is interesting. If a speculator had invested $400 in a world sugar contract for future delivery during the week ending July 14, 1962, and then had pyramided his holdings as I have indicated, he would now have a profit of $185,000 on an investment of $400.

NO INSURANCE FOR THE FUTURE

Unlike some of those whose voices have been heard most stridently on this subject, Mr. Speaker, I do not claim to be a sugar expert. I am not predicting that before this year is out we may be forced to pay as much as 8 or 9 cents a pound for raw sugar, with a corresponding increase in the price of the refined product. I am not predicting that when 1964 rolls around and new sugar quotas come into effect the quota areas, both foreign and domestic—in the light of this year's experience—may withhold or slow down deliveries under quota in order to help push the price upward—for it must be remembered that quota holders as well as speculators on the world market benefit from higher prices. I am not predicting that in 1964 the Soviet bloc will acquire enough of the so-called world market of sugar to drive the price up and then feed its cheaply acquired holdings back into the market at high prices for hard currency, although there is some suspicion in sugar circles that this is going on now.

I do not predict that these things will happen, Mr. Speaker. I merely point out—and I hope the House will consider this most seriously—that in abandoning our statutory quota policy we have canceled our sugar insurance and under the global quota, premium recapture theory of the new law, these things can happen and there is little or nothing we can do to prevent it.

Mr. Speaker, I have said many times on the floor of this House that sugar is one of the most complex and highly involved subjects with which Congress had to deal. It is, therefore, a subject on which it is easy for pseudoexperts, wild-haired theorists, and voluble commentators to make their voices heard, and to sound convincing. I apologize to the House for taking this much of its time to discuss this subject but I consider this matter to be of such great importance to every sugar consumer in the United States that the House has a right to a full explanation of the situation and to know where I, and I believe the whole Committee on Agriculture, stand on this matter. In my own defense for taking this much of your time may I point out that I have discussed only one aspect of this complicated subject of sugar—the responsibility to protect U.S. consumers both as to supplies and prices. May I point out some of the things I have not discussed.

I have not, for example, discussed the importance of a workable and effective sugar act to our domestic sugar producing industry, to the beet sugar producers of continental United States, to the cane producers of Louisiana and Florida, and to the sugar producers and, in fact, the whole economic well-being of Hawaii, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands and to the domestic beet processors and cane refiners.

I have not discussed the importance of a fair and equitable sugar program to our export trade although the promotion of that export trade is one of the basic objectives of the sugar act. In the fiscal year 1961, exports from the United States to countries holding statutory quotas under the 1962 Sugar Act, not counting India and the Netherlands, were valued at over $3.3 billion, of which $420 million were agricultural exports. The dollars we spend for sugar come directly back to us for exports from the United States. I am not discussing at this time the effect it might have on those exports if those who advocated the premium recapture theory were able to force those sugar exporting countries to sell their sugar to us at a loss on a depressed world market, instead of at the fair and equitable level of the U.S. market.

I am not discussing the possibilities, on the erratic world market we are helping to create, for the Soviet bloc to obtain Cuban sugar under cheap barter contracts and build up its hard currency holdings by selling this at high prices into the world market.

I am not discussing the bewildering and discouraging effect on our good neighbors to the south of a sugar policy admittedly designed to force them to sell us their sugar supplies at ruinously low prices, when at the same time we are making loud protestations of our concern for their economic well-being; when at the very time we were destroying the stability of the sugar market we were promoting an international conference to stabilize by quotas and other devices the price of coffee. The goal of stabilized commodity prices was sufficiently important to them that they stated in the charter of Punta del Este that one of the charter's primary purposes was:

> To find a quick and lasting solution to the grave problem created by excessive price fluctuations in the basic exports of Latin American countries on which their prosperity so heavily depends.

The people of the sugar producing countries of Latin America find it hard to understand, as I do, why we would sign such a pledge, and then, less than a year later, flagrantly and openly violate it by adopting a system of sugar procurement which, far from "finding a solution to the grave problem of excessive price fluctuations in the basic exports of Latin America," instead insured greater price fluctuations than existed before we signed it. It would be hard to conceive of legislation which is better designed to lose friends and alienate people.

Although I have taken much time of the House, Mr. Speaker, there are a great many important aspects of this sugar matter which I have not discussed.

WE SHOULD RENEW OUR INSURANCE POLICY

Now, you may well ask, What are we going to do about it?

Obviously, Mr. Speaker, we should renew our insurance policy. We should return again to a system of statutory country quotas established by Congress, pay the premium that is necessary to assure us of supply and price stability, and strictly enforce that provision of the law which summarily withdraws from any country permanently any part of its quota which it fails to fill because of more attractive prices on the world market. I assure you that if it were ever necessary to take action under this provision of the law, there would be no dearth of other suppliers ready and able to take over that obligation. And I assure you that this system will work, as it has for 30 years, to guarantee U.S. consumers adequate sugar supplies at reasonable and stable prices.

What will we do about Cuba?

I think that we should continue a statutory quota of approximately 1.5 million tons held in reserve for Cuba until such time as the Communist regime is overthrown and that island again returns to the family of free nations. Until such time, of course, Cuba would get none of this quota. Instead, it should be allotted by Congress on a temporary year-to-year basis to other sugar-producing countries able and willing to supply our needs.

I admit, Mr. Speaker, that there may be some tendency on the part of countries receiving these temporary allocations to consider them of a permanent character, but I believe that this possibility has been grossly exaggerated by the proponents of the ruinous global quota, premium recapture theory. Our friends to the south are reasonable and intelligent. They would know that the very law which temporarily divides the Cuban quota among them provides, by its own terms, that the quota will be returned to Cuba when it returns to the family of free nations. They would know when they accepted the temporary Cuban allotment that it is likely to be withdrawn at any time and only in the most reckless disregard of reality would they make plans on the assumption that this would be a permanent quota.

The very fact that the Cuban quota would be reallocated among other countries by Congress on a year-to-year basis would be a constant reminder of its temporary character. This would also, in my opinion, be the best possible way to assure that, to the greatest extent possible, our purchases of sugar at the U.S. price from these supplying countries is reciprocated by their purchase of our products. The present Sugar Act contains a provision giving some preferences in global quota purchases to those countries agreeing to purchase U.S. agricultural commodities. Admittedly, this is a cumbersome and difficult provision to administer. It would be much more effective, in my opinion, if countries temporarily filling a part of the Cuban quota knew that the allotment of that quota was to be reviewed each year by Congress and that in making new allotments, their purchase of our agricultural commodities would be taken into consideration.

Those opposed to handling the temporary allocation of the Cuban quota in this manner have contended that it would be unfair to the countries receiving a portion of that Cuban quota to give them a definite temporary allotment because this would cause them to increase sugar production and construct facilities to fill an allotment which might be withdrawn at any time, to their great financial loss. Those who make this argument overlook three rather important facts: First, the quantity of sugar involved is no larger, in fact is exactly the same, as the quantity to be acquired under the global purchase program and would come from substantially the same countries; second, there is already in existence in the Western Hemisphere outside of the United States and Cuba sugar production amounting to 11.5 million tons per year, out of which we would take, both with our permanent and temporary quotas, a total of only approximately 3 million tons; third, the temporary allotments of the Cuban quota would not be made to countries who did not, at that time, have in operation sufficient sugar-producing capacity to meet the allotment—thus no new facilities or additional cane fields would be required.

These were the essential provisions of the House bill, Mr. Speaker. The Committee of Agriculture devoted weeks of study to the preparation of that bill. The House passed the bill by an overwhelming majority. Looking back at it now, there was not much wrong with that bill.

It is unfortunate that in conference we were forced to make ruinous compromises with a bill which had been considered by a committee in the other body only a few days and where even that short time had not been devoted to the study of sugar, but in large part to questioning the motives of the witnesses who appeared before the committee.

Am I going to introduce such a bill tomorrow?

Mr. Speaker, I am not.

Never in my memory of 28 years as a Member of Congress and a member of the House Committee on Agriculture has my committee, its members, or myself, been subjected to the kind of pressure, abuse, and downright vilification as we were during that period when, in our knowledge of and experience with the Sugar Act, we were trying to enact a bill which would protect the consumers of the United States against exactly the kind of price increase they are now faced with, and at the same time be a measure of friendship and helpfulness to our friendly neighbors in this hemisphere.

I do not want to dwell on this, Mr. Speaker, and I hold no personal animosity but I have no intention of putting my committee or myself through this kind of an ordeal again. I have no intention of subjecting them again to the barrage of propaganda, criticism, slanted newspaper articles, cartoons, and pressure that they went through last summer.

I will introduce a bill and call it up promptly in my committee when, and only when, those who got us into this mess indicate clearly that they now see the error of their ways and are willing to cooperate with the Committee on Agriculture in writing a new Sugar Act that will restore our statutory obligations, reinstate our sugar price and supply insurance, and give the fullest possible protection to the forgotten man of our present law—the U.S. consumer.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Who does the gentleman mean by "they"?

Mr. COOLEY. The proponents of global quotas in the administration. That is, with the help of the U.S. Senate.

The gentleman will recall our bill came out of committee without serious opposition. It passed this House with very little opposition, if any. There was opposition to one provision affecting the Dominican Republic. But our bill passed the House and everybody was pleased with the sugar program it established. All segments of the industry, foreign and domestic, were satisfied.

It went over to the Senate, and we were forced to make concessions because the law was expiring. We had assurances we would have $180 million. That has not been true. We have cut off all of the recapture possibilities. We are not recapturing anything, and it is costing the American consumers at the rate of $110 million in higher prices in 1963.

Mr. GROSS. Has the State Department played any part in this?

Mr. COOLEY. I am certain the State Department has. I am certain that many other departments of the Government have played a part in it.

We made this concession in the conference. The gentleman will recall that those who opposed the House bill concluded overnight they had made a mistake. So we had a little honey-bee bill in the Senate. They put amendments on the honey-bee bill and picked up another 150,000 tons and made it on a country-to-country allocation.

Mr. Speaker, I advocate a return to the old sugar law which operated so well for so long, almost 30 years. During all of that time we had fair prices and stable supplies. Now we are at the mercy of a world market that can be manipulated by the Soviets cooperating with Cuba. We are, therefore, at the mercy of a world market, which is going to result in injury to the American producers and the American consumers. There is no telling what it will cost in the end.

I am not going to start anything. I am not going to introduce any bill unless those who got us into this mess come to us and ask us to correct the errors that have been made. We should go back to the former program that has operated so well over the years.

I do not want to bore you with a long discussion, but I do have the facts and figures here, and they will appear in the Record tomorrow morning.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Do I understand the gentleman is advocating the principle that is enunciated in the Jones Act that we had for about 30 years?

Mr. COOLEY. That is right. The law has been operating for 25 or 30 years. We had country-by-country quotas. Our committee sat over there and allocated 9,700,000 tons of sugar, every pound of it. We did not leave it to anybody's discretion, but we were forced in conference to go to this global quota proposition that will not work and cannot work.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. As I understand it, the gentleman's committee did go ahead and try to work out a program that would fit into the law at that time?

Mr. COOLEY. Yes.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. The bill went to the Senate and through the pressure that was put on what your committee had adopted, the bill was changed in the final analysis?

Mr. COOLEY. That is right.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. The question of the allocation of quotas to other countries was involved. The other departments were taken out of the law, which has resulted in an increased cost of sugar to the consumers of the United States of approximately $110 million?

Mr. COOLEY. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. The gentleman believes that the proper approach would be to return to the law that has worked so well for 30 years?

Mr. COOLEY. I certainly do.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Under the present bill what assurance do the cane and beet producers have as to stability?

Mr. COOLEY. The domestic cane and beet producers have their quotas. But the consumers have no assurance or insurance. They are dependent on a market here that might go on up. You do not know what is going to happen.

The Soviet Union and Cuba can if they choose, manipulate the world market and we will be at their mercy.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the gentleman for calling this situation to the attention of the Members of the House and ask him again if I heard correctly that an individual, a speculator, could have taken $400 and pyramided or parlayed it into $185,000?

Mr. COOLEY. One hundred and eighty-five thousand dollars, since last July.

Mr. GROSS. Since last July?

Mr. COOLEY. Yes, sir. These figures I have had checked and double-checked by the best advised people in Washington in the administrative branch of the Government, so I am quite certain that they are correct.

Mr. GROSS. And this could have been done on the basis of the legislation passed by Congress in the last session?

Mr. COOLEY. It was done on the basis of the world price of sugar, which our legislation has helped to skyrocket.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I know that the gentleman has no connection with this situation so I do not mean to propound a question to him. But I would call the attention of the House, since he mentioned coffee a little while ago, that there is pending in the other body, a coffee agreement for ratification, since it is in the nature of a treaty, that I hope will be thoroughly scrutinized by Members of the other body and by the Members of the House before it is ratified. Personally I have serious doubts about this coffee agreement for I understand it will result in substantially increased prices for coffee to American consumers.

Mr. COOLEY. The gentleman knows that the sugar program operated so well and so satisfactorily that the ordinary housewife was not even aware of the fact that we had a sugar program. Over the years this program had operated at a net profit to the Treasury of more than $450 million, not counting import duties of as much as $37 million a year. We had ample supplies. Why in the world anybody would want to disturb a program that had operated as well as that I do not know.

Mr. GROSS. There had to be some changes in the sugar program in view of the fact that we had been obtaining a very substantial amount of sugar from Cuba; but this did not make it necessary for Congress to enact legislation that would open the door to what has happened.

Mr. COOLEY. I know. We could have gotten that sugar, we could have replaced the Cuban sugar by buying it from other sources of supply.

Mr. GROSS. Without changing the law?

Mr. COOLEY. Yes. We took away the Cuban quota. Then under the law we could have allocated that quota to other countries, and I was interested in giving it to the friendly countries in the Western Hemisphere. We tried our best to do that.

KAISER FOUNDATION MEDICAL CARE PROGRAM—THE NATION'S LARGEST PREPAID DIRECT SERVICE MEDICAL AND HOSPITAL PLAN

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. Libonati). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. Holifield] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, over the past two decades I have watched a private enterprise pattern for providing medical care take shape and grow in my part of the Nation. In 1943, when I first came here as a Member of the 78th Congress, this pattern was one industry's solution to providing medical care for its own workmen in badly overcrowded wartime communities. This industrial program has evolved into the largest voluntary medical care plan of its kind in our Nation—a plan now serving a diverse membership larger than the populations of each of 13 of our 50 States.

I am speaking of the Kaiser Foundation medical care program. Undoubtedly the name is a familiar one. It is receiving more and more favorable attention, both here and abroad, as more and more responsible individuals concern themselves with the problems of organizing and financing medical care, and closely study all types of existing solutions.

Recently I talked at length with the leaders of this program and then observed how it functions in a visit to its newest medical center at Panorama City in southern California's San Fernando Valley. I was so favorably impressed with its fundamental principles, with the cooperative accomplishments of businessmen and independent groups of physicians, and with their mutual philosophy for a private enterprise approach to the problems of providing medical care, that I wish to present this report on its activities.

Six major organizations share the primary responsibility for conducting this program. They are Kaiser Foundation Health Plan, four independent groups of physicians—the Permanente medical groups—and Kaiser Foundation Hospitals.

THE KAISER FOUNDATION HEALTH PLAN'S MEMBERSHIP

The health plan is the Nation's largest prepaid direct service medical and hospital care plan, with more than 940,000 members in the Pacific States and Hawaii. Voluntary subscribers may enroll themselves and their dependents either through groups or on an individual family basis. Among its group subscribers are retail clerks, longshoremen and warehousemen, culinary workers, faculty and staff members of educational institutions on all levels of learning, public utilities employees, personnel of Federal, State, and local governments, and employees from a wide variety of industries.

Federal employees and their dependents comprise the largest group with approximately 180,000 members, or nearly 20 percent of the total enrollment. No other group, including Kaiser employees and their dependents, make up more than 5 percent of the total.

The health plan contracts with all subscribers to arrange necessary hospital and professional care on a prepaid basis for themselves and their families. To carry out this commitment, it then contracts with Kaiser Foundation Hospitals for hospital facilities and services, and with one of four independent medical groups for professional services. There is one medical group for each of the program's four autonomous service regions which include the San Francisco Bay area, Metropolitan Los Angeles, and Fontana, the island of Oahu in Hawaii, and the two-State metropolitan area of Portland, Oreg., and Vancouver, Wash.

Here are the program's resources for serving these 940,000 health plan members. The four cooperating medical groups have a total complement of more than 900 physicians representing general practice and all the major specialties of medicine. There are 12 Kaiser Foundation hospitals with a total complement of about 2,200 licensed beds; all 12 are self-supporting, nonprofit community hospitals also serving other doctors and patients in surrounding areas. The medical groups operate about 36 medical office locations. And together, the six organizations have a total nonphysician personnel force of nearly 7,000 men and women including nurses, pharmacists, technicians, administrative personnel, service and maintenance people, and a wide variety of others.

To express these figures another way, for each 10,000 health plan members the program has close to 10 physicians and about 75 people in paramedical and service capacities; and at current cost levels, each 10,000 members require a capital investment of about $1 million in hospital and medical facilities and equipment.

THE PROGRAM'S OBJECTIVE IN PROVIDING MEDICAL CARE

The contracts between the health plan and the medical groups and the hospital organization link these organizations together in pursuing one objective: to provide the public with a comprehensive, high quality medical and hospital care plan on a nonsubsidized and self-sustaining basis, at costs which the average family can afford.

When I visited the program's newest medical center at Panorama City and met with its southern California region's medical and lay management, I wanted to determine their success in reaching this objective. One of the things which interested me was the scope of services that health plan members purchase with their monthly dues.

I was told that each of the program's four regions offers a selection of plans for group enrollment and one plan for individual enrollment. Unlike plans offered by other programs, the scope of services never varies. The only differences are in the monthly dues and benefits, which are based on local medical economics.

Here is the illustration of the benefits which an employed subscriber and his family receive under one group enrollment plan available in the southern California region:

Unlimited visits to doctors in their offices without supplemental charge; all necessary surgery without supplemental charge, 125 cost-free days of hospitalization per year, with the remaining 240 days at half-rates; special duty nursing in the hospital, if medically required, without charge; all necessary laboratory work, X-rays and physical therapy without supplemental charge; blood on a replacement basis; eye examinations without supplemental charge; doctors' home calls, day or night, at $5 per call; prenatal and maternity care through the baby's birth for a supplemental charge of $100, after 10 months of membership; polio benefits; and free ambulance service. In addition, members are protected by a maximum of $1,000 in indemnity coverage for accidental injury or emergency illness occuring outside the health plan service area. Under this particular group plan, the subscriber pays $24.85 per month for himself, his wife and his dependents. An individual subscriber in this group would pay $8.85 for himself, or $17.70 for himself and his wife.

As Time magazine concluded last September 14 in an article on the Kaiser Foundation medical care program:

> And for their money subscribers get more complete protection than is available from most other forms of U.S. medical insurance In most of the United States, Blue Cross pays only hospital bills and Blue Shield pays only surgeons' fees and some doctors' bills; HIP (the Health Insurance Plan of Greater New York), runner-up to Kaiser as the Nation's biggest prepaid care plan, does not cover hospital bills. Kaiser covers almost everything.

THE PROGRAM IS BASED ON FIVE PRINCIPLES

The participating organizations follow five guiding principles in organizing this comprehensive medical care plan: prepayment, group practice, voluntary enrollment, integrated hospital and medical facilities, and preventive medicine.

Prepayment is generally accepted as the only way by which people of moderate means can pay the increasing costs of modern medical care. Prepayment allows individual families to budget for medical care and also spreads the cost of each member's treatment over a large number of persons.

This prepayment principle is found among all voluntary health insurance programs. However, there is one basic difference between direct service prepayment plans—such as Kaiser Foundation Health Plan, Group Health Cooperative of Puget Sound, and Group Health Association here in Washington—and the fee-for-service plans such as Blue Cross and Blue Shield. The latter plans collect subscribers' prepayments and then pay claims on the traditional basis of a fee for each service rendered. Kaiser Foundation Health Plan, instead of paying providers of services on the traditional fee-for-service basis, employs an entirely different economic approach to remunerating its contracting hospital and medical organizations.

The health plan collects subscribers' prepayments and then uses these revenues to pay Kaiser Foundation Hospitals and the medical group for providing all necessary hospital and professional services. The medical groups are paid a negotiated amount for each health plan member per month as a regular and stable income, rather than payment on the fee-for-service basis. Kaiser Foundation Hospitals receives its remuneration through a cost reimbursement agreement with the health plan, with contractual payments covering operating costs, amortization of facilities and a modest earnings provision. In this arrangement, both the medical groups and the hospitals share one sound and stable planning base: the health plan's prepaid membership population.

Prepayment coupled this way with direct service actually reverses the traditional economics of medicine. The well health plan member becomes an asset to the participating medical group; the sick member becomes a liability until he regains his health. For physicians associated with this program, the only economical medical care is good medical care.

The next principle is group practice, which again is not unique within the Kaiser Foundation medical-care program. This method of medical organization has long been employed by many of the Nation's leading clinics and medical centers associated with educational and charitable institutions. Under this organization, each doctor in the group practices in the field of medicine in which he has been trained.

The physicians themselves control all professional care, with no lay or corporate interference with their services to, and relationships with, their patients.

Each health plan member is encouraged to choose a personal family physician from among the group's general practitioners or internists. This personally chosen physician directs all phases of the member's medical care, ordering X-rays, and laboratory tests, prescribing medications, and therapy, and referring to other specialists within the group whenever examinations and consultations appear necessary.

The medical groups' pooling and sharing of all income from health plan members and from private and industrial patients creates economic unity within the group, rather than individual economic rivalry.

In the Kaiser Foundation medical-care program, the four cooperating medical groups provide the four cornerstones on which the entire program is built. The medical groups' professional leaders are directly responsible for measuring and controlling the quality of medical care for health plan members, and for maintaining and striving to improve this essential factor of quality.

I talked at considerable length with leaders of the southern California medical group on this point of quality. Their feelings are that quality of care is best ascertained and controlled by key well-trained physicians working with other members of the medical group in the actual care of patients. Their staffs are organized by services or departments such as internal medicine, surgery, and pediatrics. Each chief of service has the responsibility of constantly reviewing and supervising the medical care practiced by his staff members. Together with keymen on his staff, he establishes a standard of care and then sees that this standard is maintained.

Physicians within the group select new staff members on the basis of training, experience, professional standing, a warm and personal attitude toward patients, and the personal ability to work cooperatively. Both a new staff member and his work are regularly reviewed by the chief of that particular service. Once each year the individual members of all services are discussed formally by their chiefs of service, their medical directors and the medical group's board of directors. After 3 years of such observation, the physicians who meet the medical group's standards are admitted as partners. In this way, group practice effects a potent control on quality.

The third principle—voluntary enrollment—means that each health plan subscriber belongs to the plan by choice. At the beginning of each new contract period, each subscriber has an opportunity to continue membership or choose another plan.

Another aspect of this principle is the concept of dual choice, which was developed and introduced by the Kaiser Foundation Health Plan. It means the health plan does not accept new members through captive groups. Any contracting group such as a labor union, a health and welfare fund or a Government health benefits program must offer its members a choice between the Kaiser Foundation Health Plan and at least one significantly different prepayment program such as an indemnity or service plan. The health plan actually refuses enrollment requests if the interested group does not plan to make arrangements for offering its members a choice of programs.

As I mentioned earlier, there are approximately 180,000 Federal employees and their dependents enrolled in the health plan through the Federal employees' health benefit program. Each of approximately 60,000 Federal employees who enrolled as the health plan subscriber exercised his choice among a number of different plans, including two nationwide programs. I was impressed to learn that among all the programs available to Federal employees, the Kaiser program is the most popular choice in two of its four geographic regions and the second choice in its remaining two regions.

Leaders of this program also point out another aspect of this principle of voluntary enrollment and dual choice: It gives the consumer an opportunity to exercise his opinions, influentially.

Dual choice—or multiple choice—means competition, and competition encourages improvement. By selecting from competing plans and approaches, the consumers of medical care exercise their influence on the direction of future developments and their judgment as to which types of plans and developments best meet consumer needs.

The fourth principle is that of well-planned, integrated facilities. The program's medical and lay leaders believe that doctors and their patients need to have a central medical center with modern hospital and outpatient facilities and, as needed, outlying satellite medical offices from which patients are referred to this main center.

This principle is readily apparent at the new Kaiser Foundation Hospital and Medical Center which I visited at Panorama City, Calif. This 10-story facility opened last September. Its first three floors, which are rectangular in shape, contain doctors' offices and all the supporting diagnostic services such as laboratory and X-ray. The top seven floors, which are shaped like a pair of binoculars with twin circular wings connected by a vertical column for elevators and other services, contain a hospital with 146 licensed beds and surgery and maternity facilities.

Some 60,000 health plan members in the surrounding San Fernando Valley identify their medical needs with this one central location. Patients are not forced to waste time traveling from one specialist's office location to that of another, or from a doctor's office to an outside laboratory. Doctors caring for critically ill hospitalized patients can attend their outpatients and still remain within close proximity to the hospital room.

And there are advantages in economy, too. When a large group of doctors and a large hospital share the same diagnostic facilities and equipment, there is no need to duplicate these costly items at various locations.

The fifth principle, preventive medical care, is the effort to safeguard health. As I mentioned earlier, prepayment and direct service together reverse the traditional economics of medicine. The doctors and hospitals depend on the total health plan membership for their incomes and not primarily on people who are ill. Thus, the natural desires of physicians and hospital administrators to contribute toward maintaining good health is reinforced by an economic incentive. And with prepayment greatly reducing the economic barriers, health plan members are easily encouraged to obtain diagnosis and treatment early—before a condition becomes severe and more costly, more dangerous and more tragic.

The intriguing thing about these five principles is that none of them were preconceived by the program's founders. Each one arose from practical experiences in solving medical care problems in a series of situations.

THE FIVE PRINCIPLES EVOLVED OVER 30 YEARS

The first such situation goes back 30 years when a young surgeon named Dr. Sidney R. Garfield organized an industrial medical-care program for workers building the Los Angeles Aqueduct across the southern California desert. His medical group began their program on the traditional fee-for-service basis, but soon discovered they needed a more stable and adequate method for financing it.

The contractors joined them in persuading insurance carriers to drop fees-for-service in favor of prepayment at a monthly rate of $1.50 for each employee. This new financial arrangement was such a success that the doctors soon were able to expand the plan to prepaid medical coverage for nonindustrial illness and injuries.

Similar programs later were organized first for Kaiser employees constructing Grand Coulee Dam in 1938 and then for 90,000 warworkers at Kaiser's west coast shipyards and steel mills during World War II. Again these programs proved themselves self-sustaining and financially sound.

Immediately after the war, former war workers and a number of labor unions asked Henry J. Kaiser and the cooperating physicians to open this kind of program to the general public. They decided to accept this new challenge and in 1945 opened health plan enrollment to groups and individuals on a voluntary basis. Then the plan had only about 10,000 members. By the end of 1962, membership stood at 940,000. Within a year, this figure may reach 1 million.

As Henry J. Kaiser told the 83d Congress House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce during its consideration of national health legislation:

> The principles of the health plan have been tested under all sorts of conditions—in wartime and in peacetime; through depression, recession and prosperity; in all sorts of locations—in deserts, in remote rural areas, in suburbs and in large cities; in areas with only a small number of members and in other areas with tens of thousands of members; with scattered groups and concentrated groups.

PHYSICIANS CONTROL QUALITY OF PATIENT CARE

Actually, I was even more impressed with the program's built-in controls on quality of care than I was with its size or its guiding principles.

While describing the principle of group practice, I mentioned how the cooperating medical groups establish their standard of quality. For maintaining and improving upon this standard, the medical leaders say the development of the individual physician is the major factor. Leaders of the Permanente medical groups say they believe the most important benefit they offer their staff physicians is the opportunity to develop professionally in a manner usually available only in centers for medical education.

Within this program, these opportunities are available both on an informal and formal basis. Informally there are opportunities for physicians to discuss cases with colleagues, to confer with specialists from other services within the group, and to obtain aid or advice from medical education centers in the area, if necesary.

On a formal basis, the four medical groups and Kaiser Foundation Hospitals sponsor continuing programs in education and research, in the interest of better patient care. Doctors in the major hospitals at San Francisco, Oakland, Los Angeles, and Portland, Oreg., direct and participate in intern or residency programs which are approved by the American Medical Association's Council on Medical Education and Hospitals. A number of physicians from the medical groups hold academic appointments at nearby medical schools and universities such as Stanford, University of California, UCLA, and USC. In addition, the doctors in each hospital organize a number of regularly scheduled medical conferences, teaching sessions and symposia, all of which are also open to attendance by any physician in the community. Any physician on the staff of a Kaiser Foundation hospital may also apply for funds for a clinical research project. Each such application is reviewed by the research committees of the medical groups and Kaiser Foundation Hospitals, which decide whether funds should be made available by the hospital organization.

These activities in education and research, together with the Kaiser Foundation School of Nursing, the Kaiser Foundation Research Institute, and Kaiser Foundation Hospitals' charitable care, constitute the program's community service endeavors. Last year Kaiser Foundation Hospitals expended more than $1.5 million to support these pursuits and in addition, the research institute received a total of another $1.5 million in Federal grants for research involving basic sciences related to medicine.

Another significant aspect of quality control in this program is that the medical groups' practices are hospital based. All major Kaiser Foundation hospitals which have been open for the required year are accredited by the joint commission on hospital accreditation, representing the American Hospital Association, the American Medical Association, and the American College of Surgeons. This means the hospitals have voluntarily invited inspection by the commission and have been found to meet its standards for approval. The medical groups believe these standards are important, and their chiefs of services cooperate closely with the hospital administrations in maintaining accreditation requirements.

THE ENTIRE PROGRAM IS SELF-SUSTAINING

Another impressive fact is that this entire program is economically self-sustaining.

Looking back 21 years, Mr. Henry J. Kaiser recalls that when he sought the first bank loan to build hospital facilities for his wartime shipyard workers, the bankers told him they "wouldn't loan a dime on a hospital, because hospitals are such money losers." He personally had to guarantee the first hospital construction loan of $250,000.

Last June, 20 years later, Kaiser Foundation Hospitals completed negotiations for a $35 million loan from four private financial institutions. This amount refinanced all long-term financial obligations and provided $16.5 million for development of additional facilities. Kaiser Foundation Health Plan was the only guarantor.

THE PROGRAM'S LEADERS ARE SENSITIVE TO COVERAGE GAPS

Despite these successes—in terms of comprehensive coverage and membership growth, construction and financing of new facilities, and organizing quality medical care services—the program's leaders point out a number of problems that still need solution.

Health plan membership is closed in some areas because the program's facilities cannot keep pace with the demand for enrollment. Both physicians and lay management are sensitive to gaps in health plan coverage and are studying ways to fill them.

Significant work is being done in southern California between the medical group and the Retail Clerks Welfare Fund, on a cooperative and demonstrative basis, to determine how best to integrate psychiatric care into the scope of services to health plan members. In Portland, Oreg., limited coverage is now provided for inpatient psychiatric care. Also in Portland, under very recent arrangements, prepayment by health plan members covers a substantial portion of their outpatient drug bills.

In assessing the importance of the Kaiser Foundation medical care program in answering the health care needs of the public, one fact is clearly outstanding: On a private enterprise basis, dedicated physicians and farsighted businessmen are pooling their talents in efficiently organizing the complex resources of modern medical care to serve a population now greater in number than the populations of each of 13 States in our Nation.

Edgar F. Kaiser, president of Kaiser Foundation Hospitals and Kaiser Foundation Health Plan, says this about the program:

> Among all the activities which my father has organized and stimulated, the one he views with greatest pride is the Kaiser Foundation medical care program. The program's antecedents began because we had a need we could not fill. Doctors, nurses, and other members of the health professions responded by joining with us to form a relationship from which has evolved our present-day program. Together with independent groups of dedicated physicians for whom there is no substitute, this program answers expressed health care needs of the public in the true spirit of the free enterprise system, under which the financing and organization of medical care may be met by diverse approaches.

A RECORD VOTE ON ALL SPENDING BILLS

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Washington [Mr. PELLY] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, this week the House considered its first appropriation bill. This was House Joint Resolution 284, making supplemental appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963. The amount of taxpayers' money involved was $503 million.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to say first that when it came to the vote on final passage of the resolution, I asked, and the House sustained my request, for the vote to be taken by "yeas" and "nays". I sought this record vote in line with the firm belief that there should be a record of how all Members vote on all appropriations bills. In other words, Mr. Speaker, I am hopeful that in the balance of this session, the House will support me in trying to get record votes on all spending bills.

If this can be done, Mr. Speaker, then an analysis can be made of individual voting. Such an analysis would show the Members who consistently vote for larger appropriations and then, quite inconsistently, vote against such legislation as an increase in the national debt ceiling. Certainly if Members help to create an increase in the national debt, in all honesty they should be willing to vote for an increase in the legal limit. The record should be such as to allow the press to point up such inconsistencies.

This year, with the first planned deficit budget of an administration that I can recall, with an administration proposal calling for greatly increased expenditures, and with a proposed loss of revenue through a cut in taxation, priority, of course, will have to be given by the President to legislation that will raise the national debt ceiling.

As for me, Mr. Speaker, I voted last year against an increase in the debt ceiling to $308 billion, just as I did before that. According to Treasury estimates, the national debt stands at about $302 billion. Furthermore, under the present law, the debt ceiling will drop to $305 billion on "April Fool's Day," then in turn to $300 billion on June 25, and to $285 billion on July 1.

The administration has known all along that we were facing this situation. The President could have called for a curb in spending in order not to bring about this present emergency and thereby avoided the need to continue the $308 billion limit. I see no way to exert pressure for economy other than to refuse to go along, and instead to vote down the bill to authorize the debt ceiling increase.

Mr. Speaker, some people say we do not need any debt ceiling. Such individuals completely overlook the fact that at the moment there is authorization under back-door spending programs for the agencies of Government to borrow from the Treasury and spend without any appropriation legislation a total of about $28 billion. The only assurance Congress has that Government agencies will not borrow all this money and spend it without coming to Congress is the legal debt ceiling, and I for one see no method of bringing about fiscal control or responsible economic policies other than to maintain a debt ceiling.

To return, however, to the subject of the $503 million supplemental appropriation, during consideration of this resolution, I inquired as to how much of this $508 million impairment in the Commodity Credit Corporation funds was due to shipment of surplus commodities to Communist Poland and Communist Yugoslavia. I could not get a precise answer, but I was informed that since the program began in 1954, around $900 million worth of commodities have been supplied to Yugoslavia under the Public Law 480 program, and some $590 million worth of commodities under this law have been supplied to Poland.

In other words, Mr. Speaker, the huge deficit of the Federal Government and the reason for the administration's request for an increase in the debt ceiling is substantially the result of a policy of aiding and feeding the Communists. Those who embrace the very philosophy of the international conspiracy to destroy our freedoms are the ones who have been aided. These deficits have been making communism succeed. These deficit dollars have been going to a nation that has loaned money to Cuba and helped Castro build a Communist beachhead in the Western Hemisphere.

Mr. Speaker, as I said at the start, I expect to try to obtain a record vote on every appropriations bill that comes up in this session. Then, I hope someone will analyze this record and find out who are the Members of Congress who are supporting the vast expenditures which are creating our huge debt and futhermore, Mr. Speaker, I hope the analysis will show the Members who vote the dollars that go to help the slave world try to destroy the free world. It is about time that the American people be given the facts. Let the record show just which Members of the House are the ones who are responsible for the vast public debt and what the money is spent for. It is time someone did some finger-pointing. Too many spending bills have been by voice votes with no showing as to how individuals vote on these measures.

CIVIL RIGHTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. McCulloch] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Speaker, at long last the President today sent a message to Congress recomending some legislation and outlining prospective Executive action in the field of civil rights. In the preamble to this message the President says that his administration has done more in the field of civil rights than any other administration in our Nation's history.

Since I am the ranking member of the Committee on the Judiciary, which has had responsibility in this field for many years, I am forced to take issue with that statement and to say that there is no unanimity concerning that claim by the President.

I would like to remind the House that in the last term of the Eisenhower administration, in 1957 and in 1960, far-reaching civil rights legislation was passed. I am sure that those who are without prejudice will admit that that legislation is the most effective legislation in the field of civil rights since the days of the Carpetbaggers.

In addition, during President Eisenhower's term in office the President's Committee on Equal Employment Opportunities was given its principal impetus. Furthermore, the beginning of real, effective school desegregation occurred in the Eisenhower administration following the 1954 Supreme Court decision.

In addition, the action to eliminate discrimination in transportation first became effective in the Eisenhower administration.

I am sure that those of you who were in the armed services within the last two decades know that desegregation in the Armed Forces occurred during the Truman administration. And I am also sure that those of you who were in Washington from 1950 to 1960 know that in the Nation's Capital desegregation had its first effective help in the Eisenhower administration.

As a matter of fact, more effective civil rights legislation was enacted in the 8 years of the Eisenhower administration than has been enacted in all the years since the death of that great President, Abraham Lincoln.

In large part, the President now recommends legislation much like, but not nearly as broad in scope, the civil rights legislation which was introduced by a score or more of the minority Members of the House on the 31st day of January of this year.

I particularly note in section 1 of the President's message that the right to vote is discussed at some length, but there is a singular omission in that section of his message to the Congress. Of course, every qualified American should have the right to vote, and he should be able to freely exercise it, without discrimination, in accordance with the laws of the State in which he resides; but of equal importance, if not of greater importance, is the right of every citizen to have his vote properly counted or to prevent citizens who are not qualified to vote for one reason or another, even by death, from having such votes counted.

Mr. Speaker, I refer to news story after news story in the press and on the air concerning illegal voting and the illegal counting of votes in elections in recent years in Philadelphia, in Chicago, in Detroit, and in certain political subdivisions in Texas.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCULLOCH. I will be glad to yield to the gentleman from Florida, one of the able members of the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, at this point in the Record, and for the purpose of the Record, and I think the gentleman will confirm it, I should say that it was 2 years ago that the Committee on the Judiciary in considering the extension of the Civil Rights Commission voted out by a very substantial majority the specific provision to which the gentleman is now referring that has been omitted from the administration's proposal, and that is that the right not only of a person to vote but to have that vote counted should be within the jurisdiction of the Civil Rights Commission to investigate and make recommendations on, adding that as a subject matter within its jurisdiction. I am sure the gentleman recalls that.

Mr. McCULLOCH. I do recall it, and I am very happy to say that the gentleman from Florida wrote the original proposal that was submitted to the Committee on the Judiciary and he made a successful fight to have that proposal in the bill which we considered. It is regrettable that it was not enacted into law.

Mr. CRAMER. The reason for my offering such an amendment arises from the fact that, by appointment of the Speaker, I, for two sessions now have served—at that time one session—on the special Subcommittee on Campaign Expenditures and Elections; and I came to the very definite conclusion that the major shenanigan in voting in America is that votes cast often are not properly counted or are not counted at all.

Numerous instances that have been documented, including events during the last presidential election, I think clearly show that. The objective of this amendment was to make sure that the right of the citizen to have his vote counted, which is of equal importance with the right of the vote itself, be preserved.

I am sure the gentleman is also familiar with the fact that the majority turned handsprings, speaking procedurally, to keep that amendment which was voted out of the committee from ever being considered on the floor of this House in that the other body, to avoid that amendment, to avoid a vote on it on the floor of the House, put its own extension of the Commission bill as a rider on a totally unrelated appropriation bill for the Justice Department and sent it over and made the House accept it without the right-to-have-the-votes-counted amendment which affects all people, including the majority as well as the minority. That was certainly a backhanded way of preventing the House of Representatives from voting on what I think is one of the crucial questions in connection with the right to vote, to have the vote counted of both the majority and all minorities. Does not the gentleman agree with that?

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Speaker, I agree with the comments of the gentleman from Florida. It is regettable, indeed, that that provision is not now the law of the land. Before we leave that subject, I would like to say, Mr. Speaker, when we are talking about public images, I do not know what can give us a blacker and a darker image in the eyes of the people of the rest of the world that are struggling so hard for the elective franchise than to hear it charged in responsible publications and news media of every kind that votes are being illegally cast in this great country and that some votes that are properly cast are being either not counted or illegally counted.

Now I yield to my good friend the gentleman from New York [Mr. Derounian].

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Ohio is making a contribution to truth in his statement today. I would like to ask the gentleman, since the President is taking all the credit for all civil rights advances: Was it not during the Truman administration that Mr. Ralph Bunche was offered a position in the administration, but he refused it because he said Negroes were not comfortable in living quarters in Washington, D.C.?

Mr. McCULLOCH. I do have a recollection that that statement was made.

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Is it not true under President Eisenhower's administration, hotels and restaurants were desegregated in the District of Columbia by Executive order?

Mr. McCULLOCH. Yes, of course; 3 or 4 years ago, I attended a dinner at the Willard Hotel to which were invited some of the leading business and political leaders, including Negroes, of this country. One of the leaders of the majority in the other body spoke and said there has been more progress made in desegregation in the District of Columbia in the last half decade than in all the history of the District theretofore. I was about to give the name and the date, but that detail is unnecessary.

I should like to say, that Ohio has no voter qualifications which seek to prevent or which do prevent people from voting, who meet the residence qualification. Any person 21 years of age, and under no legal restraint and who has lived within the State for 1 year and within the political subdivision for 40 days may vote. We have had no election scandals in Ohio for more than a third of a century when that able, effective, and courageous secretary of state, Clarence J. Brown was in, large part, responsible for indictments and trials and convictions for violation of the election laws in my State.

I am further disturbed by the failure of the President to make recommendations to end conditions which exist in discrimination in employment by those who have authority in the labor movement in America. While the right to vote and to help select people to represent one is of great importance, the opportunity to get a job and earn one's bread by the sweat of one's brow is even more important and more basic than the right to help select public officers.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Maryland who has been so active—so constructively active and interested in this subject.

Mr. MATHIAS. I think the gentleman is touching upon one of the most significant failures in the civil rights message. Certainly, if one holds in one hand a copy of the message and in the other hand a copy of the Democratic platform of 1960, what has been sent to the Congress today can be viewed only as a retreat. It is an ironic fact that the Washington Post and Times Herald for today has a story on the front page which is headlined "Race Barrier Still a Factor in Jobs Here." This news story appears the very day that a Presidential message comes to the Congress which has repudiated the many repeated promises made on this subject and which offers neither help nor hope for relief in this important area of discrimination in employment. In contrast to the weakness of the President's message in proposing measures to safeguard equality of opportunity for employment, the bill introduced by the distinguished gentleman from Ohio and by other Republican members of the Judiciary Committee would make a real contribution.

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Speaker, I am very happy that the gentleman from Maryland has made that comment. I can with good grace say to the House that the civil rights bill which the gentleman from Maryland introduced contains a section which would remedy the thing that is so distasteful to so many.

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCULLOCH. I am pleased to yield to the gentleman from New York who also has been so interested and active in the field of civil rights.

Mr. LINDSAY. I thank my distinguished friend, the ranking minority member of our committee, for yielding to me. He has shown great leadership in proposing a comprehensive meaningful civil rights bill which I and others were privileged to cosponsor with him on January 31.

I suppose we have embarrassed the administration somewhat, because I am happy to see that some parts of the bill which a group of us on the minority side of the Judiciary Committee proposed have been included in the President's message that was sent to the House today. Although I am gratified to that extent, I am disappointed and amazed that the President would send up such a thin proposal and ask the Congress to act only on that proposal.

This is a retreat; and is in effect an invitation to legislative catastrophe in the civil rights area. I cannot help noting at the same time that the message is accompanied by a good deal of propaganda. I wonder if poor Abe Lincoln is not turning in his grave a little bit as I read this sentence in the President's message:

> In the last 2 years more progress has been made in securing civil rights for Americans than in any comparable period of our history.

That is quite a statement, and I would have thought that the drafters of that statement would have thought twice before putting it in, because at the end of the message the President asks that there be no partisan consideration, that there be no disagreement, and that we just accept this meager proposal as it stands.

I take note also that it was under the Eisenhower administration that the lead was taken in ending segregation practices and discrimination in interstate transportation, land and air; yet that credit is magnanimously assumed by Mr. Kennedy. The Eisenhower administration also took the lead in ending desegregation for the District of Columbia.

So I think that we on the minority side owe it to the public and owe it to ourselves as members of the minority to call for an accounting on statements of this kind.

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Speaker, I certainly agree with my colleague from New York, and that is the reason why earlier today I asked for this 30-minute special order that we might discuss the matter. From a hurried reading of the message, it appears to fall far short of the Democratic platform on the subject, adopted at the convention in which the President was nominated. On the other hand, the bill which the gentleman from New York had so much part in preparing carries forward, in substance, the Republican platform.

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. McCULLOCH. I yield further to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. LINDSAY. The Democratic platform of 1960 specifically states that the Civil Rights Commission should be made a permanent commission, yet the proposal sent to us today in this message calls for only a 4-year extension.

Mr. McCULLOCH. The gentleman's bill likewise provides for a permanent commission. A permanent commission in this field is needed.

Mr. LINDSAY. And with proper subpena powers.

Mr. McCULLOCH. Yes.

Mr. LINDSAY. One reason we know this is important is that contrary to what is stated in the President's message, the problem of civil rights in securing for all citizens equal opportunity under the law is a continuing one which is not going to be solved in 4 years; it will not be solved in 24 years. In order to have a proper Civil Rights Commission examining into the problems, it must be permanent. We are going to have continuing difficulty in securing truly qualified men to serve on such a commission on a temporary year-to-year basis.

The 1960 Democratic platform also calls for providing governmental authority to institute a civil action in a Federal court.

This proposal is not even mentioned in the message. Our bill, the bill introduced by the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. McCulloch] contains this provision in the field of education, which is the most critical area.

A third area where the Democratic platform is breached by this message is in the area of employment practices. A Federal FEPC was promised in the platform. No mention of it was made in the message.

Mr. McCULLOCH. Would not the gentleman agree that the denial of the opportunity to earn a living by reason of race or color is one of the most troublesome and inexcusable discriminations with which we are faced?

Mr. LINDSAY. The gentleman is absolutely correct.

Mr. McCULLOCH. It is basic?

Mr. LINDSAY. It is basic. It should be pointed out that the bill the gentleman offered to the Congress contains a provision setting up a Federal commission on a permanent basis that has power to make surveys, and to bring cases in this area involving discrimination in connection with Government contracts, in the great complex where the Government cooperates with private industry and universities to forward the defense of America. This is the area we propose to do something about.

May I say that I have no intention of being partisan on this issue, and I hope we will not force ourselves into a partisan angle, but it is difficult to remain silent in view of statements made in this message.

Mr. McCULLOCH. I interrupt the gentleman from New York to say in view of the fact some 80 or 90 new Federal judges have been appointed, the court calendars in most of the Federal district courts should be kept current.

Mr. LINDSAY. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCULLOCH. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Speaker, I, too, want to compliment the gentleman from Ohio for his many contributions throughout the years to the solution of the problems in the field of civil rights.

I note on page 6 of the message of the President these words:

> Beginning in September of this year, under the aid-to-impacted-area school program, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare will initiate a program of providing on-base facilities so that children living on military installations will no longer be required to attend segregated schools at Federal expense.

My question to the gentleman from Ohio is this: There is nothing in the bill which the gentleman and other Republican Members introduced that would perpetuate school segregation by building integrated schools on military installations?

Mr. McCULLOCH. Of course not. I am happy that question has been asked, in view of the language in the President's message.

Mr. SHRIVER. Would not such a plan result in actually rewarding local school districts for noncompliance with our Constitution?

Mr. McCULLOCH. Yes, it would. I think those who joined in introducing the bill of the minority, would have no part in such proposals.

Mr. SHRIVER. Is it the gentleman's understanding that the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People is very much against this proposition?

Mr. McCULLOCH. That is my understanding.

Mr. SHRIVER. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. MacGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCULLOCH. I am pleased to yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. MacGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I should like to most sincerely commend the distinguished ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. McCulloch] as well as the gentlemen who have participated with him in this discussion of the merits of the civil rights legislation introduced by many of us last month, and the lack of merit in the President's message given to the Congress today.

In noting the superficial nature of the proposals contained in the Presidential message, the thought occurs to the gentleman from Minnesota that there must be some understanding between powerful congressional Members of the President's party and the drafters of this message; how else does one account for the serious deficiencies and oversights in the legislation requested by the White House? For example, there is nothing in the Presidential message calling for added legislative tools to eliminate discrimination in employment opportunities.

I cannot let this day go by without suggesting that considerations of political expediency, and the plans going forward for the 1964 campaign, have been more evident in the content of this message than the expected sincere desire to advance the cause of civil rights in America.

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

At this point I would like to comment upon a statement that was made by my colleague from New York who said that he hoped legislation in this field would not take on partisan political attributes. I, too, hope that there is no partisanship in the consideration of this legislation either in committee or on the floor of the House or in the other body.

Mr. BROMWELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCULLOCH. I am pleased to yield to my good friend from Iowa [Mr. Bromwell].

Mr. BROMWELL. Mr. Speaker, let me join my colleagues here in congratulating the gentleman from Ohio in his anticipation of sound civil rights legislation over a month ago in the introduction of a sound civil rights bill.

Apropos the most recent remark of the gentleman about partisan political considerations I, too, am in hopes that partisanship can be avoided and that a sound bill will be enacted very swiftly. Here is a situation where all that is needed is a minority of the majority to put good civil rights legislation on the books. I think the expression has been made abundantly in this session from this side of the aisle, that the only thing that is needed for some decent legislation is cooperation from the other side. I would, however, like to make one statement, which I cannot forbear making—I made it substantially a month ago when the civil rights bills were introduced from this side of the aisle—and it is brought to mind by the reference to the poll tax amendment in the message we received today. I think that it cannot be pointed out too often to the people of the United States, or too vigorously, that the poll tax amendment is a glittering political fraud, that no one has so far voted because of its adoption after a full 40 minutes of debate in this House, that no one has yet voted; 13 States have ratified and we have some 25 to go and when they get done, it is still a question whether anybody will vote, because it applies only to Federal elections and Federal officers, who are on the same ballot with State officials, to vote for which poll taxes have to be paid. I think we should deemphasize the poll tax amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. McCulloch] has expired.

CUBA SITUATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Rumsfeld] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, as a new Member of the Congress, I have refrained from taking the time of the Members of this House until today. I would have hoped that the occasion of my first remarks could have been one of less urgency and of less danger to this Nation than the increasingly critical problem of Cuba.

As many Members of the House, I have been anxiously hoping that the administration would, after weighing all of the various alternatives, assume the advantage we seemingly held some months ago and have since lost, by stepping forward in a capacity of leadership, and, with the cooperation of the other nations in this hemisphere to the greatest extent possible, by undertaking a positive course of action aimed at preventing the strengthening of the Castro regime, stopping the further spread of communism from Cuba to other nations of this hemisphere, and hopefully accelerating the eventual elimination of communism from Cuba. Regrettably, this has not happened.

Personally, as serious as these questions may be, I have been less concerned of late with debating the exact number of missiles or Communist troops remaining in Cuba, or the often obscure distinction between offensive and defensive weapons, or even the exact meaning of a so-called bipartisan foreign policy, than with the very real danger which Cuba represents to this hemisphere as a training ground and stepping off point for Communist guerrillas, saboteurs, and infiltrators. Certainly, recent developments in Brazil dramatize this problem. We cannot tolerate four or five South Vietnams in this hemisphere.

I rise today to call to the attention of my colleagues some shocking facts concerning the dramatically increased trade between Cuba and Communist-bloc nations, particularly Red China, and to point out that much of this cargo, which serves to strengthen the Castro regime in Cuba and to assist Cuba in its subversive activities, is being moved through our own Panama Canal.

The 1962 annual report of the Board of Directors of the Panama Canal Company states on page 6:

> The volume of cargo moving through the canal to Red China in 1962 totaled 877,000 long tons, for an increase of 600 percent, and movements to Russia totaled 344,000 long tons, for an increase of 48 percent.

While this is shocking to me, it apparently is not of great concern to the administration, in that the president of the Panama Canal Company, and, incidentally, the Company is a corporate agency and instrumentality of the Government of the United States, stated in his 1962 letter to the stockholder—the stockholder being the Honorable Cyrus Vance, Secretary of the Army:

> It is gratifying to report that a record volume of traffic moved through the Panama Canal last year, reflecting the canal's expanding role of world oceanborne commerce.

I, for one, do not consider an increase of 600 percent in cargo movements to Red China through the Panama Canal gratifying. The report points out that sugar movements from Cuba accounted for a major portion of the increased combined tonnage to Red China and Russia through the canal. The report goes on to say:

> Thus, cargo movements during 1962 marked another year in the continued phenomenal growth in world traffic since World War II.

Mr. Speaker, I am writing today to the President of the United States, expressing my concern and asking a series of four questions regarding the advisability of the United States extending the recently announced policy of denying the use of U.S. ports to ships trading with Cuba to include the ports at either end of the Panama Canal. I wish to insert my letter to the President in the RECORD at this point:

FEBRUARY 28, 1963.

THE PRESIDENT,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I am deeply concerned by the dramatically increased cargo movements through the Panama Canal to Red China during 1962 as reported in the 1962 Annual Report of the Panama Canal Company. Certainly the restrictions which the United States has imposed on trade with Cuba represent an attempt by this country to weaken the Castro regime. This obviously is and must be our goal. In that the increased trade between Communist-bloc nations and Cuba is defeating this goal, it seems obvious that serious consideration should be given to the possibility of a move by the United States to deny the use of the Panama Canal to all ships carrying cargo into and out of Communist Cuba.

In the event that existing treaties and international agreements prevent such action, it would further seem feasible that this Nation give immediate consideration to the possibility of a revision of the treaties and international agreements involved to adapt them to the cold war being fought in this hemisphere in 1963.

The danger of the establishment of a Communist dictatorship on the continent of South America which is posed by the continued exportation of communism from Cuba to the continent is serious. Today the Panama Canal could serve as an effective tool in preventing the strengthening of the Castro regime and the further spread of communism to the continent. At the point where a Communist dictatorship is established on the continent of South America, control of the Panama Canal will cease in large measure to be an effective tool in preventing the further spread of communism.

For your consideration and response, I am attaching a series of four questions which are of grave concern to me. I will look forward to your early reply.

Sincerely,

DONALD RUMSFELD,
Member of Congress.

QUESTIONS SUBMITTED

1. Would existing U.S. treaties and/or international agreements permit a move by the United States to deny the use of the Panama Canal to ships carrying cargo into and out of Cuba?

2. What are the restrictions contained in the recent administration statement limiting the use of "American ports" under certain circumstances by certain vessels?

3. Could the facilities, whether they be called harbors, ports, or entrances at both ends of the Panama Canal be considered American ports for the purposes of international agreements, treaties, and the recently established policy referred to above?

4. Since the rise of the Castro regime in Cuba, the United States has taken various steps to weaken that regime including restrictions on trade between this country and Communist Cuba. To offset the desired harmful effects on the Cuban economy as the result of these U.S. actions, the Communist bloc nations, particularly Red China, have substantially increased their trading activities with Cuba. In view of these facts and in view of the events in the past 5 months, would it not be appropriate for this Nation to impose a restriction on the use of the Panama Canal by any ships carrying cargo to or from Cuba?

Problems are not solved by pretending that they do not exist. Certainly the continued delay in commencing a coordinated hemispheric action will reduce our chances for success in stemming the tide of world communism. Once the Communists have established a firm beachhead on the continent of South America, we will have lost the advantage which our control of the Panama Canal today represents and with it the opportunity to prevent the continued spread of communism throughout this hemisphere. Today, the Panama Canal can be an effective tool against communism; tomorrow, it may not.

To my knowledge, this question was first raised in two articles appearing in the Chicago Sun-Times during the past week. For the benefit of those who share my concern, I wish to insert the following articles from the Chicago Sun-Times in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks: A syndicated column by Milburn P. Akers, of Friday, February 22, an editorial advocating that this Nation deny the use of the Panama Canal to all ships carrying cargo into and out of Communist Cuba, of February 22. The syndicated column of Milburn P. Akers which I understand has been distributed for publication in the Chicago Sun-Times on March 1, also deals with this problem and I intend to insert it in the RECORD as soon as copies are available.

I wish to point out that our policy of denying the use of U.S. ports, or even a step to deny the use of the Panama Canal to Communist vessels engaged in trade with Cuba, will not solve the problem, in that a major portion of these cargoes move on vessels flying non-Communist flags.

Mr. Speaker, I am not suggesting an invasion of Cuba; I am not suggesting a full blockade of Cuba; I am not rattling sabers; rather, I am urging the administration to take cognizance of this dramatically increased Communist trade through the Panama Canal. I am requesting and urging that the appropriate committee of the House of Representatives conduct an investigation as to the advisability of a move by the United States to deny the use of the Panama Canal to all ships carrying cargo into and out of Cuba. If under existing treaties and international agreements this cannot be accomplished, and I fully appreciate that there are obstacles including treaties with both Panama and Great Britain, I am asking that consideration be given to prompt revision of these treaties or agreements to adapt them to cope with the cold war we are fighting in this hemisphere in 1963. Certainly if such course of action is deemed advisable, the necessary changes could be accomplished. If at the conclusion of these studies it is the decision of the House to express to the President the sense of the House that these or similar steps be taken, I strongly urge that every effort be made to encourage the cooperation of the other nations of this hemisphere through the Organization of American States.

I wish also to include at the conclusion of my remarks pages 4, 5, and 6 from the 1962 Panama Canal annual report of the board of directors:

[From the Chicago Sun-Times, Feb. 22, 1963]

(By Milburn P. Akers)

Total isolation of Fidel Castro's Cuba by the remaining Western Hemisphere nations has been proposed by President Romulo Betancourt of Venezuela.

This step, effectively enforced, would help. But it isn't enough. Cuba should be isolated by the entire free world. So long as the Castro regime remains in power, Cuba's potential for mischief, or worse, remains.

The United States risked atomic war to force Soviet Russia to withdraw its missiles. It is now treading on risky ground in efforts to bring about the removal of remaining Soviet troops. Even after these troops are removed, as they probably will be shortly, Cuba under Castro remains as a threat—a threat not so much to the United States, which if need be, can overrun Cuba at will, but to Latin America generally.

Cuba is being used as a training ground for saboteurs, guerrillas and other varieties of Communist troublemakers from various Latin American nations. If that is permitted to continue, the United States, sooner or later, will be fighting many dirty, little wars in Latin America as it is now doing in South Vietnam. Twelve thousand American soldiers and much equipment are now employed in South Vietnam in the effort to eradicate relatively small bands of Viet Congs, that nation's equivalent of Communist guerrillas. The United States is spending a minimum of $500 million annually in this effort alone.

Do we want to do the same thing in half a dozen or more Latin American nations?

Ridding Cuba of Soviet missiles and troops isn't enough. Castro and the Communist regime on that island are the real culprits. The missiles and troops wouldn't have been in Cuba except for Castro and his regime. They were brought into Cuba surreptitiously in the first place. They can be returned in the same manner so long as Cuba has a Communist government.

Neither the Kennedy administration nor most of its Republican opposition is taking or advocating those steps, short of invasion, which would eradicate the infection at its source. Total isolation of Cuba by the free world might do the job.

Total isolation would mean that no citizen of the free world would be permitted to travel to Cuba; that no person, company, or cartel would engage in any kind of traffic whatsoever with Cuba.

Various nations whose own security is totally dependent upon the atomic capability of the United States hesitated or refused to ban commerce with Cuba previously. Even the United States hasn't sought to plug all Cuban supply sources in this country. The Kennedy administration acted courageously and effectively in forcing Soviet Russia to remove its missiles. Otherwise its course insofar as Cuba is concerned has been one of timidity, expediency and sheer bubbleheadedness.

So long as the United States itself fails to follow policies resulting in an effective total ban on all commerce and travel with Cuba by American citizens and American companies, other free world countries cannot be expected to do so.

Once the United States has instituted such policies most others in the Western Hemisphere can be expected to follow suit. Once the Western Hemisphere has demonstrated it is taking effective steps to rid Cuba of its Communist regime other nations in the free world may do likewise.

It becomes increasingly apparent that the Communist planners, having a foothold in Cuba, intend to use it as a training ground for hordes of guerrillas and saboteurs who will turn many Latin American nations into South Vietnams. Our experience in South Vietnam demonstrates the difficulties such guerrilla bands can create as well as the cost, both in lives and in money, in efforts to rid a nation of them.

It was good to rid Cuba of Soviet missiles. It will be good to rid Cuba of Soviet troops. It will be even better to rid Cuba of Castro and his Communist regime. Without them, there could have been neither Soviet missiles nor troops. With them, we are constantly confronted with a possible return. And with them, we are confronted with the possibility of many dirty, little wars throughout Latin America.

[From the Chicago Sun-Times, Feb. 26, 1963]

Take Off the Gloves

Sixty-two Americans have been killed in the abortive fighting in Vietnam. The latest to die is a U.S. Army machinegunner who was killed when two Army helicopters were downed by ground fire while they were carrying out a medical evacuation mission 100 miles east of Saigon.

To check this mounting casualty list an order has been given to allow our troops to open fire first, "in some cases." The criterion is that the American soldier must pick for a target a "positively identified" guerrilla.

This is a specious order. It is inconceivable that a trained Army machinegunner, sitting exposed and naked to ground fire in the open door of a helicopter, would wait to be fired upon before he opened fire. If he did not immediately rake any enemy area where he detected movement before he was fired upon he would not be worthy of the training he had received. Death is as final to a soldier in a political action as it is in a formally declared war.

The relaxing of the "rules of engagement" (State Department terminology for as yet undeclared warfare) does have a major significance, however.

We have now declared war in Vietnam. Our troops can fire as soon as they identify armed guerrillas as the target. This is war; pure and simple. The line has been drawn in the dust with the heavy toe of a military boot. If you see the enemy—shoot to kill.

There has been an overabundance of political falderal and shilly-shallying in Vietnam and other areas. We are not at war, but our troops have been shooting at an "enemy." We are not at war, but the survivors of those killed in action in Vietnam have been accorded full survivor's benefits consistent with those awarded during a formal conflict.

Now we must buckle down to the difficult and onerous task of driving the enemy—and there is only one enemy, communism—out of southeast Asia.

As a matter of cold fact, it is high time we take off our velvet gloves and stop worrying about offending Russia. The Russian troops in Cuba must go, whether they go in response to a formal protest from our State Department (and no such protest has yet been lodged, so far as anyone knows) or whether they go because we threaten to drive them out.

In Cuba the Red cancer grows. Now Senator Dirksen, Republican, of Illinois, normally a careful and precise man in his public utterances of import, says that four Americans died in invasion aircraft during the Bay of Pigs fiasco.

It is not known, yet, whether these four men were members of our military forces. The management of news about Cuba has been shocking and calloused beyond recall. It does not matter a great deal—they were Americans and Senator Dirksen takes proper umbrage in protesting the remark of Senator John Stennis, Democrat, of Mississippi, that the Bay of Pigs affair is "spilled milk."

Cuba must be isolated and removed as a mounting platform for armed subversion of Latin America. As Milburn P. Akers, editor of the Sun-Times, noted in his column Friday: "Communist planners, having a foothold in Cuba, intend to use it as a training ground for hordes of guerrillas and saboteurs who will turn many Latin American countries into South Vietnam."

We must not only blockade Cuba—we must also deny the use of the Panama Canal to all ships carrying cargo into and out of Communist Cuba.

Let there be an end to this defeatist philosophy of fearing to offend Russia. When Russia is confronted with the harsh fact that the game is up—as they were confronted in Cuba on October 22—they follow the only course open to them if they hope to survive; they back down.

There will be some who will call this course of confrontation jingoism. There are always those who choose to believe a bully can be won over with soft talk and sweet reason.

Jingoism is an outdated word. A better name is self-preservation.

Panama Canal Company Report

Subject: Annual report of Board of Directors.
Letter to stockholder:

It is very gratifying to report that a record volume of traffic moved through the Panama Canal last year reflecting the canal's expanding role in the steady growth of world oceanborne commerce. The average time spent by ships in Canal Zone waters during transit was reduced to 15.5 hours, compared with 16.5 hours per transit in 1961. This 1 hour reduction in transit time represents a savings of approximately $1 million to our customers.

Waterway improvements progressed on schedule during 1962, and the final contract in the channel widening program will be awarded within the next year.

For the 11th successive year since its reorganization (July 1, 1951), the Panama Canal financed within its resources, and without cost to the taxpayer, all of its operational and capital requirements.

The capital program required expenditures of $16.1 million during the fiscal year. This was the second highest annual expenditure of this nature since the reorganization. The largest single item of capital expenditure was $5.9 million toward widening of the Empire Reach within Gaillard Cut. In the 5 years through fiscal year 1962, a total of $22.8 million has been expended for the channel improvement program and additional expenditures necessary to complete this program will approximate $20.9 million. Other major expenditures in 1962 included $2.3 million on the quarters replacement program, $1.3 million for an additional electric generating plant, $0.6 million on the central air-conditioning plant, and $0.5 million on the new locks towing locomotives.

The funds provided through operations, net revenue, depreciation, etc., were not sufficient to finance capital expenditures and it became necessary to draw down cash reserves to the extent of $1.7 million.

Tolls revenue was at an alltime high of $58.3 million, for transiting 11,340 ships over 300 tons. Comparatively figures for 1961 were $55.2 million and 11,054 ships. The average cost to the shipper per cargo ton was 74.9 cents (excludes vessels transiting in ballast or measured on displacement basis), as compared to 74.8 cents for the previous year. The tolls rate remains unchanged at 90 cents per laden ton under Panama Canal measurement.

On June 29, 1962, the SS *Ancon* was transferred to the U.S. Maritime Administration, Department of Commerce, on a nonreimbursable basis, for ultimate transfer to the State of Maine. Consequently, the equity of the U.S. Government in the Company was reduced some $2 million.

Special emphasis has been given to equality of treatment of all employees. Several programs have been initiated to improve communications with our Spanish-speaking employees as well as our neighbors in the Republic of Panama.

(By order of the Board of Directors.)

Robert J. Fleming, Jr.,
President.

Canal Traffic

Demands for Panama Canal services established new high records for the year. Oceangoing transits increased by 2.6 percent, cargo tonnage by 6 percent, and tolls income by 5.8 percent over the previous record year of 1961. The flags of some 38 nations of the world were represented by the 11,149 commercial transits. Ranked in the order of their transit volume were the flags of the United States, Norway, Great Britain, Germany, and Liberia. Russian ships in trade with Cuba made 12 transits. The average tonnage of transiting commercial vessels increased by 3 percent. The number of large ships with beams of 80 feet and over increased by 6 percent.

Of the 67,525,000 long tons of commercial cargo that passed through the waterway, 96.5 percent originated in or was destined to one of the nations of North, South, or Central America. Some 22,189,000 long tons of U.S. exports, 17,669,000 tons of U.S. imports, and 5,562,000 tons of cargo moving in the U.S. intercoastal trade passed through the canal.

The flow of cargo to the Far East continued to dominate canal traffic growth as it has for the past 3 years. Commercial cargo movements increased 3,855,000 long tons over last year, of which 3,321,000 long tons was increased flow to the Far East. Cargo movements to Japan alone increased 2,700,000 tons. Japan's industrial boom has been reflected in canal traffic. The beginning of the current expansion phase occurred in 1959 when 7,973,000 long tons of cargo passed through the canal to Japan. This year 16,504,000 long tons moved to Japan. Some slowing in the rapid rate of growth in cargo movements to Japan occurred in late fiscal year 1962. Showing a very impressive percentage increase for the year was the volume of cargo moving to Red China and Russia. Cargo movements to Red China totaled 877,000 long tons for an increase of 600 percent and movements to Russia totaled 344,000 long tons for an increase of 48 percent. Sugar movements from Cuba accounted for the vast majority of this combined tonnage. In the return flow of cargo, Red China and Russia shipped 52,000 tons of cargo to Cuba.

Thus cargo movements during 1962 marked another year in the continued phenomenal growth that has occurred in canal traffic since World War II. During this 16-year period, commercial cargo movements have increased 212 percent, an annual average increase of 7.5 percent. Only 1958 failed to surpass the previous year in total tonnage movements.

Mr. BELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RUMSFELD. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BELL. I would like to commend the gentleman from Illinois on his first speech in the House of Representatives and for his very fine and astute analysis of problems of such importance as this.

Mr. RUMSFELD. I thank my colleague.

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RUMSFELD. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, I want to compliment the gentleman from Illinois in the very excellent presentation he has made to the House today and also to suggest that each and every suggestion and warning and advice that can emanate from this House which may help in the solution of the very tense international situation primarily in the area of Cuba is a contribution to the Nation. This important message that we have had today from the gentleman from Illinois is along that line and contributes to that end. He has made a suggestion which provides a forceful and yet a nonbelligerent method of helping to resolve this difficult problem. I compliment the gentleman on the research and study that has evidently gone into the preparation of his remarks. I am confident that the Executive will want to take very careful note of the suggestions and recommendations that have been made. Also, Mr. Speaker, I want to associate myself with the gentleman in the presentation which was given to the House today.

Mr. RUMSFELD. I thank my colleague.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RUMSFELD. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Illinois, my colleague.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I would like to congratulate the gentleman for his remarks here this afternoon. The gentleman is my neighbor to the north and it is certainly a pleasure to see him deliver his maiden speech today in the fine manner that he did and to see him get into the general swim of debate in the House of Representatives. His constituents have every reason to be proud of their Congressman for his maiden speech here today. I am familiar with the Sun-Times recommendation regarding denial of the Panama Canal to ships hauling goods to Communist-dominated Cuba. The gentleman from Illinois is wise in urging the proposal be adopted as part of our policy toward Cuba. This is a sound proposal. I should like to congratulate the gentleman from Illinois on his opening remarks when he said he was not so much concerned about the number of troops or types of weapons in Cuba, but whether or not the very presence of Soviet Communists in Cuba is serving as a base for exporting communism to the entire South American Continent. This is really the heart of the Cuban issue and I hope the gentleman will agree that this is the concept in which President Kennedy is today viewing the entire Cuban situation. He has stated repeatedly that the presence of Communists in Cuba constitutes a menace to this country and this entire hemisphere in that Cuba serves as a base for exporting communism to the rest of the South American Continent.

I believe that the suggestion made by the gentleman today certainly is one that should be given careful consideration as a step toward an overall effort to narrow the ability of the Communists to fortify Cuba economically so they can continue exporting communism to South America. Once we succeed in isolating Cuba economically, I believe we can start looking confidently toward the day when we can eradicate the Communists from Cuba. It has been my judgment for some time that sooner or later the Communists will fall from the weight of their own oppression—not only in Cuba but all over the world. No system has had as dismal a record of failure as the Communist system. Mr. Speaker, I am very happy to congratulate my neighbor to the north of my congressional district, for the significant contribution he has made here today in his maiden speech and certainly, for calling our attention to the excellent editorial which appeared in the Sun-Times. Even though the gentleman and I are of different political parties and beliefs, I am certain I can state with confidence, Mr. RUMSFELD's constituents can be proud of his initial contribution today.

Mr. RUMSFELD. I thank my colleague.

ROGERS CHARGES THAT WEATHER NOT THE REASON FOR CIA MISSILE PHOTO LAG

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LIBONATI). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. ROGERS] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, weather conditions can hardly be the reason why the CIA, according to reports, was unable to produce photos of Russian missiles in Cuba and the Air Force did. From published reports, it appears that the very first Strategic Air Command overflight of Cuba produced the photographs which showed the extent of Russian missiles in Cuba was sufficient for the President to act.

I have compared the weather reports for Cuba during the period September 5 through October 14—the period during which CIA was allegedly conducting aerial intelligence reconnaissance over Cuba. Cloudy to rainy weather prevailed on the days CIA overflights were reportedly conducted. As confirmed by the Department of Defense, aerial reconnaissance of Cuba was performed by the Air Force during the early morning hours of October 14. This is the important point—weather conditions on that morning were generally as cloudy and difficult as those under which the CIA had been operating for the previous 5 weeks. And as the President stated in his speech on October 22 when he came before the Nation to expose the Soviet threat in Cuba, his decision was based on receiving the first preliminary hard missile information the morning of October 16.

Just what is the reason?

In any case, the Congress has a right to review the operations of the CIA. Such review should be conducted by Members of both the House and the Senate in a joint watchdog committee as I have proposed. I urge all Members of Congress to get behind the movement to form this permanent joint watchdog committee for the security of this Nation.

ELLIS ISLAND

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. FARBSTEIN] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, inasmuch as Ellis Island is in the 19th Congressional District which I have the honor to represent, I feel a special interest in the problem of its disposition. Let me recall that it has been more than 7 years since the historic old facility was abandoned, 7 years in which the island has been idle and has been allowed to gradually decay.

Now, there is no need to argue at length for the special importance of this piece of property. Ellis Island is not ordinary real estate to be sold to the highest bidder. Yet unless Congress takes action, the General Services Administration will once again throw the island open to competitive bidding and we may indeed see a commercial project replace the historic buildings.

We are fortunate that there are citizens in our community sufficiently alarmed by this prospect to have organized and to have worked for an alternative. A group of our most distinguished educators has, in the past 2 years, elaborated a detailed, concrete, and practical plan that would convert the existing buildings on Ellis Island into a first-rate new liberal arts college. Their plan would accomplish a double goal; it would preserve all the existing buildings and at the same time it would put them to practical use by meeting the urgent and growing need for more educational facilities.

I think we who have been concerned about the disposition of this property owe much to the educators who have taken the trouble to create an imaginative plan for its use. There are virtues to their proposal which seem to me to be superior to any that have been offered in the 7 years since the island's abandonment. I would like to suggest a few.

In the first place, their proposal helps to meet an immediate and pressing need. We are all, I think, growing aware of the problems that face us in the present shortage of college facilities. The next few years will see an acute crisis. With a facility readily adaptable and crying for use, it would be disgraceful not to seize this opportunity.

Second, the new college has the virtue of putting the historic site to a use which I find most appropriate. Ellis Island once stood for opportunity for millions. Formal higher education has never been so crucial; it has never been so important in opening up opportunity. We cannot handicap our youth by failing to give them the educational chances they need and deserve. But this means we must be alive to every new possibility.

Again, I am much impressed by the public support the proposal has received, so evident in newspaper editorials like the New York Times, the Journal American, the Washington Post, and others. I think it is a most important consideration that the alternative we choose for Ellis Island's future be one that is in the interest of and has the support of the public. We remember the outcry in the past against commercial sale. It was justified. Ellis Island is a monument to a very special and important part of our historical experience. The new college at Ellis Island would preserve the old buildings as a living and fitting memorial to the past.

Because of her special location in the great harbor, thousands of visitors pass Ellis Island daily. Set beside the Statue of Liberty, the symbolic value of the new institution is most important. We must not allow this opportunity to pass. Let us make a farsighted decision. Housing projects, hospitals, and the like are worthy endeavors. But they can be usefully built elsewhere. Let us provide on Ellis Island a new institution that will belong to the Nation, an institution that we will be proud to point to as we pass it in the harbor. Let us preserve the old buildings and put them to appropriate use.

In short, let us back the efforts of the distinguished citizens who want to create a great new liberal arts college on that site. They have worked unselfishly toward that end for a long time. Let us share their vision and help make a new and exciting reality of Ellis Island, one in which we may all partake and one in which we may all take pride.

Toward this end I am today introducing legislation authorizing the Administrator of the General Services Administration to dispose of Ellis Island to the Ellis Island for Higher Education, Inc., of New York for educational purposes.

ONE GENERAL EXPENDITURE AUTHORIZATION FOR EACH FISCAL YEAR

Mr. BELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. Skubitz] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. SKUBITZ. Mr. Speaker, today I introduce a resolution that would provide that the Congress place an annual expenditure limitation on every spending account in the Federal budget. This is a companion resolution to one that was introduced in the Senate on January 24, 1963, by Senator Byrd of Virginia and Senator Williams of Delaware.

There is nothing new about this resolution. Similar ones have been introduced at each session for at least a dozen years, and all of them have ended up in the pigeonholes of unfinished business.

It is my sober judgment that this resolution transcends in importance all other business that will come before the 88th Congress. It is not pleasant to think about, but we now stand with our backs against the fiscal wall. It should now be obvious to even a child that if this Nation is to escape national bankruptcy and runaway inflation, it is going to be necessary for the Congress to regain control of expenditures. This administration, like the three that have preceded, has shown no signs that it intends to embrace fiscal sanity. It has been completely taken in by the political heresy of bug-eyed and long-haired university professors who have been bamboozling the young with the Keynesian theory that the more we spend and waste the more prosperous we shall become. This theory has long since landed on the seashore of exploded delusions, and the sooner we abandon it the better.

It is not necessary here to tell any Member of this House that unless we place an annual limitation against all expenditure authorizations, including current appropriations, unexpended balances and countless other loopholes that invite public waste, that chaos is inevitable. You have all been to school and know it as well as I do.

To delay any longer effective expenditure control amounts to no more than ignoring a grave responsibility of Government that should have been discharged a dozen years ago.

EQUAL RIGHTS

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. Powell] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert in the Record a communication which I have received from a member of my constituency, and an outstanding leader in the field of labor, Mr. L. Joseph Overton, vice president, Negro American Labor Council:

February 22, 1963.

Congressman Adam Clayton Powell,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Adam: This letter may be a little late coming during a time when you may be under the deepest criticism. I sincerely hope that you realize the position you are in is one which has been and will always be criticized throughout history. You are the chairman of one of the greatest committees in the history of our Nation. The top two domestic issues of our Nation are labor and education. The only persons in this position who would not draw criticism would be the ones not doing anything. And an individual not doing anything, and not drawing criticism would mean the same thing—nothing.

Since those who recognize the importance and significance of the operations of your committee know that your job is one which the world would recognize and feel that in lieu of all criticism, the job which has been done by your committee and under your supervision since you have been chairman is one to be hailed by our Nation because of your closeness and understanding of the people for which this committee was established in the Halls of Congress some 80 years ago, has again created the same conflict and condemnation for which came about in the Halls of Congress and the Nation in these ancient years.

It is regrettable that after 100 years since the Emancipation Proclamation, you have to suffer today the pressures and condemnations of that era, but, since the committee of which you are chairman did not complete the work on behalf of the people, the job of creating equal opportunities in employment and education for all American people, the job must be done.

I feel for you in the condemnations and criticisms which are now being launched against you. However, I do believe that your decision to remain in Congress and to continue your struggle to place before the American people the way of a true democracy was the right one and by doing so the future would undoubtedly vindicate your action and position in all of these matters which are now being criticized.

With the above thoughts in mind, I would like to express my personal feeling which I believe is shared by many of the black people of America, and certainly by all of those with whom I am and have been associated. We pledge our fullest support and confidence in your efforts to eradicate all injustices in discrimination in the fields of labor and education that may now exist in our Nation.

Sincerely and fraternally yours,
L. Joseph Overton.

ACCIDENT RATES IN COAL MINES

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Flood] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, in 1962, 289 men were killed in accidents in the U.S. bituminous coal, lignite, and anthracite mines. These fatalities occurred at a frequency rate of 1.20 per million man-hours of exposure, the same as last year which was the second worst year since World War II.

At least 95 percent of all injuries and fatalities in coal mines are preventable and only occur because of the failure of all concerned to apply the knowledge they possess and have not used.

In an analysis of coal mine roof, face, and rib fall fatalities by size of mine and district the Bureau of Mines shows 47 men were killed in title I mines—those employing 14 or less underground—against 66 killed in title II mines—those employing 15 men or more underground. Nearly half such deaths occurred in the so-called small mines in spite of the fact that they produce less than 14 percent of the coal.

Mr. Speaker, I took an active part in the fight to pass Public Law 552 the original Mine Safety Act. At that time I was opposed to the amendment which refused Federal inspectors the power to shut down a mine working less than 15 men underground when an imminent danger was found. I am still opposed to it. I believe that every man who goes down into a hole in the ground is entitled to all the protection the operator, the State, and the Federal Government can give him. I think that every State inspector and every Federal inspector should have that power. I know that men seeking a job are not wholly free. They must work for a living.

They cannot remain idle and must accept offered employment even if it means they are taking their lives in their hands when they do so. They must take care of their wives and children and they do even if it means taking a chance in an unventilated, untimbered, gassy and dusty hole in the ground.

I hope and trust that the 88th Congress will undo the wrong done to the mineworkers of America and provide them with the full protection of Public Law 552, the Federal mine safety bill.

A BILL TO AMEND THE FEDERAL COAL MINE SAFETY ACT SO AS TO PROVIDE FURTHER FOR THE PREVENTION OF ACCIDENTS IN COAL MINES

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Public Law 552, Eighty-second Congress, entitled "An Act to amend Public Law 49, Seventy-seventh Congress, so as to provide for the prevention of major disasters in coal mines", approved July 16, 1952, chapter 877, 66 Stat. 692, 30 U.S.C. 471, be amended by striking out section 201(b) thereof.

THE SUBCONTRACTOR'S RIGHT TO SUE THE GOVERNMENT

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, a major reform needed in the Government's procurement process is to accord to subcontractors the right to recover directly from the Government payment due for labor or material furnished to the prime contractor in prosecution of a Government contract. I have introduced H.R. 4390 to accomplish that reform.

A prime contractor may demand from the Government the payment due under his Government contract, and institute a suit in case of nonpayment. However, although the Government is the beneficiary of the services rendered or supplies furnished under the subcontract, there is no procedure by which the claim of the subcontractor can be presented against the United States except as a claim of the prime contractor. The reason is said to be that there is no contract, express or implied, between the subcontractor and the Government.

Presently, the subcontractor may resort to private litigation in a court of law against the prime contractor for payment due under the subcontract, but a small subcontractor can neither afford the high cost of the usually protracted litigation nor the interminable delays involved. Small contractors are, thus, often forced to submit to offers of settlement which are, in many instances, ruinous. Additionally, the fact that a subcontractor is unable to count on prompt payment by his prime contractor constitutes a definite handicap to the subcontractor and his ability to obtain financing.

This constitutes a clear injustice to the subcontractor and a hardship which, in my opinion, should not be imposed upon him, especially at a time when, due to the increasing complexity and sophistication of military weaponry, it is becoming more and more difficult for small business to obtain a fair share of Government business as prime contractors.

It behooves the Government to deal with the small subcontractor in this matter on the same basis as it deals with the prime contractor, especially since the Government controls subcontracts by requiring the prime contractor to include in the contract certain clauses before it will approve a subcontract. These clauses contain general conditions to the effect that the subcontractor should perform his work in accordance with the provisions of the prime contract, that the Government may inspect, and reject the subcontractor's work, and that the obligations of the subcontractor and prime contractor toward each other should be equivalent to the obligations between the Government and the prime contractor. These clauses grant the Government authority over the subcontractor without assuming corresponding responsibility.

Not only is the Government denying the unpaid subcontractor direct access to the courts for the benefits it is receiving, but it also prohibits its contracting officers to consent to a subcontract containing a clause conferring upon the subcontractor the right to resort to the Government's own administrative procedures—Armed Services Procurement Regulation 3-903.5.

This is an intolerable situation both from the point of view of the small contractor as well as that of the Government. The bill I have introduced will remedy this injustice, in that it will establish privity between the subcontractor and the Government which is now required to enable him to obtain payment for services rendered or supplies furnished to the Government under a subcontract entered into with a prime contractor.

This is a needed amendment and I urge that early action be taken on H.R. 4390 by the Congress.

YOUTH CONSERVATION CORPS MUST BE LARGER

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. HECHLER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Speaker, 1963 is a year of decision.

We must decide this year whether we want this Nation to remain strong in the 1970's and the long future, or whether we will slip downward through inaction and neglect of the greatest natural resource America possesses—the youth of this Nation.

We all know the familiar figures: 1 million more 16-year-olds this year than last year, as a result of the postwar baby boom; unemployment among youths 2½ times the national average. We are all familiar with the social pattern: rising idleness, frustration, juvenile delinquency, crime—all sapping the national strength.

The principle of the Youth Conservation Corps is the most thrilling development since the establishment of the Peace Corps. It is not the most important bill in Congress. I think education is far and away the most important. But youth employment comes a close second.

We have heard a lot of talk about fiscal responsibility. I think this Nation would be highly irresponsible fiscally if we sat on our hands and failed to act to save what could be a lost generation. The fiscally responsible thing to do is to invest a small amount in a program which will pay rich dividends in a stronger America, as our young people develop a sense of responsibility, new skills, and help enrich the value of our vast resources and learn the great lessons of service to their home communities.

Let me turn the focus for a minute on West Virginia, and illustrate why this program is so badly needed. In West Virginia, we first experienced the shock of losing young people right after the Korean conflict. West Virginia paid a bonus to its Korean war veterans, and 44.3 percent of the bonus checks went to out-of-State addresses—thus indicating that the cream of our young work force was leaving the State in the 1950's because they found superior economic opportunities elsewhere.

What is the situation today? The strength of West Virginia's future rests on the shoulders of our young people between the ages of 16 and 21. These young people will not only supply our future leadership, but they will in large part determine the economic future of West Virginia. I am sure everyone is aware that West Virginia has in a sense become a laboratory to determine whether the American economic system can flourish. A lot of local programs have lifted communities up by the bootstraps. For example, in the city of Logan, the Woman's Club won a nationwide award from the General Federation of Woman's Clubs by reason of communitywide effort to bring in a new industry, to provide new employment and recreation opportunities, to lift the face of this largest coal-producing county in the Nation. In 1963, West Virginia's centennial year, this kind of spirited grassroots activity is going on all over the State. The Area Redevelopment Administration, the accelerated public works program and efforts to channel more Federal contracts into West Virginia have generated an economic upturn. We are starting to move in West Virginia.

Now comes this surge of thousands of young people thrown onto the labor market, and here is the crisis which the Youth Employment Act can and must meet. There has been a lot of talk about school dropouts. Between 1960 and 1962, the Office of Education reports that nationwide, the rate of high school graduates rose from 68.5 to 69.7 percent. Nationwide, the dropout rate is still too high, but it did decline in the last 2 years. But while the dropout rate was declining in the Nation, it was rising in the State of West Virginia. During the same period, high school graduates in West Virginia declined from 62.1 percent in 1960 to 59.9 percent in 1962. This means that not only is our dropout rate in West Virginia going in the wrong direction, but in 1962 it was almost 10 percent above the national average.

The national dropout percentage for 1962 was 30.2 percent. For West Virginia, it was 40.1 percent.

In the face of these serious developments, we are taking action in West Virginia. In 1962, the State legislature appropriated $70,000 for a pilot study and experiment in one county—Mercer—in the southern area of the State where there is a high percentage and also a high ratio of school dropouts. The study took 149 school dropouts in Mercer County, and made participation in the program compulsory. An instructional program during the summer months was aimed at preparing the boys for practical jobs. This morning I talked with the State Superintendent of Schools, Rex Smith, about the results of the pilot study. He said that of the 149 enrolled, 114 completed the course. Of the 35 that did not complete the course, some were employed, entered military service, or moved out of the State. Of the 114, 12 returned to school, 9 entered military service, 14 were employed, and 79 were still unemployed at the time the survey was completed last fall.

Superintendent of Schools Smith told me that West Virginia is now applying the experience in this one-county pilot study in other areas of the State. Gov. W. W. Barron reported on Monday of this week that the West Virginia dropout rate is now leveling off, and for the first 3 months of the current school term the rate is considerably lower than the dropout average in recent years. Incidentally, Superintendent of Schools Smith enthusiastically endorsed the principle of the Youth Employment Act and said it would be a step in the right direction.

Recently, the Secretary of Labor reported a very ominous figure: in West Virginia, unemployment of male youths between 16 and 21 in April 1960 was 19.4 percent. The national average in this age bracket is only 10.8 percent.

Unemployment of this age group is two and a half times the national average, as has been pointed out; but in West Virginia, it is nearly four and a half times the national average. Only one State has a higher unemployment rate for young people—Alaska—and, of course, there are special circumstances in Alaska during the winter season, among the Eskimos, and in certain areas of that State.

In the next 4 years, 95,000 to 100,000 young people lacking the benefit of a specialized skill will be entering the labor market in our State, or else migrating to other States because they cannot find work. More positive measures must be taken immediately to provide a reasonable training program for young people in order to help these young people acquire some constructive work experience.

The State of West Virginia has experimented in many programs which have provided some measure of the success of the type of approach used in the Youth Employment Act. The State spent $50,000 in rehabilitating 95 delinquent boys at a State-operated forestry-conservation camp near Davis, W. Va. In the 2-year period involved these young men accomplished some $200,000 worth of constructive conservation work. It would have cost more than $50,000 if these youngsters had been confined or maintained in idleness. Yet the major dividend is the healthful, purposeful outdoor life provided and the skills learned in the rehabilitation process.

One important point here is that voluntary opportunities for this type of healthful outdoor work are not available to those unemployed youths who are not delinquent—or who may be potential delinquents in the near future.

The Youth Employment Act would offer our young people hope for the future and would give them a chance to perform useful activities which would benefit both themselves and their State. The Federal land in West Virginia totals 950,000 acres, and State-owned land 220,000 acres. We have 19 State parks, 9 State forests, and 12 hunting areas. This morning I talked with State director of national resources, Dr. Warden Lane, and he told me:

> I would give anything to get some young people working in these areas.

And Dr. Lane added that he could use all we could get for him. Dr. Lane enthusiastically endorsed the principle of the bill.

Title I is a very appealing part of the bill, since we have the tremendously successful experience of the Civilian Conservation Corps to build on. But the amounts are pitifully small. I can see the force of the argument that we should not bring in too many youngsters to exceed accommodations. But 15,000 is barely enough to slow down a few forest fires, let alone carry out some of the more constructive conservation programs. Surely, we cannot expect 15,000 to contribute much toward solving the youth unemployment problem of our Nation. Take West Virginia, for example. Under title I, I am informed that 225 young men might be eligible for our State. You have heard the conditions which confront us; yet a 15,000-man program would mean only 4 boys per county in West Virginia. I cannot understand the timidity which would dictate that kind of total. This is worse than competing for a college scholarship to get a slot in the Youth Conservation Corps, if they figure on those kind of totals. Furthermore, the ultimate limit or ceiling of 60,000 is fantastically low. The CCC was nearly ten times that size at a time when the country's population was much smaller. Our own Department of National Resources annually employs 300 young men between the ages of 17 and 20 in our State parks. The Federal program would seem very small in comparison to what the State is already doing.

Under title II, the local area youth employment program, the numbers provided for are a little larger, but still too small for the problem. There is another suggestion which I have for title II. In section 206, provision is made for the Federal Government to pay up to 50 percent of the costs. This means additional matching funds which just simply are not available. The States and localities are just about matched to death financially already. Along came the accelerated public works program and we are squeezed some more and some communities could not even put up 25 percent in very depressed areas.

Now I recognize that any larger Federal contribution under title II would result in fewer young people being able to take advantage of the total program, but I think some of the very hard-hit areas should receive a larger percentage of Federal contribution. Perhaps for the first year of the program, the Federal Government could provide the seed money at 100 percent of the contribution to get the program off the ground, and thereafter the type of formula used by the Public Works Acceleration Act could be employed; that is, a sliding scale between 50 and 75 percent on the basis of a formula including unemployment rate and median family income in the area.

If such provisions were not included in title II, I am afraid that those areas and communities in the Nation which need help the most and can least afford to put up the matching funds will end up not fully participating in the program.

To summarize, I believe this is a great program in principle, but it must be bolder in its approach. It must be larger in scope, and should give attention to the serious financial crisis of the areas it is designed to help.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent leave of absence was granted to Mr. MORTON (at the request of Mr. HALLECK), for March 4, 5, and 6, 1963, on account of official business.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. PELLY, for 10 minutes today.

Mr. MCCULLOCH, for 30 minutes, today.

Mr. RUMSFELD, for 30 minutes, today.

Mr. HOLIFIELD, for 30 minutes, today, and to revise and extend his remarks.

Mr. ROOSEVELT, for 2 hours, on Wednesday next.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. TAFT (at the request of Mr. BELL), for 5 minutes, on Monday next.

Mr. FARBSTEIN (at the request of Mr. ALBERT), for 15 minutes, today and to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. ALGER, for 30 minutes, on Wednesday next.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. SNYDER.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. BELL) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. DEROUNIAN.

Mr. CURTIS.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. GIBBONS) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. DINGELL.

Mr. NATCHER.

Mr. PATTEN.

Mr. MACDONALD.

Mr. TAYLOR.

Mr. UDALL and to include certain tables.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND ON CIVIL RIGHTS DISCUSSION

Mr. BELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who took part in the discussion on civil rights be granted permission to revise and extend their remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LIBONATI). Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 45 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, March 4, 1963, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

488. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States transmitting a report on the review of the programing, delivery, and utilization of selected missile system equipment delivered to European countries under the military assistance program; to the Committee on Government Operations.

489. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense, transmitting the sixth report on property acquisitions of emergency supplies and equipment by the Office of Civil Defense, Department of Defense, for the quarter ending December 31, 1962, pursuant to the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950, as amended; to the Committee on Armed Services.

490. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting the 62d quarterly report on export control covering the 4th quarter, 1962, pursuant to the Export Control Act of 1949; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

491. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the review of unnecessary planned procurement of generators by the Department of the Army; to the Committee on Government Operations.

492. A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting the report of the Archivist of the United States on records proposed for disposal under the law; to the Committee on House Administration.

493. A letter from the president, Boys' Clubs of America, transmitting an audited financial statement of Boys' Clubs of America for the year 1962, pursuant to Public Law 988, 84th Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

494. A letter from the Administrative Assistant Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a report on the extraordinary contractual actions to facilitate the national defense, of the U.S. Coast Guard for the calendar year 1962, pursuant to Public Law 85–804; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

495. A letter from the executive vice president, National Fund for Medical Education, transmitting a report of an audit of the National Fund for Medical Education for the year ended December 31, 1962, pursuant to Public Law 685, 86th Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

496. A letter from the Chairman, U.S. Civil Service Commission, transmitting a report relating to positions in grades 16, 17, and 18 of the general schedule of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, pursuant to Public Law 854, 84th Congress; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

497. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice, transmitting a report relating to refugee operations during the fifth 6-month period ending December 31, 1962, and reporting that refugee operations were conducted in Austria, Belgium, France, Germany, Greece, Italy, and Lebanon, countries in which the Department of State has determined that refugee situations exist, pursuant to Public Law 87–510; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. DORN:

H.R. 4378. A bill to prohibit interstate contributions in connection with congressional primaries and elections and with elections for electors of the President; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mrs. DWYER:

H.R. 4379. A bill to authorize assistance to public and other nonprofit institutions of higher education, including junior colleges and technical institutes, in financing the contruction, rehabilitation, or improvement of needed academic and related facilities; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. FARBSTEIN:

H.R. 4380. A bill to prevent the use of stopwatchers or other measuring devices in the postal service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. FINO:

H.R. 4381. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to permit for 1 year, the granting of national service life insurance to certain veterans heretofore eligible for such insurance; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 4382. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to authorize the President, during periods of acute unemployment, to provide that all individuals otherwise eligible may retire with full benefits thereunder at age 60; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FLOOD:

H. R. 4383. A bill to amend the Federal Coal Mine Safety Act so as to provide further for the prevention of accidents in coal mines; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. KARTH:

H.R. 4384. A bill to amend section 9(b)(3) of the National Labor Relations Act in order to permit labor organizations representing guards to be admitted to certain affiliations of labor organizations; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. LANGEN:

H.R. 4385. A bill to donate to the Minnesota Chippewa Tribe, White Earth Indian Reservation, some submarginal lands of the United States, and to make such lands parts of the reservation involved; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 4386. A bill to amend the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 to provide for more effective evaluation of fiscal requirements of the executive agencies of the Government of the United States; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. LANKFORD:

H.R. 4387. A bill to provide that employees whose basic compensation is fixed and adjusted from time to time in accordance with prevailing rates by wage boards or similar administrative authority serving the same purpose, shall be paid on a weekly basis; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MATHIAS:

H.R. 4388. A bill to amend title I and XVI of the Social Security Act to permit a State to establish or designate a separate agency to administer the portion of its State plan relating to medical assistance for the aged; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MORRISON:

H.R. 4389. A bill relating to the tariff classification of woven fabrics in chief value of wool and in part of braid; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MULTER:

H.R. 4390. A bill to amend the Small Business Act; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. NYGAARD:

H.R. 4391. A bill to amend the Civil Rights Act of 1957, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'KONSKI:

H.R. 4392. A bill to amend the Small Business Act to authorize the provision of contracting and procurement assistance to business concerns otherwise qualifying therefor, even though they are not independently owned and operated, if they are located in depressed areas; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 4393. A bill to amend the public assistance provisions of the Social Security Act to prohibit any State or political subdivision from imposing a lien against an individual's property as a condition of aid or assistance; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. OLSEN of Montana:

H.R. 4394. A bill to govern the harvesting of Indian timber; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 4395. A bill to amend section 3574 of title 39, relating to nightwork compensation; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 4396. A bill to increase night differential to 15 percent; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 4397. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act, as amended, to change the computation of annuity; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 4398. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act to increase the survivor annuity from 55 to 75 percent of the principal annuity in certain cases, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. PUCINSKI:

H.R. 4399. A bill creating a commission to be known as the Commission on Noxious and Obscene Matters and Materials; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. PURCELL:

H.R. 4400. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to exempt certain farm vehicles from the highway use tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RIEHLMAN:

H.R. 4401. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code to assist small and independent business, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RIVERS of Alaska:

H.R. 4402. A bill to establish a land and water conservation fund to assist the States and Federal agencies in meeting present and future outdoor recreation demands and needs of the American people, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 4403. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to include Alaska among those States which are permitted to divide their retirement sysems into two parts for purposes of obtaining social security coverage under Federal-State agreement; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SECREST:

H.R. 4404. A bill to authorize waiver of indebtedness growing out of erroneous payments by the Armed Forces to military personnel or their dependents, to bar recovery of these payments if recovery action is not initiated within 6 years of payment, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4405. A bill to increase rates of death compensation payable under laws administered by the Veterans' Administration; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BOB WILSON:

H.R. 4406. A bill to make permanent the temporary provisions of Public Laws 815 and 874, 81st Congress, which relate to Federal assistance in the construction and operation of schools in areas affected by Federal activities; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 4407. A bill to amend the Assignment of Claims Act of 1940, as amended, with respect to priority of assignments; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4408. A bill to repeal the excise tax on amounts paid for communication services or facilities; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WILSON of Indiana:

H.R. 4409. A bill to insure the awarding of defense contracts on a basis of merit through requiring a public record of ex parte communications with respect to such contracts, requiring disclosure of the reasons for awarding of such contracts, and establishing a congressional committee to oversee negotiated contracts; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. MACGREGOR:

H.R. 4410. A bill to amend the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 to provide for more effective evaluation of the fiscal requirements of the executive agencies of the Government of the United States; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. MORSE:

H.R. 4411. A bill to prohibit the Postmaster General from intentionally issuing defective stamps; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. O'KONSKI:

H.R. 4412. A bill to provide uniformity in determinations of disability made by departments and agencies of the United States by requiring the use of the standard schedule for rating disabilities prescribed by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. PATMAN (by request):

H.R. 4413. A bill to repeal certain legislation relating to the purchase of silver, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. ROBERTS of Alabama:

H.R. 4414. A bill to provide for the establishment of Fort Toulouse as a national historic site; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 4415. A bill to improve, strengthen, and accelerate programs for the prevention and abatement of air pollution; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WATSON:

H.R. 4416. A bill to provide for the retirement of the public debt; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. ASPINALL:

H.J. Res. 293. Joint resolution to designate the lake to be formed by the waters impounded by the Flaming Gorge Dam, Utah, and the recreation area contiguous to such lake in the States of Wyoming and Utah, as "O'Mahoney Lake and Recreation Area"; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. SMITH of Virginia:

H.J. Res. 294. Joint resolution amending section 201(a) of the Budget and Accounting Act of 1921, as amended; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. WATSON:

H.J. Res. 295. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to provide that appropriations shall not exceed revenues of the United States, except in time of war or national emergency; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SKUBITZ:

H. Con. Res. 104. Concurrent resolution providing for one general expenditure authorization act for each fiscal year, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. FINO:

H. Res. 271. Resolution creating a select committee to conduct a study of the fiscal organization and procedures of the Congress; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. MAHON:

H. Res. 272. Resolution to amend rule XXI of the Rules of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. WATSON:

H. Res. 273. Resolution to amend rule XVIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives to require that certain information be contained in committee reports accompanying general appropriation bills; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By Mr. LIBONATI: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Illinois, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to an amendment to the Internal Revenue Code of 1954; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RHODES of Arizona: House Memorial No. 1, of the Arizona House of Representatives, adopted February 8, 1963, urging the Congress of the United States to authorize the immediate cessation of printing of all $1 silver certificates which do not bear the inscription "In God We Trust"; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Idaho, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to call a convention for the purpose of proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Kansas, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to call a convention for the purpose of proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to article V thereof; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CELLER:

H.R. 4417. A bill for the relief of Bryan Simpson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4418. A bill for the relief of Louise Knibbs; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FARBSTEIN:

H.R. 4419. A bill to authorize the Administrator of General Services Administration to dispose of Ellis Island for educational purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. MONAGAN:

H.R. 4420. A bill for the relief of Laura Do Nascimento; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4421. A bill for the relief of Manuel Pires-Mestre; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TOLL:

H.R. 4422. A bill to waive the statute of limitations in a certain case; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Young Citizens in Action

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. NATCHER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 28, 1963

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, this year the week of March 2 through 9 has been set aside as National 4-H Club Week and once again it is a pleasure to salute these clubs which are dedicated to the development of multiple programs serving many varying needs. The 4-H Club work does indeed belong to the people and rightfully inspires a reaffirmation of our faith in our country when we realize the vital part such organizations play in preparing our youth of today for their mature responsibilities of tomorrow.

The phenomenal growth of the system of 4-H Clubs, initiated in the early years of this century, is due to a dynamic program of education functioning through our State land-grant colleges and universities in cooperation with the Federal Extension Service of the Department of Agriculture. In addition to this leadership at the national level, the State extension services provide helpful direction as do the more than 307,750 unpaid volunteer local leaders who are assisted by about 114,960 older club boys and girls designated as junior leaders. Working together also for the betterment of the

4-H movement are two nongovernment organizations, the National 4-H Club Foundation and the National 4-H Service Committee.

Ample proof of the effectiveness and wisdom in providing Federal funds to assist in conducting 4-H Club work is found in the fact that, since 1914, when Federal legislation was passed for this purpose, nearly 22,830,400 different young people have participated in this "learn by doing" program.

The widespread changes in agricultural technology have created new 4-H needs and these needs are being met squarely by these young people who now have a breakdown of 51 percent from farm homes; 29 percent from rural nonfarm homes; and 20 percent from urban localities. Present-day challenges make it neither possible nor desirable for all farm youth to stay on farms and accordingly, rural members and others are trained to become well-rounded citizens equipped to earn and serve in many fields. The number of projects available to 4-H'ers range from about 25 in some States to approximately 100 in others and constitute an incredibly diversified group of programs which have had and will continue to have far-reaching benefits individually and collectively at every level.

In view of today's urgent need for worldwide understanding between the people of all nations, it is indeed gratifying that the National 4-H Club Foundation conducts an international people-to-people program through its International Farm Youth Exchange and its Peace Corps projects. Each year, approximately 115 U.S. delegates from the Youth Exchange are sent abroad to contribute to the social and economic growth and expansion of some 65 countries. In like manner, the same number of young people are brought to this country under this program designed to promote an exchange of ideas, aims, and purposes.

More and more it becomes evident that our Nation, and indeed the world, needs youth organizations such as the 4-H Clubs, because, if the United States is to lead the free world down the road to a lasting peace, our youth must be adequately prepared to meet the challenges which tomorrow holds.

Again, Mr. Speaker, I want to say that it is a pleasure as well as a privilege to salute this outstanding organization which has well earned worldwide commendation for past achievements and I am sure has the best wishes of all of us for continuing successes in its many fine and worthwhile endeavors.

Medical Care for the Aged

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAT McNAMARA

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 28, 1963

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, on Tuesday last, Congressman Frank Thompson, Jr., of New Jersey, debated the medicare issue with Dr. Annis of the American Medical Association. Congressman Thompson's speech is so lucid and persuasive that it should be made available to all Members of the Congress.

In his speech, the Congressman quotes a brief poem concerning a disease, the symptoms of which we have seen in congressional lobbies all too often. It goes as follows:

If you make a diagnosis
Of the medical psychosis
That is now identifiable as AMA disease,
You would find that hypertension
Is induced by any mention
Of a method whereby patients could afford
their doctor's fees.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the entire speech be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Speech by Hon. Frank Thompson, Jr., Democrat, of New Jersey, at the University of Illinois

Students and faculty of the University of Illinois, ladies and gentlemen—it is a pleasure and an honor for me to be here tonight. It is a pleasure because I will be talking about one of the most significant and humane pieces of social legislation in the Nation's history. It is an honor because I can defend and advocate this great measure to you.

I am talking about the proposal—introduced in the Congress again this year—to provide our elderly with adequate insurance under social security against unmanageable hospital costs.

My opponent this evening is not only a speaker trained to smooth perfection since college debating days, he is also a doctor. And as such, I thought he might appreciate this little poem which appeared in the Reporter magazine several years back. It goes like this:

"If you make a diagnosis
Of the medical psychosis
That is now identifiable as AMA disease,
You would find that hypertension
Is induced by any mention
Of a method whereby patients could afford
their doctors' fees."

Of course, we are not talking about doctors' fees this evening. We are talking about hospital costs. We are talking about our aged population, which is a low-income group with extra-high health needs and inadequate means of paying for care. We are talking about a measure which proposes to do something about this sorry situation.

The tart little poem I cited does serve a purpose. In a crisp manner it isolates the major source of opposition to this much-needed social legislation.

That opposition comes from the doctors' trade union—the American Medical Association. It is the only group with a professional speaker-president touring the country criticizing this measure. The workers of the Nation, who pay into social security, are not up in arms against this program—they are for it. The workers' employers have not seen fit to mount such a campaign of obstructionism, nor the hospitals, nor the insurance industry.

And so I am glad that it is the AMA which is representing the negative side in this debate.

It has been less than 2 years since Dr. Annis assumed his first official position in the AMA. But in that time as chairman of the speakers' bureau and now as president-elect he has spoken widely and too often irresponsibly on the subject of health insurance for the aged.

I think it is now high time to have a close look at some of the charges being leveled by Dr. Annis this evening and in the recent past.

The first problem to consider is why there has been such concerted effort in the last several years by the Kennedy administration, concerned Congressmen, and private citizens to provide the aged with social security hospital insurance. Are the aged a low-income group? Do they have high health costs? Are they having trouble meeting these costs?

According to Dr. Annis the answer is "No" once, "No" twice, and "No" again. In a speech last month to the Economic Club of Detroit, Dr. Annis had this to say about the financial status of the aged:

"Turn to your own University of Michigan. Its recent survey committee reported that great majorities and great numbers of our senior citizens are well able to provide for themselves. Think among those of your own membership and the members of the community beyond the age of 65 who are still among the sultans of industry."

Now I submit that a person with a cash income of $20 a week is hardly a sultan of anything. Twenty dollars a week equals $1,000 a year and that, my friends, is the annual cash income of more than half the 17½ million elderly citizens of this affluent society.

That figure is the latest estimate of the U.S. Bureau of the Census.

But let us look at the University of Michigan report which led Dr. Annis to the extraordinary conclusion that our aged possess the luxuries of sultans.

The report found (and I quote): "Not only do older spending units have substantially lower incomes than younger ones, but low incomes are commonly temporary among young families and permanent among the aged."

Dr. Annis, who has eight children, has tried to confuse the issue by saying 90 percent of his family has income of less than $500.

He knows perfectly well that in the over-65 age group three-quarters of all families consist of two persons. And the median income for them in 1960 was $2,530.

Do the aged have extra high health costs? A year ago Dr. Annis told the Senate Special Committee on Aging that "most of our senior citizens are healthy and require little medical attention."

Not according to the U.S. national health survey.

The survey shows that 9 out of 10 aged can expect to be hospitalized at least once during their retirement, 2 out of 3 aged at least twice and 1 out of 3 at least 3 times.

Moreover the aged can expect their hospital stays to be at least twice as long as those of younger people and their bills to be twice as large. An elderly person will get an average bill of $700 for his hospital stay. For those 300,000 aged who annually must spend more than 30 days in hospitals, the average bill will be in excess of $1,000.

These expenses have zoomed all out of proportion with the income of the aged since Social Security was passed in the 1930's. In the decade of the fifties alone, medical costs went up by 36 percent and hospitalization rose by 65 percent. Where hospital costs were $9 a day in 1946, they are now around $35 a day.

These figures have spiralled for a number of reasons. In part, because all prices have risen; in part because hospitals are catching up with prevailing wage levels. But mostly it is because of the tremendous strides made in curative medicine, much of it due to Government-financed research. Of this we are very proud.

We are proud enough to want our aged to share in these new benefits. At the moment, too many of them cannot. The increased expense of medicine has caused a major breach in the economic protection we seek to provide to the elderly. A nation which cherishes the values of independence and self-reliance, and which has undertaken to maintain these values through a far-reaching system of social insurance, can hardly afford to leave this breach unclosed.

But just as Dr. Annis doesn't believe the aged are a low-income group, just as he doesn't believe they have higher than average medical expenses, so doesn't he believe they have any trouble meeting their bills.

In his statement to the Senate Special Aging Committee, Dr. Annis said all but the completely indigent can provide for their own health care needs through voluntary insurance plans.

Would that were the case. The said fact is that half the aged who must pay an average hospital bill of $700 have their savings wiped out. They must then beg from relatives or borrow from banks at high rates because they are poor credit risks. In about one case out of five, they must go to public welfare or charity agencies for help.

The Massachusetts General Hospital reported in 1961 that one-third of its annual deficit is accounted for by unpaid bills of the aged.

Hearings of the Senate Special Aging Committee—held around the country—are full of tragic tales that might enlighten Dr. Annis to the true plight of the elderly.

But does Dr. Annis really think our aged can adequately meet their health bills? Does Dr. Annis consider it sufficient that 4 out of 10 older families have either no liquid assets or less than $200 in such assets?

I doubt it, because I do not think Dr. Annis considers doctors that much different from other people who have retired. Why then did medical economics—a magazine for which Dr. Annis has served as editor-at-large—recently offer this piece of retirement advice to physicians: Do not set your financial sights far below the $200,000 nest-egg needed for old-age security or you will be in trouble. I ask the doctor if there isn't a notable difference between $200,000 and $200?

Dr. Annis believes the aged can be neatly split into two groups—those who are so indigent they need a handout and those so wealthy they can afford any size medical bill.

The former are well provided for, according to Dr. Annis, by State welfare agencies and Kerr-Mills programs.

The latter find what little assistance they need in the high-premium, small benefit private health insurance that is available to the aged. Let us look at these suppositions.

The Kerr-Mills Act—passed in 1960—has two parts. The first is an increase in a 10-year-old program of Federal support of medical care for recipients of old-age assistance—usually referred to as OAA. The second part is a new Federal-State program of medical assistance for the aged—known as MAA. MAA was meant to provide relief for a whole new segment of the aged, who can be described as "medically needy."

These are persons whose income and resources are too high to qualify them for OAA public assistance but still too low to meet the costs of medical care.

It is obvious that MAA was meant as a specialized supplement to hard-pressed and flagging State welfare programs. It is thus absurdly misleading for Dr. Annis to state (and I quote) "That under the terms of the Kerr-Mills law any State can set up any provision to provide any and all total medical care for its senior citizens."

Kerr-Mills has not even been able to do the much smaller task assigned to it: To date only 25 States and 3 territories have enacted Kerr-Mills programs and of these only 3 or 4 States can be said to have comprehensive plans. Most States simply do not have the funds to match Federal grants. Thus half the States have no programs and 21 other States have totally inadequate ones.

The inequities of the Kerr-Mills system are appalling. In November three States received 70 percent of the Federal matching funds. The three States—New York, California, and Massachusetts—had 63 percent of all recipients, made 72 percent of the payments, although they had only 22 percent of the Nation's aged population.

Among the poorer States struggling to create the illusion of adequate Kerr-Mills programs we find such things as the following: Eligibility limited to individuals with annual incomes of less than $1,200 or $1,500. Hospital care limited to 6 days per admission in one State, 10 days per year in another and in several States care is provided only in life endangering or sight endangering cases.

What is perhaps most disappointing of all is the gradually emerging fact that the States are not using MAA to help a new group of the aged—the medically needy. Instead they are switching former recipients of OAA to MAA. Thus the States benefit because of the larger Federal payments in the latter program. As of September 75,987 former OAA recipients had been switched to MAA plans. In Massachusetts, the welfare director estimated he has saved $15 million by such transfers.

Furthermore, Kerr-Mills is proving to be—in the words of the New York Times—"An administrative monstrosity." This is no wonder. There are 25 different programs—one for each State. There is the need for annual appropriation of funds by each State and the Federal Government. And most of all there is the means test. To check out an applicant for MAA, to shuffle through all his records, to quiz his relatives, to completely strip away his dignity costs about $40 a person each time and some persons must be tested more than once.

It is no wonder that Tennessee is spending more on red tape than on MAA benefits; it is no wonder that in 1961 the cost of administering the MAA program in Kentucky was 124 percent of the amount paid for medical expenses and it is no wonder that it costs Oregon 38 cents for every $1 of benefits.

And is it any wonder that the other 25 States are hesitant to adopt Kerr-Mills?

Dr. Annis used to say that all our States—including his own, Florida—would shortly have MAA programs. He has had to change his tune. In recent speeches, he has been claiming that those States which don't have MAA programs don't need them—including Florida.

Which States don't need these programs? Rich ones that have them like New York, California, and Massachusetts or lower income States which don't have MAA like Mississippi, North Carolina, and Florida? The rich States already had adequate programs before MAA: the poor States still don't.

Let us take Dr. Annis' Florida for example. In testimony before the Senate Special Aging Committee, the doctor said, "Florida is presently implementing the aim and objective of the Kerr-Mills law, namely to provide medical and/or surgical care when necessary to any of our senior citizens."

Now I submit that it is difficult to be too bountiful to any and all your senior citizens when Florida has the most strict residence requirement permitted by Federal law.

A person who has not lived in Florida at least 5 years cannot expect any help through the Old-Age Assistance program—this from a State that gains so much from being a retirement center. A University of Florida economist told the Senate committee that retirement income provides Florida the same kind of expenditures as tourism: It is money in a sense that comes in from outside. Apparently Florida is happy to have its economy bolstered by retired people spending money there but it stacks its welfare against them.

There is more to be said about the Florida OOA program. Only 11 percent of the State's aged receive OOA, even though a very large proportion of the elderly couples there have less than $2,500 a year income and a majority of widows have less than $1,000.

These are the conditions that lead Dr. Annis to tell us that Florida doesn't need a Kerr-Mills MAA program, much less anything else.

Dr. Annis' other supposition is that all the aged who are not indigent can afford private insurance policies which provide adequate coverage. Can they afford these policies and are they adequate?

A little over half the aged have private insurance now. Dr. Annis says that 80 to 90 percent will have it by 1970. Beside the fact that those presently covered have inadequate policies for the most part, the projected growth figures of Dr. Annis are preposterous. They are even higher than those of the insurance industry.

The doctor knows that the aged who have not been signed up in the 5-year crash program to extend coverage to the elderly are the highest cost risks and those least able to pay for insurance.

Half of those with insurance now have Blue Cross, and Blue Cross says it cannot afford to sell any more to the aged at present prices. Blue Cross premiums have already gone up 83 percent in the last 12 years.

The State of Washington provides a grim example of what Blue Cross is presently offering the aged. There, a couple can get health insurance for $27.50 a month—or $334 a year. This huge sum doesn't include Blue Shield.

And this huge sum doesn't cover preexisting conditions; or hernia, cardiac, vascular, cancerous or tumorous conditions until after 12 months of coverage. Thankfully, most Blue Cross plans for the aged cost less even if they don't offer more. The average around the country for an elderly couple is $144 a year.

The private insurance companies are doing little better. The much heralded noncancellable plans for the aged usually have a safety catch. The Connecticut Plan, for example, has annual and lifetime maximums, which makes the noncancellable face dubious indeed. Furthermore, there is a $100 deductible, 20 percent coinsurance, the cost of excluded medical items and for this package a couple would be asked to pay $408 a year and up.

Paid-up-at-age-65 plans aren't much help either. Couples nearing retirement can't afford them and the benefits offered are meaningless to younger people, because the amount of insurance bought might be worthless in 20 years upon retirement if hospital charges go up 500 percent as they have in the past 20 years.

This situation is not the fault of the insurance companies. There is simply no way for profitmaking organizations with small numbers of policyholders relative to the social security system to cover the aged without charging extravagant fees.

If private insurance would concentrate on covering those under 65 who are, as a whole, good risks and offering supplementary coverage to the aged, there would be more than enough business. Life insurance has had its greatest growth since social security was enacted. The same will be true of health insurance, once hospital coverage for the aged is added to social security.

The social security approach has the support of a majority of Americans. Poll after poll shows it. The approach has recently been copied by Republicans in the Senate. It has received endorsement from such solid

Republicans as Marian Folson, former Secretary of HEW under Eisenhower and from Ike's special advisor Arthur Larson. Conservative-oriented magazines, including Life, Time, and Business Week, have plunked for it. And just last week in a letter to the Senate Special Aging Committee, the Saturday Evening Post joined the growing list of endorsers.

What are these substantial people and organizations endorsing? They are backing a program which would provide 90 days of hospital care, 180 days of care in a skilled nursing home, 240 home health visits and diagnostic services rendered by the outpatient departments of hospitals.

They are backing a program that would cover nearly 100 percent of those over 65.

They are endorsing a program that would be financed by a one-fourth of 1 percent increase in the social security payroll tax.

They are endorsing a program that will cost the highest paid eligible worker $17.16 a year and the average-paid worker $12 a year. Put those figures next to the $144, the $408 annual cost of private plans.

The social security mechanism can handle the aged's hospital insurance needs at reasonable rates because of the number in the system and because the system is so efficiently run. Administrative costs run at about 3 percent of every dollar handled compared with the 50 percent and up costs of private and Kerr-Mills programs.

Social security health insurance is not intended to cover everything, as Dr. Annis has often said. There is, for example, a $90 deductible, there are time limits—though liberal—for any one illness and there are no funds for doctors' bills or drugs. These conservative aspects of the program are, to my mind, as important as the liberal ones.

Congress is charged by the Constitution to "promote the general welfare," not "provide for it." This plan, like social security itself, is a floor program on which people can build to meet their own standards through additional savings and supplemental insurance.

This program has singled out hospital costs because these are the least budgetable, most catastrophic health costs confronting the aged. By insuring the elderly against the financial ravages of serious illness, we remove the haunting fear that they will suddenly be turned from self-sufficient citizens into applicants for alms. In short, we add a sense of security, a measure of dignity and a new dimension of happiness to their retirement years.

But it would be more accurate to say they do this for themselves.

For the essential characteristic—the real genius—of the social security mechanism, is that every American can pay during his working years for benefits after he retires. As the Supreme Court has said, social security allows every man to earn a retirement unmarred by economic dependency. It has become one of his unalienable rights.

These features of the system have never particularly impressed Dr. Annis or the AMA. They are opposing this health insurance plan with many of the same arguments and much of the same phraseology they originally displayed in opposing social security, in opposing Blue Cross and in opposing benefit programs for Government employees.

Dr. Annis' charges, implications and innuendos against the program are too numerous to answer in full. But his major attacks should not go unanswered.

He has sought to undermine confidence in the whole social security system by claiming the Supreme Court has ruled it isn't insurance. The Court has done just the opposite. Dr. Annis always fails to mention that he refers to the opinion of an Eisenhower Solicitor General arguing in the case, Fleming versus Nestor.

The Court's ruling in that case reads as follows:

"The social security system may be accurately described as a form of social insurance, enacted pursuant to Congress' power to spend money in aid of the general welfare."

Dr. Annis has further sought to undermine confidence in social security by suggesting that it is financially unsound. In Detroit he pointed out that the system is presently unfunded by $330 billion and concluded with what sounded suspiciously like a call for repeal of social security. He said, "the day is coming when we are going to have to take a second look at this system."

Dr. Annis has twisted a known and obvious fact when he discloses that social security does not maintain the reserve that an insurance company with the same liability would have to maintain. To build such a reserve would be unnecessary and foolish, for unlike an insurance company the Government does not have to reckon on going out of business.

The financing of social security is too long a story to go into here, but the method of financing has been studied again and again by distinguished experts and each time—most recently in 1959—it has been given a clean bill of health.

Dr. Annis has sought to instill the fear of Government control of medicine. He knows the legislation in question specifically forbids Government control of any kind over the practice of medicine. He knows that the accrediting and admitting procedures for hospitals were written into the bill at the urging of the American Hospital Association. He knows that Government has no control over those procedures. He knows that 38,000 of the 50,000 physicians he charges will be controlled by the Government are actually interns and residents on salary at the hospitals.

Dr. Annis has sought to instill the fear that patients will lose their freedom of choice. He knows that this measure is only a means of paying the bills. Patients will choose their doctors, follow their advice and go to the hospitals of their choice as they always have in the past. It is Kerr-Mills that takes away a patient's freedom. For under this act, he can be assigned to any welfare or county hospital that the State chooses.

Dr. Annis has sought to stir up class antagonism by raising the specter of a hoard of rich people benefiting from this program. I ask what rich people? Three-tenths of 1 percent of those over 65 have incomes of $50,000 or more and only 3 percent have incomes of $10,000 or more.

To ferret out the wealthy would require a degrading means test that would weigh just as degradingly on the other 97 percent of the aged. And as we have learned from Kerr-Mills experience, a means test would cost more to operate than it would save for the program by excluding the wealthy. The rich are already doing pretty well by the Government. In the top tax bracket, 91 percent of medical expenses can be written off as tax deductions.

And finally Dr. Annis invariably raises the specter of socialism. This program is socialistic, he says, and is only an entering wedge to very broad Government health insurance.

Except for the aged, our population is well taken care of by private health insurance. This program is meant to meet a particular need and it is a complete program. In itself, the program has nothing to do with socialism. It provides for insurance, not care; the Government does not own the hospitals which do provide care nor does it employ the doctors who prescribe care.

I have always considered this accusation the most revealing of the AMA's true feelings. It shows what they are really concerned about * * * not the condition of the aged but the slim chance that in some future time someone might want to socialize the AMA. Thus they obstruct a good and needed program because of a bad and unfounded fear.

And they have the gall to attribute their selfish motivation to those of us who back social security health insurance for the elderly. Well, they are wrong. We have not the slightest interest in the bogus issue of socializing medicine. But we are vitally committed to providing adequate health insurance to the aged as a matter of right and not on the basis of indigence. We believe that as many people as possible should be spared the degrading need for public assistance. The American Medical Association thinks that a means test and public assistance should be acceptable to everyone. This is our difference.

Thank you.

An Address of Congressman Horace R. Kornegay

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROY A. TAYLOR

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 28, 1963

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, my colleague, HORACE KORNEGAY, made a timely and thought-provoking address at a dinner sponsored by the Wake County Young Democratic Club honoring Democratic members of the North Carolina General Assembly, which I was permitted to attend. The address was delivered on the eve of the convening of the 1963 Legislature in North Carolina's new State House at Raleigh.

Because of the challenge to all lawmakers contained in this address, I recommend it to all Members of this body.

The address follows:

TALK BEFORE THE 1963 DEMOCRATIC LEGISLATIVE DINNER, WAKE COUNTY YDC, RALEIGH, N.C., FEBRUARY 5, 1963, BY THE HONORABLE HORACE R. KORNEGAY

It is a distinct pleasure and privilege to be here with you tonight as guest of the Wake County Young Democratic Club at this 1963 legislative dinner honoring the 147-man Democratic delegation in the 1963 General Assembly of North Carolina.

To the returning veterans this occasion is a great and genial homecoming. To those of you who are serving in the State legislature for the first time, let me say that I have a warm fellow feeling for you. For as you have journeyed to Raleigh for your first term, it was just 2 years ago that I journeyed up to Washington, in cold and sleet and snow, to embark upon a similar experience in the U.S. House of Representatives.

Now being an ancient veteran of one 2-year term in the Congress, however, I look back on those days with a mixture of relief and nostalgia—relief that I survived them intact, and nostalgia because being a freshman carried certain concessions and courtesies. You weren't supposed to know anything, so allowances were made for you. After that first term, however, these amenities cease. It's like being the "lap baby" for 2 years and suddenly being thrust into the role of the "knee baby" where you have to fend for yourselves in the cold world.

I am sure that your veteran colleagues in the general assembly will patiently lead you newcomers into the right corridors, the right customs, and the established procedures, and that you will emerge from this session experienced solons—that fine old word which derives from the name of an Athenian lawgiver of the sixth century, B.C., and which means a "wise man, a skilled legislator" in present day usage.

I know of no greater accolade I would rather earn than to be considered a skilled legislator. The science of law giving is an exact one, and the path to its accomplishment is a thorny one, strewn with the bleached bones of many good men who have tried and failed.

To be a legislator is to wear two hats, for even as you are a legislator, you are also a representative. In this dule role, therefore, you are to participate in an important, exciting, and unique experience—that of being an integral part in the functioning of a representative government—the very essence of democracy at work.

There are certain fundamental principles recognized in our system of representative government, and one is that a government derives its just power from the consent of the governed. Thus the legislative powers of our great State of North Carolina are delegated to it by the people, and this becomes an operative principle in the institution of representation. The best form of self-government is representative government, whereby those who make the public laws are chosen periodically by the people and remain accountable to them, and whereby the people have the final and very effective means of making their representatives accountable to them, and that is by giving them the hatchet at the next election, if they do not believe they have been well represented.

Thus when we speak of government by the consent of the governed, we mean that this consent is achieved by the indirect participation of the people in the very process of the formulation of the law. At the very minimum, the people are called on to think through the issues of legislation and arrive at their own conclusion on them and communicate to their duly elected representatives.

So you are going to be hearing from the people—make no mistake about that. And if you think the people speak with one clear, clarion call, as with one voice, the veterans in the general assembly here can emphatically tell you that it just ain't so. You are here by the grace of God and the Democratic Party to represent your constituency. But here again is a jolting thought—the party does not always speak a clarion, unfractured call. We're all a family of good and true Democrats here tonight. But if we all had exactly the same thoughts and the identical philosophy of government, down to the most minute detail, we would be little more than rubberstamps and the label would inevitably become greater than the man and greater than the laws the man is here to make.

So now we must conclude that you successful candidates to the general assembly actually wear three hats—the hat of the legislator, the hat of the representative, and the hat of the party you represent. It sounds like one big happy family, but the veterans among you know that it isn't always the coziest of togetherness with all those hats on the hatrack.

We often hear—what is good for this or good for that is good for the country.

What is good for the country, for its economic well-being, for its international stature, for its internal welfare, security, and defense is a question so thought provoking and so nearly imponderable that its solution cannot automatically be equated with one group, one area, one district, one thought pattern. Just as here in our great State of North Carolina, the larger good of the whole State transcends the consideration of what is good for one county or one senatorial district. It is a larger canvas and requires a lot of brushes to paint properly.

By the same token, the larger good of the Democratic Party paramounts any group or individual preferences. This is no time to complain of wounded feelings or hurt pride, but it is the time for all Democrats to follow the example of Philip of Macedonia, by forming a phalanx welded together in a common mission of dedicated service to the people of North Carolina. Let unity be our password and victory our cause.

What I would like to leave with you tonight is the thought that as good Democrats we owe allegiance to our great party, as representatives we owe allegiance to our constituency, as lawgivers we owe allegiance to the very best that is in ourselves to do for our people, our State, and for its government, whose greatness lies in the fact that it is a government of laws and not of men.

And if these considerations do not always mesh together in a perfect whole, with a single objective, if there are dissident opinions, and times of confusion as to what is right in the final essence, let us draw upon the wisdom of that great statesman of England, Edmund Burke, in the year 1774:

"Certainly, gentlemen, it ought to be the happiness and glory of a representative to live in the strictest union, the closest correspondence, and the most unreserved communication with his constituents. Their wishes ought to have great weight with him; their opinions high respect; their business unremitted attention. It is his duty to sacrifice his repose, his pleasure, his satisfactions, to theirs—and above all, ever, and in all cases, to prefer their interest to his own.

"But his unbiased opinion, his mature judgment, his enlightened conscience, he ought not to sacrifice to you, to any man, or to any set of men living. These he does not derive from your pleasure, no, nor from the law and the Constitution. They are a trust from providence, for the abuse of which he is deeply answerable. Your representative owes you, not his industry only, but his judgment; and he betrays, instead of serving you, if he sacrifices it to your opinion."

This session of the North Carolina General Assembly which begins tomorrow is a very significant session. As we enter upon our tercentenary year commemorating the issuance of the Carolina Charter, we look back at our first 300 years and see the unbelievable progress we have attained albeit through unbelievable hardships. We look ahead to the next 300, veiled in the mists of the future.

You, whom we honor here tonight, are the recipients of a noble legacy—built and acquired by the generations of dedicated and future looking Democratic legislators who have preceded you in these positions of great trust. From their legislative pens came the laws which made North Carolina the envy of many and gained her the respect of all of her sister States. Her accomplishments are legion, and point particularly to our vast and well balanced highway system; the enormous growth of our industry; our humane and ever increasing concern for the mentally ill and handicapped; and by all means, our herculean efforts in the field of public education for which tremendous credit should go to our farsighted and courageous Governor, Terry Sanford. Yes, you, the 1963 General Assembly, are inheriting a great tradition of statesmanship which was nurtured with a passion for progress and a zealous striving for excellence.

That is your challenge and we are confident that you will acquit yourselves well in the carrying out of these heavy responsibilities. For what you do here in the next few months will have great meaning for the future of North Carolina.

I have not yet had opportunity to learn what the beautiful new State House contains in the way of inspiring inscriptions. But in the chamber of the House of Representatives in Washington there is only one quotation, as such, and this is a plaster plaque inscribed with a quotation from Daniel Webster directly over the Speaker's rostrum, which reads as follows:

"Let us develop the resources of our land, call forth its powers, build up its institutions, promote all its great interests, and see whether we also in our day and generation may not perform something worthy to be remembered."

These stirring words are often a great comfort to me, as well as a challenge, and may they also be to you in your consideration of the land of the old North State and what is best for her, now and in the future.

It goes without saying that the North Carolina delegation in the U.S. Congress is eager to be of assistance in every appropriate way to you who serve our State in the legislative halls in Raleigh. There are many areas of Federal-State cooperation where we can labor together for the good of the country and the State. I hope we will have the freest communication and exchange of ideas on these matters of vital interest to all of us.

And now I thank you for the privilege of being with you tonight and I wish for you a productive and highly successful general assembly for this 300th year in North Carolina.

Legislative Questionnaire

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MORRIS K. UDALL

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 28, 1963

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, I have just issued a report to my constituents in the Second Congressional District of Arizona on a legislative questionnaire which I distributed recently, results of which have now been tabulated. I believe this indication of opinion in my district may be of considerable interest to our colleagues.

The report follows:

THE PEOPLE SPEAK: A REPORT TO THE PEOPLE OF SOUTHERN ARIZONA ON CONGRESSMAN UDALL'S 1963 LEGISLATIVE QUESTIONNAIRE

This is a report on a very successful and encouraging experiment. Just before Congress convened, I prepared and mailed a 22-question legislative questionnaire. The response has been most encouraging and rewarding. This is my report on the returns.

About 11,000 questionnaires were distributed, nearly all of them in the Second Congressional District, although a few were mailed in from Districts 1 and 3 and are included in the tabulations. Out of 11,000 mailed, 2,547, or 23 percent, were returned—a somewhat greater return than other Congressmen have experienced with similar questionnaires.

We are sometimes led to believe that Arizonans are apathetic on public issues; I now have clear evidence this is not true. Many who received the questionnaire not only have replied but enclosed thoughtful letters or additional comments. I have read all of these letters and found much to think about. Arizonans apparently want to be consulted in this way. All of 96 percent thought the questionnaire a good idea—and one enthusiastic reader urged me to sponsor a law requiring every Representative to poll his registered voters once a year.

The complete results are tabulated below. In summary form the results show:

Strong support for continued membership in the United Nations, 80 percent.

Substantial support for foreign aid as a tool in the cold war struggle against communism, 60 percent.

Solid support for six new Kennedy programs—the Peace Corps, 78 percent; Domestic Peace Corps, 57 percent; Alliance for Progress, 78.5 percent; Youth Conservation Corps, 73 percent; medicare, 54 percent; and the wilderness system, 73 percent.

Opposition to farm subsidies, 66 percent; a World War I pension, 73 percent; Federal aid for teachers' salaries, 55 percent; Federal aid for private and parochial schools, 76.7 percent; and a Department of Urban Affairs, 47.5 percent.

Support for present or increased expenditures in all 11 categories of spending, but by relatively narrow margins in the case of military assistance, 57.7 percent, and veterans' benefits, 53.8 percent.

HOW THE QUESTIONNAIRE WAS DISTRIBUTED

I wish I could have distributed this questionnaire to every voter in my district. Staff and financial considerations made this impossible. Many people have asked how the distribution was handled. Here is the answer:

The initial mailing went to my regular mailing list, made up of businessmen, schoolteachers, clergymen, the rosters of many civic organizations, and innumerable people who have asked to receive my newsletters. I have taken pains to see that this list is representative of my district as a whole, not just members of my own party. From time to time, including a special "Christmas present" offer last December, I have publicly invited constituents to request inclusion on my mailing list.

When the initial mailing was made I issued a news release informing newspapers, radio, and television stations that interested persons could obtain copies of the questionnaire by writing my Washington office. Approximately 2,000 additional questionnaires were distributed as a result of this announcement.

While the tabulation has now been completed, I want to renew my invitation to all interested constituents to send me their names for inclusion on my mailing list. This will enable them to receive my regular newsletters and such future questionnaires as I may find it possible to issue.

WAS THIS A SCIENTIFIC POLL?

During the period when questionnaires were being received here, the Arizona Republic in Phoenix kindly offered to reprint it in its columns. I was delighted to give my consent to this proposal. Also, the Tucson Daily Citizen covered a few of the same subjects in a questionnaire which it drafted. I commend the editors of both papers for stimulating interest in the issues of 1963, and their published findings have been noted.

Since the results below differ rather markedly from some of the results received by the Republic and Citizen (while others are markedly similar), many will ask: just how scientific and how accurate were the three polls? Of course, the answer is that none of the three was based on scientifically selected samples of the public, and I specifically make no such claim for mine.

The only citizens whose opinions were counted were those who took the time to reply; all of us are grateful for this interest, and I think it of tremendous significance that so many felt strongly enough to complete one or more of the three questionnaires.

While many of these questionnaires were sent in by people who voted against me and generally do not agree with my stand on issues, I think it should be recognized that those who agree with a polling organization are, generally speaking, more inclined to participate in such a mail survey than those who disagree with the organization. This principle would likely apply in a general way to all three polls.

This tendency is reflected in my mail. Several people clipped the two newspaper polls and sent them to me, saying, "I want you, not the Arizona Republic, to have my opinion," etc. Conversely, one lady sent back my questionnaire, remarking, "I am a Republican, and I don't want you to have my opinions." I think both these attitudes are unfortunate, but they illustrate the general tendency I have described.

In weighing the accuracy of the opinion sample obtained in my own survey, I am comforted by two factors:

The voter registration in my district is 68 percent Democratic as against a combined total of 32 percent for Republicans and independents. Of those returning my questionnaire, 68.7 percent identified themselves as Democrats, 31.3 percent as Republicans or independents.

After the results were tabulated, I checked them against recent Gallup poll findings of national opinion on a few selected issues. Here are the comparisons:

MEMBERSHIP IN UNITED NATIONS

	Stay in	Get out	No opinion
	Percent	*Percent*	*Percent*
Gallup poll, Feb. 18, 1962	90	5	5
Udall questionnaire	80	18	2

DOMESTIC PEACE CORPS

	Approve	Disapprove	No opinion
	Percent	*Percent*	*Percent*
Gallup poll, Nov. 22, 1962	62	22	16
Udall questionnaire	57	31	12

YOUTH CONSERVATION CORPS

Gallup poll, April 13, 1962	79	16	5
Udall questionnaire	73	22.6	4.5

FOREIGN AID

Gallup poll, July 3, 1962	58	30	12
Udall questionnaire	60	(*)	(*)

*Other choices not comparable.

WHAT IS THE VALUE OF SUCH A POLL?

Dr. George Gallup, founder and director of the Gallup poll, places little value on surveys such as I have just conducted. He said recently that "the 20 percent who may reply do not really represent a cross section of the electorate" and that they tend to be the better educated people higher up on the economic ladder. He recalled the famous Literary Digest debacle of 1936 when that magazine predicted the election of Alf Landon to the Presidency; on that occasion, he said, the fault lay in polling too heavily in the upper economic groups. Of Congressmen who make surveys such as mine, he said, "If they set out to misinform themselves, they couldn't do a better job of it."

What, then, is the value of such a survey as this? I think there are several things to be said for it:

(1) Opinions thus expressed give a Congressman a broader sweep of constituent thinking than he is likely to receive in his regular mail.

(2) Studying individual responses can be quite revealing. For example, if the Alliance for Progress receives substantial support from both those who oppose foreign aid and those who support it (which happened to be the case), the Alliance may be regarded as enjoying broad support among the electorate.

(3) Such a survey gives people an opportunity, not just to pull a lever and vote for a candidate, but to register their views on legislative matters. In this survey a great many of the 2,500 respondents expressed their thoughts to their Congressman for the very first time.

In the end, of course, a Congressman is expected to acquaint himself more thoroughly than can any constituent with the merits of legislative proposals. We elect Congressmen on the basis of their education, experience, and judgment—and we expect them to use that judgment in deciding public questions. As your Congressman, I don't intend to take an opinion poll every time I have to make a decision. However, I value your opinions, and I want to do the best job I can to represent you in the Congress. I believe this questionnaire will help me do this.

To all of you who participated in this survey, and especially to the volunteers who helped me tabulate the returns, I want to express my deep gratitude.

Following are the results, expressed in percentages:

After each question please check the answer which is closest to your view.

(1) United Nations: Should the United States stay in or get out of the United Nations? Stay in, 80 percent; get out, 18 percent; no opinion, 2 percent.

(2) Red China: Do you favor or oppose admission of Red China to the United Nations? Favor, 20 percent; oppose, 74 percent; no opinion, 6 percent.

(3) Peace Corps: Do you favor or oppose the Peace Corps? Favor, 78.5 percent; oppose, 13.7 percent; no opinion, 7.8 percent.

(4) Domestic Peace Corps: Would you favor or oppose a domestic Peace Corps whose volunteer members would perform similar functions in our own country? Favor, 57 percent; oppose, 31 percent; no opinion, 12 percent.

(5) Fallout shelters: Would you favor or oppose Federal assistance for an expanded program to build public and private fallout shelters? Favor, 31.2 percent; oppose, 56.8 percent; no opinion, 12 percent.

(6) Foreign aid: Which of the following statements comes closest to expressing your opinion of foreign aid?

You can't buy friends; foreign aid is a total waste of money and the whole program should be ended at once, 17.8 percent.

Foreign aid is OK for our military allies and countries which support us in the United Nations, but neutral or uncommitted nations shouldn't get help, 22.2 percent.

Foreign aid is a tool in the cold war struggle against communism; it should be used wherever the President and Congress think it will contribute to our national security and strengthen the free world, 60 percent.

(7) Alliance for Progress: One part of our foreign aid program is the Alliance for Progress, a 10-year program to help Latin American countries head off communism by improving living standards and broadening democratic government. In general, do you favor or oppose the Alliance for Progress? Favor, 78.5 percent; oppose, 15.5 percent; no opinion, 6 percent.

(8) Kennedy support: In general, do you believe Congress should give greater, less, or about the same support as it gave last year to President Kennedy's program? Greater, 46.4 percent; less, 13.4 percent; about the same, 30.2 percent.

(9) Medicare: President Kennedy has asked for a "medicare" bill which would pay a part of hospital bills for persons over 65. No doctor bills would be covered. The plan would be financed by a $1 per month increase in employees' social security deductions and a similar increase in contributions of employers. In general, would you favor or oppose a plan of this kind? Favor, 54 percent; oppose, 40 percent; no opinion, 6 percent.

(10) Aid to education: (a) Do you favor or oppose increased Federal aid to the States for elementary and high school construction? Favor, 56.2 percent; oppose, 40.2 percent; no opinion, 3.6 percent. (b) Do you favor or oppose increased Federal aid to the States for teachers' salaries? Favor, 38.1 percent; oppose, 55 percent; no opinion, 6.9 percent. (c) If Congress decides to increase Federal financial aid to public elementary and high schools, would you favor or oppose giving similar Federal aid to private and parochial schools? Favor, 18.8 percent; oppose, 76.7 percent; no opinion, 4.5 percent.

(11) Urban affairs: In 1962 President Kennedy asked Congress to authorize a new Cabinet-level Department of Urban Affairs and Housing. Proponents point out that the new Department would add no new Government functions but would bring together related functions now scattered in various agencies for more effective handling of this Nation's mounting urban problems. Opponents argue that establishing the new Department would further concentrate power in Washington and threaten cities with Federal domination. Would you favor or oppose establishment of this new Department? Favor, 39.5 percent; oppose, 47.5 percent; no opinion, 13 percent.

(12) Youth Conservation Corps: It has been proposed that Congress establish a Youth Conservation Corps (somewhat similar to the CCC's of the 1930's) providing a 3-year program of public service employment and training for young men and women 16 to 22. Would you favor or oppose such a program? Favor, 73 percent; oppose, 22.5 percent; no opinion, 4.5 percent.

(13) Wilderness system: The wilderness bill would set aside about 15 million acres of forest lands already owned by the Federal Government (including about 600,000 acres in Arizona) to be preserved in its natural state as a national wilderness system. Opponents urge multiple use of Federal forest lands and contend that mining, timber, and cattle industries would be damaged by this legislation. Proponents say existing commercial uses would continue and assert we have a duty to set aside at least this 1 percent of our Nation's land area for future generations to enjoy. Do you favor or oppose the wilderness bill? Favor, 73 percent; oppose, 22.5 percent; no opinion, 4.5 percent.

(14) Farm subsidies: Generally speaking, which of these courses do you believe Federal farm legislation should take (choose one): Continue present programs for basic commodities (wheat, tobacco, rice, cotton) under which price supports and mandatory acreage allotments are provided if approved by two-thirds of farmers voting in referendum, 20.7 percent. Discontinue price supports and acreage allotments for basic crops, substituting a voluntary system of land retirement payments for farmers who wish to participate, 13.3 percent. Abolish all Federal controls, acreage allotments, and price supports for basic crops, letting the agriculture industry operate under free market conditions with the Government's role restricted to soil conservation, research, extension work, etc., 66 percent.

(15) World War I pension: A bill before Congress proposes to grant most veterans of World War I a pension of $102 per month regardless of need or disability, provided the veteran served 90 days in the Armed Forces. The pension is estimated to cost $11 billion. Do you favor or oppose this pension? Favor, 16.4 percent; oppose, 73 percent; no opinion, 10.6 percent.

(16) Income taxes: If income tax rates are cut by Congress, should the main reductions go to individuals with low incomes, 30 percent; all individual taxpayers in both high and low brackets, 25 percent; both corporations and individual taxpayers, 45 percent.

(17) Federal budget: This fiscal year Federal tax collections seem likely to fall short of Federal expenditures by about $7.8 billion. (a) If expenditures could be reduced to balance the budget, would you favor this course, or would you favor the deficit as a means of stimulating the economy? Balanced budget, 60 percent; deficit to stimulate economy, 32 percent; no opinion, 8 percent. (b) If expenditures cannot be reduced sufficiently to balance the budget, would you favor an increase in your taxes of 4 to 5 percent to avoid a deficit? Favor, 31.1 percent; oppose, 60 percent; no opinion, 8.9 percent.

(18) Federal spending: In general, should Congress spend more, less, or about the same as last year for these programs:

Fiscal 1963 expenditures	Program	Spend more	Spend less	About same
Billions				
$52.7	National security	17.0	28.0	55.0
2.4	Space programs	25.5	30.0	44.5
5.4	Veterans' benefits	12.3	46.2	41.5
1.3	Reclamation, parks, forests and reclamation.	30.0	18.0	52.0
1.3	Military assistance to allies for mutual defense.	9.0	42.3	48.7
1.0	Development loans and grants to new and underdeveloped countries.	18.0	39.0	43.0
.4	Supporting assistance to protect U.S. security interests abroad.	20.7	26.8	52.5
.5	Alliance for Progress	25.3	27.0	47.7
1.3	Federal aid to education.	38.4	32.0	29.6
1.9	Medical research, aid for hospital construction, welfare.	40.2	21.1	38.7
2.8	Aid to aged, blind, dependent children.	40.7	13.7	45.7

(19) The economy: Generally speaking, do you think you and your family are better off, or worse off, financially than you were 5 years ago? Better, 45.5 percent; worse, 18.8 percent; about the same, 35.7 percent.

(20) Television: As our children grow up today they are exposed to almost constant advertising for beer, wine, and cigarettes on radio and television. Many parents believe such advertising cannot help but shape psychological attitudes of children toward use of these products. Would you favor or oppose legislation to prohibit such commercials before 8 p.m. local time? Favor, 55.6 percent; oppose, 34 percent; no opinion, 10.4 percent.

(21) Party identification: Do you consider yourself a Democrat, 68.7 percent; Republican, 17.7 percent; independent, 13.6 percent.

(22) Questionnaires: Do you think questionnaires like this one are a good idea? Yes, 96 percent; no, 2 percent; no opinion, 2 percent.

Extension of Impacted-Areas Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. TORBERT H. MACDONALD

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 28, 1963

Mr. MACDONALD. Mr. Speaker, I intend to introduce legislation to extend for 4 years the Federal aid to education bill for impacted areas. Massachusetts has received over $38 million in payments from the Federal grant to its school systems under the Impacted Area Act.

I have personally observed the significant assistance to schools in my congressional district resulting from Federal payments under the impacted-area law. The money received in cash benefits to the people of the Seventh Congressional District has amounted to approximately $2½ million. This in no small measure aided in keeping the local taxes from climbing higher than they are now. It seems clear to me that there is no logical reason why the Federal Government should not continue to reimburse local communities for taxes lost to municipalities from tax-free Federal installations.

Many of the provisions of the impacted-areas law will expire on June 30 of this year. This law must be extended if our school districts are to continue to provide necessary school services to schoolchildren residing in areas heavily impacted by Government employees. Action on my bill should be taken promptly so that school administrators may know what funds are available to them in planning their budget for the coming year. Without the assurance of Federal aid these school officials cannot make firm commitments for expenditures after June 1963.

Bulgarian Liberation Day, March 3, 1878

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 28, 1963

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, the Bulgarians were masters of a mighty kingdom in the Balkans during the late Middle Ages, and formed a formidable force which was a decisive factor in that region's affairs. But early in the 15th century their kingdom was overrun by the Ottoman Turks and they lost their independence. Thenceforth for some 400 years these sturdy and rugged people lived under Ottoman sultans without losing sight of their objective and without relinquishing their right to freedom and national independence. In 1878 they at last attained their goal at the conclusion of the Russo-Turkish War of 1877–78. The peace treaty signed on March 3 of 1878 guaranteed Bulgaria's independence.

That historic event of 85 years ago became a national holiday for the Bulgarian people, ushering in a new era in their modern history. Since then, however, their history has been compounded of happiness with misfortune, joy with tragedy. They were dragged into the First World War and fought on the side of the defeated powers. If in this they were unfortunate, they were even less fortunate in the last war. Much against their wishes, they were drawn into that war and again they fought on the side of the losers. In the end they were saddled with a Communist government and placed behind the Iron Curtain.

Today they are separated and sealed off from the free world. For all practical purposes Bulgaria is part of the Soviet Union and its people are pawns in the hands of their Bolshevik bosses. For almost two decades these proud and gallant fighters of southeastern Europe have been suffering under the unrelenting yoke of Communist tyranny. But these brave fighters for freedom have not forgotten the momentous event of 85 years ago, their liberation day. Though they are not free to celebrate it in their homeland, here we observe it, and I gladly join my friends among the Bulgarian-Americans on this 85th anniversary of that historic event, Bulgarian Liberation Day.

Building an Urban America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. PATTEN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 28, 1963

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, U.S. Senator HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR., Democrat, of New Jersey, spoke on Monday, February 25, 1963, on urban housing before 500 delegates of the 32d National Housing Conference, in Washington, D.C.

I was present when Senator WILLIAMS delivered his address on the problems and goals in the vital field of housing and found his speech enlightening and impressive. I request that the contents be placed into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The speech follows:

BUILDING AN URBAN AMERICA

Since you all know that this is not expected to be what we call a housing year, I think this might be a good time to step back to take a broader look at some of the things going on in the development of an urban America.

You know, whenever I dip into the literature on urban living, I am always struck by the fact that fashions change in our attitudes here almost as often as they do in the field of dress designing.

One day we hear that our cities are doomed to a fate of creeping chaos and decay, that our monolithic suburbs will spread like amebae until they cover the face of the earth.

But as soon as enough people begin to agree, those elusive members of the urban establishment—always alert to new opinion-molding opportunities—begin to herald the dawn of a new and glorious urban age.

After all, isn't the Manhattan skyline breathtaking to behold? Doesn't Kalamazoo have a permanent pedestrian mall? We know that the city of Rochester has Victor Gruen and his specially designed downtown shopping center.

And isn't it true, as the always provocative Mr. Moses has written, that all the "little identical suburban boxes of average people represent a measure of success unheard of by hundreds of millions on other continents?"

If I may be pardoned a simple-minded observation on this running debate between our urban bears and our urban bulls, it seems clear that we have come quite a long way in building a better society for our citizens. And it seems equally clear that we have quite a way left to go before we achieve the goal of a decent home and a suitable living environment for every American family—to say nothing of achieving communities that are both beautiful and just.

I think we can fairly say that there has been much expansiveness, physical improvement and prosperity in our urban endeavors—but almost no grandeur, no recognition that our surroundings are the outward reflection of our inner self-esteem.

The real question, however, is not how well or poorly we have done.

The question is where we are going.

THE GAPS AND THE GOAL

There are several ways of approaching this question. For one thing, we can try to measure the gap between what needs to be done and our present rate of progress.

In the field of housing, we know we are building about 1.4 million units a year, which must be stepped up to 2 million a year if we are to meet the needs of the 10 million new households that will be formed by 1970, and if we are to handle the additional influx of farm families into the urban areas, compensate for the houses that will be demolished, and eliminate the million and a half totally dilapidated and unredeemable housing units in the country.

In transportation, we know that we have about 70 million registered vehicles on the road today in the United States. In just 15 short years, this number is expected to rise to well over 115 million. Obviously we have a need for the 41,000-mile Interstate Highway System.

Since outdoor recreation demand for Federal land and water resources alone will double by 1970, we must expand our park and recreation facilities, with the help of the open-space program for urban areas and the President's new land and water conservation fund.

Our transit is deteriorating at the very time traffic congestion is becoming increasingly intolerable, and the magnitude of the problem certainly calls for the all-out effort that the administration's $500 million transit bill would trigger.

We have far more acres of slumland than we have cleared under the urban renewal program. We have far more ill-housed low-income families than we are providing homes for under the public housing and other moderate income housing programs. In fact, right here in Washington, there is a waiting list of about 4,000 for public housing at the present time. Yet only 29,000 units have been put under construction throughout the entire country since passage of the 1961 Housing Act.

And so it goes down the list.

But while we have to keep measuring the needs and present performance, and while we have to formulate legislative goals to fill the gap, pass the bills, administer the programs, clear the land, pour the concrete, and build the buildings, this is not enough.

At some point we have to step back and look at our work, what it all adds up to, where it is all leading us.

We need to because our individual efforts are not ends unto themselves. Building highways is not an end. Nor is clearing a slum, building a home, or acquiring a park.

They are all means to an end—the enjoyment of a better, more just, and fuller life by all the people who live and work in our urban communities.

If we are to achieve that goal, we must look beyond our immediate interests and broaden our horizons.

Above all, we must begin facing the hard issues involved in building a better urban America.

RACIAL DISCRIMINATION

And the hardest issue of all is the problem of racial and minority group discrimination. It permeates almost all our urban development activities.

The suburbs have become the pure white collars around central cities, which are rapidly becoming vast ghettos for Negroes and other outcast minority groups.

This overriding social problem compels us to ask ourselves: How many L.P.A.'s have presided over projects in our cities the purpose of which was more Negro removal than urban renewal?

How many times has the problem of discrimination rather than the goal of decent housing in a suitable environment led to the construction of stacks of high-rise public housing projects, concentrating thousands upon thousands of low-income and problem-ridden families in a wholly unnatural and isolated environment?

How many of our public transit systems are in trouble today because upper income breadwinners have fled to faraway suburbs and would rather endure the agony of traffic congestion in the privacy of their cars than ride with the lower class in a public conveyance?

RELOCATION

Another hard issue is the question of relocation. You really have to get out and talk to the people who have been caught in the maelstrom of massive change in our cities to appreciate the enormous impact forced relocation can have on these people, especially the elderly.

In the last few months I had an opportunity to do just that during the hearings we held around the country on the relocation problems of the elderly.

As a matter of fact, just last Friday I went down to a shanty town in Fairfax County in Virginia on what you might call a voluntary domestic peace corps mission to see if we could help fix up the shacks at least temporarily so that these Negro families would not have to be evicted immediately with no place else to go, because of violations of the building and health codes.

During our hearings on the west coast we talked to a 74-year-old man who was living in one of those 50-cent-a-night hotels in a skid row area, scheduled to be cleared by an urban renewal project.

We asked him where he would go when the hotel was torn down, and he replied, matter-of-factly, that he'd "go back under the bridge."

The thing that became clear to me from these hearings is that we really don't know very much about the people we are displacing through various Government actions. We don't know what the people are like, what their special needs may be, what their ties to the neighborhood are, and so forth.

As a result, the efforts we do make in relocation are often poorly geared to the needs of these people.

They don't take into account the fact that the forced relocation of these people can be a traumatic experience, especially for the elderly and people living in ethnic neighborhoods where the social ties are particularly strong.

As a matter of fact, I am forced to say that in far too many instances where relocation assistance is required, the officials do not treat the task of relocating people into decent housing in a suitable environment as a primary and positive objective of enlightened public policy. On the contrary, too many officials regard it as a plain nuisance, another cumbersome task to be dispensed with as quickly and painlessly as possible.

Needless to say, we have also been exceedingly remiss at the Federal level.

Because of the patchwork quality of our Federal laws, we have produced grossly inequitable situations where a family displaced by an urban renewal project gets a payment for moving expenses, advisory assistance and the assurance of safe, decent, and sanitary housing, while a family across the street, displaced by a public housing project or a Federal office building might get nothing but a kick in the pants.

For that reason, I intend to introduce legislation shortly to achieve uniformity in our relocation policies in the Federal programs that displace families.

PLANNING AND WORKABLE PROGRAMS

Next we come to the question of workable programs and comprehensive planning—and how we all worship at the altar of these two principles.

But who does not know of instances where communities have gotten Federal aid to hire an outside consultant to come in with his standard master plan—suitable for all purposes and all occasions—so that the community can then qualify for other Federal assistance?

Who does not know of instances when communities lying right in the path of explosive urban growth have seized upon comprehensive planning as a way of rationalizing the status quo, instead of as a way to honestly meet the problems of urban growth?

How many times has that most sacred of all forms of planning—regional planning—consisted of pasting together all the separate local plans on one big new regional map?

And how many housing and redevelopment agencies have fussed and fumed over the delays of their individual projects because the workable program requirements have not been met—requirements which must be met if individual housing or renewal projects are to have any real meaning and lasting value to the community?

And how many workable programs are themselves hollow documents, offered with a wink and accepted with a grimace for the sake of getting the project under way?

My point is simply that it is very easy to go through the form and motion in planning and developing workable programs without really facing up to the host of difficult issues floating like icebergs just beneath the surface.

URBAN LAND POLICY

Another very important area in which we have done almost nothing is the development of rational and effective urban land use policies.

Our metropolitan areas are exploding outward at a fantastic rate, wasting land in the most profligate way, compounding our transportation problems, driving costs for essential public facilities and services up to unnecessarily high levels, and pushing the open space of our countryside farther and farther away from more and more people.

The bold new world has become almost an endless maze of curvilinear streets and split-level houses, until no man is an entity, but merely a cipher in a vast environment.

Is it any wonder that people seem so apathetic about what goes on around them?

I personally believe there are two values that are extremely important to us all as individuals.

One is a sense of identity with the community.

While this sense of identity still exists in some of our more prosperous and insular suburban communities, there are vast stretches in our metropolitan areas, especially in the gray areas, where a person might just as well say: "I live in town X which lies somewhere between towns Y and Z and you can tell when you get there if you look closely enough for the city limits sign that's located in the empty lot with all the billboards in it, right across the street from the gas station."

THE OTHER VALUE IS THE FREEDOM OF CHOICE

We tend to forget that the one great advantage to the organization of society into cities is choice—the choice of jobs that it offers, the choice of friends, the choice of shops, the choice of theaters, restaurants, cultural events, housing, sports, recreation. In short, the choice of diversity.

While the technological developments of transportation, the telephone, television and so forth, have expanded the range of our living and working environment without too much sacrifice in the freedom of choice, it seems clear to me that there are limits to this expansion, and always will be. When we go beyond these limits, we gravely restrict this freedom of choice.

There are a whole host of forces at work which are propelling our living environment out over the landscape, forces over which we, as individuals, do not have very much control.

For example, in my own State two-thirds of the vacant land within a 50-mile radius of New York City is zoned for single-family homes on half-acre lots or larger. Half of the land is zoned for 1-acre lots or larger.

This illustration is typical of just one of the many forces that are contributing to the chaotic dispersal of the urban environment.

Despite this, we have yet to develop at any level of Government effective urban land use policies which would guide and shape the pattern of growth so as to preserve the maximum amount of choice for the maximum number of people.

WHITE HOUSE CONFERENCE

I could go on to the problems we face in bringing the polluters of our air and our water to task, the problems we face in controlling those who are desecrating the face of our cities with atrocious architecture and other works of appalling ugliness, from roadside slums to overhead utility lines. We could talk about how we are going to get anything more than lip service on the question of achieving coordination and cooperation among the innumerable political jurisdictions of our metropolitan areas in matters affecting the region as a whole.

These are just some of the issues we need to bring out into the open and look at squarely.

It was for that reason I wrote President Kennedy last December to urge that he hold a White House conference on urban problems—which has never before been held, despite the fact that two-thirds of the Nation's population is vitally affected by these problems. In fact, not since 1931 has there been a Presidential conference on the subject of housing, which is a major component of every community's environment.

Incidentally, I am delighted to see the leadership that the national housing conference has taken in urging such a conference.

My greatest hope is that a White House conference would help rally public concern for the problems of urban development so that we may hope for the day when we can say of this country's urban areas what Samuel Johnson said long ago of his city: "When a man is tired of London, he is tired of life."

Public Service in Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 28, 1963

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted, I insert into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the remarks of Anthony J. Celebrezze, distinguished Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, at a dinner held February 22, 1963, at the Woman's National Democratic Club.

Secretary Celebrezze has brought to Washington with him an outstanding record of public service and interest in Government. He has been characterized throughout his governmental service by not only efficiency but also by humanity.

His comments at that time are particularly appropriate to the vast problems in which the United States finds itself today. The remarks of Secretary Celebrezze appropriately reflect the need for a Government which not only is interested in economy but which is concerned with the intelligent and humane solutions of the multitude of problems facing our people today.

The address follows:

PUBLIC SERVICE IN GOVERNMENT

(Remarks by Anthony J. Celebrezze, Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, at the dinner of the Woman's National Democratic Club, Washington, D.C., Friday, February 22, 1963)

I am pleased to note that this is a bipartisan occasion—the 231st anniversary of George Washington's birth. The Republicans customarily gather on Lincoln's Birthday, and we Democrats pay faithful annual tribute to the genius of Jefferson and Jackson. But Washington was a unique figure in American political annals. First in so many things, he bears the unusual distinction of being the first—and also the last—President to be elected outside the party system.

Politics was very much alive, of course, even under Washington's administration, and the two-party system that marks the structure of American politics was already in the making. It was in Washington's first term that Jefferson and Madison took their famous botanical expedition through the Northern States and planted the seeds of the great national party that is parent to our own. Since then, throughout the years, men and democracy have been tested by our politics, and time has proved the system worthy.

Some 80 years ago, the great English historian, James Bryce, comparing American politicians with their counterparts in Europe, described two categories of politicians—those of the "inner circle" and those of the "outer circle." What he found remarkable in America was that the membership of both the inner and outer circles was relatively larger here and, therefore, more representative than in most European states. Whereas in Europe the "inner circle"—the people who devoted their full time to politics—was made up of only a small number of individuals, usually men of independent means and aristocratic background, in America the profession of politics attracted thousands of people from all walks of life. And, more importantly, the American "outer circle"—in which he placed all who work for the party without pay and without seeking office—he found came nearer to including the whole country here than it did in England.

This is not the usual conception of the ins and outs in politics, but it is a refreshing one, and it is a mark of American democracy that we have reason to be proud of.

Politics has a special meaning for Americans. Some call it the science of government. Others, more poetically, call it the art of freedom. Pragmatists like to call it the art of the possible. But whatever you call it—by fair name or foul—it comes down finally to the act of responding individually to the obligations of self-government. And whether one counts oneself a member of the inner circle or the outer circle, every American is, or should be, a politician. Over the age of 21, everyone should be an active politician, letting his voice be heard at least through his vote.

I have found also that there are plenty of active politicians under the age of 21. I have been surprised and gratified by the number of letters I have been getting from schoolchildren. I like to get these letters. They don't tell me how to run the Department. They ask me what I do.

And from these younger citizens I sometimes get a pretty good idea of what's being taught in the schools around the country. I can say, for example, with a fair degree of accuracy, that during the past 6 weeks a lot of ninth graders have been studying the Cabinet, and I'm sure that a lot of class reports have been given on the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

This is as it should be, and I am glad that in this country schoolchildren can feel free to ask a member of the Cabinet just what it is that he does. I make a special effort to answer these letters because I feel a special obligation to these youngsters who will become the responsible politicians of tomorrow.

I am glad, too, that they care about the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. In spite of our rather long and specific title, there is widespread misconception about what we do and how we do it. A lot of people don't realize, for example, that nearly 90 percent of the Department's appropriations are passed on to the States, educational and scientific institutions, and hospitals and individuals in the form of grants—for public assistance, for medical research, for aid to education, for water pollution control, and a host of other projects in which State, local, Federal, and nongovernmental energies and resources are combined to promote the general welfare.

Because the work of our Department directly affects the lives of so many millions of people in so many different ways, any single impression of HEW is bound to be colored as much by what is opinion as by what is fact.

One of my staff members tells about his 5-year-old daughter who asked him what his job was. He found it somewhat difficult to put this into 5-year-old terms, but he went on at some length about how the Department looks after all the people in the country—how we try to keep people from getting sick, how we try to protect the food they eat and the medicine they take, how we try to see that everyone has enough to eat, how we want to make sure that everyone has a chance to go to school. The child was visibly impressed. A few days later the father overheard his daughter telling another child, "My daddy's better than your daddy—he takes care of everybody, just like God."

Unfortunately, like the 5-year-old, too many grownups share that mistaken impression. At one extreme are the anti-Federal forces who oppose all national programs in health, education, and welfare. Their view is that we have gone too far in the caretaking role. At the other extreme are the absolute paternalists who think we are not fatherly enough.

Both extremes, I think, have a narrow, cramped view of the needs and problems of our society. One clings to an ideal that may have been possible in a simpler, bygone age—the belief that each of us can stand entirely alone. But today, in a world that is changed by fantastic advances in science and technology, such a belief is as obsolete as the Pony Express.

The "let-the-Government-do-everything" school is equally shortsighted. Its followers show too little faith in the ability of man to adapt to new conditions, to meet new challenges. In their rush to take care of all his material needs, they forget his most basic need for self-respect and self-reliance and would rob him of the great happiness—the intense personal satisfaction—that comes from independence, growth, and achievement.

Neither approach would benefit society. With one we would flounder; with the other we would grow flabby. But between the two there is a path that will lead to social progress—a way that would sacrifice neither security nor independence—a way that would enhance both the dignity of the individual and the strength of the Nation.

And it is this path that the Kennedy administration is following.

In public welfare, for example our goal is to provide opportunities for independence to all who need them. For youth and adults who are handicapped by lack of education, by physical or mental disabilities, by social and economic pressures beyond their control, the dole is being exchanged for a bootstrap, so that they can help themselves.

We are also examining the causes of dependency and are looking for ways to cure or prevent them. Disease and poverty, ignorance and idleness are social ills that—like cancer—will respond to treatment if caught in time.

Our experiences over the past quarter of a century have amply demonstrated the soundness of the social security approach to establishing a floor of economic independence for people beyond their working years. When this independence is threatened by the high cost of hospital and related health care—as it is today—we feel it is time to add another plank to social security, to give people the means of insuring themselves against the pauperism that can quickly result from the heavy expenses of illness in the later years of life. This would not intrude upon individual freedom and dignity. Instead, it would make them possible.

The inadequacies of education, at a time when we are confronted with increasing demands for a more broadly and more highly educated population, have brought us face to face with a national crisis of major proportions.

Here, while respecting the prerogative of the States and local communities to control the education of our youth, we have proposed Federal assistance to selected areas of need where it is most appropriate and where it can be most useful.

We can no longer ignore the need for emergency classroom construction and aid to teachers' salaries in the public schools, for revitalized vocational education programs, for broadened opportunities in higher education, for expanded college facilities, for improving the quality of teaching, for meeting the special needs of handicapped children, and for expanded opportunities for adult education. These are among the nationwide needs which the Federal Government can properly help to meet. Indeed, it will be failing in its responsibility if it does not come forward to meet them.

And there are still other national problems that are waiting solution. There is mental retardation which needlessly blights the lives of millions of Americans. There is the problem of accidents which are the leading cause of death for young people up to the age of 35. There are the costly and debilitating problems of alcoholism and drug addiction which strike alike at rich and poor and have too long been shrouded with mystery and misunderstanding. There is the matter of air pollution and the harmful effects of manmade chemicals on man himself and his environment.

These are problems which George Washington and Jefferson and Madison and Hamilton could scarcely foresee. Yet they saw the need for a national government that would be strong enough to withstand the strain which accompanies any real progress—a government which would be strong enough to protect the whole body of the people—one that would be able to promote the general welfare without threat to individual freedom.

To be sure, the National Government cannot do these things alone. Nor was it ever intended that it should. We are a pluralistic society, a government of, by, and for the people, and all of us share in the responsibility of keeping our Nation free and strong.

But the stimulus for social progress must rise from each one of us as responsible individuals. It must come from our public conscience. It must respond to public needs. It must pull together our multiple resources and convert them into action.

The big job ahead is a job for all of us—every individual, every level of government, labor, management, professional organizations, welfare and civic groups, the technicians, and the man on the street.

Most basically, it is a job for politics—for the inner circle and the outer circle—because nothing at all will happen if we sit still.

We can't afford to sit still, and we don't intend to sit still. The past, for all its grandeur, is behind us. The present—tomorrow—will slip into the past. From the past and the present we must mold the future. We are responsible for its shape, its condition, and the promises that it holds for all mankind.

It is the job of politics to anticipate the future, to seek out opportunities for progress and to propel the Nation forward.

It is the job of politics to resolve the differences that divide and tend to immobilize us.

It is the job of politics to convert ideas into energy and energy into action, so that progress is possible and the future can be secure.

Politics, in turn, is led by parties, each of which has chosen a different path to the future.

Today, we know where we are going, and, with your help and the help of millions of others throughout the country, we will get there. We have purpose, we have energy, we have leadership.

These are three of the essential elements of progress, but there is still a fourth, and that is action.

When we can galvanize our forces into action, only then can we say that we, as a party, and we, as politicians, and as citizens have fulfilled our responsibilities to the Nation—and to ourselves.

I am confident that we will not be found remiss.

An Evaluation of the Common Market and American Trade

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 28, 1963

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, our very able and distinguished colleague, the gentleman from New York [Mr. Derounian] recently wrote an article on "New York, The Common Market, and World Trade," for the February 1963 issue of County Government, a journal of opinion and discussion on matters affecting New York State. Mr. Derounian's remarks, based upon his close study and hard work during the discussion of the Trade Expansion Act of the last Congress, well deserve the close attention of all of those interested in this important matter. To share these ideas with the Congress and the country, I am placing the gentleman's article, "New York, The

Common Market and World Trade," in the RECORD at this point.

NEW YORK, THE COMMON MARKET, AND WORLD TRADE

(By STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN)

Despite the fact that I have great respect for Luther H. Hodges, our present U.S. Secretary of Commerce, I feel that it is incumbent upon me to answer in a somewhat critical manner the article written by him in the December issue of this magazine. While Mr. Hodges took an extremely optimistic view of the European Economic Community (popularly known as the Common Market)—and I wish he could be proven right in his optimism—I feel that his views resembled those of a man in an ivory tower. Everything is not rosy with the Common Market as far as the United States is concerned.

First let me touch on our trading situation with Europe prior to the evolution of the Common Market and during this period of transition. (One must keep in mind that the entire Common Market scheme of trade restrictions has not yet been fully implemented.) Although tariffs have always been an obstacle to U.S. manufacturers attempting to create markets in the countries of Europe, they were by no means the greatest hurdle they had to overcome. Restrictions other than tariffs, so-called administrative restrictions, have for a long time retarded the growth of U.S. markets abroad. I make direct reference to restrictions such as the horsepower use tax in France, the restrictions against the importation of coal into Great Britain, the ban against the importation of watch parts into Switzerland and prohibitions against the importation of dairy products into the Scandinavan countries.

Although our negotiators have in many instances been successful in bargaining down prohibitive tariffs against U.S. products, at the same time they have devoted little or no time toward administrative restrictions. In essence this has meant that while our U.S. representatives to trade negotiations have been able to obtain more equitable tariff rates on U.S. products, in many cases these reduced rates have offered little incentive to our domestic producers as other restrictions still prohibited anything resembling a freer flow of trade.

Since the formation of the Common Market there has been little indication that the member nations in combination will tend to take any positive action with respect to prohibitive administrative restrictions. From all indications their only intent is to create common trade barriers and to lower these trade barriers only for those products which they desperately need. Moreover, there is little guarantee that once Common Market sources for these needed products are developed that even these beneficial rates will not be raised. From all indications their goal is as self-sufficient a Europe as is possible. In the opinion of many, the Common Market has at least the potential of becoming one of the most restrictive trade cartels in modern times. What one must understand about the Common Market is that for those within its walls such an arrangement can be most beneficial. Member nations under the Common Market will tear down traditional trade barriers. They will promote both the free flow of labor and capital throughout its member nations. On the other hand, in joining together they are at the same time raising a common wall against the rest of the free world.

This is not to say that we cannot make some inroads through this wall, but at what expense? For example, prior to the formation of the Common Market the bulk of our automobile exports were shipped to Germany and to the Benelux countries where there was a tariff of 18 percent. The Common Market initially proposed an external tariff of 29 percent. As a result of further concessions on our part, this initial tariff was reduced to 22 percent. However, U.S. automobile exporters, as a result of the formation of the Common Market, are faced with a higher rate of duty than was heretofore applicable to the bulk of their exports—despite our bargaining efforts and additional concessions.

The case of automobiles is not an isolated one. When the full effect of the Common Market's external tariff wall is realized, other U.S. products will have to find their way into Europe under higher tariffs than those presently enjoyed. This averaging of the tariff rates of member nations, in many cases, will close present markets and open no new ones.

Our negotiators have bargained away U.S. rates to a point where there are only four major trading nations in the free world that have rates lower than our own. The Common Market rates when they are fully implemented will, on the average, be considerably higher than ours. Based on weighted averages, only West Germany, Sweden, Switzerland, and Denmark have lower average industrial tariffs. West Germany is already a member of the Common Market so in reality under Common Market averaging this leaves only three nations with rates lower than ours. Moreover, there is talk that even these three nations may become members of the Common Market in the future. Where does this leave us? To answer my own question, this leaves us with very little to bargain with. To lower Common Market external tariff rates back to pre-Common Market levels we will have to lower our rates even further. This will open no new markets, only preserve old ones. At this point it becomes questionable whether our domestic industries can stand the increased competition at home that such action is bound to bring, for it goes without saying that in almost all cases we will have to give additional concessions via lower rates on European goods coming into the United States of America.

Agricultural products are another area of grave concern. The Common Market has proposed a system of variable import fees. These fees will slide up and down, thereby tending to keep the prices of imported agricultural products somewhat above the prices of corresponding Common Market agricultural products. This is meant to encourage the European farmer (including the inefficient farmer) to produce more—with the end objective a self-sufficient Europe.

The implementation of these variable import fees by the Common Market could cost us millions of dollars in the near future, particularly in the product areas of food grains, poultry, eggs, fresh fruit, and vegetables. In the long run, as the Common Market becomes self-sufficient and the European farmer more and more efficient we might well find ourselves pitted against Europe in cutthroat competition for other world markets. In a time when we have large farm surpluses, agricultural price supports and other costly Government subsidies to agriculture, such action presents a real threat and a triple threat at that—to the farmer, the consumer, and the taxpayer. Moreover, it is not too difficult to imagine what this will do to our present unfavorable balance of payments, which is out of balance in great part because of the tremendous expense of maintaining oversea military installations and the foreign aid program—activities which directly and indirectly are of great benefit to our European neighbors.

To summarize, so far I have attempted to show that restrictions other than tariffs present a serious threat to U.S. industry marketing, or hoping to market, abroad. A threat, I might add, to which this administration gives little voice or understanding. Those of us who worked on drafting the final trade bill understood the problem. That is why the bill as it became law contained a section that gives the President expressed power to act against nations or groupings of nations that make use of discriminatory import restrictions.

Also I have discussed the threatened hardships of the averaging method of arriving at uniform external tariffs by the Common Market. It appears that little is to be done about this right away. It has been stated that it will be 1964 before any new trade negotiations will be entered into. Our last round of trade negotiations took approximately 18 months. Using this past experience as a measuring rod, it will be late 1965 or 1966 before any new agreements with the Common Market or our other trading partners would become effective. By this time Europe may be self-sufficient in many areas of production and we will be shut out of much-needed markets.

As if this ought to be enough of a concern, it is only half of our problem. Remove all trade barriers and in many product areas the U.S. manufacturer still could not compete in foreign markets. Here at home we are in, and for the past several years have been in, a period of inflation and increased national debt. Inflation raises domestic prices, stimulates imports, reduces exports and employment, and reduces our gold reserves. A growing national debt shakes business confidence—businessmen are less likely to speculate in times of uncertainty. A growing national debt requires additional debt monetization, which takes money out of circulation that could well be used for consumption and business investment. Our present debt of roughly $300 billion includes interest on that debt of about $9.5 billion. Debt management is rapidly becoming an overpowering problem spurred by the inherent threat of increased inflation.

Furthermore, our present tax structure does not offer the proper incentives for modernization and expansion of American plants and equipment. Granted, within the last year depreciation, schedules have been somewhat liberalized and the 7-percent investment credit was instituted. These, however, are not the kind of sweeping reforms that are so desperately needed. At most they are only mild attempts by the New Frontier to appeal to business.

The Federal budget should be brought into balance. This is not something which can be put off for some indefinite future time. Even the Kennedy administration has given credence to the concept of a balanced budget. However, and this is where we have a parting of the way, they maintain that the budget should be balanced over the cycle and not fiscal year by fiscal year. Even conceding the concept of a balanced budget over a cycle, unless the cycle is to run into infinity there has not been, and will be no balancing. Over the past 33 years we have experienced 27 deficits (current fiscal 1963 included). While our too few surpluses of the past have only been slight or marginal, our deficits have been deep and alarming. In this current fiscal year we are faced with an expected budget deficit of almost $8 billion. It will be much larger if there is a tax cut without an accompanying cut in Federal spending. Nonessential, nondefense spending should be cut, and there is even some indication that defense spending could be trimmed without seriously threatening our national defense or space projects. The 100,000 and some employees that the Kennedy administration has added to the Federal payrolls should be cut. Federal budgets which are more nearly in balance would help to reduce our national debt and debt-management problem, and curb the threat of more inflation. Secondly, they would go far toward reinstating the confidence that both domestic business and foreign interests seem to lack in our somewhat shaky economy.

The yearly productivity gains of domestic industry should be used primarily to reduce prices, and not to increase wages. Between 1953 and 1960 wages in the United States rose by 31 percent while productivity rose by only 15 percent. In comparison with other industrial nations of the free world, our ratio of wage increases to productivity gains is most unfavorable. Productivity gains used to reduce the price of goods would tend to stimulate consumption and employment, increase exports, and in the end increase the real wages and income of all.

In conclusion, it is incumbent that the Kennedy administration toughen up its foreign trade policy. The Trade Expansion Act of 1962, which those of us on the Ways and Means Committee worked closely on, has the potential of becoming a fine and rewarding trade program. However, standing alone it is only a paper document. The act needs to be implemented by men who understand its purposes. It needs the force and enthusiasm of a persuasive and aggressive administration. Beyond this, we need trade negotiators who will "bring home the bacon" by protecting American interests.

Concurrently, we need greater domestic economic stability. More specifically, we need balanced budgets, more incentives for the business community to invest and expand, productivity gains which reduce prices—bringing about more competitive prices for American goods in foreign markets.

During its first 2 years in office this administration has shown little understanding of our problems—domestic and foreign. We need positive action not indecision coupled with empty promises. We need an administration that concerns itself with our immediate and foreseeable problems and is not off chasing rainbows.

Red Gamble Held Gain for West

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. M. G. (GENE) SNYDER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 28, 1963

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, the following Associated Press article has been brought to my attention by a constituent, and I feel it should be a matter of interest to this House:

[From the Louisville (Ky.) Courier Journal, Feb. 24, 1963]

RED GAMBLE HELD A GAIN FOR WEST

WICHITA, FALLS, TEX., February 23.—Vice President LYNDON B. JOHNSON said Saturday night that Russia has lost its gamble to extend the Communist empire into the Western Hemisphere.

JOHNSON said in a speech to a dinner audience that the year 1962 is likely to be pinpointed "as one of the decisive turning points in the cold war and of the whole long struggle between freedom and tyranny."

He continued: "First, after 15 years of containment, the Russian Communists gambled desperately in an attempt to extend their armed empire across the oceans to the Western Hemisphere. They gambled greatly—and they lost."

LEADERSHIP DEFIED

"Second, after that failure, the Russian Communists turned back to an empire in which—for the first time since communism came into existence—they found their own leadership and control defied and challenged by the Chinese Communists. And the whole myth of Communist unity exploded."

JOHNSON said that when the Soviets moved missiles into Cuba they found themselves facing the hard reality of an America ready, an America prepared, an America resolute.

"In the face of that preparedness and resolve, the forces of communism backed away.

"But there is one vital point which I believe needs to be brought home. The American strength which Khrushchev faced in Cuba—the strength which has held the line against aggression through all these years of the cold war—is not solely the strength of arms and planes and missiles and bombs."

SOLIDARITY CITED

"The greater strength which has carried us through these years of peril is the strength of this country's political system—the system of which all of us are part and to which each of us adds or subtracts strength and solidarity."

JOHNSON said the country needs to recognize that partisanship is not "the end-all and be-all of citizenship."

"In our national history, there are no heroes who made their names as partisans," he said. "The only men remembered—the only men worth remembering—have always been those who have placed the country above party and principle above partisanship. We shall have lost the keystone from the arch of our national strength if ever our values are otherwise."

Mr. Speaker, I think it is obvious that the Vice President has miscalculated when he makes the statement that Russia has gambled in the Western Hemisphere and lost. Khrushchev declared to all the world after he had withdrawn 42 missiles from Cuba that they had scored a major victory in Cuba and since we know that it is basic Communist strategy to take three steps forward and one or two steps back in their advancing—it would certainly seem that in view of the no-invasion guarantee which it is reported Mr. Khrushchev received, it can hardly be said that the Russians lost in this hemisphere.

Second. The Vice President is quoted as saying that 1962 is likely to be pinpointed as one of the decisive turning points of the cold war, and I will ask in which direction, and in whose favor? Is there anything to indicate that the Communists have had any reversals of any significance?

Third. The phrase "after 15 years of containment, the Russian Communists" is an insult to the intelligence of the American people. It certainly is tragic that the Vice President of the United States should feel that communism has been contained during the last 15 years. A call to the Library of Congress today indicates that 15 years ago approximately 330 million people lived under communism and today approximately 1,059 million are living behind the Iron Curtain or in the satellite countries. Can this be construed as containment?

Fourth. The Vice President seems to take comfort, as do many, in some supposed cleavage between the Chinese Communists and the Russian Communists. I quite frankly cannot take much comfort in any disagreement as to methods and do not feel that a disagreement in methods can in any way indicate a break in Communist objectives. It has been repeatedly indicated by both of the Communist empires that it should be understood that they would stand together and they both look forward to the day when they will joyfully shovel the last spadeful of dirt on the grave of capitalism.

The Chinese Communists and the Russian Communists may scrabble over methods, but they are both unswervingly and unrelentlessly committed to the same objective, world conquest and world domination.

Secretary of Commerce, Hon. Luther H. Hodges, Calls for Development of an Adequate Nationwide Transportation System in Speech Before American Road Builders' Association—Senator Jennings Randolph, Democrat of West Virginia, Addresses 61st Annual Convention

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 28, 1963

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, the 61st annual convention of the American Road Builders' Association, a national organization devoted to the advocacy of adequate highway and airport programs, has just concluded its sessions in Chicago, Ill.

The meeting this year was of particular interest because it was held in conjunction with the construction equipment and exposition road show which, I am told, was the largest industrial exhibit in the world. Without question, it was of tremendous significance. The exhibits covered an area equivalent to that of 13 football fields. It was attended by more than 100,000 people including some 7,000 foreign visitors.

Aside from its impressive size the show was meaningful in that it clearly illustrated the great strides which have been made in the technology of equipment design. The increased productivity of modern machines accounts for a very important part in keeping the unit costs of highway construction at a low level.

The problems and progress of the highway program were discussed from many different approaches during the meeting of the ARBA.

The highway legislative situation was ably presented by my good friend and former House colleague, the distinguished chairman of the House Subcommittee on Roads, the Honorable GEORGE H. FALLON, and by the energetic ranking minority member of that subcommittee, the Honorable WILLIAM C. CRAMER.

It was inspiring to hear from such outstanding leaders as John C. Mackie, the Michigan State highway commissioner who is the 1963 president of the

American Association of Highways Officials; Ralph R. Bartelsmeyer, who has recently completed a distinguished term of service as chief engineer of the Illinois Division of Highways, and W. A. Bugge, the noted director of highways of the State of Washington.

I gained an insight on the thinking of the highway industry from W. K. Cox, who is the president of the Construction Industrial Manufacturers Association and vice president of the Caterpillar Tractor Co., and from Maj. Gen. Louis W. Prentiss, the capable executive vice president of the American Road Builders' Association.

A high spot of the convention, the annual road builders' luncheon, was addressed by the Secretary of Commerce, the Honorable Luther H. Hodges.

I was particularly happy to be present to see the annual American Road Builders' Association Award presented to Nello L. Teer, Jr., president of the Nello L. Teer Co. of Durham, N.C., a firm which is among the world's leaders in highway construction. I was most pleased that the founder of that outstanding company, Nello L. Teer, Sr., was also present, as was the Federal Highway Administrator, Rex M. Whitton, and many other distinguished leaders representing both government and industry.

Secretary Hodges delivered an outstanding speech which contained a message which should be read by every Member of Congress.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Secretary Hodges' speech at the 61st annual meeting of the American Road Builders' Association be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Also, Mr. President, I request that there be printed at the conclusion of Secretary Hodges' address my own remarks delivered at the opening session of the convention.

There being no objection, the remarks were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY SECRETARY OF COMMERCE LUTHER H. HODGES PREPARED FOR DELIVERY AT A LUNCHEON OF THE AMERICAN ROAD BUILDERS' ASSOCIATION, PALMER HOUSE HOTEL, CHICAGO, MONDAY, FEBRUARY 25, 1963

When Nello Teer asked me to come to Chicago for the American Road Builders' Association convention, he suggested as a topic, "Trends Threatening To Curtail Motor Vehicle Use and Highway Development."

The Department of Commerce, however, is responsible for promoting the health of the Nation's entire transportation system and not just its roads. Since there are trends threatening the development of our whole transportation system, I think it would be properly responsive to your subject to talk with you as transportation men and not just as roadbuilders.

We do not have to look far to discover why the Federal Government is concerned with transportation. The industry makes a huge contribution to the national economy. It is estimated that the cost of passenger and freight transportation, including the private automobile, presently is more than $100 billion a year, or nearly one-fifth of our gross national product. It is further estimated that this cost will rise above $150 billion before 1980.

The influence of the transportation industry, however, goes far beyond these dollar figures. It affects the cost of every item we produce, and thus is vital to our country's economic growth at home and abroad.

The Federal Government estimated that it will spend nearly $5 billion in transport-oriented operations in fiscal 1964. At the Department of Commerce better than 85 percent of the funds we will administer in fiscal 1964 are for transportation. This includes more than $3 billion in the highway trust fund, but even out of the Department's general fund we spend nearly half for transportation, mainly maritime subsidies.

Yet, despite the fact that the public is spending more for transportation facilities and equipment than ever before in history, transportation is not serving—let me repeat, not serving—as well as it should or as well as it could.

Millions of dollars in business are lost in central city districts because of traffic congestion.

Common carriers, which are the backbone of our transportation system and vital to the welfare of small business, specially, are getting less and less of the total intercity freight shipments.

In spite of increasing subsidies, our merchant marine's share of world shipping is declining at a time when we are trying to expand our oversea commerce.

And, finally, many of our railroads, airlines and trucking firms are operating at losses, or with profits that are unhealthily small.

The present state of affairs has been some time in the making. An abundance of studies in the past have pointed to the problems of transportation, but not until last year was an effort made to present a comprehensive program for the functioning of the transportation complex as an efficient whole.

Until now attention has been concentrated on strengthening a particular mode of transport, generally for sound historical reasons. The past decade, for example, has seen an intensification of highway construction. I don't mean in any way to deprecate this activity—our need for better roads has been and still is great. We still have much to do to build a highway network adequate to our domestic commerce and defense requirements.

As I mentioned before we shall spend well over $3 billion for highways in fiscal 1964. Much of this money will go toward completion of the 41,000-mile National System of Interstate and Defense Highways. More than 14,000 miles are now open to traffic and construction is underway on another 4,300. Roadbuilding in 1962 involved about 10,000 individual firms. Highway construction costs, exclusive of engineering and rights-of-way, involved an estimated $5.6 billion. We have tightened our audit and investigations program to insure that the most efficient and honest use of funds is made. This is a story in itself.

We are continuing our safety and research projects. We have to go no further than last year's record 41,000 traffic fatalities to find the reason why we are so concerned with safety.

Within the last year or so, two specific organizations have been set up to improve Government's role in traffic safety—one is the Bureau of Public Roads Office of Highway Safety, the other is the Interdepartmental Highway Safety Board under the chairmanship of the Secretary of Commerce. These two groups plus participating members offer scientific, technical and educational aid to groups in and out of Government to promote traffic safety.

We have established a Federal drivers' register, which keeps track of all drivers whose licenses have been suspended for drunken driving or involvement in fatal accidents. States participate voluntarily in this program, and to date only four States have not taken part. Two of these holdouts are expected to participate in the very near future. We also have a program with the States to promote uniformity in signs, signals, and markings to end accident-causing confusion.

We have further expanded educational and training services to States, and have programs to stimulate and coordinate traffic research.

We are proud of our accomplishments in these areas, but we must also face the problems arising in integrating highways into the overall transportation complex. It is fortunate that we can see them and hopefully act on them now—not later when solutions would be much harder to effect.

Perhaps the most immediate and vexing problem facing us is urban transportation. Traffic snarls result in millions of dollars in lost business and time, not to mention frayed tempers and raw nerves.

The difficulty in finding a solution, it seems to me, has been that in pursuing their parochial interests, the various factions have failed to state the problem—and the problem is how to move goods and passengers in the fastest, most economical, and most comfortable manner that is acceptable to the user, the customer so to speak.

We must not only make the best possible use of each mode of transportation, but find the best combinations of modes—we need, in short, an integrated, rather than a fragmented approach. This may call for some thinking of the national interest, rather than local or modal concerns.

The problems of urban transportation are going to grow rather than diminish with time. The population of the United States will soar to 214 million by 1970. One hundred and fifty million of these will be concentrated in urban areas.

An important step toward an integrated approach to these problems was taken in the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1962.

First, the act allows a State to use Federal-aid secondary funds on extensions of the system that pass through urban areas. This permits increased flexibility of financing arrangements and promotes improvements in such areas, particularly those having important feeder routes on the secondary system.

Second, the act requires assurance from the State highway department that relocation advisory assistance will be provided for the relocation of families displaced by acquisition or clearance of rights-of-way for any Federal-aid highway.

The loss of taxable property for a freeway right-of-way creates real problems for city officials. We are actively promoting the use of air space over freeways, and have adopted procedures and standards which would permit States and cities to utilize space above and below freeways to build parking facilities, apartments, stores, public buildings, and even parks and playgrounds.

Third, and most important, the Secretary of Commerce is directed to cooperate with the States in the development of long-range highway plans and programs coordinated with plans for improving other affected forms of transportation. This provision will encourage transportation planning and improve the quality of urban planning generally. It will not delay the current Federal-aid highway program. Urban areas of 50,000 or more must have plans in process by July 1, 1965, to be eligible for Federal participation in costs of projects.

At last, I think we have made a move toward curing the illness rather than treating the symptoms.

Urban congestion is acute and, therefore, has occupied much of our immediate attention, but other problems are shaping up, and our hope is that together we can attend to these before they become too serious.

We expect to have ready for submission to Congress within 60 days the Department of

Commerce recommendations for possible changes in the present weight and size limitations for vehicles using the Interstate System.

Here again the task is not easy. While physical characteristics of highways, such as width of lanes, the ability to withstand heavy axle weights, and other criteria are important, we must also evaluate weights and sizes in terms of the economics of truck transportation. We must provide the combination that will result in the most efficient and effective standards for highway vehicles.

The need to evaluate the effectiveness of alternative methods and standards must be extended throughout our transportation system. The interlocking nature of urban planning, highways, and truck sizes carries on through railroads, waterways, and air transport. The parts must mesh if the machine is to run properly.

For this reason the administration has formulated a basic transportation policy. Briefly what President Kennedy has called for is greater reliance on competition and less on regulation, consistent policies of taxation and user charges, increased research for equipment and systems.

Much of the weakness in transportation today can be traced to the existing Federal regulatory policies. As the President said, in his transportation message to Congress last year, "A chaotic patchwork of inconsistent and often obsolete legislation and regulation has evolved from a history of specific actions addressed to specific problems of specific industries at specific times. This patchwork does not fully reflect either the dramatic changes in technology or the parallel change in the structure of competition."

The unequal application of present regulatory laws impedes competition and leads to a host of inconsistencies.

Coal, petroleum, grain, and other bulk commodities move by barge over inland waterways completely without regulation, but the same commodities moving by rail or common carrier truck are completely regulated.

Hauling buttermilk is exempt from regulation, but the same truck hauling chocolate milk over the same route between the same points is regulated. Powdered milk is exempt but condensed milk is not. And there are many other such inconsistencies.

There is in the legislative machinery right now a most important bill. It would assure all carriers the right to ship containers and vehicles on other carriers at rates available to noncarrier shippers.

The object, of course, is to encourage coordination among the various agencies of transportation, to assure shippers better and cheaper service. One result would be to stimulate the growing piggy-back technique, which eliminates much of the cost and time loss of repeated loadings and unloadings.

Another purpose is to further the growth of containerization, which promises to cut transportation costs considerably and is one of the exciting developments in the field.

A trend appears to be developing to standardize containers in sizes of 4 by 8, 8 by 8, 8 by 10, and 8 by 20. If these do become standard sizes we must give consideration to how these can be effectively moved by all modes of transportation. It would affect the trucking industry, for example, because piggyback trailers are really nothing but containers.

Developing these new techniques, however, depends to a large extent on allowing all carriers equal rights to use them rather than regulating some and penalizing others.

Inequities persist, too, in our policies toward taxes and user charges.

For example, the Federal Government now spends about $500 million a year on the airways system and this expenditure continues to grow. Yet, airlines pay only a small portion of this public cost in the form of user charges. Passengers pay a 5-percent user charge on their tickets, and there is no tax on air freight. A 2-cent-per-gallon charge is levied on the fuel for reciprocal engine airplanes, but there is no fuel tax for the big, fast, efficient jets.

The public has invested more than $2 billion in the inland waterways system and continues to spend at the rate of about $70 million a year. Yet, inland waterway operators pay no user charge for this publicly provided facility.

I am happy to say that the highway trust fund which supplies all of the Federal-aid highway funds for construction is set up to allocate construction costs as nearly as possible in relation to user benefits. Revenues from the fund are derived from motor fuel taxes, rubber taxes, use taxes for heavy vehicles, and taxes on new trucks, buses, and trailers.

Our aim is to bring costs in a similar fashion more into line with user benefits in other segments of industry. We hope to establish equity in terms of taxes and regulation and allow free enterprise as free a rein as possible. For it is through competition we feel we can best get the lowest possible shipper costs and the most effective service.

Competition gives us more than efficiency for a static situation. It sharpens our awareness for the pressures of change. It requires that we not only keep up with a rapidly moving world, but that we anticipate and precipitate change in the constant desire to forge ahead.

It is important that we move with purpose—blind change for its own sake is inadequate. Only through the various forms of well reasoned research can planned change be accomplished in a way that will produce the kind of transportation system that will be responsive to the economic and social requirements of the future.

In his transportation message, President Kennedy said, "To understand the increasingly complex transportation problems of the future, to identify the relationships of social, economic, administrative, and technical factors involved, to translate scientific knowledge into transportation engineering practice, to weigh the merits of alternative systems, and to formulate new, improved, and consistent policies—we need information that can evolve only from a vigorous, continuous, and coordinated programs of research. Yet, in the field of transportation where we have many unfulfilled opportunities, research has been fragmented, unsteady, inadequate in scope and balance."

In the long view, I don't think we can commit ourselves too firmly to any mode of transportation, to any process of manufacture, to the use of any material, or engineering procedure. Research is pointing to new high strength, low cost, durable materials, new sources of power, new types of vehicles. The jet airplane is fairly new on the scene, and investigations are underway for commercial aircraft to fly at three times the speed of sound. A nuclear-powered merchant ship is operational, and a hydrofoil ship has been built. A variety of surface effect vehicles are in the experimental stage. And who is to say that something will not follow that sounds incredible now?

The President said, "Taking advantage of new techniques that would provide convenience and efficiency, we must consider the impact of different forms of transportation investment on economic development; we must combine and integrate systems to take advantage of the maximum benefits of each mode of travel; we must consider the Nation's transportation network as an articulated and closely linked system rather than an uncoordinated set of independent entities."

The Department of Commerce has been given the job of developing a comprehensive transportation research program for the Government for later consideration by the Congress.

Our Commerce Department's Census Bureau is undertaking a survey of all transportation to fill in the gaps of present knowledge, especially with respect to private trucking.

Our Bureau of Public Roads has been using research for many years to aid it in planning and building the world's finest intercity network of highways. It is now reemphasizing its work and has undertaken the complex job of evaluating the relation of highway planning to mass transportation by rail or express bus, and to city planning.

I cannot stress too much the importance of accomplishing these goals. Transportation is tightly tied to public policy. Transportation is the catalyst that makes our economy work. It affects economic growth, it is a determining factor in the price of every commodity we produce, consume, and export. It is a vital cog in our defense machinery. An inefficient transportation system can render inefficient every vital aspect of our country's life.

We've made a start on a long, continuing, complex, and difficult job. It is going to take the best techniques and cooperation of Government and private enterprise to put and keep our transportation program at the high level our country requires.

But I feel that Government is facing up to the overall problems of our transportation industry with more realism than it has in the past. With your help we will build an industry that is responsive to our Nation's growth needs, economically and socially.

Keep up your good work and thank you for letting me be with you today.

Address by Senator Jennings Randolph, Democrat, of West Virginia, Chairman, Subcommittee on Public Roads, U.S. Senate Committee on Public Works, at Afternoon Session of Annual Convention of American Road Builders' Association, Chicago, Ill., February 25, 1963

On several occasions during the past 4 years I have been invited to address national conventions of the American Road Builders' Association, contractor groups, and affiliated State units of ARBA. For the most part, I have spoken on subjects such as the role of the citizen in public affairs and the relations of the businessman and his Government.

I intend to speak here more specifically of problems in the area of concern of the roadbuilders and of the highway planners and administrators.

First, however, I should say that in the Senate, and especially in our Public Works Committee, we have felt in a keen official and a deep personal way the losses of Senators Dennis Chavez of New Mexico and Robert Kerr of Oklahoma in recent weeks. They were policymakers and leaders of action in highway matters in the Congress. Our new chairman, the capable Senator Pat McNamara, of Michigan, and others will carry on. None of us is indispensable, but our success and the progress we seek to effectuate by our decisions and actions will be all the more assured by our drawing on the experiences we acquired while serving under the expert leadership of our predecessors.

There has been a minimum of partisanship on the Public Works Committee and on the Public Roads Subcommittee. Senator John Sherman Cooper, of Kentucky, is the ranking Republican member and brings to his duties a commendable diligence. In this respect, I acknowledge and commend the productivity of the Subcommittee on Public Roads during the 86th and 87th Congresses under the chairmanship of Senator McNamara. It was a privilege to have served with him, Senator Cooper, and other colleagues on that subcommittee. I am sure we will continue to labor cooperatively.

Concerning the important question of coordinate but separate branches of our Government—especially as relate to administration of public roads matters—I have some positive opinions. Between the legislators and the administrators in the public roads agencies of the executive branches of both State and Federal Governments there should be mutual understanding, mutual respect, and helpful liaison in the public interest.

Those in the executive establishment responsible for public roads administration receive from the legislative branch outlines of policy in the broadest possible terms.

I stress the word "broad" in speaking of most legislative policy declarations and authorizations passed on to the executive. This is as it should be. The legislative branch must not straitjacket the executive branch. By and large, I do not believe there is straitjacketing in any substantial degree.

But it does seem that occasionally there are some legislators in the State assemblies or in the Federal Congress who exceed the bounds of what I consider to be propriety on the one hand and constitutional requirements on the other hand. I refer to those members of legislative bodies who seem neither to respect nor to subscribe to the concept of coordinate but separate branches of government. I believe there are legislators and staffs of legislative bodies who abuse the relationship between the executive and legislative authority—especially in the area of public roads. This condition is deplored.

A legislator does not have a right to seek to administer the law or laws which stem from legislative action. That is a usurpation of power because administration is a duty reserved for the executive branch by constitutional provision and in statutes brought into being under the Constitution.

Furthermore, I believe a legislator or a legislative body or a legislative committee staff should not seek and should not attempt to take over law enforcement authority which is specifically a responsibility of the executive branch. Yet, this sometimes happens. And, I assure you, I believe a legislator or any group of legislators or any legislative body or any legislative committee staff should not infringe on the judicial branch by seeking to be prosecutor, judge, and jury. But, unfortunately, this, too, sometimes occurs.

There are also instances wherein some among our fellow citizens expect—even demand—that their legislative representatives shall transgress on the authority reserved by the Constitution or specific statutes for the executive branch or for the judiciary.

Citizens who have complaints against administration should first direct their objections to the executive. They should not complain to the legislative representatives or committees unless and until they are prepared to suggest and support valid, reasonable, and responsible changes in existing law—or to recommend new statutes relating to conditions and circumstances apparently not covered by law.

If citizens have complaints to lodge against the legality of an administrative action and they cannot bring about correction within the structure of the executive branch where responsibility reposes, the proper course for those citizens to follow is to seek appropriate judicial review and/or action.

It is the responsibility of citizens as well as legislators, executives and administrators, and jurists to keep their actions within the framework of our constitutional system of coordinate but separate branches of the Government. Nowhere does this seem to be more necessary than in public roads matters.

In spite of some distracting influences there has been much substantial progress in the implementation of the public roads program authorized by the Highway Act of 1956. And there has been sound progressiveness in the American Road Builders' Association, too, since 1956. That was the year during which the knowledgeable and efficient executive vice president of this association, Maj. Gen. Louis W. Prentiss, became head of the organization's administrative staff. I share a view ably expressed recently that much of the current prominence which the association holds in the highway world is attributable to his conscientious leadership. And General Prentiss' deputy, Burton F. Miller, has contributed effectively to the American Road Builders' Association leadership effort. His was a significant article for our magazine recently on the subject "Teamwork in Constructive Progress." I share his comment that technological advancements in the highway field are speeding highway planning, construction, and maintenance and are creating better, more efficient roads for a traveling America.

There are, of course, capable and dedicated administrators, planners, researchers, and engineers in the Bureau of Public Roads of the U.S. Department of Commerce. It is pleasant to have their cooperation and a privilege to cooperate with them.

I believe citizens can agree that in view of the high capital investment required for construction of the Interstate and Defense Highway System and the substantial maintenance charges which devolve on the States, our highways in that system necessarily must be designed for a long service life. In fact, Bureau of Public Roads analysts have estimated a service life of 80 to 100 years for Interstate System grading, 35 years for surfacing, and 65 to 75 years for structures. It seems to me that where evidence accumulates that the estimated traffic for 1975 approaches a breakover point, it would be wise to provide now for either the additional lanes required to take care of traffic needs projected beyond the 1975 period or at least make those provisions necessary to assure that the structures being included in highway projects will continue to have useful lifespans. It certainly would be tragic to permit structures to become obsolete early in their life because of insufficient rights-of-way, lack of control of access, or because of other reasons.

I understand that what actually has happened in some instances is that new sections of highways which have only recently been completed, and which were designed on the basis of the estimated 1975 traffic load, already are carrying traffic equal to that which had been anticipated to develop no sooner than 1975. Based on these experiences, steps should be taken to assure that sections of highways now being constructed will continue to be of optimum use beyond 1975.

The importance of the longevity of the highways is apparent to the most casual observer. Consequently, there is much interest in obtaining assurances of quality construction. And this interest is displayed not only by State and Federal highway officials but, also, by State legislative committees, by committees of the Congress, and by the public at large.

This concern generates demands that each stage of construction be subjected to thorough and expert inspection.

From a technical standpoint, the informed consensus seems to be that inspection procedures and nondestructive testing have improved and will continue to improve with more emphasis on measuring devices utilizing radioisotopes and various applications in the field of electronics and sonics. The technical tools are available now to measure construction performance with micrometer exactness. There is no real doubt that technological advances in this field will enhance the building of better highways at lower costs to the taxpayers.

I share the view that it must be accepted as fact and as a practical consideration that highways cannot be constructed under degrees of exactness comparable to laboratory control. Indeed, there must be leeway allowed in order to meet working conditions actually encountered in field operations. This should be clear, even to the layman. But there should be no lessening of quality, nor lowering of standards. Perhaps the correct approach would be the placing of more reliability on field decisions and allowing greater acceptance of reasonable variations from the technical specifications.

Unless procedures permit prompt and firm decisions by field engineers, it is conceivable—even probable—that the highway program would be bogged in greater degree under a maze of indecision and the proverbial redtape. This consequence would prove to be extremely costly for the taxpayers.

Insofar as inspections are concerned, there would appear to be a demand for and an ability to perform them precisely and with prompt results. But in informed circles I hear two dominant questions. They are:

1. What tolerances can be permitted in the various construction operations without loss of quality in the finished product?

2. What inspections are necessary and desirable to make certain that the work has been accomplished within the required tolerances?

In spite of the fact that the State, as the instrumentality contracting for the highways, bears the primary inspection responsibility, we hear numerous demands that the U.S. Bureau of Public Roads must conduct extensive physical inspections of every Federal-aid project—and especially the Interstate System projects—to make certain that full value is received for every Federal-aid dollar allocated and expended.

If the Bureau of Public Roads inspects in the interest of every Federal dollar involved and if the State checks on behalf of every State dollar, it would appear that there would be costly duplicate inspections at every stage of construction. There are few if any instances in which duplication of effort is not wasteful. In the matter of the types of inspections under discussion, duplications patently result in many excessive and mostly unnecessary delays and much confusion. This reflects in the high costs to the taxpayers and extra expense imposed on the contractor.

For more than 40 years highways have been built successfully within the framework of the Federal-State partnership—and this certainly should continue.

I reemphasize a point about which I have consulted with segments of the highway industry. It is this:

If we are to achieve throughout the United States the acceleration of the roadbuilding program called for by our transportation and economic needs, we must reinstate at every level a vigorous Federal-State-industry partnership and the sense of mutual trust that such a relationship implies.

By and large, the partners are working well together, notwithstanding some disrupting influences.

There is need for Federal cooperation with the agencies of the States. This does not necessitate duplications, and it certainly does not imply and should not countenance undue and unnecessary Federal controls.

I have the positive feeling that the U.S. Bureau of Public Roads, headed by Federal Highway Administrator Rex Whitton—who had long experience as a State administrator and understands the State point of view—really has no designs on a so-called takeover. In fact, under Administrator Whitton, it is my belief that the Bureau is exerting leadership to strengthen the partnership concept.

One of the most promising developments in this area is the formation of a task force within the Research and Development Division of the Bureau of Public Roads to work with the State highway departments and with industry to explore the whole problem of permissible tolerances and inspection procedures.

The consensus of informed persons, as I interpret it, is that the approach being followed is based on the fact that the testing of samples taken at random provides data which can be plotted on a curve, and an analysis of which determines whether or not a given standard of quality has been met. I would be inclined to the more lenient interpretation that in using this approach it does not follow that a job is categorized as a failure because a few samples may fall below the lower limit of specified tolerances. Shouldn't the whole curve be considered?

Early completion of the work of the task force in the Bureau's Research and Development Division is a matter of urgency. Acceptance by the States of recommended tolerances to be brought forth likewise is an urgent matter.

I am informed that planning and construction delays have reached proportions in many areas which are costly not only to the taxpayers but also are threatening the stability of the contracting industry.

Highway contractors should find acceptance of workable tolerances to be of significance to their work and beneficial to their operations.

Experts assure me that new inspection and testing techniques, coupled with engineering judgment of high order, will promote decisions on the spot, so to speak, and will thus eliminate many costly delays, as well as speed the process of approving estimates for payment.

Close cooperation between State and Federal authorities and between government and industry is, of course, essential to success through these approaches.

I am gratified that the American Road Builders' Association has a committee at work to provide industry participation in and support for this project undergoing study by the Bureau's research and development task force.

The interest of our Public Works Committee in the matter of new materials and new uses of materials, new equipment and new methods employed in construction has been demonstrated by the activities during the past year in connection with the compiling of seven committee prints dealing with the subject of new materials, new design methods, etc., in public works construction. One of the outstanding presentations which the committee received was prepared by the Bureau of Public Roads, in cooperation with others. It has shown very clearly and concisely the high degree of technical refinement that is being employed in highways construction in this country. It is my hope that we can expand this study by conferences with representatives of industry and that eventually we can publish a composite report which will point up specific areas where additional research may be helpful in improving public works structures.

In summary, I emphasize the belief that important contributions can be made—indeed, must be made—to three vitally necessary goals, namely:

1. Maintenance of a Federal-aid highway program—and I underscore the fact that it must be an aid program—conducted by the States, rather than one which would be a Federal highway program with aid to the States unfortunately deemphasized.

2. Improved and duplication-free inspection which would have the positive result of strengthening public confidence in the integrity of the highway program.

3. Elimination of project and construction delays costly both to the taxpayers and to the contractors.

It is my hope that this year will be one during which the administrators can devote their efforts to administering—the engineers to engineering—the roadbuilders to building—the paving contractors to paving—and the highway and safety researchers to their important investigations and development.

I trust there will be a minimum of requirement on the time of those in the public road agencies and those in the private sector of road construction for response to legislative inquiries and legislative hearings.

In the absence of objection—to use legislative parlance—I will close, as I did the last ARBA convention I had the privilege of addressing, with these admonitions and assurances:

There is an overriding requirement that there will be full recognition of the fact that this Nation's road construction needs are among our most urgent domestic problems. But these needs can be had and will be fulfilled—and the blight of accounts of alleged and/or actual wrongdoing will be overcome—if we unite to promote a harmonious Federal-State-industry partnership. I call for a partnership for progress—one guided by men to match our times.

SENATE

Friday, March 1, 1963

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, and was called to order by the Vice President.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D., offered the following prayer:

God of all grace, Thou hast taught us that in quietness and in confidence shall be our strength. On this day of world prayer, when around the earth the incense of intercession arises from the agonized needs of Thy children, we, too, in this Chamber of governance, would climb the world's great altar stairs which slope through darkness up to Thee, the giver of all good.

We lift up our prayer for Thy endowment of spiritual might upon the godly women of all the churches in this our Capital City, who are reverently bowing this very hour at an altar set up in this white-domed shrine of each patriot's devotion, asking for Thy healing grace as the only balm in Gilead for the ills of this sundered and wounded world.

On this appointed day we would join the hosts under all skies in the mystery of united prayer by which more things are wrought than this world dreams of. We do not ask for Thy bestowal upon us of any material thing. We but ask that Thou wouldst make us men and women of pure hearts, purged from the mire of moral failure, free from the lure of selfish advantage, and of the prejudice which blinds our inner eyes and warps our judgment.

So above all, in turmoils without and within, day by day we would find—

A little place of mystic grace,
Of self and sin swept bare,
Where we may look upon Thy face,
And talk to Thee in prayer.

In the dear Redeemer's name we ask it. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. Mansfield, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, February 28, 1963, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

LIMITATION ON STATEMENTS DURING MORNING HOUR

On request of Mr. Mansfield, and by unanimous consent, statements during the morning hour were ordered limited to 3 minutes.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

Report on Export Control

A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on export control, covering the quarter ended December 31, 1962 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Use of Civil Aeronautics Board Records and Testimony of Board Personnel Regarding Aircraft Accidents

A letter from the Chairman, Civil Aeronautics Board, Washington, D.C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation relating to the use of Civil Aeronautics Board records and testimony of Board personnel regarding aircraft accidents (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Commerce.

Report on Financial Condition and Fiscal Operations of Highway Trust Fund

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the financial condition and fiscal operations of the highway trust fund, dated June 30, 1962 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Finance.

Report on Review of Manpower Utilization in the Maintenance of Facilities and Operation of Utilities at Selected Military Installations in Japan

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the review of manpower utilization in the maintenance of facilities and operation of utilities at selected military installations in Japan, Department of Defense, dated February 1963 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

Report on Extraordinary Contractual Actions To Facilitate the National Defense, U.S. Coast Guard

A letter from the Administrative Assistant Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on extraordinary contractual actions to facilitate the national defense, U.S. Coast Guard, for the calendar year 1962 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Report on Research and Training Activities Under Manpower Development and Training Act

A letter from the Secretary of Labor, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on research and training activities under the Manpower Development and Training Act, for the 6-month period ended December 31, 1962 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Idaho; to the Committee on Government Operations:

"House Joint Memorial 10

"*To the Honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the United States, in Congress assembled:*

"We, your memorialists, the Legislature of the State of Idaho, respectfully represent that:

"Whereas, in its act of June 30, 1906, the Congress of the United States recognized that nontaxpaying national forests situate within the States created an imbalance within those States and within the counties in which such forests were situate, and by said act authorized payment to said States and counties of 25 percent of the receipts from sales of timber in such national forests in lieu of taxes on said forest lands and the timber thereon; and

"Whereas although it appeared to be the intent of the Congress that such payments in lieu of taxes were to be computed on the gross receipts, as aforesaid, nevertheless the quantitative payments to the said States, and especially to the State of Idaho and to the counties situate therein, have become smaller in relation to the gross receipts from sale of timber from said national forests because of increasing deductions from said gross amounts; and

"Whereas, it has been estimated that, because of increasing deductions from said gross payments the counties of the State of Idaho have been receiving as little as 8 percent of said gross receipts; and

"Whereas it would require, because of present deductions which have been made since the original enactment of the act of Congress of June 30, 1906, payment to the State of Idaho for the counties therein of 65 percent of the receipts from the sale of timber severed from forest lands to realize the amount of 25 percent as originally contemplated by the Congress: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the 37th session of the Legislature of the State of Idaho, now in session (the Senate and House of Representatives concurring)*, That we most respectfully urge the Congress of the United States to enact such legislation as will authorize the payment to the States wherein are situate national forests an amount of 65 percent of the gross receipts from the sale of timber in such forests, or such other percentage of said receipts, as will assure such States of receiving an amount equivalent to the intent of the Congress in enacting the act of June 30, 1906; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the secretary of state of the State of Idaho be, and he hereby is, authorized and directed to forward copies of this memorial to the President of the United States, the Vice President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress, and to the Senators and Representatives representing the State of Idaho in the Congress of the United States.

"Passed the house on the 9th day of February 1963.

"Pete T. Cenarrusa,
"*Speaker of the House of Representatives.*

"Passed the senate on the 18th day of February 1963.

"W. E. Drevlow,
"*President of the Senate.*

"Attest:

"Robert H. Remaklus,
"*Chief Clerk of the House of Representatives.*"

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Idaho; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

"House Joint Memorial 7

"*To the Honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the United States in Congress assembled:*

"*Resolved by the 37th session of the Legislature of the State of Idaho, now in session (the Senate and House of Representatives concurring)*, That we most respectfully urge the Congress of the United States of America to call a convention for the purpose of proposing the following article as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States.

" 'Article —

" 'Section 1. Article V of the Constitution of the United States is hereby amended to read as follows:

" ' "The Congress, whenever two-thirds of both Houses shall deem it necessary, or, on the application of the legislatures of two-thirds of the several States, shall propose amendments to this Constitution, which shall be valid to all intents and purposes, as part of this Constitution, when ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States. Whenever applications from the legislatures of two-thirds of the total number of States of the United States shall contain identical texts of an amendment to be proposed, the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives shall so certify, and the amendment as contained in the application shall be deemed to have been proposed, without further action by Congress. No State, without its consent, shall be deprived of its equal suffrage in the Senate."

" 'Sec. 2. This article shall be inoperative unless it shall have been ratified as an amendment to the Constitution by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States within seven years from the date of its submission'; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That if Congress shall have proposed an amendment to the Constitution identical with that contained in this resolution prior to January 1, 1965, this application for a convention shall no longer be of any force or effect; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the secretary of state of the State of Idaho be, and he hereby is, authorized and directed to forward certified copies of this memorial to the President and Vice President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress, and to the Senators and Representatives representing this State in the Congress of the United States.

"Passed the house on the 7th day of February 1963.

"Pete T. Cenarrusa,
"*Speaker of the House of Representatives.*

"Passed the senate on the 19th day of February 1963.

"W. E. Drevlow,
"*President of the Senate.*

"Attest:

"Robert H. Remaklus,
"*Chief Clerk of the House of Representatives.*"

A memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of Arizona; to the Committee on Banking and Currency:

"House Memorial 1

"Memorial urging the Congress of the United States to authorize the immediate cessation of printing of all one dollar silver certificates which do not bear the inscription 'In God We Trust'

"*To the Congress of the United States:*

"Your memorialist respectfully represents:

"Whereas Public Law 140, enacted by the 84th Congress, and approved by the President of the United States on July 11, 1955, provided that all U.S. currency shall bear the inscription 'In God We Trust,' the intent of the U.S. Congress is clear and this law is hereby quoted below:

" '*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled*, That at such time as new dies for the printing of currency are adopted in connection with the current program of the Treasury Department to increase the capacity of presses utilized by the Bureau of Engraving and Printing, the dies shall bear, at such place or places thereon as the Secretary of the Treasury may determine to be appropriate, the inscription "In God We Trust", and thereafter this inscription shall appear on all U.S. currency and coins.

" 'Approved July 11, 1955.'

"Whereas 8 years have elapsed since the enactment of this law by the Congress of the United States; and

"Whereas as recently as the fiscal year 1962, the Bureau of Engraving and Printing delivered 193,960,000 silver certificates, series 1935 G, without the inscription; and

"Whereas it appears that the use of currency without the inscription 'In God We Trust,' gives aid and comfort to those nations which pursue the atheistic Communist ideology:

"Wherefore your memorialist, the House of Representatives of the State of Arizona, prays that the Congress of the United States authorize the appropriate officials and agencies of the Federal Government to order the cessation of printing of all $1 silver certificates which do not bear the inscription 'In God We Trust.'

"Adopted by the house on February 8, 1963.

"Approved by the Governor, February 8, 1963.

"Filed in the office of the secretary of state, February 8, 1963."

CONCURRENT RESOLUTIONS OF SOUTH DAKOTA LEGISLATURE

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I bring to the attention of the Senate a concurrent resolution adopted by the State Legislature of South Dakota urging that the Commodity Credit Corporation shall recognize the full protection which licensed South Dakota public grain warehousemen provide for the owners of grain in storage, and urging the abandonment of any proposed action by the

Commodity Credit Corporation to duplicate such protection. I request that the resolution and the letter of transmittal be made a part of the RECORD, and referred to the appropriate committees.

There being no objection, the letter and concurrent resolution were referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, as follows:

STATE OF SOUTH DAKOTA,
SENATE CHAMBER,
Pierre, S. Dak., February 25, 1963.

Hon. KARL E. MUNDT,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I have the honor to transmit herewith Senate Concurrent Resolution 1 which has been adopted by the Legislature of the State of South Dakota, convened in its 38th regular session at Pierre, S. Dak.

Your favorable consideration of the purpose and intent of this concurrent resolution will be greatly appreciated by the citizens of South Dakota.

Respectfully,

NIELS P. JENSEN,
Secretary of the Senate.

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 1

Concurrent resolution urging that the Commodity Credit Corporation shall recognize the full protection which licensed South Dakota public grain warehousemen provide for the owners of grain in storage, and urging the abandonment of any proposed action by said Commodity Credit Corporation to duplicate such protection

Whereas the licensed public grain warehousemen of South Dakota do provide a surety bond to the State of South Dakota for the full market value of all grain that they hold in storage, either for private individuals or for the Commodity Credit Corporation, in contrast to many other States where warehouse laws do not afford this safeguard; and

Whereas the Commodity Credit Corporation has publicly announced its intention to seek a blanket bond or legal liability insurance policy covering all warehouses in the United States by whom Government grains are held in store; and

Whereas the need which Commodity Credit Corporation may feel to secure adequate protection arises solely from absence or insufficiency of statutory safeguards elsewhere than in the State of South Dakota; and

Whereas the Commodity Credit Corporation proposes to arbitrarily distribute the cost of such blanket bond or legal liability coverage under some plan which has not yet been determined, to which extent they would inflict a cost upon South Dakota warehousemen for duplicating a protection which has always been required by South Dakota law: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the senate of the 38th Legislature of the State of South Dakota (the house of representatives concurring), That the action under study by the Commodity Credit Corporation would be in conflict with the regulatory controls already wisely established in this State and administered by the Public Utilities Commission; and be it further

Resolved, That the Senate and the House of Representatives of the State of South Dakota hereby memorializes the Commodity Credit Corporation to abandon any action which serves to duplicate the safeguards which they now already have provided to them; and be it further

Resolved, That the assessment of any costs which Commodity Credit Corporation might incur, to warehousemen licensed under the South Dakota public grain warehouse law, would be imposing an unfair and unnecessary burden upon them; and be it finally

Resolved, That a certified copy of this resolution be transmitted to the U.S. Secretary of Agriculture, the Board of Directors of the Commodity Credit Corporation, and to the Members of the Congress of the United States elected from the State of South Dakota.

Adopted by the senate January 28, 1963.

Concurred in by the house of representatives February 20, 1963.

NILS A. BOE,
Lieutenant Governor,
President of the Senate.

Attest:

NIELS P. JENSEN,
Secretary of the Senate.

PAUL E. BROWN,
Speaker, House of Representatives.

Attest:

W. J. MATSON,
Chief Clerk, House of Representatives.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I bring to the attention of the Senate a concurrent resolution adopted by the State Legislature of South Dakota, memorializing the Congress of the United States, relative to providing incentive payments by the Federal Government for domestic gold producers.

In presenting the concurrent resolution, Mr. President, I call attention to the bill, S. 824, which I have introduced and in which my colleague from South Dakota [Mr. McGOVERN] has joined as a cosponsor.

Mr. President, I request that the resolution and the letter of transmittal be made a part of the RECORD. I also request that a copy of S. 824 also be printed in the RECORD immediately following the text of the concurrent resolution.

There being no objection, the letter and concurrent resolution were referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and the concurrent resolution, letter and bill were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATE OF SOUTH DAKOTA,
SENATE CHAMBER,
Pierre, S. Dak., February 25, 1963.

Hon. KARL E. MUNDT,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I have the honor to transmit herewith Senate Concurrent Resolution 4, which has been adopted by the Legislature of the State of South Dakota, convened in its 38th regular session at Pierre, S. Dak.

Your favorable consideration of the purpose and intent of this concurrent resolution will be greatly appreciated by the citizens of South Dakota.

Respectfully,

NIELS P. JENSEN,
Secretary of the Senate.

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 4

Concurrent resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States relative to providing incentive payments by the Federal Government for domestic gold producers

Whereas domestic gold producers have been obligated to sell their product to the Federal Government at the established price of $35 an ounce since 1934; and

Whereas constantly increasing inflationary costs of mining and milling this precious metal have resulted in closing down the properties of virtually all of the gold producers in the United States; and

Whereas production of gold from domestic sources has remained in the range of 1½ million ounces contrasting to 6 million ounces in 1940 while current industrial use of gold in this country amounts to 3 million ounces per annum; and

Whereas our dwindling national gold reserve is a matter of grave concern to our citizens; and

Whereas it is in the national interest to increase our domestic gold production: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate of the 38th Legislature of the State of South Dakota (the House of Representatives concurring therein), That the members of the Legislature of the State of South Dakota respectfully request the Congress of the United States to provide incentive payments to assure domestic gold producers a fair economic return on their properties with the objective of increasing gold production in the United States. Such incentive payments would enable gold mines currently operating to survive under current high levels of cost, would aid in reopening closed mines and likewise provide a stimulus for exploration and development of new gold properties. Such incentive payments are essential to prevent complete destruction of our domestic gold mining industry; and be it further

Resolved, That a duly attested copy of this resolution be immediately transmitted to the Secretary of the Senate of the United States, the Clerk of the House of Representatives of the United States and to each Member of the Congress from this State.

Adopted by the senate February 13, 1963.

Concurred in by the house of representatives February 21, 1963.

NILS A. BOE,
Lieutenant Governor,
President of the Senate.

Attest:

NIELS P. JENSEN,
Secretary of the Senate.

PAUL E. BROWN,
Speaker, House of Representatives.

Attest:

W. J. MATSON,
Chief Clerk, House of Representatives.

S. 824

A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to increase the percentage depletion allowance for gold produced in the United States

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the second sentence of section 613(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to percentage depletion) is amended by inserting before the period at the end thereof the following: ", except that in the case of gold mines, such allowance shall not exceed 65 percent of the taxpayer's taxable income from the property (computed without allowance for depletion)".

SEC. 2. Section 613(b)(2)(B) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to mines and other natural deposits entitled to 23-percent rate of percentage depletion) is amended by inserting "gold," after "columbium,".

SEC. 3. The amendments made by this Act shall apply to taxable years ending after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of South Dakota, identical with the foregoing, which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.)

RESOLUTION OF ARIZONA HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record a resolution of the House of Representatives of the State of Arizona, relating to the withdrawal from circulation all $1 silver certificates which do not bear the inscription "In God We Trust."

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

A Memorial Urging the Congress of the United States To Authorize the Immediate Withdrawal From Circulation All $1 Silver Certificates Which Do Not Bear the Inscription "In God We Trust"

To the Congress of the United States:

Your memorialist respectfully represents:

Whereas Public Law 140, enacted by the 84th Congress and approved by the President of the United States on July 11, 1955, provided that all U.S. currency shall bear the inscription "In God We Trust." The intent of the U.S. Congress is clear and this law is hereby quoted below:

"*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That at such times as new dies for the printing of currency are adopted in connection with the current program of the Treasury Department to increase the capacity of presses utilized by the Bureau of Engraving and Printing, the dies shall bear, at such place or places thereon as the Secretary of the Treasury may determine to be appropriate, the inscription 'In God We Trust', and thereafter this inscription shall appear on all U.S. currency and coins.

"Approved July 11, 1955."

Whereas 8 years have elapsed since the enactment of this law by the Congress of the United States; and

Whereas as recently as the fiscal year 1962, the Bureau of Engraving and Printing delivered 193,960,000 silver certificates, series 1935G, without the inscription; and

Whereas it appears that the use of currency without the inscription, "In God We Trust", gives aid and comfort to those nations which pursue the atheistic Communist ideology.

Wherefore your memorialist, the House of Representatives of the State of Arizona prays:

That the Congress of the United States authorize the appropriate officials and agencies of the Federal Government to order the cessation of printing and immediate withdrawal from circulation of all $1 silver certificates which do not bear the inscription "In God We Trust."

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. McCLELLAN, from the Committee on Government Operations, without amendment:

S. 345. A bill to provide for the approval of a payment in lieu of taxes to be made for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1959, by the Hawaii Housing Authority to the city and county of Honolulu (Rept. No. 13).

By Mr. McCLELLAN, from the Committee on Government Operations, with an amendment:

S. 812. A bill to provide for the release of restrictions and reservations on certain real property heretofore conveyed to the State of Arkansas by the United States of America (Rept. No. 14).

By Mr. McCLELLAN, from the Committee on Government Operations, with amendments:

S. 13. A bill to authorize the Administrator of General Services to convey certain land situated in the State of Arkansas to the city of Fayetteville, Ark. (Rept. No. 15).

By Mr. ANDERSON, from the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences, with amendments:

S. Res. 74. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences to make a study of matters pertaining to aeronautical and space activities of Federal departments and agencies; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

By Mr. HILL, from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, without amendment:

S. Res. 95. Resolution to provide funds for additional staff for the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey, from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, with amendments:

S. Res. 22. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare to examine, investigate, and study matters pertaining to migratory labor; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. McGEE:

S. 963. A bill for the relief of Constantina (Mihas) Michia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SALTONSTALL (by request):

S. 964. A bill for the relief of Michele Tunzi and his wife, Carmina, and their minor children; and

S. 965. A bill for the relief of Amalia Seresly; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TOWER:

S. 966. A bill for the relief of Yukio Iseri; and

S. 967. A bill for the relief of Dr. Antonio A. Moure; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HILL:

S. 968. A bill to amend the Vocational Rehabilitation Act to assist in providing more flexibility in the financing and administration of State rehabilitation programs, and to assist in expansion of services and facilities provided under such programs, particularly for the mentally retarded and other groups presenting special vocational rehabilitation problems, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. MAGNUSON (by request):

S. 969. A bill to provide medical care for certain Coast and Geodetic Survey retired ships' officers and crewmembers and their dependents, and for other purposes;

S. 970. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to utilize funds received from State and local governments for special meteorological services; and

S. 971. A bill to authorize the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency to arm his employees, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. Magnuson when he introduced the above bills, which appear under separate headings.)

By Mr. BIBLE:

S. 972. A bill for the relief of Jesus Te Torrado-Espana; and

S. 973. A bill for the relief of Manuel Gil-Carrasco; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 974. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to authorize the construction, protection, operation, and maintenance of a public airport in or in the vicinity of the District of Columbia"; to the Committee on Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. Bible when he introduced the last above-mentioned bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. BIBLE (by request):

S. 975. A bill to provide for the satisfaction of claims arising out of scrip, lieu selection, and similar rights; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks by Mr. Bible when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. BENNETT (for himself and Mr. Moss):

S. 976. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to permanently set aside certain lands in Utah as an addition to the Navajo Indian Reservation, and for other purposes," approved March 1, 1963; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. FONG:

S. 977. A bill for the relief of Henry Kaufusi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MAGNUSON (for himself, Mr. Bartlett, Mr. Jackson, and Mr. Kennedy):

S. 978. A bill to provide medical care for certain persons engaged on board a vessel in the care, preservation, or navigation of such vessel; to the Committee on Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. Magnuson when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. JOHNSTON (for himself and Mr. Hruska):

S. 979. A bill to amend section 332 of title 28, United States Code, in order to provide for the inclusion of a district judge or judges on the judicial council of each circuit; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. AIKEN (for himself and Mr. Prouty):

S. 980. A bill to provide for holding terms of the U.S. District Court for the District of Vermont at Montpelier and St. Johnsbury; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey (for himself, Mr. Burdick, and Mr. Humphrey):

S. 981. A bill to amend title V of the Housing Act of 1949 to assist in the provision of housing for domestic farm labor; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

(See the remarks of Mr. Williams of New Jersey when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

RESOLUTION

MEMORIAL ADDRESSES ON THE LATE SENATORS DWORSHAK, CHAVEZ, AND KERR

Mr. MANSFIELD submitted a resolution (S. Res. 104) providing for memorial addresses on the late Senators Dworshak, Chavez, and Kerr, which was considered and agreed to.

(See the above resolution printed in full when submitted by Mr. Mansfield, which appears under a separate heading.)

MEDICAL CARE FOR CERTAIN RETIRED COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY PERSONNEL

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, at the request of the Acting Secretary of Commerce, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to provide medical care for certain Coast and Geodetic Survey retired ships' officers and crew members and their dependents, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent that a letter from the Acting Secretary of Commerce and an enclosed statement of purpose and need for the proposed legislation, be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the letter and statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 969) to provide medical care for certain Coast and Geodetic Survey retired ships' officers and crew members and their dependents, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. MAGNUSON, by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

The letter and statement presented by Mr. MAGNUSON are as follows:

THE SECRETARY OF COMMERCE,
Washington, D.C., February 19, 1963.
Hon. LYNDON B. JOHNSON,
President of the Senate,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: There are attached four copies of a proposed bill to provide medical care for certain Coast and Geodetic Survey retired ships' officers and crew members and their dependents and for other purposes.

There are also attached four copies of a statement of purpose and need for the proposed bill.

The proposed bill is not being submitted to the Speaker of the House for introduction as a similar bill, H.R. 74, is pending before the House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

We are advised by the Bureau of the Budget that there is no objection to the submission of this proposed bill to the Congress from the standpoint of the administration's program.

Sincerely yours,
C. D. MARTIN, Jr.,
Acting Secretary of Commerce.

STATEMENT OF PURPOSE AND NEED FOR PROPOSED LEGISLATION TO PROVIDE MEDICAL CARE FOR CERTAIN COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY RETIRED SHIPS' OFFICERS AND CREWMEMBERS AND THEIR DEPENDENTS AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

The attached legislation would provide permanent authority for treatment at Public Health Service facilities of retired vessel employees and their dependents of the Coast and Geodetic Survey. This authority was inadvertently repealed by section 5 of Public Law 86-415, approved April 8, 1960, 74 Stat. 34, but has been continued on a year to year basis by language in the Public Health Service appropriation acts. The bill would also provide for an eventual transition to coverage under the Federal Employees Health Benefits Act of 1959, rather than under the Public Health Service Act, for retired vessel employees and for the dependents of all vessel employees, active or retired.

For many years ships' officers and crewmembers of Coast and Geodetic Survey vessels when on active duty have been authorized to receive medical care at PHS facilities on the same basis as other seamen employed on American vessels. In 1939, retired ships' officers and crewmembers of the Coast and Geodetic Survey and dependents of retired or active officers and crewmembers were also authorized to receive such care. In 1960, in amending the Public Health Service Act to provide parity of treatment for members of the uniformed services (which do not include the vessel employees covered by this proposal), the Congress inadvertently repealed the authority to provide medical care to retired vessel employees and to the dependents of such retired employees, while leaving unchanged the authority to provide medical care to vessel employees on active duty and their dependents (sec. 5(d) of Public Law 86-415).

Present vessel employees were hired and have served for a period of years with the understanding that they and their dependents would receive Public Health Service medical care during active service and after retirement. Elimination of this service for those now retired would be a severe hardship and is inconsistent with the administration's concern in regard to adequate medical care to the aged.

Discontinuance of the service to the dependents of those now employed similarly would be an obvious breach of a moral obligation. Moreover it would undoubtedly result in the loss of some highly qualified personnel. To keep faith with these employees, the Department recommends it be made clear that Public Health Service care will continue to be provided to all vessel employees now on active duty or retired, and their dependents.

We believe, however, that for those entering on service in the future, medical care after retirement, and for dependents at all times, should be provided on the same basis as those benefits are provided for Federal employees generally, that is, under the Federal Employees Health Benefits Act of 1959.

The attached legislation would accomplish this purpose by providing in effect that a vessel employee who entered on duty before July 1, 1963, would be eligible to receive care at PHS facilities after retirement and his dependents would be eligible for such care at any time. Employees entering on duty after that date would receive medical care after retirement, and for their dependents, under the Federal Employees Health Benefits Act of 1959.

The legislation would also amend section 326(c) of the Public Health Service Act to make clear that the Public Health Service is to supply for the Coast and Geodetic Survey not only care for the sick and disabled but also ancillary services such as medical examinations for purposes of appointment, retirement, and the like. This would be accomplished by extending to the Coast and Geodetic Survey existing authority for the Coast Guard to receive such services. The amendment to section 326(c) also would extend to Public Health Service officers assigned to Coast and Geodetic Survey vessels the authority to render medical aid to crews of fishing vessels now vested in Public Health Service officers assigned to Coast Guard vessels.

AUTHORIZATION FOR SECRETARY OF COMMERCE TO UTILIZE CERTAIN FUNDS FOR SPECIAL METEOROLOGICAL SERVICES

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, at the request of the Under Secretary of Commerce, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to utilize funds received from State and local governments for special meteorological services. I ask unanimous consent that a letter from the Under Secretary of Commerce and an enclosed statement of purpose and need for the proposed legislation be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the letter and statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 970) to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to utilize funds received from State and local governments for special meteorological services, introduced by Mr. MAGNUSON, by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

The letter and statement presented by Mr. MAGNUSON are as follows:

THE SECRETARY OF COMMERCE,
Washington, D.C., February 13, 1963.
Hon. LYNDON B. JOHNSON,
President of the Senate,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: There are enclosed four copies of a draft bill to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to utilize funds received from State and local governments for special meteorological services, and four copies of a statement of purpose and need in support thereof.

We are advised by the Bureau of the Budget that, from the standpoint of the administration's program, there would be no objection to the submission of this proposed legislation to the Congress.

Sincerely yours,
EDWARD GUDEMAN,
Under Secretary of Commerce.

STATEMENT OF PURPOSE AND NEED

The Weather Bureau has often been requested by various State and local governments to provide or undertake special meteorological investigations, tests, and services which the personnel and facilities of the Weather Bureau are specially capable of carrying out. It has become increasingly difficult for the Weather Bureau to perform such functions, which ordinarily cannot be effectively undertaken by any other organizations, because of the lack of adequate statutory authorization to utilize funds for these purposes which the requesting public agency would be willing to provide. The purpose of this proposed legislation is to enable the Weather Bureau to accept and use funds provided by State and local governments for special services required by them which cannot be financed from available Weather Bureau resources. The proposed legislation provides that if work or services requested have no value to the public at large, the Secretary of Commerce must require reimbursement for the total direct and indirect costs before undertaking such work or services. Moreover, the Secretary of Commerce could not undertake work or services having no public value unless they cannot be obtained from private firms or individuals with special competence.

Some instances in which the authorization herein proposed could be utilized for the benefit of local needs are as follows:

1. The State of California is embarking on a large-scale water resources program (headed by its department of water resources) for which it requires a large increase in precipitation stations, in reporting, in maintenance and inspection of stations, and in processing of data. The Weather Bureau's responsibility is national, with its available funds actually insufficient to cover the local needs of California. The State is willing to pay for the increase required to meet its needs. The necessary funds cannot be accepted and utilized by the Bureau unless the proposed legislation is enacted.

2. In 1955 the Kansas Water Resources Factfinding and Research Committee recommended to the Governor and legislature a "cooperative program with the U.S. Agricultural Research Service, U.S. Geological Survey, U.S. Weather Bureau, and U.S. Soil Conservation Service for comprehensive research in hydrology of small watersheds, requiring detailed data on all aspects of the water cycle and effects of man's operation.

Estimated State funds $150,000 per year for 20 years, to be matched by Federal funds." But of the four Federal agencies mentioned, only the Weather Bureau cannot now accept and utilize the State funds.

3. Many thousands of communities on lesser tributaries and in headwater areas suffer devastating flash floods. With the support of the Weather Bureau's national main stem and tributary flood forecasting system and its developing radar network, these communities could be warned effectively in many cases after establishment of special local observational and reporting networks and communications, development of localized forecast and warning procedures, and eduactional liaison in planning actions based on warnings. The costs may average only a few thousand dollars per community per year. There are thousands of such communities, and the Bureau is able to serve only a token few with its available funds. The job could be done wherever the community felt it was sufficiently needed to pay for it—if the Bureau could accept and use funds made available by the community.

4. Fire-Weather Service of the Weather Bureau is another service which operates on a cost-sharing basis in many instances, and which is handicapped in its operation by lack of adequate legislative authority. The Service provides day-to-day forecasts and advices during the fire season and issues detailed localized operational forecasts for going fires. The Bureau is subject to a heavy demand from forest protection agencies for an expansion of this service to new areas. In most cases it is unable to provide the needed assistance. Enactment of the proposed legislation would greatly facilitate arrangements to provide additional badly needed services of this nature where Federal funds are not available but State or local governments are willing to help.

5. Agricultural weather services, particularly those requiring highly localized and detailed forecasts and special instrumentation, would be greatly benefited by enactment of the proposed legislation. This type of service cannot be adequately handled through the general forecast service and as a rule it is of direct benefit to a relatively small segment of the population. Accordingly, such services are often arranged on a cost-sharing basis where the recipients of the service assume a share of the costs involved. The Horticultural Protection Service which operates in Florida, California, Washington, Oregon, and a few other States is a good example of a specialized weather service that often uses cost-sharing procedures. Under present law the cooperating agency is limited to furnishing such items as communication expenses and office quarters while the full salary of the employee limits the number of points where such service can be provided since the major expense must continue to be handled by the Federal Government. The Bureau has had many requests from all parts of the country for more agricultural weather service of the above-mentioned type. Although cost-sharing is one good way of furnishing more service of this kind, the Bureau is seriously handicapped by the present inability to utilize funds which the localities would be willing to furnish.

6. The Weather Bureau has, in the past few years, received several requests for special observations and assistance in the field of air pollution. Two specific examples of recent origin are the request from the Los Angeles County Air Pollution Control District for the reinstitution of intermediate upper air soundings at Santa Monica, Calif., and the request from the San Diego County Air Pollution District for additional wind installations and additional upper air soundings in the vicinity of San Diego. There have been other similar requests in the past. The Bureau has generally met such requests either by declining on the basis of inadequate funds or, where consultation work and a minimum of observations would suffice, arranging for support through other agencies such as the Public Health Service or the Atomic Energy Commission. In light of the increased interest in air pollution, it can be expected that the number of these requests will increase, particularly for specialized observational data such as low-level radiosondes and additional wind measurements. The Bureau will be unable to accommodate most of these requests unless it can accept reimbursement.

On December 22, 1955, the Presidential Advisory Committee on Water Resources Policy recommended: "Continued cooperation with States and municipalities should be encouraged. Such cooperation serves to supplement the basic data programs of the Federal Government in fields in which there is substantial joint interest. State and local participation contributes to the fundamental programs for interpretation, analysis, and research which are primarily national in character and extend beyond the interests of any single geographical area. Federal matching of State financial support for data programs on a 50–50 basis has been mutually satisfactory and should continue to be a sound basis for such cooperation. * * * Authorization for cooperative participation should be provided if necessary authorization is lacking."

The Bureau cannot provide the cooperation proposed unless legislation is enacted authorizing it to utilize State funds.

Harvey O. Banks, director of water resources, State of California, in supporting legislation such as here proposed, said:

"In many areas, there is need to supplement the basic information now gathered in order that more detailed evaluation may be made of the nature and occurrence of water supplies. California is most vitally interested in the most efficient and complete control and utilization of its water resources to meet the needs of all beneficial uses.

"Therefore, it is the recommendation of the State of California that legislation be enacted by the Congress which would permit agreements permitting cooperative financing between the Weather Bureau and non-Federal agencies under which the trained personnel of the Weather Bureau might be assigned to these cooperative endeavors to obtain and develop information and to make analyses thereof, in addition to that gathered under the Bureau's present basic responsibilities. If this legislation is enacted, we expect to take advantage of it, by entering into such a cooperative agreement at an early date."

AUTHORIZATION FOR ADMINISTRATOR OF FEDERAL AVIATION AGENCY TO ARM HIS EMPLOYEES

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, at the request of the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to authorize the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency to arm his employees, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent that a letter from the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency, requesting the proposed legislation, be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the letter will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 971) to authorize the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency to arm his employees, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. MAGNUSON, by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

The letter presented by Mr. MAGNUSON is as follows:

FEDERAL AVIATION AGENCY,
Washington, D.C., January 31, 1963.

Hon. LYNDON B. JOHNSON,
President of the Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Enclosed is a draft bill "To authorize the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency to arm his employees, and for other purposes."

This proposal is part of our legislative program for 1963 and its enactment by the Congress is recommended. The bill would authorize the Administrator to purchase and furnish firearms to employees of the Agency as necessary for the protection of public property under his jurisdiction, custody or control, or the execution of responsibilities vested in him by law.

It is the opinion of this Agency, and one shared by other agencies, that the head of an agency of the Federal Government has implied authority to arm his employees for the protection of Federal property. (See S. Rept. 1858 and H. Rept. 2087 accompanying H.R. 11700, 85th Congress.) Accordingly, at those facilities for which we must provide guard service, and for which the normal protective services of the General Services Administration are not available, the Agency has provided arms to the guards. In one instance, the arming of the guards has been preceded by securing from local jurisdictions their designation as "special policemen." This has been done as a precautionary measure to prevent any conflict with local authorities. However, such a designation cannot always be obtained and because of the potential hazards involved in the carrying of firearms, we believe it prudent to obtain express legislative authority. This would place beyond dispute the legal status of our employees in the event of an incident.

In addition to the normal peacetime requirements for property protection, the recent international crisis demonstrated some of the very urgent protection problems which this Agency will face in a national emergency when all of its resources must be directed to maintaining an air defense and air strike capability. The continuity of service of the hundreds of air navigation facilities and other installations which this Agency operates then becomes a matter of critical importance. To assure protection of these facilities, we anticipate arming a limited number of employees at each installation during an emergency. The legislation which we propose would also eliminate any doubt as to the authority of those employees to bear arms.

The Bureau of the Budget has advised that there is no objection from the standpoint of administration's program to the submission of this proposed legislation to the Congress.

Sincerely,

N. E. HALABY,
Administrator.

CONSTRUCTION OF A DOWNTOWN HELIPORT FOR WASHINGTON, D.C.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill which would authorize the construction and operation of a downtown heliport for Washington, D.C.

Helicopter transportation is no longer a novel idea or a mere vision in the eyes of planners. Successful operations are being conducted in American and foreign cities, serving local and international air transportation needs. Washington, as the capital of the free world, must build to meet the needs of its users of air transportation. A public heliport would serve this purpose.

The Nation's capital city should not lag behind other major metropolitan areas, such as New York, Chicago, and Los Angeles, in providing fast and efficient transportation for those who desire it between downtown business areas and jet airports, required to be located more miles away from cities than terminals for conventional aircraft.

With the opening of Dulles International Airport, a new era in air transportation has begun for the Washington area. No longer is it possible for passengers to travel 15 or 20 minutes to National Airport and board a plane to almost any destination. Most long-haul flights, including both arriving and departing jet and conventional aircraft, will be utilizing either Dulles or Friendship terminals. These airports are located between 27 and 34 miles from the District, a greater distance than jet airports presently serving New York, Chicago, and Los Angeles.

Helicopter transportation will provide the service sought by many air travelers who prefer speedier travel to and from jet airports, thereby effectively taking advantage of the timesaving features made possible through the development of jet air transportation.

Forecasters tell us that air transportation in the Washington, D.C., area will increase greatly during the next 5 years. The Bureau of National Capital Airports, Federal Aviation Agency, predicts that Dulles Airport alone should be handling 4,088,000 passengers in 1967 compared to an estimated 1,035,000 passengers in 1963.

My bill would leave to the discretion of the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency the downtown Washington location, which would be in close proximity to the business section and easily accessible to Federal offices.

It is essential that the prestige of the Nation's Capital be maintained as a leader in the air transportation field and as a forward-looking and progressive city supplying the finest in air services.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 974) to amend the act entitled "An act to authorize the construction, protection, operation, and maintenance of a public airport in or in the vicinity of the District of Columbia," introduced by Mr. Bible, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

PROPOSED LEGISLATION TO SATISFY SCRIP CLAIMS

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, by request, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to provide for the satisfaction of claims arising out of scrip, lieu selection, and similar rights. This legislation has been submitted by the Secretary of the Interior and has as its principal purpose closing the books by 1970 on 462 unredeemed old "blank checks" for 16,522 acres of public lands administered by the Bureau of Land Management.

I ask unanimous consent that a departmental press release which embodies all of the points suggested by the Department in their letter transmitting the proposed legislation, and the bill be printed in the Record at this point in my remarks.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill and press release will be printed in the Record.

The bill (S. 975) to provide for the satisfaction of claims arising out of scrip, lieu selection, and similar rights, introduced by Mr. Bible, by request, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, except for military bounty land warrants, all claims and holdings recorded under the Act of August 5, 1955 (69 Stat. 534, 535), which are not satisfied in one of the ways hereafter set forth, shall become null and void on January 1, 1970, or at the termination of any transaction initiated pursuant to this Act, whichever is later.

Sec. 2. Prior to July 1, 1966, holders of claims recorded under the Act of August 5, 1955, may apply to the Secretary of the Interior to have conveyed to them, in satisfaction of their claims, such lands as they may, in their applications, designate. The Secretary shall thereafter convey the selected lands if he finds them to be proper, under existing law, for such disposition, and if the claim upon which an application is based is determined to be valid.

Sec. 3. Prior to January 1, 1967, the Secretary shall classify lands which he finds can properly be sold at public sale under the Small Tract Act, as amended (43 U.S.C. 682 a–e) or other public sale laws as suitable for selection in satisfaction of claims recorded under the Act of August 5, 1955. Holders of recorded claims may apply for reasonably compact areas of land so classified, and, upon his determination that the claim upon which application is based is valid, the Secretary shall convey such lands to the applicant.

Sec. 4. Prior to January 1, 1968, the Secretary shall, by registered mail or certified mail send to the address of record of each person having an unsatisfied claim, offer in satisfaction of such claim lands which in the opinion of the Secretary shall have a fair market value per acre not less than the average price received for lands sold under the Small Tract Act, as amended (43 U.S.C. 682 a–e) during the three years prior to the date of the appraisal of the offered lands. Upon the acceptance of the offer, the Secretary shall convey the lands to the claimant, if he determines that the claim is valid.

Sec. 5. Prior to January 1, 1970, any person who has a claim recorded pursuant to the Act of August 5, 1955, by written notice to the Secretary of the Interior, or any officer of the Department of the Interior to whom authority to receive such notice may be delegated, may elect to receive cash instead of public land in satisfaction of his claim, at a rate per acre equal to the average value of the lands offered by the Secretary under section 4 of this Act. Upon a determination that the claim is valid, the Secretary or his delegate shall certify the claim to the Secretary of the Treasury who is authorized and directed to pay the claim out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated. Acceptance of the money shall constitute a full and complete satisfaction of the claim or holding for which the money is paid. No agent or attorney acting on behalf of another to procure a payment under this Act shall demand, accept, or receive more than 10 per centum of the payment made, and any agreement to the contrary shall be null and void.

The press release presented by Mr. Bible is as follows:

INTERIOR SEEKS LAW TO SATISFY LAND "SCRIP" CLAIMS BY 1970

The Department of the Interior has asked Congress to enact legislation that will permit the Government to close its books by 1970 on 462 unredeemed old "blank checks" for 16,522 acres of public lands administered by the Bureau of Land Management.

Under the proposed bill, holders of land scrip—I O U's issued by the Government against public lands for various reasons—would have to make their selections by 1970 or forfeit their claims.

From 1776 until as late as 1922, the Government, from time to time, issued public land warrants, or scrip, to satisfy a wide variety of claims and obligations to individual citizens. The acreage entitlement was specified, with the location to be chosen by the holder. It was a handy way of paying off Government debts during the years when the United States had easier access to land than to money.

But the scrip problem has plagued Federal administrators for many decades. The situation has become unsatisfactory because of changing times, lost records, and unforeseen practices.

Until August of 1957, no one had any sure way of knowing how many valid and unsatisfied scrip claims on the public lands were still outstanding.

A law passed by Congress on August 5, 1955, required scripholders to record their claims within 2 years or forever hold their peace. When the deadline came and passed, it finally became possible to ascertain the maximum amount of land the United States still owes the holders of these I O U's.

Congress dealt with a part of the remaining problem in July 1962 when it passed a law providing for the final settlement of claims on scrip issued for military bounty purposes. This measure authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to buy up remaining military bounty land warrants at $1.25 per acre, and imposes a 1-year deadline for warrant holders after receipt of the Secretary's offer.

Military bounty land warrants were the most numerous and best known form of scrip, issued to veterans of American wars and skirmishes fought prior to March 3, 1855. One recipient of a 120-acre scrip certificate was former Capt. Abraham Lincoln of the Illinois militia, for his service during the Black Hawk War.

There were numerous other varieties of scrip, based on about 10 major acts of Congress and about 30 minor ones.

There was, for example, Gerard scrip—issued as partial reimbursement to the three children of Joseph Gerard, who died in service as a messenger to the hostile Indians of the old Northwest Territory; Sioux Half-Breed scrip, issued to Sioux Indians of mixed blood in exchange for lands set apart for them under a treaty signed in 1830; Choctaw scrip, with a similar background. Other forms of scrip were issued to compensate landowners for early Government survey errors which, when corrected, led to partial loss of their properties.

The bill now proposed by the Department of the Interior is aimed at finishing the job by settling claims for the other remaining kinds of scrip within a limited period. Eleven varieties have been identified among those still outstanding.

Holders of scrip must be able to show valid title through inheritance or purchase before it can be honored by the Government. Still, other problems have arisen in the transfer of scrip to land.

Some scripholders, for example, in recent years attempted to take some highly valuable public properties in exchange for long-unredeemed warrants—public beaches in California, offshore properties in the Gulf of Mexico and in the Pacific, and valuable timber stands. Some effort was made to set up a lively traffic in scrip sales, at substantial sums, based on the asserted value of such lands.

Activities like these led Congress to pass the so-called Recordation Act of 1955. Now that it is known how many claims must be considered for a definite number of acres, the Department and the Bureau of Land Management are seeking a fair way to clear the books at last—before the passage of time can create further difficulties for purchasers and Government alike.

Under the proposed bill, scripholders could continue to apply for land of their own choosing until June 30, 1966, and the land could be secured if it were classified by the Secretary of the Interior as proper for selection.

After July 1, 1966, scripholders of record would be permitted to apply only for lands that are first declared proper by the Secretary for scrip location.

Before January 1, 1968, every remaining scripholder of record would be offered a specific tract of land by the Secretary, equal in acreage to the amount of his claim. Procedures are specified in the proposed bill to insure that the offers would be of a reasonable value.

If scripholders should prefer money instead of land, they could elect to do so, at fair market value of the equivalent offer by the Secretary. All applications, either for land or for money, would have to be submitted before January 1, 1970.

If the bill passes, a long and colorful era in American history will end, and so will a bothersome problem in governmental housekeeping and business practices.

The following is a list of the kind, number and acreage of scrip recorded which would be affected by this proposal:

Kind of scrip	Approximate acreage recorded	Number of pieces of scrip recorded
Valentine certificate	2,119	65
Soldier's additional rights	5,563	275
Forest lieu selection rights	6,252	61
Sioux half-breed certificates	560	7
Wyandotte certificates	250	7
Porterfield warrants	436	11
Isaac Crow	80	1
Railroad lieu selection rights	542	18
Merritt W. Blair selection right	80	1
Gerard certificates	440	11
McKee certificates	200	5
Total	16,522	462

MEDICAL CARE FOR SELF-EMPLOYED SEAMEN

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, on behalf of Senator Bartlett, Senator Jackson, Senator Kennedy, and myself, I introduce for appropriate reference, a bill to provide medical care for certain persons engaged on board a vessel in the care, preservation, or navigation of such vessel.

This bill is needed to correct inequities which resulted from a ruling in 1954 of the General Counsel of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. For 20 years or more prior to this ruling in 1954, self-employed seamen or those who had financial interest in the vessels on which they served as seamen had been entitled to medical care at facilities of the U.S. Public Health Service. This medical care was given to all persons working on board these vessels irrespective of whether they were working for themselves as owners or part owners of vessels or whether they were employees working for others just as long as they were employed in "the care, preservation, or navigation of any vessel, or in the service, on board, of those engaged in such care, preservation, or navigation."

In May 1954, the General Counsel of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare issued an opinion stating that the term "employed" would thereafter be interpreted in the narrow sense to mean only those persons working for someone else in an employer-employee relationship. This interpretation had the effect of denying medical care to the thousands of self-employed seamen all over the country, particularly in the fishing industry. It had the effect of dividing the crews on these vessels into two parts: one consisting of those who had no ownership in a vessel and who were eligible for medical care at facilities of the Public Health Service, and the other consisting of those who had an interest in the vessel no matter how small and who were excluded from receiving medical care at Public Health Service facilities. This situation should be corrected as soon as possible.

Legislation similar to that now introduced was passed by the Senate in the 87th Congress but failed of favorable consideration in the House. This failure was to a large extent attributable to the views of the Bureau of the Budget on one small aspect. The version today is designed to eliminate that objection.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 978) to provide medical care for certain persons engaged on board a vessel in the care, preservation, or navigation of such vessel, introduced by Mr. Magnuson (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

HOUSING FOR MIGRATORY LABOR

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and Senators Burdick and Humphrey, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill relating to housing for migratory labor. I ask unanimous consent that a statement prepared by me relating to the bill be printed in the Record.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the statement will be printed in the Record.

The bill (S. 981) to amend title V of the Housing Act of 1949 to assist in the provision of housing for domestic farm labor, introduced by Mr. Williams of New Jersey (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

The statement presented by Mr. Williams of New Jersey is as follows:

Statement of Senator Harrison A. Williams, Jr., Democrat, of New Jersey, Upon Introduction of Migratory Labor Housing Bill

The problems faced by the migratory farm citizens of this Nation are many, complex, perennial, and when encountered firsthand, disheartening. Of this panoply of problems, none is more pressing or persistent than the inadequacy of the housing in which our migratory citizens and their families live. Inadequate housing destroys the incentive for qualified workers to enter agricultural employment; adequate housing, on the other hand, attracts those already working in agriculture to areas where they are needed. Thus, adequate farm labor housing is essential to insure a sufficiently large farm labor force and insure the efficient allocation of this labor force to seasonal farm jobs—two factors that are indispensable to the efficient operation of our Nation's farm economy.

In addition to the obvious hazards and degradation that ramshackle housing imposes upon its occupants, this housing is a major source of the serious health problems that afflict our migratory farm citizens. Their interstate movement, moreover, endangers the health of the residents of communities in which these laborers work and through which they pass.

Although our Nation's farmers are aware of the seriousness of this housing problem, and in many instances have made outstanding efforts to remedy it, too often the farmer is unable to obtain funds needed to construct new housing or to renovate existing housing. The financial squeeze is particularly acute in the case of the small or marginal farmer—frequently, the farmer with the worst housing facilities. Thus, the key to any amelioration of the migratory farmworker housing problem is a program that will lessen the financial difficulties that prohibit or prevent the establishment of housing for our Nation's farm laborers and their families.

There are three basic reasons why financial assistance is required to make adequate migratory farmworker housing a reality in our Nation.

First, commercial money is not readily available for building or rehabilitating migratory farmworker housing because of the high investment risk resulting from the fact that the economic usefulness of such housing is generally limited to the short duration of the harvest season. The practical consequences of this situation are that the farmer must make expenditures for housing from his profits, or mortgage his entire farm enterprise to finance a relatively minor part of his farming operation. Neither action can be regarded as a sound business transaction, particularly in view of the expense of such housing.

Second, the emergence of more stringent State housing and sanitation codes is producing greater needs for new or rehabilitated farmworker housing. Many States are moving in this direction, and still others have begun more vigorous enforcement of existing codes. This situation means, of course, that without adequate Federal assistance the already difficult financing problems can be expected to grow worse in the near future.

Third, the farmworker himself, when he does manage to acquire title to property, seldom has sufficient financial resources to take the next steps toward homeownership; consequently, those dwellings which the migratory farmworker manages to acquire are frequently ramshackle, patchwork shacks that constitute health hazards to their occupants and to the community in which they are located.

The absence of Federal legislation designed to meet the housing needs of our domestic farmworker is another factor that accounts for the lack of adequate farm labor housing. The existing low-rent housing provisions are geared to the metropolitan-urban complex and cannot accommodate the low-paid migratory worker who is constantly on the move or who lives in rural areas.

In recognition that the farm labor housing problem is national in scope, I send to the desk a bill to amend title V of the Housing Act of 1949 to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to develop and operate a program utilizing direct loans, loan insurance, loan-grant combinations for minor repairs, and financial assistance for low-rent housing so as to assist in providing adequate housing for this Nation's domestic farm laborers and their families. This bill will make a major contribution toward establishing domestic farm labor housing that is adequate to meet the minimum needs and standards for shelter, sanitation, durability, and human dignity that every citizen needs and deserves.

Mr. MONRONEY subsequently said:

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill introduced earlier today by the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS] relating to housing for migratory labor, may lie on the desk until March 8, 1963, for additional cosponsors.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

WARTIME BENEFITS FOR PEACETIME VETERANS—ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILL

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, at the request of the senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], I ask unanimous consent that, at the next printing of S. 836 (a bill to authorize wartime benefits under certain circumstances for peacetime veterans) the following names be added as cosponsors: Senators ALLOTT, BEALL, BOGGS, CARLSON, CASE, CURTIS, DOMINICK, FONG, HICKENLOOPER, HRUSKA, JAVITS, JORDAN of Idaho, KEATING, MILLER, MUNDT, PEARSON, PROUTY, SCOTT, SIMPSON, TOWER, and YOUNG of North Dakota.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, also at the request of the senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], I invite any other Senator who would care to cosponsor S. 836 to contact Senator SALTONSTALL's office.

PRESENTATION TO PEOPLE OF MEXICO OF A MONUMENT COMMEMORATING THEIR INDEPENDENCE—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILL

Under authority of the order of the Senate of February 28, 1963, the name of Mr. LONG of Missouri was added as an additional cosponsor of the bill (S. 944) to provide for the presentation by the United States to the people of Mexico of a monument commemorating the independence of Mexico, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. KUCHEL (for himself and other Senators) on February 28, 1963.

NOTICE OF POSTPONEMENT OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF CARL E. McGOWAN, TO BE U.S. CIRCUIT JUDGE, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CIRCUIT, BEFORE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, this is to announce that the hearing scheduled for Tuesday, March 5, 1963, on the nomination of Carl E. McGowan, of Illinois, to be U.S. circuit judge, District of Columbia circuit, has been postponed until further date.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

By Mr. GOLDWATER:

Article entitled "Today's Liberals: Better Called 20th Century Tories," by Senator KARL E. MUNDT, published in Critique, Penn State University magazine, January issue, related to the meaning of the term "Liberal."

NATIONAL WEIGHTS AND MEASURES WEEK

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, for the sixth consecutive year the National Conference on Weights and Measures is sponsoring a "National Weights and Measures Week." We in Massachusetts are proud that Mr. J. Ellis Bowen, city sealer of Newton, Mass., is serving as chairman of the education committee of the conference, and that he and his committee colleagues have the responsibility for this undertaking.

National Weights and Measures Week, which begins today, March 1, and continues through March 7, will be a timely reminder to Americans of the important role that accurate weights and measures play in our daily lives. Industry, business, agriculture, and, in fact, every field of endeavor, depend heavily upon the accuracy of such determinations.

In these difficult times, with all the pressures on us, it is easy to lose sight of the vital importance of such basic governmental services as weights and measures enforcement. But it is fair to say that our complex civilization could not exist without them.

Weights and measures enforcement is performed at national, State, and local levels. All work together in close harmony, with personnel numbering only some 3,000 officers. At the national level is the National Bureau of Standards, which is the custodian of our national standards of weights and measures and is the calibrating authority for State standards. The Bureau is also constantly occupied in a teaching and technological advisory capacity to the lower governmental levels. State-operated offices of weights and measures direct statewide administrative and enforcement activities. At the local level, county and municipal offices of weights and measures carry out strictly local enforcement.

Some laws, and the enforcement thereof, touch the average person only occasionally, if at all. But as John Quincy Adams said in his report on weights and measures, made to the Senate in 1821, when he was Secretary of State:

> Weights and measures may be ranked among the necessaries of life to every individual of human society. They enter into the economic arrangements and daily concerns of every family.

Historically in America weights and measures are of sufficient importance that the Constitution specifically delegates to Congress the authority to "coin money, regulate the value thereof, and fix the standard of weights and measures."

It is not accidental that these two powers were mentioned together, for while money is a medium of exchange, what a purchaser receives is of equal importance to what he pays therefore, for to receive short weight or short measure is the equivalent of receiving counterfeit money in change.

Today, proper weights-and-measures administration constitutes a sound governmental investment. It confers a two-sided benefit, protecting the seller as well as the buyer. I have been assured by Mr. Bowen that at least half of the mistakes in weighing and measuring that are uncovered throughout the United States each year are against the interests of the owner of the weighing or measuring device. In discovering such mistakes, protection is provided the honest businessman or merchant against loss of just profit by means of a faulty device.

America's weights and measures officers inspect and either approve or reject all commercially used weighing and measuring devices. These range from large-capacity railroad and vehicle scales to the delicate prescription balances and tiny weights used by hospital pharmacies and drugstores, the accuracy of which can spell the difference between death and life itself. Also involved are the scales of the butcher, the grocer, and the baker; scales used for counting piecework for wage purposes; fuel-oil measuring meters and gasoline-dispensing pump meters; yardsticks; and taximeters. All of these are definitely related to the cost of living of every family; and usually neither the merchant nor the customer is aware of any inaccuracy of devices or in packaging and labeling operations, unless such is discovered by an inspector of weights and measures during his inspections.

Mr. President, it is my conviction that America is indebted to these dedicated officers. National Weights and Measures Week is a good time to suggest that our weights and measures service, at all levels, is deserving of the commendation of the Senate and of our fellow citizens.

Mr. President, I am very happy that a fellow citizen of mine in Newton, Mass., is serving as chairman of the education committee of the national conference.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, for the information of the Senate, let me

state that it is the intention of the leadership to call up for debate and consideration House Joint Resolution 284, Calendar No. 10, the agricultural supplemental appropriation bill for the Commodity Credit Corporation, on Monday next.

I also wish to announce that Senate bill 20, the outdoor recreation bill, is on the calendar, and will also be considered shortly.

APPLICATION OF SCIENTIFIC PROGRESS TO MILITARY PROBLEMS

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I believe we can all agree that science is wonderful. But I seriously doubt if it is wonderful enough to justify a policy of unilateral disarmament by the United States. Perhaps I am a skeptic, but I find it very difficult to put my complete faith in so-called scientific developments which fit in so neatly with Communist objectives and which arise so conveniently when Soviet intransigence at Geneva seems to call for another concession on the part of the United States.

In this morning's newspapers, we read that Mr. Jacob D. Beam, Assistant Director of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, has stated that the concessions being made at Geneva are not concessions to the Soviet Union but rather are concessions to scientific progress. In other words, scientific progress has taken another leap now that the United States is getting ready to present a new draft treaty for a nuclear test ban at Geneva. Presumably this scientific progress will encourage our negotiators to drop our previous requirement that international observers be placed at national seismic stations that would monitor a test ban and excuse another downward revision of the number of on-site inspections required on Russian soil. Presumably, this so-called scientific progress will allow us to give the Soviets just about anything they demand.

On this basis, Mr. President, are we to conclude that the Russians are not keeping pace with our scientific progress? I have not read anywhere that scientific progress has led the Soviets to ease their position at Geneva. It is true that they have made a tongue-in-cheek offer to accept two or three on-site inspections, and, of course, that is like saying they will accept none. This is not an offer made in good faith; it is a cynical attempt to see how far the United States will go in its headlong drive toward accommodation.

Why is it that all the scientific progress is on the side of American concessions? Why is it that our scientific computations in the Pentagon tell us that manned bombers are no longer necessary; that the Skybolt is no good; that we no longer need missile bases in Turkey and Italy; that perhaps surface ships are as good as submarines for carrying the Polaris missile?

Another point I should like to raise is whether the world at large is fully apprised of this scientific progress? I certainly am not one to dwell on the surpassing value of world opinion, but I do recognize the fact that it will do the United States no good if the entire world views our concessions at Geneva and our jettisoning of the manned bomber and the Skybolt as signs of weakness. In other words, can we be sure that the rest of the world understands the marvels of this scientific progress and the wide vistas it opens to us alone for disarmament moves? Or will it interpret our actions as frantic moves to pacify an enemy which has sworn to bury us?

As I said at the beginning of my remarks, science is wonderful and I am as thankful as anyone else for the great benefits which it has given to mankind. But I also recognize the fact that the application of scientific progress to military problems is subject to human error and open to wide disagreement and debate. This is particularly true when such application so conveniently fits a pattern of unilateral disarmament in a dangerous world.

TRIBUTE TO EDWARD J. MEEMAN

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, on February 25, several hundred persons—just a small percentage of his admirers in this country and abroad—gathered in Memphis to pay tribute to one of the greatest newspapermen of our time, Mr. Edward J. Meeman, editor emeritus of the Memphis Press-Scimitar.

The occasion was a dinner at which Mr. Meeman received the National Human Relations Award of the National Conference of Christians and Jews. The principal speeches were made by Edmund Orgill, former mayor of Memphis, who presented the award to Mr. Meeman and Secretary of Commerce Luther Hodges.

Mr. Orgill traced the fabulous career of this wonderful man, who framed the motto, "The newspaper working alone can do much, but citizens working with their newspaper can do anything"—and believed in it and lived by it every day, and still does.

Secretary Hodges paid deserved tribute not only to Mr. Meeman for his dedicated service to Memphis and the Midsouth, but also to the people of Memphis for their very substantial progress in the crucial area of better human relations.

In his response after receiving the Human Relations Award, Mr. Meeman was truly in character: he was appreciative of his recognition of his past services, but he was already pointing out that there was still work to be done.

> Our task now—

He said—

> is to widen the opportunities for employment for our Negro citizens.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the remarks of Mr. Orgill, Mr. Meeman, and Secretary Hodges be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the addresses were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY EDMUND ORGILL

In 1931, Edward J. Meeman, came to live amongst us—and we are blessed that he did.

He came to Memphis as the editor of the Memphis Press-Scimitar. He had started his newspaper career at the age of 18 as cub reporter for the Evansville (Ind.) Press. His work impressed his bosses, and in 1921, he was sent to Knoxville to start, and to edit a new paper, the Knoxville News.

Under his guidance the News flourished and bought out its competitor. It became the News-Sentinel and the city's leading newspaper, which it is today.

In Knoxville, the Great Smoky Mountains National Park was among this man's visions. He and his paper supported every move for the establishment of this national park. They were successful and the whole Nation is happier for it. Meeman is now chairman of the board of the National Committee on State Parks, he is vice president of the American Planning and Civic Association and he has just been appointed the conservation editor of the Scripps-Howard newspapers.

In Knoxville, Ed Meeman fought for the establishment of the Tennessee Valley Authority. When he came to Memphis, he carried on the fight for TVA power, and low electric rates. He and his star reporter, Null Adams, went into the towns of northeast Mississippi and west Tennessee preaching TVA's advantages.

After TVA power was secured for Corinth and Tupelo, the Press-Scimitar went after it for Memphis. It published a series of articles under the heading "The Tale of Two Cities," in which the electric rates of Tupelo and Memphis were compared. There was built up a popular demand, and the local politicians in power "took the ball" and in 1934 Memphians voted overwhelmingly to become a TVA city. Ladies and gentlemen, what a great contribution this was to the Memphis area.

There have been many more great achievements by this great editor. I will mention just a few of them. When he came to Memphis we had an old, crumbling, mismanaged, rat-infested city hospital. As a result of a Press-Scimitar crusade, this was replaced in 1935 by the modern John Gaston teaching hospital.

In the middle thirties, Ed Meeman returned from a European trip deeply impressed by the Black Forest of Germany. He thought that Memphis should have something like it. He and his associates started looking. One day they discovered in the northwest corner of this county, the forest along the Chickasaw Bluffs, and in the adjacent Mississippi River lowlands. Meeman cried, "This is it," and jumped up and down with joy. (This information comes from the man who was with him.)

He persuaded the Federal Government to buy 12,000 acres. This was later transferred to the State of Tennessee, and is now our Shelby Forest. It is the most visited of Tennessee's State parks and probably Ed Meeman's greatest love. His home and his Forest Farm adjoin Shelby Forest. His writings make constant reference to the birds and flowers and trees and animals and to the many joys of nature. (Incidentally, the flowers on the tables will be delivered to Forest Farm and it is our hope that they will be replanted and serve as a reminder to our honoree of this happy occasion.)

Through 32 years in Memphis, Ed Meeman has pleaded—and fought for—more democratic government with greater citizen participation.

His vigor and vigilance, imparted to his reporters, helped see to it that local government in the years of machine rule, was honest, if not democratic.

And, democracy began to come alive in 1948 with the election that year.

Citizens have overcome their fear and now speak out on public issues.

With Press-Scimitar support, we have gotten permanent registration, voting machines and other election reforms.

We have an effective city-county planning commission. City employees are protected to a degree by civil service. Reassessment of all real property is underway by qualified experts. Many other improvements in local government have been accomplished and still more are under discussion.

Ed Meeman has stimulated an interest in international affairs. It was at his home in November 1946, that a small group met with Clarence Streit, author of "Union Now" and editor of the magazine, Freedom and Union, and pledged themselves to work for a Federal Union of the self-governing peoples. (We are delighted that Mr. Streit is with us tonight.)

Out of this meeting the Atlantic Union Committee was born. Its efforts resulted in the Atlantic Convention in Paris last January, and the increasingly strong movement towards economic and political unity of NATO and the free world.

Meeman's interest in world trade resulted in his appointment to the Regional Export Expansion Council by Secretary Hodges.

Any one of these achievements would make a man's life worthwhile—a success. When we consider them together, we all must agree that Ed Meeman justly deserves the honor that is his tonight.

We are sorry that Mr. Jack Howard could not be with us tonight. We want him to know of the accomplishments of the Memphis Press-Scimitar and its editor emeritus and his conservation editor. We hoped to let him know what we think of Ed Meeman.

We wanted also to tell him that Memphis likes Charlie Schneider. We are glad to have him back with us.

Again we wanted to express thanks for the support which both the Press-Scimitar and the Commercial Appeal give to all worthwhile civic causes. They both fulfill the role of good citizens.

But it is the National Human Relations Award that Ed Meeman is receiving. Therefore, it is fitting that we know and recognize his strong efforts through the years towards a better understanding between men—between labor and management—and between members of different religious faiths (hence his interest in the National Conference of Christians and Jews). He believes that men should be judged by their character and not by the color of their skin. He and his paper have been big factors in the good race relations which we enjoy in Memphis. Mr. Secretary, Mr. Streit—we want you and other visitors to know that many leading white and Negro citizens are working together to maintain and improve these relations.

But the best thing of all was emphasized by one of the editors of the Commercial Appeal. This man said to me last Thursday, "I have always liked and respected Ed Meeman—he is so interested in the people who work under him."

And how true this is. I expect that he has personally helped more young men up the ladder of success than any other editor in America.

And so, Ed Meeman, my friend—our friend—I present to you on behalf of the National Conference of Christians and Jews—this National Human Relations Award.

RESPONSE BY EDWARD J. MEEMAN

This award means much to me, because I see it not as an honor given to one individual, but as an honor given to principles in which a great many people believe, principles which have brought us together this evening in this assemblage.

What are those principles? That Jews, Catholics and Protestants each find in faiths which are not their own, so much more which they hold in common with the other faiths than they find differences. We all believe in one good God, the same God, and that it is His will that all His children should live together as brothers, sharing harmoniously in the good earth He gave us.

We may have different theological reasons for being good and doing good, but our differences as to what is good are minor. At least there is a vast area of common agreement on what good needs to be accomplished. When the men and women of the three faiths join hands to accomplish this good, they find joyous fellowship, brotherhood, and unity of spirit. Each reflects credit on his own faith by the fruits he shows in his contribution to such community action.

Memphis has had many examples of fine accomplishment when men and women, each inspired by the teachings of his own faith, have joined hands with those of other faiths to make our community an ever better place of abode. Most recent have been the changes in race relations, for which the time had come, which were brought about in Memphis peaceably and without violence, by men and women of the Protestant, Catholic, and Jewish faiths, all working together to practice the principles of each of those faiths. This accomplishment has made our community a happier place for those who live here, and brought us the generous envy of other American cities, and the admiration of the world.

GOOD FOR ONE—GOOD FOR ALL

It is my faith, which has been proved to my satisfaction in both observation and experience, that what is good for one is good for all, and that what is good for all is good for each. Conflict is only in the erring human mind, not in reality. The solution of any problem, mathematical or human, always lies right alongside the problem. We can always find the solution if we will lay aside self-interest and prejudice, and discuss it in the spirit that our religious faith has taught us, whatever that faith is. We need to ask not "Who is right?" but "What is right?" and if we look for the answer in enlightened discussion, reinforced by mediation and prayer, we will find the answer. The answer will be found to be good for all concerned, and we will wonder why we did not see this solution in the first place, it will seem so obvious when it is found.

RECALLS AN ILLUSTRATION

When we have that spirit, every problem will become an opportunity. I recall an illustration of this truth. When the New Deal, during the depression, issued a brochure saying that the South was the Nation's No. 1 problem, the editors of the seven Scripps-Howard newspapers which are published in the South met in Memphis to consider the brochure. Not in the spirit of criticizing the New Deal's pronouncement, but in order to strike a positive note, we editors issued our own pronouncement, declaring that the South was "the Nation's No. 1 opportunity." And so it proved, when the success of the Tennessee Valley Authority created a vast new market for the goods of northern manufacturers.

THE NEXT PHASE IN RACE RELATIONS

We have come to the next phase in race relations in Memphis.

We have already accomplished more difficult tasks. We have desegregated buses, schools, libraries, and the art gallery, a university, parks and playgrounds, restaurants; what is now our task is less of a break with our traditions. Therefore it is easier. Our task now is to widen the opportunities for employment for our Negro citizens. It is to find more and better jobs for the men and women who constitute more than one-third of our population, jobs in both public and private employment. Everyone is now agreed that Negroes should have the opportunity to obtain an education as good as that which is available to whites. Having been prepared to hold good jobs by this training, they should not be shut out from the opportunity to get them.

The great pioneer of Negro opportunity, Booker T. Washington, told the story of sailors from a wrecked ship, marooned in open lifeboats, who were dying of thirst. They had failed to see that they had drifted from the open sea to the estuary of the great Amazon River, and that the water around their boat was now fresh water. All they had to do was to let down their buckets where they were. He told this story to show his fellow Negroes, just emerged from slavery into personal freedom, that there was opportunity for progress all around them, if they but had the gumption to see it and use it. "Let down your buckets where you are," he told them.

This story has a moral, not only for Negroes then and now, but it has a moral for white people now. Let us let down our buckets where we are. All around us is a great pool of competent, educated, trained Negro labor. Let us dip into it and use it fully. If we use it, the South will have a great increase of prosperity. There should not be Negro jobs and white jobs but a job for the one best qualified to hold it. Many Negroes now dependent and a drag on the economy, will become self-supporting. Those just getting along will have increased income and become better customers.

JOB GAINED DOESN'T MEAN JOB LOST

Let white labor not make the mistake of thinking that a job gained by a Negro is a job lost by a white man. The good God has not given us the kind of universe in which the good of one man is at the expense of another. When we open wider the doors of opportunity to Negroes we shall have such an improvement in our economy that more jobs will be available to white men also.

Why are so many nations clamoring to get into the European Common Market? Because it is a wide, free trade area with a high standard of living.

When we upgrade a large portion of our population, the South will raise its standard of living, improve the labor supply, become an area with greater attractions to industry and distributive commerce, and provide a greater prosperity for all of us who live here, and the peace of mind that comes from friendship and cooperation between the races.

BROTHERHOOD COMMANDED BY RELIGIONS

Brotherhood is commanded by the teachings of the religions to which all of us in this room adhere. Thus we know it is right. It would be a lawless universe if that which was right was not also practical. Hate, prejudice, fear, and division are negative, and they are shown by their fruits to be impractical. Brotherhood is practical.

I thank you, Edmund, for this award, and I thank everyone in this room, and those they may represent for their part in it.

I look forward to working with you for these things in which we believe.

ADDRESS BY SECRETARY OF COMMERCE LUTHER HODGES

It is a pleasure to join with you tonight in thanking Edward Meeman for his many outstanding contributions to the cause of human brotherhood.

You have already heard many things about his constructive leadership as editor of the Press Scimitar and about his dedicated community service activities which have contributed so much to the social and economic progress of this Midsouth region and to the very substantial progress you have made here in Memphis in the crucial area of better human relations.

I want to compliment the people of Memphis for the highly constructive approach they have taken on this difficult problem of race relations.

You have demonstrated how much can be accomplished in a relatively short time when responsible leaders of both races work together in good faith to serve the best interests of all of the citizens of the community.

As a southerner, I congratulate you on the honorable beginning you have made toward meaningful brotherhood in a highly sensitive area of human relations.

Tennessee has enjoyed progressive leadership in many areas of national policy in the past.

An example is Mr. Meeman's strong, lifelong commitment to the cause of freer trade among the nations of the world—a cause which, I feel is closely related to our national goal of an expanding international brotherhood of free men.

Mr. Meeman was one of the most vigorous supporters of the Trade Expansion Act of 1962—that bold new instrument of the liberal trade philosophy of another great Tennessean, Cordell Hull, who fashioned the first reciprocal trade act in 1934.

He is also a valued member of the Memphis Regional Export Expansion Council, which is helping the Department of Commerce in its national effort to expand the sale of U.S. products abroad.

I am looking forward to meeting with him and with the other members of this export council at breakfast tomorrow to discuss ways of putting more steam behind this vital effort.

It is essential that we increase our exports from the Midsouth and from every other part of our Nation.

We must sell more abroad to strengthen our domestic economic growth.

But most importantly, we must increase our export earnings to offset the continuing deficit in our balance of international payments—which is serious indeed.

Since 1957 our total payments to other countries have exceeded our receipts by several billions of dollars a year.

In 1960 we were running in the red in our international accounts to the tune of nearly $4 billion a year.

The result has been a heavy drain of our gold reserves and a massive build-up of dollar claims on our gold by foreign banks, individuals, and governments.

In 2 years, through a variety of measures, we have cut this annual deficit nearly in half—to $2.2 billion in 1962.

But this reduced deficit is still much too much—so far as I am concerned, $2.2 billion too much.

To maintain our financial position in the world—and maintain our position of political leadership in the free world—we must bring our international accounts into balance.

Our balance-of-payments deficits result largely from our country's heavy moral commitment to the ideal of a world brotherhood of freedom, prosperity, and peace—an ideal implicit in our great Judaic-Christian religious heritage.

Over the years we have continued to enjoy a substantial surplus of exports over imports in our merchandise trade with other nations.

But these export earnings have been more than offset by our oversea military expenditures to help safeguard freedom, by our foreign aid expenditures, and by our U.S. private investment in the economic development of other countries.

The only practical solution is to increase our exports.

If our exports were at least 10-percent larger than they are, we would go a long way toward eliminating the present annual deficit in our international accounts.

But the required $2 billion or more increase in our exports will not be achieved easily.

Competition in world markets is getting keener.

And there has been a slowdown in the rate of economic growth in Europe, our largest regional market, so there is a slackening of European demand for imports from the United States, and we have the uncertainty caused by General de Gaulle's outbursts.

Last year our sales abroad totaled nearly $21 billion—up about $1 billion from 1961.

Nevertheless, there is plenty of room for improvement in our export performance.

The United States exports only about 4 percent of its total production of goods.

Yet our chief world trade competitors, the six countries of the European Economic Community—the Common Market countries—export 12 percent of their total production.

More American companies must get into the export field, and all of our exporters must work on these export markets as aggressively and as imaginatively as they sell in our domestic market.

The great thrust of this export expansion drive must come from private business and private initiative, but the Department of Commerce stands ready to do everything it can to help U.S. companies enter the export market and succeed in that market.

The Trade Expansion Act, adopted overwhelmingly by the Congress, is designed to open broader markets for U.S. goods, both in Western Europe and in the other countries of the world that account for about two-thirds of our total exports.

But it can do much more than this; it can help to bind the free nations closer together through expanding mutually profitable, international trade.

I have always believed that trade among friendly nations promotes greater understanding and strong ties of mutual interest among the peoples of these nations.

I feel this even more strongly today when trade and understanding are vital to our efforts to create a prosperous dynamic, international economic community.

Such a community is essential.

We must have an international community which recognizes both the value and dignity of the individual and the constructive power of individual enterprise.

I am certain we cannot find lasting peace and prosperity in a world which throws up barriers to enterprise in trade or investment.

We cannot create a strong community of interests if nations or regional blocs become self-centered and adopt policies of "beggar thy neighbor."

I am confident, therefore, that, despite such incidents as General de Gaulle's recent dash of cold water on the prospects for an outward-looking European Economic Community, the postwar trend toward more liberal trade policies in the world will continue.

History requires that Europe look beyond its borders and join with the United States in shaping a viable, prosperous world community of free peoples.

This trend toward closer cooperation and more meaningful brotherhood in the world must be matched by a keener awareness of our responsibilities to our fellow men at home.

That great southerner, my fellow North Carolinian, Clarence H. Poe, pointed out more than 50 years ago that "the prosperity of every man depends upon the prosperity of the average man."

"Every man whose earning power is below par," he said, "is a burden on the community; he drags down the whole level of life, and every other man in the community is poorer by reason of his inefficiency, whether he be white man or Negro."

This wise observation is as pertinent today as it was when it was made in 1910.

It reminds us that what is done to the least of these, our brethren, is a matter of concern to all of us—as practical men as well as humanitarians.

Let me cite a few examples of how these shortfalls in earning power and economic opportunity affect our communities, our national economy, and even our capacity to compete in markets of the world.

More than 4 million of our fellow Americans are currently unemployed for a variety of reasons.

A prime reason is our slow rate of economic growth and the underutilization of our industrial capacity.

But there are other causes of unemployment that are just as serious, and some of them may be even more difficult to remedy.

Last year, young people under 25 accounted for more than one-third of our total unemployment, although they represent only one-fifth of our total labor force.

Many of these young people are being frustrated by the slow growth in the number of available jobs.

But many thousands of them are looking for work without success because they lack adequate education and marketable skills.

Hundreds of thousands of young men and women drop out of school each year before they finish high school.

It is estimated that there will be 7½ million such dropouts during the current decade.

Yet surveys show that the unemployment rate for young people who fail to complete their high school training is twice the rate for high school graduates.

In our present labor force, more than 3 million workers have not even completed the fifth grade.

And among unskilled laborers the rate of unemployment is more than twice the rate for the labor force as a whole.

The shortfall in earning power among Negro workers is especially large—due both to inadequate education and to the pressures which tend to confine nonwhites to unskilled and low-skilled occupations.

On the average, nearly a million nonwhite workers were without jobs last year.

And, again, the rate of unemployment for nonwhite workers was more than twice that for white workers.

Together, these figures describe a serious unemployment problem which will not readily yield to our efforts to step up our national rate of economic growth.

If we achieve our national goal of a full employment economy, civilian employment will rise from about 67 million to more than 80 million in 1970.

But there will be no increase at all in jobs for unskilled laborers, as we continue to mechanize and automate.

Stepping up production and our rate of growth will not provide jobs for those who lack useful skills or for those who are barred by custom or prejudice from employment for which they may be fitted.

Instead of benefiting as a Nation from the energies and innate abilities of these potential workers, we will have to bear the social and economic costs of their idleness, their frustration, and in many cases their bitterness and hostility to their communities and everyone around them.

To avoid this social alienation and this waste of valuable human resources, we must step up our efforts to improve our educational system and, equally important, to strengthen the motivations for self improvement.

This is a challenge to all of us, as private individuals, as businessmen, as public officials, as people who care about their fellow men and women.

Our economy falls short of its potential when earning power and consumer buying power are inadequate to maintain a higher rate of growth.

The development of our human resources is, thus, a matter of concern to each of us.

And in view of our domestic and international responsibilities and our world competition, it is a matter of pressing national interest.

Our most urgent domestic economic business is, of course, the need to lighten the heavy Federal tax burden which is depressing our rate of economic growth.

The President's tax program includes reductions of corporate income taxes to provide both incentive and the means for greater business investment to create additional jobs.

This will help to bring down the rate of unemployment by creating new jobs for those whose unemployment is due, not to lack of marketable skills, but to inadequate consumer demand.

Further lowering of our jobless rate will depend heavily upon our ability to upgrade our present labor force and to do a better job of preparing the more than 1 million new workers entering the labor force each year.

To do this, we must improve our public schools and stimulate our students to develop their abilities to the fullest.

We must expand our community junior colleges and our special facilities for vocational and technical training.

We must also expand our senior colleges and universities.

Our ablest young people also must be better prepared to deal with the complex problems of this technological age.

And we must strive unceasingly to remove those barriers in every industry and every community which deny Americans the opportunity to obtain the best educations and the best jobs of which they are capable.

To further these efforts, the President has proposed a comprehensive program of Federal assistance for education and vocational training.

This program emphasizes the special areas of need—the expansion of our community college programs, for example, and the improvement of teacher training and teaching research, the expansion of vocational education, the improvement of our public libraries, and the expansion of our adult education and adult literacy programs.

But the greatest responsibility for doing all of these things falls upon our States and our local communities.

The development of our human resources is a matter of national concern, but the obligation to see that this development takes place rests upon each of us in his capacity as a citizen of a community and a State, as well as a citizen of these United States.

This challenge to us as southerners is especially great.

We live in a region that has enormous natural and human resources.

But we are not realizing the full benefits of these resources for ourselves or for the Nation.

We have made great economic progress in the South in the last few decades.

This is reflected in the rapid increase in southern per capita incomes.

Since 1929, when it was only half the national average, per capita income in the South has increased by almost 400 percent.

This compares with a 200-percent increase for the Nation as a whole.

But we cannot let this dramatic progress blind us to the fact that per capita income in the South is still only 75 percent of the national average.

Today, our national economy is operating at about $35 billion below capacity.

Our consumer demand and investment demand are this much below what is necessary for full utilization of our available manpower and productive facilities.

Yet, if per capita income in the South were raised to the level of the rest of the Nation, this would generate enough additional spending and investment to restore this country to full employment.

The whole country suffers when any part lags in the development of its natural resources, in the education of its youth, or in the earning power of its people.

The South has made substantial progress in its agriculture.

The region, you know, has more cropland than all of the rest of the Nation.

But we are still hampered by generations of inadequate conservation which permitted the depletion of our soils.

Southern farmers have had to pay more than half of the Nation's fertilizer bill to overcome these deficiencies, and they have had to do it out of about one quarter of our total national farm income.

The South has about three quarters of the Nation's commercial forest land, and we have made striking progress in developing this great resource.

But we have to overcome generations of chronic overcutting and inadequate fire protection and restocking which reduced our total timber stand to less than one-third of the national total.

Southern industrial progress in recent years has been a source of justifiable pride for us all.

The trend of modern technology is running in the South's direction—emphasizing wood pulp, petrochemicals, petroleum, and other southern products as basic industrial raw materials.

The South has all of the Nation's reserves of natural sulfur and bauxite.

It has 65 percent of the Nation's petroleum; 75 percent of its natural gas, phosphate, and titanium; half of the Nation's clay and coal; and it ranks very high in the rare-earth metals that are so important in this space age.

Yet, value added per worker in manufacturing in the South lags behind the value added per worker in the Nation as a whole.

And this shows up in the comparable lag in incomes of southern families headed by a year-round, full-time worker.

This lag underscores the vital importance of improving the education and technical skills of our people—to raise their productivity and their earning power, and consequently the level of per capita income in the South.

We have made great progress in our public schools.

But we can and we must do more.

We have further to go than other parts of the country to lift the educational level of our people to the standards imposed by a modern technological society.

The latest census figures show that the median number of years of schooling completed by southerners is a full year below the national average and more than 2 years below the level of the Western States.

Our school expenditures are only 71 percent of the national average—$265 per pupil, compared with $375 for the Nation as a whole.

We must invest more in education to overcome our deficiencies in classroom space, in teachers' salaries, and in teaching equipment—to improve the quality as well as the quantity of our educational effort.

We also must be concerned about the quality of the employment opportunities we make available to the young people we educate at such great cost.

I want to be very frank about this last point:

We cannot continue to waste the talents of our Negro citizens if we ever hope to raise the South to its full economic potential.

We cannot afford to employ in menial jobs educated Negro men and women who are qualified for better jobs.

We cannot let the talents of a Negro engineer be wasted in sweeping floors, in sorting mail, or in digging ditches.

We cannot use trained stenographers as maids.

We cannot make trained electricians rake yards, or use as construction laborers men who have the training to be draftsmen.

One of the reasons our per capita income is so low is the widespread underemployment of Negroes in our labor force.

Less than half of our Negro families are headed by persons with full-time, year-round jobs.

Too many Negro men and women are confined to jobs which produce little for themselves or for those who employ them—to jobs which in other parts of the country have been eliminated by machines, with a resulting rise in the average productivity and average incomes of the people in those areas.

The right to seek a job in keeping with one's ability—and have a reasonable prospect of finding such a job—is fundamental to my concept of freedom and equality of opportunity in a free enterprise economy and a free society.

For the South, this matter of better job opportunities for our Negro citizens is an economic necessity, as well as a duty imposed by our sense of fairness and right.

With constructive local leadership such as you have been showing here in Memphis and with growing public awareness of the importance of developing our region's human resources to the fullest, we can make great progress in this area of better job opportunities in the next few years.

The South has a great opportunity to demonstrate to the Nation and to the world both its capacity for orderly change and the extent of its faith in its future.

Those of us who know the South and love the South and its people cannot doubt that this region has a great destiny to lead both in our national economic growth and in the development of a deeper understanding of the meaning of practical human brotherhood.

Challenging opportunities produce growth, and I am confident that the South has only begun its growth to greatness in our time.

Thank you, and my best wishes to you all.

PROBLEMS INVOLVED IN DISARMAMENT NEGOTIATIONS

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, yesterday the distinguished senior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS], spoke in detail and with great care on the problems involved in our disarmament negotiations and in support of his resolution designed to give the U.S. Senate a voice in the acceptance or rejection of any tentative agreement which might be reached.

A number of our colleagues on this side of the aisle joined in this discussion supporting the need for passage of this resolution. Lest we be accused of partisanship I call to your attention the excellent and documented letter appearing under the name of our distinguished colleague, the senior Senator from Connecticut. In this letter which I call to the attention of all Members, a detailed list is set forth of the continuing series of concessions which the United States has recently granted in our disarmament and nuclear test-ban negotiations without a single concession on the side of the Soviets.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this letter appearing in the Washington Post for March 1, 1963, be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DODD AND THE TEST BAN

I would like to comment on your editorial of February 22 which misrepresented my position in several respects.

I have never stated or implied anything so preposterous as that this administration or its predecessor would deliberately imperil the security of the United States. I do contend that the test-ban policy pursued in good faith by both administrations has already cost us our nuclear superiority over the Soviets, and will gravely imperil our security unless soon revised.

My assumptions are these: Such peace as we have is based upon our nuclear parity with Russia; if the Soviets continue nuclear tests, and we do not, they will develop weapons so superior to ours that they can confront us with a choice between surrender or annihilation; the safeguards in our current test-ban proposal are so inadequate that the Soviets can continue testing in secret, after they have disarmed us through the signing of a treaty.

It is demonstrable that in 4 years of negotiations, the Soviets have whittled down our detection and inspection provisions to the point where they are only one-tenth as effective as those in our original proposal. And the whittling goes on.

We once demanded the right to inspect all seismic disturbances of a significant size, i.e., several hundred per year; we then dropped to 20, and then to 12, and then to 8, and then to 7, and now to 5.

We once insisted on 600 monitoring stations, then 180, and now 80.

We once insisted that monitoring stations be manned by nonnationals of the country involved. We now accept the principle that these stations may be manned by nationals, which means that the Russians are to be the judges of whether or not they themselves are cheating.

We once excluded from the treaty, tests so small that they could not possibly be detected. We now include these undetectable shots.

We once proposed a control body on which no nation had the power of veto. We now give the Communist bloc the veto power.

We have made all of these retreats despite the testimony last September of our Disarmament Director, William Foster, that there has been no improvement in our verification capability.

Continued nuclear testing is essential to the perfection of the antimissile missile and to the development of the neutron bomb. The nation which first perfects either of these weapons will decisively overturn the balance of power. The kind of testing involved here is underground testing of small yields, which is precisely the kind most easily hidden. Under the provisions of this treaty, our chance of detecting sneak tests is 1 in 1,000. I am not willing to stake the survival of this country on such a gamble.

The question, then, recurs: Is it possible that any administration would negotiate a treaty as dangerous as I contend this one to be?

The Washington Post answers "No" and its answer seems to be based more on an act of faith than on an examination of fact. As a Senator it is my duty to assume that such a mistake is possible; and the history of all major nations in the 20th century is replete with mistakes of similar magnitude.

There is one supreme question which the Senate must ask about any nuclear test-ban treaty: Does it provide reasonable protection against cheating by the Soviets? If it does not it is worthless, worse than worthless, because it could lead to our national destruction. In my judgment, the present proposal of the United States does not meet that test. And so I am against it.

THOMAS J. DODD,
Senator from Connecticut.

WASHINGTON.

THE LATIN AMERICAN SCHOOL LUNCH PROGRAM

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, one of the most encouraging success stories of the Alliance for Progress is the school lunch program now reaching more than 8 million Latin American children. This is a part of the U.S. food-for-peace program, which it was my privilege to direct during 1961 and 1962.

My successor in this program, Mr. Richard Reuter, expects that within a year, the United States will be assisting in the feeding of 1 out of 3 of Latin America's schoolchildren. This program not only provides a constructive outlet for American agricultural surpluses, but it contributes both to the health of the schoolchildren and to their education.

I know of no other single overseas U.S. aid effort which has had such spectacular results as our school lunch programs.

The current issue of Time magazine—March 1, 1963—carries a special news note on this food-for-peace effort, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE ALIANZA: FEEDING THE CHILDREN

Despite all the discouraging news about the lagging Alliance for Progress, the United States could find a lift last week in the record of one relatively modest but highly successful program. In 1954, the United States started shipping surplus food stocks to Latin America for use in a free school-lunch program. So far, under the food-for-peace program, the United States has sent thousands of tons of surplus flour, cornmeal, edible oils, cheese, beans and powdered milk. Distributed by private relief agencies and local officials, the food will help feed 8,300,000 children this year, or 25 percent of Latin America's school-age population. Another 5,400,000 babies and pregnant women get at least one square meal a day.

In Washington, food-for-peace officials have coined a name for the project—Alianza para los Niños, meaning Alliance for Children. The food is credited with helping to double Peru's rural school attendance since the program began; school absenteeism in Bolivia has dropped from 38 to 2 percent, and students now make sure to be on time since latecomers go to the end of the lunch line. Each day in Mexico, more than 1 million schoolchildren receive the donated food. "The lunch is the only reason a lot of parents send their children to school," says Djalma Maranhão, mayor of Natal in Brazil's impoverished northeast. In Brazil alone, some 3 billion glasses of milk a year are distributed in 25,000 public schools. At the end of a 3-month period, reports one Brazilian teacher, most of her pupils gained at least 5 pounds. With plenty of surplus food where this came from, Food-for-Peace Director Richard W. Reuter expects that within a year the United States will be helping to feed one-third of Latin America's schoolchildren.

BULGARIAN LIBERATION DAY AND COMMUNIST TAKEOVER OF BULGARIA

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, 85 years ago, on March 3, 1878, the Bulgarian people were liberated from the yoke of the Ottoman Turks. That day, coming at the end of the bloody Russo-Turkish War of 1877–78, marked the culmination of the struggle for their national independence which the Bulgars had been carrying on for some 400 years. During all that time they were held down by their powerful oppressors, and hard as they tried to shake off the foreign yoke, they were unable to do this by themselves alone. Finally, when the Russians came to their aid by declaring war against the Turks in April of 1877, their independence was assured. Their success was guaranteed in the peace treaty signed on the historic day of which we take notice today.

Since then fate has not been kind to the Bulgarian people. During the First World War their leaders made the grievous mistake of allying themselves with the Central Powers—with Germany and Austria—and when these powers were defeated, Bulgaria shared their fate of suffering the inevitable consequences. But the Bulgarian people, inured to hardship and adversities, took these in their stride. When World War II came, they once more were fated—forced one might say—to be drawn into fight on the German side. But before the end of the war the Bulgarians succeeded in extricating themselves from the Nazi-Fascist anti-democratic camp. At first it seemed that with their liberation from Nazi-Facist domination, they could look forward to living in freedom in their homeland. But the evil-minded men in the Kremlin had another design. They decided to capture Bulgaria, force the people of that country into their own camp, and cut them off from the free world, thus robbing them of their freedom and independence before they even had a chance to enjoy it.

This Soviet design was carried out with mechanical precision. At first the British and the United States Governments had been totally unaware of this design, but beginning in September 1944, it became evident that any government installed in Bulgaria had to be subservient to Soviet authorities there. Thenceforth Russian functionaries, with the aid of local Communists, succeeded in eliminating all independent and democratic groups opposing their design. It is true that the last, and perhaps the stoutest opponent of communism in the country, the late Nikolai Petkov, was not put to death until September 1947, but actually Bulgaria had fallen a victim of Soviet aggression even before the end of the last war, and since then has been a mere Soviet satellite. Its liberty-loving and courageous people are prisoners in their homeland, behind the Soviet-imposed Iron Curtain. On this 85th anniversary of their liberation day, we hope and pray for their deliverance from Soviet totalitarian tyranny.

TRAINING HIGH SCHOOL DROPOUTS FOR SPECIFIC SKILLS

Mr. LONG of Missouri. Mr. President, school and government officials as well as employers all over the country will be watching with keen interest the new experimental programs recently inaugurated under the Manpower Development and Training Act whereby young people, many of them high school dropouts, are to be trained for specific skills that are in demand.

Educators are becoming increasingly plagued by the large and increasing number of dropouts among high school students. City and other government officials are increasingly vexed with a growing pool of untrained, hence unemployable, youth. Yet at the same time many employers are unable to fill job vacancies they have because there are no available trained persons on the local labor market.

The new manpower development and training projects centering on youth stand to help toward solutions to each of these problems.

An editorial appearing in the February 19 edition of the Kansas City Star says the programs make sense. I agree, as I believe would most, if not all of our colleagues in Congress. Because the problems are of such general current concern in all parts of the country, I ask unanimous consent that this Star editorial, "Another Approach to Job Retraining," be printed in the Congressional Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Another Approach to Job Retraining

In Kansas City the job retraining program is well underway as a combined effort of the Federal and State Governments and the school district. Motorcar mechanics and welding classes are in progress. Another welding class is scheduled for April and classes in stenography and typing will begin in March. One of the welding students is expected to drop out. Recently he took a test and did well enough on the welding questions to be offered a job for $2.85 an hour.

Last week a new (experimental) program under the Manpower Development and Training Act was outlined. It will put the emphasis on youth. In New Haven, Conn., 100 to 200 young persons—including high school dropouts—will be trained for specific jobs in laboratory technique, industrial drafting and industrial X-ray uses.

A similar program is being considered for Kansas City in which potential employers would be asked to waive high school graduation requirements. The New Haven project would appear to go a step further by bringing the employers in on the actual training.

Certainly this is a positive approach to school dropouts and the chronic unemployment problem of unskilled youth. Training for skills that are in demand make sense—not only for mature adults who have been hit by automation, but for young persons who have no job specialties at all.

AWARD TO SENATOR WILLIAMS OF NEW JERSEY

Mr. YARBORCUGH. Mr. President, last Saturday in Kansas City, the National Council for the Spanish Speaking honored our colleague, the junior Senator from New Jersey, for the leadership he has given to legislation affecting migrant farmworkers.

This award, the first Father Raymond A. McGowan Award, was presented to our colleague by a distinguished Texan, the Most Reverend Robert E. Lucey, archbishop of San Antonio, who cited the junior Senator from New Jersey as "a champion of social justice and the American way of life."

I ask unanimous consent that the remarks of Archbishop Lucey on presenting this award, as well as an interesting speech by Rev. Theodore E. McCarrick, president of the National Council for the Spanish Speaking on "The Contribution of the Latin American People to the United States," be printed in the Record.

I also ask unanimous consent that a sketch of the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. Williams] by the Reverend John A. Wagner, executive secretary of the National Council for the Spanish Speaking, and the program, be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Excerpts From Address by His Excellency Most Rev. Robert E. Lucey, S.T.D., Archbishop of San Antonio, for Presentation of First Annual Father Raymond A. McGowan Award of the National Catholic Council for the Spanish Speaking to the Honorable Harrison A. Williams, Jr., Senator From New Jersey

One of my earliest recollections of Raymond McGowan in our student days was this: A debate was going on in the United States between Father John A. Ryan, a professor in the Catholic University, Washington, D.C., and Morris Hillquit, an economist. The debate had to do with problems of capital and labor, specifically with socialism. It appeared monthly in a publication known as Everybody's Magazine. Often I saw the latest issue of the magazine sticking out of Ray McGowan's cassock pocket as we walked in camarata formation to the university. Fifty years ago he was deeply interested in the problems of men who labored for a living.

As a matter of fact, Raymond McGowan was sensitive to all the problems of humanity, spiritual and temporal. He was concerned with the poverty of the masses in many parts of the world. He knew that there was a close connection between the economic order and the field of international relations. He was saddened to behold that greed of gain and lust for power might lead to armed conflict. Europe at that time was seething with unrest. There was rioting in the streets of Rome. Then in 1914 World War I erupted with all its bloodshed and tragedy.

Father McGowan founded the Catholic Conference on Industrial Problems at a time when many of our citizens knew little or nothing about good social organization. The gospel which Father McGowan preached about social justice and social charity was not popular always and everywhere but he never ceased to proclaim the rights and obligations of both capital and labor. If he denounced the oppression and exploitation of working men and women, he also recognized that there is a natural right to private property and that a bankrupt employer is no help to employees. He recognized with the great Pope Leo XIII that capital needs labor and labor needs capital.

In 1926, between two world wars, Father McGowan organized the Catholic Association for International Peace in the city of Chicago. He was aware that most of our citizens knew precious little about international relations. This was true of Catholics generally even though they had at their disposal a papal peace program beginning with the magnificent "Message to the Belligerant Nations" published by Pope Benedict XV on August 1, 1917. In that message a League of Nations and compulsory arbitration of disputes were advocated. The pontiff went so far as to say that sanctions should be imposed on any nation that refused to submit a dispute to an international court of justice or would decline to accept the award of the court.

These were the principles for peace proclaimed by Father McGowan in his speeches and writings. Isolationists didn't like those principles but he preached them courageously. With his brilliant mind he saw clearly that our own beloved Nation was a danger to the peace of the world. We had not learned then to play our proper role in the family of nations. Many Americans believed sincerely that isolation and neutrality would alone keep us out of war. Our Government and our people did not seem to realize that neutrality in the face of crime is itself a crime. We encouraged tyrants and despots to attempt unprovoked aggression by assuring them beforehand that we would be neutral; that we would not fight to defend justice everywhere. And, when justice is not defended by the strong, it falls. This was the gospel of peace, justice, arbitration, and conciliation that Father McGowan preached for 40 years. He wanted our great country to take her rightful place in the world community and vision, his courage, and his devotion to humanity have been vindicated in today's United Nations.

During World War II growers were permitted to import some Mexican nationals to harvest our crops of food and fiber. After the war their numbers increased so that up to a few years ago as many as almost half a million braceros were employed in agriculture under Public Law 78. Wages, hours of labor, and conditions of employment for citizen migrants had been bad enough but with the importation of braceros a situation which had been deseparate became unspeakable.

About 4 years ago a man strode into this scene who is a champion of social justice and the American way of life. He is not fearful, he is not apprehensive. He believes that every American should enjoy the blessings of justice, liberty, and equal opportunity. The courageous man of whom I speak is our honored guest this evening: Senator Harrison A. Williams, Jr., of New Jersey.

It is not difficult to speak well of liberty and justice because they are popular throughout the world. To pay lipservice to these natural rights involves no hardship, but to make them effective is not always easy. Arrayed against them are hatred and greed. These are controlled with difficulty; they do violence to natural rights and this is the heart of the matter. The little people, the weak, the defenseless are made in the image of God regardless of their color, their hunger, their poverty, and this is what Senator Williams has recognized in the migrant agricultural worker—he is a human being, a creature of supreme dignity and surpassing destiny. In the Senator's book of life the migrant is a man.

You all know the legislative program of our distinguished guest: A decent education for the migrants; housing that will protect them from the elements; day care for children; a national advisory council which will analyze the problems of migrancy and give necessary information to the President, the Congress, and the general public; health care; better employment service; crew leader registration; control of child labor; and fairer wages.

Neither this legislation nor the Constitution of the United States gives migrant farmworkers natural rights—"They are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights." Senator Williams proclaims, defends, and makes effective the rights that were bestowed by Almighty God.

Father McGowan spent 40 years fighting for the rights of man. It is peculiarly appropriate that the Reverend Raymond A. McGowan Award should be bestowed first on a courageous champion of human rights: The Honorable Harrison A. Williams, Jr., a Senator of the United States.

The Contribution of the Latin American People to the United States

(An address by Rev. Theodore E. McCarrick, president of the National Council for the Spanish Speaking, given at the testimonial dinner honoring U.S. Senator Harrison A. Williams, Jr., of New Jersey, at the presentation of the first annual Father Raymond A. McGowan Award, February 23, 1963, Hilton Inn, Kansas City, Mo.)

This evening as we are gathered together at what we trust is the first instance of a tradition in the life of the National Council for the Spanish Speaking in the United States, I am very conscious that we gather to do a threefold honor. Certainly we are here to honor one of the modern champions of the dignity of man and the rights of labor, the distinguished Senator Harrison Williams, of New Jersey. It is surely an added tribute to his zeal and interest in this important field of social welfare that he has taken time from a busy session of Congress to be here with us in person this evening. In an equal manner, through the very title of this award, we seek to do honor here to the memory and to the life work of an extraordinary priest of God.

Some men make their mark in life because they fall in love with great ideas, others because they fall greatly in love with people. Father Raymond McGowan was the more unusual because he fell in love with both. Early in his life he became aware of the troubles and yet also of the tremendous opportunities presented to the church and the Nation by the Spanish-speaking community in the United States. He fell in love with their openness, their hearty friendliness, their deeply Catholic faith. His contacts with them throughout the land gave him a people to love. The national council was his great idea.

It is eminently fitting that this organization, which came into being largely through his foresight and his efforts, should have this opportunity to honor his memory in the annual Father Raymond McGowan Award.

Yet, there is another tribute to which I rise this evening, another honor to be paid, another debt of gratitude to be satisfied to the small extent that it is mentioned here on this occasion. I speak of the debt of gratitude that this Nation already owes to the millions of Spanish-speaking peoples who have made and are making a mighty contribution to the life and strength of this Nation.

In our zeal—and this zeal is commendable indeed—to secure for those of Spanish speaking and Latin background the rights that are truly theirs as children of God and participants in the national life of a great democracy, we must not overlook the fact that not only should this farflung community be the object of our interest and concern, but that it has already earned its place as the recipient of our gratitude and in a most substantial way.

I should like to speak very briefly this evening of three contributions which the Spanish speaking have made or are presently making in the United States.

No one of us is so far removed from our history books that we do not recall how eminent a place in the chronicle of explorations and discoveries is occupied by those who came to these States under the Spanish flag. Columbus himself, the great admiral of the ocean seas, carried the colors of Spain to the New World. It was a Gomez sailing for Spain, who perhaps even before Verrazono sailed into the great harbor of New York. In 1570 a mission bearing the name of Segura existed near the very banks of the Potomac. Who can forget the foolhardy daring of Ponce de Leon, the thrilling story of De Soto crossing the Mississippi, of Coronado pushing into the Colorado Territory, of Cabeza de Vaca who walked from the Texas coast to the shores of the Pacific.

And they have left their mark on the charts and maps of America. Names which sing in lilting Castellano, which testify to their deep faith and their sense of the mystery of Providence. From San Agustin to the sprawling modern metropolis of Our Lady Queen of the Angels, from the city of St. Anthony to the city of St. Francis, the map of America bears witness to their coming and their faith. But this is only one of the major contributions of the Spanish speaking to this land.

The second area of contribution of the Spanish-speaking community in the United States is economic. The scientific American economist has not even yet fully explored and delinated the contribution that immigrant and migrant groups have made to the wealth and productivity of the Nation. How many industries have been maintained, how many resources have been able to be developed, how many essential community services have been dependent on the newcomer and his entrance into the labor market, his contribution to the economic forces of the section to which he comes. New York and the great population centers of the East have good reason to be mindful of the economic value of the tremendous Puerto Rican immigration of the past score of years. The great arc of the Southwestern States of this Nation, from California into the valley of the Rio Grande, would be economically handicapped to a disastrous degree if the economic support in both supply and demand were not forthcoming from the millions of Spanish speaking and their descendants who make their homes in this region. Who can deny that the sudden growth of Cuban and other Latin-American populations in southern Florida has made a tremendous impact on the economic life of that section of the country. Throughout the length and breadth of the Nation, migrant workers of the Spanish-speaking community have provided a necessary support to many industries and thus have reason to be proud of their part in the building up of the wealth of the Nation.

Finally, the Spanish speaking have brought to this country and to its culture a new focus which is specifically different in many important features and which is—of all the moments in our history—never more needed than now. To an American society, which prides itself on its pluralism but is constantly exhibiting the trend to the monolithic, they have brought their own ways of doing things, their own ways of thinking about things, and a deeply spiritual sense of values which transforms the ordinary things of life. To an American society which tends to be characterized by the lonely crowd, they have brought their sense of family and values that do not depend on material things. This is perhaps the greatest contribution that they can make today, and one for which the Nation has reason to be grateful.

As president of the National Council for the Spanish Speaking, I pledge all our constant, our—please God—increasing efforts to serve the community of the Spanish speaking in the United States: to make their real contribution to this Nation better known and better understood, to strive for the removal of the obstancles which may stand in their way of playing a fuller part in the life of this Nation, and to work for that day when mutual understanding and cooperation will build for the future greatness of the United States a union of the best parts of two cultures, a harmony in nature and in grace, a wholly integral family and community, like wisdom in the Old Testament: One in unity and in beauty, yet surrounded with variety.

The Honorable Harrison A. Williams, Jr., Senator From New Jersey

The National Council for the Spanish Speaking is honored to present the first Rev. Raymond A. McGowan Award to the Honorable Harrison A. Williams, Jr., U.S. Senator from New Jersey. In him domestic farmworkers throughout the United States have found a champion on the national level through his chairmanship of the Senate Subcommittee on Migratory Labor called for by the Senate Resolution 267 and agreed to by the 86th Congress on March 24, 1960. He has made practically all the problems associated with migratory workers known to the public.

Without public understanding we cannot hope for progress. The Senate subcommittee, through public hearings, field trips, personal visits and extensive studies and analyses, has given to the citizens of the United States the understanding needed for corrective action.

Because of the efforts spearheaded by Senator Williams the 87th Congress considered more bills pertaining to migratory farmworkers than any of its predecessors. A complete legislative program has been prepared by the Senate subcommittee for the 88th Congress. Specifically, this legislative program includes measures to provide decent housing and sanitation facilities, day care centers for migrant children, improved educational opportunities for the migrant and his family, modification of existing child labor laws, national labor relations coverage, improvement of employment service for migrants, minimum wage, and a National Advisory Council on Migratory Labor.

In our judgment, our choice of Senator Williams for the reception of the first award is justified by the Senator's own words taken from a statement prepared for floor delivery when the migrant bills are to be introduced, "It is often ascertained that prosperous society tends to forget its poor and Congress will not concern itself with a group lacking a political voice, especially the migrant citizen whose very mobility costs him his vote. This myth has been exploded. People from all walks of life have expressed their concern for the migrant citizen and his family. A first step has been taken. We must take many more steps, however, if social justice is to become a reality for the many millions who go through life with the burdens of second-class citizenship."

I know that the thousands and thousands of Spanish speaking found in the domestic migrant stream will cheer our presentation of the Father McGowan Award to Senator Harrison Williams.

Rev. John A. Wagner,
Executive Secretary.

Program

"Star-Spangled Banner."

Invocation: Most Rev. Charles H. Helmsing, D.D., bishop of Kansas City-St. Joseph.

Dinner

Toastmaster: Rt. Rev. Msgr. Arthur M. Tighe, M. SS. W., chairman of the arrangements committee.

Welcome: Most Rev. Charles H. Helmsing, DD.

Remarks: Hon. H. Roe Bartle, mayor of Kansas City, Mo.

Guest Speaker: "The Contribution of the Latin American People to the United States," Rev. Theodore E. McCarrick, president of the National Council for the Spanish Speaking.

Tribute to Father Raymond A. McGowan and presentation of the award: Most Rev. Robert E. Lucey, S.T.D., archbishop of San Antonio, executive chairman of the bishops' committee for the Spanish speaking.

Response: Hon. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, U.S. Senator from New Jersey, chairman, Senate Subcommittee on Migratory Labor.

Appreciation: Rev. John A. Wagner, executive secretary, National Council for the Spanish Speaking.

Benediction: Most Rev. Edward J. Hunkeler, D.D., LL.D., archibishop of Kansas City in Kansas.

PLIGHT OF DOMESTIC SOFTWOOD LUMBER INDUSTRY

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I am concerned about the attitude demonstrated by our Government toward an industry which is so important to my State of Texas. I first want to associate myself with the remarks of my colleague, the junior Senator from Idaho, in his clear statement in regard to a need for an immediate and temporary emergency quota on the importation of softwood lumber. However, there were several other matters I would like to call to the attention of the Senate that may be productive in providing parity for our domestic softwood lumber industry on U.S. markets.

Texas has been one of the leading lumber-producing States since the turn of the century. More than one-tenth of the State's manufacturing establishments are wood-using plants. They account for nearly 5 percent of the value of all products made in the State. The output of the wood-using plants is worth more than one-half billion dollars per year. In terms of human beings, something that is far more important to me, nearly 10 percent of the people employed in manufacturing in Texas work in forest industry plants. Many others supplement their income with part-time work in the woods, harvesting the timber crop, or in mills that make trees into some of the thousands of wood articles used every day.

About 9 percent of the total Texas industrial payroll is paid by the forest-dependent industries. This $138 million income of the forest industry workers finds it way into every part of the State's economy. Barber shops, gasoline service stations, grocery stores, sporting goods shops, movie theaters—all share in the bounty of the forests in Texas.

Some of the best managed woodlands and finest growing pines in the United States are found in east Texas. Lone Star State timberlands grow wood for over 1,000 mills and factories that make a large variety of wood products. Although we Texans are accused of overstatements from time to time, it is true that a single Texas tree farm is almost as big as the entire State of Rhode Island. Texas forests and the industries they support provide full-time jobs for 43,000 persons and, more important, trees are a renewable resource—they grow. In Texas, timberlands today are growing wood faster than it is being used. I am sure that my good conservation friends will be delighted with this single fact.

Small ownerships prevail in the forest land ownership pattern in east Texas. Nearly two-thirds of the privately owned commercial forest is in holdings under 500 acres each. Farmers own more than 21 percent of the commercial forest lands of east Texas. Forest industries own about 27 percent and other private investors own approximately 45 percent. The governments—Federal, State, and local—own or control less than 7 percent of the total commercial forest land in Texas. However, the Federal Government is the largest governmental owner, with 736,400 acres, mostly in national forests.

The standing sawtimber in east Texas commercial forests measures over 27 billion board feet. As most of my colleagues know, a board foot is represented by a piece of wood 1 foot square by 1 inch thick and when a Texan refers to saw timber, he means a tree 9 inches or over in diameter, breast height. This is enough lumber for a five-room house for every family in the State of Texas plus the schools and churches that they might need. Southern pine accounts for 63.4 percent of this total inventory.

We can reach back into our early days in Texas for the roots of our present lumber industry. Records indicate that one of Texas' earliest sawmills was operating in 1819. By 1869 it ranked 24th among the States with lumber production of approximately 107 million board feet. By 1956, it stood 11th in lumber production—supplying 3.1 percent of the total national production.

Texas forest lands certified as tree farms in the American tree farm system exceed by more than 300 square miles the entire area of the State of Connecticut. For my urban friends, a tree farm is a privately owned taxpaying forest area whose owner has been publicly recognized by his State forest industries committee for doing an outstanding job in protecting and managing his woodlands for the continuing growth of forest crops for commercial purposes.

Mr. President, I give all of this background of the forest industry activity in my home State of Texas to demonstrate the importance to me of the great problems confronting our American softwood lumber industry. I am very concerned when the U.S. Tariff Commission decides that for a very technical legal reason, the fourth largest employer of manufacturing labor in the United States is without recourse under our Trade Agreements Act to mounting imports that are in fact causing serious injury to it.

I am personally convinced that we are going to have to face up to the proposition that the Trade Expansion Act of 1962, as presently worded, affords no protection from imports for domestic industry and—because the criteria for granting relief to workers deprived of employment by imports is the same as that for industries—large segments of our work force are going to be without a forum to which they can take their problems and expect a reasonable opportunity for relief.

Even more significant, I believe, is the action taken by the administration in its tax proposals which affect this basic American industry. In the face of all the difficulties confronting the American domestic lumber industry, this administration has seen fit to recommend that the tax system applicable to timber for 20 years—a system under which conservation and sound forest management practices have reached their zenith by all worldwide standards—this administration has called for a repeal of the timber capital gains provision first written into the Tax Code in 1944. Mr. President, I consider this to be the height of absurdity. I was delighted to see the junior Senator from Oregon call to the attention of the Senate the provisions in the tax bill recommended by Secretary Dillon as they relate to the forest industry. She performed a great service in pointing out the importance of this single most important provision in the Tax Code in terms of the sound forest industry in these United States. Prior to the enactment of section 631 of the present Tax Code, the tax laws were such that there was an incentive on the part of landowners to cut their timber and not invest in the cost of replanting and forest management extending over the life of a new forest, which can be from 20 to 80 years depending upon which part of the country the trees are growing. Since 1944 there has been a real incentive for tree owners to bear the long-term expense of forest management which has sustained the highest growth of forest lands in the entire world.

Yet, another provision of this administration's tax proposal seems ludicrous when consideration is given to the domestic lumber industry's problem. That is the recommendation that a flat ceiling be placed on deductions permitted to the average taxpayer for interest payments out of income. It takes very little imagination to recognize the inducement for single family housing ownership that is found in the present Tax Code which permits individual taxpayers to deduct from taxable income the cost-of-interest payments on home mortgages. It seems to me the quickest way to encourage rental housing and to discourage home ownership is to limit this interest deduction as is proposed in the administration's tax package. How do I relate this to the lumber industry?

To my associates who are familiar with the lumber industry's economic health, the answer is clear that in large measure it depends upon single family housing starts. In the average single family house approximately 10,000 board feet of lumber are utilized; in rental housing that average drops to below 7,000 board feet per unit. Consequently, the encouragement of rental housing and the discouragement of a single family ownership has a direct and immediate impact upon the lumber industry and its economic health.

Now, Mr. President, I want to make specific reference to a bill that I think the Senate can act on with considerable haste. I am referring to S. 957, introduced yesterday by the junior Senator from Idaho [Mr. JORDAN].

The U.S. Tariff Commission in the softwood lumber industry case opened the door for legislative action by the Congress by stating:

> The withdrawal of the country-of-origin marking requirement cannot be regarded as a trade agreement concession within the meaning of section 301(b) of the Trade Expansion Act.

It also stated:

> Concurrently, country-of-origin marking would involve little expenses in addition to that already incurred in complying with the grade-marking requirements instituted in 1960 by the Federal Housing Administration.

Finally, it stated:

> It is clear that its restoration (that is, the restoration of the requirement for country-of-origin marking) in recent years would not likely have contributed to a reduction in the level of imports of softwood lumber. On the basis of evidence obtained by the Commission, its restoration might well have had a contrary affect.

What this series of quotations suggests, Mr. President, is that a requirement that all lumber entering the United States be marked as to the country of origin would not be considered a violation of a prior trade concession which would involve us in GATT problems. In fact, the Tariff Commission is saying that to require that lumber entering the United States from abroad be marked as to the country of origin would not be a burden to any foreign producers at all. I am very much convinced that such a marking—now required for every other product entering the United States that I am aware of—would be of immeasurable help to our domestic softwood lumber industry. It could then promote its products in U.S. markets as being domestically manufactured.

Finally, Mr. President, the junior Senator from Idaho introduced a bill (S. 958) requiring the use of domestically manufactured lumber in all FHA-insured construction. His reason for introducing this bill is that much, if not all, of the lumber being imported into the United States comes in, either ungraded or grade marked in the foreign country by agencies over which the United States has only the minimum amount of jurisdiction. That lumber is competing with our own domestic lumber which is grade marked within the United States by agencies regulated very closely by the American Lumber Standards Committee. Because of the volume of lumber going into FHA insured housing these days, I am confident that in spite of the best intentions the FHA is unable to honestly certify that all Canadian lumber being utilized is, in fact, on grade. As a matter of sound administration, it is my recommendation to the Senate that the Congress require that all FHA housing utilize lumber which bears a grade mark from an agency that has inspected the lumber within the continental United States and has graded the lumber as to its quality.

I hope the Senate will act as quickly as it can on this proposal.

ST. LOUIS, RIVER TOWN

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, a recent editorial in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch calls attention to the tremendous part that low-cost water freight transportation has played in the economic development of the St. Louis area.

The past and future of this great city are inseparably linked with the mighty Mississippi and Missouri Rivers which flow by her boundaries.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point this clear and constructive editorial from the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of February 25, 1963.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ST. LOUIS, RIVER TOWN

A million and a half tons of petroleum products annually go out of the Greater St. Louis industrial complex by water. A quarter of a million tons of iron ore mined in Peru and Venezuela come upriver by barge from New Orleans, along with 165,000 tons of scrap iron from Minneapolis, for the steel mills and 440,000 tons of finished steel and tinplate move in and out. Of the $200 million worth of grain moving out, a large and increasing part goes by way of the Mississippi River, much of it to be reloaded into ocean-going vessels for export to Holland, Germany, France, England, Japan, India, and Latin American countries. Ten million tons of coal move out, nearly half of it by water.

These figures indicate only part of what it means to St. Louis that it is a major center of the Nation for water as well as for rail, truck, pipeline, and air transportation of freight. Water transport is a major mainstay of heavy industries here. Its low cost strengthens their competitive position and enlarges their market area—in coal, for example, 42 percent of the delivered cost nationally consists of transportation charges.

What the river means to St. Louis is presently a matter of more than usual concern because of proposals by the Kennedy administration to deregulate most of the traffic of the railroads, which would enable them to cut rates to destructively low levels and possibly drive their competitors from the inland waterways.

So it is a pertinent time to take stock of what low-cost water-freight transportation means to the industrial life and development of our area as part of an integrated transport system.

Many of us whose lives are directly affected by it are little if any aware of the teeming traffic of our waterfront—the quantities of superphosphate barged in from Florida, sulfur from Texas and Louisiana, fluorspar from Mexico, refined sugar from Louisiana, raw sugar from Mexico and the Philippines, barbed wire from Japan, semifinished steel from Belgium, Japan, and Germany; the large and growing traffic outbound in chemicals, one of our major industries; the tinplate for our can factories, another principal enterprise.

St. Louis is headquarters of two of the largest common-carrier bargelines in the country, Mississippi Valley and Federal, each carrying freight over some 4,000 miles of waterways—with regular service to Minneapolis, Chicago, Pittsburgh, Omaha, New Orleans, Chattanooga, Mobile, Birmingham, Fort Myers, Brownsville, and other ports. Here is situated the largest builder of towboats in the United States, the St. Louis Shipbuilding & Steel Co.

Water transport has not only provided low-cost freight hauling on its own account but has also through its competition been the most effective single means of obtaining favorable freight rates. It is credited with reducing rail rates on coal from St. Louis by some 25 percent. It has been a large factor in the success of the Granite City Steel Co., now the 14th largest steel producer in the Nation, enabling it to compete as far away as Baton Rouge with steel mills at Birmingham, several hundred miles closer to the market—and bringing down rail rates on the haul by nearly a third.

The asset of low-cost water transportation affects our future as vitally as it has affected our present, if not more so. This is best demonstrated in coal and steel.

Southern Illinois across the river from St. Louis contains what is said to be the largest known deposit of low-cost steam coal east of the Rocky Mountains. Until fairly recent years the railroads enjoyed a virtual monopoly on coal haulage and transportation costs were high. Many mines in the area were forced to close. Coal mining was almost defunct when water transport revived a measure of activity. Today an estimated 65 percent of the coal mined there goes out by water.

But the area looks to still further waterway development to realize the potentials of its coal resources by means of the proposed Kaskaskia River and Big Muddy Creek navigation channels and associated projects.

This development would be linked with the large iron ore deposit discovered in recent years 70 miles southwest of St. Louis at Pea Ridge, near Sullivan, which the St. Joseph Lead Co. and the Bethlehem Steel Corp. are jointly preparing to develop.

The proximity of these deposits to enormous coal reserves for use in manufacture into steel creates a remarkably rich opportunity for both eastern Missouri and southern Illinois to reap an industrial development which could be very large indeed—and its realization depends on low-cost water transportation.

St. Louis is not only a river town, it is a two-river town.

It was founded because it was on the Mississippi and near the Missouri.

Because it was a river town, it became the Gateway to the West, as our magnificent arch in the Jefferson National Expansion Memorial on the riverfront will signify.

It thrived until around the turn of the century on the river trade.

But though St. Louis may have lost some consciousness of the linkage of its destiny with the "Meeting of the Waters," celebrated in Carl Milles' memorable statuary, the link has continued and has become more important to us than ever before.

A single towboat now pushes barges containing more cargo than could have been carried by all the steamboats that once lined our waterfront for 20 blocks.

St. Louis and the industrial complex around it in two States reap an indispensable advantage from the Mississippi, mightier today than ever. It is essential to our future progress to protect that advantage from impairment, and to utilize and extend it.

SOUTH DAKOTA LEGISLATURE ASKS ASSISTANCE FOR GOLD MINING INDUSTRY

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, in my remarks to the Senate on Monday, I called attention to the critical situation in South Dakota which confronts our gold producers. One of America's most valuable industries has fallen on unhappy days and most of the gold mines in this country have been forced to close in recent years. To help remedy this situation, my senior colleague from South Dakota and I have introduced S. 824, which would increase the depletion allowance for gold produced in the United States.

Today I received a copy of Concurrent Resolution 4, adopted on February 21 by the Legislature of the State of South Dakota, which memorializes the Congress of the United States to provide incentive payments by the Federal Government for domestic gold producers. I ask unanimous consent that this resolution be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 4

Concurrent resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States relative to providing incentive payments by the Federal Government for domestic gold producers

(Introduced by committee on State affairs and public institutions)

Be it resolved by the Senate of the State of South Dakota (the House of Representatives concurring therein):

Whereas domestic gold producers have been obligated to sell their product to the Federal Government at the established price of $35 an ounce since 1934; and

Whereas constantly increasing inflationary costs of mining and milling this precious metal have resulted in closing down the properties of virtually all of the gold producers in the United States; and

Whereas production of gold from domestic sources has remained in the range of 1½ million ounces contrasting to 6 million ounces in 1940 while current industrial use of gold in this country amounts to 3 million ounces per annum; and

Whereas our dwindling national gold reserve is a matter of grave concern to our citizens; and

Whereas it is in the national interest to increase our domestic gold production: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate of the 38th Legislature of the State of South Dakota (the House of Representatives concurring therein), That the members of the Legislature of the State of South Dakota respectfully request the Congress of the United States to provide incentive payments to assure domestic gold producers a fair economic return on their properties with the objective of increasing gold production in the United States. Such incentive payments would enable gold mines currently operating to survive under current high levels of cost, would aid in reopening closed mines and likewise provide a stimulus for exploration and development of new gold properties. Such incentive payments are essential to prevent complete destruction of our domestic gold mining industry; be it further

Resolved, That a duly attested copy of this resolution be immediately transmitted to the Secretary of the Senate of the United States, the Clerk of the House of Representatives of the United States, and to each Member of the Congress from this State.

Adopted by the senate February 13, 1963.

Concurred in by the house of representatives February 21, 1963.

PAUL E. BROWN,
Speaker, House of Representatives.

Attest:

W. J. MATSON,
Chief Clerk, House of Representatives.

NILS A. BOE,
Lieutenant Governor,
President of the Senate.

Attest:

NIELS P. JENSEN,
Secretary of the Senate.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, is there further morning business?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to consider executive business, to consider the new nominations sent to the Senate by the President of the United States.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. HILL, from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

John Harold Fanning, of Rhode Island, to be a member of the National Labor Relations Board;

Dr. Francis Keppel, of Massachusetts, to be Commissioner of Education;

Daniel Patrick Moynihan, of New York, to be an Assistant Secretary of Labor;

Howard G. Gamser, of New York, to be a member of the National Mediation Board;

David Frost, and sundry other candidates, for personnel action in the Regular Corps of the Public Health Service;

George C. Trevorrow, of Maryland, to be a member of the Federal Coal Mine Safety Board of Review; and

Joseph C. Robinson, and sundry other candidates, for personnel action in the Regular Corps of the Public Health Service.

The VICE PRESIDENT. If there be no further reports of committees the clerks will state the nominations on the calendar.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Roland R. Renne, of Montana, to be an Assistant Secretary of Agriculture.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Roland R. Renne, of Montana, to be a member of the Board of Directors of the Commodity Credit Corporation.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

FEDERAL HOUSING ADMINISTRATION

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Philip N. Brownstein, of Maryland, to be Federal Housing Commissioner.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of the nominations.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

TRIBUTE TO ROLAND R. RENNE, ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, before returning to legislative session, I should like to make a few comments on the nomination of a distinguished citizen of my State, Dr. Roland R. Renne, the president of Montana State College. It has been my privilege to know Dr. Renne for approximately 32 years, which comprises practically the entire span of his period of service at Montana State College. He has been an outstanding professor at that institution which, incidentally, is one of the truly great institutions of our country. He has been the president of Montana State College for the past 19 years. He is a man of great integrity and ability. We of Montana are extremely proud that this outstanding citizen of our State has been given this recognition.

We know that he will do a good job. We know that he will be a credit to his State and to the Nation; and no one can expect more of any man.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, I join my distinguished colleague, the majority leader, in paying tribute to a distinguished Montanan, whose nomination to be an Assistant Secretary of Agriculture the Senate has confirmed. He will bring to the Department of Agriculture a vast amount of experience and information necessary to the execution of the duties of that important position. He has already been an outstanding educator in the State of Montana, as the senior Senator from Montana has described. He has been a researcher and an author. He has published books on agricultural economics, and published the most important text on the government of the State of Montana. He is now on leave of absence from Montana State College. His career has contributed to building up that institution into one of the great land-grant colleges of the country.

I am proud to have been able to support the confirmation of his nomination; and I am especially proud because he is an old and valued friend, as well as an outstanding Montana citizen.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, in view of the agreement which has been reached, I should like to invite the attention of Senators to the fact that at 12:30, Senators will begin the delivery of eulogies for our late departed colleagues. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to suggest the absence of a quorum and to have the call of the roll terminated at 12:30.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request by the Senator from Montana? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The hour of 12:30 having arrived, under the previous order, the order for the quorum call is rescinded; and the Senator from Montana is recognized.

HELEN M. JOHNSON

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of order of business No. 7 on the calendar, Senate Resolution 102.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be stated by title.

The Legislative Clerk. A resolution (S. Res. 102) to pay a gratuity to Helen M. Johnson.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana.

The motion was agreed to; and the resolution was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate hereby is authorized and directed to pay, from the contingent fund of the Senate, to Helen M. Johnson, widow of Curtis E. Johnson, an employee of the Senate at the time of his death, a sum equal to 10½ months' compensation at the rate he was receiving by law at the time of his death, said sum to be considered inclusive of funeral expenses and all other allowances.

SON RANKINS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 8, Senate Resolution 103.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be stated by title.

The Legislative Clerk. A resolution (S. Res. 103) to pay a gratuity to Son Rankins.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana.

The motion was agreed to; and the resolution was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate hereby is authorized and directed to pay, from the contingent fund of the Senate, to Son Rankins, widower of Ella M. Rankins, an employee of the Senate at the time of her death, a sum equal to one year's compensation at the rate she was receiving by law at the time of her death, said sum to be considered inclusive of funeral expenses and all other allowances.

REVISION AND PRINTING OF SENATE MANUAL FOR 88TH CONGRESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 9, Senate Resolution 101.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be stated by title.

The Legislative Clerk. A resolution (S. Res. 101) authorizing the revision and printing of the Senate Manual for the use of the 88th Congress.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana.

The motion was agreed to; and the resolution was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Rules and Administration be, and it is hereby, directed to prepare a revised edition of the Senate Rules and Manual for the use of the Eighty-eighth Congress, that said Rules and Manual shall be printed as a Senate document, and that one thousand six hundred and fifty additional copies shall be printed and bound, of which one thousand copies shall be for the use of the Senate, two hundred copies shall be for the use of the Committee on Rules and Administration, and the remaining four hundred and fifty copies shall be bound in full morocco and tagged as to contents and delivered as may be directed by the committee.

MEMORIAL ADDRESSES RELATING TO LATE SENATORS DWORSHAK, OF IDAHO, CHAVEZ, OF NEW MEXICO, AND KERR, OF OKLAHOMA

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I submit a resolution (S. Res. 104) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be stated.

The legislative clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That, in accordance with notice given on February 25, the legislative business of the Senate be now suspended in order that memorial addresses may be delivered, respectively, on the lives, characters, and public service of the late Senators Henry C. Dworshak, of Idaho, Dennis Chavez, of New Mexico, and Robert S. Kerr, of Oklahoma.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the resolution is agreed to.

TRIBUTES TO THE LATE SENATOR DWORSHAK, OF IDAHO

Mr. JORDAN of Idaho. Mr. President, Idaho has been represented in the Halls of Congress by several outstanding people, and one of the most illustrious was the late Senator Henry C. Dworshak. Except for a short period of time in 1949, he served the State of Idaho as a Member of the House of Representatives or as a Senator, from January 3, 1939, until his death on July 23, 1962.

Our State of Idaho was admitted to the Union over 72 years ago, on July 3, 1890. For almost one-third of that time—for 23 years—Henry Dworshak was one of the State's most able representatives in the Congress of the United States.

Before Senator Dworshak became interested in politics, he had been quite active in civic affairs in Idaho. At one time he served as governor of the Idaho-Utah district of Rotary International, being installed at convention in Nice, France, in June 1937. He was a 33d degree Scottish Rite Mason and Shriner, and a member of the Elks and the Odd Fellows.

During the First World War, Henry Dworshak served overseas as a sergeant in the 4th Antiaircraft Machine Gun Battalion in 1918 and 1919. For many years thereafter he was quite active in the American Legion, serving as the Idaho commander in 1932. He never lost his interest in veterans' affairs and was a Member of Congress who could always be counted on to see that the veterans of this country received proper benefits and treatment. At various times he was on the boards of visitors of the Naval Academy, the Military Academy, and the Air Force Academy.

Professionally, he was a newspaperman. From 1909 until 1918, when he entered the Army, he worked at the printing trade. After his tenure of service in the Armed Forces, for 4 years—1920 to 1924—he was manager of a printers' supply business. Then, in 1924, he became editor and publisher of the Burley Bulletin in Burley, Idaho. This position he held for 20 years, until 1944 when he sold the paper. In 1931, Henry Dworshak was president of the Idaho Editorial Association.

As has often been said about newspapermen, Senator Dworshak had printer's ink in his blood, and he was never too far removed from the newspaper world. He was an avid reader of all newspapers, sometimes spending hours going over them. By his side in the Senate Office Building was his ever-present typewriter, and it was not at all unusual to see him sitting there, putting his thoughts on paper by typing rapidly away with four fingers. He used to have a pet saying, and I quote: "You give me the leads and I will furnish the news." All one has to do to appreciate his ability as a writer is to look over his old correspondence files. They are filled with clear, concise, and interesting letters dictated by Henry Dworshak.

He was a vigorous man and a trim man who, with his thatch of white hair, really looked the part of a U.S. Senator. He had a keen sense of humor, and it was often difficult to tell whether he was being serious or was kidding. It was only the twinkle in his eye which usually gave him away.

Senator Dworshak was a member of three powerful committees here in the Senate at the time of his death—Appropriations, Interior and Insular Affairs, and the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

As a member of the Appropriations Committee, he sat on five subcommittees—Army Civil Functions, which handles development of rivers and harbors and flood control problems; Agriculture, which handles farm and forest appropriations; Defense, which reviews expenditures for the Pentagon and Armed Services; Interior, which deals which such problems as Indian affairs, fish and game problems, irrigation, public lands, parks and territories; and the State, Justice and Judiciary Subcommittee, which handles the FBI, State Department, and Federal court funds.

Many times two or more of these subcommittees of the Appropriations Committee would be meeting at the same time in separate rooms. But Senator Dworshak had an exceptionally good record of attendance at these meetings. Oftentimes he would go from one meeting to another, rationing his time on a clockwork basis. He was a vigorous man whose schedule would often make a much younger man gasp for breath.

He was always considered a stanch supporter of and member of the economy forces here in the Senate. He operated under the idea that the taxpayer should get the most for every tax dollar he had sent to Washington; and, through his work on the Appropriations Committee, he worked tirelessly to cut waste, unnecessary government spending, and duplication and inefficiency in the Federal Government.

Senator Dworshak was ranking minority member on the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee. There he did a great deal of good for Idaho by his work in respect to Indian affairs, land management, reclamation, fish and wildlife, geological surveys, the Bonneville Power Administration, and national parks. Idaho is 65.1 percent federally owned, and a Member of the Senate from Idaho cannot be placed on a better committee than Interior as far as his State is concerned.

He was particularly interested in Indian affairs and the progress of the Indians in Idaho. He felt that Indian affairs should rely quite heavily on the tribal councils, and he wanted to keep the management of Indian affairs as far away from Washington as possible.

Through his diligent work on the Interior Committee, Senator Dworshak accomplished many things for the State of Idaho—reclamation projects, dams, and so forth. He served on two subcommittees of Interior—the Public Lands, and the Minerals, Materials, and Fuels Subcommittees.

From 1957 until his death he served as a member of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, which supervises operations of the Atomic Energy Commission. He was very helpful in getting the AEC National Reactor Testing Station situated at Idaho Falls and Arco, Idaho, through his work on this Joint Committee. He also served on two subcommittees of this Joint Committee—the Legislation Subcommittee and the Raw Materials Subcommittee. This brought the total subcommittees on which he served to nine.

All of his committee assignments put him in close touch with legislation affecting nearly every facet of the lumbering, mining, and farm industries so important to our State.

Senator Dworshak was very active in securing more access roads for forest harvest and recreational use. He worked for adequate tariffs to protect the domestic mining industry and for a good highway program emphasizing farm-to-market roads. He got through Congress many bills to reclaim desert lands through irrigation. Henry Dworshak was quite an exponent of the full development of flood control, power, and irrigation uses of streams and rivers which flow through Idaho and the Northwest.

He was also a member of the National Outdoor Recreation Resources Commission.

In addition to all the committee and subcommittee meetings he attended, he was just as diligent in his attendance on the Senate floor. For his many years here in the Senate he had better than a 97-percent attendance record for all rollcall votes. During the 1st session of the 87th Congress and up until the time of his death during the 2d session, he had 100-percent attendance on rollcalls. There are not many of us who can match that record.

I commented earlier that Henry Dworshak was a man with a fine sense of humor and that sometimes the only way one could tell whether or not he was kidding was by the twinkle in his eye. I have heard of one time, however, when everyone close by knew he was quite serious. For some reason, neither he nor any member of his staff heard the bells for a rollcall vote. And, had not a photographer in the office at the time told him of the vote, he inadvertently would have missed it. That day it seems the late Senator Dworshak became very agitated and disturbed—and there was no doubt in his staff's minds that he was quite serious. Henry Dworshak certainly did take his attendance here in the Senate with a great deal of seriousness.

But despite his many meetings and conferences and the diligence and seriousness with which he tended to his Senate business, Henry Dworshak always had a kind word for his colleagues and the many employees in the office buildings who were his friends. There are many people here on the Hill who feel his absence besides those who worked directly with him and for him. At times there may have been a gruffness about him, but this was just to cover up the innate gentleness of the man.

Also, he always had time to help individuals with their separate problems. Many people from Idaho appealed to him over the years for help on many things, and he always saw to it that he gave them whatever help he could through his contact with the Government agencies and bureaus.

One outstanding case where Senator Dworshak virtually changed the entire life of an individual was brought to my attention just this week. A young man came into the office to meet me, and I quickly learned that several years ago Senator Dworshak had gone out of his way to help this young man with his problems.

This young man had been a native of China and a citizen of Spain, and had been born in Shanghai, China. He had first entered this country in 1948 as a seaman, but had departed again with his ship. Later, in 1949, he came into the port of New York as a seaman and became ill enough to be hospitalized in New York. While he was hospitalized, he was advised to make an application for adjustment of his status under the Displaced Persons Act of 1948. However, not knowing all the provisions of the law, when he got out of the hospital, he went to Idaho where his two sisters lived. In all good faith, he entered Idaho State College, feeling sure that his application would be approved. This was not the case. His application was returned to him by the Immigration and Naturalization Service as unaccepted because he had not arrived in the United States prior to April 1948, as required by the act. Consequently, the Immigration Service had no other course to follow than to start deportation proceedings.

At this point this young man's case was brought to Senator Dworshak's attention and, because of the very strong recommendations concerning the young man's intelligence and ability, his earnestness of purpose, and good character and dependability, Senator Dworshak introduced a private bill for his relief. This bill provided him with permanent residence in the United States.

But that was only the beginning. This private bill received an adverse report from the Department of Justice. Therefore, Senator Dworshak took it upon himself to make several personal appearances before the proper committees in behalf of this young man. In the end, despite the obstacles involved, this private bill was finally passed by the Congress and approved by the President, giving this young man his citizenship.

Soon thereafter this new citizen graduated from Idaho State College with high honors, went on to get his master's degree, and later served for 6½ years as a commissioned officer in the Air Force Reserve and as an intelligence officer in the Regular Air Force. Ten years after the enactment of this private law, this young man, who speaks six languages fluently, is an outstanding citizen of these United States. He is now executive vice president of a college which trains electronic technicians and has some 1,000 students enrolled at this time.

I think this one instance is a good example of Senator Dworshak's great humanity and goes far to show what this country might have lost had Henry Dworshak not been a Member of the Congress of the United States.

Mr. President, today I have not mentioned any personal contact of mine with Henry Dworshak. I would simply like to say this—and I do not think there is a higher tribute that can be paid to any man by any other man—he was my friend.

Mr. President, the people of Idaho loved Henry Dworshak for his fine qualities. I join with them and with my colleagues in the Senate in paying my deepest sympathy to his wife and the members of his family on this occasion.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, when our late colleague, Senator Henry C. Dworshak, of Idaho, was removed most suddenly from our midst, an outpouring of sympathy for his family came from people of all walks of life. The concern for the State's loss in the death of this good man was manifold and widespread.

One unquestioned theme found in all of these expressions of sympathy was that Henry C. Dworshak was a person of great sincerity, character, and dedication; that he was one whose warm, outgoing personality had created and kept for him the friendship of thousands of people. I can think of no warmer tribute.

This was the hallmark of his service, that in the increasingly complicated society of today, and in a position subject always to the arrows of criticism, he kept his friendships intact down through the years. Even those people who disagreed with his political creed found that their friendship and respect for him never faltered.

This, I think was Henry Dworshak's rule for dealing with people: be candid, be sincere—a rule, written in all our halls of learning, spoken from every rostrum—but few have practiced it with the same fidelity as he. Even though the Senator had many accomplishments to his credit, they pale beside this memory of an honest man.

I knew Senator Dworshak only slightly when I first came to the Senate in 1957 as the youngest member. In the forefront of those colleagues who were anxious to help me and to make my reception a warm and gratifying one was Henry Dworshak. Even though he sat on the opposite side of the aisle for his nearly 24 years of dedicated public service to the people of Idaho, Senator Dworshak gave me much kindly advice. I shall always remain indebted to him.

Henry Dworshak was such a forthright man; dedicated to the public service, ready to fight for his ideals, impatient of pretense, and unswerving in his course. Such was the habit of this man, directly a product of a pioneer western culture which sent him back to Washington for four terms as a Member of the House of Representatives and three terms as Senator. Henry Dworshak looked like a westerner; he looked like a Senator. He was, as the Twin Falls Times-News said, "the big Idahoan." Big of stature, big of heart, Senator Dworshak was truly a man of the West. He spoke the language of the Main Street businessman, understood the problems of the homesteader, appreciated the rough humor of the logger. His own views were solidly grounded in a conservatism that often cast him in the role of opposition to much of the legislation offered by four administrations under which he served. After Eisenhower became President, a friend once wrote to him, pointing out that he had long been a member of the opposition during the years of Democratic administration, and, now that a Republican administration had arrived, he might be more charitable to its President who "looked ahead." Senator Dworshak wrote back: "If I did look back, it would be in order to look forward."

Regardless of how one viewed his political philosophy, Senator Dworshak was honored and respected by his fellow Idahoans. Nearly everyone in Idaho counted Senator Dworshak as a "personal friend," commented the Emmett Messenger-Index. His perserverance in the pursuit of his goals and his fairness to everyone were characteristics of this man of Idaho.

He was "never one to seek the limelight," said the Caldwell News-Tribune, "he was one of the hardest workers in the Senate; he was active in committee work as well as on the floor and still had time to listen to a constituent or a representative of a Government department before making his decision."

Henry C. Dworshak—the big Idahoan—a man with the courage of his convictions. A gentleman we shall long remember. If we serve our constituencies as well as he, democracy will ever flourish.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, I served with Senator Dworshak when he was a Member of the House. I had the privilege of serving with him here in the Senate. I very much appreciate and subscribe to the eloquent statement made by the senior Senator from Idaho [Mr. Church] on behalf of the late Senator Dworshak.

As a Member of the House, I was chairman of the Subcommittee on Irrigation and Reclamation, of the Subcommittee on Mines and Mining, and finally chairman of the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. In each one of those capacities I had occasion to work with Senator Dworshak when he was a Member of the House, and also when he was a Member of the Senate, and I can subscribe wholeheartedly to all that has been said on his behalf by the senior Senator from Idaho.

He was a hard worker. He diligently represented the interests of his State. He had an intense interest in the mining industry, which over the years we tried to save and which over the years we have seen slowly decline into almost complete oblivion as a national industry, not only in my State, but also in Idaho and throughout the Far West.

In addition, he had a great interest in the development of the water resources of the Far West, and he worked for his State in the development of water resources within his State.

I recall appearing in Idaho for hearings at the time the junior Senator from Idaho [Mr. Jordan] was Governor of the State. Some of those projects were in the interest of the State of Idaho, and we were encouraged by Senator Dworshak. I am happy to join in these tributes to him, and I concur wholeheartedly in what the Senator from Idaho has said, that as long as we have men of that kind of diligence and that kind of devotion, and that kind of adherence to the fundamental principles of our country, whether they are on our side of the aisle or on the other side of the aisle, this Nation will be better off.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, on January 3, 1939, nearly a quarter century ago, I was sworn in as a Member of the U.S. House of Representatives. I was in a new place, and had not yet had the opportunity to become acquainted with the rest of that body, but on that occasion, which I shall always remember, I was looking in particular for one Representative.

The late Senator Hugh Butler, of Nebraska, had told me to be on the lookout for the new Congressman from Idaho, Mr. Henry Dworshak. The late Senator Butler was very active in Rotary International, and so was our distinguished colleague whose memory we honor today. Henry Dworshak had served as Governor of the Idaho-Utah District of Rotary International. He had been installed as such at the convention in Nice, France, in June, 1937. Many of my fellow Rotarians who had served as Governor of Rotary or who had attended national conventions either knew Henry Dworshak or knew of him. Henry's broad outlook, his intense patriotism and his dedication to the principles in which he believed had made him a very much admired man. I met him on that day.

Through all the years that followed, it was my privilege to have the friendship of Henry Dworshak. The friendship of Henry Dworshak was not a fair weather friendship. If Henry had a fault, it was that he believed so deeply in the sound principles that he embraced that he burned inside when those principles were violated. It put a strain on his heart and at times it was necessary to urge him to take it easy and to slow down, but everyone who came in contact with Henry Dworshak could honestly say: There was a man of courage; there was a man who represented stability. Henry was an individual to whom yes meant yes and no meant no. Reliability and dependability were his creed. Honesty and integrity were rigidly adhered to. Loyalty and devotion were part of his makeup, and sham and meanness and untruths found no place in the life of Henry Dworshak.

His first speech in Congress as a freshman Member of the 76th Congress began with these words:

> Mr. Chairman, the wholehearted support accorded the national defense measure last week in this House indicates that no trace of partisanship was permitted to influence Members in their desire to provide adequate preparedness for our Nation. Such expenditures and policies are predicated upon the theory that, instead of being Republicans or Democrats we are Americans with a single objective of preserving peace.

In these days, when thoughtful people are concerned about the fiscal plight of our Government, we remember Senator Dworshak with gratitude. He was an aggressive champion of Government economy. He was thorough, hard-working, and effective as a member of the Appropriations Committees of both the House and the Senate. One of his early votes, in 1939, was against an authorization for an additional $100 million for an artificial work program which was not bringing about real recovery.

His patriotism is attested to by his record in support of the Committee on Un-American Activities of the House of Representatives and his support of the Internal Security Subcommittee of the Senate.

Henry Dworshak was an example of what I like to refer to as the American dream coming true in the life of a man. He was born in Duluth, Minn., on August 29, 1894. There he went to the public schools. His background taught him the necessity of hard work. It was in his home city that he learned the printing trade and entered newspaper work.

In the First World War he left his printing press, laid down the tools of his trade and served with distinction in the Armed Forces of his country. He was a part of the American Expeditionary Forces that brought victory to the country and its allies. He served as a sergeant in the 4th Antiaircraft Machinegun Battalion.

Henry Dworshak, upon being discharged from the service, returned to Duluth and managed a printers' supply business. In 1924 he adopted his beloved Idaho as his home and he became editor and publisher of the Burley Bulletin of Burley, Idaho.

Henry's force of character, his dedication and his hard work, took him to a place of prominence in his chosen field. In 1931 he was elected president of the Idaho Editorial Association. In 1932 he was Idaho Commander of the American Legion. He served his community and State in many capacities and, as I have mentioned, was district governor of Rotary International for Idaho-Utah shortly before his election to Congress.

His affiliations were many, his friends were legion, and he commanded the highest respect from all who came in contact with him.

Henry Dworshak possessed true humility. He embraced a faith that recognized the Great Architect of the Universe as the one in charge of the lives of men and nations. He entered that Eternal City, not made with hands, eternal in the heavens, on the 23d day of July, 1962.

Mrs. Curtis joins me in extending to Mrs. Dworshak and to her fine family our most sincere sympathy.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the sudden death of our friend and colleague, Senator Dworshak, was a grievous loss to the Senate and to me personally. We had been good friends for many years. We were neighbors in the Northwest and I was fortunate to be his colleague in both the House and the Senate.

Senator Dworshak was a determined champion of his ideals and fought fiercely for what he regarded to be in the best interests of the people of his State and of the Nation. The Senate may not have always agreed with him, but it never questioned his personal dedication, his integrity, and sincerity.

The voters of Idaho chose Senator Dworshak to represent them on six different occasions, three times as a U.S. Representative and three times as their spokesman in the U.S. Senate.

During his 16 years in the Senate, he rose to the position of ranking minority member of the important Interior and Insular Affairs Committee. From this vantage point, he wielded considerable influence on measures dealing with the West in general, and with his State in particular.

In addition to this assignment, he also held a position on the Appropriations Committee where he could project his philosophy to a national constituency.

Senator Dworshak was a man of humble origins and he rose to great heights of public achievement. But he never lost his basic simplicity. He conducted his Senate work out of the public spotlight and with little fanfare.

I had the opportunity to get to know Senator Dworshak well because of our mutual interests in developing the Rocky Mountain Northwest. I often found him to be a valuable ally in this endeavor, particularly as affecting certain public power projects. Shortly before his death, I had an opportunity to travel with him to Latin America on behalf of the Appropriations Committee. He worked indefatigably on that trip, revealing his great concern for the public purse and the public interest not only at home, but in our farflung activities abroad.

Mr. President, Senator Dworshak was an honest, sincere and dedicated public servant. I shall miss him. Mrs. Mansfield and I wish to extend our heartfelt sympathy to Mrs. Dworshak and her family in their time of sorrow.

Henry Dworshak was a good man.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, at the beginning of the 76th Congress, I stood in the well of the House of Representatives, together with the junior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. Curtis], to take the oath of office as a Member of Congress. At my side on that day was another freshman Congressman, from Idaho, Henry Dworshak. Our work in the House of Representatives marked the beginning of a warm and lasting friendship which I shall forever cherish.

We not only served together in the House, but, for some time, we shared adjoining suites in the House Office Building. Many a night, after the day's work was done, Henry and I would sit together, pondering the problems with which we were faced, comparing notes, trying to fit ourselves into the role in which the fortunes had cast us. There, in those quiet times, I came to know him well—and to appreciate those qualities which served to make him a man to remember, a name to honor, and a model to follow.

How do we describe a man like Henry Dworshak? What words can we comb from the language which we speak which will paint the picture of his character? Only two that I can summon up seem to fit. These words are "rugged honesty."

One never had to worry about Henry Dworshak's intentions or plans. There was never a doubt about his motives. He could not be devious. He could not stoop to chicanery. He could only say what he thought and felt—and he did it face to face.

Henry and I came to Congress during troubled times, and all his service to our country was in those days when the world was caught in a cauldron of hate, fear, and turmoil. There were never any easy answers. Some of them were heartbreaking, but Henry Dworshak always aproached his duty like a good soldier. It was not always possible to say, "This is the answer" or "That is the answer." There was no clear blueprint to follow. Nevertheless, we could always be sure that when Henry Dworshak made a decision, cast a vote, or wrote an opinion, he did it after an abundant search of his conscience, making sure that he did not violate any of the high principles for which he stood.

During our service in the Senate we served together on many Senate committees. He and I were companion members of special committees, assigned to untangle some of the most unpleasant problems ever to face the Senate.

For example, we worked together during the harrowing times of the Army-McCarthy hearings. There was at times considerable hurly-burly in the hearings. Participants in the hearings were vigorously persistent in their contentions. Sometimes the atmosphere was supercharged, tension was high and there were heated exchanges. During those times, Henry sat quietly, patiently, and unharried. Once he had made up his mind, he was vigorous and forceful in his presentations. He was an example for all Members and witnesses. His work was judicious and without rancor, and serving with him was a genuine pleasure.

Henry Dworshak served on the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee of the Senate. He was anxious to help preserve the natural resources of the West, to develop other resources which would benefit the Nation, and to expand the opportunities for his people. His State of Idaho, and my native State of South Dakota had many of the same problems. We always felt that we had a kind and understanding friend in Henry Dworshak when problems relating to the preservation of our natural assets were before Congress. The mountains that he loved, the waterways that he explored, the parks and treelands that he helped save, will stand as his monument before God and man in the years ahead.

Henry Dworshak and I served on the Appropriations Committee of the Senate, where Henry was always one of the most thorough and meticulous members. He firmly believed in trying to operate this Government within a balanced budget whenever possible. He disliked waste, overindulgence, carelessness, or squandering in the handling of public funds. He thought the Government had the right and duty to demand full return for money spent.

He made a full study of budget requests, even to the point of traveling abroad to see for himself whether there was a need for the money which was requested, or to determine whether the policies which were being followed were safeguarding the welfare of our Nation.

For Henry Dworshak loved his country, and he loved serving that country. He believed in the freedom of man, the freedom of enterprise, the freedom of expression, and the freedom to grow. Like William Cowper, he believed that:

> Freedom has a thousand charms to show,
> that slaves, however contented, never know.

Henry Dworshak opposed efforts to change the basic concepts of our Government, and he worked, to the last hours of his life, in an effort to keep this country strong and free.

A short time ago, I heard the "Freedom Pledge" of the American Heritage Foundation recited. As I listened to it, knowing that I would soon be speaking in eulogy of Senator Henry Dworshak, I thought how well the following words bespoke his own philosophy:

> I am an American. A free American.
> Free to speak—without fear
> Free to worship God in my own way
> Free to stand for what I think right
> Free to oppose what I believe wrong
> Free to choose those who govern my country
> This heritage of freedom I pledge to uphold
> For myself and all mankind.

Those words could well have been written by Henry Dworshak himself, for they set out the things in which he deeply believed.

I want to offer the deepest expressions of sympathy of Mrs. Mundt and myself to Mrs. Dworshak and to her four fine sons. All of us who knew the late Senator from Idaho, remember him with affection. We shall cherish that memory, as we know his family will cherish it. They can be comforted in the knowledge that they have shared with those of us in this body—and with all the citizens of our Nation—the life and work of one of the finest and most noble men ever to come out of the West.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, one of my close friends, although we sat on opposite sides of the aisle, was Senator Henry Dworshak, of Idaho. For many years we worked together in efforts to improve and promote the natural resources of our country.

Senator Dworshak was particularly interested in the fish resources of the Pacific Northwest and worked effectively to the end that this great resource would be preserved. The construction of dams across the great rivers in that area affected the spawning grounds of a variety of fish and he was always on hand to offer suggestions as how best to protect them.

As I said, Senator Dworshak was always very sympathetic to resource development while sitting with me on the Appropriations Subcommittee on Public Works. He was particularly active in promoting the Bruce's Eddy project on the banks of a fork of the Salmon River in his home State of Idaho. It will be recalled that some opposition to this project arose from the Fish and Wildlife Service of the Department of the Interior.

Senator Dworshak was one of the prime movers in suggesting and authoring proposing legislation to make possible extensive surveys and planning for this project. He wished to insure that it would not impair the salmon runs which are so important to that section of the country.

After his death last year I made strenuous efforts to have the Bruce's Eddy project named for my good friend, the former Senator from Idaho. I think it would have been a most fitting monument, and I still believe that it should bear his name.

In 1960, Senator Dworshak and I, as well as other members of the Subcommittee on Public Works, made a boat tour down the Mississippi to inspect the various installations and public works projects along the river. We started at Memphis and ended our trip in New Orleans for a 2 days' stay, where we attended meetings with representatives of the Lower Mississippi Valley Flood Control Association.

I believe that I knew Senator Dworshak as well as any other Member of the Senate, and counted him as among my closest friends. His and my interests were much the same, and they transcended the fact that we came from widely separated areas of the country. His loss was a great one not only to the State of Idaho, the Pacific Northwest, and the country as a whole, but to me, as well. I hope that I may continue to carry on this work in which he was so interested.

I extend to his wife and family my deepest sympathy.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, it is easy for me to understand why the people of Idaho chose Henry Dworshak to represent them, first in the House for 8 years, then in the Senate for 15. Henry was more than a representative; he was the living symbol and personification of the people of his State.

Idaho is a big State filled with small towns. Burley, on the eastern edge of the great irrigated middle empire, is such a small town. For 20 years before he came to Congress, Henry Dworshak was the editor and publisher of the Burley Bulletin. In that period, he became both the mirror of his community and the repository of its hopes, fears, and secrets. A man who lives with such a responsibility is either loved and trusted or hated and endured. That the people of Burley took Henry to their hearts when he came from far-off Minnesota as a young man, there is no doubt. That he was trusted, first in Burley, then in the State, and finally in the intermountain region, was demonstrated by the ever-widening circle in which he became the ambassador and voice of his hometown. First, he became Idaho's State commander of the American Legion, and then district governor of Rotary International for both Idaho and Utah.

I met him first while he held that high office in Rotary, and I was filling a lesser responsibility in the Salt Lake club. I was very much impressed by his down-to-earth effectiveness; and I was thrilled to meet him again when I came to Congress, where he had preceded me by a dozen years.

Before I came to Congress, I had been doing business in Idaho for nearly 30 years. Therefore, I feel that I know the people of Idaho, and therefore know why they sent Henry here in the first place. All of us who have worked with Henry know why they kept him here so long. Rural Idaho and Henry Dworshak were well matched in background, in philosophy, in character, and in devotion to our traditional principles of government.

There are so many forces that play on men in Congress that too frequently many of us give way and change, and not always for the better. In the important ability to mirror and represent his people, Henry did not change.

Life is not easy in a town like Burley. People have to work hard both for a living and for the thing we call success. Henry matched that characteristic here in the Senate. He never stopped working. He was always ready to do more than his share of the unglamorous, tiresome daily jobs that kept the stream of legislation moving. The people of Idaho are not the kind who look for easy answers to their problems. They hope to solve them by the wise application of trusted truth. In these, too, Henry was their counterpart. He built his congressional career on the same time-tested principles on which he ran his Burley newspaper—courage to live by the simple virtues, public and private, that cannot be faked in a small town where everyone knows everyone else, courage to speak the truth as he saw it, plus a wisdom which reflected a sound scale of human values.

Henry did not speak often on the Senate floor; but when he did, frequently it was with a rush of words like the breaking of a dam—words which released his pent-up anguish and impatience with ideas and programs that he thought unworthy of this great body. If he suspected that anything like that might be happening, he could be roused to strong denunciations, always followed by periods of deep self-criticism which reflected his natural self-effacing modesty; but never did he abandon his faith in the rightness of his position.

It was a sad day for the Senate when Henry's voice was stilled. It was also a sad day for all the people who live in little towns like Burley, Idaho, no matter in what State those towns may be located.

Today, there is a tide of power running against people from little towns and there is a strongly voiced demand for increased power for those who live in great metropolitan centers. We must not seek to satisfy this demand by silencing the spokesmen for scattered millions in the hinterlands. Both groups are Americans, and both must be well represented here. For all these reasons, the passing of a man such as Henry Dworshak is a tragic loss, not only to the people of Idaho and to his family, but also to the little people in the little towns everywhere in America. God grant that there will be others like him who will work and speak with courage, as he did within these hallowed halls.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I desire to say a few words about Henry Dworshak, whom I regarded as one of the finest men ever to serve in the Senate during the few years I was privileged to serve with him.

I met him in the organization known as Rotary International, long before either of us thought of coming to Washington, D.C. He loved the ideals of Rotary, and found it a body of expression for both his own life and his actions.

I came to the House of Representatives in 1941, and found Henry already there. He was helpful to me as a newcomer in the House of Representatives, and was kind and courteous at all times. We had many problems on which we worked together; and I found him then—as I always did—courteous, decent, and helpful.

Subsequently, we served on the Appropriations Committee of the House of Representatives. His attitude toward the expenditure of public funds is well known to Senators. He had strong convictions on the need to be careful with the budget of the United States and the expenditures of this country. I always found him a very fine person with whom I could deal.

Later, we both came to the U.S. Senate; and here he was assigned to the Interior Committee, on which I have served during all the years I have been here. Toward the end, he became the ranking Republican member of that committee. Then I had a new test to apply to the things he did. There were daily conferences to be held and joint actions to be taken. I found how fair and how undemanding a person he could be.

Subsequently, he was appointed to a committee on which I served for a good many years—the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy. One of the members of the committee said:

> You are going to have some tough times, because HENRY will oppose all the programs which you may want to sponsor.

We took particular pains to make sure that the able Senator from Idaho was made familiar with all the projects, particularly the ones to which he might have had objection. It was interesting to me to watch the expression of his views. Every day that he was on the Joint Committee and was called upon to cast votes, I think that in voting on the majority of the proposals which came before that committee he acted with probably better tolerance than did most of the rest of us who served on the committee. I was proud to be associated with him in that endeavor.

Mr. President, I can testify to the fact that there was no proposal brought before the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy which involved the security of the United States and its welfare in the family of nations on which HENRY DWORSHAK did not vote as a true patriot with the finest interests of the country at heart.

Therefore, Mr. President, Mrs. Anderson and I extend to Mrs. Dworshak our sympathy and our love, as we praise the character of Senator DWORSHAK, who exemplified the fine traits that a Member of the U.S. Senate should have.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I join my colleagues in paying brief tribute to the memory of HENRY DWORSHAK. I was a Member of the House of Representatives when HENRY entered the House. I came to know him early. I came to know him as a courageous man of deep convictions, and one who could always be depended upon to stand by his convictions.

Later I came to the Senate, and not too long thereafter HENRY also came to the Senate. In the Senate HENRY displayed the same strength of conviction and character.

He served his constituency well. It was a sad day when his voice was stilled in behalf of his constituency and the principles for which he stood.

Mrs. Sparkman and I extend our sympathy to Mrs. Dworshak and members of the family.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, one of the best opportunities to judge the worth of a fellow Senator is to serve with him on committee assignments—especially on those assignments where issues are of a highly controversial nature. It is during this time that judicious decisions, even temperment, and balanced judgment are needed and appreciated.

I had the privilege of serving with the late Senator from Idaho, HENRY DWORSHAK, on two different Senate committees. We served together on the Government Operations Committee from 1951 through 1954. Also, as Senators will remember, we both served on the committee that conducted the famous Army-McCarthy hearings in 1954. His calmness during stormy sessions and his ability to sift the kernel of fact out a barrage of charges and countercharges were valued assets to the committee.

He was always a hard-working Member. He was prompt and thorough. He had a keen insight into legislation and rendered his decisions after careful and thoughtful study and preparation.

During the time he served on the Government Operations Committee, we had a number of historic hearings, at which difficult decisions were hammered out. HENRY DWORSHAK never shirked his responsibilities. He served with a quiet determination in an effort to arrive at the truth.

We also served together on the Appropriations Committee of the Senate. Here he exercised caution and care, and showed concern for the welfare of the taxpayer. He was interested in maintaining fiscal responsibility in this Government. He was careful and precise in his inquiries in an effort to make sure that for every dollar spent, the Government got a dollar's worth of services or goods in return.

One of the last great labors in which the late Senator from Idaho and I were jointly engaged was a special study trip through Latin America in late 1961. We served on the State, Justice, and Judiciary Subcommittee of the Senate Appropriations Committee. I had the honor to serve as chairman of our group, which consisted of the majority leader, Hon. MIKE MANSFIELD, and Senators MARGARET CHASE SMITH, ALAN BIBLE, ROMAN HRUSKA, and HENRY DWORSHAK. We traveled through 7 Latin American countries, covering 14,000 miles during the 19 days we were on the trip, examining our foreign aid programs, the Alliance for Progress and other international programs. Every day we worked long hours in our search for information.

I believe that the report which we made to the Congress, following our investigations and research, has been valuable as a guide to our oversea operations in the Latin American countries. Our committee tried to do a good and careful job. We worked as a team—a bipartisan team—and HENRY DWORSHAK, in the tradition and pattern he followed during his long years of service, undertook his share of the assignment, always contributing a positive and practical viewpoint on the problems we had before us.

He was an honest man—straightforward in his dealings with others. He knew no other way to operate in the Senate than in a down-to-earth, practical manner.

He served with a conscience. He did not shirk his assignments. He believed, with Thomas Paine, that:

> Those who expect to reap the blessings of freedom, must, like men, undergo the fatigue of supporting it.

He always dealt with issues and did not engage in personalities. In debate he fought hard for the things in which he believed—and whether he lost, or whether he won, he was gracious and kindly to his opponents.

HENRY DWORSHAK has left this body, but the imprint of his character will remain and the impact of his work will be felt for long years ahead.

Mrs. McClellan and I extend our heartfelt sympathy to Mrs. Dworshak and members of the family.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, the Senate lost a valuable Member with the death of HENRY DWORSHAK. The Appropriations Committee particularly will miss him, for he was a vigorous advocate of economy. He attacked waste and misuse of funds at every opportunity, and was a strong opponent of back-door spending that would bypass the normal appropriations procedure.

Senator DWORSHAK labored unremittingly for a balanced budget and for the curtailment of swollen bureaucratic payrolls. He was a hard and earnest worker and a man of sterling character.

He was a newspaperman of distinction and ability, leaving this work in his youth to volunteer for service in World War I, and returning to the newspaper business after the war as editor and publisher of the Burley, Idaho, Bulletin. which he continued to operate until 1944.

HENRY DWORSHAK's first congressional service was in the House of Representatives, which he entered in 1938. He then came to the Senate in 1946 and, with a brief interruption in service, remained here until his death.

All of us will miss HENRY DWORSHAK, a distinguished conservative and an admirable gentleman.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, the longer one is a Member of this body the more he becomes aware of the bond of fraternalism which exists in an area that could, because of its very makeup, be a setting for dissension and acrimony. The pervasive warmth of that bond is always present, yet it becomes even more pronounced during those times of tragedy when death removes a colleague from our ranks.

HENRY DWORSHAK, of Idaho, one of the three great Senators who have passed to their reward recently, and whom today we eulogize, was a stalwart defender of the highest traditions of this great body. Significantly, he, as did the other Senators whom we shall eulogize, had a humble beginning. He plodded industriously to scale the ladder of success, and if there is any validity to the term "a self-made man," the appellation would fit him whose memory we honor today.

HENRY DWORSHAK was a journeyman printer as a young man and rose to become editor of one of Idaho's prominent weeklies. He served in the House of

Representatives prior to entering the U.S. Senate in 1947. It was my pleasure to serve with Senator DWORSHAK on the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, and we shared many interests common to Senators from the western region of the United States. HENRY DWORSHAK was a hard-working legislator, ever mindful of his responsibilities to the people of Idaho yet equally cognizant of his responsibilities to the Nation as a whole. He was a fine Senator in the fullest sense of the word.

In conclusion, I point out that the Senate has benefited immeasurably from the presence in this Chamber of Senator HENRY DWORSHAK. He has left the mortal scene, yet he has left an imprint on this body which will not be eroded with the passage of time.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, HENRY DWORSHAK was a real, true conservative in the finest meaning of that word. I had the pleasure of serving with him on various committees, but especially on the Appropriations Committee and on several subcommittees of that committee. I found him always interested in economy, always willing to express his views on how we could save money here, there, and elsewhere. Many times he had to regret the fact that others would not go along with him in saving money where he wanted to save it, but I found him to be perfectly willing to look forward and take a position for new expenditures which were manifestly needed as our country and its people progressed.

I respected him very greatly indeed. In the work for veterans, on the Independent Offices Appropriations Subcommittee, I found him always taking particular interest in their welfare.

In talking with him at one time, I think he told me he had been commander of the American Legion for his fine State, the State of Idaho. At any rate, he showed great concern and interest in the welfare of veterans who needed help from their country and for their dependents.

There is not much I can add to the many tributes that have been properly paid to this fine American. I merely wanted the RECORD to show that I regarded him as one of our finest Americans, a patriot in the fullest tradition of that word, and that we shall ever miss him.

We in Florida were happy that Senator DWORSHAK and Mrs. Dworshak found occasion to come to our State for such infrequent vacations as the work of the Senate would permit. We found him always popular in the areas where he stayed; he always had kindly words about the people he met there. I want to assure Mrs. Dworshak and the children that no one who has gone to our State from the Senate was more genuinely admired than was HENRY DWORSHAK.

Mrs. Holland wishes to join me in offering at this time this meed of our sympathy, respect, and affection.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, in 1947, when I came to the Senate for a 2-year term, I met the Senator from Idaho, HENRY DWORSHAK. He also came to the Senate that year for his first term. Throughout the years as we served together, I came to know him better and better. I agree with those who have spoken today, that he had strength of character, courage, and convictions.

Even in disagreement, as occurs often in this body, we knew his great sense of humor and his tolerance.

I considered him a friend. His death was a loss to this body, to his State, and to our Nation. I, too, join in expressing to Mrs. Dworshak and to his family the sympathy which I know all of us feel.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, it was my pleasure to serve in the U.S. Senate with the late Senator HENRY DWORSHAK, of Idaho. I served with him on two committees, the Appropriations and Interior and Insular Affairs Committees. There, in the close contact of legislative examination and discussion, I had the opportunity to observe the day-to-day actions and interest of this notable Republican. His hard work, his unerring frankness, his keen concern for legislative integrity as he saw it, all provide a warm background for our personal remembrances of the late Senator from Idaho, for, in agreement or in disagreement, HENRY DWORSHAK wanted to keep his friends.

During his more than 20 years of service to Idaho and America, he labored for fiscal and administrative integrity in the Federal Government's complex operations. This belief that Government should serve the individual, and not itself, was best illustrated by his untiring efforts on the Senate Committee on Appropriations.

HENRY DWORSHAK's legislative endeavors were also marked by his special and unique competence and interest in natural resources, especially in mining and in the public lands of the West.

I was fortunate to have served on the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs while my esteemed colleague was the ranking minority member of that committee. I think he would consider his successful efforts in that committee to realize the construction of the Palisades Dam on the South Fork of the Snake River in Idaho as perhaps his greatest personal triumph for the people of his State. I am glad to recall that I supported him in that endeavor.

For a word I wish to touch on Senator DWORSHAK's other dedicated service as spokesman for the people of Idaho. He worked to establish the Arco Atomic Reactor Testing Plant, which stands in vivid contrast to the mines and lumbering industry in Idaho, and will open up a new era of techonology for the State. As a former newspaperman and editor, Senator DWORSHAK was responsive to the requests and problems of his constituents. Yet he maintained a constant and vigilant interest in national and international affairs.

His courage was unique, and it typified the rugged character of Western America. His distinguished appearance matched that of the rugged mountains of his native Idaho. He looked like a Senator, and a Senator he was.

Mr. President, I join my colleagues in expressing my very real sorrow in the passing of the late HENRY DWORSHAK, a Senator from Idaho. Yet I am sure we know that the warmth of the Senate's affection here in Washington for our late colleague and our respect and esteem for him will never equal the esteem, and now the regret in his untimely passing, felt by the people of the State which he served so long and with such never-ending devotion.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, it was my good fortune during most of my years of service in the Senate to serve on a committee with the late Senator DWORSHAK. No man was ever held in higher esteem than he was, or was more respected; or whose opinion was valued more than his. We liked him for his good, strong, rugged, honest qualities, which were always in evidence without any pretense whatsoever. He was fair and conscientious in his consideration of public matters.

I know that on the Appropriations Committee very frequently we would say, "Well, let us see what HENRY has to say." We always knew that he was a student of the problems of that committee, always honest and sincere, and nonpolitical in his thinking and in his presentation of matters under our consideration. He was an unusually valuable member of that committee, whose work is never completed and is ever increasing.

I saw in him not only the qualities of a man that one would want for a friend—and I am honored to have been his friend—but also the qualities that one wants to see in anyone who can be considered a real American, with all the qualities of patriotism, not for show, but from a sense of sincerity, the qualities one looks for in a good neighbor, the qualities one would look for in a man who was a true servant of the people.

I believe he set as high an all around standard for these fine qualities as anyone I have ever know in public life.

I know that on our committee there was and still is a very strong feeling that we miss him, and miss his work. At the same time we feel that his contribution to our country does continue to live. In that way he is still with us and will continue to be with us and with this Nation for many decades, and we will continue to feel the strength of his character and the contributions he made to the Nation in both public and private life.

Mrs. Stennis and I have been close neighbors of Senator DWORSHAK and Mrs. Dworshak. Mrs. Stennis joins me in the expression of these sentiments of friendship and feelings of great respect and esteem for him and his memory, and for Mrs. Dworshak and their fine family.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I feel a special loss in the passing of Senator DWORSHAK because of my long and pleasant association with him in the Congress.

We served together in the House of Representatives before coming to this body. In the Senate, we worked together on the Committee on Appropriations. He was always courteous and thoughtful toward me and other members of the committee, regardless of party. Moreover, he always did his homework and did it well; he was one of the best informed members on whatever subject might be before the committee.

Some years ago I had the privilege of visiting Moscow with him. I found him to be a delightful traveling companion.

The Nation has lost a dedicated public servant who will be missed by many.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, to have served with HENRY C. DWORSHAK in both House and Senate for a great many years was a rewarding experience.

As soldiers in World War I we had the kinship and the fellowship which comes from wearing the uniform in the same war.

As a newsman, editor, and a publisher, HENRY DWORSHAK had a sharp capacity for accurately appraising men and events.

His leadership in Rotary International and his election as the State commander of the American Legion for the Department of Idaho both proclaim a deep gregarious instinct which was the basis for his love for people.

His long years in the great open West gave him that expansive spirit which actually reflected the great outdoors.

All this compounded in him a deep conviction and a sense of fidelity to his country which expressed itself in the deep earnest, thundrous speeches which were like the rolling thunder coming down from the sacred mountain top. It was the voice of the patriot speaking from the depth of his soul for a land he truly loved.

But in him also was a rare gentility and a sense of humor which was as refreshing as a morning breeze perfumed by the thousand-year-old cedars of his State. To see his huge frame roll with appreciative laughter on hearing the recital of a whimsical anecdote or a humorous incident was truly an energizing tonic to a tired spirit.

For more than a score of years he served the Republic in House and Senate with vigor, with diligence and ability. And truly it could be spoken of him as was spoken in an ancient day:

> Thou good and faithful servant, enter unto the joy of thy Lord.

Mrs. SMITH. Mr. President, back when I was a daily nationally syndicated columnist I expressed myself in print in newspapers throughout the Nation about Senator HENRY C. DWORSHAK. On July 10, 1953, my column was devoted completely to my appraisal and opinion of him.

I am thankful that I publicly acclaimed my respect and admiration for him while he was alive. Ten years later and after he has passed away, I wish to repeat those words that I wrote by reading that column today—or in the 10 years that followed that column my admiration and respect for him grew even greater and deeper.

DWORSHAK OF IDAHO A HARD-WORKING SENATOR

(By Senator MARGARET C. SMITH)

WASHINGTON.—Right across the hall from my office in the Senate Office Building is the office of one of the hardest working and most conscientious Members of the U.S. Senate—Senator HENRY C. DWORSHAK, of Idaho. I have worked with him more than most Members of the Senate, as we are members of the same committees. We are both on the Appropriations Committee and the Government Operations Committee. My third committee is the Armed Services Committee, while his third is the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee. He is also a member of the Senate Reorganization Subcommittee of which I am chairman.

Several times I have met the Senator in the hall in the evening as we both left our offices after working much later than those in most of the other offices. If we run into each other leaving for the day as early as 7 or 8 o'clock in the evening, we joke good-natured sarcasm and ask each other if we are working half days.

DEVOTED TO DUTY

I don't believe that there is any Senator more devoted to the duty of his committee work than Senator DWORSHAK. He always faithfully attends the meeting of my Reorganization Subcommittee and does a very effective job. But he is that way about all of the committees and subcommittees on which he serves. Indicative of the seriousness with which he takes his committee and subcommittee work is the fact that one month he attended more than 60 committee and subcommittee hearings and meetings.

We have more than just our committee and subcommittee work in common. Both of us have consistently been rated as economy champions in the Senate—both of us have been in the newspaper business—both of us have been members of the military forces—both of us started our service in Congress in the House of Representatives in the 76th Congress. Senator DWORSHAK has been elected to the Senate twice and appointed to the Senate once. We both come up for reelection to the Senate next year.

He takes his duty of attendance at Senate sessions just as seriously as the committee work. The record proves this conclusively, as it shows that during the 82nd Congress he has the best record of the Senators for attendance at roll call votes. The then Senate majority leader praised his attendance record by observing that the Senate would complete its work and adjourn much sooner if all Senators were as cooperative and faithful as Mr. DWORSHAK.

ON POLICY GROUP

There is another Senate Committee of which he and I are both members. It is the Republican Policy Committee which sets the Republican policy in the Senate. It is headed by able Senator William Knowland of California, who succeeded Senator Robert Taft in the post of chairman. If the people of Idaho could attend the meetings of this committee, they would surely swell with pride at the forceful and intelligent contribution that Senator DWORSHAK makes to the work of this all-important Republican committee in the Senate.

All in all, there is no harder or more conscientious Senator than HENRY DWORSHAK. Whatever the Senate accomplishes, it is because of faithful public servants like him who refuse to work by the clock. Their only interest is in making this a better country for all of us.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, it is difficult to believe that 7 months have passed since these Senate halls saw the happy hurrying of HENRY DWORSHAK. His pleasant smile seemed always a headlight of friendliness as his mighty figure moved about at a pace which seemed to find the day all too short—and finally found life all too brief.

HENRY DWORSHAK was termed a conservative. His Idaho neighbors endorsed his spirit of caution and his colleagues of our Senate Appropriations Committee respected his sincerity. He stood his ground—and lost no friends.

Newsman, journalist, editor and publisher, soldier, and statesman, his life was one of discipline and dedication. Through the dragging days of last July no Senator was more faithful in attendance than he. Within the week of his passing, here on the floor of the Senate by his presence and his words, he declared his readiness at any sacrifice and at any hour to stay here to consummate the Senate's business.

Here in the morning hour of the very day of his passing, his response to a live quorum call was further proof of his constancy.

Those were days that continue to take their toll of our membership.

Because HENRY DWORSHAK's life was that of a man who hearkened to their meaning, I would like to borrow some phrases from our Chaplain's prayer of that Monday, July 23, 1962.

> We live too much in the shallowness and shabbiness about us and in the rush and clash of busy hours, too often we forget the heavenly vision that lifts our eyes to far horizons.
>
> Whatever this new day may hold for us as it commandeers our strength of mind and body and heart, send us forth girded by Thy might, until by patience, persistence, and enduring courage we become sufficient for the tasks we must accomplish.

Beside the life of HENRY DWORSHAK his Creator has written "Task accomplished."

And we add our prayer: "May he rest in peace."

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, the passing of our late and beloved colleague, Senator HENRY C. DWORSHAK, is a grievous loss. HENRY was one of the few Senators left of the old truly conservative school of thought. He believed in this with all his heart and he practiced daily what he preached. He was an honorable, dedicated, and valuable public servant.

I came to know HENRY DWORSHAK very well through our many years of service together on the Senate Appropriations Committee. The more you knew of HENRY DWORSHAK, the more you admired and respected him. He had a deep sense of loyalty and dedication to our system of Government and all it stood for.

HENRY was a tremendously hard worker. He went about his duties in such a serious way that he sometimes appeared to be stern and harsh. Actually, at heart HENRY DWORSHAK was a very kind and friendly person. He would not have intentionally harmed anyone if he could help it. He was a rugged individualist so typical of the great statesmen of old who made possible this great Nation.

HENRY DWORSHAK served the Nation well in many capacities from the battlefields of World War I to State commander of the American Legion, as a Member of the House of Representatives and as a Member of the U.S. Senate. He left his mark on much of the better legislation that was enacted during his service in the Congress of the United States. He was a highly respected

Member of the Senate and a friend I will long remember.

In attending his funeral services at Arlington Cemetery, I could not help thinking how fitting it was that a man of his dedication to our Nation and its ideals should have a final resting place in this beautiful cemetery dedicated to our great heroes and the preservation of our country.

May I extend to Mrs. Dworshak and all the family my most sincere sympathy.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, in honoring the lamented Senator from Idaho today, I join in paying tribute to a colleague, but also to a Senator from a neighboring State who was my friend. We did not always agree, but there was never any doubt where Senator DWORSHAK stood on issues before the country. There was never any question as to his integrity and his devotion to America. He was the ranking minority member on the Interior Committee where we served together. He was faithful in attendance and was forthright in his defense of our western resources and contribution to development of our neighboring States.

His record as a distinguished and valued citizen of Idaho and his devoted service in both Houses of the Congress of the United States leaves a void that will take long to fill.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I considered HENRY DWORSHAK a warm friend. Above all, I knew him as an untiring and selfless worker in the cause of his honest and strong convictions on what would serve best our Nation. It was always a fine sight to see HENRY rise from his seat to take up the cudgels for a cause. When he was through, no Senator and no spectator could ever doubt where HENRY DWORSHAK stood and what he believed. While we could hardly have disagreed more on a number of issues, I cannot imagine having disagreed with a nicer or finer person.

Mr. BEALL. Mr. President, the Nation lost a fine public servant with the passing of our late distinguihsed colleague, Senator HENRY DWORSHAK, of Idaho. Outstanding among his excellent qualities were his sincerity, his integrity, his dedication to hard work, and his capacity for far-ranging friendship.

I had the pleasure of serving with HENRY DWORSHAK, first in the House of Representatives, and then in the Senate. He preceded me by 4 years in the House. When I was elected to my first term in the House—that was to the 78th Congress—I soon became closely acquainted with HENRY DWORSHAK, and he was of immeasurable help to me in my freshman days. He was always thorough in his work, and one could accept his advice as one would accept the advice of an acknowledged expert in the field. We served together during the 78th and 79th Congresses, before he left to take his seat in the Senate.

Again, in entering the Senate, I followed HENRY DWORSHAK by about 4 years. We served together in the Senate through numerous Congresses—from January 1953 until his death in the fall of 1962. The years of association were rich for me. It was my pleasure to cosponsor numerous bills with Senator DWORSHAK. On most matters we saw eye to eye.

HENRY DWORSHAK's service in the Senate was marked by his particular interest in the field of natural resources. As the ranking minority member of the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, he was an authority on matters of water, land, mineral, and forest resources. I was especially impressed by HENRY DWORSHAK's consistent advocacy of close cooperation between the States and the Federal Government in planning and developing needed projects.

HENRY DWORSHAK's capacity to make friends resulted from his warm personality, his humility, and his sincere interest in the problems of others. He was loved and respected by all—regardless of political affiliation. Everyone knew HENRY DWORSHAK as a fair and honorable gentleman in all his dealings.

HENRY DWORSHAK's passing was a personal loss to me. It was a loss to this body, to his State, and to his Nation which he so dearly loved.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, HENRY DWORSHAK and I served together on the Appropriations Committee of the Senate for over 10 years. We sat beside each other. We became friends and discussed committee problems together. I found him to be frank and outspoken, with a sound, practical knowledge of the questions that face us in our Government. He was not partisan in his point of view. He was objective and made his judgments realistically in the way he felt to be most helpful to his country and to the section of the country which was involved. He was absolutely sincere in doing what he considered to be the right thing under the circumstances. He fought hard in behalf of the interests of his State of Idaho. There was his home. There he raised his family, and there were his friends.

He always expressed his beliefs vigorously and sometimes with a feeling of exasperation, but that was his way. With all his forcefulness of expression, he was considerate of the feelings of others. He was good natured, thoughtful, friendly, and always fair. He was conscientious in his attendance at hearings of the Appropriations Committee and his questions were always pertinent. Altogether he had a firm philosophy of government and he fought vigorously to uphold it.

After the war, Senator DWORSHAK and I were among those on the Appropriations Committee who went to Europe to study the conditions there as they involved our aid to those countries in a military and economic way. He was opposed to spending the taxpayers' money in ways that he believed were not in the best interests of our Nation's security. He believed that our resources should be spent as far as possible in building up our own country, though he realized the necessity of cooperating in rebuilding the free nations of the world which had suffered from the calamities of war and revolution.

HENRY DWORSHAK and his good wife were friends of Mrs. Saltonstall and myself. We enjoyed their company on many occasions and always knew we would be received in a friendly, sociable way that made for greater happiness and greater comradeship in the busy life that surrounds us here in Washington. He was proud of his family and of the life and activities of his sons in the war and after.

HENRY DWORSHAK was a good citizen in war and in peace and a patriotic public official in the fullest sense of the word. I miss him as a colleague who sat close by me on the Senate floor. I miss him as a fellow member of the Appropriations Committee whose judgment I respected. I miss him as a friend.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, on this day we engaged in one of the saddest rites which our body enacts. The U.S. Senate has set aside this day for those of us who wish to speak to the memory of our late brother in this body, HENRY C. DWORSHAK.

In this day when cynicism too often surrounds the individuals who see public service as one of the highest forms of service to mankind, the life of HENRY DWORSHAK was a challenge to all of us. He was completely aware during the last few years of his life that he had certain physical disabilities wihch should have been cared for, and which indicated the need for a slowing down of the personal load which he carried as ranking minority member of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs and as a member of the Appropriations Committee. Notwithstanding this, he continued to give the same zeal, devotion, and attention to his work, which he had done as a younger man, when he would not have been limited by the physical disabilities which took him later. His work and his devotion to public service were a direct, contributing factor to his decease. All men should know that here was in fact a man who was a public servant to his own detriment and to the great loss of his own family.

In a more personal vein, HENRY DWORSHAK was probably the closest friend I have ever had in the U.S. Senate. No death could have shocked me more, nor left a greater void in my daily responsibilities here. I found that when HENRY opened up his great heart to you, his friendship was as wide and encompassing as anyone could ever wish or ask. It was a gift he bestowed—and we the recipients appreciated it.

Both Mrs. Allott and I want to extend our deepest sympathy to Mrs. Dworshak and their four sons and hope that his contributions to our country and the warmth of his friendships in the Senate will help to diminish by some small amount the loss of this wonderful person.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, it was my privilege to serve 8 years in the House of Representatives and 12 years in the U.S. Senate with HENRY DWORSHAK.

During these many years we were closely associated in sponsoring and working for legislation in the interest of the people of the West and the Midwest. We became close personal friends.

HENRY DWORSHAK was truly a rugged individualist, a conservative and a man with great character. Once his mind was made up on an issue or a piece of legislation, you never need question where he stood.

He was a kindly man and I know personally of many instances of his generosity to individuals and to institutions. He was a man of courage that typifies the great West. All of these qualities are needed in the U.S. Senate and we miss him greatly.

Mrs. Carlson and I extend to Mrs. Dworshak and the family our sincerest and deepest sympathy.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, all of us are saddened by the passing of a respected and capable gentleman whose service to the State of Idaho was long and faithful. Henry C. Dworshak was a diligent and forthright addition to this body whose dedication to the public interest brought credit to himself and to his native State.

As a Member of the House of Representatives, it was my privilege to serve with Henry Dworshak in the 76th through 79th Congresses. Later, from 1960 until his death, we were colleagues in the U.S. Senate.

Though we were occasionally alined on opposite sides of issues brought before this group, the late Senator from Idaho was at all times straightforward and reasonable in debate and willingly gave careful attention to the views of those who differed with him.

Senator Dworshak was an influential and highly respected member of the minority as his responsible committee assignments will attest. We shall miss his robust and hearty personality as well as his steadfast efforts in projects designed to benefit citizens of Idaho and of the United States.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I knew Henry Dworshak as colleague and friend, both in the House of Representatives and in the Senate. His service and devotion to his home State of Idaho, and to the Nation as a whole, place him firmly and well in history, and in the hearts of those who knew and worked with him. His conception of his role as a U.S. Senator was in the very finest tradition, and he filled that role with unique distinction. Neither political partisanship nor possibiilty of personal gain swayed him from the path of principle as he saw it. And though his efforts and action certainly bore the mark of a statesman, I believe that he himself would wish to be remembered as a U.S. Senator who represented his people well.

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, I was not privileged to know the late Senator Dworshak as a close colleague. We did not serve on any committees together and our legislative interests were not similar.

During my years in the Senate, however, I had an opportunity to observe his hard work and firm commitment to those causes in which he believed so deeply. I pay tribute, today, to his memory and to his record as a Senator who stood up for his point of view without flinching and without fear of opposition.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, today we pause to pay a heartfelt and richly merited tribute of remembrance to our departed friend and colleague, the distinguished and able son and servant of the great State of Idaho, Henry Dworshak. Since his election to this body in 1946, Henry Dworshak contributed the full measure of his outstanding gifts to the advancement of his State and Nation toward an ever richer fulfillment of freedom and security. He was a man who gave stature and dignity to every office he held during his long an eminent career. We who were privileged to call him friend, and to work at his side, were ever impressed by the integrity of character and the depth of understanding he brought to the duties and responsibilities entrusted to him. Even those who might find themselves in disagreement with him could not but admire the sincerity of his convictions and the vigor with which he expressed and defended them. As we deeply valued Henry Dworshak as a friend, so, too, we esteemed him as a man who lent distinction to this body in which we proudly serve.

His beloved State mourns a son. His Nation salutes him for his contribution to the better, fuller national life toward which he worked so zealously. His friends turn to his family in this sorrowful hour and share with them the grief of a loss so deeply, so personally felt by each of us privileged to know the warmth of Henry Dworshak's friendship.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, today we honor the memory of the late Henry C. Dworshak and express our profound appreciation for the opportunity to be associated with him.

Senator Dworshak was an unusual man. Trained in the newspaper craft, he was not content merely to observe events and to write about them. He insisted on doing something about them. That is why he left his desk as editor and publisher of the Burley Bulletin to run for the House of Representatives in 1938.

His service in the House and later here in the Senate were marked by the newsman's inquisitiveness. He seldom accepted statements at their face value. He wanted to know who, what, where, why, and how much.

I will long be in Henry Dworshak's debt for his kindly advice and assistance to me on the Appropriations Committee. His thorough knowledge and general competence in this field were of great help on many occasions.

It was my pleasure to visit several Latin American countries in 1961 in company with Senator Dworshak. I was particularly impressed with his intimate knowledge of the mining operations we observed in some of the countries we visited and with Senator Dworshak's keen awareness of his responsibility to the mining industries of the section he represented in the Senate.

Senator Dworshak served Idaho and the Nation with a devotion and purpose which all of us might well seek to emulate. And yet despite his strongly held convictions and his fierce fights for that in which he believed, he never lost the essential quality of dignity which he wore like a bright jewel.

We shall miss Senator Dworshak. Too few of his kind of men are in the public service.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, Henry Dworshak was my good friend. He was, in a real sense, an ideal against which one could not hesitate to measure his own worth.

Politically, he was a conservative. And, because he had espoused the cause of conservatism, adherents to that philosophy increased in number and respect for it was increased among those who take issue with it.

Others of my colleagues in this eulogy to Henry Dworshak will mention specific accomplishments of his career. They are many, they are important and they shall endure. But, from the time of our first acquaintance, I was struck most forcefully by his personification of those qualities possessed by great and good men.

Physically, Henry Dworshak was a big man. Looking at him, one was immediately reminded of the grandeur of the mountains which surround his home in Idaho. To know this man, was to recall the gentleness of the beautiful valleys among those mountains—equally an important part of that magnificent sector of this great country.

This combination of great mountains and beautiful valleys is the West. So, also, this combination of physical strength and gentle nature merge to form magnificent men.

But, there were yet other fine qualities which Henry Dworshak possessed in great measure. He, as much as any man I ever knew represented a personal geography of the State he so ably represented:

He possessed the freshness of pure mountain air.

His was the swift pace of a cold, clear mountain stream.

His humor was a chipmunk on the lofty crags and buttercups in a high meadow.

Ardor for his causes, tempered by good judgment, was as the evergreen relieved by warm golden aspen at late fall in the high Rockies.

One can stand alone in the silence of high mountains, gentle valleys, vibrant wildlife, and become irresistibly an humble man.

Henry Dworshak was all of that, too.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, Henry Dworshak will always live in our memories as one of the stalwarts of the U.S. Senate. His rugged features, his square jaw, his snow-white hair, his broad shoulders, and massive stature marked him as a man of iron will. I always had the feeling that the pioneers who conquered the West must have resembled him in appearance.

In the case of Henry Dworshak, these physical characteristics were not deceptive for he was endowed with a moral courage and an unflinching devotion to his ideals that won and held the respect of all who knew him. He was a man who took with deep seriousness the responsibilities of his high office. He loved his country with a passion and feared for its welfare with an anxiety that left its marks upon him and shortened his years.

He believed in what he believed with all his heart and he fought for it with all his might.

No more dedicated man ever served in the U.S. Senate.

We sorrow with his loved ones in his passing, but we share with them the solace that he was one of that band of noblemen who have given of themselves unstintingly and have truly passed to their reward.

> Why pity them? Full well they lived
> Their God-appointed plan, died joyously,
> And left a golden memory! Pray who
> Could ask a fairer rate for them, or me.

Mr. FONG. Mr. President, we who knew our able and esteemed colleague from Idaho, HENRY DWORSHAK, regarded him with utmost respect and warmest affection. The shock of his sudden and untimely passing last year saddens us still. It was all the more sorrowful because his robust appearance and his vigorous manner gave outward promise of far longer tenure on this mortal planet. A mighty oak had fallen, leaving a gaping void in the tall timber.

When I first met HENRY DWORSHAK less than 3 years ago, I was impressed by his physical stature, his magnificent white hair and his handsome visage. To me, he looked every inch a Senator.

As I subsequently learned through working with him on the Senate Interior Committee and in the Senate Chamber, he was every inch a Senator.

Able, hard working, diligent, dedicated, sincere, straightforward, HENRY DWORSHAK brought honor to this body, honor to his State, and honor to his country.

His rugged appearance and sturdy independence were characteristic of the pioneer people who settled in the West from whence he came. And so, it is easy to understand that, in any struggle for what he believed right, he was a man of dogged determination and unswerving tenacity. An exponent of conservative thinking, he had a prudent man's high regard for fiscal soundness in government, a reasonable man's zeal for steady progress, and a conservative man's faith in the people to govern themselves in States and local areas and a corresponding horror of overcentralized Government in Washington.

We often drove together to our Washington homes at the close of a long day in the Senate, and in our conversations I soon discovered his booming voice belied his warm and compassionate spirit and his kindly and considerate manner.

I am sure I echo the sentiments of every Member of the Senate and of the many employees of the Senate when I say we miss him sorely.

At this sad time, there are no words adequate to assuage his dear one's sense of loss. But I do hope they may derive some measure of comfort to know that we honor and esteem in the highest his memory.

My wife Ellyn and I convey our deepest sympathy to his wife and family in their bereavement.

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, the late Senator HENRY C. DWORSHAK first applied his voice to the problems of his State and Nation through the pages of his newspaper, the Burley Bulletin. In 1944 he came to Congress where he served ably until his death.

Senator DWORSHAK and I frequently disagreed on the issues debated in this body, but I could not disagree with the devotion he displayed to duty and country. He put his very real talents to the job of representing his State and serving his country as he thought the job should be done, with all the energy at his command.

Mr. President, it is indeed a sad fact of life that the laws of God and nature make these eulogies necessary. But I am proud to have had the privilege of serving with the three Senators we honor today and I am confident that their record in the eyes of historians of the future shall reflect the utmost honor and credit upon the United States of America and the U.S. Senate.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, the senior Senator from Idaho, HENRY DWORSHAK, is no longer with us. He was a beloved and respected Member of our body. His loss will be felt by his friends in the Senate for a long time to come.

Senator DWORSHAK was a Member of the Senate for many years, having come first to this body in 1946. Over the years his interest, his knowledge of the problems of the development and conservation of our natural resources came to be known and respected by all. As ranking minority member of the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, the Senator made a substantial contribution to the cause of intelligent use of the resources of our Nation.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, with the passing last year of the distinguished Senator from Idaho, Mr. DWORSHAK, the people of the State of Idaho lost the services of a courageous, capable, sound, and devoted public servant. Senator DWORSHAK was a man who possessed all the basic qualities which are so vital in winning and holding the respect and confidence of his fellow man. He was a man of great intellect, wisdom, judgment, industry, integrity, sincerity, and courage. Because of these qualities, the people of Idaho elected him to the House of Representatives four times and also to a seat in the U.S. Senate on four occasions.

Of all the qualities I have mentioned in describing our deceased colleague, there is one upon which we must place a premium in our country today, especially for public servants. That quality is courage. Winston Churchill has well said that "courage is rightly esteemed the first of all human qualities, because it is the quality which guarantees all others."

HENRY DWORSHAK demonstrated this priceless quality on many occasions in performing his duties as a Congressman and Senator. He had the courage to oppose the demands of special interest groups, when their demands were not in the public interest or in the best interest of the preservation of freedom—which to me runs parallel to the public interest. He fought to correct the corrupt practices of big union bosses in the interest of the working people, realizing the power of the union bosses to work their will in election contests. He fought to preserve freedom when conformity appeared to be the order of the day. He promoted programs and ideas to help our farmers be more competitive and prosperous, but jealously guarded their freedoms in doing so. He stood up for the Constitution and the rights of the States as against usurpation of power and the centralization of government in Washington. He spoke up against deficit financing and in his voting record he hewed to the line in favoring fiscal sanity and a balanced budget.

HENRY DWORSHAK defended our great free enterprise system against the rising tide of socialism, and he supported bold, firm foreign policy proposals designed to win the cold war which the forces of world communism have forced on us. And, he advocated a program of national defense which would insure a supremacy of military power and full readiness to cope with the aggressive intentions of any enemy power.

I count it a high privilege to have been able to serve in this great body with the distinguished Senator from Idaho, and I join my colleagues in extending my deepest sympathy to the people of Idaho and the members of the Dworshak family in the incalculable loss they have incurred by his passing.

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, the West lost a good friend in the sudden passing last summer of HENRY DWORSHAK. I served with him for 3½ years on the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, and I found him at all times thoroughly dedicated to the development of the West and its natural resources in the way he felt was in the best interests of the people.

We did not always agree what was in the best interests—we had many lively discussions on the merits of various proposals and measure—but I never doubted that Senator DWORSHAK always acted with honest conviction, and with unquestionable integrity. He was industrious, high principled, and eminently fair.

His length of service in the Congress—from 1939, when he first came to the House—on through 8 years there and almost 16 years in the Senate, indicate the high regard in which he was held by the people of Idaho. He won and held their confidence and respect, and his death was a great loss to them.

Mr. MORTON. Mr. President, I join with my colleagues in paying deserved tribute to the late Senator HENRY C. DWORSHAK, of Idaho. It was my privilege to know him for some years before I joined him as a colleague in the Senate. Our friendship developed during our mutual service in this body and his death was a great personal blow to me as well as a loss to the people of his State and the Nation.

There was no more dedicated Member of the U.S. Senate than HENRY DWORSHAK. I know of the long hours that he spent in the hearings and executive sessions of the Appropriations Committee. No one was more tireless in his devotion to duty or more conscientious in the discharge of his responsibilities as a Member of this body.

It was my privilege to visit Idaho with him on several occasions. I traveled throughout the State with him in 1959 and 1960. I know from firsthand the very high place that he had in the hearts of the people of Idaho.

I take this occasion to extend to Mrs. Dworshak and her wonderful family my deepest sympathy. We shall all miss him.

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. Mr. President, no man who worked with and knew Henry Dworshak could have anything but the highest respect and regard for him.

Henry Dworshak came from a rugged part of our country, and he was a rugged individualist. He always lived by the highest principles and he believed strongly in individual and governmental integrity. He was deeply devoted to the conviction that individuals and groups of individuals should make every effort humany possible to solve their own problems rather than to turn to the Federal Government for help and oftentimes what turned out to be expensive assistance.

In his long years of public service in the House and the Senate Henry Dworshak brought to the Halls of the Congress the true spirit of the West. As a newspaperman and as a public servant he believed in hard work, and he proved time and again that honest labor and unwavering conviction are among the best qualities man can possess.

In many respects Senator Dworshak was a quiet man, but when he spoke everyone listened and respected his views. In the legislative body no higher tribute can be paid to a man.

I know that Idaho will miss him, and I know that the Senate and the Nation will miss him and all of the unselfish work he did so willingly and so effectively.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, it is impossible to express adequately the sense of loss which all of his colleagues in the Senate feel on the death of Henry Dworshak.

My acquaintance with Senator Dworshak began in 1945 when I first came to the House of Representatives. From the beginning I was attracted to him particularly as a warm human being, and our friendship was a very close one for all of these years.

Senator Dworshak was a highly respected Member of this body. His colleagues especially knew and admired his diligence and his comprehension of the problems affecting the Nation and, particularly, his own great Northwest. Most of all, they knew and loved him as a man.

Mrs. Case joins me in expressing to Mrs. Dworshak and all the members of their family our deepest and most affectionate sympathy.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I would like to pay tribute to our late colleague, Senator Henry Clarence Dworshak, of Idaho.

When Henry Dworshak came to the Senate in 1947, he brought with him the experience of four terms in the House of Representatives as well as two decades as editor and publisher of the Burley Bulletin in his home State.

He also brought to this body his high ideals and an unparalleled pride in our country.

Senator Dworshak was a rugged individualist, in every good sense of the word. He was respected and admired as much as anyone in the Senate.

We will miss him deeply, as a close friend and a devoted public servant.

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, I am privileged to join in the justly deserved tributes to the late Senator from Idaho, Henry Clarence Dworshak, who served his State and Nation with dedication and distinction.

The Senate has lost an outstanding Member, and it is fitting that we honor his memory in eulogies here where he had so many friends and where his service for many years was so well known to all of us.

All who knew our late colleague valued his friendship and respected his devotion to duty. It was a great pleasure for me to serve with him in the Senate. I deeply regret his passing, and shall miss his presence.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, it is a sad occasion when we rise in this Chamber and undertake to express our feelings upon the passing of one of our colleagues. Words mean little to me, for I find them inadequate to define my feelings.

I believe this more so in speaking of a man like Henry Dworshak. Here was a man of character, a man of honesty, of tolerance, and of patience. He was a rugged son of the West who was a dedicated public servant not only during his illustrious career in the Senate, but also in the years when he served with distinction in the other body.

Henry Dworshak was a great American. He was an American in the old tradition, a man who was solid on the inside. He was a man of great integrity. You would not find Henry Dworshak cutting fancy political capers on the floor of the Senate in an effort to win either publicity or acclaim. He was a man of principle and high ideals.

He was a great Senator and one who made many great contributions to the welfare of his country, both in the active military service of the Nation and in the Halls of Congress. Death laid a heavy hand upon the Senate when he was taken from us. Believing as I do that there are eternal rewards for men of honor and decency who live justly and show tolerance and forbearance, I have no doubts as to where Henry Dworshak will spend eternity.

It is always difficult to fill the void left by a man of great character, and Henry Dworshak had character. He was an easy man to know and love. One could communicate with Henry Dworshak. Perhaps that was because his earliest training was in communications. He entered newspaper work and later became editor and publisher of the Burley, Idaho, Bulletin in his hometown.

His philosophy was grounded on the Constitution and the Bill of Rights, and he recognized the Senate of the United States as the forum of States. No public act of his ever demeaned the Senate or diminished the high purpose of the Founding Fathers that in this Chamber the representatives of proud States were entitled to the fullest of freedom to voice the hopes, the aspirations and the desires of those who sent them here.

He was a champion of sound federalism, with the National Government confined to its proper functions. Henry Dworshak was a practical man. He was not beset by illusions. He was a genial man whose friendship was warm and whose compassion was deep. He was a man of dignity and simplicity, and when he spoke you knew there was something worthwhile to be said.

He was a man of courage and action, and when there was something to be done, he acted promptly and forthrightly. I felt a great sense of personal loss in the passing of Henry Dworshak, and I share the grief of his family in the loss of a loving father and husband. I understand the grief of the people of Idaho who are deprived of his wise counsel and devoted service.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, I join with my colleagues in expressing my sympathies over the sad and untimely death of a good friend, Senator Henry Dworshak.

His loss was not a family sorrow alone for it was felt by his colleagues here in the Senate and the citizens of Idaho.

By training and experience Henry Dworshak was well prepared for the giant task of representing the West that he knew and loved so well.

Mr. President, I extend my deepest sympathies to the family of Senator Dworshak, and I want to express a special regret of the State of Nevada at the loss of a stalwart son of its neighboring State.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, as a freshman Senator, I found myself assigned to the Interior Committee, where our late beloved Senator Henry Dworshak was the ranking Republican member. Senator Dworshak quickly took me under his wing and provided me with the warmhearted, friendly, and helpful guidance which he always offered to new Republican members of the committee. I can say that his kindness meant a great deal in enabling me to adapt myself to my new surroundings.

Henry Dworshak was a great fighter. Sometimes one hears it said that younger men are needed in the Senate to engage in debate and to fight hard over principles. However, that is not entirely true. Among the older members of the Senate, there was none who fought harder for his principles and who really enjoyed a battle on the Senate floor more than did Senator Dworshak. In this, he will continue to be an inspiration to me and to all younger Members who had the privilege of serving with him.

Mrs. Miller joins me in extending our deepest sympathy to Mrs. Dworshak and the rest of the family. We shall remember Henry in our prayers.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, this speech is a most unhappy occasion for me. The people of Idaho and the Nation were saddened on July 23, 1962, by the sudden death of Senator Henry Dworshak.

I had known Senator Dworshak for many years. It is true that although we sat on the opposite sides of the political aisle, and we disagreed on many policies and issues, I always had the greatest respect for his integrity and energy as a legislator on the national scene.

HENRY DWORSHAK was a kind man, a dedicated man. He was the type of man that you could always count on for a helping hand. He had an extraordinary way of dealing with people. He always looked and acted the part of a distinguished Senator. He had a friendly, humble, homey manner; yet he was always dignified, courteous, and always businesslike.

During his lifetime, Senator DWORSHAK was a printer, a sergeant in a machinegun battalion in World War I, a newspaper editor, and a legislator. Before coming to the U.S. Senate, he served four terms in the House of Representatives. After the people of Idaho elevated him to the U.S. Senate he served in this great body for 14 years. During the 22 years that he served in the House and Senate, he remained a devoted public servant. He voted his conscience and his duty, as he saw it, for the American people.

During his tenure of 22 years he was on many important committees and was the sponsor of legislation of national importance. He was a member of the House and later the Senate Appropriations Committees, where he gained a vast knowledge and understanding of all the operations of the Government. His particular interest was in the field of natural resources. He worked closely with those agencies which manage our water, land, mineral, and forest resources. He was ranking minority member of the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee at the time of his death. He always advocated close cooperation between the States and the Federal Government in planning and developing new projects.

To his good wife, and to his four sons, I would like to say that I miss him in the Senate; however, I would like to add, that a grateful Nation shares in their great loss.

Mr. JORDAN of Idaho. Mr. President, I am sure the members of the Dworshak family would desire that at this time I express their appreciation for the thoughtful statements which have been made by the late Senator's colleagues and friends.

TRIBUTES TO THE LATE SENATOR CHAVEZ, OF NEW MEXICO

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I rise today to honor in words a man whose deeds speak far more eloquently of his dedicated service over four decades to his Nation and his State—our late colleague, Senator DENNIS CHAVEZ, a man whom I knew very well. We had associated ourselves in public affairs for some 40 years. We had campaigned together back and forth across New Mexico for 30 years. We had been colleagues in the Senate for 14 years. I can speak of him with authority, with conviction, and with deep respect.

When Senator CHAVEZ died last November 18, former President Harry S. Truman observed that he was "a good public servant, and that's about the highest thing you can say about a man."

Another measure of our colleague's devotion to the public's cause was the way in which thousands of his friends, the humble and the high, paid their final respects to DENNIS CHAVEZ when he was laid to rest in his native soil of New Mexico.

DENNIS CHAVEZ came from a family whose roots lay deep in that soil. His ancestors were Spanish and more than 300 years ago first settled in New Mexico on land granted by Philip II of Spain.

He was born on April 8, 1888, at Los Chavez, not far from Albuquerque, into an impoverished household, the oldest of eight children. He went to work as a youngster to help put bread on the family table. When his formal education had to be laid aside in order to help his family, he began the process of self-education through extensive reading, a process which continued to the very day of his death. It was years later before he was able to obtain a law degree from Georgetown University. DENNIS CHAVEZ was 32 before he was able to hang out his lawyer's shingle in Albuquerque.

In 1920, DENNIS CHAVEZ was elected to the State legislature, where he sponsored a bill to provide free textbooks to schoolchildren, a recognition of his own love for learning. He began his service in Congress in 1931 when he was elected to the House of Representatives. He came to the Senate in 1935 and served here continuously until his death.

Mr. President, in a time when this Nation is increasingly concerned about conditions in Latin America, DENNIS CHAVEZ was one of the best of good neighbors. Perhaps that was due to his Spanish origins; perhaps it was due to the fact that New Mexico shares a common border with the northernmost of the Latin American nations. One of his landmark efforts to more closely link the United States with its hemispheric neighbors is the Pan American Highway. He strongly supported the construction of that road, and diligently sought to have the project completed. Although many difficulties remain along that road, his intentions were of the finest.

When the Ambassador of Mexico presented Senator CHAVEZ with that country's highest medal in 1961, our colleague observed that the award "was the culmination of years of effort to better relations with our vital neighbors to the south."

Mr. President, most of us in this Chamber know of the struggle Senator CHAVEZ had with his health over the last 10 years of his life. A number of years ago a large part of his stomach was removed to arrest cancer. But he remained with us, effectively working for the causes he believed in. Toward the end, he underwent prolonged treatment for cancer of the throat. It became necessary for him to master the technique of speaking through a special tracheal tube. But with persistent courage that was typical of this man, he learned to use it. Although he was confined to the National Institutes of Health, Senator CHAVEZ announced that he would attend the opening of the second session of the last Congress. And attend he did—despite a snowstorm—and we gave him a warm welcome when he appeared on the floor.

It is one of those circumstances of fate that on this day when we pay homage to DENNIS CHAVEZ, he is also to be honored by the Reserve Officers Association of the United States for his service in behalf of the military strength of this country. Had he lived, DENNIS CHAVEZ would have personally received the honor of Minuteman of 1963, but that award, which will be made tonight, regrettably will be posthumous.

As chairman of the Defense Appropriations Subcommittee, Senator CHAVEZ was an untiring advocate and architect in the construction of a stronger free world. The citation which will accompany the award reads in part:

> Few men have shouldered the burden of deciding the preparedness course of this Nation, and have done so with wisdom, dedication, and resultant effectiveness as has Senator CHAVEZ. The degree of our Nation's strength has been subject to his judgments. We are convinced history will demonstrate that to Senator CHAVEZ is due a goodly portion of the security every American shares today.

I only wish that Senator CHAVEZ were still here to hear those words. But I am sure, Mr. President, that he would have accepted them with characteristic modesty, for while he had achieved a degree of eminence in legislative affairs which few men do, he never lost the close touch with the people.

I well recall the evening in Albuquerque when many of DENNIS CHAVEZ' friends gathered to commemorate his 25th anniversary of service in the Senate of the United States. On that occasion it was observed of our colleague:

> He succeeded where other native sons of New Mexico have failed. He stood four-square to every wind that blew. He has faced life with courage and fortitude. He has never lost the common touch. He has never forgotten old friends and loyalties. He has never allowed politics to interfere with the dictates of his conscience. He is an illustrious son of New Mexico.

Mr. President, Senator CHAVEZ was the devoted friend of groups in this country who sometimes found themselves without an articulate spokesman. In a memorable statement of his fundamental faith in democracy he once declared:

> It matters little if the Congress appropriates hundreds of millions of dollars to check the erosion of the soil if we permit the erosion of our civil liberties, free institutions, and the untrammeled pursuit of truth.

DENNIS CHAVEZ, who had delivered groceries in a horse-drawn wagon to help his family, was witness to an amazing transformation of his State and helped to engineer that change. Works to control the ravages of flood, impoundments and canals to bring water to parched lands, military bases vital to the defense of freedom, highways to link rapidly growing centers of population: these are some of the markers DENNIS CHAVEZ left along the route he traveled.

It can be said that the story of DENNIS CHAVEZ is another chapter in the continuing story of America. It is a story worth the telling to the generations that succeed him.

To Mrs. Chavez and the other members of the family of Senator CHAVEZ, Mrs. Anderson and I extend our affection as we today express our reverence for his memory and our appreciation for the life he led and the contributions he made to the welfare of the people of the land he loved.

Mr. President, at the time of the illness of Senator CHAVEZ, the able Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON] took on the great burden of handling the military appropriation bill. I yield the floor to him for his kindness to my colleague.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I appreciate the kindness of the senior Senator from New Mexico in yielding the floor to me at this time.

Senator CHAVEZ rendered to the Senate, to his home State, and the United States long and valuable service; and in his death, I felt a keen personal loss.

He became a Member of the House of Representatives in 1931 and a Senator in 1935. During these three decades the Congress has met many crises—the depression, World War II, Korea, the atomic age. Senator CHAVEZ contributed much to the Nation in all of these years.

Senator CHAVEZ brought to his service in the Senate a culture and courtesy for which aristocratic Spaniards have been known throughout the world, an intimate knowledge of the great Southwest, a zeal for the perpetuity of democratic institutions, and a capacity for friendship which endeared him to his colleagues.

It was a real pleasure for me to serve with him on the Senate Appropriations Committee for nearly 14 years, and especially to have been a member of the very important Subcommittee on Defense, of which in recent years he was the distinguished chairman.

Although the parents and grandparents of Senator CHAVEZ were all Republicans, he became a Democrat by conviction. All his life he was a stanch supporter of the doctrine of States' rights. One of the great-uncles of Senator CHAVEZ was a colonel in the Confederate Army, and a picture of General Lee and his officers occupied a place of honor in Senator CHAVEZ' office. Because of his connections with our region, he had the particular affection of those of us who come from the Southern States.

Senator CHAVEZ was a genuine and friendly man and truly democratic in his personal contacts with everyone. We miss him.

Mr. MECHEM. Mr. President, it is with deep conviction that I rise on behalf of the people of New Mexico and myself to express our respects and pay tribute to Senator DENNIS CHAVEZ.

It is good for us to pause, as we now do, to view with new perspective the recent past, for it is difficult to see a man such as Senator CHAVEZ, while still with us, for what he really was.

He was the very epitome of the "American dream."

Born in a dignified but poor farm family which did not speak the English language, he raised himself by sheer exercise of will to become one of the most influential and able figures in the United States.

What other nation can produce such a self-made man?

What other form of government encourages and rewards such a climb?

Senator CHAVEZ endeared himself to hundreds of thousands of New Mexicans—who felt great affection and trust—simply because he was a symbol of hope, a shining example for his fellow man.

He walked among the mightly, but he never forgot his humble roots, deep in the soil of the sunshine area of this Nation.

He was never too busy with urgent national problems to stop and give a hand to the downtrodden and friendless.

He fought all of his life for individual equality, for the equal opportunity our Constitution promises Americans of every race and creed. He knew—as we all must learn sooner or later—that only eternal and unflagging effort can make this goal come true.

This is why New Mexicans loved DENNIS CHAVEZ and returned him for more than a quarter of a century to a seat in this body.

They knew him as a faithful friend.

They knew him as a man with courage—a tough fighter.

And they knew him as a man with the human touch—a man with an open mind and a warm heart.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, one of the joys of Senator CHAVEZ was his close and continuing friendship with the distinguished senior Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL], the minority whip. I now yield to him.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, the sad news of the passing of the late DENNIS CHAVEZ came to me last November when I was in West Berlin as an American delegate to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization Parliamentary Conference. West Berlin represents man's struggle for freedom. In a very real sense, the life of the late, respected DENNIS CHAVEZ also represented, in all its many facets, a successful struggle for freedom and for equality of opportunity in our own beloved America.

Humble product of our common soil, this gallant Christian man attained a pinnacle of responsibility in the U.S. Senate. It was he who guided through the Senate its enormous and crucial pieces of legislation designed to strengthen our country, its security, and its role of leader in the cause of freemen everywhere.

The Nation has lost the services of a great American. New Mexico has lost a distinguished son who fought the good fight, and did so successfully, for Americans of all races and creeds, and he was sustained in his fight by the proud and noble blood of Spain. His family had lost a loving and devoted husband and father; and we who were honored to know him and work with him have lost a beloved friend.

Like my colleagues in the Senate, I cherish the memory of DENNIS CHAVEZ, lawyer and statesman, great leader, loyal and devoted, possessed of an unbounded courage which carried him through all manner of crises and pain, and which sustained him to the very end.

I served under DENNIS CHAVEZ on the Senate Committee on Public Works. If I may say so, I came to know him intimately. I remember the great public works projects which came from his committee, on their way to the White House, to become law. They were fashioned under his leadership. The good of the country was his guide. I remember all the compassion and all the sympathy which he brought, side by side, with his legislative responsibilities and power. Rich or poor, great or small, all stood equal before him and his committee. Equal treatment under law for all our people, the high American gift of liberty, and our resolute duty to maintain it, formed the basis of his official life. And as simply a human being, with his family and with his legion of friends, sweetness, generosity, and a sense of unselfish devotion and of faith ever guided him. I know, Mr. President, for a year ago, with pride, I took with me to my State of California his faith, freely and publicly given in a fashion which may well be unique in the political history of our Republic.

I treasure fond recollections of the years I spent with him here in the Senate.

With my wife, I send once again to the Chavez family, son and daughters, and particularly to his dear widow, our neverending condolences. DENNIS CHAVEZ will live in our memory, as he will live eternally in the minds of his family and in the minds of all his many, many friends in the Senate, in his native State, and across the great breadth of America.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, many times I have heard our late colleague, Senator CHAVEZ, speak of his affection and genuine friendship for the senior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] and I now yield to him.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, the Senate has been most unfortunate to lose the services of Senator DENNIS CHAVEZ of New Mexico. I served beside him for many, many years on the Senate Committee on Appropriations. I knew him to be a public servant who was devoted to serving the people of his State and the country as a whole.

Senator CHAVEZ was one of the first men of Spanish extraction to come to Washington in the service of his country. He was beloved by his constituents, as can easily be seen by his long term of service in the Senate.

Senator CHAVEZ had a most difficult assignment on the Appropriations Committee of the Senate, serving as chairman of the Subcommittee on Armed Services. Well over 50 percent of all funds appropriated each year by the Congress during the last 10 years were handled by him.

Mr. President, let me add that as chairman of the Senate Committee on Public Works, he did noble work in authorizing the funds for important projects in order to assist in protecting and preserving our water and land resources. I served as chairman of the Public Works Subcommittee of the Senate Appropriations Committee, whereas his committee authorized the projects; and it was my business to see to it that the funds necessary in order to make them effective were appropriated. Therefore, we were very close, and on many occasions discussed many of these projects. I know the Senate has lost a great leader in that respect.

I was truly saddened when I was informed of his death while I was traveling in the jungles of Africa, last year. I regret his passing; and I extend my deep sympathy to his wife and family.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I want to join my colleagues in a brief tribute to our late colleague, DENNIS CHAVEZ of New Mexico.

Before I came to Congress, I became familiar with his name. I came to know him personally when I entered Congress. He had moved from the House of Representatives to the Senate.

Shortly after coming to the Senate, I was named to the Committee on Public Works and had the privilege of serving under the chairmanship of Senator CHAVEZ. He was a wonderful chairman whom all members of the committee, Democrats and Republicans alike, respected. All the members enjoyed working on the committee under his guidance. It was also my privilege to serve under the chairmanship of Senator CHAVEZ on the Senate Office Building Commission.

I have had the pleasure of campaigning across the State of New Mexico with DENNIS CHAVEZ. I greatly enjoyed the experience of riding with him and having him point out the historic home site of his family through many generations. Many historic sites were pointed out as we went from place to place, and many interesting stories of his own campaign experiences were related.

DENNIS CHAVEZ was a serious and hardworking public servant. He was dedicated to his work, devoted to his family, and intensely loyal to his country. I am glad to have enjoyed his friendship.

Mrs. Sparkman and I extend our sympathy to Mrs. Chavez and the other members of the family.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I do not know what I can add to the eloquent tributes that have already been paid to our late departed colleague, DENNIS N. CHAVEZ. But I wish to express the sadness I feel at his passing.

Senator CHAVEZ and I served and worked together on the Appropriations Committee of the Senate. I also served with him for a period of time, during my early days in the Senate, on the Public Works Committee. It was a rewarding experience to serve on a committee with him. He exercised caution and care, and approached his duties with sincere dedication to the welfare of the people of the United States and of the people of the State of New Mexico, whom he loved.

We in the Senate will long remember the years of service he rendered to the Nation as chairman of the Public Works Committee. Throughout this great country, projects initiated by the Public Works Committee under his leadership stand as monuments to his achievements and to the contributions he made to the welfare and progress of our Nation. Many such projects in Arkansas will serve to remind the people of my State of his important contributions to its growth and development.

He was a man of sympathy and understanding, and he was a man of courage, who continued over a period of years to discharge his duties here with distinction while enduring much pain and suffering. Many weaker men would have given up the effort and quit in such circumstances of disadvantage. But not Senator CHAVEZ. He fought on unwaveringly with a manifestation of fortitude, strength, and devotion to duty seldom matched and unexcelled, and which we might all do well to emulate.

Mrs. McClellan and I both express our deepest grief and heartfelt sympathy to Mrs. Chavez and the family.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the Senate was deeply saddened by the death of Senator DENNIS CHAVEZ. This quiet and kindly man served in this body for nearly 30 years with distinction to himself, to his beloved State of New Mexico, and to our country. During those years, he made a great many friends and set an example for unassuming and unpretentious public service.

I pay homage to our late colleague, whose ancestors came to this country, not decades, but centuries ago. He was truly, and in the best sense a descendent of the real first families of our country.

Senator CHAVEZ was close to his people. He was close because he remained one of them even as he rose to high office. He knew their problems. When only 13 years old, he had to leave school to contribute to the support of his seven brothers and sisters. He later worked as a newsboy and delivery boy. But he continued to study at night and later passed a special college entrance examination. With personal determination and the encouragement of his wife, he went on to earn a law degree and begin his career in politics.

Because of his Spanish-American background, Senator CHAVEZ was intimately aware of the problems facing minorities in this country. His history of public service was one of constant support of his people and other minority groups. In fact, he first gained national prominence because of his leadership in support of a permanent Fair Trades Employment Commission to combat job discrimination.

Another area of special interest was that of national defense. As chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee on Defense Funds, he championed a strong military posture during the critical early years of the cold war. Both in this position, and as chairman of the important Public Works Committee, Senator CHAVEZ left his mark on the Nation.

Yet valuable as his contributions were in these fields, his ultimate reputation will rest on his unflagging fight for human freedom and human decency. His finest hour came on this floor when he protested in simple, yet eloquent, terms against an atmosphere which he termed would have "quietly shackled the growth of men's minds." Prefacing this remark, he said:

> I should like to be remembered as the man who raised a voice * * * at a time in the history of this body when we seem bent upon placing limitations on the freedom of the individual.

I am sure that Senator DENNIS CHAVEZ would have been proud to know that a grateful Nation and constituency have accorded him this honor after death.

Mr. President, in spite of the late date of these remarks, I want to express again to Mrs. Chavez and her family, and to the people of New Mexico, the profound sympathies of Mrs. Mansfield and myself.

May his soul rest in peace.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, many Senators are admired. The late Senator CHAVEZ was not only admired, but also actually loved. I was among those who appreciated and loved him.

For almost the entire time I have been in the Senate I had the privilege of serving on a committee with him. First, I served with him on the Committee on Public Works, of which he was chairman. Later I served on the Appropriations Committee, at a time when he was chairman of the Subcommittee on Defense Appropriations.

In the brief time available to me I wish to speak of him primarily as an individual, and to laud him for his human qualities.

I think first of his unfailing kindness. He was a man of great human appreciation. He was truly a great humanitarian. Simple in his manners, sincere in his friendliness, he did not wear those qualities on some days and leave them at home on others. He had them with him at all times.

As has already been said, his name as a legislator, will forever be linked with major forward-looking and constructive legislation having to do with many subjects. I mention only a few. First, the public works program of our Nation has felt the impact of his great strength. He worked on it year in and year out. Second, our defenses and the national security of our Nation have been greatly strengthened by his attention and his unfailing effort.

Mr. President, Senator CHAVEZ sat almost within reach of me for the past 15 years. I know that he was a man of great courage, both political and physical.

He was also a man of great gratitude. Many years ago I had an older brother who lived in New Mexico. In their early days my brother and Senator CHAVEZ were friends. When I came to the Senate, Senator CHAVEZ put his arm around me and said, "Welcome." And he really meant it. For years he went out of his way in efforts to help me or to befriend me. He encouraged me as well as others in our committee work, where he gave unfailing attention to matters that might concern me. It is one of the happy thoughts of my life that I really tried to reciprocate.

I was with Senator CHAVEZ for a week in his home State during one of his campaigns. I spoke with him in the daytime and at night. I then had an opportunity to see the real warmth of heart, the gratitude and the love exhibited there for his own people, with whom he had lived, for whom he had worked so long, and to whom he felt so dedicated. That feeling of interest, appreciation, and friendship was fortunately reciprocated by those people a thousandfold.

I wish to extend to Mrs. Chavez, who is a great friend of humanity, my feeling of utmost appreciation for her in her own character and personality. She has been a favorite of Mrs. Stennis and myself for many years.

Mrs. Stennis joins with me in this short but strongly felt tribute to a man who had a great record and a great soul. I bow with the rest of my colleagues in appreciation of his great life and work. We miss him, but we continue to love him.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I wish to speak briefly about our late colleague Senator CHAVEZ, this fine man, this gentleman, this good friend whom we lost a few months ago. I speak not so much of the great work which he did—though I watched him with admiration as he did it—but more of his personal qualities.

As one who sat next to him in the Committee on Public Works for a long time, I saw his great interest and effective action in the development of our country in all those fields in which public works mean so much in developing our great Nation. He served our country loyally in that capacity. He served it greatly in the husbanding of the defense of our Nation. But it is of his personal qualities that I must speak.

First, I speak with reference to his intense interest in Latin America. Along with him, and after him, I had some small interest in the Inter-American Highway and in those nations which, as he believed intensely, that highway would enable to develop to much greater heights of independence, of security for their people, and of advanced living standards. We talked of that field many times. His compassion toward those weaker Latin American neighbors I shall always remember.

When I made several visits to that area, I found that he was beloved in that area as few Americans probably ever have been beloved there. It is my feeling that somehow and in some way, when the highway is completed—as it will shortly be—we should find an opportunity, in conjunction with our friendly neighbors who are so greatly affected by that highway, to memorialize Senator CHAVEZ' great interest and effective participation in moving ahead with that development.

The second thing I wish to speak about is his friendship, his comradely qualities, on trips when we were together. I remember one trip we took to the Columbia Basin and to Alaska. I believe his distinguished colleague [Mr. ANDERSON] was there with another committee at the same time, and we happened to see each other briefly. I recall that the distinguished Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS], who has just spoken, was a member of Senator CHAVEZ' committee, and went with us on the trip I mentioned.

Not only was he intensely interested in all public works going on there—and that was at a time when Alaska was a territory, and there was perhaps even more interest then than now in providing the public works required to gain greater stature—but also he knew the background of each project, wherever we went, in a way which was amazing to me. I found the people there very grateful for his continuing interest in their development.

Again it is about a personal thing I wish to speak. When we were ready to come home—we were living at the officers club on Elmendorf Air Force Base—he told me he had to find a way to bring some flowers to Mrs. Chavez. He left us that morning and later showed up at the plane with a great paper package of the flowers of Alaska, much bigger than similar flowers in this more southern latitude. He brought sweet peas and pansies. We kidded him all the way home, and it took 18 hours on the plane, for we came by way of Rapid City. He made sure that those flowers stayed moist and were in as nearly perfect condition as possible when he delivered them to his good wife, whom he loved so dearly.

I think I shall always remember him best for that indication of the deep affection and undying love which he felt for his wife and family.

Mrs. Holland and I will always grieve because of his passing; and we want his widow and children and the other members of his family to know that they have our deep and affectionate sympathy.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, the late Senator CHAVEZ had many, many friends in Tennessee, and I am proud that I could count myself among them.

When DENNIS first came to Washington, he worked as a clerk in the same Senate office as one of my fellow Tennesseans, Pride Tomlinson, who later became a justice of the Tennessee Supreme Court. We talked very frequently of his relationships with Justice Tomlinson and many mutual friends in Tennessee.

Senator CHAVEZ was also admired by many in my State because of his concern with resource development in the Tennessee Valley. As chairman of the Public Works Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations, he conducted many hearings on the annual budget for the Tennessee Valley Authority. He was always fair and just.

It was a great privilege for me to serve with him on the Appropriations Committee. He was never too busy to talk with any younger Member of the Senate or the House about any problem, and always was willing to help them if he possibly could.

In the passing of Senator CHAVEZ, the Nation has lost a genuine humanitarian, a very effective Member of Congress, and a great statesman. We have all lost a wonderful friend.

Mrs. Kefauver and I extend our deepest sympathies to Mrs. Chavez and to all members of his family.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I had the opportunity to serve under the late Senator CHAVEZ on the Committee on Public Works for a number of years, and I admired and respected him.

I do not think it is necessary for me to dwell upon his work as a member of and chairman of that committee, or upon the service he rendered our country as chairman of the Subcommittee on Defense Appropriations. Yet the country should know that his work as chairman of the Subcommittee on Defense Appropriations contributed greatly to the defense and security of our Nation.

As a member of the Committee on Public Works, I know that his leadership had much to do with the development of our Interstate Highway System, and the growth of the Federal-State system. As the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] has truly said, it was his initiative and his persistent support which has made possible the Inter-American Highway.

There were many things which made all of us respect and love DENNIS CHAVEZ. It always seemed to me that among his many unusual qualities three were joined—his dignity, his simplicity, and his courage.

Early in my service in the Senate I had occasion to visit his home city of Albuquerque, N. Mex., in 1947. There I found him exactly the same in his own city, among his own people, as we knew him in the Senate. He was loved and respected by the people of his State, by those who had known him throughout the years.

His dignity and simplicity were always evident in the Senate. His dignity led him to express his pride in his ancestry—the fact that his family was among the first of those who lived as the new Americans upon this continent. Yet always he spoke the greater pride that he was an American and a citizen of the United States.

We also admired his dignity and his courage in those latter days when all of us knew of his illness. Again and again he came to the Senate and to the committees, and until the very last he was engaged in the work of the Senate.

He had great dignity, great simplicity, and great courage. We have noted these same characteristics, in the members of his family, in Mrs. Chavez and his children. I shall always remember DENNIS CHAVEZ as a friend, and for his qualities of courage and dignity.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, DENNIS CHAVEZ, one of the three great Senators who have recently passed to their reward, and who today we eulogize, was a stalwart defender of the highest traditions of this great body. Significantly, he, as did the others, had a humble beginning. He plodded industriously to scale the ladder of success, and if there is any validity to the term "a self-made man," the appellation would fit him whose memory we honor today.

DENNIS CHAVEZ was truly a man of the people. His unswerving devotion to the cause of his constituents was a testimony to his depth of feeling and understanding. He was a fierce fighter for the underdog, and his more than a quarter of a century in the U.S. Senate is studded with instances where he did battle for those he felt needed his voice, his courage, and his implacable dedication to justice.

The people of New Mexico loved DENNIS CHAVEZ. DENNIS CHAVEZ loved the people whom he served. The Senate has benefited immeasurably from the presence in this Chamber of Senator DENNIS

Chavez. He has left the mortal scene; yet he has left an imprint on this body which will not be eroded with the passage of time.

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, all the Nation does, and should, feel the loss of the late distinguished senior Senator from New Mexico, Dennis Chavez. My acquaintance with this man began long ago, when I first came to the Senate. Dennis Chavez befriended me when we served together on the Post Office and Civil Service Committee, and we remained close throughout the years. Working with him in committee and in the Senate afforded me an opportunity to know him well, and witness firsthand his distinguished service to his State and Nation, his unfailing courteousness and kindness to every person he met.

His great mark was the quiet, easygoing manner in which he went about his work in the Senate. Never loud or boisterous in his endeavors, he won support for himself and his causes through the power of sincerity of purpose and friendship.

As chairman of the Senate Public Works Committee, Dennis Chavez was endlessly helpful in passing authorizations for projects vital to South Carolina's development. There is hardly a county in my State that has not benefited from legislation he fostered as chairman of the Public Works Committee.

Extremely dedicated to public service, even his painful illness did not stop him from attending to his business in the Senate. He was loyal and sincere, and lived and died a friend of the people.

At all times he was trying to do something that would make life easier for the people of this Nation. Long will he be remembered and loved by all who were fortunate enough to have known and worked with him.

Mrs. Johnston and I feel the loss of Dennis Chavez, and we sympathize with Mrs. Chavez and his family in the loss of this great family man, for he was, in the true sense of the word, very close to his family and thought of them on every occasion. For that reason we all must admire him.

At this time our sympathy is extended to Mrs. Chavez in the loss of her fine husband.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, while the Senate was in adjournment, death came to one of our most beloved and honored colleagues, a man whose memory will shine brightly and enduringly in the minds of Americans everywhere. I know of no Senator who was held in greater affection than Dennis Chavez.

Indeed, Mr. President, I am sure that each of us feels keenly and in a deep personal sense the absence of our late colleague, Senator Dennis Chavez, of New Mexico. It can truly be said of him that he lived with an abiding faith in the democratic process which he zealously guarded. By doing so, he provided a ringing affirmation of our way of life in this age of challenge. He said in 1960, in answer to critics when a subcommittee of which he was chairman recommended the appropriation of $1 billion more for defense than President Eisenhower had requested, "There can be no price tag on freedom."

A sense of dedication to his office and the people he represented illuminated his nearly 28 years of fruitful service in the U.S. Senate and his almost 4 years of service in the U.S. House of Representatives.

To us who knew him well Dennis Chavez was a generous, warm, and understanding, gentle man. Above all, he was a fighter for the causes in which he believed. Possibly because of his own Spanish heritage, and certainly because he knew the needs of our neighbors to the south, he was one of the earliest supporters of President Franklin D. Roosevelt's good neighbor policy. More recently he was one of the great champions of President Kennedy's Alliance for Progress.

Senator Dennis Chavez in many respects was a very predictable man. He was always with the underdog. He was for the little fellows whether they were struggling farmers fighting debts, drought, and low farm prices; underprivileged and forgotten American Indians; or workingmen seeking to better their lot and provide a more secure future for their children. At all times he was the champion of the poor and the humble, a fervent advocate of our Nation's defense, a protector of our national resources, and a voice for the oppressed.

Though a most lovable and friendly man, he was a resolute and unyielding battler from his early manhood to the time of his death for the principles and causes in which he believed. He served his country well.

He exemplified the spirit of individual courage and conviction, which, unfortunately, is more and more becoming absent in American life. As he took his position in the front line of combat for his cause, he never looked behind to count the supporting troops. He cared not if there were many or there were none, but moved forward in the just belief of the rightness of his cause.

About 30 years ago I first served with him in the House of Representatives. I was Representative at large from Ohio, and he was then a very well-known Representative from New Mexico. I became acquainted with him at that time.

Upon being elected to the Senate in 1958, I requested that I be appointed to serve on the Committee on Public Works, of which he was chairman. I knew within a few weeks, when we began holding hearings, that Dennis Chavez was a great chairman of that vital committee. I considered myself fortunate in serving with him and in being associated with him. No one served under him; we served in association with him.

He was good to me, and I followed the advice that he gave me. I was glad as a member of that committee to follow the leadership of Dennis Chavez. It will always be a happy personal recollection of mine that some time later I was permitted to accompany him on a study mission of all the Central American countries. It was a thrilling experience to see the affection and love with which the leaders of these proud Latin American countries greeted him, particularly for the part he played in their receiving the great public works projects and public roads that were built in part through the generosity of the people of the United States. I hope that some appropriate plaques will be placed there by the governing officials of Nicaragua, Guatemala, and the other Central American countries.

Our Nation will miss Senator Dennis Chavez. He was my close personal friend. I feel a deep personal loss at his passing. He was, as I said, a great, good man, and he will be remembered by all of us who served with him or knew him.

Quite frequently, even now, from my seat in the Chamber I look over to the desk that he occupied. I still expect to see him sitting there. I feel a twinge of sadness because he is no longer with us.

To his lovely wife, Ymelda, to his two beautiful and extremely talented daughters, Mrs. George Dixon and Mrs. Jorge Tristani, and to his son, Dennis Chavez, Jr., we express our deepest sympathy. Senator Dennis Chavez was one of the noblest men ever to be sent from the great West to serve his country in the House of Representatives and in the Senate of the United States.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, Senator Dennis Chavez was my trusted personal friend. He aided me in my efforts to come to the Senate. I shall miss him and I do miss him. He is a friend of the State of Texas. He was a friend to the people. He was regarded as "their Senator" by the nearly 1½ million Spanish-speaking people of Texas. He was called El Paso's third Senator. As chairman of the Public Works Committee and third ranking Senator on the Appropriations Committee, he proved that he was a friend to all the navigation and reclamation progress of Texas. But in a wider field, Senator Chavez was a broadminded friend of all Americans, of all people. He was a Senator, not for New Mexico alone, but for all Americans.

The Albuquerque Journal, on November 19, 1962, stated about Senator Chavez:

> But overall, Senator Chavez will be remembered as the true friend and defender of the poor man. He never wavered in his long senatorial career of more than 27 years in battling for legislation that benefited the people who needed help.
>
> Senator Chavez knew well what was poverty. He was born in poverty, but of rugged, honest, and humble stock. His strong and persevering character was molded early in life when he strove valiantly for an education. He won that uphill contest as since he has won other battles, politics or otherwise, in which he became engaged.
>
> He was tenacious and never compromising in fighting for what he thought was right. As any man in public office, he had his political foes. But never did such political differences prod the Senator into other than ethical conduct.
>
> As the Senator's career extended into the years his seniority enabled him to wield great influence on powerful committees which went far toward giving New Mexico its rightful share of appropriations covering many types of governmental projects, including military and defense installations.

In the field of racial and cultural relations the Senator was always a dominant and effective figure on the side of tolerance.

The Senator's long and heroic fight for life, while enduring great suffering after he had been stricken with cancer, followed the pattern of his whole career in never yielding without a fight to the finish.

We could sum up Senator Chavez' outstanding characteristics with this: He had the human touch.

The Senator's passing is a distinct and distressing loss to his family, and the State and his country.

Our sincere condolences to the Chavez family in their time of great sorrow.

Mr. President, this editorial, a sincere and stirring tribute to a great man, expresses my view. May the memory of this great life console the loving family he leaves behind.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record at this point an article from the Albuquerque Journal entitled "A Fighter, Senator Dennis Chavez Battled to Top Post," describing something of the life of this distinguished leader.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

A Fighter, Senator Dennis Chavez Battled to Top Post

(By Wayne S. Scott)

He was a fighter, the lad who was born 74 years ago in a poor adobe home in Los Chavez and was baptized Dennis Chavez. He fought his way out of the poverty of his early days, battled his way to one of the most powerful posts in the U.S. Senate, kept on fighting to better the conditions of those who had not been able to work their own way above poverty.

He was uncompromising in his beliefs—even to the point of giving up a needed job rather than deliver groceries to strikebreakers. He early broke from his father's political party because he didn't think it had the interests of the common man at heart—but was not adverse in later years to withholding support from the nominee of his own party. He was beloved by thousands of his fellow New Mexicans—and hated by almost as many.

His political fights were savage—but he won most of them. He twice fought, and licked, that dreaded ailment, cancer. Death was due at last to a heart attack.

Chavez served 27 years in the Senate, becoming one of its most colorful and powerful figures. He was fourth in seniority in the entire Chamber, and held the powerful chairmanships of the Committee on Public Works and the Subcommittee on Defense Appropriations.

He will be remembered chiefly for his Senate service. But before that he was a U.S. Representative and served in the State legislature. He was an attorney, had been an engineer, newspaper editor, deputy game warden, and grocery store employee.

Senator Chavez was born April 8, 1888, in a small adobe house in the village of Los Chavez, north of Belen in Valencia County. The land on which the house stood had been granted to his direct ancestors by King Phillip II of Spain in 1597. His parents, David Chavez and Paz Sanchez de Chavez, were members of families which had lived in the community for generations.

His boyhood was typical of that of a rural New Mexico boy of that time. The family spoke only Spanish. Young Dennis worked long hours in the fields, tending the crops that were to furnish the family's food and watching the cattle and sheep on the pastures.

In 1895, the family moved to Barelas—that part of present-day Albuquerque just east of the Barelas Bridge.

The move was made to give the children better educational opportunities. Young Dennis attended a Presbyterian mission school which then stood at Second and Trumbull SW. He later attended the old third-ward school.

But the family's finances, which had never been good, became even worse. Young Chavez was forced to quit school when in the seventh grade, to aid his father in supporting the family. There were eight children.

His first job was as a delivery boy for Charles Conroy, at the Highland Grocery Store. Work hours were 6 a.m. to 7 p.m. daily—11 p.m. on Saturdays.

During this time Chavez pursued his education by the aid of books from the public library.

His grocery career ended abruptly when he was 18. He was instructed by his employer to deliver groceries to a group of strike breakers. He refused. He was promptly fired.

It was about this time he made his decision to join the Democratic Party. His father had been a Republican, a peace justice and GOP precinct chairman at Los Chavez before moving to Albuquerque. He was Republican chairman of precinct 5 after moving here.

The Senator used to recall he "had many a hot word with my father" over politics. The younger Chavez hated the so-called patron system—which set up landowners as virtually omnipotent people in their communities. They owned the land and houses and—in effect—the people themselves. Most were Republicans.

A DEMOCRAT

So when the younger Chavez turned to politics himself, in 1916, he entered through the Democratic Party.

Meanwhile, about the time he was fired from his grocery job, Chavez made the acquaintance of Jim Gladding, a young engineer who had just moved to Albuquerque. Under Gladding's guidance, he studied engineering at night and qualified as a surveyor. When Gladding became city engineer of Albuquerque, in 1906, Chavez became his assistant. As such, he aided in designing and supervising construction of the old part of the present city hall and 33 miles of sewage system. He later worked for the territorial engineer, Jim French, and built the first highway in Rio Arriba County, between Espanola and Abiquiu.

In 1911 he married Imelda Espinosa, a member of another longtime and prominent New Mexico family.

For the next few years, Chavez worked at a variety of occupations. He edited a Belen newspaper—until he wrote an editorial which did not match the owner's views. He was fired again. He then worked for the territorial engineer, operated a construction firm in Albuquerque in partnership with the late Rafael Garcia, became an assistant State game warden in 1917.

In 1916 he had his first political fight—and lost. He became Democratic nominee for Bernalillo County clerk and attempted to unseat the incumbent, Don Nestor Montoya. The latter, an experienced orator and public official, president of the New Mexico Press Association, and member of the then-dominant Republican Party, won easily.

In 1917 came a big chance for young Chavez to continue upward. The late Senator A. A. Jones, Democrat, offered him the post of assistant clerk of the U.S. Senate. He jumped at the chance—mainly because he could continue his education in night school. In 1920 he graduated from the law school of Georgetown University and returned to Albuquerque to practice law. Two years later he was joined in that practice by his brother, David Chavez, Jr., now a justice of the State supreme court. He was elected to the State legislature in 1920, where he sponsored a bill to provide free textbooks for schoolchildren.

In 1930 he won election to the U.S. House of Representatives, defeating the incumbent, Albert G. Simms, Republican. During his first term in the House he unsuccessfully fought for a public works bill, but successfully sponsored a bill granting a moratorium on construction assessments of reclamation districts. During his second term, he successfully sponsored a measure which allowed longtime settlers on lands to which Indians had title to keep the lands, with the Indians receiving payment.

HEADED THE PARTY

Chavez became Democratic national committeeman for New Mexico in 1933.

The next year, he opposed the incumbent, Republican Bronson Cutting, for the U.S. Senate. Cutting was declared the winner. Chavez filed a contest with the Senate. This was pending when Cutting was killed in an airplane crash. The late Clyde Tingley, then Governor, appointed Chavez to the vacancy. He was elected in 1936—defeating the powerful Miguel A. Otero, Jr., of Santa Fe, Republican. He was reelected in 1940, 1946, 1952 and 1958. Every election was a tough fight.

In 1940, he was opposed for the Democratic nomination by the late John J. Dempsey, former Congressman and former Governor. Chavez won by about 3,000 votes. But recounts demanded by Dempsey went on for weeks, without changing the results. The 1946 primary was a repeat. Chavez defeated Dempsey by about 10,000 votes in this contest—but was opposed by Republican Patrick J. Hurley in the general election. Hurley tried again in 1952 to wrest the Senate seat from Chavez, and when the incumbent was declared the winner, filed a contest of the election with the Senate itself. This dragged on until March 1954, when the Senate confirmed Chavez winner.

PLANNED NEW CAMPAIGN

His renomination and reelection in 1958 was relatively easy. He had announced, about a year ago, he would seek reelection in 1964. He repeated this intention in an interview during his last visit to Albuquerque, shortly before the general election.

The Senator always kept a close watch on the political pulse of New Mexico—and frequently tried to influence the course of its elections. He had frequent "breaks" with leaders of his own party.

In 1942, Chavez backed his friend, Bryan G. Johnson, in the latter's unsuccessful attempt for the Democratic nomination for Governor. Dempsey won the nomination. Clyde Tingley—who had appointed Chavez to the Senate originally—was among those who fought Johnson in this primary.

He carried on open feuds with John E. Miles and Thomas J. Mabry, during their terms as Governors. When Miles was defeated, in 1950, for a return to the Governor's office, there were many rumors Chavez had given support to the winner, Republican Edwin L. Mechem.

DOUBTS REMOVED

There is no doubt as to the Senator's role in the defeats of Gov. John F. Simms in 1956 and Gov. John Burroughs in 1958, by Mechem. Dennis Chavez, Jr., son of the Senator, in a recent campaign talk in New Mexico said his father had withheld support from Simms and Burroughs in their bids for reelection because he had not liked their administrations.

In 1948, Chavez had his first serious bout with disease. He became quite ill with cancer of the stomach and had about two-thirds of his stomach removed in an operation at St. Joseph's Hospital.

He suffered cancer of the throat about 2 years ago He came to Albuquerque for treatment, had an operation and in Washington took cobalt treatments. Between hospital stays, he continued to actively work in the Senate and on its committees. His death was attributed to a heart attack.

CHAVEZ received many honors during his long career. Among them, and its bestowal was ranked by the Senator as one of the top events of his life, was the Order of the Aztec Eagle, First Class, the top award of Mexico. It was presented by Mexican Ambassador Antonio Carrillo Flores in September, 1961.

TOPPED EFFORTS

"For me it was the culmination of years of effort to better relations with our vital neighbors to the south," CHAVEZ himself said.

Toward the end of his life, he looked backward in a series of articles for the Journal. He made this comment:

"It was the early years, the hard years of growing up in a poor country, that made the difference. They were years rich in human warmth. They taught me a knowledge of New Mexico, her people and problems, that has enabled me to serve effectively through more than 30 years in high office.

"I like to think I've repaid New Mexico in some small measure for the favors she did me as a child."

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, the tributes paid to the late Senator DENNIS CHAVEZ today are appropriate and well deserved. I have never known a senior Senator of this body to be more generous and more helpful to a very junior Member than Senator CHAVEZ was with me as a new Member of this body. Senator CHAVEZ, then chairman of the Public Works Committee, made me chairman of the Public Roads Subcommittee. It would have been easy for him to exercise the power of chairman, to take the leadership in the enactment of the superhighway program. Instead, he referred it to the subcommittee.

As chairman of the full committee, he accorded to me the full support and the full confidence of which he was capable—and this was powerful. This program ultimately came to enactment and is now the largest public works program in the history of the world.

Not only did Senator CHAVEZ demonstrate generosity and comradeship to me, but this was the pattern of his conduct toward all members of the Committee on Public Works. A man possessed of great ability, enormous capacity for loyalty, and devotion to friendship, DENNIS CHAVEZ also possessed an unusual degree of moral, political, and physical courage. Many of his colleagues recall his appearance on the floor of the Senate after many months of suffering and travail, rigors which might have discouraged men of lesser faith and courage. He rose in the Senate and spoke representing the people of New Mexico. I thrilled at this demonstration, a demonstration of indomitable spirit.

DENNIS CHAVEZ loved life, and he loved it to its fullest. He loved his friends and his family, and they in turn loved him in full measure.

To his wife, who was ever constant and ever loving, and to his children, I extend sympathy and condolence, but also I extend to them congratulations for having been the wife and the children of a great husband and father.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, when Senator CHAVEZ died last November, the State of New Mexico lost a devoted servant, and the Nation lost a steadfast defender of human rights.

DENNIS CHAVEZ was born to poverty in New Mexico. He was truly and in every sense of the word a self-made man. He made himself what he was—a great, strong American. He was the first American of Spanish origin to serve in the Congress of the United States. He served 2 years in the House of Representatives and 27 years, until his death, in the U.S. Senate.

He was loved by Spanish-speaking people all over the world, especially in this country, and particularly in California, where there are 1,750,000 Spanish-Americans who live in Los Angeles and in other areas of the State.

He was an authentic hero to the Mexican people, in every sense of the word. He gave them hope, he gave them encouragement, and he gave them dedication. For more than three decades, Senator CHAVEZ dedicated himself to the needs of the underprivileged and those who are discriminated against.

He was a quiet, soft-spoken man; but when our civil liberties were threatened, he could speak with great eloquence and vigor. Senator CHAVEZ will long be remembered for a statement he made on the floor of the Senate in 1950. It has been alluded to before. It appears in the tribute to Senator CHAVEZ in the House, some weeks ago. Our distinguished majority leader [Mr. MANSFIELD] referred to that statement. He did not read all of it. I should like to read into the RECORD the entire statement of Senator CHAVEZ:

> I should like to be remembered as the man who raised a voice—and I devoutly hope not a voice in the wilderness—at a time in the history of this body when we seem bent upon placing limitations on the freedom of the individual. I would consider all the legislation which I have supported meaningless if I were to sit idly by, silent, during a period which may go down in history as an era when we permitted the curtailment of our liberties, a period when we quietly shackled the growth of men's minds.

That is one of the greatest and most eloquent statements ever made on the floor of the U.S. Senate.

Some time ago the late beloved Robert Frost said that he thought the people should be more patriotic than partisan. Senator CHAVEZ was a good example of this philosophy. As chairman of the Committee on Public Works and of the Subcommittee on Defense Appropriations, he held a position of great influence and power in the Senate. However, he did not use that advantage for selfish political or sectional purposes. His country always came first.

DENNIS CHAVEZ served his State and his Nation with distinction. His colleagues will never cease to miss him on the floor of the Senate. The people of New Mexico will never forget him. As a personal friend, I will never forget him.

I am proud today to join with Senators who are paying tribute to a man whom we loved and respected, the tribute to the service he rendered to his country.

Lou and I extend our deepest and most heartfelt sympathy to the wonderful members of his family, who are in the gallery today, most especially to the wonderful lady, Mrs. Chavez, who stood by him all the years of his life and during his public service.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, we who knew Senator DENNIS CHAVEZ in his late years as a Member of the Senate knew him primarily as a man dedicated to the Senate and particularly to the work of the committees on which he served. We knew him as one who was ever ready to help the other Members of the Senate, especially those of us who were new in this body.

At the time of his death, it was noted by commentators that few Members of Congress were more closely identified with the States which they represent than was Senator CHAVEZ, of New Mexico. Born at Los Chavez, Valencia County, N. Mex., he was of Spanish ancestry and became a spokesman in Washington not only for his State but also for Spanish-speaking Americans in the United States, in Puerto Rico, and in the countries of Latin America.

As a Senator, he was a quiet and efficient workman, and served long and skillfully as a legislative and political technician. He was more than a technician.

It is my opinion that Senator CHAVEZ will be best and longest remembered, at least in public life, for two public positions which he took during the course of his long Senate career. One of these in political terms might be described as a popular one, in the sense that it might be charged that it might have gained him votes. The other position was, at the time, a most unpopular one, with respect to public attitudes of the time.

Senator CHAVEZ was the first sponsor of fair employment practices legislation during World War II. This was the popular position.

He was among the first to issue a clear warning 13 years ago of the dangers to America in unjustified charges regarding disloyalty and security.

His battle for fair employment practices legislation was unsuccessful, so far as obtaining the passage of specific legislation was concerned, although his effort came very close to success. This early effort brought the issue to the front, and the demonstration of support provided a base upon which modern civil rights legislation has been developed.

The second great public position for which he should be remembered was, at the time, for him and for every man in public life a most unpopular and dangerous one.

In a speech delivered on the floor of the Senate on May 12, 1950, Senator CHAVEZ warned against the dangers of demagoguery in America.

That was a time when there had been raised in this country voices of discord and voices of misunderstanding and mistrust. It was a time when voices of accusation and suspicion were heard in many quarters. It was a time when truth—which should be honored and guarded—had been redesigned and contracted by some; it was a time when many were called upon to prove in the marketplace whether truth was more effective than falsehood; a time when doubts, which should be isolated, guarded against, and contained had been expanded; a time when words, which should be cherished instruments of communication and repositories of meaning and thought, had been misapplied and misused; a time of confusion, agitation, and appeals to the emotions. All of them had been developed in their full force and flow. It was a time when patriotism, which should be the badge and shield of honor, was being forged into a weapon to be used against all who might disagree with one. It was a time when unwarranted and unjustified appeals to religion, to support a political position, were being used to serve ignoble aims and objectives. In that speech, Senator CHAVEZ stated the simple fact, "My ancestors brought the cross to this hemisphere"; and he denounced those who, as he stated, were "using this cross as a club." That was a time when betrayal, the greatest natural fault which could be charged against a fellow man, was freely charged; and it was a time when treason—the last word which should be used against a good man—was readily on the tongues of many.

Under those circumstances, DENNIS CHAVEZ stood and spoke for all America and for the dignity and value of every man. That action, together with his actions in the area of fair employment practices, indicated, in my judgment, in broad strokes the real measure of the character and the contributions of DENNIS CHAVEZ to the U.S. Senate and to the United States.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, with a heavy heart at the loss of our beloved colleague, DENNIS CHAVEZ, I wish to join in the tributes to him and to his great service both as a public servant and as a citizen.

Much has been said and much will be said about his public service in the 32 years—nearly one-third of a century—during which he served in the Congress, 28 of them in the Senate. Those services, numerous and important, deserve permanent chronicling for which a trained historian, a qualified biographer, could find no better subject. I have no doubt that this recording will be made.

I can think of no better project for the University of New Mexico than to turn some of its political scientists to work on such an assignment, for no man from New Mexico ever served as long in the Congress as did DENNIS CHAVEZ, and few men from any State have served so long through a period of such great change and such import in the history of our Nation and in the history of the world.

Occupying—as Senator CHAVEZ did in the latter years of his life—the extremely important positions of chairman of the Public Works Committee and chairman of perhaps the most important subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee, that dealing with the Department of Defense, it would be inevitable that he would contribute importantly to national policy. He did contribute importantly to our internal economy, through the multitude of public works and highways, river and harbor developments, public buildings, and power dams—all these great contributions to our national economy and growth which recently have received the appellation of infrastructure. No less important were the tremendous achievements, for which he was in a large measure responsible, in strengthening the defenses of our Nation by providing adequate appropriations, and thus not only preserving our own liberties, but also striking telling blows, in behalf of all mankind, for both the nations that are free and want to remain free, and also those whose people were emerging from colonialism or were seeking to escape totalitarianism and wished to be free.

It is probable that few men had so great an opportunity to serve effectively in the national interests, both at home and abroad, as did DENNIS CHAVEZ; and he served effectively. The results of his attitudes and actions will be indelibly inscribed in the history of our country's growth, progress, and strength.

Others will develop fully, I have no doubt, these aspects of DENNIS CHAVEZ' illustrious career. As I said, I hope his public service, as well as his fruitful and happy private life, from its humble origins, will be made the subject of a book-length biography.

What I would like to stress, however, are the outstanding traits which I think above all distinguished DENNIS CHAVEZ among his fellow men. Those traits were his personal kindliness, his warm human sympathy, his friendliness, and his helpfulness. They were inevitably part of his love of his fellow men, his feeling for the common man, his sympathy for the underprivileged, the poor, the needy, the sick, the disadvantaged, the victims of any kind of discrimination. In his early days he had experienced poverty and want, and he could understand the problems of those who had similarly undergone the experiences and trials of humble surroundings.

His kindliness was, of course, notable to his colleagues, and particularly to those newcomers to the Senate who needed the cooperation, friendly assistance, and guidance of those who, like DENNIS CHAVEZ, had both the experience and the position and power to be helpful.

I, myself, recall most gratefully some of these experiences. I wish to recall, in the first place, DENNIS CHAVEZ's great help to the cause of statehood for both Alaska and Hawaii. It could scarcely be otherwise with one so deeply imbued with basic American principles, especially the most basic American principle—that of Government by consent of the governed. He was old enough to remember when New Mexico was a territory; and both his personal recollections and his knowledge of American history made crystal clear to him that the disadvantageous status of being a territory was not one that could permanently be consistent with the basic aspirations and professions of America. So he vigorously supported statehood for Alaska and Hawaii—in which, I may say, the other Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] was also a tremendous force, having led the fight on more than one occasion, and also in seeing it through to a successful conclusion. Indeed, DENNIS CHAVEZ supported every worthy cause, every cause that made life better and nobler for his fellow men.

I recall another episode for which we Alaskans must be and are grateful. In Alaska we have a unique episode related to the Matanuska Valley, which was the scene of a project in 1935 initiated with the imagination characteristic of President Franklin D. Roosevelt. When I first saw him at Hyde Park, in September 1934, just prior to my appointment as the first Director of the Division of Territories and Island Possessions of the Department of the Interior, President Roosevelt reviewed the conditions and needs of our outlying areas over whose Federal relations this newly created Federal agency would have jurisdiction. In regard to Alaska, he said:

> Alaska needs more people and we should also do what we can to stimulate agriculture there.

He recommended that the following spring a thousand people be moved from our stricken agricultural areas, victims of the dust bowl droughts and other natural calamities, and be given a chance to start life anew on "the last frontier."

One of the problems which these settlers faced was that of developing their farm economy. They did so by starting a dairy industry. They were encouraged to do that when, 5 years after their settlement in the Matanuska Valley, in 1935, defense belatedly came to Alaska, and Fort Richardson and Elmendorf Field, Army and Air Force installations, respectively, were established near Anchorage. It was then that encouragement was given to the farmers to develop their dairy herds and supply the military, furnishing not only a market and a livelihood for the settlers, but helping to develop the economy of Alaska and getting the military to use healthful locally produced dairy products.

Our congressional delegation, my colleague BOB BARTLETT, and I, however, found that for some reason or other the quartermaster department of the military preferred to import reconstituted milk from the other States, which, upon investigation, proved to be grade C milk with a high bacterial content. An effort to change this by buying locally produced fresh milk met with firm opposition from the military purchasing authorities. My colleague and I appeared before the Subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee of which Senator CHAVEZ was the chairman. He was presiding on that occasion. After we had testified, his attention was called to a pertinent aspect of this issue, which was that the officers on the bases were furnished with grade A fresh milk but the rank and file received the reconstituted grade C milk with the high bacterial content. That was enough for DENNIS CHAVEZ. He promptly espoused the cause which we were supporting and provided that in the subcommittee's report, the Army and Air Force were ordered to give the GI's precisely the same treatment that the officers were getting.

I think this example is illustrative, and there are many others which could be cited, of DENNIS CHAVEZ' great feeling not merely for the rank and file, but for equality—political, social, and economic—of all Americans.

One aspect of DENNIS CHAVEZ' life was unique in the Senate. Being of Spanish origin and of Mexican descent during the period of Mexican independence, he naturally had warm feelings for our neighbors to the south. He represented the people of that culture in the Southwest with a warmth and understanding which did much to improve and strengthen our relations with our southern neighbor.

I recall what a magnificant contribution he made during the first meeting of the Interparliamentary Union with Mexico two years ago, at Guadalajara. He could and did speak as a representative of both the Anglo-Saxon and Hispanic cultures, and his democratic ways, kindliness, and knowledge of our neighbor's ways contributed greatly to the success of this important new undertaking, which was designed to strengthen the bonds of our two neighboring Republics. In this respect, as in many others, his place cannot be filled.

And so, we shall miss him—but say to his family, in offering our deep, heartfelt condolences, that he has left them a legacy of which all of them, and his children's children, and their children, through the coming generations may always be proud.

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, I rise to add my few words to those that have already been expressed. I knew Senator CHAVEZ well enough to admire him as a leader. He was a fine and honorable man who exemplified courage and an inspiring concern for his fellow men.

I did not know Senator CHAVEZ as long or as well as I would have liked. But I knew him well enough to admire him as a brave and fine man who exemplified the practice of courage. He was a fighter for what he thought was right, and a crusader for civil liberties. He worked hard and successfully for the welfare of his native State and was its great benefactor.

He combined the fire and spirit of his distinguished forebears with a very real concern for his fellow man.

To my mind, he demonstrated triumph of spirit over body. I extend my condolances to his family who, indeed, can and should be very proud of him.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, after the adjournment of the 87th Congress every Member of the Senate was shocked when the news came that one of the most lovable and best loved Members of this body was summoned on the final rollcall to that vast confraternity in the domain of eternal rest.

When I first met DENNIS CHAVEZ in the 73d Congress in 1933—which as you will note is 30 years ago—I was deeply impressed by the fact that a somewhat weatherbeaten Spanish-speaking citizen from distant New Mexico should be among the lawmakers of the Nation. This was, perhaps, hard testimony to the fact that I was not a very well traveled citizen in those days.

He intrigued me immensely and I made it a special point to cultivate his friendship. That friendship soon ripened into an affection which continued to grow with the years and continued without interruption through our long association in both the House and the Senate.

It must have been a rugged and determined spirit which brought him across country to the Nation's Capital, which carried him through a law school course, which brought him to the U.S. Senate as a clerk, which took him back to New Mexico to establish a law practice, which impelled him to successfully seek a place in the legislature of his State, which later made him successful in his first bid for a seat in the House of Representatives and which finally brought him to the U.S. Senate, where he served for more than a quarter of a century. Few members of this body had so varied, so successful, and so influential a career.

His contributions to the Nation in the field of national defense and public works were notable indeed and what comfort and pride his family can find in that record.

I have said before that to me he was an amazing person. Consider for a moment the long affliction which kept him in the hospital; his determined struggle to survive and continue in the public service; his long handicap for expression and how frustrating it must have been on many an occasion when the spirit cried for expression but the physical instrument for expression could not respond. Seldom will one see such tenacity for life and for the purpose of carrying on the work which he began when his congressional career was first established.

I have said of him on many occasions that he was one of the most colorful people I ever knew. This one can quickly define from the variety of his service, his great popularity in Spanish-speaking lands where he engendered good will for his own country; his campaigns in a bilingual State—all these made him a truly colorful person.

I said he was so deeply beloved. It was that spirit of helpfulness which was always evident in him and one of his great attributes that endeared him to his colleagues. I for one must confess a deep debt of gratitude to him for the generous way in which he dealt with a number of measures in which I had an abiding interest.

Today in reverent tribute I salute his service and his spirit. That service was long and devoted. The spirit was humble and helpful and he shall always be enshrined in our remembrance. So across the months since the eternal finger touched him into eternal sleep, let me say "buenas noches," gentle friend.

Mrs. SMITH. Mr. President, it was my privilege to serve on the Senate Appropriations Subcommittee on Defense during the time that Senator DENNIS CHAVEZ was the chairman of that subcommittee.

I saw him in action. No Senator was ever more dedicated to his duties and to his country's defense and national security than DENNIS CHAVEZ in his untiring efforts as chairman of that subcommittee.

Several years ago when a move was made to unseat Senator CHAVEZ because of alleged irregularities in a New Mexico election, I was one of five Republican Senators voting against unseating him. I did not see how we could single out Senator CHAVEZ when in the very same election New Mexico had given a majority to President Eisenhower and elected a Republican Governor.

I have spoken of how the late Senator ROBERT S. KERR, even though he was a Democrat, offered campaign contributions to me in 1954 and 1960 and desired that I be reelected.

I know that Senator CHAVEZ felt that way too. It is not important that he felt that way about me—the importance is that he was not controlled by narrow political partisanship. I am sure that had I asked him for a letter of endorsement of my candidacy for reelection in 1960 he would have unhesitatingly given it to me even though we were of opposite political parties.

For he did that very thing in 1962 for the Republican assistant leader in the Senate—the senior Senator from California. This was an act of considerable political courage—and act of political statesmanship.

But it was typical of DENNIS CHAVEZ.

Political courage was one of the many outstanding traits of Senator CHAVEZ. He had it in abundance. One of the many times that he demonstrated that courage was back in 1950 when our Nation was plagued with a mental sickness in which neighbor began to distrust neighbor—in which name-calling became the vogue of the day—in which the Senate was debased with unrestrained vilification and character assassination—when there was a silence of fear that almost completely paralyzed the Senate—and when heretofore leaders became mental mutes afraid to speak their minds lest they commit political suicide.

It was back in those fear-ridden days of 1950 that DENNIS CHAVEZ risked political suicide and with extraordinary political courage declared his moral conscience against the tactics that had gripped the Senate.

If DENNIS CHAVEZ is remembered by historians for any one act above all other acts on his part, I am confident that it will be this.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, one of my first friends, as a new Senator in these Halls, was the gracious DENNIS CHAVEZ, of New Mexico. His was a chivalry of true Spanish origin with the humility of a man who loved America as he cherished his own State as the Land of Enchantment, where out of his earliest responsibilities he fashioned his own opportunities.

Out of his own memories of difficult days, it was the character of DENNIS CHAVEZ to befriend the friendless. Out of his own boyhood experience of insecurity, he demanded that his land be secure and strong. Out of a preeminence in statesmanship earned and proved in this Senate, he was understanding and generous to the newcomer.

Dennis Chavez could be restrained on this floor with the eloquence of a man who did his homework and knew whereof he spoke. Dennis Chavez could be eloquent on this floor with the indignation of a man who hated chicanery and pretense.

And my friend from New Mexico could be courteous to my friends—and to my family as he was and would be to yours—and leave them all with the lovely impress that our Senate must, indeed, be a courtly place, for men like Dennis Chavez made it so.

There was a pleasure in serving here with him. There is a sadness since these Halls will know him no more. May he rest in peace.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, one of the first Members I met when I came to the U.S. Senate in 1950 was Dennis Chavez. I shall never forget his first statement to me. He said, "You and I represent States from the great West and Southwest and I am sure we will be working together."

One of the real joys of working with the Senator was the fact that he knew and understood the problems of that area and the people.

We were associated in many public works programs for the conservation of water for beneficial uses, in an area where water is so important.

One of Dennis' outstanding characteristics was his kindness and his friendliness. He always had a kind word and a friendly greeting for everyone. His many years of service in the U.S. Senate had endeared him to everyone he came in contact with. I miss him very much. The Senate just does not seem the same without him.

Mrs. Carlson joins me in extending our sincerest and deepest sympathy to Mrs. Chavez and the family.

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, it was with a feeling of deep personal loss that I received the news of the death of Senator Dennis Chavez, of New Mexico.

My long and pleasant association with Senator Chavez dates back to January 1955 when I first entered the Senate and had the good fortune to be assigned to the Committee on Public Works, of which he was the chairman.

It was my privilege to serve with Senator Chavez on that committee for almost 8 years—until his death on November 18, 1962. Senator Chavez always treated me with unfailing courtesy and consideration and with eminent fairness. He was my good friend.

Senator Chavez was a great and distinguished American. His many battles on behalf of the underprivileged and the unfortunate earned him the title of "Champion of the Underdog."

He served the people of his beloved New Mexico and of the United States for many years with great devotion. It is a tribute to the wisdom of the people of New Mexico that they early recognized his great potential for public service, first electing him to the Senate in 1936, confirming his earlier appointment to this body by the Governor. They then proceeded to reelect Senator Chavez four times. At the time of his death, he was serving his fifth term.

As chairman of the Public Works Committee and as chairman of the Military Affairs Subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee, he made many great and lasting contributions to the physical development and the national security of his country.

The knowledge of these achievements, plus the high regard in which he was held by his colleagues of the Senate, will, I hope, be of some comfort to his bereaved family to whom I extend my most sincere condolences.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, Dennis Chavez was first elected to Congress in 1931. He became a Member of the Senate in 1935 and served as a faithful Senator from New Mexico until his death in 1962. I came to know Senator Chavez from our service together on the Appropriations Committee of the Senate. For a number of years he served as chairman of the Subcommittee on Defense Appropriations and I was the senior minority member of the same committee. So we sat beside each other. We discussed the questions that were important to our country's security. We respected each other's opinion and thus became good friends. Senator Chavez' decisions on questions that involved the security of our country were always without partisanship. We differed at times—not on a partisan basis—but on what we believed to be in the best interest of the military services of our country. These differences, always without partisanship, brought us closer together in our work.

Senator Chavez was always insistent on making it possible for men who were intelligent, energetic, and hard-working to make a career of the military service which would be of value to our country and at the same time a career of which such men could be proud and in which they would be happy to serve. Hospitals, housing, proper pay for services rendered were thus matters on which he stressed and exercised the full weight of his position as chairman of our subcommittee.

In his efforts to improve the military services and thus the security of our country, he gave the best of his experience, his knowledge, and his zeal, but at the same time he never forgot to help, in ways that the Federal Government could help, the people of his own State of New Mexico. He fought to get better roads and to build up the conservation resources of his State. He never forgot the Indians who were resident in the State of New Mexico.

Many times we argued pleasantly over whose ancestors came first to our country—his, who came to our country through Mexico, or mine, who came to New England at Plymouth and Salem and elsewhere. We never did reach a conclusion, but we enjoyed our discussions.

On the floor of the Senate, he stood up for what he believed, and on military questions as they came from our committee he backed forcefully the decisions reached by the committee.

Senator Chavez and his wife and family were very close to each other. It was a happy sight to see them together.

His friendly presence on the Appropriations Committee, his wise judgment on its decisions, and his pleasant personality on the Senate floor will be missed by every Senator no matter what his partisan faith. And I personally have lost a colleague whom I came to respect and with whom I became friends.

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, I pay tribute, today, to the memory of Senator Chavez, whose courage and attention to his responsibilities even in the depths of a painful illness will always be an inspiration to those of us who were privileged to be his colleagues.

Senator Chavez, though he spent many years in Washington and rose to a place of high responsibility and national prestige in the Senate, never forgot his State or the citizens who elected him. His record as a Representative and a Senator stands as a monument to a responsive and responsible career in the Congress of the United States.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, Dennis Chavez was a friend and a colorful figure in the Senate. His Spanish-American heritage lent a piquancy to his important position in the Senate over so many years. His success in great office made him one of the shining symbols of what a man can do in our Nation when given the opportunity; and his physical and moral courage in the face of terrible pain and adversity cloaked his figure with the mantle of human greatness.

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, a western Senator who left his mark upon this body was the late Dennis Chavez. Senator Chavez represented the blend of cultures and backgrounds that gave variety and distinction to the settlement of the West. His is also the story of attaining cherished goals through hard work and determination. And when he had reached his goal, when he saw success in his efforts for advancement he did not choose to rest on his laurels. He worked hard for the people of his State and Nation.

The extent of his devotion to duty was easily observed by those of us in this body who saw him at his desk and in this Chamber even after he was cruelly attacked by the illness that ultimately caused his death. Lesser men would have given up, would have retired to their sickbeds. But Dennis Chavez continued his lifelong habit of hard work. His was an example for everyone's benefit and his determination should give courage to those who would hesitate in the face of formidable obstacles or retreat in the face of pain and suffering.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, as Members of the U.S. Senate, we share a deep and common sense of loss in the passing of our distinguished colleague and esteemed friend, Dennis Chavez. Although it is a shared loss, this does not lighten the burden of sorrow for any who proudly and affectionately claimed Dennis Chavez within the circle of their friendship. In his long and eminent career of public service, this outstanding

American gentleman brought the highest qualities of dedication, of intellect, of energy, and of leadership to the tasks and responsibilities which his fellow citizens entrusted to him. He was a fighter in spirit, in mind, in body—ever prepared to commit his full self to both the defense and the achievement of the ideals, the principles, the convictions which he found in his heart.

Valiant in his long and grievous illness, his spirit unyielding in the daily battle against pain, Dennis Chavez died as he had lived, a man of singular and indomitable courage. Our deepest expression of sorrow and sympathy goes today to his beloved family, to the people of the great State of New Mexico whom he served so well, and to the Nation he ennobled by his life and his work.

To me the friendship of Dennis Chavez was ever a valued personal treasure, and so too, will his memory remain the precious, inspiring legacy that friend leaves to friend.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, it is well that we take this time to voice our tributes to the memory of Senator Chavez. It is a time for quiet and solemn reflection. It is a time to repledge our efforts to carry on with the heritage which Dennis Chavez left.

He was a proud man. He was proud of his noble ancestry. He was proud of the State of New Mexico where he was born 24 years before it became a State and he was proud of the Senate of the United States which he first served as a clerk while working for his law degree at Georgetown University.

He was proud of the Senate, both as an institution and proud of us, his colleagues. I was privileged to serve under his chairmanship of the Public Works Committee. No chairman could have been more fair or more considerate of the rights of the committee members, whether they towered in seniority or were the most recent of newcomers.

I well recall his describing the Public Works Committee and its role.

"We are builders," he said. "We are building America, harnessing its rivers, developing its resources, making it a greater Nation."

He insisted that partisan politics play no part in the consideration of a project before his committee. It either had merit or it did not. He had a discerning eye for projects which lacked merit.

The true character of Dennis Chavez is best illustrated, I think, by the last several months of his life. Although he had been in failing health for some time, he never sought sympathy. Instead, he always endeavored to have a word of cheer and encouragement for others.

It was my great and good fortune to have had him as a friend.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, Senator Dennis Chavez served 27 years in the Senate. In these 27 years no man in the Senate was more loved or respected than he was. He worked long and hard. He worked with intelligence and devotion, with honor and integrity, for his Nation and his State.

Senator Chavez was chairman for many years of the Public Works Committee. His work and that of his committee make a fitting memorial to this beloved man. There is no State in our Nation in which evidence of his wisdom and foresight cannot be seen—embodied in our great dams, our highways and our public buildings.

Of Spanish-American origin himself, he was deeply sympathetic to the injustices which are done to the racial and religious minority groups of our Nation. Time and time again he used the authority of his office to see that right was done to individual citizens who had been unfairly treated by the officials of our Nation. He was, I know, greatly loved by the people of New Mexico. He was no less loved by the Members of the Senate.

In the last months of his life in spite of intense pain and discomfort, he continued to served his State, his Senate and his country. His presence among us last year was a moving example of high courage and selfless devotion.

His loss is a heavy burden for us. His death is a great personal loss to me.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, the first committee assignment that I received upon entering my duties in the Senate in 1959 was membership on the Committee on Public Works. Dennis Chavez was chairman of that committee at that time.

He was one of the first friends I made in the Senate, and I have profited greatly from his good counsel.

Senator Chavez occupied in his capacity as chairman of the Committee on Public Works a position of prestige—and of great power. His grasp of his job and his wise conduct of the affairs of his committee were qualities to provoke admiration from an observer such as one becomes as he enters the Senate.

One other quality which I remember in Senator Chavez endeared him to many of his colleagues. While on the floor of the Senate, I have seen him, perhaps more frequently than most other Members, spontaneously offer his congratulations to a Senator who had made an important point in a speech.

In this way alone, he constantly offered encouragement to his colleagues. Any new Senator needs such kindness. And Senators could have only great appreciation for the author of such welcome gestures.

For a long time, Senator Chavez was afflicted with an illness which would have caused lesser men to despair. But the lived with it, fought it, and as was characteristic of his fortitude, conquered it.

I am glad that the opportunity presented itself for me to have known and worked with this fine man.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, with the death of the Senator from New Mexico, Mr. Chavez, the Senate lost one of the kindliest men that ever graced these halls.

Dennis Chavez was interested in people. He liked people. The heat of the battle never prompted him to do or say an unkind thing.

Senator Chavez was first and always an American. He was proud of his nationality background but his devotion to this country was the important thing in his life. He shared the American dream and he wanted all of our citizens to have an opportunity under it.

Senator Chavez had grit. He would hang on when others might give up. His successful struggle with serious illness will be an encouragement to everyone and no doubt will even add to medical knowledge.

I endorse all of the fine things that are being said today concerning our late friend. I wish to extend to Mrs. Chavez and to all the family the sincere sympathy of Mrs. Curtis and myself.

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. Mr. President, we in the Senate who worked with Dennis Chavez are better Senators as a result of our associations with him. Without him, we are without a very warm friend and a true patriot who put the good of his country above all else.

Dennis Chavez loved people and people loved him. He was a great believer in democracy and government with a heart that responded to the needs of the people and the demands of the times.

The U.S. Senate was very much a part of Dennis Chavez and his life, and he had a unique career in this body. He came to Washington and to the Senate as a clerk as just a boy, and he was a part of the life of the Senate and the Federal Government during the most crucial periods of our Nation's history.

I often called on Senator Chavez for advice and counsel. He was always understanding, and above all, reasonable and fair. I know that the other Members of the Senate also looked to him for guidance, and I am sure they found in him the same qualities.

Senator Chavez looked upon the vast Southwest as the new frontier of the United States. He worked most effectively to develop the tremendous resources of that region, because he believed, and rightly so, that what was good for the Southwest—or for any other area for that matter—was good for America.

For many years to come, we will see the work Senator Chavez did in the field of resources development bear fruit in the form of a growing, stronger economy.

Even in ill health, Dennis Chavez always put his country first, and he gave to his country all that was in him.

We have sustained a great loss, but we are a better Nation as a result of what Senator Chavez contributed to us.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, my first acquaintance with Dennis Chavez was when I entered the Senate and was assigned to the Committee on Public Works, of which he was chairman. I served under him for a period of years and came to regard him with a deep and abiding affection.

Senator Chavez could be fiery and vehement when battling for his State or for the causes in which he believed, but he was friendly, helpful, and warmhearted with all of his colleagues, and especially kind to those who were his juniors and to the attachés and others who served under him.

His long, intrepid fight against ill health and his constant triumph over physical weakness to perform the duties and discharge the responsibilities of his great office sets a high mark of courage that few of us can ever hope to attain.

Deeply religious, devoted to his family, loyal to his friends, he leaves a warm spot in the hearts of every one of us who knew him.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, it was a real pleasure to serve as a member of the Committee on Public Works under the chairmanship of the distinguished gentleman from New Mexico, Mr. Chavez.

When I came to the Senate, he had already established a reputation for his interest in development of our public resources and in the first Americans, the American Indians.

The map of the United States is dotted with monuments to his effective interest in water resource development, reclamation, and irrigation.

Mr. BEALL. Mr. President, this body lost a great Member with the passing of Dennis Chavez. We will miss him very much. He was a very active member, a hard worker. Much legislation now in existence bears his stamp.

Dennis Chavez preceded me in the Senate by some years. In fact, when I first became a Member, he was one of the stalwart leaders. He was of a warm, friendly nature, and was always glad to be of help to new Members. I leaned heavily on his always available helpful advice. Dennis Chavez' presence in this Chamber dates back to 1918, when he became a clerk in the Senate while studying law at Georgetown University. He served as a clerk in the Senate for some 2 or 3 years. Upon graduation, he returned to his native State of New Mexico, which elected him to the House of Representatives in 1931. There he served during the 72d and 73d Congresses, and then came to the Senate. From 1935 through 1962, Dennis Chavez served in the Senate with distinction. I am sure that all of us were particularly impressed with his effectiveness in committee work. He studied each issue carefully, and was always well informed on the matters which came before his committees. It was in committee work that he was outstanding. In my dealings with Dennis Chavez, I found him to be a fair and just man. He was always willing to cooperate with others in anything he believed was for the good of the Nation.

Senator Chavez knew the problems of the Nation, and particularly those of special interest to his State. He deeply believed in our system of government. Though we were of different political parties, I never found this to be any kind of a barrier to his cooperation with me in matters which were of special interest to me.

People like Dennis Chavez are "the salt of the earth." When we consider that first and foremost he was an American, it makes us proud to call ourselves Americans.

Dennis Chavez has gone, but his work and his memory will live forever.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, the departure from this official body and this earthly life of Senator Dennis Chavez creates a void in the hearts of those who knew him that will not easily be filled.

Dennis Chavez was a quiet and gentle man, whose activities as a Senator were devoted not to the mere winning of plaudits of the press and galleries, but to serving the people of his beloved State of New Mexico, the American West, and the United States.

It was my privilege first to know Dennis Chavez when I came to Washington as a new Member in the 73d Congress, and in the subsequent 30 years our association deepened to cherished friendship.

During the past 4 years, as a member of the Senate Committee on Public Works, I served under the chairmanship of Dennis Chavez, where I observed at close range the work of equity and justice which he brought to that post. In a sense, every colleague was a member of his constituency, for every Senator at some time pressed the claims of his State on Dennis Chavez. Though these needs could not always be filled to the satisfaction of the individual request, I doubt that a single Member could deny that he invariably received a responsive and sympathetic hearing from Senator Chavez.

Though a lifelong and loyal Democrat throughout his career, the late Senator from New Mexico never lost sight of Aristotle's dictum that:

> Those who think that all virtue is to be found in their own party principles push matters to extremes; they do not consider that disproportion destroys a state.

Dennis Chavez held always to this sense of proportion, and his wise and reasoned counsel will not soon be forgotten by those who served with him.

Mr. FONG. Mr. President. I should like to join my colleagues today in honoring the memory of Dennis Chavez, whose sudden passing last November saddened all of us. He was a most remarkable man, indeed, another of a long line of Members of Congress whose careers add proof that America is a land of opportunity for those willing to grasp the opportunity and work hard.

Dennis Chavez made no secret of the fact that he enjoyed being a Senator—he reveled in it—not because of any prestige that might attach to the post, but because it gave him a chance to help his native land. He made it plain that his country had been good to him, and he dedicated his long tenure in public office to repaying America in fullest measure.

During the last session of Congress, despite his newly acquired physical impediment, he refused to be deterred from his senatorial duties. We all admired his faithful attendance to the tasks of his office during what must have been very trying and uncomfortable days for him.

I came to know Dennis Chavez through my membership on the Public Works Committee, of which he was chairman. How proud he was of the work of that committee. He regarded it as a most constructive committee, for it deals with protecting human lives and safeguarding property from floods and other natural disasters; expediting navigation and transportation; developing America's natural resources; preserving our Nation's shorelines; building post offices and other Federal buildings; improving highways and harbors; harnessing the energy of waterpower; creating recreational areas for our people. These were actions which gave him tremendous satisfaction, as well they might.

Through his Public Works Committee work and his long tenure as chairman of the Subcommittee on Defense Appropriations and through extensive travel, he came to know America very well. He had a retentive mind for people, places, and things. And he had a long memory for acts of friendship toward him. This was impressed upon me by a personal experience.

In the course of a defense inspection tour soon after Congress adjourned in 1959, he stopped over in Hawaii, aboard a Matson liner. To greet my chairman and extend a welcome to the islands, I journeyed out to his ship before it anchored. He never forgot the incident, often recalling it to me. I think he would have a good chuckle to know how close to seasickness I became in the process.

Dennis Chavez was a firm friend of Hawaii, a fact he demonstrated on many occasions in his capacity as Senator by voting for statehood and as chairman of the Subcommittee on Defense Appropriations and as chairman of the Public Works Committee. He was familiar with the extensive defense installations in Hawaii and he took great pains to make sure our forces in Hawaii were strong and ready—that America's defense outpost in the mid-Pacific would be equal to any emergency.

He recognized the value of public works projects in the economic development of all the States and of the protection of lives and property, and he took the lead in promoting these essential measures.

I recall he was especially sympathetic to the need for protection of Hilo, Hawaii, after the devastating tidal wave of 1960. With his active support, construction of a breakwater was approved by Congress.

So as I pay personal tribute to the man whom I came to know and admire in the Senate, I also pay honor to him in behalf of all the people of Hawaii who are the beneficiaries of his steadfast support and assistance.

Every State in the Union has benefited from his service in the Senate. Everywhere there are enduring memorials to his constructive leadership and his deep and abiding interest in the necessary and orderly development of needed public works. The very strong military shield that protects America today shows his handiwork. His good works, indeed, live on.

To Mrs. Chavez and other members of his family, my wife Ellyn and I extend our heartfelt condolences on their loss, a loss shared by all of us.

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, Senator Dennis Chavez was my chairman on the Senate Public Works Committee, and in his passing I feel a great sense of personal loss. Although he was ill much of the time during which I served on the committee, he had a magnificent courage which lifted him above and beyond his physical infirmities.

He came to the Senate in 1935, from the House of Representatives, and for almost 30 years he dedicated himself to people of his State and of the country. He has left behind many proofs of his generosity, aid, and comprehension, and his name belongs in the annals of important Americans of our time.

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, it is with a deep sense of sorrow that I join my colleagues in paying tribute to the late Senator from New Mexico, DENNIS CHAVEZ.

His untimely death was a great loss, one which was felt by his friends in the Senate, his native State, and indeed the Nation as well.

DENNIS CHAVEZ, who entered the practice of law in 1920 in Albuquerque when New Mexico was still a young, new State of the Union, dedicated his life to duty and service. His long record in the U.S. Senate, punctuated by many outstanding accomplishments, shows that he devotedly pursued his ideal to the end.

The late Senator from New Mexico was especially preeminent in the conservation and development of our natural resources and in the maintenance of a mighty Military Establishment. It also is to his credit that he was a stanch defender of the rules and traditions of the Senate.

We shall all miss DENNIS CHAVEZ, but we shall always remember him as a true and loyal servant of the Nation and the people he represented.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, it was a sad day for the Senate and for the country when DENNIS CHAVEZ was called home.

This kind and genial man, warm and generous friend, devoted husband and indulgent father, fair and manly opponent, incorruptible and courageous public servant, was a martyr to duty, to the people's cause, and to the service of his country.

We saw DENNIS CHAVEZ, as the chairman of the Senate Committee on Public Works, laboring indefatigably for the development of America's waterways and her great natural resources with which God has so blessed our land. As chairman of the Subcommittee on Armed Services of the Senate Appropriations Committee, he bore the heavy burden and labored incessantly for the building and maintenance of the strength and effectiveness of the Army, the Navy, the Air Force, and the Marines, to keep America strong that we might keep America free.

It was as a member of the Subcommittee on Labor, Health, Education, and Welfare of the Senate Committee on Appropriations, including the period of some several years when DENNIS CHAVEZ was chairman of the subcommittee, that I was privileged to work closest with him and to see his noble heart, his love and compassion for his fellow man, and his deep sympathy and concern for all who suffer.

A few months ago I was privileged to witness the Ambassador from Mexico confer upon DENNIS the highest honor that his country confers upon any citizen of another country. The ceremony of conferral was held at the clinical center of the National Institutes of Health where the battle is being waged against the dread diseases, the cripplers and killers of mankind. As I sat there, moved by the occasion and humbly proud to see so richly deserved an honor bestowed upon my friend, I could not but think how fitting it was that the ceremony should be held at the National Institutes of Health that DENNIS had done so much to bring into being and to which he had made so many fine contributions. I was reminded of the words of the ancient Greek philosopher when he declared, "One cannot get closer to God than by bringing health to one's fellow man."

The example of DENNIS CHAVEZ' life is a light to lead us to higher and nobler paths. It is a part of every life he touched while on this earth and it will be transmitted from heart to heart, from soul to soul, until the last mortal shall put on immortality.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, I wish to join with other Members of the Senate in a well-deserved tribute to our beloved departed friend, DENNIS CHAVEZ.

"DENNIE" CHAVEZ, by which name he will always be remembered by his friends—was a truly wonderful person. He rose from a humble beginning to become a great statesman of our country. His contributions to important legislation over the many years that he served in the U.S. Senate are many. He was a most effective Senator, an untiring worker, and one of the most courageous men I ever knew. He never once thought of giving up, no matter how rough the going was.

DENNIE CHAVEZ will probably be remembered most for his great interest and concern for the poor and less privileged not only in his own State but throughout this Nation and, for that matter, our entire hemisphere.

DENNIE was a wonderful friend and a great statesman. We miss him here greatly. We in the Senate grieve with his beloved family in this great loss.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, when a man who is rendering magnificent service to his State and country passes from the scene of public life, it is indeed a sad occasion.

While I did not have the privilege of serving on any committee with DENNIS CHAVEZ, I grew to know him from my associations with him on the floor of the Senate and in our respective official duties. He was a man who inspired friendship and confidence, always willing to give the benefit of his long experience and background in government to a colleague.

I respected his views and benefited from his counsel.

DENNIS CHAVEZ was a great champion of the West and a man who could look ahead to the needs of future generations of his own State and of the Nation. My sympathies go out to all those who knew him and particularly his family with whom we join in a profound sense of loss on this occasion.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I join my colleagues in the U.S. Senate in paying tribute to the memory of a distinguished former Member of this body who served his State and Nation with distinction and dedication for more than three decades. DENNIS CHAVEZ was a devoted servant of his people, and they rewarded him for his dedication to duty by returning him to the U.S. Senate on five occasions.

Mr. President, it is an amazing feat just to be able to win the confidence of the people of a great and sovereign State. To be able to hold that confidence for such a long period of time, however, is indeed a rare distinction, as all the Members of this body can well appreciate. This can only signify public belief in one's character, ability, and unselfish devotion to the people.

I had the pleasure of serving as a member of the Public Works Committee under Senator CHAVEZ when I first came to the Senate in 1955. I found him to be a fine gentleman who presided over his committee with competence, impartiality, and dignity. He rendered many valuable services to his Nation as a member and as chairman of this important committee, and also as chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee on Defense Expenditures. I particularly remember his capable work on the great interstate highway program which was approved in the Congress under his leadership and that of the junior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE].

To the people of New Mexico and the members of the Chavez family I again extend my sincere and deep sympathy on the passing of this distinguished and able public servant.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, it is with great sadness that I pay tribute to the late Senator from New Mexico, DENNIS CHAVEZ.

We were all proud to be his friends, and it was my privilege to work with him on the many programs in which we shared an interest.

His youth in New Mexico endowed Senator CHAVEZ with a great knowledge of the land, and during his years in the Senate he devoted much energy to the development of our precious natural resources.

He was also an expert on military matters, and brought a keen mind to the complex problems of preparedness and defense.

Senator CHAVEZ was a tireless worker in behalf of the American Indian, and he made many permanent contributions to the betterment of our hemispheric relations.

It was my pleasure to serve with him on two committees, and he was unfailingly gracious and wise with respect to the problems of my State.

In many ways, we will miss his presence in the Senate for years to come.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, one is always hard put to express his opinion and sentiments when the subject is a friend and colleague over a period of many years. It will be impossible for me in a few short minutes to say the things that I feel in my heart about a very dear personal friend and one of the truly courageous public figures of our time, the late Senator DENNIS CHAVEZ.

I am one of the few Members of this body who was here when DENNIS CHAVEZ took the oath of office as a Senator of the United States. Over a period of years, we worked in many instances on the same committees and I came to know him intimately.

He was the toughest man physically I have ever known. He sustained and recovered from several major operations that would have taken all of the heart out of a lesser man, but DENNIS CHAVEZ was a great fighter. He fought the most terrible of diseases with the same courage and determination with which he always supported his political beliefs. He had courage in any field to back up his convictions. No man, no single group of men, no mighty combination or groups could shake him in his beliefs or frighten him into yielding a conviction.

We have many self-proclaimed liberals in this day. DENNIS CHAVEZ was a true liberal and he was proud of his philosophy. He was a liberal in the finest traditions of the political meaning of that word. He was a liberal in the tradition of La Follette, Borah, and Norris. He fought for the common man, the little man, the underprivileged in our society. He stood for equality of opportunity for all Americans and he supported with everything he had the great liberal traditions upon which our Republic is founded and our precious way of life rests.

DENNIS CHAVEZ was a genuine Senate type. He had not served here long before he became a Senate man through and through. He was jealous of the prerogatives of the Senate and he had a fierce pride and faith in the Senate as an institution. He understood the roll that the Senate and individual Senators are supposed to play in our scheme of government. I do not know of a higher compliment that I could pay any man who ever served in this body.

It is said that he was born in an adobe hut and of poor parents. The story of DENNIS CHAVEZ is a story in the greatest American tradition. The record DENNIS CHAVEZ accumulated and the battles he fought during his long years in public life will be long remembered and often discussed, not only by his beloved people of New Mexico, but by all others in this Nation who, though humble born, aspire to success and yearn for the opportunity to serve and possess the character with which to do it well.

Several years ago I traveled through some of the public forests and other public lands of New Mexico with Senator CHAVEZ. We visited a number of small communities largely populated by Americans of Spanish descent. The faith and pride of these people was clearly reflected on their countenances as they sought an opportunity to touch him if they could not shake his hand. His entire career bears proof that the faith and confidence of his people was justified in every respect. He never let them down.

I have never known a man who had a more complete faith in the basic American system of government than did DENNIS CHAVEZ. All of us will miss him here in the Senate, and I will miss him as my friend and confidant, and most especially the inspiration I derived from his courage every time I saw him.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, I wish to join briefly with my colleagues in the Senate in paying tribute to the memory of DENNIS CHAVEZ. He had made his mark in this body, as a Senator and statesman of the first rank, before I came to know him. It was in the closing days of his life that he set before us the example of courage and stamina that for me will be an indelible memory. I will remember this man as he stood in the Senate, mortally ill, refusing to yield in spirit to the final colloquy to which he was being called by the failing flesh, persevering in his duty while an ounce of strength remained. I will always remember DENNIS CHAVEZ as the personification of a courage to which every man should aspire, and which every man who knew him may come closer to matching, when his own time of need arrives, by recalling the burning will which kept DENNIS CHAVEZ on his feet, on the floor of the Senate, so long as the call to duty could be heard.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, when I first came onto the Senate Public Works Committee, of which the late Senator CHAVEZ was chairman, I was warmly received by the Senator and was made to feel very much at home. He loved the committee, and he had a deep affection for all of its members. We were, he said, on a committee which had no purpose other than to be constructive, to authorize projects which would make the United States a greater country, and its people happier and more productive.

The Senator had great courage, and he will always be an inspiration to those of us who knew that he was fighting a physical affliction which would have caused many a strong-willed person to lose hope and to despair. But Senator CHAVEZ never despaired. We will miss him. Mrs. Miller and I extend to Mrs. Chavez and the family our deepest sympathy over their great loss.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I wish to join my colleagues in expressing my sense of deep personal loss in the death last November of Senator CHAVEZ.

Senator CHAVEZ in his more than three score years of service in this body, established an enviable record of service to his State, the Nation, and to the Americas.

He was in all a great builder. As chairman of the full Committee on Public Works, he guided the world's largest construction program during the many years of his chairmanship. In this work it was his duty to program and plan the many facets of our public works development in water resources, navigation, road and highway construction, and even to our public buildings.

Aided by devoted and enthusiastic committee members, Senator CHAVEZ gave leadership and direction to this mammoth program and saw that proper emphasis was placed on not just one—but all—of the areas where the strengthening of our Nation was needed in this field of resource development. Each section received its rightful share of attention and development according to its needs. The sad plight of highway systems was corrected by the well planned and programed interstate highway program.

Vital needs of the newer States of the West, which Senator CHAVEZ knew and understood so well, were likewise provided new agricultural opportunities through irrigation projects built by the Army Engineers.

But the Senator's interest in building was not alone in physical buildings, as important as they were. He built opportunity for the underprivileged throughout all the States. He was a pioneer in the fight for civil rights and for opportunities for those who otherwise would have been passed by. His attention and work for the improvement of racial relations will long stand as a monument to his love for all Americans. He wanted all to have fair and equal opportunities.

In the field of our inter-American relations, Senator CHAVEZ was likewise active. As the first Senator of Spanish-American origin, he was able to communicate our ideas and ideals to our Latin American neighbors. This way he helped improve the solidarity of relationships with both North and South America.

We who knew him well knew of the warm personal friendship that he extended to his colleagues. As a new Member I early learned of his solicitude for our success in the Senate and found him always ready and willing to assist us in our problems connected with our service on our committees or to our States.

The people of New Mexico can be proud of the service he rendered, not only for them, but for all the Nation.

To his wife who was a true companion through all of his public and private life and to his children I extend for myself and for Mrs. Monroney our deep sympathy and condolence for the loss of a devoted public servant.

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, DENNIS CHAVEZ was at home on the old frontier and the New Frontier. The Nation owes him a great debt. This warmhearted New Mexican dedicated his life to serving his country. His service on the Public Works Committee of the Senate was long and dedicated. Through the efforts of this great American, three great rivers of the country are being tamed and harnessed, and the people who live in their valleys protected. This is a service for which Senator CHAVEZ was rarely, if ever, truly recognized. Quietly, effectively and with great dedication DENNIS CHAVEZ also served tirelessly and devotedly as head of the Defense Appropriations Subcommittee. Hardly a decision was made in the momentous years of war and cold war without his hard work, deep research, and solemn advice. Atomic warfare, conventional warfare, manned bombers, deadly missiles, Polaris, machines, men, ships—all these were his to check, to examine, to probe, to worry and brood over.

Yet, DENNIS CHAVEZ, a man who had served in the Senate for four decades, had time to be concerned with the welfare of his own constituents and with the problems of his colleagues. His heart was big and warm. His efforts were for all of us. It was our good fortune to have had him with us. We shall miss him greatly.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I am among the many who will miss Senator DENNIS CHAVEZ, as a friend, a legislator and as a wise American. He was truly a great man.

Senator CHAVEZ was a native son of New Mexico and was the oldest of eight children. He served his State ably as a member of the State legislature and was next elected to the U.S. House of Representatives, where he served from 1931, until his appointment to the U.S. Senate in 1935, where he served until his death in 1962.

DENNIS CHAVEZ had served 9 years in the Senate before I was appointed to the Senate. I became closely associated with him on many legislative matters and found in him a faithful friend. Our friendship grew for each other through the years and I considered myself a member of his family.

Senator CHAVEZ served for many years on the Appropriations Committee and I will always treasure the years that I was able to work with him on appropriation matters. He was a great organizer, armed with the tools of logic. He served as chairman of the Subcommittee on Defense of the Senate Appropriations Committee.

I could write volumes on the good work which DENNIS CHAVEZ did as a member of the Public Works Committee of the Senate. He served ably as chairman of this committee for a number of years. He did outstanding work in authorizing the funds for important projects in order to assist in protecting and preserving our water and land resources.

It is true that during a number of years DENNIS CHAVEZ was in ill health. How he fought on, day after day, over unsurmountable odds, everyone had to admire. He was a tough fighter and continued to remain active almost until the time of his death.

When Senator CHAVEZ died last November, former President Harry S. Truman observed that he was "a good public servant, and that's about the highest thing you can say about a man."

A note was sent to Mrs. Chavez by the President of the United States, when she accepted on behalf of her husband the Minuteman Award of the Reserve Officers Association of the United States. President Kennedy said:

> Tonight we honor him as the citizen who contributed most to national security—but we shall also long remember him as a great patriot—and a great American.

I extend my heartfelt sympathy to the Chavez family, son and daughters and particularly to his wife. In my mind DENNIS CHAVEZ will live on and his overall impact on posterity will be enormous.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, on behalf of the people of New Mexico, and indeed of our country, Republicans and Democrats, the rich and the poor, the high and the humble, I desire to express our thanks to Senators who participated in the expressions of tribute to our beloved Senator.

TRIBUTES TO THE LATE SENATOR KERR OF OKLAHOMA

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, the untimely death of Senator ROBERT S. KERR ended a career of public service unequaled by any Oklahoman, a career that deeply affected the course of our Nation.

For Senator KERR's great energy, intellect and human qualities combined to mark him with the genius of leadership. His life was one of distinguished service, not only for his State, but for the Nation as well.

This Senate, this Government, and the people of this Nation will for years to come feel the loss of this buoyant, resourceful, dynamic individual who loved the Senate, its duties, its opportunities, and its responsibilities.

Senator KERR's monumental achievements in his many fields of endeavor were matched by his amazing capacity for friendship, his unbounded faith in his fellow man and in his abiding and all-encompassing faith in God. His life exemplifies the great American story of attaining nearly impossible goals through hard work.

His dynamic and confident approach to challenging projects and new concepts sparked the drive in hundreds of friends, who were willing to follow his tested leadership in many fields. Those who were associated with Senator KERR in any project followed his lead, knowing that his careful study and evaluation would bring success. He brought this quality to all the many fields where he directed his energy. Whether it was a drive to finance a university, to build hospitals, to promote new scientific institutions, or whether it was in a daring and novel project for the conservation of water resources, in social legislation, or in private business, his carefully thought-out plans and means of achieving his goals inspired others to join in his crusades.

For his basic formula for success was not only in having unbounded confidence in himself, but in transmitting that enthusiasm and loyalty to others. This enthusiasm made molehills out of obstacles that to some might seem mountains. This zest filled the contest with adventure as though it were an athletic event. It was fun for BOB KERR, and those who loyally followed him shared in the fun.

His aims and activities reached across all vital realms of human experience in our time. Born in a log cabin on what was truly a frontier, he strove always in the vanguard, maintaining a newness and freshness of thought. His imagination and his vision seemed boundless. In science, in social welfare, in resources development, in strengthening our national security and in enlarging our economy, he forsook outmoded concepts to seize with youthful enthusiasm the rationale of new ideas and new approaches. "'Tis not too late to seek a newer world," Senator KERR sometimes remarked, quoting from Lord Tennyson's "Ulysses."

ROBERT S. KERR was born in a place where the world was new. His parents had come to Indian territory in a covered wagon and had established a small farm on land rented from the Indians. In that rustic pioneer setting, 11 years before Oklahoma was granted statehood, ROBERT S. KERR was born. In his early years, his love and respect for God's good earth were nourished in the toil of making things grow that a family might live. One learns to love and respect the order of the seasons, the rich earth, the pure blue water, the value of the forest, and the beauty of the sky when life itself depends upon the harmony one achieves with such an environment.

The son of a scholarly but self-taught father, ROBERT S. KERR diligently sought the benefits of a formal education under most difficult circumstances. Like many another pioneer boy before him, he walked many miles to and from a small schoolhouse, and he lived on the edge of destitution as a student at what was then the small beginning of what is now a great educational institution known as Oklahoma Baptist University. Unable to afford the full college course, the future Senator interrupted his studies at the age of 17 to become a teacher in a one-room school. When World War I came, he enlisted in the Army and saw duty in France as a field artillery lieutenant. Later, he gained much of his knowledge of the law during an apprenticeship in the office of one of the great early-day Oklahoma attorneys. He worked his way through courses at East Central State College in Ada, Okla., and at the University of Oklahoma. He sold magazines door to door. He also established a small produce business, buying the fruits and vegetables from the farmers in his home community and selling them at distant cities.

But BOB KERR's real education came after the end of his formal education. Everything he did, everything he read, all that he saw were a part of the learning that lifted him to a wide range of understanding of myriad subjects and made him an able master of most of them.

Without realizing the transition that was taking place, his colleagues in the Senate and his people in Oklahoma saw this vast understanding of the Government's most complicated activities translated into national leadership. This leadership was acknowledged in the last session of the Senate.

For it was his ability, his understanding of the subjects, his command of earthy debate in explaining complicated measures, that enabled Senator KERR to dominate the scene. These measures ranged from space communications to the President's 1962 trade bill, from medical care to a nationwide program to conserve our water resources, from tax revision to improvement in social security legislation.

Always an outstanding debater in scholastic competition, Senator KERR's natural leadership abilities first came to statewide attention when at the age of 28 he was elected State commander of the American Legion. This was while he was still a struggling lawyer in a small city. His first ventures in oil came soon after, however, and a few years later he was the principal organizer of one of the greatest industrial organizations ever founded in Oklahoma.

In 1925, Robert S. Kerr met, wooed, and won the hand of Grayce Breene, the talented daughter of a pioneer Oklahoma oil drilling contractor. The late Senator often described himself as a "wife-made man." His family always came first with Robert S. Kerr. Their three boys and one girl have now established families of their own, and the love and affection that Oklahomans had for Robert S. Kerr was reflected in an outpouring of sympathy for these fine citizens when he passed away.

Robert S. Kerr's work in civic affairs and as a lay leader of his church brought him recognition rapidly after he moved from his home community in Pontotoc County to Oklahoma City in 1931. His father had taught him the principles of Thomas Jefferson, and he rose quickly as a leader of the Democratic Party in his State, being elected national committeeman in 1940. Two years later, he became the first native Oklahoman to be elected Governor. Four years of splendid management of State affairs followed. During that period, Oklahoma was able to retire an indebtedness of $44 million, and when Robert S. Kerr left the Governor's office a surplus of more than $40 million existed in the State treasury.

During Senator Kerr's term as Governor, devastating floods occurred in Oklahoma to compound economic difficulties which had been set in motion a decade earlier by drought and depression. When he came to the U.S. Senate in 1949, the first bill he introduced was to create the Arkansas, White, and Red River Study Commission. This resulted in a completely coordinated plan for the development of the soil and water resources of the area, which Robert S. Kerr envisioned as the heartland of a fabulous new empire. But Robert S. Kerr's knowledge of the forces of nature and their effects upon our country's economy and security benefited vast regions of the United States far removed from the rural, agricultural community from which he came. The basin-wide study concept adopted with the passage of his first bill has now set a pattern being followed in many parts of the Nation.

Bob Kerr believed that the Nation's final greatness depended upon the conservation of its water resources. From the beginning of his public career, it became his principal goal. Certainly, he was interested in water for Oklahoma, an area which he loved and knew best. But from his understanding of area problems came a devotion to solving the Nation's problem of providing a certain and dependable supply of good water for the generations to come.

His unmatched knowledge in this field was recognized as he rose to lead the Senate in planning water resource development.

Much of the landmark legislation bears Senator Kerr's name and attests to his success in the passage of most of the major bills in this field.

Robert S. Kerr authored a bill to liberalize the benefits of soil conservation projects designed for upstream flood prevention. This legislation now provides water for irrigation, municipal water supply, and other benefits in needy sections of many States.

Senator Kerr was the author of the Tennessee Valley Authority self-financing bill, which at a moment of crisis for that great conservation and development system in the South gave the TVA an opportunity for new growth and stability.

He was a coauthor of the Pollution Control Act, which provides grants-in-aid to cities as an incentive to adequately treat sewage, prevent pollution of our streams, and provide policing powers to the Public Health Service. Always in search of new methods and new solutions, he secured in this bill a provision for research into better techniques for treating the critical problem of keeping our water clean.

Millions of Americans living in Northern and Eastern States will enjoy the benefits resulting from the compromise legislation which Senator Kerr worked out permitting the construction of the Niagara power development project. Opposite opinions had practically stalemated this development when Senator Kerr intervened. He also assisted in working out the legislation for the St. Lawrence Seaway, for the Delaware River Compact, and the Colorado storage project.

Robert S. Kerr was chairman of the Select Committee on National Water Resources, which, after an exhaustive nationwide survey, established principles which now have become the cornerstone policies of water resources development throughout the Nation. To hasten action upon these vital conservation projects, Robert S. Kerr, through indomitable insistence and persuasion, secured a liberalized policy making recreation part of the justification for reservoir building and providing for storage in Federal reservoirs for low-flow regulation to improve what he liked to call water quality management. This expression, "water quality management," was his method of accentuating the positive, rather than relying upon the negative term of antipollution control.

A résumé of Senator Kerr's legislative activity in the final 2 years of his life embraces an amazing spectrum. His accomplishments in the fields of foreign trade and tax legislation are wellknown, and to recite them here is unnecessary. His strong support and aid in the working out of our interstate highway program is likewise a matter known to us all. Another monument arising from his diligence in the Finance Committee is the Kerr-Mills bill, which now provides medical care for many of our aged citizens who deserve it most.

Robert S. Kerr was a charitable man. The Kerr-Mills bill is but one of many, many legislative enactments relating to social security and the welfare of our less fortunate citizens which had his meaningful support. Not so well known, perhaps, were the activities of a charitable nature which occupied many of his hours when he was not on the floor of the Senate or in the confines of the committee rooms. Many of these activities focused on Senator Kerr's beloved Baptist Church. He had served as president of the Baptist General Convention of Oklahoma and as vice president of the Southern Baptist Convention. For several years before his death he had been president of the Baptist Foundation of Oklahoma.

In the book of Malachi it is written:

> Bring ye all the tithes into the storehouse, that there may be meat in mine house, and prove me now herewith, saith the Lord of hosts, if I will not open you the windows of heaven, and pour you out a blessing, that there shall not be room enough to receive it.

Intimates of Senator Kerr know that he went far beyond this biblical admonition, providing not only one tithe, but much more to support the charities and good works that he believed in. No one, I am sure, will ever be able to document accurately the extent of his giving, for his talent in this field he carefully and humbly hid from public view.

No one knows how many hundreds of young men there are—now outstanding business, professional, and technical leaders—who received help from Bob Kerr when they needed it most. His door was always open to youth who were seeking—as Bob Kerr once sought—an opportunity to work their way up. In his own business, in his gifts and support to young men starting out in new fields or professions, his help was there in countless cases.

Sometimes it was substantial aid in the face of financial disaster for a new family. Sometimes it was a new start in life or a stake in a business that he believed would prosper through the qualities of those he helped.

Being a friend in time of need brought him a substantial part of the satisfaction he had in his own success—it enabled him to help others to be successful, too.

His gifts to educational institutions and organizations will be of much benefit to deserving youth long after all of us here today have joined him in the course of mortal man.

Robert S. Kerr recognized the inevitability of change, and profoundly expected most changes to be constantly for the better. His work as chairman of the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences was rooted in the philosophy that mankind is fast discarding the shackles of fear, the fear of the unknown. "Faith," he said, "smashes the shackles of fear, frees us from its imprisonment, replaces its paralysis with unlimited power."

In taking the lead in the bipartisan effort to accelerate our Nation's program for the development of outer space for peaceful purposes, he once explained his position in terms of his faith in God, in our country, in our free institutions, in ourselves. "Reinforced and fortified by faith," he said, "we can live safely and happily amid the astonishing realities of today and face the fabulous predictables of tomorrow. We can also anticipate the astounding unpredictables of the unknown depths of space with unshakable serenity."

Time—as well as space—had to be conquered. And with his unusual ability to get things moving, Senator Kerr applied his drive to this vast and complicated field. It was his ability to understand industrial methods in big projects that gave him the experience to move rapidly into this field of space exploration with a well organized program for mobilizing the Nation's best talents into the new effort in space.

We could not buy time, and Senator Kerr was dedicated to establishing this Nation's preeminence in this vast new field. He considered the Russian effort a challenge to the supremacy of democracy, and acted accordingly. We were out to win.

President Kennedy once described Senator Kerr as "the man with the long view." That simple encomium fits.

All of us recall how his mind sometimes overflowed with poetry or song, erupting as a fountain of wit to ease the strife and turmoil of debate. Senator Kerr had many favorite passages from scripture and many verses and sayings of his own that seasoned and enriched the lives of all who came in contact with him. In serious moments, his stately passages or quotations gave dignity and meaning to the subject at hand. Or if the occasion demanded, he could frolic with words and phrases to lighten the burdens of debate or discussion.

Whether in debate on the floor of the Senate, or in a farm meeting in the hills of Oklahoma, Bob Kerr always had at his command a story in point to sharpen his explanation of his position or to puncture the argument of an opponent. He loved to use his vast store of anecdotes—many native to Oklahoma—not as a gag to get a laugh, but to make understandable a philosophy or a point he was anxious to have thoroughly understood. It was also this facility for weaving humor into serious discussions to clarify his meaning that made him one of the Senate's most sought after speakers on platforms and in forums throughout the country.

It was his humor that made friends of those who once discounted his ability. It was his humor that added a mellowness to a drive that would otherwise have been suspect of seeking too much power. It was his humor that helped sustain him in the long hours that he worked.

He loved his work, but above all he loved the Senate—its Members and the body itself—as one of the world's greatest institutions. I am sure that if he had been required to make a choice between his vast business enterprises and his seat in the Senate, he would have chosen the Senate; for no man loved his work here more than the senior Senator from Oklahoma.

No one quotation can epitomize this man. His philosophy was expressed in many voices. His unique mind held in constant readiness these expressions that reflected his philosophy.

Yes, in a moment of challenge he would say:

> Come, my friends,
> Tis not too late to seek a newer world.
> Push off, and sitting well in order smite
> The sounding furrows; for my purpose holds
> To sail beyond the sunset, and the baths
> Of all the Western stars, until I die.
> It may be that the gulfs will wash us down;
> It may be we shall touch the Happy Isles,
> And see that great Achilles, whom we knew.
> Though much is taken, much abides; and though
> We are not now that strength which in old days
> Moved earth and heaven; that which we are, we are;
> One equal temper of heroic hearts,
> Made weak by time and fate, but strong in will
> To strive, to seek, to find, and not to yield.

Yes, Robert S. Kerr enjoyed the gift that enabled him to translate the vibrant spirit of his personality through the use of timeless and borrowed phrases of "Ulysses" and many another stalwart figure from the past. He was, however, more than a Ulysses of his day, for his heroic heart was tempered by his love for mankind. One of his favorite Biblical quotations came from the 13th chapter of St. John. He would interrupt a fiery argument, when tempers seemed about out of hand, to remind that Jesus said:

> A new commandment I give unto you, that ye love one another; as I have loved you, that ye also love one another.

This was Robert S. Kerr, a loving and heroic heart, strong in will. He strove, he sought, he found, and until the end of his life he did not yield.

All Oklahoma expresses great sorrow in mourning the loss of her distinguished son and great sympathy for the honored family he left behind.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to include in the Record as a part of my remarks the prayer given by Dr. Frederick Brown Harris, Chaplain of the Senate, at the funeral services, and various editorial comments from newspaper publications in the State of Oklahoma.

There being no objection, the prayer and editorial comments were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Prayer Offered at the Funeral of Senator Kerr, by Dr. Frederick Brown Harris, Chaplain of the Senate, January 4, 1963

Our Father God, as we come to this solemn hour a sentence from Thy book is ringing in our ears: "Know ye that there is a prince and a great man fallen this day in Israel." Fallen? Yes, that is the poor, blundering verdict of tear-dimmed eyes and of broken spirits, shadowed today by the somber sadness of farewell.

We bow in this sanctuary he loved, vividly conscious of the empty place at which our surprised eyes are staring, staring stunned, bewildered, and strangely moved. For there is a vacant place against the sky of our national life, a vacant place against the sky of our friendship, of this church, of this city, of this State, and of the worldwide enterprises of the Kingdom of God.

One loved by his friends, trusted by his colleagues, honored by his church, has gone down—"As when a giant cedar, green with boughs, goes down with a great shout upon the hills and leaves a lonesome place against the sky. Thou knowest that is the first thing we see. For a while it seems the only thing we see. Our eyes are glued upon that vacant place against the sky. With a poignant sense of tragic loss we are gazing today with altered eyes upon an altered world and our lonely and wondering hearts are crying out in those ancient words of startled surprise, "My Father, my Father, the chariot of Israel and the horsemen thereof."

Upon our waiting hearts as we gather in this hallowed shrine, where his hungry heart listened to the proclamation of the word of God, where he entered into the fellowship of the sweet communion, the solemn vows, and the church's hymns of love and praise, may there fall upon us the mantle of a double portion of the enabling spirit of the Master he loved and served.

We come this day, with a background of Christian living and serving, which for dedicated time and strength, and substance, strikes dumb any poor faltering word of estimate or appreciation we might try to bring.

Like thy servant Moses he wished not that his countenance shone—but it did. Not with any external halo of boastful profession, but with the glow of an inner radiance. Diligent in business, yet he instinctively turned from a subtle secularism which so often, alas, in these days of crass materialism dims life's altar light. His holiness was not a claim but a climate which, while frank and open and truthful, had no place for meanness or duplicity. His was never a cloistered piety, for while only a ministering doctor saw him die, we saw him live in the glory of public service.

Here in this State of which from pioneer days he was a rugged builder, he dreamed his dreams and saw his visions of the city of God hovering over this expanding land.

We are conscious today that in his record is an epic of achievement which stands as a prophetic beacon of hope for the youth of America. Here it was by force of character and ability he climbed the steep ladder of business success and won the recognition of strong men. He belonged to this age of amazing expansion, with its perennial tearing down and building up of titanic energy and of gigantic plans. This was his field of service. His prayer was not for an easy place.

That prayer of thy servant, Carl Sandburg, expresses the very spirit of his sacrificial service: "Lay me on an anvil, O God, let me lift and loosen old foundations, let me be the great nail holding a skyscraper through blue nights into white stars."

We are grateful today that with a sense of his stewardship through his church he touched the world with his prayers and his gifts. Thus, he was a statesman of the kingdom of God, a custodian of God's purposes, a trustee of the great commission.

He was intense when mind and strength and time were to be focused upon the thing to be done but he kept the heart and bubbling enthusiasm of a child.

Thus we gratefully bring the record of one who was not a conformist, who spoke for himself and for those who sent him as their spokesman, who consecrated his ability and his love of country and his massive strength across toiling years to help build an America which under God is the torch of the world.

And so no parting here, even though unheralded and poignant, can hush the song our confident spirits raise,

> "Jesus I live to Thee
> The loveliest and best
> My life in Thee—Thy life in me
> In Thy blest love I rest.

Jesus I die to Thee
Whenever death shall come
To die in Thee is life to me
In my eternal home."

Lord bring us all to that homeland of Thy eternal love.

In the name of the loving redeemer, we pray. Amen.

[From the Daily Oklahoman, Oklahoma City, Okla., Jan. 2, 1963]

ROBERT S. KERR

A giant has fallen. Oklahoma's ablest and most honored native son was struck down yesterday. He was in the prime of his power and at the pinnacle of his career, a statesman and a patriot. He was the champion defender and developer of his native Oklahoma. No other man had fought so hard and achieved so much in raising Oklahoma to a high place in the eyes of the world.

His ability, energy, and keenness of intellect challenged the admiration of his friends and the fear of his opponents. In his death, Oklahoma suffered a crippling wound. The Nation itself and the whole world in which our country moves will suffer changes unknown.

Seldom has one man so dominated the course and future of his beloved State. In the death of Senator KERR, the State of Oklahoma has been shaken to its foundations. A host of friends and uncounted numbers of his opponents will deplore his untimely death.

Always he was a friend to the poor, a generous giver who shared his wealth unstintingly in a myriad of benefactions.

Now is no time to count or evaluate the extent of the disaster which has fallen upon the country and his cherished Oklahoma.

Where is the leader who can take his place?

[From the Oklahoma City Times, Jan. 2, 1963]

OKLAHOMA'S GREAT SON

What Oklahoman will ever forget the chill that struck the heart Tuesday as he heard the shattering news that Senator ROBERT KERR had died?

Even though the tidings 2 weeks before that the 66-year-old senior Senator had suffered a heart attack had spread premonitions throughout the State, Oklahomans had been reassured by the drive and hardiness of KERR into believing he would recover.

But it was not to be.

And a relaxed Oklahoma, its thoughts on the Orange Bowl game at Miami, saw the future of the State suddenly shiver in uncertainty.

At a time like this one remembers the qualities of the deceased—Senator KERR's single mindedness for Oklahoma, his vision, his fine mind, his wit. But because of his superb ability to get things done, these qualities were so intermingled with accomplishment after accomplishment that even in the hour of his death one cannot separate the personal qualities from the achievements and the plans for the future. Nor does one need to.

So even as we remember the past we can reflect in sadness upon an untimely death that came with so much the Senator had planned as yet unaccomplished. The Senator who loved Oklahoma so much and did so much for his State would understand.

The loss is not ours alone. The ramifications of this death go far beyond our borders—into Congress, the Kennedy administration's plans, our space effort, public works, conservation, oil legislation, finance. The title of a Saturday Evening Post article on Senator KERR which came out by coincidence just this week, "The Uncrowned King of the Senate," describes the impact this loss will have in national affairs.

Oklahoma mourns with the grieving family of this man, one of her great sons of all time.

But even in this hour of sorrow we must realize what Senator KERR, tireless worker for the Oklahoma of tomorrow, would want above all. That would be for Oklahoma, without despair, to press on to make come true that glorious future toward which he did so much to blaze a splendid pathway.

[From the Tulsa (Okla.) Tribune, Jan. 2, 1963]

BOB KERR

You could write a lot of trite editorial sentences about the death of Senator ROBERT S. KERR.

You could say that his loss will be keenly felt in the Senate. You can say that it is a great blow to Oklahoma. These things are true.

You could also point out that he grew as his jobs grew. But maybe that's in reverse. That's what you might say about any one of a number of American Presidents who were plunged into a place of great power with only modest equipment, and who suddenly began to measure up to their responsibilities. BOB KERR could have been just a garden variety Senator. But he became the most powerful man in that body because he first demonstrated his capacity to handle great responsibilities.

He was a driving man. But he drove no one as hard as himself. He peddled magazines to put himself through college. He studied law while he taught school. He set out to become a millionaire and became a multimillionaire. He never completely satisfied his thirst for wealth, and, with his partner, Dean McGee, never ceased making purchases and expansions. But along about 1940 he decided he was financially fixed for life, so he roared into politics like a tornado.

As a politician BOB KERR lost only one major battle, his drive for the presidential nomination. Yet you can't say that he started out as a statesman. There was a lot left to be desired in his 4 years as Governor of Oklahoma. But he was learning. As he grew more sure-footed he began to spend less time playing politics as though it were a poker game and more time trying to figure out what was sound.

He didn't hit his stride until after he gave up his White House hopes. Then he relaxed. He began to appear occasionally on the unpopular side of issues. His colleagues, who had regarded him as a church-basement orator, long on platitudes and Biblical quotations, began to listen to him. They discovered that there was a lot more to BOB KERR than homilies and billingsgate. He was formidable in debate because he did his homework. He was powerful in committee because he arrived stuffed with information.

BOB KERR's love affair with Oklahoma caused wry smiles and some resentment. But someone had to love Oklahoma. BOB KERR chafed at the stagnation brought about by unwise farming, lack of soil conservation, and high transportation costs. His conviction that this could be reversed by the proper employment of land, wood, and water became his credo and he backed it by heavy investments in pasture and coal land in eastern Oklahoma, an area that had been on the skids for 40 years.

BOB KERR, fortunately, lived long enough so that much of his work cannot be undone. The Arkansas River development program is now far enough along so that completion is assured. Oklahoma's potential will be realized many years earlier than it would have been without BOB KERR.

But we will miss him, just the same. He was a locomotive. He was ruthless and he was human. He was acquisitive and he was generous. He was partisan and he was also patriotic. He was a complex and amazing man.

[From Vinita (Okla.) Daily Journal, Jan. 3, 1963]

JOURNALLY SPEAKING

(By O. B. Campbell)

Many facets of American life will feel the loss of Senator ROBERT S. KERR for he figured in so many phases of activity in Oklahoma and the Nation.

All these activities added together emphasize the demands made upon his time and his services.

Anyone who has not followed closely the work of a U.S. Senator or Congressman cannot realize the hours and hours of work spent in trying to properly carry out the duties of the office. Their hours are long, often far into the night to become informed on legislation that is being considered by the legislative bodies. Constant trips to and from their States, public appearances, stacks of mail, campaigns, committee meetings, and hundreds of other demands add more and more burdens to their already loaded shoulders.

It is no wonder that these services eventually become more than the body can bear. But, being the type of public servants that they are, they continue to carry on while the demands never let up.

Senator KERR, a great Oklahoma leader, joins the ranks of those who have fallen in the service of their country.

[From the Seminole (Okla.) Producer, Jan. 2, 1963]

BOB KERR'S DEATH A BLOW TO OKLAHOMA

(By Milt Phillips)

Senator KERR's death is a serious blow to Oklahoma. His philosophy of government may not have coincided with the philosophy of every reader of this column. Whether it did or did not, none can sincerely say the Senator's influence was not one of the most important factors in bringing numerous industrial developments to Oklahoma. The faith expressed in Oklahoma by Senator KERR and his business associates—the influence he exerted because of his seniority and exceptional ability in the Congress—his constant alertness for governmental and industrial payrolls for his State—all of these added up to one of the State's greatest potentials for economic growth.

* * * * *

Oklahoma not only lost one of the most brilliant men ever to serve in Congress from Oklahoma, it lost the most influential man ever to sit in Congress from this State.

[From the McAlester (Okla.) News Capital, Jan. 2, 1963]

THE LOSS OF SENATOR KERR

The death of Oklahoma's Senator ROBERT S. KERR is a loss to his State and his Nation. His importance is shown by the fact that the future of President Kennedy's legislative program has been put in doubt and there well may have been a cloud drawn over Oklahoma water projects by his death.

Loss of "the most powerful man in Congress" also shifts responsibility for many important Oklahoma programs to his colleague, Senator MIKE MONRONEY.

Senator KERR was a fighter and a cooperator in Congress and at the same time had a tremendous sense of humor when the occasion justified it. It is being said he is the Congressman President Kennedy will miss most during the coming session.

As Senator HUMPHREY said of Oklahoma's senior Senator, it is hard to describe the characteristics of a man who was as accomplished as Senator Kerr.

Oklahoma will miss his leadership in the front ranks of its continuous fight for progress.

[From the Purcell (Okla.) Register, Jan. 3, 1963]

STATE MOURNS DEATH OF KERR

Bob Kerr is dead. Oklahoma people have lost their most faithful, most effective, and most beloved public servant.

Senator Kerr was a native son, a typical Oklahoman. Born of a rugged pioneer family, he grew up under primitive conditions, conditions that called for hard work and total perseverance. Commencing with an innate ambition, he planned his career in business, profession, and politics just like an architect would design a building or like an artist would paint a picture or a sculptor would carve an image of a great face. He worked consistently and methodically on every operation, every lawsuit and every project and that coordinated system of labor brought him success in every field of endeavor.

It is well the editor of this newspaper remembers a description of Bob Kerr given him by the late judge of the district court in Purcell, W. G. Long. Judge Long described Bob Kerr as a lawyer having the best analytical mind of any attorney who had ever appeared in his court, and some of the greatest lawyers in Oklahoma appeared in Judge Long's court.

Senator Kerr is stricken down just as he reached the heights of popularity, strength, and outstanding accomplishments in the field of national service. Oklahoma has lost its most faithful friend.

Senator Robert S. Kerr will go down in the history of this State as Oklahoma's most famous citizen.

[From the Edmond (Okla.) Booster, Jan. 3, 1963]

SPEAKING FRANKLY

The death of Senator Robert S. Kerr this week is being mourned by thousands of Oklahomans and countless other thousands throughout the United States.

Eulogies of this man are being spread over every newspaper in the country, but they all cannot help but fall short in accurately depicting the influence wielded on the lives of so many others by his outstanding personality. And the effect of so many of his decisions will be felt for many, many years to come.

Few individuals in the history of our country have had the opportunity to serve their country and their fellow man in such positions of responsibility as did Senator Kerr. He sought and accepted these opportunities with a fervor few men could muster.

Wisdom, courage and humility are three traits of character seldom found in one individual, but Kerr had more than his share of each.

* * * * *

Statesmen of Senator Kerr's stature are hard to come by, and there are none that could begin to compare with him on the Oklahoma horizon. The realization of this fact is one of the reasons Democrats and Republicans alike are saddened by his loss.

No man—including the great Will Rogers—has ever contributed so much to the State of Oklahoma as has Robert S. Kerr.

[From the Shawnee (Okla.) News-Star, Jan. 3, 1963]

SOME HUMAN WARMTH HAS GONE, TOO

By now little has been left unsaid or unprinted concerning Oklahoma's Senator Robert S. Kerr. His untimely death Tuesday morning occasioned an immediate flood of praise and flattering appraisals of his life which had reached towering achievements in many fields. Most of the printed tributes came from men of high stature themselves, who were in position to know the great qualities that had brought him success.

"A giant has fallen," "the uncrowned king of the Senate," "a bit of Oklahoma died New Year's Day along with Senator Bob," "a great industrialist and oil executive," "Oklahoma's greatest asset," "OBU's most generous benefactor," were but a few of the ways by which such men appraised Oklahoma's senior Senator, perhaps the title he cherished most. In this role he was able to bring to bear the kind of influence that was fruitful to his native State to which few men have been more fiercely devoted.

The writer is not presuming to be numbered among the great personages who have so unstintingly praised Senator Kerr, or will. Rather we choose to evaluate him as a man who one just instinctively likes because of the human warmth that he couldn't have concealed had he chosen. Those little lines that were etched around his eyes because of the happy smiles or more hearty laughs with which he cloaked his visage must have been no small reason for the great affection which he evoked among his fellow beings. Certainly they worked such magic on us, upon occasions when we were around him, mostly on the basis of press meetings. Even though we were not always in accord with the issues to which Senator Bob brought his vast resources of support, we were never naive enough to believe that only we knew all of the answers—and we felt that the Senator was really at heart a conservative and very, very good for the Oklahoma which we also wished to see progress.

We will always cherish a letter from Senator Kerr which he took the time to write in longhand in appreciation of something we had said about him that he liked. "God bless you, Beachy," was his closing sentence, and we felt the warmth of a great man then, as now.

And we feel that God has blessed us more because of Senator Kerr's request.

[From the Lawton (Okla.) Morning Press, Jan. 3, 1963]

STATE MOURNS LOSS OF LEADER

The people of Oklahoma today mourn the loss of their greatest statesman and leader, Robert S. Kerr.

His untimely death on New Year's Day leaves a void which cannot be filled, Senator Kerr was without peer in many walks of life. He was without doubt Oklahoma's greatest native son, who rose from lowly beginnings to become one of the outstanding leaders of his time in both State and Nation.

A man of strong character, untiring energy, and keen intellect, he had the drive and the ability to forge to the top in statecraft and business in a constructive way. He was instrumental, almost singlehandedly at times, in lifting his beloved State of Oklahoma to greater heights, morally, spiritually, and industrially. He was a man of vision who could see the potential of his fellow man and his State, and work constructively to achieve results. Not the least of Bob Kerr's attributes was his devotion to his God and his church. He was a deeply religious man and practiced his religion.

Senator Kerr gave all he had to his State. He has often said "when I can no longer be of service to the people of Oklahoma I do not care to serve in the Senate." On recent visits to the State, friends have felt that the Senator was pushing himself too hard. But he never let up. He continued working for Oklahoma to the very end.

Bob Kerr was loved by many, hated by few. There is no one in Oklahoma who can take his place. His sudden and tragic death is Oklahoma's and the Nation's loss.

[From the Altus (Okla.) Times Democrat]

A GREAT LOSS AND A CHALLENGE

Senator Robert S. Kerr had been described as Oklahoma's greatest living asset.

This great and good citizen is dead at the peak of his power and influence in the Nation's Capital. The end followed 2 weeks of enforced rest, which came too late because Bob Kerr would never stop working for the people of Oklahoma.

Senator Kerr was in this area a few days before he entered the hospital. He was very, very tired, but he would not slow down and he never complained. His life was dedicated to the service of the people of his native State.

It is doubtful that any man in history will leave his personal imprint so deeply etched on a State as Robert S. Kerr has on Oklahoma. It is to be found everywhere—religious institutions, hospitals, schools, charities, highways, parks, vast reservoirs of water that will bless and sustain us for years, job-providing industries located in Oklahoma, and through his efforts, agricultural and other developments in a hundred ways that have never been publicized.

Oklahomans have known for a long, long time that Bob Kerr truly was an amazing man. The writer was with him for most of a full day immediately following the close of the last session of Congress. It is a miracle that he lived through those grueling months. The Senator said he had slept most of 2 days after the adjournment of Congress. And if he was weary, he hardly showed it. He acted like a young man starting on a new job. There was work to be done and he would not quit.

We spent a part of a day with him in the middle of November. He held a press conference in Tulsa at a convention of an international journalistic society. Searching questions came from a hundred reporters and magazine writers and the comment from all was that the senior Senator from Oklahoma was a most remarkable man. Senator Kerr's spirits were high and he appeared to be refreshed and stimulated by the hour-long questioning.

Senator Kerr frequently was a controversial individual, but he was respected. To some he seemed to be gruff at times, but he was kind, generous, and warmhearted. He was beloved and will be honored by future generations of Oklahomans for doing so much to make this State a better place to live.

Oklahoma will miss Senator Robert S. Kerr. His family, his personal staff, and his immediate associates know all of us grieve with them. Oklahoma faces a new challenge. We don't have Bob Kerr. His great works were not all completed. We now must unite to finish his program and in a way that will honor his memory. We never again can rest on our oars and say, "Bob Kerr will take care of us."

[From the Nowata Daily Star, Jan. 2, 1963]

It is to be hoped the outstanding fight conducted by Senator Robert S. Kerr to defeat President Kennedy's socialist medicare plan will not have been in vain.

And it is to be hoped President Kennedy can't take any comfort in the knowledge that Senator Kerr's death has removed a stumbling block to his socialistic legislation that would slowly but surely enslave the American people.

Senator Kerr in making his all-out fight to defeat a plan that would eventually lead to a dictatorial Federal Government probably got the message across to a lot of Americans. That message was: the strength of this Nation is the freedom of each individual.

Speaking in Nowata December 6, 1961, Senator Kerr told Scottish Rite Masons and their guests:

"The strength of the Nation provides the environment in which free men live and raise families, build churches and institutions so that when they move on they leave with the knowledge they have not been unfaithful to the great heritage imposed upon them."

* * * * *

Sure, Oklahoma and the Nation have lost a great citizen and public servant. But what he believed in and fought for are the same great principles which guide the vast majority of American citizens. It is only when we permit false leaders to dazzle us with tinsel that we get into trouble.

The great program of utilizing Oklahoma's vast resources to create a stronger economy was a well-known goal of Senator Kerr's. The cost of better utilizing these resources wil be repaid the Federal Treasury many times over by the taxes generated by new jobs and new business.

Senator Kerr had an interesting life of service. Certainly man can have no greater blessing.

[From the Oklahoma Courier, Jan. 4, 1963]

SENATOR KERR

Senator Robert Kerr was unquestionably the strongest political personality in Oklahoma. His death deprives the State of the single most important element in its promising future. The immense growth that is expected in the coming decade, industrially and in population, was based primarily upon the position and influence of Robert S. Kerr.

Now, Oklahoma must face the present and immediate future without its ablest champion.

In a time and in a part of the United States where politicians are held in even less esteem than is usual, the commanding intelligence and the quick-strided leadership of the late Senator made substantial contributions toward bettering the politician's image. And, the politician in the temporal realm is our most important personage. It is little less than tragic he is not recognized and treated as such.

Senator Kerr, of course, had political foes and during his lifetime undoubtedly made some bitter enemies. Whether friend or foe is a matter of no importance to him or to anyone else anymore. All that matters is that we all alike beg Almighty God to be good to one of our chief political leaders and most famous citizens.

[From the Oklahoma City, (Okla.) Advertiser, Jan. 10, 1963]

ROBERT S. KERR

So much has been written of Senator Robert S. Kerr since his sudden death New Year's morning one wonders what is left to be said? And yet his interests were so varied, drama so crowded his life, the story is all but endless; and for years to come parents and grandparents will be regaling children with tales of this man, who, as Dr. Waldo Stephens said in his always fine Sunday morning program on KWTV, was truly unlike anyone else.

I am sure many of us inside the church last Friday afternoon must have thought, with pricks of conscience, of those others, equally devoted and faithful, lining the streets, in the cold rain outside. For this man began his political career as the spokesman for humble men and women and, despite his millions, he never lost contact with them. In these early days Senator Kerr won his battles for election against the bitter opposition of many "at the top," who became supporters much later, when the senior Senator's place was too firm for upsetting.

All walks of life were, of course, represented both inside and outside the church and neither city nor State has seen such an outpouring of saddened humanity to honor a public servant. Whatever the disappointments along the way, in the final moments people seem to remember.

To the gentle, healing organ music the church filled and came to epoch moments. The first, it seemed to me, was when Mike and Ellen Monroney walked slowly down the center aisle, followed by the delegation from Congress; men we knew from newspaper headlines and TV, many of them from the far corners of the country, come to honor our fellow citizen. Some there were who may not have always agreed with Senator Kerr but all had come to pay a last tribute to a man they honored and respected.

The second emotion-packed moment came when former Mayor Allen Street, his own face showing the strain, led President John F. Kennedy, Vice President and Mrs. Lyndon Johnson, and Governor and Mrs. J. Howard Edmondson to their first row seats, just across from the space which Mrs. Robert S. Kerr and the family next quietly filed in to take.

The minister's reading of the First Psalm, of course, had more than the usual meaning:

"Blessed is the man that walketh not in the counsel of the ungodly. But his delight is in the law of the Lord. And he shall be like a tree planted by the rivers of water, that bringeth forth his fruit in his season; and whatsoever he doeth shall prosper."

When the service was over a fine drizzle had begun to fall again and as I walked back to the office other scriptural words came to me, these from Ecclesiastes.

"To every thing there is a season, and a time to every purpose under the heaven. A time to be born, and a time to die; a time to plant and a time to pluck up that which is planted."

The heritage of a life such as Senator Kerr's is rich beyond computation, alike to family and the State and Nation he served. It is a small matter that not everyone agreed with all he said, with all his votes. He served faithfully to the end.

Senator Kerr was blessed in many ways. Dr. Stephens said Sunday morning that his ability to accumulate this world's goods came from his pioneer spirit, the ability to apply this same spirit in the world of science, air and space, the facility to bridge the in-between gaps.

And certainly Senator Kerr was blessed in the manner of his going, in his time to die. A man at the very pinnacle of his fame, the flush of success warm on his brow, trusted confidant of his country's great, no lingering illness, no weeks or years of empty idleness removed from the fray he loved.

How well, I wonder, will we learn the lessons in such a life. Certain it is we cannot all amass such fortunes—even on promise to share in many good works as he did. But perhaps we can learn better our lessons of determined loyalty to principles he held dear, causes for which he labored and on which the well-being of today's world may well hang.

EXCERPTS FROM EDITORIALS IN OKLAHOMA NEWSPAPERS

Pryor Daily Times: "Senator Kerr never hid the fact that he was in Washington to obtain all of the political plums possible for his home State. He regarded that as his first duty and succeeded at it at the same time his role as a national political power reached lofty heights. His loss to Oklahoma is immeasurable. The Kerr shoes are big and will be difficult to fill."

Muskogee Phoenix: "The people of this State were shocked Tuesday morning just before the Oklahoma-Alabama football game when the TV audience was told that there would be an interruption for a special bulletin—and then in a moment the announcer said: 'It has just been announced that Senator Kerr has died.' A great shock it is indeed. Oklahoma has lost her greatest citizen and probably the most powerful man the State has produced in its 55 years of existence."

RECALL MEDICARE FIGHT

Nowata Star: "It is to be hoped the outstanding fight by Senator Robert S. Kerr to defeat President Kennedy's socialist medicare plan will not have been in vain. Senator Kerr in making his all-out fight to defeat a plan that would eventually lead to a dictatorial Federal Government, probably got the message across to a lot of Americans. That message was: The strength of this Nation is the freedom of each individual."

Norman Transcript: "While his public service career spanned a period of only 20 years, his tireless energy, strength of purpose and dedication to the causes in which be believed enabled him to write a record that will stand for a long time in Oklahoma."

The Duncan Banner: "Oklahoma faces a new challenge. We don't have Bob Kerr. His great works were not all completed and we now must unite to finish his program. In that way, we will honor his memory. We never again can rest on our oars and say: 'Bob Kerr will take care of it.'"

Daily Ardmoreite, Ardmore: "Kerr's big dream was to make Oklahoma an industrial State and he lived to see the start of that dream, with many new industries coming to the State. Starting out life in a log cabin, Kerr's life is an example that anyone can be successful in America and he rose from those humble beginnings to become an oil millionaire and a key figure in the Senate."

McAlester News-Capital: "His importance is shown by the fact that the future of President Kennedy's legislative program has been put in doubt, and there well may have been a cloud drawn over Oklahoma water projects by his death. Senator Kerr's death also shifts responsibility for many important Oklahoma programs to his colleague, Senator Mike Monroney."

The Ada Evening News: "Mrs. Robert S. Kerr, sons, daughter, and grandchildren are suffering heart pains they have never known before.

"Their distinguished husband, father, and grandfather has been cut down at the peak of his influence in home, in church, in business, in State and National and world affairs.

"But, friends, we here in Ada, the men and women who grew up with our Bob, those who were here before he grew to acknowledged greatness and those who have grown up in later years but have known of his multiple activities, also are heartbroken. We know we have lost a dear friend, one who cannot be replaced, and thus there will always be a void in our hearts."

The Pawhuska Journal: "Many, many tributes will be paid to Senator Bob Kerr in the press and elsewhere this week. Many of them will be eloquent and impressive.

"There is little we can say about Senator Kerr other than a rather all-inclusive statement that has been heard here often the past 2 days: 'We sure will miss "Ole Bob."'"

The Anadarko Daily News: "The death of Senator Robert S. Kerr put a heavy damper upon the start of a new year.

"Few if any communities had not felt the personal touch of service from the senior Senator. Few if any communities were not looking to great expansion in the future by the development of eastern and central Oklahoma River navigation. Our State's industrial climate was being adjusted to accommodate the almost unlimited space program that was being guided by Senator Kerr.

"It will take all of the political cooperation that can be developed within the Democratic Party of Oklahoma to hold the advance which has been made. And this cooperation must come at a time when the Democratic Party has lost its most determined leader."

The Cushing Daily Citizen: "'There were giants on the earth in those days.'—Genesis 6: 4.

"Historians of the future, and not necessarily the distant future, will record that ROBERT S. KERR was a giant in those days in which he lived to manhood and carved out a career of achievement. His strides were long and his workloads stupendous.

"If Will Rogers was Oklahoma's most loved citizen, then KERR was its most powerful. Some say that Senator KERR though himself indestructible. That I would deny.

"He only thought himself expendable. He was so deeply concerned with aims and goals, with the work he hoped to do for the world in which he lived, that it never occurred to him to spare himself."

The Woods County Enterprise: "Oklahoma suffered two great losses New Year's day. However, the State will recover from Sooner's Orange Bowl loss by Alabama much sooner than it will from the death of Senator ROBERT S. KERR."

The Sapulpa Daily Herald: "Ask 10 persons what they think the death of Senator BOB KERR will mean to Oklahoma and most likely all will express an opinion of doubt as to the State's future in the space age from the standpoint of new industries.

"There is no denying the fact that many of the space-age people were opening up facilities in Oklahoma for the principal reason that they wanted to be counted among the constituency of Senator KERR.

"As to the Arkansas River development, it must be assumed the Government has too great an investment in the project to abandon it at this late date. And too, Senator MIKE MONRONEY is one of the ranking Members of the Senate and he now will swing an even greater stick for Oklahoma and the many projects now in the hopper.

"But for the most part Oklahoma surely will be able to grow industrially despite the severe loss created by KERR's death. The Oklahoma congressional delegation, now led by MONRONEY, has worked as a team and the show will continue in the future as it has in the past."

[From the Oklahoma Union Farmer, February 1963]

The Oklahoma Farmers Union and all rural Oklahoma lost a great friend and stanch ally New Year's day in Washington when death came to ROBERT SAMUEL KERR, Oklahoma senior Senator.

While he climbed to heights found by few in American finance and politics, Kerr never moved, spiritually, far from the Pontotoc County farm where he first saw light 66 years ago. Always he found renewed strength in close comradeship with those who tilled the soil of the Sooner State. His hopes were theirs; his interest theirs, too; and his ambitions ran hand in hand with those of Oklahoma farm families.

Since the middle 1940's when KERR served as Oklahoma's first native-born governor, the jovial giant of Oklahoma politics and finance was a frequent and willing speaker at OFU conventions. Many times he dropped pressing engagements in private and public affairs and came winging halfway across the Nation in his own aircraft because he wanted to be with us.

* * * * *

While he dwarfed even the late Gov. E. W. Marland in accumulation of a personal fortune * * * and unlike him retained it * * * money was never the supreme thing with Senator KERR. "I was just as happy when I didn't have a dollar," he said and we believe he meant it.

In the list of things that count, KERR's religion and his friends stood far above material possessions. It was a simple religion and he was a stanch soldier in the Baptist faith; but he granted a wide and protective tolerance to those of all other beliefs.

KERR bridged the gap between the log cabin and space-age generation Americans. Yet he was at home in both. He was almost the last of American statesmen who could boast of a log cabin beginning. Few in American politics have died at the apex of power where he stood at the moment he was stricken.

His was a unique character. Yet in it were many of the qualities of Lincoln, more than a bit of Senator George Norris, and a lot of both the first and second Roosevelts. We think he and Newt Gresham would have found great comradeship, too.

[From the Oklahoma Rural News, publication of the Oklahoma Association of Electric Cooperatives, Feb. 1, 1963]

SENATOR ROBERT S. KERR

The late Senator KERR's battles for rural electrification have been classic rounds which will long be remembered in the Halls of Congress.

"My own background has given me a devoted interest in rural electrification," he says in Land, Wood, and Water. "I have seen the rural electric cooperative bring a revolution to the farms in just one generation.

"When I was a young man, few farmers could get electricity. Private utility companies could not, or would not string lines tô isolated farms. So we read by kerosene lamps and milked the cows by hand."

Thus impressed he bucked the powerful Senate Appropriations Committee while yet only a freshman Senator and won his battle.

Southwestern Power Administration sought a continuing fund to give it greater flexibility in the sale and purchase of power. If its bill failed in Congress SPA officials feared it would be "thrown back into the arms of the private utilities whose affection they doubted and whose prices they feared."

In this situation Senator Kerr took the floor to tell the Senate he hoped its action would not leave the rural electrics in a fix similar to the tall awkward country boy who was brought into a doctor's office in the foothills of the Ozarks by a stern-visaged oldster who said, "Doc, I want you to fix up my son-in-law.'

"'What's his trouble?' asked the doctor.

"'Oh, I shot him in the laig yestiddy and lamed him up a mite.'

"'Shame on you,' said the doctor, 'for shooting your own son-in-law.'

"Which brought this brisk rejoinder, 'well, you see, he wairn't my son-in-law 'til I shot him.'"

With this story the Senator made his point: that without his amendment, rural cooperatives and municipalities could be headed for a shotgun wedding with the utilities, which was exactly what they did not want.

Battling for public power projects and cheaper electricity for rural folks seemed to come naturally to him. Through it all he retained the mark of a really great man—the ability to laugh even at himself. Relating his clash with the director of the New York State Power Authority over hydroelectric power development of Niagara Falls, Senator KERR says:

"After the two of us had blown off enough steam to operate a small generating facility, we finally agreed to proceed * * * to find an acceptable formula to permit the great project to go forward."

He was winner in the historic controversy over financing the Tennessee Valley Authority as well as of many others. Of them he says,

"Out of all these and the numerous other legislative battles and debates, a constructive power policy has been and will be hammered out of Congress. The goal must be to develop our natural resources to have the greatest value to the most people."

His fight for rural electricity alone entrenched him firmly and everlastingly in the hearts of rural people throughout the Nation.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. President, I rise today with a sense of pride, but also with a sense of inadequacy, to pay tribute to Oklahoma's first native-son Governor and late senior U.S. Senator. No other man surpassed ROBERT S. KERR in service to our State.

My active career in politics began with his first campaign for the Senate in 1948. He had completed a successful term as wartime Governor of Oklahoma. I went to his office in Oklahoma City and volunteered my services, and a group of us recently discharged from military service in World War II organized students in some 20 colleges in the State for his Senate campaign.

My impression of him then was to remain always. Here was a man not only with vision, unlimited energy, and an almost fierce dedication, but also a man with a unique understanding of people and a sincere concern for their well-being.

In 1948, he was elected to his first term and so began one of the Senate's most successful and productive careers. Such effectiveness did not come without sacrifice. He realized better than anyone that it took hard work to achieve success, and his road to it was never an easy one. He was always willing to work, and one could always count on him working just a little bit longer and harder than his toughest competitor. As Senator KERR once said:

> I came here to do a certain job for Oklahoma. It is a big program. It takes a long time. I can't figure any other way to get it done—except to work.

Of all his outstanding qualities, and he had many, I believe this untiring dedication to the realization of a job well done was most significant. Couple this with his ability to see beyond today's horizon—to see the possibilities of tomorrow and make them probabilities today—and we have the blueprint of a man who succeeded in business, in industry, and in agriculture; served his State and country well; and was a leader in his church.

Being a son of the soil, born in a log cabin, he had a keen awareness of the importance of conservation, development, and full utilization of our natural resources.

Years before others, he saw the Arkansas River as a vast navigation channel from the Mississippi River across the entire State of Arkansas and deep into Oklahoma. To many, such vision appeared in earlier years to be pure folly. To the untrained eye the Arkansas River looked like a vast sandbed with too little water for navigation—a scar on the face of our State caused by our own careless, thoughtless, and wasteful use.

But to Senator KERR it was no folly. It was a challenge to restore one of the country's greatest rivers to its original condition and uses, and in the process open the heart of the Nation to industrial development and production.

When he campaigned across the State preaching such plans and possibilities, his opponent often belittled them by suggesting it would be far more practical to pave the Arkansas. But today this dream, this often-called folly, is close to completion and stands as a monument to his foresight and, more particularly, his untiring effort.

As the Members of the Senate know, this ability to serve your State, this effectiveness, does not come overnight or easily, but only through years of service and a constant dedication to the job to be done.

In later years, the effects of this great Oklahoman's service not only crossed the borders of States, but spanned the oceans as well. In the last session alone, his contributions in the fields of space and world trade stand as mute testimony to this fact. To his wife and family—Mrs. Edmondson joins me in expressing our deepest sympathy.

Words alone neither can nor need be adequate today to pay tribute to Oklahoma's native son. His deeds are his monument, as lasting as the land, wood, water—and finally space—to which he dedicated his life.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, BOB KERR has gone; a mighty oak has fallen. A void has been left in the U.S. Senate, hard to fill.

In the passing of this economic, political, and religious leader, the U.S. Senate, the people of Oklahoma, and the people of the Nation have suffered a great loss. For the past 14 years, it has been my privilege to serve with him in the Senate and to claim him as a personal friend. I felt about him as did Maj. Thomas Howie, of Virginia, who said of the heroic courage of the men of the 116th Infantry whom he led in its historic landing on Omaha Beach in World War II:

> I am both humble before God and proud before my fellow men that America produces the breed of men I have had the privilege to go into action with.

History will record how Senator ROBERT S. KERR, of Oklahoma, exemplified the philosophy of Woodrow Wilson, who said: "It is the primary duty of a leader to lead his own generation and not the next." Today, I ask the privilege of merely paying tribute to Senator KERR as a man and a Christian gentleman. BOB KERR had a capacity for friendship and we in the Senate loved him. He achieved success without conceit, accumulated wealth without arrogance, and power without ruthlessness—a self-made man who gave to God all credit for what he was. He was a man of character whose faith in God never wavered; a man of courage who flinched before no foe—either on the battlefield in World War I or in any subsequent political arena. He was taken from us while still in the full possession of a vigorous and elastic mind. But his was the philosophy of Robert Louis Stevenson, who said:

> And does not life go down with a better grace foaming in full body over a precipice than miserably straggling to an end in sandy deltas?

We shall miss him, but we give assurance to his relatives and constituents who loved him that we loved him too and that love will keep his memory green. We must not be too sad over the passing of one who "kept the faith," because:

> When the great and good depart,
> What is it more than this
> That man, who is from God sent forth,
> Doth yet again to God return?
> Such ebb and flow must ever be
> Then wherefore should we mourn?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, we were all shocked by the sudden death of Senator ROBERT KERR. BOB KERR was an immensely talented and versatile man. Rising from humble beginnings, he parlayed these talents into success in a number of fields. Not the least of these was in the legislative field, where he gave full expression to his manifold abilities.

As a member of three important committees, as an orator, as a skilled debater, as a Senator who defended the interests of his constituents, and as one who did his homework thoroughly, he had few if any peers. The rest of us had grown so accustomed to his personal competence that it is hard to imagine the U.S. Senate without BOB KERR. He was a giant of a man, not only physically, but in the sense that he filled the Senate with his presence.

BOB KERR's unexpected death was a tragic one. His loss has been felt in the Senate, in Oklahoma, and in the Nation. But those who mourn his passing can find consolation in the achievements of his life and of his career in the Senate. He played a key role in the passage of countless measures—some controversial and some universally acclaimed. It is fitting that his greatest legislative contribution came in the last of his 15 sessions in Congress. Senator KERR's efforts in behalf of the historic Trade Expansion Act of 1962 were of inestimable value in gaining almost unanimous acceptance of the measure in the Senate. The overwhelming success of the act in this body may be properly considered the crowning achievement of his legislative career. He was, in my opinion, the ablest of the able.

Both in and out of the Senate, BOB KERR had a lively sense of humor which complemented his dedication to hard work. And he was a deeply religious man who took a lifelong interest in the activities of his church. For these and his many other qualities, he will be sorely missed.

BOB KERR was a great American, a great Senator, and a great Democrat. Last, but certainly not least, he was a great Oklahoman.

I wish to take this opportunity to extend once again the heartfelt sympathies of Mrs. Mansfield and myself to Mrs. Kerr and her family and to the people of Oklahoma.

BOB KERR was an outstanding Senator who has made his mark on this body and whose good works will be his enduring monument.

As the majority leader of this body, no one will miss him more.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, it is with a deep sense of personal loss that I join my colleagues in paying tribute to a great American—Senator ROBERT KERR. It is most appropriate to use the word "great" in describing BOB KERR, for I am sure all will agree that he was in the truest sense of the word a great citizen, a great Senator, a great Oklahoman, and a great American. As a measure of his stature and greatness, we have only to look to the void created in this body by his death. He served with us here in this body for 14 years with great distinction, devotion and dedication. In those years of service and close associations, he endeared himself to the high respect, confidence and personal esteem of all of us, and of all America.

I have lost a personal friend, and the State of Arkansas has lost a true friend and a wonderful neighbor to whom it will always be indebted. There has always been a community of interest between my own State of Arkansas and the great State of Oklahoma. Because of these common interests, I often had the privilege of working closely with Senator KERR in furthering the progress and development of our respective States. Perhaps the outstanding example of this and of the results that have been obtained through cooperative efforts between Senator KERR and the Arkansas congressional delegation is the Arkansas River basin development program which means so much to both Oklahoma and Arkansas. The people of Arkansas will never forget, and will always be grateful for, the tremendous contribution which BOB KERR made in bringing this project to fruition. Generations yet unborn will benefit from the prosperity which this program will bring to the Arkansas River Valley.

BOB KERR was the kind of man who is so greatly needed in our country today. His kind of man has been rare in all periods of history. He was a living example of what can be accomplished by hard work and individual initiative in this great country of ours. Young people of today would do well to study his life, for there is no finer example of the opportunities presented to the individual by the free enterprise system of the United States than the life of BOB KERR. His activities in both private and public life were a succession of accomplishments that represent perhaps the best illustration possible of the American success story.

Throughout our service here together, my respect and admiration for him grew ever greater with the passing of years. He was possessed of marked ability, industry, and courage. No Member of this body had greater wisdom or influence in legislative affairs, or a more striking and impressive personality. He was a Senator's Senator. He was a deeply Christian man. He could be gentle, but he could also act with the strength and toughness of a man who knows no fear. He stamped the print of his personality on the course of events in this body as few men have done.

The people of Oklahoma, I am sure, loved and respected him for what he was, a remarkable and dedicated public servant, whose services to his State and his Nation were of the very highest order.

BOB KERR will be greatly missed by all of us, and by all Americans. When we consider the stature of the man, we realize that anything we might say about him would be an understatement. I find words, mere words, truly are inadequate to express the emotions and sentiments that well up in my heart on this occasion. It is difficult for me to realize that he is gone.

Mrs. McClellan joins me in extending our heartfelt sympathy to Mrs. Kerr and members of the family. We share their deep sorrow and their great loss.

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, it is with deep sorrow that I recall the tragic death of my beloved friend and colleague, Robert S. Kerr. His untimely passing marks the end of the long, distinguished career of one of the century's greatest champions of democracy.

Serving and working side by side with Bob was indeed one of the most rewarding and fulfilling experiences of my life. I never met a man who did not respect him. Driven by an indefatigable determination to pursue and fulfill all his dreams, he set his goals high. His interests encompassed many fields and in his lifetime he served as a schoolteacher, lawyer, soldier, rancher, oilman, industrialist, financier, statesman, humanitarian, author, orator, and churchman.

Born in a log cabin in the blackjack country of Pontotoc 13 years before Oklahoma became a State, Bob Kerr found no task too big or too overpowering for him. He was one of the last true pioneers of America, and in keeping with that spirit he touched the lives of thousands of people. Always he retained his deep faith and inherent understanding and compassion for all people, his inspiration coming from spiritual truth and an intense love of his country and fellow men.

One of the leading national churchmen of the Baptist Church, Bob was a deeply religious man. He was one of the most dedicated men I have ever known, and strove against overwhelming odds to attain his ideals.

He lived and worked under the slogan "Land, wood, and water." Despite his fantastic success, he never lost sight of these three things, and became America's first and foremost developer of natural resources and soil conservation both in Oklahoma and all over the United States.

Having a thirst for factual knowledge, a fondness for research, and an analytical mind, Bob Kerr acquired a foresight for predicting the future problems of this Nation. With these talents he became a founder and champion of the space efforts in this country.

Loyal to his beloved State, he earned the title of "Mr. Oklahoma." Bob was also well known and loved in South Carolina, having visited my State on several occasions in an official capacity. As chairman of the Senate Select Committee on Natural Water Resources he conducted hearings in Columbia and Charleston. He was guest speaker at a meeting of the South Carolina Press Association and just this past year spoke in Columbia at a Democratic Party rally. A great orator, Bob touched the hearts of the people of South Carolina with his sincere words.

His endless deeds and toil for his fellow men and his devotion to public service and to making America a better place can never be erased. Long will this Nation mourn the death of Bob Kerr, and never will there be a man big enough to follow in his footsteps. May his spirit and memory ever be a shining light and lasting inspiration for all generations.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I wish to observe at the beginning that the Members of this body who served the longest with Senator Kerr are the ones who have been more inclined to remain in the Chamber during all of the memorial service. I know that all Senators who can be here are present. I observe in the Chamber the Vice President, who was one of Senator Kerr's great friends. Everyone is giving the utmost attention. That within itself is an unspoken tribute to this truly great man whom we knew and loved so well.

At the expense of some repetition, I desire to make a few remarks about this big, friendly, magnanimous man who did so much for his country in the relatively short time he was a Member of the Senate.

I pass on to the youth of this country, especially those who are interested in public life, a point which Senator Kerr made with me when he told me of a conversation he once had with his father, who was a trusted and respected county official in Oklahoma. Senator Kerr one day walked into the office of his father, who was clerk of the court, and said, "I want to be the Governor of Oklahoma."

His father said:

> Fine, son. Keep your eye on that goal, and you will get there. But first establish yourself in some kind of business or profession, so that you will have something substantial besides the salary of your office on which to fall back, and thus be able greatly to increase your opportunity for service.

Bob did that, and in a great way. I think it is mighty good advice for young men, and we want more of them to become interested in entering public life, to bear such advice in mind, and thus to build an economic foundation on which to broaden their opportunities in public life.

Senator Kerr was also a man of great faith—not only faith in God, but faith in mankind, as well. He always attended our breakfast gatherings. Shortly before our last meeting in October of last year, at the end of a hard session, particularly hard for him, I remarked to him one day that he appeared to be rather fagged out. I said, "Bob, the last meeting we will have will be next Wednesday morning. We must end the year on a great note of faith. I want you to lead."

He said, "I will be there."

He gave us one of the finest talks on practical spirituality, the practical side of spiritual values, that we had ever heard. So valuable were his remarks that I asked him for his notes that he had made hurriedly the night before—I understood it was about midnight—and had a photostatic copy made of them. I treasure them not only as a guide to this great man's thinking, but also for the value they have to me in a personal way.

Mr. President, I have heard it said that one of the former Vice Presidents said to a Member of this body that in order to be a great Senator, it was more important to have courage than to have brains. I believe that to be true. Bob Kerr had both.

Mr. President, I wish to have printed in the Record one of the greatest funeral services I have ever heard. It was delivered at our friend's funeral by his pastor, the Reverend Mr. Herschel H. Hobbs, of the First Baptist Church of Oklahoma City, Okla. Those of us who heard that great man pay that wonderful tribute to Bob Kerr knew that Rev. Mr. Hobbs was talking about the same man we had known.

Before I ask unanimous consent to have the entire sermon printed in the Record, I wish to read "A Prayer for My Pastor," which, as Rev. Mr. Hobbs said, Robert Kerr published many years ago. This is what our late friend wrote:

> Our Father, let me be a pillar of strength to help hold him up and not a thorn in his flesh to sap his strength, nor a burden on his back to pull him down.
>
> Let me support him without striving to possess him.
>
> Let me lift his hands without placing shackles around them.
>
> Let me give him help that he may devote more time in working for the salvation of others and less time in gratifying my vanity.
>
> Let me work for him as the pastor of all the members and not compel him to spend precious time in bragging on me.
>
> Let me be unselfish in what I do for him and not selfish in demanding that he do more for me.
>
> Let me strive to serve him and the church much and be happy as he serves me less and the church and others more.

Mr. President, as his pastor said, I believe Bob Kerr's prayer was answered a thousandfold. It was characteristic of him. He was always doing for others and he was always thinking of others.

Mr. President, I now ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record the entire sermon delivered by the Reverend Mr. Hobbs.

There being no objection, the sermon was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

EULOGY FOR SENATOR ROBERT S. KERR, BY REV. MR. HERSCHEL H. HOBBS, PASTOR, FIRST BAPTIST CHURCH, OKLAHOMA CITY, OKLA.

(SCRIPTURE: PSALM 1:1–3)

We are gathered today, the great and the lowly, to honor the memory of a great man who was a friend to both. We would not disturb the memories which fill your hearts and minds. Rather we would leave them to each of you as precious treasures to be enjoyed in the secrecy of your own life. But we would seek to voice for all a tribute regarding one who lived wonderfully and wrought greatly among us.

President James A. Garfield said, "I mean to make myself a man, and if I succeed in that, I shall succeed in everything."

Robert S. Kerr was a man in the highest sense of that word. Before he made his first dollar, or his fame had spread beyond the bounds of Pontotoc County, Okla., he was a man. He possessed a character endowed with the possibility for greatness. His was a character ingrained with qualities of righteousness received at the hands of a pioneer mother and father. More than once he was heard to say, "My old daddy was the greatest man I ever knew."

And though he was destined to rise to the dizzy heights of economic and governmental power, he brought to those heights these principles of righteousness which were the very warp and woof of his being. He was always a man.

He was a man of vision. Robert S. Kerr was a walking commentary on the words of Robert Browning.

> "Ah, but a man's reach should exceed his grasp
> Else what's a heaven for?"

There is a vast difference between a visionary man and a man of vision. Our friend was the latter. He dreamed great dreams, and then turned them into realities. To whatever task he set his hand, he did so not merely with a view of things as they were but what they could become. Thus he saw vast economic empires where none existed before. He envisioned cargo-bearing streams and life-giving water amidst vast prairies and rolling hills, derricks in the ocean, homes for orphaned children, seats of learning for youth, and sustenance for the aged.

No one man could achieve in one lifetime the visions which ever beckoned him on. But he blazed trails, pointed the way, and challenged others to pursue the goals to whose achievements he gave his last ounce of energy and devotion.

Robert S. Kerr was a man of wisdom. His ready wit was exceeded only by his sober judgment. When he spoke he did so in utterances based upon facts. When he lifted his voice others listened, convinced not by the flow of his oratory but by the soundness of his reason. His encyclopedic mind amazed both friend and foe. He was always ready to listen to the counsel of others. And he was never too busy to give wise counsel when sought. Almost infinite was his patience as he sought to lead others to see and understand that which was so clearly comprehended by him. For he was blessed with a mind which readily could sift the wheat of decision from the chaff of details.

Robert S. Kerr was a man of courage. His life was a moving drama of the American dream. Born in a log cabin to poor but righteous, hardworking parents, he rose to sit in the councils of the mighty. His slogan of "Land, wood, and water" was a dramatic testimony to the basic origin of his courage and stamina. In his journey across the years he encountered many obstacles, but none so great as to cause him to dip his colors. Often in times of difficulty in a given enteprise when the courage of others seemed to fail, one heartening challenge from the Senator brought others back to face resolutely the problem and to win the victory.

Our friend possessed not only physical but moral courage. Men might criticize his program but never his principles. He never sacrificed personal convictions on the altar of questionable conduct. And he will ever remain a monument of a man in the world but not of it.

Robert S. Kerr was a man of faith. He had an unshakable faith in God and in God's word. On his desk was always seen a much used Bible. Often when he was alone his secretary would find him reading from its pages as he filled his soul with its precepts and power. Or he was reading and expounding its message to a friend. On one occasion he is reported to have read Psalm 91:7 to one whose courage had failed. "A thousand shall fall at thy side, and ten thousand at thy right hand; but it shall not come nigh thee." "Do you believe it?" asked the Senator. "Do you really believe it? Then quit worrying, and live by it." He ever fortified his advice by his example.

Because he had faith in God he had faith in men. His life was that of a thousand because he entrusted vast enterprises to others. He gave absolute loyalty to those about him, and received the same in return.

No task was too great or too small for him to undertake for a friend. Many years ago this speaker asked him to leave his many duties in Washington to travel to San Francisco, at his own expense, to address a group of pastors. He agreed, saying, "A wish from my pastor is a command performance. I'll be there."

Robert S. Kerr gave much and expected little in return. Many years ago he published what he called "A Prayer for My Pastor."

"Our Father, let me be a pillar of strength to help hold him up and not a thorn in his flesh to sap his strength, nor a burden on his back to pull him down.

"Let me support him without striving to possess him.

"Let me lift his hands without placing shackles around them.

"Let me give him help that he may devote more time in working for the salvation of others and less time in gratifying my vanity.

"Let me work for him as the pastor of all the members and not compel him to spend precious time in bragging on me.

"Let me be unselfish in what I do for him and not selfish in demanding that he do more for me.

"Let me strive to serve him and the church much and be happy as he serves me less and the church and others more."

And God answered his prayer a thousandfold.

But most wonderful of all was Robert S. Kerr's simple, childlike faith in Jesus Christ as his personal Saviour. In this hour it matters not how much wealth one accumulated. Or how much fame adheres to one's name. But one thing matters. What did you do with Jesus who is called the Christ? Bob Kerr trusted in Christ in life. He has found Him trustworthy in death.

For years the Senator carried an engagement pad in his pocket. Its many entries bespoke the stature and the stress of the life that he lived. But always at the head of each page were written these words:

> "Be near me when my feet
>   Are slipping over the brink;
> For I am nearer home today,
>   Nearer, perhaps, than now I think."

These were prophetic words. For in a moment of quiet serenity he slipped away to be with the Lord. And even before the news media carried the word of his going to a shocked Nation, he heard the glad, triumphant words of the Saviour whom he loved and served. "Well done, thou good and faithful servant: thou hast been faithful over a few things, I make thee ruler over many things: enter thou into the joy of thy Lord."

Many trees grow in the forest and are cut down, the only evidence of their going being the stumps which they leave. But once in a great while a mighty oak falls. And falling, it leaves a vacancy against the sky.

Robert S. Kerr was such an oak. Who will take his place? Alas! None will take it. For he received it not by appointment, but through achievement. What one mighty man began, many must continue. And doing so, we shall realize for him that he did not live, nor did he die, in vain.

God help us to make it so.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I find it difficult to express the feeling of personal loss I suffered when I was informed of the death of Senator Robert S. Kerr. It is more difficult to express the loss that the entire Nation sustained in his passing.

I had the privilege of working with Senator Kerr for many years on conserving, preserving, and developing the natural resources of our country. He and I both took a deep, fervent, and abiding interest in waterway and river valley development.

I am glad to to be able to say that his interest extended not only to his own State of Oklahoma, but also to all the other areas of our great Nation. However, it is only natural that his primary interest would lie in the development of his native State and its river valleys. He and I worked jointly on these developments: the Gillham Reservoir, in Arkansas; the Millwood Reservoir, also in Arkansas; and the Broken Bow and Pine Creek Reservoirs, in Oklahoma; as well as many other projects designed to aid the development of the Arkansas and Red River Valley and the development of the Nation as a whole.

In the earlier days we were among the first to express an interest in the Ferrell's Bridge Reservoir, in Texas, which is on a tributary of the Red River, and in the large and promising McGee's Bend project, also in Texas, on a tributary of the Red River.

Our interest was joint, and it was lasting. He and I considered, and I still consider, that the development of the Arkansas and Red Rivers to their full potential should be a concern of the utmost importance to the Nation as a whole.

Of these worthy projects, only the Ferrell's Bridge Reservoir, in Texas, has been completed. I expect to carry on Senator Kerr's ideal; and I express the hope that my future efforts will result in the completion of those projects, in which he was so vitally interested.

In 1960, Senator Kerr published his now well-known and widely respected volume entitled: "Land, Wood, and Water." I am pleased and proud to be mentioned in its pages. I am indeed fortunate in having an autographed copy of it on my desk.

Senator Kerr's inscription to me on the flyleaf is very complimentary. It contains such words as "greatest," "most able," and "generous." I am sincere when I say that if I could now return those compliments to him, they would prove far, far insufficient to describe the man.

I am sure the first paragraph of the preface to "Land, Wood, and Water" contains a large measure of Senator Kerr's personal philosophy. That paragraph reads as follows:

> Ever since I was a boy on the frontier, the wonders of nature have awed and inspired me. My father cultivated this taste, coining the rhythmic phrase of "Land, Wood, and Water." As he often told me, these were his objectives when he set out to find a home in the old Indian territory. There on the farm he chopped out of a wilderness, I could plainly see the basis of our existence. As I grew to manhood with broader horizons, I realized that the trio of natural wealth is the foundation of all prosperity and essential to a better way of life everywhere.

While living, Senator Kerr did everything in his power to make stronger that foundation of all prosperity.

I close by saying that I count myself most fortunate to have been a friend of Senator Kerr, and to have been able to aid him in some small degree in carrying out his life's work.

I am deeply grieved at his passing, and I extend to his wife and family my heartfelt sympathy.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I first had the privilege of knowing our late friend, Governor and Senator BOB KERR, when both of us were serving as Governors—he as the Governor of Oklahoma, and I as Governor of my native State, Florida. The last 2 years of my term—1943 and 1944—overlapped the first 2 years of his; and I had the chance to get in close touch with him when we met in the Southern Governors' Conference meetings or at national defense conferences. It was my pleasure—and I have a good deal of pride in remembering it—to nominate him to be chairman of the Southern Governors' Conference when I was leaving the office of Governor, in 1944; and he was named to serve in that capacity. I believe he served in it 2 years.

He used to say to me—I am sure the remark was facetious, but, nevertheless, I appreciated it—that he thought my helping him to be named to that particular position launched him beyond the borders of the State of Oklahoma. That statement was typical of his generosity, for it would have been impossible to have contained him within the bounds of Oklahoma.

When he came to the Senate, we served together on the Public Works Committee, and also on the Appropriations Committee, in connection with matters relating to public works, because he served there as ex officio member of the Public Works Subcommittee when it was dealing with matters relating to public works. He was always on hand at those meetings, as my distinguished friend, the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the able chairman of that particular subcommittee will recall.

I can remember now what happened late one evening last year when we were having a conference with the conferees from the other body in the old Supreme Court Chamber when Senator KERR was a conferee for the Senate on the public works appropriation bill. I shall never forget the delightful way that he wangled some particularly desirable things, from his standpoint and those of his constituency in Oklahoma, from the conferees from the other body.

On the Space Committee I had the pleasure of serving under his chairmanship for 2 years. I take this opportunity to say that I have never heard any greater illustration of knowledge of a complex subject matter than he showed in cross-examining leading executives from some of the communications firms of the country when we were holding hearings on the Telstar bill last year.

Insofar as my State is concerned, he honored us frequently with his presence at Canaveral and elsewhere. He conducted a meeting of his Select Committee on Water Resources in Jacksonville, at which time our people paid him the acclaim that was due him.

He used to come down fishing on the St. Johns River with a friend of his and mine, Capt. Noah Tillman, who operates a fishing houseboat which he has named *Noah's Ark*, and out of which Senator KERR seemed to draw particular pleasure. He used to like to talk about the good times he had down there fishing.

He was a very human person, liking things of the type that I mentioned, especially in the way of being out in the wide out-of-doors with friends.

Last fall he came down and spoke as the honored guest at the University of Florida annual Blue Key meeting at the homecoming game. Though I frequently heard him on the floor of the Senate when his sarcasm almost baffled description, I have never heard him to better advantage than I heard him that night when he felt that the preliminary portions of the program, trespassed upon his time after he had come down the long distance to Florida to deliver a speech to us. He wound up with everybody in that huge crowd of about 1,500 leading citizens from all over our State loving everything that he said and everything that he stood for.

In closing, I wish that the RECORD could preserve the feeling of sorrow, solemnity, and absolute devastation that prevailed when we heard that Senator KERR had unexpectedly passed away on January 1 of this year. Many of us were at Miami for the Orange Bowl game. The President of the United States was flying from West Palm Beach to Miami to be our distinguished and honored guest at that game. When the news came through the air of the death of BOB KERR, the whole affair was turned into a channel which is almost indescribable in any words that I might utter. When the President came into the little tent which had been set up for him so that he might be received by a group of friends, there was on his face the mark of a terrible sorrow that had struck him a few minutes before. The same is true of Senator MANSFIELD and of all others who were present.

I do not believe I would be going too far to say that Senator KERR's death at that particular time may have had some effect on the result or outcome of that game. Without by any means discrediting the fine performance by the football team from the University of Alabama—and it was an outstanding performance—I am sure that every man on the Oklahoma team that day felt a sense of distinct personal loss and sorrow, and it must have had some effect upon what he did that day.

That indicated the kind of man Senator KERR was. He left his mark upon all who knew him and many who did not know him. He will be long remembered as a personage who had a character distinct and different from that of anyone else, which marked him as a man among men, and one whom, of course, we shall always miss greatly in the Senate.

Mrs. Holland and I join in expressing our deep sympathy to Mrs. Kerr and the children. I am sure that the words of all who speak here today will make them understand how deeply their beloved one will be missed by all of us and by a grateful nation.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, Oklahoma, and the Nation, suffered a great loss by the death of BOB KERR. He belonged in that unusually small group of men who seem to be born to lead and he used this God-given ability well. Monuments to his contributions to this Nation exist in the form of far-reaching programs touching the daily lives of every American—from conservation of our natural resources to exploring the frontiers of space. Perhaps the fact that he was born and raised on the frontier helped form his deep and abiding faith in the future of America. He watched Oklahoma grow from a raw, untamed territory to one of the most dynamic and progressive States in the Union. Much of this progress was due to his own efforts growing from confidence in the great potential of his State and our Nation. He had courage and enthusiasm. He had judgment and perspective. He had humor. He had loyalty. And he had tremendous drive and ability.

Few men have, in real life, lived the American success story. BOB KERR was one of them. Born in a log cabin, he was a self-made man who, through hard work, ability, and initiative, became the head of a great industry and more important, one of the most able Senators ever to serve in this body. His was a remarkable career, but he was a remarkable man. Throughout his life BOB KERR never forgot the source of his wisdom and strength. He was a faithful and devoted leader in the Baptist church and I know that his fellow Baptists will sorely miss him.

He had certain precepts for living and he stuck by them.

For his church, he tithed. And for his beliefs he indulged in neither alcohol nor tobacco.

He was a strong believer in self-discipline.

His talents as a legislative craftsman are legendary. Whenever he brought a bill to the Senate floor for action every other Senator knew that the Senator from Oklahoma had done his homework. He knew the answers to any questions raised in debate on his bills. BOB KERR mastered the intricacies of legislation dealing with subjects all the way from taxes to space. He knew his business, and all other Senators knew that he knew it. We are all familiar with his great ability in debate. I think that a good bit of his well-deserved reputation as a debater, was due to his thorough knowledge of legislative business coming before the Senate.

The people of Arkansas lost a great and true friend at BOB KERR's passing. The Arkansas delegation worked closely with him on many projects of mutual interest. The Arkansas River navigation and Red River programs on which he worked so tirelessly will be only two of the more important monuments in our area to his efforts. His work on this project is typical of his foresight on conservation matters. He took the long range view—the view that it was incumbent on us to protect the Nation's natural resources for generations to come. Our children and our children's children will owe a great debt to BOB KERR for his efforts in protecting their heritage.

It is sometimes hard for us to understand why—for lack of a tiny part—a great whole can disintegrate.

How often we wonder at the fall of a giant jet for lack of a bit of metal in a crucial spot. And now we have wondered at a big man's falling for the nonfunctioning of a small but vital part.

Bob Kerr did not have great seniority in the Senate but his vital interest in the processes and his deep convictions on many points led to his having influence far beyond that to be expected from one of his tenure.

His mark on our times is indelible and it is our loss, the Senate's loss, the country's loss, that he could not have had a longer span among us. He paid me the honor of coming to my State last fall to speak in my behalf. He was my friend and I miss him.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, it is not often that the U.S. Senate and the Nation suffers such a grievous loss as it has in the passing of Robert Kerr. He was an unusually talented and effective public servant.

Bob Kerr had so many fine qualities. He was the truest friend anyone could have. Even though tremendously busy he always found time to help others. Mr. President, Bob Kerr spent much of his time in the U.S. Senate helping other Senators. If he thought a Senator had a worthy cause he would leave no stone unturned to help him, but if he thought his cause was not worthy he was frank to tell him so.

Among Bob Kerr's many talents were his quick wit, his great intellect, and his ready grasp of any subject he chose to debate on the Senate floor. Few Senators ever successfully sponsored as much important legislation as he—legislation of the kind that was not only beneficial to his beloved State of Oklahoma but also to the entire Nation.

One of the memories of Bob Kerr that I will always cherish is the opportunity that I had to serve with him on the Select Committee of National Water Resources. Every one of us in this Chamber is aware of his dedication to the development of the resources of this country, and no Member of Congress ever went to Bob Kerr and asked his help with a worthy project that he did not receive it. I remember very well that the first hearing the select committee held was at Bismarck in my State of North Dakota, and at that meeting Bor Kerr seemed to take as much interest in what my people had to say as if the hearing had been held in his own State of Oklahoma.

In the years that I had the privilege of serving in the Senate with Bob Kerr, notwithstanding the fact that he probably had a reputation as being partisan, I can never recall a time when he was not anxious to help the Members on this side of the aisle as well as those on his side. Bob Kerr was a big man. He was bigger than politics; he was bigger than a region. I have never known another man who had the vision and the courage and the complete faith in the future of this country that could compare with his. As an example of his vision, he one time said:

> No region in the country, possibly in the world, is better stocked with fuels—oil, natural gas, and coal. Only 10 percent of the potential hydroelectric power has been developed. The mineral treasures are almost endless. The forests are being restocked in mammoth proportions, and this is what will make this the greatest country under the sun, its resources of which the people are the greatest.

Every 1 of the 50 States of this great country lost a friend in the homegoing of Bob Kerr. It will be a long time until he can be replaced with a man of vision such as he possessed. His State is filled with monuments to his vision. Almost every river in this State has reservoirs that testify to his efforts. The soil conservation program of his State stands as an example for all of us to follow.

As a member of the select committee, I came to know why he was considered the leader in the field of developing natural resources.

In addition to his efforts in the resources field, no man ever stood on the floor of this Senate who was more qualified in taxes and finances than Bob Kerr. The most difficult pieces of legislation in this complicated field were made to appear simple by the ability of Bob Kerr to provide a complete analysis of how they would work and what their effect would be.

> Many trees grow in the forest and are cut down, the only evidence of their going being the stumps which they leave. But once in a great while a mighty oak falls. And falling, it leaves a vacancy against the sky.

The U.S. Senate sorely misses Bob Kerr—one of the great intellectual giants of our time—a man of many talents who made good use of all of them.

Bob Kerr's greatest contribution was to his church. He spent much of his time and energy in serving his church and gave liberally of his earnings. He was a true Christian.

In Bob Kerr's passing I have lost one of the best friends I ever had. May I extend my deepest sympathy to Mrs. Kerr and all of his wonderful family.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I suppose there were few people in the Senate who felt as deeply as I did the loss of the great man from Oklahoma.

I think of him, first of all, as a great neighbor. While he was Governor of Oklahoma, there were many items he wished to have disposed of in connection with the agriculture of that State. Time after time he came to the Department of Agriculture, where I was then associated, and presented the problems to me.

He had under consideration at one time a piece of land which he wanted for one of the agricultural colleges. He finally found a way to acquire it. But there was no putting him off until that was worked out.

He had at another time a program for agricultural price supports which he thought could be handled in a businesslike fashion. He prevailed upon me, as Secretary of Agriculture, to accept the program for purchase, and he said, "Leave it to me from there on out. I will see that you do not have to buy anything." And, true enough, I did not. The program worked exceptionally well because it was sponsored by an individual who had rare business judgment.

I point out that he remembered things of that nature.

In 1948, when he and I both were candidates for the U.S. Senate, he was very busy with the campaign in his own State. I appealed to him to come to my State and to make one or two speeches for me. He finally asked me to set a date. I set a date. He said, "You will have to give me a little while to think it over. I will call you later this afternoon." He called me later in the afternoon and he said, "I'll be there. A little change is required in what I have to do, but I'll be there."

He stopped first at Roswell, where he had a sister living, and made a talk there. Then he flew to Clovis, N. Mex., where there were assembled a great group of people interested in him because of his philanthropies. There he made a fine talk. Then he came to my home city of Albuquerque, where he made a perfectly wonderful talk for me that evening.

Afterwards I learned that in order to do this he had had to cancel his own rally in the city of Tulsa, one of the largest cities in his State. What he had to do did not compare with what he wanted to do for those people whom he regarded as friends.

He was also a great businessman. We have thorough knowledge of that in my home State of New Mexico. Many companies became interested in the development of uranium, but when Senator Kerr put his mind to it great changes took place in the development that he pioneered. Some $16 million was spent by the Kerr-McGee Co. in the development of a great mill. Of far greater interest, probably, to the people of this Nation, is the fact that out of the processes developed in that mill the cost of yellow cake—of uranium put away in processed form—came down substantially. As a matter of fact, the costs in his mill were approximately half of what they were in certain antiquated mills throughout the country, which previously had been supplying the product.

I have many times thought that it would be interesting to calculate the millions upon millions of dollars which his enterprise and genius brought to the American people because of what he did in the development of that one industry alone.

I regarded him as a great Senator. We have all watched the things that he could do.

He and I were assigned, at the beginning of our first terms, to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. In that committee he began to express his great interest in reclamation, in the use of water and in the conservation of water.

Some time after that he called me one day and told me that I was going to Oklahoma City for a meeting of the Arkansas, Red, and White River group. I tried to assure him that I had made no commitment of any kind to go. He assured me that I had. We checked every piece of paper that we could find in my office. There was no single evidence of any kind that I had ever agreed to go.

Nonetheless, I went. I was on his plane that afternoon, because he was determined that I should be there and because of what he was trying to do to make sure that a great development took place.

I made no contribution, except to hold up my hand at the meeting and to say that I was willing to support Senator KERR in everything he had to propose for the development of the water of his State and the conservation of it for use in the future.

There was an Indian problem of great complexity which we considered. That happened to be in the State of the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG], who is now in the Chamber. We had a great deal of trouble with it. Members of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs were trying hard to solve it. We were unsuccessful in reaching any formula which seemed to promise any reasonable solution.

Finally the chairman of the committee said to Senator KERR, "Why don't you go out and see if you can bring the contending groups together?" A short time later he reported that an agreement had been reached.

Mr. President, I have no way of knowing how long the Congress would have wrangled over it. I have no way of knowing how long the committee would have debated it. I know it did not take Senator KERR long to dispose of it.

Subsequently, there was introduced in this body a resolution for a water resources survey. I was extremely happy to suggest to the leadership that the Senator from Oklahoma be asked to take charge of it. We had many discussions before he finally agreed, because he had calls on his time. As the Senator from North Dakota pointed out, the results showed why he had been selected for these important duties.

Everywhere he went he met the people of the State he was visiting and had them understand that ultimately the greatest thing that could happen to the Nation would be the development of these water resources. He left the States with the support of the people for water resource conservation and for the things which the water conservation proposal was trying to accomplish. It was not just in the State of North Dakota or the State of Oklahoma; it was everywhere he went that the Senator from Oklahoma had taken the time to acquaint himself with the problems there and what ought to be done about them.

Finally, I would say he was a great friend. Many, many times those of us who knew him well would carry our problems to him.

Sometime last fall I had a period in which I was not feeling particularly well. While in the Finance Committee I went to answer a telephone call. When I came back the Senator from Oklahoma asked me what was the matter. I told him it was a call from my doctor telling me I had no business being in a committee meeting. The Senator from Oklahoma said, "You are going to leave right now." He accompanied me to the door and to the hall and said, "I am going to see that you go home." I went home. He knew that the votes were desperately close on some of the issues he was interested in. He knew I was going to vote with him. But he was more interested in my trying to conserve my health than he was in having enacted legislation with which he was concerned.

So I say he was a good neighbor, a great businessman, a great Senator, and a great man. We will not see many like him in the U.S. Senate.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, the late Senator ROBERT S. KERR was a man among men. I believe he was the quickest witted man I have ever known. He could match wits with the keenest of men in depth of intellect, in quickness of perception, in mirth, in sarcasm, in pathos. He had a capacity for friendship that could survive the keenest rivalry, the strongest of contention.

Early after my coming to the Senate the bonds of friendship were established between Senator KERR and me. These survived mutuality of interest and contention in legislative issues.

One of the keenest debaters that I have ever known, indeed, I believe one of the great debaters this Chamber has ever enjoyed, one crossed swords with BOB KERR with the greatest of trepidation.

I am sure he would think it quite appropriate, even in a eulogy, to recall one bit of mirth which illustrates how difficult it was upon occasion to "get the better of him," so to speak.

Last year, during the debate on the tax bill, the late Senator KERR and I had a particularly vigorous exchange over a considerable period of time on the floor of the Senate. When that debate was concluded, the New York Times requested that Senator KERR and I go to the President's room in order that our photograph might be taken. Mr. President, you can imagine with what alacrity both of us responded. I did not notice, and I am sure he did not notice, that the photographer had posed us with a portrate of George Washington hanging on the wall between us.

It was rather startling, the next morning, to see on the front page of the New York Times a two column picture of Senator KERR and me, with the Father of our Country looking seemingly down upon us, big as life.

One of my secretaries called attention to the fact that if one examined the portrait of George Washington carefully, he could see there was a different expression on his face. I found this amusing. I obtained a copy of the picture and sent it to Senator KERR with this note: "Dear BOB: I give you with my compliments a picture of two eminent statesmen who seem to be under the surveillance of the Father of our Country. I hope you will not mind my suggesting that if you examine the portrait closely, George seems to be smiling at me and glowering at you."

Right back came a messenger with this note: "Dear ALBERT: I thank you for the picture and I agree as to the eminence of the statesmen shown therein, but I suggest you take another and a closer look at George. Can't you tell the difference between smiling and laughing?"

He was a man capable of love—magnanimous love—of his fellow man; a man capable of compassion in the smallest of things, comprehension and dreams of the greatest of events—truly a man among men. To illustrate the quality of being a man among men, let me call attention to one item to which the distinguished and able junior Senator from Oklahoma has already made brief reference.

He referred to the TVA self-financing act. For many years this great publicly owned utility system had been a matter of political contention annually. For 20 years I had regarded as my primary duty, as a Representative and as a Senator, as did the senior Senator from Kentucky for many a year, the obtaining of sufficient appropriations for the TVA to meet the growing demands of the great area which it serves.

Doing that which he was equipped to do better than any man who lived within the valley, Senator KERR brought to enactment the TVA self-financing bill. No longer is TVA a matter of political contention on the floor of either House of Congress. When the people it serves now require more electricity, the TVA in a businesslike way determines the need for additional generating capacity, locates it in a businesslike way, and sells bonds to raise the revenue in a businesslike way; and now the people are secure in the confidence that this utility system is removed from political contention and will be permitted to thrive and to serve a thriving people.

I said Senator KERR was capable of compassion and faith. He and I enjoyed a mutuality of love of the soil and of cattle. Upon occasion we would walk together upon the green turf. Upon occasion he would speak of his faith in God, his religious convictions, which were deep and profound. Possessed of great talents, great courage, great perception, great vision, his faith was the simple faith of a God-fearing mother and father who had given him parenthood.

To his loving wife, to his three stalwart sons, and to his loving and charming daughter, all of whom I know and call my friends, I extend the deepest sympathy and yet congratulations, because this father and this husband was one of the greatest Senators who has graced this body.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, the death of Senator ROBERT S. KERR came as a shock to those of us who knew him well.

He was a man of many interests, a man of great strength, a man of great vitality. Senator KERR was a man who, in my judgment, lived in the great tradition of the empire builders of America, a man who dealt with the physical and material structure of America.

Those who served with him on the Finance Committee know that he had respect for finance as something necessary and useful. However, his real goal and delight was to make and build things. He was concerned with cattle and with the land. He was concerned with rivers and with the minerals of his own State, and with the resources of this Nation.

He did not hesitate to penetrate to the very bowels of the earth in order to develop things which might be useful to man; nor did he shy away from exploration in space when that became a challenge to America and a challenge to him.

He was a man of vision. He was not a visionary. His dreams were not idle but, instead, lead to planning on almost every occasion.

He was much respected in the Senate. Those who did not know him well, particularly some columnists and commentators, suggested that this respect in the Senate was based more on fear than on affection and real understanding. This was a misrepresentation of the character of Senator KERR and of the attitude toward him of many Members of the Senate.

His basic strength was one which was based on loyalty and affection and respect for this intelligence, and on respect for his great effectiveness in the Senate.

There were those who said that he was a compromiser. He would have been the first to admit it. However, his compromises were not compromises with principle, but, rather, with the realities of the day or the realities of history.

He was a genuine realist in the best sense of that word. Indeed, he preferred some progress and some advance to a kind of perpetuation or a perfection of an issue without any achievement.

It was sometimes charged that he was harsh in debate. In a sense, I suppose, sometimes he was. However, that was primarily, I believe, because he was in a hurry on most of the issues. Even so, Mr. President, there was a kind of evenhandedness in his harshness. He welcomed all adversaries into battle and treated all of them as though, being Members of the Senate, they were the equal of anyone else and should be prepared for the contest. He believed that every man was to be trusted until he had proved to be untrustworthy; that every man was to be accepted unless he had somehow betrayed his trust.

He was basically, in the real meaning of the word, an optimist. I do not mean that in the sense of one who foolishly or falsely believes that the world necessarily is getting better and better every day, but of one who sincerely believes that when men band together as individuals and exert a great force and exercise their fair judgment and direct their energies to both old and new problems, they can bring about some improvement. This is genuine optimism, which is based, fundamentally, upon the religious virtue of hope.

Senator KERR had a deep respect for the Senate and for its traditions. Through his actions in the Senate and outside the Senate he was a positive force for the building and strengthening of America.

All of us who served with him in the Senate have reason to be grateful for having had occasion to be here with him, and have cause to express our grief and regret at his passing; but at the same time to say to his family, his wife, and his children, that they, too, are honored in the service which he has given to the Senate and to America.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, during time of war we honor those Americans who give their lives for their country on the field of battle. We honor such men, and justly so. Today we have come together to honor three Members of the U.S. Senate who have passed way. But I think it is entirely fitting and proper that we consider the death of Senator CHAVEZ, Senator KERR, and Senator DWORSHAK as representing the ultimate sacrifice these outstanding Americans have made for their country.

As every colleague in this Chamber well knows, the task of fulfilling the responsibilities of a U.S. Senator with fidelity and devotion demands a total commitment of time and energy. The Senators we honor today certainly made such a commitment. I am quite confident that their unrelenting expenditure of themselves in the service of their country and their States will stand as their supreme sacrifice.

At the time of his passing, the senior Senator from New Mexico, Mr. CHAVEZ, was the fourth-ranking Senator in terms of seniority. Only the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], and the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] served for a longer period of years.

I know that other Senators have already commented upon the details of Senator CHAVEZ's career. I wish to emphasize only the highlights. The citizens of his State gave him their stamp of approval no less than seven times by electing him twice to the House of Representatives and five times to the Senate. This constitutes the highest degree of approval from those persons best qualified to pass judgment.

During his long years of service among us, the Senator from New Mexico rose to two positions of great importance in this body: Chairman of the Committee on Public Works and chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee on the Department of Defense. Both these duties carried great pressures and responsibilities but the Senator from New Mexico executed his duties with wisdom, justice, and efficiency. The words of praise that we speak today will endure for the ages; they will be read by historians and students of government. But the true monuments to the Senator from New Mexico will be the strength of this Nation's defenses that he always sought; and the dams, irrigation systems, and harbors that protect our people from destruction and create areas of profitable farming from the arid deserts. Protecting our Nation, saving lives, and creating life are accomplishments that will perpetually do honor to the Senator from New Mexico.

I know his colleagues also share the greatest admiration and respect for the tremendous courage displayed by the Senator from New Mexico during the last years of his life. His tenacious determination to continue his service despite the gravest illness will never be forgotten.

The Senator from Oklahoma, Mr. KERR, was suddenly taken from us at the peak of his career. Every Member of this body was deeply shocked and dismayed at his sudden passing. Truly the Senator from Oklahoma could have looked ahead to many years of the same productive, courageous, and resourceful life that characterized his amazing career.

Each Member of the Senate knows the importance of the late Senator from Oklahoma in the operations of this body. As chairman of the Aeronautical and Space Sciences Committee he took the lead in implementing President Kennedy's pledge to the American people that the United States would be second to no other nation in the quest for outer space. As ranking Democrat on the Committee on Finance he was the principal leader in writing the President's tax proposals into law. As ranking Democrat on the Committee on Public Works he carried on the responsibilities of the chairman during the absence of the late Senator from New Mexico. The magnitude of these responsibilities only assume their true proportions when one realizes the humble origins of the Senator from Oklahoma.

Born on September 11, 1896, in the Indian Territory of Oklahoma, the Senator from Oklahoma first viewed the world from the windows of a log cabin. Is there another American of this generation who rose to comparable heights of personal fortune, political success, or national power? I know of no other such American.

He was always a persuasive and faithful advocate for the interests of his State. He was a true and dedicated member of his party. He was honored with the respect of his colleagues in the Senate as few other Senators are. We have lost a great Senator and a great American.

Likewise, the late Senator from Idaho, Mr. DWORSHAK, was a faithful representative of his State and his party. While the Senator from Minnesota differed with the late Senator from Idaho on many issues of public policy, he always did so with the greatest respect and admiration for his honesty, courage, and dedication to the principles of government in which he believed. As a respected member of the Committees on Appropriations, Interior and Insular Affairs, and the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, the late Senator from Idaho exhibited the greatest concern for the natural resources of this country. His knowledge and wisdom in such areas will be sorely missed by members of both Republican and Democratic Parties in the Senate.

This Nation has truly sustained a great loss with the passing of Senator CHAVEZ, Senator KERR, and Senator DWORSHAK. The Senator from Minnesota wishes to convey his personal sympathy to the families of these great Americans who are present with us today.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I do not believe I can add very much to the words of my colleagues. I can say that I miss Senator KERR very much, and I shall miss him in the days that lie ahead. Somehow his abilities, personality, and his great powers at times held the Senate, and held each one of us enthralled. He had a tremendous capacity for work, a powerful intellect, and a great power of exposition. These and other qualities made him one of the most powerful leaders that the Senate—indeed, the country—has known.

I felt something unusual in his leadership. He had unquestionably, the type of leadership which because of the very power of his intellect and his force could bring people along with his views.

But I thought also he had that type of leadership which drew people to him. It was hard to be against BOB KERR because of his human qualities. I saw this quality on the floor of the Senate, and in the committees on which I served with him. His human qualities, humor, persuasion, friendship impelled one to want to be with him.

I saw this quality, as it related to members of the staff of the committees and the men and women who served with him in his office. They were most faithful to him and loved him, because he gave them his loyalty and confidence.

I found in him the human quality of kindness and sympathy; and as others have said, a willingness to help another Member, even though his problem was far from those of his own State.

His wit and his irony could be devastating, but he was very human. I shall never forget one day, sitting in his office, talking with him, when he showed me pictures of his family, and a picture of his father and mother. In talking of them, tears came to his eyes. I was not surprised. Yet, with all his great force, power, and strength, it was an illustration of his pathos and simplicity.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, the death of the senior Senator from Oklahoma, ROBERT S. KERR, is a grievous loss. His was the fabled success story that is so much a part of the living dream of America, the story which sets our country apart from all others. He knew war as a young soldier knows it, troubled peace as a statesman knows it, democracy as one who rose from log cabin to Governor's chair to Senate Chamber knows it, hard work as one who achieved stature in the business world from a standing start knows it.

His loss is not only to Oklahoma, the State he loved and served so well. He was a true friend to my State of Texas, for he was, above all, a man of great intellect and outstanding accomplishment, a man who had vision and the ability to turn vision into reality.

All the Southwest, the vast land that is the wide-open door to future generations of a growing Nation, will miss this strong man and will be forever indebted to him for his interest in bringing water to a thirsty earth, new commerce to an inland haven.

His memory will be kept fresh for generations by his achievements not only for Oklahoma, but in all the Nation. He invigorated his own party, the Democratic Party, in the days of its defeat in the 1950's, with his sharp wit and his great speaking ability. I heard him stir audiences in Dallas, Amarillo, Sweetwater, and other places in my home State of Texas in the first half of the decade of the fifty's, at a time when members of his own party were so dispirited that some of the leaders did not want to accept speaking invitations there.

I was with him at the Hayden dinner in Arizona, in 1961, and returned with him on the long, sad trip to Bonham, Tex., for the final rites for our dear friend, the great Speaker of the House, Sam Rayburn. On that plane trip, I heard him speak of his faith, which was as strong as that of the early settlers of America. He had a deep religious faith.

Senator KERR was a broad-gaged man. In reading the accounts of his life, which were published in many of the newspapers following his death, I saw references to the fact that he used his great position of power to try, perhaps, to control the votes of other Senators. I do not think that was true. That was not my own experience. I differed as sharply with him on subjects such as the communications satellite bill as I ever have with any other Member of the Senate.

Last fall, during the long, tiring days of September and the first half of October, days which I think placed on Senator KERR the great burden which was ultimately to take his life, he worked unstintingly.

Texas was concerned about many water projects. I went to Senator KERR and asked him to give his help on project after project. He placed every single one in the bill. There was not the slightest discrimination, not the slightest hesitancy, not the slightest bit of pettiness in him. He was a broad-gaged man. The fact that I disagreed with him on other major proposed legislation made not one whit of difference in the Committee on Public Works. He considered every project on its merits and decided whether it was sound. That was the kind of broad-gaged man he was.

All of us in this body will miss him. My area of the country will miss him. Our two States of Oklahoma and Texas have a similar outlook about most matters. There are areas in the western portions of our States which are lands of little water. It is that area about which Mr. Justice Holmes said in one Supreme Court decision, "Water is more than an amenity, it is a treasure." It is that part of the country that esteems land and water, and the things that grow on the land and in the water; forests or crops plants by man, where the cattle industry is highly prized, where people think of the elemental things—the minerals in the ground, the crops that grow on it, and the natural things which abound in the earth. It was in that environment that Senator KERR gained his stature as a statesman.

Mr. President, I have read many articles about Senator KERR since he passed away; but of all those I have read, both from my own State and from Oklahoma and other States, the one which I thought was best and that I liked the best was the one entitled, "President, Other Leaders Pay Tribute to KERR," published in the Tulsa Daily World of Wednesday, January 2, 1963. Perhaps it has already been placed in the RECORD; but since I think it was the best of the many articles I read, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Tulsa Daily World, Jan. 2, 1963]

PRESIDENT, OTHER LEADERS PAY TRIBUTE TO KERR

Many called Senator ROBERT S. KERR, Democrat, of Oklahoma, the uncrowned king of the Senate and his sudden death Tuesday in Washington brought an outpouring of sorrowing comment from President John F. Kennedy and the Nation's leaders.

The President learned of KERR's death from a heart ailment while flying by helicopter from Palm Beach to Miami for the Orange Bowl football game.

"He possessed a unique combination of talents, which joined with his deep devotion to his State and Nation, brought him to a high place in American public life," said the President.

"His legislative accomplishments were exceptional. In the last 2 years alone, almost every major bill enacted bore the mark of his untiring leadership and skill: the space program, the trade bill, the tax bill of 1962, the improvements in social welfare and in national resources development. He will be greatly missed when the Senate opens next week and even more so in the months ahead."

Vice President LYNDON B. JOHNSON, long a personal friend of KERR, said KERR "had the strength of the pioneers of old and daring of the pioneers of today and he gave both to his country in full measure."

He said he had never known a more effective legislator and that "America has lost one of our great resources."

"He was a man of brilliance and great ability," said Senator HARRY F. BYRD, Democrat, of Virginia, for whom KERR often acted as the ranking member of the Senate Finance Committee.

"He will be mourned by his political foes as well as his allies because both admired him," said John Bailey, chairman of the Democratic National Committee.

Oklahoma's Governor-elect Henry Bellmon, from his home at Billings, said "Few men in our history have reached the pinnacle of power attained by Senator KERR and no man has had a more profound effect on his native State.

"Generations unborn will pay homage to his great vision and to his tireless efforts in behalf of Oklahoma."

"It is the most severe loss that Oklahoma has suffered among its public figures since statehood," said House Majority Leader CARL ALBERT, a fellow Oklahoman. "He is absolutely irreplaceable."

Senator CLINTON P. ANDERSON, Democrat, of New Mexico, said KERR's death was a great loss to the Nation.

"He was a great developer of property and did a lot for the uranium industry in New Mexico."

Senator MIKE MONRONEY, called his colleague's death an "irreplaceable loss" to the Nation.

"Senator KERR's death takes away from the service of the Nation at this critical time a man whose ability, energy and dedication to public service had won him preeminence of leadership in the Senate," MONRONEY said.

Senator JENNINGS RANDOLPH, Democrat, of West Virginia, said KERR "possessed a keen mind and a strong will."

Bailey termed KERR "one of the great Senators of his era in history."

U.S. Representative ED EDMONDSON, of Muskogee said "I think in the loss of Senator KERR, Oklahoma, suffered its greatest loss in our generation. We lost a great leader in the field of statecraft, in the field of industry and in the spiritual life of our State and country. And his loss is irreparable for Oklahoma.

"I think the project closest to his heart was probably the Arkansas River Basin program. In his memory, I expect to introduce in the next session of Congress, legislation to name the Arkansas River navigation system the Robert S. Kerr Seaway, and I feel it will have unanimous support in both the House and the Senate."

Representative John Jarman, Democrat, of Oklahoma, said Oklahoma's congressional delegation has "lost a great leader."

"Senator Kerr literally gave his life and his talents to his church and State," said Representative Victor Wickersham, Democrat, Oklahoma.

"Oklahoma has lost her most valuable asset," said Representative Tom Steed, Democrat, of Oklahoma. "There has never been or ever will be anyone like him in public service."

Oklahoma Gov. J. Howard Edmondson, already mentioned as a possible successor to Kerr, brushed away tears after he was informed of Kerr's death while attending the Orange Bowl football game in Miami, Fla.

"His death is a great loss to the country and especially to Oklahoma."

Gov. Buford Ellington, of Tennessee, a personal as well as political friend, said he was deeply grieved.

He said the loss would be felt "by the entire country, to which he devoted so many years of service."

State Democratic Chairman Gene McGill, of Oklahoma, said: "It's a great loss to Oklahoma, the Nation, the Democratic Party and to me, for he was a very good friend."

Former Oklahoma Gov. Raymond Gary, who had feuded privately with Kerr during last year's campaign and indicated he would run against him in 1966, said: "I have always admired Senator Kerr because of his ability, courage, and untiring efforts he would put forth to make a success of whatever he undertook to do."

Dean McGee, Kerr's partner in the oil business, said "He was not only a great man, he was a great gentleman along with it."

B. Hayden Crawford, Tulsa attorney who ran against Kerr in 1960, said "This is a great loss to the State of Oklahoma. I extend my deep sympathy to his family and associates."

Senator John Stennis, Democrat, of Mississippi, who served with Kerr on the Senate Space Committee, called Kerr's death a personal loss as well as a loss to the Senate said "I certainly am grieved." He was "one of our great leaders and one of the most versatile men I have ever known and a fine gentleman."

Senate Democratic Leader Mike Mansfield, of Wyoming, called Kerr's death "a tragic, unexpected loss that will be felt most keenly in the Senate, in Oklahoma, and in the Nation."

Senator Frank Carlson, of Kansas, said Kerr's death cost this Nation "one of its greatest citizens and the Senate one of its ablest Members."

The Kansas Republican, at home in Concordia for the New Year's holiday, said "Senator Kerr's death is a tremendous loss to the Midwest and the Nation."

Former Gov. Roy J. Turner said the loss of Senator Kerr "can't be anything but tragic."

Turner, who ran against Kerr for the Democratic nomination for the Senate in 1954, said: "It's a real tragic thing to have happened. I don't know what else I can say about it."

Senator Herman E. Talmadge, Democrat, of Georgia, said the death "is a great tragedy for our country."

Talmadge said he served with Kerr the past 4 years on the Senate Finance Committee and "he had the most incisive, retentive mind that I have ever known.

"He was an extremely hard worker, being well prepared on all bills and all issues," Talmadge continued.

"When he made up his mind as to what was best for our country, no amount of pressure from any source could deter him from his convictions. As a warm personal friend I deeply mourn his passing."

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, the longer one is a Member of this body, the more he becomes aware of the bond of fraternalism which exists in an area that could, because of its very makeup, be a setting for dissention and acrimony. The pervasive warmth of that bond is always present, yet it becomes even more pronounced during those times of tragedy when death removes a colleague from our ranks.

Robert Kerr, of Oklahoma, one of the three great Senators who has passed to their reward recently, and whom today we eulogize, was a stalwart defender of the highest traditions of this great body. Significantly, he, as did the others, had a humble beginning.

Although I never had the privilege of serving on a Senate committee with Bob Kerr, I did enjoy the pleasure of his warm friendship. I recall vividly an occasion a few years back—it was a campaign year for me, in fact—when I asked Bob Kerr to come to Nevada to address the Democratic State convention. He agreed with his usual heartiness, and delivered a speech that set the tone for one of the liveliest conventions in my State's history. A man of limitless ability, he also possessed the oratorical skill to drive home his points with the clarity of a bell and the punch of a jackhammer. In the passing of Bob Kerr, the Nation lost an able servant and the Senate has been deprived of one of its most colorful personalities.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, there is a small three-letter word which describes every dimension of Robert S. Kerr, his philosophy and his career. All those who knew him know that word is "big."

Bob Kerr was a big man physically, and in his leonine head there hummed the wheels of a tremendous intellect.

His heart was as big as his body; and it was a diversified heart. It was big in the courage to meet conflict or to deal with danger, and it was big in compassion to deal with those he encountered along the road of life who had suffered the vicissitudes of fortune—the humble and the broken.

He thought in big terms. His plans for his private life were big, and they brought a financial success that was one of the notable contributions to the history of the opportunities which are afforded by our form of government.

His plans for his beloved Oklahoma and for our Nation were big enough to encompass the whole horizon.

Bob Kerr did nothing halfway. He was big in his affection for his family and for those who were fortunate enough to enjoy the priceless boon of his friendship. Only those know how big was his capacity for friendship.

Candor compels me to say, Mr. President, that he could be big in the retribution he showered upon any who happened to incur his wrath, either on the political hustings or in this forum where we are today.

Bob Kerr and I became fast friends within a few days after his services here commenced, and I have never enjoyed a sweeter or more satisfying friendship. We seemed to understand each other completely.

There were a few, rare occasions when we disagreed on some matters; but he knew what I was thinking, without discussing it; and I knew the conclusions and the processes which led him to his positions; and we did not even have to discuss them. We understood each other completely.

Bob Kerr was a big man in the U.S. Senate. A log cabin may have been the place of his birth, but he was born to be a big leader of men.

He enjoyed conflict, either in committee or here on the floor of the Senate; and he enjoyed it and dealt with it in a big way.

Bob Kerr was proud of the U.S. Senate; and no one guarded it more jealously, to assure that the Senate would not be demeaned or that there would be no diminution of the big place which the Founding Fathers intended to have the Senate play in our scheme of government, when they hammered out the Constitution in Philadelphia in 1787.

Mr. President, the passing of such a figure naturally creates a big void in this body. Bob Kerr's fine mind will be sorely missed in the days ahead.

I mourn the loss of a personal friend and a comrade at arms in many legislative struggles. For me, the Senate will never be exactly the same without Bob Kerr. Sometimes I feel almost as if some part of myself is missing, when I look across to where he sat in this Chamber and do not get the look of reassurance that sustained me so many times.

One of my most prized possessions is a letter written in his own hand, on the back of a piece of gaily colored Christmas wrapping paper—a letter which he wrote to me from the hospital, about 2 days before he passed away. The letter was written in answer to a little note I had written him.

Mr. President, I regret that I cannot comfort his family. But I cannot, because I feel so bereaved that I cannot comfort myself. I can say to them—and I say it also to the thousands of people in this country, from horny-handed sons of toil to masters of finance and business, all of whom trusted and loved and followed Bob Kerr—that I deeply grieve with them at the passing of this big American.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, so many fine things have been written and said about Senator Robert Kerr that it would be presumptuous of me to try to add anything. However, I do want to say that it was my privilege to have served with him and to have become well acquainted with him. He was helpful to me, as a new Member of the Senate, on a number of occasions; and he was always warm and cordial. One of his great loves was for the Aberdeen Angus strain of livestock; and when he learned that I had a bronze model of a Hereford bull on my desk, he was quick to make sure that I had a Black Angus model to stand beside it.

Bob Kerr was a tireless and effective worker for the State he represented. Indeed, it was his great love for work, and for battle, too, that weakened his magnificent constitution during the last session of Congress to such an extent that Oklahoma lost one of her greatest citizens. We will miss him. Mrs. Miller and I extend our most profound sympathy to Mrs. Kerr and the family.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, Robert S. Kerr, affectionately known to his colleagues as "Bob," was one of the most amazing men I have ever known and certainly one of the most unselfish and spectacular Members to ever grace the U.S. Senate.

From the log cabin where he was born to his last mortal moments in the hospital where he passed to eternal rest here in the Nation's Capital, in which he had served with such distinction, his life was in the frontier tradition and epitomized the essence of America—a free land where opportunity was open to all and where there were no limits to the goals which an individual could achieve.

His career in public service as a member of the legislature and as Governor of his own State and as a U.S. Senator was in itself a major achievement for any man, and what he accomplished for his State and his country constitutes a great and epic story.

But with all these accomplishments there was also his vast operations in the field of livestock farming, land reclamation, with improved techniques and his contribution toward the productivity of American agriculture.

His achievements, however, do not stop there. He became, in fact, one of the great leaders in the petroleum and gas industry and his efforts were of such dimensions as to set him apart as one of the outstanding men of this generation.

But Bob Kerr was never so busy that he did not have time for his God. Friends who knew him best can testify to his deep and unremitting devotion to his church. He exemplified in the highest degree those four precious words in the preamble to the Constitution of the American Legion, which recite "For God and country." It was not merely his benefactions in sharing with the Lord but his work in advancing the Christian cause. Not only did he pray for the advancement of the Lord's kingdom, but he did something about it.

Was there a secret weapon in Bob Kerr's life which made his accomplishments possible? There was. In fact, there were two. One was his unfaltering faith and the other his amazing capacity for doing his homework well. Every Senator can testify to Bob Kerr's skill and ability in handling the most abstruse and complicated legislation on the Senate floor.

He was a great and happy warrior who fought in the great causes of his time and fell in battle at a moment when his skill, his ability, and capacity were and are so sorely needed by this Republic.

Mrs. SMITH. Mr. President, it was my privilege to serve on the Senate Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences when the late Robert S. Kerr was chairman of that committee. Although I was not the ranking minority member of the committee during that time, Chairman Kerr treated me as though I was.

This may have stemmed from the fact that the ranking minority member was also the ranking minority member of the Committee on Foreign Relations and the Committee on the Judiciary and consequently with such heavy official duties did not have the time to take from them for the Space Committee that I would have.

Whether it was this factor or not, this much is certain and true. No other committee chairman ever extended to me the consideration that Senator Kerr did.

This, of course, would prejudice me very much in his favor. It might well have prompted greater tolerance on my part toward him when we differed so very basically on some issues like the 27½-percent oil depletion allowance that he so stoutly defended and I have sought for years to pare down.

But I know that it was not that. I know that it was because Bob Kerr had two deep-seated characteristics which made him the dynamic, effective power that he was in the Senate—characteristics for which I admire him so much.

In the first place, he was a fighter for what he believed in and for his State of Oklahoma and his constituency. He pulled no punches and no one ever had to guess where he stood. There was nothing ambivalent about him—and because he refused to play the role of expedient political ambivalence, he made many bitter enemies. Perhaps that, in itself, was his most impressive hallmark of leadership.

In the second place, he was not a man motivated by narrow political partisanship. As a Democrat, he did not automatically view all Republicans as enemies. Nor did he permit his economic views control his attitude toward those of his colleagues who held opposite views.

Of this I had very personal knowledge. In 1954 when I was first running for reelection, oil millionaries sent money into Maine in an attempt to defeat me. One reason they did was because of my opposition to the 27½-percent depletion allowance—on which Senator Kerr was their champion defender.

In spite of this and even though I am a Republican, Senator Kerr came to me and said that though we disagreed on many issues and were of opposing political parties, he wanted to see me returned to, and remain in, the U.S. Senate because I did not hesitate to speak my mind. In doing so, he offered to contribute to my campaign funds. I thanked him but declined to accept any contribution from him.

And I continued my opposition to the oil depletion allowance for the next 6 years—and still do.

When I was running for my third term in 1960, Senator Kerr came to me and said that he did not like what members of his own Democratic Party were attempting to do to me—that whatever I needed to finance my campaign he would be happy to provide himself. Again I thanked him but declined to accept any contribution from him.

My opposition to matters dear to him—such as the oil depletion allowance—made no difference to him. My being a Republican made no difference to him.

I am certain that many other persons witnessed this trait in him. But individuals are of no importance and significance. What is important is that rare trait of a person being able to disagree and yet remain a friend—that rare trait of not judging individuals in terms of narrow partisanship or political prejudice.

Robert S. Kerr had that rare trait in abundance. His death is a great loss to me in the Senate. It is a loss of strength to me. But more important is that it is a loss of strength to the entire U.S. Senate and to our country. It is irreplaceable.

I am sure that no one knows this better than President Kennedy. For Robert S. Kerr opposed President Kennedy on issues in the Senate and beat him—and yet it was Robert S. Kerr that the President looked to for legislative victories on many matters and on which Robert S. Kerr delivered magnificently.

Here again was his rare trait of not permitting deep differences on some issues to prevent him from friendship and performance for the President of the United States.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, the year 1963 was new—and suddenly it was old. Senator Robert S. Kerr had passed away.

Something is gone from this Senate, something of the challenge, something of the fervor of debate and the firmness of argument. There is gone from us that dramatic moment when Bob Kerr would slowly rise to his full height and slowly raise his voice to its full power in the heat and heart of his cause.

All this is missing because Bob Kerr is not here; all too suddenly gone from our midst.

I stood at his interment with those who heard the words of his neighbors; neighbors who had known his growth from log cabin limitations to the majesty of a majestic business empire; neighbors who knew him as the good neighbor and God-fearing man.

I would here borrow from my words addressed to his dear ones at that moment.

Bob Kerr gave character and courage to his every role in public life with a gift to sharpen with wit and to soften with human warmth the discussions out of which democracy works its destiny.

It was a privilege to be his colleague, it was a pleasure to share some of his purposes, and it was even delightful, at times, when one differed with him, for he was always an inspiration and invitation to outspoken Americanism.

Bob Kerr's memory will long live in the Halls of the Senate and I am sure it will be an enduring pride in those he loved so deeply.

May a country's appreciation be of comfort to them in their loss as each of us adds his own humble sentiments of sorrow and sense of loss.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, in Robert Kerr many of us in the Senate met a powerful figure, physically and intellectually. When we were on opposite sides of an issue, he was a formidable adversary, but when we were on the same side, he was an equally formidable ally. New York State owes him a great debt of gratitude for his role as architect of the Niagara power project. Robert Moses and I had discussed plans to invite Bob Kerr to tour the Niagara power project later this year; and with Senator Kerr's approval, we were going to have a "Robert Kerr Day" in which the Niagara community would participate. We in New York regret that Bob Kerr did not live to have a firsthand look at that project in operation, as he would have been proud of the role he played in having it developed.

Robert Kerr was indeed one of the alltime giants of the Senate.

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, none of us who served with Senator Kerr will soon forget his forceful presence in this body. His intelligence, wit, perception, and determination brought him to a unique position as one of the giants of the Senate.

Today I pay tribute to his memory as a man who understood other men, a Senator who grasped the potential of this institution, and a citizen who did not hesitate to battle for those values he held dear. All of us have much to learn from his example.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, the Nation and the U.S. Senate lost one of its great leaders in the death of Robert Kerr. Bob, as he was affectionately known by all of us, was a man of great ability and great courage. He was truly an optimist and a man of vision. To him the sun always seemed to shine through the clouds. He was a big man and he made big plans for his personal life for his State and for his Nation.

There was nothing small about Bob Kerr. He had an abiding faith in his God and his Creator. Never at any time did he hesitate to confess this faith. He was an active Christian layman and his work in the church and the Sunday school will continue to bear fruit for decades to come.

Bob Kerr owed much to Oklahoma and the great West and he never forgot to keep that in mind when considering problems of the Midwest.

It was my privilege to have been closely associated with him in working for the best interests of our States and Nation. We were very close friends and his death was a personal loss to me.

It was my privilege to introduce him at a meeting in Wichita, Kans., just a few days before he left for Washington where he was stricken. This was one of his last great public meetings. His subject was soil and water conservation—a field in which he was recognized as our greatest conservationist. The soil and water conservation projects that he sponsored in Oklahoma and the Nation will stand as living monuments to his service.

Bob Kerr was devoted to his family, and Mrs. Carlson and I want to extend our sincerest and deepest sympathy to Mrs. Kerr and the family.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, with very great pride I called the late Robert Samuel Kerr, senior Senator from Oklahoma, a dear friend. And with very great sorrow, my wife and I express to his family our heartfelt condolences on their tragic loss.

Bob's passing, however, was far more than a personal one for those who called him husband and father. Oklahoma lost a preeminent Senator. And the Nation, particularly the Senate of the United States, lost one of its great citizens and Senators. I never ceased to marvel at Bob Kerr's intellectual capacity. He was a truly brilliant person—greater than most and as great as any. Fully armed in every Senate debate, there was no more powerful adversary ever to sit in this chamber, skillful, colorful, and persuasive.

The late Senator Kerr was an imposing example of the American success story. From humble beginnings, he became one of the most successful businessmen in the Nation. But he devoted himself, in what was far more important, to his family, his church, and his Nation, in a tireless and unselfish fashion. He loved his family, his dear wife and his children. I remember the moving eulogies uttered to his memory in his church in Oklahoma City, where the President of the United States, the Vice President of the United States, and many of us from the Congress, gathered to mourn his passing. There were plain people in attendance at those final ceremonies. They came to share the sorrow of all who knew him, rich and poor, high and low, in the sudden conclusion of his span of life.

Bob Kerr was my friend. I am most proud that I may say that. But my relations with him were not unique. For his friendship with his fellow man, in and out of the Senate, was a constantly enlarging and happy circle, and those who take part today in these eulogies, share a common pride that the circle included all of them.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, the death of Robert S. Kerr has deprived the Senate of the United States of one of its most vibrant personalities. Bob Kerr's strong character was felt in this chamber even though he might have sat quietly at his desk, an observer, rather than a participant in the debate.

This Chamber will always remain a little empty without him. It was not just his size, or his booming voice or his hearty manner which made him so vital.

It was his forthright devotion to his service here for the people of Oklahoma—a service he regarded as a dedicated trust.

It was my good fortune to have served with Senator Kerr on the Public Works Committee and later on the Appropriations Committee of which he was an ex officio member. We had our differences but just about as often the issues found us on the same side. No one could have a more capable opponent—or a more loyal ally.

Bob Kerr placed loyalty at the top of his list of virtues. He worked diligently at the notion that loyalty runs two ways.

Though he may have appeared somewhat bluff and direct, particularly here in this arena of debate in which he reveled, all of us who were proud to count him a friend know that he was gentle, tolerant and considerate. Few of us here have not profited by some sound and sage advice from Senator Kerr.

I well recall an appearance by Bob Kerr on the television program, "Meet the Press." Perhaps my recollection of the words is inexact but they may well form the proper epitaph for Robert S. Kerr. He was asked about his lack of support of the President on a specific national issue. I shall never forget his reply. It was:

> I love the President of the United States, but I love the people of Oklahoma more.

In this way did he express pithily his devotion to the people of his State and his deep belief in the concept of truly representative government.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, the first week of this year brought a severe and unexpected shock to each of us and to America with the knowledge of the passing of the late Senator Robert S. Kerr.

Senator Kerr was the kind of man who does not often pass our way. Even in such a body of individualists as this, the force of his presence and personality laid special claim to one's attention.

None was more formidable in debate, giving no quarter and asking none. And there are few, if any, Members who joined in debate with Bob Kerr who did not feel the imprint of his agile mind and the occasional bite of his acid wit.

But, though Senator Kerr was perhaps more widely noted for his skill as a debater, his greatest services were rendered as a mediator and conciliator of what to others would seem to be irreconcilable positions. Nowhere was this more evident than in the demonstration of his leadership as conference chairman of the omnibus public works bill in the 87th Congress. Out of an apparently hopeless deadlock between the two bodies in the late hours of the 87th Congress, Senator Kerr brought forth a measure that won support on both sides of Capitol Hill.

Though it is a grievous loss to those of us who were his colleagues and friends, to the State of Oklahoma, and to the Nation to have Bob Kerr taken at the peak of his powers and prowess, we may truly say that no one lived more fully during the time allotted him. His tremendous zest for life seemed almost to assume the proportions of a force of nature.

This quality of Bob Kerr may be best expressed, I believe, by reference to a line written by the philosopher, William James, to his sister on the occasion of his purchasing a summer home. He exclaimed with joy that it had "14 doors and they all open outward." Such was the world of Bob Kerr—and open universe with many doors, all opening out.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, Bob Kerr was a fighter, and I like fighters.

In legislative battles the side that had the help of Bob Kerr was happy. If he was on the opposing side it often caused alarm.

Much will be said today about the success story of our late departed friend.

He went to the top in his profession, in business, in politics, as a citizen and in his church. I wish to associate myself with all of the laudatory things that are said about him today.

I wish to extend to Mrs. Kerr and to all the family the sincere sympathy of Mrs. Curtis and myself.

Shortly after Senator KERR's death the Omaha World Herald published an editorial entitled "Without Mr. KERR." It appeared in their paper on January 3, 1963. I think that editorial should be preserved in these records and I include it as a part of these remarks:

[From the Omaha (Nebr.) World-Herald, Jan. 3, 1963]

WITHOUT MR. KERR

Last summer, as the final legislative battles of the 87th Congress were shaping up, this newspaper observed that Senator ROBERT KERR, of Oklahoma, was probably the most influential legislator in Washington and that his influence usually served the public interest.

Mr. KERR, who died Tuesday, was a self-made man who delivered strongly in the American enterprise system. He never saw reason to apologize for his wealth or his success. Yet he was a broad-gaged man whose interests went beyond business. They encompassed the world and America's place in it.

To him, perhaps more than to any other man, was due the credit for curbing the excesses of the administration's welfare legislation. Without his informed and persuasive opposition, the President's medical care plan might very well have become law.

But Mr. KERR was not merely a naysayer and an obstructionist. He believed that there is a degree of Federal responsibility for medical care for the aged, and he had tried to meet it—successfully in the opinion of many—by coauthoring the Kerr-Mills Act.

Senator KERR was No. 2 man, behind Chairman HARRY BYRD, on the taxwriting Senate Finance Committee, and he saw eye to eye with Mr. BYRD on many issues. As chairman of the Senate Aeronautical and Space Sciences Committee, he unquestionably was the leading congressional figure in space matters.

Thus by position, by knowledge, and by force of character, he quite likely was the Senate's most substantial man. His death Tuesday is not only a grievous loss to the country but it can alter the balance between legislative and executive power.

This self-made man was a fierce champion of the integrity and independence of Congress at a time when President Kennedy, like most Presidents before him, was trying to expand the power of the White House.

At a time when leadership in Congress had become relatively weak, ROBERT KERR was strong.

The Oklahoma Senator rose to prominence with relative suddenness after years in which he had been a minor figure. Americans will hope that some other Senator may come out of obscurity similarly to replace him. For with Senator KERR gone the Congress is weaker, and so is the voice of moderation.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, it is customary at times such as this to comment on the lives and work of those Members of this great body who are no longer with us. The great tragedy to me is that our departed colleagues cannot be in this Chamber today to hear our expressions of admiration and affection which all too often go unsaid during their lifetimes.

The U.S. Senate is sometimes referred to as the "most exclusive club in Washington." In the sense that I cannot think of any other body of only 100 members representing over 188 million people, perhaps this is so. And being a comparatively small body and working closely together it is inevitable that we form strong bonds of friendship and respect for the positions which we have sworn to carry out.

The great English poet, John Donne, wrote that "any man's death diminishes me" and when death takes a respected Senator and great statesman the loss to mankind is much more than just this.

The new year, as we all know, opened on a very sad note. The untimely death of Senator ROBERT S. KERR was a shock and source of grief to all of us. I can think of no other man who possessed such vitality or who enjoyed living as did BOB KERR. It is still hard to believe that his figure will no longer be seen entering the Chamber doors or his resonant and articulate voice heard on the Senate floor.

But more than just an admired and respected colleague, BOB KERR was a true and devoted friend whose death came as a great personal loss to me. His advice and assistance were always welcomed because I knew they were based on sound judgment and unfailing loyalty. I do not think that anyone can quite fill his shoes for I know of no man who possesses as many outstanding and unique qualities as he did.

Senator KERR was also well known for his unlimited capacity for hard work and his brilliant and incisive mind which enabled him to grasp and comprehend the most difficult problems in every area of legislation.

I am reminded of an incident last year which occurred following a Finance Committee meeting where we were struggling with a particularly complex and complicated piece of legislation. While walking out of the committee room after what seemed a trying and interminable session, another colleague on the commitee came up to me and said:

> You know, GEORGE, one Senator tends to evaluate things in terms of acres and you have to be explained things according to tourists or oranges, but BOB KERR is the only man I know who can understand everything in terms of anything.

I will not attempt to go into Senator KERR's extensive personal, business, or public accomplishments as I know my Senate colleagues have and shall continue to do this much more eloquently than I.

In closing, I recall that when BOB KERR ran for the Senate in 1948 he adopted the campaign slogan "Land, Wood, and Water," which turned from a political catchword into his credo for championing the needs and interests of his fellow Oklahomans. When he became chairman of the Senate Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences, he added the word "space" to his slogan. Since it has been said that man is immortal as long as his name or his works are remembered by the living, I would like to suggest that today Senator ROBERT KERR's slogan be further enlarged to "Land, Wood, Water, Space, and Immortality."

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President—

> The tumult and the shouting dies,
> The captains and the kings depart.

Thus, Mr. President, wrote Rudyard Kipling in 1897.

Thus could Rudyard Kipling have written today on the passing of ROBERT S. KERR, late Senator from Oklahoma.

BOB KERR was a big man, with a big voice—with big abilities commensurate with his big ideas. He was a man with great power, great prestige, and great presence.

Perhaps no man in recent times was more able in the Senate to make his presence felt, and to accomplish more in the way of legislation in which he believed than was BOB KERR. He possessed an extraordinary breadth of knowledge, and a tremendous capacity to translate that knowledge into action.

Certainly he shouted; surely he was in the midst of tumult. And no man was, in recent times, more effective in the use of his talents.

BOB KERR was no king. For kings are not born in log cabins. But, BOB KERR was a leader.

I served on the Committee on Public Works with BOB KERR for the first 4 years of my present term in the Senate. I can assure every Senator that each of the moments in our committee sessions was no more dull than every minute which held BOB KERR on the floor of the Senate.

We shall not soon see again a legislator so effective in the manner of Senator ROBERT S. KERR, of Oklahoma.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, I join my colleagues today in paying tribute to a Senator who was a great and distinguished Member of this body.

Although I have only been a Member of the Senate for a short while, my acquaintance with Senator KERR dates back to the time he came to Montana in the campaign of 1948. His charm and ability captivated the Montanans who heard him, and he had substantial support for the nomination for President from the Montana Democratic delegation to the Democratic National Convention. BOB KERR's name is still a legend in the areas where he spoke in Montana and the grief at his untimely death was real and moving.

Since coming to Congress, and especially since I came to the Senate 2 years ago, I had the privilege of working with Senator KERR in one of his favorite fields, conservation and development of America's water resources.

Senator KERR was one of the first legislators that I have had the opportunity to observe. He had an intuition about legislation that was only matched by the incomparable Speaker Rayburn. He used his great abilities and his skill in the public interest for the advancement of a legislative legacy that will be a memorial to him for many years ahead.

It was a distinction to have worked with Senator KERR, it was a pleasure to observe him at work, I am honored to have had the opportunity to serve with him. He will be sorely missed.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, running through every word and every thought uttered on this solemn occasion by the friends and colleagues of ROBERT KERR is the same basic theme. The force and power of his personality impressed itself upon each one of us as it did on any group or any assembly in which he served through his long and crowded career. He was a man of strong convictions with a lightning mind and a rapier-like tongue to express them. In debate he was almost invincible so that a stranger in the gallery or a new colleague whose acquaintance with him had been brief would consider him almost cruel in the ruthless way that he riddled his opponents' arguments, lashing them with powerful eloquence. Yet, as we came to know him we found a warm and affectionate friend who had not one ounce of venom or bitterness in his heart. He reveled in a battle of wits. Yet, he spoke without anger.

In the first years of my Senate service, I served with him on the Committee on Public Works. I well remember one occasion as we were sitting about the table waiting for a quorum to assemble when one Member mentioned a departed colleague and expressed regret that his last contact with his friend had been in the heat of Senate debate. BOB KERR leaned back in his chair and recited these words:

These clumsy feet, still in the mire,
Go crushing blossoms without end;
These hard, well-meaning hands we thrust
Among the heartstrings of a friend.

The ill-timed truth we might have kept
Who knows how sharp it pierced and stung!
The word we had not sense to say—
Who knows how grandly it had rung!

It impressed me so much that I asked him to send me a copy of the quotation which I have always kept. It told me much of the warm affection which he had for all his friends and which I am thankful I enjoyed through the years, both on the Public Works Committee and later with him on the Committee on Finance.

He fell suddenly at the height of his power in the Senate and at a time when he was most needed. Yet, in that there is one consolation. He will always live among us in all his strength and power. There can never be a memory of fading faculties and slackening strength that comes with age. We unite with his loved ones in mourning him today, but we can say in the words of the poet who wrote of "An Athlete Dying Young":

Now you will not swell the rout
Of lads that wore their honors out,
Runners whom renown outran
And the name died before the man.

Mr. BEALL. Mr. President, when historians of the future look back on this era, they will see throughout our land the indelible footprints of a relatively small band of giants who towered over their fellow men in ability, in leadership, in patriotism, and in devotion to duty.

Because of these men, our Nation has continued to grow and prosper.

Because of these men, we have preserved our treasured heritage and have enriched it for the benefit of future generations.

Yes, Mr. President, giants have left their unmistakable marks on this, our present age, and among their number was the late ROBERT S. KERR, who was our esteemed colleague from Oklahoma.

Senator KERR was truly a giant in every possible manner—in the scope of his interests, in the magnitude of his philanthropies, in the plenitude of his knowledge, and in the extent of his devotion to the welfare of the Nation he loved so well.

With Senator KERR's death, we in this body have lost a memorable friend; the citizens of his State and our Nation have lost a powerful, a dynamic, and a devoted public servant.

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, it is always a sad occasion when this body sets aside a day for eulogies for departed colleagues. The three men we remember today were all from the West and exemplified those virtues which developed the West and have made it the region of the future. They had courage to face new challenges, determination to overcome all obstacles, and a vision of a better life for those who would follow them.

The late Senator from Oklahoma, Mr. KERR, was a dynamic example of the American dream. He had the distinction, now a political rarity, of being born in a log cabin. His origins were humble, but his ambitions proud. He was a living example of the dictum that success comes to those who are willing to work for it.

Senator KERR worked long and hard for the people of his State, his region, and Nation. I had the good fortune to serve with him on the Select Committee on Water Resources. That committee spent many hours considering what is and will be for many years one of our Nation's most perplexing problems—the development of water resources to match our population and economic growth. No one worked harder, no one was more concerned that the people of our Nation should not be deprived of the necessity of adequate water than was Senator ROBERT KERR. And this singular devotion to the cause at hand could as easily have been applied to a myriad of other projects to which he devoted his efforts. Mr. President, ROBERT KERR was a man who could get things done; he will be sorely missed in the U.S. Senate.

Mr. FONG. Mr. President, last year the Senate was in a state of perpetual mourning as, one by one, five of our colleagues fell victim to the grim reaper. It was a terrible toll, and sorrow was heaped upon sorrow. Among those whose loss we grieve is the late senior Senator from Oklahoma, my friend BOB KERR.

He was a giant of a man, who possessed a mentality to match. He had a capacity to grasp the most complex problems, to cut through the mass and the maze of irrelevancy to get to the heart of a matter and to manage difficult legislation in committee, on this floor, and in conference.

One could not be long in his presence without sensing the force of his strong personality. He had a natural proclivity for leadership, and he never was one to shirk his leadership responsibility.

Since coming to the Senate in August 1959, I had the opportunity to serve on the Public Works Committee with BOB KERR and to observe him in action. We worked particularly closely on the Subcommittee on Flood Control-Rivers and Harbors last year, where he demonstrated over and over again his ability to accomplish the impossible. He confounded the pessimists who predicted there would be no omnibus public works bill enacted before adjournment last fall. As a consequence, many essential projects all over America are one step nearer realization.

BOB KERR was a Senator who had an enormous capacity for hard work. He made certain he did his homework, so that in legislative skirmishes he proved always to be both a worthy protagonist and a worthy antagonist. We all knew that, if we challenged him, we had better be prepared to defend our point of view. Nowhere did he show his mettle more clearly than in the debates last year on the tax bill and on medicare for the aged.

BOB KERR possessed a great competitive spirit. When he undertook a task, he determined to be successful, to win the struggle.

During his lifetime, he won the economic struggle from poverty to plenty. He won the political struggle to high office in the U.S. Congress. His notable business and public careers attest to his ability to win.

But there is one battle all of us must lose some day. That BOB KERR should have lost this ultimate struggle for the breath of life in his very prime saddens us all. We in the Senate are the poorer for the loss of his rare skills and his informed guidance.

To his beloved wife and family, Ellyn and I extend our heartfelt condolences. May the Almighty comfort you in your bereavement.

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. Mr. President, it is impossible for the friends and colleagues of Senator KERR to find words to adequately describe how much he meant to us and the extent to which the Nation will miss him.

The story of BOB KERR's life is the story of America. Through hard work, ingenuity, and determination he started from meager beginnings and worked his way to the highest peaks.

Many men have done this, but few demonstrated the wide range of abilities that BOB KERR possessed. A keen businessman, a skillful legislator, a respected leader—all apply to BOB KERR. But he was more than these things, too. He was a warm, understanding human being who enjoyed working with and for people. This quality showed through all that Senator KERR did, and it enabled him to accomplish what all men dream of and what few men realize.

Regardless of what the contest was, BOB KERR was the kind of man everybody wanted on their side. When he undertook a job he went all the way, and he knew exactly where he was going and how to get there.

As for myself, the highest tribute I can pay to BOB KERR is the fact that I called on no one for advice and counsel more than I did Senator KERR. I deeply respected his wisdom, his knowledge, and his understanding.

We know that we must go on without Bob Kerr, but only time will make us realize how much we miss him.

Mr. MORTON. Mr. President, I join with my colleagues in paying deserved tribute to the late, great Senator from Oklahoma, Robert S. Kerr. There is no need for my detailing his great accomplishments in serving the people of his State and the people of his country.

Before I came to the Senate, I developed a great respect for Bob Kerr. During my years of service with him in this body, this respect continued to grow and along with it, a very real personal friendship. Although we sat on different sides of the aisle and often disagreed, I still never lost my respect for his judgment or the position that he took. I am bold enough to say that he in turn respected my judgment as being sincere even though at variance with his own point of view.

I rarely saw Bob Kerr except in connection with our legislative duties. Nevertheless, one of the most enriching experiences of my life was our friendship developed here in the Capitol, on the floor of the Senate, in committee, in conference. To me our friendship was one of those extra values of legislative service which I shall always treasure.

Bob Kerr was a warm, sympathetic man. He had charm, he had humor and he had great intellectual capacity. His penetrating mind could get to the heart of the problem without being lost in peripheral details. His contributions to his State which he loved and served so well and his country which he loved and served so well are too many to enumerate here. His untimely death was a real loss to Oklahoma, the country, and the Senate of the United States.

I join with my colleagues in extending to Mrs. Kerr and all members of the family, my deepest sympathy.

Mr. BARTLETT. It is my sad purpose today, Mr. President, to speak of the loss of three Senators and three friends. The Senate will not be the same place without Henry Dworshak, Bob Kerr, and Dennis Chavez. All Senators will take their passing as both a personal and national loss.

The senior Senator from Oklahoma, Mr. Kerr, served in the Senate for close to 15 years. During this period he served the people of his State with attention, intelligence, and devotion. No State has ever had better representation in this body than that received by Oklahoma from the late Senator. In recent years the Senator's leadership and clear ability elevated him to a position of great importance in this body as ranking member of both Finance and Public Works Committees and as chairman of the Space Committee. Robert Kerr was in a position to serve his Nation as also his State. He served his Nation well.

No better illustration may be given of his ability and skill than that offered by his leadership of the controversial tax bill in the last session of the Congress.

Mr. President, the President of the United States, the Nation, this Senate and especially the people of Oklahoma have reason to mourn the passing of Robert Kerr.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, knowing Bob Kerr was an adventure like a first trip into new country. Viewed from afar, his life's landscape could seem almost overwhelming in its size and ruggedness, but to those who were privileged to watch him at close range, this ruggedness was broken up by much that had sweet and kindly beauty. Though most people associate him with wealth, oil and power, he believed that his greatest contribution was measured in the title of a book he wrote—"Land, Wood, and Water," which was inscribed on the gold clasp he wore around his tie.

Essentially, Bob Kerr's life was built upon a foundation of great simplicity reflected in the fundamentalism of his religion. At the same time, he was a man of great versatility, and striking contrasts. He had a deep loyalty to whatever and whomever he loved, including his family, Oklahoma, and oil, but he found keen delight in all-out combat with those who challenged these loyalties. He could be a generous and effective ally, as well as a resourceful foe.

He had a great facility in the use of words. They came easily to him, and he could use them with great skill—to tell a story, to sell an idea, to charm or entertain an audience, to pray, to plead, or as weapons with which to strike an opponent down.

Bob Kerr was a strong man, prodigal with his energy and strength. When we adjourned last year, all of us would have said his reserves of energy like those of the oil of Oklahoma, were inexhaustible. Looking back now, we realize that he never spared himself and therefore can understand why he fell suddenly.

Toward the end of his career, the newsmen began to call him "the uncrowned king of the Senate," as though he loved power for its own sake. To me, this is a sad misjudgment. I feel instead he acted always to increase his capacity to serve the causes that he loved.

The Senate is poorer for his passing.

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, the sudden passing of our colleague—Senator Robert S. Kerr, of Oklahoma—came as a great shock to all of us.

We lost not only a good friend, but an excellent Senator, as well. He will be sorely missed by his family, his country, his State, and the Senate, where he had served since 1949.

I had the pleasure of working closely with Senator Kerr during the past 8 years as we served together on the Senate Public Works Committee.

I quickly developed a great respect for his ability and his integrity, and I valued his friendship very highly.

Bob Kerr was a powerful advocate of what he thought was right.

The contributions he made to the fields of conservation and public works, and to the legislative records of this body, will be his lasting monuments.

There is no one among us who was more dedicated to the preservation and proper utilization of our Nation's vast natural resources.

The work that Senator Kerr did in the field of water resources, for example, will be long remembered and will pay vast dividends in the years ahead.

Our greatest tribute to Bob Kerr, I believe, would be to carry on the programs and policies which he started.

To his family, at this time, I would like to extend my sincere condolences.

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, it was my privilege to serve both on the Senate Public Works Committee and on the Select Committee on National Water Resources with Senator Robert S. Kerr, and I came to respect both his great mind and his great heart.

All of us would like to think that during our tenure in the U.S. Senate we became experts in at least one, and perhaps two or three fields. But Bob Kerr managed to become an expert in everything he touched.

I am sure it is safe to say that he handled as many major bills on the Senate floor in these past few years as any other Member, and he was well versed in the subject matter of each. I can see him now, standing at his Senate desk, every muscle at attention as he waited to parry and turn aside with wit and eloquence every objection to the measure at issue—ready to answer from the great depths of his knowledge every question raised against it. He was a commanding figure and one we in the Senate shall not soon forget.

I personally will never forget his many kindnesses to me—the times he helped me with legislation or projects in which I was interested. He was a good friend—and it is hard to believe that this great heart has been stilled. The Senate will never be quite the same without Bob Kerr.

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, I consider it a distinct honor to have known Robert S. Kerr and to have served with him in the Senate of the United States and on the Senate Finance Committee.

I am deeply saddened by his passing.

In many respects, Bob Kerr was one of the most remarkable men I ever knew. He was gifted with the quickest mind—the most inquisitive and retentive mind—that I ever saw in action on the floor of the Senate, in the committee room, or anywhere else.

Anyone who ever met him in debate can attest to the fact that as a forceful defender or advocate of a cause, Senator Kerr was without peer.

Why? Because he made it his business to know what he was talking about. Because he always spoke with the authority of one who has done his homework. Because the Senator from Oklahoma asked no quarter and gave none.

When Bob Kerr spoke, all men listened, sometimes perhaps with disagreement, but always with respect. He commanded a memory I have yet to see matched. Nothing escaped this man.

Depending upon what the occasion called for, Bob Kerr could bring to bear a great wit or a great solemnity, a sweet tongue or a biting attack. But he did not rely on oratory alone to win his battles. Always it was supported by an irrefutable statement of facts and an intelligent grasp of every aspect and implication of the subject at hand.

Bob Kerr was one of the great men of this country. The Nation and the Senate will sorely miss him.

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, it was my good fortune to have been assigned to the Finance Committee when I came to this body. This meant working with many great men. None was greater, none was friendlier to a young country boy from Indiana than that big Oklahoma country boy, Bob Kerr.

I have visited on Senator Kerr's vast ranch on the land he loved so much. Together we shared the vista in Oklahoma, viewing the cattle and enjoying the fresh air. We often talked about Senator Kerr's love of the land and the things he tried to do to protect the future of the country.

Others have spoken eloquently about Senator Kerr's devotion to our beloved country, about the contribution he made to our space program, of his great work in taxation and finance. Although the day-to-day official contact we had was in the field of finance and taxation, I prefer to think of Senator Kerr as the great conservationist—the one who worried, fretted, and acted to save our wood, water, and soil.

Senator Kerr was at his best when he talked about these things and when he was doing something about them. I remember when he flew out to a meeting of the Wabash Valley Association at my behest to talk about these things. I remember when we would visit about them. His concern was deep and unselfish. His labors were long and successful.

If America's water resources are developed to the fullest, if our streams and woods are protected, if flooding can be controlled, Bob Kerr's living memorial will have been established beyond anything we can say here or build from rock and steel.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I wish to join my colleagues who have spoken words of tribute to our late departed colleague and friend, Bob Kerr.

I first came to know Bob Kerr before either he or I came to the Senate of the United States. In fact, I first knew him when he was Governor of Oklahoma. I shall never forget the great and rallying keynote address that he delivered at the Democratic National Convention.

I recognized him from the first as a man of great energy and tremendous ability.

When Bob Kerr first came to the Senate he was assigned to a committee on which I was serving, the Public Works Committee, of which he later became chairman. I also served with him on the Senate Office Building Commission. I learned to admire greatly his ability in handling legislation and in getting quickly to the point. He had a masterful way of bringing persons of divergent views together and in getting out of committees beneficial legislation and in getting problems satisfactorily solved.

I have had the privilege of campaigning with Bob Kerr in his beloved State of Oklahoma. His energy, his knowledge of facts and figures pertaining to his State, his grasp of the situation under all conditions to me were always impressive. On several different occasions Bob Kerr has come to Alabama and spoken at various meetings, political and otherwise. He was a favorite of Alabama audiences.

Bob Kerr had a perception that was beyond that of most people. I recall one instance when a group of us were being briefed on the vast operations of TVA. It was probably the first visit of Bob Kerr to that area. He was impressed with the man who did the briefing. Without knowing what his job was, he said to him:

> Young man, I don't know what you are doing at the present time, but I would like very much to have you work with me.

It happened that the young redheaded man was "Red" Wagner, who was then serving as general manager of the TVA and is today the Chairman of the TVA Board.

Bob Kerr was a fine Senator, a great and loyal churchman, a devoted family man and a wonderful friend.

Mrs. Sparkman and I extend our sympathies to Mrs. Kerr and to her children and other members of Bob Kerr's family.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, the untimely passing of our colleague Bob Kerr removed from the Senate one of the most skilled legislators of our time.

Bob Kerr was a self-made man. He was fearless and forceful. There was no limit to his capacity for taking on large responsibilities. These qualities which he had in abundance won for him the admiration and respect of even his sharpest critics. He had a powerful intellect and a great gift of expression—and it was always an unforgettable experience to see him in action on the floor of the Senate or at work in his committees. It was for his colleagues also a rewarding experience because we learned a great deal from him about the art of legislation. We will miss him very much.

It is to the enormous advantage of his State and country that Bob Kerr turned his talents into the public service. As chairman of the Senate Space Committee and of the Rivers and Harbors Subcommittee, and as second in command in the Finance Committee—Bob Kerr was in a position to make a significant contribution to the Nation. And he did.

From humble beginnings Senator Kerr reached great heights in the business world as well as in the political world. I believe that this was largely because he never lost the common touch. He served the people well—with courage and devotion to the end. His death has left a great vacuum in the Democratic Party and in the U.S. Senate.

I join with my colleagues in expressing deepest sympathy to his family.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, all of us were profoundly shocked when we learned of the sudden and tragic passing of Senator Robert S. Kerr. This distressing news reached us as the new year was beginning, but the impact of this event will be felt for many years to come.

The untimely death of this great statesman was not only a loss to the State of Oklahoma, to the Senate, and to his friends, but it is my firm conviction that the people of the United States also lost the services of one of their finest public servants. Few men in public life possess his qualities of leadership. The story of his life exemplifies what our Nation has to offer to citizens if they have the will and determination to carry out their ambitions.

It was my privilege to work closely with Senator Kerr in my capacity as a member of the Senate Aeronautical and Space Sciences Committee and the Senate Public Works Committee. We spoke frequently and often exchanged ideas relative to the space program. He was always considerate, and he could always be approached with confidence. I shall miss his friendship and guidance. He was always very good to me personally.

The Nation could ill afford to lose the services of this outstanding American. We, his friends, will always remember him. His memory, his deeds, and his contributions to our Government are a part of the history of our Nation.

He was a vastly popular, extremely influential man who served the people of his State with a dedication and devotion. No doubt it was this same energy which lifted him from humble beginnings in a log cabin in the Indian territory, which later became the great State of Oklahoma, to a position of wealth and respect. Had Senator Kerr been content with the security that comes from having achieved great success in business and acquired almost limitless financial resources, he probably could have rested on that and still have been highly regarded. However, of course, he did not. He was a man of outstanding intellectual attainments. He devoted the remaining years of his life to public service, first as Governor of his State and then as a U.S. Senator.

I shall miss Senator Kerr as a friend and as a colleague, and there are thousands of others who will miss him too. The Senate in particular will miss his refreshing candor, his determination, and his guiding hand.

Mr. President, I join with my colleagues in extending to Mrs. Kerr and her family my deepest sympathy.

Mr. LONG of Missouri. Mr. President, the sudden and untimely passing of Senator Robert S. Kerr has shocked and saddened us all. To his family, it has brought a sorrow that will ease with time—but never cease.

Among his friends and colleagues, it has left an emptiness that will be filled with memories—but never a replacement.

Throughout the length and breadth of the America he cherished in heart and served in life, there has been a loss that can never be regained, but there will forever remain the indelible mark of a devoted man that nothing short of the infinity of eternity can erase.

Many knew Bob Kerr much closer—and for many more years than it was my honored privilege to know him. But this is not the gage that measures my personal feelings about him—feelings which I am certain are shared with all my fellow Missourians. He had close ancestral ties with Missouri through his father, William Samuel Kerr, who was born in Bakersfield, Ozark County, Mo. On many occasions he had mentioned this to me and told me of his feeling of close interest for my State.

He was also our neighbor, not only in geography, but in philosophy as well. He always demonstrated clearly the interest and concern of a good and faithful neighbor.

As a man, he rose from the most humble of beginnings to vast material gains, but never lost sight of the truth that nothing is accomplished without the assistance of our Creator.

As a public servant and official, he achieved the highest success and power, but always used it in keeping with the solemn obligation of trust that it imposes.

Because of the success and power he earned, many refer to him as a "king," yet it is clear from the example of BOB KERR's life that for him there was truly only one king, God himself.

So while each of us misses the wonderful blessing of a daily association with such a trusted and loyal colleague as ROBERT S. KERR, great American and good man, we can be thankful for the worthy example that his life and his service sets for us all.

Many will recall that his favorite hymn was the wonderful and simple "Shall We Gather at the River," and know that he is now gathered at the greatest of rivers, the goal toward which his life and works were always directed.

Mr. President, I now ask unanimous consent that five editorials from Missouri newspapers, which are typical of the many appearing in newspapers, throughout my State, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the St. Joseph (Mo.) News-Press
Jan. 2, 1963]

A FRIEND HAS GONE

Although they didn't have much to say about it, Democrats of this congressional district backed U.S. Senator ROBERT S. KERR, of Oklahoma, for the party's nomination for President in 1952. The Senator died yesterday.

Ellis Cook, of Maryville, and DeWitt Campbell, of North Kansas City, were the delegates of this northwest Missouri district at the Chicago convention that year. They were uninstructed. Adlai Stevenson seemed to be the front runner, but they came out at the start for Senator KERR. Mr. Stevenson went on to win the nomination—but nothing else.

Only a little more than 2 months ago, Senator KERR in the waning days of the 1962 election campaign came into this Sixth District to make a speech for Congressman WILLIAM R. HULL and U.S. Senator EDWARD V. LONG. He spoke at a fundraising dinner at North Kansas City.

It was a typical Kerr speech. He was a man of powerful voice and an orator of the old school, one given to tying in Biblical quotations to make political points. For example the Biblical verb "smite" fit often into the woof and warp of his political blasts at the opposition.

Oklahoma and the United States have lost a colorful lawmaker in the death of Senator KERR. He was a man who made friends and who made enemies—of equal ardor—because he was a man who was not to be bluffed. The Senator always stood his ground.

It is good to have men like that in the Senate.

[From the St. Louis (Mo.) Globe-Democrat,
Jan. 2, 1963]

SENATOR ROBERT S. KERR

The unexpected death of U.S. Senator ROBERT S. KERR, of Oklahoma, has deprived Congress and the Nation of a Capitol Hill powerhouse, a very human and picturesque figure on the Washington scene, a fine Senator.

His growth from log cabin beginnings to become a multimillionaire oil and mining tycoon was more than the usual American success story. And his rise to become the "uncrowned king" of the Senate had little to do with business acumen.

Mr. KERR used a keen mind, a prodigious talent for homework, a native skill for slashing debate to become the most sought after—and sometimes feared—Senator on the Hill.

He was friend and foe of the New Frontier. The President courted him whenever possible.

Mr. KERR was credited with being the biggest single factor in clobbering Mr. Kennedy's pet medicare program, yet the White House turned to the Senator for help in the battle for the administration's tax and trade bills.

No one in Congress knew as much about America's water resources, or the urgent need to conserve them, than Senator KERR. He came to St. Louis a few months ago and spoke in behalf of the successful bond drive to clean up our rivers. Mr. KERR was also a resolute champion of highways. He coauthorized the Kerr-Mills law to help needy aged with medical and health problems.

A man of homespun wit, that could develop a rapier thrust or a withering sarcasm, Senator KERR was respected in Congress almost as much as among his Oklahoma constituents, for whom he stood first and last. He was a devout churchman, a leading Baptist in his State.

BOB KERR left his mark on much legislation he was significantly instrumental in passing, laws that will long serve his country. His loss will be deeply felt among the major Senate committees in which he served.

His passing deprives the Nation of a signally able public servant.

[From the St. Louis (Mo.) Post-Dispatch,
Jan. 3, 1963]

CHANGES IN THE SENATE

The death of Senator ROBERT S. KERR, of Oklahoma, will have a profound effect on the work of the Senate and on its relations with the White House. Senator KERR had become known as the most powerful man in the upper body, and though he opposed the administration on certain issues, he was a mainstay of President Kennedy on others.

The Senator, who headed Kerr-McGee Oil Industries, Inc., a $200 million oil, chemicals, and uranium concern, led the fight last year against Mr. Kennedy's program of medical care financed through social security, but he was in the forefront of the battle for the President's trade expansion program. He upheld the 27½-percent depletion allowance, of vital importance to extractive industries, but the administration had hoped for his assistance in putting over a tax reduction program this year.

Although Senator KERR was a witty orator and a skilled debater, he exercised much of his power behind the scenes. He had a keen grasp of the inner workings of the governmental machine. A major source of his power was his ability to control pork-barrel projects through his chairmanship of a Public Works Subcommittee. He was a member of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation and of the Senate Finance Committee, and was chairman of the increasingly important Senate Aeronautical and Space Sciences Committee.

There will be important changes in the Senate other than those caused by Senator KERR's death. The defeat of Senators Wiley and Capehart has, for example, left two openings on the Foreign Relations Committee. The stature of the replacements chosen by the Republican Senators will measure the importance the party attaches to the conduct of a sound foreign policy, particularly with respect to bipartisanship.

A new factor in the Senate will be the presence of 30-year-old EDWARD KENNEDY, of Massachusetts, who will occupy a unique position because one of his brothers is President, and another is Attorney General. The new Senator has been described by the President as the best politician in the family, and he is confirming this judgment by deliberately choosing assignments that will keep him out of the limelight.

The Senate faces a heavy workload in the coming 2 years, and the factors noted here will influence the legislative product. By how much, time will tell.

[From the Warrensburg (Va.) Daily Star-Journal, Jan. 4, 1963]

IMPACT OF KERR DEATH

No one can say with precision just what effect Senator ROBERT S. KERR's death will have on the administration's legislative program in Congress. There is no doubt that White House measures will have tougher sledding without the powerful Oklahoman's strength and legislative skill behind them.

Administration leaders thus have particular reason to mourn Senator KERR's passing. Others, of whatever political complexion, may regret the departure of one who acted boldly and resourcefully in behalf of strong convictions.

During the past year or so it had often been remarked that Senator KERR had become the most powerful man in the Senate. In a sense, he filled the power vacuum created when LYNDON B. JOHNSON left the Senate to become Vice President. Though he jumped on the Kennedy bandwagon with notable tardiness in 1960, he quickly became the President's right-hand man in the Senate. It was he whose support was principally instrumental in administration successes with trade, tax, and other legislation.

Now the White House must find another man, or men, to take up the slack in leadership. Particularly, a man must be found to manage administration tax proposals and maneuver them through the Senate. Senator KERR's shoes will be hard to fill.

[From the St. Louis (Mo.) Globe-Democrat,
Jan. 4, 1963]

POWER VACUUM IN SENATE

Calling him "the Senate's single most powerful Member," Washington officials and correspondents are speculating on how the death of Senator ROBERT S. KERR will affect the Kennedy program in the upcoming session of Congress.

The power vacuum Senator KERR leaves is the one he stepped into 2 years ago. Up until then, he had spent 12 years in the Senate building up seniority, acquiring influence, but not exercising active leadership, which was held pretty firmly in the strong political hands of Majority Leader LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

With Senator JOHNSON moving up to the Vice Presidency, MIKE MANSFIELD was supposed to take both his title and his place but, somehow, couldn't manage to fill his shoes. That gave Senator KERR his opportunity.

In the absence of a strong liberal or strong conservative who could exercise effective control of the Senate, the Oklahoman, hardly classified as either, simply took it over.

> As was to be expected under these circumstances, Senator Kerr used it for moderation. He supported those parts of the Kennedy program which he approved, but opposed those he didn't. Frequently, he would trade with the President, making concessions to the administration in exchange for some he wanted as a Senator.
>
> That, particularly, is why Washington is trying to estimate how the Kennedy legislative program will fare in the absence of Senator Kerr, who could give it the strongest support or the strongest opposition of any Member of the Senate.
>
> Initially, objective observers feel that it could help Mr. Kennedy with his medicare proposal, which Senator Kerr—coauthor of the Kerr-Mills plan—opposed, but hurt him with his tax-cut program, which the Senator favored. On these measures, however, the final decision may well come in the House. The House would probably spike both.
>
> In the Senate, itself, the effect will be determined by who now steps into the power vacuum which Senator Kerr filled the last 2 years. It is a tribute to his great service to the Congress and to the country that both are left wondering who can fill his place.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, in the passing of Senator Kerr, the Senate lost one of its most forceful personalities and the Democratic Party one of its most vigorous adherents.

Senator Kerr fought hard for the things he believed in; he was an able advocate and, as many in this body learned to their sorrow, a formidable adversary in debate. As a fellow Democrat, I was grateful for his effectiveness in this regard for he could rally support for common causes. One of the best speeches I ever heard was the keynote address he gave at the Democratic National Convention in 1944.

Many of my fellow Tennesseans knew him as one of the principal architects of the self-financing act for the Tennessee Valley Authority, under which TVA may issue bonds for the needed expansion of its power production facilities.

Senator Kerr was one of the most important figures on the American political scene in modern times, and history will not soon forget him.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, I should like to join my colleagues in expressing my deep sense of loss at the passing of Senator Kerr, and my conviction that the Senate, the Nation, and the State of Oklahoma have suffered a truly great loss. During my brief service here, I have learned that there are few men who could so completely win the hearts, friendship, and loyalty which Bob Kerr won in his long and honorable Senate service. He was a strong man, yet a kind man, and he had the deepest sense of humility. He was a man who had strong convictions and the courage to fight for his beliefs, but all of his struggles were devoid of bitterness or rancor.

In his personal life Senator Kerr was a devoted family man, and one deeply moved by charity and the spirit of religion. He was a natural leader of men, a man of both character and moral strength, and big enough to consider the views of other men because of his dedication to justice, democracy, and the perpetuation of this great body.

I had the privilege of serving with him during the period that he was chairman of the Senate Space Committee. I know of his deep commitment that this Nation be preeminent in space and science. I know of his devotion to education and the development of the resources of this country for the use of its citizens. Some have said that he is a man who had everything and with this I would agree; but he had the humanity to care about the aged and the sick, about the less privileged, and the economically distressed.

Many bills which have passed this body to become law, bear his indelible signature. He has given much to this Nation, and we as a people are thankful for his having been here to serve and to leave his mark on present and future generations.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I rise to pay tribute to the memory of a great American who has been recognized by many as one of the most distinguished and effective public servants ever produced by the great State of Oklahoma. Senator Robert Kerr earned an enviable reputation as a man who turned his every endeavor into success, whether it be in the business world, in the Governor's chair, in the U.S. Senate, or as a lay leader in the Baptist church. His meteoric rise from his humble beginnings in a log cabin to a position of strong leadership and powerful influence in the councils of government and also his almost unmatched success as a businessman present a ringing testimony to the great and vast opportunities which our form of government and our free enterprise system offer to all Americans. Bob Kerr proved that a man who is willing to work hard and face all the challenges of life can meet with eminent success in America. I must admit, however, that Bob Kerr possessed many more valuable traits which contributed considerably to this success, including, of course, his warm and friendly personality, his integrity, his vast store of knowledge and intelligence, and his dedication to his State and Nation.

I had the pleasure of serving with the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma on the Public Works Committee, and I value my associations with him while serving on that committee and while working with him on many legislative matters in the Senate.

The State of Oklahoma and the people of this country have lost the services of a valuable and dedicated public servant, and I join my colleagues in extending my deepest sympathy to the people of Oklahoma and all the members of the Kerr family.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, as we all know, the Senate and the Nation have suffered a grave loss in the sudden passing of Senator Robert Kerr; and I have lost a dear friend.

Bob Kerr was one of the most brilliant men ever to serve in the U.S. Senate. His great mental capacity was only matched by his boundless physical drive, in behalf of those things he believed to be necessary and right.

To him the most complex problems seemed simple, and the most herculean tasks possible.

Senator Kerr was one of the most successful and industrious businessmen ever to serve in the legislative branch of our Government. Nevertheless, he maintained a close and affectionate relationship with all the people of his State.

He was an expert in the field of conservation. His observations on that subject have been permanently recorded in a book of such quality that it is now widely used as a textbook in the colleges of Missouri.

Bob was an outstanding Biblical scholar, whose impressive knowledge substantiated his own great faith as well as that of others.

His rare oratory and his unforgettable humor will always be remembered by those who knew him.

With this abundance of talents, it is as though we have lost many men.

To his gracious wife and fine children Mrs. Symington and I extend our deepest sympathy.

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, it is with profound humility that I add my voice to those of my colleagues in lament and praise for Senator Robert Samuel Kerr. He will always be remembered as a pillar of strength and power in this body. But there were many other attributes to the man which will always make him memorable and his example one to respect. Colorful in speech and dress, forceful in oratory, the late Senator Kerr was never one to allow himself or his interests to be submerged in the anonymity of government. And this, it seems to me, is the great lesson of his career to us all, as it was the source of his great influence in this body. The record of his life reads like a lexicon of the history of his State. Born in what was then Indian Territory, he grew up in that lusty area, won from her his education and his well-being, saw her come to statehood and became her Governor. And when he came to Congress, he was always first to say that Oklahoma's interests were his interests and that his interests were Oklahoma's. Robert Kerr had his critics, but the lesson he left for us, it seems to me, was that he persisted in being his own colorful, independent self. The result was that we in the Senate always had a fresh burst of Oklahoma sunlight to illuminate our way, and we shall always be the richer for having had it.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, I rise to pay tribute to Bob Kerr, late a Senator from the State of Oklahoma, and a man who honored me with his friendship. The Members of this body who knew Senator Kerr are aware that he was a man who stood apart in many ways. He was a giant among us, physically, mentally, and in the mark he left by his generalship here of legislation of far-reaching significance. He was the kind of man of whom legends are made. Indeed, he was a living legend while yet among us—which can be said of few men, and never of little men. The legends will grow and flourish, for the basic stuff was there, and Bob Kerr will enter into the folklore of our politics, as one of the rare ones of whom stories are told and memories cherished. The tribute we pay today is but the beginning for Bob Kerr. We may be as confident that he will live in the history of the Senate as we can be confident that he has now found communion with the one Master whom Bob Kerr recognized and served in all he did on earth.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I, along with the entire Nation, was shocked to hear the news, last December, that Bob Kerr, of Oklahoma, had died suddenly.

I have enjoyed my close working relationship with Senator Kerr, and it is much too difficult to crowd into this short tribute all the accomplishments which were his during the time he served in the U.S. Senate. While he had done so much, I truly felt that his star was just beginning to shine much brighter on the horizon had he been able to remain with us, to continue the work which he had so nobly advanced.

Senator Kerr was born in a log cabin. He was a native son of the State of Oklahoma. He was a devout member of the Baptist church. He had served as president of the Baptist General Convention of Oklahoma and as vice president of the Southern Baptist Convention. For several years before his death he had been president of the Baptist Foundation of Oklahoma. He struggled hard to get his formal education and came from a poor family. He was a great debater and became an expert on every subject he handled in the U.S. Senate.

Bob Kerr served with honor and distinction on many committees in the Senate and his first love was the utilization of our natural resources.

I worked very closely with Bob Kerr on the Senate Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences, which he so ably chaired. One could not help but be amazed at the confidence which he always demonstrated on many of the seemingly impossible tasks which he handled. Were it not for his bipartisan effort for the use of outer space for peaceful purposes, our Nation today, would, indeed, be lagging far behind in this field. He was determined to make our country first. The speed with which he got our space program underway was most encouraging and had it not been for his background in business and politics, I feel that this would never had been accomplished.

I had looked forward to working with Senator Kerr during the 88th Congress. We needed him and were counting on him.

I join with my colleagues in expressing my deep sympathy to his wife and family.

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. President, the affection and respect for the great contribution of our former associate, Senator Robert S. Kerr, of Oklahoma, extended far beyond the limits of his home State. This has been said to the Senate many times. Another example of this respect is indicated by the resolution of the City Commission of the City of El Dorado, Kans., which I submit here for inclusion in the Record relating to the designation of the lake at Ponca City, Okla., on the Arkansas River as Lake Robert S. Kerr.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Be it resolved by the governing body of the city of El Dorado, Kans., That in recognition of the commendable public services of the late Senator Robert S. Kerr, of the State of Oklahoma, not only to the people of his State, but to the people of the State of Kansas, and in particular to the Arkansas Basin Development Association in Kansas, and as partial recognition for his efforts and contributions to the public good, that it be recommended to the proper authorities, that the lake to be created on the Arkansas River east of Ponca City, Okla., be entitled and called Lake Robert S. Kerr.

Passed and approved this 5th day of February 1963.

Paul F. Martens,
Mayor.
V. Eugene Payer,
Commissioner.
Virgil K. Godding,
Commissioner.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, the words spoken today here on the floor in tribute to Senator Kerr make a lasting record of his love for Senators and of their love for him.

I consider it a great honor to have been privileged to serve 12 years as his junior colleague—the most happy relationship a man could possibly have.

His passing leaves a deep void in the State of Oklahoma, where his leadership was so effectively known.

All Oklahoma, and particularly myself and Mrs. Monroney, deeply sympathize with Mrs. Kerr and the wonderful family in this loss.

NATIONAL DEFENSE CONTRACTS

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, compelling evidence is piling up of the need for full public disclosure of the basis on which national defense contracts are being awarded. Yesterday the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. Case] made a statement highly critical of the President for remarks made last year during the course of the campaign which confirmed that politics, influence, and other extraneous considerations governed the selection of top Government contractors. I ask unanimous consent that an article appearing in the Washington Post on March 1 setting forth some of the comments of the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. Case] be printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Senator Case Asks Arms Contract Publicity Rule

(By Laurence Stern)

A top Republican liberal in the Senate called yesterday for broad public disclosure action to insure that political favoritism is kept out of the Pentagon's $60-billion-a-year spending program.

Senator Clifford Case, Republican, of New Jersey, further said that President Kennedy during last year's election personally confirmed that politics, influence, and other extraneous considerations govern selection of top Government contractors.

Case spoke as a Senate investigations subcommittee headed by Senator John L. McClellan, Democrat, of Arkansas, continued its closed inquiry into possible favoritism in the award of a $6.5 billion TFX tactical fighter aircraft contract to the General Dynamics Corp.

And on another front, the award of the TFX contract was defended yesterday by Defense Secretary Robert S. McNamara as a tremendous step forward that would save at least $1 billion in research and development costs.

CONGRESS TAKES INTEREST

It was the controversial fighter contract that created a flareup of congressional interest in the perennial issue of favoritism in Government contract awards.

Case cited the TFX award and the Mohole project of the National Science Foundation, designed to provide greater knowledge about the earth's interior, as cases in which top administration officials reversed the recommendations of expert panels in awarding contracts.

He criticized the President for having lowered campaigning standards by saying that Democrats could get more Government contracts for their States than Republicans. Case's home State of New Jersey lost 17 percent of its prime Government contracts since the Kennedy administration took over, a recent Defense Department study disclosed.

THREE-POINT PROGRAM

The New Jersey Republican proposed a three-point program which he said would protect the integrity of the contract system:

Require that records be maintained, open to public inspection, of all written and oral communications (except by the bidder) on defense or space contracts, including those from Members of Congress. This is intended to prevent back-door wirepulling in behalf of contractors.

Require full, complete, and prompt public disclosure of the basis on which noncompetitive negotiated contract awards are made. Nearly two-thirds of all Pentagon contracts, he noted, are negotiated.

Create a joint House-Senate committee as a watchdog over all defense and space contract awards. He suggested that it be headed by a Republican during Democratic administrations and by a Democrat when a Republican is in the White House.

INTRODUCED IN HOUSE

Companion legislation was introduced yesterday in the House by Representative Earl Wilson, Republican, of Indiana, who charged that "influence, politics, manifestations of good will and other pressures are being used to channel defense contracts to favored manufacturers at all levels."

Protested Wilson: "Wining and dining of middle-grade civil servants in both skyrocketing the cost of defense procurement and disrupting efficiency of the military. * * *"

At the McClellan committee hearings, meanwhile, investigating Senators pursued the question of why Defense Secretary McNamara ignored the unanimous recommendations of four evaluation boards and awarded the fighter contract to General Dynamics. The military boards, representing all the services affected by the fighter project, picked Boeing Aircraft.

The closed-door testimony was released to the press after being sanitized by Pentagon officials, who were instructed by McClellan to remove only classified information.

COST CLAIMS DOUBTED

McNamara awarded the controversial contract to General Dynamics last November despite findings by military professionals that the Boeing airplane was superior in range, bomb-carrying capacity, radar evasion, and other military advantages. An Air Force review board also found that Boeing could produce the plane for $100 million less than General Dynamics.

One of the factors that reportedly weighed in McNamara's reversal of the evaluation boards was doubts among his civilian analysts of Boeing's cost claims.

At his press briefing yesterday the Secretary, without referring to any individual company, mentioned during the discussion of the TXF project the "serious underestimates of program costs * * * that have plagued us in the past."

McNamara pointed out that in 10 or 15 major weapons systems he has examined recently "no one of them had an actual cost less than 300 percent of the original estimate and several of them had final costs that were approximately 1,000 percent of the original estimate."

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I call attention to unclassified testimony which was received by the Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations of the Senate Committee on Government Operations, showing Air Force evaluation of the operational characteristics and cost comparisons between the Boeing and General Dynamics TFX fighter aircraft proposals. I ask unanimous consent that this unclassified comparison be printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the comparison was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Operational comparison of 2 TFX proposals, General Dynamics versus Boeing, as evaluated by U.S. Air Force

[Only subcommittee selected items are shown]

	General Dynamics	Boeing
Contractor's proposal (millions) [1]	$5,455.5	$5,364.2.
Air Force program estimate (millions)	$7,083.2	$6,983.0.
Air Force program estimate adjusted figure (millions)	$5,803.0	$5,387.5.
Ferry range (nautical miles)	X	X plus 1,100 miles.
Reaction time at minus 65° F. (minutes)	2 times X	X.
Landing distance over 50-foot obstacle (feet)	X plus 590 feet	X.
Deceleration device	Dive brakes and spoilers	Thrust reverser.
Air Force estimate of Navy weight (pounds)	X plus 2,208 pounds	X.
Air Force estimate of Navy mission A (loiter time in hours)	X	X plus 30 minutes.
Air Force estimate of Navy mission B (loiter time in minutes)	X	5½ times X.
Aircraft carrier spotting [2]	X plus 5	X.
Avoidance of foreign object damage	Deflectors	High scoops.
Area intercept mission (radius in nautical miles)[1]	X	X plus 177 miles.
Ordnance carrying capability (pounds of demolition bombs):		
Wings out	X	X plus 69 percent.
Wings in	X	X plus 11 percent.
Contractor's proposed ordnance loading: [1]		
Nuclear bombs	X	X plus 50 percent.
Air-to-ground missile	X	Do.
Demolition bomb	X	X plus 105 percent.
Cluster dispenser	X	X plus 180 percent.
Fire bomb	X	X plus 250 percent.
Land mine	X	X plus 70 percent.
Rocket launcher	X	X plus 44 percent.
Air-to-air missile	X	X plus 100 percent.

[1] Contractor data.

[2] Navy evaluation.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I call attention to the fact that the chairman of the Committee on Government Operations, who is also the chairman of the Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations, the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN], stated yesterday that the Pentagon's civilian hierarchy overruled four times the recommendations of military evaluation boards for acceptance of the Boeing proposal as being a cheaper and far superior design.

I suggest that this testimony being received by the subcommittee reveals that the Air Force estimated the Boeing program would cost $100 million less than the one offered by General Dynamics.

The Air Force further stated that with certain adjustments in both programs, the Boeing program would cost over $400 million less. At the same time the comparison which I have had printed in the RECORD reveals that the Boeing model was estimated by the Air Force to have a ferry range 1,100 nautical miles greater, 177 nautical miles of greater radius for interception, capability of landing at a distance of 590 feet less, and a much greater ordnance carrying capacity than the General Dynamics model.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an article written by Cecil Holland, appearing in the February 27 issue of the Washington Evening Star, and another article by the same writer appearing in the February 28 issue of the Washington Evening Star, on the subject of the investigation of the TFX contract, be printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Star, Feb. 27, 1963]

TFX Hearing Witness Defends Boeing Design

(By Cecil Holland)

An aeronautics expert has told Senate investigators he does not consider that the Boeing Aircraft Co. was overoptimistic in its design of a fighter aircraft with numerous advantages over one for which the Defense Department has contracted.

The testimony was given by John Stack, a former official of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, before the Senate Investigations Subcommittee in its inquiry into the award of the TFX fighter aircraft contract.

Mr. Stack, vice president of Republic Aviation Corp., is known as the father of the new type plane designed for use by both the Air Force and Navy.

TRANSCRIPT RELEASED

He testified before the subcommittee in a closed session yesterday and a heavily censored transcript of what he said was released today.

The transcript revealed that the Boeing Co., which lost out to General Dynamics Corp. in the bid for the contract, was held by the Pentagon's top civilian officials as being too optimistic in its proposal.

The transcript showed to Air Force Secretary Zuckert made this point in a memorandum justifying the action of the civilian officials, including Secretary of Defense McNamara, in overruling recommendations of four military evaluation boards in favor of the Boeing design.

MEMORANDUM QUOTED

An excerpt from Mr. Zuckert's justification said:

"There are additional examples of exceptional optimism in the Boeing proposal—the apparent belief that thrust reversers can be developed without major problems and engineering changes; the view that the variable swept wing can be quite easily applied to the use of the TFX concept; the use of titanium instructural members; the unique design of the propulsion installation.

"These examples suggest, if our experience is any guide, that much redesign and testing would be necessary, contrary to the reduced engineering estimates and costs indicated in the Boeing proposals."

The Boeing design was estimated at $100 million less costly than General Dynamics and far superior in several features.

TO TOTAL $6.5 BILLION

The contract is expected eventually to total $6.5 billion and the subcommittee is undertaking to determine if there was any favoritism in awarding the award. Secretary McNamara, Mr. Zuckert, and Navy Secretary Korth, who overruled the military experts, will be called as witnesses later in the investigation.

Committee Counsel Jerome Adlerman questioned Mr. Stack about some of the advantages indicated in the Boeing design and asked if he considered the Seattle-based company was overoptimistic in its proposals.

"Why, no," Mr. Stack replied.

Among advantages of the Boeing design indicated by Mr. Adlerman's questions were a lighter aircraft, a range of 1,000 to 1,100 miles greater and an ability to land on a field 600 feet shorter. Mr. Stack agreed that these and other features would make a plane more desirable.

The witness testified that from his knowledge while in Government service Boeing started design work on the TFX type of aircraft in 1959 and that General Dynamics began its work about a year later.

FEATURES DEFENDED

He also said that use of titanium would not detract from the aircraft and expressed confidence that competent engineers would be able to work into the aircraft the thrust reversers (for slowing the plane down for landings, for example) and the variable swept wing. Without the variable wing, the witness said, there would not be a TFX plane.

He also said the Boeing design of locating airscoops or intakes on the upper surfaces of the fuselage would seem to be better than General Dynamics design placing them under wings. He explained that there would be a hazard of drawing in pebbles and stones with the intakes under the wings when the aircraft was taking off from turfed or unpaved landing fields.

The witness also said the Boeing design offered more area for attaching weapons.

"It would make your head swim when you see how much stuff they are going to have in this * * *," Mr. Stack said. "It will look like a porcupine."

OTHER WITNESSES CALLED

The investigation continued today, still behind closed doors, with a number of military officers and staff investigators as the witnesses.

The inquiry began yesterday with Chairman McCLELLAN detailing how the Pentagon's civilian hierarchy overruled four times the recommendations of military evaluation boards for a cheaper and far superior design.

While Boeing lost out on the airplane contract, the biggest since World War II, it scored yesterday in landing one for the development and production of 11 Saturn 1–C first-stage boosters for a spacecraft which it is hoped will carry a crew of astronauts to the moon in this decade.

The contract totals $418.8 million.

While the hearings are closed because of security considerations, the subcommittee has ordered censored transcripts of the testimony released to the press.

At yesterday's opening hearing, Senator McCLELLAN said an evaluation group known as the Source Selection Board recommended the Boeing design four times between January and November 1962.

STILL 2 YEARS OFF

First test flights of the plane, designed for use by both the Air Force and Navy, may be as much as 2 years away, Mr. Stack said. "I think we could have had an outstanding airplane flying today if those concerned with the project had moved faster," he added.

Mr. Stack helped develop the idea of the all-purpose "wonder plane" while stationed at the Langley Research Center in Virginia.

[From the Washington Star, Feb. 28, 1963]

PROBERS SEEK DATE PENTAGON RULED ON TFX

(By Cecil Holland)

Senate investigators of the TFX fighter plane controversy want to know exactly when the Pentagon's civilian bosses decided to award the procurement plum to General Dynamics Corp. of Fort Worth, Tex.

The matter came up during the Senate investigation's questioning of two Air Force colonels in a closed hearing yesterday. The testimony, heavily censored, was made public today.

Secretary of Defense McNamara, Secretary of the Air Force Zuckert, and Navy Secretary Korth overruled unanimous recommendations of military experts favoring the Boeing Aircraft Co. of Seattle, Wash., and gave the contract to General Dynamics. The program is expected eventually to total $6.5 billion.

TWO COLONELS HEARD

Col. Charles E. Gayle, program director for the project, and Col. Roy A. Jaynes of Air Force headquarters testified, the transcript showed, that Mr. Zuckert was briefed on the fourth and final rival proposals last November 9.

Subsequently, Colonel Jaynes said, Secretary Zuckert requested on November 14 a history of the rival proposals and supporting documents. The officer said he understood the Secretary wanted the material for use in making a decision.

However, Senator MUNDT, Republican, of South Dakota, said, "We have reason to believe the decision was made before November 13 or 14." He did not elaborate, and Senator CURTIS, Republican, of Nebraska, suggested that the Secretary may have requested the material to back up a decision already reached by the Pentagon civilian leaders.

The award to General Dynamics was announced on November 24.

SECRETARIES TO TESTIFY

Mr. McNamara and the two service secretaries will be called as witnesses later in the investigation.

It was brought out during the questioning of the two colonels that it was unusual for the civilian secretaries to overrule the unanimous recommendations of the military boards and other high-ranking officers who recommended Boeing as the producer of the plane. Both said they were unaware of any other incidents of this kind.

"I want to find that out," Chairman McCLELLAN said. "I think it is important * * * if this is a most unusual thing, that a weapons system or procurement problem like this would be processed as much as it is, and have such apparent unanimity among those who are presumed to know most about weapons and how to use them, and their judgment is overruled."

The committee was told yesterday that the civilian defense officials ordered an unusual course before making the award.

COMPETITORS ASSISTED

After the third rejection of the board's recommendation of Boeing as the producer of the multipurpose aircraft for use by both the Navy and Air Force, Colonel Gayle told the subcommittee, the officials ordered an evaluation team to give the major competitors every assistance in reworking their designs.

Colonel Gayle said this was the first time as far as he knew that such instructions had been issued. Colonel Gayle also was recalled as a witness.

The colonel also testified that during the months while the award was pending, he took the position that the successive rejections of the board's recommendations by the civilian officials and their orders to rework the designs brought the two companies closer together in their proposals and made it harder to reach a decision.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I also call attention to a report in the press that Secretary of Defense Robert McNamara considered doubts of the Pentagon's civilian analysts of Boeing's cost claims in his reversal of the Military Evaluation Board recommendations. However, I wish to point out that I am not concerned about the Boeing estimates. I am concerned about the Air Force estimates which I have previously inserted in the RECORD. I suggest that if there was any concern on the part of the Secretary of Defense, it should be couched in the light of the Air Force estimates rather than the estimates of the unnamed civilian analysts in the Pentagon.

I shall not prejudge the hearing, but I do suggest that if public confidence in the integrity of our defense contracting system is to be maintained, there must be much less secrecy surrounding the system. Coupled with the news management policy of the administration, its cynical hinting that Democrats can get more contracts for their districts than Republicans, and the fact that about two-thirds of Pentagon contracts are negotiated on a noncompetitive basis, I think the publics' right to know how its money is being spent in this area is vital. Furthermore, I trust that the claim of executive privilege, which seems to be increasingly put to use in denying facts to investigating committees of the legislative branch, will not be interposed in the defense contract award area.

In that connection I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks a copy of the address by Mr. Clark Mollenhoff, one of the Nation's leading reporters, who is affiliated with the Washington Bureau of the Cowles Publications.

The address was delivered at the University of Oregon on February 15, 1963. Mr. Mollenhoff is the author of the book "Washington Cover-Up," and the address which I have requested to be printed in the RECORD gives an excellent description of the way in which executive privilege can be whimsically interposed between the executive branch and the public, which has the right to know how its affairs are being conducted by those in whom it has placed its trust.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WASHINGTON COVER-UP

(By Clark Mollenhoff)

Much has changed in the newspaper world in the 50 years since Eric W. Allen founded the department of journalism at the University of Oregon. Reporters and editors are better educated than in the period of even 25 or 30 years ago. There has been a specialization on many of our larger newspapers that is regarded by some observers as a tremendous step in giving the public a better understanding of such fields as education, science, and labor. Certainly, most local newspaper staffs are better equipped today to report and analyze the activities of local and State governments than they were in 1912. Much credit for this progress belongs to men like Eric Allen.

However, there is real reason for asking if the newspapers are keeping pace with the national and international problems that confront our society. These problems involve both bigness and complexity. They are best illustrated by a simple reference to the tremendous increase in Federal responsibilities and Federal expenditures.

In 1912, Federal expenditures were less than $1 billion—$689,881,000 to be exact. Recently, President Kennedy has proposed a budget of $98.8 billion, and it could easily soar over the $100 billion mark. More than $50 billion of the Federal spending will be for defense. This means it will be spent behind a heavy curtain of military security that will prevent the press and the public from examining many of the decisions of Defense Secretary Robert S. McNamara.

There can be little doubt, we have reached the point where it is impossible for any newspaper reporter, or any group of reporters, to engage in a comprehensive analysis of Government spending. The size of the spending is staggering. The complexity of the laws and regulations is overwhelming. The powers assumed by the executive branch are almost unbounded.

Yet, somehow we must manage to examine and criticize this mammoth Federal Government if we are to carry out our assignment in the American democracy. Somehow, we must find the means to expose corruption or favoritism even if it involves areas where the Defense Department may seek to use false claims of military security for a shield. Somehow, we must oppose the arbitrary and arrogant use of authority within the huge bureaucratic agencies. Somehow, we must keep all channels of information open unless the real military security of our Nation is at stake. And even in those areas where genuine military security can be claimed, we must assure ourselves that the Congress has provided an effective check on the use of arbitrary power by the executive branch.

Bound up in these press responsibilities is the most vital issue of our time: Can the United States fight effectively in the long range cold war, and also continue to function as a real democracy?

The newspapers of the United States must carry a heavy responsibility, if not the major responsibility, in the determination of how that question will be answered in the next 10 or 20 years ahead of us. Newspaper editors and reporters must be able to understand the problem of obtaining information from Government. They must know all the avenues for obtaining information, and must recognize when those avenues are being barricaded. They must recognize when a false claim of military security is used to cover up matters that are simply embarrassing to the executive branch.

It is not enough for our editorial pages to shout freedom of information or news management with a fervor. It can be relatively easy to deplore the news managers on a well-publicized Federal case where others have led the way. However, it is more important that you be able to do your own analysis of Government operations to expose the unjustified secrecy that slips into Government agencies under many different guises.

Many journalism schools and many professional newspaper organizations are doing a laudable job of trying to promote a greater interest in depth knowledge of Government information problems. However, the effort is still far from successful.

It is unfortunate that deep splits have developed in the ranks of the working newsmen that tend to hurt the entire cause. One group tends to scoff at the resolutions passed by freedom of information committees as being ineffective. This group may point to an enthusiastic resolution supporter who does not follow through in his daily operations. There is the claim that all that is needed is good reporting to break through any of the information barriers.

Such feuding tends to weaken the newspapers on an issue upon which they should be united. There is no doubt that good aggressive reporters and editors can do a great deal to break through news barriers. However, when the problem becomes national in scope, there is also the need for strong and unified support from other newspapers and from professional organizations. It is seldom that one reporter or one newspaper can break through a secrecy wall on the national level if there is not general newspaper support. It is even more difficult if there is active opposition from well-known but poorly informed national columnists.

Fortunately, most of the columnists are reasonably well informed on this issue, but some are not. One well-known columnist screamed about news management but a short time later supported a total arbitrary secrecy in a claim of Executive privilege.

How could he complain that an administration was engaged in news management by putting out favorable press releases, and then defend that administration for arbitrarily barring Congress from investigating behind the self-serving declarations in the news releases. Some might contend that the man was forsaking journalistic principles to promote the things he felt were expedient.

He was not dishonest. It was worse than that. He simply does not know Government operations. He writes the big picture, second-guessing the President, the Secretary of Defense, and the Secretary of State on all types of broad policy issues. Yet, I know from considerable personal experience that he is unfamiliar with the detailed little pictures that are necessary if one is to draw sweeping conclusions on the so-called big picture.

This columnist had no understanding of the laws, regulations, or court decisions involved in the problem of Executive privilege. Secrecy was wrong one week because it interfered with a story he was pursuing. Broader secrecy was acceptable the next week because it seemed to bar information from a Senator he did not like.

Over a period of years, I believe that the activities of our journalism schools and our professional newspaper organizations can do a lot to eradicate or minimize such misleading commentary.

As far as the overall information picture is concerned, I do not want to be an alarmist. However, I do want to express concern over a number of actions in the Kennedy administration that deal with the information policy. Some are mere extensions of the Eisenhower administration's policies, and some seem to carry the New Frontier stamp.

I do not believe we are faced with public officials who want to interfere with the rights of a free press or the proper operations of our democracy. However, this does not mean that I believe we can count on the good intentions or the self-serving statements of any administration. The President and others charged with the responsibility for military defense can easily rationalize steps to bar the press or Congress from embarrassing information. The political aspirations of nearly every high official in the executive branch tend to make it easy to justify press releases that give an overly optimistic picture of how well Government is being administered.

The men heading our Government may have the best interests of the press at heart, but it is cause for concern when Assistant Secretary of Defense Arthur Sylvester starts to talk of "an inherent right to lie" about defense matters. This is particularly troublesome when it is accompanied by a directive which makes it necessary for all civilian and military officials at the Pentagon to report all conversations with reporters before the close of business each day.

Take such pronouncements in context with other developments in recent years, and it is apparent why newsmen should be giving more serious study to the laws and practices on Government information. Just review some examples:

When an Air Force navigator was crippled for life in a bomber crash, the Air Force denied him Government records he needed to press a damage claim.

When a Government investigator displeased his superiors with a report on misuse of U.S. foreign aid to Cambodia, the State Department refused him access to his own personnel records which, he claimed, would show he was railroaded out of his job.

The Defense Department refused to allow a Senate committee to question Defense censors on their official actions.

The State Department refused Congress access to records containing evidence of fraud in foreign aid spending in Laos and Peru.

The Atomic Energy Commission and the Budget used an arbitrary secrecy ruling to hide a conflict of interest which made a multimillion-dollar power contract illegal.

A State Department official refused to give the Senate Foreign Relations Committee a copy of a controversial foreign relations planning paper.

High State Department officials accused a foreign government representative of bribery, but refused to produce documents or testimony to support the charge.

Even a Government agency, the General Accounting Office, was denied access to official Navy, Air Force, and State Department records despite a specific law giving GAO such right of access.

These are not examples of what might happen in the United States under an all-powerful authoritarian executive branch of Government. These are only a few of the cases demonstrating what has happened in the American democracy in recent years under an arbitrary claim of a right to unlimited secrecy.

This unlimited secrecy has been promoted under the term "Executive privilege." Through a simple self-serving declaration that the public interest is involved, officials of the executive branch have pulled down the broad secrecy curtain. The public, the press, the Congress, and even the courts are barred from records of testimony from Government officials or records of official acts.

President Eisenhower claimed his administration could bar Congress and the GAO from any records or testimony containing advice of high level officials.

President Kennedy has taken the Eisenhower thesis and extended it to declaring that he will not allow the questioning of "subordinate officials of our career service" on their official acts.

Executive branch officials admit there is hardly a paper of importance in any executive agency that does not include the opinions, conclusions, or recommendations to qualify for an "Executive privilege" secrecy stamp.

The result is a doctrine that disregards the law, flies in the face of court decisions, scoffs at the right of the public to be informed and arrogantly rejects the processes of Congress.

In its simplest form, it is a proclamation that the executive branch cannot be challenged in its invocation of total secrecy. It strips away, or diminishes, the constitutional right of the Congress to investigate the administration of laws.

Neither the Eisenhower administration nor the Kennedy administration has used the ultimate power inherent in the "Executive privilege" doctrine. Total application of this doctrine would create a public uproar for it would be executive tyranny. Both administrations have made much information available that might have been hidden by Executive privilege, and in some cases information was revealed that was against the political interests of the administration in power. However, in many of these cases, the executive branch officials had no real choice for there was already enough information in the public domain to make a coverup impractical.

It would have been poor politics for the Kennedy administration to have tried to use Executive privilege to pull down the secrecy curtain on the Billie Sol Estes case. When the McClellan committee started its investigation of Estes in April there had already been an exposure of large segments of the Estes case by a Texas newspaper and by Texas Attorney General Will Wilson.

Use of Executive privilege at that point would have meant political disaster for Agriculture Secretary Orville Freeman. Pulling down a secrecy curtain in the face of strong evidence of fraud would have been similar to claiming the fifth amendment. Freeman couldn't afford secrecy in the face of evidence indicating fraud or favoritism. The Kennedy administration couldn't afford to face a charge of cover-up on the first major scandal problem.

The Kennedy administration opened the records for Chairman McCLELLAN, and for a House subcommittee headed by Representative L. H. FOUNTAIN, Democrat, of North Carolina. Investigative reports were made available to the press and to the Senate and House investigators. High level officials testified on their opinions, conclusions, and recommendations in the cotton allotment decisions that favored Billie Sol Estes, and on the decisions that resulted in Estes being named to the National Cotton Advisory Board.

Low level officials testified in detail on their dealings with Estes. Nothing was withheld, the administration claimed.

The open Government policy in the Estes case was a complete reversal of form for the Kennedy administration. Less than 2 months earlier, President Kennedy had given his approval to a Defense Department decision to refuse to allow a Senate Armed Service subcommittee to question Defense censors on their official actions.

Defense Secretary Robert S. McNamara used the secrecy of Executive privilege to block the Stennis subcommittee from questioning the censors on specific changes in speeches of high ranking military officers.

On February 8, 1962, President Kennedy wrote to McNamara:

"I have concluded that it would be contrary to the public interest to make available any information which would enable the subcommittee to identify and hold accountable any individual with respect to any particular speech that he has reviewed.

"I therefore direct you, and all personnel under the jurisdiction of your Department, not to give any testimony or produce any documents which would disclose any such information."

President Kennedy did not contend that the national security of the country might be jeopardized in the questioning of the censors. He did not contend that Defense or State secrets of a highly classified nature might be involved. This would have been ludicrous.

So, the President simply gave his view that it was in the public interest and the secrecy of executive privilege was claimed.

It was politically practical to assert a claim of unlimited secrecy in the censors hearings because Senator Strom Thurmond, Democrat, of South Carolina, was the major opposition. Senator Thurmond held a position on racial and economic matters which had little national appeal, and he was regarded as a symbol of extreme rightwing thinking. It was Senator Thurmond who contended that the Pentagon and State Department censors were watering down the speeches of generals and admirals, and were in essence pursuing a no-win philosophy. The Defense and State Departments denied the allegation, and the Armed Services Subcommittee, under Chairman John Stennis, Democrat, of Mississippi, was established to do a full investigation of the controversial blue penciling.

The Defense Department made copies of the public speeches available, and McNamara and others testified on the general policy under which censors operated. However, the important question was how the policies were interpreted and applied by the actual censors. That question was never answered because the claim of executive privilege was used to avoid pinpointing of responsibility for specific actions.

This was not a wild and free-swinging investigation under an irresponsible chairman. This was not a committee operating outside of its jurisdiction, and engaging in abusive treatment of witnesses. It was a properly authorized subcommittee of the Senate Armed Service Committee, it was operating within its jurisdiction, asking for Government records and asking questions that were pertinent to the inquiry.

McNamara declared that the Congress would have to content itself with his self-serving declaration—his high-level handouts—and would be prevented from going behind his assertions. Amazingly, the editorial cheers for McNamara were deafening. He was cheered because he was defying Senator Thurmond.

The question of whether Senator Thurmond was right or wrong in his conclusions on the censors was not important. He had the right to be wrong, as long as he conducted himself in a proper manner, and asked pertinent questions in a legitimate investigation. He had fully as much right to ask questions as any member of the press, and he had a right to expect answers that were truthful.

The press should examine its performance in this case as it considers information policies that were adopted later by McNamara and Sylvester. The press forgot principles for the moment in the interest of kicking a Senator who held an unpopular view. The press also forgot its own longtime self-interest.

McNamara was arbitrary, he was defiant of the power of Congress, and he was crowned a hero. Was it any wonder that he and Sylvester were confident in seeking the maximum in their more recent news managing ventures in connection with the Cuban affair? Was it any wonder Pentagon officials and the White House believed it was possible to adopt the Sylvester directive to control press contacts at the Pentagon?

Pentagon reporters have characterized the Sylvester directive on press contacts as a "Gestapo" tactic. They comment that they feel the Sylvester directive, if implemented, will have the potential for shutting off legitimate dissent on policy matters that have nothing to do with national security. Even if the order is not fully implemented, it is felt it will be a club over the heads of military and civilian personnel. It is a formal order, and can be used as a basis for disciplinary action at the times when the McNamara team wants to use it to curb dissent.

Defense Secretary McNamara may want to run the Defense Department in the best and most efficient manner. We can credit him with wanting to achieve the maximum military strength for the minimum expenditure. We can assume that he believes his policies are in the best interest of the Nation. However, the same thing could have been said for most of our past Secretaries of Defense and their military chiefs.

The present administration did not accept the Eisenhower administration's assessment of its achievements. In fact, President Kennedy and Gen. Maxwell Taylor, the present Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, were sharply critical of the defense policies of President Eisenhower. Since assuming office, they have stressed that the Eisenhower administration policies resulted in what they believed to be serious military weaknesses. They have assured us that Defense Secretary McNamara and General Taylor have been working feverishly and have repaired many of the weaknesses in our defense armor.

The men who are now leading our Nation did not want us to accept the self-serving declarations of the Eisenhower administration on our defense posture. Now they contend that what they found demonstrated the former policies were wrong.

Are we now to assume that we have finally found that infallible team composed of men who will instinctively know what is best for us? Are we to assume that McNamara, only 2 years in the job, can produce the right answers on complex problems of defense without the benefit of dissent or public debate?

The press should be insistent that the Sylvester directive is wiped off the books. The effectiveness of the press in opposing the directive will depend upon its persistence. While it has been encouraging to see the Nation's press genuinely irritated over the Sylvester order and the attitudes that surround it, it is doubtful that this fury will continue.

If there is sharp and continued criticism, I have no doubt the Sylvester order will eventually be modified or withdrawn.

However, if the Nation's newspapers follow a characteristic pattern, the fury will soon give way to a few mild protests, and these will in turn give way to a whimpering acceptance of the chains. The short attention span of many newspapers will mean that the Sylvester directive will be forgotten, and the high-level handout collecting that goes with it will become an accepted part of the Washington newsgathering picture.

The press has an obligation to rip the Sylvester directive apart at every opportunity, not only because it is bad, but because it can become the pattern for further similar directives if it survives.

Past history should pretty well demonstrate that the executive branch does not do a good job of investigating itself. This is particularly true of the Military Establishment. It was the Congress that revealed the scandals involving Gen. Benny Meyers. It was the Congress that pulled loose the scandals involving Harry (the Hat) Lev and the New York procurement office. It was the Congress that produced the "chamber of horrors" on military buying practices generally. It was the Congress that revealed the details of the classic military corruption and mismanagement, in the construction of an airstrip at Fort Lee, Va.

These scandals were actually being hidden or disregarded by the Pentagon until the Congress stepped in and forced aggressive action. Our thinking on future problems should be keyed to these documented studies of the past.

We should remember that the Symington Armed Services Subcommittee has demonstrated that several billions of dollars were wasted in the stockpiling of strategic and critical material. A vast curtain of secrecy covered the stockpile purchasing and the political letters and questionable decisions that went into the creation of that $9 billion stockpile.

By now the lesson should be clear. Government secrecy has been used to hide corruption, mismanagement, and arbitrary abuse of power.

However, we must accept some secrecy as necessary to cover some military matters and some diplomatic negotiations. (Also, some secrecy is provided by law, such as in the income tax field.)

Our job is to see that the secrecy is limited to the areas clearly defined by laws and regulations. Even in the areas of military security and diplomatic negotiations there must be an avenue for review by proper committees of Congress and by the General Accounting Office.

Today we have four basic information problem areas:

1. The common news management in which an administration releases information that is most favorable to its activities, and makes it difficult to obtain contrary facts.

2. Such special directives as the Sylvester order of October 27, 1962, to control all press contacts at the Pentagon.

3. The misuse of military security classifications to cover up mistakes of judgment, malfeasance, and incompetence on the part of an incumbent administration.

4. The arbitrary and unlimited secrecy claim inherent in the Executive privilege doctrine as stated by President Eisenhower and carried on by President Kennedy.

Of all these problems, I am least concerned about simple news management as it is usually defined. Usually this term refers to the timing and wording of Government press releases to put the best foot forward for the incumbent administration. I am concerned only when the administration insists we accept these self-serving declarations, and then refuses to allow us to go behind them.

I am most gravely concerned about the Executive privilege doctrine. This doctrine is a naked claim to unlimited secrecy on the whim of the executive branch. It has been used to bar the press, the public, the Congress, and the General Accounting Office from examining Government business. It has been used to hide scandals and mismanagement in our regulatory agencies, in the foreign aid program, and in the Defense Department.

There is one thing that every citizen can do, and that every newspaper should do, in opposing the Washington coverup.

Give full support to Congress in asserting its right to investigate Government activities and Government spending.

I am not advocating that you should agree with the conclusions that any or all committees of Congress may reach in an investigation. I do suggest that you support the full right of Congress to call for documents and testimony in properly authorized investigations of Government activities.

The executive branch of the Government has grown more powerful year after year, and it seems unlikely that this power will be cut. It may be that a powerful executive is needed in dealing with the problems of the cold war.

However, I do not believe that many of us would suggest that this great power that is lodged in the President and his official family should go unchecked. If that power is unchecked then we will have lost one of the most important aspects of our form of government—the checks and balances.

The Congress represents the only effective check on the executive branch. All legislative power resides in the Congress, and this means the power to pass laws, to investigate to see how the laws are being administered, and to investigate to determine if new laws are needed.

Every curtailment of the right of Congress to investigate is a curtailment of the right of the press to learn about the operations of Government. This is a curtailment of the public's right to know.

Congress may have its scoundrels, its scandals, and its abuses. But it is well to remember that Congress is a bipartisan body. It has within it the representatives of every shade of political thinking in our society from extreme liberal to extreme conservative. This diversity of thought is the strength of our Congress, and it is the real strength of our system of government. It is our only protection against the arbitrary and unauthorized use of power by the powerful executive branch that exists today.

In the last few weeks, I have read all of the earlier Eric Allen memorial lectures. They covered a wide range of interests, as diverse as were the interests of the men who gave them. However, it did seem to me that through them all ran one dominant theme—one basic belief:

Freedom of the press exists only to provide for reporting and commentary on public affairs. We are true to our profession only as we work to provide the light that makes the democratic process more effective.

It cannot be emphasized too often that our basic responsibility is governmental affairs. It was encouraging to see that all of your past Eric Allen speakers were in agreement on this point. In one way or another, each of them sought to demonstrate that the comics, gossip columns, fashions, sports, and puzzles—necessary as they may be in making mass appeal—are not the press activities the framers of our Constitution had in mind in guaranteeing a free press.

I believe Eric Allen would have found something of value in each of those earlier lectures, and I am sure he would have found the compiled lectures carried an inspiration greater than any single one.

We need a full measure of inspiration, as well as perspiration, to handle our responsibilities in these days of $100 billion budgets. We need a persistent devotion to our tasks if we are to understand and control the high cost of Government secrecy at the city, county, State, or Federal level.

The future of democracy is contingent upon whether we can subordinate political partisanship and petty differences for basic principles. This is the least we can do to honor the memory of men like Eric Allen.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, as a further mark of respect to the memory of the three deceased Senators, I move that the Senate stand in adjournment until 12 o'clock noon Monday, March 4.

The motion was unanimously agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 17 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned until Monday, March 4, 1963, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate March 1, 1963:

PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

The following candidates for personnel action in the regular corps of the Public Health Service subject to qualifications therefor as provided by law and regulations:

To be senior assistant surgeons

Eugene A. Arnold, Jr.
Jo Anne F. Holzman
Joseph T. English

To be assistant surgeons

David L. Child
John R. Furman
Allan L. Brakensiek
Robert K. Heide
George A. Reich

To be senior assistant dental surgeons

Raymond E. Goepfrich
Richard D. Lowe
Terrance W. Baker

To be assistant dental surgeons

Richard P. Frank
Richard F. Rappl
Robert F. Williams
Sheppard M. Levine
Charles A. Borgman
Paul J. Carr
James C. Dunkel
John A. Matis
Jack L. Cox
Paul J. Heins
Bruce R. Thorburn
Louis S. Vodzak
William S. Driscoll
Stephen J. Christensen
Joseph Schwartz
Fred D. Greenblatt
Robert H. Dumbaugh

To be assistant sanitary engineer

Vincent P. Barnaba

To be junior assistant sanitary engineers

Donald S. Baker
Robert L. Thoem
Joseph R. Tynsky

To be senior assistant sanitarian

William P. Wollschlager

To be assistant sanitarian

Edwin J. Heidig

To be senior assistant veterinary officers

Arnold F. Kaufmann
Melvin J. Worth, Jr.
Donald D. Smith

To be assistant veterinary officers

Albert S. Ricker
John G. Orthoefer
Larry T. Grubbs

POSTMASTERS

The following-named persons to be postmasters:

ALABAMA

Ersie T. Palmer, Birmingham, Ala., in place of J. R. Moncus, retired.

Erskine W. Bonds, Docena, Ala., in place of J. A. Hyde, transferred.

Thomas P. Weeks, Moundville, Ala., in place of M. E. Sims, transferred.

ALASKA

Marshall C. Higginbotham, Aniak, Alaska, in place of I. A. Begin, resigned.

Mildred J. Sanford, Tok, Alaska, in place of L. F. Trafton, resigned.

ARIZONA

Marion L. Massey, Jr., Claypool, Ariz., in place of J. S. Raymond, retired.

R. Odie Shipp, Miami, Ariz., in place of H. P. Williams, retired.

ARKANSAS

Eliot T. Bush, Arkinda, Ark., in place of Deedy Newsome, retired.

Marvin J. Wilber, Maysville, Ark., in place of Clara Evans, retired.

CALIFORNIA

Floyd H. Erickson, Ahwahnee, Calif., in place of G. H. Crooks, retired.

Joy L. Fansler, Big Pine, Calif., in place of E. D. Willson, retired.

Carl W. Fischer, Jr., Camarillo, Calif., in place of C. B. Schmill, removed.

Clayton F. Malling, El Cerrito, Calif., in place of L. W. McNeil, retired.

Nathaniel R. Evans, Fortuna, Calif., in place of C. L. Batten, retired.

Frances M. Reed, Glen Ellen, Calif., in place of G. A. Rock, retired.

Jack J. Snyder, Harbor City, Calif., in place of A. E. Collins, deceased.

John F. Bushell, Oakland, Calif., in place of K. E. Francis, deceased.

Nancy C. Avery, Pacoima, Calif., in place of L. M. Friedman, retired.

COLORADO

Harley O. Mullins, Aurora, Colo. Office established July 2, 1962.

Elmer D. Vagher, Bristol, Colo., in place of H. L. Elmore, resigned.

Claude T. Cecil, Gill, Colo., in place of Clarence Townley, retired.

Phyllis M. Jenkins, Gilman, Colo., in place of L. M. Heyer, resigned.

Goldie L. Simpson, Monument, Colo., in place of W. W. Carrothers, resigned.

Frank A. Batman, Jr., Pierce, Colo., in place of E. F. Huitt, retired.

Fredda H. Mizner, Pine, Colo. Office reestablished July 22, 1961.

Vernon L. Morris, Ramah, Colo., in place of William Kloster, retired.

Archie N. Hain, Wellington, Colo., in place of A. L. Carlson, transferred.

CONNECTICUT

B. Woodruff Clark, Litchfield, Conn., in place of S. A. Beckwith, retired.

John H. Murphy, New Canaan, Conn., in place of F. B. Leslie, retired.

Eugene D. Lynch, New Milford, Conn., in place of J. J. Berger, resigned.

Donald T. Hogan, Plymouth, Conn., in place of M. E. Ryan, retired.

Stanley L. Zaprzalka, Seymour, Conn., in place of A. H. Forst, retired.

Carl J. Gniadek, Southport, Conn., in place of E. J. Speer, retired.

Matthew J. Monahan, Thomaston, Conn., in place of M. T. Doyle, retired.

Louis P. Gage, Washington Depot, Conn., in place of J. F. Connerty, retired.

John J. Slattery, Waterbury, Conn., in place of W. J. Phelan, retired.

GEORGIA

Fred A. Kimler, Damascus, Ga., in place of J. A. Webb, retired.

Clifton H. Conner, Gainesville, Ga., in place of H. R. Tucker, Sr., retired.

Rothwell A. McCaskill, Sparta, Ga., in place of H. H. Berry, retired.

ILLINOIS

Eugene J. Tafel, Algonquin, Ill., in place of M. W. Struwing, removed.

Ralph E. Haffenden, Belvidere, Ill., in place of P. I. O'Brien, retired.

Carl H. Vaughn, Kinderhook, Ill., in place of M. E. McCarl, retired.

C. Kenneth Sizemore, Paris, Ill., in place of Grady O'Hair, deceased.

Vincent E. Stephenson, Pittsfield, Ill., in place of A. B. Caughlan, retired.

Owen A. Reimer, Roscoe, Ill., in place of V. M. Wallace, retired.

Curtis J. German, Rossville, Ill., in place of Joseph Brown, deceased.

Thomas A. Wood, Wheaton, Ill., in place of C. E. Carlson, retired.

Harold G. Minor, Windsor, Ill., in place of D. M. Wallace, resigned.

IOWA

Kenneth A. Madigan, Council Bluffs, Iowa, in place of J. C. Jenson, resigned.

Vernon M. Hill, Davis City, Iowa, in place of C. L. Evans, transferred.

Helen A. Bellmann, Durango, Iowa, in place of Elizabeth Grimme, retired.

Leon L. Wilson, Nevada, Iowa, in place of C. S. Price, retired.

Rex V. Ritz, Selma, Iowa, in place of W. W. Fulton, retired.

KANSAS

Henry L. Smith, Abilene, Kans., in place of R. M. Hill, retired.

Donald I. Beamgard, Atwood, Kans., in place of Sophia Kesselring, retired.

Joseph B. Nick, Basehor, Kans., in place of J. D. Grisham, retired.

Virgil W. McCune, Benton, Kans., in place of M. P. Hill, transferred.

Francis R. Gorman, Chapman, Kans., in place of C. W. Taylor, resigned.

Fred A. Riggs, Cottonwood Falls, Kans., in place of R. D. Bennett, retired.

Myrl H. Kliesen, Dodge City, Kans., in place of C. V. Houlton, retired.

Harold D. Brown, Eureka, Kans., in place of R. L. Marlin, resigned.

Clarence E. Zarnowski, Halstead, Kans., in place of E. H. Malleis, retired.

Lawrence V. Ferrell, Independence, Kans., in place of Benjamin Taylor, retired.

Donald E. Plank, Iuka, Kans., in place of B. M. Dillon, retired.

E. Maxine Nelson, Lenora, Kans., in place of R. A. Fuller, retired.

Mabel B. Hoss, Ness City, Kans., in place of J. E. Clouston, retired.

Daryl M. Ford, Valley Falls, Kans., in place of Clayton Wyatt, retired.

KENTUCKY

David S. Miranda, Ashland, Ky., in place of H. D. Shanklin, retired.

M. Aileen Hall, Betsy Layne, Ky., in place of A. M. Boyd, retired.

Henry M. Fannin, Ezel, Ky., in place of Roy Murphy, retired.

Joseph L. Thomas, Glendale, Ky., in place of L. M. Stuart, retired.

Bremer Ehrler, Louisville, Ky., in place of J. D. Scholtz, retired.

James H. Hicks, New Haven, Ky., in place of C. R. Johnson, resigned.

Mary R. McCormack, Sparta, Ky., in place of E. K. Riley, retired.

LOUISIANA

Rowland C. Regan, Egan, La., in place of F. E. Richey, retired.

Lloyd E. Chachere, Eunice, La., in place of Rene Tate, retired.

Phillip A. Hanks, Greensburg, La., in place of E. M. Barbier, retired.

William E. Scott, Lake Providence, La., in place of T. G. Biggs, retired.

Chester L. Guidry, Morse, La., in place of DeLuke Thibodeaux, retired.

Cecile B. Cheramie, Paradis, La., in place of F. C. Bertrand, retired.

Marvin E. Schauf, Saint Joseph, La., in place of J. A. Schuchs, deceased.

MAINE

Sidney W. Bessey, Buckfield, Maine, in place of G. C. Thurlow, retired.

Samuel A. Saunders, Calais, Maine, in place of N. F. Townsend, deceased.

Ervin D. McCluskey, Jr., Freeport, Maine, in place of E. H. Stowell, retired.

Erma M. Small, Monson, Maine, in place of H. E. Johnson, deceased.

MARYLAND

Eugene G. Bujac, Bowie, Md., in place of J. M. Porter, resigned.

Ora H. King, Clarksburg, Md., in place of J. M. Hess, resigned.

Henry J. Mundell, North Beach, Md., in place of M. G. Van Edsinga, retired.

W. Conway Beall, Upper Marlboro, Md., in place of E. V. Dorsey, transferred.

M. Ilene Trotter, Waldorf, Md., in place of W. L. Ryon, retired.

MASSACHUSETTS

Edward F. O'Leary, Holliston, Mass., in place of W. P. O'Grady, retired.

Marion O. Lantagne, Linwood, Mass., in place of G. V. Brady, retired.

William A. Latraverse, Northbridge, Mass., in place of C. E. Dion, retired.

George E. Owens, Jr., Wayland, Mass., in place of T. E. Hynes, retired.

MICHIGAN

Donald G. Bachman, Sr., Ann Arbor, Mich., in place of O. J. Koch, deceased.

Florence W. Letvenow, Atlantic Mine, Mich., L. M. Pyykkonen, retired.

Stennette E. Walsworth, Augusta, Mich., in place of J. B. Woodrow, Jr., transferred.

Robert E. Mohr, Clinton, Mich., in place of R. F. Richardson, transferred.

James M. Mahoney, Decatur, Mich., in place of H. H. Creagan, removed.

William H. Schwartz, Flint, Mich., in place of W. O. Kelly, resigned.

John W. Kelly, Manistique, Mich., in place of F. M. Gierke, Sr., retired.

Leo E. Osterberg, Pleasant Lake, Mich. Office established October 2, 1961.

John H. Brule, Watervliet, Mich., in place of J. R. Crumb, retired.

MINNESOTA

William J. Pattinson, Currie, Minn., in place of H. I. Gervais, retired.

Audrey A. Johnson, Esko, Minn., in place of C. M. Mattinen, retired.

Earl W. Dressen, Green Isle, Minn., in place of J. C. Myers, retired.

Virgil R. Buffington, Kenyon, Minn., in place of J. S. Cole, deceased.

Walter A. Dietz, Mapleton, Minn., in place of W. B. Lievan, retired.

Loren L. Marsden, St. James, Minn., in place of C. J. Strom, resigned.

Chester L. Stimpert, Sleepy Eye, Minn., in place of A. D. Bertrand, retired.

Gordon W. Friesen, Solway, Minn., in place of M. S. Dalby, transferred.

Dellin F. Segar, Wells, Minn., in place of W. P. Horan, retired.

Clarence B. Minyard, Lexington, Miss., in place of A. R. Alexander, retired.

MISSOURI

Albert D. Teter, Callao, Mo., in place of W. P. Clarkson, deceased.

Lewis D. Baldwin, Collins, Mo., in place of D. C. Selvidge, deceased.

Charles A. Reed, Concordia, Mo., in place of E. E. Sagehorn, retired.

Johnnie Moyer, Jr., Corder, Mo., in place of W. M. Riley, deceased.

John W. Volker, Craig, Mo., in place of C. M. Randall, retired.

Kenneth W. Alexander, Greentop, Mo., in place of J. H. Goeke, transferred.

William B. Bales, St. Peters, Mo., in place of A. B. Iffrig, retired.

Clyde E. Maxwell, Thompson, Mo., in place of D. A. Meyer, retired.

James M. Crighton, Willard, Mo., in place of B. L. McLin, retired.

MONTANA

Jean M. Hanson, Simms, Mont., in place of E. N. Skinner, retired.

George A. Henderson, West Glacier, Mont., in place of H. P. Gibb, retired.

NEBRASKA

Blaine T. Larsen, Beaver Crossing, Nebr., in place of P. C. Geis, transferred.

Wilfred L. Kozisek, Bruno, Nebr., in place of E. L. Spatz, retired.

Carl C. Larson, Edgar, Nebr., in place of C. A. Scism, retired.

Elgar R. Dempcy, Eustis, Nebr., in place of A. R. Montgomery, transferred.

Mary E. Hartigan, Inman, Nebr., in place of J. M. McMahan, deceased.

Frederick G. King, Lynch, Nebr., in place of N. L. Nelson, deceased.

John P. Munnelly, Omaha, Nebr., in place of Walter Korisko, resigned.

W. Edward Chamberlain, Rushville, Nebr., in place of H. J. Mayes, retired.

NEW HAMPSHIRE

Ernest F. Rossi, Jr., Milford, N.H., in place of J. J. Kirby, retired.

NEW JERSEY

Vincent T. Fagan, Jackson, N.J., in place of F. A. Asay, retired.

H. Pearl Hinshaw, Long Valley, N.J., in place of Clarence Frone, retired.

Herbert J. Jackson, North Bergen, N.J., in place of J. V. Zoppel, not commissioned; overage.

NEW YORK

Daniel F. Mulvana, Bombay, N.Y., in place of Frank Crowley, deceased.

John J. Frazer, Earlton, N.Y., in place of H. G. Haines, retired.

Floyd A. Jones, Marathon, N.Y., in place of C. L. Kelley, retired.

Edna K. Baldassare, Tomkins Cove, N.Y., in place of J. M. James, retired.

NORTH CAROLINA

L. Hubert Collins, Brunswick, N.C., in place of Redden Gaskin, retired.

Patricia S. Fipps, Clarendon, N.C., in place of M. H. Pittman, retired.

Josephine D. Riggs, Cove City, N.C., in place of H. R. Heath, retired.

Giles F. Bryson, Marble, N.C., in place of B. H. Mintz, retired.

NORTH DAKOTA

Richard D. Grieve, Buffalo, N. Dak., in place of J. U. Pavlik, deceased.

Chester C. Cowee, Crosby, N. Dak., in place of M. J. Wallin, removed.

Robert E. Fischer, Hague, N. Dak., in place of K. E. Fischer, retired.

Clements H. Weigum, Hazen, N. Dak., in place of Ronald Keeley, deceased.

Margaret L. Keenan, Portal, N. Dak., in place of N. L. Talmo, retired.

OHIO

Louise E. Hoover, Bascom, Ohio, in place of J. H. Glick, deceased.

Mabel M. Bendetta, Malvern, Ohio, in place of H. H. Hart, retired.

Russell E. Yackee, Martin, Ohio, in place of A. C. Witt, retired.

Paul L. Casci, Middleport, Ohio, in place of J. W. Waddell, retired.

Harold A. Schonhardt, Venice, Ohio, in place of Jane Neuscheler, retired.

OKLAHOMA

Don A. Neumeyer, Council Hill, Okla., in place of H. H. Swadley, retired.

Jack E. Clement, Fairfax, Okla., in place of J. J. Quarles, Jr., retired.

Youvon W. Martin, McAlester, Okla., in place of H. S. Howard, retired.

Paul D. Sockey, Red Oak, Okla., in place of W. L. Smith, transferred.

OREGON

Orval R. Layton, Lakeview, Oreg., in place of F. R. Peat, retired.

PENNSYLVANIA

Harry D. Hess, Bangor, Pa., in place of A. R. Cramer, retired.

Donald M. Crouch, Butler, Pa., in place of P. R. Faux, retired.

Carolyn F. Singley, Cashtown, Pa., in place of I. G. Ridinger, retired.

Ernest W. Parsons, Pen Argyl, Pa., in place of R. W. Mosteller, retired.

Stanley T. Wagner, Penns Creek, Pa., in place of J. C. Showers, retired.

Russell G. Kratzer, Richfield, Pa., in place of O. G. Leitzel, deceased.

Russell S. Powell, Jr., Riegelsville, Pa., in place of R. S. Powell, Sr., deceased.

Ethel E. Murphy, Rossville, Pa., in place of M. E. Spangler, resigned.

Kenneth A. Harrison, St. Thomas, Pa., in place of J. M. Martin, retired.

Barbra M. Wissinger, Salix, Pa., in place of B. F. Wissinger, deceased.

Joseph Kosik, Townville, Pa., in place of L. D. Kingsley, retired.

PUERTO RICO

Sixto G. Mercado, Isabela, P.R., in place of Luis Domenech, deceased.

RHODE ISLAND

Pasquale D. Prisella, Wakefield, R.I., in place of E. W. Belknap, deceased.

SOUTH CAROLINA

David B. Brockman, Greer, S.C., in place of W. B. Smith, retired.

John W. Rogers, Pelzer, S.C., in place of Sue Scott, retired.

William D. Russell, Ware Shoals, S.C., in place of E. M. Wharton, retired.

SOUTH DAKOTA

William C. Feather, Marty, S.D., in place of M. E. Becking, retired.

Wanda M. Humiston, Oelrichs, S. Dak., in place of Marie Logue, removed.

Virgil C. Guderian, Waubay, S. Dak., in place of Marion Paterson, retired.

TENNESSEE

Raymond B. Cox., Cottage Grove, Tenn., in place of D. F. Ross, transferred.

Harvey G. Fitzgerald, Humboldt, Tenn., in place of E. H. Gibson, retired.

Robert E. Harris, Kingston Springs, Tenn., in place of Wilton Rust, transferred.

Roscoe M. Hill, Luttrell, Tenn., in place of J. C. Davis, retired.

R. Frank Cunningham, Obion, Tenn., in place of H. B. Fox, deceased.

James H. Armstrong, Rogersville, Tenn., in place of G. B. Kyle, retired.

John L. Norris, Jr., Tiptonville, Tenn., in place of P. W. Campbell, retired.

Jeff J. Blanks, Jr., Trezevant, Tenn., in place of J. B. Goodwin, retired.

TEXAS

Thomas H. Journeay, Angleton, Tex., in place of J. A. Armstrong, resigned.

Erwin O. Dallmeyer, Burton, Tex., in place of L. W. Fisher, retired.

Thava H. Brown, Canutillo, Tex., in place of E. L. Jackson, resigned.

Graham M. Phillips, Cranfills Gap, Tex., in place of O. J. Bronstad, deceased.

Alma J. Littleton, Dryden, Tex., in place of B. R. Farley, retired.

James J. Kaster, El Paso, Tex., in place of C. T. Boyce, retired.

Anna L. Franklin, Fort Hancock, Tex., in place of M. B. Franklin, retired.

Frank A. Yeager, Galveston, Tex., in place of R. A. Stewart, retired.

James W. McMillan, Kingsville, Tex., in place of P. D. Cauley, Sr., retired.

Harold I. Line, O'Donnell, Tex., in place of Hal Singleton III, transferred.

Milton H. Elliott, Shallowater, Tex., in place of A. J. Evans, transferred.

Charlene Westbrook, Talco, Tex., in place of G. L. Barber, retired.

Bertha L. Delz, Texon, Tex., in place of B. F. Irby, transferred.

VERMONT

Robert W. Swann, Roxbury, Vt., in place of F. B. Tilden, deceased.

VIRGINIA

John H. Glass, Dewitt, Va., in place of L. R. Bolte, retired.

Gary H. Helms, Stafford, Va., in place of V. M. Dent, retired.

WEST VIRGINIA

Fletcher E. Andrews, Proctor, W. Va., in place of V. M. Dunham, retired.

WISCONSIN

Clarence G. Buss, Belmont, Wis., in place of P. R. Sornberger, retired.

Keith E. Anderson, Eleva, Wis., in place of B. E. Sands, retired.

Gordon H. Mollers, Glenwood City, Wis., in place of H. E. Lauber, resigned.

Frederick W. Pagel, Watertow, Wis., in place of R. W. Lueck, Jr., resigned.

John F. Graham, Whitewater, Wis., in place of R. J. Chamberlain, retired.

ALABAMA

Ida L. Colgrove, Boligee, Ala., in place of B. M. Means, deceased.

ALASKA

J. Raymond Roady, Ketchikan, Alaska, in place of P. N. Ripley, retired.

ARIZONA

Merle W. Heap, St. Johns, Ariz., in place of J. A. Brown, deceased.

ARKANSAS

James G. Ramey, Everton, Ark., in place of D. A. Trammell, deceased.

Kathryn R. Richards, Gamaliel, Ark., in place of E. E. Maynard, retired.

Maxine R. Edmondson, Gentry, Ark., in place of E. E. Epperson, transferred.

Herbert Miller, Jr., Junction City, Ark., in place of J. A. Fairly, deceased.

John A. Graves, Siloam Springs, Ark., in place of J. E. Trahin, retired.

Erwin B. Medart, West Fork, Ark., in place of E. R. Robinson, transferred.

CALIFORNIA

E. Vernon Putnam, Arbuckle, Calif., in place of I. M. Griffin, retired.

Joe R. Edde, Five Points, Calif., in place of N. J. Marshall, resigned.

Robert M. Lee, Freedom, Calif., in place of M. C. Tierney, deceased.

Ralph E. Lozano, Greenville, Calif., in place of F. M. Taylor, deceased.

Louis L. Brunnemer, Los Molinos, Calif., in place of C. T. Gadwood, retired.

COLORADO

William J. Smith, Craig, Colo., in place of E. E. Sullivan, retired.

Laurence Montano, Leadville, Colo., in place of C. A. Fitzsimmons, removed.

Clara W. Dennison, Hesperus, Colo., in place of Ethel Dunn, retired.

CONNECTICUT

Warren A. Holbrook, Amston, Conn., in place of S. G. Turshen, deceased.

Philip V. Rokosa, Bristol, Conn., in place of H. C. Polhill, retired.

Ruth C. Soracchi, Columbia, Conn., in place of L. W. Beck, retired.

Charles N. Doane, Jr., Essex, Conn., in place of P. D. Gtptill, deceased.

Arline M. Fife, Falls Village, Conn., in place of B. S. Reymers, resigned.

Merle E. Phelps, Staffordville, Conn., in place of Benjamin Phelps, retired.

Leopold A. Szczygiel, Uncasville, Conn., in place of M. P. Geary, retired.

FLORIDA

William C. Hurston, Laurel Hill, Fla., in place of J. L. Adams, resigned.

IDAHO

Oscar H. Egbert, Heyburn, Idaho, in place of G. F. Bixler, retired.

ILLINOIS

Clemit T. Peifer, Beecher City, Ill., in place of V. U. Barr, retired.

Marvin H. Stewart, Brighton, Ill., in place of A. A. Moehle, retired.

Orville E. Van Brocklin, Caledonia, Ill., in place of M. A. Ralston, retired.

Lee Bush, Cambria, Ill., in place of Edmond Lovel, retired.

Maynard R. Koltz, Capron, Ill., in place of M. M. Boyd, removed.

Marvin C. McCulley, Chatham, Ill., in place of L. W. Tice, retired.

James T. Bobbit, Dalton City, Ill., in place of G. A. Morrison, retired.

Mabel J. Atkins, Dawson, Ill., in place of C. B. Stanton, deceased.

Joel F. Parker, Divernon, Ill., in place of J. W. Rettberg, retired.

George C. Cavanaugh, Gillespie, Ill., in place of H. R. Ganey, retired.

Russell W. Martin, Hanover, Ill., in place of A. E. Young, deceased.

Haven W. Hammond, Martinsville, Ill., in place of Clem Wiser, retired.

Betty J. Jones, Mound City, Ill., in place of C. A. Stout, deceased.

Leroy M. Smith, McHenry, Ill., in place of E. R. McGee, retired.

Donald W. Ferris, Marshall, Ill., in place of Leroy McNary, retired.

Henry W. Roehrkasse, Red Bud, Ill., in place of A. H. Brandt, retired.

Cornelius L. DiPiotti, Taylorville, Ill., in place of S. W. Hershey, deceased.

Eldon R. Bristow, Waynesville, Ill., in place of A. E. Swan, retired.

James T. Shinnebarger, Williamsville, Ill., in place of G. T. Hobkirk, retired.

Ruth P. Spraggins, Yale, Ill., in place of R. J. M. Howard, transferred.

IOWA

Leonard R. Brasel, Dow City, Iowa, in place of B. L. Bremser, transferred.

Florence K. Hamilton, Riverside, Iowa, in place of J. R. Shebek, retired.

Irvin F. Husmann, Scotch Grove, Iowa, in place of E. F. Plueger, transferred.

KANSAS

Herbert P. Franz, Goessel, Kans., in place of Mary Warkentin, retired.

Raleigh J. May, Haven, Kans., in place of W. M. Stoffer, transferred.

Robert W. Foster, Sterling, Kans., in place of F. H. Chesky, retired.

KENTUCKY

Newell M. Hargett, Maysville, Ky., in place of N. M. Hargett, removed.

James E. Morris, Neon, Ky., in place of J. M. Caudill, resigned.

Charles M. Crawford, Olive Hill, Ky., in place of W. H. Roe, removed.

MAINE

William E. Comer, Bangor, Maine, in place of J. S. Dinsmore, retired.

Keith G. Robinson, Pembroke, Maine, in place of S. A. Gillis, retired.

Edward E. Scribner, Stratton, Maine, in place of H. T. Ricker, retired.

MARYLAND

Joseph E. Kenney, Frostburg, Md., in place of M. J. Byrnes, retired.

Virginia M. Goode, Marbury, Md., in place of L. S. Henderson, retired.

MASSACHUSETTS

Francis J. Mooney, Andover, Mass., in place of S. A. Boland, retired.

Howard M. Hayden, Athol, Mass., in place of Richard Mullen, retired.

John F. Keefe, Dracut, Mass. Office established February 3, 1962.

MICHIGAN

Allen J. Dahl, Iron River, Mich., in place of P. J. Nora, retired.

Leslie C. Willer, Marion, Mich., in place of C. E. Rawson, transferred.

MINNESOTA

Marvin G. Loeck, Balaton, Minn., in place of T. H. Lohrke, retired.

M. Wallace Post, Cottonwood, Minn., in place of E. M. Kolhei, deceased.

Fred M. Colwell, Morton, Minn., in place of R. R. Keefe, retired.

Eugenie A. Wollum, Porter, Minn., in place of B. W. Meyers, retired.

Bertrand H. Strandlund, Stacy, Minn., in place of L. E. Hewson, removed.

MISSISSIPPI

James H. Simpson, Winona, Miss., in place of C. M. Jaco, retired.

MISSOURI

Griffith E. Benson, Chillicothe, Mo., in place of J. D. Stewart, retired.

Walter E. Bamman, Jacksonville, Mo., in place of H. R. McDaniel, retired.

George E. Bennett, Purdy, Mo., in place of F. W. Aderhold, retired.

Herbert L. Coggin, Republic, Mo., in place of H. L. Wells, retired.

Barclay T. Cortelyou, Troy, Mo., in place of T. W. Withrow, retired.

NEW HAMPSHIRE

George A. Clement, Chester, N.H., in place of R. N. Ray, retired.

NEW JERSEY

Claude R. Poyer, Belvidere, N.J., in place of N. H. Deshler, retired.

Helen M. Emley, Creamridge, N.J., in place of L. G. Wygant, deceased.

William F. Martin, Elmer, N.J., in place of L. L. Bignell, retired.

Ida E. Smith, Goshen, N.J., in place of H. C. Shaw, deceased.

Emma M. Stout, Island Heights, N.J., in place of E. V. Sharp, retired.

Stewart J. Hyland, Lakehurst, N.J., in place of H. J. Puccile, removed.

Rita M. Kosminsky, Liberty Corner, N.J., in place of E. J. Burnett, retired.

Joseph W. McCauley, Millburn, N.J., in place of H. F. Jacobus, deceased.

Frank W. Howell III, Newton, N.J., in place of M. N. Strader, retired.

Ralph J. Caneva, Park Ridge, N.J., in place of J. J. McNally, retired.

Oscar N. Benson, Rumson, N.J., in place of P. G. Peterson, retired.

John B. Porter, Runnemede, N.J., in place of F. R. Barker, retired.

Frank A. Maressa, Stratford, N.J., in place of E. B. Carr, retired.

Lawrence H. Friedman, Teaneck, N.J., in place of J. F. Carroll, removed.

John R. Latourette, White House Station, N.J., in place of W. W. Lance, retired.

NEW YORK

Erma B. Tenney, Alexander, N.Y., in place of E. R. Harrington, retired.

John J. Biondolillo, Avon, N.Y., in place of J. L. Light, deceased.

Edward K. Sutryk, Bradford, N.Y., in place of F. R. Schuh, retired.

Michael Pokitko, Burt, N.Y., in place of C. W. Rentschler, retired.

Richard J. Lobdell, Canton, N.Y., in place of E. R. Wood, retired.

Edwin J. Faber, Caroga Lake, N.Y., in place of Burton Yates, retired.

Oreina L. Lavoie, Champlain, N.Y., in place of E. A. Coonan, deceased.

John M. Edwards, Chester, N.Y., in place of J. J. Diffily, deceased.

Alan R. Mann, Cobleskill, N.Y., in place of L. R. Mann, retired.

Henrietta B. VanDerheyden, Coeymans, N.Y., in place of G. C. Hazelton, retired.

Marcella J. Lee, Crown Point, N.Y., in place of C. S. Kloos, deceased.

Donald J. Fitzpatrick, Dannemora, N.Y., in place of Jacob Tolosky, retired.

Jams A. Mulholland, Delmar, N.Y., in place of A. I. Ryan, retired.

Thomas J. Dolan, Dover Plains, N.Y., in place of K. C. Lasher, removed.

Christene S. Myers, Eldred, N.Y., in place of E. C. Stevens, retired.

Mae S. Cohen, Fallsburgh, N.Y., in place of Sam Rosenberg, resigned.

Marie M. Olds, Freeville, N.Y., in place of W. F. Moore, retired.

John L. Kress, Jr., Galway, N.Y., in place of J. T. Hunter, retired.

Helen S. Victor, Grand Gorge, N.Y., in place of A. V. Joslyn, retired.

William E. Vaughn, Greenville, N.Y., in place of W. P. Stevens, retired.

Raymond E. Skinner, Greenwood Lake, N.Y., in place of I. J. Posten, retired.

Rodney N. Lockwood, Hinsdale, N.Y., in place of E. S. Baxter, deceased.

Jean T. Klemann, Honeoye, N.Y., in place of Pauline Clement, deceased.

Martin J. Harr, Jr., Indian Lake, N.Y., in place of J. F. Farrell, retired.

Clarmarie S. Kenerson, Jacksonville, N.Y., in place of M. C. Baker, deceased.

Raymond W. Gould, Jamestown, N.Y., in place of O. K. Palm, deceased.

Lawrence J. Daley, Kanona, N.Y., in place of D. K. Griesa, resigned.

George L. Longyear, La Fayette, N.Y., in place of I. B. Locke, retired.

Alton E. Briscoe, Laurens, N.Y., in place of M. D. Taylor, deceased.

Jean V. McQueen, Little Genesee, N.Y., in place of P. D. Kuhn, resigned.

Guy E. Hobbs, Jr., Manlius, N.Y., in place of W. C. Farnham, retired.

Mary V. Quigley, Mottville, N.Y., in place of J. F. Quigley, retired.

Benjamin N. Ketcham, Mountainville, N.Y., in place of B. S. Ketcham, retired.

Donald E. Van Vliet, Niverville, N.Y., in place of G. L. Crausway, retired.

Grant D. Morrison, Northville, N.Y., in place of P. H. Griffing, retired.

Arthur C. Jacobia, Old Chatham, N.Y., in place of A. M. Tobin, deceased.

Shirley A. McNally, Olmstedville, N.Y., in place of E. C. Sullivan, retired.

Francis P. Secor, Otego, N.Y., in place of R. A. Southard, declined.

Joseph J. Farrell, Paul Smiths, N.Y., in place of R. J. Longtin, retired.

Nathan R. Walker, Phelps, N.Y., in place of J. F. Cudebec, retired.

George R. Low, Pine Bush, N.Y., in place of G. H. Stanton, retired.

Joseph Espinar, Plattekill, N.Y., in place of P. K. Fleming, retired.

Karl E. Putnam, Prattsburg, N.Y., in place of G. L. Patch, retired.

Michael L. Odak, Red Hook, N.Y., in place of J. S. Hobbs, deceased.

Donald M. Slocum, Richfield Springs, N.Y., in place of R. J. Conklin, deceased.

Raymond R. MacDonald, Rock Tavern, N.Y., in place of Winifred Fisher, retired.

Albert G. Evans, Saratoga Springs, N.Y., in place of J. T. Bryant, deceased.

Helen H. Kirker, Seneca Castle, N.Y., in place of M. P. Leadley, deceased.

Margaret B. Belmont, Sidney Center, N.Y., in place of D. L. Hoy, removed.

Maurie G. Flanigan, Slingerlands, N.Y., in place of W. P. Degenaar, retired.

Frank H. Doyle, Jr., Stuyvesant, N.Y., in place of F. H. Doyle, deceased.

Arthur H. Withall, Ulster Park, N.Y., in place of C. H. Schoonmaker, retired.

Robert A. Nussbaum, West Hurley, N.Y., in place of L. E. Joyce, retired.

Irene I. Carson, York, N.Y., in place of V. A. Spring, resigned.

NORTH CAROLINA

J. Preston Andrews, Jr., Bahama, N.C., in place of M. W. Harris, retired.

Henderson W. Haire, Garner, N.C., in place of J. G. Penny, retired.

Edward K. Leggett, Hobgood, N.C., in place of R. R. Wyatt, retired.

Helen H. Huggins, Laurel Hill, N.C., in place of M. H. Calhoun, retired.

Louis E. Bottiglier, Lillington, N.C., in place of M. D. Lanier, retired.

NORTH DAKOTA

Ronald E. Monson, Edinburg, N. Dak., in place of W. D. Flaten, retired.

William L. Arenstein, Washburn, N. Dak., in place of H. C. Nelson, retired.

OHIO

Kenneth W. Gerber, Kidron, Ohio, in place of H. R. Sprunger, deceased.

Frances M. Adams, Ludlow Falls, Ohio, in place of J. R. Gallagher, deceased.

John W. Sharick, Nankin, Ohio, in place of R. E. Funk, transferred.

Ruth E. Kenny, Paris, Ohio, in place of E. F. Kintner, retired.

Josephine E. Pittenger, Pavonia, Ohio, in place of A. W. Pittenger, deceased.

OKLAHOMA

Guy E. Warren, Norman, Okla., in place of M. L. Autrey, retired.

Eura V. Furr, Stringtown, Okla., in place of T. J. Winters, Jr., resigned.

Buster T. Robb, Sulphur, Okla., in place of G. E. Snethen, retired.

OREGON

Joseph L. Dail, Nyssa, Oreg., in place of L. W. Lewis, deceased.

Bernice M. Ladd, Tualatin, Oreg., in place of C. W. Adams, retired.

Laura A. Wassenmiller, Tygh Valley, Oreg., in place of D. B. Ritchie, deceased.

PENNSYLVANIA

Robert I. Grove, Alexandria, Pa., in place of R. N. Lankard, resigned.

Charles H. Heffner, Arendtsville, Pa., in place of W. A. Raffensperger, retired.

Bernard F. Cooney, Jr., Austin, Pa., in place of M. G. Collins, retired.

Robert E. Dibble, Cedars, Pa., in place of Isadore Sacks, deceased.

Joseph W. Kudasik, Jr., Central City, Pa., in place of J. W. Kudasik, retired.

Derry A. Miller, Clearville, Pa., in place of Marshall Troutman, retired.

John A. Reph, Jr., Danielsville, Pa., in place of E. M. Reph, retired.

Edward L. Thomas, Drifton, Pa., in place of N. E. Breslin, retired.

Edward P. O'Connell, Eagleville, Pa., in place of M. E. Honsberger, retired.

Dorothy R. Karpyn, Egypt, Pa., in place of E. A. Breinig, retired.

John W. Richard, Elysburg, Pa., in place of S. L. Hower, removed.

George T. Steinberger, Fairfield, Pa., in place of J. W. Beach, resigned.

Charles W. Pentz, Gettysburg, Pa., in place of L. E. Oyler, deceased.

John H. Reynolds, Grove City, Pa., in place of G. C. Bower, deceased.

James J. McLaughlin, Holmes, Pa., in place of N. G. Landenberger, retired.

Blanche G. Smyers, Hopewell, Pa., in place of E. T. Smith, retired.

Oscar W. Laucks, Hummelstown, Pa., in place of L. W. Fisler, retired.

Carl F. Englehart, Hunlock Creek, Pa., in place of S. C. Croop, deceased.

A. Thomas Carty, Lafayette Hill, Pa., in place of H. G. Mack, retired.

Michael J. Clark, Lansdowne, Pa., in place of E. S. Husband, Jr., deceased.

Merle C. Bamat, Lanse, Pa., in place of Adolph Johnson, retired.

Stephen W. Ochs, Lucinda, Pa., in place of F. G. Neuland, retired.

W. Deen Lauver, McAlisterville, Pa., in place of L. I. Leister, retired.

Thomas F. Doyle, Marion Center, Pa., in place of R. M. Dodson, retired.

George M. Guswiler, Mechanicsburg, Pa., in place of G. C. Dietz, transferred.

Jay F. Pollock, Mount Union, Pa., in place of R. E. Bell, retired.

Luther D. Clewell, Nazareth, Pa., in place of J. U. Fetherolf, retired.

Robert A. Feinour, New Tripoli, Pa., in place of F. D. Weiss, retired.

Roy C. Brey, Red Hill, Pa., in place of E. T. Thomas, deceased.

Dean A. Risch, Sarver, Pa., in place of F. I. Risch, deceased.

Walter S. Morrison, Jr., Transfer, Pa., in place of R. D. Heile, retired.

James F. Acker, Venango, Pa., in place of George Acker, retired.

Glen E. Cluck, Waynesboro, Pa., in place of C. L. Johnston, retired.

Thomas W. McIntyre, West Chester, Pa., in place of J. F. Sullivan, deceased.

Agnes K. Timko, Windber, Pa., in place of C. W. Baumgardner, deceased.

SOUTH CAROLINA

J. Lawton Harper, Estill, S.C., in place of C. W. Ellis, retired.

TENNESSEE

William A. Roberts, Newport, Tenn., in place of H. C. Mantooth, retired.

TEXAS

James Q. Pennington, Bluegrove, Tex., in place of R. O. Childs, removed.

Oscar R. Hawkins, Crawford, Tex., in place of R. B. Miller, transferred.

Burton L. Kirtley, Jr., Graham, Tex., in place of W. E. Simpson, removed.

James H. Jones, Jarrell, Tex., in place of M. C. Watkins, retired.

Bobby L. Raspberry, Keller, Tex., in place of Alex Jones, retired.

Junius P. Ray, Llano, Tex., in place of A. P. Box, retired.

Hiram C. Hughes, Munday, Tex., in place of F. L. Haymes, retired.

Clarence E. Garrett, Pittsburg, Tex., in place of G. H. Holman, resigned.

Mary L. Rutherford, Putnam, Tex., in place of E. C. Waddell, retired.

Elmo W. Ullrich, Randolph Air Force Base, Tex., in place of F. A. Benedict, retired.

UTAH

Don A. Mayhew, Duchesne, Utah, in place of W. H. Case, retired.

Harry J. Bigelow, Kamas, Utah, in place of R. F. Lambert, Jr., retired.

Bryce R. Jensen, Roy, Utah, in place of E. M. Russell, retired.

VERMONT

Helen A. Howrigan, Fairfield, Vt., in place of E. J. Howrigan, deceased.

VIRGINIA

Alfred P. Tirelis, Alberta, Va., in place of E. R. Johnson, deceased.

Robert J. Sturgis, Belle Haven, Va., in place of E. L. Willis, retired.

Doran W. Fary, Deltaville, Va., in place of J. H. Norton, removed.

Hume P. Doyle, McKenney, Va., in place of D. M. Cliborne, deceased.

John G. Mizell, Richmond, Va., in place of J. F. Bates, deceased.

Charles M. Mastin, Spotsylvania, Va., in place of M. M. Blaydes, resigned.

WASHINGTON

Lila E. Cahill, Kittitas, Wash., in place of F. W. Cahill, deceased.

Donald F. McLennan, Sedro Woolley, Wash., in place of W. R. Allhands, retired.

WEST VIRGINIA

Maynard W. Weaver, Arthurdale, W. Va., in place of R. R. Vanaman, removed.

Robert F. Wilson, Decota, W. Va., in place of M. I. Jackson, resigned.

Kenneth L. Taylor, Hopemont, W. Va., in place of Herman Taylor, retired.

Dennis P. Stanley, Superior, W. Va., in place of S. L. Sinnett, retired.

Ross White, Weston, W. Va., in place of S. M. McWhorter, retired.

Benjamin F. Lowe, Jr., Yolyn, W. Va., in place of Geraldine Chambers, removed.

WISCONSIN

John W. Crimi, Brookfield, Wis., in place of W. G. McCoy, transferred.

Max H. Bergen, Chetek, Wis., in place of P. H. Moe, transferred.

Cleo N. DeLaura, Menomonee Falls, Wis., in place of M. M. Minten, retired.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate March 1, 1963:

Department of Agriculture

Roland R. Renne, of Montana, to be an Assistant Secretary of Agriculture.

Commodity Credit Corporation

Roland R. Renne, of Montana, to be a member of the Board of Directors of the Commodity Credit Corporation.

Federal Housing Administration

Philip N. Brownstein, of Maryland, to be Federal Housing Commissioner.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Liberalism in the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BARRY GOLDWATER
OF ARIZONA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, March 1, 1963

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, the fact that the so-called liberals of our political life in this country have been usurping the real meaning of that term is beginning to get through to the American people. They are realizing, as the Europeans have for many years, that the end result of the phony liberal proposals will destroy freedom instead of extending and protecting it. More Americans are speaking out on this bold theft of a word and the twisting of it to mean something it never was meant to mean. The most articulate argument I have read thus far is one made by our brilliant colleague, the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. Mundt]. This appears in the Penn State University magazine Critique January issue. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

"Today's Liberals," Better Called 20th Century Tories

(By Senator Karl E. Mundt, Republican of South Dakota)

"All down the ages the fight of the true liberals has been to take power from the executive and give it to the legislative branch. Now the so-called liberals want to give more power to the executive."—Former Senator Burton K. Wheeler, Democrat of Montana.

Nobody familiar with the political history of this Republic during the past three decades can deny that Burt Wheeler, of Montana, is rightfully one of the great fighting liberals of this era. It is likewise pertinent that Wheeler's liberalism was demonstrated on the floor of the U.S. Senate and in his public career rather than in the safe, serene atmosphere of a college classroom or the impersonal and untested philippics of a book. Senator Wheeler expressed his convictions in public debate with a consistent courage that made him an effective advocate willing to wager his reputation and political future on the logic and wisdom of his viewpoints.

As a consequence, when former Senator Wheeler speaks of today's "liberalism" and the curious and irrational projects which its present day disciples advocate, he speaks as an authority on what comprises genuine liberalism in public life and what principles and concepts give validity to the term liberal as a political philosophy. Thus, he serves the Nation well when he bluntly calls attention that our latter-day "liberals" have deserted the traditional liberal crusade and have, strangely enough, associated themselves with power drives similar to those of the Tories of early America.

It is my conviction that those who inaccurately describe themselves as liberals today, while persistently advocating policies and programs promoting authoritarian government in the United States, might be described more accurately as the 20th century Tories.

Somewhere along the line these Tories have lost confidence in the American people and have, by some curious form of self-delusionment, convinced themselves that only the Federal politicians are motivated by a high sense of ethics; only the Federal politicians can be trusted to do what is right; and only the Federal politicians can understand and provide what the people need and want. Thus, these misnamed and misdirected liberals, Tories, in fact, continue to chip away at the power, the rights, and the free choice of the people while transferring to bigtime politicians in Washington the authority to determine the people's destiny. This does not imply that these self-proclaimed but thoroughly deluded liberals are evil men. It definitely does mean, however, that they would substitute for a government devoted to promoting the general welfare one imbued with the paternalistic concepts of ancient times and Tory governments. The function of such government would be to provide for the general welfare rather than to promote the conditions through which the people can advance themselves in accordance with their desires, deserts, and abilities. They have lost sight of, or propose to destroy, the careful distinction between the responsibility of the Federal Government to provide for the common defense and the responsibility of the Central Government only to promote the general welfare as it is set out so clearly and meticulously in the preamble to our Constitution: "We the People of the United States, in Order to form a more perfect Union, establish Justice, insure domestic Tranquillity, provide for the common defence, promote the general Welfare, and secure the Blessings of Liberty to ourselves and our Posterity, do ordain and establish this Constitution for the United States of America."

Our wise and prudent constitutional forefathers used the English language carefully and thoughtfully. They evaluated and weighed every word before it was enshrined in our great charter of freedom. It was with specific purpose and prudent forethought that they drew the distinction between the terms "promote" and "provide" * * * it was not by accident that they did not connect the phrases dealing with the common defense and the general welfare by the conjunction "and" * * * they deliberately emphasized their conception of the vast difference between the Federal responsibilities for the common defense and the promoting of the general welfare. The programs and projects which our modern liberals espouse would eliminate that difference and shift to the Federal state the same responsibilities and authority for the general welfare that are rightly exercised by it in protecting the common defense and maintaining the national security.

By placing their primary confidence and trust in the bigtime politicians, instead of in the people our Government was designed to serve—not control—these illegitimate liberals would receive a golden age of toryism when the king, the Federal Government, "could do no wrong." It would seem that Hitler and Mussolini, Stalin and Khrushchev should have disproved that naive assumption during the lifetimes of most of those hiding the desire for increased political power behind a mask of liberal concepts and phrases which either they do not understand or refuse to implement.

During the past 25 or 30 years, the growing influence of those I prefer to designate as "20th century Tories" instead of identifying them as "liberal," to which they claim, but repudiate by their actions, while embracing with their adjectives, has made an important, and in the main, unfortunate impact upon our national destiny. During this era, we have been following a global drift toward the overcentralization of government and the glorification of the central politician over the rights and privileges of the individual citizen.

Some 24 years ago when I first came to Congress, an oldtimer told me that a good political axiom for reelection was to remember that "economic conditions determine political decisions." He recommended that a candidate identify himself and/or his party with every upswing of economic conditions, with full employment, good profits, and happy living conditions. A great many voters, he argued, vote for the candidates whom they believe to be associated with their economic well-being. I believe there was some truth to his observations and, perhaps, his formula for victory still has a validity. During the intervening years, however, many new issues have come into play and new political alinements, the influence of big city political machines, labor organizations, ethnic groups, and other developments have tended to blunt the truism that "economic conditions determine political decisions."

Today we confront a comparatively new political axiom which has unquestioned validity and which all Americans should recognize when deciding their personal preference for either a steadily expanding power for the Federal Government, which means personal power for politicians, elected or appointed to Federal positions, or for a return to the concepts of keeping the Federal Government subject to the desires and controls of the voting citizens. This latter-day axiom is the converse of the earlier axiom. It now is stated, "political decisions determine economic conditions." Federal taxes are now so high that any alteration has a vital impact on business; inflation has gained so much headway that adding any further increase could destroy the base of many successful economic enterprises; new and mighty regulatory agencies and commissions in Washington hold life or death power over many economic activities. Even the sharp verbal expression of Federal displeasure drove the steel industry into ignominious and discredited defeat.

We live in an era of big government with big powers. We are witnessing a shift toward an authoritarian American state in which big politicians hold the whip and in which "who you know" in Government circles seems likely to replace "what you know." As yet, this consolidated central state is neither Socialist nor Communist nor Fascist in nature. But, neither is there anything remotely liberal about its nature or its design. It is big time politics in action, and regardless of which "ism" it eventually embraces or which embraces it, it would be a careless student of history who could not envision the possibility that our basic American concepts of private ownership, reward of merit, self-determination, and effective control of the politicians by the people are being threatened.

This switch of emphasis and the glorification and exaltation of the Federal politician at the expense of the private citizen is a deplorable change. It is the more deplorable because it has been promoted by a sustained drive for concentrated political power led by self-designated liberals who have practiced a semantic sham unprecedented in political history. The one notable exception must be those masters of doubletalk, the Russian Communists, whose standard stock in trade is to talk of "democracy" when they mean "dictatorship," to talk of "coexistence" when they mean "capitulation" and to talk of the "peoples' rights" when they mean the "politicians' privileges." It is a sham because it espouses the same type of proposals for expanding political controls over the people as advocated by the reactionaries, the tories, and the royalists of a century or two ago.

The true, tried, and tested liberal of history and of today is the private citizen or public official who advocates the maintenance or extension of individual liberties free alike from the power and the encroachments of an economic or political monopoly. It is the danger, and the presence, of a political monopoly and of programs moving toward that ugly goal which is the blind spot in the thinking of our latter-day liberals who are so busy looking at the problems of our times that they fail to see the even greater perils created by their proposals for solution.

Analyzed from the political standpoint of the predominant political performance of the members of each major party, one must conclude that the Republican Party, by supporting the concept that the size of Government should be reduced rather than expanded is far more identified with the great American liberal ideal than is the Democratic Party. And the always ready and willing handmaiden of the Democratic Party, Americans for Democratic Action, is no more liberal in concept or progressive in action than a Scotsman playing poker in an Edinburgh club.

Our American dream has evolved from the idealistic concept that proper ethics, sound morals, good judgment, prudent economy, and wise decisions are not the exclusive monopoly of those holding public positions of power and authority in Washington. It is an ideal our current pretenders to the liberal label seem entirely unable to comprehend or to accept. While the Republican Party has excelled its major adversary in clinging to this liberal ideal which has had its greatest fruition on American soil and which has provided more happiness for more people and greater individual liberties than man has attained in any other era or area of human history, it must be admitted that among Republicans, also, there are some who have succumbed to the seductive concept that the people must be pushed around by their political officials rather than have them retain the power and push the politicians toward the goals which they desire.

It is not, however, the purpose of this discourse to identify basic Republicanism with true liberalism nor to stigmatize all Democrats as people seeking personal and political power after the manner of Tories. Rather, it is my purpose to point up the forensic fakery involved in trying to identify a candidate, a party, or a cause involved in seeking more power over more people through Central Government, with any realistic, accurate, honest, or historic relationship with liberalism unless the relationship is to show how these linguistic liberals differ so sharply and so deeply from the programs and philosophies of such recognized liberals as Jefferson, Wilson, and Wheeler.

One of the great responsibilities of any administration in this country is to protect and wisely use what we usually term "the American system." To me, the American system means that system which seeks to provide a maximum of opportunity and freedom for our individual citizens. It is no more abstruse nor complicated than that. It is a system which manifests confidence in its people, and it is a system which has produced results unequaled and unexcelled by any other, any place, any time.

Those who would change our American system so as to place the basic responsibility for progress in the hands of Federal politicians instead of with the local citizens and governments are turning back the clock of history. Just as there is nothing liberal about such drives for increased political power in concentrated hands, there is also nothing new or novel in their proposals.

If one were to accept the pratings of the current crop of self-appointed liberals as providing courses of action and programs of progress which are, in fact, liberal in nature, one would logically be forced to the conclusion that the greatest liberals of current history are such advocates of concentrated power as Khrushchev, Hitler, Mussolini, Franco, Salazar, and Castro. Each of these promised the more abundant life, better schooling, better health, better economic opportunities, and greater well-being to their people. Each sought to provide them by reducing the areas of self-determination and free choice enjoyed by the private citizen and by expanding the areas of control and power enjoyed by the politicans in the capital cities of their lands. Each failed to achieve the degrees of well-being and human happiness enjoyed by the peoples of free countries where even the right to err in judgment is an inherent part of any system which provides unlimited rights to succeed and to aspire. To those who argue that it is not our system which has made America so outstanding but rather something else—our temperature, our resources, our good fortune, or our great complex population—it should be pointed out that West Germany has employed this system with spectacular success and even such formerly backward countries as the Philippines and Japan are making it work.

How, then, can one recognize an actual liberal in the great American tradition and in conformity with the true meaning of the term as shaped by the flow of human history everywhere? Obviously, not by accepting the unsupported boast of an ambitious politician who proclaims, "I am a liberal" much as Louis XIV boasted, "L'etat c'est moi". A real liberal must be tested by his actions, by his programs, by his goals, and by his methods just as we test the veracity and worth of any sloganeer or propagandist who hopes to persuade us by his rhetoric rather than his reason. The wisdom of Emerson is as sound now as it was when he wrote his immortal observation that what you do speaks so loudly that no one can hear what you say.

Let us apply that what-you-do test to today's misleading or misled liberals rather than limiting ourselves to an artless acceptance of their what-you-say pronouncements. There is available for each of us a test which every intelligent and thoughtful citizen should use to decide whether any public proposal or public personality is in fact liberal in conception and nature. We need not become involved in a battle of semantics or in a controversy over terminology. Simply stated, a man or a program is appropriately described as liberal if identified with circumscribing excessive power over the people from any source whether it be concentrated economic, political, or hereditary power. On the other hand, if any man or program is identified with expanding and increasing the power of politicians or economic tycoons over the average citizen, that smacks of reactionism, Toryism, and has no place anywhere in the dictionary of valid liberalism.

This yardstick of good government, this do-it-yourself test of whether a political party, an individual citizen, or a proposed change is in fact liberal in nature, can be employed by applying the following tests to any given circumstance:

(1) Does the proposal expand individual freedom or does it expand the power and authority of the central state?

(2) Does the proposal give a greater choice to the greatest number or does it give greater decisions to be made by a steadily decreasing number of politicians at the top?

(3) Does it enlarge the powers and opportunities of all individual citizens to determine their own destiny or does it give greater power and additional opportunity to politicians at the Federal level to determine the destiny of all citizens?

After examining a public proposal or a suggested reform; after analyzing the speeches, votes, and positions of a politician or a public figure; after studying the recommendations of an organization, a political party, or a reform group, and after asking the foregoing questions and relating your honest answers to the steps which have been advocated, you will know whether what it proposed is actually liberal, or reactionary, and paternalistic in conception. With the clarification of its character, one can still be for or against a proposal or consider it wise or unwise, but it will be assured that no literate and prudent citizen will be found supporting an issue or a cause on the pretext that it is liberal when in fact it is demonstrably a step backward toward the eras of the overpowering central state.

Since 1776, the march of human freedom in this Republic has been in the direction of expanding and protecting the rights of self-determination by each individual citizen. We have been happily moving toward a more effective implementation of the goals set out in our Declaration of Independence and in the Preamble to our Constitution. We have been endeavoring to extend the vote to all our citizens; to correct imbalances of political power between urban and rural areas; to reform our electoral college system so that every citizen shall have the right to exercise equitable authority through the vote he casts for a President.

But, the ebb tide of freedom is in motion in our country. It is imperative that we seriously question ourselves as to whether, in our impatience to get things done and to bring about improvements, we may be destroying a system of checks and balances which has helped shape the basic formula by which in less than 200 years, we have developed a system so successful that no other country has remotely approximated it. Not only have we provided more happiness and more opportunity for more people than the world has ever seen but we are today also contributing to the support of over 80 less fortunate—or perhaps less prudent—countries in the world.

We have done all this under a constitutional charter of freedom which provides for the most liberal government in the world, one in which the wishes, the desires, and the ideals of the people can predominate. The light of human liberty burns brightest when the will of man is given free rein—uncontrollable by the politicians of his time and place. Let us not reduce that light of liberty to a mere smudgepot of low-level security by casting aside our traditions in reckless pursuit of illusionary goals that require a subjugation of the individual to achieve the false promises of any form of authoritative or totalitarian government. Let us examine each new proposal with an analytic test rather than accepting or rejecting it because of a political label or the mistaken notion that because it is noble in objective it must be liberal in nature.

All Americans are challenged these days—but the greatest challenge is to the real American liberal of 1962. If he is true to the liberal traditions of the past, the liberal heritage which is his as an American, he can not embrace concepts of collectivism or of centralized controls which would have been as much anathema to Thomas Jefferson as they are to the real constitutional libertarians of today.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, MARCH 4, 1963

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Ephesians 3: 16: *That He would grant you to be strengthened with might by His spirit in the inner man.*

Almighty God, during this Lenten season may we become richer in the culture of our souls and stronger in gaining the mastery over every insurgent impulse, every inordinate desire, and every self-indulgent habit.

May we daily cultivate a more intimate and radiant fellowship with the spirit of the lowly Man of Galilee who went about doing good and who called upon His followers to share their strength with the weak, their sympathy with the sorrowing, their substance with the poor, and to give their hearts to God.

Inspire us to live among our fellow men as messengers of helpfulness whose minds and hearts are impervious to the spirit of self-seeking and self-glory but who are defining and interpreting life in terms of its usefulness and its value in contributing to the building of Thy kingdom and the blessedness of all mankind.

In Christ's name we offer our prayer. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, February 28, 1963, was read and approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Sundry messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the House by Mr. Ratchford, one of his secretaries.

ANNOUNCEMENT

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 6, of February 27, 1963, on House Joint Resolution 249, I am recorded as being absent. Had I been present I would have voted "yea."

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL WEDNESDAY

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Wednesday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF LABOR DEPARTMENT

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to note that it was just 50 years ago that President Taft signed into law the bill creating a new Department of Labor.

Thereby the concern of America for its working men and women was evidenced and in the ensuing years of expanding industrialization the wisdom of having the Government interest itself in workers and working conditions has been fully demonstrated.

Under free labor and a free system of enterprise, and under also our great Constitution and Bill of Rights, this Nation has been producing 35 percent of the world's goods through the organized effort of only 6 percent of the world's population.

This achievement has been possible because of our system of economic freedom and the wage and profit incentives under it during the past half century.

I want to express my appreciation of the Department of Labor and extend this tribute to the workers of America who look to this Department to oversee their interests and basic rights.

DISARMAMENT AGENCY DEPUTY'S STATEMENT IS BLUEPRINT FOR SELF-MUTILATION

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, Adrian S. Fisher, Deputy Administrator of the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, speaks for himself, William G. Foster, the Agency's Administrator, and for the President. His statement today on the administration's test ban position in answer to Senator DODD's recent speech is shocking and tragic.

Mr. Fisher has at last revealed the Kennedy administration's blueprint for an American strategy of gradual nuclear self-mutilation.

Fisher's claim that "the strategic military balance between the United States and the U.S.S.R. could not be altered in any major way" by clandestine Soviet test cheating flies in the face of repeated statements to the contrary by several U.S. experts in the actual making of nuclear weapons.

More than that, however, it completely undercuts any reason for U.S. demands for an adequate control system in any test ban treaty. Why should such machinery to detect and verify cheating be included in a treaty if the contention is correct that no significant progress could be made while the Soviets test clandestinely and we test not at all? The administration's position, therefore, must now be that detection and inspection machinery need no longer be insisted upon.

Fisher's words must be a great aid and comfort to the Kremlin. They signal it to sit tight while the Americans cave in on the test ban talks. He has ratified the long-suspected fact that bargaining and negotiation have been replaced by kowtow and concession on the U.S. side of the Geneva conference table.

I intend to issue a series of point-by-point exposures of the fatally dangerous Foster-Fisher fallacies. These gentlemen try to make some kind of meaningful distinction between surrender to Communist objectives on the installment plan and outright relinquishment of the world to Communist domination. There is no such distinction and I do not believe the American people can be sold the bill of goods that there is.

Also I am pressing my request that the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy hold exhaustive hearings on nontechnical as well as technical factors involved in the test ban.

RESUMPTION OF PUBLICATION OF NEW YORK POST

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, last Thursday I pointed out in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD that in the city of New York there were seven newspapers which were not publishing; that of that number, three had voluntarily ceased publication in accordance with a publishers' agreement and were not under strike. I am delighted to report to the House that the publisher of the New York Post, Mrs. Dorothy Schiff, announced that she would start today to publish the New York Post again. I commend her and believe that this should help to resolve the present labor dispute.

JOINT WATCHDOG COMMITTEE TO OVERSEE CIA

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, the CIA is fast becoming the subject of many questions asked in the Congress and in this Nation. The intense interest of the American public in following the handling of the Cuban situation has claimed close attention to the details surrounding U.S. actions in Cuba. The questions are becoming more precise in nature every day. However, such questioning should be above partisan approach but valid questioning of the CIA and other intelligence operations of the U.S. Government is in order.

The major area of concern lies in determining just how far the CIA may have strayed from the intent of Congress; what powers and authority has the CIA acquired or not fulfilled since it was originally established by act of Congress in 1947?

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I urge the establishment of a joint watchdog committee composed of members of both political parties, from both the House and the Senate, to oversee the activities of the CIA as well as the other intelligence operations of the Government. I urge the Members of both the House and the Senate to join in the effort to establish this joint watchdog committee for the security of our Nation.

THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE ESTABLISHMENT OF THE DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, in connection with the recognition of the 50th anniversary of the establishment of the Department of Labor in the executive department, I have noted an unfortunate failure to recognize the significance of the part played by the late William Howard Taft, 27th President of the United States, who on March 4, 1913, at the very close of his term as President signed the bill establishing the Department of Labor.

It was during the administration of William Howard Taft that important progress was made by the American Federation of Labor, which had more than 1,500,000 members in 1910 and which was composed largely of trade unionists who supported Taft and who resisted with him efforts to wreck the union movement threatened by the expansion of the radical International Workers of the World.

President Taft's role is frequently misinterpreted and often deliberately distorted. During his administration there was greater progress in the elimination of monopoly and restraints of trade than during any prior administration. He proposed and Congress passed the Mann-Elkins Act of 1910 enlarging the powers of the Interstate Commerce Commission, established postal savings banks and the parcel post system, and authorized a National Health Bureau and Federal Children's Bureau. By Executive order he extended the merit system in the Postal Department and in the consular and diplomatic services.

On this day when the 50th anniversary of the establishment of the Department of Labor is being celebrated, full recognition should be given to the man whose pen converted this dream into the permanent fabric of our Nation.

I am pleased to join with my esteemed colleague from Ohio, Congressman ROBERT A. TAFT, JR., in this timely recognition of the establishment of the Department of Labor, in connection with which his grandfather, the late William Howard Taft, played such a leading roll.

MEDICAL CARE

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, last Thursday I introduced a bill which would remove medical care beneficiaries from the welfare rolls of the individual States, H.R. 4388.

Among the recent messages from the White House to the Congress has been the President's message with regard to medical care. This raises again the entire question of medical care which can be provided in this country for all of our citizens regardless of their age or their financial condition. There are not many Americans who would contest the principle that we should all have available the kind of medical care which our doctors and our scientists have made possible. There is still, however, a considerable dispute as to the means by which this care should be provided particularly to those segments of the population who by reason of age and financial inability have difficulty in getting the kind of hospital treatment and the kind of medical treatment that they need.

Much has been done in this field already, and it is interesting to examine where we now stand with regard to medical care programs. We should also look into some of the suggestions of things that can be done to improve our current legislation on this subject. A program for medical assistance for the aged has been in operation in Maryland since June 1, 1961. This was made possible by the so-called Kerr-Mills bill which was passed by the 86th Congress and signed into law by President Eisenhower in 1960.

Like the other assistance programs in the State, the medical assistance for the aged program is under the supervision of the State department of public welfare and is administered by the county department of public welfare in 23 counties and by the Baltimore City Department of Public Welfare. The department of public welfare is responsible for certification of eligibility for this aid and reinvestigation and recertification are made annually if warranted by changes in the recipient's circumstances. Identifying the need for and arranging medical care, however, are the responsibility of the State department of health in accordance with the contract between the department of welfare and the department of health.

Under this program, in fiscal year 1962, 10,881 applications for medical aid were approved within the State of Maryland. In the first 6 months of fiscal year 1963—that is, from July 1 of 1962 through

December 31 of that year—there were 4,417 applications approved. Thus, you will see there is a considerable acceptance of medical aid under this program which has the substantial approval of the medical profession and of the public officials of the State of Maryland. There are, however, improvements that could be made. One of the objections to the Kerr-Mills plan as it is now administered is that applicants must apply to the State welfare department. Many people feel that there is a certain stigma to making applications for welfare aid. This objection has some basis in fact because those who receive medical aid through the welfare department may not otherwise be needful of welfare assistance.

I have, therefore, introduced into the House of Representatives H.R. 4388, a bill which will change the Kerr-Mills law permitting individual States to select the agency to be responsible for medical assistance for the aged. This will be to every State's advantage and I believe that it will simplify efforts to provide comprehensive and continuous care to all of our citizens who need it. Through changes such as this, the Kerr-Mills medical program can be improved to meet the demands of the American people for the best medical care for all of our citizens.

THIRTIETH ANNIVERSARY OF THE INAUGURATION OF PRESIDENT FRANKLIN DELANO ROOSEVELT

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, 30 years ago a man who had climbed up the ramp, his lifeless limbs encased in irons, and leaning on the arm of his eldest son James, was inaugurated as President of the United States. Before him was a Bible that for 300 years had been in the Roosevelt family, a source of strength for many generations. That Bible was open to a page in the book of Corinthians with the counsel of the ages—faith, hope, and charity.

The counsel of the Bible, counsel that had given strength to peoples in many troublesome periods of the world, was the reliance of Franklin Delano Roosevelt as President of the United States.

I remember so well those years. Nobody had any money. Few had food sufficient for the nourishment of their families. The banks had failed. There were no jobs. The savings of people had been wiped out. There seemed no hope. Day after day, week after week, month after month, American people went through the wilderness of hopelessness, strengthened only by the admonition of Franklin Delano Roosevelt to have faith and courage and to go ahead with faith and with courage—and then day would break—and the march in the wilderness would be ended.

Mr. Speaker, I doubt if any man in the history of the world gave as much to a suffering people as Franklin Delano Roosevelt did through his example of courage, and faith that out of the darkness of every night there comes the dawn of a new day.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. I yield to the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. ALBERT. I think the House appreciates the fact that the distinguished gentleman has taken this time to commemorate the occasion 30 years ago when Franklin Delano Roosevelt was inaugurated as President of the United States. And with his inauguration a new era of hope and a new era of opportunity was inaugurated also for the American people.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. I thank the distinguished majority leader for his statement.

Mr. Speaker, I remember one evening when I was in the city hall in Chicago and the word came of the passing of President Roosevelt. As I left the city hall, scrubwomen were in tears. As I came into the streets of Chicago, men and women and children were crying—so deeply had the image of Franklin Delano Roosevelt reached into the hearts and minds of the American people.

Mr. Speaker, I will make this observation. In one of the Chicago papers yesterday, there was a photograph of President Roosevelt on the occasion of his inauguration. By his side in that photograph was James, his eldest son. I am happy, Mr. Speaker, that James, his eldest son, is a Member of this body and that he is carrying on in the pattern and in the spirit of his father.

Mr. Speaker, I am happy that in my very humble way, I am seeking to carry on in the pattern of the man I, with all my countrymen, looked to for spiritual as well as material strength when ours was a stricken Nation with no hope save in Franklin Delano Roosevelt, counseling us to faith and courage as we marched out of the wilderness.

I was born in the same year of 1882. He was 51 when he was inaugurated President. I was approaching my 51st birthday. I am still here—I do not know for how long, but as long as I am here I shall try to go on in my humble way in the years ahead inspired in the doing of the work of each passing day by one who inspired me then, and now to all is an inspiration of immortality.

Yes, in the darkness of the night—no hope. And I know, because people would come to me who had everything wiped out, who did not know how they could go on; and then Franklin Delano Roosevelt would speak to the Nation and overnight courage came, and faith, and a suffering people marched out of the wilderness. How they did it I do not know, if the measure of their power to survive and to conquer overwhelming odds of adversity was material. But they did it by the inspiration of a great soul, one of the great souls in the history of our world.

And, Mr. Speaker, may I touch on one other matter mentioned on the opened page of the 300-year-old family Bible lying before Franklin Delano Roosevelt on his inaugural 30 years ago today—charity. Faith, hope, charity, these three: but the greatest of these is charity.

Preceding the Presidency of Franklin Delano Roosevelt was the Presidency of Mr. Hoover. In those days of the great depression when our people were entrapped in the wilderness of despair, Mr. Hoover was blamed for very much that had happened. It always seems that when one gets caught in a time of collapse he is blamed for everything, even though the collapse had come from a chain of preceding events not of his immediate making. Mr. Speaker, I think we all are happy that today in the evening of his life ex-President Hoover is respected and beloved by all his fellow citizens. And I know that no one would wish me more to say this than Franklin Delano Roosevelt.

So I hope, Mr. Speaker, that as in each succeeding generation we go through the many problems of our Nation, and as we argue, sometimes bitterly in the intensity of varying convictions, that as time goes on and makes evaluation of what we in each generation have done, that there will be a reflection in that evaluation of that charity that Franklin Delano Roosevelt had in mind when he had before him at his inauguration this page from the 300-year-old family Bible: Faith, hope, charity, these three: but the greatest of these is charity.

And so let us give to all our fellow Americans full credit for sincerity. All seek to serve God, country, and mankind. And when time has passed let history be equally charitable and say that the Franklin Delano Roosevelts and the Herbert Hoovers and all were great Americans, that they had at heart the interests of their people and of mankind. The differences that divide in days of great crises are best forgotten and erased from memory. Ours cannot remain a great nation, the bulwark of freedom, if there are not always differences of opinion, honestly presented, honestly fought out, with a mutuality of respect that is part and parcel of our American heritage.

Mr. Speaker, I was humbly grateful when you asked me to make these remarks. I have been speaking from the heart and not from a manuscript, not even from any mental notes to guide the continuity. I am speaking, as one who went through those frightful years of the depression leaning upon a great spirit, lifted with my countrymen to the heights of the physically impossible by the presence of a great soul, inaugurated 30 years ago today as President of the United States.

MARCH 4—AN ANNIVERSARY DAY

Mr. RYAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ULLMAN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to commend the distinguished gentleman from Illinois for taking this time to commemorate the 30th anniversary of the inauguration of Franklin Delano Roosevelt for his first term as President.

March 4, 1933, is surely one day in our Nation's history that will long be remembered. Thirty years ago today, Franklin Delano Roosevelt was inaugurated President of the United States. Most of us can still vividly remember the depths of despair into which the Nation had fallen in that fourth year of the great depression. It can be truly said that FDR's first important act was his inaugural address. The eloquent words he spoke that day, "The only thing we have to fear is fear itself," helped to restore the Nation's confidence in itself. The lack of that national self-confidence was undoubtedly the most dangerous aspect of those black days. President Roosevelt was able to transmit that personal courage, which had enabled him to conquer his own physical handicap, into the inspiration which restored the courage of a whole people.

Many of our senior colleagues began their service in this House on a March 4 in the past. Four of our fellow Members are today celebrating anniversaries of decades of service to their country:

Clarence Cannon, the esteemed chairman of the Appropriations Committee, who entered the House 40 years ago today after a distinguished career as Parliamentarian of the House of Representatives; and Emanuel Celler, the distinguished chairman of the Judiciary Committee, also began his service in this House 40 years ago. His fight against monopoly and for the protection of civil liberties and civil rights has gained him a well-earned place in the history of the fight for equal treatment for all.

On the same day 30 years ago when Franklin Roosevelt delivered that eloquent inaugural address, three of our distinguished senior colleagues entered upon their long careers of service in the national House of Representatives.

William M. Colmer, the ranking Democratic member of the House Rules Committee who has a long record of dedicated service on that most important Committee; and Thomas J. O'Brien, my beloved fellow member of the Ways and Means Committee to whom I have often turned for counsel and advice in order to benefit from his many years of experience.

Francis E. Walter, the revered chairman of the Democratic conference and one whose skill and fairness as chairman of the Committee of the Whole House has been recognized and appreciated by Members on both sides of the aisle.

Today we also celebrate the anniversaries of distinguished service, though not of even decades, of three others of our fellow members.

Joseph W. Martin, Jr., our distinguished former Speaker and earnest advocate of his party's cause who has won the admiration and affection of Members of this House on both sides of the aisle, who entered this House 38 years ago today; and Wright Patman, the chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee whose spirited devotion to the interests of the less-favored has been an inspiration to us all, who entered this House 34 years ago.

Howard W. Smith, the astute and able chairman of the Rules Committee, known to us all affectionately as Judge Smith, who has always treated every Member with consideration and fairness in fulfilling his responsibilities for the managing of the House's business, who entered this House 32 years ago today.

These constitute the total membership of the House who were sworn into office on a 4th of March. In 1933, the 20th amendment to the U.S. Constitution was ratified which changed the starting dates of Presidential and congressional terms to January 3.

Two other of the distinguished senior Members of this body have a record of service prior to 1933, but they were elected in the middle of congressional terms to fill vacant seats:

Carl Vinson, who has served longer in this body than any other living Member, is the House's preeminent expert on national defense matters. I look forward to November 3, 1964, when we can congratulate the dean of this House on 50 years of loyal and distinguished service to his country as a Member of this body.

John W. McCormack, our esteemed Speaker, will celebrate 35 years of continuous service in this body on November 6 of this year. Before his election as Speaker of the House of Representatives, John W. McCormack had an unequaled record of service to his party and country in his position as Democratic leader under Speaker Rayburn and as the architect of many of the important measures passed in the last 35 years to strengthen the Nation's defenses and to protect the welfare of its citizens.

I know I speak for every Member of this House in congratulating these 10 men on their long records of service and in expressing the wish of us all that they be with us for many more years so that we may have the continued benefit of their mature judgment and great wisdom.

SEMIANNUAL REPORT OF THE NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION — MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 78)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read; and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Science and Astronautics and ordered to be printed with illustrations:

To the Congress of the United States:

Pursuant to the provisions of the National Aeronautics and Space Act of 1958, as amended, I transmit herewith a report on the projects and progress of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for the period of January 1 through June 30, 1962. This is the seventh of these reports since the passage of the legislation establishing that agency.

This report covers a period of acceleration in the national space program and reveals the significant role of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration in that progress. Congressional support and interagency cooperation have contributed substantially to this record of space and aeronautics performance.

John F. Kennedy.

The White House, *March 4, 1963.*

SEMIANNUAL REPORT ON ACTIVITIES UNDER PUBLIC LAW 480—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 79)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read; and together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Agriculture and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

I am transmitting herewith the 17th semiannual report on activities carried on under Public Law 480, 83d Congress, as amended, outlining operations under the act during the period July 1 through December 31, 1962.

John F. Kennedy.

The White House, *March 4, 1963.*

CONSENT CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. This is Consent Calendar day.

The Clerk will call the first bill on the calendar.

PROVIDING ADDITIONAL COMPENSATION FOR VETERANS HAVING SERVICE-INCURRED DISABILITY OF DEAFNESS OF BOTH EARS

The Clerk called the first bill (H.R. 199) to amend title 38 of the United States Code to provide additional compensation for veterans having the service-connected disability of deafness of both ears.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

STATUTORY AWARD FOR APHONIA

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 214) to amend title 38 of the United States Code to provide additional compensation for veterans suffering the loss or loss of use of both vocal cords, with resulting complete aphonia.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

LEWIS DESCHLER

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 274) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the House of Representatives hereby tenders its thanks and appreciation to Lewis Deschler, whose 35th anniversary as its Parliamentarian occurred on January 1, 1963, in recognition of his dedication to this House, his wise and impartial advice to the Speaker and Members, and his exceptional contribution to the operation of its rules.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask for recognition on the resolution.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Oklahoma is recognized.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, the spontaneous response of the Members of the House on this resolution makes it almost anticlimatic for anyone to make a speech. But I cannot let this opportunity pass without saying a few words.

Mr. Speaker, this is a high privilege that I now have. It is with great pride that I offer this resolution in my name. But, Mr. Speaker, as much as I would cherish the honor, this resolution is not just offered on my own behalf alone. It is offered on behalf of the great and distinguished Speaker of the House; it is offered on behalf of the great and distinguished minority leader; it is offered on behalf of the entire leadership on both sides of the aisle. More important, it is offered indeed, Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the House of Representatives and all its Members.

Yesterday was Lew Deschler's birthday. This year also marks his 36th year of service as Parliamentarian of the House. In honoring this great American on this occasion the House does honor to itself.

Lewis Deschler was born in Chillicothe, Ohio, on March 3, 1905, the son of Joseph Anthony and Lilian Louise—Lewis—Deschler, who are still residing in Chillicothe.

Mr. Deschler began his higher education at Miami University, Oxford, Ohio, where he was a student from 1922 to 1925. During these years at Miami, he played tackle on the varsity football squad and engaged in other extracurricular activities. In 1925, he came to Washington, D.C., where he completed his undergraduate work at George Washington University. In 1932 he received both the degrees of juris doctor and master of patent law from National University in Washington, and in 1947 he was awarded the honorary degree of doctor of laws from the same university. He took the examination for the District of Columbia bar in 1934 and received the highest score ever given on the exam to that date. He was admitted to the District of Columbia bar in the same year. On motion of Hatton Summers he became a member of the U.S. Supreme Court bar in December 1937.

On January 18, 1931, Mr. Deschler married Virginia A. Cole of Washington, D.C. They have two children: Lewis Deschler II, an attorney practicing in Boca Raton, Fla.; and Joan Mari—Mrs. William B. Eddy—who resides with her husband and two children in Bethesda, Md. Mr. Deschler has one brother, Kenneth Deschler, living in Secaucus, N.J.

Lewis Deschler's career on Capitol Hill began in December of 1925—69th Congress, 1st session—when he was appointed by Speaker Longworth to be messenger at the Speaker's table, U.S. House of Representatives. He performed the duties of the timekeeper. At that time there was no position at the Speaker's desk carrying the title of Parliamentarian. The functions of Parliamentarian were performed by the Clerk at the Speaker's table, a position which had been filled by Lehr Fess, of Ohio, since the 66th Congress, 2d session—1919. In 1927—69th Congress, 2d session—the title of the position was changed to Parliamentarian—44 Stat. 1150, Public Law 631, 69th Congress—and the position of Assistant Parliamentarian was created—House Resolution 365, January 31, 1927. Mr. Deschler became the first Assistant Parliamentarian of the House, effective February 1, 1927, and served in this capacity until January 1, 1928, when he succeeded Mr. Lehr Fess as Parliamentarian. He has served as Parliamentarian continuously since that date; thus, on January 1, 1963, he began his 36th year in that position and he is currently in his 38th year of service in the House. During this long career, Mr. Deschler has had the honor to serve under Speakers Longworth, Garner, Rainey, Byrns, Bankhead, Rayburn, Martin, and McCormack.

On many occasions over the past several years I have heard the beloved Speaker McCormack say, without equivocation and without qualification, that "Lew Deschler is the greatest Parliamentarian in the world." I believe that is a fact. Lew Deschler knows the rules of this House, the parliamentary procedure of this House as nobody else on earth ever knew them. The parliamentary language of this House, in every conceivable procedural situation, is as much a part of his vocabulary as the words he learned at his mother's knee. To the presiding officer either of the House or of the Committee of the Whole, his work has been indispensable. He never forgets, he never falters, he never fails.

But perfect practitioner that he is, Mr. Speaker, Lew Deschler is more than this. He is a philosopher and historian of parliamentary law. He knows and loves the rules of this House. He knows when and why they were developed. He knows their importance to the dignity and decorum of the House, which itself has been his life and his love. He knows the pitfalls that accompany departures from parliamentary procedure, pitfalls both to individual Members and to the prestige and to the role of the House itself.

Lew Deschler has combined this great knowledge of parliamentary law and parliamentary procedure and his long years of experience in this House with rare and innate qualities of judgment and insight. He has the ability to sense instinctively almost the important missions of each succeeding Congress. Though his job is entirely objective, he has a talent for sifting the legislative wheat from the chaff. He knows when a transitory victory in a legislative battle may cost the legislative war. He knows the value of timing in the legislative process.

Lew Deschler has served at the right hand of many great Speakers, all of whom I have previously named. Every one of them, and they have all been preeminent judges of men, has singled Lew out for the quality of his service to the House. In the language of this resolution, Mr. Speaker, Lew Deschler has earned the commendation of us all for his exceptional contribution to the operation of the rules of the House, for his wise and impartial advice to the Speaker and to Members of the House, and for the quality, and the dedication, and the importance of his service to this body.

I yield to the distinguished minority leader, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Halleck].

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding; I also thank him for myself and for all of the Members on my side of the aisle for his presentation of this resolution. Too often it has seemed to me that some of the good things that we can say about people who are with us are delayed too long.

I seldom deal in superlatives but agreeing with our able Speaker I want to say that Lew Deschler is the world's greatest Parliamentarian, and that I realize is taking in a lot of territory.

I never cease to be amazed at the length and breadth of his knowledge of the rules of the House of Representatives.

These rules, as we all know, have evolved out of decades of experience and are designed to protect the rights not only of the minority, but of the 435 individual Members of this body.

Obviously, without them, we never would get anything done around here.

Sometimes I think it is a miracle that we accomplish what we do even with the rules to keep us in line with proper procedure.

Certainly one of the reasons is because we have a Parliamentarian who, throughout his career, has shown a capacity for a completely fair application of those rules.

Through the years that I have known Lew Deschler ours has become one of the closest personal relationships, and never has it made the slightest bit of difference in that relationship, especially as it had to do with the business of this House, whether I was a member of the majority party or the minority party.

I say without equivocation that never have I known Lew Deschler's advice, his judgment or his decisions to be influenced by any partisan considerations whatsoever.

My admiration for him as a man goes far beyond my respect for Lew Deschler as an officer of the House. He has a deep understanding of his job that transcends its purely technical aspects.

In my years of service here I have known no other person more fiercely proud of the highest traditions of the House of Representatives, and no other who has been more careful or more determined to protect and maintain the prestige and standing of this body.

People reach the top in their chosen field only because of strong motivation. It is this complete dedication to our great institution that has made Lew Deschler the very best, and I wish him many, many more years of distinguished service to the Congress and his country.

Mr. ALBERT. I thank the gentleman for his excellent statement. I yield to the distinguished Speaker of the House.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I might say that the offering of this resolution and the remarks of various Members are a complete surprise to our distinguished friend. I might make the observation in connection with the surprise that when I recognized the gentleman from Oklahoma and he addressed me to offer a resolution, Lew Deschler turned to me and said, "Did you know about this?"

I said, "Yes; and you had better stay here because I am afraid there might be a point of order made. So you had better stay here." So it was a complete surprise to our dear and distinguished friend.

The gentleman from Oklahoma has covered the background of the years of dedicated service of Lew Deschler to this great body. My remarks will be made from another angle, about Lew Deschler the man. It is true that whenever I introduce Lew Deschler to anyone, particularly those from abroad, I always introduce him as the No. 1 Parliamentarian of the world, and that is true. But more than being a Parliamentarian he is a human being, he is a man possessed of nobility of character, with a fine, broad understanding outlook on life and a sweet and noble philosophy of life.

In addition, he is a man of wisdom, a man whose influence in the legislative affairs of our country for so many years has been tremendous, unseen possibly from the angle of the public but well known to each and every Member who has ever served in this great body.

As my dear friend from Indiana, the minority leader, so well said, Lew Deschler "is dedicated to the House of Representatives." He is loyal to the House as such. He is loyal to whoever might be the presiding officer of the House without regard to what the presiding officer's political party or affiliation might be. His views, his opinions, are sought not only by the Speakers that he has served with, and I might use the words under or in cooperation with, but also by all Members of the House, and his views and his opinions are profoundly respected.

My friends from Oklahoma and from Indiana, as I have said, have covered not only Lew Deschler personally but Lew Deschler's contribution as Parliamentarian. I like to look at him and to make my remarks from the angle of Lew Deschler the individual. He was here when I first came to Congress a little over 35 years ago. During my period of service there has developed between Lew Deschler and John McCormack a feeling of friendship which I shall always treasure.

One of the most ennobling influences of my life has been the fact that by reason of my service in this body I have been able to meet so many fine Members, men and women, possessed of beautiful minds, who, without regard to party, have been dedicated to the service of our country. Among all of them there is none who will forever as long as I live occupy a more treasured position in my mind than our dear friend Lew Deschler.

To Lew and to Mrs. Deschler, and to his parents and his other loved ones, I extend my hearty congratulations not only on his birthday anniversary of yesterday but on this anniversary today in his official position as Parliamentarian. May God continue to bless Lew for countless years to come in the service of our country and particularly in the service of this great body.

Mr. ALBERT. I thank the distinguished Speaker.

I now yield to the majority whip, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. Boggs].

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, Lew Deschler has set a high standard for ability, for tireless dedication, and for wise and honest counsel. As the minority leader has said, and as the distinguished Speaker of the House has said, he is unquestionably the greatest Parliamentarian in all of the world. Historians will never be able to trace the very far reaching influence of this man in helping the House of Representatives to pass well-conceived and well-thought-out legislation, and legislation able to pass the constitutional test. Every Member, as the Speaker of the House has just said, who has sat in this House at any time in the past 36 years will bear testimony that his influence has had a tremendous impact and that he has contributed far more than the world will ever know toward maintaining the dignity and the supremacy of this great body.

I think one of the great characteristics of this man, speaking of him as a man, as the distinguished Speaker just did, is that no one ever questions his impartiality. Everyone knows that when one of us has the privilege of presiding as chairman in the Committee of the Whole, or sometimes when the Speaker of the House designates one of us as Speaker pro tempore, we are constantly, so to speak, in the hands of the Parliamentarian. When someone makes a point of order or raises a parliamentary question or whatever the situation may be, we turn immediately to the Parliamentarian and he advises us. It has been my observation over the years regardless of whether we have had a Democrat or a Republican sitting in the Speaker's chair, and regardless who may have been presiding in Committee of the Whole, no one ever questions the fairness or objectivity of Lew Deschler. To my way of thinking, that has been one one of his very important contributions to this great body. Our distinguished Speaker has described Lew Deschler as the greatest Parliamentarian. I remember when another great Speaker, Mr. Rayburn, used to say he was, to quote, "A big brain man." I think that describes Lew very adequately. He is a big man in every sense of the word. He understands the bigness of this country and the challenges that this country faces. He understands the unique and magnificent role that the House of Representatives plays in carrying on the spirit and the strength of our democratic institutions in the United States of America.

So it is my great pleasure, number one—to express my profound gratitude to Lew Deschler for the great help he has given to me over the years both as a Member of this body and as one who has had some minor responsibility in the leadership—and that has been a personal matter and one for which I will be forever grateful; and number two—to say to him, I join with all your colleagues in wishing for you and your family a happy birthday chronologically and a happy birthday as an officer of this great body.

Mr. ALBERT. I thank the distinguished gentleman from Louisiana.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. Harris].

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join our distinguished Speaker and the leaders on both sides in extending congratulations to our beloved and distinguished friend and Parliamentarian, Lew Deschler, and at the same time also to extend my felicitations to him on the occasion of his birthday yesterday.

I wish also to join others in expressing my appreciation for our distinguished majority leader's presenting the resolution today appropriately recognizing the life work of our Parliamentarian, Lewis Deschler.

Apropos to what our distinguished majority whip has just said, I recall one occasion which I think would be appropriate to include in these remarks. Legislation was being considered in the House; one of the Members serving as the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole; some question was raised by a Member regarding a parliamentary matter; the Chairman of the Committee remarked that the Parliamentarian said it was so-and-so. It was a little out of the ordinary for a Chairman of the Committee of the Whole to say that for the Record, but it is so obvious, it was so true.

And I want to associate myself with the appropriate and splendid remarks that have been made here about my good friend who has always so willingly and gladly given counsel and advice.

Lew, we wish you the best for many, many more years of fine service, because you have meant so much to us as a group, to us as inudividuals, to me not only as a Member, but also as chairman of one of the great committees of this House; and I personally want to thank you for it.

Mr. ALBERT. I thank the gentleman from Arkansas, and now yield to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Thornberry].

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, it gives me a great deal of pleasure to join others in paying this deserved tribute to Lewis Deschler, Parliamentarian of this House. I recall more than fourteen years ago when I first came here, the distinguished gentleman whom I succeeded in the House and who now serves this Nation as Vice President, the Honorable LYNDON B. JOHNSON, gave me much valuable and good advice. One of the most valuable pieces of advice he ever gave me was:

> You get to know the Parliamentarian, Mr. Lewis Deschler. He is a wise man, he is a good man, he is nonpartisan, and he will always advise you not only as to the rules of the House, not only as to the proper procedure, but also as to the proper conduct of a Member of the House.

The two of them have been fast and good personal friends over the years.

I took advantage of that advice and as a result of the Vice President's wise judgment I have been afforded a personal and close friendship which means much to me and will always mean much to me. I expect Lew Deschler enjoyed, as much as any mortal man, the friendship and confidence of the immortal and beloved Sam Rayburn. I do not believe there was ever a day went by that Mr. Rayburn did not in some way or in other refer to Lew Deschler as his friend and confidant. Not only did Mr. Rayburn think of him as a big brain, but more important than that, as a big man with a big heart.

I think it is a great privilege for all of us who come to this House not only to know Lew Deschler as a valiant champion of the House and of the Members of the House, see him take pride in the House and do his best to see that the House maintains its prestige and place in this capital, but also to be afforded his friendship and advice. We can rejoice in the pardonable pride that his father and mother, his wife, Virginia, her parents, and their children have in him, not only because of today but particularly because of what he has meant to them, to his friends, and to this country. All the members of the family are in Washington today, or most of them are, to help celebrate this day with him.

And so, to Lew Deschler, go my congratulations, my thanks, and my best wishes.

Mr. ALBERT. I thank the distinguished gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALBERT. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, in my 37 or 38 years here I have had the good fortune and great privilege of meeting some of the finest men I have ever met in all my life or ever expect to meet. When I first came up to Washington it was with a Member of Congress with whom I was closely associated prior to that time, in fact, a relative. He said to me:

> Herbert, in getting around try to meet some smart people, try to meet people who have been around, people who amount to something.

I followed his advice, and as I met these people who were the leaders on the majority side at that time and on the minority side, I always heard them mention this fellow Deschler's name.

So I made it my business to get acquainted with Mr. Deschler.

Mr. Speaker, I can sincerely say that fortunate is the man who knows Lew Deschler.

Lew Deschler has helped more individual Members of this House and their staffs than any man I know of on this side of the Capitol, because if you are fortunate enough to get advice from Mr. Deschler, it is good advice. I have often heard the former Speaker of this House, Mr. Rayburn, say, "When I am talking I am not learning anything." So I had the privilege many times of being in Mr. Deschler's company and of listening to him talk to other people. I learned something about the operations of this House and the things that had gone on in the past as well as his prediction of the things that would take place in the future.

It has been one of the great privileges in my life to know this fine Christian gentleman, and I am everlastingly grateful for having had the opportunity of this great association, this fine association, because he has meant so much to me. I am proud to call you, Lew, my friend.

I hope you spend many, many more happy birthdays and continue to render to the Members of this House impartially, in the future as you have in the past, the wonderful service you have given the House of Representatives, the Congress, and this Nation.

Mr. ALBERT. I thank the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

It is now with pleasure that I yield to the gentlewoman from Ohio [Mrs. BOLTON].

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, it is a very great pleasure to me to get up and wish Lew Deschler a happy birthday at this time.

I suppose I go back as far as anyone, so far as Lew Deschler is concerned. When I first came down here with my husband there were a lot of greenhorns around, just as there are today who did not know anything about parliamentary law. So they asked Lew Deschler if he would give them lessons. They would come to our house, Clarence Hancock, Bill Hess, Carroll Beedy, and others, of an evening. Lew certainly put them over the bumps. It was wonderful.

I must say at that time I was not very greatly interested in politics. Of course, I was interested in my husband's service in the House, but I did not expect to be down here myself. Even so I found it fascinating.

Mr. Deschler was a most wonderful teacher in addition to being a most delightful person to have around.

I do wish you, Lew, every joy in the world, and a lot more years. May I congratulate the House, Mr. Speaker, that we have had his services for so many, many years. Heaven bless you, my dear.

Mr. ALBERT. I thank the gentlewoman from Ohio, and I now yield to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN].

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, following my colleague from Ohio, may I say that I have probably known Lew Deschler longer than any other Member of this House, because I have known him since he was a lad of 13, back in 1918. I knew his father and his grandfather before him.

So, it has been a real pleasure to me to sit here today and listen to the tributes which have been paid to a wonderful man, Lew Deschler, by those who have served with him here in the House of Representatives.

As has already been said, Lew is a big man in many, many ways. He is a big man physically. Lew and I have had a little joke between us for a good many years—because Chillicothe is just up the tracks a piece from my hometown—about erecting a statue to Lew in Chillicothe. We have always said it should be of gold but have always insisted Lew should first go on a diet to hold down the cost of his statue.

But, Mr. Speaker, if you think Lew Deschler is a big man physically, you should have seen his grandfather, who would make Lew look like a little boy if he were standing beside him today. He too was a great American, as was Lew's father.

Mr. Speaker, Lew comes from the old stock. Chillicothe was the first capital of Ohio, as you all know, and from those hills that make up the background of the seal of the State of Ohio came the pioneers, who in turn have given Lew not only a strong constitution and great physical strength, but a strong character, a great moral strength, and unusual mental capacity, which has permitted him to become the renowned Parliamentarian that he has been described here today, but also a truly great man, which counts the most, after all.

Mr. ALBERT. I thank the distinguished gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALBERT. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, it gives me a great deal of personal pleasure to join in this well-deserved tribute to our Parliamentarian, Lew Deschler.

Everything has been said so well that I will merely tell one story and then make one point. It happens that a number of years ago, some years after the late Speaker Rayburn had broken Henry Clay's record of service—that of longest service as Speaker of the House of Representatives—I happened to go into Speaker Rayburn's office when he and Lew were discussing some problem. Shortly thereafter Mr. Deschler left. The Speaker and I began to discuss a variety of matters. I said "Mr. Speaker, you probably know more about the rules of the House than anybody in the history of the House." The Speaker looked at me and said, "There is only one man around here who knows the rules of the House. He just left. Lew Deschler."

Mr. Speaker, I believe that Speaker Rayburn meant exactly what he said and I expect he was telling the precise truth.

Mr. Speaker, there is one characteristic of Lew that has not been brought out today. He was surprised by this event. In fact, I think he learned only a few seconds ago that some members of his family were more aware of the coming event than he. One of the things you must recognize about him is that he probably views these proceedings with mixed emotions. He has had an enormous influence on the Members and the proceedings of this House for many decades and yet he is less well-known in the United States than many men of less importance here. That is entirely deliberate on his part. He has a real passion for anonymity. He wants to do things, and not talk about them.

Mr. Speaker, it is a great pleasure again to congratulate our fine Parliamentarian.

Mr. ALBERT. I thank the distinguished gentleman from Missouri for those very pertinent and accurate observations.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who have addressed the House on this subject today may revise and extend their remarks, and that all Members have permission to extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD on this resolution, and that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the subject matter of this resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. LIBONATI. Mr. Speaker. Mr. Lewis Deschler has functioned in the office of the Parliamentarian of the House for a period of 36 years. It is a fitting tribute that on this day the House by resolution pays tribute to his honorable and distinguished services in this capacity.

The office of Parliamentarian covers many important segments of the business of the House: the assignment of messages and resolutions to the committee properly having jurisdiction of the subject matter; the rulings on sundry motions, points of inquiry, and order made by the membership in the hearings on the floor at various stages during the progress of legislation.

Lewis Deschler has through the years established himself as a final authority in the specialized field. The importance of his rulings has guided the destiny of hundreds of pieces of legislation through the House of Representatives.

The many miscellaneous questions of parliamentary nature arising in committee or in conference between both Houses and settled through his good offices are matters of legislative history.

His high talents in this service have earned for him the respect of the membership and the appreciation of the leadership of the House of Representatives.

His constant application to the duties of his office together with a continuing study in research on questions pertinent to his specialization has given to him a national recognition as an expert authority in his field.

His intellectual and legalistic mastery of Jefferson's Manual and the ten thousand rulings on parliamentary questions decided in the highest parliamentary controlled body from its very beginning have marked him as a master in his chosen field of endeavor.

His valuable service to the Congress has been the controlling factor in keeping legislation within the constitutional limits prescribed by the Constitution of the United States.

His assistants, William P. Cochrane and William H. Brown, reflect the thorough training received under his tutelage. The old adage of the teacher and the efficiency of the pupil is no better demonstrated.

We, of the Illinois delegation, are proud of the important services rendered by our friend and distinguished public servant Lewis Deschler, and give public thanks to him for his many years of dedication to the American people.

May God bless him and his family with health and happiness, and to him many years of continued service in the House of Representatives.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, the past two elections happily have brought a goodly number of new Members to the minority side of this body.

As a freshman in the 87th Congress, I can attest from personal experience the fair and helpful way in which Lew Deschler fulfills the office of Parliamentarian. As teacher, technician, and friend, he has been most helpful.

I know from contacts with other new Members that this same fine standard has been applied to all.

Our very best wishes to Mr. Deschler on this anniversary.

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, as a new Member of Congress, I have had occasion to call on our Parliamentarian, Mr. Lew Deschler, for assistance and advice. I have found him to be most cordial and helpful, and I am most appreciative of his service and knowledge. It is a pleasure to join in the ceremony congratulating Lew Deschler on the occasion of his birthday.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, there is little I can add to what has been so eloquently and so justifiably said about the distinguished service of our Parliamentarian, Lew Deschler. I join in what has been said about this truly able and truly fine official of the House. But I, and only I can testify to the personal respect and great affection I have for him. Even as I attempt to do so I cannot find the words adequately to express what is in my mind and heart.

That Lew has sat at the Speaker's table since 1925 and has been our Parliamentarian since 1928, under eight Speakers, both Republican and Democrat, itself attests to the quality of his service and the quality of the man himself. As Parliamentarian he may be said to be the chief legal adviser of our Speaker and whomever may occupy the chair as Chairman of the Committee of the Whole. Not infrequently the Chair is obliged to make an immediate ruling on an extremely difficult question, but Lew is there to advise the Chair instantly as to exactly what the precedents are on such an issue. That there should be an absence of appeals from the Chair's rulings bespeaks the soundness and the fairness of the advice the Chair receives from Lew.

There is considerably more involved in connection with the position of Parliamentarian than advising the Chair during the course of proceedings on the floor. That the legislative program is handled so expeditiously on the floor from day to day is due to the thorough preparations made for the business of the day by the Parliamentarian. Frankly, I am sometimes amazed how he seems to anticipate the unexpected, and I think this is because he is familiar with every aspect of every bill that is called up.

Lew is now serving his 36th year as our Parliamentarian. I congratulate him. On this occasion we Members of the House might appropriately congratulate ourselves in having such a man as Lew Deschler in the service of the House. Without him the House will not be the same, and we sincerely hope he will be our Parliamentarian for many, many more years.

Mr. BETTS. Mr. Speaker, I certainly want to be included with those who are praising Lew Deschler on his birthday today. Anyone who has observed Capitol Hill over the last 30 years can testify to his great contribution to the legislative process. Both in character and ability he has made a record which has impressed everyone who has had occasion to come in contact with him. His fairness in the discharge of his duties as Parliamentarian is universally acknowledged. Not many persons have the talent of being able to make vital decisions on the spur of the moment without question or criticism. But Lew has this talent and that is one of the reasons why he will be recorded as the greatest Parliamentarian in the history of the House of Representatives.

As a friend and admirer I extend my greetings and best wishes on this occasion.

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure for me to join in this tribute to our distinguished Parliamentarian. I soon learned after my arrival in the House that Lewis Deschler is all that our great Speaker and majority and minority leaders have said. He is not only a walking encyclopedia of the rules and procedures of the House, but a patient and lucid teacher, ever willing to share his knowledge with the Members. The House indeed has been fortunate to have had the benefit of his invaluable service during the past 35 years. I want to add my voice in wishing continued success and happiness to Lewis Deschler and his family.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, though mine has been a relatively short stay in Washington, it has witnessed and continues to realize the importance and expertness of Lewis Deschler, our House Parliamentarian. In a very real sense, his service in such capacity, of which this august body has been the fortunate recipient since 1928, has helped to sustain and vindicate the axiom that ours is a government of laws, not men. Serving as the parliamentary alter ego of the Speaker, and for that matter, of the entire membership, Lewis Deschler has cleared the well-known tight congressional procedural path time and time again in a way characterized as impartial, decisive, and quiet. His response to inquiries as to procedural stratagems and as to rights and privileges of Members has been particularly invaluable to my congressional brethren as well as myself. Indeed, this great body has been and continues to be the better for its selection some 35 years ago of the outstanding ability and parliamentary wisdom of Lewis Deschler.

I congratulate Lew on his recent birthday anniversary, and, moreover, on the occasion of his 36th year of service as House Parliamentarian. His has been a long and productive service; may the House of Representatives continue to enjoy his wise and nonpartisan counsel for many years to come. May Heaven bless Lew Deschler, and may he continue to privilege this great Chamber with his presence.

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Speaker, I am more than delighted that our majority leader, Mr. ALBERT, offered the resolution affording the House of Representatives the opportunity to extend its thanks and appreciation to Lewis Deschler, our Parliamentarian, who is now serving in his 36th year in this important capacity. Others have spoken of Lew Deschler as "the greatest parliamentarian in the world," of Lew Deschler "the man," of his great contributions to all of us as individual Members; and I would like to join with my colleagues in all of these expressions of recognition, appreciation, and high confidence in Lew Deschler, our friend.

More than this, I would also like to record for history the tremendous assistance Lew Deschler through the years has rendered to the professional staffs of the committees of the House of Representatives. As assistant counsel to the Education and Labor Committee in the 82d Congress, I learned that Lew Deschler was always available and often was called upon for opinions on parliamentary questions arising within the committees of the House, as well as to give advice regarding the rules and procedures for presenting committee legislation for floor action.

While I am confident that every Member of the House of Representatives who has ever served with Lew Deschler recognizes his outstanding contributions to the leadership of the House and the Members individually, I know that each staff member who has ever called on the Parliamentarian likewise could testify that his advice and assistance have been invaluable in the work of the Congress in the committees.

It is a great pleasure and privilege to join in saluting Lew Deschler for all of his many contributions. I extend to him my best wishes for many, many years of continued service in this most important position of service to our Nation.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, the resolution tendering the thanks and appreciation of the House of Representatives to Lewis Deschler for his faithful service as Parliamentarian of the House of Representatives for the past 35 years is a very fitting tribute to a great American.

Lewis Deschler is not only the greatest Parliamentarian of our times, but he has endeared himself to all Members of the House. In addition to his many splendid qualifications as Parliamentarian, he has those personal attributes which make people admire and respect him.

It has been a real privilege for me to have been associated with Lewis Deschler throughout my service in the Congress, and I wish him the best of everything in the years that lie ahead.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pleasure that I am privileged today to extend my sincere congratulations to Lew Deschler on the occasion of his 35th anniversary as Parliamentarian of the House of Representatives.

This is a very great achievement and one I am sure that Lew is proud to claim. His devotion to his duties, to our Speaker and to the membership of this House is reflected in his modesty, but we all know he is, without a doubt, the greatest authority on parliamentary law in the United States today.

Above and beyond this acknowledged ability, Lew is a very human and understanding man. He is a humanitarian and is never too busy to lend a helping hand when requested to do so.

Mr. Speaker, we are most fortunate to have had Mr. Deschler with us over the past 35 years and I hope the good Lord will watch over him and guide him for many more years to come.

Lew, we will always need your wisdom and your valuable assistance. Again please accept my heartiest congratulations on this very important occasion in your fabulous life on Capitol Hill.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, one of the pleasantest associations I have enjoyed during my long service in the House has been with our able and distinguished Parliamentarian, Lewis Deschler, who has now entered upon his 36th year of service in this vitally important office. Not only has this been a delightful association, he is one of my closest and dearest friends in this body.

During my terms as Speaker in the 80th and 83d Congresses, he sat at my right hand. As any Speaker, of either party would testify, if any employee of the House is an indispensable man, it is Lew Deschler. His knowledge of the rules, precedents, and procedures of the House is profound and instantaneous. During my terms as Speaker, his services were of inestimable value. It would be impossible to exaggerate the value of his services to the Speaker and to the House.

There is no more dedicated and faithful public servant in our Government than Lew Deschler. He loves this House. He is a stalwart defender of its privileges, its rules and its dignity. He has earned the everlasting admiration, esteem, and respect of the entire membership of this body for his great ability, his knowledge, and his devotion to duty.

I hope he will continue in robust health so that he may serve the House for many years to come.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, I want to join our distinguished Speaker and the majority and minority leaders in extending my congratulations and best wishes to our well beloved and dedicated Parliamentarian, Lew Deschler. At the same time I want to wish him a very happy birthday.

I am pleased to be able to join my colleagues in expressing appreciation for the counsel and advice which I have received from him over the years. I can recall numberless occasions when his assistance proved invaluable.

It is a great privilege for all of us who come to the House of Representatives to meet and know Lew Deschler. He has proven to be a great champion of this legislative body and a symbol of reverence for its traditions.

Moreover, I want to associate myself with the remarks which have been made here about Lew. These tributes are sincerely meant and keenly deserved.

We wish you, Lew, many more years of fine service in behalf of the House of Representatives, and our Nation.

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, I want to add a brief word of congratulations to Lew Deschler in marking the 35th anniversary of his service as House Parliamentarian.

Without question, the ability of the House to act responsibly and progressively on legislation and in fulfilling its obligations to the many diverse and geographically disparate constituencies from which its members come depend upon the rules which it adopts and follows as a legislative body. The preservation of order, decency and regularity is of the greatest importance to our democracy.

No better statement of the purpose of the rules can be found than that set forth in Jefferson's Manual, which is in the hands of all House members in an edition which is prepared and revised regularly under the careful supervision of Lew Deschler. As Lew has noted, the rules under which the House operates today are perhaps the most finely adjusted, scientifically balanced and highly technical rules of any parliamentary body in the world.

We often hear criticism and complaint about rules when they seem to be invoked to prevent haste. Yet rules are established and maintained primarily to protect the rights of minorities, while permitting the majority to work its will.

In the course of daily events, the House and its Speaker and its members must rely constantly on the word and judgment of a man who is fully familiar with this body of rules, and it is in his knowledge and experience that the solution is found for steady and regular progress, without constant wrangling and captious argument.

This is an important and sensitive role, and it is one that Lew Deschler has discharged faithfully and well over many years, earning the praise and warm regard of the House.

Mr. MARSH. Mr. Speaker, I venture to add a new Member's word of appreciation to the eloquent and fully merited tributes which have been paid here today to the distinguished Parliamentarian of the House, Mr. Lewis Deschler.

Many a new Member has learned early in his service here that at least a modest working knowledge of the rules and procedures of the House is essential to his comprehension of the lawmaking process and his appropriate role in it. He is heartened to find that he is not without willing assistance in this effort at self-education.

Mr. Deschler is affable, patient and, above all, rich in knowledge of form and precedent. One realizes quickly that 35 years of service have not dulled his enthusiasm for his work, or his pride in the responsibilities assigned him.

Every Member of the House, I am sure, is secure in the recognition that Mr. Deschler's counsel is available to all, and is given conscientiously, impartially and wisely.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. Speaker, it is truly gratifying to praise the accomplishments of a selfless man. It doubles that satisfaction when the man who deserves and gets that praise is my friend. I add my voice to that of many others when I give just recognition to the more than 35 years of understanding service rendered to the House of Representatives by Lew Deschler.

Before I speak for anyone else, I first speak for myself. When I was new here, Lew personally helped me to avoid legislative mistakes. He increases my efficiency as the Representative of the people who send me here.

What Lew Deschler does for me, he does for every Member of the House who seeks his counsel.

This same patience and sagacity lubricate the parliamentary wheels of the full legislative body. As the years accumulate, as the influence of legislation enacted here increases around the world, as emerging nations struggle to form parliamentary systems of their own and emulate one already functioning, who but the probing historians of future years can fathom the impact this one quiet, knowledgeable man may have had on the history of his fellow men?

To paraphrase a verse from a New Testament parable, "Well done, thou good and faithful public servant."

Mr. PIRNIE. Mr. Speaker, it is a real privilege to join in this well-deserved tribute to our distinguished Parliamentarian, Lewis Deschler. His vast knowledge, unbelievable memory and alert mind have won him top recognition in his chosen field and every Member of the House will attest to the fair and impartial manner in which this outstanding capability is exercised. His ready smile is sincere and warm. His huge frame commands attention upon first meeting, but association soon demonstrates he possesses a heart and spirit of equal size.

Lew Deschler has seen history made during some of the most stirring periods of our Nation. His role, though great, has been little known, largely due to his quiet and unassuming manner, but those who have glimpsed him in action know how effective are his rapid fire responses as he counsels and advises. The tribute of the Speaker gives special validity to this attribute. It is my hope that Lew Deschler will continue to discharge his important service to our Nation for years to come. We congratulate him on his birthday and extend every good wish.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join my colleagues in all the words they have uttered in praise of our able Parliamentarian Lew Deschler. Lew was on the job when I came to Congress almost a quarter of a century ago, and I learned quickly to seek his counsel and advice, all of which proved to be good. Lew Deschler possesses that sixth sense, to see the right, and to live right during every minute of the day.

I could go on for hours, Mr. Speaker, expounding my high esteem of this great and good man, but it is simply not possible to gild the rose, neither is it possible to say anything that would add to the love and high esteem that all have who know well, my friend, Lew Deschler.

I only wish for you, Lew, many more years of service to the Members of Congress and to our beloved Nation, which you have served so well for over one-third of a century.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, in a legislative body like the House of Representatives with 435 Representatives of such widely different areas and interests, the daily functioning of the House in a smooth and orderly way is a continuing tribute to its Parliamentarian.

However, on the occasion of Lew Deschler's 35th anniversary in that post, it is fitting to pay special and explicit tribute to the service he has rendered to the House and, with exemplary impartiality, to all its Members. The rules of the House are both numerous and technical. There are more than 11,000 rulings that constitute precedents for the conduct of House business. In these circumstances, the sureness with which Lew Deschler makes his judgments, represents ample evidence of his immense accumulation of knowledge and of his dedication to his work.

I should like to join many of my colleagues in congratulating our distinguished Parliamentarian on his anniversary and his birthday. I hope his highly valued service will continue so that I shall have many occasions in the future on which to renew these congratulations.

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Speaker, there has been a great deal of well-deserved tribute paid to one of the best friends the House of Representatives has, Lewis Deschler. For more than 35 years he has displayed his genius as a parliamentarian. His guidance is accompanied always by wit and courtesy, and his warm good nature has endeared him to us all. Without subtracting from Lew Deschler's own outstanding talents, and with perhaps more truth than modesty, I would like to point out that he exemplifies the sort of character we from Ohio think of as typically Buckeye. In addition to having had the original good sense of being born in our great State, Lew comes from Chillicothe. As a freshman that won my heart immediately, since the Minshalls were politically active in Chillicothe for almost a century. All in all, it is hard to fault Lew Deschler, a man of enormous talent, graciousness, and dedication. Ohio is proud of him and the U.S. House of Representatives is deeply in his debt.

Mr. ALBERT. Now, Mr. Speaker, to conclude these remarks I would like leave of the House to read a letter:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, March 2, 1963.

HON. LEWIS DESCHLER,
Parliamentarian, House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR LEW: I have learned from the Speaker that on Monday you will be honored by the Members of the House of Representatives for your long record of service to the Congress. In your parliamentary capacity over 36 years, you have played a unique and vital role in the life and work of the House of Representatives. I had an opportunity myself as a Member of Congress to know of your wise and effective influence.

With warmest best wishes.

Cordially,

JOHN F. KENNEDY.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the resolution was unanimously agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON COMMUNICATIONS, COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Communications of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce be permitted to sit this afternoon during general debate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

TRUTH-IN-LENDING ACT

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, today I have reintroduced the Truth-in-Lending Act. This bill, which is sponsored in the other body by Senator PAUL H. DOUGLAS and other Senators, requires simply that there shall be a full written disclosure of charges for credit when credit is extended to consumers.

Installment buying is a major part of our economy. Since the end of World War II consumer credit has increased more than eightfold from less than $6 billion in 1945 to more than $55 billion. Although credit buying is a large segment of consumer buying, it is often impossible for the consumer to know exactly the price he pays for an item bought on credit.

Dr. Theodore O. Yntema, vice president in charge of finance, Ford Motor Co., in testimony during the 1961 Senate hearings on automobile financing stated:

> The variety and complexity of finance and insurance arrangements and the charges for them are such as almost to defy comprehension. It is impossible for the average buyer to appraise the rates for the finance and insurance services offered, as compared with alternatives available elsewhere.

In an article written by the Industrial Union Department of the AFL–CIO it is pointed out:

> Easy credit and the ruthless imposition of consumer debt upon the unwary have led to frightful abuse and sometimes to tragic consequence. Because of the ignorance regarding the true costs of money, lives

have been needlessly scarred or even wrecked. Unless excesses are halted, the entire American business community may be discredited.

The truth-in-lending proposal spells out the disclosures, including the total amount to be financed, the amounts to be credited as downpayment and/or trade-in, which are to be made by merchants and lenders when they extend consumer credit. The information will enable the consumer to know how much is added by credit to the cost of things he buys. This legislation will aid almost every American. Economists estimate that almost every family uses some form of consumer credit at some time, and on the whole Americans spend 13 cents out of every dollar they earn for repayment of installment loans.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that this legislation will be acted upon favorably during this session.

TAX PROGRAM

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, in order to keep the Members of the House informed on the facts in connection with the President's tax proposals upon which the Ways and Means Committee is presently holding hearings, I would like to include as a part of my remarks the testimony of one of the best informed witnesses to appear on the tax question. He is Mr. Roswell Magill, of New York City, and the statement he presented to the committee this morning will appear at the end of these remarks.

I would like to emphasize that President Kennedy's tax program is contradictory to its announced objectives in four basic ways. First, the investment capital incentive is penalized because consumer purchasing power is overly stressed; second, the structural reforms defeat rate cuts; third, the timing is bad, there being no immediate stimulus as intended; and, fourth, the budget is further imbalanced through lack of expenditure control.

The testimony contained a six-point constructive tax recommendation with which I am in agreement:

First. Substantial rate reductions should be made in the individual income tax. It would be a good idea to spread these over several years.

Second. To moderate the revenue loss in individual rate reductions, the opening rate on the new scale might be set at 16 percent instead of 14 percent. This one step would eliminate the need for revenue-raising reforms and keep the total tax reduction within the level set by the President.

Third. The corporation tax rate needs to be lowered quickly, if the reduction is to have the desired effects. The simplest way to do this is to permit the Korean rate increase on corporations from 47 to 52 percent to expire on June 30, as scheduled.

Fourth. Structural reforms need not be undertaken in this bill but should be treated in a separate measure. In any case, only true reforms that would improve the structure should be considered, and not revenue-raising measures such as the reduction of allowable deductions by 5 percent of gross income, the repeal of the dividend credit, and the proposed new levy on unrealized capital gains, levied at death or transfer by gift.

Fifth. For the long run, we should work toward a top rate on the individual income tax of 50 percent. Similarly, for the long run, a much lower level of taxation of business would be desirable. To make this possible, the Congress should consider alternate business or transaction taxes in the future to provide substitute revenues and relieve the burden of taxation on profits.

Sixth. Finally, Federal expenditures should be rigorously held at least to the fiscal 1963 level, preferably to a lower level so as to insure that the budget will actually reach a balance in the near future when the good effects of the tax reduction program begin to appear.

Finally, a basic fallacy in the President's proposal, the longstanding policy on percentage depletion, is not reexamined in terms of whether the percentage allowance is too large or whether the policy is good. Admittedly the percentage depletion provisions have been effective in achieving their objectives over the past 35 years. Nevertheless, the proposal is that the basis for calculating depletion be changed in a way that would restrict severely the very activities that percentage depletion is designed to encourage.

In this constructive criticism of the President's tax proposals and the positive program offered, we have the basis for the discussion of a workable tax cut and reform program if the administration sincerely wants tax cuts and reform instead of just a political issue.

STATEMENT TO THE COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, BY ROSWELL MAGILL, MARCH 4, 1963

The President's special message to Congress on January 24, 1963, is specifically addressed to two topics—tax reduction and tax reform. The recommendations in the message all have to do with the income tax. In general, the tax reform proposals are devised to recoup some of the revenue that would be lost if the tax reduction proposals were adopted.

The message was preceded by a number of speeches by the Secretary of the Treasury, and by the chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers, emphasizing that the current Federal tax structure impedes economic growth. The prescription to cure that malady was said to be a substantial reduction in taxes on business and on the upper income brackets to stimulate investment incentives and unleash venture capital. The income tax was described as a drag on the economy.

These statements, with one notable exception, repeated in substance what the business community has said for years. The business community has emphasized that the weakness of the Federal tax structure lies primarily in the fact that the U.S. Treasury is almost wholly dependent for tax revenue upon the income tax; that a reduction in the steeply progressive income-tax rates, coupled with the substitution of another form of tax to produce some of the revenue now produced by the income tax would be highly desirable.

The reforms proposed in the special message are all income tax reforms. In general, they are devised to produce additional revenue from taxpayers in the middle and upper brackets. The Secretary of the Treasury has urged in substance that the two parts of the program should be adopted together; that the price of tax reduction is the adoption of the reforms, that if the reforms, or some of them, are not adopted, then the tax reduction program must be modified, at the expense of taxpayers in the middle and the upper brackets.

1. Will the administration's tax proposals achieve these objectives? It is unfortunate, however, that the tax package proposed by the administration is not well designed in the judgment of many of us to accomplish the objectives of removing barriers to business growth. The tax reduction and tax reform proposals appear to be contradictory. They contain conflicts both in purposes and ideas which tend to neutralize each other and thus to cancel out the good effects we seek. May I refer specifically to four of these conflicts.

2. The first contradiction is in the economic thrust of the entire program. The tax reductions proposed by themselves would be a constructive reform in our present income tax. The new scale of rates suggested for individuals—14 to 65 percent—represents an across-the-board reduction ranging from about 28 percent at the lowest income bracket to something over 20 percent at the highest and averaging about 23 percent. Such a reduction in rates has long been advocated by all who believe a lower tax burden is imperative.

Moreover, this proposal would be an excellent first step toward a long-range permanent income tax scale. Ultimately the top rate of the individual income tax should be brought down to 50 percent on the principle that a taxpayer's interest in earning a dollar of additional income should at least equal the Government's.

The administration has coupled these rate reductions with a series of revenue-raising measures labeled "tax reforms" which completely transform the proposed tax cuts. The tax liabilities are reduced by 40 percent at the lowest bracket, by 29 percent in the $3,000-to-$5,000 income bracket, and by only 9 percent in the $50,000-and-over bracket. Minimizing tax reductions in the middle and upper income brackets while concentrating the tax relief in the lowest brackets, is justified by the proponents on the theory that what the economy needs is more consumer spending. While the President and Dr. Heller recognize the need to expand investment opportunities, the tax relief proposed is overbalanced in favor of more consumption spending.

Similarly, the proposal to lower the corporation tax is a first step in what I believe should be a most important long-range goal, namely to lower the level of business taxation. Profit margins would be increased and more earnings freed for business expansion. Lowering the corporate tax rate would be a fundamental step toward stimulating larger capital investment and furthering job opportunities and economic growth. But of the total $10 billion reduction in tax liabilities in these proposals, less than one-fourth applies to corporations.

Moreover, the proposed rate reduction is coupled with a proposal to speed up corporation tax payments and 5 years will elapse before corporation tax payments are lower by the full extent of the 5 percentage point tax cut. The 5-percent cut in the corporate rate would still leave the corporation tax substantially higher than in the pre-Korean war years.

Less than a year ago, Secretary Dillon, arguing for the investment credit before the

Senate Finance Committee, said: "Some critics of the investment credit have suggested that we should approach the problem of increasing investment through tax changes by giving first priority to measures designed to add to consumer demand. We cannot be content merely with the level of capital formation that will result from response to increased consumer demand. The American economy now is in much need of modernization of its capital equipment which, in the technological environment of the 1960's, requires an increase in the ratio of capital to output. One of the important means of achieving a higher rate of economic growth lies precisely in increasing this ratio, and a direct approach to investment incentives is needed to accomplish this." Apparently, although the diagnosis remains unchanged, the remedy prescribed has now been reversed and the emphasis placed on increased consumer spending.

This confusion in the economic purposes of the tax program can give investors and businessmen, both large and small, little confidence in the administration's stated intentions to remove the barriers to investment.

3. Structural reforms versus revenue needs: A second conflict of aims is evident in the approach to reform of the tax structure. We can all agree that the tax system needs to be reconstructed in the interests of equity, simplicity, and better balance. The Federal tax structure for many years has placed too great a reliance on the income tax. Further, the system is tremendously and I believe needlessly complex. In recent years, many accusations have been leveled against it on the grounds of equity. Granted that structural reforms are needed, do the administration's proposals represent a good way to go about it? In my judgment, they do not.

Certainly, the proposed change in the taxation of capital gains to include in income a smaller percentage of long-term gains is a step in the right direction since it will serve the main purpose of encouraging investment. The same endorsement can be given to the proposals to limit the surtax exemptions of affiliated corporate groups and at the same time repeal the tax on consolidated returns. Some of the proposed changes in definitions of capital gains are desirable to offset abuses which have arisen in attempts to bring ordinary income under capital gains treatment. Some are not so desirable. For example, I question whether the change in the treatment of timber sales is a move in the right direction. A crop of timber requires many years for development. It is subject to many natural hazards. Congress adopted section 631 in the code after careful study to serve public interests; in this case to tax timber sales in a way which would encourage wise forest management. The provisions seem to have served their purpose well. What assurance do we have that the adoption of the proposed substitute treatment would achieve an equally good result?

The major base broadening and equity provisions, so-called, are not reforms at all but, as the Secretary admitted in his testimony to this committee, merely revenue-raising measures, attempts to recover some of the revenue lost through tax reductions. They strike with particular inequity at the middle and upper income brackets and wash out a substantial part of the tax relief granted by rate reductions.

When the Congress sets out to change the tax structure in the interests of equity and simplicity, it will certainly want to examine each of the deductions in order to arrive at the best possible policy decisions. But the proposed reduction in deductions by an amount equaling 5 percent of the taxpayer's gross income does not attack these deductions as loopholes or inequities; it leaves them in the structure without reference to whether they are good or bad. The so-called 5-percent floor under deductions is proposed simply to produce $2.3 billion of additional revenue by denying in part deductions many of which have been in the income tax law for 50 years and which have long been recognized as fair and reasonable.

Similarly, the proposed tax on gains accrued at time of gift or death is a straightforward revenue-raising measure, involving in this instance a further problem of constitutionality. The proposed repeal of the dividend credit and exclusion moves in exactly the opposite direction from the policy carefully and determined by the Congress to be correct, namely that there should be some relief, however minimal, for the double taxation of dividend income.

The longstanding policy on percentage depletion is not reexamined in terms of whether the percentage allowance is too large or whether the policy is good. Admittedly the percentage depletion provisions have been effective in achieving their objectives over the past 35 years. Nevertheless, the proposal is that the basis for calculating depletion be changed in a way that would restrict severely the very activities that percentage depletion is designed to encourage.

In sum, these structural reforms would steepen the progression of the individual income tax, add a new layer of complex restrictions and requirements on top of existing complexities, free some groups of taxpayers from any tax, and limit tax relief in the middle and higher income brackets. Such measures cannot be termed "reforms" of the tax structure. They work against what should be our objectives for improving the system.

4. The third conflict is between short-term and long-run goals. In presenting his program, the President stressed the need to make long-range tax changes which will get the economy off the plateau on which it has rested for the past 5 years. To this end, he is willing to gamble increased deficits in the next few years to achieve more rapid economic growth and a balanced budget later. But the timing of the program is such that it cannot fully achieve either the stimulating or the capital expansion effects which are claimed for it.

If stimulation of the economy through more consumer spending is desired (and we must remember that only 6 months ago Dr. Heller was preaching the need for an immediate massive tax reduction not tied to any reforms), then what stimulation can we expect from rate reductions for individuals which will total only $2.7 billion in 1963? Will these sufficiently offset the $2 billion increase in social security taxes this year? Will they offset the expected rise of $1.5 billion in State and local taxes this year? Will they offset the rise in State income taxes which will be the natural consequence of changes in the Federal tax base and Federal taxable income next year?

In the case of corporations, the effect of the acceleration of payments is to increase corporate tax payments in fiscal 1964 and fiscal 1965. Not until fiscal 1966 will corporate tax payments decrease and then by only $1 billion, less than 5 percent of corporate tax payments; and not until 1969 will the benefits from the five-point reduction leave $2½ billion with corporations for expansion purposes.

Revenue reasons may dictate that tax reduction of the kind proposed should be spaced out over several years. But there must be some substantial effects immediately if we wish to start the economy moving at a more rapid pace. The result of phasing out the tax changes in this combination program will produce only a very modest increase in consumer purchasing power this year and next. It will produce practically no stimulus to increased savings, to investment incentives and to capital expansion for several years to come.

5. Will this program help balance the budget? Finally a conflict arises in the great gamble that increased deficits for the next few years will generate much larger revenues some years later. Why do we pay taxes at all? The obvious answer is that we pay taxes in order to meet Government expenditures. Tax revenues have not been high enough in recent years to keep up with rapidly increasing spending. Can we hope that the present program will change that situation?

Government expenditures have been rising rapidly year after year. This year's budget is $6.5 billion higher than last year's, and that in turn was $6.3 billion higher than the year before. Now an increase of $4.5 billion is proposed for 1964. The deficits for the 4 fiscal years 1961 to 1964 will total over $30 billion. In each year the requests for new obligational authority have exceeded expenditures. In the 1964 budget, new obligational authority exceeds proposed expenditures by $9 billion. These are built-in increases for future spending.

In addition, the President has sent the Congress a whole series of messages suggesting new programs, all with modest beginnings but requiring heavier outlays in the future. While the President has stated that attempts are being made to hold down nonmilitary spending, what confidence can we have in a future budget balance unless expenditures are brought under better control than heretofore? If the budget continues to rise at the rate that it has in recent years, will even these tax cuts, assuming that they have all the stimulting effects with which the administration endows them, succeed in generating sufficient revenues to catch up with the budget? It seems unlikely.

The only assurance we can have that the increased deficits due to the adoption of this tax program would ever be wiped out, would be a strong effort to bring expenditures under control. A first step would be to hold expenditures at the current year's (1963) level, and preferably at some lower level. This should be coupled with determined and vigorous action to reverse the trend of rising Federal expenditures and establish a stronger relationship between taxing and spending.

Secretary Dillon has argued that without the structural reforms the deficit would be too large. In that case it would be better to discard the reforms and make more modest cuts in taxes. In this connection it is well to observe that even a small change in the opening rate—applicable to 85 percent of all taxable income—would make unnecessary the adoption of the proposed revenue-raising reforms. For example, a scale ranging from 15 percent or 16 percent to 65 percent would produce between $2 and $4 billion more revenue than the 14 percent to 65 percent scale proposed, and would probably be just as effective in increasing investment incentives.

To summarize: There is a great need for a substantial income tax reduction both for individuals and for corporations. In view of the current and prospective deficits, it is probably wise to spread reductions over several years and accompany them by substantial cuts in expenditures. The goals sought by the President are important and ones which we can all endorse. We regret that it is unlikely that the tax package proposed by the administration will achieve these goals because it is a mixture of contradictory and often conflicting recommendations. The economic goal seems to be a stimulus to consumption spending whereas the need is to encourage greater investment. The program is a mixture of reductions and reforms, but the latter are principally revenue-raising measures which erode the purpose of free investment capital and would not improve the structure of the income tax. The timing of the proposals is a conflict between short- and long-term aims, with insufficient emphasis on what should be the primary goal, greater productivity and more jobs. Finally, the deliberate choice of larger deficits for the next few years is too risky when not coupled with better restraint and control over spending. It does not instill confidence that budget balance will result within the foreseeable future.

6. What kind of a program is needed?

I am convinced that major and permanent tax cuts at this time would be desirable. Several elements in the President's program move taxes in directions which in my opinion are sound. Others are not geared to the main goal of stepping up the flow of venture capital to productive enterprise.

The President has urged his critics to submit recommendations of their own. My recommendation to this committee is that it modify the President's program along the following lines:

(a) Substantial rate reductions should be made in the individual income tax. It would be a good idea to spread these over several years.

(b) To moderate the revenue loss in individual rate reductions, the opening rate on the new scale might be set at 16 percent instead of 14 percent. This one step would eliminate the need for revenue-raising reforms and keep the total tax reduction within the level set by the President.

(c) The corporation tax rate needs to be lowered quickly, if the reduction is to have the desired effects. The simplest way to do this is to permit the Korean rate increase on corporations from 47 percent to 52 percent to expire on June 30 as scheduled.

(b) Structural reforms need not be undertaken in this bill but should be treated in a separate measure. In any case, only true reforms that would improve the structure should be considered, and not revenue-raising measures such as the reduction of allowable deductions by 5 percent of gross income, the repeal of the dividend credit, and the proposed new levy on unrealized capital gains, levied at death or transfer by gift.

(e) For the long run, we should work toward a top rate on the individual income tax of 50 percent. Similarly, for the long run, a much lower level of taxation of business would be desirable. To make this possible, the Congress should consider alternate business or transaction taxes in the future to provide substitute revenues and relieve the burden of taxation on profits.

(f) Finally, Federal expenditures should be rigorously held at least to the fiscal 1963 level, preferably to a lower level so as to insure that the budget will actually reach a balance in the near future when the good effects of the tax reduction program begin to appear.

These tax changes would have the virtue of concentrating on the primary goal, to step up business and jobs. They should be accompanied by expenditure reductions and controls to minimize the risks of inflation and a further weakening of the dollar which a continued series of unbalanced budgets might otherwise entail. Such a program of expenditure control and tax reduction would have a strong stimulative effect on investment incentives and on corporate expansion programs. Tax burdens on individuals would be lowered substantially to encourage more consumer spending. The program would considerably lighten the tax burden on the vast majority of taxpayers in the lower income brackets. Further it would insure the accumulation of savings to permit greater investment, business growth, and more jobs.

We are in reasonable agreement with the administration on the aims and purposes of tax rate reduction. Our disagreement centers on the question whether the so-called reforms proposed by the President and the Secretary will not defeat the main purposes on which we are agreed. In such a case, the part of wisdom would seem to be to push forward on the tax rate reduction program, to give the economy needed stimulation; and to subject the so-called reforms to further study.

The Nation simply cannot afford the archaic tax system that now saddles its people and its productive facilities. This committee's task is a formidable one, but I hope it will be able to seize this great opportunity for fundamental change and make a lasting contribution to America's future strength.

IDAHO TERRITORIAL CENTENNIAL

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Idaho.

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, Idahoans today celebrate their State's territorial centennial. The establishment of the Idaho Territory on March 4, 1863, came during tumultuous times, for our Nation was still in the midst of civil conflict.

The name "Idaho" is a derivation of the Indian word, "Ee-da-how," which means "Light on the Mountain." The country was first seen by white men when Lewis and Clark crossed the Continental Divide from what is now Montana and came down the Clearwater River through north-central Idaho. This identical historic route can now be traveled on the new Lewis and Clark Highway which crosses the midsection of the State through the Bitteroot Mountain Range to Lewiston.

Fur trappers and traders followed in the early 1800's. Many of the names of lakes, streams, and towns reflect the influence of early French-Canadian trappers and missionaries.

Gold, first discovered at Pierce, Idaho, in the fall of 1860, brought the next influx of white men. The discovery of this important metal greatly influenced the creation of the Idaho Territory when it became apparent that the stampede for gold would sufficiently change the distribution of population and threaten the control of the Washington Territorial legislature.

Idaho's central primitive area, penetrated by the Salmon River and its tributaries, remains today as formidable as it was when Lewis and Clark skirted its vertical canyons on their way west. The explorers heeded the Indians advice against attempting to navigate the Salmon, known as the River of No Return. The mighty Snake River, another important waterway, has carved the deepest gorge in North America, which you well know as Hells Canyon.

Throughout the year, Idahoans will celebrate this momentous occasion in the State's history. Displays, pageants, balls, and other programs will remind the people of their rich heritage. At Caldwell, Idaho, for instance, the citizens are planning to run a stagecoach from that progressive city to what remains of the once flourishing mining town of Silver City. Last Saturday at Boise, Idaho's colors of blue, silver, and gold were used for the centennial ball sponsored by the Sons and Daughters of Idaho Pioneers. In our State capitol, a group of Idaho oldtime fiddlers serenaded the legislators with an old-fashioned hoedown.

Events such as these will be presented in many fashions in communities, both large and small, throughout the Gem State. I wish to extend a cordial invitation to my fellow colleagues here in the U.S. House of Representatives to visit Idaho in 1963 and become a part of our territorial centennial celebration.

IDAHO TERRITORIAL CENTENNIAL

Mr. HARDING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Idaho?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARDING. Mr. Speaker, March 3 marks an important date in Idaho history books. It was on March 3 exactly 100 years ago that President Abraham Lincoln approved the Organic Act to establish and govern the Idaho Territory.

The act created a princely domain covering 325,000 square miles which was carved out of the Washington, Dakota, and Nebraska territories. It encompassed the area now approximately occupied by Idaho, Montana, and Wyoming and exceeded in area the present State of Texas by over 60,000 square miles.

The name, Idaho which freely translated means "Gem of the Mountains" or literally translated, "Behold, the sun coming down the mountain," was selected in preference to all other suggested names by U.S. Senator Henry Wilson of Massachusetts, who later became the Vice President of this great Nation.

During the past hundred years Idaho has had an illustrious and fascinating history. Today it is the home of the world famous Idaho potato but produces equally as good beef cattle, wheat, and many other products of the soil.

Idaho primarily is an agricultural State, on the threshold of industrial development and is a sportsman's paradise. The State has a great number of beautiful crystal clear streams and rivers which are well known the world over as outstanding fishing haunts, including Silver Creek. This creek has been described as the best fly fishing stream in America. Then there is the Salmon River which produces great numbers of salmon and steelhead to the fresh water angler annually and the Snake River which is famous as a trout stream throughout the West.

In addition, the lakes of northern Idaho are famous for their large trout. The State also has some of the finest hunting grounds in the continental United States with elk, moose, mountain sheep and goats, bear, and deer among the wild game that is hunted in the mountains of Idaho.

The snows of the fall turn a hiker's paradise into beautiful ski slopes with probably Sun Valley the best known of the ski areas in the State and the Nation as well.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to represent this great State that has so many natural beauties—the majestic mountains, crystal clear streams, wild game, fighting fish—and some of the finest people found anywhere in the world. Most of them are the descendants of pioneers who helped to carve the State from the territory that was created 100 years ago. As a result of their pioneering heritage, they retain their independence, their self-reliance and their friendliness.

I am sure that Americans everywhere would enjoy spending a few weeks in Idaho, but this year when all Idaho will be celebrating its territorial centennial there will be a special welcome to all visitors. I join with Idahoans everywhere in saying, "Come to Idaho, the Gem of the Mountains, partake of our hunting and fishing, our hospitality and help us celebrate our territorial centennial."

U.N. AIR OPERATIONS TRAINING FOR CUBA

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, our colleagues, are well acquainted with the term "pilot" project. We seem to be getting news of a good many pilot projects these days.

The Kennedy's Federal service corps for youth is a going thing under a pilot organization without any congressional authorization.

Many spending proposals are squeezed through this Congress as small experimental or pilot plans, only to balloon to gigantic proportions in later years.

And the United Nations is active in pilot projects, also. A number of these are in Communist nations both under and outside of the much-lamented Special Fund.

It is a United Nations pilot project in a Red nation which brings me before the House today.

An airplane pilot project.

Gentlemen, it is with deep regret and dismay that I inform the House that the taxpayers of America, through their subsidization of the United Nations, are scheduled to pay to teach Communist Cubans to learn to fly airplanes. Indeed, we already have paid, so that Cubans and Yugoslavs could learn about aircraft operations and maintenance.

In a small project, probably designed to get a U.N. boot in the door, the United Nations through its International Civil Aviation Organization has programed a $17,280 grant to Castro Cuba that not only could send 12 Cuban officials to flying school, but also could instruct them in meteorology, air traffic control, and maintenance of radios, aircraft, and engines.

Just as in its plan to give agricultural aid to Cuba, the United Nations once again is working in direct opposition to whatever foreign policy we should have in the United States, and against the best interests of the Latin American Republics. Yet, it is only with the continued massive financial support of the American taxpayers that the United Nations is able to remain solvent. Here again is that 40 percent we contribute to the Special Fund.

Under the proposed U.N. project the Cuban officials would be trained at the Mexico City Training Center of the International Civil Aviation Organization. That school—which came under Special Fund support in July 1961—trained some 300 students from Latin America in the 1961-62 period.

It teaches meteorology, air traffic control, radio, aircraft and engine maintenance, and flight operations. The aircraft used in training are the Piper Apache, Cessna 172, DC-3 and Hiller helicopter.

May I point out to this House that as a member of the Committee on Armed Services, I am well aware of the uses of these aircraft in military operations, and it matters not to their military effectiveness whether the pilots and mechanics and air controllers were trained on planes configured for civilian operations. The Piper, Cessna and Hiller models are light aircraft that can be used for battlefield transport, for observation and for artillery fire direction, as our advisers in South Vietnam have so well provéd. The old-faithful DC-3, of course, can and has done dozens of military jobs in past years including cargo and troop transport operations and the dropping of paratroops.

Need I point out to this House that just a few weeks ago two airplanes from Cuba fired upon an unarmed American shrimp boat?

Can there be any question but that training of Castro Cubans in flying operations does benefit Cuba in a military sense?

Who will say that a Cuban trained in air traffic control, in interpretation and prediction of the weather, in aircraft engine repair, or in radio maintenance will not be a valuable addition as a trooper and as an instructor in Fidel Castro's Red armed force, which if it never attacks the United States is already—today—attacking in a bits-and-pieces assault, the nations of Latin America?

The United Nations has seen fit to help Castro do this.

The Latin American nations have not yet protested, perhaps due to our faulting leadership.

The American taxpayers are to help pay for it.

Mr. Speaker, this cannot be allowed to continue. This still is a small program. But the principle is intolerable to Americans. We will not, we must not, pay to train our enemies.

In the period 1961-62 this same program was operated on a smaller scale by the United Nations. Training of six Cubans was programed at that time. Luckily for the United States only a small portion of the granted money was spent, and the U.S. State Department feels that few, if any, Cubans already have benefited from the program.

But we may not be so lucky in the 1963-64 period. Castro is not stupid enough to turn down a chance to train key young men in aircraft techniques that lend themselves well to his guerrilla operations in Latin America—and all for free.

The U.S.S.R., as we know, runs Cuba. Russia must be getting a big kick out of the things communism is getting Americans to pay for, under the United Nations.

I also find that Communist Yugoslavia—which seems to get continuing preferential treatment from the U.N., and from our own State Department, was provided under the ICAO program in 1961-62 three aircraft maintenance instructors and one pilot instructor.

What these U.N. instructors did in Yugoslavia is revealed by this quotation from the 1962 annual report of the ICAO to the U.N. General Assembly:

> They spent 2 months in Yugoslavia early in the year to assist in setting up maintenance procedures for the aircraft of Soviet manufacture operated by the national airline and in the selection of personnel to undergo further rtaining in the U.S.S.R. * * *"

Now, I ask my colleagues, does that sound like the State Department's goal—wooing Yugoslavia away from Russian communism—is being served by this "second foreign policy" of ours administered by the United Nations?

It seems decidedly not.

And once again the name of Ghana crops up as that leftist leaning nation comes in for more U.N. aid at the expense of American taxpayers. That nation received in 1961 two air traffic service experts from ICAO. Ghana also was favored with helpers from the U.N. in the fields of "airworthiness procedures," and teletype maintenance.

Yugoslavia also came in for additional aid in the form of fellowships that enable students to train in civil air law, meteorology, airport engineering, radar, airworthiness, airport design, airline accounting, airport management, civil aviation administration, radio engineering and telecommunications. Some of this training by the U.N. was conducted in the Soviet Union.

Mr. Speaker, American taxpayers do not object to the general goals of the International Civil Aviation Organization. We are glad to help our sister republics in this hemisphere in development of air technicians—to the extent that our deficit budget will permit.

But this hemisphere has isolated Cuba.

Cuba has admitted an ideology alien to this free hemisphere.

American taxpayers are under no obligation to help the bearded and loudmouthed Cuban dictator and his boss from the U.S.S.R. who keeps reminding us that the Communist aim is to bury us.

Many of the Members of this House have risen here to attack the Special Fund of the United Nations. Now we must turn our vigilance to the entire United Nations program. For this "pilot" project in Cuba is partly under the Special Fund and partly under the United Nations' Expanded Program of Technical Assistance.

Unfortunately, this is not the only case of United Nations aid to Red Cuba. My

continuing investigation of this sorry situation has brought to light other instances of aid about which I will advise the House as final documentation of the programs is gathered.

Distribution of ICAO expenditures under the expanded program by regions and states

[In U.S. dollars]

	1961	1960	1959
Africa:			
Congo	8,000		
Ethiopia	98,336	106,379	84,103
Ghana	1,973		
Guinea	3,608	14,847	9,125
Liberia	11,865	2,841	
Mali	6,942		
Morocco	21,272	23,357	6,432
Senegal	11,200		
Sudan			7
Tanganyika	3,980		
Togo	19,863		
Tunisia	22,464	24,734	36,451
Subtotal	209,503	172,158	136,118
Asia and the Far East:			
Burma	2,350	1,900	11,095
Cambodia	16,181	19,740	18,550
China (Taiwan)			9,111
India	36,960	27,176	52,087
Indonesia	120,266	111,629	115,020
Japan	3,534	8,546	7,564
Korea, Republic of		4,600	9,705
Nepal	9,143		
Pakistan		2,049	22,014
Philippines	19,118	37,637	49,271
Thailand		43,607	32,870
Subtotal	207,552	256,884	327,287
Europe:			
Greece		25,998	44,961
Yugoslavia	11,065	15,221	4,600
Subtotal	11,065	41,219	49,561
Latin America:			
Argentina	16,831	16,867	16,387
Bolivia	15,049	9,428	4,476
Brazil	4,000		
British Honduras	342	2,220	2,382
Chile	20,092	6,392	
Colombia		7,200	7,732
Costa Rica	18,108	600	4,800
Cuba	1,152	3,250	5,038
Dominican Republic			1,200
Ecuador	15,107	13,115	16,237
El Salvador	17,009	15,586	10,851
Guatemala	30,151	41,689	48,936
Haiti	17,512	12,399	
Honduras	28,239	3,517	6,302
Nicaragua	360	3,000	2,972
Panama	6,653		5,600
Paraguay	33,776	31,974	38,115
Peru	41,912	36,967	34,154
Venezuela	3,581	13,907	7,858
West Indies Federation	1,604		
Central America Air Navigation Services Corp	5,615	20,599	11,999
Regional Latin America (Training Centre, Mexico City)	60,426	90,471	73,894
Subtotal	337,519	329,181	298,933
Middle East:			
Afghanistan	102,006	65,600	87,672
Iran	111,718	117,448	118,998
Iraq	64,498	52,171	32,207
Israel	2,228	14,734	34,743
Jordan	34,887	25,871	3,121
Lebanon	56,211	48,849	75,308
Saudi Arabia	47,461	19,724	13,012
Syrian Arab Republic	50,159	49,722	48,663
United Arab Republic	38,476	47,376	48,864
Seminars on Forecasting	35,346		
Regional projects:			
Firefighting	14,645		
Flight safety	43,945	28,520	43,422
Frequency	26,522	9,724	16,181
Teletype maintenance	21,649	8,007	
Subtotal	649,751	487,746	522,191
Total for projects	1,415,390	1,287,188	1,334,090
Administrative costs	197,535	184,122	179,064
Exchange losses		12,447	15,583
Grand total	1,612,925	1,483,757	1,528,737

SIXTY-FIRST ANNUAL CONVENTION OF THE AMERICAN ROADBUILDERS' CONVENTION

Mr. McLOSKEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. McLOSKEY. Mr. Speaker, during the last week in February the American Roadbuilders' Association held its 61st annual convention at the Palmer House Hotel in Chicago, Ill. One of the main speakers at the convention was the Honorable WILLIAM C. CRAMER, who is the ranking minority member of both the Subcommittee on Roads and the Special Subcommittee on the Federal-Aid Highway Program.

Congressman CRAMER's remarks were informative and challenging, and I was particularly interested in his comments concerning toll traps on the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways. I am informed that at the present time the Illinois State Toll Highway Commission is seeking to direct Interstate Route 80 through collection gates on 8 miles of toll road near Chicago.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include here the full text of Congressman CRAMER's speech for the benefit of my colleagues who share my interest in the Federal-aid highway program.

The speech follows:

REMARKS OF THE HONORABLE WILLIAM C. CRAMER AT THE ANNUAL MEETING OF THE AMERICAN ROAD BUILDERS' ASSOCIATION AT CHICAGO, ILL.

Two years ago, at the beginning of the 87th Congress, the problems confronting the highway program were grave, difficult, and, in some cases, highly controversial. The problems were largely financial. It had become obvious that the receipts of the highway trust fund would not be sufficient to continue the Federal-aid highway program on an orderly basis under existing and anticipated authorizations. Furthermore, the latest estimates of the cost of completing the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways made it clear that additional Federal funds would have to be provided in order to complete the Interstate System as originally planned.

In a fine display of bipartisan effort, which has become traditional in Federal-aid highway legislation, the 87th Congress enacted the Federal-Aid Highway Acts of 1961 and 1962, which provided solutions to most of the financial problems, continued the highway program on an orderly basis, and added certain modifications and revisions to the Federal-aid highway laws.

Fortunately, the 88th Congress is not confronted with these difficult and controversial financial problems. It is still too early in the first session of this Congress to make a detailed analysis of the proposed legislation which will be considered. But it is a certainty that many bills affecting the Federal-aid highway program will be introduced, considered, and possibly enacted by the 88th Congress.

Today, I want to discuss three matters which certainly will be considered by the 88th Congress and which I believe are of the greatest importance. First, the geometric standards for the construction of interstate highways. Second, the extent to which toll roads—toll traps—are being inserted into the supposedly toll-free Interstate Highway System. Third, the occurence of fraud, dishonesty, and incompetence in the highway program.

When the Interstate Highway program was started in 1956, we visualized a complete nationwide system of highways, adequate to accommodate the traffic anticipated for years in the future. Too often, in the past, had highways become congested and overloaded shortly after their construction simply because the volume of traffic which would use the highway had been badly underestimated. Determined to avoid this, the Congress required that the Interstate System be constructed to standards adequate to accommodate the types and volumes of traffic forecast for the year 1975. At the time this provision of law was enacted, in 1956, it seemed that this 19-year anticipated use period was a reasonable, perhaps even a generous provision.

However, the Bureau of Public Roads has interpreted this as a limiting factor on the design of interstate highways. The law has been interpreted to mean that interstate funds can be expended to build a highway which will accommodate traffic forecast for 1975, but cannot be expended for additional lanes and other facilities to handle the additional traffic which is expected to develop in later years. In other words, the traffic volume forecast in 1963 for 1975, a spread of 12 years, is used for interstate highway design purposes, even though it may be known that the traffic which will develop by 1980, a spread of 17 years, will require a larger facility.

It is generally accepted that fairly accurate traffic forecasts can be made for approximately 20 years in the future. Such forecasts are frequently used as the basis for designing primary and secondary highways. However, on interstate highways, the design is based on traffic forecasts for the year 1975—now only 12 years away. The Interstate and Defense Highway System, which was supposed to be of unquestioned adequacy, is being designed on the basis of less advanced traffic forecasts than many of our less important highways.

This can lead to very undesirable and uneconomical results. Suppose that traffic forecasts as of 1963 indicate that a four-lane highway will handle the traffic anticipated for 1975, but that a six-lane highway will be needed by 1980. Obviously, the economical thing to do is to build four lanes now, but make provision for two additional lanes in the future. Rights of way adequate to accommodate six lanes should be purchased. Interchanges, bridges and separation structures, and drainage facilities should be constructed to six lanes, or so designed and constructed that they can be easily and economically widened in the future.

However, as the present law has been interpreted, Federal-aid interstate highway funds cannot be used to provide for these future needs. And, in many cases, the States lack the necessary funds to pay the additional cost. The result is that some interstate highways may be built with the knowledge that within a very short time expensive and uneconomical projects will have to be undertaken to expand the facility and the adequacy of the project for future use is limited to 12 years, a period that decreases as each year passes between now and 1975.

This problem was not critical in 1956. At the present time, 1963, it has become quite critical. And as time goes on, it will be more and more serious. As the law is now interpreted, in 1972 interstate highways will be designed to accommodate traffic forecast for only 3 years in the future.

It seems obvious that something should be done to solve this problem but quite frankly, I am not sure just what the solution is. One proposed answer is to simply change the law to require interstate highways to be designed to accommodate traffic forecast for 20 years after the date of construction. However, this deceptively simple solution has some very troublesome aspects. Many miles of Interstate highways have been already built to 1975 standards, and most of this mileage is in States which have advanced the program most diligently. To amend the law now so as to permit the construction of interstate highways to higher standards would be to penalize the more advanced States, and give inequitable benefits to those States which have lagged. Providing additional funds to assist the advanced States to improve the earlier interstate highways would create difficult financial problems.

Whatever may be the best solution, it is essential that the Congress take early action. We are now only 10 years away from the end of the program, and every day that goes by makes the problem more serious.

Secondly, since 1921, Federal law has required that all highways constructed with the aid of Federal funds be free of tolls of all kinds with certain exceptions in the case of toll bridges and tunnels. The Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1956, which provided for construction of the Interstate System with Federal funds paying 90 percent of its cost, authorized the Secretary of Commerce to approve, as part of the Interstate System, toll roads which meet the geometric and construction standards adopted for that system. This provision was designed to avoid the economic waste that could result if toll-free highways were constructed to duplicate the service provided by toll roads. I believe this provision has been distorted and abused.

Since 1956, more than 2,200 miles of toll roads in 17 States have been approved as parts of the Interstate System. Some other States are even now constructing or contemplating the construction of additional toll road sections of the Interstate System, which were not planned as toll roads in 1956.

In my opinion, the legislative history indicates that the Congress intended the provisions of the 1956 act to apply only to toll roads then in operation, under construction or authorized, and not to authorize the future substitution of newly conceived toll roads for toll free highways on the Interstate System. The unrestrained placing of unjustified toll traps on the Interstate System is not, in my opinion, either in the public interest nor in accord with the intent of the Congress.

Let us examine the effects of inserting toll sections into the generally toll-free Interstate System.

I mentioned that more than 2,200 miles of toll roads have been approved as part of the Interstate System, most of them planned or in existence when the 1956 act was passed. This is a little more than 5 percent of the total 41,000 mile system. However, these 2,200 miles obviously have been placed in the most heavily traveled traffic corridors, and thus affect a much greater percentage of Interstate System traffic. And, although Federal funds do not participate in the cost of constructing toll roads, Federal funds do participate in the cost of constructing the highways which funnel interstate highway traffic into these facilities, and when this is the planned purpose, they become toll traps.

Now, we are concerned with future toll traps. Now the costs of toll road travel to the individual motorist becomes relevant in considering these new toll traps. Obviously, he must pay twice: once in highway user taxes, and once in tolls. But what does this mean in cold, hard dollars? The Bureau of Public Roads has calculated that the cost per mile of operating a fairly typical 4-door sedan is about 10 cents per mile, of which State and Federal highway user taxes comprise about 1.17 cents. These taxes are paid whether the motorist is traveling on a toll road or a toll-free highway. Toll charges on the major toll roads range from about 1.09 cents per mile on the Pennsylvania East-West Turnpike, to 2.25 cents per mile on the West Virginia Turnpike. The latter, incidentally, is scheduled for future integration into the Interstate System. For the average motorist driving, let's say, 100 miles, these figures mean this: On a toll-free highway, the motorist will pay $1.17 in highway user taxes. On the Pennsylvania East-West Turnpike he will pay the same $1.17 plus $1.09 in tolls—a total of $2.26 for the same distance. On the West Virginia Turnpike he will pay $1.17 in highway user taxes plus $2.25 in tolls, or a total of $3.42, or nearly three times as much as on a toll-free highway, for a 100-mile trip.

Let us view this from a different standpoint. As you know, the Federal tax on gasoline is 4 cents per gallon, while the average State tax is about 6 cents per gallon—a total of roughly 10 cents per gallon. The toll charge on the Pennsylvania East-West Turnpike, the lowest on any major toll road in the country, is equivalent to an additional gasoline tax of approximately 16 cents per gallon, computed on the basis of a typical passenger car traveling 15 miles per gallon of gasoline. On the West Virginia Turnpike, to be integrated into the interstate system after juggling the interstate routes to accomplish this, the toll charge is equivalent to an additional gasoline tax of about 33.7 cents per gallon for the same type of vehicle.

Now, how about the relevant comparative cost of constructing toll roads as compared to free roads. Ordinarily toll facilities are financed through the issuance of revenue bonds. Of all methods of financing highway construction, revenue bonds for toll facilities are the most expensive. The Chesapeake Bay bridge-tunnel facility near Norfolk, Va., will cost about $139 million to build. But the users of this toll facility will have to pay an added $345 million in interest and financing costs—a total of $484 million for a facility which will be constructed for less than one-third that amount. In my own State of Florida, a proposed extension of the Sunshine State Parkway will cost $76.4 million to build. But financing costs bring the total bill to $169.5 million.

I fail to see any real justification for assuming such exorbitant additional costs for toll traps that could be financed as free roads on the Interstate System, after all, in 1960, the States certified to the Congress that they could finish the system as free roads if Congress provided the money—which Congress did. Federal funds are thus available to pay 90 percent of the cost of toll-free Interstate Highways.

It has been stated by some as a justification for toll traps that Federal funds are not apportioned rapidly enough to permit the early construction of badly needed Interstate Highway facilities, and in order to provide a highway now rather than several years in the future, toll revenue financing is necessary. This is not very convincing. Many States, faced with a shortage of highway funds, have constructed toll-free highways with the proceeds of general obligation anticipation of revenue bonds at a much lower cost than would have resulted from revenue-bond-financed toll roads. This anticipated financing is provided for under section 122 of title 23 of the U.S. Code. These bonds are paid for out of future funds due and anticipated. The Bureau of Public Roads has published figures concerning the bond financing programs of five States which issued both revenue bonds and general or limited obligation bonds for highway purposes. These figures show that savings of from 65 to 78 percent of financing costs were realized when general or limited obligation bonds were issued rather than revenue bonds.

Perhaps even more important than cost to the public and to the individual motorist is the effect of toll roads on the construction of other highways in the area. Highway officials are reluctant to construct highways which might divert traffic from a toll road and thus reduce its revenues and often overemphasize feeder roads serving toll roads, giving them priority treatment and neglecting other needed highways. The Bureau of Public Roads has adopted the official policy that it will not permit Federal-aid interstate funds to participate in the construction of a highway which will compete with and thus jeopardize the financial security of a toll road.

In my own State of Florida, the State road department has agreed to defer needed highway improvements even in the Cape Canaveral area in order to channel traffic into the Sunshine State Parkway. It announced that its official policy was to construct and improve all roads in the State:

"Except when the construction of any competing highway, or the improvement of any existing highway paralleling any portion of the existing parkway or of the aforesaid extension, in the same traffic corridor, would reduce the driving time or improve the convenience to such an extent that through traffic which might otherwise use the parkway or the aforesaid extension would be substantially diverted therefrom."

One additional aspect of this matter must be mentioned. Federal funds cannot participate in the cost of toll roads. However, they can and are used in the cost of constructing highways which funnel traffic into toll roads. This has led to the insertion of far too many toll traps into our supposedly toll-free Federal-aid Interstate Highway System. For just one example, the New England section of the New York State Thruway is 11.5 miles long, and the southerly 2.6 miles and northerly 5.3 miles were constructed with Federal-aid funds. The middle section, 3.6 miles long, was financed with other funds, and a tollgate is on this section. It is said that Federal participation in the northerly and southerly sections of this facility was legal, because the tollgate can be bypassed by use of local roads. However, to a motorist not familiar with the area, the New England section of the New York State Thruway is a single 11.5-mile facility, he travels its entire length and pays a toll—despite the fact that more than two-thirds of the length of the highway was financed with Federal-aid funds, and highways financed with Federal-aid funds are supposed to be free of tolls of all kinds.

In my opinion, this purposeful insertion of new toll traps not planned by 1956 is a distortion of the plain meaning of the 1956 law, and was not the intent of the Congress. I have introduced a bill (H.R. 3494) which would prohibit future toll facility construction on the Interstate System unless there is an affirmative finding by the Secretary of Commerce that it is in the public interest to build a toll rather than toll-free facility and to make this decision subject to congressional review. I feel strongly that this is important and urgently needed legislation, and intend to press for early congressional action.

Lastly, some comments on the distasteful subject of fraud, dishonesty and incompetence in the highway program. I assume that you are familiar with the shocking disclosures which have been made by the Special Subcommittee on the Federal-Aid Highway Program, of which I am the ranking minority member.

So far the subcommittee has held public hearings with respect to practices in five States: Oklahoma, Florida, New Mexico, Massachusetts, and West Virginia. It was found that certain serious deficiencies and irregularities existed or had occurred in all of these States.

The findings, which were established by conclusive proof, included examples of these: Deplorable failure to meet construction specifications; little or no testing, inspections, or supervision; actual falsification of test reports and samples; conflicts of interest on the part of highway department officials; payments of cash and other things of value by highway contractors to State employees who were responsible for inspecting and supervising the contractors' work; improvements on rights-of-way which had been purchased with public funds and had to be removed to permit highway construction being turned over to contractors, who sold them at huge windfall profits; payments of greatly excessive amounts for highway rights-of-way through pure incompetency of appraisers; and criminal conspiracy between State employees, appraisers, and attorneys resulting in payment of clearly inflated prices for right-of-way and sizable illicit profits by the conspirators.

We don't like to admit that these things occur. We have confidence in our highway program and highway officials, and most of us are proud of the part we may have played in building the finest highway system in the world. We comfort ourselves with the belief and knowledge that irregularities and dishonesty occur in only a small percentage of the cases, and that the vast majority of people involved in the highway program are honest, competent, dedicated persons. Even though this is true, and I am convinced that it is true, the fact remains that dishonesty and incompetency do exist and cannot be condoned or tolerated.

Every person involved in the highway program—highway officials, contractors, material suppliers, engineers, attorneys, appraisers, and the rest—must not only be personally honest, but must do everything possible to assure that his associates are doing their job honestly and properly. I am afraid that in too many places it is being said, "The irregularities disclosed in those other States are shameful—but can't happen here." But the fact of the matter is that it can and very possibly has happened here.

A friend of mine put his finger on the problem, I think, when he observed, "It's hard to be suspicious of a friend." It is hard to be suspicious of people that you have known, liked and worked with for a long time. But the cases of dishonesty and incompetency revealed in congressional hearings occurred largely because honest, competent people assumed that everybody else was equally honest and competent, and therefore did not review the work of their subordinates or associates carefully or critically. They accepted everything at face value, and thus created the opportunity for fraud.

I am not suggesting that we establish a spy system, where nobody trusts anybody. I am saying that we should not take everything for granted. We should not blindly accept a statement or certification that a job has been done. We must make some inquiry or examination to assure that the job has actually been done and done properly. This is the only way that we can minimize the opportunity for fraud and incompetency, and have some assurance that dishonesty will be promptly detected and punished.

All of us know that much has been done already to tighten procedures and minimize the opportunity for fraud. But it is not sufficient that we simply take action in that direction and stop. We must make the public aware of the fact that such action has been taken, and that the program, fairly clean in the past, will be more so in the future.

I have heard it said many times that the banking industry is not threatened or attacked simply because a cashier embezzles money or a bank official absconds with the day's deposits. I think that this is true because the American public is satisfied that the banking industry has established proper safeguards, and that thievery occurs in only rare, isolated instances. In other words, the banking industry has convinced the people that it has done everything it can to protect its patrons.

The highway people must do the same. We complain that frauds make the headlines, while accomplishments are never considered newsworthy. Unfortunately, this seems to be one of the facts of life, and there is not much we can do about it. However, if we can convince the public that we have taken vigorous, affirmative action to eliminate fraud and incompetency, and are doing everything humanly possible to protect public funds, I believe the black headlines will be viewed with proper perspective. The public will be satisfied that cases of fraud and incompetency are the rare exception rather than the rule in the highway program.

It was partially for this reason that last session of Congress, and again this session, I introduced a bill (H.R. 2557) to strengthen and revise the Federal criminal laws relating to the Federal-aid highway program.

Briefly speaking, my bill would do the following:

1. It would prohibit donations to political parties or political candidates by individuals or firms contracting with the States on Federal-aid highway projects. Existing Federal law, enacted in 1940, contains such a prohibition with respect to Federal contracts. My bill would simply extend this to Federal-aid highway contracts which are generally State rather than Federal contracts, although Federal funds may bear from 50 to 95 percent of their cost.

2. My bill would prohibit reprehensible practices which we know have occurred with disturbing frequency: the practice of highway contractors giving money and other things of value to the highway department personnel responsible for inspecting or supervising the contractors' work, and the directly related practice of performing work or furnishing materials and equipment, or permitting the performance of work or furnishing materials or equipment other than as provided in the contract or applicable plans and specifications.

3. The bill contains provisions directed toward conflicts of interest. It would prohibit persons performing services for the highway departments (including highway department employees) from having a financial or other personal interest in Federal-aid highway contracts with respect to which they have performed such services. It would also require such persons to publicly disclose any interest they might have in any real property required for Federal-aid highway projects on which they worked or had an official responsibility.

4. The bill would revise and strengthen the existing law having to do with false statements and certifications concerning Federal-aid highway projects, by extending its terms to cover real property transactions.

The need for enactment of legislation covering these matters has become obvious, and I intend to press for early congressional action.

[From the Chicago (Ill.) Tribune, Feb. 27, 1963]

CONGRESSMAN OPPOSES TOLL ROAD ADDITION

CRAMER CITES BURDEN ON MOTORISTS

(By Hal Foust)

Additions to the Nation's tollways, such as those planned in Illinois, were denounced yesterday by Representative WILLIAM C. CRAMER, Republican, of Florida, ranking minority member of the congressional Subcommittee on Roads.

In a speech before the American Road Builders Association Convention in the Palmer House, CRAMER declared that it was the intention of Congress in its 1956 enactment of the 41,000-mile interstate program to incorporate the then existing 2,200 miles of tollways but not to accept any further mileage.

SEEK LEGISLATIVE AID

The Illinois Toll Commission is seeking legislative aid to extend its East-West route 95 miles from Aurora to Fulton at a cost of $105 million. The commission also is seeking to put the Hammond-Rock Island (I–80) expressway, a quarter-of-a-billion-dollar freeway, through its collection gates on 8 miles of tollway in southern Cook County.

"The cost of travel to the individual motorist is relevant in considering new toll traps," CRAMER said. "The Federal Bureau of Public Roads estimates that the cost per mile for a typical family car is 10 cents, including 1.17 cents in Federal and State license fees and gasoline excises. These taxes apply whether the travel is on a toll road or a free road.

"Toll charges range from 1.09 cents per mile on the Pennsylvania Turnpike to 2.25 cents on the West Virginia Turnpike. In Pennsylvania, on the cheapest tollway in America, the motorist is paying the equivalent of an additional 16 cents a gallon. In West Virginia, the toll is the equivalent of an additional 33.7 cents a gallon."

BONDS MOST EXPENSIVE

On the Tri-State tollway bypassing Chicago, the toll is $1.80 for 77 miles, which is the equivalent of an additional 35 cents a gallon tax for a car making 15 miles per gallon.

"Of all methods of financing highway construction," the Congressman continued, "revenue bonds for toll construction are the most expensive.

"The Illinois Toll Commission expects to collect $1.7 billion revenue from its users before the retirement of the $441 million in revenue bonds used to build the existing 187-mile system."

AFFECTS OTHER ROADS

"Perhaps even more important than cost to the public and to the individual motorist," CRAMER said, "is the effect of toll roads on construction of other highways in the area. Highway officials are reluctant to build freeways that will take traffic from tollways."

This reluctance on the part of Indiana is perpetuating a gap of 30 miles near Michigan City in the otherwise completed Chicago-Detroit freeway.

When Illinois adopted its tollway program, plans were postponed or canceled for modernizing Skokie Road as a freeway; an interstate route from Chicago through the Fox Lake and Lake Geneva region was killed; and a belt route around Chicago was removed from the Federal program.

COMMUNIST MILITARY PENETRATION OF THIS HEMISPHERE

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Hampshire?

There was no objection.

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am one of those Republicans who remain convinced that our resolution to deal firmly with Communist military penetration of this hemisphere is not and must not be based on political considerations. The great majority of Americans are for running Communists out of Cuba whether Republicans or Democrats.

Secretary of State Rusk says he is for it too, at least he gives the impression he is for it by saying that it continues to be America's policy that "Castro must go." But it is about time we had some action, Mr. Speaker. Informed sources among the military are deeply disturbed. So is the general public, and rightfully so.

I have repeatedly sought the use of force if needed to end Communist control of Cuba. This I have done regardless of the political complexion of the administration involved. On July 5, 1960, as chairman of the Committee on Internal Security of the National Association of Attorneys General of the United States, I submitted a report to the association at San Francisco, Calif., specifically urging the use of armed force if necessary "to prevent the construction of missile launching bases, landing fields, or Russian submarine bases 90 miles off the American coast." This was almost 3 years ago.

The report in which this recommendation was made is an extremely interesting document. It addressed itself to the acuteness of the problem of how to meet communism's challenge to our internal security, made substantially more difficult by the unnecessary language of a number of decisions of the U.S. Supreme Court.

This report which continues to be of current interest and pressing importance was as follows:

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON INTERNAL SECURITY TO THE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF ATTORNEYS GENERAL, SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF., JULY 5, 1960

In June 1957 the National Association of Attorneys General authorized the creation of a committee on internal security and instructed the committee "to confer immediately with interested Federal agencies and other national groups, including the American Bar Association, with a view to preparation of legislation for introduction at the current session of Congress designed to reaffirm and reactivate Federal and State internal security controls; and further authorized the committee, with the approval of the executive committee, to appear before Congress in support of its recommendations."

In June 1958, at the 52d annual conference, the National Association of Attorneys General resolved as follows:

"*Be it resolved by the 52d annual meeting of the National Association of Attorneys General, meeting in Chicago, Ill., on June 11, 1958,* That the president is authorized to continue a committee on internal security and that the committee is authorized to communicate to the proper congressional committees the support and approval of the association for legislation to accomplish the following purposes:

"1. Reestablish the rights of States to enforce their subversive control laws by, in effect, amending the Smith Act to declare that it does not occupy the field to the exclusion of the States.

"2. Redefine the offense of teaching and advocating the overthrow of the Government to indicate that the immediate probable effect of such action is immaterial, and further to provide that whenever intent to cause the overthrow is proved that the offense is established.

"3. To define the term 'organize' in the Smith Act to include the continuing organization and recruiting of members for subversive organizations and the formation or expansion of either new or existing units of subversive organizations."

At the time of the 1958 meeting a number of measures designed to effect the specific recommendations of your committee were pending in Congress. In February 1959 the American Bar Association through its house of delegates by an overwhelming vote adopted similar recommendations. On April 21, 1959, the chairman of the committee on internal security testified before the Senate Judiciary Committee, Subcommittee on Internal Security, in support of these recommendations. A copy of this testimony was appended to the report of this committee submitted in May 1959 in New Orleans, La. As was then reported to this association:

"The legislative recommendations are simple. They are specific. They affirm congressional intention. They neither limit the appellate jurisdiction of the Supreme Court nor do anything more than plug loopholes in existing internal security laws shown (to exist) by judicial decision. The need for State factfinding investigation complementary to the work of Federal committees is reflected in the position of the Department of Justice and Federal authorities, desirous of continued cooperation between the States and the Federal Government in this field. Transcripts of sworn testimony are a useful adjunct to the work of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, which for all its splendid record has but a limited number of agents with a great many other things to do than deal with subversion and is without power to take testimony under oath, which is required for adequate survey of subversive activities.

"Your committee feels that in no respect does any of the legislation which has been recommended sanction abuse of process, interference with academic freedom, discrimination against teachers, undue interference with private rights, nor the pernicious practice of exposure for the sake of partisan political advantage. Contrariwise, it is believed that the power to investigate in fields in which there is power to legislate is vital to the manifest need to keep abreast of Communist and other subversive activity within the several States as a sensible precautionary measure in which the States and the Federal Government should work together. In addition to redefinition of the word organize and permission to the States to prohibit subversive activity by State law, it is felt that intentional criminal advocacy of overthrow of the Government of the United States or of any State by force and violence should be prohibited whether or not the advocacy at the time of utterance incites to the commission of an overt act. Lacking such an amendment, the Smith Act is now largely ineffective and opportunity is afforded for Communist indoctrination by intentional subversive advocacy within and without educational institutions across the land."

At the present time Congress has before it a number of measures designed to carry out these recommendations. In varying language all of the objectives have been favorably reported by the Senate Judiciary Committee and some have passed either the House or the Senate but not both. A very considerable Senate committee disposition to recommend and enact legislation authorizing the enforcement of State statutes prescribing criminal penalties for subversive activities (S. 294, 86th Cong., 1st sess.) lost considerable pressure for enactment in June 1959 with the Supreme Court decision in *Uphaus* v. *Wyman*, 360 U.S. 72, 3 L. Ed. 2d 1090, 79 S. Ct. 1040, which was erroneously believed by many persons to have revitalized State sedition laws. While this decision was of considerable helpfulness in permitting State legislatures to investigate subversive activity within their States (including subversion directed toward the United States insofar as the same infringed upon the security and safety of the State) it reaffirmed the holding of *Commonwealth of Pennsylvania* v. *Steve Nelson*, 350 U.S. 497, 100 L. Ed. 640, 76 S. Ct. 477, to the effect that State sedition laws were superseded by the Federal Smith Act to the extent the State laws attempted to make it a crime within the State to seek the overthrow of the Federal government by force, violence or other unlawful means.[1]

In addition to the foregoing measures, an omnibus bill offered by Senators DODD and KEATING (S. 2652, 86th Cong., 2d. sess.) was reported from the Internal Security Subcommittee on September 7, 1959, and favorably by the Senate Judiciary Committee on June 30, 1960. It is now pending before the Senate.

Your committee would be something less than candid if it did not report that in this election year the prospects for enactment of this legislation are not bright. It is hoped that in the postelection period it will be possible for Congress to adopt the recommendations of this association in the field of internal security, which are relatively simple, urgently needed, and should not become embroiled in partisan political conflict.

At the 1959 meeting your committee was authorized in addition to keeping the association advised of the progress of the foregoing recommendations for congressional legislation, to note such other matters relating to internal security as may be of interest or concern to the National Association of Attorneys General. It is difficult to define the periphery of "matters of interest or concern to this association in respect to internal security." It disturbs many of us that Congress has not reacted with more alacrity to the tremendous limitation of State power and authority implicit in the decision in *Commonwealth* v. *Nelson*, 350 U.S. 497, 100 L. ed. 640, 76 S. Ct. 477 Congress, particularly in the House of Representatives, being very directly reflective of public sentiment, thus demonstrates more than ever the apathy, indifference, and lack of understanding that besets America in this field. Without doubt, eclipsing all other nonpolitical issues either domestic or international, the paramount problem of this time is whether communism and capitalism can live in one world in peaceful coexistence or are destined to clash in the death throes of hydrogen warfare. Tactical maneuvering by the Communists has warmed the cold war as this report is written, to a point where it is seriously urged that the United States maintain a 24-airborne, hydrogen and atomic bomb equipped air alert against the possibility of surprise Communist attack. Khrushchev's treatment of the President of the United States at the recent attempted Summit conference has beyond question materially increased world tensions but is of value in revealing the real Communist attitude toward this Nation.

It is impossible to assess the problem of internal security without regard to these international factors. This is for the reason that communism is international in scope and purpose and seeks the destruction of all free nations everywhere in the world by force and violence if other means fail. This objective with regard to the United States has never been clearer than in the propaganda of hatred toward the United States that is daily taught the youth of the Soviet Union and its satellites and by devious means is spread among the youth of other lands to inflame them against the American imperialists and warmongers. That such propaganda efforts can be successful has been proven last month in Japan. That it continues unabated is reported daily at intelligence levels within the U.S. Department of State, particularly in reference to Latin America and Mexico.

---

[1] A fundamental weakness of such a holding being, of course, that Communist conspiracy to destroy our system is not aimed at any particular government, either State or Federal, but at capitalist free America.

How much of the same pernicious propaganda is being distributed to young and old in this country is hard to know. The number of Communist-front groups and organizations infiltrated by Communists is reported by Federal committees to be substantial, each having its particular segment of the Communist mission reflecting the Communist Party line of the moment. How far such propaganda separately or cumulatively may contribute to persuade otherwise loyal American citizens to renounce that loyalty and to become agents for the Communist Party and agents for communism generally is impossible to assess. It is indisputable, however, that as this report is written there has been a recent noticeable resurgency of Communist activity both open and secret throughout the entire United States. That this was predictable was stated by your chairman when president of this association in Sun Valley in June 1957. The suggestion from sources that should know better that Communist activity in this country is some kind of lawful political activity privileged from surveillance by reason of the first amendment has noticeably emboldened and broadened written and spoken activity on the part of Communists throughout the United States.

We should all be grateful that the U.S. Supreme Court in *Barenblatt* v. *United States*, 260 U.S. 109 (June 1959), with reference to the Communist Party has now said that those who would claim that it was "just an ordinary political party from the standpoint of national security, is to ask this Court to blind itself to world affairs which have determined the whole course of our national policy since the close of World War II—and to the vast burdens which these conditions have entailed for the entire Nation."

Your committee believes that there is even more pressing present need to keep abreast of Communist activities throughout the Nation than existed 10 years ago. We are distressed by the apathy, the complacency, the indifference, and even the blindness of too many comfortably situated Americans who hear Khrushchev in Austria claim that the Communist Party line has eliminated force and violence but remain uneasily aware that throughout history every Communist leader since Karl Marx has said that war between communism and capitalism is inevitable. Your committee is strongly of the view that the internal security of each State would be materially improved by procedures designed to enable each State government to be kept advised of the nature and extent of the operations of Communists in that State. For such purposes the use of the subpena power through legislative investigation is indispensable. In this view the committee is aware of the fact that Communist Party members have not carried cards for more than a decade. It also knows that many of the so-called intelligentsia who knowingly and intentionally work for and in behalf of the Communist Party and Communist-front organizations have never assayed membership for reasons obvious. Your committee continues to be of the abiding conviction that every Communist in the United States is a potential security risk and that State and Federal policy should not fail to take due cognizance of this fact.

The relationship of the foregoing to the internal security of each State is clear. In this time no attorney general on behalf of any State can disregard within his State, Communist operations whatever they may be. As attorneys and members of the bar sworn to uphold the Constitution of State and Nation, it is our fundamental moral and legal responsibility to exert every lawful means to keep apprised of the machinations of those who would destroy our Constitution, our system, and our way of life.

Your committee recognizes that no amount of fixed doctrine nor Maginot-line-type of education can vest us with that vitality necessary to meet and defeat the challenge of communism without war. We also recognize that this challenge must be met and defeated without war or there will be little left in the world but chaos and destruction. Therefore, with confidence in the capacity of an intelligent and informed free citizenry to fashion a better panacea for tomorrow's citizens than can be offered by communism, and with confidence that the day will soon come when the courts will affirm in indisputably decisive language the principle that those who claim the priceless benefits of American citizenship and the protection of its laws owe to their State and Nation both moral and legal responsibility to answer relevant questioning relating to the security of our people, your committee reports that the internal security of the Nation is under continuing Communist stress which is being partially met by active State and Federal countermeasures. It is felt that a much larger complementary role in this struggle might be effectively waged by State agencies, and to the extent that each member of this association in his State can assist in this direction, he is respectfully urged to do so.

Most Americans are concerned by the developments in Cuba as well as in other less easily recognized locations in this hemisphere indicating intentional aggressive Communist penetration of what has always been heretofore considered a place of primary concern and control of the United States. It is shocking to see American properties and American citizens and companies pushed around and discriminated against by the Castro government while we stand by and just watch. Economic sanctions in such circumstances are not enough if this country or its citizens are to have any self-respect left. Nothing is perhaps accomplished by descriptive adjectives, but your committee is beginning to wonder whether the world thinks we are afraid to stand up for what we believe in.

To put off dealing firmly with a situation of outright Soviet military aid to the Castro government in Cuba is to mortgage the future day when a much worse problem is presented with Panama. In terms of the internal security of the United States—not solely of the State of Florida—it is simply intolerable that we should permit the construction of missile launching bases, landing fields, or Russian submarine bases 90 miles off the American coast even if it takes force to prevent it. The same principle applies to the unlawful thefts and discriminations by the Castro government against Americans in Cuba. The impetus to this new aggression is undeniable. How can any American be safe in any Caribbean travel if this Nation will not protect him against outlawry?

For many years the unpleasant moment which is now upon us has been foreseeably predictable from American policies which have deferred the day of reckoning by continued appeasement of Communist aggression.

Just as surely as this Nation misled Britain and France into believing that they might with our sanction use force to defend their interests against Nasser's taking of the Suez Canal, and misled the Hungarian people into believing we would help if they would rise up and rid themselves of communism's yoke, it is a certainty that we would use force to prevent the taking over of the Panama Canal should the Panamanian Government become too friendly with the Soviet Union, accept its aid and military supplies as Egypt has done, and attempt to seize it.

We should meet the Cuban aggression now. Latin America and the entire Caribbean are watching.

The conclusion is inescapable that the United States must be ready to risk war to keep hostile Communist military establishments out of this hemisphere. The heavy logistical burden of maintaining effective military defensive action in Indochina and other places in the Far East is not present with respect to operations in this hemisphere. Those who claim that if we can arm bases in Turkey the Communists have the right to do so in Cuba, are intellectually dishonest, for the mission, objective, and spiritual dedication of the American people as well as American policy is neither imperialist nor aggressive toward any other nation in the world, whereas Soviet communism aims at unlawful world domination and individual slavery by aggression and violence all over the world.

Neither in terms of international law nor in the field of propaganda is there merit to any charge that by acting to prevent such military preparations by a foreign enemy power in this hemisphere, we are imperialists. As Americans the United States seeks nothing other than a world in which freedom and equal justice under law will stand some reasonable assurance of continuing in peace. Such a position, properly explained to the peoples of the world, is all the moral sanction we need. If the Communists can get away with what is going on in Cuba in plain view, we stand (and deserve) to lose not only the respect but in all probability the support, of a great majority of the countries of Latin America.

No thorough contemporary assessment of our internal security in this time should fail to appraise the intrinsic will of the American people to fight to preserve the American way of life. Such an appraisal does not lend to optimism for the future safety of this Nation. The dedication and purpose with which many Communists approach the problems of the education and orientation of youth, application of their work, elimination of wasted time, and indoctrination in young and old of a single-mindedness of purpose toward a Communist world, is a caution for all of us in our opulence. While we should not endeavor to indoctrinate our youth with the same virus of hatred with which the youth of the Soviet Union and other countries are being infected toward this Nation as a germ warfarer and imperialist aggressor, nevertheless, it is of the first order of importance that the generation now being trained by us should be fully and completely aware of the nature, purposes and objectives of international Communism in relation to those of American constitutional government. Anything short of this is to send our younger generation into the world ill prepared to wage the struggle for the minds of mankind that reaches from the Congo to Oslo. It is not enough only to offer these explanations to our own youth. In the schools of the friendly nations of this world we must send our qualified representatives to tell the truth concerning the United States and its role as protector of freedom and individual liberty.

No State in this Union has internal security if the United States itself is insecure.

At this moment Communist enemy forces are actively at work aiding existing hostile nations and seeking to further encourage other younger nations now frenzied with nationalism by propagandizing them that America, like John Bull of old, is against their nationalism, and that the West seeks to prevent their independence.

Unilateral Western talks on disarmament are bound to be ineffective, as have been those spheres of United Nations activity that have required concurrence of the Soviet bloc. We can never disarm as long as the Soviet does not also do so. We can never safely disarm without contemporaneous full and complete inspection. The world is not going to obtain such a commitment from Communists. In the meantime, the race toward the neutron bomb, the satellite mirror, and the military conquest of space goes on at the expense of the soundness of our fiscal structure.

For the immediate present there is little doubt that defense requires continued sorely needed U.S. billions even at the price of more deficit and a correspondingly weaker dollar, but one has only to project such a situation continued over the next two decades to arrive at the conclusion that short of that time some way must be found to stop it or the economic structure of the United States will be ruined—itself a Communist objective.

If millions upon millions of young men and women now growing up throughout the world continue to be indoctrinated with communism's philosophy of the use of unlawful force, of class struggle, of hatred, of the justification for subversion in the name of a Communist world, of the justness of atheism and alleged soundness of the material concept of the explanation and derivation of the universe, it means only one thing for us within our lifetime—aggressive war upon this country. This is because young adults trained in this manner from earliest adolescence in their willingness to destroy us will exceed even the banzai of the Kamikaze pilot in World War II who was sure he was on his way to Japanese heaven. These, with the many now in their forties in Japan and in Germany who also hate this Nation in the memory of the destruction heaped upon theirs in World War II, make the projection almost a dismal certainty.

Some say that the only way the people of this country will awake to the need for authorization of powerful and effective governmental action to combat further Communist aggression is an attack upon us. The price of this would be the infinite horrors of atomic destruction, for we would certainly retaliate. Short of the shock of an attack, some method must be found to jar Americans from their complacency and inspire them to authorize their legislatures and the Congress to firmly take those steps in our behalf that must be taken to make certain that not one additional inch of the earth's surface nor one additional citizen of the world's population, adult or juvenile, is added to the Soviet Communist bloc.

Along with such a governmental policy, if Americans traveling abroad conclusively demonstrate by word and deed that we are for peace, freedom, and justice for all, and that communism means individual slavery, we are bound to succeed, for ours is the more attractive package.

Only a blind man would disregard the situation now existing. Internal security in our States is inadequate. We should not delude ourselves to the contrary. Internal security is literally dependent on the external security of the United States itself.

We have implicit confidence that just as communism is atheistic and denies the existence of God, so are we and our allies essentially law-abiding, God-fearing men and women. If Divine Providence and the omnipotence of Almighty God are to be made manifest upon this earth in our time it must mean that in this struggle we will win. Faith alone, however, is not enough. Strength in meeting any public challenge to American authority is indispensable.

As attorneys general let us as one firmly reject any governmental policy, State or Federal, that includes further appeasement or equivocation in dealing with Communist aggression. In firmness reflecting our genuine concern for the peace and security of the world will be found the only sure road to an honorable peace which will result from aggressors' unwillingness to face the showdown if we stand firm. The hour is late but not too late.

If we continue to show an incredulous world that we are unwilling to fight to preserve our freedom or that of our allies, the balance of world power will swing to the Soviet Union. Should this happen, we predict that whether resulting from ultimatum or secretly in the night, The United States will suffer a major and terrible attack—an avoidable catastrophe if we have the courage now to stand firmly for freedom.

Your committee respectfully recommends that the committee on internal security be continued, instructed, and authorized to keep the association advised of the progress of the association's recommendations for legislation in the field of internal security and of such other matters relating to internal security as may in the opinion of the committee, be of interest or concern to the National Association of Attorneys General. The chairman has been authorized to prepare and deliver to the resolutions committee a resolution to this effect.

Respectfully submitted.

LOUIS C. WYMAN,
Chairman,
Committee on Internal Security.

Mr. Speaker, I sincerely hope that the concepts expressed in this report will soon become an integral part of American policy.

HOW REDS USE PANAMA CANAL

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, last Thursday on the floor of the House, I revealed that during 1962 there had been a 600-percent increase in cargo movements through the Panama Canal to Red China as reported in the annual report of the Panama Canal Company. At that time, I indicated that I had written the President of the United States urging prompt consideration of the advisability of denying the use of the Panama Canal to all vessels trading with Cuba. At that time, I further urged a study of this question by the House of Representatives. Today I rise to report that I am introducing a House resolution which it is hoped will provide the impetus to bring about such a study by the appropriate committee of the House.

The resolution is as follows:

Resolved, That it is the sense of the House of Representatives that the President of the United States should take such steps as may be necessary to deny the use of the Panama Canal to all vessels engaged in trade with Cuba.

Since the rise of Castro, there has been, to my knowledge, little or no consideration of the possibility of denying the use of the Panama Canal to ships trading with Cuba. In view of the above report that during 1962 there was a 600-percent increase in cargo movements through the canal to Red China and a 48-percent increase to Russia, and in view of the fact that CIA Chief John A. McCone, in his February 19 statement to the House Foreign Affairs Committee emphasized the increasingly serious problem of subversion spreading from Cuba to South America and stated that at least 1,000 to 1,500 South Americans went to Cuba in 1962 for sabotage and guerrilla training, with more going this year, I consider such a study necessary—without delay.

Our goal must be to weaken the Castro regime, to prevent the spread of communism from Cuba to the continent of South America, and, hopefully, to bring about the eventual downfall of the Castro dictatorship. I do not suggest that I am an expert on Cuban or South American affairs. However, from a study of a map of this hemisphere, it seems logical to predict that once the Communists have established a firm position on the continent of South America, we will have lost in large part the advantage which our control of the Panama Canal today represents as a method of preventing the strengthening of communism in this hemisphere. Today the Panama Canal can be an effective tool against communism: tomorrow it may not.

The situation today represents a major danger to all of the American nations. Its solution will require the United States to assume and maintain a capacity of leadership, with the cooperation of the Organization of American States and the United Nations to the extent possible. This is not, in my opinion, saber rattling. A leadership vacuum exists, and we must fill it.

Mr. Speaker, I know that there are obstacles to restricting the use of the Panama Canal. We have treaties with Panama—the Hay-Bunau-Varilla Convention of 1903—and with Great Britain—the Hay-Pauncefote Treaty of 1901—to mention two. However, if, after study, it is considered desirable to deny the use of the canal to vessels trading with Cuba, there are ways to do it. If it is impossible under existing agreements, these agreements can be revised, as they have been before. We can ask the cooperation of the Organization of American States. We can consider extending our right to deny the use of U.S. ports to include those ports at either end of the canal. We can consider the possibility of liberally interpreting these treaties of the early 1900's to permit such action in view of the cold war of 1963.

Regrettably, we have lost much of the advantage we held some months ago. To wait further could result, within a matter of months, in having communism firmly established on the continent of South America. We cannot afford four or five South Vietnams in this hemisphere. I urge prompt consideration of this resolution in the House.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to include in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks a column from the Chicago Sun-Times of March 1, discussing Communist trade through the canal, and an editorial from the Chicago's American of February 25, concerning the recent OAS report urging the individual member nations to invoke the 1948 Rio Treaty for their mutual defense against Communist Cuba. I also refer the

Members of the House to the recent testimony of CIA Chief John McCone, before the Foreign Affairs Committee for a discussion of the seriousness of tne problem of Communist subversion in South America:

[From the Chicago (Ill.) Chicago's American, Feb. 25, 1963]

WARNING TO THE OAS

A report just made public by the Organization of American States soberly warns that individual member nations can no longer defend themselves adequately against the threat of Communist Cuba, and urges them to invoke the 1948 Rio treaty for mutual defense.

The report was submitted by a special 7-man study group and is "advisory," meaning that it doesn't have official OAS approval. Getting it adopted will involve many a wrangle, since some of its recommendations—for instance, breaking off all hemisphere relations with the Castro government—are still regarded as controversial by some member states. But the United States and other governments aware of the danger should press hard for approval; there isn't much time to spare.

What has been revealed of the report is restrained and factual, and does not indulge in nightmares. It points out that Castro and the Soviets have developed in Cuba a "political-military apparatus" which is expressly designed to get around the haphazard security measures now in force. Against the Communists' highly engineered techniques of subversion and agitation, the hemisphere's defenses aren't much beyond what they were in 1948, and are simply not adequate for the job.

One sorely needed element, the report said, is coordination of intelligence and counterespionage work among the hemisphere's free nations. Without that, they won't have the means to plan and carry out joint action. The report also called for organizing, equipping, and training security forces of the American republics to counter subversion and guerilla activity directed from Cuba.

This does not mean that the United States should rely wholly on cooperative action against Cuba. As Defense Secretary McNamara said last week in testifying before the Senate Armed Services Committee, it is United States policy to eliminate Castrosim and communism from Cuba, and that's a job that will have to be handled principally by this country.

But the United States cannot police the rest of the hemisphere against subversion and guerrilla attacks. That will be up to the governments involved—and they'd better get together fast on ways to do it.

[From the Chicago (Ill.) Sun-Times, Mar. 1, 1963]

HOW REDS USE PANAMA CANAL

(By Milburn P. Akers)

Red China and Soviet Russia are making very good use of the Panama Canal in efforts to bulwark Fidel Castro's regime in Cuba.

The 1962 report of the board of directors of the Panama Canal Co. contains, on page 6, the following statement:

"Showing a very impressive percentage increase for the year (1962) was the volume of cargo moving to Red China and Russia. Cargo movements to Red China totaled 877,000 long tons for an increase of 600 percent and movements to Russia totaled 344,000 long tons for an increase of 48 percent. Sugar movements from Cuba accounted for the vast majority of this combined tonnage. In the return flow of cargo, Red China and Russia shipped 52,000 tons of cargo to Cuba."

Undoubtedly, Nikita Khrushchev, Mao Tsetung and Castro fully appreciate the use of this American-built and American-operated facility which helps them to carry out their Caribbean designs without the necessity for the long and expensive sea voyage around South America. The fact that the Panama Canal Co., which operates the canal for its owners, the taxpayers of the United States, spent $16,100,000 to improve the canal in 1962 probably causes them to rejoice also.

Ships which transit the canal are required to pay for its use. Such payments are, no doubt, a bit of a load on the Cuban economy. But now that the traffic has been called to Washington's attention efforts will no doubt be made to remit the tolls on these shipments. Such action would be in line with the solicitous manner in which U.S. policy in respect to Castro's Cuba is currently conducted.

Why the United States should permit use of its facilitiels to undermine its position in the Caribbean is difficult to comprehend.

The statement that we are obligated by treaty and international law to permit transit of the canal by the ships of all nations is not a sufficient answer.

The United States doesn't recognize Red China. Treaties and international laws and practices which may be binding upon the United States insofar as other nations are concerned are not applicable to Red China. The United States has broken diplomatic relations with Cuba. There may be a technical distinction between nonrecognition and the current status of United States-Cuban relations. That point is moot. If, however, the United States has the right to deny use of American ports to foreign ships engaged in the Cuban traffic, a right it has asserted, it can find ample legal grounds on which to deny use of the Panama Canal and its facilities, including the harbors, to the ships engaged in this particular traffic.

The ships engaged in the Sino-Soviet-Cuban traffic fly many flags. Those three Communist countries have relatively small merchant marines. Much of the traffic is carried in Greek, British, Norwegian, Lebanese, Japanese, Polish and Yugoslav bottoms. These also should be forbidden use of the canal's facilities for this particular traffic.

If the American Government doesn't intend to employ every economic tool it has to bring about Castro's downfall it shouldn't announce such policies; halfway measures, such as it now engages in, are worse than none at all.

Since the ending of World War II Panama Canal traffic has increased 212 percent. In 1962 canal shipments between Red China and Cuba increased 600 percent over 1961. This huge increase gives some measure of the use to which this American-built, American-operated facility is being employed to thwart American policy in respect to Castro's Cuba.

The United States stopped buying Cuban sugar for the sole purpose of wrecking that island's economy and, in so doing, bringing about Castro's downfall. To prevent that downfall, Red China and Soviet Russia have been taking huge amounts of Cuban sugar in barter deals. As noted in the 1962 report of the Panama Canal Co., sugar shipments from Cuba to Red China and Soviet Russia "accounted for the vast majority of this (increase) combined tonnage."

This is but another example of the fact that the United States, as a consequence of inept policies and implementation, does more to defeat itself than all the Communist nations combined.

RESOLUTION TO PREVENT U.S. CONTRIBUTIONS TO UNITED NATIONS FROM BEING USED FOR ASSISTANCE TO CUBA

Mr. MONTOYA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Mexico?

There was no objection.

Mr. MONTOYA. Mr. Speaker, I have today submitted a resolution to the Congress to prevent U.S. contributions to the United Nations from being used for assistance to Cuba. The resolution provides that if the United Nations expanded program of technical assistance or the United Nations Special Fund hereafter provides any assistance, directly or indirectly, to Cuba, then the maximum U.S. contribution which may be made to that program or Fund, as the case may be, for the next calendar year shall be reduced by the amount spent by such program or Fund in providing such assistance to Cuba.

The recent decision by the U.N. Directorate to extend $1,157,600 from the United Nations Special Fund for a 5-year project intended to diversify Cuban agriculture reveals the need for such a joint congressional resolution. U.S. officials strongly opposed the project, which was first considered in May, 1961, when it came up again before the Special Fund several weeks ago. It was argued that the likelihood of success for such a project was considerably less than when the project was first approved because of the increasing chaos, in fact the utter disorganization, of Cuban agriculture caused by Castro's follies. It was pointed out that some of Cuba's best agricultural experts had fled the country, that food production was in trouble, in short, that Castro's dictatorial hand and his inept policies were reflected throughout the agricultural sector. Foreign agents—Soviet agricultural experts—were replacing native technicians. And yet, the Special Fund was not convinced by these arguments. The old contention that the extension of assistance must be decided on the basis of project feasibility alone—and that political considerations must play no part—was once again dragged out in support of the United Nations action. But do not these facts—the disorganization of Cuban agriculture, the inept agricultural policies of the Castro government, the presence of large numbers of Soviet agents—challenge the feasibility of the United Nations scheme?

Furthermore, Castro has not been noted for his cooperation with the United Nations in the past. He blocked the recent United States-Soviet negotiations on the crisis caused by the Soviet military buildup in Cuba at every point. He refused to allow United Nations inspectors on Cuban soil to verify the removal of Soviet offensive weapons. When Secretary General U Thant attempted to mediate in the crisis, Castro adamantly denied him every point. He alleged that Soviet bombers belonged to Cuba and could not be withdrawn without his consent. In short, Castro has failed to cooperate with the United Nations in political settlements in the past. Why should he now be granted Special Fund assistance? What guarantee is there that once United Nations experts arrive, Castro will aid their efforts? What about the Soviet agricultural experts? Will they and the U.N. technicians work hand in hand? The answers to these questions are vital to the feasibility of the project. The question marks are surely numerous enough to have made the Directorate think twice and then a third time before extending assistance to Castro.

Granted, these questions also involve political considerations, but political considerations of a sort which must be taken into account, I contend, in deciding upon any United Nations activity. The Special Fund criteria for determining what projects may be approved deny inclusion of political considerations. But what is meant by political considerations—the attempt of any one government or group of governments to influence a decision on the basis of its own, or their own, self-interest rather than in terms of the usefulness of the project to the country concerned and its chances for success? In the case of U.N. assistance to Cuba there are political considerations of a different sort—political considerations which touch upon not the relations of individual states with Cuba, but the relationship of international organizations, the Organization of American States, and the United Nations itself.

In the eyes of all Latin America, Castro is an outlaw in the Western Hemisphere who is trying to subvert democratic governments throughout the hemisphere. The OAS declared him persona non grata in the inter-American system when the foreign ministers voted to expel Cuba from the Organization of American States at the Punta del Este Conference in January 1962. Currently the OAS has undertaken a thorough study of the means by which Castro is attempting to infiltrate Latin America and spread the gospel of communism. All Castro's actions—repression within Cuba, subversion without—contravene the cooperative and collective security bases of the Organization of American States. Castro is a threat to the hemisphere, a barrier to the cooperative efforts of the inter-American community, and an outlaw in the inter-American security system. Does he deserve international assistance? Can such assistance be justified in view of Castro's unlawful actions in the Western Hemisphere?

The same political considerations arise with regard to the United Nations itself. Castro's oppressive policies within Cuba—the execution of political prisoners, the forcing of thousands of citizens into exile, the denial of individual freedoms—make a mockery of United Nations efforts in the field of human rights. How can the world organization on the one hand spend years formulating basic codes of human rights in order to improve the condition of man throughout the world and on the other hand lend its assistance to a government which is flagrantly flouting basic individual freedoms? Furthermore, the chief purpose of the United Nations is preservation of peace and security; it was established as a collective security organization explicitly dedicated to deterring aggression. Yet, on this score, too, Castro is guilty. He allowed Cuba to become an open Soviet military base; he turned his island into a bridgehead of covert Soviet penetration in the Western Hemisphere. How can the United Nations extend assistance to a government which is subverting the basic purposes of the world organization, which is dedicated not to maintaining international peace and security but to deterring international peace and security?

Even more basic than these questions insofar as the U.S. Congress is concerned is the relationship between the United States and the United Nations, for it is in this area that the Congress can make itself heard. If the United Nations will not listen to the dictates of reason and justice, if it will not exert some sense of discrimination between a foolish and a wise course of action, if it will not accept its responsibility as an organization dedicated to the collective security of the world and the betterment of man's lot, the U.S. Congress can do nothing. It can only point out insufficiencies; it can only hope that wiser counsels will prevail in the future.

But as one of the branches of government engaged in the formulation of U.S. foreign policy, Congress has the right, and the duty, to make its will felt in the area of relations between the United States and the United Nations. It is in this spirit that the resolution to prevent U.S. contributions to the United Nations from being used for assistance to Cuba was placed before the Congress. It is from a sense of responsibility for the foreign policy of the United States that the Congress is suggesting the President reduce future U.S. contributions to the U.N. or its agencies, in the event such contributions will be used for assistance to Cuba.

Paul Hoffmann, the Managing Director of the Special Fund and an American himself, it is true, has promised that no U.S. funds will be used on the Cuban project and that no U.S. technicians will be sent to Cuba. But this does not get at the root of the problem. For one thing, the substantial U.S. contribution to the Special Fund—$28 million for 1963—will release other funds that can then be diverted to the Cuban project. Furthermore, Mr. Hoffmann's promise does not resolve future difficulties, future instances in which the United Nations may allocate assistance to Cuba. The problem is rather that the action of the U.N. Directorate in authorizing the agricultural assistance project for Cuba was in direct contravention of U.S. foreign policy toward Cuba. The United States, along with the rest of the Western Hemisphere, has declared itself the enemy of the Castro government. We are dedicated to weakening Castro's economic and political position in order to open the way for the establishment of a democratic government in Cuba. We have been attempting to put the economic squeeze on Castro—through the withdrawal of sugar quotas, the elimination of trade. We have urged our friends to do the same. The United Nations action, designed to improve Castro's agricultural sector, if successful, would strengthen rather than weaken Castro's position and is therefore in direct opposition to the avowed policy of the United States toward Cuba. If the United States succumbs quietly to the United Nations position, we are letting the United Nations make our foreign policy for us—and a foreign policy which, in this case, is far different from that which we have time and again stated we are pursuing with regard to Cuba. The U.S. Congress cannot allow the United Nations to take over the function of formulating U.S. foreign policy.

We feel too that it was impolitic of the United Nations to overlook the fact that the United States is contributing over 40 percent of the total contributions to the Special Fund for the year 1963, some $28 million. While it may be true that the basis of the United Nations is the equality of member states as reflected in the one-state one-vote General Assembly, only too often the equality factor is overemphasized and it is forgotten that the great powers were given a preferred position in the world organization. The permanent member veto in the Security Council acknowledged that the powers had a special responsibility and that therefore they ought to have a special privilege in the United Nations. Should not some form of recognition be given to the fact that the United States is contributing over 40 percent of the Special Fund's resources, over 32 percent of the U.N. regular budget, and a major portion of the Congo operations? The United States has poured considerable financial resources into the United Nations. It has bailed the United Nations out of financial trouble. Just last summer the U.S. Congress authorized the President to purchase up to one-half of the total issue of U.N. bonds to finance peacekeeping operations. Should the United Nations not have listened a little more carefully to U.S. objections concerning assistance to Cuba?

The United States cannot support, cannot be asked to contribute financial resources, to a project which subverts its own foreign policy. The United Nations is dependent on U.S. contributions. It could not continue to exist if U.S. funds were withdrawn. May the Cuban assistance controversy be a lesson to the United Nations that it cannot ignore the basic foreign policy position of one of its chief contributing members. The resolution before you, if adopted, would insure that U.S. money will never be used by the United Nations to subvert U.S. foreign policy in Cuba. It would assure that our foreign policy toward Cuba will continue to be formulated in Washington and not at the United Nations in New York.

Contributions to the U.N. Special Fund are not based on a schedule of assessments; they are entirely voluntary. Each year governments pledge their contributions to the Special Fund for the current year at a U.N. conference convened for this purpose. Thus, the loss of voting sanctions of article 19 of the charter, which pertain only to assessed contributions, do not apply to Special Fund contributions.

The following statistics setting forth the amount of U.S. contributions to the Special Fund, as well as pledges by Soviet Russia and its satellites substantiate the dependence of the United Nations upon U.S. contributions:

(1) Expenditures of U.N. Special Fund through 1962

(Thousands)

1959	$37,368
1960	59,715
1961	36,189
1962	81,454
Total	214,726

(2) U.S. contribution to Special Fund through 1962

(Thousands)

1959	$10,325
1960	15,842
1961	19,525
1962	25,341
Total	71,033

(3) Percent of U.S. contribution to fund in relation to expenditures through 1962

1959	27.63
1960	26.53
1961	53.95
1962	31.11

(4) Soviet Union and satellite pledges through 1962

A. PLEDGES (IN U.S. DOLLARS)

	1959	1960	1961	1962
Albania			2,000	2,000
Bulgaria		14,706	14,706	17,647
Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000
Cuba				25,000
Czechoslovakia	69,444	69,444	69,444	69,444
Hungary	42,608	42,608	42,608	42,608
Poland	125,000	125,000	125,000	125,000
Rumania	16,667	16,667	16,667	16,667
Soviet Union	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000
Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic	125,000	125,000	125,000	125,000
Yugoslavia	150,000	175,000	192,000	220,000

B. PERCENT OF PLEDGE IN RELATION TO EXPENDITURES

	1959	1960	1961	1962
Albania			0.006	0.002
Bulgaria		0.02	.04	.02
Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic	0.13	.08	.14	.06
Cuba				.03
Czechoslovakia	.18	.12	.19	.09
Hungary	.11	.07	.12	.05
Poland	.33	.21	.35	.15
Rumania	.04	.03	.05	.02
Soviet Union	2.68	1.67	2.76	1.23
Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic	.33	.21	.35	.15
Yugoslavia	.40	.29	.53	.27

NOTE.—Cuba and Yugoslavia have been included as members of the Soviet bloc.

WE NEED TO CONSERVE THE WILD ANIMALS OF THE WORLD BEFORE IT IS TOO LATE

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced today a House concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that the Secretary of the Interior, in consultation with the Secretary of State, should take all necessary steps to convene an international conference to begin a worldwide cooperative effort to conserve wild animals.

Such an effort is most urgently needed. A world conference can provide the basis for decisive measures to save many of the world's most famous animals which are now threatened with extinction.

MANY ANIMALS ARE THREATENED WITH EXTINCTION

In these days the words "critical" and "desperate" are used so often and so casually that we become inured to them and often fail to accept their full meaning. But I assure the Members that these words should be given their full weight when they are used to describe the plight of many species of wild animals in the world today. Man has already ignobly succeeded in exterminating about 200 species of birds and animals, among them beautiful, useful and once plentiful creatures. The common phrase, "dead as a dodo," serves as a continual reminder of one species wiped out by man. Now we recklessly threaten nearly 250 species with the same fate. These almost condemned creatures include some of the most spectacular and successful animals evolved during millions of years. Yet if we continue our present course, they may be gone forever in a decade or less. And none of the scientific and technological prowess of which we are justly proud will suffice to recreate any of them.

The American bald eagle, the emblem of our Nation, may exist only metallically on our coins one day. Its numbers are dangerously reduced.

A partial rollcall of immediately threatened species includes the California condor, the polar bear, the woodland caribou, the trumpeter swan, and the sandhill and whooping cranes in the United States, the giant tortoise, the Arabian oryx, the Ceylon elephant, the Kashmir stag, all species of wild chinchilla, the Angolan giraffe, and several types of rhinoceros. An experienced game warden in East Africa has warned that unless something is done promptly, the great migratory herds of antelopes, rhinos and elephants, among others, will be doomed in a decade or less. This is a terrible prospect which demands our attention.

THE SLAUGHTER IS FREQUENTLY SENSELESS

The reasons for the prospective extermination of many of these animals are so trivial and ridiculous that they reveal the depths of man's thoughtlessness and capacity for injustice. The Arabian oryx, a member of the antelope family, is being gunned down from cars because some Arabs believe that by killing an oryx they will obtain the animal's legendary courage and virility. The rhinoceros is being hunted and killed so that the horn can be cut off and ground into powder for sale in parts of Asia where the myth persists that it is an aphrodisiac. The desire for the tails of wildebeests and giraffes so that they might be sold for several dollars as fly swatters has led to the destruction of countless of these animals. Fashion fads that have required animals' skins or feathers have decimated wildlife populations. Much of the destruction of wildlife is deliberate and so highly organized that even fabulous abundance will not by itself prevent a species from soon being snuffed out.

Ironically, but perhaps logically, the threat to wildlife is most acute in Africa, the continent we traditionally associate in our minds with the most marvelous variety and wealth of animal life. A century ago, reports from Africa told of huge herds of antelope and zebra and an amazing profusion of elephants, hippos, and rhino. Although nowadays the picture is still of large herds, surveys indicate that all these animals are greatly reduced in numbers. In parts of the continent where they once lived, some of these animals are nonexistent outside zoos, preserves, and farms.

The reasons for this downtrend are easy to find. Newspaper reports and other accounts describe an annual slaughter that the less prolific species cannot stand much longer.

MUCH OF THE DESTRUCTION IS DELIBERATE KILLING

Much of the killing is to provide ivory, horn, skins, pelts, and other animal products for export. A quite large number of animals can be killed legally to meet the demand for animal products. In Kenya, for example, between 1955 and 1960 the yearly legal sales were 1,400 pounds of horn and 73,000 pounds of ivory. Thus the desire for a supposed sexual stimulant, for chessmen and billiard balls and other products that could be met within legal bounds required the death of 175 to 200 rhino and 1,000 elephants annually.

But this legal killing amounts to only a fraction of the total destruction of African wild animals. Poachers take a truly terrible toll every year in a business which is, as the eminent biologist, Sir Julian Huxley, reported after an African survey, "profitable, highly organized, extremely cruel, and quite ruthless." This widespread illegal killing is also very wasteful in the short run. In the long run, it will be disastrous ecologically and economically.

Most of the demand for the products of African wild animals originates in the United States and in Western Europe. It reflects trends, fads, and vagaries in fashion. After several prominent ladies of fashion appeared in leopard skin coats recently, a demand for leopard skins far in excess of the supply from legal sources suddenly materialized. Immediately, a motely crew of white entrepreneurs descended upon the African bush in search of fast profits. The leopard, which is not scarce but is reduced below the balance of nature in several areas, was reduced still further. British Overseas Airways installed a weekly flight from Uganda to London to transport leopard skins.

POACHING IS RAMPANT

The white entrepreneurs find that there are few law enforcement officers to hinder illegal killing of the desired animals. Typically, this type of white hunter hunts nothing more than an African or Asian middle man who in turn easily finds natives willing to poach for a paltry share of the profits. The African poacher runs no great risk anyway for he is hard to catch and when caught faces very little real punishment. The authorities tend toward the view that he is doing what comes naturally. If they try to impose punishment at all, fines are virtually impossible since few natives have any money. A jail sentence is usually prized as a sort of paid vacation in which the government provides the food and lodging which are constantly struggled for in the bush.

So the native goes gladly about his poaching, with hair-raising cruelty. Wire loop snares are spread widely around the landscape, particularly at gaps in thorny barriers set up by the poachers. Wire of sufficient strength to hold even an elephant is cheap and readily available. One end is attached to a tree or log. Zebras, wildebeests, antelopes, rhinos, and elephants are caught by the leg in these devices and suffer intense pain as their struggling causes the wire to cut deeply into their flesh. They die slowly in agony. The poachers visit the snares only infrequently, so as not to be troubled by arriving while the animals still live.

Arrows smeared with a poison that acts so slowly that the animal is subjected to long suffering are also much in favor among the poachers. Another weapon frequently used is the muzzleloading gun, of which there are reportedly more than 100,000 in the hands of natives of Kenya and Northern Rhodesia alone. These firearms, loaded with whatever miscellaneous hardware lies at hand, are fired into herds, maiming and wounding many animals. In some cases the wounded creatures may be more easily tracked and killed but often they die unnoticed in the bush.

Another poachers' device is the pitfall covered with branches and studded with pointed stakes. A lingering death awaits the animals falling into these pits, for they are seldom killed outright.

THE KILLING IS EXTREMELY WASTEFUL

Sometimes the animals are used for meat which is shipped to nearby African towns by "bicycle boys." More often, only the horns, tusks, skins or other wanted parts are removed and the remains left to rot. Frequently, the animal blindly killed is not the one whose parts are currently in vogue and it is merely left where it fell. The illegal exports start their journey to America or Europe by devious paths to the coast where a tramp steamer waits, by long overland routes to nations from which they may be exported without hindrance and by air.

High profits for the poaching master are the rule in this grisly trade. For example, the native poacher in East Africa will probably get about 7 to 10 shillings—98 cents to $1.40—per pound for rhino horn which sells on the open market for 90 shillings—$12.60. Much of the difference is pocketed by the white entrepreneur, some of whom have boasted of earnings of $50,000 a year in their callously destructive undertaking.

KILLING FOR SPORT AND FOOD

Wildlife is also being killed deliberately and haphazardly for sport, food, and in attempts to wipe out animal-borne diseases and to protect crops and domestic animals. Although there is some poaching, most of the killing for these purposes is legal, a fact that often is an illustration of the weakness of the game laws.

There are still some "slaughter safaris," but most countries have bag limits that are respected by hunters. Sportsmen are also frequently interested in conservation. And there are an increasing number of safaris that do their shooting with cameras only.

Usually the killing for food is ruinously wasteful. The lechwe antelope, which is killed for meat, has been subjected to mass hunts by men and dogs in which thousands were speared to death at once, including young and pregnant females. As a result, of course, its numbers were reduced sharply and rapidly so that there are less than one-eighth as many as there were 30 years ago.

MANY ANIMALS ARE BEING KILLED BY FIRE

Innumerable wild animals have been killed in Africa in campaigns against the sleeping sickness, but with little success in eliminating the scourge. Since the hides and meat from these animals are not used, this program entails the loss of very large potential incomes.

In Africa, another significant cause of destruction of animals and their habitats is fire. Aside from many blazes stemming from natural causes and human carelessness, others are set purposely for spectacles or as a means of driving game to a place where it may be killed. Wardens suspect that a number of fires in national parks have been planned to force animals out of the protective surroundings into death-dealing traps.

WILDLIFE HABITATS ARE BEING DESTROYED

In addition to the deliberate killing that occurs, as I have described, particularly in Africa but also elsewhere in the world, there is the usually inadvertent destruction of wildlife through man's changes in the environment.

These changes occur very obviously in the construction of roads and the establishment of towns and industries. The impounding of large bodies of water by dams and hydroelectric projects on one hand and the drainage of wetlands and marshes on the other will harm the wildlife of those areas.

Another major source of damage to wildlife is water pollution, not only of inland water but of the seas. Discharges of urban sewage, of toxic wastes from factories and of petroleum on the high seas take their toll of birds and water animals.

Attempts to divert marginal land to uses to which it is not well suited also injures wildlife with little or no compensating benefit. Marginal bushland converted for grazing of cattle in Africa has produced far less needed protein than could have been obtained by well-managed game ranching. Before being used for grazing the land provided a great variety of plants. To match this, there was a differentiation of herbivores to make use of all the vegetable resources. But when put into use for cattle grazing, the land was stripped and it deteriorated rapidly.

MISAPPLIED SCIENCE AID EXOTIC ANIMALS HARM HABITATS

The application of scientific knowledge to the benefit of one animal can bring an unprecedented increase in its numbers with consequent harm to the habitat and other animals. Improved veterinary practices have allowed a large expansion in the herds of scrubby cattle that the Masai tribe of East Africa use as money and measures of prestige. The result is large areas that are in bad shape from overgrazing and unable to support the wildlife that had lived there.

The harm to native animals and their environment that can result from the introduction of a highly successful exotic animal is notorious, with the depredations of the outlandish rabbit in Australia being perhaps the most familiar example. Unfortunately, animals are being moved about in the world today with little thought about the damaging results to native animals.

It is not my purpose, Mr. Speaker, to assign blame for these tragedies but only to describe the problem as it exists. We cannot feel complacent in this country, for there is much we have failed to do to perfect our own conservation program, though our resources are sufficient to the task. It may be recalled, too, that the flightless, penguin-like Great Auk once populated our Atlantic coast in large numbers. After several centuries of indiscriminate clubbing, the last one was killed in 1844. We still appear bent on destroying other species by failure to practice conservation. But we have also shown in our rescues of the bison and the pronghorn antelope that it is possible to reverse an animal's downslide to obliteration and give it a new lease on life.

PRIVATE GROUPS ARE WORKING TO CONSERVE WORLD WILDLIFE

The picture I have presented is dark indeed. It would be blacker still if it were not for the efforts of several organizations which are already attempting to promote conservation of wild animals throughout the world.

The International Union for Conservation of Nature and Natural Resources—IUCN—is the foremost among these. It was formed in 1948 under the sponsorship of the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization — UNESCO. The IUCN, with headquarters in Morges, Switzerland, is now an independent organization but it still works closely with UNESCO and the United Nation's Food and Agriculture Organization. It has as members the governments off Belgium, Cambodia, Dahomey, Denmark, West Germany, Ivory Coast, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaya, Monaco, Morocco, the Netherlands, Sudan, Switzerland, Thailand, Venezuela, and South Vietnam and more than 240 organizations throughout the world.

The IUCN has held several general assemblies of its members—the latest in June 1960 at Warsaw. An eighth general assembly is scheduled to be held from September 12 to 20, 1963, in Nairobi, Kenya. It will focus particularly on problems in Africa.

The IUCN has established a professional staff to collect and distribute information on preservation of wildlife. Its Survival Service Commission strives to catalog and preserve threatened species. Its studies have been the basis for action to save wild animals native to the Middle East and Southern Asia and have led to the foundation of a group to preserve the remarkable animals of the Galapagos Islands. With aid from UNESCO, the IUCN has made country-by-country reviews of the status of nature protection in many parts of the world.

AFRICA HAS BEEN SINGLED OUT FOR SPECIAL ATTENTION

As a result of a decision at Warsaw that the most critical threat to wildlife was in Africa, the IUCN has undertaken a three-stage African special project to attempt to deal with the problem. This project, which is being carried out in cooperation with other international and national organizations, is aimed at convincing African leaders and public opinion of the need and value of nature conservation. In addition, assistance is being given through the exchange of scientific and technical information. The threatened animals are initially the subject of particular attention.

A conference at Arusha, Tanganyika, in September 1961, brought together leading figures in the new African states and African, European, and American scientists and administrators. FAO, which was represented at the conference, announced its concern with the status of African wildlife and its intention to support conservation measures. Two wildlife experts, who are being paid by the FAO, have been hired to provide professional services and advice on wildlife problems.

As another part of the African special project, Sir Julian Huxley investigated the status of African wildlife for UNESCO in 1960 and wrote a report that has provided some of the valuable information I have presented to the House today. Dr. F. F. Darling, vice president and director of research for the Conservation Foundation also made an exploratory survey of 14 African countries.

But the IUCN and other existing agencies are not capable of meeting the problem without greater aid. The IUCN has only a small budget, reportedly amounting to about $90,000. No large, wealthy nation except West Germany belongs. To contrast resources with the need, the World Wildlife Fund—International—estimates that $1.5 million a year is needed to save the most seriously threatened animals and that a realistic worldwide wildlife conservation program would cost at least $3 million.

The WWF—International—is a sponsoring organization of national groups which exist in the United States, England, and the Netherlands and are being established in Germany, France, and Switzerland. Among the projects to which the WWF has contributed were: the establishment of the Charles Darwin Research Foundation to preserve the giant tortoise, the penguin, the flightless cormorant, the flamingo, and the fur seal; an expedition to take into captivity a breeding stock of the Arabian oryx; purchase of part of the famous Marismas at the mouth of the Guadalquivir in Spain to save the most important marshland wilderness in Europe and the return of 28 Hawaiian geese, bred by the Wildfowl Trust in England, to a national park on Maui Island from which they disappeared some years ago.

The WWF has been aided by Prince Philip, Duke of Edinburgh, and by Prince Bernhard of the Netherlands, but its efforts still fall short of meeting the need.

There are other groups making contributions to the work to promote conservation, among them the Conservation Foundation mentioned previously; the African Wildlife Leadership Foundation, which raises funds to train Africans in conservation; the United States Agency for International Development which is aiding in the establishment of a school of wildlife management in Tanganyika; the Interior Department, which is working on a program for wildlife management in Africa; and the new Canadian Wildlife Foundation, which should extend measures to conserve wildlife in North America.

In addition, the Fulbright program has provided a number of scientists to work abroad in the fields of conservation and wildlife management.

THE HUMAN INTEREST IN SAVING OUR WILDLIFE

Why, it may be asked, should we worry about saving all these wild animals?

Part of the answer, surely, is that there are inherent, sentimental and esthetic values in doing so. The different world we will have when the last lions or rhinos are to be found in zoos or when a youngster must ask "What was a lion, daddy?" is evident. The inherent value of preserving animals that have caught and held man's attention from time immemorial hardly requires advocacy. There is a spectator value in the threatened wildlife that is altogether incomparable and irreplacable. Many of these beasts are as beautiful as anything ever upon this earth and contemplation of that beauty cannot help but affect and uplift human sentiments.

"To see large animals going about their natural business in their own natural way, assured and unafraid, is one of the most exciting and moving experiences in the world, comparable with the sight of a noble building or the hearing of a great symphony or mass," Sir Julian Huxley once wrote.

This by itself argues strongly in favor of vigorous conservation measures. But in addition, there are very practical reasons for conserving the wildlife of the world.

Wildlife is a valuable subject of study to establish important scientific principles. Some of the areas of Africa contain climax communities which represent the highest development of the prehuman ecological system.

THE ECONOMIC VALUE IN SAVING OUR WILDLIFE

More practical still is the economic potential of wildlife under proper conservation. Wildlife can and should be a significant factor in the economic growth of the developing nations. By properly managed game ranching, wildlife can provide more much-needed meat than is being obtained from the reckless, indiscriminate slaughter now being practiced. And because of the differentiations of type among wildlife to prefectly fit the environment, game ranching can in many cases provide more meat than could be obtained from turning the land over to the grazing of domestic stock or to agriculture. The crop of domestic livestock, mostly cattle, in East Africa grassland is slightly more than 30,000 pounds per square mile. On savannah it sinks to under 16,000 pounds. But for wild game on savannah the figure is between 66,000 and 90,000 pounds. On African land which will support one cow on 30 acres, game can yield 4 pounds of meat per acre for every 3 pounds from cattle, experts estimate. This yield from game could be increased if modest sums were invested to improve the habitat, by opening new water holes, for example. Moreover, game ranching protects the environment whereas the grazing of cattle on much of the land now occupied by wildlife leads to its rapid deterioration. The advantages of depending upon game ranching is also very great in areas where use of cattle or other domestic animals is barred by the presence of diseases and pests. In South Africa, game ranching is already an important supplement to income derived from domestic animals on many farms.

Not only does game ranching produce meat, but also the hides and other animal parts which are so much in demand in the Western World and elsewhere. By management to assure that the animal sources of these products are not soon killed off and by subjecting the trade to controls, the developing nations can assure themselves and the world a continuing and perhaps increasing source of revenue.

WILDLIFE WILL BRING TOURIST INCOME TO DEVELOPING NATIONS

Tourism generated by the presence of extraordinary wildlife can also be a source of revenue for nations that preserve their animals. Already expenditures by tourists comprise the second largest source of revenue in Kenya, amounting to some $22 million. Through the construction of better roads and accommodations and by developing national parks replete with films, guides, lectures, information bureaus in the manner of many of our parks and natural attractions income from tourism can be increased further. The Treetops facility in Kenya where visitors can spend a night in a tree shelter with the certainty of seeing a variety of wild animals going their way unaware of human presence has become very popular. Continued urbanization and industrialization of the United States and Europe will enhance the attraction of such settings in Africa and other developing nations if wildlife is conserved. But the developing nations lack the means to avail themselves of this opportunity without aid for that purpose.

A WORLD CONFERENCE CAN MARSHAL THE COMPREHENSIVE MEASURES NEEDED TO SAVE THE WORLD'S WILDLIFE

Many of the threatened animals are native to areas of Latin America, Asia, and Africa. It may, therefore, be asked why we in the United States and in this Congress need to concern ourselves with their fate.

I would reply that each species, wherever it may live, belongs to all mankind. When the stock of life is diminished by the senseless slaughter now going on, all of us lose something very real and irreplaceable. We have an interest in preventing the squandering of the animal riches of the world and in avoiding the day when man and his domestic animals alone occupy the globe.

The United States is also seeking to promote the development of many of the nations which possess the greatest wild animal resources. By helping them to see the value of conserving these resources and by aiding them to begin their conservation programs we can, at small cost, make a considerable contribution to their growth, their ability to fulfill the rising expectations of their people and their capacities to remain independent parts of the free world.

The participation of the governments of the world is needed since they control conservation programs within their borders, regulate imports and exports, and can provide the funds that are required to reap the benefits of conservation. Action to control imports of wild animal products can be of great assistance to nations attempting to prevent the outrages of poachers. With vast areas and few wardens this presents tremendous enforcement problems otherwise. Import bans or limitations would strike at the poachers' incentive to crime and put new difficulties in their way. For import restrictions to be effective, they must be imposed by all importing countries. It would be of little value to prevent the fashionable ladies of America from having leopard-skin coats, for example, while their counterparts in England or Germany continued to buy them apace.

Since bilateral negotiations would necessarily be protracted and cumbersome, an international conference seems the best way of focusing attention on the problem and getting the world started toward more general, more effective action by governments and private groups to save the world's wildlife. The nations represented at the conference could hammer out an agreement on a total program, set out the responsibilities of each nation, make provision for new studies in areas where information is lacking and decide, at least tentatively, how the program will be financed. It is possible that the wildlife conference might be held in conjunction with the World Food Congress of the Freedom From Hunger Campaign of the FAO in Washington June 4 to 18, 1963.

The text of House Concurrent Resolution 107 follows:

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Congress that the Secretary of the Interior, in consultation with the Secretary of State, should take all necessary steps to convene an international conference within one year after the adoption of this concurrent resolution for the purpose of initiating cooperative action to further conservation of wild animals on a worldwide basis.

SEC. 2. The following countries should be invited to participate in the conference:

(1) Those countries (hereinafter referred to as the "consuming countries") whose demand for furs, skins, pelts, tusks, feathers, and other parts of wild animals, or whose citizens, by hunting wild game, cause a diminution of species of wild animals, and which include, but are not limited to, the members of the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development; and

(2) Those countries (hereinafter referred to as the "producing countries") in which the major wild animal habitats exist and which include, but are not limited to, countries in Africa, Asia, and Latin America.

SEC. 3. The conference should consider the following cooperative actions:

(1) Legislative or administrative action by consuming countries curtailing or banning imports of commodities the chief value of which is derived from wild animals; and

(2) Assistance by consuming countries to producing countries, either unilaterally or multilaterally through the United Nations or other international agencies, to establish training schools for wildlife and conservation specialists, to establish conservation departments in the producing countries, or otherwise to assist desired world conservation programs; and

(3) Joint study by producing and consuming countries to determine how wildlife conservation and management can increase tourist revenues for producing countries; and

(4) Assistance by the United States to the producing countries through use of local currency accruing to the United States under the food-for-peace program to further the objectives stated in paragraphs (2) and (3) of this section; and

(5) Any other action to promote wild animal conservation.

DEVELOPED NATIONS CAN AID IN ELIMINATING POACHING AND IN TRAINING CONSERVATIONISTS

Some of the specific steps proposed in House Concurrent Resolution 107 could go far toward meeting major specific parts of the problem. Many leaders in the developing nations see the need to conserve their wildlife resources but lack the means to act decisively. Subsection 1 of section 3 proposes a way of aiding developing nations in eliminating the devastating poaching now going on, by controlling imports of the skins and other products of threatened animals.

Another great deficiency in meeting the threat to wildlife is the great shortage of specialists in wildlife management and conservation in the developing nations. There are so many demands on the limited supply of highly trained persons and so strong an impulse among the educated to forsake the bush for the city, that aid particularly to train game managers, conservationists and ecologist is very much needed. A college to train game wardens is to be established in Tanganyika but it is only a small beginning. The need is large. There are fewer than 30 wardens for 355,000 square miles in Tanganyika. In Kenya, for instance, there are only 22 for 200,000 square miles. The central agencies concerned with conservation are embryonic. House Concurrent Resolution 107 proposes that the conference consider means by which the developed countries that import wild animal products can aid the developing nations to establish training schools and conservation departments.

Relatively small outlays to bring Africans, Asians, and Latin Americans to this country for training in wildlife management and to supplement efforts to set up conservation colleges in the developing countries could pay big dividends. The resolution suggests a means by which some of this could be financed, through use of local currency accruing to the United States under the food-for-peace program.

It is clear, as I pointed out earlier, that the nations fortunate enough to have marvelous stocks of wild animals can derive considerable tourism income from them. But to make the most of this possibility they will have to make some improvements in roads, tourist accommodations, information services and other preparations. To avoid ill-conceived projects and waste, careful studies of the economics of each proposal will be requisite. Joint study by the developed nations, whose citizen will comprise the bulk of the tourists, and the developing nations offers the best approach to the situation. This is proposed in subsection 3 of section 3 of House Concurrent Resolution 107.

Mr. Speaker, I hope the Congress will take note of the desperate plight of the many magnificent animals of which I have spoken and of the demands of reason and morality that the current rush toward extermination be stopped. I hope it will promptly pass House Concurrent Resolution 107.

DIALOG ON THE PROBLEMS OF THE NATIONAL ECONOMY

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. BECKER] is recognized for 2 hours.

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Speaker, I assure you I do not intend to take for myself all the time allotted to me but shall make my remarks as brief as possible. Before I begin my prepared remarks, entitled "Dialog on the Economy of the United States," as requested by President Kennedy last June in his speech at Yale, bearing on the question of tax reduction and tax reforms, I should like to make two things clear:

First, I shall finish my statement and then I shall be glad to yield to anyone on the floor.

Second, my remarks, while they may include political implications in that I shall refer to certain political statements made in the past and apply them to the present, it is not my intention to make a partisan speech.

I want especially to call to the attention of the Members of the House that only yesterday again I read in the newspaper some remarks made by our Vice President of the United States, the Honorable LYNDON JOHNSON, a man for whom I have the highest respect and admiration not only as a statesman but as a politician. I do so because it seems that when we Republicans stand up and fight for our beliefs and our principles and point up what we believe to be the errors, mistakes and bungling, if you will, of the Executive of this country, we are immediately accused of political motives by members of the Democrat Party as did the Democrats when I spoke a couple of weeks ago on the economy of the country. But the Democrats very rarely go back to their own remarks of just a couple of years ago when President Eisenhower was the Executive of this Nation, when they sniped at him continuously for 8 long years, even to the point at which many of the remarks, such as those on the missile gap, were very dangerous. Recall also, Democrat criticism of the matter of U.S. prestige in the world, again a very dangerous political attack. This continued from one end of the land to the other, day in and day out, and we had to accept it as being the political rights of the Democrat Party.

Mr. Speaker, I shall read this statement as rapidly as I can.

Mr. Speaker, I shall address myself for a few minutes to the problems of our sagging economy and the changing moods and methods of this administration with reference thereto.

Then, I invite my colleagues to join in the discussion because this is a matter of extreme importance to our country. What I say will not be of a partisan nature and cannot be so construed.

Let us start with the period in which Mr. Kennedy, then a U.S. Senator, was a candidate for the Presidency.

In reply to a question by the Scripps-Howard newspapers October 3, 1960, Mr. Kennedy said:

> It is extremely important that the United States maintain, to the extent that it is possible, a balanced budget. The only true reasons justifying an unbalanced budget would be a great national emergency—and serious unemployment.

Now, it should be noted here that, first, we now face no great national emergency; and, second, any unemployment is too much, but the unbalanced budgets of the last few years have not decreased it. Actually, unemployment has gone up a little while the unbalance of our budgets on the red ink side has gone up and up, during the first 2 years of this administration and in the budget before us now.

The facts are: To my knowledge, President Kennedy has not sent to this Congress a single idea designed to balance the budget, but that, on the contrary, he continues to send us programs that will cost increasingly fantastic amounts of money, and planned deficits.

Then, the President made his famous Yale University commencement address in June 1962, in which he called for a dialog on the problems by this time besetting the American economy.

Two months later, in August, he told a nationwide television audience why he would not propose a tax cut at that time.

But now we have the administration's tax-cut, tax-reform program before us in the Congress. President Kennedy sent it up here with the flat warning that he must have an all-or-nothing package of tax cuts and tax reforms.

The President's fiscal spokesman, Treasury Secretary Douglas Dillon, testified before the House Ways and Means Committee, in answer to a question by Mr. Brynes of Wisconsin, that unless the tax-cut, tax-reform proposal was adopted in a package, he would recommend a Presidential veto.

Subsequently, the President began to hear from Members of the House and from the people. He found they didn't agree with these screwball economics such as a tax cut, by borrowing $12 billion; followed by tax reforms to take it back, and adding to the national debt, and increased inflation.

So, on February 25 last, the President told the American Bankers Association he would be satisfied with a tax cut alone. He already had estimated officially that the entire package as originally requested would result in a deficit of nearly $12 billion. Without the so-called tax reforms where would the deficit go?

Where, in fact, has the idea of a balanced budget gone in the mind of the President if, in reality, he ever did have such an idea?

Now, let us go back to another speech Mr. Kennedy made at Rockford, Ill., on October 24, 1960. He said:

> Members of the House of Representatives have great responsibility placed upon them by the Constitution. They are the representatives of the people. Therefore, the power to tax, to appropriate money, other great powers, are vested in Members of the House.

If the President believes in this constitutional power, why then has he so aggressively interfered with the affairs of Congress?

I refer to his personal intercession in stacking the Rules Committee of the House in the 87th and 88th Congresses in order to get what he called a committee that would be responsive to his legislative requests.

Why has he interfered at the start of this session to load the Finance Committee of the other body with people responsive to his wishes?

I ask the President to study his statements in the light of subsequent attempts by him to pressure the Members of the House into adopting his tax package under threat of a recession.

Mr. Speaker, I agree with the President's statement at Rockford, Ill. We, as Members of the House, are the representatives of the people. We do have great responsibility. We do have the power to tax and appropriate money.

In my opinion, it is high time we made the truth of the statement very clear. We do represent the people.

And, in my opinion, the people are sick and tired of high taxes, deficits, and inflation brought about by gimmick programs to which the President is so persistently devoted.

In my opinion, the people I represent are sick and tired of their Government continuing to bleed them, to finance all kinds of fantastic schemes, continuing, meantime, to operate at a deficit with an ever-increasing national debt leading to higher inflation and inevitably to bankruptcy.

The dialog Mr. Kennedy asked for is on in a big way.

Many divergent views are expressed in various ways. But, the basic theme of it all, is, that what we need to get the country going, as President Kennedy has phrased it, is to cut the expenses of government before we cut its revenue.

Every housewife, every worker, every businessman knows that to keep his financial head above water, he must do that very thing, so he asks very logically: "Why should not my Government do that, too?"

Now, the President finds himself and his administration in an embarrassing position for which he would like to shift the blame to Congress—to Members of the House especially.

Nobody objects to paying his fair share of taxes. But, the people wonder, Mr. Speaker, why their Government should continue to go further in debt—a debt on which the interest alone, some $10½ billion, takes second highest position in the budget.

"When, if ever," they ask, "can we begin to get rid of this debt and interest payment if we cannot begin now when our Nation enjoys its highest national product, greatest national income and most people employed?"

That's a good question. And, the only answer to it is that we can never begin to attack the debt until the responsible leaders of the administration learn basic economics.

The very proposal of the President's tax-cut, tax-reform program violates basic economics. Surely, the administration knows it. And, yet, the leaders of the President's party have been told from the White House that this program must pass or Mr. Kennedy's chances for reelection will not be so bright.

In any event, the President's pronouncement that he must have a tax cut and tax reform bill or the country would be plunged into a recession was the appeal of a frantic man.

He recognized insurmountable opposition to his program, not only in the Congress, but among the people—opposition coming from just about every segment of the population, as is pointed out in U.S. News & World Report which lists these groups as a few: churches, charity groups, homeowners, homebuilders, elderly people, stockholders—17 million—employee groups.

Other new tax ideas to which there is objection include: tighter rules on stock options, capital gains taxes on estates and gifts, limits on casualty-loss deductions, speedup in payment of taxes by large companies.

The President's frantic state of mind overcame his judgment to the point at which he actually shook the economic foundations with his forecast of a recession. For him to so predict is to undermine the confidence of investors et al on whose confidence rests the economic future.

If this was an attempt to blackmail the Congress into passing his tax reduction bill by shifting the blame for any recession that might occur to Capitol Hill, the President is resorting to ruthless interference with the congressional responsibility he so aptly recognized in his Rockford, Ill., speech in October 1960.

The opposition I have recounted came when the people began to understand some of the provisions of the administration plan, which are as follows:

ADMINISTRATION TAX PROPOSALS

I. Reductions

(a) Personal: Income tax would be reduced from present 20-percent to 91-percent range to a 14-percent to 65-percent range over a 3-year period.

(b) Corporate: Normal tax would be reduced from 30 percent to 22 percent on $25,000 or less. Surtax on income of more than $25,000 goes up in 1963 from present 22 percent to 30 percent; would be reduced in 1964 to 28 percent and 1965 to 25 percent. Net effect: Good tax break for small companies immediately; a 5-percent reduction for larger firms after 3 years.

II. Reforms (the major proposals concerning which there is the most controversy)

(a) Deductions (personal):

1. Itemized deductions: Only itemized deductions (taxes, interest, contributions, medical expenses) in excess of 5 percent of adjusted gross income deductible. Present law: All such items deductible.

2. Casualty losses: Only casualty losses (fire, flood, theft, etc.) in excess of 4 percent of adjusted gross income deductible.

3. Dividend credit: Eliminated.

4. Dividend exemption: $50 dividend exemption eliminated.

5. Sick pay credit: Eliminated.

(b) Other changes:

1. Estate gift: Capital gains tax on appreciation of property at time of decedent's death or at time of gift.

2. Stock options: Increased value of stock between time option is made and exercised would be taxed as regular income. For example: If one is given an option to buy stock valued at $100 and 6 months later exercises that option, and the market price of the stock has climbed to $150, the added $50 would be taxed at regular income.

3. Disability pensions: Now not taxed; would be.

4. Government pensions: State, local, or Federal now not taxed; would be.

5. Acceleration: Corporations with tax liability of $100,000 or more required to speed up payments so that by 1965 they would be on current basis.

6. Group insurance: Employer contributions to group insurance programs to be considered as employee income and would be taxable as such.

The President expressed surprise at the opposition. I wondered, as do many others, where the President got such ideas.

The Chairman of Mr. Kennedy's Council of Economic Advisers, Mr. Walter Heller, came before the Joint Committee on Economic Affairs to defend the plan. He gave at least a part of the answer to where such ideas come from. Mr. Heller said it was remarkable that the "basic puritan ethic of the American people" would overcome their desire for a tax cut.

Well, let us compare what one great American, Benjamin Franklin, said about this subject, with what Mr. Heller said, as published in the U.S. News & World Report, a compilation of their comparative views:

BEN FRANKLIN ON DEBT

Sayings of Benjamin Franklin, as published in "Poor Richard's Almanack" about 1750, had a lot to do with forming Americans' early ideas on borrowing money and having debts. Some of Franklin's teachings:

"He that goes a borrowing goes a sorrowing."

"If you'd be wealthy, think of saving, more than of getting. The Indies have not made Spain rich, because her Outgoes equal her Incomes."

"Beware of little Expenses: a small Leak will sink a great Ship."

"'Tis against some Men's Principle to pay Interest, and seems against others' Interest to pay the Principal."

"Rather go to bed supperless than run in debt for a breakfast."

"The second Vice is Lying; the first is running in Debt."

"Spare and have is better than spend and crave."

"Pay what you owe, and you'll know what is your own."

"He that buys by the penny, maintains not only himself, but other people."

"Frugality: Make no expense but to do good to others or yourself; that is, waste nothing."

"It is hard for an empty sack to stand upright."

AND THE NEW WAY OF LOOKING AT DEBT

Walter W. Heller, Chairman of the President's Council of Economic Advisers:

"I think it is quite remarkable that the basic puritan ethic of the American people should be such that they want to deny themselves tax reductions because of (a) their fears of deficits, and the additions to the national debt; and (b) because they do not understand that their spending, in effect, makes this contribution to the national growth and full employment."

"This economy is running well short of its potential. The tax cuts can generate higher output, higher employment, higher incomes; can, in effect, broaden the base for taxes so that any increase in the deficit is really a downpayment on a stronger economy and on future surpluses when this economy comes back to something approximating full employment."

"It isn't a choice between no tax cut and a balanced budget on the one hand, and a tax cut and a deficit on the other. It is a choice between a deficit of weakness which comes from sliding along below full employment, and a deficit of strength, or a deficit of transition, which comes from cutting taxes, leaving more money in the hands of private individuals, and invigorating the economy. And I think that business itself, as you can see, has come more and more to this point of view."

In reading these opposition views, one must wonder which one has been proved by history to be right. Ben Franklin or Walter Heller? This is an easy one to answer. Certainly the puritan ethic expressed by Franklin has been the rock of our Nation and its economy. The Heller concept is simply the Keynesian theory of economics that proved near fatal in England, and during our depression years.

I would suggest to President Kennedy that he fire his battery of pseudoeconomists and allow them to return to the ivory towers at Harvard, and so forth. Among these I include America's leading advocate of democratic socialism, Arthur Schlesinger, and Walter Heller, the President's chief economic adviser, whose advice the West German Government rejected in 1951, and, by so doing, went on to create the healthiest economy in Europe.

You know, we do not have to spend a dime of the taxpayers' money to build rockets to send these advisers into orbit. I am convinced they are up there already. I hope the President personally is not as confused about this situation as his ever-changing mood and direction would indicate.

But, whatever the reason may be, there can be no doubt that he has lost his way; that he needs an experienced guide. The Members of this House can be that guide.

The President should simply reduce nonessential spending and then present to the Congress a comprehensive tax reform bill along the lines of H.R. 266, the Herlong-Baker bill. This bill provides for tax reduction on a graduated scale over a 5-year period and covers both corporate and personal income taxes. This would release the additional money needed for more rapid plant expansion, retooling, and increased research. It would further put additional money in the consumer's hands for increasing the purchasing power of the American public. The stimulus from this increased economic activity would create more jobs and make up for lost revenues from increased taxable incomes.

Another great contribution the President could make to getting the country going is a publicly expressed change in attitude toward business—a change from the scare tactics he employed in the steel price controversy. His performance then did as much harm to the Nation's economy as anything else in the Nation's history.

During the campaign of 1962, I stated time and time again that I favored tax cuts. They are necessary not only for the well-being of our people directly by permitting them to keep more of their earnings, but for the good of the economy by providing business expansion and jobs for more people.

But, I made the stipulation that I would not vote tax reduction without a like reduction in spending. I said then and repeat now, that my political and economic philosophy will not permit me to absorb the theory of borrowing money to pay for tax reduction. I believe this theory to be screwball economics and economic suicide.

My constituents are under no illusion as to where I stand, believe me. I have informed them regularly since the President's message on tax reduction and tax reforms.

Now, does it seem strange to you, that I, as one Member of this House, have not received a single letter advocating or supporting tax reduction under the President's plan?

On the contrary, I have received considerable mail, from individuals and business, opposing the President's proposal of planned deficits.

I am sure many Members must recall that during the past several years I have referred to deficit financing and backdoor spending as immoral. It has been my position in the past and will remain so.

The policy now advocated by President Kennedy is that of the social planners, the sponsors of the planned economy, the regimenters of the American people, the advocates of purchasing things now to be paid for by our grandchildren and great-great grandchildren. Is this not immoral? Is this not the kind of immorality and real danger that is revolting to the American people?

I want to quote an article that appeared in the Fort Lauderdale (Fla.) News entitled: "Aroused Populace Can Halt Administration's Plunge Into Financial Disaster":

> From events of the past few months, it has become frighteningly clear—

The article reads—

> that President Kennedy * * * no longer believes in the philosophy that progress and prosperity for our Nation can be achieved through the sound principles of a balanced budget. * * * Instead, he has surrendered to the Keynesian philosophy that real prosperity can only be achieved by spending what we do not have for things we do not truly need in the hope this reckless spending binge will produce an artificial kind of prosperity that will keep us afloat in a sea of red ink. * * * It is time more Americans wake up to what is going to happen to their country if we don't get some sanity back in Washington.

Well, I am sure the Fort Lauderdale News is aware by now that the American people have awakened to the real danger, and want none of it.

In the statement by Mr. Heller, he said and I quote:

> I think it is quite remarkable that the basic puritan ethic of the American people should be such that they want to deny themselves tax reduction because of, etc.

This statement by Mr. Heller, in itself, shows a great lack of understanding of the American people. He just does not know and admits it, that the American people are far smarter than he is.

Abraham Lincoln said, many years ago:

> You can fool all of the people some of the time; you can fool some of the people all of the time; but you can't fool all of the people all of the time.

The American people are not fooled this time. They are making themselves heard in revolt, and this appears to be surprising to Mr. Heller and his Keynesian followers.

Perhaps it is these economic dreamers who have advised the President to send up the program which he said at Yale would, with the help of Congress, get the country moving.

These included farm controls, aid to depressed areas, medicare, youth employment, manpower retraining, and discretionary Presidential power for public works spending.

It takes a great stretch of the imagination to place any of these in the get-the-country-moving category. For the most part, they have little or nothing to do with the economy, except that they all cost a lot of taxpayers' money.

Whatever else may be said for the President's unsuccessful farm bill, its purpose was to regiment the farmer into producing less, not to stimulate more production.

Regardless of the pros and cons of medicare on other grounds, not even its proponents could very well claim it was a growth additive.

Aid to depressed areas, unemployed youth manpower retraining, public works—all of these are by definition tranquilizers, designed at most to soothe sore spots. They can no more be expected to stimulate growth than did similar programs in the thirties, when all the considerable efforts of Government, year after year, were unable to significantly alleviate mass unemployment, much less lift the economy out of the mire of depression.

Thus it would appear that the help the President sought from Congress—and much of it he got—has not started the country moving.

The answer, in my opinion, lies in a forthright statement by President Kennedy, that he is going to reduce nonessential spending and restore fiscal responsibility to the Federal Government. If he would then reduce his requests for spending, then and only then, should Congress consider tax reduction.

The proper procedure for the Congress to follow, in my opinion, is as follows:

First. Act on all appropriation bills first with a sharp eye toward elimination of nonessential appropriations.

Second. If sufficient cuts are made to more than balance the budget, apply the black ink balance to tax reduction and the national debt.

Speaking for the people of my district now and as I have for many years, I say that we must stop foisting all of these social gimmicks on the people; stop being the tool of the pressure groups.

We must act on behalf of the great majority of the American people who look to us to conduct the affairs of their Government in a sound and sensible way.

Let us put aside the thought of political expediency or who will win the next election.

Let us respond to the puritan ethic of the American people and base our judgment on what is right and what is moral.

Let us assure the American people that principles are the foundation of good and only on this basis will we decide the issues.

For the good of my country, I want to see my President make good. But I will never concede that he is God, or speaks with a God-like voice, no matter how many threats he makes or what terrible retribution he seeks to invoke.

And, finally, let me say this. The task of, and responsibility for, cutting public expenditures is not limited to the Federal Government.

It is just as important to State and local governments. The people are sick and tired of outlandish government spending, no matter at what level it may be.

Now, Mr. Speaker, so that nobody can conceivably get the idea that I am against lower taxes, I want to make it clear that since I have been in the House I have advocated less spending and less taxes. This is no new position for me.

For instance, it startles me when I realize that our factories, stores, mines, utilities and all other corporations, on an average, must operate the first 190 days of the year—more than half the year—to make enough money to pay their taxes.

As Henry J. Taylor, the learned writer, says:

> Surely one definition of socialism is the line beyond which a government gets more than the owners. We've crossed that line, even excluding State, county and community taxes on corporations.

Mr. Taylor further points out that Hitler took only 44 percent of profits; that Mussolini took 40 percent, and that they were, as he says, "pikers compared to Washington's 52 percent bite."

So let there be no question about where I stand. Taxes are too high and they have got to come down.

Taxpayers are already forking over $2.2 billion more this year in social security taxes. There are 47 State legislatures meeting this year. Preliminary budget estimates indicate they will seek at least $2.5 billion in additional State taxes.

Many State tax systems are based on the same deductions, allowances, as is that of the Federal Government. President Kennedy reforms which would cut deductions would be incorporated into these State laws, thus raising State taxes. Thirty-three States are studying ways of increasing taxes at present.

As Mark Twain said, maybe we are lucky we are not getting as much government as we are paying for. But paying we certainly are, and a tax cut may be a frustrating, illusory thing.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BECKER. I would be happy to yield to my colleague, the gentlewoman from New York.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend my colleague, the gentleman from New York [Mr. BECKER] on this very excellent and well-prepared speech. I want particularly to ask the gentleman, since he brought Benjamin Franklin into this discussion and since I also read the remarks in U.S. News & World Report which the gentleman quoted—does not the gentleman feel that perhaps if we went back to the original concept of government which prevailed in the days of Benjamin Franklin when the Congress legislated and the executive carried out the legislation, we might be a little better off than we are today since we too are guilty in this respect?

Mr. BECKER. I am in wholehearted agreement with the statement of my colleague, the distinguished gentlewoman from New York. That is exactly what we must do. I think we are hearing more and more about that every day, for we, through the years, have permitted the executive branch of Government and I might say the judicial branch of Government to usurp the power and authority of the Congress. I agree wholeheartedly with the gentlewoman, and that is what I mean here. We must reassume our responsibilities as one of the three equal branches of the Federal Government.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman; I quite agree with him.

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BECKER. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, I want to compliment the gentleman on his very fine economics discourse. I should like to ask the gentleman if he can point to any one recommendation of the administration that he considers an aid to private industry.

Mr. BECKER. That is what I tried to get at in my remarks; in going over President Kennedy's recommendations, both last year and so far this year, I can find absolutely nothing that would add to the growth of what we call the gross national product upon which income and employment depend and upon which revenues of the Government depend. There is really nothing in here. I would like to see some concrete ideas to get the country moving; that is, legislation in that direction.

Mr. YOUNGER. I think the gentleman also can find many instances of harassment of private industry.

Mr. BECKER. I think one of the ways in which President Kennedy could get the country moving, one of the greatest contributions he could make is to get government off the backs of the people and of business and let them operate as business people; do not restrict or confine them so that business does not know whether it is going or coming, and does not know on what day it is going to get hit over the head by threats or through regulation. I think that if we would free our business people, our enterprise system that has made this one of the greatest nations in the world and has put it where it is today, conditions would improve. The Government did not make our country. It provided the rules under which we could live. But it was business, the free people of this Nation, working under laws, that made this the greatest Nation on earth. We could do that again. I think if President Kennedy adopted this idea and moved forward with the idea of reestablishing the moral principles of our government, he would really get this country moving. And I would love to see him do it.

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, does not the gentleman feel that it is impossible to put all of the unemployed to work in the Peace Corps foreign and the Peace Corps domestic, and by increasing the payrolls of the Federal Government? The Government simply cannot absorb all of the unemployed, as they are attempting to do.

Mr. BECKER. As I said in my statement these are all gimmicks they are using to take the minds of the people off their many problems. I mentioned earlier that the President promised this year to make a greater utilization of the employees of the Federal Government so that we could have less people on the payroll. Then, a couple of days later, he asks us for appropriations to put 37,000 more people on the Federal payroll. These are some of the inconsistencies that I am talking about, that tend to destroy us.

Mr. YOUNGER. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BECKER. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Speaker, I compliment the gentleman on a splendid statement. I have a constituency which is very much addicted to letter writing. I, like the gentleman from New York, have yet to receive one letter from a person in my district urging me to support the President's tax program.

Mr. BECKER. I appreciate my colleague's saying that because I have had the same expression from many other Members. Mr. Speaker, may I add this: I appreciate the complimentary things that have been said about my statement. I am not a writer of speeches, believe me. All I have done today is to try to get off my mind and off my chest those things which I believe I am for and those which I am against.

Mr. REIFEL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BECKER. I yield to my colleague.

Mr. REIFEL. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend my colleague from New York, the distinguished gentleman who has just spoken, for the excellent statement he has made.

He made reference to the Keynesian philosophy of government. It did not come as any surprise to the gentleman when the other day the President said it did not make any difference whether we had any kind of tax reform just so long as he got his tax cut. It seems that at the other end of the avenue his advisers who believe in this Keynesian philosophy that we can spend ourselves into prosperity have been speaking with tongue in cheek when they said that we might have some tax reform but so long as they get money out of the Federal Treasury they can go on spending and spending and electing and electing.

I join with the gentleman in the remarks he has made.

Mr. Speaker, we have heard the President recommend another record budget of about $99 billion, but with lower taxes promised to all. The budget, proposed in a time of prosperity, seeks to meet unemployment problems by massive Federal spending, the same method used unsuccessfully during the New Deal in a time of depression.

It seems to me that such a proposal is the height of fiscal irresponsibility. With a promise of a tax cut and an increased budget there can be only one result, and that is an unbalanced budget and a higher Federal debt.

The President's proposals are based on the premise that joyous taxpayers will join the Government in spending more, creating new economic activity to end unemployment and at the same time produce more tax revenues to wipe out the record deficit.

The value of the dollar meanwhile is supposed to hold steady, contrary to past experience in periods of big Federal deficits.

In looking at the rosy forecasts for increased Federal revenues, some of us keep recalling that Federal spending has climbed much faster than income during the past 2 years. And chief relief for the unemployed has been to put them on the rapidly expanding Federal payroll.

The administration anticipates big cuts in spending for farm programs and international finance with lesser cuts in housing and veterans affairs. There is little reason to look for reduction in any of these areas. In addition, there is evidence that the cost of present and proposed domestic programs has been seriously underestimated.

In all probability, we can look forward to an increase in deficit spending and a higher Federal debt if the administration's budgetary proposals are followed. In the face of an increased deficit, the President has offered a tax cut which will add further to the already soaring Federal debt.

Chief interest is centered in the administration proposal to place a 5-percent floor on tax reductions for such things as interest on home mortgages, contributions to church and charities, and so forth.

The average tax cut for a family of four with an income of $5,000 is estimated at $58 by 1965.

Congressional tax experts say the 5-percent floor will reduce the average itemized deductions by between 20 and 30 percent. This includes other changes allowing smaller deductions for medical expenses and casualty losses.

Under present law the standard deduction is equal to 10 percent of the adjusted gross income—with a ceiling of $1,000—or a deduction by itemization. The proposed 5-percent floor would appear to reward those who use the standard deduction and penalize those who itemize—which falls most heavily on the middle income group.

At the same time it would seem to discriminate against the homeowner paying local and State taxes and contributing to his church, charity, or school. It would reward the person who does not own his home, does not pay local or State taxes, and does not contribute to charity.

The whole question of tax reduction while increasing Federal spending involves a grandiose gamble. The President is putting everything on the line in the hope that the increased expenditures and tax reduction will result in spectacular economic growth. There is no guarantee that his proposals will work now, when they have failed in the past. If the economy fails to realize such spectacular growth, then tax rates will have to be increased to prereduction levels.

The citizens of South Dakota are deeply concerned about the President's proposals. Many of them have expressed their views to me. I would like to cite some of the comments which my constituents have expressed in recent letters. They are representative of many additional letters being received:

Hon. Ben Reifel,
House of Representatives, House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Reifel: I am extremely concerned about the Treasury Department's recent recommendation to Congress for changes in our Federal income tax laws.

An inducement to keep good teachers in any community is that fact that under their limited income, and under present legislation, it is possible to purchase a home on a monthly purchase plan. The fact that these folks can presently deduct all of certain expenses in computing the net for tax purposes is surely a positive factor. Home mortgage interest and real estate tax deductions were approved as an inducement for growth of homeownership; this inducement, it seems to me, is as important today as ever before.

Thank you.

Very sincerely yours,
Clair T. Blikre.

Hon. Ben Reifel,
U.S. Congressman from South Dakota,
Washington, D.C.

Honorable Sir: It appears to me that our congressional representatives should represent their constituents, but there are times when the constituents are misled by governmental propaganda, and at such times, the representation should be a matter of protection of the constituent.

If there was ever a time when the unthinking citizen needed protection, it's now. A tax cut is, of course, popular, but if it entails greater debt, and eventual federalization of our country, I feel that our representatives should save the public from its own ignorance and folly.

Please use your influence and vote to defeat any and all political schemes to perpetuate an all-powerful Central Government.

No one ever successfully spent himself rich. How can Democrats justify their stand? We must return the government to the people.

Respectfully yours,
L. J. Pankow.

Hon. Ben Reifel,
Congressman from South Dakota.

Dear Mr. Reifel: We had a livestock meeting here last night with some of the commission men and packer buyers and one of the topics discussed was income tax crackdown for business people.

There is no question that it is hurting the cattle market. It has probably been abused, but the net result will be less tax money. These farmers are very disturbed about the whole deal, and many seem to think that we will simply raise the U.S. debt.

I personally think that a big tax cut would make more activities for all business and perhaps make more people employed, but how can it help as long as big labor leaders step in and raise more wages. The administration is antagonistic to business anyway.

You must remember when F.D.R. came in 1933 until 1941 with the same kind of gang in power, unemployment was higher in 1941. All farm products were down. We sold hogs for 4 to 5 cents in 1940 and 1941 and the only reason prices came up was the war.

Sincerely,
Jim Biggar.

Hon. Ben Reifel,
U.S. Representative,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

My Dear Mr. Reifel: A lot of voters in South Dakota are becoming irate over Federal spending and what it is costing us. From the information we get, the proposed tax cut is a mere pittance compared to what could be done.

We—I believe I speak for many South Dakotans—are awestruck over the method that is proposed to allow for tax reduction. The beatnicks have a phrase for it—"snow job."

In my opinion, it is time that careful legislators band together, tighten controls on spending at home and abroad, making sure we get our dollar's worth; exert pressure on the committee responsible for tax laws that irrigate the bank accounts of most Americans who are literally living from hand to mouth.

The February issue of Nation's Business states that government spending will take 31 percent of the gross national product in 1963 as opposed to 10 percent in 1940 and 24.8 percent in 1955. Perhaps the sages on Capitol Hill know where we are heading and have ceased to listen to the still small voice of the taxpayer and voter who are fearful of a ruptured bubble.

Respectfully yours,
J. E. Swallum.

Mr. REIFEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include certain letters.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. BECKER. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

Mr. STINSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BECKER. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. STINSON. Mr. Speaker, I believe we all realize that the public is losing confidence in the present administration—

Because of the double failure, for example, that we have had down in Cuba.

Because this administration has allowed the wall to be erected in Berlin.

Because we have had a continuing program of giving aid to the Communist bloc countries.

Because of the fantastic budget proposals that have been made.

Because of the unrealistic tax reduction and reform proposals.

Because of helping form a coalition government with the Communists in Laos.

Because business failures are the highest since 1935.

Because mortgage foreclosures are extremely high.

Because of having alienated the Canadians, the British, the French, the Portuguese, and probably some others.

However, I find it extremely difficult to understand what would motivate the administration to use tactics that may well start a recession in this country. It is quite possible that a recession can be induced when a person in high office starts referring to a recession as being likely if certain legislation is not passed.

The people have gone along with the deficit-spending fiscal irresponsibility of the administration for the past couple of years. Now they are demanding that we return to a sound financial position.

My mail also has been overwhelmingly in favor of not going along with the fiscally irresponsible program of the administration.

Mr. BECKER. I thank the gentleman for his contribution. I agree with what he says. I am sure his constituents feel exactly that way.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BECKER. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. FINDLEY. I should like to compliment the gentleman from New York on his most important presentation, and to make note of the fact that it is especially appropriate on this 30th anniversary of the inauguration of former President Franklin D. Roosevelt. Our late President became noted for his deficit financing, but during his years in the White House I do not recall a single peacetime year in which he failed at least to give lipservice to the objective of a balanced budget.

Mr. BECKER. The most significant part of it is that it started off with the idea that we would probably reach a balanced budget by this method in 1967 or 1968, but now they have even pushed this by the board and it may not be until 1975. Who is going to carry the load along the way?

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BECKER. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. NELSEN. I wish to thank the gentleman from New York for taking the time to discuss the importance of a sound national budget.

I am sure the gentleman would be pleased to know that obviously the general public does not buy, as a sound proposal, the so-called planned deficit approach. I reach this conclusion judging from the many comments included in the many letters I receive. I think the gentleman should know that actually some folks are amused, feeling the tax proposal is ridiculous.

A quote from one letter reveals this fact very well—here is the quote:

Dear Congressman: Could you get President Kennedy to write my banker. You see I am planning a deficit in my budget and I am having trouble making the dumb cluck understand.

I thank my colleague for yielding.

Mr. BECKER. I am glad to have a little levity in this, but the gentleman is perfectly right.

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BECKER. I am happy to yield to my colleague.

Mr. HUTCHINSON. I desire to associate myself with a particular remark of the gentleman in which the gentleman points out that probably all unemployment is too much unemployment, but obviously our experience for many years now is that you do not lick an unemployment problem with a deficit spending program. The present program of the administration tries, as I see it, first, to increase the spending and then reduce the taxes. I suppose they intend to make up the difference by borrowing.

Mr. Speaker, it also has been my observation that a debtor is not in a very healthy financial situation and I do not think it is proper ever to consider a debt as an asset. Nevertheless, this administration seems to so consider it.

Mr. Speaker, a debt—the national debt in the size to which it has grown, represents to my mind the failure of our generation to meet the demands of our time. Practically all of the present national debt, Mr. Speaker, was created by our generation—permitted to grow by our generation, and it measures the extent to which our generation has failed to meet the requirements of our time and, yet, we see fit to cast that burden upon the future. I submit, Mr. Speaker, that the future will have need of all of its own resources to meet all of its own needs without bearing our burdens as well. Consequently, I do not see how we can avoid the very elemental economic principle that you cannot spend and have, and that the way to get this economy of ours on a sound basis again would be to reduce Government spending, to balance the budget and to undertake an orderly process for the reduction of the national debt.

I thank my colleague for yielding.

Mr. BECKER. I certainly would agree with what the gentleman has said. This is getting into the immorality of what we are doing. It seems in recent years the pseudoliberals—and I call them pseudoliberals because that is all they are—they want to spend my money but not theirs, to do all the fancy things that they want, but that they do not want to pay for themselves. I would like to see them spend their money to do some of these things, which they could very well do because their funds are unlimited. But they are in such a hurry to do everything now and to remake the world now. It took God all these years to create the world and mankind as we know it today, but they want to do this today, tomorrow and yesterday. But they do not care whether my grandchildren and my great-grandchildren are going to be able to build a sidewalk or whether they are going to have a bankrupt nation. They do not care about that. I say if they want these things now, let those people who propose to do the spending bring in an additional tax bill and place that tax bill before the people and be honest about it and say, "This project is going to cost $5 billion, therefore, we are going to increase taxes so much." To me—this would be the moral way to handle the situation.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BECKER. I am glad to yield to my colleague, the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ROGERS].

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, do I understand that your chief objection is that this is a planned spending deficit?

Mr. BECKER. No, sir. I am against deficit spending except when it happens as a result of a national emergency or an uncontrolled recession or depression.

I am against deficit spending. I have voted against it through the years.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. How would you go about getting from under the deficit?

Mr. BECKER. I think I detailed that in my lengthy dissertation on the economy.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. What part of the appropriations would you cut out?

Mr. BECKER. Oh, I would cut out a lot of foreign aid. I would cut out a lot of agriculture. I would cut out this $5 billion for Federal aid to education. I would cut out a lot of things the people do not want and which they could get along better without.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Would you do without subsidies to airlines?

Mr. BECKER. If we are going to get into this matter of cutting expenditures to meet revenues I could detail where you could cut out billions of dollars from the budget, at least $10 billion, without getting into the matter of subsidies to airlines.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. If the gentleman will yield further, what the gentleman is talking about is the budget.

Mr. BECKER. That is right.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. And the tax bill.

Mr. BECKER. That is right.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. And the gentleman is objecting because they do not come out even.

Mr. BECKER. No, that is not it.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Is not that the extent of your argument?

Mr. BECKER. That is only part of it.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Do you not realize that after the depression of 1929 we have been engaging in deficit spending almost every year since then, including the Eisenhower years when we had more than $32 billion in deficit?

Mr. BECKER. No, you did not. In the Eisenhower years it was $30 billion.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Only $30 billion.

Mr. BECKER. And that was too much.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. And that was not planned, was it?

Mr. BECKER. During that time there were two recessions that caused a great part of that deficit. The gentleman will remember that in 1954 we balanced the budget with a Republican-controlled Congress, and reduced taxes. We did that under a Republican Congress. Under a Republican Congress and Republican President in 1954 we balanced the budget and we reduced taxes nearly $7.5 billion. I would think that was quite an accomplishment.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. BECKER. I yield.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. The gentleman is talking about the slump of 1955.

Mr. BECKER. I believe it was after that.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. The gentleman is talking about the slump of 1955.

Mr. BECKER. I believe it was after that.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. The gentleman admitted to two depressions in the Eisenhower administration.

Mr. BECKER. Not depressions. The gentleman referred to the Hoover depression. I would like to have him define what he means by a Hoover depression.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. The Hoover depression came when the Republicans manipulated the market.

Mr. BECKER. Republicans?

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. When they threw the farmer and the working man completely out of employment.

Mr. BECKER. Just a minute. I wonder if Joe Kennedy should not bear some of the responsibility? Nobody made more money in the stock market in 1929 than Joe Kennedy. That is where he made many millions. He also manipulated the stock market. Was he a Republican?

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. BECKER. I yield.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Was it not the Republicans who set up the RFC to help out the railroads and the banks?

Mr. BECKER. When was it that was set up?

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. In 1930.

Mr. BECKER. Certainly it was neither 1928 or 1929.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. It came about at a time when every bank and railroad was in trouble and the man Hoover appointed at the head of it was Mr. Dawes, "Hell-and-Maria" Dawes, Vice President under "Keep Cool With Coolidge."

Then what did he do? The first $90 million he lent was to his own bank in Chicago. He resigned and went home, as did every other Republican who had the ability to get close to the RFC, the railroads, and the banks. That was when the Federal spending got started, under the Republicans in 1930, 1931, and 1932.

Mr. BECKER. The gentleman will concede that whoever started it, it has kept going ahead.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Eisenhower followed that philosophy.

Mr. BECKER. He did not. At no time did he follow that philosophy.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. The Republicans had a $32 billion deficit from the time he went in 1953.

Mr. BECKER. Again the gentleman is wrong. In the first place, the gentleman will remember we were in the Korean war in 1953 and there was a big deficit that year.

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BECKER. I yield.

Mr. HALEY. Is it not true that every President for the last 50 years in running as a candidate for the Presidency has sold the people on the idea, or told the people that he was going to have and submit to the Congress a balanced budget?

Mr. BECKER. I agree with the gentleman, yes.

Mr. HALEY. And it has not been done, has it?

Mr. BECKER. It has not been done, no.

Mr. STINSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BECKER. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. STINSON. Mr. Speaker, in reference to the remarks made by the gentleman from Colorado, I would like to point out to the gentleman that the Democrats had control of the Congress 6 of the 8 years that President Eisenhower was in office, and that the Republicans have had control of only two sessions of Congress since 1930. I do not think a Republican in Congress or any Government employee can be blamed for the deficit spending program that this country has embarked upon since.

Mr. BECKER. The gentleman referred to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and said it was created by Mr. Hoover. What kind of Congress did we have in 1931? It was a Democratic Congress elected in 1931. It was not a Republican Congress. If the gentleman wants to argue about the matter, let us look at the record. There was not one recommendation made by Hoover to stave off the depression that the Democratic majority passed in the Congresses of 1931 and 1932. The record is abundantly clear on recommendations made by President Hoover at that time. This is an exercise in futility, if we are going to try to discuss what happened in 1928 and 1930. I am trying to discuss what we ought to do today. We should get down to business today. We should balance the budget by having sane, sound programs, and reducing the national debt, then reducing taxes, but not come in here with some gimmicks involving a deficit that nobody can point to with one ounce of reason that it will work.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BECKER. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. I am sure the gentleman knows that in the election of 1930, and certainly in the election of 1928, with the Hoover landslide, you got a Republican Congress with him?

Mr. BECKER. That was for 2 years. The gentleman said in 1930.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. That is what I said. We had the election in 1930.

Mr. BECKER. Right.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. And the Republicans had a majority.

Mr. BECKER. No.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. After the election and before the Congress came along on March 4, 1931, and there were vacancies, the Republicans failed in the special elections, and it was possible for the Democrats to take over. I think that is the history of it. If you do not believe what I am talking about, go talk to JOE MARTIN.

Mr. BECKER. I do not think it makes a particle of difference what happened in 1930. I think we should keep the discussion on what we are going to do now, what we have to build on. Because I made a mistake last year or 5 years ago, does the gentleman not think I should correct it now?

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BECKER. If the gentleman has a contribution to make that is appropriate to the discussion at hand, I will yield to him. But if we are going back, it is a great waste of time, and I do not think we should burden the Members with it.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. The contribution I would like to make at this time is to ask the gentleman, How does he propose to take care of automation and unemployment and not carry on as we have since World War II?

Mr. BECKER. Let me ask the gentleman this question, How did business provide jobs for the American people over the last 150 years? Did the Government provide the means for that? It did not. It provided a confidence in the minds and hearts of the American people. We should move forward and provide opportunities for the people. That is how we get along. Automation? Labor and business will take care of automation if we do not get in between them. I think I have yielded now enough to the gentleman.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. I want to answer the gentleman's question.

Mr. BECKER. I do not believe it will contribute anything to what we are trying to do here. In this present budget I have indicated $10 billion that you can cut. If you want to give a tax cut after that, all right.

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BECKER. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. HALEY. I thoroughly agree with the gentleman in this respect: It is not where we have been. It is, Where are we going now?

I say this, and I think every Member of this Congress knows it: You can cut the budget which has been submitted to this Congress by 20 percent, and you will not interrupt any essential function of Government, if we will get the Government out of the people's hair and let them get back to doing the things that have made this country a great Nation—individual initiative, private enterprise—and we will not have the Congress messing into these things about which it does not know anything. The people will take care of them.

Mr. BECKER. I must say that I am in wholehearted agreement with my colleague on the other side of the aisle, and I would only hope and pray that our leadership and our Government would get down to this basis. That is what I am trying to bring out today.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BECKER. I yield to the gentleman from Utah.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to compliment the gentleman from New York for the light which he has shed on this subject today.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Utah?

There was no objection.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, I would like to hear my colleague, the gentleman from New York [Mr. BECKER], comment on this item that has been been bothering me a little bit:

The President, when he submitted his message to us, told this House, if we approved his tax program and the budget which gives us a deficit of nearly $12 billion on the one hand and a big tax cut on the other, it would "strengthen every segment of the American economy and bring us closer to every basic objective of American economic policy." A tax cut and a deficit at the same time, according to the President, is designed to strengthen every segment of the American economy. My point is this: I wonder if we have discovered some new economic law under which we can operate the Federal Government? If we have discovered some new economic law, I wonder if the Members of the House who have indicated they might support this type program would not be good enough to write to their respective Governors, because we have a lot of State legislatures now in session. They are stumbling around in the dark. In Utah, for example, they are figuring out ways now to solve their school problems by raising taxes so they can balance the budget. In Utah we are working under some archaic economic principles if the President is correct. I wish someone could shed some light on this matter so we could cut our taxes and increase our spending program at the same time and maintain a balanced budget. Perhaps the New Frontiersmen have discovered a new economic law and they ought to share it with us all.

In his special tax message, President Kennedy told the Congress:

> The chief problem confronting our economy in 1963 is its unrealized potential—slow growth, underinvestment, unused capacity and persistent unemployment. The result is lagging wage, salary, and profit income, smaller take-home pay, insufficient productivity gains, inadequate Federal revenues, and persistent budget deficits.

The President was correct in every respect. These are difficult problems, the solution of which will try the best minds in the country. Since that time I have been baffled by the solution which the President and some of his fellow Harvardites have proposed. To cure two of the ills he itemized—"inadequate Federal revenues and persistent budget deficits." He asks us to deliberately plan a $12 billion deficit and at the same time deliberately cut Federal revenues.

The Congress and the Nation are being told by the "wagonmaster" of the New Frontier that this great big budget coupled with a great big deficit and backstopped with a great big tax cut is good for the country.

Mr. Speaker, if it is true that the economic problems facing our great Nation, are shared on a somewhat lesser degree by our States, counties, and towns, why will not the President share his magic with the Governors, commissioners, and mayors who, all across this broad land are stumbling in the darkness, laboring under false impressions, and trying their best to make old fashioned concepts, like the myth from our Puritan past, work; and I refer to the myth that government revenues should equal government expenditures.

If the President has no doubt that increased spending, decreased revenues, and pyramiding debt are the answer to the economic ills at the Federal level, why doesn't he urge that all of the 50 States cut their taxes, go into debt, and spend 12 percent more this year than they anticipate taking into their treasuries? I believe the States have a role to play in the Republic, and they ought to do their share of tax cutting, overspending, and debt building. Furthermore, we ought to get our 3,072 counties to help out too. If they would all overspend their budgets 12 percent and cut their taxes in one fell swoop, I imagine the rate of recovery would stagger even the President and Mr. Heller.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all the Members of this House who intend to support this sort of White House hocus-pocus to immediately write their Governors, county commissioners, and mayors and urge them to do their part to help the President get the country moving again.

The plain truth of the matter is, that this sort of economic logic would not work for you, nor for me. It would not work either for the States, the counties, and the cities and I, for one, do not believe it will work for the Federal Government.

With the adoption of his tax recommendations the President expressly promises:

First:

> Total output and economic growth will be stepped up by an amount several times as great as the tax cut itself. Total income will rise—billions of dollars more will be earned each year in profits and wages.

Second:

> Unemployment will be reduced, economic prospects of our depressed areas will improve, those presently employed will have greater job security.

Third:

> Price stability can be maintained * * * with increased profits after tax there should be less pressure to raise prices. * * * Inflationary expectations have ended * * * the balanced approach that the Treasury has followed in its management of the public debt can be relied upon to prevent any inflationary push.

These blessings are promised if we will but adopt the largest budget ever, build in a good healthy deficit and then cut taxes.

Many Members of Congress would buy a tax cut if we could knock $10 to $15 billion off the budget. But we have been advised that the program won't work if we try to balance the budget by cutting expenditures. Mr. Kennedy said in his very proposal to cut the taxes:

> It would be a grave mistake to require that any tax reduction today be offset by a corresponding cut in expenditures.

We may well wish that we could solve all of our problems, that we could feed, clothe and house the poor, provide for the Nation's defense, and educate our children with this little effort. We cannot, except by effort, work, and sacrifice, accomplish these goals and we know it.

I challenge the administration with all of its economic experts to prove the soundness of their logic. Can the gentleman from New York further enlighten us?

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield? I think I can shed some light on it.

Mr. BECKER. Just a moment.

Mr. BURTON. I think that is my point. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. BECKER. The gentleman asked me the question, and let me say this to the gentlemen: This is the very nub of what I am talking about. If we would get down to cases here in the Federal Government, reduce all of this spending and get out of local affairs such as urban affairs and this mass transportation business, and let the localities do it, we would cut our Federal spending by $10 billion. Then by doing this we could cut Federal taxes and let the people in the States and the various localities handle their own money and spend it on what they need in those areas. This is what I have been getting at.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BECKER. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I wonder if my friend, the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ROGERS], thinks that to borrow and spend is going to increase the national income, and whether it has increased the national income? What does the gentleman propose? Is this what the gentleman is proposing—that we would borrow the money and increase the national income? I would like to know.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BECKER. I will yield to the gentleman to answer the question.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Of course, I do not want to get into the economics that the gentleman from Utah talked about and that the gentleman from Iowa is now asking the question about. There has been a change in the economics of this country beginning in 1930 when the Republicans dipped into the till to save the banks, the railroads, and whatnot. Now, in 1933 when President Roosevelt came in he opened the barrel wide open. He opened it to whom? The farmers represented by the gentleman from Iowa. And they have had their hands in the till ever since and he has not gotten them out of it. At the same time we created, or there was created in 1933 the Home Owners Loan Corporation. Now we have a Federal Housing Administration. Does the gentleman from Iowa propose that we should do away with that altogether? And at the same time we set up the——

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Speaker, I refuse to yield further to the gentleman.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I want to answer the question of the gentleman from Utah and the statement of the gentleman from Iowa. They asked the questions.

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Speaker, I refuse to yield further.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PILCHER). The gentleman from New York [Mr. BECKER] refuses to yield.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, but I have not yet finished.

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Speaker, I am not going to permit the gentleman to go back to 1902 in order to answer a question just asked.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. I think you should know that there has been a change in the economic conditions in the last 30 years.

Mr. BECKER. That is the gentleman's idea. That does not mean that we have to like the change or that we have to live with it. Maybe we want to correct it now.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. How are you going to meet the problem? Are you going to kick the farmers of Iowa out the window and refuse to give them anything?

Mr. BECKER. I am not referring to the farmers of Iowa alone, but we could cut this farm program by several billion dollars instead of pyramiding its cost every year.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Are you going to withdraw the insurance that has been given to every homeowner that has built a home, until we have 60 percent homeownership now in this country? Are you going to do away with that program?

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Speaker, I refuse to yield further.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New York refuses to yield further.

Mr. BECKER. If the gentleman wants to offer a detailed program, I suggest he put in the RECORD. I refuse to yield further at this time.

Mr. Speaker, there are billions—$10, $15, $20 billion, by which this budget can be cut. It should be cut now. Irrespective of what was done 30 years ago or 50 years ago, my children should not be blamed for my mistakes, or for the mistakes of my grandfather or father. If we can correct these mistakes, it is our moral duty to do it now and not follow what was done yesterday or last year or 20 years ago. Now we have the golden opportunity to carry out our own responsibility. The Members of Congress must have some idea of what the people are thinking back home, across this land. That is evident I believe to the President and his economic advisers today, because they really backed up on their proposals for tax reform. But they are threatening a recession if a tax reduction is not voted, in attempt to blackmail the Congress, if we do not pass such a tax reduction bill. They do not know which way to run now. I think we should guide them in the right direction. That is our responsibility.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for one quick observation?

Mr. BECKER. I am pleased to yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I will say to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ROGERS] that we got the old triple A in 1933. It came from a Democratic Congress. That is where the law was born and that is where the subsidy to the farmers was born.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BECKER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to make this observation, coming from a bourbon State, that it seems to me that "spending yourself into prosperity" seems to be analogous to "drinking yourself sober."

Mr. BECKER. I think that is about right.

Mr. BEERMANN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BECKER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BEERMANN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to speak in behalf of the statement of the gentleman from New York and comment on his remarks. A farmer from Nebraska very much appreciates his position. If the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. Rogers] were a farmer and had to operate a farm under the control program that this administration tried to pass last year, he would realize that Federal control of the food supply would cause many additional grave problems.

If the Congress had passed that bill it would affect 40 percent of the economy of the United States. Even though the farmers are about 10 percent of the population, the industries relating to farming would bring the total up to almost 40 percent of the economy. If we had allowed that bill to pass and an all-powerful Federal Government could have had control of 40 percent of the economy, it would be but a short step to take over all the rest of the economy. At that time whatever man was Secretary of Agriculture trying to run American farms by the seat of his pants down here at a desk in Washington would not understand the problems of the farmer.

For instance, it would be hard for some to understand why a 4-plow tractor will pull only one plow on different farms.

Federally controlling the food supply in the United States would put the American farmer in the same position farmers are in today in Russia and China.

I plead for the support of the gentleman from Colorado with 50 or 100 or 200 Democrats on that side, to gradually get the Government out of production and marketing. We ask you at the same time to gradually get the Government out of the rest of the economy so free enterprise can take over and do a better job of operating the economy of this country.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BECKER. I will not yield.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BECKER. Does the gentleman have a question or a statement?

Mr. PUCINSKI. I am sure we all share the gentleman's great concern about fiscal responsibility. I try to join the gentleman in trying to save some money for the taxpayers. I wonder if the gentleman will be good enough to put down on paper at the end of his remarks for all of us to study how he proposes to save this $20 billion. He might find a great deal of support if he did that, I am quite sure. I should like the gentleman to give us all the facts, breaking it down specifically, on where he proposes to save $20 billion in this budget. I assure the gentleman I will be looking at the Record tomorrow and I will be very eager to see how he is going to do that. He will get a great deal of support if his program is workable.

Mr. BECKER. In the first place, I must interrupt to say that I did not say $20 billion, I specifically named $10 billion. I said this would probably grow, if we went deep enough, to $15 or $20 billion; I do not know. But $10 billion has been the figure. With just the few items I have mentioned it went beyond $10 billion.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Will we find that in the Record tomorrow?

Mr. BECKER. I have got it in the Record already. I mentioned $4 billion in the foreign aid program. We can take $4 billion out of agriculture.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Will the gentleman be good enough to break down that $4 billion? We are asking for only $3.8 billion this year in the whole foreign aid program. I would like the gentleman to break this down and show us specifically where he would make the cuts. Then maybe he would find a great deal of support.

Mr. BECKER. I will be very happy to have the gentleman's support, but I will bet right now he will not vote against one appropriation this year, the President is going to bring up here. He will not vote against it whether it has cuts in it or not. We on this side want to give you the opportunity to make cuts. If the gentleman from Chicago will refer to the remarks by the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. Snyder] he will find a detailed list of reductions that can be made in the budget this year.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BECKER. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I want to correct the gentleman to make the record clear. They are not asking for $3.8 billion, it is $4.9 billion.

Mr. PUCINSKI. But I would like to have a breakdown.

Mr. BECKER. I have not yielded to the gentleman.

The gentleman made a grievous error like Democrats will do of only $1 billion. That may be peanuts in his book, but in my book even $1,000 is a great deal of money.

Mr. PUCINSKI. If you break the figures down, we may support you.

Mr. BECKER. I doubt that very seriously despite the fact I know the gentleman might be sincere in making the statement.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Try us; let us have the figures and see what the difference is.

Mr. BECKER. May I say to the gentleman, let me refer to his record last year. How many of our amendments on the foreign aid bill did you vote for last year?—not one.

Mr. PUCINSKI. On the contrary, the record will show I voted for every single amendment made by the committee headed by Congressman Passman. We trimmed that foreign aid bill way down last year and the year before and the year before that.

Mr. BECKER. I am talking about the amendments made on the floor here.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Amendments written on your knees—ill-conceived and ill-thought out? I went with the committee and I think the majority of the Members of this Congress went with the committee. We trimmed it, if my memory serves me right in this House, I believe, almost $1 billion.

Mr. BECKER. How did the gentleman vote on the farm bill last year?

Mr. PUCINSKI. Sir?

Mr. BECKER. How did the gentleman vote on the farm bill last year?

Mr. PUCINSKI. I believe we supported the committee on that too.

Mr. BECKER. Yes, you are right.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Of course, we did.

Mr. BECKER. That is all. I do not yield further.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BECKER. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. FINDLEY. I think we have gotten far off the track of the central theme of the presentation of the gentleman from New York which, I am sure, all will agree was a very excellent one. One factor which might be pointed up at this time was the strange character of this planned deficit, so-called tax cut incentive which the administration is talking about. I think we might properly consider the proposed tax cut actually a bit of hokus pokus because, so long as we continue to spend, the Government is going to exact its pound of flesh from the taxpayer whether it be in the form of direct taxes or in the form or indirect taxation, namely, inflation. What we need to be concerned with here is the level of spending and I thank the gentleman from New York for so eloquently presenting this theme to us.

Mr. BECKER. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BECKER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. CLEVELAND. I would like to compliment the distinguished gentleman from New York on his thoughtful presentation. I would like to inquire of him: Under the proposed tax reforms, is it not less advantageous for a person to make contributions, to pay property taxes, or to pay interest on a mortgage? I have reference to my understanding of the so-called 5-percent floor under deductions. Will this not result in reducing the amount of interest and property taxes and charitable contributions that a taxpayer can take as a deduction?

Mr. BECKER. Of course; in other words, if a taxpayer has, we will say, taxes to pay or interest on his mortgages or charitable contributions, let us assume that these total $1,000. Now, if 5 percent of his gross income is $500, he then loses $500 worth of the deductions that he is getting today of $1,000. That is my understanding of it and it is why every property owners organization in this country took off after this. Certainly, if we are going to knock the props out from underneath all our home-building institutions, this is a good way to do it.

Mr. CLEVELAND. I thank the gentleman from New York for clarifying this situation. This was my understanding of it too. As a country lawyer, I have made out a great many tax returns for small property owners, and it seems to me this is going to discourage charitable contributions and home ownership. I understood from some of the remarks of the gentleman from Colorado that he took great pride in the fact that his administration is in favor of home ownership.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BECKER. I do not yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BECKER. The gentleman refuses to yield at this time. I have yielded to the gentleman from New Hampshire.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Continuing my remarks, the point I am trying to make is: this administration has submitted a proposal, this 5-percent floor, which will reduce the amount of interest paid on a mortgage which can be deducted. Also the amount of property taxes deductible would be limited. This will discourage private ownership of homes.

Mr. BECKER. I think the answer to that is simple. The President and his advisers, at least the President, has backed away from this tax reform proposal that they sent up; and I am sure the reason they backed away from it is that if we are going to disallow the interest paid on mortgages and the amount of money paid in taxes it certainly will injure the homebuilding industry of this country.

Secondly, such a policy means we would be breaking faith with the millions of people who bought their homes and who have been paying interest and taxes because they are allowed deductions. We would break faith with them if we turn around and say we are going to allow you only that part above 5 percent of your gross income, perhaps cut in half the deduction you are now getting. This is not good faith. I do not think we are in any position to break faith with these people, and I do not think we should attempt to destroy our economy by putting hundreds of thousands of homeowners in this position. I think we should have a floor on spending, a floor on deficits.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Is it the gentleman's understanding that the administration will no longer press for the so-called reform that puts a 5-percent floor on deductions?

Mr. BECKER. If the gentleman is asking me for an opinion I can only give you my own. I think the President's own statement indicates that, for he said he would accept tax reduction without tax reform. But let us not think that perhaps later on if we pass a tax reduction bill this year that there will not be tax reform next year or in the near future.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Another factor that enters it besides interest payments and taxes is the matter of contributions to churches, schools, and charities. Is it not true that this 5-percent floor will discourage that type of contribution?

Mr. BECKER. That is quite correct. Included is a person's contribution to church, to any form of charity that is deductible. That is included in this so-called reform proposal. It would mean a floor of 5 percent of a person's gross income.

Mr. CLEVELAND. This proposal discourages contribution to churches and charities. This discourages homeownership because of the treatment of interest paid on mortgages and taxes. Is this not part of a continuing attempt to do all things for the people by the Federal Government in Washington? Is this not an attempt to discourage local individual and private efforts to do important things at home?

Mr. BECKER. All we have to do is to look back over incidents that have happened in the last 30 years to see how this socialistic philosophy of government has been developing and growing. I do not know whether it was planned. Actually I do not know what was planned by this tax reform suggestion, but if they want to ruin the economy of this country all they have to do is to pass this thing.

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BECKER. I yield.

Mr. HALEY. I just want to call the attention of the gentleman from New York to this: In the 5-percent floor under allowable deductions it is my understanding that various religious organizations, churches and so forth, have a method of tithing 10 percent of a person's earnings.

I have some of these people in my congressional district. Ten percent of all their earnings they give to the church.

So the gentleman from Colorado, who seems many times here to be anxious and zealous in protecting civil rights, I would suggest he also ought to be just about as zealous in protecting the religious rights of some of the people, because, after all, it boils down to civil rights also.

Mr. BECKER. I think the gentleman is quite right.

I want to say something to the gentleman from Colorado. He and I have been friends for years on this floor and off the floor. So there is no misunderstanding about that. I may possibly yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. I thank the gentleman. That is a promise.

Mr. BECKER. No, I said "may" not "shall." I may change my mind.

May I say to the gentleman that during the course of this discussion I thought I was quite liberal earlier in yielding constantly to the gentleman from Colorado. I do not think I restricted the gentleman at all. But finally I came to the conclusion that he was attempting to utilize my entire time and the time others might want to use. That is the reason I found it necessary to refuse further to yield. We are coming down to the point where we will be belaboring our colleagues if we continue along this line. I did not take this discussion far afield. We cannot afford the immoral act of borrowing $12 billion to give a tax reduction to the people. It is unprincipled, it is immoral. I do not think it is at all fair to put on generations to come a tax reduction now for things we have and perhaps they never will have.

I said we could reduce this budget by $10 billion. Possibly you may build it up to $15 billion or $20 billion. Someone has suggested that. From the looks of the present budget, we could cut out $5 billion for Federal aid, and a few other things. You can easily balance this budget and forget about a tax reduction. I think the American people would be the happiest people in the world if we came in now at this session of Congress with a balanced budget. We can cut appropriations. Let us not vote a tax reduction which would increase the deficit next year. Then we will have tax reforms, putting more on their backs.

Now, briefly, I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I do not know how reasonable I shall be in face of the many statements made by the gentlemen on the other side.

Mr. BECKER. Is the gentleman going to attempt to answer all these questions?

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. If the gentleman will give me time, I will.

Mr. BECKER. I do not know that I want to stand here that long.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. As to the farm program, the gentleman says he is against that.

Mr. BECKER. Does the gentleman want to know something?

The Farm Bureau in New York State endorsed me for reelection and I have voted against every farm bill to come up in the House of Representatives. I have no farm in my district.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. The gentleman from New York would propose as part of the $10 billion reduction to take that money now allocated to the farmers; is that right?

Mr. BECKER. No; not all at one time. You could take $4 billion or $5 billion right away.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. That is about all they get.

Mr. BECKER. I heard the gentleman say the other day it would be about $8 billion this year including the surplus and crop supports.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Be that as it may——

Mr. BECKER. Let us not quibble about billions.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Each billion is important.

Mr. BECKER. I know.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Each billion is important even as to you and I.

But the question that I propounded and the thing that I want to know is this: Since we have had a changed economic condition that started in the 1930's and since we have had a tremendous buildup in deficits each year since then, what is the solution when just recently the Republicans on the other side of the aisle were jumping on the President because he had not done anything about unemployment and stated that unemployment was up almost to 6 percent.

Now, the President in his message that he sent up here is apprehensive that we may get into another depression. The question I would like to ask the gentleman is this: Would the gentleman just as soon we go into a depression and not have any deficit spending?

Mr. BECKER. I would like to say this to the gentleman: The gentleman says right now that the President is apprehensive that we might go into another depression, or recession. Is that what the gentleman just said?

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Yes.

Mr. BECKER. The President is apprehensive. Did the gentleman read and hear the President's state of the Union message in January? The President spoke in the most beautiful and superlative terms about the economic condition of the country, both domestic and international, in terms most superlative and beautiful that I have heard in my life. I could not imagine that the President would be apprehensive over a recession in the offing. He said this in the event he does not get his tax reduction bill.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. BECKER. Yes, sir.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. The statement about the large number of unemployed, uttered by some people on the other side——

Mr. BECKER. I did not hear that, so I do not know where it came from.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Does not the gentleman know that unemployment is increasing and if we do not here in the Congress see that those who are unemployed or those who want to work get work, we will be in extreme difficulties?

Mr. BECKER. You bet your life I do. That is the reason I am prescribing the program which I have proposed today; to get the country off the back of business so business can expand and employ people. As the gentleman knows, in the thirties the Government tried this same scheme that is before us now. We started with 11 million unemployed in 1933 and in 1939 we still had 10 million unemployed. Only God knows that World War II absorbed the unemployment of that depression. So all of these synthetic operations of the Government will never end unemployment. Only business will do that. Get the Government off the back of business and I am sure business will solve the greater part of these problems.

Mr. BEERMANN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BECKER. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. BEERMANN. With reference to this discussion about unemployment, there are 1 million more people employed in the last 2 years. As I recall, about 235,000 or approximately 25 percent of these were put on the Federal payroll for all of the taxpayers to pay their salaries.

I would like to go back to this 1933 discussion for a moment, when the national debt was $22 billion, and when the Department of Agriculture had 23,000 employees helping farmers. Now, in 1963 the national debt is $303 billion, or $305 billion, and there are almost 100,000 employees in the Department of Agriculture. In 1964 it is planned, along with the planned deficit spending of $12 billion, to have a total of 121,000 employees in the Department of Agriculture to help fewer farmers. In other words, there will be more and more Government employees to help the Department in this administration in a planned program of attrition against farmers.

I think back to last year when the Democrats in this House of Representatives turned down an amendment which was offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. GRIFFIN] which prescribed that there should not be more employees in the Department of Agriculture than there are farmers.

So, it looks to me, that as the debt goes up there are less people on farms to help pay the taxes, and more Government employees to help increase the taxload.

One place we can cut and cut fast is the uneconomical advisory personnel in the Department of Agriculture hired to sell the farmers a planned economy program.

As one of my constituents said the other day in a letter—and I received almost 2,500 letters last week in response to my last newsletter; not a questionnaire, a newsletter—stating that this administration has taken us closer and closer to a democratic socialistic republic. I go for the democracy and I go for the representative republic. But I cannot go for these schemes that will eventually break our country as they will hamstring our private economy and individual initiative and put us into that kind of government which was never intended by the original founders of this country.

I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Speaker, I am going to conclude on this note. Along with many other people I am extremely worried because of this theoretical tax reduction program and planned deficit. Certainly no one, by the wildest stretch of the imagination, can put his finger on any evidence that this program will succeed, because it is purely theoretical. However, we do know that the tax reform program, as I said before, was something that certainly had to fail, because they would have to break faith with the people who were assured in previous years that they would be permitted to make a deduction for interest paid on mortgages, and for taxes paid; particularly those two items. They must have known that they would be putting the homebuilding business out of business, and would be hurting industry and labor, and would be creating more unemployment than anyone could possibly imagine. But what worries me about these theorists and these planners who are offering this program is that in the budget of 1962 there was estimated a surplus of $500 million. Now the President has said that business has been on the move and that everything was going well. Those were his words; everything was increasing—gross national product, and so forth. Yet, what happened? Those who advised the President were off in their estimate to the point where we had a deficit of $8 billion. For the 1963 budget they told us that the estimated surplus would be $1.5 billion. In the President's state of the Union message in January, he told us in what wonderful condition the country was; how well we were doing under his administration; but we are now running a deficit of about $8.8 billion this year instead of a surplus of $1.5 billion.

That means that for this year their estimates will have been wrong by $10.3 billion. That is for 1 year. For 2 years, it would mean a mistake of $18 billion that they had made in their estimates of income. If they can make that much of a mistake in 2 years in their estimate of income—and they say that for the 1964 budget they plan a $12 billion deficit—can anyone assure that I am wrong in thinking that they might very well make the same mistake for the 1964 budget that they did for the 1962 and 1963 budgets, and that our deficit for 1964 may run some $20 billion or more, instead of $12 billion?

That is what worries me and that is the reason why I think we should try to cut these appropriations down to a point where we can pay our expenses out of a real estimate of revenue. I think the Committee on Appropriations and the Committee on Ways and Means will be able to tell more about this than can Walter Heller down at the White House.

Mr. Speaker, that concludes my statement. I have tried to express my idea on this subject. I can only hope and pray that Members of the House will get down to business this session and cut appropriations, and reduce the burden on the people and then, if there is something left over, reduce taxes.

AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WRIGHT] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, with considerable fanfare, a committee of the other body has been investigating the source selection by the Department of Defense of the General Dynamics and Grumman aircraft companies for the development and construction of the TFX fighter plane. Much publicity has attended this investigation. The publicity has tended to present in general a one-sided interpretation of that contract award. It has omitted many extremely important and valid considerations which well could have led to the decision which the Department of Defense, in the exercise of its very best judgment, made.

I have not desired to enter into any public controversy over this matter. Heretofore, I have refrained from doing so. Since it was a closed issue, already determined on the basis of the many complicated factors involved, there seemed to me utterly no point in following the course against which Kipling enjoined when he spoke of those who "Peck out, dissect, and extrude to the mind the flaccid tissues of long dead issues, offensive to God and mankind, like vultures over an ox that the Army has left behind."

Yet the continued daily repetition of partial quotes and one-sided comments in the newspapers emanating from this somewhat overpublicized inquiry make it necessary for me today to take the floor for the purpose of balancing the public record with information which heretofore has been given practically no acknowledgment or publicity.

I do this not to provoke an argument nor to extenuate the already overextenuated discussion. I do it rather to protect the reputations of a very excellent firm in my own district, of another honored firm in the State of New York, and of a number of very fine public officials from the wholly unwarranted suspicions which this prolonged second guessing and the veiled and undocumented public charges accompanying it may have cast upon them.

The loser in this contract competition was the Boeing Co. of Seattle and Wichita. Somewhat curiously, the committee in the other body has undertaken to inquire as to why the Department of Defense would consider granting a contract to other firms when Boeing was interested in it. The Boeing Co. has been given numerous contracts for many defense and space programs. It has better than a billion dollar backlog of these orders today. It has never occurred to anyone, of course, to investigate the reasons on any of those numerous occasions when Boeing has been awarded lucrative contracts. The odd assumption behind the investigation in the other body seems to be that Boeing receives contracts solely on "merit", but a competitor could only win by some undisclosed chicanery.

One week ago today, the Boeing Co. was awarded a $418,820,967 contract, described as the largest ever awarded in the U.S. space program, to produce 11 boosters for the Saturn V moon shots. Nobody has suggested that this should be investigated.

The award to build the TFX was granted after long and tight competition and after prolonged and careful consideration to the General Dynamics Co. of Fort Worth in association with the Grumman Co. of New York. Since the statements emanating from the hearing in the other body have included only remarks which would tend to favor Boeing or to be detrimental to the General Dynamics-Grumman submission, I think in the interest of a more balanced record and a fairer public exposure of the factors and elements involved in that decision, it is incumbent upon someone to list publicly some of the extremely valid factual considerations upon which the decision of the Department of Defense may well have been based.

VALID CONSIDERATIONS

Therefore, I shall list here a few of the impelling reasons which may have weighed the scales in favor of awarding this particular TFX contract to General Dynamics and Grumman rather than to Boeing.

EXPERIENCE IN SUPERSONIC AIRCRAFT

First of all, the Government had every reason to be interested in the contractor's proven experience in developing and producing a manned supersonic aircraft. Since the TFX is to be a supersonic plane, capable of flying more than twice the speed of sound, this would surely seem to be an important criterion. General Dynamics has produced supersonic manned military aircraft. Boeing has not.

In the B-58, built at this same Fort Worth plant, General Dynamics and the Air Force achieved the greatest advance in the state of the art which has been achieved in modern times. This is the free world's only supersonic bomber. It holds six world speed records previously held by Soviet aircraft. Boeing, by contrast, has been producing the B-52 which is subsonic, slower in fact than the commercial aircraft in common use throughout the country.

The B-58 accomplished a greater incremental increase in speed over the Boeing-built B-52 than the B-52 accomplished over the aircraft originally built and flown by the Wright brothers.

EXPERIENCE IN NAVAL AIRCRAFT

Second. Since the TFX is to be a biservice aircraft, for common use by both the Air Force and the Navy, it is only natural to assume that the Government would be deeply interested in the contractor's experience in meeting the sometimes difficult requirements of Naval Air Operations.

In designing and building this biservice fighter, General Dynamics wisely formed a team in association with the Grumman Aircraft Corp. This company, whose talents are melded with those of the General Dynamics firm in this program, has built more naval aircraft than any other firm in the United States. Quite probably, at least half the total number of take-offs and landings ever made from the U.S. aircraft carriers have been made in Grumman-built aircraft.

Boeing, by contrast, has not been dealing with the Navy in the meeting of these exacting requirements.

Boeing has not had a naval aircraft production program in 30 years unless we were to count an experimental design of which only two models were ever built.

TOP PRIORITY

In the third place, because of the vital importance of this particular program and the necessity that it be given top priority by the firm undertaking its construction, it naturally would be important to the Government that its production source be in a position to devote its full and undivided attention to this individual program. The General Dynamics plant at Fort Worth, with its proven engineering and manpower team and its well equipped 4,000 feet long assembly plant, was in a position to give real priority to the TFX program since the B-58 program in which it had been engaged was finished.

Boeing, on the other hand, has so many programs going that its engineering skills and talents must be divided among them all.

Boeing right now has a backlog of defense and space orders that run to a total volume of several billions of dollars. Boeing had proposed to do the TFX designing and development work in Seattle, the actual production work in Wichita. Even the Wichita plant, relatively less busy, has been engaged in doing extensive repair and modification work costing the Government many millions of dollars on the failing wings of B-52 aircraft which it earlier built.

DESIGN COMMONALITY

Fourth, and probably most important of all, was the central question of design commonality in the slightly differing versions of this craft to be used by the Air Force and the Navy. The basic purpose of the plan was to design and build one airplane which could serve both services. Probably the most significant factor was the question of which design had the greater percentage of common and interchangeable parts.

Fundamentally, it was a question of whether we were to have one airplane or two airplanes. Secretary McNamara was deeply committed to the concept of one basic model with the highest possible degree of commonality. He believes truly great financial savings will thus be effected in the long run.

In this all-important criterion, the General Dynamics-Grumman design is reliably accounted to have been clearly and demonstrably superior.

GOVERNMENT INTEREST

In the fifth place, it surely is desirable from the standpoint of our Government to keep our defense production arsenal functioning. It is not healthy to give all the work to one firm and reduce the Government to a dependence upon one company. Obviously, the purposes of the United States are served when both Boeing and General Dynamics and the other top aircraft production firms are holding together the trained and proven management teams which have been developed at such cost over the years to our Government.

Single-source procurement is potentially dangerous. When we have only big-company producing in a given field, the Government itself suffers. A few years ago, the Bendix Co. was the only producing concern making aircraft brakes. That company went out on strike and many aircraft were temporarily decommissioned. The same thing has happened in the field of radar altimeters. It serves the public purpose to keep a number of good companies in active production.

In the absence of a substantial contract of this type, the General Dynamics team at Fort Worth was faced with dismemberment. Having produced the B-24, the B-36, and the B-58, its talents and equipment would have lain idle and wasted if it had not received this or a similar contract. Our Government has an enormous investment in the physical properties of that plant. It also has a far greater financial investment, and one incapable of calculation, in the 20 years of aircraft design and manufacturing which have resulted in the development there of a smoothly functioning team of management, engineering, and machine skills.

Employment at the Fort Worth plant had gone from a peak of 27,000 during the B-36 program to a level of only 8,000 at the time the TFX contract was awarded.

Without this contract to hold the team together, it inevitably would have declined sharply and drastically below that point. A team whose members are scattered to the four winds is no longer a team. It was not in the interest of our Government to allow this to happen. Had it been allowed, our Nation's defense structure would have lost a very valuable national asset.

AIRCRAFT CARRIERS

In the sixth place, since naval aircraft carriers contain limited space, an extremely important consideration is the question of how many aircraft of a given design can be placed on a single carrier. Our number of aircraft carriers is limited. Therefore our total naval air striking power is limited by the number of combat aircraft which can be carried aboard each such vessel.

Since the committee in the other body has seen fit to make certain inquiries into certain selected characteristics of design, I suggest that in the interest of a complete record they should want to inquire into the question of which of the competing designs would have better served this extremely important purpose of allowing the maximum number of aircraft on each individual carrier. Unless I am completely misinformed, the General Dynamics design was considerably superior in this vital aspect.

UNINTERRUPTED PRODUCTION

Finally, it is only logical to assume that due to the urgent need for this new plane in adequate numbers as soon as possible, the Defense Department would be deeply interested in assurances of uninterrupted production at the plant where the plane is built. At the time the contract was awarded, the General Dynamics firm had just signed a 3-year labor contract with the organization representing its employees, thus guaranteeing at least 3 years of labor peace and top production unhindered by strikes and walkouts or work stoppages.

The same could not be said for Boeing, where management and labor still were in dispute and the possibility of work-stoppages or discordant strife still unremoved.

These are not all of the considerations, I am sure, which went into the decision by our Defense Department in the awarding of this important contract. But surely any fairminded person would have to admit that they are indeed considerations of the greatest importance. No doubt there were other things, and perhaps many other things, which had to be taken into consideration.

Yet since much of the publicity from the hearings in the other body has tended to leave the extremely erroneous impression that there were no proper reasons at all for awarding this contract to the General Dynamics-Grumman group, I thought it very much worthwhile and in fact essential in the interest of objectivity that the above facts be publicly disclosed.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WRIGHT. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. PUCINSKI. I believe the gentleman from Texas is making a very, very significant statement here today, and I am very grateful to him for bringing to the attention of the House these pertinent facts on this particular contract. I want to congratulate him for the effort he has exerted in assembling the material and arguments on this very important development. I would like to associate myself with his remarks, because it appears to be obvious that there has been an effort to develop something sinister in the awarding of this contract. I do not follow that on the basis of the information the gentleman is presenting to the House. It appears that the Defense Department was perfectly correct and proper in its decision. I congratulate the gentleman for calling our attention to these very pertinent facts.

Mr. WRIGHT. I thank the gentleman from Illinois and appreciate his comments.

Mr. PIKE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WRIGHT. I yield to the gentleman from New York, a member of the House Armed Services Committee.

Mr. PIKE. I, too, would like to join with the gentleman from Illinois in congratulating the gentleman from Texas. It is a rough job for any of us to follow the eloquent and articulate gentleman from Texas. He and I have shared in the past the kind of disappointment which comes when a major defense contractor in his district fails to get something, or something happens to one of them. In the case of the gentleman from Texas a B-58 bomber was phased out, and it certainly was essential to his district, and in my own case it was an F-105 fighter which was phased out. It was also essential to my district. We were keenly disappointed. In either case we questioned the judgment which had been made.

I think it is all right to question a judgment which is made by the Department of Defense in these cases from time to time, but I would like to add to what the gentleman from Illinois just said; some have gone a little farther than just questioning judgment in this TFX matter; they have gone to questioning motives. One sees in publications coming out all over the country in connection with this program that something is wrong with the motives for awarding this contract to the General Dynamics and Grumman team, and I think that there is a real danger that we might bog down so much on the question of the motives of the people who are working on this thing there will be delay and confusion in this essential program, and there is no room for any delay and confusion whatsoever. We certainly have had enough delay and confusion.

This is not like the phasing out of the B-58 in the past. That was a controversial matter. It is not like the phasing out of the F-105 in the past. That was a controversial matter. It is not like the B-70 program which is a controversial matter today. But it is universally agreed that this TFX program must be done. This is a program which every segment of the industry and of the military and the Department of Defense agrees must be done and it should be done as fast as possible. This is a plane we need and it is a plane we have got to build without delay.

I do not in any sense blame the disappointed people who did not get this contract, for questioning the judgment of those who put it where they did, but I want to join with the gentleman in a few of the specifics in this thing. It was not just a question of adding one or two planes to a carrier, it was a question of adding five planes to a carrier; and I submit that the five planes which are added to a carrier in this Grumman-General Dynamics—or respecting the gentleman from Texas, General Dynamics-Grumman proposal—might be the differences between yes and no in any given mission.

I would like to say further that in questioning the judgment used or utilized by the Department of Defense in the awarding of this contract, the judgment goes just a little bit deeper than the business of comparing what one company says it can do with what another company says it can do.

There has to be a complete credibility in the proposals which are made by any company in any defense contract. Our country has had entirely too much experience with defense contractors who say they can do such and such and so and so. Then time after time after time we have found that the programs which have been presented, when they are fulfilled, when they are completed, have cost 300 percent of what the original proposal said it would cost.

With General Dynamics and Grumman the Defense Department knows they have corporations which can and will produce what they say they can and will produce, and they will do it within the time frame they say they will do it in—if Congress will let them.

I want to associate myself completely with the remarks of the gentleman from Texas. I am proud of him for having taken this time for this very important purpose today. I think it is time we quit haggling about judgment and devote our time, energies, and resources in speeding the design and the manufacture of this aircraft which we need so badly.

Mr. WRIGHT. I thank the gentleman. I think he is thoroughly and completely correct.

Mr. STINSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WRIGHT. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. STINSON. I concur with the gentleman we need this very, very valuable TFX, sometimes known as the LBJ aircraft. I can understand the gentleman's elation also in getting this contract in his district. I am somewhat familiar with the TFX and the fact that the TFX was originally conceived in the Boeing Co. in my particular congressional district.

I would like to point out a few misconceptions here about the proposed designs of the Boeing aircraft and the General Dynamics aircraft. We certainly need the TFX aircraft, but we should procure this aircraft at the lowest possible price to the American taxpayer.

Mr. WRIGHT. May I inquire, Is the gentleman leading to a question?

Mr. STINSON. Yes, I am leading up to a question.

There are good indications in the hearings that have been held by the Senate that there is a savings of between $100 million and $400 million by taking the Boeing design.

Also, I might point out that the bomb load capacity of the Boeing is much higher. There is also a design feature of the General Dynamics model that would indicate that this aircraft might suck up gravel from runways.

Reference has been made to the point that the airplane is smaller, the General Dynamics airplane is smaller, but the Boeing aircraft is somewhat lighter in weight when adapted to Navy use. This is a very important factor on aircraft carriers; namely, that the weight should be kept down to the lowest possible level. Also, the Boeing design requires about a 600-foot shorter runway to take off than does the General Dynamics design.

As far as priority is concerned, the Boeing Co. has ample people to design and build this particular aircraft, because of the phasing out of the B–52 program. The military people involved in this particular problem are all in favor of the Boeing design rather than the General Dynamics design.

I should also like to point out that the Boeing Co. has had a marvelous reputation of living up to its commitments with the military and the American Government.

I also point out that the General Dynamics Corp. in the last year has been involved in a financial problem, but I am not in any way being derogatory with regard to that company, because all companies can have financial problems. But it would appear, therefore, that the Boeing Co. has a capability at least as good as that of General Dynamics as far as fulfilling the production of this aircraft is concerned.

So for these reasons, I think, and would not the gentleman agree, that perhaps some of the criticism of the awarding of this contract is justified, and that there might just be a very small amount of political influence involved in awarding this particular contract to the General Dynamics Co.?

Mr. WRIGHT. Let me take these questions up point by point, if I may, and then I will gladly yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PRICE].

The first point that is made seems to rely on the presumption that a cost figure as estimated by an aircraft company is the final and totally reliable figure as to exactly how much such a program will end up costing the Government. This simply is not true.

I think sad and checkered experience teaches us that this is at best an estimate only. I would refer the gentleman to the Bomarc program as an illustration that even a fine aircraft producing company like the Boeing Co. can be not only wrong, but considerably wrong, in the amount that it initially estimates to be the final cost of producing its commodity. In the Bomarc program not only has the cost far exceeded the initial cost estimate upon which the Defense Department relied. I think it also can be said without any overstatement that the performance has considerably fallen below that which the designers initially felt it could do.

Therefore, the Secretary of Defense and his Defense Department advisers have to ask this question: Can the company actually produce a plane by this design which actually and in truth will do those things the company believes and says it will do? Numerous times companies have submitted designs and with the submittals claimed probably in good faith that the plane or manufacture of that particular design would do certain things, and then those commodities will not do those things. This is the reason I say that the Secretary of Defense had every reason to weigh in the balance the question of which of these companies has actually been over this specific road and which of them is better able actually to know on the basis of its own demonstrated experience that it can design a plane of this particular type that will do what it says it will do. This is why the General Dynamics experience in producing the supersonic B–58 and the Grumman experience in producing naval aircraft would have been, in my judgment, valid considerations.

Second, the Defense Department must ask of each company: can it actually perform this mission for the cost estimates? The Defense Department officials, joined by the heads of the Navy and the Air Force, concluded that the cost estimate submitted by the Boeing Co. in this particular instance was unrealistically low; that it did not take into account many of the cost factors involved in producing a supersonic plane and particularly a new design of this type.

POLITICS?

Insofar as the matter of politics is concerned, that charge has been somewhat surreptitiously made before. I am glad the gentleman from Washington has brought it out in the open. Let me be perfectly frank with the gentleman from Washington.

Dark hints have been heavily leaked to the press that some mysterious and undisclosed political influence must have been responsible for the Defense Department's decision to award this contract to the General Dynamics-Grumman team. This goes back to the original assumption and prejudgment that Boeing just cannot be beat unless something sinister is at play.

Well, let us just briefly discuss the question of supposed political influence. For my own part, I do not believe that anyone is capable of persuading Secretary McNamara beyond his own best judgment. I should know, because I have tried it, and have been unsuccessful in the attempt. In 1961, after Congress had authorized and appropriated $525 million for the continued production of manned bombers, I requested and gained an audience with Secretary McNamara at which I did my very best to persuade him to take the money and continue bomber production. To make a long story short, I fanned out.

As for supposed political influence, in the awarding of the TFX contract, that depends entirely on what is meant by "political influence." Webster defines "politics" as "the science and art of government." In that sense, anything said or done concerning this Government program could be called political. I know of no other person in a public office who has been any more deeply interested in this particular matter than I have been during the past 18 months. It meant the difference between employment or unemployment for thousands of my constituents whose interests I am charged with serving.

Let me be completely frank. During the course of last year, I talked about this subject with everybody whom I could get to listen. Believing that good and adequate reasons existed for giving every fair and just consideration to the General Dynamics submission, I made it my business to try to persuade people to this point of view. I am not ashamed of that. I considered it my duty. There is nothing sinister about it. I made no secret of the fact. I talked with both military and civilian officials. I tried to be as persuasive as I knew how to be. That does not in my judgment amount to undesirable political influence. The same sort of thing was being attempted on the other side. If you choose to call this "political influence," then I did my best to engage in it and I am not the least bit ashamed of having done so. It was truthful and open and wholly honorable.

But I had absolutely no illusions whatever that I could ever have prevailed upon our military leaders or our defense officials to grant such an award to the firm in my hometown unless that firm had come up with a truly superb design and this is exactly what it did. Any argument I might have been able to make as an admitted Fort Worth partisan would have been utterly unavailing had it not been for the truly magnificent record of performance which the General Dynamics plant at that city and the Grumman plant have to their credit.

Let me further make it amply clear that any reasoning I used in this connection was of the type embraced in five of the seven reasons listed earlier in these remarks. At the time, of course, I had no specific knowledge as to the points of technical design comparisons. Every point of logic I made or attempted to make with any civilian or military official was addressed to the question of what would be best for the United States, and that only.

I emphatically did not employ anything which could be remotely described as pressure. For that matter, I would have had no pressure to apply. I expressly did not promise any reciprocal favor in return for the granting of this award to General Dynamics and Grumman. I am unaware of any favor which would have been at my disposal to grant even had I been so inclined.

Perhaps more to the point, I expressly did not threaten any type of reprisal in event the decision should have been other than what I wished. Most expressly, I did not threaten anyone in our Defense Establishment with a congressional investigation if their decision should go against my wishes. That is what I would call political pressure.

That is what I would call undesirable or unhealthy political influence. Perhaps we might inquire as to whether anyone is employing pressure of this type. I employed none, nor to my knowledge could any such threat or attempted reprisal have been made by any other person interested in the awarding of this contract to General Dynamics and Grumman.

Of course, I talked with people about this contract award. I talked with many people. Perhaps it would not be inappropriate to ask whether the Senators from the State of Washington are prepared to deny that they ever talked with anyone in our Defense Establishment in behalf of the Boeing Co. Specifically, I ask if the Senator from Washington, Senator JACKSON, is prepared to deny that his office directly initiated at least seven separate contacts with top officials in Boeing's behalf prior to the awarding of this contract?

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WRIGHT. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PRICE].

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, I see that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WRIGHT] needs no assistance in this matter. However, I rose originally to compliment him on his statement before any questions were directed to him because I think what he said needed to be said somewhere in an official area.

There were not only two proposals submitted for the TFX; these were the two that had final consideration. I think every major aircraft producer in the country submitted proposals and one of the last to be eliminated was one that was very close to my area. But I do not recall that any of these others who lost in this competition requested any congressional investigation. They accepted it in the competitive spirit that private enterprise is founded upon.

I have followed the TFX very closely because of my interest in research and development and all the information I have on it indicates that the idea for this plane did not originate with any aircraft producer or manufacturer. As the gentleman mentioned a few minutes ago it originated within the military services and specifically within the Department of Defense. They requested the aircraft manufacturers of the country to submit proposals on this type of aircraft. It has been under study for 1 or 2 years at the least and it has had thorough and considered study.

I am glad the gentleman from Texas has taken the time to indicate his concern that any time a contract is let there must be a congressional investigation to follow. When there is wrongdoing that has been indicated or charged, then I suppose we should have an investigation and possibly even in this case we may welcome it so that the air may be cleared. But I am disturbed over the fact that when a contract is lost the manufacturer should seek a congressional investigation, because I think this is the last place in the world, the floor of this Congress, where we should start handing out contracts for Government procurement. We have our job in a legislative way but we are not the administrative or executive arm of the Government. We do have recourse in the event of abuses in this area and we should follow them.

I think the gentleman also has very well answered the question directed to him by the gentleman on the other side who has been querying him, but I rose, particularly, not to give the gentleman any help because, as I stated, he is well able to take care of himself, but to express my congratulations to him on bringing this into an official arena so that some sense of balance may be attained on this particular problem. I have been disturbed over congressional investigations and all that we have been reading about concerns the investigation being held, but we have never had the other side of the story.

Mr. Speaker, I want to compliment the gentleman for taking the floor this afternoon to express his views on the subject.

Mr. WRIGHT. I am very grateful to the gentleman and would like to express my appreciation of his comments in that regard.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WRIGHT. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. POAGE. As one who comes from a district which never had an airplane factory, which never produced a plane of any kind, and which probably will not, a district which does not adjoin anybody's district in which planes are being produced, and which has no financial interest in this matter one way or the other, other than as citizens of the United States all have an interest in it, I wonder if the gentleman would not clarify, in country language which I can understand, some of the conversations which have passed between him and the gentleman from Washington. To be specific, is it not a fact that there has never been a bid made on the production of this plane?

Mr. WRIGHT. It is a fact that no bid has been made in the sense of any company's saying:

> We will undertake to produce this total package for you as you request for X number of dollars and guarantee that it will not cost any more than that.

Mr. POAGE. That is what we country boys are talking about. When we talk about building a tank or stock pond we are talking about getting just what was described and about somebody's delivering just what he said he would deliver for what he said it would cost and at the time he said he would complete it. The Boeing Co. has not guaranteed to deliver this plane, has it? Nor to do so for a definite price? Nor to guarantee that it will do what they say they think it will do?

Mr. WRIGHT. To be completely fair, I think the Boeing Co. has proposed that they believe they could build the plane for X number of dollars. This could be more accurately described as an "estimate," however, than as of a "bid."

Mr. POAGE. Suppose I gave a proposal that I believe I could build this plane for about half of what Boeing says they can build it for, and I am so ignorant that maybe I believe I could do that, because there is a lot of money involved in it, and I believe maybe I could do it for half that amount. Do you think the other body ought to conduct some kind of investigation to find out what went on in the Pentagon, to find out why they did not accept my proposal?

Mr. WRIGHT. I think the gentleman's point is very well taken.

Mr. POAGE. I never have failed on any of my proposals, have I? I have never made any.

Mr. WRIGHT. Certainly not to my knowledge.

Mr. POAGE. I am talking about making airplanes. I never have suggested I could build an airplane for less and then found that the Government must pay about 300 percent more than I estimated.

Mr. WRIGHT. I am certain the gentleman has never done anything remotely like that.

Mr. POAGE. There have been aircraft companies which have done it.

Mr. WRIGHT. There have, indeed.

Mr. POAGE. I never have made a proposal to these departments that I could shoot missiles from one plane to another and bring them down, have I?

Mr. WRIGHT. I am quite certain the gentleman has not.

Mr. POAGE. There have been people who have?

Mr. WRIGHT. There have been. And often those programs have cost considerably more than originally estimated. Also the performance of such missiles has often been less than originally held out.

Mr. POAGE. We are still doing little more than throwing rocks to bring those planes down, is that not right?

Mr. WRIGHT. I think that may be about what it amounts to.

Mr. POAGE. Could it be that some of the same people who have been so certain as to what they could do in the past, now come with a similar certainty and tell the Department of Defense with absolute certainty what they can do and how much it will cost? If so, has their statement been taken as an absolute fact? That is what I have read in the newspapers.

Mr. WRIGHT. Apparently some of the members of the committee in the other body have accepted at face value these statements without thus far giving the Secretary of Defense or any of those who advise him the opportunity of even explaining why they arrived at the decision they did.

Mr. POAGE. That is right; and the newspapers have pretty well dipped up most of the mud in Puget Sound and thrown it on the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of the Navy and the Secretary of the Air Force.

Mr. WRIGHT. This is why I felt called upon to rise this afternoon, certainly not to condemn the Boeing Co. nor to degrade or disparage that company. It is a fine organization. It has built some very fine aircraft for our Nation in its time of need. But it seemed necessary for someone simply to balance the record with some of these facts which unfortunately have not been made available to public inspection through the media of the investigation and the press releases that have come out of that investigation in the other body.

Mr. POAGE. Now to give those of us who are not experts on this thing a little better understanding, has the so-called low bidder offered to post any bond that they could produce this plane for even twice what they have said they could produce it? Have they even said that they would do what they outlined in their proposal?

Mr. WRIGHT. So far as I am aware, and I believe this is correct, no bond has been posted nor has any ironclad guarantee been made that the final, ultimate cost would be that which was presented in the proposal. I might say in passing that it is not customary for aircraft manufacturing firms to make such bonds or to underwrite such guarantees because so many unaccounted—or unaccountable things can arise in the manufacture of an entirely new aircraft. But this simply highlights the fact that the Department of Defense is going to have to be free to judge in its own best reason whether or not a cost submittal is truly a realistic cost submittal. An estimate, of course, certainly may be far removed from the final, ultimate cost to the taxpayer. The Secretary has to award these contracts on the basis of his very best judgment, not solely on the basis of what a company guesses or represents that it could do.

Mr. POAGE. But the newspaper articles that you have read, or at least all those I have read, have indicated that the findings of a committee of the other body were to the effect that certain people could and would deliver certain results for certain money. And I believe our colleague, the gentleman from Washington, just said they would do it for $100 million less. But he has not offered to post any bonds, nor are those in whose behalf he pleads about to make any firm commitment. They have just expressed an optimistic hope that they could do the things suggested in their outline. Is it not a fact that that is the function of the Department of Defense, to pass upon these proposals and to determine whether they are within the bounds of reason and whether there is a reasonable expectation that they could and would be carried out for the amounts suggested? Is it not the duty of the Department to weed out all obviously overoptimistic proposals?—and particularly is it not the duty of the Department to avoid a repetition of overoptimism from sources which have shown their lack of realism in the past?

Mr. WRIGHT. Precisely, the gentleman is correct.

Mr. POAGE. And is that not just what the Department of Defense and the Department of the Air Force and the Department of the Navy did do?

Mr. WRIGHT. That is exactly what they did, and I am glad the gentleman has helped to make this clear.

Now let me move from this point briefly to cover one or two of the other points that have been touched upon, but not thoroughly elaborated in this discussion. First, on the question of who originated this concept of the TFX plane, it is correct, as the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PRICE] said that the concept originated within the Department of Defense. This plane is to be built for the two services. It is Secretary McNamara's baby. It is his brainchild. It is going to be his window piece to demonstrate that effective unification of the services can be achieved. I think in truth, we must say that a lot of people in the uniformed services, the career military personnel in the various branches, met this idea with something less than overwhelming enthusiasm. It is only natural that those who make their livings by career military services identify themselves with the perpetuation and ascendency of their own particular branches of the service. Therefore, it is only natural, I think, that these career military people or at least many of them, identify themselves with a separateness of their particular branch and with as complete autonomy as can possibly be achieved within that branch. That is what we were trying to get around when we created the Department of Defense in the first place. Some of the ideas that have been expressed, pretending shock and outrage that some of the military people might have wanted the Boeing Co. to build the plane, seem to overlook the fact that the Secretary of Defense is charged with the responsibility of making these decisions.

The notion that this idea for a TFX program originated with Boeing is inaccurate. It is like some of the other thoughts that have been expressed through the papers in this regard. Boeing is a fine aircraft company, but it did not originate the TFX concept.

One presumptive exposé written by a columnist who must have relied on utterly incorrect advice, asserted that the variable-sweep wing, a key to the TFX design, was originally invented and developed by Boeing. This is just not true. This feature, so vital to the TFX design, was, in fact, developed some years ago by Grumman, the General Dynamics partner. Grumman, in fact, built and flew a plane embodying this revolutionary design feature. The Boeing Co. has never done so.

Certain other representations carried in the newspapers during the last several days have similarly tended to distort the truth of what actually happened with respect to the Defense Department's decision. News stories have made reference to three so-called reversals or overrulings of military advisers by civilian chiefs. The three occasions to which they refer could hardly be described as reversals. They were occasions in which the designs of both companies were officially held to be insufficient, the specific deficiencies pointed out to each, both required to attempt specific improvement, and additional time allowed to both companies to come up with better designs for this revolutionary new concept in aircraft.

This could hardly be called a reversal of military advice. Some of the professional military people may indeed have said, in effect, that if you take either of these designs at this particular time, we would recommend the Boeing design. But clearly it was a decision properly within the purview of the Secretary of Defense to determine whether or not either design adequately met the rugged, difficult, and rigorously exacting standards set out by the two services. On three occasions, neither of them did.

On at least one of those occasions, it is clear that the granting of additional time to both contractors to perfect and improve their designs would have worked to the advantage of Boeing. Boeing initially had built its design around a new G.E. engine. But this particular engine on which G.E. then was experimenting could not be produced in time to meet the desired production schedule for the TFX. Therefore, Boeing was given the opportunity to go back and redesign its proposed project around the Pratt & Whitney engine.

In any event, the decision to require improvements in design on the part of both competitors clearly has resulted in a better final production. I believe that neither Boeing nor General Dynamics would seriously assert that its originally submitted design was anywhere near as good as the ones they both finally were able to develop as a result of the long competition.

Mr. STINSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WRIGHT. I yield again to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. STINSON. I thank the gentleman.

I would remind the Members that the Boeing Co. has always lived up to its commitments and that is as much assurance as is necessary that these airplanes would be produced at the price given.

I think there is no question but that the two companies are equal. The Boeing Co. on numerous occasions has shown its potentiality in building the finest aircraft in the world.

Here is the next thing I would like to point out: Reference was made to the fact that somebody on this side of the aisle was trying to put some pressure on the military or on the Secretary of Defense.

Mr. WRIGHT. If the gentleman will withhold at that point, I made or meant or implied no indication that anyone on that side of the aisle had done this. I am not aware of anything that anyone on that side of the aisle had done in that regard. My remarks were addressed to the other side of the Capitol, not the other side of the aisle. I simply wondered aloud whether a gentleman in the other body was prepared to make a specific statement.

Mr. STINSON. I misunderstood the gentleman.

The next point I wanted to mention is this: No one on this side of the aisle has to my knowledge tried to put any pressure at all on the Department of Defense or the military to see to it that this contract would be awarded to the Boeing Co. May I say that it is a Democrat who is conducting the hearings on this particular matter and not a Republican.

I would also like to point out that the Boeing Co. was almost a year ahead of the General Dynamics Co. in submitting the first design for this aircraft. So the Boeing Co. was much in the vanguard as far as submitting a design for this aircraft is concerned.

Going back to the political aspect, we on this side of the aisle would only argue that the aircraft be awarded to the lowest bidder so that the taxpayers will get the most for their money. If the awards are not going to be made to the lowest bidders, what basis are we going to use? Is Mr. McNamara more capable of designing an aircraft than engineers of the Boeing Co. or people in the Air Force who have been working with aircraft similar to this?

I would like to make a proposal to make this a fair program. Perhaps we should have the General Dynamics Co. and the Boeing Co. both build a prototype of their particular design. Then we could have a competitive program to see which is the better aircraft. I believe we would end up by saving the taxpayers a lot of money and would get the best possible aircraft for the Air Force and Navy.

Mr. WRIGHT. I cannot yield further at this point.

What the gentleman proposes is so completely contrary to established procedure, and so completely contrary to the contract that has already been determined and awarded that I cannot entertain a suggestion of that kind to be seriously made on the floor of the House. I would merely remind the gentleman of two or three points. Some years ago, after the modification of the B–36 program, when there was a need in the Air Force for a new long-range bomber to get there and back, there was competition between a number of companies. Among those companies were the General Dynamics Corp. and the Boeing Co. The General Dynamics Corp. proposed to make a supersonic plane similar to the B–36. The Boeing Co. came up with a proposal which is the B–52. It was awarded on that basis to the Boeing Co. Nobody suggested that the decision ought to be investigated; nobody suggested something crooked had taken place, or something sinister. Nobody suggested that this contract which had gone to Boeing should be taken back and divided up to see if we could not have one built down at Fort Worth and one at Wichita. Nobody suggested any of those things.

It followed its normal procedure.

More fundamental that any of this, however, are three rather basic principles in this regard which concern us all.

The first relates to the proper employment of congressional committees in such a matter. The second relates to our longstanding American tradition of civilian control over the military. The third concerns whether attempts at necessary military unification are to be forever frustrated.

PROPRIETY OF CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES

In regard to the first, permit me to say that I have great respect for the committees of the Congress. That respect certainly extends to the committees of the other body. It extends to the gentlemen who comprise those committees.

It would be unfortunate indeed if a great investigating committee which has done such notable and outstanding work in the past should degenerate in the public mind to a body attempting to exercise its power to influence the selection of contracts as between competing firms.

It would be hurtful to the Congress if the impression should be gained that members of our executive branch or our Military Establishment were to be subject to attempted personal harassment, embarrassment, or recrimination whenever their decisions in regard to the awarding of contracts might run at cross purposes with the personal wishes of certain ranking members of congressional investigating committees.

Surely it would be a flagrant misuse of the congressional investigating power if the word were to get around among public officials charged with the awarding of contracts that, unless they want to be called on the carpet and attacked in the public press, they had better play ball with firms represented by members of certain congressional committees.

In this particular instance, it has caused more than a few raised eyebrows when the highly touted star witness, on whose presumed objectivity the committee's case apparently rests, turns out to be the vice president of a firm which was itself interested in this contract. Certainly I do not question this gentleman's integrity nor that of the Senator from Boeing's home State at whose request this unusual inquiry was launched and who had authored so many of the questions in the hearing. I am sure they both are honorable men.

But as one who is interested in the reputation of our congressional investigating committees, I simply say that we should exercise greater care to make sure that they are truly objective, that they more fully and fairly develop both sides. Our entire system of congressional investigations loses prestige and respect when one of our committees leaves the impression that it has first drawn its conclusions and then gone out in search of whatever it can find to substantiate those prejudgments.

I think it would be extremely dangerous if the impression were to be gained that one munitions manufacturer, now doing work on the Saturn program, the Minuteman program, the Bomarc program, the Dyna-Soar program, the B–52 program, the KC–135 program, and others, had become so powerful that it could cause a congressional investigation whenever it does not get everything it wants, exactly when the company wants it.

When questioning in a congressional hearing is directed along a one-sided line to adduce a predetermined result, magnifying one side of a question and ignoring the other, it unfortunately tends to lead to the above impressions.

Mr. Speaker, I do not disparage Boeing. It is a fine organization, and builds fine airplanes. But I do want to say it is not the only organization in this country capable of building airplanes.

I do want to emphasize that it would be extremely dangerous were we to get into a situation where the Government is reduced to dependency upon any one company. We have tried that in other lines of endeavor.

Mr. Speaker, I happen to know something about a situation in which two companies are being maintained for the purpose of producing helicopters, the Bell Co. and a company on the west coast. Although the Bell Co. sometimes does come in with lower bids for the production of these items, the Department of the Army has held for some years that it is in the long-range best interest of the Government to see to it that there are at least two and not just one in the business with their tools and their machine shops going, with their skilled management and manpower teams working together. This is another thing that cannot be evaluated simply on the question of who says he thinks he can build it cheaper than someone else.

Mr. PIKE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WRIGHT. I would be glad to yield to my distinguished colleague from New York.

Mr. PIKE. I would like to comment on two things said by the gentleman from Washington, I believe.

First. On the question of the Boeing design having been a year in advance. The fact of the matter is that, so far as in advance is concerned, the design was based on a powerplant that did not exist. When the fear developed that this particular aircraft might have to be built with this powerplant they had to admit they could not build it with that particular powerplant because there was not any such powerplant and they themselves had to change to a different powerplant.

Second. On the question of the lowest bidder, it sounds good—and I have sat on the Armed Services Committee not too long, but I have sat there long enough to vote against the expenditure of an awful lot of money that other people who talk about reducing taxes vote for all the time, but you cannot put out a contract like this on a simple contract basis to the lowest bidder. I submit to the gentleman if they did say to Boeing "Will you give us a contract price on which you agree to build these aircraft without any renegotiation clauses in it, without any right to come back to the Government for more money if you get in trouble?" I submit to the gentleman either that the price would not have been what the price Boeing submitted was, or that Boeing would not have submitted any price whatsoever.

Mr. WRIGHT. As a matter of fact, it has been reliably stated that, on the basis of price estimates alone, both the Boeing estimate and that submitted by the General Dynamics-Grumman team, were less than the amount the program had been estimated actually to cost by the Air Force. So, in that regard, the Air Force in its best judgment felt that the estimates submitted by both of them were too low. They felt that neither one of them actually could be expected to perform the total contract on the amount of money that they individually said and thought that they could.

In the end the civilian heads of our Defense Establishment simply had to exercise their very best judgment. And this leads me to a matter of fundamental public policy.

CIVILIAN CONTROL OVER MILITARY

My concern in this regard lies in the protection of the great American tradition of the preeminence of civilian over military authority. A few of the quotations attributed to those who seem displeased over this contract award decision seem to bring into question the right of civilian heads of our Defense Establishment to make the final decisions. They seem to be founded upon a presumption that the Secretary of Defense and his Service Secretaries are supposed to perform only a meaningless ceremonial function and leave all the decisions to the men in uniform.

If this were the policy, there would be no need for a man of the capabilities of Robert S. McNamara in that crucial position. If he is not to perform the ultimate decisionmaking function, then indeed there is no need for a Secretary of Defense at all. Either the civilian heads of our Defense Department are to have the authority that goes with their enormous responsibilities, or they will be of utterly no value.

I am perfectly willing to concede that the average colonel in the Air Force probably knowns more about the physical job of flying an airplane than Secretary McNamara knows. But I certainly think we all would have to agree that Secretary McNamara knows infinitely more about the tools, techniques, technicalities, and requirements of manufacturing and producing than any career military personnel in the country. With so great a share of the national budget devoted to military procurement, his great experience in this particular field no doubt was a primary consideration behind his selection for this responsible post.

Above and beyond the personalities involved, however, lies the more fundamental question of just who is going to run this country—the military or the civilian. Many of our forefathers came from nations in Europe where, by bitter personal experience, they had learned the dangers adherent in governments dominated by an all-powerful military clique whose judgment was presumed to be infallible and whose edicts had become incontestable. They wanted no repetition of that sad situation on these shores.

Nor do the American people want to see developed here the kind of volatile and unstable situation in which military juntas have controlled and dominated certain governments in the Caribbean area of this hemisphere. That would be anathema to our country, contradictory of our most basic beliefs and completely contrary to our truest traditions.

The history of the United States contains many recitals of the principle that the civil authority of our Government must exercise the final judgment. Often this has been done over strenuous objections of the military. In reviewing the history of such decisions, we are inclined to say "Thank God!" Very often have subsequent events proven that civilian authorities were right and the military wrong.

The first repeating rifle for example was purchased for the Union Army by Abraham Lincoln over the vigorous objections of the Army Ordnance. This Spencer rifle was the decisive turning point in many subsequent engagements.

Under the same strenuous military opposition, Lincoln bought the Gatling gun which could fire 2,500 rounds a minute. The Army stubbornly refused to use it. Eight of them were left behind by General Custer when he went to Little Big Horn.

It was under the stubborn objections of the career Navy officers Lincoln ordered the *Monitor*. The result of that decision is history.

The Army General Staff was bent upon crucifying Billy Mitchell until the Congress intervened.

History is full of such illustrations. Today our Secretary of Defense and the civilian heads of our Defense Establishment confront enormous responsibilities in which the exercising of their very best judgment could indeed be crucial to our survival.

It would be a long step backward and not forward if Congressmen were to leave the impression that it expected the responsible civilian officials of this Government to abdicate their responsibilities to the hands of the military, or to be bound in all things by the advice of colonels or even generals.

SUCCESS OF UNIFICATION

In this particular instance, a further and final question of impelling importance arises. This concerns the repeated and continuing frustrations which have been encountered by those who attempt to bring about practical implementations of the Unification Act.

Secretary McNamara has vigorously prosecuted numerous efforts to create efficiency and desirable unification in matters of supply and program management. He has been attacked and criticized on many such attempts.

The TFX program is probably the outstanding case in point. The Secretary is trying to protect tax dollars. He believes that the basic concept of one plane for both services can ultimately save our Government upward of $1 billion in this one program alone.

The crucial question in the TFX award was whether or not the Secretary was to be permitted to carry forward this program to the greatest degree possible. His essential requirement was that of the highest degree of commonality in the design. The General Dynamics-Grumman design more adequately embodied this feature.

I, for one, believe that Secretary McNamara deserves to be encouraged and supported and upheld in his determination to bring about the most desirable ends of military unification.

And so, this aircraft represents not only a revolutionary design but a revolutionary concept in military unification. We need these aircraft. We need them at the earliest possible date. The program is vital to our security. Let's curtail the second-guessing and Monday morning quarterbacking and get on with the job of building the planes.

Mr. Speaker, I do not wish to prolong this much further, but there is one further thing I would like to say and then I shall yield the floor, having done that. That is this. I do earnestly regret that it ever became necessary for me to take the floor of the House to discuss a matter of this type. I did it reluctantly. It became necessary, however, because of the totally and completely one-sided publicity which had been accorded to the inquiry in the other body. It became necessary because no publicity whatever had been given to these matters which I regard to be strong and impelling reasons why the Secretary of Defense in his own good judgment may have selected the Grumman-General Dynamics team. I do not know that those were the reasons. I know that some of them were among his reasons. But I do believe that he is an honorable man, that he is an honest man. I believe that the Secretaries of the Air Force and of the Navy are honorable and honest men. I believe them to be capable men. I believe them to be doing their earnest best to promote the defense of this country for the lowest consistent cost.

I believe that in the exercise of their own good judgment, as charged by their responsibilities in this matter, they did their best to do that very thing. Nobody certainly can say that they have not. I am convinced that they have.

I say let us stop the quibbling, let us stop the quarreling, let us stop the "Monday morning quarterbacking", let us stop all this second-guessing. Let us stop trying to poke holes in other people and charging them vaguely with some sinister activity. Let us get on with the job of building these airplanes. We need them. We need them desperately. We need them in numbers as soon as we can get them. Let us join forces, unite, be both good winners and good losers in this business.

Mr. STINSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I do not desire to yield further at this particular time to anyone. My allotted time has just about expired. I would not want to end this discussion on a note of controversy. What I am trying to say at this particular time is not controversial in this sense. What I am trying to say is that every American from whatever State has a stake in our defense effort. Let us be good winners and good losers and stop calling one another names. What I am trying to say is all the companies ought to be willing to be as good losers as they are winners, that they ought not to try to harass or embarrass our public officials when those public officials do not happen to go along with their particular private wishes. When a decision has been made, let us close ranks and get to building and move forward together.

FIFTIETH ANNIVERSARY OF THE LABOR DEPARTMENT

The **SPEAKER.** Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Taft] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. **TAFT.** Mr. Speaker, I asked for this special order today to assure that the celebration of the 50th anniversary of the Department of Labor does not pass unnoticed in this body and from this side of the aisle.

The concern of America for the welfare of our people as workers and members of organized labor groups has found voice in the many great steps led by the Department to the betterment of conditions and enjoyment of our economy and better life by laboring men and women over the years.

In the increasingly complex times in which we live its functions have been many. Two of grave importance have been the strengthening of the free collective bargaining process and the safeguarding of the rights, opportunities, and privileges of all who labor.

To these ends, as with all its duly assigned duties and missions, we join in wishing the Department well.

In connection with the anniversary of the Department there was published in the Washington Post on Sunday, March 3, 1963, an article by Mr. Morton Mintz, as follows:

Labor Department Is 50 Years Old, and It Took a Taft To Start It

(By Morton Mintz)

Although the Government had been in labor since 1884, when it established a Bureau of Labor in the Interior Department, it didn't give birth to a fullfledged department until March 4, 1913.

The 29-year gestation period ended when President William Howard Taft, on his last day in office, signed the law bringing the Department of Labor into the world—a world in which the workingman, the workingwoman, and the working child needed all the help they could get.

Monday is the 50th anniversary of the Department. The anniversary will be observed with regional banquets and conferences in 16 cities.

The Washington banquet, which will follow other special events during the day, will be held Monday night at the Sheraton-Park. President Kennedy, Labor Secretary W. Willard Wirtz, three former Secretaries—Frances Perkins, James P. Mitchell, and Justice Arthur J. Goldberg—and leaders of industry, the AFL–CIO, and the three branches of Government are among those scheduled to attend.

TO IMPROVE CONDITIONS

The law that created the Department said its purpose was "to foster, promote, and develop the welfare of the wage earners of the United States, to improve their working conditions, and to advance their opportunities for profitable employment."

Today few would question that the law's purpose reflected compelling needs.

A 1913 Government report, for example, said that almost 30 percent of the Nation's steelworkers were on a 7-day week, that some worked 18 to 24 hours without letup, and that 2 out of 5 worked 72 or more hours a week.

The report said that 42 percent were earning less than 18 cents an hour, with a weekly potential maximum of $12.50. From their pay deductions were made for such things as ice water, disablement funds, medical fees, rent for company houses, and identification badges.

Owning almost everything in towns where many workers lived, employers could charge what they wished for rent, transportation, and even food.

In the 1st decade of the 20th century there were few laws governing safety, health, sanitary conditions, or child labor. Sick leave, paid vacations, and other fringe benefits were virtually unknown.

A common laborer toiled 50 hours a week for an average of $11—and a child may have worked beside him under dangerous conditions. Illness or old age could cut off his income.

More than 40 percent of his take-home pay went for food, beverages, and tobacco—compared with about 25 percent today. A suit of clothes took 75 hours' work—compared with 20 hours today.

To the Department's 10th Secretary the task today is "equal in magnitude" to the challenges of 1913.

In an anniversary statement, Wirtz said that the Department "carries much of the responsibility for a major decision we must face as a people: Can we make our economy a human as well as a technical success?"

The Secretary said that we have today "an economy so forward and aggressive in its technical ability that it has outstripped the skills of millions of persons, deprived itself of that many consumers, and come to an impasse of demand.

"As framer of the manpower policies of this Nation, the Department of Labor must keep pace with the scientific advancements that offer promise of man's fulfillment.

"We have the responsibility of developing those programs which will safeguard the person who may, as an individual, be adversely affected by a technological development which greatly benefits the community as a whole.

"We are going to have to review our seniority, our job-right systems, our employment security programs, and our retirement programs in order to find ways of insuring man's rights despite his displacement by a machine."

Of the four units that comprised the Department when it was born, only the Bureau of Labor Statistics remains in it. Within the last quarter century the Bureau of Immigration was transferred to the Justice Department and the Children's Bureau to what is now the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. The Mediation and Conciliation Service has become an independent agency.

But changing times have brought changing needs, and the Department's activities and responsibilities are now of a scope that could not have been imagined 50 years ago.

EMPLOYMENT SERVICE

They include career counseling for women, reemployment help to veterans, the U.S. Employment Service, training in labor subjects for about a thousand foreign visitors annually, apprenticeship and training programs, publication of the Dictionary of Occupational Titles (a new edition will list about 40,000), studies of the chronically unemployed, thousands of investigations to assure compliance with the Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act, help in retraining jobless workers (an estimated 400,000 in the next 3 years) and enforcement of fair labor standards.

"During its first half century of service to the United States," Wirtz said, "the concern of the Department of Labor can be expressed in one word: People. Human welfare remains its interest."

AMERICAN LABOR

Mr. **FINDLEY.** Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. McClory] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. **McCLORY.** Mr. Speaker, in further recognition of the Department of Labor's 50th anniversary, I am pleased to call to the attention of the Members of the House the heartening and thoughtful expression of Mr. Rick Lampella, of Waukegan, Ill., a loyal friend. Mr. Lampella is a carpenter, an active union leader representing Local 48 of the Carpenters & Joiners of America on the Lake County Branch of COPE, an effective Republican precinct committeeman and Republican candidate for alderman in Waukegan. Rick Lampella's words are as follows:

We are the hands and heart of labor. Our hands are the hands that helped make America strong. They may be the grime studded hands of a steelworker, perhaps the hands of a machinist, or the calloused hands of a carpenter, but always the hands of a free, dedicated American. These hands will never know the tyrant's sword as long as we are allowed to exercise free choice in a system of free enterprise. A system where men sit down together to negotiate their differences of opinion and to come away with an amicable solution. In times of crises, our hands will lay down the implements of our peaceful labor and will take up the armaments of defense.

Our peace and prosperity has not been cheap, rather it has been wrought by the sweat of the brow. No power shall ever take it from us. We are strong for we are free. We are labor.

Though our hands may be coarse and strong, yet our hearts flow with admiration and humble thanks to those who made our heritage so great. Our hearts swell with pride of accomplishment when we see mighty towering buildings, each one a monument to the men who built it. Our hearts never cease to wonder at new and intricate implements our fellowmen in the technological field devise for us in industry.

Above all our hearts flow with gratitude to the Maker for the blessings He has so copiously bestowed upon us as free laboring men. As time goes on, our hands will remain firm, our hearts sure, for our faith is in our Creator who gave this great Nation as a citadel of strength so that all men who crave freedom might look to it and be encouraged in their pursuit. Today we are strong. Today we are free. Today we are the grateful American labor.

MILITARY MANPOWER UTILIZATION: TESTIMONY BEFORE ARMED SERVICES COMMITTEE

Mr. **FINDLEY.** Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. Curtis] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. **CURTIS.** Mr. Speaker, this morning I had the opportunity to testify before the Armed Services Committee of the House of Representatives on the highly important subject of proper manpower utilization. I believe that this is an area in which we must give careful study and plan intelligently in order to avoid wasteful duplication of efforts and to provide for our country a secure defense. I am placing my testimony of this morning in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point:

MANPOWER UTILIZATION

(Testimony of Hon. THOMAS B. CURTIS, of Missouri, before the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives, Monday, March 4, 1963)

I appreciate very much the courtesy this committee has extended to me to testify at this time on one of the most important subjects which faces our society today: proper manpower utilization.

I know of no one piece of legislation which has a greater impact upon the subject of manpower utilization than the Draft Act which is again before your committee for extension.

It is almost unbelievable that the President in his message to the Congress on Youth on February 14, 1963, failed to mention, let alone, discuss the question of the draft as it bears on this youth problem. There is no single force which causes more disruption in the education, training, employment, and personal lives of our youth today, which the President's message points up, than the draft law.

It becomes imperative to know whether the penalties that our society pays as a result of this disruption are penalties we must pay in order to provide for the defense of our country. A great burden is placed upon this committee to fully understand the effects of this disruption and weigh them against the benefits. Certainly the Congress needs this advice before it sets up more Federal programs which will interfere with the lives of our young people, as the President has proposed.

This committee will have under consideration this year another request which relates to the basic question of efficient manpower utilization. I refer to the request for increasing the pay scales in the Armed Forces so that the rapid and costly turnover of military manpower can be somewhat arrested. Surely, the high cost and military inefficiency involved in the rapid rate of turnover of trained manpower in the military suggests that this committee look carefully into all aspects of the policies of procurement, training, promotion, and retirement of the Armed Forces to determine where basic errors may exist so they may be corrected. I am satisfied that the most costly error exists in the basic manpower procurement policy which relies upon the draft instead of positive recruitment techniques. This is the matter this committee must delve into in great depth and not dismiss out of hand with a cursory review and set of hearings.

The third matter to which I wish to direct the attention of this committee is the Manpower Training Act of 1962 and the philosophy which underlies it. This act was the result of lengthy studies into the basic problems of employment and unemployment in our dynamic economy where technological advancement has been so fast we have coined a name for it, automation. There is no question that we must concentrate a great deal more than we have been on the subject of education, and training, both in preparing our people to enter the labor market and in adult education and retraining to keep their skills up to date after they have entered the labor market.

Probably the largest sums of money being spent in the field of training and retraining in our society today are spent by the Military Establishment. The Military Establishment runs the largest single vocational education systems in the world, most of them in direct competition with the civilian society for pupils, teachers, and facilities. These systems are largely uncoordinated with the civilian sector and therefore are redundant as well as unnecessary competition. The armed services make the complaint that they seem to be training people only to have them enticed away by the civilian sector. They attribute a substantial part of the costly turnover problem they are experiencing to this fact; the obvious deductions to which I have alluded to be drawn from this should not be lost sight of.

I have been before this committee on other occasions to discuss manpower utilization. As the chairman knows, I was one of a group who strongly opposed the concept of universal military training in 1951 and 1952, not on the basis of an ideological difference, but upon the concepts of efficiencies. I happen to agree quite strongly with the advocates of universal military training that whatever personnel our Military Establishment needs they must have. I pointed out during the debate on universal military training in the House that the military needs for manpower were primarily quality needs, not quantity needs, needs for skills rather than for numbers. Our technology has continued to advance since then to make that point which was valid in 1951–52 even more valid today. A second point I sought to make was that a high proportion of the skills the military needed had counterparts in the civilian economy. Again, as we have advanced rapidly technologically this point is even stronger today.

This second point suggests that we should be doing a careful job of coordinating the civilian skill needs with the military skill needs. This requires as a mere rudimentary beginning developing nomenclature and description of skills both in the civilian sector as well as the military sector. Very little has been done in this area by the military sector. The same has been true in the civilian sector. However, the Manpower Training Act of 1962 can correct this if it is properly implemented by updating, keeping up to date and anticipating the new skills coming into being in the Dictionary of Skills which the Department of Labor is required to maintain.

Once the military has some understanding of the skills it needs in relation to the skills in use and coming into use in the civilian sector then intelligent decisions can be made on specific points of where the civilian sector or the military sector is best suited to maintain and operate the institutions of learning to develop these skills. As we move forward here we will develop a new mix, with the emphasis much heavier on the civilian sector and lighter on the military sector than it is today.

In opposing universal military training it was suggested that the theory of the high school ROTC program which worked well in the 1920's and proved itself in World War II could be used to develop a more efficient and less costly system to procure the great bulk of the skills needed by a modern technologically developed Military Establishment, than the universal military training concept which required the military to move into the entire field of housing, feeding, maintaining as well as training and paying the young men.

Universal military training was rejected by the Congress, in its wisdom, after hearing testimony from many educators and persons knowledgeable in the field of manpower utilization. It is apparent that the policy decison the Congress made has been ignored by the Military Establishment abetted by those in powerful positions in the Congress who support the universal military training concept. The draft law now up for extension has been perverted from a system of satisfying the real manpower needs of the military establishment into an awkward and costly program of universal military training which does not result in a strong man-for-man defense.

I sometimes think that emotion rather than reason supports a continuation of this concept which so hampers our civilian society and provides such an inefficient procurement system for the military. The emotion is directed not to those of us who wish to discuss the problems of efficient manpower utilization but toward those who argue somewhat emotionally on their part that peacetime draft has no place in our free society. I do not wish to minimize the value that freedom has for us by eliminating it from the discussion but I do not believe it is necessary to make an appeal beyond one to efficiency to establish the case against the system of peacetime draft for military personnel procurement.

I want to get the discussion on the plane of what system is the best for our society. There is no question in my mind about the great penalty we are paying in the civilian sector in inferior education and training resulting from the disruption of the plans of our youth in entering the labor market and embarking upon their life's endeavor.

I also think there is no question that the peacetime draft has proved to be, as many of us suggested it would be, a costly, inefficient personnel procurement system which would result in an inferior defense for our society.

In these times of increasing needs of the military for high quality rather than quantity in personnel procurement, our basic emphasis should be on strong recruitment programs backed by a topnotch system of pay schedules, promotions, retirement and fringe benefits.

Gentlemen, in the early 1900's the Navy had recruitment officers at the gates of every Federal penitentiary. Largely as the result of the experiences in World War I and the wisdom of the Naval leaders of the day the personnel system was changed to one of recruitment of topflight enlistments and top caliber training with real career opportunities based upon a good promotion and retirement system. Granted the Navy has become a more technical service where unskilled and semiskilled personnel are in less demand, but so it is with all military services today, including the Army.

Adm. Ben Moreel pointed the way to proper procurement practices for post World War II in the personnel system he established for the Seabees in World War II, matching civilian skills with military needs and adapting these skills as the case required. I discussed this and other aspects of the problems of manpower utilization at some length in my testimony before the Senate Armed Services Committee in 1959 when the Draft Act was last extended. I ask that this testimony which is just as appropriate today as it was then be made part of these hearings. I also call attention to and ask that it be made part of these hearings an article appearing in Newsweek, April 4, 1960, entitled "The Draft—Campus to Chaos." I placed this timely article which sought to develop the points I have discussed in the CONGRESSIOAL RECORD, volume 106, part 7, pages 8446–8447.

[From Newsweek, Apr. 4, 1960]

THE DRAFT—CAMPUS TO CHAOS

Is there any sense trying to plan a career? Is it worthwhile to look for a permanent job? Should I get married? These are questions that tens of thousands of young men graduating from college must face up to now, as they bump squarely into four words "Uncle Sam needs you."

For most who graduate from high schools, there will be time to postpone the question of military service. But what about the young men of 21 and 22 who know the draft is coming soon. Will they be drafted? And how soon? How can they find out?

Or should they just enlist and get it over with? Or what about signing up for one of the Reserve programs? And if so, which one of a bewildering variety of alternatives should they choose?

At sometime, almost every American family will be touched by the draft—now in a state of terrible uncertainty and confusion. For the first full appraisal of the draft, and its effect on the Nation's youth, a team of Newsweek correspondents headed by General Editor Jack Iams talked to students, parents, draft boards, and public officials across the Nation. Following is the summing up—and the answers to all-important questions:

The conscientious father in Arlington, Va., was both hurt and disturbed when his college sophomore son spoke up: "Dad, do you realize you've got me locked in with this darned draft thing until I'm 35? The other guys are just kissing it off until they're 26; and then they'll be exempt."

"I told you to do what the draft board requires," said the father. "To apply for a student's deferment while you're in college. Keep your grades up. It's true that makes you liable until you're 35. But that's the law."

"It may be the law," said the sophomore, "but the other guys aren't bothering. They say it's the only way you can beat the draft."

Father, sure he was right, reached for the phone. But the woman clerk at his son's draft board shook him to his conscientious core. "Your son's right," she said. "We just aren't bothering with college deferments any more. It's mostly redtape and the boys aren't filing requests for deferment. They hardly ever get called until they're 23 and they're out of college by then, so why bother? But, of course, since your son did apply, he's liable until he's 35. Otherwise, the liability ends at 26."

That is one example of draft law confusion. Another, and a more common one, is provided by 23-year-old Robert Reed, who was graduated from Princeton in 1958 and is waiting patiently at his home in Chicago's suburban Lake Forest for his local draft board to tap him. "Ever since college, I thought it would be just a couple of months. Then as time went by I thought maybe they had forgotten all about me. Two months ago I had my physical. I guess I'll be called any time now. I've been waiting so long, it'll be a relief." But, relief or no, nearly 2 years of uncertainty will have gone out of young Reed's life, with 2 years of active duty and 4 years Reserve obligation still to come.

Or there is the Detroit office boy, high school graduate James Gentner, now 21. "In June of 1957 I volunteered for induction. They deferred me for 3 months. They were supposed to call me in October that year, but they haven't done it yet. They may call today, tomorrow, a year from now. They've got me hanging." And while he's hanging, young Gentner marks time in a "just for now" job.

Another, and less resigned attitude, is that of 22-year-old Tom Taylor, a recent University of California graduate currently looking for a job in San Francisco. "I don't want to be drafted. It seems to be a waste of time in terms of career and the little good it does. I want to go into advertising but I can't get a good job because of the Army thing. I just hope there'll be a draft cut."

THE ODDS ARE 99 TO 1

These are typical cases, chosen at random. They can be multiplied thousands of times with individual variation in any part of the Nation today.

Few, if any, of these uncertain and badgered young men—and there are an eligible million and a half of them now in the draft age bracket of 18½ to 26—are unwilling to serve their country if they are really needed. But many wonder how great that need is, particularly when they know that the draft is currently taking fewer than 100,000 men a year (an estimated 93,000 in fiscal 1961). No wonder the temptation is to play "roulette," to lie low, say nothing, and hope to reach the magic age of 26 before one's number comes up.

But "draft roulette" is a game that plays havoc with nerves and with self-respect. Also, the chances of winning are slim. Right now, the Pentagon insists that "virtually no nonfather who is otherwise eligible is currently escaping the draft." The word "virtually" is a slippery one, of course. But Pentagon officials say the odds are at least 99 to 1 against the roulette player.

But even those who gamble on waiting it out are weighted down by what many young men consider the heaviest burden imposed on them by the draft as it stands today: The near impossibility of going into a desirable job upon which a career can be built. Obviously, the great majority of employers are reluctant to hire young men for positions of any real responsibility when there is no telling just how soon they may be plucked for service. Conversely, many of the young men themselves would prefer to mark time in some run-of-the-mill job—working in a filling station or at a soda fountain—rather than embark on a serious working life that may be interrupted at any time.

A dean speaks: The way a majority of college students apparently feel is summed up by Amherst's Associate Dean John C. Estey, Jr., himself an Air Force veteran of Korea and student adviser on military obligations:

"In my experience in counseling some thousand students, I think I could characterize their reaction to the draft as one of uncertainty, inequity, and—I am extremely sorry to say—frustration and demoralization.

"They are uncertain when they will be called, if at all. They sense the inequity involved when they see friends with the money and inclination go on to graduate school, planning to stay deferred until age 26 when they will be freemen. They sense the inequity in the indefinite deferment of their friends who precipitate marriage and have a family, often with the sole purpose of avoiding the draft.

"If it is true that raw manpower is still needed in great numbers by the Armed Forces, this message does not get through to the college student. He does not see why he is needed. He reads about the competition with Russia in research, technology, engineering, economics, culture, and he wonders why his brains and training are not as valuable as his feet and back. Finally, he sees so many men being deferred for apparently flimsy reasons that he is bound to say, 'How shall I get out of it?', rather than 'How shall I serve?' "

Ways out: For those who frankly want "to get out of it" there are a number of more hopeful prospects than "roulette." Some are matters of chance; some aren't. Briefly, these are the main avenues to "freedom":

Rejection for failure to meet physical or mental standards.

Fatherhood. Actually, fathers are not exempt or even automatically deferred; but they are far enough down on the order of preference to give them what is tantamount to indefinite deferment.

Continuance of graduate schooling until age 26—providing that a high average is maintained. The fact that this requires money has caused critics of the present draft setup to cry "one law for the rich, one for the poor." Representative William H. Meyer, Vermont Democrat, has even compared the educational deferment to the Civil War practice of a draftee's hiring a substitute.

Pursuance of certain essential occupations, such as science, engineering, agriculture, and teaching. Decisions as to degree of essentiality are up to local draft boards.

The ministry, and study for the ministry. That is a flat exemption. It has raised problems, according to a California draft board official, with such sects as Jehovah's Witnesses, some of whose members claim to be ministers though they hold full-time jobs.

Hardship cases—again determined by local boards. About a million and a half are currently listed in this category.

To what extent any or all of these categories are being exploited by the unscrupulous draft dodger, nobody knows for sure. Draft board officials are generally convinced that the successful faker is rare, indeed, though the tendency these days is toward leniency, and as one put it: "We stretch a point not to create hardship."

But where the question of fatherhood is concerned, there is simply no way of knowing when a young man has cynically and deliberately got himself married and started a family strictly for draft avoidance. There are now 400,000 fathers who are as good as exempt. A recent Labor Department study estimates that 35 to 40 percent of the men reaching the age of 22–23 will have become fathers. Certainly many a parent must wonder uneasily if his son has made a hasty and perhaps foolish marriage, saddling himself with a family that he may not be able to support. One New Jersey father put it like this: "My kid, who is 22, swears that he wouldn't think of getting married except for old-fashioned romantic reasons. But in the same breath he talks about friends of his who have started families just to get out of service." And it is a standard gag among deferred students at the University of Southern California: "If your grades fall you'd better have a fertile girl on tap."

The job problem: If the normal course of marriage is upset by the draft, the normal path of starting on a career is even more seriously affected. The college graduate who wants a job as a steppingstone to better things is just out of luck, in a great many cases, as long as the draft hangs over him. It's true that if he is drafted out of a job, his employer by law must rehire him when he is free. But the fact is that most employers don't want to hire a 1–A in the first place.

Large companies with elaborate personnel systems are inclined to insist that draft imminence is no factor in their hiring policies. But a far more widespread attitude was bluntly put by the San Francisco Bank of America's vice president, Frank E. Young: "We usually wait until a young man has completed his draft requirements. If you take a man and put him through training and then let him go off for 2 years in the Army, we have to start him again from scratch and this isn't worthwhile."

Employment agencies are still more outspoken. An official of Detroit's Action Center put it: "Many employers express the stipulation that employees be 4–F or have completed military training. It is rather prevalent as a stipulation."

The fresh college graduates themselves say flatly there is almost no chance of getting a decent job—one that will lead anywhere—during the months of limbo between the bright day of graduation and the dark one when Uncle Sam's greetings arrive. What burns up the eligibles is that during this same period their friends who are rejected as unfit or who have become fathers are walking into the jobs of their choice and getting a long head start.

How vital? This disruption over the draft during what is, nominally anyway, the peacetime American way of life, raises a basic national question: What justification is there for continuing a law passed in a time of stress, namely 1940?

The very history of that law provides a partial answer. It was dropped at the beginning of 1947. It was renewed 15 months later, in 1948, when the Soviet aggression threat appeared clear and present. Even then the law's teeth were not really felt until the summer of 1950 and the outbreak of the Korean war. In September of that year, 50,000 were called up (compared with the presently monthly average of about 7,500).

The draft law has been renewed five times since then, most recently in February of last year for another 4-year stretch, until July 1, 1963. (It was no accident that Congress chose to set a nonelection year for the next bubbling up of the controversial issue.)

Baby crop: There was some opposition to renewal in Congress last time. There will almost certainly be more in 1963—barring some world upheaval—because that's when the postwar bumper baby crop will start crowding the registration lists. That means that the draft, purely in terms of providing the armed services with manpower, will be only a drop in the bucket. For that matter, it isn't much more than a drop in the bucket today, providing as it does less than 100,000 men annually to a total defense manpower of 2.5 million.

If that is so, why is the draft necessary even now?

Defense officials, led by Lt. Gen. Lewis B. Hershey, have plenty of answers, but they mostly boil down to this: If it weren't for the hot breath of the draft, volunteer enlistments would drop far below the point of sufficiency.

Assistant Secretary of Defense Charles C. Finucane, in charge of manpower and reserves, put it simply: "Even if we don't take many people in the draft, we need it for a proper flow of enlistments. The Armed Forces would dwindle if you removed that impetus. We would never have time in an emergency to rebuild a Selective Service System if it were dissipated. Selective Service is the machinery in being, a pillar of our ability to mobilize manpower in an emergency." It is a hard argument to answer. One answer may come from England; there conscription has been abolished as of the end of this year, on the ground that sufficient volunteers are available to meet Britain's military commitments—and provide more efficient forces. But skeptical American officials reply that results of the British experiment won't be known for another 2 years.

It should also be stated, on the side of the draft, that the civilian officials who carry out most of the actual, backbreaking work of administering the law do a first-class, thoughtful, considerate job ("a beautiful job," says Georgia Tech's Dean Fred Ajax)—and furthermore, the bulk of them do it without pay.

Nevertheless, the great problems of disruption, delay, uncertainty, confusion, and general demoralization, where the flower of the Nation's young manhood is concerned, are undeniably present, casting their shadows across a nation opposed since its birth to the militaristic tradition. What can be done about it?

Two presidential aspirants have ideas on the subject:

Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY says: "I am not at all satisfied with the present law. One immediate step should be taken. Our whole program should be reviewed and revised by a special manpower commission of civilian members."

Senator STUART SYMINGTON, the candidate most deeply immersed in defense problems, says: "A force made up of volunteer professional military personnel is more effective and less costly than one dependent upon involuntary draftees. If the current atmosphere of complacency were dissolved, and a military career made more respected and attractive, the draft could be eliminated."

Keep it: Vice President Richard Nixon, on the other hand, has never changed from the position he voiced in 1956, when he said there was no "easy way" to maintain defense, and the draft, however hard a way, was indispensable to national security.

The average youngster, for all his grumbling, knows full well that behind all the confusion and uncertainty of the draft, behind the rosy promises of service recruiting officers, behind the inequities and the skulduggery and the smart-guy stuff, there lies the simple, basic need of his country's welfare. His complaint is not: "Why should I serve?" It is: "Tell me when and how I should serve, and to the best of my ability." He doesn't want his time wasted—and his time, in the long run, is the Nation's time.

STATEMENT OF HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS, OF MISSOURI, BEFORE SENATE ARMED SERVICES COMMITTEE, MARCH 3, 1959

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the opportunity to testify before this committee on the very serious question of the extension of the induction provisions of the Universal Military Training and Service Act.

This act had a difficult birth and its life has been a strange one. If anyone doubts it let him ponder over its title. It is probably neither universal, military, nor training. It is theoretically a draft act, as it is popularly called.

I would like to review the legislative birth of this act from the time it received its undescriptive title if I had the time. Instead I will refer to the remarks I made on the floor of the House during various debates upon it. The first, volume 97, part 3, pages 3220-3222 and pages 3786–3787 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; volume 98, part 2, pages 6174–1678; volume 101, part 5, pages 6497–6498; and stress the highlights.

Before doing this I would like to refer to the testimony I gave before the House Subcommittee on Education and Labor which reported out its version of the National Defense Education Act of the last Congress, an act which also does not live up to its title.

I quote: "Before Congress undertakes to extend the Federal Government's authority in the field of education it is essential that it thoroughly appraise the Federal Government's present role in this important area to determine whether its role is proper and conducive to the growth and stability of the educational system. Regrettably, this appraisal has not been made to any great extent to date. I am convinced that the greatest damage that is occurring in our educational system today stems from the role of the Federal Government during the past 8 years.

"Under the guise of a peacetime draft law the Military Establishment has effectively disrupted for the past 8 years the education and training of every youth in America. Even those who have not been drafted have had their plans disrupted by uncertainty. Those who have been drafted include potential teachers, engineers, scientists, and indeed any potential professional man or technician, who have had 2 to 3 years taken out of the most crucial periods of their education. Their time has been devoted to largely sitting on their hands in a military uniform. If the military utilizes the peacetime draft system for its intended purpose, i.e., acquiring the personnel needed to carry out its functions, it would be an entirely different matter. Unfortunately, the peacetime draft law is being used to carry out the specious, impractical, and rejected philosophy that 'every American boy should have military training.' I say rejected philosophy because the Congress rejected the Military Establishment's request for universal military training. It was rejected, in part, because the military could never define by curriculum or even in general terms what constituted military training. During the debates on the various bills, members of this Committee on Education and Labor raised the point that if the bill really was to be a training bill it should be referred to the Committee on Education rather than to the Committee on Armed Services. Members of your committee warned, and I joined in that warning, that UMT would badly damage our educational system. I charge that the peacetime draft has been perverted in its use to a quasi-universal training program and indeed it has badly damaged our educational system and is continuing to do so.

"The first step that should be taken by this committee is to examine into this charge to see if it is substantiated. If it is, then it should recommend to the Congress what steps must be taken to require the Military Establishment to carry out the intention of the peacetime draft law and not subvert it. Such positive action should bring positive results, to wit: (1) We would improve our educational system, particularly in the area of scientists and technicians; (2) we would improve our defense strength because we would be getting our men trained in military science back to the jobs they are trained for and away from education for which they are not trained; (3) we would save billions of dollars that are presently being wasted on inadequate training and usage of personnel.

"In the 1920's and 1930 the American Legion sponsored a universal military training bill that was based upon an extension of the high school ROTC program. It had proved quite effective in training men for wars like World War I and to some degree World War II. The basis of this plan was the proper utilization of the educational facilities already existing in the society, rather than an attempted duplication of these facilities in the military.

"The need in modern warfare for technical skills, as opposed to close-order military drill skills, indicates that we should be utilizing the educational facilities that exist in the society in the field of vocational education, instead of having the Military Establishment duplicate them at the cost of billions of dollars.

"We achieve at least three things by following a program based upon utilization of the educational plant already in existence, to wit: (1) We get better trained technicians; (2) we get these technicians at one-tenth the cost; (3) we work with rather than foul up the civilian educational system.

"Fortunately, this is not a matter of theory. It is a matter that was proved conclusively in World War II by the Seabee personnel procurement system. To illustrate, the Seabees needed bulldozer operators. They did not take 18-year-old boys with a couple of weeks boot training camp experience and send them for a few months to a bulldozer operating school set up by the Navy. Instead they offered enlistment opportunity with a suitable rating to the experienced bulldozer operators in the civilian society and accepted them even though they were fat and 40—if they really knew how to operate a bulldozer. The accomplishment of the Seabees in World War II is fabulous and resulted essentially from this personnel system.

"The Seabee formula was abandoned when the war was over. The Navy now operates a bulldozer operators school and takes young men, whether they want to be bulldozer operators or not, and sends them to this school for a few months. The results are obvious: (1) You don't have a very good bulldozer operator; (2) after the enlistment period is up the man involved may or may not take a civilian job operating a bulldozer * * * likely not * * * so the skill is lost * * * (the Reserve program has not been carried out successfully to retain these skills); (3) the cost to the Navy of running the school is considerable; (4) the talents of the naval personnel who run the school are taken away from the fields where they could be efficiently utilized."

Unfortunately the House Subcommittee on Education and Labor did not make the studies I recommended. No committee in the Congress or executive agency to my knowledge has made such studies. Yet the truth of my basic observations is borne out by our common experiences and requires some pretty strong evidence to rebut.

The reason I am before this committee in the Senate is because the House Armed Services Committee made no study into these important charges. In hearings covering a period of 4 days and lasting only 7 hours and 13 minutes according to the committee's own records the extension of this draft act was passed out unanimously by the committee. An examination of the hearings demonstrates that it received the most cursory type of study. Not one educator testified. Not one person in the field of technical training testified. The testimony was exclusively that of representatives of the armed services and various church and other groups who were concerned with the spiritual aspects of the draft law.

I am concerned with the efficacy of the draft law in providing the type of defense this country needs. Not so strangely the most efficacious measure to provide the strongest defense happens to be the least costly. A fat man never could fight with efficiency and a fat Military Establishment can't fight any better.

The speeches I referred to in my opening remarks give sufficient detail to follow up the points I shall now state. If this committee undertakes to make a real study of these points I should be happy to supply to your committee staff the many reference books and other materials I have accumulated on this subject, hoping that some day some committee or even executive commission would undertake this important study.

The points:

1. An enlistee is considerably more valuable than a draftee. Enlistees are obtained by making the military service as attractive as possible.

2. Draft laws are necessary if there are insufficient volunteers. Yet relying on the draft law to meet personnel needs tends to weaken the efforts to attract volunteers. It is like getting used to relying on a crutch.

Therefore, drafting as a basis for getting personnel should be abandoned just as soon as possible. Indeed, it should be abandoned on a trial basis—just as a crutch should be abandoned—to see if a system of attracting volunteers will not work. And to test different methods of attracting volunteers.

3. To defend our way of life without having the very defense we set up destroy our way of life we must rely on a small standing military force backed by Ready Reserves:

(a) To make a Reserve system work the regular Military Establishment must try to make it work. One good test of whether they have tried to make it work is whether they are in a position to testify in detail as to why it does not work. The testimony of the leaders of our Military Establishment over a period of years on the inadequacies of the Reserve and National Guard systems demonstrate beyond much doubt to one who looks a little beneath the surface that they have not tried to make either system work.

4. Modern warfare (even the World War II variety) requires 90-percent noncombatant skills and of these noncombatant skills an increasing proportion are technical skills:

(a) Most of these skills have their civilian counterparts and these civilian type skills are readily adaptable to their military counterparts.

(b) The civilian educational system, including the vocational, trade, industry, etc., schools, has the specialists in the field of education and training.

(c) The leaders of the Military Establishment are specialists in the field of military science. Military science is a different field from education and training.

Therefore, the 90-percent noncombatant skills needed by the Military Establishment should be taught through the civilian educational system. The 10-percent combatant skills should be taught by the Military Establishment.

Corollary: The 10 percent needed for combatant duties could undoubtedly be procured through volunteer enlistment, particularly if the bright uniforms, medals, honors and veterans' benefits were reserved for this group.

Corollary: The 90-percent noncombatant skills could be procured through voluntary enlistment inasmuch as the men would be moved by the greatest incentive there is to be employed in skills they know and like.

5. A-1 physical specimens are not needed for noncombatant skills. A one-legged man can be a stock clerk. A midget an airplane mechanic. Only one thing seems to serve as a check on utilization of personnel with physical limitations: The cost of veterans' benefits. But if veterans' benefits are reserved for combatants this problem is eliminated.

6. Military law and discipline is required for combat and those who might be in combat. It is not the best or most efficacious system for utilizing noncombatant skills.

The Code of Military Justice of World War II evolved from centuries of battle experience was found to be inadequate when applied to the 90-percent noncombatant personnel. Without appreciating the fact that the error lay in trying to apply a system of discipline and law in an area where it was inappropriate we junked this time-tested code for a watered-down code which is no longer effective for combatant activity and doesn't do very well in the noncombatant area.

We should take a new look at the code for military justice. Set it up for combatant activities and combatants and withdraw it from noncombatant activities.

In other words, there is no sense in putting a military uniform on a Pentagon clerk. In fact, we cut down on the ability to recruit good clerks by subjecting them to military law.

7. A thorough job analysis of the technical skills needed by the Military Establishment should be done. At the same time an inventory of the civilian counterpart skills should be taken. Match the two groups to determine what may be lacking and set up an incentive system to encourage the training and the enlistment for training through the civilian educational system in those areas where there are skill shortages. Have a Reserve system set up geared to receive these skills to keep them from becoming rusty and to keep them up to date with the needs of the military. Have a stepped-up civilian-type law during war or emergency to deal with absenteeism and malingering and I believe we will have a strong defense system.

Gentlemen, these are the points that have not been studied. I am satisfied a study of them would give a sensible answer to what some have looked upon as insoluble problems of how we are to have defense in modern warfare and sustain its cost, how we are to preserve and strengthen the education system that will continue our advance in science and technology and yet have the manpower necessary to man the defenses, how to defend our way of life without destroying it, or setting it aside for the nonce, saying we will reset it up after the emergency.

The committee has several months to study this serious matter. I pray that you take the time to make this study.

EXERCISE IN FUTILITY

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HARSHA] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARSHA. Mr. Speaker, in my opinion, the State Department's foreign policy with Latin America is an exercise in futility and I have called upon the State Department to explain to the American people why it would even entertain the thought of granting a $1.5 billion loan, or any sum, to Brazil, or any other country, to develop a trade program between that country and Russia.

A delegation from Brazil was scheduled to visit the United States today for the purpose of negotiating a $1.5 billion loan from the United States to help develop long-term trade between Russia and Brazil; however, the visit has been delayed.

During these days when we are so concerned with Communist expansion in the Western Hemisphere; when our national leaders state publicly that the United States will not tolerate Communist expansion into Latin America; when the administration is calling for $11 billion of the taxpayers' money to help Latin America combat communism; why in the name of commonsense would the State Department even consider any such loan.

This dramatically demonstrates the futility of our foreign policy.

We spend billions on our defense to combat communism; we spend billions to help other nations combat communism; this Government is sacrificing American lives in Vietnam to combat communism; yet, our State Department apparently does not realize that the expansion of Russian trade, a very effective cold war weapon, will enhance the spread of communism and completely nullify the advantage, if any, of making these vast expenditures of money and American lives.

I think the American people are entitled to an explanation. I think the American taxpayer should be aware of the muddled philosophy of those in the State Department who advocate such a policy, and I think we should be told just who such persons are and why they would even entertain such a meeting.

This situation affects not only our security and fight versus communism, but also our own deficit financing and balance-of-payments problem.

BEWARE OF DANGEROUS CURVES ON PAPER

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Saylor] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, in recent months there has been a deluge of statistics emanating from the Soviet Union which, if taken at face value, seem to indicate that Russia is really on the move in almost every area of activity. The latest of these statistics show that during 1961 the number of telephones in the Soviet Union increased by 19 percent—the most rapid percentage increase made by any major nation. On this basis, the United States increased 4.1 percent for the year. Considering only these raw percentage figures, some people might try to make us think the United States is falling sadly behind. But, we should all know this is ridiculous.

The current issue of Public Utilities Fortnightly effectively "bells the cat" on the use of percentage increase to try to compare growth. It points out that when you start with nothing—or nearly nothing—it does not take much to show a phenomenal rise percentagewise in almost anything.

Let us not lose sight of the fact that the United States still has over half the telephones in the entire world. We have 42 phones per 100 population as compared with about 2 per 100 population in Russia. Even though we have 21 times more telephones for each 100 Americans, the real important point is that this is being accomplished by American enterprise and private initiative rather than some heavyhanded bureaucracy as in the Soviet Union. History will bear out the fact that our free enterprise type of economy has been the most productive in the course of civilization in supplying the needs of the people and contributing to their well-being.

Trying to use Soviet percentage increase statistics for comparisons with the United States reminds me of the well-known line about the billiard game in Gilbert and Sullivan's "The Mikado"—playing with a cloth untrue, a twisted cue, and elliptical billiard balls. The author of the statement in Public Utilities Fortnightly warns, "Don't rely too much on curves." I might add that to use such percentage figures is actually throwing a curve and we had better beware.

I agree wholeheartedly with the thought of the author that all of us should keep the proper perspective when some individuals try to tell us—after a pilgramage to Moscow—the Soviets are going to overtake us in the electric energy field.

Mr. Speaker, this interesting statement in Public Utilities Fortnightly would be so useful for all of us to keep in mind when we hear any individual try to use such scare statistics about the Soviet Union in an attempt to play down or minimize the outstanding accomplishments of our free enterprise system. Therefore, under unanimous consent, I insert it in the Congressional Record at this point with the suggestion that each of my colleagues read it and remember it well:

Beware of Dangerous Curves on Paper

Did you know that as of January 1, 1962, the number of telephones in the Soviet Union had increased 19 percent over 1961? This was by far the greatest, most rapid increase shown of any major country in the world (meaning those with more than a half million telephones). The runnerup for statistical honors in the percentage increase race was Japan, whose total number of phones in 1962 was 14.8 over 1961.

Compared on this same basis, the United States makes a pretty sorry showing, indeed—only 4.1 percent—the third worst record for percentage increase of 25 other major countries. Only Brazil (with 2.3 percent) and South Africa (with 3.5 percent) show smaller increases percentagewise. There is no telling what an imaginative statistician might do if he were let loose with such short-range comparisons and plenty of curve charting paper.

Our only point in bringing up this sifly comparison—and it is silly, admittedly—is to point out that when you start from nothing, or nearly nothing, it does not take much to show a phenomenal rise percentagewise. The really significant fact is that well over half the telephones in the entire world (150 million) are right here in the United States (77.4 million). And whereas there are about 42 telephones for every 100 persons in this country, there are only a little over 2 phones for every 100 persons in Soviet Russia.

We would do well to bear such sane figures in mind the next time some sensation-seeking Government official tries to get us all hot and bothered about the great progress Russia is making in electrification. Fears that the Reds will overtake us at the bus bar are freely thrown around the pages of the Congressional Record. But the hard fact is that Uncle Sam now has around 200 million kilowatts capacity (as against about 75 million for Russia) and produces three times as many kilowatt-hours for a much smaller population. The moral is: Don't rely too much on curves for tomorrow unless there is some real meat in the sandwich for today.

STATEMENT OF REPUBLICAN MEMBERS OF HOUSE APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, the Republican members of the House Appropriations Committee conducted a press conference this morning at which I outlined our plans and hopes for sizable and meaningful reductions in the budget for the 1964 fiscal year.

I wish to include my statement with my remarks, but first, let me relate the background of this effort.

Immediately upon receipt of the President's budget message, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Jensen], who is the ranking Republican member of the House Appropriations Committee, called together the minority members of the committee.

We met to discuss the budget and share our views on how it might be possible to hold Federal spending within bounds. The problem, quite frankly, was as staggering as the size of the proposed spending, itself.

The gentleman from Iowa, Congressman Jensen, therefore, appointed a subcommittee of six men, of which I am the chairman, to conduct a detailed, line-by-line survey of the budget and make firm recommendations as to where savings could be made. Our subcommittee soon became known as a task force, and it is under that title that we made our statement to the press today.

After several weeks of careful analysis, with the expert help of Mr. Maurice H. Stans, and others, we believe that a budget reduction of from $10 to $15 billion can be achieved.

Other members of the task force are the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Jensen], the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Ford], the gentleman from New York [Mr. Ostertag], the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. Laird], and the gentleman from New York [Mr. Pillion].

Following is the text of our statement to the press today:

Statement of Representative Frank T. Bow, of Ohio, Chairman, Special Task Force of Republican Members of House Appropriations Committee

The President's budget for the fiscal year 1964 has been before the Congress for nearly 7 weeks. During this period the Republican members of the Appropriations Committee have been carefully analyzing the voluminous documentation of the staggering budget request for $108 billion in new spending authority and $99 billion in actual expenditures for next year.

We have obtained expert assistance in our analysis of this budget, in the person of Mr. Maurice H. Stans, Director of the Budget from 1958 to 1961. His services as an adviser have been of inestimable value to us. In addition, we have consulted with dozens of other persons in various walks of life who are familiar with various aspects of Government spending.

We have concluded from this study that it is not only feasible, but urgent in the national interest, to reduce substantially the President's budget request. Our preliminary conclusion is that new spending authority can be reduced by a magnitude of from $10 to $15 billion. A reduction in appropriations of such magnitude would result in an expenditure reduction of from $4 to $6 billion in 1964 and of $6 to $9 billion in subsequent years.

The Republican members of House Appropriations are prepared to submit detailed amendments to the budget to achieve this objective. We believe that if such reductions are not achieved, the chances of congressional approval of a tax cut at this session will be almost nil. The American people have become deeply alarmed at the prospect of continued heavy deficit financing in a time of high national output. While everyone desperately desires tax reduction, the American people do not want this to be at the expense of their children in the form of a steadily mounting, staggering national debt. We are conscious of the fact that many of our colleagues in the majority party are equally concerned, and we will welcome their assistance as this program develops.

To understand the magnitude of the fiscal 1964 budget proposals, let us look at the record.

Prior to the submission of this budget, the largest expenditure in our Nation's history was in fiscal 1945 when we spent $98 billion to end World War II. The fiscal 1964 budget proposes the expenditure of nearly $99 billion, an alltime high, with no shooting war in progress and no recession to fight.

The expenditures proposed in this budget are almost exactly three times as great as those of postwar fiscal 1948.

The expenditures proposed in this budget will be $22.3 billion higher than in fiscal 1960, the last full Eisenhower year. This is an increase of almost 30 percent.

These proposed increases in expenditures are reflected in all departments of the Government if the budget is adopted:

Defense expenditures will be up $9.7 billion since fiscal 1960.

Space expenditures will rise $3.8 billion in the same period.

All other expenditures will be up $7.5 billion over fiscal 1960.

The Federal payroll will have added 215,000 people since 1960, in addition to 220,000 in the armed services.

Perhaps an even more serious implication for the future is found in the new spending authority (which is the form of congressional appropriations) requested in the fiscal 1964 budget. These new "obligational authority" requests are a forecast of expenditure levels for future years.

New spending authority requested in fiscal 1964 is $108 billion, a fantastic $27.2 billion or 34 percent higher than for the last Eisenhower budget, just 2 years ago.

These increases in "new obligational authority," which are nearly $10 billion higher than proposed 1964 expenditures, are woven into the entire fabric of Government, and would irrevocably be reflected in fiscal 1965 budget expenditures of well over $100 billion.

In concluding that a $10 to $15 billion cut in new spending authorizations could be made, we applied the following basic principles:

1. Limitation of personnel additions in 1964 to requirements of nondeferrable workload increases such as may be caused by recent new legislation, or for law enforcement or protection of property, or high priority objectives.

2. Absorption by all agencies of the half year payroll increases effective January 1, 1964, even though this necessitates personnel attrition or other expense economies; this was stipulated in the pay legislation.

3. Postponement of a considerable portion of new nonemergency construction, both civil and military; and some stretchout of previously authorized capital outlays.

4. A moratorium on initiation of new programs not essential for the national welfare or security.

5. Conscious reappraisal of continuing programs and services, with a view to reducing those of low priority and leveling out temporarily those (like research) which have enlarged substantially in recent years.

Applying these principles could not be said to produce an austere budget. The result of taking all the reductions indicated would still be a 1964 expenditure level equal in the aggregate to that of 1963, for the budget as a whole. Only by holding the dimensions of spending to a fixed level for a few years, while annual revenues grow, will it be possible to bring about a balanced budget again.

With all the budgetary growth the past few years, it is inconceivable that the reductions contemplated would harm the economy or the security or the welfare of the Nation. All real needs of the Nation can be met without attempting to satisfy everybody's demands on the Federal Treasury.

CUTS IN FEDERAL SPENDING

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SNYDER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PUCINSKI] earlier today has asked for some examples of places where spending can be cut. May I suggest that potential spending in any of the fields hereinafter listed are examples of past spending which might well bear scrutiny to see if any of these appear in the projected budget submitted to this Congress.

This list does not include losses incurred by the Federal Government due to its business activities in some fields wherein the Government is in direct competition with private enterprise.

First. A grant totaling $65,000 in Polish zlotys given for agriculture research—U.S. Department of Agriculture, daily summary, July 5, 1962.

Second. An item of $9,483,000 for redevelopment of an Oklahoma lake as a tourist center given under the administration's area redevelopment program.

Third. An untold amount to construct a solar-powered ship to win friends and influence people along the rivers of Surinam—House Foreign Operations Subcommittee Report No. 2436, part 1, September 19, 1962.

Fourth. One thousand 23-inch television sets ordered for use in community education programs in underdeveloped oversea areas were ordered at a cost of $400,000 for areas where there was no electrical power supply—House Foreign Operations Subcommittee Report No. 2436, part 1, September 19, 1962.

Fifth. Studies by the National Institutes of Health provided for:

Indian caste cohesiveness and personality development	$7,820
Empirical tests of a theory of interpersonal behavior	17,250
Alcohol used in a changing Navaho community	1,996
Juvenile delinquency in Japanese-American population	50,180
Studies of silent thinking	26,565
Behavior and physiological concommitants of dreaming	20,700
The social role of aging wild ungulate	8,205
The ontogeny of English phrase structure	2,100
A stereotactic atlas of the beagle brain	9,775
Blood groups genetics of Southampton Island Eskimos	11,500
Oral health of Icelandic peoples	14,030
Investigation of information contained in echoes	13,837
Studies of disease in a giant snail	20,092
Role of behavior of frontal monkeys	$15,998
Student culture and intellectual development	43,613
Travel of synthetic detergents with percolating water	20,991
Emergent leadership among the New Guinea Tolai	1,251
Mental age, IQ, sex, and divergent thinking	2,227
The establishment and maintenance of a monkey colony	13,816
A suicidal referral demonstration	100,215
Red tuna and yellow fat disease in the cat	19,965
Premarriage counseling	14,403
The skilled clinicians assessment of personality	94,587
Social space as bicommunication	21,616
Longitudinal growth studies on anamolies of the head	23,712
Appointment breaking in a pediatric clinic	18,000
Initiation and support of a colony of baboons	61,985

Senator PAUL H. DOUGLAS, Democrat, of Illinois, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 108, part 11, page 14286.

Sixth. The National Science Foundation, an independent agency of the Federal Government, has provided a total grant of $78,000 to conduct turtle studies to find out what makes them tick.

Seventh. The National Aeronautics and Space Administration awarded a $80,700 1-year contract for research on dolphin talk to try to establish communications between dolphins and mankind—announcement made September 16, 1962.

Eighth. A grant of $1¼ million was given for a 6-year study of the affectional relationship of an infant monkey and its mother—hearings, part 2, page 238.

Ninth. Ten thousand dollars was given for a tour of the U.S. defense plants by a Communist Polish official—brought over from Poland under educational and cultural exchange program by State Department in 1962.

Tenth. Air-conditioned Cadillacs eligible under aid program—hearings, part 2, page 414.

Eleventh. Plant explorers sent on a 30-month trip to the Kingdom of Nepal to look for specimens—particularly for those that are especially ornamental—Department of Agriculture announcement, September 17, 1962.

Twelfth. Foreign aid funds used in Kenya, Africa, for purchase of extra wives for government officials—hearings, part 2, page 289; hearings, foreign operations appropriations for 1962, House committee.

Thirteenth. Splendid new sports stadium built in an African country with primitive roads to get to it—statement by Eugene R. Black, World Bank President, September 18, 1962.

Fourteenth. A strikingly modern air terminal building constructed for a few planes while fertile land is left without irrigation in an African country—statement by Eugene R. Black, World Bank President, September 18, 1962.

Fifteenth. Chester Bowles, President Kennedy's roving Ambassador, spent $600,000 on an 18-day jaunt around the world meeting ambassadors and their wives—hearings, part 2, page 60.

Sixteenth. U.S. Government is lending $27 million to Ghana to build the Volta River Dam in addition to other loans. In questioning Secretary of State Dean Rusk during hearings, Representative JOSEPH MONTOYA, Democrat, of New Mexico, asked:

> Looking at the commitment on this loan in retrospect, what do you have to say in view of the fact that it has been disclosed there is in Ghana a school for the training of Communists—that was disclosed in the papers a few days ago, for the purpose of infiltrating into the different countries in Africa.
>
> Secretary RUSK. I would not think that in itself would be grounds for not proceeding. There are other relationships between Ghana and Western countries in the military, educational, and technical assistance fields which we believe will serve in the longer run to be a very heavy counterbalance to the type of influence you just mentioned. We were playing also for the long-range political stakes in that country besides the economic stakes (hearings, pt. 2, p. 77); hearings, foreign operations appropriations for 1963, House committee.

Seventeenth. Many Latin American countries have taken their dollars and have bought U.S. gold. Argentina, for instance, insisted on gold for dollars and in 1961 bought over $150 million worth despite the fact that the United States was paying interest on the dollars. Many other countries are doing the same thing so that our deficit in the balance of payments and our gold reserves are at a dangerous level—hearings, part 2, page 122.

Eighteenth. An FHA aid, fired for gambling, is rehired by the Alliance for Progress and sent to Caracas, Venezuela, at a salary of $17,030 per year—hearings, part 2, page 131.

Nineteenth. Greek Government appealed to its wheatgrowers to curb the growing of wheat to spur U.S. aid and then suggested the acreage be placed in cotton, competing with U.S. cotton—hearings, part 2, page 161.

Twentieth. Of the 24 countries sending delegates to the so-called neutral Belgrade Conference in September 1961, 23 are receiving U.S. economic assistance and 13, military assistance in fiscal year 1962. In fiscal year 1963, economic assistance is programed for 22 countries and military assistance for 13. Section 112 of last year's Appropriation Act stated:

> It is the sense of Congress that in the administration of these funds great attention and consideration should be given to those nations which share the view of the United States of the world crises.

Those words were almost exactly the same as those used by President Kennedy when he signed the authorization bill. Among the nations at that conference were Cuba, Ghana, Yugoslavia, Guinea, and Indonesia—hearings, part 2, page 206; hearings, foreign operations appropriations for 1963, House committee.

Twenty-first. No feasibility or engineering studies completed on many projects for foreign aid running into millions of dollars, yet not the smallest American flood control or drainage project would be authorized a penny until such plans and costs were completed—hearings, part 2, page 230.

Twenty-second. Many foreign aid plans initiated by the United States, not by the recipient countries—hearings, part 2, page 237.

Twenty-third. Because of commitments made for foreign aid projects, Congress is losing control of aid program amounting to billions of dollars—hearings, part 2, page 264.

Twenty-fourth. Foreign funds spent to build superhighways in countries where there are few, if any, automobiles—hearings, part 2, page 288.

Twenty-fifth. A luxury yacht replete with air conditioning and gold wallpaper furnished a millionaire Emperor at the cost of $3.1 million. Yacht called a training ship—hearings, part 2, page 329.

Twenty-sixth. Funds spent for troughs for camels—hearings, part 2, page 289.

Twenty-seventh. Funds spent for suits for Greek undertakers—hearings, part 2, page 289.

Twenty-eighth. Agreement between Morocco and the United States gives Morocco the U.S. bases worth millions of dollars by the end of 1963. One base now occupied by Russian personnel and Russian Mig planes. Yet we are substituting an aid program which according to the Under Secretary of State for African Affairs "would be judged like every other country"—hearings, part 2, pages 313 and 314; hearings, foreign operations appropriations for 1963, House committee.

Twenty-ninth. Teachers, claimed to be in short supply in the United States, are all over the world in the Peace Corps and in AID, some of them in the same buildings—hearings, part 2, pages 320 and 321.

Thirtieth. Southern Rhodesia has an agriculture school with 9 to 11 pupils as part of aid program and yet has 5 professors, more buildings than they can use, and everything else for a large school—hearings, part 2, page 326.

Thirty-first. Countries buying jet planes in Africa with aid money without proper facilities or business. Ghana has its own airline, all standing dead at the airport—hearings, part 2, page 327.

Thirty-second. In Liberia, independent since 1847, where there is a great deal of poverty and misery, a $10 million palace is being built for the President despite the fact that the present palace practically equals the U.S. White House. Through fiscal year 1962, Liberia has received over $40 million in foreign aid and around $250 million for development loans—hearings, part 2, page 360.

Thirty-third. Three hundred and thirty thousand dollars spent for Libyan textbooks, refused by Libya because of its sensitiveness over American technicians editing them from French into Libyan texts—hearings, part 2, pages 398 and 444.

Thirty-fourth. Peace Corps made demands on air transport industry in letter to U.S. international carriers from Peace Corps Director Sargent Shriver, stating:

> You are hereby instructed to file a tariff for Peace Corps personnel at 35 percent below economy class fares—hearings, part 2, page 459.

Thirty-fifth. Contingency funds transferred for aid to countries. Even British possessions are considered for aid programs—hearings, part 2, page 468, hearings; foreign operations appropriations for 1963, House committee.

Thirty-sixth. Household furnishings and other items under highway projects in Cameroon with average contract to technicians at $30,000 each, at an average salary of $12,000—hearings, part 2, pages 540.

Thirty-seventh. Ten million dollars loan to textile mill in Sudan; $500,000 for textile mill in Ethiopia while our textile mills are suffering—hearings, part 2, page 701.

Thirty-eighth. New project for a survey of water supply system for the city of Libreville at cost of $150,000 made without congressional approval—hearings, part 2, page 708.

Thirty-ninth. Increased funds for Kenya, a British possession, home of the Mau Mau, to $3.2 million for fiscal year 1962—hearings, part 2, page 789.

Fortieth. No control can be exercised over the $9 million of aid funds for Libya—hearings, part 2, page 837.

Forty-first. Two and one-half million dollars in aid for Mali with a very large element in the Government taking an anti-Western stand. Mali became independent in September 1960. It has 4.5 million people—hearings, part 2, page 845.

Forty-second. Nigeria, gaining independence October 1, 1960, from Great Britain, received a grant aid of $20.5 million for 1962 in addition to U.S. loan commitments of $225 million. Among projects is a TV educational program at a cost of $343,000 for 1963 although Nigeria has only two TV stations and very few TV sets. Population is 36 million—hearings, part 2, pages 875 through 891.

Forty-third. For helping tourism in Tunisia there is an estimated obligation of $167,000 for fiscal 1963. Communist bloc countries have extended over $46 million in aid tied in with technical assistance and/or sale of capital goods—hearings, part 2, pages 951–952; hearings, foreign operations appropriations for 1963, House committee.

Forty-fourth. One hundred and eighty-five thousand dollars for project for airline training for Tanganyika—hearings, part 2, page 975.

Forty-fifth. Two hundred thousand dollars allocated for a translation center in the African regional region together with an additional $139,000 for translation services to translate African technical publications into French—hearings, part 2, page 982.

Forty-sixth. Cambodia given enough rifles so that each man had two rifles apiece—hearings, part 1, page 493.

Forty-seventh. Peace Corps has contract of $59,000 with Institute for the Study of Man and another contract for experiment in international living for training of Peace Corps members—hearings, part 1, page 727.

Forty-eighth. Peace Corps men assigned as evaluators of other Peace

Corps men at an estimated cost of $1 million—hearings, part 1, page 733.

Forty-ninth. Ten physical education directors assigned to Ivory Coast by Peace Corps—hearings, part 1, page 735.

Fiftieth. Peace Corps sent man, wife, and nine children to Philippines at a one-way cost of $13,190. The man's salary is $10,190. He is former executive secretary to the Newspaper Guild of Greater Boston and a Harvard graduate—hearings, pages 782, 783, 840, and 841.

Fifty-first. AID agency requested information from Library of Congress to compile and supply information to ascertain nations which have or have not received aid from the United States in order to answer questions by House Committee on Foreign Operations Appropriations—hearings, part 3, part 253; hearings, foreign operations appropriations for 1963, House committee.

Fifty-second. In Lebanon, at the stock breeding farm furnished by U.S. funds, there were nine stalls to each bull. Lebanon is one of the wealthiest countries in that area—hearings, part 3, page 278.

Fifty-third. Cyprus, which received $679,000 in aid in 1962 from the United States bought up $2 million of our gold at the end of 1961—hearings, part 3, page 375.

Fifty-fourth. India, which has received a total amount of about $4 billion in U.S. aid is now negotiating to buy a Russian Mig aircraft plant—hearings, part 3, page 383.

Fifty-fifth. Iran, in the last quarter of 1961, purchased $16.1 million of U.S. gold, yet that country is under the mutual security program for $54.4 million exclusive of military aid—hearings, part 3, page 433.

Fifty-sixth. Iraq, which has, through fiscal year 1962, received a total of $67.5 million in U.S. aid, bought a total of $29.8 million of U.S. gold in 1960—hearings, part 3, page 467.

Fifty-seventh. Request for $225 million for Pakistan, for projects on which there are no commitments, has been programed for 1963—hearings, part 3, page 499.

Fifty-eighth. Cambodia, to whom we gave $24 million in fiscal 1961, turned around and bought $12 million worth of U.S. gold—hearings, part 3, page 556.

Fifty-ninth. Indonesia, to whom the United States gaves $44 million in aid in the last half of 1960, bought up $24.9 million of U.S. gold in 1960—hearings, part 3, page 607.

Sixtieth. Cambodian Highway, paid for by the United States, to cost—hearings, foreign operations appropriations for 1963, House committee—$15 million, was so badly planned and built that it resulted in a cost of $32 million and now must be further repaired at an additional cost of $2.7 million—hearings, part 3, page 636.

Sixty-first. Vietnam, where our marines and other defense forces are fighting and dying, taxes U.S. goods received in that country as gifts. These are distributed in part to private businesses which sell them at a profit—hearings, part 3, page 684.

Sixty-second. Other nations with a system of taxing U.S. aid and selling it for a profit similar to Vietnam's are Cameroon, Guinea, Kenya, Morocco, Senegal, Spain, Tunisia, Uganda, Yugoslavia, Bolivia, Cambodia, Korea, Thailand, Greece, India, Israel, Pakistan, and Turkey—hearings, part 3, page 693.

Sixty-third. In Taiwan, Nationalist China, a sawmill was built in the mountains with U.S. aid; then it was learned it would not saw the type of logs produced there—hearings, part 4, page 714.

Sixty-fourth. AID is spending $120,000 for an orientation course for employees going overseas, together with their wives and adult dependents—hearings, part 3, page 744.

Sixty-fifth. Fraudulent invoices from Laos for generators and sawmill equipment of $207,500 were paid by the United States when actual cost was $44,000. No recovery was made of the money expended. Laos also bought $1.9 million of U.S. gold while taking $24 million in aid for 1961—hearings, part 3, page 775.

Sixty-sixth. Four hundred and fifty-eight thousand dollars granted by the United States to bring Japanese labor leaders to this country—hearings, part 3, page 811; hearings, foreign operations appropriations for 1963, House committee.

FIFTIETH ANNIVERSARY OF DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Mr. RYAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, as a Member of the Congress long interested in American labor, it gives me pleasure to stand here today and say to the Department of Labor, on the occasion of its 50th anniversary—well done.

For labor, for Congress, indeed for all Americans, this is truly a golden occasion not only in time, but in terms of achievement. Congress passed the bill which created a separate Department of Labor half a century ago, on March 4, 1913. President Taft signed the bill and the one Department of the President's Cabinet which has as its sole concern people became a fact.

Working together, the legislative and executive branches of this Government have examined, been deeply concerned with, and worked hard to improve the welfare of the working force of America—those 70 million men and women who form the backbone of this country.

It is appropriate, therefore, to turn back the clock for a moment, and recall what working conditions were in 1913. I do not mean remember personally, mind you, I am having a 50th birthday myself this month. But perhaps that, too is symbolic. I am proud that labor has always been my own special concern. But we all know, of course, that working conditions were far different in 1913 than they are today. Long hours of toil, wages not far above the subsistence level of living, unsafe, unhealthy sweatshops, child labor, little security—such, frequently, were the conditions of labor only 50 years ago. Weariness and fear were the daily companions of many a workingman—or the child that may have toiled beside him.

What has happened since, through the joint efforts of the Congress and the Department of Labor, and with the cooperation of both labor leaders and management, has been a continuing record of betterment for our working people. Child labor and immigration were among the major problems solved in the beginnings of the Labor Department. Social security, fair labor standards, minimum wage and hour specifications, unemployment insurance—these are only some of the benefits which have given Americans a better way of life.

Through two World Wars, the Department of Labor helped marshal a labor force ready to meet the production needs of the Nation. The National Employment Service helped in solving the problems of the depression period of the early 1930's. The Women's Bureau sought, and continues to work on, the status of women as a contributory factor in the economy, as more women than ever before are entering the ranks of labor. The Bureau of Labor Statistics furnishes us with data on the cost of living, family budgets, employment, and the occupational outlook—facts we must have at our fingertips in reviewing and anticipating trends in the economy of the Nation.

It has been a tremendously changing 50 years. It is gratifying to look at the working man and woman today and say, for the most part: their life is good. Both the Labor Department and Congress are to a large extent responsible for this march of human progress. It was not too long ago that unions were secret societies whose members had their names blacklisted by industry. Today, employees may negotiate freely.

But our problems are not all solved. The rush of automation in our new technology is setting a pace which the Labor Department and the Congress must equal and even anticipate, if the needs of the man and woman on the job are to be served. It is not an easy task.

The Manpower Development and Training Act which the Congress passed last summer is undertaking to train 400,000 persons in the next 3 years. The Area Redevelopment Act has translated into terms of action the concern for parts of the country where technological change must itself sponsor other changes. Fifty years ago we were just moving out of the horse-and-buggy age. Today, we are talking about why we cannot live on Venus. In such terms, we realize that although America has come a long way from the plantation life and industrial towns of colonial days, this country is still just laid out in the rough.

We are not going to forget the working people in all these changes. The Department of Labor and the Congress will see to that. People cannot be ignored merely because machines are also more numerous. We faced other problems in the past. We will continue to do the same, in the same spirit, in the future.

It is often said that good things come in small packages. The Labor Department is the smallest branch of the President's Cabinet. But for tens of millions, it has certainly been a good thing. I have been proud to work with it and for it in its high goal of achieving the best for every man. In 50 years, we have come a long, long way.

SUSQUEHANNA RIVER BASIN COMPACT

Mr. RYAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Flood] may extend his remarks at this point and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, today I have reintroduced my bill to establish a Susquehanna River Basin compact between the States of Pennsylvania, New York, and Maryland.

Last year I requested that a comprehensive survey and report on the water and related resources of the Susquehanna River Basin be undertaken, and this survey, which will take some 6 years to complete, is now underway by the Army Corps of Engineers.

Mr. Speaker, the purpose of my proposed measure is to create a regional agency by intergovernmental compact for the planning, conservation, utilization, development, management, and control of the water and other natural resources of the entire Susquehanna River Basin.

The establishment of such a compact would also provide for the improvement of navigation, reduction of flood damage, reduction and control of surface subsidence, regulation of water quality, control of pollution, development of water supply, fish and wildlife habitat, hydroelectric energy and public recreational facilities.

Some 15 million people at present live and work in the region of the Susquehanna River Basin and its environs which covers a geographic area in excess of 27,500 square miles, and the government, employment, industry, and economic development of the entire region and the health, safety, and general welfare of its population are and will continue to be vitally affected by the use, conservation, management, and control of the water and related resources of the Susquehanna River Basin.

Demands upon the waters and related resources of the basin are expected to mount rapidly because of the anticipated increase in the population of the region projected to reach 23 million by 1980 and 33 million by the year 2010, and because of the anticipated increase in industrial growth projected to double by 1980.

Mr. Speaker, the public interest requires that facilities must be ready and operative when needed to avoid the catastrophe of such things as unexpected floods or prolonged drought such as we experienced last summer.

I am hopeful, Mr. Speaker, that the Congress will adopt this measure at an early date so the organization of this vital compact can be undertaken.

PLACING THE CUBAN CRISIS IN PERSPECTIVE WITH RESPECT TO U.S. FOREIGN POLICY

Mr. RYAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentlewoman from Oregon [Mrs. Green] may extend her remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, in recent weeks, we here on the floor of the House of Representatives and the Senate have been asked to partake of a smorgasbord of innuendo, misshapen facts, false alarms and all kinds of advice regarding foreign policy, particularly in respect to the Cuban situation.

On the right hand, we hear advice recommending that we should send forth a military expedition to unseat the regime of Fidel Castro. On the left hand, we hear advice that we should effect a reconciliation with the leftist Castro regime because it was driven leftward only because some unidentified capitalistic interests wished to do in the Cuban revolution in the first place. Both brands of advice seem unpalatable to me.

In the late 1930's and the early 1940's, the America First movement displayed its fare of disunion and distrust. Now apparently we have in our midst the "America last" critics. According to these critics, General de Gaulle is right, Chancellor Adenauer is right, Canadian Prime Minister Diefenbaker is right, every propertied Cuban emigree is right and every rumor ground from the plush, expense-account bar in Miami is right. According to these critics, President Kennedy is wrong, the entire intelligence-gathering apparatus of the U.S. Government is wrong and Defense Secretary McNamara is wrong.

It is human nature for fallible human beings to second-guess other human beings, particularly a President of the United States. President Kennedy sits today in the world's loneliest job in America, a welter of hair-raising problems—the thrust of Soviet imperialism, a nuclear arms race that threatens to destroy the world as we know it and maybe a few others.

President Kennedy not long ago replied with this stanza of poetry to his critics and at this point I quote it with approval:

> Bullfight critics ranked in rows
> Crowd the enormous plaza full
> But only one is there who knows
> And he's the man who fights the bull.

I recall with a shudder the numbers game of the unsavory McCarthyite past. The numbers game in new dress today revolves around Soviet facilities and men stationed in Cuba.

The numbers game is, of course, not new. Shakespeare has the following passage in Othello during a debate between the Duke of Venice and his council regarding the size of the enemy Turkish fleet.

> Duke. There is no composition in these news that gives them credit.
>
> First Senator. Indeed, they are disproportioned. My letters say a hundred and seven galleys.
>
> Duke. And mine, a hundred and forty.
>
> Second Senator. And mine, two hundred.

Now in place of the Turkish fleet we are talking as I said earlier, about the Soviet presence in Cuba.

It would seem to me that any fair-minded critic would say that the recent extraordinary 2½-hour briefing of news correspondents by Defense Secretary McNamara and President Kennedy have placed the Cuban crisis in proper perspective.

The President is not saying that the United States is content to have alien military forces stationed in Cuba. The President, as I understand him, is saying that the nature of the Soviet presence is not of a nature to justify resort to military means at this time to expel it.

Mr. McNamara, the Defense Secretary, as I read the transcript of that press conference of his I mentioned earlier, has stated that the United States has the will and the means to discover in swift fashion potential use of defensive weapons in Cuba for offensive purposes.

We should, of course, look askance at the positioning of Soviet arms in Cuba. We should desire and work for their removal. We should encourage the establishment of a truly democratic administration in Cuba—but not the return to entrenched power and privilege of the Cuban counterparts, now in Florida, of the French Bourbons who in a statesman's cogent words: "Forgot nothing, forgave nothing."

Once again Cuba is an example of how we react with a military fixation to a problem whose largest element perhaps is nonmilitary in character. President Kennedy has stated this danger as being one of Cuba as a base for subversion in the Americas. He has also stated that time is short in which to bring about the social and economic reforms necessary to forestall brutish, totalitarian revolution in the developing countries of the Americas.

An essential fact is that frustration about Cuba is not new. Cuba has troubled us for some 150 years. This in itself should indicate that some quick solution is not available.

And that leads me to a collateral comment. There exists a myth that the Monroe Doctrine is some magic key to resolving difficulties. In the first place, Messrs. Monroe and Adams did not conceive of their policy as "doctrine"—the word was not employed until 1895 during Cleveland's second administration when Secretary of State Olney employed the term. Nor did Messrs. Monroe and Adams ever speak of "enforcing" it—if it was enforced, it was enforced only by courtesy of the British Navy. Both recognized it could be enforced only in cooperation with another European nation—in this case, as I said, the British fleet.

In recent years the Monroe Doctrine has in fact been mutualized under the aegis of the Organization of American States which provides for consultation in any possible application of the policy.

I would also like to point out another historic parallel which has in the past gotten us in trouble—the use of the U.S. mainland as a base for operations for filibustering against Cuba and other nations. This began with such adventurers as Aaron Burr.

I think that Secretary of State Dean Rusk is to be commended for not playing politics with diplomacy. Diplomacy should not be conducted by means of Fourth of July oration papers.

Once again, there is no miracle tablet to cure our frustration in Cuba and in other troubled spots. There is the danger, too, of smaller nations or their self-appointed representatives playing one great power against another in frenzies of an excess.

President Kennedy has said that the Cuban problem must be dealt with as part of the larger worldwide issues. We should exercise the wisdom that the President has suggested and that he himself exercises. In an age of nuclear destruction, the charade of military might in the form of orations and saber rattling is indeed unforgiveable and holds the most profound consequences.

At this point, Mr. Speaker, I wish to introduce an editorial on the Cuban situation that appeared in the February 28, 1963, issue of the Portland, Oreg., Journal and a column by Art Buchwald that appeared in the March 3, 1963, editions of the Washington Post.

POLITICAL WAR OVER CUBA

When President Eisenhower was in office, and particularly during the 1960 campaign, the Journal criticized leading Democrats for partisan attacks on foreign policy of a kind that were damaging to this country.

Now it seems to us that some Republicans are guilty of the same thing over Cuba.

Cuba rightly is a foreign policy issue. Communist control of a country 90 miles from our shores is a serious matter. The presence of 17,000 Soviet troops and heavy supplies of Soviet military equipment is not to be taken lightly.

But the nature of the threat from Cuba ought to be kept clearly in mind. We see no possibility of an overt attack from Cuba on this country. We accept the proof offered by the Defense Department from its surveillance that Cuba does not possess missiles of the range needed to strike this country.

The chief value to Castro of Russian troops and materiel is to guard the Castro administration from an internal uprising by Cubans themselves or to defend against attack from abroad.

But the main thing we have to fear from Cuba is its use as a base for Communist revolution in the rest of Latin America. If Cuba is to remain a political issue, that ought to be the focal point of discussion.

The recent visit to Washington of Venezuelan President Romulo Betancourt is a reminder of this aspect of the Cuban threat. Betancourt is convinced that Communist terrorism in his country is fomented and supported from Cuba.

If the Reds should succeed in destroying the moderate kind of government Betancourt has been trying to establish in Venezuela, after years of misrule by rightist dictatorship, then their threat to the rest of Latin America will have been multiplied. Communist control of Venezuela would be many times more dangerous than Communist control of Cuba. U.S. policy toward Latin America has to be a lot more comprehensive than simply getting the Russians out of Cuba.

Soviet Premier Khrushchev has promised to withdraw thousands more of Soviet troops from Cuba. Nobody knows for certain that he means it. But there ought to be a moratorium on debate over this particular point until we see whether he fulfills his promise.

Some of the critics of our Cuba policy are not clear on what ought to be done. Few of them recommend that we invade the island. They simply say that we ought to do something.

Lots of things are being done. Time will be required to see whether they will accomplish the goal short of all-out nuclear war that nobody wants.

Meanwhile it helps to keep things in perspective if we remember that blame for Castro's rule can be widely shared. The bearded dictator came to power during the Eisenhower administration. He consolidated his position after Kennedy became President.

Everybody concedes that the Bay of Pigs invasion attempt was badly bungled. Nobody knows whether it would have led to Castro's overthrow even if it had been well planned and executed.

We think the debate on Cuba ought to be carried on more responsibly than it has been in recent weeks.

GETTING THE NEWS IS ALWAYS A BATTLE

(By Art Buchwald)

There has been a lot of talk about news management in the Government these days, but if you go through history you can find that every presidential administration tried to manage the press in one way or another. We found an old transcript the other day of a press briefing between Abraham Lincoln's press secretary and White House reporters, which shows that even in those days attempts were made to bottle up vital news of interest to the public.

Here are excerpts from it:

Question. Mr. Nicolay, yesterday the President gave a speech at Gettysburg, and he started it out by saying, "Four score and 7 years ago our fathers brought forth on this continent a new nation." Sir, would you mind telling us the names of the fathers he was referring to?

SECRETARY. I'm sorry, gentlemen. I can't reveal the names at this time.

Question. The Saturday Evening Post, which is published in Philadelphia, said he was referring to Washington, Jefferson, and Franklin.

SECRETARY. That's just conjecture. The President is not responsible for everything written by his friends.

Question. The President said yesterday in the same speech that the country was engaged in a great Civil War, testing whether that nation or any nation so conceived and so dedicated can long endure. He didn't say how he intended to win the war. Does this mean he has a no-win policy?

SECRETARY. The President in his speech was only concerned with the Battle of Gettysburg, which incidentally we won. The Department of War will give you full details on other battles.

Question. The Department refuses to give us any information. We don't know how many troops were used at Gettysburg, who commanded them, or how many casualties there were. All we were given were some lousy photos of Confederate gun emplacements. How can we be sure the Confederates still don't have artillery hidden in the hills around Gettysburg?

SECRETARY. We have constant surveillance of the hills. To the best of our knowledge all southern artillery pieces have been removed.

Question. What about Confederate troops? There are an estimated 17,000 in the area.

SECRETARY. We have the South's promise they will be removed in due course.

Question. Mr. Secretary, why didn't Mrs. Lincoln go with the President to Gettysburg?

SECRETARY. Mrs. Lincoln feels that her place is at home with her children. But she did send a telegram.

Question. In talking about the government of the people, for the people, and by the people, did the President have any particular group in mind?

SECRETARY. Not to my knowledge, gentlemen. But I'll check it out just to make sure.

Question. Mr. Secretary, the President in his speech yesterday indicated he intended to manage the news.

SECRETARY. How did he do that?

Question. He said in the same speech, "The world will little note nor long remember what was said here." It seems to me in this phrase he was intimidating the newspapermen who were there.

SECRETARY. I don't think you have to interpret the speech in that manner. The President's remarks, written on an envelope, were off the cuff, and he felt there was no reason to be quoted. An official version of his speech will be made available to the press in due time, as soon as the President has a chance to go over it again.

SOCIAL SECURITY SEEKS OUT ELIGIBLES UNAWARE OF BENEFITS

Mr. RYAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentlewoman from Oregon [Mrs. GREEN] may extend her remarks at this point and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, the "big heart" project of the Social Security Administration was publicized by Jerry Kluttz, Federal news reporter for the Washington Post, in the two articles appearing in the March 3 and 4, 1963, issues of that newspaper. It is always pleasing to read of private and public efforts that go beyond the bounds of duty. And it is particularly pleasing to read about these efforts of the social security agency which provides a margin of assistance to millions of low-income Americans. These articles follow:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Mar. 3, 1963]

SOCIAL SECURITY SEEKS OUT ELIGIBLES UNAWARE OF BENEFITS

(By Jerry Kluttz)

A couple of weeks ago, on a chilly night, a vagrant crawled into a large trash can in downtown Baltimore and fell asleep.

The next morning, the man, who appeared in his 70's, was awakened when he was tossed into a 30-foot refuse pit.

A mechanical shovel was about to pick him up along with a pile of junk and throw him into the city incinerator when a truckdriver saw the elderly man struggling in the debris and rescued him.

Benard McKinley Jackson was taken before municipal court on a vagrancy charge. He said he had no money, no home, no job; and he asked to be placed where he could be looked after for awhile. The judge cooperated by sentencing him to 90 days in city jail.

But Jackson was better off than he had thought and his near tragic experience was a blessing in disguise. His story came to the attention of an employee in the sprawling headquarters of HEW's old-age and survivors insurance in the Woodlawn section of Baltimore.

The employee wondered if the vagrant was eligible for social security benefits. It took him only a matter of minutes to get a preliminary answer from OASI's stable of IBM electronic machines, the largest single number in operation anywhere.

The machines spit out 313,134 names of Jacksons, the 17th most popular surname in OASI's file of 140 million names. There were hundreds of Bernard Jacksons, but the robot revealed that only one Bernard McKinley Jackson was insured and eligible for benefits—and wasn't being paid them.

OASI investigators quickly confirmed that the penniless wanderer was the Bernard McKinley Jackson in their files. A claims expert visited Jackson in jail to explain that he should have been paid benefits for the past 9 years—since he became 65—if he had only applied for them.

Jackson signed the claim and he will receive $520 in back benefits, the maximum he's entitled to under the law, and $40 a month for the remainder of his life.

Unusual case? Not really. OASI has what is officially known as a leads program but which is also referred to as a "big heart" project to seek out aging persons who are eligible for social security benefits and to make payments to them.

Social security benefits are being paid monthly to 17 million men, women, and children and its rolls are growing at a rate of nearly a million annually. You'd think that anyone who pays into OASI's insurance fund would apply for benefits the minute he qualifies for them. But this isn't necessarily so.

To launch its "big heart" project, a few buttons were punched on the electronic machines and they served up the names of 1,156,000 insured persons who were over 65 and who had filed no claims for benefits.

A cross-section of 350,000 names were selected and they were sent to OASI's district offices which serve sections covered by the original addresses of the missing insured, many of them dating back 26 years when social security started.

As a result, more than 100,000 persons, many destitute like Jackson, are being paid benefits they had overlooked. OASI employees were unable to locate 191,086 of the 350,000 and the remainder weren't eligible for one reason or another.

OASI then took another batch of 240,000 names, persons it described as "less obviously insured," and sent them to its field offices along with what few clues it had on their possible whereabouts.

This program is in process now, and up to a few days ago agency employees set in motion machinery to pay benefits to 17,311 additional persons who were no doubt delighted with their windfalls.

The high degree of automation at OASI makes possible the "big heart" program. The machines may be cold and calculating but they also provide material for the human touch which an agency like social security can't afford to lose.

The machines, for example, keep Victor Christgau, OASI Director, supplied with the names and addresses of each person on the rolls who reaches age 100 and also the birthdays of the 412 recipients of social security who are more than 100 years of age. Christgau sends each of them happy birthday greetings. Incidentally, a dozen of the century oldsters are still actively employed.

OASI Employees Have High Productivity Rating

(By Jerry Kluttz)

Employees of HEW's old age and survivors insurance are cocky, confident and proud. They have good reason for their reassuring attitude.

They have one of the best work records in or out of Government. The President has publicly commended them on their efficiency. Administrative costs take only 2 cents of each dollar spent by OASI, a low figure. Employee turnover is lower than the average in either HEW or the entire Government.

Employee productivity is rising steadily, an estimated 5 percent this 1963 fiscal year and a gain of 2.8 percent is contemplated in fiscal year 1964. If production had continued at the 1962 level, about 2,900 additional employees and $18.5 million in new funds would be required to operate the world's largest insurance system.

OASI pioneered the use of electronic data processing machines and its own experts helped to develop some of the most advanced and sophisticated IBM machines at its headquarters in the Woodlawn section on the outskirts of Baltimore.

Someone guessed it would take a million Federal employees to handle OASI's chores if there were no electronic machines to work their magic round the clock. Could be. Consider this: One machine can produce more work than 500,000 employees with desk calculators.

More than 18 million persons are paid monthly benefits and an average of 300,000 new claims for benefits are received each month. About 75 million persons work under social security and contribute to the OASI fund each year and 280 million earning reports, supplied by their employers, are recorded on their individual accounts.

The latter makes OASI the world's largest bookkeeper but it has no books to keep. The records are kept on tape and microfilm. The names and social security numbers of more than 140 million persons are maintained on 2,000 magazines of microfilm that can be stored in a single room.

The agency handles its duties with a 35,000-man staff of whom 10,000 are at its Baltimore headquarters, moved from Washington during World War II, and a goodly number of them commute from the Washington area.

OASI employees have no job worries. The agency has never had a layoff and its people are well aware that social security has overwhelming public and political support and is here to stay. Despite the giant machines that gobble up the work, the staff has had to be increased gradually to make effective the more liberal amendments voted to the social security law.

The employees are confident that one of these days, or years, Congress will give it another major task—to manage the proposed medicare program for the aged through social security.

If and when that happens, the headquarters building, the fifth largest in Government, would need to build another wing to house an estimated 3,000 new employees to manage it.

OASI has perhaps the most extensive program of preventive medicine for its 10,000 headquarters employees than any agency in Government. Dr. Leon Kochman heads a 31-man staff of doctors, nurses and technicians.

Physical exams are given every 3 years to employees under 40, every other year for those between 40 and 55, and annually for those over 55. Electrocardiograms are available to those 45 and older. A number of cases of cancer, tuberculosis and other diseases have been detected in their early stages by the tests. The employees are referred to their private physicians for treatment.

Chest X-rays, hearing tests and inoculations, for small fees, also are available to employees. The health office also keeps its own blood reservoir for the use of any employee and his family. The health office goes further and checks cafeteria employees who handle food even though they aren't employed by OASI but OASI employees are protected by this activity.

Only emergency treatment is administered by Dr. Kochman and his staff. Ailing employees must be treated by their private physicians who, Kochman stressed, have accepted the OASI program.

Perhaps one of the secrets of the splendid productivity record of OASI employees is the fact that they have a large voice in setting what is regarded as reasonable standards, or guidelines, for their work. Cardpunchers and other mechanical groups are given two 10-minute breaks daily, one in the morning and the other in the afternoon.

Sixty percent of OASI's employees are G-girls and women hold many of the key posts in the agency. Civil service's federal service entrance examination is most used by OASI which takes about 25 percent of all persons hired from the register. More than 5,000 employees have been hired from the FSEE during the past 2 years.

GABRIEL RICHARD, PRIEST, POLITICIAN, AND PATRIOT

Mr. RYAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. RYAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, 140 years ago today marked the beginning of congressional service of Gabriel Richard, priest, politician, and patriot. He was elected as the Territorial Delegate to the 18th Congress of the United States from the Territory of Michigan. His term was to commence on March 4, 1823.

Representing the territorial wilderness of the Midwest, he had a wide and far vision for its future development. His prime interest was in the education of the people in the areas which he served and, as a priest, in ministering to their spiritual needs. These two objectives he performed with zeal and vigor.

His personage and his attributes have been highly respected, not only by the persons with whom he was in constant contact during his lifetime, but the tributes to his memory have followed down throughout the years to this date.

I would like to take this opportunity to bring out some facts on the life and priestly, political, and patriotic accomplishments of Father Gabriel Richard, a well-known individual in the annals of Michigan history.

Gabriel Richard, Priest, Politician, and Patriot

The city of Detroit has dedicated two public elementary schools in the name of Gabriel Richard. In 1936 Detroit created the Gabriel Richard Park overlooking the Detroit River at Belle Isle Bridge. In that park stands a statue of Father Richard paid for by popular subscription. In large measure these tributes to Gabriel Richard are due to the effort commenced almost 30 years ago by Msgr. Edward J. Hickey to bring to light the achievements of this remarkable son of France and pioneer citizen of early Detroit. By a ceremony held on June 7, 1948, a distinguished group of Detroit citizens celebrated the sesquicentennial of Father Richard's arrival in Detroit. It is appropriate that with the passing of the years another tribute be paid now to the memory of the only Catholic priest who served in the Congress of the United States.

Gabriel Richard was born on October 15, 1769, at La Ville de Saintes, France. He was the son of Francis Richard, a civil servant, and Genevieve Boussuet Richard. He was educated at the College of Saintes and the Sulpician seminaries at Augers and Issay. He was ordained a Sulpician priest on October 15, 1791, and remained to teach mathematics at Issay where he was associated with Benedict Joseph Flaget and Louis Du Bourg, both of whom later became Catholic bishops in the United States. He fled France during the Revolution, and arrived in Baltimore, Md., on June 24, 1792. It had been intended by the superior-general of his order that he serve at St. Mary's Seminary in Baltimore, but his services were not needed at the small seminary, and he was assigned by Bishop John Carroll to work as a missionary among the French and Indians at Prairie du Rocher, Kaskaskia, and Cahokia. In the 6 years he spent in the Illinois country his zeal and courage were tested by frontier hardships, lack of companionship, the impiety of the Indians, the furmen, and the settlers, and the danger of roving tribesmen. No missionary ever had a more difficult assignment. From the time of the departure of the Jesuits from the district a hundred years before, the French inhabitants of Illinois had been without pastoral care. Their intemperance and low morals had been a constant concern of Bishop Carroll's. Father Richard's outstanding success in this missionary venture led Bishop Carroll to appoint him to the pastorate of the Church of St. Anne in Detroit, and later to the vicariate of the entire territory of Michigan.

As vicar general Father Richard became an institution in the territory, a man of austere life, an eloquent preacher even in English, a reformer of commonsense, and a picturesque figure of sepulchral bearing marked by a livid scar, the result of a wound inflicted by a revolutionary mob as he made his escape from France. He ministered to the Indians of the whole area of Sault Saint Marie, Mackinac, Arbre Croche, Georgian Bay, and other fur posts. He compromised their difficulties, held French traders in check, and fought the evils of liquor. We shall say more later about his outstanding efforts in education.

In 1805 when Detroit was burned out he led relief work, and conducted services in a tent until he had rebuilt his church. In 1809 he obtained from Baltimore a printing press and a printer. On August 31, 1809, he published the first newspaper to appear in Detroit, the Essai du Michigan ou Observateur Impartial. Before the War of 1812 stopped his publishing activities, he had edited and published a children's spelling book, several devotional books, a volume of selections from the French poets, a Bible for Indians, and the laws of Michigan.

In addition to importing books and an organ from France, he imported carding machines, spinning wheels, and looms in an effort to stimulate local industry. He was a favorite among his own people and with the territorial officials as well. In 1807 he was asked by the governor of the territory and other officials to preach to them in English. Accordingly, on Sunday afternoons he met with his Protestant friends and preached to them of Christianity's truths.

Father Richard was a thoroughgoing American. During the War of 1812 he refused an oath to the King of England and was held by General Brock as a prisoner of war at Fort Malden near Sandwich until his release was demanded by Tecumseh. He is reputed to have prevented a massacre of prisoners through his influence with the Indians. On his return to Detroit he engaged in relief work among the destitute who had been impoverished by military and Indian raids.

The University of Michigan was established in 1817 by an act of the territorial Governor and judges dated August 26. Drawn up by Judge Augustus Brevoort Woodward, the law provided that 13 professorships, or courses, should be taught. The first, that of universal science, was to be taught by the president of the university. The Governor chose as president the Reverend John Monteith, a young Princeton graduate who had come to Detroit as a minister. He was also to teach six additional courses.

The Reverend Gabriel Richard was appointed to the second position in the university by the Governor. Father Richard was to teach 6 of the 13 courses. One of his courses was formidably described as "ennoeica, or intellectual sciences, embracing all the epistemiim, or sciences relative to the minds of animals, to the human mind, to spiritual existences to the Deity, and to religion, the didactor, or professor of which shall be vice president of the institution."

Education was one of Father Richard's deepest interests. He opened a school in 1804 which was to prepare boys for entrance into the seminary in Baltimore. Classes were held in his rectory on St. Anne Street until the fire of 1805 completely destroyed the town.

Undiscouraged, Father Richard trained three young women as teachers and opened another school in 1806. In 1807 he established still another at Spring Hill, about 2 miles outside the town. To provide equipment for his schools, he purchased in the East electrical apparatus, looms, a printing press, and surveying instruments. Father Richard so impressed President Thomas Jefferson with his plans for training Indian children at the Spring Hill School that for several years he received a grant from the Government of the United States to assist in their education for life in the civilized community.

In 1808, petitioning the Governor and judges for funds, Father Richard reported that he had two English schools in Detroit, and, in addition, four primary schools for boys and two for girls at Spring Hill, the Grand Marrais, and at the River Huron. His years of effort and experience in promoting education in Michigan eminently qualified Father Richard for a position on the faculty of the new university.

The university envisioned by Judge Woodward was to be more than an institution of higher learning. The act provided that it should have power to operate "colleges, academies, schools, libraries, museums, atheneums, botanic gardens, laboratories, and other useful literary and scientific institutions—in, among, and throughout the various counties, cities, towns, townships, and other geographical divisions of Michigan." The university was to be supported by tax moneys.

Since at the time there were no students prepared to enter upon advanced studies, the founders of the university now organized a primary school and a classical academy in Detroit and erected a building to house them.

The Presbyterian minister and the Catholic priest cooperated cordially in managing the affairs of the new university. That they were friends whom differences of religious belief could not divide is shown by entries in the Reverend Monteith's diary. After calling on Father Richard, who was ill, the minister wrote "I think he loves to have me visit him." Another entry records the gift of a book from the priest; one of the books found in Reverend Monteith's collection bears the inscription on the flyleaf, "un present de M. G. Richard." It is one of the first books printed in Detroit, and it was printed on Father Richard's press.

On April 30, 1821, the territorial legislature passed an act which provided that the university should be governed by 21 trustees. Both Rev. John Monteith and Reverend Richard were made members of this board. The former left Detroit later in the year, but Father Richard served as a trustee until his death.

The University of Michigan today is the successor of the dream of Monteith and Richard in 1817. Its founding act designed an institution which was nonsectarian and supported by public funds, a public agency benefiting the people of Michigan. The University of Michigan has always been guided by the educational ideals which were loyally supported by its two clergymen founders.

Is it so surprising, then, that this man, beloved by many, should be elected the Territorial Delegate to the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States? He entered the contest in order to serve better the interests of all the citizens of Michigan in their task of opening the West. It is also believed that he regarded the salary that he would receive as a means toward meeting the cost of the completion of construction of St. Anne's. Some of his own parishioners organized against him to vote for his opponent, John Biddle, brother of Nicholas Biddle, head of the Bank of the United States. Yet with the support of the majority of both his parishioners and nonparishioners he won the election to the 18th Congress. When he took his seat it was contested by John Biddle, but the House Committee on Elections upheld Father Richard.

His travels as a missionary had convinced Father Richard that there would be no westward progress of the United States unless roads were built through the wilderness. Therefore as a Delegate in the House he presented many petitions relating to lands and roads. One was for the construction of a road from Fort Meigs to Detroit, another for a post road from Mt. Clemens to Fultonville, another for roads through Detroit. His greatest service was his petition that a road be constructed from Detroit to Chicago, the great highway that today begins at Michigan Avenue in Detroit and ends at Michigan Avenue in Chicago.

In his January 28, 1825, speech to the House on his bill he foresaw the future greatness of his country:

"Everybody knows that the contemplated road is of the greatest importance, not only to the Territory of Michigan, but also to the general Government; and the consequence is, that it ought to be done immediately. This road will connect the East of the Union with the West. The grand Canal of New York will be completed next July. When the said Canal is finished, we consider Detroit in contact with New York. Last fall, I was on Lake St. Clair, on board a vessel built during the preceding winter, with a movable keel, ready and calculated to go down, through Lake Erie and the whole of the Canal, to land at the battery in New York.

"In relation to our military operations, the utility of a road across the peninsula of Michigan, from Detroit to Chicago, is obvious. This road will afford a facility to transport munitions of war, provisions, and troops, to Chicago, Green Bay, Prairie du Chien, and St. Peter's River, et cetera. When our upper lakes are frozen, an easy communication will be constantly kept open, in sleighs, on the snow. Everybody knows that, during the last war, for want of a proper road across the Black Swamp, our Government incurred an expenditure of $10 or $12 million, which would have been avoided by having a good road, made in due time. Make this road now, when you have the full sovereignty over the territory of Michigan, before it becomes an independent State, and you may easily anticipate how beneficial this road will be to your finances. There are more than 17 million acres of, generally, good and fertile land, in Michigan proper (without speaking of the 94 million acres in the Northwest Territory.) Without a road to go to those lands, they have no value.

"We are credibly informed, that, on our inland seas, I mean Lakes Erie, St. Clair, Huron, and Michigan, no less than 150 vessels are plying up and down, on board of which whole families do come, sometimes, with their wagons, horses, sheep, and milk cows; land in Detroit, ready to go in search of good land, to settle on it, and having their money ready to give to the receiver of the land office. No road to go into that immense wilderness. What a disappointment. During about 12 months, last elapsed, more than $100,000 have been actually paid into the hands of the receivers of public moneys, in the territory of Michigan, for land purchased. How much more would have been paid, if the proposed road had been made. We can learn from the commissioner of the general land office, that about 10 surveyors have been employed in surveying public lands in the interior of Michigan territory, between Detroit and Chicago, during last winter. These lands will soon be advertised to be sold. If there is no road to come to them, who will purchase them? But let this road be made; let it be determined by this House that it shall be made; then you will have purchasers enough: They will come as a torrent from the Eastern States. It cannot be questioned that the land along the intended road will sell for 200 or 300 percent more than it would if there were no such road; and so, in nearly the same proportion, the adjacent lands will be increased in price. If you ask me what will this road cost? I beg leave to answer, it will cost nothing to the Government. I might say it will cost less than nothing. The half of the land along the road only, will, after the road is made, or determined to be made, sell for a great deal more than the whole would, without the road. What an immense profit for your Treasury you can derive from the sale of this immense wilderness, which remains entirely unprofitable, if you have no road to come at it. This road is, therefore, to be beneficial to your finances, and your military operations, and to all parts of the Union, as well as to Michigan itself; as it will afford all kinds of encouragement to the citizens of the Eastern States, who wish to emigrate to the beautiful and fertile lands of the West."

The bill (H.R. 204) which he introduced was passed by the 18th Congress, and it was signed into law by the President on the last day of the second session of that Congress, March 3, 1825, the day that Father Richard's political career ended. He was defeated for reelection by not more than 70 votes.

From 1825 until his death in 1832 he continued as Vicar-General of the Territory. He died of cholera on September 13. He had contracted the disease while trying to relieve the suffering of the sick during the plague of that year. He was buried in his beloved St. Anne's Church in Detroit.

"His death was a public calamity," said a contemporary. His body lay in state in the church which he had built. Members of the 1st Regiment of Michigan Militia returned to pay their respects to their chaplain. As the good shepherd lays down his life for his sheep, so had he served his God, his people, and his country.

RATE ADJUSTMENT OF BONNEVILLE POWER ADMINISTRATION

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I am today releasing a recent letter I received from Charles F. Luce, Administrator of the Bonneville Power Administration, in reply to my letter of last January 28 concerning the need for an increase in the electric power rates charged by the BPA.

I am delighted to learn from Mr. Luce that he is committed to restoring BPA to the sound financial basis on which the agency was operated prior to 1957. It is gratifying to know that BPA plans to complete a general review of rates during the summer and fall of 1963 instead of waiting for the need of the statutory 5-year review period which comes late in 1964. Mr. Luce's decision to act this year is in accord with the recommendation I made to him last January.

Mr. Luce has indicated in his letter that BPA realizes that a rate increase may be required for the period 1964–69. This realization will be welcomed warmly by the taxpayers provided that the increase is sufficient to eliminate the drain which the BPA currently inflicts on taxpayers' funds. It occurs to me that Mr. Luce might consider seriously the possibility of increasing BPA rates where possible prior to December of 1964.

The suggestion was made by Mr. Luce that any BPA rate increase will depend in large part on congressional action on the proposed Federal transmission line between the Pacific Northwest and the Pacific Southwest and on enactment of the so-called regional preference legislation. I hesitate to predict at this time how Congress will act on these two proposals, but I know Mr. Luce will agree that both pieces of legislation are quite controversial. It would be better, as I see it, for Mr. Luce to proceed to a determination as to BPA rates solely on the basis of the present situation rather than to wait indefinitely while Congress considers the course of action it will take on either or both of these two particularly controversial proposals.

I am somewhat disturbed by Mr. Luce's attempt to confuse the issue, in his letter to me, by equating BPA's interest rate with "the average cost of money to the U.S. Government." The data to which he refers cover the average interest rate paid on all marketable short-term and long-term Treasury securities. If Mr. Luce had chosen what I regard as the more honest approach, he would have equated the BPA interest rate with the interest rates on long-term Treasury bonds. He would have found, according to the Treasury Bulletin for January of 1963, that the interest rate for such bonds has varied from 2.55 percent in 1954 to 4.08 percent in 1959. The average interest rate in 1962 was 3.95 percent.

Mr. Luce extended himself to some extent by reminding me that the colloquy in the Senate on August 9, 1937, between Senator Ellender and Senator Steiwer—81 Congressional Record 8524—"clearly indicates that it was the understanding and intent of the Senate that rates be based upon generating capacity, and that if the full capacity was not sold the amortization period be extended rather than increasing the rates."

While this may be true, the colloquy to which Mr. Luce refers revolved around the question of whether there would be a sufficient market for BPA power and whether the quantity of power purchased would be enough to repay Federal costs. My reading of the remarks in the Senate that day do not lead me to conclude that the Senate intended then—nor does it intend now—to provide an artificial means of maintaining Bonneville's low power rates. I think Mr. Luce is eminently wise in avoiding use of an argument based on this colloquy in order to suggest a rate reduction for BPA or a delay in increasing Bonneville's rates.

I am most gratified that Mr. Luce has accepted my suggestion to study present Bonneville rates with the intention of increasing the rates in the near future to levels which reflect more accurately the costs which should be borne by BPA customers rather than by the taxpayers of the country as a whole. In my view the situation is serious enough to warrant immediate initiation of this rate study. Any delay, even into late summer or early fall of this year, can only make matters worse for BPA.

The text of Mr. Luce's letter of February 8, 1963, is attached.

U.S. Department of the Interior,
Bonneville Power Administration,
Portland, Oreg., February 8, 1963.

Hon. John P. Saylor,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Congressman Saylor: Thank you for your letter of January 28 concerning the possible need for an increase in Bonneville Power Administration rates.

We are committed to a program of putting Bonneville back on a solid financial basis, as it was until 1957. To the extent this requires an increase in our rates, that is what we will propose to the Federal Power Commission. In fact, 2 months ago we told our customers that we intend to complete a general review of BPA's rates in the summer and fall of 1963 and (as your letter recommends) not wait until the end of the present 5-year rate period which comes in December 1964. A month ago I publicly stated our intentions in this regard in an address before a meeting of the Allied Daily Newspaper Association of the State of Washington.

Although, because of surpluses accumulated prior to 1957, Bonneville is still cumulatively $20 million ahead of schedule in meeting its obligations to the Treasury; we realize that a rate increase may be required for the rate period 1964–69.

The amount of any BPA rate increase will depend in large part upon the reception which Congress gives our Pacific Northwest-Pacific Southwest intertie program. An integral part of this program is the enactment of legislation defining our primary market area, as recently introduced in the House by Congresswoman Hansen and Congressman Westland. If the Congress this spring approves the program we have proposed, it should not be necessary to raise BPA rates enough to hurt electric consumers in our region. We estimate that our intertie program would net BPA between $6 million and $15 million per year.

Your letter refers to the House Public Works Appropriations hearings for 1962 in which we submitted data which showed BPA recent deficits would have been much greater had we been paying interest at 4 percent instead of 2½ percent. For those same hearings we also submitted data which showed that from 1939 through 1960 the average cost of money to the U.S. Government was only 2¼ percent and that Bonneville has been paying an interest rate higher than the average cost of money to the Government.

Your letter also refers to the Bonneville Project Act which requires amortization of projects over a reasonable period of time. The act also states that rates shall be set "upon the basis of the application of such rate schedules to the capacity of the electric facilities." At the time the act was passed in the Senate an amendment was offered to require amortization in 50 years, but this amendment was defeated. Further, the colloquy between Senators Ellender and Steiwer (81 Congressional Record 8524) clearly indicates that it was the understanding and intent of the Senate that rates be based upon generating capacity, and that if the full capacity was not sold the amortization period be extended rather than increasing the rates. If we were to adopt the liberal approach to ratemaking permitted by the Bonneville Act, BPA would be considering a rate reduction instead of a rate increase, for in every deficit year unsold capacity has exceeded the amount of the deficit.

Over the years we have taken a more conservative approach to the problems of Bonneville rates and payout than the act itself contemplated.

We appreciate your keen interest in our fiscal problems. I hope that in the near future I will have an opportunity to discuss them further with you personally.

Sincerely yours,

Charles F. Luce,
Administrator.

AUTHORIZING THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE TO RECEIVE MESSAGES FROM THE SENATE

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent notwithstanding the adjournment of the House until Wednesday, that the Clerk be authorized to receive messages from the Senate and that the Speaker be authorized to sign any enrolled bills and joint resolutions duly passed by the two Houses and found truly enrolled.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. Pilcher). Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to announce a revision in the program. It was previously announced that the resolution—House Resolution 228—would come up on Wednesday and the resolution—House Resolution 254—on Thursday. I take this time to advise after consulting with the minority leader and the chairman of the Committee on House Administration that if the resolution—House Resolution 228—which is a resolution to provide funds for investigation and studies by the Committee on Banking and Currency is finished expeditiously on Wednesday, then the resolution—House Resolution 254—which is a resolution to provide funds fo. investigations and studies for the Committee on Education and Labor might be called up also on Wednesday.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. McGown, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a joint resolution of the House of the following title:

H.J. Res. 284. Joint resolution making supplemental appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, and for other purposes.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. Auchincloss (at the request of Mr. Halleck), for the week of March 4, 1963, on account of illness.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. Wright, for 1 hour, today.

Mr. Fogarty (at the request of Mr. Ryan of Michigan), for 15 minutes, today, and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. Boggs (at the request of Mr. Ryan of Michigan), for 30 minutes, on Wednesday, March 6, 1963, and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the Congressional Record, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. Toll.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. Findley) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. Utt.

Mr. Berry.

Mr. Alger.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. Ryan of Michigan) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. Gilbert in two instances.

Mr. Moorhead.

Mr. Powell in two instances.

Mr. Morris.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. RYAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 53 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Wednesday, March 6, 1963, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

498. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting the seventh annual report on the financial condition and fiscal operations of the highway trust fund, pursuant to the Highway Revenue Act of 1956 (H. Doc. No. 76); to the Committee on Ways and Means and ordered to be printed.

499. A letter from the President of the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to pay relocation costs made necessary by actions of the District of Columbia government, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

500. A letter from the Secretary of Labor, transmitting the first report on operations under title I and part A of title II of the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962 (Public Law 87–415); to the Committee on Education and Labor.

501. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the review of improvident disposals of crane shovels and unnecessary procurement of outboard motors under a modernization program of the Department of the Army; to the Committee on Government Operations.

502. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the review of manpower utilization in the maintenance of facilities and operation of utilities at selected military installations in Japan; to the Committee on Government Operations.

503. A letter from the Chairman, Civil Aeronautics Board, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill relating to the use of Civil Aeronautics Board records and testimony of Board personnel regarding aircraft accidents"; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

504. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to amend section 2455 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (43 U.S.C. 1171), and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

505. A letter from the Chairman, U.S. Atomic Energy Commission, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to authorize appropriations for the Atomic Energy Commission in accordance with section 261 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes"; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

506. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Maritime Commission, transmitting a draft

of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to extend the provisions of section 3 of Public Law 87-346, relating to dual rate contracts"; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

507. A letter from the Director, Office of Legislative Affairs, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, transmitting the report of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration with respect to certain civilian positions established pursuant to section 1581, title 10, United States Code, during calendar year 1962, pursuant to section 1582, title 10, United States Code; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

508. A letter from the Chairman, U.S. Civil Service Commission, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to provide for the payment of certain amounts and restoration of employment benefits to certain Government officers and employees improperly deprived thereof, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

509. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the examination of the costs to the Government for storage of petroleum in new commercial facilities under Department of Defense negotiated contracts; to the Committee on Government Operations.

510. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the review of the manned aircraft nuclear propulsion program of the Atomic Energy Commission and the Department of Defense; to the Committee on Government Operations.

511. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a supplemental report and certification of economic justification on the Crystal Dam, reservoir, and powerplant, which comprise a segment of the Curecanti Unit, Colorado River storage project, in Colorado (H. Doc. No. 77); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs and ordered to be printed with illustrations.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ASPINALL:

H.R. 4423. A bill permitting the Secretary of the Interior to continue to deliver water to lands in the third division, Riverton reclamation project, Wyoming; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. AVERY:

H.R. 4424. A bill to authorize the establishment of the Prairie National Park, in the State of Kansas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BERRY:

H.R. 4425. A bill to amend the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BONNER:

H.R. 4426. A bill to authorize appointment of the Director and Deputy Director of the Coast and Geodetic Survey from civilian life, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. BRAY:

H.R. 4427. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to provide for the establishment and maintenance of a Junior Reserve Officers' Training Corps program; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BURKE:

H.R. 4428. A bill to provide for a comprehensive, long-range, and coordinated program in oceanography, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H.R. 4429. A bill to amend the act of June 12, 1960, for the correction of inequities in the construction of fishing vessels, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. CELLER:

H.R. 4430. A bill to amend title 35 of the United States Code to permit a written declaration to be accepted in lieu of an oath, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CELLER (by request):

H.R. 4431. A bill to amend section 77 of the Bankruptcy Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CLARK:

H.R. 4432. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for the payment of pensions to veterans of World War I; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. DAWSON (by request):

H.R. 4433. A bill to provide for the adjustment of the legislative jurisdiction exercised by the United States over land in the several States used for Federal purposes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. DEROUNIAN:

H.R. 4434. A bill to strengthen democratic processes within labor organizations respecting the calling of strikes, to protect union members against unjustifiable pay losses from strikes, to protect employers from needless production interruptions arising out of strikes contrary to the wishes of union members, to minimize industrial strife interfering with the flow of commerce, and to promote the growth of the Nation's economy through reducing economic waste by providing for an impartial secret strike vote; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. DERWINSKI:

H.R. 4435. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DIGGS:

H.R. 4436. A bill to amend the Hospital Survey and Construction Act to prohibit discrimination in any respect whatsoever on account of race, creed, or color in hospital facilities; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 4437. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FINO:

H.R. 4438. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that a widow under retirement age may continue to receive mother's insurance benefits (but at a reduced rate) even though none of the children of her deceased husband are any longer entitled to child's insurance benefits; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FOGARTY:

H.R. 4439. A bill granting the consent and approval of Congress to the Northeastern Water and Related Land Resources Compact; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 4440. A bill to establish a land and water conservation fund to assist the States and Federal agencies in meeting present and future outdoor recreation demands and needs of the American people, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. GALLAGHER:

H.R. 4441. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to permit, for 1 year, the granting of national service life insurance to certain veterans heretofore eligible for such insurance; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. GIAIMO:

H.R. 4442. A bill granting the consent and approval of Congress to the Northeastern Water and Related Land Resources Compact; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. GILL:

H.R. 4443. A bill to provide under the social security program for payment for hospital and related services to aged beneficiaries; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HÉBERT:

H.R. 4444. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to provide for the establishment and maintenance of a Junior Reserve Officers' Training Corps program; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. KASTENMEIER:

H.R. 4445. A bill to assist in the promotion of economic stabilization by requiring the disclosure of finance charges in connection with extensions of credit; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. KING of New York:

H.R. 4446. A bill to amend section 503 of title 38, United States Code, to provide that payments for jury duty shall be disregarded in the computation of income for purposes of payment of pensions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. KNOX:

H.R. 4447. A bill to provide a new basis for determining the amount of money made available to a State for schools and roads by the Secretary of Agriculture in the case of sales of certain forest products from national forests located within such State, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 4448. A bill to amend the Saltonstall-Kennedy Act so as to establish an additional fund for fishery research programs and fisheries rehabilitation and development projects, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H.R. 4449. A bill to provide for the medical and hospital care of the aged through a system of voluntary health insurance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 4450. A bill to amend section 1034 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that where the taxpayer or his spouse has attained the age of 65 no gain on the sale or exchange of the taxpayer's home will be taxed; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LAIRD (by request):

H.R. 4451. A bill to provide for the increased use of agricultural products for industrial purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. LANKFORD:

H.R. 4452. A bill to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Service Act of 1949, as amended, to implement the purposes for which surplus personal property may be donated; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. LEGGETT:

H.R. 4453. A bill authorizing a monetary contribution for the flood control accomplishments of the multiple-purpose developments to be constructed on the Yuba River by the Yuba County Water Agency of Marysville, Calif.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. MACDONALD (by request):

H.R. 4454. A bill to extend the benefits of the Panama Canal Construction Service Annuity Act of May 29, 1944, to certain additional civilian officers and employees; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. McCLORY:

H.R. 4455. A bill to amend section 172 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to permit taxpayers to elect to use net operating losses only as carryovers; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 4456. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to change certain dates prescribed for making declarations and installment payments of estimated income tax by individuals so that such payments will be due at regular 3-month intervals; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McINTIRE:

H.R. 4457. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to terminate the existing authority to suspend the marking requirement with respect to sawed lumber and timber, certain poles of wood, and bundles of shingles; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DEROUNIAN:

H.R. 4458. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide, in the case of a widow who has attained age 65, that gross income does not include gain from the sale or exchange of her residence; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MOORHEAD:

H.R. 4459. A bill to amend the Federal Coal Mine Safety Act so as to provide further for the prevention of accidents in coal mines; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 4460. A bill to amend section 7 of the Administrative Expenses Act of 1946, as amended; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. OLSEN of Montana:

H.R. 4461. A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code, to provide for the payment of expenses of counsel assigned to indigent defendants; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4462. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act, as amended, to provide for the recomputation of annuities of retired employees who elected reduced annuities at the time of retirement in order to provide survivor annuities for their spouses; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 4463. A bill to prohibit the reproduction and reissuance of postage stamps found to be defective; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. PIRNIE:

H.R. 4464. A bill to amend section 114 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1956 to state the policy of Congress with respect to reimbursement for certain highways on the Interstate System; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. QUIE:

H.R. 4465. A bill to require the national referendum on wheat to be held prior to May 15, 1963; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. ROBERTS of Texas:

H. R. 4466. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to revise the pension program for World War I, World War II, and Korean conflict veterans, and their dependents; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. ROUDEBUSH:

H.R. 4467. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act to increase from 2 to 2½ percent the retirement multiplication factor used in computing annuities of certain employees engaged in hazardous duties; to increase from 6½ to 6¾ percent the deduction from the basic salaries of employees generally for retirement; and to set 60 as the mandatory retirement age for certain employees engaged in hazardous duties; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. RYAN of New York:

H.R. 4468. A bill to assist in the promotion of economic stabilization by requiring the disclosure of finance charges in connection with extensions of credit; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. SAYLOR:

H.R. 4469. A bill to amend the prevailing wage section of the Davis-Bacon Act, as amended; and related sections of the Federal Airport Act, as amended; and the National Housing Act, as amended; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 4470. A bill to amend the Federal Coal Mine Safety Act so as to provide further for the prevention of accidents in coal mines; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 4471. A bill to amend section 8(b) (4) of the National Labor Relations Act, as amended; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. SCHWENGEL:

H.R. 4472. A bill to exempt from compulsory coverage under the old-age, survivors, and disability insurance program self-employed individuals who hold certain religious beliefs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SECREST:

H.R. 4473. A bill to amend section 312 of title 38, United States Code, to provide a presumption of service connection in the case of heart disease becoming disabling within 3 years after discharge; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. SHIPLEY:

H.R. 4474. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934, with respect to the hours of operation of certain broadcasting stations; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SICKLES:

H.R. 4475. A bill to establish a National Service Corps to provide opportunities for dedicated American citizens; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. STAFFORD:

H.R. 4476. A bill to provide for holding terms of the U.S. District Court for the District of Vermont at Montpelier and St. Johnsbury; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STUBBLEFIELD:

H.R. 4477. A bill to amend the Federal Trade Commission Act, to promote quality and price stabilization, to define and restrain certain unfair methods of distribution and to confirm, define, and equalize the rights of producers and resellers in the distribution of goods identified by distinguishing brands, names, or trademarks, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 4478. A bill to provide for the establishment of a fish hatchery in the State of Kentucky; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. TALCOTT:

H.R. 4479. A bill to provide for the conveyance to the State of California of certain mineral rights reserved to the United States in certain real property in California; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey:

H.R. 4480. A bill to provide under the social security program for payment for hospital and related services to aged beneficiaries; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin:

H.R. 4481. A bill to establish a research laboratory at which programs of research and study shall be conducted to develop new and improved industrial uses for dairy products, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. TOLL:

H.R. 4482. A bill to prescribe a national policy with respect to the encouragement of invention by inventors and their employees, and thereby contribute to the advancement of the Nation's welfare, by providing for the administration in the public interest of the property rights to inventions resulting from research or development which is financed at least in part through the expenditure of public funds; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WALLHAUSER:

H.R. 4483. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act to increase from 2 to 2½ percent the retirement multiplication factor used in computing annuities of certain employees engaged in hazardous duties; to increase from 6½ to 7½ percent the deduction from the basic salary of such employees for retirement; and to set 60 years as the mandatory retirement age for such employees; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. WALTER:

H.R. 4484. A bill to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, to provide for marketing quotas on Irish potatoes through the establishment of acreage allotments; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. WHITE:

H.R. 4485. A bill to guarantee electric consumers on the Pacific Northwest first call on electric energy generated at Federal hydroelectric plants in that region and to guarantee electric consumers in other regions reciprocal priority, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON:

H.R. 4486. A bill to authorize the Housing and Home Finance Administrator to provide additional assistance for the development of comprehensive and coordinated mass transportation systems in metropolitan and other urban areas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H.R. 4487. A bill to amend the act of August 1, 1958, in order to prevent or minimize injury to fish and wildlife from the use of insecticides, herbicides, fungicides, and pesticides; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H.R. 4488. A bill to amend the Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act to require approval by the Secretary of the Interior of highway projects before they can be constructed; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. HALL:

H.R. 4489. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to provide additional deductions and exemptions for the expenses of medical care of persons 65 years of age and over; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HARRISON:

H.R. 4490. A bill permitting the Secretary of the Interior to continue to deliver water to lands in the third division. Riverton reclamation project, Wyoming; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. JOHNSON of California:

H.R. 4491. A bill to establish in the Department of the Interior a Gold Procurement and Sales Agency, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. KEOGH:

H.R. 4492. A bill to provide under the social security program for payment for hospital and related services to aged beneficiaries; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MACDONALD:

H.R. 4493. A bill to extend for 4 additional years the temporary provisions of Public Laws 815 and 874, 81st Congress; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. FLOOD:

H.J. Res. 296. Joint resolution to create a regional agency by intergovernmental compact for the planning, conservation, utilization, development, management, and control of the water and related natural resources of the Susquehanna River Basin, for the improvement of navigation, reduction of flood damage, reduction and control of surface subsidence, regulation of water quality, control of pollution, development of water supply, hydroelectric energy, fish and wildlife habitat, and public recreational facilities, and other purposes, and defining the functions, powers, and duties of such agency; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GIBBONS:

H.J. Res. 297. Joint resolution to establish a Joint Committee on Foreign Information and Intelligence; to the Committee on Rules.

H.J. Res. 298. Joint resolution to provide that Members of Congress shall be limited to per diem allowances and necessary transportation costs in connection with travel outside the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. HARDING:

H.J. Res. 299. Joint resolution to establish a Joint Committee on Foreign Information and Intelligence; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. HERLONG:

H.J. Res. 300. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States reserving to each State the exclusive power to apportion membership of its legislature; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KING of New York:

H.J. Res. 301. Joint resolution extending an invitation to the International Olympic Committee to hold the 1968 winter Olympic games in the United States; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MONTOYA:

H.J. Res. 302. Joint resolution to prevent U.S. contributions to United Nations programs from being used for assistance to Cuba; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. UDALL:

H.J. Res. 303. Joint resolution to establish a Joint Committee on Foreign Information and Intelligence; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. WRIGHT:

H.J. Res. 304. Joint resolution to establish a Joint Committee on Foreign Information and Intelligence; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. CANNON:

H. Con. Res. 105. Concurrent resolution relating to Panama Canal Sovereignty-treaty interpretations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. KING of New York:

H. Con. Res. 106. Concurrent resolution requesting the President to initiate action to the adoption of a United Nations' resolution calling for the withdrawal of Soviet troops from Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia and the conduct of free elections in these nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. REUSS:

H. Con. Res. 107. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to the convening by the Secretary of the Interior of an international conference to initiate cooperative action to further conservation of wild animals on a worldwide basis; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. DIGGS:

H. Res. 275. Resolution favoring enactment by States of compulsory school attendance laws; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. BOLAND:

H. Res. 276. Resolution amending clause 2(a) of rule XI and clause 4 of rule XXI of the Rules of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. RUMSFELD:

H. Res. 277. Resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives with respect to the use of the Panama Canal by vessels engaged in trade with Cuba; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin:

H. Res. 278. Resolution establishing a Special Committee on the Captive Nations; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By Mr. BERRY: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of South Dakota, memorializing the Congress of the United States relative to providing incentive payments by the Federal Government for domestic gold producers; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HARRISON: Memorial of the House of Representatives, 37th State Legislature of the State of Wyoming, memorializing the Congress of the United States with reference to supporting basic changes in Federal reclamation laws to make it possible for reclamation development to meet the needs of today; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. McINTIRE: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Maine proposing the abolition of futures trading of potatoes on the New York Mercantile Exchange; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Alaska, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relating to the creation of a Department of Fisheries and Oceanography; to the Committee on Government Operations.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Arizona, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to authorize the immediate cessation of printing of all $1 silver certificates which do not bear the inscription "In God We Trust"; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to local airline service to cities in California; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Idaho, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to give early consideration to the authorization and construction of the Challis project, Idaho; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Hawaii, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to extending sincere appreciation and aloha to the Congress and the Department of the Interior for its continuing interest in these fairest of all islands; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Indiana, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States that land of the State of Indiana within 25 miles of Lake Michigan shall not be ceded or surrendered to the United States of America or any other sovereign power whose intentions do not coincide with the best interests of the State of Indiana; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Illinois, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to urging adoption and enactment of appropriate measures to relieve the financial burdens presently borne by States and local governments as a result of numerous interstate residential changes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Kentucky, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to rejecting the report from the Office of Emergency Planning regarding the relaxation of import control on foreign residual oil, and also to aid the domestic coal and oil industry; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Maine, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to proposing abolition of futures trading of potatoes on the New York Mercantile Exchange; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of South Dakota, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to providing incentive payments by the Federal Government for domestic gold producers; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Washington, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to assuring that the funding requirements for the Pacific Northwest regional water pollution laboratory at Corvallis, Ore., receive adequate attention in the preparation of the budget for 1965; to the Committee on Appropriations.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BARRETT:

H.R. 4494. A bill for the relief of Karbis Balta; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BARRY:

H.R. 4495. A bill for the relief of Osvaldo Severo and Cortese Severo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON:

H.R. 4496. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Helen Matsis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin:

H.R. 4497. A bill for the relief of Ruben A. Nepomuceno; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CONTE:

H.R. 4498. A bill for the relief of Miss Evelina Persello; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DIGGS:

H.R. 4499. A bill for the relief of Dr. Angelos A. Kambouris; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FINNEGAN:

H.R. 4500. A bill for the relief of Melina Camello Agustin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FOGARTY:

H.R. 4501. A bill for the relief of Anthony F. Bernardo and Ambrose A. Cerrito; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4502. A bill for the relief of Arturo Longobardi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 4503. A bill for the relief of Luigi Giuseppe Luraschi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MACDONALD:

H.R. 4504. A bill for the relief of Robert E. Picardi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MARSH (by request):

H.R. 4505. A bill to confer jurisdiction on the Court of Claims to entertain, hear, and determine a motion for a new trial on the claim of Robert Alexander; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. OSTERTAG:

H.R. 4506. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Josephina C. Aquino Heindel; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RYAN of New York:

H.R. 4507. A bill for the relief of Angeliki Devaris; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. VANIK:

H.R. 4508. A bill for the relief of Francesco Todaro; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON:

H.R. 4509. A bill for the relief of Guy Fleming; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4510. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Luisa L. Burkes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

57. By Mrs. ST. GEORGE: Petition of William A. O'Dea and 33 others to preserve the Monroe Doctrine; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

58. By Mr. SNYDER: Petition of Mrs. Selby Love and other citizens of the Third Congressional District of Kentucky to preserve the Monroe Doctrine; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

59. Also, petition of Thomas N. Golden and other citizens of the Third Congressional District of Kentucky to preserve the Monroe Doctrine; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

60. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Peter Poulson and others, Grand Avenue Junior High School, Bellmore, Long Island, N.Y., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to requesting that the electoral college be nullified by an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, and that it be replaced with a system utilizing the popular vote; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

◆

SENATE

MONDAY, MARCH 4, 1963

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, and was called to order by the Vice President.

Rev. Alfred O. Fuerbringer, D.D., president, Concordia Theological Seminary, St. Louis, Mo., offered the following prayer:

In the name of God, the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit. Amen.

Eternal and almighty God, creator and preserver of the universe and all that it contains, ruler of all the peoples of the earth: Since Thou hast given us this good land for our heritage and dwelling place, we humbly ask Thee to guide us so that we may always prove ourselves a people mindful of Thy favors and glad to do Thy will. Forgive, we implore Thee, our many shortcomings as individuals and as a nation. Purify our hearts to see and love the truth. Help us to overcome our inclination to selfishness and the prejudices which hinder the welfare of our fellow men.

Bless our land with sound learning, honorable industry, useful arts, and good manners. Save us from violence, discord, and strife. Keep us from pride, arrogance, and every evil way. Preserve our liberties and prosper our endeavors to fashion and keep as one united people the multitudes who claim this country as their own.

Endue with the spirit of wisdom all those to whom we have, in Thy name, entrusted the privilege and the responsibility of government, that they may plan and do what is right, and that justice and peace may be preserved throughout our land. Help us to observe Thy ways and to show forth Thy praise to all the nations of the earth. Teach us to be sincere in our dealings with our allies and our opponents, and incline the hearts of men everywhere to mutual confidence and to a genuine desire for equity and peace.

To Thy especial care we commend all those who are in suffering or want, who are deprived of their rights or their freedom, or who are in any kind of danger. Sustain them with Thy power, and deliver them by Thy might.

In the days of prosperity, fill our hearts with gratitude; and in time of trouble, do not let us lose our confidence in Thee and Thy sure help. All of this we ask through Jesus Christ, our Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Friday, March 1, 1963, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

REPORT OF NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION — MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 78)

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which, with the accompanying report, was referred to the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences:

To the Congress of the United States:

Pursuant to the provisions of the National Aeronautics and Space Act of 1958, as amended, I transmit herewith a report on the projects and progress of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for the period of January 1 through June 30, 1962. This is the seventh of these reports since the passage of the legislation establishing that agency.

This report covers a period of acceleration in the national space program and reveals the significant role of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration in that progress. Congressional support and interagency cooperation have contributed substantially to this record of space and aeronautics performance.

JOHN F. KENNEDY.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *March 4, 1963.*

REPORT ON ACTIVITIES CARRIED ON UNDER PUBLIC LAW 480, 83D CONGRESS—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 79)

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which, with the accompanying report, was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

To the Congress of the United States:

I am transmitting herewith the seventeenth semiannual report on activities carried on under Public Law 480, 83d Congress, as amended, outlining operations under the act during the period July 1 through December 31, 1962.

JOHN F. KENNEDY.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *March 4, 1963.*

CALL OF LEGISLATIVE CALENDAR DISPENSED WITH

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the call of the Legislative Calendar was dispensed with.

COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the Committee on the District of Columbia was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

LIMITATION ON STATEMENTS DURING MORNING HOUR

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, statements during the morning hour were ordered limited to 3 minutes.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business, to consider the nominations on the Executive Calendar, beginning with the new reports.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

The VICE PRESIDENT. If there be no reports of committees, the nominations on the Executive Calendar, beginning with the new reports, will be stated.

NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of John Harold Fanning, of Rhode Island, to be a member of the National Labor Relations Board for the term of 5 years expiring December 16, 1967.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

COMMISSIONER OF EDUCATION

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Dr. Francis Keppel, of Massachusetts, to be Commissioner of Education.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

LABOR DEPARTMENT

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Daniel Patrick Moynihan, of New York, to be an Assistant Secretary of Labor.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

NATIONAL MEDIATION BOARD

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Howard G. Gamser, of New York, to be a member of the National Mediation Board for the term expiring February 1, 1966.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

FEDERAL COAL MINE SAFETY BOARD OF REVIEW

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of George C. Trevorrow, of Maryland, to be a member of the Federal Coal Mine Safety Board of Review for the remainder of the term expiring July 15, 1965.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Public Health Service.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that these nominations be considered en bloc.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nominations will be considered en bloc; and, without objection, they are confirmed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of all the nominations which have been confirmed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT TO THURSDAY

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate concludes its session today, it adjourn to meet at 12 o'clock noon, Thursday next.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

CONSIDERATION ON THURSDAY OF OUTDOOR RECREATION BILL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, for the information of the Senate, I wish to state that, at the request of a Senator, Senate bill 20, to promote the coordination and development of effective Federal and State programs relating to outdoor recreation, and for other purposes, will not be taken up today, but will be taken up Thursday next.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

Report of Office of Civil Defense on Property Acquisitions of Emergency Supplies and Equipment

A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the Office of Civil Defense on property acquisitions of emergency supplies and equipment, for the quarter ended December 31, 1962 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

Extension of Provisions of Section 3 of Public Law 87-346, Relating to Dual Rate Contracts

A letter from the Chairman, Federal Maritime Commission, Washington, D.C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to extend the provisions of section 3 of Public Law 87-346, relating to dual rate contracts (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Commerce.

Payment of Certain Relocation Costs in the District of Columbia

A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to pay relocation costs made necessary by actions of the District of Columbia government, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Report on Improvident Disposals of Crane Shovels and Unnecessary Procurement of Outboard Motors Under a Modernization Program of the Department of the Army

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on improvident disposals of crane shovels and unnecessary procurement of outboard motors under a modernization program of the Department of the Army, dated February 1963 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

Supplemental Report and Certification of Economic Justification on the Crystal Dam, Reservoir, and Powerplant, Colorado

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a supplemental report and certification of economic justification on the Crystal Dam, Reservoir, and powerplant, which comprise a segment of the Curecenti unit, Colorado River storage project, Colorado (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Amendment of Section 2455 of the Revised Statutes, as Amended (43 U.S.C. 1171)

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 2455 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (43 U.S.C. 1171), and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Report of Bureau of Land Management on Negotiated Contracts Made for the Disposal of Materials

A letter from the Director, Bureau of Land Management, Department of the Interior, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Bureau on negotiated contracts made for the disposal of materials, for the period September 25 through December 31, 1962 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Report of National Aeronautics and Space Administration on Certain Civilian Positions

A letter from the Director, Office of Legislative Affairs, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on certain civilian positions in that Administration, for the calendar year 1962 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

Appropriations for Atomic Energy Commission

A letter from the Chairman, U.S. Atomic Energy Commission, Washington, D.C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize appropriations for the Atomic Energy Commission in accordance with section 261 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A resolution of the Senate of the State of Washington; to the Committee on Appropriations:

"Senate Resolution 15

"Whereas the expanding economy and growing population of these United States make ever increasing demands upon available water resources and require vast quantities of water of high quality; and

"Whereas it has been recognized that a greatly expanded program of research, investigations, experiments, and studies relating to the prevention and control of water pollution is necessary to keep pace with the need of providing adequate supplies of water of high quality; and

"Whereas the scope and magnitude of water quality research problems vary widely from region to region so that the best means of coping with these problems is to conduct research at a regional level; and

"Whereas research on water pollution control directed to the specific problems in the State of Washington is very necessary, and many aspects of Washington's economy are dependent upon sound development of the State's water resources, and if economic growth is to proceed within the State it is necessary to have a much greater understanding of how to cope with the many emerging problems of water pollution; and

"Whereas provision has been made under the Federal Water Pollution Control Act for the construction of a Pacific Northwest regional field laboratory and research facility at Corvallis, Oreg., to assist in the solution of the many complex problems which affect water resources in the Pacific Northwest: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That the President of the United States do include in the President's budget for fiscal year 1964, adequate funds to initiate research on an advance basis during fiscal year 1964, and that the President of the United States do encourage and the Congress assure that the funding requirements for the Pacific Northwest regional water pollution laboratory at Corvallis, Oreg., receive adequate attention in the preparation of the budget and in the appropriation processes for 1965; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the Honorable John F. Kennedy, President of the United States, the President of the U.S. Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, to Senator Magnuson, Senator Jackson, and to each member of the Washington delegation in the House of Representatives.

"Attest:

"Ward Bowden,
"*Secretary of the Senate.*"

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Maine; to the Committee on Banking and Currency:

"Joint Resolution Proposing Abolition of Futures Trading of Potatoes on the New York Mercantile Exchange by the Congress of the United States of America

"We, your memorialists, the Senate and House of Representatives of the State of Maine in the 101st legislative session assembled, most respectfully present and petition your honorable body as follows:

"Whereas the Constitution of the United States provides that the Congress may regulate commerce among the several States; and

"Whereas potatoes are now traded in futures contracts on the New York Mercantile Exchange, 6 Harrison Street, New York City, N.Y.; and

"Whereas the price at which future contracts are bought and sold has a direct and immediate effect on cash prices received by producers for potatoes in Maine and all other areas producing potatoes for market; and

"Whereas futures prices reflect the effects of manipulation and unlimited speculation to the detriment of producers of potatoes; and

"Whereas futures trading of potatoes obstructs all attempts of Maine potato producers to market their product in an orderly fashion; and

"Whereas futures trading of potatoes encourages overproduction in Maine and all other producing areas with resulting disastrously low prices for the producer; and

"Whereas experience has proven that futures trading can be carried on without detrimental and depressing effect on price only in the case of those commodities which can be stored for extensive periods of time either within the areas of production or the areas of marketing and distribution; and

"Whereas Irish potatoes are a perishable commodity that do not lend themselves to extended periods of storage, especially following preparation for market; and

"Whereas Irish potatoes historically are one of the most volatile commodities in terms of price range and in degree of sensitivity to myriad market factors, including total volume produced, anticipated production, available supply on track and in the marketplaces, as well as many others; and

"Whereas many areas of production have vehemently registered their opposition to the continued trading of Irish potato futures, either with or without the supervision of the Commodity Exchange Authority of the USDA, and producers in Maine, by mail ballot, have voted overwhelmingly in favor of abolishing futures trading in Maine potatoes; and

"Whereas the Congress of the United States has already established a precedent for the action to be proposed by this resolution in the instance of another perishable commodity, namely onions, leaving potatoes as the only perishable commodity now being traded on the futures market: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That we, your memorialists, recommend that the Congress enact legislation abolishing futures trading in Irish potatoes upon the New York Mercantile Exchange or upon any commodity exchange; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That a copy of this memorial, duly authenticated by the secretary of State, be immediately transmitted by the secretary of state, by mail, to the Senate and House of Representatives in Congress, to the Members of the said Senate and House of Representatives from this State.

"HARVEY R. PEASE,
"Clerk.
"CHESTER T. WINSLOW,
"Secretary."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Alaska; to the Committee on Commerce:

"SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 9

"Joint resolution relating to the creation of a Department of Fisheries and Oceanography

"Whereas the fisheries of the United States occupy an ever increasing importance to the general well-being of the Nation; and

"Whereas the power of States to adequately protect and enhance the value of fisheries is clearly limited by the nature of our constitutional system; and

"Whereas foreign nationals have created competitive pressures which may only be met on a national scale; and

"Whereas the past lack of interest of Federal authorities in fisheries problems has resulted in a drop of American fisheries production from second to fifth in the world market, and a complete lack of aid and protection for American fishermen; and

"Whereas fisheries provide a source of livelihood for hundreds of thousands of Americans citizens deserving of constant Federal attention to the maintenance and improvement of the industry; and

"Whereas a cabinet level Department of Fisheries and Oceanography containing a research and management section, an economic development section, and an international section is necessary to deal with the scope and magnitude of the problems involved; and

"Whereas Gov. William A. Egan has already requested the President of the United States to make every effort toward establishing such a cabinet position: Therefore be it

"*Resolved*, That the Legislature of the State of Alaska joins with Governor Egan in respectfully urging the President of the United States to establish a Department of Fisheries and Oceanography at an early date; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That copies of this resolution be sent to the Honorable John F. Kennedy, President of the United States; the Honorable Lyndon B. Johnson, Vice President of of the United States and President of the Senate; the Honorable John W. McCormack, Speaker of the House of Representatives; and the members of the Alaska Delegation in Congress.

"Passed by the Senate February 5, 1963.

"FRANK PERATROVICH,
"President of the Senate.
"Attest:
"EVELYN K. STEVENSON,
"Secretary of the Senate.

"Passed by the House, February 18, 1963.

"BRUCE KENDALL,
"Speaker of the House.
"Attest:
"PATRICIA R. SLACK,
"Chief Clerk of the House.
"[SEAL] WILLIAM A. EGAN,
"Governor of Alaska."

A resolution of the House of Representatives of the State of Illinois; to the Committee on Government Operations:

"HOUSE RESOLUTION 39

"Whereas to resolve acute problems of civic administration, law enforcement and general health and welfare inflicted on large urban communities throughout the United States by a widespread and increasing influx of inhabitants from less densely populated regions of the Nation, the large urban communities have been compelled to accept and sustain severe financial burdens; and

"Whereas the difficulties inherent in such multitudinous residential changes from State to State are plainly national in area, scope and dimension; and

"Whereas the States and local governments obliged to provide for new residents are, apart from the failure of their resources, reluctant to expand the tax burden borne by their residents from a fear of assuming a position of economic disadvantage as compared with neighboring States; and

"Whereas the Congress of the United States has the power to check deteriorating welfare conditions of national scope by use of the resources of the Nation: Therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the House of Representatives of the 73d General Assembly of the State of Illinois*, That the Congress of the United States be respectfully urged to adopt and enact appropriate measures to relieve the financial burdens presently borne by States and local governments as a result of numerous interstate residential changes; and that suitable copies of this resolution be sent by the secretary of state to the President of the Senate of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States and each Member of the U.S. Senate and House of Representatives from Illinois.

"Adopted by the House, February 27, 1963.

"JOHN W. LEWIS, Jr.,
"Speaker, House of Representatives.
"FREDERIC B. SELCKE,
"Clerk, House of Representatives."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Idaho; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

"SENATE JOINT MEMORIAL 8

"To the Honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the United States, in Congress Assembled:

"We, your memorialists, the members of the Senate and House of Representatives of the Legislature of the State of Idaho, assembled in the 37th session thereof, do respectfully represent that:

"Whereas in cooperation with the local interests, the Bureau of Reclamation has undertaken a study of the development of the Challis project in Custer County for the purpose of providing supplemental and additional irrigation of lands, the control of floods, the preservation of fish and wildlife, and the creation of additional recreational opportunities; and

"Whereas the proposed Challis project is an upstream storage project which will provide additional late-season water, will augment the existing livestock and grazing utilization of the area, and will stabilize and influence the general economic development and contribute to the further growth of the local area of the State and of the Nation; and

"Whereas the Challis project includes upstream storage development which will minimize or eliminate the existing possibilities of flood damages to the great benefit of the existing community and surrounding area; and

"Whereas, the Challis project investigational studies have indicated the proposed plan of development is economically and financially feasible and is desired by the local interests for the further development and economic growth of Custer County and of the State: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the State of Idaho*, That the Congress and President of the United States be respectfully petitioned to give early consideration to the authorization and construction of the Challis project, Idaho; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the Secretary of State of the State of Idaho be, and he hereby is, authorized and directed to forward certified copies of this memorial to the President and Vice President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress, the Department of the Interior, the U.S. Bureau of Reclamation, and to the Senators and Representatives representing this State in the United States.

"Adopted by the senate on the 19th day of February 1963.

"W. E. DREVLOW,
"President of the Senate.

"Adopted by the house of representatives on the 21st day of February 1963.

"PETE T. CENARRUSA,
"Speaker of the House of Representatives.
"Attest:
"ARTHUR WILSON,
"Secretary of the Senate."

The petition of A. W. Lafferty, of Washington, D.C., relating to the O and C Land Grant Acts of April 10 1869, and May 4, 1870; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

RESOLUTION OF HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

Mr. McINTYRE. Mr. President, the Portsmouth Naval Shipyard is not only an integral part of New Hampshire's economy, but it is also closely linked with the history of shipbuilding in the United States.

That the Portsmouth Navy Yard be kept operating at full force is of utmost importance to the safety and security of this Nation. Since coming to Washington, I have been bending all efforts in this direction, and will continue to work for full employment at the Portsmouth Yard.

The honorable House of Representatives of the New Hampshire General Court has passed a resolution calling on the State's congressional delegation to "use their utmost endeavors to the end that the Portsmouth Navy Yard be kept in operation at full force, not only to supply our country with the needed submarines but to insure full-time employment for our citizens."

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be entered in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Armed Services, and, under the rule, ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

RESOLUTIONS IN RE PORTSMOUTH NAVY YARD

Whereas Portsmouth Navy Yard has been considered the top ranking navy yard since the days of wooden ships; and

Whereas it is of vast importance that this place be kept in operation particularly because it produces submarines which fire the Polaris missiles, an important part in our country's defense; and

Whereas many of its employees have been threatened with layoffs at the yard due to lack of work: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives of the General Court of New Hampshire requests that our delegation in Washington, D.C., U.S. Senators NORRIS COTTON and THOMAS J. MCINTYRE and Congressmen JAMES C. CLEVELAND and LOUIS C. WYMAN, use their utmost endeavors to the end that the Portsmouth Navy Yard be kept in operation at full force, not only to supply our country with the needed submarines but to insure full-time employment for our citizens; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be transmitted to each of the above-named members of our congressional delegation.

STEWART LAMPREY,
Speaker, House of Representatives.
JOHN D. HACKETT,
Representative from Epping.
FRANCIS W. TOLMAN,
Clerk, House of Representatives.

REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

The following report of a committee was submitted:

By Mr. McCLELLAN, from the Committee on Government Operations, without amendment:

S. 816. A bill for the establishment of a Commission on Science and Technology (Rept. No. 16).

REPORT OF JOINT COMMITTEE ON REDUCTION OF NONESSENTIAL FEDERAL EXPENDITURES—FEDERAL EMPLOYMENT AND PAY

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, as chairman of the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures, I submit a report on Federal employment and pay for the month of January 1963. In accordance with the practice of several years' standing, I ask unanimous consent to have the report printed in the RECORD, together with a statement by me.

There being no objection, the report and statement were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FEDERAL PERSONNEL IN EXECUTIVE BRANCH, JANUARY 1963 AND DECEMBER 1962, AND PAY, DECEMBER AND NOVEMBER 1962

PERSONNEL AND PAY SUMMARY

(See table I)

Information in monthly personnel reports for January 1963 submitted to the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures is summarized as follows:

Total and major categories	Civilian personnel in executive branch			Payroll (in thousands) in executive branch		
	In January numbered—	In December numbered—	Increase (+) or decrease (−)	In December was	In November was	Increase (+) or decrease (−)
Total [1]	2,477,937	2,486,628	−8,691	$1,337,052	$1,307,794	+$29,258
Agencies exclusive of Department of Defense	1,413,827	1,419,740	−5,913	789,232	735,455	+53,777
Department of Defense	1,064,110	1,066,888	−2,778	547,820	572,339	−24,519
Inside the United States	2,309,290	2,318,809	−9,519			
Outside the United States	168,647	167,819	+828			
Industrial employment	556,897	558,865	−1,968			
Foreign nationals	168,766	169,666	−900	28,865	28,639	+226

[1] Exclusive of foreign national shown in the last line of this summary.

Table I breaks down the above figures on employment and pay by agencies.

Table II breaks down the above employment figures to show the number inside the United States by agencies.

Table III breaks down the above employment figures to show the number outside the United States by agencies.

Table IV breaks down the above employment figures to show the number in industrial-type activities by agencies.

Table V shows foreign nationals by agencies not included in tables I, II, III, and IV.

TABLE I.—*Consolidated table of Federal personnel inside and outside the United States employed by the executive agencies during January 1963, and comparison with December 1962, and pay for December 1962, and comparison with November 1962*

Department or agency	Personnel				Pay (in thousands)			
	January	December	Increase	Decrease	December	November	Increase	Decrease
Executive departments (except Department of Defense):								
Agriculture	101,017	104,624		3,607	$49,809	[1] $51,038		$1,229
Commerce	29,890	29,701	189		18,737	19,318		581
Health, Education, and Welfare	77,521	77,750		229	39,428	40,646		1,218
Interior	61,595	61,882		287	33,000	[1] 33,891		891
Justice	31,902	31,813	89		20,335	21,393		1,058
Labor	8,883	8,836	47		5,095	5,006	$89	
Post Office	583,991	588,829		4,838	[2] 350,066	279,129	70,937	
State [3] [4]	41,214	41,101	113		20,565	21,468		903
Treasury	85,073	83,648	1,425		47,931	49,778		1,847
Executive Office of the President:								
White House Office	351	338	13		236	238		2
Bureau of the Budget	468	466	2		402	417		15
Council of Economic Advisers	50	66		16	44	44		
Executive Mansion and Grounds	73	79		6	41	46		5
National Aeronautics and Space Council	28	28			24	24		
National Security Council	45	39	6		31	34		3
Office of Emergency Planning	434	416	18		350	371		21
Office of Science and Technology	45	63		18	27	30		3
President's Commission on Campaign Costs						(5)		

See footnotes at end of table.

TABLE I.—*Consolidated table of Federal personnel inside and outside the United States employed by the executive agencies during January 1963, and comparison with December 1962, and pay for December 1962, and comparison with November 1962*—Continued

Department or agency	Personnel				Pay (in thousands)			
	January	December	Increase	Decrease	December	November	Increase	Decrease
Independent agencies:								
Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations	27	43		16	$21	$21		
American Battle Monuments Commission	389	392		3	81	80	$1	
Atomic Energy Commission	6,992	6,953	39		5,123	5,325		$202
Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System	607	602	5		387	408		21
Civil Aeronautics Board	832	830	2		614	642		28
Civil Service Commission	4,145	4,146		1	2,752	2,451	301	
Civil War Centennial Commission	5	5			4	4		
Commission of Fine Arts	7	7			6	6		
Commission on Civil Rights	85	98		13	52	59		7
Delaware River Basin Commission	2	2			2	2		
Export-Import Bank of Washington	281	277	4		198	191	7	
Farm Credit Administration	240	240			170	179		9
Federal Aviation Agency	45,256	45,273		17	30,470	31,885		1,415
Federal Coal Mine Safety Board of Review	6	6			4	4		
Federal Communications Commission	1,443	1,435	8		973	1,014		41
Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation	1,246	1,236	10		786	832		46
Federal Home Loan Bank Board	1,216	1,194	22		764	814		50
Federal Maritime Commission	211	198	13		145	146		1
Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service	391	390	1		339	348		9
Federal Power Commission	1,063	1,034	29		724	731		7
Federal Trade Commission	1,139	1,134	5		772	807		35
Foreign Claims Settlement Commission	111	88	23		58	55	3	
General Accounting Office	4,585	4,614		29	2,927	3,070		143
General Services Administration	31,959	32,004		45	15,148	15,885		737
Government Printing Office	7,135	7,084	51		3,883	4,094		211
Housing and Home Finance Agency	13,704	13,626	78		8,268	8,602		334
Indian Claims Commission	22	22			26	21	5	
Interstate Commerce Commission	2,394	2,400		6	1,602	1,680		78
National Aeronautics and Space Administration	26,210	25,667	543		18,421	19,881		1,460
National Capital Housing Authority	414	418		4	184	195		11
National Capital Planning Commission	53	50	3		33	36		3
National Capital Transportation Agency	81	[1] 81			55	65		10
National Gallery of Art	323	324		1	136	145		9
National Labor Relations Board	2,004	2,056		52	1,359	1,410		51
National Mediation Board	133	138		5	116	128		12
National Science Foundation	884	854	30		673	620	53	
Panama Canal	15,634	14,905	729		4,993	5,188		195
President's Committee on Equal Employment Opportunity	43	47		4	30	33		3
Railroad Retirement Board	2,004	2,028		24	1,117	1,143		26
Renegotiation Board	207	206	1		166	181		15
St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation	158	155	3		99	114		15
Securities and Exchange Commission	1,409	1,405	4		946	972		26
Selective Service System	6,817	6,829		12	2,132	2,219		87
Small Business Administration	3,203	3,180	23		1,971	2,075		104
Smithsonian Institution	1,351	1,320	31		668	699		31
Soldiers' Home	1,056	1,059		3	352	379		27
South Carolina, Georgia, Alabama, and Florida Water Study Commission	[6] 49	49			44	46		2
Subversive Activities Control Board	26	26			21	22		1
Tariff Commission	266	270		4	196	203		7
Tax Court of the United States	154	154			119	120		1
Tennessee Valley Authority	17,608	18,025		417	10,130	10,823		693
U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency	113	106	7		82	112		30
U.S. Information Agency	11,517	11,444	73		4,969	5,317		348
Veterans' Administration	173,475	173,411	64		77,682	80,968		3,286
Virgin Islands Corporation	562	521	41		118	134		16
Total, excluding Department of Defense	1,413,827	1,419,740	3,744	9,657	789,232	735,455	71,396	17,619
Net change, excluding Department of Defense			5,913				53,777	
Department of Defense:								
Office of the Secretary of Defense	2,075	2,055	20		1,660	1,516	144	
Department of the Army	[7] 383,453	387,487		4,034	190,704	200,017		9,313
Department of the Navy	[7] 344,438	345,102		664	183,686	191,851		8,165
Department of the Air Force	306,347	306,886		539	159,139	165,990		6,851
Defense Atomic Support Agency	2,017	2,074		57	1,011	1,065		54
Defense Communications Agency	478	290	188		165	178		13
Defense Intelligence Agency	306	285	21		191	201		10
Defense Supply Agency	[7] 23,427	21,149	2,278		10,094	10,350		256
Office of Civil Defense	1,032	1,026	6		867	864	3	
U.S. Court of Military Appeals	40	40			31	34		3
Interdepartmental activities	20	18	2		17	15	2	
International military activities	58	57	1		39	38	1	
Armed Forces information and education activities	419	419			216	220		4
Total, Department of Defense	1,064,110	1,066,888	2,516	5,294	547,820	572,339	150	24,669
Net decrease, Department o. Defense			2,778				24,519	
Grand total, including Department of Defense [8] [9]	2,477,937	2,486,628	6,260	14,951	1,337,052	1,307,794	71,546	42,288
Net change, including Department of Defense			8,601				29,258	

---

[1] Revised on basis of later information.

[2] Includes pay of temporary Chistmas employees.

[3] January figure includes 16,401 employees of the Agency for International Development as compared with 16,460 in December and their pay. These AID figures include employees who are paid from foreign currencies deposited by foreign governments in a trust fund for this purpose. The January figure includes 4,179 of these trust fund employees and the December figure includes 4,205.

[4] January figure includes 860 employees of the Peace Corps as compared with 832 in December and their pay.

[5] Less than $500.

[6] Subject to revision.

[7] In January 2,044 employees and their functions were transferred to the Defense Supply Agency as follows: 1,899 from the Department of the Army and 145 from the Department of the Navy.

[8] Exclusive of personnel and pay of the Central Intelligence Agency and the National Security Agency.

[9] Includes employment by Federal agencies under the Public Works Acceleration Act (Public Law 87-658), as follows:

Agency	January	December	Change
Agriculture Department	4,897	7,854	−2,957
Interior Department	3,259	3,395	−136
Department of the Army	495	434	+61
Total	8,651	11,683	−3,032

TABLE II.—*Federal personnel inside the United States employed by the executive agencies during January 1963, and comparison with December 1962*

Department or agency	January	December	Increase	Decrease
Executive departments (except Department of Defense):				
Agriculture	99,819	103,472		3,653
Commerce	29,254	29,067	187	
Health, Education, and Welfare	76,909	77,164		255
Interior	61,080	61,363		283
Justice	31,553	31,471	82	
Labor	8,786	8,751	35	
Post Office	582,539	587,369		4,830
State [1] [2]	10,393	10,277	116	
Treasury	84,459	83,030	1,429	
Executive Office of the President:				
White House Office	351	338	13	
Bureau of the Budget	468	466	2	
Council of Economic Advisers	50	66		16
Executive Mansion and Grounds	73	79		6
National Aeronautics and Space Council	28	28		
National Security Council	45	39	6	
Office of Emergency Planning	434	416	18	
Office of Science and Technology	45	63		18
Independent agencies:				
Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations	27	43		16
American Battle Monuments Commission	7	7		
Atomic Energy Commission	6,959	6,922	37	
Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System	607	602	5	
Civil Aeronautics Board	831	829	2	
Civil Service Commission	4,141	4,142		1
Civil War Centennial Commission	5	5		
Commission of Fine Arts	7	7		
Commission on Civil Rights	85	98		13
Delaware River Basin Commission	2	2		
Export-Import Bank of Washington	281	277	4	
Farm Credit Administration	240	240		
Federal Aviation Agency	44,248	44,269		21
Federal Coal Mine Safety Board of Review	6	6		
Federal Communications Commission	1,441	1,433	8	
Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation	1,244	1,234	10	
Federal Home Loan Bank Board	1,216	1,194	22	
Federal Maritime Commission	211	198	13	
Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service	391	390	1	
Federal Power Commission	1,063	1,034	29	
Federal Trade Commission	1,139	1,134	5	
Foreign Claims Settlement Commission	66	64	2	
General Accounting Office	4,498	4,529		31
General Services Administration	31,947	31,992		45
Government Printing Office	7,135	7,084	51	
Housing and Home Finance Agency	13,522	13,448	74	
Indian Claims Commission	22	22		
Interstate Commerce Commission	2,394	2,400		6
National Aeronautics and Space Administration	26,198	25,654	544	
National Capital Housing Authority	414	418		4
National Capital Planning Commission	53	50	3	
Independent agencies—Continued				
National Capital Transportation Agency	81	[3] 81		
National Gallery of Art	323	324		1
National Labor Relations Board	1,970	2,022		52
National Mediation Board	133	138		5
National Science Foundation	871	841	30	
Panama Canal	153	80	73	
President's Commission on Equal Employment Opportunity	43	47		4
Railroad Retirement Board	2,004	2,028		24
Renegotiation Board	207	206	1	
St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation	158	155	3	
Securities and Exchange Commission	1,409	1,405	4	
Selective Service System	6,665	6,677		12
Small Business Administration	3,151	3,128	23	
Smithsonian Institution	1,339	1,306	33	
Soldiers' Home	1,056	1,059		3
South Carolina, Georgia, Alabama, and Florida Water Study Commission	[4] 49	49		
Subversive Activities Control Board	26	26		
Tariff Commission	266	270		4
Tax Court of the United States	154	154		
Tennessee Valley Authority	17,606	18,023		417
U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency	113	106	7	
U.S. Information Agency	3,215	3,177	38	
Veterans' Administration	172,462	172,406	56	
Total, excluding Department of Defense	1,350,140	1,356,894	2,966	9,720
Net decrease, excluding Department of Defense			6,754	
Department of Defense:				
Office of the Secretary of Defense	2,014	1,994	20	
Department of the Army	[5] 331,293	335,256		3,963
Department of the Navy	[5] 320,086	320,903		817
Department of the Air Force	278,007	278,448		441
Defense Atomic Support Agency	2,017	2,074		57
Defense Communications Agency	452	267	185	
Defense Intelligence Agency	306	285	21	
Defense Supply Agency	[5] 23,427	21,149	2,278	
Office of Civil Defense	1,032	1,026	6	
U.S. Court of Military Appeals	40	40		
Interdepartmental activities	19	17	2	
International military activities	38	37	1	
Armed Forces information and education activities	419	419		
Total, Department of Defense	959,150	961,915	2,513	5,278
Net decrease, Department of Defense			2,765	
Grand total, including Department of Defense	2,309,290	2,318,809	5,479	14,998
Net decrease, including Department of Defense			9,519	

---

[1] January figure includes 2,720 employees of the Agency for International Development as compared with 2,732 in December.

[2] January figure includes 588 employees of the Peace Corps as compared with 575 in December.

[3] Revised on basis of later information.

[4] Subject to revision.

[5] In January 2,044 employees and their functions were transferred to the Defense Supply Agency as follows: 1,899 from the Department of the Army and 145 from the Department of the Navy.

TABLE III.—*Federal personnel outside the United States employed by the executive agencies during January 1963, and comparison with December 1962*

Department or agency	January	December	Increase	Decrease
Executive departments (except Department of Defense):				
Agriculture	1,198	1,152	46	
Commerce	636	634	2	
Health, Education, and Welfare	612	586	26	
Interior	515	519		4
Justice	349	342	7	
Labor	97	85	12	
Post Office	1,452	1,460		8
State [1] [2]	30,821	30,824		3
Treasury	614	618		4
Independent agencies:				
American Battle Monuments Commission	382	385		3
Atomic Energy Commission	33	31	2	
Civil Aeronautics Board	1	1		
Civil Service Commission	4	4		
Federal Aviation Agency	1,008	1,004	4	
Federal Communications Commission	2	2		
Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation	2	2		
Foreign Claims Settlement Commission	45	24	21	
General Accounting Office	87	85	2	
General Services Administration	12	12		
Housing and Home Finance Agency	182	178	4	
National Aeronautics and Space Administration	12	13		1
National Labor Relations Board	34	34		
National Science Foundation	13	13		
Panama Canal	15,481	14,825	656	
Independent agencies—Continued				
Selective Service System	152	152		
Small Business Administration	52	52		
Smithsonian Institution	12	14		2
Tennessee Valley Authority	2	2		
U.S. Information Agency	8,302	8,267	35	
Veterans' Administration	1,013	1,005	8	
Virgin Islands Corporation	652	521	41	
Total, excluding Department of Defense	63,687	62,846	866	25
Net increase, excluding Department of Defense			841	
Department of Defense:				
Office of the Secretary of Defense	61	61		
Department of the Army	52,160	52,231		71
Department of the Navy	24,352	24,199	153	
Department of the Air Force	28,340	28,438		98
Defense Communications Agency	26	23	3	
Interdepartmental activities	1	1		
International military activities	20	20		
Total, Department of Defense	104,960	104,973	156	169
Net decrease, Department of Defense			13	
Grand total, including Department of Defense	168,647	167,819	1,022	194
Net increase, including Department of Defense			828	

---

[1] January figure includes 13,681 employees of the Agency for International Development as compared with 13,728 in December. These AID figures include employees who are paid from foreign currencies deposited by foreign governments in a trust fund for this purpose. The January figure includes 4,179 of these trust fund employees and the December figure includes 4,205.

[2] January figure includes 272 employees of the Peace Corps as compared with 257 in December.

TABLE IV.—*Industrial employees of the Federal Government inside and oustide the United States employed by the executive agencies during January 1963, and comparison with December 1962*

Department or agency	January	December	Increase	Decrease
Executive departments (except Department of Defense):				
Agriculture	3,779	3,794		15
Commerce	5,404	5,581		177
Interior	8,490	8,475	15	
Post Office	252	248	4	
Treasury	5,184	5,134	50	
Independent agencies:				
Atomic Energy Commission	250	247	3	
Federal Aviation Agency	2,938	2,960		22
General Services Administration	1,766	1,780		14
Government Printing Office	7,135	7,084	51	
National Aeronautics and Space Administration	26,210	25,667	543	
Panama Canal	8,074	7,482	592	
St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation	156	155	1	
Tennessee Valley Authority	14,551	14,977		426
Virgin Islands Corporation	562	521	41	
Total, excluding Department of Defense	84,751	84,105	1,300	654
Net increase, excluding Department of Defense			646	
Department of Defense:				
Department of the Army:				
Inside the United States	[1] 131,860	[2] 133,381		1,521
Outside the United States	[1] 4,275	[2] 4,298		23
Department of the Navy:				
Inside the United States	197,509	198,082		573
Outside the United States	1,279	1,279		
Department of the Air Force:				
Inside the United States	134,064	134,540		476
Outside the United States	1,196	1,200		4
Defense Supply Agency:				
Inside the United States	1,963	1,980		17
Total, Department of Defense	472,146	474,760		2,614
Net decrease, Department of Defense			2,614	
Grand total, including Department of Defense	556,897	558,865	1,300	3,268
Net decrease, including Department of Defense			1,968	

[1] Subject to revision.

[2] Revised on basis of later information.

TABLE V.—*Foreign nationals working under U.S. agencies overseas, excluded from tables I through IV of this report, whose services are provided by contractual agreement between the United States and foreign governments, or because of the nature of their work or the source of funds from which they are paid, as of January 1963 and comparison with December 1962*

Country	Total		Army		Navy		Air Force	
	January	December	January	December	January	December	January	December
Canada	35	35					35	35
Crete	61	62					61	62
England	3,324	3,315			102	102	3,222	3,215
France	22,007	22,268	18,090	18,344	11	11	3,906	3,913
Germany	81,762	81,457	68,992	68,698	85	85	12,685	12,674
Greece	266	267					266	267
Greenland	174	174					174	174
Japan	51,979	52,878	18,553	18,921	14,225	14,366	19,201	19,591
Korea	6,207	6,204	6,207	6,204				
Morocco	2,357	2,410			786	785	1,571	1,625
Netherlands	54	55					54	55
Trinidad	540	541			540	541		
Total	168,766	169,666	111,842	112,167	15,749	15,888	41,175	41,611

STATEMENT BY SENATOR BYRD OF VIRGINIA

Executive agencies of the Federal Government reported civilian employment in the month of January totaling 2,477,937 as compared with 2,486,628 in December. This was a net decrease of 8,691 including a net reduction of 3,032 in temporary employment under the Public Works Acceleration Program authorized by P.L. 87–658.

Civilian employment reported by the executive agencies of the Federal Government, by months in fiscal year 1963, which began July 1, 1962, follows:

Month	Employment	Increase	Decrease
July 1962	2,510,950	14,455	
August	2,512,199	1,249	
September	2,485,324		26,875
October	2,482,982		2,342
November	2,498,312	15,330	
December	2,486,628		11,684
January 1963	2,477,937		8,691

Total Federal employment in civilian agencies for the month of January was 1,413,827, a decrease of 5,913 as compared with the December total of 1,419,740. Total civilian employment in the military agencies in January was 1,064,110, a decrease of 2,778 as compared with 1,066,888 in December.

Civilian agencies reporting larger decreases were Post Office Department with 4,838 and Agriculture Department with 3,607. Larger increases were reported by Treasury Department with 1,425, Panama Canal Company with 729, and National Aeronautics and Space Administration with 543. The decrease in Agriculture Department and increase in Treasury Department was largely seasonal.

In the Department of Defense decreases in civilian employment were reported by the Department of the Army with 4,034, Department of the Navy with 664, and the Department of the Air Force with 539. The largest increase was reported by the Defense Supply Agency with 2,278.

Inside the United States civilian employment decreased 9,519 and outside the United States civilian employment increased 828. Industrial employment by Federal agencies in January totaled 556,897, a decrease of 1,968.

These figures are from reports certified by the agencies as compiled by the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures.

FOREIGN NATIONALS

The total of 2,477,937 civilian employees certified to the committee by Federal agencies in their regular monthly personnel reports includes some foreign nationals employed in U.S. Government activities abroad, but in addition to these there were 168,766 foreign nationals working for U.S. agencies overseas during January who were not counted in the usual personnel reports. The number in December was 169,666. A breakdown of this employment for January follows:

Foreign nationals, January 1693

Country	Total	Army	Navy	Air Force
Canada	35			35
Crete	61			61
England	3,324		102	3,222
France	22,007	18,090	11	3,906
Germany	81,762	68,992	85	12,685
Greece	266			266
Greenland	174			174
Japan	51,979	18,553	14,225	19,201
Korea	6,207	6,207		
Morocco	2,357		786	1,571
Netherlands	54			54
Trinidad	540		540	
Total	168,766	111,842	15,749	41,175

FEDERAL PAYROLL

(There is a lag of a month between Federal employment and Federal payroll figures in order that actual expenditures may be reported. Payroll expenditure figures in the committee report this month are for December.)

Payroll expenditure figures in the executive branch during the first 6 months of the current fiscal year 1963 total $7.6 billion. These payroll expenditures for the first half of the fiscal year, July–December 1962, exclusive of $168 million of U.S. pay for foreign nationals not on the regular rolls, follow:

Month:	Payroll (in millions)
July	$1,222
August	1,282
September	1,147
October	1,317
November	1,308
December	1,337
Total	7,613

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. McGEE (for himself and Mr. SIMPSON):

S. 982. A bill permitting the Secretary of the Interior to continue to deliver water to lands in the third division, Riverton Reclamation Project, Wyoming; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. McGEE when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. LAUSCHE:

S. 983. A bill to amend chapter 93 of title 18, United States Code, to prohibit the use of contracting authority by officers and employees of the United States for purposes of duress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. LAUSCHE when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. HICKENLOOPER:

S. 984. A bill for the relief of Ling-Chuan Chiao; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ERVIN:

S. 985. A bill for the relief of the Boren Clay Products Co.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PEARSON (for himself and Mr. CARLSON):

S. 986. A bill to authorize the establishment of the Prairie National Park, in the State of Kansas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. PEARSON when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. JAVITS (for himself Mr. DOUGLAS, and Mr. KEATING):

S. 987. A bill to amend the War Claims Act of 1948, as amended, to provide compensation for certain additional losses; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. JAVITS when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

Mr. HUMPHREY:

S. 988. A bill to amend title I of the Social Security Act so as to define more specifically certain of the benefits which may be provided under State programs of medical assistance for the aged established pursuant to such title; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. HUMPHREY when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. CARLSON:

S. 989. A bill to require the national referendum on wheat to be held prior to May 15, 1963; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. COTTON:

S. 990. A bill to give financial assistance to the States for educational purposes by authorizing annual appropriations to each State equal to 1 percent of the Federal individual incomes taxes collected therein; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. COTTON when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. JOHNSTON:

S. 991. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act to provide for the inclusion in the computation of accredited service of certain periods of service rendered States or instrumentalities of States; and for other purposes; and

S. 992. A bill to amend the Federal Employees Health Benefits Act of 1959 to provide additional choice of health benefits plans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BENNETT (for himself and Mr. MOSS):

S. 993. A bill conferring jurisdiction on the Court of Claims to make findings with respect to the amount of compensation to which certain individuals are entitled as reimbursement for damages sustained by them as a result of the cancellation of their grazing permits by the U.S. Air Force, and to provide for payments of amounts so determined to such individuals; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BIBLE (by request):

S. 994. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to create a Board for the Condemnation of Insanitary Buildings in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved May 1, 1906, as amended;

S. 995. A bill to amend the Street Readjustment Act of the District of Columbia so as to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to close all or part of a street, road, highway, or alley in accordance with the requirements of an approved redevelopment or urban renewal plan, without regard to the notice provisions of such act, and for other purposes;

S. 996. A bill to increase the partial pay of educational employees of the public schools of the District of Columbia who are on leave of absence for educational improvement, and for other purposes;

S. 997. A bill to promote safe driving and eliminate the reckless and irresponsible driver from the streets and highways of the District of Columbia by providing that any person operating a motor vehicle within the District while apparently under the influence of intoxicating liquor shall be deemed to have given his consent to a chemical test of certain of his body substances to determine the alcoholic content of his blood, and for other purposes;

S. 998. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for a mutual-aid plan for fire protection by and for the District of Columbia and certain adjacent communities in Maryland and Virginia, and for other purposes";

S. 999. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for compulsory school attendance, for the taking of a school census in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved February 4, 1925;

S. 1000. A bill to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to sell a right-of-way across a portion of the District Training School grounds at Laurel, Md., and for other purposes;

S. 1001. A bill to provide for the regulation of the business of selling securities in the District of Columbia and for the licensing of persons engaged therein, and for other purposes; and

S. 1002. A bill to authorize certain expenses in the Government of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. CASE:

S. 1003. A bill for the relief of the Middlesex Concrete Products and Excavating Corp.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MAGNUSON (by request):

S. 1004. A bill to authorize appointment of the Director and Deputy Director of the Coast and Geodetic Survey from civilian life, and for other purposes; and

S. 1005. A bill to amend paragraph (2) (G) of subsection 309(c) of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, by granting the Federal Communications Commission additional authority to grant special temporary authorizations for 60 days for certain nonbroadcast operations; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. MAGNUSON (for himself, Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. ENGLE, Mr. KENNEDY, and Mr. SALTONSTALL):

S. 1006. A bill to amend the act of June 12, 1960, for the correction of inequities in the construction of fishing vessels, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. JACKSON (for himself, Mr. CHURCH, Mr. JORDAN of Idaho, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. MANSFIELD, Mr. METCALF, Mr. MORSE, and Mrs. NEUBERGER):

S. 1007. A bill to guarantee electric consumers in the Pacific Northwest first call on electric energy generated at Federal hydroelectric plants in that region and to guarantee electric consumers in other regions reciprocal priority, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. SCOTT (for himself and Mr. CLARK):

S. 1008. A bill to authorize the coinage of 50-cent pieces in commemoration of the 100th anniversary of the delivery of Lincoln's immortal address at Gettysburg; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mrs. NEUBERGER:

S. 1009. A bill to improve, strengthen, and accelerate programs for the prevention and abatement of air pollution; to the Committee on Public Works.

(See the remarks of Mrs. NEUBERGER when she introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. KEATING:

S. 1010. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act so as to remove the limitation upon the amount of outside income which an individual may earn while receiving benefits under such title; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. KEATING when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION

PRINTING AS A HOUSE DOCUMENT THE PAMPHLET ENTITLED "OUR AMERICAN GOVERNMENT—1,001 QUESTIONS ON HOW IT WORKS"

Mr. HUMPHREY submitted a concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 26) to authorize the printing as a House document the pamphlet entitled "Our American Government—1,001 Questions on How It Works," which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

(See the above concurrent resolution printed in full when submitted by Mr. HUMPHREY, which appears under a separate heading.)

RIGHT OF PERSONS RESIDING ON FEDERALLY OWNED LANDS TO VOTE IN CERTAIN ELECTIONS

Mr. BEALL submitted the following concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 27); which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That it is hereby declared to be the sense of the Congress that persons residing on federally owned lands (other than military reservations) situated in any State should be extended the right to vote in elections conducted in such State for presidential and vice presidential electors and for Members of the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States if such persons meet all the requirements for voting in such State except the requirement of residence, which requirement they are unable to meet solely because they reside on federally owned lands.

RESOLUTIONS

TO PRINT AS A DOCUMENT A COMPILATION OF MATERIALS ENTITLED "SUMMER EMPLOYMENT BY COLLEGE STUDENTS IN THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT—1961"

Mr. SALTONSTALL submitted a resolution (S. Res. 105) to print as a document a compilation of materials entitled "Summer Employment by College Students in the Federal Government—1961," which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

(See the above resolution printed in full when submitted by Mr. SALTONSTALL, which appears under a separate heading.)

PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF SENATE DOCUMENT 117, 84TH CONGRESS, 2D SESSION

Mr. EASTLAND submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 106); which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

Resolved, That there be printed seven thousand additional copies of Senate Document Numbered 117, of the Eighty-fourth Congress, second session, entitled "The Communist Party of the United States of America, What It Is, How It Works—A Handbook for Americans", compiled by the Subcommittee To Investigate the Administration of the Internal Security Act and Other Internal Security Laws for the use of the Committee on the Judiciary, United States Senate.

DELIVERY OF WATER TO LANDS IN THIRD DIVISION, RIVERTON RECLAMATION PROJECT, WYOMING

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and my colleague, the junior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. SIMPSON], I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to permit the delivery of water by the Bureau of Reclamation to settlers in the third division on the Riverton reclamation project in Wyoming.

This project was initiated following World War II. It has promise of being a very beneficial and useful project, Mr. President, but unfortunately problems have been encountered that have delayed the execution of repayment contracts past the development period. My bill would give authority for water delivery in the division to farmers who want it. Without this authority no water can be released this year. I need not stress the need for a rapid decision on this matter. Mother Nature waits for no man, and today's wonderful weather is an indication that spring is almost here. The farmers in the third division have plans to make and those plans will hinge upon the availability of water from this project for this year's growing season.

Mr. President, I will not go into the problems that have beset this project except to say that they are problems which can be corrected. My bill would allow for water now while permanent solutions to these problems are being worked out. I might point out that at the direction of the Congress a Wyoming reclamation projects survey team was appointed by the Bureau of Reclamation to study this project and others in my State. This team, made up of highly qualified men, has just completed its study of the Riverton project and submitted a report and recomendations to the Secretary of the Interior.

Mr. President, I am confident that with the assistance of this valuable report and with the cooperation of the settlers, Bureau of Reclamation, affected State agencies and the Congress of the United States, we will be able to find permanent solutions to the problems of the third division. In the meantime, I would urge rapid consideration of the bill I introduce today so that the farmers on this project may start preparations for planting their crops.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 982) permitting the Secretary of the Interior to continue to deliver water to lands in the third division, Riverton reclamation project, Wyoming, introduced by Mr. McGEE (for himself and Mr. SIMPSON), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

PROHIBITION OF USE OF CONTRACTING AUTHORITY BY OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE UNITED STATES FOR PURPOSES OF DURESS

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend chapter 93 of title 18, United States Code, to prohibit the use of contracting authority by officers and employees of the United States for purposes of duress.

Mr. President, the time has arrived when the Congress of the United States must define by law the power that may be used by Federal agencies and officials in coercing private industry and labor to adopt business practices, including labor-management relations, to suit the feelings of Federal officials.

Without special authority granted by the Congress, no Federal official or agency should be permitted to withhold or threaten to withhold any contract from the operator of a business on the grounds that such operator did not adopt labor-management practices responding to the individual will and wish of such Federal official. Manifestly a private enterprise which seeks a Government contract ought to be awarded such contract if it is the lowest responsible bidder and has fully complied with the requirements of law as distinguished from the requirements of the Federal official's individual fancies and feelings.

In the labor-management disputes involving the steel industry, General Dynamics Corp., North American Aviation, Inc., Ryan Aeronautical Co., Lockheed Aircraft Corp., and currently the Boeing Aircraft Corp., Federal officials threatened to withhold contracts from these employers unless, in the management of their respective business, they followed practices demanded by the Federal officials although such practices were not required by law.

These threats should not have been made. They had no authority in law. They constituted an usurpation of power; a vivid example of government by men and not by law. Newspapers and news magazines from coast to coast have carried numerous articles citing alleged threats and acts of coercion against firms holding important Government contracts.

Mr. President, I am certain that if the Congress were called upon to pass a law authorizing a governmental agency or official to order a settlement of a labor-management dispute in conformity with the views of the Federal agency or officer, such proposal would meet with vigorous opposition from both labor and management. The opposition would argue that labor as well as management should not be harnessed and straitjacketed in managing their own business.

Ours is a government of laws and not of men.

To me that precept means something. I only regret that it is not inscribed somewhere on the wall of the Senate Chamber. Let us quit invoking our whims and fancies, disregarding the requirements of law in the execution of our duties.

Motivated by their own wishes, Federal officials should not be allowed to force their judgments of what is right or wrong upon either business or labor management. When we permit that type of conduct we enter the dangerous field of requiring the people not to act in conformity with established law but in obedience to the changing wishes of changing men in changing administrations. It is wrong, should not be suffered, and is a threat to our democratic system of government.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill may be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 983) to amend chapter 93 of title 18, United States Code, to prohibit the use of contracting authority by officers and employees of the United States for purposes of duress, introduced by Mr. LAUSCHE, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) chapter 93 of title 18, United States Code (relating to Public Officers and Employees), is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"§ 1916. Duress through use of contracting authority

"(a) Whoever, being an officer or employee of the United States or any department or agency thereof—

"(1) with intent to coerce or induce any person to perform any act which such person has no obligation to perform, or to refrain from performing any act which such person may refrain from performing without default of any obligation; or

"(2) with intent to penalize any person for the performance of any act which such person was entitled to perform without default of any obligation, or for refusing to perform or for refraining from performing any act which such person had no obligation to perform,

withholds, attempts to withhold, or threatens to withhold from such person by any means any Government contract, or excludes, attempts to exclude, or threatens to exclude such person by any means from opportunity to enter into or to perform any Government contract, shall be fined not more than $10,000, or imprisoned not more than five years, or both.

"(b) As used in this section—

"(1) the term 'obligation', when used in relation to any person, means an obligation imposed upon such person by any statute of the United States, any rule or regulation duly prescribed or promulgated pursuant to any such statute, or any Government contract to which such person is a party or under which such person has assumed duties; and

"(2) the term 'Government contract' means any actual, proposed, or prospective contract entered into or which may be entered into by or on behalf of the United States or any department or agency thereof, and any actual, proposed, or prospective assignment, substitution of parties, or subcontract of any tier entered into or which may be entered into for or in connection with the performance of any such contract."

(b) The sectional analysis of that chapter is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new item:

"1916. Duress through use of contracting authority."

PRAIRIE NATIONAL PARK IN POTTAWATOMIE COUNTY, KANS.

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. President, on behalf of the senior Senator from Kansas [Mr. Carlson] and myself, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill providing the establishment of a Prairie National Park in Pottawatomie County, Kans.

Expanding our National Park Service to include more features mirroring this country's natural offerings and its latent beauty was a basic part of a national policy concerning recreational resources.

As a Senator from Kansas, I am conscious that in the vast expanse of land in the heartland of this Nation, there are acres of natural prairie which, today, face extinction unless they are preserved.

I am in agreement with the program of the National Park Service, as previously stated, that we must do our utmost to preserve such latent natural areas as the midwestern prairie. We ask that the establishment of a Prairie National Park in Pottawatomie County be one of the priority projects of the Department of the Interior and the National Park Service. The establishment of a Prairie National Park will complement the national recreational development.

After full evaluation by a team from the National Park Service, it was found that Pottawatomie County offered not only the finest examples of true prairie, but also ideal wildlife habitat which would be conducive to the establishment of herds of buffalo, antelope, and deer, as well as providing propagation grounds for game birds such as the prairie chicken and quail.

Specifically, the park would be located in an area not to exceed 60,000 acres along the eastern shore of Tuttle Creek Reservoir.

The Prairie National Park bill has been drafted to provide the maximum in community and local participation to assure landowners in the affected area of full opportunity to help decide the boundaries within which the park would be established.

The bill provides for a seven member advisory commission which would give Pottawatomie County and the State of Kansas a voice in the deliberations and recommendations. Under the terms of the bill, the advisory commission would recommend to the Secretary of Interior where the park's boundaries would be established. This arrangement has met with the approval of the local people, the National Park Service, and the Department of the Interior.

I am advised meetings have been held with representatives of the affected landowners and it was determined that owners should be accommodated by early condemnation of their properties if negotiations for sale were not successful. This would prevent the landowner from being subjected to lingering and fruitless negotiations. Provision for this has been included in the bill.

Since the establishment of the Prairie National Park has been approved by the National Park Service, congressional endorsement would add another chapter to our park, monument, and historic site program and would fill a void in this system of natural showplaces by adding to our recreational system in the Nation and in Kansas.

I might point out, in closing, Mr. President, that Kansas is proud to have been selected as the site for a possible national park following a long and intensive study of numerous sites. We are indeed happy with the prospect of having the Prairie National Park as the first such national park, monument, or historic site in Kansas.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a copy of this bill providing for the establishment of a Prairie National Park in Pottawatomie County, Kans., be printed in the Record at this point.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the Record.

The bill (S. 986) to authorize the establishment of the Prairie National Park, in the State of Kansas, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. Pearson (for himself and Mr. Carlson), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That in recognition of the influence of grasslands upon the progress and economic development of our country, and to preserve the scenic, scientific, and educational values of a representative portion of such lands for the inspiration and enjoyment of this and future generations, there is hereby authorized to be established, in the manner hereinafter provided, the Prairie National Park, in the State of Kansas, such park to be administered by the Secretary of the Interior pursuant to the provisions of the Act of August 25, 1916 (39 Stat. 535), as amended and supplemented.

Sec. 2. (a) The Secretary of the Interior is authorized to designate such land and interests in land in townships 7, 8, and 9 south, range 7 east; townships 7, 8, and 9 south, range 8 east; and townships 8 and 9 south, range 9 east; sixth principal meridian, as he determines are necessary and desirable to preserve representative portions of the prairie grasslands and the native wildlife: *Provided*, That the area as designated shall not exceed sixty thousand acres.

(b) For the purpose of assisting the Secretary to designate a suitable boundary line for the Prairie National Park, there is hereby established an advisory commission to be composed of seven members as follows:

(1) the Chairman of the National Parks Advisory Board, who shall serve as chairman of the advisory commission;

(2) two members selected by the Secretary from among individuals recommended by the Board of County Commissioners of Pottawatomie County, Kans.;

(3) two members selected by the Secretary from among individuals recommended by the Governor of the State of Kansas; and

(4) two members selected by the Secretary.

Sec. 3. Within the area designated as the Prairie National Park pursuant to section 2 hereof, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to procure land and interests in land through purchase, exchange, donation or with donated funds.

When requested by the owner of property with respect to which the Secretary of the Interior has been unable to negotiate a voluntary sale, the Secretary, subject to the availability of funds, shall initiate action to file a declaration of taking on such property in accordance with section 258A of title 40, United States Code.

Administrative jurisdiction over the lands administered by the Corps of Engineers, Department of the Army, above contour elevation 1,075 and which, under the authority of section 2 of this Act, are designated for inclusion in the park, is hereby transferred to the Secretary of the Interior without a transfer of funds. Such transfer of administrative jurisdiction shall not preclude continuation of flowage uses of the affected lands by the corps but shall preclude the development by the corps of access roads and such other development as would, in the judgment of the Secretary, defeat or impair the purposes of the park.

Sec. 4. The Secretary of the Interior is authorized to enter into cooperative agreements with the State of Kansas, and its political subdivisions, including Pottowatomie County, which will enhance or insure preservation of the park and promote use thereof in accordance with the purposes of this Act.

Sec. 5. When the Secretary of the Interior has designated a boundary for the Prairie National Park pursuant to section 2 of this Act and has determined that sufficient land and interests in land have been procured by the United States to provide an administrable unit within such boundary, he shall declare the establishment of the Prairie National Park by publication of notice thereof in the Federal Register. Following such establishment, and subject to the aforesaid acreage limitation, the Secretary may continue to acquire lands and interests in land for the park as authorized in this Act.

Sec. 6. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act.

UNFINISHED WAR-CLAIMS LEGISLATION

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, during the 87th Congress, a measure—Public Law 87-846—was enacted which resolved part of the long-outstanding problem of war claims settlement. In that legislation, Congress dealt among other things with the sale of seized properties, such as the General Aniline & Film Corp., which, as we note from today's newspaper accounts, will also happily be the subject of settlement in the courts as well. This is good news for a number of communities around the Nation, but particularly in Binghamton, N.Y., where a large Ansco plant is located.

However, I rise today to emphasize that, despite these long-awaited developments, a significant problem in the war claims area remains unresolved. I refer to two classes of claimants who as yet have received no measure of recognition for their claims: The first consists of refugees from Nazism and other tyrannies who became citizens of the United States after their property was seized. I offered an amendment to last year's bill to include such claimants, but the conferees rejected the amendment, at the same time offering hope that if funds remain after payment of other claimants, favorable action might ultimately be taken for these unfortunate citizens.

My colleague, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. Douglas], also introduced an amendment to deal with a second group of claimants: prisoners of war and internees who have personal injury claims. When this amendment was also rejected, Senator Douglas and I introduced S. 3796 to incorporate both provisions and pledged our continued efforts to have these measures enacted.

I am now sending to the desk on behalf of my colleagues, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. Douglas], the junior Senator from New York [Mr. Keating], and myself a measure identical to S. 3796. I hope that action will not be delayed on this still unfinished war-claims legislation.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 987) to amend the War Claims Act of 1948, as amended, to provide compensation for certain additional losses, introduced by Mr. Javits (for himself, Mr. Douglas, and Mr. Keating), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

AMENDMENT OF SOCIAL SECURITY BILL

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I send to the desk a bill designed to correct a deficiency in an earlier social security bill which I introduced in the present session of Congress. Briefly, the bill would expand the term of "prescription services" to include drugs prescribed by a dentist and such other persons authorized to prescribe drugs in addition to the physicians provided in the earlier bill. I send the bill to the desk and ask that it be appropriately referred.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 988) to amend title I of the Social Security Act so as to define more specifically certain of the benefits which may be provided under State programs of medical assistance for the aged established pursuant to such title, introduced by Mr. Humphrey, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE TO STATES FOR EDUCATIONAL PURPOSES

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate referral, a bill which, upon enactment, will give financial assistance to the States and the District of Columbia for educational purposes by authorizing annual appropriations to each State and the District of Columbia equal to 1 percent of the Federal individual income taxes collected therein.

I feel strongly that this bill represents a direct and workable solution to a serious problem of national concern and I expect to address the Senate more fully on the advantages of the bill at a later date.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 990) to give financial assistance to the States for educational purposes by authorizing annual appropriations to each State equal to 1 percent of the Federal individual income taxes collected therein, introduced by Mr. Cotton, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

APPOINTMENT OF DIRECTOR AND DEPUTY DIRECTOR OF COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY FROM CIVILIAN LIFE

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, by request of the Acting Secretary of Commerce, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to authorize appointment of the Director and Deputy Director of the Coast and Geodetic Survey from civilian life. I ask unanimous consent that the letter from the Acting Secretary, requesting the proposed legislation, be printed in the Record.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the letter will be printed in the Record.

The bill (S. 1004) to authorize appointment of the Director and Deputy Director of the Coast and Geodetic Survey from civilian life, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. Magnuson, by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

The letter presented by Mr. Magnuson is as follows:

The Secretary of Commerce,
Washington, D.C., February 25, 1963.

Hon. Lyndon B. Johnson,
President of the Senate,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. President: There are enclosed four copies of a draft bill "To authorize appointment of the Director and Deputy Director of the Coast and Geodetic Survey from civilian life, and for other purposes" and four copies of a statement of purpose and need in support thereof.

We are advised by the Bureau of the Budget that, from the standpoint of the administration's program, there would be no objection to the submission of this proposed legislation to the Congress.

Sincerely yours,

C. D. Martin, Jr.,
Acting Secretary of Commerce.

Statement of Purpose and Need

The purpose of this legislation is to authorize the appointment of the Director and Deputy Director of the Coast and Geodetic Survey from civilian life.

Under existing law the Director and Deputy Director are required to be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, for terms of 4 years, from the active list of commissioned officers of the Coast and Geodetic Survey not below the rank of commander. (Section 1, act of June 4, 1920, 41 Stat. 825, as amended (33 U.S.C. 852), and section 8, act of January 19, 1942, 56 Stat. 8, as amended (33 U.S.C. 852b).)

In 1960 a Special Advisory Committee of the National Academy of Sciences-National Research Council, chaired by Dr. Mervin J. Kelly, submitted to the Secretary of Commerce a comprehensive report entitled "The Role of the Department of Commerce in Science and Technology."

The Committee made two recommendations concerning the Survey which required legislative action. The first of these recommendations was that the act of August 6, 1947, 61 Stat. 787 (33 U.S.C. 883a, Public Law 373, 80th Congress), be amended to remove the geographical restrictions imposed on operations of the Survey. The act of April 5, 1960, 74 Stat. 16 (Public Law 86–409), enacted this recommendation into law.

The second recommendation was that "the positions of Director and Deputy Director be open to both civilians and officers, with the only restriction being that both positions not be filled simultaneously by either officers or civilians."

The proposed legislation would implement this recommendation of the Committee. In addition to opening these positions up to civilians as well as to commissioned officers of the Coast and Geodetic Survey, the bill would provide that the Director shall serve at the pleasure of the President, rather than for a term of 4 years. This change is in conformity with existing practice in the appointment of the heads of other important bureaus in the Department of Commerce, including the National Bureau of Standards, the Weather Bureau, the Patent Office, the Bureau of the Census, the Maritime Administration, the Bureau of Public Roads, the Area Redevelopment Administration, and the U.S. Travel Service.

The bill would further provide that the Deputy Director shall be appointed by the Secretary of Commerce and shall serve at his pleasure, rather than be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. This change is in accord with common practice in filling positions at the deputy chief level in civilian

Government bureaus. In addition, it represents a return to the practice long followed prior to 1942. (See act of June 5, 1920, 41 Stat. 929.)

The proposed legislation would provide increased flexibility in appointment of the two top officials of the Coast and Geodetic Survey. It would greatly broaden the sources from which selections may be made for the two most important positions in the bureau. It would provide a better balance in the background, skills, and orientation of the officials responsible for directing the work of the bureau by providing for a team of commissioned officer and civilian scientific and engineering personnel. Finally, it would tend to strengthen the capacity of the Coast and Geodetic Survey to recruit and retain outstanding civilian professional and technical personnel for its important programs in oceanography, aeronautical charting, geodetic and geophysical survey work, and research in related fields, by providing improved career opportunities for civilians in the Coast and Geodetic Survey.

Appropriate provision has been made for the compensation of the Director and Deputy Director, when appointed from civilian life.

The recommendation of the Kelly Committee that both positions should not be filled simultaneously by either officers or civilians is provided in the form of a directive to the Secretary of Commerce to follow such a policy to the extent he deems appropriate. It is believed unwise arbitrarily to specify such a requirement since flexibility should be reserved under which the Secretary may make whatever selection may appear to be in the best interests of the Department under various circumstances, e.g., a period of national emergency, nonavailability of a well-qualified commissioned officer, nonavailability of a well-qualified individual from civilian life, and the like.

Various other minor changes of a technical or editorial nature are included in the bill.

Provision is made in the bill that it shall not be deemed to require reappointment or other change in the employment status of any person serving as Director or Deputy Director under an appointment made prior to the date of enactment of the bill.

AUTHORITY TO GRANT SPECIAL TEMPORARY AUTHORIZATIONS FOR 60 DAYS FOR CERTAIN NONBROADCAST OPERATIONS

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, by request of the Federal Communications Commission, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend paragraph (2)(G) of subsection 309(c) of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, by granting the Federal Communications Commission additional authority to grant special temporary authorizations for 60 days for certain nonbroadcast operations. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record a letter from the Acting Chairman of the Commission requesting the proposed legislation.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the letter will be printed in the Record.

The bill (S. 1005) to amend section 309(c)(2)(G) of the Communications Act of 1934 to permit the Federal Communications Commission to grant special temporary authorizations for periods of 60 days in certain cases, introduced by Mr. Magnuson, by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

The letter presented by Mr. Magnuson is as follows:

Federal Communications Commission,
Washington, D.C., February 20, 1963.

The Vice President,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Vice President: The Commission has adopted as a part of its legislative program for the 88th Congress a proposal to amend section 309(c)(2)(G) of the Communications Act of 1934 to permit the Federal Communications Commission to grant special temporary authorizations for periods of 60 days in certain cases (47 U.S.C. 309 (c)(2)(G)).

The Commission's draft bill to accomplish the foregoing objective was submitted to the Bureau of the Budget for its consideration. We have now been advised by that Bureau that from the standpoint of the administration's program there would be no objection to the presentation of the draft bill to the Congress for its consideration. Accordingly, there are enclosed six copies of our draft bill and explanatory statement on this subject.

The consideration by the Senate of the proposed amendment to the Communications Act of 1934 would be greatly appreciated. The Commission would be most happy to furnish any additional information that may be desired by the Senate or by the committee to which this proposal is referred.

Sincerely yours,

Rosel H. Hyde,
Acting Chairman.

Explanation of Proposed Amendment to the Communications Act To Permit the Federal Communications Commission To Grant Special Temporary Authorizations for Periods of 60 Days in Certain Cases (47 U.S.C. 309(c)(2)(G))

Paragraph (2)(G) of subsection (c) of section 309 of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended (47 U.S.C. 309(c)(2)(G)), now exempts from the public notice and 30-day waiting period requirements of subsection 309(b) those applications for "a special temporary authorization for nonbroadcast operation not to exceed 30 days where no application for regular operation is contemplated to be filed or pending the filing of an application for such regular operation, or."

The Commission believes that this subsection should be amended to permit it to grant special temporary authorizations (STA) for 60 days in those cases where the application for the STA is filed pending the filing of an application for regular operation. We are not suggesting any changes in the 30-day limitation on those STA's in cases not contemplating a subsequent application for regular operation.

The purpose of paragraph (2)(G) of subsection 30(c) is to permit short-term radio operation in the nonbroadcast field without the delay of a 30-day waiting period (as provided in subsection 309(b)) after the issuance of public notice by the Commission of the acceptance for filing of such application. The Commission has found that this purpose is frustrated by the 30-day limitation on STA's in those cases where the short-term operation relates to a radio system for which an application for regular operation is filed later. In those cases, the provisions of subsection 309(b) are applicable and a 30-day waiting period is required before the Commission can act on the application for regular operation. As a result, there is a hiatus between the expiration of the STA and the Commission's grant of the application for regular operation. During the period of the hiatus, the applicant would be unlicensed and would, as a consequence, be unable to operate his radio. This defeats the purpose for which Congress made special provision for granting special temporary authorizations. Moreover, it does not appear that the Commission has authority to remedy this statutory defect by renewing the STA until it can grant the application for regular operation.

The Commission believes that this deficiency in the statutory scheme can be corrected by its proposed amendment. Therefore, we recommend that paragraph (2)(G) of subsection 300(c) be amended to give us this additional authority.

DISTRIBUTION OF ELECTRICAL ENERGY GENERATED IN FEDERAL HYDROELECTRIC PLANTS IN PACIFIC NORTHWEST

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, for myself and Senators Church, Jordan of Idaho, Magnuson, Mansfield, Metcalf, Morse, and Neuberger, a bill to guarantee electric consumers in the Pacific Northwest first call on electric energy generated at Federal hydroelectric plants in that region and to guarantee electric consumers in other regions reciprocal priority, and for other purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1007) to guarantee electric consumers in the Pacific Northwest first call on electric energy generated at Federal hydroelectric plants in that region and to guarantee electric consumers in other regions reciprocal priority, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. Jackson (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, the bill I have just sent to the desk is the same bill, with two minor changes, as S. 3153 passed by the Senate last year by a rollcall vote of 51 yeas to 36 nays. This bill is cosponsored by all the Senators from the Pacific Northwest. The two changes in the bill were suggested by Governor Hatfield of Oregon in a letter to the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee. Last year the bill had administration support, and I am informed that it will have such support again this year.

This bill is needed to permit the Bonneville Power Administration to market surplus power outside the Pacific Northwest on an orderly basis, and to retain its sound financial position. All segments of the utility industry in the Northwest, public and private, have agreed on the need for the legislation. This year and last year the Northwest produced a total of 27½ billion kilowatt hours of secondary energy which had to be spilled over the dams and wasted.

In dollar terms this amounts to almost $52 million lost revenue to the Bonneville Power Administration. The Bonneville Power Administration needs these revenues to avoid a very substantial rate increase. It hardly wishes to raise its rates until every practicable step has been taken to market all the power that the dams will produce.

The Bonneville Power Administration has indicated that this bill is the keystone to a successful marketing program. Not only will sales of surplus Bonneville power strengthen its financial position and produce revenues for the U.S. Treasury, but also they will prevent an inexcusable waste of energy that our Nation cannot afford. In addition, such sales will bring to consumers of neighboring regions large quantities of low-cost surplus Columbia River hydroelectricity.

The power supply of the Pacific Northwest is unique in the United States because it is virtually all—96 percent—hydro. The bill just sent to the desk applies only to hydroelectricity. The great Columbia River is the prime energy source for the Northwest. Because the natural flows of the Columbia have recorded a variation of about 1 to 25 between the low- and high-water years of record, the Columbia dams produce a large amount of seasonal power. This seasonal power, that cannot be relied upon the year around, and that ceases to exist in critical water years, cannot be sold as firm power. Only a relatively small amount of it can be sold in the Northwest until the Northwest develops large steam-electric generation. But there is already a market for large amounts of it in California and the Southwest, where large steam-electric plants already exist which can firm up surplus Northwest power.

This bill lays down sensible ground rules for the movement of bulk quantities of electric energy between the Northwest and other regions. It is broad enough to permit the advantages of increased efficiency and economy that can be achieved by strong regional interties—for example, sales of surplus energy and peaking capacity, diversity exchanges, and firming power.

But it would not permit regional interties to be used to the disadvantage of the utilities and the industries of the Northwest or on any region connected with the Northwest. If firm power were needed for local utilities or industries, such power could not be transported for use 1,000 or more miles away. Many of the industries now in the Northwest have invested millions of dollars in reliance upon a continued supply of Columbia River power.

Some confusion has arisen over the relationship of this bill to the construction of extra high voltage interties. This bill does not authorize the construction of such interties by Federal agencies. Such authority already exists. Bonneville Power Administration has legal authority to construct lines anywhere within economic transmission distance of the Columbia River plants. Proposals have also been made for the construction of a Northwest-California intertie by private utilities. Public agencies in both the Northwest and California are also known to be considering the construction of a large intertie between the two regions.

The numerous advantages of economy and efficiency in the use of our Nation's energy resources made possible by strong interregional connections make some form of Northwest-Southwest intertie inevitable. Within recent months, proposals have been received by the Bonneville Power Administration from six non-Federal utility groups for the construction of an interconnection between the Pacific Northwest and the Pacific Southwest. Regardless of who owns or operates the lines this bill is needed to provide the fullest orderly and economic movements of hydropower between the regions. With the passage of this bill, this sound national objective can be assured with great savings to electric consumers in both regions.

THE CLEAN AIR ACT

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, in his health message to the Nation President Kennedy drew, in a few brief strokes, an indelible image of the terrible economic and human costs of air pollution.

> Economic damage from air pollution amounts to as much as $11 billion every year in the United States. Agricultural losses alone total $500 million a year. Crops are stunted or destroyed, livestock become ill, meat and milk production are reduced. In some 6,000 communities various amounts of smoke, smog, grime, or fumes reduce property values and—as dramatically shown in England last year—endanger life itself. Hospitals, department stores, office buildings, and hotels are all affected. Some cities suffer damages of up to $100 million a year. One of our larger cities has a daily average of 25,000 tons of airborne pollutants. My own home city of Boston experienced in 1960 a "black rain" of smoke, soot, oil or a mixture of all three.

It was in response to such evidence as this, that, on March 2, 1961, I introduced proposed legislation to establish a national air pollution abatement program, paralleling the newly successful Federal program for water pollution control. This measure, unfortunately, was not destined for success in the 87th Congress. But the intervening 2 years have witnessed both a dramatic expansion in technical knowledge of the enormity, complexity, and national character of the air pollution problem, and increased awareness, among public officials and ordinary citizens alike, of the profound need for remedial action.

During these 2 years, there have been major advances in the technology of air pollution control. In June of last year, for example, the Public Health Service completed the definitive study of motor vehicle air pollution which had been authorized by the farsighted provisions of the Schenck Act of 1960. This study revealed the ugly price which we are paying for the benefits of motor vehicle travel, identifying vehicular air pollution as the source of a broad spectrum of evils, from the decimation of crops and livestock to the aggravation and complication of human disease. Responding to the stimulus of this report and to the prodding of concerned Members of Congress, the Federal Division of Air Pollution Control, and States such as California, the automobile industry has made substantial progress in mitigating this hazard.

These 2 years have also brought insight into the particularly lethal role played by sulfur compounds in the air. Several recent studies have demonstrated that there exists a dramatic relationship between the levels of sulfur dioxide and sulfur trioxide in the air and the frequency and duration of the common cold and other respiratory ailments.

A series of studies carried out under the direction of Dr. F. Curtis Dohan, of the University of Pennsylvania, supported by funds from the Public Health Service, compared the frequency of colds among a group of industrial and office workers with levels of sulfates in the air of the cities where they worked.

Dr. Dohan found a striking relationship between airborne sulfate levels and the frequency with which workers were absent because of upper respiratory infections. The frequency of colds was apparently unrelated to levels of other pollutants and weather conditions. The study covered workers in eight cities in New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Ohio, and Indiana, and the pattern of colds closely paralleled the differing sulfate levels in the eight cities.

In another investigation, scientists at the Vanderbilt University School of Medicine and the Public Health Service reported a high statistical correlation between asthma attacks and levels of sulfur dioxide in Nashville, Tenn.

Dr. L. D. Zeidberg, of Vanderbilt, and Dr. Richard A. Prindle and Mr. Emanual Landau, of the Divison of Air Pollution, found that the asthma attack rate in Nashville closely followed the measurements taken of sulfur dioxide. They reported, in addition, that variations in temperature and humidity apparently were not related to the occurrence of asthma in the group of patients studied.

There is compelling evidence that air pollution is a contributing factor in a number of chronic respiratory diseases, including asthma, emphysema, bronchitis, and lung cancer. It now appears that sulfurous air may contribute also to our most common acute respiratory disease—the cold—which last year alone cost the Nation tens of millions of lost workdays. It should also be noted that sulfur dioxide and sulfate levels have been extremely high during several acute episodes of air pollution in this country and abroad in which many people have died.

We most do all we can to pursue and encourage further research on the sulfur air pollution problem.

The Division of Air Pollution of the Public Health Service informs me that sulfur compounds in air come from certain industrial operations, such as oil refining, ore roasting, and acid manufacture, as well as from the combustion of sulfur-containing fuels. When coal or oil containing sulfur is burned in factories, powerplants, or home furnaces, substantial amounts of sulfur di- and tri-oxide are released into the air. These gases and other solid compounds formed from them are commonly present in polluted urban air and are highly irritating to tissue in the respiratory tract.

In addition to their adverse effects on health, sulfur compounds in the air are known to cause corrosion of metal and other structural materials and to cause injury to vegetation.

While technical methods are available generally to prevent emissions of sulfur pollutants from industrial processes, satisfactory technology is not available for preventing such emissions from fuel combustion sources, chiefly industrial and commercial smokestacks and residential chimneys. What may be needed is more emphasis on removing sulfur from fuels before they are burned.

A report recently prepared for the Public Health Service by the Bureau of Mines of the Department of the Interior reviewed present techniques for removing sulfur from fuel oil. One well-known method — hydrosulfurization — can extract as much as 90 percent of the sulfur from residual oils. Residual oils represent the residue remaining after gasoline and other lighter oils have been separated from crude oil. This residual is the source of much of the fuel oil burned by industry and for electric power generation in the United States.

Although current costs estimated for removing sulfur from fuels are significant, they might prove to be much lower if greater emphasis were placed on finding improved techniques. Moreover, when these costs are weighed against the health and economic damage caused by sulfur compounds in the air, the expense would seem more than justified.

While we have not yet developed adequate techniques for controlling the levels of sulfur compounds in the air, there are today technically sound, economically feasible, and effective procedures and devices for solving other major sources of air pollution. Yet we have failed to implement them.

On the local level, with a few notable exceptions, air pollution control has been an aspiration rather than a reality. As of last summer, only 106 local air pollution control agencies could boast a full-time staff and even these agencies served a bare 45 percent of the Nation's population. Moreover, virtually all the control agencies were hampered by insufficient funds.

On the State level, 35 States still lacked coherent air pollution programs while the remaining States had programs of greatly varying efficiency. In 1961, the median annual expenditure for air pollution control was approximately 10 cents per person, an inadequate sum by any relevant standard.

December 1962 produced two significant events which may yet prove to have been the much needed catalyst for transplanting public concern over air pollution into public action.

In early December we received news of a lethal smog descending upon the hapless city of London for the second time in a decade, disrupting the life of that great city, and leaving in its wake damaged property, disease and death. During the 4-day misery of the smog, 100 persons died and a thousand more were hospitalized. It would, of course, be quixotic to claim that what happened in London could not happen here. It is happening here.

Less than a week later, the attention of the Nation was sharply focused upon air pollution by the convening in Washington of a national conference on air pollution. For several days technical experts and public health officials testified to the immediate need for a vigorous national program to combat air pollution.

It was most gratifying, and, I believe, significant, that support for legislation such as I had proposed was forthcoming from such divergent sources as Dr. Arthur S. Flemming, President Eisenhower's Secretary of HEW, and the present president of the University of Oregon, and the American Medical Association. The American Medical Association has not, in the past, been characterized by the reckless espousal of Federal programing.

Following the conference, both the former Secretary of HEW, my esteemed colleague from Connecticut, and the present Secretary, Mr. Celebrezze, joined in supporting legislation embodying the principles contained in my earlier proposals. Finally, on February 7, President Kennedy, in his health message expressly endorsed such legislation.

During the early days of this session, I undertook to review and amend the provisions of my 1961 bill so that it might now reflect intervening advances in the science of air pollution control. To this end, I have worked closely with the distinguished chairman of the House Subcommittee on Health and Safety, Mr. ROBERTS, who has long been a champion of adequate Federal programing for air pollution abatement. The bill which I introduce today is substantially identical to legislation which he is introducing in the House.

This proposed legislation is designed, as was my earlier bill, to provide the Secretary of HEW the authority requested by President Kennedy in his health message:

> (a) To engage in a more intensive research program permitting full investigation of the causes, effects and control of air pollution;
>
> (b) To provide financial stimulation to States and local air pollution control agencies through project grants which will help them to initiate or improve their control programs;
>
> (c) To conduct studies on air pollution problems of interstate or nationwide significance; and
>
> (d) To take action to abate interstate air pollution, along the general lines of the existing water pollution control enforcement measures.

In addition, I am calling for a separate, intensified research effort directed toward the development of improved low cost techniques for extracting sulfur from fuels.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1009) to improve, strengthen, and accelerate programs for the prevention and abatement of air pollution, introduced by Mrs. NEUBERGER, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Works.

EARNINGS LIMITATION UNDER SOCIAL SECURITY ACT

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, proposed legislation to amend the Social Security Act by removing the earnings limitation presently imposed on recipients. As is well known, no means test is required in order to become eligible for benefits under the Social Security Act. Each person who has contributed to the fund during his working years has a right to receive these benefits. However, a certain penalty is attached if the recipient continues to work after becoming eligible to receive payments. Beneficiaries under 72 years of age whose earnings consist of wages from self-employment income, forfeit their benefit payments in whole or in part if their income exceeds $1,200 a year. One of the most inequitable features of this regulation is the provision which exempts from this calculation all income from investments, annuities, and pensions. In fact, it is possible to earn an unlimited amount of money in dividends and interest, and still receive one's full social security benefits. Only the person who needs to work and earn wages to supplement his social security income is penalized.

It has been estimated that 17½ million citizens of this country are over 65 years of age. This year, the Congress will consider legislation to help these citizens meet their financial obligations on reduced incomes. Members of both parties, for example, have, during this session, offered bills to provide Federal assistance to these senior citizens for meeting medical expenses. It is my belief, however, that most Americans would prefer to help themselves rather than become dependent upon the community for support. Persons between 65 and 72 can make valuable contributions to the work force, and I believe that their initiative and independence should be encouraged, and their self-reliance commended.

Let us be realistic and recognize the fact that no person can live decently on $1,200 a year in the United States today. The income restriction provision of the law was first enacted in 1939, when the limitation was set at $180 a year. After numerous revisions, the figure $1,200 was reached in 1954. Although it is possible that at the time of enactment it represented a reasonable sum, it is indeed unduly frugal by our standards today.

Many would say that the only solution is an increase in social security payments, but I believe that most Americans, both recipients and taxpayers, would prefer to encourage retired persons to help themselves by earning supplemental income. The purpose of my bill is to give them that chance by removing the handicap which presently makes self-reliance impossible.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1010) to amend title II of the Social Security Act so as to remove the limitation upon the amount of outside income which an individual may earn while receiving benefits under such title, introduced by Mr. KEATING, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

PRINTING OF "OUR AMERICAN GOVERNMENT"

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I submit, for appropriate reference, a concurrent resolution to authorize a new printing of the document, "Our American Government. What Is It? How Does It Function?" I believe my colleagues will agree that this document is one of the most informative and popular documents ever published by the Congress.

The author of this excellent introduction to American Government is the distinguished chairman of the House Banking and Currency Committee, the Honorable WRIGHT PATMAN, of Texas. There are few individuals more qualified and competent to prepare such a document. Its value has been amply demonstrated by the thousands of copies that have been distributed by every Member of Congress.

I recently discovered that the last printing of this document has been exhausted. Representative PATMAN submitted House Concurrent Resolution 85 on February 7, 1963, to authorize another printing of "Our American Government." This resolution provides, as does the resolution I introduce today, that each Member of Congress will receive 2,000 copies for distribution among interested constituents.

Mr. President, I hope both Houses of Congress will take prompt action on this concurrent resolution so that "Our American Government" will be returned to circulation as quickly as possible.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The concurrent resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 26) was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (*the House of Representatives concurring*), That (a) with the permission of the copyright owner of the book "Our American Government—1001 Questions on How It Works," with answers by Wright Patman, published by Scholastic Magazines, Incorporated, there shall be printed as a House document the pamphlet entitled "Our American Government. What Is It? How Does It Function?" In addition to the usual number there shall be printed two thousand copies for use and distribution by each Member of Congress.

(b) As used in this concurrent resolution the term "Member of Congress" includes a Member of the Senate, a Member of the House of Representatives, and the Resident Commissioner from Puerto Rico.

TO PRINT AS A SENATE DOCUMENT A COMPILATION OF MATERIALS ENTITLED "SUMMER EMPLOYMENT OF COLLEGE STUDENTS BY THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT—1961"

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I submit, for appropriate reference, a resolution providing for the printing as a Senate document of information regarding the summer employment of college students in the Federal Government excluding clerical jobs.

The college interns I have had in my own office have been of high caliber and have performed useful tasks, in the course of which I am hopeful they have added significantly to their knowledge and understanding of the legislative process. I know that my colleagues here in the Senate have been equally pleased with the work of the interns who have assisted them. In many instances the experience on Capitol Hill has motivated students to enter Government service or has reinforced their previous intent to do so.

Just as we in the Congress have been making increased use of college students during their vacation periods in recent years, the executive departments have increased their programs. Yet very little information is available concerning which departments hire students for the summer and the size of the programs in existence. Inquiries to my office indicate that students desiring to benefit from a summer's work with the Federal Government—in many instances they contribute their services without charge to the Government—do not know how to go about it. Their college advisers frequently also lack sufficient information to guide them properly.

In view of the lack of readily available information on this important subject, about a year ago I requested the Library of Congress to survey the summer intern programs for undergraduate and graduate students being sponsored by the various executive departments. I was not certain whether legislation would be necessary or desirable in this field but I felt that such a study would be of assistance in indicating the kind of action which would prove most helpful.

A questionnaire was prepared and distributed to the various departments and agencies by the Library of Congress. Miss Helen Miller, of the Legislative Reference Service staff, was assigned to do this work and has done a thorough and effective job. A great deal of her time has been devoted to circularizing the various departments and agencies and in preparing a report based on the material received. Excellent cooperation was received from the various departments.

The response has proved most useful. The Civil Service Commission has expressed an interest in the findings and a representative of at least one department has told us that prior to this survey, his department had no accurate measure of the programs being undertaken within its own jurisdiction.

My examination of the report prepared by the Library of Congress convinces me that no legislation is necessary. Further dissemination of information regarding these programs would, however, in my opinion, be helpful in guiding students and in stimulating them to seek summer employment with the Federal Government. It is with this thought in mind that I am filing this resolution asking that a major portion of the report prepared by the Library of Congress be printed as a Senate document.

This material shows, by departments, the number of positions—excluding clerical jobs—likely to be available to summer students, by location and job description. The complete report provides the names of the universities from which the students who served as interns in the summer of 1961 came. It has not been thought necessary to include this information as part of the Senate document but it will be on file at the Library of Congress. In 1961, the summer for which the study was made, a total of 12,033 jobs were reported to the Library. Though final figures are not yet available, it has been estimated that more than 13,000 jobs will be filled by students in the summer of 1963.

With the Senate document in hand, a student and his college guidance officer can better determine the agency or office on which to concentrate in the search for a satisfactory position. Several university officials with whom the matter has been discussed have expressed the opinion that their task would be aided significantly by the publication of such a document.

I understand that the executive department is establishing a clearinghouse for these positions. As the procedure is described in the press, a student will apply to the office of his choice. If that office has filled the positions available there, the student's application will be transferred to an office where it is felt he might be useful. Publication of this document would assist the student in making a logical initial selection and should simplify the work involved on the part of the Government. I think it would increase the likelihood that students would receive assignments compatible with their interests and their skills.

I know we all feel that the continued success of our way of life requires that we recruit the best available people for Government service. I am hopeful that printing this report as a Senate document will represent a step in that direction. Since the season has arrived for students to begin making their inquiries regarding placement, I hope that expeditious attention will be given to this matter.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The resolution (S. Res. 105) was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

Resolved, That there shall be printed as a Senate document compilation of materials entitled "Summer Employment by College Students in the Federal Government—1961", prepared by the Legislative Reference Service, Library of Congress; and there shall be printed six thousand two hundred additional copies of such Senate document for the use of the Members of the Senate.

AUTHORITY TO SIGN ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION DURING ADJOURNMENT

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Vice President or the President pro tempore be authorized to sign, during the adjournment following today's session, the enrolled joint resolution (H.J. Res. 284) making supplemental appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, and for other purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

REQUIREMENT FOR CERTAIN NEW PACKAGES OF IMPORTED ARTICLES TO BE MARKED SHOWING COUNTRY OF ORIGIN—AMENDMENT

Mr. JORDAN of Idaho. Mr. President, last Thursday I introduced four measures to offer some relief for the American lumber industry in its fight against increased Canadian imports of softwood lumber into the United States. One of the bills I introduced at that time, S. 957, would amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to require the marking of lumber and wood products to indicate the country of origin. I later found out that on the same day, February 28, a House-passed bill, H.R. 2513, was referred to the Senate Finance Committee. H.R. 2513 would amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to require certain new packages of imported articles to be marked to indicate the country of origin.

In keeping with my statement that I will continue to work for relief of the American lumber industry, I today submit an amendment to the House-passed bill, H.R. 2513. This amendment would require that lumber and wood products be included under the bill as items to be marked with the country of origin.

I am also sending a letter to the chairman of the Senate Finance Committee, the distinguished senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. Byrd] to the effect that I would like to have this amendment considered by his committee when H.R. 2513 is up for consideration.

I hope, in this way, to expedite the handling of one aspect of legislative relief for the American lumber industry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be received, printed, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

AMENDMENT OF ARMS CONTROL ACT — ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILL

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the name of the senior Senator from New York [Mr. Javits] be added as a cosponsor of S. 777, a bill to amend the Arms Control Act.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

NATIONAL ACADEMY OF FOREIGN AFFAIRS ACT OF 1963—ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILL

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at the next printing of the bill (S. 865) to provide for the establishment of the National Academy of Foreign Affairs, and for other purposes, the names of the senior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. Monroney], the senior Senator from Hawaii [Mr. Fong], the junior Senator from Michigan [Mr. Hart], and the junior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. McIntyre] be added as cosponsors.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

JOINT COMMITTEE ON CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE—ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF CONCURRENT RESOLUTION

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Florida [Mr. Smathers], I ask unanimous consent that upon the next printing of Senate Concurrent Resolution 23, introduced by him on February 25, providing for the establishment of a Joint Committee on Central Intelligence, that the names of Senators Bartlett and Gruening, of Alaska, be added as cosponsors.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILLS AND CONCURRENT RESOLUTION

Under authority of the orders of the Senate of February 20, 1963, the following names have been added as additional cosponsors for the following bills and concurrent resolution:

S. 861. A bill to provide for the general welfare by assisting the States, through a program of grants-in-aid, to establish and operate special hospital facilities for the treatment and cure of narcotic addicts: Mr. Long of Missouri and Mr. Williams of New Jersey.

S. 862. A bill to provide that, for purposes of certain studies, investigations, and demonstrations authorized with respect to mental illness under the Public Health Service Act, addiction to narcotics be considered as a mental illness: Mr. Long of Missouri and Mr. Williams of New Jersey.

S. 863. A bill to amend chapter 402 of title 18, United States Code, to make the Federal Youth Corrections Act applicable to certain persons who violate the Federal narcotics statutes: Mr. Long of Missouri.

S. 864. A bill to enable the courts more effectively to deal with the problem of narcotic addition: Mr. Williams of New Jersey.

S. Con. Res. 21. Concurrent resolution expressing the determination of the United States with respect to the matter of general disarmament and arms control: Mr. Beall, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Dominick, Mr. Fong, Mr. Goldwater, Mr. Hruska, Mr. Jordan of Idaho, Mr. Lausche, Mr. McClellan, Mr. Mechem, Mr. Metcalf, Mr. Mundt, Mr. Randolph, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Scott, Mr. Simpson, Mr. Thurmond, Mr. Tower, and Mr. Young of North Dakota.

NOTICE OF MEETING OF JOINT COMMITTEE ON DEFENSE PRODUCTION

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, section 712 of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, provides that the Joint Committee on Defense Production shall be composed of 10 members, 5 of them members of the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency, and 5 of them members of the House Committee on Banking and Currency. The law provides that these five members from each of the committees are to be appointed by the chairman of the respective committee, three from the majority and two from the minority party.

During the last session of Congress the Senate members of the Joint Committee on Defense Production were Senators Sparkman, Douglas, Capehart, Bennett, and myself.

Senators Sparkman, Douglas, Bennett, and I wish to continue as members. In addition, in accordance with section 712 of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, I have appointed Senator Tower as a member of the Joint Committee on Defense Production.

A meeting of the Joint Committee on Defense Production has been called for 10:30 a.m., Thursday, March 7, for the purpose of electing officers and adopting rules for this Congress. The meeting will be held in room S–126 of the Capitol.

NOTICE OF HEARING ON THE CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS OF THE AMERICAN INDIAN

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, as chairman of the Senate Judiciary Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights, I wish to announce a forthcoming hearing on the constitutional rights of the American Indian. The hearing is scheduled to begin at 10 a.m. on March 7, in room 457 of the Senate Office Building.

The subcommittee has been conducting a nationwide investigation on Indian rights since 1961. It appears from the hearings and investigations held in seven States and the District of Columbia that congressional clarification is needed to guarantee more fully Indian citizens their rights. Since a large number of tribal delegations will be in Washington during the week of March 4 to 8, the subcommittee feels it appropriate to schedule a hearing to receive the views of the tribal representatives, not heretofore represented in our study, who wish to be heard.

NOTICE OF HEARINGS ON S. 537, TO CREATE A JOINT COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET, BY COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, the Committee on Government Operations will hold hearings on the bill, S. 537, proposing the creation of a Joint Committee on the Budget on March 19 and 20, 1963. This bill was introduced in the Senate on January 25, under the sponsorship of 77 Senators. Full details relative to its purpose and objectives are set forth in the Congressional Record at pages 1095 through 1101.

Outstanding experts on Federal fiscal problems will be invited to give the committee the benefit of their views and recommendations. Members of the Senate or the House of Representatives and others who may desire to be heard, or who wish to submit statements, relative to the proposed legislation should contact Mr. Walter L. Reynolds, the chief clerk of the committee, room 3304, New Senate Office Building.

NOTICE OF HEARINGS BY COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY ON DAIRY LEGISLATION—STATEMENT BY SENATOR ELLENDER ON HIS RECENT TRIP TO AFRICA

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I should like to make two announcements. The first is that on March 18 the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry will begin hearings on all proposed dairy legislation before it.

The second announcement I wish to make is that on next Thursday I will present to the Senate my report on my recent tour of Africa.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

By Mr. RANDOLPH:

Statement on the 50th anniversary of the U.S. Department of Labor.

TRIBUTES TO SENATOR BYRD OF VIRGINIA

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, 30 years ago a new President of the United States, Franklin D. Roosevelt, came into office. He was one of the great Presidents of our time. His contributions have been many, and the marks he left are visible even to this day.

Fifty years ago the Department of Labor came into being, under the auspices of a Republican President; and I am glad to note that anniversary today, and to commend the Department of Labor for its many fine activities through the years.

Thirty years ago, the Nation was in the midst of the great depression. It was the year in which a new President came into the White House and, with great determination and courage and with imagination and boldness in public policies, restored to the people of the United States hope in their system and in their future. One of his supporters in the election campaign which led to his election was a public-spirited Virginian.

In the same period, the same Virginian came into the Senate. From the outset, he was a man of independent views; but he understood the problems confronting the President and the Nation, and he did his part in seeing to it that those problems were faced in the Senate, and that appropriate remedies were devised.

Through the years, Mr. President, through the administrations of President Roosevelt, President Truman, and President Eisenhower, and into that of President Kennedy, the same Senator has continued to serve his State and the Nation. Sometimes he has agreed with Presidents, and sometimes he has not; but he has never failed to face the issues frankly, and to see to it, insofar as it lay within his power to do so, that the Senate faced them. That has been his hallmark.

It was 30 years ago to the day that HARRY BYRD came to the Senate. He has seen this country grow under policies which he has espoused and also under policies with which he disagreed. He has not won all the battles, nor has he lost them all. But, either way, the Nation has gained because those battles were fought.

Nor are the battles over, Mr. President. The Senator from Virginia sits as chairman of the Finance Committee at a moment when great and complex social and economic issues, involving finance, are once again in the forefront of the Nation's concern. I do not look to the Senator from Virginia to agree with the President or to disagree on every issue. I look to the Senator from Virginia to bring to these issues his own, individual wisdom; and I look to him to see to it that these issues are faced by the Senate as a whole. Finally, I look to him—once the decisions are made by the whole Senate—to submerge his own views, to close ranks—whatever the outcome—as the great American that he is and has always been.

So, Mr. President, I congratulate the Senator from Virginia on his 30th anniversary in the Senate. I wish him many more battles and many more years of service in the Senate and to the Nation.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I wish to join in the statement of the majority leader concerning the distinguished senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD]. I am indeed proud to be a Member of the Senate with him. All of us respect his views, and all of us consider him a friend. I value his friendship highly.

I hope he will have many more years of useful service, for there is no more patriotic citizen or more conscientious public servant than HARRY BYRD.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, no Senator is held in higher esteem or greater respect than our friend the distinguished senior Senator from Virginia, who today celebrates the 30th anniversary of his service in this legislative Chamber. I am honored to join with the able majority leader in saluting one who always has spoken out without hesitation, who has taken a position on all public questions, and who has followed the principles which have guided him down through the years.

I call HARRY BYRD a friend. So do my Republican colleagues, and so do my Democratic colleagues. It is not at all a question of whether one agrees with another on issues as they come before us. It is simply a question of a Senator being able to stand, to speak his piece as he sees the light, to advocate that which to him appears to be right and just. The senior Senator from Virginia has always done just that. So I rise to express my own salute and best wishes to our colleague from Virginia, and to associate myself with the remarks of my friend from Montana.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I wish to associate myself with others in commending the senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] on his 30 years of valuable and outstanding service to the U.S. Senate and our Nation.

Those of us who serve with him on the Finance Committee fully understand and value his patriotic devotion to our Nation and his dedication to the preservation of the fundamental principles laid down by our Nation's Founding Fathers.

In the New York Times on April 10, 1953, Arthur Krock commented on the "rare combination of integrity, ability, courage, and specialized knowledge of complex subjects" which have given Senator BYRD a unique place in the Senate and made him its strongest force on many great and controversial occasions.

HARRY BYRD, since March 4, 1933, when he became a Member of the U.S. Senate, has been battling against deficit financing and for the "pay as you go" principle in Government. He is nationally known as "Mr. Economy" and "the watchdog of the Treasury."

We need more HARRY BYRDS in the U.S. Senate if we are to preserve the solvency of the U.S. Government and preserve for future generations the great heritage we have received.

He has held many positions of honor and trust in behalf of the citizens of the great Commonwealth of Virginia. He has not betrayed their trust. In fact, during many years of service, he has proven his fidelity to public service, his independence of mind and the courage of his convictions.

Much has been written about Senator BYRD's outstanding public service, but he also has rare personal qualities. He is soft spoken, he has great personal charm; he is friendly, and those of us who work with him hold him in great affection.

Henry Drummond, in his book entitled "The Greatest Thing in the World," mentions several virtues that are evident in a true gentleman.

The first is patience, and those of us who have had the opportunity of knowing and working with HARRY BYRD know that he has unlimited patience.

In addition to patience, kindness is another virtue of a true gentleman. Generosity, humility, and sincerity are additional virtues and I am sure all my colleagues will agree with me that HARRY BYRD has all these traits.

Courtesy is another requisite of a true gentleman. To this we add unselfishness. Good temper is another attribute, and certainly those of us who know HARRY BYRD can honestly state he is not easily provoked to anger.

Personally, it is a great privilege for me to serve as a member of the Senate Finance Committee, of which he is chairman. On many occasions he has gone out of the way to be helpful to me. I am greatly indebted to him.

It is my sincere hope that he will continue to serve in this body for many years to come.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I join my colleagues in paying respect to a man who 30 years ago first assumed his duties as a U.S. Senator. Unquestionably HARRY BYRD will go down into history as one of the Senate greats. During his service he has done more to restore and maintain a degree of fiscal responsibility than has any other man in the Congress. The American people, not only from the State of Virginia but throughout the country, owe to this man a deep debt of gratitude for his tireless service as a public servant.

His integrity and his courageous stand for what he believes is right has made his name synonymous with honesty and efficiency in government. I know of no greater tribute to be paid to this man than to say that his State, our country, and we in Congress are all better men and women as the result of the example he has set.

Members of his personal staff as well as the members of the committee staff have asked that they be included in this tribute to a man whom they all admire and respect so highly.

As a member of the Senate Finance Committee, of which he is the chairman, and as one who has had the privilege of working with Senator Byrd for a number of years, I join Senators on both sides of the aisle not only in extending to him our best wishes but also in expressing the hope that he will be in the Senate for many years to come.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I wish to join other Senators in paying tribute today to the distinguished Senator from Virginia, who has just entered the Chamber.

I agree with everything that has been said about him. Although he and I disagree on many subjects, we have had a warm personal friendship. We have lived in the same area as neighbors for more than a quarter of a century. I feel that I am a friend of him and his family. I join in what our majority leader, the distinguished Senator from Montana, has said about him. I desire also to wish for him many more years of health and happiness.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, service in the Senate occasionally creates images of individuals who themselves become institutions. The service that Senator BYRD has rendered to the people of his State and to the United States during the past 30 years has made him an institution. The image which represents that institution has everything in it that the American people regard as fine, good, and sound. It is an image of personal responsibility, of the ideal American who manages his affairs well, lives within his income, and is always responsible in every decision that he makes affecting himself, his family and his country.

It is an image that draws solutions from sound, time-tested principles—that considers no gimmicks, no shortcuts, no imaginative solutions based on vague theories, but returns always to the principles which the experience of centuries has demonstrated.

We live in an age when many people are looking for shortcuts. Many of us are impatient with the consequences of our own mistakes. Many of us try to find solutions which are guaranteed against failure.

Senator BYRD represents the soundness and wisdom of faith in those principles which always produce the right solution. His is an image of fiscal responsibility, an image of thrift, an image of the wisdom of living within one's income.

It has been a privilege to me for the past 10 years to serve on the Finance Committee under his chairmanship, and I am proud of the number of times I have supported the principles he supports.

I think Senator HARRY BYRD has made a tremendous contribution to his country through his service in the Senate in the past 30 years. Like the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS]—and, I am sure, every other Member of this body—I hope that his service may be continued. I am sure his service has benefited our country and will continue to benefit it, by reason of his courage, his vision, his wisdom, and his great devotion to the people he serves.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, one of the great delights which has come to me in my service in the Senate has been the association with Senator BYRD, of Virginia. While we have not agreed on all issues I hold him in the highest esteem.

If I were to speak to a class of students in political science and to advise that class what course it should follow, what principles it should adopt with respect to service to the country, I would say, "Emulate generally the example of HARRY BYRD, of Virginia." He is devoted to our country. He is devoted to the sound principles in Government. He thinks not only of the immediate but also the long-range impact of what happens in the Congress. He has been a bastion against the Congress of the United States running away from responsibility and following the star of political expediency.

It is very simple to take the easy course of spending the taxpayers' money, of being unconcerned about the future of the country, devoid of thought of the impact which fiscal policies may have in the future, but it is quite hard in the face of the tide to intermittently say, "No." HARRY BYRD has had the courage to say "No" when the political demands of the moment probably cried out for the word, "Yes."

I say to Senator BYRD, "I have been proud to serve with you. You have contributed much in keeping the brakes applied in stopping this vehicle of Government from running wildly to the bottom of the hill and destruction.

"I am proud to be with you today and proud to express these words of tribute to you."

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I am sure it will surprise no one if I make no unqualified endorsement of all the policies pursued by my dear friend, Senator BYRD, with whom I differ probably as often as I differ with anybody in this Chamber.

I rise especially to pay tribute to and offer congratulations to a friend—a warm friend and a very instructive friend.

I have had the privilege of differing with the Senator on issues which to me are very deep and profound, such as civil rights issues. At the same time, I have had the privilege of sitting at the Senator's desk and drawing tremendous stores of wisdom and enlightenment upon economic subjects, as to which, whether we agree or not, it has been tremendously illuminating to me to see his fine and informed mind in operation.

What too many people in the country may not know about HARRY BYRD is that he not only has stubborn conservative views about money, but also he does his homework.

Our friendship has been a great joy to me. I know enough about this body, whatever may be our differences, to know that those differences are essential to that tradition which makes America and makes for legislation in the greatest interest of our country.

So, with warmth and friendship, because our friendship is cemented in that holy of holies called the Senate gym, I rise to express my congratulations on three decades of service to my colleague, Senator BYRD.

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, it has been my pleasure to follow the political career of the distinguished senior Senator from Virginia for more than two decades. I have had the great privilege of knowing him personally for some 12 to 15 years. I have had the further privilege of serving for more than 4 years on the Finance Committee, of which he is the distinguished chairman.

During all the time the distinguished senior Senator from Virginia has served in the U.S. Senate, our country has been confronted with tremendous and momentous issues of various kinds. The Senator from Virginia has been constant, dedicated, courageous, and forthright in all of his views throughout that period.

When I think of our distinguished Senator from Virginia I think of the great patriots his State has furnished our Nation. I think of Thomas Jefferson. I think of George Washington. I think of James Madison. I think of Robert E. Lee. I think of "Stonewall" Jackson. The Senator from Virginia has some of the characteristics and qualities of all of those immortal statesmen. If I were to summarize with one word the qualifications of the Senator from Virginia, I would say that he has courage.

Courage, Mr. President, is one of the most scarce commodities in the political arena of our country at the present time. The Senator from Virginia exercises courage. He does not let any combination of forces whatever in our country or in his State—the power of the executive branch, of the judicial branch, of the electorate, or anything else—deter him from acting on his convictions. The Nation admires him greatly for that characteristic. Even though some people may not agree with the political philosophy of the Senator from Virginia, all recognize his great characteristic of courage.

Then, too, he has courtesy, sound commonsense, and courtliness; he is gentlemanly in every respect. I am happy, indeed, to join my colleagues on both sides of the aisle in saluting what I think is one of the outstanding political services in our Nation, that of the distinguished Senator from Virginia.

TRIBUTE TO SENATOR ROBERTSON OF VIRGINIA

Mr. President, if I may, I would not wish to let this opportunity pass without pointing out the fact that the other Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON] has also served in the Congress for a period of 30 years. He has not served in the Senate during that period of time, but he rendered valuable service in the other body before he was made a Member of the Senate. He now serves as the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency of the Senate.

WILLIS ROBERTSON also has those rare qualities I have referred to as being possessed by the distinguished senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD]. He has them in tremendous abundance. It has been my privilege to have been intimately acquainted with the distinguished junior Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON]. We not only worked together in the legislative halls, but we have had occasion to hunt and fish together, to visit in the fields, to visit with some of his friends, constituents, and neighbors of his native State. I know of no Member of the Senate who is more beloved and dedicated than is the distinguished junior Senator from Virginia.

Mr. President, Virginia and the country are fortunate, indeed, to have this pair of dedicated public servants. I salute our distinguished colleagues. I salute Virginia. I salute our Nation.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I welcome this opportunity to join my colleagues in the Senate in extending warmest congratulations to my friend and senior colleague from Virginia, HARRY FLOOD BYRD.

It was my happy privilege to commence my political career with Senator BYRD in January of 1916, when we both entered the Senate of Virginia. I served with him there in that capacity for 6 years. Incidentally, he and I served on the committee that laid out the highway system of Virginia. He and I were joint patrons of the bill that created the highway system of Virginia; and he was the chief architect of the Virginia plan to build that splendid 55,000-mile system of highways without one red cent of public debt.

I look back first upon the service of Senator BYRD in the State senate, and later his remarkable career as Governor. Incidentally, I had the privilege of serving in his cabinet when he was Governor. In my opinion the highway system of Virginia compares favorably with that of any other State in the Union. I reflect that we have no State debt by reason of that highway system, or by reason of anything else.

Then I think of the laws Senator BYRD sponsored. He is now looked upon as a conservative, but in 1925, when he was elected Governor of Virginia, he was a liberal and a progressive. He is still a Thomas Jefferson liberal. In an interview with James J. Kilpatrick, editor of the Richmond News-Leader, Senator BYRD described himself as one of the last of the old New Dealers. The Democratic platform of 1932, he has asserted, was an admirable platform, adding, "I'm still standing on it."

As I look back on his career, I cannot recall any Governor of Virginia whose services to his State have been more significant than have been those of HARRY BYRD as Governor of Virginia.

Mr. President, all of my colleagues, of course, are familiar with the wonderful contributions HARRY BYRD has made here in the Senate.

Senator BYRD remarked, with regard to the Chicago platform, that it called for a reduction in Federal spending, for a renewed dedication of States rights, and for stringent economy in Government. The first bill Senator BYRD voted for in this Chamber was drafted "To preserve the credit of the U.S. Government."

Economy in Government and reduction of unnecessary Federal spending have been Senator BYRD's watchwords in all his years of service here. While the chairmanship of other committees passes from one side of the aisle to the other with each change in party majority, Senator BYRD, by common consent, has kept the chairmanship of the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures ever since the committee was established, at his instance.

Those who tend to judge a man altogether by his voting record have accused him of voting with the Republicans. He, in turn, has replied that, since his name begins with the initial "B," he votes first and the Republicans then vote with him.

On one occasion, however, Senator BYRD spoke out against his critics in this fashion:

> I want to tell you what kind of a Democrat I am. I am not a Republican, I will tell you that. I vote with them when they are right and against them when they are wrong, but I am not a Republican. The kind of Democrat I try earnestly to be is that kind of Democrat that two of the greatest Presidents of these United States were, both from Virginia, Thomas Jefferson and Woodrow Wilson. The kind of Democrat I try to be is the kind that Andrew Jackson was, who boasted that the proudest achievement of his administration was to pay off in toto the public debt. That is an opportunity that no one will ever have again. I am the kind of a Democrat that Grover Cleveland was, who said * * * it was the duty of the people to support the Government, and not the Government the people. The test of my vote in the Senate and my actions elsewhere, now, as they have been in the past, and as they will be in the future, is determined by what I believe to be best for my country.

That is the end of the quotation, but it is by no means the end of his concern for what is best for his country, best for his State, and best for his party.

Mr. President, I salute the senior Senator from Virginia on his 30th anniversary of service in this body, and I ask unanimous consent to have published at this point in the RECORD a fine tribute to Senator BYRD that was published last week in the Richmond News Leader.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Richmond (Va.) News Leader, Mar. 1, 1963]

BYRD REVIEWS TRAIL HE BLAZED IN SENATE

(By Carl Shires)

WASHINGTON, March 1.—HARRY FLOOD BYRD, the toughest rooster in Virginia's political aviary, looked back from his top-rung perch today at the 30 years that lie behind him as U.S. Senator from Virginia.

His look was a self-effacing one. There was no crow and no strut. If there was malice toward the proud young cocks whose tail feathers he'd plucked, it didn't show during an hour-long conversation in his office.

What he wanted stressed most in a story dealing with his 30th anniversary in the U.S. Senate was this:

"The people of Virginia have been mighty good to me; they've overlooked my errors; they've supported me when they thought I was right. They're the best."

LONGEST VIRGINIA TERM

Five times they've demonstrated to Senator BYRD's satisfaction that they're "the best." Five times they've voted him into the Senate seat he holds. That's the longest time ever for a U.S. Senator from Virginia.

Monday, March 4, that's the specific anniversary date for the Senator.

On that date, three decades, two wars and four Presidents ago, he was sworn into the Senate, there under appointment of Governor John Pollard. He'd gone to fill the vacancy that came with the resignation of Claude Swanson.

A President, Franklin Delano Roosevelt, was sworn in that day also. Roosevelt had picked Swanson as his Secretary of the Navy.

The new Senator from Virginia and the new President of the United States were friends. They'd known each other well while each was Governor of his State.

The friendship didn't last. Roosevelt had promised that Government expenses would be slashed 25 percent.

That's the kind of talk that impresses Senator BYRD. Promises weren't kept. Economy in Government didn't come with Roosevelt.

TRUMAN NEXT

Strike one President from the list of the Senator's favorite people.

Harry Truman was next; he'd once been Senator BYRD's Senate deskmate, but he wasn't strong on economy either.

Strike another President.

Eisenhower followed; promised surplus turned into a deficit. There went another.

And now there's Kennedy. Paraphrasing Senator BYRD, he wants to cut taxes and raise the national debt. And besides, he just recently tried to pack the Finance Committee, which the Senator heads, with a couple of members friendly to the Kennedy program.

STRIKE ANOTHER ONE

That obviously won't do; strike another.

"I've supported them all when there was an outside enemy," said BYRD, "Mr. Roosevelt and Mr. Truman during World War II and Mr. Eisenhower during the Korean war. But it's been different on domestic matters.

"I think a Senator should represent his State, and I believe that Virginia still is among the most conservative States in the Union.

"And get this down, when I say conservative, it isn't a matter of money, it's a question of conserving the principles of government, the three-branch form of government, the executive, the judicial and the legislative."

CIVICS LESSON

He was off on a favorite topic. There was no trouble hearing him now. A voice that had been barely audible picked up in decibel output. His finger jabbed at the air; he took off his glasses, swiveled in his seat. He continued his lesson in basic civics:

"My greatest concern is the tremendous concentration of power in Washington. In 1776 there was born the greatest Nation the world has ever known. It did not grow great by public charity. It grew great by effort and sacrifices * * * the people ought to support the Government and not the Government the people."

He warmed still more; forefingers of both hands rent the air.

GREAT DEBTS

"And now we're having our cake and eating it too. We're passing on great debts to coming generations. It's your grandchildren and mine (he has eight) who will pay.

"Put it down that I'm completely hostile to the President's tax cut unless there's a reduction in expenditures."

One wouldn't dare not put it down.

That was the end of the Senator's easy articulation. For thereafter he was prodded into talk of self; he doesn't like to talk of self.

He'd talk of "Candy"—the sleeping cocker spaniel who lay nearby. She's 9 now, an age when dogs get uppity. She sleeps most of the time, refuses to walk in snow, and scratches on the door as a signal to a secretary when she wants to go tend to dog business.

WON'T SPEAK ILL

He declines to talk ill of his fellow Senators, though he's not certain that the caliber's so high as 30 years ago. "But," he wanted emphasized, "I've never known a man in the Senate who's done anything improper in a financial way."

Of his constituents, he thinks the caliber's about the same as it was when he first was elected to Winchester's city council in 1908. "They still write," he grinned, pointing to a desk stacked high with mail, "when they've got something to write about."

His most formidable opponent: That honor goes to Francis Pickens Miller, his liberal opposition in the 1952 Democratic primary. Mr. Miller draws the most formidable title because he was articulate, a good speaker, and waged quite a campaign. Miller turned some buckshot verbiage on the BYRD he sought to shoot down.

PLEASANT MEMORY

The Senator's memory this time obviously was a pleasant one. A formidable foe brought out a formidable array of Byrdmen. "I beat him by 90,000 votes," he chuckled, "the biggest majority I ever got."

Though a Democrat's never beaten him in Virginia, a Republican did once. That was after the term as councilman in Winchester.

"I thought I'd done a pretty good job and I didn't campaign very hard. He beat me." There's a memory block on that one; the Senator doesn't remember the Republican's name.

POLITICAL RETURN

He got back into politics after that sobering experience by running successfully for the State senate in 1915. Ten years later he ran for Governor on the "pay-as-you-go road" issue. He won decisively and it's been pay-as-you-go in theory if not always in full fact in Virginia since.

Senator BYRD will be 76 in June. Though his suit hangs loosely from weight lost in a bout with a virus this winter, he's regaining pounds. He's got a gimp-legged walk from an arthritic knee, but still takes a daily, early-morning, 1-hour, 3-mile hike and climbs to the top of a mountain every chance he gets.

He's got an apple redness to his cheek, a quickness in his moves, and a fiery twinkle in his eye. He lets his hair go off in byways of disarray.

BORN IN MARTINSBURG

His start nearly 76 years ago came in Martinsburg, W. Va. The Senator doesn't seem inordinately proud of his West Virginia birthplace. There are no constituents there. "I was born there because my mother went over to stay with some relatives for the occasion."

He remembers it was King Street in Martinsburg, and that WILLIS ROBERTSON (Virginia's other U.S. Senator) was born on the same street, 3 blocks away.

"WILLIS," reminds BYRD, with a little sideways grin, "is right much older than I am (exactly 2 weeks)."

DEFINES POLITICS

For a definition of the "organization" he heads in the Old Dominion's politics, the Senator likes the one offered a few years ago by John Battle. It goes roughly like this: "An association of friends for the benefit of the State."

And in reference to a recent observation that the organization was held together by a thread, he retorts: "It's a mighty stout one if it's a thread."

Will he run again in 1964?

That brings an incredulous look, a "golden silence" of response, as though it's a question so naively foolish it doesn't merit attention.

Old roosters don't tell ambitious young cocks everything they know.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I could not let this occasion pass without giving a small measure of testimony, to the best of my ability, to my sincere admiration for one of the greatest Americans, at least of this generation, in the Senate, Senator BYRD of Virginia.

When I first became a member of the Senate—not as many years ago as the time when Senator BYRD entered the Senate, but nevertheless a number of years ago—I was aware of his great reputation as a farsighted, stable defender and advocate of the sound American system of opportunity and freedom.

I had great respect for him, although I did not belong to the same political party. I had the rare privilege of being assigned to a committee of which he was a member at the time, and worked under his tutelage, in effect, in attempting to assault some problems that were then beginning to assert themselves so far as the financial and fiscal affairs of this country at that time were concerned. That was in 1945.

Not only was my already conceived great respect for him amplified and, in my opinion, justified, but it has increased with every year since that time.

I agree with the fine things that have been said about Senator HARRY BYRD by other Senators. I do not know that I can add anything to those eulogies, except that I believe it to be my conscientious duty to testify publicly to that agreement, and state my affirmation of those opinions because of that association with the Senator.

No one individual—at least in what we may call modern times, whatever "modern times" may mean—has contributed more to the maintenance of a consciousness of a great segment of the American people of the fact that there is a responsibility of the individual to his government and to himself and to his community, and that that responsibility is deeply entwined with fiscal honesty and fiscal responsibility and obligations, and with a keeping of the faith by the representatives of the American people, and with the people whom they represent, than has the senior Senator from Virginia.

I feel that the overwhelming majority of the American people believe that it is not possible to spend more than is taken in and survive economically under our system of government. I feel that a great majority of the American people believe that debts should be paid, that obligations must be met. I fully believe that the great majority of the American people believe, as statesmen of the past have said, that a public office is a public trust. I believe that HARRY BYRD not only believes in those great principles, and believes in them very deeply and vibrantly, but that he has fought with as great vigor as has any other man I have ever known. He sees those principles clearly and has defended them vigorously.

A few moments ago I came to the Capitol on the subway car with the junior Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON]. I did not know at that time that this was the 30th anniversary of Senator HARRY BYRD's service in the Senate. Perhaps I should have looked it up, but I did not know of it until Senator ROBERTSON told me about it. I said, "I want to hasten to the floor so that I may in my own small way testify to my admiration and appreciation."

I also said to Senator ROBERTSON that throughout the history of the United States the great State of Virginia has contributed as much as, if not more than, any other State in the Union to the stability and founding of our great Nation under a new philosophy of the dignity of man. In my experience in the Senate the representatives of the State of Virginia in the Senate have upheld that record magnificently, in the tradition of the Founding Fathers and of those who followed after them, in the preservation of this country of ours and its stability.

I know of no one who dislikes the senior Senator from Virginia. I know of a great many people who would, in the fashion of termites, undermine the basic concept of this Government and change it from a representative type of government under responsibility of the people, into a government of concentration of bureaucracies in Washington and irresponsible financial policy, and those people fear him. I do not say they dislike him. They fear him, because he stands as a great rock against the incursions of some of those philosophies into our American system. He is one of the hopes for the preservation of the basic principles, and of the responsibility of the American individual and the answerability of the Government of the United States to the American people, rather than the answerability of the people to the Government.

As I said a moment ago, I shall not indulge in more expansive eulogies, although I would, if I had the capabilities, but others have done it much better than I can.

I conclude much as I began, by saying that HARRY BYRD has my congratulations, my thanks, and my appreciation for his 30 years of service in the Senate, for his service in his sovereign State as its Governor, and as a great private citizen of that State.

I have profited as much from his example, from his courage, and from his clarity of thought in my service here as I have from any other man with whom I have been associated. I wish him well. I wish him continued years of service to his State and his Nation and continued years of health and happiness. My appreciation goes to him for the opportunity of having been able to serve with him in this body.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, I congratulate Senator BYRD, the Commonwealth of Virginia, and the United States of America, upon his completion of 30 years' service in the Senate. Senator BYRD's public service in the Senate and in other political offices has been characterized by a devotion to fundamental principles, by fidelity to intellectual honesty and by a degree of political courage never surpassed in the annals of the Republic.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I esteem it a privilege to say a word for a very distinguished statesman, who held up his hand in this body 30 years ago in the same week in which I held up my hand at the other end of the Capitol and took the oath of office as a Member of Congress.

His name is a household word in the Commonwealth of Virginia, where he is universally regarded with respect and affection. That respect and affection go infinitely further. If one went into the area which we traditionally describe as the rockbound coast of New England, or to the sun-drenched valleys of California, or to the area where I live, where corn and hogs and soybeans are kings, or where greening wheat covers the landscape in the Plains States—everywhere, Mr. President, HARRY BYRD is held in high respect and affection.

Perhaps it seems strange to some, who think that about him there is a Machiavellian touch, or that he is the genius behind a machine that is dedicated to reaction and standpattism, that everywhere in this country there is a genuine respect and affection and admiration for the distinguished senior Senator from Virginia.

There are many reasons for it. I think I could assign two. The first is his fidelity to principle. That is a fine, mouth-filling term. How frequently and how easily we use it—devotion to fidelity and to principle. But the fact is that the great tradition of the Republic, which has been exemplified in the contributions of this great man, runs in his veins. It comes through other great Virginians of other days, beginning with George Washington and continuing with John Randolph, Thomas Jefferson, James Madison, and James Monroe, whose names are constantly on the front pages long after they have gone to their eternal reward. But that is the tradition that flows in the veins of HARRY BYRD. He comes by it honestly. He has kept the faith and has kept the vigil in all of those days. It began with his service as a State senator; it continued when he was chief executive of his State; and it has continued for all the years during which he has graced the Senate of the United States. So we salute him for his fidelity to principle.

Second, we salute him on this occasion for his courage. I doubt whether anyone will deny that expediency, fear, and timidity are not unknown in the political domain. It was 120 years ago that Thomas Babington Macaulay made a speech in the House of Commons, in which he spoke of the self-interest of politicians sometimes urging them to think more of their own security and the security of their seats in Commons than of the security of the country. That kind of feeling has never blemished, has never touched, has never tarnished the thinking or the escutcheon of the distinguished senior Senator from Virginia.

It is easy to follow the expedient course in times of controversy. Obviously, people like to perpetuate themselves in office—and I am not immune to that sentiment. But what a great thing it is to look back upon a long, unscarred, unblemished record of doing what conviction and fidelity to principle have always dictated.

In whimsical vein, I think of the time when Clancy was on his deathbed, and the good father came to shrive him and to administer unction. He said, "Clancy, do you accept God and renounce the devil?"

Clancy studied for a moment and then said, "Father, I do accept God; but as for renouncing the devil, I am in no position to make any enemies right now."

That is a sentiment which enters into the political domain. So I salute a man who has fidelity to principle, a man whose record is one of great and naked courage in the interest of this Republic. So long as this body is graced by men and women who will bring to it that kind of courage, that kind of fidelity, the record of this Republic will be sustained.

I salute you, Senator BYRD.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I wish to join in the tributes which are being paid to our friend, the distinguished senior Senator from Virginia. While we may disagree on many issues, the Senator from Virginia and the junior Senator from New York have at least one thing in common: Each of us has been an unsuccessful candidate for President of the United States on the Alfalfa ticket. I am proud of that connection with my friend from Virginia.

His friendship and good will toward the junior Senator from New York—as toward all Members of the Senate—have frequently been manifested. Differences of opinion never affect the friendship and unfailing courtesy of the senior Senator from Virginia toward all his colleagues.

The outstanding quality which has been referred to by the minority leader, is his devotion to his convictions. When he has reached a conviction on any problem, he adheres to it with tenacity, with firmness, and, frequently, with success.

I join in saluting the Senator from Virginia on the anniversary of the day 30 years ago when he first took the oath of office as a Senator of the United States.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, when students of American Government in the years ahead look back to March 4, 1963, review the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and study the many eulogies which have been rendered today in respect to and in honor of the distinguished senior Senator from Virginia, they will learn a great lesson about American Government. During our years of representative government we have learned to debate and discuss the great issues of the day. We have taught ourselves how to disagree on many of the great issues without being disagreeable. We have learned how to dissent without being disrespectful.

Many of the statements which have been made today concerning the distinguished Senator from Virginia have been in the vein of great respect for this gentleman, this outstanding public servant. At the same time, the individuals expressing these sentiments of friendship, affection, and respect have indicated that on some of the issues of the day and throughout Senator BYRD's many years of public service there has been honorable disagreement. I, for one, have disagreed with the Senator on such vital issues as fiscal and monetary policy, civil rights, and agricultural policy.

When I came to the Senate, like many other young men of that day, I knew the distinguished Senator from Virginia, who is my seatmate, as a strong conservative. I took issue with him. It is a matter of record that he also took issue with me, administered a political spanking, went on his way, and permitted me to become one of his friends.

The Senator from Virginia, as has been described today, is a true gentleman. He is a fine family man. We have visited many times. His name is known in the annals of American history, because the name BYRD is as much a part of American history as the American Revolution.

The senior Senator from Virginia is not only a student of government and economics; he is also a politician in the best sense of that word. He is a political leader and a political organizer, and he exercises political leadership when it is needed for what he believes to be the right.

The Senator from Virginia is an unquestioned patriot who is greatly admired and respected. His love of this country is second to that of no other citizen.

Previously I said the Senator from Virginia is a political conservative. We need in American politics those who can discuss the issues of the day from different points of view. Nothing would be more tragic to the American political scene than to have a monolithic political structure or political attitude. The only way in which we can discuss the important issues of fiscal policy, monetary policy, foreign policy, and domestic policy, and then come to a consensus and to some form of agreement which will gain the respect of the American people, is to have honest discussion of differences here in the legislative halls, in the Congress of the United States.

The Senator from Virginia takes his position; he mans the ramparts, and defends his position; and then he respects the decision of the majority.

I am very much pleased to be able to make this statement about him, although certainly it is not needed, because both his private life and his public life are so outstanding that tributes by his friends are not needed. The great qualities and the outstanding achievements of the distinguished senior Senator from Virginia speak for themselves.

A few minutes ago the distinguished junior Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON] stated that Senator BYRD was elected as a New Dealer. I knew that he and I had much in common, and I am delighted to know that this point of common interest has been spread on the RECORD today. [Laughter.]

Mr. President, let me say in all seriousness that Senator BYRD's record is one of fairness and fearlessness. I have done my best to try to persuade him to take the point of views I hold. I have been disappointed to find that my powers of persuasion has not been more effective. [Laughter.] On occasion I have been saddened to learn that, despite whatever efforts I may have made and whatever eloquence I may have indulged in and whatever powers of persuasion I may have had, all of them have been for naught, insofar as persuasion of the Senator from Virginia has been concerned. However, Mr. President, let it be noted for the RECORD that there are occasions when the Senator from Virginia and I stand together and vote together. Those are happy occasions.

Mr. President, what is most meaningful to me is the friendship of this most distinguished gentleman, and also the fact that he has served his State and Nation for some 30 years in this great body, the U.S. Senate.

This is a most memorable day. Thirty years ago, Franklin Delano Roosevelt became President of the United States, and a new era came to America.

Thirty years ago, HARRY FLOOD BYRD became a U.S. Senator from the State of Virginia, and a record of great public service in this body was then begun.

Fifty years ago saw the establishment of the Department of Labor.

Fifty years ago saw the inauguration of one of the greatest men ever to serve the United States of America or any other free people—Woodrow Wilson. I know the Senator from Virginia is one of the great admirers of Woodrow Wilson.

Let me say that my first introduction to politics was by means of a study of Woodrow Wilson—a study which was begun at the breakfast table in the Humphrey household, when my father, a Wilsonian Democrat, would speak to his sons about Woodrow Wilson. Never did a greater man serve a free people; and I am sure the Senator from Virginia will agree with me on this day, the 50th anniversary of the inauguration of Woodrow Wilson, as President, that the American Republic is much the better because of the distinguished service of that great American.

I am sure the Senator from Virginia will also agree with me that Virginia has given many great men to America; and let me state—because of his great modesty—that HARRY FLOOD BYRD is one of them.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I wish to join in the tributes to the distinguished Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] on the occasion of the 30th anniversary the beginning of his service in this body.

He is a thoughtful gentleman. He is always appreciative of the point of view of others. He takes time to talk with and advise younger Senators.

While we may disagree on some subjects, such disagreement has always been in a friendly spirit. Indeed, Senator BYRD is one of the outstanding statesmen of our time.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I am pleased to join my colleagues in honoring the distinguished senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] as he begins today his 30th anniversary of service in the U.S. Senate. I deem it a high privilege and honor to have been able to serve in the Senate, for a little more than 8 years, with this distinguished Virginian, whom I rank among the greatest statesmen the State of Virginia, and this Nation, have produced. I realize, Mr. President, that in making this statement that I am ranking the Senator with America's top alltime statesmen, and this is my intention.

Senator HARRY FLOOD BYRD is one of the most capable and most respected Senators ever to serve in this great body, and he has earned the accolades of his colleagues and millions across this country, despite the fact that he has refused to conform to the party line or any line except the dictates of the conscience of HARRY FLOOD BYRD. I doubt seriously, Mr. President, if there have been many—if any—Senators who, when they announced their intention to retire, ever received more pleas from their colleagues, their fellow countrymen, and from their own States to offer for reelection and continue serving in the U.S. Senate. I recall well in 1958 how the distinguished senior Senator from Virginia was virtually drafted to run for reelection to the Senate by the Virginia Legislature and the Members of this body.

Since that time, when he was reelected by an overwhelming margin of victory, Senator BYRD has continued to serve with distinction, courage, and effectiveness the people of Virginia and the United States of America. He has won respect from friend and foe alike for the strong leadership he has exerted in this country for sound Government financing, as the chairman of the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures, the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation, and the Senate Finance Committee. He is also highly regarded for his long record of service as a ranking member of the Senate Armed Services Committee, on which I have the honor to serve with him.

I take great pleasure, Mr. President, in paying tribute to the distinguished senior Senator from Virginia. I wish him many more years of capable and dedicated service to his State and Nation. I was most encouraged and pleased to read in U.S. News & World Report this morning that the Senator from Virginia is expected to seek reelection in 1964, as much as he deserves to enjoy a well-earned retirement from his long and illustrious record of public service, which dates back to 1915 when he was elected to the Virginia Senate. I urge that he offer for reelection and that if necessary, he again be publicly drafted to continue providing this country with his wise counsel on fiscal sanity and his effective service as a Member of the greatest deliberative body in the world.

ASIA'S FRONTIERS OF FREEDOM

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, recently there has appeared in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, the Washington Star, and other newspapers, a series of articles entitled "Asia's Frontiers of Freedom." The articles, written by Richard Dudman, are based upon his journey of observation in the southeast Asian region. These articles constitute a job of first-rate and careful reporting on this region, in which we are deeply involved and about which we are inadequately informed. I commend these articles to the attention of the Senate. They are worth reading and studying in connection with our legislative responsibilities. I ask unanimous consent that the articles be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the St. Louis Post-Dispatch,
Feb. 3, 1963]

ASIA'S FRONTIERS OF FREEDOM—U.S. POLICY: PLUSES, MINUSES, AND QUESTIONS—HARD GOING FOR YEARS INDICATED IN FIGHT TO ROLL BACK RED CHINESE

(By Richard Dudman)

(First of a series)

American policy along the rim of China can best be characterized as a holding operation.

It is really not a single policy, but a collection of different policies.

It supports the national leaders—mainly dictators—who say they are for us and against communism. It sometimes helps and sometimes ignores the leaders—also mainly dictators—who call themselves neutrals. It frowns on a third group of dictators, those who side with the Communists.

It guarantees the territory of Chiang Kai-shek, joins with China and the Soviet Union to support a neutral coalition government in Laos but hesitates to give similar assurances when Cambodia requests them. Is spurns altogether a request for diplomatic relations with Outer Mongolia.

The best that officials in Washington can do to give coherence to these varying and sometimes contradictory policies is to say that the United States is supporting and strengthening the "free nations" on China's periphery. They say that inconsistency is inevitable; different situations require different policies.

The aim, in short, is to contain Chinese expansionism, just as the overall postwar policy toward the Soviet Union has been to contain Russian expansionism.

(Some officials object to the term "containment" as being too negative. They say American policy is to "check and roll back" Communist expansion by both the Soviet Union and mainland China.)

A corollary is and has been that we will accept virtually any ally, no matter how repressive or unpopular, so long as he is reliably anti-Communist.

Popular revolts have overthrown two such leaders in recent years—Nuri Said in Iraq and Syngman Rhee, in South Korea, but supposed stability and anticommunism continue to be put before popularity and independence.

Under the Kennedy administration, as under the Eisenhower and Truman administrations, American policy with respect to China is essentially a negative, short-run course of reaction to Chinese initiatives, whether aggression or subversion.

American policy no longer looks for any early collapse of the Communist regime in China. "Only two people expect a collapse—Chiang and Joseph Alsop," runs a current quip that expresses the prevailing view.

Nor does current policy look toward a day when China may be brought into the community of nations and at least go through the motions of seeking world peace.

Positive aspects of American policy consist mainly in helping build the economies of the non-Communist nations bordering China and specifically in helping make India a beacon of hope that will outshine Communist China in Asian eyes.

How well is all this working? And if it does work, is it enough?

To answer these questions, the Post-Dispatch sent a reporter-photographer team on an 11-week tour of southeast Asia and India, to observe, ask questions, and take pictures.

Their conclusions are a number of plusses and minuses and some question marks. They add up to a bleak total—hard going in the next months and years, and no end in sight. Barring a major reappraisal of the American role in Asia, the greatest hope lies in Chinese blunders and misfortunes.

The worst of the present problems is Vietnam. American Armed Forces are actively engaged in the only current shooting war along China's border. They are advising, supporting, and occasionally fighting in a war against Communist-led insurgents trying to overthrow the government of an unpopular but anti-Communist dictator.

Too many blunders or misfortunes on the American and South Vietnamese side could bring a military disaster that would make the abortive Bay of Pigs in Cuba look like a beach party.

Some of the participants and observers in Vietnam maintain the standard view of cautious optimism. Public statements by officials along this line must be discounted, however. Techniques of psychological warfare call for attitudes of confidence and predictions of success, all calculated to create an air of victory and to discourage support for the enemy.

But others express an uneasy feeling that the operation in Vietnam may go the way of the operation in China in 1949, when Chiang Kai-shek's Nationalist soldiers sold their American weapons to the Communists and lost China by default.

The U.S. part in the operation involves about 11,000 American troops. They are called advisers, but they are risking their lives alongside combat forces and sometimes take part in combat.

The war is costing the United States roughly $2 million a day—$1 million in military and economic aid to Vietnam and possibly another $1 million in American troops and the arms, trucks, planes, and supplies they are using directly.

Official casualties since January 1, 1961, now stand at 63 dead, including 24 killed in combat, and 90 wounded.

On a purely military level, the operation showed evidences of improvement in recent months. But it has just suffered a stunning setback.

The insurgent Vietcong (short for Vietnamese Communists), had seemed unwilling or unable to mount big offensives like those of a year ago. Moreover, although they still were capturing weapons from Government forces, the rate had slowed; a year ago Government forces were losing twice as many as the insurgents, whereas until recently the numbers had begun running about equal.

Then came the January 2 counterattack by 500 Vietcong in the rice paddies of the southern Mekong Delta. The attackers turned a routine troop-lift operation by the Government into a shambles, shooting down 5 helicopters, and killing 3 Americans and 65 Vietnamese.

Other major battles in the next few days increased the Vietnamese dead to 122 and resulted in the capture of hundreds of prisoners and sizable stocks of arms by the enemy.

Some officials in Washington sought to offset the losses by citing unconfirmed claims by the Government in Saigon that 101 Vietcong had been killed. The figure later was raised to 140. The Washington officials called the episode perhaps a standoff but certainly not a defeat. They said it differed from past enemy actions in that the Vietcong had not initiated the attack but had been forced into a defensive action.

Observers at the scene, however, know how unreliable are the Vietnamese reports of enemy casualties, a hodge-podge of accuracy, wishful thinking and speculation based on such things as blood spots on the ground. What bodies are found and counted as enemy dead are often those of innocent peasants mistaken for Vietcong or killed by accident.

The big battles last month gave new evidence that the fight for Vietnam will be long and difficult, that it must go on for at least another year before we can know whether the operation has even a reasonable chance of success—and that it may be lost entirely.

All involved in the campaign in Vietnam agree that it can be won only by a combination of military and political means. The American advisers say it, American diplomats say it and American aid officials say it. So do the three powerful figures that run the Vietnamese regime—President Ngo Dinh Diem; his brother and political counselor, Ngo Dinh Nhu; and Nhu's outspoken wife.

They are familiar with Mao Tse-tung's doctrine that a guerrilla army moves among the people like a fish swimming through water. The guerrilla depends on the support he gets from the peasants, whether through persuasion or coercion.

President Kennedy was expressing the same thought when, as a Senator in 1954, he said, "I am frankly of the belief that no amount of American military assistance in Indochina can conquer an enemy which is everywhere and at the same time nowhere, 'an enemy of the people' which has the sympathy and covert support of the people."

Breaking the Vietcong's hold on the peasants is the central problem in Vietnam. To solve it, the United States and the Diem regime have joined in a "strategic hamlet" program, in which a widening network of protected settlements is spreading slowly across the country.

Each strategic hamlet is surrounded by a fence of sharpened stakes or barbed wire. Often there are two fences and, between them, a moat filled with poisonous cactus or short spikes to pierce the feet of intruders.

The hamlets' threefold purpose is to protect the peasants from the Vietcong; to separate the Vietcong from its sources of food, weapons and recruits, and to instill loyalty and respect for the government.

American political and military advisers place great importance on the last feature. Their theory is the same as that of British Field Marshall Sir Gerald Templer in the campaign against Communist-led insurgents in Malaya in the 1950's: "This is a battle for the hearts and minds of men."

They want the armed villages to work in two directions in building a new relationship between the people and the government. They want the people to be organized into an effective loyal supporting force that will supply food, manpower and intelligence to the government, instead of to the enemy. They believe this can come about only if the government makes itself the friend and protector of the people and gives them a stake in its management and survival.

Officials of the Vietnamese Government express similar views, but their actions show that they consider the hamlet program a military device first of all and a political device only as a poor second.

A limited land reform program; an American-assisted project to help each family raise a pig; hamlet elections, in which there rarely is an opposition slate; occasional free medical service and agricultural advice from a traveling civic action team—such measures have not yet had important effect in swinging Vietnamese peasantry to the side of President Diem.

A peasant woman in the central highlands spoke for many others when she said: "I've been lucky this month. The Vietcong, didn't seize my rice and neither did the Vietnamese Army."

The truism seems to hold good that the peasant just wants to be let alone.

When the Vietcong, harassed by helicopter raids and rockets and napalm, begins stealing rice in an area, the peasants sometimes move out in a body and take refuge in a new fortified settlement provided by the government with American help and financing.

When the government steps up the draft or uproots families to force them to move into strategic villages, menfolk often disappear into the jungles and paddies to join the Vietcong.

A disturbing fact of the war thus far is that, at the best estimate, the number of armed Vietcong guerrillas remains at about 23,000, even though the government claims a weekly kill of around 500. Recruiting of new guerrillas inside South Vietnam seems to offset losses through casualties.

The tide will have turned when peasants begin stopping army convoys to warn them of an ambush ahead; when young men in large numbers, instead of mainly women and children and old persons, enter the relocation camps, voluntarily; when the women of a raided Vietcong village say, "They went that way," instead of replying with a blank look when asked where the guerrillas fled.

If the tide fails to turn, if the cautious optimism voiced by top officials fails to develop a solid basis, then what?

Some of the men actually engaged in the undeclared war do not share the view expressed by President Kennedy in his state of the Union address that "the spearpoint of aggression has been blunted in Vietnam." They are restless under the present restrictions and would like to see American forces in either full combat status or withdrawn altogether.

There can be no doubt of the firmness of the American commitment. Vice President Richard M. Nixon spoke for a Republican administration in 1953, at an earlier stage in the struggle for Vietnam, when the United States was trying to persuade the French to keep fighting.

"Under no circumstances could negotiations take place that would place people who want independence under bondage," Nixon said. "It is impossible to lay down arms until victory is completely won."

In similar words, Attorney General Robert F. Kennedy stated the Kennedy administration's position a year ago in Saigon: "We are going to win in Vietnam. We will remain here until we do win."

Responsible officials have been frank and realistic in warning that the war would be long and bloody.

Adm. George W. Anderson, Jr., Chief of Naval Operations, told a congressional committee a year ago: "I would not minimize the fact that we are going to lose helicopters and we will lose airplanes, and we will probably have people killed, Americans killed and wounded and perhaps captured. You cannot provide this type of assistance, which is absolutely essential, without some bloodletting."

But if the war sinks into a stalemate, possibly along the lines of the French experience in Algeria, it is questionable how long the effort would remain acceptable to the American people or to a President who likes to see foreign problems solved promptly, particularly if they carry political disadvantage at home.

No reappraisal of U.S. policy in Vietnam is in sight yet. Grave doubts are expressed by some American officials in Washington and in southeast Asia, but not by those who have real power in the Kennedy administration.

If the situation does eventually reach the point of thorough reappraisal, three other main courses are available:

1. Send in far more American troops and commit them fully to combat.

2. Withdraw support from Diem in hope that a more popular national leader will

emerge and lead the country in a successful independence.

3. Negotiate a settlement, possibly under the Geneva agreement of 1954, which provided for the military neutralization of Vietnam and its eventual reunification.

The first choice seems unlikely at present. Pentagon and State Department officials deny flatly a recent report that American authorities in Saigon have recommended that United States forces take over combat command in Vietnam.

The Defense Department, moreover, has long opposed the large-scale commitment of American combat forces in southeast Asia, except as a last resort. Military difficulties would be formidable. The possibility of triggering World War III would be enormously increased.

Finally, the spectacle of a white man's army fighting Asians in Asia would play into Communist hands by supporting the propaganda line that portrays the United States as an imperialist, neocolonial power that mistreats its own racial minorities at home and tries to subjugate dark-skinned peoples abroad.

Few Americans involved in the Vietnam operation consider Diem an ideal leader, but there is no one in sight who might become an ideal leader to replace him. If Diem should go, his most likely successor would be the army—a military dictatorship along the lines of that in South Korea.

As for negotiated settlements, they have never satisfied those who make American policy; they have been accepted only as a last resort. Korea was negotiated only to end a long and bloody war bogged down in hopeless stalemate. Laos was negotiated only after the humiliating military defeat of the American-backed rightists.

Reluctance to negotiate sometimes means that the United States has only a weak position by the time it reaches the conference table. Some believe that is the only possible eventual outcome of the fighting in Vietnam.

Vietnam and most of the other countries of southeast Asia emerged only recently as independent states in an area that has known little but foreign rule and bitter internal rivalries.

Japanese occupation in World War II spelled the end of colonial rule throughout southeast Asia. French Indochina was among the first of the colonial possessions to break up. Immediately after the Japanese surrender, Ho Chi Minh, heading the Vietminh, a Communist-led Vietnamese nationalist coalition, established a government and declared Vietnam independent.

That touched off the 9-year war with the French, which ended with the Geneva accords of 1954. The Vietminh seemed headed for a complete takeover of Indochina. Communist China, after first being cool to the Vietminh campaign, began supplying encouragement, support, and finally the training and guns that defeated the French at Dien Bien Phu.

With a Communist victory in sight, the Soviet Union moved to shut down the war, partly as leverage to prevent creation of a European Defense Community, partly out of fear of the "massive retaliation" policy of John Foster Dulles, and possibly also to maintain Soviet influence in the area instead of letting it go entirely to the Chinese.

Russia joined Britain and France in pressing for a compromise end of the fighting. As a result of negotiations at Geneva, Vietnam, Laos, and Cambodia were declared independent and were neutralized militarily. Vietnam was to be divided temporarily, pending national elections in 2 years for a unified government.

The Geneva settlement was signed by 14 nations, including Communist China, North Vietnam, France, and the two conference chairmen, Britain and the Soviet Union. It provided for the withdrawal of Viet Minh and French troops to their own sides of the 17th parallel. It prohibited the entry of additional troops or military equipment except for replacement of what was there already. Neither zone was to join any military alliance or permit any foreign bases on its territory.

Neither the United States nor South Vietnam would sign the accords. The American delegation merely took note of them and stated that the United States would "refrain from the threat or the use of force to disturb them."

Both sides have violated the agreements. South Vietnam, with American encouragement, refused to discuss unification elections. North Vietnam has been encouraging and supporting the Vietcong insurgents in the south. U.S. troops and arms have been sent in far beyond the Geneva limits.

The Indian-Canadian-Polish control commission set up to police the agreements has found both sides in violation, although it said North Vietnam started the trouble. The commission's report criticized both parties' refusal to allow commission inspectors free movement.

Communist activity in Laos has been similar to that in South Vietnam. The insurgent Pathet Lao has received help, encouragement, and leadership from the Viet Minh in its efforts to take over the country. The main difference has been that there was no strong Laotian government willing and able to drive out the Communist influences and unify the country.

Until near the end of the Eisenhower administration, U.S. strategy in Laos was to try to make it an anti-Communist bastion, part of a containment line around China and a protection to the regimes in South Vietnam and Thailand.

There were signs of change just before Mr. Kennedy's inauguration. The Pentagon inspired newspaper stories that military intervention would be extremely difficult, that Laos was not worth fighting for, and that Prince Boun Oum, the rightest leader backed by the United States, had little popular support.

An abrupt change came when the rightist forces turned and ran from the Pathet Lao. President Kennedy's choice was complete military defeat, partition, or a neutralist coalition.

Acting out of necessity, the administration entered negotiations to neutralize Laos. Again the Soviet Union cooperated to help close down a civil war that had been virtually won by the Communists. Ironically, the United States now pins its hopes for peace and stability on a neutralist coalition headed by Prince Souvanna Phouma, whom the Central Intelligence Agency had helped oust twice in 5 years.

The result so far, somewhat better than had been expected, is actual partition of the country under a weak tripartite central government. Each faction has its own army and guards its own territory. The three factions have agreed to merge these forces and create a national police force, but the plan has not yet been carried out.

Government leaders in Thailand, like those in South Vietnam, regard the neutralization of Laos as a sellout by the United States.

They asked for help last May, when the fighting in Laos threatened to spill over into Thailand, and President Kennedy sent in 4,000 troops. Six months later, with the crisis past, the Thais asked privately that the troops be withdrawn. They departed last November but left behind their barracks and heavy equipment in readiness for a quick return if necessary.

Two other neutralist countries in the area, Cambodia and Burma, go their own ways, accepting aid from East and West. Their neutralism extends within the Communist bloc, too; they take aid from both China and Russia. They are more preoccupied with their own immediate problems than with some eventual threat of Chinese Communist expansion.

Off to the west, around the arc of China's southern border, the United States has embarked on another commitment that could surpass in cost and effort and lives the commitment in Vietnam. The United States is backing with arms and advice the new Indian determination to contest Chinese territorial claims in the high Himalayan border country.

Asians are watching these various American operations on their continent, as well as the continued backing of Chiang Kai-shek and his dreams of returning to the mainland; the encouragement of Japan's shift away from the extreme pacifism that followed the World War II defeat; the cold-shouldering of Outer Mongolia's overtures for diplomatic relations with the United States, and the adamant insistence on keeping China out of the United Nations.

America's future in Asia will depend partly on American techniques of using its aid and showing its strength. More importantly, it will depend on a correct reading of the Peking-Moscow split, China's motives in attacking India, China's capacity to survive as a nation, North Vietnam's role as a satellite of China or something more nearly approaching Yugoslavia, and the true nature of insurgent movements such as the Vietcong and the Pathet Lao.

[From the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, Feb. 4, 1963]

Asia's Frontiers of Freedom—Communist-Led Vietcong Fighting on Shoestring With Homemade or Captured Guns—Modern Weapons From China Could Change Course of War, in Which 11,000 American Military Men Are Aiding the South Vietnamese

(By Richard Dudman)

(Second of a series)

An American B-26 combat plane shot down a few weeks ago in the Mekong Delta told much about the nature of the undeclared war in Vietnam.

Before American or Vietnamese troops could reach the scene, the insurgent Vietcong had stripped the plane clean of ammunition, radios, first-aid kits, even the clothes off the bodies of four dead American crew members. Most important, the guerrillas got eight 50-caliber machineguns.

From that day on American and Vietnamese intelligence and operations maps have carried small crosses, sometimes along the east coast of the Camau Peninsula, sometimes inland along the many canals through the rice paddies.

The moving crosses mark reports and rumors of where those eight lost guns have been sighted or are believed to be. They are supposed to have been camouflaged and mounted on sampans. Not one has been spotted for sure.

Helicopters must fly higher when they approach places marked with the crosses. Airborne Vietnamese troops give them a wide berth.

The eight captured machineguns are important because they are so much better than most other Vietcong weapons.

A gun of the same caliber, which Americans captured in the delta area, was a handmade weapon, constructed of a length of pipe, a carved teakwood stock and hand-forged firing parts, made to shoot captured shells one at a time.

Chinese automatic weapons are scarce. Mostly the Vietcong carry captured American carbines or rifles, firearms left over from the war with the French, or else one-shot weapons they have made for themselves.

An American helicopter returned recently from a flight over Vietcong territory with a steel crossbow arrow stuck in its fuselage.

One of the most effective antihelicopter weapons is simply a forest of 15-foot stakes planted in any open area where the helicopters are expected to land. These "rotor bumpers" force pilots to slow their landings to avoid damaging their rotors or impaling the thin bellies of their planes on the stakes.

When a ground force with an American adviser marched into upper Phu Yen Province north of Saigon to remove and burn thousands of the poles, Vietcong forces moved in at the other end of the area and began pulling them up and hiding them. As soon as the Government troops left, the guerrillas began replanting the helicopter trap.

The concern over the eight machineguns shows that, with little additional effort, China or North Vietnam could feed enough modern weapons into South Vietnam to change the whole course of the war.

The bloody Vietcong counterattack in the delta last month, in which 5 helicopters were shot down and 65 Vietnamese and 3 Americans were killed, gave further indication of what a few modern guns can do in enemy hands.

The Communist-led Vietcong is fighting on a shoestring. Some American officials speak of massive infiltration of North Vietnamese troops and weapons along the so-called Ho Chi Minh trail through Laos and even far south through Cambodia.

Other sources, well-informed Western officials, discount this infiltration and insist that the Vietcong now gets its new manpower and weapons mainly from inside South Vietnam. Part of the confusion on this point, says a Canadian observer, is that American intelligence on the subject comes mainly from Vietnamese sources, which often exaggerate.

American military experts in Cambodia and Laos say it would take 15 American divisions to seal off the wild, unmarked border between Vietnam and Cambodia. But they say there would be no need to do that, since there is only a little movement back and forth, nothing of military significance.

They deny entirely the Vietnamese claim that an extension of the Ho Chi Minh trail extends down through Cambodia. They assert that this would be needlessly difficult when the Vietcong has easier access through Laos.

It is true that the Vietcong gets much of its direction, many of its leaders and much of its propaganda encouragement from Hanoi, the capital of North Vietnam.

But the insurgents' continuing numerical strength, their material support and their vitality as a guerrilla army come mainly from the South Vietnamese peasantry. They obtain this support partly through terror, partly through ignorant fanaticism that believes charges of "American imperialism," partly through real grievances against the regime in Saigon and partly through the peasants' choice of what they see as the easiest path at the moment between two evil forces.

Guerrilla prisoners of war often say they were forced into the Vietcong by threats against themselves or their families. Some American officials conclude that the Vietcong relies exclusively on terror. But such statements can be self-serving; no prisoner is likely to say he joined the guerrillas because he thought they were on the right side.

It is a dangerous oversimplification to call the Vietcong merely a tool of international communism.

Propaganda statements out of Hanoi and Peking lead some to believe the Vietcong is nothing more than a tool of international communism. It is that, but it is also an expression of Vietnamese nationalism, drawing on indigenous sources for its strength.

The same can be said of Ho Chi Minh, president of Communist North Vietnam. He turned to communism after trying unsuccessfully at the Versailles conference to qualify Vietnam for Woodrow Wilson's principle of self-determination. After World War II, he turned first to the United States and Nationalist China for support for his independence movement.

Even now, he is above all else a Vietnamese nationalist. He maintains a degree of independence of Communist China and the Soviet Union, while siding with them and accepting their aid.

A minority view in the State Department holds that the United States is overlooking a good bet in not making some overture to Ho Chi Minh, some appeal to his Vietnamese nationalism that might override his ties to China and Russia.

In this view, he might be inclined to seek trade and eventually a truly neutral coalition with South Vietnam in hopes of building a strong nation that could be independent of China.

Current American policy, however, runs in the opposite direction and is devoted to wholehearted support of President Ngo Dinh Diem, regardless of his widely conceded shortcomings as a national leader.

The extent of American military involvement is an open secret. No official reports are given out on the number of men and weapons committed to the undeclared war. The secrecy stems from the fiction kept up by both East and West that they are abiding by the Geneva agreement of 1954, which prohibited additional troops or arms in the area.

The United States refused to sign the accords but promised to "refrain from the threat or use of force to disturb them." If it admitted publicly the extent of its aid to South Vietnam, it would be making a case for the Communists to charge violation.

Thus it was only unofficially that spokesmen disclosed that "about 11,000" American troops were in Vietnam. They did not make clear whether or not this figure includes the hundreds or thousands of troops on temporary duty from Okinawa or other American bases in the Far East.

Secretary of Defense Robert S. McNamara testified last week, however, that "there is now a total of more than 11,000 U.S. military personnel in Vietnam, providing training, airlift, communications, and advice to Vietnamese forces, and administering the military assistance program."

Officials explained afterward that the American forces are a temporary buildup, needed because the Communists had violated the limitations of the 1954 agreements, and would be withdrawn whenever the Communists withdrew.

No figure is being given out for the total cost of the operation. American military and economic aid to South Vietnam is running at about $1 million a day. How much it costs in addition to pay, feed, transport, supply the American forces is an unanswered question.

"It would be impossible to give a figure even ballparkwise," said a Pentagon spokesman.

The Pentagon approach is to point out that the troops in Vietnam would be getting their salaries, food, and other benefits somewhere else if they were not in Vietnam. By this reasoning, no military operation costs anything but transportation.

A reasonable estimate would be another $1 million a day, including additional operating costs and the sizable losses of planes and other equipment and expenditures of American ammunition.

Confusion also surrounds the precise role of the American forces in Vietnam. Officially they are nothing but "advisers," engage in no combat, shoot only when fired at, and fly armed planes only when accompanied by at least one Vietnamese.

Actually, they frequently are involved in combat. The never-shoot-first rule is broadly interpreted—"You can always say, 'There goes a burst'," explains a realistic American captain.

An official statement, posted at an American helicopter base, allows the same leeway:

"There is no change in the status of American advisers in Vietnam. They remain advisers, not combat troops. They are authorized by the President of the United States to return fire to protect themselves or other Americans when fired upon.

"This decision can only be made by the individual on the scene in light of the immediate and specific circumstances pertaining at a given moment."

The Arvin (short for Army of Vietnam) observer who is supposed to accompany the Americans in the new combat helicopters is often regarded as just so much surplus baggage. He is left behind if he is slow in appearing for a flight, or if Americans need all the seats.

American fliers often find the restrictions an annoyance and believe they are fully justified in blasting an entire village with rockets and machineguns if a man in black pants steps out of a shack and fires at a circling helicopter.

Here is the way an American officer discussed a mission in one of the new HU-18 armed helicopters:

"We took a couple of bursts of automatic weapon fire from a village and then small arms fire opened up from all over. We were ready to shoot back, but we had a general aboard who ordered us not to. He said, 'Don't shoot back—you might hit some innocent women and children'.

"Now, one way to look at it is that maybe 10 Vietcong were in the village and they were the ones doing the shooting and the rest of the villagers shouldn't have to suffer for it.

"But another way to look at it is that if those villagers are harboring 10 Vietcong they aren't really neutral. Besides, if the VC can fire at us without getting something back in return, it sets a bad precedent and makes them think they can get away with anything.

"We called for an air strike and some fixed-wing aircraft went in with rockets and napalm and really clobbered that village.

"The general was sore, of course. He wanted to know who ordered that air strike. We said we didn't know—it just came over the radio, might have been from the Arvin."

Operations from the air are not always so precise. Some fliers say they fire at any group of black-clad figures on the ground if they look suspicious and if a nod of approval can be obtained from an Arvin observer.

A common rule of thumb is that anyone in black pants who is running must be a Vietcong.

"They must be guilty or they wouldn't be running," explained an American officer. "Besides, President Diem has ordered them to stand still when they see a plane."

The disastrous helicopter ambush of January 2 gave new evidence of some basic shortcomings in the Vietnamese operation as a purely military exercise.

American military advisers charge repeatedly that Vietnamese soldiers are poor shots and lack aggressiveness.

"They're short on two ships—leadership and marksmanship," says an American captain, repeating one of the GI gags that sums up a widespread view.

According to a common complaint, Vietnamese soldiers hit the dirt at the first sound of gunfire, instead of advancing and returning the fire according to the antiguerrilla training they have been given.

The advisers also report repeated instances of arriving in helicopters at a "drop zone" with a second group of Vietnamese troops to find the first group busy cooking their lunch and preparing for a siesta instead of chasing the enemy.

"Sometimes I think these people are laughing up their sleeves at us," said a soldier who had seen such incidents. "Maybe we ought to charge them an amusement tax and get back at least part of what this is costing us."

Top officials take a more tolerant view. They point out that habits are hard to change and that the Vietnamese have been fighting one or another enemy for the last 20 years and cannot be expected to have the same sense of urgency as a soldier who has been assigned there for a year and wants to see a quick victory.

They recall the irritable complaints by Americans in World War II that British fighting men always stopped for tea.

Two new weapons, added to the war in the last year, were expected to turn the tide. Helicopters have permitted rapid envelopment of an enemy stronghold, and the tanklike M–113 amphibious personnel carrier, with aluminum armor plate and chain tread, has helped pursue the elusive Vietcong through the canals and rice paddies of the southern delta area.

But the new vehicles add further to the dependence of the Vietnamese army on modern carriers to fight a shadowy enemy who has only his gun and his bag of rice, who travels on foot, and who is willing to crouch for hours under water with leeches clinging to his body, breathing through a bamboo tube, so that he can live to fight again.

An American lieutenant colonel, back from a ground operation in which two companies of Vietnamese had chased a group of Vietcong through the jungle in a rainstorm, said afterward:

"This was only a sweep. You couldn't call it a clear-and-hold operation. We can't hold it, because there are no roads and these people depend on roads.

"Take away the jeeps and trucks and let them fight like the VC, and we could beat them a lot sooner."

The helicopters also were expected to work as a lever to give the American advisers a hand in the planning of operations against the Vietcong. The Americans had rarely been able to get a look at a plan before the mission began.

By providing the transportation, it was thought, the American officers would have something approaching a veto over the grandiose "sweeps" so often employed by the Vietnamese. These drives through Vietcong territory merely harass the enemy and do nothing toward extending the area under reliable government control.

But the expected leverage has not worked. The sweeps continue and the advisers still complain that their advice is often disregarded.

Official comments are more optimistic. After the wave of complaints last month about the Vietnamese army, Gen. Paul D. Harkins, the top U.S. commander in South Vietnam, said anyone who criticized the fighting qualities of the Vietnamese armed forces was "doing a disservice to the thousands of gallant and courageous men who are fighting in the defense of their country."

He said 10,000 South Vietnamese soldiers had been killed in action in the last year and that almost 30,000 dead Vietcong insurgents "attest to their courage."

Official estimates of the military operation are influenced by the needs of psychological warfare. An essential to victory is swinging the peasants to Diem's support. They will swing if they think he is winning. Hence, there is a policy of deliberate optimism.

Important visitors also are given a rosy view of the hamlet defenses by being taken to a few demonstration hamlets, where the peasants have been put through their emergency drill in front of so many visitors and cameras that they no longer want to work but sit around waiting for the gong to sound for the next drill.

In the last few months of 1962, the standard phrase for the war in Vietnam came to be "cautious optimism."

The rash of new mass attacks by the Vietcong has given more reason for caution and less reason for optimism. Victory, even in a purely military sense, is not yet in sight.

[From the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, February 5, 1963]

Asia's Frontiers of Freedom—U.S. Efforts in South Vietnam Weighted With Undemocratic, Unpopular Diem Family Rule—Washington Committed Not Only to President but to Clique, Including Brother and Brother's Wife, That Flouts Advice and Resists Change

(By Richard Dudman)

(Third of a series)

Success or failure of American policy in Vietnam depends heavily on the merits versus the shortcomings of President Ngo Dinh Diem and his family-controlled regime.

The United States helped him to power 8 years ago and now finds itself fully committed, with money, arms, and diplomacy, not only to Diem but also to his brother, his brother's wife, and his other relatives whom he has brought into the small ruling group.

Diem and his nepotarchy are anti-Communist, independent, patriotic, courageous, bright, and apparently quite sincere.

They are also undemocratic, self-righteous, unpopular, cunning, clannish, repressive and inclined to label anyone who criticizes them a Communist or a tool of the Communists.

Radio Hanoi is right when it refers to the "Diem clique," although the use of that phrase is said to have been enough to expel an American correspondent from the country.

The Communist mouthpiece in North Vietnam is wrong, however, when it calls the Diem regime a puppet of the United States.

Diem flouts American advice on military strategy and government policy. His sister-in-law, Mme. Ngo Dinh Nhu, creates a disruptive major issue by prohibiting Americans and everybody else from dancing in South Vietnam and gibes at "that crazy freedom" in the United States.

The family resists American efforts to ease the dictatorial rule, broaden the base of the government and create a more popular and attractive image that will arouse enthusiasm and loyalty among the Vietnamese.

Some of the Americans on the scene wish the Communist charge were true and that Diem were a puppet, at least to the extent of taking American advice intended to strengthen his chances of survival.

Diem's aloofness from his people stems partly from his own introspective nature, partly from the fact that he and his family are Roman Catholics in a nation that is 90 percent Buddhist.

He has a good excuse not to risk mingling with his people like a Magsaysay in the Philippines, a Bourguiba in Tunisia or a Sihanouk in Cambodia. Army paratroopers revolted and surrounded the palace in an unsuccessful coup in 1960. Two air force pilots bombed the palace last February in an unsuccessful assassination attempt.

On South Vietnam's independence day last October 26, Diem reviewed a military parade from behind police barricades that kept the general public three blocks from the reviewing stand. No one could enter without security clearance and a special pass.

Later in the day, when he attended mass at the main downtown cathedral in Saigon, his security forces threw a similar cordon around that area.

Diem was asked in a recent interview why he avoided his people. He denied doing so. He said his advisers, on the contrary, reproached him for not being careful enough as he traveled through the country and mixed with his people.

One of his aids later supplied a map showing that Diem had gone on 62 major inspection tours, aside from public appearances in the Saigon area, and had visited 24 of South Vietnam's 40 provinces one or more times in the previous year.

On independence day, Diem said, the Government had received a tip that grenades might be thrown. As for the reviewing stand, there was not room for the general public without obstructing the view of the marine parade on the river, and then the navy would have protested.

"You can't satisfy everyone," he said.

Diem likes to recall that his struggle for an independent Vietnam began 30 years ago when he resigned as colonial minister of the interior after the French refused to give the legislative assembly real deliberative powers.

But now that he is in control, he is reluctant to permit much self-government. He appoints all the provincial governors, who have both civil functions and military commands. Provincial advisory councils are made up of elected village representatives, but at least half the local elections are rigged.

Rigging has been charged in national elections also, starting with the referendum in 1955, which made Diem chief of state in place of Emperor Bao Dai. The final count gave Diem an implausible 98.2 percent of the votes cast.

The government's leading non-Communist opponent, Phan Quang Dan, was elected to the national assembly in 1959 over government objections, but he was arrested afterward and the election was annulled. The charges were that he had campaigned too early and had made false promises.

Diem's supporters excuse his heavy reliance on his family on the grounds that the young country has few capable persons and that factional fights make it unsafe to trust outsiders.

A result, however, is that many of the educated persons of Saigon are openly hostile to the Diem regime and complain continually of fixed elections and graft by high officials.

Diem is reluctant to talk about the political prisoners held in his reeducation centers. The reason he gives is that too many others might consider the free room and board attractive and demand admittance.

When pressed, he said 8,000 to 9,000 members of dissident political sects were now being reeducated. Other sources, considered reliable, put the current figure at 15,000.

Diem has balked at making budgetary and currency reforms sought by the United States. A dispute over American accounting of foreign aid funds was left moot rather than settled when United States officials gained access to provincial offices where they could see where the money went and no longer needed formal control.

Military advisers are not yet satisfied with intelligence arrangements, but there have been some improvements. The number of competing intelligence organizations has been reduced from about seven to two or three. The advisers now sometimes can see captured documents promptly, but this is often because the Americans are present at the time.

Against American advice, Diem continues to push ahead with his more extreme measures for population control The United States has withdrawn funds from the "agrovilles," huge collective farms where peasants do forced labor reminiscent of the communes of Red China. American officials also have tried to shelve Operation Sunrise, in which Diem's government uprooted peasants from lands they had held for generations and put them in armed camps for the sake of security and surveillance.

Another disagreement is over the American requirement that aid funds be spent in the United States and that commodities be hauled in American ships.

Diem told the Post-Dispatch an exception should be made for South Vietnam, "so that the increase in aid can be a reality and not just theoretical."

His assistants supplied tables to show that metal products cost from 31 percent to 145 percent more if bought in the United States than if bought in Europe. They said freight charges were often two or three times as much if American ships were used.

Diem argues that Vietnam is at war and on the forefront of the fight against communism and should not be subject to the same rules as other nations receiving American aid.

American officials say the United States did waive the requirements for $12 million worth of spare parts up to December 1961. It stopped the practice to help reduce the American gold outflow.

They point out that the countries from which South Vietnam wants to buy products are also potential aid contributors and should be doing their part to help. They mention Japan and France particularly.

Instead of asking the United States to relax its rules, these officials say, South Vietnam should bring pressure on these other anti-Communist countries to extend grants or credits.

Officials note also that South Vietnam has some foreign exchange of its own and could earn more if it stimulated rice exports, instead of penalizing them as it now does under its multiple exchange rate system. They say it could earn $40 million a year by exporting rice.

For all his difficulties, Diem speaks as if things are going well with the campaign against the Communist-led Vietcong. He estimates that it will take 3 more years, at the present rate, to establish "complete security" in his country.

Diem's restraint and politeness contrast sharply with the outbursts of his sister-in-law, Mme. Ngo Dinh Nhu. Some Americans suspect it is by prearrangement that he speaks in conciliatory tones while she sounds off against American policies and institutions.

She has been promoting her ban on dancing with all the fervor of a Carry Nation, especially where Americans are involved.

Lecturing a U.S. Army audience in the swampy Mekong Delta, she said: "The Americans came here not for dancing but to help us, and they should share our austerity and our way of life. Here in Vietnam we dance only with death."

An experienced American observer believes she has begun to exhibit an almost pathological hostility and hatred for Americans.

Mme. Nhu told the Post-Dispatch she thought there would be no problem of American compliance with the morality law.

"For the minority who really prefer to abandon this front to go to prostitutes or to dance, we shall not miss them and will 'invite them out' of this country with pleasure," she said.

She created another controversial issue by pushing through the National Assembly her "code of the family," a law prohibiting divorce except by Presidential decree and making adultery a prison offense.

She says she meets the press only as a duty, but when duty calls she seems to enjoy lashing back at American criticisms. In a recent interview she said the American press was infiltrated with Communists and referred to "that crazy freedom in your country, where the press refuses any organization of self-correction."

Asked by the Post-Dispatch to explain what she meant by "that crazy freedom" in America, she said she referred to "freedom which hurts and harms, which goes loose and gets lost."

"I would not trust anything unless it had a careful and well-organized system of filtering and self-control, just to make sure that the liberty they want to enjoy is not exploited and turned against the great majority," she said. "I do not have the impression that there is any self-control organization in American information media, for example, to protect it against infiltration."

Mme. Nhu's feminist campaigns may sound trivial, and they arouse much criticism, but they appeal strongly to many Vietnamese women, who take her women's solidarity movement seriously. Criticism and ridicule come mainly from the men.

Some observers believe she already exerts powerful influence by using her women's organization as a political and intelligence network.

She denies she has any real power in the government, but then she goes on to tell anecdotes that prove she is a key figure.

When Laos was neutralized last year, the Diem government was displeased, but at American request refrained from saying so. But Mme. Nhu, in West Berlin at the time, told a press conference the Laotian compromise was a cowardly solution that prepared Laos for legal conquest by the Communists.

She said Diem complained about her remark, but she told him she could not be telephoning him every 5 minutes when she was halfway around the world.

"I said I would ask his advice when I was in this country if it was possible," she said. "But I don't know where he is every minute, and so far I have never asked."

On her return from Europe, she repeated and amplified her view that the United States compromise in Laos was a cowardly mistake.

When rumors connected her with a lottery racket in Saigon, she summoned the minister of the interior and told him to stop the rumors and the racket. He said he could not.

"I know that I am not behind this racket," she said she told him. "Inasmuch as you are permitting it to continue, I can believe only that you are behind it."

The intimidated official took prompt steps.

Another official told her he could not very well sew up people's mouths to stop them from spreading rumors connecting her with a shipping scandal.

"I ordered his security file checked 10 times a day, just to be sure it was not he that was behind the shipping scandal," she said. "He soon found he could stop the rumors."

She related also how she had urged Diem to make a public demand that the United States give South Vietnam a bigger radio transmitter so that his broadcasts would reach more of his people.

"But he said he couldn't bring public pressure on the United States—he didn't want to become a Sihanouk," she recalled.

If the Diem family hates anyone more than the Communists, it is Prince Norodom Sihanouk in neighboring Cambodia. The two countries have been feuding for hundreds of years.

In one of the arguments between Mme. Nhu and President Diem, she recalls telling him: "I'm not a child. I'm an adult. You're neither my father nor my husband."

Mme. Nhu's husband, Ngo Dinh Nhu, is Diem's youngest brother. They live in the palace, where Nhu has his office as political counselor to the President. He also operates an elite political party, the 70,000-member Can Lao, which serves as a secret espionage network for the Diem family.

Nhu is the chief theoretician of the campaign against the Vietcong. He led in adapting the strategic hamlet program to South Vietnam. He sees it as a cooperative system that can mobilize the forces of all the underdeveloped countries to raise standards of living and defeat Communist subversion throughout the world.

Nhu says he has to resist government pressure as well as Communist pressure as he tries to make the hamlet program effective.

"Government officials sometimes are afraid of prompt hamlet elections and a truly secret ballot," he told the Post-Dispatch. "They say a really free election might choose inexperienced persons or even a Communist.

"My answer always has been that we have to take that chance. Even if the wrong man is elected, the danger is limited to one hamlet. The advantages of free elections are nationwide."

American officials confirm that Nhu is one of the few in the Diem government who see the strategic hamlet program as a means of creating loyalty to the government rather than as primarily a control apparatus.

"This is a quiet revolution, but a very deep one," he said. "It aims at reversing the guerrilla warfare and subversion that is on the march throughout the world. To win, the government must have a sincere intention to develop democracy."

Nhu also has developed a military strategy which calls for beating the Communists at their own game. He believes that the United States and South Vietnam are both still limited to counterguerrilla warfare—dependent on heavy equipment and elaborate supply lines.

"My main personal effort is to push them to become pure guerrillas, to make them self-sufficient not only materially but also ideologically."

By adopting guerrilla tactics, Nhu believes the Americans and South Vietnamese can lead the Vietcong to concentrate their forces, abandon guerrilla warfare and become dependent on logistical support. They then will be vulnerable to attack by conventional forces.

There have been signs in the last few weeks that Nhu wants to abandon his behind-the-scenes role and become a political figure in his own right. He has begun making well-publicized speeches to classes for strategic hamlet cadres, and he had himself elected president of the Republican Youth Organization, in an unexpected maneuver that required three other candidates to withdraw hastily. Some observers think Diem may be preparing to retire as an elder statesman in favor of Nhu as president.

Two other brothers are also important in the regime. Ngo Dinh Can lives at Hue, up near the 17th parallel, where he controls central Vietnam through his own secret police organization. Ngo Dinh Thuc is archbishop of the new Roman Catholic cathedral in Hue.

Americans who deal with the Diem nepotarchy agree that it practices something approaching absolute rule. They disagree on what to do about this fact.

Efforts at urging reforms have been mainly unsuccessful. The line now appears to be: Don't press the government too hard, don't expect too much, remember that most governments in southeast Asia are dictatorships, and above all keep in mind that no satisfactory substitute is in sight.

A minority view holds that the Diem government faces greater stresses than other regimes in southeast Asia and cannot afford the luxury of dictatorship. This view looks with dismay at the political side of the struggle and questions whether it will be possible at all to win with Diem.

John Kenneth Galbraith, U.S. Ambassador to India, was not referring to Diem, nor was he speaking for the administration, when he wrote recently about dictatorship, but his comment applies in Vietnam:

"We must not excuse dictatorship on grounds of anticommunism or convenience or the absence of visible alternatives. This is one of the oldest habits, and is certainly the most myopic, of our foreign policy. Its price, as we have now painfully learned, is disaster magnified by postponement."

[From the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, Feb. 6, 1963]

Asia's Frontiers of Freedom—Political Reaction a Problem in the Use of Dirty Tactics To Fight Vietcong Guerrillas—Military Advantage of Poisoning Crops, Fire Bombing Villages Weighed Against Opposition to Government Such Techniques Arouse

(By Richard Dudman)

(Fourth of a series)

Dirty-war tactics being used by the United States and its Vietnamese allies in Southeast Asia pose a dilemma for American policymakers.

The dilemma, clearly recognized but not yet resolved, is how to use the dirty tactics effectively without turning the Vietnamese people against their Government.

Take, for example, Operation Ranch Hand, a system of spraying the land with poison to kill plants that provide the Communist-led guerrillas with food and shelter.

Officials hope it can be effective in helping starve out and flush out the enemy Vietcong. Details are secret, but it is known that converted U.S. Air Force planes sweep across the countryside spraying poison from nozzles along their wings to destroy rice fields around insurgent strongholds and to strip the brush from roadsides where the enemy sometimes hides in ambush.

For technical reasons, the defoliant sprays have not worked very well yet. Correct mixtures and concentrations have not been learned. A plan to burn a path 1 mile wide along the Cambodian border, to keep the enemy from taking refuge in neutral territory, is still on the drawing board.

A troubling question is whether the use of poisonous sprays is a valid technique of warfare. That is, Will the military results be offset by political disadvantages, by resentment over the destruction of food?

The same dilemma arises over the use of strafing, bombs, rockets, and napalm to destroy peasant villages where groundfire has indicated the presence of guerilla bands.

American flyers seek to justify these attacks by saying that villages deserve retaliation if they give shelter to the enemy. They say there can be no such thing as an innocent bystander in a war that depends ultimately on whether the peasants support the enemy or the Government.

Officials who are carrying on the counterinsurgency campaign give the more sophisticated argument that terror must be met with terror. They say the peasants must be taught that if they give in to the terror of the Vietcong, supplying food, recruits, and information, the punishment from the Government side will be even worse than the Vietcong can impose.

At the same time, this harsh tactic can be interpreted as proving that the fighting in Vietnam is a war by the Vietnamese Government, with American help, against the Vietnamese people.

Similarly, a strict system of population control, proposed by American officials and now being enforced on a pilot basis in Phu Yen Province, has some military justification but also some serious political drawbacks.

After the Post-Dispatch reported details of this plan last October, officials scrapped the original Agency for International Development booklet describing it, had it rewritten to take out objectionable passages, and considered giving the revised version a security classification to keep it from public knowledge.

The plan itself remains unchanged in its essentials. It calls for sweeping restrictions on the movement of persons, food and supplies in an effort to starve out the Viet Cong and separate it from its sources of food, supplies, information and recruits.

Features of the plan include fixed check points, where vehicles and persons are searched by armed inspectors; emergency check points to conduct surprise searches; elaborate accounting of all commodity shipments, and predawn searches of peasant huts or entire villages.

The original plan was published in a booklet titled "Control of Population and Material Movement" by E. H. Adkins Jr., a former Federal Bureau of Investigation agent who now is assigned by AID as public safety adviser to the Vietnamese Government. He adapted it from a system used by the British in suppressing Communist-led insurgents in Malaya in the 1940's and 1950's.

Adkins' outline of the control system aroused bitter disagreement among American officials. One called it insane and said it would only alienate the Vietnamese people.

Some complained that the plan called for police-state methods reminiscent of the Gestapo. They objected particularly to the statement that "arrests, wherever possible, should be made in the early hours of the morning to insure the element of surprise."

Another part of the plan said a check point should be equipped with two machine guns, two shotguns, two carbines and pistols. It said one man should always have a weapon at the ready when a vehicle was halted. The driver should be ordered to "stand facing the vehicle with his hands on the roof or side of the car" while an inspector searched "under the arms, the stomach, inside the thighs and the crotch." Persons halted in this way were to be searched first and questioned afterward.

Advantages and disadvantages of the Adkins plan were described in an introduction by Frank J. Walton, chief of the public safety division of the U.S. operations mission, the AID field office in Saigon.

He described the control of food, medicine, and clothing as a "vital factor in the war against subversion and guerrilla activities" and said such controls in Malaya "were a major factor in starving out, tracing, locating, and bringing to justice the insurgents."

Walton went on to say that the controls would be "extremely bothersome and time-consuming to good citizens." Therefore, he urged a public relations program to explain the need for the program and to tell how it would work. He said the Vietnamese authorities should be trained in "courteous, but firm, handling of the general public."

Officials who objected to passages in the book also found fault with the phrase "population control" and said the American part in the plan should be concealed. They also obtained oral assurances that inspectors would search travelers at gunpoint and force them to lean against the sides of their vehicles only in extreme cases.

AID officials persuaded the Vietnamese to adopt the plan by linking it to the counterinsurgency and strategic hamlet programs.

"The minute you say something is connected with counterinsurgency or strategic hamlets, they go for it right away," an official explained.

Other techniques that have been considered as part of the insurgency campaign are a portable one-man radar, portable heat-sensitive cells to detect hidden Viet Cong, and the use of police dogs to help track down the enemy.

The idea of using dogs was dropped after it was found each animal's canned horsemeat was costing $1.20 a day—three times the pay of a Vietnamese soldier.

Strategic hamlets are at the heart of the campaign against the insurgents. With American help, the Government is working to cover the country with a network of fenced settlements similar to the stockade of American colonial days or the kibbutzim in Israel.

Protection is one feature. An armed civil guard patrols the perimeter at night, and American radios are used if necessary to call for help from other hamlets or regional army units. Armed guards watch over the peasants when they go out to work their rice paddies.

Separation is another feature. Screened peasants are required to live inside the fence. Each family must keep a census book and will soon have to keep its own group photograph; if a member of the family is absent he is presumed to have run off to join or help the Vietcong.

As the hamlets spread across the country, so the theory goes, the Vietcong will be confined to poorer sections and forced to raid the hamlets to seize food and supplies. This is supposed to make the guerrillas the enemies of the people and frustrate their efforts to pose as the friends and saviors of the people.

There are technical difficulties in Vietnam that make it hard to apply the techniques pioneered by the British in Malaya.

In Malaya, the guerrillas were Chinese squatters, easy to distinguish from the Malayan population. In Vietnam, the guerrillas are Vietnamese and can vanish into the general population.

Finally, Malaya has a rubber economy and a food deficit. Starving out the enemy was a practical possibility. Vietnam, however, has a food surplus, and food is grown in most parts of the country. Living off the land is relatively easy for the Viet Cong.

Malaya has no common boundary with a Communist country, whereas cadres, weapons and supplies can be carried into South Vietnam from the north across wild unmarked boundaries, and on coastwise junks.

A more fundamental difficulty in Vietnam is a difference in point of view between the government of Ngo Dinh Diem and the top American advisers on counterinsurgency.

The Vietnamese Government tends to take a limited and mechanical view of the population living and building schools, clinics, and waterworks.

The Vietnamese Government races so fast to build spiked fences, set up new strategic hamlets and control more and more of the population that AID officials cannot keep up with the accompanying tasks of digging wells and providing schooling and medical help.

Americans and Vietnamese disagree also over some sort of amnesty program, opening the way for insurgents to defect and become loyal citizens. The Vietnamese regime tends toward the view that once an enemy always an enemy. It's reeducation centers are more like concentration camps than places for rehabilitation.

This problem involves around 300,000 South Vietnamese. Estimates of the number who are armed regulars range from 20,000 to 30,000. The others support the national liberation front, the Communist-led political apparatus in South Vietnam, to the extent that they are willing to take personal risks in its behalf.

It is this group from which the Vietcong draws its recruits and gets supplies of food, clothing, and intelligence.

As the military phase of the war progresses, there remains the political phase in which these 300,000 must be wooed back into the society.

There is reason to fear that the Diem regime may give no way out to these Vietnamese who have been coaxed or coerced into the insurgent movement. Even worse would be a fraudulent amnesty, persuading insurgents to give themselves up and then invoking harsh punishment and offering no chance of rehabilitation.

Another way of saying all this is that winning the military war is hard enough, but that even while winning the military war we could lose the political war.

[From the St. Louis Post-Dispatch Feb. 7, 1963]

Asia's Frontiers of Freedom—U.S. Policymakers Having Trouble in Supporting Both Asian Allies and Neutralists—Current Efforts Satisfying Neither—SEATO Divisive, Ineffective Against Subversion—Has Pushed Some Nonalined Nations Toward Reds

(By Richard Dudman)

(Fifth of a series)

One of the American dilemmas in Southeast Asia is how to deal with the neutralists.

The problem is how to help the uncommitted neighbors of the countries whose governments have sided with the West against the Chinese-Soviet bloc—in short, how to aid the non-Communists without breaking faith with the anti-Communists.

The Kennedy administration indicates by its actions that it has not settled on a firm policy.

On the one hand, it actively seeks friendship with the neutrals. It helped add to their ranks, in fact, when it backed a neutralist compromise last year to end the civil war in Laos.

W. Averell Harriman, Assistant Secretary of State for Far Eastern Affairs, said recently that the Kennedy administration had adopted a policy somewhat different from that of its predecessor.

Recalling that Burma, Cambodia, and Malaya had been successful in stemming Communist subversion in their countries, Harriman said the administration believed that it was "adequate for a government to be non-Communist (as distinct from anti-Communist) in order for the positive power of its nationalism to preserve its independence and resist subversion."

On the other hand, the administration has continued to support the Southeast Asia Treaty Organization, one of the alliances the late John Foster Dulles devised to unite the pro-Western nations and set them apart from the neutrals, whose position he considered immoral.

SEATO has been ineffective against Communist subversion and, worse, has been a devisive force in southeast Asia. It has isolated its own members from the rest of Asia and has pushed some nonalined countries toward the Communist bloc.

The administration has given only a cool reception, moreover, to Cambodia's request for joint East-West protection of its neutrality and territorial integrity along the lines of the agreement covering Laos.

As usual in such cases, the current American policy satisfies no one. The neutrals believe they are receiving second-class treatment. Some of the Western-alined regimes, notably those in Vietnam and Thailand, believe that the United States is rewarding softness toward communism at the expense of the dedicated anti-Communists.

Neutralist sentiment is strong throughout southeast Asia, even in the countries now considered pro-Western. Its sources are centuries of civil war and conquest, generations of colonial rule, devastation, and Japanese occupation in World War II, and, above all, their proximity to China.

The aggressive expansionism of China is not just a Communist phenomenon; it dates back more than 1,000 years. Tribes from China's border regions overran southeast Asia repeatedly. Their decendants now populate much of Burma, Thailand, Laos, and Vietnam.

The rich rice bowl of the Indochinese peninsula always has been a powerful magnet attracting the rulers of China, with its chronic hunger.

Cambodians and Burmese like to point out that they have had little or no trouble with Communist China, whereas the countries that sided with the West, such as South Vietnam, Thailand, and Laos, when it was under its short-lived rightist regimes, had serious problems of Communist insurgency.

There is some basis for this assertion just now, although the Cambodians and Burmese have had to use harsh police measures to suppress their Communist undergrounds. Continued Communist insurgency in Burma was one reason given for a military coup last year that set up the present dictatorship under General Ne Win.

Burma claims an additional benefit from its neutralism. In 1960 Peking abruptly agreed to compromise its claim to a large part of northern Burma. It signed a border agreement, gave Burma an $84 million interest-free loan and promised to buy 350,000 tons of Burmese rice at a premium price.

It seemed not to matter that this conciliatory attitude by the Chinese turned out to be a prelude to tough action along China's frontier with India. Burma still considers the transaction to its advantage.

The Chinese attacks along the Himalayan border last October and November have not spelled out the same lesson to the neutralists of Southeast Asia that they did to the State Department. The American hope and expectation was that these neutralists would see the light and realize that coexistence is an illusion and that Chinese promises cannot be trusted.

Burmese and Cambodian leaders seem to conclude, on the contrary, that India's problem was in not being neutral enough. They profess also to see two sides to the India-China border dispute and to believe it could have been compromised in 1959 and should be compromised now.

A Burmese official recalled a conversation with a Communist-bloc diplomat about the China-India fighting.

"Who is in the right?" the Communist asked.

"I have read the claims by both sides and find them both convincing," the Burmese replied.

"Which did you read more recently?" the Communist asked.

"I read them both at the same time," said the Burmese.

A basic fact in southeast Asia is that most of the people and many of their governments do not regard Communist China as their overriding hazard. They do not share the belief of Chiang Kai-shek and the State Department that the aggressiveness and even the existence of the Communist regime are by far the worst threat to the area.

This fact accounts for the failure of SEATO as well as for the difficulties of American policy generally in southeast Asia.

Laos, the newest of the neutrals, has really never been anything else. American agreement to support a neutral coalition government merely marked the end of an abortive American effort to turn Laos into a bastion of anticommunism.

Through most of the Eisenhower administration, the State Department and the Central Intelligence Agency fought to prevent the very compromise solution that the United States now hopes will succeed.

They tried to block the Geneva accords of 1954, which left Laos a neutral buffer between Thailand and north Vietnam. Through American aid, they built up a huge rightist army intent on suppressing the insurgent Pathet Lao rather than integrating it into Laotian political life.

Twice in 5 years, American agents and dollars were used to help back rightist coups that overthrew neutralist coalitions headed by Prince Souvanna Phouma—the same man on whom the United States now bases its hope for an independent neutralist regime.

The upshot of these American efforts in Laos was to push Souvanna Phouma's neutralists into an alliance with the Pathet Lao and to bring about Soviet intervention in Laos, not as a case of clear-cut aggression but in response to an American-supported effort to overthrow a neutralist government there.

The end came when the huge army of the American-backed Gen. Phoumi Nosavan fled across the Mekong River into Thailand before a limited Pathet Lao attack at Nam Tha.

Considering that background, the new troika-style government with Souvanna Phouma as Premier and Defense Minister, is progressing somewhat better than had been expected. Prince Souphanouvong, the Red Prince, vice premier and minister of economic planning, is a nationalist as well as a Communist and pays at least lipservice to the objective of making the coalition work.

Phoumi Nosavan, as vice premier and minister of finance, ironically, has been the one to visit Moscow, Peiping and Hanoi, returning with promises of economic aid and an attitude described by an acquaintance as euphoric.

The major immediate problem is to unify the armed forces and end the present de facto partition of the country. The 3 factions have agreed to do this, by cutting back the 70,000 rightists, 19,000 Pathet Lao and 12,000 neutralists to 10,000 each. The agreement has yet to be carried out.

The Premier is beginning to achieve the power to move freely through the country. Freedom of movement, by government officials and a unified army, can enforce neutrality in a manner impossible for the three-nation International Control Commission formally charged with that task.

Several thousand Vietminh Communist troops from North Vietnam are said to remain in the country, but they are believed to be staying inactive rather than safeguarding infiltration routes through Laos to South Vietnam.

Cambodia enjoys internal security under a popular ruler, Prince Norodom Sihanouk. He mingles freely with his people and inspires enthusiastic patriotism, unlike the aloof President Ngo Dinh Diem in South Vietnam, Marshal Sarit Thanarat in Thailand and Gen. Ne Win in Burma.

Cambodia's big fear is invasion by Thailand and South Vietnam. They have been encroaching on Cambodian territory from time to time over the last five centuries, and their leaders have been threatening lately to divide Cambodia between them.

Sihanouk, for his part, upsets the State Department and his Asian neighbors by voicing his own version of the "better Red than dead" position. He says he would rather see Cambodia as a satellite of Communist China than to see it destroyed by Thailand or Vietnam.

Under these circumstances, Cambodia takes no sides in the war in Vietnam. It would, indeed, hate to see the country unified under any leadership, for fear the united armies would be turned against Cambodia.

Cambodia gets 40-percent American support for its 30,000-man army (compared to 200,000 regulars in South Vietnam and 8[illegible],000 in Thailand) and recently received 16 American fighter planes. It wants more military aid, either from the West or from the Communists, unless it can have some new political protection against its two neighbors.

Its formal proposal, circulated privately in early December, went to the other 13 nations that took part in the Laos conference. It calls for assurances rather than a guarantee, as Cambodia first proposed and omits the idea of another Geneva conference. It would require signers to send troops if necessary to protect Cambodia against invasion.

This goes considerably further than the Laos pact, which calls merely for consultation.

Communist China said it was prepared to sign immediately. The Soviet Union and France also approved the proposal. The United States, Britain and India so far have withheld substantive comment.

The State Department has been cool to the whole idea because of the strong objections of South Vietnam and Thailand, which insist that they fear aggression from Cambodia. The Department opposed a conference for fear it might be extended to a discussion of some neutralist solution for the war in Vietnam.

Meanwhile, Sihanouk continues to accept economic aid from the United States, the Soviet Union and Red China and to lead his palace volleyball team to victory over the Americans of the Military Assistance Advisory Group, a diplomatic corps team that is mainly Communist and the other groups that take part in his nonalined athletic league.

Watching a game recently, Sihanouk smiled as he noticed the Indian ambassador sitting on the sidelines with the Soviet ambassador on one side of him and the U.S. Ambassador, Philip D. Sprouse, on the other.

"Volleyball is good for friendship and good for health—a good combination," said the prince.

Relations with Cambodia have been inpaired by a tendency of some American publications to ridicule the prince by charges in South Vietnam that Cambodia offers privileged sanctuary and an infiltration route for the insurgent Vietcong.

American military observers in Laos and Vietnam deny those charges.

Unlike Cambodia, which tries to be friendly with all the big powers, Burma gives the impression that it distrusts them all.

U.S. Ambassador John S. Everton has seen General Ne Win only three times since last March—when he presented his credentials, when Ne Win protested against a flight by an American plane, and when Everton introduced Senator MIKE MANSFIELD on a visit to Burma.

The Burmese dictator seems to be keeping a tally of his diplomatic appointments with the United States, China, and the Soviet Union and holding them equal.

Burmese distrust of the United States results partly from 10 years of insurgent activity by units of Chiang Kai-shek's Chinese Nationalist Army. The forces were supplied from Formosa by planes flown by former U.S. Air Force pilots.

A captured Nationalist document said the insurgent group was to make trouble between Communist China and Burma with a view to bringing the United States into war against the Peking regime.

The Burmese put these pieces together and concluded that the United States could stop the raids if it wanted to. The Eisenhower administration eventually evacuated some of the Nationalist forces and withdrew American support for those remaining in Burma. After a new flareup, the Kennedy administration airlifted more of the Chinese Nationalist troops out of Burma in 1961.

That prompt action eased the situation, but resentment lingers. Last year Ne Win ordered the Ford and Asia Foundations and the Fulbright educational exchange program to get out of Burma.

The year-old dictatorship has stated its policy in a manifesto, "The Burmese Way to Socialism." The document says the regime will build a Socialist state using indigenous Burmese methods.

It firmly renounces parliamentary democracy which, it says, "has not only failed to serve our social development, but also, due to its very defects, weaknesses and loopholes, its abuses and the absence of a mature public opinion, lost sight of and deviated from the socialist aims."

Ne Win flies about the country continually on missions announced only later. He is working to build up the Burmese economy, partly by its own efforts and partly through economic aid from East and West. He is suppressing gambling and superstition and reforming the educational system to support socialist development.

He avoids contact with his people. When he plays golf, soldiers with machineguns surround the course.

In keeping with his disdain for parliamentary democracy, his government turned submachineguns on demonstrating students at Rangoon University last July. The controlled press said the students first were warned 3 times to disperse and then 15 were killed and 40 wounded.

Students told the Post-Dispatch there was no warning. They said 45 were killed and 100 were wounded.

The next morning, Ne Win's troops returned and dynamited the 34-year-old Student Union Building, cleared away the rubble and left the site vacant. An official statement said the institution had become a haven for underground leaders plotting overthrow of the government.

Ne Win, in one of his rare public speeches, blamed certain political organizations for the incident and promised to "meet sword with sword and spear with spear."

There had been some student resistance to plans to create a new single political party. A draft constitution had been published a few days earlier.

But the students said the point of their demonstration was merely to have the supper hour changed from 6 p.m to 4 p.m. and to obtain permission to stay out of their dormitories until 11 p.m., instead of 8 p.m.

A statement last November by U Sun Tun, dean of students of the university, indicated the intellectual atmosphere of the place under the Ne Win regime. He banned political discussions of any kind on the university campus "to keep the student body from falling prey to scheming politicians as in the past."

The dean said he had halted a discussion of the Berlin and Cuba situations in a meeting that was addressed by a leftist leader, since Burma's neutrality requires it to avoid taking sides in the cold war.

"We cannot allow our students to be biased one way or the other in controversial political issues and the best way to safeguard them from this danger is to ban political discussions on the university campus," he said.

[From the St. Louis Post Dispatch, Feb. 8, 1963]

ASIA'S FRONTIERS OF FREEDOM—POLITICAL USE OF MILITARY POWER RATHER THAN COMBAT IS INVOLVED IN TECHNIQUE BEING TRIED BY UNITED STATES—FEATURED BY CONCENTRATION OF ARMAMENTS AND STRATEGIC MOVEMENT OF TROOPS—LONG-TERM PROGRAM NEEDED FOR SELF-DETERMINATION

(By Richard Dudman)

(Sixth of a series)

A field full of "mothballed" American military equipment in northern Thailand is a reminder that the 4,000 combat troops stationed there for 6 months last year could return on 15 hours' notice.

The field, outside the city of Korat, contains tanks, howitzers, armored cars, heavy trucks, and stocks of structural steel that can be assembled into military bridges.

Nearby are rows of simple but comfortable barracks, wooden floors and frames with screened sides, and thatched awnings that can be let down for protection against the driving monsoon rains. The wood is teak, which lasts a lifetime.

These items are part of the hardware for a new style of warfare being developed by the United States, a style that often involves no fighting, so it is hoped.

Southeast Asia is its chief laboratory, the testing ground for new techniques being devised to deal with the threats and blandishments, the political agitation, the subversion, and the guerrilla fighting that characterize the struggle between the Communist bloc and the American-led Western bloc.

For want of a better phrase, the new American techniques are sometimes lumped together by Washington policymakers as the political use of military power.

Some of the techniques are well known. The troop airlift from Hawaii to Thailand, in fact, was important mainly for its public aspect. It was intended to discourage the Communist-led Pathet Lao from taking over the rest of Laos, to reassure Thailand that the United States stood ready to protect it, and to show the world that the United States was determined that the Lao compromise of 1961 would stick and that the country would in fact become a neutralist buffer state.

The strategy seemed to work. The Pathet Lao advance stopped. The three Laotian princes resumed their stalled negotiations and reached an agreement on a coalition government.

Administration officials claim similar success for an earlier show of force in the same area. They say the Russians and the Chinese were willing to meet at Geneva in 1961 and negotiate for a neutralist coalition in Laos because U.S. Navy units had steam up in full preparation for military intervention.

Other politicomilitary techniques are less publicized.

Nothing is said publicly about the "White Star" teams said to have trained tribesmen in the mountains of Laos to fight the Pathet Lao, and to have undertaken other covert missions in other countries.

Their existence is well known in parts of southeast Asia—there was a brothel in Vientiane for a time called the Etoile Blanche—but their organization and functions are secret. It is not clear whether they work for the Defense Department, the Central Intelligence Agency, or some other agency.

Army special forces units operate in the back country of South Vietnam, organizing mountain tribesmen into counterguerrilla units and working to win the sympathy of the civilian population by providing food, shelter, and medical treatment.

Other specialists work at developing poisonous plants with which to surround strategic hamlets and poisonous sprays to kill underbrush and food crops and deprive enemy guerrillas of hiding places and food supplies.

Still another special technique makes use of the mohlam, a Laotian improvised musical show. American propaganda specialists feed simple pro-Western themes to the mohlam troupes, at the same time keeping the spirit of the earthy folk art form.

A recent problem faced by these psychological warfare specialists was how to persuade the singers to drop a line that ridiculed the "Red Prince," Souphanouvong, questioning his virility in specific terms. Now that he is a member of the neutralist coalition supported by the United States, the line is considered objectionable.

One advantage of these techniques is economy. Conventional warfare, even if it could be effective against an elusive enemy who fights a war that is more political than military, would cost far more.

W. Averell Harriman, Assistant Secretary of State for Far Eastern Affairs, wrote recently that the decision to aid South Vietnam had the merits of not involving the deployment of American combat forces and not requiring the occupation of foreign territory by U.S. or other Western forces.

"Instead, the North Vietnamese could be engaged by the people of the Republic of

Vietnam, provided they were given technical assistance, training for the defense of their village areas, and increased mobility for their fighting forces," he wrote.

American military action in Laos, on the other hand, Harriman said, would have meant putting large U.S. and SEATO forces into that country, on the border of Communist China, "with unforeseeable consequences in the direction of a major world conflict."

He contended that it would have solved nothing to occupy merely that part of Laos that was in friendly hands.

Some other officials disagreed, believe a moderate-sized American force could have occupied the Lao plains and bottled up the Pathet Lao in the mountains by sealing off five narrow river valleys.

A convenient feature of such techniques, especially troop movements, is that they apply military power without raising the question of a declaration of war, a congressional prerogative under the Constitution.

In the case of sending troops to Thailand, the action had some color of advance congressional approval under the Southeast Asia Collective Defense Treaty, which had been ratified by the Senate.

This SEATO treaty calls for consultation in case of a threat to the peace of the area, and appropriate action of the members unanimously charge aggression. The unanimity rule was in effect eliminated last year in an agreement between President Kennedy and Thai Premier Sarit Thanarat.

American forces made full use of their 6 months in Thailand to practice operations in rice paddies and jungles in dry and rainy seasons. Their practice marches crisscrossed the country. They subsisted on jungle fruits and parachuted combat rations.

Sometimes the claims of strategic success of such operations turn out to have been exaggerations.

A neutralist source in Laos told the Post-Dispatch the Pathet Lao forces stopped of their own accord last summer, rather than occupy the rest of the country including Vientiane. He said the leftist group did not want the responsibility of feeding the 138,000 inhabitants of the capital.

If that sounds disingenuous, there is more to the story. What the rightists had called a major advance led by 10 Chinese Communist and North Vietnamese battalions turned out to have been only a limited attack. When more facts became known, it appeared that the rightist army had run away and crossed into Thailand without a sign of pursuit.

Moreover, it was in the interests of the Soviet Union in both 1961 and 1962 to halt the fighting in Laos and rely instead on the possibility of an eventual political takeover. Increased fighting would have led to another Korean war. A Communist military victory would have increased Chinese influence in the area at the expense of Soviet influence.

Relations are not always easy with the countries where the United States must carry on this new political warfare. Thailand, for example, was anxious to have the American troops arrive when danger seemed imminent, but it began pressing for their withdrawal when the danger was past.

Thailand, furthermore, became so upset over some increases in military aid to Cambodia last fall that Thai officials began advocating what they called a "Thai-ist" policy that was never fully explained but seemed to hint at a swing toward neutralism.

Reliance on supposedly strongly anti-Communist regimes has had its hazards. In Iraq, a revolution overthrew the government of Nuri Said, and guns that had been supplied by American military aid were used to bombard his residence.

More recently, Pakistan showed its anger over American military aid to India by firing a propaganda barrage and signing a treaty with Communist China.

A fundamental difficulty with the new techniques of political warfare is simply that they are no more than techniques.

Used pragmatically, to combat a particular enemy that has ties with the Communists or to bolster a regime that professes friendship with the West and enmity toward communism, they may have satisfactory short-term effect.

But the future of the long-term struggle in southeast Asia involves historical trends and political forces that have little to do with day-to-day victories and defeats.

Self-determination is a major goal among southeast Asians. In seeking it, they can find much to oppose in both of the world's major power blocs. Communist promises sometimes blind them to communism's actual behavior as a new colonialism. When the West backs unpopular regimes, it recalls Western colonialism and dims current Western professions of freedom.

In South Vietnam, the United States is transplanting the techniques of population movement control that worked for the British, with much effort and a 12-year campaign, in suppressing Communist insurgency in Malaya. What is being overlooked is that victory was assured only when the British granted independence to the federation, thus robbing the Communists of their role as liberators.

Economic progress with an increased standard of living is another important goal among southeast Asians. Here again, Communist theory and Communist leaders promise much. Wherever American aid makes the rich richer, as it often has done in Laos and Vietnam, for example, it supports the Communists' case.

In Latin America, where people have similar overriding hopes, the Kennedy administration has come forth with the Alliance for Progress, which promises generous American help in a cooperative plan for social, political and economic progress and reform.

In southeast Asia, American officials sometimes argue that the threat of communism is too imminent to allow any 10-year plan like the Alliance.

But unless they hold out a positive program that offers hope and self-respect, the best of anti-Communist techniques can fail.

[From the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, Feb. 10, 1963]

Asia's Frontiers of Freedom—Red China Versus Neutral India—Extreme Views of Chinese Aims in Border Fighting Now Seem Exaggerated—Neutralism Encouraged by U.S. Aid—Militant Indian Nationalism May Be Most Important Long-Term Result

(By Richard Dudman)

(Seventh of a series)

No one knows for sure what the Chinese Communists had in mind when they attacked India last fall.

Responsible Indians assumed at the time that they faced a major invasion. They said China was trying to seize the oilfields of Assam in the northeast, planning to humiliate India in the eyes of other Asians, or possibly starting to drive to cut India in two with a thrust all the way to Calcutta and the Bay of Bengal.

American officials also were prepared to believe the worst. Some added the suspicion that China wanted to drive a still deeper wedge between India and Pakistan and isolate Pakistan from the Western alliance.

Some of the Americans favored the elaborate speculation that China was arranging a calculated demonstration of the effectiveness of force to contrast with what it called Soviet softness in agreeing to remove its missiles and missile bases from Cuba.

Those appraisals were widely believed at the time. No independent check was possible. Indian restrictions prevented reporters or military observers from other countries from getting near the fighting.

The extreme estimates now seem to have been seriously overdrawn. The Chinese have halted and pulled back of their own accord. They have proposed negotiations that would leave the border situation much as it was 4 years ago when the shooting started along the Himalayan frontier.

Indian and American officials were not the best sources of unbiased analysis of the crisis. Both had good reason for deliberate or subconscious exaggeration.

The Indians, proud of their army and confident of their superiority over the Chinese, were profoundly embarrassed by the military defeats and by what they regarded as a stab in the back after years of Chinese lip service to the coexistence pact between the two countries.

A normally soft-spoken Indian official shook with anger as he said, "We will not tolerate this humiliation to our country. We will throw out the Chinese if it takes our last drop of blood."

To American officials, the Chinese attack was final proof of the folly of neutralism and the impossibility of doing business with the Communists. The bigger the invasion, it was thought, the better the lesson would stick.

More specifically, a full-scale Chinese invasion could persuade Indian to accept American military aid for the first time; at last get rid of Defense Minister V. K. Krishna Menon, the strongest anti-American voice in India, and possibly even modify its policy of nonalinement in the cold war.

A major invasion of India, moreover, might impress Pakistan with the danger of Chinese aggression and persuade that nation to overcome its fear and hatred of India and not raise objections to an American arms airlift to India.

An American official in Saigon may have had some of these points in mind when he talked with a reporter who had just been assigned to the China-India crisis.

"If you see any Chinese, tell them to keep on coming about 200 miles into India," he said.

It was hardly surprising that officials in New Delhi and Washington insisted that the fighting was far more than a border clash and that China was guilty of unprovoked aggression.

Other observers leaned toward a more prosaic explanation. As they saw it, China's objective was simply to maintain a right of way, to secure its hold on a strategic route from its province of Sinkiang into Tibet.

The current trouble spots are two remote areas where the mountains are the highest in the world and even the passes are 15,000 feet or more above sea level.

In both regions, it was neither the Indians nor the Chinese, but the British, who drew on a map the boundary line now in dispute.

One of the areas is northern Ladakh, in India's northwest, originally part of Tibet and still inhabited by people of Tibetan stock. A Sikh ruler conquered it more than 100 years ago and in turn was conquered by the British.

The frontier was not important until the British came. The area was valuable mainly as a trade route to and from China, and the border was where one side stopped collecting taxes and the other side started.

After the British took over, they joined with the Russians in establishing a boundary commission to fix the frontier and also the interests of the two parties. China was weak at the time, especially in its outlying territories of Sinkiang and Tibet, and was left out of the negoitations.

The Indians inherited what they assumed would remain an uninhabited zone so secure it would require no patrolling. The best route through it, after all, had five passes higher than 16,000 feet, and the highest, the Karakoram, was more than 18,000 feet.

But the Chinese achieved the supposedly impossible in 1956 and 1957 and built a road that soon was carrying tanks and guns and 10-ton military trucks into Tibet. The equipment helped China overrun Tibet in 1959. The highway is called the Aksai Chin Road, after the "white desert" that it crosses.

The Indians first learned of the new Chinese road through a map published in a Chinese newspaper. The Indian Government sent out a survey party in 1958, and the Chinese arrested 15 members of the party on charges of trespassing.

The other region in dispute is the northern part of Assam, in northeastern India. When the British moved into Assam in the 1850's, they were interested chiefly in the rich plain of the Brahmaputra River, not in the high mountains and dense jungles of the northern section. They paid subsidies to the hill tribes living there, peoples related to the Tibetans, on condition they would not raid the flatland Assam villages.

Britain saw a chance to draw a permanent boundary north of Assam when an earlier Chinese occupation of Tibet ended with the overthrow of the Manchu dynasty in 1911. The British and the Tibetans drew a line along the crest of a 20,000-foot range and called it the McMahon line. A Chinese envoy initialed the agreement, but his Government repudiated him. No Chinese Government has since recognized the legality of the McMahon line.

The British never occupied this northern territory. They forgot even to show the McMahon line on maps published by the Survey of India.

When the Indians inherited it, however, they began administering it as a closed territory, guarding the tribes against outside influence and trying to raise their living standards. The Chinese continued to claim the area but did nothing about it.

What brought the dispute to a head was India's belated realization that the Chinese had possession of northern Ladakh. The Indians began contesting the Chinese occupation by sending patrols into and building forts in the same area, approaching but not reaching the Aksai Chin Road.

In 1959, the Chinese stated formally their claim to the area in Ladakh and conceded that the disputed area in the northeast, south of the McMahon line, had not been occupied by the Chinese for some time. They offered to settle the border disagreement through negotiations.

This claim and concession, coming together as they did, were interpreted in India as an offer to give up the Chinese claims in the northeast if India would give up northern Ladakh.

India rejected the proposal and continued to press the Chinese in Ladakh. Last September the Chinese retaliated with strong attacks in both the northwest and northeast.

In Ladakh, the Chinese recaptured areas that the Indians had taken in the previous 3 years. In the northeast, technical disagreements over the precise location of the McMahon line made it difficult to say for sure whether the Chinese had pressed south of the unmarked frontier.

Later Chinese advances, in October, went well south of the McMahon line. The Chinese said the advance was retaliation against an Indian offensive intended to drive them back from positions they already had taken. India had, in fact, announced a new push. It is not clear whether the Chinese reacted to it or anticipated it.

In any event, if it was security of the Aksai Chin road that the Chinese wanted, that is what they have achieved, at least for the present. Prime Minister Jawaharlal Nehru has offered repeatedly to negotiate if the Chinese will withdraw to their positions of last September 8.

That would put a cease-fire line at the point of farthest Indian advance in Ladakh, but it would mean India's giving up the portion around the Aksai Chin road. It would leave the northeast frontier area in India's hands.

Other results, possibly because most of the world considered the engagement a relatively minor border fracas, did not bear out most of the American expectations.

Neutrals of southeast Asia see both sides of the border dispute and are not inclined to put moral blame on the Chinese. This may be due partly to fear of China and partly to a dislike for India that is widespread in the area.

To the neutralists, the lesson, if anything, is that a nation can remain neutral and still receive help from the United States if coexistence breaks down and the Communists attack.

India has continued to hold firmly to its policy of nonalinement, even though Nehru did at last accept the resignation of his old friend Menon.

India did accept American military aid, but only reluctantly and with a minimum of publicity. Indian newspapers were instructed by telegram to publish only brief accounts of the airlift and to omit photographs.

They obeyed almost without exception but complained that Radio Moscow and Radio Peiping carried more news of the American military aid than appeared in the India press.

American arms, which arrived by airlift every 3 hours around the clock, disappeared behind a wall of Indian secrecy. United States and Indian crews unloaded from 20 to 24 tons of cargo from each plane, and trucks or Indian transport planes took the materiel away without further accountability.

One of the reasons Americans desired more publicity on the aid was to reassure Pakistan. The Pakistan press was complaining that the American arms would actually be used to strengthen India's position against Pakistan.

Pakistan's fear and hatred of India remains undiminished today.

In the longer term, China has brought about another result that could prove far more important than merely holding control of a road to Tibet.

The Chinese attack, whatever the rights and wrongs, aroused India to a pitch of militant nationalism unmatched in that nation's 15 years of independence.

At the time of the fighting, Indian students held almost daily demonstrations, marching, shouting slogans, giving blood, and often throwing rocks at the Chinese Embassy and burning effigies of Chou En-lai.

Indians of all classes now stop a visiting American on the street to condemn Chinese treachery and praise American friendship and help in time of need.

Indian businessmen sent out Christmas cards that were color photographs of flag-decked Indian tanks. On the inside, they said, "Season's greetings and all good wishes for a bright and prosperous New Year."

This new Indian unity and determination could be decisive in the continuing rivalry with China for influence among the developing nations of the continent.

[From the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, Feb. 11, 1963]

ASIA'S FRONTIERS OF FREEDOM—BICKERING BETWEEN NATIONS COMPLICATES FIGHT AGAINST REDS IN SOUTHEASTERN ASIA—SOME OF THE COUNTRIES HATE EACH OTHER MORE THAN THEY HATE COMMUNISTS—EVEN AMERICAN OFFICIALS FIND THEMSELVES TAKING SIDES IN DISPUTES

(By Richard Dudman)

(Eighth of a series)

A dispute over a centuries-old border temple has been a major public issue for the last few years in Cambodia and Thailand.

The controversy, legally concluded by the World Court last June but still rankling in both countries, is one of the many local quarrels that complicate the cold war.

Some of them, including the disagreement over the temple, are bigger public issues than the threat of Communist aggression in the countries involved.

These local disputes are not limited to any one part of the world, of course. India and Pakistan have fought bitterly in the past and are ready to fight again over the Kashmir. Hostilities between the Arab States and Israel plague the Middle East. Ecuador and Peru struggle over ownership of the headwaters of the Amazon.

In southeast Asia, the most serious current quarrels are between Cambodia and Thailand and between Cambodia and Vietnam.

The three countries are among the strong, expansionist states that developed on the southeast Asian peninsula about 1,000 years ago, after an earlier millennium in which tribes from the border regions of China had pushed southward and populated much of the area.

Burma invaded Thailand several times in a dispute that lasted four centuries and ended only with British colonization in the 1800's.

Thailand conquered several northern Malayan States, invaded the Khmer (Cambodian) empire and struggled with Vietnam for influence in Laos. The Vietnamese pushed southward and forced the Khmers out of Cochin China, now the southernmost part of Vietnam.

Colonialism brought a suspension of these regional rivalries. The pause lasted until World War II when Japanese occupation marked the end of colonialism in the area. Nationalism had been growing and the rivalries burst forth again after the nations gained independence.

Thailand, having grabbed two Cambodian provinces and part of Laos with Japanese help in World War II, was forced to give them back in 1947, but still wants them. Cambodia continues to claim Cochin China, which is inhabited by some 400,000 Cambodians.

Cambodian leaders charge that both Thailand and South Vietnam have designs on their country. They say, with apparent conviction, that they believe their two neighbors want to split Cambodia at the Mekong River and divide its territory between them.

Each of these nations is proud of a long and glorious history. Their politicians paint pictures of a golden age that was destroyed by colonialism.

It matters little that these histories have only a fragmentary basis, mainly the work of European scholars who removed jungle growth from ancient temples and cities and pieced together series of civilizations that were all but forgotten.

Recent discoveries reinforced dim recollections and the result was a strong sense of history that makes even minor border disputes become issues of national honor and prestige.

So it has been with the trouble over the temple of Preah Vihear. The holy place was founded in the 10th century, but it was neither well known nor particularly important until the Thai occupied it in 1953 and the Cambodians began issuing a series of protests.

Some Thai scoffed that it was not even Buddhist, but Brahman.

By the time the controversy was handed to the World Court in 1959 it had become a fighting matter. Thailand massed troops on the frontier and there was a demonstration in front of the Cambodian Embassy in Saigon.

Thailand stole a march by retaining as its counsel Philip C. Jessup, an international law expert who has held important State Department assignments. Cambodia responded, to the Thai chagrin, by retaining former Secretary of State Dean Acheson.

When Jessup later was named a judge of the World Court, some Thai thought they saw a dark plot. They thought the United States had decided to fix the case in Cambodia's favor in one move by taking away Thailand's lawyer and bribing him with an appointment to the Court.

The Thai, nevertheless, became confident they would win. On the day of their final argument, three elephants were seen walking together in Thailand and the sun broke through the clouds at The Hague. These were considered good omens.

When the Court found in favor of Cambodia, the news was a profound shock to Thailand. There were more riots in front of the Cambodian Embassy, encouraged or at least permitted by the Thai Government.

Hard feeling continued even after Thailand agreed reluctantly 3 weeks later to abide by the Court's decision. Officials in Bangkok speculated that Prince Sihanouk of Cambodia would not be able to visit the shrine from the Cambodian side, because the only access was up some broken steps on the face of a cliff. One of the steps was said to be 9 feet high.

There was speculation that Sihanouk would go to his temple by helicopter. There were Thai threats to shoot any Cambodians who dared set foot on Thai soil.

Sihanouk eventually visited the temple without serious incident, but the exchanges of threats continue.

One of the more colorful attacks on Cambodia was an editorial blast in a Bangkok newspaper. The paper recalled that several hundred years ago a Thai king had cut off the head (the highest, most sacred part of the body) of a Cambodian king and had used the blood to wash his feet (the lowest, most profane part of the body). The paper said the Thai were ready to do the same thing again.

For a time in 1960 the two countries had an agreement not to threaten or insult each other, but the truce broke down in a series of bitter exchanges that culminated in what the Cambodians considered an intolerable insult.

Sihanouk had stopped off in Tokyo and had been interviewed by the Japanese press. He was asked whether he was worried about Communist activities in Laos. He replied that he was not worried as much about the Communists as he was by the threats of Thailand and Vietnam against Cambodia.

Through a misunderstanding or poor translation, Marshal Sarit Thanarat, Thailand's premier, took the remark as a threat against Thailand.

He promptly issued a statement saying that "for Prince Sihanouk to threaten Thailand is like a pig threatening a lion.

Sihanouk suspended diplomatic relations.

When the United States blockaded Cuba and threatened invasion, many Thai concluded that meant it would be all right for Thailand to do the same to Cambodia.

Cambodia's relations with Vietnam have been just as bad. Both sides have charged repeatedly that the other side sent armed raiding parties across the border.

Newspapers of both countries carry frequent accounts of water buffalo rustlers slipping across the border and driving the cattle off to the other side.

The South Vietnamese have made the serious charge that Cambodian territory is being used as a sanctuary by Vietcong forces, as the Communist-led guerrillas flee from Vietnamese army attacks. They have charged also that North Vietnam sends arms and reinforcements through Cambodian territory into South Vietnam.

It is generally agreed that there are some minor incursions of the wild, unmarked border. But investigations of the border area have failed to disclose any Vietcong bases or organized infiltration traffic on Cambodian territory.

These bitter local controversies are facts of life in southeast Asia, as in other parts of the world. They raise the question of what responsibility the United States has for military assistance it gives countries in the area. Must the United States guarantee that Cambodia will not use its American arms to threaten Thailand and South Vietnam, or that Thailand and South Vietnam will not use their American arms against Cambodia?

A related question is how to keep American officials from taking sides in the disputes. Some of the diplomatic and aid officials are as vehement as the Asians with whom they work in denouncing the other Asians across the border.

Two old friends, one stationed in Saigon and the other in Phnom Penh, the capital of Cambodia, used to see eye to eye on most public issues. When they see each other now, they find themselves arguing continually about whether South Vietnam or Cambodia is in the right in the quarrels between them.

An obvious solution to this second question is to shift the Americans around more and more often to prevent them from developing "localities."

The first question is more difficult. The plain fact is that some of the countries in southeast Asia hate each other more than they hate the Communists.

[From the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, Feb. 12, 1963]

ASIA'S FRONTIERS OF FREEDOM—TREND TOWARD NATIONALISM IN JAPAN; PACIFISM DECLINING, TRADE WITH REDS INCREASING—GROWING UNWILLINGNESS TO FOLLOW U.S. LEAD IN POLICY OF CONTAINING CHINA IS EXPECTED TO RESULT FROM ECONOMIC PRESSURES, NATIONAL PRIDE

(By Richard Dudman)

(Ninth of a series)

A new nationalism is stirring in Japan. It shows itself in such diverse ways as a modest rebirth of militarism and plans for increased trade with Communist Russia and China.

The new tendency toward militarism is nothing spectacular yet. It is hardly comparable to the public interest in the military to be found in most Western countries.

What makes it significant is that it represents a sharp change from the extreme and emotional pacifism that swept the country after its defeat in World War II.

Japanese children now are beginning once more to play with guns. Most Japanese parents forbade such toys in the earlier postwar years.

Children swarmed to a military exhibition sponsored last year outside Tokyo by a Japanese newspaper. They climbed enthusiastically on American guns and tanks lent for the occasion, just as American children admire weapons at a military show in the United States.

The Government appears to encourage the trend. It sponsors a serial show on the Nippon educational television station, depicting the lives of soldiers in glorifying terms.

Applications for the Japanese military academy are up, running 25 for every acceptance. In previous years even the free bachelor's degree offered by the institution had not proved sufficient lure to outweigh the strong pacifist inclinations of most Japanese.

Kokushikan University in Tokyo, a conservative school, has reinstuted a feudalistic form of dueling called kendo, which was prohibited during the occupation.

The 45-year-old institution expects to increase its enrollment from the present 3,000 to 10,000 in the next 5 years. But it still is not comparable to the big universities of Japan, where Zengakuren, the leftist student federation, is a strong influence.

"We have no Zengakuren, no Communists, no pacifists—just patriots," a sociology professor said.

In practicing kendo, students face each other in pairs, armed with long bamboo sticks and wearing black plastic chest protectors, heavy gloves, baggy dark blue trousers, and helmets of heavy steel wire.

At the instructor's signal, the duelists begin howling in mock frenzy and whack each other with all their might. The beating of a drum halts each round and the instructor decides winners on points.

The sociology professor explained that the sport builds strength of muscle and character.

"We lost the war because you were too strong," he said.

The trend to militarism is limited mainly to children and young men. Middle aged and older men, as well as most women, seem to remain strongly pacifist.

Japan is building its own natural uranium reactor and could eventually produce its own atomic bombs. But any talk of bombs or plutonium, their raw material, is still as taboo as ever.

Strong pressure has developed for a revision of article 9 of the Japanese Constitution, which renounces war, but there is still strong resistance to any change in this provision.

Article 9, virtually dictated by Gen. Douglas MacArthur, says:

"Aspiring sincerely to an international peace based on justice and order, the Japanese people forever renounce war as a sovereign right of the nation and the threat or use of force as a means of settling international disputes.

"In order to accomplish the aim of the preceding paragraph, land, sea, and air forces, as well as other war potential, will never be maintained. The right of belligerency of the state will not be recognized."

Japan has long since circumvented article 9. With the encouragement and help of the United States, it began rearming near the start of the Korean war. Japan called its new armed forces "self-defense forces," rather than an army, navy, and air force.

These now number 171,500 men in ground units, 32,000 in sea units, and 38,500 in air units. The 242,000 men operate nearly 1,000 tanks and motorized guns, 200 ships and 1,100 planes.

Proposed revision of article 9 is one of several possible constitutional changes being studied by a committee of experts named in 1957. The group has taken testimony from hundreds of witnesses and has presented 19 interim reports. Its final report is due sometime this year.

The movement for increased trade with Communist China finds support in the Japanese tradition of close relations with the mainland. In 1928, 26 percent of Japan's exports went to China. In 1961, the fraction was only 0.4 percent—an amount only one-tenth of Japan's trade with Formosa.

Trade grew for a few years starting in 1955 under a government-to-government trade agreement. But the Chinese denounced the agreement in 1958 after rightists tore down a Chinese flag, at a trade fair in Nagasaki.

Behind that incident was a dispute over whether Japan would permit the flag to fly as a right and thus take a step toward recognition of Communist China. The Chinese since then have generally insisted that improvements in trade relations be accompanied by improvements in political relations.

Other obstacles to a resumption of the trade with the mainland are the strong opposition of Chiang Kai-shek's government in Formosa and of the United States. Japanese leaders fear that both will retaliate if Japan disregards their objections.

New negotiations began last summer, when Premier Chou En-lai sent an emissary to speak with Kenzo Matsumura, an elder statesman of the ruling Liberal-Democratic Party. He is sometimes known as the Cyrus Eaton of Japan.

At Chou's invitation, Matsumura went to China for 2 weeks last September and came back with an enthusiastic report that China was prepared to trade salt, soybeans, corn, and iron ore for Japanese fertilizer, urgently needed to increase China's agricultural output.

Matsumura's understanding was that Japan could enter into expanded trade with China without becoming involved in any political conditions. Some Japanese told themselves such an arrangement would be acceptable to the United States. They had read into some congressional reports and some campaign statements by President Kennedy the unjustified conclusion that the United States was preparing to recognize Communist China and adopt a "two Chinas" policy.

Tatsunosuke Takasaki, former minister of trade and now chairman of the Dai-Nippon Fishery Association, thereupon went to work to organize a mission to China.

The steel and fertilizer industries were reluctant to support the move. Each had an eye on Washington and the fertilizer industry was fearful of a boycott by its big customers in Formosa and South Korea.

Takasaki talked target figures with the Chinese, leaving details and credit arrangements for later discussions. Steel and fertilizer representatives watched with interest and are said now to be swinging toward participation.

These talks have been entirely private, on the Japanese side. Eventually, however, they will require some sort of government blessing, since they involve the biggest Japanese industries.

Meanwhile, two other groups, the Japan-China Trade Promotion Association and the Japan International Trade Promotion Association, have signed a trade protocol in Peiping, calling for increased trade between the two countries.

Reflecting a leftist slant of the two Japanese organizations, the protocol recognized China's three political principles governing commerce—Japan must avoid enmity toward China, will take no part in the "U.S. plot" of creating "two Chinas," and will not impede the development of normal relations between the two countries.

These organizations are said to represent a number of smaller commercial firms that want trade with China and have no objections to political entanglements, as well as some dummy firms that actually are subsidiaries of large, well-known companies that dare not seek such trade openly.

Economic pressures are combining with an independent pride of country to lead Japan to take its own place in the affairs of Asia and the world. The outlook is for Japan to be gradually less willing to follow America's lead in its policy of isolating and containing Communist China.

[From the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, Feb. 13, 1963]

Asia's Frontiers of Freedom—China Apparently in Upturn After Miscalculating Great Leap Forward in Its Economy—Much of American Wishful Thinking About Communist Chinese Found To Be Based on Myths—Wall of Ignorance Maintained by Both Countries

(By Richard Dudman)

(Last of a series)

Much American thinking about Communist China is based on myths repeated so often that they have been widely accepted as true.

These are:

That the Chinese are suffering from widespread starvation.

That Chinese industrialization failed because Communist organization, particularly in the communes, was ruthless and unpopular.

That dissatisfaction is so general that internal revolt is a very real possibility and could be touched off by an invasion from Formosa.

These beliefs, together with China's bitter split with the Soviet Union over strategy against the West, give basis for a feeling that the problem of China, distasteful as it is just now, will eventually solve itself.

A further easy assumption holds that when the Communist regime finally collapses the Chinese people will return with relief to their traditional friendship with the United States.

Information gathered by a Post-Dispatch reporter-photographer team touring the southern rim of China indicates that these widely held beliefs and expectations are false, a compound of exaggeration, wishful thinking, misinformation, and ignorance about what is going on in the biggest country in the world with its 700 million population.

The ignorance is due mainly to an artificial wall erected between the United States and China after the Chinese Communists gained control in 1949. Both countries work at keeping the wall nearly impenetrable. With few exceptions, both stand in the way of Americans who would like to visit the Chinese mainland.

Almost all American passports bear the printed prohibition: "This passport is not valid for travel to or in Communist-controlled portions of China, Korea, Vietnam, or to or in Albania."

The principal exceptions are for 34 news organizations that the State Department has judged to be qualified and six persons who have visited relatives held prisoner in China.

Edgar Snow, one of the few Americans to obtain a visa to enter Communist China, visited the country in 1960 and related his experiences in the book "The Other Side of the River," published last November. He said the State Department authorized the trip only after he became a correspondent for Look magazine, on the approved list. China, on the other hand, admitted him only as a writer and not as a news correspondent.

Barred from entering the country, an American investigator must resort to the data and analyses of the many China watchers operating in Hong Kong, Japan, Burma, India, and other countries around China's periphery. Some of these observers are working for the United States or other governments, some are supported by churches or other private institutions, some are self-supported through the sale of newsletters or intelligence reports.

Another source is the testimony of refugees who come out of China. Still another is the testimony of non-American businessmen, diplomats, and journalists who have traveled in China recently.

These sources must be considered in terms of their possible bias, and their information must be judged for plausibility and consistency.

What follows is a judgment on this basis of China's problems and prospects.

As for starvation, it does not exist on any large scale in China today. There is and always has been considerable hunger and some malnutrition. Imports of more than 10 million tons of grain from non-Communist countries in the last 2 years have been a heavy financial burden on the government. But the reports of mass starvation in recent years do not stand up as showing a repetition of the famines that have plagued China from time to time through the centuries.

One of the sources of starvation reports is Father Luis Ruiz, a Jesuit priest at the Portuguese colony of Macao, a peninsula and some islands on the China coast near Hong Kong. He greets several hundred refugees a month, feeding and housing those who cannot arrange to be smuggled to Hong Kong. He hears their stories and sees their hunger and judges that starvation in China is widespread.

He showed the Post-Dispatch team five farmers in their early twenties, who had arrived from China 6 days earlier. They were bright eyed, strong muscled, and huskily built.

"They were starving when they arrived," said Father Ruiz. "We fattened them up."

A British physician, after examining a group of 200 newly arrived refugees, observed that they were hungry from a 5-day walk to freedom but concluded: "These people are not suffering from malnutrition."

He explained that malnutrition has specific symptoms—swollen stomachs and ankles and loss of hair. He said he saw no such signs.

China's economic breakdown, which began in 1958, is more complicated than the simple explanation that the people are starving and resentful.

The trouble came after a first 5-year plan, 1953 through 1957, that American experts concede worked out rather well. Agricultural goals were modest, providing for a slight increase over population growth, and considerable progress was made in industrialization.

Suddenly, in 1957 and 1958, the Chinese stepped up the pace enormously in the "great leap forward." They set production goals that seemed astronomical and consolidated collective farms into rural communes of 3,000 to 4,000 persons. City communes engaged in such projects as building the famous backyard iron hearths, later dismantled and converted into larger and more practical blast furnaces.

American observers say the Chinese seemed to have gone mad, through a combination of national cockiness and an unrealistic ambition to overtake the Soviet Union and the United States as a great industrial power.

Some other observers think the scheme made sense in terms of China's needs and resources, notably its tremendous population, but foundered on two technical difficulties.

One was that the commune idea spread too fast for efficient organization. When it began in Honan Province, it caught public imagination as a quick jump to pure communism—from each according to his ability and to each according to his needs. It sounded like the ultimate welfare state. The communes spread like a flood through the country.

The other difficulty was statistical. Local bureaucrats exaggerated their production figures to make a good showing against their high quotas. The cumulated errors resulted in the impossible 1958 harvest total announced as 375 million tons.

Believing its own figures, the Communist regime speeded up its industrialization program building new plants to be financed, it thought, out of surplus agricultural production. Farm acreage was cut back, in fact, to prevent anticipated overproduction.

The crash came late in 1960. The Chinese Government admitted the 1958 harvest had been overestimated and cut back the official total by one-third, to 250 million. Outside observers think the 1958 harvest was actually about 190 million to 200 million tons. That total still would have been the biggest harvest in Chinese history, but it was not enough to supply China's own needs, much less finance a construction boom.

Floods and droughts, combined with bad management based on bad statistics, caused poor harvests in 1959, 1960, and 1961.

The Government, in a drastic remedy, halted industrialization so suddenly that a foreign observer said the country looked like Pompeii after the eruption of Mount Vesuvius. Erection of buildings was halted at every stage of construction, as if by a blanket order from Peiping.

Industrial capacity was cut more than 90 percent, and 20 to 30 million persons were taken off industrial jobs and sent back to the farms. The rural communes were split into smaller units, and farmers were permitted to operate private plots once more.

Another step was to resume a national birth control program, interrupted when the "great leap forward" began and the theory was that the huge and growing population was China's single greatest resource.

Outside observers now estimate the 1962 harvest at around 200 million tons, about the 1957 level with allowance for the population increase since then. Grain purchases from the West are continuing.

Steel production was still dropping in 1962. From a peak of 18 million tons in 1960, it sank below 10 million tons. But these figures must be compared to the totals of 2,800,000 in 1955 and 5,300,000 in 1957.

Looking back at the economic difficulties, the trouble can be likened to the flight of an airplane. Managers of the economy overestimated its forward thrust, tried to climb too fast, and went into a stall.

As in aeronautics, an economy can come out of a stall without crashing if it has reached a sufficient altitude.

In China's case, the upturn seems to have occurred in time. The economy is making a gradual recovery. The big question now is whether China will try to resume the "great leap forward" and, if it does, whether it can do so with rational management. Technical publications have been preaching respect for honest statistics, suggesting that the Government has learned its lesson.

Estimates of morale inside China come largely from those who interview refugees. The significance of this testimony is not that the refugees are dissatisfied—that much is to be expected from those who are fleeing—but in two other comments frequently heard.

One is that they are proud of their country's new strength. They think they had to work too hard and had too little to eat, but younger refugees often credit the Communist regime with making China a powerful nation, able to command the fear and respect of the rest of the world and even stand off the armed might of the United States, in the Korean war. Even young Roman Catholic priests coming out of China have expressed pride in this new national strength.

The other significant refugee view is that the great majority, while ready to break with the Communist regime, has no desire to go to Formosa and come under the rule of Chiang Kai-shek and the Chinese Nationalists. Energetic recruiting campaigns by the Nationalists among the refugees in Hong Kong have had meager success.

The surge of refugees last May, when the Communists inexplicably lowered the bars for a month and let 60,000 cross into Hong Kong, proved to some China-watchers that the Government had lost control for a time. To others, the important fact was that the Communists could reimpose control without stirring mass violence among those who hoped to escape.

Internal collapse, at this point, seems out of the question. Some of the China-watchers, however, cling to the hope that Chiang can and will trigger a successful counterrevolution by undertaking a full-scale invasion.

"If the Nationalists could establish a bridgehead in Shanghai," said one of these China hands, not an American, "it would be a place where the Chinese could run to. This would require U.S. assistance, of course. The bridgehead would be a magnet for a stream of defectors. The regime eventually would fall."

This speculation leaves out of account a widespread propaganda-fostered hatred of Chiang and the United States. Chiang's threats of an invasion, together with small-scale landing attempts last summer, mean to many Chinese that the only alternative to Communist rule is a new dictatorship under Chiang.

In the eyes of China's leaders, the United States is an implacable enemy that pushed up to China's border in the Korean war and continues now to encourage Chiang in his dream of returning victoriously to the mainland. Some qualified Western observers in China have found this view widely held among the Chinese people.

If the People's Republic of China is here to stay, what of the future?

Historically, China is expansionist, and the rich rice-growing country of southeast Asia is a natural field for conquest. China's announced strategy is to encourage "wars of liberation" to overthrow the "bourgeois nationalist" regimes in the region.

But Red China's record of expansionism should not be exaggerated. China entered the Korean war only when American advances to the Yalu River threatened China's internal security and seemed on the point of proving to the rest of Asia that China could not save its one true satellite, North Korea, from extinction.

Along the Indian border, China has pursued strictly limited objectives, reestablishing its hold on disputed territory in the west and withdrawing voluntarily after administering a humiliating defeat to India in the east.

In Vietnam, it would be a simple matter for China to step up the scale of the guerrilla war against the South Vietnamese regime and its American support. So far, China has accepted a leisurely timetable, relying mainly on encouragement through propaganda blasts against the Diem government and the "American imperialists."

In the rest of southeast Asia, China has been practicing peaceful coexistence where it can, competing economically with the aid programs of the Soviet Union and the United States. The common American picture of Communist China as a threatening monster about to gobble up southeast Asia is not shared by most southeast Asians.

The bitter dispute between Communist China and the Soviet Union breaks the pattern of a monolithic Communist bloc following a consistent policy in southeast Asia, just as differences among Western powers had long since broken the pattern of a unified West building a wall of containment around Communist China.

American policy in southeast Asia is still centered on a constant threat of military action against Communist China by the American-backed nationalist forces on Formosa, followed, so it is hoped, by an internal breakdown. Other national regimes in the area are still judged mainly on the basis of their anticommunism rather than their acceptance at home as expressing the national self-interests of their own countries.

But the overriding aspirations of the peoples of southeast Asia is not the downfall of Communist China or even the promotion of democracy and free enterprise. Nor is it the downfall of Western imperialism, as the Communists would have them believe.

They aspire, instead, to their own self-determination, their own political and economic independence. Big power policies, whether by East or West, that neglect this basic fact must fail in the long run.

TRIBUTE TO VICE PRESIDENT

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I wish to state to the Vice President that I am profoundly delighted, as I am sure every other Member of the Senate is, by his constantly being in attendance in presiding over the deliberations of this body. It has been a source of strength to me to see the Vice President here day after day, especially in view of the length of time he is assigning to this important task.

It gives a Senator comfort and strength to see the Vice President listening attentively to what is going on.

DISCLOSURE OF FINANCIAL INTEREST BY MEMBERS OF CONGRESS

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I have long believed that the Congress should provide a code of ethics for its Members and employees, and that the public good requires it. Accordingly, together with my colleague [Mr. Keating], I have submitted Senate Concurrent Resolution 5, to establish a Joint Committee on Ethics, which would develop and recommend such a comprehensive code for congressional adoption, and I have introduced S. 281, to make congressional communications with Federal regulatory agencies matters of public record.

Senate Concurrent Resolution 5 provides an interim code of ethics for the guidance of Members and employees during the period prior to the adoption of a comprehensive code. One of its requirements—which comes from the New York State Code—is that Members "having a financial interest, direct or indirect, having a value of $10,000 or more, in any activity which is subject to the jurisdiction of a regulatory agency" make a matter of public record the nature of such interest, by filing a statement with the Comptroller General.

Since Senate Concurrent Resolution 5 has not yet been agreed to, the Comptroller General does not have authority to receive and maintain such lists. However, in order to demonstrate my concern with the matter, I am now making a statement for the Record. As of this date, my holdings of the described nature are as follows:

As trustee of a family trust, I have an indirect interest in the following companies or their subsidiaries or affiliates; these are normal investments in publicly owned corporations, with no element of control alone or in combination with others: American & Foreign Securities Corp., Cities Service Corp., Criterion Insurance Co., Government Employees Corp., Government Employees Financial Corp., Government Employees Insurance Co., Government Employees Life Insurance Co., Sinclair Oil & Gas Co., South Carolina Electric & Gas Co., Southern Co., and Transamerica Corp. of Delaware.

UNITED NATIONS BONDS

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, it will be recalled that the matter of United Nations bonds was a hotly controverted issue in the Senate. Last September the Congress passed legislation by which the United States agreed to purchase the United Nations bonds on a matching basis—a formula which I am honored to say I had a part in drafting. Therefore, Mr. President, it is a matter of great satisfaction to me to be able to state that a recent United Nations report shows that so far a total of 58 nations have purchased or signified their intention to buy United Nations bonds, and that the total amount pledged or paid is now more than $137 million.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a United Nations press release listing the nations, the amounts, and the dates of the purchases of United Nations bonds, paid or pledged, to February 15, 1963.

There being no objection, the list was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED NATIONS BONDS

On February 14, India and the Netherlands purchased United Nations bonds to the value of U.S. $2 million and U.S. $1,333,000 respectively, bringing to $124,288,680 the total actual payments made for the purchase of such bonds.

India became the 40th country to buy United Nations bonds, while the Netherlands fulfilled its pledge of April 4, 1962, to buy $2,020,000 worth of bonds. The Netherlands had made an earlier purchase of $687,000 on October 19, 1962.

A total of 58 governments have either bought United Nations bonds or announced their intention to do so, and the total amount paid or pledged, including the matching increase by the United States, is $137,670,937. Details of these purchases and pledges are as follows:

Country	Amount in U.S. dollars	Date of purchase
Purchases:		
Afghanistan	25,000	Oct. 3, 1962
Australia	4,000,000	June 15, 1962
Burma	100,000	Nov. 30, 1962
Cameroon	9,569	Oct. 24, 1962
Canada	6,240,000	Oct. 8, 1962
Ceylon	25,000	Oct. 23, 1962
China	500,000	Dec. 17, 1962
Denmark	2,500,000	Mar. 23, 1962
Federal Republic of Germany	10,000,000	Oct. 15, 1962
Federation of Malaya	340,000	July 25, 1962
Finland	1,480,000	Mar. 8, 1962
Greece	10,000	Aug. 23, 1962
Honduras	10,000	Jan. 3, 1963
Iceland	80,000	Mar. 27, 1962
India	2,000,000	Feb. 14, 1963
Indonesia	200,000	Aug. 1, 1962
Ireland	300,000	June 13, 1962
Israel	200,000	May 1, 1962
Italy	8,960,000	May 2, 1962
Ivory Coast	60,000	Oct. 2, 1962
Jordan	25,000	July 6, 1962
Korea, Republic of	400,000	Dec. 7, 1962
Kuwait	1,000,000	July 18, 1962
Lebanon	8,271	Nov. 15, 1962
Luxembourg	100,000	Dec. 27, 1962
Purchases—Continued		
Morocco	280,000	Dec. 6, 1962
Netherlands	2,020,000	Oct. 19, 1962 Feb. 14, 1963
New Zealand	500,000	June 15, 1962
Nigeria	1,000,000	Dec. 18, 1962
Norway	1,800,000	Mar. 8, 1962
Sierra Leone	28,000	Sept. 24, 1962
Sudan	50,000	May 18, 1962
Sweden	5,800,000	May 18, 1962
Switzerland	1,900,000	Nov. 15, 1962
Thailand	160,000	Nov. 15, 1962
Togo	10,000	May 29, 1962
Tunisia	485,000	June 27, 1962
United Kingdom	12,000,000	Oct. 31, 1962
United States	59,672,840	Nov. 2, 1962 Dec. 21, 1962
Vietnam	10,000	July 11, 1962
Pledges:		
Austria	900,000	Mar. 19, 1962
Brazil	100,000	Aug. 10, 1962
Cambodia	5,000	May 14, 1962
Cyprus	26,175	Apr. 4, 1962
Ecuador	12,000	June 10, 1962
Ethiopia	200,000	Mar. 20, 1962
Ghana	100,000	July 20, 1962
Iran	500,000	Apr. 5, 1962
Iraq	100,000	Oct. 5, 1962
Japan	5,000,000	July 13, 1962
Liberia	200,000	Mar. 30, 1962
Mauritania	4,082	July 19, 1962
New Zealand	500,000	Apr. 27, 1962
Pakistan	500,000	Feb. 14. 9162
Panama	25,000	June 15, 1962
Philippines	750,000	Aug. 30, 1962
Turkey	100,000	Dec. 5, 1962
United Arab Republic	250,000	July 2, 1962
Venezuela	300,000	Apr. 13, 1962
Yugoslavia	200,000	June 8, 1962

(Yugoslavia handed over a check for $100,000 to the United Nations on January 2, 1963, but has yet to take receipt of the United Nations bond.)

FREE WORLD UNITY

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, one of the prime architects of free world unity, who has done pioneer work in bringing Europe together into a strong economic partnership, is Jean Monnet, really the father of the European Common Market and the European Coal and Steel Community. On January 23, 1963, M. Monnet was presented the annual Freedom Award for outstanding service in the cause of freedom, at a Freedom House dinner in New York City. In his acceptance address M. Monnet emphasized the tremendous potential of the European Common Market in cooperation with the United States as a powerful force for peace and the common defense of the free world.

I consider it a great honor and privilege to ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the acceptance address by M. Monnet, and the message from President Kennedy which was read by Under Secretary of State George W. Ball.

There being no objection, the letter and the address were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE 1962 FREEDOM AWARD TO JEAN MONNET

TEXT OF LETTER FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

DEAR MR. MONNET: I am delighted to join my friends at Freedom House in doing honor to your great achievements. You come at a moment of high importance, and you come as the exemplar of disinterested service to Europe and to the Atlantic world.

For centuries, emperors, kings, and dictators have sought to impose unity on Europe by force. For better or worse, they have failed. But under your inspiration, Europe has moved closer to unity in less than 20 years than it had done before in a thousand. You and your associates have built with the mortar of reason and the brick of economic and political interest. You are transforming Europe by the power of a constructive idea.

Ever since the war the reconstruction and the knitting together of Europe have been objectives of U.S. policy, for we have recognized with you that a strong Europe would be good not only for Europeans but for the world. America and a united Europe, working in full and effective partnership, can find solutions to those urgent problems that confront all mankind in this crucial time.

I have been happy, therefore, to read your statement of January 16 in which you call attention to the responsibility of Europe to share with the United States in the common defense of the West. I believe, with you, that Americans and Europeans must recognize that neither one nor the other is defending a particular country, but that the ensemble is defending a common civilization. The United States will be true to this conviction, and we trust that it will have the support of Europeans, too.

Your practical wisdom, your energy in persuasion, your tested courage, and your earned eminence in Europe are the reasons for this celebration in your honor. They are also a great resource for freedom, and I wish you many years of continued strength in your service to our cause.

Sincerely,

JOHN F. KENNEDY.

ADDRESS BY M. JEAN MONNET

Your Excellencies, ladies and gentlemen, I am very honored to receive from the board of trustees of Freedom House the Freedom Award at your hands today.

That you are giving this award to a European is to me a proof of the deep community of mind and feeling that unite the people of Europe and North America.

I am convinced that this feeling is rooted in our common civilization, the essence of which is its tradition of freedom. This freedom truly is the main issue between the two ways of approaching life that compete for men's minds today.

So many people have written and spoken about liberty more thoroughly than I can that I want to limit myself to what seems to me the most important and urgent practical problem confronting the West and its traditions of freedom, the one that requires action from us today.

The worst enemies of freedom have been, and still are, the spirit of domination and its consequence, the threat of war.

While within our frontiers we have organized liberty and, by mutual consent, maintained the rule of law that largely eliminates the spirit of domination, internationally we are still maintaining peace by force.

Now we must go beyond national frontiers and create new forms of relationships between our countries.

The next step ahead of us must clearly be to complete the unity of Europe including Britain, and gradually develop a strong partnership of equals between the United States and Europe.

These are essential for the organization of peace in the world and the maintenance of freedom.

For, as we progress toward the unity of the West, we will create the conditions favoring a lasting peace between the West and the Soviet Union.

Naturally, the process of putting these great aims into practice involves great changes in the form of relationships now existing between our nations. This brings us up against difficulties.

I would like to talk of the one that looms largest over all at this moment.

It is more than important, it is essential that Britain should join our European Community under the same conditions as the present members.

The negotiations have been going on too long, but they can be rapidly concluded.

We must remember that on fundamental issues, as two World Wars have proved, Britain is part of Europe.

People in Britain and on the Continent must free their minds of the obsolete and static idea that Britain, because an island, is bound to be insular, that she does not belong to Europe and that her commercial policies and interests will keep her forever apart from the natural trend toward unity of Europe.

Entry into Europe would be good for Britain, for Europe, for the West and for world peace.

I still hope and believe, like most people in the six, that the negotiations on Britain's entry into Europe will succeed.

Those who had anything to do with European unity know from their own experience that the difficulties encountered at any moment do not matter so long as the objective is kept clearly in view.

The world has recently become aware of the success of European economic unity, and people everywhere see political unity emerging in Europe. But this sudden awareness has concealed the 12 years of work and often of serious trouble that lie behind the achievement.

When the treaty of the European Defense Community was rejected in 1954, most competent observers thought unity in Europe was dead and buried. And yet the progress we have made during the last 12 years shows that despite all the difficulties, we are on the way.

The countries of continental Europe—France, Germany, Italy, and Benelux—are uniting in a European Economic Community of nearly 200 million people.

Germany and France, which have struggled to dominate one another for centuries, are now coming together, accepting the fact that they have the same destiny. In the European Economic Community they are pursuing a common course which is gradually transforming their mutual relations and the outlook of their peoples. They have even been building recently the possibility of closer cooperation.

I have no doubt that France, from the start one of the promoters of the European unity, will follow this course in the future as in the past.

What are the simple reasons that made these changes happen?

It is because the countries of the European Community have agreed that their economic problems which, in the past, were national responsibilities, have now become common responsibilities and being common, unite them instead of dividing them.

It is because they have established common rules and common institutions that they can do the job.

It is because each of the steps they have taken one after the other, as circumstances allowed, have been designed to further the same objective.

The European Coal and Steel Community, which was at the beginning of all this enterprise, was not set up just to pool coal and steel, but as a first step on the way to European union.

The Common Market has not been created just to build a better system of exchanging goods, or to create a new power. We had, and have, as our objectives essentially the creation of a united Europe and the elimination between nations and their peoples of the spirit of domination that has brought the world close to destruction many times.

To produce such a change, it was essential to eliminate the feeling of discrimination between nations—the feeling that was the inevitable consequence of the many European wars.

To begin to unite Europe only 5 years after the war, it was vital that everyone should see that there were no more victors or vanquished, but only partners equal before the common law.

The institutions of the Common Market work in such a way that discrimination between European nations has now been ended.

The independent European Commission is the authority empowered to propose the economic policies of the Community. The national governments whose representatives sit in the Council of Ministers, decide on the common policies proposed by the Commission according to the rules and spirit of the Rome Treaty. In a widening field its decisions no longer require unanimity.

The attitudes of the people of Europe are rapidly changing. The peoples of these community countries, producers, farmers, labor and members of the professions, have become partners in change and are taking on the same community outlook. In fact, when you look at what's happening, these people are the same people as they have been for centuries but their attitudes today toward one another have changed, and this, in my opinion, is the process of civilization itself.

This process is taking us faster and farther than anyone would have dared to hope after the war.

Britain's request to enter European union is one sign.

Another is your President's speech of the last 4th of July, where he called for a partnership of equals between the United States of America and the European Community. You are now preparing to negotiate new trade links across the Atlantic which must serve the interests of the world as a whole.

Ever since the Marshall plan, and the Schuman plan, American support for European unity has never faltered.

I can testify from my own experience that this support has been invaluable in bringing European unity to the point where it is today. For once, the most powerful country in the world has helped others to unite instead of adopting the old principle of divide and rule.

But during all those years, the United States took her decisions alone. Now the partnership means a new form of relations.

Let me read to you what the Action Committee of the United States of Europe said on this matter in its joint declaration of June 26 last:

"The partnership between America and a united Europe must be a partnership of two separate but equally powerful entities, each bearing its share of common responsibilities in the world. This partnership is natural and inevitable because the peoples of Europe and America share the same civilization based on freedom and conduct their public life in accordance with common democratic principles."

I think this has implications for defense which, with the entry of Britain into the Common Market, is the main problem that looms over the great debate in the West.

We must recognize, in this nuclear age, that while making every effort to disarm, we must pursue and improve our common defense with all its political implications on both sides of the Atlantic.

Europe and America must both acknowledge that neither of us is defending a particular country, that we are all defending our common civilization.

You, in the United States, must realize that the claims of Europe to share common responsibility and authority for decisions on defense, including the nuclear weapons, is natural since any decision involves the very existence of the European peoples.

On the other hand, I think the Europeans must understand that the nuclear terror is indivisible and that they too must shoulder an adequate share of the common defense.

Today, however, the countries of the Atlantic Alliance have such divergent views of their immediate interests that a common approach to the problems has to be developed if agreement is to be achieved.

To achieve the partnership between Europe and America, we must create an increasingly common interest by acting in common on a growing number of questions. When sufficient points of common interest have been created, a degree of community in defense will be accepted that today appears utopian.

In my opinion, while progress on defense must be sought continuously, the field where results can be most promptly obtained is the economic one.

There are urgent problems which neither Europe nor America can settle alone. These are, to my mind, the monetary stability of the West, the organization of agriculture in an increasingly industrial world, help to the developing countries to speed their growth and, of course, the freeing of trade to be negotiated between yourselves and the Common Market.

I realize fully that economic partnership will not automatically lead to a partnership for defense. In Europe, too, the Common Market alone is not enough to create political union. But without the Common Market, political union would never have been raised as a practical issue. Similarly, the creation of the rules and institutions needed to build up the economic partnership between the United States and Europe will change the context for dealing with defense. It will then appear in a new light on both sides of the Atlantic.

The unity of Europe and its partnership with the United States will not only change the relationship between us, it will fundamentally change the relationship of the West with the Soviet Union.

As long as Russia believes the West can be divided, it will be tempted to upset the balance of power in its favor.

As we organize new forms of relationship between the Western nations, we will be showing ourselves, the Soviet Union, and the rest of the world, that as a result of the union of Europe and its partnership with the United States, the West cannot be divided.

The conditions will then exist for establishing the basis of lasting peace between the Soviet Union and ourselves.

I believe this development can come much faster than we imagine today. My hope is based on my experience of European unity. This experience has been that once people are convinced a new situation is inevitable, they adapt themselves to it spontaneously and by doing so. hasten the process itself.

This is the most hopeful road to the creation of peace today, and to the consolidation of freedom.

ESTONIAN INDEPENDENCE

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, the independence of Estonia was celebrated on February 24, the 45th anniversary of this historic event in the life of the Estonian people. They proclaimed their Republic in 1918, after two centuries of Russian rule; but they enjoyed self-government for only two decades. In 1940, the Soviet Russian armies swept over the Baltic States, and brought the Republic to an end.

Communist repressive measures have ruthlessly put down all manifestations by the Estonian people of their hope for freedom and independence; but the flame of liberty still continues to burn high. The United States has steadfastly upheld the principle of self-determination, and will continue to press for the recognition of this basic right until all the captive peoples of Europe are freed from the oppressive rule of their Communist overlords. Our voices in commemoration of this anniversary of freedom will help to keep hope alive in the hearts of the Estonian people.

TRIBUTE TO BRIG. GEN. HERBERT D. VOGEL

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I am genuinely sorry to learn that Brig. Gen. Herbert D. Vogel, U.S. Army, retired, is leaving Tennessee, his adopted State for the past 9 years.

General Vogel served as Chairman of the Tennessee Valley Authority from 1954 until last summer, when he resigned, and was succeeded on the Board of Directors by the Honorable Frank Smith, a former Member of Congress from Mississippi.

As the appointee of an administration that was less than enthusiastic about the TVA, General Vogel at first was regarded with suspicion by many of those in the valley and in Washington who had worked to establish the TVA as the finest example of regional resource development in the world.

However, as often happens to those who are exposed directly to the things that make it great, General Vogel became one of the TVA's most outspoken champions. I recall that once a Texas physician wrote to complain that he did not want his tax money spent for such socialistic enterprises as TVA dams. General Vogel, who had spent much of his adult life in river and harbor development work for the Engineers, wrote back that the Government seemed to be spending more of the taxpayers' money to build dams in Texas than to build dams in the Tennessee Valley, and asked whether the doctor would like to "squawk" about that.

I should also like to remind the Senate that it was during General Vogel's tenure as TVA Chairman that identical bidding on TVA purchases of electrical equipment was exposed through the Senate Subcommittee on Antitrust and Monoply—a development quickly followed by the impaneling of a Federal grand jury at Philadelphia, and the indictment and conviction of a large number of individuals and corporations in the electrical equipment industry. The cooperation which General Vogel caused to be accorded by the TVA to our subcommittee was excellent and was fully in the public interest.

Both during his service as TVA Chairman and afterward, General Vogel took an active interest in the affairs of the community, Knoxville, and of the State in which he lived. Indeed, upon his departure from the TVA, he was sought as a candidate for election as Governor of Tennessee; but he declined to run.

According to news reports from Knoxville, General Vogel has closed the consulting engineer's office he had opened in Knoxville after leaving the TVA, and he and Mrs. Vogel plan to move to some place in the East. I wish them well, and I say again that Tennessee will miss them.

TRIBUTE TO MAJ. GEN. HAROLD K. JOHNSON, COMMANDANT OF THE COMMAND AND GENERAL STAFF COLLEGE AND COMMANDING GENERAL OF FORT LEAVENWORTH

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. President, Maj. Gen. Harold K. Johnson has endeared himself to the citizens of Leavenworth, Kans. As a gesture of appreciation, the chamber of commerce, Central Trades & Labor Union, and the National Federation of Federal Employees issued a resolution, which I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD together with names and editorial entitled "We Lose an Outstanding Citizen," published in the Leavenworth Times of February 1, 1963.

There being no objection, the resolution and editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A JOINT RESOLUTION ISSUED BY AND FOR THE CITIZENS OF LEAVENWORTH, KANS., FEBRUARY 15, 1963

(To be read before the U.S. House of Representatives by the Honoroble WILLIAM H. AVERY, of Kansas, with his personal comments added)

Resolved, That it is with deep regret that the city of Leavenworth and its citizens have received the news that Maj. Gen. Harold K. Johnson will leave his command at Fort Leavenworth for a new assignment in Washington on February 25, 1963. Having witnessed General Johnson's exceptional ability at work, it should not have been unexpected to see him moved prior to a "normal" period of duty; nevertheless, the action was met with surprise mingled with regret.

The city of Leavenworth has seen many commanding generals at Fort Leavenworth. None have captured the esteem, respect, and downright admiration of the citizens of Leavenworth as General Johnson has. Several came close, but did not reach General Johnson's mark.

General Johnson's devotion of time and talent to what may be called civic affairs has been little short of amazing. No native civilian could have done more to promote the welfare of Leavenworth.

What we in Leavenworth think of General Johnson may best be summarized by the following editorial published in the Leavenworth Times February 1, 1963:

"WE LOSE AN OUTSTANDING CITIZEN

"The Leavenworth community will lose an outstanding citizen the last of this month when Maj. Gen. Harold K. Johnson, commandant of the Command and General Staff College and commanding general of Fort Leavenworth, leaves for a new assignment at the Pentagon.

"To say that General Johnson is popular is to use a trite expression but Webster's dictionary defines popular as a person having many friends, and certainly the general has a multitude of friends in both Leavenworth and Fort Leavenworth.

"In the city, he took an active part in civic and social affairs. He served on committees, both as member and chairman, for projects devoted to the welfare of the community. For this work he was given a man of the hour award by the chamber of commerce last year.

"At the fort he has been active in school and Boy Scout work and was awarded the Silver Beaver, one of scouting's top awards by the Kaw Council. Park College conferred an honorary doctor of education degree in recognition of his work in public relations.

"General Johnson had already established himself as a top military leader before his assignment to Fort Leavenworth and it didn't take long for people in this area to recognize his leadership in civic affairs. He has been in demand as a speaker in the Midwest because of his forceful presentations of world and military affairs in words that are easily understood.

"Because of his success in getting things done and securing cooperation within the combined community of the two Leavenworths, he leaves a tough mark to shoot at for his successor, Maj. Gen. Harry J. Lemley, Jr. Both generals will start their new assignments with best wishes for continued success by friends and coworkers here."

J. F. MITCHELL,
Mayor, City of Leavenworth.
IVAN J. MEYER,
President,
Leavenworth Chamber of Commerce.
IVAN MARSHALL,
President,
Central Trades & Labor Council.
MILTON H. STROH,
Public Relations Officer,
EDWARD F. LARKIN,
Public Relations Officer,
National Federation of Federal Employees, Local 49
(For Alfred E. Michael, President).

ALF M. LANDON'S COUNSEL ON CURRENT DOMESTIC AND INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. President, many years have passed since Alf Landon carried the Republican Party's banner in its campaign for the Presidency. In the years since, Mr. Landon has demonstrated his wisdom and sound judgment as a spokesman on public issues and as a counsel to his fellow Kansans and to those in the highest places of Government. As with many men of character and wisdom, the years have brought increasing respect and admiration.

I ask unanimous consent at this time to have printed in the RECORD the recent address which Mr. Landon delivered to the Washington County Bar Association at Bartlesville, Okla., on February 28, 1963, in order that I might call to the attention of the Senate and to all of those who read this RECORD his sound counsel on current domestic and international affairs.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INTERNATIONAL POLITICS

(Address by Hon. Alf M. Landon)

I speak on international politics not as an expert steeped in classified information on foreign affairs.

I speak simply as one with some experience in politics, with a background of history, and close reading of world daily political events, viewing international politics as I would American politics.

It is obvious that economic problems and troubles in a country mold its foreign policies. Even in a rich and powerful country like these United States, the Secretary of Defense stresses the saving of billions of dollars that will be saved by abandoning bombers for missiles.

That decision involving life or death matters of our great country as a Nation of free people was made in the Pentagon by civilians over all the general staff, except Gen. Maxwell D. Taylor, the appointee for the President to head the general staff.

Of course, there are other factors involved than economic. I have previously spoken of the tendency of generals to start the next war with the last war's weapons.

Nevertheless, I believe we can afford what engineers call a margin of safety in our calculations for military defense equipment. Certainly the Congress should give this decision by civilians a hard, thorough, and objective going over.

Just as there is political chaos prevailing today in international relations, so is there growing confusion in labor, business, and farming over our President's fiscal policies.

The Kennedy administration has called for a startling departure in fiscal policy. In a nutshell, this new policy is that taxes be substantially cut and expenditures substantially increased. This policy request comes after years of deficit spending and from an administration that has pledged itself to fighting the inflationary tendencies in our economy.

The question that we as citizens must ask is, What is behind this new policy call? It has been said that the practice of cutting taxes while increasing expenditures has been tried successfully in other countries. Yet what country has an economy as complex as that of the United States?

What complicated, stable economy has proportionately—

1. A National, State, and local debt the size of ours;

2. A tax load the size of ours—in 1961, National, State, and local taxes claimed 35 percent of our national income;

3. Defense and foreign aid commitments the size of ours; and

4. The freedom to act that is still possessed by our businessmen, bankers, and labor unions?

If the administration is experimenting rather than following an applicable precedent, as it would appear, it should say so. We Americans are not temperamentally opposed to experimentation.

Every President since Harding—including Kennedy—has tried one or more economic policies and failed to secure either economic stability or political calm or a debt reduction, or all three, for any length of time. We have fortunately survived these experiments so that we could experiment another day to try to improve our economic situation without losing our political freedoms. Yet the fact is that we are challenged to do just that in the Keynesian-Kennedy Government-financing policies.

One can sympathize with President Kennedy and appreciate his concern. The question is, Is this policy, if implemented, likely to achieve positive goals that will benefit the whole country? In other words—to avoid disastrous results for our country—I am only asking questions which must be asked and have yet not been answered satisfactorily by the administration.

1. Can the rise in the national debt and the presumed increase in private credit and spending (which should occur with increased Government expenditures and reduced taxes) be such that they will not lead to an inflationary spiral that would wipe out the tax savings and rob savings of tens of millions of Americans—especially those who could least afford the loss—a result that would favor the nimble speculator instead of the businessman, laborer, or farmer?

2. Will the new policy give us the low-skilled jobs in work areas where unemployment is so pressing or will it open up new high-skilled jobs which we already find difficult to fill?

3. Will it really ease the citizens' tax load at a time when every State and locality is desperately seeking more revenue and would gladly fill any tax void created by the Federal Government? In considering this question, one must keep in mind that the demands upon the States and localities have been increasing and that they will increase all the more if inflation is the result of new Federal policy.

4. Should inflation come, would it not ultimately pose the need to raise Federal taxes drastically to accommodate the needs of the Government for dollars to buy goods and services at inflated prices?

5. Can we persuade our sources of credit to cover what appears to be a substantial increase in the national debt as a result of the new policy, and if we can, would not this prevent the expansion of private credit at the rate anticipated by the administration?

6. Isn't it possible that the new policy would weaken our already touchy economic and political position with London, Bonn, Paris, Amsterdam, etc., which are now operating with conservative economic policies and have looked askance at the relatively mild deficit spending which we have engaged in during the past 5 years?

7. Will the new policy halt or increase the flow of gold, with which we are so much concerned?

The argument for the President's fiscal policy goes this way: The volume of business domestically and externally would be increased so much beyond tax cuts and increased Government spending that—assuming the supply and demand ratios were stable—the tax yield at reduced rates would keep the deficit down and the national debt manageable. For example, if the Government deficit ran—based on the present outlook—at $20 billion annually for the next 5 years—that would mean theoretically an increase in the national debt of $100 billion. If, however, business volume increased, thanks to these stimuli, at the rate of about 8 percent per annum, this would lead to an accumulated 5-year increase in the gross national income of $400 billion which, if taxed at 20 percent, would yield $80 billion extra in revenue and therefore leave only a new net debt of $20 billion. That could of course be easily managed. Moreover, at this rate, by the sixth year the annual tax yield should be such that a balanced budget could be achieved.

Pretty good, if it can be done—disastrous if it does not work.

Therefore, it is time to take stock of the past and the future.

The fiscal policies recommended to the Congress by President Kennedy are loosely based on the economic theories of the English Lord Keynes. Keynes asserted that the national economy could grow by pumping Government money into the economy on a deficit spending basis. He sold the idea to the New Deal and Mr. Roosevelt in 1933. It did not work here and has not been adopted by any other country. The Keynesians could only lamely say it did not work because Mr. Roosevelt did not spend enough money.

This same idea—Lord Keynes' idea—now seems to be at the base of President Kennedy's new fiscal policy—but with one great difference: Keynes did not call for tax cuts to accompany increased Government spending. Apparently the new Keynesians have figured out that the real reason for Mr. Roosevelt's failure was not just that he did not spend enough but that the deficit was not great enough for us to spend our way so far into debt that we would reach greater prosperity. They have persuaded Mr. Kennedy that this explanation is economic gospel, and their only criticism of him is that he is not planning to spend more money and create a bigger deficit.

It will take at least 3 years for the Keynesian-Kennedy fiscal policy to prove itself. In the meantime, there are many other factors that will affect national growth besides taxation and the volume of spending. There are Government policies to be initiated and established on agriculture, trade, and labor. A disruptive factor is the dispute over wages and hours. The limits Mr. Kennedy placed on hours and wages are rejected by the AFL-CIO and are now being set aside by the national administration. A rising tide of unemployment demands immediate and forthwith complete review by the Congress of all these factors in national growth to stimulate employment.

Then there is the international situation, which is now in greater flux because of France's refusal to let Britain join the Common Market.

There are the market demands. What will people and business do with their tax savings—if any really materialize? It must be evident that much will depend on the wisdom of business management. For illustration, if increased profits are used by railroads to improve their roadbeds and equipment, that, in turn, stimulates business. On the other hand, if increased profits are used for increased dividends to increase the price of stock on Wall Street, that will be inviting nationalization of railroads.

For sure, if business and employment do not grow, the administration will be forced to explain its failure not by admitting that the Keynesian-Kennedy fiscal theories were wrong, but that not enough money was spent and the deficit was not big enough.

President Kennedy might then ask Congress to spend more money, create a bigger deficit, and adopt more sweeping Government controls over business, labor, and farmers.

One can be sure that the leftwingers will try to foster a loss of public confidence in the capitalistic system—not in the Keynesian-Kennedy financial theories—despite the fact that communism's basic difficulty today is economics.

Whatever the decision of the Congress on the new fiscal policies of the President, it should have priority on the legislative calendar.

Uncertainty as to tax changes and inflation are a blight on business planning and markets. Merchants buying for the fall market are bound to take that into consideration.

In turn, that will affect employment in industry.

Therefore, the quicker that question of tax reduction and the changes in other taxation provisions are settled, the quicker business can plan for the next fiscal year starting July 1. That is also true of our industrial and agricultural planning for changes in foreign markets brought about by the EEC—commonly called the Common Market.

The free world has become so intermeshed that practically every economic decision America makes affects every free market in the world. That, in turn, affects their political and military policies.

It is not only a matter of logistics; it is also a matter of public uncertainty on what our new fiscal policy will be—and public psychology on inflation devaluing the dollar if it does not work. Our dollar is the corollary of the atom bomb in defense of the free world. The free world is as interested in keeping our dollar sound as in our atomic strength.

Yet not only economics but also politics shapes foreign relations. There is an atmosphere of intrigue—mystery, spies, and murder—clinging to the phrase "international politics."

International politics, however, is not just man-to-man combat, as in the spy movies, but a lethal contest that means life or death for millions. It is a contest that takes into account what we do and say at home, one that requires more restraint, moderation by the press, both political parties in discussing foreign affairs.

Yet this does not require that we as a nation or individuals not maneuver and comment on foreign policies. There is and must be maneuvering in foreign policies as there is in domestic policies.

As for maneuvering on foreign policies, I will not attempt to discuss that in terms of military hardware, combat troops, of positions of strength either for pagan tyrannical Communists or for popular democratic capitalistic governments with their proven record of contributing to the general good.

Neither will I attempt to reconcile the often puzzling declaration of President De Gaulle or Chancellor Adenauer of West Germany, Prime Minister Macmillan of England, and the other heads of European countries, or President Kennedy and Prime Minister Diefenbaker. I will simply say there is no principle involved between any of them similar to the one involved between Mao and Khrushchev.

It is apparent that China has won a victory over India. It appears that China's next step will be to attempt to consolidate some other Asian area under Communist domination.

Nehru said in a recent interview that Mao believes in a nuclear war and is thinking and planning that. He quotes Mao as saying, "What difference does 200 million lives make?" Mao himself has said that a country of 800 million people will have more left after a nuclear war than a country of 200 million people.

Hence there should not be a close and dependable alliance between China and Russia.

Furthermore, Chinese Communists are angry at the growing adoption of capitalistic production methods by occidental Communists. All that could mean if Khrushchev's present line is consistent—improving relations with European socialistic parties. In the latest news, Khrushchev is still harping on the economic collapse of decadent capitalistic states. But no responsive chord from Mao. A rising tide of nationalism is confounding communism in most countries.

Our foreign policy has been to defend the democratic governments of Europe—including England—and to build them up after two World Wars.

Having become economically strong, if Europe under the leadership of France now wants to decide its own policies and build its own defense weapons, I do not believe we can do much about it except be ready to cooperate at all times. We should help hold together in unity and strength the EEC. That organization has a better potential as a force for peace than SEATO, CENTRO, NATO, and the U.N. all put together.

It is obviously to the vital interests of West Germany to maintain close friendly relations with both France and the United States. That is true also for the United States of America. France is across the main supply lines to our troops in West Germany.

Then there is the crucial question of satisfactory trade agreements we must work out with the EEC.

The question of—After Adenauer and De Gaulle, what?—can be left for the future.

After all, we have done all we could to foster a United Europe, including England. Certainly a greater sharing and acceptance of the cost of defending the free world from Communist tyranny is long overdue by Europe, England, and other countries economically capable.

Berlin, Vietnam, and Cuba are where the evil intentions of the Soviet are now displayed. There is only one man in America that can put together for us the meaning of all these military and political situations and our answer to them. That man is the President of the United States. That does not mean that Members of the Congress—Republican or Democrat—should refuse to discuss foreign affairs. That is their obligation and duty to discuss them.

There is not a division between the two political parties on Cuba. Instead, there are two camps. While both agree with President Kennedy that Latin America is as critical as any area in the world today, they disagree on the steps that should be taken to meet the Russian-Cuba center of that critical area. Once again Cuba is the focus of world attention.

Of course our country and the democratic world is nervous because of the failure of intelligence in the Bay of Pigs fiasco.

Even more so when there has been no adequate explanation of how the Russian missile buildup in Cuba went on for months, to the point of Russian missiles staring down the streets of every Atlantic city to some 1,500 miles inland without alarming our President.

According to a very dramatic thriller semiofficial explanation, our President would not have known of that fateful massive installation if it had not been for a break in the clouds just prior to his October 22 address to the Nation. Yet, as early as May, Col. Robert S. Allen was writing in his column of the Russian missile buildup in Cuba. Senator Keating, in September, was trying to arouse the administration to that danger.

Another reason for uneasiness is the administration's policy of not only managing—but suppressing—news threatening our military security. Of course, that went on in the preceding administration. We must rely, for adequate and proper press coverage of military events threatening our national security, on reporters who wear out their shoe leather instead of being satisfied with administrative news handouts.

The statement I most frequently hear is that America has no friends anywhere. I do not think that is so. The contradictions I have briefly mentioned are the contradictions inherent in democratic processes. Just as there are new weapons, new mass communication, new standards of living, maybe new worlds, we have a new kind of alliance—an alliance not for the perpetuation of a family on a throne, or for power, or for gold or trade.

The alliance of the Western World—NATO, OAS, SEATO are all based on the common bond of preservation and defense of democratic processes for all mankind against tyranny.

That is a connecting web that binds together the free world in the strength, characteristics, and ideals of the democratic processes. However strong that web, however dedicated a people are to their country's interest in that alliance, emergencies cannot be successfully met against a dominant dictator without a center of decision on diplomatic and military tactics.

By reason of our economic and military power, that place of decision has been forced on the President of the United States of America. There is a time for discussion and consultation. There is a time for instant decision, without talking things over. That's the way it will be for some time to come, providing there is clear direction and clear leadership.

In this contest with age-old tyranny, expressed in modern form by communism, we know the method of communism is to win by force and by fear. The volume and the variety of Communist lies are amazing. Forewarned is forearmed. Every Communist country in the world is ruled by a dictator. How fantastic to call them peoples democratic governments. Yet that is the Communist line. That line and the threat it represents must be met forthrightly to perpetuate the world democratic alliance.

That this is true is shown in a story on the installation of our President's Cuban quarantine last October. Our embassies the world over received the official explanation to be made to foreign diplomats.

One of our ambassadors started to make that explanation to a diplomatic caller. The veteran European ambassador was not interested. All he wanted to know was whether we were going through with it.

It is up to all Americans to show the world that we are going to stick to our policy regarding the imperialism of tyranny.

Our policy for 45 years has been to defend democratic processes in Europe at all cost against tyranny. That we will stick to. We have followed a similar policy in the Far East for over a decade. And that we will stick to. Can we do less for the Western Hemisphere—in Cuba—90 miles from our own coastline?

As I seee it, the administration is continuing its policy of last November of quarantining Castro.

This is a realistic policy if it isolates the threat of communism in the Western Hemisphere. There is no easy answer in determining the steps that will have to be taken one by one in solving the Cuban question. That is why we need a national debate on its progress.

TRIBUTE TO THE LATE JEAN FELIX PICCARD

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I would not want the Senate to fail to note the regrettable passing of one of the great scientists of America and the world—Dr. Jean Felix Piccard.

Professor emeritus of aeronautical engineering of the University of Minnesota, he was one of the great scientists of our time. A naturalized American citizen, he brought to this country excellence in stratospheric science, just as his famous brother brought excellence in oceanographic science.

The world can never have enough men of scientific and other genius such as Dr. Piccard represented. His loss was deeply felt throughout his adopted State of Minnesota, the Nation, and the world.

His talented wife, a distinguished scientist in her own right, and his family can feel a sense of deep pride in what this great man contributed throughout the 79 fruitful years of his life.

I ask unanimous consent that there be printed at this point in the Record an article which appeared in the Minneapolis Tribune, which summarizes his contributions, together with the biographical summary from "American Men of Science."

There being no objection, the article and summary were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Balloonist Jean Piccard, 79, Dies on Birthday

Dr. Jean Felix Piccard, internationally famous balloonist, died today on his 79th birthday.

Piccard, University of Minnesota professor emeritus of aeronautical engineering, was known for his stratospheric balloon flights and cosmic ray research.

He died at his home at 1445 East River Road at 2:30 a.m. He had had a heart condition for a number of years.

He was a member of the Piccard family of Basel, Switzerland, known for its scientific achievements. His twin brother, the late Auguste Piccard, was the first man to soar into the stratosphere and the first to plumb the ocean depths.

His nephew Jacques, Auguste's son, descended 37,800 feet to the bottom of the Pacific Ocean in 1960 in a bathyscaph, an underwater vessel used for exploring ocean depths.

WIFE HELPED

Mrs. Jean Piccard worked with her husband in many of his studies and experiments.

Mr. Piccard studied at the Swiss Institute of Technology, Zurich, where he earned his doctor of science degree in 1909. He served as private assistant to Adolph von Baeyer at the University of Munich from 1910 until 1914.

After World War I, Mr. Piccard was associated with the University of Lausanne, where he remained 2 years. From 1916 until 1919 he was on leave in the United States to serve as associate professor at the University of Chicago, where he met his wife, the former Jeannette Ridlon.

He was a research associate at Massachusetts Institute of Technology from 1926 until 1929. In 1931 he became a U.S. citizen.

Two years later, in collaboration with Auguste, he designed a stratosphere gondola, built at Midland, Mich. In 1934 he became a research associate of the Bartol Research Foundation, Swarthmore, Pa. That year he made a stratospheric flight from Detroit, Mich., to study cosmic rays.

JOINS 'U'

Mr. Piccard joined the University of Minnesota faculty in 1936 as a lecturer in the department of aeronautical engineering and remained with the department until his retirement in 1952.

In a flight made in 1934 with his wife, Mr. Piccard soared to an altitude of 57,559 feet during a 5-hour flight. He had made his first flight, with Auguste, in 1913.

In 1937 he made a test flight to an altitude of 11,000 feet over Rochester, Minn., using a metal gondola and 100 rubber latex balloons.

His son, Donald, made a flight from the Minneapolis parade grounds in 1947 to test a new gas valve designed by Mr. Piccard.

Donald, a resident of Sioux Falls, S. Dak., was in the Twin Cities at the time of his father's death. He had competed in the St. Paul Winter Carnival balloon races Sunday.

ONE OF 100

In 1950 Mr. Piccard was named one of Minnesota's 100 living great men. Edward R. Murrow brought his television crews to Minneapolis in 1957 to interview Mr. Piccard on "Person-to-Person."

Besides his widow, Jeannette, and his son, Donald, survivors include sons John, Wilmington, Del., and Paul, Tallahassee, Fla.; a sister, Madame Paul Rambert, Lausanne, Switzerland, and a brother, Dr. Paul Piccard, a retired justice of the Swiss Supreme Court, Lucerne, Switzerland.

Services will be at 10 a.m. Wednesday at St. Paul's Church on the Hill, Summit and Saratoga Avenues, St. Paul.

The family prefers memorials to the University of Minnesota or to St. Paul's Episcopal Day School, 1524 Summit Avenue, St. Paul.

[From American Men of Science, 1961]

DR. JEAN FELIX PICCARD

Specialty: Aeronautical engineering; organic chemistry.

Born in Basel, Switzerland, January 28, 1884; naturalized American citizen; married 1919; three children.

Diplomate, Swiss Federal Institute of Technology, 1907; doctor of natural sciences, 1909; honorary doctor of science degrees awarded by Jamestown College, 1956, Southern Illinois University, 1959. P.D. in organic chemistry in Munich, Germany, in 1914; Lausanne, 1914–16; assistant professor, University of Chicago, 1916–18, associate professor, 1918–19; professor at Lausanne, 1919–25; research instructor, Massachusetts Institute of Technology; head, department of chemical services, Hercules Powder Co., 1929–32; stratosphere flying work, 1933–34; research associate, Bartol Research Foundation, 1934–36; special lecturer, aeronautical engineering, University of Minnesota, 1936–37; professor, 1937–52, emeritus professor, 1952 to date; civilian with U.S. Army Air Force, 1945.

Member of the following societies: American Chemical Society, American Meteorological Society, Society for Engineering Education, Aeronautics Association (awarded the certificate of merit, 1934), Geophysical Union, Institute of Aeronautical Sciences.

Principal areas of scientific research: Constitution and color of organic compounds; dissociation into free radicals of organic compounds as detected by color changes; Piccard effect; problems of aero engineering; design of plastic balloons.

COMMUNIST COUP IN CZECHOSLOVAKIA

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, on February 25, my distinguished colleague from Illinois [Mr. Douglas] spoke some well-chosen words concerning the plight of the people of Czechoslovakia under Communist rule. In connection with the 15th anniversary of the Communist coup d'etat in Czechoslovakia, he caused to be printed in the Record a report compiled by the Czechoslovak National Council of America. I received a copy of this report and was deeply moved by its account of the economic and other sufferings of the great Czechoslovak people. The report plainly reveals that the self-appointed Communist authorities in Prague have no compunctions about extracting the utmost from their own subjects while cynically taking advantage of their privations in order to extort needed foreign exchange from American citizens.

It was my intention to join my colleague at that time in order to pay homage to the living spirit of Czech democracy—a spirit personified in the life and works of that great Czech and that great European, Thomas G. Masaryk. The Masaryk tradition was ably sustained by his successor Edward Benes and other liberal Czech nationalists. It was trampled underfoot by an unprincipled Communist minority in the dark days of February 24–26, 1948.

Owing to my necessary absence from the Senate on official business, Mr. President, I could not then pay tribute to the Czechoslovak people. Nevertheless, I wish at this time to acquaint Senators with a report, entitled "The Communist Coup D'Etat in Czechoslovakia," which was prepared at my request by Mr. Moorhead Wright III, of the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress. I asked for this report because in these troubled times it is instructive to have before us an example of the tactics employed by Communists in seizing power through so-called peaceful means. I suggest that the threatened governments of Latin America pay special attention to this report, because it should be borne in mind that the Czech coup took place even though all Red army troops had been withdrawn from Czech soil.

The Czech coup took place for a variety of reasons, including the strength of the national Communist Party, the fact that the government coalition was headed by a Communist, the widespread demoralization that followed Munich and the Nazi occupation, and the inability of the non-Communist majority to thwart the will of the disciplined Communists and fellow travelers. Not all of these facts are brought out in Mr. Wright's report because I did not ask him for a thorough analysis of the situation. Nevertheless, I wish to call Senators' attention to them now, because the overthrow of Czech democracy is a classic model for Communist seizure of power through "democratic" or "parliamentary" processes. In this connection I call particular attention to the dire consequences that flow from the control of a country's Ministry of the Interior—or the government agency that controls the police—by the Communists. The result is the almost inevitable loss of authority by the duly constituted government. The police, the armed forces, the government—these are the three prime targets of a Moscow-supported Communist insurrection. If any Latin American, African, or Asian government feels safe with its central police force in Communist hands, let it ponder the experience of Czechoslovakia and other East European countries.

Mr. President, the Czech coup was responsible in large measure for the fact that we awoke to the postwar Communist threat. It shared this effect with the Greek civil war and Soviet demands on Turkey. It steeled the West to resist Communist encroachments elsewhere. It was a major link in a chain of developments that led to the formation of NATO and to the creation of the hitherto unbroken solidarity of the West against Communist expansionism. How tragic that we had to learn this lesson at the expense of a small East European nation which had already suffered long years of totalitarian tyranny.

Free Czechoslovakia, Mr. President, shares our national spirit of industriousness and enterprise; it is imbued with the finest traditions of European humanism. It is pro-Western despite having ample reason for disillusionment with the West. In commemoration of the 15th anniversary of the extinguishment of freedom in Czechoslovakia, I ask unanimous consent that the abovementioned report be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

THE COMMUNIST COUP D'ETAT IN CZECHOSLOVAKIA

The Communists were in a strong position in Czechoslovakia as early as 1945 when they gained a number of key ministries in the first postliberation cabinet. They controlled the Ministry of the Interior, which included the police; the Ministry of Agriculture, which was responsible for land reform and the distribution to peasants of land seized from Germans or collaborators; and the Ministries of Information and Education. The army and its leader, General Svoboda, came under Communist influence while undergoing training in the Soviet Union. The first Government was headed by the pro-Communist leader of the Social Democratic Party, Zdenek Fierlinger; after July 1946 the Prime Minister was Klement Gottwald, chairman of the Communist Party.

Although the Communists controlled the main power centers in the country, they continued to work within the limitations of popular front government. They sought to dominate the coalition by gaining control of the Social Democratic Party and by dividing and weakening the other parties. The Social Democrats declared their intention to remain independent, however, and in November 1947 the leftwing Fierlinger was replaced by the independent-minded Lausman as party chairman. In addition, it became increasingly evident that the Communists' electoral position was weakening; a public opinion poll conducted by the Minister of Information predicted that the party would not do well in the general election in May 1948. The Communists thus had to turn to extra-constitutional methods to complete their takeover of Czechoslovakia.

The end of democratic government was also hastened by the deepening rift between Russia and the West. Czechoslovakia's foreign policy was traditionally pro-Russian, but she had important economic ties with the West. Stalin could not tolerate this bridge between the two camps, and in July 1947 he forced the Czech Government to decline an invitation to attend Marshall plan talks in Paris.

There was a permanent political crisis in the country from the summer of 1947 to February 1948 when the coalition government split, as the Communists hoped it would. The issue which caused the break was the Minister of the Interior's dismissal of eight police commissioners in Prague and their replacement by Communists. Since these commissioners controlled the police's arms supply, this was an ominous indication of the Communists' intentions. The other cabinet members balked at this move and passed a majority resolution on February 12 demanding that the eight commissioners be reinstated. The Minister of the Interior refused to obey the resolution and was backed by the Communist Prime Minister Gottwald. On February 21 the ministers belonging to three of the four non-Communist parties resigned in protest; the Social Democrats, who had voted for the resolution on the police issue, now hesitated to join the other parties in the resignation gesture. President Benes pledged not to accept the ministers' resignation and called for continuation of Popular Front government with all parties represented in the cabinet.

The Communists moved swiftly to insure their victory in the crisis. They armed detachments of factory workers and paraded them through the streets of Prague; on February 22, Gottwald addressed Communist mass trade-union demonstrations. The Minister of the Interior charged the National Socialist Party with plotting an armed revolt against the state and used this as a pretext for police seizure of party headquarters; also, a warrant was issued against Ursiny, leader of the Slovak Democrats, on charges of high treason. The left wing of the Social Democrats revolted against the party's middle-of-the-road leadership, seized control of party headquarters, and reinstated the pro-Communist Feirlinger as party head. The Communists silenced party and independent newspapers by force. "Action committees" headed by Communists took control of government ministries, local government councils and other organizations.

President Benes' resistance to Communist pressures gradually weakened; he was isolated and ill, and he wanted to avoid civil war and a break with the Soviet Union, which he considered the main defense against a revived Germany. Finally, on February 25 he gave in to the Communists' demands, accepting the resignation of the 12 ministers and authorizing Gottwald to set up a Communist-dominated cabinet. One of the few anti-Communist ministers in this new cabinet was Jan Masaryk, who continued to be Foreign Minister. But on March 10 his body was found in a courtyard of the Foreign Ministry. In Hugh Seton-Watson's words, "The death of this great democrat, the last surviving male member of the family of the 'President-Liberator,' whose extraordinary charm and goodness had made him hundreds of devoted friends all over the world, especially in the Anglo-Saxon countries, brought home to the Czech people and to world opinion the horror of Czechoslovakia's tragedy."[1]

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may have an additional 2 minutes in order to yield to the distinguished Senator from Ohio.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I commend the Senator from Minnesota for his very excellent statement on the lesson that is to be learned through the tragic experience of the Czechs and Slovaks having been taken over by the Communists.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the Senator very much for his statement.

UKRAINIAN ARCHBISHOP SLIPYI FREED AFTER 18-YEAR SOVIET IMPRISONMENT

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, on February 17, Archbishop Josyf Slipyi celebrated his 71st birthday. It was the first time in 18 years that the spiritual leader of Ukrainian Eastern-Rite Catholics had celebrated his birthday as a free man. Released last Christmas by the Kremlin, Archbishop Slipyi has become an inspiring symbol of the resistance of the Ukrainian faithful to the repressive measures of the atheistic Soviet regime.

Archbishop Slipyi was a distinguished scholar and rector of the Theological Academy in Lvov before he became Archbishop of Lvov in 1939. He became the leader of Ukrainian Eastern-Rite Catholics in 1944 when the great Metropolitan Andrew Szeptycki died under mysterious circumstances. Archbishop Slipyi became metropolitan shortly after the Soviets reoccupied the Ukraine. With the Soviet Union at war, the regime did not want to alienate the people's feelings, so the traditional Russian persecution of Ukrainian Eastern-Rite Catholics, which had been especially virulent in 1915 during World War I, was not immediately renewed. But soon the Soviets began to exert pressures on the metropolitan. At first they sought to enlist the church's help in stamping out partisan resistance to Soviet occupation in the Ukraine, but Archbishop Slipyi did not give in to this demand. Then the Soviets tried to force him to renounce all ties with the Holy See in Rome and place his communicants under the jurisdiction of the Kremlin-dominated Russian Orthodox Church. This the metropolitan also refused to do. On April 11, 1945, he was arrested with four other Ukrainian bishops. Eleven months later he was secretly tried and sentenced to 8 years' hard labor on false charges of "traitorous activity and collaboration with the German occupation forces." None of the other bishops sentenced with him are still alive.

Although the details of his 18-year imprisonment are sketchy and often contradictory, it is apparent that the first 8 years of hard labor in a Siberian prison camp were the most arduous. The Soviets tortured him in a vain effort to make him embrace Russian orthodoxy. According to one report, he was confined with four Catholic priests in a small cell, where they said mass in secret using dried crusts of bread for the Host and using wine made from clandestinely fermented grapes and raisins. In 1954 he was allowed to return to Lvov, where he remained under house arrest without permission to exercise his priestly duties. He was tried and sentenced again, this time without any pretense of legality. At the time of his release in 1963 he was a servant in a Siberian old people's home.

It is extremely doubtful whether this gesture by the Kremlin presages an easing of religious persecution in the Soviet Union. Vatican officials view the archbishop's release as a simple act of personal respect by the Soviet Government for Pope John. The Vatican deserves the thanks of all freemen for whatever part its representatives may have played in arranging the archbishop's release. This act certainly offers a precedent for the release of other imprisoned religious leaders, such as Cardinal Mindszenty, who is a de facto prisoner in the American Legation at Budapest.

In the long run the release of Archbishop Slipyi should be viewed as a tactical shift rather than as a change in the Kremlin's basic attitude toward religion. It fits the general pattern of Khrushchev's substitution of relatively moderate methods of coercion for the brutal repressive measures which Stalin employed. The Communists may be learning gradually that religious faith thrives on persecution. In this context, Khrushchev's move can be interpreted as an act of enlightened self-interest, for as a living martyr, Archbishop Slipyi was a source of inspiration and courage for his flock.

While the release of Archbishop Slipyi is a joyful event, it does not in itself herald the return of religious freedom to the Soviet Union. There is strong evidence of increased efforts to curtail the practice of religion, which is one of the greatest threats to the totalitarian Communist regime. It is all the more urgent, therefore, that we strive unceasingly for the establishment of cultural autonomy—religious, educational, linguistic—in the Soviet Union. More than anything else, the "new Soviet man" of whom the Communists boast needs an inviolable bill of rights which emphasizes his freedom as an individual rather than his obligations as a cog in a machine. Unless such respect for basic human rights is introduced throughout the area under Soviet rule, Archbishop Slipyi's ordeal will have been in vain. His victory of faith and courage must guide us in this task.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that certain articles and press reports relating to Archbishop Slipyi's arrest be printed at this point in the Record.

---

[1] Hugh Seton-Watson, "The East European Revolution" (London: Methuen, 1950), p. 190.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, Feb. 11, 1963]

Prelate Freed by Soviets Tells Pope of Torture

Vatican City, February 10.—The elderly head of Ukrainian Catholics told Pope John XXIII today how he survived 18 years of forced labor and horrible torture in Soviet prisons.

Msgr. Josyf Slipyi, who will be 71 next Sunday, met the Pope this morning for a lengthy audience.

Monsignor Slipyi, the metropolitan of Halyc and archbishop of Lvov, Soviet Ukraine, arrived in Rome last night and it was revealed that he had been released by the Russians last Christmas.

Monsignor Slipyi was first imprisoned April 11, 1945. He was one of 11 Ukrainian archbishops and bishops to be sentenced to various terms.

A number since have died—one by assassination—and Monsignor Slipyi is the first to be released.

A spokesman for the Ukrainian Pontifical College in Rome said that Monsignor Slipyi, head of Eastern rite Catholics in the Ukraine, "was horribly tortured and was forced to do hard labor in Siberia during his imprisonment."

The college spokesman said, "it is unlikely the metropolitan will discuss persecution in public because his every word could have a serious effect on thousands of people in the Ukraine."

Vatican sources said the archbishop's release "was not the result of an agreement between the Holy See and the Soviet Government, nor did the Holy See ask for it. There have been no negotiations on this matter."

The sources warned against believing Soviet persecution of the religious would be changed because of Monsignor Slipyi's release.

Pope John, during a cornerstone-laying ceremony for an Ambrosian seminary this morning, referred indirectly to Monsignor Slipyi's release.

"From the east of Europe there came yesterday evening a touching consolation, for which we thank the Lord," he said.

Monsignor Slipyi was charged with collaboration with the Germans at the time of his arrest. A booklet released by the Ukrainian college said this charge was based on the fact that his predecessor or Archbishop of Lvov had played host to German Army officers in the bishop's palace during the German occupation of the Ukraine.

It was not until 2 years later Moscow radio announced he had been sentenced to 8 years hard labor in Siberia. The Ukrainian college said he later was sentenced to two more terms of various lengths.

[From the Washington Post, Feb. 13, 1963]

Vatican Got Reds To Free Archbishop

Vatican City, February 12.—The release of the imprisoned Archbishop of Lvov, Josyf Slipyi, from a Soviet forced-labor camp, was arranged under a Vatican ecumenical council program to ease points of friction between Roman Catholic and other churches, Vatican sources said today.

The release was engineered by the secretariat to promote Christian unity, which handles contacts with non-Catholic churches.

Monsignor Willebrands, member of the secretariat, brought the Ukrainian prelate back to Rome from Moscow by train after a visit there last week. On another mission to Moscow, last fall, the monsignor arranged for the presence in Rome of two observers of the Russian Orthodox Church.

Vatican sources said the success of Monsignor Willebrands' two missions have considerably improved relations between the Catholic and Russian Orthodox Churches. The 70-year-old archbishop, who had been a Soviet prisoner for 18 years, arrived in Rome last Saturday.

The plan for the archbishop's release was evolved during the Vatican council last fall. Giacomo Cardinal Testa, secretary of the congregation for oriental rites, met the two Russian Orthodox observers and asked for a good-will gesture toward Archbishop Slipyi.

[From Time magazine, Feb. 22, 1963]

Roman Catholicism: Kremlin Cooperation

Pope John XXIII, for all of his dislike for communism, is willing to be polite about it. Gone is the defiance that Pius XII used to hurl at the Kremlin; instead Rome makes such amicable gestures as inviting Russian Orthodox observers to the Vatican council. Last week the Pope produced in Rome a living gain from his policy of easing tensions: Ukrainian Archbishop Josyf Slipyi of Lvov, freed after 18 years of Soviet confinement.

The spiritual leader of the Ukraine's 2 million Byzantine-rite Catholics, tall, bearded Archbishop Slipyi, 71, is a Jesuit-trained theologian who was elevated to the episcopacy in 1939. Slipyi (pronounced slee-pay) protested a postwar Russian attempt to force Byzantine-rite Ukrainians into the Russian Orthodox Church, and in 1946 was imprisoned, charged with "political crimes during the German occupation." Confined to a tiny cell with four Catholic priests, he said mass in secret, using dried crusts of bread for hosts and wine made by letting grapes and raisins ferment in a glass. In 1953, his hard-labor sentence was reduced to house arrest in Lvov, but 2 years later, Slipyi was shipped to a Siberian old people's home, where he was put to work as a servant.

MEETING WITH TWO RUSSIANS

Slipyi's release is the diplomatic handiwork of two close Curia friends of Pope John—Augustin Cardinal Bea, chief of the Secretariat for Promoting Christian Unity, and Gustavo Cardinal Testa, secretary of the Sacred Congregation for the Oriental Church, which supervises Byzantine-rite Catholics. Late last November, Bea arranged a quiet meeting between Testa and the two Russian observers at the Vatican Council. Testa smoothly pointed out that the Pope had officially disavowed a protest prepared by a group of Ukrainian bishops at the council objecting to the presence of the Russians, tactfully brought up the subject of Archbishop Slipyi's long confinement. The Russians promised to do what they could, and last month notified Cardinal Bea that Slipyi would be freed. A fortnight ago, Bea's chief assistant, Dutch Msgr. Jan Willebrands, flew secretly to Moscow, escorted Slipyi by train to Vienna and then on to Rome. Slipyi had a personal audience with the Pope, has since been resting at the Byzantine-rite monastery of Grottaferrata, 15 miles southeast of Rome. He hopes eventually to return to Lvov.

ONLY THE BEGINNING

The Vatican regards Slipyi's release as only the beginning. "This was a simple act of personal respect by the Russian Government for Pope John," says one Vatican official. "It also gives us hope that other negotiations will work out." There is little doubt as to who would be the subjects of other negotiations: Hungary's Josef Cardinal Mindszenty, a political refugee in the U.S. legation at Budapest since the 1956 uprising, and Archbishop Josef Beran of Prague, who was seized by Czech Communists in 1950, has not been heard from since.

PROPOSED CHANGE OF NAME OF HUNGRY HORSE DAM

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, there has been speculation in the newspapers of my State—and I am quite sure I know from where that speculation comes—concerning the changing of the name of the reservoir formed by Hungry Horse Dam, known as Hungry Horse Lake, to Truman Lake or Truman Reservoir.

Mr. President, I am a great admirer of former President Harry Truman. I know he did a great deal to bring about the consummation of the project known as Hungry Horse. However, I believe in States' rights, to a certain extent, and I must say that I would not be in favor of changing the name of Hungry Horse Lake to Truman Lake, or to any other designation, with one exception.

Some years ago my distinguished colleague the junior Senator from Montana [Mr. Metcalf] and I introduced a bill to change the name of the reservoir behind Hungry Horse Dam to Harry Kelly Lake. We did so because Harry Kelly, who was long and favorably known as Hungry Horse Harry, fought for and worked for the Hungry Horse project long before anybody else in the Flathead area. Many times his was the lone voice in the wilderness—and I make that as a literal statement.

However, we were not successful in our endeavor to change the name.

I feel that, as a matter of State pride, if the name of Hungry Horse Harry Kelly is not to be attached to the lake, the name Hungry Horse Lake ought to be retained.

I am in full accord with a St. Louis Post-Dispatch editorial, which states in part:

> Hungry Horse is one of our favorites—

It is one of mine, also, I say incidentally—

> rich in flavor as a part of the Montana scene * * * in close harmony with the Old West of the Hungry Horse and the New West of hungry horsepower.

To that I say, "Amen."

Insofar as the dam is concerned, Mr. President, the present name should continue in the future.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an editorial from the Great Falls Tribune of February 28, 1963, may be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Hungry Horse Dam It Is and So It Should Remain

We have admired former President Harry S. Truman. As President he supported and advanced water development projects in Montana and other Western States, but we are unalterably opposed to the proposal of congressional advocates to change the name of the reservoir formed by Hungry Horse Dam to Lake Truman.

This is included in a list of dams and reservoirs for which name changes are being sought to honor former Presidents and Senators. The effort to make the nauseous pill more palatable by splitting the name between reservoir and dam only compounds the felony and confuses one and all.

If a personal name were fitting for the Hungry Horse layout, none other would be so deserving of the honor as the late Harry J. Kelly, pioneer Montana newspaperman and longtime Kalispell weekly publisher. He was the first champion of Hungry Horse Dam—at a time when supporters were scarce and scoffers numerous. He began his crusade of editorials and speeches in support of the project in 1933 and continued it until 1944, when Congress approved the Bureau of Reclamation plans. He gained the nickname of "Hungry Horse Harry" and earned the title of "Father of Hungry Horse Dam."

It is not surprising that a few years ago a proposal to designate the reservoir Kelly Lake was supported by the Montana congressional delegation. We were not in favor of that despite Kelly's qualification for the honor.

A St. Louis Dispatch editorial hit the nail on the head when it said: "Hungry Horse is one of our favorites—rich in flavor as a part of the Montana scene * * * in close harmony with the Old West of the Hungry Horse and the New West of hungry horsepower."

There is a lot of interesting legend attached to the name Hungry Horse. We should cultivate and preserve it instead of trying to water it down.

FREE WORLD TRADE WITH CUBA

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, during the past 2 or 3 weeks, at various intervals, I have placed in the RECORD the names of free world ships engaging in Cuban trade. These names have been received on the basis of facts supplied by the Defense Department and the Maritime Administration, as well as other reliable sources of information. All the names have been placed in the RECORD, giving the flag under which the ships sail as well as the number of ships involved.

Mr. President, some ships are still engaging in trade with Cuba, and the number is greater than many people realize.

A dispatch to the Baltimore Sun, published in the February 19 issue of that paper, reported that eight ships flying flags of countries outside the Communist bloc were sighted by crewmen of the U.S.-flag freighter SS *Santo Cerro* during the 3 days that vessel was in a Cuban port, discharging its cargo of ransom medicines, drugs, and baby foods.

Three of the vessels reported seen by the crewmen were of British registry, three flew the Greek flag, one was Norwegian, and the other Yugoslavian. Together with the dozen or more additional freighters from Communist countries observed by the U.S. crewmen there were thus 20 or more ocean freighters in that Cuban port in the 3-day period cited. They represented a total freight carrying capacity which, if maintained with any degree of regularity, would go far toward taking care of a great proportion of Cuba's food and other requirements.

I ask unanimous consent that the Baltimore Sun article be printed in the RECORD in connection with my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FREE-WORLD SHIPS SEEN IN HAVANA—EIGHT NOTICED DURING 3 DAYS RANSOM VESSEL WAS THERE

WASHINGTON, February 18.—Eight free world ships were in Havana harbor during the 3 days the last ransom-bearing American-flag freighter, the SS *Santo Cerro*, was there, it was learned today.

This number in such a short period of time is considered significant, because the Kennedy administration pointed out that since only 15 free world ships had called at Cuba during the entire month of January, stringent regulations were not necessary against trading with Cuba.

Therefore, the administration's only restriction was to prevent vessels calling at Cuba since January 1 from loading U.S. Government-owned and financed cargo at U.S. ports, but not at foreign ports.

SEEN BY CREW

Seen by the crewmembers of the *Santo Cerro* from February 10 to February 13 were three British vessels, three Greek, one Norwegian, and one Yugoslav. In addition to these free world ships, they saw 10 Russian and several East German vessels. No mention of Poland was made.

The *Santo Cerro* carried the third shipload of ransom medical supplies, drugs, and baby foods demanded by Premier Fidel Castro in exchange for the 1,113 released Bay of Pigs prisoners.

The American-flag *Santo Cerro* loaded in Baltimore and sailed February 7. Her cargo brought up to $25 million the total sent to Cuba. The full ransom is $53 million.

The fourth ship is to be the German-flag *Priamos*, made available by the Standard Fruit Co. for loading at New Orleans beginning Thursday. The ship sails regularly from New Orleans.

NO REFUGEES EXPECTED

The *Priamos* is to load 2,300 tons valued at $1,100,000. She is not expected to bring back any refugees, the American Red Cross said, because she will head directly from Havana for Costa Rica to pick up bananas.

Like the *Santo Cerro*, the *Priamos* is a refrigerated vessel.

The 3,027-gross-ton German freighter will be the first of the four to load at a gulf port. The first—the SS *African Pilot*—took on her $11 million cargo at Port Everglades. The *Shirley Lykes* and the *Santo Cerro* loaded at Baltimore.

H.D.B.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I have been placing the list in the RECORD from time to time, in the hope that the efforts of the President of the United States and of the State Department—to have the countries involved voluntarily prohibit their ships from moving in and out of Cuba, at the risk of losing their cargoes—can succeed, and so that the economic quarantine or shipping quarantine will be actually such.

On February 7, I published another list in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. In that list I mentioned the names of ships, and included in the list was that of a Swedish vessel, the *Cooranga*. Upon learning of this, the owner of the ship contacted the Ministry for Foreign Affairs at Stockholm and reported that the inclusion of the *Cooranga* in the list was incorrect, and asked rectification of that error. We have checked on that. Apparently the Maritime Commission, in the case of this one ship among many, listed it erroneously, and the following day I submitted a corrected list.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a letter to me, together with a list of the ships referred to.

There being no objection, the letter and list were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ROYAL SWEDISH EMBASSY,
Washington, February 13, 1963.

The Honorable WARREN G. MAGNUSON,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR SENATOR MAGNUSON: On page 2057 in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, of February 7, 1963, a list has been reproduced at your request on free world ship arrivals in Cuba, January 1–31, 1963. In this connection, may I draw your attention to the following:

Among the names of ships listed that of a Swedish vessel, the *Cooranga*, occurs. Upon learning this the owners of the ship in question contacted the Ministry for Foreign Affairs in Stockholm, reporting that the inclusion of the *Cooranga* in the list was incorrect and requesting a rectification. On instructions from Stockholm, my Embassy contacted the U.S. authorities concerned, conveying to them the information received from the shipping line. They immediately confirmed that the listing was erroneous, and the following day issued a corrected list, a copy of which I enclose herewith for your ready reference.

Against the background of the above facts, I would very much appreciate if you could kindly have the RECORD corrected on this point.

Sincerely yours,
GUNNAR JARRING,
Ambassador of Sweden.

REVISED LIST OF FREE WORLD SHIP ARRIVALS IN CUBA, JANUARY 1–31, 1963

NAME OF SHIP—FLAG OF REGISTRY

1. *Arlington Court* (British).
2. *Cannaregio* (Italian).
3. *Capetan Petros* (Greek).
4. *Gloria* (Greek).
5. *London Confidence* (tanker) (British).
6. *London Splendour* (tanker) (British).
7. *Meishun Maru* (Japanese).
8. *Mousse* (Lebanese).
9. *Overseas Pioneer* (tanker) (British).
10. *Pampas* (British).
11. *Perseus* (tanker) (Greek).
12. *Redestos* (Greek).

NOTE.—The *Cooranga* (Swedish) and the *Freedom First* (Panamanian) were carried on a previous listing as having called at Cuba between January 1–31, 1963. More complete information now available discloses these two ships did not call at Cuba during the period indicated.

(Prepared by Maritime Administration, Department of Commerce, Washington, D.C.)

NOMINATION OF PHILIP N. BROWNSTEIN TO BE FEDERAL HOUSING COMMISSIONER

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I wish to make a brief statement concerning the nomination of Philip N. Brownstein, of Maryland, to be Federal Housing Commissioner. This nomination was confirmed by the Senate on Friday last.

The nomination of this distinguished citizen has met with enthusiastic approval by Representatives in Congress, as well as by members of the financial community.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a number of letters from Members of Congress and others in tribute to Mr. Brownstein and in support of this excellent nomination.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

February 4, 1963.

Hon. A. Willis Robertson,
Chairman, Banking and Currency Committee, U.S. Senate, New Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator: I was pleased to learn of President Kennedy's recent nomination of Mr. Philip N. Brownstein for Commissioner of the Federal Housing Administration.

Mr. Brownstein's experience in the housing field eminently qualifies him for this appointment, and I am happy to advise you of my support for his confirmation.

With best personal regards, I remain,
Sincerely yours,
George A. Smathers.

January 22, 1963.

Hon. A. Willis Robertson,
Chairman, Committee on Banking and Currency, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Robertson: Your committee will soon be holding a hearing on the question of confirming Philip N. Brownstein, whom the President has nominated to be Commissioner of the Federal Housing Administration.

I hope your committee will recommend Mr. Brownstein's confirmation.

In my judgment, no better choice could have been made. He is an outstanding civil servant, possesses both a keen mind and mature judgment, and his long experience with both the FHA and VA loan programs has eminently qualified him for the post.

Sincerely,
Albert Rains,
Chairman.

January 23, 1963.

Hon. A. Willis Robertson,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator: I was very pleased to read of the pending appointment of Philip Brownstein as head of the Federal Housing Administration.

Mr. Brownstein has had a distinguished career in Government service and I believe is ably fitted for this position. He enjoys the confidence and respect of leaders in the housing industry and I believe his confirmation would meet with overwhelming approval.

This appears to be an excellent appointment of an outstanding public servant.

Very best wishes.
Sincerely yours,
William B. Widnall.

January 24, 1963.

Hon. A. Willis Robertson,
Chairman, Banking and Currency Committee, U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Chairman: May I say a few words to you and your distinguished colleagues on behalf of Phil Brownstein whose confirmation as Commissioner of the Federal Housing Administration is pending before you.

Not that I think Phil needs them, but it gives me great pleasure, based upon years of association with him, to give you my personal estimate of him. At all times, I have found him to be a man of excellent conduct and manners and a man of exceptional ability—also, he is a tremendous organizer and most levelheaded.

He will do an outstanding job for the good of the country and the agency as Commissioner of FHA. I hope you will confirm him.

With kindest personal regards and best wishes, I am
Respectfully yours,
Albert Thomas.

February 11, 1963.

Hon. A. Willis Robertson,
Chairman, Banking and Currency Committee, U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Chairman: Several weeks ago the appointment of Mr. P. N. Brownstein, now the Chief Benefits Director of the Veterans' Administration, to be the new Federal Housing Administration Commissioner, was made.

Mr. Brownstein has done an outstanding job as Chief Benefits Director of the Veterans' Administration and in that capacity he has been responsible for directing a variety of Veterans' Administration programs costing several billion dollars a year. As part of his responsibility he was charged with supervision and operation of all Veterans' Administration regional offices.

We regret very much losing Mr. Brownstein from the Veterans' Administration program but I did wish to express to you the belief you are getting a good man for the Federal Housing Administration. I believe that you will find him able and cooperative.

Sincerely,
Olin E. Teague,
Chairman.

January 22, 1963.

Hon. A. Willis Robertson,
Chairman, Banking and Currency Committee, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

My Dear Senator: I am taking the liberty of communicating with you in support of the nomination of Mr. Philip N. Brownstein as Federal Housing Commissioner.

I know Mr. Brownstein personally and can commend him to you as one who would creditably discharge any duties imposed upon him. His background and experience eminently qualify him for the position of Federal Housing Commissioner, and it is my hope that your committee will consider his nomination favorably.

With kind regards, I am,
Sincerely yours,
Eugene J. Keogh.

January 15, 1963.

Hon. A. Willis Robertson,
Chairman, Senate Banking and Currency Committee, Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Robertson: As a former Commissioner of FHA I wish to express to you my great pleasure in learning that President Kennedy has appointed Philip N. Brownstein to be Commissioner of FHA subject to Senate confirmation.

During a good part of my 20-year tenure with FHA I was privileged to work closely with "Phil" on many matters arising from our efforts to coordinate the housing activities of FHA and VA.

On these occasions I was always greatly impressed with his good judgment and outstanding administrative ability.

I am sure that you will find in him the same high qualities that I have so long recognized.

Cordially,
Walter L. Greene,
Vice President.

January 22, 1963.

Senator A. Willis Robertson,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Willis: A recent Richmond newspaper mentioned the possibility of Philip Brownstein being appointed as Federal Housing Commissioner.

I have been acquainted with Mr. Brownstein for a number of years and hold him in highest regard. His 25 years experience in this field and his other qualifications make him an excellent choice. Your support of him would be appreciated.

Sorry you cannot make the United States League reception Tuesday night.

Hope to see you before too long.

Sincerely,
Mark W. Saurs,
Executive Vice President.

January 22, 1963.

Hon. A. Willis Robertson,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Robertson: I would like to take this opportunity to convey to you my support for the President's nomination of Philip N. Brownstein to be the new Commissioner of the Federal Housing Administration.

I have known Mr. Brownstein for many years and have found him to always be objective, understanding, and extremely capable. His many years of experience in the housing field eminently qualify him to be the FHA Commissioner, and I was delighted to learn of his appointment.

Naturally, I hope that your committee can quickly and favorably recommend his confirmation as Commissioner, and I wanted you to know that I have never heard anyone question Mr. Brownstein's ability to do this job as one of the top Government officials in the housing field.

Sincerely,
Henry A. Bubb,
Chairman, Legislative Committee.

SELECTION OF OFFICERS FOR THE DIPLOMATIC SERVICE

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Record at this point an article entitled "Are We Getting Our Share of the Best?" written by R. Smith Simpson, and published in the Foreign Service Journal for November 1962. The article relates to one of the most critical questions confronting our foreign service in the country. I commend it to the interest of all my colleagues.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Are We Getting Our Share of the Best?

(By R. Smith Simpson)

The process of finding and selecting officers adequately equipped for our diplomatic service is a singularly exacting one keyed to highly selective criteria. It has been developed by trial and error over a number of years, subjected to numerous reappraisals, exposed to various essays of experimentation. One would be justified in expecting it would bring into the Foreign Service a flow of superbly qualified young men and women, the pick of their generation—young men and women fully aware of the importance of the calling to which they aspired and at least moderately well prepared for its opportunities and obligations of representing the United States abroad.

A year of service as a deputy examiner engaged in interviewing candidates and a round of colleges as a part of the Department's recruiting effort have persuaded me that accomplishment falls grievously short of the ideal. Of those candidates I examined a few were good, a rare one was outstanding, but the great majority were wholly unprepared for diplomatic work, and did not even have the slightest glimmer of what it was. Somehow they had acquired a feeling they might like the Foreign Service, or at any rate it would do no harm to give the examinations a whirl to see "what gives." They had no conception whatever that this is an exacting calling, involving not only considerable hazard and adventure but also a profound cultural awareness, knowledge of history and political science, some familiarity with the behavioral sciences and at least an elementary grounding in international law, international organization and diplomacy—in other words considerable intellectual preparation, if they are adequately to represent their country abroad.

My initial surprise was to find among the candidates an abysmal ignorance of so elementary a subject as the geography of the United States. Few could even place accurately the principal rivers: one with so descriptive a name as the Ohio was not infrequently identified as being "somewhere west of the Mississippi." Few could name the principal seaports, and, of course, any requirement demanding such detailed familiarity with this country as identifying the States comprising the Wheat Belt or the Corn Belt was completely beyond the average candidate's depth.

As to elementary economics and social data, most could only guess at the population, labor force, and gross national product of their country. Many did not know what constituted "gross national product." They had no clear idea as to the principal products of their country, nor as to its exports and imports. They could name a few of each, but had no notion of their relative importance and had given no thought to the role of imports in the American economy.

As with elementary geographic and economic aspects of the United States, so with historical, sociological, and cultural. Americans abroad are asked a great many questions about their country. How did the United States acquire the Panama Canal? What is its status now? Who started our war with Spain (or Mexico) and what came out of it? When did our labor movement start and where does it stand now? How does a Jimmy Hoffa get control of a powerful union? What were some of the reform movements in American history? What became of them?

A good half of our candidates could answer such questions with only the thinnest recital of facts; many could not discuss them at all. Some could not recall ever having heard of the Populist movement; few knew its connection with Woodrow Wilson's New Freedom. Asked if he knew anything about the progressive movement, one candidate replied, "Oh, yes, that was LaFollette's movement." To the question, "Where did LaFollette come from?" he could only reply vaguely, "Somewhere out west."

I would say that the proportion of candidates who could handle current events questions reasonably well was about 6 out of 10. Perhaps three or four could give fairly adequate definitions of the Truman Doctrine or the Eisenhower Doctrine, even state the composition and responsibilities of SEATO and CENTO. Most of them had never heard of ANZUS.

If we explored American foreign policy we encountered baffling deficiencies. Most of them knew the origin of the Monroe Doctrine and its general content, but beyond that their knowledge rapidly petered out. The tests the Doctrine has undergone, the various interpretations placed on it, its abuses were beyond them. Naturally, we rarely ventured to ask for a discussion of whether it is still in existence; although this is a question many of them will encounter and all of them should be expected to handle with some degree of information and intelligence.

The American abroad is asked about American culture as often as about our history, our politics and our policies. An Indian dinner guest may inquire: "America is very materialistic, I understand. Is that so? What has it contributed to cultural and spiritual progress?" No more than 1 candidate in 20 could provide a thoughtful, well-informed response to such a question. Even sadder to relate, they were equally blank on purely factual questions. Could the candidate give his Indian guests the names of five or six American painters and tell something of their work? The names of five composers? Of two or three philosophers? Of a few poets, novelists or essayists other than the contemporaries with whom the Indian was probably familiar?

The answers were halting and feeble. Many could not name a single painter, a single composer, a single philosopher, other than contemporary. Even in the literary field knowledge was surprisingly limited. Thought-provoking questions, requiring a certain amount of relating and synthesizing—"What has been Chicago's contribution to American literature?" for example—left them gaping and stumbling. We put simpler factual questions: What was the New England school of literature in the 19th century? We found college graduates native to New England itself who could not answer.

Most candidates showed some slight familiarity with 20th century writers. Asked to name some poets, they almost invariably led off with Robert Frost. Among novelists, they could produce the names of Hemingway and Faulkner, perhaps others. (One mentioned Tennessee Williams.) But under questioning this familiarity proved to be shallow; it did not survive much discussion.

Questions of a sociological nature asked us abroad and on which we should be able to throw intelligent light found candidates pitifully uninformed. Such questions concern the basis and nature of our society. They are problems people confront abroad. They raise doubts of our fitness for leadership. What are the causes of our sizable problem of juvenile delinquency? What are the causes of our high divorce rate? Why do we permit trashy pulp magazines to exist, to be exported? Why Hollywood? To what extent are our basic civil rights effective? Rare indeed was the candidate who could cope with such questions.

As to diplomacy itself, few of the candidates had any idea what it was. Nine out of ten had not even given any thought to it, it never having occurred to them to so much as look the word up in a dictionary, much less go to a library and read something about it, if only a biography or two. This was baffling indeed. I had expected to find far greater interest in a profession which candidates were considering as a career. I had expected, even, preparation, but as to this I found our universities deficient. One has to search far and wide for a course in diplomacy, particularly one in which its methods and techniques are discussed. Our universities appear to be hypnotized by the machinery and formulation of foreign policy: consideration of its execution is well-nigh nonexistent.

Indeed, one conclusion that emerges from such an experience as this is that American education is letting us down. An educational system that turns out graduates lacking the simplest geographical and sociological knowledge about their country is not an adequate educational system. Universities that graduate men and women with only a smattering of knowledge of their Nation's history, its governmental structure and political system, and its cultural evolution as well as of the international political system, do not merit the name of universities.

Unless the quality of our education is even more appalling than I think it is, a second conclusion must be that the State Department and the Foreign Service are no longer getting their share of the cream of college graduates.

One reason for this is that the Foreign Service is no longer the principal avenue for dedication to constructive work abroad. The spirit of service now has a score of outlets to two or three existing 30 years ago. Philanthropic and charitable organizations with oversea programs have multiplied, and broadened their activities. Three thousand American companies now operate outside the United States and offer all kinds of opportunities, including negotiation of agreements with foreign governments and the development of exchange, training and technical assistance programs, in a private diplomacy very similar in content to public.

The competition of the professions is more formidable than ever. Teaching now offers many opportunities for travel and cross-cultural adventure through scholarships and fellowships, exchange programs, foundation grants, positions in oversea branches. Law schools send moot court teams to college to demonstrate the practice of law and attract promising undergraduates. The physical sciences have taken on new glamour; there is a widespread feeling that our country's destiny lies in the hands of the scientists. Space technology has the adventuresome appeal that diplomacy had 30 years ago and the financial rewards are much greater.

The competition is not only from this extensive area of private and semipublic enterprise, but from other components of the Federal establishment. There are few departments and agencies not engaged in foreign affairs in some manner. They also have taken to offering summer employment as a means of stimulating interest. The military services offer many opportunities which parallel the Foreign Service, with fringe benefits our Service does not provide.

Impairing the competitive position of the Foreign Service is also the fact that in recent years it has become somewhat less of a foreign service than formerly. We can no longer offer the virtual certainty that a recruit will spend extended periods of his life abroad, with diversity of life, work, travel and adventure that this means. Since Wristonization, officers must expect to spend sizable periods of their careers right here at home.

The barrage of criticism directed at the Department and the Service has discouraged some applicants. I had candidate after candidate attest to this and query me about the criticism. It seems quite evident that we must be prepared to discuss criticism frankly, conceding deficiencies and mistakes where they exist, pointing convincingly to our achievements, although these may be quiet and unobtrusive, presenting clearly the difficulties and problems confronting the practice of diplomacy in this age.

For this complex of reasons, we are not now achieving the high level of quality the times require and which was envisioned by the various committees which, in the last 15 years, have examined the Foreign Service and made recommendations for its improvement. "Foreign policy," said the Wriston committee, "will be dynamic or inert, steadfast or aimless, in proportion to the character and unity of those who serve it."[1] Formal unit we have achieved, but character we have neglected.

In addition, since World War II, we have achieved the establishment of a broader base for recruitment. Our candidates now come from all parts of the country, all income levels, all social environments, all occupational backgrounds, all types of schools and almost every racial and national origin. But the Department has not correspondingly extended its effort at quality recruitment. It has followed the letter of the recommendation that the Nation's diplomatic service be more representative without recognizing the ancillary necessity of refining its competitive appeal to achieve a reservoir of suitable quality. It has not offered to college students or faculties a clear enough image of the Service and the kind of people it seeks. It has not set forth either the educational preparation needed nor, clearly and precisely enough, the personal qualifications, aptitudes and skills. It has engaged in a dragnet, come-one-come-all operation. If quality is to be combined with representativeness in our reservoir of talent, a greater effort—qualitative, in particular—is required.

---

[1] Toward a Stronger Foreign Service. Report of the Secretary of State's Public Committee on Personnel, June 1954. Department of State Publication 5458. U.S. Government Printing Office.

To get across to our colleges, and even to our secondary schools, and the general public, a clearer image of our diplomatic service and the kind of people who can qualify is, I suggest, a fundamental responsibility of the department of foreign affairs in a democracy and it is going to take some doing. It requires, first, a clearer and deeper analysis of diplomacy. The content and techniques of our work rather than its situs abroad must now be emphasized. What is required is (1) a clearer concept among ourselves of what diplomacy is today—which is to say, the different types of diplomacy which the current environment exacts; (2) a clearer analysis of the competitive factors we are up against, including the interests of young people and why they have these interests, in order that our presentation may be sharply pitched to these interests; and (3) a more discriminating selection of the Foreign Service officers assigned to present the Service and its requirements to our educational system and the public, and the assignment of such officers for long enough periods to provide continuity of contact, experience and effort.

We must be quite clear and very determined about this. We can no longer afford the luxury of letting the Department and the Service be represented by officers who are not sufficiently seasoned and intellectually responsive to their audiences. Let me give an example or two of what I mean. Some high school teachers who had attended one of the Department's seminars complained to me afterward that the Department's presentation was incomplete and evasive. I pointed out that naturally there were matters that could not be placed on the top of a seminar table for public discussion. That was not the kind of thing the teachers had in mind, however. They were referring instead to such instances as the reply of a senior Foreign Service officer who, when asked what kind of informational program the United States had in the area under discussion, told the questioner he would have to get his answer from USIA. No one in the seminar felt that this was satisfactory or reassuring as to the Department's familiarity with, much less coordination of, our total diplomacy.

Another example is directly related to our recruiting effort. Representatives of the Department and of another Federal agency visited a certain eastern college for recruiting purposes. The other agency sent its deputy director; the Department's representative was a junior Foreign Service officer. Among the dozen or so students who showed up at the Department's meeting were the sons of a Foreign Service colleague. They described the Department's spokesman as timid, evasive, and inadequately informed on the current crises facing the United States. By contrast, the agency representative impressed the students as mature, frank, responsive, and well informed. No more than two or three students showed any further interest in the Foreign Service, but a dozen or so filled out applications to the other agency.

I would warn against any superficial or merely bureaucratic effort to improve our communication with the educational establishment and the general public. This is not something that can be handed out to officers as a kind of recruitment patter. It is not a matter of visiting more campuses or staying longer. What is needed is a clearer conceptualization of diplomacy in the 20th century and this can come only from the minds of the officers themselves. We must take a more analytical—let us say a more scientific—interest in the overall nature of our policymaking and diplomatic functions, and the way in which these fit into the work of other departments, other agencies, private firms, universities. We must be willing to examine our work critically, pinpointing its deficiencies as well as its excellence, its failures as well its achievements, and ask ourselves why these deficiencies and failures occur. We must familiarize ourselves with the growing literature on foreign policy and operations and the wide range of sociological factors involved.

The Department on its side must be prepared to take steps to stimulate and make possible such an intellectual effort. This means, for one thing, that the Department and the Service must be staffed generously enough to provide time for intellectual, as contrasted with routine, day-to-day effort. Officers so hard pressed by daily demands that they can scarcely keep up with a good daily newspaper will not be able to measure up to what is required.

If this effort can be made, one consequence will be to bring us into closer relationships with our colleges and universities. The thinking of the faculties of our higher institutions of learning can help us in our search for clarification; we in turn have something to offer them. From this exchange will come a clearer understanding, on the campus and among ourselves, of the kind of work in which we are engaged and the kind of people we are seeking.

As the Wriston Committee said: "No segment of the Foreign Service machinery stands in more pressing need of modernization than its recruitment of junior officers." But no tinkering and tampering will produce this modernization. It must take place in the minds of men.

GENERAL EISENHOWER'S MARKSMANSHIP IN MEXICO AND THE BIRD POPULATION

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, a small news item in the Washington Evening Star last Monday caught my eye. It was a very sketchy report of a highly successful bird hunting excursion enjoyed by General Eisenhower in Mexico. According to the report, General Eisenhower killed 40 ducks and 35 other birds in a period of less than 3 hours last Saturday.

This is certainly a testimonal to General Eisenhower's keen marksmanship, but I shudder to think what the grand total would have been if he had made a full day of it. I do not know how many were in his party, but it is obvious that if their eyesight was as keen as the general's, the duck population has incurred a serious setback.

I do not believe that Arkansas duck hunters would necessarily be impressed with the general's markmanship. We have some mighty good hunters in Arkansas too, but they have little opportunity to test their skill under the same circumstances, since last season they were limited to only one mallard a day. Duck hunting has traditionally been excellent in Arkansas and it has in the past contributed a great deal to our economy by attracting thousands of out-of-State sportsmen. With a bag limit of only one mallard a day, however, there is not much incentive for someone to travel a considerable distance to merely watch the ducks fly over. If they could shoot all the ducks they wanted, I daresay that they could equal the general's record but, of course, there would not be any ducks at all the next year.

Two years ago the Congress authorized what is in effect a crash program to try to halt the decline in the duck population by speeding up the purchase of good breeding and nesting lands. This was a bipartisan program which encountered little, if any, opposition in the Congress. The question was not whether or not to authorize the conservation program but rather how fast to carry it out. Seven million dollars was appropriated by the Congress last year as the intitial increment in the purchase program and $12 million has been requested by the President for the next fiscal year. We have been working with our Canadian friends in an effort to improve the waterfowl situation at that end of the flyway. Neither the wetlands acquisition program nor the efforts to solve the breeding problem in Canada will accomplish much if the ducks and geese are all decimated at the wintering end of the flyway.

General Eisenhower's reputation as a marksman may have been improved by this recent hunt, but I fear that it does not lend much encouragement to our wildlife officials who are trying so hard to improve the waterfowl situation. I hope that all U.S. hunters visiting in Mexico do not follow the General's example.

I ask unanimous consent that the newspaper article to which I have referred be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

EISENHOWER SHOOTS 75 BIRDS IN MEXICO

Culiacan, Mexico, February 25.—Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower's marksmanship is still hot. And so is his appetite while on vacation at nearby Las Cruces.

The former President went duck hunting here and killed 40 ducks and 35 other birds in less than 3 hours Saturday. Then he rolled his own tacos, a sort of Mexican sandwich made of tortillas, and enjoyed chile con carne and enchiladas.

GOLD MEDAL FOR EDDIE CANTOR

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, on Monday, February 18, 1963, my distinguished colleague, the junior Senator from Florida [Mr. Smathers], introduced Senate Joint Resolution 47, which would authorize the President of the United States to express the high esteem and appreciation of the American people, and the issuance of a gold medal to Eddie Cantor.

The Senator from Florida has done this country a great service in calling to our attention the need for recognizing this outstanding humanitarian and entertainer, who not only has devoted his life to entertain Americans via radio, television, the motion picture, and stage, but also has given of his time to help in many worthy causes, the most notable of which is probably the March of Dimes, the 25th anniversary of which we celebrate this year.

Because it was the beloved Mr. Cantor who 25 years ago suggested to President Franklin D. Roosevelt the idea of every American interested in combating poliomyelitis to send 10 cents to the White House—the idea of a March of Dimes was created. It has stood the test of time—and because of it and through it, this dread disease today has virtually been stopped.

And even though the March of Dimes has virtually eradicated polio, the work of this great organization still goes on seeking cures, through research, of other crippling diseases.

Knowing that Mr. Cantor is a modest man, his recognition is symbolic of all Americans who have given so unselfishly and untiringly of their services to this great humanitarian effort.

The Senator from Florida has asked the Congress to act promptly and favorably on this resolution. I join with my distinguished colleague from Florida in this request, and particularly urge the Senate Banking and Currency Committee, to which this resolution was referred, to move with dispatch.

The junior Senator from New York [Mr. Keating] has assisted us all in putting this overall resolution in its proper perspective when he said that for the Congress to recognize Mr. Cantor through issuance of this gold medal, we are recognizing not only a fellow man who is a national figure, but a man who is a national asset.

FEDERAL AID TO CITIES

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, as a Member of a body directly concerned with the operations of the Federal Government I have many times heard the accusation that the Federal Government is a bureaucratic octopus continually seeking involvement in more and more areas of government.

I am convinced that the Federal Government is involved in a great many areas of concern primarily because there was a job to do and no one else would do it. It often appears that when there is a vacuum of responsibility the only level of government with the interest and ability to fill that vacuum is the Federal.

I for one would certainly be glad to see State and local units of government assume more responsibility. But I cannot believe that needed programs and services should be abandoned if no one at the local level will carry them out.

This problem is very well put in perspective in a recent editorial in a fine weekly newspaper in Wyoming, the Kemmerer Gazette. This editorial points out that the same people who are so vocal in condemning the Federal Government for moving into governmental vacuums are the same people who help create those vacuums by inaction at the local level.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have this editorial printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Toward Federal Aid

> It is hardly surprising that the State legislature flatly refused to give Wyoming cities and towns badly needed additional revenue. The State legislature, through the years, has never been particularly responsive to the needs of the citizens of Wyoming's rapidly growing municipalities.
>
> The legislature's refusal to act was, however, extremely disappointing because it appeared as late as a week before adjournment that the cities and towns would get more revenue.
>
> The sales tax measure (of which the towns would have gotten only one-fourth) passed the house of representatives by a substantial margin. The disappointment came when the senate defeated the measure by nearly a two to one majority.
>
> Even if the lawmakers didn't like the sales tax, however, they could have passed any one of a number of alternative revenue-producing bills sponsored by the Wyoming Association of Municipalities. But they chose not to.
>
> Thus, once again, the cities and towns get nothing.
>
> There is one ironic, almost ridiculous, aspect about this situation. This comes in the fact that several of the most influential legislators like to speak long and loud in criticism of Federal aid.
>
> By their act of denying cities and towns State revenue, the legislators are forcing the municipalities to seek aid from the Federal Government.
>
> A good case in point is near at hand. A new bill has been introduced into the U.S. Congress which would appropriate $100 million to aid cities in eliminating combined sanitary and storm sewers.
>
> Does this strike a familiar chord?
>
> The town of Kemmerer has combination sanitary-storm sewers. The matter has been under discussion recently. The city council would like to separate the two sewer systems if money were available to do the job. Many other cities and towns, some of them in Wyoming, have the same problem.
>
> The Federal Government is working on a solution to these problems. Our State government, through the lack of action by its legislature, has ignored these problems.
>
> In the next few years, the Federal Government will move into many fields which were formerly considered the province of local government. One of the chief reasons for this will be the failure to solve problems by local government.
>
> Wyoming's State legislature has boosted the cities and towns another step along the way to becoming dependent on the Federal Government.

PEACE CORPS TRAGEDY

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, I was informed yesterday that the bodies of two members of the Peace Corps were found in the wreckage of an airliner which crashed yesterday in the Philippines. The two were Phillip Maggard, of Buffalo, Wyo., and Nancy Ann Boyd, of Martinez, Calif.

There is little anyone can say or do to lessen the heartbreak of a tragedy like this one. These young people with their enthusiasm for life and their concern for their fellow man are gone. We can only say to their parents, their relatives and friends, that we too share your grief.

These deaths have illustrated a sad fact of human nature, that it is the bold, the daring, who pay the price for the advancement of mankind. Whether it be the pioneer extending the boundaries of civilization or the Peace Corpsman fighting the forces of want and suffering, it is those who live their convictions, who are not afraid to venture into unknown or dangerous fields who make the sacrifice for progress.

The Peace Corps is to me patriotism of the highest order. It is an endeavor that calls upon the very best in the human spirit and the very finest in the American traditions. These two young people exemplified the spirit of this Nation and the Peace Corps. We suffer because of their deaths; the world and the cause of freedom suffers a loss, yet at the same time the world is a better place because they were here.

Mr. President, the dedication of members of the Peace Corps is superbly illustrated by a statement made by Phillip Maggard in his application to join that group. Phillip, who hoped someday to be a minister, wrote:

> Since my ministry would be concerned mainly with attempts to help humanity, I feel the Peace Corps would provide a way of gaining experience that would make that attempt more feasible. And, having worked with the Peace Corps, I should hope to feel that I have left my area better than I had found it.

Phillip Maggard was 22 years old; he attended the University of the South at Sewanee, Tenn., and the University of Wyoming at Laramie. He entered Peace Corps training last June at San Jose State College in California and was a member of the Seventh Peace Corps contingent sent to the Philippines. At the time of his death he was teaching at a small village school in Liangu Bay, Agusan Province on the isle of Mindanao. His father, J. M. Maggard, is superintendent of schools in Buffalo, Wyo. Members of the family have long been friends of mine.

Mr. President, there are always many mundane details that attend tragedies such as this one and I am gratified to know that Sargent Shriver, Director of the Peace Corps, has been able to send one of his assistants, Nathaniel Davis, to Buffalo to relieve the family of as much of this detail as is possible.

Mr. President, I should like to include the following statements from persons concerned with the Peace Corps in my remarks. Mr. Shriver said of Phillip and Nancy Ann that both were "outstanding volunteers performing valuable service to mankind. They could have devoted their lives to no more valuable effort. I extend my deepest sympathy to the parents and friends of these fine young people."

The superintendent of schools for Agusan Province said that these two were "outstanding Americans who were doing highly competent work, they will be missed greatly."

Ameito Mutuc, Philippine Ambassador to the United States, said:

> Nancy Ann Boyd and Phillip Maggard exemplified a new and dedicated breed of young Americans who are giving of their best to extend the variety and strength of

the free way of life to the far corners of the earth. They consecrated their lives to the pursuit of peace and thus contributed to the important work of imparting peace and fostering good will and the democratic way of life which is the mission of the Peace Corps.

SOVIET ANTI-SEMITISM

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, over the past few years there have been many carefully researched articles in the American press dealing with the increasing manifestations of anti-Semitism in the Soviet Union, and with the evidence that the Soviet officials are themselves deliberately fanning the flames.

Last June 28, I wrote to the Department of State in connection with this situation and I urged that some dramatic action be taken to make manifest our official displeasure over the persecution of religious minorities in the Soviet Union.

In a lengthy reply on July 11, 1962, Assistant Secretary of State Frederick G. Dutton wrote, among other things, that it is "not possible to determine whether Soviet Jews are deliberately being singled out as Jews for a disproportionate amount of condemnation and victimization."

I must confess that I found it difficult to understand Mr. Dutton's uncertainty because it seemed to me at the time that there was overwhelming evidence that the Soviet Jews were, in fact, the victims of special persecution. In this connection, I should like to bring to the attention of the Senate an article which appeared in the London Observer for Sunday, January 13. This article, written by the Soviet expert, Edward Crankshaw, clearly points the finger at Prime Minister Khrushchev, himself, as the chief condoner, if not the chief instigator, of the persecution of the Soviet Jews.

Mr. President, in 1954, during the 83d Congress, I was a member of the Select Committee To Investigate Communist Aggression and Forced Incorporation of the Baltic States into the U.S.S.R. At that time, on September 22 and 23, 1954, we conducted hearings on the treatment of Jews by the Soviets. A report was published as a result of those hearings. I believe that the conclusions reached in the committee's study are worthy of reiteration, for the past 9 years have produced no evidence to indicate a contrary determination. The report stated:

> Indeed, the conclusion to which one is driven by the great mass of evidence presented to this committee is that the official and deliberate policy of communism was aimed directly at forced assimilation of the Jews as the preferred technique for exterminating the Jews as a people.
>
> The end result sought by the Communists stands revealed by the evidence, therefore, as being no different from the end result sought by the Nazis.

As the Observer article indicates, this continuing Soviet racism reveals not only to the world but also to the Soviet people that Communist deeds do not match Communist words.

This is a lesson that will stand us in good stead in all of our dealings with the Communists.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the article from the London Sunday Observer be inserted into the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MR K. IS WORRIED OVER JEWS

(By Edward Crankshaw)

The position of Jewry in the Soviet Union continues to worry Mr. Khrushchev—and the Jews.

According to a reliable report from Moscow, the much-publicized meeting on December 17 of writers, artists, and musicians with the highest Government leaders, including Mr. Khrushchev himself, was largely taken up with a bitter argument on and around anti-Semitism.

None of this was published in official versions of the speeches at that meeting because the Soviet Government has been advised by certain satellite leaders that the latest drive against Soviet Jewry—the arrest of rabbis and Jewish leaders on currency charges, the steady closing of synagogues—has been creating a poor impression in the outside world.

Mr. Khrushchev himself was uneasily half-defensive, half-aggressive. There was no more anti-Semitism in the Soviet Union, he said, because "the nationalities question has been solved." There was only "individual anti-Semitism."

Nevertheless, it was better for Jews not to hold top positions in the Government because this only provoked popular resentment. He had already said all this to the leaders of Poland and Hungary in 1956, and in his view the revolt in those countries were largely due to the fact that there had been too many Jews in top Government posts.

CONSTERNATION

The occasion for these remarks seems to have been the attack by Mr. Ilychev on the composer, Shostakovich, for using Yevtushenko's poem about the Nazi massacre of the Kiev Jews at Babi Yar as the text for his new symphony. The remarks produced so much consternation that afterward Mr. Khrushchev was moved to go up to Ilya Ehrenburg, who had also been violently attacked by another speaker, and assure him that his words were not directed at him personally. "You must understand that as a professional politician I have to take things as I find them and warn against dangers."

These words do not ring quite true in view of the sustained attack, increasing all through 1962, on Jewish culture and Jewish religious observances. At least 10 important centers of Jewish population have had their synagogues closed down in recent months, making a total of at least 60 since 1959.

Over 60 percent of the published total of all those persons shot for "speculation" and similar activities have been Jews; and in some of the trials synagogues were described as the meeting place for "crooks and speculators."

PILLORIED BY PRESS

One of the most important closures was the Lvov synagogue on November 5 last year. Lvov, capital of the Western Ukraine, has been traditionally a great Jewish center, and even now there remain between 30,000 and 40,000 Jews. These now have no place of worship.

Their synagogue was closed after a series of articles in Lvov Pravda, the local party journal, had stigmatized it as a black-market center, and named various offenders; these were then tried and given heavy prison sentences.

Lvov Pravda subsequently published "demands" by Jewish workers that the synagogue should be closed, and it was.

Other synagogues closed last year were those at Sverdlovsk, with 40,000 Jews; Zhitomir, with 30,000; Kazan, with 25,000; Grozny, with 12,000; and many more.

In many places Jews meeting for prayer in private houses have been dispersed by the police and pilloried in the press.

For the first time in Soviet history, 1962 saw the banning of the manufacture of mazot, or unleavened bread, and the prohibition of parcels containing mazot from abroad.

The only Jewish religious seminary in the whole of Russia was immunized by the simple process of denying residential permits to 9 of its 15 students. "Individual anti-Semitism" seems to be running pretty high.

SUZANNE LABIN: JOAN OF ARC OF FREEDOM

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, a number of my colleagues have shared the pleasure with me of meeting with Madam Suzanne Labin, the remarkable Frenchwoman who has done so much in recent years to help focus the attention of the free world on the harsh realities of the cold war.

The late Forrest Davis, one of our distinguished American correspondents, described Madam Labin as "the most luminous and eloquent voice of the West against the terrible menace it faces." I, myself, have likened her to Joan of Arc, not only because she is a Frenchwoman and petite, but because of her dedication and her ability to inspire others and because the situation the free world faces in a sense resembles the crisis confronting the French nation when the Maid of Orleans called it to arms.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert into the RECORD at this point an article entitled "Suzanne Labin: Joan of Arc of Freedom," by Eugene Lyons, who is nationally known to all of us as a senior editor of Reader's Digest and as an authority on communism.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the American Legion magazine, December 1962]

SUZANNE LABIN: JOAN OF ARC OF FREEDOM

(By Eugene Lyons)

Incensed by an anti-Communist book that was making a sensation in France, the Moscow paper Soviet Russia struck out at its author. "Is Suzanne Labin," it asked with heavyhanded irony, "an old maid wearing glasses, sour on the whole world, or a young girl who couldn't pass her school exams?"

Whether posed in ignorance or in malice, the question could hardly have been more grotesquely mistaken, and the Paris publishers exploited Moscow's blunder. In issuing a new edition of the book, "Liberté aux Liberticides" (Freedom for the Murderers of Freedom), they inserted a leaflet to set the comrades straight.

"Since the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the U.S.S.R. is inquiring about the author," it said, "we are pleased to comply." A picture of Suzanne Labin attested that she was strikingly good looking; a succinct biography attested that she was a seasoned scholar, held a string of academic degrees, and was happily married. This was in 1957. Since then, we may be sure, Soviet intelligence has caught up with the lady. The Communist press denounces her as the very embodiment of anti-Communist fury, but it no longer raises doubts about her looks or education.

In the intervening years, Suzanne Labin has emerged as the most dynamic, ubiquitous and effective opponent of communism in the free world. She is today as well known and as highly esteemed among dedicated anti-Communists in Asia, Latin America, and the United States, as she is in her native France and Europe. The shelf full of her books, pamphlets, and articles adds up to a hardheaded course on the theory and practice of political warfare. She accepts repeated threats of death that reach her by mail and by phone, as accolades from the enemy. The same applies to an attempt to kidnap her in New Delhi, when she escaped from a car that was taking her to the Soviet Embassy.

Senator Thomas J. Dodd has called Suzanne the Joan of Arc of freedom against communism, and he is not the only one. Because she is a Frenchwoman, petite, and a magnificient crusader, it was inevitable that she should be compared to the Maid of Orleans. The late Forrest Davis wrote, in addition, that she is the most luminous and eloquent voice of the West against the terrible menace it faces. Edmond Michelet, a former Minister of Justice, spoke of her as our magnificient, unique Suzanne Labin.

Certainly, political dynamite has rarely come in a smaller or more attractive package. A natural blonde with flashing eyes and a radiant smile, she ekes out 5 feet of height on high heels. In addressing large audiences around the world, she often has to stand on a box to get her head above the lectern. Somehow, the contrast between her feminine charm and her robust logic adds dimensions to the total impression. Whether in French, English, or Spanish, her eloquence is seasoned with Gallic wit.

Both her zeal and her energy seem inexhaustible. Consider her visit to the United States this summer:

She had traveled halfway around the globe, from her home in Paris to Seoul, Korea, to take part in an Extraordinary Congress of the Asian People's Anti-Communist League. The delegates and observers from some 30 countries regarded this tiny Westerner—the chief European correspondent of the league's official organ—as one of their very own. The principal achievement of the Congress was the adoption of Suzanne Labin's plan to create a permanent freedom center in Seoul—an Asian equivalent of the Freedom Academy project now bottled up in congressional committees in Washington.

The freedom center, which has the official support of the Korean and South Vietnam Governments, will "initiate and develop an integrated, operational science to educate and train anti-Communist leaders and cadres superior to Communist cold war professionals, and to develop a specific program designed to unmask and frustrate the false propaganda of the Communists and to propagate the gospels of freedom." The wording clearly bears the imprint of Mme. Labin's mind and style.

With this accomplished, she felt that there was work to do in America in connection with the mounting Red threats in southeast Asia. Therefore, instead of returning home directly, she went on to the United States. Her itinerary here included Los Angeles, San Francisco, Kansas City, St. Louis, Chicago, New York, Philadelphia, and Washington. Into about 5 weeks, she managed to pack 26 lectures (all but a few gratis), a dozen press conferences, 18 radio and television appearances, and uncounted consultations with individual anti-Communists and political leaders.

She wound up the tour by addressing 2 luncheons in Washington—1 tendered by Senator Dodd and attended by 25 Senators, the other by Congressman Walter H. Judd, attended by 37 Representatives. Reluctantly, she declined other American invitations because she had to rush to Paris to supervise the filming of her documentary—"In Berlin, Freedom Is at Stake"—in time for the anniversary of the Berlin wall, and to prepare for a scheduled lecture tour in South America soon thereafter.

In New York, where we shared the platform at an anti-Communist seminar at the Commodore Hotel, Suzanne Labin explained the main purpose of her American trip to me. She was thoroughly alarmed by the intensive propaganda underway in the free world, and especially in the United States, against the government of Ngo Dinh Diem in South Vietnam.

"I wanted to warn anti-Communists in your country," she explained, "and as much of the public as I could reach, that the anti-Diem campaign is Communist inspired. It aims to discourage and if possible put an end to American support of the Saigon government in its life-and-death struggle against the Red guerrilla offensive."

This, indeed, was the message running through all her private and public talks while she was in our country. She recalled how similar propaganda against Chiang Kai-shek, in which the Mao Tse-tung forces were pictured as just agrarian reformers, helped bring about the fall of China. Always, she emphasized, when the Communists concentrate on conquering some country, the incumbent anti-Communist regime becomes the target of systematic attack in the free world. Now, she said, it was President Diem's turn.

In South Vietnam, the United States had decided to back the Saigon government against the Communist invasion. "This was too much for the numerous species of auxiliaries and dupes of the Kremlin," she wrote in the Washington World. "A case of true resistance to communism cannot be tolerated. Therefore, an immense campaign was launched through the powerful press of capitulation to decry and kill our ally of Saigon." Point by point, she then refuted the lies and half-truths about the Diem regime being spread by the Red propaganda apparatus—in print, on the air, through knowing allies and eager dupes.

In the last few years, Mme. Labin has made several extensive trips through South Vietnam, questioning its people, addressing meetings in towns and villages, checking anti-Diem allegations on the spot. Though the Government has its faults—to expect Western-style democracy in southeast Asia would be naive, she says—it has improved the lot of the people and was making exciting progress in agrarian reform until Communist terror slowed up the process.

The guerrilla offensive is not a popular revolt, as a portion of the Western press would have us believe, but "a prefabricated affair, teleguided from headquarters in Communist Hanoi and Peiping. We should never forget," Suzanne Labin told American audiences, "that more than a million persons have fled from North to South Vietnam. There would have been millions more had the borders not been closed in brutal violation of the Geneva agreement dividing Vietnam. You must see to it that the blunders the great democracies made in China, then in French Indochina, are not repeated in South Vietnam."

I had met Suzanne Labin briefly when she was in the United States in 1959. But I was able to observe her in full action for the first time in December 1960. It was a phenomenon not easily forgotten—a demonstration of what one dedicated and tireless woman, without money, without official support, despite the apathy of the press, could accomplish.

The occasion was the 3-day International Conference on Political Warfare, in Paris: the first global gathering of "activists" in the struggle against communism, above national and party line, ever staged. It was Suzanne Labin who had conceived and planned the enterprise; she who, almost singlehandedly and against heartbreaking odds, had mobilized the conclave.

Some 400 delegates showed up—trade union leaders, parliamentarians, writers, exile leaders from Communist-captive countries, and others—mostly as individuals, some as spokesmen for organizations. About three-quarters were French, of course, but the rest came from 15 other countries and included 10 Asians, 6 Africans, and a small American contingent. The whole spectrum of anti-Communist thinking and feeling, from right to left, was represented, in a search for common ground against the common enemy.

Like others before her, Suzanne Labin had learned the hard way that the rich seem indifferent to their own peril. Her efforts to raise money for the conference had netted only $2,400. Undismayed, she had proceeded with the project on that shoestring. She obtained a meeting hall, rent free, and managed to borrow tape recorders and crude simultaneous translation equipment. The delegates paid their own fares and expenses; in fact, on one occasion when the shoestring gave out, they raised the needed francs by passing the hat at the conference.

The first session, held in the NATO auditorium, was opened with an address by Paul-Henri Spaak, then Secretary General of NATO. Those who attended the sessions that followed, held in a cramped and shabby Paris hall, heard speeches by dozens of the world's most stalwart and knowledgeable anti-Communists. Among these were French leaders like Maurice Schumann; the Vice President of West Germany's Bundestag, Richard Jaeger; the Spanish philosopher, Salvador de Madariaga; a top official from South Vietnam; and Senators Dodd and Kenneth Keating.

Most of the pacticipants were unknown to each other, but all of them knew the gallant little Frenchwoman. She was the dominant figure throughout, the heart and soul of the gathering and, in terms of ideas, its brain as well. Her several appearances on the speaker's rostrum were inspirational and deadly serious, but always spiced with humor. In a keynote address she raised three slogans: (1) "Freemen of all nations, unite"; (2) "What is the use of filling our arms with weapons, if we let the enemy disarm our brains"; and (3) "Communism must kill freedom abroad, otherwise freedom will kill communism at home." These set the tone for much that followed.

Selections from the 3 days of oratory and argument appeared in book form a few months later, in French, under the title "Life or Death of the Free World." That, too, was made possible only by Mme. Labin's exertions in editing the vast materials and raising the modest financing for publication. The Italian delegates had been so impressed that they took the initiative in staging a second such world conference, in Rome, a year later. Again it brought together some 400 men and women from all over the world, and again Suzanne Labin played a major role. If her efforts to that end bear fruit, the most important of this series of worldwide consultations will be held in the United States.

What she envisages, ultimately, is a permanent worldwide organization not unlike the Asian People's Anti-Communist League in its own area. Slowly, painfully, that sort of global counterforce to communism may be taking shape. The fact that thus far it has received not the slightest encouragement or aid from the great democratic governments gives point to something I heard her say at the Hotel Commodore seminar:

"The most important thing to stop the spread of communism is not help for underdeveloped countries in the East but help for underdeveloped minds in the West."

Suzanne Andrée Devoyon was born in a slum district of Paris, one of four children in a desperately poor family. Both parents were factory workers, but the father ceased to contribute early and the whole burden fell on the mother. Though she labored literally day and night, they often knew the bitter taste of hunger.

She was a blond doll, this Suzanne—only 2 feet high at the age of 6—but remarkably pretty and bright. Mother Devoyon was determined that her daughter get an education. Luckily, the girl easily won scholarships, though they came to little enough, and in due time she entered the Sorbonne.

She had been brought up in the revolutionary traditions of the French working class. Devoyon forebears took part in the Paris Commune of 1871, and her mother was active in the semianarchist French Union movement at the turn of the century. At an age when other girls were stuffing on romantic novels, Suzanne was chewing on Marx and Engels.

It was then the popular front period. On the campus, politics all but drowned out learning. Suzanne Devoyon threw herself into the student fight against pro-Fascist groups. From the first, however, she was repelled by the unfair and immoral tactics of the campus Communists and refused to join their organizations. In time, she found herself fighting both extremes.

One evening, Suzanne was cornered in a dark Sorbonne corridor by an excited "fascist" brigade bent on beating up its opponents. In the nick of time an "antifascist" squadron came to her rescue. The young man who headed the rescue party claimed the spoils of victory—he steered the tiny blonde to a cafe on Boulevard Saint-Michel and never let her go again. Edouard Labin was his name—tall, fair-haired and handsome, the son of a relatively well-to-do intellectual family, he was completing his studies in physics.

Edouard, at the time they met, had been a young Communist and had resigned in disgust. Their common dislike of the booming ideology helped the courtship, which led within a few months to a student marriage. They compared and solemnly discussed their political views down the line, and ended by renouncing Marxism. They joined a moderate non-Marxist faction of the Socialist Party (roughly equivalent to liberalism in Anglo-Saxon countries), to which they still adhere.

The young husband took his degree in science and went on to a successful career in electronics; in recent years he has specialized in automation. Suzanne, by the time she obtained her master's degree in chemistry and physiology at Sorbonne, decided that her real interests were in the social sciences. With Edouard's consent, she enrolled in the famous Ecole des Hautes Etudes Sociales et Internationales.

One of the professors, the famous historian Charles Seignobos, proposed that for her master's thesis she undertake a study in depth of living standards in leading countries, among these the Soviet Union. This, she has said, proved to be a turning point in her political and scholarly career. She had rejected communism for moral reasons, but went along with the widespread belief that the Soviet system, for all its faults, was bringing benefits to the Russian workers. Now, delving into the facts, she was soon disillusioned on this score.

After graduating with honors, she continued research on Soviet Russia. Her first two articles based on this work were promptly accepted and published by leading Paris magazines and led to a request for a book by a top publisher. Her course was set—she would be a political writer, with a searching, uninhibited book on Russia as the immediate goal.

But the war intervened. Edouard went into the army. Suzanne fled to Vichy as the Germans advanced. There her husband, having been demobilized, joined her before long. Together they worked in a resistance group which attained fame under the name "Reseau du Musée de l'Homme"—their underground services are mentioned in the two books about this period by André Weill Curiel. Edouard's skills in the electronics field were especially useful in procuring and setting up secret radio transmitters.

Because of treason within the group, however, the Labins soon had to flee for their lives. Pierre Laval himself signed the order for their interception and arrest. But they succeeded, after a series of close escapes, in reaching Spain and from there went on to Argentina. In all these flights, the Labins sacrificed their wardrobes and other belongings in order to rescue two trunkloads of Suzanne's research materials and manuscripts—the makings of her planned book.

They joined the Buenos Aires section of General de Gaulle's movement. Edouard established an electronics laboratory, one of the first in South America, and later also taught physics at the University of Buenos Aires. Suzanne wrote articles on literature and philosophy for La Nacion and other leading Latin American publications, and worked on her book. It was completed about the time the war ended—a profound, carefully documented, brutally realistic assessment of communism in practice.

The publishing house that had asked for the book was gone with the winds of war. Suzanne Labin sent the bulky manuscript to one prominent publisher after another, only to get it back. Nearly 30 publishers in France, England and the United States turned it down on the ground that her portrayal of Stalin and his system was too extreme, too emotional, in short "too anti-Soviet." She was discovering how deeply the illusions about communism had taken root in the West during the war years.

Meanwhile, the Labins had returned to Paris. There, in 1948, the book finally was published, under the title "Stalin the Terrible: A Panorama of Soviet Russia." In quick succession, translations appeared in Spanish, English, Italian, Portuguese, and Chinese; the London edition carried an enthusiastic preface by Arthur Koestler.

The book was widely hailed as a definitive work of scholarship and acute insight and, as was to be expected, drew fierce attacks from pro-Soviet quarters. In a foreword to the volume, the author defended the moral passion she had brought to the writing. In dealing with the monstrous truths about communism, she argued, she was under no moral obligation to conceal her sense of horror. "I claim," she wrote, "that I have studied communism with total objectivity and that this very objectivity leads me to a total condemnation. I am objective but not neutral."

The evolution of this woman's thought and attitudes thereafter, seems to me fascinating. Space limitations, however, allow only a summary statement. Suffice that her study of communism turned her to search for antidotes to its poisons, and gradually the scholar evolved into an anti-Communist activist, the analyst into a fervid crusader.

Her articles and lectures increasingly explored the nature of freedom, as well as its weaknesses, failures, and inhibitions in meeting the totalitarian challenge. She developed these ideas in a book first published in Paris in 1954 and 2 years later, under the title "The Secret of Democracy," in New York. Then, in 1957, came her book, "Freedom for the Murderers of Freedom." The question it raised was whether democracy is really compelled, by its principles, to commit suicide by guaranteeing freedom to those plotting to obliterate freedom. The answer was an incisive "No."

Madam Labin cut through the haze of sophisms and semantics to prove that democracies have not only the moral duty but the juridical right to suppress Communist and other totalitarian organizations. The conclusion was not new, but coming from a prominent liberal, it attracted immense attention and touched off passionate debate. The book won the French Liberty Award.

Embodied in this work was the author's civic code, a clear formulation in practical, legal terms of society's obligation to outlaw those committed to its enslavement. Since it threatened their most important advantage—their right to organize freely—the Communists were thoroughly alarmed by the civic code. The mouthpiece of their party, l'Humanité, attacked in fury and so did the Soviet press.

While she was attending a meeting of the Pen Club in Tokyo, Suzanne Labin received invitations from their governments to visit and lecture in South Vietnam and Taiwan (Formosa). This led to the first of four extensive tours of the Far East in as many years. She met all the anti-Communist leaders and, with a scholar's zeal, learned about the peoples and the problems in the area. By this time she is the Westerner best known and most admired by Asians seriously fighting the Communist plague.

Among the literary products of her deepening concern with Asia is the book which was published in America in 1959 as "The Anthill." It is a closeup and devastating account of life in Red China, based on systematic interviews with dozens of Chinese refugees in Hong Kong and Macao, carefully selected to provide a true cross section of the country's people.

When the Fourth French Republic fell and General de Gaulle came to power, June 1, 1958, a commission was set up to edit a new Constitution. Suzanne Labin saw in this an opportunity to put her civic code into law. She launched a remarkable campaign for that purpose and fought fiercely, often working 'round the clock, through friends on the commission and through the press. L'Humanité thundered against what it called the Mollet-Labin Civic Code and others railed against "the De Gaulle-Labin constitution." Telephone calls warned Suzanne Labin that she would be assassinated if she didn't desist. She didn't—and the campaign was successful.

Article IV of the new constitution guarantees the free functioning of all political parties—provided the goals and methods are democratic and they are not subservient to a foreign power. This was the substance of the Labin civic code. Unfortunately, De Gaulle, for reasons of his own, has as yet failed to apply this provision, but the continued existence of the French Communist Party is today clearly in violation of the constitution.

In her writings and speeches all over the world, during the last 5 or 6 years, Suzanne Labin's emphasis has been increasingly on the urgent need to engage in political-psychological warfare. While concentrating on military defenses, she points out, the free nations remain in effect unilaterally disarmed in the decisive nonmilitary areas. Endlessly she warns that our world is doomed to defeat by default, unless it finally develops political strategy and tactics on a scale for victory in the cold war.

This was the crucial warning she was eager to project in London in June 1959 when leading people from 15 member nations met to mark the 10th anniversary of NATO. The conference was opened with great pomp by Queen Elizabeth. As a member of the French delegation, Mme. Labin had herself designated to report on Soviet propaganda, though the subject was not on the original agenda.

She had come prepared for the assignment and worked feverishly on the completion of an ambitious, documented, and closely reasoned paper: "The Techniques of Soviet Propaganda." It not only disclosed the startling dimensions and vast diversity of the Red political offensive, but sketched a free world counteroffensive. Appeasement-minded elements which dominated the proceedings, having gotten wind of the nature of her contribution, tried by pressure and intrigue to silence her.

But she succeeded in reading her report into the record and it was generally acknowledged as the high point of the London meeting. More than that: with the help of an influential American participant, Gen. David Sarnoff, she proposed and forced the adoption of a resolution asking NATO to create special machinery for dealing with propaganda, subversion and other nonmilitary types of Communist aggression.

The resolution languishes in NATO files, ignored. But the effect of the Labin paper on world opinion has been considerable. Issued in pamphlet form by the U.S. Senate Committee on Internal Security, it has sold over 150,000 copies. This makes it, by a wide margin, the committee's alltime bestseller. Tens of thousands more copies were distributed by the "Committee of One Million," the American group opposing recognition of Red China. In expanded form, Mme. Labin also published it as a book, titled "Il Est Moins Cinq."

Her activities have been so multifarious that they cannot be recounted here in full. Let me just cite one episode typical of her dynamic response to events:

When the Hungarian people suddenly rose in revolt, she wrote at once a vibrant and now famous appeal for support of the Freedom Fighters. In days and sleepless nights on the telephone, she and her husband obtained hundreds of prominent signatures for the appeal. The literary paper Figaro was moved to provide her with secretaries and telephones, others volunteered help, and soon the list of signers grew to 3,500, among them virtually all the outstanding writers, artists and opinion leaders of France.

Whatever the challenge—Hungary, Cuba, Katanga, Red China, Vietnam—this diminutive blond has been in the forefront of enterprises to stem the tide of communism. Edouard Labin has worked with her, always in the background; though his income is moderate, he has footed the bills for most of her activities and travels.

In America, too, Suzanne Labin has become a familiar name to militant anti-Communists. During her first visit here, in 1959, she was asked for her impressions of the American people. Her answer: "They are what everybody abroad believes they are not: a highly cultivated people; and they are not what everybody abroad believes they are: an anti-Communist Nation." In her most recent visit she gladly revised the last part of that aphorism. The American people, she felt, were finally coming awake to the crowding menace of communism. If the awareness can be turned into world leadership on policy, she believes, communism can still be defeated.

What is needed, as Suzanne Labin sees it, is "a sacred union of all free men against communism," whatever their differences on other issues. The political struggle against the Moscow-Peiping axis and its worldwide apparatus of conflict must be given unquestioned priority. "Let us hear among us," she pleads, "the old cry of the besieged: Unite or perish."

RACIAL DISCRIMINATION

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, on Friday, March 1, 1963, the archdiocesan newspaper, the Catholic Review, printed a pastoral letter by His Excellency Lawrence J. Shehan, archbishop of Baltimore, on the question of racial discrimination.

This was a notable letter in that it eloquently presented the civil rights issue in its true moral and religious context.

Archbishop Shehan, who was formerly the bishop of the diocese of Bridgeport, Conn., outlined the concrete steps taken by the archdiocese of Baltimore to eliminate all vestiges of racial discrimination in the schools, hospitals and other facilities under its jurisdiction. But he pointed out that while agencies of the Government and of the church have accomplished a great deal in the field of civil rights, and should accomplish more, essentially, this is a problem for everyone; a problem that can be solved only by the application of justice and charity.

I believe that this statement by Archbishop Shehan should be widely read and I, therefore, ask unanimous consent that it be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Archbishop Shehan on Racial Justice

Dearly beloved in Christ, in the month of November 1958, the bishops of this country at their annual meeting issued a statement entitled "Discrimination and the Christian Conscience." After noting the rather remarkable progress made by our Negro fellow citizens, particularly during and after the Second World War, toward such goals as political equality, fair educational and economic opportunities, good housing without exploitation, and a full chance for social advancement, the bishops went on to say that in more recent years "the issues have become confused, and the march toward justice and equality has been slowed, if not halted, in some areas. The transcendent moral issues have become obscured and possibly forgotten."

"The heart of the race question," they declared, "is moral and religious. It concerns the rights of man and our attitude toward our fellow man. If our attitude is governed by the great Christian law of love of neighbor and respect for his rights, then we can work out harmoniously the techniques for making legal, educational, economic, and social adjustments. But if our hearts are poisoned by hatred, or even by indifference toward the welfare and rights of our fellow man, then our Nation faces a grave internal crisis."

Among the signers of that document was my beloved predecessor, Archbishop Keough, who was then serving as chairman of the administrative board of the National Catholic Welfare Conference. That the statement served as an expression of his personal conviction on the subject of racial discrimination, no one who knew him could doubt. Coming from a part of the country where such discrimination had never been a major issue, he at first found it difficult to realize the urgency of the problem here, in a State which lies midway between North and South, whose northern boundary has long symbolized the social barrier between two so diverse sections of this country. His gentle and charitable mind found it particularly hard to believe that some of his people would not be convinced and guided by the statement of principle issued by the bishops of this country as their official teaching on the subject of race relations.

Moreover, the illness which weighed so heavily upon the archbishop during the latter years of his tenure prevented him from coming to closer grips with the baffling racial problem and from issuing public directives on this subject to his priests and people. Events, however, which have occurred during the past 18 months have brought to me the conviction that I ought at this time to speak out in reverence for his memory and in fulfillment of my own duty of conscience.

A pastoral letter on this subject, moreover, seems particularly appropriate in this year when we are observing the centenary of the Proclamation of Emancipation issued by President Lincoln on Janutry 1, 1863. With that document, this country formally undertook to correct and undo the moral and social evil of slavery which had afflicted it from the beginning. The breaking of the shackles of bondage, however, was only the beginning of the process to which this country stood committed. The document by which our forefathers declared their political independence clearly stated the principle by which they justified their rebellion and guided their action in forming a new government: that all men are created equal and are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights, among which are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

The struggle to give adequate expression to this principle has been long and arduous. There has been, however, real progress during the past century and—as noted by the American bishops—particularly during the last generation. Yet it is no exaggeration to say that in hardly any State of the Union has complete social, political, economic, and educational equality been established. In some States, the barest beginnings have only recently been made, under intense Federal pressure. Here in our own State, recent experience has shown that much—very much—remains to be done; that grave wrongs still need to be righted.

Nothing should be more evident to the fairminded citizen than the fact that the equality proclaimed by our Declaration of Independence, and the freedom described by it as "unalienable" requires, as a very minimum of justice, the right to equal accommodations, both on public property and within those enterprises licensed and protected by the State for the service of the general public. Yet our proposed State law of equal accommodations has thus far been emasculated by our State legislators. In our own See city, although there is a glaring public evidence of the failure to recognize the right of equal accommodation as properly belonging to the Negro, we are—for the present at least—without such an ordinance.

In this, the oldest and most venerable See in the United States, it should be particularly disconcerting to all of us to know that the recently invalidated equal accommodations ordinance failed to receive the support of some Catholic legislators who represent districts heavily Catholic in population. Does this mean that many of our own people have failed to recognize the serious duty of justice which flows from the basic equality of men of all races and all social conditions?

Such a failure is all the more regrettable since our Christian faith imposes upon us all a special duty of both justice and charity toward all men, no matter what may be their racial and social origin. By the very terms of Christian teaching, we believe that all men are God's special creatures, made to His image and likeness. We believe that the Son of God, Jesus Christ, the God-man, came into the world to save all men; that on the Cross of Calvary He shed His Blood to redeem all of us from our iniquity—all, without any exception. In our eyes as Christians, then, there is a fundamental bond that links us all together in the sight of God and in the order established by Him. We have an essential duty in justice to recognize and to respect equally the rights of all men.

As Catholics, we have an even higher and more sacred duty to all those who are "of the household of the faith." In his Epistle to the Galatians (3: 28), St. Paul tells us: "You are all children of God through faith in Christ Jesus. For all you, who have been baptized into Christ, have put on Christ. There is neither Jew nor Greek; there is neither slave nor freedman"—and today St. Paul would certainly have added: There is neither black nor white; neither brown nor yellow—"for you are all one in Christ. Therefore, you are no longer strangers and foreigners, but you are citizens with the saints and members of God's household. You are built upon the foundation of the Apostles and Prophets with Christ Jesus as the chief cornerstone. In Him, the whole structure is closely fitted together and grows into a temple holy unto God; in Him, too, you are being built together into a dwelling place for God in the Spirit" (Ephesians 2:19–22).

Nay more, according to the testimony of the same Apostle, by faith and by baptism we have been incorporated into the mystical body of Christ. For although Christ has given us different functions within His church, He has done this "for the building up of the Body of Christ," which is His church, of which Christ Himself is the Head; "for from Him the whole body derives its increase to the building up of itself in love" (Ephesians 4: 12).

Within this household of the faith, this temple holy to the Lord, this dwelling place of God in the Spirit, this mystical body of Christ, there can be no room for racial discrimination and the bitterness and rancor that inevitably grow out of it. In this year, when the minds and hearts of men are turning longingly and hopefully toward the goal of Christian unity, it is particularly important that justice and charity, without any discrimination or prejudice or antipathy, should shine brightly within the church of Christ. There is, we know—and there can be—only one center of Christian unity: Christ and His mystical body. But how can that body be recognized for what it is unless there is within it unity without division or dissension, and unless within and between its members there shine the justice and charity of Christ?

Within the time and space available to me in this letter, it is impossible to set forth in detail the extent and the nobility of the duty of justice and charity incumbent upon us as members of Christ's mystical body. Under the circumstances of today, however, it may be useful if I attempt to state briefly the minimum that is required of us as members of Christ's church in this archdiocese.

There is, I hope, no need to say that in our churches and in our parochial life generally there must be not only no racial segregation, but also no distinction of rank or place or treatment based upon racial difference: "* * * because we are members one of another. * * * Do not grieve the Holy Spirit of God in whom you were sealed for the day of redemption" (Ephesians 4: 25, 30). "For now the justice of God has been made manifest * * * through faith in Jesus Christ upon all who believe. For there is no distinction: as all have sinned and need the glory of God" (Romans 3: 21–23.

In our schools, both elementary, and secondary, the same general policy holds. As Catholic schools, they are meant primarily, although not exclusively, for Catholic students—for all Catholic students insofar as facilities can be made available—without racial or any other discrimination. This means that in the registration of students a common policy, approved by our Catholic School Board, must be followed in the case of all Catholic children living within the boundaries of every parish fortunate enough to have its own school. The same policy must govern all transfers from one school to another. Within the school, identical academic standards must apply to all students, and all must be treated with equal justice and charity.

In our diocesan organizations and institutions of charity, a sincere effort has been made over a period of years to eliminate discrimination and to effect true integration. Longstanding social and cultural patterns have at times made this process difficult. With the opening of the new St. Vincent's Home, we believe that the last traces of discrimination in this field will have disappeared.

It is some months now since all our Catholic hospitals gave formal approval and acceptance to the policies of nondiscrimination I specifically proposed. This means that they have agreed to admit and treat applicants for medical and surgical service without distinction in their outpatient departments; to follow the same procedure in admitting patients into the hospital, and in assigning beds to them; that there shall be no discrimination practiced in handling applications for membership on medical, surgical, and nursing staffs; that advancement within each staff will be governed only by ability, training, experience, and character; that a policy of integration and nondiscrimination is to be effective for all employees of the hospital.

In older and outmoded hospital plants, it has sometimes been difficult to eliminate some customs based on age-old prejudices and social patterns, but now that the last of our hospitals, is acquiring a modern building, we are confident that the final traces of segregation and discrimination will disappear.

Some of these policies have been in effect in each of these fields for a long time. We do not claim that any of them go beyond mere justice. I have spelled them out in some detail because of questions which have been raised from time to time.

The duty of justice and charity applies not only to our churches, our schools, our charitable organizations and institutions, and our hospitals, but also to all of us as individuals. It must guide us in our personal relationships—within our block, our neighborhood, our community; in our social and fraternal organizations; in the business we may conduct; in the labor unions to which we may belong; at work and at play; in all the circumstances of everyday life.

Particularly lamentable is the unreasonable and automatic panic, too often fanned by unscrupulous and disreputable real estate brokers and speculators, which accompanies the arrival of a Negro family in an area previously occupied by white families only. The flight that occurs not only unfairly prejudges the new neighbors, but it also works an economic hardship on departing property owners, destroys the community, undermines church life, and hits hard at substantial investments made in schools, rectories, convents, and recreational facilities, as well as in the actual places of worship.

Nor can we afford to overlook the crippling effect that division and dissension within our community have on our efforts to meet what is perhaps the most alarming problem of this and every other large city of the country—crime. This is not the place to go into the sources or causes of crime within our midst. Suffice it to say that no part or group of our people has a monopoly on those sources or causes. What should concern us is that the problem is so great as to call for the best minds and the combined, intense, and persistent efforts of the ablest leaders of all elements within the community. In saying this, we reflect in no way on the police force of either city or State. On the contrary, we have complete confidence in the integrity and ability of both the heads and the ranks of our police departments. But this problem is one that requires the continuing scrutiny and efforts of the community as a whole. It will not be met adequately if there is dissension, division, suspicion between the two chief racial groups of our citizens.

Even to enumerate our present duties and policies brings vividly to our minds our past defects. Those defects we frankly admit. With humility and regret, we Catholics must acknowledge that we have been all too slow in the correction of our shortcomings, although in the light of the experience of many of our forefathers, we should have been particularly sensitive to the unjust inequalities suffered by other groups. For this reason, we have a special obligation to place ourselves in the forefront of movements to remove the injustices and discriminations which still remain.

We are all aware of the present grave social problems which have had their origin in racial prejudices and tensions, and which are fed by longstanding racial antipathies. These problems cannot be suddenly solved or wiped out by wishful thinking or good intentions. They are community problems. They, therefore, cannot be successfully met by any one part of the community nor any one group, however, highminded and earnest. They call for the combined thought and planning and cooperation of all of us. They require patience and understanding and good will, and persistent effort on the part of everyone. They call for a sense of justice, above all, in that part of the community in which the evil had its origin, and a spirit of charity on both sides.

In their 1958 statement, the bishops of this country, while calling for concrete plans for the elimination of discrimination and the establishment of equal justice and opportunities, urged that such plans be based upon prudence—the virtue which inclines us to view problems in their proper perspective. The problems we inherit today, they noted, are rooted in decades, even centuries, of custom and cultural patterns. When we are confronted with complex and far-reaching evils, it is not a sign of weakness or timidity to weigh carefully the proposed remedies and reforms. Some changes are more necessary than others. Some may be easy to achieve; others may seem impossible at a given time. It is the mark of wisdom, rather than of weakness, to study problems fully and to form plans carefully. Prudence will indeed guard against the rashness which may endanger solid accomplishment, but prudence must never serve as an excuse for inaction or unnecessary gradualism, or as a reason for not holding a straight, steady course toward our goal of full justice.

In this letter, my dearly beloved people, I have spoken chiefly of our duties of justice, because they are so basic to our relations with our fellow men. During this season of Lent, it is well for us to ponder these duties and to reflect on our conduct to see whether our attitude and our acts measure up to what God requires of us. Lent, furthermore, is a season of repentance when, having seen clearly our shortcoming, we seek to bring about the needed reforms. But Lent is also a season when the church places constantly before us the mystery of our redemption, the mystery of that infinite love of God for us which seeks from us in return not only love for Himself, but also love for our fellow men. In that magnificent passage from the First Epistle to the Corinthians which formed the lesson of last Sunday's mass, St. Paul has shown us what our Christian love for each other must be: "Charity is patient, is kind, does not envy, is not pretentious * * * rejoices with the truth, bears all things, hopes all things, endures all things. * * * If I have not charity, I am nothing. I have become as sounding brass or a tinkling cymbal." These words of the Apostle serve as a commentary to our Lord's saying: "By this shall all men know that you are My disciples, that you have love one for another" (John 13: 35).

In this era of the Second Vatican Council, Pope John has given us an example not only of the charity but also of the wisdom and courage which we here in the Archdiocese of Baltimore need for the solution of the problems of race prejudice and discrimination which we find within our civil community and also within our Catholic community, our own particular "household of the faith."

It has been due to the wisdom of our present Holy Father and his two great predecessors that the council presents to the world a true image of the unity and universality of the church as Christ must have meant it. In the hall of the council, men of all races and nations take their places in perfect equality—in the College of Cardinals in the ranks of archbishops and bishops, and of priest superiors of religious orders. All speak with equal freedom; all vote with equal force. To help us allay some of the prejudices which beset this country, it may be well to recall that some of the most effective voices within the council have been those of African archbishops and bishops who by birth stand much closer to the hills and plains and wilds of Africa than the Negroes in our midst.

The charity of Pope John has not only transfused the council, giving to it its unique pastoral spirit; it has also overcome many of the prejudices and antipathies of countless non-Catholic brethren, giving to them a new vision of the church. It has awakened in all of us new longings and new hopes for Christian unity. Such charity within ourselves could enable us to purge from ourselves whatever racial prejudices and antagonisms we may still retain, and could help us to give to our non-Catholic Negro brethren such a vision of Christ's church as might open for them the door to spiritual truth.

Finally, the courage with which Pope John in the face of so many difficulties and adverse predictions, called into being this council, which may well prove to be one of the great turning points of the church's history, should lead us to face our own problems full of Christian faith and confidence and fortitude. In that ecumenical spirit of Christian renewal which, in the words of Pope John, is meant to restore to the church the simple, pure lines of her pristine beauty, let us—priests and people of this archdiocese—face boldly and confidently the task that is before us, certain that with God's help we shall achieve in the church of this archdiocese a holy unity, free from all stain of prejudice and from every defect of division or discrimination.

Sincerely yours in Christ,
LAWRENCE J. SHEHAN,
Archbishop of Baltimore.

THREATENED NATIONALIZATION OF OIL INDUSTRY IN INDONESIA

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, a recent news article in the Wall Street Journal reports that Indonesia has raised the threat of immediate nationalization of the oil industry in this country. The activity on the part of President Sukarno not only in his own domestic affairs but internationally as well should be carefully scrutinized by the administration in order to protect ourselves against another Cuba.

I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INDONESIA WARNS FOREIGN-OWNED OIL FIRMS TO AGREE TO CONCESSIONS OR FACE SEIZURE

JAKARTA.—Indonesia has raised the threat of immediate nationalization in its deadlocked negotiations with the three foreign-owned oil companies over terms of a new concession agreement.

Chaerul Saleh, the island nation's Minister of Mining and Basic Industries, declared the Government doesn't intend to wait any longer to reach an accord. The sides already have spent more than 2 years debating royalties, a long-term plan for eventual Government ownership and, a new issue, restrictions on rupiahs (Indonesian money) earned on domestic sales.

The Government, Mr. Saleh stated, may take "necessary measures in accordance with the situation" unless a settlement is reached soon.

STAKES WOULD BE HIGH

To some officials here, the statement was a thinly veiled warning that Indonesia was considering a quick seizure of the oilfield facilities and refineries of the three foreign concerns: Caltex Pacific, jointly owned by Standard Oil Co. of California and Texaco, Inc.; Standard Vacuum Petroleum, owned by Standard Oil Co. (New Jersey) and Socony Mobil Oil Co. and Shell Indonesia, a unit of the Royal Dutch-Shell Group.

"It's a real threat," say one U.S. Embassy official. But he tempers his appraisal. "We can't really believe they really would take such a foolish action. After all, they need the revenue from oil sales and they're very conscious of what happened in Ceylon," he notes. The United States recently cut off all aid to Ceylon when it refused to make payment for nationalized oil properties to their U.S. owners.

The stakes in a conflict would be high. The United States in the fiscal year ending in June is extending about $71 million in economic assistance to Indonesia. And the three foreign oil companies earn Indonesia $300 million a year, returning the county about 40 percent of its foreign exchange credits.

At issue in the negotiations are oil concessions on the Indonesian island of Sumatra and in West Borneo originally granted by the Netherlands more than 30 years ago. Indonesia permitted the companies to continue their operations after the southeast Asian nation won its independence in 1949. But President Sukarno's leftward-leaning Government pressed for revisions in the concession terms.

Formal negotiations began early in 1960, but progress has been tediously slow. The Government tried to intensify pressure for an agreement by imposing a series of deadlines, but these with no apparent consequence. The latest deadline expired December 31.

Minister Salah now, however, has imposed a new deadline—buttressed with the threat of immediate nationalization—that could be crucial. He has indicated he will submit new draft contracts within a week. The companies then have 2 weeks to submit their final positions.

Some of the Government's previous demands were met earlier by the oil companies. The concerns separately agreed to give the Government a 60-percent share of their profit, instead of the 50-percent slice extended to the Dutch. In addition, the companies agreed to a long-term timetable for eventually turning over to the Government without compensation all their refineries, production facilities, and domestic marketing operations in Indonesia.

TERMS CALLED IMPOSSIBLE

But then, according to one U.S. oil executive, the Government suddenly submitted new proposals on February 2 that are "negative in attitude and bombastic in language." The terms, says another U.S. official, are "impossible to accept."

The Government's latest proposals insist the foreign companies bring in dollars and other foreign exchange to cover production costs in Indonesia, rather than utilize rupiahs earned from local sales of petroleum products. These rupiahs would be blocked in Indonesian bank accounts, subject to Government approval for repatriation.

The oil companies also are asked to waive any claims for compensation should their oil facilities be seized by the Government "in the interest of national security." The companies argue they have invested close to $1 billion in their oil properties in the past 20 years.

The foreign-owned concerns, nonetheless, are willing to turn over their facilities to the Government at some future date. By late last year, they say, they had agreed to relinquish their refineries within 20 years and their Indonesian marketing facilities within 5 years.

But even this agreement was rendered obsolete, they insist, by a later Indonesian demand. The Government wants ownership of the refineries within 10 years and of the domestic marketing facilities in 1 to 5 years.

Indonesia already is engaged in the oil business on a limited basis. Three state-owned companies currently produce about 50,000 barrels of crude oil a day. The three private concerns, by contrast, produce more than 400,000 barrels a day. Caltex Pacific's output is about 220,000 barrels. Standard Vacuum produces about 10,000 barrels and Shell Indonesia about 115,000 barrels a day.

AMERICAN AID TO INDONESIA

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, in the Sunday issue of the Washington Post, Chalmers Roberts reports on a 10-day visit to Indonesia. This country of a hundred million people has received since 1949 a total of $665 million worth of American aid. It is also interesting to note that it has received approximately $665 million in economic aid from Communist bloc countries excluding a massive Soviet military aid. Because of its strategic geographical position in the South Pacific and because of the great interest the Soviet is showing in its present military buildup, it is my belief that all pertinent information on this area should be carefully scrutinized.

I ask unanimous consent that this article by Mr. Roberts be included at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RICH INDONESIA IN DEEP TROUBLE ECONOMICALLY

(By Chalmers M. Roberts)

DJAKARTA.—Indonesia is in economic trouble so deep that something probably is going to happen, and happen sooner rather than later.

This reporter has spent 10 days in Indonesia, chiefly in Java, where 65 million of the nation's estimated 100 million people live. Few lands are more lush or richer in natural resources. But Indonesia is more frustrating than most nations when it comes to trying to estimate where it is headed.

In talks with Indonesians, high and low, and with foreign observers of several nationalities, it is evident that economic conditions have greatly deteriorated in the past 6 months. Rice, the basic staple, is in short supply and prices have been rising erratically.

Copra, the coconut product, lies rotting or is burned because of price problems and disorganized transportation. Communists are alleged to be behind the burning of some sugarcane in the fields. People lack sugar and oils, and margarine has about disappeared. Indonesia is the world's No. 1 importer of rice, yet it is the world's fourth largest producer.

AN ELASTIC CURRENCY

The exchange rate of the Indonesian currency, the rupiah, reflects these economic troubles. The "official" rate is 45 to $1, the figure at which the United States must spend the rupiahs it receives in exchange for the food it sends here under Public Law 480. At the Hotel Indonesia, here in Djakarta, the nation's one first-rate hostelry, there is a 500 to $1 rate for food but room bills for foreigners must be paid in dollars or other hard currencies. The black market rupiah rate both here and in Singapore, however, has advanced in the past 6 months from 600 to $1 to about 1,300 to $1.

The result is too much money in circulation, too few goods for the rank and file to buy, inflated prices of rice in the free market (which is used to supplement the absolutely vital rice allowances supplied to Government and many other employees) and a vast amount of smuggling. It has been learned, for example, that half the Indonesian imports into nearby British Singapore are smuggled there from Sumatra or the islands off its coast.

Indonesia is still 80 percent agricultural and rural, only 20 percent industrialized, and few of the industries employ even 1,000 people. Yet industry as a whole is estimated to be running at only around 20 percent of capacity. This means less goods badly needed at home and less for exports to earn dollars to pay for badly needed imports. Smuggling, too, cuts deeply into foreign exchange earnings.

AID HAS BEEN MASSIVE

American aid to Indonesia since independence in 1949 has totaled around $665 million, of which about 45 percent has been in farm surplus items. Aid from all free world nations (of which Japanese reparations, credits and grants together slightly top the American total) has amounted to more than $1.5 billion, compared to an estimated $665 million in economic aid from the Communist bloc. This excludes the massive Soviet military aid.

The U.S.-built cement plant, Indonesia's biggest, is one of the few places now running at 100 percent capacity, and the United States is building a urea fertilizer plant. Each was financed by an Export-Import Bank loan and each will provide about one-third of the national need for its output. The World Bank won't do business here, so poor is Indonesia's credit rating and so shaky its economic structure.

With such a dismal picture so evident, one would expect an explosion of some sort. But Indonesians seem to have a low boiling point; the farmer somehow manages to eat and the city worker frequently resorts to graft and stealing.

A WEST IRIAN SEQUEL

The optimists here, both Indonesian and foreign, argue that these serious economic conditions are about to be faced. They say that the military rebellion against the government has now been liquidated and the issue of West Irian (West New Guinea) will be finally solved May 1 when that territory comes under Indonesian rule by way of the United Nations from the Dutch. Hence now is the time to tackle the economic problems.

Indonesian life, of course, is dominated by President Sukarno, as it has been since independence. He recently said that the time had come to concentrate on the economic problem and the cabinet is reported to have formulated "a basic strategic economic principle for surmounting present economic difficulties."

Critics contend that Indonesia's economic problems are self-made, though they concede that recent floods have added to the woe. Last summer's massive buildup (for a country such as this) for the projected attack on West Irian resulted in commandeering much of the transportation equipment, including the shipping, so vital in a nation of some 3,000 islands stretched across an area the width of the continental United States.

Incidentally, senior military officials have told me that some 30,000 men were within 2 or 3 days of D-day when the Dutch-Indonesian agreement was signed.

Now that some shipping, at least, is coming back to its normal commercial uses, there is an obvious need for a revaluation of the rupiah and a currency stabilization scheme on an international basis. The hopeful think this will happen; the pessimists do not think that Sukarno, whom they rate as an economic illiterate however high they regard his political prowess, will buckle down to the job and enforce the tough decisions, if, indeed, he makes them.

POSSIBLE RED MAJORITY

Such an economic situation, of course, is ready-made for the Communists. The PKI, the Communist Party of Indonesia, and its related labor organization, known as SOBSI, are very powerful. The party now claims 3.5 million members, up from an earlier 2 million claim.

No one knows how strong they really are, but one measure is the fact that a high official remarked to me that if elections were held today, the PKI would win an absolute majority. Some outside observers tend to think he could be right and not merely justifying the lack of elections. At any rate, Indonesia is still under martial law, though it is supposed to be lifted May 1.

Ten political parties are legal, but they operate in something of a vacuum since no election is in sight. Sukarno has talked vaguely of an election in 1963; other officials say perhaps in 1964, but the franker ones concede that date is illusory, too.

As long as Sukarno is alive—he is now 61—he probably will continue to be the boss. Officials here tend to throw up their hands when you ask what will happen if he disappears, but the general view is that the military would take over with a civilian figurehead.

Sukarno has built his guided democracy on what we might call the principle of consensus; that is, of getting all rival forces to agree. Since he can enforce a high degree of cooperation, Sukarno has made the Communists keep within bounds.

Of late, Sukarno has been talking a good deal about something he calls NASAKOM, an alphabet soup word meaning nationalism, religion, and communism. The third element used to be socialism; the change seems to reflect the growing power of the PKI. Sukarno's proclaimed aim is to run Indonesia on this three-legged stool principle.

The Communists' aim is to increase the strength of their leg and in due course to upset the stool in their direction. Currently, they are pressing for posts in Sukarno's inner cabinet, from which so far they have been excluded though they hold posts in the so-called outer cabinet.

The PKI is said to want the Finance and Information ministries, and the reason is obvious enough; to make more economic troubles and to control the already left-tinted public utterances of the Government and the press.

The PKI, incidentally, is officially oriented toward Peking in its ideological dispute with Moscow, but there appears to be no evidence of a split below the Politburo level. The rank and file party members are concentrating on exploiting the economic misery. Nor is there any sign that Peking is attempting to steer the PKI into military opposition to the Sukarno regime, a move which, now at least, probably would be as disastrous for the party as was the Stalin-ordered revolution here in the early post-World War II years.

The press in Indonesia is a disgrace by any democratic standard. News of the outside world is at a minimum and often is quite slanted. Newsprint is imported and publishers are under the government's heel. In this capital of Djakarta, with a population estimated at 3 million, the 15 papers have a combined circulation of 360,000, of which the five Communist or far left papers have about half the total.

The radio is state-owned. Television, which Indonesia can ill afford but which is a status symbol, has begun in Djakarta, where there are an estimated 10,000 imported TV sets.

This is not a land for dissent by any democratic standard. Dissent runs afoul of the Sukarno philosophy of government, which is based on the ancient village system of concensus and which therefore has wide public appeal.

Marxist terminology abounds. When Sukarno received an honorary degree February 2 at the University of Indonesia here, he was praised for having denounced "individualism, liberalism, capitalism, imperialism, feudalism, fascism as sources of exploitation of man by man." Communism was missing from the list. Any enemy of Indonesia will quickly be branded as an imperialist or neocolonialist or capitalist.

Some of this is explicable for reasons other than the power of the nations' Communist Party. As able American Ambassador Howard P. Jones, a man with 7 years' experience here, recently put it in a speech: "To the majority of Indonesians—in fact to most of the newly emerging peoples of the African and Asian world—the word 'capitalism' brings forth an immediate and vivid picture of foreign control of their economy and, not infrequently, of foreign exploitation and oppression."

The Dutch, who exploited the wealth of the Indies during 300 years of rule, are still unpopular although some Indonesians want enough of them to come back to help revitalize the largely Dutch-built farm and factory equipment. The Japanese, who occupied the country from 1942 to 1945, are looked upon as liberators from the Dutch.

Those who worry publicly about communism in Indonesia are accused of having a Communist phobia. The more democratic leaders will tell you, as foreign observers also do, that the PKI's power is balanced by the military, which is rated as highly anti-Communist.

Large numbers of army, navy and air force officers have been to the United States and the resulting friendship, from the sample I have had, is impressive. The same can be said for the several thousand students and technicians who have been sent to the United States.

Indonesians talk a lot about their poorness despite their great wealth of little-tapped resources, which include the biggest oil source in Asia, much rubber, copra, tin, and other items. In moments of frankness, they will say they have their hands out to both East and West—and that they expect to have their wants met.

The people, of course, are the greatest resource. They are not as aggressive as the Japanese nor as hard-working as the many Chinese among them, on whom they look with suspicion and often with envy despite the official Indonesian friendship with Red China. Yet Indonesians are industrious; they must be to survive, especially in Java, the most crowded major area in the world after Belgium.

They are not naturally very adept mechanically but they are trying, or at least the upper echelon is trying, to propel the nation into the 20th century industrial revolution. Sukarno has in motion, at least, a massive education program with three shifts in the schools. But the lacks are everywhere—trained teachers, buildings, books, paper. And it costs the university student far more to board than to study.

Indonesia's problem today quite obviously is to get its economic house in order. Perhaps the optimists are right and the necessary moves will now be made. But the pessimists are correct in demanding to see the evidence.

One would be more of an optimist, despite the nation's obvious shortcomings and the massive power of the Communists, if it were not for the lurking suspicion that Sukarno would prefer another foreign policy adventure. The row with Malaya over the British colonial possessions along the northern fringe of Borneo is the subject for another article.

Then, too, the Portuguese hold half of the island of Timor, an anachronism which Indonesians hint they will get around to in due course. To many, Sukarno is a permanent revolutionary who needs such foreign issues to keep his momentum.

In short, this is an attractive yet often baffling nation where many are seeking real progress but where the machinery of government "socialism" is clearly inadequate to the need. Indonesia's future is questionable, yet it is full of vital people who are trying to shed the colonial past with all its inhibitions in order to come to grips with the future.

FOREIGN POLICY SYSTEM OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, as long as our foreign policy is conducted along the lines of an "experimental baker's school," I am sure that our allies and enemies alike will be completely confused as to exactly what our objectives are, both from a long-range standpoint and in the cold war. Political allegiance rather than foreign policy experience seems to be the key to the "confused frontier."

Constantine Brown in an article published in the Evening Star on Thursday, February 28, reports in shocking terms the reaction our allies throughout the free world and in particular Western Europe have to the foreign policy gyrations of the present administration.

I ask unanimous consent that it be included in the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Foreign Policy System of the United States—Europeans Feel That Too Many Cooks Are Involved in Decisions, Writer Says

(By Constantine Brown)

Rome.—The saying that too many cooks spoil the broth applies these days to diplomacy. Over the last 2 years this reporter has seen dozens of high and low American Government officials, legislators and mere friends of the administration roaming over Europe at the taxpayers' expense on various kinds of special diplomatic missions. They insist on seeing the highest in the land and then make special reports to the White House. It is probable that their impressions add to the confusion in Washington.

According to the Constitution, the President of the United States is alone responsible for the country's foreign policy; the Secretary of State is his executive officer. Until the advent of the New Frontier the various Presidents followed the Constitution and tradition. President Franklin Roosevelt was his own Secretary of State during his four terms, although the counsels of his right hand man, Harry Hopkins, did often prevail over those of Cordell Hull, particularly during the war. Mr. Hull was often belatedly informed about momentous decisions.

During John Foster Dulles' 6 years as President Eisenhower's Secretary of State, he was the real policymaker. The attempts of the President's brother, Dr. Milton Eisenhower, to influence foreign policies were successful only in regard to Latin America. There were no other "cooks" in the White House to spoil the international broth, since Harold Stassen's efforts to have a voice in African diplomacy and on disarmament were ignored. President Eisenhower relied completely on Mr. Dulles.

Now when President Kennedy speaks and apparently makes his own decisions they are suspected as being the result of advice from half a dozen theoreticians, mostly inexperienced in practical international affairs, who vie with each other to guide our destinies. This at least is the overall impression of responsible statesmen in Europe who watch American international gyrations with concern because they concern them directly.

The consensus in the principal European capitals is that Secretary of State Dean Rusk, given a real chance, could become "another Dulles." He possesses many of Mr. Dulles' qualities and is regarded as frank, understanding, and trustworthy. But as a high official put it to this reporter: "Mr. Rusk is uncertain of himself because he does not carry the necessary weight in Washington."

There are many other intimate advisers who are closer to the elbow and ears of President Kennedy than Mr. Rusk. In discussions with foreign ministers or heads of state Mr. Rusk makes no commitments—as Mr. Dulles so often did—because of fear that "the others" in the White House may disagree with his sound judgment and thus he may be overruled by Mr. Kennedy on advice of pedagogic counselors.

The bloopers made in recent months by the administration are blamed by European statesmen more on "too many cooks" in the White House than on the President himself and Mr. Rusk.

It is in reference to these cooks that well-informed General de Gaulle reportedly gave Mr. Kennedy the fatherly advice, "My dear young friend; always make your own decision," at the Elysee in 1961.

In Europe foreign policy decisions, good or bad, are made exclusively by those responsible for their acts. The special adviser system is unknown here.

Nobody will deny that General de Gaulle follows a policy line determined by himself. It is based on a thorough study of situations.

Like General de Gaulle, but to a somewhat lesser extent, Prime Minister Macmillan is also his own Secretary of State. Lord Home gives counsel more frequently than his French opposite number. Had the British Prime Minister consulted his Foreign Secretary before he made the mistake of losing his temper publicly when Britain's entry into the Common Market was blocked by General de Gaulle, his political position would not have been jeopardized.

Until the Spiegel affair rocked the Bonn government, Chancellor Adenauer was very much his own Secretary of State. Since then he has been wavering between his personal convictions and political expediency. But even so, the Germans, like the rest of the Europeans, have either none or a very small number of cooks preparing the international broth.

MANAGEMENT OF NEWS BY KENNEDY ADMINISTRATION

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I ask for unanimous consent to include in the body of the Record a news release issued by my office on February 27 concerning the management of news by the Kennedy administration. Along with this insertion, I would like to include an article by Constantine Brown from the Saturday, February 2, issue of the Evening Star which is most informative as to the present status of our prestige abroad.

There being no objection, the news release and article were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

The management of the news has reached the point of ridiculousness. The USIA, after much prodding, has a scheme whereby it will release a handful of carefully selected polls designed to show that U.S. prestige was low at the end of the Eisenhower administration. These are the only polls released on the prestige of the United States. Two other polls of 2 years ago turned on the prestige of the Executive and the unfavorable attitudes of Castro.

This is not what the country has been asking for. If the news were not being carefully managed, these polls would have been accompanied by at least some evidence on the rise and fall of American prestige during the whole period of the past 2 years. Such release should certainly be made without the flimsy excuses that sources would be imperiled or security involved.

This administration is determined not to expose anything about how it was doing abroad and relies on a continual campaign to blame all its troubles on the Eisenhower administration. I do not see how any respected newsmaker could be content with "all we can tell you is how things happened before we got here." The policy of releasing news after 2 years means that about October 22, 1964, there will be a release geared to the total public bipartisan support of actions relating to Cuba around October 22, 1962. This combination of news management for political advantage helps the party in power but conceals from the American public the ups and downs of reactions to our foreign policy.

The Luster of U.S. Statesmanship—Some Fading Is Noted Among Europeans Who Find Our "Meddling" Distasteful

(By Constantine Brown)

Rome.—During the 1960 campaign candidate Kennedy and his aids complained that the American image had suffered much throughout the world through mishandling of international affairs by the Eisenhower administration. He promised, if elected, to restore American prestige. After a short upsurge, the American image is now at a low ebb with rank and file Europeans.

President Kennedy's inauguration speech, filled with electrifying words and promises of great things, plus his own youth and personality, charm and vigor, took Europe by storm. "Let both sides be united to heed in all corners of the earth the command of Isaiah—to 'undo the heavy burdens * * * (and) let the oppressed go free,' " were words of hope everywhere in the world. "Let every other power know that this hemisphere intends to remain the master of its own house," were fair words of warning to Fidel Castro and Nikita Khrushchev.

But the words had hardly faded from memory when came the disastrous Bay of Pigs invasion in Cuba. And while that pot was still boiling the Berlin wall was erected and the oppressed were locked behind it. Only stern protests came from Washington.

But the following year the world took heart when again the ringing, strong words of President Kennedy announced that the United States would take firm action if Mr. Khrushchev did not remove missiles and bombers from Cuba. But Cuba still remains a strong Soviet bastion in the American Hemisphere, a threat to every Latin American country and thus to the United States itself.

Crowding out the De Gaulle veto of Britain's entry into the Common Market and his refusal to join in NATO's nuclear arms force is the administration's fumbling recovery from the De Gaulle pronouncements. President Kennedy promised Polaris submarines in exchange for the removal of the Jupiter bases in Italy and Turkey. These subs eventually were to be manned by multinational crews. On second thought, it was realized that beyond the difficulty of handling crews speaking different languages, each Polaris sub needed five crews for rotation; that Polaris subs remained under water for 2 months at a time; and, that 5 years were needed to train the crews.

It was then proposed that the missiles be placed on surface ships, which several European navy men pointed out are as vulnerable as land-based missiles. At about that time it was reported in the European press that the Joint Congressional Atomic Energy Committee was bringing to the attention of the administration that the McMahon Act prohibited the United States giving atomic warheads to other countries. Perhaps this confusion results from what Secretary of State Rusk complains about: So many of the Presidential aids and friends in key policy planning roles send conflicting orders "from the President himself."

This reporter has recently heard complaints from a number of highly placed Europeans that while they appreciate America's help in getting them on their feet after the war, they do not appreciate the present tendency of Washington to meddle in their affairs. In fact, they now say that America needs their help for financial support to keep the dollar at the present rate of exchange.

There is a strong feeling here that our insistence that NATO nations increase their forces by at least another six or seven divisions is not based on actual military necessity but to procure the necessary weapons from the United States for gold. Germany already has pledged herself to purchase $750 million worth of ordnance in the United States during this and the next year. Italy has contracted for $125 million worth this year and an additional $350 million in the next few years.

While the direct inmixture of the United States into the quarrels of European states has been applauded by the governments in London, Rome, Brussels, and The Hague, the European press reflects the thinking of the people who find our "meddling" distasteful. Here in Italy politicians see that Washington is doing everything possible to help Prime Minister Fanfani remain in office. And our meddling will certainly be an issue in the April Italian elections. Most Italians do not want the Polaris missile submarines to have an Italian base and already cartoons are appearing showing Mr. Fanfani telling the people there "are no Polaris" while hiding them behind a screen.

The popularity of Americans in Europe is as high as ever, but the luster of American statemanship has faded.

KNOWLAND KEYNOTES CALIFORNIA REPUBLICAN MEETING

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, on February 23, former U.S. Senator William F. Knowland, now editor and publisher of the Oakland, Calif., Tribune, delivered the keynote address to the California Republican Assembly Dinner held in the Disneyland Hotel. His address merits the careful reading and consideration of all Republicans—whether domiciled in California or elsewhere in this Republic.

Bill Knowland, as we who served with him all know him, holds the rare distinction of being one of the few Republican Senators to have served both as a majority leader and as a minority leader of the U.S. Senate. He served his country well in both these capacities during the Eisenhower administration before Knowland voluntarily retired from the Senate.

Because of Bill Knowland's profound and intimate knowledge of Washington affairs and the political developments of our era his counsel to the California Republicans is especially important. So that all who are interested may read his remarks, I ask unanimous consent that his address be printed in the body of the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Fellow Californians, since this Republican assembly was organized three decades ago we have gone through many political battles together. We have tasted both the champagne of victory and the vinegar of defeat.

In that time, by my reckoning, we have been on the winning side in 2 of 7 presidential elections, 5 of 8 gubernatorial campaigns, and 8 out of 10 contests for U.S. Senator. During this period of 30 years, the founders have aged from young men in our twenties or early thirties, to the middle fifties or early sixties.

To the young men and women who have since joined our ranks, I can assure you that the passing of these years has not dimmed our dedication to the cause of good government in California and in the Nation.

If history teaches anything, it is that men and women must be prepared to fight for principles even though victory may come not to them but to their successors.

Those who died on Bunker Hill, at Concord, and at Lexington were not present to share the thrill of the British surrender at Yorktown, nor did the victims of Pearl Harbor, Bataan, and Corregidor share the magnitude of the capitulation aboard the *Missouri*. But there were some who survived in each case to see defeat turn to victory.

So it has been in many a political campaign in our Nation. The 1856 defeat of John C. Fremont as the first Republican nominee for President laid the foundation for the election of Abraham Lincoln 4 years later.

Lincoln, himself, tasted defeat at the hands of Stephen A. Douglas for the office of U.S. Senator in 1858 only to, in turn, defeat Douglas for the Presidency in 1860.

We must always try to keep a proper perspective on the events of the moment. The tide of history moves and mere man does not always know what destiny may hold in store 2 or 4 years hence—nor does a political party or a nation.

I am vitally interested in the future of the Republican Party because I am concerned for the future of the United States. Our form of government cannot continue without an effective two-party system.

The Republican Party is the only mechanism available to give effective opposition to the present administration in 1964. We must pull the party together and not join in the prevalent pastime of tearing it apart.

There are millions of dedicated conservatives who belong to no organization other than the Republican or Democratic Parties. They are needed and have no intention of being liquidated from political activity.

Every time a conservative leader arises there is an attempted smear to tar him as a reactionary or a member of the Birch Society, regardless of the facts in the case. This is the "guilt by association" technique the liberals bitterly objected to during the investigations by Senator Joseph McCarthy. Now, some Republicans are emulating the liberal Democrats.

There are millions of dedicated liberals (some of the Jeffersonian tradition) who resent being blanketed in with the ADA or the more extreme left wing elements that operate in this country.

We need the dedicated conservatives and liberals who can find room for agreement in saving this Nation from having a bankrupt Federal Government which dominates our economy and submerges our State governments.

Republicans won a substantial victory in the First Congressional District on January 22. DON CLAUSEN (who was Del Norte chairman of my first senatorial campaign in 1946) won a resounding victory with a margin of 14,000. He won in a district with a democratic registration lead of 14,000. He won in an area that had been represented by the late Democratic Congressman Clem Miller, since 1959.

This was the first congressional district election in the Nation since the general elections of last year and it has attracted widespread national attention. With qualified candidates and dedicated workers this pattern can be repeated in other areas of our State and Nation.

There is no reason for either Republican defeatism or complacency as a result of the November 6, 1962, elections. From a national point of view the election was spotty. Strong Republican trends were apparent in some areas whereas in nearby States the tide was running toward the Democrats.

Certainly we are realistic enough to recognize that the President is entitled to satisfaction in that his congressional majority, from a partisan Democratic point of view, improved in an off year election for the first time since 1934.

It is my judgment, however, that the 88th Congress will not be a rubberstamp for the President any more than the expired 87th Congress.

For this the country can be thankful. Article I of the Constitution gives all of the legislative power to Congress. If Congress is to remain a coordinate branch of the Government it must not become subordinate to any President—Republican or Democrat.

Party organization is important. We cannot wait until 1964 to organize for victory in the presidential election of that year. Now is the time to start. In every State the young men and women must be brought into positions of importance and responsibility. Without constant infusion of new blood, any political organization will wither on the vine.

I have a strong feeling that in 1964 the public will be looking for men with principles and party platforms that mean what they say. The party that can inspire the interest and dedicated support of the millions who stayed at home in 1962 can win the election of 1964.

As far as 1964 is concerned, the Democrats will renominate President Kennedy. The Republican Party has a number of potential candidates whose names immediately come to mind. In the next year others will move into national prominence. They may come from among the presently lesser-known Governors, Senators, Members of the House, or out of the business and professional life of the Nation.

In 1938 and 1939 a reading of the newspapers of those days would indicate that the next Republican presidential nominee of 1940 would be Senator Robert A. Taft, of Ohio, or District Attorney Thomas E. Dewey. It was not until the nomination year of 1940 that Wendell Willkie loomed on the horizon as a formidable contender who took the nomination from the two "professionals."

At the present time the names (in alphabetical order) of those receiving most national attention are: Barry Goldwater, U.S. Senator from Arizona; Mark O. Hatfield, Governor of Oregon, reelected to second term; Nelson A. Rockefeller, Governor of New York, elected to second term; George Romney, Governor of Michigan; William F. Scranton, Governor of Pennsylvania, Member of House of Representatives 87th Congress.

In addition, there may well be a large number of "favorite son" candidates whose States will want to hold their votes intact until the picture clarifies.

The year 1964 may be one of those years that could result in the emergence of a "Dark Horse" as was the case of James A. Garfield, Member of Congress from Ohio, and Senator-elect who was chosen on the 36th ballot as a compromise between Grant, Blaine, and Sherman.

There were a number of very close elections in 1962, in Minnesota, Rhode Island, and South Dakota the final results were not known for several weeks after the election.

Republicans replaced Democrats as Governors in Colorado, Michigan, Ohio, Oklahoma, Pennsylvania, Wyoming, and Rhode Island.

Democrats replaced Republicans in Hawaii, Iowa, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, New Mexico and Vermont. A little more effort could have changed the result in these and a number of other States that were carried by the Democrats.

Organization was important in 1962 and it will remain important in the elections of 1964.

It is time for the Nation to regroup so that the people will have a clear-cut choice and not be led by either leaders or parties down paths that violate their fundamental beliefs and principles.

It is my strong belief that the Republicans should make a major effort to carry the South in 1964 and thereafter. I strongly believe that we could carry Florida, Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina, Tennessee, Alabama, Kentucky, and Texas in the southern area. There are several other possibilities as well.

The South, the Midwest, and the additional States we will win on the Atlantic and Pacific coasts would give the Republicans a majority in the electoral college. While we would intend to carry in 1964 both New York and California, the Southern States mentioned would permit us to win without either the first and second State in population.

Without the South, the Republicans cannot win unless they have New York and California or at least as a minimum, one of these States.

The Kennedy administration has struck out in the domestic ball game and in the international one as well. As a great Democrat, Al Smith, said: "Let's look at the record." In 1960 Candidate Kennedy said: "I believe in the balanced budget and the only conditions on which I would unbalance the budget would be if there were a grave national emergency or a serious recession."

In his state of the Union message, President Kennedy was optimistic about world conditions and also stated that "America has enjoyed 22 months of uninterrupted economic recovery." Yet President Kennedy presents a budget with a $10 billion deficit which may well reach $15 billion by the time of the nominating conventions next year.

When President Eisenhower left office in January of 1961 our historic close relations with our neighbor, Canada, were firm, our entente with France was cordial, and our understanding with Great Britain was friendly and clear.

In the last 60 days we disturbed our understandings with Great Britain by our unilateral termination of the Skybolt program; we have upset the friendly relations with France, our oldest ally since Lafayette and the Revolutionary War; and our lack of diplomacy has deeply shocked our good neighbor, Canada and plunged them into an election where "pulling the eagle's feathers" may turn out to be as popular as "twisting the lion's tail" was at one time in our own country.

The "whiz kids" have certainly established their amateur standing in foreign policy dealings with our friends.

Now let's look at our opponents: Last October we had apparently won a real victory in Cuba, Khrushchev was caught with his missiles showing. We had a united country, unanimity among our Latin American nations, full support of our Western Allies, and the power to gain a decisive settlement of the Cuban question. Let's look at the Cuban situation now compared to last October. Defeat was snatched by the "whiz kids" out of the jaws of victory.

1. We backed down on our demand fór on-the-ground inspection of missile sites and potential missile hiding places.

2. We failed to board and examine the cargoes of Soviet ships with canvas-covered objects purporting to be missiles.

3. We failed to get Soviet agreement for the immediate withdrawal of all Soviet armed forces from Cuba. Four months later the administration throws the Nation a Kremlin sop that "some of these troops will be withdrawn." The American policy should be that every Soviet soldier be promptly removed from Cuba.

I refuse to accept the doctrine that we are helpless (short of armed conflict) to act in a decisive manner to get these Soviet troops out of Cuba. We could, in conjunction with the Organization of American States:

(a) Announce that if they were not all out by April 1, a tight naval and air blockade around Cuba would be instituted.

(b) The entire Organization of American States could notify the Soviet Union that diplomatic relations would be suspended as of that date and all Soviet embassies closed until the last Soviet soldier left Cuba.

I doubt the Soviet Union would want this to happen since Soviet embassies are centers of Soviet espionage and Communist propaganda in Latin America, as they are elsewhere in the world.

4. By the latter fatal oversight the Kennedy administration has for the first time in our history made the Monroe Doctrine a dead letter and has given tacit acquiescence to the establishment of a hostile Soviet base with approximately 20,000 troops just 90 miles from our shores.

For the first time in our history a responsible member of the administration has advocated "managed news" and enunciated the doctrine that it is proper on occasion to lie to the American people.

From now on during the remaining 20 months of this administration the public will be in doubt as to when they are being lied to and when they are being told the truth.

In his inaugural speech, the next Republican President on January 20, 1965, should make it clear that deceit will not be tolerated and the word of an administration official will be as good as his bond.

Only in this way can confidence be restored and a free people be assured they can make their decisions based on facts as they are and not as colored by officials assuming a papa-knows-best attitude.

This administration is striving to enlarge the executive power at the expense of the legislative power. It must be stopped in its tracks.

During the previous Congress the President compared Congress to Lazarus. If Congress dies, even temporarily, the Constitution dies with it. Congress is indeed no Lazarus and the President is no Saviour.

The time has come to take our stand in meaningful support of the Constitution.

1. We cannot permit an all powerful Federal Government that can overpower, submerge, and destroy the functions of our 50 State governments.

2. We cannot permit an all powerful Executive that can overshadow the legislative and judicial branches of our Government.

3. We cannot permit any world government to overpower, submerge, and destroy our constitutional form of government and the Bill of Rights of our people.

4. Excessive Government costs and taxes must be reduced to preserve the system of private enterprise. Among the essential steps is a drastic reduction in foreign aid where American enterprise is being taxed to provide an endless cornucopia to the socialist and neutralist nations of the world.

5. We must insist that the American people be protected from domination by big government, big business, or big labor. No man or no group of men must be allowed to have the power to strangle the economic life of our Nation, our State, or our community.

6. Civil rights must be respected but civil rights are far more extensive than racial rights alone. The right to own property and to dispose of it, to walk in safety on our streets to and from work, to have a job, to engage in a business or profession, are also civil rights entitled to the protection of government—National, State, and local.

Equality for the Negro will come when we stop treating him as a minority voting pressure group, to whom promises are often made and seldom kept—and we treat him as an individual American citizen who has the same rights, interests, and obligations of citizenship that the balance of our people have.

7. Education is and should remain the primary function of local and State government. We must resist the encroachment of the Federal Government in the field of education.

8. The constitutional separation of church and state does not require taking God out of government or out of our personal lives. Prayers were said in our Constitutional Convention and are said in our National and State legislative bodies. Prayers have been said in our inaugural ceremonies and the Bible is used for the Presidential oath.

At home we must not permit big government, big business, or big labor to so overshadow the individual that he loses his identity and becomes a mere statistic on an electric tape.

The individual must not willingly surrender nor have forcibly taken from him the control over his conscience and his power of decision in matters moral, economic, or political.

For this is what the American heritage is and what the American Revolution was about.

The real, deep, moving, powerful (yes, irresistible) strength of our Nation comes from the free and undominated convictions of men and women, old and young, rich and poor, native and foreign born, educated and unschooled, who have a deep faith in America and a belief in Almighty God.

PAYMENT IN LIEU OF TAXES BY HAWAII HOUSING AUTHORITY

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, during the morning hour, I now ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate bill 345, which is Calendar No. 11, and which has been cleared by the minority and majority leaders.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 345) to provide for the approval of a payment in lieu of taxes to be made for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1959, by the Hawaii Housing Authority to the city and county of Honolulu.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on passage of the bill. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

There being no objection, the bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, notwithstanding the provisions of any other law or any contract or rule of law, the Public Housing Commissioner shall approve a payment in lieu of taxes to be made for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1959, in the amount of $24,167.78, by the Hawaii Housing Authority to the city and county of Honolulu.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a brief statement in explanation of the bill be placed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE

S. 345 would require the Public Housing Commissioner to approve a payment in lieu of taxes in the amount of $24,167.78 made by the Hawaii Housing Authority to the city and county of Honolulu, with respect to housing projects HA–1, HA–2, and HA–3 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959.

This payment was disallowed by the Public Housing Administration because it was made after the expiration of the time limit set for such payments in the annual contributions contract between the Hawaii Housing Authority and the Public Housing Authority. The contract provided that no voluntary payments in lieu of taxes may be made more than 1 year after the end of the fiscal year to which they apply. The payment which was disallowed was made on July 9, 1960, 9 days after the final permissible date, which, in this case, was June 30, 1960.

BACKGROUND

This restriction on voluntary payment in lieu of taxes was included in the contributions contracts with local agencies which have not contracted through cooperation agreements to make specific payments to their localities. The restriction was designed to prevent the excessive accumulation of potential expenditures, and to relate payments to the periods in which the city's services were rendered.

In opinion B–125637 (35 Comp. Gen. 345), dated December 7, 1955, the Comptroller General ruled that adherence to the time limit may not be waived by the Public Housing Agency. The summary of this decision stated:

"The establishment of time limitations for payments in lieu of taxes in annual contributions contracts between the Public Housing Administration and local housing authorities is a proper exercise of administrative discretion and the Public Housing Administration is proscribed from waiving such contract conditions to permit a local housing authority to make payments after the expiration of the limitation."

The Housing Act of 1956, section 408 (70 Stat. 1108), provided relief for 11 housing authorities affected by the above-cited ruling, and the Housing Act of 1961, section 907 (75 Stat. 191), provided relief for another. When the Housing Act of 1956 was before the Congress for consideration, the Housing and Home Finance Agency assured the appropriate committees that it would not support special legislation of this type in the future.

In two circulars dated May 17 and June 14, 1956, the Public Housing Administration called to the attention of all local housing authorities the Comptroller General's decision and warned them not to expect special legislative relief if in the future payments in lieu of taxes were not made within the time period specified in the contributions contract. The local housing authorities were advised either to amend their cooperation agreements with local towns to provide for mandatory payments, or to be careful not to exceed the time limit on any future voluntary payments.

The Administrator concluded that although the enactment of this legislation would be reflected in an additional contribution payment by the Federal Government "in view of the foregoing, we believe that it is a matter for Congress to determine whether relief should be granted under the circumstances of this case."

AGENCY COMMENTS

In a letter addressed to the chairman of the committee by the Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency, commenting on an identical bill, S. 2627, which was pending before the committee in the 87th Congress, the Administrator stated:

"The present case is * * * a matter of oversight, and one involving failure to make proper payment by only a few days. In his letter of January 3, 1961, requesting waiver of the contract provisions, the acting executive director of the Hawaii Housing Authority pointed out that 'the contract violations are technical, that they were not intended, and resulted from an oversight.'"

The comments of the Bureau of the Budget and the Comptroller General of the United States follow:

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT,
BUREAU OF THE BUDGET,
Washington, D.C., February 5, 1963.

Hon. JOHN L. MCCLELLAN,
Chairman, Committee on Government Operations, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: This is in reply to your request for our views regarding the provisions of S. 345, to provide for the approval of a payment in lieu of taxes to be made for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1959, by the Hawaii Housing Authority to the city and county of Honolulu.

The bill would require the Public Housing Commissioner to approve the $24,167.78 payment in lieu of taxes made by the Hawaii Housing Authority to the city and county of Honolulu with respect to housing projects HA–1, HA–2, and HA–3 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959. The enactment of this legislation would be reflected in an additional contribution payment by the Public Housing Administration to the Hawaii Housing Authority.

The payment in question was disallowed by the Public Housing Administration because it was made 9 days after expiration of the time limit set for such payments in the annual contributions contracts between the Administration and the Hawaii Housing Authority. It appears that the violation in this case resulted from an oversight on the part of the Hawaii Housing Authority and is technical in nature. The Comptroller General has ruled, however, that adherence to the time limit may not be waived by that Administration.

If, despite the notice and warning by the Public Housing Administration to all local housing units concerning the exact situation covered by S. 345, your committee believes that relief should be granted, the Bureau of the Budget would not object to favorable action on the bill.

Sincerely yours,
PHILLIP S. HUGHES,
Assistance Director for Legislative Reference.

CONVEYANCE OF CERTAIN LAND IN ARKANSAS TO CITY OF FAYETTEVILLE, ARK.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Order No. 13, Senate bill 13.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 13) to authorize the Administrator of General Services to convey certain land situated in the State of Arkansas to the city of Fayetteville, Ark.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Government Operations, with amendments, on page 1, at the beginning of line 4, to strike out "General Services" and insert "Veterans' Affairs"; on page 2, line 4, after the word "the", to strike out "fifty-sixth" and insert "fifth"; and in line 22, after the word "of", to strike out "General Services" and insert "Veterans' Affairs"; so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, subject to section 2 of this Act, the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs shall convey by quitclaim deed, without consideration, to the city of Fayetteville, Arkansas, for park and recreational purposes, all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the following described tract of land, which constitutes a portion of certain lands heretofore conveyed by such city to the United States without consideration, and which has been declared surplus to the needs of the United States: A tract of land situated in the county of Washington, State of Arkansas, being part of the northeast quarter of section 9, township 16 north, range 30 west, of the fifth principal meridian, and being more particularly described as follows:

Beginning at the northeast corner of section 9; thence south along the east line of said section 9, 660 feet to a point; thence west 165 feet to a point; thence south 100 feet to a point; thence west 733 feet to a point; thence north 350 feet to a point; thence west 435 feet to a point; thence north 410 feet to a point on the north line of section 9; thence east along the north line of said section 9, 1,333 feet to the point of beginning; and containing 19.382 acres, more or less.

SEC. 2. The land authorized to be conveyed by the first section of this Act shall be conveyed subject (1) to the condition that it shall be used for park and recreational purposes in a manner which, in the judgment of the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, will not interfere with the care and treatment of patients in the Veterans' Administration hospital situated on lands adjacent to the land herein authorized to be conveyed, and (2) to the condition that in the event that the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs determines, within twenty years after the date of execution of such conveyance, that the land so conveyed has been devoted to any use other than for park and recreational purposes, all right, title, and interest therein shall revert to and revest in the United States in its then existing condition, and (3) to the gas easement which was granted to the Arkansas Western Gas Company (for a period of fifty years) by the Department of the Army.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended, so as to read: "A bill to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to convey certain land situated in the State of Arkansas to the city of Fayetteville, Arkansas."

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have placed in the RECORD a brief statement on the bill.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 13, as introduced, would have authorized and directed the Administrator of General Services to convey the property covered by this measure to the city of Fayetteville by quitclaim deed, without compensation, and to be responsible for making any determination regarding the operation of a reverter in favor of the United States in the event the conditions of the conveyance were not met by the donee of the property. The bill also gives the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs general responsibility to insure that the operation of the property by the donee, for park and recreational purposes, would not interfere with the care and treatment of patients in the VA hospital located adjacent to the land authorized to be conveyed.

Inasmuch as the Veterans' Administration is the agency directly concerned, by virtue of its maintenance of a hospital adjacent to the property involved, the committee deems it more appropriate to lodge all responsibility imposed by this bill with that agency. The amendments, therefore, merely substitute the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs as the transferring agency for the Administrator of General Services, as well as the administering agency, and make a correction in the description of the property.

PURPOSE

The purpose of the bill, as amended, is to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to convey by quitclaim deed, without consideration, to the city of Fayetteville, Ark., for park and recreational purposes, all right, title, and interest of the United States in about 19 acres of surplus land, which constitutes part of a larger tract of land originally donated by the city of Fayetteville to the United States as a site for a veterans' hospital.

BACKGROUND

Except for the amendments noted above, S. 13 is identical to the amended version of S. 1412, 87th Congress, which the committee reported favorably on July 17, 1961 (S. Rept. 546, 87th Cong.), and the Senate passed on July 20, 1961. S. 1412 was referred to the House Committee on Government Operations on July 24, 1961, but no further action was taken on the measure.

The land proposed to be returned to the city of Fayetteville is a portion of an original tract containing about 82 acres, donated to the Federal Government by the city in 1932. It is reported that the city purchased the original tract at a cost of $66,250. The portion of the original tract of land covered by the subject bill was reported excess to the needs of the Veterans' Administration on September 7, 1955. It was transferred to the Department of the Army on November 20, 1956, and used by the Arkansas National Guard for outdoor training. On September 2, 1960, the Department of the Army declared the land excess to its needs and referred it to the General Services Administration for disposal as surplus property.

Under the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, the Administrator of General Services has authority to dispose of surplus realty to States and local governments at its fair market value, and if it is to be used for health, education, park or recreational purposes, a public benefit allowance may be made in the disposal of such property. Such conveyances shall be made at a price equal to 50 percent of the fair value of the property conveyed, based on the highest and best use of the property at the time it is offered for disposal. This authority may, however, be exercised by another agency which may have an interest in or be affected by the transfer when so designated by the GSA or by an act of Congress.

The city of Fayetteville sought to obtain this surplus property for use as a park, under the above provisions, but was unable to reconcile differences over the appraisal basis in subsequent negotiations with the General Services Administration, thus prompting the introduction of legislation to convey the property without consideration.

The city had independent appraisals made by three qualified local appraisers who valued the property at approximately $10,000, if it is to be used for public purposes, as proposed by the city. Applying the 50-percent formula to this appraisal, the city would be required to pay only about $5,000 for the land.

However, the GSA appraisal of the property was based on its highest and best use (residential) at $20,000, which meant that the city would be required to pay $10,000 under the public-benefit formula.

By letter of January 25, 1961, Senator J. W. FULBRIGHT advised this committee that the General Services Administration was in the process of offering the land for sale to the general public and requested that such sale be postponed until further negotiations could take place between the city and the General Services Administration on a fair price for the land. Senator FULBRIGHT also indicated his intention to introduce legislation to authorize conveyance of the property to the city without cost if further negotiations failed to result in an agreed price, since the property had been donated to the Government by the city.

In response to Senator FULBRIGHT's letter, the committee requested the General Services Administration to postpone disposition of this property until a satisfactory adjustment could be made or, if this did not develop, until legislation providing for the conveyance of the property to the city of Fayetteville without compensation could be introduced and considered by the committee.

Additionally, members of the committee staff met with representatives from General Services Administration and Senator FULBRIGHT's office in an effort to reach an agreement that would be satisfactory to the Administrator and to the city of Fayetteville. At that time the staff director, on behalf of the committee, requested the General Services Administration to seek a compromise on the appraisal value of this property so that the city of Fayettville might purchase the property at 50 percent of the fair market value, based on its use as a public park and not for residential purposes.

Subsequently, General Services Administration advised the committee, in a letter dated February 23, 1961, that it had requested its Dallas office to obtain another appraisal of the property in an effort to reconcile the aforementioned differentials in valuations. However, this reappraisal placed the value of the property at $21,000, or $1,000 more than the first appraisal by the General Services Administration, based on its use for residential purposes.

Thus the second evaluation by General Services Administration served only to widen the difference between the city and General Services Administration and prompted Hon. Guy E. Brown, mayor of Fayetteville, in a letter addressed to Senator JOHN L. MCCLELLAN, chairman of the Senate Committee on Government Operations, dated March 8, 1961, to comment as follows:

"The land in question was given to the Government several years ago by the city of Fayetteville, for the veterans' hospital. Since they did not use the land, it became surplus property. We thought that, in fairness to the city of Fayetteville, it should be given back to the city free of any charges.

"The General Services Administration office in Dallas called me the other day and stated that they had another appraisal made, and that the appraised value of the land was $21,000, $1,000 more than the first appraisal. This land is on a hillside, and there is a drop of 100 feet in the terrain from one side to the other. It can only be used for barbecue pits and picnic tables. Since we have no park in that part of town, we would like very much to have such a plot of ground for that purpose.

"We understand that we would receive the land for one-half of the appraised value, but we cannot see that it would be worth $10,500 to the city, for barbecue pits and picnic tables.

"The city of Fayetteville would be most grateful to you, and to Senator FULBRIGHT and the other Senators, if you would introduce such legislation as would be necessary to give this land back to the city of Fayetteville."

In view of the failure of negotiations to achieve a satisfactory solution, Senator FULBRIGHT then introduced S. 1412, which was designed to return the property to the city without cost, subject to the conditions set forth therein. As noted above this measure passed the Senate during the 87th Congress, but was not enacted by the House of Representatives. The measure was then reintroduced in this session in the form of S. 13 by Senators FULBRIGHT and MCCLELLAN.

CONCLUSION

If the statutory provision relating to the conveyance of surplus property to States and local governments under the public-benefit formula is applied in this instance, the city of Fayetteville would be required to pay one-half of a market value predicated on the property's use for residential purposes when, in fact, the city intends to use the land for park and recreational purposes and, under the terms of the bill, as amended, the city will be required to so use the land.

The committee feels that it would be unfair to apply this formula to a city which originally donated a tract of land more than four times the size of the property in question to the Federal Government. In view of the fact that the city donated this land, and now seeks but a small, unimproved, surplus portion of its original grant for use as a public park, the committee feels that a compelling case is made for the return of this property to the city of Fayetteville without compensation.

FREEDOM OF CHOICE IN VOTING FOR UNIONIZATION OF EMPLOYEES

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, several days ago I sent a letter to the National Mediation Board, accompanied by a letter I received from a constituent in Ohio. This Ohio constituent, an employee of the United Air Lines, in his letter to me complained that in a ballot which was to be used in determining whether there shall be unionization of the employees, there was no separate space under which a worker could say, "No, I do not want to belong to a union." The ballot provided as follows:

1. Representation by the Brotherhood of Railway Clerks.
2. Representation by the I.A.M.
3. Representation by any other organization.

There was no space on the ballot which would allow the employee to say, "I do not want to belong to a union."

I wrote to the Mediation Board and pointed out that there was not the ability to express a free choice on the ballot. The only way the employee could express a free choice clearly would be to write into the ballot, himself, "I do not want to belong to a union."

In reply to my letter there came this interesting information: That a suit has been filed in the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia known as Civil Action No. 402-63, on February 12, 1963. The issue will be determined in that lawsuit. However, if it is determined adversely to the view of those who say, "We want a ballot that will give us a chance to vote 'No' with the same facility as we can vote 'Yes'" I am of the belief that matters of such importance as this should eventually have the cognizance of Congress so it can enact necessary legislation to provide that there shall be open and free elections, with an opportunity for all views to be given and equal facility for expression.

I yield the floor.

DEPUTY CHIEF OF ARMS CONTROL AGENCY ANSWERS TEST BAN CRITICS

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, over the past several weeks some of us seem to have been engaged in an undeclared war concerning the desirability of a nuclear test ban. The intensity of the conflict has risen in direct proportion to reports coming out of Geneva and elsewhere as to the likelihood of an agreement between the United States, Great Britain, and the Soviet Union. With every sign of progress, starting with the publication of the exchange of letters between President Kennedy and Chairman Khrushchev, we have heard a steady counterpoint of comment—usually unfavorable to a test ban—from a variety of sources.

One of the most exhaustive of these comments was delivered in the Senate Chamber recently by my good friend and colleague, the senior Senator from Connecticut. I read the Senator's speech with great care while flying cross country immediately after my arrival in the United States from the 18-nation disarmament talks in Geneva. I attended these talks, which dealt with the nuclear test ban issue, at the special invitation of the President. It was an enlightening, if sobering, experience. Nothing that happened there, and nothing that I read in the speech of the Senator from Connecticut, diminished my conviction that a nuclear test ban is essential from the point of view of U.S. security—not essential for the sake of some do-gooding principle of world morality and human brotherhood—however important those concepts are—but essential from the point of view of our national safety and well-being.

In this morning's Washington Post and Times Herald, there is a letter from Mr. Adrian Fisher, Deputy Director of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, which sets forth admirably the arguments in favor of a nuclear test ban—a test ban on terms commensurate with U.S. security and national interest. It answers point by point the chief criticisms of the Senator from Connecticut. I commend it to the attention of Senators, and ask unanimous consent that the letter and an accompanying front page news article be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, this week the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy has scheduled some extremely important open hearings on matters relating to nuclear test detection capability. I shall be watching with great interest for reports on these hearings and on the remarks of the distinguished witnesses who are going to appear before the Committee.

I wish to announce in this connection that the Subcommittee on Disarmament, of which I am chairman, will hold hearings on the test-ban issue. Hearings will take place on Monday and Tuesday next week, March 11 and 12. To the extent possible, all sessions of the subcommittee will be open, and in any case all members of the Committee on Foreign Relations are cordially invited to attend. I can assure Senators that we will be going into both the technical and general policy aspects of a test ban, and no important consideration relative to United States policy is going to be swept under the rug.

In addition, I myself plan to take the floor tomorrow to present my own views and observations concerning the necessity of a nuclear test ban. The speech will explain in detail why I disagree with the view that a test ban is inimical to U.S. security. It will attempt to explain why I believe that a test ban containing adequate safeguards and backed up by the full panoply of rapidly advancing scientific and technical knowledge is definitely in the best interest of our country. I hope that all interested Senators will be present and will contribute their views to our thinking on this most important of world problems.

[EXHIBIT 1]

[From the Washington Post, Mar. 4, 1963]

A COMMUNICATION

On March 1 your newspaper carried a letter from the senior Senator from Connecticut, THOMAS J. DODD, in which he gave reasons why he believed the present U.S. position in the nuclear test-ban negotiations was unsound. It is with great reluctance that I find myself having to express a disagreement with the Senator, a respected lawmaker and a distinguished public servant. But since it is the firm view of the national security advisers to the President that an effective test-ban treaty is in the national interest and that our position at the negotiations is eminently sound, a few comments should be made with respect to the U.S. position and the points raised in the Senator's letter, as well as in his recent speech in the Senate.

1. The Senator stated that the test-ban policy pursued by both the Eisenhower and Kennedy administrations "has already cost us our nuclear superiority over the Soviets." The actual situation is quite different. The United States has not lost its nuclear superiority over the U.S.S.R. The trend with unlimited testing, however, in the absence of an agreement will be toward equality in the major nuclear forces between the United States and the U.S.S.R.

2. A test-ban agreement would inhibit nonnuclear powers from obtaining a nuclear weapons capability. The national interest of the United States is served more by a policy of inhibiting the proliferation of nuclear weapons than by a policy of being indifferent to the number of countries that may develop nuclear weapons of their own. A test-ban agreement would not in itself be sufficient to prevent the spread of independend national nuclear capability, but it would be a definite step in the right direction. This question of nonproliferation is one that must be included in any total appraisal of the importance of a test-ban agreement to the United States.

3. The Senator states that if the Soviets continue testing in secret under an agreement and we do not test, "they can confront us with a choice between surrender or annihilation." This is not correct. It is true that if the U.S.S.R. were able to test small devices clandestinely underground for an indefinite period, they could make significant advances in the general field of small nuclear weapons. However, every analysis conducted by the executive branch in recent years has reached the conclusion that the strategic military balance between the United States and the U.S.S.R. could not be altered in any major way by such developments. Furthermore, the risks of detection of a series of such tests would not be ignored by the U.S.S.R. One test would hardly be significant to a nation bent on attempting to gain a military advantage by testing secretly. Such a nation would more likely want to conduct a series of tests, and a series runs a much greater probability of detection than a single test. The risk of undetected cheating would be present under any treaty. The type of treaty prepared by the United States would provide deterrence against Soviet attempts at undetected cheating so that while such a risk must be recognized, on balance the security of the United States would be better served by taking this risk than taking the risk of continued unlimited testing with no agreement.

4. It is contended that the U.S. provisions for inspection and detection are only one-tenth as effective as those in our original proposals because the United States is now proposing fewer detection stations and fewer inspections. The monitoring system now proposed will have at least the same degree of deterrent effect as that contemplated 4

years ago. The original proposal of an internationally operated system of 180 control posts located in every geographic area of the world was made at a time when we had less knowledge about the detection and identification of underground events and was for a system designed to monitor the entire globe. On the basis of knowledge and experience of seismic events in the Soviet Union, we now know that the areas of interest can be monitored by a much smaller system which places primary reliance for the detection of events in the Soviet Union upon U.S. national systems located outside the Soviet Union. This is what we propose.

The original proposal would have required some 4 to 6 years to install and the international staff of technicians would have had to have been recruited and in many cases trained from scratch. Under the present proposal the United States would be relying on its own detection system which could begin operating immediately and which would be operated by United States and United Kingdom nationals who are already trained and skilled. This proposal would give the United States both maximum flexibility and maximum control of the detection system.

The previous proposal of the United States would have excluded from inspection underground events below a certain size—roughly, anything below a 20-kiloton explosion detonated in tuff, a relatively soft rock. And, at the same time, the United States would have agreed on a 3-year moratorium against conducting tests below this size. The present U.S. proposal would permit the United States to inspect, within the quota, for any underground event that had been detected and had not been positively identified as being an earthquake.

We also now know that the number of earthquakes in the U.S.S.R. is less by a factor of 2½ than we previously believed. This, coupled with our increased knowledge of earthquake identification, means that the number of unidentified underground events for which we might consider inspection, will be very substantially smaller than was assumed a few years ago. Furthermore, our knowledge in these areas is now based on actual observation whereas only a few years ago it was based in large part on uncertain estimates.

5. It is suggested that the United States now is willing to accept the principle that monitoring stations be manned by Russians and that Russians "are to be the judges of whether or not they themselves are cheating." Again, this is not a correct statement. The detection stations on which the United States would rely would be operated or supervised by the United States and United Kingdom and would be outside of the Soviet Union. No Soviet national would judge whether the Soviets are cheating. Automatic recording seismic stations inside the Soviet Union would play a supplementary role only; furthermore, the sealed recording devices which these would contain would be serviced and the records would be picked up by non-Soviet personnel.

6. It is said that we now propose to give the Communist bloc a veto power on the control body of the test-band organization. No veto on inspection has ever been proposed by the United States, and there is no consideration of proposing such a veto in the future.

7. It is stated that William Foster, Director of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, testified in September that there had been no improvement in our verification capability. On the contrary, Mr. Foster testified in September concerning two significant developments which increased our verification capability. The first was a "better capability for long-distance detection of earth tremors caused by nuclear explosions or earthquakes." The second was that "an earlier estimate of the number of tremors from earthquakes in the Soviet Union which might be confused with tremors from nuclear explosions has been shown by actual observations and research to be several times too large. Since there are fewer actual earthquakes which produce tremors similar to those of an explosion, the number of onsite inspections needed to identify the cause of any observed tremors is less." (Hearings before the Senate Preparedness Subcommittee, Sept. 17, 1962, p. 6.)

8. The Senator believes that continued testing is essential to the perfection of the antimissile missile and to the development of the neutron bomb, and that the nation which first perfects either of these weapons will decisively overturn the balance of power. These contentions were refuted generally in points 1–3 above. Additionally, the perfection of the antimissile missile does not rest primarily on nuclear weapons testing. It rests on other kinds of activities. Even then, our military experts are of the view that the nation sending a missile to its target will always have the advantage over any foreseeable antimissile missile defense system. With respect to the neutron bomb, a weapon whose successful development is by no means assured no matter how many tests are made, the chief interest of the United States is to prevent the Soviet Union and other states from acquiring this kind of a weapon. These states are much more likely to be inhibited from developing and producing the neutron bomb under a test-ban agreement than under a situation of unlimited testing.

The United States will continue to persist in its negotiations with the Soviets to achieve an effective treaty. We do this because we firmly believe such an agreement is in the national interest of the United States.

Every person weighing the value and the risks of a test-ban agreement must face squarely the situation in which we reach no agreements and allow testing to go on, unlimited, and see the arms race continue to spiral upward. Those within both the Eisenhower and Kennedy administrations who have studied these questions and these alternatives thoroughly have concluded that every effort to bring the arms race under control, of which nuclear testing is a part, must be pursued diligently.

I would hope that this letter demonstrates that the kind of test-ban agreement now being negotiated by the United States is one that is in the national interest.

Adrian S. Fisher,
U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency.

A-Test Ban Bid of United States Defended—Fisher Leads Off For Kennedy Prior to Policy Session

(By Laurence Stern)

The Kennedy administration jumped to the offensive yesterday against congressional critics who have been clamoring for a harder U.S. line in nuclear test-ban negotiations with the Soviet Union.

In the administration's first exchange of fire with 'Capitol Hill, Adrian S. Fisher, Deputy Director of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, challenged as not correct recent criticisms of test-ban policy by Senator Thomas J. Dodd, Democrat, of Connecticut.

Dodd and other congressional critics in both parties have expressed alarm that reductions in American demands for onsite inspection will permit the Soviet Union to achieve nuclear superiority through secret bomb tests.

Such concessions, Dodd argued, "have already cost us our nuclear superiority over the Soviets."

ISSUES REBUTTAL

Fisher yesterday issued a point-by-point rebuttal to this line of attack and argued instead that U.S. security can best be preserved with a test-ban treaty rather than in a no-holds-barred nuclear arms race.

In his letter to the Washington Post, Fisher replied to a letter from Dodd published in this newspaper last Friday. Fisher's letter is printed in full in today's editions.

Yesterday's opening skirmish foreshadowed a showdown on test-ban policy between the administration and its critics on Capitol Hill later this week. The forum for the debate probably will be a Joint Atomic Energy Committee hearing on Project Vera, the program for refining our underground nuclear blast detection techniques.

DEFENDS REDUCTION

Fisher defended the administration's lowering of annual onsite inspection demands from a starting point of 20 to a current proposal of 7 on the grounds that our knowledge of Soviet earthquake activity levels is more precise than it was several years ago.

Original U.S. inspection demands, he pointed out, were based on a 250-percent overestimate of the number of earthquakes in the U.S.S.R.

"This, coupled with our increased knowledge of earthquake identification, means that the number of unidentified underground events for which we might consider inspection will be very substantially smaller than was assumed a few years ago," Fisher wrote.

Yesterday's letter coincided with the return to Washington of Disarmament Agency Director William C. Foster from the deadlocked test-ban negotiations in Geneva. He is expected to brief the President today on the talks.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, is there further morning business?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The absence of a quorum has been suggested. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

VISIT TO THE SENATE BY HON. SUDHIR GHOSH, MEMBER OF INDIAN PARLIAMENT

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, at this time I desire to call to the attention of the Senate the fact that we are privileged this afternoon to have as a distinguished visitor a fellow parliamentarian from the great nation of India. I call the attention of the Senate to the presence in this Chamber of Mr. Sudhir Ghosh, one of the most distinguished and able parliamentary leaders of the Parliament of India, a true friend of democracy and freedom, and a gentleman who enjoys the friendship of many Americans and many Members of this body. Mr. Ghosh is a recognized leader in his country; a disciple of the late Mahatma Ghandi; a friend and adviser to Prime Minister Nehru. I wish to welcome him to the Senate.

[Applause, Senators rising.]

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I should like to say I have had the pleasure of knowing Mr. Ghosh ever since 1952, when I first met him on a trip to India. I have had occasion to be with him on many occasions since then. I have found him to be an active, alert, devoted, patriotic Indian, and a very fine and dear friend of the West. He possesses much native ability. He was closely associated with the late Mahatma Ghandi, and was a student, or at least a disciple, of his. I think he still exhibits a great deal of the qualities which characterized Mr. Ghandi.

Several of us have just had the privilege of lunching together in the Foreign Relations Committee room, and we went over a good many of the questions which are of mutual concern and interest to both countries. I am delighted Mr. Ghosh is able to be here, and would welcome him every time he came.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I am glad to join other Senators in welcoming a member of the House of the People, which is the elected house in India. I had the great honor and pleasure of knowing Mr. Ghosh in India. He is highly respected there. He is one of the strong leaders in the Congress Party and also in the House of the People. He has been here on several occasions. He has many friends among Members of this body and the other body of the Congress.

I concur in the statement that he is a great believer in and advocate of democratic institutions.

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE, 1963

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 10, House Joint Resolution 284.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The joint resolution will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A joint resolution (H.J. Res. 284) making supplemental appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, and for other purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Minnesota.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, this measure will be handled on the floor by the distinguished Senator from Florida.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I understand that the distinguished Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG], who is now in the Chamber, will be present to make any replies that may be requested by other Senators who are also here, and to join in the handling of the joint resolution.

I have a brief statement to make in regard to the pending measure.

The Appropriations Committee has acted promptly in its consideration of the supplemental budget request of $508,172,000 for the Department of Agriculture. This amount is needed to enable the Commodity Credit Corporation to carry out its authorized programs for the balance of fiscal year 1963. In submitting the supplemental budget request—House Document No. 64—the President submitted an amendment to the 1964 budget request decreasing it by the same amount. In other words, the pending resolution, House Joint Resolution 284, deals solely with a shift in funding from the 1964 budget to providing these funds for fiscal 1963.

Over the years, Congress has enacted various laws under which the authorized borrowing authority of the Commodity Credit Corporation is to be used to finance costs incurred thereunder, subject to reimbursement appropriations. There is considerable misunderstanding with regard to the expenditures of the Commodity Credit Corporation versus the annual appropriations required to enable the Corporation to continue to carry out such authorized programs.

Today, we are dealing with just one aspect of the programs financed through the $14.5 billion borrowing authorization available to the Commodity Credit Corporation. This resolution (H.J. Res. 284) deals only with title I of Public Law 480, under which sales of agricultural commodities are made for foreign currencies pursuant to the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act, as amended. That, of course, is Public Law 480. The current legislative authorization for title I of Public Law 480 authorizes the Secretary of Agriculture to enter into agreements during the period beginning January 1, 1962, and ending December 31, 1964, which will call for appropriations to reimburse the Commodity Credit Corporation in a total amount not in excess of $4,500 million. This legislative authorization provides that sales agreements shall not be entered into during any calendar year of the authorization period which will call for appropriations to reimburse the Commodity Credit Corporation in amounts in excess of $2,500 million.

The various titles of Public Law 480 set the size of the programs for calendar year periods and the authorized reimbursement appropriations to reimburse the Commodity Credit Corporation for costs incurred are usually made on a fiscal year basis.

The pending joint resolution is a supplemental item in this fiscal year.

The committee and the Congress have been dealing with these reimbursement appropriations for a number of years. I offer for the record a compilation of these legislative authorizations, and appropriation authority under which the Commodity Credit Corporation carries out these programs and is authorized to be reimbursed for the costs or the losses thereunder, and ask that it appear in the RECORD at this point.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. EDMONDSON in the chair). Is there objection?

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REIMBURSEMENT FOR NET REALIZED LOSSES, OR COSTS, TO THE COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION

PUBLIC LAW 480 PROGRAMS

Title I.—Sales of surplus agricultural commodities for foreign currencies: Under title I of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act, as amended (7 U.S.C. 1701–1709), surplus agricultural commodities are sold for foreign currencies. Within certain limitations, these currencies may then be used by the U.S. Government for agricultural market development, purchase of strategic materials, military equipment, facilities and services for the common defense, payment of U.S. obligations, military housing, and other specified purposes.

Appropriation authority: Agricultural The committee and the Congress Public Law 480, title I (7 U.S.C. 1703): "(a) For the purpose of making payment to the Commodity Credit Corporation * * * for commodities disposed of and cost incurred under titles I and II of this act, there are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums, etc. (b) Agreements shall not be entered into under this title during the period beginning January 1, 1962, and ending December 31, 1964, which will call for appropriations to reimburse the Commodity Credit Corporation in a total amount in excess of $4,500 million: *Provided*, That agreements shall not be entered into during any calendar year of such period which will call for appropriations to reimburse Commodity Credit Corporation in amounts in excess of $2,500 million."

Title II.—Commodities disposed of for emergency famine relief to friendly peoples: Under title II of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, Public Law 480, as amended (7 U.S.C. 1703, 1721–1724), the Commodity Credit Corporation makes its surplus stocks of agricultural commodities available to the President for famine relief and other assistance to friendly nations and friendly people in meeting famine or other relief requirements and to pay ocean freight charges for the shipment of donated commodities.

Appropriation authority: Public Law 480, title II (7 U.S.C. 1723), July 10, 1954 (sec. 203): "Programs of assistance shall not be undertaken under this title during any calendar year beginning January 1, 1961, and ending December 31, 1964, which call for appropriation of more than $300 million to reimburse the Commodity Credit Corporation for all costs incurred in connection with such programs." Public Law 480, title I (7 U.S.C. 1703(a)), July 10, 1954 (sec. 103a): "For the purpose of making payment to the Commodity Credit Corporation for commodities disposed of and costs incurred under Titles I and II of this Act, there are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums."

Title IV—Long-term supply contracts: Under title IV of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act (7 U.S.C. 1731–1736), the President is authorized to make agreements with friendly nations under which the United States would deliver surplus agricultural commodities over periods of up to 10 years and accept payment in dollars with interest over periods of up to 20 years.

Appropriation authority: Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act—Public Law 480, title IV, as amended by Public Law 86–341 (7 U.S.C. 1736), September 21, 1959: "In carrying out this title, the provisions of section 103(a) shall be applicable to the extent not inconsistent with this title."

BARTERED MATERIALS FOR SUPPLEMENTAL STOCKPILE

Under current policy, the Commodity Credit Corporation acquires strategic and other materials through barter of price-support commodities only for other Government agencies or for transfer to a supplemental United States stockpile established by section 104(b) of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954. Transfers are valued at the lower of the domestic market price of the Commodity Credit Corporation's investment therein as of the date of transfer. The General Services Administration maintains the supplemental stockpile and transfers are made pursuant to their procedures.

Appropriation authority: Agricultural Act of 1956—Public Law 540, title II (70 Stat. 200) (7 U.S.C. 1856), May 28, 1956: "In order to reimburse the Commodity Credit Corporation for materials transferred to the supplemental stockpile there are hereby authorized to be appropriated amounts equal to the value of any such materials so transferred. The value of any such material, for the purpose of this subsection, shall be the lower of the domestic market price or the Commodity Credit Corporation's investment therein as of the date of such transfer, as determined by the Secretary of Agriculture."

INTERNATIONAL WHEAT AGREEMENT

The International Wheat Agreement of 1962, originally signed by 25 importing and 10 exporting countries and to remain in force until July 1, 1965, encompasses all commercial trade in wheat and wheat flour between member countries. It established maximum and minimum prices at $2.02½ and $1.62½ a bushel, respectively, for the basic grade of wheat, Manitoba Northern at Fort William, Port Arthur, Canada, in terms of Canadian currency at the parity for the Canadian dollar determined for the purposes of the International Monetary Fund as at March 1, 1949. Importing countries undertake to purchase from participating exporting countries at prices within the prescribed price range, not less than a specified percentage of their total commercial imports.

Exporting countries undertake to make available to participating importing countries at prices within the price range, quantities of wheat sufficient to satisfy the commercial requirements of these countries.

Appropriation authority: Public Law 421 (7 U.S.C. 1641), October 27, 1949, as amended: "There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to make payments to the Commodity Credit Corporation of its estimated or actual net costs."

NATIONAL WOOL ACT

Under the National Wool Act, Commodity Credit Corporation is required to make incentive payments to eligible producers of wool and mohair on a percentage basis reflecting the amount required to bring the national average received by all producers up to the announced incentive level. The objective of this program is to encourage an annual domestic production of approximately 300 million pounds of shorn wool. The incentive level shall not exceed 110 percent of parity.

Appropriation authority: Public Law 690, title VII, National Wool Act (7 U.S.C. 1784), August 28, 1954:

"For the purpose of reimbursing the Commodity Credit Corporation for any expenditures made by it in connection with payments to producers under this title, there is hereby appropriated for each fiscal year beginning with the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, an amount equal to the total of expenditures made by the Corporation during the preceding fiscal year and to any amounts expended in prior fiscal years not previously reimbursed: *Provided, however,* That such amounts appropriated for any fiscal year shall not exceed 70 per centum of the gross receipts from duties collected during the period January 1 to December 31, both inclusive, preceding the beginning of each such fiscal year on all articles subject to duty under schedule 11 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended."

Public Law 87–155, approved August 17, 1961, authorizes reimbursement to Commodity Credit Corporation for realized losses on price support and related programs. The new authority repealed sections 1 and 2 of the act of March 8, 1938, which provided for an appraisal by the Secretary of the Treasury of the assets and liabilities of the Corporation and authorized restoration of capital impairment or surplus payments to the Treasury based on such appraisal.

Appropriation authority: Public Law 87–155 (75 Stat. 391), August 17, 1961: "There is hereby authorized to be appropriated annually for each fiscal year, commencing with the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961 * * * an amount sufficient to reimburse Commodity Credit Corporation for its net realized loss incurred during such fiscal year, as reflected in the accounts and shown in its report of its financial condition as of the close of such fiscal year. Reimbursement of net realized loss shall be with appropriated funds * * * rather than through the cancellation of notes."

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, so, today, we are simply dealing with a supplemental amount needed for the balance of this fiscal year to restore the capital structure and to enable the Commodity Credit Corporation to carry out all of its authorized program activities until June 30, 1963. Last year, the regular Agricultural Appropriation Act carried $832 million less for reimbursement appropriations than was requested in the President's budget. The pending resolution restores $508,172,000 of those reductions made for this year. All of these reimbursement appropriations will be dealt with again later in the session when the annual agricultural appropriation supply bill is under consideration in this body.

The Secretary of Agriculture testified before the committee that the borrowing authority of the Corporation was down to the perilously low level of $127 million. As recently as early January, when the President's budget message was submitted to the Congress, it was the belief of the Secretary of Agriculture and of officials of the Commodity Credit Corporation that sufficient funds would be available to enable the Corporation to carry out its programs for the balance of fiscal 1963. As indicated in the committee report, unanticipated changes have recently occurred in use of the borrowing authority. There has been an unusually heavy demand for loans on 1962 crop corn, a decrease in the receipts from feed grain sales, a larger volume of cotton loans, continuing demands for dairy product purchases and export payments, together with the continuing expenses and costs of Public Law 480, as well as payments to producers for acreage diversion agreements pursuant to the Food and Agricultural Act of 1962.

In conclusion, Mr. President, the reimbursement appropriation for $508,172,000 is entirely for expenses resulting from title I of Public Law 480 for sales of surplus agricultural commodities for foreign currencies.

By advancing this amount from the 1964 budget request to the current fiscal year, the funds provided will enable the Commodity Credit Corporation to carry out all of its authorized programs for the balance of fiscal year 1963; that is, through June 30 of this year.

In fact, the need for this particular supplemental amount did not arise because of price support and related programs carried on by the Commodity Credit Corporation under price support and related programs, but is due to the costs under Public Law 480. I want to make it amply clear that the deficiency in borrowing authority available to the Commodity Credit Corporation at this time does not arise from the feed grain program, the wheat program, or any other of its regular authorized program activities, but is occasioned by the expenses incident to carrying out Public Law 480.

That, Mr. President, is, of course, a foreign aid activity, rather than a strictly domestic agricultural activity.

Mr. President, I move that the Senate approve the pending resolution (H.J. Res. 284) as reported from the committee, without amendment.

I wish to call attention just briefly to the fact that the pending joint resolution, of course, has already been passed by the other body, and is here now for final consideration. If approved without amendment it would, as the Secretary believes and states, allow the Department of Agriculture to operate without further requests for supplemental funds to the conclusion of the present fiscal year, or until June 30, 1963.

I now yield to the distinguished Senator from North Dakota, the ranking minority member of the subcommittee.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, I support the joint resolution which is now before the Senate. This is a policy which we have followed for years, right or wrong, that of obligating the Federal Government under certain contracts, and to reimburse it afterward. This bill happens to provide for the reimbursement of expenditures under Public Law 480. It concerns the selling of our surplus food to hungry people throughout the world for their currencies. Much of these currencies are then used locally to help those people. In fact, it is really a foreign aid program that we have here. The State Department has testified year after year that if it were not for this program they would have to ask for additional funds under their foreign aid program for exactly their kind of assistance.

I know of no program that has gained more friends for the United States than giving them our surplus food or selling it to them for their currency. On page 24 of the hearings is a table showing the amount of those funds from July 1, 1954, through December 31, 1962, and their use. The total of these funds amounted to $9,068,660,000, 7.1 percent was used for the common defense of the two countries, 18.3 percent was used for grants for economic development, 5.9 percent was used for loans to private enterprise, 45.7 percent was used for loans to these foreign governments, 23 percent was used for U.S. uses, such as the expenses of embassies and other uses we might have for these currencies.

If this money were not repaid to the Commodity Credit Corporation, the Department of Agriculture would be in the position of having to foot the whole bill for one of our best foreign aid programs. I do not think we want to have those expenditures permanently charged to the farm program.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I appreciate the very clear statement made by the distinguished Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the entire table be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Uses of foreign currency as provided in title I, Public Law 480 agreements signed July 1, 1954, to Dec. 31, 1962 [1]

[Amounts are in thousand dollar equivalents at the deposit rate of exchange]

Country	Total amount in agreements (market value including oversea transportation)	104(c) Common defense	104(e) Grants for economic development	104(e) Loans to private enterprise	104(g) Loans to foreign governments	For U.S. uses [2]
Argentina	64,100	------	------	8,250	36,500	19,350
Austria	42,940	------	------	------	26,328	16,612
Bolivia	24,559	------	------	3,132	17,375	4,052
Brazil	386,420	2,000	34,400	------	285,247	64,773
Burma	51,370	------	8,134	------	32,525	10,711
Ceylon	30,800	------	5,280	5,465	12,720	7,335
Chile	71,900	100	------	850	56,330	14,620
China (Taiwan)	163,110	85,981	------	15,800	26,840	34,489
Colombia	70,890	80	------	11,270	41,180	18,360
Congo	18,750	------	16,875	------	------	1,875
Ecuador	13,190	------	------	1,273	8,785	3,132
Finland	46,535	------	------	3,615	25,634	17,286
France	35,775	------	------	7,824	------	27,951
Germany	1,200	------	------	------	------	1,200
Greece	109,300	5,040	7,470	9,171	53,450	34,169
Guinea	10,670	------	------	298	7,811	2,561
Iceland	13,930	------	198	567	10,119	3,046
India	2,428,306	------	788,175	165,262	1,164,933	309,936
Indonesia	314,025	------	25,312	21,086	213,497	54,130
Iran	50,971	5,763	------	3,253	27,803	14,152
Israel	291,069	------	32,589	46,891	172,899	38,690
Italy	152,900	------	------	6,250	100,500	46,150
Japan	150,800	700	600	------	108,850	40,650
Korea	342,860	290,583	------	5,891	------	46,386
Mexico	28,200	------	------	7,100	13,600	7,500
Morocco	21,870	------	------	2,130	14,273	5,467
Netherlands	275	------	------	------	------	275
Pakistan	1,065,920	79,366	556,841	51,740	276,432	101,541
Paraguay	13,200	------	3,420	1,170	6,000	2,610
Peru	37,280	100	------	3,762	22,723	10,695
Philippines	36,150	8,102	3,045	6,438	8,027	10,538
Poland	425,700	------	------	------	------	425,700
Portugal	7,100	------	------	------	3,400	3,700
Spain	505,630	9,910	------	------	253,480	242,240
Sudan	4,600	------	1,150	690	1,610	1,150
Syrian Arab Republic	37,200	------	------	6,550	22,750	7,900
Thailand	4,600	------	------	------	2,050	2,550
Tunisia	33,600	------	7,700	4,020	16,665	5,215
Turkey	386,065	97,750	2,340	42,011	115,000	128,964
United Arab Republic	782,940	------	25,731	77,504	554,047	125,658
United Kingdom	48,150	------	------	------	------	48,150
Uruguay	48,400	------	------	12,050	24,300	12,050
Vietnam	71,280	54,930	------	5,725	------	10,625
Yugoslavia	624,130	------	143,092	------	378,333	102,705
Total	[3] 9,068,660	640,405	1,662,352	537,038	4,142,016	2,086,849
Uses as percent of total	100.0	7.1	18.3	5.9	45.7	23.0

[1] Many agreements provide for the various currency uses in terms of percentages of the amounts of local currency accruing pursuant to sales made under each agreement. In such cases, amounts included in this table for each use are determined by applying the specified percentages to the total dollar amount provided in each agreement. Amounts shown are subject to adjustment when actual commodity purchases and currency allocations have been made.

[2] Fiscal year 1962 agreements provide that a specific amount of foreign currency proceeds may be used under various U.S. use categories, including currency uses which are limited to amounts as may be specified in appropriation acts. Included are uses specified under subsections 104 (a), (b), (f), (h), (i), (j), (k), (l), (m), (n), (o), (p), (q), (r), (s) and sometimes (c) and (d), insofar as specified in agreements.

[3] Amounts shown in this column may differ from amounts on table 3, which reflect purchase authorization transactions.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, the 23 percent which is applied for U.S. uses is for such items as the building of embassies and legations, the buying of food for our personnel, military or otherwise, in the areas where the local currencies are available, and other similar purposes which are strictly U.S. expenditures for our own benefit.

The fact is that none of the these currencies for use in these countries can be used to support or carry on the normal, ordinary functions of the Commodity Credit Corporation, for its domestic operations intended to help agriculture in this Nation.

I think the case is clearly made by the committee report and also by the hearing record. But rather than to delve at this time into the numerous phases on which hearings will be held later on various items on which there have been losses, or where there will be need for repairment of capital, the Department of Agriculture has, instead, preferred—and for myself, I completely agree with that policy—for them to come to us on a single reimbursement item, a matter as to which there cannot be any doubt about our duty to the Commodity Credit Corporation. The Corporation has simply carried out the foreign policy assistance program created by Congress and approved by the President, and has asked for this restoration of funds. When restored, this amount will enable the Commodity Credit Corporation, in its present judgment, to complete its full operations for the current fiscal year.

The other reimbursement appropriation items, which are of a similar nature, have to do with domestic operations, and will come before the committee for hearing in connection with the regular supply bill for the Department of Agriculture. At that time the wisdom or unwisdom of all of them may be gone into before the Committees on Appropriations of both Houses, and, of course, the wisdom or unwisdom of these programs may be gone into before the legislative committees which handle agricultural matters in the Senate and in the other body. But this joint resolution does not relate to such items.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield to the distinguished minority leader.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, this is an obligation which must obviously be discharged. It relates to operations of the Commodity Credit Corporation which are authorized by law. It is intended to replace money which was expended in earlier days and will repair the capital stock of the Corporation which has been impaired.

But this matter goes infinitely further, notwithstanding the fact that this item is an obligation and, as such, there is nothing offensive about it. I take this opportunity to say that as other appropriation bills, notably the regular supply bills, come before the Senate, there will be amendments and suggestions for reductions and adjustments. I think I ought to say that a request will be made for yea-and-nay votes on those proposals and upon the passage of those bills.

In the last few years we have done very little about having yea-and-nay votes on appropriation bills; but in view of the approaching tax bill and the importance of the reduction of expenditures as a hedge and an offset, I believe that a record must be made, and it should be so written and so made that all the world can see.

I thought I ought to interpose that thought at this particular time, because this is the first deficiency or supplemental supply measure to be considered at this session. In due course, the whole entourage of appropriation bills will come before the Senate, and we shall have some very specific recommendations to make at that time.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I appreciate the statement made by the distinguished minority leader, and it is a constructive statement. He has correctly stated the exact meaning and substance of this particular measure.

I shall welcome his approach to the later items which he mentions, because the Congress should be very careful in passing upon all of the items of expenditures of public funds, including those which are involved in the important activities of the Department of Agriculture.

However, I call the Senator's attention to the fact that we may be faced with situations in which the Department will simply be carrying out the purposes of the legislation which Congress has passed. In that case, although I have frequently been against such legislation, I would have to vote for the approval of items properly created under legislation which Congress has passed. In other words, when we are passing upon legislation, we are in one position; but after the legislation has been enacted and the money spent under it, we may be in an entirely different situation, as the Senator from Illinois well knows.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I recognize that whenever there is an obligation—and sometimes a moral obligation is involved—there is a duty to discharge it. But this situation affords an opportunity, also, to call attention to the fact that the new budget contains many items which call for completely new obligational authority, new functions, and new projects of one kind or another. I think we shall have one of them later in the week in connection with a recreation project. As I see it, these proposals envision the creation of bureaus for numerous purposes; and everyone knows how bureaus proliferate.

I remember when we first took $5 million out of the contingent fund to establish the Peace Corps. Now the Peace Corps, in the 1964 budget, calls for $108 million. It will be rather interesting to see what amount will be sought for the Peace Corps for fiscal 1965.

Also, I have read that there is an office downtown which is taking applications for the domestic Peace Corps. It has started probably with minor borrowing from the contingent fund; but in due course it will be before Congress; and then, like Topsy, it will grow, and who shall say the dimensions it will take before we get through?

There are quite a number of such proposals, which, of course, we shall have to examine with a rather hard, perspective eye.

Mr. AIKEN and Mr. LAUSCHE addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. EDMONDSON in the chair). Does the Senator from Florida yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I had agreed to yield next to the distinguished Senator from Vermont, who is the ranking minority member of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry; following which I shall gladly yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I believe Public Law 480 has been one of the most potent weapons that the United States has used in the cold war, which has been taking place during recent years. I, too, think the amount requested to supplement the amount available to the Commodity Credit Corporation is necessary. It is an obligation of Congress to provide that amount. However, I think we ought to make the record as clear as possible. I notice that the Secretary of Agriculture, in his communication to Members of Congress under date of February 28, states:

> CCC holdings of wheat and feed grains were 1,077,000 bushels less on February 15, 1963, than the peak quantities held in 1961, before the new program was effective.

That statement appears on the second page of the Secretary's communication.

The question I ask is, at what period of the year are peak quantities of feed grains held by the Commodity Credit Corporation?

Mr. HOLLAND. I would have to say to the distinguished Senator from Vermont that I would have to get the information elsewhere before I could answer his question fully. I am prepared to deal with any of the items which have to do with the operation of Public Law 480 in connection with this matter, but not in connection with matters which will come up in the general hearing on the agricultural supply bill. I understand that the date on which the Secretary based his statement was February 15, 1963.

Mr. AIKEN. That is correct.

Mr. HOLLAND. I do not have before me the date of the beginning of the period to which his statement related—if that is what is sought by the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. I think that is what we should look into, because it is my impression that feed grains are taken over beginning in August and wheat a little earlier; and, naturally, if those holdings were obtained at about that time in 1961, it seems to me it would be more appropriate for the Secretary of Agriculture to compare the holdings of February 15, 1963, with those of February 15, 1962. Perhaps he did. I wish to make clear that he did not compare one period of 1963, reflecting the takeover from the 1961 crop, with the corresponding period of 1962 which would reflect the takeover from the 1960 crop. His failure to do so could make a difference of several hundred million bushels.

Mr. HOLLAND. I think the point is a fair one. I call the attention of the distinguished Senator to the fact that, as an ex-officio member of the Appropriations Committee, he will of course be present at the hearings on the Department of Agriculture supply bill.

Mr. AIKEN. Yes.

Mr. HOLLAND. I suggest that at that time he clarify this question—not that I am unwilling to do so, but merely because I do not have the information as to the date of the beginning of the period to which the statement by the Secretary of Agriculture relates.

I fully agree with the Senator from Vermont that the same date and inventory facts for the various years should be used, in order to make a real comparison.

Mr. AIKEN. That is correct.

In addition, I notice that apparently the Secretary takes credit for a reduction of a billion bushels in the supply of feed grains and wheat for the programs which have been in effect during the last 2 years. Does not the Senator from Florida understand that there has been a very large increase in the utilization of feed and in the exports of wheat during the last 2 years?

Mr. HOLLAND. Of course that is correct. The authorized operations under Public Law 480, for example, have been increased very greatly; and it was the duty of the Secretary to increase them, because the law we passed directed him to do so.

Mr. AIKEN. Yes.

Mr. HOLLAND. So in arriving at the exact meaning of his statement, much more than is available as of now is involved.

Mr. AIKEN. I do have the information that during the last 2 years the exports of feed grains increased 268 million bushels over the level of the previous year—the figures for which the Secretary uses for comparison; and the utilization of feed grains for livestock feeding increased 300 million bushels—making a total of 568 million bushels of this reduction which was due entirely to increased exports and increased feeding in this country. Those figures do not take wheat into consideration. I note that the Secretary compares the amount of wheat on hand now with the amount on hand at the peak period in 1961. It is my recollection that the wheat program has been in effect only 1 year. Therefore, any reduction which took place between 1961 and 1962 should not be credited to a program which was not in existence at that time.

I raise these points merely because I cannot avoid feeling that the Department of Agriculture has grossly exaggerated the benefits of these two programs; and I feel that this point should be made clear for the record.

Mr. HOLLAND. I agree with the distinguished Senator to this extent: I feel that the record should be made completely clear before we get through with this year's activities. I do not think it has much relationship to the presently pending bill; and I recall to the mind of the distinguished Senator that the two programs he has mentioned are not programs which I supported, and differences of opinion as to the wisdom of those programs are to be found on each side of the aisle.

What the Senator seeks—and I think he is entitled to the information, and I shall help in every way I can to obtain it—is a complete explanation of our present situation and a completely factual comparison or contrast, as the case may be, between the present situation and the situation at the appropriate times in the past which the Senator from Vermont has in mind.

Mr. AIKEN. I am sure that when the main legislation comes up for renewal, the Senator from Florida and I will be found to be not very far apart. Perhaps I am a little unduly critical of some of these communications from the Department of Agriculture; but this cynicism, or whatever one may wish to call it, was prompted by recent releases relative to the dairy program—releases in which, in an apparent attempt to make it appear that conditions got worse after Congress rejected the administration's request for compulsory dairy controls, they showed that purchases of dairy products in 1962 were greater than those in 1961. However, they were completely oblivious, or apparently they were oblivious, to the fact that in 1961 there were 3 months—January, February, and March—in which there were no accumulations whatever of butter and cheese in this country. Therefore, in that case they compared the purchases of butter and cheese for 12 months in 1 year with the purchases of those commodities during 9 months in the previous year.

I refer to these several instances and I make these statements in the hope that there may be some reformation by the Department of Agriculture, with the result that the reports and the releases will be issued in such a way that the average reader can obtain the correct picture by referring to page 1, rather than have to be expert enough to refer also to pages 16, 33, and other pages and study complicated tables, and thus figure out the truth, if he can. The truth is usually there, but it is not always readily discernible.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, if I have noted anything in the course of watching the operations of both the present Secretary of Agriculture and his predecessor and earlier predecessors, I have never found any of them unwilling to provide the facts. I have never found a time when Senators and Members of the House of Representatives were not able to digest those facts and arrive at the correct conclusions, and I have never found a time when the Secretary of Agriculture was not able to defend himself when asked questions—sometimes questions by the distinguished Senator from Vermont, sometimes questions by other Senators on his side of the aisle, and sometimes questions by Senators on this side of the aisle.

We are dealing with an immense program which cannot be reviewed today here with any real justice to any part of the program.

So I think this matter should properly be reserved for later discussion, because it seems to me that the fact is—as has been well stated by the Senator from Vermont and the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN]—that this particular item is unquestionably a just one on which we must proceed to repair the capital structure; and I hope we proceed speedily to do so.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield to me?

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I agreed to yield first to the Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE]. After yielding to him, I shall be glad to yield to the Senator from Delaware.

I yield now to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, following the statement of the Senator from Vermont, I should like to add that when I served on the bench, my mental process was as follows: The witness would appear before the court. As the judge of the court, I swore in the witness. I did not relegate that duty to my clerk. The oath was as follows:

> You do solemnly swear that you will tell the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth.

I felt that for the purpose of streamlining it would be enough to say, "You do solemnly swear to tell the truth," and leave out the words, "the whole truth and nothing but the truth." Upon analysis it became clear to me that the words "the whole truth" had significance. What one tells may be true, but because of what is omitted, what is told may become untrue.

I frequently find omissions which clearly indicate that what has been told is true, but the failure to tell the whole truth labeled as untrue that which was told.

I should like to obtain some information for purposes of clarification. Perhaps the Senator from Florida is not able to give me the information I desire. What I am saying also has a relationship to the thoughts raised by the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN]. With regard to the expenditures of the Commodity Credit Corporation, I have figures showing that in 1962 reimbursement for net realized losses was $1,017,610,000, with reimbursement for a special milk program of $90 million, making a total of $1,107,610,000.

The amazing point is that the program will jump in 1963 to $2,373 million. The losses are $1,200 million more in 1963 than they were in 1962. Can the Senator from Florida explain why the losses have increased by that amount? Is it because more of the Commodity Credit Corporation's products have been sold at a loss?

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator from Ohio, in complete good faith, is bringing into his question the item of reimbursement for net realized losses in various years of the Commodity Credit Corporation, growing out of all its regular operations. I invite his attention to the fact that the losses have varied. They have risen and fallen in various years.

I have before me a tabulation beginning in 1955 and coming through 1963, which means that the price support programs and other programs of the CCC, like everything else in agriculture, have fluctuated with weather conditions, crop conditions, and crop volume, with all the various things that happen to make agriculture always a speculative and not a certain operation.

The Senator will note that the appropriations to meet these losses have gone all the way from only $1,634,659 in 1956 to a total of $2,110,424,413 for 1960 and other varying amounts. So there is no real basis for expecting uniformity year after year in an agriculture program because it does not operate in that way.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Am I correct in my understanding that with the present activities, programs relating to surplus foods are resulting in a greater cost to the taxpayer than has been the case for several years past?

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator is correct. That results primarily from the fact that the scope of the Public Law 480 program was very largely stepped up through the farm legislation enacted 2 years ago. We passed such legislation because we had found that the operation under Public Law 480 was very helpful in the foreign policy of our Nation. It was the joint judgment of the two Houses of Congress, by great majorities, that the best way to serve ourselves in the field of mutual assistance or foreign aid was to step up this particular aspect of the program. The distinguished Senator from Vermont has already touched on that subject—and I fully agree with him—by stating that the food program to which we refer has been found to be the most helpful part of the whole mutual assistance program.

I well remember—and I am sure the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] will remember also, because, as I recall, they served on the same conference committee on which the Senator from Florida served when Public Law 480 was set up—that there was a bipartisan approach.

For example, I remember that one of the distinguished authors of that program was our friend the late distinguished Senator from Kansas, Mr. Schoeppel.

Others came from the Democratic side of the aisle. There has always been a bipartisan effort to do something which would get rid of our surpluses, but get rid of them to excellent advantage in the building of more results for our country out of foreign aid and mutual assistance programs. The results have been better than any other part of the foreign aid program.

In 1961 we greatly enlarged the program. For that reason we are now beginning to see a largely increased reimbursement appropriation made each year to the Commodity Credit Corporation as required under an amendment which enlarged the authorization 2 years ago.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. I think the major reason for the increase of the funds in the agriculture bill is that in years gone by sizable sums were appropriated in the foreign aid program for food to go to foreign countries. Now practically all of that program is carried in the agriculture bill. Not much of it is now included in the foreign aid appropriations bill.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. When did we insert the granting of food aid under Public Law 480 and take it out of the foreign aid bill? For my information, was that done recently?

Mr. HOLLAND. My recollection is that it was done in 1954.

My recollection is that the requirement that the sum be included in an appropriation bill rather than handled through the cancellation of notes was accomplished under a very worthwhile amendment offered, as I recall—and if I am in error the Senator can now correct me—by the distinguished Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS]. Before the adoption of the amendment these operations were handled on a paper basis. The CCC made notes to the Treasury. Of course, they were audited. Then the notes were canceled.

As I recall, under the amendment, offered by the Senator from Delaware it was required that for the information of the Congress and the people an actual appropriation be made so that annually, at least, the size of our operations in terms of costs to the United States in cash might be understood. Personally, I believe it was an excellent thing to do. As I recall, that amendment was later than 1954. Perhaps it was in 1957 or 1958 that that amendment was offered. Will the Senator from Delaware refresh my mind on that point?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I do not recall the exact year, but the Senator is correct. I was the author of an amendment which would require annual appropriations to reimburse the Commodity Credit Corporation. As the Senator has stated, it was done for the purpose of enabling Congress and the taxpayers to know the cost of the program.

Mr. HOLLAND. I correct the RECORD to say that that amendment was adopted in the act of March 20, 1954; which means it has been in operation now for 9 years.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I recognize this is a fixed obligation we must honor. My query to the Senator from Florida relates to whether or not the discretionary action by the Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Freeman, in March of 1961, in lifting the price support on cotton from $3.24 to $3.42, contributed to the deficit.

Mr. HOLLAND. I believe the Senator is referring to the dairy prices.

Mr. LAUSCHE. That is correct; to the dairy prices.

Mr. HOLLAND. I think that lift did play some part in the creation of a greater deficit for CCC in its regular price support operations. That had no relation to the presently pending measure or the fund which is to be covered thereby.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The raising of the support from $3.24 to $3.42 was made under the provision of law which gives the Secretary authority to raise the support "whenever the Secretary determines" that is necessary to insure an adequate supply of dairy products; is that correct?

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator is correct. The law has always simply laid down guidelines, but left to the discretion of the Secretary of Agriculture the cash amount to be fixed as the basis of support year after year in the various commodities. That is the only practical way in which it can be done.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Our problem with respect to a dairy surplus has been aggravated; am I correct in that understanding?

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator is probably correct in that understanding.

I say to the Senator that there is no action which the Secretary can take—in raising, or sustaining, or lowering price support levels—which is not reflected in the total operations of the Commodity Credit Corporation. That is a fact which I am sure the Congress recognized when it passed the original price support act and which it has recognized every time amendments or new acts have been passed. Certainly every decision based on the discretion of the Secretary in this very complex field does tend to affect in some way or other the operations of the CCC.

Mr. LAUSCHE. What is the present status of the cotton storage in the Commodity Credit Corporation? It has gone up rather extensively, has it not?

Mr. HOLLAND. It has gone up. The situation with reference to cotton is so disturbing that I understand the Secretary has made specific recommendations for legislation in that field. I also understand that those specific recommendations have not been received with uniform acclaim either in this body or in the other body. It is a highly complex and highly controversial subject, which I hope we shall not have to go into now, because it does not have direct relation to the subject matter of the pending measure.

Mr. LAUSCHE. In 1961 the Secretary increased by 2 cents a pound the support on cotton, bringing it up to 32 cents. It is my understanding that that was done because it was thought there was not an adequate supply of cotton.

Did that discretionary judgment aggravate the problem we have with respect to surpluses of cotton?

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, Senators are not agreed on an answer. Neither are Members of the other body. Some think it aggravated the problem. Some think it was a justified action.

I say again to my friend, I am not anxious to ignore the problem. I certainly expect it to be presented to us in a very detailed way when there are appropriate hearings. Probably we shall be confronted with it both in the legislative committee and in the Committee on Appropriations.

But again I say, with all kindness, I do not think this is the time or the place to deal with that.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I merely asked the questions because I cannot help but feel alarmed about the cost of this program and the recurrence of aggravated expense when assurances have been given that the costs would be lowered.

I will go along with the Senator from Florida on this measure, but I agree with what the Senator from Illinois said—that we had better take a good look at the program this year.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I agree heartily with the distinguished Senator from Illinois. I expect to have to take two good looks at it—one in the Appropriations Committee, in which the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] and I, though we happen to be on the two different sides of the aisle, nearly always are together on the question of supplying the needs of agriculture; and the other in the legislative committee, since the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] and I happen to be members of the Senate committee which deals with legislative problems affecting agriculture.

I surely expect that the cotton matter mentioned by the distinguished Senator, and many others, will be reviewed in both those committees before we conclude the present session of Congress.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, earlier this afternoon the senior Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] raised a question as to the dates used by the Secretary of Agriculture in comparing inventory holdings of wheat, corn, and certain other commodities.

I have figures which will show the inventories for January 1 for each of the past 3 years. In order that we may have a comparison of these inventories on comparable dates, I ask unanimous consent that the figures showing inventories of wheat, corn, and other feed grains, as well as dairy products, for January 1, 1961, 1962, and 1963, be printed in the RECORD at this point.

While these figures show inventories of both corn and wheat down in the past 2 years, they also show that the inventories of sorghum grains, butter, butter oil, cheese, and dried milk, to be substantially higher than they were when Secretary Freeman took office.

There being no objection, the information was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Commodity Credit Corporation inventories

Date	Corn (bushels)	Wheat (bushels)	Grain sorghum (bushels)	Butter (pounds)	Dried milk (pounds)	Cheese (pounds)	Butter oil (pounds)
Jan. 1, 1961	1,471,276,965	1,132,960,901	311,965,117	66,295,284	279,836,322		
Jan. 1, 1962	1,412,192,934	1,130,279,687	341,404,047	205,679,438	354,917,176	59,709,137	
Jan. 1, 1963	1,044,325,049	1,044,992,557	579,266,082	350,791,487	662,458,995	111,587,560	48,330,960

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I may say that I am glad to have those figures printed in the RECORD, and I would be glad to have printed any other figures which bear upon any problem Senators wish to have reflected in the debate. I hope, however, we will all remember that we are now dealing simply with an obligation we ourselves set up by the legislation which we passed, and we should now recognize that by passing the pending measure.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I appreciate that point. I think it would be well to have figures for these inventories on comparable dates, rather than to have the Department compare a low point with a high point.

Mr. HOLLAND. I think it will be helpful to have those figures in the RECORD.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. Since I asked the question originally as to the peak holdings of feed grains by the Commodity Credit Corporation in 1961, I am advised that the date was October 1; which is the beginning of the feeding season and the beginning of the 1962 corn marketing year, also.

At that time—October 1, 1961—the Commodity Credit Corporation held 2,169,753,000 bushels of the four feed grains. On February 15, 1963, the Commodity Credit Corporation owned 1,374,517,000 bushels of feed grain, or 795,236,000 bushels less than held at the high point in 1961.

The Department records show that the increase in feeding and exports for the past 2 years amounted to 568 million bushels. If we deduct that from the 795,236,000 bushels, as a result of the program, it shows that the net reduction in holdings would be 227,236,000 bushels, which is quite a bit different from 1.1 billion bushels.

He undoubtedly had some answers for this, because they have some good pencils there. If they did not, they would not get everybody so confused as to what the actual figures are. But this is the pencil I used and I got this result. Really, for the $1½ billion spent on the feed grain programs—and I do not know what it was on the wheat program—we reduced the supply by 796 million bushels, which means it cost about $1.90 a bushel to reduce the supply to that extent.

Mr. HOLLAND. I am glad the Senator has mentioned these figures for the RECORD. It points out the fact that there is a complicated study in accounting and fixing of blame ahead of us, but it does not have to get into this consideration today.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I am glad to yield.

Mr. COOPER. Like many others in this body, I had the opportunity to vote for Public Law 480 when it was originally passed in 1954. As the distinguished Senator from Florida has said, it has enjoyed bipartisan support throughout the years. I believe it is one of the best programs of foreign aid that the United States uses. It is the best program for many countries and their people because it supplies their needs of food and fiber. Also, as the Senator again said, it is a program which only the United States can follow. It is one that the Communist countries cannot use except perhaps in a very, very small way. Yet, as the Senator from Florida has suggested, there is a certain contradiction—I am not sure whether he suggested this—between the agricultural program and Public Law 480 program, which is actually basically a foreign-aid program. On the one hand, the Department of Agriculture attempts to reduce surpluses. On the other, it helps subsidies in carrying out Public Law 480.

I see in the chair a distinguished Senator [Mr. McGOVERN] who was director of the program until he resigned to become a candidate. I am sure that the additional volumes of surplus food which were disposed of in the last 2 years were the result, to a large extent, of his efforts.

I should like to ask the Senator from Florida about this problem: He mentioned in his statement a few moments ago the cost of this program, which is over $1 billion a year. I believe many persons in this country, and certainly a great many of those who write on surplus problems, while they may know, do not at times make it clear that the $1½ billion which in the last year has been obligated is a chief part of the foreign-aid program. Would the Senator from Florida think it would be possible? As the Secretary of Agriculture each year presented his programs to the Congress, and, as the Senator so well knows he does, estimated the disappearance or use of feed grains, wheat, and other commodities—if we are going to have the Public Law 480 program, and I think we should—would it not be possible for him to place as one of the factors in his estimation of the disappearance of surpluses "x hundred million dollars, Public Law 480, which is an essential part of the foreign-aid program"? If that were done, I think there would be a clearer understanding in this country about the work of the Public Law 480 program and also about the cost of the agricultural program.

Mr. HOLLAND. I think the Senator has raised a good point. Two years ago our committee report stated it would be appropriate to show these food disappearances under foreign aid. The Secretary of Agriculture, while he showed all the facts from which one could figure it out for himself, is willing to show it in one figure and as foreign aid, but the President's budget advisers are not in agreement upon that. As I have been advised in the course of the hearings, there is disagreement between the two branches of the executive department as to the method of accounting for it as we wished and expressed the hope it would be, and which would have the furnishing of the information to the committee as the Senator from Kentucky pointed out.

I thoroughly agree with him. The public ought to know, year after year, just what our surpluses are and just what funds have been expended in foreign aid. I think we can make it clearer to the public and also relieve agriculture immediately from the burden of being charged with having that additional amount added to the total cost of the agricultural program.

I may say that no one has been more insistent than the distinguished Senator from North Dakota, throughout the years, that this policy be followed. Frankly, I am at a loss to know why the Bureau of the Budget is not willing to follow his request.

Mr. COOPER. I believe we ought to insist on it, because this is the only way accurately to describe the cost of the farm program, and also the cost of the Public Law 480 program as a part of foreign aid.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. I share the opinion of the Senator from Kentucky. For years I have been trying to get action like that now proposed, under the Eisenhower administration and since then, as a member of the Committee on Appropriations. We have an agricultural budget of about $7 billion, and all these items are listed as expenditures. Most people believe that the farmers get a subsidy check for it. There are involved nearly $600 million in loans for various agencies, which have a very good repayment record, and nearly $300 million of loans to the FHA, which also has a very good repayment record.

The school lunch program and several other programs are charged as expenditures of the Department of Agriculture. It is the feeling of many people that the farmers get a subsidy check for this. All this is a good example of parts of the foreign aid program which are charged to agriculture. Many people believe that it is charged as a subsidy to the farmers. I hope we can get this changed.

Mr. HOLLAND. I have strongly supported the insistent attitude of the Senator from North Dakota year after year, and that attitude is shared by the Senator from Kentucky. We should keep working for a change. I do not want it to appear that the essential facts are not supplied, because they are. I mean that in order to get at what is actually charged to agriculture and what is charged to foreign aid, one must take a pencil and figure here and there, not only in the Public Law 480 program, but in the international wheat program as well, and in various other places, in order to come up with the answer.

I have insisted year after year that we are entitled to have a plain, understandable answer on this matter so that we can reflect the actual size of the agricultural program, and what it is. It is big enough, but it is not as big as some people insist it is, particularly people who are critical because of misapprehension as to what the real size of it may be.

Mr. HUMPHREY rose.

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I thank the Senator. I wish to join the Senator from Kentucky and the Senator from North Dakota for their insistence that the analysis of the Department of Agriculture's budget be not only factual in terms of statistics, but also in terms of objectives and purposes for which these funds are committed. During my service on the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, I was as insistent about this matter as is the Senator from North Dakota. I consider the presentation of the Department of Agriculture's budget incomplete, inadequate, and, in a sense, inaccurate, when it comes to the proper interpretation of the use of the moneys which are provided to the Department of Agriculture.

Let us take, for example, the food stamp plan. While this is a program which was worked out within the Department of Agriculture and the Committees on Agriculture and Forestry of the two Houses of Congress, and falls within the jurisdiction of the Committees on Agriculture and Forestry, the food stamp plan is a relief program; it is an assistance program. It ought to be assigned by some notation within the Bureau of the Budget to a category called public assistance.

This undoubtedly would fall within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. If the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare does not wish to have this amount fixed in its budget, at least there ought to be a footnote or there ought to be a cross-reference in the budget as it comes from the President which notes that the food stamp program, the school milk program, the school lunch program, the assistance program for the needy through the use of surplus foods, and so forth, are items which belong to public welfare and public assistance.

The meat inspection program, for example, relates to health. The poultry inspection program relates to health. The international wheat program relates to foreign policy. I believe it is fair to point out that the export subsidy program relates to trade and foreign policy. The amounts can be tabulated under the Department of Agriculture, but there ought to be a cross-reference in the budget, as I have indicated.

If the executive branch of the Government is unwilling to do it, I believe we ought to adopt a resolution in Congress demanding that it be done. If we cannot get some help voluntarily from the Bureau of the Budget on this matter, then I believe we ought to direct that there be a clarification. The Department of Agriculture's budget today is not a reflection of the Department of Agriculture's programs insofar as price-support programs or marketing programs are concerned, relating to the farmer and his production and distribution problems.

I wish to join most vociferously and vigorously with the efforts which have been made today to have the budget show the facts. The facts are clear. What the facts relate to is another thing. The fact of the matter is that Public Law 480 is probably the most effective foreign economic aid program that we have. That program ought to be noted as a part of foreign assistance. It ought to be shown as a valuable part of our foreign aid and as a part of our foreign policy.

I call attention to the fact that the present Presiding Officer—Mr. McGovern in the chair—was the Director of the food-for-peace program in the new administration which came into office in 1961, and I submit that it is to the credit of the farmers of America, the Department of Agriculture, and the food-for-peace office, and to the credit of the producers on the farm, that we have Public Law 480 on the statute books.

We ought to look at it not as something that aids the farmers, but as something that helps people. The fact of the matter is that the farmers are but the producers of the food. We do not call the defense program aid for American industry, even though the defense program procurement is produced by some of our great industries. We call it defense, and properly so. We ought to call Public Law 480 a part of our foreign economic assistance program and a part of our international good will program. It ought to be tabulated in the budget to show what it is.

When the people in the Bureau of the Budget read the Record they will note there are Senators who have served here for many years who believe that the time is long overdue for the kind of clarification of the budget procedures which we have talked about here this afternoon. If we do not get it I will submit a resolution, and call upon my colleagues to back that resolution, ordering the Bureau of the Budget to print its report accurately in terms of what these figures represent.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Minnesota. I wish to call attention to the fact that the Senator from Minnesota has just pointed up a few of the complexities which exist in this whole bookkeeping process. We have been talking in this resolution simply about the operations under title I, under Public Law 480. We also have the famine relief operation under another title, and we also have the barter for strategic materials program under another act, which is completely apart from Public Law 480. There is institutional supply program, which does not come under public welfare.

This is a very complex bookkeeping operation. However, what is necessary can be done. I fully agree with the distinguished Senator that it should be done. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, I desire to commend the distinguished senior Senator from Minnesota and the senior Senator from North Dakota and the senior Senator from Florida for clarifying the budget situation with reference to the appropriations for the Department of Agriculture.

I remember when the Senator from Minnesota served on the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. He, along with the senior Senator from North Dakota and other Senators, pointed out that the vast segment of the so-called appropriations for the Department of Agriculture related to agriculture only in a very minor way, if in any degree whatever.

A few days ago, I requested the Department of Agriculture to break down the budget in this regard, because I have been interested in trying to devise and promote a farm program which would subsidize only farmers, instead of subsidizing railroads, subsidizing warehouses, subsidizing foreigners, and subsidizing every aspect of the American economy, all in the name of aiding farmers to improve their income.

I was indeed surprised when the Department of Agriculture submitted to me a breakdown of its proposed budget for the fiscal year 1964. The Department will request approximately $6,500 million. A study and analysis of that budget will show that only about $2 billion relates to agriculture and support prices. Even including the Rural Electrification Administration, which is a rural program, but not exclusively a farm program, the appropriation for agriculture still amounts to only about $3 billion, out of $6,500 million which is requested under the guise of a farm program.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the Record a breakdown and analysis of that budget.

There being no objection, the analysis was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

U.S. Department of Agriculture, budget expenditures, fiscal year 1964, estimated

PROGRAMS WHICH CLEARLY PROVIDE BENEFITS TO CONSUMERS, BUSINESSMEN, AND THE GENERAL PUBLIC

	Millions
Programs having foreign relations and defense aspects:	
Sales of surplus agricultural commodities for foreign currencies	$1,282
Emergency famine relief to friendly peoples	246
International Wheat Agreement	72
Transfer of bartered materials to supplemental stockpile	62
Payments to Veterans' Administration and armed services under section 202 of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, for milk and other dairy products used in excess of normal requirements	40
Value of foreign currencies used by Defense Department for military housing, and long-term supply contracts	284
Defense food stockpiling	30
Total	2,016
Food distribution programs:	
Commodity purchases under the program for removal of surplus agricultural commodities	164
Pilot food stamp plan	51
School lunch program	182
Special milk program	102
Total	499
Investment in REA and FHA loans, which are subject to repayment:	
REA loans	259
FHA loans	189
Total	448
Long-range programs for the improvement of agricultural resources, including research, meat inspection, disease and pest control, education, market development and services, protection of soil and water resources, and forest and public land management:	
Forest Service	311
Agricultural Research Service	195
Soil Conservation Service	195
Extension Service	77
Cooperative State Experiment Station Service	40
Agricultural Marketing Service, Marketing Research & Service	43
Farmers Home Administration, salaries and expenses	39
Other, including FCS, FAS, CEA, FCIC, REA expenses, and staff offices	94
Total	994
Total	**3,957**

U.S. Department of Agriculture, budget expenditures, fiscal year 1964, estimated—Continued

OTHER PROGRAMS WHICH ARE PREDOMINANTLY FOR STABILIZATION OF FARM INCOME, BUT WHICH ALSO BENEFIT OTHERS

	Millions
Agricultural conservation program	$124
Conservation reserve program	294
Land-use adjustment program	27
CCC price support, supply, and related programs:	
CCC price support, supply and related programs	327
Less: Payments to Veterans' Administration and armed services under section 202 of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, for milk and other dairy products used in excess of normal requirements	−40
Acreage diversion payments:	
Feed grains	227
Wheat	173
Price support payments:	
Feed grains	490
Wheat	91
National Wool Act program	106
Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service expenses	115
Total	1,989
Sugar Act program	84
Total	2,608
Grand total	6,565

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, I agree wholeheartedly with the view of the able Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND], the able Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], and the able Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] that it is high time that we not saddle every so-called expenditure on the face of the earth on the poor farmer's back and say it is a farmer's program, when it relates to health, public welfare, foreign aid, and every other aspect of the Federal Government, yet is submitted to Congress under the guise of a so-called farm bill.

Many of those programs are fine. I have supported a number of them. But we ought to charge them where they are supposed to be charged, and not make the American people think that we are appropriating billions of dollars for the benefit of the farmers of this country, for that is simply not true.

I thank the able Senator from Florida for yielding to me on this point.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Senator from Georgia for his able, constructive addition to the debate.

Mr. President, in order that the debate, before it terminates, may show the answer of the Secretary of Agriculture to the request of our committee for the breakdown of expenditures, which we have been talking about in the last few minutes, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a letter addressed to Hon. RICHARD B. RUSSELL from Hon. Orville L. Freeman, Secretary, dated February 26, 1962, which is in reply to an inquiry about the item in the report on the appropriations for 1962, which has just been mentioned.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Washington, D.C., February 26, 1962.

Hon. RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Department of Agriculture and Related Agencies, Committee on Appropriations, U.S. Senate.

DEAR SENATOR RUSSELL: The report of the Senate Committee on Appropriations on the 1962 Department of Agriculture and related agencies appropriation bill requested that this Department consult with the Director of the Bureau of the Budget concerning a presentation in the next budget which would delineate more clearly, by programs, those that are chargeable to the farm program as distinguished from foreign assistance. It was also requested that the Department submit a report to the committee setting forth by items the regular programs of primary benefit to agriculture as well as foreign assistance items, with a breakdown of expenditures for each program.

These requests were considered intensively by both this Department and the Bureau of the Budget. The Department explored the purposes of its programs with the view of possibly classifying expenditures according to beneficiary. In this respect it was found that there was no objective way to clearly delineate between specific groups, such as farmers, businessmen, and consumers, since the benefits of the programs carried out are spread so widely among all segments of the economy. It was concluded that in the interest of a clearer public understanding of the Department's programs, a classification according to major purposes would be more feasible and appropriate.

The discussions with the Bureau of the Budget were therefore on the basis of classifying expenditures according to major purpose or function. In arriving at the classification for presentation to your committee of the programs carried out by the Department, it was the position of the Bureau of the Budget that such classification should be consistent with the treatment accorded the programs of the Department in the functional classification appearing in the President's budget. There is attached a statement showing the expenditures of the Department in fiscal years 1961 and estimated for 1962 and 1963 which reflects the functional classification appearing in the budget, and which provides a breakdown of the programs included in each group. Those programs constituting the food-for-peace effort under Public Law 480 are identified in the breakdown.

We will be glad to furnish any additional information the committee may want on this matter.

Sincerely yours,
ORVILLE L. FREEMAN,
Secretary.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Classification of expenditures by functions as reflected in the budget for the fiscal year 1963

[In millions]

	1961	Estimated, 1962	Estimated, 1963
International affairs and finance: Economic and financial assistance: Food-for-peace (Public Law 480, title II)	$199	$281	$300
Agriculture and agricultural resources:			
Farm income stabilization and food-for-peace:			
Price support, supply, and purchase programs:			
Present programs	1,331	2,497	2,516
Proposed legislation			−434
National Wool Act	61	67	70
Food-for-peace (Public Law 480, titles I and IV)	1,455	1,489	1,389
International Wheat Agreement	76	81	81
Transfer of bartered commodities to supplemental stockpile	201	225	250
Removal of surplus agricultural commodities	203	225	235
Conservation reserve	363	346	323
Sugar Act	72	82	87
Other	39	69	68
Subtotal	3,801	5,081	4,585
Financing rural electrification and rural telephones:			
Present programs	301	330	370
Proposed legislation			−136
Financing farm ownership and operation: Farmers Home Administration	353	158	198
Conservation of agricultural land and water resources:			
Soil Conservation Service (including watershed protection and Great Plains program)	146	164	181
Agricultural conservation program, CCC loan for ACP, and emergency conservation measures	251	256	257
Research and other agricultural services	324	352	380
Total	5,176	6,341	5,836
Natural resources: Forest resources:			
Forest Service:			
Payments to Klamath Indians	69		
Other	246	279	281
Total	315	279	281
Health, labor, and welfare: School lunch and special milk programs:			
Present programs	241	274	271
Proposed legislation			20
Total	241	274	291
Grand total	5,929	7,177	6,709

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, as one who served as director of the food-for-peace program during 1961 and 1962, I am especially interested in the legislation before us today.

Public Law 480, the legislative authority for the Nation's food-for-peace effort is one of the most important statutes ever enacted by the Congress.

Using our agricultural abundance to reduce hunger in the world is not only in our self-interest but is a tremendous humanitarian achievement.

The food-for-peace program (Public Law 480) stabilizes American farm incomes, reduces costly storages, stimulates our shipping industry, develops new commercial markets, improves the health and economy of other peoples, and promotes the cause of peace and freedom.

It is imperative that we recognize that while the cost of the program is chalked up to the budget of the Department of Agriculture, it is to a considerable extent an arm of our foreign economic aid program.

The supplemental appropriation which we are called upon to approve today is needed to restore the capital impairment of the Commodity Credit Corporation resulting from our sales of surplus agricultural commodities for foreign currencies under title I of Public Law 480.

The Commodity Credit Corporation plays an essential role in our entire farm economy and especially in the stabilization of farm prices.

It may be assumed by some persons that we are paying unreasonable prices for price supported commodities. The facts are that the American consumer is getting a remarkably good buy on farm commodities. Consumer food costs are $4 to $6 billion a year less than if farm prices had increased as much as prices in other parts of the economy during the past 8 years.

I ask unanimous consent that a paper prepared at my request by Walter W. Wilcox, senior specialist in agriculture of the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress entitled "Consumer Savings Due to Decline in Farm Prices and Increased Government Cost of Farm Programs, 1953–54 to 1961–62," be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the paper was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Consumers Savings Due To Decline in Farm Prices and Increased Government Cost of Farm Programs, 1953–54 to 1961–62

Consumers' food costs are $4 to $6 billion a year less than if farm prices had increased as much as prices in other parts of the economy in the past 8 years. This amounts to a saving of $100 per family. These savings may be compared with an increase in Government farm price support costs of $0.7 billion in the 8-year period (or $2.4 billion if the cost of foreign assistance programs is added).

IF FARM PRICES HAD INCREASED AS MUCH AS MARKETING AND TRANSPORTATION CHARGES

The Economic Research Service of the U.S. Department of Agriculture estimates civilian expenditures for domestic farm food products at $63 billion in 1961–62. If the farm prices of these domestically produced foods had increased as much between 1953–54 and 1961–62 as the marketing and transportation charges on the foods in the standard farm food market basket, or 17 percent,[1] civilian expenditures for these foods in 1961–62 would have been about $69 billion, or $6 billion higher than they were. This estimate assumes no change in marketing margins due to the higher farm prices.

IF FARM PRICES HAD INCREASED AS MUCH AS WHOLESALE PRICES OF NONFARM PRODUCTS

Wholesale prices of all commodities other than farm products and food increased 10.6 percent between 1953–54 and 1961–62. Had the farm prices of domestic food products increased by this percentage, rather than declining 6 percent as they actually did, consumers would have had to spend $4 billion more—or $67 billion—in 1961–62 for their domestically farm-produced foods. This again assumes no change in marketing margins.

IF FARM PRICES HAD INCREASED AS MUCH AS PRODUCTION EXPENSES

In the 8-year period 1953–54 to 1961–62, farm output increased 15 percent. The increased output was due to increased use of fertilizers, insecticides, weedkillers, improved seeds and breeding stock, and other improved practices. Prices paid by farmers for all purchased items, interest, taxes, and wage rates increased 9 percent in the 8 years. Taking into account the larger quantities of purchased materials and the higher prices, production expenses per unit of all farm output, including tobacco and fibers, increased 11.3 percent in the 8-year period. Had farmers balanced their supplies with market outlets, and had farm prices for food products increased by the same percentage as production expenses, civilian consumers would have had to spend $4.4 billion more than they did spend in 1961–62 for their farm-produced foods. Again, this does not allow for increased marketing margins resulting from percentage markups in the wholesale and retail markets.

IF FOOD PRICES HAD INCREASED AS MUCH AS OTHER ITEMS IN THE CONSUMERS PRICE INDEX

Still another comparison is possible. During this 8-year period, the cost of all items in the consumers price index other than food increased 12.9 percent. If farm prices of food products had increased by this percentage, without any change in marketing margins, civilian consumers would have had to pay $4.8 billion more annually for their domestically produced foods.

Because of the current organization of the economy and agriculture's rapid technical progress, civilian consumers are paying $4 to $6 billion less each year for food than they would be paying if farm prices had increased as much as production costs, or as much as prices in other sectors of the economy, where unused capacity and idle resources are greater today than in agriculture.

INCREASED COST OF FARM PROGRAMS LESS THAN CONSUMER SAVINGS

As compared with the above-estimated consumer savings, budget expenditures from appropriations for programs primarily for stabilization of farm incomes increased from an average of $1.9 billion per year in 1953–54 to $2.6 billion a year in 1961–62.[2] In addition to the cost of programs primarily for the stabilization of farm incomes, budget expenditures for foreign assistance programs or Public Law 480 programs, which began after 1954, averaged $1.7 billion per year in 1961–62.

Savings in retail food costs per family due to the decline in farm prices in the past 8 years while most prices were rising, average $100 a year as against increased farm program costs of $20 to $40 per family.

Details of the budget expenditures are as follows (million dollars)

	1953–54	1961–62
Acreage allotments and marketing quotas	27.0	70.0
Sugar Act program	64.6	75.1
Conservation reserve program	-------	348.0
CCC price support and related programs	1,582.7	1,691.0
Special milk program	-------	89.3
International Wheat Agreement	94.9	83.3
National Wool Act	-------	63.1
Sec. 32 removals	129.6	209.0
Subtotal	1,898.8	2,628.8
Foreign assistance:		
Public Law 480:		
Title I	-------	1,454.8
Title II	*37.2	220.3
Total	1,936.0	4,303.9

*Expenditures for famine relief prior to Public Law 480.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, unless there are other questions to be asked, I hope the Senate will pass the joint resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution is open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the third reading of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution (H.J. Res. 284) was ordered to a third reading and was read the third time.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, before the vote on the passage of the joint resolution, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record summaries of certain programs under the Commodity Credit Corporation, together with the statement of the Secretary of Agriculture with respect to the reimbursement of the Commodity Credit Corporation and the status of CCC borrowing.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Summary of Effect of Wheat and Feed Grain Programs on CCC Costs (ASCS, February 28, 1963)

HIGHLIGHTS INDICATING SUCCESS IN CUTTING SURPLUSES AND REDUCING COSTS

1. CCC holdings of wheat and feed grains were 1.077 billion bushels less on February 15, 1963, than the peak quantities held in 1961 before the new program was effective, and total stocks at the end of 1963 marketing year will be 2,509 million bushels less than they would have been if the pre-1961 programs had been allowed to continue.

2. The fact that the CCC does not now own the 1.077 billion bushels of grain it formerly owned is now saving the Government $770,000 each day in carrying charges—$280 million a year.

3. The 1964 budget includes $246 million less for carrying charges on these grains than was spent in fiscal year 1961, and $813 million—or $2.2 million a day—less than the annual rate that would have occurred by 1964 if the pre-1961 programs had been allowed to continue.

These and other figures show that the new programs designed to eliminate the costly and unnecessary surpluses of wheat and feed grains, that had climbed to record levels in 1961, are working.

The Congress has given the CCC the responsibility to finance all Government price support and commodity purchase programs through use of its own funds and a borrowing authorization limited to $14.5 billion. Each year the Corporation's realized losses are met by appropriations by the Congress for restoration of capital impairment. The amount of appropriations needed is determined by CCC's realized losses.

---

[1] U.S. Department of Agriculture. Economic Research Service. Table 1. February 1963 (MTS–148).

[2] 87th Cong., 2d sess. House Department of Agriculture appropriations for 1963, hearings. Pt. 1. Table 5, "Budget expenditures from appropriations," pp. 243–245, and USDA Office of Budget and Finance.

The realized losses of the CCC since 1960 are shown below:

Fiscal year	Realized loss (millions)	
	Amount	Change from preceding year
1961	[1] $2,067.0	+$454.9
1962	2,799.4	+732.4
1963 (estimated)	2,753.6	−45.8
1964 (estimated)	2,646.9	−106.7

[1] Does not include inventory revaluation loss of $1,268.5 million applicable to 1961 and prior years.

(1) Fiscal 1962 losses were higher than the previous year, primarily because of:

(a) an increased loss on commodity sales in the disposal of large quantities of corn and grain sorghums acquired from the 1960 and prior years' crops; such grain was acquired at a higher price in the 1950's than market prices in 1962. Obviously as the grain is moved out of surplus into consumption realized losses take place.

(b) increased loss on donations, due to the donation of more dairy products, wheat flour and corn meal, thus increasing benefits to millions of people at home and around the world by a more effective use of our agricultural abundance.

(c) acreage diversion payments to farmers as the immediate cost of launching supply adjustment programs enacted by the Congress—programs that by now have significantly reduced stocks of grain and the costs of both acquiring and carrying such stocks, while they have brought about substantial increase in farm income.

(2) Estimates indicate that realized losses for fiscal 1963 will be $45.8 million less than for the previous year, and that this encouraging trend will be stepped up in 1964 by an estimated decrease of $106.7 million below that for 1963.

(3) Stocks in CCC inventory in excess of needs for an adequate reserve have been substantially reduced—by a total of 1.077 billion bushels as compared with peak quantities on hand before programs for supply adjustment began to take effect. As a result, the 1964 budget estimates before the Congress show $245.6 million less for carrying charges on wheat and feed grains for the fiscal year 1964 than the actual cost in the fiscal year 1961. The fact that the CCC does not now own the 1.077 billion bushels of grain it formerly owned is now saving the Government $770,000 each day in carrying charges—$280 million a year.

(4) Cumulative savings of $480 million in carrying charges on feed grains and wheat from the record 1961 level have already resulted or are budgeted as a result of the decrease in CCC stcoks, as follows:

[In millions]

Fiscal year	Total carrying charges, feed grains and wheat	Savings from 1961 level
1961	$846	
1962	776	$70
1963 (budget estimate)	682	164
1964 (budget estimate)	600	246
Cumulative savings through June 30, 1964, from 1961 level		480

(5) If the new supply adjustment programs had not replaced the pre-1961 programs it is a conservative estimate that carryover stocks at the end of the marketing year for the 1963 crop would have amounted to 3.8 billion bushels of corn and grain sorghums and 1.6 billion bushels of wheat, and the annual carrying charges on these quantities would have amounted to at least $1.4 billion by 1964 as compared with the current estimate of $587 million for these three grains in the 1964 budget. The difference is equivalent to about $2.2 million per day.

(6) If pre-1961 programs had been allowed to continue and stocks had built up as indicated through 1963, it is estimated that ultimate carrying costs to the CCC before disposal of the additional quantities added to stocks would have amounted to approximately $3.3 billion. This would result from the time which would elapse before these added stocks would be disposed of, based on the annual rate of disposition which occurred prior to 1961. This would be 10 to 12 years for feed grains and between 6 and 7 years for wheat.

U.S. Department of Agriculture—Supplemental Estimate for Reimbursement to Commodity Credit Corporation for Costs of Title I, Public Law 480

(Statement of Hon. Orville L. Freeman, Secretary of Agriculture, U.S. Department of Agriculture, before the Senate Committee on Appropriations)

Mr. Chairman, I am here today not to request an increase in appropriations, but rather to ask for a shift in appropriations from fiscal year 1964 to fiscal year 1963. Your authorization of a supplemental appropriation of $58,172,000 to reimburse the CCC for unrecovered 1963 costs for title I, Public Law 480, will be accompanied by a reduction in our budget request for 1964 by that identical amount.

Congress has given the CCC the responsibility for financing all Government price support and commodity purchase programs through the use of its own funds and a borrowing authorization limited to $14.5 billion. Because the nature of CCC operations and expenditures are to a considerable extent unpredictable—due to factors such as weather, insect damage, domestic and import demand, trade psychology, and other intangibles—Congress has seen fit to authorize such borrowing and to make up for realized losses by later appropriations for restoration of capital impairment.

There are two circumstances that have brought about the present situation in which the CCC, required by law to carry out price support programs by purchases or loans for such commodities as wheat, cotton, dairy, and feed grains, is faced with resources now at the perilously low level of $127.6 million.

The first of these circumstances is the fact that the Appropriation Act for 1963 as approved by Congress last year did not include $831.6 million for reimbursement for past and estimated 1963 expenditures as requested in the 1963 budget.

The second is the combination of unpredictable factors that have resulted in: (1) heavier loans on cotton than expected, largely because mills have postponed buying in anticipation of lower prices; (2) heavier loans on corn than expected, largely because unusually favorable weather produced corn of such high quality that larger amounts went under loan earlier than anticipated; (3) lower sales from CCC stocks than were estimated a year ago.

Action is therefore necessary at this time to provide the CCC with enough operating capital to carry out the price support programs that are mandatory under law, along with its responsibilities for Public Law 480 operations, during the remainder of fiscal 1963. This action will have no effect on the total of the appropriations required for the 2 fiscal years of 1963 and 1964.

Status of CCC Borrowing Authority

CURRENT SITUATION

The Congress appropriated $832 million less than the amounts requested in the 1963 budget to reimburse CCC for costs of the foreign assistance programs and for realized losses.

This left only a narrow operating margin for changes in the estimates which could result from weather conditions, farmer participation in programs, production abroad, timing of expenditures, and receipts, and other uncontrollable and unpredictable factors.

Available borrowing authority of CCC: With only a narrow operating margin, changes in timing of receipts and expenditures have occurred with the result that CCC's available borrowing authority has dropped to $149.6 million as of February 18, 1963. Section 4(i) of the CCC Charter Act (15 U.S.C. 714b(i)) prohibits the Corporation from exceeding its borrowing authority of $14.5 billion. The Corporation has used approximately $8 billion of the $14.5 billion borrowing authority in its investment in loans and inventory. The Corporation is required by law to use its borrowing authority to finance costs of the foreign assistance programs (Public Law 480, IWA, Bartered Materials for Supplemental Stockpile).

At the current rate of use, there is grave danger that the entire $14.5 billion of authorized borrowing authority will be exhausted by the end of February or early in March unless remedial action is taken promptly.

During this period, the Corporation is required by law to carry out certain mandatory programs which require use of sizable amounts of borrowing authority, such as cotton loans (averaging about $2.5 million per day in February), corn loans (averaging $9.6 million per day in February) and dairy purchases (averaging about $1.8 million per day in February). Under the 1963 feed grain and wheat stabilization programs, advance payments are authorized (averaging about $5 million per day).

STEPS TAKEN TO DATE

Payments to other Government agencies are being held in abeyance; for example, $15 million to AID for ocean transportation, and $20 million for loans to the ACP program for advance purchase of conservation materials and services.

Foreign assistance program funds have been shifted from the 4th to the 3d quarter for advance to CCC ($110 million).

Recovery of $93.1 million repayments from foreign currency loans was accelerated through special arrangements with the Treasury Department.

Daily reports from field offices are obtained and analyzed on borrowing authority used, cotton and corn loans and repayments, feed grain dispositions, purchases of dairy products, and advance feed grain and wheat payments.

ALTERNATIVES

1. Stop all payments and loans to producers under all price support and related programs. In addition, stop payments due and payable under contracts and firm commitments:

(a) To warehousemen.

(b) To rail and truck carriers.

(c) To processors and packaging firms.

(d) To vendors of dairy products.

(e) To U.S. exporters of wheat flour, cotton and cotton products.

(f) To U.S. exporters and U.S. ocean freight carriers for commodities shipped under Public Law 480 (food-for-peace program). Such action would result in a nationwide loss of confidence in the integrity of the U.S. Government to meet its financial obligations. It would disrupt all phases of the agricultural economy and incur the ill will of farmers and related industries throughout the Nation. It would set off a chain reaction which would be extremely damaging to farmers and people doing business with farmers, with resulting serious damaging effects upon the economy in general.

2. Use of section 32 funds: Section 32 currently finances payments for diversion or export of commodities, and has, in the past, procured commodities from CCC for distribution to domestic outlets. The 1964 budget estimates that in the fiscal year 1963, CCC will donate domestically approximately $300 million of surplus commodities and will make export payments of approximately $270 million. In order to lessen the impact upon CCC's borrowing authority, section 32 funds could be used to procure commodities from CCC for distribution to domestic outlets and to finance diversion payments and export payments.

If section 32 funds were used to the maximum extent permitted by available funds and existing authorities, it is possible that up to $250 million could be advanced to CCC, principally for commodities to be distributed to domestic outlets. In view of the provision in section 32 which limits the amount which can be devoted to any one commodity to 25 percent of available funds, not more than $150 million could be used for any one commodity; e.g., dairy products.

This large use of section 32 funds for commodities under CCC price-support programs has not been generally favored by members of the appropriation committees, by other Members of Congress and by officials of the Department of Agriculture and should therefore, be avoided, if possible.

3. Provide promptly a supplemental appropriation of $508 million as requested by the President. There is a budget amendment for 1964 to reduce the 1964 appropriation request by a like amount.

Such action would permit the continuation of CCC operations on a normal basis for the balance of this fiscal year consistent with current estimates.

CCC borrowing authority—Estimated major obligations and receipts

[In millions of dollars]

Item	February	March
Balance available or deficit (—), beginning of month	210	—31
REGULAR ACTIVITIES		
Obligations:		
Corn and cotton loans	170	53
Dairy purchases	62	60
Feed grain and wheat payments	131	105
Export payments	84	25
Storage, transportation and reseal payments	43	43
Other purchases, loans, interest	80	101
Total obligations	570	387
Receipts:		
Corn and wheat sales	179	325
Wheat and cotton repayments	80	107
Other sales, repayments, etc	26	57
Total receipts	285	489
Net obligations or receipts (—)	285	—102
SPECIAL ACTIVITIES (PUBLIC LAW 480, ETC.)		
Obligations	169	172
Receipts	[1] 213	17
Net obligations or receipts (*), special activities	*44	155
Balance available or deficit (—), end of month	—31	—84

[1] February includes $110,000,000 of reapportioned 4th quarter funds under the foreign assistance program and $93,100,000 loan repayments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass?

The joint resolution (H.J. Res. 284) was passed.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I move that the Senate reconsider the vote by which the joint resolution was passed.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I thank the acting majority leader. I think it timely to say that, as I recall, not only is this the first appropriation measure of the session, but it is also the first measure of general importance which has been passed. I express the hope that there will be many others to follow soon, and that Congress may be able to adjourn at an early date, as soon as possible after July 31.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Whenever the Senator from Florida handles a measure as he has the appropriation bill today, he always acts with dispatch, efficiency, clarity, and with positive results.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The distinguished Senator from Florida mentioned the date of July 31. I think I should announce at this time that it is not the anticipation of the leadership to have the Senate take an Easter vacation this year because of the fact that we are at least 7 weeks behind in our schedule, and because committees are only now getting down to work. I think it behooves us to stay on the job and do the best we can to get legislation rolling, to the end that it may be possible for us to adjourn some time this year which, I am sure, will not be July 31, but because of the delay which has already been incurred, may well be in October or perhaps November.

Mr. HUMPHREY. O Senator. O Leader.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I had not expected to have my hopes crushed at such an early date; but I cannot help approving the general position taken by the majority leader. We have an immense amount of work to do. While the purpose of my comment was to call attention to the fact that we have finally started to do it, I hope we may proceed much more expeditiously than we have in the recent past.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I am happy that, almost 8 weeks after the convening of the 88th Congress, it has been possible, finally, for the Senate to consider a measure and pass it. I believe that the first bill passed this year had to do with a situation in the State of Hawaii. I am delighted that that bill, which was sponsored by Senator FONG and Senator INOUYE, and reported by the Committee on Government Operations, under the chairmanship of the distinguished Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN], has the honor of being the first bill to be passed by the Senate after almost 8 weeks of effort, of a sort.

I am especially happy that the first measure of major significance on a nationwide basis is the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 284) which was reported by the distinguished senior Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND], making supplemental appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, and for other purposes, which was also passed today.

I compliment the Senator from Florida for the skillful, sound generalship he always shows in the consideration of a bill, and also the fact that in explaining a bill he proves to us conclusively that he does his homework and knows whereof he speaks.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank my friend, the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MAINTENANCE OF HIGHEST MEDICAL STANDARDS IN VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, there has been considerable discussion and concern in certain departments of the Veterans' Administration relating to the medical and hospital care of veterans. Today I wish to address myself to these developments and to set at rest some of the worries and concerns of many Members of the Senate. I have received letters from Members of Congress, as well as from many veterans' representatives and organizations relating to the medical care program of the Veterans' Administration.

Throughout my service in the Senate, it has been my pleasure to devote attention to one of the most important obligations of the Nation: Providing the finest possible medical care for our wounded and ill ex-servicemen.

I should like today to mention some of the great medical challenges and opportunities which the Veterans' Administration faces.

A BRIEF VA MEDICAL HISTORY

First, however, a bit of historical perspective is necessary.

I will not recapitulate in detail the history of the Veterans' Administration medical program. I will only say this: This Nation today conducts the finest medical program in the world for those who defended it on the field of battle.

The program was not always thus. There was a time when Veterans' Administration medicine was the victim of an appalling combination of indifference, politics, the worst forms of bureaucracy, and professional mediocrity.

Then a great revolution occurred. It rightly bore the title, informally, of two of its great leaders, Dr. Paul Hawley and Dr. Paul Magnuson. After a time, however, that great reform movement itself ran into difficulties and was on the point of collapse. At that point—in 1951—a U.S. Senate subcommittee, of which I was privileged to be chairman, stepped in and, observers said, saved the day.

That was 12 years ago. Since then, Veterans' Administration medicine has enjoyed outstanding esteem in the eyes of the medical world—and rightly so.

But times and circumstances change. Today, Veterans' Administration medicine confronts significant, albeit more subtle, challenges than in years gone by.

Fortunately, the outlook for those challenges to be successfully met is very bright.

FULL SUPPORT AT HIGHEST LEVEL

President John F. Kennedy and Administrator John S. Gleason are determined that Veterans' Administration medicine shall achieve new peaks of professional excellence.

The three great foundations of medicine—medical care, medical research, and medical education—are each being strengthened.

The key to Veterans' Administration's medical future lies, in considerable part, in the competent hands of the Nation's great medical schools. Today, 87 of the 170 Veterans' Administration facilities are affiliated with 77 medical schools. Some hospitals have multiple affiliation. In each of these hospitals, what are known as deans' committees help to assure the highest possible medical standards.

I cannot speak too strongly of the importance of this type of dynamic, high-level medical sponsorship and monitoring.

As a June 1960 report by a National Academy of Sciences Survey Committee stated on page 2:

> The total effectiveness of the Department of Medicine and Surgery of the Veterans' Administration is undoubtedly more dependent on cooperation with the medical schools than on any other single factor. In the future, with an increase in the competition for professional personnel expected, this relationship will assume even greater importance.

NEED FOR HIGHER PAY

Meanwhile, the Congress, itself, as always, has a vital role to play. This particularly is the case in enabling the Veterans' Administration to compete successfully in the job marketplace, as I have indicated.

The 88th Congress must, in my view, enact additional Federal salary reform legislation. Only thereby can it enable the Veterans' Administration to recruit and keep the highest caliber of medical and paramedical personnel.

A Federal professional pay schedule should be adopted by Congress. If we are to maintain the technical, scientific, and medical personnel the Government requires for providing service to veterans, to the general public, and to the scientific institutes and medical institutes in this country, Congress must promptly act on the professional salary schedules needed to recruit and hold personnel of this kind.

On May 16, 1962, Administrator Gleason made a very strong and well-merited plea, before the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee, on behalf of an adequate system of compensation for Veterans' Administration medical personnel. Many of the observations which he made at that time might well be repeated today. Today the Veterans' Administration cannot effectively compete in the job market with other public and private sources. It has not been able to keep pace with compensation available elsewhere.

The greatest threat today to the medical and surgical programs of the Veterans' Administration is the failure of Congress to adjust the professional salary schedules so that trained and competent scientific personnel can be maintained on the job.

THE MENTAL ILLNESS AND REHABILITATION REVOLUTIONS

Yet, Mr. President, the Veterans' Administration medical program is subject to dynamic change. A great revolution in chemotherapy of tuberculosis has been followed and paralleled to some extent by a revolution in what is known as psychopharmacology. A magnificent opportunity to reduce mental illness confronts the Nation. This is subject, of course, to the proviso that we proceed with all due safeguards in the case of the many powerful new mind medications.

All the while, the Nation's veterans' population is itself subject to the factor of time and aging. More and more, the Veterans' Administration is confronted with the problems of the chronic illnesses and disability characteristic of advanced years.

The Veterans' Administration is beginning pioneering efforts in establishing restoration centers. The Veterans' Administration faces the great opportunity of not only adding years to lives, but also adding lives to years for our senior veterans. More and more, the concept of restoration must take hold. We should not be content until, if it is at all possible, we enable the senior, ill veteran to return to society.

APPREHENSION OVER TRANSFER OF AREA MEDICAL DIRECTORS

In view of all these significant challenges facing the Veterans' Administration, I was particularly concerned in recent days to note much apprehension—as I have already said—among experts as to one particular administrative move in the offing. I refer to the transfer to Washington of the Veterans' Administration area medical directors.

I shall not go now into this subject in detail, except to say that men of unimpeachable medical credentials have expressed to me deep concern over this relocation. Outstanding among those who view the move with deep misgivings is Dr. Paul Magnuson.

Every veteran and every veteran's family in the Nation owes Dr. Paul Magnuson a debt of gratitude for his reforms in the Veterans' Administration's Medical and Surgical Division. He made veterans medicine the finest medicine practiced today in America.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, at this point will the Senator from Minnesota yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McIntyre in the chair). Does the Senator from Minnesota yield to the Senator from New York?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. KEATING. I wish to join in the tribute to Dr. Magnuson. I know of no one in public life who has performed a more significant service than that which Dr. Magnuson has performed for our veterans. No words of praise are too strong for the services of this distinguished man to the Government, and particularly to veterans.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I am very grateful to the Senator from New York for his words of commendation of Dr. Magnuson, and also for his joining me in this expression of our appreciation and our respect for him. Of course, I may also include—as I have previously said—Dr. Hawley, Admiral Booth, and the other medical directors who have served the veterans of this country so faithfully.

I have discussed the issue of the relocation of certain area medical directors at high levels within the executive branch. I have been assured that the move will not impair the professional integrity of the Veterans' Administration medical service in any way, and that it will advance administrative efficiency.

I do not presume to render final judgment on the issue. In all frankness, I have strong doubts over the wisdom of moving Area Medical Directors away from the scene of their immediate responsibility. Inevitably, they will have to spend more time in travel to the field. Inevitably they will become more associated with the Washington scene than they will with the scene and the problems in the areas concerned.

DANGER OF INTERFERENCE WITH VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION MEDICINE

What is more, I am distressed that the move was ordered from the Office of the Administrator, initially unknown to and over the head of the Veterans' Administration Medical Director. The latter was confronted with what amounted to an accomplished fact.

The able Veterans' Administration Medical Director has stated that he does not share this concern over the geographic relocation. I respect his judgment and that of the Administration. But I remind the Veterans' Administration that the Congress has expressed in unmistakable terms the position that the Veterans' Administration Medical Department shall be professionally independent. I have high regard for Mr. Gleason. He is doing a good job as Administrator, and I believe his staff is also doing a good job. But I have previously watched efforts to change the pattern of the Veterans' Administration medical care. I have seen attempts made to get it back into the old bureaucracy, subject to the pressures which come from many political sources. We are not going to let that happen again.

As I have said, in 1951 it was my privilege to step in and stop such a move. This afternoon, I repeat the warning that if there is any attempt to put Veterans' Administration medical and surgical programs under some form of political influence or administrative control that would violate medical standards and professional medical care, I will wage battle against whoever attempts to do it.

In the past, Dr. Magnuson recalls time after time when changes which were regarded as relatively innocuous have been part of a systematic pattern of interference with the professional independence of Veterans' Administration medicine. I repeat: I serve notice that I, for one, do not intend to be silent in the face of any such effort, now or in the future.

That is no threat. It is merely a statement of my concern in respect to the program. I have watched the program for the past 12 years. I have visited many of the veterans' hospitals. I shall do all I can to see that the existing high professional standards are maintained.

The Veterans' Administration's assurances over the situation cannot, however, be lightly dismissed.

At a December 3, 1962, meeting of the Veterans' Administration's Special Medical Advisory Group, Mr. Gleason stated the following noteworthy reasons for bringing the area medical directors to Washington:

> To improve communications between the field and the central office staff; to establish one point of contact in central office for each hospital director; to utilize the central office staff to provide technical program guidance and to advise hospital directors; to provide more uniform supervision and evaluation of field station operations, and to involve those with the most intimate knowledge of field operations (the area medical directors, themselves) in the development of top-level policies and plans.

Dr. William S. Middleton, the present Veterans' Administration Chief Medical Director, is a fine and able public servant. He has volunteered the belief, based on his experience in serving under three Administrators of Veterans' Affairs, that no Administrator has more stanchly supported the Department of Medicine and Surgery than Mr. Gleason. He has strengthened Veterans' Administration ties with deans' committees of the Nation's medical schools; he has insisted that Veterans' Administration hospitals be built near medical schools; he has supported the record appropriations for care and treatment of veterans patients, hospital construction, and medical research.

Mr. President, I concur in Dr. Middleton's opinion. Mr. Gleason is making a fine record as the Veterans' Administrator. I wish to support his efforts. But I want him to know that some of us are standing guard to see that nothing happens to weaken the independence and the professional competence of the medical section of the Veterans' Administration.

The geographic relocation, Mr. Middleton feels, in no way minimizes either the prerogatives or the duties of the Area Medical Director or of the Chief Medical Director.

In summary, the move is regarded, at least by Veterans' Administration, as within the authority of the Administrator, and has been accepted by the Chief Medical Director, who has, as I have indicated, given assurances that it will in no way whatsoever detract from direct patient care.

I have gone into that question with considerable care. I have had a staff member of the Senate Subcommittee on Reorganization look into this situation carefully. My remarks today are the result of that study.

The Congress, however, is under no obligation to accept the relocation, particularly without further examination. I, for one, respectfully suggest that the Senate and House Appropriations Subcommittees with jurisdiction over the Veterans' Administration may wish to look into the merits and disadvantages of the geographic shift. In addition, perhaps our colleagues in the expert House Veterans' Affairs Committee may wish to explore the problem.

Certain people in Veterans' Administration were apparently planning to order the move as far back as 6 years ago. Yet, Mr. Gleason has only been in office 2 years. So, I do not want anyone in Veterans' Administration to get the idea that henceforth the Director of the Medical Department can again be circumvented and presented with an accomplished fact. Nor do I want them to get the idea that the Medical Advisory Committee can be told that a move is going to take place, instead of being consulted whether the idea of a move is sound.

The Medical Advisory Committee is supposed to give advice and not just act as a sounding board for decisions already taken.

In conclusion, I intend to give Veterans' Administration medical needs my close attention. I have ordered my staff on the subcommittee to keep a watchful eye over the program. As a member of the Senate Committee on Appropriations, I am going to keep two watchful eyes on the program.

I may add, on this last point, that while Veterans' Administration has an outstanding record in many respects as regards interagency cooperation, we have found, in some areas—notably as regards drug communication—much to be desired.

So that this record will be complete and so that perspective will be maintained, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed at this point in the Record a Washington Post editorial of February 3, 1963, as regards the relocation move.

I also would like to outline briefly the work performed by the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Subcommittee in 1951 as referred to in the above editorial.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Veterans' Medicine

That indefatigable watchdog of the Veterans' Administration, Dr. Paul B. Magnuson, is barking again. Experience has made it altogether plain that his warnings ought not to be ignored. Politicians and organized veterans' groups, he says, are making another grab for control of VA medicine.

A dozen years ago Dr. Magnuson was fired from his position as director of medical affairs for the Veterans' Administration. The resulting commotion produced a Senate investigation by a subcommittee under the chairmanship of Senator Hubert Humphrey which completely vindicated Dr. Magnuson and blamed the Veterans' Administrator of that time, Carl R. Gray, Jr., for developments which "could conceivably return the VA medical care program to the shambles which made it a national scandal in 1945."

Dr. Magnuson had been fired because he objected vigorously to directives which would have brought the management of Veterans' Administration hospitals and medical facilities directly under the authority of the Administrator, bypassing the Director of Medical Affairs. Now, he asserts, incumbent VA Administrator John S. Gleason, Jr., has inaugurated a similar move, ordering VA regional medical directors to move their offices to Washington and report directly to a deputy VA medical director; and this has been done despite opposition by the retiring Medical Director.

It is easy to understand why a Veterans' Administrator would like to centralize control over medical affairs under his own direct supervision. But there are serious dangers, as Dr. Magnuson has pointed out, in "interference with medical matters by the Administrator which may have a direct bearing on the care and treatment of patients and hospitals." It was precisely this kind of interference which Senator Humphrey's investigating subcommittee excoriated 12 years ago. Perhaps it had better have a fresh look at the situation. The Nation has an inescapable obligation to see to it that the medical care provided for veterans is of the highest professional caliber and wholly free from political overtones and influences.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The danger of collapse of medical reforms within the Veterans' Administration was the subject of an urgent study made in 1951 by a Special Subcommittee To Investigate Veterans' Administration Policies and Practices With Respect to Medical Care.

It was my privilege to serve as chairman of this subcommittee. Four other Members served on the subcommittee: the Senator from Alabama [Mr. Hill], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. Douglas], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. Morse], and the then Senator Richard M. Nixon, of California.

The subcommittee heard direct testimony from Gen. Carl Gray, then Veterans' Administrator, and Dr. Paul B. Magnuson, who had served as Chief Medical Officer until January of that year. All in all, the subcommittee conducted 9 hearings, in February, March, and May 1951, with 25 witnesses. In addition, the subcommittee met in five other sessions at which operations were planned, testimony was analyzed, and recommendations were formulated.

On August 2, 1951, it was my pleasure to file the report of the subcommittee, as approved by the full committee. It appeared as Senate Report No. 610, 82d Congress, 1st session. The report was endorsed by leading medical experts throughout the Nation. It became, they said, a "benchmark" for the highest caliber medical policies in Veterans' Administration. The report itself stressed the role of the deans' committees.

It had reprinted—pages 4–6—the Veterans' Administration policy memorandum No. 2, dated January 30, 1946. That memorandum was entitled "Policy in Association of Veterans Hospitals With Medical Schools." Under it, it noted, each affiliated school of medicine organized a deans' committee, which assumed responsibility for the schools' functions in the program. The deans' committees usually consist of senior faculty members from all schools cooperating in each project, whether or not furnishing any of the attending or resident staff.

The report emphasized, in recommendation No. 1, page 41, that the Chief Medical Director of the Veterans' Administration must be the principal medical authority of the agency with primary authority to control, manage, and operate its medical and hospital program. It recommended that the Chief Medical Director be appointed by the President, and by and with the advice and consent of the Senate—page 45—that the Special Medical Advisory Group be strengthened and be given every possible help.

The report emphasized—page 46—that the medical program on behalf of our Nation's veterans "must be kept dynamic and alert to the continuous scientific advances that are being made in hospital care."

It stressed that "affiliation of hospitals with the medical schools is the only way this can be successfully accomplished." It pointed out that the relationship must rest on mutual confidence and cooperation.

The underlying spirit and guidelines of the report merit, I believe, continued heed and respect.

There is no substitute for professional excellence in medicine and in all the healing arts.

LABOR DEPARTMENT—50 YEARS LATER

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, today we celebrate a significant milestone in the life of our Nation on this, the 50th anniversary of the Labor Department.

Dedicated to promoting the welfare of the wage earner in this country, to improving his working conditions, and to advancing his opportunities for profitable employment, the Department has advanced these goals with distinction.

It has been most instrumental in fostering the dignity of labor in a free society, and on the occasion of its 50th anniversary, I wish to offer my congratulations to the Department, as well as my deep appreciation for the role it has played in seeing to it that the price we pay for our industrial achievements is no longer measured in terms of human sacrifice.

From its small beginnings in 1913, the Department has met the challenges of changing times as the prime architect of our manpower policies in this country. Its able and dedicated Secretaries have helped the Department acquire a reputation for thoughtful and impartial devotion to integrity and objectivity among employers, unions, and the public in general.

Fifty years ago the workingman of this country was ill paid, ill housed, ill fed, and unprotected. Fringe benefits were almost nonexistent. There were few laws governing the safety and health of the workingman, or the child laborer. While prices were lower, the purchase of basic necessities took a far larger bite out of the workingman's pay than is now the case.

Today most of our children are protected against industrial exploitation. The sweatshops and yellow dog contracts are a thing of the past. Wages and working conditions have improved dramatically. Under the influence of many Federal laws, organized labor has risen from a position of ineffectual weakness to one of balanced power with management—a balance that is absolutely necessary to the achievement of the goal outlined by the first Secretary of Labor, "Industrial peace through progressively nearer realization of the highest ideals of industrial justice."

Yes, we have come a long way from the dark days of industrial life in the United States, and much credit must go to our present Secretary of Labor, Willard Wirtz, and all his distinguished predecessors.

But as Secretary Wirtz has pointed out, the challenges facing labor-management relations today are at least "equal in magnitude" to the challenges of 1913. And a key question is, in his words: "Can we make our economy a human as well as a technical success?"

The fact is that, despite areas of affluence, mass poverty still exists in the United States today. Millions of people are still ill paid, ill housed, ill fed, and unprotected. While real wages have been increasing for everyone, the greatest gains are occurring at the upper end of the income scale, not the lower. In fact, the poor are even poorer today than they were years ago in terms of the percentage of the national income they are receiving. And the rate at which poverty is being eliminated has slowed down alarmingly since 1953, according to a recent eloquent article in the New Yorker by Dwight MacDonald.

High and persistent unemployment remains an unsolved problem of the greatest magnitude, and it is being increasingly aggravated by the accelerating rate of automation. We are not only faced with the problem of the millions of unskilled or poorly educated workers who cannot find jobs in the pages of want ads for engineers, scientists, and managerial executives that fill our papers every day, but we are also faced with the problem of people who, because of automation, suddenly find their skills obsolete. They may be ill suited or too old for retraining, or the job opportunities that are available may be far from the communities in which these people have planted deep roots.

In the face of these great challenges to the ability of labor-management relations in a free and democratic society, I have been increasingly disconcerted by the extent to which we, as a nation, seem to have forgotten the lessons of the past.

I have heard people so enraptured by the processes of automation that it seems they will not be satisfied until the last workingman is replaced by a machine. It seems to have escaped many people that the secret of our country's economic success has been the distribution of greater purchasing power in the hands of more and more working men and women, not fewer. Economic prosperity does not lie down the path of fewer jobs, more machines, and a wealthy elite to run them. Automation will indeed be a cruel triumph unless it leads to the creation of more new jobs than it displaces.

Increasingly we seem to hear cries for legislation designed to drastically upset the balance of power between labor and management that has slowly developed over the years, without realizing the implications of the proposed remedy.

Whenever a major, prolonged strike occurs, people begin demanding antistrike legislation and compulsory arbitration in order to protect what they consider the public interest.

Surely we need better mechanisms for dealing with major labor-management disputes, but keeping in mind the importance of a balance of power between labor and management in our kind of society, what power would organized labor have without the right to strike? And if we are to turn the question of wages and working conditions over to the Government or some designated third party, what possible reason would there be for not doing likewise for prices and profits? And then where would we be?

It seems to me that anyone truly interested in the preservation of the private enterprise system as we know it today would think long and hard before recommending such drastic remedies to the problem of major and prolonged strikes affecting the national interest.

The pressure to place labor under the jurisdiction of the antitrust laws also seems to me to be poorly thought out.

The purpose of the antitrust laws is to promote competition among the industries of the Nation to prevent monopoly control over the production and prices of the commodities we need. Aside from the fact that it is pretty difficult these days to find price competition in buying a car, gasoline, and other major commodities, we cannot forget that labor is not a commodity. We are not trying to promote the competition for jobs, or competition to see how little one union is willing to have its members paid.

But even assuming that unions have achieved too much power over the ability to determine wages and working conditions through the economic consequences of their right to strike, what evidence is there that the decentralization of union power would lessen the number of strikes or make labor more "responsible" or less "demanding"? It might, in fact, work just the other way around, for it is quite possible that union officers exercise a restraining influence on their members more often than the members exercise a restraining influence on the union officers.

One could go on to examine other proposals that have been made from time to time, which are based on the premise that "labor has grown too strong," but most of them seem designed to either plunge us back to the dark ages of industrial strife or involve the most dangerous degree of Federal intervention and control.

We have achieved, after years of strife and turmoil, a rough balance of power between labor and management in an atmosphere of freedom from government control.

It is not a perfect arrangement, and sometimes when bitter disputes develop, the public interest suffers very greatly. And at present our only real bulwark lies in the sense of responsibility and fairness on both sides.

But as I believe Winston Churchill once said in another context:

> Democracy is the worst form of government in the world—save all the rest.

Just so, one can argue that the present relationship between labor and management is the worst possible way to serve the interests of our Nation as a whole, but it beats any other system devised so far by mere human beings.

For the accomplishments we have achieved, let us be thankful on this 50th anniversary of the Labor Department, which deserves great credit for those accomplishments. At the same time, let us look for constructive ways to improve the equilibrium of labor-management relations in keeping with the traditions we value as a nation.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD news articles from the Washington Post and Washington Star, and an editorial commemorating the 50th anniversary of the U.S. Department of Labor.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, Mar. 4, 1963]

Labor's 50 Years

As the country observes the 50th anniversary of the Labor Department today, there is a strong inclination to dwell upon the accomplishments of the last half century. The gains for labor have been enormous. When President Taft fixed his signature on the Labor Department bill, the 7-day week was still common, wages were low, child labor was prevalent, safety measures were meager, sick leave, paid vacations, and many other benefits were still dreams of the future. The occasion is likely to be meaningful, however, to the extent that it is used for assessment of the enormous problems still on the labor horizon.

Secretary of Labor W. Willard Wirtz thoughtfully observed that, as his Department begins its second half century, "it carries much of the responsibility for a major decision we must face as a people: Can we make our economy a human as well as a technical success?" The task of the Department is very different from that of 1913, but in many respects it is more baffling and infinitely more complicated.

Today the country is keenly aware of the need for 4 million additional jobs. With all the advance in technology and productivity, the goal of full employment is still elusive. Workers are troubled by the consequences of automation; employers, by the consequences of featherbedding. As a nation, we have an appalling amount of idleness and underutilization of energy and skill. Yet, on the other hand, there are mountainous needs that remain unfilled and surplus capacity and production that are not put to constructive use.

If any simple solution of these maladjustments were at hand, it would doubtless have been applied long ago. In the absence of such a solution, the Labor Department will have a constant struggle to improve the lot of the workingman or, as Secretary Wirtz put it, to make change "the instrument for man's deliverance, instead of permitting it to become the instrument for his destruction."

Fortunately, it is now recognized that improved well-being for the rank and file is itself the goal, although there remains much controversy over how this can best be attained. One thing is certain: the problem will require continued intensive study by the best minds in labor, industry, and Government. And since the Labor Department will remain close to the center of the struggle, it will need to gird itself for still more intensive service.

[From the Washington Star]

Labor Department's Full 50 Years

(By Truman R. Temple)

It took agitation by the labor movement from the end of the Civil War to the eve of World War I to create it.

When the Department was created by a stroke of President Taft's pen on his last day of office March 4, 1913, 18,000 children were working underground in mines.

Two years earlier, 146 workers at the Triangle Waist Co. in New York had been killed in a fire. A little-known social worker named Frances Perkins, who happened on the scene, watched in horror as some of the women leaped from windows to their death. She later pushed through a new State code for factories before becoming Secretary of Labor.

THE CLIMATE

Five men were killed in work accidents for every million tons of coal mined in 1913. One railroad worker in 500 lost his life on the job. Less than half the States had any workmen's compensation laws. Unemployment insurance did not exist, and 23 years would pass before it came into being.

It was this kind of climate that gave birth to the U.S. Department of Labor. Tomorrow President Kennedy will join with labor and management leaders at a banquet in the Sheraton-Park Hotel celebrating the agency's 50th birthday, in a climate so changed that observers would be hard pressed to find any similarities with 1913.

Today the American wage earner is the envy and the model for the rest of the world. A large measure of his well-being can be attributed to the Department here that administers the many laws protecting him.

In its first half century, the Labor Department has scored some unusual firsts. It was the first of Cabinet rank to be headed by a woman, Frances Perkins—who incidentally will attend tomorrow's ceremonies.

Her appointment by F.D.R. in 1933 was not hailed with joy by American unions. The head of the AFL said Miss Perkins was a charming lady but unacceptable to organized labor. Unimpressed, she went on to hold office for 12 years, longer than any other Secretary before or since.

Labor also remains the smallest of all Cabinet rank departments, with only 8,642 employees last year compared to 64,762 in Interior, 110,934 in Agriculture, over 1 million in the Defense Department. And its budget was $563 million, compared to $873 million for Interior, $7.1 billion for Agriculture, and $49 billion for Defense.

Among other firsts, Labor can claim authorship of the alltime publication, "Infant Care," first printed in 1913. More than 45 million copies have been published and a new 11th edition will appear next month.

THE PRESENT SECRETARY

The current Secretary, W. Willard Wirtz, is considered the wittiest of Cabinet members. He once served as a member of the Illinois Liquor Control Commission and of the Winnetka, Ill., Library Board for 5 years, and recalled later, "I got to the point that every time I opened a book I felt compelled to open a bottle. It was a spiritual experience, and one which I must say prepared me for this tour of duty in Washington beyond any I can imagine."

Should the Labor Department race from one major strike to another like a Federal fire department? Under Secretary Goldberg, now safely transferred to the quieter realm of the Supreme Court, it often seemed so. In fact aids once contemplated equipping his office with an alarm bell and fire chief's hat.

DIFFERENT IDEAS

But neither Mr. Wirtz nor Miss Perkins hold this view, though the present Secretary has won some notable settlements. "Many people have the idea," Miss Perkins said on the Department's 25th anniversary "that the Government has the right to intervene in strikes and settle disputes, to step in between warring labor factions.

"It cannot dictate any settlement in either case. If it could, this country would not be a democracy. This Department can only help each side to see the other's point of view and to endeavor to point a way to a settlement which will be satisfactory to both sides."

In any event, it seems likely no Labor Secretary could sustain Mr. Goldberg's phenomenal run of luck in ending strikes including one at the Metropolitan Opera, traditional haven of temperament, even if he wanted to. And as one observer warned on White House interventions, "If the President hangs out his shingle, he's going to get all the business."

Like others before him, the present Labor Secretary sees the Department's basic challenges in long-range problems of full employment, manpower retraining and the like.

He accepts the problems of change, even though he once remarked that history "ought to be arrested for reckless driving." In looking back at the Department's first half century, Mr. Wirtz notes that change has been its steady companion.

In World War I it was embroiled in supplying manpower to win the war. In following years it worked for more security for workers hit by technological change to mass production.

MANY ACTIVITIES

After the 1929 crash, the Department added many activities—the national employment service, wage and hour law enforcement, apprenticeship and training, and new labor standards to improve working conditions.

In this era other agencies were removed, including Immigration and Naturalization, the Children's Bureau, and the Mediation and Conciliation Service. The Hoover Commission urged putting some back, but they remain elsewhere.

As Mr. Wirtz remarks, in a statement prepared for its golden anniversary tomorrow, "The history of the Department is thus a record of response to change, always the welfare of the American worker and his family dominating the aims, thoughts, efforts and actions of the Department."

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Mar. 3, 1963]

Labor Department Is 50 Years Old, and It Took a Taft To Start It

(By Morton Mintz)

Although the Government had been in labor since 1884, when it established a Bureau of Labor in the Interior Department, it didn't give birth to a full-fledged Department until March 4, 1913.

The 29-year gestation period ended when President William Howard Taft, on his last day in office, signed the law bringing the Department of Labor into the world—a world in which the working man, the working woman, and the working child need all the help they could get.

Monday is the 50th anniversary of the Department. The anniversary will be observed with regional banquets and conferences in 16 cities.

The Washington banquet, which will follow other special events during the day, will be held Monday night at the Sheraton-Park. President Kennedy, Labor Secretary W. Willard Wirtz, three former Secretaries—Frances Perkins, James P. Mitchell, and Justice Arthur J. Goldberg—and leaders of industry, the AFL-CIO, and the three branches of Government are among those scheduled to attend.

TO IMPROVE CONDITIONS

The law that created the Department said its purpose was "to foster, promote, and develop the welfare of the wage earners of the United States, to improve their working conditions, and to advance their opportunities for profitable employment."

Today few would question that the law's purpose reflected compelling needs.

A 1913 Government report, for example, said that almost 30 percent of the Nation's steelworkers were on a 7-day week, that some worked 18 to 24 hours without letup, and that two out of five worked 72 or more hours a week.

The report said that 42 percent were earning less than 18 cents an hour, with a weekly potential maximum of $12.50. From their pay, deductions were made for such things as ice water, disablement funds, medical fees, rent for company houses and identification badges.

Owning almost everything in towns where many workers lived, employers could charge what they wished for rent, transportation, and even food.

In the 1st decade of the 20th century there were few laws governing safety, health, sanitary conditions, or child labor. Sick leave, paid vacations, and other fringe benefits were virtually unknown.

A common laborer toiled 50 hours a week for an average of $11—and a child may have worked beside him under dangerous conditions. Illness or old age could cut off his income.

More than 40 percent of his take-home pay went for food, beverages, and tobacco—compared with about 25 percent today. A suit of clothes took 75 hours' work—compared with 20 hours today.

To the Department's 10th Secretary the task today is equal in magnitude to the challenges of 1913.

In an anniversary statement, Wirtz said that the Department "carries much of the responsibility for a major decision we must face as a people: Can we make our economy a human as well as a technical success?"

The Secretary said that we have today "an economy so forward and aggressive in its technical ability that it has outstripped the skills of millions of persons, deprived itself of that many consumers, and come to an impasse of demand. * * *

"As framer of the manpower policies of this Nation, the Department of Labor must keep pace with the scientific advancements that offer promise of man's fulfillment.

"We have the responsibility of developing those programs which will safeguard the person who may, as an individual, be adversely affected by a technological development which greatly benefits the community as a whole. * * *

"We are going to have to review our seniority, our job-right systems, our employment security programs, and our retirement programs in order to find ways of insuring man's rights despite his displacement by a machine."

Of the four units that comprised the Department when it was born, only the Bureau of Labor Statistics remains in it. Within the last quarter century the Bureau of Immigration was transferred to the Justice Department and the Children's Bureau to what is now the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. The Mediation and Conciliation Service has become an independent agency.

But changing times have brought changing needs, and the Department's activities and responsibilities are now of a scope that could not have been imagined 50 years ago.

EMPLOYMENT SERVICE

They include career counseling for women, reemployment help to veterans, the U.S. Employment Service, training in labor subjects for about a thousand foreign visitors annually, apprenticeship and training programs, publication of the Dictionary of Occupational Titles (a new edition will list about 40,000), studies of the chronically unemployed, thousands of investigations to assure compliance with the Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act, help in retraining jobless workers (an estimated 400,000 in the next 3 years) and enforcement of fair labor standards.

"During its first half century of service to the United States," Wirtz said, "the concern of the Department of Labor can be expressed in one word: People. Human welfare remains its interest."

CREATION OF IDAHO TERRITORY

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, 100 years ago yesterday this body amended and passed House bill No. 738. The House of Representatives subsequently concurred in the amendments, passed the bill, and it was rushed to the White House and there signed—on March 3, 1863—by President Abraham Lincoln.

This was the historic legislative act, Mr. President, which created the Territory of Idaho.

Establishment of this vast government, which included much of the present States of Idaho, Montana, and Wyoming—as it was first created—was the preliminary to Idaho's entrance into the Union as the 43d State. Even then, statehood did not come until 1890.

In 1863, this new territory was a mountain wilderness, and other than various tribes of Indians, its only population several thousand miners who had flocked to rich diggings on the Clearwater and Salmon Rivers in the north and Boise Basin in the south.

It has been said that Idaho was born in a gold pan; it was not until after 1860, when a handful of adventurers led by Capt. E. D. Pierce, discovered gold on Orofino Creek in the Clearwater River watershed, that a brave young population washed into the mountain wilderness and set up housekeeping. Prior to this, only hardy Mormon settlers from Utah had ventured into southern Idaho seeking a permanent settlement; this region was primarily a path for the Oregon Trail, and before that had known only the explorers and the fur traders.

But with the wave of miners came a demand for foodstuffs, freighting, professional services, and other requirements for existence. Settlements grew where trails bisected the mining traffic, and roads followed. Establishment of the Territory in 1863 brought the framework for law and order, social and economic progress.

It is remarkable that a Congress, so concerned with the problems of a tragic war, could at this particular time respond to the needs of tiny frontier settlements more than 2,000 miles to the west. I have just completed reading the Congressional Globe, forerunner of our present CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, for the 3d session of the 37th Congress, which convened on December 1, 1862, and adjourned in March 1863. In these detailed accounts of the debates concerning the war and its many ramifications, is sandwiched the story of the creation of Idaho Territory. It is most interesting to note that but for the lateness of the bill's consideration, and the insistence of Senator Henry Wilson, of Massachusetts, Idaho Territory might never have existed but would have been Montana Territory instead.

An outstanding historian-teacher of Idaho, Miss Annie Laurie Bird, of Nampa, recently suggested that the account from the Congressional Globe might well be compiled in digest form for the benefit of future historians. I believe this should be done in this territorial centennial year, and I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, to insert in the RECORD these highlights of that important and historic legislative action.

There being no objection, the matters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Congressional Globe, Dec. 15, 1862 (House)]

PROPOSED NEW TERRITORY

Mr. KELLOGG, of Illinois. I was absent when the State of Illinois was called, and ask consent now to introduce a resolution of inquiry.

No objection being made, Mr. Kellogg, of Illinois, submitted the following resolution; which was read, considered and agreed to:

"*Resolved,* That the Committee on Territories be instructed to inquire into the propriety of establishing a territorial government for that region of country in which are situate the Salmon River gold mines; and that they report by bill or otherwise."

[From the Congressional Globe, Dec. 22, 1862 (House)]

TERRITORY OF IDAHO

Mr. Ashley also introduced a bill to provide a temporary government for the Territory of Idaho; which was read a first and second time, and referred to the Committee on Territories.

[From the Congressional Globe, Feb. 11, 1863 (House)]

TERRITORY OF MONTANA

Mr. Ashley, from the Committee on Territories, reported back House bill No. 626, to provide a temporary government for the Territory of Montana; which was ordered to be printed, and recommitted to the same committee.

[From the Congressional Globe, Feb. 12, 1863 (Senate)]

BILLS INTRODUCED

Mr. Lane, of Kansas, asked, and by unanimous consent obtained leave to introduce a bill (S. No. 521) to provide a temporary government for the Territory of Montana; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Territories.

[From the Congressional Globe, Feb. 12, 1863 (House)]

MONTANA

Mr. Ashley, from the Committee on Territories, reported back House bill No. 738, to provide a temporary government for the Territory of Montana, with the recommendation that it do pass.

(Editor's Note.—Minor changes in wording of bill made following debate.)

Mr. Allen, of Ohio, demanded the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and it was decided in the affirmative—yeas 85, nays 39.

So the bill was passed.

[From the Congressional Globe, Feb. 13, 1863 (Senate)]

Message From the House

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Etheridge, its Clerk, announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

A bill (No. 707) making appropriations for the construction, preservation, and repairs of certain fortifications and other works of defense for the year ending 30th of June 1864; and

A bill (No. 738) to provide a temporary government for the Territory of Montana.

(The bill was referred to the Committee on Territories.)

[From the Congressional Globe, Saturday, Feb. 14, 1863 (Senate)]

Reports From Committees

Mr. Wade, from the Committee on Territories, to whom was referred the bill (H.R. No. 738) to provide a temporary government for the Territory of Montana, reported it without amendment.

[From the Congressional Globe, Mar. 3, 1863 (Senate)]

Provisional Governments

(Editor's Note.—The Senate began consideration of S. No. 200, a bill to establish provisional governments, and a move to "lay it on the table" failed; a move to adjourn the Senate also failed.)

The **Presiding Officer**. There is a question before the Senate. The question is on the amendment of the Senator from Virginia to the amendment of the Senator from New York to Senate bill No. 200.

Mr. **Wilkinson**. I move to lay aside the pending bill and all other orders, and take up House bill No. 738, providing for a temporary government for the Territory of Montana.

Mr. **Harris**. I hope not.

Mr. **Wilkinson**. This bill has passed the House of Representatives, and I think it is necessary that it should pass this body. I am in favor of the bill which is now before the Senate, but I do not believe it can pass; or if it passes this body, it certainly cannot pass the other. It seems to me entirely futile to undertake to press it at this late day of the session.

The **Presiding Officer**. The Senator from Minnesota moves to postpone the pending bill and all prior orders, and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the bill indicated by him.

Mr. **Harris**. I hope that motion will not prevail. I hope we shall have action on this bill. * * * The question is whether or not the President shall go on appointing Governors for the rebel States, as we get possession of them, without any authority, perhaps, of law, as a mere matter of necessity, or whether we shall regulate it by act of Congress * * *.

Mr. **Wilkinson**. If I thought the Senate could come to any decision on the Senator's bill without a long discussion, I would not urge this motion; but I do not believe it can. I believe there is great diversity of opinion here, and I am satisfied the bill will be strenuously opposed. I therefore move that it be laid aside, and that the Senate proceed to consider the bill which I have named.

Mr. **Sumner**. I would suggest to my friend from Minnesota that perhaps it would be better to proceed with the consideration of the bill now in charge of the Senator from New York. If there be such opposition to it as the Senator anticipates, we shall then know it. I am not aware of it now. Besides, the Senator says if the bill passes the Senate, it cannot pass the House of Representatives. Now, I am of opinion that if it passes the Senate it can pass the House of Representatives.

Mr. **Wilkinson**. I may be mistaken about that.

Mr. **Sumner**. That is my idea; and on the whole, I think we had better make the experiment.

Mr. **Doolittle**. I agree with the Senator from Minnesota. I am a practical man. I do not believe, practically, that you can pass this bill through the Senate and the House of Representatives at the present stage of the session. It is a bill which will necessarily lead to debate both in this House and the House of Representatives; and we are now in the last day of the session. The bill which he proposes to take up, to organize the territory of Montana, is a practical measure; it has passed the House of Representatives; it is simply pending in this body, awaiting action here. We can take it up and pass it. It is important that it should be passed. The territory of Montana is an important territory, with great gold mines in it, and with a large population in it already.

Mr. **Grimes**. Where is it?

Mr. **Doolittle**. North of Utah, taking what lies east of Oregon and east of Washington territory, and north of Utah, and taking a portion of Dakota, embracing the fine gold mines and a large population.

(Editor's Note.—Some debate left out here.)

Mr. **Nesmith**. I trust that the motion of the Senator from Minnesota will prevail. There is a very great necessity for the organization of the proposed territory. There are today from 15,000 to 20,000 persons there. They are remotely situated, some 500 or 1,000 miles from any seat of government. There have been recent discoveries of rich gold mines there; and I have no doubt that within the next 4 or 5 months there will be 50,000 or 60,000 people there, who will be entirely without law or municipal regulation for their government unless this bill shall pass. A class of people go there whom it is necessary to have some regulation to control. I trust therefore the bill will be taken up for the benefit of the people who are there without law and without government.

Mr. **Harris**. Mr. President, I do not forget that this is the last evening of the session. Now, sir, in relation to the bill to organize the territory of Montana, if I am correctly informed, it is a bill of very doubtful expediency, and one which may well be postponed until another session of the Congress.

The **President** pro tempore. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Minnesota that the Senate postpone the pending and all prior orders, and proceed to the consideration of the bill to organize the territory of Montana.

Mr. **Harris** called for the yeas and nays; and they were ordered.

Mr. **Howe**. I beg to offer just this word upon this motion; I shall vote against it, because however important it may be to organize a government for the territory of Montana, I do conceive and submit that its importance is utterly insignificant compared with that of organizing governments for this large body of people, spread out between us and the Gulf of Mexico, who for the last 2 years have been subject to two rules, a military rule, which, however well adapted it may be to the government of military men, is utterly unfitted for the government and regulation of civil society * * *.

(Editor's Note.—Senators here continued their discussion of the bill to provide provisional governments.)

Mr. **Harding**. Mr. President, the territory proposed to be organized under a territorial government by the bill referred to by the Senator from Minnesota has not at this time a population exceeding probably 5,000. During the last summer, in the mining district known as the Salmon River mines, there were probably 10,000 persons. The usual severity of the winter in that country has induced most of those miners to leave there and go to the lower country for the winter. Since August, other mines have been discovered on Boise River, where there are now probably from two to three thousand miners at work, according to the best information we can get. In the Salmon River mines there are now probably one, two, or three thousand miners altogether.

The territory included in the boundaries fixed in the bill contains but little agricultural country, and there are, probably, not today more than a few dozen families residing within that territory; but all the accounts we receive from there show that the mines are very rich, and that large numbers of people intend to go there early this spring. I suppose the prospects of the territory are as good today as the prospects of Nevada were the day its territorial organization was completed.

As the bill now stands I cannot vote for it, because it does not include the population east of the Cascade Mountains who desire a territorial organization; but by a proper amendment I think the bill can be made a good one. I hope it will be taken up and amended, and then passed.

Mr. **Lane** of Kansas. The Senator from Oregon, in his estimate of the population, does not count the people on the eastern slope of the mountains.

Mr. **Harding**. That is so. I know nothing of the eastern slope of the Rocky Mountains on this side. I only speak of the western side.

Mr. **Lane** of Kansas. The delegate from Dakota estimates the number of miners on the eastern slope of the mountains as equal to the number given by the Senator from Oregon, which would make a population of from 8,000 to 10,000 persons. I do hope that the Montana bill will be passed; and that then we shall take up the bill to enable Nevada and Colorado to form State governments, and pass them.

The question being taken by yeas and nays on Mr. Wilkinson's motion, resulted—yeas 22, nays 13.

TERRITORY OF MONTANA, OR IDAHO

So the motion was agreed to, and the bill (H.R. 738) to organize the Territory of Montana was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

Mr. **Wilson** of Massachusetts. I move to strike out the name of the territory, and insert "Idaho." Montana is no name at all.

Mr. **Doolittle**. I hope not. I hope there will be no amendment at all. Montana sounds just as well as Idaho.

Mr. **Wilson** of Massachusetts. It has no meaning. The other has.

Mr. **Doolittle**. It has a meaning; it refers to the mountainous character of the country.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. **Harding**. I move to strike out of the first section all after the words "to wit," in the fourth line, to the word "the" in the 26th line, being the boundaries of the proposed territory, and in lieu of the words stricken out to insert:

"Beginning at a point to the middle channel of the Snake River, where the northern boundary of Oregon intersects the same; then following down said channel of Snake River to a point opposite the mouth of the Kooskooskia or Clearwater River; thence due north to the 49th parallel of latitude; thence east along said parallel to the 27th degree of longitude, west of Washington; thence south along said degree of longitude to the northern boundary of Colorado Territory; thence west along said boundary to the 33d degree of longitude west of Washington; thence north along said degree to the 42d parallel of latitude; thence west along said parallel to the eastern boundary of the State of Oregon; thence north along said boundary to the place of beginning."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

Mr. WILSON of Massachusetts. I renew the amendment to change the name from "Montana" to "Idaho."

Mr. DOOLITTLE. As the bill has already been amended, and will have to go back to the House of Representatives, I do not care much about the name; and if it pleases my honorable friend from Massachusetts to call it Idaho instead of Montana, I am willing to yield to his suggestion.

Mr. HARDING. I think the name of Idaho is much preferable to Montana. Montana, to my mind, signifies nothing at all. Idaho, in English, signifies "the gem of the mountains." This is a mountainous country, and the name Idaho is well understood in signification and orthography in all that country; and I prefer it to the present name.

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time. The bill was read the third time.

Mr. Carlile called for yeas and nays on the passage of the bill, and they were ordered; and being taken, resulted—yeas 25, nays 12.

So the bill was passed.

The title was amended by striking out "Montana" and inserting "Idaho."

[From the Congressional Globe, Mar. 3, 1863 (House)]

TERRITORY OF MONTANA

An act (H.R. 738) to provide a temporary government for the Territory of Montana, returned from the Senate with amendments.

The amendments were read.

Mr. ASHLEY. I move that the House nonconcur in the Senate amendments, and ask a committee of conference.

Mr. SARGENT. I hope that will not be done. I should somewhat hesitate to try the experiment of the gentleman from Ohio, a friend of this bill, at this very late hour of the session, thereby sending it back to the Senate, and hence to a committee of conference. I am as desirous of the passage of this bill as he is, but at the same time it is better to concur in the Senate amendments as they now stand, rather than to risk the loss of the bill entirely.

Mr. ASHLEY. I am very much obliged to the gentleman from California for his advice. The Committee on Territories have had this matter in charge, and I ask this House to nonconcur in the Senate amendments, and ask a committee of conference.

Mr. SARGENT. I was not offering advice to the gentleman from Ohio. I do not presume to give him information on this or any subject; but as the bill relates to the erection of a Territory upon the Pacific, and as I am anxious for the passage of the bill, as I believe the gentleman himself is, I suggested to the House—not to the gentleman—that it might be well not to hazard the passage of the bill by nonconcurring in the amendments of the Senate at this late hour of the session. That seems to me to be good policy. I made the suggestion to the House, and the gentleman is under no obligation to me. I call the previous question.

The previous question was seconded, and the main question ordered.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Is this a mere contest between the two names of Montana and Idaho?

Mr. ASHLEY. Oh, no; there is a change in the boundaries as well as in the name. I call for tellers on concurring in the amendments of the Senate.

The tellers were not ordered.

The amendments were concurred in—ayes 65, noes 33.

[From the Congressional Globe, Mar. 3, 1863 (Senate)]

BILLS BECOME LAWS

A message from the President of the United States, by Mr. Nicolay, his Secretary, announced that the President had this day, approved and signed the following bills and joint resolutions:

A bill (H.R. No. 738) to provide a temporary government for the Territory of Idaho.

SETTLEMENT OF GENERAL ANILINE & FILM CORP. CASE

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, last year I was pleased to support the bill authorizing the sale of the last major industry still held by the Federal Government under the alien property laws. Litigation over the ownership of General Analine & Film Corp. had continued for many years. It had come before the Supreme Court on two occasions. During this extended period, the corporation did not develop its full potential. It was clear that, if General Analine was to grow and extend its employment rolls, it should compete in the market on the same basis as did other private firms and under private management. The bill we passed last year was the necessary first step in bringing about that result.

Yesterday the Attorney General announced that an agreement for the sale of General Aniline had been completed. I ask unanimous consent that a press release from the Department of Justice concerning this matter be printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the release was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE,
March 3, 1963.

Attorney General Robert F. Kennedy today announced that the Department of Justice has secured an agreement in principle which will permit the Government both to sell the General Aniline & Film Corp. and to conclude 20 years of legal dispute over its ownership.

Mr. Kennedy said the agreement was reached with representatives of Interhandel, a Swiss holding company, which since 1943 has contested the Government's seizure of General Aniline as an enemy asset in 1942.

If the agreement is approved by Interhandel's stockholders and the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia, the Attorney General will be able without further litigation to sell General Aniline on a competitive bid basis as authorized by Congress last fall, and divide the proceeds according to specific terms.

Mr. Kennedy said the exact amount each side would receive cannot be known until the sales price is known. However, if the sales price, as an example, is $200 million, the Government would receive about $140 million and Interhandel about $60 million, Mr. Kennedy said. If the price were $250 million, the Government's share would be about $170 million and Interhandel's about $85 million.

If the sales price were higher, Mr. Kennedy said, both the Government and Interhandel would receive correspondingly larger amounts.

General Aniline, known as GAF, is a large chemical and dye manufacturer, whose products include Ansco photographic equipment. Its headquarters are in New York City and it has plants in New York, New Jersey, Alabama, California, Kentucky, Pennsylvania, Ohio, and Texas.

The Government seized 93.5 percent of the stock of the company in 1942 as a German asset under the Trading With the Enemy Act. Interhandel began administrative recovery action February 1, 1943, and took the case to the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia, October 29, 1948.

Interhandel has claimed that it, a Swiss corporation—and thus not a company of an enemy country—owned 89 percent of the stock seized. The Government has contended that Interhandel did not own the stock but was in reality a cloak for the actual owner, the I. G. Farbenindustrie, A.G., a giant German industrial firm.

The case has gone to the International Court of Justice once, the Supreme Court of the United States twice, the court of appeals a number of times and still has not come to trial. The case now is before a special master appointed by the district court.

Mr. Kennedy said Interhandel stockholders are expected to vote on the proposed settlement this month. If they approve, the Government and Interhandel would enter into a consent judgment, subject to the approval of the district court.

"The General Aniline Co. has been controlled by the Government through four administrations," Mr. Kennedy said. "The Government has sought to let the company operate in as free and competitive a manner as possible. In recent years, the company has done well and its net income in the first 6 months of 1962 was the highest in history.

"Nevertheless, our fundamental aim throughout has been for the Government to step out of its unnatural role as the owner of a private corporation, and to end the extensive litigation in this case.

"It is already the second oldest proceeding still pending in the Department of Justice. Substantial questions of fact and law still remain to be decided, both in American courts and in the International Court of Justice. Such litigation might last for a decade or longer.

"Even if the Government were to seek to sell General Aniline, as authorized in the Sales Act," Mr. Kennedy said, "the Government would be faced with from 1 to 3 years of litigation over its right to do so." "As soon as we would try to sell," he said, "the constitutionality of the Sales Act almost certainly would be challenged immediately.

"This settlement would permit us to sell the company to the highest American bidder; to increase considerably the war claims fund with our sales proceeds; to settle the pending claims in an equitable manner; and to bring to an end one of the longest and most complex court actions in history."

Since Interhandel has contested the ownership of only 89 percent of the GAF stock owned by the Government, the first 11 percent of the sales proceeds would go to the Government.

The proposed settlement provides that Interhandel and the Government each will receive half the proceeds from the remaining 89 percent. However, the settlement also provides that Interhandel, out of its share, would pay the Government nearly $24 million and will assume the defense of claim by 1,800 stockholders who have intervened in the suit, paying such claims as may be successful.

The $24 million payment would be for a disputed tax claim of $17,500,000 against Interhandel and for $6,430,000 on Interhandel shares previously accepted by the Government as dividends.

The proposed settlement also provides that the Government would retain $5,277,000 in cash dividends and cash seized at the time of the General Aniline seizure.

Interhandel representatives have given assurances that payment to the Swiss will be accomplished in a manner which will not adversely affect the U.S. balance-of-payments position.

The Attorney General will appoint a committee of financial experts to advise him on when and how to conduct the sealed-bid sale in order to secure the highest price. Mr. Kennedy said he would request Interhandel to suggest the name of at least one American expert to serve on this committee.

Government proceeds from the sale of GAF would go, by law and like other proceeds from alien property sales, into the War Claims Fund. This fund is used to pay claims to American citizens for injuries and property damage suffered at the hands of enemies during World War II and for other claims authorized by Congress.

Legal negotiations were conducted over a period of months with Dr. Alfred Schaefer, chairman of the board of Interhandel, John J. Wilson, Washington counsel for Interhandel in the long litigation and other representatives of the company, Mr. Kennedy said.

Interhandel's full name is the Societe Internationale pour Participations Industrielles et Commerciales S.A. "Interhandel" comes from its name in German, the International Industrie und Handelsbeteiligungen A.G., previously known as I. G. Chemie. The firm's headquarters are in Basle, Switzerland.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I am glad to see this long-delayed move get underway. I commend the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART], and the Senator from New York [Mr. KEATING], for their persistence in bringing about the passage of the enabling legislation; and I commend the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON] for his long study of the basic problem of vested enemy assets. I hope we will see the fruits of this sale in the form of higher employment, a vigorous management policy, and increased competition in the industry.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, last year Congress enacted legislation permitting the early return of the vast General Aniline & Film Co. to private American enterprise after 20 years of Government control. A bipartisan group in the House and Senate—led by Representatives HOWARD W. ROBISON and LEO O'BRIEN—joined several of us in the Senate in bringing this legislation to fruition after many years of delay and obstruction by its opponents. It was our view that this important company and its thousands of employees could reach levels of growth and prosperity under private enterprise which could not possibly be attained under continued Government management.

The Department of Justice has advised me that passage of this General Aniline & Film Co. sale legislation significantly strengthened the Government's hand in the negotiations leading to a settlement of the long drawn-out litigation over the ownership of General Aniline & Film Co. and that the actual sale of General Aniline & Film Co. will be accomplished on a competitive bid basis as authorized in the sale legislation. Certainly all of those who worked for the sale bill are delighted with its important contribution to the Government's efforts in this case.

It should be made clear, however, that under our bill, General Aniline & Film Co. could have been sold without any settlement of the pending suit and that nothing in our bill required a settlement on any particular terms.

It was the publicly stated position of the Department of Justice that any challenge to a sale of General Aniline & Film Co. during the pendency of the ownership litigation would be successfully overcome within a year.

Under these circumstances the terms of settlement are bound to strike some observers as extremely generous from the point of view of the United States. What the United States has agreed to, in effect, is a 50–50 split with Interhandel in the proceeds of the sale of the contested shares of stock with Interhandel agreeing to absorb tax and other claims in the neighborhood of some $24 million out of its share. The net total payment to Interhandel under these arrangements could exceed $60 million.

Any settlement of this magnitude deserves close scrutiny to make certain that it is in the interests of the United States. In the first instance, this will be the task of the district court, which will have to approve any consent judgment submitted by the parties. But, Congress also has a legitimate concern in this transaction, and congressional study of the settlement would not be at all inappropriate.

There is no suggestion that the Department of Justice has not been sufficiently zealous in the protection of the interests of the United States in arriving at this settlement. I recognize as a lawyer that there is no certainty in any. lawsuit and also that a settlement will lead to the disposition of GAF with the least amount of further delay.

At the same time, we cannot lose sight of a number of salient facts: First, that GAF is an extremely valuable asset of the Government; secondly, that hundreds of millions of dollars have been realized by the Government for payment to American war claimants out of the sales of other vested assets, in most cases with no settlement at all with the former owners and in no case with a settlement approaching this amount; thirdly, that any amount paid to Interhandel as a result of the sale of the stock of GAF will reduce the funds which would be available for payment to American war claimants—some of whom have received nothing on their war claims to this very day.

Charges have been made that a Government deal to turn GAF over to a Swiss cartel has been concluded under the direction of William H. Orrick, Jr., now Deputy Under Secretary of State and formerly Assistant Attorney General. The settlement announced today makes it obvious that these charges are without foundation. Under no view of the settlement can it be fairly said to constitute a transfer of GAF to Swiss control. On the contrary this settlement will guarantee, in accordance with the GAF sale bill, that GAF will be sold to American interests and never be returned, whether to its former German or alleged Swiss owners.

In order that the record may be complete on this issue, I ask unanimous consent to include at this point in my remarks the text of a February 13, 1963, letter from me to Mr. Orrick on this very point and Mr. Orrick's reply of February 19.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FEBRUARY 13, 1963.

Mr. WILLIAM H. ORRICK, Jr.,
Deputy Under Secretary of State for Administration, Department of State, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. ORRICK: It has been reported to me that you are in charge of negotiations for a possible settlement of the General Aniline case.

As you know, legislation was enacted during the last session of Congress authorizing the Government to sell this property despite the pending litigation as to its ownership. In my judgment, the continued operation of this company under Government management is a severe handicap to its growth and prosperity. Its sale to private enterprise on favorable terms, therefore, is a matter of considerable importance to the thousands of employees of the company and the communities in which it operates.

In the hearings on this legislation, Government representatives expressed complete confidence in the ultimate outcome of the pending litigation and any new suit challenging the constitutionality of the sale bill. Under these circumstances, I am concerned about the reports that the Government is contemplating a settlement which may involve a substantial payment to the litigants and which may serve to delay unreasonably the Government's disposition of this property.

Since this is a matter of particular importance to several areas in the State of New York, I would appreciate your furnishing me with full information with respect to this situation.

Your cooperation, as always, is very gratifying.

Very sincerely yours,
KENNETH B. KEATING.

FEBRUARY 19, 1963.

Hon. KENNETH B. KEATING,
U.S. Senate.

DEAR SENATOR KEATING: I have your letter of February 13 and appreciate your natural concern in the disposition of the General Aniline case.

As you undoubtedly know, I was intimately involved in this case when I was Assistant Attorney General in charge of the Civil Divison. However, since I have been working in the Department of State for the last 9 months, I no longer have any direct responsibility over the General Aniline case, nor am I in charge of any of the negotiations which may look toward the eventual settlement of the case.

I can assure you, however, that from my experience in the Department of Justice and from my knowledge of the Attorney General's view of the case, the Government would not enter into any settlement which did not coincide with a fair estimate of the Government's case on the merits, or which would unreasonably delay the Government's disposal of the property.

May I suggest that the present officials in the Department of Justice would be in a better position than I to furnish you with a more complete and up-to-date status of any negotiations which may be in progress.

With best wishes, I remain,
Sincerely yours,
WILLIAM H. ORRICK, Jr.

Mr. KEATING. As will be noted, Mr. Orrick's reply categorically denies that he has had any direct responsibility over the General Aniline & Film case since joining the Department of State or that he is in charge of any of the negotiations which may look toward the eventual settlement of the case. I am disclosing this exchange of correspondence at this time in fairness to Mr. Orrick.

It may very well be that Swiss pressures were a factor in the willingness of U.S. officials to agree to the generous terms of this settlement. The General Aniline & Film litigation has been an irritant in United States-Swiss relations ever since Interhandel filed its suit, and I know that our Ambassador to Switzerland has been anxious for a settlement. In these circumstances, it is not unlikely that foreign policy considerations played as important a role as the merits of the case in inducing the United States to accept a 50-50 share of the proceeds with Interhandel.

General Aniline & Film is a major American concern with important facilities in a number of areas in New York. My major concern always has been to allow this company to operate under conditions which would best promote the welfare of the communities in which it operates and its thousands of employees. For this reason I am gratified that as a result of the General Aniline & Film sale bill we have moved very close to the day when this company can become part of the mainstream of our free enterprise system and reach its full potential of growth and prosperity, for the benefit of the stockholders, the employees, and the communities where the plants are located, all of whom have been unanimous in their desire to remove the dead hand of the Government from this company and return it to the free enterprise system.

I am hopeful also that this objective will be accomplished in a manner which fully protects and safeguards the interest of the United States.

CONTRADICTIONS ON CUBA

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, as new and alarming information on Cuba comes to light, many persons are asking if the United States suffers from an intelligence gap.

It is becoming clearer each day that no such gap exists. The events of the past year, as the story of Soviet-Cuban aggression has slowly and painfully unwound, have shown that our intelligence community is hard at work, producing accurate information—in other words, "doing the job."

We do suffer, however, from unwillingness of our top officials to believe what our intelligence produces, from attempts to gloss over facts revealed by our intelligence, and in some instances attempts to suppress information entirely.

Last weekend the testimony of the Director of the Central Intelligence Agency, Mr. John McCone, given before the House Foreign Affairs on February 19, was released. His statements directly contradict Secretary of Defense McNamara's incredible assertions that Cuba is not being used as a base for subversion against other Latin American countries, and fully confirm statements I made on the Senate floor on January 31.

This is another of many striking instances in which high Government officials have first denied, then admitted, facts I have disclosed about Soviet activities in Cuba. These examples strongly suggest that the crisis of confidence now existing is more the result of refusal to convey hard truths to the American people than any gap in our intelligence capabilities.

On January 31 I said, with reference to Soviet activity in Cuba:

> What they are planning to do—in fact they are already doing it—is mount an increasing wave of sabotage, terrorism, political subversion and agitation throughout Latin America. Already riots in Venezuela, Peru, Brazil clearly and demonstrably are the work of Communists trained and armed in Cuba.

This was emphatically denied from the top level within a week. On February 6, in a 2-hour television presentation on Cuba, the Secretary of Defense said:

> I have no evidence that Cuba is being used as a base for subversion directed against Latin American countries. It is a matter that is of constant interest to us and one we are monitoring continuously.

If our Government is "monitoring continuously," as the Secretary said, how do we account for what happened only 8 days later? On February 19, the Director of the Central Intelligence Agency flatly contradicted the Defense Secretary's statements. Mr. McCone told the House Foreign Affairs Committee:

> Fidel Castro is spurring and supporting the efforts of Communists and other revolutionary elements to overthrow and seize control of the governments in Latin America.

At another point, Mr. McCone states:

> Some guerrilla forces in Peru are equipped with Czech weapons which most probably came from Cuba.

How did that get by the "continuous monitoring" of the Secretary of Defense?

Mr. McCone also revealed that the trainees in Cuba are instructed to operate rifles and machineguns they would presumably steal or capture from local police or security units. They are being taught how to manufacture homemade "Molotov cocktail" bombs.

Comparing the terrorist tactics of the early Castro days with the present training, Mr. McCone said:

> Today the Cuban effort is far more sophisticated, more covert, and more deadly. In its professional tradecraft, it shows guidance and training by experienced Communist advisers from the Soviet bloc, including veteran Spanish Communists.

From a news conference held February 28 we learned that Soviet bombers have been tracking U.S. aircraft carriers for some time. An announcement of flights which occurred from January 27 to February 22 was made, according to news reports, 6 days later, on February 28. Interestingly enough one of the Soviet planes flew over the carrier *Forrestal*, just off Gibraltar, on February 22. Many are wondering whether the fact that a group of editors and publishers were aboard, and saw the overflight, encouraged the Defense Department to at last release this interesting information the day before the *Forrestal* docked with the newspapermen aboard.

Examples such as this suggest that the crisis of credibility is not the result of any intelligence gap but rather the result of a gap in disclosing information to the public.

According to many reliable press reports covering the events of the past year, CIA Director McCone was warning as early as last August that the Soviets probably would place offensive missiles in Cuba. As substantiation for his position gradually came into the public view—first through unchecked refugee reports, then through thoroughly checked intelligence material, and later through statements of alarmed Members of Congress of both parties—our Government kept busy denying everything. At last, on October 22, when the President clamped down a blockade, the frightening facts were suddenly officially unloaded on the American people.

There are disturbing indications that an attempt is being made to use the intelligence community as a scapegoat and whipping boy for the present crisis of confidence in the Government's handling of the Cuban situation. No intelligence system is perfect, and it may be that problems of coordination and cooperation have hampered the CIA's effectiveness on some occasions. In my judgment, however, we would be placing the onus on the wrong source if we blamed the fact gatherers rather than the policymakers for the failure to give the American people an accurate and complete picture of Communist activities in Cuba.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

APPOINTMENTS TO COMMISSIONS AND COMMITTEES

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair appoints the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] to fill the Republican vacancy on the National Forest Reservation Commission.

The Chair appoints the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] chairman of the Special Committee on Aging, and the Senator from Utah [Mr. MOSS], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from New York [Mr. KEATING], the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. FONG], and the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. MECHEM], as members of the special committee.

To the Mexico Interparliamentary Group, the Chair appoints the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. Long], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. Dodd], the Senator from Florida [Mr. Smathers], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. Williams], the Senator from Maine [Mr. Muskie], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. Brewster], the Senator from Utah [Mr. Bennett], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. Allott], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. Mechem], and the Senator from California [Mr. Kuchel].

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL THURSDAY

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, if there be no further business to come before the Senate at this time, I move, pursuant to the order previously entered, that the Senate adjourn until 12 o'clock noon on Thursday.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 16 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned, under the order previously entered, until Thursday, March 7, 1963, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate March 4, 1963:

United Nations

Charles F. Baldwin, of the District of Columbia, Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to the Federation of Malaya, to serve concurrently and without additional compensation as the representative of the United States of America to the 19th session of the Economic Commission for Asia and the Far East of the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations.

U.S. Marshal

Paul G. April, of New Hampshire, to be U.S. marshal for the district of New Hampshire for the term of 4 years, vice Royal Dion, resigned.

Mississippi River Commission

Brig. Gen. Robert F. Seedlock, U.S. Army, to be a member of the Mississippi River Commission, under provisions of section 2 of an act of Congress, approved June 28, 1879 (21 Stat. 37) (33 U.S.C. 642), vice Brig. Gen. Jackson Graham, reassigned.

Postmasters

The following-named persons to be postmasters:

ALABAMA

Liberty B. Todd, Attalla, Ala., in place of W. L. Mason, deceased.

William H. McCarty, Moulton, Ala., in place of J. C. Weatherwax, deceased.

ARKANSAS

Leslie H. Johnson, Hackett, Ark., in place of O. E. Mathis, retired.

Milton M. Hemingway, McGehee, Ark., in place of H. G. Boyd, deceased.

Joe D. Taylor, Plainview, Ark., in place of Leola Garner, retired.

James E. Landes, Stamps, Ark., in place of B. R. Tatom, transferred.

CALIFORNIA

Laura B. Morgan, Clayton, Calif., in place of J. D. Bloching, resigned.

Alice O. Mills, Finley, Calif., in place of D. K. Manning, retired.

Edgar L. King, Stratford, Calif., in place of O. L. Edman, retired.

Lee B. Downs, Whittier, Calif., in place of W. H. Mitchener, retired.

DELAWARE

Thomas Holcomb, New Castle, Del., in place of A. P. Gallagher, retired.

FLORIDA

Myrla M. Bishop, Archer, Fla., in place of E. L. Grantham, retired.

Ross C. Marler, Destin, Fla., in place of Nellie Baker, resigned.

Ruth A. Childers, Florahome, Fla., in place of F. R. Cook, deceased.

J. Donald Carter, Fort Myers Beach, Fla., in place of Charles Wyland, deceased.

Daniel D. Clements, Land O'Lakes, Fla., in place of A. M. Douglas, retired.

A. Edward Hoyt, Port Richey, Fla., in place of T. R. Hillsamer, resigned.

GEORGIA

Charles E. Garrett, Alley, Ga., in place of G. B. McIntyre, retired.

Newt S. Hinton, Porterdale, Ga., in place of B. C. Chapman, retired.

C. Wayne Shannon, Preston, Ga., in place of J. S. Rees, transferred.

IDAHO

Don C. Chrystal, Bovill, Idaho, in place of E. R. David, retired.

Elmer M. Fetzer, Paul, Idaho, in place of E. R. Morgan, retired.

ILLINOIS

James C. Hobbs, Abingdon, Ill., in place of J. W. Lucas, resigned.

Charles E. Resch, Anna, Ill., in place of Frank Keistler, Jr., declined.

Peter W. Bast, Ashland, Ill., in place of Pearl Caswell, removed.

Lola M. Baumunk, Bardolph, Ill., in place of J. L. Baumunk, retired.

Rudolph E. Beranek, Berwyn, Ill., in place of J. J. A. Borkovec, retired.

Joseph F. Alfeld, Carrollton, Ill., in place of M. D. Dowdall, retired.

Verna H. Welsh, Durand, Ill., in place of Lillie Doyle, retired.

Arthur J. Lawrence, East Alton, Ill., in place of E. R. Hill, deceased.

Richard C. Hazer, Elizabeth, Ill., in place of E. J. Coveny, deceased.

Robert A. Smith, Elvaston, Ill., in place of J. N. Cunningham, retired.

Clifford L. Lehman, Eureka, Ill., in place of C. B. O'Marah, retired.

William H. Haycraft, Franklin, Ill., in place of W. A. Tranbarger, transferred.

Charles J. Nash, Greenville, Ill., in place of D. J. McAlister, retired.

Edythe A. Grover, Hamburg, Ill., in place of E. F. Day, retired.

Paul D. Jordan, Herscher, Ill., in place of A. C. Westphal, retired.

L. Dale Wingo, Kenney, Ill., in place of Enid Trowbridge, retired.

Dona J. Beard, Leaf River, Ill., in place of A. L. McCaw, resigned.

Richard J. Thilmony, Loda, Ill., in place of H. E. Goodell, retired.

Ora K. Reid, Media, Ill., in place of R. E. Sullivan, deceased.

John R. Ryan, Mundelein, Ill., in place of C. E. Teson, retired.

Morris A. Mettendorf, Neoga, Ill., in place of J. V. Worland, retired.

Anton Macrowski, Jr., North Chicago, Ill., in place of W. H. Woodard, retired.

Norbert W. Haberer, Pocahontas, Ill., in place of H. F. Mounger, transferred.

Leo A. Hayes, Ramsey, Ill., in place of O. W. Hinton, removed.

Charles F. Schultz, Reynolds, Ill., in place of B. W. Sharp, retired.

Leonard M. Koeberlein, St. Elmo, Ill., in place of P. E. Ball, retired.

Wendell L. Smith, Sandwich, Ill., in place of J. R. Montgomery, retired.

G. Kenneth Furrer, San Jose, Ill., in place of F. E. Smith, retired.

W. Rex Butler, Saybrook, Ill., in place of E. E. Tipsord, transferred.

G. Clark Ewing, Sheldon, Ill., in place of W. G. McEwan, deceased.

Ralph F. Bennett, Sidell, Ill., in place of C. W. Pyle, retired.

William J. Murphy, Stockton, Ill., in place of F. C. Niemeyer, deceased.

Kenneth B. Lorenson, Sullivan, Ill., in place of G. C. Miller, retired.

Gerald A. Melvin, Tamaroa, Ill., in place of J. E. Lee, removed.

Edwin B. Wirth, Techny, Ill., in place of W. E. Halvey, resigned.

William E. Morgan, Tennessee, Ill., in place of B. P. Hodges, retired.

Dorothy E. Anderson, Thomasboro, Ill., in place of A. J. Ulrich, retired.

Donovan O. Hutchins, Viola, Ill., in place of F. H. Weihler, transferred.

John R. Graves, Virginia, Ill., in place of C. R. Wilson, retired.

Warden D. White, Wayne City, Ill., in place of Ira Dezouche, retired.

INDIANA

Andrew E. Street, Crane, Ind., in place of J. F. O'Neal, retired.

Charles R. Forgey, Freetown, Ind., in place of C. J. Bebout, retired.

George R. Bills, Lewisville, Ind., in place of G. C. Davison, retired.

IOWA

Clifford S. Heng, Cylinder, Iowa, in place of Mary Coway, retired.

Iva M. Mauck, Garwin, Iowa, in place of E. L. Ochs, retired.

Don H. Richards, Hinton, Iowa, in place of W. A. Spies, transferred.

Cecil C. Ramsdell, Toledo, Iowa, in place of C. E. Brandt, retired.

Glenn W. Fleck, Vinton, Iowa, in place of H. E. Carrier, resigned.

KANSAS

Burgess L. Stephenson, Leoti, Kans., in place of E. F. Giesick, transferred.

KENTUCKY

Edward A. Runyan, Marion, Ky., in place of H. G. McConnell, deceased.

James C. Tracy, Smithland, Ky., in place of H. B. Rappolee, retired.

LOUISIANA

Rhea L. McIlveene, Cotton Valley, La., in place of J. A. Moody, retired.

Nelson J. Falcon, Duson, La., in place of R. D. Comeaux, transferred.

Frances B. Farmer, Princeton, La., in place of A. H. McWilliams, resigned.

MAINE

Lorraine J. Bragdon, North Vassalboro, Maine, in place of M. E. Donnelly, retired.

Lloyd E. Beckett, Thomaston, Maine, in place of D. P. George, retired.

MARYLAND

Richard H. Bates, Branchville, Md., in place of F. K. Hazard, retired.

MASSACHUSETTS

Harry W. Vozella, Franklin, Mass., in place of C. H. Carlson, retired.

MINNESOTA

Charles C. Lenz, Ellsworth, Minn., in place of L. N. Riley, retired.

Harold A. Legatt, Rice, Minn., in place of M. A. Marchand, transferred.

MISSISSIPPI

Norman E. Snowden, Collinsville, Miss., in place of I. E. Blanks, retired.

Samuel L. Westmoreland, Houlka, Miss., in place of A. N. Graves, retired.

MISSOURI

Lawrence O. Kinyon, Forsyth, Mo., in place of J. V. Moore, retired.

MONTANA

L. Preston Blakeley, Absarokee, Mont., in place of J. W. Campbell, retired.

Lois M. Walker, Wolf Creek, Mont., in place of M. E. Jacobson, retired.

NEBRASKA

Donald F. Carey, Bancroft, Nebr., in place of W. C. Schleusener, retired.

Norman I. Anderson, Concord, Nebr., in place of E. J. Hughes, retired.

NEVADA

Maxine A. Anderson, Verdi, Nev., in place of E. E. Ubbins, deceased.

NEW HAMPSHIRE

Roger E. Hebert, Hooksett, N.H., in place of D. P. St. Germain, deceased.

Martin J. Keenan, Jr., Peterborough, N.H., in place of M. J. Keenan, retired.

NEW JERSEY

Calvin L. Naylor, Blackwood, N.J., in place of J. A. Beetle, resigned.

Joseph J. Stahley, East Brunswick, N.J. Office established April 1, 1959.

Thelma C. Cooper, Navesink, N.J., in place of C. C. Cooper, deceased.

Richard M. Johnson, Ridgefield, N.J., in place of H. J. Formon, deceased.

NEW MEXICO

R. Warner Dutro, Anthony, N. Mex., in place of A. N. Ealy, removed.

Artenia L. Crick, Williamsburg, N. Mex., in place of T. B. Williams, removed.

NEW YORK

John P. Frey, Atlantic Beach, N.Y., in place of Catherine Damme, retired.

James F. Hill, Centerport, N.Y., in place of Elizabeth Zoeller, retired.

Marie L. Murray, Ellington, N.Y., in place of R. M. Seekins, retired.

George L. Nelson, Glen Head, N.Y., in place of J. T. McLaughlin, retired.

John W. Carroll, Jr., Great Neck, N.Y., in place of E. F. Higgins, retired.

Hugh E. Birdslow, Lacona, N.Y., in place of G. C. Edick, retired.

John W. McCormick, Maine, N.Y., in place of I. E. Tymeson, retired.

Gerard R. T. O'Grady, Malverne, N.Y., in place of K. R. Brewer, retired.

Ruby L. Folds, Maple View, N.Y., in place of M. W. Newton, retired.

Joan C. Jendral, Mastic Beach, N.Y., in place of C. S. Jendral, deceased.

Dominic A. Amuso, Mount Kisco, N.Y., in place of Bernard Daley, retired.

Mary A. Jones, Oyster Bay, N.Y., in place of D. V. Walker, retired.

Ella N. DeLaire, Prospect, N.Y., in place of E. B. Dailey, retired.

Walter F. Schiener, Sardinia, N.Y., in place of M. C. Cudoba, deceased.

William B. Mackey, Schenectady, N.Y., in place of J. F. Connelly, deceased.

Victor W. Humel, Shirley, N.Y., in place of F. M. Landau, deceased.

Louis P. Kriss, West Islip, N.Y. Office established September 15, 1958.

Michael J. Taylor, Whitney Point, N.Y., in place of M. C. Wilcox, deceased.

NORTH CAROLINA

George B. Herndon, Fayetteville, N.C., in place of W. M. Shaw, retired.

OHIO

Frank I. Miller, Ada, Ohio, in place of V. W. Spellman, retired.

Kathryn E. Peters, Arcadia, Ohio, in place of L. M. Crawford, retired.

Herbert G. Wright, Grand Rapids, Ohio, in place of J. P. Minnick, retired.

Emmet F. Millard, Oregonia, Ohio, in place of R. E. Sherwood, retired.

Wesley D. Wickline, Rio Grande, Ohio, in place of L. A. Myers, retired.

Billy H. Ten Eyck, Vanburen, Ohio, in place of E. G. Duffield, retired.

Kenneth H. Haynes, Whitehouse, Ohio, in place of A. N. Weckerly, retired.

OKLAHOMA

Earl A. Moore, Boley, Okla., in place of L. L. Dolphin, retired.

William R. Kilgore, Sr., Idabel, Okla., in place of T. F. Bonner, deceased.

OREGON

Ned Palmer, Dayton, Oreg., in place of F. B. Willert, retired.

Vernon E. Stewart, Haines, Oreg., in place of M. E. Potter, retired.

Eva L. Albert, Trail, Oreg., in place of I. H. Howe, retired.

PENNSYLVANIA

Jack A. Lanager, Clearfield, Pa., in place of A. R. Hinkle, retired.

Daniel J. Gildea, Coaldale, Pa., in place of J. M. Donahue, deceased.

Richard D. Hetrick, Easton, Pa., in place of H. C. Schultz, retired.

Shirley G. Marmer, Frederick, Pa., in place of Howard Hasson, deceased.

George W. Nase, Tylersport, Pa., in place of N. W. Nase, resigned.

SOUTH CAROLINA

Ralph E. Edenfield, North Augusta, N.C. Office established October 2, 1961.

TENNESSEE

Gladys I. Price, Saint Bethlehem, Tenn., in place of C. B. Young, retired.

John E. Griffith, South Pittsburg, Tenn., in place of Lois McReynolds, retired.

TEXAS

Charlie T. Cummings, Alvarado, Tex., in place of E. P. Robinson, retired.

Marjorie W. Duncan, Bedias, Tex., in place of Lallie Griffith, retired.

A. Earl Beck, Dumas, Tex., in place of G. K. Denman, deceased.

Mary N. Barger, Goree, Tex., in place of E. L. Chamberlain, resigned.

Gilma C. Jones, Graford, Tex., in place of L. M. Dye, retired.

Maurice P. Long, Mount Vernon, Tex., in place of W. L. Nelson, deceased.

Preston R. Wheeler, Slaton, Tex., in place of T. E. McClanahan, retired.

VERMONT

Robert H. Lawrence, South Hero, Vt., in place of C. S. Joslyn, retired.

VIRGINIA

Annie D. Berry, Madison, Va., in place of E. S. Cave, retired.

WASHINGTON

Jean M. Olson, Manchester, Wash., in place of M. E. Randall, retired

Dorothy E. Bjornsgaard, Rosburg, Wash., in place of L. H. Olson, retired.

WEST VIRGINIA

Cora M. Smith, Lost Creek, W. Va., in place of G. P. Rector, retired.

Clyde E. McClung, Reedy, W. Va., in place of M. C. Carpenter, retired.

WISCONSIN

Daniel A. Wirkus, Edgar, Wis., in place of F. J. Shortner, retired.

Raymond A. Austad, Hawkins, Wis., in place of F. W. Anderson, deceased.

Charles F. Held, Jackson, Wis., in place of A. W. Quade, deceased.

Irene L. Genisot, Montreal, Wis., in place of F. M. Kirby, retired.

Charles M. Bruner, Prentice, Wis., in place of C. A. Lundborg, retired.

Donald C. Tuttle, Suamico, Wis., in place of Ambrose Sheedy, deceased.

George P. Grabarec, Union Grove, Wis., in place of E. K. Sheen, retired.

Elmer F. Crowell, Wittenberg, Wis., in place of K. C. Meisner, retired.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate March 4, 1963:

National Labor Relations Board

John Harold Fanning, of Rhode Island, to be a member of the National Labor Relations Board for the term of 5 years expiring December 16, 1967, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate.

Commissioner of Education

Dr. Francis Keppel, of Massachusetts, to be Commissioner of Education, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate.

Labor Department

Daniel Patrick Moynihan, of New York, to be an Assistant Secretary of Labor.

National Mediation Board

Howard G. Gamser, of New York, to be a member of the National Mediation Board for the term expiring February 1, 1966.

Federal Coal Mine Safety Board of Review

George C. Trevorrow, of Maryland, to be a member of the Federal Coal Mine Safety Board of Review for the remainder of the term expiring July 15, 1965.

Public Health Service

The following candidates for personnel action in the Regular Corps of the Public Public Health Service subject to qualifications therefor as provided by law and regulations:

I. FOR CONFIRMATION OF RECESS APPOINTMENT

To be surgeons

David Frost
Raymond T. Moore
Patricia K. Roberts
Paul G. Smith
Wesley W. Wieland

To be senior assistant surgeons

Scott I. Allen
Ronald L. McCartney
William P. McElwain
Will L. Nash
Milton Z. Nichaman
Stuart C. Nottingham
Raphael T. Nussdorf
S. David Rockoff
Bruce I. Shackter
Leland L. Sprague

To be dental surgeon

Edward A. Graykowski

To be senior assistant dental surgeons

Richard R. Baker
Meade E. Butler
Richard Q. Dunn
Donald W. Johnson
James V. Petersen
Keith J. Ryan
John W. Topping, Jr.
Dale S. Pyke

To be senior sanitary engineer

John H. McCutchen

To be sanitary engineer

Theodore C. Ferris

To be assistant sanitary engineers

Oscar E. Dickason
Rodger L. Leupold
Albert C. Printz, Jr.

To be junior assistant sanitary engineers

Fred O. Bridges
Troy Marceleno
Walter S. Smith

To be senior assistant pharmacist

Robert Frankel

To be assistant pharmacists

Donald E. Hill
John J. Lucas
Donnie L. Powell

To be senior scientist

Richard B. Eads

To be scientist

Thomas W. Haines

To be senior assistant scientist

McWilson Warren

To be sanitarian

Francis J. Goldsmith

To be senior assistant sanitarians

Donald R. Johnston
Gerald J. Karches
Arthur L. Kenney

To be assistant sanitarians

Joseph Lovett
Thomas C. Rozzell

To be veterinary officer

Robert L. Rausch

To be senior assistant veterinary officer

Calvin E. Sevy

To be nurse officers

Agnes Des Marais
Mary J. McGee
Marjorie E. Myren

To be senior assistant nurse officer

Marion N. Keagle

To be senior assistant therapist

Gordon S. Pocock

To be assistant therapists

Richard S. Mazzacone
Herbert R. Pruett

To be health services officer

Viola L. Cunningham

II. FOR CONFIRMATION OF RECESS PERMANENT PROMOTION

To be senior assistant sanitary engineer

Richard D. Grundy

To be assistant sanitary engineer

William A. Felsing, Jr.

To be senior veterinary officer

Lauri Luoto

To be senior assistant nurse officer

Juanita M. Barkley

To be senior assistant health services officer

Martha G. Barclay

III. FOR APPOINTMENT

To be senior assistant surgeons

Morton G. Miller
Roger W. Schuler

To be senior assistant dental surgeons

Allen Doorn
Earl F. Pierce, Jr.

To be assistant sanitary engineers

John J. Henderson
Thomas C. Tucker

To be assistant therapists

C. Douglas Billion
James L. Witt

IV. FOR PERMANENT PROMOTION

To be senior assistant therapist

Richard S. Mazzacone

To be senior surgeon

Joseph C. Robinson

To be surgeon

Jerry C. Rosenberg

To be senior assistant surgeons

N. Burton Attico
John P. Blake
Ormond V. Brody
Rawser P. Crank, Jr.
Anthony N. Damato
Raymond A. Dieter, Jr.
Rodney G. Elliott
Frank P. Greene
Wallace H. Holthaus
James E. Maynard
Leslie G. Nelson
Thomas B. Stucker
Christfried J. Urner

To be senior assistant dental surgeons

Paul L. Beckley
Douglas G. Bell
William F. Bird
Clinton C. Cox
Stanford E. Hamburger
John S. Huling, Jr.
Val D. Jensen
Orlen N. Johnson
Sanford Krotenberg
Winslow B. Lee
Gene P. Lewis
Rollie W. Lyman
Glenn W. Smith
John J. Timmermans

To be assistant sanitary engineers

Francis M. McGowan
Donald W. Mantay
Francis G. Mattern
Donald G. Remark
Lowel A. Van Den Berg

To be junior assistant sanitary engineers

B. David Clark
Walter W. Liberick, Jr.
Edgar D. Preissner

To be assistant pharmacist

Henry W. Winship III

To be junior assistant pharmacist

James C. Yatsco

To be scientist

Samuel L. Buker

To be senior assistant sanitarians

John R. Bagby, Jr.
Harry Haverland
Wendall C. McElwee
Gene W. McElyea

To be assistant sanitarian

Gerald J. Lauer

To be veterinary officer

James R. Ganaway

To be senior assistant veterinary officers

Carl E. Miller
Robert D. Phemister

To be senior assistant dietitians

Lois R. Seidler
Betty J. Shuler

To be senior assistant therapists

John B. Allis
Thelma L. Reeder

To be assistant therapist

Gary L. Smidt

To be health services officer

David D. Haworth

To be senior assistant health services officer

Robert H. Bradford

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

The 50th Anniversary of the U.S. Department of Labor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, March 4, 1963

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, during the 50 years since its formal organization on March 4, 1913, the U.S. Department of Labor has faithfully and fully discharged its mission to "foster, promote, and develop the welfare of the wage earners of the United States, to improve their working conditions, and to advance their opportunities for profitable employment." The Department has served equally both organized and unorganized labor in accordance with the best interests of the American people as a whole, and has been directly responsible for much beneficial change which has been achieved.

It is altogether fitting that we, as a nation, should pause to pay tribute to the U.S. Department of Labor as it marks the completion of a half-century of service in the public interest. As a member of the President's Committee for the Department of Labor 50th Anniversary Year, I am gratified to note that popular recognition of the meaningful contributions of the Department has been widespread and sincere. Citizens realize the importance and desirability of a well-conceived and effective governmental agency staffed by experienced and dedicated experts who seek to promote healthy cooperation and justice in areas of labor-management concern.

As a member of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and earlier, as a member of the Labor Committee in the House of Representatives under President Franklin D. Roosevelt and President Harry S. Truman, it has been my responsibility to aid in the drafting and passage of significant legislation designed to support the efforts of the Department of Labor and advance the well-being of American working men and women. Much has been achieved in creating safer and more healthful working conditions, workman's compensation and rehabilitation benefits, sound labor standards, unemployment insurance, impartial mediation, and many other functions which have created in America the healthiest working climate in the world.

During the New Deal administration of President Franklin D. Roosevelt, as a Member of the House of Representatives I was privileged to support a number of far-reaching measures which were instrumental in strengthening and raising the status of labor. Although trade unionism had been previously established in the United States it was under legislation of the New Deal era that the employer was first enjoined from interfering with the workers' right to organize; moreover, the employer was additionally obligated to recognize unions and to bargain with them in good faith. These provisions came into being under the National Labor Relations Act of 1935, often termed the Magna Carta of labor, and was one of the New Deal's major contributions to economic and social justice.

Two other pieces of meaningful legislation enacted during this period were, the Government Contracts Act of 1936, and the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938. The first required that persons employed by Government contractors must be paid not less than the standard minimum wage determined by the Secretary of Labor; while the latter established the principle of a universal floor under wages and a universal standard for hours in interstate commerce. It is interesting to note that the concept that the worker has the right to share in the benefits flowing from America's rising capacity to produce enjoyed its greatest legislative implementation during the New Deal.

And, it has become abundantly clear that the Department of Labor, through its many and diverse functions, has been instrumental in seeking more effective application of the Employment Act of 1946. This monumental piece of legislation was, according to the respected economist Gerhard Colm, "an expression of the peoples determination that appropriate Government policies would be used to avert depressions and unemployment. It was, in a way, an expression of confidence that a satisfactory economic performance could be accomplished within the framework of a free society; not through a policy of laissez faire, but through deliberate economic and fiscal measures."

It is in the areas of formulating and implementing these measures to uphold the performance of the economy as a whole that the Department of Labor has exhibited outstanding and consistent leadership. The Department has effectively demonstrated that we can, through diligent and imaginative effort, achieve the goals of the Employment Act of 1946, namely: To reach maximum employment, production, and purchasing power.

The battle is far from over, however, and many challenges must be overcome before we realize the full intent of the Employment Act. Our country is engaged in a worldwide effort to prove that an economy based on free enterprise and free institutions can be adapted to fit the needs of a complex industrial society. Deliberate governmental policies, programs and implementation will be required, and it is in this area that the U.S. Department of Labor will continue to serve the American people as it has for the past 50 years.

The Department will aid in the drafting of legislation, it will regulate the administration of law, it will mediate labor disputes, and will act as a factfinding and statistical service. But, most important, it will serve to protect the interest of American workers and American employers, and through them, it will safeguard every citizen of this Nation.

Let us join in offering heartiest congratulations to the Department on this, its 50th anniversary. May the next half century prove even more fruitful.

Amendment to Administrative Expenses Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 4, 1963

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced a bill which is aimed at correcting an inequality in the Administrative Expenses Act of 1946, as amended.

The act provides that appropriations for the departments shall be available for travel and transportation expenses of student trainees when promoted upon completion of college work to positions for which there is determined by the Civil Service Commission to be a manpower shortage.

Ostensibly, the act provides authority for all student trainees who, upon graduation are placed in shortage category positions. Actually, a small group of trainees, approximately 50 each year, are excluded from coverage. Although assuming full professional status upon graduation, these trainees do not, at that time, receive a promotion to a higher grade. These are the trainees covered by special training agreements between their employing agencies and the Civil Service Commission. These agreements are desirable, because of critical shortages in some occupations, to provide for more rapid advancements of trainees. This small group has, prior to graduation, already reached the grade level to which the majority of the trainees are promoted at the time of graduation.

This perfecting amendment to the Administrative Expenses Act is intended to provide the same authority for payment to all student trainees, whether or not a promotion to a higher grade level at the time of graduation is involved. Enactment of this amendment will affect very few employees but will remove a potential source of irritation over unequal treatment of two groups of employees.

The annual cost of the transportation expenses provided for by this amendment is estimated to be between $15,000 and $20,000. This does not represent any increase in Federal expenditures over earlier cost estimates for this purpose since Public Law 86–587 was enacted on the assumption that all student trainees moving into shortage category positions upon graduation would be eligible to receive these payments.

Save Your Vision Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. Y. BERRY

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 4, 1963

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, today is the first day of Save Your Vision Week and I would not like it to pass without a word of commendation for the work of our optometrists who sponsor this observance annually through their professional society, the American Optometric Association.

Largely through the efforts of our 18,000 practicing optometrists this Nation has the highest standards of vision care in the world. How important this is we realize when we consider that more than 80 percent of our knowledge comes to us through that most precious sense of all, our vision.

To those Members of Congress who are or have been the beneficiaries of optometric services, there should be little need for emphasizing the importance of good vision in our daily pursuits. However, we are apt to take this for granted. And yet, when we break, lose, or leave our glasses at home, we find our productivity—and disposition—greatly impaired. We become different persons, with newly imposed limitations of mobility and accomplishment until our eyeglasses are again at hand and our keenness of vision restored.

Among our duties as representatives of this great Nation are the promotion and development of its free enterprise system. Its continued progress depends in part on how efficiently its operations are conducted. Better vision contributes considerably to such efficiency, so therefore I wish to voice our appreciation to the American Optometric Association and its State affiliates for their public educational programs which alert all of us to the latest techniques and procedures of optometric care. Surely the efficiency of our productive and educational systems has been raised by attention to such care.

Because of the excellent services of our 18,000 optometrists, 60 million American men, women, and children are getting more out of life and giving more to others in both work and play.

There are some 400 optometrists commissioned in our armed services who are making an outstanding contribution to our national defense. America is indebted to its professional vision specialists for their contributions to our total well being.

Yet, there is a great unmet need, for statistical evidence has come to my attention that two out of three adults have inefficient vision which can handicap their work and personal job advancement opportunities.

During National Save Your Vision Week, it is proper that we recognize both our high vision standards and our unmet vision needs.

We should always be mindful of the fact that our modern pace of living is making ever-increasing demands on our vision capabilities.

Independence Day of Morocco

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ADAM C. POWELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 4, 1963

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, on March 2, the Republic of Morocco celebrated the anniversary of her independence. On this memorable occasion, I wish to take this opportunity to extend warm felicitations to His Majesty, King Hassan II; and His Excellency, the Moroccan Ambassador to the United States, Ali Benjelloun.

Late last year, yet another momentous event of modern reform occurred in independent Morocco when the King promulgated a constitution whereby the Moroccan people would be able to take part in the governing of their country. This constitution, promised to the people by the late and great King, Mohammed V, and now fulfilled by his son, Hassan II, the present ruler, established the King as hereditary chief executive and a parliament. It also created all people of Morocco equal, with no discrimination against any minority. Women were given equal rights with men.

The constitution is the culmination of the democratic processes of law initiated when Morocco achieved its independence from the French on March 2, 1956. On that date, the French Government rescinded the Treaty of Fez of March 30, 1912, which had established the French protectorate, and had recognized the independence of Morocco. The French protectorate had ended an independent kingdom which had been founded by the

Arabs in the eighth century. At one time, the Moroccan cities of Fez and Marrakesh were considered to be the most prominent seats of learning in the world. The Moroccans were unable to stem the tide of French expansionism, though, and fell prey to colonial rule. Resistance persisted, however, and became an active force to contend with when the French deposed their beloved Sultan, Mohammed V, in 1953. At this time the entire nation rose up against the French and demanded independence. Three years of bitter struggle were to ensue before sovereignty was achieved.

Since its independence, the country has progressed toward modernization. Faced with a 92-percent illiteracy rate, the Government has placed emphasis on education projects. By the end of this year, all children of primary school age will be enrolled in schools. Agriculture and industry have also been stressed to relieve the rampant unemployment situation. Morocco is now the world's second largest producer and leading exporter of phosphates. A new 5-year plan has inaugurated several irrigation projects to reclaim new lands for agriculture development.

Relations with the United States have been amicable. The U.S. Government has aided the Moroccan people at times when the need was great. The drought of 1961 and the Agadir earthquake were only two disasters for which we extended a helping hand. Hassan II is expected in this country in the near future to continue the furtherance of these friendly relations.

In its own sphere of influence, the King is attempting to establish closer collaboration between the countries of north Africa—Tunisia, Algeria, and Morocco—thus creating a union more able to compete successfully with other nations of the world. He is also assuming a position of stature among the other African nations. It is his dream that Morocco may once more resume the leadership that it once held before French intervention.

We in the United States recognize the accomplishments of the people of Morocco and salute them on their independence day anniversary. It is with sincere expectations that the relations between our two countries remain amicable, that they may prove to be a symbol to other nations in promoting world peace.

Federal Inventions Administrations Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERMAN TOLL

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 4, 1963

Mr. TOLL. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill which if passed will be known as the Federal Inventions Administration Act.

The bill prescribes a national policy with respect to the encouragement of invention by employees of the Government and its contractors, the result of which would be many contributions to the advancement of the Nation's welfare. It aims to achieve this objective by providing for the simplified administration in the public interest of the property rights to inventions resulting from research or development which is financed at least in part through the expenditure of public funds.

In many respects the bill represents a compromise between the extreme views voiced by various individuals in congressional hearings which have been held in recent years. The bill provides that in every case the Government would obtain a royalty-free, nonexclusive license to use any invention arising from a Government-sponsored research or development project. Title to each such invention and any patents covering it would remain with the inventor or his assignee subject to one condition: Instead of just owning the patent and optionally doing nothing about the invention, he has to put it into commercial use either on his own or by licensing someone else to make, use, or sell it. The patent owner has 5 years within which to do this after the patent issues, and if he fails to do it by then the Government can step in, take back title to the patent, and reassign it to someone who gives assurances he will put the invention into public use.

The cardinal objectives of the bill are to get into actual circulation as many as possible of the inventions which stem from Government-sponsored research, and to encourage qualified contractors to seek Government contracts. It should eliminate the objections which many concerns have had with respect to the policies of such agencies as the Atomic Energy Commission and the National Aeronautics and Space Administration whose enabling statutes require that almost all inventions made in the performance of their contracts be assigned to the Government. Contractors who have been clamoring that they should be allowed to hold on to the patent rights will get them, but they will not be able to suppress them. In recognition of the public's interest in those inventions, which public funds helped to make possible, the inventions will have to be "put to work" publicly.

Government employees who make inventions will be treated in the same way as Government contractors. They can keep or assign title to their inventions, but within the stated time interval they also must establish that the inventions have been publicly utilized or forfeit their right to keep title. This provision should help the Government agencies to recruit and retain scientific and technical personnel who might otherwise be tempted to leave the Government for higher paying positions in industry.

Another feature of the bill is the proviso that any Government contractor who seeks to take advantage of the title-retention rights which it provides must install an approved award and rewards program. According to that program, any of the contractor's employees making an invention while working on the Government contract will be eligible to receive cash rewards for his efforts. This provision is similar in some respects to laws now in force in some European countries which require all employers to give their employee-inventors a share of the profits derived from their inventions over and above any normal salary considerations which may be in effect. Such awards programs are, of course, not unknown in the United States, as many domestic corporations have used such means for years in order to stimulate the inventive activity of their personnel.

Administration of the proposed law would be entrusted to an Office of Federal Inventions, established in the Department of Commerce. The single Office and Government-wide administration of a uniform law should effect tremendous economies, as it would make unnecessary the comparable offices now functioning in practically every Government department and agency for the purpose of settling matters dealing with inventions made by Government employees and contractors.

Statement by Hon. Jacob H. Gilbert, 22d District of New York, Before Committee on Education and Labor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACOB H. GILBERT

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 4, 1963

Mr. GILBERT. Mr. Speaker, I am including in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD my statement to the Committee on Education and Labor, concerning the important subject of assistance to the youth of our Nation:

> Mr. Chairman and members of the Committee on Education and Labor, I am grateful for this opportunity to speak on a subject which is of vast importance and which should be of great concern to all of us—assistance to the youth of our Nation.
>
> My bill, H.R. 2396, to authorize the establishment of a Youth Conservation Corps is before you for consideration. May I say at the outset, that I am also heartily in favor of another bill before you, based upon the President's recommendations, to provide jobs for youths in the city as well as in the countryside, the Youth Employment Act.
>
> It is a tragic fact that there is a lost generation growing up in our great country with no skills and little hope; that there are about 700,000 young people looking for jobs; jobs are unavailable to them; a high percentage are school dropouts, who need the opportunity to work if they are to be saved from a life of delinquency and crime.
>
> Mobilization for Youth on New York's Lower East Side, which operates under grants from the President's Committee on Juvenile Delinquency, is probably one of the most far-reaching programs to help school dropouts and other problem youths; it has proved conclusively that youths want to work; that they prefer employment to idleness and the evils created by idleness; they need to feel useful and wanted.
>
> The Youth Conservation Corps has aroused great interest among school and youth officials and the youth of our Nation; it would put young men to work in our National and State forests, tackling the $8 billion backlog of needed conservation work. Ten hours'

weekly training and basic educational skills would be provided, and the complex tools and equipment the young men would use in their work would provide them with many skills needed in industry today.

The number of school dropouts, in urban and rural areas both, has reached tremendous proportions. Communities cannot meet the problems alone; the fullest Federal assistance possible is required if we are to meet the problem in a constructive manner and if we are to develop and conserve the human resources represented by the army of young people now denied employment and usefulness. Many thousands of young people exist under terrible conditions in the slums of our cities; many belong to minority groups and suffer from discrimination and lack of job opportunities; they live without hope and their futures are bleak. Certainly, these countless young people are to be given a helping hand and hope for a brighter future, the gratification brought by employment, and the opportunity to take their places as working, respected, members of their communities. To take a boy out of an atmosphere of defeat and slum existence and to place him under the guidance of people who care about him, is to provide him with hope and incentive.

It was recently pointed out in hearings on this question that the $100 million annual cost of the program advocated by the President amounted to only what our Nation spends on defense in a matter of hours. To what avail is it to create for ourselves the strongest nation in the world, from a military standpoint, when we permit our very foundations to crumble—for the future strength of our Nation is truly dependent upon our youth; our young people are our future. No money must be spared, no efforts curtailed in what must be our aim now—to help and save our young people from idleness and feelings of rejection and futility, to assist them along the path of industrious living and good citizenship, to give them pride in their heritage as citizens of our great Nation.

The duty of this Congress is clear and I urge your committee to take favorable action without delay, so that the Congress can enact this greatly needed and important measure and work can go forward under the programs provided, as soon as possible.

Washington Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES B. UTT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 4, 1963

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to insert my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I wish to include my Washington Report of February 27 dealing with the Operation Water Moccasin III. Since the report was written, the Army has revealed the various nations involved.

While I concur in the training of our allied officers in jungle warfare. the emphasis of my objection lies with the imposition of this training upon the population living within this 1½-million-acre area.

The training should be carried out within the enclave of our military reservation. The towns and villages should not be subjected to military law.

A similar operation was carried on in California in the summer of 1951 and was billed as a United Nations takeover, and the civilian population which refused to cooperate were threatened with prosecution.

The report follows:

WASHINGTON REPORT

(By Congressman JAMES B. UTT)

Now hear this and listen well. By the time this Washington Report reaches you, there will be underway one of the most fantastic and, to me, truly frightening, military maneuvers ever to be held in the United States. It is called Exercise Water Moccasin III, and is just as deadly. These maneuvers will be held on a 2,500-square-mile area of 1,500,000 acres, covering all of four counties and parts of four other counties in the State of Georgia, just south of Savannah. It will include the participation of 16 foreign allied nations and involves guerrila warfare, psychological warfare, and counterinsurgency.

The area, for lack of a better name, will be called the mythical country of Claxtonia, a free world nation. Claxtonia is to be invaded by foreign guerrilla troops, whose goal is to take over that mythical country. Opposing troops will be brought in by parachute drop in an effort to resist this invasion. It seems impossible to get much information on these maneuvers from the Pentagon intelligence, which denies any knowledge of this operation. Those in the know refuse to identify the 16 foreign allied nations involved, nor can we determine the number of troops involved. They may be members of NATO, SEATO, or CENTO

A form sheet came to my desk in response to many inquiries, but I cannot tell from this sheet which department issued it. The memo indicates that the operation will include 600 personnel. Other authoritative sources say there will be 3,000 personnel. If there are only 600, that would be one man for every 2,500 acres, which is ridiculous on the face of it.

The cities, towns, and villages, and the rural inhabitants of Claxtonia, are supposed to participate in this operation and will be targets of intensive propaganda campaigns by the invaders and by the counterinsurgency troops. This intensive propaganda campaign will be carried on by three local radio stations which will be supporting the counterinsurgent guerrillas of Claxtonia, and by two radio stations in Savannah supporting the invading guerrillas. The inhabitants of Claxtonia have been requested to take sides. Having done so, they are to house, feed, keep and aid the guerrillas of their choice and transport them to ambush sites. The various cities are to either accept or impel the invaders. The psychological effect on American citizens placed in this position will be enormous. These maneuvers will last for about 3 weeks. Signs have been posted throughout the area in five different languages. There will be foreign observers as well as a U.N. contingent.

It is my belief that this operation comes squarely under Article 43 of the United Nations Charter. This, of course, will be vehemently denied by the State Department, as was everything else that happened in Cuba, the truth notwithstanding.

We do not know whether African troops will be involved or not, but we do know that there is a large contingent of barefooted Africans that have been moved into Cuba for training in guerrilla warfare. I would like to quote a few lines from 13-year-old Anna Maria Delgado, who escaped from Cuba:

"I went to a church school. They closed it about a year ago. The Russians and all sorts of foreigners moved in * * * Then about 3 weeks ago, these Africans came. They're all over the place * * * Men and women too. They put them in my school. It looked like a whole tribe. * * * "I was terrified of them. They're savages. I heard one of them beat a woman.

"They're always barefooted and they wear short skirts that come just above their knees. They have big rings in their ears and noses.

"They talk funny and nobody understands what they're saying. * * *

"They can't go out on the streets unless some militiamen go with them. Everybody's afraid of them. I wouldn't go near them."

Who brought these Africans to Cuba? Was it the United Nations? Was it Russia? Or was it the United States? And are they being trained for the forthcoming invasion of peaceful Angola, which, with the knowledge and consent of the U.N., has been subjected to murder, pillage and rape from bases in the central Congo? Instead of bringing peace to the world, the U.N. has brought war, and it has brought disgrace upon the United States.

With the subjugation of Katanga, you can look forward to seeing the U.N. move its "peaceful" forces into Angola, Northern Rhodesia, Mozambique, and the Republic of South Africa, simply because these countries desire self-determination rather than to be subjected to the communist-infested United Nations.

The Dangers of Increased Imports of Residual Fuel Oil and Increased Imports Quotas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS G. MORRIS

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 4, 1963

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Speaker, imports of residual fuel oil into the United States have increased greatly. This has resulted in the loss of thousands of jobs and millions of dollars of income. Increasing imports have been a contributing factor in creating numerous areas of unemployment throughout the coal and oil producing sectors of the Nation.

Not only have the imports of all forms of residual fuel oil increased, but also, the quotas have been raised several times on imports of residual fuel oil used only for fuel which have been under mandatory import control by quota since April 1, 1959—except for amounts withdrawn from bonded warehouses for ship supplies or for export. In addition, overland imports from Canada and Mexico are exempt from control.

Imports of all types of residual fuel oil rose from 36.5 million barrels in 1944 to 182 million barrels in 1958, and, in spite of import quotas, under the mandatory control program, inaugurated in 1959, the import of 232.9 million barrels of residual oil in 1961 represents an increase of 50.9 million barrels over 1958.

Total imports and import quotas are still zooming upward. This has recently been sharply brought to notice, because on January 30, 1963, quotas were increased to allow imports of an additional 6.5 million barrels before March 30, 1963.

Import quotas have been changed several times. They have risen, for example, from 343,347 barrels per day for the period from April 1–June 30, 1959, to 507,497 barrels daily from April 1, 1962 to January 30, 1963, and to 525,408 barrels a day as announced January 30, 1963, by the Oil Import Administration. The press release inferred that the additional 18,011 barrels daily could be retroactive back to April 1, 1962.

Reportedly, it has been calculated that the increase in the quota from 154 million barrels in 1960 to an estimated 190 million barrels per year via the recent quota rise will permit an increase of 36 million barrels of imports annually which in itself is equal, for example, to the displacement of 8.3 million tons of coal, and loss of the equivalent of 3,300 coal miners' jobs.

On February 13, 1963, the Director of the Office of Emergency Planning recommended that in the interest of national security and the attainment of Western Hemisphere objectives there should be a relaxation of controls on residual fuel oil imports. Some individuals and organizations have vigorously disagreed with that recommendation, stressing, among other things, that healthy industries, and greater job security in the United States are more vital national security considerations. Furthermore, these criticisms emphasize that we should not take lightly, or ignore, the ominous threats of Communist takeover of governments or the sabotage of industries in Central and South America from which we import 90 percent of our residual fuel oil.

It is high time we considered seriously the rising tide of residual fuel oil imports and their effects on our national security here at home, and the maintenance of our free economy and the economic and social well-being of our people.

Congress Should Pass Legislation To Eliminate National Origin Quota System

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACOB H. GILBERT
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 4, 1963

Mr. GILBERT. Mr. Speaker, on February 21, 1963, the Honorable EMANUEL CELLER, chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, of which I am a member, introduced H.R. 3926 to eliminate our national origin quota system. I am heartily in favor of this proposed legislation and have introduced today an identical bill, to indicate my strong support.

Since 1924, our immigration system has been based upon the unfair and discriminatory principles of national origin. Under present laws, controlling factors as to whether an immigrant may be admitted to the United States, his admission delayed, or refused, are area of the world in which he was born, his race, and nationality. My bill would eliminate this repugnant principle. It provides that the person he is, and his fitness to become a citizen of the United States would determine his right to come here—not his place of birth, his race, or his nationality.

The bill provides for a total annual immigration quota of 250,000 to be distributed among four specifically defined classes: first, family unification class; second, occupational class; third, refugee asylum class; and fourth, resettlement class. There would be an annual distribution of the overall immigration quota under the following procedure. Each year the President of the United States, after consulting with the Secretaries of State, Commerce, and Labor, and with the Attorney General, would submit to the Congress, prior to March 1, the proposed allocation for each of the four classes and Congress will have 60 days following the submission of the President's proposal to disapprove it by passing a concurrent resolution. If the proposal is not disapproved by the Congress, it takes effect on the first day of the fiscal year immediately following. If the Congress disagrees with the President, the allocation effective in the preceding fiscal year would automatically become effective.

The flexible distribution of a permanently fixed annual quota will permit us to decide what category of immigrants would at any particular time best serve our country's needs and suit world conditions.

I would point out that an important provision of the bill provides a guarantee that no unfair distribution of immigrant visas for the benefit of inhabitants of one particular country can take place. Within each of the four classes, no more than 15 percent of the annual allocation could be issued to inhabitants of any single country.

My assistance has been asked in hundreds of immigration cases, and I know the suffering and heartache endured by countless persons who are prevented from coming to our country because of our antiquated and unfair quota system based on national origin and race. Many must be registered with a U.S. consul for half a lifetime before they can be reached under the quota; many do not live long enough to be reached. It is high time that we let intending immigrants know that we shall be happy to admit them as soon as possible and practicable, if they meet reasonable qualifications—that is, that they will be considered as persons, individuals—not solely on the basis of geography or color of skin. Brotherhood—love for our fellow man—should be our guiding motives, not cruel discrimination and implied downgrading of human beings because of their race, color, or place of birth.

The bill also contains additional proposed amendments to remove restrictive features such as the needless distinctions between natural born and naturalized citizens; it also provides for a statute of limitations on deportations. It seeks improvement of administrative structure as well as of administrative and judicial review.

Our Committee on the Judiciary last year undertook an extensive study of population and immigration problems. This study is being continued, and it is hoped that helpful results will be obtained. I feel certain that the study will prove conclusively the need for the new legislation covered by this bill. I trust that the Congress will realistically approach the problem and take favorable action so that these greatly needed improvements in our immigration and nationality laws will become a reality.

Independence Day of Ghana

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ADAM C. POWELL
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 4, 1963

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, on March 6, the Republic of Ghana will celebrate the sixth anniversary of her independence. On this memorable occasion, I wish to take this opportunity to extend warm felicitations to His Excellency, the President of Ghana, Kwame Nkrumah; and His Excellency, the Ghana Chargé d'Affaires ad interim to the United States, Osei Tutu.

The birth of the Republic of Ghana on March 6, 1957, stirred the imagination of all the world, for Ghana was the first of the countries of sub-Saharan Africa to achieve independence after World War II. Ghana's hard-won privilege was also an immense responsibility, for the eyes of all peoples, independent and dependent, great and small, rich and poor, were turned toward the former British colony on the West Coast of Africa. Would Ghana make a go of it? Could her political institutions survive or would they be destroyed by old tribal rivalries? Could she develop her economy sufficiently to achieve a satisfactory living standard for her whole population?

These questions are no longer asked. Ghana has made a go of it. Ghana has become a leading nation of Africa, indeed of the neutral world. In the council chambers of the United Nations the Ghanaian Ambassador is listened to carefully as one of the chief spokesmen of the nonalined nations. Within the African Continent Ghana has been one of the stanchest advocates of pan-Africanism. Under the able and dedicated leadership of President Kwame Nkrumah, the Republic of Ghana has developed a deep national consciousness; the pessimists who predicted that the newly independent nation would soon be torn asunder by tribal rivalries vastly underestimated the capabilities of Ghana's President and the sincere devotion which he was able to inspire in the hearts of the Ghanaian people.

Economically Ghana is progressing admirably. Although Ghana is a comparatively small country—smaller than our State of Wyoming—it is centrally located in west Africa and is endowed with significant natural resources. Ghana is handy to the sealanes of the South Atlantic and to some of the African Continent's busiest highways and airlines. Its forests are rich in hardwoods such as mahogany, and the country is well endowed with mineral wealth. Gold, Ghana's most important mineral, has been one of the country's leading exports for over 400 years; Ghana was, in fact, formerly called the Gold Coast because of its trade in gold dust. Manganese and bauxite are also important export products. But it is cocoa which is Ghana's chief moneymaker. Ghana produces over one-third of the world's cocoa crop, of which American manufacturers purchase approximately 23 percent. As for manufacturing, Ghana has many flourishing small-scale industries in such fields as palm oil extracting, furniture making, and ivory working. Development plans called for the further expansion of industry and for broadening the economic base of the country. The Volta River dam and hydroelectric project, which the United States is helping to finance, will be an additional spur to Ghana's economy, for it will provide hydroelectric power for refining the country's vast bauxite resources into aluminum.

The old Ghana, which was a flourishing west African kingdom in the medieval ages, would be proud of the new Republic of Ghana. Ghana's per capita income is one of the highest in Africa. Her political leadership is able. Her people are industrious. The Ghanaian national flag is an accurate symbol of the new Ghana: its three horizontal stripes of red represent the blood and sweat of those who worked for independence; the gold stripe, the wealth of the country; and the green, its forests and farms. The five-pointed black star in the center of the gold stripe is the lodestar of African freedom.

On this sixth anniversary of independence, we salute Osagyefo Dr. Kwame Nkrumah and the people of Ghana; we wish them continued prosperity in the future.

Washington Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 4, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I am herewith submitting the text of my newsletter, "Washington Report" of March 2, 1963:

WASHINGTON REPORT

(By Congressman BRUCE ALGER, Fifth District, Texas)

MARCH, 2, 1963.

VITAL ISSUES DISCUSSED IN HOUSE THIS WEEK

In the first full week of House sessions this year, a number of vital issues were discussed. To keep you abreast of how your Representative is participating in debate on the problems we face, I am including in this newsletter excerpts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD containing my remarks on various problems:

On Monday, February 25, Congressman FRANK J. BECKER, of New York, took the floor to challenge President Kennedy's demand for bipartisan approval of all his actions in foreign policy. My part of the discussion follows:

"Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to join with the gentleman from New York in his discussion and his definition of the use and misuse of the word 'bipartisan.' My question is this: Does the gentleman not feel first of all that it is the prerogative, indeed, the duty of Members of Congress to be critical of foreign policy and, secondly, not to be shut off by the use of the word 'bipartisan' as though they are not supposed to be critical of the foreign policy which affects all of us?

"Mr. BECKER. This is exactly the intent of my remarks today. I believe that we would be irresponsible—irresponsible to the *n*th degree—if we attempted to roll over and play dead every time the President makes a mistake, whether it be our domestic or foreign policy.

"The mistakes that have been made during the past 2 years, from the time of the Bay of Pigs invasion right on down the line to Laos—keep occurring. What happened recently during the so-called blockade of Cuba as to whether missiles were or were not in Cuba? What happened in the situation with reference to Canada? These things create a responsibility on the part of Members of Congress to let the American people know that we are not parties to that decision. I assure the gentleman I would not have been a party to them myself.

"Mr. ALGER. If the gentleman will yield further, does the gentleman feel that some of the concern expressed now by the administration is the fear indeed of congressional criticism of policies that do not reflect the will of the people?

"Mr. BECKER. I am quite sure of that. Permit me to call the attention of the gentleman to this: You know when the situation with the administration had become very, very critical and bad in recent months and when the people were catching up with it, you know what happened. They pulled a 50-mile hike out of the bag in order to get front-page publicity. They got important news off the front pages and off the radio and television. Instead we heard and read about 50-mile hikes. The minds of the people are supposed to be taken off the real problems confronting us. This is the type of thing that is going on, and I think we should make the people understand why.

"Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, may I comment further and ask another question of him?

"Mr. BECKER. I am happy to yield.

"Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, I have been asked by very dedicated Americans who are sincerely concerned, and who are also worried about criticism of the Commander in Chief if, indeed, we are weakening his posture and the posture of our Nation today when we are critical; so I want to ask the gentleman, Is there not even greater danger that if we stifle and eliminate freedom of speech in this country in order to defeat the enemy, we have actually adopted the enemy's techniques and have already been defeated by him, so that there does not need to be any party or parties, except one party and a dictatorship?

"Mr. BECKER. The gentleman is absolutely correct. I might call the gentleman's attention to an article that appeared yesterday in the Washington Star 'Krock Calls Kennedy Policy Cynical on News.' I suggest the gentleman read that article. I intend to put it in the RECORD."

Tuesday, February 26, several Republican Members defended the integrity of Congress against one Member charged with indiscretions in connection with junketing.

"Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

"Mr. ASHBROOK. I yield to the gentleman.

"Mr. ALGER. I, too, want to join with the gentleman and thank him for having the courage as well as the forthrightness to say what needed to be said. And so that my colleagues understand, even as each of us, of course, is responsible for his own conduct, and I have the honor as has each other Member to represent some mighty fine people, I put my views on this in the RECORD yesterday at page 2987 with reference to the expenditures made by one of the Members of this body when he was overseas.

"It is my further contention that there are times when the Members of this body not only must travel the world but should travel all over the world when we have so many commitments abroad, but there are many trips that might very well be curtailed. I am going into my 9th year here. I have not been called upon to travel abroad. I hope some day if I can make any contribution to the matter then under consideration I may have the opportunity, but I do not intend to be reckless.

"I am sure there are many others who will say that the conduct of one of our colleagues does not speak for the rest of us in this body. Certainly it does not speak for the Member from the Fifth District of Texas. I join with others who feel that we should do whatever housecleaning is necessary when this body is not properly represented, as the representatives of the people not only of Texas but throughout the United States."

The House voted on Wednesday, February 27, a $508,172,000 appropriation to continue Public Law 480 for disposing of agricultural products. The bill passed 254 to 154. In debate I said:

"Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, my opposition to House Joint Resolution 284, supplement appropriations for the Department of Agriculture, is very basic. Public Law 480 has become not just a means of disposing of surplus foods, but a reason for continuing the piling up of surpluses. The tail is wagging the dog. An emergency program has become self-perpetuating. Further, this program is really a foreign aid program, yet has seldom been so considered except incidentally in totaling yearly aid. The abuse or misuse of taxpayers' money is best seen on those many occasions when we have shipped these foods to Communist countries.

"Nor is there much to commend the generating of counterpart funds. We get no pay, except in local currency that must be used locally, and which has been subject to much abuse.

"Finally, the Federal Government is not intended to be in the business of feeding people. It is unconstitutional."

One of our fine Dallas high schools won high honors in a debate tournament in the Nation's Capital and I was pleased to call attention to the achievement in this insertion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

"DALLAS HIGH SCHOOL DEBATE TEAM DEFEATS 117 RIVALS IN TOURNAMENT

"(Extension of remarks of Hon. BRUCE ALGER, of Texas, in the House of Representatives, Thursday, February 21, 1963)

"Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pride that I announce the victory of a debate team from Jesuit High School in Dallas last weekend in the National Invitational High School Cherry Blossom Tournament sponsored by Georgetown University. The Jesuit High School students, Rick Atkinson and Jim Turner, competed against 117 other high schools, public and private, representing 20 States. The debate topic was "That the United States Should Provide a Common Market for the Western Hemisphere." The Jesuit team took the affirmative side in the final debate, but debated both sides of the question in the course of the tournament. Jim Turner also won an award as third highest ranking speaker out of all the orators in the tournament.

"Mr. Speaker, this achievement by a team representing one of our fine Dallas high schools is another indication of the fine record of Dallas County. It is natural for Dallas to lead. Our people have always prided themselves on getting things done and as a result we have one of the greatest metropolitan areas of the Nation. Our achievements in industry, retailing, education, and cultural activities are a constant wonder to people everywhere. It always gives me great satisfaction to announce the achievements of Dallas people and to call attention to the fact that our progress as a community, in every field, is done through the efforts of our own people.

"That success in scholastic achievement is not confined to one Dallas high school was stressed by Rev. Father Herlong, of Jesuit, talking of the friendly rivalry between the various school debate teams. He said the Dallas students have a close bond with one another. He told how this was demonstrated last year in an intercity debate in which Byran Adams, a public high school, and Jesuit competed. Jesuit was declared the winner and when the announcement was made, the whole Bryan Adams team stood up and cheered. Father Herlong paid tribute to Bryan Adams as well as Garland High School and said they are both on a par with Jesuit and he feels that in last week's tournament they would have done as well and perhaps even better than Jesuit.

"Incidentally, on a personal note, Father Herlong is a distant cousin of our colleague, Congressman Sid Herlong, of Florida."

In a continuing effort to arouse a sense of rededication to basic American principles, I included in the Record some remarks on a truth too often overlooked in the Declaration of Independence:

"HAPPINESS MUST BE EARNED

"(Extension of remarks of Hon. Bruce Alger, of Texas, in the House of Representatives, Thursday, February 21, 1963)

"Mr. Alger. Mr. Speaker, the following copy from the advertisement of the Warner & Swasey Co., in the February 25 issue of U.S. News & World Report, should be read by all freedom-loving Americans. It reminds us that no government can guarantee happiness, only the right to seek happiness. Too many our our people today are becoming imbued with the idea that the guarantee of happiness is a right, forgetting the happiness must be bred within the individual and cannot be superimposed by any outside force. Any attempt by a government to give to its people some kind of happiness means a subsequent loss of freedom, and without freedom no man can be truly happy.

"The article follows:

" '*Life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness*

" 'When you read the Declaration of Independence (and everyone of us should) read it all. Too many Americans think it guarantees them life, liberty, and happiness. Not at all—only the pursuit of happiness.

" 'No one but a selfish child thinks he has the right to happiness. Adults know it has to be deserved, earned—and the only way to earn it is to contribute more to the world than you take.

" 'If you are a worker, you produce enough to pay your wage plus enough to pay for the machine, without which you would have no job.

" 'If you're a businessman, you produce enough to pay your workman a fair wage, enough for an incentive return to your stockholders whose savings built the company, and enough for your share of necessary taxes to protect your country.

" 'If you're a politician you work first for the good of your country, not your party or yourself.

" 'That is the honest way to happiness as every intelligent adult knows. Anything seized in any other way is grasping greed, of which any self-respecting American should be ashamed.

" 'Is it useless to hope for that kind of Americanism? We don't think so.' "

These excerpts from the Congressional Record are just a sampling of the week's work of a Member of Congress. In addition to debate on the floor, most of my time this week was spent in committee where we continued the hearings on the President's tax proposals and on his request for an extension of the increase in the debt ceiling.

Witness after witness, under my questioning and that of my Republican colleagues on the committee, have been forced to admit the proposals of the President, if enacted into law, will retard, not accelerate our economy. I continued to hammer home the fact that while tax cuts are necessary and justified, they will be completely meaningless unless a substantial cut is made in Federal spending. Without reduced spending a $10-to-$20 billion tax cut will cause inflationary pressures which will mean higher prices, lower dividends on investments and savings, higher insurance premiums, and in the end the great majority of our people will have less money to spend, and business growth will be hindered, not helped.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 6, 1963

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., offered the following prayer:

I Chronicles 29: 5: *Who then is willing to consecrate his service this day unto the Lord?*

O Thou gracious Benefactor, who alone can supply our temporal needs and satisfy our eternal longings, help us to walk the way of life with a determination of courage which nothing can daunt and a splendor of faith which can never be eclipsed by doubt or despair.

May the mind and heart of our President, our Speaker, and all the Members of Congress be strengthened and sustained by lofty principles and purposes as they seek, in unity of spirit, to discharge faithfully the arduous tasks of their high vocation.

Grant that this Lenten season may not only be a time of commemoration but of consecration when we shall commit ourselves unreservedly to the doing of Thy will and the building of a finer social order.

Hear us in Christ's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of Monday, March 4, 1963, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. McGown, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 13. An act to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to convey certain land situated in the State of Arkansas to the city of Fayetteville, Ark.; and

S. 345. An act to provide for the approval of a payment in lieu of taxes to be made for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1959, by the Hawaii Housing Authority to the city and county of Honolulu.

The message also announced that the President of the Senate, pursuant to title 16, United States Code, section 513, had appointed Mr. Aiken to be a member of the National Forest Reservation Commission to fill an existing vacancy.

The message also announced that Mr. Robertson, chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency of the Senate, pursuant to section 712(a) of Public Law 774, 81st Congress, appointed Mr. Tower a member of the Joint Committee on Defense Production to fill an existing vacancy.

The message also announced that the Vice President has appointed Mr. Johnston and Mr. Carlson members of the Joint Select Committee on the part of the Senate, as provided for in the act of August 5, 1939, entitled "An act to provide for the disposition of certain records of the U.S. Government," for the disposition of executive papers referred to in the report of the Archivist of the United States numbered 63-8.

HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION ENROLLED

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had, on March 5, 1963, examined and found truly enrolled a joint resolution of the House of the following title:

H.J. Res. 284. Joint resolution making supplemental appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, and for other purposes.

ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The SPEAKER. The Chair desires to announce that pursuant to the authority granted him on Monday, March 4, 1963, he did on March 5, 1963, sign the following enrolled joint resolution of the House:

H.J. Res. 284. Joint resolution making supplemental appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, and for other purposes.

DISSEMINATION OF OBSCENE MATTER THROUGH THE MAILS

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, one of the most serious problems existing in our Nation today is the harm that is caused to our people, especially the youth of our country, through the dissemination of obscene literature and other degrading publications and pornographic material through the mails.

The Post Office Department has been hampered in the efforts it has made to ban such material from the mails by reason of the lack of adequate statutory authority.

Our church, patriotic, and civic organizations throughout the country are making a splendid effort to curb the dissemination of obscene matter through the mails. Unless adequate statutory authority exists, however, for the Post Office Department to punish those engaged in distributing immoral and degrading matter the problem will continue to exist.

Mr. Speaker, I have introduced a bill which, if enacted, will do much to halt the spread of obscene matter. My measure prescribes what I believe to be adequate penalties for those who would engage in the distribution of material which has such an adverse effect on the moral health of our Nation.

My bill provides that anyone who places in the mails a lewd, lascivious, or degrading article, publication, or picture of any kind shall be subject to a fine for the first offense up to $5,000 and imprisonment up to 5 years, or both. For a second offense a person would be liable to a fine of $10,000 and imprisonment from 5 to 10 years, or both.

I feel that the Congress has no greater duty than to provide adequate safeguards against the distribution of obscene matter in the mails, and it is my sincere hope that my colleagues in the House will support the enactment of my measure.

THE SOVIET BUILDUP IN CUBA

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, during the Soviet buildup in Cuba last year, allied merchant ships indirectly aided the Communist bloc by chartering their hulls for nonmilitary cargoes, thus freeing the limited Communist merchant fleet for military shipments to Cuba. Along with several other Members of Congress who realized this situation, I advocated that U.S. ports be closed to flagships of nations engaged in hauling goods of any kind to Cuba.

Little has been done by the U.S. Government since that time to thwart allied shipping to Cuba. The only real change in the situation has been the shifting of public attention from allied shipping to Cuba to several other aspects of the Cuban problem—namely, such matters as the debate over whether Communist arms in Cuba are offensive or defensive in nature.

However, I am pleased to see the recent reports that bear out my suggestions that all U.S. ports be closed to flagships calling in Cuba. Last week, wire service reports were carried stating that the State Department is holding further talks with nations engaged in this commerce—namely, Great Britain, Japan, Greece, Lebanon, Italy, and Norway. As you can see, these nations are among our closest allies, yet they continue their shipping for our avowed Communist enemies.

Life magazine has now endorsed the suggestion that U.S. ports be closed in this week's issue, pointing out that such a closure would place severe economic restrictions on Castro, yet not constitute an act of war. I urge that this Government intensify its efforts to cut off allied shipping, and increase our efforts by closing U.S. ports to the flag of any nation which allows its ships to trade with Cuba.

SERVICES OF LEWIS DESCHLER, PARLIAMENTARIAN

Mr. McINTIRE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maine?

There was no objection.

Mr. McINTIRE. Mr. Speaker, I want to join with my colleagues in extending congratulations to Lew Deschler as he passes the 35-year landmark of superb service as Parliamentarian of the House of Representatives.

As he always proves helpful to Members in House proceedings, so has his counsel been my guide rail on numerous occasions. And his assistance and advice are always given willingly, generously, and courteously.

Mr. Deschler's work is of a demanding nature, and his efficiency in resolving complex problems of parliamentary procedure quickly convinces one that here is a man who really knows his job. Such a facility for coping with congressional complexities can be the product only of vast wisdom and long experience.

In a large sense, Lew can be likened unto a referee who officiates in one of the greatest of all games, the vital game of legislation. And we who are players in that game cannot help but feel surer of foot and more certain of our moves because of the proven ability of the man who calls the rules on the plays.

It gives me great pleasure then, on this occasion, to express to Lew my great appreciation for the many kindnesses and courtesies he has extended me.

And I am certainly happy to lend my voice to those who, with sure sincerity and good cause, acclaim Lew Deschler as a "parliamentarian's parliamentarian."

CUBA AS A BASE FOR SUBVERSION

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, on February 6, 1963, at 5 p.m., the Secretary of Defense, Mr. Robert S. McNamara, held a so-called press conference in the State Department Auditorium, and it is my understanding it was broadcast throughout the Nation by television and radio.

He was asked this question at that interview:

> Mr. Secretary, could you comment on the possibilities that Cuba is being used as a training base for subversion in other Latin American countries.
>
> Secretary McNAMARA. I have no evidence that Cuba is being used as a base for subversion directed against other Latin American countries.

Mr. Speaker, the House Committee on Foreign Affairs and its Inter-American Subcommittee has been holding hearings on the situation with respect to Cuba and the Central and South American area. Mr. McCone, Director of the Central Intelligence Agency, appeared before the committee on February 19, 1963. Let me quote one paragraph from his testimony:

> At least 1,000 to 1,500 persons came to Cuba during 1962, from all the other Latin American countries with the possible exception of Uruguay, to receive ideological indoctrination or guerrilla warfare training or both. More have gone in 1963 despite the limited facilities for reaching Cuba at present.

Mr. Speaker, with respect to those who administer the affairs of this Government, I ask whether the left hand knows what the right hand is doing?

COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I call up House Resolution 228 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

> *Resolved,* That effective from January 3, 1963, the expenses of conducting the investigations and studies authorized by H. Res. 179, Eighty-eighth Congress, by the Committee on Banking and Currency, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, not to exceed $530,000 for the Eighty-eighth Congress, including expenditures for employment, travel, and subsistence of accountants, experts, investigators, attorneys, and clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized by such committee, signed by the chairman of such committee, and approved by the Committee on House Administration.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the committee amendments.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Line 5, strike out "$530,000" and insert "$180,000".
>
> Line 13, insert the following new paragraph:
>
> "SEC. 2. No part of the funds authorized by this resolution shall be available for expenditure in connection with the study or investigation of any subject which is being investigated for the same purpose by any other committee of the House, and the chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency shall furnish the Committee on House Administration information with respect to any study or investigation intended to be financed from such funds."

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, the subcommittee and the full Committee on House Administration have agreed to give the Banking and Currency Committee the amount of $180,000. This was done after very careful consideration and justification of the need for this minimum appropriation.

Our committee feels that if the chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee finds he does not have sufficient funds later on, he can come back and request an additional appropriation if he can justify it. We assure him that our committee will give him a prompt hearing on any such request.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRIEDEL. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. HAYS. As one of the members of the subcommittee, I just want to say I think what the gentleman has said is obviously an invitation to come back, and I want to say that the amount with reference to this committee has escalated from $5,000, for 2 years in the last Congress, to where we have given them $180,000 for 1 year and if the chairman of the committee accepts the invitation of the gentleman from Maryland, he had better be prepared to do a lot of justifying.

Mr. FRIEDEL. That is just what I said. If it is justified, the committee would consider it.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN], for the purpose of making a statement.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, may I invite the attention of the Members of the House to the fact that one private organization, the Commission on Money and Credit, recently completed a study of the Nation's money and credit system. This commission spent 3 years at the task and spent almost $2 million of private money. When a private organization spends $2 million to make a study of matters needing legislation by the Congress, it shows there is a public need and demand for information about problems which are the responsibility of Congress.

The need is there. As this commission report points out, there has been no overall study of our money and credit system since the study of the Aldrich commission, made more than 50 years ago.

The Commission on Money and Credit issued a report which makes at least 85 major recommendations for changes in the laws affecting the Nation's financial institutions, public and private. If the subject matter of these recommendations is important enough to call for the expenditure of $2 million of private money, then they are important enough for the Congress to spend a few thousand dollars to study this matter, so that it can legislate intelligently.

Obviously, our committee cannot simply accept or reject these recommendations without itself looking into the factual situations which underlie them. In fact, I am not at all sure that the Commission on Money and Credit actually gathered any new facts. It seems to me that their scholars mostly did think pieces, and the recommendations were based on these. For example, I asked Mr. Frazar Wilde, the chairman of the Commission on Money and Credit, a question along these lines:

> Did you consider the significance of the decreasing number of commercial banks in the country over the past 40 years? During these years, the period of greatest growth in our history, the number of commercial banks has gone down from 31,000 to 13,500. Did your commission go into that to determine why the number of commercial banks is going down?

Mr. Wilde answered "No," that the commission did not examine into this question.

Now, that is a very important question, and it should be gone into; we should find out the reason for this trend. We need a good banking system. We need a profitable banking system. We need commercial banks in time of peace and in time of war. We cannot do without them.

There are many questions in the jurisdiction of our committee that should be gone into, that have not been gone into in the last 50 years.

Obviously it is impossible even for this one task to be performed without funds. If we have the funds I would expect to obtain the help of some of the college professors and other experts. I would expect to use some of the same professors who worked for the Commission on Money and Credit; some of them have complained to me that they were not privileged to obtain some of the facts they needed. That is the reason why in our budget we have stated that we will use people on a contractual basis, college professors, for example, where we can get them only for 6 weeks, 3 months, or for a year. The money, if appropriated, will be prudently spent, of course.

Our studies and investigations will not be for the purpose of trying to embarrass any political party, any person, or any group of financial institutions. It will be for the purpose of making factual studies.

I respectfully suggest that the amount of funds which the Committee on House Administration approved is low. The committee has recognized, however, that this amount is just for 10 months, and if we can make a showing at the end of that time that we need more money, then we can come back to that committee and ask for more money. Any money we get we expect to use in the most careful possible way, and for the public interest. If we do not use it all, we will, of course, turn it back.

May I say also that our committee has pending an extremely large volume of legislation, the reason being in part, I think, because it has been so long since we have made any study of our money and credit system and the component financial institutions.

I thank my colleague the gentleman from Maryland for yielding.

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HAYS].

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Ohio is recognized.

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYS. I yield.

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, I want to make sure that this is not construed as an invitation for any committee to come back for more funds. They will have to justify any additional request, but if they can justify such a request, we will hear them while the House is in session.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, I have been a member of this subcommittee of the Committee on House Administration for the past 14 years and some months with the exception of a period of 2 or 3 months in the 83d Congress. A lot of committees have come before the committee in that length of time.

I have no quarrel with the chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency. I want to see him have as much money as he needs, but I am telling him that if he is going to take every report that some committee downtown submits to this body, I do not care whether it costs $2 million or $20 million, there is not enough money in the contingency fund to finance it. For instance, many reports come to the Foreign Affairs Committee. There was the report of the Draper Committee, and I do not know how many others; but when we get a report we file it in file 13, the round one under the desk, and then proceed to have our own committee hearings and make the decision which is our responsibility to make.

You can have a hearing about money and credit from here on out. You can have a hearing about many phases of banking. There are endless hearings and investigations that could be had. We hear a lot about the spending of counterpart money by Members who go abroad, but I can point to you that there are at least half a dozen committees in this House who spend more—I know one last year that spent more than the total amount spent by all Members on foreign travel put together. I am not going to name names, but there are two committees that contract for employees. I was on the select committee of the Committee on House Administration to study these contracts last year, and there were two committees of this House who had—23 in one committee and 30 in another—people under contract for amounts varying from $500 to $10,000 supposedly to make studies and reports to the committee, and I will bet you not 1 of the 63 could justify their existence. One of them was the secretary of the NAACP. He was under private contract for $10,000. I maintain that we should not have the secretary of any organization—White Citizens Committee, Grain Dealers of America, or any other organization—making a private investigation under his own steam, while being paid with Government funds.

The Committee on House Administration, Mr. Speaker, has never crippled any committee. The only reason I take this time is to say to the gentleman from Texas and all the rest, there has been a lot of criticism of some committees, there has been a lot of criticism of these people being hired under contract. All I said before and all I am saying now is that if you come in again before the first of next year, you had better have a lot of facts and figures to justify what you are asking for, as far as I am concerned.

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York [Mr. KILBURN].

Mr. KILBURN. Mr. Speaker, I agree with the amount recommended by the Committee on House Administration for the Committee on Banking and Currency. I thought the first request was too large. I think they have arrived at a fair figure.

I would also like to inform the House that the chairman of the committee [Mr. PATMAN] and I have come to a fine agreement as far as staff is concerned. The gentleman from Texas has been very fair. Our present staff is 10, 2 to the minority and 8 to the majority; but of those 8, some of them serve us just the same as they do the majority. If he adds five more members to the staff, one would be for the minority and four for the majority. If he adds 10, 2 will be for us and 8 for the majority. I think a lot of them will be nonpartisan and we can all use them. The thing has worked out very well, due to the fine cooperation of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN].

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the ranking minority member of the Committee on House Administration, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SCHENCK].

Mr. SCHENCK. Mr. Speaker, I would like to express my deep personal appreciation to the chairman of the full Committee on House Administration, Mr. BURLESON, the distinguished gentleman from Texas, the chairman of the subcommittee, Mr. FRIEDEL, the distinguished gentleman from Maryland, and my colleagues, both majority and minority, on the committee for the very sincere and hard work they have done and for their high degree of fairness on all the difficult questions raised during the thorough considerations for the appropriations for the operation and work of the committees of the House.

Our committee has worked hard and long on these appropriation resolutions. It has not been easy. There have been honest differences of opinion, but they have been resolved as sensible people should resolve differences of opinion and without sacrificing sound principles.

I want to associate myself with the comments of my colleague, the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HAYS] and my colleague, the distinguished gentleman from Maryland [Mr. FRIEDEL] as to the question of justification for any additional appropriations. It has seemed to me, Mr. Speaker, there has arisen a misunderstanding of the reasons for making these 1-year appropriations.

When I first suggested to our chairman, Mr. BURLESON, the distinguished gentleman from Texas, the idea of making these appropriations for 1 year, and we agreed on that, my purpose was to give the Committee on House Administration an opportunity, as has been said, to review the expenditures and the work done by the various committees each year and to thus establish better control over these expenditures. This was not intended, Mr. Speaker, as an invitation to come back to the House Committee on Administration for more funds; neither was it our intention to permit chairmen of committees to develop studies which would take extensive time and money for staff, and then come to our committee later and say, we have only partially completed our investigation and we will need additional funds to complete our unfinished work.

Mr. Speaker, it was my own personal intention in making the suggestion to the chairman of our Committee on House Administration, that all the committee chairmen of the House be cautioned to spend the money allocated to them with prudence and responsibility so that the work and program they intended to do can be fully completed within the appropriation allotted for this year of the Congress. Also, Mr. Speaker, that if it should become necessary for any committee chairman to request additional funds for any purpose whatsoever, that the chairman of such committee would be on notice and fully aware of the need to completely justify and document any such subsequent request for any additional funds.

Mr. Speaker, on February 27, when we here on this floor approved some 20 committee appropriations, both the chairman of the Committee on House Administration, and as I recall, the majority leader of the House of Representatives—these two distinguished gentlemen—called attention to the fact that the majority party in the House does have the full responsibility for the regulation and supervision of committee policies and procedures and that the majority party both recognizes and will exercise this responsibility.

Mr. Speaker, if anyone doubts that those statements were made he can refer to pages 3053, 3054, and 3055 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of February 27, 1963, and read again these flat statements.

Mr. Speaker, it is my hope that the majority will fully assume its proper responsibility and that its leadership will guide the studies and the investigations to be developed by all the committees of the House and their chairmen.

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the committee amendments.

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING THE COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE TO EMPLOY TWO ADDITIONAL EMPLOYEES

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I call up House Resolution 225 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That effective February 1, 1963, the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce is authorized, until otherwise provided by law, to employ two additional employees at rates of compensation to be fixed by the chairman in accordance with section 202(c) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXPENSES FOR STUDIES AND INVESTIGATIONS TO BE CONDUCTED BY THE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration I call up House Resolution 254, with committee amendments, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That, effective from January 3, 1963, the expenses of the studies and investigations to be conducted pursuant to H. Res. 103 by the Committee on Education and Labor, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, not to exceed $697,000, including expenditures for the employment of investigators, attorneys, and experts, and clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, and all expenses necessary for travel and subsistence incurred by members and employees while engaged in the activities of the committee or any subcommittee thereof, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized and signed by the chairman of such committee and approved by the Committee on House Administration.

SEC. 2. The official committee reporters may be used at all hearings held in the District of Columbia, if not otherwise officially engaged.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 5, strike out "$697,000" and insert "$200,000".

Page 1, line 11, after "House" insert a period and strike out all that follows down through and including the period on page 2, line 1 and insert in lieu thereof the following: "Of such amount $25,000 shall be available for each of six subcommittees of the Committee on Education and Labor, and not to exceed $50,000 shall be available to the Committee on Education and Labor. All amounts authorized to be paid out of the contingent fund by this resolution shall, in the case of each subcommittee, be paid on vouchers authorized and signed by the chairman of the subcommittee, cosigned by the chairman of the committee and approved by the Committee on House Administration; in the case of the committee, such amount shall be paid on vouchers authorized and signed by the chairman of the committee and approved by the Committee on House Administration."

Page 2, line 17, insert the following new section:

"SEC. 3. No part of the funds authorized by this resolution shall be available for expenditure in connection with the study or investigation of any subject which is being investigated for the same purpose by any other committee of the House, and the chairman of the Committee on Education and Labor shall furnish the Committee on House Administration information with respect to any study or investigation intended to be financed from such funds."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, I desire recognition on the resolution.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Maryland is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. Goodell].

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Speaker, this is a resolution on the Education and Labor Committee. We are authorizing $200,000 for a single year. We have restricted $150,000 of that $200,000 to be channeled through the subcommittee chairmen, six subcommittee chairmen. All vouchers presumably from this $150,000 given to the subcommittee chairmen must be approved in advance by the subcommittee chairmen.

Mr. Speaker, there is an additional $50,000, making the total $200,000, which will be available to the full committee and to the chairman of the full committee.

Mr. Speaker, I regret to say that I think the end effect of what we are doing will be to disable completely the minority on the Committee on Education and Labor. We are at this point prepared, as a minority, to hire expert professional help in the field of education and in the field of labor. We would like to hire them. Hearings have been going on in both these fields for some time. We need that professional help.

The chairman is going to have, with this $200,000 that is authorized here, $50,000 with which presumably he could meet the needs of the minority and also take care of all of his own committee expenses; reporting services, stenographic, telephone bills, and that type of thing.

Mr. Speaker, I think we should understand what we are doing. I think there have been abuses, and we had a bipartisan front in the House Administration Committee to try to control the expenditure of these funds. But as a practical matter the passage of this resolution in its present form will give nothing to the minority. Perhaps I am premature. We intend to request the chairman to grant the minority some help, and perhaps he will accede to that request. But I think in view of past experience that it is a very highly optimistic view—to presume that he may accede to that request, especially under present circumstances. I think we are going to be back here very shortly with further requests to try to protect the minority.

I want to pay tribute to the members of the majority party on the House Administration Committee in this respect. There was expressed throughout these hearings a willingness and a desire and an intention to protect the minority, to give them an opportunity to hire the necessary professional help which we need. Unfortunately, it was not put into precise language in this resolution to give us the guarantee that we need.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOODELL. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I find myself in agreement with much that the gentleman is saying. I think the gentleman will agree that in the last 24 hours an unproductive but reasonable solution or agreement had been reached. I think the gentleman will find that most members of the majority on the Committee on Education and Labor are anxious that the minority have the staff which we acknowledge it needs, in particular an education and a labor expert; that if following the adoption of this resolution there is constructive action taken we can reach an agreement rather quickly and bring about a more equitable solution for everyone.

We have been cut, in my judgment, by this resolution, not only to the bone but into the bone. It is an unhappy set of circumstances which brings this about. Once the resolution is adopted, however, I am certain we can reach an agreement and I, for one, will work with the gentleman from New York [Mr. Goodell] and the ranking member, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. Frelinghuysen], to bring this about.

Mr. GOODELL. May I express appreciation for that assurance, but I want to emphasize that this is a very immediate need and a very critical need on the part of the minority on the Committee on Education and Labor.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. We recognize that.

Mr. GOODELL. We cannot wait a month or 2 months to see how unsatisfactory our situation is because of the refusal to recognize minority rights in our committee. We are well along with hearings in the field of education, the Youth Conservation Corps, and other fields. Two months have passed by without our having the professional help we need. We hope in someway we can provide a means to meet this immediate need in a fair and bipartisan way.

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Hays].

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, I had not intended to speak on this resolution. However, I hear that there is a possibility that a motion to recommit will be made to add $35,000 for the minority.

I should like to point out that this committee, the same as every other committee in the House, has a provision in the reorganization act for 10 staff members. I understand from the testimony adduced from the minority itself that two of these men are assigned to the minority. Of this money, $150,000 is assigned to the subcommittees. I would think from what I have heard from both sides that the minority will get fair and equitable treatment in the subcommittees.

I want to make another point. I have heard a lot of conversation about the tremendous amount of work this committee does, and I am sure it does, and how they have been cut out of funds. Last year the Committee on Foreign Affairs handled the foreign aid bill, which started out with $4 billion, the Peace Corps bill, the disarmament bill, and a half a dozen others of great importance, with exactly one-third the amount of money the House Committee on Education and Labor had to spend last year.

We have a professional staff on that committee. If somebody said, "Here is a million dollars if you can tell me the politics of three of them or whether they are of the majority or minority," I could not accept the money because I do not know. Most of them have been there from the time the Republicans controlled this House, and they have stayed on. That committee turns out a lot of work, yet nobody knows who the minority members are. They are staff members and they do the job when they are asked to do it. This might be the solution for the Education and Labor Committee.

We have heard a lot of testimony about how they are asking too much money for both sides. We have assured them if they are really being crippled they can come in and get a further hearing before our committee. But we had testimony from the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Landrum], among others—and I hope he does not mind my mentioning his name—that there are many employees of this committee that he had never seen or knew where they were working, if they were working at all, and there were a great number of people under private contract. The select subcommittee of which I was chairman looked into these private contracts and found that nobody on this committee except the chairman had any knowledge of these employees whatsoever. This is an attempt on the part of the House to sort of regulate this so that the employees, wherever—I am sorry—whoever they may be, will be here in Washington working for the committee and not drawing checks when they are off some place in some other part of the country.

There has been talk about abuses in connection with the appointment of staff members. I expect this committee was pretty high on the list of those who abuse it. We read a lot of news in the papers about a shortage of college professors. There were so many under contract around here in these committees last year, that I can understand that is why we have this shortage. That is why we have this rule not to hire anybody under contract unless the House Administration Committee takes a look at the contract. We want them to get back to the university and get back to teaching.

I do not think that will be an entirely unwholesome proposition when it finally works out. I just want to point out in conclusion that every other committee in the House has refrained from having stipulated how much money the minority would get, and if you do it for this committee by a motion to recommit or otherwise, you can expect to destroy the nonpartisan staffs of a great many committees that the Members on both sides would not like to see destroyed—and I can mention the Committee on Foreign Affairs and the Committee on Armed Services as two of them.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GRIFFIN. What do you propose to do about the minority staff problem on the Committee on Education and Labor?

Mr. HAYS. I propose that you settle it in your committee and, if there is a real abuse, I think you can get enough of the people on our side to vote with you to do something about it.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Under the resolution you have reported only $50,000 is available to the chairman.

Mr. HAYS. That is right. The chairman now has 10 employees of which you say you have 2.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Do you think the chairman is going to give any of that $50,000 for minority staffing?

Mr. HAYS. I expect that he will not.

Mr. GRIFFIN. All right, then.

Mr. HAYS. But I do not think he can hire very many people with it and still pay travel and phone bills either so your ratio is not going to be too bad.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. Roosevelt].

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, I believe I am correct in saying that the $50,000 referred to by the gentleman from Michigan is available not to the chairman but to the committee, and if the gentleman on the other side of the aisle wishes to discuss the matter not only with the chairman but with the entire membership of the committee, that is the proper place to do it. Unfortunately, the chairman of the committee is ill today with influenza and cannot be here.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure the gentleman will find his description of the uncooperative spirit of the chairman with respect to the $50,000 is quite wrong. If he wants to bring this forward and have a discussion, I think as soon as the chairman is on his feet and is able to be here, he will find that he will be able to do so and I am sure it will be in the very near future.

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. Frelinghuysen], the ranking member of the Committee on Education and Labor.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a brief observation?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. With respect to the allocation of funds, I would like to point out to the House that on page 2 of the resolution on lines 2 through 5, there is this language: "of such amount $25,000 shall be available for each of the six subcommittees of the Committee on Education and Labor and not to exceed $50,000 shall be available to the Committee on Education and Labor."

Now this is the language of the resolution and it is the language of the Reorganization Act. The moneys are within the control of the majority of the committee. All we are trying to indicate, and at least what I am trying to indicate, is the assurance that the majority will make an effort to see that justice is done.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I appreciate the gentleman's assurances. I only wish I had something more substantial from the chairman of the full committee.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous material.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I should like to remind my colleagues that 8 weeks ago today this Congress convened. I, for one, feel it is high time that the Committee on Education and Labor received funds so it can operate properly. I should also like to point out that it is almost 3 months ago, on December 14, to be exact, that I had a discussion with the chairman of the full committee with respect to funds for the minority staff. We have had a very serious problem over the last 2 years, with respect to the necessity for more adequate staffing. Since that time, unfortunately, I have had until very recently no discussion with the chairman of the full committee with respect to the staff. Nor have I had any answers to my letters since December requesting information as to his position on this question. Finally, on February 28, I did receive a brief memo which stated his position, and I quote:

> This is a firm commitment that out of the present budget, $110,000 will be allotted to the minority to use as they see fit.
>
> Plus two minority staff personnel, Mr. Richard T. Burress and Mrs. Beverly Pearson, will be on the standing committee at all times.

I should like to correct an observation made by the gentleman from Ohio with respect to what the minority presently has on the standing committee. We have only one member on the standing committee at this time. We hope that the firm commitment from the chairman will insure that we will have two members on that committee hereafter.

I do not know whether this proposed cutting of funds will make him change his mind about what he has described as a firm commitment. I did receive from the clerk of the full committee yesterday a telephone notice, and I quote:

> The chairman can give no commitments to the minority until he finds out how much he is getting.

In other words, the firm commitment which I got last week is apparently worth nothing because of the reduced amount which is to be made available to the committee.

I consider it essential that the minority have an adequate amount. I would like to ask the chairman of the House Administration Subcommittee what perhaps we might anticipate, in his view, as a reasonable amount? A total of $200,000 is to be made available, of which $50,000 is to be made available to the committee itself.

I notice that the request for funds for the committee's operation was $25,000 for the next 2-year period. This would seem to mean that $12,500 a year would be sufficient for the full committee. Might not the House Administration seem to indicate that the reduction in funds should be directed primarily at the so-called investigative task force, for which $202,000 was requested in the next 2-year period?

I hope we can anticipate that the minority can get a substantial amount of that $50,000. We need some reassurance from the chairman, or the committee itself, that we are entitled to it. We need some indication with respect to a percentage of the total, or the specific number of employees that we can have. I for one am very much disturbed about the uncertainty of things.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I yield.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. The language of the resolution leaves the question not up to the Committee on House Administration but to the Committee on Education and Labor. I again would like to assure the gentleman and the minority that a majority of the majority side is anxious to resolve this question and to do it within a matter of as few days as possible. The gentleman knows something of the tentative agreement which we have. We can do this within a matter of days.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I can only say that if the committee has that power, I wish they had reached a firm agreement before now, and thus avoiding the necessity of coming here and publicly airing our problems.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. There can be no doubt the power exists.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. It is obvious, of course, to all who have listened to this discussion that there have been difficult problems in connection with this particular resolution. I think it is worthy of note that in connection with previous similar resolutions accommodations that were fairly satisfactory were arrived at.

I think it is fair to say that as of today no such accommodation has been arrived at with respect to this resolution as it passed the Committee on Education and Labor. In view of that fact, there has been a difference of opinion on the minority side as to what best ought to be done about it, and I do not know what ultimately might be done. But I do want to say that with the assurances that have been given to us, first of all the other day when we had some general discussion involving this matter of minority rights and responsibilities in connection with committee staffs, I thought very fair statements were made by the leaders on the majority side of the aisle.

I certainly feel today there have been assurances given that cannot be put into effect immediately, but assurances given by responsible members not only of the House Administration Committee but of the Committee on Education and Labor, that I am sure were meant in good faith, in all sincerity, by people of integrity; and I would certainly express the hope that if this resolution goes through as it has been reported, that very, very soon some accommodation could be reached that would protect what I feel are the essential rights of the minority on this very important committee.

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. Albert].

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, apropos of what the gentleman from Indiana has said, I think the gentleman will agree with me that under the resolution pending, and under the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, this is a matter which has always been left to the legislative committees.

I think the gentleman would further agree that in a matter of this kind, if we want to depart from the objectives of the Reorganization Act we ought to do it by amending the rules and not by starting a piecemeal departure, committee by committee. If we do anything else, we are going to get ourselves in the position of amending the rules of the House piecemeal in the wrong forum, at the wrong time, and under the wrong circumstances.

With respect to what the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey has said, may I say that this very committee in previous years, by a majority vote of the committee, under the control of this side of the House, vetoed the action of a previous chairman relating to the appointment of a staff member. That power rests in the committee, and if the committee in its wisdom cannot work out its problems, it would seem to me that the gentleman and others interested in this matter would approach the matter of amending the rules of the House in such a manner as to provide for equal treatment of all committees.

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LANDRUM].

Mr. LANDRUM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend by remarks and include a statement I made to the Committee on House Administration.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANDRUM. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the Committee on House Administration for the action it has taken. I can imagine it took a great deal of courage to do the things that it had to do. Simultaneously, I want to give my assurance, if any is needed, to the minority that I will work with the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. THOMPSON]; the gentleman from California [Mr. ROOSEVELT]; and the other members of the committee who are subcommittee chairmen, in trying to work this problem of money out to the complete satisfaction of the minority.

Mr. Speaker, we are dealing with a committee which has jurisdiction over two of the most live subject matters of the day. Education is the foundation on which this country will continue to grow and be the powerful leader in the world it must be. If we do not give proper and adequate attention to that subject and adjust ourselves to the changing needs of education, then our structure of government is going to fall because of it.

Likewise, this committee deals with another most sensitive and important subject, that of labor, which, if it does not give proper, careful, studious attention to, the country's productive capacity will suffer tremendously, and instead of growing, our standard of living will cease to grow at the rate we require.

So I say rather than have the two delicate, important, and sensitive subject matters lumped under one head, it is high time the House of Representatives recognize that the real problem here does not lie in the amount of money that comes to one particular member, whether he be chairman or not chairman, to do with as he pleases, to carry on studies that he wants for his own particular benefit, but that we amend the rules of this House by dissolving the present Committee on Education and Labor and establishing separate committees instead.

I hold a resolution which I intend to drop in the hopper, and on which I intend to ask for a hearing and consideration at the earliest possible time. These two major subject matters have to be separated, and a major Committee on Education, consisting of 25 members, and a major Committee on Labor, consisting of 25 members, be established under the rules of the House.

Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, it is my opinion that if we will get down to business on this important matter then we can eliminate the great overlap that exists throughout this Government in the field of education.

Mr. Speaker, we come here annually and discuss the matter of Federal assistance to education and some are opposed to it, and say that they want no part of Federal aid to education. Listen, the Federal Government is saturated, it is pregnant with educational assistance. Each year we spawn something here in the field of Federal assistance to education about which few people know, and 2 or 3 years down the road we arrive at "Well, what have we done? We have not helped education, but we have helped a particular group or a particular institution."

Mr. Speaker, it is time we begin to study the fact that almost every agency of this Federal Government is conducting some form of educational program. Moreover, it is high time that we recognize the fact that while there might have been some justification for joining the areas of education and labor when the Reorganization Act was passed in 1946, there is no basis for continuing to study these vital subjects under one committee.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired.

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANDRUM. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. HALEY. The gentleman has stated that this committee is a very important committee. It has two very important functions. I agree with the gentleman, but I would just like to call the attention of the House to the fact that the committee has always had these responsibilities.

Mr. Speaker, I think I know about what the Members of the House are alarmed at this time, and that is that in the 83d Congress this committee received $125,000. In the 84th Congress again it received $125,000. In the 85th Congress it received $125,000 for 2 years of its operations.

I think every Member of this Congress will agree that they did a good job during those 6 years. Yet in the 87th Congress this committee spent $633,000.

Could the gentleman tell me what responsibilities this committee has that it did not have back in those years?

Mr. LANDRUM. Well, I will say to the gentleman from Florida that so far as I know there are no additional responsibilities, but maybe some additional activities have been undertaken.

Mr. HALEY. If the gentleman will yield further, I agree with the gentleman.

Mr. LANDRUM. I will say to the gentleman from Florida that in the statement I shall include with my remarks here this morning the gentleman will find not only the figures which the gentleman has given to the Members of the House, but the additional figures for the other two Congresses, together with the amounts which were returned for each Congress through the 86th, and stating that nothing was returned from the 87th Congress.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks, I include at this point the statement which I delivered to the Committee on House Administration yesterday on this subject.

The statement referred to follows:

Mr. Chairman, the proposed budget of the House Committee on Education and Labor for the 88th Congress is outrageously high. Frankly after careful study of all the responsibilities devolving upon this committee I am compelled to state that the request for the sum of $697,000 is an unconscionable affront to the Members of the House of Representatives and the U.S. taxpayers.

Specifically it is my considered judgment that the request for $202,000 appropriation to support an investigative task force ought to be eliminated in its entirety. All information required by the committee on labor-management irregularities and federally supported education activities, can be, and is supplied by the various units set up in the Department of Labor for enforcing and policing labor-management laws. Likewise, the Office of the Commissioner of Education can do, and does do, an adequate job of keeping the committee informed on federally supported education activities.

A careful study of the activities of the investigative task force inaugurated in the 87th Congress will show that no benefits have accrued to the committee or to the Congress as a result of sums expended on such activities. This $202,000 is a shrewdly calculated patronage grab. It ought to be deleted by this Committee on House Administration. The self-respect of each Member of Congress requires condemnation by the entire membership. Official records available to your committee support this contention.

I have also made a very careful study of the activities of the various subcommittees, six in number, for which specific sums of $60,000 for each committee is requested. I can and do appreciate the responsibilities of a subcommittee and its chairmen to discharge the committee's obligations. I do not believe, however, that the obligation of any one of these subcommittees require such exorbitant sums of money. It is my belief that each of these subcommittees can operate effectively on no more than $20,000 annual budget.

Adoption of the recommendations I make here would reduce the proposed budget by $322,000. I have made no recommendation with regard to the amount requested for the full committee for reporting services, telephone, telegraph, supplies, witness fees, and miscellaneous or on the amount requested for the minority staff. I have no specific information on which to base an opinion, or a conclusion on these items.

I have been a member of the Committee on Education and Labor for the entire 10 years I have served in the Congress. These conclusions are based on a careful study of the committee budgets over this 10-year period of service. For 6 of these 10 years, the committee appropriation stayed the same with fairly high amounts turned back each session. Then for the 86th Congress, the appropriation increased markedly. During the last Congress this increased appropriation nearly doubled.

Here are the specific appropriations for the past 10 years. For the 83d Congress $125,000 was authorized of which $40,356 was returned. For the 84th Congress $125,000 was authorized and $68,971 was turned back. The 85th Congress saw $125,000 again authorized with $12,353 returned. The first big boost came during the 86th Congress when $328,000 was authorized of which $41,949 was turned back. For the 87th Congress $633,000 was authorized and nothing was returned.

When the request was made last session for a near 100 percent increase, I spoke with several leaders in Congress at that time and urged that the budget be reduced. I pointed out then that the Committee on Education and Labor was about to be injected into activities not contemplated by the rules of the House.

I most respectfully yet urgently maintain that unless this budget request is reduced drastically, and travel and patronage of the committee diminished proportionately, respect for the committee will cease to exist, and embarrassment will be heaped upon the Congress and upon each Member individually.

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Kyl].

Mr. KYL. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Committee on House Administration who has attended every session of that committee, the gentleman from Iowa seeks to clarify his position, his motives and his practice in the light of this afternoon's discussion.

His purpose has been twofold. First, it has been his goal to assist in developing the kinds of principles, policies, and procedures which create an atmosphere conducive to proper performance of our congressional duties. It has been his purpose to eliminate duplication of efforts which consume time of legislators, staff members, and committees already overburdened by obligations of our office. It has been his purpose to help in designing and implementing guidelines for expenditure of money so that the House can set an example in fiscal responsibility—so that we can say in truth, "Our porch has been swept"—and from that point we can in good conscience take necessary steps to insure wise use of tax moneys in other departments of the Government. This job, our House rules tell us, we must do.

There is, in the second instance, a deeper philosophic purpose. The U.S. House of Representatives is the greatest legislative body in the world. Its conception, the purposes to which it is dedicated, the manner in which it is constituted, make it a true instrument of free government.

No government can long exist without the confidence of its citizens. The citizen must respect our high office—not tolerate it. The citizen must honor the office—not deprecate it. In America, the citizen must criticize the office—not ridicule it.

In turn we must treat our office as a seat of dignity and integrity and service and not a political prize to be won in a periodic political carnival.

Under the Constitution, the House and the Congress have prerogatives under a philosophy of separation of powers. This separation was by design, to prevent concentration of power in an executive. There have been moments in history when such concentration has been necessary and when it has been of benefit. In the end, continuation of such concentration can mean only the destruction of individual freedom and representative government. This is a consideration which must be pondered many times each session of the Congress. Much erosion of our constitutional authority has not been caused by theft. It has been given away. Too many times, we have succumbed to pressures. We have built in a custom under which legislative proposals are accompanied by reports from the administrative branch—reports which approve or disapprove the proposition under consideration. The Presidents now determine what the legislative proposals shall be, and in the effort which they call responsibility of leadership, try to dictate the course which the Congress shall pursue. The practice can be carried to an extreme at which traditional constitutional concepts are canceled or reversed. We even find ourselves considering propositions which would see the administrative branch legislating and the Congress having the veto power.

This distortion of separations of power are aided and abetted by the waywardness and the peregrinations and the lack of responsibility exhibited by a few Members of the Congress. One bad apple does not cause all other Members of the congressional barrel to spoil. But the presence of a few spoilers causes a deterioration in the attractiveness and the effectiveness of the Congress.

We have been subject to much criticism—some justified; most not justified. Our image is tarnished. Sometimes the portrait of the Congress is painfully photographic. Sometimes it is as distorted as the wildest surealism. In either case, the best remedy is a good look at ourselves and the glass house in which we operate.

We can solve our own problems. In so doing we can restore the faith and confidence of our American citizens in their representative government. It is gratifying to note that we are making progress.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KYL. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to repeat that we did receive a firm commitment from the chairman of the full committee that $55,000 a year would be made available to the minority. If we could have received some assurance that a proportionate share of the reduced amount being made available to the committee would be made available to the minority, this problem never would have developed. We need such reassurance now.

I would like to stress again that the role of the minority on the Education and Labor Committee is very considerable. To make my point clear, the minority now has only two employees on the staff. Over the past 2 years the majority has averaged about 50 employees.

I am going to put in some information with respect to what we have developed in the way of views of our own. The problem is that without adequate staff assistance we cannot perform satisfactorily. I have no desire to belabor this point, but I do think that as matters stand now we Republicans are left without any assurance. With these funds sharply reduced there is every prospect, despite all the good will in the world, that we will not have sufficient funds with which to operate in the next year.

The following tabulation provides an indication of the considerable responsibilities of the minority during the 87th Congress:

Work of the Minority Staff Education and Labor Committee—87th Congress

I. MINORITY AND SUPPLEMENTAL VIEWS

Education, first session:

House Report No. 440, College Academic Facilities and Scholarship Act, H.R. 7215.

House Report No. 445, School Assistance Act of 1961, H.R. 7300.

House Report No. 674, National Defense Education Act amendment of 1961, H.R. 7904.

House Report No. 674, National Defense Education Act amendment of 1961 (part 2).

Education, second session:

House Report No. 1551, Adult Basic Education Act of 1962, H.R. 10896.

House Report No. 1750, General University Extension Education Act of 1962, H.R. 11340.

House Report No. 1962, Migrant Agricultural Employees and Children, S. 1124.
Educational Assistance Act of 1961, H.R. ——.

Labor, first session:

House Report No. 75, Fair Labor Standards amendments of 1961, H.R. 3935.

House Report No. 879, Manpower Development and Training Act of 1961, H.R. 8399.

House Report No. 998, Welfare and Pension Plan amendments of 1961, H.R. 8723.

House Report No. 833, Youth Employment Opportunities Act of 1961, H.R. 8354.

Labor, second session:

House Report No. 1554, amendments to the Davis-Bacon Act, H.R. 10946.

House Report No. 1370, Equal Employment Opportunity Act of 1962, H.R. 10144.

House Report No. 1719, Joint industry promotion, H.R. 11537.

House Report No. 1963, National Advisory Council on Migratory Labor, S. 1132.

House Report No. 1666, Employment of Children in Agriculture, S. 1123.

House Report No. 1965, Occupational Safety Act of 1962, H.R. 12306.

House Report No. 1540, Youth Employment Opportunities Act of 1962, H.R. 10682.

II. SPECIAL INVESTIGATIVE SUBCOMMITTEES

1. Subcommittee on Unemployment and the Impact of Automation:

(a) Extensive hearings.

(b) Assisted in the preparation of the subcommittee report. (See House report dated September 1961.)

2. Subcommittee on the Administration of the National Labor Relations Act by the National Labor Relations Board:

(a) Extensive hearings.

(b) Minority and supplemental views prepared. (See House report dated September 1961.)

3. Subcommittee on the Impact of Imports and Exports on American Employment:

(a) Extensive hearings.

(b) Supplemental views prepared. (See House report dated May 1962.)

4. Special Subcommittee inquiry on the administration of the Davis-Bacon Act:

(a) Extensive hearings.

(b) Report now being prepared.

5. Subcommittee on Irregularities in the Garment Industry:

(a) Extensive hearings.

(b) No report prepared.

6. Racial discrimination in schools receiving Federal assistance in federally impacted areas:

(a) Extensive hearings.

(b) Assisted in preparation of report. (See House Rept. No. 1751.)

III. MAJOR FLOOR DEBATES

1. Fair Labor Standards Amendments of 1961 (H.R. 3935).

2. Manpower Development and Training Act of 1961 (H.R. 8399).

3. Welfare and Pension Plan Amendments of 1961 (H.R. 8723).

4. College Academic Facilities Act (H.R. 8900).

5. School Lunch Act as amended (H.R. 11665).

6. Equal Pay Act of 1962 (H.R. 11880).

7. Amendment to Fair Labor Standards Act dealing with child labor (S. 1123).

IV. MINORITY SUBSTITUTE BILLS ADOPTED BY HOUSE

1. Fair Labor Standards Amendments of 1961 (H.R. 3935).

2. Manpower Development and Training Act of 1961 (H.R. 8723).

V. HOUSE-SENATE CONFERENCES

1. Fair Labor Standards Amendments of 1961 (H.R. 3935).

2. Manpower Development and Training Act of 1961 (H.R. 8399).

3. Welfare and Pension Plan Amendments of 1961 (H.R. 8723).

4. College Academic Facilities Act (H.R. 8900).

5. School Lunch Act as amended (H.R. 11665).

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have permission to extend their remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the House Administration Committee and a member of the Subcommittee on Accounts of that committee, I have consistently opposed the granting of Chairman Powell's budget request for $697,000. I have maintained that his budget should be cut to the bare essential needed for his committee to function because of the unacceptable manner in which he has served in his capacity as chairman. I would advocate even greater cuts in his budget except for the fact that I do not want to cripple the good men who are members of his committee and who have consistently done a good job. With the addition of further restrictions as to how and by whom this money is spent and for what purpose it is spent, I hope we can by this action, restore the faith of the people in this committee and in the Congress. Certainly that is my desire.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, the restriction of $25,000 for each subcommittee provided in the budget for the Committee on Education and Labor is one with which I, as a chairman, can live. I will have to live with it. But it will impair our efficiency.

During the 87th Congress when we were on a 2-year budget, each subcommittee was given $26,000 per year—a total of $52,000. I was the chairman of the Select Subcommittee on Education. Salaries of staff employees of the subcommittee amounted to about $20,000 per year. During 1962 I spent $21,103.79 on salaries of personnel. I spent approximately $1,000 per year on office supplies—items from the stationery room—long-distance telephone calls and telegrams. The balance, something less than $4,000 per year, was spent on travel.

The subcommittee conducted 2 days of hearings in San Francisco and 2 days in New York City in our study of the economic problems in the performing arts. We had 1 day of hearings jointly with the General Subcommittee on Labor in Morehead, Ky., and 1 day of hearings in Providence, R.I.

Legislation from my subcommittee that eventually was reported to the House included the general university extension bill, the Federal Advisory Council on Arts bill, the quality in education bill, and the educational and training films for the deaf bill. This latter became Public Law 87-715. In addition my subcommittee shared in the consideration of legislation to extend and expand the National Defense Education Act, which was also reported to the House. My subcommittee also reported to the full committee a bill to establish a Carver Memorial Library.

The 87th Congress, in its wisdom, provided for a 7-percent pay raise for all Federal employees, including employees of the House of Representatives. On the $25,000 which is being made available for the Special Subcommittee on Labor which I am heading now, I am either going to have to take that pay raise away from my staff employees, or the subcommittee can conduct no field hearings or field investigations. In either case—and I cannot expect my staff to take the full burden of this action—we shall be hampered in discharging our responsibility to the Congress.

My subcommittee's jurisdiction embraces the Taft-Hartley Act, the Landrum-Griffin Act, the National Labor Relations Board, and the Equal Pay Act of 1963, upon which hearings are scheduled. We shall also have such other matters as the chairman may see fit to assign.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, I wish to commend the Committee on House Administration for this action in which it has vindicated the entire membership of this House. Because of the manner in which the affairs of the Committee on Education and Labor have been conducted during the past 2 years, I feel that each Member of this body was in the position of deciding whether or not we should condone and continue the policies which will now be held in close check due to the timely action of this watchdog committee.

Some will say that the cuts are too deep. I think not. As the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Landrum] so well put it, it will very definitely mean cutting back on some of the employees whom we never saw, rarely heard of, and little benefited by. It will mean fewer opportunities for lavish spending, fewer trips, and without doubt, less waste of taxpayers' money. The basic work of our committee will be accomplished on the fourth floor suite of the Old House Office Building. It will be accomplished by Members of Congress whose pay is not charged against this committee. If we buckle down and proceed expeditiously, we can do as much or more with less costly expenditure. The effort of the committee members and not the dollars expended will be the true test of accomplishment.

What we have done today, however, is but a first step in getting our own House in order. The chairman of the Rules Committee has promised to tighten up the provisions for oversea travel, not only for our committee but for the entire membership of this body. Other expenditures should be scrutinized.

It seems ridiculous to me that our State Department should be in the position of arranging for the oversea travel of Members of this body. At a time when world conditions command every ounce of resourcefulness and initiative that we can display, why should we put them in the position of being advance men for those of us who travel in foreign countries.

I would like to read a telegram that they sent to their embassies last summer as a case in point, and I quote:

> Congressman Adam C. Powell, chairman, Committee on Education and Labor, accompanied by Mrs. Tamara J. Wall and Miss Corrine Huff, staff members, traveling Western Europe accordance following itinerary:
>
> August 8 sailing *Queen Mary* arriving Southampton, August 13; Paris, August 16; Venice, August 20; Rome, August 23; Athens, August 27; Delphi, August 30; sailing *Leonardo da Vinci*, September 15 from Gibraltar. Arrival times and flights forwarded when firm.
>
> Provisions handbook congressional travel apply. Codel and party authorized use local currencies 19FT561 funds. Meet assist appoint control officers.
>
> Request one single and one double with bath as follows: London-Cumberland Marbel Arch Hotel; Paris Hotel San Regis; Venice Royal Denieli; Rome (1) Excelsior (2) Flora (3) Victoria whichever has special embassy rates; Athens beachhouse at Astir Hotel Delphi new government hotel name unknown. Confirm Department soonest.
>
> London, request three tickets August 14 and 15, best shows playing, except Broadway plays.
>
> Paris-Codel desires use U.S. Army car and chauffeur. Reserve three for first show and dinner best table Lido August 16.

Southampton-Codel requests be met at *Queen Mary* Cherbourg with $100 U.S. equivalent in local currencies for each member party.

Mr. Speaker, let me again say that I commend Chairman BURLESON and the members of this committee as well as the entire body of the House for the action taken today. Let us not forget that it is merely a start.

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the resolution as amended is agreed to, and a motion to reconsider laid on the table.

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries have permission to sit this afternoon during general debate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

NURSERY STOCK, PLANT, AND SEEDS QUARANTINE NO. 37

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, on February 1, 1963, the Subcommittee on Appropriations for the Department of Agriculture held a hearing with respect to the proposed amendment to nursery stock, plant, and seeds quarantine No. 37.

The proposed change would permit growing media in which plants were grown in foreign countries to be brought into this country, and would require the United States to furnish specifications for buildings and employees to supervise production of foreign plants in foreign countries for as much as 2 years.

The proposal by the Department would not be limited to letting azaleas into the country from Belgium, but would in effect provide a change in policy which would permit foreign countries to bring into the United States growing media which admittedly "could" serve to bring in the thousands of injurious pests and diseases which, fortunately, we do not yet have.

The Government has spent hundreds of millions of dollars because of them. Notwithstanding these facts, there are probably 20,000 injurious insects and diseases which we do not yet have in this country, which according to the Department would endanger up to $30 billion worth of crops annually if ever they reached here.

The Department's proposal to supply employees to provide specifications for buildings and supervise the growing plants in foreign countries for as long as 2 years, though the cost of such employees would be repaid by the foreign country. This would be taking a further step along the road of providing assistance to foreign growers to enable them to better compete with U.S. growers. If we were to furnish Department of Agriculture employees to help foreign producers, as is proposed in this case, where are we going to draw the line?

If you once start this, there is no telling how far it will go. I hope that the Members will secure copies of these hearings and see how dangerous this proposed change would be.

Even now, we are intercepting an injurious insect coming into this country every 16 minutes of every day.

Mr. Speaker, we have therefore asked the Secretary to cancel this proposed amendment.

THE MICA STOCKPILE PROGRAM

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, when the Government program of purchasing mica for the national defense stockpile terminated in July of 1962, thousands of North Carolinians, engaged in the production of this critical mineral, were thrown out of employment.

While a number of counties in western North Carolina were affected by the termination of the mica stockpile program, two counties in my congressional district suffered unusual economic hardship through the loss of jobs brought about by the closing of the program. I refer to the counties of Avery and Mitchell.

The counties have some of the finest mica in the United States. Approximately 3,500 people, miners and mica processers, were engaged in the stockpile program while it was in operation. Now that the program has terminated, many of these people have been left without suitable employment. The counties of Avery and Mitchell have been declared depressed areas by the Federal Government, and the Area Redevelopment Administration is making an effort to create new job opportunities for those who were left without jobs when the stockpile program was terminated.

Mr. Speaker, while mica is a mineral vital to our defense requirements in time of war, it is also a mineral that must be in plentiful supply to keep the wheels of industry turning in time of peace. I believe it would be a great economic tragedy for our mica mines to close, not only in North Carolina but in those other areas of the Nation where mica can be mined successfully.

While we feel we have enough mica on hand at the present time to satisfy future requirements in time of peace and war, no one can definitely predict the course of future events in our country. In my opinion I feel that the only safe course we can follow is to keep our mica mines in operation. Not only will we be keeping an industry alive necessary to our security, we will be affording employment opportunities to thousands of people, many of whom are living in areas that are receiving assistance through various Federal programs.

In order to keep our mica mines open, Mr. Speaker, I have introduced a bill today to establish a program for the purchase and resale of domestically produced, newly mined, processed mica and mica ore. The bill which I have introduced calls for a new type of Government purchase program. It would give the Department of the Interior the authority to purchase mica for a period of 5 years.

During each 90 days while the purchase program is in effect an auction will be held by the Department of the Interior for the purpose of selling to domestic users and fabricators the mica acquired during the previous quarter. The funds received by the Secretary of the Interior for the mica could then be used for the purchase of additional mica and for expenses involved in carrying on the program.

The price of mica under the provisions of my bill would be at the level established at the time the General Services Administration stockpile mica purchase program terminated in July of 1962. My bill provides that the Department of the Interior can expend a sum not to exceed $5 million each year in the form of a subsidy to equalize the difference between the amount received from the sale of mica at the auctions and the total price paid to the producer. The program to be set up under my measure would terminate on July 1, 1968.

Mr. Speaker, the idea of a subsidy to keep vital industries in operation in our Nation is not new to our economic system. While I am not one who advocates indiscriminate use of subsidies, I nevertheless feel that the overriding considerations of national defense and economic hardship for mica miners certainly justify the imposition of a small temporary subsidy to keep our mica mines operating. It is my sincere hope, Mr. Speaker, that my colleagues in the Congress will join with me in supporting my bill.

THE CONTROL OF AIR POLLUTION

Mr. ROBERTS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include an analysis and copy of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROBERTS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, on February 28, 1963, I introduced a bill—H.R. 4415—whose purpose is to provide for the mounting of a comprehensive national effort to control the great scourge of air pollution which presently jeopardizes the health and wellbeing of our Nation and which, unless prompt action is taken, will become increasingly severe over the next few years.

The need for such an effort has become increasingly apparent to me after careful study of the problem in my capacity as chairman of the Subcommittee on Health and Safety of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. The problem of air pollution has been under consideration by the committee for many years. In 1955, the committee reported favorably on the basic legislation establishing the present Federal air pollution research and technical assistance program.

In 1956, the Special Subcommittee on Traffic Safety of the committee made a study of noxious, toxic, and harmful motor vehicle exhaust fumes in connection with a comprehensive investigation of highway traffic fumes in connection with a comprehensive investigation of highway traffic safety. Testimony was taken and research activities of the industry were studied on visits to manufacturing plants.

Hearings have been held by the Health and Safety Subcommittee in 1958, 1959, 1960, and 1962 on various bills concerned with extension of the Federal air pollution program and on the progress being made in air pollution control, particularly with regard to motor vehicle exhausts.

In 1959, the committee reported favorably on legislation to extend the Federal air pollution program—Public Law 86-365—and in 1960, a favorable committee report was made on a bill requiring increased emphasis on research into the motor vehicle exhaust problem and a report to Congress on the results of such investigations—Public Law 86-493.

Last year, the committee reported favorably on legislation to extend the Federal program for an additional period of 2 years and to enact into permanent law the substance of Public Law 86-493 requiring the Surgeon General specifically to conduct studies on motor vehicle exhaust as it affects human health through the pollution of air—Public Law 87-761.

Thus, over the course of years the air pollution problem has been carefully studied. During these years significant progress has been made, through research, in understanding the nature of the problem and the methods for its control. But, in comparison with the magnitude of the problem, far too little has been done at all levels of government, to actually apply the knowledge we now possess to control the existing problem and to prevent its aggravation in the future. The record of the National Conference on Air Pollution documents in detail the nature of the problem and the terrible threat to our Nation's health and well-being which it poses. And to this record of words, the London smog of only 3 months ago, in which hundreds of people in that great metropolis became ill and died, should serve as a grim reminder that action to protect the purity of the air we breathe can no longer be delayed.

What is the nature of this threat? Looking superficially at the vastness of the air resources available to the entire country, it would seem a virtual impossibility to seriously threaten it. But the problem can be understood when it is realized that only a small part of the vast supply is available for our use in any single location. Over one-half of our population now lives on less than 10 percent of the land area of the country. For the most part, sources of air pollution are concentrated where people are concentrated. Furthermore, there is every indication that by 1970 two-thirds of our population at that time will live in this same limited land area.

We are already overburdening those portions of the air resource available to many of our cities. Few people realize the enormous magnitude of the quantities of pollutants being discharged to the atmosphere. In one of our larger American cities a well-known research institute has estimated the emissions of pollutants at 25,000 tons daily—comprised of a great variety of contaminant gases and liquid and solid aerosols. Despite daily and seasonal variations, the air supply available to this city, as to our other cities, is basically fixed, and the ability of the atmosphere to dilute and disperse pollutants is limited.

Air pollution is a heavy economic burden to this country, causing extensive economic damage through its effects on animal and plant life, the corrosion and soiling of materials and structures, depreciation of property values, interference with air and surface transport, and losses of unburnt fuel. Estimates of such losses have tended to increase as research has progressed on these problems. Thus, in the case of agricultural losses, estimates of damage to crops in southern California have risen from $500,000 in 1939, to over $3 million in 1953, and over $8 million in 1958. It is reported informally that truck crop losses from air pollution in New Jersey have recently totaled many millions of dollars annually. Summation of estimates of the various types of economic damage from air pollution have led a number of investigators to conclude that these may amount to over $11 billion a year.

Of even greater concern are its adverse effects on human health. Research conducted over the past several years has produced a growing body of evidence which indicates that the long-term effects of exposure of community populations to ordinary concentrations of air pollutants adversely affects the health of many and may result in chronic disease, and premature death. Air pollution has been linked with increased mortality from cardiorespiratory causes, increased susceptibility to respiratory disease, and interference with normal respiratory functions. Specific diseases associated in one degree or another with air pollution are emphysema, chronic bronchitis, asthma, and lung cancer.

When we combine the threat to health posed by air pollution and the economic damages it causes, it appears clear that we must put to work all of the procedures which are now available for use in the control of air pollution. At a technical level, procedures are available by which the majority of air pollutants can be controlled or prevented, generally at costs far below the social costs to the Nation of economic damage, illness, and death which is associated with air pollution. The fact that for some types of pollutants technically feasible control methods are not available and the need for additional research concerning the nature and effects of the problem does not provide justifiable reasons for waiting to do what can be done now.

Over the past several years, on requests from the Surgeon General, the President, and the Congress, several committees composed of highly qualified people have examined the problem of air pollution in the United States and the actions needed in coping with it. All of these groups have emphasized the essentiality of preserving the quality of our air resource and the need for more research and technically trained manpower, and greater application of our available technology in preventing air pollution.

The wide-scale application of available technical procedures is dependent upon the development and operation of community programs on State and local government levels. Here, the situation nationally is far from adequate for dealing effectively with the needs for air pollution control. With respect to our urban population, approximately 90 percent lives in localities having air pollution problems. It is estimated that all 232 communities in this country with a population greater than 50,000 have air pollution problems; approximately 40 percent of the communities in the 2,500 to 50,000 population range have problems. In total, about 6,000 communities in the United States have air pollution problems of varying degrees for which action programs should be initiated or strengthened as soon as practicable.

At this time, there are only 106 local control programs on record which have full-time staffs. These programs serve 342 local political jurisdictions, which comprise about 45 percent of the national urban population. Only 28 of these control programs have 5 or more full-time employees. There is an additional number of local programs with part-time staffs. The median annual expenditure is about 10 cents per capita, an amount highly inadequate to do the job which is necessary to attain effective control.

On the State level, during the past decade, there has been some improvement in the status of State air pollution legislation and the development of comprehensive programs dealing with problems in this area. Thus, about 15 States now have enactments which authorize the conduct of specific programs, whereas no State had such authorization as of 1950. But, the inadequacies of these programs is reflected in the fact that little more than $2 million was spent for air pollution by all States in 1961 and that, of this, more than $1 million was spent by the State of California.

Air pollution control practices currently are largely pragmatic in character, with regulatory requirements necessarily based on judgments as to what control measures are technically and economically feasible. More rational air quality criteria and standards are desirable and can be developed as we improved our knowledge through research and improved understanding of local and regional problems.

Nationally, it is clear we have a long way to go and a lot of catching up to do in dealing adequately with problems of air pollution. It is particularly important in this connection that State and local government air pollution control programs be extended in coverage and strengthened in depth to cope with the complex technical problems with which they must deal. Further, in recognition of the fact that the air currents respect no boundaries, authority needs to be given to the National Government to control interstate problems when the States fail to do so.

The ultimate national objective in air pollution control is to protect the quality of the air resource used in common by the American people to the end that: First, death and sickness caused by polluted air will be prevented; and second, property damage and economic loss from air pollution will be minimized. In support of these recommendations, I have introduced H.R. 4415. As noted earlier the bill is the product of years of study by myself and the other members of the Subcommittee on Health and Safety. In these studies, particular note should be made of the role of my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Ohio, Congressman PAUL F. SCHENCK, who has made such outstanding contributions to the work of the subcommittee and whose concern for the problems caused by motor vehicle exhausts is reflected in this bill.

The purpose of the bill I have introduced is to develop a comprehensive national program for the prevention and control of air pollution, providing for Federal leadership while recognizing the fundamental responsibilities of State and local governments.

The bill provides for—

First. Establishment of a national research and development program for air pollution prevention and control, including continuation of investigations into the motor vehicle emission problem.

Second. A 5-year, $30 million matching grant program to State and local agencies to assist them in establishing, improving, and maintaining programs for the prevention and control of air pollution.

Third. Enforcement measures against air pollution, with Federal enforcement of interstate pollution, and State enforcement of intrastate pollution. Federal, State, and local governments would become partners in effective action to abate pollution.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I include the full text of the bill and a section-by-section analysis in the RECORD at this point:

CLEAN AIR ACT—SECTION-BY-SECTION ANALYSIS OF H.R. 4415

SECTION 1. FINDINGS AND PURPOSE

This section makes congressional findings that the predominant part of the Nation's population live in urban areas which are generally interstate in character; that air pollution has become a serious and major problem especially in these areas; that the primary responsibility for solving this problem rests with State and local governments; and that Federal leadership and financial assistance are essential for the development of cooperative Federal, State, regional, and local programs.

The purposes of the act are to protect the Nation's air resource; initiate and accelerate a national research and development program; provide technical and financial assistance to State and local programs; and encourage regional program development.

SECTION 2. COOPERATIVE ACTIVITIES AND UNIFORM LAWS

(a) This subsection provides that the Secretary shall:

1. Encourage cooperative activities by the State and local governments for prevention and control of air pollution.

2. Encourage the enactment of improved and uniform laws where practicable.

3. Encourage agreements and compacts between States for prevention and control of air pollution.

(b) This subsection requires that the Secretary cooperate with and encourage cooperative activities by all Federal departments—so as to assure utilization of all facilities and resources of the Federal Government.

(c) Consent of Congress is given to two or more States to negotiate and enter into agreements or compacts for (1) cooperative effort and mutual assistance and (2) for establishment of agencies joint or otherwise for prevention and control of air pollution. No compact or agreement is binding until approved by the Congress.

SECTION 3. RESEARCH, INVESTIGATION, TRAINING, AND OTHER ACTIVITIES

Subsection (a) requires the Secretary to establish a national research and development program for prevention and control of air pollution. As a part of such a program:

It is provided that the Federal Government shall conduct and promote the coordination and acceleration of research, investigations, training, demonstrations, surveys and studies relating to the causes, effects, and prevention and control of air pollution; encourage, cooperate with and render technical and financial assistance to local and State agencies.

That the Secretary conduct investigations, research, and surveys concerning any specific problem of air pollution if he is requested to do so or if, in his judgment such a problem may affect or be of concern to communities in various parts of the Nation or is interstate in nature with a view to recommending a solution to the problem.

The Secretary would specifically be required to conduct studies regarding the discharges from motor vehicles from the standpoint of human health.

Subsection (b) authorizes the Secretary in carrying out the provisions of the preceding subsection to:

1. Collect and distribute information pertaining to research and other activities including appropriate recommendations.

2. Cooperate with other Federal, State, and local departments and agencies and with private organizations, including industry, in the preparation and conduct of research activities.

3. Make grants to air pollution control agencies and other agencies and individuals for the conduct of appropriate air pollution programs; upon such terms and conditions as he may determine.

4. Enter into contracts for the conduct of research, investigations, training, and other authorized activities.

5. Provide training for and make training grants to qualified individuals.

6. Establish and maintain research fellowships in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and at public or nonprofit private educational institutions, etc.

7. Collect and disseminate basic data relating to the prevention and control of air pollution; chemical, physical, and biological air quality data.

8. Develop effective and practical processes, methods, and prototype devices for the prevention or control of air pollution.

9. Recommend to air pollution control agencies and other appropriate organizations such criteria of air quality, after such research as may be necessary to protect the public health and welfare.

SECTION 4. GRANTS FOR SUPPORT OF AIR POLLUTION CONTROL PROGRAMS

(a) Authorizes to be appropriated $30 million over a 5-year period for grants to air pollution control agencies in meeting the costs of establishing and maintaining program for prevention and control of air pollution. Such sums remain available during fiscal year appropriated and the succeeding fiscal year.

(b) The Secretary is required to make allotments to States, in accordance with regulations, on the basis of (1) population, (2) extent of the problem, and (3) financial need of the respective States.

(c) From each State's allotment the Secretary is authorized to make grants to air pollution control agencies in an amount equal to two-thirds of the cost of establishing and maintaining such programs. Grants equal to three-fourths of such cost may be made to regional air pollution programs meeting specified criteria. Interstate air pollution agency grants will be made from the allotments of the constituent States.

(d) Grants to be made in accordance with regulations and terms and conditions of the Secretary.

(e) Funds allotted to a State which have not been obligated by the end of the fiscal year because of a lack of approvable applications shall be reallocated by the Secretary to other States.

SECTION 5. ABATEMENT OF AIR POLLUTION

Interstate pollution: In the case of air pollution which is endangering the health or welfare of persons in a State other than that in which the discharge originates, the Secretary is empowered to call a conference of the air pollution control agencies of the States involved either at the request of the State or States involved (including municipalities with the concurrence of the State agency) or on his own initiative. The purpose of the conference is to determine the extent of the pollution problem, what is being done about it, and the nature of any delays being encountered in abatement work. Following the conference, if the Secretary believes that effective progress is not being made toward abatement he shall recommend appropriate remedial action. If after 6 months such action has not been taken, the Secretary shall call a public hearing. Each State involved will be able to choose one member of the hearing board. The hearing board shall hear evidence and make findings on the basis of such evidence as to whether pollution exists and whether effective progress toward abatement is being made. The board will recommend appropriate remedial measures if such are necessary. The findings and recommendations of the board will be sent by the Secretary to those causing or contributing to the pollution and to the States and local air pollution control agencies with a notice specifying a reasonable time (not less than 6 months) to secure abatement. If appropriate action is not taken in the specified time, the Secretary can request the Attorney General to bring a suit on behalf of the United States to secure abatement. The court giving due consideration to the practicability and to the physical and economic feasibility of securing abatement of any pollution proved, will have jurisdiction to enter such judgment, and orders enforcing such judgment, as the public interest and the equities of the case may require.

Intrastate pollution: The same procedure as above is followed in cases involving pollution occurring wholly within one State except that Federal action can be taken only at the request of the Governor of a State or a State air pollution agency or a municipality with the concurrence of the State agency. Such findings and recommendations shall be turned over to the Governor or Attorney General for appropriate State action. The Secretary would be authorized, upon the request of the Governor or Attorney General, to provide technical and other assistance necessary to assist the State in judicial proceedings to secure abatement under State or local law.

In all cases of intrastate air pollution it is required that the municipality affected or the municipality in which such pollution originates either has made or concurred in the request to the Secretary for the holding of a conference and subsequent actions as provided in this section. The Secretary is further granted the discretion of not calling a conference if in his judgment the effect of such pollution is not of such significance as to warrant the exercise of Federal jurisdiction under this section.

Federal property: The Secretary is required to include in his summary of any conference references to any discharges contributing to air pollution from Federal property. Notices of hearings involving any pollution alleged to be affected by such discharges shall be given to the Federal agency having jurisdiction.

SECTION 6. REQUIREMENT OF REPORTS

(a) This section authorizes the Secretary to require any person whose activities result in the emission of air pollution which has been the subject of a conference under section 5 to file reports relating to the character, kind and quantity of pollutants discharged and the use of devices or other means to prevent or reduce the emission of pollutants. All information bearing on trade secrets and similar matters in such reports is considered confidential.

(b) Failure to file reports within the time fixed by the Secretary will result in a $100 forfeiture for each day of such failure. The Secretary is further authorized to remit or mitigate such forfeiture.

(c) Requires the various U.S. attorneys under the direction of the Attorney General to prosecute for recovery forfeitures.

SECTION 7. COOPERATION BY FEDERAL AGENCIES TO CONTROL AIR POLLUTION FROM FEDERAL FACILITIES

This section presents the intent of the Congress that Federal departments and agencies should, to the extent practicable and consistent with the interests of the United States and within any available appropriations, cooperate with the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and with air pollution control agencies in preventing and controlling air pollution from Federal facilities.

SECTION 8. INFORMATION AVAILABLE TO THE PUBLIC

This section requires that all information, uses, products, processes, patents, and other developments be made available to the public from research contracted for, sponsored, cosponsored, or otherwise authorized under the provisions of the bill. The rights of the owner of any background patent are protected.

SECTION 9. ADMINISTRATION

Regulations and delegation of functions: Subsection (a) provides that the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare is authorized to prescribe such regulations as are necessary to carry out his functions under the act, and to delegate his functions except the making of regulations.

Loans of Federal personnel: Subsection (b) would authorize the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare upon the request of an air pollution control agency, to detail personnel of the Public Health Service to such an agency. The provisions of section 214(d) of the PHS Act shall be applicable with respect to such personnel.

Grant payment methods: Subsection (c) authorizes the payment of grants, under the act, in advance, in installments, or by way of reimbursement.

SECTION 10. DEFINITIONS

This section defines the term "Secretary" as meaning the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

The term "air pollution control agency" means a single State agency designated by the Governor thereof; an agency established by two or more States; a city, county, or other local government health authority or other single agency having specific responsibility; an agency of two or more municipalities in the same or different States.

The term "interstate air pollution control agency" means an air pollution control agency established by two or more States or two or more municipalities in different States.

The District of Columbia, Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, and Guam are included in the term "State".

Definitions are also included for the terms "person" and "municipality".

SECTION 11. OTHER AUTHORITY NOT AFFECTED

This section provides that the act shall not be construed as superseding or limiting the authorities and responsibilities, under any other provision of law, of the Secretary or of any other Federal officer, department, or agency.

SECTION 12. SEPARABILITY

This section contains a standard separability clause.

SECTION 13. SHORT TITLE

This section would amend the present act to provide that the act may be cited as the "Clean Air Act."

H.R. 4415

A bill to improve, strengthen, and accelerate programs for the prevention and abatement of air pollution

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Act of July 14, 1955, as amended (42 U.S.C. 1857–1857g), is hereby amended to read as follows:

"FINDINGS AND PURPOSE

"SEC. 1. (a) The Congress finds—

"(1) that the predominant part of the Nation's population is located in its rapidly expanding metropolitan and other urban areas, which generally cross the boundary lines of local jurisdictions and often extend into two or more States;

"(2) that the growth in the amount and complexity of air pollution brought about by urbanization, industrial development, and the increasing use of motor vehicles, has resulted in mounting dangers to the public health and welfare, injury to agricultural crops and livestock, damage to and the deterioration of property, and hazards to air and ground transportation;

"(3) that the prevention and control of air pollution at its source is the primary responsibility of States and local governments; and

"(4) that Federal financial assistance and leadership is essential for the development of cooperative Federal, State, regional, and local programs to prevent and control air pollution.

"(b) The purposes of this Act are—

"(1) to protect the Nation's air resources so as to promote the public health and welfare and the productive capacity of its population;

"(2) to initiate and accelerate a national research and development program to achieve the prevention and control of air pollution;

"(3) to provide technical and financial assistance to State and local governments in connection with the development and execution of their air pollution prevention and control programs; and

"(4) to encourage and assist the development and operation of regional air pollution control programs.

"COOPERATIVE ACTIVITIES AND UNIFORM LAWS

"SEC. 2. (a) The Secretary shall encourage cooperative activities by the States and local governments for the prevention and control of air pollution; encourage the enactment of improved and, so far as practicable in the light of varying conditions and needs, uniform State and local laws relating to the prevention and control of air pollution; and encourage the making of agreements and compacts between States for the prevention and control of air pollution.

"(b) The Secretary shall cooperate with and encourage cooperative activities by all Federal departments and agencies having functions relating to the prevention and control of air pollution, so as to assure the utilization in the Federal air pollution control program of all appropriate and available facilities and resources within the Federal Government.

"(c) The consent of the Congress is hereby given to two or more States to negotiate and enter into agreements or compacts, not in conflict with any law or treaty of the United States, for (1) cooperative effort and mutual assistance for the prevention and control of air pollution and the enforcement of their respective laws relating thereto, and (2) the establishment of such agencies, joint or otherwise, as they may deem desirable for making effective such agreements or compacts. No such agreement or compact shall be binding or obligatory upon any State a party thereto unless and until it has been approved by Congress.

"RESEARCH, INVESTIGATIONS, TRAINING, AND OTHER ACTIVITIES

"SEC. 3. (a) The Secretary shall establish a national research and development program for the prevention and control of air pollution and as part of such program shall—

"(1) conduct, and promote the coordination and acceleration of, research, investigations, experiments, training, demonstrations, surveys, and studies relating to the causes, effects, extent, prevention, and control of air pollution; and

"(2) encourage, cooperate with, and render technical services and provide financial assistance to air pollution control agencies and other appropriate public or private agencies, institutions, and organizations, and individuals in the conduct of such activities; and

"(3) conduct investigations and research and make surveys concerning any specific problem of air pollution confronting any air pollution control agency with a view to recommending a solution of such problem, if he is requested to do so by such agency or if, in his judgment, such problem may affect or be of concern to communities in various parts of the Nation or may affect any community or communities in a State other than that in which the source of the matter causing or contributing to the pollution is located.

"(4) in view of the nationwide significance of the problems of air pollution from motor vehicles, conduct studies of the amounts and kinds of substances discharged from the exhausts of motor vehicles and of the effects of the discharge of such substances, including the amounts and kinds of such substances which, from the standpoint of human health, it is safe for motor vehicles to discharge into the atmosphere.

"(b) In carrying out the provisions of the preceding subsection the Secretary is authorized to—

"(1) collect and make available, through publications and other appropriate means, the results of and other information, including appropriate recommendations by him in connection therewith, pertaining to such research and other activities;

"(2) cooperate with other Federal departments and agencies, with air pollution control agencies, with other public and private agencies, institutions, and organizations, and with any industries involved, in the preparation and conduct of such research and other activities;

"(3) make grants to air pollution control agencies, to other public or nonprofit private agencies, institutions, and organizations, and to individuals, upon such terms and conditions as he may determine;

"(4) contract with public or private agencies, institutions, and organizations, and with individuals, without regard to sections 3648 and 3709 of the Revised Statutes (31 U.S.C. 529; 41 U.S.C. 5);

"(5) provide training for, and make training grants to, personnel of air pollution control agencies and other persons with suitable qualifications;

"(6) establish and maintain research fellowships, in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and at public or nonprofit private educational institutions or research organizations;

"(7) collect and disseminate, in cooperation with other Federal departments and agencies, and with other public or private agencies, institutions, and organizations having related responsibilities, basic data on chemical, physical, and biological air quality and other information pertaining to air pollution and the prevention and control thereof;

"(8) develop effective and practical processes, methods, and prototype devices for the prevention or control of air pollution; and

"(9) recommend to air pollution control agencies and to other appropriate organizations, after such research as he determines to be necessary, such criteria of air quality as in his judgment may be necessary to protect the public health and welfare.

"GRANTS FOR SUPPORT OF AIR POLLUTION CONTROL PROGRAMS

"SEC. 4. (a) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated $5,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, $6,000,000 for each succeeding fiscal year to and including the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and $7,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, for grants to air pollution control agencies to assist them in meeting the costs of establishing and maintaining programs for the prevention and control of air pollution. Sums so appropriated shall remain available for making grants as provided in this section during the fiscal year for which appropriated and the succeeding fiscal year.

"(b) From the sums available therefor for any fiscal year the Secretary shall from time to time make allotments to the several States, in accordance with regulations, on the basis of (1) the population, (2) the extent of the air pollution problem, and (3) the financial need of the respective States. For purposes of this section, population shall be determined on the basis of the latest figures furnished by the Department of Commerce, and per capita income for each State and for the United States shall be determined on the basis of the average of the per capita incomes of the States and of the continental United States for the three most recent consecutive years for which satisfactory data are available from the Department of Commerce.

"(c) From each State's allotment under paragraph (b) for any fiscal year, the Secretary is authorized to make grants to air pollution control agencies in such State in an amount equal to two-thirds of the cost of establishing and maintaining programs for the prevention and control of air pollution: *Provided,* That the Secretary is authorized to make grants to air pollution control agencies described in section 10(b) (2) or (4) in an amount equal to three-fourths of the cost of establishing and maintaining regional air pollution control programs which meet criteria established in regulations by the Secretary as necessary for the effective control of air pollution in the area: *And provided further,* That in the case of grants to an interstate air pollution control agency (as defined in this Act) the grant shall be made from the allotments of the several States which are members of such agency on such basis as the Secretary finds reasonable and equitable. As used in this subsection, the term "regional air pollution control program" means a program for the prevention and control of air pollution in an area that includes the areas of two or more municipalities, whether in the same State or different States.

"(d) Such grants shall be made, in accordance with regulations, upon such terms and conditions as the Secretary may find necessary to carry out the purposes of this section.

"(e) Sums allotted to a State under subsection (b) of this section which have not been obligated by the end of the fiscal year for which they were allotted because of a lack of approval applications shall be reallotted by the Secretary, on such basis as he determines to be reasonable and equitable and in accordance with regulations promulgated by him, to States from which approvable applications have been made but which have not been approved for grants because of a lack of funds in the allotment of such State. Any sum made available to a State by reallotment under the preceding sentence shall be in addition to any funds otherwise allotted to such State under this Act and shall be available for grants to air pollution control agencies in such State.

"ABATEMENT OF AIR POLLUTION

"SEC. 5. (a) The pollution of the air in any State or States which endangers the health or welfare of any persons, shall be subject to abatement as provided in this section.

"(b) Consistent with the policy declaration of this Act, municipal, State, and interstate action to abate air pollution shall be encouraged and shall not be displaced by Federal enforcement action except as otherwise provided by or pursuant to a court order under subsection (f)(1).

"(c)(1)(A) Whenever requested by the Governor of any State, a State air pollution control agency, or (with the concurrence of the State air pollution control agency for the State in which the municipality is situated) the governing body of any municipality, the Secretary shall, if such request refers to air pollution which is alleged to endanger the health or welfare of persons in a State other than that in which the discharge or discharges (causing or contributing to such pollution) originate, give formal notification thereof to the air pollution control agency of the municipality where such discharge or discharges originate, to the air pollution control agency of the State in which such municipality is located, and to the interstate air pollution control agency, if any, in whose jurisdictional area such municipality is located, and shall call promptly a conference of such agency or agencies and of the air pollution control agencies of the municipalities which may be adversely affected by such pollution, and the air pollution control agency, if any, of each State, or for each area, in which any such municipality is located.

"(B) Whenever requested by the Governor of any State, a State air pollution control agency, or (with the concurrence of the State air pollution control agency for the State in which the municipality is situated) the governing body of any municipality, the Secretary shall, if such request refers to alleged air pollution which is endangering the health or welfare of persons only in the State in which the discharge or discharges (causing or contributing to such pollution) originate and if a municipality affected by such air pollution, or the municipality in which such pollution originates, has either made or concurred in such request, give formal notification thereof to the State air pollution control agency, to the air pollution control agencies of the municipality where such discharge or discharges originate and of the municipality or municipalities alleged to be adversely affected thereby, and to any interstate air pollution control agency, whose jurisdictional area includes any such municipality, and shall promptly call a conference of such agency or agencies, unless, in the judgment of the Secretary, the effect of such pollution is not of such significance as to warrant exercise of Federal jurisdiction under this section.

"(C) The Secretary shall also call such a conference whenever, on the basis of reports, surveys, or studies, he has reason to believe that any pollution referred to in subsection (a) is endangering the health or welfare of persons in a State other than that in which the discharge or discharges originate is occurring.

"(2) The agencies called to attend such conference may bring such persons as they desire to the conference. Not less than three weeks' prior notice of the conference date shall be given to such agencies.

"(3) Following this conference, the Secretary shall prepare and forward to all air pollution control agencies attending the conference a summary of conference discussions including (A) occurrence of air pollution subject to abatement under this Act; (B) adequacy of measures taken toward abatement of the pollution; and (C) nature of delays, if any, being encountered in abating the pollution.

"(d) If the Secretary believes, upon the conclusion of the conference or thereafter, that effective progress toward abatement of such pollution is not being made and that the health or welfare of any persons is being endangered, he shall recommend to the appropriate State or municipal air pollution control agency (or to both such agencies) that it take necessary remedial action. The Secretary shall allow at least six months from the date he makes such recommendations for the taking of such recommended action.

"(e)(1) If, at the conclusion of the period so allowed, such remedial action or other action which in the judgment of the Secretary is reasonably calculated to secure abatement of such pollution has not been taken, the Secretary shall call a public hearing, to be held in or near one or more of the places where the discharge or discharges causing or contributing to such pollution originated, before a hearing board of five or more persons appointed by the Secretary. Each State in which any discharge causing or contributing to such pollution originates and each State claiming to be adversely affected by such pollution shall be given an opportunity to select one member of such hearing board and at least one member shall be a representative of the Department of Commerce, and not less than a majority of such hearing board shall be persons other than officers or employees of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. At least three weeks' prior notice of such hearing shall be given to the State, interstate, and municipal air pollution control agencies called to attend such hearing and to the alleged polluter or polluters.

"(2) On the basis of evidence presented at such hearing, the hearing board shall make findings as to whether pollution referred to in subsection (a) is occurring and whether effective progress toward abatement thereof is being made. If the hearing board finds such pollution is occurring and effective progress toward abatement thereof is not being made it shall make recommendations to the Secretary concerning the measures, if any, which it finds to be reasonable and suitable to secure abatement of such pollution.

"(3) The Secretary shall send such findings and recommendations to the person or persons discharging any matter causing or contributing to such pollution; to air pollution control agencies of the State or States and of the municipality or municipalities where such discharge or discharges originate; and to any interstate air pollution control agency whose jurisdictional area includes any such municipality, together with a notice specifying a reasonable time (not less than six months) to secure abatement of such pollution.

"(f) If such action reasonably calculated to secure abatement of the pollution within the time specified in the notice following the public hearing is not taken, the Secretary—

"(1) in the case of air pollution which is endangering the health and welfare of persons in a State other than that in which the discharge or discharges (causing or contributing to such pollution) originate, may request the Attorney General to bring a suit on behalf of the United States to secure abatement of the pollution. The court shall receive in evidence in any such suit a transcript of the proceedings before the hearing board in such case and a copy of such board's recommendations and shall receive such further evidence as the court in its discretion deems proper. The court, giving due consideration to the practicability and to the physical and economic feasibility of securing abatement of any pollution proved, shall have jurisdiction to enter such judgment, and orders enforcing such judgment, as the public interest and the equities of the case may require.

"(2) in the case of air pollution which is endangering the health or welfare of persons only in the State in which the discharge or discharges (causing or contributing to such pollution) originate, shall send to the Governor and the attorney general of such State the findings and recommendations of the hearing board and his notice, together with a transcript of the hearing and his finding that action reasonably calculated to secure abatement of the pollution has not been taken, and at the request of such Governor or attorney general he shall provide such technical and other assistance as in his judgment is necessary to assist the State in judicial proceedings to secure abatement of the pollution under State or local law.

"(h) Members of any hearing board appointed pursuant to subsection (e) who are not regular full-time officers or employees of the United States shall, while participating in the hearing conducted by such board or otherwise engaged on the work of such board, be entitled to receive compensation at a rate fixed by the Secretary, but not exceeding $100 per diem, including travel time, and while away from their homes or regular places of business they may be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, as authorized by law (5 U.S.C. 73b-2) for persons in the Government service employed intermittently.

"(i) In his summary of any conference pursuant to this section, the Secretary shall include references to any discharges allegedly contributing to pollution from any Federal property. Notice of any hearing pursuant to this section involving any pollution alleged to be affected by any such discharges shall also be given to the Federal agency having jurisdiction over the property involved and the findings and recommendations of the hearing board conducting such hearing shall also include references to any such discharges which are contributing to the pollution found by such hearing board.

"REQUIREMENT OF REPORTS

"SEC. 6. (a) The Secretary is authorized to require any person whose activities result in the emission of air pollutants causing or contributing to air pollution which has been the subject of a conference under section 5 to file with him, in such form as he may prescribe, a report, furnishing to the Secretary such information as may reasonably be required as to the character, kind, and quantity of pollutants discharged and the use of devices or other means to prevent or reduce the emission of pollutants by the person filing such reports. Such report shall be made under oath or otherwise, as the Secretary may prescribe, and shall be filed with the Secretary within such reasonable period as the Secretary may prescribe, unless additional time be granted by the Secretary. All information in such report shall be considered confidential for the purposes of section 1905 of title 18 of the United States Code.

"(b) If any person required to file any report under this section shall fail to do so within the time fixed by the Secretary for filing the same, and such failure shall continue for thirty days after notice of such default, such person shall forfeit to the United States the sum of $100 for each and every day of the continuance of such failure, which forfeiture shall be payable into the Treasury of the United States, and shall be recoverable in a civil suit in the name of the United States brought in the district where such person has his principal office or in any district in which he does business: *Provided*, That the Secretary may upon application therefor remit or mitigate any forfeiture provided for under this subsection and he shall have authority to determine the facts upon all such applications.

"(c) It shall be the duty of the various United States attorneys, under the direction of the Attorney General of the United States, to prosecute for the recovery of such forfeitures. The costs and expenses of such prosecution shall be paid out of the appropriation for the expenses of the courts of the United States.

"COOPERATION BY FEDERAL AGENCIES TO CONTROL AIR POLLUTION FROM FEDERAL FACILITIES

"SEC. 7. It is hereby declared to be the intent of Congress that any Federal department or agency having jurisdiction over any building, installation, or other property shall, to the extent practicable and consistent with the interests of the United States and within any available appropriations, cooperate with the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and with any air pollution control agency in preventing and controlling the pollution of the air in any area insofar as the discharge of any matter from or by such building, installation, or other property may cause or contribute to pollution of the air in such area.

"INFORMATION AVAILABLE TO PUBLIC

"SEC. 8. All research within the United States contracted for, sponsored, cosponsored, or authorized under authority of this Act shall be provided for in such manner that all information, uses, products, processes, patents, and other developments resulting from such research developed by Government expenditure will (with such exceptions and limitations, if any, as the Secretary may find to be necessary in the interest of national defense) be available to the general public. This subsection shall not be so construed as to deprive the owner of any background patent relating thereto of such rights as he may have thereunder.

"ADMINISTRATION

"SEC. 9. (a) The Secretary is authorized to prescribe such regulations as are necessary to carry out his functions under this Act. The Secretary may delegate to any officer or employee of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare such of his powers and duties under this Act, except the making of regulations, as he may deem necessary or expedient.

"(b) Upon the request of an air pollution control agency, personnel of the Public Health Service may be detailed to such agency for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this Act. The provisions of section 214(d) of the Public Health Service Act shall be applicable with respect to any personnel so detailed to the same extent as if such personnel had been detailed under section 214(b) of that Act.

"(c) Payments under grants made under this Act may be made in installments, and in advance or by way of reimbursement, as may be determined by the Secretary.

"DEFINITIONS

"SEC. 10. When used in this Act—

"(a) The term 'Secretary' means the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

"(b) The term 'air pollution control agency' means any of the following:

"(1) A single State agency designated by the Governor of that State as the official State air pollution control agency for purposes of this Act;

"(2) An agency established by two or more States and having substantial powers or duties pertaining to the prevention and control of air pollution;

"(3) A city, county, or other local government health authority, or, in the case of any city, county, or other local government in which there is an agency other than the health authority charged with responsibility for enforcing ordinances or laws relating to the prevention and control of air pollution, such other agency; or

"(4) An agency of two or more municipalities located in the same State or in different States and having substantial powers or duties pertaining to the prevention and control of air pollution.

"(c) The term 'interstate air pollution control agency' means—

"(1) an air pollution control agency established by two or more States, or

"(2) an air pollution control agency of two or more municipalities located in different States.

"(d) The term 'State' means a State, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, and Guam.

"(e) The term 'person' includes an individual, corporation, partnership, association, State, municipality, and political subdivision of a State.

"(f) The term 'municipality' means a city, town, borough, county, parish, district, or other public body created by or pursuant to State law.

"OTHER AUTHORITY NOT AFFECTED

"SEC. 11. This Act shall not be construed as superseding or limiting the authorities and responsibilities, under any other provision of the law, of the Secretary or any other Federal officer, department, or agency.

"SEPARABILITY

"SEC. 12. If any provision of this Act, or the application of any provision of this Act to any person or circumstance, is held invalid, the application of such provision to other persons or circumstances, and the remainder of this Act, shall not be affected thereby.

"SHORT TITLE

"SEC. 13. This Act may be cited as the 'Clean Air Act'."

SEC. 2. The title of such Act of July 14, 1955, is amended to read: "An Act to provide for air pollution prevention and control activities of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and for other purposes".

RETURN TO ONE-PRICE COTTON

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing two bills which would return us to a one-price cotton system. It is my hope the Agriculture Committee will consider both of these bills and report now one or the other or a combination of both.

The situation is urgent and even desperate. The cotton farmer is confused. He can never plan from one year to the next. The textile industry is faced with growing unemployment. It is unfair and almost criminal for our textile industry to be forced to pay 8½ cents per pound more for cotton than our foreign competitor.

Mr. Speaker, the American textile industry is the greatest friend of the American cotton farmer. The American textile industry purchases more than 70 percent of its cotton from the American cotton farmer. If the American textile industry and the American cotton farmer are to stay in business, something must be done now.

I represent a district where cotton is grown. My district also includes some of the most efficient cotton textile manufacturing plants in the world. I have a vital interest in the welfare of cotton farmers and the textile workers in my district. For more than 25 years I have watched the control program operate with respect to cotton. Each year, except during World War II and the Korean conflict, the situation with regard to the cotton industry has constantly deteriorated.

At the present time we are faced with a situation where, in my opinion, if something is not done rather quickly, we are on the threshold of liquidating this great industry. This will be a tremendous blow to not only the cotton farmers in some 20 States but it will mean unemployment for a large number of very highly skilled people who are engaged in the manufacture of cotton textiles.

My colleagues from the textile manufacturing areas know what has happened. We are allowing our competitors abroad an 8½-cent-per-pound advantage in price. This, coupled with the cheap labor supply, has allowed a flood of textiles to be imported into the United States. This is a very serious situation. Just as serious is the fact that many domestic users of cotton have changed to synthetics while the importation of foreign synthetic fiber is on the increase and thus the per capita consumption of cotton is going down, down, down. This is due primarily to price.

I believe that if we are going to maintain any semblance of a cotton industry we must reduce the Government-guaranteed price.

The bills I am introducing today are designed to move in a direction that will restore confidence in the cotton industry, increase the consumption of cotton both at home and abroad, lessen the drain on the Federal Treasury, and above all, improve and increase the net per family farm income of cotton producers.

THE HONORABLE GRAHAM B. PURCELL, JR.

Mr. ROBERTS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include a speech by the Vice President of the United States.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROBERTS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, on February 23, 1963, more than 1,200 citizens of the 13th District of Texas turned out at Wichita Falls to pay respects to their Congressman and our colleague, the Honorable GRAHAM PURCELL.

It was a great honor for me to participate in the recognition paid this outstanding Texan.

On this occasion, the Vice President of the United States, the Honorable LYNDON B. JOHNSON, was the principal speaker, and under unanimous consent I include herewith his timely remarks:

> There is no place I am ever more willing to come—and no place I am more reluctant to leave—than Wichita Falls. I have been especially anxious to come here for this occasion tonight.
>
> So long as I can remember Wichita Falls has been distinguishing itself in producing leadership for our State and Nation. There was a time back in the 1930's when nearly every major candidate for Governor—both Democrat and Republican—came from Wichita Falls. You gave Texas one of its very finest Governors—James V. Allred.
>
> Through my service in Congress, this district was represented by some of the most able men ever to serve in Washington—my good friends, W. D. MacFarland, Ed Gossett, and Frank Ikard. While I might feel the less said about his party the better, you have now given Texas one of its U.S. Senators, a vigorous young member of the Republican Party, JOHN TOWER.
>
> This is a distinguished record for Wichita Falls. Few other cities can equal it—and I am sure none have excelled it. That is why I am happy to come tonight to tell you—as I hope you already realize—that you have done yourselves proud once more by sending to the Congress of the United States the man we honor on this occasion, GRAHAM PURCELL.
>
> Woodrow Wilson once said that one of two things happen to a man when he goes to Washington—he either grows or swells. In these last 12 months, GRAHAM PURCELL has grown.
>
> If there has been any swelling, it is because he pulled a muscle playing football with that fine homegrown backfield he and his wife are raising. In Washington, you see many types of men come and go. I remember the story of the new first-term Congressman who had just arrived in Washington and felt called upon to make a speech to his colleagues nearly every day. In speech after speech, he told the House that he would rather be right than President. One day the wise old Speaker, presiding over the Chamber, rapped his gavel and said: "The gentleman need not be so worried—he will never be either."
>
> In his service as your Representative, GRAHAM PURCELL has not tried to be Commander in Chief, Chief Justice, Secretary of State, Secretary of Defense, and Budget Director—all rolled into one. He has been doing what you elected him to do: serving the people of this district, by serving the Nation every time the roll is called.
>
> None of us will ever forget that great American, Sam Rayburn. Mr. Rayburn was a man of much wisdom and few words. The highest compliment he ever gave new Congressmen when he was convinced of their worth consisted of two words: "He'll do." If the gentleman from Bonham were with us tonight, I believe he would say of GRAHAM PURCELL: "He'll do."
>
> Since he left home here a year ago, GRAHAM PURCELL—like all of us in Washington—has been both a witness to and a participant in the making of some of the most significant history of the century. While none of us can yet be sure of what the future holds, I believe that when the final judgment on our era is written, the year of 1962 will be remembered and pinpointed as one of the decisive turning points of the cold war and of the whole long struggle between freedom and tyranny.
>
> In that year two events occurred which cannot be ignored or dismissed—and cannot be downgraded.
>
> First, after 15 years of containment, the Russian Communists gambled desperately in an attempt to extend their armed empire across the oceans to the Western Hemisphere. They gambled greatly—and they lost.
>
> Second, after that failure, the Russian Communists turned back to an empire in which—for the first time since communism came into existence—they found their own leadership and control defied and challenged by the Chinese Communists. And the whole myth of Communist unity exploded.
>
> The finger of history rises slowly. Those who are witness to history's great movements often are unaware of the meaning of what their eyes behold. We may be unaware of the full import of the events which have transpired in recent months. But I like to recall the episode of history which Winston Churchill cited to us back in the dark days of 1950 when the Russian threat to Western Europe seemed so grave and the armed might of Communist aggressors seemed so irresistible.
>
> Sir Winston pointed out that 500 years ago the West had been prostrate before the Mongol hordes advancing from the East. In two separate battles, which occurred on almost the same day in Poland and in Austria, the last remaining armies of western civilization were defeated and destroyed. Nothing stood in the way of the aggressors from the East.
>
> But at that critical moment, the great Khan died. The Mongol armies turned back to travel 7,000 miles homeward to resolve their internal differences. And, as Sir Winston put it, "They never returned till now."
>
> In the year of our Lord 1962, it was no chance of fate or accident of history that turned back the aggressors from the East. They found themselves facing the hard reality of an America ready, an America prepared, an America resolute. In the face of that preparedness and resolve, the forces of communism backed away. And today the two great powers of the Communist bloc are being drawn into a vicious and decisive struggle with each other.
>
> Our need for vigilance has not ended. Our need for preparedness will not end during your lifetime or mine. America must continue to maintain its strength—and this we shall do. But there is one vital point which I believe needs to be brought home. The American strength which Khrushchev faced in Cuba—the strength which has held the line against aggression through all these years of the cold war—is not solely the strength of arms and planes and missiles and

bombs. The greater strength which has carried us through these years of peril is the strength of this country's political system—the system of which all of us are part and to which each of us adds or subtracts strength and solidarity.

Through the ages, every great civilization has made its contribution to the progress of man. The contribution of some have been philosophy or art or literature. The imprint which American civilization has left indelibly upon this century—and upon all centuries to come is political.

The genius of our system is described in many different ways by many different people. The businessman may say it is the profit motive. The working man may say it is the right to organize. The school man may say it is educational. The farmer may say it is agricultural. All these answers are right but none is complete.

The abiding genius of America is our ability, under the Constitution, to unite ourselves together to resolve our national problems, to face our common dangers, and to achieve through our efforts the greatest good for the greatest number.

The heart of this genius is the fact that the American people can and do rise above party and above the doctrine and dogma and division of partisanship, to unite in common devotion to principles which transcend the interests of parties, of class or region or race or religion.

This is a greater strength than we remember—a source of strength we too often forget. In the Communist-controlled countries—as in the Axis powers of the 1930's—the party is supreme and paramount. The people are exhorted to rally to the party, to give up their freedom, their possessions, and even their lives to the cause of party, not principles. Time will prove that this is the fatal defect of the totalitarian way.

I say this tonight for a reason. This is not a partisan occasion. If we are partisans at all, we are here as partisans of our friend and neighbor and faithful servant, GRAHAM PURCELL. But we are passing through a time in the history of our Republic when many voices counsel Americans that partisanship is the end-all and be-all of citizenship. This is counsel we should not heed.

In our national history, there are no heroes who made their names as partisans. The only men remembered—the only men worth remembering—have always been those who have placed the country above party and principle above partisanship. We shall have lost the keystone from the arch of our national strength if ever our values are otherwise.

There is much for Americans to be proud of, much for which we should be grateful. We live the freest lives of any peoples on earth. We enjoy the greatest abundance of any peoples who have ever lived. We are the least policed and least afraid of all God's children. At the heart of what we enjoy in this regard is the sense of individual responsibility.

In 1962, Americans paid more than $90 billion in taxes to the Government. Of that huge total, 97 percent was self-assessed and voluntarily paid. In no other country—today or ever—has there been a comparable record. We build our schools; we care for the aged; we minister to the sick; we concern ourselves with the problems of our youth because of this inherent sense of individual responsibility. For the same reason and in the same way, we give of our resources so that other men and women half a world away may keep the freedom they want to keep for their children too.

The world is not ungrateful. The world is not unaware of what we do. Around this globe, nation after nation has adopted for itself constitutions modeled after the Constitution of the United States. Of the more than 50 new nations which have become independent during the years of the cold war, not one has chosen voluntarily to live under communism or to submit to Communist rule. That revolution of freedom that began on these shores 200 years ago continues to be the greatest and most compelling force in the world today—and it is a revolution which knows no partisanship, no dogma, and no partisan doctrine.

This political system which we have wrought is made stronger when the will of the people is represented by men like GRAHAM PURCELL. While GRAHAM PURCELL never forgets the principles of the party of which he is a member, he never remembers the party affiliation of a constituent he serves who enters his office with a worthy cause. This is what makes America strong—not arms alone, not factories alone, not fields alone.

The ultimate strength of America is the capacity of her people to unite together for common cause and higher purposes. And those who would have us divide ourselves along lines of partisanship and party subtract from our strength rather than add to it.

FEDERAL SPENDING

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Speaker, many taxpayers regard their tax payments as an onerous tribute exacted from them to keep Washington bureaucrats on the payroll. Since they get no merchandise back in return for their tax payments, they feel that they are getting nothing for their money. Accustomed as they are to seeing the shiny paint and chromium when they acquire a new car, or the fine fabric when they purchase a new garment, they somehow get the feeling that their tax dollars purchase nothing tangible or valuable for them.

It is the aim of this statement to inquire into the purposes for which our income tax money is spent, and the alternatives to such spending. Americans in and out of political life talk much about our determination to protect our precious freedoms and to resist the spread of government by dictatorship throughout the world. The question arises, however, as to whether we really hold these freedoms to be so precious that we are willing to pay for them with the hard cash of tax dollars. We must decide whether we are ready to invest in freedom and democracy with the sure knowledge that these twin blessings are not bought cheaply. To use a blunt expression, we must determine whether or not we are willing to put our money where our mouth is.

The principal misconception that must be cleared away is that our national budget is so astronomical because of all kinds of welfare programs in which the Government participates. The fact of the matter is that in fiscal 1963, out of every dollar which the taxpayer paid to his National Government, approximately 74 cents goes for national defense and security, space exploration, and the direct cost of our involvement in past wars. The entire remaining cost of Government and its various domestic and international programs, departments, courts, and agencies comes from the 26 cents left over.

Our total budget in fiscal 1963 amounted to over $94 billion. Out of this sum, almost $50 billion was appropriated for the cost of our Armed Forces and our national defense. It should be emphasized, moreover, that these appropriations were made by the House of Representatives by a unanimous vote after unanimous recommendation of both the House Armed Services Committee and the House Appropriations Committee.

Thus, we see that military appropriations alone in fiscal 1963 came to 54 percent of our national budget, or 54 cents out of every tax dollar. Interestingly enough, some of those Congressmen who were most vocal in their support of these and other expenditures which will be dealt with hereafter are also the most vociferous in condemning the high level of Federal spending.

Congress in its foreign aid program for fiscal 1963 also allocated almost $1½ billion exclusively for military assistance to help our allies protect themselves, and ultimately ourselves, against Communist expansion. This expense likewise was generally supported as a desirable alternative to sending additional American troops abroad at a much greater cost and at great hardship to many American families.

Do we remember the day Col. John Glenn successfully accomplished his historic mission into space? Can we recall how thrilled and proud we were to be an American when he and our other astronauts performed their fateful tasks so brilliantly? Well, in fiscal 1963, the U.S. Congress appropriated over $3½ billion for space exploration. The vote in the House of Representatives was unanimous, and came upon the heels of the unanimous recommendations of the House Committee on Science and Astronautics and the House Appropriations Committee. This accounted for more than 3½ cents out of every tax dollar.

At this point it should be made clear that I do not suggest that there is not waste in defense or space expenditures. Constant vigilance and scrutiny by those responsible for the administration of such costs is indeed vitally needed. However, the figure of $49,455,000 for military appropriations in 1963 was not picked out of the sky as an attractive round figure. It was arrived at after long and careful consideration and study by the committees of the House and Senate charged with the responsibility of providing for the national defense. Broken down item by item, it calls for a given amount for missiles, aircraft, naval vessels, operational training facilities, and so forth.

When the House Armed Services Committee after months of conscientious consultation with dedicated military personnel unanimously recommends that the sum of almost $50 billion is required to make us impregnable and keep us at full strength, what Congressman can with responsibility call for across-the-board slashes. To do so would be to engage in a perilous game of Russian roulette with our national security, and you can be sure that it would expose the dissenter to charges of "soft on communism" from the very persons who most loudly bewail our high Federal budget.

Nevertheless, we must realistically face the fact that until such time as we can make significant reductions in our spending for military and space programs, economies effected in other areas cannot be substantial enough in terms of the overall budget to have the desired impact on our national spending picture. Despite the fact that opponents of social welfare and international cooperation programs are trying to use the budget problem as an excuse to scuttle these programs, the ultimate fiscal solution lies in the field of defense and space appropriations which account for the lion's share of our great national cost.

Is it not strange that those who uncomplainingly support appropriations for military aircraft costing millions of dollars apiece will do battle against expenditures for the National Institutes of Health and its associated projects for health research? Yet it may indeed be true that the value of military and space equipment destroyed yearly in accidents alone exceeds our total expenditures for health research.

Returning once more to our list of military expenditures, our involvements in the wars that have plagued the 20th century have brought us face to face with the problem of veterans' benefits. Congress faced the issue in fiscal 1963 by appropriating about $5½ billion for veterans' benefits, or over 5½ cents out of every tax dollar. This was accomplished without significant dissent after unanimous recommendation of the House Veterans Affairs Committee and the House Appropriations Committee.

We could, of course, eliminate or reduce the cost of veterans' benefits but to do so would involve turning our backs on those who suffered the most to protect our way of life. No one seriously suggests that this should be done. It would be a justifiably unpopular act to scale down our veterans' hospitals program or to take disability benefits away from those who are maimed or disabled by reason of serving their country. It is true that there may be some small percentage of cases of veterans who receive benefits to which they are not entirely entitled, but this again is a matter calling for careful administration rather than broadside budget cutting. To slash the appropriation for veterans' benefits because of a very limited number of abuses would be tantamount to throwing out the baby with the wash.

Let us now turn to the expenditure for interest on the national debt. In 1963 our annual interest payment on the national debt amounted to almost $10 billion, or more than 10 cents out of every tax dollar. This is an expenditure which is roundly decried. However, it should be borne in mind that our national debt is overwhelmingly the result of the participation of the United States in World War II followed by the Korean war. The national debt swelled from $43 billion in 1940 to $269 billion at the end of World War II.

During the dark years of World War II the U.S. Government was faced with the need to borrow money from the American people in order to finance the heroic war effort. Most of us recall the bond rallies at which the American people were exhorted to invest in Government bonds. Bright stars of the entertainment world sang, danced, and quipped in a patriotic endeavor to induce us to finance our struggle against our totalitarian enemies. Fortunately, the people responded, and they responded well.

We could have avoided the enormous financial expense of World War II by the very simple expedient of surrender. After the attack at Pearl Harbor, we might have ignominiously capitulated to the Japanese war lords. Likewise, we might have done business with Adolph Hitler. By so doing we would have held down our national debt. We also would have ceased to exist as a nation.

Had we as a nation failed to do what was necessary in 1941 to maintain our democratic system, we would have earned the scorn and calumny of future generations. In view of this, the argument that by our national indebtedness we are passing an intolerable burden along to our descendants has a hollow ring indeed.

What of the argument that we are spending our way into a welfare state? It can best be answered with the statistic that out of every tax dollar in fiscal 1963, only 7 to 9 cents was allocated to so-called welfare programs. The figure contracts or expands from 7 to 9 cents depending on your definition of the term "welfare." However, included among such programs are aid to to aged and blind, medical research and hospital construction, the national scholarship and college aid system, school lunch programs, manpower retraining, and so forth. In 1939, 45 cents of the tax dollar, as contrasted with today's 7 to 9 cents, were allocated to labor and welfare programs.

Many persons ask why the Federal Government cannot live within its means like State and local governments. As a matter of fact, if State and local governments did not have the advantage of Federal grants paid for out of the National Treasury, their burdens would be insupportable. Your U.S. Government could probably balance the budget tomorrow if it withdrew the prop of Federal money from the various State and local governments.

Whisking along a wide four-lane highway, we should consider that we would very likely be poking along a narrow, choked road from congested city to congested city if the U.S. Government had not paid 90 percent of the cost. Stop to think what it would cost local governments too if the Federal Treasury did not foot a great part of the bill for relief, hospital construction, and many other purely local necessities.

We constantly read in the press editorials charging that legislators support spending programs to perpetuate themselves in office. As a matter of fact, however, it is not true that all spending programs are popular and that Congressmen support them for political advantage. On the contrary, it often takes more political courage for a Congressman to support than to oppose some spending measures which are not widely in demand, but which he believes to be in the national interest. Consider, for instance, the issues of foreign aid and the purchase of United Nations bonds.

Actually, our tax payments represent an investment in liberty. Liberty being a concept, it cannot be seen or measured or weighed. How much freedom makes a pound? But talk to any American who has been in a dictator-ridden country and has come back home. He will tell you that liberty can surely be felt. And when you make an investment in that bright commodity, believe me you are getting a lot for your money.

I do not suggest that governmental economies are not possible. Of course, the Congress has the responsibility of seeing that the peoples' money is not wasted by maladministration or by topheavy payrolls. This responsibility is all the more heightened by the dimensions of our expansive programs. However, we should not deny or begrudge our own Government the just cost of our sizable and complicated operations. Any person who receives the benefits of orderly democratic processes under freedom is immature and unreasonable if not willing to help his Government support such processes financially.

I once heard a man say: "Living is a waste of money. I can't afford it." Let us not as Americans say the same thing about democracy.

MORE WASTE IN DEFENSE SPENDING

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, Mandrake, the magician, had nothing on the Navy Department's procurement experts. Believe it or not, Navy now has a procurement underway which requires a manufacturer to make an item before he can bid on it, but he cannot get the drawings he needs to meet this requirement.

The end result, unless this purchase is stopped and revised, will be that a favored company will get the contract, some Navy employee or employees will get an evening's or an afternoon's entertainment, and the taxpayer will get it in the neck again.

Once you wade through a maze of boilerplate documents the details are simple. They add up to another before-the-fact disclosure of the capriciousness and irresponsibility of middle-grade servants. They point to a serious error which must be immediately corrected.

Last June 26 the Navy signed a contract with General Atronics Corp., of Philadelphia. It covered development of an oscilloscope, a device which visually measures changes in a varying current. Development, drawings, and services totaled $49,415 under terms of this contract—NObsr 87573. Production was also generated under another contract for production of the oscilloscope, called the USM-117, and this contract cost the taxpayer $107,325.

After spending $150,000 for development and first production, the Navy decided it needs 927 more of these devices. This time the requirement was put out for competitive bidding, only Navy purchasing officials rigged the rules to keep all other firms out of the action.

Currently scheduled to close May 1, 1963, is Navy invitation to bid 600-481-63. Under terms of this document all manufacturers who want to bid are first required to make a sample unit and have it approved by Navy. This will cost a manufacturer about $25,000, with no guarantee of getting the contract, but several manufacturers are interested even on these terms. The problem is that they cannot get the plans to build the equipment. This purchase is under the supervision of Navy purchasing office chief, Capt. C. A. Appleby, contract negotiator, C. Lear—telephone Oxford 6-6696—and engineer, Raymond Usilton—telephone Oxford 6-2010. These men have issued an invitation which stipulates that microfilms of manufacturing drawings will be issued to a contractor only after the award of contract. This provision is on page 14 of IFB 600-481-63-S.

In other words, a manufacturer must make the equipment and have it approved by the Navy before he can even be considered in the bidding. However, the same man cannot get the necessary drawings until he has won the contract, and he cannot build the set until he gets the drawings.

It is very plain to see that the stage has been set for a contract award to a company which already has the drawings and the only firm that has them—the company that developed the set and produced it first on a sole-source basis.

In short, Mr. Speaker, you just cannot get from here to there, and all this is because of the capricious and irresponsible action of Mr. Usilton, Mr. Lear, and Captain Appleby. There is absolutely nothing fair about this sort of conduct, and as a representative of American taxpayers, I protest vigorously. I also want to remind the Secretary of Defense that this sort of conduct is in direct conflict with his freedom of information policy issued last December which was supposed to aid manufacturers in getting every paper they needed to do business with Uncle Sam.

What should be done right now is to make these manufacturing drawings available to anyone who wants them for the cost of reproduction. The requirement to build a set before you can bid on it should be removed and this procurement should be made 100 percent competitive. If this is done, we will get a truly competitive procurement, provided some other bureaucrat does not change the rules again. If Navy continues to hide the drawings, it will again demonstrate its inefficiency and incompetency in handling public moneys.

I say today that the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of the Navy should put the drawings for this oscilloscope out on the counter, make this a truly competitive procurement, and let American industry go to work. I have great confidence in the results.

LEGALIZING A NATIONAL LOTTERY

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, to those Members of Congress who react with shocked feelings at the mere thought of legalizing a national lottery, I would like to bring to their attention some interesting facts which prove that tens of millions of our American citizens enjoy the relaxation and pleasures of gambling.

The National Association of State Racing Commissioners has just released its 1962 report on horse racing in the United States. It shows that $3,669,463,825 was wagered in 24 States where gambling on horses is legal and proper—at least inside the gates. I might point out that this figure represents an increase of over $202 million from last year.

The interesting part of this report, Mr. Speaker, is the tax revenue to the 24 States—collected painlessly and voluntarily—amounted to almost $288 million. This also is an increase of over $23 million over last year.

Mr. Speaker, in spite of our sanctimonious attitude about gambling, our Federal Treasury was the recipient of additional millions of dollars in taxes collected on admission charges from 50,582,092 persons whose urge to gamble brought them through the turnstiles.

To those who look upon gambling as wicked and immoral, I would like to point out to them that gambling funds collected in all 24 States are commingled with other State revenues and used to build schools and teach our children. As a matter of fact, the State of Florida last year programed nine extra racing days which were allotted for scholarships and charities.

Mr. Speaker, it is difficult for the average American taxpayer to understand why all the resistence to a National Lottery when every day millions of dollars change hands at every stock exchange, at every race track, at just about every sporting event that is staged. Are these transactions any different than buying a lottery ticket? Are these activities any different than the lotteries conducted every month by thousands of civic and fraternal clubs, churches, and welfare organizations where automobiles, television sets, and other prizes are raffled off to the lucky ticket holder?

I believe, Mr. Speaker, that the time has come for this Congress to stop pussyfooting. I think the time has come for this Congress to wipe out hypocrisy and recognize the indisputable fact that man, by his very nature, is a gambler and wants a chance to legally satisfy his gambling thirst.

More importantly, Mr. Speaker, I think the time has come for this Congress to realize that a national lottery is the only painless, sensible, and voluntary way to raise over $10 billion a year in additional revenue which can be used to reduce our national debt and cut the heavy tax burden carried by our American wage earners.

THE WASHINGTON POST AND THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Hampshire?

There was no objection.

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, today's editorial in the Washington Post entitled "Seeing Reds" once again reflects an illogical and unreasonable prejudice against the important work and objectives of the House Committee on Un-American Activities. For a paper that repeatedly claims to pride itself on a claimed objectivity of approach to important national issues, it seems to me that the Post does the public a disservice in repeatedly so editorializing as to slant facts against this Committee.

For example, "Seeing Reds" finds the Post repeating the well-worn strawman that we do not need the House Un-American Activities Committee because we have an FBI. This is ridiculous as the Post well knows. Why? Because, first, while the FBI is a splendid, efficient, and effective organization, the limited number of FBI agents—approximately 6,000—are required to do a great deal in the way of criminal and security investigation entirely unrelated to subversion; only a very small number of agents are available at any one time for subversive detail; but, second, even if detailed to subversive investigation, or surveillance, the FBI is an investigating agency lacking, completely, the power to compel testimony under oath. In the investigation of subversion it is indispensable that the activities of Communists should be developed by a process that compels answers under oath to relevant questions that are subject to penalties of perjury and wherein refusal to answer is punishable by contempt; otherwise there just would be little reliable information; third, in the important mission of keeping abreast of subversion within the United States the work of the FBI, House Un-American Activities Committee, and the Internal Security Subcommittee of Senate Judiciary are complementary, not opposed. They can and do work toward the single desirable objective, the safety and security of the American people.

It is unfortunate that the Post should continue to minimize or misrepresent the fundamental importance of the House Un-American Activities Committee and its continuation because of occasional differences of opinion as to method or application in individual cases. The committee is composed of sincere and loyal men who do not conceive themselves as superior in loyalty to other Americans but who are deeply concerned that there can be some who call themselves Americans who either profess membership in the Communist Party or knowingly and intentionally give aid and comfort to Communist Party objectives in this country. When we consider that the No. 1 objective of communism is the destruction of this Nation, the killing of its Government, its judges, and its leadership, it becomes reasonably obvious that Communist activity in the United States demands continuing investigation.

The tremendous bipartisan endorsement of this House of the continuation of its Un-American Activities Committee reflects the overwhelming support of the American people in which I am glad to say I join.

U.N. AID TO CUBA

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, in my first statement to this House last month concerning the workings of the United Nations Special Fund, I said that an investigation was continuing into U.N. aid going to Cuba from sources other than the Special Fund.

Today, I will outline a number of U.N. aid projects being conducted in Communist Cuba with the subsidization of American taxpayers. These are over and beyond the $1.2 million Special Fund project for Cuban agriculture, and the Special Fund project for nuclear research in Red Yugoslavia.

Cuba has been receiving U.N. assistance under the United Nations expanded program of technical assistance since the 1950's. In programs scheduled in the 1961 to 1964 period Cuba has continued to receive U.N. aid, and currently—1962 to 1963—some $1,033,080 is being spent by the U.N. in its efforts of technical assistance designed to strengthen Cuba.

This aid is administered by five suborganizations of the U.N.—International Labor Organization, Food and Agriculture Organization, United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization, International Civil Aviation Organization, and World Health Organization.

All of these organizations have high, altruistic aims and goals in the service of mankind. We Americans, certainly, agree with their general work. But once again, in the case of Cuba, American taxpayers who keep the U.N. solvent are being put in the position of paying to strengthen a Communist, enemy nation.

It is my purpose here today to provide for the House additional details about these projects so that Americans can be made aware of what they are paying for under the U.N. Americans may wish to continue to support some of the humanitarian programs listed here. On the other hand, they might prefer to curtail our support of others.

I already have addressed the House about the International Civil Aviation Organization program for training Cubans in aircraft operations and maintenance—a $17,280 project.

Here are the other U.N. aid projects for Cuba:

1. INTERNATIONAL LABOR ORGANIZATION

The ILO is conducting in Cuba a $69,000 project concerning social security. This project has been underway since the pre-Castro days of 1955, but has been continued to the Communist dictator's benefit.

It is planned that in 1963 at least three ILO experts will be in Cuba to further this project. In previous years two experts have been provided.

The project is designed in the words of the United Nations to "overcome a situation which might cause serious economic and social repercussions." It involves a study and recommendations about actuarial difficulties involved in a number of pension funds operated in Cuba with a view to combining some of the funds.

The project includes a "review of the policy of social security in the country as a whole."

That leads one to wonder if social security benefits are being paid to the widows and orphans of the men murdered by Castro firing squads.

2. FOOD AND AGRICULTURE ORGANIZATION

The FAO is conducting a continuing project in Cuba programed in the 1963 to 1964 financial year for $160,000 and for increasing amounts until 1968. The project is entitled "Fisheries Development."

Main objectives of this project, the U.N. says, are to develop Cuba's fishery resources along the Continental Shelf and on the high seas. To do this the U.N. plans to help Cuba improve its fishing fleet, explore fisheries and study fish biology and inland water restocking possibilities.

The U.N. says that among its objectives is one to "facilitate the Government's shipbuilding and marine investigation projects."

It may occur to some Americans that shipbuilding is a necessary adjunct for the conducting of guerrilla operations in Latin America.

Also the FAO, subsidized by American dollars, is helping Cuba in its "general economic development and food supply plans." FAO is providing experts to assist the Cuban Fishing Research Center of the Fishing Department of the National Institute of Agrarian Reform.

Castro's Communist agrarian reform movement is well known in this House of Representatives.

3. UNITED NATIONS EDUCATIONAL, SCIENTIFIC, AND CULTURAL ORGANIZATION

UNESCO is conducting two projects in Cuba at this time.

The first is entitled "Educational Services" and is costing the U.N. and its American supporters $13,500. Under this program, the U.N. says, an expert will cooperate with the Cuban Higher Institute of Education in preparing curricula and textbooks, organizing courses, and planning research.

This work is being done in connection with Castro's educational reorganization program, which, if it is at all like his other reorganizations, is being reorganized to teach children to parrot the Red line.

The second UNESCO project in Cuba is entitled "Marine Biology" and provides for $54,000 for work in close conjunction with the FAO fisheries project in Cuba discussed above. Why two U.N. organizations are conducting the same project with separate funds has not been explained by the U.N.

This UNESCO project also is planned for continuation through 1968.

4. WORLD HEALTH ORGANIZATION

The WHO, U.N. organization with which I am well acquainted as a doctor and as a Member of Congress who attended as an adviser of this House the WHO meeting in Geneva last year, has a number of projects underway in Cuba. The chief one is entitled "Public Health Administration" and is programed for a current cost of $152,000.

Essentially, it is designed to investigate the human resources and physical health facilities of Cuba and to train technical and auxiliary staffs in the fields of public health. It is proposed, the U.N. says, that the program will "progressively cover the whole territory of the Republic of Cuba, in a network of protection, promotion, and rehabilitation of the health of inhabitants." The plan will last for 10 years or more.

There are several other WHO projects in Cuba, all designed to improve the health of the unfortunate people enslaved on that Red island—a goal with which few Americans will find fault. These projects include:

First. A drive to eradicate the yellow fever mosquito from the Havana area at a 1963–64 cost of $143,000. It is planned that the area involved will be expanded in later years. Staffers include a medical officer and two sanitarians.

Second. A project in nursing education features a school of nursing adapted to Cuba's needs and opened in October, 1960, with 94 students. By 1962 the school had 100 students and trained them at 400-bed National Hospital. In addition a special 6-month course for preparation of nursing instructors is given in Cuba.

Third. A malaria eradication project under the WHO general budget lists expenses for 1963 to 1964 of $170,000. It involves a survey of the malarious area of Cuba, including Oriente and Camaguey Provinces, and the area around the U.S. base at Guantanamo. Provision is made for a malariologist, a sanitary engineer, two sanitarians, and an entomologist.

Fourth. A program for fellowships in public health training under the WHO and the Pan American Health Organization is slated to cost $254,300 for the 1963 to 1964 period. These fellows are to collaborate with the government in training staff for improvement and expansion of its public health services.

Fifth. A final Cuban project undertaken by the United Nations World Health Organization is entitled "Refuse Disposal" and provides for a consultant to advise Cuba in establishing facilities for proper disposal of refuse from Havana and adjacent areas. Fellowships were provided under this plan in 1962.

Supplemental United Nations aid projects in Cuba, 1963–64 financial year

Project title	Supervisory agency	Cost estimate
Social security	International Labor Organization	$69,000
Fisheries development	Food and Agriculture Organization	160,000
Educational services	UNESCO	13,500
Marine biology	UNESCO	54,000
Public health administration	World Health Organization	152,000
Yellow fever eradication	do	143,000
Nursing education	do	(1)
Malaria eradication	do	170,000
Public health training fellowship	do	254,300
Havana refuse disposal	do	(1)
Air operations training	International Civil Aviation Organization	17,280
Total costs available		1,033,080

[1] Unavailable.

THE CRISIS OF CREDIBILITY

Mr. MacGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. MacGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, the effectiveness of any democratic government depends to a great degree on whether or not the people believe that the government is dealing with them in a forthright manner. This is entirely as it should be, for this is a government of the people.

As Americans the significance to us of this realism is not confined to our 50 States alone. The actions of our Government and the statements of our leaders are as meaningful in Karachi and Rome as they are in Kalamazoo and Sacramento. Without seeking it we have come to a position of world influence and we find that millions of people the world over look to us hopefully not only for bread and encouragement but for what they, as nations, desperately seek most of all: their national integrity and the right to develop national self-determination.

In the 50 States and in all non-Communist nations, U.S. leadership is essential: our diplomatic stance must build confidence, our military position must be convincing, our dollar must have the solidity of a rock, and our pronouncements must carry the weight of reliability.

In the years leading to 1961 our Government carefully constructed the kind of reliable stance demanded under the trying conditions of postwar reconstruction and the search for national and world tranquillity. Whether one agrees or disagrees with every action taken by the Truman administration or by the Eisenhower administration, the U.S. Government had been forthright with our own people and with the world in these important years.

Statements of our Presidential leadership accurately reflected our intent, and actions supported the statements. The most basic requirement of moral leadership was met. People everywhere believed what the U.S. Government said.

Since 1961 we have stumbled and fallen, losing concern for reliability. Our present leadership, taking maximum advantage of the reputation previously acquired, has demonstrated more faith in the superficial impressions of what it says rather than in the basic meaning of what it does. As a result we as a people and our friends abroad are coming to view with suspicion what used to be a responsible Government concern for truth. Official statements no longer carry the weight of reliability. We now face a crisis of credibility.

To what do we owe this condition? How can it be that a credibility of such sound foundation could be undermined and cast in doubt in a relatively brief period? Our people, and those the world over, are fairminded and sound thinkers in matters of this kind. We should not conclude that loss of credibility results from one, two, or even a few incidents. People reach judgments on the basis of what they see over a period of time; on a trend rather than on a single piece of evidence. Perhaps it will serve us well if we examine some events which may have contributed to the trend.

A recent event of significance is the statement of Mr. Kennedy, February 14, regarding the plan of the United Nations Special Fund to spend $1.1 million on an agricultural project in Cuba. Mr. Kennedy said:

> There are not any U.S. dollars that will go into that program.

Americans and our friends abroad are unconvinced. They know the United States provides 40 percent of the money used by the United Nations Special Fund, and that the money loses its identity when utilized. They have a right to ask if the Kennedy statement is based simply on a U.N. bookkeeping exercise designed to camouflage the actual manner in which U.S. taxpayers' money is put to use.

Our people have a right to ask if the United Nations itself has not lost a great deal in this kind of incident, since the U.N. can be effective only to the degree that people believe in its purposes and methods. The Kennedy attempt to obscure the facts of the Cuban agriculture project does a real disservice to the United Nations itself.

It is another chapter in the unfortunate story which began with the U.S. involvement in the Congo, an affair about which misleading statements rather than accurate information served to becloud and confuse, thereby creating doubt and despair. In what was evidently a move to justify the Kennedy support for military action against Katanga, the President and his associates made a substantial effort to discredit the Katanga government.

On September 27, 1961, Assistant Secretary of State Carl T. Rowan said the Katanga lobby was conducting a clever big-money campaign in the United States through the Katanga Information Service.

Mr. Kennedy should now deny or confirm that Justice Department files show that while Katanga operated on an information budget of about $100,000 annually, the central Congo Government spent $219,552 for this purpose in 1962. The Adoula government evidently more than doubled Katanga's expenditures and did it through two different public relations agencies in New York, one of which operated on a monthly retainer of $2,000. This effort was designed to reshape American opinion toward the Congo so as to accord with Kennedy policy. Americans rightly want to know by what standards the Kennedys judged the two groups.

The substantial loss of credibility suffered by the Kennedy administration in recent months is related also to the policy of managed news.

Managed news is the control of public information either by outright falsification of the facts, controlled public interpretation of the meaning of events, deliberate stoppage of the release of undesirable news, or the actual manufacturing of desirable news. Kennedy people have demonstrated their readiness to practice all these arts, and have advanced the practice to a precise skill.

Of course this phenomenon is not new. The most ancient of governments found that their people could be controlled if public information could be controlled. The esteemed editor of the Hartford Courant, Mr. Herbert Brucker, wrote in 1949 in his book "Freedom of Information":

> What the people of a democracy must know, whether in war or in peace, is not what official opinion holds good for them to know, but what has happened. If something has happened, or has been said in important places, or has been decided on, the people have an inalienable right to know it.

In contrast with that, Mr. Kennedy and his administration have embarked on a policy which sets themselves up as the judges of what the people are to know. Mr. Kennedy said in a press conference that he wished to clear up the controversy over public information "so that there is a free flow of the news to which the press is entitled and which I think ought to be in the press." Clearly he feels himself to be the judge of what the people should know.

Responsible newspapermen, and all of our people, find this to be an idea foreign to our concept of democratic government. Mr. Kennedy's actions to assume a controlling influence over the Nation's news media is viewed with extreme seriousness.

In time of war or extreme national peril, the United States has always granted a degree of news management to its leadership. This is commonsense. And if this is what Mr. Kennedy has in mind, we would feel little concern. But the evidence is to the contrary. Mr. Richard Wilson, long respected and able Washington newsman wrote recently: "For many months the President and his associates have been instructing the press on what it publishes right and what it publishes wrong."

Mr. Wilson lists several examples of outright falsehoods perpetuated by Mr. Kennedy on the people. They range from the story that the Kennedy-Khrushchev discussions in Vienna were conducted in a friendly atmosphere to the inaccuracies regarding the military buildup in Cuba.

I want to commend and give my support to this body's special Subcommittee on Government Information and its chairman, the gentleman from California, Congressman JOHN MOSS. The subcommittee has been engaged in highly useful and constructive work, and its objectives take on even more importance now as the Nation is faced with intense and skillful news management by the Kennedy administration.

The gentleman from California, Congressman Moss, was right when he said in San Francisco last November 30 that President Kennedy has taken firm control of the management of Government news in a manner that is unprecedented and unique in peacetime. He said important newsmaking events are under firm Presidential control, and he rightly called for a broad public discussion.

The subcommittee's current examination of news management will have the support of the entire country and in fact has already been commended in responsible newspapers around the country, including the St. Paul, Minn., Dispatch, in its lead editorial February 9.

We are not justified in feeling that the managed news policy of the Kennedys is an accident. Assistant Defense Secretary Arthur Sylvester said in New York December 6 that news generated by the Government is considered as a weapon.

He said the Government has an inherent right to lie. He added:

> If any of us are virtuous 51 percent of the time in life, it's a good record and in politics an amazing record.

In my opinion, this tells us a lot about the Kennedy administration.

The distinguished New York Times newsman, Mr. Arthur Krock, elaborated in his Fortune magazine article where he said the Kennedys are managing the news with a cynicism, boldness, and subtlety unmatched in peacetime history.

He said news management has been used to inflate success or to gloss over error. Mr. Kennedy himself was pictured as the most brilliant operator of the subtle, indirect method of administration news management.

In recent days, various Kennedy spokesmen have spoken of what they term irresponsible Republican criticisms which they say threaten the national interest. They have said that Republicans offer no alternative policies to Kennedy policies they oppose. These contentions deserve comment.

The American people and people all over the world recall vividly the reckless charges of John Kennedy in the 1960 election campaign that our country had fallen way behind in the production of missiles. These charges, repeated over and over, were echoed throughout the world and served to cast a heavy pall of concern for the ability of this country to defend itself and to defend friendly nations against an aggressive enemy. The irresponsibility of the missile gap charges was unprecedented and of grave consequence. The inaccuracies were so pronounced that they had to be counteracted very shortly after Mr. Kennedy's inauguration. The Secretary of Defense was put in the uncomfortable position of having to set the record straight in order to try to undo some of the damage that had been recklessly done to the national interest. In this light the recent politically motivated accusations of Kennedy spokesmen are exposed as simply extensions of the Kennedy management of public information.

Examination of the attacks by Republicans on the Kennedy foreign policy will show that they are responsible and constructive comments on matters which are of legitimate concern to us all. For example, revelations of Communist military strength on the island of Cuba have been substantiated. Even the newest estimates by administration critics have not been convincingly contradicted. On the contrary, they have stimulated the Kennedy administration to provide more information relating to the military buildup than it had released previously. A troubled American Nation does not call this irresponsibility. We have witnessed one falsehood after another regarding Cuba, each one serving to lessen our faith in our leadership. Even the loss of four young American men at the Bay of Pigs was concealed until discovered by those who, Mr. Kennedy would have us believe, are irresponsible.

There are two main concerns regarding Cuba today. The first is the real extent of the Communist military buildup, and how we can best learn about it in the face of Mr. Kennedy's avowed policy to provide the news only as he sees fit. The second is just as important: What is the meaning that we give to the buildup in terms of our national interest and in terms of the interests of the Western Hemisphere? To what degree is Cuba being used as a base for the terrorist and revolutionary activities we see growing elsewhere in Latin America?

It is these points which are the concern of the American people and of the administration's critics. Republican comments are directed at stimulating a meaningful dialog on these issues of national policy, and the attempts to call this irresponsible fall on ears which have been deadened by the cries of the missile gap.

We must also consider the matter of Republican alternatives. It speaks well for the effectiveness of Kennedy news management that administration spokesmen have made considerable progress in their attempts to portray Republicans as offering blind obstruction, without providing alternatives.

The truth is that Republicans have offered constructive and workable alternatives to virtually all major legislative program which they oppose. They provide responsible opposition. And further, Mr. Kennedy and his associates have sometimes grasped these Republican ideas and implemented them and claimed them as their own. The Manpower Retraining Act of the 87th Congress, termed a great Democrat success by the Kennedy people, is basically the Republican program. It is the result of hard, progressive, constructive work by the gentleman from New York, Congressman CHARLES GOODELL, and many other Republicans.

Mr. Kennedy's action in October 1962 setting up a partial blockade of Cuba was a Republican proposal advanced 13 months earlier. Several Republican Members of Congress, myself included, in September 1961 proposed a peaceful search and seizure program to prevent further Communist military equipment from reaching Cuba. Had our idea been accepted earlier, there would have been no need to go to the brink last fall. During most of 1962 Republicans who originated and presented this alternative were on one hand accused of presenting no alternatives, and on the other were accused of irresponsible and trigger-happy moves right up to the very hour, literally speaking, at which Mr. Kennedy said that he would take the action we recommended. We only regret that Mr. Kennedy has not fully implemented his announced intentions in that October 22 speech. We respectfully ask that he do so.

Our people are coming to learn more of the Republican alternatives. The Republican education proposal, for example, holds promise of making real progress toward providing meaningful Federal Government assistance to those school districts where the need is the greatest. The Republican proposal for providing additional opportunity for voluntary Federal help to senior citizens in obtaining medical and hospital care is also a program of real potential. As more and more citizens learn of these constructive Republican programs, it becomes easier for people to see the concern of our party for national progress. The political public relations gimmicks of the Kennedys stand exposed.

It is in the area of civil rights that we should pay special attention. We have all heard eloquent words from the Kennedy people of the need for effective action to extend full citizenship rights and responsibilities to all Americans. I call attention to the civil rights proposal advanced in this session of the Congress by myself and other Republican members of the Judiciary Committee. We think it is a constructive proposal which merits serious consideration. We welcome and suggest a full comparison with the well-publicized but superficial

Kennedy proposal of February 28. The inadequate Kennedy message is a retreat from progress because it invites defeat of any truly meaningful civil rights legislation in the 88th Congress.

However much Mr. Kennedy's loss of credibility has impaired his leadership in matters of importance within our own borders, the same phenomenon reaches most serious consequences in terms of the free world alliances. Here we have heard from Mr. Kennedy himself that bold American leadership is needed. But we are faced with a serious deterioration in our international position. Presidents Truman and Eisenhower steadily, patiently, and effectively constructed a system of alliances of substantial meaning. They built a reliability for our country, and convinced friend and foe alike of our determination to stand firm in defense of our principles.

Today the North Atlantic Treaty Organization is faltering to the point of crisis. France has rejected all pretense of cooperation and is saying openly that we cannot be relied upon; England has taken two serious blows in succession, first from this country and then from France. The source of greatest influence toward reconciliation is now West Germany, not the United States. The SEATO pact has become meaningless and our good friends in Pakistan are having to review their trust in our country. The Alliance for Progress is in deep trouble, and we are soon to be treated to the spectacle of lively anti-American sentiment from what should be the least likely source, Canada.

The integrity of the American dollar is a major part of this country's claim to leadership. But even here, the Kennedy loss of credibility has had serious consequences both at home and abroad. Mr. Kennedy's budget estimate for fiscal year 1963 was first stated as a small surplus of about $400 million. But that goal is grossly impossible, and a deficit in excess of $8 billion is expected.

Mr. Kennedy, in his efforts to convince us that any national problem can be solved through expanded government activity, attempts to show that anyone with other ideas is opposed to progress. Reliance on the individual, the family, and on local and State government is thus strangely equated with objection to the public interest. This further harms the Kennedy credibility.

The Government's spending on nonessential programs is growing so fast as to alarm all responsible people. Senator JOHN L. MCCLELLAN, for example, says the "crime of national insolvency" callously and mercilessly burdens the livelihood and earnings of future generations with a tremendous, oppressive national debt." In this body our esteemed chairman of the Appropriations Committee refers to the newest Kennedy budget as being nothing like he has ever seen in 40 years. He reminds us that it is a recordbreaker, that it proposes spending in an amount $500 million more than we spent in the peak year of World War II when survival was the sole object, and that much of this huge amount is for nondefense purposes.

Last year Mr. Kennedy said he would propose a balanced budget for fiscal year 1964. But despite that statement, and even though national revenues are expected to be at a record high level in the new fiscal year, Mr. Kennedy is now proposing a budget deficit of $11.9 billion, which is clearly a tentative and precarious estimate only. The final actual deficit will be considerably greater. The effect is frightening, to us and to our friends abroad. It is small wonder that our allies hesitate to rely on us.

Mr. Kennedy's credibility has not been enhanced by his current tax proposals. He presented his tax message as tax reduction and reform. But in fact it has been shown that some taxpayers would actually find their tax liability increased under the Kennedy plan. And what he called reform has been shown to be simply alteration of the present morass of tax regulations. The noted economic columnist, J. A. Livingston, writes that the proposed alterations would enable the Government to take with one hand what it yields with the other. "It makes neither good sense nor suits the normal standards of logic or equity," he says.

Perhaps the most telling blow of all to the credibility of the Kennedy administration has been struck on this issue of taxes. Mr. Kennedy's inaugural speech was noted for its eloquent passage, "Ask not what the country can do for you, but what you can do for your country." This idea touched all of us for its simple expression of the national interest.

But soon after the Kennedy tax message of January 24, 1963, began to stir an undercurrent of discontent, Mr. Walter Heller, Chairman of the Kennedy Council of Economic Advisers, said he was surprised to see these objections. He laid it to a Puritan ethic in our people. This was the only reason he could see that would cause people to object to reductions in their own taxes.

It appears that despite the noble sentiments of inauguration day the Kennedy people do not really believe people are motivated by concern for the national interest. They believe the people are motivated by selfish interests, and that a proposal for reduced taxes would automatically be received with great favor by the voters because it would appeal to these selfish interests.

My opinion is that Americans today feel a great concern indeed for the national interest. They do not ask for reduced taxes if it means greatly increased budget deficits. The letters coming from constituents demonstrate this. Our people want to eliminate nonessential Government spending; they want a balanced budget in times of relative peace and national economic health; and they want a tax structure designed to stimulate, not discourage, the proper exercise of individual economic incentive. They want a government as servant of the people, not a people as servant of the government.

Most important, our people want credibility in their leaders. It is not only desirable, but essential, that we as a nation work to restore our Government standards to the high level of veracity and integrity expected by our people and by the world.

The present crisis of credibility can and must be overcome so that the United States will reestablish its rightful position as diplomatic, military, economic, and moral leader of the free world.

RECOGNITION BY LAW OF ORGANIZATIONS OF POSTAL AND FEDERAL EMPLOYEES

Mr. DANIELS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. DANIELS. Mr. Speaker, I invite the attention of my colleagues to a bill which I have this day introduced providing for recognition by law of organizations of postal and Federal employees.

This bill is similar to my previous bill in the 87th Congress, H.R. 4078, and, if approved, it would not only provide recognition for Federal employee unions, but it would also specify procedures for the adjustment of grievances.

It is highly appropriate that this legislation should be presented today because of the fact that employee organizations are in the process of signing, today, a contract under the terms of Executive Order 10988 which enables the Federal Government to recognize employee organizations in a fashion similar to that which would be accomplished were my bill to be enacted into law.

My bill is submitted for introduction notwithstanding the fact that contracts are now being signed, and the bill is presented because of two things:

First. In my opinion the matter at hand is of such significance that it should be on the statute books, rather than remain subject to amendment by a Chief Executive who may be less favorably inclined toward the responsibilities and prerogatives of Federal employee organizations than is the present incumbent in the White House.

Second. The omission from the contract of any provision for an orderly promotion procedure in the Post Office Department seems to me to allow chaos to be continued in the postal service, where the largest number of rank and file Federal employees is concentrated.

In view of the fact that the contract is just now being signed, we in Congress cannot have yet any way of knowing precisely what is included in that document.

However, the contract covering the postal service will apply to a larger number of employees than perhaps any single industrial union contract currently extant.

My act of introducing appropriate legislation is intended to portray my deep and abiding awareness of the need to solemnize by law, the marriage between Government, as employer, and the organizations which represent the various groups of employees.

In spite of the lack of current access to the exact terms of the contract, I have been advised by employee leaders of the omission of a promotion program as has already been indicated.

Another very salient point in my estimation is the fact that the contract does not provide for disposal of the infamous stopwatch system which was initiated in the Postal Service by the previous administration, and which has a surface appeal to those legislators and the fiscal watchdogs of the executive department who have been persuaded to believe that an elaborate array of production statistics may be a valid substitute for true efficiency and high employee morale.

I have introduced separate legislation to correct that condition. However, the topic of stopwatches is pertinent to the matter of labor-management relations because the Post Office Department has maintained that its administration of the work measurement system is not a topic of negotiable character. Consequently, I understand there will be nothing on work measurement appearing in the contract.

Because of considerations such as these and because of my deep concern for the dignity of postal employees wherever they may be assigned, I decided, Mr. Speaker, to reintroduce my legislation concerning recognition of employee organizations.

I hope that consideration may be early and swift.

FEDERAL EMPLOYEES HEALTH BENEFITS ACT OF 1959

Mr. DANIELS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. DANIELS. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced an important bill to eliminate some built-in inequities in the Federal Employees Health Benefits Act of 1959. I have requested unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record so that I might discuss this bill with my colleagues and point out the need for this legislation to correct existing inequities.

In my opinion, the Health Benefits Act is one of the most useful and intelligent pieces of legislation ever passed by the Congress of the United States. It gives to approximately 2,500,000 Federal employees a measure of protection and security that had been denied them for too many years.

However, no legislation devised by the mind of man is ever perfect. In two significant respects the Health Benefits Act has failed to achieve what the Congress intended it to achieve. The bill I have introduced will, in effect, restore to the act the intentions the Congress had when it was first signed into law.

Congress, Mr. Speaker, intended to give the Federal employees a health insurance program equal to those prevailing in modern American industry. To do this, the Federal Government—as the employer—would have to contribute to the program at least half the overall cost, with the employees contributing the other half.

Because of technical difficulties, which my bill would correct and overcome, things have not worked out that way. The Federal Government's contribution today averages around 38 percent, while the employees' contributions average around 62 percent.

The Federal Government should serve as an example for private industry in these matters. Instead, we are considerably behind private industry in the management of our health benefits program. My bill would bring the Federal Government up to date in the health benefits field by making it an equal partner with the employee in paying for the program on a 50–50 basis.

This was the intention of the Congress when the bill was discussed and passed in 1959. I feel certain of this. By approving this bill that I have introduced, we shall merely be carrying out the original intentions of the Congress.

There is another inequity in the original bill which was never intended. This concerns married women with nondependent husbands. A nondependent husband is presently excluded from the benefits of the act, while a nondependent wife is included. This is not only illogical, it is contrary to the spirit of our times. In addition, it is grossly unfair. My bill would also eliminate this inequity.

I sincerely hope and trust that the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service will consider this bill as soon as possible. Since I have the honor to be a member of that committee, I shall do everything in my power to assist in winning for this bill a speedy approval, both in the committee and on the floor.

VETERANS' AFFAIRS

Mr. LIBONATI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. LIBONATI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to note and to respond to the murmurs of criticism, which I have heard in recent weeks, aimed at the present President of the United States, who is in fact a disabled veteran of World War II, and who, it is alleged, is trying to reap political advantage from his status as a veteran.

There seems to be building up a resentment against the status of the President as a disabled veteran, his deep interest in veterans' affairs, and his feeling of closeness to our former fighting men and their families.

There seems to be implied in this undercurrent of carping a strange theory that somehow the President is making political capital of his veteran's status and his interest in their affairs.

This sniping reminds me of the sniping on the great battlefields of World War I. It was always the courageous fellow advancing in front of all the other soldiers who drew the heaviest enemy fire.

This seems to be happening now to the President.

Now it is undeniable that he is a veteran, and—a disabled veteran—others have called him a war hero. But never has he himself referred to his combat record as anything but that of a citizen doing his best, the same way most veterans regard their wartime contribution.

As evidence to support this outlandish political theory, it is pointed out that President Kennedy participated personally in the 1961 Veterans' Day ceremony at Arlington National Cemetery; that he has seen fit to honor the memory of deceased veterans by issuing a Memorial Certificate to the next of kin; that he twice proposed that Congress increase the compensation rates of the service connected; that, following enactment of this increase, the veteran received a notice with his check stating "President Kennedy has signed a law"—that veterans were similarly reminded of the President's role in the acceleration of insurance dividend checks.

It is undeniably true that President Kennedy has felt deeply his kinship with veterans. He was the first President to play an active part in the national observance of Veterans' Day. Not since 1954, when this holiday was so named, did a Chief Executive personally participate in the ceremony as he did in 1961.

Mr. Speaker, I honor the President for his personal participation in the Veterans' Day ceremony at Arlington National Cemetery, for by doing so he is relating service to one's country with the history of our Nation, with our national character, purposes, and present-day problems. This is a most fitting, a most proper usage of the prestige and power of the head of state.

I would say that his leadership of the national ceremonies did much to lift this great day of dedication out of the obscurity and apathy into which it had declined.

I would say that it is absurd to grumble and to point out that President Kennedy's predecessor did not do likewise.

Likewise, it is absurd to look behind the President's issuance of a Memorial Certificate for a political motive. This is a decent, thoughtful, human act. I am appalled to hear it referred to as a "politically inspired action."

The critics also mutter darkly about inserts mailed out with insurance dividend and compensation checks. The facts are simple. The insert used with the regular 1961 Government life insurance dividend said that the payment was "part of the President's program." This was done to clearly call attention to the fact that it was an advance payment made on the assumption that policy premiums would be continued for the entire year, or else an overpayment would take place. It was the first time dividends had ever been paid in advance. Normally, they are paid over an entire year at the anniversary date of each individual policy. At the time, the press was full of news about the President's program to advance the economy and of the part to be played by paying GI dividends ahead of time. Therefore, this wording was used to identify the checks, and so prevent needless, delaying queries from individuals.

Similarly, a notice went out with payment of service-connected compensation checks of October 1962, following enactment of the law which provided for an increase in the service-connected compensation rates. The purpose was to explain that the veteran's check was augmented by a 3-month retroactive increase, and to forestall a deluge of telephone calls, letters, and personal visits inquiring about the extra amount.

Again, press attention at the time had focused on the President's action in signing the compensation increase, a measure he had twice urged Congress to pass. The VA so identified the check. In effect, it was simply a quick, easily understood method of saying "this is the compensation increase you have been reading about in the newspapers."

The criticism of these inserts seems to be based on an unusual theory of the President's freedom of speech.

It is permissible, so this theory goes, for the President to talk to the American people on radio or television. He may also deliver a speech, address, or remark in person. It is acceptable for him to give interviews and be quoted extensively in newspapers, magazines, or books—both hard cover and paperback. The President may also direct a message to the public via posters or signs.

However, if a Presidential message—or even bare mention of his name or office finds its way into envelopes that are mailed to individuals or groups, then complaints are heard about "political motivation and partisan machinations."

May I add that the use of the name of the President of the United States in announcing actions of the Federal Government is common practice. The President, after all, is the Chief Executive. Illustrative of this practice is the enclosed announcement to all Federal civilian employees. It mentions a new low-cost group life insurance plan "developed as a part of the program of this administration." It bears the personal signature of President Eisenhower.

GROUP LIFE INSURANCE FOR FEDERAL CIVILIAN EMPLOYEES

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, D.C., August 17, 1954.

To Federal Civilian Employees:

As a result of favorable action by Congress, we are now able to provide the benefits of low-cost group life insurance to Federal employees. The proposal to provide this protection to employees through private insurance companies, with Government assuming a portion of the cost, was developed as a part of the program of this administration to improve the Government's personnel system.

I urge all eligible employees to give serious consideration to this worthwhile program which will help provide economic security for their families.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE PLAN AT A GLANCE

What are the benefits?

Life insurance at low cost without requiring a medical examination.

Payment of double indemnity for accidental death.

Payment for accidental loss of one or more limbs or eyesight (dismemberment).

Life insurance after retirement at no cost to you.

Free insurance if you are 65 years of age or older.

Am I eligible?

Yes, unless you (1) are a noncitizen employed overseas, or (2) fall within the small group of employees excluded because of the nature and type of employment, such as part time, seasonal, or intermittent employment.

Who pays for the insurance?

You pay 25 cents per $1,000 of insurance each biweekly pay period by payroll deduction until you reach age 65. If you are paid on other than a biweekly basis, the cost is proportionate. (See table following.)

The Government helps to pay the cost of this insurance by contributing half as much as you do.

How do I become insured?

If eligible, you will be automatically insured unless you fill out standard form 53 (waiver of life insurance coverage) which is available at your personnel office.

For how much will I be insured?

The amount of insurance depends upon your annual basic salary. (See table following.)

You may not choose a lesser or greater amount of insurance.

If you are 65 years of age or older, or when you become age 65, the amount of your insurance will be reduced by 2 percent for each month you are over 65 until a reduction of 75 percent is reached. The remaining 25 percent stays in effect.

Must I name a beneficiary?

No. Your life insurance will be payable in the following order: (1) widow or widower, (2) children, (3) parents, (4) estate, (5) next of kin. Your personnel office will have the proper form for you to use if you wish to change this order or name someone else.

What if I retire?

Your life insurance is provided without further cost, if you retire on an immediate annuity either for disability or after at least 15 years of creditable service, at least 5 years of which are civilian. Your double indemnity and dismemberment protection stops.

What if I leave Government Service?

Your life insurance continues in effect 31 days during which you may buy, without a medical examination, an individual life insurance policy at standard rates.

May I cancel my insurance under this plan?

Yes, at any time.

Insurance schedule

If annual basic salary—	Amount of insurance	Amount of deductions per pay period			
		Weekly	Biweekly	Semimonthly	Monthly
Is not more than—					
$1,000	$1,000	$0.13	$0.25	$0.27	$0.54
$2,000	2,000	.25	.50	.54	1.08
$3,000	3,000	.38	.75	.81	1.63
$4,000	4,000	.50	1.00	1.08	2.17
$5,000	5,000	.63	1.25	1.35	2.71
$6,000	6,000	.75	1.50	1.63	3.25
$7,000	7,000	.88	1.75	1.90	3.79
$8,000	8,000	1.00	2.00	2.17	4.33
$9,000	9,000	1.13	2.25	2.44	4.88
$10,000	10,000	1.25	2.50	2.71	5.42
$11,000	11,000	1.38	2.75	2.98	5.96
$12,000	12,000	1.50	3.00	3.25	6.50
$13,000	13,000	1.63	3.25	3.52	7.04
$14,000	14,000	1.75	3.50	3.79	7.58
$15,000	15,000	1.88	3.75	4.06	8.13
$16,000	16,000	2.00	4.00	4.33	8.67
$17,000	17,000	2.13	4.25	4.60	9.21
$18,000	18,000	2.25	4.50	4.88	9.75
$19,000	19,000	2.38	4.75	5.15	10.29
Is above $19,000	20,000	2.50	5.00	5.42	10.83

A FINAL WORD ABOUT THIS INSURANCE PLAN

This plan will provide an added measure of family security at low cost. It is, however, term insurance and does not carry cash surrender or loan privileges. You should not look upon this plan as a substitute for regular individual insurance policies purchased through your own insurance agent.

This leaflet outlines the principal features of the plan for your general information only. Each insured employee will receive a certificate outlining in more detail the benefits and terms of this group insurance.

SPECIAL DIVIDEND, 1961

The enclosed check or statement is a special dividend on your Government life insurance policy. This dividend is an extra one being paid in 1961, and represents your share of gains and savings in the insurance fund.

VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION.

Always keep your choice of beneficiary up to date.

(VA form 9–5976 (NR), May 1961.)

NOTICE SENT TO INSURED TO HAVE DIVIDENDS LEFT ON DEPOSIT

The VA is paying ahead of schedule the 1961 dividend on Government life insurance as part of the President's program for advancing the economy. These advance payments are made on the assumption that your premiums will continue to be paid for the remainder of your policy year. If premiums are not so paid, this dividend will constitute a partial overpayment which will become an indebtedness against your insurance.

VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION.

(VA form 9–5974 (NR), February 1961.)

NOTICE

President Kennedy has signed a law increasing service-connected compensation rates for disabled veterans. The increase is included in the enclosed check. This check also includes a retroactive payment equal to a 3-month increase as provided by the new law unless special action is necessary. In that case you will get your adjustment check in the near future.

The table on the back of this notice shows some of the new wartime rates. Compensation based on peacetime service is paid on approximately 80 percent of the amounts shown.

Degree of disability	Old rate of payment	New rate of payment [1]
10 percent	$19	$20
20 percent	36	38
30 percent	55	58
40 percent	73	77
50 percent [2]	100	107
60 percent [2]	120	128
70 percent [2]	140	149
80 percent [2]	160	170
90 percent [2]	179	191
100 percent [2]	225	250

[1] The amount payable for all checks received after the first one.

[2] Veterans disabled 50 percent or more may receive an additional allowance for dependents. The law does not change the amounts paid for dependents.

[U.S. SEAL]

THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
HONORS THE MEMORY OF

——— ———

This certificate is awarded by a grateful nation in recognition of devoted and selfless consecration to the service of our country in the Armed Forces of the United States.

——— ———,
President of the United States.

RECORD OF THE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. Roosevelt] is recognized for 2 hours.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, in view of the action just taken by the House there does not seem to be much point in continuing this particular discussion. However, I originally requested this time in order to clarify the record established by the Committee on Education and Labor during the last session of Congress under the chairmanship of the gentleman from New York, the Honorable Adam Clayton Powell, with the various members of the committee cooperating with him; and also to indicate some of the vital items of legislation before the committee in this Congress.

In order that various Members may have the opportunity to discuss their own particular work, Mr. Speaker, at this time I ask unanimous consent that all Members who wish to do so may include their remarks on this subject, in the Record, at the conclusion of my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. (Mr. Ryan of New York). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, rather than to take up the time of the House now, I think it would be proper for me to put my remarks in the Record at this point and simply add that in view of what the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Hays] had to say, I hope that he also will read these remarks as others will, because I think he will find that in many areas education and labor are not quite as separable as might seem to be the case on the surface. We have a bill, for instance, that has to do with manpower training and retraining and this affects not only labor but is a matter of education. We have a matter before us now of the so-called youth opportunity bill which again is very close to both the labor area and the educational area.

I think before we come to any hasty conclusion we should study it very carefully and reach a sound decision.

At this point I am submitting for the Record the subject matter under the general jurisdiction of the committee as established under rule XI of the House of Representatives and the committee amplification thereof. At the conclusion of my remarks I will submit a complete record of the legislative achievements of the committee during the 87th Congress.

The importance of some of the major education and labor statutes under the jurisdiction of the committee cannot be overemphasized. Among them are: the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938; the Labor-Management Relations Act of 1947; the Welfare and Pension Plans Disclosure Act of 1958; the Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act of 1959; the Davis-Bacon Act of 1931; the Work House Act of 1962; the Federal Employees' Compensation Act of 1916; the Federal Coal Mine Safety Act; the National Defense Education Act of 1958; the Vocational Rehabilitation Act of 1954; impacted area laws; Juvenile Delinquency Control Act of 1961; school lunch laws; vocational education laws; teacher training laws for retarded and deaf.

The legislative record of the committee during the 87th Congress is one of notable achievement: 44 bills, requiring extensive hearings and studies by the committee members and staff, were reported to the House. Of these 44 bills, 18 were enacted into law. Among the major laws were the Manpower Development and Training Act; the Welfare and Pension Plans Disclosure Act amendments; amendments to the Fair Labor Standards Act; extension of the National Defense Education Act; the Work Hours Act of 1962, Juvenile Delinquency, and Youth Offenses Control Act of 1961. This, of course, is not a complete list, but only an attempt to indicate to the Members of the House the momentous work being done by the Committee on Education and Labor and the progress made through enactment of measures considered by it. Suffice it to say that the legislative achievements of the committee were significant. Of the 18 bills reported by the committee which were enacted into law, 14 of those bills were enacted in the first 14 months of the 87th Congress.

I need not elaborate on the importance to our country and indeed the whole world of the progress we made in the areas of education and labor. Our position as leader of the free world certainly depends upon such progress. When the leadership of our Nation is threatened, not only by the Soviet Union and the Communist world, but by the impact of the European Common Market and other regional and social organizations, we cannot afford to stand still in these two vital fields. The challenges in these areas are many. All of us, I am sure, realize the tremendous impact of automation in this country; of the difficulty experienced by an unskilled person in finding a job; of the heavy burden of unemployment both to the unemployed and to our society, and of school dropouts and the waste of human talent and energy. It is to these unsolved problems that Congress must address itself.

I can tell you that the members of the Committee on Education and Labor are anxious to fill their legislative responsibilities in these areas. The committee has no intention of resting upon its past achievements, but, rather, looks critically toward the demands of the future. Hearings have just been concluded on the President's youth opportunities bill. During the past 3 weeks the administration's omnibus education bill, H.R. 3000, has been the subject of extensive hearings. Merged into this bill are general aid to elementary and secondary education and Federal aid to higher education, special education and vocational rehabilitation, renewal and revision of the National Defense Education Act, vocational education and renewal and revision of aid to federally impacted areas. Soon we will begin hearings on the Domestic Peace Corps. No one can overemphasize the importance of the legislation to the future growth and vitality of this great Nation.

Other education bills before our committee having major legislative importance involve creating a National Fine Arts Center, legislation relating to the aged and aging which includes the establishment of a Bureau of Senior Citizens and provisions for Federal assistance for programs in States for projects which will benefit older persons. On the labor side of the committee there are bills concerning the shorter workweek, national emergency disputes, equal pay for equal work, amendments to the Davis-Bacon Act, migratory labor, and others which deserve committee study and action. The committee has embarked upon and is eager to continue the work in these important areas. If the United States is to maintain its paramount position in a rapidly changing and highly competitive world it must give serious consideration to the condition of education and labor and act upon the conclusions of such serious and realistic analysis. We must look ahead now or we shall have only a past to look upon.

In speaking about the legislative accomplishments of the committee I would be derelict if I did not give proper recognition to the invaluable assistance and competency of the committee staff. Dr. Wolfe, the education chief, is presently on leave from Queens College of New York City. She has been in the education field for 23 years with experience as a teacher at all levels and as a principal and administrator. She received her doctor of education degree from Columbia University and did advance work at Vassar College and postdoctoral work at the University of Pennsylvania. She has published numerous articles and made invaluable contributions to American education.

Mr. Gamser, chief counsel for labor-management, after graduating from the New York Law School, had extensive experience in the labor field working for the National Labor Relations Board. He received a Fulbright grant as a lecturer in labor law and has taught labor law at Cornell and Columbia Universities. Through the respective efforts of Dr. Wolfe, Mr. Gamser, and the other very competent members of the staff, the work of the committee has been ably accomplished. Incidentally, Mr. Gamser has only this week been confirmed as a member of the National Mediation Board.

With the aid of a competent staff the committee has published some very comprehensive and valuable studies. To name a few: "Congressional Action for Higher Education," "Federal Assistance for Educational Purposes," "Problems of the Aged and Aging," "Pioneer Ideas in

Education," "Impact of Automation on Employment," "Administration of the Labor-Management Relations Act by the NLRB," and "The New Image in Labor."

Before concluding these general remarks, I should like to point out to the Members that the Committee on Education and Labor, with the enormous workload, though in nature one committee, is in essence two committees. Two subjects as significant, extensive and complex as education and labor could be intellectually divided into separate committees. But through the wisdom of this House by the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, envisaging the enormous community of interests of education and labor, the two separate committees were combined and have remained joined. In the highly complex society of today an education in its full sense is certainly necessary for job opportunities. The interrelationships between education and labor are borne out by such legislation as vocational education and rehabilitation, manpower development and training, education of the handicapped. But though this great identity of interests exists, the committee does consider two subjects which in terms of workload and expense are equal to two separate committees. With absolutely no desire to have the committee divided, I do recommend that the double work and expense load be considered.

The Special Subcommittee on Education of the Committee on Education and Labor is concerned primarily with higher education legislation, education and rehabilitation of the handicapped and prevention and control of juvenile delinquency. I think it cannot be disputed that these are areas vital to the welfare and well-being of our country. As President Kennedy has said in his education message to the Congress on January 29 of this year:

> Education is the keystone in the arch of freedom and progress.

In the 87th Congress, the Special Subcommittee on Education reported out eight bills after countless hours of public hearings, consultations, discussions and study. The subcommittee answered thousands of letters and inquiries regarding this legislation. On one subject alone, special education for handicapped children, more than 500 letters were received, from all parts of the country. Nearly every Member of the House has referred a letter or inquiry to the subcommittee regarding legislation pending before it. All eight bills reported out by the subcommittee were approved by the Committee on Education and Labor, and five were enacted into law.

These enactments were:

Public Law 87–274, the Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Offenses Control Act.

Public Law 87–276, to assist in training teachers of the deaf.

Public Law 87–294, authorizing wider distribution of books for the blind.

Public Law 87–262, authorizing a new teaching hospital at Howard University and transferring Freedmen's Hospital to the university.

Public Law 87–137, authorizing an additional Assistant Secretary of Labor.

It was most regrettable that the conference report on H.R. 8900, the College Academic Facilities and Student Assistance Act was not approved and that another bill considered by this subcommittee, H.R. 12070, the special education and rehabilitation bill, was not enacted.

During the 87th Congress, the Special Subcommittee on Education, also considered H.R. 10396 and related bills to assist in developing programs to train highly skilled technicians needed by industry today. No final action was taken on these bills last year.

And in the 87th Congress, the subcommittee initiated a special study of all Federal education programs in order to obtain an overall picture of the educational activities of 42 different Federal agencies and departments. This study is primarily concerned with possible duplication, overlapping, and inconsistencies in the educational programs. The subcommittee will consider and publish its final report on the study in the very near future.

In the 88th Congress, the Special Subcommittee on Education again will turn its attention primarily to higher education and special education legislation. The needs of our colleges and universities for classrooms to teach the growing student population are becoming more pressing. Since this House passed the College Academic Facilities Act on January 30, 1962, college enrollments have increased by more than 8 percent. Let us consider college enrollments in the present decade.

In 1960, there were 3,582,000 students enrolled in our higher education institutions. By last fall, the number had increased to 4,207,000; by 1965, the figure will be 5,220,000; and by 1970, it will climb to 6,595,000—if there is sufficient space for these students.

The student loan fund established by the National Defense Education Act of 1958 currently is providing loans to about 5 percent of the students in institutions participating in this program. But the overall ceiling on loan funds, and the limit on funds for any one institution, has restricted the program at some of our largest colleges and State universities. More than 90 colleges and universities, with an enrollment of some 900,000 students, would be eligible for larger loan funds if the present institutional ceiling did not exist.

The President's Science Advisory Committee tells us that our increasingly technical civilization will require substantial gains in the number of Ph. D. and master's degrees awarded each year in the physical sciences, mathematics and engineering. We are frequently reminded that we need more engineers, more technicians, more highly trained personnel in almost every field.

In special education, we still are desperately short of adequately trained teachers for the 6 million handicapped children of school age. Only one-fourth of these children now are receiving the special education they require.

These are some of the areas which the Special Subcommittee on Education must consider during the 88th Congress.

Mr. Speaker, in the time I have taken to make these remarks I have attempted to affirmatively state, not defend, the record of the committee. That record can stand on its own merits. The committee and the staff did anticipate a highly productive year resulting from application of skills and knowledge to an enormous workload. We are aware of our responsibilities to the House and to the Nation and eagerly seek to fulfill them. It would seem to me a most shameful waste if we are to jeopardize needed, significant legislative accomplishments by letting personal animosities control us.

Mr. Speaker, I submit for reference a detailed record of the accomplishments of the House Committee on Education and Labor:

Jurisdiction of the Committee on Education and Labor, Established by Rule XI, U.S. House of Representatives

(a) Measures relating to education or labor generally.

(b) Child labor.

(c) Columbia Institution for the Deaf, Dumb, and Blind; Howard University; Freedmen's Hospital, and St. Elizabeths Hospital.

(d) Convict labor and the entry of goods made by convicts into interstate commerce.

(e) Labor standards.

(f) Labor statistics.

(g) Mediation and arbitration of labor disputes.

(h) Regulation or prevention of importation of foreign laborers under contract.

(i) School lunch program.

(j) U.S. Employees' Compensation Commission.

(k) Vocational rehabilitation.

(l) Wages and hours of labor.

(m) Welfare of miners.

Legislative activities in the fields of education and labor during the 87th Congress

GENERAL STATEMENT

Bills referred to the committee	741
Total bills reported out of committee	44
A. Bills reported by the committee and enacted into law	18
B. Bills reported by the committee, passed in House and Senate and pending in conference at end of the 87th Congress	1
C. Bills reported by the committee and denied a rule	[1]2
D. Bills reported by the committee and pending before Rules Committee at end of the 87th Congress	[2]21
E. Bills reported by the committee, granted a rule, but consideration not completed in the House	1
F. Other legislative inquiries	10
G. Committee prints	10
H. House reports on legislation	41
I. Conference reports	4
J. Hearings held	49

[1] Equal Pay Act of 1962 passed House; passed Senate as rider to H.R. 11880, Foreign Service Building Authorization Act.

[2] Includes one bill which was considered and tabled by Rules Committee, S. 1126 (crew leader registration, migratory labor).

A. Bills reported by the committee and enacted into law:

The Practical Nurse Training Extension Act of 1961, Public Law 87–22. (April 24, 1961.)

Fair Labor Standards Act Amendments of 1961, Public Law 87–30. (May 5, 1961.)

Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act Amendments, Public Law 87–87. (July 14, 1961.)

Additional Assistant Secretary of Labor, Public Law 87–137. (August 11, 1961.)

Establishment of Teaching Hospital for Howard University, Public Law 87-262. (September 22, 1961.)

Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Offenses Control Act of 1961, Public Law 87-274. (September 22, 1961.)

Teachers for the Deaf and Speech Pathologists and Audiologists, Public Law 87-276. (September 22, 1961.)

Education of the blind and increased appropriations for the American Printing House for the Blind, Public Law 87-294. (September 22, 1961.)

Metallic and Nonmetallic Mines Safety Act, Public Law 87-300. (September 26, 1961.)

Federal Employees' Compensation Act Amendments, Public Law 87-339. (October 3, 1961.)

Extend National Defense Education Act of 1958; extend impacted areas (extension of Public Law 815 and Public Law 874), Public Law 87-344. (October 3, 1961.)

Amendment to title II of National Defense Education Act, Public Law 87-400. (October 5, 1961.)

Manpower Development and Training Act, Public Law 87-415. (March 15, 1962.)

Welfare and Pension Plans Disclosure Act Amendments, Public Law 87-420. (March 20, 1962.)

Work Hours Act, Public Law 87-581. (August 13, 1962.)

Captioned Films for the Deaf, Public Law 87-715. (September 28, 1962.)

Amendment to Manpower Development and Training Act, Public Law 87-729. (October 1, 1962.)

National School Lunch Act Amendment, Public Law 87-823. (October 15, 1962.)

B. Bills reported by committee, passed in House and Senate and pending in conference at end of the 87th Congress:

College Academic Facilities Act, H.R. 8900. (Passed House 319 to 79, January 30, 1962.)

Equal pay for equal work, H.R. 11677. (Passed House by voice vote July 25, 1962.[1])

C. Bills reported by the committee and denied a rule:

Federal Coal Mine Safety Act Amendments, H.R. 5741. Reported April 13, 1961; denied a rule June 7, 1961.

Crew Leader Registration Act, H.R. 7812. Reported July 19, 1961; denied a rule August 23, 1961.

D. Bills passed by committee and pending before Rules Committee at end of the 87th Congress (date referred):

Education:

Federal aid to higher education, H.R. 7215 (May 26, 1961).

H.R. 7300, general aid to elementary and secondary education (June 1, 1961).

Overall revision of National Defense Education Act, H.R. 7904 (July 6, 1961).

Federal Advisory Commission on the Arts, H.R. 4172 (July 19, 1961).

Emergency Educational Aid Act, 1961, H.R. 8890 (August 24, 1961).

Revision, National School Lunch Act, H.R. 8962 (February 21, 1962).

Adult basic education, H.R. 10896 (April 2, 1962).

Amendment to Land-Grant Colleges Act to eliminate the "separate but equitable" clause of the act, H.R. 11707 (May 23, 1962).

Amendments to impacted areas laws to deny payments to school districts that practice racial discrimination and segregation, H.R. 10056 (May 31, 1962).

University extension, H.R. 11340 (May 31, 1962).

Quality Education Act, H.R. 11888 (May 31, 1962).

Special education and vocational rehabilitation, H.R. 12070 (July 5, 1962).

Amendment to titles II and III of National Defense Education Act (H.R. 13204) (October 2, 1962).

Labor:

Youth Employment Opportunities Act, H.R. 10682 (March 29, 1962). (This superseded earlier bill referred to rules in first session.)

Occupational Safety Act, H.R. 12306 (July 5, 1962).

Equal Employment Opportunities Act, H.R. 10144 (February 8, 1962).

Davis-Bacon Act Amendments, H.R. 10946 (April 5, 1962).

National Council on Migratory Labor, S. 1132 (July 5, 1962).

Crew Leader Registration Act, S. 1126. (Referred April 18 and tabled September 20, 1962.)

Education for migratory children, S. 1124 (July 5, 1962).

Joint industry promotion (amendment to sec. 302(c)(6) of Labor-Management Relations Act, H.R. 11537 (May 22, 1962).

E. Bill reported by committee, granted rule, consideration not completed in House at end of session: Amendment to Fair Labor Standards Act dealing with migratory child labor, S. 1123 (considered on floor October 4, 1962).

F. Other legislation inquiries—ad hoc subcommittees:

Subcommittee on Unemployment and the Impact of Automation.

Subcommittee on the Administration of the National Labor Relations Act by the National Labor Relations Board.

Subcommittee on the Impact of Imports and Exports on American Employment.

Special subcommittee inquiry on the administration of the Davis-Bacon Act.

Subcommittee on Irregularities in the Garment Industry.

Advisory Committee on Higher Education.

Subcommittee on Integration in Federally Assisted Public Education.

Study group on federally impacted areas.

Special study on federally assisted educational programs.

Field study of juvenile delinquency.

G. Committee Prints:

Education:

Federal Aid for Education. (A history of proposals which have received consideration by the Congress of the United States, 1789 to 1960.) May 1961.

The University in Latin America: Argentine and the Alliance for Progress, September 1961.

Federal Interest in Education, September 1961.

Activities and Accomplishments of the Committee on Education and Labor During the 1st Session of the 87th Congress, December 1961.

Higher Education in the Soviet Union, January 1962.

Congressional Action for Higher Education, January 1962.

The New Image in Education, February 1962.

A Directory of Federally Financed Student Loans, Fellowships, and Career Training Programs in the Field of Higher Education in the United States, April 1962.

Cultural Factfinding Mission to Latin America and Caribbean Countries, April 1962.

Integration in Public Education Programs, May 1962.

Views on Relationships of Church and State in the Field of Education, May 1962.

Interim Report on Education and Citizenship in the Public School System of Puerto Rico, August 1962.

Problems of the Aged and Aging, October 1962.

Publications With a Major Emphasis Upon Education. (A selected bibliography.) November 1962.

Pioneer Ideas in Education, December 1962.

Federal Assistance for Educational Purposes. (Part I: Digest of Laws; Part II: A History of Proposals Which Have Received Consideration by the Congress, 1789 to 1962.) December 1962.

Labor:

Worker Participation in Business Management, February 1961.

Some Important Dates in the History of American Labor, February 1961.

A compilation of economic data on industries affected by H.R. 3935 and other bills to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act, February 1961.

Comparative print showing changes to be made in existing law by H.R. 3935 as reported by the committee, March 1961.

Federal Labor Laws, a Compilation, March 1961.

Impact of Automation on Employment, June 1961.

Farm Labor Contract Registration Act of 1961, July 1961.

Fair Labor Standards Act Amendments of 1961, July 1961.

Administration of the Labor-Management Relations Act by the National Labor Relations Board, September 1961.

Applicability of Anti-Trust Legislation to Labor Unions; Selected Excerpts and Bibliography, September 1961.

Federal Labor Laws, Revised Compilation, November 1961.

Activities and Accomplishments of the Committee on Education and Labor—Activities in the Area of Labor Legislation, December 1961.

The New Image in Labor, June 1962.

Legislative History of the Davis-Bacon Act, September 1962.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, during the 87th Congress the General Subcommittee on Labor had pending before it a number of legislative proposals involving youth employment, Youth Conservation Corps camps, construction site picketing, disabled Government employees compensation, programs for providing adult basic education for uneducated adults and programs in the field of occupational safety.

YOUTH UNEMPLOYMENT

Hearings were held by the subcommittee beginning on June 14 and extending through July 6 on H.R. 7536 and related measures to establish programs of on-the-job training, public service employment on a Youth Conservation Corps in order to provide employment opportunities and increase the employability of out-of-school and unemployed young people between the ages of 16 and 22. Following subcommittee action on this measure the full committee reported H.R. 8354—House Report 833—on August 2, 1961. The subsequent passage of the Manpower Development and Training Act included an amendment providing on-the-job training opportunities for young people obviating the need for title I of H.R. 8354. Following the subcommittee's consideration, the full committee reported H.R. 10682—House Report 1540—which bill eliminated title I of H.R. 8354 and made other modifications to the previously reported bill. On May 16 the House Rules Committee held 1 day of hearings on the request of the House Education and Labor Committee for a rule on H.R. 10682. No further action was taken on the measure in the 87th Congress.

---

[1] Senate passed an Equal Pay Act as a rider to H.R. 11880, the Foreign Service Building Authorization Act, thereby placing final passage within jurisdiction of Foreign Affairs Committee. There was objection to unanimous consent to go to conference on H.R. 11880 in form presented by Senate.

In the 1st session of the 88th Congress the General Subcommitte on Education conducted 6 days of hearings on H.R. 1890, the Youth Employment Act, making provision for a Youth Conservation Corps in title I and a local public service employment and training program. The subcommittee has held 3 days of executive sessions to consider further action on the bill. We hope to have the Youth Conservation Corps legislation before the full committee of the House Education and Labor Committee next week for consideration.

CONSTRUCTION SITE PICKETING

Since the Supreme Court decision in the *Denver Building Trades* case, 341 U.S. 675, decided in June 1951, various legislative proposals have been made with respect to amending section 8(b)(4) of the National Labor Relations Act, as amended. Such legislation has been often referred to as construction site picketing bills which deal generally with the question of whether or not picketing activities at a construction location because of a dispute with a subcontractor should be considered a secondary boycott and an unfair labor practice when there is no dispute with the prime contractor. Extensive hearings were conducted on this legislative issue by the General Subcommittee on Labor in the 1st session of the 87th Congress. This identical legislation in the 86th Congress was reported out of the Education and Labor Committee, but did not clear the House Rules Committee.

FEDERAL EMPLOYEES COMPENSATION ACT

The subcommittee held hearings on amendments to the Federal Employees Compensation Act during the 1st session of the 87th Congress and reported H.R. 8871 to the full committee. This measure corrected an oversight in the Federal Employees Compensation Act, Public Law 86–767, which excluded District of Columbia government employees from the benefits of section 104 of the act. H.R. 8871 passed the House of Representatives on September 12, 1961, and passed the Senate on September 14—Public Law 87–339.

ADULT BASIC EDUCATION

Because large numbers of adult citizens, in many instances comprising the hard core of our unemployment, lacked the basic education to enable them to be retrainable under State and Federal programs designed to increase the employability of unemployed workers, the General Subcommittee on Labor took an active interest in legislative proposals to establish programs of adult basic education instruction. Consequently, the General Subcommittee on Labor with the Select Committee on Education, held hearings on various legislative proposals in this field resulting in report of H.R. 10896 on April 2, 1962, House Report 1551.

OCCUPATIONAL SAFETY LEGISLATURE

On April 17, 1962, the General Subcommittee on Labor started hearings on H.R. 11192 and related measures which would encourage the development, initiation and expansion of occupational safety programs in the States through grants to States for demonstrations and experiments on occupational safety. Hearings were concluded on May 2. At an executive session of the subcommittee on June 27, a clean bill, H.R. 12306, was reported to the full committee. On June 28 the full committee ordered reported favorably H.R. 12306—House Report 1965.

In discussing the work of the Education and Labor Committee in this session of Congress, I wish to take this opportunity to congratulate the administration for its comprehensive and penetrating analysis of the problems facing American education and the constructive program for dealing with those problems which is embodied in the proposals of H.R. 3000, the National Education Improvement Act of 1963.

Recognizing the vital role of education in the life of the individual citizen and the dependence of the Nation's future upon the competence of a fully educated people, the administration has surveyed the American educational scene in its entirety and proposed for our consideration a program carefully designed to deal simultaneously and effectively with the major problem areas in which the Federal Government must play a more crucial role.

The program is selective. It is not designed to solve all domestic problems, nor to usurp the traditional local responsibilities for education, but rather to concentrate Federal resources in such a way as to stimulate State and local response and thus to strengthen the independence of existing school systems. Wherever possible, it is transitional—aimed at providing immediate and adequate relief to acute problems—while permitting local authorities to prepare to deal with them on a continuing basis. Above all, it is a balanced program, related in all its parts to achieving over the whole spectrum of American education its aims of improving the quality of education at all levels; meeting the challenge of providing facilities for the vastly increased school-age population which faces us in the sixties; and enlarging the opportunities for each individual, whatever his present level of education, to develop his capabilities to their fullest potential.

This is not a partisan approach. Nearly half—11—of the programs are based on the continuation and expansion of programs already voted into law by preceding Congresses. The results and experience gained under the National Defense Education Act, the Library Services Act, and the Vocational Education Act, together with consultations with the various educational organizations, the resources of the Office of Education, and the wisdom of specially appointed panels of independent experts have all been skillfully weighed in creating the 13 new proposals.

The 24 programs contained in the bill fall into 5 major categories:

First. The expansion of opportunities for individuals in higher education.

Second. The expansion and improvement of facilities for higher education.

Third. The improvement of educational quality through better teaching methods and more and better teacher training.

Fourth. The strengthening of elementary and secondary education through the construction of facilities and the raising of teachers' salaries.

Fifth. The expansion and improvement of opportunities for vocational and continuing education at many levels.

These programs necessarily take many forms. The problems facing American education today are neither simple nor unrelated. The task of this committee in carrying out its responsibilities has been immeasurably aided by the precision and sound judgment which this bill represents in identfying and defining the most urgent of these problems. These numerous proposals have been developed into a cohesive program.

Nevertheless, the field is controversial, the programs are detailed, and the study of this measure in its entirety is a responsibility of great magnitude for this committee and its staff.

Perhaps no task facing this body this year will have as far-reaching effect on both the individual citizens of this country and the future of this Nation—as an example to the world of the benefits to be derived from free institutions—as the full and deliberate consideration of this comprehensive approach to the education of our youth.

The General Subcommittee on Education plans to hold extensive hearings on vocational educational needs. It plans to continue studies and hold hearings on educational problems in connection with retraining, particularly with respect to the educational opportunities and needs of an estimated 11 million American adults who lack formal education in the basic areas of mathematics, reading, and writing.

The General Subcommittee on Education plans to conduct hearings regarding special educational needs in economically distressed areas of the Nation to ascertain to what extent the Federal Government can or should be providing assistance to bolster educational facilities in areas where there has been long prevailing unemployment or underemployment. It will be recalled that the Public Works Acceleration Act, Public Law 87–658, specifically precluded the use of public works funds for planning or construction directly or indirectly of any school or other educational facility. Preliminary information available at this time indicates that in areas where unemployment has prevailed over a long period of time, educational deficiencies are the severest and contribute substantially to a growing national problem involving increasing numbers of hard-to-employ citizens, increased welfare and other public financial loads. This area should be fully explored as to what specific improvements to the educational assistance in such areas are needed and to what extent assistance to these areas will be in the national interest.

I am confident that when we, the Members of this 88th Congress, have completed our work, that we will pass a bill that will give the Nation a comprehensive program of Federal aid to education. As America moves into the age of space, every young person in every corner of the land must have an opportunity to receive a good education so that he can develop his maximum abilities. Then we will guarantee the ever expanding growth and security of our country.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, on at least two occasions in the past several weeks it has been stated by Democratic members of the Education and Labor Committee that the Harlem project was a fine example of the programs which would be accomplished under the Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Offenses Control Act of 1961. A close check of the slipshod manner in which this project has started gives little to substantiate the high hopes of these colleagues.

Close scrutiny of the handling of the affairs of the project group indicates many interesting discrepancies which lead me to believe that we are in really poor shape if this particular project is supposed to be the model which Attorney General Kennedy, this administration and Members of Congress picture.

As is often the case, a little homework will unearth some truths which are glossed over when superlatives are used to describe a project or program the merit of which is more political and superficial than real.

The Office of Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Development has been obliged to mildly chastise the project in Harlem which is proceeding under a grant of $250,000 made last year. Training project No. 63201 is currently being conducted by Associated Community Teams, Inc., known as ACT. Many interesting discrepancies were turned up in a recent audit. It was determined that a very incomplete accounting and auditing system was being used. The regional auditor, Division of Grant-in-Aid Audits of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare noted that transactions "involved a number of errors which were not adjusted in any systematic way."

Further, it was noted that accounts "are inadequate to control the expenditures being made by this agency."

It was even necessary to call in a CPA for the purpose of auditing these accounts.

Anyone who knows anything about the incorporation of an organization is aware of the fact that basic records must be kept concerning original meetings, bylaws, and so forth. Yet, the auditor noted:

> Although an "official minute book" was purchased, the formal original minutes were not available.

Little pretext was given as far as carrying on a businesslike operation is concerned. I do not know the laws of the State of New York but after reading the auditor's report, I would be surprised if ACT were in compliance with the corporation statutes of that State. In an almost cryptic comment, the auditor tells us:

> Other than as noted in this memorandum, no particularly significant entries were found.

On the very face of the lease of space from the Adam Clayton Powell Community Center on West 137th Street in New York City, it can be seen that the period of the lease extends 2 months beyond the present approved termination date of this project. Are they so sure that it will be renewed? The rent of $2,000 per month was not questioned although I am still of the opinion that the Committee on Government Operations should take a good look at the setup involved in this training project, the lease and every facet of its operation.

In the important area of personnel, several interesting factors were noted by the auditor. The project director is being paid at a salary of $15,000 which exceeds any of the salaries provided for in the approved budget. The auditor gives us a good idea of what has been going on when he reported:

> During the period under audit (July 1, 1962, to November 30, 1962), there were no time, leave, or attendance reports kept.

It is also interesting to note that no procedure was in effect for formally documenting personnel actions, appointments or changes in pay, nor was there any written statement of conditions of employment or personnel policies. About the only thing that was definite in this arrangement was the salaries. The record is very silent as to working hours, responsibilities, leave policies, and so forth.

The facts cited are nothing more than a superficial checking of this Harlem project. I hesitate to guess what would be brought out if a thorough investigation of this project were completed.

Attorney General Kennedy used superlatives to describe this vanguard of the Domestic Peace Corps. Members of my Committee on Education and Labor have used superlatives to describe it. Some have suggested that they are a little tired of hearing about it since they feel any criticism of it is an attack on our committee chairman which is certainly not the case.

Consider the very inefficient manner in which the taxpayers' funds have been accounted for. I have known Mr. Wingate, the project director, for 2 years and found him a very competent employee of our committee. It appears to me that he was thrown into the middle of this situation and is confronted with a virtual impossible task. I certainly hope he can give us something to show for the quarter of a million dollars we will spend.

The payroll of ACT approaches $60,000 per year as can be seen in the report which I have included after these remarks. Coupled with the $24,000 rent of their quarters we see a bureaucratic overhead of almost $85,000 at the very start.

I submit that none of us here in Congress would, in a private capacity, tolerate such a situation. None of us as responsible businessmen, lenders, stockholders, directors, or managers would touch anything which is so loosely drawn and poorly organized. Why do we tolerate such a condition to exist simply because the Government is picking up the bill?

When you look around at the mushrooming growth of Federal bureaucracy and the waste and duplication that we have in so many other areas of Federal activity, you can only come to the conclusion that this Harlem project, described in so many superlatives by our top brass, is a fitting offspring to an irresponsible parent. I suggest that Secretary Celebrezze and Attorney General Kennedy take a good second look at the activities of Associated Community Teams, Inc.

FEBRUARY 15, 1963.

(Attention: Chief, Field Branch.)

To: Office of Field Administration, OS Division of Grant-in-Aid Audits, Room 5743 HEW Building, North.

From: Albert Hirt, regional auditor, New York.

Subject: Audit of juvenile delinquency grant, ACT.

At the request of the Special Assistant to the Secretary for Juvenile Delinquency we have made a review of the fiscal transactions of the Associated Community Teams, Inc., Training Project No. 63201, as reported on a preliminary financial statement for the period July 1, 1962, through November 30, 1962. Although we made the usual verification of the actuality and accuracy of expenditures and fund balances, our chief attention was directed toward the propriety of expenditures to date and acceptability of the fiscal and related procedures now in use. We made no attempt to evaluate program operations or personnel qualifications since these areas are outside the scope of our competency. We were accompanied during the review by Mr. George Roemer of the special assistant's staff.

We have the following comments:

1. ACCOUNTING SYSTEM

At the time of our visit, January 30, 1963, the accounts consisted of a cash disbursements book and a checkbook. The last posting to the cashbook was November 30, 1962. Check transactions, as reflected in the stubs, involved a number of errors which were not adjusted in any systematic way. The balance in the checking account was not carried forward after January 7, 1963. These accounts are inadequate to control the expenditures being made by this agency. When requested to prepare a statement of expenditures (as of November 30, 1962) it was necessary to call in a CPA for this purpose. The position of "bookkeeper-auditor" provided in the approved budget has not been filled.

2. BOARD OF DIRECTORS MEETINGS

Although an official minute book was purchased, the formal (original) minutes were not available. Loose copies in a manila folder were provided and covered the following meetings: August 11, 16, 23, September 7, 27, November 11, November 8, 20, December 13, 20, all in 1962. After encountering a reference to a meeting on October 25, 1962, we asked about the corresponding minutes. A freshly made photo copy was given us. We were assured by Mr. Wingate, acting executive director, that the file of minutes was now complete. Other than as noted in this memorandum, no particular significant entries were found.

3. RENT OF PREMISES

ACT has formally rented space (approximately 25 rooms) on the first (3,737 square feet) and second (3,917 square feet) floors of the Adam Clayton Powell Community Center on West 137th Street in New York City. The period of the lease is July 9, 1962, through December 1963 (project termination date). Use of furniture and fixtures in the space and maintenance of the premises are included in the rental which amounted to $1,155.74 for the initial period from July 9, 1962 to August 31, 1962, and $6,000 per quarter, payable in advance, for the remainder of the lease term until December 1, 1963, when payment of $2,000 will be due. Before establishing this rate the agency obtained two appraisals of the premises. The first (Frost) resulted in a $3 per foot estimate including furniture, utilities and maintenance. The second (Hanson) produced the same rate including janitor services but no utilities. The lease at the rate of $2,000 per month was thereafter completed.

The terms of this lease provide for $6,000 payments on September 1, December 1, 1962, March 1, June 1, 1963, etc. It should be noted that any payment on June 1, 1963, for a quarterly period will cover 2 months beyond the present approved termination date of this project.

4. PERSONNEL

There is attached a schedule setting forth the salary data concerning personnel employed during the period of audit and comparing titles and rates of pay with the approved budget. In addition, the minutes of November 20, 1962, authorize the appointment of Mr. Carl Johnson as Director of Peace Corps and Acting Project Director at a salary of $15,000.

During the period under audit there were no time, leave, or attendance records kept. Some time thereafter a procedure for daily sign in and out sheets was instituted.

No procedure was in effect for formally documenting personnel actions (appointments, changes in pay, etc.). The minutes indicated Board approval of some appointments but made no mention of others.

No written statement of conditions of employment or personnel policies (leave policies, working hours, etc.) could be located.

5. OTHER

Two reported expenditures requires future adjustment. A payment of $400 (miscellaneous) covers a deposit with the telephone company and a reported unliquidated obligation (subsequently paid—check No. 1134, $483.16) covers expenses of Mr. Fred Hubbard, a per diem consultant. A refund is due on this payment because only a portion of Mr. Hubbard's time was devoted to ACT. According to correspondence between ACT and Mr. Russell of DHEW the remainder of Mr. Hubbard's time is chargeable to the President's Committee on Juvenile Delinquency.

Copies of some of the ACT publicity material are attached for your information.

Associated Community Teams, Inc.—Summary of salary expenditures and comparison with budget

Position title	Annual salary rate		Incumbent	From	To
	Budgeted	Expended			
Project director	$14,000	$14,000	M. Lewis	July 16, 1962 [1]	Aug. 24, 1962 [2]
Program coordinator	13,000	13,000	R. Kurahara	do [1]	(3)
Trainee supervisor	8,500	8,500	G. Jones	do [1]	(3)
Office manager-administrative assistant	7,500	7,500	B. Griggs	do [1]	(3)
Telephone operator-receptionist-typist	4,800	4,800	W. S. Bowden	Aug. 14, 1962	(3)
Special assistant to director		12,500	G. Broadfield [4]	Oct. 22, 1962	(3)
Stenographer		3,640	M. Clark	Oct. 9, 1962	Nov. 4, 1962
Do		4,160	do	Nov. 5, 1962	(3)
Trainee supervisor	8,500	4,100	R. Giles	Nov. 20, 1962	(3)

[1] Appointments approved by Board action Aug. 11, 1962, effective July 16, 1962.

[2] Resigned.

[3] Through Nov. 30, 1962 (end of audit period).

[4] Appointment authorized by Board per minutes of Oct. 11, 1962. Salary $10,000 to $13,000, "to serve in any capacity the Board sees fit."

NOTE.—Appointed as consultant at $75 per day from Oct. 9 to 12, 1962; at $200 per week from Oct. 15 to 19, 1962

FEBRUARY 20, 1963.

Mr. LIVINGSTON WINGATE,
ACT, Inc., Adam Clayton Powell Community Center, New York, N.Y.

DEAR MR. WINGATE: We have just received the report of our regional auditor in New York who audited your books on January 30, 1963. He notes a number of deficiencies, including the following:

1. THE ACCOUNTING SYSTEM

The balance in the checking account was not carried forward after January 7, 1963. The last posting to the cash book was November 30, 1962. The position of bookkeeper-auditor provided in the approval has not been filled.

2. BOARD OF DIRECTORS MEETINGS

The formal (original) minutes were not available.

3. RENT OF PREMISES

The terms of the lease provided for payment beyond the life of the grant.

4. PERSONNEL

Inadequate time records were kept.

These and other deficiencies noted make it important that I discuss this with you and our regional auditor at your earliest convenience. Please contact me immediately so that we can arrange this meeting for a followup on the audit.

I look forward to hearing from you soon.

Sincerely yours,

BERNARD RUSSELL,
Director, Office of Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Development.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak in the defense of the Committee on Education and Labor—the committee of which I have been a member for the past 7 years. This is a role, I might say, that I never expected to be required to play.

The record this committee established during the 87th Congress is one the majority of other House committees will find hard to equal.

This committee, during those 2 years, did more for the field of education and the plight of the workers in America than was accomplished in the previous 8 years during the era of the Eisenhower-Barden leadership.

It seemed to many of us, who were members of Education and Labor for those nonproductive years, that those gentlemen believed in neither education nor in labor.

The ranks of the unemployed grew and grew with each new recession under the Eisenhower administration.

But, nothing constructive was done. No effort was made to assist our unemployed toward rehabilitation, toward reentering the active working force again. Yet there was legislation in the Education and Labor Committee to offer such a program while Mr. Barden was chairman and Mr. Eisenhower was President.

I know for I introduced it in 1957 and there it remained, until Mr. Eisenhower left Washington, and Mr. Barden retired to his farm.

A sop was offered to the unemployed in the form of "temporary unemployment insurance" but, after that, came the inevitable active membership on our relief rolls.

The only monument erected for labor, under Eisenhower and Barden, was one approved by the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, the National Association of Manufacturers and every ultraconservative and reactionary group in America, the infamous Landrum-Griffin bill, which restricted our recognized labor unions and created conditions forcing them to expend their energies and moneys to protect the rights they had secured through previous legislation. Their chances for expansion and growth went out the window with the passage of that act.

In other words, Mr. Speaker, during those years, this committee was run under the guidance and with the full approval of big business and with no thought nor consideration for the average American citizen who tomorrow might join the ranks of the unemployed.

In regard to the field of education the other major responsibility of our committee the record under Eisenhower and Barden is not only pitiful but disgraceful.

With the need for additional educational opportunities becoming more and more apparent each year, our committee remained stagnant.

In 1956, I introduced legislation providing scholarships for students who were mentally capable and desirous of furthering their education but were financially unable to meet the required expenses.

These scholarships were to be under the direction of the National Science Foundation, strictly nonpolitical, the Nation, as a whole, would have benefited. There was, even then, a need for engineers, a shortage of scientists, a dearth of mathematicians, teachers in our secondary and elementary schools, and our colleges and universities were scouring the Nation for qualified personnel.

In 1957, I reintroduced this legislation and all we heard was from our friends at the U.S. Chamber of Commerce and the National Association of Manufacturers saying "this is a local matter, it can be handled better at the local level; all those who want to get an education can find a way to do it."

That session of Congress closed, adjourned, on August 30, with no action.

Then, in October of 1957, sputnik entered space.

In November, Mr. Eisenhower started making speeches on our need for more educational facilities and more opportunities. He even thought a few scholarships, financed by the Federal Government, might be wise.

Well, we got the National Defense Education Act, in 1958—with student loan programs, with assistance and loans to our institutions of higher education.

But, we owe our thanks for this progressive move not to the Eisenhower-

Barden leadership but to Russia and to Sputnik.

In the following 2 years no further gains were made in the educational field. We maintained our status quo.

However, in 1961, when the leadership of this Nation and the leadership of this committee changed hands the whole atmosphere in the field of education and labor changed.

At the end of the 87th Congress the record shows that this Committee on Education and Labor reported to the Rules Committee 44 bills, 22 on education and 22 on labor.

The 87th Congress passed 18 of these bills, 9 on education and 9 on labor, and they were good bills. They were legislation in the interest of the people of America, not just the vested interests of the Nation.

The manpower training bill, to train and educate our long-term unemployed, was passed. That was what I wanted Eisenhower to do back in 1957, but he and Barden did not believe in recognizing we had an unemployment problem. Profits were still coming in at a satisfactory rate.

The Minimum Wage Act was improved and increased, the Welfare and Pension Act was improved, a survey to determine requirements for mine safety was approved, specific hours were set for workers on projects operating with or by Federal moneys, the railroad workers were included in our Manpower Training Act, programs were enacted for practical nurses' training, additional special programs were initiated for teaching the blind and the deaf, school lunches were extended, student and construction loans were extended under the National Defense Education Act, a program was started for the correction and control of juvenile delinquency, and other long-overdue measures were enacted into law.

This is the record of the Committee on Education and Labor under the dual leadership of Kennedy and POWELL.

These men believe in both education and in labor.

There is still much to be done to catch up for the 8 years of idleness we drifted through under disinterested and incapable leadership.

The whole Nation is now aware of the inadequate educational program we have allowed to exist—

With approximately three-quarters of a million dropouts from high school, untrained and uneducated for gainful employment in the space era we are entering;

With the prospects of 7 million more this decade, unless we act and act quickly;

With automation and technological advancements increasing output daily—while it decreases employment in these same areas;

With hundreds of thousands of our adults needing special academic educational programs as well as technical ones;

With the problem of those between the ages of 40 and 65 that industry feels are too old to start new careers, but, we know they are too young to retire;

With all these issues to be faced and solutions to be found, this committee must have an adequate staff and adequate funds to do the job.

The chamber of commerce and the NAM are still sending out flyers—newsletters and special announcements—that these jobs should be done at a local level—that Congress should not interfere, that we should settle back and not bother ourselves, just let nature take its course.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that we have learned our lesson. I hope we realize we cannot retreat into our shell and watch the world go by.

If our people are not gainfully employed and almost 6 percent of our people are not, then our Nation will suffer.

During this 88th Congress I hope to be able to continue what we started last session.

Many of the Members of this House realize that the findings of my Subcommittee on Unemployment and Automation, which resulted in the Manpower Training and Development Act of 1962, merely scratched the surface of our most serious domestic problem. When this legislation was passed, just a year ago this month, it was stated in this House that "this program, we know, will not completely solve our unemployment problem but it is a step in the right direction, and the first of many we will have to take to attain full employment and insure an expanding economy."

We cannot afford to stop now, Mr. Speaker. If we do, these problems we still have will not even be considered and no attempt will even be made to try to find solutions.

I sincerely feel the record of the Committee on Education and Labor, in the 87th Congress, is one to be held in high esteem and it is one that we, who are members of this committee, can be proud we helped produce, for the legislation we sponsored and we had passed was for the benefit of the average American and the good of the Nation as a whole.

NEW FRONTIER PROGRAMS IGNORE TECHNOLOGY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ALGER] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, last October 5 I had occasion to make a long speech about urban renewal and certain abuses which had developed in that program. I was trying to place emphasis on technical difficulties which were responsible for the embarrassing position in which the administration found itself. As I examine the proposed budget for fiscal 1964, I find many of the same technical difficulties. The President seems to be acting on impulse rather than on any sound technical basis.

This is a serious charge and I do not make it lightly. Therefore, I should like to submit evidence in support of the assertion just made.

For the present, my attention will be focused on the welfare part of the New Frontier program, which, in spite of suggestions to the contrary, is being expanded at a faster rate than most other segments of the budget, including national defense. The justification for this expansion is political rather than logical or reasonable. The New Frontier is trying to capitalize on a formula developed by the New Deal. That formula reads somewhat as follows:

First. Many persons are in need.

Second. The Nation has resources with which to meet the need.

Third. The Federal Government should use the resources to meet the need.

This is not a syllogism with its major premise, minor premise, and conclusion. It presents no logical pattern of reasoning. The justification for the formula is the assumption that people will accept and support it. That assumption, which stood up rather well for about 30 years, is now beginning to wear thin and is in danger of falling under the heavy load which the President is trying to place upon it.

I am not going to argue with the first two points in the New Deal formula. They have too much popular appeal. They also have just enough truth in them to make difficult their denial.

My quarrel is with the third point in the New Deal formula. And in this fight, the technological evidence is on my side. Logically, points 1 and 2 do not justify the conclusion implied in point 3. Technologically, no standards or criteria can be developed by which to administer Federal social welfare programs to produce the results which the administration promises when it proposes Federal financial involvement.

Let me move immediately to a set of specific examples which will show both the failure of past budget appropriations to produce the results expected and the probability that future appropriations of the same kind can lead only to the disillusionment of people and a waste of the Nation's substance.

URBAN RENEWAL

The first example has to do with urban renewal. It summarizes the evidence submitted to this House on October 5 last, and in a previous speech. Some of you may recall that in the October 5 speech my indictment of the urban renewal program was built around the following three simple questions:

First. How is need for urban renewal determined?

Second. Where does the money come from?

Third. Who gets the money?

Discussion of need centered on the impossibility of establishing standards by which to measure the extent of need. As a result the recipients were allowed to determine the extent of their need. Abuses inevitably resulted. When the Federal Government failed to correct the abuses it made itself a party to the fraud and encouraged other communities to participate in the fraud.

Discussion of the millions of dollars involved indicated that, as a national policy, the Congress of the United States was taking tax moneys from the poor and sending that money into the greatest centers of population and wealth in the Nation. Such a policy is unprecedented in a democracy.

Discussion of who gets the money suggested that the poor families displaced from urban renewal areas do not benefit financially. The money actually provides windfall profits to slum landlords, excessive fees to planning consultants, and opportunities for great profits with minimum risk for large corporations now taking over the redevelopment of project areas all across the United States.

Does someone suggest that these are abuses which can be corrected without casting doubt on the validity of Federal participation in urban renewal? Any such suggestion indicates a complete misunderstanding of the technology which must apply to this activity. The fact is that no patterns or procedures can be developed in advance, which can be made applicable on a national scale, and which will predict the results of projects to be undertaken with Federal funds. The advocates of Federal urban renewal and many other programs are making false promises when they appear before the committees of Congress and say, "If you will appropriate funds, we will find ways to administer the programs so that they will produce the results expected from them."

MUST BE MEASURED BY RESULTS ACHIEVED

The best technology in this field was developed before the New Deal formula was invented. Dr. Clarence E. Ridley, for years the executive secretary of the International City Managers' Association, investigated the development of standards by which to measure the effectiveness of public services, and said they could be measured but only in terms of results achieved, not in terms of methods or procedures formulated. All his subsequent studies served only to confirm that thesis.

What Dr. Ridley has done is to pull the rug from under the New Dealers and the New Frontiersmen in any promises of performance which they make in connection with welfare programs. The only valid test of these programs is the result achieved. In urban renewal the evidence is that the Federal effort has been a failure. More than 200 projects initiated with assurances of the fullest possible Federal support have failed. Seventy percent of the land cleared for redevelopment has not been put to the originally planned reuse.

This statement is not made in opposition to urban renewal. I am for urban renewal. But I am for a program which works. And, in spite of all the successes which are claimed for the Federal program, I know that it will never be technologically sound until it is completely revamped. Federal appropriations to continue it in its present form are a waste of taxpayers' money. It is slower, more costly, and less efficient by far than completely local programs which have been developed and demonstrated and which are available for national application.

AREA REDEVELOPMENT PROGRAM

My second example is the area redevelopment program established in the Department of Commerce but with assistance from the Departments of Agriculture and Labor, among others. The stated purpose is to assist areas of substantial and persistent unemployment or underemployment in planning and financing economic redevelopment, and to establish stable and diversified local economies.

This program has been in operation long enough to demonstrate that its political expediency far outweighs its technical soundness. The program has been used to "bail out" communities where need undoubtedly existed but where precedents, established to meet the need, can plague the economy as a whole. The program has injected Government into economic and industrial development in ways never contemplated in the Constitution.

Let us not take time to examine the constitutional question involved. That would raise an endless debate about policy on which evidence may not be conclusive to some.

Let us concentrate instead on certain aspects of the program where the results speak for themselves.

The record indicates clearly that the Department of Commerce has been willing to assist low-wage precarious industries to help a locality even when such help is in conflict with national goals of high wages, increased productivity, sound investment, and healthy profits. Two examples which are part of the record, follow:

First. Dan Goldy, Deputy Administrator of the Area Redevelopment Administration, speaking before the Western Forest Industries Association in San Francisco in March 1962, said:

> We might as well go out of business if we can't make loans although there might be plenty of capacity in an industry already.

Second. The Washington Post for December 9, 1961, carried a story about the first project approved by ARA. The headline was: "Mountain Home Territory Didn't Get Its Industrial Revolution for Nothing." The introductory paragraphs of the story follow:

> MOUNTAIN HOME, ARK.—To get a shirt factory employing 500 women at low wages this depressed area had to—
>
> Provide a modern, air-conditioned building financed with a $535,000 bond issue.
>
> Lease the 75,000-square-foot, one-story building to the shirt company for 35 years at a monthly rental of $1,500, a sum that is not large enough to cover the cost of the structure and interest on the bond issue.
>
> Raise real estate levies $6 a year for the average taxpayer to make up the difference between the cost of the plant and the rental income.
>
> Allow the shirt manufacturer to renew his lease for another 64 years at a token cost to him of only $1 a year.
>
> Maintain the building and its 20-acre site, which is in a field 7 miles west and one-half mile east of the tiny town of Gassville, Ark.
>
> Furnish temporary quarters, at a cost to area businessmen of at least $10,000, so workers could be trained and production could begin before the new building was completed.
>
> Obtain $160,000 in aid from the Area Redevelopment Administration—the first grant and loan under the new depressed areas program—to build a water system adequate to the needs of the plant.
>
> Agree not to encourage the location of any plant in the area that would compete with the shirt factory for women workers.
>
> Become partner to a further agreement that in effect pledges the community to help the company keep a union out of the plant.

A second aspect of the ARA program on which the record speaks with eloquence has to do with planning. The law requires that before any locality can become eligible for this particular form of Federal aid, an overall economic development plan must be submitted to and approved by the Department of Commerce.

NO TECHNICAL STANDARDS

The Area Redevelopment Administration has been unable to develop technical standards or criteria by which to judge impartially and objectively the merits of these submissions. The result is that the Government is free to exercise discrimination either for or against a community. It can put a locality into a business where it does not belong and where the long-range outlook is dismal. It can help one community to upset an entire industry.

The ARA is gathering information in Washington which could be used to undermine the private enterprise system. The Government can use the information to plan and compel certain kinds of economic activity to be undertaken in certain parts of the Nation. This is already being done in the missile and space programs, presumably in the interests of national defense. A comparable control can be established over much of the economy by the area redevelopment program and without any comparable justification.

Once such control has been established by the Federal Government, the average businessman will no longer be free to exercise his independent judgment in the operation of his business. His decisions are no longer determining. He must wait to see what the Government is going to do. If the Government decides to set someone up in competition with him under conditions more favorable than he can create for himself, his economic fate is sealed.

The fate of communities can be controlled also. The sound economy of one city can be destroyed by actions taken by the ARA under existing legal authorizations. The data which these communities submit in support of their applications for Federal aid can be used against them. Political decisions can take the place of economic forces in the determination of their future.

ARA IN AGRICULTURE

One final aspect of the area redevelopment program deserves consideration in this look at the record. It concerns the part which the Extension Service of the Department of Agriculture is asked to play.

As you know, the Extension Service has had a long service in helping the American farmer. It has been an educational and an advisory service designed to help the individual farmer make his most advantageous adjustment to circumstances.

The Extension Service has been concerned with policy questions in agriculture but always on a basis which kept the Service from becoming involved in controversy. The traditional approach of the Service to public problems has been set forth clearly in the following statement from Cornell University in connection with what it has chosen to call Operation Advance:

> The objective of Operation Advance is not consensus. Everyone in a group is not expected to agree on answers. The purpose of the discussion is to help each leader develop and refine his or her own judgments. This is done by forcing the examination of individual concerns in broad context, by stretching individual thinking, and by developing some understanding of unfamiliar considerations, points of view and interests. The purpose of Operation Advance is not to make policy, but to serve as a basis for informed action by individual leaders. Therefore, agreement or consensus by the group is neither essential nor helpful. Thus, Operation Advance provides education support for leaders of organizations and groups involved in action in a political democracy.

As part of the area redevelopment program the Extension Service has been asked to combine its traditional service to individuals with group decisions and social action. Consensus is to be relied upon to decide the projects for which Federal aid is to be requested. This can involve the coercion of minorities by majorities. It can generate conflict instead of the cooperation which is essential for sound community development.

We are doing a favor to the President when we eliminate these technically unsupportable items from his budget. We are saving him from grievous failures which can have an adverse effect on the economy and must finally turn the people against him.

ADVANCING CIVILIAN TECHNOLOGY

My third example of budget requests which cannot be technically supported has to do with a request for $7.4 million for "advancing civilian technology." The construction, machine tool, and textile industries have been selected as the immediate focus for this kind of technological advancement.

Let us concede that everyone wants to advance civilian technology. Let us also concede that some of the research which might be helpful is not now being done.

Such an admission of need offers no technical support for the proposed appropriation. It leaves completely unanswered the question: How will the Federal appropriation accomplish what is needed?

Emphasis on the improvement of civilian technology is not original with this administration. The problem of improvement has been under study for about 10 years in connection with the work of the Small Business Administration. That agency has had funds with which to study and to take advantage of every possible technological advance for the benefit of small business. The results have been meager. It is results rather than predictions or promises upon which the Congress must rely in appropriating public funds.

Let me comment specifically on the concept of advancing civilian technology as it applies to the construction industry. The need for such a program is not generally accepted. Indeed many individuals and organizations certain to be affected by the program are not sure what the program is intended to accomplish, how it will be operated, or how it may affect the vast research program which private enterprise is now financing.

At present, research programs are being carried out by many individual corporations, large and small, and by various trade associations. While no accurate information is available about the total funds involved, many experts are convinced that the amount exceeds $250 million. In many areas the construction industry has developed technical advances which are years ahead of what the public is prepared to accept.

The administration has no clearly defined procedure for this program of advancing civilian technology. It has not even discussed its general approach to the problem with important segments of the construction industry. Leaders of this industry, whose cooperation is essential to the success of the Government's program, do not have confidence in it and are not prepared to help make it work.

The only way to reassure the construction industry about this program is for the Government to formulate in advance the criteria or standards by which the program will be controlled. The available evidence indicates that such a formulation is technologically impossible. That is what makes the administration's position untenable and requires that the Congress refuse to make the requested appropriation.

FEDERAL AID TO EDUCATION

My fourth example is taken from the field of education. Here again the President has seen fit to make excursions into uncharted fields without any substantial technical support.

To help concentrate attention on the technical aspects of Federal aid to education, let me make certain disavowals. I am discussing the obvious need for every American to receive the best possible education. Nor am I raising any question about the availability of resources with which to make that education possible. I am asking what technical evidence exists to support the claim that the Federal Government either can or should control the course of American education. I concede that we can appropriate money. I insist that money alone will not insure the kind of education which America needs.

Last year the President made certain recommendations about Federal aid to education. Because he could not give necessary assurances about the effect of these proposals he was not successful in having them enacted. As I understand the situation, both he and the Congress agreed that certain studies should be made to establish a foundation of fact upon which new proposals could be based. These studies were initiated. The results have not yet been made available for the consideration and reaction of many of the important segments of education certain to be affected by any decisions made and action taken. Nevertheless, the President has seen fit, without waiting for the facts which he once recognized to be essential, has submitted a most elaborate program of recommendations to the Congress. He has given no indication of standards or criteria by which the programs will be administered. He can give no assurances about results which will flow from the programs.

Let me review quickly three of the principal studies which were initiated in an effort to determine the proper place of the Federal Government in education.

The first was initiated by a Special Subcommittee on Education of the House Committee on Education and Labor. The report of the Special Subcommittee has not yet been made public and presumably was not available at the time when the President's program was formulated. Certainly, its technological contribution has not been tested in the crucible of public discussion.

The second study was referred to in the President's message. It concerns the report of the Panel of Consultants on Vocational Education. That report has not yet been published and subjected to public criticism. There is available at present no evidence that the report will provide any technical foundation for the proposals which the President has incorporated in title V of H.R. 3000.

The third study is being made by the President's Committee on Youth Employment. No report has been made public. Nevertheless, the President has seen fit to make recommendations which cannot be supported technically until the report has been published and ample time for the reaction of interested groups has been allowed.

How serious is this lack of technological support? Some of my colleagues across the aisle may suggest that it is not damaging at all. That my claim that the President, in acting before the facts have been established, is not making recommendations contrary to the facts. They may suggest that the studies, when completed and made public, will support the President's position.

The matter is not that simple. The wisdom of the ages will not be found in the three reports just mentioned. There already exists an extensive body of technology which the President has chosen to ignore.

Let me give you a single example involving the question of whether Federal aid should consist of general appropriations without control or itemized appropriations with careful specifications of activities. Senator Robert Taft used to say that Federal aid must involve either strict control or waste. He insisted that no middle ground could exist.

The President is now trying to straddle that issue. He is trying to do both. And he is acting before he has a sound technical basis for either one.

I am sure all of you know that the Hoover report indicated the existence of more than 200 educational programs in the Federal Government. No administration has been powerful enough to establish coordination of these programs at the Federal level. There is no semblance of control over the impact of these programs on educational institutions and on communities.

Partial evidence has accumulated to indicate that Federal programs are already beginning to have harmful impact. A recent Brookings Institution report indicates that Federal programs have already become a major influence on the career planning of individuals. Many college leaders are concerned about the emphasis on science and mathematics at the expense of the humanities and the social sciences.

The President may have standards or criteria of his own on which he is willing to base fundamental educational decisions for the American people. But these standards have not been revealed to the people. They do not have the support of scholars in the field. They can become a menace to the entire educational system of the Nation. We should examine them most carefully before we attempt to implement them with Federal funds.

A fifth, and an almost perfect example of either ignoring or violating the technical knowledge of the day is to be found in the Youth Employment Act proposed by the President and now under consideration by the House Committee on Education and Labor.

The Youth Conservation Corps proposed by this bill, H.R. 1890, would abandon the realistic desire to provide youth with salable skills to fill identified job opportunities in favor of a program designed to remove young men of the Corps from the ongoing economic activities of their communities and States. The Corps men will be no better prepared to fill manpower needs after their tour in the "woods."

The YCC proposal appears to assume economic conditions in the 1960's comparable to those in the 1930's when the predecessor program, the Civilian Conservation Corps was established. However, our unemployment today is but a fraction of that of 30 years ago. Actually a shortage rather than excess of skilled labor exists.

Here again technology is being ignored. The administration has no criteria or standards by which to justify the proposals included in the Youth Employment Act. Nevertheless it persists in trying to make political capital out of problems which its proposed procedures cannot help solve.

This is my effort to present what I think to be the technological failure of this administration in the various programs confronting us. We are spending money like water without actually getting back to the guidelines that I referred to.

That philosophy I say is in error; that is, since the American people have needs, and the United States has resources to meet the needs that the Federal Government should use those resources to meet the needs. I do not believe that is the role of the Federal Government and technologically the evidence is all on my side.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALGER. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. SNYDER. The gentleman said something about control in Federal aid to education. I am wondering if the gentleman from Texas is suggesting that perhaps there would be no more control over aid to education than there is over aid to the farmer.

Mr. ALGER. I think the gentleman has given an apt analogy. There would be control, and he and I know it. I think the majority of the American people have the proof that the farmer is so controlled that he cannot even decide what he shall grow on his own farm to use for his children and his own stock. But that kind of control is embraced in anything that the Federal Government does. That was set out in the remark of Senator Taft. The gentleman knows and I know that when the Government gets into education, the education of our youth will indeed be controlled.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALGER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the gentleman from Texas on this very excellent and timely presentation. As a member of the Committee on Education and Labor I have had the opportunity to hear some of the testimony in regard to the Youth Conservation Corps proposal. One of the very mystifying developments is the contradiction in testimony by Cabinet-level officers as to what the purpose of this training program would be. Several have denied emphatically that it was intended to impart new skills to those attending, while other members of the Cabinet have insisted that that was the proper purpose. So here indeed the left hand does not know what the right hand is doing or is even proposing to do.

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his observation. I think once again, where a need is recognized, and we can all recognize needs, we too frequently immediately formulate Federal programs. But there is no assurance that first, this is the area for the Federal Government and that, second, we can accomplish under any procedure or criteria or standards these goals that they say need to be attained.

Mr. Speaker, the point of my entire presentation has been this. We all agree that there are needs and we know that somehow or other these needs will be met. But the Federal Government, by going in right away with money, has been unable to set up standards under which this money can be equitably distributed into the various districts of our country, or where the programs may be set up, or where results may be achieved in accordance with what we set out to do. That is the burden of my entire statement today, that by the yardstick of results achieved, ever since the early days of the New Deal, it was proven over and over and over again, that the Federal Government, even when it goes into a field presumably to solve a problem, does not solve that problem. For instance, in the welfare field, because of an inability to lay down procedures and guidelines this merely postpones the day of reckoning, or admits that it was a failure. That was the result in trying to solve unemployment, or the farm problem. And now we are trying to do the same in the welfare field by spending proportionately more than even our defense. It strikes me that it is time to look for a technological base by which we can measure the Federal programs, where the Federal Government is to be involved, or indeed make the agonizing reappraisal that will delete, will eliminate, Federal programs that have failed to solve problems, measured by results achieved.

Mr. Speaker, I hold that the Federal Government is not designed nor intended to feed, clothe, house, provide jobs, medicines and the basic necessities of life. That is my philosophy. Constitutionally I think our forefathers had this their reason for not laying down those areas as the role of the Federal Government. When we get into them as government, there is no technology that we can use. The Federal Government cannot do a better job than the people can do for themselves. I really believe the American people can do for themselves better than government can. They can spend their own money better than government can spend it for them.

PUBLIC OPINION ON THE ADMINISTRATION'S POLICIES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BOGGS] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I believe this is the first time I have had a special order since I was a freshman Member of the House of Representatives. I do so now only, as I see it, to set straight a record which I think should be set straight. I would not even do that if I were not concerned about some effort being made to distort the record and the impact that this effort could have.

I have a profound respect for the press of this country. I spent my college years as a newspaper reporter.

I have a profound respect for the magazines in our country. I try as best I can, with the limited amount of time that all of us have, to read most of the magazines. I particularly respect the U.S. News & World Report, which comes to the desk, I think, of every Member of Congress every week. I get it here and at my home in Orleans.

What I have to say has nothing to do with the editorial opinion taken by that magazine or any publication. What appears on the editorial page is the property of the publisher. One may disagree with what appears. That is in the tradition of American journalism, and is as it should be. But it has come to my attention that there has been a questionnaire circulated among the Members of the House. I will not read all of the questions, but they go something like this:

> 1. Why is President Kennedy, as a Democrat, able to exert so little influence over a House and Senate that have majorities heavily Democratic?
>
> 2. White House messages and ideas go to Congress and seem to disappear. As far as anyone can see they generate no response out in the country. Why?

3. Has the President failed to get into tune with the mood of the country?

4. Is there a feeling that the President's plans do not command wide support among the voters?

And so forth. There are several others that I will place in the RECORD. They are already in the RECORD, in fact. There is no secret about them. They appear on page 3220.

I am familiar with polls. I may say that anyone who makes a poll and anyone who uses a poll never asks what is regarded as a loaded question, because if you are going to take a poll you want to get honest answers. You want facts, not fiction.

I remember seeing the great chairman of the Republican National Committee just a week before the last election. He was and still is a good friend of mine. He is a member of the other body. The rules being what they are, I will not mention his name.

We talked about the upcoming election. It was the 1960 election.

He said to me, "All of our indications are it is very, very close."

I said, "What do you mean by your indications?"

He said, "The polls that we have conducted,"—and one thing led to another, and finally he said, "Well, there is no secret about this, I will show you one." And he did. It indicated that the election would be within one or two percentage points throughout the Nation. That was an accurate poll. Now when his committee hired whoever made that poll, they did not give them a set of loaded questions—they went out to find out exactly what the people were thinking, they were not attempting to justify a preconceived notion about what people might be thinking.

Now let us analyze some of these questions for just one moment.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOGGS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HALLECK. I have listened to the gentleman explain about the questionnaire. I am sure I never received one. I have inquired of some of our Members here on the floor, and they say to me that they never received any such questionnaire. I might have been tempted to respond with some answers had I received a questionnaire. Could the gentleman tell us whether that was just distributed to Members on the other side of the Capitol, or did Members on his side here in the House of Representatives receive a questionnaire?

Mr. BOGGS. I am frank to tell you that I do not know. I had a gentleman from this magazine come to see me and ask me some of these questions. He did not hand me the questions, however, to be quite frank with the gentleman. The questions, as I read them to you, are as inserted in the RECORD by a Member of the other body, and I was informed that they had been circulated. If they have not been circulated, then I am in error.

Mr. HALLECK. Certainly I am very positive that no such questionnaire came to me, and no one has come to my office to interrogate me along the line of any of these questions. Of course, there might have been a rather limited circulation on the questionnaire. I might ask at this time if any of my colleagues who are now present on the floor on our side of the aisle received any such questionnaire? Evidently no one has received any such questionnaire, and the indication is negative in reply to that inquiry.

Mr. BOGGS. I am reassured by the gentleman from Indiana because the tenor of the questionnaire alarmed me from the point of view of objectivity and from the point of view of what the function of the Congress is.

Mr. HALLECK. I would add this further thought, if the gentleman will yield, with reference to the inquiry as to who might have received the questionnaire, I would not want that to be taken as some sort of condemnation so far as I am concerned of the distribution of the questionnaire.

Mr. BOGGS. I did not interpret the gentleman's remarks as a condemnation of it at all, and if I gave any such impression, I wish to make it plain that that was not my intention. But I will say to the gentleman, some of these questions—although not all of them—were asked of me by a staff member of this magazine. Of course, I am not being critical of the magazine, but I am being critical of this approach and I will discuss this as objectively as I know how. In the first place, I do not think that any Congress should be a simple echo of the executive branch of the Government. I have had the great privilege of serving here for a good many years, and I respect what this body is—a House of Representatives. I consider myself first, last, and always a Representative of the people who elected me. But this is quite different from an attitude of obstructionism. For we have another branch of Government called the executive branch of Government. It is the duty of the executive branch of Government to give direction and to execute and administer the laws enacted by the Congress. The executive branch must carry out the foreign policy of the United States and perform all the other duties that are enunciated in the Constitution and in the statutes passed by the Congress.

Now let us just examine some of the implications implicit in the questions. I hope that they have not been circulated or even asked in this fashion of others. But they are a matter of record and I would like to talk about them for just a few minutes.

Let us talk about the question of the President's messages. I do not think there is anything particularly sacred about a message from the President of the United States, but I am sure I can pretty well demonstrate that these messages have not just suddenly evaporated and that nothing further has been heard about them or that "they seem to disappear." If anyone has any such notion, it is just not correct. Let me read the subject matter of some of these messages.

There was the state of the Union message on January 14. No one will take exception to a state of the Union message by the President of the United States.

Then on the 17th of January there was the budget message. If anyone says that it has disappeared, then obviously no one is watching television programs or reading editorials in the press or listening to witnesses before the Ways and Means Committee or before the Appropriations Committee. As a matter of fact, regardless of what position you may take on the budget, whether you think it is too big, too small, inadequate, inflationary, whatever it may be, anyone who thinks that that message has suddenly disappeared is just not acquainted with the facts of life in this month of March 1963.

Then there was the economic report. Did it disappear? It seems to me the gentleman from Missouri, for whom I have a deep respect—he and I serve on two committees together—I think the Joint Economic Committee is meeting this afternoon to agree or disagree on its own analysis of the economic health of the Nation—can answer that question.

Here are the facts: each year the President submits an economic report which goes into detail about the economy as he sees it; then the Joint Economic Committee holds hearings on the President's report—the message that he sends down to the Congress—the one that allegedly disappeared. We have had a whole host of very distinguished witnesses appear before that committee to comment on that message. Some have agreed with the President's recommendations, the President's analysis; some have disagreed. Some have said that the tax proposals are wrong; some have said they are right. Some have said they are adequate; some have said they are inadequate. But this has been the subject of great discussion before the Joint Committee for the past month.

So to say that the question has been laid aside is just not so.

Just a few moments ago we heard the gentleman from Texas, the distinguished gentleman from Dallas, Mr. ALGER, make a very fine statement of his beliefs. Just a few moments ago he disagreed with the recommendations of the President relative to the young people in our country. But this shows that the message on youth has not disappeared. This matter is being discussed very widely. You will hear more about the youth employment act, about the domestic Peace Corps, about the Conservation Corps. You will hear more about the growing problem of juvenile delinquency. Why will you hear more about it? Because whether the President sends a message about it or not the problem is with us. It is estimated that within the next several years there will be 70 million young people under the age of 20 living in our country. So we are bound to hear a great deal about juvenile delinquency and youth problems.

The President also sent up a message on mental health, the first one that ever came to Congress on this question, and the related one of retarded children. There is hardly a family in the United States that does not have some experience with this whether it be as a result of the devastations of service in World

War II or in Korea, or the strains and stresses of the times in which we live, whether it be the advance of medical science which has enabled doctors to maintain life where it could not be maintained before, especially of children who might have died under former circumstances. This is a problem that confronts us.

This morning I heard on the radio that the American Medical Association, which does not always agree with the recommendations of the present administration, had endorsed many of these proposals relative to mental health. And I am informed by the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce that a bill pending before his committee would aid medical education—which bill overlaps both the education message and the mental health message—is nearing completion in that committee.

I could go on with these messages. There is the one about taxes. Would anybody for one moment say that we have disregarded that message? We have a list of witnesses a mile long scheduled to appear before the Ways and Means Committee. We have hearings scheduled until the end of March, with the most distinguished panel of witnesses I have ever seen.

The point I am making is that I do not understand this kind of approach. The notion that these messages have no impact, that there is no responsibility, that they have no connection with the problems confronting the country, the Nation, and the world, is not so.

Let us deal with some of these other matters. The first proposition in the questionaire. The notion that the President has not exerted any influence on the Congress.

As I said a moment ago, I am not one who thinks because the President says X ought to be X that it should necessarily be X. I had the great privilege of sitting in on some Presidential conferences with a former Speaker of the House, and I have the privilege today of sitting in these conferences. As all of you know the legislative leaders confer with the President. Speaker Rayburn used to say to the President—to quite a few presidents—and these gentlemen say to him today: "Mr. President, that cannot be done. We disagree."

Nobody requires complete agreement. In the years I have been here there has been only one Congress where the Republican Party was in control of the House and also in control of the executive branch of the Government. We had the 80th Congress, when President Truman was President of the United States, and the Republicans were in control of the House. The only other Congress was the 83d Congress. If my memory serves me correctly, those are the only two times since 1930 when the Republicans controlled the Congress.

How did President Kennedy's program fare in his first term compared to President Eisenhower's in his first term?

I have compiled some figures. I trust they are accurate. If they are not accurate, I will certainly correct the RECORD to make them so. Here are the figures I got.

To the 87th Congress, President Kennedy made recommendations on 53 major matters. That is in the first session. In the second session, he made recommendations on 54 major matters. Approved in the first session were 33 major matters, in the second 40 matters. The first session approved 62 percent, the second session 74 percent.

In the 83d Congress, President Eisenhower's percentages of major recommendations that won approval were 52 and 40 percent. So President Kennedy has fared mighty well.

No one has ever denied the popularity of President Eisenhower. No one ever said President Eisenhower did not fit the mood of the people of the United States. We Democrats who were confronted with running a candidate against him knew what we were up against. Whether we agreed with him or disagreed with him, he had captured the imagination of the American people. Yet, despite that, his percentages were 52 and 40 as compared to 62 and 74 percent for President Kennedy. And despite his popularity in the 83d Congress, President Eisenhower lost the 84th Congress, and the Democrats took control.

The question is asked: Does the President of the United States fit the mood of the people? Well, take a look at what happened last November. There are three more Democratic Senators than prior to 1962, an off-year election, and the character of the House of Representatives changed hardly at all where normally there is quite a change.

I do not cite this in a partisan way. I know my party makes mistakes, and I know that the other party does too. But to give the impression that the President of the United States is devoid of leadership, and in the process to give the impression this Congress has accomplished nothing, is a wrong impression.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOGGS. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. CURTIS. I am curious to find out about these questions, because taking up where the minority leader, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK], left off, apparently no one over here has seen them, except that I have because the gentleman directed my attention to them.

Was this circulated? It has not been published. Were these questions circulated among the Democratic Members?

Mr. BOGGS. It may be that the questions were withdrawn. I gave the best answer I could give to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK] a moment ago.

Mr. CURTIS. If the gentleman will yield further, did anyone on this side receive it? Did all of you on the other side receive questions like this? I think somebody is playing a joke on us. That is what I think.

Mr. BOGGS. The questions are so ludicrous that it does take on that aspect.

Mr. CURTIS. I think somebody has played a joke on the gentleman. I do not know. But unless these questions were circulated on the other side—Senator DOUGLAS in his statement just said they asked this. It does not say who asked the questions. But I agree that these are leading questions.

Mr. BOGGS. I said to the gentleman from Indiana that I had been asked several of these questions by a representative of this magazine—that I personally had been.

Mr. CURTIS. If the gentleman will yield further, I think perhaps they are just putting a needle in you.

Mr. BOGGS. They could have been. I would not think that that was the case. I know the gentleman from Missouri was speaking half earnestly and half facetiously, but I would not expect a major magazine to put the needle in me or anyone else. This would be most surprising.

Mr. CURTIS. That is why I was trying to identify the situation. Apparently this has not been published, and at least as far as I can find out, I know I did not receive any questionnaire. No one over here apparently did. I thought maybe there was a wide circulation on your side. Maybe it is just putting a needle in your leadership.

Mr. BOGGS. It could be.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOGGS. I am delighted to yield to the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. ALBERT. If my office has received a copy of these questions, I must confess that I have not seen it. I did see this list of questions in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD where it was indicated that they were prepared by U.S. News & World Report. It would be unparliamentary to read the entire article.

First of all, I want to commend the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BOGGS] for the presentation he is making. If a representative of this very respectable magazine did prepare this list of questions he was engaging in a form of journalism which is far below the standards we expect of that type magazine. Every single question is loaded. Every question involves a premise which is adverse to the President of the United States. Every question assumes that the President of the United States does not have that standing among the Democratic Members of this House, or among the Members of the Congress as a whole, or in the Nation as a whole, which we would expect of the leader of this country or of a great political party. This simply is not true.

I think the gentleman in pointing this up is doing the House a service, because this matter is a serious matter, whether the questionnaire has been distributed to every Member of the House or not. The figures, which the gentleman has just put into the RECORD, are accurate in my opinion. I have similar figures which have been prepared by my staff, and they are very, very close to the figures which the gentleman has given us.

The first question asks: "Why is President Kennedy as a Democrat able to exert so little influence over a House and Senate that have majorities that are heavily Democratic?"

The truth of the matter is that the Democratic Party of this House has supported the proposals of the President of the United States time after time in heavy majorities on issue after issue over the opposition of a majority of those on the other side of the aisle. When this House passed the act extending area redevelopment to rural areas 100 percent of the Democrats voted for the proposal, 75 percent of the Republicans voted against it.

On passage of the bill for aid to distressed areas, which was one of the very important measures submitted by the President of the United States, 83 percent of the Democrats in this House voted on the side of the President and 74 percent of the Republicans voted on the other side. I am not criticizing my friends, I am just reciting the facts.

On the Kitchin-Ayres amendment to narrow and reduce the Minimum Wage Act, 71 percent of the Democrats voted for a higher minimum wage and broader coverage as recommended by President Kennedy; 85 percent of the Republicans voted the other way.

On the greatest Housing Act ever passed by this Congress, the Housing Act of 1961, 85 percent of the Democrats voted for the bill; 85 percent of the Republicans voted against extending housing legislation as contemplated in that bill.

On the water pollution control amendments, to provide pure water for the American people, which was a strong administration measure, 99 percent of the Democrats voted for that bill; 88 percent of the Republicans voted against it.

On the Emergency Education Act of 1961 to provide classrooms for American children 67 percent of the Democrats voted for the bill; 96 percent of the Republicans voted against it.

On the public welfare amendments 99 percent of the Democrats voted "yea" and less than 60 percent of the Republicans voted "yea" although a majority of the Republicans did support that bill.

On the public works acceleration bill 82 percent of the Democrats voted "yea." This was one of the President's really important measures, one that he stressed over and over again to the press and in meetings which the gentlemen attended last year at the White House; 89 percent of the Republicans voted against it.

On the farm bill 84 percent of the Democrats voted "yea" and 99 percent of the Republicans voted "nay."

The story of the 87th Congress is a story of progressive legislation in which the Democrats of this House supported the President of the United States in overwhelming numbers while the Republicans, on the whole, did not do so. These are the facts. This is the answer to the loaded questionnaire to which the distinguished Democratic whip has referred.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I think that is a proper presentation of the record. I glory in my Republican colleagues taking their point of view. This is the way democratic institutions are supposed to function. If it were otherwise we would not have a United States of America. But I think it is a terrible mistake to try to imply that there is no direction, no leadership of any kind in this Congress. When the gentleman from Massachusetts, Joe Martin, and my good friend, the gentleman from Indiana, Charlie Halleck, were leading the House of Representatives back in the 80th Congress and again in the 83d Congress, I had profound respect for their leadership. There were times when they took positions that were somewhat different from those which they had taken when they were in the minority. I understood that, because the problem of being in the majority is quite different from that of being in the minority. When you are in the majority you have to act, you have to decide, you have the responsibility and it is quite a different business from being in the minority. So the gentleman from Oklahoma, the distinguished majority leader, in my judgment has properly stated the case.

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOGGS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the gentleman if it is not true that when Members of the House did support the President the same politicians of the press made the charge that this was a "rubber-stamp" Congress and that those who supported the President were "rubber-stamp" Congressmen.

Mr. BOGGS. Well, that is right. I would say that that is another matter I would like to touch on for just a moment, because in many ways this is an attack, as I see it, if this thing is going on—and I hope my friend from Missouri [Mr. Curtis] is right; maybe I am just being needled. In many ways though this is an attack on Congress. I have been reading newspaper pieces and other things to the effect, "Is Congress Outmoded?" And then there are other pieces indicating that Congress cannot function, that somehow or other the 20th century has left us behind. Of course, if you really want to create a dictatorship, just abolish Congress. I do not care whether you are a Democrat, a Republican, an independent, or whatever you want to call yourself, what this really is is an attack on the Congress itself. I want to go into that for just a moment.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOGGS. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. EDMONDSON. I would like to commend the gentleman initially for bringing this matter to the attention of the House. May I add further that the fact that the gentleman was asked some of these specific questions by a representative of this magazine is all the evidence in the world that should be needed by any Member of this body to establish the authenticity of the magazine as a source for these questions.

Mr. BOGGS. The response I have made to the gentleman from Missouri and the response I made to the gentleman from Indiana are totally accurate. I am not even implying this thing was circulated.

Mr. EDMONDSON. I think the gentleman from Illinois may have put the source of the item in the Congressional Record. It may throw some light on this.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOGGS. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. PUCINSKI. I think I can throw some light on it. I have it on good authority that the magazine had asked for an interview on a series of questions, and the magazine was requested to submit the list of questions that were going to be involved in the interview, and the magazine had submitted the questions in a letter. At that point it was made clear that other magazines asked similar questions of other Members of Congress. Apparently there was no blanket questionnaire sent out.

Mr. BOGGS. The best answer, of course, would come from the magazine itself.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Louisiana has expired.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 15 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. EDMONDSON. I do not know how many other Members of this body may have been questioned by the Gallup poll. Personally I have never been asked a question by the Gallup poll. Most of the people I have talked to have never been interviewed by a representative of the Gallup poll. But the existence of the Gallup poll and the fact that that questionnaire was put out and was given wide circulation and was given a lot of publicity certainly could not be denied by anybody in this body.

Mr. CURTIS. If the gentleman will yield, the only publicity given to this was by the Senator from Illinois, Mr. Douglas, and right here and now, that I know of, unless someone else can point to the publicity. That is what we are trying to find out, or at least I am. I happen to think these are loaded questions, and I think they are rather funny questions in a way, and needless questions to the leaders of your party. I know I get loaded questions all the time. All of us do. If we have not learned by now how to take the sting out of them and turn it back again—I think we all know that. But if this was publicized in any way other than by the people to whom it was directed, I think we are being a little unfair to the U.S. News & World Report.

Mr. BOGGS. I have tried to keep the record completely straight so far as I am concerned. I have no desire to be unfair.

Mr. CURTIS. The gentleman has been very fair.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOGGS. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Unfortunately I was at a meeting and did not get in on the start of this discussion. Are you discussing the USIA poll throughout the world that nobody seems to know anything about, and that the administration has under wraps?

Mr. BOGGS. No. I wish they would release them if they do have them under wraps.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman knows they do. We have not been able to get this report.

Mr. BOGGS. No, we were not discussing that; but if time permits and the gentleman wants to discuss it, I will be very glad to discuss it to the best of my ability.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOGGS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. PUCINSKI. I would like to commend the gentleman for calling this subject to our attention today. I am particularly interested in one question that was asked in this survey: "Has the President failed to get into tune with the mood of the country?"

It would appear to me that if the U.S. News & World Report will look at the most recent Gallup poll, they can find their answer there from an awful lot of people in America because, if my memory serves me correctly, the Gallup poll sustains the President in refusing to be stampeded into an invasion of Cuba. The President certainly has tried very hard to resolve this problem and 63 percent of the people of America said the other day through a Gallup poll that they are opposed and are against any invasion of Cuba at this time. So it would appear to me that the President is certainly reading the mood of the people of this country a lot better than those who have been making big speeches here trying to goad him into some sort of military action in Cuba.

Mr. BOGGS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, if time permits, I would like to go along for just a few minutes to discuss what I consider the damaging effect of this sort of approach. I do not think it is the function of the Congress to have to pass a dozen laws every day. Some people have pointed out, and I think quite wisely, that ofttimes it is better not to legislate than it is to legislate.

Congress has a wide variety of functions. We have been able to move into these difficult days in which we live, I believe, quite ably and quite well.

Just think of the fact that 10 years ago there was not even such a thing as a space program. I saw the distinguished chairman of that committee walk on this floor a minute ago. We had to go out and hire experts who were able to advise us and consult with us and give us information about such a program as the space program. The distinguished Speaker of this House of Representatives had much to do with the creation of that committee.

This has nothing to do with partisanship. We have had to move into this period of fantastic weaponry such as the hydrogen bomb and nuclear energy and all of these other aspects, and I think the Congress by and large is entirely adequate.

I remember at this time last year that we had all this business about the 87th Congress being described as a "do nothing" Congress. Yet, I noticed there was inserted in the RECORD a few days ago by the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. ST. GEORGE] an article which appeared in one of the local newspapers on Sunday last entitled "Congress Has Been Maligned."

I am not going to read that article to you, but I commend it to your attention regardless of what position you may take. Incidentally, the gentlewoman from New York, I suppose, as a member of the Republican Party, did not vote for many of these programs which are set out in this article, but I will read you just a word or two. It says:

> The daily reports of the 87th Congress made it appear to many as a catastrophe.

That is true. I remember reading those reports just as you remember reading them.

It reads:

> Yet with a hindsight view of its accomplishments, we can judge it a smashing success. In the area of foreign and security affairs, Congress approved the defense buildup, the Peace Corps, the Disarmament Agency, the Alliance for Progress, an expansion of the food-for-peace program and the important Trade Act.
>
> In the domestic area, it passed among others, the most comprehensive housing program in our history; the area redevelopment, manpower retraining; and emergency public works programs; an increase in the minimum wage to $1.25; expansion of the social security system, including lowering the male retirement age to 62; complete revision of the public assistance programs; an increase in postal rates; revision of civil service and other Federal salary systems—

And so forth. I could add the drug bill and the satellite program and countless other programs.

Mr. STINSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOGGS. I am glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. STINSON. Did the gentleman ask the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. ST. GEORGE] or did he tell her that he was going to use her name this afternoon?

Mr. BOGGS. No, I did not; but I did not use her name unfavorably. The gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. ST. GEORGE] is a very good friend of mine and has been for a long time. I did not want to imply that she had voted for or against some of these things.

Mr. STINSON. The gentleman said that she voted against some of these programs.

Mr. BOGGS. I said that I presumed she voted against them. I repeat that the gentlewoman from New York is one of my very close friends and I admire her very much.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOGGS. I yield.

Mr. STAGGERS. I commend the gentleman from Louisiana for his brilliant discussion here today, and I would like to say with reference to these questions that I agree with him that it does not become a national magazine to get into this kind of interrogation in any way.

I would like to remind the gentleman from Louisiana and the Members of this Congress that this is the only body I know of on earth in which if a vacancy occurs it cannot be filled either by appointment or succession, for we are responsible only to the residents of our districts. We are not responsible to the President of the United States. Our first responsibility is to the people of our districts to do what they want us to do. If we were responsible to the President, we would just be rubberstamps and the people would not need us here to represent them.

I am not always in favor of everything the President suggests, but I always will support the principles of my party. I may vote against some of his propositions, but I will stand by the principles of my party.

This President of ours has inherited more problems than any President in the history of America or any man in the long span of history, and I think that he has acted with vision, sometimes ahead of most of the Members of this Congress here in the House of Representatives and in the other body. I believe that history will put him in the place that he has earned, that of a great leader not only of America but of the free world. I believe that when history is written he will go down as one of the great Presidents of these United States. I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

Mr. BOGGS. Some of us here have traveled about and seen some other parliamentary bodies, even the alleged sedate House of Commons in London; and I have had opportunity to compare whatever you will, the efficiency, the dedication, the ability of the average Member of the House of Representatives, yes, and the ethics—and I do not care whether he be Republican or Democrat—with other members of parliamentary bodies, and I think that in every category we would compare favorably.

You have heard the uproars in some of these legislative bodies. I have sat in the gallery of the Chamber of Deputies in Paris and watched what I considered sheer disorder, something that would appall a Member of this body. I have seen things happen which no American Representative would dream of doing.

So in many ways what this really in effect constitutes is an attack upon the free institution of Congress itself which is the ultimate safeguard of the liberties of the people of the United States of America.

As some persons have so well said and what all of us at times have said, the President of the United States does not need anyone to defend him; he does very well himself.

I remember our late Speaker Rayburn saying in times of stress—and in this case he was referring to a Republican President, President Eisenhower—but I have heard him refer oftentimes to that President and other Presidents and say: "Either he is my leader and the leader of the United States of America or we have no leader."

This does not mean you have to acquiesce in everything the President is for, not by any stretch of the imagination, but there is a difference between total obstruction and opposition just because it comes from a person of an opposite party, and constructive loyal opposition, as the expression is used elsewhere in the world.

One of the proudest documents I have is a letter written by President Eisenhower in which he gave me some credit for the enactment of the trade agreements program of his administration. I am proud of that letter, and I am happy that I was able to make some small contribution to the passage of that bill which he considered vital to his administration.

The President of the United States cannot be right about everything; but, on the contrary, he cannot be wrong about everything either. I must say that I get a little bit annoyed at people who are able to find that De Gaulle is right about everything; that Diefenbaker is right about everything; and even Mr. Tshombe is right about everything, but the President of the United States is wrong about everything.

They talk about people whom we work with who come from the White House. There is a certain implication in this. I have known Larry O'Brien for a long time. He, too, does not need anybody to defend him. I invite any member of the opposition to indicate to me any time where he has been unfair, where the thing he did was not right and what a man in his position was required to do and should do, if there is to be comity between the executive and legislative branches of the Government.

As far as I am personally concerned, all that Americans require of a public official, regardless of party, and from those instruments which go to make public policy—namely, the press, newspapers, radio, editorialists—is that all of us act responsibly.

I do not know of a single Member of this body who does not know how to act irresponsibly. It is so easy to do. I do not know of anyone who does not know how to join in the public clamor, whatever it may be.

The only monument on the Capitol Grounds is erected to a former Republican Member of the Congress of the United States, the other body. I refer to the distinguished former Senator from Ohio, Senator Taft.

One of the things for which that monument ultimately came to him was the fact he stood alone in the other body and said he would be against drafting workers into the Army to run the railroads, despite the fact that this body had voted for it, with only a few dissenting votes.

The point I make is: it is difficult to act responsibly at times, but it is important to act responsibly. We have the greatest nation on earth and the freest nation on earth. The way to lose it is to be irresponsible, and it is just as bad for a journalistic enterprise to be irresponsible as it is for you, me, or any other person who is charged with some responsibility.

CUBAN REFUGEE AGITATION AND RIOTING SHOULD NOT HAPPEN AGAIN

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore (Mr. RYAN of New York). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. FASCELL] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, on February 21, 1963, and again on February 26, 1963, I addressed the Members of this body with reference to the problems that have arisen in Miami and south Florida with the Cuban refugees.

At that time I called the Members' attention to a riot between the Cuban refugees and local police authority at about 10 a.m. February 21.

At the session of February 21, I spread on the RECORD the stories of this uncalled for outburst as they were carried on the wires of the Associated Press and United Press.

At the session of February 26, I respread on the RECORD these same wire stories and included for the RECORD a story written by Milt Sosin, a reporter of the Cox newspapers for the Miami News, wherein he ably presented the story of this tragic and untimely incident. There was also spread on the RECORD an editorial from a Knight newspaper, the Miami Herald, dated February 26, titled "No Right To Riot."

The day before the appearance of the four or five picketing members of the Committee for Nonviolent Action in front of the Cuban Revolutionary Council headquarters in Miami, and the ensuing riotous action of the Cuban refugees, the editorial staff of the Miami News, in the evening edition of February 20, 1963, carried the following editorial comment:

> REFUGEES SHOULD IGNORE PEACE AGITATORS
>
> The Committee for Nonviolent Action seems determined to keep busy until it stirs up a little violent action.
>
> What these extreme pacifists hope to accomplish by announcing—2 days in advance—that pickets will parade tomorrow in front of the Cuban Revolutionary Council headquarters is not too hard to understand. The refugee would only be playing into their hands by marching against the pickets in force.
>
> The Cuban radio announcer who urged the demonstration against the pickets showed poor judgment. A riot on Biscayne Boulevard would end a 4-year record of peaceful assimilation by the Cubans into the community, a record remarkably free of violence.
>
> There is no disposition here to come out against peace, nor against the right of people to assemble or picket for special causes, no matter how unpopular or extreme the causes.
>
> But we think the Committee for Nonviolent Action has tipped its hand in electing to taunt a refugee population that is understandably edgy and which has no vote in the political matters that interest the committee.
>
> This committee is out to make propaganda for a program which, if followed along its unlikely course, would leave the United States unarmed and defenseless against communism. Their exploitation of the Cuban refugees is calloused and cruel, and the refugees would be smart to ignore them.

On February 20, 1963, the day prior to the pacifist picketing of the Cuban Refugee Council headquarters, Ralph Renick, vice president in charge of news at WTVJ, channel 4, Miami, issued the following TV editorial:

> The National Committee for Nonviolent Action has been provoking violent action by staging demonstrations in Miami Shores, Coral Gables, and Homestead Air Force Base. Tomorrow the committee members intend to set up shop outside the headquarters of the Cuban Revolutionary Council. It should be said that these people claim they hate nobody. They just want the United States to disarm and disband our military services. The theory is we can trust the Communists to do the same and therefore peace will reign forevermore. This would be great except the Communists have openly demonstrated and stated their intention to take over this little world of ours by whatever means necessary, including deceit and lies. The only thing they can be trusted to do is be untrustworthy.
>
> These pickets are irritating—but the best thing to do is to do nothing; just ignore them. To do otherwise would play into their hands.

On February 21, 1963, Ralph Renick, vice president in charge of news, WTVJ channel 4, Miami, and their Latin news editor, Manolo Reyes, issued the following TV editorial comment:

> CUBAN RIOTS: WHY IT SHOULDN'T HAVE HAPPENED
>
> What happened at Biscayne Boulevard and 17th Street this morning is deplorable. Riot action of any kind can only give a city a black eye and considering the tense state of Caribbean affairs at the moment, a riot in Miami is bound to create undue fear elsewhere that it is somehow unsafe to visit here.
>
> We should like to note that channel 4 in its twice-daily Spanish language news program pleaded for all Cuban exiles to stay clear of the revolutionary council headquarters where the pacifist picketing was to take place.
>
> Last night and this morning, Mayor High appeared on the program, speaking in Spanish, telling Cuban residents to ignore the picketing.
>
> There are probably 150,000 Cubans here—149,700 heeded this advice. The 300 that didn't are guilty of giving all of their fellow exiles a black eye along with the city.
>
> What happened should never have happened. Miami police and firemen are to be commended for efficiently handling a volatile situation. It should be said that the revolutionary council and its leader, Dr. Jose Miro Cardona, did little to prevent the gathering of the mob nor to quell the action which followed at its headquarters.
>
> Channel 4 Latin News Editor Manolo Reyes, on WTVJ's program "News En Espanol," later tonight and tomorrow morning, will carry an editorial addressed to the Cubans saying "the law comes before the will of men and no one is authorized to take justice by his own hand. The law is to be respected above all personal prejudice or emotion or justified anger."
>
> Reyes deplores the fact that a minority group of Cubans fell into the trap made by a group of pacifists. He called upon the Cubans to "think with their head and not their heart."
>
> It is time for Miami's Cuban colony to develop a form of leadership which can exert self-discipline. To do otherwise will gravitate this community to an explosive state of human relations which will hurt the exiles, the town and its permanent population.

These timely and well-stated words of warning, unfortunately, went unheeded. Nonetheless, they bear repeating lest some other persons with misguided, or possibly purposeful intentions, again attempt to rile the emotions of persons who have been angered and oppressed by the Communist tyranny within their homeland, Cuba.

In our great country, within the framework of our democracy, we provide that each citizen shall have the basic right to agree or disagree, or present his views, publicly or otherwise, by peaceful means.

These are the rights which the Communist would have us destroy.

The Cuban refugee would do well to remember that had he, and other persons oppressed by tyrannical governments ruled from extremes of either the right or the left, been permitted the right to think, speak, and act peacefully, without fear of governmental reprisal, he might not have found himself today, nor during prior governmental regimes, the victim of oppression.

They would do well to remember that in our democracy, we settle our differences through judicial, peaceful means rather than with emotional and riotous outbursts.

Those who demonstrate for peace would similarly do well to remember that they may well be aiding the cause of communism and those who would overthrow the Government—that peace cannot be found through public actions that tend to incite riot—nor those actions that prey upon the emotions of refugees from oppression.

The incident of February 21 should not have occurred and should not happen again.

CUBAN REFUGEES RESPONSIBILITY OF ENTIRE NATION—NOT JUST SOUTH FLORIDA

Mr. Speaker, through January 25, 1963, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare reports they have resettled 53,974 Cuban refugees from Miami, Dade County, Fla., to other parts of the United States. This is not quite one-third of the 157,525 persons who had entered the United States and registered at Miami from Cuba.

Untold numbers of Cuban refugees who entered the Miami area did not register. Therefore, the 157,525 Cuban refugees figure is not entirely accurate. Reliable sources estimate the actual number of Cuban refugees entering the south Florida area at 200,000 or more.

Whether the figure is 105,000 or 155,000 Cuban refugees still remaining in Miami is immaterial.

The point is that there are well over 100,000, in fact maybe as many as 200,000 Cuban refugees, still in the Greater Miami, Fla., community; an area which had a population of only 1 million.

No community, no matter how large, could withstand the almost immediate impact of a 10- to 20-percent increase in population; the number of persons bringing about this increase being penniless and destitute without homes, clothing, food, in many cases without friends, with little or no knowledge of the English language, and all unemployed.

The situation is worsened by the fact that there already existed in Dade County, Fla., a serious unemployment problem—so much so that the U.S. Department of Labor and the Area Redevelopment Administration had long ago found that there were a sufficient number of unemployed American citizens so as to qualify Dade County as a class D labor surplus market area.

The result: The American citizens of south Florida were thrown into open competition with the Cuban refugees for the very limited number of jobs available.

The Cuban refugee, in desperate straits, was willing to work for ridiculously low wages. Employers in a distressed State, seeking to keep their economic heads above water, engaged the refugee at a lesser wage, and an American thereby became unemployed. Approximately 30,000 Cuban refugees are employed in the Miami area.

The laboring classes—and the Negro particularly—suffered from the influx of the refugees who entered in large numbers in the field of domestic work, light manufacturing, and the many other areas of nonskilled as well as professional labor. They had no Cuban refugee center to turn to when their jobs were gone and their funds expired. Often, he became the refugee—pulling up stakes before his funds ran completely out; some left Florida and went to areas foreign to them in search of work.

We are all well aware of the tremendous sum of money that the Federal Government has pumped into the Dade County area to assist with the Cuban refugee situation. Without this Federal financial assistance, the community might well have been substantially more economically distressed.

The Greater Miami-Dade County area has opened its arms and its pocketbooks to these refugees and has done and will continue to do everything humanly possible to assist them to maintain their livelihood and their honor.

However, the situation in Miami obviously did not result from foreign policy actions of the Floridians. The responsibility is that of the entire Nation. Uttering nice words about the wonderful way in which the Miamians have reacted to the situation was, and is, no substitute for more equitable actions—actions of other cities and States and the Federal Government to share in greater proportion a burden which is theirs as well.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FASCELL. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. ALBERT. I want to commend the gentleman on the forceful and fair manner in which he is bringing this problem to the House and to commend his city on the tremendous job it has done in dealing with these people who are refugees from a tyranny that seeks to threaten the United States. I think the job has national implications, and I think the gentleman in pointing up its national implications is doing a service to this country as well as to his own constituents.

Mr. FASCELL. I thank the gentleman. This is one purpose of my remarks as I have made them from time to time on this subject on the floor of this House; also I seek the continued assistance of our House Democratic leadership, which has assisted us so generously as it has other areas which have a similar unemployment problem.

Along with the majority of Congress, I have strongly supported some administration policies dealing with the economic plight of our American citizens whether in West Virginia, Florida, Pennsylvania, Detroit, or some other State. I want to advise any Member of Congress if he wants to listen to me that all it takes is for serious economic distress to happen to you one time, to your district and your people, and as you see other economically distressed areas around the country, you will decide quickly that your problem is not one for the community to take care of by itself.

Every day here in Congress we have to draw a line regarding each issue we confront. Sure, it is easy to be in political opposition to anything. We all know that. That is no trick. But blind political oppositon is also the height of irresponsibility. But in the stand we individually take on every issue there is a right place to draw a line based on our own criteria and responsible judgment, whether our decision is based on what we responsibly believe is the national interest, the national security, the desires of our constituents, or the principles of our party.

That is why I was very much interested in the remarks previously made here today by our distinguished majority whip on this question of blind political opposition and irresponsibility. It does not make any difference whether the Republicans are in power or the Democrats are in power, we have to recognize the problems in this country and then attempt to do the best within our ability and judgment to meet and solve those problems. There we are going to have arguments. There we are going to make political capital out of the differences which exist, as to how the country's needs should be met. That is part of the American political system. This is what we love, this is what we fight for.

But as was so ably stated by the distinguished gentleman from Oklahoma, our majority leader, Hon. Carl Albert, and also in the forceful remarks of the distinguished majority whip, the gentleman from Louisiana, Mr. Hale Boggs, the pattern of irresponsible political attack that seems to be emerging I call frightening, discouraging, I call disheartening, and I call downright dangerous. The pattern of irresponsibility is to attack blindly; attack the democratic institution of the Congress of the United States; attack it; weaken the confidence of the American people in the greatest democratic assemblage the world has ever known; destroy it; attack the Chief Executive of the United States; attack the Commander in Chief of our Armed Forces; attack, destroy, and weaken the confidence of the American people in the ability of a democratic government to hold off the tyranny of communism; attack the Defense Department; weaken and destroy the confidence of the American people in the ability of our military people to exercise the proper judgment and to meet the challenges that we have to face; attack and destroy the State

Department; weaken the confidence of the American people in those who are responsible for carrying out the foreign policy decisions of the United States; attack the Supreme Court, abolish it, modify it, change its powers, weaken the confidence of the American people in the democratic institution of divided powers and authority.

Do all this—for political purposes? God forbid—but the dangerous pattern faintly but clearly emerges out of the cloud of irresponsible political venom filling the air.

Do all this—to accomplish what?

Win the Congress? Win the White House? Throw out the "ins"?

Let us have our political opposition. Let us have our political fights. Let us draw the lines on the issues. Let us call them very clearly to the attention of the American people. But let us be responsible and preserve, not attack, our democratic institutions. Let us be responsible and then go to our own people and let them decide who should carry on.

Mr. Speaker, it is in this context that I bring to this body today the problems that exist in my area with respect to the Cuban refugees who are fleeing the tyranny of communism in Cuba.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FASCELL. I yield to my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. PEPPER. I want to associate myself very strongly with the sentiments expressed by my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. Fascell] and to ask him whether in that part of his remarks which I did not hear he called attention to the fact that the gentleman and I have planned to hold hearings within a few days in Miami and to have all the agencies of the Federal Government that have to do with the relocation program of the Cuban refugees present with us and to let them, in our presence, hear the sentiment of the people of our country as to the impact, economic and otherwise, of the Cuban refugees upon our economy. Did my distinguished colleague cover that in his very able remarks?

Mr. FASCELL. I thank the distinguished gentleman, who is my able colleague from my former district. I did not include that in my remarks and I am very happy that the gentleman made mention of it. I want to take this opportunity, by the way, since I have not had the opportunity before, to say I am delighted that my district has been split in half and that you now so ably represent the other half. I also want to say here on the record that from the day you have been here you have interested yourself ably in this problem and have exercised great leadership and knowledge with respect to it. I know that we can solve this problem. I thank the gentleman for his remarks.

Mr. PEPPER. I thank my colleague.

MINNESOTA TACONITE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. Ryan of New York). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MacGregor] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. MacGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. MacGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, all of us in this body are concerned, as are our colleagues in the other body, with the problems of our country's depressed areas. All of us are disturbed by the continuing problem of serious unemployment in this country. We are concerned with proper solutions to the problems of these economically unfortunate areas, and many of us recognize that the best solutions lie in the efforts of private citizens, private associations, and companies, and the efforts of local and State governments.

In this connection, there is about to be written in the State of Minnesota a successful conclusion to an effort to properly bring to northeastern Minnesota the economic health which that area of the State and of the country deserves to enjoy. That success story is not the result of action by the Federal Government, but rather it stems from concerted activity by municipal and local government officials, by the executive and legislative branches of the Minnesota State government, and by officials of the United States Steel Corp. and the United Steelworkers.

Mr. Speaker, as a Congressman from the State of Minnesota I desire to inform the House of Representatives of an issue of vital importance to the people of economically depressed northeastern Minnesota, indeed to the entire State of Minnesota, and to the Nation. That issue is taconite, and the related attempt to add a taconite tax amendment to the Minnesota State constitution. The argument for the amendment had been arrived at only after careful study and analysis. I should like to present some of the background of this proposal.

For more than three-quarters of a century, Minnesota and iron ore have been linked together. Since 1884, when the Soudan Mine was opened on the Vermilion Range, iron mining has played a major role in Minnesota's economy.

Vermilion Range iron mining operations were much like those of Michigan and other areas—underground mining for the most part. But when the great Mesabi Range began to sprout mining camps, a revolution was about to begin in the American iron and steel business. Never before had iron ore of such rich quality been attainable so easily from open pits.

The Mesabi Range began to produce ore shortly after 1890 when iron ore was discovered near Iron Mountain, Minn. Further discoveries near Biwabik led to the construction of the Duluth, Mesabi, and Northern Railroad line in 1892, when the first Mesabi ore was shipped to dockside in Duluth.

The Mesabi Range proved to be far larger than any of its discoverers had ever dreamed. Within a few years after 1892, the ore—chiefly soft hematite—was discovered all the way from Babbitt on the east to Grand Rapids, 110 miles to the southwest. Then when ore shipments from the Cuyuna Range began to flow down the Great Lakes in 1911, Minnesota's position as the world's foremost iron ore producer was assured.

As mining methods improved, and with the demands of World War I and the economic growth that followed it in the 1920's, Minnesota's importance as a source of iron ore steadily grew. By 1940, Minnesota had produced more than 1.2 billion tons of iron ore. Indeed, Minnesota had the lion's share of the iron ore market.

World War II brought an even greater demand for Minnesota ore, and during the 5 war years, Minnesota's mining industry produced over 338 million tons of ore—ore for all but a minute percentage of our war armaments. And the next 5 years saw only a slight lessening of the need for Minnesota-produced ore, with 295 million tons being shipped.

Then came the Korean war and the prosperity of the 1950's—a time during which Minnesota had its biggest ore-producing years—79 million tons in 1951, a Korean war year, and 81 million tons in 1953. These were good years for Minnesota and its iron mining industry, good years for iron miners and their communities.

Today, however, conditions are much different. Minnesota no longer has a monopoly on iron ore sources. In fact, our largest fields of rich, pure ore are close to being depleted. Ore today is being produced in dozens of different places, all of which compete with our Minnesota ore. While Minnesota's share of the iron ore market has declined, the State has been unable to keep pace with other areas in attracting investments for iron ore products.

PROBLEMS FOR MINNESOTA ORE PRODUCERS

Actually, Minnesota's iron ore problem can be traced to a number of different causes—all of which have contributed to the overall problem. The problem, basically, is that Minnesota no longer dominates the market for iron ore as it previously has. The reason for this loss of hold on the market is that other areas can produce ore of equal or better quality at an equal or lower cost. If iron ore cannot compete on the quality-cost front, then it cannot sell, and if it does not sell, there are no opportunities for jobs. This is the current problem—demand for high-quality ore at a reasonable and competitive cost.

It would seem reasonable to assume that iron ore produced in Minnesota should cost approximately the same as iron ore produced elsewhere in the Nation, if not in the world when added to shipping costs, but it does not. Iron ore, depending on its quality and structure, sells for a certain price in a competitive market. This does not mean, however, that all iron ore producers make the same profit on their ore, because it may cost a producer in one place more to mine and treat the ore than it does a producer in another. The Minnesota iron ore producer may have higher costs than his counterpart in, say, Michigan, Missouri, Canada, or Venezuela.

In Minnesota, as elsewhere, taxes are a cost to be met. Full and true value is supposed to be the market value of the property if it were to be sold. In practice, however, assessors do not value property in this way. According to the Minnesota Department of Taxation, the average full and true value of real property in Minnesota as valued by assessors amounts to only 34.2 percent of the property's actual market value.

The practice of undervaluing property is common throughout the State. This practice does not apply, though, in the case of iron ore. Iron ore is valued by the State Department of Taxation. It is not valued by local assessors. Drill cores and other data taken from the various mining properties are reported to the School of Mines of the University of Minnesota. The School of Mines then reports the tonnage figures and the quality analysis of the ore to the Commissioner of Taxation. He then values the ore at 100 percent of its market value.

It has been argued that these differences in assessment practices mean that there are great discrepancies between the valuation of mineral and nonmineral properties. They point to the average valuation of nonmineral property in St. Louis County, which is 20 percent of market value and where most of the mines are located, comparing it to mineral properties, which are valued at 100 percent of market value.

This combination of factors—the higher assessment rate, and the undervaluing of nonmineral property—means that iron mining companies are required to pay up to 20 times more in property tax dollars than nonmining properties of the same value.

Higher State and local taxes for mining have been upheld by the natural heritage theory, a position which holds that removal of an irreplacable raw material should be taxed higher than other products. Local governments and the State government have looked to iron ore as a major source of tax revenues, and both political parties for years have based this policy on the natural heritage theory.

Basically, there are three taxes on iron ore in Minnesota. There is the ad valorem, or general property tax, the occupation tax, and the royalty tax. The ad valorem tax is a general property tax levied against real and personal property, with certain exemptions, and requires that mined and unmined ore be assessed at 50 percent of the appraised full and true value. Other property in Minnesota is assessed at rates ranging from 40 percent of full and true value down to 10 percent.

The occupation tax is not designed to tax profits like the corporation income tax, but instead, it is a tax on the occupation of mining—a tax to be paid for the right to do business in Minnesota.

The occupation tax was established 40 years ago when the people passed an amendment to the State constitution setting up a special tax for mining. There was some question at the time regarding the legality of creating a special tax for iron mining which would have been different from that imposed on other business in the State, but on November 7, 1922, the occupation tax amendment passed by an overwhelming vote. At current levels, the occupation tax amounts to 14.25 percent of the value of the ore at the mouth of the mine, versus the present corporation income tax rate of 10.2 percent.

The third ore tax is a royalty tax. A royalty is a payment made by the mine operator to the owner of the land which is being mined. In Minnesota there is a tax on these payments. In other words the mine operator pays twice, once to the landowner, and again to the State in the form of a tax on the royalty payment.

TACONITE: WHAT IS IT?

Taconite first attracted the interest of an early prospector named Peter Mitchell. Mitchell traveled through northeastern Minnesota in 1869, 1870, and 1871, and sank some test pits in the Babbitt area. While Mitchell felt that taconite offered great promise, 80 years were to pass before taconite began to show real signs of fulfilling that promise.

Taconite is the basic rock of the Mesabi iron formation. It is a sedimentary deposit laid down, according to some estimates, around 1 billion years ago. The vast deposits of taconite, stretching from Babbitt on the east to Grand Rapids on the southwest, underwent a number of physical changes over the millions of years of its formation. On the eastern end of the Mesabi Range some hot, molten material flowed from the earth near the taconite deposits, and the tremendous heat baked the rock, giving it its extreme hardness and also converting its iron content from hematite to magnetite. Elsewhere, along the formation, where the taconite was not so hard, the forces of nature broke up the taconite in certain areas allowing ground waters and erosion to carry away silicate and other impurities. It was this action which formed the natural iron ore deposits of the Mesabi Range.

Taconite, then, is the iron-bearing formation of the Mesabi Range. For the most part, it contains only 25 to 30 percent iron, in the form of tiny particles, spread through the taconite. Taconite derives its name from the Taconic Mountains of western Massachusetts. A geologist noted similarities between the two areas and named the material taconite.

Today taconite is often called an ore, but for years it was considered to be too low in iron content to be an ore. Taconite has been referred to as "lean and mean." Since taconite is not very high in iron content, it received little attention. The direct shipping ores of the Mesabi were being developed, and no one had much time for the supposedly inferior product.

There were a few, however, who did see great potentials in taconite, and among these few was a young electrical engineer at the University of Minnesota, E. W. Davis. Davis worked, experimentally, with magnetic taconite from the Mesabi Range. He developed a laboratory device which could separate the magnetic iron ore particles from the waste material in the taconite, and he worked to develop methods of breaking up the hard, stubborn rock.

As the years passed Davis continued his work at the mines experiment station of the University's School of Mines, as did various mining companies and private research organizations. In the 1930's, two mining companies were formed for the possible development of taconite. They were Reserve Mining Co. and Erie Mining Co.

Then, in 1941, the Minnesota Legislature passed a bill which was to have far-reaching effect upon Minnesota's taconite potential. Again Davis played an important role in this effort. The bill for the taconite tax law passed the conservative house and senate, and was signed into law by Republican Gov. Harold Stassen. The purpose of the law was to stimulate development of taconite processing. Its effect is widely known. Taconite companies moved ahead with their plans, secured investment money approaching half a billion dollars in total, and proceeded with construction work.

Taconite developments in Minnesota, and the development of similar mineral resources in other areas do require vast amounts of investment in money. Insofar as the American steel industry's interest in domestic and continental ores is concerned, attention seems to have been shifted from direct shipping high grade ores—of which there is a rapidly dwindling supply now known in the United States—to low-grade ores, of which we have great abundance. With such great and scattered supplies of these low-grade ores available, competition is keen for investment money to develop local projects.

While it is true that Minnesota in prior years virtually monopolized the American iron ore market, it is equally true today that Minnesota's share of this market has drastically declined. In 1950, for example, Minnesota mines supplied 62 percent of the iron ore used in the American steel industry, while other U.S. areas supplied 30 percent, and foreign imports supplied but 8 percent. However, by 1960, Minnesota's share had fallen to but 47 percent; other U.S. areas went down to 24 percent, but foreign imports jumped to 29 percent.

In analyzing the reasons for this Minnesota decline, the same two factors mentioned previously stand out—cost and quality. Mining officials say that taxes, as a part of their costs, discourage investors from making capital available for Minnesota ore projects in the taconite field. It is argued that vast tonnages of high-quality and taconite-type ores in other States and nations makes it mandatory for Minnesota to improve both its ore product and its tax structure if it is to be competitive once again in the iron ore market, in which Canadian, Brazilian, Peruvian, Venezuelan, and Liberian producers are now active, as well as other American States.

Taconite operations in Minnesota currently employ about 5,000 persons. Since taconite operations continue through the winter months, these—unlike high-grade ore positions—are year-round jobs. Naturally, enlargement of Minnesota's taconite industry would not produce economic solvency for the area immediately. But from the ground breaking for a new plant right on through the start of production, growth would come gradually and increase rapidly in an area that today has one of the highest percentages of unemployment and economic depression in the Nation. The raw materials are there—the product, and the workers, but the product needs developing, and the men need jobs.

The U.S. Chamber of Commerce in 1956 prepared a study which shows that for every 100 new factory workers in a community, there are 296 more people, 112 more households, 51 more schoolchildren, $590,000 more in personal income every year, $270,000 more in bank deposits, 107 more passenger cars registered, 174 more workers employed, 4 more retail establishments, and $360,000 more in retail sales per year.

PRESENT TACONITE TAXES IN MINNESOTA

State and local taxes on taconite operations differ from those on natural iron ore operations. The taconite tax law passed by the legislature in 1941 exempted taconite from the ad valorem taxes paid by other mining companies. Instead, a tonnage tax was imposed amounting to 5 cents for each gross ton of taconite concentrate. An additional one-tenth of a cent is imposed for each 1 percent of iron content in the concentrate in excess of 55 percent. This production tax amounts to between 5 and 6 cents per ton of taconite concentrate, since Minnesota taconite products contain about 62 percent iron.

The taconite tax is paid in lieu of ad valorem taxes, although taconite companies are required to pay a property tax of $1 per acre on lands containing unmined taconite. The taconite tax is basically designed to support local units of government.

Taconite companies in Minnesota are also required to pay a railroad gross earnings tax of 5 percent. Both Erie Mining Co. and Reserve Mining Co. own their own railroad facilities which are used to haul crude taconite or taconite pellets. The law provides that the gross earnings of these railroads are defined as a "sum of money equal to the amount which would be charged under established tariffs of common carriers for the transportation of an equal tonnage of iron ore from Mesabi Range ports at the head of Lake Superior.

The revenue from this tax amounts to 7.4 cents per gross ton of taconite concentrate, and it is distributed in the same way as the taconite tax.

Taconite companies which have had to build new communities also pay additional tax levies for local purposes. More than $13 million in special levies against taconite operations have been passed by various legislative sessions during the past 6 years. These levies have been passed with the support of taconite companies themselves. In addition taconite companies, in building new communities, have paid for the installation of streets, sewers, water treatment plants, recreational facilities, and other items which would normally be paid by property owners.

Taconite companies pay State occupation and royalty taxes. The rate, however, is lower than it is for natural ore producers. When the legislature added the surtax on the occupation tax, taconite operations were not included. Therefore, the basic rate of the occupation tax on taconite operations is 11 percent of the value of the product at the plant. The basic rate of the royalty tax, likewise, is 11 percent. Added to this basic rate for the occupation and royalty tax, is 1 percent for the veterans bonus. Labor credits can be applied against both the occupation and royalty taxes, as they can with natural ore operations.

A special tax law was written during the 1959 session of the Minnesota Legislature to provide for the taxation of semitaconite. The semitaconite tax is quite similar to the taconite production tax, and revenues from it are distributed in the same way as the taconite tax. This tax law was developed to encourage research and investment in the development of semitaconite, another low-grade ore resource found on the western end of the Mesabi Range.

THE TACONITE AMENDMENT: ITS NEED

In the summer of 1960, a group of northeastern Minnesota mayors proposed that something be done to help the distressed condition of the Iron Range where thousands of men had been and still are unemployed, some for 3 or 4 years. Their suggestion came in the form of a proposed amendment to the State constitution which would establish the principle that the taxes imposed upon taconite would be kept in balance with taxes on other industry in the State.

Elmer L. Andersen, then Republican candidate for Governor in 1960, proposed a similar idea during the course of the campaign. In his tax message to the legislature on February 6, 1961, Governor Andersen urged the legislators, as part of the tax program, to "adopt a constitutional amendment that will assure firms engaged in taconite production that their taxes will not exceed those of manufacturing and other industrial concerns. This is simply an assurance of equality, and not a grant of special privilege nor a freezing of tax rates."

On March 24, 1961, the taconite tax amendment was introduced in the legislature. As the Minneapolis Tribune reported the next day:

> Its [the bill's] purpose is to allay the fears of the industry that, if more high-cost plants are built to process lower grade ores, the legislature will single them out for higher taxes. Occupation revenues are expected to drop as high-grade ore production fades.

The regular session bill sought to spur taconite construction plants by specifying that the amendment, if approved, would not become effective until such time as the total capacity of the industry in the State reached 19.5 million tons. It presently is about 17 million. The amendment stated that combined royalty, excise, and occupation taxes imposed on the processing of taconite and semitaconite shall not exceed the taxes computed under present ore tax laws or under income tax laws, whichever are greater.

On April 13, 1961, the liberal-controlled Minnesota House Tax Committee adjourned without taking action on the bill. The committee chairman, apparently motivated by political ambition and the fear that the Republican Governor would be given credit for this piece of legislation, said he planned no more meetings of the committee in the regular session. The vote on the motion for adjournment followed strict party lines, as did the vote killing the bill. The previous Tuesday the conservative-controlled Minnesota Senate Tax Committee had all but unanimously approved the measure.

With the defeat of the bill in the house, the matter was temporarily dropped in capitol halls, but it was soon to come up again. In the meantime, the full fury of an aroused electorate was to be felt in the St. Paul mayoralty election.

The amendment had originated with the nonpolitical Northeastern Minnesota Mayors Association, many members of which are lifelong Democrats. Republican Gov. Elmer L. Andersen and strong Republican Party support gave the bill a truly bipartisan flavor. The amendment dealt only with State taxes, leaving local tax policies to the communities. It simply recognized that times have changed in the mining industry, and the industry was building in States which were willing to take action to stimulate investment. The amendment was to be Minnesota's demonstration of its desire to successfully compete with its sister States and foreign nations.

Liberal State legislators and the Democrat-Farmer-Labor Party in Minnesota argued that tax legislation should not be written into the State's constitution. Yet the amendment is needed because of a present constitutional provision passed in 1922 under which special mining taxes are now paid. That provision made it legal for iron mining in Minnesota to be taxed at a rate higher than other industry in the State. The proposed amendment would limit the effect the 1922 law has on taconite at the present time. Futhermore, there are presently 19 amendments and several other sections dealing with State fiscal matters in the present Minnesota State constitution.

These same groups further argued that there was no need for a constitutional amendment. If any change were needed, they maintained, a legislative statute certainly should be sufficient. The difference is both simple and far-reaching. A statute can be passed by one session of the legislature and repealed by the next, indeed passed and repealed by the same session if they so desired; while an amendment could certainly be repealed, it would take a vote of the people to do so, and is a much more permanent and stable assurance to the mining industry that they are both protected and the provision is going to stay on the books for a while. After the tax "bleeding" the industry underwent in Minnesota when the State had a monopoly on its raw material, their concern is both valid and well justified.

A Minnesota poll of September 10, 1961, showed that 63 percent of all Minnesotans supported the amendment idea, including 55 percent of the Democrats, 76 percent of the Republicans, 71 percent of the Independents, and 64 percent of the labor union members. Since that time the percentage of voters supporting the idea has approached 70. Yet the amendment process continued to be opposed by leaders of the labor unions, the Democrat-Farmer-Labor Party, the Farmers Union, and other liberal-Democrat-Farmer-Labor oriented groups.

On April 25, 1961, Governor Andersen called the legislature into special session. On that date, in an address before the legislature, the Governor said:

> Failure to give our people a chance to vote on a constitutional amendment designed only to assure those engaged in processing taconite and semitaconite to taxation equal to that imposed on other industry could be a tragic mistake. Adoption of this amendment could well be the signal for ore processing development assuring jobs for thousands. There is so much to gain, the assurance is so minimal, the competition so keen, I find your hesitation incredible.

On May 8 testimony began on the controversial amendment before the house tax committee. The bill in the special session was the same as the one in the regular session except for the restrictions as to the effect and the date it should go into effect.

By late afternoon on May 11, the committee had heard all those wishing to speak on the bill and were ready to take the vote. The liberal-Democrat-Farm-Labor leadership, who had been a stumbling block in the regular session, moved to lay the bill on the table. The vote was taken and, almost on straight party lines, the motion passed 16 to 10, thus killing the bill again.

In December of 1961 the Governor once more called a special legislative session, this time a 2-day affair to accomplish congressional redistricting which the Democrat-Farm-Labor-liberal caucus in the legislature had also blocked during the regular and first special session. Again Governor Andersen and the Minnesota Republican Party joined with northeastern Minnesota and statewide civic groups in urging the legislature to put the taconite amendment on the ballot in the 1962 general election. "Just give the people the right to vote," they urged. But again the opposition held their stubborn ground. Again the proposal did not carry the day.

As the 1962 Minnesota State and legislative campaigns grew more heated, the taconite issue played an ever-increasing role in the campaign oratory; Republicans and conservatives were for, Democrat-Farmer-Laborite and liberals were against. The people wanted the right to vote on the amendment. Not receiving that privilege, they vented their anger on many legislators who had prevented them from doing so. Both houses of the Minnesota Legislature are now controlled by the conservatives, the liberals having lost control of the State house for the first time since 1955.

While not as certain as the control of the legislature, it also would appear that the people of Minnesota are finally going to get the right to vote on the taconite tax amendment. The present Minnesota Legisature seems certain to pass the amendment and put it on the November 1964 ballot. The district 33, United Steelworker's Council has endorsed the proposal, and the Democrat-Farmer-Laborite Party seems to be moving toward a compromise position on the matter. Regardless of the outcome of Minnesota's gubernatorial recount now in progress, it is to the lasting credit of Gov. Elmer L. Andersen that he stuck to his guns and that he has contributed greatly to date in bringing the taconite tax amendment to the threshold of victory.

As evidence of what this matter will mean to the State of Minnesota should it be approved by the State's electorate next November, I include herein the following statement made to the Minnesota House of Representatives yesterday by Mr. Christian F. Beukema, president of the Oliver Iron Mining Division of United States Steel Corp.:

Statement of Christian F. Beukema

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee; I welcome the opportunity to appear before your committee to urge favorable consideration of this important piece of legislation. As an official of a major producer of iron ore in Minnesota, I have previously discussed the importance of a favorable tax climate to the competitive position of Minnesota ores.

During the last several years substantial progress has been made in acquainting the people of Minnesota with the mining industry's problems at both the State and local levels and in acquiring their understanding toward reasonable solutions. A start has been made toward finding a solution to the very serious question of fairness in local tax valuations. With increased understanding and cooperation on the part of all concerned we believe more progress will be made in this very essential area so important to the competitive position of natural ores and taconites in Minnesota.

In the light of this belief in the progress made and faith in continued progress to be made on local tax matters, and in order that this committee, Minnesota's legislature and its people may be assured of the position of United States Steel Corp. and Oliver Iron Mining Division and of our desire and intention to continue as a major producer of iron ore in Minnesota, we wish to make the following statement:

We are convinced that the proposed constitutional amendment gives assurance to the taconite industry of an equitable tax climate at the State level and, if recommended to the voters by the legislature, will be approved in the referendum of November 1964. Promptly after the constitutional amendment has been so adopted, United States Steel Corp. will complete engineering and commence construction of a major taconite plant in the vicinity of Mountain Iron, Minn., of not less than 3 or 4 million tons capacity. The new plant will be so designed that it may be expanded readily.

This commitment is offered to assist the unification efforts of all sincerely concerned Minnesotans as they seek satisfactory solutions to the problem of assuring fair tax treatment for taconite and semitaconite. Substantial progress toward a bipartisan approach has already been made. The authorship and submission of this bill with committee sponsorship is one example.

Another example of progress toward a desirable solution is the forthright approach of District 33, United Steelworkers. Through understanding and cooperation with the industry, the United Steelworkers have contributed a practical approach to the issues involved in the constitutional debate. Opening the door to additional jobmaking investments which are so vital to the economic status of northeastern Minnesota is a matter of continuing importance and the position of United Steelworkers recognizes the serious import of this matter.

The deteriorating position of Minnesota natural ores in comparison with high quality ores from many sources has a consequent impact on both present employment and future expectations of employment. The local tax burdens which have been historically carried by natural ores are of such magnitude that they cannot be shifted to taconite and semitaconite if Minnesota is to encourage new investments in taconite plants of substantial capacities. The passage of the constitutional amendment will be reassuring to investors in taconite and will go far toward establishing for the Minnesota mining industry a more competitive position and related increased employment.

United States Steel Corp. believes that further clarification of its position at this time will be of benefit to those who wish to achieve a bipartisan support for the proposed amendment, to those seeking the advantages of taconite investments for the State of Minnesota, and to those whose jobs are dependent upon or benefit from iron ore production.

The commitment now to construct a taconite plant after adoption of this constitutional amendment by the voters at the end of 1964 naturally involves some uncertainties and the commitment must be subject to war, governmental or legal restrictions, or other unusual conditions beyond our control which may delay or prevent the consummation of such a program. With this necessary limitation, it is nevertheless a commitment which United States Steel Corp. willingly undertakes in the interest of all concerned.

This is a statement of major importance for Minnesota and its mining industry; its significance is indicated in the following article from the March 6, 1963, Wall Street Journal:

United States Steel Plans Taconite Plant in Minnesota—Project Hinges on Assurance of Fair Tax Treatment; Issue May Go to Voters—Cost Put at Over $120 Million

St. Paul.—United States Steel Corp.'s Oliver Iron Mining Division said it plans to build a taconite plant near Mountain Iron, Minn., if what it considers fair tax treatment is assured.

Christian F. Beukema, division president, told the Minnesota house of representatives tax committee the company plans a facility "of not less than 3 or 4 million tons capacity" a year. Though he didn't discuss cost, it is estimated such a plant would cost between $120 and $160 million.

Taconite plants extract iron ore from flinty taconite rock and send it in pellet or powder form to steel mills. The low-grade taconite ore requires processing before it can be used.

The committee is considering an amendment to the State constitution which would guarantee the taconite industry that there would be no disproportionate rise in industry taxes for 20 years. Under present Minnesota law, taconite plants are taxed on a tonnage basis instead of under real estate levies applying to other industry. The amendment, if approved by the legislature, must be submitted to the voters.

"We are convinced that the proposed constitutional amendment gives assurance to the taconite industry of an equitable tax climate at the State level and, if recommended to the voters by the legislature, will be approved in the referendum of November 1964," Mr. Beukema said.

Immediately after the amendment's adoption, he said, United States Steel will complete engineering and begin construction of the plant. The division has operated a 1-million-ton capacity pilot taconite plant at Mountain Iron since 1953.

Ford Motor Co. late last month said it is considered a taconite plant at Eveleth, Minn., in association with Oglebay Norton Co., a Cleveland mining company. The plant is understood to have a planned capacity of about 1.5 million tons a year. Erie Mining Co. and Reserve Mining Co., both owned by various steelmakers, have taconite plants in the State, and McLouth Steel Corp. has expressed interest in building one.

The Oliver official said the company's commitment "naturally involves some uncertainties and must be subject to war, governmental or legal restrictions or other unusual conditions beyond our control which may delay or prevent the consummation of such a program."

Walter E. Weber, vice president of Hanna Mining Co., told the committee Hanna is considering building a plant in Minnesota for processing semitaconite. The facility would have a capacity of 1.5 million to 2 million tons annually and cost $30 to $60 million, he said.

In Cleveland, Hanna officials said many aspects of the plans still had to be considered before the company moved ahead with the project.

Semitaconite is similar to taconite but requires a different processing method.

THE FEDERAL EXCISE TAX ON AUTOMOBILES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CHAMBERLAIN] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, in his recent message to the Congress, the President said that tax reduction and reform is the most urgent task confronting the Congress in 1963. The announced objectives of the President's program are to step up the growth and vigor of our national economy—to increase job and investment opportunities—to improve our productivity.

Now that the initial effect of the President's proposals have given way to deeper reflection of specific provisions for tax reform, this whole program is encountering serious resistance. Many of the recommendations for so-called reforms are hard to justify and have only created confusion and controversy. The President himself has made the situation more puzzling when, in the face of a budget deficit of approximately $12 billion this year, he appears to be retreating from his insistence for tax reform by indicating his willingness to accept a tax cut without tax revision.

In seeking a way to accomplish the urgent objective of spurring our economy, I simply cannot comprehend why the administration has given no consideration to the possibility of reducing or repealing the discriminatory 10 percent automobile excise tax which is imposed on the largest single segment of our economy. Not only has the administration ignored the possibility of excise tax reduction, but its recommendations to stimulate economic activity are based upon the premise that our largest industrial community should, in fact, continue to pay a temporary wartime tax that has no parallel in our entire tax structure.

As all of you must be quite aware, I have long advocated the repeal or reduction of this tax and now, with public discussions centering around the use of tax reduction as a stimulant to our economy, it seems to me that the climate has never been more appropriate, the stage was never so well set, to achieve this, and to give real impetus to our whole economy at the same time.

Year after year, I have vigorously protested the extension of this tax through every source available to me. I have spoken from the floor of the house, until some have dubbed me the "automobile horn of Congress"; I have inserted pertinent material in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which I felt warranted serious study; I have written letters not only to my colleagues, but to many officials in the executive department; I have originated extensive research on the subject; and I have appeared before the House Ways and Means Committee whenever I have been permitted to do so.

Just recently my attention has been called to an analysis prepared last December by the Automobile Manufacturers Association, "The Federal Excise Tax on New Passenger Automobiles," which so clearly sets forth the many factors involved that I would like to have it included in the RECORD in its entirety.

I anticipate that it will not be many weeks before we will be called upon to act on recommendations for tax revision and also to extend our present excise taxes. With this in mind, I urge all of you to give this analysis your careful examination and study, for I am confident it will convince you that here is an opportunity to help fulfill the President's objective of stimulating our economy and, as I have said, correct a gross inequity in our tax structure:

THE FEDERAL EXCISE TAX ON NEW PASSENGER AUTOMOBILES

SUMMARY

This statement reviews the economic consequences arising from the Federal 10-percent excise tax on new passenger automobiles, which averages $230 per car, and points out the necessity for the elimination or substantial reduction of this excessive wartime rate in the interest of national economic growth as well as tax equity.

The postwar growth of the U.S. economy is not attributable to any single factor, but rather has reflected the conjunction of a great many forces arising out of both the war and the depression preceding it. Under these circumstances, economic demand increased almost without regard to tax or other deterrents. The momentum of this process certainly stimulated U.S. economic growth through 1957. Since 1957, the growth rate has been slower; and it is no longer possible to endorse repressive taxation on the one hand, while giving allegiance to economic growth on the other.

The present Federal excise tax structure is largely a product of war emergency needs to increase Federal revenues and to reduce consumption. Under such circumstances, the overall economic consequences of such excises have understandably been of secondary concern. In today's climate of slow economic growth, it is especially necessary to reconsider and reduce such deterrents as the 10-percent excise tax on new passenger automobiles.

In recent years, the selective and discriminatory aspects of the new passenger automobile excise tax have become even more pronounced as Congress has granted rate reductions in the excise tax on other consumer goods and services. It will be recalled that, in recent years, tax reductions have been made by Congress on numerous items—electric, gas, and oil appliances, refrigerators, jewelry, cosmetics, and only this year on passenger rail, bus, and airline fares. A new passenger automobile is the principal consumer durable which is still subject to tax at wartime rates. In the case of a new passenger car, this averages about $230, an amount in excess of the annual individual income tax paid by several million taxpayers. Over 11 years have now passed since the current 10 percent rate was first imposed; and over 21 years have elapsed since the rate was increased from 3½ to 7 percent to meet the needs of World War II.

Viewed in terms of its broad economic impact, the 10 percent excise tax on new passenger cars is comparable in its effect to a tariff—designed to limit rather than to stimulate consumption. In fact, it is clear that the increases to 7 percent and then to 10 percent were intended to discourage consumption of cars and raw materials as well as to increase Federal revenues. The long-term direct result in an economy no longer primarily oriented toward war is less vigorous growth—less production, less employment, and less investment than would otherwise be forthcoming. The indirect results of such repressive taxation touch all the hundreds of thousands of businesses, small and large, that depend upon the growing production and use of passenger automobiles.

The automotive industry's vital role in the economy is clear—it provides about 6 million jobs in the production, distribution and service of its product and constitutes nearly 10 percent of the Nation's gross national product. In 1960, for example, the automotive industry consumed 21 percent of all steel, 62 percent of all rubber, 11 percent of all aluminum, 47 percent of all lead, and 35 percent of all the zinc used in the United States. In addition, it provides a substantial share of the market for a host of other materials and products—textiles, copper, electrical goods.

In the post World War II period, the automotive industry's $14 billion investment in new plant and equipment plus added billions for new tools and techniques has provided an important stimulus and been an innovating force felt throughout the whole economy. New jobs and new products have resulted from these automotive investments.

Moreover, the indirect effects of the industry have been even more beneficial to the economy. The growth of the passenger car industry has been the stimulus which has reshaped the American landscape—new highways, new urban developments, new shopping centers and new housing have all been affected and stimulated by the growth of automobile use. Thus, the industry generates effects on consumption and investment that are far more widespread than almost any other industry's contribution since the railroads opened up the country in the 19th century.

The many requests by the automobile industry in the past for relief from the burden of a high and discriminatory excise tax rate have received the careful and sympathetic consideration of the congressional tax committees and the Treasury. Nevertheless, immediate revenue needs have been given priority in considering the tax on automobiles on past occasions. Now, in conjunction with a general review of the Federal tax structure's effects on economic growth, the longrun effects of the automobile tax also require further consideration. To the extent that this tax acts as a brake on the Nation's economic growth, it may actually impede the related growth in Federal tax revenues from all sources.

If the automobile excise tax were reduced from 10 percent to, say, 3 percent, it is estimated that $1 billion of added purchasing power would be immediately released. Normally, an increase in consumer income of two times the amount of the tax cut, in this case about $2 billion, would be added annually to the income stream. In turn, this $2 billion increase would generate an estimated $600 million additional Federal tax revenues. This increase would offset 60 percent of the immediate revenue reduction attributable to a 7-percentage-point cut in the automobile excise tax rate.

There is a growing realization in and out of Government that the current tax structure constitutes a drag on economic growth. This view also holds that, in the long run, the revenue requirements of the Federal Government can best be met by a vigorously expanding economy. Ultimately, elimination of the present 10-percent Federal excise tax on passenger cars, and presently, a substantial reduction in the tax from 10 percent to not more than 3 percent would remove a discriminatory levy on the sale of new automobiles. This levy has been permitted, for short-term considerations, to persist too long after the emergencies which prompted its imposition.

BACKGROUND

History of the automobile excise tax

The crises of war in this century have imposed two major economic requirements on the national economy. The first was the need for a prompt increase in Federal revenues to finance war costs. The second need was to discourage private demand in order to release economic resources required for the war effort. Excise taxes, of which the automobile excise is an outstanding example, have served both purposes efficiently in wartime. However, under wartime circumstances, measures to stimulate the rate of economic growth were not and did not need to be vital considerations. The economy operated at forced draft with full or overfull utilization of labor and capital facilities to meet military demands.

The first automobile excise tax was imposed during World War I at a rate of 3 percent of the manufacturer's selling price. A subsequent increase to 5 percent was enacted early in 1919 to help defray the war costs and those of demobilization. However, Congress recognized the war-related nature of the tax, and within a few years first reduced and then repealed the emergency automobile excises created by the war emergency. Thus, in 1926, the 5 percent tax on passenger cars was reduced to 3 percent, and in 1928, the tax was repealed. In the face of these tax reductions, overall Government revenues continued to increase steadily during the 1920's. In fact, the tax reductions which left more dollars in the hands of consumers may well have played an important role in the vigor displayed by the economy during this period.

To meet a budgetary crisis arising out of the depression, and in lieu of a general manufacturer's sales tax, a number of emergency excise taxes were imposed in the economically depressed year of 1932. One such tax was the 3-percent excise tax imposed on new passenger automobiles. These selective excises were continued during the depression years. No definite answer can be given as to the extent that the imposition of these taxes during the depression may have retarded recovery. However, it is noteworthy that, even under the growing pressures of a rearming economy, following the outbreak of actual war in Europe in 1939, Congress saw fit to impose an automobile excise tax of only 3½ percent in 1940. This was followed by an increase to 7 percent in the fall of 1941. This rate, however, was largely ineffective during the war, owing to production limitations. And, in the immediate postwar years, the pressures of pent-up demand effectively obscured the economic effects of the tax.

With the outbreak of the Korean war, it will be recalled, the automobile excise rate was increased to a "temporary" 10 percent. But this "temporary" Korean war rate has been continued for over 11 years despite the fact that wartime inflationary pressures, which obscure the economic effects of discriminatory excise taxes, have long since vanished.

The historical record of the legislative changes in the Federal excise tax on new passenger cars since 1917 is shown in the table below:

Federal excise tax rates on new passenger automobiles 1917–62

[Excise tax rate on manufacturer's selling price]

Effective date:	*Percent*
Oct. 4, 1917	3
Feb. 25, 1919	5
Mar. 28, 1926	3
May 29, 1928	-----
June 21, 1932	3
July 1, 1940	3½
Oct. 1, 1941	7
Nov. 1, 1951, to date	10

The high wartime automobile excise tax rate should now be modified to a level compatible with our longrun peacetime economic goals of growth and full employment. With the current emphasis on restructuring the Federal tax system to accomplish these objectives, Congress now has such an opportunity.

Congressional action on other emergency excise taxes

While the 10 percent automobile excise tax has remained unchanged since the Korean war, Congress has subsequently reduced or repealed numerous other so-called emergency taxes on both goods and services. In 1954, Congress reduced the Federal excise taxes on several major groups of consumer goods. These included refrigerators, electric, gas and oil appliances, as well as jewelry, cameras, and sporting goods.

In 1954, Congress also lowered the excise taxes on general admissions and local telephone service. Subsequently, in 1958, the excise taxes on the transportation of freight and the movement of oil by pipeline were repealed. Only this year, the 10 percent tax on rail and bus fares was repealed, while the 10 percent tax on air fares was reduced to 5 percent.

These periodic excise tax reductions on other goods and services have accentuated the selective and discriminatory nature of the 10 percent tax on new passenger cars. A new automobile is the principal consumer durable goods still subject to excise tax at wartime rates. This tax averages about $230 per car, an amount in excess of the annual individual income tax paid by several millions of taxpayers.

Vital economic use of passenger automobile

The passenger automobile, today, plays a vital role in the Nation's economic life. For a host of business and professional men, such as doctors, salesmen, lawyers, accountants, and insurance representatives, a car is a vital business tool contributing importantly to their efficiency. Recent studies prepared by the Bureau of Public Roads of the U.S. Department of Commerce disclosed the fact that car use by the general public is predominantly for necessity—e.g., for business, school and shopping purposes, with less than 20 percent of all automobile trips by urban residents being made for social or recreational purposes. Americans find their cars essential to modern living and business.

Congress, in enacting the 10-percent rate on passenger cars, acknowledged the burden imposed by this high rate on car purchases. Thus, both the House Ways and Means Committee and the Senate Finance Committee in their reports on the Revenue Act of 1951, stated:

"However, your committee recognizes that cars represent a necessity to a large segment of the population under present conditions and, therefore, deemed it inappropriate to increase the rate above 10 percent on the manufacturer's price, the rate applying in the case of most manufacturers' excises. Moreover, the purchase of a car represents a larger outlay on the part of the consumer than is true in the case of most other durable consumption items, with the result that the amount of the tax payment in these cases is larger than in the purchase of other durable goods and, therefore, likely to be considered more burdensome."

The burden of the tax on passenger cars has even wider implications, however, than those suggested above. In today's circumstances, the burden imposed by a repressive automobile tax is felt by the whole economy whose growth is constricted by a consumption tax that retards both production and investment. Our concern, therefore, is not only with the impact of the tax on the car buyer and the automobile industry, but also with its significance in terms of national economic growth.

The economic importance of the automobile industry

In measuring the economic effects of the 10-percent excise tax on new passenger cars, the relative magnitude of the automobile industry in the economy is highly significant. Few industries can match the automobile industry for its overall impact on the national economy. For example, in 1960, automotive related sales, including the purchase of passenger cars and the cost of their operation, totaled $47 billion and represented 9.4 percent of the gross national product.

In terms of manpower, the employment opportunities provided by the automotive industry are well known. The number and variety of jobs generated directly and indirectly by the industry would be legion. While the manufacture of automobiles, alone, has provided work directly for nearly 700,000 people, the total employment opportunities generated by those who supply the industry and service and distribute its product is many times that number—with the total for the industry possibly in excess of 6 million employees.

It should also be recognized that almost one business out of every six in the United States is dependent upon the manufacture, distribution, service and use of motor vehicles. On the basis of an analysis of data developed in the 1958 Census of Manufactures and Census of Business, the AMA has estimated that close to 800,000 individual businesses in the United States depend on the motor vehicle and, primarily, on the passenger car. This includes close to 300,000 passenger car dealers and gasoline service stations, and over 100,000 independent automobile repair shops.

It should also be noted that the automotive consumption of many materials sustains the growth and development of numerous other industries vital to our industrial base and economic growth. For example, in 1960, 21 percent of all steel, 62 percent of all rubber, 35 percent of all zinc, 11 percent of all aluminum, and 47 percent of all the lead used in the United States was for automotive purposes.

In the light of the foregoing data, it is apparent that the adverse effects of an excessive tax on new passenger cars will be widespread throughout the whole economy. The impact of the new car excise extends from basic industries such as steel and aluminum to hundreds of thousands of small businesses in manufacturing, distribution, and servicing of automobiles.

AUTOMOBILES AND ECONOMIC GROWTH

Economic growth in the United States has often been described as the resultant of one or more major innovating forces which combine to open up a wide range of new investment opportunities. The development of the railroads in the last half of the 19th century and early 20th century is often cited as a major factor in the dynamic growth of the economy during that period. Following World War I, the rising automobile industry replaced the railroad system as a major innovating force.

However, the ability of the automobile industry to continue as a dynamic factor in national long-term economic growth will be facilitated by relief from discriminatory taxation which impairs its freedom to compete on equal terms with other industries in the U.S. economy. It is with the long-term economic consequences of the repressive 10 percent new automobile excise tax to the Nation, not just one industry, that Congress must primarily be concerned. It is clear that the economic vitality of the automobile industry will be intimately involved in the Nation's growth rate for the future, as it is currently and has been in the past. Freed of excessive tax burdens, the industry can be expected to continue to play its role in making the investment needed to meet our economic goals.

Investment in plant and equipment by the automotive industry

The postwar growth of the U.S. economy is not attributable to any single factor, but rather has reflected the conjunction of a great many forces arising out of both the war and the depression preceding it. Under these circumstances, economic demand increased almost without regard to tax or other deterrents. The momentum of this process certainly stimulated U.S. economic growth through 1957. Since 1957, the growth rate has been slower; and it is no longer possible to endorse repressive taxation on the one hand, while giving allegiance to economic growth on the other. The excise tax on new passenger cars is one such repressive tax. Its only effect can be to retard growth, and the harmful effects of the tax can extend far beyond the limits of the automobile industry into almost every phase of contemporary life.

From the automobile industry's very beginning, the force of innovation has been one of its outstanding characteristics. Moreover, it has acted as a spur to the growth of other industries and a strengthening force to the Nation's economy. The very nature of competition in the automobile industry (including competition with foreign manufacturers) has required that each manufacturer strive constantly to turn out better products than its competitors at the lowest possible cost. This has led to continual improvement, from one model year to another. Such improvement requires substantial investment in both plant and equipment.

Excise taxes which press on long-term demand will certainly constitute a more substantial deterrent to new economic growth in the future than they have in the early postwar years. They can, to a significant degree, offset much of the effort of American industry to achieve the growth in volume demand which is basic to rising investment. As Dr. Walter W. Heller, Chairman of the President's Council of Economic Advisers, has recently said:

"By strengthening sales and pushing output closer to capacity, tax reduction spurs investment in inventories and in new equipment and new plants. This impact on investment in productive capacity is called the 'accelerator effect.' The increased production of capital goods expands gross national product, stimulates further consumption and increases profits. It reduces the deterrent effect of excess capacity, which has tended to discourage investment in productive facilities during the past 5 years or so."

During the period from 1946–62, the automotive industry has been a leader in plant and equipment expenditures for both the modernization and expansion of its production facilities. The industry invested $14 billion in manufacturing facilities, excluding the heavy cost of tools for new model cars. This represented nearly one-sixth of all the plant and equipment expenditures by durable goods producers during the 1946–62 period. It would not be unreasonable to claim that this volume of plant and equipment expenditures has been a significant factor in the postwar growth and prosperity of the national economy. It has enabled the industry, in spite of rising labor costs, to meet consumer demand efficiently and to contribute importantly to price stability. Significantly, for example, since 1958 the list prices of comparable automobiles have remained virtually unchanged.

An especially important part of new investment is that which contributes to technological improvement under the stress of increasingly competitive markets. The technological change fostered by the automotive industry's investment has been a major innovating force in our economy. New and better products as well as improved production methods have resulted therefrom. This has opened up a wide spectrum of opportunities for men with imagination and initiative. Such change thus promotes new jobs and, in turn, stimulates further new capital investment. The President, in his 1962 economic message, pointed out this close relationship between technological innovation and investment when he stated:

"Investment in new equipment serves as a vehicle for technological improvements and is perhaps the most important way in which laboratory discoveries become incorporated in the productive process."

The investment by the automotive industry of $14 billion in new plant and equipment during the post-World War II period has been such a vehicle. It has permitted the industry to provide better products and, as noted, has enabled it in recent years to hold the price line.

The interstate highway program

The investment in other areas of the economy resulting from rising car usage is clearly seen in connection with the Interstate Highway System now in process of construction. This program is wholly financed by taxes levied on the direct beneficiaries of the highway program and will involve an average national expenditure of some $4 billion annually over a 10-year period. In addition to its direct investment effects, the highway program will contribute to the increased efficiency of the movement of goods and people, with greater safety than ever before. The program also adds importantly to our national defense capabilities. Further, it opens up new and more productive uses of land for industrial development with attendant rises in land values and commercial activity which have improved the tax resources of State and local governments.

Living changes attributable to increased car use

The tremendous shifts of industry and population occurring in the United States since World War II provide another example of investment opportunities which have been induced by the growth of automobile use. The automobile has changed the face of the American landscape and the whole mode of living for millions of our citizens. Out of this has come new demand creating forces that have expanded whole industries beyond anything imagined before World War II.

The rapid growth of metropolitan areas after World War II unquestionably was fostered by the automobile and the expanded road systems around the urban centers. The remarkable increase in private residential housing after World War II has been unequalled in the history of this or any other country. The construction of nearly 1,300 new shopping centers in the United States during the period 1947–60 can also be attributed in large part to the increased mobility of the American consumer provided by the automobile.

The examples above are but a few dramatic illustrations of how a major force like the passenger automobile can promote investment which contributes to national economic growth and better living standards for millions. As shown, the demand for automobiles carries with it a derived demand for a host of other products and services requiring new investment that helps to build and develop our entire national economy.

Excise tax reduction—Effect on aggregate consumer demand

As observed earlier, the increase in the automobile excise tax reflected, in part, a desire to reduce new car demand under the pressures of a war emergency. In contrast, under today's very different economic circumstances, it seems clear that a reduction in the 10-percent excise tax on new passenger cars would favorably influence overall economic demand in the long run, even if this effect might not be immediately evident. The importance of this type of economic stimulation through tax reduction has already been recognized by both the Canadian and British Governments, which have been faced with similar problems of accelerating economic growth.

Under the intense competitive pressures existing in the automobile markets today, reduction in the excise tax on new passenger cars would be reflected in lower costs to the consumer. The tax today, on the average, is $230. Reduction of this tax from 10 percent to, say, 3 percent would reduce the tax by about $160 per car.

While the industry believes it is logical and appropriate to assume that a reduction in the new passenger car excise tax will stimulate aggregate consumer demand in the long run, it is, of course, difficult to specify the precise demand increase to be expected. Nevertheless, the release of an amount in excess of $1 billion is certain to influence favorably aggregate consumer demand—that is, the demand for all types of goods and services. Over a period of a year, it is generally considered reasonable to expect aggregate demand to increase by at least two times the amount of any tax reduction.

While the benefit of an automobile excise tax reduction to purchasers of new cars is readily apparent, a benefit will also be afforded to purchasers of used cars even though such vehicles are not subject to any Federal excise tax. In 1960, over 40 percent of all used and new car sales were in overlapping or competitive price groups. As a result, any lower price on new cars attributable to a reduction in the excise tax would induce a used car price decline, in order for them to remain competitive with new cars. Thus, the beneficial effects of a reduction in the new car excise tax would (1) result in a cost saving on the price of a used car, (2) bring buyers into the used car market who could not afford cars offered at prices reflecting the current high excise and (3) release these substantial savings on cars for use elsewhere in the economy.

Thus, the stone of tax reduction cast into the economic pool creates an ever-widening circle of effects throughout the economy—all favorable. Some broad estimates of these effects are discussed below.

Stimulating effect of an automobile excise tax reduction

There is widespread agreement that tax reduction has a stimulating effect on spending and income and produces an increase in gross national product generally equal to two or more times the amount of the original tax cut. To the extent that this occurs, of course, additional tax revenues are generated by the increased economic activity. As a result, the ultimate revenue effect for the Government can be substantially different from the immediate effect associated with the initial tax reduction.

Thus, if the automobile excise tax were reduced from 10 percent to, say, 3 percent, it is estimated that $1 billion of added purchasing power would be immediately released. If we assume that the increase in consumer income will be about two times the amount of the tax cut (i.e., the tax reduction will turn over twice within the year), then $2 billion would be added annually to the income stream (gross national product) as a result of the tax cut—providing this excise tax reduction is not offset by corresponding increases in other taxes. In turn, this $2 billion increase in gross national product would generate an estimated $600 million additional Federal tax revenues. This increase would offset 60 percent of the immediate revenue reduction attributable to a 7 percentage point cut in the automobile excise tax rate of 10 percent.

A favorable effect on aggregate investment as well as consumption can also arise out of reduction of the car excise tax. Where sales press upon industrial capacity, an incentive would be given to spending for new plant capacity. This, in turn, would further expand both national income and consumption and thereby generate added Federal revenues. As a result, a tax cut could, in the long run, increase overall tax revenues. The experience of the 1920's tends to bear this out. In Great Britain, the Government has just reduced the tax on domestically purchased automobiles in an effort to stimulate the economy. Only a year or so ago, Canada repealed its special excise tax on cars to aid its total economy.

The United States is now in a position to make the long overdue reduction in the new passenger car excise which other countries have already undertaken. As noted above, the entire economy would benefit from such a stimulus to economic growth. Tax reduction can be the needed impetus required to achieve the accelerated growth rate required for full employment of the Nation's manpower and physical resources.

We can no longer afford the retention of taxes at wartime rate levels designed to repress consumption and investment. In today's economy, discriminatory and excessive tax rates put a burden upon the consumer and business which is reflected in lagging consumption and investment with resulting high unemployment and underutilization of plant and equipment.

The Automobile Manufacturers Association therefore respectfully submits that Congress should give a high priority to reduction or elimination of the 10-percent excise tax on new passenger cars, as a meaningful and necessary contribution to the progress and growth of the American economy.

GENERAL NOTE

As presented in the foregoing statement, the Automobile Manufacturers Association holds strongly to the conviction that selective excise taxes, at discriminatory rates, are harmful to the economy as well as to the industries whose products are so taxed. However, the association recognizes that, under certain circumstances, revenue needs as well as the requirements of a balanced tax structure may require some form of excise taxation. Therefore, the association wishes to make it clear that it will not oppose any nondiscriminatory taxes levied on consumer goods and services at low rates if Congress should feel that such taxation were required.

The AMA recognizes that the best means to the attainment of needed tax reduction is control of Federal expenditures to prevent their growth at a rate equal to or exceeding that of national income. Under such circumstances, economic growth, over the long term, can be expected to yield adequate revenues to meet all reasonable requirements of the Federal Government at tax rates well below the excessive levels currently imposed.

APPENDIX

TABLE 1.—*Percent remaining of Korean war rates in Federal excise taxes on selected manufactured goods*

Manufactured goods	Unit of tax	Percent remaining of Korean war rate	Year Korean rate reduced
Passenger automobiles.	Manufacturer's sales price.	100	--------
Refrigerators	do	50	1954
Electric, gas, and oil appliances.	do	50	1954
Cigarette, cigar, and pipe lighters.	do	66⅔	1954
Electric light bulbs	do	50	1954
Cameras	do	50	1954
Sporting goods	do	66⅔	1954
Jewelry	do	50	1954

Source: Derived from U.S. Treasury Department data.

TABLE 2.—*Distribution of passenger-car trips by major purpose of travel*

Purpose of travel	Percentage distribution of—	
	Trips	Vehicle-miles
Earning a living:		
To and from work	33.6	26.0
Related business	13.9	17.7
Total	47.5	43.7
Family business:		
Medical and dental	1.4	1.9
Shopping	15.0	6.9
Other	10.7	8.7
Total	27.1	17.5
Educational, civic, and religious	6.1	3.2
Social and recreational:		
Vacations	.2	4.8
Pleasure rides	7.2	12.8
Other	11.9	18.0
Total	19.3	35.6
All purposes	100.0	100.0

Source: Highway Transportation, Office of Research, Bureau of Public Roads, U.S. Department of Commerce, 1960.

TABLE 3.—*Purchases of passenger cars and related automobile expenditures by consumers and business, 1960*

[Billions of dollars]

Expenditures by consumers and business:	
Purchases of passenger cars	18
Auto—related items:	
Gas and oil	14
Repairs and service	6
Tires, parts and accessories	4
Financing charges	3
Insurance and miscellaneous	2
Subtotal	29
Total	47

Source: Derived from U.S. Department of Commerce data.

TABLE 4.—*Automotive consumption of selected raw materials—1960*

	U.S. total consumption	Automotive consumption	Percent automotive
Steel, all forms (tons)	71,149,218	14,610,424	20.5
Rubber (long tons)	1,834,808	1,144,620	62.3
Zinc (tons)	861,125	299,775	34.8
Aluminum (tons)	2,329,000	257,000	11.0
Lead (tons)	1,021,200	479,300	46.9

Source: Based on data from various trade associations published in Automobile Facts and Figures, 1962, Automobile Manufacturers Association.

PRESIDENT'S YOUTH EMPLOYMENT ACT MAKES POSSIBLE ESTABLISHMENT OF HOMETOWN YOUTH CORPS IN CITY OF PHILADELPHIA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BYRNE] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, during the decade of the 1960's, 26 million young people will enter the labor market—an average of about 2½ million each year. The lack of experience of these young people who have already entered into the competition for jobs has been determined during the early years of this decade. In January 1963, over 700,000 young people aged 16 through 21 years of age were dropouts of school and out of work.

Unemployment rates in the 16 through 21 age group are about three times as high as unemployment in the adult population. Among those unfortunate youngsters who dropped out of school before completing high school the problem of unemployment reaches its most intense form with 28 out of every 100 school dropouts unemployed, according to Department of Labor studies.

To meet the challenge of putting our young people to work during the 1960's will require the creation of 25,000 new jobs each week for the next 10 years. In commenting on this urgent problem, Secretary of Labor W. Willard Wirtz made the following statement to the House Labor Committee:

> We recognize that the basic answer to this problem must be in the achievement of that growth rate in the economy which will mean more jobs through private employment. Better education, training, and counseling are also necessary. But there is also increasing evidence that special measures are required to provide some of our unemployed youngsters with special opportunities for

learning work disciplines and skills, with the added dividend of motivation to return to school for further education and training.

I believe H.R. 1890, the President's Youth Employment Act, will serve admirably the need to provide the special training opportunities that presently out-of-work young people must receive to fit them for beginning jobs.

Title I of the act creates a Youth Conservation Corps modeled after the highly successful Civilian Conservation Corps of the 1930's. Under this provision, 15,000 young men aged 16 through 21 years would be given the chance to work in camps in national forests and parks under the supervision of skilled workmen, and with classroom schoolwork in the evenings to fill in the gaps in their education. Enrollments would be for a period of 6 months, with the opportunity to reenlist for additional 6-month periods up to a total of 2 years. Work in the camps would be done on projects to make our national lands more attractive for recreational use.

The boys will work with tools such as light construction equipment, power tools, compressor drills, and the like which are used extensively in civilian work. Following completion of enlistment, the Youth Conservation Corps trained youth will return to the local office of the State employment service through which he was originally selected. Here his skills, work habits, and classroom training will be evaluated and, on the basis of this newly acquired experience, he will be referred to potential employers for job interviews. The purpose of the YCC is to follow a young man from original selection, through training in the Corps, through the job interview stage, and into the job.

Title II of the bill, which has come to be referred to as the "Home Town Youth Corps" has great potential usefulness for the city of Philadelphia. Briefly, the Home Town Youth Corps will provide for programs of useful employment of a public service nature to be sponsored by city or county governments, with 50 percent of the cost to be borne by the Federal Government. In testifying on this part of the Youth Employment Act before a Senate subcommittee, Randolph E. Wise, Philadelphia welfare commissioner, said the program was urgently needed by urban centers.

In Philadelphia, nearly 8,000 youths 16 years of age and older dropped out of school prior to graduation from high school in 1961 alone, according to Mr. Wise. And he added that the size and scope of the problem make it obvious that the Federal Government must share responsibility for its prevention and control.

Work in the Hometown Youth Corps will be performed by both young men and young women aged 16 through 21. The work will include service in hospitals where nurse aids are very much in demand; in schools where members of the Hometown Youth Corps can perform clerical work, and thus free teachers for classroom work; in libraries, in welfare agencies; in children's homes and in other branches of Government where they will be learning job skills without displacing regular workers. When a young person has completed work in a Hometown Youth Corps project he or she will be referred to the local employment service office for placement.

All of us must make the transition from the schoolday world of youth to the adult working world. The transition is not an easy one to make. It is even more difficult these days because of the disappearance of many of the unskilled jobs once performed by youngsters just out of school. Our responsibility to young people does not end when they leave school. In a very real sense it begins at once when they cannot find an established place of employment in the complicated world in which we live and continues until they are placed in a job. The President's Youth Employment Act offers a needed lift to our young people at the most critical period in their lives.

CAN PUBLIC FUNDS BE CONSTITUTIONALLY GRANTED TO PRIVATE SCHOOLS?

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 15 minutes and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the issues joined for Congress in proposals for Federal aid to education are not simple ones, nor are they new ones. There are enormously important questions, including those of need, of scope, of formulation, of policy, and of national purpose. The Congress has considered these matters in various ways for years and the complexities presented are evidenced by the important fact that they are still with us for consideration in this session.

Among the important issues that have confronted us in the past and are before the Congress again relate directly to private schools at the college level and at the elementary and secondary levels. These schools are enmeshed in the same considerations already mentioned but present special additional issues for deliberation and resolution, partly because they are private schools, but importantly, because of mistaken and misleading attitudes toward them. The term "private school" itself presents its complexities. It is legally recognized as an integral part of the States' public school programs for the purpose of compulsory attendance laws. There is no quarrel over recognition of the immense contribution made by these schools to public purposes and none respecting the excellence of the education given to citizen students. There is no question remaining respecting their juridical status. But there persists widespread misconception of these schools and lingering but diminishing controversy over the permissability of provision of public funds for education in these private schools.

Opponents to the participation of private schools, especially the church related, private school, premise opposition on a disturbing absolutism in asserting a constitutional prohibition to their entitled participation in public assistance in any form. But support of that position mainly rests on dicta in decisions and extremely dubious interpretation of relevant constitutional precedent.

Fortunately, the pendency of the proposals for Federal assistance to education has stimulated new and substantive research into these important constitutional questions. Legal scholars, in increasing numbers across the country, are devoting renewed attention to the constitutional issues and with penetrating new vision. It is important to Members of Congress to be aware of this developing and expanding concentration and especially the clarification and illumination these research efforts impart to the problem before us.

At a symposium on church-state problems, sponsored by the University of Chicago Law School, an important address was given by Rev. Robert F. Drinan, S.J., dean, Boston College Law School, entitled "Can Public Funds Be Constitutionally Granted to Private Schools?" This is only an example, but an important one in the current scholarly evaluation of constitutional principles. To assist my colleagues in Congress in their heavy responsibilities to review again these issues, Dean Drinan's address follows:

CAN PUBLIC FUNDS BE CONSTITUTIONALLY GRANTED TO PRIVATE SCHOOLS?

(By Rev. Robert F. Drinan, S.J.)

It would be an easy answer to the question under discussion in this paper if we could simply state that no public funds should ever be expended for private purposes. With regard to schools, however, the fact is that no nonpublic school can be private in every sense of that term. American law recognized in the Pierce decision the right of the private school to exist and has thereby given to it a juridical status. This status, however ambiguous, has rendered the private school a quasi-public or, if you will, a parapublic institution.

The fundamental issue therefore in the controversy over public funds for private schools arises out of the fact that private schools are public schools for the purpose of compulsory attendance laws but have not been designated as public schools capable of being the beneficiaries of public funds. The anomolous juridical status of the private school in America has no parallel or precedent in any other phase of our law. Those who seek to retain Pierce and yet reverse Everson do not appreciate the implications of the juridical position conferred on the private school by Pierce. Those who seek to retain Pierce and who would accept Everson as containing the ultimate concessions which can be made to the private school likewise do not appreciate the logical implications of the holding in Pierce.

THE PUBLIC DIMENSIONS OF PRIVATE SCHOOLS

Let us start then with Pierce and see if from this decision there can be developed a line of reasoning by which the private school can claim to be an institution charged with a public responsibility and hence eligible for some public funds.

As is well known, Pierce was decided a few days before the guarantees of the 1st amendment were for the first time transferred to the States via the 14th amendment. Consequently, Pierce decided nothing about first amendment freedoms in relation to the existence of the private school. But the spirit of the Pierce decision clearly affirmed that no institutionalized dissent from educational orthodoxy could be constitutionally suppressed. The brief opinion in Pierce, however, left almost totally unsolved the extent to which a private school, legally recognized as a permissible substitute for the public school, could on this basis claim a right to be supported by public funds.

A plausible argument can be made for the proposition that the Pierce decision elevated the private school to the status of a publicly recognized institution which cannot logically and fairly be granted State accreditation and denied State subsidization. Even if, however, everyone agreed with this conclusion the real issue confronting the Nation today and the thorny problem to be discussed in this paper would not be resolved. That issue is, of course, not the private but the church-related school and, more particularly, the Catholic school.

In order, therefore, to give reality to the discussion it is proposed to talk here not in a conceptualistic way about public money and private schools but in a realistic way about Federal aid and Catholic educational institutions. At the same time it must be recognized that no satisfactory resolution of the controversy over the very small subsidy to church-related schools which is in issue in connection with Federal aid can be reached without attaining some agreement on the function and juridical nature of the private school in America.

What then is the claim being made by Catholic parents and Catholic officials? The claim is a very small one; the Catholic contention is that, if Federal aid is to be enacted, some recognition should be given to Catholic schools. This Catholic request is grounded on several factors among which are the following:

1. About 92 percent of all children attending private schools in America today are enrolled in Catholic elementary and secondary schools.

2. Some 6 million students—or every eighth child in America—attend a Catholic school. Any program designed to elevate the Nation's standards of educational excellence which ignores the 12 percent of the Nation's schoolchildren enrolled in nonpublic schools is neglecting in a serious manner a significant element in the population.

3. The first program of massive Federal aid to education must in the nature of things be designed either to help public schools alone or to elevate the educational excellence of all schools. Consequently, an important public policy decision must be made before Federal aid can become a reality.

Even this telescoped version of the Catholic case for a share in the distribution of Federal aid to education will indicate that the controversy over this issue involves profound questions of public policy. These questions can be resolved in a speculative way by peering into the interstices of the half dozen church-state opinions which the Supreme Court has written from Everson to Engel. But even the most resourceful and convinced advocate or opponent of Federal aid for Catholic schools must confess that the most careful reading of all Supreme Court decisions and dicta leads only to the feeling that the real questions have not yet been asked, much less resolved, in Supreme Court jurisprudence.

Some few "absolutes," however, with regard to religion and education have emerged from the Everson to Engel line of cases. The following principles seem to have a secure place in church-state law:

I. The benefits of public welfare legislation may not be granted or denied to citizens because of their religious faith or their lack of it.

II. If the State, in the pursuit of a legitimate public purpose, selects means to achieve this purpose which have an incidental effect of assisting religion, such means are not thereby unconstitutional—especially if no alternate means are as easily available.

III. No sectarian teaching or religious practice may be constitutionally permitted on the premises of a tax-supported school—even if student and teacher participation is on a truly voluntary basis.

Analyzing in turn each of these three broad principles, what can one conclude about the constitutionality of a grant of public money to a Catholic school?

I. PUBLIC WELFARE LEGISLATION

If there was one thing that Mr. Justice Black sought to make clear in Everson it was the finding that the challenged statute authorizing reimbursement to Catholic parents for school bus transportation for their children was public welfare legislation. Mr. Justice Black assumed or asserted several conclusions which formed the following line of reasoning:

1. Public welfare legislation is ordinarily identifiable as a particular type of law and should not be nullified by the courts except for the gravest reasons.

2. Such public welfare legislation is not unconstitutional even if it facilitates attendance at church-related schools.

3. Such legislation does not offend against the wall of separation between church and state provided that (1) any aid given to religion is incidental to the main purpose of the law and (2) a denial of such aid would be discrimination against persons or groups because of their faith or lack of it.

It may be that someone would challenge the foregoing summary of Everson as inadequate and even misleading. Such a person could indeed cite respectable authority for his position because the fact is that several State courts have been confused about the meaning and thrust of Everson. The opinion of Mr. Justice Black is more encouraging to the advocate of Federal aid for Catholic schools than are the several interpretations placed on the opinion by the four dissenting Justices in Everson. Equally discouraging are the interpretations given to Everson by the Supreme Courts of the States of Washington, New Mexico, Oregon, Wisconsin, and Alaska. All these tribunals have given lip service to Everson but have declared laws granting bus transportation or other benefits to Catholic schoolchildren to be unconstitutional even though these laws were concededly written and enacted as public welfare legislation. In other words, State courts have not accepted the idea that public welfare legislation is constitutionally permissible if it only grants to children in Catholic schools those benefits which are also granted to pupils in public schools. The basic rationale of Everson has either been misunderstood, misinterpreted or rejected. Only the Supreme Courts of Connecticut and Maine have accepted and followed Everson as meaning that bus transportation statutes can be framed as public welfare legislation in such a manner as to be constitutionally unassailable.

The confusion over the meaning of Everson has not been lessened by the fact that the U.S. Supreme Court has since 1951 refused to review decisions based on Everson from the States of Washington, Connecticut, Oregon, and Alaska. One can argue, therefore, either that Everson is properly interpreted by the highest court of Connecticut which sustained the constitutionality of a law authorizing bus transportation to private schools or, on the other hand, that Everson has almost no relevance or meaning at the State level—as the highest courts of Washington, Wisconsin, and Alaska have declared.

It will be seen, therefore, that the history of Everson does not encourage one to employ it as a firm foundation for a case for Federal aid to Catholic schools. At the same time the literal wording of Mr. Justice Black's opinion in Everson supplies a solid basis for a line of argument that would support the case which Catholics and others are making on behalf of the constitutionality of Federal aid for private schools. The fact is that Everson reaffirmed Cochran and the child-benefit theory and that Everson is still good law—despite McCollum, Torcaso, and Engel. Mr. Leo Pfeffer highlights the consequences of Mr. Justice Black's opinion in this comment:

"When the Everson decision is coupled with the Cochran decision they lead logically to the conclusion that the State may, notwithstanding the first amendment, finance practically every aspect of parochial education, with the exception of such comparatively minor items as the proportionate salaries of teachers while they teach the catechism." ("Church, State and Freedom," p. 476.)

One could add a dimension to Mr. Pfeffer's reading of the Cochran-Everson rule by urging that in the ultimate analysis Everson follows from Pierce; public money, in other words, cannot logically be withheld from the private school if it is publicly accredited as an institution where children may fulfill their legal duty to attend school.

The many ambiguities in the Pierce-Cochran-Everson line of cases arise from the enigma which lies behind the institution to which has been assigned the nondescriptive and unenlightening name of the nonpublic or private school. Schools of this kind have an equivocal juridical status in America and until that status is clarified the entire controversy over the financing of such schools will be carried on in language and with concepts which do not really express the realities which they seek to describe. The terminology of "private" and "public" schools becomes even less useful when the private school in issue turns out to be a church-related school. The thorny issues involved in this area lead us to a discussion of the second "absolute" in the Everson to Engel line of cases—namely, the proposition that the State may constitutionally achieve a legitimate public purpose in such a way that an unintended incidental benefit comes to religion.

II. STATE PROGRAMS WHICH GIVE INCIDENTAL AID TO RELIGION

The various Supreme Court opinions in the Sunday law cases made it very clear that the requirement of separation between church and state does not mean that the state, in carrying out a legitimate secular purpose, must do so in a way which gives no aid to religion. It is significant to note that Mr. Justice Black, who wrote the rigorously separationist language in Everson and McCollum, sees no problem involving establishment or of free exercise of religion in Sunday laws which, whatever their present purpose may be said to be, clearly aid the Christian religion by fixing Sunday as a day of universal rest.

It is the secular purpose behind Sunday laws which, in the mind of the Supreme Court, renders them constitutional. As Mr. Justice Frankfurter put it in his concurring opinion in the Sunday law cases: "not every regulation, some of whose practical effects may facilitate the observance of a religion by its adherents, affronts the requirement of church-state separation."

Employing this reasoning the majority of the Supreme Court held that the incidental aid which Sunday laws give to the Christian religion does not make them unconstitutional. Nor are these laws contrary to the first amendment because of the "indirect burden on religious observance" which they impose on Sabbatarians. There is, however, a qualification on the power of the state to impose such a burden. As Chief Justice Warren put it:

"If the state regulates conduct by enacting a general law within its power, the purpose and effect of which is to advance the state's secular goals, the statute is valid despite its indirect burden on religious observance unless a state may accomplish its purpose by means which do not impose such a burden."

Is it arguable from this principle that the state in carrying out its "secular goals" in the field of education has some obligation to do so, if possible, in a manner which does not impose even an "indirect burden on religious observance"? If Catholics could demonstrate that the denial of aid to their schools imposed a burden on their religious observance would such a law be subject to the qualification which Chief Justice Warren attached to Sunday laws?

Whatever one might answer to that question it is clear that the establishment clause has not been interpreted by the Supreme Court to mean that the secular aims of the state must be achieved in a manner deliberately designed to preclude any incidental aid to religion. In view of this position then, what policy can the state adopt with regard to the distribution of funds for the purpose of raising the Nation's standards of excellence in education?

The advocates of Federal aid for Catholic schools ground their plea on the principle that the state, in carrying out its secular goals in the field of education, can comply with the first amendment if it makes available funds for strictly secular purposes in all schools. Under such an arrangement no aid is intended for religion and whatever benefits students in church-related schools may receive are exclusively of a secular nature.

The two most fundamental objections to this line of reasoning are the following:

1. Even if public money were given to a Catholic school for strictly secular objectives these objectives would be carried forward in an atmosphere permeated by a Catholic orientation,

2. Even if this permeation can be prevented the grant of public money to a Catholic school makes available to this school funds which would otherwise be committed to the teaching of secular subjects.

Let us try to analyze and, if possible, bring some clarification to these two issues.

1. Reflections on permeation

The permeation argument against aid to Catholic schools does not contend that the legitimate secular purpose which the state seeks to fulfill in giving aid for education in secular subjects is thwarted or frustrated in Catholic schools. The secular purpose is concededly carried out in Catholic schools but it is permeated—and somehow constitutionally contaminated—by a sectarian atmosphere. The argument against aid to church-related schools because of the permeation of sacred or sectarian values into the teaching of secular subjects must assume for its validity the viewpoint that the state is constitutionally required to seek out ways to carry out its secular objectives which will not give even incidental aid to religion. No such constitutional requirement can be found in the decisions from *Everson* to *Engel* and indeed the opinions in the Sunday law cases expressly deny the existence of any such constitutional requirement.

The opponents of Federal aid for Catholic schools who place great reliance on the permeation argument must logically say that the secular or silent attitude with regard to religion in the public schools is the only official orthodoxy which the state is allowed to promote in the pursuance of its public welfare objectives. This may be a philosophy of education subscribed to by a majority of the American people but it is not good constitutional law or, it is submitted, sound public policy.

Some recent writings on the permeation issue have focused attention on some graphic examples of the intermingling or rather the intrusion of sectarian teaching into textbooks on secular subjects used in Catholic schools. Two comments on this matter seem appropriate:

A. No scientific study has ever been done on the question of the extent of the permeation of sectarian teaching in the instruction in secular subjects in Catholic schools. Concrete examples of such permeation in textbooks can be cited but an important distinction should be made between the factitious and indefensible insertion of sectarian symbols or teaching into secular subjects and the conclusions or judgments based on religious values which are properly found in texts in the area of the social sciences. The latter type of permeation is much more significant than the former and is, moreover, a justifiable exercise of academic freedom by social scientists writing from a particular point of view.

B. Although there undoubtedly exist some unjustifiable examples of permeation in secular textbooks used in Catholic schools little work has been done on the extent to which ultranationalistic or secularistic symbols and teachings have permeated the textbooks used in the public schools of America. Studies have shown, however, that the beliefs of minority groups, religious influences in American history and the religions of lands different from America have received very inadequate treatment in the textbooks which enjoy widespread use in the Nation's public schools. Many of these texts can be fairly and properly criticized as being permeated with an excessive emphasis on the secular with a resulting failure to give adequate treatment to the sacred, the sectarian or the spiritual elements in the life of man and of society.

Permeation is, therefore, a factor in every textbook since values are omnipresent. If the state, therefore, cannot constitutionally give public money for instruction in secular subjects if religious values are commingled in the instruction the state is equally disabled from financing instruction in secular subjects where the orientation of the instruction is, by silence or by implication, permeated with a secularistic outlook.

Those who argue against Federal aid for Catholic schools because there exists in these schools some permeation of secular subjects with sacred values must be prepared to accept the major premise of their argument—the assumption that the orientation of secular humanism is the only type of educational orthodoxy which the state can subsidize.

Even if permeation of secular instruction with sectarian teaching can be prevented, however, the additional argument is made that the granting of public money to nonpublic schools for instruction in secular subjects relieves this school from a financial obligation which it would otherwise have. Hence a church-related school would have more funds available to it and such funds could be used for sectarian purposes.

The logical thrust of this argument leads to the conclusion that any church-related school must be placed not in the category of a school but of a church. To deny public funds to nonpublic schools for secular instruction because such a grant would bring to the church-related school a freeing of otherwise committed funds is to state that the fully accredited school which is affiliated to a church thereby loses its right to any public funds even for exclusively secular purposes. Such a conclusion is specifically contrary to the Everson decision where Mr. Justice Black in effect conceded that the public money granted to parents for bus transportation of their children to a Catholic school would make available to the parents and to the school more money for other purposes.

The contention that the State should refuse public funds for the attainment of a secular purpose unrelated to the religious function of a church-related school simply because such a grant would free the funds of this school for a religious purpose leads logically to the conclusion that no church-related institution may be entrusted with the implementation of any of the secular objectives of the state. Such a conclusion runs contrary to the basic traditions and the widespread contemporary practice of the state assisting church-related social welfare agencies in caring for the sick, the aged and those in need of social sciences.

It should be remembered that Everson sustained the constitutionality of a law which granted the benefits of public welfare legislation to individuals even though such benefits helped them to get to a church-related school. This result was reached in an opinion in which Mr. Justice Black stated:

"No tax in any amount, large or small, can be levied to support any religious activities or institutions, whatever they may be called, or whatever form they may adopt, to teach or practice religion."

This famous sentence proscribes tax support only for "religious activities or institutions" in whatever form they may adopt "to teach or practice religion." It does not proscribe public funds for instruction in secular subjects even though such instruction may be conducted under the auspices of a religious institution. Far less does it forbid the granting of public funds to a church-related institution for the accomplishment of a secular purpose simply because such a grant might liberate other funds of this institution for a religious purpose.

Aid to religion as such is clearly forbidden by all the decisions from Everson to Engel. But state aid for the improvement of secular education need not be distributed only under circumstances where not even any incidental aid to religion may occur. The broadening of the concept of separation of church and state to this point must necessarily assume the validity of the theory that America is a completely secular state. Such a viewpoint makes it difficult if not impossible to reconcile the mandate of the establishment clause with the guarantee of the free exercise of religion clause.

It must be noted, however, that Supreme Court opinions from Everson to Engel are ambiguous at best with regard to the central question of whether America is a completely secular state. No decision has repudiated Mr. Justice Douglas' assertion in Zorach that "we are a religious people whose institutions presuppose a Supreme Being" but in the very same opinion Mr. Justice Douglas wrote that "Government may not blend secular and sectarian education." The Court has seemingly supported a theistic basis for America's legal institutions but has simultaneously insisted that the public school may not blend any "sectarian education" into its program. This apparent paradox leads us to a consideration of our third absolute in church-state law—the unconstitutionality of religious teaching or practices in the public schools—even when they are conducted on a truly voluntary basis.

III. THE SECULAR ORIENTATION OF THE PUBLIC SCHOOL

Mr. Justice Rutledge, dissenting in Everson, gave as a reason for the Pierce decision his conviction that children should not be required to attend public schools because "their atmosphere is wholly secular". While it would be difficult to prove or disprove that the Supreme Court has agreed that the public school must have an atmosphere that is wholly secular the Court would seem to be pointing in that direction.

If the Supreme Court in its present term declares the reading of the Bible and the recitation of the Lord's prayer to be unconstitutional in a public school the secularization of the public school will be, at least in popular opinion, considerably extended. In a certain sense, however, the reasoning of the Court in the Bible-reading case will be more important than the result reached. The Court can develop a line of reasoning employed in the past and forbid Bible reading as contrary to the establishment clause—even if no infringement of religious liberty is found to be present. The Court seems to have followed this reasoning in the Engel decision although the fact of State authorship of the prayer involved in that case made the Court's decision unique.

Very few scholars and no group of religionists have sought to explore the implications of the Supreme Court's recently developed interpretation of the establishment clause as constituting a source of rights independently of the free exercise-of-religion clause. The theory that the establishment clause is merely instrumental to the implementation of the free exercise clause has been rejected by the Court. And by this rejection the Court has opened up the following possible arguments on behalf of the constitutionality of aid for private schools:

1. Can religionists claim that the secularized public school violates the establishment clause because it prefers irreligion over religion?

2. Can religionists claim further that the state by assisting only the secularized school subscribes to and promotes an orthodoxy which is imposed on all students to whom by law the state has given a pledge of a free education unaffected by any officially established indoctrination?

Let us search through these ideas in the light of the recent Supreme Court interpretation of the establishment clause.

1. Secularized schools and the establishment clause

The theory advanced by Mr. Justice Black in Torcaso, McGowan and Engel that the establishment clause can be violated without a violation of the free exercise of religion clause may now have become an accepted part of Supreme Court jurisprudence. Under this interpretation of the first amendment can it be argued that the secularization of the public school amounts to a violation of the establishment clause since a particular form of religion (or irreligion) is given a preferential status? If such a violation of the establishment clause can be shown, Catholics or others can enjoin it even though there is no infringement of anyone's religious freedom.

Aside from the question of standing to sue, can religious parents prove a violation of the establishment clause if the state gives financial assistance only to the school where education is deliberately divorced from religion? Preferential treatment to irreligion would seem to be as constitutionally objectionable as any preference given to religion.

Some Catholics have asserted that attendance at a public school by their children violates or restricts the religious freedom of both children and parents. The assertion is made that Catholics have a right to be treated like conscientious objectors or like Jehovah's Witnesses who have been granted an exemption from laws requiring a flag salute in a public school.

Mr. Justice Frankfurter saw the force of this analogy when, dissenting in Barnette, he voted against granting an exemption from the flag salute to children conscientiously opposed to the practice. Mr. Justice Frankfurter saw the consequences of the Court's bowing to the religious scruples of a minority and raised this question:

"What of the claims of equality of treatment of those parents who, because of religious scruples, cannot send their children to public schools?"

This potential argument of the Catholic or other parent has not been developed or litigated. To be able to show that religious parents "because of religious scruples cannot send their children to public schools" (to use Mr. Justice Frankfurter's language) would seem to require more proof of an antireligious bias in the public school than would appear to be now provable.

It is not now necessary, however, to have such proof before one can claim rights by reason of the first amendment. Under the interpretation of the establishment clause adopted in recent years by the Supreme Court any preferential treatment granted by the state to religion or irreligion constitutes a violation of constitutional rights. The allegation that is difficult to prove is, of course, the assertion that the secularized public school gives preferential treatment to irreligion. The widespread and deeply held conviction persists that silence about religion in the public school is the same as neutrality or impartiality. On this basic conception is built the whole thesis that the public school can be fair to believers and nonbelievers by assuming that their differences for the purposes of education are without significance. It is this basic assumption of the public school which, it is submitted, violates the letter and the spirit of the establishment clause.

The secularized public school meets and treats its students only as future citizens. Their religious or spiritual beliefs are to be regarded as irrelevant and hence unimportant with respect to the entire educational process. It is this basic disregard of the great ideas and religious aspirations in the lives of the students in a public school which is the gravamen of the religionist's complaint. To the believer—at least to many believers—the silent assumption by the public school that religion in any meaningful sense is irrelevant to the educational process amounts to an official establishment of secular values.

2. Secularized schools and the ideal of a free education

Two of the greatest ideas underlying American democracy were born in the mid-19th century; they are the pledge of the State to give a free education to every child in an atmosphere not affected by a sectarian orientation. When these twin ideals emerged more than a century ago their fulfillment was relatively easy in a pan-Protestant nation. Today, however, in a religiously pluralistic society those ideals have become more difficult to realize because the nondenominational pan-Protestant environment of the common school has been largely displaced by a secularistic orientation. The tendency of the law from Everson to Engel has been to make mandatory the secularization of the public school without at the same time providing for a free education in a school without a secularistic orientation.

The denial of public funds to church-related schools means in effect that the ideal of a free education in an atmosphere apart from any officially fixed indoctrination has been compromised. The important thing here to prove, of course, is that there is a secularistic indoctrination which accompanies an education in the public school. This is the most important and the most difficult point of dispute in the entire controversy over public funds for private schools. But in a nation whose law knows no heresy and whose legal institutions support no orthodoxy how is it possible to reject the contention made by a substantial minority of citizens that the tax-supported school by its silent disregard of religion thereby promotes irreligion? This, of course, is the essence of the Catholic parent's case and no satisfactory answer seems to have been given.

It is uncertain what American law would say if tomorrow all the Catholics of the Nation withdrew all their children from the public schools because of their conviction that the secularistic orientation of these schools was destructive of the faith of their children. American courts could compel the children to return to the public schools or could give financing for schools consistent with the consciences of Catholics.

American law today confronts the situation where about half of all the Catholic children of the Nation have withdrawn from the public school because of a profound disagreement with the approach to education and to life which that institution has adopted. American society and American law do not seem concerned that these children who for compelling religious reasons have forfeited the education offered to them must be thereby deprived of their right to share in the commitment of the state to provide a free education for every future citizen.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

It seems clear that many converging forces have precipitated the national debate about the advisability of parochial schools sharing in some part of Federal aid to education if such assistance is authorized by the Congress. The debate is filled with anomalies the most curious of which is the fact that no controversy exists at the State level over parochial schools since at that level the question was resolved in the last century when virtually all States enacted laws prohibiting the distribution of public funds to sectarian schools. In the Federal aid controversy Catholic spokesmen are in effect asserting that this policy embraced in the last century by the States is not a wise or fair one for the Federal Government to follow.

Cogent arguments exist to support the Catholic contention. Among them are the following:

1. The fully accredited private school has important public dimensions in that it carries out the secular goals of the State; because of this semipublic status conferred on the private school this institution has some claim to share in the public funds set aside by the State for the education of all of its future citizens.

2. Public welfare benefits surely include secular education and by the rulings in Cochran and Everson the benefits extended by the State to all citizens may not be denied to anyone, because of his religious faith or lack of it.

3. In the distribution of these public welfare benefits no Supreme Court opinion has held that the only constitutional formula is one which prevents even some incidental aid to religion. The Sunday law decisions in fact expressly hold that the state is not precluded from implementing its secular goals in a way which bestows some collateral benefits on religion.

4. In view of clear Supreme Court rulings precluding sectarian teaching and religious practices in public schools it can be persuasively argued that the granting of funds only to the public school is a violation of the establishment clause because such a policy endorses and prefers one educational and philosophical orthodoxy over all others. This is the very essence of the Catholic case.

It seems fair to conclude that neither the Congress nor the Supreme Court of the United States have confronted the claim which is being made by parents who are dissenters from the orthodoxy which the public school represents. No quotation seems more appropriate to express their sentiments and to affirm the spirit with which the entire controversy over church-related schools should be discussed than the ringing words of Mr. Justice Jackson in the *Barnette* decision:

"If there is any fixed star in our constitutional constellation, it is that no official, high or petty, can prescribe what shall be orthodox in politics, nationalism, religion, or other matters of opinion or force citizens to confess by word or act their faith therein."

CAPTIVE UKRAINE, COSSACKIA AND A SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON THE CAPTIVE NATIONS

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DERWINSKI] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, in the past month the editors of the Washington Star performed a most valuable public service by publishing an article and several letters dealing with the captive non-Russian nations in the U.S.S.R. They deserve our highest praise, and I for one congratulate them on their contribution to public enlightenment in our Nation's Capital on a subject of most fundamental importance to our national security and to our chances for victory in the cold war. I presume, however, that our State Department's goal is a victory in the cold war.

NEED FOR A SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON THE CAPTIVE NATIONS

The material published in the Star points up more than anything else the undeniable need for a Special House Committee on the Captive Nations. Unlike the haphazard perfunctory, and careless hearings and reports of a subcommittee of the Foreign Affairs Committee last year, such a special committee would seriously address itself to the captive nations issue, with particular stress on captive Ukraine, Cossackia, Byelorussia, and all other captive non-Russian nations and peoples in the Soviet Union. The Star has helped immensely in showing how important it is for our citizens to know about these captive nations in the very front yard of Moscow's vast colonial empire.

Mr. Speaker, despite the broad, popular demand for a Special Committee on the Captive Nations, the 87th Congress failed to establish this necessary committee in the House. The several maneuvers used to sidetrack this vital issue have by no means discouraged our citizenry to see such an indispensable committee created. We look forward to the creation of this committee in the 88th Congress. Periodically, more evidence will be furnished as to why this special committee is desperately needed for our people and our country in the struggle against Soviet Russian imperiocolonialism. For the moment, the published material in the Star should stimulate the interest and concern of every Member in this Chamber.

THE WASHINGTON STAR CONTRIBUTION

Mr. Speaker, I request that at the conclusion of my remarks the following material, making up the Washington Star contribution, be printed for the interest of our Members in the RECORD: First, the eloquent article on "The Ukraine and You," by Dr. Frederick Brown Harris, in the Sunday Star, January 27, 1963; second, the two letters on "The Ukraine and You" in the Sunday Star, February 3, 1963; third, two letters "'The Ukraine and You' Plus Some Others" attacking Dr. Harris and also Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky, of Georgetown University, in the Evening Star, February 6; fourth, a letter, "Knows the Ukraine," in the Sunday Star, February 10; fifth, the full text of the reply by Dr. Dobriansky, which for want of space was published almost in its entirety under the caption "Captive Ukraine and 'Holy Mother Russia' Complex" in the Evening Star, February 14; and sixth, the letter, "Cossackia," in the Sunday Star, February 17.

MOSCOW ATTACKS ROCKEFELLER AND OTHERS

In addition, highly pertinent to this Star material are the simultaneous attacks unleashed by Moscow against Governor Rockefeller and others in connection with our Ukrainian Independence Day celebrations in this country. It is evident that colonial Moscow seeks to conceal from the world the captive status of Ukraine and for that matter all the other captive non-Russian nations in the U.S.S.R. With a Special Committee on the Captive Nations we could develop worldwide knowledge in showing the imperio-colonial system that exists in the U.S.S.R.

Mr. Speaker, as an example of the Moscow and puppet attacks against our leaders, I request that the January 23 Associated Press release be printed in the RECORD, followed by a report on "Violent Soviet Reaction to Ukraine's Independence Celebration," which appeared on February 21 in Amerika, a leading Ukrainian and English language daily in this country:

THE UKRAINE AND YOU

(By Dr. Frederick Brown Harris, Chaplain of the U.S. Senate)

The independence of the Ukraine, now a non-Russian captive nation, was proclaimed on January 22, 1918. On the 45th anniversary of that light which failed until truth crushed to earth shall rise again, the cause of that dauntless people, yearning to breathe free, was lifted up to the God of justice in the prayer, offered by a representative of the Ukrainian Church, which opened the U.S. Senate. To the petitions there offered for fetters to be broken there echoed the fervent "amen" of over 2 million Americans of Ukrainian ancestry.

To a recently held congress of these fine citizens of this free land came felicitations from 33 State Governors, 40 U.S. Senators, and 140 Members of the House, where a vital bill for a permanent captive nations committee is now pending. In this convention the voice of the Governor of New York was also heard as he cried out, "We protest with you against the Soviet persecution of millions for their Jewish faith. We deplore the Red oppression of the Ukrainian Catholic and Ukrainian Orthodox Churches. This convention is a sobering reminder to all the world that the cold war at many times and places is not cold at all—it cost the lives of men like Lev Rebet and Stepan Bandera, two Soviet-murdered Ukrainian underground leaders." To this council there was added a ringing salute from President Kennedy, declaring that the just aspirations and rights of all people to choose their own rulers "is and will remain a basic goal of U.S. world policy."

Now what is the truth regarding the Ukraine—a territory a little larger than Texas? This fair land, with its face always toward the West, richly endowed with natural resources, with a favorable climate conducive to the raising of various crops, has long been called the granary of Europe. It is now the breadbasket and the sugar bowl of the U.S.S.R. But the salient historic fact is that the Ukrainian people are not Russian and their country has never belonged to Russia except by physical force. A thousand years ago their culture and commerce were at high levels but always these fiercely independent-minded people had to fight predatory neighbors. In 1709 Czar Peter I, by his military might, annexed the Ukraine as a conquered province. The long years that followed are valiant with the struggle to gain freedom. When at long last the 1917 Bolshevik revolution pulverized the sovereignty of the Czar, a new day of glorious emancipation seemed to gild the long darkened sky. In the ancient city of Kiev, as bells of freedom rang out, the Independent National Republic was proclaimed.

But, that proved to be but a fleeting dream. The rapacious arms of Soviet aggression, using their familiar upside down jargon, called the Kremlin manipulated regime they imposed "The Ukraine Soviet Socialist Republic." It was the anniversary of the Ukrainian vow to be free which was observed in the Senate of the United States. The 2 score years plus 5 which have passed since that January 22d are written in crimson letters of heartless cruelty. The blood of a martyred host cries from the ravaged ground. It is a record of imposed famine, genocide, deportation, torture, and liquidation. In spite of these fiery trials the population of the Ukraine is presently over 40 million.

Religious leaders have suffered persecution matching that of the early church. Thousands of Christian churches and chapels have been desecrated. Over 200 literary Ukrainian men and women have paid with their lives because they scorned to dip their pen in the venom of the Communist line.

To this day a saintly archbishop, Metropolitan Slipy, languishes in barren, cold Siberian dungeons sentenced to degrading servitude. He has spent 17 of his 71 years in that blasphemous captivity because he has refused to bow the knee to a pagan Baal in the image of a subservient church hierarchy in his homeland.

The voice of a Ukrainian poet of a hundred years ago, who died during Lincoln's first year in the White House, yet speaketh. His name, Taras Shevchenko. His message is about to be amplified to all Americans, as well as loyal Ukrainians, and we might add, to the Russians too. To honor him the American Congress has authorized the erection of a statue which will be a perpetual prayer in stone. That sculptured form is now being fashioned and will be erected near the Capitol in Washington. Listen to the prophetic song of Shevchenko ringing clear across a hundred years:

> It makes a great difference to me
> That evil folk and wicked men
> Attack our Ukraine once so free
> And rob and plunder it at will.
> That makes a great difference to me.

In 1963 that is still the sad story of the Ukraine, and, it makes a great difference to this sweet land of liberty.

In the pathos of Shevchenko's lines is mirrored the plight of all the other captive nations, including Latvia, Lithuanian, Hungary, Rumania, and now Cuba, and all the rest, held in the grip of Soviet colonialism. That makes a difference, a great difference, to the United States of America.

There is a silence that is not golden but craven concerning captive nations. In a world that cannot permanently remain half slave and half free, calloused indifference as the policy of any so-called democracy not only dooms the captives now in foreign fetters but also passes the sentence of ultimate death upon its own freedom. Yes, it makes a great difference to you and the Ukraine—and to the whole world of tomorrow.

The Ukraine and You

The article by Dr. Harris on "The Ukraine and You" is one of the most magnificent pieces I've ever read. As a student of East European history, I heartily congratulate Dr. Harris for his excellent grasp of this vital subject and thank him for the public service he has been performing through his instructive column, "Spires of the Spirit."

In the real struggle against Soviet Russian imperiocolonialism, Ukraine and the other captive non-Russian nations in the U.S.S.R. constitute our most formidable weapon in the cold war. Unfortunately, this fact is not sufficiently understood in the highest quarters of our Government. I strongly suggest that copies of Dr. Harris' article be sent to the White House, the Secretary of State, Mr. Rostow, and Senator Fulbright. There is enough documentary proof to show the deficient understanding each of these has displayed with regard to the makeup of the U.S.S.R. Dr. Harris' brilliant article might inspire them to undertake some serious research on the majority of non-Russian nations in the U.S.S.R.

Mary Kusy.

So little is known in this country about Ukraine, and so often is it appendaged to Russia, that every truthful bit of information on the subject is welcome. And Dr. Harris' fine feature is not only truthful, but also bursting with deep sympathy and friendliness toward the hapless Ukrainian people—one of the first victims of Russian Communist imperialism and one of the greatest martyrs in the history of mankind.

G. D. Corbett.

"The Ukraine and You" Plus Some Others

The recent article, "The Ukraine and You," by Dr. Frederick B. Harris, repeats some shocking misinformation about the Ukraine.

It should be remembered that: (1) The population of the Ukraine had never voted concerning separation from Russia; (2) a handful of separatists which proclaimed the separation of the Ukraine from Russia 45 years ago was not supported by the people and fled to get help from the German Army; (3) the present leaders of emigre Ukrainian separatists have no formal or moral right to speak in the name of the population of the Ukraine.

The above points were made by Andrey A. Diky in the January 19, 1963, issue of the New York anti-Soviet Russian language daily Novoye Russkoye Slovo. I know that they are true and I, therefore, indorse them.

The greatest guilt of the Ukrainian separatist emigres however is that their leader, Lev Dobriansky, so thoroughly misinformed the U.S. Congress that the so-called Captive Nations U.S. Public Law 86–9C even includes several mythical "nations," such as "Cossackia." This makes an aggressive farce out of the present congressional approach to the captive nations question, in spite of the glowing references to it by Dr. Harris. (According to the Congressional Record, Dobriansky claims that it was he who substantially provided and wrote the clauses in addition to the basic ideas of that law.)

Fifteen permanent tenure and emeriti professors of 12 American universities have joined me in a published statement which condemns the present form of that law and calls for its repeal since it aims at the complete dismemberment of Russian territories.

To expose the hoaxes of the "Captive Nations" law, I hereby formally offer to pay $1,000 to the first person who will be able to prove to a properly constituted arbitration commission of American historians that there ever was a nation called Cossackia the national independence of which—according to the U.S. Public Law 86–90—was subjugated by the imperialistic policies of Communist Russia."

This particular clearcut point is easiest for me to deal with since I am a former Don Cossack officer who had fought the Reds in south Russia so that I know that there was no Cossackia in existence then or later.

As an American citizen for over 20 years I cannot remain indifferent when Dr. Harris succumbs to the false propaganda of people whom I have dubbed the merchants of hate. In these days of menacing nuclear holocaust such things should be of the gravest concern to every American.

Gregory P. Tschebotarioff,
Professor of Civil Engineering, Princeton University, Princeton, N.J.

After reading Dr. Frederick Brown Harris' sermon on freedom abstract and freedom specifically for the Ukrainians, I have found the answer to why the men of the cloth have so little effect in the councils of men despite their moral posture.

To carry influence, eloquence is one of the more superficial requisites; many more important is a cleavage to the truth and the avoidance of that opportunistic bias lightly mistaken for patriotism.

Indeed, Dr. Harris, what are the facts about the Ukraine? First of all the Ukrainians are related to the Russians by race, religion, common cultural heritage, and even common enemies. In his statement about the Ukrainians fighting for their freedom from predatory neighbors for 1,000 years he avoids mentioning that those predators were not the Russians, but the Tatars, Turks, Lithuanians, and Poles. This is a neat bit of semantics for the gist of the article leads the reader to the desired wrong assumption.

It is a matter of historic record that the Ukrainians under Ataman Bogdan Khmelnitsky, in 1653, 30 odd years before Peter the Great was born, when the ravages of their neighbors were becoming too great to bear alone, voted to be under the eastern Czar who was like them, "of the same race and Orthodox religion." It was the time of the Cossacks' fight for survival against rapacious Poland, whose troops were absolved by the Holy Father in Rome of all sins in their aggression against the schismatics.

True, at the time of the battle of Poltava, Peter the Great's erstwhile friend, the Hetman Mazeppa, betrayed him and went over to the Swedes. But, the majority of Ukrainians were loyal and thus Charles XII, one of the long line of would-be conquerors of barbaric, but rich, Russia, was utterly defeated and fled ignominiously to the fat pasha in the Divine Porte.

Later czars and czarinas pushed the Poles back to Poland proper. (This process was completed after World War II with the Soviet's addition of the Carpathians, the Galicians and the Bukovenians to the Ukraine—not to mention the millions of Ukrainians who were in prewar Poland.) The wicked czars continued the battles of the cossacks and pushed, first the Crimean Tartars and then the Turks beyond the northern shores of the Black Sea. Thus all the Dnieper and the Crimea became a part of the great Ukraine one sees carved, way beforehand, by the assorted emigres and their not disinterested backers.

A little scholarly reading of history, instead of satisfying perusals of sensational Jesuit, German (Kaisern or Nazi) and other poop-sheets will show why—despite all the differences real and imagined, between these two closely related peoples, neither the Roman Catholic Church, Poland, Turkey, the Swedes, Napoleon, the Kaiser, or Hitler, have ever been able to sunder the Union.

And now as a contrast let's look at our little glass house. How, good Doctor, was the Confederacy kept in our Union? Did we allow the ballot box or the will of a dissident people to rule supreme in their desire to go their own way? Didn't we use the overwhelming wealth and power of the North to destroy this aspiration and to fasten a rigid military dictatorship over the conquered provinces? What happened to that pure American type freedom we had preached to all the wicked world of centralized governments? We found that we, too, could not afford that objective freedom, for there were too many practical considerations, sometime called Manifest Destiny, but all ending in the inviolability of the sacred Union.

Russell Forrest.

Knows the Ukraine

Being of Ukrainian descent, I resent letters criticizing the Ukraine article by Dr. Frederick Brown Harris. He has given the true picture of the situation. I know, because my parents came to America from the Ukraine and they speak of their homeland as a beautiful, fertile country taken over by the Russians. I also resent being classed with the Russians. The Ukrainian people are an entirely different people, with customs all their own. They are, as a whole, gentle, peace-loving Catholics, as compared to the fiery, aggressive Russians.

Olga B. Roylance.

Captive Ukraine and Holy Mother Russia Complex

To the Editor of the Evening Star:

Since my name was injected into an issue of crucial importance to our foreign policy and national security, I trust you will afford me the opportunity of replying in full text to the Tschebotarioff and Forrest letters. Not only does Dr. Harris have my warmest congratulations on his recent masterpiece "The Ukraine and You," but also my compliments go to the Star's editors for bringing to public view these two excellent examples of calculated disinformation and apology for traditional Russian imperialism, both Czarist and Soviet.

Considering the Tschebotarioff letter first, it was most intriguing for me to learn that allegedly I have the honor of leading "Ukrainian separatist emigres." If with some respect for truth the writer had checked biographical sources, such as "Who's Who in America," he would have found this to be an impossible characterization. I have never led any such group, nor could I, by virtue of birth, loyalty, and thorough American training. This low level of credibility features both letters.

As the record plainly shows, my scholarly and educational endeavors have been directed at a comprehensive understanding by our people of the Soviet Russian imperiocolonial system that prevails in the U.S.S.R. By all evidence this system is the most vulnerable sector in the expanded empire of Moscow. The persistent struggle for independence and freedom by all the captive non-Russian nations in the U.S.S.R. against the one remaining imperialist system in the world is of the same spirit and substance as our own American Revolution. Once we understand and appreciate this fundamental truth, tremendous opportunities for our victory in the cold war will be open to us. Glimmers of such opportunities have already appeared in the U.N. debates on Soviet Russian colonialism, Congress passage of the Captive Nations Week resolution, the Captive Nations Week observances, and many other events. Moscow's reactions have been most defensive and fearful.

The interesting aspect of my endeavors has been the discovery that a common denominator of an imperialist "Holy Mother Russia" complex exists between Soviet Russian propagandists and numerous Russian and Russianized emigres and their unknowing friends who, despite the privileges of American citizenship, would misguide us in not exploring this whole new non-Russian dimension in the U.S.S.R. Every argument and position taken in these two letters exemplifies this; even the terms are meaningful. For example, the term, "Ukrainian separatist emigre" is a favorite Russian usage applied to Ukrainian patriots, and as shown just last October in the Stashynsky trial in West Germany, even the mighty Khrushchev had out of fear to order the assassination of two Ukrainian emigre leaders.

The fantasies about Ukraine not voting separation from Russia, a handful of separatists proclaiming independence, and Ukrainian emigres not having a moral right to speak in behalf of their captive homeland are also familiar Soviet Russian tunes. These typical Russianistic distortions of the histories of conquered nations are easily contradicted by the Ukrainian Congresses held in 1917, from which delegates were elected to form the independent Republic, the recognition by the Russian Council of People's Commissars in December 1917 of "the Ukrainian National Republic and its right to full separation from Russia," and after the rape of independent Ukraine and its forced incorporation into the U.S.S.R., the existence of article 17 in the U.S.S.R. Constitution, "The right freely to secede from the U.S.S.R. is reserved to every Union Republic."

A measure of commonsense on these Soviet Russian responses to the Ukrainian drive for independence should alone suggest that they weren't made in a vacuum but rather with an eye to the expressed popular will of the historic Ukrainian nation. If the reader is not familiar with this history, he can consult the compact bibliography on Ukraine and other captive non-Russian nations in the U.S.S.R., published in the February 4 issue of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. From our American viewpoint in the cold war, we should press the present Russian imperio-colonialists to demonstrate under U.N. auspices the "free right" the Ukrainian people have to secede from the Union.

Another striking identity of position between the first letter and Soviet Russian propaganda is their opposition to the Captive Nations Week resolution. From the time I worked on this resolution with former Congressman Cretella of Connecticut in 1958 to the very present, it has been quite educational to see who and what groups in this country have lined up with Khrushchev in denouncing the resolution. Invariably, those bred in the Russian political environment and their few friends have supported the hands-off position on Soviet Russian imperio-colonialism. Americans who for some time have understood this problem in our midst (e.g. James Bundy, Containment or Liberation? p. 236) have wondered on whose side these people will be when a showdown comes; and this includes the 15 professors cited in the first letter. Needless to say, we've had many other university professors in this country sympathetic to the various policies of imperial Moscow.

Finally, as concerns Cossackia, it doesn't surprise me that the first writer shows little appreciation of the national sinews binding the Cossack people. His outlook is so totalitarian Russian that he no longer recognizes his own ancestry. Such Russianized types have been the ripe products of systematic Russification both under the white and red czars. As Lenin once pointed out, they even out-Russianize the chauvinist Russians. However, since he resorted to the rather cheap pecuniary bravado of offering $1,000 to prove the points on Cossackia and since the Star publicized this, I suggest that in behalf of public enlightenment the Star arrange for the formation of a committee of competent scholars, here and abroad, to judge this. There are many intellectual Americans of Cossack ancestry who would be willing to oblige in showing the Cossack struggle against Russian domination and Cossackia's declaration of independence in 1918. In fact, if the engineer has any $1,000 bonuses to offer on Idel-Ural, Turkestan, and the non-Russian entities of North Caucasia, the editors could rest assured of an enthusiastic Moslem response. This would be one effective way of informing our people about the captive non-Russian nations in the U.S.S.R., our allies in the cause of universal freedom.

As for the Forrest letter, its anticlerical tone and Russian version of Ukrainian history are enough to substantiate my several comments above. However, here, too, it is important to observe the selfsame arguments used by Moscow for free world consumption. Indeed, the writer almost competes with Khrushchev as a defender of the enforced union of Ukraine with Russia. His version of the actual military treaty between Khmelnitsky's Ukraine and Muscovy in 1654 is exactly the same version found in Tass' "Theses on the Tercentenary of the Reunion of the Ukraine with Russia—1654 to 1954." A military treaty is scarcely an organic union. Significantly, both fail to mention that after Moscow, in typical Russian fashion, broke the treaty and attempted to enslave Ukraine, the two were at war in 1659. The words of Hetman Vyhovsky, leading the Ukrainian forces then, are strikingly pertinent for our times: "The treacherous action of Moscow was apparent in preparing for us a slavery primarily by means of instigating a civil war in Ukraine."

The writer's comments on Mazeppa and the war against the Russian tyrant, Peter the Great, are also sheer fabrications which one often finds in Soviet Russian adulations of the empire-builder. Imagine, in this Nation dedicated to the freedom and independence of all nations, the writer has the gall also to extol Russia's tyrants for consolidating Ukraine's territories, which only meant the conquest of the entire nation as a springboard for further Russian expansionism. Lastly, his reference to the Confederacy as an analogy to the Russo-Ukrainian situation—which Moscow also employs from time to time—doesn't even make logical sense in the framework of his own argument. Ours was a nation divided; Ukraine and Russia are two distinct nations, the latter imprisoning the former in sacred union.

Isn't it significant that while Dr. Harris is being attacked for his American insights into the 45th anniversary of Ukraine's independence by the Russia-first cabal in this country, Moscow attacks Governor Rockefeller for his proclamation of the event (AP, January 23, Moscow)? The common denominator shows itself again. As we continue to flush out the exponents of the "Holy Mother Russia" complex—those who view Ukraine, Armenia, Georgia, etc., as "traditional parts of the Soviet Union" (e.g. Secretary Rusk's letter to Hon. HOWARD W. SMITH, Aug. 22, 1961)—the ground will be set for the exposure of the worst imperio-colonial system in modern history, the Russian one in the U.S.S.R. itself. As he's demonstrated so often, Khrushchev has nightmares over this; we have a cold war to win with this.

LEV E. DOBRIANSKY,
Georgetown University.

"COSSACKIA"

Yes, Professor Tschebotarioff, there was a Cossackia, a nation which consisted of the territory where you were born yourself, and which was populated by your own people, the Don Cossacks. In the Russian empire this territory was called "The region of the Don Host," and in the Soviet Union this region is now called "The Rostov on the Don region."

It was after the Russian Revolution of 1917 that the Don Cossacks proclaimed this territory and its people an independent nation. Its first president was Don Cossacks Gen. Bogayevsky African Petrovich. That was the nation, which was mentioned in the American Congress' resolution on the Captive Nations Week. Congress called it "Cossackia" because of the difficulties of pronunciation of the archaic name, Vsevelikoye Voisko Donskoye.

But I do not pretend to get the professor's money. I ask him to send $500 to the Jew's Home for the Old and $500 for the Ukrainian Home for Old Age. Perhaps there now are living there old men and women who in their youth were beaten by the long whips in which Don Cossacks officers used to delight.

MRS. A. SYCYNSKY.

MOSCOW ATTACKS GOVERNOR ROCKEFELLER FOR PROCLAIMING "UKRAINIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY"

MOSCOW, January 23.—The news agency Tass reported today a "groundswell of indignation" among the working people of Ukraine over New York Gov. Nelson A. Rockefeller's proclamation of a "Ukrainian Independence Day."

Tass quoted from letters of workers, one of whom denounced Rockefeller as a "capitalist who has waxed rich on the blood and sweat of millions."

Earlier this week the Governor proclaimed yesterday as "Ukrainian Independence Day," calling it a gesture of "our keen sympathies" with the Ukrainian people's hope for freedom.

Without saying how the people in Ukraine learned of the proclamation, Tass cited these reactions from among the "numerous letters" received from Ukrainians:

Piotr Stepanchuk, building worker, "hero of Socialist labor" and deputy of the Ukrainian Supreme Soviet: "Look who is showing concern for us; Rockefeller, a capitalist who waxed rich on the blood and sweat of millions of people * * *. My people do not need aid from anybody * * * to our self-appointed benefactor from abroad I say, Don't butt your nose, Mr. Rockefeller, into our Soviet home."

Nikolai Tarnavsky, a writer who Tass said lived 49 years in the United States: "Don't make like simpletons. The people of the whole world are well aware that it is your famous America that lacks freedom. What goes on in your Southern States? The Ukrainian people freed themselves long ago, as far back as 1917, when they did away with the rule of the czars and such magnates as you."

Vasili Rubanik, chairman of a collective farm: "We do not want your freedom. We have no use for it. American correspondents who visited our collective farm last year expected to see dilapidated huts, but they saw spacious houses, they saw abundance instead of misery. You ask about this from Lauren Soth, the editor of the Des Moines (Iowa) Register-Tribune, and other newsmen. They could not understand how it was possible in such short time and after a devastating war to achieve such success."

VIOLENT SOVIET REACTION TO UKRAINE'S INDEPENDENCE CELEBRATIONS

NEW YORK.—Observances of the 45th anniversary of Ukraine's independence by the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America throughout the United States and especially the solemn observances in the U.S. Congress evoked violent reaction in the Soviet Union. Immediately after the proclamations of "Ukrainian Independence Day" were issued by American Governors and after prayers were delivered by Ukrainian clergymen in Congress, a number of Governors, especially Gov. Nelson A. Rockefeller, of New York, and other American officials, U.S. Senators were assailed by the Moscow radio for taking part in these observances. Subsequently, a series of articles, caricatures, verses, and other satiric and abusive reports appeared in the following Soviet organs in Moscow and Kiev: Izvestia (January 24, 1963), Pravda (January 23, 1963), Izvestia (January 25, 1963, and article by Lubomyr Dmyterko, member of the Ukrainian S.S.R. mission to the U.N. in New York), all of which were in the Russian language and printed in Moscow, and Radyanska Ukraina (January 24, 1963), Molod Ukrainy (January 26, 1963), and Robitnycha Hazeta (January 24, 1963), in the Ukrainian language in Kiev. Also Pravda Ukrainy, a Russian-language daily appearing in Kiev, on January 24, 1963, printed a vitriolic article against the observances of Ukrainian independence in the United States.

All these articles are replete with accusations of "American imperialism" and protestations that the Ukrainian people were "liberated" in December 1917 (reference to the establishment of a Soviet puppet regime in Kharkiv), and that the United States need not worry about the present position of the Ukrainian people.

QUOTA ALLOCATIONS FOR IMPORTATION OF RESIDUAL OIL

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. NYGAARD] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. NYGAARD. Mr. Speaker, last week I requested and received permission to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a copy of a letter I had addressed to the Secretary of the Interior asking that the proposed new quota allocations for importation of residual oil be withheld until such time as interested Congressmen had had an opportunity to review them. I have not been notified of an announcement of these allocations, and I understand unofficially that conferences have been arranged between Department of the Interior officials and Members objecting to increases in import levels.

I find it hard to believe that the economic welfare of the U.S. workers could be deliberately sacrificed on the altar of foreign political expediency. Surely the administration cannot rate Venezuelans as more important than its own citizens. Yet if the President chooses to accept the recommendations contained in the Office of Emergency Planning report, that is what his action will signify.

Mr. McDermott's view that hemispheric solidarity—whatever that means—must be achieved at any cost, does not add up to sound thinking.

Does he think Venezuela would permit the United States to sell uncontrolled amounts of a waste product to it where this would compete unfairly with one of its industries and deprive Venezuelans of jobs? Of course it would not.

It is a strange foreign policy, indeed, where our Government is solicitous of and caters to the people of other nations to the detriment of U.S. citizens. Sure we know we are fighting communism in Latin America. But what guarantee do we have, no matter what we do, that Venezuela will not succumb to the techniques and ideas of this insidious Soviet philosophy?

We believe in a policy of imports and exports that operates in the interest of the people of the United States. What advantage do we obtain by favoring a nation of dubious importance and questionable stability at the expense of our own citizens? Self-interest is just good national commonsense. Could it be that commonsense has flown out the windows of the ivory towers in which the administration's economic and political pundits concoct their fanciful theories?

You may ask, Mr. President, why North Dakota way out in the Midwest is so seriously concerned with imports of residual oil into east coast markets. The answer is relatively simple. The dislocation or elimination of big coal markets on the east coast through inequitable oil competition has a marked effect on the economy of Midwestern States.

And that is not all. North Dakota is fighting for the right to develop a major industry for the State. While coal production in recent years has been only a few million tons, we have every reason to believe that this amount can be increased manyfold because of the way demand for coal is growing in the Midwest. Did you know that North Dakota has one of the largest reserves of coal in the country, a grand total of recoverable deposits of 175,359 million tons?

Since the location of oil there in 1951, North Dakota has developed into one of the important States in oil production. Because of the lack of oil markets at this time, the extent of our oilfields has not been fully explored, and the continuation of imports of residual oil has had a very depressing effect upon the American oil industry as a whole.

So of course we are concerned, profoundly concerned. We have high hopes of developing industries of considerable magnitude and importance to the State from our vast oil and lignite deposits. We do not want to see them wrecked on the shoals of increasing imports of foreign residual oil.

If more residual oil pours into the east coast, big coal and oil producing States will lose more and more business, more miners and oil workers will lose jobs, more mines and oilfields will close. The railroads will sustain severe revenue losses. Many other industries and trades will be gravely injured financially. And you had better believe that the economies of many States other than those on the east coast will feel serious repercussions.

Another way of saying "big imports of residual oil" is "big economic disaster for thousands of U.S. citizens."

The economic havoc which can be wrought by the residual oil import policy fostered by the OEP report, of course, represents only half the story. Mr. McDermott also failed to face up squarely to the sober facts of national security. His so-called hemispheric solidarity may be actually only a myth—an abstraction that can evaporate overnight. It is scant comfort when our national security is threatened, as it may well be.

You know as well as I that a communistic revolt could erupt in Venezuela overnight. Oil wells could be dynamited as they were once before. A situation could develop where Russian subs based in Cuba could disrupt oil supply lines with Venezuela.

One of the grave dangers of allowing more volumes of residual oil to flood into our east coast is that more and more defense plants will use it. Actually the only merit of residual oil is its dump price. It cannot be stockpiled—it has to be used up quickly. Consequently most companies using it would be without any fuel in a matter of days once shipments of it were cut off.

Few companies now have dual burning facilities, so they could not quickly convert to coal. Prolonged loss of markets by a shortsighted residual oil import policy also causes mines to shut down and coal production to diminish. The coal industry cannot operate on a standby basis. It could not be magically restored to production to meet the immense demands of an emergency. Our Nation might therefore suffer from economic strangulation for a considerable period when time was of the essence and it was imperative to produce war material fast.

No patriotic, clear-thinking American wants to gamble with this Nation's security through politically expedient foreign import policies. We cannot believe the President does, either.

The people of the State of North Dakota have a big stake in what would happen if residual oil imports are relaxed just as much as other coal producing States. We raise our voices, Mr. President, with utmost vehemence. We strongly protest any change in residual oil import controls. We urge this administration to reject the strange thinking of Mr. McDermott that the national security implications of the residual oil import program are irrelevant, that the economic welfare of the coal and related industries are inconsequential.

Strict controls on residual oil imports must be kept on for the security of our Nation and for the economic benefit of U.S. workers. Let us start using some commonsense. Let us solve our domestic problems first.

DR. WILLIAM S. MIDDLETON

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MORSE] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, during the period that I had the privilege of serving as Deputy Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, I came to know and admire a great man. This man, Dr. William S. Middleton, was Chief Medical Director of the VA's Department of Medicine and Surgery.

Citing his title tells you something of his position, but may actually be misleading about the man himself. For Dr. Middleton was no austere medical administrator, sitting in an office high above the arena of man's pain and suffering. The symbol of Dr. Middleton was never the plush chair and the big desk; rather, his most treasured possession, one always physically close to him, was the stethoscope he carried for the 43 years he served the University of Wisconsin Medical School, including 22 years as dean. Certainly during the time I was his associate in the Veterans' Administration, Dr. Middleton was never happier than when touring the wards of a veterans' hospital, combining his stethoscope, his magnificent brain, and his deep feeling for his fellow man in order to cure and to soothe.

On the first of March, after 8 years as Chief Medical Director, Dr. Middleton, now 73, retired. Behind him he leaves many friends, those who have known him, and those—perhaps never having heard his name—who have received better medical care as a result of his service.

Also retiring after 45 years of service to veterans is "Senator" Robinson E. "Bob" Adkins, who has been the principal administrative adviser and assistant to VA chief medical directors since October 1945.

Bob was a close friend and confidant of Dr. Middleton, the two making an admirable working team, particularly since they agreed 100 percent that VA medicine must not only continue its position in the first rank, but must never settle for less than a deep and genuine sympathy for each individual veteran, not as a patient or a case, but as a human being with a medical problem. That the Department of Medicine and Surgery has succeeded and is succeeding in this endeavor is, in large measure, due to Dr. William S. Middleton and Robinson E. Adkins.

INCOME TAX EXEMPTION

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. Morse] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, a year ago I introduced a bill which would provide an income tax exemption of an additional $1,000 to taxpayers with dependent students in institutions of higher education. The reasons which prompted me to introduce this legislation then are still extremely valid.

Even with Federal aid in the form of student loans, housing grants, and subsidies to scientific activity, our colleges and universities have been forced to raise their tuition fees in order to meet rising costs on a fixed endowment base.

It seems only reasonable, Mr. Speaker, to give some form of support to families who are making every financial sacrifice possible in order to give their children a fine higher education. Therefore, I am reintroducing this bill and I will continue to work for its passage as vigorously as I know how.

THE FRESH AIR OF COMPETITION

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. Keith] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEITH. Mr. Speaker, recently I had the good fortune to hear an address on the state of the economy by Dr. Charles F. Phillips, the distinguished president of Bates College. It was delivered to a meeting of the Life Underwriters Association of the District of Columbia, but deserves a much wider audience.

Dr. Phillips has a way of being very entertaining and down to earth, yet direct and incisive in his comments on the economic facts of life. I was so impressed with his remarks that I made arrangements to have the tape recording transcribed and edited for inclusion in the Congressional Record. I did so because I know that many of my colleagues have a high regard for Dr. Phillips and will want to read this very timely and pertinent speech.

With all the discussion today about economic stimulants, the controversy surrounding proposed tax measures, and the unhappy task we face in dealing with the largest peacetime budget in history, I sometimes think we often lose sight of the basic issues behind the more apparent economic problems. Dr. Phillips has not lost sight of the real issue and has placed it very ably into its proper perspective. He concludes that more than anything else, our economy needs a restoration of competition, and that this will not occur unless those of us who believe in the American system of a free economy get out and fight for the best solutions. I agree with Dr. Phillips and commend this excellent speech to the attention of my colleagues in Congress:

Speech of Dr. Charles F. Phillips, President of Bates College, Lewiston, Maine, January 23, 1963, in Washington, Before the District of Columbia Life Underwriters Association

Mr. President, Mr. Chairman, members, and guests of this association, ladies and gentlemen, I want you to know how pleasant it is to be here with you this afternoon, to leave the Bates campus down in the State of Maine, to fly here so comfortably, to meet with those of you who are members of this association and your many guests and to have this chance of chatting with you for just a few minutes.

And, of course, it is especially pleasant to be introduced by one of my own distinguished colleagues from the field of education and to have so many others from the field of education here.

And since this is such a pleasant occasion from my point of view, I want to be sure equally well that it's pleasant for you. And so let me tell you right at the beginning that I plan to follow my usual practice of not chatting for very long. You see, I think all speakers should follow the advice of that current advertisement for an electric washing machine. If you noticed it, it says, "After it spins dry, it automatically shuts itself off." [Laughter and applause.]

I don't know what agency prepared that, but I think it has very broad application [laughter] throughout many areas of American life so far as that's concerned.

Actually, though, I have another reason for chatting for a very short time today, and that's simply because I want to get back on the Bates campus. So many interesting and fascinating things have been happening there of late that I just don't want to be away any longer than I have to and miss them. For example, just to pick one, one night last spring—in fact, it was the night just before Colonel Glenn went into orbit, you remember—and a group of students, as students sometimes do, President Carroll, decided to explore a building which we were then putting up—nowhere near completed but the frame was up, and at the top—it was a science building—was a big dome; eventually, you know, it would have a track inside for the telescopes; the dome would open and the telescope would point up to the sky. And this group got in the building and went up to the top. The telescope wasn't there; the dome was and the track was there. Somehow they got this track to go around and around. It isn't supposed to now; its supposed to go just 180 degrees and come back, and it's never been quite right since [laughter] but they did. They opened the top and placed on the revolving track an American flag which they had with them, together with a great big sign on which they had written "Good Luck Glenn." And you know what bothered me, President Carroll? You knew they were college boys—they spelled Glenn, G-l-e-n. [Laughter.] Who else could do this? [Laughter.] In fact, I could even pick the nearby college from which they came. [Laughter and applause.]

When something like this happens I feel exactly like that little kindergarten teacher who had one of those terrible days in class, everything has gone wrong; all of her little angels have turned into hellions. And as she was leaving for home that night one of the other teachers heard her mutter to herself, "Tomorrow I'm going to find some quicksand for them to play in" [laughter].

I came here to Washington today because I want to take you on a little trip with me. I hope you find it an interesting trip; I think it will be somewhat unusual, because what I would like to do in these very few minutes together is take you on a little space flight with me. Actually, in the couple of minutes I've been standing here, this whole room has been picked up, we have jetted to Cape Canaveral, we've been on the launching pad, we've had our blast-off, and now we're soaring. But in contrast to most spaceships, we're not going to orbit around this earth; we are going to move at exactly the same speed as the earth so that in effect we place ourselves right up over the United States where we can take a bird's eye view of what's going on down here, but free from all the economic, social, and political pressures which surrounds us when we are on this earth.

And this particular spaceship has one wonderful gadget. It has a button which is right under my thumb, here, right on the podium, which if I push, backs us up just a little bit in time and then brings us forward ever so quickly to get a bird's-eye view of the last year.

I'm going to push it now and the next voice you're going to hear is that of the President of the United States a year ago, in January, when he was then giving his January message to Congress and his Economic Report was being read. And as we listen to him, we soon get the point that no President, ever in the history of the United States, gave such an optimistic forecast as did President Kennedy just a year ago: Gross national product 521 in 1961 would go up to 570 in 1962; labor was to gain by higher wages and a decrease in unemployment; stockholders would gain by a 23-percent increase in corporate profits; consumers would benefit from an increased output of goods and services at stable prices. And we would have all of this and a balanced budget, because while spending would go up about $3.5 billion, Government income would increase at a more rapid rate so we would end up the year with about a half-billion dollar surplus.

And as I push this gadget and we come along just a little bit in the year, we see in many ways the year is being a good year. Looking down we see some 67, 68, 69, to 70—depending on the time of the year—millions of people scurrying to work each morning against 2 or 3 million fewer people the previous year. Through our radio connections with the earth we hear cash registers ringing up new highs in retail sales; we hear the pound of hammers as home starts reach, not a new all-time high, but certainly the highest point in the previous 3 years.

But as I push this gadget and we come along a little bit more, we see that in a number of areas what's actually happening is falling substantially behind the forecast of the President. This gross national product which was to go from 521 to 570, gets around 550 and 554 and becomes very sticky. Unemployment, which was to go down month after month, reaches the 4 million range and then just hangs there. The index of production which was to go up month after month after month gets up to around 119 by midyear and then has a difficult job just to hold at that level.

In fact, some very disquieting signs develop, signs as disquieting as the experience of the man at the dentist's with a bad tooth. Said the dentist: "I'll have to pull it for you." "Oh, Doc, how much is it going to cost?" "Ten dollars." "Doc, isn't that an awful lot of money for 30 seconds' work?" "All right, I'll pull it for you more slowly, if you like." [Laughter.] This was disquieting.

And likewise it was disquieting by midyear to see a stock market tumble in 6 months about 25 percent, taking along with it some $94 billion of paper value. It was somewhat discouraging to see this market decline give rise in the minds of many people to a worry about recession, a worry which was accentuated by a steady rise in the rate of business failures.

Even more important, we discovered by midyear that we were plowing back into plant and equipment nowhere near as much as had been our normal custom. Ten years ago we were putting back each year about 6.6 of our gross national product into expanding plant and equipment, and this is the only way a competitive economy can grow—to plow back funds into plant and equipment. Ten years ago, about 6.6 percent; last year, about 4.9 percent. In other words, we spent too much of the year living off of our past capital; we were not being as realistic as the man living the life of Riley on the town. Finally, when he began to feel a bit run down, he went to the doctor, and the doctor took one look at him, put him down in a chair and began to give him a lecture about the way he was living.

"Doc," he said, "you stop right there. I didn't come here to have you tell me I was burning the candle at both ends; I came for more wax." [Laughter.]

We just didn't use enough reinvestment.

And then, of course, by midyear, it became perfectly clear to everyone that what was to be a surplus was rapidly turning into a deficit, which is now estimated at roughly $9 billion for the fiscal year. This deficit, in turn, has given rise to worry about the stability of the American dollar as gold has again begun to leave our country.

So here on our spaceship, Mr. Chairman, with this brief review behind us, we get together in a little huddle. We say, "Why has this happened?" On the surface, we have everything; we have fine managers, able workers, huge capital sums for investment; we have superb natural resources. Why are we growing at such a slow rate?

And the answer to this question—as seen from our spaceship, where we don't have to worry about all the pressures of events that force themselves upon us when we're down below—becomes perfectly clear the minute we ask ourselves another question: What is it that makes a competitive, private economy grow? What is the thing that encourages businessmen to take funds and reinvest them to expand their plant and equipment—literally, if you like, to create jobs?

The answer: the rate of profit. When the rate of profit is increasing and is deemed adequate, expansion takes place. When it starts going down, expansion slows up; and if it goes down rapidly enough, we go into a period of contraction.

The rate of profit is the same kind of incentive that one farmer found in the football. After painting it white, he took it out to the hen coop and dropped it in and said, "I want you gals to see what some of the ladies next door are doing." It's the same kind of incentive. [Laughter.]

But what has been happening to the rate of profit? No matter how you measure it—whether you put it in terms of percentage return on capital invested, in terms of percentage on manufacturer sales, or in terms of percentage of our total gross national product—any way you want to look at it—for 12 years it has, with minor inconsistencies, been running downhill. Twelve years ago manufacturers earning roughly 7.1 percent net, after taxes, per dollar of sales; currently they are earning about 4.3 percent.

So you ask yourself, sitting up in our spaceship, "Why did this happen?" And again it is perfectly clear. Profits are nothing but the difference between cost, including taxes, and prices and for the past 10 years we have been shrinking this margin. While the price level has gone up a bit, about 13 percent, costs have gone up much more. So year after year we have been shrinking the driving force of a competitive economy. We have been shrinking it (1) because of certain cost policies and practices which we have been following, (2) because of a 47 percent increase in average hourly earnings, and (3) because of a tax structure which today is the highest tax structure of any industrial nation of the world.

How do we get ourselves out of this situation? How do we restore the profit margin that makes Johnny run? Obviously, we cannot do it by raising prices. If we do, we will price ourselves out of the market, and we have already done a pretty good job of that. Therefore, if we want to restore our profit margin, it must be done by an all-out attack on the three factors I just mentioned which have affected our cost structure. So may I now turn to a few suggestions as to how we may get our cost structure under control.

Let me start with two illustrations of cost policies and practices which have worked to our own detriment.

First, our farm program. The basic problem, here, of course, is that we simply have too many people on our farms. When I was a youngster living on a farm it took one farmer to raise enough food to feed five people. By 1940 he could feed 10, today he can feed 20, tomorrow, meaning the middle of the next decade, he will be able to feed 40. A complete agricultural revolution has taken place and yet through Government support and loan programs we have encouraged people to remain on the farms where they continue to produce. These programs raise prices—and remember that higher prices to the farmer means higher costs to the businessmen. They also curtail our foreign markets. In addition, we end up with the Government owning some $8 to $10 billions in so-called surplus products on which the annual cost just for storage is in excess of a billion dollars. I tell you this makes no sense.

How do we get out of this jam? By bringing in the fresh air of competition. When you overproduce something you must let prices go down. Don't misunderstand me, I'm not suggesting that we bankrupt our farmers. But I am suggesting that we take our price-fixing program and turn it into an insurance program. Instead of saying, "We will hold prices at a certain level," we should say to the farmer, "We won't let any great catastrophe hit you in any one year." Consequently we will guarantee that prices will not fall more than 10 percent in any particular year, but they can fall several years in a row so pressure is exerted to move people out of this part of our economy.

As a second illustration, consider the practice of featherbedding, the tendency to hang onto jobs after the economic need for these jobs has gone by. We usually think of featherbedding as existing only on our railroads. We think of the firemen—originally put on a locomotive to shovel coal—still riding the electric or the diesel today where there are neither fires to stoke nor boilers to tend. Or we think of the engine crew with its payday based upon a 100-mile trip—which made sense when the average freight went 12½ miles per hour. But today, when this distance is covered in from 2 to 4 hours, it becomes a practice of featherbedding.

Actually featherbedding is rampant throughout industry. It exists in our textile mills with the setting of the number of looms that a man is allowed to handle. It exists in our building trade, where for many jobs that practically anyone can do, we still require skilled labor. It exists in our great air transportation industry. Today's jets, easier to fly, so my good friends, air pilots tell me, easier to fly than the giant props which they are replacing, and vet on many lines still today, crews of from three to four are required where two or three can do the job.

How do we get out of this situation? Again by bringing in the fresh air of competition. By making union membership voluntary so you can join if you want to or refuse to join. It is under such conditions competitive influence can be brought to bear to put an end to this type of featherbedding practice.

Turning to our wage structure, our basic job is to educate people that the policy we have been following for a number of years doesn't make sense. This is going to be terrifically difficult because the most widely accepted economic idea in the United States is that every increase in productivity must be followed by an equal increase in the average wage level. That is, the majority of our citizens believe that if the output per man-hour, which is what we mean by productivity, goes up by 2 percent in 1 year, wages should go up 2 percent; if it goes up 3 percent, wages should go up 3 percent. This idea is accepted by the present President of the United States and the one before him, which gets both political parties involved. It is deeply imbedded in many of our labor contracts. Fourteen years ago the General Motors Corp. signed its first automatic escalator clause contract with the United Auto Workers, which was based on the assumption that output per man-hour would go up 2 percent a year and, therefore, wages would go up 2 percent per year. This idea of an automatic escalator clause spread to the other automobile companies and then to other industries and today one-third of all the labor contracts of the United States have in them automatic escalator clauses.

Despite the popularity of relating wages to productivity, I stand here in all sincerity to say to you that this idea is bad for our country, for labor, for you, and for your customers. Instead we should let this great increase in productivity reflect itself in gradually falling prices. Why do I say this? For two very simple reasons.

In the first place, if we let our increase in productivity be reflected in gradually falling prices we would raise the standard of living of everyone, not just those who are in the position to achieve higher wages. For example, during the past 20 years, the price of your private passenger car has gone up 300 percent. This means that anyone whose income, net after taxes, has not advanced 300 percent is less well off in terms of buying private passenger cars for transportation today than he was 20 years ago. Which of course means that thousands of Government employees, teachers, and retired individuals, just to select three groups at random, now have less in standard of living in this area than they had two decades ago. Whereas, had we let the tremendous increase in productive possibilities of our automobile industry be reflected in gradually falling prices, everyone would be better off—even if their wages had remained exactly as they were.

Secondly, I suggest that if we would let this increased productivity reflect itself in falling prices, we would protect, note "protect," our home markets. I don't have to say to a group like this, as knowledgeable as you are, how American manufacturers are being increasingly undercut pricewise even within our own country. A few years ago if you wanted to see any great number of foreign-made cars you had to get on a plane and go to the German autobahn, the streets of London or Paris, or to Italy's Amalfi Drive. Today you don't have to—you can see them on the highways and the byways of the United States anywhere you want to go. And what is happening in automobiles, is also happening in steel, with German cameras and typewriters, and with Japanese transistor radios and sewing machines. And the end is not yet. As I travel around the world and talk with my manufacturing friends of other nations, the one thing of which they are sure is that in the years ahead they will take over a greater share of the American market.

Now don't misunderstand me. I am not suggesting to you for one moment to go back to protectionism. Nor am I suggesting that we turn around and cut wages. And I am certainly not suggesting that labor should have no share in the growing productiveness of our economy. But I am saying that labor should share in our economy on the same basis as everyone else does, no more and no less. And the only way to distribute our gains equitably is to do it through gradually falling prices which raise the standard of living of everyone, protect markets at home, and expand markets throughout the world.

As for taxes, here we must start from two obvious facts. On the one hand, taxes retard production. On the other hand, no matter what we want to do, we've got to collect great amounts of taxes. Taxes retard production by taking funds that otherwise might be reinvested in plant and equipment. It takes about $14,000 in the United States to put a man to work—to buy the plant and equipment necessary to go along with his job. Every time we take $14,000 out of the hands of some private company, we make it less possible for that company to create that job. But taxes do something else; they decrease individual initiative. When we have a corporate tax of 52 percent and pile on top of that a personal income tax ranging from 20 to 91 percent, we stifle the degree of initiative, make people less venturesome. It becomes much safer to put money into tax-exempt securities, rather than in new enterprises. Yet, as I just stated, we cannot have a $94 billion budget like we have today without collecting great amounts of taxes.

What do we do when we face this kind of paradoxical situation? May I suggest that we do two very simple things. One, that we turn to those areas where we can make substantial reductions in our spending and start making those reductions. And when you have a total budget of $94 billion it is not difficult to find soft spots. The farm program, on which I have commented already, is costing us $5,800 million a year. Let us turn it into an insurance program with a maximum cost of $1 billion. Our foreign aid program, of which I have been a firm supporter and into which we have put some $63 billion since the end of World War II.

When we have cut spending—created a little elbow room—then I want to make another suggestion: a tax cut. Now I am not recommending an emergency tax cut. An emergency tax cut in which one does not know whether this will be in effect for 1 month, for 5 months, or for 5 years will not put a penny to work. What we need is a carefully thought out program in which we commit ourselves now, that over the next 10 years we will make a 1- to 2-percent gradual reduction each and every year to bring that 52 percent corporate tax down to 40 percent. We need a 4- to 6-percent reduction each year in the high personal income tax brackets to bring the 91 percent down to 50 percent over this period of time.

Will such a tax program unbalance our budget? It may. I don't lose too much sleep over that. I'd have been dead long ago, had I. We have operated on an unbalanced budget for 24 of the past 30 years. But a careful tax reduction program may not unbalance the budget. If annual reductions can be counted upon, this would spur our economy. This has happened before. Back in 1954, in the early days of the Eisenhower administration, taxes were cut by 7½ billion; yet 2 years later, because of the remarkable growth of the economy, at the lower rates we were collecting more in dollars than we were at the higher rates of 2 years before. Our economy needs this kind of stimulation. Its growth rate is too low, its unemployment rate is too high.

Now let's leave our spaceship. It has landed, the capsule has opened, we are walking around the United States. And all of a sudden we feel the pressures that we did not feel up in free space. We feel the social pressures, the economic pressures, the political pressure. Can we do the things we talked about while up in space? Can we put them into effect? Can we do these things necessary to stimulate the growth of our economy? Obviously we cannot do them in the clearcut fashion that I have just suggested. The farm vote is too strong to turn the farm program overnight into an insurance program; the strength of labor is too great to bring unions under our antitrust laws overnight. The desires for spending are too great to achieve quick reductions.

And so I am saying to you that if you are realistic, you won't look for all of these things to happen quickly. You won't look for the economy to take off as rapidly as it could if we were willing to do these things. Does this make you pessimistic? Do you react to it like the old cow munching in the field and, seeing a tank of milk going by with a sign, "Our milk is pasteurized, homogenized, standardized," turning to a neighboring muncher to say, "Doesn't that sign make you feel sort of inadequate?" Is that the way you react? Or do you come up fighting? Do you come up like the two babes walking down Broadway with a sailor following about 10 paces behind. After an hour of this, one of the babes turned to him and said, "Look, stupid, stop following us, or at least have enough gumption to go and find another sailor." Do you come up like that? We need to recognize whether you like it or not, that life is a compromise. It always has been. We have compromised with inflation since 1900 because basically, since 1900, we have had a rising price level. We have compromised with the devaluation of the dollar before—in the early days of the Roosevelt administration when we took the ounce of gold from $20.67 to $35. Yet despite all these compromises, the competitive economy has still given us a higher standard of living. It will do the same in the years ahead if all of us will make every effort to get the best possible compromise to restore the force of competition.

As a matter of fact, wherever in the world the power of competition is allowed to function, it results in higher living standards. If I could take you with me to Japan, to Hong Kong, to Thailand, and to the Malayan Peninsula, I would be showing you countries in which private enterprise is the basic factor—and these are all growing areas. In contrast, if I took you to the slow-growing areas, I'd be taking you to India, into Indonesia, and into Burma; areas in which government control and government operations are playing the dominant role. In brief, wherever you go in this world, a competitive system, even though under restraint, is still doing the best job. A competitive economy does something else: it helps to maintain freedoms which are important to you and me. The history of this world makes it clear that when people lose the right to select their own careers, to buy and sell in competitive markets, they also lose their freedom of speech, of assembly and of religion.

What am I saying to you today? With all the sincerity I can command, really five simple things. I'm saying to you in the first place that 1962, which began on such a note of optimism gave way as the months went by to a feeling of despair as the economy failed to grow as rapidly as you and I know it should. Second, that this is basically because of the slow growth of an economy which, in turn, is related to a gradual fall in the profit margin. Third, I have tried to suggest certain ways in which we could move to restore competition—give our economy the boost that it needs. Fourth, this won't happen at all unless enough people who believe in this kind of an economic system will get out each and every day of their lives and fight and work for the best possible compromises. Finally, I am saying to you, not only will a private economy produce the world's highest standard of living, but it is the only economy devised by man which gives any promise of preserving freedom—freedoms which are important to any people who maintain that among their unalienable rights are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

TRIBUTE TO LEWIS DESCHLER

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. LINDSAY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, it is a great pleasure for me to join in the tribute that the House has paid to Lew Deschler on the occasion of his 35th anniversary as the Parliamentarian of the House.

Lew Deschler's highly professional contribution to the House of Representatives, his profound understanding of its workings, and his unfailing assistance to the Speaker and Members on all occasions has merited the deepest respect and appreciation of us all. The knowledge and experience which he constantly imparts to others is an insurance that our free institutions will continue to uphold the principles of a democracy under the rule of law.

I am especially grateful for the advice and help which Lew Deschler has so willingly given me and my staff during my service in this body. I wish him many continued years of service to the House and to our country.

BUDGET CUT

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SNYDER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, much has been said both on and off the floor of this House requesting that the minority suggest where the proposed budget might be substantially cut. Last Monday I tried to mention a few such instances. Today I would like for the House to have the benefit of an editorial appearing in the March issue of the Kentucky Farm Bureau wherein they requested that $1 billion be cut from the agriculture budget.

I commend this editorial to the Members of this House and to the members of the Appropriations Committee.

A TAX CUT WILL BE JUSTIFIED IF BUDGET IS BALANCED FIRST

On January 17 President Kennedy presented his budget to Congress. The proposed expenditure budget of $98,802,000 is the largest since 1789. It tops that of World War II spending by $500 million. And it is $4,491 million above the current year's estimated level. Even with the tax revisions, it proposes to take more from the people than in any year since 1789, war or peace.

To add to the fiscal confusion and lack of consistency, Secretary of the Treasury Dillon in his appearance before the House Committee on Ways and Means on February 6 said that the administration will almost certainly ask for an increase of the debt limit from $308 billion to $320 billion.

Senators, Representatives, and Farm Bureau members across the country have expressed concern about increasing the national debt. Many are very much concerned about a reduction in taxes without a reduction in expenditures.

We all realize that dealing with the Federal budget is becoming increasingly difficult, and complicated. But we believe that Farm Bureau's approach to the problem is a sound and sensible one.

Farm Bureau is recommending a $11.8 billion reduction in expenditures which would produce a balanced budget and justify the consideration of a tax cut by Congress.

To show good faith and willingness to share in the general appropriations cut, Farm Bureau is recommending a reduction of $1 billion in the current level of expenditures for the Department of Agriculture and we believe it can be done if Farm Bureau's farm program is adopted.

Items included in the $1 billion agriculture reduction include: Elimination of emergency feed grain program—$800 million. Reduction of export subsidies on cotton—$62,500,000. Reduction of export subsidies on wheat—$360 million. Revised estimate of USDA figures for Public Law 480 (foreign trade aid program) based on more realistic estimates—$177,500,000.

Considering the reduced estimated cost of Farm Bureau cropland retirement program (20 million acres at $20 per acre for 1964 crop year) the estimated net saving from the budget request for fiscal year 1964 is $1 billion.

Farm Bureau is not recommending any cuts from the President's budget requests for such programs as Soil Conservation Service, Farmers Home, and REA lending authorization, and others.

Farm Bureau members have established this policy concerning Government spending and tax reduction:

"A high level of Government spending is inflationary even with a balanced budget. We cannot hope to prevent inflation if the Federal Government continually engages in deficit spending.

"The Government must exercise strict economy, eliminate duplication of effort, and promote efficient operations.

"Congress must take effective measures to manage and control Federal expenditures. The practice of authorizing expenditures from public debt transactions as a means of avoiding annual review by the Appropriations Committee should be discontinued.

"The continued growth of the American economy requires a sustained growth in savings and investment. Extreme graduation in income tax rates tends to discourage the incentive to save and invest. Economic growth and private control of the economy cannot be maintained if a continually increasing proportion of the national income is withdrawn from the economy through taxes.

"Tax programs should be designed to maintain our private competitive enterprise system and to bring about a fair and equitable distribution of the tax burden.

"We recognize the need for a substantial downward adjustment in Federal taxes to create a better climate for economic growth; however, the current budget deficit and our mounting national debt make it mandatory that a cut in Federal expenditures accompany any general reduction in taxes. We are opposed to tax cut proposals which would further unbalance the budget and add to our already excessive national debt.

"We recommend, therefore, that the Federal budget for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1963 be reduced at least 10 percent below the current level in order to permit both a reduction in the deficit and a tax cut.

"We recognize that Federal expenditures for agriculture are contributing to the need for high taxes, and, as evidence of our willingness to share in the proposed reduction of Federal spending, we recommend that the budget of the U.S. Department of Agriculture for price support operations and payments be reduced by $1 billion, effective in fiscal 1964.

"We challenge all other groups who agree that a tax cut is desirable to make specific recommendations to Congress for comparable reductions in expenditures. We believe that the foreign aid program, for example, can be reduced by $1 billion—and improved in the process.

"We recognize the need for, and strongly favor, an adequate defense program; however, we believe that several billion dollars can be saved without impairing our defense posture by insisting that the military establishment provide a dollar's worth of defense for each dollar of expenditure."

The time has come we believe for the budget to be balanced. This is basic to sound government. Any plan for tax reduction must be based on this principle.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA BUDGET

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced the bills which were recommended to the Congress by the President and by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to carry into effect the proposals which the President made to put the fiscal affairs of the District of Columbia on a sound permanent basis. I am happy to say that I am joined in the sponsorship of these two bills by several of my colleagues on the Committee on the District of Columbia, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DAWSON], the gentlemen from California [Mr. COHELAN and Mr. SISK], the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. ST GERMAIN], and the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DIGGS].

Mr. Speaker, on January 18, 1963, for the first time within my memory, a President transmitted to Congress a message accompanying the budget for the District of Columbia. President Kennedy did it because, as he said, the financial problems of the District have become so critical that they present a challenge to the National Government which must be met. While the District faces many problems, the basic one is a need for additional funds for many vital programs.

The existing authorizations for appropriations for the District of Columbia fall short by more than $33 million in meeting the needs which it must meet next year. These are vital, basic needs. The budget message from the President dramatically illustrated some of them—in the fields of education, of welfare and health, of public safety. We have been for too long unwilling to provide the District with the tools which it needs in education. For example, good teachers, adequate school buildings with adequate textbooks and other materials.

We cannot say that we have done what we can to provide a capital city worthy of the greatest nation on earth when we countenance thousands of children in split sessions, for lack of classroom space; hundreds of children on the waiting list for kindergarten, because of lack of both space and teachers; textbooks which are woefully out of date; to say nothing of inadequate counselors, special classes, and the like.

But what must be realized is that even this inadequate level of support—which is just as bad in the fields of health, welfare, recreation, and others—will further deteriorate unless additional authorizations are provided. The population of the District has declined, but the population in need of services—the young, school-age group, and the aged, over-65 group—is increasing, and increasing rapidly.

To add to the problem, the Congress was recently compelled to increase wage rates for District employees, as well as all Federal employees. This alone cost the District more than $13 million.

We could, of course, grapple only with the problem of fiscal 1964. In the President's budget message, however, he proposed what I believe to be a far better solution, and one which will relieve the Congress of the need to consider the adequacy of authorizations for at least the rest of the decade. He proposes, in short, that the Federal payment to the District be made equitable by a formula which would authorize the appropriation of just what the Federal Government would pay in District taxes if it were a taxable business rather than a government. Under such a formula, while the overwhelming proportion of the funds for the District would continue to be derived from the businesses and individuals who now pay taxes to the District, the District's biggest "business," its biggest landholder and employer, would contribute its equitable share.

The President's proposed solution to the District's financial problems also included additional, and in some cases higher local taxes, to produce $11 or $12 million annually. The Commissioners, after a hearing, have proposed and presented a tax package to accomplish this part of the solution. This package is included in the bills introduced today. It is wholly appropriate that the taxpayers of the District contribute a portion of the additional funds which the District so sorely needs.

Finally, the President proposes an increase in the authority of the District to borrow money for capital improvements for schools, health centers, libraries, firehouses, and all the rest except highways and sewers, which are separately funded. Again, rather than authorization to meet only immediate needs, the budget message proposes a long-range solution—that the limit on borrowing be, as it is in most States, a percentage of the taxable property in the District reflecting the District's ability to repay.

The present authorization of $75 million has been committed. The bills which we have introduced would increase the figure to 6 percent of the tax base, or about $225 million. Unless the District is to stop, almost entirely, its capital works program, this additional borrowing authority is essential.

Mr. Speaker, this Congress has the opportunity to redeem some of the inadequacies which blight many parts of our Capital. We do not cure them with money alone, but neither can we cure them without it.

The Appropriations Committees in both this House and the Senate will insure that the funds which the Congress authorizes will be spent properly, and in the most effective way.

I believe the President has presented this Congress with an opportunity, as well as a challenge. I sincerely hope that the proposals which he has presented will be given the fullest consideration by the Committee on the District of Columbia.

PROTECTION OF NATION'S ANTHRACITE COAL RESOURCES

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, today I reintroduced my bill which has the twin purpose of protecting the Nation's vital anthracite coal resources and preventing pollution of Pennsylvania streams.

Specifically, this measure would further permit the use of Federal and State of Pennsylvania funds authorized under the Federal Mine Dewatering Act of 1955, which I sponsored, for a percentage of the cost of the operation and maintenance of pumps in mines.

This proposed bill is a companion measure to the act authorized in last year's Congress which provided for the control and drainage of water in the anthracite coal formations by sealing and filling abandoned coal mines.

No new appropriations are requested of Congress in the bill I have introduced today. Both this bill and the one enacted last year are intended to implement the Federal Mine Dewatering Act of 1955, also known as the Mine Drainage Act, for which appropriations have already been made.

Under the 1955 act, the Federal Government appropriated $8.5 million, which was equally matched by the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, for the purchase and installation of pumps and other necessary machinery for the pumping of water from the mines.

Mr. Speaker, because of the sharp decline in the anthracite industry, and particularly because of the disastrous floods of 1959 which broke into many of the mine operations, a great many anthracite mines have been abandoned. As a result, there is no one to operate and maintain the pumps in these abandoned mines, and the overflow endangers operating mines.

At the time the Mine Sealing Act was passed last year there was $10 million left in the fund, of which half, of course, were Federal funds. Last year's legislation reserved $1.5 million for water pumping and a Commonwealth of Pennsylvania companion measure reserved $2 million of State funds for the same purpose.

In addition to those interested in protecting this vital national resource, the sportsmen and conservationists of Pennsylvania should welcome this legislation as a further protection against acid water pollution of Pennsylvania streams.

The operating anthracite coal companies are presently pumping water from their mines under controlled conditions imposed by the State health department. Unless they are continuously pumped out, the water levels would eventually reach the point where the overflow would seep into the rivers and streams downstate with wholesale acid water pollution.

Mr. Speaker, the anthracite coal industry cannot bear the full costs of water pumping caused by conditions in abandoned mines beyond their control and still be able to sell coal at prices which will keep them in business.

Unless steps such as called for in this legislation are taken we can drive the remaining anthracite industry out of business. If that happens, the uncontrolled acid water seepage will cause a water pollution problem in Pennsylvania streams the likes of which have never been seen before.

COMMITTEE ON RULES

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH], I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Rules may have until midnight Friday night to file certain reports.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent (at the request of Mr. THOMPSON of Texas), leave of absence was granted to Mr. TEAGUE of Texas for Wednesday, Thursday, and Friday, March 6, 7, and 8, on account of illness.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED

Bills of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 13. An act to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to convey certain land situated in the State of Arkansas to the city of Fayetteville, Ark.; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

S. 345. An act to provide for the approval of a payment in lieu of taxes to be made for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1959, by the Hawaii Housing Authority to the city and county of Honolulu; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, a joint resolution of the House of the following title:

H.J. Res. 284. Joint resolution making supplemental appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, and for other purposes.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. FASCELL, for 20 minutes, today.

Mr. MACGREGOR, for 15 minutes, today.

Mr. BOW, for 15 minutes, today.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN, for 10 minutes, today.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon, for 30 minutes tomorrow, March 7, 1963.

Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania, for 10 minutes, today and to revise and extend his remarks.

Mr. HECHLER, for 30 minutes, on tomorrow, Thursday, March 7, 1963.

Mr. HEMPHILL (at the request of Mr. ALBERT), for 60 minutes, on March 7, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. PELLY.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. FINDLEY) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. SIBAL.

Mr. HOSMER.

Mr. HALL.

Mr. SCHWENGEL.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. ALBERT) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. ST. ONGE in two instances.

Mr. MULTER.

Mr. BURKHALTER.

Mr. POOL.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 10 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, March 7, 1963, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

512. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting drafts of two proposed bills as follows: (1) "A bill to exempt certain carriers from minimum rate regulation in the transportation of bulk commodities, agricultural and fishery products, and passengers, and for other purposes"; and (2) "A bill to provide for strengthening and improving the national transportation system, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

513. A letter from the Board of Trustees of the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance and Disability Insurance Trust Funds, transmitting the 23d Annual Report of the Board of Trustees of the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Trust Fund and the Federal Disability Insurance Trust Fund, pursuant to section 201(c) of the Social Security Act, as amended (H. Doc. No. 80); to the Committee on Ways and Means and ordered to be printed.

514. A letter from the Administrator, Veterans' Administration, relative to reporting a violation of an overobligation of the amount permitted by agency regulations issued pursuant to the following legislation pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 665 (i)(2); to the Committee on Appropriations.

515. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the review of the rejection of the low bid on procurement of AN/GRC-19 radio sets by the U.S. Army Electronics Materiel Agency, Philadelphia, Pa.; to the Committee on Government Operations.

516. A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, so as to authorize the Administrator of General Services to enter into contracts for inspection, maintenance and repair of fixed equipment in Federal buildings for periods not to exceed 5 years, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Government Operations.

517. A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to amend subsection 506(d) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, regarding certification of facts based upon transferred records"; to the Committee on Government Operations.

518. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to amend the act redefining the units and establishing the standards of electrical and photometric measurements to provide that the candela shall be the unit of luminous intensity"; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

519. A letter from the Chairman, Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, transmitting the 49th Annual Report of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System for the year 1962, pursuant to section 10 of the Federal Reserve Act, as amended; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. FRIEDEL: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 228. Resolution to provide funds for the investigations and studies authorized by House Resolution 179; with an amendment (Rept. No. 58). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. VINSON: Committee on Armed Services. H.R. 2438. A bill to extend the induction provisions of the Universal Military Training and Service Act, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 59). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. FRIEDEL: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 225. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to employ two additional employees; without amendment (Rept. No. 60). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. FRIEDEL: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 254. Resolution providing for the expenses incurred pursuant to House Resolution 103; without amendment (Rept. No. 61). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. VINSON: Committee on Armed Services. H.R. 2440. A bill to authorize appropriations during fiscal year 1964 for procurement, research, development, test, and evaluation of aircraft, missiles, and naval vessels for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. No. 62). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas: Committee on Veterans' Affairs. H.R. 200. A bill to repeal chapter 43 of title 38, United States Code; without amendment (Rept. No. 63). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas: Committee on Veterans' Affairs. H.R. 211. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide increases in rates of dependency and indemnity compensation payable to children and parents of deceased veterans; without amendment (Rept. No. 64). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas: Committee on Veterans' Affairs. H.R. 220. A bill to amend section 704 of title 38, United States Code, to permit the conversion or exchange of policies of national service life insurance to a new modified life plan; without amendment (Rept. No. 65). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas: Committee on Veterans' Affairs. H.R. 228. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, with respect to the salary of directors and chiefs of staff of Veterans' Administration hospitals, domiciliaries, and centers; with amendment (Rept. No. 66). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas: Committee on Veterans' Affairs. H.R. 242. A bill to amend section 1820 of title 38 of the United States Code to provide for waiver of indebtedness to the United States in certain cases arising out of default on loans guaranteed or made by the Veterans' Administration; without amendment (Rept. No. 67). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas: Committee on Veterans' Affairs. H.R. 243. A bill to amend section 314(k) of title 38, United States Code, to authorize payment of statutory awards for each anatomical loss or loss of use specified therein; without amendment (Rept. No. 68). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas: Committee on Veterans Affairs. H.R. 248. A bill to amend section 801 of title 38, United States Code, to provide assistance in acquiring specially adapted housing for certain blind veterans who have suffered the loss or loss of use of a lower extremity; without amendment (Rept. No. 69). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas: Committee on Veterans' Affairs. H.R. 249. A bill to amend section 632 of title 38, United States Code, to provide for an extension of the program of grants-in-aid to the Republic of the Philippines for the hospitalization of certain veterans; with amendment (Rept. No. 70). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WILLIS: Committee on the Judiciary: H.R. 1048. A bill providing for the design of the flag of the United States; without amendment (Rept. No. 71). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. WILLIS: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 2837. A bill to amend further section 11 of the Federal Register Act (44 U.S.C. 311); without amendment (Rept. No. 72). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the

Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. CELLER: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 4374. A bill to proclaim Sir Winston Churchill an honorary citizen of the United States of America; without amendment (Rept. No. 57). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BAKER:

H.R. 4511. A bill to amend titles I and XVI of the Social Security Act to permit the administration of medical assistance for the aged under an approved State plan by or under the supervision of a State agency separate from the State agency administering the rest of the plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BENNETT of Michigan:

H.R. 4512. A bill to repeal section 13a of the Interstate Commerce Act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BRAY:

H.R. 4513. A bill to amend section 503 of title 38, United States Code, to provide that under certain conditions the profit from the sale of a home shall not be considered as income; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BROMWELL:

H.R. 4514. A bill to authorize wartime benefits under certain circumstances for peacetime veterans and their dependents; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia:

H.R. 4515. A bill to amend section 602 of title 18, United States Code, to make it a crime for certain persons, for political purposes, to divulge information relating to lists or names of persons employed by the Federal Government; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COHELAN:

H.R. 4516. A bill to amend the National Labor Relations Act, as amended, so as to make its provisions applicable to agriculture; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 4517. A bill to provide financial assistance to the States to improve educational opportunities for migrant agricultural employees and their children; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 4518. A bill to amend the act of June 6, 1933, as amended, to authorize the Secretary of Labor to develop and maintain improved, voluntary methods of recruiting, training, transporting, and distributing agricultural workers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 4519. A bill to provide for the establishment of a Council to be known as the "National Advisory Council on Migratory Labor"; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 4520. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to extend the child labor provisions thereof to certain children employed in agriculture, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 4521. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act, 1938, as amended, to provide for minimum wages for certain persons employed in agriculture, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 4522. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act so as to establish a program to assist farmers in providing adequate sanitation facilities for migratory farm laborers; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 4523. A bill to amend the Social Security Act so as to assist States in providing for day-care services for children of migrant agricultural workers; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DANIELS:

H.R. 4524. A bill to provide for recognition of Federal employee unions and to provide procedures for the adjustment of grievances; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 4525. A bill to amend the Federal Employees Health Benefits Act of 1959, with respect to the contributions made by Government toward health benefit protection for employees and annuitants and members of their families; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 4526. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code in order to provide a 1-year period during which certain veterans may be granted national service life insurance; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. DENT:

H.R. 4527. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp in commemoration of the Battle of Bushy Run; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. DORN:

H.R. 4528. A bill to revitalize the cotton growing and cotton manufacturing industry and to reduce Federal expenditures for price support operations; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 4529. A bill to revitalize the cotton growing and cotton manufacturing industry and to reduce Government expenditures for price support and other subsidy operations; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. FINO:

H.R. 4530. A bill granting to persons in the classified (competitive) civil service the right to a hearing before removal or suspension, and the right to a judicial review of a removal or suspension; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. FLOOD:

H.R. 4531. A bill to amend the act of July 15, 1955, relating to the conservation of anthracite coal resources, to remove certain restrictions; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. GILBERT:

H.R. 4532. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HANNA:

H.R. 4533. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to authorize the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to prohibit the prescribing or administering of certain prescription drugs without first informing the patient, or his representatives, that death could result from the use of such drugs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HARRIS:

H.R. 4534. A bill to authorize mortgage insurance and loans to help finance the cost of constructing and equipping facilities for the group practice of medicine and dentistry; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HORAN (by request):

H.R. 4535. A bill to authorize a per capita distribution of $350 from funds arising from judgments in favor of any of the Confederated Tribes of the Colville Reservation; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. JENSEN:

H.R. 4536. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for the payment of pensions to veterans of World War I and their widows and dependents; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. JOELSON:

H.R. 4537. A bill to assist the several States in establishing hospital facilities and programs of posthospital aftercare for the care, treatment, and rehabilitation of narcotic addicts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 4538. A bill to prevent the use of stopwatches, work measurement programs, or other performance standards operations as measuring devices in the postal service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 4539. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a taxpayer a deduction from gross income for tuition paid by him for the education of a dependent child at an institution of higher education; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MORTON:

H.R. 4540. A bill to provide for reimbursement of toll charges necessarily incurred by Federal jurors; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NYGAARD:

H.R. 4541. A bill to amend the Federal Trade Commission Act, to promote quality and price stabilization, to define certain unfair methods of distribution and to confirm, define, and equalize the rights of producers and resellers in the distribution of goods identified by distinguishing brands, names, or trademarks, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. O'BRIEN of New York:

H.R. 4542. A bill to prohibit the use of stopwatches or other measuring devices in the postal service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. OLSEN of Montana:

H.R. 4543. A bill to increase to 15 percent the night differential of postal field service employees; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 4544. A bill to amend title 13, United States Code, to provide for a mid-decade census of population, unemployment, and housing in 1965 and every 10 years thereafter; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. ROGERS of Colorado:

H.R. 4545. A bill to amend section 356 of title 38, United States Code, to provide a permanent rating of 50 percent disability for veterans who have suffered from active tuberculosis for 10 or more years; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mrs. ST. GEORGE:

H.R. 4546. A bill to amend section 2(d) of the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to permit the payment of annuities to retired railroad workers whether or not they render service to the last person (other than a railroad) by whom employed; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SIBAL:

H.R. 4547. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to the income tax treatment of certain contributions to nonprofit medical research organizations and to provide exemptions from certain excise taxes for such organizations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SICKLES:

H.R. 4548. A bill to assist in the promotion of economic stabilization by requiring the disclosure of finance charges in connection with extensions of credit; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas:

H.R. 4549. A bill to amend section 4103 of title 38, United States Code, with respect to the appointment of the Chief Medical Director of the Department of Medicine and Surgery of the Veterans' Administration; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. WHITE:

H.R. 4550. A bill to establish in the Department of the Interior a Gold Procurement and Sales Agency, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. WHITENER:

H.R. 4551. A bill to amend section 1461 of title 18 of the United States Code with respect to the mailing of obscene matter, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4552. A bill to establish a program for the Government purchase and resale of domestically produced, newly mined processed mica and mica ore; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. ADDABBO:

H.R. 4553. A bill for the better assurance of the protection of citizens of the United States and other persons within the several States from mob violence and lynching, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BETTS:

H.R. 4554. A bill to permit certain employees of a State or political subdivision thereof to elect coverage under the Federal old-age and survivors insurance system, as self-employed individuals; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BONNER:

H.R. 4555. A bill to extend the provisions of section 3 of Public Law 87-346, relating to dual rate contracts; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H.R. 4556. A bill to amend section 883 of title 46, United States Code; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia:

H.R. 4557. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to acquire through exchange the Great Falls property in the State of Virginia for administration in connection with the George Washington Memorial Parkway, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. COHELAN:

H.R. 4558. A bill to provide for the registration of contractors of migrant agricultural workers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. FALLON:

H.R. 4559. A bill to amend section 104 (b) (3) of title 23, United States Code, relating to the apportionment of funds for extensions of the Federal-aid primary and Federal-aid secondary systems within urban areas; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. GARMATZ:

H.R. 4560. A bill to amend chapter 2 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to extend the period within which certain ministers, members of religious orders, and Christian Science practitioners may elect coverage under the old-age, survivors, and disability insurance system; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GONZALEZ:

H.R. 4561. A bill to improve intergovernmental relations and Government operations by assisting the States to carry out on a continuing basis inservice training programs for officers and employees of State and local governments with a view to increasing efficiency and economy in the operations of State and local governments, including the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, and the possessions of the United States, and encouraging the highest standards of performance in the transaction of the public business; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. HOSMER:

H.R. 4562. A bill to provide for a program of weather modification to be carried out by the Secretary of the Interior, acting in cooperation with the National Science Foundation, to increase substantially the annual average of usable supply of water available in the Colorado River drainage basin, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. KNOX:

H.R. 4563. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to repeal the excise tax on communications; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 4564. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to authorize payment of old-age insurance benefits to all individuals who have attained age 70; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 4565. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a credit for amounts paid for tuition or fees to institutions of higher education or for occupational training or retraining, to allow a credit for taxes paid for public education, and to exempt from income tax certain scholarships, fellowships, and student assistantships; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LENNON:

H.R. 4566. A bill to appropriate funds to initiate preconstruction planning of improvements to Wilmington Harbor, N.C.; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. McDOWELL:

H.R. 4567. A bill to amend title 17, United States Code (Copyrights), to permit a further extension of copyrights for a 15-year period and to provide that one-half of the royalties received during that period shall be used to assist promising young composers and authors; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MOORE:

H.R. 4568. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MORSE:

H.R. 4569. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide an additional income tax exemption of $1,000 for a taxpayer, spouse, or dependent who is a student at an institution of higher learning; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PEPPER:

H.R. 4570. A bill to authorize the Housing and Home Finance Administrator to provide additional assistance for the development of comprehensive and coordinated mass transportation systems in metropolitan and other urban areas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. REUSS:

H.R. 4571. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to protect the navigable waters of the United States from further pollution by requiring that synthetic petroleum-based detergents manufactured in the United States or imported into the United States comply with certain standards of decomposability; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. RHODES of Arizona:

H.R. 4572. A bill to establish penalties for the operation of a motor vehicle between States by a person while his motor vehicle operator's license is suspended or revoked; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RODINO:

H.R. 4573. A bill to prohibit discrimination in employment because of race, color, religion, or national origin; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 4574. A bill to provide for the desegregation of public schools, with all deliberate speed, including nationwide first-step compliance by 1964, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 4575. A bill to enforce constitutional rights, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RYAN of New York:

H.R. 4576. A bill to establish a new program of loans to be made from a revolving fund by the Housing and Home Finance Administrator to assist in the provision and rehabilitation of housing for middle-income families; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 4577. A bill to amend title I of the Housing Act of 1949 to prohibit the construction of luxury housing in the redevelopment of urban renewal areas; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 4578. A bill to amend title I of the Housing Act of 1949 to require the establishment of more effective procedures for the relocation of individuals, families, and business concerns from the area of urban renewal projects; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 4579. A bill to amend title I of the Housing Act of 1949 to provide more adequate relocation payments for individuals, families, and business concerns displaced from urban renewal areas; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 4580. A bill to amend title I of the Housing Act of 1949 to provide that individuals, families, and business concerns displaced by an urban renewal project shall have a priority of opportunity to relocate in the project area after its redevelopment; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 4581. A bill to amend title I of the Housing Act of 1949 to authorize Federal participation in the cost of acquiring air rights as a part of an urban renewal project, and to prohibit luxury housing in the redevelopment of urban renewal areas; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 4582. A bill to amend the U.S. Housing Act of 1937 to permit occupants of dwelling units in low-rent public housing projects to purchase such units; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 4583. A bill to amend title II of the National Housing Act to provide Federal Housing Administration mortgage insurance for individuals purchasing dwelling units in cooperative housing projects in the same way that such insurance is provided for individuals purchasing other single-family residences; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 4584. A bill to amend the U.S. Housing Act of 1937 to provide that a tenant in a low-rent public housing project may not be evicted therefrom without a public hearing; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 4585. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to require the owner of an apartment building or other multifamily structure to establish and utilize a repair, replacement, and maintenance reserve as a condition of the allowance of a depreciation deduction with respect to such structure; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 4586. A bill to provide that no Federal financial or other assistance may be extended to any educational institution which discriminates against students or prospective students on account of race, religion, color, ancestry, or national origin; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 4587. A bill to provide for recognition of Federal employee unions and to provide procedures for the adjustment of grievances; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. SHEPPARD:

H.R. 4588. A bill to provide for the withdrawal and reservation for the Department of the Navy of certain public lands of the United States at Mojave B Aerial Gunnery Range, San Bernardino County, Calif., for defense purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BOB WILSON:

H.R. 4589. A bill to provide that in determining the amount of retired pay, retirement pay, or retainer pay payable to any enlisted man, all service shall be counted which would have been counted for the same purposes if he were a commissioned officer; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 4590. A bill to strengthen the criminal penalties for the mailing, importing, or transporting of obscene matter, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4591. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code to provide additional compensation for veterans suffering the loss or loss of use of both vocal cords, with resuiting complete aphonia; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. MULTER:

H.R. 4592. A bill to provide for increased Federal Government participation in meeting the costs of maintaining the Nation's Capital City and to authorize Federal loans to the District of Columbia for capital improvement programs; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. DAWSON:

H.R. 4593. A bill to provide for increased Federal Government participation in meeting the costs of maintaining the Nation's Capital City and to authorize Federal loans to the District of Columbia for capital improvement programs; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. COHELAN:

H.R. 4594. A bill to provide for increased Federal Government participation in meeting the costs of maintaining the Nation's Capital City and to authorize Federal loans to the District of Columbia for capital improvement programs; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. ST GERMAIN:

H.R. 4595. A bill to provide for increased Federal Government participation in meeting the costs of maintaining the Nation's Capital City and to authorize Federal loans to the District of Columbia for capital improvement programs; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. SISK:

H.R. 4596 A bill to provide for increased Federal Government participation in meeting the costs of maintaining the Nation's Capital City and to authorize Federal loans to the District of Columbia for capital improvement programs; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. DIGGS:

H.R. 4597. A bill to provide for increased Federal Government participation in meeting the costs of maintaining the Nation's Capital City and to authorize Federal loans to the District of Columbia for capital improvement programs; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. MULTER:

H.R. 4598. A bill to provide revenue for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. DAWSON:

H.R. 4599. A bill to provide revenue for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. COHELAN:

H.R. 4600 A bill to provide revenue for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. ST. GERMAIN:

H.R. 4601 A bill to provide revenue for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. SISK:

H.R. 4602. A bill to provide revenue for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. DIGGS:

H.R. 4603. A bill to provide revenue for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. BENNETT of Michigan:

H.J. Res. 305. Joint resolution to temporarily suspend the authority of the Interstate Commerce Commission to approve consolidations, unifications, or acquisitions of control of railroad properties; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BETTS:

H.J. Res. 306. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McINTIRE:

H.J. Res. 307. Joint resolution requesting and authorizing the President to impose an immediate 6 percent emergency quota on all imports of softwood lumber; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. NYGAARD:

H.J. Res. 308. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WIDNALL:

H.J. Res. 309. Joint resolution to authorize the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to make a study to determine the best means of providing an expanded college education program at Howard University by agreement with the Board of Trustees of Howard University; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. WYMAN:

H.J. Res. 310. Joint resolution expressing the determination of the United States with respect to the situation in Cuba; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. WILLIS:

H. Con. Res. 108. Concurrent resolution to provide for the printing of "How Our Laws Are Made" as a House document; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. ZABLOCKI:

H. Con. Res. 109. Concurrent resolution to favor the establishment of an international living museum; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. COLLIER:

H. Res. 279. Resolution authorizing a Captive Nations Committee; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. DEROUNIAN:

H. Res. 280. Resolution establishing a Special Committee on the Captive Nations; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. LANDRUM:

H. Res. 281. Resolution to amend the rules of the House by creating a separate standing Committee on Labor; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. RYAN of New York:

H. Res. 282. Resolution to authorize the Committee on Banking and Currency to conduct an investigation and study of the operation of the slum clearance and urban renewal program in New York City and the other major cities of the United States; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mrs. REID of Illinois:

H. Res. 283. Resolution establishing a Special Committee on the Captive Nations; to the Committee on Rules.

H. Res. 284. Resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives with respect to the use of the Panama Canal by vessels engaged in trade with Cuba; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By Mr. LIBONATI:

Memorial of the 73d General Assembly of the State of Illinois, urging the adoption and enactment of appropriate measures to relieve the financial burdens of States and local governments as a result of interstate residential changes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By the SPEAKER:

Memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to a commemorative stamp honoring Hollywood's entertainment industry; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CONTE:

H.R. 4604. A bill for the relief of certain retired officers of the U.S. Army; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COOLEY:

H.R. 4605. A bill for the relief of Carlota Figueira Miguens; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CORMAN (by request):

H.R. 4606. A bill for the relief of Mercedes De Toffoli; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CRAMER:

H.R. 4607. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Juan C. Jacobe, and their four children, Angela Jacobe, Teresita Jacobe, Leo Jacobe and Ramon Jacobe; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FASCELL:

H.R. 4608. A bill for the relief of Gertrude P. Splaine; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GALLAGHER:

H.R. 4609. A bill for the relief of Hisae Otsu Coleman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HERLONG:

H.R. 4610. A bill for the relief of Juanita Alice Lind; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOELSON:

H.R. 4611. A bill for the relief of Sister Rosaria Carlino; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4612. A bill for the relief of Sister Ornella Longo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4613. A bill for the relief of Sister Corrada Amoroso; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. KELLY:

H.R. 4614. A bill for the relief of Cynthia L. Morrison; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MILLS:

H.R. 4615. A bill for the relief of Inez Humphreys Dixon; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'BRIEN of New York:

H.R. 4616. A bill for the relief of Yu Bing Chuck, Yu Lai Jing, Yu Lai Chun, and Yu Bing Cheong; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. VAN DEERLIN:

H.R. 4617. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Carole Ann Lee; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4618. A bill for the relief of Rene Sportes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

61. By Mr. SCHENCK: Petition of Paul R. Deger and 184 others to preserve the Monroe Doctrine; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

62. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Z. Michael Szaz, Queens County Young Republican Association, Richmond Hill, N.Y. relative to recommending that the U.S. Government shall, by extending a short time limit, demand from the Cuban and Soviet Governments that a ground and air inspection of missile and air bases be permitted under the supervision of the Organization of American States; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

The Unnecessary Elk Slaughter in Yellowstone National Park

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EVERETT G. BURKHALTER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 6, 1963

Mr. BURKHALTER. Mr. Speaker, it has been brought to my attention by many sportsmen from California and other States, that there have been several hundred elk killed each year for the last 3 or 4 years in the Yellowstone Park area by the National Park Service. During the winter of 1961–62 the herd was reduced by a total of 5,229 head. Following is an excerpt from information received from the Wyoming Game and Fish Commission, regarding the reduction numbers and categories as reported by Acting Superintendent Luis A. Gastellum:

Direct kill by rangers in park	4,309
Hunter kill outside of park	125
Live trapped and shipped	297
Lost in trapping operations	13
Winter kill	476
Total reduction	5,220

I would also like to quote from a report I received from the Department of the Interior, National Park Service covering the winter season of 1962–63 up to and including February 15, as follows:

Direct control (inside Yellowstone)	404
Live shipped	671
Hunter killed (outside)	530
Biological collection	108
Lost in trap (unsalvable 10, salvable 4)	10
Miscellaneous	10
Total reduction	1,735
Live trapping	
Live trapped	1,468
Neckbanded and released	390
Retrapped elk	8
Escaped	397

Many of these sportsmen who are complaining about this annual elk massacre, make annual hunting trips to the States which border Yellowstone Park, and each spend approximately $500 for gasoline, automobile repairs, motels, hotels, restaurants, sporting goods, heavy clothing, ammunition, groceries, snake bite medicine, guides, packers, pack animals, airplanes, and many other things, in addition to $75 to $100 for a nonresident hunting license.

Many of the States out West, including California, where I hail from, have established a protective policy for deer, elk, and antelope, when there is a surplus of these animals in a given area, or on the winter range, where they bunch up in large herds and do damage to the farmers' haystacks, fences, and livestock. Action has been taken along one of two prescribed lines, as has been decided in meetings held by the fish and game departments and the sportsmen in California. When conditions arise on the range, as described above, the department of fish and game either takes hay and grain out into the areas where the game is doing damage and/or starving, and feed them; or if the department feels there is a surplus of a certain kind of game in a given area, the department traps the amount of game they feel is surplus and moves them in padded trucks to other parts of the State where there is a shortage of that particular game. Different game has been moved as far as 500 miles in California, and even to neighboring States. There is always the chance of losing a few animals during this transplanting; however, it has been well below 15 percent of the total group.

These same varieties of animals, largely elk and mule deer, however, bunch up during the heavy winters on land under control of the U.S. Forest Service, and overgraze these lands during the winter months, inflicting heavy and irreparable damage to the surrounding timber and shrubbery. However, it is the overwhelming opinion of the sportsmen that this direct method of control killing is far too drastic, and that the Park Service in cooperation with the adjoining States' fish and game departments should carry on a more extensive program of live trapping and transplanting in the future.

It is my thinking, as well as that of many sportsmen, biologists, and wildlife and conservation authorities, that the problem I refer to is the joint responsibility of the departments of fish and game of the respective States that border Yellowstone National Park and the National Park Service. Since our warehouses in this country are overflowing with surplus farm commodities, such as grain and other forage crops, possibly much of this material could be used to good advantage to prevent the game from starving on their winter range, or doing damage in our national parks.

Also, it is the opinion of many sportsmen that the elk and deer seasons open too early, since the game is still in the high country, and spread over such a large area, the percentage of hunters that go hunting in early October are not as successful as the hunters that go hunting later when the elk and deer are starting to work their way down to their winter feeding grounds. A later season would give the hunters a chance to harvest all surplus elk before they get into the Yellowstone Park area. I know many hunters who have been hunting for years in those States bordering Yellowstone Park, and unless these States open their seasons later, and the National Park Service stops killing elk promiscuously, many of the hunters will switch their annual hunting trips to other States, such as Washington, Oregon, New Mexico, Colorado, and Arizona, where the deer and elk hunting is almost on a par with that of Montana and Wyoming.

In some of the States mentioned, I believe, the State legislatures, the departments of fish and game, and the fish and game commissions are influenced too greatly by the packers and guides who insist on the early season so they can pack the hunters into the high country. However, the guides will have to alter their routine to give the hunters the full advantage of the replanted herds. This will mean more trips of shorter duration, which in turn, would mean many more satisfied hunters, returning home with a valued elk. This later season will eventually result in a better season for the hunter, and a more remunerative season for the guide and pack animal owners.

I hope that the National Park Service, the U.S. Congress, the departments of fish and game, the fish and game commissions, and the State legislatures of the States involved will give this problem their immediate attention.

Poland Is Part of Vast Communist Prison

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM L. ST. ONGE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 6, 1963

Mr. ST. ONGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert into the RECORD the text of a brief address I delivered last Sunday afternoon, March 3, 1963, at the annual convention of the Connecticut District of the Polish American Congress, held in Hartford, Conn. I was very pleased to meet with my Polish friends and to express my support for their cause.

The address is as follows:

ADDRESS BY CONGRESSMAN WILLIAM L. ST. ONGE, POLISH AMERICAN CONGRESS, MARCH 3, 1963, HARTFORD, CONN.

Mr. Chairman, ladies, and gentlemen, I am delighted to be here with you today and to have the opportunity to address your annual convention. As you know, I came specially from Putnam to be here with you and to meet many of my friends.

Just as many of your leaders and members are well known to me, so the objectives and activities of the Polish American Congress are not unfamiliar to me. Your work in behalf of the people of Poland in the past, and your deep anxiety about your kinsmen abroad who are suffering now under the yoke of communism, is a chapter in itself which is well known to many Americans. We are with you in this struggle and in your efforts to help them.

We in Connecticut are very proud of our citizens of Polish ancestry. They are a good, sturdy, hard-working, industrious, and patriotic element. The men, women and children of Polish origin who have immigrated into this country in substantial numbers over these many decades brought with them the rich heritage of their culture, civilization, religion, as well as their passionate love for freedom. They have made great contributions to America in every sphere of activity. They have helped to enrich the American way of life and American democracy.

Americans of Polish descent have not forgotten their motherland, Poland, nor have they forgotten the millions of freedom-loving Poles who live there today under a ruthless regime. Your anxiety about them is understandable. They are your blood and flesh. Poland is your ancestral homeland. You have cultural and religous ties with the country and its people.

About 2 weeks ago I introduced a resolution in Congress requesting that the United States do all in its power through the United Nations to obtain the liberation of the Baltic States, which have been incorporated into the Soviet Union lock, stock and barrel. In the case of Poland, however, there exists the myth of an independent country, but you and I know well that the people of Poland no more enjoy freedom and independence than do the people of the Baltic States. They are just as enslaved to Communism, just as subservient to the leaders of the Kremlin.

The people of Poland today are a silenced, grim, and unhappy people. They are not free to speak their mind. They cannot practice their religion freely. They cannot observe their historic events and holidays. Poland is not a happy land, a free "People's Democracy," as the Communist leaders would have us believe. The truth of the matter is that Poland is a part of that vast prison of captive European nations which make up the Communist empire.

Neither Poland nor any of the other countries subjugated to Moscow are today independent and sovereign states. They have no freedom. They have no right of self-determination. They are not the masters of their own destiny. Those masters sit in the Kremlin.

The masters in the Kremlin are dedicated to their goal of world domination. That goal does not change, it remains constant. Today it is directed against your kinsmen in Poland and the other countries of Eastern Europe. Tomorrow it will be directed against free nations in other parts of the world. Eventually, it will be directed against us in the United States. They are conducting the cold war in deadly earnest—make no mistake about it!

But let me say to you, my friends, that it would be a hopeless and depressing picture if we were to look at it from one side only. We know that the Poles and the other peoples have a profound attachment to Western culture, civilization, and ideas. Their desire for freedom cannot be crushed. Their hopes for self-determination are burning bright in their hearts. We must nurture those hopes. We must give them all the courage we can.

I am convinced that we, in our lifetime, will yet see the liberation of the enslaved nations of Europe. I am convinced that communism is not the wave of the future, but the nightmare of the past. Let us all work together to bring this nightmare to an early end.

Item No. 1: Where To Cut the Budget

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS M. PELLY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 6, 1963

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the Democratic leadership invited members of the Republican Party interested in cutting the recordbreaking budget of this administration to stop generalizing and instead name specific areas where cuts could be implemented without jeopardizing the security of the United States.

I regard this as an appropriate request and from this point on intend to suggest specific items in line with the Democratic leadership's suggestion. Here is the first one I would like to draw to your attention. It involves the TFX contract award presently under Senate investigation. Here is a case where the administration, overriding the recommendations of five military boards, selected a second-class design costing $500 million more than the design of the Boeing Airplane Co. During the current hearings it has been demonstrated that the Boeing design could have been produced at the much lesser cost and with a much greater flight range of military capability.

Consequently, Mr. Speaker, I offer this in evidence as item No. 1 for reduction of the administration's budgetary requests.

Sikorsky Aircraft

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABNER W. SIBAL

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 6, 1963

Mr. SIBAL. Mr. Speaker, 40 years ago today a new company was incorporated under the name of Sikorsky Aero Engineering Corp. Its physical assets were meager, but its hopes were great.

Today that company is Sikorsky Aircraft, of Stratford, Conn., a division of United Aircraft Corp. and a world leader in the design and manufacture of helicopters.

President and guiding light of the 1923 organization was Igor I. Sikorsky, then just 33 years old but already a legend in aviation. The first location was a farm on Long Island near Roosevelt Field; the first workers were Russian immigrants and friends of Mr. Sikorsky.

Four years before, this young engineer had arrived in New York City, a refugee from the revolution in his native Russia where he had established himself as a man of vision in the field of aeronautics.

Behind him were early experiments with helicopters in Russia, and success with the Grand, the world's first multiengine—four—airplane and forerunner of World War I's most successful bomber.

The first aircraft built by Sikorsky Aero Engineering Corp. was the S-29-A—the A for America—a twin-engine, all-metal transport which proved a model for future airliners. Despite an early shortage of funds, a number of aircraft followed—including the twin-engine S-38 amphibian with which Pan American Airways pioneered in establishing air routes to Central and South America. With the success of the S-38 came an opportunity for Mr. Sikorsky's company to become a subsidiary of United Aircraft Corp. in 1929.

Under United, Mr. Sikorsky developed a number of flying boats which set outstanding records. In 1935 the S-42 opened air trails to Hawaii and the Orient, and paved the way for regular transatlantic flights. A later and more advanced flying boat, the S-44, established itself as the first airliner capable of regular transatlantic runs without stopping and without refueling.

Early in 1939, Mr. Sikorsky returned to his first great interest, the helicopter. On September 14, 1939, the VS-300—with Mr. Sikorsky at the controls—lifted itself a few feet from the ground in Stratford, and the Western Hemisphere knew its first practical helicopter. In 1943, quantity manufacture of the R-4 made it the world's first production helicopter and the only rotary-wing aircraft to see action in World War II.

Sikorsky helicopters came into their own during the Korean war. S-51's, and later S-55's, flew rescue and troop-carrying missions that provided a new perspective of helicopters as military vehicles. There followed bigger and faster helicopters as turbine engines took the place of piston engines; helicopters blazed new trails in private industry, and as passenger aircraft. Latest Sikorsky helicopter is the S-64 Skycrane, a heavy lifter that can carry loads of various shapes and sizes up to 10 tons in weight.

Mr. Sikorsky retired as engineering manager of the division in 1957, but he still serves as consultant to a new generation of engineers at Sikorsky Aircraft. He has received numerous honors in a lifetime of leadership in both fixed-wing and rotary-wing aeronautics.

He can look back 40 years to the beginning of a company on a small farm in Long Island and ahead to new aircraft, with new dimensions in design, ability, and use, coming from the present Sikorsky plant in Stratford.

Republicans Coming Up With Positive and Constructive Answers—Partial Text of a Speech by Representative Florence Dwyer, of the Sixth Congressional District of New Jersey, Before the Legislative Dinner, Morris County Woman's Republican Club, Inc., Morris County Golf Club, Convent Station, N.J., Saturday, February 9, 1963

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED SCHWENGEL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 6, 1963

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, exciting things are happening within Republican Party circles these days. The GOP is actualy the Go party for 1963 and 1964. When Republican speakers take to the hustings these days they can electrify and inspire their audiences with news of what the Republicans are doing in Congress to offer a positive and constructive program for meeting the challenge of the sixties.

One of our talented spokesmen is Representative FLORENCE DWYER, of New

Jersey, who recently presented a factual summary of the new sense of direction which is taking place on Capital Hill. Her February 9 speech before the Morris County (N.J.) Woman's Republican Club, Inc., is a great one which bears further attention. Under leave to extend my remarks, I include Representative Dwyer's speech in the Record:

(Partial text of a speech by Representative Florence P. Dwyer, Republican, Sixth District, before the legislative dinner, Morris County Woman's Republican Club, Inc., Saturday, February 9, 1963, 7 p.m., Morris County Golf Club, Convent Station, N.J.)

I am particularly pleased at the opportunity to talk with you today, for I know, both personally and through our mutual friend Congressman Frelinghuysen, of your deep and enlightened interest in the Republican Party. We share many interests, I am sure, but above all we share the determination to make our party a stronger, more effective, and more successful party—a party fully equipped to take over the reins of government in the United States and provide our people with the kind of leadership that will assure the security and well-being of our country.

With this in mind, therefore, I am delighted to report to you that things are happening today in Washington that hold out great hope for the Republican Party in the months and years ahead.

It is not too much to say, I think, that a new vigor, a new sense of purpose, a new direction even, and certainly an added enthusiasm is evident among Republicans on Capitol Hill.

Although the signs I see indicate this is happening at all levels of the Republican Party throughout the country—our new Governors, our increased numbers in State legislatures, our renewed activity and strength in local government—I speak especially of the Congress and more particularly of the House of Representatives where the real decisions of national policy will be made this year.

Basically, what is happening is this. Republicans are reassuring what it means to be the opposition party and coming up with some positive and constructive answers. Congressional Republicans are not going to be satisfied to sit back and play dead to the Democrats. This is not opposition in any sense at all. Republicans are not going to be content to say nothing but "no—no—no." This is opposition only in the very narrowest and least meaningful sense. Republicans are not going to permit a political vacuum to grow in which the opposition would be allowed to appear as the only party which has any ideas, any social conscience, any sense of obligation to the public interest. This would not be opposition; it would be surrender.

The greatest Republican of them all—Abraham Lincoln, whose birthday we celebrate on Tuesday—had some words to say on this subject which, though we have heard them many times, seem most appropriate at this point in our party's history.

"The dogmas of the quiet past are inadequate to the stormy present," Lincoln said. "The occasion is piled high with difficulty and we must rise with the occasion. As our case is new, so we must think anew and act anew. We must disenthrall ourselves."

Today, Republicans in Congress are thinking anew and acting anew. We are responding affirmatively and responsibly to the far-reaching changes in technology which have made our globe so much smaller and more complex. We are confident that our party has the resources of people and talent and ideas to deal effectively with these changes. Republicans provided 8 straight years of sound and progressive government under President Eisenhower. Our party's 1960 platform is an up-to-date statement of Republican principles and policies, a model of balance between the imperatives of progress and the claims of an older tradition—in brief, a chart to be relied upon to navigate a course through troubled, shoal-filled waters.

What we Republicans are proposing, in effect, is the rather revolutionary idea that we take our platform seriously—seriously enough to use it as a foundation of a program of action in Congress.

We believe our platform was an excellent one to run on in 1960 and much too good today to run away from—which seems so often to be the fate of party platforms.

We believe that if the platform was good enough to be the blueprint for 4 more years of a Republican President—and, certainly, it was not the fault of the platform that we lost the 1960 election—then that platform is good enough to guide us through 4 years of opposition.

We believe that opposition must be more than a negative thing, that it necessarily involves proposing positive programs, where the need for action is real, as well as opposing programs we believe go too far or not far enough.

We believe the people will judge the Republican Party by what we stand for as well as by what we stand against.

We believe the people should be given a choice between a Democratic Party we believe is too often inadequate, opportunistic and misguided in its legislative leadership and a Republican Party that offers a realistic promise of stable, commonsense, progressive government, government that will benefit all our people.

We believe that the place in which to make this choice plain and clear to all who will see is in the Halls of Congress where both parties must write the records which the people will judge for themselves.

How are we doing this job? What do I see that gives me so much confidence that Republicans are on the right track?

Before attempting my answers to these questions, I suggest we recall just what it was that first raised the question of what kind of opposition the Republican Party should be.

Republicans lost the 1960 election when we had almost every reason to expect we would win it. To say the least, defeat came as something of a shock. And the hair-thin margin of our loss only added to the sense of frustration that resulted. For Republicans, this was the first experience in 8 long years in adjusting to the difficult role of opposition party. The fact that Democrats had controlled the Congress during 6 of the 8 years of the Eisenhower administration did not lessen the problem, since even as a minority in Congress our energies were devoted to obtaining approval of the Eisenhower program.

As 1961 arrived and the new Kennedy administration prepared to take office, rumors spread to the effect that Republicans would seek a coalition with conservative southern Democrats for the purpose of blocking the new administration's program even before that program had been prepared and sent to Congress.

In that atmosphere, seven Republican Members of the House, including two of us from New Jersey, urged the House Republican conference to repudiate the idea of a coalition and preserve our freedom as an opposition party to oppose the President when we felt he was wrong or support him when we believed he was acting in the best interests of the country.

Although the conference did not act on our resolution, the issue came before the House soon after in the form of the famous proposal to enlarge the membership of the Rules Committee—a proposal intended to make it possible, at least, for important legislation to reach the floor of the House for consideration. Since it is Congress responsibility to vote one way or the other on bills reported by its committees, this was hardly a very radical proposal.

Fortunately, enough Republicans joined us on this issue and voted in favor of enlarging the Rules Committee that the resolution was approved. This was a major factor, I believe, in shaping the kind of opposition party the Republicans in the House have become. While it did nothing to prevent or weaken Republican opposition to the objectionable parts of the Kennedy program, it made it impossible for the Democrats to succeed in portraying Republicans as the party of negativism and blind obstructionism. Moreover, it has helped encourage Republicans to take the initiative in advancing counterproposals and constructive alternatives when we believed that administration programs were unacceptable.

The first major example of this came last year in connection with the Manpower Training and Development Act. For several months, Republicans in the House conducted a thorough study of the problems of automation and unemployment and developed a number of recommendations to deal with this difficult situation. When the manpower bill came to the House floor, Republicans were ready and virtually rewrote the Democratic legislation making of it a Republican program. The Republican position was so sound that a majority of Democrats joined us to pass it.

This year, the trend toward an active, positive Republican opposition has continued—and with results that are already gratifying.

In its first action of the 88th Congress, the conference of all Republican Members of the House replaced its chairman with a younger, more energetic leader who is fully committed to the principle that Republicans should not forfeit leadership to the Democrats. We have broadened the membership of the House policy committee making it more responsive to like-minded members of the party.

One of the first projects of the conference, for instance, is an effort to obtain for the Republican minority a larger share of the staff members assigned to the legislative committees. This is particularly important if Republican Members are to play an active role in the decisions of Congress and fulfill our responsibilities effectively.

Republicans in the House have also moved ahead with our own alternative programs, even at this early stage of the session, in two very significant areas of legislation—education and civil rights.

Under the leadership of your own Representative Peter Frelinghuysen, Republican members of the Committee on Education and Labor have drafted and introduced legislation designed to help solve the No. 1 problem of American education, the need to provide increased facilities for the millions of young Americans who will want and need a college education.

This Republican proposal is sharply in contrast with the administration's education program—a catchall, multibillion-dollar bill that covers no less than 24 separate items. Rather than indulging in the expensive luxury of a gigantic program which has no chance of approval, Republicans have chosen the realistic and responsible approach, a bill aimed at the top priority problem, a bill that will make a decisive impact on this problem, and a bill that can be passed.

In the field of civil rights, there is a different kind of contrast between Republican and Democratic methods. Here, Democrats are caught in their age-old dilemma between high-sounding promises and the inability to perform. Despite their claims of interest in guaranteeing the equal rights of all our citizens, the administration has retreated to the point where it is recommending only a single civil rights measure, a voting rights bill.

In my judgment, civil rights is the chief moral and practical problem facing the United States here at home. Legislation is badly needed—moderate, even-handed legislation that will strengthen the hands of those now working to improve racial relations and eliminate the burdens of segregation. The need for this legislation should not be sacrificed on the altar of political expediency.

Once again, Republicans have come forward with a realistic and effective civil rights bill. Under the leadership of Congressman LINDSAY, of New York, 24 House Republicans, including the majority of the New Jersey Republican delegation, have introduced civil rights bills—the most carefully drawn and comprehensive civil rights bill since President Eisenhower's 1957 program. Moreover, this bill has the support of the Republican leadership in the House.

Slowly, perhaps, but surely, this new initiative and energy among congressional Republicans is beginning to attract wide attention. The story has not yet been completed and will not be completed, I hope, until Congress has finished its business. Republicans will take the lead in other fields, as well—the vital matter of putting some sense and order and direction into the tangled affairs of our urban areas, for example, a subject to which I am devoting considerable attention at this time.

This is the kind of activity, however, by which Republicans will write a successful record in the 88th Congress. It will be a record, I am confident, that will document for the entire Nation our claim to be the party of responsibility, of concern for people, the party on which all can depend to give America the good government it deserves.

Does the United States Have Nuclear Weapons Superiority?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 6, 1963

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, the No. 1 argument for a nuclear test ban treaty given by U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency Administrator William C. Foster, and others on behalf of the administration, is this: The United States has nuclear superiority and unless further nuclear testing is prohibited the United States will gradually lose that superiority.

This squarely brings into issue the following question: Does the United States have nuclear weapons superiority?

Careful examination of statements by the President, Mr. Foster, his deputy, Adrian S. Fisher, and others reveals the following:

SUPERIORITY

Claims for superiority: First, regarding nuclear weapons yield to weight ratios—that is, more bang per pound of warhead—and, second, greater variety and numbers of tactical nuclear weapons in stockpile.

PARITY

In general, parity between the United States and the U.S.S.R. seems to be admitted respecting, first, lack of complete knowledge of weapons effects—that is, effects of radiation on radar detection, communications, command and control systems, "hardened" installations, and so forth—second, unavailability of really effective antimissile warheads, and, third, nondevelopment of pure fusion weapons—that is, the neutron bomb.

INFERIORITY

No claims are made respecting very high yield U.S. weapons superiority. The Soviets are known to have tested a 58-megaton weapon and claim the ability to scale it up without further testing to 100 megatons.

The foregoing may be assumed to be a relatively accurate assessment of the relative capabilities of the United States and the U.S.S.R. if it also is assumed those making the claims have relatively accurate information regarding: first, the Soviet stockpile; second, all Soviet tests, including small, undetectable yield underground experiments with tactical and pure fusion weapons.

In evaluating whether or not the assessment of relative capabilities actually supports the advantage claimed for a test ban treaty—that is, that the United States will retain its lead longer under conditions of nontesting than conditions of testing—the following should be in mind:

First. Small yield-to-weight ratios are important to the American military which does not possess very large thrust rocket engines and thus must rely on lighter warheads for its missiles. This ratio is less critical to the Soviet military which does possess very large thrust rocket engines.

Second. Tactical weapons will be most useful to the American military in defending the homelands of its allies against invasion by an aggressor. Severe limitations on the actual use of tactical nuclear weapons on free world soil in defense of free world soil will be imposed by the necessity to protect friendly populations from the effects of fallout. Additionally, defenders must have in stockpile many such tactical defensive weapons at a variety of locations which the aggressor might choose for its thrust.

Since the Soviet military can expect its role to be that of the aggressive invader of foreign soil at locations of its own choice, it has little need in its arsenal either for variety in or large numbers of tactical nuclear weapons. On the contrary, relatively crude and dirty weapons might conceivably appear advantageous to Soviet tacticians.

Third. In relation to facts set forth in the previous paragraph, it is obvious that pure fusion tactical weapons capability would be of markedly greater advantage to the American military than the Soviet military.

Fourth. In the role of defender rather than aggressor, it would seem that knowledge of weapons effects and truly effective antimissile warheads would be of much greater relative advantage to the American military than to the Soviet military. On a recent occasion Premier Khrushchev claimed Soviet scientists had "solved" the antimissile problem.

Fifth. In light of Defense Secretary McNamara's recent testimony that considerable hardening of Soviet missile bases is taking place, the advisability of including very high yield warheads in the U.S. stockpile deserves knowledgeable consideration.

Sixth. Inasmuch as this argument for a nuclear test ban treaty does not contend the United States will succeed in keeping its "nuclear superiority"—only that it might do so for a longer time under conditions of nontesting—it implies that Soviet laboratories would move faster than our own under a test ban. Inevitably then Soviet capability would catch up with us. Then surpass us. What happens then?

It is desired to emphasize that U.S. nuclear capabilities as set forth above are only those collected from various statements by administration officials while speaking on test ban questions. Therefore they do not necessarily represent my own opinions or the actual situation.

Taxes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 6, 1963

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege this morning to testify before the House Ways and Means Committee on the subject of the revision of our tax structure.

My statement follows:

STATEMENT OF CONGRESSMAN ABRAHAM J. MULTER BEFORE THE COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, MARCH 6, 1963

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the opportunity to appear here today to comment on the President's proposal to revise our tax structure.

In dealing with legislation as important as this and covering as wide an area, it is unlikely that we will find many people who will agree with every facet of the President's recommendations. I assure you that I do not envy the tremendous burden which you must assume in performing the task of bringing out a bill that will be acceptable to a majority of Members of the House. I do trust that my comments will prove helpful and not further confuse an already complicated problem.

In the interests of time I will not discuss the general principles underlying these tax recommendations but will address myself to specific parts thereof. I would like, however, to make this one general statement, to wit, the enactment of the bulk of the President's recommendations should redound to the benefit of the entire economy of our country and more particularly to the benefit of the small businessman and to the lower income groups.

I address myself first to the matter of treatment of itemized deductions from personal income.

The proposed new treatment of these deductions by limiting them to that in excess of 5 percent of the taxpayer's adjusted gross income is in my opinion the wrong way to tackle this problem. This would hit hardest at the lower income groups whose deductions while small dollarwise are most meaningful to them. There certainly will be no incentive to anyone to meet their civic and charitable obligations by saying to them that they can get no tax deduction or credit until after they have paid 5 percent of their income. It works an even greater hardship to say to them that the first 3, 4, or 5 percent of their gross income which they actually expend for medical expenses is not deductible. I could never understand the theory by which only the excess over these percentages was deductible.

The recommendation as to minor casualty losses so as to exclude all deductions up to 4 percent of the taxpayer's income would merely create another incentive to cheat. This is analogous to insurance policies which provide that the first $25 or $50 of loss is not payable by the insurance company. Insurance carriers will tell you that this results in most people getting bills for double the amount of the loss in order to cover the excludable portion thereof. The same thing will undoubtedly occur if this provision should be enacted. The Internal Revenue Service couldn't find a force large enough to investigate and check upon those items. It would undoubtedly cost the Government many times more to unsuccessfully attempt to collect the taxes for these deductions than the deductions themselves would aggregate.

Any attempt to remove the exemption from interest on mortgages and the real estate taxes on homeowners' properties would be nothing less than a breach of faith by our Government. Thomas Jefferson wrote, "The small landowners are the most precious part of a State." For years our Government has been urging our citizens to become homeowners. The latest statistics show that almost 60 percent of our families own their own homes today. One of the greatest incentives to the acquisition of homes was the fact repeatedly stressed that interest on mortgages and real estate taxes were deductions from gross income for tax purposes. I urge that we do not change that exclusion.

Another recommendation that I oppose is the repeal of the $50 and 4 percent deduction on dividend income. This exemption was to have been a first step toward the elimination of the unfair and inequitable double taxation on earnings.

In considering what should be done with this recommendation I urge that this committee do not consider how much tax can be received by our Government but rather, do we have a right to tax earnings twice? Once the earnings of a corporation have been taxed, the net amount belongs to the stockholders and, while there might be some logic in taxing a corporation for failure to pay those earnings as dividends to the stockholders, we cannot justify taxing those identical earnings a second time when they are distributed to the owners thereof.

With reference to capital gains, I urge that you will decrease the net revenue payable to the Government on capital gains by extending the period from 6 months to 1 year in order to qualify for a long-term capital gain. It is my opinion that the capital gains taxes payable to the Government would increase two or three times if instead of increasing the period we decreased it to 3 or 4 months. By decreasing the period to 3 or 4 months these capital assets would turn over that much more frequently and each time they were sold there would be a capital gains tax paid.

I heartily endorse the recommendation to tax as earnings and not as capital gains the moneys realized on stock options. But I suggest that that tax be payable not on earnings in connection with stock options granted after enactment of the law but on all earnings received after the enactment of the law, regardless of when the stock option was granted. The proposed changes of the rate of taxation will apply to all earnings thereafter received and any change in the tax structure should equally be made to apply to all earnings thereafter received regardless of when and where contracted for.

The President has recommended an additional tax credit of $300 for all people age 65 or over regardless of the source of their income. This credit is to replace both the extra exemption allowed to older people and the retirement income credit. Our senior citizens are greatly in need of tax relief since the annuities which they receive are usually not enough to live on. I believe that the Committee should consider the exemption from Federal income tax of annuities received by individuals age 65 and over. As a partial step in this direction I have introduced H.R. 4182, which would exempt amounts up to $2,400 in annuities, pensions, or requirement benefits paid by local, State, or Federal governments.

I strongly urge that as recommended in H.R. 4182 all annuities paid by State, local, and Federal governments be exempt from Federal income tax.

I recommend that the provisions of my bill, H.R. 525, to assist small business and persons engaged in small business by allowing a deduction from Federal income tax for additional investment in depreciable assets, inventory, and accounts receivable, should be included in any new tax bill enacted.

I also urge the inclusion of the provisions of my bill, H.R. 530, which would amend the Internal Revenue Code to assist small and independent business by permitting individuals and partnerships filing income tax returns for small businesses to revoke an election to be taxed as a corporation; to provide a normal tax rate of 20 percent for taxable years after June 30, 1963, and to increase the surtax exemption; to provide a growth, expansion, and modernization exemption on net taxable earnings; to liberalize the income tax treatment of losses incurred through loans; to provide an exemption for goodwill in the determination of the value of an estate and to provide family sized farmers an exemption for the improvement, modernization, and renewal of buildings or equipment used in the production, care and marketing of farm products and to provide family sized farms the same exemption.

I believe that these last two items will greatly stimulate small business.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Three Thousand Two Hundred Space-Related Products

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE R. POOL

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 6, 1963

Mr. POOL. Mr. Speaker, recently I had the honor of accompanying Vice President LYNDON JOHNSON and Gen. Bernard Schriever to Texas for a look at the aerospace industry in an area where we have always been aware, and proud, of space.

In Grand Prairie, we visited Ling-Temco-Vought, one of the leading aerospace firms producing the weapons carriers, rocket boosters, guidance and detections systems used in the U.S. defense and exploration efforts. We toured the facilities and spoke with men who are tops in the field of space science and its needs. General Schriever spoke for our delegation when he said he was impressed with the tremendous resources, technology, and management, which he saw there.

The place of a firm such as Ling-Temco-Vought in the present and future economy of a space-studious United States is, of course, obvious. But the needs of space age production offer an invitation also to smaller firms in less obvious areas of production.

The following day Vice President JOHNSON spoke at a board of city development dinner in the southwest Texas city of San Angelo. He spoke of the ways in which small business participates in the aerospace industry, in a speech which is cogent for many, many areas of this Nation. I am pleased to offer for insertion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the remarks made by the Vice President in San Angelo on February 22.

The address follows:

REMARKS OF VICE PRESIDENT LYNDON B. JOHNSON, BOARD OF CITY DEVELOPMENT DINNER, SAN ANGELO, TEX., FEBRUARY 22, 1963

As long as I can remember, people have been saying they like San Angelo because the air is better here. I agree, the air is mighty good. But what I like about San Angelo—and what has always made your city one of my favorites—is the people.

I like the spirit of progress, the sense of civic pride, the confidence in the future that has always been so much a part of the people of San Angelo and southwest Texas. It is good to be with you once again—and I am most grateful for all your generous courtesies today.

When I accepted this invitation, I asked one of your distinguished citizens what he thought I should talk about tonight.

He replied, "Why don't you talk about space, we have so much of it."

Space is a good subject—an increasingly important subject for Texans, as for all Americans. We are moving far faster than most of us realize into the age of space, and our lives are being reshaped every day by the flow of invention and discovery coming from space research.

That is what I would like to talk about tonight—about the practical, down-to-earth implications of our great national effort to explore the distant realms of outer space.

You of San Angelo understand the first and foremost implication. You are demonstrating this by the support you are giving to education—at the college level as well as at the public school level. The clear and immediate challenge of space requires that we make available to all of our young people far better education than any of their parents enjoyed.

Ninety percent of the scientists who ever lived are alive today. Ten years from now three-fourths of the people working in the plants and factories of the United States will be working on products not yet invented or discovered. If our sons and daughters are to have an even break in the competition of the 1970's and 1980's, education—at all levels—must have the kind of support throughout the Nation that it has here in San Angelo.

Some are quick to say that there is no place in our system of the small local area college. But as you well know, that is simply not so. Hundreds of thousands of young people are being denied essential college educations because there is no college in their own community. The likelihood of a high school graduate going on to college is 50 percent greater when the student lives within 20 to 25 miles of an institution of higher learning.

Whether close to home or far away we need better education at all levels. We need to be turning out two and one-half times more

Ph. D.'s in engineering, mathematics, and the sciences. At the present rate, the United States will be short 90,000 doctoral degree holders by 1970. We need a wider dispersal of the graduate schools from which such degrees are obtained, because today three-fourths of all Ph. D.'s are being granted by a handful of universities located in only 12 States.

When I say these things to you I am not talking about education for education's sake alone. I know you love freedom. I know how you cherish independence. If we love freedom, if we cherish independence, we will recognize that the battlefield on which these great heritages will be won or lost in this century is the classroom.

The United States leads the world in the aggregate annual number of higher education graduates. But in the Soviet Union institutions of higher learning are today graduating three times as many engineers and four times as many physicians as the United States. I am unwilling—as I know you are unwilling—to be content with second place. In education—as in all things—we have the resources, we have the ability, we have the wealth to be first, and we must not settle for less than the best.

When we talk of space and space research there are those who raise the question that our efforts cost too much. Certainly American leadership in space is not cheap. We are now spending 20 cents per week per capita on our national space program. But, at the same time, we are spending each year more than four times our space budget on golf and fishing and movies and other recreation.

Out of this effort that we are making, many Americans ask the question: Is the effort we are putting forth worthwhile? Is it practical? What will it mean to those of us on earth for one or two among us to land on the moon?

I would like to answer that question in terms we can all understand. We are today only in the infancy of the age of space. Our efforts have only just begun. When we look back over the past, we remember that it took us 112 years to develop photography, 56 years to develop the telephone, 35 years to perfect the radio, 15 years to develop radar. Television took 12 years. The atomic bomb took 6 years. Even the transistor took 5 years.

While the space age is not yet 5 years old, we have made remarkable strides in producing usable down-to-earth products. More than 5,000 companies and research organizations have been or are now involved in our space effort. We have produced more than 3,200 different space-related products, many of which are already being put to use.

As one example, at Lawton, Okla., a small hatmaking company experienced difficulty and costly losses because the resin used to stiffen hats often stuck to the heating blocks. That company contacted the Office of Industrial Applications of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. NASA gave them information about nonstick coatings which had been developed in connection with space research on solid rocket fuels. Today, the little hat company in Oklahoma is coating their presses with this substance and its problem has been solved.

I could cite many more examples such as this. But the truth is we have only just begun to realize the benefits of our concentrated space research. These future applications will have meaning for all of us.

Let me give you some other examples. Medical scientists have determined that the kind of space suits worn by our astronauts—such as Colonel Glenn—can be and soon will be used to relieve the discomfort of victims of strokes. In our hospitals and medical centers, the little wire sensors used to signal the earth about the physical conditions of the astronauts will be put to use to keep constant check on the physical conditions of patients in their sickbeds. One product of our research on rocket propellants is already being used to treat tuberculosis.

A great many housewives today are using in the kitchen pots and pans made of ceramics which are the result of space research. Thermoelectric devices, first used to provide power for space satellites, are now being used in heating and refrigeration systems for our homes.

Out here in west Texas we know that the future is being shaped by the application of space technology to such projects as taking salt out of sea water and making the inexhaustible gallons of the gulf available for irrigation in this area. When space technology will permit us to modify the weather, we do not know. We do know that the weather satellites already projected will permit us to make great savings of lives and property in combating storm damage, providing early warning against floods, tornadoes, and hurricanes. Our space scientists even tell me that we will someday soon be using those satellites to guard against invasion of grasshoppers in west Texas and locusts in other parts of the world.

Within a generation it may be possible for us to predict the weather as far in advance as a year, and think what that will mean to both ranchers and farmers in this area.

The day is not too distant when you will be able to pick up your telephone and call distant continents—Europe, Australia, or Asia—as quickly and as cheaply as you can call other Texas cities today. Live television shows will reach your living room from all points of the globe. The scientists in India or Africa or South America will be able to solve problems on computers located at Rice University or the University of Texas. Texas businessmen will be able to check their inventories in warehouses and retail establishments throughout the world in a matter of seconds.

When we recite prospects such as this, I know it is hard for the mind to grasp the full implications. But it is important that we make the effort to see beyond the present and to recognize the full import and impact of the future. Many of us present remember when people were saying that the automobile would never replace the horse and that airplanes would never fly safely and successfully. Twenty or forty years from now our children will be smiling indulgently at our own conservatism and caution today.

You and I—and our 180 million fellow Americans—stand now at the edge of one of the great adventures of mankind. In these years ahead the exploits and adventures of our young pioneers in space will make the headlines. But here on earth without fanfare, without much notice and without us even realizing it, our lives will be changed as never they have been changed in any comparable period of man's experience.

If, in this new age, America is to retain its position as a leader of the cause of freedom it will be necessary for us as a nation to mobilize the full resources of nature and of humankind. We cannot indulge the luxuries of leaving idle the mineral resources and other resources of nature which underlie these rocks and plains of southwest Texas. We cannot afford the expense of undertraining and undereducating our young people. We shall need—and we must have—the full natural and human resources of America mobilized for the great thrust forward which is coming within your lifetime and mine.

When this century began, only 1 out of 10 adult Americans had a high school or college education. Today, such an education is a first requirement for an ever-increasing number of jobs in our economy. Yet, only 43 percent of our adults have completed high school. Only 8 percent have completed college. And nearly 40 percent of our young people are dropping out of high school before they receive their diplomas.

The treasure of America today as always is its young people. We must not permit that treasure to be lost or wasted. Here in San Angelo your community dedication to education has won national attention. You have built one of the finest high schools in America—you are proud of it and you have the respect of your countrymen for the sense of local responsibility which you have shown. In the same sense, you are showing comparable support for higher education through your college.

It is this sense of local responsibility that has made America strong. It is this sense of local responsibility that will help America realize the full rewards and potential of the future. I come here tonight to salute you, to congratulate you, and to commend your example of local responsibility to communities throughout the Nation.

Our strength as a nation—and as the center of the free world alliance—depends upon the sense of local responsibility which freemen in every county, every city, and every State manifest through these times of trial and peril. Governments at all levels—Federal, State, and local—is the creation of the people and the servant of the people. There is no room for contests and conflicts in a struggle for power between the levels of government. There is only room for effort and assertion on the part of all Americans to make our system strong, to make our Nation strong, and to make our cause successful.

We are extending our reach today—we are reaching among the stars to touch the new frontier of man's experience. That longer reach will bring us rewards of which we have never dreamed. We shall live a life of greater freedom, a life of greater reward, a life of greater peace—and this is what we all want to have for our children.

Temper of the People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DURWARD G. HALL

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 6, 1963

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, the Missouri Ozarks has a fond affection for my esteemed colleague, the gentleman from Michigan, Representative August E. Johansen, ranking minority member of our Committee on Un-American Activities, who incidentally is married to the sister of Dr. George Wood, an outstanding physician in the town of Carthage, Mo. On February 19, the gentleman from Michigan, Representative Johansen, delivered an outstanding, thoughtful, and discerning speech before the Battle Creek, Mich., Lions Club. His remarks were timely, to the point, and reflected the views of many Members of Congress sitting on both sides of the aisle. I commend them to the attention of all Members:

(Address by Congressman August E. Johansen, Battle Creek Lions Club, February 19, 1963, Battle Creek, Mich.)

I welcome this opportunity to be with you. This half hour is an interlude between a 12-day stay here at home in my congressional district and my return to Washington for the real start of legislative business in the new 88th Congress.

Let me say a word about this session of Congress and also about the time I have spent here at home.

This is the beginning of my 9th year in Congress. I am certain that the months ahead in Washington will be by far the most controversial, the most difficult, and the most crucial that I have experienced as a Member of Congress. By the same token, they can also be the most constructive and fruitful in many years. The potentials of wise, beneficial contributions to the general welfare are there.

Whether or not we make the gains which are so urgently needed depends upon a three-way partnership—a partnership which includes the President, the Congress, and the American people. And the American people themselves can be the decisive factor. I hope you, as citizens, will meet your responsibility and make your power felt by making known to the Congress and the Executive your judgment and your will with respect to the grave issues facing our country.

While I have made a few speeches during the 12 days I have been home I have also done a great deal of listening. If I rightly understand the sentiments and the temper of the people of this district—and I think they are typical of a great many Americans—they are acutely aware of events and of problems; they are thinking earnestly and with deep concern; and they are voicing their thoughts and their concerns and their frustrations, both to each other and to their representatives in Government.

This situation, it seems to me, offers a great opportunity for sound, broad-gage leadership. It imposes a very heavy responsibility on that leadership. And it poses a grave danger. "Hope deferred maketh the heart sick" and persistent frustration can be explosive and immensely damaging.

Today I want to speak to you briefly, bluntly, and from the heart about some of the things which I am convinced gravely concern the American people. And I hope to relate those concerns to a few of the specific issues and problems which confront the Congress in the weeks ahead.

1. Never has the desire of the American people to know the facts or their desire to be able to believe what they are told by their leaders—and by the media of public information—been so urgent, or so desperately insistent.

The American people accept the fact that some information regarding the activities and affairs of Government cannot be generally divulged.

But they want—and have the right—to know that the withholding or the editing of information is not for the purpose of covering up mistakes, protecting blunderers, or serving partisan or personal political advantage.

They are disturbed, and rightly so, by references to news as part of the "weaponry." They are disturbed, and rightly so, by abuses of executive privilege which result in denial of vital information to Congress by the executive branch. They are disturbed, and rightly so, by suggestions that Members of Congress refrain from responsible discussion of grave international problems. They are disturbed, and rightly so, by the knowledge that under the past administration one Herbert Matthews, of the New York Times, not only took the lead in formulating a completely, tragically mistaken estimate of the Castro takeover in Cuba on the part of the American people, but that this same Herbert Matthews was actually designated to guide official U.S. policy in the State Department regarding Cuba.

The American people are disturbed, and rightly so, by the fact that allegations and warnings from responsible Members of Congress—of both parties—have been flatly contradicted and denied; then partially conceded to be accurate; and finally acknowledged to be entirely true.

There is plenty of blame to go around for this situation. And the American people themselves share in this blame. We have become the victims of our own genius for advertising, for so-called public relations.

We have become obsessed with a horrible, detestable, abominable thing called the public image. Everyone talks about the "image" we want to build for our political party, for our State, for our Nation, for a segment of our society, for a candidate or other individual.

I am fed up with this word. I think the American people are becoming fed up with it. I think they are becoming desperately concerned, not about the image, but about the reality, the substance, the hard facts, the unvarnished truth.

And all the more so when we learn by bitter experience and disillusionment that the "image" is, in fact, a false facade. We are beginning to learn that what we appear to be is important only as it faithfuly reflects what we actually are.

The most compassionate man who ever walked the earth had a biting phrase for the image makers of his own day: "Whited sepulchres, which indeed appear beautiful outward, but are within full of dead men's bones."

The American people cry desperately for the truth. And they hope with equal desperation for a restoration of confidence in the spoken words of their elected leaders. What a supreme irony it would be if, in this golden age of modern communications, we should lose the one priceless thing which makes communication meaningful and worthwhile—confidence in what is said and heard.

The matter is summed up in the ancient adage: The penalty of being a suspected or proven liar is that one is not believed even when he speaks the truth.

There are already underway many congressional investigations of official policies and actions in your Federal Government. There will be more. Do not believe it when you are told that these are merely politically motivated. Do not believe it when you are told that they are solely for the purpose of dredging up past blunders.

They are a part of the necessary process of getting the truth, of profiting by past mistakes, of charting wiser courses of action in the future.

2. The American people are gravely concerned about fiscal policies, about fiscal responsibility, about the factors which undergird our economic security and well-being, our economic opportunity, our chances for better business and more jobs.

It is a tragedy if we equate this concern with greed. It is a tragedy if we assume that this concern is merely one which puts dollars ahead of people.

The Communists are wrong when they declare materialism to be the supreme factor of life. The undisciplined humanitarians, on the other hand, are equally wrong when they make unrestrained human wants the basis of all legislative and spending decisions.

Increased conscientious liberals, like the the late Senator Neuberger, Senator Proxmire of Wisconsin, and Congresswoman Griffiths of Michigan, are recognizing this fact, and voicing their alarm.

Increasingly, thoughtful Americans are asking—and they are asking me—how we can continue to raise expenditures, increase deficits, add to the national debt and to the interest charges on that debt, and still decrease revenues. And when they ask me, they expect answers, not doubletalk.

And yet a top economic adviser to the President told the Joint Economic Committee of Congress the other day that those who would deny themselves a tax cut merely in order to avoid further deficits are victims of "a Puritan ethic."

This sort of folly is beginning to greatly alarm the American people. It is a justifiable alarm. It is a healthy alarm. I share the alarm.

3. The American people are awakening to the fact that there are no rights in a free society without matching responsibilities—that these are the two sides of an indivisible coin.

They are beginning to recognize this truth with respect to big labor as well as big business. They believe in the right of collective bargaining. They believe in the need and the right of workers to protect themselves through organization against uncontrolled greed for profit. But they likewise know that profit is the lifeblood of business and industry. They know that ownership and management and, above all, the public interest, also have rights and also have need for protection against unchecked greed for power.

It is quite possible that this truth will be reflected in legislative proposals and action this session in the field of labor law. Let us hope that it will be reflected in corrective and not merely punitive legislation.

The American people are beginning to recognize this truth also with respect to relationships between majorities and minorities in our society—whether those majorities and minorities are racial, or religious, or political, or ideological. Unless there is a mutual recognition of mutual rights and also of mutual duties and responsibilities, we can look forward only to more and more controversy, more and more internal conflict, more Oxford, Mississippis; more dubious no-prayer decisions by the Supreme Court; more shameful lawlessness in the Nation's Capital; more intolerance; more chaos.

The American people basically are dedicated to justice, to equal opportunity, to the preservation of rights. But they are heartsick also in their yearning for domestic tranquility. And only responsibility matching the clamor for rights can bring us that. Only that way can we live together in peace and progress.

4. Finally, the American people are beginning to understand that the ultimate defense against our enemies, and the ultimate hope for victory, rest upon firmness in the right, upon resoluteness of will, and upon boldness of action. And they are beginning to demand policies and actions based upon such resoluteness.

Military might is necessary, but it alone is not enough. Military solutions alone are not enough. Indeed we are caught in the ironical situation in which the very destructiveness of our ultimate weapons is such that that we are tempted totally to renounce force as an instrument of national policy, and in the process we may also renounce courage and resoluteness, and so expose ourselves to defeat by nuclear blackmail. And meanwhile our enemies go ahead with their little wars of national liberation, as in Cuba; with their subversion, infiltration, and internal takeovers.

And we find ourselves confronted with such contradictory statements within the period of 24 hours as Senator FULBRIGHT's assertion Sunday, "I do not regard Cuba, as such, as a threat to the physical security of this country or any other country in the hemisphere," and, on the other hand, the testimony of Assistant Secretary of State Martin, yesterday, that the Soviet Union, from its base in Cuba, is expected to step up terrorism, sabotage, and guerrilla activities in months ahead.

What a confusing, paralyzing, and vacillating effect these conflicting expressions from supposedly responsible leaders of our Nation is bound to have.

Small wonder my own constituents write me, call me, and confront me face to face to demand: What is happening? Have we no guts? How long before we take again the posture of firmness of last October 22 and this time follow through?

Clarity of purpose * * * resoluteness of will * * * firmness of action. These are the ultimate weapons and the only ultimate hope of victory and survival for ourselves and our way of life.

In General MacArthur's words: "It must be of the spirit, if we are to save the flesh."

Religion Versus Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM L. ST. ONGE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 6, 1963

Mr. ST. ONGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert into the RECORD the text of an address which I delivered last Sunday, March 3, 1963, at a communion breakfast of the Knights of Columbus in New Britain, Conn. Our distinguished colleague, the Honorabe EMILIO Q. DADDARIO, was scheduled to address this gathering, but he was designated as U.S. member of the Subcommittee on Space Law meeting in Geneva and had to leave just a few days before the meeting in New Britain. I was glad to substitute for him as speaker.

The address is as follows:

RELIGION VERSUS COMMUNISM

(Address by Congressman WILLIAM L. ST. ONGE, communion breakfast, Daly Council No. 12, Knights of Columbus, New Britain, March 3, 1963)

Mr. Chairman, reverend clergy, friends, I am very pleased to be here with you this morning. It is a delight for me to break bread with you and to have the opportunity to exchange a few thoughts with you.

As you know, Congressman DADDARIO was supposed to have been your speaker here today. He is presently on an important mission in Geneva for the U.S. Government as a member of the Interparliamentary Union Subcommittee on Space Law. As you know, the United States and the Soviet Union are in sharp conflict over proposals for the solution of legal space problems.

The late Pope Pius XII, in his annual Christmas message to the world in 1956, spoke of the divine grandeur and its meaning for mankind in our day. His holiness made this observation:

"In truth modern man, precisely because in possession of all that the mind and labor of man have produced, ought to recognize even more the infinite distance between what he can do and what proceeds from the limitless power of God."

I think this is very sage and sound advice. Unless we recognize the infinite distance between what man can do and that which proceeds from the unlimited powers of God, we are in danger of being carried far away from the belief in God and turn to the belief in a single all-powerful man—a belief which is based more on fear than on conviction.

We need not look too far afield for this possibility. The present regimes in Soviet Russia, Communist China, and the other countries of the Communist bloc, which are all based on a godless philosophy and a way of life from which religion has been completely excluded, are perfect examples of man living in fear instead of freedom, of man living with brutal power instead of God's words of truth and love.

I often wonder how much better life could be for the entire human race, if we would live by God's words. I wonder how much more pleasant it could be if mankind would really practice truth and love, and charity and helpfulness, toward one another. Instead we have a world that is confused, a mankind that is tormented, a way of life which for half of humanity means living in constant fear and enjoying no freedom and no dignity as human beings.

In our lifetime we have experienced the destruction brought on by three great wars. We have witnessed the extermination of millions of people. We have seen whole nations and hundreds of millions of peoples in Eastern Europe and Asia become enslaved and tyrannized by a ruthless and godless ideology. And let us not overlook the fact that we have developed the most awesome weapons, which constitute the greatest danger to human survival in the future. Surely, the genius of man is not destined to reach its zenith in the destruction of all human life on earth? In the last 2,000 years the world has gained much knowledge, but when we observe the direction in which mankind is headed, I am afraid that we have gained very little wisdom.

To my mind, the Roman Catholic faith is beyond all doubt the most formidable spiritual weapon against this antireligious conspiracy known as communism. Spiritual coexistence between religion and communism is impossible. The church and communism must remain forever mutually antagonistic. Communism is the embodiment of the total state which represents a definite danger to civilization itself. It goes to the very roots of life. It is political, economic, it is personal, it affects every phase of day-to-day living.

For us the great danger represented by communism is spiritual. In our form of government there is no conflict between God and loyalty to country. Our system of government accepts the supremacy of God—the Communist state does not. There is the underlying difference.

You can share economically. You can endure politically. You can even suffer personally. But no system has yet been devised for cutting the human soul in two and making it serve two masters. Our soul belongs only to God, and not to the state. The Communist state cannot share its monolithic authority with any other institution. Its basic credo forbids it to accept democratic rule by the people or the principle of obedience to God. With diabolical cunning it seeks to subvert religion and God to a position of subordination to the state.

This is the most wicked element of all in the total fraud that is the total state. Against an enemy of this kind there is nothing left for us to do but to wage a total struggle, a spiritual war, under leadership of the church. By giving voice to your faith, you will help bring about the doom of the enemies of God. We who have faith know that, regardless of its temporary gains, communism will eventually be destroyed because of its godless philosophy.

As we struggle to preserve the peace and fredom of our people, we are also fighting to preserve the peace and freedom of all mankind. With the help of God and in the American spirit that every man is entitled to walk upright in human dignity before God and men, we shall succeed in winning this struggle.

We know that truth and knowledge and charity to our fellow men will, in themselves, not win wars, but we also know that they constitute basic ingredients of freedom and justice, and they can serve as solid foundations upon which to build permanent peace. It is important that we gather these ingredients, strengthen them, and build on them with patience and loving care. We must do so not only with nations as a whole, but also with individuals. We must help them become better human beings, more wholesome citizens, persons with good character and with a positive approach to life. We must not only lend a helping hand to those who need our help, but we must also strengthen the hands of those who are laboring in the vineyards of truth and knowledge and charity.

I should like to conclude with a little story. Shortly after the end of World War II, a devastated city in England began the heartbreaking task of restoring and rebuilding its life. In the old city square had stood, before the destruction, a large statue of Christ, with hands outstretched in an attitude of invitation to the people. On the pedestal were carved the words: "Come unto Me."

During the bombings of the city the statue was struck and shattered. When the restoration began, master artists and sculptors were brought to the city to help restore the statue. The figure was eventually reassembled, except for the hands, of which no fragments could be found anywhere in the rubble. At first it was suggested that new hands be fashioned, but later many people said: "No, leave Him without hands."

And so, today there stands in the public square of that city the restored statue of Christ without hands, and on its base are carved the words: "Christ has no hands but ours."

And so, I say to you: Let us strengthen the hands of those who labor for God and man, those who seek to help their fellow men, and all those who strive for genuine peace in the world.

SENATE

THURSDAY, MARCH 7, 1963

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, and was called to order by the Vice President.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father, God, enable, we pray, with the light of Thy wisdom and the strength of Thy might, those who in these fear-haunted times are in this Chamber entrusted with the stewardship of the Nation's life.

When it seems to us that our times are too perplexing and oppressive, and we are at our wits end, and that evil casts a depressing shadow over all our dreams for a fairer humanity, remind us that so it seemed to those who went before us, and that we can find, as they found, that the prayer for wisdom, for vision, for courage, and for the kindly light that leads, is the prayer that never goes unanswered.

So we dare ask for light upon one step ahead, faith to take one day at a time, and endurance in the darkness to wait in patience and confidence for the dawn.

We ask it in the name of the Holy One whose life is light. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, March 4, 1963, was dispensed with.

ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED DURING ADJOURNMENT

Under authority of the order of the Senate of March 4, 1963,

The PRESIDENT pro tempore, on March 6, 1963, signed the enrolled joint resolution (H.J. Res. 284) making supplemental appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, and for other purposes, which had previously been signed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States, submitting a nomination, was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

As in executive session,

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States, submitting the nomination of Fred Gates, of Minnesota, to be a member of the Advisory Board for the Post Office Department, vice William C. Doherty, which was referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

LIMITATION OF STATEMENTS DURING MORNING HOUR

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, statements during the morning hour were ordered limited to 3 minutes.

COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the Constitutional Rights Subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following communication and letters, which were referred as indicated:

Proposed Legislation Relating to Transportation

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to exempt certain carriers from minimum rate regulation in the transportation of bulk commodities, agricultural and fishery products, and passengers, and for other purposes; and to provide for strengthening and improving the national transportation system, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Commerce.

Report on Overobligation of an Appropriation

A letter from the Administrator, Veterans' Administration, Washington, D.C., reporting pursuant to law, on the overobligation of an appropriation in that Administration; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Report of Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System

A letter from the Chairman, Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Board, for the year 1962 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Amendment of Act Relating to Standards of Electrical and Photometric Measurements

A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the act redefining the units and establishing the standards of electrical and photometric measurements to provide that the candela shall be the unit of luminous intensity (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Commerce.

Establishment of a Correctional Industries Fund for the District of Columbia

A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to establish in the Treasury a correctional industries fund for the government of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Report of Board of Trustees of the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Trust Fund and the Federal Disability Insurance Trust Fund

A letter from the Managing Trustee of the Trust Funds and members of the Board of Trustees of the Federal old-age and survivors insurance and disability insurance trust funds, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Board, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1962 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Finance.

Report on Study of Financial Advantages of Purchasing Over Leasing of Electronic Data Processing Equipment in the Federal Government

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the study of financial advantages of purchasing over leasing of electronic data processing equipment in the Federal Government, dated March 1963 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

Report on Examination of Costs to the Government for Storage of Certain Petroleum

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the examination of the costs to the Government for storage of petroleum in new commercial facilities under Department of Defense negotiated contracts, dated February 1963 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

Report on Review of the Rejection of Low Bid on Procurement of AN/GRC–19 Radio Sets

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the review of the rejection of low bid on procurement of AN/GRC–19 radio sets by the U.S. Army Electronics Materiel Agency, dated February 1963 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

Report on Review of Manned Aircraft Nuclear Propulsion Program, Atomic Energy Commission and Department of Defense

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the review of manned aircraft nuclear propulsion program, Atomic Energy Commission and Department of Defense, dated February 1963 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

Contracts for the Inspection, Maintenance, and Repair of Fixed Equipment in Federal Buildings

A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, Washington, D.C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, so as to authorize the Administrator of General Services to enter into contracts for the inspection, maintenance and repair of fixed equipment in Federal buildings for periods not to exceed 5 years, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Government Operations.

Amendment of Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, Regarding Certification of Facts Based Upon Transferred Records

A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, Washington, D.C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend subsection 506(d) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, regarding certification of facts based upon transferred records (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Government Operations.

Back Pay Act of 1963

A letter from the Chairman, U.S. Civil Service Commission, Washington, D.C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide for the payment of certain amounts and restoration of employment benefits to certain Government officers and employees improperly deprived thereof, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

Amendment of Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930

A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

NOMINATION OF JOHN GREEN TO BE COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS, DULUTH, MINN.

As in executive session,

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the memorial of Proctor Lodge No. 672, International Association of Machinists, of Proctor, Minn., remonstrating against the confirmation of the nomination of John Green to be collector of customs for the port of Duluth, Minn., which was ordered to lie on the table.

JOINT RESOLUTIONS OF WYOMING LEGISLATURE

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, I bring to the attention of the Senate two joint memorials adopted by the State Legislature of Wyoming memorializing the Congress of the United States of America with reference to supporting basic changes in Federal reclamation laws to make it possible for reclamation development to meet the needs of today and memorializing the Congress of the United States to provide legislation designed to return to the State of Wyoming additional sections of land from the public domain.

Mr. President, I request that the memorials be made a part of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the joint resolutions were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ENROLLED JOINT MEMORIAL 5

Joint memorial memorializing the Congress of the United States of America with reference to supporting basic changes in Federal reclamation laws to make it possible for reclamation development to meet the needs of today

Whereas several statewide organizations, such as the Wyoming Stock Growers Association, Wyoming Wool Growers Association, Wyoming State Association of Soil and Water Conservation Districts, Wyoming Farm Bureau, and the Wyoming Development Association have taken formal positions requesting that the land limitation restrictions of reclamation law be revised to recognize the economic conditions and farming practices of today; and

Whereas these organizations have recognized that the large proportion of irrigated land in Wyoming was provided water through private initiative, and that, in many instances, these lands need a supplemental supply of water; and

Whereas the development of irrigation should be accomplished in a manner that is compatible with existing irrigation, livestock, industrial, municipal, tourist, and recreational interests insofar as possible; and

Whereas irrigated agriculture in the State of Wyoming does not produce crops that are in surplus as defined by section 301(b)(10) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of the 37th Legislature of the State of Wyoming (the senate of such legislature concurring), That the President and the Congress of the United States of America be and they are hereby memorialized to take such action as may be necessary to: (1) provide adequate size of farm units on reclamation projects in the State of Wyoming; (2) give special emphasis to planning projects which will provide supplemental water supplies to existing irrigated land and without acreage restrictions for such lands requiring a supplemental supply; and (3) orient planning activities to develop projects compatible with existing irrigation, livestock, industrial, municipal, tourist, and recreational interests insofar as possible; and be it further

Resolved, That certified copies hereof be transmitted promptly to U.S. Senator GALE W. MCGEE, U.S. Senator MILWARD L. SIMPSON, and Representative in Congress WILLIAM HENRY HARRISON.

Approved January 29, 1963.

CLIFFORD P. HANSEN,
Governor.
CHARLES G. IRWIN,
President of the Senate.
MARLIN T. KURTZ,
Speaker of the House.

ENROLLED JOINT MEMORIAL 6

Joint memorial memorializing the Congress of the United States to provide legislation designed to return to the State of Wyoming additional sections of land from the public domain

Whereas the State of Wyoming is at a disadvantage due to the fact that in excess of 50 percent of the land area of the State is owned or controlled by the Federal Government; and

Whereas the State of Wyoming has received two sections per township from the public domain for the support of public schools and whereas many States, including several Western States have received four sections per township for similar purposes: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of the 37th Legislature of the State of Wyoming (the senate of such legislature concurring), That the President and Congress of the United States of America, be, and they are hereby memorialized to take such action as may be necessary to return to the State of Wyoming the two additional sections from the public domain the same as have been granted other States, or the equivalent thereof; and be it further

Resolved, That certified copies hereof be transmitted promptly to the President and Vice President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of said Congress, U.S. Senator GALE W. MCGEE, U.S. Senator MILWARD L. SIMPSON, and Representative in Congress WILLIAM HENRY HARRISON.

Approved January 29, 1963.

CLIFFORD P. HANSEN,
Governor.
CHARLES G. IRWIN,
President of the Senate.
MARLIN T. KURTZ,
Speaker of the House.

OREGON LEGISLATIVE MEMORIAL ON TIMBER SALES

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, members of the Oregon State Legislative Assembly are concerned over the manner in which timber. blown down in a severe storm on October 12, 1962, will be disposed of by agencies of the Federal Government.

Some segments of the lumber industry in my home State of Oregon have encountered difficulty in recent months because of the vast increase in softwood lumber imports from Canada. Unless timber damaged in the Columbus Day storm is disposed of in an orderly and efficient manner, this situation could become even more complicated.

The 52d Legislative Assembly of Oregon recently adopted Senate Joint Memorial 1, urging action by the Departments of Agriculture and Interior to expedite salvage and sale of the damaged timber.

I ask unanimous consent to include in the RECORD with my remarks the text of the memorial and the certificate from the secretary of state of the State of Oregon which accompanied the statement.

There being no objection, the certificate and joint resolution were referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, as follows:

ENROLLED SENATE JOINT MEMORIAL 1

To His Excellency, John F. Kennedy, President of the United States, and to the Honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America, in Congress assembled:

We, your memorialists, the 52d Legislative Assembly of the State of Oregon, in legislative session assembled, most respectfully represent that:

Whereas the standing timber which was blown down in the severe storm of October 12, 1962, is an economic loss to the State; and

Whereas the loss will become greater as a result of infestation if the timber is not salvaged; and

Whereas the downed timber constitutes a severe fire hazard; and

Whereas much of this salvageable timber is located in an economically depressed area of this State; and

Whereas the salvage operation is one well suited to the small operator: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Legislative Assembly of the State of Oregon:

1. The U.S. Departments of Agriculture and Interior are urged to expedite the salvage and sale of the downed timber by:

(a) Authorizing sale of small tracts, particularly those located adjacent to existing access roads.

(b) Establishing scaling stations to determine the quantity of timber removed and thus avoiding the time and cost of recruising.

(c) Authorizing local supervisors to make sales of timber up to $10,000 estimated value without lengthy public advertisement.

2. The Congress of the United States is urged to enact any necessary enabling legislation which may be required.

3. The Oregon Members of the U.S. Senate and House of Representatives are urged to encourage action on the part of the Departments of Agriculture and Interior and to promote and support any needed legislation.

4. The secretary of state shall send a copy of this memorial to the President of the United States, to the Secretaries of the Departments of Agriculture and Interior and to each member of the Oregon congressional delegation.

Adopted by senate February 5, 1963.

DALE A. HENDERSON,
Secretary of Senate.
BEN MUSA,
President of Senate.

Adopted by house February 15, 1963.

CLARENCE BARTON,
Speaker of House.

Filed February 26, 1963.

——— ———,
Secretary of State.

STUDY OF CERTAIN MATTERS BY COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. MAGNUSON, from the Committee on Commerce, reported the resolution (S. Res. 29) authorizing the Committee on Commerce to make a study of certain matters under its jurisdiction, with amendments, which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. FULBRIGHT, from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

William J. Porter, of Massachusetts, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to the Democratic and Popular Republic of Algeria;

Dr. James Watt, of the District of Columbia, to be the representative of the United States of America on the Executive Board of the World Health Organization;

Charles D. Withers, of Florida, a Foreign Service officer of class 2, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to the Republic of Rwanda;

Carl T. Rowan, of Minnesota, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Finland;

Jonathan B. Bingham, of New York, to be representative of the United States of America on the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations;

Edward M. Korry, of New York, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Ethiopia;

Archibald S. Alexander, of New Jersey, to be an Assistant Director of the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency;

Sidney R. Yates, of Illinois, to be the representative of the United States of America on the Trusteeship Council of the United Nations; and

Charles F. Baldwin, of the District of Columbia, Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to the Federation of Malaya, to serve concurrently and without additional compensation as the representative of the United States of America to the 19th session of the Economic Commission for Asia and the Far East of the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, in addition, I report favorably the following nominations that have already been printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. In order to save the expense of printing them on the Executive Calendar, I ask unanimous consent that they be ordered to lie on the Secretary's desk, for the information of any Senator.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The nominations will lie on the desk, as requested by the Senator from Arkansas.

The nominations are as follows:

Edward Glion Curtis, of the District of Columbia, Leo M. Goodman, of New York, and Joseph O. Zurhellen, Jr., of New York, now Foreign Service officers of class 2 and secretaries in the diplomatic service, to be also consuls general of the United States of America;

Miss Mary Vance Trent, of the District of Columbia, for reappointment in the Foreign Service as a Foreign Service officer of class 3, a consul, and a secretary in the diplomatic service;

Paul M. Bergman, of New Jersey, for appointment as a Foreign Service officer of class 4, a consul, and a secretary in the diplomatic service;

Frederick C. Ashley, of Ohio, and sundry other persons, for appointment as Foreign Service officers of class 7, vice consuls of career, and secretaries in the diplomatic service;

Laurence Desaix Anderson, Jr., of Mississippi, and sundry other persons, for appointment as Foreign Service officers of class 8, vice consuls of career, and secretaries in the diplomatic service;

Irl W. Smith, of Illinois, a Foreign Service Reserve officer, to be a consul and a secretary in the diplomatic service;

James D. Bartlett, of Pennsylvania, and sundry other Foreign Service Reserve officers, to be consuls in the diplomatic service;

Paul A. Arsenault, of Maryland, and sundry other Foreign Service Reserve officers, to be vice consuls in the diplomatic service;

Earl R. Allison, of Nebraska, and sundry other Foreign Service Reserve officers, to be secretaries in the diplomatic service; and

Archie Davies, of Florida, John A. Tarin, of Texas, and Miss Catherina Van Lier Ribbink, of California, Foreign Service Staff officers, to be consuls in the diplomatic service.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. SALTONSTALL (for himself, Mr. ALLOTT, Mr. BEALL, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. BOGGS, Mr. CARLSON, Mr. CASE, Mr. CURTIS, Mr. DIRKSEN, Mr. DOMINICK, Mr. FONG, Mr. HICKENLOOPER, Mr. HRUSKA, Mr. JAVITS, Mr. JORDAN of Idaho, Mr. KEATING, Mr. MILLER, Mr. MUNDT, Mr. PEARSON, Mr. PROUTY, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. TOWER, and Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota):

S. 1011. A bill to authorize wartime benefits under certain circumstances for peacetime veterans and their dependents; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. ERVIN (for himself, Mr. EASTLAND, Mr. JOHNSTON, Mr. MCCLELLAN, and Mr. BYRD of Virginia):

S. 1012. A bill to make voluntary admissions and confessions admissible in criminal proceedings and prosecutions in the courts of the United States and the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. ERVIN when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. LAUSCHE (for himself, Mr. SCOTT, and Mr. HARTKE):

S. 1013. A bill to provide for a study by the Secretary of the Interior of strip and surface mining operations in the United States and for a report to Congress of the results of such study, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. LAUSCHE when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. DIRKSEN:

S. 1014. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Joyce Mark Bouvier; and

S. 1015. A bill for the relief of Edith Annikki McRae; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PASTORE:

S. 1016. A bill for the relief of Irene Golato and Clorinda Golato; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEATING:

S. 1017. A bill for the relief of Angelo Coppola; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HART:

S. 1018. A bill for the relief of William E. Blythe; and

S. 1019. A bill for the relief of Robert W. Kube, Jr.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ANDERSON (for himself, Mr. BIBLE, Mr. CANNON, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. MOSS, Mr. ENGLE, Mr. KUCHEL, Mr. MCGEE, and Mr. BENNETT):

S. 1020. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a program in five areas of the United States to increase usable precipitation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. ANDERSON when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. HRUSKA:

S. 1021. A bill for the relief of Mansour Batarse; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BYRD of West Virginia (for himself and Mr. RANDOLPH):

S. 1022. A bill to provide for the establishment of the Spruce Knob-Seneca Rocks National Recreation Area, in the State of West Virginia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. JACKSON (for himself and Mr. MAGNUSON):

S. 1023. A bill to provide for increasing the storage capacity of the Bumping Lake Reservoir, Yakima River Basin, Wash.; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. BIBLE (by request):

S. 1024. A bill to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to pay relocation costs made necessary by actions of the District of Columbia government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. TOWER:

S. 1025. A bill to amend the act authorizing the Library of Congress to provide books and sound-reproduction records for the blind so as to make the books and sound-reproduction records available to armless readers; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

By Mr. HUMPHREY:

S. 1026. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to permit an otherwise qualified disabled widow to receive widow's insurance benefits thereunder even though she has not attained age 62; and

S. 1027. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to eliminate the restriction on the period during which an application for a determination of disability is granted full retroactivity, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. HUMPHREY when he introduced the above bills, which appear under a separate heading.)

S. 1028. A bill for the relief of Jessie Hunter Todd; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1029. A bill to amend the public assistance provisions of the Social Security Act to eliminate certain inequities and restrictions and permit a more effective distribution of Federal funds; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. HUMPHREY when he introduced the last above-mentioned bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MCINTYRE:

S. 1030. A bill for the relief of Sister Aurora Martin Gelado (also known as Sister Nieve); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MAGNUSON (by request):

S. 1031. A bill to repeal the Inland Waterways Corporation Act;

S. 1032. A bill to exclude cargo which is lumber from certain tariff filing requirements under the Shipping Act, 1916;

S. 1033. A bill to establish a uniform system of time standards and measurement for the United States and to require the observance of such time standards for all purposes;

S. 1034. A bill to amend section 902 of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 relating to penalties for falsification of records, and for other purposes;

S. 1035. A bill to extend the provisions of section 3 of Public Law 87-346, relating to dual rate contracts;

S. 1036. A bill to amend the inland and western rivers rules concerning anchor lights and fog signals required in special anchorage areas, and for other purposes; and

S. 1037. A bill to amend section 208(c) of the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended; to the Committee on Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. MAGNUSON when he introduced the above bills, which appear under separate headings.)

By Mr. JAVITS:

S. 1038. A bill to provide civil remedies to persons damaged by unfair commercial activities in or affecting commerce; to the Committee on Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. JAVITS when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. BYRD of Virginia:

S. 1039. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to acquire through exchange the Great Falls property in the State of Virginia for administration in connection with the George Washington Memorial Parkway, and for other purpose; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. CASE:

S. 1040. A bill to direct the Surgeon General to establish and publish criteria useful in indicating the harmful effects of various air pollution agents; to the Committee on Public Works.

(See the remarks of Mr. CASE when he introduced the above bill which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. RANDOLPH:

S. 1041. A bill to provide for the humane care and treatment of vertebrate animals used in research, experiments, testing, or training by departments, agencies, and instrumentalities of the United States and by recipients of grants and awards from the United States, and to encourage the study and development of new methods of minimizing pain and discomfort of animals used for such purposes, and for other purposes;

to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. Randolph when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. KENNEDY:

S. 1042. A bill for the relief of Susan A. Tikiryan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CHURCH (for himself, Mrs. Neuberger, and Mr. Engle):

S. 1043. A bill to provide for the conservation of anadromous fish spawning areas in the Salmon River, Idaho; to the Committee on Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. Church when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MOSS:

S. 1044. A bill for the relief of Earl H. Smith and his wife, Dorothy Smith; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MOSS (for himself and Mr. Bennett):

S. 1045. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Genevieve Olsen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORSE:

S. 1046. A bill to provide hospital, domiciliary, and medical care for non-service-connected disabilities to certain recipients of the Medal of Honor; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

S. 1047. A bill to amend the act of August 12, 1955 (69 Stat. 699), relating to elections in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

(See the remarks of Mr. Morse when he introduced the above bills, which appear under separate headings.)

By Mr. DIRKSEN:

S.J. Res. 57. Joint resolution designating the American marigold (Tagetes erecta) as the national floral emblem of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. Dirksen when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION

AMENDMENT OF SECTION 133 OF LEGISLATIVE REORGANIZATION ACT, RELATIVE TO PROCEDURE ON APPROPRIATION BILLS

Mr. CLARK submitted the following concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 28); which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That section 133 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (relating to committee procedure) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(g) In each session of the Congress one-half of the bills making appropriations of the revenue for the support of the Government shall be introduced in the House of Representatives, and one-half of such bills shall be introduced in the Senate. The chairmen of the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and of the House of Representatives shall determine by agreement which of such bills shall be introduced in each House. No such bill shall be introduced in more than one House of the Congress. Hearings upon each such bill shall be conducted jointly by the Committee on Appropriations of the two Houses, or by subcommittees of those committees. A member of the Committee on Appropriations of the House in which any such bill was introduced shall preside at all joint hearings upon that bill."

VOLUNTARY ADMISSIONS AND CONFESSIONS ADMISSIBLE AGAINST DEFENDANTS IN CRIMINAL PROCEEDINGS

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, on behalf of Senators Eastland, Johnston, McClellan, Byrd of Virginia, and myself, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to make voluntary admissions and confessions admissible against defendants in criminal proceedings and prosecutions in the courts of the United States and the District of Columbia.

Mr. President, the rising tide of crime in the District of Columbia points up once again the need for legislation to reverse this trend. I feel that the results of this trend during the year 1962 are demonstrated in an article which appeared in the Washington Post for Monday, March 4, 1963, which I ask unanimous consent be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Crime Up 4.9 Percent in District in 1962

Washington ranked fifth among 16 cities of its population class last year in the incidence of serious crime but was first in aggravated assaults and second in robberies.

The 1962 figures, compiled both locally and by the FBI on a national basis, showed a 4.9-percent rise here in overall crime, with a 16.6-percent increase in robberies leading the various categories. The overall increases in crime nationally was 7 percent, the FBI said.

The District's 1962 totals, as compared with those of the previous year (in parentheses) follow:

Murder and nonnegligent manslaughter, 91 (88); aggravated assaults, 3,005 (2,955); forcible rape, 100 (82); robbery, 1,572 (1,348); burglary (housebreaking), 5,022 (4,902); larceny, 2,666 (2,464), and auto theft, 2,581 (2,459).

Among the 16 cities in the 500,000-1 million population range for which the figures were compiled, Washington ranked fourth in population behind Baltimore, Houston, and Cleveland, but was behind those cities in its crime figures only in the incidence of murder.

Only Baltimore, Houston, and St. Louis were close to Washington's assault score which ranked it first both in the actual number of such crimes and in the rate per 1,000 population.

The city's rapes, which showed an 18-percent increase from 1961, ranked it 10th among the cities and its larcenies and auto thefts put it in the same position.

Mr. ERVIN. I feel that this significant increase in the lawlessness in our Nation's Capital points to the need for legislation to clarify the Supreme Court ruling of 1957 in *Mallory* v. *United States* (354 U.S. 449) and the more recent decision of the U.S. Court of Appeals, Killough against United States, which extended the scope of the Mallory decision even further. The Mallory ruling held inadmissible the voluntary statement of a convicted and self-confessed rapist because of the delay in taking him before a committing magistrate. The Court held that a delay of 7½ hours in arraigning the prisoner violated rule 5(a) of the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure which requires that an arrested person be taken before a committing officer without unnecessary delay.

The Mallory ruling and the decision in the earlier case of *McNabb* v. *United States* (318 U.S. 332) have resulted in abolishing an old and fundamental rule of evidence regarding the admissibility of a confession. Prior to these decisions, the sole test of the admissibility of a confession was whether it was made voluntarily. Under this test, if a confession was freely and voluntarily made, it was deemed to be trustworthy. Of course, if there was a showing that the delay itself constituted sufficient inducement to confess, the court could, in its discretion, render such a confession inadmissible. But, the point is that mere delay in itself was not enough to invalidate a confession.

In the Mallory case, time alone was the deciding factor. There was no showing that any duress was used in extracting the confession from the prisoner. Indeed, there was no allegation on the part of the prisoner that any force whatever was used to have him confess to the crime. There was nothing to indicate that the confession was anything but voluntarily given. Nevertheless, despite the voluntary nature of the confession and despite the fact that the confession was substantiated by all the facts of the crime charged against the prisoner, it was invalidated merely because of the passage of time.

The Mallory rule was extended even further in the decision of Killough against United States, decided on October 4, 1962, by the Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia. In Killough, the prisoner had confessed two separate times to the murder of his wife, once prior to arraignment and once thereafter. Not only did the Court use the Mallory doctrine to throw out the voluntary confession of the accused made prior to his arraignment, but the Court extended this doctrine to invalidate an admission made after the arraignment. The Court reasoned that the second confession was prompted by the first admission, which was illegal under Mallory. Judge Burger alluded to the departure from precedent and the ramifications of this decision in his dissenting opinion; he stated, as follows:

> The majority holding today is one of the most significant and far-reaching of this court in many years. It goes far beyond the statute it purports to interpret and far beyond any prior opinion of this court or the Supreme Court. No statute remotely authorizes the holding. No one even suggests that any right under the Constitution is involved.
>
> The majority holding constructs an entirely new statute and takes a step neither contemplated by Congress nor remotely warranted by the Mallory case. The Mallory doctrine operated to exclude or suppress incriminating statements made during unnecessary delay before taking the arrested person to a committing magistrate. The entire rationale of Mallory is that the statements are barred because made while detention is unlawful—unlawful for failure to have a prompt hearing. Today's majority holding, carries the "fruit of the poisonous tree" doctrine to new lengths and means in effect, that statements made either before

or after the hearing are to be excluded unless the statements are made with the defendant's lawyer at his elbow. For all practical purposes the majority bars any admissions except where the accused is advised and prepared to enter a guilty plea. It would be difficult to overstate the enormity and scope of this incredible interpretation of rule 5(a). Mallory to a large extent foreclosed police investigation prior to preliminary hearing; this holding eliminates any interrogation of an accused after he has had the judicial warning until he secures a lawyer. In light of this holding it is ironic that in the Mallory opinion Justice Frankfurter characterized rule 5(a) as a part of the procedure devised by Congress for safeguarding individual rights without hampering effective and intelligent law enforcement.

Mr. President, I contend that it is both unsound and unreasonable to apply time alone as a measure of admissibility. This subverts a rule of procedure relating to the duty of an arresting officer into a rule of evidence. Because a police officer fails to observe the requirements of rule 5(a) a self-confessed criminal may be turned back to society, even though he may have confessed again subsequent to his arraignment. In other words, the supposed sins of the policeman are visited upon an innocent society.

I submit, Mr. President, that when Congress approved the promulgation of the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure, it did not intend to throw on the scrapheap the time-honored test of voluntariness concerning the admissibility of a confession. I submit that Congress had no intention of making convictions impossible simply because a police officer failed to take a prisoner before a committing magistrate until 7½ hours had elapsed.

As chairman of the Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights, Mr. President, I am not unmindful of the many protections which the Constitution of the United States bestows upon the persons accused of crimes within our society. But, in the words of Judge Alexander Holtzoff, U.S. district judge for the District of Columbia, who testified at subcommittee hearings on the subject of "Confessions and Police Detention," in 1958:

> We must bear in mind that the purpose of the criminal law is to protect the public. On the one hand, it is essential that no innocent person be convicted of a crime and that oppressive methods be not used against the guilty. On the other hand, it is equally indispensable that victims of a crime and potential victims of possible future crimes receive protection. The victim must not become a forgotten man. As was said by Mr. Justice Cardozo in *Snyder* v. *Massachusetts* (291 (U.S. 97, 122), "Justice, through due the accused, is due to the accuser also. The concept of fairness must not be strained till it is narrowed to a filament. We are to keep the balance true."

In considering the effect of these decisions, Mr. President, we should keep in mind that the Supreme Court did not base its decisions on any constitutional issue. It did not suggest that to admit Mallory's confession into evidence would be a violation of due process. The Court in both Mallory and Killough based its decision on its interpretation of the will of Congress as expressed in rule 5(a) of the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure. I do not believe that the Court has correctly interpreted the will and intent of Congress in this matter. It is for this reason that I have introduced, for appropriate reference, this bill to make voluntary admissions and confessions admissible in criminal proceedings and prosecutions in the courts of the United States and the District of Columbia. I ask unanimous consent that the bill lie on the table for 7 days so that additional Senators may add their names as cosponsors, and that the bill be printed at this point in the Record.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will lie on the table as requested by the Senator from North Carolina, and may be printed at this point in the Record.

The bill (S. 1012) to make voluntary admissions and confessions admissible in criminal proceedings and prosecutions in the courts of the United States and the District of Columbia, introduced by Mr. Ervin (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

> *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That, notwithstanding the provisions of rule 5 of the Rules of Criminal Procedure for the United States District Courts or any other rule or statute of like purport, a voluntary admission or a voluntary confession of an accused shall be admissible against him in any criminal proceeding or prosecution in the courts of the United States or of the District of Columbia, and the finding of the trial court in respect to the voluntariness of the admission or confession shall be binding upon any reviewing court in the event it is supported by substantial evidence.

STRIP MINE RECLAMATION STUDY BILL

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, for myself, the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. Scott] and the Senator from Indiana [Mr. Hartke], a bill to provide for a study by the Secretary of the Interior of strip- and surface-mining operations in the United States and for a report to Congress of the results of such study.

Strip- and surface-mining operations in many sections of our country, in recent years, have made possible the tapping of some of our mineral resources in quantities of great magnitude and at costs far below those of deep-shaft and other mining methods. While one might justifiably say this progress has been beneficial to our economy as a whole, nevertheless, we must face the fact that it also, in a majority of instances, has destroyed all other usefulness of the land and has left abominable, grotesque scars. Plainly stating it, Mr. President, in many areas the land has been robbed of its resources and abandoned to the wrath of the elements. Time alone will not heal these wounds.

There are large areas in Ohio and other States where, as a result of stripping operations, public highways have suffered severe damage by reason of slippage; streams, lakes, and wells have been polluted; wildlife cover has been destroyed; and, finally, the entire areas themselves have been abandoned as unproductive and virtual wasteland. The future economy of these areas is seriously threatened.

Mr. President, during my administration as Governor of Ohio, after many unsuccessful attempts, there was finally enacted a strip mine reclamation law requiring strip mine operators to restore the usefulness of the land by a degree of leveling of the spoil banks and planting of them in grasses and trees. While the law has been helpful in land restoration, I have always felt that it should have required more strict conservation measures. Faced with almost insurmountable opposition, it was the best that I could get.

While some other States have had some strip mining regulation laws enacted in recent years, there remain throughout the country thousands upon thousands of acres of prelaw spoil banks, which can, it is my belief, be converted to some useful purpose with a little help. Strip and surface mining operations are no longer confined to the once-limited areas. These operations are spreading daily in many of the mineral producing States. With the cooperation of the several States and the Department of the Interior, as our bill provides, a very beneficial land use study would be made in order that the Congress could determine in what manner and in what degree it would have responsibility in helping to restore to usefulness these ever-growing numbers of acres of desolation.

Mr. President, during the 87th session of the Congress, I introduced a similar bill, which, subject to two minor perfecting amendments, met with the approval of the Bureau of the Budget and the Department of Interior. Those suggested amendments are incorporated in the bill I introduce today. I urge speedy and favorable consideration of this bill.

I ask unanimous consent that the entire text of this bill be printed in the Record.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the Record.

The bill (S. 1013) to provide for a study by the Secretary of the Interior of strip and surface mining operations in the United States and for a report to Congress of the results of such study, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. Lausche (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

> *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That, (a) in order that the extent and effect of strip and surface mining operations in the United States can be ascertained, and in order to develop information which may aid in determining what remedial action with respect to such operations can be taken by Congress and by the several States, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized and di-

rected to make a survey and study of strip and surface mining operations in the United States.

(b) The Secretary of the Interior shall make the study and survey authorized in subsection (a) in full cooperation with appropriate Federal and State agencies, including the Department of Agriculture.

Sec. 2. The survey and study authorized by the first section of this Act shall include, but not be limited to, the following matters—

(1) the nature and extent of strip and surface mining operations in the United States;

(2) the ownership of the real property involved in strip and surface mining operations;

(3) the safety of the conduct of such strip and surface mining operations;

(4) the hazards to public health and safety resulting from such operations;

(5) the effect of strip and surface mining operations on highway programs of the United States and the several States;

(6) the effect of strip and surface mining operations on the scenic features of the United States and the several States;

(7) the effect of strip and surface mining operations on the fish and wildlife and other natural resources of the United States and the several States; and

(8) the public interest in and public benefits which may result from the appropriate development and use of areas subjected to strip and surface mining operations.

Sec. 3. (a) The Secretary of the Interior shall transmit to Congress a report on the survey and study authorized by the first section of this Act. Such report shall contain all information developed as a result of such survey and study together with the recommendations of the Secretary, based on the finding of this study and on techniques developed by Federal agencies as part of their continuing programs, and shall be made as soon as practicable after the completion of the survey and study, but not later than two years after the date of enactment of this Act.

(b) The Secretary of the Interior shall transmit a copy of the report which he submits to Congress under subsection (a) of this section to the Governor of each State of the United States and the Governor of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, the bill contemplates a study by the Secretary of the Interior of strip and surface mining operations in the United States, and a report to Congress on the results of such study.

Strip and surface mining operations in many sections of our country in recent years have made possible the tapping of some of our mineral resources in quantities of great magnitude and at costs far below those of deep shaft and other mining methods, but while moneys have been saved that way the surface of the land has been denuded and rendered sterile. The banks have been left exposed. The fertile topsoil has been plowed under. Instead of growth and grass coverage there is nothing now but barrenness.

Ohio is a State which has suffered very substantially. The State of Tennessee likewise has suffered, as have the States of Pennsylvania and West Virginia.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there may be included in the Record an article carried in the Washington Post and Times Herald on Thursday, March 7, dealing with the situation as it prevails in Tennessee.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

TVA Study Ducks Issue of Restoring Strip-Mined Land

(By Julius Duscha)

The Tennessee Valley Authority has sidestepped one of the Nation's most difficult and most controversial conservation problems.

The problem is the reclamation of fields and mountainsides devastated by strip-mining operations.

Strip mining is a process used to get at coal deposits by first stripping away soil or rocks covering the coal and then digging the coal out with power equipment.

The process denudes the countryside and leaves land so badly churned up and so full of acid that it is often difficult to get anything to grow on it. Strip mining also leads to serious erosion problems.

In 1961, the last year for which complete figures are available, strip mining accounted for 30 percent of the Nation's coal production.

TVA, which now produces more electric power from coal than from water, is one of the Nation's largest users of coal.

In 1961 about 50 percent of the coal bought by TVA was produced in strip-mining operations.

In recent years this pioneering New Deal agency has come under attack from its former supporters who have charged that it has turned into nothing more than a big electric utility interested only in the cheap production of power and no longer concerned with conservation matters.

In releasing a report on strip mining the TVA Board of Directors said that the reclamation of areas following such mining operations should be controlled by States.

The facts are that coal strip mining, its effects and the methods of land reclamation are so varied that no overall remedy to the problem can possibly be prescribed, the TVA directors said in a statement issued last week both in Washington and Knoxville, Tenn., the agency's headquarters.

As a purchaser of coal, the statement continued, TVA pays in the price of the coal it buys the cost of reclamation where it is required by State law.

As a conservation agency, TVA is anxious to work with States, private agencies and coal producers in achieving the best techniques for reclamation and use of stripped areas.

However, the authority and, we believe, the responsibility to act lies with State governments and TVA's efforts will be directed toward working with the States in the exercise of this authority and responsibility.

The TVA report said that reclamation of strip-mined areas would cost less than three cents for each ton of coal mined in such areas.

The report said that strip mining is far more economical than deep underground mining.

Strip-mining operations recover from 90 to 95 percent of the coal while recovery through underground mining methods ranges from 35 to 85 percent.

A man can produce 25 tons of coal a day in a strip-mining operation compared with 11 tons in deep mining.

Since the first strip-mining operations began nearly 50 years ago 500,000 acres have been stripped of coal. The TVA report estimated that at least another 1.5 million acres will eventually be stripped.

Most land that has been strip mined is good only for the planting of trees. Even this sometimes cannot be done until 3 years after the mining operations have ended because the stripping operation disturbs the soil and fills it with acid.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I wish to read a brief excerpt from the article:

> The Tennessee Valley Authority has sidestepped one of the Nation's most difficult and most controversial conservation problems.
>
> The problem is the reclamation of fields and mountainsides devastated by strip-mining operations.
>
> Strip mining is a process used to get at coal deposits by first stripping away soil or rocks covering the coal and then digging the coal out with power equipment.
>
> The process denudes the countryside and leaves land so badly churned up and so full of acid that it is often difficult to get anything to grow on it. Strip mining also leads to serious erosion problems.

It is not generally known, but in the stripping of the land they have developed booms of 100 feet in length, which grab 50 to 60 tons of the top coverage at one time, thus digging deep into the land to get out the coal which lies beneath.

The Federal Government is the owner of much land on which mineral rights have been given to others. In Ohio we have seen the spectacle of the Federal Government being the owner of some of the land with mineral rights belonging to coal companies, and the coal companies taking off the coverage—all of it—exposing nothing but rock and shale, and finally a mixture of coal with it, which creates a toxic condition, making it impossible for anything to grow.

I am asking that a study be made of this subject. I think the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. Gore] is probably familiar with what is happening. I think a study ought to be made and a report ought to be sent to the Congress as to how the Federal Government should interest itself in this problem.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LAUSCHE. I yield to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. GORE. I am indeed interested in the subject. I hope something constructive will flow from the efforts of the distinguished senior Senator from Ohio. I think perhaps the TVA, an individual agency of the Federal Government, insofar as its authority and capacity is concerned, has reached a proper conclusion. It is a problem which is nationwide in its scope and one with which a lone agency of the Government cannot cope.

I assume the Senator wants a broad study in order to reach a national policy on the problem.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Yes. I thank the Senator for his contribution very much.

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LAUSCHE. I yield to the Senator from Indiana.

Mr. HARTKE. I was wondering whether the Senator's proposal for a study included an intent to go into the question of what should be done with the land.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The time of the Senator from Ohio has expired.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may be granted an additional 2 minutes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HARTKE. Does the Senator plan to have studied the problem as to what should be done to level the cuts and rehabilitate the land? I do not know about Ohio, but in Indiana, after this land has been stripped, its value for assessment purposes and property taxes is practically none, therefore, leaving the land in an unusable condition for a long period of time, without any value to anybody at all. Is that the point?

Mr. LAUSCHE. That is the point I have in mind. May I say that 12 years ago I led the fight for the adoption of a law in Ohio. I succeeded in getting a law passed which I never believed was adequate. The power of the coal operators was so great that I could not get a satisfactory law. I can only say that if anybody with some sense of esthetic value goes into the strip mining areas and sees what has been done, he can do nothing else but weep at the cruelty of mankind in destroying and butchering the beauty of the land.

Mr. HARTKE. I thank the Senator for yielding to me. I think such a study should be made at the earliest possible moment.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, the Senator from Ohio has not mentioned one thing about strip mining. Strip mining is done to a great extent in the mountain areas, where there is clear water both for domestic use and for recreation. Wherever strip mining has taken place, the water thereafter cannot be used for any purpose, including trout fishing. The study which should be made will lay the foundation for State laws to prohibit any company which strip mines from failing to cover the land after its operations. I think such a study should be made, and I think that can be done.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I think it can be done.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARY

INCREASE OF USABLE PRECIPITATION

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and Senators BIBLE, CANNON, MOSS, ENGLE, KUCHEL, MCGEE, BENNETT, and MCGOVERN, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a program in five areas of the United States to increase usable precipitation and for other purposes.

Mr. President, the possibility of providing some measure of control over weather has been one of man's dreams from earliest recorded history. However, it was not until the World War II studies of fog particles by Dr. Langmuir and Dr. Schaefer that it was demonstrated that clouds could be modified and some precipitation produced by scientific means. This particular experiment involved the use of dry ice seeding of supercooled clouds. Project Cirrus by the Department of Defense in 1947 and the cloud physics program of the U.S. Weather Bureau in 1948 were followed by commercial rainmaking activities on a multimillion dollar scale especially after the discovery that silver iodide particles were similarly effective. These projects generally employed ground generators which produced silver iodide smoke as the cloud seeding material.

The advent of major droughts which gripped parts of the country during the mid-1930's, the late 1940's and the early 1950's made the subject of weather modification and rainmaking a matter of national concern. The extravagant claims of some rainmakers were countered by severe criticism from parts of the scientific community and this led Congress in 1953 to create an Advisory Committee on Weather Control "to study and evaluate public and private experiments in weather modification."

As a result of these studies and experiments, the American Meteorological Society recently reported:

> Developments in recent years have suggested that limited control of weather and climate may be possible. Among these developments are:
>
> 1. The demonstration that clouds can be modified artificially by seeding them with dry ice or silver iodide.
>
> 2. The demonstration that physical laws governing atmospheric motions can be cast in mathematical form suitable for processing on high speed electronic computers, to predict the future state of the atmosphere.

Mr. President, the practicability and economic feasibility of weather control and modification of climate is likely to remain uncertain for some time to come. However, these uncertainties are balanced by two very important considerations: First, the tremendous economic and humanitarian advantages if a significant degree of control or modification turns out to be possible; and second, the likely result of basic research studies required to answer this question will lead to improved accuracy in weather prediction and extension of the time period for which useful weather forecasts can be prepared.

The potential importance of the problem warrants a substantial effort in meteorological research, both basic and applied. Almost every human activity is affected to some degree by the weather. Availability of water supplies for the growth of crops is one of the basic requirements of society which is almost entirely dependent on precipitation and other weather factors and, as yet, this area of research has generally been bypassed. For example, a special report prepared by the Water Information Center, Inc., states:

> Actually, more than six times as much water flows across the United States in the atmosphere than is carried by all of the country's rivers. Some of this water vapor has traveled 3,000 miles without ever having fallen on land below, and has passed over arid and semiarid parts of the country that could become highly developed if rain could be induced to fall. The economic value of this potential rainfall is immense. A mere 15-percent increase in total precipitation, for example, on a 1,000-square-mile watershed having a normal annual rainfall of 15 inches, would yield an additional 100,000 acre-feet of water. If this water were to fall in the drier parts of the Southwestern United States, it would have an estimated monetary value of $2,000 per square mile if used for crop irrigation, or $5,000 per square mile if used for municipal water supplies (assuming its worth to be $20 per acre-foot for irrigation and 15 cents per 1,000 gallons for water supply).

Mr. President, it is readily apparent that it is vital to the public interest to reassess the position of weather modification research with a view toward paralleling Government-supported basic research with more extensive field applications of processes already known to be adapted to practical application.

My purpose in directing this legislation to the Secretary of the Interior is because the Bureau of Reclamation is the only agency in the U.S. Government whose primary function is the engineering and development of irrigation projects that have their repayment capacities inexorably associated with water supply conditions. It has constructed and is continuing to construct an extensive network of water storage facilities throughout the Western United States. Water resource development on many western watersheds is rapidly approaching the limit of water supply capabilities under present conditions. During times of drought, supplies of stored water are depleted and shortages of municipal, industrial, and irrigation water occur. Even during wet years many of the storage reservoirs are not filled to capacity. It is conceivable that an operational program of weather modification conducted during the periods when the air masses are naturally carrying large amounts of water could result in the filling of these reservoirs. The water could then be retained to assist in the amelioration of water deficiency which now occurs under natural conditions.

Mr. President, I request that the bill lie on the desk for 3 days in order that other Senators interested in this program may join as cosponsors.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will lie on the desk, as requested by the Senator from New Mexico.

The bill (S. 1020) to direct the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a program in five areas of the United States to increase usable precipitation, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. ANDERSON (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, I am delighted to have the opportunity to join the distinguished senior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] and other able western colleagues, in sponsorship of the bill stressing the need to accelerate the adaptation of scientific principles to providing increased precipitation.

As Senator ANDERSON has pointed out, the bill would direct the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a program in five areas of the United States designed to increase usable precipitation where such an increase would be beneficial.

This is a subject which has generated my personal interest for some time, because of the distinct hope it holds for the greater development of my State of Nevada, as well as stepped up development of the entire southwest portion of our Nation.

Early in 1957, I conducted hearings on the bill to provide for an experimental research program in cloud seeding.

At that time, I reminded those in attendance that congressional hearings between 1951 and 1953 yielded some very revealing facts. Those hearings, I noted, disclosed that farmers, ranchers, electric utilities, municipalities and other water users were paying from 2 cents to 20 cents per acre, thus annually spending between $3 million and $5 million on cloud seeding activities. These activities covered approximately 10 percent of the land area of the Nation.

The hearings also showed a definite necessity for an impartial evaluation of these extensive cloud seeding activities in order to ascertain what results, if any, they were producing.

My 1957 hearings resulted in the enactment of Public Law 85–510, which provided for a $5 million 5-year cooperative Federal-State experimental research program.

Mr. President, I have been so encouraged by the results of the experiments conducted under Public Law 85–510 that I firmly believe the time has arrived for active field demonstrations conducted on an adequately large scale to prove the value of the program.

In this respect, I should like to call the Senate's attention to a statement made by Dr. Vincent J. Schaefer, one of the Nation's foremost atmospheric scientists. In a brilliant paper presented at the Nevada Water Conference, held last fall in Carson City, Dr. Schaefer said:

> While there remain uncertainties concerning the economic value of cloud seeding activities, and we are still waiting for results acceptable to the statistician, a number of us who have been active in this field are convinced the time has arrived when we must encourage the development of what might be termed the engineering phase of weather modification.

Continuing, Dr. Schaefer said:

> It would be, in my opinion, a mistake to delay the inauguration of this step until everything is understood to the ultimate degree. A certain degree of gambling is necessary in any applied science development.

Mr. President, Dr. Schaefer summed up the faith in the premise we are on the right track when he borrowed from an esteemed colleague, Dr. I. Langmuir, to state:

> It may be easier to make the weather than to predict its behavior.

In Nevada, a 5-year cooperative program is presently being conducted between the local governments on the Humboldt River, the State of Nevada, the Desert Research Institute of the University of Nevada, the National Science Foundation, and the U.S. Bureau of Reclamation.

Mr. President, the program as envisioned in the terms of the bill introduced today by Senator Anderson has my full support. I believe it could well transform vast expanses of parched desert into productive range lands where grass will grow cinch-high on a saddle horse.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that the full text of the paper by Dr. Schaefer, to which I made earlier reference, be made a part of the Record following my remarks.

There being no objection, the matter was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Some Problems Concerning Weather Control

(By Vincent J. Schaefer)

In the 16 years which have passed since the writer dropped 6 pounds of dry ice into a supercooled altocumulus cloud over Greylock Mountain in Massachusetts,[1] the field of experimental meteorology has developed into a major scientific activity engaging atmospheric scientists throughout the world.

The rash of entrepeneurs and rainmakers, which developed shortly after these experiments were announced, and the expansive claims and brash attitudes, played on the relative ignorance and desperate situation of groups of farmers and ranchers, mulcting them of hundreds of thousands of dollars; at the same time putting the entire field of experimental meteorology in disrepute. This unfortunate development has gradually been supplanted by individual scientists and research groups anxious to establish the scientific facts and thus delineate the possibilities and limitations existing in this new area of science.

The task of establishing a sound scientific understanding of the effects of seeding and other trigger-like effects which interfere with the natural course of events in atmospheric processes, is fraught with intricate problems, not the least of which is our limited knowledge of many of the fundamental dynamic properties of the atmosphere. Such seemingly simple things as the formation of snow and rain, the cause of the electrical charge buildup in thunderstorms, and the structural features of cumulus clouds, are inadequately understood at the present time despite several decades of intensive studies.

In view of the current discrepancies in our knowledge, it is not surprising that occasional disagreements take place during meteorological meetings dealing with the effects of cloud seeding operations. Because of its vast complexity, there is probably no scientific subject more difficult to understand than the behavior of the atmosphere.

As Langmuir has pointed out,[2] the many atmospheric processes which combine to cause weather developments include phenomena of a divergent nature. Such phenomena defy prediction, since they result from minor disturbance which trigger off major results. Only convergent type phenomena lend themselves to prediction. In one of his later public lectures, Langmuir said, "It may be easier to make the weather than to predict its behavior."

The activities of Project Cirrus[3] between 1947 and 1952 established a number of the potentialities and limitations of the use of dry ice and silver iodide as seeding materials. In the 10-year period following the termination of the Cirrus operation, a number of more elaborate research programs were conducted, the results of which are only now being published.

As might have been expected, the results of these efforts are not without disagreement. They range from the reports of research groups in Arizona[4] and California[5] covering 4 years of aerial and ground seeding effects with the use of silver iodide generators, reporting no statistical evidence supporting increased precipitation; to the findings of the Australian group,[6] showing precipitation increases of 9 percent to 21 percent with some statistical significance; to the highly positive but not yet statistically significant of the Japanese,[7] reporting increases of 150 percent precipitation downwind of the Sea of Japan. Other studies, not yet ready for publication but conducted by capable researchers known to the writer, imply that the Japanese result may be quite real due to ideal conditions and well designed and operated field work. In areas of the world adjacent to rich moisture sources where supercooled clouds develop in abundance and naturally occurring ice nuclei are rare, seeding effects may be quite spectacular if intelligent activities are conducted. On the other hand, there will be geographical areas where little if any effects can be expected no matter how intensive or intelligent the effort.

At the present time there are few countries in the world that do not have field programs underway in experimental meteorology.[8] At the International Conference on Cloud Physics[9] held September 1961 in Australia, more than 70 scientists representing 17 countries described the progress being made in their respective areas. These efforts ranged from token activities to very elaborate and intensive studies on a wide front. Research is now being directed toward a wide variety of problems related to experimental meteorology ranging from cloud modification to some which closely approach weather control. These include such efforts as the studies of simple systems involving supercooled fogs and stratus clouds, hailstorms, orographic snowstorms, lake effect snowstorms, thunderstorms, tornadoes, orographic cumulus, manmade cumulus, blowdown storms, hurricanes, frontal cyclones, and largescale circulation. Some of these studies are well underway; others in only the initial exploratory phase. In a number of instances multiple studies of these storm types are underway in different parts of the world. Some results will be similar, but others are bound to show differences since there are few places where all of the significant variables are the same or even have any but the most superficial features in common.

Dry ice and silver iodide are still the most promising materials for producing trigger effects in atmospheric clouds, although they are strictly limited to supercooled clouds.

---

[1] Schaefer, V. J., "The Formation of Ice Crystals in the Laboratory and the Atmosphere," Chem. Rev. 44, 2 (1949).

[2] Langmuir, I., "Science, Common Sense and Decency," Science 97, 1, (1943).

[3] Schaefer, V. J., "Final Report, Project Cirrus Part I," laboratory, field and flight experiments contract No. DA 36–039–SC–15345, rept. No. RL785 General Electric Research Laboratory, Schenectady, N.Y. (Mar. 1953).

[4] Battan, L. J., and Kassander, Jr., A. R., "Cloud Seeding Experiments in Arizona," monograph No. 16, Int. Union of Geodesy and Geophysics, Paris, January 1962, p. 73.

[5] Neyman, J., Scott, E. L., and Vasilevskis, M., "Statistical Evaluation of the Santa Barbara Randomized Cloud Seeding Experiment," Bull. Amer. Meteoro. Soc. 41, 531 (1960).

[6] Adderly, E. E., "Analysis of Cloud Seeding Trials in Australia," monograph No. 16 Int. Union of Geodesy and Geophysics, Paris, January 1962, p. 77.

[7] Isono, Kenji, "Some Results of Cloud Seeding Experiments With Use of Silver Iodide Ground Generators," monograph No. 16, Int. Union of Geodesy and Geophysics, Paris, January 1962, p. 75.

[8] Third Annual Report on Weather Modification (1961) National Science Foundation, 78 pages, Superintendent of Documents, Washington, D.C.

[9] International Conference on Cloud Physics, Monograph No. 16, Paris, January 1962, p. 89; International Union of Geodesy and Geophysics; Int. Assoc. of Meteor. and Atmos. Physics.

While the majority of the activities in various parts of the world utilize silver iodide invisible smokes from ground and airborne generators,[10][11] a number of new materials and effects are the subject of investigations. The introduction of positive or negative ion clouds in substantial quantities has been achieved by Vonnegut[12] in Texas, Illinois, and New Mexico. Claims have recently been advanced by the Russians that substances such as phloroglucinol are as effective as silver iodide and become active as nuclei for ice crystal formation at a temperature of −2°C. Procedures for generating high concentrations of these materials are not currently as easy to carry out as with silver iodide.

The placing of finely divided carbon black into clouds to modify them was given enthusiastic support for a short period. Further studies, however, failed to confirm the results claimed, and the present status appears to be that effects, if any, are of dubious economic value for affecting clouds.

Sodium and calcium chloride, ammonium sulfate, and similar substances, some having a hygroscopic nature, have been tried as materials which hopefully would initiate warm rain precipitation. It was hoped that the results might be as effective in warm clouds as silver iodide and dry ice is in supercooled clouds. These materials thus far have failed to produce effects to a degree of economic value. This is because the warm cloud lacks the instability that makes the supercooled cloud so easy to modify. The other feature so important in economic evaluation is that silver iodide is effective when about 0.01 micron in diameter. Dry ice and similar materials colder than −40° C. are as efficient as silver iodide, weight for weight, when used properly. Materials thus far used in warm clouds must be 1 to 10 microns to have any effect. Thus the volume or weight of materials necessary to produce triggering reactions (if they can) must be at least a million times greater. If delivery is by plane or even by some sort of ground generator, the logistical problems make such procedures of doubtful economic value.

While it has been demonstrated[13][14] that relatively small amounts of water can initiate precipitation in warm clouds by a "chain reaction," the economic value of such operations is also doubtful except under very special conditions.

An example of such a condition exists in the Hawaiian Islands. On the island of Maui, Hawaii water from a mountain stream, which ordinarily flows into the sea, has been diverted and sprayed continuously into the oncoming streams of trade wind clouds at the point where they contact a steep cliff and are forced rapidly upward. The droplets sprayed into the cloud grow about a hundredfold in volume while in the upward moving clouds. They then fall earthward from the clouds as a drizzle at a point where the resulting precipitation can be caught in a flume and usefully deployed.

Similar conditions probably occur on many forested mountains swept by storm clouds.

While there remain uncertainties concerning the economic value of cloud seeding activities and we are still waiting for results acceptable to the statistician, a number of us who have been active in the field are convinced that the time has arrived when we must encourage the development of what might be termed the engineering phase of weather modification.[15] This activity would deal with the procedures, logistics, and routine operational problems which are the steps necessary to implement a reliable large scale utilization of scientific knowledge. It would be, in my opinion, a mistake to delay the inauguration of this step until everything is understood to the ultimate degree. A certain degree of gambling is necessary in any applied science development.

If plans are laid carefully, with thoroughness and intelligence, many worthwhile results will accrue from such activity. The greatest care must be exercised to insure that such projects are designed to take advantage of the most up-to-date scientific knowledge available and that active field research programs are superimposed on the field activities.

The trend of nearly every long-range precipitation increase operation I am aware of in America and in other countries shows evidence that positive effects occur when seeding activities are carefully executed and realistically applied in relation to the local weather systems. Some of these effects cannot be interpreted as having important economic value, although the majority indicate the results have value in excess of the cost of the seeding activities. In fact the relative cost of seeding compared to the economic advantages possible in most areas is so great that the utmost effort must be directed to understanding the possibilities and limitations of such activities.

The economics of cloud precipitation in each area must be better evaluated in order to establish these relationships. Even trace amounts of rain or snow at critical periods of the year may have value or cause losses entirely out of proportion to much larger amounts at other periods. The secondary effects and byproducts of the type of studies which need to be made might in special cases actually turn out to be of greater value than the seeding effects.

The definite buildup of interest in the atmospheric sciences now underway as part of the concerted effort[16][17] of government, educational institutions, private industry, and the scientific community, is bound to provide useful information, manpower and ideas that will need testing and operational activities by weather engineering groups.

The increase of supply of irrigation water in semi-arid regions by augmentation of the snow pack in the high mountains nearby is a logical development which might be anticipated. In addition to increasing the snowfall by more effective cloud water extraction by intelligent seeding activities, increased supplies in the lowlands might also be achieved by improved forest management, evaporation reduction, melting control, and other manipulations of the mountain precipitation.

If methods are discovered which will lead to a control of the general circulation, potential troubles to the economy might occur to a dry land adaption such as has been achieved by Reno, Palm Springs, Phoenix, and Albuquerque, to mention a few American cities which have grown because of the predominance of sunny skies and mild dry climate. Much of the economy of such places is based on an adjustment to the salubrious climate, an inherent feature of a dry environment.

The augmentation of rainfall in the local area to any considerable degree would cause many painful economic readjustments because of the change in sunshine, humidity, and the general ecology that would follow a radical change in the precipitation regime. It is unlikely this problem will confront us immediately, but we should be actively evaluating all such possibilities as part of a broad plan dealing with the proper use of our natural resources.

While it may be desirable to concentrate efforts in certain watersheds, especially those already in critical supply such as the Colorado, it may be desirable to direct attention to other areas too, such as the Sacramento, the Columbia, the Platte, the Missouri, and the Hudson. Some of these latter might provide more useful procedural information in the early stages of weather engineering development than areas where economic pressure demands immediate attention.

Encouragement should be extended to the university community throughout the United States so that they might bring their specialized knowledge to bear on the multidisciplinary problems involved.

It seems to me that the logical partners in such an activity are the National Science Foundation (to provide support for basic studies), the Bureau of Reclamation (to provide the engineering design and supervision), and the Weather Bureau to provide the weather forecasts and observations. Cooperation from the scientific and engineering community will support a comprehensive plan if it is carefully developed and conducted with enthusiasm and imagination. The best individuals in each area of activity must be utilized in making the plans. We should continually search for high-ability young people to become actively involved in these activities if we are to achieve the long-range potential of such efforts.

I sincerely hope the time has come when we can go forward without further delay with a comprehensive plan for the development of our water resources in the sky, on and under the ground, enjoying the fullest cooperation of public and private organizations, scientists, engineers, technicians, and our representatives at the State and Federal level. All are essential since we deal with one of the most complex and challenging problems in science.

Water and air are among our most valuable natural resources. Until we adequately understand them and their interrelationship, we will not be able to properly develop, conserve, and utilize them to the betterment of mankind.

AMENDMENTS TO TITLE II OF THE SOCIAL SECURITY ACT

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, two bills to amend title II of the Social Security Act.

The first bill would permit an otherwise qualified disabled widow to receive widow's insurance benefits under the social security system even though she had not attained age 62. The equity in this provision is self-apparent. If a widow is disabled and unable to provide for her livelihood, I see little justice in prevent-

---

[10] Schaefer, V. J. and Dieterich, J. H., "The Seeding of Cumulus Clouds by Ground Based Silver Iodide Generators," Jour. of Appl. Math. and Phys., 10, 174 (1959).

[11] Fuquay, D. M., "Generator Technology for Cloud Seeding," Journ. Irrigation and Drainage, Division Proc., Amer. Soc. Civil Engineers, 86 No. IRI, 79 (1960).

[12] Vonnegut, B., "Recent Studies of Cloud Electrification," monograph No. 16, Int. Union of Geod. and Geophys., Paris, January 1962, p. 29.

[13] Langmuir, I., "The Production of Rain by a Chain Reaction in Cumulus Clouds at Temperatures Above Freezing," Journal of Meteorology 5, 175 (1948).

[14] Braham, Roscoe R. et al., "Artificial Nucleation of Cumulus Clouds," Meteorological Monographs 2, 47 (1957), American Meteorological Society, Boston.

[15] Schaefer, V. J., "Serendipity and the Development of Experimental Meteorology," Journ. of the Irrigation and Drainage Division, Proc. of the Amer. Soc. of Civil Engineers 86, 1(1960).

[16] The Atmospheric Sciences 1961–1971, vols. I & II, Public No. 946, National Academy of Sciences-National Research Council, Washington, D.C. 1962.

[17] Schaefer, V. J., "Atmospheric Sciences Program for High-Ability Students," Weatherwise 14, 183 (1961).

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARY

ing her from receiving widow's insurance until she reaches age 62. Very probably the recipient is living on a small disability pension; my bill provides a sensible way to augment this small sum with funds for which she would eventually qualify under social security.

My second bill eliminates the restriction on the period during which an application for a determination of disability is granted full retroactivity. This bill is similar to H.R. 12877 of the 87th Congress. It would provide the Social Security Administration with the authority to consider the application of many disabled persons who delayed filing their disability applications past the deadline of June 30, 1962. Passage of this bill would remove a technical provision in the social security laws that has proven to be unfair and unjust in a large number of cases.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the full text of both bills be printed in the Record at the conclusion of my remarks.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bills will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bills will be printed in the Record.

The bills, introduced by Mr. Humphrey, were received, read twice by their titles, referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

S. 1026

A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to permit an otherwise qualified disabled widow to receive widow's insurance benefits thereunder even though she has not attained age 62

Be it enacted, by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) section 202(e)(1)(B) of the Social Security Act is amended to read as follows:

"(B)(i) has attained age 62, or (ii) has not attained age 62 but is under a disability (as defined in section 223(c)(2)),".

(b) Section 202(e)(1)(C) is amended to read as follows:

"(C) has filed application for widow's insurance benefits, or (in case of a widow who has attained age 62)—

"(i) was entitled, after attainment of age 62, to wife's insurance benefits, on the basis of the wages and self-employment income of such individual, for the month preceding the month in which he died, or

"(ii) was entitled, on the basis of such wages and self-employment income, to mother's insurance benefits for the month preceding the month in which she attained age 62, and".

(c) Section 202(e)(1) of such Act is further amended by inserting after "remarries, dies," the following: "ceases to be under a disability (as defined in section 223(c)(2)) before attaining age 62,".

(d) Section 223(a)(3) of such Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: "The preceding sentence shall not apply in the case of an individual whose entitlement to widow's insurance benefits is based upon a disability (as defined in subsection (c)(2)) of such individual, if such individual ceases to be under such disability prior to attaining age 62."

Sec. 2. The amendments made by the first section of this Act shall apply only with respect to monthly insurance benefits under title II of the Social Security Act four months after the month in which this Act is enacted.

S. 1027

A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to eliminate the restriction on the period during which an application for a determination of disability is granted full retroactivity, and for other purposes

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) section 216(i)(2) of the Social Security Act is amended by striking out the third sentence and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "A period of disability shall (subject to section 223(a)(3)) begin—

"(A) on the day the disability began, but only if the individual satisfies the requirements of paragraph (3) on such day;

"(B) if such individual does not satisfy the requirements of paragraph (3) on such day, then on the first day of the first quarter thereafter in which he satisfies such requirements."

(b) Section 216(i)(3) of such Act is amended by striking out "of paragraphs (2) and (4)" and inserting in lieu thereof "of paragraph (2)".

(c) Section 216(i)(4) of such Act is repealed.

Sec. 2. The amendments made by the first section of this Act shall apply in the case of applications for disability determinations filed after June 30, 1962.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I ask unanimous consent that a letter which I have received from the Director of the Social Security Administration relating to a particular case in point be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

January 25, 1963.

Re Mrs. Eva M. Rogers, 2060 North Northwood Drive, North St. Paul, Minn.

Hon. Hubert H. Humphrey,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Humphrey: This is in further reference to Mrs. Rogers' disability claim.

As you know, to be considered disabled under the disability provisions of the Social Security Act, a person must meet two basic requirements. First, he must have a mental or physical condition so severe that it prevents him from doing substantial gainful work in any occupation. Secondly, he must have sufficient earnings for social security credits in 20 calendar quarters (5 years) of the 10 years ending with the quarter in which the disability began. In the case of applications filed prior to July 1, 1962, a disabled worker could qualify if he met the earnings requirement as of any date he became disabled. In the case of applications filed on or after July 1, 1962, however, the law now provides that the earnings requirement must be met within 18 months of the date of the application. Since Mrs. Rogers filed her application on October 25, 1962, and her social security record shows that she does not have the required 5 years of covered employment during the 10-year period that ended April 24, 1961 (which is 18 months before the date she filed her application), she does not meet the earnings requirement under the present provisions of the law.

A sizable number of persons who became disabled long ago and did not apply for disability protection prior to July 1, 1962, are faced with a similar problem. In a number of instances, disabled persons who did not work for many years before filing application not only fail to meet the requirement of substantial, recent employment for disability protection but also are no longer insured for retirement or survivor protection.

The insured-status requirement for disability protection applicable to disabled workers who file applications on or after July 1, 1962, stems from a provision enacted in 1954 that was designed to avoid possible problems in obtaining the facts on which to make a disability determination where an individual does not file application until long after he becomes disabled. Subsequent experience in making disability determinations has indicated that such problems are somewhat less difficult than anticipated. This consideration and the consideration that many disabled workers do not file timely disability applications led Congress to postpone the deadline on several occasions in the past, and most recently to June 30, 1962.

When it became clear that, despite our efforts to inform disabled people of the need to file timely applications, there would continue to be a sizeable number of disabled workers who delay filing for relatively long periods of time, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare recommended last year that the June 30, 1962, deadline be eliminated. A bill—H.R. 12877—to implement the Department's recommendation was introduced. The 87th Congress, however, adjourned without taking action to extend or eliminate the June 30, 1962, deadline.

In view of these circumstances, and the possibility that legislation may be considered to adjust or remove the retroactivity limitations of applications filed on or after July 1, 1962, we have felt it advisable to temporarily postpone what would otherwise have to be a denial action on applications like Mrs. Rogers' involving the earnings requirement of the law, until such time as there are clearer indications of the outcome of any proposed legislation and its effect on existing claims of this type.

Accordingly, Mrs. Rcgers will be notified that a final decision on her claim is being held in abeyance for the reasons indicated. It is not necessary for her to contact us or take further action at this time. As soon as a final decision is made she will be notified. It should be noted that since Mrs. Rogers does not meet the earnings requirement at this time, no determination has been made as to whether her impairment is so severe as to meet the disability requirement of the law.

If Mrs. Rogers desires further information, she should feel free to contact her local social security district office.

Senator Eugene J. McCarthy and Representative Joseph E. Karth also inquired about the disability claim of Mrs. Rogers.

Sincerely yours,

Victor Christgau,
Director.

HUMANITARIAN AND OLD AGE RIGHTS ACT

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference, my Humanitarian and Old Age Rights Act. This bill removes certain inequities and inhumane restrictions that still exist in the Federal public assistance programs.

These proposals continue the modernization of this country's welfare laws and programs begun so successfully last session. Encouraging progress has been made. It is our obligation to continue this record in the 88th Congress.

The purpose of my proposal is summarized in the bill's introductory policy statement:

> It is the purpose of this Act to provide more effectively for the protection, care, and assistance of the people of the United States who are in need thereof, and to promote the welfare and happiness of the people of the United States by providing public assistance to its needy and distressed, administered promptly and humanely, with due regard for the preservation of family life, to encourage self-respect, self-reliance, and the desire to be a good citizen.

We have a great moral obligation to the needy, aged, the blind, the physically handicapped, and dependent children. In a society as prosperous as ours—truly an affluent society by any known standard—there is no justification for such persons being denied dignity and self-respect through administrative inequities and restrictions, particularly when the principle of public assistance for these persons has been established. Moreover, we have the obligation to administer these programs in a fashion that—to the greatest extent possible—will serve to restore the persons as self-supporting and productive members of society.

AGE REQUIREMENT FOR OLD-AGE ASSISTANCE

First, this proposed legislation provides that the age requirement for old-age assistance recipients will be the same as the age established for old-age beneficiaries under title II of the Social Security Act.

When one considers the relatively low minimum benefits currently paid under the OASI program, the need for this modification is clear. Many beneficiaries simply cannot exist on OASI benefit payments of $50 to $60 per month, those received in the lowest category. In order to supplement this meager income, they are forced to apply for public assistance. In 1956 the age for women OASI beneficiaries was lowered to 62, but Congress did not make a corresponding change in the public assistance program. Therefore, the original purpose of this age liberalization was nullified in many instances. My amendment would rectify this unfortunate situation.

EARNINGS ALLOWANCE

This proposed legislation would also permit the aged and handicapped on public assistance to earn up to $50 per month and the families of needy children up to $30 per month in order to supplement the payments received through the public assistance program.

I might add that that is a very limited sum. It is inconceivable to me that we would not authorize that modest amount.

This provision enables public assistance recipients to develop self-reliance and begin the difficult task of becoming self-supporting members of society. We should certainly encourage such efforts rather than inflict penalties.

The Senate version of the Public Welfare Amendments of 1962 contained this provision, but unfortunately the Senate could not sustain this item in conference. I sincerely hope that both Houses of Congress will pass this amendment in the 88th Congress.

HOMEOWNERSHIP

My bill would allow public assistance recipients to own a home of an assessed valuation, less all encumbrances, of up to $5,000. The current practice of forcing an aged person to sign over title of his home—a home he might have spent many years acquiring—as a condition of receiving public assistance in time of need, is cruel and unnecessary.

My bill would also exempt household furnishings and other personal effects, plus insurance policies or burial funds up to $500 in value, when considering need and would establish a floor of $1,200 under the amount of personal property a single recipient is permitted to hold.

Why should we require persons to become total paupers before considering them qualified for assistance in obtaining the basic necessities of daily life? To force them to abandon every personal resource before receiving such public assistance is to strip them of personal dignity and the few remnants of security they still possess. If, for example, an aged and poor couple has been sufficiently thrifty through the years to purchase a burial policy, I do not believe they should be forced to cash this policy and thereby probably sentence themselves to potter's field.

HARASSMENT OF RELATIVES

This legislation would prohibit the practice of some States whereby the public assistance laws are used to enforce, or as a substitute for, the general support laws of the State. These so-called responsible relative laws are often used by State and county administrators to harass children of pensioners even though the children may not be financially able to support their aged parents.

I firmly subscribe to the belief that it is the moral responsibility of children to care for their parents to the limit of their financial resources. But I maintain this objective should be achieved through State support laws specifically drawn for such purposes.

The results of using our public assistance laws to harass relatives often works a real hardship on the aged recipients. For example, in some States the mere existence of a living relative of the aged person is sufficient reason for denying public assistance. Whether or not the relative is actually supporting the needy person—or capable of providing such support—is not considered.

OUTLAW THE SHAME LIST

My bill further provides that each State must administer the public assistance program in such a manner to insure uniform treatment of the needy in all its political subdivisions. It would also reinstate the congressional policy that names of recipients must be kept confidential.

That is, it would outlaw the shame list which occasionally is used as a means of exposing public assistance recipients to ridicule. I believe this guarantee of anonymity is absolutely essential.

RESIDENCE REQUIREMENTS

This legislation also provides a means to modify the residence requirements that many States impose before granting public assistance to otherwise qualified recipients.

Frankly, the entire concept of a residence requirement makes little sense in the context of the public assistance program. Although I am a-resident of the great State of Minnesota, I am also an American citizen. When I travel to Washington, I do not apply for a visa or carry a Minnesota passport with me in order to return to my home State. I am just as much an American citizen in California, in Nebraska, or in Florida as I am in Minnesota. Therefore, my bill provides that the Federal share of public assistance funds available within a State shall be immediately available to an otherwise qualified applicant if the person is unable to meet the State's residence requirement. Moreover, my bill provides for an incentive payment of one-half of 1 percent of the Federal share of public assistance funds if the State removes all residence requirements. If every State of the Union would remove all residence requirements, the effect on the national program of public assistance would be highly beneficial.

AID TO DEPENDENT CHILDREN

The 87th Congress extended through June 30, 1967, the 1961 amendment to the Social Security Act which made children of unemployed fathers eligible for ADC grants. My bill would establish this provision on a permanent basis.

Several years ago the Advisory Council on Public Assistance made this highly intelligent assessment of the situation:

> On the premise that a hungry, ill-clothed child is as hungry and ill-clothed if he lives in an unbroken home as if he were orphaned or illegitimate, the program for aid to dependent children should be expanded to include any financially needy children living with any relative or relatives.

The Congress indicated their general agreement with this proposition when it expanded ADC eligibility criteria to include children of the needy unemployed. I hope this temporary extension can become a permanent provision in the public welfare statutes.

Mr. President, none of these amendments would change materially the nature of the existing public welfare programs. But they would remove, modify, or improve many aspects of these programs to make them more effective, humane, and equitable. I happen to believe that Congress should look upon such modifications as an obligation we have toward these less fortunate members of society. I urge prompt consideration of these amendments.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the full text of this bill be printed in the RECORD at this point. I also ask unanimous consent that this bill remain at the desk for an additional week so that other Senators may join as cosponsors if they desire.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will remain at the desk as requested by the Senator from Minnesota, and will be printed at this point in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1029) to amend the public assistance provisions of the Social Security Act to eliminate certain inequities and restrictions and permit a more effective distribution of Federal funds introduced by Mr. HUMPHREY, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 1029

A bill to amend the public assistance provisions of the Social Security Act to eliminate certain inequities and restrictions and permit a more effective distribution of Federal funds.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

Act may be cited as the "Humanitarian and Old-Age Rights Act".

STATEMENT OF PURPOSE AND POLICY

SEC. 2. It is the purpose of this Act to provide more effectively for the protection, care, and assistance of the people of the United States who are in need thereof, and to promote the welfare and happiness of the people of the United States by providing public assistance to its needy and distressed. It is the policy of the Congress that assistance under titles I, IV, X, XIV, and XVI of the Social Security Act, as amended by this Act, shall be administered promptly and humanely, with due regard for the preservation of family life and without discrimination on account of race, religion, or political affiliation, and that such assistance shall be so administered as to encourage self-respect, self-reliance, and the desire to be a good citizen, useful to society. Titles, I, IV, X, XIV, and XVI of the Social Security Act shall be liberally construed in order to carry out this purpose and policy.

OLD-AGE ASSISTANCE

SEC. 3. (a)(1)(A) Section 2(a)(1) of the Social Security Act is amended to read as follows:

"(1) provide that it shall be in effect in all political subdivisions of the State;".

(B) Section 2(a)(3) of such Act is amended to read as follows:

"(3) provide for the establishment or designation of a single State agency to administer the plan;".

(2) Section 2(a)(10)(A) of such Act is amended to read as follows:

"(A) provide that the State agency shall, in determining need for such assistance, take into consideration any other income and resources of an individual claiming old-age assistance, as well as any expenses reasonably attributable to the earning of any such income; except that, in making such determination, the State agency shall disregard (i) the first $50 per month of earned incomes, (ii) the ownership by such individual alone or with his or her spouse) of a home having an assessed value, less all encumbrances of record thereon, of less than $5,000 (except to the extent that he is receiving rental income therefrom), (iii) the ability of such individual's family and relatives to provide for his support, (iv) any donations of surplus food which may have been made to such individual from stocks of the Commodity Credit Corporation, and (v) the first $1,200 in value (over and above all encumbrances of record) of personal property owned by such individual;".

(3) Section 2(a) of such Act is further amended by striking out the period at the end of paragraph (11) and inserting in lieu thereof a semicolon followed by the word "and", and by adding at the end of such section 2(a) the following new paragraph:

"(12) provide that there will be no discrimination based on sex in determining the needs of individuals receiving assistance under the plan."

(4) Section 2(a) of such Act is further amended by adding after paragraph (12) the following new sentence: "For purposes of paragraph (10)(A)(v), no life insurance policy shall be valued at more than its present surrender value to the individual, and the term 'personal property' shall not include (A) the individual's clothing, furniture, household equipment, foodstuffs, fuel, personal jewelry, or other personal effects, or (B) interment plots, money placed in trust or insurance for funeral, interment, or similar expenses, or any contract rights connected therewith, if such money, insurance, or contract rights do not exceed $500 in value."

(5) Section 2(b)(1) of such Act is amended to read as follows:

"(1) an age requirement at any given time which is greater than the minimum age at which individuals are permitted at such time to become entitled to old-age insurance benefits under title II of this Act; or".

(6) Section 2(b)(2)(A) of such Act is amended to read as follows: "(A) in the case of applicants for old-age assistance, excludes any resident of the State who has resided therein continuously for one year immediately preceding the application, and".

(b) The second sentence of section 1 of such Act is amended by inserting before the period at the end thereof a semicolon and the following: "but no payment shall be made under this title to any State which has not also submitted, and had approved by the Secretary, State plans under this Act for aid and services to needy families with children, aid to the blind, and aid to the permanently and totally disabled".

(c) Section 4 of such Act is amended by striking out "or" at the end of paragraph (1), by adding "or" at the end of paragraph (2), and by inserting after paragraph (2) the following new paragraph:

"(3) that in the administration of the plan there is imposed, as a condition of old-age assistance to any individual, a requirement that such individual subject his home to a lien of any kind or transfer to the State agency any interest in his home;".

(d) Title I of such Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sections:

"Direct payments to individuals not satisfying residence requirements

"SEC. 7. If an individual, after making application for old-age assistance, is denied such assistance by the State agency solely because he does not satisfy the residence requirements imposed under the State plan, and if such individual is not entitled to old-age assistance by reason of prior residence in another State, the State agency shall promptly notify the Secretary of the fact that such individual has made such application and would be eligible for old-age assistance if he satisfied such requirements. The Secretary shall thereupon pay directly to such individual for each month, beginning with the first month (after the month of such individual's application) in which such individual would have been eligible for old-age assistance if he satisfied such residence requirments and ending with the month preceding the first month in which he satisfies such requirements, an amount (as determined under regulations prescribed by the Secretary) equal to the Federal Government's proportionate share of the old-age assistance which such individual would receive for such month if he then satisfied such requirements.

"Assistance for needs of recipient only

"SEC. 8. Assistance provided to any individual under this title is provided for the purpose of assisting him in meeting his individual needs and is not for the benefit of any other person; and such assistance shall not be regarded as income of any person other than such individual."

ADDITIONAL FEDERAL FUNDS FOR STATES WITHOUT ANY RESIDENCE REQUIREMENTS UNDER PUBLIC ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS

SEC. 4. (a) Section 1101(a)(8)(A) of the Social Security Act is amended by striking out "except that the Federal percentage shall in no case" and inserting in lieu thereof "except that (i) the Federal percentage (except as provided in clause (ii)) shall in no case" and by inserting before the period at the end thereof ", and shall be 50 per centum for Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, and Guam, and (ii) for purposes of determining the amount to be paid to a State under paragraph (1) or (2) of section 3(a), 1603(a), 403(a), 1003(a), or 1403(a), the percentage for a State otherwise determined hereunder for a quarter shall be increased by one-half of 1 percentage point if no plan of such State approved under title I, IV, X, XIV, or XVI includes during such quarter, as a condition of eligibility for aid under the plan (or for old-age assistance or medical assistance for the aged in the case of the plan approved under title I), a residence requirement which excludes any individual who is in need in the State".

(b) (1) The first sentence of section 6(c) of such Act is amended by inserting "(except as provided in clause (iii))" after "in no case" in clause (i) and after "shall" in clause (ii), and by inserting before the period at the end of such sentence ", and (iii) in case of a State to which the provisions of clause (ii) of section 1101(a)(8)(A) are applicable for a quarter, the percentage otherwise determined under this subsection for such quarter shall be increased by one-half of 1 percentage point".

(2) Paragraph (2) of sections 3(a), 403(a), 1003(a), 1403(a), and 1603(a) are each amended by striking out "one-half" wherever it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "the Federal percentage".

AID TO NEEDY FAMILIES WITH DEPENDENT CHILDREN

SEC. 5. (a)(1)(A) Section 402(a)(1) of the Social Security Act is amended to read as follows: "(1) provide that it shall be in effect in all political subdivisions of the State;".

(B) Section 402(a)(3) of such Act is amended to read as follows: "(3) provide for the establishment or designation of a single State agency to administer the plan,".

(2) Section 402(a)(7) of such Act is amended to read as follows: "(7) provide that the State agency shall, in determining need, take into consideration any other income and resources of any child or relative claiming aid to families with dependent children, as well as any expenses reasonably attributable to the earning of any such income; except that in making such determination the State agency (A) shall disregard the first $15 per month of income earned by such child and the first $30 per month of income earned by his parent or guardian, (B) shall disregard the ownership by such child (or by his parent or guardian) of a home having an assessed value, less all encumbrances of record thereof, of less than $5,000 (except to the extent that he is receiving rental income therefrom), (C) shall disregard any donations of surplus food which may have been made to or for such child (or his parent or guardian) from stocks of the Commodity Credit Corporation, and (D) may, subject to regulations prescribed by the Secretary, permit all or any portion of earned or other income to be set aside for future identifiable needs of such child;".

(3) Section 402(a) of such Act is further amended by (A) striking out the word "and" at the end of clause (12) thereof, and (B) inserting immediately before the period at the end of clause (13) thereof the following: "; (14) provide that there will be no discrimination based on sex in determining the needs of individuals receiving assistance under the plan; and (15) in providing aid to dependent children of unemployed parents, include (A) provision for entering into cooperative arrangements with the system of public employment offices in the State looking toward employment of the unemployed parents of such children, including appropriate provision for registration and periodic reregistration of the unemployed parent of any such child and for maximum utilization of the job placement services and other services and facilities of such offices, (B) provisions to assure that aid to families with dependent children is not provided to any such child or relative if, and for so long as, the unemployed parent refuses without good cause to accept employment, in which he is able to engage, which (i) is offered through such public employment offices, or (ii) is otherwise offered by an employer if the offer is determined by the State or local agency

administering the State plan, after notification by such employer, to be a bona fide offer of such employment, and (C) provision (i) for entering into cooperative arrangements with the State agency responsible for administering or supervising the administration of vocational education in the State, looking toward maximum utilization of available public vocational education services and facilities in the State in order to encourage the retraining of individuals capable of being retrained, and (ii) for denying aid to families with dependent children to any such child or relative if, and for so long as the unemployed parent refuses without good cause to undergo any such retraining."

(4) Section 406(a) of such Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following: "The term 'dependent child' also includes a needy child under the age of eighteen who has been deprived of parental support or care by reason of the unemployment (as defined by the State) of a parent and who is living with any of the relatives specified in the preceding sentence in a place of residence maintained by one or more of such relatives as his (or their) own home."

(5) Section 407 of such Act is hereby repealed.

(b) The second sentence of section 401 of such Act is amended by inserting before the period at the end thereof a semicolon and the following: "but no payment shall be made under this title to any State which has not also submitted, and had approved by the Secretary, State plans under this Act for old-age assistance, for aid to the blind, and for aid to the permanently and totally disabled".

(c) Section 404(a) of such Act is amended by striking out "or" at the end of paragraph (1), by adding "or" at the end of paragraph (2), and by inserting after paragraph (2) the following new paragraph:

"(3) that in the administration of the plan there is imposed, as a condition of aid under such plan, a requirement that any dependent child (or his parent or guardian) subject his (or their) home to a lien of any kind or transfer to the State agency any interest in such home;".

(d) Title IV of such Act is further amended by adding after section 406 thereof the followed new section:

"DIRECT PAYMENTS TO NEEDY FAMILIES WITH DEPENDENT CHILDREN NOT SATISFYING RESIDENCE REQUIREMENTS

"SEC. 407. If an individual, who has filed application claiming aid to needy families with dependent children, is denied such aid by the State agency solely because he does not satisfy the residence requirements imposed under the State plan, and if such individual is not entitled to aid to families with dependent children by reason of prior residence in another State, the State agency shall promptly notify the Secretary of the fact that such individual has filed application and would be eligible for such aid if he satisfied such requirements. The Secretary shall thereupon pay directly to such individual for each month, beginning with the first month (after the month in which such application is filed) in which such individual would have been eligible for such aid if he had satisfied such residence requirements and ending with the month preceding the first month in which he satisfies such requirements, an amount (as determined under regulations prescribed by the Secretary) equal to the Federal Government's proportionate share of the aid to families with dependent children which such individual would receive for such month if he then satisfied such requirements."

AID TO THE BLIND

Sec. 6. (a)(1)(A) Section 1002(a)(1) of the Social Security Act is amended to read as follows: "(1) provide that it shall be in effect in all political subdivisions of the State;".

(B) Section 102(a)(3) of such Act is amended to read as follows: "(3) provide for the establishment or designation of a single State agency to administer the plan;".

(2) Section 1002(a)(8) of such Act is amended by striking out the word "and" at the end of clause (A) thereof, and by inserting before the semicolon at the end of clause (B) thereof, a comma and the following: "(C) the ownership by such individual (alone or with his or her spouse) of a home having an assessed value, less all encumbrances of record thereon, of less than $5,000 (except to the extent that he is receiving rental income therefrom), (D) the ability of such individual's family and relatives to provide for his support, (E) any donations of surplus food which may have been made to such individual from stocks of the Commodity Credit Corporation, and (F) the first $1,200 in value (over and above all encumbrances of record) of personal property owned by such individual".

(3) Section 1002(a) of such Act is further amended by striking out the word "and" at the end of clause (12) thereof, and by inserting immediately before the period at the end of clause (13) thereof the following: "; and (14) provide that there will be no discrimination based on sex in determining the needs of individuals receiving assistance under the plan".

(4) Section 1002(a) of such Act is further amended by adding after clause (14) thereof the following new sentence: "For purposes of clause (8)(F), no life insurance policy shall be valued at more than its present surrender value to the individual, and the term 'personal property' shall not include (A) the individual's clothing, furniture, household equipment, foodstuffs, fuel, personal jewelry, or other personal effects, or (B) interment plots, money placed in trust or insurance for funeral, interment, or similar expenses, or any contract rights connected therewith, if such money, insurance, or contract rights do not exceed $500 in value."

(5) Section 1002(b)(1) of such Act is amended to read as follows:

"(1) Any residence requirement which excludes any resident of the State who has resided therein continuously for one year immediately preceding the application; or".

(b) The second sentence of section 1001 of such Act is amended by inserting immediately before the period at the end thereof a semicolon and the following: "but no payment shall be made under this title to any State which has not also submitted, and had approved by the Secretary, State plans under this Act for old-age assistance, for aid and services to needy families with children, and aid to the permanently and totally disabled."

(c) Section 1004 of such Act is amended by striking out "or" at the end of paragraph (1), by adding "or" at the end of paragraph (2), and by inserting after paragraph (2) the following new paragraph:

"(3) that in the administration of the plan there is imposed, as a condition of aid to any individual, a requirement that such individual subject his home to a lien of any kind or transfer to the State agency any interest in his home;".

(d) Title X of such Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sections:

"DIRECT PAYMENTS TO INDIVIDUALS NOT SATISFYING RESIDENCE REQUIREMENTS

"SEC. 1007. If an individual, after making application for aid to the blind, is denied such aid by the State agency solely because he does not satisfy the residence requirements imposed under the State plan, and if such individual is not entitled to aid to the blind by reason of prior residence in another State, the State agency shall promptly notify the Secretary of the fact that such individual has made such application and would be eligible for such aid if he satisfied such requirements. The Secretary shall thereupon pay directly to such individual for each month, beginning with the first month (after the month of such individual's application) in which such individual would have been eligible for aid to the blind if he satisfied such residence requirements and ending with the month preceding the first month in which he satisfies such requirements, an amount (as determined under regulations prescribed by the Secretary) equal to the Federal Government's proportionate share of the aid to the blind which such individual would receive for such month if he then satisfied such requirements.

"ASSISTANCE FOR NEEDS OF RECIPIENT ONLY

"SEC. 1008. Assistance paid to any individual under this title is provided for the purpose of assisting him in meeting his individual needs and is not for the benefit of any other person; and such assistance shall not be regarded as income of any person other than such individual."

AID TO THE PERMANENTLY AND TOTALLY DISABLED

SEC. 7. (a)(1)(A) Section 1402(a)(1) of the Social Security Act is amended to read as follows: "(1) provide that it shall be in effect in all political subdivisions of the State;".

(B) Section 1402(a)(3) of such Act is amended to read as follows: "(3) provide for the establishment or designation of a single State agency to administer the plan;".

(2) Section 1402(a)(8) of such Act is amended to read as follows: "(8) provide that the State agency shall, in determining need, take into consideration any other income and resources of an individual claiming aid to the permanently and totally disabled, as well as any expenses reasonably attributable to the earning of any such income; except that, in making such determination, the State agency shall disregard (A) the first $50 per month of earned income, (B) the ownership by such individual (alone or with his or her spouse) of a home having an assessed value, less all encumbrances of record thereon, of less than $5,000 (except to the extent that he is receiving rental income therefrom), (C) the ability of such individual's family and relatives to provide for his support, (D) any donations of surplus food which may have been made to such individual from stocks of the Commodity Credit Corporation, and (E) the first $1,200 in value (over and above all encumbrances of record) of personal property owned by such individual;".

(3) Section 1402(a) of such Act is further amended by striking out the word "and" at the end of clause (11) thereof, and by inserting immediately before the period at the end of clause (12) thereof the following: "; and (13) provide that there will be no discrimination based on sex in determining the needs of individuals receiving assistance under the plan".

(4) Section 1402(a) of such Act is further amended by adding after clause (13) thereof the following new sentence: "For purposes of clause (8)(E), no life insurance policy shall be valued at more than its present surrender value to the individual, and the term 'personal property' shall not include (A) the individual's clothing, furniture, household equipment, foodstuffs, fuel, personal jewelry, or other personal effects, or (B) interment plots, money placed in trust or insurance for funeral, interment, or similar expenses, or any contract rights connected therewith, if such money, insurance, or contract rights do not exceed $500 in value."

(5) Section 1402(b)(1) of such Act is amended to read as follows:

"(1) Any residence requirement which excludes any resident of the State who has

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARY

resided therein continuously for one year immediately preceding the application; or".

(b) The second sentence of section 1401 of such Act is amended by inserting immediately before the period at the end thereof a semicolon and the following: "but no payment shall be made under this title to any State which has not also submitted, and had approved by the Secretary, State plans under this Act for old-age assistance, aid and services to needy families with children, and aid to the blind".

(c) Section 1404 of such Act is amended by striking out "or" at the end of paragraph (1), by adding "or" at the end of paragraph (2), and by inserting after paragraph (2) the following new paragraph:

"(3) that in the administration of the plan there is imposed, as a condition of aid to any individual, a requirement that such individual subject his home to a lien of any kind or transfer to the State agency any interest in his home;".

(d) Title XIV of such Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sections:

"DIRECT PAYMENTS TO INDIVIDUALS NOT SATISFYING RESIDENCE REQUIREMENTS

"SEC. 1406. If an individual, after making application for aid to the permanently and totally disabled, is denied such aid by the State agency solely because he does not satisfy the residence requirements imposed under the State plan, and if such individual is not entitled to aid to the permanently and totally disabled by reason of prior residence in another State, the State agency shall promptly notify the Secretary of the fact that such individual has made such application and would be eligible for such aid if he satisfied such requirements. The Secretary shall thereupon pay directly to such individual for each month, beginning with the first month (after the month of such individual's application) in which such individual would have been eligible for aid to the permanently and totally disabled if he satisfied such residence requirements and ending with the month preceding the first month in which he satisfies such requirements, an amount (as determined under regulations prescribed by the Secretary) equal to the Federal Government's proportionate share of the aid to the permanently and totally disabled which such individual would receive for such month if he then satisfied such requirements.

"ASSISTANCE FOR NEEDS OF RECIPIENT ONLY

"SEC. 1407. Assistance paid to any individual under this title is provided for the purpose of assisting him in meeting his individual needs and is not for the benefit of any other person; and such assistance shall not be regarded as income of any person other than such individual."

COMBINED PROGRAMS OF AID TO THE AGED, BLIND, AND DISABLED, OR AID TO THE AGED, BLIND, AND DISABLED, AND MEDICAL ASSISTANCE FOR THE BLIND

SEC. 8. (a)(1)(A) Section 1602(a)(1) of the Social Security Act is amended to read as follows:

"(1) provide that it shall be in effect in all political subdivisions of the State;".

(B) Section 1602(a)(3) of such Act is amended to read as follows:

"(3) provide for the establishment or designation of a single State agency to administer the plan;".

(2) Section 1602(a)(14) of such Act is amended to read as follows:

"(14) provide that the State agency shall, in determining need for aid to the aged, blind, or disabled, take into consideration any other income and resources of an individual claiming such aid, as well as any expenses reasonably attributable to the earning of any such income; except that, in making such determination, the State agency shall disregard (A)(f) in the case of an individual claiming aid to the blind, the first $85 per month of earned income plus one-half of earned income in excess of $85 per month, and for a period not in excess of twelve months, such additional amounts of other income and resources, in case such individual has a plan for achieving self-support approved by the State agency, as may be necessary for the fulfillment of such plan, and (ii) in the case of an individual claiming aid to the aged or disabled, the first $50 per month of earned income, (B) the ownership by such individual (alone or with his or her spouse) of a home having an assessed value, less all encumbrances of record thereon, of less than $5,000 (except to the extent that he is receiving rental income therefrom), (C) the ability of such individual's family and relatives to provide for his support, (D) any donations of surplus food which may have been made to such individual from stocks of the Commodity Credit Corporation, and (E) the first $1,200 in value (over and above all encumbrances of record) of personal property owned by such individual;".

(3) Section 1602(a) of such act is further amended by striking out the word "and" at the end of clause (14), by striking out the period at the end of clause (15) and inserting in lieu of such period a semicolon followed by the word "and", and by adding after clause (15) the following new clause:

"(16) provide that there will be no discrimination based on sex in determining the needs of individuals receiving assistance under the plan."

(4) Section 1602(a) of such Act is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: "For purposes of (14)(E), no life insurance policy shall be valued at more than its present surrender value to the individual, and the term 'personal property' shall not include (A) the individual's clothing, furniture, household equipment, foodstuffs, fuel, personal jewelry, or other personal effects, or (B) interment plots, money placed in trust or insurance for funeral, interment, or similar expenses, or any contract rights connected therewith, if such money, insurance, or contract rights do not exceed $500 in value."

(5) Section 1602(b)(1) of such Act is amended to read as follows:

"(1) an age requirement at any given time which is greater than the minimum age at which individuals are permitted at such time to become entitled to old-age insurance benefits under title II of this Act; or".

(6) Section 1602(b)(2)(A) of such Act is amended to read as follows: "(A) in the case of applicants for aid to the aged, blind, or disabled excludes any resident of the State who has resided therein continuously for one year immediately preceding the application, and".

(b) The second sentence of section 1601 of such Act is amended by inserting immediately before the period at the end thereof a semicolon and the following:

"but no payment shall be made under this title to any State which has submitted a State plan under this title unless such State undertakes to provide, pursuant to such plan and other State plans approved by the Secretary under other titles of this Act, for old-age assistance, aid and services to needy families with children, aid to the blind, and aid to the permanently and totally disabled".

(c) Section 1604 of such Act is amended by striking out "or" at the end of paragraph (1), by adding "or" at the end of paragraph (2), and by inserting after paragraph (2) the following new paragraph:

"(3) that in the administration of the plan there is imposed, as a condition of assistance to any individual, a requirement that such individual subject his home to a lien of any kind or transfer to the State agency any interest in his home;".

(d) Title XVI of such Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sections:

"DIRECT PAYMENTS TO INDIVIDUALS NOT SATISFYING RESIDENCE REQUIREMENTS

"SEC. 1606. If an individual, after making application for assistance under a State plan approved pursuant to this title, is denied such assistance by the State agency solely because he does not satisfy the residence requirements imposed under the State plan, and if such individual is not entitled to similar assistance under a State plan (approved pursuant to this Act) of another State by reason of prior residence in such other State, the State agency shall promptly notify the Secretary of the fact that such individual has made such application and would be eligible for assistance if he satisfied such requirements. The Secretary shall thereupon pay directly to such individual for each month, beginning with the first month (after the month of such individual's application) in which such individual would have been eligible for such assistance if he satisfied such residence requirements and ending with the month preceding the first month in which he satisfies such requirements, an amount (as determined under regulations prescribed by the Secretary) equal to the Federal Government's proportionate share of the assistance which such individual would receive for such month if he then satisfied such requirements.

"ASSISTANCE FOR NEEDS OF RECIPIENT ONLY

"SEC. 1607. Assistance provided to any individual under this title is provided for the purpose of assisting him in meeting his individual needs and is not for the benefit of any other person; and such assistance shall not be regarded as income of any person other than such individual."

MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

SEC. 9. (a) Section 618 of the Revenue Act of 1951 (relating to public access to State public assistance records) is repealed.

(b) No check or warrant drawn in payment of assistance to any individual under title I, IV, X, XIV, or XVI of the Social Security Act, and no envelope or other outer covering therefor, shall bear any printing or marking which indicates or implies that such individual is indigent or a pauper.

(c) The amendments made by sections 3(d), 5(d), 6(d), 7(d), and 8(d) shall apply with respect to months beginning after the date of the enactment of this Act. Section 7(a) shall apply with respect to payments to which the States (including the agencies and political subdivisions thereof) became entitled after the date of the enactment of this Act. Section 7(b) shall take effect on the date of the enactment of this Act. The amendments made by section 4 shall be applicable in the case of expenditures, under a State plan approved under title I, IV, X, XIV, or XVI of the Social Security Act, made after the calendar quarter in which this Act is enacted; and for purposes of this sentence, the term "calendar quarter" means a three-month period commencing on January 1, April 1, July 1, or October 1. The remaining amendments made by this Act shall take effect on July 1, 1964.

REPEAL OF INLAND WATERWAYS CORPORATION ACT

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, by request, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to repeal the Inland Waterways Corporation Act. I ask unanimous consent that a letter from the president of the Federal Barge Lines, of St. Louis, Mo., relating to the bill, be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred;

and, without objection, the letter will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1031) to repeal the Inland Waterways Corporation Act, introduced by Mr. MAGNUSON, by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

The letter presented by Mr. MAGNUSON is as follows:

FEDERAL BARGE LINES,
St. Louis, Mo., February 1, 1962.

Hon. WARREN G. MAGNUSON,
Chairman, Committee on Commerce,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MAGNUSON: As you know, in 1924 the Inland Waterways Corporation was created as a temporary instrument to carry out the Government's policy of reestablishing water transportation on the Mississippi River. It was contemplated that as soon as this purpose was accomplished, the Government would withdraw from the business, and the enabling act spelled out the prerequisite conditions.

As the Congress hoped, water transportation did in fact "come back to life" on the Mississippi, due in no small measure to the example of the Federal Barge Line. By 1953 the growth of private enterprise in the barge business had reduced the relative importance of the Federal Barge Line to about 5 percent of the total. Accordingly, the facilities were sold in 1953 to the highest bidder by contract drawn up to satisfy the conditions in the 1924 enabling act.

The price was $9 million, payable in annual installments with interest.

One of the conditions of sale spelled out in the law, which was made one of the covenants in the sale contract, is the requirement that the purchaser agree to continue to operate the facilities "in the common carrier service in a manner substantially similar to the service rendered by the corporation." Because the contracting parties realized that service in a dynamic industry like transportation is not a static concept, this requirement was hedged in the sale contract with escape clauses which sought to provide for every reasonable contingency that might arise in the transportation industry where technological progress, keen competition, and changing distribution practices of commerce and industry make an ever-changing pattern.

Federal Barge Lines under its new ownership has for nearly 9 years performed faithfully under the terms of the sale contract. Payments have been made on schedule; the remaining unpaid balance of the purchase price is $5 million, to be paid off by June 30, 1969. All service covenants have been met or failure excused under appropriate provisions of the contract. Not one service complaint has been made to the Government.

However, as time passes, the obsolescence of the service requirements in the contract, with their qualifying escape clauses, becomes increasingly apparent. The barge service that is practical and needed in today's keenly competitive transportation market is just as different from that performed by the Government bargeline in 1953 as that 1953 service was different from what the Government performed in 1941, before World War II. Accordingly, the Federal Barge Lines approached the Secretary of Commerce last year and sought a modification of the sale contract to remove the obsolete and burdensome service requirements, so as to leave the Federal Barge Lines in the same position as to service requirements as are other competing common carrier bargelines, who are only responsible to the Interstate Commerce Commission as to the proper performance of their obligation to serve the public.

The Secretary of Commerce viewed our request sympathetically and consulted the Attorney General, who advised him that the service requirements of the sale contract could not be modified under the terms of the 1924 enabling act, and that we should seek relief in a change in the statute. The possibility of such congressional action was contemplated in the sale contract itself, which provides:

"Should Congress through legislation grant relief with respect to the present requirement of said law that the purchaser continue its common carrier service in a manner substantially similar to the service rendered by the corporation, the contract shall be deemed as modified to reflect such change."

This letter is to ask if you will place the matter before your committee in the form of a bill to repeal the Inland Waterways Corporation Act (sec. 151–157, title 49, U.S.C.).

We believe that such a bill would be generally supported. The Transportation Association of America, representing the users, investors, and all forms of transportation adopted the following position on the subject on January 15, 1953:

"'The Inland Waterways Corporation should be dissolved and the properties and routes of its operating unit, the Federal Barge Lines, should be sold or otherwise disposed of within 2 years of the enactment of legislation embodying this proposal, such sale or other disposition to be conducted without regard to the restrictions and conditions placed on such sale or other disposition by the Denison Act (sec. 153 of title 49, U.S.C.)."

Respectfully yours,
A. C. INGERSOLL, Jr.,
President.

EXCLUSION OF LUMBER FROM CERTAIN TARIFF FILING REQUIREMENTS UNDER SHIPPING ACT

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, by request, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to exclude lumber from tariff filing requirements under the Shipping Act of 1916, as amended. I ask unanimous consent that a statement of purpose of the proposed legislation be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the statement of purposes will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1032) to exclude cargo which is lumber from certain tariff filing requirements under the Shipping Act, 1916, introduced by Mr. MAGNUSON, by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

The statement of purposes presented by Mr. MAGNUSON is as follows:

PURPOSE OF LEGISLATION TO EXCLUDE LUMBER FROM TARIFF FILING REQUIREMENTS UNDER THE SHIPPING ACT OF 1916 AS AMENDED BY THE PROVISIONS OF PUBLIC LAW 87–346

Public Law 87–346 amending the Shipping Act became effective January 1, 1962, and requires the filing of rates charged for the movement of freight by the steamship companies operating a regular service between the United States and foreign countries.

No upward revision in freight rates which can meet changing world conditions can be made in less than 30 days. Reductions can be made on short notice but it is necessary for the steamship companies to publish the rates and have them on file with the Federal Maritime Commission before they can be made effective.

There is severe competition from British Columbia in Canada to all the foreign markets reached from the United States. They have been gaining in the relative volume shipped to each of these foreign markets. One of the reasons is that there is no such filing requirement on the movement from British Columbia to foreign markets, and there is a hesitancy on the part of the steamship companies to lower rates when the market on freight rates is down from U.S. shipping points because if the market takes a current upward trend then it takes them 30 days to get an advance in effect.

The published rate effective February 1 from U.S. ports to United Kingdom for example is 305 shillings, or $42.70 per thousand feet of lumber shipped, whereas the rate is open from Canada but currently they are quoting 240 shillings—a total of $33.60 for freight. This indicates a freighting charge of $9.10 more from the United States than from British Columbia. The action requested by the lumber industry is supported by the Steamship Conferences and by the Federal Maritime Commission under whose jurisdiction the filing must be made. The Department of Commerce is urging American business to endeavor to develop foreign trade to a greater extent, and in conformity with this desire on the part of the Department of Commerce we have been in touch with their Trade Mission Section and are planning a trade mission to Europe early in 1963.

It is imperative that the block of transportation charges be removed prior to the trade mission if at all possible, and therefore, we urge the Members of the Senate and House to promptly enact such legislation.

UNIFORM SYSTEM OF TIME STANDARDS AND MEASUREMENT

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, by request, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to establish a uniform system of time standards and measurement for the United States and to require the observance of such time standards for all purposes. I ask unanimous consent that a letter from the Chairman of the Interstate Commerce Commission, requesting the proposed legislation, together with a recommendation and justification, be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the letter, recommendation and justification, will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1033) to establish a uniform system of time standards and measurement for the United States and to require the observance of such time standards for all purposes, introduced by Mr. MAGNUSON, by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

The letter, recommendation, and justification, presented by Mr. MAGNUSON, are as follows:

INTERSTATE
COMMERCE COMMISSION,
Washington, D.C., March 4, 1963.

The Honorable WARREN G. MAGNUSON,
Chairman, Committee on Commerce,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CHAIRMAN MAGNUSON: I am submitting herewith for your consideration 40 copies of a draft bill (together with statement of justification therefor) which would give effect to Legislative Recommendation No. 1 in the Commission's 76th Annual Report.

I believe it appropriate to observe, however, that the Commission is not unanimous concerning the propriety of its initiating a detailed draft bill of the type here transmitted, the ramifications of which extend far beyond matters relating to surface transportation. On the other hand, we are agreed both as to the need for some additional time legislation and for a redetermination by Congress as to whether the Commission is the most appropriate agency to administer present or future legislation relating to standard time.

Accordingly, and to the extent that such action will focus attention on and help to resolve these problems, your assistance in having the enclosed draft bill introduced and scheduling a hearing thereon would be appreciated.

Sincerely yours,

LAURENCE K. WALRATH,
Chairman.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 1

This proposed bill would give effect to legislative recommendation No. 1 of the Interstate Commerce Commission as set forth on page 198 of its 76th annual report to Congress as follows:

"We recommend that Congress amend the Standard Time Act for the reasons set forth in the 'Standard time zones' chapter in this report, and if Congress does not see fit to so amend the statute, that we be relieved of the responsibility for its administration."

JUSTIFICATION

The present Standard Time Act was enacted by Congress in 1918 largely in response to an immediate need for increased national efficiency during World War I. Its stated purpose "To save daylight and to provide standard time for the United States," coupled with an injunction directing the Interstate Commerce Commission to define the limits of the zones "having regard for the convenience of commerce" (not just interstate commerce) and a requirement that standard time be observed in relation to acts required to be performed "by any person subject to the jurisdiction of the United States," was thought to evince the intent of Congress to fix standards of time for all purposes.

For a brief period, the standards of time prescribed under the act were universally observed despite the fact that it contains no enforcement procedure or penalty provisions. The daylight-saving feature, however, was repealed in 1919 over President Wilson's veto, and shortly thereafter the Commission began to experience difficulty due to the limited scope of the act and the tendency of individual States and cities to exercise a claimed right of local option. Thus, local daylight saving time, adopted at first by Boston, New York, and Chicago, gradually spread to many other cities and towns in the East and Midwest. In a suit to enjoin the authorities of Massachusetts from enforcing the observance of an advanced time standard, a Federal district court held that, in enacting the Standard Time Act, Congress had not fully occupied the time field and, consequently, that there was no necessary conflict between that act and the enforcement of a different standard of time designed for purposes other than those specified in the act. See *Massachusetts State Grange* v. *Benton,* 10 F. (2d) 515, *Aff'd. sub nom. Mass. State Grange* v. *Benton,* 272 U.S. 525 (1926).

With the way open to States and individual communities to act independently, an ever-increasing confusion and conflict of time standards has developed; and, in an era characterized by jet speed and by remarkable advances in space technology, this situation has become particularly aggravated and, therefore, potentially dangerous.

The situation in Indiana, as depicted in Standard Time Zone Investigation, 314 I.C.C. 101 (126–129), decided June 6, 1961, provides a pointed illustration of the problem. There, among other things, the evidence details the difficulties experienced by numerous commercial, communications, and transport concerns as well as the extreme confusion attending the arrival and departure of air flights at the Indianapolis airport. Another example is the recent time law of Virginia, which provides for daylight-saving time for most of the State from Memorial Day to Labor Day, but exempts Bristol, and permits the usual period of daylight saving for that part of the Washington metropolitan area located in Virginia. Accordingly, the same standard is observed in Richmond, Arlington, and Bristol during the winter and early spring. From the last Sunday in April until May 30, however, Richmond time is the same as Bristol, but an hour behind Arlington; from May 30 to the first Monday in September, Richmond time is the same as Arlington, but an hour ahead of Bristol; and, from the first Monday in September to the last Sunday in October, Richmond time is the same as Bristol and an hour behind Arlington. Thereafter, the same time is again observed by all three localities. While this arrangement is confusing, it is undoubtedly superior to the situation which existed when each community in Virginia determined for itself whether it would observe daylight saving time and for what period.

For many years, annual reports of the Interstate Commerce Commission have directed the attention of Congress to the need for additional time legislation; and, at the same time, in proceedings held under the act, the Commission has earnestly endeavored to find a solution to the numerous conflicts caused by the action of State or local authorities in changing local time standards. The pattern is usually the same. The shift in local time brings a flood of complaints and petitions for a change in the zone boundaries or for some action restoring the former situation, which finally impel a reopening of the proceeding for reconsideration. Thus, the Commission is repeatedly injected into bitter local controversies without power to resolve them with any reasonable regard for the convenience and safety of the area as a whole. If it is found that the requested change would not enhance the convenience of commerce, a denial of the petition, in most instances, merely perpetuates the existing conflict and causes it to spread to additional areas. On the other hand, a grant of the relief sought often produces a similar outcome, since the resulting mutation of boundaries creates inconvenience in adjacent areas and, thereby, precipitates other independent local changes followed by further complaints and petitions for further modifications.

The Commission's experience amply demonstrates that any attempt to confine the application of the standard of time solely to Federal matters or to interstate commerce, while local matters or intrastate commerce are governed by a different standard, is bound to result in chaos. The original idea of Congress that a Federal standard would dominate and control local time has not been borne out in the practice. Instead, the conflict between Federal and local standards is usually resolved by the observance of local time by Federal officers and establishments.

The Commission has consistently taken the position that this hopeless intermingling of Federal and local time standards adequately justifies the complete occupancy by Congress of the field of standard time regulation. In this respect, however, it is not necessary to rely solely upon the commerce clause, since, in the opinion of the Commission, other clauses of the Constitution, including the standards of weights and measures clause, grant Congress the power to prescribe a uniform system of standard time for the country which is not limited to matters relating to interstate commerce or foreign commerce.

In its current annual report, this Commission has reiterated its prior recommendations that the scope of the Standard Time Act be broadened by providing that the standard time of the zone shall be the exclusive measure of time and by adding more definite standards, requirements for observance, penalties for violation, and provisions for administration and enforcement. The proposed bill has been drawn to accomplish these purposes.

The general intent of the draft bill—to provide a uniform system of time standards and measurement for the United States—is stated in section 4. In addition, to the five existing zones, this section would add one zone to the east primarily to provide a substitute for the designation "eastern daylight-saving time," and two to the West in order to cover Alaska and Hawaii adequately.

It is useful to recognize that the 8 designated zones are parts of the international system of 24 zones stretching from Greenwich east and west around the world, as is done in section 5.

The meridians of longitude dividing the designated zones are specified in section 6. The names selected for the zones are those which are now in use or, as in the designation "Alaska-Hawaii," appear to be appropriate choices. It should be noted, however, that the position of the word "standard," which in the official designations in the present act precedes the names of particular zones, has been changed to follow the names, so as to conform to general usage. Thus, the designation "eastern standard time" is used rather than the now official form "standard eastern time."

Section 7 follows the present act and authorizes the "agency" designated as administrator to define the limits of the zones and to modify them from time to time. The proviso would continue existing boundary determinations until changed. Provision is made for the continued observance of daylight saving time until the designated agency has had an opportunity to define the limits of subzones provided for in the act or for 1 year.

Section 8 includes a number of general principles which the Commission has found useful in determining the zone boundaries in the past. Difficulty is experienced in adhering to them, however, due to lack of explicit authority under the present act and also because commercial interests would have the Commission confine its consideration strictly to the convenience of interstate commerce. This section also provides that, in fixing the boundaries, the designated agency shall not include in any zone a point or area for which the standard time would be more than 1 hour faster than sun time.

Numerous bills presented to Congress in prior years have required national observance either of standard time throughout the year or of standard time coupled with a provision for daylight-saving time during that portion of the year when daylight extends considerably beyond normal work hours. Straight standard time bills, however, are apt to engender vigorous opposition from the large areas in the Northeast, Midwest, and Pacific coast which now observe daylight-saving time. On the other hand, bills requiring nationwide observance of daylight-saving time generally are unpopular in certain remaining portions of the country.

The draft bill meets and, in the opinion of the Commission, obviates these difficulties in section 9. Where desirable in the public interest, the administering agency would be authorized to delineate an area within any zone—a subzone—for transfer during a specified period to the zone immediately to the east. If, for example, a subzone were defined in the northeastern part of the central standard time zone, such subzone would become a part of the eastern standard time zone during the summertime. Accordingly, this section introduces a needed flexibility into the application of an advanced time standard. In those zones or portions of zones where no popular demand for a faster standard of time is manifested, none will be provided.

Sections 10, 11, and 12 would authorize the administering agency to conduct necessary proceedings, to issue subpenas, to employ the staff necessary to perform its duties under the act, and to receive and hear petitions as to the time zones. The present act contains no provisions for its administration.

Sections 13 and 14 contain important provisions making the standard time of the zone the measure of time for the transaction of all public business by the Federal or State Governments or by persons subject to the jurisdiction of the United States, except for scientific purposes or for other purposes expressly exempted by the designated agency under a provision designed to foster and protect the public interest.

Provisions for the execution and enforcement of the draft bill, entirely absent from the present act, are provided in sections 15 to 18. These include injunctive relief, civil forfeitures, and fines for willful violations.

In total effect, the proposed bill would provide for the United States a stable and orderly system of time characterized by clearly defined boundaries and truly geared to the vastly accelerated tempo of the age in which we live. Accordingly, it is recommended that this bill be enacted substantially in its present form.

Finally, it must be observed that the Commission's experience indicates that the convenience of transportation is only one of the many considerations in time-zone hearings, and that the major portion of the testimony adduced at such hearings is elicited from a broad spectrum of sources, including representatives of Federal, State, county, and municipal governments, banks, brokers, insurance companies, manufacturers, mining companies, refineries, wholesale and retail dealers, radio and television broadcasters, telephone and telegraph companies, newspapers, lawyers, doctors, hospitals, tour bureaus, school boards, farmers, stock breeders, and dairymen. For this reason, it is also recommended that careful consideration be given to the question of whether the Interstate Commerce Commission is the most appropriate agency to administer the provisions of any future law relating to standard time. In any event, should the Congress not see fit to change or amend the present Standard Time Act so as to provide a more efficient and effective system of time regulation, it is recommended that the Commission be relieved of the responsibility for its administration.

AMENDMENT OF FEDERAL AVIATION ACT OF 1958, RELATING TO PENALTIES FOR FALSIFICATION OF RECORDS

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, by request, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend section 902 of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 relating to penalties for falsification of records, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent that a letter from the Administrator, Federal Aviation Agency, requesting the proposed legislation, be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the letter will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1034) to amend section 902 of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 relating to penalties for falsification of records, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. MAGNUSON, by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

The letter presented by Mr. MAGNUSON is as follows:

FEDERAL AVIATION AGENCY,
Washington, D.C., February 20, 1963.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I transmit herewith for the consideration of the Congress a draft bill "To amend section 902 of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 relating to penalties for falsification of records, and for other purposes."

Section 902(e) of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 presently provides criminal sanctions for failures to submit or preserve accurate records as required by law. The section is an important part of the Agency's authority to monitor air safety through the examination of relevant documents. The bill would amend section 902(e) in three particulars: it would broaden the class of persons to which the section applies; it would add a prison sentence as an alternative sanction; it would make a minor correction in the syntax of the section as now drafted.

Section 902(e) presently provides for the punishment of "air carriers" or their representatives for willfully failing to submit or preserve accurate records. No criminal sanctions, however, are available under the act for use against other operators who are required to submit and preserve records, but who are not "air carriers." Recent experience indicates the need for more effective sanctions with respect to non-air-carrier operators. Last year, for example, two especially flagrant violation of recordkeeping obligations were discovered involving part 45 commercial operators. These operators were found to have falsified applications, airmen records, aircraft logs, loading schedules, passenger manifests, maintenance records and flight records. While these commercial operations are in many cases technically indistinguishable from air carrier operations, and while part 45 operators may, under the regulations, owe the same recordkeeping obligations as scheduled and supplemental air carriers, no criminal sanctions are available against them since they are not technically "air carriers."

The two remedies which are available have not proved satisfactory. In cases such as those mentioned above, the Administrator can revoke the operating authority of the operator. This was in fact done in the two cases mentioned. But, in these frequently small companies, there is a real need for authority to proceed directly against the individuals responsible for the violations. Such individuals are otherwise able to (and in fact have) set up new companies, securing new operating authority by the use of still further record falsifications. Authority to move directly against these individuals would provide a more effective deterrent.

The other available remedy allows such a direct approach, but to a limited degree only. Title 18 of the United States Code provides in section 1001 that certain types of record falsification shall be punished as felonies. Because of the severity of the penalties imposed, however, the statute is narrowly drawn. It does not directly reach, for example, failures to make required reports, failures to keep and preserve accurate records, or failures to submit records in the form and manner prescribed by law. All of these requirements are presently covered by section 902(a) since they are critical in the process of monitoring air safety. Further, title 18 has not proved a satisfactory deterrent even where it applies because of the understandable reluctance of the Department of Justice to prosecute violations which may not rise to real felony proportions. The instant bill will punish these violations as misdemeanors and, being easier to enforce, should prove a more effective deterrent.

It is proposed by the present bill to broaden the coverage of section 902(e) by substituting the phrase "Any person" for the phrase "Any carrier, or any officer, agent, employee, or representative thereof" in the first line of the section.

The bill also adds a prison sentence as an alternative to the monetary penalty now authorized. This will increase the deterrent effect of the section. Similar alternative sanctions are presently available under sections 902(b), 902(c), 902(f), 902(g), and 902(h) of the Federal Aviation Act, and under section 19 of the Federal Airport Act.

Finally, the bill will clarify the question of whether the proscription of section 902(e) runs to falsification of reports required by regulation as well as to the falsification of reports required by the act. The language can now be interpreted to refer only to the latter. Since there are no reports specifically required by the Act, it was obviously the intent of Congress to refer to the former and, to make this intent clear, the phrase "or by regulations promulgated under this act" has been added to the third line of section 902(e), immediately following the comma.

The Bureau of the Budget has advised that there is no objection from the standpoint of the administration's program to the submission of this proposed legislation to the Congress.

Sincerely,

N. E. HALABY,
Administrator.

EXTENSION OF PROVISIONS OF SECTION 3 OF PUBLIC LAW 87–346, RELATING TO DUAL RATE CONTRACTS

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, by request, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to extend the provisions of section 3 of Public Law 87–346, relating to dual rate contracts. I ask unanimous consent that a letter from the Chairman of the Federal Maritime Commission, requesting the proposed legislation, together with a statement of the purpose and provisions of the bill, be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the letter and statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1035) to extend the provisions of section 3 of Public Law 87–346, relating to dual rate contracts, introduced by Mr. MAGNUSON, by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

The letter and statement presented by Mr. MAGNUSON are as follows:

FEDERAL MARITIME COMMISSION,
Washington, D.C., February 28, 1963.

Hon. LYNDON B. JOHNSON,
President of the Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: There are submitted herewith four copies of a proposed bill, together with a statement of purpose and need for the draft bill, to extend the provisions of section 3 of Public Law 87–346.

The need for and purpose of the proposed bill are set forth in the accompanying statement.

The Federal Maritime Commission urges enactment of the bill at the 1st session of the 88th Congress for the reasons set forth in the accompanying statement.

The Bureau of the Budget has advised that, from the standpoint of the administration's program, there is no objection to the submission of this proposed legislation to the Congress.

Sincerely yours,

THOMAS E. STAKEM,
Chairman.

Purpose and Provisions of Bill To Extend the Provisions of Section 3 of Public Law 87–346

The bill would extend the period during which the Federal Maritime Commission shall approve, disapprove, cancel or modify, existing dual-rate contracts in use in our waterborne foreign commerce for a period of 1 year.

By Public Law 87–346 Congress imposed comprehensive requirements which must be included in dual-rate contracts. Section 3 of Public Law 87–346 provides that all existing dual-rate contracts which were lawful on the date that the law was enacted, if modified to comply with the requirements of Public Law 87–346 within 6 months (April 3, 1962), would remain lawful for a period not to exceed 1 year (April 3, 1963).

The section provided that the Commission within such year approve, disapprove, cancel or modify such contract in accordance with the new requirement contained in that Public Law.

On or about April 3, 1962, amendments to some 60 dual-rate contracts were filed with the Commission pursuant to the foregoing statutory provisions.

As required by law by appropriate notice in the Federal Register the Commission requested the views of interested persons. Comments were received from many interested parties particularly shippers, exporters and importers which raised objection to many of the amendments proposed, and requested an opportunity to be heard as provided by Public Law 87–346 before the Commission took action to approve, disapprove, cancel or modify the contracts.

In accordance with the desires of Congress as expressed in the House and Senate committee reports on the bill which became Public Law 87–346, the Commission has also undertaken by a former rulemaking proceeding to deal with certain matters which, to some extent, were left unsolved by the public law. This rulemaking proceeding must of necessity, be closely coordinated with the 60 individual contract proceedings.

In order to afford all persons the rights accorded to them under the procedures set out in Public Law 87–346 and in view of the many complex questions which unavoidably flow from the Commission's attempt to accord due weight to the many and diverse interests represented in these matters, additional time is needed to allow the Commission to discharge its responsibility in approving, disapproving, canceling or modifying the amended contracts. The bill would extend until April 3, 1964, the time by which the Commission must pass upon the lawfulness of all current contracts; and, while it is our serious hope and intention that the matter will be disposed of short of that time, prudence suggests that the April 3, 1964, date would not be unreasonable.

AMENDMENT OF INLAND AND WESTERN RIVERS RULES, RELATING TO CERTAIN LIGHTS AND SIGNALS

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, by request, I introduce for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the inland and western rivers rules concerning anchor lights and fog signals required in special anchorage areas, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent that a letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, requesting the proposed legislation, together with a comparative type showing changes in existing law made by the proposed legislation, and a sectional analysis, be printed in the Record.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the letter, comparative type, and sectional analysis will be printed in the Record.

The bill (S. 1036) to amend the inland and western rivers rules concerning anchor lights and fog signals required in special anchorage areas, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. Magnuson, by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

The letter, comparative type, and sectional analysis, presented by Mr. Magnuson, are as follows:

The Secretary of the Treasury,
Washington, February 20, 1963.

Dear Mr. President: There is transmitted herewith a draft of a proposed bill, "To amend the inland and western rivers rules concerning anchor lights and fog signals required in special anchorage areas, and for other purposes."

The purpose of this proposed legislation is, first, to ameliorate existing statutory requirements of inland and western rivers rules for anchor lights and fog signals with respect to certain classes of vessels when anchored in "special anchorage areas" designated by the Secretary of the Army under authority of 33 U.S.C. 180 and 322, and, second, to make the inland and western rivers rules regarding anchor lights uniform.

Under existing provisions of the above rules, vessels at anchor in "special anchorage areas" must, with one exception, carry the same lights and sound the same fog signals as vessels anchored elsewhere. Those under 150 feet in length must carry a single all-around white light in the forward part of the vessel, visible for at least 2 miles under western rivers rules, 1 mile under inland rules. Those of 150 feet or upward in length must carry a second such light in the afterpart of the vessel, at least 15 feet lower than the forward light. All vessels must, under conditions of fog or reduced visibility, sound the prescribed fog signal. This consists of rapidly ringing a bell for about 5 seconds at intervals of not more than once every minute. The one exception is that vessels of not more than 65 feet in length when anchored in these special anchorage areas need not display any anchor light.

A subcommittee of the Western Rivers Panel of the United States Coast Guard's Merchant Marine Council, upon completion of a recent study of problems facing towboat and barge operators on interior and coastal waters of the United States, recommended that the above requirements be modified in certain particulars. This group pointed out that "special anchorage areas" which are designated by the Secretary of the Army can be safe, well marked, removed from the immediate vicinity of navigable channels or fairways, and published to mariners generally; that barges, scows, and other nondescript craft would often be tied together and anchored in these areas in groups; that such craft are customarily left unmanned; and that existing lighting and fog signal requirements for vessels of this type when anchored in these special areas can safely be reduced. The Merchant Marine Council carefully studied these recommendations and approved them to the extent reflected in this bill.

The bill would ameliorate existing requirements for vessels at anchor in these special anchorage areas in the following particulars:

(1) Barges, scows, canalboats and other nondescript craft of 150 feet or upwards in length would carry a single anchor light in lieu of the two which are presently required.

(2) When barges, scows, canalboats or other nondescript craft are tied together and anchored as a group, only the vessel with its anchor down would display an anchor light.

(3) Barges, scows, canalboats and other nondescript craft of all sizes would be exempt from the requirement of sounding a fog signal.

(4) Vessels of any type not more than 65 feet in length would be exempt from the requirement of sounding a fog signal.

Existing provisions of the inland and western rivers rules with respect to anchor lights are divergent in several minor particulars. Under the inland rules, the forward anchor light of a vessel of 150 feet or upward in length must be displayed at a position not less than 20 or more than 40 feet above the hull; under the western river rules, only the minimum distance is specified. The inland rules require that a vessel of under 150 feet in length display its single anchor light at a height not exceeding 20 feet above the hull; the western river rules make no such requirement. The inland rules prescribe that the visibility of anchor lights shall be at least 1 mile; the western rivers rules prescribe 2 miles. The proposed bill would eliminate these differences and make both sets of rules uniform in these particulars.

It is believed that these changes will remove an unnecessary burden from the shipping industry without materially reducing safety of navigation.

There is enclosed for your convenient reference a comparative type showing the changes in existing law that would be made by the proposed bill, along with a sectional analysis of the bill.

It would be appreciated if you would lay the proposed bill before the Senate. A similar proposed bill has been transmitted to the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

The Department has been advised by the Bureau of the Budget that there is no objection from the standpoint of the administration's program to the submission of this proposed legislation to the Congress.

Sincerely yours,

Douglas Dillon.

Comparative Type Showing Changes in Existing Law Made by the Proposed Bill

[Matter proposed to be omitted is enclosed in brackets; new matter is in italic]

ARTICLE 11 OF THE RULES OF THE ROAD FOR INLAND WATERS AS CONTAINED IN THE ACT OF JUNE 7, 1897, AS AMENDED (33 U.S.C. 180)

Art. 11. (*a*) *Except as provided in paragraph (c) of this article,* [A] *a* vessel under one hundred and fifty feet in length when at anchor shall carry forward, where it can best be seen, [but at a height not exceeding twenty feet above the hull,] a white light in a lantern so constructed as to show a clear, uniform, and unbroken light visible all around the horizon at a distance of at least [one mile] *two miles.* [*Provided,* That the Secretary of the Army may, after investigation, by rule, regulation, or order, designate such areas as he may deem proper as "special anchorage areas"; such special anchorage areas may from time to time be changed, or abolished, if after investigation the Secretary of the Army shall deem such change or abolition in the interest of navigation: *Provided further,* That vessels not more than sixty-five feet in length when at anchor in any such special anchorage area shall not be required to carry or exhibit the white light required by this article.]

(*b*) *Except as provided in paragraph (c) of this article,* [A] a vessel of one hundred and fifty feet or upward in length, when at anchor, shall carry in the forward part of the vessel, at a height of not less than twenty [and not exceeding forty] feet above the hull, one such light, and at or near the stern of the vessel, and at such a height that it shall be not less than fifteen feet lower than the forward light, another such light.

[The length of a vessel shall be deemed to be the length appearing in her certificate of registry.]

(c) *The Secretary of the Army may, after investigation, by rule, regulation, or order, designate such areas as he may deem proper as "special anchorage areas"; such special anchorage areas may from time to time be changed, or abolished, if after investigation the Secretary of the Army shall deem such change or abolition in the interest of navigation. When anchored within such an area—*

(*1*) *a vessel of not more than sixty-five feet in length shall not be required to carry or exhibit the white light required by this article;*

(2) *a barge, canal boat, scow, or other nondescript craft of one hundred and fifty feet or upward in length may carry and exhibit the single white light prescribed by paragraph* (a) *of this article in lieu of the two white lights prescribed by paragraph* (b) *of this article; and*

(3) *where two or more barges, canal boats, scows, or other nondescript craft are tied together and anchored as a unit, the anchor light prescribed by this article need be displayed only on the vessel having its anchor down.*

ARTICLE 15 OF THE RULES OF THE ROAD FOR INLAND WATERS AS CONTAINED IN THE ACT OF JUNE 7, 1897 (33 U.S.C. 191)

ART. 15. * * *.

In fog, mist, falling snow, or heavy rainstorms, whether by day or night, the signals described in this article shall be used as follows, namely:

* * * * *

(d) A vessel when at anchor shall, at intervals[,] of not more than one minute, ring the bell rapidly for about five seconds[.] , *except that the following vessels shall not be required to sound this signal when anchored in a special anchorage area established pursuant to paragraph* (c) *of article 11:*

(*1*) *a vessel of not more than sixty-five feet in length; and*

(2) *a barge, canal boat, scow, or other nondescript craft.*

RULE NUMBERED 13 OF THE RULES OF THE ROAD FOR WESTERN RIVERS AS CONTAINED IN SECTION 4233 OF THE REVISED STATUTES (33 U.S.C. 322)

RULE No. 13. (a) *Except as provided in paragraph* (c) *of this rule,* [A] *a* vessel under one hundred and fifty feet in length, when at anchor [and not moored to the bank or wharf,] shall carry forward, where it can best be seen, a white light in a lantern so constructed as to show a clear, uniform, and unbroken light visible all around the horizon at a distance of at least two [miles] *miles.* [: *Provided,* That the Secretary of the Army may, after investigation, by rule, regulation, or order, designate such areas as he may deem proper as "special anchorage areas"; such special anchorage areas may from time to time be changed, or abolished, if after investigation the Secretary of the Army shall deem such change or abolition in the interest of navigation: *Provided further,* That vessels not more than sixty-five feet in length when at anchor in any such special anchorage area shall not be required to carry or exhibit the white light required by this article.]

(b) *Except as provided in paragraph* (c) *of this rule,* [A] *a* vessel of one hundred and fifty feet or upward in length, when at anchor, [and not moored to the bank or a wharf,] shall carry in the forward part of the vessel, [where it can best be seen,] *at a height of not less than twenty feet above the hull,* one such light, and at or near the stern of the vessel, and at such a height that it shall not be less than fifteen feet lower than the forward light, another such light.

(*c*) *The Secretary of the Army may, after investigation, by rule, regulation, or order, designate such areas as he may deem proper as "special anchorage areas"; such special anchorage areas may from time to time be changed, or abolished, if after investigation the Secretary of the Army shall deem such change or abolition in the interests of navigation. When anchored within such an area—*

(1) a vessel of not more than sixty-five feet in length shall not be required to carry or exhibit the white light required by this rule:

(2) a barge, canal boat, scow, or other nondescript craft of one hundred and fifty feet or upward in length may carry and exhibit the single white light prescribed by paragraph (a) of this rule in lieu of the two white lights prescribed by paragraph (b) of this rule; and

(3) where two or more barges, canal boats, scows, or other nondescript craft are tied together and anchored as a unit, the anchor light prescribed by this rule need be displayed only on the vessel having its anchor down.

RULE NUMBERED 15 OF THE RULES OF THE ROAD FOR WESTERN RIVERS AS CONTAINED IN SECTION 4233 OF THE REVISED STATUTES (33 U.S.C. 331).

RULE No. 15. * * *.

In fog, mist, falling snow, heavy rainstorms, or any other condition similarly restricting visibility, whether by day or night, the signals described by this article shall be used as follows, namely:

* * * * *

(d) A vessel when at anchor shall, at intervals of not more than one minute, ring the bell rapidly for about five seconds [.], *except that the following vessels shall not be required to sound this signal when anchored in a special anchorage area established pursuant to paragraph (c) of rule 13:*

(1) a vessel not more than sixty-five feet in length; and

(2) a barge, canal boat, scow or other nondescript craft.

Sectional analysis

SECTION 1: This section amends article 11 of the inland rules of the road (33 U.S.C. 180), relating to lights required for vessels at anchor, in the following particulars:

(1) It eliminates the present requirements that the single anchor light carried by a vessel of under 150 feet in length be located at a height not exceeding 20 feet above the hull (conforming to western rivers rules).

(2) It eliminates the present requirement that the forward anchor light carried by a vessel of 150 feet or upward in length be located at a height not exceeding 40 feet above the hull (conforming to western rivers rules).

(3) It extends the visibility requirement of anchor lights from 1 to 2 miles (conforming to western rivers rules).

(4) It ameliorates existing anchor light requirements with respect to vessels at anchor in "special anchorage areas" designated by the Secretary of the Army, in the following particulars:

(a) Vessels of not more than 65 feet in length are exempt from the requirements of displaying an anchor light.

(b) Barges, scows, canal boats, or other nondescript craft of 150 feet or upward in length will carry a single anchor light of the type prescribed for vessels of under 150 feet in length in lieu of the two which are presently required.

(c) Barges, scows, canal boats, or other nondescript craft which are tied together and anchored as a group need display only a single anchor light of the type prescribed for vessels under 150 feet in length, such light to be displayed on the vessel which has its anchor down.

(5) It deletes the existing provision that the length of a vessel shall be deemed to be the length appearing on her certificate of registry (conforming to western rivers rules).

Section 2. This section amends subsection (d) of article 15 of the inland rules of the road (33 U.S.C. 191), relating to sound signals for fog, by exempting the following classes of vessels from the requirement of sounding fog signals when anchored in "special anchorage areas" established by the Secretary of the Army pursuant to article 11(c):

(1) Vessels of not more than 65 feet in length.

(2) Barges, scows, canal boats, or other nondescript craft.

Section 3: This section amends rule No. 13 of the western rivers rules (33 U.S.C. 322), relating to lights required to be carried by vessels at anchor, in the following particulars:

(1) It interjects a new requirement that the forward light carried by a vessel of 150 feet or upward in length be displayed not less than 20 feet above the hull (conforming to the inland rules).

(2) It ameliorates existing anchor light requirements with respect to vessels at anchor in "special anchorage areas" designated by the Secretary of the Army, in the following particulars:

(a) Barges, scows, canal boats or other nondescript craft of 150 feet or upwards in length will carry a single anchor light of the type prescribed for vessels of under 150 feet in length in lieu of the two which are presently required.

(b) Barges, scows, canal boats or other nondescript craft which are tied together and anchored as a group need display only a single anchor light of the type prescribed for vessels under 150 feet in length, such light to be displayed on the vessel which has its anchor down.

Section 4: This section amends subsection (d) of rule No. 15, western rivers rules (33 U.S.C. 331), relating to signals for fog, by exempting the following classes of vessels from the requirement of sounding fog signals when anchored in "special anchorage areas" established by the Secretary of the Army pursuant to rule No. 11:

(1) Vessels of not more than 65 feet in length.

(2) Barges, scows, canal boats or other nondescript craft.

The net results of these amendments are that (1) of the inland rules and the western rivers rules are made uniform and consistent in their requirements as to anchor lights and fog signals, and (2) under both sets of rules new and lesser requirements are established with respect to anchor lights and fog signals for certain classes of vessels which are anchored in "special anchorage areas" designated by the Secretary of the Army.

AMENDMENT OF SECTION 208(c) OF INTERSTATE COMMERCE ACT

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, by request, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend section 208(c) of the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended. I ask unanimous consent that an explanation of the proposed legislation be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the explanation will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1037) to amend section 208(c) of the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, introduced by Mr. MAGNUson, by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

The explanation presented by Mr. Magnuson is as follows:

Repeal of Automatic Charter Rights for Motor Carriers of Passengers

INTRODUCTION

The intercity bus industry, represented by its national trade association, National Association of Motor Bus Owners, urges amendment of part II of the Interstate Commerce Act to abolish automatic charter rights. The effect of the proposal would be to require future applicants for passenger certificates to prove public convenience and necessity for charter operations. Grandfather rights would be accorded existing certificates. As a result, there has not in the past been opposition to this legislation.

The proposal is to substitute for the present section 208(c) of the act of the following provision:

"(c) Any common carrier by motor vehicle transporting passengers under a certificate issued under this part on or before 180 days following the effective date of this section, or under any reissuance of the operating rights contained in such certificate may transport in interstate or foreign commerce to any place special or chartered parties under such rules and regulations as the Commission shall have prescribed."

Similar legislation was recommended by the Interstate Commerce Commission in each of its annual reports from 1955 through 1959. It was omitted from the 1960 and subsequent reports because, it is understood, the Commission felt the bus industry itself must assume the burden of pressing for enactment.

S. 1459, embodying this proposal, was passed by the Senate in the 85th Congress. H.R. 5660 was introduced in the same Congress and hearings were held before the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee. However, the bill was not reported out of committee.

REASON FOR LEGISLATION

There has been widespread abuse of the present provision of section 208(c) of the act relating to charter operations, as the Interstate Commerce Commission pointed out in its legislative recommendations for 1955 through 1959. Applications for regular-route motor passenger certificates, particularly over short routes, have frequently been made solely or primarily for the purpose of securing these incidental unlimited character rights. In many instances only token service is offered on regular routes in order to keep alive the charter rights automatically granted with the regular-route certificate.

This situation is of particular concern to the established regular-route carriers which render bona fide essential services to thousands of communities which are entirely dependent upon intercity buses for their only means of public passenger transport. Much of this service tends to be noncompensatory, particularly over short routes, and a very significant portion of it is actually supplied at a loss to the carriers. In many cases the service would necessarily be discontinued if it were not for the revenues received from charter business which offset the losses on the regular-route service.

Charter services were only a small part of common carrier passenger operations at the time section 208(c) of the act was passed. They were then truly incidental to regular-route operations. Accordingly, proof of need for regular-route authority was sufficient safeguard to protect the public from the destructive consequences of overcrowding in the charter field. For that reason the provisions of section 208(c) granting charter rights as an incident to regular-route authority were sufficient to assure the integrity of the principles contained in the national transportation policy for an orderly development of an adequate transportation system.

However, the situation has undergone a radical change since that time. Charter services have increased many times in amount and they have become essential as a support for regular-route operations. They are an important part of our transportation system. They are no longer merely incidental to regular-route services.

Despite the importance of charter services, there has not been a controlled development such as we have had for regular-route operations. The result is that the field is tremendously overcrowded. A grossly wasteful duplication of charter facilities exists which has led to destructive competition for charters contrary to the basic purposes of the Interstate Commerce Act. The proposed amendment of section 208(c) would tend to correct this situation.

In view of the present growth and importance of charter services, they should not be authorized except upon proof of need in the same way that a need must be shown for regular-route authority. The proposed amendment would accomplish this objective. The amendment would not bar bona fide applicants for charter services and it would reduce the existing effects of overcrowding in this field.

The financial plight of the established regular-route carriers would now be less serious if they had not been confronted with this condition of overcrowding. The proposed amendment would tend to restore the bus transportation industry to the sound economic conditions for which the Motor Carrier Act was originally enacted.

CIVIL REDRESS TO PERSONS DAMAGED BY UNFAIR COMMERCIAL ACTIVITIES IN OR AFFECTING COMMERCE

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to provide civil redress to persons damaged by unfair commercial activities in or affecting commerce. Recommended by the committee on trademarks and unfair competition of the Association of the Bar of the City of New York, the bill is designed to create a uniform body of Federal law on unfair competition, enforceable in the Federal courts, in cases where interstate commerce is affected. First introduced in 1959 in the House of Representatives, the bill was introduced by me in the 87th Congress as S. 1036 and subsequently in a revised version as S. 2784. The bill has since been further perfected by the bar association committee after consultation with other bar and business groups. A parallel measure is being introduced today in the House of Representatives by Congressman Lindsay.

I ask unanimous consent that there may be incorporated as a part of my remarks the text of the bill, together with an explanatory memorandum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill and memorandum will be printed in the Record.

The bill (S. 1038) to provide civil remedies to persons damaged by unfair commercial activities in or affecting commerce, introduced by Mr. Javits, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Commerce, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the intent of this Act is to regulate all commerce which may lawfully be regulated by Congress by making actionable in a Federal forum all unfair commercial activities set forth herein thereby to protect any person engaged in interstate commerce against such unfair commercial activities whether used or committed locally or in interstate commerce.

Sec. 2. Any person damaged or likely to be damaged by unfair commercial activities in or affecting commerce shall be entitled to an injunction in a civil action brought by that person against any person who has engaged in such activities. The prevailing party in any such action also shall be entitled to judgment for taxable costs and disbursements and, in the discretion of the court, reasonable attorneys' fees.

Sec. 3. Unfair commercial activities under this Act shall be—

(a) the commission of any act or practice or the use of any statement which is likely (1) to cause confusion as to the affiliation, connection, or association of the person charged therewith or (2) to cause confusion as to the origin, source, or sponsorship of the goods or services of such person or (3) to dilute the distinctive quality of a trademark or trade name of another;

(b) the use for purposes of profit of any statement of fact as to the goods or services of either party which is false or misleading by reason either of misstatement or omission of a material fact;

(c) the commission for purposes of profit of any other act or practice which is likely to deceive or which violates reasonable standards of commercial ethics; or

(d) the institution of an action under this Act in bad faith.

Sec. 4. Absence of competition between the parties, of actual damage to the person seeking protection, or of a public interest in such unfair commercial activities shall not be a defense to an action brought under this Act.

Sec. 5. Absence of knowledge or intent shall be a defense to any action brought under this Act against a publisher or broadcaster in respect of any contents of any news, literary, educational, advertising, or entertainment medium.

Sec. 6. Relief shall not be available under this Act in respect of an issue of a newspaper, magazine, or other similar periodical, the broadcast of any radio or television program, or the showing of any motion picture when restraining the appearance or performance of any particular issue of such periodical, program, or picture would delay its dissemination after the regular time therefor, and such delay would be due to the method by which dissemination is customarily conducted in accordance with sound business practice and not to any method or device adopted for the evasion of this Act or to prevent or delay the issuance of an injunction or restraining order.

Sec. 7. This Act shall not be construed so as to extend or enlarge the rights and remedies provided under the patent or copyright laws of the United States.

Sec. 8. The district and territorial courts of the United States shall have exclusive original jurisdiction and the circuit courts of appeal of the United States and the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia shall have exclusive appellate jurisdiction, of all actions whatsoever under this Act without regard to the amount in controversy or to diversity or lack of diversity of the citizenship of the parties. Writs of certiorari may be granted by the Supreme Court of the United States for the review of cases arising under this Act.

SEC. 9. The relief provided for by this Act shall be in addition to and not in exclusion of those rights and remedies otherwise available under the common law or pursuant to the statutes of any State or of the United States. Nothing in this Act shall be construed so as to preempt the jurisdiction of any State to grant relief in cases of unfair commercial activities.

SEC. 10. In the construction of this Act, unless the contrary is plainly apparent from the context—

1. The term "person" includes any individual, partnership, corporation, association, union, or other organization capable of suing or being sued in a court of law.

2. The term "commerce" means all commerce which may lawfully be regulated by Congress.

3. Words used in the singular include the plural and vice versa.

4. The term "trademark" includes any word, name, symbol, or device or any combination thereof adopted and used by a manufacturer or merchant to identify his goods and distinguish them from those manufactured or sold by others; any mark used in the sale or advertising of services to identify the services of one person and distinguish them from the services of others, including without limitation the titles, character names and other distinctive features of radio and television programs notwithstanding that they, or the programs, may advertise the goods of the sponsor; any mark used upon or in connection with the products or services of one or more persons other than the owner of the mark to certify regional or other origin, material, mode of manufacture, quality, accuracy, or other characteristics of such goods or services or that the work or labor on the goods or services was performed by members of a union or other organization; or any mark used by the members of a cooperative, an association or other collective group or organization, including marks used to indicate membership in a union, an association, or other organization.

5. The term "trade name" includes individual names and surnames, firm names and trade names used by manufacturers, industrialists, merchants, agriculturists, and others to identify their businesses, vocations, or occupations or the names or titles lawfully adopted and used by persons, firms, associations, corporations, companies, unions, and any manufacturing, industrial, commercial, agricultural, or other organizations engaged in trade or commerce and capable of suing and being sued in a court of law.

SEC. 11. If any provision of this Act or the application of such provision to any person or circumstance is held invalid, the remainder of this Act shall not be affected thereby.

SEC. 12. This Act shall be in force and take effect immediately upon its enactment but shall not affect any suit, proceeding or appeal then pending.

SEC. 13. This Act may be cited as the "Unfair Commercial Activities Act."

The memorandum presented by Mr. JAVITS is as follows:

MEMORANDUM

The accompanying bill essentially is the same as H.R. 7833, 86th Cong., 1st sess. (1959); H.R. 4590, 87th Cong., 1st sess. (1961); S. 1036, 87th Cong., 1st sess. (1961); H.R. 10038, 87th Cong., 2d sess. (1962); and S. 2784, 87th Cong., 2d sess. (1962). Although no hearings were held on any of these bills, they have been the subject of considerable study within the legal profession which has led to various modifications, culminating in the present version. The original bill was drafted by the committee on trade marks and unfair competition of the Association of the Bar of the City of New York, which also has prepared each of the successive variations in response to comment and criticism from other bar associations, trade associations and the like.

The basic purpose of the bill is to create a Federal statutory cause of action that could be invoked by an injured party as an alternative to the common-law tort of unfair competition in cases where interstate commerce is affected. In the absence of such a statute, there can be no uniform Federal rules in the law of unfair competition. This comes about because of the decision of the United States Supreme Court in 1938 in the famous case of *Erie R. Co.* v. *Tompkins*, 304 U.S. 64, which held that there is no Federal common law. As a result, Federal courts that have jurisdiction of cases because of the diversity of citizenship of the parties must apply the law of the State in which they sit; and this extends to unfair competition cases.

There are many branches of law where the rule of *Erie* v. *Tompkins* has salutary effects because it prevents the accidental availability of Federal jurisdiction from affecting the law applicable to a given controversy. In the field of unfair competition, however, the effect of this decision has been to prevent the development of uniform nationwide rules of business fair play and this situation has been widely criticized.

As communication and transportation become increasingly rapid, business activities tend more and more to be interstate in character and even local operations more often than not will have an effect on the interstate business of someone else. Accordingly, there is a clear need for uniformity in the law applicable to unfair commercial activities, and this has been recognized by many eminent authorities. However, uniformity cannot be secured under the present checkerboard system where the specific legal principles of the individual States must be applied even by the Federal courts. This bill would make unfair commercial activities an offense cognizable in the Federal courts as the violation of a right created by a Federal statute. As a result, a uniform body of law would be created. This would provide certainty for businessmen, prevent forum shopping and tend to raise the level of commercial morality in the country as a whole.

The bill does not favor any particular class, group or industry as against any other. It is an effort by disinterested lawyers to improve the administration of justice in the important field of unfair competition.

Section 1 states the intent of the bill, which is to protect any person engaged in interstate commerce against unfair commercial activities by making actionable in a Federal forum all unfair commercial activities set forth in the bill, whether used or committed locally or in interstate commerce. Section 1 is designed to invoke the fullest possible scope of congressional power under the commerce clause of the Constitution. This statement of intent is somewhat reminiscent of the corresponding provision in the Lanham Act, the Trademark Act of 1946 (15 U.S.C., sec. 1127, "Intent of Act"), but is even more explicit in its language.

Section 2 sets forth the scope of relief to be available under the bill. The right of action is for an injunction; no damages may be recovered. There are two main reasons for the limitation to injunctive relief. It is believed that plaintiffs in most cases of this nature are interested primarily in bringing about the cessation of the unlawful acts rather than in collecting damages, which may be difficult to prove even in the best of circumstances. Furthermore, the absence of any provision for damages should prevent the use of the new right of action as the basis for strike suits. At the same time, a party with a genuine claim should not be deterred from bringing an action because of its expense; accordingly, section 2 provides for reasonable attorneys' fees in the discretion of the court, in addition to taxable costs and disbursements. Such a judgment is available not merely to a successful plaintiff, but to the prevailing party, so that a successful defendant also is entitled to make an application for counsel fees, as well as to recover statutory costs and disbursements.

Section 3 lists the unfair commercial activities that are made actionable. The expression "unfair commercial activities" was selected deliberately because it was felt that "unfair competition" might be construed as a limitation, since some unfair competition cases have required a showing of actual competition, in addition to a showing of unfairness, as a prerequisite to relief. Section 3 contains only four subsections. This brief list of unfair commercial activities that would violate the statute represents a carefully chosen compromise. On the one hand, it would be a practical impossibility to define in detail every type of conduct sought to be prohibited; as the U.S. Supreme Court said in the case of *Federal Trade Commission* v. *Gratz*, 253 U.S. 421, 437 (1920), "An enumeration, however comprehensive, of existing methods of unfair competition must necessarily prove incomplete, as with new conditions constantly arising novel unfair methods would be devised and developed." On the other hand, a simple statement that all unfair acts in commerce shall be unlawful would not have been sufficiently precise to serve as a basis for the desired uniformity of decision throughout the Federal judicial system.

Section 3(a) is framed in terms of the "commission" of an act or practice, or the "use" of a statement. This introductory language is intended to embrace all forms of activity, including the unfair use of a statement prepared by a third party. There are three parts to subsection (a); the first two of these cover confusion as to the affiliation, connection, or association of the defendant, and confusion as to the origin, source, or sponsorship of the goods or services of the defendant. The concept of confusion is the basis of trademark infringement under the Lanham Act (15 U.S.C. 1114(1)); the bill would extend this concept to confusion caused by means other than the use of colorable imitations of a trademark. In addition, section 3(a)(2) would codify the law of confusion of sponsorship, which (under that designation) has developed largely in cases involving questions of the registrability of trademarks, and make it available in nontrademark cases as well. Section 3(a)(3) would be a Federal anti-dilution law, paralleling similar enactments in recent years in Georgia, Illinois, Massachusetts, and New York. This liberal doctrine thus would become available in any trademark or trade name case where interstate commerce was affected.

Section 3(b) prohibits the use of false or misleading statements about the goods or services of either party. It is limited to statements of fact in order to avoid prohibiting anyone from stating his opinion. Since section 3(b) applies to statements about the goods or services of either party, it covers not only false advertising of what the defendant is offering, but also trade libel or disparagement directed against the plaintiff's products or services. Doubts about the availability of injunctive relief against disparagement, caused in some jurisdictions by false analogies to libel and slander, thus would be removed. Section 3(b) specifically contemplates the possibility that a statement may be false or misleading by reason of the omission of a material fact as well as by an actual misstatement of fact. In this respect, it resembles the definition of a false advertisement in the Federal Trade Commission Act (15 U.S.C., sec. 55(a)(1)).

Section 3(c) is a deliberate catchall. It is directed against "the commission for purposes of profit of any other act or practice which is likely to deceive or which violates reasonable standards of commercial ethics." This language resembles the provisions of two multilateral treaties to which the United States is a party: Article 10 bis, paragraph 2, of the International Convention for the Protection of Industrial Property, which provides, "Any act of competition contrary to honest practices in industrial or commercial matters constitutes an act of unfair competition"; and article 20 of the Pan-American Trade-Mark Convention, which provides, "Every act or deed contrary to commercial good faith or to the normal and honorable development of industrial or business activities shall be considered as unfair competition and, therefore, unjust and prohibited."

Section 3(d) is a provision against the institution in bad faith of an action under the proposed new act itself. This is considered to be an obviously desirable protective feature to avoid possible abuses of the statutory right.

In summary, section 3 has for its purpose the establishment of guideposts for the Federal courts that are explicit enough to identify the principal types of unlawful activity and yet will allow the flexibility of interpretation that is essential in a field where rapid technological advances in business and communications constantly create new opportunities for exploitation by the unscrupulous few.

Section 4 is designed to provide additional assurance of a broad, liberal construction for the bill. It states that, "Absence of competition between the parties * * * shall not be a defense to an action brought under this act.'" Section 4 also assures the widest possible access to the benefits of the statute by providing that no showing of actual damage shall be a prerequisite to relief and that absence of any public interest in the subject-matter of the action shall not constitute a defense.

Section 5 protects innocent publishers and broadcasters by making the absence of knowledge or intent a defense in an action against such a party in respect of the contents of "any news, literary, educational, advertising, or entertainment medium." Section 6 provides that relief under the statute shall not be available when the injunction would delay the dissemination of a particular issue of a periodical, the broadcast of a radio or television program, or the showing of a motion picture, after the regularly scheduled time therefor. These provisions are similar to the corresponding section in the Lanham Act (15 U.S.C., sec. 1114(2)) and also resemble the provisions of the Federal Trade Commission Act (15 U.S.C., sec. 53(b)).

Section 7 limits the substantive offense by providing that the statute is not to be so construed as to "extend or enlarge the rights and remedies provided under the patent or copyright laws of the United States." The purpose of this provision is to guard against possible attempts that might otherwise be made to use the new statute as a device for increasing the scope or duration of a patent or copyright monopoly. Trademarks are not mentioned in section 7 because they stand on a different footing from copyrights and patents. The bill does broaden the rights of trademark proprietors; and the possible criticism about extending the duration of the right that might have been made (in the absence of sec. 7) with respect to copyrights and patents is inapplicable to trademarks, because a trademark remains valid indefinitely under existing law so long as it is not abandoned.

Sections 8 and 9 should be considered together. Section 8 grants exclusive jurisdiction to the Federal courts of all actions arising under the statute, without regard to diversity of citizenship or jurisdictional amount. However, this does not mean that State law is discarded. Section 9 of the bill provides that the relief available under the statute "shall be in addition to and not in exclusion of those rights and remedies otherwise available under the common law or pursuant to the statutes of any State or of the United States." Section 9 goes on to state explicitly that the statute shall not be construed in such a way as to preempt the jurisdiction of any State to grant relief against unfair commercial activities. The net effect of these provisions is to create a new right of action cognizable exclusively in the Federal courts, but at the same time to preserve existing State law in the same field. Most cases of unfair competition tend to be brought in the Federal courts and it is expected that in the future such cases would invoke the new statute. However, a plaintiff who wished to invoke State law would be free to proceed in the State court based on the same facts that also would create a right of action under the new Federal statute; such a party would be entitled to all the benefits of State law if he chose to pursue them, either in addition to or in substitution for the Federal right of action, entirely unaffected by the provisions of the bill.

Section 10 contains definitions of a number of terms used in the bill. Most of these are borrowed almost verbatim from the definition section of the Lanham Act (15 U.S.C., sec. 1127).

Section 11 is the customary saving clause for partial invalidity.

Section 12 provides that the new statute shall take effect immediately upon its enactment, but that it shall not affect any proceeding pending at that time.

Section 13 provides a short title for the statute, viz., the "Unfair Commercial Activities Act."

AIR POLLUTION CRITERIA

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to direct the Surgeon General to establish and publish criteria useful in indicating the harmful effects of various air-pollution agents. This would help greatly to bring about an informed public understanding of the growing problem of air pollution, and would also add strength to the effort for its prevention and control.

Over the country there are some 175 State and local air sampling stations, in addition to the continuous air monitoring stations operated by the Federal Government in 9 major cities. The data they record flow into the Robert A. Taft Sanitary Engineering Center, in Cincinnati, an agency of the U.S. Public Health Service.

Our critical need, however, is for readily available information on the effects of the various substances which are polluting our atmosphere. I believe that one of the reasons why relatively little effort is being made by many of our States to control air pollution is the existence of the largely unnecessary smog of public confusion and uncertainty about the meaning of air-pollution levels.

According to the Washington Post of February 7, the amount of sulfur dioxide in the air, as reported by the Washington Air Monitoring Station on February 6, reached the highest level since the station began to monitor air in Washington. For 8½ hours the sulfur dioxide measured more than 0.3 parts per million parts of air.

What does this mean? Does 0.3 part per million of sulfur dioxide in the air constitute a reasonably healthy level, perhaps merely imparting a bracing and vigorous tang to the air? Or does this amount mean that we are close to the sort of disaster which claimed many lives in Liege, Belgium; in Donora, Pa.; and, on two occasions, in London? All of these tragedies involved, in part, at least, air pollution from the oxides of sulfur, as well as the weather phenomenon known as air inversion.

In the absence of standards indicating the relative danger of various levels of sulfur dioxide pollution, the public has no way of placing in perspective this air pollution reading, even with the most careful reporting of the immediately observable effects. Such information may not even be possessed by health and air-pollution officials.

A conference on air pollution, open to the public, was held in the Health, Education, and Welfare Department auditorium the day following the record reading of sulfur dioxide here in Washington. A Public Health Service speaker at the conference was asked to explain the significance of 0.3 part per million of sulfur dioxide in the air, as recorded in Washington, D.C., on the previous day. He indicated he could not answer the question, because there were no Federal air pollution standards, and because he did not have at hand a copy of the California standards.

California is the only State which has developed and published extensive air-pollution standards. The following is an excerpt from a table entitled "California Standards for Ambient Air Quality," as amended by the California State Board of Public Health on March 16, 1962, and as incorporated into the California Administrative Code, title 17, chapter 5, subchapter 5, article 1:

CALIFORNIA STANDARDS FOR AMBIENT AIR QUALITY

POLLUTANT

Adverse level: Level at which there will be sensory irritation, damage to vegetation, reduction in visibility, or similar effects.

Serious level: Level at which there will be alteration of bodily function or which is likely to lead to chronic disease.

Emergency level: Level at which it is likely that acute sickness or death in sensitive groups of persons will occur.

SULFUR DIOXIDE

Adverse level: 1 part per million for 1 hour or 0.3 part per million for 8 hours (plant damage).

Serious level: 5 parts per million for 1 hour (bronchoconstriction in human subjects).

Emergency level: 10 parts per million for 1 hour (severe distress in human subjects).

Mr. President, this table permits one to make some judgment as to the significance of the reported level of sulfur dioxide. Furthermore, the California standards also indicate the more powerful effects of sulfuric acid mist, into which the oxides of sulfur in moist air are sometimes converted. I believe that the table of California standards, still admittedly incomplete in regard to a number of pollutants, illustrates one of many possible ways in which the Federal Government could well make available to the public information on specific air pollutants and combinations of them.

The basic facts about the effects of air-pollution agents do not vary from State to State. The Federal Government, with its great research facilities, is obviously in the best position to bring together all the known research on air pollutants and to carry on the research necessary to formulate criteria of air quality.

In the current fiscal year, the Congress has made available to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare $9.6 million for research on air pollution, including $2.9 million for grant programs. It is my understanding that the Air Pollution Division of the Public Health Service already has sufficient information to establish criteria for a number of specific pollutants. Under the provisions of my bill, further additions would be made as new scientific evidence becomes available.

Helpful as the California standards are, scientific knowledge about air pollution is developing so rapidly the information provided by the Federal Government will certainly need supplementing from time to time. Only this week, studies conducted in various cities in New Jersey, Indiana, Ohio, and Pennsylvania have been reported, indicating that a link exists between sulfur dioxide air pollution and the common cold. Earlier this week, the distinguished Senator from Oregon [Mrs. NEUBERGER] discussed the relationship; and yesterday the Washington Post published an article, by Morton Mintz, providing further information and comment on it. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, to have part of Mr. Mintz's article printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the excerpts from the article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE LINKS COLDS TO AIR POLLUTION

(By Morton Mintz)

The Public Health Service said yesterday it believes a link exists between colds and air pollution.

Surg. Gen. Luther L. Terry said "there is strong circumstantial evidence" that airborne sulfur compounds "trigger outbreaks of upper respiratory infections."

Dr. Terry added that the frequency and duration of such infections—running and stuffed noses, coughs, mild sore throats—appear related to the amount of sulfur dioxide, sulfur trioxide, and related sulfur compounds in the atmosphere.

The relationship was called dramatic by Senator MAURINE NEUBERGER, Democrat, of Oregon Monday in a Senate speech in which she cited studies by Dr. F. Curtis Dohan, of the University of Pennsylvania School of Medicine.

Dr. Terry's statements were made in response to a request by The Washington Post for comment on the Neuberger speech, in which she noted colds cost the Nation tens of millions of lost workdays a year.

Sulfur compounds are released into the air by the burning of coal and oil in factories, powerplants, and home furnaces, and through oil refining, ore roasting, acid manufacture, and other industrial processes.

Although modern precipitators on industrial stacks efficiently collect smoke, fly ash and other solids, they are very ineffective in trapping sulfur gases.

The studies by Dr. Dohan, associate professor of preventive medicine at the University and also medical director of the Radio Corporation of America, were conducted among 15,600 office and industrial women employees of 10 RCA plants in 8 cities.

The cites were Harrison, Camden, and Woodbridge, N.J., Indianapolis, Bloomington, and Marion, Ind., Cincinnati, Ohio, and Lancaster, Pa.

Dr. Dohan found direct correlations between frequency of absence from work, upper respiratory infections and the concentration of sulfur compounds in the air.

No correlation was found between the absence caused by such infections, pollutants other than sulfur compounds and additional factors ranging from local weather to employee morale.

In Lancaster and Cincinnati, where sulfur compound pollution levels were lowest, the incidence of respiratory infections was lowest. The levels were highest in Harrison and second highest in Camden—and so were the rates of infection-caused absence.

Primarily for reasons of statistical reliability, the only absences tabulated were those lasting 7 or more days.

However, Dr. Richard A. Prindle, Deputy Chief of the Division of Air Pollution of the PHS, said it is believed that a correlation with light colds also exists.

Air pollution of various types has long been suspected of being a contributing factor in such chronic respiratory diseases as asthma, emphysema, bronchitis, and lung cancer, and also in circulatory diseases, allergies and other afflictions.

In recent years, PHS-supported studies at Nashville, Tenn., have indicated a lockstep relationship between asthmatic attacks and high levels of sulfur dioxide.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, I believe that Mr. Mintz' article indicates the type of development we can expect in the years ahead, and which might well be reflected in addition to air-pollution criteria established by the Federal Government.

Such criteria would be enormously useful at all levels of government. They would be useful to State, interstate, and municipal agencies, in connection with their own air-pollution detection and control efforts, as well as to Federal health and air-pollution officials. They would be useful to State and local legislative bodies, in connection with laws and ordinances on air pollution. But my bill is particularly important, I believe, in the way it relates to the general public and the press.

The problem of air pollution is a large and growing one. A much greater nationwide effort than has yet been evident is necessary in order to cope with it. Essential to that effort is an aroused public opinion; and my bill will, I believe, help provide the public with the facts on which it can form that opinion. This is a very simple step, and one which can be taken quickly. I hope we get prompt action on it.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that a summary of the provisions of my bill be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks, along with the text of the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill and summary will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1040) to direct the Surgeon General to establish and publish criteria useful in indicating the harmful effects of various air-pollution agents, introduced by Mr. CASE, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Public Works, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 3 of the Act entitled "An Act to provide research and technical assistance relating to air-pollution control", approved July 14, 1955 (69 Stat. 322, 42 U.S.C. 1857b), as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(c)(1) The Surgeon General shall conduct research on, and survey the results of other scientific studies on, the harmful effects on the public health or general welfare of the various known air-pollution agents (or combinations of agents).

"(2) Whenever the Surgeon General determines that there is substantial scientific agreement that a particular air-pollution agent (or combination of agents), when present in the air in certain quantities, produces effects harmful to the public health or general welfare, he shall establish and publish criteria useful in indicating the kind and extent of such effects which may be expected from the presence of such air-pollution agent (or combination of agents) in the air in varying quantities. Any such criteria shall be published by the Surgeon General for informational purposes only and shall have no legal effect. The Surgeon General shall revise and add to such criteria whenever necessary accurately to reflect developing scientific knowledge.

"(3) The Surgeon General shall submit an annual report to the Congress with respect to the administration of this subsection. Such report shall include a list of air-pollution agents for which criteria have been established under paragraph (1), and the status of research on known air-pollution agents with respect to which such criteria have not previously been published or with respect to which the criteria previously published under paragraph (1) are not complete."

The summary presented by Mr. CASE is as follows:

SUMMARY OF THE PROVISIONS OF SENATOR CASE'S BILL TO DIRECT THE SURGEON GENERAL TO ESTABLISH AND PUBLISH CRITERIA USEFUL IN INDICATING THE HARMFUL EFFECTS OF VARIOUS AIR POLLUTION AGENTS

The bill would amend the 1955 act relating to air pollution control, adding three new provisions:

1. While the 1955 act authorizes the Surgeon General to carry out research activities relating to air pollution, this bill specifically directs the Surgeon General to conduct research on, and to survey the results of other scientific studies on, the harmful effects of air pollution agents.

2. The Surgeon General is directed to establish and publish criteria indicating the harmful effects on the public health or the general welfare of different levels of various air pollution agents. The Surgeon General would publish such criteria for informational purposes only, and he would revise or add to them as new scientific knowledge warranted.

3. The Surgeon General would report annually to the Congress on the progress made and on the status of research on air pollution agents where criteria had not yet been established and published.

HUMANE TREATMENT OF CERTAIN ANIMALS

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to provide for the humane treatment of animals used in research and training by agencies of the United States and by recipients of grants from governmental agencies.

Efforts to achieve such protection for experimental animals in the United States have in previous years generated rather heated controversy between some segments of the scientific community and those who have pressed for animal protection.

A similar controversy prevailed, prior to passage of the Humane Slaughter Act in the 87th Congress, between the commercial meatpackers of America and the various humane societies. However, I believe there now prevails a fairly general consensus that the act has contributed significantly to more humane treatment of animals without working to the economic detriment of the meatpacking industry.

It is my opinion, Mr. President, based on my own study as well as the testimony of experimental scientists, that proposals for the humane treatment of experimental animals submitted to the Congress in previous years have contained provisions which might unnecessarily hamper the orderly progress of scientific research. It is for this reason that the measure I propose would place the appraisal and enforcement activities within the present grant-making structure of Federal agencies disbursing research and training funds, and thus encourage the scientific community to police its own ranks in this respect.

I would hope that when and if hearings are conducted on the pending measure it will facilitate a more meaningful level of discourse between experimental scientists and those who are primarily concerned with the humane treatment of animals.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill—S. 1041—to provide for the humane care and treatment of vertebrate animals used in research, experiments, testing, or training by departments, agencies, and instrumentalities of the United States and by recipients of grants and awards from the United States, and to encourage the study and development of new methods of minimizing pain and discomfort of animals used for such purposes, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. RANDOLPH, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

CONSERVATION OF ANADROMOUS FISH SPAWNING AREAS IN THE SALMON RIVER, IDAHO

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, Mrs. NEUBERGER, and Mr. ENGLE, I introduce, for appropriate reference, the Salmon River preservation bill, a measure to provide for the conservation of anadromous fish spawning areas on the Salmon River, in the State of Idaho. The bill would prohibit the Federal Power Commission from authorizing any structures on the Salmon River which would restrict the passage of anadromous fish to reach spawning areas or which would flood established spawning grounds.

I introduced a similar measure in the 86th Congress, cosponsored by the late great Senator from Oregon, Richard L. Neuberger. That bill, after referral to the Senate Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, was the subject of extensive hearings in Lewiston, Idaho, in November 1959. Over 50 witnesses testified, and although overwhelming support was expressed for the basic objective of the bill, many expressed the view that its prohibiting language should be strengthened. Therefore, in the opening days of the 2d session of the 86th Congress, Senator Neuberger and I introduced a strengthening amendment.

No action was taken in the 86th Congress, so the bill, with minor revisions, was again introduced in the early days of the 87th Congress, this time, on behalf of myself, the distinguished junior Senator from Oregon, and the distinguished junior Senator from California. The bill I introduce today is identical to that introduced in the 87th Congress, and I again want to emphasize the importance for favorable action on this measure.

The nursery areas for Chinook salmon in Idaho are found in the high mountain valleys of the central part of the State. The Middle Fork of the Salmon, widely known as the River of No Return, runs almost entirely through primitive areas from its headwaters in Bear Valley, including its tributaries, Sulphur Creek, Marsh Creek, Loon Creek, and Big Creek. The main Salmon, which rises in the uplands of the Sawtooth Mountains and its tributaries like Yankee Fork Creek, the Pahsimeroi, and the Lemhi, also have retained their natural character.

This vast nursery area is of immense significance to the great number of sportsmen in my State, as well as to the great anadromous fish resource of the Northwest. No other river system contributes so heavily to the Chinook runs. No other river system has so long escaped the works of man. And no amount of protection in the spawning areas avails us if the fish cannot get to them.

Evidence indicates that projected development of the upper Columbia will reduce the spawning there as the reservoir areas and slack water encroach upon spawning grounds. The Salmon River's importance as the principal spawning stream will proportionately increase.

Salmon fishing has become a favorite sport for thousands of Idahoans. In addition, Idaho attracts fishermen from all over the Nation, and this, in turn, is a boost to the economy of the State. But fishing for these salmon is more than just a sport, for, as you all know, once caught, the salmon is one of the tastiest of fish. Indeed, it is now widely appreciated that the anadromous fishery resource in the Columbia River Basin is of major economic importance to the area.

It is, therefore, imperative that a solution be found to protect and perpetuate the salmon. By enacting this bill, the Congress would express its will that the solution to the fish-passage problem past high dams be worked out before any structures restricting fish passage are built on the Salmon River, whether for power, flood control, or otherwise.

Fortunately, such a prohibition against dam construction on the Salmon River will have no detrimental effect on the economy or the growth of Idaho or the Northwest. For many years to come, we have sufficient damsites available on our other major rivers to provide all of the water storage, the power, the flood control, and the navigational benefits that the growing needs of the Northwest may require.

The desirability of this bill entitles it to sympathetic consideration in the Congress. A similar bill introduced in the 87th Congress—S. 323—was the subject of hearings conducted by the Senate Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, held in October of 1961, at Seattle, Wash. These hearings again demonstrated the need for, and the overwhelming support of, this measure. The future of one of our greatest outdoor sports, and that of one of the Northwest's important industries may depend on this measure, Mr. President, so I am hopeful that the Congress will meet its responsibility by enacting it in this session.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed at this point in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill—S. 1043—to provide for the conservation of anadromous fish spawning areas in the Salmon River, Idaho, introduced by Mr. CHURCH (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Commerce, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That in recognition of the fact that the Salmon River and its tributaries constitute one of the principal spawning areas of anadromous fish from the Pacific Ocean, it is the purpose of this Act to prohibit, until developments justify a change in this policy, the authorization of structures on the Salmon River that would restrict the passage of such fish to reach spawning areas or which would flood established spawning grounds.

SEC. 2. The Federal Power Commission shall not authorize under the provisions of the Federal Power Act a structure for the storage or collection of water or the development of power on the Salmon River in Idaho or its tributaries which would restrict the passage of anadromous fish, or which would flood established spawning grounds.

SEC. 3. The Secretary of the Interior shall report to the Congress developments in fish conservation or in the construction of dams and reservoirs that in his opinion justify amending the provisions of this Act.

AMENDMENT OF DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA ELECTION LAWS

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill amending the District of Columbia election laws.

In 1960, there were 75,660 registered voters in the District of Columbia. According to the District of Columbia Board of Elections, of the 75,660 registered voters, approximately 30,025 cast their ballots. In my judgment these figures are not a credit to the citizens of the Nation's Capital.

In 1960, Congress adopted legislation imposing restrictions on citizens seeking to register to vote. The action taken by Congress, in my judgment, was a serious mistake. Rather than making it difficult for people to register we should be making it easier. This is especially true in the District of Columbia where its citizens will for the first time be able to vote for President and Vice President and have not been conditioned to register and vote. Thus, it is imperative that if there is to be a reasonably large vote next year in the primary and general elections in the Nation's Capital every effort must be made now to get citizens registered and the election machinery set up to handle the vast amount of work which must be done. We all know what criticism we will hear if there is a small turnout at the polls.

According to the 1960 census, 509,110 persons 21 years or older resided in the District of Columbia. I think the Board of Elections is doing a lot of wishful thinking when it estimates that 100,000 persons will vote in the 1964 May primary election and 250,000 persons will vote in the 1964 November election. The estimated 100,000 voters in next year's primary election is roughly double those who voted in 1956, and triple those who voted in 1960. Next year's November election estimate prepared by the Board is approximately seven times those who voted in 1960 and six times those who voted in 1956. Unless the Board of Elections and the two political parties in the District of Columbia have been doing a lot of work that I am completely unaware of, I am at a complete loss to understand how such estimates were reached.

Under the present provisions of the District of Columbia Code, the board of elections is required only to maintain a registry. The 1961 amendment to the code deleted the word "permanent" in this regard. My bill restores the permanent character of such registry.

The code also provides that a person may vote only if he is a qualified elector and if he registers in the District of Columbia during the year in which such election is to be held. This means that there must be complete reregistration of voters for each election. Under my amendment, a single registration will suffice to meet the requirement in any election, and a person so registered may vote if he is otherwise qualified as an elector.

My bill provides that the registry shall be closed Sundays and holidays and during the 30-day period immediately preceding any election. In addition, it provides, first, for the establishment and maintenance of official registry offices; second, that such registry offices shall be open during the normal business hours of each day; and, third, that during the 10-day period immediately preceding the date of closing the registry for any election, that is, the date of the beginning of the 30-day period immediately preceding any election—the registry offices shall not close before 9:30 p.m.

In essence, my amendment provides for the establishment of registry offices and regulates the hours of operation of such offices. The present statute only infers such authority from the general grant of authority to maintain a registry and to prescribe rules and regulations necessary to carry out the provisions of the act.

The act currently provides that the registry shall be open from January 1 until 45 days before the first Tuesday following the first Monday in November during each presidential election year except the 45-day period which ends on the first Tuesday in May, and except as provided by the board of elections in the case of a special election.

The remaining provision of my bill would add two new sections to the District of Columbia Code. These sections provide for the following:

That the board of elections shall appoint two deputy registrars from each voting precinct in the District of Columbia. Their duties would be to assist registrars in conducting registration and to register or change registration of any eligible citizen residing in the precinct from which such registrars were appointed. Such registration by a deputy registrar could be at any time other than during the period that the registry is closed for an election as provided in my bill.

In the selection of deputy registrars each political party which has had its candidate elected as President of the United States after January 1, 1950, and prior to the date of the enactment of my bill, shall be entitled to have a member of its party appointed as one of the two deputy registrars appointed in each precinct.

In effect, my bill guarantees that one Democratic Party and one Republican Party member shall be appointed as a deputy registrar in each precinct.

My bill provides a training program for all appointed deputy registrars conducted by the board of elections.

The District of Columbia Commissioners would fix the rate of compensation without reference to the Classification Act of 1949, as amended.

The District of Columbia as a Federal city stands as a symbol as the Capital of a democratic nation and the Capital of the free world. We are faced in this city with a unique situation with the people being given the opportunity to vote for President and Vice President for the first time. The election machinery is not well established and the political parties are not well organized. There is a tremendous amount of work to be done between now and the November election in 1964 and I am fearful that far too few party leaders and District officials are aware of this.

In my judgment, Mr. President, unless people are permitted to begin registering soon, I have serious doubts whether many more people will register and vote in 1964 than in 1960. Because of my firm belief that every eligible citizen has a duty and responsibility to register and vote in elections, and because I think we should make it as easy as possible for them to do so, I introduce my bill today.

I sincerely hope that hearings can be scheduled on my bill at an early date because if action is not taken on it soon, there will be little need to take action until after the 1964 elections. I am hopeful that the measure will receive the support of the White House, the two national committees of our political parties, and the two local political committees, as well as other organizations in the community.

I ask that the text of the bill and a summary outline of its contents be printed at this point in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill and summary will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1047) to amend the act of August 12, 1955 (69 Stat. 699), relating to elections in the District of Columbia, introduced by Mr. MORSE, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) paragraph (1) of subsection (a) of section 5 of the Act entitled "An Act to regulate the election in the District of Columbia of electors of President and Vice President of the United States and of delegates representing the District of Columbia to national political conventions, and for other purposes", approved August 12, 1955 (69 Stat. 699; D.C. Code, sec. 1–1101), is amended by inserting "permanent" immediately before "registry".

(b) Subsection (a) of section 7 of such Act is amended by striking out "he registers in the District during the year in which such election is to be held" and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "is registered in the District".

(c) Subsection (d) of section 7 of such Act is amended to read as follows:

"(d) The registry shall be kept open except during the thirty-day period immediately preceding any election held pursuant to this Act. In conducting registrations under this Act, the Board shall establish and maintain official registry offices which shall be open for registration or changes of registration during the normal hours of business of each day (other than Sundays and holidays) during the period that the registry is open; except that for the ten-day period immediately preceding the date of closing the registry for any election, such offices shall not be closed prior to 9:30 p.m."

(d) Section 7 of such Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsections:

"(f) For the purpose of assisting registrars in conducting registrations under this Act, the Board of Elections shall appoint two deputy registrars from each voting precinct in the District. Each political party which has had its candidate elected as President of the United States after January 1, 1950, and prior to the date of enactment of this subsection shall be entitled to have a member of its party appointed as one of the two deputy registrars so appointed in each precinct. It shall be the duty of such deputy registrars to register or change the registration of any eligible citizen residing in the precinct from which such registrars were appointed upon application by such citizen in accordance with the provisions of this Act. Any such deputy registrar may register or change the registration of any such eligible citizen at any time other than during a period that the registry is closed for an election as provided under subsection (d) of this section. The Board of Elections shall establish a training program for all deputy registrars so appointed. Deputy registrars appointed under this subsection shall be compensated for their services at a rate of compensation fixed by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, without reference to the provisions of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended.

"(g) If any person registered in the District and otherwise qualified to vote in a general election in the District fails to cast a ballot in that election, such person's name shall be removed from the permanent registry and he shall not thereafter be entitled to vote in any election held under this Act unless he again registers in accordance with the provisions thereof."

The summary presented by Mr. MORSE is, as follows:

The Morse election bill provides for the following:

(1) Permanent registration;

(2) Registration permitted at any time during the year except for 30-day period immediately preceding any election;

(3) Establishes registry offices and regulates the hours of operation of such offices;

(4) Appointment of two deputy registrars from each voting precinct to register any eligible citizen residing within the voting precinct at any time other than 30-day period that registry is closed prior to an election;

(5) Democratic and Republican member appointed deputy registrar in each precinct;

(6) Training program for deputy registrars conducted by Board of Elections;

(7) Compensation to be fixed by District Commissioners without reference to the Classification Act of 1949, as amended.

THE MARIGOLD AS THE NATIONAL FLOWER

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, the rather cold and distressing weather which has enveloped the earth has doubtless made people conjecture as to whether spring would ever come. I find great comfort in the lines of Shelley:

> If winter comes, can spring be far behind?

So, Mr. President, unless some supernal force disturbes the procession of the seasons, there will be spring; and when spring comes, there will be flowers. We shall be delighted with the earlier flowers—the tulips, the daffodils, the redbud, and the dogwood blossoms.

A little later will come all the delightful annual flowers, which nature compels us to cultivate every year, but leaves a residue of seed which makes them almost perpetual. They will include the humble but beautiful petunia, the zinnia and the calendula, and also the marigold.

Two or three years ago, I introduced a joint resolution to make the marigold the national flower. That stirred quite a controversy; and, as a result, the corn tassel and the rose and other flowers were advanced as candidates for our national floral emblem.

But I still find myself wedded to the marigold—robust, rugged, bright, stately, single colored and multicolored, somehow able to resist the onslaught of insects; it takes in its stride extreme changes in temperature, and fights back the scorching sun in summer and the chill of early spring evenings. What a flower the marigold is. I am looking forward to the time when these gay flowers will salute and intrigue our sense of beauty.

So, Mr. President, once more I find myself impelled to introduce a joint resolution to make the American marigold—its botanical name is Tagetes erecta—the national flower of our country.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I merely wish to ask our distinguished minority leader a question: Of what country is the marigold a native?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mexico, I believe.

Mr. AIKEN. At any rate, it is not the United States?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes. As a matter of fact, the marigold started in Mexico as something of a wild flower. It was taken to Europe, and there was hybridized and improved; and then, at long last, the American nurserymen took it up. What a magnificent thing they have made of the marigold. What I like about it is that it will flourish in soil not blessed with fertility. It takes on every stage of weather. It marches through three of the four seasons—through spring, summer, and autumn—until at long last the heavy frosts of early winter finally make it fold.

But what a wonderful flower it is, and what rich dividends in beauty one receives for such a minimum of care, because its nurture requires so little attention.

Mr. AIKEN. So the Senator from Illinois is saying that the marigold went to school in Europe. But has it been naturalized since its return?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Oh, yes, Mr. President; our nurserymen have naturalized it, and have cultivated it, and have refined it into the thing of beauty it really is. I can think of no other variety of flower that with its gay colors so beautifully salutes the human eye with its grace.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Under the 3-minute limitation of the morning hour, the time available to the Senator from Illinois has expired.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, in view of the extraordinarily exhilarating speech the distinguished minority leader is making, plus the sound advice being given by the Senate's first expert on agriculture, Mr. Vermont, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Illinois be allowed 15 additional minutes. [Laughter.]

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none; and the Senator from Illinois is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. DIRKSEN. O, Mr. President, I shall not take 15 minutes, because it takes only a moment for one to express the sense that is in his heart about the beauty of flowers.

I remember what Wordsworth wrote in his poem on the daffodils:

> Ten thousand saw I at a glance,
> Tossing their heads in a sprightly dance.

In those two lines Wordsworth captured a sentiment which probably I could not capture if I took not only the 15 minutes allowed me, but even much more time, in order to extol the grace, the beauty, and the loveliness of that flower.

But I still think the marigold is extraordinarily rich in dividends for everyone. As a consequence, I enter it as a contender, because the carnation was entered when a seminar on the national floral emblem was held in the Caucus Room 2 or 3 years ago. The rose also was entered; likewise, the corn tassel was entered; and I presume that others were suggested.

So, Mr. President, in order to make sure that our discriminating public will have a chance to evaluate the importance of the matter and to make a decision, I very humbly submit the marigold.

Mr. AIKEN. I would not desire to say anything which would discredit the marigold, because it certainly provides a great deal of color for a few cents of expense. I point out that Wisconsin has the violet, which is a native American flower, and of which there are 100 species or more. We have phlox, many species of which are native to Illinois.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The violet is the official flower of my State.

Mr. AIKEN. Which violet?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Well, just any violet.

Mr. AIKEN. The violet in Wisconsin is Viola Pedata bicolor. I do not know what the Illinois violet is. But the violet is a wonderful flower. So is the rose. We have many native species of roses, although perhaps some of the high-colored packaged ones have been developed. We are developing the rose in our country probably more than it is being developed in any other country at the present time.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I am sure we are.

Mr. AIKEN. All but one known species of phlox is native to the United States. It was taken to Europe and became educated, too. The phlox species came back here with all the colors of the rainbow, wearing Paris gowns, and so forth.

Mr. DIRKSEN. My trouble with phlox is as follows: The rabbits will let the salvia alone, and they will not bother the pansies. They will not bother the petunias. But the rabbit is a discriminating animal. He always nibbles off my phlox.

Mr. AIKEN. But the rabbit does not nibble the marigold. He does not like its flavor.

Mr. DIRKSEN. It has a distinctive flavor.

Mr. AIKEN. It has a distinctive smell, too.

Mr. DIRKSEN. It has a distinctive fragrance all its own.

I have been informed that the Vice President is having difficulty in hearing us.

Mr. AIKEN. The blue bonnet is an annual, if the Vice President is thinking of some flower that is native to Texas. The blue bonnet is a beautiful flower; it is the State flower of Texas but it is not a perennial. Seeds must be planted every year. Marigold seeds must be planted every year, too.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The marigold is an annual also.

Mr. AIKEN. Yes.

Mr. DIRKSEN. But nature has wisely provided at the end of the season a seed, which is stored, and in the following spring there it is for perpetuation of the flower and to make possible improvement of the strain.

Mr. AIKEN. That is true, but whether we should consider adopting an alien as our national flower——

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair is having difficulty hearing the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. Whether we should consider adopting an alien as a national flower of the United States is a question which is, to say the least, subject to considerable debate. We do not permit an alien to be President of the United States.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I end where I began. I bring comfort to those who think that, perhaps, because of the unseasonable weather which we have had all over the country, there will be no spring. But Shelley wrote it beautifully when he said:

> If winter comes, can spring be far behind?

Mr. President, I introduce the joint resolution for appropriate reference.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 57) designating the American marigold (Tagetes erecta) as the national floral emblem of the United States, introduced by Mr. Dirksen, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. ERVIN. At the outset I should like to say that if spring has heard the beguiling words of the young man from Illinois, it will come hurrying to us on impatient feet with the perfume of flowers and thoughts of love.

APPOINTMENT TO BOARD OF VISITORS TO COAST GUARD ACADEMY

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, as chairman of the Committee on Commerce, I wish to announce that I have appointed the Senator from Alaska [Mr. Bartlett] and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. Beall] as members of the Board of Visitors to the U.S. Coast Guard Academy.

APPOINTMENT TO BOARD OF VISITORS TO U.S. MERCHANT MARINE ACADEMY

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, as chairman of the Committee on Commerce, I wish to announce that I have appointed the Senator from California [Mr. Engle] and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. Scott] as members of the Board of Visitors to the U.S. Merchant Marine Academy.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Rules and Administration be discharged from further consideration of Senate Joint Resolution 15, and that the joint resolution be referred to the Committee on Public Works.

Senate Joint Resolution 15, which would authorize the construction of a monument to James Madison, is substantially identical to Senate Joint Resolution 119 of the 87th Congress, on which hearings were held last year by the Committee on Public Works. If this request is granted, I am reliably advised that the Committee on Public Works, because of its previous study of the proposal involved, would be able to report the bill to the Senate at an early date.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the Committee on Rules and Administration is discharged from further consideration of the bill, and the bill will be re-referred to the Committee on Public Works.

FLYING THE AMERICAN FLAG OVER THE REMAINS OF THE U.S.S. "UTAH" — ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILL

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, at its next printing, I ask unanimous consent that the names of Senators Williams of New Jersey and Bartlett may be added to the bill (S. 703) to provide for the flying of the American flag over the remains of the U.S.S. *Utah* in honor of the heroic men who were entombed in her hull on December 7, 1941, introduced by me on February 5, 1963.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ESTABLISHMENT OF THE NATIONAL ACADEMY OF FOREIGN AFFAIRS—ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILL

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at the next printing of the bill (S. 865) to provide for the establishment of the National Academy of Foreign Affairs, the names of the junior Senator from Maryland [Mr. Brewster] and the senior Senator from New York [Mr. Javits] be added as cosponsors.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILLS

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the names of Senator Kuchel, Senator Curtis, and Senator Fong be added as cosponsors to S. 869, the bill which I introduced to provide for the burial of certain news correspondents in national cemeteries.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the name of Senator Douglas be added as a cosponsor to S. 1009, to improve, strengthen, and accelerate programs for the prevention and abatement of air pollution.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

HONORARY CITIZENSHIP FOR SIR WINSTON CHURCHILL—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF JOINT RESOLUTION

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, earlier in this session, in January, I introduced Senate Joint Resolution 3 authorizing the President of the United States to issue a proclamation declaring Sir Winston Churchill to be an honorary citizen of the United States of America. My colleague, the distinguished junior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. Byrd], wishes to be listed as a cosponsor of the joint resolution at its next printing.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION

Under authority of the orders of the Senate of February 28, 1962, the following names have been added as additional cosponsors for the following bills and joint resolution:

S. 943. A bill to provide for denial of passports to supporters of the international Communist movement, for review of passport denials, and for other purposes: Mr. Dodd and Mr. Dominick.

S. 956. A bill providing a program of financial assistance to the States for the construction of public community colleges: Mr. Scott.

S. 957. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to require the marking of lumber and wood products to indicate to the ultimate purchaser in the United States the name of the country of origin: Mr. Allott, Mr. McClellan, Mr. Mundt, Mr. Simpson, Mr. Tower, and Mr. Young of North Dakota.

S. 958. A bill to amend the National Housing Act to provide that only lumber and other wood products which have been produced in the United States may be used in construction or rehabilitation covered by Federal Housing Administration insured mortgages: Mr. Allott, Mr. McClellan, Mr. Mundt, Mr. Simpson, Mr. Tower, and Mr. Young of North Dakota.

S. 960. A bill to establish the Joint Committee on Defense and Space Contracts, and for other purposes: Mr. Dominick, Mr. Douglas, Mrs. Neuberger, Mr. Proxmire, and Mr. Williams of Delaware.

S. 961. A bill to require public disclosure of certain information concerning the award of contracts entered into by the Armed Forces and by the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, and for other purposes: Mr. Dominick, Mr. Douglas, Mr. Kuchel, Mrs. Neuberger, Mr. Proxmire, and Mr. Williams of Delaware.

S. 962. A bill to amend section 22 of the act of August 24, 1935, as amended (49 Stat. 773; 7 U.S.C. 624), to require the Secretary of Agriculture to include lumber and wood products as an agricultural commodity under the act: Mr. Allott, Mr. McClellan, Mr. Mundt, Mr. Simpson, Mr. Tower, and Mr. Young of North Dakota.

S.J. Res. 56. Joint resolution requesting and authorizing the President to impose an immediate 6-percent emergency quota on all imports of softwood lumber: Mr. ALLOTT, Mr. DOMINICK, Mr. ERVIN, Mr. MCCLELLAN, Mr. MUNDT, Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. TOWER, and Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota.

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF JOHN W. DOUGLAS TO BE AN ASSISTANT ATTORNEY GENERAL

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Thursday, March 14, 1963, at 10:30 a.m., in room 2300 New Senate Office Building, on the nomination of John W. Douglas, of Maryland, to be an Assistant Attorney General, vice William H. Orrick, Jr., resigned.

At the indicated time and place persons interested in the hearing may make such representations as may be pertinent.

NOTICE OF RESCHEDULING OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF CARL E. McGOWAN, TO BE U.S. CIRCUIT JUDGE, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CIRCUIT

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been rescheduled for Tuesday, March 12, 1963, at 10:30 a.m., in room 2300 New Senate Office Building, on the nomination of Carl E. McGowan, of Illinois, to be U.S. circuit judge, District of Columbia Circuit, vice Henry W. Edgerton, retiring.

At the indicated time and place persons interested in the hearings may make such representations as may be pertinent.

The subcommittee consists of the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], chairman, the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA], and myself.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

By Mr. PASTORE:

Address delivered by Senator HARTKE at the luncheon session of the eighth annual conference of State Broadcasters Association presidents.

By Mr. RANDOLPH:

Editorial entitled "Honoring Sir Winston," from the Washington Post of March 4, 1963; editorial entitled "Citizen Churchill," from the Washington Post of March 6, 1963; excerpts from an article entitled "Urgency Noted on Citizenship for Churchill," written by Edward T. Folliard and published in the Washington Post of January 13, 1963; also an exchange of correspondence between Sir Winston Churchill and Senator RANDOLPH.

TRIBUTE TO SENATOR ROBERTSON, OF VIRGINIA

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, Virginia and the Nation are indeed fortunate to have in the Senate an outstanding Member of the calibre of its junior Senator [Mr. ROBERTSON].

Here is a man whose unfaltering dedication to duty knows no bounds, whose untiring love for hard work makes no task too large or too difficult to undertake, and whose devotion to the principles of our republican government as laid down by our forefathers is steadfast.

Senator ROBERTSON has served his State and Nation in the Congress for 3 decades, and I join his many friends and associates in saluting him. On March 4, 1963, the Richmond News Leader published an excellent article marking the 30th anniversary in the Congress of the junior Senator from Virginia.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THIRTY YEARS IN CONGRESS—ROBERTSON OBSERVES BIG DAY BY WORKING

WASHINGTON, March 4.—Senator A. WILLIS ROBERTSON celebrated his 30th anniversary of congressional service today—and the occasion was to be just another working day for a man who has seen 10,000 such days come and go in Washington.

He started it as he has started every day since he was in training as a football player at Richmond College nearly 60 years ago, when he learned to begin each day with sitting-up exercises, a brisk walk, and a hearty breakfast.

Predictably, he will end the day with a workout in the Senate gymnasium, a light dinner and an hour or so of reading before retiring early to bed.

During the course of the day, he will have made a speech on the Senate floor, dictated replies to an estimated 100 or so letters from constituents, and conferred with professional staff members of two separate committees to schedule the hearings he will conduct with a minimum of overlapping.

He also will have put a little more polish on a major address he is preparing in which he will urge substantial budget cuts to offset a tax reduction he feels sure is in the making.

ROBERTSON, who will be 76 on March 27, stands 6-foot-2 and weighs the same (190 pounds) as he did when he took the oath of office as a Member of the House of Representatives in 1933.

DEMONSTRATED AGILITY

On his last birthday, he demonstrated for a skeptical reporter his ability to kick his hand when held straight out (a loosening-up exercise much favored by football punters and placekickers).

His working habits follow much the same pattern as that established by his fondness for regular physical exercise. He has never tried to emulate Caesar's feat of dictating to eight stenographers at the same time. But it is not unusual for him to stride through the rooms in his office suite giving instructions over his shoulder to each employee he passes to "find out so-and-so" or to "get me such-and-such" or "tell him I say * * *" or "find out if * * *" and then depart for the floor to make a speech or cast a vote.

When he returns, he expects the answers to be waiting for him. He is not accustomed to being disappointed in this respect.

While speaking on the floor—or while dictating in his office—ROBERTSON falls into the habit of pacing two steps back and forth, hands clasped behind his back, head turning, and voice rising and falling with modulated emphasis.

On the floor of the Senate, this restless pacing has worn the carpet behind his desk in a definite pattern. In lengthy discussion, ROBERTSON says, pacing keeps him from becoming tired and sluggish, mentally as well as physically.

Over the years in Congress, ROBERTSON is best known perhaps for his legislation in the banking field on the Senate side and for the major tax bills and conservation legislation he wrote in the House.

His political philosophy is patterned on the principles of Thomas Jefferson and Woodrow Wilson. His economic philosophy is based at least partly on the belief that neither men nor nations can spend themselves into prosperity with money they have not worked to earn.

A descendant of early Virginia colonists, ROBERTSON has always taken a keen personal interest in the history of colonial Virginia and in the period in which the Constitution was being shaped by Jefferson and other Virginians of his day.

ROBERTSON's father's grandfather, 12 generations removed, came to Jamestown with Governor Yeardley in 1619 as surgeon to the troops brought over for the protection of the Virginia settlers. Three of his mother's ancestors served in the Virginia Convention of 1788, which ratified the Philadelphia Constitution.

Ever since he started hunting and fishing, as a boy of 12 on his grandfather's farm in Culpeper, ROBERTSON's principal recreation has been field sports.

Even in his relaxation, however, his physical restlessness asserts itself. ROBERTSON is not so fond of still hunting, from a duck blind or a deer stand, as he is of tramping the fields for quail, grouse and pheasant shooting.

In his climb up the political ladder—through service in the State senate, as Rockbridge County commonwealth's attorney, as first chairman of the Virginia Game Commission, as Seventh District Representative and as junior U.S. Senator—ROBERTSON has never lost an election. In his last race, for reelection to the Senate in 1960, he rolled up the largest vote ever cast for any candidate in a Virginia election (including presidential balloting) and was returned for his current term with the biggest majority ever accorded to a candidate in a statewide election.

But neither Senator ROBERTSON nor Senator BYRD, who today completed 30 years of service in the Senate, is the dean of Virginia's congressional delegation.

The deanship is claimed by Representative HOWARD W. "JUDGE" SMITH, who entered the House 2 years before Franklin D. Roosevelt's first inauguration.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TALMADGE. I am happy to yield to the distinguished Senator from Virginia.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I wish to express my deep appreciation to the Senator from Georgia for a tribute that is very kind, generous, and flattering to the junior Senator from Virginia. I thank my colleague.

Mr. TALMADGE. I know of no Senator who is more worthy of any tribute that could be paid by either the junior Senator from Georgia or the distinguished newspaper in the State which he has the honor to serve in the Senate.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM AND ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT UNTIL TOMORROW

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I should like to ask the distinguished majority leader a question about the legislative program. I understand there are to be some lengthy speeches today. I should like to know whether it is contemplated that we will get to the so-called outdoor recreation bill today. It is a controversial measure, and I expect to ask for a yea-and-nay vote on it in due course.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, in response to the question raised by the distinguished minority leader, it is my understanding that the distinguished senior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] gave notice several days ago that he intended to make his annual report to the Senate on the basis of his inspection tours overseas late last year, and that the distinguished Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON] likewise has remarks to deliver, which I understand will be of some duration, having to do with reductions in the budget.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield to the Senator from Virginia.

Mr. ROBERTSON. On Monday I notified the clerk of the distinguished majority leader that I was preparing a speech and desired assurance that the Senate would be in session on Thursday. I was informed that it would be. I said that that was when I would ask to be recognized. I have given copies of my address to the press for release in this afternoon's newspapers.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] also called the leadership and asked whether we were going to meet on Thursday. He desired to be prepared to deliver his address today also. From listening to previous speeches made by the Senator from Louisiana I would say that his remarks would be well worth listening to, as, of course, would be the speech of the distinguished Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON].

Then I understand that the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] has a speech which he wishes to deliver today. Those speeches would indicate that a good portion of the afternoon might be taken up in that manner. However, the leadership did notify the Senate earlier this week that the bill (S. 20) to promote the coordination and development of effective Federal and State programs relating to outdoor recreation, and for other purposes would be called up today. It is the intention of the leadership to call up that bill today. If consideration of the measure is not completed today, I ask unanimous consent at this time that when the Senate adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 12 o'clock tomorrow.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Following action on that measure it is the intention of the leadership to call up the bill (S. 812) to provide for the release of restrictions and reservations on certain real property heretofore conveyed to the State of Arkansas by the United States of America, and also the bill (S. 816), for the establishment of a Commission on Science and Technology.

That is what the future portends for us in the way of proposed legislation now on the calendar.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. McCLELLAN. When did the majority leader state that the bill to establish a Commission on Science and Technology will be called up?

Mr. MANSFIELD. That bill and the other bill reported by the Committee on Government Operations, of which the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN] is the chairman, relative to the release of restrictions and reservations on certain real property heretofore conveyed to the State of Arkansas by the United States of America, would follow action on the bill related to outdoor recreation, which will at least be laid before the Senate today. If action is not completed on that measure today, we will meet tomorrow, and upon that bill being taken up, I understand that the distinguished minority leader, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] has indicated that it is his intention to oppose it and to call for a yea-and-nay vote on it. At the conclusion of action on the outdoor recreation bill the two bills reported by the Committee on Government Operations will be brought up for consideration.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Will that be this afternoon, or tomorrow?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Not this afternoon, the way things are going.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Some time tomorrow?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I hope so.

Mr. McCLELLAN. If the Senator will yield further, am I to understand that the distinguished minority leader will oppose the two bills reported from my committee?

Mr. DIRKSEN. No.

Mr. MANSFIELD. No. The Senator will oppose the outdoor recreation bill, reported from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I should like to ask the majority leader a further question.

The majority leader observed last week that there was little likelihood, if any likelihood at all, of an Easter recess.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Yes.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I know the distinguished assistant majority leader uttered a brave entreaty on this floor when the bad news came. I note, upon examining the RECORD, that he said, "O, Senator. O, Leader." And he was greatly discomforted.

I thought that between then and now the distinguished majority leader might have had occasion to reexamine all the premises and bring the Senate a little comfort with respect to an Easter recess.

Mr. MANSFIELD. May I say, in reply, "No comfort. No hope."

UNNECESSARY EXPENDITURES BY THE DEFENSE DEPARTMENT OF $21 MILLION

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, the Comptroller General has called our attention to three examples involving unnecessary expenditures of over $21 million in the procurement program of the Defense Department.

The first instance disclosed Army plans to buy at a cost of about $6.3 million 1,365 unneeded generator sets as a result of failure: First, to provide for the continued use of acceptable substitute 30-kilowatt generators already on hand; second, to consider a reduction in the need for generators because of the conversion to commercial power sources; third, to use the actual rather than the estimated wear-out rates in determining the need to procure new generators; and fourth, to utilize 10-kilowatt generators available in the Department of the Navy.

The Comptroller General stated that at Fort Bliss the Army disposed of 59 generators—30 kilowatts—in excellent condition as excess property, and 57 of these were disposd of at public sale for an average of about $150 per generator. The Army then purchased new 45-kilowatt replacements at a cost of $4,879.

After the Comptroller General questioned this action on the basis that these good 30-kilowatt generators could be used as a substitute for the 45-kilowatt generators on procurement, the Corps of Engineers then canceled orders for 466 generators in fiscal 1961—worth $2.2 million. They eliminated planned procurement for 1962 of 484 generators worth $2.4 million and filled their requirements from existing stocks of generators as recommended by the Comptroller General.

There is no reason for the procurement officers of the Army to have been selling these new generators as surplus at ridiculously low prices when at the same time they were buying new generators.

Second. The Comptroller General cites an instance wherein the Government incurred unnecessary costs of about $5 million in fiscal 1960 to rebuild unused deteriorated tracks for tanks and other combat vehicles because the Army had allowed its inventory of such tracks to deteriorate while in storage.

The Comptroller General charged that this deterioration of the stock of rubber tracks was caused by failure to: First, issue oldest tracks first by a slight modification of the tracks; second, furnish tracks to contractors for use in production of new vehicles; and third, protect the tracks by storing them inside.

In this report the Comptroller General again calls attention to a glaring example of the calloused attitude of the procurement officers of the Defense Department in regard to spending the taxpayers' money. The bulk of these unnecessary costs resulted from the complete failure of the Defense Department to use its oldest inventory first and, to make the situation even worse, these rubber tracks were stored outside rather than being placed in a warehouse where they could be protected from the weather.

Third. The Comptroller General cited a third instance wherein the Defense Department under eight negotiated contracts involving petroleum storage will incur about $10.3 million in higher costs than necessary.

I quote from the Comptroller General's report of February 28, 1963:

> Our review disclosed that, in order to satisfy Department of the Air Force requirements, the Defense Petroleum Supply Center negotiated eight contracts for petroleum storage in new dispersed and protected commercial facilities and, as a result, the Government will incur about $10.3 million higher costs than if similar Government facilities had been acquired. The increased costs will amount to almost one-third of the Government's total expenditures for the fixed periods of the contracts, and the Government will not have title to the facilities unless an additional $9 million is paid. The increased costs result primarily because contract prices include funds needed by contractors to finance construction of commercial facilities within relatively short periods.
>
> We found no evidence that Air Force officials had compared the costs of commercial facilities with the costs of Government facilities before decisions were made to contract for commercial facilities. Had such comparisons been made, they should have disclosed that disproportionately higher costs would be incurred for storage in commercial facilities and that contracting for storage in Government facilities would result in substantial savings to the Government.

Administration officials have challenged those of us who think that the budget can be cut, to show specific examples of where to start.

I give them one suggestion which if adopted would save hundreds of millions of dollars annually; and that is that they insist upon the procurement officers of the Defense Department exercising the same degree of good commonsense in handling the taxpayers' money as they would in spending their own.

At this point I ask unanimous consent that the letters of the Comptroller General which accompanied these three reports of February 26, 27, and 28, be printed at this point, and I suggest that both the Congress and the Defense Department read these reports in their entirety.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COMPTROLLER GENERAL OF
THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, D.C., February 26, 1963.

To the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives:

Enclosed is our report on review of unnecessary deterioration of unused rubber tracks for Army combat vehicles.

We found that the Government incurred unnecessary cost of about $5 million in fiscal year 1960 to rebuild unused deteriorated tracks for tanks and other combat vehicles because the Army allowed these tracks to deteriorate in storage. The deterioration of the rubber tracks was caused by failure to (1) issue oldest tracks first by a slight modification of the tracks, (2) furnish tracks to contractors for use in production of new vehicles, and (3) protect the tracks by storing them inside.

The management weaknesses disclosed in this report on rubber track are the type that could pertain to all of the Army's replacement parts which are subject to loss of serviceability through deterioration. Accordingly, we are recommending that the Secretary of the Army require the Army Materiel Command to review such items and take the necessary actions to provide that they are protected to the maximum extent practicable from the elements causing deterioration and that the oldest stocks are issued before the more recently procured stocks. Where improvements have been made to the item, consideration should be given to making appropriate modifications to the stock in storage so that this stock can be issued before it deteriorates and before large quantities of the new version are procured. In addition, consideration should be given to issuing older stocks as Government-furnished property on new end items being procured.

Copies of this report are being sent to the President of the United States, the Secretary of Defense, and the Secretary of the Army.

JOSEPH CAMPBELL,
Comptroller General
of the United States.

COMPTROLLER GENERAL
OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, D.C., February 27, 1963.

To the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives:

Enclosed is our report on review of unnecessary planned procurement of generators by the Department of the Army.

Our review of supply management of generators disclosed that the Army was planning to buy, at a cost of about $6.3 million, 1,365 unneeded generator sets as a result of failure (1) to provide for the continued use of acceptable substitute 30-kilowatt generators already on hand, (2) to consider a reduction in the need for generators because of the conversion to commercial power sources, (3) to use the actual rather than the estimated wear-out rates in determining the need to procure new generators, and (4) to utilize 10-kilowatt generators available in the Department of the Navy.

When we presented our findings to Corps of Engineers officials, they cancelled purchase requests for 466 generators in fiscal year 1961 worth $2.2 million, eliminated planned procurement for 1962 of 484 generators worth $2.4 million, and reduced planned procurement for subsequent years. Procurement of 45-kilowatt generators could have been reduced by an additional 316 generators worth $1.5 million had the Corps of Engineers not unnecessarily disposed of a like number of acceptable substitute 30-kilowatt generators in the years 1959 and 1960. The Corps of Engineers did suspend further disposals when we pointed out the continuing need for these items. After we suggested that the Corps of Engineers consider use of the excess Navy 10-kilowatt generators similar to units the Corps of Engineers was procuring, the corps obtained 124 units worth $232,000 and took action to provide for more careful review of material declared excess by the other military departments.

Although the Corps of Engineers has taken considerable corrective action, we believe that further action should be taken by the Department of the Army to assure maximum utilization of the less expensive 30-kilowatt generators as substitutes for the 45-kilowatt generators. About 1,500 30-kilowatt units have been reported to be on hand, whereas only 383 of them have been considered by the Engineer Supply Control Office in its recomputation of requirements for the 45-kilowatt generators. We are recommending that the Secretary of the Army make an examination into the actual power requirements of generator users to determine whether greater utilization of the 30-kilowatt generators can be obtained.

We found that the Army's failure to adequately utilize substitute items to prevent unnecessary procurement has occurred despite various policy statements of the Secretary of Defense designed to prevent such situations from occurring. We are recommending that the Secretary of Defense take steps to assure himself that his policies for full utilization of substitute items are being effectively applied by the military departments in considering the need for new procurement.

We believe that the deficiency of the Corps of Engineers in screening listings of excess Navy generators is further demonstration of the need for better procedures for identification of suitable substitute items in the various military departments. In our August 31, 1962, report on "Review of the Utilization of Excess and Surplus Property Within the Department of Defense," we recommended that the inventory managers at the various control points in the military departments be directed to continuously research items managed by them to identify suitable substitutes, record the substitutions when found, and report such substitutability to the Defense Logistics Services Center for future screening purposes. We believe that prompt adoption of this recommendation will materially assist in providing a means of identifying suitable substitute items in the military supply system to prevent unnecessary procurement.

Copies of this report are being sent to the President of the United States, the Secretary of Defense, and the Secretary of the Army.

JOSEPH CAMPBELL,
Comptroller General
of the United States.

COMPTROLLER GENERAL
OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, D.C., February 28, 1963.

To the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives:

Enclosed is our report on examination of the costs to the Government for storage of petroleum in new commercial facilities under Department of Defense negotiated contracts.

Our review disclosed that, in order to satisfy Department of the Air Force requirements, the Defense Petroleum Supply Center negotiated eight contracts for petroleum storage in new dispersed and protected commercial (contractor owned and operated) facilities; and, as a result, the Government will incur about $10.3 million higher costs than if similar Government facilities had been acquired. The increased costs will amount to almost one-third of the Government's total expenditures for the fixed periods of the contracts, and the Government will not have title to the facilities unless an additional $9 million is paid. The increased costs result primarily because contract prices include funds needed by contractors to finance construction of commercial facilities within relatively short periods. We found no evidence that Air Force officials had compared the costs of commercial facilities with the costs of Government facilities before decisions were made to contract for commercial facilities. Had such comparisons been made, they should have disclosed that disproportionately higher costs would be incurred for storage in commercial facilities and that contracting for storage in Government facilities would result in substantial savings to the Government.

By letter dated October 8, 1962, the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Installations and Logistics) disagreed with our estimate of the increased costs but informed us that, if other dispersed and protected storage facilities are required, appropriate consideration will be given to the relative costs of Government ownership of needed storage facilities compared with contractor ownership of such facilities. The Assistant Secretary stated that the Defense Petroleum Supply Center (now under the Defense Supply Agency) has no responsibility for making recommendations concerning acquisition of Government or commercial petroleum facilities but has responsibility only for advising the military departments on the availability of commercial facilities and for contracting to satisfy the military departments' requirements for the facilities. Thus, the Defense Petroleum Supply Center is not required to question the basis for a department's decision to use commercial petroleum facilities, even though there may be indications of increased or unnecessary costs to the Government in the prices proposed by contractors.

In order to assure that the Government is not incurring disproportionately higher costs for petroleum storage which requires construction of commercial facilities, we are recommending to the Secretary of Defense that the military departments be required to give appropriate consideration to the cost of Government ownership of needed storage facilities compared with commercial ownership of such facilities before decisions are made to acquire or lease such facilities. We are also recommending to the Secretary of Defense that military departments requesting procurement of new commercial petroleum facilities be required to furnish comparative estimates for Government facilities to the Defense Petroleum Supply Center so that the latter can ascertain before contract prices are negotiated that costs for commercial facilities will in fact be lower than the estimates for Government facilities. Further, we are recommending that the Secretary of Defense and the Director, Bureau of the Budget, amend existing policy regulations so that cost justifications will be required before decisions are made to contract for products or services requiring construction of either commercial or Government facilities.

Copies of this report are being sent to the President of the United States, the Secretary of Defense, and the Secretaries of the Air Force and the Navy.

JOSEPH CAMPBELL,
Comptroller General
of the United States.

HIGHER INTEREST RATES TO STEM FLOW OF FUNDS ABROAD WILL STIFLE ECONOMY

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, yesterday the Wall Street Journal carried a lead article which reads, "U.S. Settles on Boost in Interest Rates To Cut Flow of Funds Abroad." The lead paragraph in this article reads:

> Uncle Sam's dollar defenders have picked what they hope will be their decisive weapon for ending the deficit in the U.S. balance of international payments: A deliberate boost in short-term interest rates.

I earnestly hope this decision is not the final decision. The testimony before the Joint Economic Committee last year and this year has underlined the fact that this is no way to solve the problem of adverse balance of payments.

There have been only two studies of the effect of interest differentials on capital flow, one by Dr. Philip Bell, of Haverford College, and one by Dr. Robert Gemmill, of the Federal Reserve Board. Both studies show that interest differentials do not significantly affect capital flow, that speculation is a far more significant influencing factor. The fact is that a number of countries have higher interest rates than this country has right now.

In the last issue of the Federal Reserve Bulletin is a statement by the only Kennedy appointment to the Federal Reserve Board, George W. Mitchell, a highly able monetary economist. I read from his statement before the Joint Economic Committee:

> I would not deny that reduced credit availability and higher interest rates might have some significant and lasting effects in reducing net capital outflows. They could; but much depends on the circumstances. In the economic environment of today, my judgment is that it would take more monetary action than is desirable to significantly curtail net capital exports.

He goes on to say:

> To attack the balance-of-payments problem with stringent monetary measures would risk imposing a costly drag on an already sluggish pace of economic growth.

Of course, Dr. Mitchell is absolutely right. The testimony before our committee was that if we continue to have high interest rates, or if interest rates rose, the effect of the tax cut would be nullified.

I want to read one more statement from Dr. Mitchell:

> We might consider a more direct attack on the capital outflow problem. The United States has the largest and most accessible capital market in the world, and it ought to be kept free of exchange restrictions. It is proper and desirable that capital-poor developing countries should utilize this market to meet a portion of their enormous needs for foreign capital. It is not so clear, however, that it is either necessary or desirable for advanced countries, with balance-of-payments surpluses, to have recourse to our capital market on the recent large scale while they restrict and hamper entry of outside borrowers to their own capital markets.

Dr. Mitchell proposes what seems to me to be an eminently practical and sensible method of solving the problem by getting together with our allies and agreeing on capital flows in a sensible way, by seeking their help in our difficulties as we helped them in the 1950's. That is a far better method of solving the problem than by hiking interest rates and gutting our economy.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that both articles, the article which appeared in the Wall Street Journal, and the article by George W. Mitchell, a member of the Federal Reserve System, be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DOLLAR-GAP STRATEGY: UNITED STATES SETTLES ON BOOST IN INTEREST RATES TO CUT FLOW OF FUNDS ABROAD—LIKELY RISE IN DISCOUNT RATE WOULD AWAIT OUTCOME OF TAX BILL—WILL CANADA HELP?—FIGHTING "EASY MONEY" MEN

(By Allen J. Large)

WASHINGTON.—Uncle Sam's dollar defenders have picked what they hope will be their decisive weapon for ending the deficit in the U.S. balance of international payments: A deliberate boost in short-term interest rates.

Kennedy administration officials figure this may be the year for such a direct attempt to curb the outflow of U.S. investment dollars now seeking higher interest rates in Canada and Europe than are available at home. This flow lately has equaled somewhere near half of the gold-draining gap between the total U.S. dollar outgo abroad and dollar income from foreign lands. The payments deficit last year was a disappointingly large $2.2 billion, almost as wide as the year before.

The most likely technique for keeping investment funds at home is an increase in the Federal Reserve System's 3-percent discount rate—the fee the Federal Reserve charges on loans to member commercial banks. The effect would be to shove other U.S. short-term rates upward. Some officials suggest an increase to 3½ percent, carrying the discount rate back to the point from which it was cut in 1960, would be logical; the step might be taken in two stages to ease any shock to "easy money" advocates.

Though initiated by the "independent" Federal Reserve Board, a discount-rate rise would have the administration's support if tricky questions of timing can be resolved.

CANADA AND THE TIMETABLE

The administration would like the timetable geared to events in Canada and the U.S. Congress. President Kennedy's financial experts hope to wait until after Canada's April 8 elections, then put pressure on the new Government to cut that country's own discount rate of 4 percent. If Canada complies, it would help curb some of the northward flow of short-term U.S. investment funds.

Such Canadian action would let American officials delay boosting interest rates here until the fate of the administration's tax-cut bill is known. If Congress approves a tax cut this summer or fall, that's the time a deliberate boost in U.S. interest rates would be most likely. Officials reason a tax cut could supplant the Federal Reserve's present easy-credit policy as a domestic business stimulator, allowing a rise in U.S. interest rates.

The reasoning is summed up by the recent annual report of the New York Federal Reserve Bank:

"Tax reductions, although primarily designed to spur the domestic economy, should not be taken to imply any letdown in concern over the balance of payments. On the contrary, if tax cuts have the expected expansionary effects, the monetary (credit-regulating) authorities would have increased freedom to move significantly away from the long-continued policy of credit ease, should international considerations make this necessary."

EVENTS COULD CHANGE TIMING

The highly tentative timetable for translating this reasoning into action could be altered quickly by unforeseen events. Federal Reserve officials always hold an emergency discount-rate boost at the ready to combat not only a sudden sharp increase in the outflow of investment dollars, but also any massive conversion of foreign-owned dollars into the Treasury's gold; thus they'd aim to keep U.S. gold reserves from sinking dangerously low. Canadian refusal to lower interest rates might make early American action imperative. On the other hand, congressional postponement of a tax cut until the 1964 session could set back the Government's interest rate plans.

Timing aside, it's highly significant that top administration officials now see higher interest rates as an acceptable technique for overcoming the persistent payments deficit. Until lately they resisted the idea of a deliberate boost for fear it would cramp economic growth.

A deliberate boost in short-term rates surely would prompt protests from "easy money" Democrats in Congress, notably House Banking Committee Chairman PATMAN, of Texas. But President Kennedy himself is said to be prepared to stand this heat if the rate increase is modest. Complaints will be met with the counterargument that a full-scale dollar crisis would require a much stiffer rise in rates than that now contemplated.

A raft of other devices have been set in motion since late 1960 to reduce dollar outlays abroad and raise this country's foreign income. Some dollar-spending servicemen have been brought home from Europe; Germany and Italy are using their dollars to buy arms in the United States; foreign aid recipients are ordered to spend their money here; American tourist spending abroad is discouraged and a tub-thumping campaign attempts to coax U.S. businessmen to expand exports.

TOURISTS AND DOLLARS

These measures will be continued. The 1961 law which cut the duty-free exemption on goods brought home by tourists to $100 from $500 expires on June 30; the Treasury shortly will ask Congress to extend the exemption at the $100 level, though officials admit the lower ceiling hasn't discouraged tourist spending abroad as much as hoped.

Tourist complaints about the $100 duty-free limit have been so loud, however, that there's some talk in Congress of raising it to $200. The Treasury is ready to accept that figure, if it's made permanent. But Treasury men would resist any move to let the exemption revert to $500.

Other refinements of existing dollar-saving measures are in the works. Federal agencies this month are drawing up estimates of what they'll spend abroad in the 1964 fiscal year starting July 1. These forecasts will make up a so-called gold budget, and some agencies' pet foreign projects will be chopped by the Budget Bureau.

Under scrutiny will be such dollar outflow sources as medical research grants made overseas by the National Institutes of Health, pension payments sent abroad by the Veterans' Administration and a host of housekeeping expenses by U.S. agencies operating in foreign lands. Many of the items open to gold budget chopping are admittedly in the nickel-and-dime category, but officials hope for some savings.

MEDICINE NOT STRONG ENOUGH

Administration men now concede the gold-saving medicine employed so far probably isn't strong enough to end the chronic payments deficit soon enough. From a fat $3.9 billion in 1960, the deficit was cut to $2.4 billion in 1961. At one point the Treasury hoped for further reduction in 1962 to less than $1.5 billion, and a balance at the end of this year. But those hopes are gone. Last year's deficit of $2.2 billion emerged mainly because imports jumped 11 percent from the year before to $16.4 billion while exports crept up only 4 percent to $20.9 billion. This lopped nearly $1 billion off the favorable U.S. balance of trade.

A year or so ago, Federal analysts were betting on a lunge in 1963 exports to deal the final blow to the payments deficit. These bets are now off.

"We're going to have to run fast just to hold our own," says a Commerce Department export promoter. A drop in 1963 from last year's total exports is conceivable, he suggests. The reason: Expected declines in sales of U.S. farm products, commercial aircraft, and machine tools.

Some private analysts are more optimistic. A 5-percent gain in 1963 exports is forecast by Walter H. Diamond, economist for the Foreign Credit Insurance Association in New York. The FCIA is a group of insurance companies, assembled under Federal auspices, that guarantees repayment of credit extended to foreign buyers by U.S. exporters. Mr. Diamond says FCIA programs last year resulted in $200 million of exports that wouldn't have otherwise been made, and he expects the 1963 impact to double to $400 million.

WORRY OVER IMPORT GAIN

Even if exports rise, however, the chief worry centers on another big gain in imports that would permit no improvement in net U.S. trade earnings. The tax cut that would stimulate domestic business also would increase U.S. demand for foreign products, it's reasoned.

Whatever the short-run effect of U.S. economic expansion, administration officials have tirelessly pointed to two long-run developments in Europe that promise to ease the dollar problem. One is Europe's faster increase in labor costs than the United States is experiencing; higher prices could make European goods less competitive with American products. The second is an apparent slackening in Europe's economic growth that makes it less attractive for Americans to invest there; this development, it's claimed, may divert U.S. investment funds into underdeveloped areas, stimulating their economies and creating new markets for American goods.

But the administration has come under sharp attack in recent months for dwelling on these long-run prospects while proposing no new tangible measures for ending the payments deficit quickly. The American Bankers Association has declared: "We do not believe that the United States has either the time or the maneuverability which would allow it to seek answers to its balance-of-payments problems in essentially long-range approaches."

Such pressure, among other things, has caused the administration to isolate short-term investment outflow as a key area for attack.

DECLINE FROM 1961

By one statistical measurement, private short-term capital outflows in 1961 topped $2 billion, equal to nearly all the total payments deficit. Those outflows included private U.S. bank loans to Japanese borrowers and American purchases of British treasury bills, short-term securities of local British governments and British consumer credit paper.

Last year bank loans to Japan declined sharply, and British treasury bills became less attractive relative to U.S. Treasury bills and other short-term securities. The 1962 short-term outflow thus declined to around $1 billion, if heavy unrecorded transactions are included. But officials say American purchases of certain securities in Canada and Britain are continuing, and they'd like to erase the attractiveness of these investments.

"There's no other category in the balance of payments where we see a chance of picking up something as big as $1 billion," says one policymaker.

Administration officials hope thus to avoid more drastic dollar-saving measures, including heavy withdrawals of troops from Europe, special tax incentives to spur exports, and direct or indirect Government restrictions on movements of capital abroad. Officials swear they won't cooperate with French efforts to restrict American investments there.

[From the Federal Reserve Bulletin, February 1963]

STATEMENT OF GEORGE W. MITCHELL, MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF GOVERNORS OF THE FEDERAL RESERVE SYSTEM, BEFORE THE JOINT ECONOMIC COMMITTEE, FEBRUARY 1, 1963

Two problems—slack growth in the domestic economy and an adverse balance of payments in our international accounts—now occupy the stage of economic policy discussion. Not so many years ago, a persistently rising price level and an apparent dollar shortage in the world economy were the dominant problems of such discussion.

Though the problems have changed, the tools to deal with them are unchanged: fiscal policy, monetary policy, and structural alterations in particular institutions, practices, or programs. The mix of these alternative and complementary approaches depends on varying judgments of their relative efficacy and on the current economic environment and outlook. In my remarks today, I want mainly to focus on the recent role of monetary policy in coping with both problems and to suggest in very general terms the role that monetary policy might play in the developing situation.

Much of the commentary on the recent performance of the U.S. economy has noted that 1962 was the most prosperous year in our history. This is true but not especially notable. Real output per capita rose during the year but 1 percent. Total output increased less than 3 percent from the end of 1961 to the end of 1962 even though we had excessive unemployment and idle plant capacity throughout the year.

At the same time, the continuing deficit in our balance of payments acted as a constraint on efforts to stimulate higher levels of domestic economic activity. A trade surplus of between $4 billion and $5 billion was exceeded by our payments abroad on account of private capital, military outlays, and foreign aid. To reduce this deficit is a most pressing problem for the year ahead.

BUSINESS OUTLOOK

At the moment, it seems to me that the immediate economic prospects are favorable—more favorable than for some time past. Spurred by the excellent public reception of the 1963 model cars, retail sales rose substantially in the fourth quarter, and consumer demand generally now appears more vigorous than at any time during 1962. Government purchases, especially at State and local levels, are clearly destined to continue upward, under the pressure of our defense, space, and international requirements and the needs of our rapidly growing population. Total construction expenditures have been running at record highs, and the recent volume of contract awards suggests a continued high level of construction activity in the period ahead.

The expansion in final sales, if continued, should soon call for a higher rate of industrial output and should serve to augment business demands as well. Business inventories, for example, have changed very little in recent months, but with final sales up strongly, some restocking to accommodate a larger volume of business may now be in order.

The outlook as regards business capital outlays is more doubtful. The rate of expansion in such outlays last year was disappointing, reflecting mainly the lack of pressure on existing productive facilities, and the official surveys project a small decline in the current quarter. But operating rates in many industries have been inching upward, and it seems to me that the combination of rising final sales, continued high-level profits, and the considerable incentives provided by the tax credit and accelerated depreciation actions last summer and the prospective tax reduction for this year should give renewed impetus to investment plans and outlays as the year progresses.

The basis for accelerated economic expansion which I have sketched here owes much to the dramatic turn in business and public psychology which followed the quick and successful conclusion of the Cuban crisis. Since then, the pronounced recovery in stock market prices, the more buoyant attitude of consumers revealed by recent surveys, the strength in new car sales and housing starts—all point to a marked improvement in the business tone. It is important to note also that the stimulating effect of tax reduction on consumer buying and business investment plans will be buttressed by the record increase last year in public holdings of liquid assets and by the ready availability of credit on relatively favorable terms.

I have characterized the balance-of-payments problem as a most urgent issue. I say this because delay in its solution increasingly exposes us to pressure from our creditors and because it inhibits our freedom to stimulate a sluggish domestic economy, which has performed below par for several years.

I fully agree with those who say that we cannot neglect either the domestic or the international problem as we pursue a solution to the other. On the other hand, the two problems may call for different types of solution.

In these circumstances, what contribution can monetary policy make to achievement of fuller use of domestic resources and to improvement in the balance of payments?

MONETARY POLICY IN 1962

The bare financial facts usually used in an evaluation of monetary policy over the past year are as follows: While gross national product in current dollars rose about 4 percent, bank credit—that is, total loans and security holdings of commercial banks—increased about 9 percent. The money supply, narrowly defined as currency and demand deposits, increased about 1.5 percent, but time and savings deposits went up 18 percent. The rate of turnover of the money supply increased about 8 percent. Market interest rates were relatively stable over the year, as long-term yields crept downward and short-term rates edged up.

On the surface, these facts are conflicting in that (1) bank credit and time deposits rose by large amounts and this would seem to indicate that monetary policy was strongly stimulative; but (2) the money supply rose very little for the year as a whole, and not at all until the fourth quarter, and its rate of use increased sharply, suggesting that monetary policy was not actively expansionary. When analyzed in the context of other developments during the year, these facts seem to me to show that monetary policy was inhibited throughout much of the year by balance-of-payments considerations and was less stimulative than was appropriate to the domestic situation.

All of the monetary and credit magnitudes for 1962 were significantly affected by the upward movement a year ago in the interest rates paid on commercial bank time deposits, following the change in the Board's regulation Q. In order to interpret and appraise monetary developments during the year, it is vital to disentangle the various effects of this change, which enabled commercial banks to attract a large inflow of time and savings deposits.

Where did these time and savings deposits come from? Do they represent in effect a net addition to the community's stock of money, which the public chooses to hold as time rather than as demand deposits? Or, does the buildup in time deposits reflect a rechanneling of the flows of saving, as the public decided to hold more of its financial assets in the form of interest-earning deposits at commercial banks and less of its financial assets in the form of securities and deposits in other institutions?

I believe it is correct to say that a sizable fraction of the buildup in time and savings deposits at commercial banks last year simply represented a shift in the public's attitude toward the commercial bank as a financial intermediary. We know, for example, that individuals acquired a considerably smaller volume of State and local government bonds and corporate stock in 1962 than in earlier years, even though their total savings increased. It is reasonable to think that as individuals reduced their purchases of securities, they put the funds into time and savings deposits, on which interest payments were now higher. Similarly, corporations acquired a substantial volume of newly available negotiable certificates of deposit at commercial banks in 1962. These funds, too, would presumably have gone directly into Treasury bills and other short-term securities if they had not gone into commercial banks time accounts.

What happened, in other words, was that, to a degree, the public chose to invest indirectly through acquiring commercial bank time balances rather than directly by purchasing securities. The banks' role as financial intermediaries between savers and credit market was thereby enlarged. To the extent that this happened, the resulting increase in total bank deposits and total bank assets should not be regarded as constituting monetary expansion or as contributing to total credit expansion. Rather, it represented merely a rechanneling of the financial flow of funds, as the public exchanged securities for bank time deposits.

Another portion of the increase in commercial bank time deposits includes funds that would have gone into other savings institutions if commercial banks had not raised their rates. Although deposits at mutual savings banks and shares at savings and loan associations increased substantially in 1962, they might have gone up even more if commercial banks had not become more attractive as savings depositaries. Here again, to the extent that commercial banks increased their role as savings institutions at the expense of these other outlets for savings, the resulting increase in bank assets and deposits does not represent injections of new money and credit into the economy.

Finally, there is no doubt that the advance in bank interest rates induced some individuals and business corporations to shift from demand deposits to interest-earning time deposits at commercial banks. That is, the attractiveness of a prominent near-money asset was enhanced, and the public was thereby induced to economize further its holdings of cash balances. Or to put it differently, as bank credit expanded in 1962, the public found it desirable to place the monetary counterpart of the credit expansion into time and savings deposits. To the extent that such conversions occurred, our comparative statistics on money supply fail to take into account the increased substitution of time for demand deposits.

It is unfortunate that we are unable to measure and compare these various components of the buildup in time deposits. All we can say is that the growth of total bank credit and deposits exaggerates the degree of monetary stimulus in 1962, while the growth of money supply understates the contribution of monetary policy to economic expansion. Let us, therefore, examine two other variables that usually express the extent to which the economy has been supplied with new money and bank credit.

The turnover of demand deposits, a measure of the velocity or rate of use of money balances, has trended upward in the postwar period. If we look at the cycles around this rising trend, we find that they conform rather well to the business cycle. We also find that turnover has generally increased faster in years of monetary restraint and slower in years of monetary ease. In the year just ended, the rate of turnover rose by as much as it did in some earlier years of vigorous economic expansion and restrictive monetary policy. I take this as an indication that the public has not been supplied with redundant amounts of new money in relation to its transactions and income.

This observation is confirmed by what happened to interest rates in 1962. As I noted earlier, short-term rates crept up during the year. Although long-term rates sank a little, they remain high by historical standards. Reflecting, as they do, the interaction of the supply of funds with the demand for funds, interest-rate movements in 1962 reveal to us that the supply was not pressing very strongly on demand.

All in all, therefore, I would characterize monetary policy in 1962 as having been passively responsive to the bank credit and monetary needs of the economy but not actively stimulative. And this judgment is borne out by the fact that it was not until the final quarter of the year, when business and consumer psychology strengthened and business loan demand picked up, that money supply rose. It was at this point that the economy overtook the monetary posture of supplying reserves on terms consistent with a short-term rate pattern based on balance-of-payments considerations.

Could monetary policy have done more to encourage economic expansion in 1962? I believe that the answer is "Yes" but judgments may differ on this—and particularly would they differ as to the consequences on the balance of payments. The range of difference is not very wide and would not cover, so far as I am concerned, a sufficiently aggressive monetary policy to have single-handedly restored the economy to full use of its resources. As far as long-run growth is concerned, the major contribution that monetary policy can make is in shortening the duration, and cutting down the amplitude, of cyclical downswings and extending the period and amplitude of upswings. The secular tilt of the economy is more appropriately the concern of fiscal actions and structural reforms.

BALANCE-OF-PAYMENTS CONSIDERATION

Just how is monetary policy constrained by balance-of-payments considerations? Since 1961 the objective has been to maintain a level of short-term interest rates in the United States that is tolerably competitive, exchange risk considered, with the level of short-term rates in other money markets, mainly in London and, to a lesser extent, Western Europe. This competitive level has succeeded in limiting, though not eliminating, incentives that U.S. banks and corporations, or foreigners with short-term dollar holdings, would otherwise have to add to the U.S. balance-of-payments deficit by switching from short-term dollar investments to short-term investment abroad.

Flows of funds of this kind are sometimes interpreted by important dollar holders, domestic as well as foreign, not as rate-conscious money seeking gain from interest differentials, but as the consequence of apprehensions about the strength of the dollar. Thus, monetary policy has in effect been directed at maintaining a psychology of international confidence in the dollar.

This is a perfectly proper objective for monetary policy to pursue, but it is not one that can have a significant impact on correcting whatever basic imbalance exists in our trading-investing relationships with the rest of the world. And it is only through changes in these basic factors that a real solution to the problem can be achieved. Can monetary policy also play a role here? First, as to investing relationships.

A number of domestic and foreign observers have noted that our international transactions on current account and Government economic aid have in fact given rise to nearly equal U.S. payments and receipts in recent years. In consequence, they have identified our deficit on all transactions with our deficit on private capital account. They have argued that in order to bring our overall payments flows into balance, we must sharply reduce net outflows of private capital. They have thought this result might readily be accomplished by a tightening of monetary policy and a rise in interest rates.

I would not deny that reduced credit availability and higher interest rates might have some significant and lasting effects in reducing net capital outflows. They could; but much depends on the circumstances. In the economic environment of today, my judgment is that it would take more monetary action than is desirable to significantly curtail net capital exports.

The largest outflows of U.S. capital represent direct investments by U.S. corporations in foreign branches and subsidiaries. Basically, these investment decisions must take into account the relationship between long-term interest yields on market investments and the prospective profit yield of a particular investment. If credit conditions in this country should tighten as a result of vigorous, but noninflationary, domestic economic expansion in which the relative profitability of investment in this country was rapidly improving, then indeed U.S. firms would invest more at home and less abroad, and foreign capital, too, would be attracted here. But if last year's climate of less than vigorous growth, with some slack in resource use, were to continue and credit conditions were tightened by restrictive monetary policy alone, a large retarding effect on the direct foreign investments of U.S. business could only be significantly effective at the expense of declines in other closely linked sectors of the domestic capital markets and therefore domestic expenditure.

Other flows of capital are probably more responsive than direct investments to changes in credit and interest-rate conditions, but some of these flows, too, are less responsive than is often supposed. Much foreign borrowing last year, for example, through bond issues in our markets—the second largest category of capital outflow—was by foreign governments whose demands for external funds were not very flexible because they could find no other international capital market open and able to accommodate their transactions. Also, a good deal of lending abroad by U.S. banks was associated with U.S. exports whose financing could not readily be transferred to foreign credit markets.

Furthermore, it can hardly be argued that reduced credit availability and higher interest levels could have big effects on international capital flows but only minor effects on domestic credit flows. To have tightened monetary policy last year enough to have exerted significant restraint on those outflows of capital that are responsive could, in my judgment, also have had a strong braking effect on the lagging domestic economic expansion.

How could monetary policy be used to improve our basic trading position—to make our exports of goods and services more competitive? There is traditional orthodox prescription for a certain situation. The classical case for the application of monetary discipline, so called, is that in which a country is suffering from excess demand and is attempting to deal with the twin phenomena of inflation at home and a deficit abroad. Here monetary restraint has the dual purpose of tempering the climate of the domestic economy and reducing the deficit in the international accounts. But our current domestic problem is not one of inflation but of lagging expansion, and to attack the balance-of-payments problem with stringent monetary measures would risk imposing a costly drag on an already sluggish pace of economic growth.

Thus, the role of monetary policy can be, under present circumstances, only of limited effectiveness in dealing with the basic balance-of-payments problem just as it is of limited effectiveness in dealing with the domestic problem of lagging long-run economic growth.

In the past 2 years a good deal of direct attention has been given to the conditions and environments which can be altered to improve our basic international economic position—through the reduction of tariffs, lowering of barriers to capital outflow by other high-savings industrial nations, the tieing of foreign aid, and the fuller sharing of free world burdens for mutual security. But the situation fails to show the degree of improvement needed to clearly indicate to the rest of the world our capacity and intent to reach an equilibrium payments position. We probably should be giving consideration to alternatives that up to now have been rejected.

For example, we might consider a more direct attack on the capital outflow problem. The United States has the largest and most accessible capital market in the world, and it ought to be kept free of exchange restrictions. It is proper and desirable that capital-poor developing countries should utilize this market to meet a portion of their enormous needs for foreign capital. It is not so clear, however, that it is either necessary or desirable for advanced countries, with balance-of-payments surpluses, to have recourse to our capital market on the recent large scale while they restrict and hamper entry of outside borrowers to their own capital markets. If these countries are unwilling to open their capital markets, possibly we should look toward tax measures that might help to remedy this unbalanced position. In general, we need to explore the possibilities of various tax measures that might, consistent with our obligations as an international good neighbor, and with the status of the dollar as a world reserve currency, discourage capital movements that appear to flow "uphill" to countries that are already capital rich.

We also need to explore the possibility that tax measures might be used to encourage exports. As a matter of principle, there is no good reason why our exports should bear U.S. taxes. Taxation is a means by which we pay for government services. Why should foreign purchasers of our exports help to pay for the services provided by the U.S. Government to its citizens, and why should our exporters be expected to be so competitive that their product prices have to absorb U.S. as well as foreign taxes and tariffs?

It may be that foreign countries in their tax policies also discriminate against their nationals' exporting activities This is not easy to ascertain given the complication of various National, State, and local tax laws and conditions under which tax burdens are shifted to customers. But the discrimination against exporters of our country can hardly be doubted.

MONETARY AND FISCAL POLICY IN THE YEAR AHEAD

If the proposed tax reduction is successful in stimulating more rapid economic expansion, bank credit and monetary needs will in all likelihood accelerate. Business demands for loans will increase, consumers will impose larger calls on credit markets, and the Treasury will be financing an enlarged deficit. In such circumstances, the supply of bank credit and money can increase without downward pressures on interest rates and aggravation of capital outflows. In fact, bank credit, the money supply, and interest rates might well rise more in relation to advancing gross national product than in comparable periods of expansion. This is so because monetary expansion has lagged during the past year. The fact that deposit turnover or velocity has continued to rise rapidly over the past year suggests that we cannot count as much as in other recent periods on past monetary creation to satisfy future monetary needs.

As to the question of how the enlarged budget deficit will be financed, I see this as a problem that can only be considered in the economic environment in which it occurs. The budget went into deficit during the recession of 1960 and, just as the recovery in the economy has been incomplete, the restoration of balance in the budget has been incomplete. The past year's deficit has been successfully financed outside the banking system.

The proposed tax cut will enlarge the deficit, but gradually rather than all at once. In view of the purpose of the tax cut, which is to stimulate the economy, a consistent national policy would hardly call for monetary action to offset its effects if the economy continued to operate well below its capacity. Similarly, if excess demand develops, generating inflationary pressures and psychology, offsetting action by the Federal Reserve would be clearly appropriate. Thus, the economic climate at the time should determine the posture of our monetary policy. In judging monetary policy in relation to deficit financing, what matters most is not whether the banks or the nonbank public purchase the securities to finance the deficit, but whether the economy as a whole is provided with a volume of money and bank credit consistent with sustainable expansion at relatively stable prices. This is not to say that the Treasury does not have a debt maturity problem. Its market offerings need to be fitted into a balanced structure of maturities. In financing an enlarged deficit, the Treasury may find it necessary at various points to compete with other borrowers in the different maturity sectors of the market. Under the economic enviroment that we hope to achieve, the competition may prove to be strong and the Treasury should be prepared to meet it.

TRANSFER OF CERTAIN OFFICES OF TREASURY DEPARTMENT TO BOSTON, MASS.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware, Mr. President, it was announced Tuesday that the transfer of the duties of certain offices of the Treasury Department to the larger cities will result in some reduction in personnel and reduce the cost of the Department by $5 million annually. If it is true that this action will reduce the cost of operating the Revenue Bureau without any corresponding reduction in services it will meet our approval. However, I am not sure that this will be the result, and I am disappointed that the Department saw fit not to consult at least some members of the Finance Committee before releasing this announcement to the newspapers. It would have been much better had we been advised on what is planned. In the absence of any background information, all I can do is look at the report.

First, I have been somewhat puzzled that so much of this transfer is being concentrated in Boston. It could be argued that removing offices from Maine, New Hampshire, and Vermont, and transferring them to Boston was an attempt to centralize in the larger cities, but I do not understand how transferring the main office out of New York to Boston can be justified on the same line of reasoning. Therefore, that line of reasoning is invalid. There is a suspicion that political consideration may have been a factor in making these decisions.

The release says they are going to save $5 million for the taxpayers. I would compliment them on that objective, but in the budget submitted by the administration they are asking for an additional $430 million to run the Treasury Department next year. Furthermore, according to the 1964 budget they are planning to add 4,149 extra employees for the Treasury Department. If we must increase next year's appropriations by $430 million and add an additional 4,100 employees to save this $5 million my only comment is that on that basis we can soon save ourselves into bankruptcy.

I hope the Department can make a better justification for the transfer than that outlined in their press release. If they can show that this is a bona fide reduction in expenditures without handicapping the service I will support them notwithstanding the fact that it affects one of the offices in my State. I think this agency and all agencies should be operated as economically as possible. But I do not think we should boast of savings if it merely means transferring offices or jobs from one place to another. Such irresponsible transfers would be not only inconvenient to the employees involved but inconvenient to the American taxpayers as well.

While the Treasury Department has a responsibility to operate its Department as economically as possible, it also has a responsibility to render proper service to the taxpayers, and taxpayers in Delaware and the other 49 States are just as worthy of consideration as are the voters in Boston.

TEST-BAN NEGOTIATIONS

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I commend President Kennedy for the statement he made at his press conference yesterday on the test ban negotiations. It contained a categorical assurance to the Senate and to the American people that this administration will not negotiate a test-ban treaty which allows the possibility of undetected Soviet cheating.

I quote from the press conference transcript:

> Question. Mr. President, on Monday Adrian Fisher, Deputy Director of the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, said even if the Russians were able to test underground indefinitely this would not alter the strategic military balance between the United States and the Soviet Union. He said this was the executive assessment. Given that assessment, can you tell us what considerations then would prevent accepting a test ban on the terms set by Russia?
>
> Answer. I don't think, if I may say so—in my opinion that is not what is the administration's position. We have suggested that we would not accept a test ban which would permit indefinite underground testing by the Soviet Union. We would not accept a test ban which did not give us every assurance that we could detect a series of tests underground. That is the administration's position. We would not submit a treaty which did not provide that assurance to the U.S. Senate. Nor would the Senate approve it.

While the President was making this statement, Carl F. Romney, assistant technical director, Air Force Technical Application Center, in testimony before the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy pointed out that it is possible for the Soviets to make significant underground tests without any possibility of seismic detection by us.

I quote from the Washington Post:

> Replying to questions, Romney said that a potential cheater would be able to test 1-kiloton devices in granite; 2- to 6-kiloton devices in tuff (a volcanic ash); and 10- to 20-kiloton devices in dry alluvium (a sandy material), with no seismic means presently available to catch the cheater * * *
>
> In previous testimony before the Committee it was noted that the majority of U.S. underground nuclear tests being conducted in Nevada involved devices of 4 kilotons or less, indicating that atomic weapons progress can be made using devices of these sizes.

Mr. President, I believe it is clear from this, that the contentions expressed by Adrian Fisher, Deputy Director of the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, in a recent statement of official policy, have been repudiated by the President in two highly significant ways.

Mr. Fisher said we were willing to accept a treaty that contained a possible risk that a series of underground tests could go undetected, and that we could accept this risk because the progress the Russians could make through secret tests would not be significant enough to alter the balance of power.

I was greatly heartened by the President's statement that this was not his policy, that he would never accept a treaty that did not contain every assurance that the Soviets could not conduct a series of secret tests.

I support the view expressed by the President, and I assume that the Disarmament Agency and the negotiators at Geneva will conform to the President's view and make whatever alterations are necessary in Mr. Fisher's statement of policy.

During the past several days the real issues involved in the test-ban treaty have been brought to the American people more closely than ever before.

I am happy to have had the opportunity to play a small role in accelerating this debate and bringing these issues before the people.

I believe that Mr. Adrian Fisher should be congratulated for candidly and clearly presenting a statement of policy that is supported by many test-ban advocates but that differs significantly from the policy laid down yesterday by the President. The Joint Committee on Atomic Energy has performed an invaluable service by conducting excellent hearings which have pointed out clearly the dangers inherent in our present test-ban proposal. The Washington Post also deserves commendation for using so much of its editorial and news space to present both sides of this issue.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD the following items which trace the development of this debate:

A copy of the Washington Post story describing my February 21 speech on the floor of the Senate concerning the nuclear test-ban negotiations.

A February 22 Washington Post editorial critical of my speech.

My March 1 reply to the Washington Post editorial.

The March 4 reply to my letter by Mr. Adrian Fisher, Deputy Director of the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency.

A March 5 Washington Post editorial supporting Mr. Fisher's position.

My March 5 reply to Mr. Fisher in the form of a letter to the Washington Post.

The March 7 Washington Post news story concerning President Kennedy's news conference and testimony before the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

An extract from the President's news conference as printed in the Washington Post of March 7.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, Feb. 22, 1963]

U.S. CONCESSIONS ON A-TEST BAN COURT WAR, DODD WARNS SENATE

(By Julius Duscha)

Senator THOMAS J. DODD, Democrat of Connecticut, charged yesterday that the Kennedy administration is courting war by granting concessions to the Soviet Union in nuclear test-ban negotiations.

In a lengthy Senate speech, DODD, a conservative Democrat frequently at odds with American foreign policy, said that both the Kennedy and Eisenhower administrations have made concession after concession to the Russians.

DODD said that so many concessions have been made that he would vote against a test-ban treaty that included these concessions and he would try to prevent its ratification.

He declared that "there are two roads to peace with the Communist world * * * the proved road of strength and vigilance and * * * the unproved road of valid negotiations and reliable agreements."

WANTS PATH OF STRENGTH

"The first road is one which we can travel by our own will;" he added, "the second we must travel in yoke with our declared enemy who has thus far hobbled us at every step. * * *

"Let us place our trust in the path of strength and our hope in the path of honest negotiations. To forsake either of these paths is to court war and to invite the destruction of our country and our civilization."

Seldom has a Senator announced that he would oppose a treaty before it has ever been negotiated.

The essence of DODD's expressed opposition to a test-ban treaty of the sort being sought by the administration is that the United States has made all of the concessions in the negotiations and that the Russians simply cannot be trusted.

FOLLOWS GOP ATTACKS

DODD's speech follows a series of Republican attacks in the House on the test-ban negotiations. The GOP House campaign against the treaty is being led by Representative CRAIG HOSMER, Republican of California, a conservative Republican who is the ranking GOP member on the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

DODD maintained that the United States needs to continue nuclear testing to perfect smaller strategic atomic weapons and to develop the so-called neutron bomb.

This is a concept of a nuclear weapon supposedly designed to destroy people without nuclear fallout or disastrous fire storms.

DODD went on to charge that an aggressive faction in the scientific community has given both the Eisenhower and Kennedy administrations persistently wrongheaded advice stemming from "an appalling lack of political realities."

The only scientist he named was Hans Bethe, who was science adviser to former President Eisenhower.

The concessions that DODD said had been made by the United States to the Russians included:

A reduction from 20 to 5 in the number of inspections each year in the Soviet Union to police the test ban.

A cutback in the number of worldwide monitoring stations from 180 to 80.

A decision to allow citizens of a country to man monitoring stations in their own country rather than to have citizens of other countries do it on an international basis.

The elimination of any specific threshold of a seismic shock of an undetermined origin that would be checked.

Acceptance of the use of supposedly tamperproof black boxes to monitor the test ban.

Approval of a test-ban control body in which the Soviet Union could exercise a veto.

[From the Washington Post, Feb. 22, 1963]

DODD AND THE TEST BAN

An astonishing assumption that two successive administrations would deliberately imperil the security of the United States underlies Senator THOMAS J. DODD's attack upon the test-ban treaty and his announced opposition to it. He charged in the Senate speech he made yesterday that the adoption of the treaty would jeopardize the country because it would preclude further development on the neutron bomb and on antimissile missiles.

Another assumption in the Senator's address is that any change in the U.S. position during negotiations is a concession and a retreat. The United States has changed its positions many times during these negotiations. The changes have not been in the same direction. Many of them have been in response to better scientific information than that available in the first instance. Our position on the detection of underground tests became more unacceptable to the Soviet Union when research indicated the possibility of concealing small-caliber explosions by decoupling devices. Our position on inspection moved the other way as technical know-how needed to discriminate between natural and artificial earth tremors has improved. All revisions are not necessarily concessions.

Any test-ban treaty that reaches the Senate is not likely to preclude further scientific progress toward antimissile missiles or the neutron bomb. At the moment, the antimissile missile is not being held up by any inhibition on thermonuclear testing. The need to test is not likely to arise for some time in the neutron bomb development. There are no proposals for a treaty banning inquiry, research and development.

Senator DODD, like many other critics of a test ban, seems to believe any treaty will advantage the Soviet Union. As McGeorge Bundy pointed out in the Yale address of February 16: "the effort for the control and limitation of nuclear weaponry is exactly as much a part of our national security and an element in our national defense as our arrangements for an effective nuclear deterrent. It is simply not true as some seem to believe, that any arms agreement must be a disadvantage to one side or the other."

There always is the risk, as Senator DODD and others point out, that the Soviet Union will some day renounce a treaty and resume testing. This risk, as Mr. Bundy said at Yale, is, in the judgment of both President Eisenhower and President Kennedy, "substantially outweighed" by other considerations. Notwithstanding all the difficulties and dangers, "both administrations have believed that the basic deterrent strength of the United States can be maintained if testing is stopped on both sides, and that the disadvantages we might suffer from a sudden resumption, while real, are far from decisive."

The object of the test-ban negotiations is to obtain a treaty that will reduce the dangers inherent in the thermonuclear tests themselves and the risks resulting from the impetus they give to the competition in the development of thermonuclear weapons. It is not likely that this or any other administration will lay before the Senate a treaty that, in Senator DODD's words, "would gravely imperil the security of the United States."

[From the Washington Post, Mar. 1, 1963]

DODD AND THE TEST BAN

I would like to comment on your editorial of February 22 which misrepresented my position in several respects.

I have never stated or implied anything so preposterous as that this administration or its predecessor would deliberately imperil the security of the United States. I do contend that the test-ban policy pursued in good faith by both administrations has already cost us our nuclear superiority over the Soviets, and will gravely imperil our security unless soon revised.

My assumptions are these: Such peace as we have is based upon our nuclear parity with Russia; if the Soviets continue nuclear tests, and we do not, they will develop weapons so superior to ours that they can confront us with a choice between surrender or annihilation; the safeguards in our current test-ban proposal are so inadequate that the Soviets can continue testing in secret, after they have disarmed us through the signing of a treaty.

It is demonstrable that in 4 years of negotiations, the Soviets have whittled down our detection and inspection provisions to the point where they are only one-tenth as effective as those in our original proposal. And the whittling goes on.

We once demanded the right to inspect all seismic disturbances of a significant size; i.e., several hundred per year; we then dropped to 20, and then to 12, and then to 8, and then to 7, and now to 5.

We once insisted on 600 monitoring stations, then 180, and now 80.

We once insisted that monitoring stations be manned by nonnationals of the country involved. We now accept the principle that these stations may be manned by nationals, which means that the Russians are to be the judges of whether or not they themselves are cheating.

We once excluded from the treaty tests so small that they could not possibly be detected. We now include these undetectable shots.

We once proposed a control body on which no nation had the power of veto. We now give the Communist bloc the veto power.

We have made all of these retreats despite the testimony last September of our Disarmament Director, William Foster, that there has been no improvement in our verification capability.

Continued nuclear testing is essential to the perfection of the antimissile missile and to the development of the neutron bomb. The nation which first perfects either of these weapons will decisively overturn the balance of power. The kind of testing involved here is underground testing of small yields, which is precisely the kind most easily hidden. Under the provisions of this treaty, our chance of detecting sneak tests is one in a thousand. I am not willing to stake the survival of this country on such a gamble.

The question, then, recurs: Is it possible that any administration would negotiate a treaty as dangerous as I contend this one to be?

The Washington Post answers "No" and its answer seems to be based more on an act of faith than on an examination of fact. As a Senator it is my duty to assume that such a mistake is possible; and the history of all major nations in the 20th century is replete with mistakes of similar magnitude.

There is one supreme question which the Senate must ask about any nuclear test-ban treaty: Does it provide reasonable protection against cheating by the Soviets? If it does not it is worthless, worse than worthless, because it could lead to our national destruction. In my judgment, the present proposal of the United States does not meet that test. And so I am against it.

THOMAS J. DODD,
Senator from Connecticut.

WASHINGTON.

[From the Washington Post, Mar. 4, 1963]

A COMMUNICATION

On March 1 your newspaper carried a letter from the senior Senator from Connecticut, THOMAS J. DODD, in which he gave reasons why he believed the present U.S. position in the nuclear test ban negotiations was unsound. It is with great reluctance that I find myself having to express a disagreement with the Senator, a respected lawmaker and a distinguished public servant. But since it is the firm view of the national security advisers to the President that an effective test ban treaty is in the national interest and that our position at the negotiations is eminently sound, a few comments should be made with respect to the U.S. position and the points raised in the Senator's letter, as well as in his recent speech in the Senate.

1. The Senator stated that the test ban policy pursued by both the Eisenhower and Kennedy administrations "has already cost us our nuclear superiority over the Soviets." The actual situation is quite different. The United States has not lost its nuclear superiority over the U.S.S.R. The trend with unlimited testing, however, in the absence of an agreement will be toward equality in the major nuclear forces between the United States and the U.S.S.R.

2. A test ban agreement would inhibit nonnuclear powers from obtaining a nuclear weapons capability. The national interest of the United States is served more by a policy of inhibiting the proliferation of nuclear weapons than by a policy of being indifferent to the number of countries that may develop nuclear weapons of their own. A test ban agreement would not in itself be sufficient to prevent the spread of independent national nuclear capability, but it would be a definite step in the right direction. This question of nonproliferation is one that must be included in any total appraisal of the importance of a test ban agreement to the United States.

3. The Senator states that if the Soviets continue testing in secret under an agreement and we do not test, "they can confront us with a choice between surrender or annihilation." This is not correct. It is true that if the U.S.S.R. were able to test small devices clandestinely underground for an indefinite period, they could make significant advances in the general field of small nuclear weapons. However, every analysis conducted by the executive branch in recent years has reached the conclusion that the strategic military balance between the United States and the U.S.S.R. could not be altered in any major way by such developments. Furthermore, the risks of detection of a series of such tests would not be ignored by the U.S.S.R.

One test would hardly be significant to a nation bent on attempting to gain a military advantage by testing secretly. Such a nation would more likely want to conduct a series of tests, and a series runs a much greater probability of detection than a single test. The risk of undetected cheating would be present under any treaty. The type of treaty prepared by the United States would provide deterrence against Soviet attempts at undetected cheating so that while such a risk must be recognized, on balance the security of the United States would be better served by taking this risk than taking the risk of continued unlimited testing with no agreement.

4. It is contended that the U.S. provisions for inspection and detection are only one-tenth as effective as those in our original proposals because the United States is now proposing fewer detection stations and fewer inspections. The monitoring system now proposed will have at least the same degree of deterrent effect as that contemplated 4 years ago. The original proposal of an internationally operated system of 180 control posts located in every geographic area of the world was made at a time when we had less knowledge about the detection and identification of underground events and was for a system designed to monitor the entire globe. On the basis of knowledge and experience of of seismic events in the Soviet Union, we now know that the areas of interest can be monitored by a much smaller system which places primary reliance for the detection of events in the Soviet Union upon U.S. national systems located outside the Soviet Union. This is what we propose.

The original proposal would have required some 4 to 6 years to install and the international staff of technicians would have had to have been recruited and in many cases trained from scratch. Under the present proposal the United States would be relying on its own detection system which could begin operating immediately and which would be operated by United States and United Kingdom nationals who are already trained and skilled. This proposal would give the United States both maximum flexibility and maximum control of the detection system.

The previous proposal of the United States would have excluded from inspection underground events below a certain size—roughly, anything below a 20-kiloton explosion detonated in tuff, a relatively soft rock. And, at the same time, the United States would have agreed on a 3-year moratorium against conducting tests below this size. The present U.S. proposal would permit the United States to inspect, within the quota, for any underground event that had been detected and had not been positively identified as being an earthquake.

We also now know that the number of earthquakes in the U.S.S.R. is less by a factor of 2½ than we previously believed. This, coupled with our increased knowledge of earthquake identification, means that the number of unidentified underground events for which we might consider inspection, will be very substantially smaller than was assumed a few years ago. Furthermore, our knowledge in these areas is now based on actual observation, whereas only a few years ago it was based in large part on uncertain estimates.

5. It is suggested that the United States now is willing to accept the principle that monitoring stations be manned by Russians and that Russians "are to be the judges of whether or not they themselves are cheating." Again, this is not a correct statement. The detection stations on which the United States would rely would be operated or supervised by the United States and United Kingdom and would be outside of the Soviet Union. No Soviet national would judge whether the Soviets are cheating. Automatic recording seismic stations inside the Soviet Union would play a supplementary role only; furthermore, the sealed recording devices which these would contain would be serviced and the records would be picked up by non-Soviet personnel.

6. It is said that we now propose to give the Communist bloc a veto power on the control body of the test-ban organization. No veto on inspection has ever been proposed by the United States, and there is no consideration of proposing such a veto in the future.

7. It is stated that William Foster, Director of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, testified in September that there had been no improvement in our verification capability. On the contrary, Mr. Foster testified in September concerning two significant developments which increased our verification capability. The first was a "better capability for long-distance detection of earth tremors caused by nuclear explosions or earthquakes." The second was that "an earlier estimate of the number of tremors from earthquakes in the Soviet Union which might be confused with tremors from nuclear explosions has been shown by actual observations and research to be several times too large. Since there are fewer actual earthquakes which produce tremors similar to those of an explosion, the number of on-site inspections needed to identify the cause of any observed tremors is less." (Hearings before the Senate Preparedness Subcommittee, Sept. 17, 1962, p. 6.)

8. The Senator believes that continued testing is essential to the perfection of the antimissile missile and to the development of the neutron bomb, and that the nation which first perfects either of these weapons will decisively overturn the balance of power. These contentions were refuted generally in points 1–3 above. Additionally, the perfection of the antimissile missile does not rest primarily on nuclear weapons testing. It rests on other kinds of activities. Even then, our military experts are of the view that the nation sending a missile to its target will always have the advantage over any foreseeable anti missile-missile defense system. With respect to the neutron bomb, a weapon whose successful development is by no means assured no matter how many tests are made, the chief interest of the United States is to prevent the Soviet Union and other states from acquiring this kind of a weapon. These states are much more likely to be inhibited from developing and producing the neutron bomb under a test-ban agreement than under a situation of unlimited testing.

The United States will continue to persist in its negotiations with the Soviets to achieve an effective treaty. We do this because we firmly believe such an agreement is in the national interest of the United States.

Every person weighing the value and the risks of a test-ban agreement must face squarely the situation in which we reach no agreements and allow testing to go on, unlimited, and see the arms race continue to spiral upward. Those within both the Eisenhower and Kennedy administrations who have studied these questions and these alternatives thoroughly, have concluded that every effort to bring the arms race under control, of which nuclear testing is a part, must be pursued diligently.

I would hope that this letter demonstrates that the kind of test-ban agreement now being negotiated by the United States is one that is in the national interest.

Adrian S. Fisher,
Deputy Director, U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency.

[From the Washington Post, Mar. 5, 1963]

The Test-Ban Debate

The U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency is caught in the usual dilemma of all American treaty negotiators since John Jay: the negotiating foreign power must be convinced that concessions are being made and the Congress must be convinced that no concessions are being made. When the Agency produces a treaty—if it ever does—the document is likely to get about the same reception that Mr. Jay's treaty with Great Britain received at the hands of Congress. In Washington's administration the congressional critics at least waited until the treaty was before Congress.

To the critics on the Hill the Agency now has made, through Deputy Director Adrian S. Fisher, a point-by-point defense of its latest proposals that is calm, convincing, and persuasive. It sets the record straight on several points. Contrary to critics of the voluntary moratorium and opponents of any further test suspension, the United States has not lost its nuclear superiority over the U.S.S.R.

Far from a series of retreats on inspection, the Agency believes the system it now proposes will have at least the same degree of deterrent effect as that contemplated 4 years ago. The changes reflect scientific advances in detection and not political retreats in negotiation.

The objections that a test ban may permit the Soviet Union to get ahead on antimissile missiles or on the development of a neutron bomb are effectively dealt with. So far as the antimissile development is concerned the point is well made that thermonuclear experiment is not the primary matter in perfecting the antimissile missile. So far as the neutron bomb is concerned, the Agency once again emphasizes that the perfection of such a weapon is by no means assured and its development is likely to be deferred, in the Soviet Union as well as in this country, by carefully inspected test suspension. If no one ever develops it, mankind will be the gainer.

The risks of test suspension are put in perspective by Fisher's declaration that clandestine testing of small weapons devices would not imperil the strategic military balance between the United States and the U.S.S.R.

Two administrations, the Fisher report declares, have "concluded that every effort to bring the arms race under control (including nuclear testing) must be pursued diligently." It is a conclusion that public opinion in this country overwhelmingly supports, in our judgment.

The Arms Control and Disarmament Agency did not pretend that there are no risks involved in test suspension. There very definitely are some risks. There are risks in continued testing, too. We do not have a choice between risk and no risk but a choice between risks. This is the light in which the treaty proposals must be examined. There is bound to be a great debate over such choices of policy. Let us hope it may be conducted throughout on the high plane of the brief submitted Monday by the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency.

[From the Washington Post, Mar. 7, 1963]

A Communication

In a detailed communication published by the Washington Post on March 4 and released to the general press, Mr. Adrian Fisher, Deputy Director of the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, has challenged certain of the assertions I made in a recent speech on the floor of the Senate and in a previous letter to the editor of the Post.

I welcome Mr. Fisher's statement because I feel that only good can come from a public discussion of the issues involved. Mr. Fisher, incidentally, was my colleague at the Nuremberg trial and while I disagree sharply with some of his statements on the test-ban issue, I have the greatest respect for him both as a man and as a Government official.

For almost two decades, the peace and security of the United States and the free world have rested upon the unchallengeable military power with which our nuclear technology has armed us. All of our honorable efforts toward lasting peace and disarmament through negotiation have failed, each in its turn, because of the calculated deceit and treachery of the Communists. Yet, because of our nuclear technology, we have preserved a form of peace.

Five years ago we began to fritter away our nuclear supremacy. We stopped testing and trusted the Soviets to stop. We halted or hobbled our development of a variety of new, revolutionary weapons. Then we awoke one September morning to find that the Soviets had cheated us again.

When the mushroom clouds of their awesome series of gigantic test shots had faded, we discovered that our precious nuclear supremacy had vanished and we suddenly entered the more perilous age of parity in nuclear technology.

TESTIMONY CITED

Mr. Fisher disputes this loss of supremacy, but all scientists with access to the facts, from Edward Teller to Hans Bethe, have testified that the Soviets have eliminated our technological lead in the field of strategic nuclear weapons.

We are now asked by the administration to end all further nuclear development by entering into a treaty with the Soviets to permanently stop all tests. We are asked to do this despite the fact that we are on the threshold of decisive new discoveries, denied us by the previous test ban, discoveries that might restore our lead and dramatically strengthen the security and peace of the free world.

The great question before us is: Does this treaty provide an adequate system of inspection with reasonable assurance that the Soviets are not secretly continuing nuclear tests that can give them the revolutionary weapons denied to us by our observance of the test ban?

I have laboriously pointed out in speeches and letters that there is no such assurance; that we have no way of detecting underground tests of a size below several kilotons; that we have no way of detecting test shots in outer space of any size. This has been conceded by administration witnesses at congressional hearings. It is through hidden tests of these kinds that defy detection that the Soviets could develop a neutron bomb, and antimissile missile warhead and other decisive weapons.

Mr. Fisher's widely publicized letter purports to answer these statements. But the remarkable fact is that nowhere in his detailed defense of the administration position is it said that this treaty gives us solid assurance that the Soviets cannot continue tests and develop new weapons while we are immobilized. On the contrary, he confirms my misgivings. He affirms that the proposed treaty does involve the risk of undetected cheating. He affirms that individual tests could go undetected. He concedes that there is only a probability that a whole series of tests could be detected, not a certainty, but a probability, which means that there is a possibility that whole series of tests could not be detected. He says we must accept the risk of undetected Soviet cheating because other risks are more dangerous. I challenge this last contention, but before going on to it I want to nail down the fact that the proposed inspection terms do not give us a guarantee against cheating. This is the cardinal fact to which all other considerations must be subordinate.

REASON IS GIVEN

The reason why the proposed inspection system is inadequate as I have tried to point out in the past, is that we have made so many retreats and concessions to the Soviets in 5 years of negotiations that our proposed system of monitoring stations and on-site inspections within the Soviet Union is now a hollow shell.

Mr. Fisher disputes this in two ways: First, he says that improvements in the science of detecting earthquakes and underground explosions have justified a vastly reduced inspection system within the Soviet Union. I dispute this. I say that advances in the science of deception have outraced advances in the science of detection and I point to the fact that it is now possible for the Soviets to test secretly in outer space and to test large weapons underground without any possibility of detection. This situation did not exist 5 years ago and it makes any gain in earthquake science irrelevant and insignificant by comparison.

Second, he says that it does not matter, anyway, because our reliance is based, not upon monitoring inside the Soviet Union, but upon monitoring stations outside. Here the cardinal principle of American disarmament policy for 16 years goes down the drain. That principle was adequate onsite inspection and control. For 16 years the Soviets have rejected this principle and we now yield to them by saying that our reliance is on a system of outside monitoring and that the token inspection inside the Soviet Union is only supplemental and unimportant.

I do not take lightly the efforts of honest men to develop an inspection system that would get around the Soviet roadblock against on-site inspections, but I say to the American people: When we consider the vast land expanse of the Communist world, occupying one-fifth of the earth's surface; when we consider the limitless capacity of the Communists for fraud and deceit; when we consider their present capacity for undetectable tests underground and in space; when we consider the unknown possibilities for deception which perverted science will give them in the future, we cannot, we must not, entrust our national survival to a treaty which denies us a reasonably foolproof inspection system inside the Soviet Union. We must not entrust the future of freedom to a system of absentee monitoring.

CALLED SPECULATION

I am willing to rest my case against the treaty right here, but for the sake of adequate reply I will take up Mr. Fisher's contentions that a treaty should be ratified which admittedly involves great risk and abandons adequate onsite inspection.

The reasons he advances are in the realm of political and strategic speculation. It is contended that the risks of not signing this treaty are greater than the acknowledged risks of signing it. These greater risks are continued testing by the Soviets and the spread of nuclear technology to other nations. This argument is entirely irrelevant because the proposed treaty does not prevent all testing by the Soviet Union and does not even pretend to prevent the spread of nuclear weaponry to other nations. France and China have already repudiated the negotiations.

I voted for the establishment of the Disarmament Agency because I hoped and still hope that it can lead us to improved systems of detection which will make reliable disarmament treaties possible. I am ready to vote for such treaties and I say to the administration: Give us a proposal that does prevent continued Soviet testing and we shall all support it. Give us a proposal that does prevent the spread of nuclear weapons to other nations and we shall all support it. But do not give us a treaty which prevents only the nuclear development of the United States and Great Britain, the principal defenders of freedom in the world.

It is contended by Mr. Fisher that we can risk clandestine Soviet testing because the type of weapons that could be developed will not significantly alter the military balance of power. This argument is accompanied by speculation that it is unlikely that an effective antimissile system or a neutron bomb can be perfected.

LABELED "DEFEATIST"

This reveals a defeatist train of thought which is perhaps the most dangerous element of the administration proposal. This is a philosophy that rests its hope upon scientific stagnation and thus runs against the grain of human experience. This is a Maginot line philosophy applied to the nuclear age. This is a philosophy that says "we are going to stop here"—and that "new scientific developments by the other side won't really make any difference." This is a philosophy that says about the neutron bomb what the French once said of the German tank, "it won't make any difference anyway."

How ridiculous to say that live testing is not essential to the development of the antimissile missile. You cannot make an automobile without live tests. Does anyone suppose that the most complicated weapon ever attempted can be perfected without testing in its final assembled form?

How blind to say that the neutron bomb would not alter the balance of power. The nation that has it can destroy opposing armies without risk of fallout, or damage to the property of friend or foe. The nation that does not have it will be faced with a choice between surrender or starting an all-out nuclear war.

In the age of nuclear warfare you can make only one mistake. So long as this treaty leaves a possibility that the Russians will attain these weapons, we must have them and we must have them first.

I would like also to reply to certain challenges made by Mr. Fisher which are not central to the real argument but which do reflect upon the accuracy of those who oppose the test proposal.

Mr. Fisher disputes my contention that we have given the Communists a veto power on the control body of the test ban organization. I refer him to article IV, clause 4 of our recent draft treaty which gives the Soviets a veto power over the budget of the control body and, therefore, over its effectiveness, and to article IV, clause 8 which gives the Communists a veto over the appointment of the executive officer, thus establishing the veto precedent.

QUOTES FROM RECORD

Mr. Fisher denies my statement that Disarmament Director William Foster stated last September that there had been no improvement in our verification capabilities. I refer Mr. Fisher to page 66 of the Stennis subcommittee hearings of last September. Let me quote from the record:

"Mr. KENDALL. I was glad you made it clear, Mr. Foster, that it is important that we make a distinction between our ability to detect and our ability to identify whether an event is nuclear or nonnuclear. I believe you said, if I understand you correctly, that there had been no significant breakthrough or advancement of our ability to identify. Is that correct?

"Mr. FOSTER. That is correct."

We are constrained to walk a path that is strewn with awesome risks forced upon us by our declared enemies. We cannot lessen these risks by a policy which is a blend of defeatism, groundless idealism, and blind trust of the Soviet Union.

Since the proposed treaty does not of a certainty prevent continued Soviet nuclear development, we must place our trust in our own development. We must stake our future, not on what our enemies will forbear to do, but on what we can and must do. We must rest our faith upon the conviction that freemen, free thought, and free science, dedicated to the noble motive of preserving Western civilization, is resourceful enough to give us the tools we need to preserve our peace and our freedom.

Thomas J. Dodd.

[From the Washington Post, Mar. 7, 1963]

Kennedy Gives A-Ban Position

(By Howard Simons)

President Kennedy yesterday sought to assure Congress that his administration has no intention of signing a nuclear test ban agreement with the Soviet Union that would imperil American security.

The President's remarks came as congressional concern heightened following continued Defense Department testimony pointing up scientific and technological limitations of present U.S. capability to detect and identify secret underground nuclear tests from afar.

Setting forth the Administration's position in the current test-ban negotiations at his news conference, Mr. Kennedy said:

"We have suggested that we would not accept a test ban which did not give us every assurance that we could detect a series of tests underground. We would not submit a treaty which did not provide that assurance to the U.S. Senate. Nor would the Senate approve it."

EXPERTS TESTIFY

At about the same time yesterday morning that the President was clarifying his position, Defense Department experts appearing before the Joint Congressional Committee on Atomic Energy were continuing to chip away at any suggestion that today's seismic or earthquake detection methods, by themselves, enable experts to distinguish between earthquakes and explosions.

It is for this reason that the United States has repeatedly insisted upon a certain number of on-site inspections of Soviet territory. As Mr. Kennedy put it yesterday, "We have not been able to make discriminations so effective that we can do without on-site inspections and without a sufficient number to prevent a series of tests carried out which would be undetected."

Basically, what the Joint Committee heard yesterday was an assessment of present U.S. capability to detect and to identify seismic events occuring in Russia using detection stations outside Soviet territory. The assessment came largely from Carl Romney of the Air Force Technical Applications Center and amounted to the following:

Of the seismic events that can now be detected from afar with good reliability, about 170 occur on the average in the Soviet Union every year. Of these, 20 can be definitely ruled out as earthquakes.

Of the remaining 150, about 75 will still be suspect—that is, they cannot be easily identified as either an earthquake or a secret underground nuclear explosion. But these 75 events will give enough telltale signs to be partially identified as one or the other.

Of the last 75 events, there would be no information whatsoever to give detection experts a clue as to the true nature of these events. It is for these reasons that onsite inspections are necessary.

Replying to questions, Romney said that a potential cheater would be able to test 1-kiloton devices in granite; 2- to 6-kiloton devices in tuff (a volcanic ash); and 10- to 20-kiloton devices in dry alluvium (a sandy material), with no seismic means presently available to catch the cheater.

PROGRESS POSSIBLE

In previous testimony before the committee it was noted that the majority of U.S. underground nuclear tests being conducted in Nevada involved devices of 4 kilotons or less, indicating that atomic weapons progress can be made using devices of these sizes.

The President and Joint Committee members essentially agreed yesterday in their separate commentaries that detection was only one of the problems to be resolved with Russia. Many more exist, some as difficult to solve as seismic detection, including, as was noted yesterday, the number of onsite inspections, the kind of such inspections, and the circumstances under which the inspections would be carried out.

At one point in yesterday's Joint Committee hearings, the chairman, Senator John O. Pastore, Democrat, of Rhode Island, apparently reacting to the many recent Republican attacks on the President's handling of the test-ban talks, said the record should show that the first "giveaway, if that term is appropriate," began during the Eisenhower administration.

Pastore was referring to the Eisenhower administration's acceptance, of a Soviet proposal in 1960, which would have amounted to an unpoliced moratorium on all nuclear tests below a certain magnitude.

"Where were those loud voices in 1960, that we are hearing today?" Pastore asked.

[From the Washington Post, Mar. 7, 1963]

Transcript of President Kennedy's News Conference

TEST BAN

Question. Mr. President, on Monday Adrian Fisher, Deputy Director of the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency said even if the Russians were able to test underground indefinitely this would not alter the strategic military balance between the United States and the Soviet Union. He said this was the executive assessment. Given that assessment, can you tell us what considerations then would prevent accepting a test ban on the terms set by Russia?

Answer. I don't think, if I may say so—in my opinion that is not what is the administration's position. We have suggested that we would not accept a test ban which would permit indefinite underground testing by the Soviet Union. We would not accept a test ban which did not give us every assurance that we could detect a series of tests underground. That is the administration's position. We would not submit a treaty which did not provide that assurance to the U.S. Senate. Nor would the Senate approve it.

INSPECTIONS

Question. You believe that the present insistence upon seven will have to be maintained, is that correct?

Answer. I believe we will insist upon a test-ban treaty which gives us assurance that if any country conducted a series of clandestine underground tests that series would be detected.

Now we have not only the problem of the number of inspections, but the kinds of inspections, the circumstances under which the inspections would be carried out, so that we have a good deal of distance to go in securing an agreement with the Soviet Union.

We have not been able to make any real progress on the question of the numbers, but I want to emphasize that this is only one phase of it. We have to also discuss what the area would be, in each test, what would be the conditions under which the inspectors would move in and out.

I want to say that we have made substantial progress as a result of a good deal of work by the U.S. Government in recent years, in improving our detection capabilities.

We have been able to determine that there are substantially less number of earthquakes in the Soviet Union than we had formerly imagined. We have also been able to make far more discriminating our judgments from a long distance of what would be perhaps an atomic test and what would be an earthquake. But we have not been able to make discriminations so effective that we can do without on-site inspections and without a sufficient number to prevent a series of tests being carried out which would be undetected. I can assure you that no agreement will be accepted which would permit any such conditions.

SEABEE DAY IN RHODE ISLAND

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, this is a week of celebration for the Navy Seabees and their friends. This is especially true in my State of Rhode Island where our Governor proclaimed the very first day of March as Seabee Day; and the people have joined with their Seabee neighbors in the observance of March 5, actually the 21st anniversary of this historic organization.

The universal observance by the Seabees will be March 9 and it seems fitting and proper to add this day, March 7 in the Congress, and to include my few but appreciative remarks, to the calendar of acclaim of the Seabees.

All the people of Rhode Island have justifiable pride in this component of our Armed Forces. We would, I am sure, be proud of them under any circumstance, but our close association with them over the years while we have followed their accomplishments in both war and peace has heightened our appreciation of this fine group of men.

The Seabees were organized in Rhode Island in 1942 at what is now the Naval Construction Battalion Center, Davisville. We in Rhode Island have witnessed the birth of this new concept in the use of naval personnel—a builder-fighter who picks up his tools and weapons and goes to all parts of the globe to build shore facilities in support of the fleet. During World War II, we saw the seasoned construction worker, much older than the ordinary naval recruit, receive combat training to complement his construction skills. We saw more than 100,000 of these men train in Rhode Island to build and to fight, to operate in the forefront of amphibious assaults, or to do any other necessary job in far-off places which are now associated with hard-won victories in the annals of World War II. We heard of the immense energy and enthusiasm with which they resolved the most difficult problems and we received reports of their prodigious construction feats.

Where did they serve? The combat zone need only be named and the Seabees were there—amphibious operations in the Pacific, in North Africa, Sicily, Salerno, Omaha and Utah beaches in Normandy, the Rhine crossing. They constructed fuel depots, ship repair facilities, naval airfields, ammunition depots, and other similar advance naval base facilities in the Caribbean, Iceland, Newfoundland, Alaska, and the Aleutians.

The exploits of the Seabees have been well recognized in books, movies, on the Broadway stage and on television. This young naval organization, small by the usual standards, has indeed struck a responsive chord in the minds and sympathies of the American people.

Thus, is it any wonder that Rhode Islanders are extremely proud of their "can do" Seabees?

However, while it is gratifying that the World War II Seabee is remembered for his deeds, all recitals must not be in the past tense as the Seabee does not belong to a bygone era.

The "home of the Atlantic Seabees," the Naval Construction Battalion Center, Davisville, R.I., is today a "CB hive" of activity. Here the Seabees are housed, fed, and are provided with training and recreational facilities while they are in home port between arduous deployments. While the Seabees are given leave, rest, and training for their next assignment, the center is busily engaged in complex preparations for the future. In close cooperation with the Seabees, center personnel determine the materials that will be required for construction projects. Construction materials are procured, packed, and shipped. When the material arrives at the construction site, the Seabees have every timber, nail, bag of cement, and light bulb, necessary to erect and occupy their current project. In the meantime, their vehicles and construction equipment have been overhauled by the center and are shipped to them in tiptop operating condition.

The Construction Battalion Center takes these assignments in stride because during the more than 20 years it has worked hand in hand with the Seabees in war and peace and it has always been alert to their ever-changing needs. During World War II, innumerable quonset huts, Navy pontoons, and thousands of tons of advance base construction material were shipped. From quonset huts to nuclear reactors, the Construction Battalion Center along with the Seabees has kept pace with technological advancement and continues to serve the Seabees whether in a tropical location or snowbound Antarctica.

Today, Seabees stand ready for immediate deployment to any part of the world. They help support the U.S. scientific programs by construction of remote tracking stations for satellites and by construction of facilities in the Antarctic from McMurdo to the pole. They recently completed the installation of the first nuclear power plant in the Antarctic at McMurdo Sound. By assisting, when requested, they actively support the President's people-to-people program. Specificially, assistance in Chile after the recent horrible earthquake, assistance to the Navy in Ecuador in construction of the Naval Academy, assistance in Haiti after recent floods and in connection with improvement of port facilities.

This world service of the Seabees, Mr. President, service in the emergencies of peace no less than war, endear them to what we like to call their Rhode Island home.

Every Rhode Islander, individual and official, has a warm spot in his or her heart for the Seabee as exemplified in the proclamation of Seabee Day by Rhode Island's Governor, John H. Chafee, and I ask unanimous consent that this proclamation may be inserted in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the proclamation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PROCLAMATION FOR SEABEE DAY BY JOHN H. CHAFEE, GOVERNOR

Whereas the celebration of the Seabees' 21st anniversary will be on March 1, 1963; and

Whereas on this date units of the Naval Construction Battalion will mark another year of distinguished service to our country, and throughout the world Seabees will celebrate their 21st anniversary with the traditional birthday balls and cake-cutting ceremonies; and

Whereas Rhode Island is the home of the Atlantic Fleet and its citizens are unanimous in their admiration and respect for all components of the United States Navy; now, therefore, do I, John H. Chafee, Governor of the State of Rhode Island and Providence Plantations, proclaim Friday, March 1, 1963, as Seabee Day, and call upon the citizens of this State to join in tribute to the endeavors and achievements of the Seabees, an organization of outstanding merit.

In testimony whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and caused the seal of the State to be affixed this 30th day of January, in the year of our Lord, one thousand nine hundred and sixty-three, and of independence, the one hundred and eighty-seventh.

JOHN H. CHAFEE,
Governor.

By the Governor:
[SEAL] AUGUST P. LAFRANCE,
Secretary of State.

JOHN G. FEILD AND THE PRESIDENT'S COMMITTEE ON EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY

Mr. HART. Mr. President, the record of achievement of the President's Committee on Equal Employment Opportunity, I believe, when analyzed, will be one of the most dramatic events of recent years. It is my hope in the days ahead to have the opportunity to fully develop for the RECORD this remarkable success story.

Today I should like to place in the RECORD a series of letters which reflect in a nutshell the attitude of a man whose lifetime dedication to the cause of civil rights is well known in Michigan, and, I believe, across the country. I refer to John G. Feild, Executive Director of the President's Committee on Equal Employment Opportunity.

First I should say that John Feild and I have long been associated in this and other efforts; indeed, he and I came to Washington together in 1959.

I should like to place in the RECORD certain letters, so that everyone may better understand the attitude and sentiment of John Feild in his taking leave of the President's Committee on Equal Employment Opportunity.

The first letter, his letter of resignation, is directed to the Secretary of Labor, the Honorable W. Willard Wirtz, and is dated February 5, 1963.

In this letter Mr. Feild outlines the past 22 months, when a vast reorganization of the Federal Government's means to eliminate discriminatory employment practices within Government agencies and on the part of Government contractors took place.

He states:

> It is, therefore, with some pride on behalf of the Committee's staff that I report that this first phase of the Committee's assignment has been substantially completed and that this program is now producing unprecedented results. Not only have twice as many complaints been processed during this period than were received during the entire preceding 8 years, but the rate at which we have taken corrective action is now running two or three times that of our predecessor committees.

I ask unanimous consent that this letter be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE PRESIDENT'S COMMITTEE ON
EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY,
Washington, D.C., February 5, 1963.

Hon. W. WILLARD WIRTZ,
Secretary of Labor,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: As you know, I have served as the Executive Director of the President's Committee on Equal Employment Opportunity since it was established in April 1961. As the Committee's full-time staff director I was responsible for the organization of the Committee's program and the supervision of the Committee's staff under the overall policy guidance of Assistant Secretary of Labor Jerry Holleman, who was the Committee's Executive Vice Chairman until his resignation.

During the past 22 months we have completed a vast reorganization of the Federal Government's means and capability to eliminate discriminatory employment practices within its own agencies and on the part of Government contractors. New programs designed to add emphasis and effectiveness to our efforts have been brought into being. These have included the comprehensive compliance reporting programs involving nearly 100,000 Government contractors and more than 15 million workers. They have also included new programs designed to work cooperatively with labor organizations toward the elimination of restrictive practices; to work with vocational educational resources in the improvement of training opportunities, including apprenticeship; to work with community organizations throughout the country for the greater involvement of local leadership in the advancement of the Committee's objectives; and to work with leading businesses and trade groups toward the same objectives.

In addition, the new annual Federal Census of the Status of the Minority Workers in the Federal Establishment has been launched and regularized, placing in the hands of agency executives new tools with which to identify employment problems and improve employment opportunities for all Federal workers.

It is, therefore, with some pride on behalf of the Committee's staff that I report that this first phase of the Committee's assignment has been substantially completed and that this program is now producing unprecedented results. Not only have twice as many complaints been processed during this period than were received during the entire preceding 8 years, but the rate at which we have taken corrective action is now running two and three times that of our predecessor committees. For example, whole new patterns of employment opportunity have been introduced into the tobacco industry, in the petro-chemical industry, in electronics, in the auto and aircraft industries, in shipbuilding, and in various segments of other industries. A beginning has been made in affecting the practices of the textile industry in the South, although substantial need for improvement remains. The same could be said for utilities located in the South. Encouraging new developments have begun in the insurance industry, although the enlargement of opportunities in this and similar areas remains a formidable challenge.

For these reasons and with the Committee's policy statement adopted at its September meeting in mind, I am convinced that the Committee's commitments under the Executive Order to a program which will bring about equal employment opportunity have been firmly implemented with a new structure and a new degree of coordination among the many Federal agencies involved. It has been an honor to all of us to have worked toward these goals under the energetic leadership of Vice President LYNDON B. JOHNSON and your predecessor, Justice Arthur Goldberg.

With the appointment by the President of a new full-time Executive Vice Chairman, the Committee is now in a position to move forward effectively and comprehensively in extending its program both within government and among government contractors. As you know, this transition has been accomplished during the past few months, and I have every reason to believe that the executive leadership now being fully exercised by our Executive Vice Chairman will accomplish the goals which all of us share.

For these reasons, as you know, I have recommended that the organizational framework of the Committee be streamlined and that the Committee's small staff be coordinated under the direct executive leadership of the Executive Vice Chairman. The greatly improved capability of the various operating agencies to carry out the objectives of the Committee makes it even more important that the Committee's coordinating and reviewing responsibilities should be highly centralized.

With these considerations in mind, I have recently accepted an assignment with the Potomac Institute, a nonprofit organization working in the field of human relations, which has undertaken numerous important studies for various Federal agencies. My assignment with the Potomac Institute will enable me to direct a number of special projects which, hopefully, will contribute not only to the program of the President's Committee but to the broader field of civil rights and human relations problems.

I am, therefore, at this time submitting my resignation to you as chief administrative officer of the Committee. It would be my hope that I could be relieved of my duties as close to the first of March as possible, although as per your request, I will continue to make myself available for as long a period as you may deem necessary.

Let me say in conclusion that I have personally appreciated your strong interest in the Committee's program and I will look forward to continued association with you from my new position.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN G. FEILD,
Executive Director.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, the next letter is directed to the Vice President, who is the Chairman of the President's Committee on Equal Employment Opportunity. Mr. Feild's letter to the Secretary of Labor was enclosed with this letter to the Vice President. The letter to the Vice President is dated February 5, 1963. In it Mr. Feild says:

> As Chairman of the Committee, I wish to extend to you my sincere appreciation for the opportunity and honor of serving under you in this important undertaking. Your energetic and determined leadership has made this committee the most valuable research developed in the field of civil rights since the days of the Emancipation.
>
> I wish to add my admiration to those of your fellow Americans for the contribution you are making toward the improvement of opportunities for all Americans.

This tribute to the Vice President is most significant, not only because of the dedication and identification of John Feild, but because it is a tribute to the Vice President from the inside on the kind of drive and leadership that has been given in this area of critical importance to ourselves and to all our people by the Vice President.

I ask unanimous consent that this letter also be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE PRESIDENT'S COMMITTEE ON
EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY,
Washington, D.C., February 5, 1963.

THE VICE PRESIDENT,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. VICE PRESIDENT: Attached you will find a letter which I have forwarded to Secretary of Labor W. Willard Wirtz in which I have submitted to him, as the Committee's chief administrative officer, my resignation.

As Chairman of the Committee, I wish to extend to you my sincere appreciation for the opportunity and honor of serving under you in this important undertaking. Your energetic and determined leadership' has made this Committee the most valuable resource developed in the field of civil rights since the days of the Emancipation.

I wish to add my admiration to those of your fellow Americans for the contribution you are making toward the improvement of opportunities for all Americans. I have tried to the best of my ability to reflect in my actions on the Committee's staff the standards you have expected of our efforts. I sincerely hope that the days ahead will see even greater success for the Committee.

I want to wish you Godspeed in your efforts.

Respectfully yours,

JOHN G. FEILD,
Executive Director.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, finally I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD at this point the letter of the Vice President to Mr. Feild.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE VICE PRESIDENT,
Washington, D.C., February 11, 1963.

Mr. JOHN G. FEILD,
Executive Director, the President's Committee on Equal Employment Opportunity, Washington, D.C.

DEAR JOHN: I want you to know that I deeply appreciate your warm letter. I believe you exhibited a high degree of dedication to the cause of human rights during the months that you served as Executive Director of the Committee and your dedication will stand you in good stead.

It was pleasing to know that you are going to continue in the field that is so close to your heart, and I wish you every success in the days that lie ahead.

Sincerely,

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

PROPOSED CONSOLIDATION OF INTERNAL REVENUE SERVICE OFFICES

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I should like to discuss for a few minutes a subject which was discussed earlier by the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS]; namely, the announcement by the Internal Revenue Service that it is consolidating 12 of its offices in the smaller States with offices in larger States. I am particularly concerned over the announcement of the Internal Revenue Service that the work of this Service in Maine and New Hampshire and Vermont will be transferred largely to Boston.

I intend to disregard the political aspects of this latest maneuver of the Internal Revenue Service. I do not intend to discuss the assurance which they have given the employees that they will not be demoted until after the 1964 election.

As for moving the regional offices from New York to Boston, I have full confidence in the ability of Governor Rockefeller and the State of New York to protect themselves. If Governor Rockefeller does not yet know that the campaign of 1964 is well underway, I think he should be discouraged from becoming a candidate for office. However, I feel that perhaps he does not realize that the campaign of 1964 is underway.

Why should offices in Maine, New Hampshire, and Vermont be abolished or, in effect, abolished, and all the authority which has gone with these offices transferred to Boston?

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I do not have any time to yield, unless I am given additional time.

Mr. MORSE. I ask unanimous consent that the Senator may be given additional time so that he may yield to me for a question.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? Does the Senator from Vermont yield to the Senator from Oregon so that the Senator from Oregon may ask him a question?

Mr. MORSE. I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Vermont may be given an additional minute.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the Senator from Vermont being granted an additional minute?

Mr. AIKEN. I should like to have 5 or 10 minutes or a half hour.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President——

Mr. AIKEN. I should like to have 5 minutes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator may proceed.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I have a feeling that the Senator from Vermont, as the dean on the Republican side of the aisle, may be able to get some information from my party's administration. If he is able to do so, we will be very grateful to him. I cannot get an answer from the administration. Therefore, I should like to ask the Senator from Vermont if he will try to find out what the reason is for moving some offices of the Treasury from Portland, Oreg., out of my State. There is only one-way traffic with regard to Oregon. All the offices are being moved out of the State, whether they concern the Treasury, the regional offices of the Post Office, or the Federal Power Commission. As I say, it is all one-way traffic in Oregon. We cannot understand the reason for this move. If the dean on the Republican side of the aisle can obtain the answer for us, he will be doing a great personal favor for the people of Oregon.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Vermont yield to the Senator from Michigan?

Mr. AIKEN. I will yield, if the time is not taken out of my 10 minutes.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator may be given an additional 2 minutes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator may proceed.

Mr. HART. First I should like to say that the commitment which had been given to the people of Michigan and to their delegation in Congress has gone competely by the board. After a careful and intensive survey it was determined by the Internal Revenue Service that a data-processing center, one of nine throughout the country, would be located in the Detroit metropolitan area, which embraces a region of many counties.

The reorganization plan proposed yesterday by the Treasury Department has removed that data-processing center.

To us this proposal must be a complete oversight. I say that because I am convinced that the administration would not go back on its commitment, given to us so solidly.

When we heard about it, we went to the White House. I believe that is the euphemistic way of referring to people without describing them further. At the White House we voiced our protest against this proposal.

I trust that the commitment given to us will be honored. If the Treasury Department has any concern about getting a tax bill through Congress, it ought to double check its relationship with Congress. The proposed step is not one which will be found in any basic text on how to get along with people or how to win friends.

Mr. AIKEN. I really appreciate the comments of the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Vermont yield me another 10 seconds?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Vermont may have an additional 3 minutes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator from Vermont is recognized for an additional 3 minutes.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I am particularly proud of myself for having asked the dean of the Republican side to get this information for me from the present administration, particularly the Republican Secretary of the Treasury, who, after all, must assume some responsibility for some of the moves. I should like to work with the Senator from Vermont to see if, between us, we can get an answer from the Secretary of the Treasury.

Mr. AIKEN. I do not know what degree of responsibility is assumed by the Republican Secretary of the Treasury. Over the years, the Internal Revenue offices of Maine, New Hampshire, and Vermont—and I think I may include Rhode Island, too, since Rhode Island also is affected by this order—have been efficient and respected and have never been touched by the breath of scandal.

Why at this time should all these offices be moved into Boston? The personnel of those offices have served well for 20 years; yet now they are told that they will have to fight for their new jobs, if they can get them. The only assurance they have is that they will not have their pay cut or will not lose their jobs until after the next election—or 2 years from now.

Why should a system which has worked so well over the years now be upset in favor of one which is dubious?

In reply to the question asked by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], this latest act on the part of the Internal Revenue Service merely follows a pattern which, while it originated a long time ago, has been accelerated rapidly during the past 2 years, namely, the pattern of breaking down State lines and concentrating the activities in a few urban centers of wealth, population, industry, and political power.

It is said by the administration that this is being done in only 12 States; and that the other 38 States certainly will not complain. I hope the other 38 States are not deluding themselves in any way; their turn is coming. As soon as the administration has abolished the offices and destroyed the pride of management of good offices in 12 States, it will certainly select 12 more States. The administration has not tried to touch any State south of Delaware yet; but it will. I assure the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN] and the Senators from the other Southern States that their turn will come. The administration is selecting a few States at a time in order to accomplish its program, but it is following a pattern of concentrating its power in a few great urban centers of the United States, from which operations can be more easily controlled by a few persons in Washington.

I hope I have made it clear that I do not approve of the action taken by the Secretary of the Treasury.

I observe the Senator from New York [Mr. KEATING] on his feet. If he wishes to defend New York, that is all right. I believe the regional office of the Internal Revenue Service in New England has been well handled and has been under good management. When the Government now seeks to consolidate district offices on a flimsy pretext, it is time for us to look out.

BAY OF PIGS

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, our sympathy goes out to the widows and children of the four Americans who were killed in the Bay of Pigs invasion in April 1961. They were mature men, not boys seeking adventure. Possibly they were employees of the Central Intelligence Agency who had been given the job of training anti-Castro Cubans in Guatemala for the invasion then being planned. This was during the Eisenhower administration. According to news accounts, their pay was $1,900 per month. Whether this big pay made them soldiers of fortune, if they volunteered for combat just before the ill-fated invasion, is a matter for argument. Undoubtedly, it was not expected that they would themselves engage in combat. Their job was to teach and train. Presumably in the excitement of the invasion, they offered to go in fighting. They became casualties of the Bay of Pigs invasion. It may be that the checks for $225 received every other week by each of these four widows come from the CIA. It is said that these payments will continue until the widows remarry. Let us see: $225 every other week amounts to approximately $487 per month. Unfortunately there are a number of widows, with children now of college age, of officers of our Air Force who lost their lives in combat in the service of their country in World War II. Have those war widows whose husbands, Air Force pilots or bombardiers in World War II who died heroically for their country, received as much as $487 per month from a grateful Government?

A niece of mine, whose husband, a young lawyer who became a tank captain and was killed in action in Europe in 1944, leaving her with a child who is now a college boy, must have read with surprise the newspaper accounts of the very substantial amounts of the checks received by these other widows, whose husbands were unfortunately killed in the Bay of Pigs invasion.

THE WELFARE OF OUR FARMERS

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, although I am no longer a member of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, on which I had the honor to serve for 4 years under the chairman of that committee, the distinguished senior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], I still have a great interest in the prosperity of our farmers. I am glad to observe the chairman in the Chamber. I hold him in high admiration for the achievements and the leadership of that committee during the 4 years of my service under his chairmanship.

The present administration has done much toward making less burdensome the serious problems with which our farmers were and are faced. I am positive that we in Congress shall continue to legislate for the welfare and prosperity of our farmers. I feel certain that this will be done so long as the present majority and the present chairman control the operations of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Therefore, I read with interest the editorial response to President Kennedy's farm message in two of Ohio's widely read, outstanding metropolitan newspapers, the Akron Beacon Journal and the Columbus Dispatch. Both recognize that farm legislation enacted by the 87th Congress reduced the surplus of wheat and feed grains, increased farm income, and put surplus foods to worthwhile use through school lunches, food stamp pilot programs, distribution to needy families, and the food-for-peace program. Both recognize that the President's farm proposals point the way to further farm program improvements.

Inasmuch as these editorials are thoughtful reviews of the farm situation and the operation of farm programs, I believe they merit the attention of my colleagues. Therefore, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that they be printed at this point in the Record, as part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Columbus (Ohio) Dispatch, Feb. 3, 1963]

FARM PROGRAM OFFERS SOME HOPE OF SOLUTION

President Kennedy's farm message to Congress omits most of the mandatory crop control proposals that stirred up a hornet's nest of opposition last year. In most respects the proposed program would retain the present system of voluntary controls in feed grains (with some amplification), make little change in the wheat program launched last year, and retain such features as the wheat referendum and the current system of price supports and bonuses.

The President and his farm advisers feel that the system, while not ideal, is beginning to work and already has made progress toward its goals.

The goals are considerable: Reduction of surpluses, reduction in expenditures for price-support programs, improved income for farm families, lower prices to consumers for food and fiber, and expanded exports.

Nevertheless, the President tells us, there is a substantial improvement in farm income, a substantial decrease in Government holdings of agricultural products, and a substantial reduction in costs to the taxpayer for carrying farm surpluses, without increasing the consumer's burden.

Probably the most vital phase of the program for Ohio is the part which pertains to feed grains. The President's proposals in this field include the following:

Extension of the current voluntary acreage-cutting program for perhaps 2 more years beginning with 1964, but with a contemplated easing of curbs next year. The general goal of keeping Government feed grain stock from dropping below the 45-million-ton supply deemed adequate as an emergency reserve, but continuing the reduction from the record high of 85 million tons in mid-1961. The reduction has come about mainly because of acreage cutting, increasing domestic consumption, and heavy exports.

The President called for an affirmative vote in the forthcoming wheat referendum to be held under the legislation enacted by Congress last year.

If two-thirds of the wheat producers in the Nation vote this spring to approve the bushel marketing law authorized by that law, the President declared, the present income of wheat farmers will be protected and "the overhanging surpluses of wheat will be further reduced."

Failure to approve the wheat program will leave the wheat farmer without either supply management or effective price supports—"at the mercy of unlimited production and unprotected prices."

If the wheat stabilization program is retained in the upcoming nationwide referendum, each wheat farmer will be assigned an acreage allotment. As previously, marketing quota penalties apply to excess wheat. Marketing quotas do not apply to farms that have 15 acres or less of wheat for harvest.

A support averaging $1.82 per bushel, nationally, on the 1963 wheat production will be available to a farmer who complies with his farm acreage allotment. In addition, an 18-cent-per-bushel price support payment will be available if the farmer complies with the 1963 stabilization program in its entirety.

Ohio wheat farmers traditionally have rejected the Government program because of deep-rooted opposition to Government intervention. As in the past, if the control program is voted this year, it will be because of the favorable vote in the Western States, with their huge wheat acreage, where the farmers want to make sure they receive the Government price support.

The Ohio farmer then is in the position of being able to take advantage of the price supports, meanwhile submitting to the control features which are distasteful to him.

An imponderable in the farm picture and the efficacy of the intricately devised program, replete with political concessions one way and the other, is the weather. One drought year, for instance, could wipe out the surplus in feed grains. The effect of prolonged subzero winter weather or a late planting of corn due to heavy spring rains and flooding, perhaps followed by unfavorable growing weather, could throw even so cleverly devised a program into disarray, with deeply disturbing results.

Because of its voluntary compliance features and some evidence that the program is working favorably in most of its several aspects, farmers generally, we believe, will look with reasonable favor on the President's latest version of his farm program, although some organized elements already are arrayed against it.

For one thing, the administration, we understand, does not plan to put all its proposals in one package, on which all its provisions would have to rise or fall. Instead, the various phases of the program are to be presented in separate bills, which will allow fuller debate and separate votes on the proposals affecting various crops and dairy products, food distribution, land use adjustment, rural electrification, vocational training and water retention.

Whether the program will bring order out of chaos, or produce more chaos, remains to be seen, but there is more reasonableness in the President's program as laid down in Congress last week than in some of the earlier approaches and recommendations.

[From the Akron (Ohio) Beacon Journal, Feb. 1, 1963]

THAT FARM PROBLEM

President Kennedy yesterday talked about the problem which is the envy of Premier Khrushchev—the overproduction of farm commodities.

Whereas the Russian Communists—and the Chinese Communists, too—carry on an endless, uphill struggle to expand agricultural production to meet the bare requirements of their people, the chronic problem here is just the opposite.

The President summed it up when he said:

"Our capacity to produce still outruns the growth of both domestic and foreign demand for food and fiber. Our abundance must still be harnessed in such a way as to bring supply and demand more nearly into balance. And the benefits of our agricultural progress still need to be translated into improved income to farm families, lower prices to consumers for food and fiber, expanded exports, and reduced expenditures for price support programs."

Mr. Kennedy's message was not entirely gloomy.

Net farm income at the end of 1962 was $1.8 billion a year higher than in 1960. Government stockpiles of surplus grain are down by 929 million bushels from their 1961 peak. Exports of farm commodities reached a record $5.1 billion in fiscal 1962. The emergency and temporary feed grain legislation of 1961 has been successful. Surplus foods have been put to good use through a variety of programs—school lunches and surplus commodity distribution to needy families, the food stamp experiment, and the oversea food-for-peace program.

But there was much to be reported on the negative side.

Unless wheat producers vote this spring to approve the bushel marketing program authorized by the 1962 law, wheat farmers again will be at the mercy of unlimited production and unprotected prices. New legislation is necessary to preserve the gains made in corn and other feed grains. The cotton industry is in trouble; help is needed both for producers and for textile mills.

And as for the dairy industry, the President reminded Congress that he warned last year that failure to pass legislation in this field would cost the Treasury $440 million a year in price support payments. The legislation was not passed. What happened?

"Costs have recently been running at a rate in excess of $500 million a year, and the income of the dairy farmer has fallen by over $100 million a year," Mr. Kennedy said.

Despite maximum use of dairy products in the various food distribution programs (the needy receiving surplus foods are using twice as much butter per person as other consumers), stocks continue to pile up; we now have 300 million pounds of butter in storage.

The remedy, Mr. Kennedy said, is to "enact a program under which only producers who cooperate by reducing their marketings 'would receive, through market prices and payments, a return on their marketings substantially greater than the noncooperators who choose not to join the program."

Overall, the legislative approach outlined by the President involves a greater degree of compulsion than is provided in present laws, though it still leaves farmers considerable freedom to go their own ruggedly individualistic ways.

Theoretically, the only sound solution for the surplus problem is total freedom for farmers, with prices governed wholly by the law of supply and demand, or total regimentation, with production strictly controlled and prices guaranteed by the Government.

But Congress has never been willing to accept either of these harsh extremes. It has always compromised. Probably it always will.

The relative success gained through present legislation may be partly luck, but it raises hope that additional success can be achieved with adoption of Mr. Kennedy's recommendations.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Ohio yield?

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I commend the Senator from Ohio for his very worthwhile and constructive activity as a member of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, as one who has been a true friend of the agricultural producers, and as a Senator who has understood the intricate problems of agricultural policy. We are very fortunate to have the benefit of the service and guidance of the Senator from Ohio. Although these editorials refer favorably to the President's program, it would not have been a program in action if it had not been for men such as the Senator from Ohio, who so vigorously supported it. So I heartily commend him.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, I express my gratitude to the distinguished senior Senator from Minnesota.

I yield the floor.

PROPOSED TRANSFER OF INTERNAL REVENUE SERVICE REGIONAL OFFICE FROM NEW YORK CITY TO BOSTON, MASS.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, probably it comes as no surprise to any Senator to know that I wish to say a few words about the proposed transfer of the Internal Revenue Service regional office from New York City to Boston.

Mr. HUMPHREY. To where?

Mr. KEATING. To Boston, Mass.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Oh, yes; I have heard of that city. But I thought the Senator said "Austin."

Mr. KEATING. That could be; perhaps that will be the next move. [Laughter.]

A public official in elected office should not complain—in fact, he should be grateful—if a move which will save some tax dollars is proposed.

It is claimed by the Secretary of the Treasury that from the entire series of changes there will be a tax saving of more than $5 million.

Before attacking this plan, I wish to express my gratitude to the Secretary of the Treasury and to the Commissioner of Internal Revenue for the courtesy they did me by notifying me of the devastating New York shift on the morning before the afternoon it was announced.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a copy of the letter from Mr. Caplin to me.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. TREASURY DEPARTMENT,
COMMISSIONER OF INTERNAL REVENUE,
Washington, D.C., March 5, 1963

MY DEAR SENATOR: About noon today, Secretary Dillon will announce publicly a series of changes he has authorized me to make in Internal Revenue Service field offices. I believe these changes will be of interest to you, so I am taking this means of giving you advance information on them.

The changes we are announcing will result in total savings of over $5 million annually, when they are fully implemented. Taxpayers will not be disadvantaged in any way by these changes; they will continue to receive all of the services they now receive. The changes are mainly in behind-the-scenes activities.

In response to President Kennedy's call upon all Federal agencies to achieve lean, fit organizations, I have recommended, and the Secretary has authorized me to make, the following changes in the field office structure of the Service.

I. DISTRICT OFFICE CHANGES

A. Reduction of overhead in 12 small districts

Since the 1951–52 reorganization, our basic operating unit has been the district offices. As we have one in each State, and more than one in some of the more populous States, district offices range in size from Anchorage with 94,000 tax returns and 65 employees, to the Manhattan district with 3.8 million tax returns and 2,800 employees.

Despite these disparities in size, the basic organization structure of all districts has been fairly uniform. For example, there is a chief of audit in each district. Yet in Manhattan the chief supervises 1,400 employees, while the chief in Anchorage supervises 26 employees. Consequently, the ratio of overhead personnel to front-line enforcement personnel has been much higher in the small districts.

On the basis of a recent study, however, we concluded that we can eliminate many overhead positions in our 12 smallest districts, simply by modifying their organizational structure. What we plan to do in these districts is eliminate most of the managerial positions under the district director by having the nearest large district provide the necessary technical staff support and perform the other processing and support activities.

Taxpayers will continue to file their returns with the district director in these districts, and will continue to receive all of the services they now receive.

The districts involved are listed in attachment No. 1.

B. Merger of four multistate districts

Our studies have also demonstrated that existing workload does not justify having 62 separate district offices in the 50 States. Therefore, operations of four district offices located in States with more than one district will be merged with those of nearby districts in the same State. Large field offices will be maintained, however, in cities affected by this change, and taxpayers will continue to receive substantially all the local service they now have.

The districts involved are also listed in attachment No. 1.

II. REGIONAL CHANGES

This modification in district structure makes it possible for us to operate effectively with seven regional offices, instead of the present nine.

The regional offices to be eliminated are those now located in Omaha and New York City. The resulting regional boundaries and headquarters cities are shown in attachment No. 2.

Since most parts of our regional offices have very little contact with taxpayers, these regional realinements will not affect taxpayers significantly. The only parts of the regional office that do have substantial contacts with taxpayers are the appellate and chief counsel field offices, and we will continue to render these services in their present locations.

III. SERVICE CENTER CHANGES

As you probably know, the Internal Revenue Service is now installing an automatic data processing system that will permit us to use electronic machines to perform the millions of record-handling operations involved in the maintenance of taxpayer accounts, the issuance of bills and refunds, the matching of information documents and the many other data processing activities we must conduct.

Since we need one automatic data processing center in each region to perform this work, our decision to reduce from nine regions to seven means that we will need only seven centers instead of the nine we had planned.

IV. IMPLEMENTING THE CHANGES

Most of these changes will be put into effect gradually and the timing probably will vary from one district to another according to local circumstances.

While most taxpayers probably will not even be aware of these changes, those of your constituents who are employed by us, will be very much aware of them and some of those affected may very well write to you about them. If they do, you can assure them, as we are, that we will try to reduce the adverse impact on them as much as we can. We feel obligated to do this since most of the officials and employees whose positions will be eliminated or transferred as a result of the changes are people who have been with us for a long time, who have risen to their present positions by doing their work well, and who have experience and skill that the IRS does not want to lose.

Fortunately, because the changes will be put into effect gradually, we expect to be able to handle most of the cutbacks by attrition and transfers. However, in many of the affected districts, attrition is slow and many of the employees are both too young to retire and unwilling to move for personal reasons. Consequently, we cannot promise that no one will be hurt. We do promise, however, that we will try to minimize the hardships to our employees in every way that we properly can.

In summary, we believe that these changes will save the taxpayers substantial amounts of money, without diminishing in any way the services they are now receiving. At the same time, they enable us to take a significant step toward the President's goal of a "lean, fit, and efficient Federal Establishment."

Sincerely,

MORTIMER M. CAPLIN,
Commissioner.

(Enclosures (1) a listing of changes in IRS districts; (2) a map showing the new seven Internal Revenue regions; (3) a map showing the former nine Internal Revenue regions.)

Districts to be modified

State	Modified district	Servicing district
Alaska	Anchorage	Seattle.
Delaware	Wilmington	Philadelphia.
Idaho	Boise	Salt Lake City.
Maine	Augusta	Boston.
Montana	Helena	Salt Lake City.
Nevada	Reno	San Francisco.
New Hampshire	Portsmouth	Boston.
North Dakota	Fargo	St. Paul.
Rhode Island	Providence	Hartford.
South Dakota	Aberdeen	St. Paul.
Vermont	Burlington	Boston.
Wyoming	Cheyenne	Denver.

Districts to be merged

State	District
Missouri	Kansas City into St. Louis.
New Jersey	Camden into Newark.
New York	Syracuse into Buffalo.
Pennsylvania	Scranton into Philadelphia and Pittsburgh.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, this proposal involves elimination of the New York State regional office located in New York City and the shifting of that Office to Boston where the New York State and New England regions will hereafter have consolidated headquarters. I am told that the taxpayers of New York State pour into the coffers of the tax collectors from two to three times the amount of money taken in, not only in Boston, but in all of New England. The Manhattan District of the New York region alone processes 3.8 million tax returns. Yet by the proposed shift, as announced by the Commissioner, New Yorkers—not only those in New York City, but also those as far west as the Niagara frontier—would have to handle their tax business on the regional level through a Boston regional office.

Mr. President, I do not have to spell out the dollars and cents of the situation to state in all candor that this proposal makes no sense whatever to me; it would be a case of the tail wagging the dog.

If consolidation is needed, the place to consolidate is in New York City, where the amount of regional tax business done is two or three times as great as all such business done in the entire New England States region.

One of the reasons that may be advanced for a New York-to-Boston rather than a Boston-to-New York transfer is that the automatic data-processing equipment, which is due to be phased gradually into the operations of the Internal Revenue Service, is destined to be located at Lawrence—which I may say to the Senator from Minnesota is also in Massachusetts. Lawrence, Mass., is to have the data-processing equipment.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Does the Senator from New York have any objection to that?

Mr. KEATING. Well, the Lawrence decision is water over the dam. The point is that I have heard the argument that because that equipment is to be located in Lawrence, Mass., it is necessary to locate the regional office in Boston, Mass.

However, Mr. President, although San Francisco is the regional office on the west coast, the data-processing equipment is located in Ogden, Utah—which is, I would guess, at least 1,000 miles distant from San Francisco.

It is my sincere hope that no steps will be taken to implement the proposed change until some of the interested Members of Congress have been heard from.

I have protested emphatically to the Secretary of the Treasury. I have asked to be heard. I have taken steps to alert to this situation both the New York State steering committee—composed of the New York congressional delegation of both parties—as well as Governor Rockefeller. They also have addressed the Secretary of the Treasury, asking to be heard.

I cannot urge too strongly that the planned transfer be held up at least until we have had a full opportunity to present our case to the Secretary of the Treasury.

ROME AIR MATERIEL AREA

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, in Griffiss Air Force Base and particularly in the procurement center ROAMA, central New York has one of the best and most efficient military establishments in the Nation. We can be proud of its past accomplishments and we must continue to look with hope and confidence toward its future.

Mr. President, I have read with great interest a recent editorial from the Rome, N.Y., Daily Sentinel of February 27 on this subject. I ask unanimous consent that this forward-looking and well-justified comment be printed in the RECORD following my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STOP DOWNGRADING ROAMA

We should stop downgrading Rome Air Materiel Area (ROAMA).

It is a going concern, busily engaged in support of ground communications/electronics military systems. With GEEIA (Ground Electronics Engineering Installations Agency), ROAMA is unique in its field in the Air Force. And GEEIA is remaining as part of ROAMA.

Certainly there are changes at ROAMA. There always are changes in progress at an installation of more than 6,000 personnel. On the whole, these changes are making ROAMA more the hard core of Air Force activity in its field.

It may well be that certain electrical procurement and supply activities will be transferred elsewhere. It is the belief that these do not belong within the specialized mission of ROAMA, as it is now conceived. The personnel involved, not many in number, can remain at ROAMA.

Efficiency of the ROAMA operation, once next to the last of the nine Air Force air materiel areas, is now fifth or sixth and a determined effort is underway to improve that.

In cold figures, number of personnel at ROAMA has decreased by nine in a 2-year period, 1960–62. In this same period, the logistics command to which ROAMA belongs, has been reduced in strength by many thousands.

While employment at ROAMA has remained constant, the payroll at ROAMA is up nearly $10 million in the past 10 years. This is due to an upgrading of civilian personnel into higher paying positions, plus overall pay increases.

Meanwhile, the total workload has increased to the point where, without additional personnel, there is a severe manpower pinch in some departments.

ROAMA is not expected to grow in personnel strength in the foreseeable future, neither is it expected to decrease in manpower. It will increase its importance to the Air Force as the ground communications/electronics mission demands pile up, both on the military and on the space side.

The work being done at ROAMA has to be accomplished by the Air Force. It will either be done at ROAMA or elsewhere and there is no reason for elsewhere. The big danger to ROAMA, in fact, is that it could be given more work than it could handle, necessitating establishing a second installation to share the load. Should this happen, ROAMA would not have its unique position of being the one air materiel area that takes care of ground communications/electronics systems support.

It is understandable that rumors fly off Griffiss Air Force Base about ROAMA, that procedural changes are magnified into imaginary disasters, that personnel shifts and rating reports are twisted out of meaning. It was only 2 years ago that the Pentagon was considering closing ROAMA and transferring its functions elsewhere. While that never happened, it did shake the community from its complacency about the military installations at Griffiss Air Force Base.

That was 2 years ago. ROAMA is still here. The manpower is almost the same; the payroll is $65 million a year; ROAMA is central New York's largest civilian employer.

As far as can be seen ahead, all indications are ROAMA will continue at about the same personnel strength but steadily gaining in workload and importance.

This community needs to regain its confidence about ROAMA.

ROLE OF REGISTERED FOREIGN AGENTS

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, the hearings of the Foreign Relations Committee on the activities of lobbyists and registered foreign agents have attracted considerable attention and should be very useful. Foreign agents as well as lobbyists can serve an important and legitimate function, but effective regulation of their activities is essential and there undoubtedly have been some excesses in recent years. I assume that the committee will make recommendations after it concludes its hearings and these certainly will have my sympathetic consideration.

Unfortunately, there is a great deal of misunderstanding of the role of the legitimate foreign agent, both in this country and abroad. Recently, the German Press Club of New York, which was founded 75 years ago, invited a distinguished citizen, Maj. Gen. Julius Klein, to address them. General Klein is a native of Chicago and a pioneer in the field of international public relations. I know that he enjoys the friendship and respect of many of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle. He had a distinguished war record as a combat commander and was also the author of the Army's combat public relations plan. His speech sheds considerable light on the role of the legitimate foreign agent and contains many unusual insights into this subject.

I know that General Klein's speech to the German Press Club will be of interest to many Members and I ask unanimous consent that his remarks be inserted at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the remarks were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY MAJ. GEN. JULIUS KLEIN, RETIRED, TO GERMAN PRESS CLUB, JANUARY 21, 1963

Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentleman of the press, in the middle of the 18th century the great mercantile houses, such as Baring Bros. of Liverpool and Almy & Brown of Providence, established correspondents in major cities of the world. Their task was to report news regularly from those places. But there was another assignment for them.

These mercantile correspondents conducted a never-ending series of pamphlet wars over the merits or disadvantages of such controversial issues as the navigation and trade acts, hard versus paper money, and restrictions on imports.

These correspondents also informed the citizens of their communities of the speed and comfort of their employers' ships as well as the times of arrivals and departures and cargoes.

Parliament, the colonial assemblies and European court circles were their constant haunts. They were well known to the newspaperman of the day.

The mercantile correspondent became very popular during the last part of the 18th century and by the opening of the 19th century a great many commercial organizations were utilizing their services to gain new business abroad through publicity efforts, and to attract greater attention at home with their news reports.

As the world grew more complex the mercantile correspondent evolved into two 20th century phenomena we know today as the foreign correspondent and the foreign agent. You, ladies and gentlemen, are foreign correspondents. I, thanks to our society's demand for short and sweet labels for everything, am a foreign agent.

Foreign agentry, of course, connotes something sinister. In today's lexicon a foreign agent wears a big hat scrunched down on his head, a black cape covers his face, his pockets contain a gun, a dagger, an envelope filled with cyanide powder, a vial of acid, an infrared microfilm camera, a miniature tape recorder.

Ladies and gentlemen, I have no cloak, no dagger, no poison. My weapons are my experience, my knowledge, my typewriter. I conduct my business, not in dark alleys, but in the large industrial offices of the world.

When it is said I am a foreign agent, it means I am a representative of a friendly foreign interest. As a public relations consultant to this foreign principal I give the same services that I give such domestic clients as, for example, the California World's Fair of 1967–68. Techniques may change because of the special problems of each client, but the services are always constant.

For example, my services assume the role of a management function that evaluates public attitudes, identifies the policies and procedures of the client with the public interest, and executes a program of action to earn public understanding and acceptance. As a result my advice becomes the administrative philosophy of my client.

My services are not something that can be bought like a drill press, or suspended like an order for component parts. It is a way of life that expresses itself in attitudes and actions affecting workers, customers and the community.

In my address to you tonight I shall explain foreign agents and foreign agentry to you in light of misunderstandings and distortions of the facts in recent German press reports of activities of public relations firms that specialize in representing foreign interests. I hope that I will be able to clear up some of the misunderstandings that exist and correct the mistaken impressions, especially with a congressional hearing of nondiplomatic activities of foreign agents only a few weeks away.

Announcement of these legislative hearings some months ago brought forth a number of stories in the German press that unfortunately not only confused the purpose of the hearings, but led to unfounded attacks upon my profession and myself. May I add, however, that the more responsible segments of the German press exercised good judgment and understanding in their reports about the hearings and the foreign agents issue.

In beginning, I want to impress on you most strongly that a congressional hearing is not a court proceeding. Occasionally, in the past it has taken on such an appearance. A decade ago my good friend Estes Kefauver led a Senate committee into the underworld where a number of criminals were exposed to the light of public knowledge. Just this past year a congressional committee investigated the alleged crimes of Billie Sol Estes.

But the purpose of a hearing is not to find wrongdoers. It is to discover if proper laws exist. The hearing is designed to aid the Congress in formulating workable laws. And that is what the forthcoming review of the foreign agents registration act involves.

Speaking of the hearings on the floor of the Senate recently, Edward V. Long, the distinguished Senator from Missouri, said he feels that many reputable practitioners of the art of public relations have been unduly maligned. He remarked further:

"I might mention that several unfortunate articles recently have appeared on the subject in the German press. It was obvious that these publications did not even comprehend the difference between a lobbyist and a foreign agent, the latter being a public relations professional, a lawyer or a person who is registered with the Department of Justice as the U.S. representative of a foreign official body."

Some German newspapers, the Senator further observed, went so far as to write that one of the most reputable foreign agents in the United States may be involved in "a court hearing by the State Department."

The Senator explained: "Perhaps they were referring to the forthcoming hearings by the Foreign Relations Committee, but if so, something was very definitely lost in the translation."

Senator J. W. Fulbright, chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, wrote in a foreword to a preliminary study on the subject: "The purpose of examining foreign government lobbying is not to show that these activities are necessarily wrong. In many instances, State Department officials themselves agree that legitimate representation by U.S. citizens on behalf of certain foreign principals is necessary due to the complexities of current international problems."

Senator Fulbright went on to say his hearing is not meant to condemn, but to determine where the Foreign Agents Registration Act can be changed to make it a more effective and practical law.

Although Senator Fulbright's committee will be examining all nondiplomatic activities of foreign agents, the hearing will center on determining whether or not the activities of these foreign agents are having any detrimental effect on the U.S. foreign policy. The committee will be looking for any loopholes in the foreign agents law that need to be closed in this connection.

With respect to U.S. foreign policy, speaking for my firm and myself, in serving friendly nations that are our political and military allies, we are at the same time rendering a service to our Nation. We provide a channel of communication not otherwise available.

In fact, we are foreign agents in the reverse sense. That is, we not only work to convey our clients' viewpoint to the American community, but more importantly, our major effort consists of attempting to inform our friends, by explaining to them this country's position on current issues, and seeking better understanding and cooperation in the complex nature of today's political relationships.

This thought was carried forward in a statement made by Congressman Emanuel Celler when he remarked on the floor of the House on October 25, in connection with criticism of my activities in the German press that, "he (General Klein) represents numerous German firms in America and interprets for the United States the interests, aims, and purposes of his German clientele. He is to that extent a 'foreign agent' and has registered as such."

In serving a foreign principal our philosophy has always been that America's interest and security are first—that any difference of opinion Americans might have on domestic or foreign policy must end where the waters begin.

The current furor over foreign agents began in 1960 when the United States withdrew the sugar quota given to Castro Cuba and prepared to divide this quota among other Latin American countries.

Under the U.S. Sugar Act the various sugar producing countries of Latin America are limited to the amount of sugar they can export to the United States. This sugar is purchased by the United States at a premium rate, several cents above the world market price.

Now, at the time the House of Representatives Agricultural Committee was considering how to divide up the Cuban quota among the other Latin American countries, the Secretary of State was talking with members of the Organization of American States concerning applying sanctions against the totalitarian regime of Raphael Trujillo in the Dominican Republic. In fact, the OAS did vote, 20–0, to censure Trujillo, break off diplomatic relations, embargo arms shipment and effect a partial suspension of trade in other commodities.

It was against this background that the U.S. Congress voted to give the Trujillo regime a $90 million a year sugar bonus.

A half year later, the Secretary of State appeared before the Agricultural Committee and was able to persuade the Congressmen to withdraw this sugar bonus from the Dominican Republic.

Again, this past summer, the Dominican sugar quota issue grabbed top headlines, as the quota was reevaluated in light of the changes in the sugar market.

During each of those three instances when the Dominican Republic's sugar quota was being considered by the Congress, activity by persons and organizations representing the Trujillo regime reached a dizzying intensity.

It was this activity that made many Congressmen ask: Is there something wrong here? To what extent does this activity affect the policy of the United States?

The law itself does not prohibit an American from representing a foreign government or other official foreign organizations for any reason. All the law says is when a person does represent a foreign principal, he must register his name, his client's name, and the amount of compensation. In addition certain publications and other printed matter distributed on behalf of the client must be labeled that it has been prepared for a foreign interest.

The only drawback to an American representing interests detrimental to the United States is a person's own national loyalty.

I would like to say at this point that I love my country. I would never support a position detrimental to the national interest. I would resign an account without thinking twice if that client wanted me to do something I thought was against the national interest.

That is what I will not do as a foreign agent. But what will I do? What are the services that I offer to my clients whether they be foreign or domestic?

I do nothing special for a foreign interest. Whether the person is a Prime Minister or a board chairman, a finance minister or a comptroller, my services are the same.

To give you an example of what I do, and also to give you an even greater understanding of the services I offer friendly foreign interests and business alike, I would like to invent for you a client—the Pied Piper Co., of Hamelin, Germany.

Let us say, arbitrarily, the Pied Piper Co. has invented that cliche of our times, the better mousetrap. Only, much to their sorrow, they find the world is not beating the proverbial path to their door.

This is not unusual. There are a great many manufacturers in the world who have a product that meets a widespread need, yet they cannot sell this product. They cannot sell because the right people—the potential customers—do not know of this product's existence, or just what the product can do for them.

This is the situation of our Pied Piper Co. and its better mousetrap. The company has a sales staff that makes the right contacts. But every time the salesmen meet a buyer they are faced with a stoney stare and the comment: "I don't know you; I don't know your company; I don't know your product; I am a very busy man; what is it you have to say?"

The Pied Piper Co. has a communications problem, and they take it to an expert in solving communications problems—me. They come to our office at 22 Neue Mainzerstrasse in Frankfurt, lay out the problem in front of us, and we go to work.

The work I am about to describe using this fictitious case, is almost identical to the work we do for all our clients. It is because I do just this very same procedure for a foreign principal that I am called a foreign agent.

The first thing we do is to determine the attitude of the potential customers toward the company and the product. We analyze the state of opinion. Then we formulate a policy, plan activities, and carry out a program.

The objectives of the public relations campaign we devise for the Pied Piper Co. are nine in number. They include:

1. Corporate prestige: In order to do business in a world full of competing businesses, our client's name must be as respected and well known as, say, the name of Du Pont. To achieve this we undertake a broad image-building campaign.

2. Promotion of products and sales: There is more than just publicity involved here. We write stories saying how marvelous Pied Piper mousetraps are, certainly, but we also have special events, an international contest among flute-playing young lasses to select a "Miss Pied Piper of 1963"; the establishment of a Pied Piper Flutist Club organizing the flutists of the world; we arrange with Walt Disney to make a cartoon motion picture in 27 languages including Swahili of the Pied Piper legend; we conduct a contest between a cat and a Pied Piper mousetrap, putting both in a mouse-infested house to see which one catches the most mice.

3. Stockholders relations: We prepare reports telling the stockholders of the progress of their company.

4. Industry relations: We work for the establishment of an International Society of Mousetrap Manufacturers that will give greater scope to promotional efforts to educate the public concerning the benefits of automation in mousing.

5. Employee relations: Programs will be developed to make the employees feel they are part of a warm, intimate organization. There will be employee sporting teams, clubs, social gatherings, an employee publication.

6. Community relations: There will probably be people in Hamelin Town, as in any other town, who will feel the factory is a bad thing. It makes dirt, pollutes the air and streams, increases traffic congestion, etc. We counter this bad community relations with some positive action, not just defensive denials. We have the company sponsor an air pollution study and map plans to improve traffic conditions. Company executives join local civic associations and other groups.

7. Dealer relations: We will design and prepare an attractive package to present to dealers whom we hope will sell Pied Piper mousetraps on their store shelves.

8. Special campaigns: Some event may occur that will create some unfavorable publicity. The cat world might unite against losing their jobs to automation. The Antivivisection League might start a campaign against killing mice. We would have to respond to such campaigns in a positive way with a special program.

9. Management counseling: The eight previous services that I offer to the Pied Piper Co. and to any other company that comes to me for assistance, deal with education of the people with whom Pied Piper deals. It is just as important for me to educate Pied Piper itself. No matter how hard I try to give this company good public relations, I cannot succeed unless the company is inherently good. And, as I pointed out before, I will never do anything that would be detrimental to the interests of the United States. So, therefore, we must maintain close liaison with management, giving our advice on company practices and policies, making certain that the company has a sound base from which to launch these other eight services.

This, ladies and gentlemen, is what I do. When I do it for a domestic client I am called a public relations consultant. When I do it for a friendly foreign interest I am called a foreign agent.

Now, so far I have been talking about foreign agents and foreign agentry. Of late there has been a good deal of confusion of the terms "foreign agent" and "lobbyist." These terms are not interchangeable. However, you hear quite often someone referred to as a "foreign lobbyist."

As far as the American legal terminology goes there is no such animal as a foreign lobbyist. A public relations consultant, like myself, may be both a foreign agent and a lobbyist. But being one, does not make him the other. There are two distinct laws involved here.

Jacob K. Javits, senior Senator from New York, discussed this confusion recently on the floor of the Senate. Speaking about the Fulbright hearings, the Senator said:

"It has been approximately 20 years since Congress examined this field of activity and I am sure that these hearings will prove fruitful, if only to clear away the uncertainty which surrounds the popular conception of the nature of the functions performed by lobbyists and registered foreign agents."

The Senator then went on to praise an article that appeared in what he described as a responsible German publication, and which subsequently was inserted in the Congressional Record issue of November 2. The story in queston deals with "Public Relations in Industry and Politics" and points out that:

"The translation of 'hearing' with the German term 'unterschung' and of 'foreign agents' with 'auslandsagenten' is entirely justified, but in the German language these terms assume a double meaning which invited sensational stories."

The wide circulation in Germany of these sensational stories with their distortions, citing me as the whipping boy in the Fulbright hearings was undoubtedly due to lack of knowledge.

To give you an example of what a lobbyist does, let us go back to our mythical Pied Piper Co. I am giving this company, as I have noted, nine services. There is a tenth service I might give them—government relations.

Say, for example, there is a Federal law classifying mousetraps as a dangerous weapon, and that for a person to own a mouse trap, he must register with the local police. This law acts as a brake against mousetrap sales. As a service to my client, I therefore endeavor to get the law taken off the books, or at least modified.

Once I begin doing this type of work, I must register under the Congressional Lobbying Act, and then I become a lobbyist as well as a foreign agent.

In my services as a public relations consultant I have counseled and served many American and foreign business, financial, transport, and industrial organizations. I have been properly registered with the Department of Justice for my representation of foreign governmental agencies. I have also been registered as a lobbyist on several occasions, but I am not now engaged in any lobbying activities, nor have I any interest in such activities at this time.

If, however, any client or prospective client came to me with a request for lobbying services, I would accept that assignment only if I felt that the national interest would not be harmed.

At this point, having already outlined the task of the foreign agent, I would like to explain to you the task of the lobbyist. Only I shall not use my own words. Instead I shall borrow the words of the President of the United States.

When John F. Kennedy was a Senator in 1956, he wrote an article for the Sunday magazine section of the New York Times, in which he said, in part:

"Lobbyists are in many cases expert technicians and capable of explaining complex and difficult subjects in a clear, understandable fashion. They engage in personal discussions with Members of Congress in which they can explain in detail the reasons for positions they advocate.

"Lobbyists prepare briefs, memorandums, legislative analyses, and draft legislation for use by committees and Members of Congress; they are necessarily masters of their subject and, in fact, they frequently can provide useful statistics and information not otherwise available.

"Competent lobbyists can present the most persuasive arguments in support of their positions. Indeed, there is no more effective manner of learning all important arguments and facts on a controversial issue than to have the opposing lobbyists present their cases.

"Concededly, each is biased; but such a procedure is not unlike the advocacy of lawyers in court which has proven so successful in resolving judicial controversies. Because our congressional representatives is based on geographical boundaries, the lobbyists who speak for the various economic, commercial, and other functional interests of this country serve a very useful purpose and have assumed an important role in the legislative process."

I personally consider this description of the functions of a lobbyist eminently fair and accurate.

There is one more misunderstanding I would like to clear up. In a democracy such as the United States, politics means little in public relations.

It is a distortion to say that because I am a Republican, I cannot adequately represent my clients with a Democratic administration in Washington. Partisan politics in this country is reserved for the elections. The President, his advisers, the distinguished men and women of Congress have too great a sense of responsibility to allow partisan politics to interfere with the administration of the Government. I only need point to the Republicans who hold some of the most important positions in the land—Secretary of the Treasury Douglas Dillon, Secretary of Defense Robert McNamara, Central Intelligence Agency Chief John McCone, Federal Reserve Board Chairman William McChesney Martin, Jr., and top White House Aid, McGeorge Bundy.

The Honorable Senator Hubert Humphrey, of Minnesota, Democratic whip in the Senate, referred to criticism that my effectiveness in representing my clients' interests in Washington was hampered because I am a Republican, with the following words:

"Tell anyone that Julius Klein has more friends in the Senate and the House of Representatives than any man I know. We respect his partisanship, but even more, we cherish his friendship."

These, my good friends, are the facts in this matter. As a former newspaperman I appreciate the value of facts and writing factually. One of the important lessons I learned during my newspaper career is the responsibility the press has to its readers.

The power of the press is immense. It can accomplish almost anything it sets out to do. It is because it has such vast power, backed by the right to be uncensored, that it has an obligation to the truth, and is the protector of freedom and democracy.

I hope, ladies and gentlemen, that I have explained this issue clearly, and I thank you for giving me the opportunity to do so. There will be a number of things I am sure you want to know, so fire away with your questions, I'm ready for them.

CONGRESS DESERVES CREDIT FOR PROGRESS, INNOVATION

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, a former colleague of mine at Harvard, when I was a teaching fellow and tutor, is Arthur Maass, who also was a teaching fellow and tutor at the same time. He is now a professor of government at Harvard and an outstanding member of the Harvard faculty.

Recently, he wrote for the Washington Post an article entitled "Congress Has Been Maligned." In view of the considerable amount of criticism of Congress and its alleged slowness to operate, I think his article is most important. I wish to read some excerpts from it, as follows:

> Most of Congress' present rules were adopted in this century, and a great many reforms have been made since World War II. The committee structure of both the House and the Senate has been reorganized completely; professional staffs have been provided for all committees. * * *
>
> Moreover, Congress has refined and used extensively a new technique, the legislative veto, to check on how the Executive uses its discretionary power. With this technique available, it has granted the Executive greater discretion than it would have otherwise. * * *
>
> The Senate Democrats have modified the seniority rule, providing that freshmen Senators may sit on one committee of their choice. By shortening the terms of authorizations and through investigations, the legislative committees have taken an active role in overseeing the conduct of Government programs.
>
> As a result, they have given a different, often more sympathetic review of executive programs than have the Appropriations Committees, and have staged public debates on important issues previously not aired adequately, as in the annual authorization bills for missiles, aircraft, and ships.
>
> Finally, Congress has legislated in three areas requiring the organization of new committees. In two of these, atomic energy and general economic affairs, Congress has experimented with joint House-Senate committees. The period since World War II has been exciting for observers of Congress just because the rate of innovation has been so high.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the entire article by Prof. Arthur Maass be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CONGRESS HAS BEEN MALIGNED

(By Arthur Maass)

"When the 88th Congress assembles in January, it should turn first to self-reform, to revising its rules for conducting the Nation's legislative business." Newspaper readers have been told this repeatedly since the 87th Congress adjourned last October. We could assume, then, that the need for legislative reform is well understood.

To the contrary, this need, though widely believed, is poorly sensed because so much exaggeration and misinformation about Congress passes for intelligence. Two examples will illustrate this view.

First, Congress is held responsible for all the ills of the legislative process. Yet Congress is only one participant in a process usually initiated by the Executive. It is the President who sets the agenda for action by the legislature.

Often when Congress is criticized for concerning itself with picayune details, it is these very details that have been served up by the Executive. Even the pork barrel, which many consider a prototype of misspent congressional energies, if not misconduct, originates in the Executive, for Congress seldom authorizes projects that have not been recommended by the President.

Now, one might argue that the Executive provides the pieces of pork for the barrel because Congress wants it that way. But the initiative in the legislative process is the President's, and if he preferred some form of general legislation in the resources field to the authorization of individual projects, he could propose it. Yet since World War II no such initiative has been taken, with the possible exception of President Truman's proposals for Columbia and Missouri Valley authorities.

A second misconception is that Congress has doggedly resisted change. (The Washington Post speaks of "the antiquated, medieval-minded procedures" of the House.) Perhaps all Government institutions resist change, but the organizations and procedures of the legislature have been no more resistant than those of the bureaucracy or of the courts.

Most of Congress' present rules were adopted in this century, and a great many reforms have been made since World War II. The committee structure of both the House and the Senate have been reorganized completely; professional staffs have been provided for all committees; the House tried and then rejected a new procedure, the 21st day rule, to bypass its Rules Committee.

Moreover, Congress has refined and used extensively a new technique, the legislative veto, to check on how the Executive uses its discretionary power. With this technique available, it has granted the Executive greater discretion than it would have otherwise.

Also, Congress tried, and when it was found defective, discarded a new procedure for handling money matters: the single appropriations bill.

The Senate Democrats have modified the seniority rule, providing that freshman Senators may sit on one committee of their choice. By shortening the terms of authorizations and through investigations, the legislative committees have taken an active role in overseeing the conduct of Government programs.

As a result, they have given a different, often more sympathetic, review of Executive programs than have the appropriations committees and have staged public debates on important issues previously not aired adequately, as in the annual authorization bills for missiles, aircraft and ships.

Finally, Congress has legislated in three areas requiring the organization of new committees. In two of these, atomic energy and general economic affairs, Congress has experimented with joint House-Senate committees.

The period since World War II has been exciting for observers of Congress just because the rate of innovation has been so high. Let anyone who doubts the legislature's interest in, or capacity for change, read the debates on the annual foreign aid authorization bills. In 1961, for example, Congress argued over annual versus long-term authorizations, annual versus long-term appropriations, the legislative veto, use of the concurrent resolution to terminate programs, methods of reporting to Congress, auditing and inspecting and the meaning of all of these for organization and procedure of both Houses of Congress.

Why do so many misconceptions about our legislature persist? Why does Congress have a worse reputation than it deserves?

First, Congress, unlike the Executive, operates in a goldfish bowl. Almost every step of the congressional decision process is open to public scrutiny, whereas quite often only the final and polished step of the Executive decision process is known. If a Member of Congress asks a stupid question or proposes an offbeat solution in a public hearing, this is reported and reflects on him, on his committee and on Congress.

Who knows how many stupid questions and off-beat solutions are proposed in meetings of the National Security Council and in the proceedings by which most Executive decisions are reached? A misguided amendment to a bill is adopted in a subcommittee, and full publicity is given to this action, as it should be; yet the chances are good that the amendment will be dropped in the full committee, or on the floor, or in the other house and the conference. An equally misguided proposal made in the early stages of the executive decision process and later dropped is seldom known and reported.

Where, as in Congress, all steps in the decision process are reported, there is a heavy obligation on the reporters to construct the whole from its parts. But this is not easy, and in my opinion few reporters of national politics have shown that they have the necessary interest and skill to do so.

The daily reports of the 87th Congress made it appear to many as a catastrophe. Yet with a hindsight view of its accomplishments, we can judge it a smashing success. In the area of foreign and security affairs, Congress approved the defense buildup, the Peace Corps, the Disarmament Agency, the Alliance for Progress, an expansion of the food for peace program and the important Trade Act.

In the domestic area it passed, among others, the most comprehensive housing program in our history; the area redevelopment, manpower retraining, and emergency public works programs; an increase in the minimum wage to $1.25; expansion of the social security system, including lowering the male retirement age to 62; complete revision of the public assistance programs; an increase in postal rates; revision of Civil Service and other Federal salary systems, which some consider the most significant legislation in this area in more than a quarter century; new tax incentives for capital investments; drug controls; authorization of the communications satellite program; three seashore parks, and repeal of the disclaimer affidavit in the Federal scholarship and loan programs.

I do not ignore Congress' failure to act on education, medical care for the aged, a Department of Urban Affairs, certain tax reforms and the wilderness bill. But much more of Congress' unpopular image stems from temporary crises in the legislative histories of the bills finally passed in good form.

A second and related reason for misconceptions and excessive criticism of the legislature is simply that, compared with the Executive, Congress has a bad press. In large part this is due to its open operations and to its pluralistic organization. No one would expect Congress to be able to match the President's centralized and powerful press mechanism; at the same time, Congress as a whole suffers from not having one.

Congress suffers also from what appears to be a double standard for reporting the conduct of public servants. If an Assistant Secretary of State attends the Folies Bergere while participating in a Paris international conference, this is not likely to be reported. If it is, it will be with understanding.

If a Member of Congress sees the same girlie show while on official committee business in Paris, this will be reported, and in a muckraking style.

Finally, basic principles of our national system of government are poorly taught and poorly understood, and this is the fault of American political scientists among others. We all learned in ninth grade civics that all legislative powers are vested in Congress and all executive and administrative powers in the President and departments and that these assignments of power may be modified somewhat by what we called checks and balances.

And in the introductory college course in public administration we learned as a first rule that Congress should not interfere with the administrative processes of government.

Yet these principles, however qualified, are not the basic precepts of our National Government, and the resultant misunderstanding generally reflects unfavorably on Congress. In fact, the dominant influence in the legislative process is not normally Congress but the President; this is not because the President has a veto power, but because he may assume, with some few exceptions, the initiative in the legislative process.

For this reason the President should be given considerable credit for legislative successes and indeed he is. He should also be given credit for many, if not most, of the so-called failings. But here we are inconsistent and more likely to lay the full blame on the legislature. Also we are inclined to condemn Congress and congressional committees for sticking their fingers into the administrative process.

Yet one of the most important tasks for an elected legislature is to oversee the administrative process. We have never been willing to rely solely on the elected Chief Executive, the courts, or professional standards of the civil service to hold the bureaucracy accountable. Just as the President participates in the legislative process of our Government, so Congress plays a legitimate and important role in the administrative process.

Congress, then, is often badly misjudged. However, this does not mean that there is no need for reform. Congress, for example, has been overexuberant in using its new device, the legislative veto, for granting broad discretion to the Executive and retaining control over its application in specific cases.

The veto needs to be brought under control by intelligent analysis that leads to the setting of criteria for its proper use. For instance, authority to use the veto probably should not rest with a congressional committee, as happened when a House committee blocked the Defense Department's attempt to close the 18th century ropewalk at the Boston Navy Yard.

Instead, the veto should be exercised by one or both Houses of Congress. But the analysis needed to make distinctions of this type obviously cannot start from erroneous views about Congress.

ONE HUNDRED AND THIRTEENTH ANNIVERSARY OF BIRTH OF THOMAS MASARYK

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, today is the 113th anniversary of Thomas G. Masaryk, one of the principal founders and the first President of the Czechoslovak Republic. Less than 2 weeks ago we observed in sorrow the 15th anniversary of the Communist revolution in that unfortunate nation. It is fitting that today we note the birthdate of the elder Masaryk, who gave so much of his life to the ideal of Czechoslovakian independence, and who, fortunately, did not live to see his country enslaved by either Nazi Germany or Soviet Russia.

Masaryk came to the United States toward the close of World War I and secured from this country support for an independent Czechoslovakia. Gaining the support of our Allies, he and his countrymen were able to bring the new nation into being later that year. He was elected President and served until his resignation in 1935, being reelected in 1920 and again in 1934. He died in 1937.

The following year, Munich occurred; and from that date the life of the young nation has been hard, indeed. Liberated in 1945, Czechoslovakia enjoyed 3 precarious years of freedom, ever conscious of the Communist threat both from within and without to its existence. In 1948, the Communist coup snuffed out the light of freedom in Czechoslovakia and the life of Masaryk's son, Jan.

We in the United States, beset as we are by threats in the Caribbean, Germany, and the Far East, might nevertheless pause a moment today to count our blessings. We have survived nearly two decades of cold war; our democratic form of government retains its vigor. While we dedicate ourselves anew to the task of preserving our freedom and winning the cold war, we might reaffirm our pledge that Czechoslovakia will one day be free again, and that the lifework of Thomas Masaryk shall not have been in vain.

ANNIVERSARY OF BIRTH OF AMERIGO VESPUCCI

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, everyone who calls himself an American preserves the memory of Amerigo Vespucci, the 15th-century Italian merchant astronomer whose name was given to the two continents of the New World. On March 9 we shall observe the anniversary of his birth.

Vespucci, coming after only Columbus, might be called the second great Italian-American. Much of his life was a saga in what we call the American tradition: He began as a clerk in the Florentine commercial offices of the Medici. Sent to Spain, he became connected with a company which fitted ships for Atlantic voyages; it is believed that he helped supply Columbus' second expedition. He came to the New World four times; and in his time his name became so well known among the seafaring explorers that early in the 16th century it began to appear on maps of this hemisphere.

Columbus and Vespucci were the earliest of a vast number of Italians and Italian-Americans whose names are written on the brightest pages of American history. As we pause briefly in our deliberations to note the anniversary of Vespucci's birth, we might recall to mind these facts: that Americans of Italian birth or descent have stood high among our finest citizens; yet Italians were for many decades cruelly discriminated against in this country. Just as Vespucci and Columbus, crossing the uncharted ocean, brought the dawn of a new day in the history of the world, we ought to bend our efforts toward another new day when there will be no discrimination and when the opportunities symbolized by discovery and exploration will be open to all.

PROF. JOHN M. GAUS VISITS MADISON

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, Prof. John M. Gaus was a very distinguished professor at the University of Wisconsin until 1948. He left the University of Wisconsin to go to Harvard. He is one of the outstanding pragmatic professors of political science in America. His return visit to Madison, Wis., was celebrated with a perceptive article in the Madison Capital Times, discussing Professor Gaus and his great record in political science and what his learning and his attitude have meant in making political science a far more practical and useful discipline.

I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GAUS, MAN WHO SAVED POLITICAL SCIENCE, VISITS UNIVERSITY AFTER 16 YEARS

(By Elliott Maraniss)

Prof. John M. Gaus, the man who saved political science from dying of irrelevancy—the Dutch elm disease in the groves of academe—has returned to the University of Wisconsin campus.

Dr. Gaus will spend a week here visiting his old classes in public administration, regional planning, and political theory.

Among the political scientists in South Hall, this has aroused the same kind of excitement that would be found among historians if Frederick Jackson Turner suddenly showed up at old Bascom.

In the opinion of Prof. James McCamy, one of Dr. Gaus' hosts this week, the comparison is appropriate.

"Professor Gaus is to political science what Turner was to history," Dr. McCamy said Monday.

"He took it out of the law books and put it into life, among the people and in the communities in which they live. He said government is not just statutes and constitutions, but people dealing with other people."

For 20 memorable years between 1927 and 1947 the Wisconsin campus and the Badger State were the vineyards of Professor Gaus' fruitful labors.

A graduate of Amherst College with a master's degree and a doctorate from Harvard, he came here to become part of an Amherst triumvirate which made an imperishable contribution to Wisconsin's rise to greatness.

Dr. Alexander Meikeljohn had been president of Amherst, and Dr. Walter Agard had been an Amherst classmate. Dr. Gaus happily responded to their invitation to join them here in establishing the famed Experimental College. Dr. Agard taught the first-year course in Greek civilization and Dr.

Gaus taught the second-year course in American civilization.

In those years the Wisconsin idea—putting the resources of the university in the service of the people of the State—provided a perfect basis for Dr. Gaus' ideas about political science.

Gov. Phil LaFollette named him executive secretary of the Wisconsin State Planning Board, an advisory board of legislators and citizens, charged with the task of "making a continuing inventory of the State government and its functions and suggesting ways as to how the State may operate more efficiently and economically."

Together with Robert Goodman, who later became chairman of the Conservation Commission, F. L. Sensenbrenner, then president of Kimberly Clark, Charles W. Nash, then president of the Nash Motor Co., Dr. Gaus and his board made many important recommendations, the most lasting of which was a far-sighted plan for the uses of the State's forest resources.

As a member of the Madison Area Planning Council, Dr. Gaus helped devise an orderly plan for the growth of the city.

In every one of those 20 years Dr. Gaus was the object of flattering and bountiful offers from rich and famous universities such as Harvard and Chicago, but he turned them all down, saying "Wisconsin is where my heart belongs."

Ironically, it was during one of those dark periods when the Wisconsin spirit faltered temporarily that Dr. Gaus finally left here.

In 1947 the board of regents refused to appoint Prof. Howard J. McMurray to the political science faculty. Dr. McMurray had served a term in Congress and had sought political office as a Democratic candidate two other times while a member of the faculty.

Dr. Gaus disagreed with the regents' decision and accepted an offer to go to Harvard as professor of government. At Harvard, Dr. Gaus' reputation continued to grow and was culminated with his election as president of the American Political Science Association.

In June of 1961, Dr. Gaus retired as professor emeritus of government at Harvard and returned with his wife to a farmstead in the lovely dairy and forest country in the Adirondacks in New York State, where he was born 68 years ago, the grandson of German immigrants.

There, Dr. Gaus said in an interview Monday, he has found a perfect laboratory for his lifelong interest in the interaction of city and country.

"I really don't know what kind of society we are coming into," Dr. Gaus said. "There are thousands of people who live in the open country, yet are city oriented in their work and their recreation."

Dr. Gaus said the metropolitan areas of the country are faced with "tremendous problems" presented by the profound changes in distribution of the American population, not only in terms of space but also in terms of employment and technological development.

He remains hopeful, however, that the problems will be solved.

"It's amazing how people will respond to a really objective, factual diagnosis of what is going on if you put it to them in human terms," Dr. Gaus said.

Putting things in human terms is what Dr. Gaus has been doing all his life.

SOVIET CUBA

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, the Washington Post has published two very fine editorials dealing with the problem of Soviet Cuba. While it is believed by Government officials that last fall we were successful in forcing removal of Soviet intermediate and medium range missiles and bombers, it is now recognized that the Soviets are continuing to maintain a powerful military base in this hemisphere.

The first editorial, published on March 4, strongly affirms:

> Peace in this hemisphere will not be secure as long as Castro rules in Cuba. * * * The regime in Cuba is one with which its neighbors will not be permitted to live in peace.

The second editorial this morning is still more explicit. It suggests that the distinction between defensive and offensive weapons may have been erroneous or largely a semantic one. It then calls for an end to recriminations over the past and a recognition that Castro's Communist regime in Cuba is a very real threat to the safety of every democratic regime in its vicinity.

With that view I am in full agreement. Our concern must be with the danger Soviet Cuba poses at the present moment. This is a much more important issue than what the situation may have been in the past.

These editorials clarify the perils of the present situation and, in my judgment, emphasize the need for a firm and effective policy to meet the problem, a policy which, so far as I know, has not been made evident.

I ask unanimous consent to have both editorials printed following my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, Mar. 4, 1963]

NO PEACE WITH CUBA

Peace in this hemisphere will not be secure as long as Castro rules in Cuba. That is the meaning of the events of the past week—whether they relate to disclosures of Cuba's role in training subversive forces in neighboring countries or to the movement of Soviet personnel from Cuban ports. No one will ever be sure how much subversion is going on and, in spite of the efficacy of aerial surveillance, no one can be certain how large are the remaining Soviet forces.

The regime in Cuba is one with which its neighbors will not be permitted to live in peace. The threat to the security and peace will rise and fall as their own precautions are extended or contracted. There is every present indication that no country can afford to allow its guard to relax.

As long as Cuba remains a center from which Communist infiltration is carried on, it cannot expect the United States or any of its other neighbors to make any firm pledge against the invasion of Cuba. The day may arrive when these belligerent operations will reach a level of military significance to which there will be no appropriate response but military operations. To make sure that this pitch of activity is not achieved in total secrecy the scrutiny of operations on the island must be maintained at the highest level.

The Western Hemisphere must live in danger while this situation persists. The precautions necessary to contain this threat are so onerous, disagreeable, and unsettling that the United States will be under continuous pressure to take arms against this sea of trouble and end it. Were there any assurance that it could indeed be ended by extreme measures, it would be harder to resist such counsels. There is, however, no assurance that even this dangerous alternative would end the crisis. It might only start a greater crisis.

There is no easy escape from the Cuban nuisance. There is no present alternative to the maintenance of a high state of readiness for extreme action, a continuous scrutiny of Cuban measures for signs of increasing hostility, an unremitting readiness to defend any threatened country in the hemisphere. All that we can be sure of for the moment is that as long as this regime lasts, there can be no real peace.

[From the Washington Post, Mar. 7, 1963]

PAST AND FUTURE IN CUBA

What is going to be done about Cuba tomorrow is a question of such pressing urgency for the survival of freedom in the Western Hemisphere that it is too bad to see it put into eclipse by a debate over what was done about Cuba yesterday.

The intellectual resources of the administration and of its opponents, unfortunately, seem to be going chiefly into the controversy about the past. No aspect of this debate is more unproductive than that which centers about the date when the administration decided that the Soviet arms buildup was offensive in character and so dangerous as to require the strong measures that were taken. The charges that the administration knew of the offensive character of the weaponry long before it disclosed its knowledge and acted on it is essentially political in character. If the charge ever is proven true or false it will leave the future quite unaffected.

Perhaps the administration erred in trying to make a distinction between defensive and offensive arms. Certainly it is a very difficult thing to do. The argument is largely a semantic one. The antiaircraft weapons, the defending fighters and the antimissile missiles are defensive in one sense of the word. They are, at the same time, components in any offensive weapon system. As it turns out, these weapons in Cuba were the first components in a total offensive weapons system that became complete with the arrival of intermediate range missiles. In this sense, they were offensive weapons—or, at least, parts of an offensive weapons system, from the beginning.

There is some evidence that Chairman John McCone of the CIA began to suspect this before the heavy missiles arrived. If this Government had acted on these suspicions, however, its posture might have been difficult. Could it have acted with the firmness it exhibited once the intermediate range missiles were in place? If it had, wouldn't Cuba and the Soviet Union have blandly asserted that only defensive weapons were installed? And wouldn't the vigorous measures of the administration have seemed premature, in this context? Surely, they would have seemed premature to most of our NATO allies and to many South American governments. A strong case can be made for the argument that the American timing, whether due to ignorance, concealment or design, was well suited to achieve the desired result. A little earlier would have been too early and a little later might have been too late.

The debate over what was right or wrong with the operations of last October is not as urgent as the debate over what is the right thing for this country to do now. Castro's Communist regime in Cuba is a very real threat to the safety of every democratic regime in its vicinity. The administration is unable to perfect, or at least unable to disclose, measures for dealing with it that seem adequate. In the absence of plans for dealing with it, those who argue for the most extreme measures are having a field day. They can enlist behind dangerous and oversimplified solutions the well-known American belief that you can "do something" about every problem. The administration runs the risk that this impulse will push it into doing something reckless and unwise unless it can perfect and disclose a policy that is safer and sounder than the policies its critics propose.

VETERANS IN THE STATE OF MONTANA

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, several days ago my attention was directed to a new and very informative pamphlet on the veterans in Montana. The document is based on information gathered in the 1960 census.

I am proud, as is every Montanan, of the major contribution made by the men and women of the Treasure State in World War I, World War II, and the Korean war. Eight out of every ten Montana men between the ages of 35 and 39 years are war veterans, a record of which we are extremely proud.

The research staff at the Veterans' Administration has brought together a number of interesting and helpful facts on the veterans of my State. The statistics cover such things as length of service, residence, occupation, education, and a number of personal details. The Administrator, J. S. Gleason, Jr., is to be complimented for a job well done.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed at the conclusion of my remarks in the Record the summary which appears on pages 1 through 4 of the pamphlet.

There being no objection, the summary was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Veterans in the State of Montana, 1960

SUMMARY

Three out of eight of the civilian males 18 or more years old living in Montana in April 1960 had served in the U.S. Armed Forces during World War I, World War II, or the Korean war. Another 6 percent had served only during peacetime.

Fifty-four percent of the State's 89,300 male veterans, as compared to 47 percent of the 114,600 nonveteran males 18 years old or over, were living in cities and towns. One-third of both veterans and nonveterans lived in rural nonfarm areas. Proportionately fewer veterans than nonveterans lived on farms (veterans, 1 out of 8; nonveterans, 1 out of 5).

Of the 89,300 veterans in Montana, 51,100 had served in World War II; 17,600 in the Korean war (of whom 2,800 were also World War II veterans); and 11,400 in World War I. The remaining veterans (12,000) were peacetime ex-servicemen, except for about 180 Spanish-American War veterans.

The median age of the 89,300 veterans in April 1960 was 38.3 years. World War I veterans were the oldest—median, 66.4 years. World War II veterans were 40.2 years old (median), and Korean war veterans were 29.2 years old (median). The other service veterans were the youngest (median—25.0 years), reflecting the fact that most of them had served in the Armed Forces since the Korean war ended in January 1955.

Eight out of 10 men in Montana between the ages of 35 and 39 years were war veterans. Four out of every 10 men 25 and older had served in the Armed Forces during a war period. The lowest proportions of war veterans to total males were 1 out of 8 for the 55- to 59-year age group; 1 out of 8 for the 70 years and over group; and 1 out of 20 for the youngest males—18 to 24 years.

Of the 56 counties in the State, Yellowstone had the most male veterans: 10,100 war veterans and 1,500 peacetime ex-servicemen. Petroleum County had the smallest veteran population: 103 war veterans and no peacetime ex-servicemen.

Of the State's 89,300 male veterans, 80 percent were married; almost 15 percent were single; 4 percent were divorced; and 2 percent were widowed.

Six out of ten Montana veterans were living in a different house in April 1960 than they had occupied 5 years earlier. Three out of ten moved within the same county and one out of eight moved from one Montana county to another. One out of seven male veterans had moved to Montana from another State since 1955. The movers (those who had lived in a different house in 1955) were more than 8 years younger than the veterans who remained at the same address (median age: movers, 35.2 years; nonmovers, 43.6 years). Veterans who moved within the county were almost 2 years older (median age, 36.9 years) than those who moved to another county in Montana (median age, 35.2 years). The veterans who came to Montana from another State were even younger; median age, 33.2 years.

The average veteran in Montana had finished part of the first year of college. One out of eight had completed 1 to 3 years of college; another one out of eight was a college graduate (1 out of 20 had finished 1 or more years of postgraduate study). Three out of ten completed high school, but not a year or more of college. One out of five (19 percent) completed his education with 1 to 3 years of high school; and one out of four (26 percent) had completed no more than 8 years of elementary school.

Eighty-eight percent of the Montana male veterans were members of families—9 out of 10 of them were family heads, the others were related to the family head (son, father, or other relative). Another 1 out of 10 were living alone or with unrelated persons. Of the 2 percent (1,800) who were not living in households, 4 out of 10 were in institutions, and 6 out of 10 lived in roominghouses, college dormitories, and other group quarters.

In April 1960, 84 out of 100 (74,500) male veterans in Montana were working, another 5 out of 100 (4,800) were unemployed. The 11 out of 100 veterans who were not in the labor force were about 27 years older than those in the labor force (median age—64.1 years as compared to 37.5 years).

One-third (34 percent) of the employed Montana veterans in 1960 were craftsmen, foremen, operatives, and similar workers. One-fourth were professional and technical workers, managers, officials, and proprietors. One out of eight employed veterans was a clerical or sales worker; 1 out of 6 was a service worker, laborer, or farmworker; and 1 out of 10 was a farmowner or manager.

Median personal income in 1959 of Montana male veterans was $4,653. Veterans between 35 and 44 years old had the highest income (median, $5,502); those 70 years old and over had the lowest (median, $2,041). Six percent of all veterans reported incomes of $10,000 or more. One out of five (18 percent) had less than $2,000 and 1 out of 12 had under $1,000 of income in 1959.

Five thousand, eight hundred and fifty seven dollars was the median income in 1959 of the Montana families headed by male veterans. Twelve percent of these families had an annual income of $10,000 or more; 36 percent had between $6,000 and $10,000; 30 percent reported income from $4,000 to $6,000; and 22 percent had under $4,000. One out of eight veterans' families had a 1959 income of less than $3,000.

Of the 9,900 Montana veterans who were unrelated individuals—living alone, or with nonrelatives, or in noninstitutional group quarters—4 out of 10 had less than $2,000 of income in 1959; 3 out of 10 reported between $2,000 and $4,000; 2 out of 10 (18 percent) had between $4,000 and $6,000; and over 1 out of 10 had $6,000 or more. Their median annual income was $2,580, compared with the $4,653 median personal income of all veterans.

THE ALLIANCE FOR PROGRESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, for all its emphasis on the need for increased material benefits to the people of Latin America, we should not lose sight of the fact that the Alliance for Progress represents first and foremost a battle for men's minds. This makes the work of the Alliance in the field of education of crucial importance.

Although largely unpublicized, the work of Alliance and AID people in raising educational standards is going forward on several fronts. The magnitude of the operation is summarized very well in a speech by the Honorable Teodoro Moscoso, coordinator of the Alliance for Progress, before the California Teachers Association in Los Angeles on March 1.

After reviewing the general problem of illiteracy in areas of Latin America—and the factors contributing to it—Mr. Moscoso outlines what is being done in the field of teacher training, school construction, furnishing of school supplies, assistance to higher education and student scholarships. Even with luck, it will be a long time before significant results of our effort can be pointed to. Yet some of our first steps have been very promising.

For instance, some 2½ million primary readers—costing only about 12 cents apiece—will be distributed for the first time in the history of the elementary schools in the five Central American countries to first and second graders.

Another encouraging development is the growth of university-to-university relationships between institutions of this country and Latin America. Soon more than 35 U.S. universities will have working arrangements with some 50 sister institutions in 15 Alliance countries whereby student and faculty exchanges and other types of assistance will be carried on. The 50 Latin American universities, by the way, represent a selected 25 percent of all such institutions of higher learning in that region.

Mr. President, there are several such promising developments covered in Mr. Moscoso's speech. I recommend its reading to all those who are interested both in the Alliance for Progress and the field of education, and ask unanimous consent that it be printed at this point in the Congressional Record.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Address by the Honorable Teodoro Moscoso Before the California Teachers Association, Los Angeles, Calif., March 1, 1963

I am pleased and honored tonight to speak to this distinguished audience of educators in a State with which we recently undertook a new venture in building the Alliance for Progress. California, thanks to the leadership of your State government and a group of imaginative men in your State's agricultural community, has decided to explore ways in which to make its experience available to a Latin American country which has problems similar to those California once encountered and has since conquered—Chile.

President Kennedy found this venture significant enough to join Governor Brown in announcing it. He called it a pioneering effort to give the Alliance a new dimension. I salute you and your State for joining in this potentially great and productive undertaking—a step that helps show in still another way the resources of our people available in the great endeavor to help the peoples of Latin America make their societies over in the image of the 20th century.

I

We North Americans often think of Latin America in terms of a stereotype—a Latino asleep under a cactus, with his sombrero over his face. This "sleepy Latino" would be as out of place in Caracas or São Paulo or Santiago as here in Los Angeles. We tend to think of Latin America as a cultural unit, which it is not. We think of it as Spanish speaking, yet nearly one-third of its people claim Portuguese or Indian dialects as their mother tongue. While it is true that the Latin influence is dominant in all of the Americas south of the Rio Grande, there are other influences which color the Latin culture.

Renzo Sereno, professor of political science at Johns Hopkins University, prefers to think of it as consisting of three distinct zones. He refers to the South American countries of Brazil, Argentina, Uruguay, and southern Chile as "Ibero America." In these countries the Spanish and Portuguese cultural influence is relatively undiluted. He refers to the Andean countries of Bolivia, Peru, Ecuador, and Colombia as well as parts of Mexico and Guatemala, as "Indo-America," for in these areas the cultural influence of the great Inca and Aztec civilizations is still strongly felt and lends a different tone to this region. He refers to the lands bordering the Caribbean as "Afro-America," for in these lands the attitudes of the peoples of African origin can be seen, integrated with the dominant Spanish, and in some cases French or Portuguese cultures. Let us not think, then, of Latin America as an homogenous cultural unit.

Its geography is even more diverse. From the cold damp winds of Tierra del Fuego to the tropical rain forests of western Brazil and eastern Ecuador there is more climatic and geographic variation than people who are familiar only with Europe and North America can imagine. And in the Andean highlands of Bolivia and Peru, millions of people live at the altitude of the peak of Mount Whitney.

The levels of industry and agriculture, the ways in which people make their livelihood are just as varied as the culture and the climate. Even within Brazil there is extreme contrast. Sao Paulo is an industrial complex that resembles Chicago, with thousands of manufacturing plants, including 17 automobile factories. Paulistas set about their work with purpose and drive. Many workers own homes with TV sets and other appliances. They go to work over freeways. In northeast Brazil, on the other hand, there are huge depressed rural zones where millions of people barely eke out a living from a harsh land, where few can read and write, and suffer the cruel punishment of alternating floods and droughts.

II

It is logical, then, that the educational problems of Latin America are as variable as the people and the conditions in which they live. In turn, there are vast differences between us North Americans and Latin Americans—in historical development, political patterns and, of course, economic and social conditions. But there is one deep and abiding bond that ties all of us in this hemisphere together: the Judaeo-Christian heritage that underlies our Western civilization and that has given us common ideals to pursue: the dignity of the individual, equality before the law, and above all, liberty.

This bond is stronger than the misunderstandings and frictions that often beset our day-to-day relationships and that are the stuff of headlines and bylines. It gives us a powerful advantage in working with our Latin American sister peoples, particularly in the cultural and educational fields.

Starting out from this basic premise, let us take a look at the hard and concrete facts that go to make up the education lag in Latin America today.

As educators well know, statistics on educational attainment are hard to obtain and may be variously interpreted. One area in which we do have statistics is the area of literacy. Of course, literacy is only one small part of education, but it is the basic tool of all other formal education.

Illiteracy in Latin America varies from a low in Argentina of 12 percent, to 89 percent in Haiti. There is a striking difference in illiteracy rates between rural and urban populations in most of the Latin American countries. In almost all cases illiteracy is at least twice as high in the rural population as in the urban. In some cases rural illiteracy is five or six times that of the urban population in the same country.

It is interesting to note that in Argentina, the country with the highest literacy in all South America, the foundation of the educational system was laid by Domingo Sarmiento, President from 1866 to 1874. He was known as the "schoolmaster President" and was responsible for the founding of over 1,000 public primary schools. Though he came from humble beginnings, he traveled widely in Europe and the United States, and formed a close and lasting friendship with Horace Mann. From Mann he learned much about democratic education and became a champion of popular education in his country. Sarmiento is still remembered in Argentina, not only as a great President but as the "father of the normal school." He and his two immediate successors in the Presidency brought 64 North American teachers to Argentina to establish and direct normal schools in 14 Argentine provinces. The influence of these normal schools can be seen in the pattern of Argentine education to this day. So, you see, educational aid to Latin America is not a new thing.

To return to the problem of illiteracy for a moment: In 1950, for Latin America as a whole, the illiteracy rate was 41 percent for the population over 14 years of age. This covered 38 million people.

What are the causes behind such high illiteracy figures? Cases from two countries will serve to illustrate. In 1960 in Guatemala 61 percent of the children 7 to 14 years old were not in school. In Ecuador, of 100 students entering the first grade only 54 enroll for second grade, and by sixth grade only 14 are left. Some of them drop out because they are needed at home to work and herd animals. Others drop out of school from lack of interest and are not required to attend by their parents, who do not understand the value of schooling. Still others simply have no school to go to. Many are lost by nonpromotion. Figures from Guatemala indicate that of all the students enrolled at all levels 36 percent are not promoted.

In many cases the children who do go to school find it trying to do their learning. Schoolrooms are often small, crowded, too hot or too cold and teaching materials are almost nonexistent. Teachers, in the absence of books, reference materials, and teaching aids, must rely largely on the straight lecture method, drawing on their own, often skimpy, educational background. In addition to teaching under very adverse conditions of overcrowding, lacking books and educational materials, a high percentage of teachers in Latin America have only primary education.

Your reaction to the shortage of educational facilities will doubtless be that Latin America is not spending enough for education, and this may be true. However, our figures indicate that they are spending about the same proportion of their national income on education as are we in the United States. The scarcity of educational investment is a reflection of the severe economic problems of the area.

In order that the people of Latin America may improve their economic and social well-being, they must have trained people and knowledgeable leaders who can direct, manage, and supervise the gigantic tasks of industrial and agricultural development, of business management and government service. These leaders and technicians require educational systems which press toward providing educational opportunity for the many, while selecting the able—of any bent—for advanced study and training, regardless of origin or means. Obviously, this task cannot be accomplished in a short time. But it must be pursued, for the aspirations of the people for education are becoming more insistent all the time and demand a response. Only a major effort in the field of education can do the job.

III

This educational effort must function at all levels, and all levels of education require teachers. Therefore, major emphasis in the Alliance for Progress program in education is in the area of higher education and teacher training. We are placing much of our effort in the preparation of the teachers of future leaders. In this way we try to take advantage of the multiplier effect.

In some 15 countries the AID is working in the field of teacher training. In Bolivia, where some 4,500 rural teachers have had no specialized training and for the most part have had only 5 years of schooling, the AID mission is cooperating in an inservice program which brings these teachers in groups of 1,000 a year to a center where they are housed and given a 6-week training program. A similar effort is underway in Paraguay. We are assisting in the expansion of the three normal schools in Costa Rica, providing training materials and working with the University of Costa Rica in the development of programs for secondary school teachers. In Brazil, we are cooperating in an elementary education project in Belo Horizonte in the State of Minas Gerais where training for over 750 principals and supervisors is being given in 1963. In one of the States of Northeast Brazil, we participate in the training of some 8,000 elementary school teachers.

We also have five training centers in the United States, each providing programs for improving the work of Latin Americans who are or will become supervisors or instructors of prospective teachers in their own countries. These centers are located at Pennsylvania State University, Geneseo State College in New York, Akron University at Akron, Ohio, and at Wisconsin and Indiana Universities.

Not only are we engaged in programs of teacher education; we are also contributing to the common effort to provide textbooks and instructional materials for these teachers to use.

This spring in the five Central American countries—Guatemala, El Salvador, Nicaragua, Honduras, and Costa Rica—some 500,000 first- and second-grade youngsters will be receiving 2,500,000 readers for the first time in the history of the elementary schools of these countries. Of course, these are not the hard-back, multicolored books we in this country are accustomed to. Nor do they have the same quality of paper. They are soft covered, with the pages stapled together, but they do have illustrations, and they have been produced by the teachers of each of these countries under the supervision of textbook experts in our AID mission in Guatemala. They are being printed commercially in each country. Most importantly, they cost only about 12 cents a copy. Over the next 5 years the AID regional center in Central America hopes to produce texts and teacher manuals in each subject for all six grades. These will be written at the center by selected teachers from each country, so that after a 6-year period not only will the individual countries have a series of texts which they have developed and which they can afford to continue to supply with their own funds but they will also have a core of specialists who can help staff and strengthen the ministries of education.

While teachers, books, and equipment are essential needs, we are also engaged in very substantial school construction activities. Many of these are of a self-help nature, with the host country providing some of the materials or the labor or both. In Guatemala, for example, an agreement was signed in 1960 whereby the U.S. AID mission would give technical and financial assistance to build 2,250 classrooms in some 400 schools over a 3-year period. These were to be essentially primary rural and small urban schools. The cosponsors were to be the U.S. Government, the Government of Guatemala, and the recipient community on the basis of equal financial contributions. Community self-help was to be in the form of land, labor, and materials. To date, the local communities have exceeded their quota by providing 49 percent of the total project costs; 228 schools of 1,173 classrooms have been completed, and 115 schools with 554 classrooms are under construction. CARE is providing furniture for some 20,000 of the pupils in 500 classrooms.

In nine of the countries of Latin America where we have the most active programs, the construction of approximately 8,500 classrooms for elementary and secondary school classrooms is scheduled for 1963.

But attention to educational needs at the elementary level must not lead us to lose sight of the importance of a balanced effort which takes account of the requirements for secondary and university opportunities. AID's efforts here are beginning to expand in the direction of supporting comprehensive high school programs and the introduction or improvement of science education.

For the immediate present, we have concentrated rather heavily on vocational education. These programs are being examined and developed in the light of manpower surveys which are being conducted in 11 countries with AID collaboration. In Brazil we are cooperating in the development of a system of industrial secondary schools for young people as well as a system of productivity centers for training of the adult worker. In Ecuador, we are involved in a program to improve the training facilities and programs in five vocational secondary schools and in two post-secondary industrial institutes. In all, we have active programs in some 15 countries.

Of all our efforts in education in the last 2 years perhaps the most significant is in the field of higher education in which we have been fortunate to have the cooperation of many universities in the United States, as well as of private foundations. North American University personnel is helping to build stronger faculties in Latin American institutions in such vital fields as engineering, agriculture, science, economics, business and public administration and education.

Existing and pending university-to-university relationships are reaching a magnitude reflected by the following statistics: Within the next few weeks the total of the major U.S. universities engaged in programs in Latin America will reach more than 35, including institutions such as California, University of Southern California, Chicago, Columbia, Minnesota, Pittsburgh, Stanford, Texas A. & M., Iowa State, Michigan, Michigan State, Purdue, Indiana, Louisiana State University, Tennessee, Cornell, Catholic University of America, Syracuse, and Tulane. These institutions are or will be working in 15 Alliance countries with more than 50 Latin American universities or other institutions of higher learning, in many cases involving themselves with more than one faculty or school in each of these institutions. It is interesting to note that best estimates of existing educational institutions of this type in Latin America approximate 200, making present AID coverage approximately 25 percent—a selected 25 percent of the existing Latin American institutions.

It is also interesting to note that these relationships are of a "sister" type in that in many cases there is a mutual exchange of faculty and students and a developing concentration upon Latin American matters in the U.S. institutions concurrently with the assistance given on the Latin American campus.

IV

Of growing significance to the university effort in Latin America, in addition to the financial help forthcoming in this way, has been a growing partnership among Latin American educators in exchanging and better utilizing existing resources. The activities of the OAS special task force on education, recently concluded, have emphasized deficiencies and problems facing Latin American universities and are offering useful suggestions for their correction. A meeting is just now closing in Mexico City which has brought together rectors from leading Latin American universities and presidents of major U.S. institutions, as well as foundations and multilateral agency bodies interested in Latin American higher education.

These university activities are in addition to participant training opportunities offered directly to approximately 1,500 Latin Americans by the U.S. Government each year. Many other governmental and non-governmental sources are helping to make it possible for approximately 10,000 Latin Americans to study in U.S. colleges and universities annually. The disparity between this number and a present university population in excess of 500,000 in Latin America indicates how little can be done to solve the Latin American university problem in terms of quantity alone, to say nothing of quality. Incidentally, the potentially eligible university population is 10 times larger than the actual student body if we use the U.S. ratio of students to eligible population as our criterion. Another significant comparison is that Latin America is estimated to have some 50,000 engineers and technicians in a population larger than that of the United States where we have more than 1 million such qualified people. Obviously, gigantic efforts must be made to improve Latin American institutions in each country.

The economic problem in increasing attendance can also be alleviated by institutions such as one in Colombia, providing low interest loans with deferred payments and access to foreign currency at a discount for those who study outside Colombia. AID has made a loan of $200,000 to this organization. A bill has been introduced in the Chilean Senate providing for a similar organization.

Another interesting development is that of regional junior colleges in Chile which will provide facilities during 2 years of higher education for provincial students who are prevented from attendance at universities by sheer distance. This effort is being supported by the U.S.-supplied Social Progress Trust Fund of the Inter-American Development Bank.

And, finally, there is a great potential which exists already in Latin American institutions if only there were greater mobility and cooperation between institutions in the same country, and regionally. The development of a regional council on higher education, known officially as the Superior Council of Universities of Central America is unquestionably the most heartening development in favor of a better utilization of insufficient resources in higher education. Instead of duplicating each other's curricula and facilities, instead of continuing to turn out a surplus of lawyers, these universities will work to complement each other's programs in an effort to turn out those specialists and experts that the five countries need most badly for their development as an integrated economic and social region.

V

I have sought tonight to describe in broad brush strokes the varied programs we are carrying on in cooperation with the great universities of this Nation to broaden the base and vary the fare of education on all levels throughout Latin America.

We attribute top priority to these programs. For the youth of Latin America today is threatened by despair and a trend toward nihilism. Its frustrations are making it increasingly easy prey to the seductive call to violence, voiced by extremists of both right and left, but particularly the left.

Our effort, under the Alliance for Progress, to build stronger economies would surely fail, if we were to neglect the equally vital task of helping to build open and vigorous societies. Latin America must provide room at and near the top for all those whose talents entitle them to play a meaningful and self-fulfilling role in the conduct of their nations' affairs. If Latin America's youth finds the opportunity to exchange dogmatism for pragmatism, to plot solutions instead of revolutions, to demonstrate results instead of merely demonstrating—we shall be on the road to success of the Alliance for Progress.

When I say "we," I do not merely speak of the United States but of all the 20 nations who make up the Alliance, signed its charter and thus committed themselves freely and independently to the objectives of the program. On our part, this means cooperation in terms of loans, grants and assistance in building the institutions of modern society. On the part of the Latin Americans, it means much more: it means providing the lion's share of the financial resources and undertaking the bold and often politically risky reforms that must come to Latin America if the hemisphere is to move into the 20th century—if the bulk of the peoples are to enjoy the rights and the opportunities that are the hallmarks of the modern free society.

In this vast endeavor, education is a key that unlocks many of the doors that are now closed. We continue to count on the support, the expert assistance and the guidance of you, the leaders and practitioners of education in this great democracy.

EDWARD P. MORGAN ESSAY CONTEST

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, yesterday I had the privilege of meeting the two national winners of the 1962–63 Edward P. Morgan essay contest. Top honors went to Miss Carla Lipsig, a freshman at Brandeis University, and Richard C. Frazier, a senior at Queens College in Flushing, N.Y., for their penetrating compositions on "Youth's Challenge in the Labor Market of the Sixties." Both were honored last Monday night at the 50th anniversary celebration of the founding of the Department of Labor. In addition, they will receive scholarships to go on to graduate school.

Mr. President, I have read the essays of these two young people. They show a sharp insight into the very serious problems confronting our youth today. Both Miss Lipsig and Mr. Frazier stressed the obligation of society to youth, and of youth to themselves, to strive for educational excellence so that as newcomers to the labor force, they will possess marketable skills. This message has particular urgency today.

The Edward P. Morgan Essay Contest is held each year. It provides a real service by focusing the attention of our youth on important current topics. The caliber of this year's winners is an indication of its success, and I again congratulate them.

I might add, Mr. President, that one of the judges of this latest contest was our distinguished colleague, the senior senator from New York [Mr. Javits].

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the news release about the winners, plus their essays, be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the news release and essays were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Seventeen-Year-Old Brandeis Co-ed and Queens College Night School Senior Are First-Place Winners of Edward P. Morgan Essay Contest

Carla Lipsig, a 17-year-old freshman student at Brandeis University in Waltham, Mass., and Richard C. Frazier, a 32-year-old married senior attending night sessions at Queens College in Flushing, N.Y., have been judged winners of the 1962–63 Edward P. Morgan Essay Contest, it was announced today by ABC Radio Network President Robert R. Pauley.

The two top winners will receive graduate school scholarships and a visit to Washington where they will be special guests at a dinner Monday, March 4, celebrating the U.S. Department of Labor's 50th anniversary. Next Tuesday and Wednesday, they will meet, talk, and dine with the Nation's leading policymakers in the areas of Government, labor, education, and broadcasting.

Runners-up, each of whom will be awarded a 24-volume set of the new Collier's Encyclopedia, are: Mary Treacy, College of St. Katherine, St. Paul, Minn.; Sandra Lee Miller, San Francisco State College; Richard J. Cassidy, Sacred Heart Seminary, Detroit, Mich.; Dock (CQ) Burke, Jr., Texas A. & M. College, College Station, Texas; and Terry Segal, Amherst College, Amherst, Mass. They will be invited to attend regional functions celebrating the Labor Department's birthday.

The topic for the essay competition was "Youth's Challenge in the Labor Market of the Sixties."

Judges of the 1962–63 contest were Labor Secretary W. Willard Wirtz; Supreme Court Justice and former Labor Secretary Arthur Goldberg; former Labor Secretary James P. Mitchell; former Labor Secretary Frances Perkins; Senator Jacob K. Javits of New York; AFL–CIO President George Meany; John McConnell, president of the University of New Hampshire and former dean of Cornell University's School of Industrial and Labor Relations; ABC newsman Edward P. Morgan; and Mr. Pauley.

All entries were subjected to preliminary screening by the Reuben H. Donnelley Corporation.

Miss Lipsig wants to become a labor lawyer. Her parents live in New York City. She has a recorded I.Q. of 173, and was graduated from Columbia Grammar School and Hunter College Elementary School before entering Brandeis.

Mr. Frazier is majoring in education, with heavy emphasis on history and political science. He completed 2 years at Princeton University, and currently attends night school. During the day, he is assistant manager of the mail order department at Tiffany's in New York City. He is married to the former Dorothy Reaser, a legal secretary.

ABC Radio and the AFL–CIO, sponsor of the network's "Edward P. Morgan and the News," were joined this year by the Labor Department in their association with the contest. Secretary Wirtz has commented that "Efforts like the Edward P. Morgan Essay Contest encourage thoughtful consideration by American youth of their own contribution to our Nation's goals."

Youth's Challenge in the Labor Market of the Sixties

(By Carla Lipsig)

The challenge is twofold: it is presented by youth to the labor market; it is presented to youth by the labor market.

The challenge to youth is manifested most clearly by the fact that those under 20 in the labor market have the highest unemployment rate of any age group. And the trend seems likely to continue.

Automation creates a growing dilemma—not only is it displacing blue-collar workers, but is is encroaching upon white-collar jobs. The number of those engaging in competition for jobs is in an almost inverse ratio to the number of new jobs created by economic growth. New jobs are quickly swallowed up by workers displaced by technical advances elsewhere.

President Kennedy has pointed out that "in this era of rapidly changing industrial techniques and new approaches to many aspects of our economic life, the development of this Nation's skilled craftsmen is of vital importance to the continued national security and economic growth of the United States." The view, then, is dim indeed for those with a high school education or less, aspiring to jobs in this fiercely competitive labor market of the sixties.

Young people must meet this challenge by extending their education as far as possible, and by acquiring needed skills. But the cost of higher education is heavy. They cannot meet it alone. A more massive program must be adopted than has yet been proposed, of governmental aid to education, sholarships, loans, and grants.

The second challenge presented, therefore, is that the labor market is faced with the task of providing jobs for these many young, unemployed workers.

But the labor market in the United States is an inevitable outgrowth of our so-called free economy. For this reason, there is no social or governmental institution that can create jobs by fiat.

There are institutions that aid in channeling the course of economic development, notably the U.S. Department of Labor, but with limited power. As a Commissioner of Labor pointed out 78 years ago, "a bureau of labor cannot solve industrial or social problems, nor can it bring direct returns in a material way to the citizens of the country; but its work must be classed among educational efforts."

Therefore, it is the task of those directly or indirectly affected by the labor market, to assert what influence is possible to direct it toward its most productive state, an economy growing dynamically, at no less than a rate of 50 percent annual increase in productivity.

The burden of intelligent participation must lie with the more fully educated youth. His is the prize of a college education, carrying with it the broadening of his horizons, the deepening of his comprehension. To a lesser, but nevertheless important degree, this will also be true of the student who has had expanded vocational training. When he enters the labor market, he will not be an unknowing competitor. He will have an understanding of the market in which he is involved. Through this comprehension of its virtues and its vices, he will be able to criticize intelligently. In his union, his office, the school or university where he will teach, this well-educated youth has the ability to offer ideas to stimulate the economy, to harness automation, to decrease unemployment.

There is yet another, more abstract challenge that youth presents to the labor market, which lies in the fundamental nature of youth itself. Youth is of a new generation, and wants to wreak changes. It is energetic, it is optimistic. It loooks to the solution of internal ills through world peace and idealistic perfectionism. By its very nature, youth may bring vast, as yet unseen, changes to the labor market, changes yet unborn even in the minds of the new generation.

Youth's Challenge in the Labor Market of the Sixties

(By Richard C. Frazier)

Whither American youth in the labor market of today and the remainder of this decade? With each passing month, this question assumes a greater and greater urgency. The challenge to American youth is not only that of the income which will be earned by each young man and woman, it is also that of dedication to, and support of, the American ideal and ethic. If American youth fails to answer this challenge in an affirmative and imaginative way, no degree of affluence and material well-being will suffice to preserve our heritage of freedom and democracy. Young, working America will be rich and self-satisfied; America, the Nation, will have lost her soul.

Enlightened and intelligent citizenship is a demanding responsibility. Voting and knowing the political issues of the day are only a small part of this obligation. True citizenship demands that each member of society develop his individual capacity to the utmost, as did the Greeks during the golden age of Athens. The young American worker facing the future owes it to himself, to his fellow citizens, and to the survival of his country to prepare himself as completely as his intellect and circumstance will permit. To sacrifice a longer period of training and mental cultivation for immediate personal gain or profit is not only a selfish and shortsighted decision, it also undermines the future development and existence of America. As President Kennedy so aptly remarked in his inaugural address, "Ask not what America can do for you, ask what you can do for America."

In today's fast moving world of technical progress and change, America and the youth of America are best served by a continuing growth of skills and training in the young worker. A grade or high school education is no longer a sufficient preparation for further acquisition of the skills that are necessary if the youth of America is to exploit its natural endowment to the fullest extent possible.

The young American who is undereducated is, in reality, a wasted natural resource. Today, brain power and intellect are assets that we can ill afford to lose; they are resources that are to be valued far above the more prosaic ones of metal and fiber with which nature so generously blessed this great land of ours. Today's youth will squander this greatest of all God's gifts only at his own risk and the peril of the United States. What, then, can youth do to meet this challenge? What manner of man will be needed in the future to answer the summons of destiny? Education and training, as has been suggested, are the font of future growth and progress both for the individual and the Nation. However, formal education is not the complete answer. Each American, after he has completed all the education that his own situation will allow, must never cease to grow and to nurture his skills and knowledge. Each achievement must be a spur to further study and learning. Curiosity, one of humanity's greatest boons, must not be allowed to wither; stasis and reaction are the cancers that have destroyed many civilizations in the past.

With educational maturity comes self-confidence and a belief in the power to accomplish just ends. The man who lacks a sense of adequacy cannot be expected to produce to his ultimate capacity. With freedom from a feeling of inferiority will come the power and the strength to meet the unknown, to accept the challenge of tomorrow, secure in the knowledge that he has heeded the stricture, "To thine own self be true."

OPPOSITION TO REMOVAL OF INTERNAL REVENUE SERVICE OFFICE FROM AUGUSTA, MAINE, TO BOSTON, MASS.

Mrs. SMITH. Mr. President, the citizens of Augusta, Maine, are on the verge of having a Boston Tea Party of their own over the proposed drastic removal of Internal Revenue Service jobs from Augusta, Maine, to Boston, Mass., as announced by the Kennedy administration.

This movement of more to Massachusetts and Boston at the expense of the three northern New England States is but the latest development in the long established colonial attitude of Massachusetts and Bostonians toward Maine. Apparently it is still regarded as a mere colony of Massachusetts even though Maine broke off from Massachusetts on its own in 1820 and became a separate State.

I ask unanimous consent to place in the body of the RECORD at this point a telegram which I received this afternoon expressing the official views of the Augusta, Maine, City Council and the mayor of Augusta.

There being no objection, the telegram was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AUGUSTA, MAINE, *March 7, 1963.*

Senator MARGARET CHASE SMITH,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Mayor Gilbert and the members of the Augusta City Council respectfully request your consideration in initiating an investigation of the reorganization of the Internal Revenue Service and your taking adequate steps in abating the move of eliminating local service here in Augusta. Should the reorganization be allowed the Federal savings of $5 million annually on the national level will affect economically not only the citizens of Augusta and the State of Maine but four of the six New England States. There are 53 residents of the city of Augusta that will be affected by the change. The city assessed valuation on their homes exceeds $419,000 representing over $14,000 of a municipal property tax income of the community the citizens of Augusta and private industries cannot absorb the unnecessary burden that will be placed upon them. It is fully realized that the President's tax cut proposal demands curtailment of certain Federal services but a cut of this nature will create local economic problems far beyond the community's ability to absorb. The local internal revenue office initially processes over 500,000 returns a year. Of these 200,000 are fully processed here in Augusta. The citizens of the State of Maine in paying an average of 20 percent of their salaries to the Federal Government for income tax alone are certainly entitled to direct personal service which can only be afforded them through a local office here in central Maine and not by satellite service from Boston.

PAUL G. POULIN,
City Clerk of the City of Augusta.

ALL-WEATHER SERVICE AT YORK, PA., AIRPORT

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, the March 1963 issue of Skyways magazine contains an article which I would like to bring to the attention of every Senator. The article describes the successful efforts of the York Airport, York, Pa., to provide the best service to its customers. As a result of 2 years of ingenious labor and a total expediture of about $5,000, the airport now provides its customers—40 aircraft—with all-weather capability. The improvement was brought about through the installation of a LF "H" homer. The owners and operators of the York Airport should be commended for taking this valuable step to improve air safety.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article in question be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TWO YEARS PLUS $5,000 EQUALS LF HOMER FOR YORK—BUSINESS FLYING GETS AN ALL-WEATHER AIRPORT

(By Oscar L. Hostetter)

This is the story of how one business-flying airport, at a cost of 2 years of effort and about $5,000, provided all-weather capability to its customers through installation of an LF "H" homer.

York Airport, located 8 miles west of York, Pa., is the home base of 40 aircraft, 10 of them multiengine corporate airplanes with professional flight crews. Regular users of the field include 20 business firms which have plants or branches in York, 60 air taxi operators, more than 200 other business airplanes, and student and private pilots.

The airport was built in 1939, and in a major improvement program in 1955 a 4,200-by-100-foot macadam runway was constructed, along with a 120 by 152 hangar and 30 T-hangars. Three 72 by 80 hangars and one 40 by 72 hangar were already in existence.

With the opening of the new runway, York Airport's weather limitations became obvious. The absence of radio facilities forced uncounted flights to go elsewhere in bad weather; local operators often found themselves unable to return home when weather deteriorated.

The logical answer to the problem was a homing facility. Thus in January 1961 we began to explore the possibility of acquiring a TVOR. At the request of FAA we prepared studies of need, traffic potential, and other justifications, and in the end the Agency suggested we build our own facility in order to prove our instrument operation count and then request Federal aid.

In the meantime we learned that many people involved in accidents blame malfunctioning omnis and erroneous directional information for the mishaps, though few prove their case.

For these reasons, in November 1961 we decided an LF homer would be more desirable, less complicated, and less expensive, and made a formal request to FAA for a site survey.

An on-site inspection was made by the Agency the following January. In April a flight check and an airspace study indicated that there were no serious objections to location of a homer at York Airport, and minimums of 700 feet and 1 mile for circling were recommended.

At the same time we were given a suggested homer location by the Agency, but after considerable terrain study we found the location would not be satisfactory. Another site was chosen, and final site approval was granted on June 12, 1962.

We could not start to build, however. First we needed site survey and drawings, a land lease contract, airspace site approval, a 5-year FAA operational contract, and a contract by which we agreed to pay FAA $700 for ground and flight checks before commissioning (checks after commissioning are done for free).

By early August the installation was nearly complete, and FAA granted a frequency and power of 242 kilocycles at 25 watts. This allocation still had to be coordinated with the Federal Communications Commission, and the necessary FCC application was mailed in late August. The application was returned for additional information, which was supplied, and final FCC approval was granted on November 7.

On November 11 we went on the air on a test basis. FAA flew in on November 13 for flight testing, and pronounced themselves well pleased. The next step was to make eight copies of a manual of operations, and to locate a monitoring radio receiver to indicate any malfunction (off frequency or low power). Since the receiver must be monitored 24 hours a day, we arranged with the cooperation of York's mayor, to locate it in the city police department. York Airport was responsible for installation, maintenance, and operating expense.

On January 12, 1963, York Airport's LF homer was commissioned by FAA. After proper publication in the Federal Register, instrument approaches were authorized as of February 23.

Out-of-pocket cost for our homer was about $5,000, with the Pennsylvania Aeronautics Commission furnishing $2,600 of this amount. We held our costs down by leasing a surplus LF radio, keyer and monitor receiver from FAA—cost of this equipment new would be about $2,000.

A licensed radio technician to do the installation cost $500, and an 8-by-8-by-7-foot metal, insulated building to house the radio facility cost another $500.

The ground system consisted of stringing No. 8 copper wire underground in a 100-foot radius connected to 8-foot lightning rods driven below ground level. The antenna system was composed of two 60-foot poles 250° apart, dropping the feed from the center of the cable stretched between the poles. A 110-volt line was also necessary. Total cost of this installation was aproximately $1,500.

We estimate the annual operating cost of the homer at a few hundred dollars. Requirements include weekly functional checks, monthly maintenance checks which must be reported to FAA, and an FAA inspection each 6 months. The inspections must be conducted by an FCC-licensed radio technician, and cost for this service will depend on location and circumstances. Cost of parts and electricity are modest, and in our case land rental is $100 a year.

The York homer has a range of about 60 miles with the identification code of THV. We are now working toward a straight-in approach with lower minimums, and we are in hopes that traffic one day will warrant installation of an omni near the airport.

Much effort went into establishment of this facility, but we feel the effort will be repaid in customer satisfaction.

SUPERFICIAL CHANGES IN RUSSIA DURING THE PAST DECADE

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, in the Tuesday, March 5, 1963, issue of the Wall Street Journal, William Henry Chamberlin reports on the superficial changes which have taken place over the past decade in Russia. Although the wilder excesses of Stalinism have been abated and some of the approaches altered, the Soviet Union still retains the same totalitarian framework it did 10 years ago. The ambitions of its rulers have not changed in that they will take as much as they can get until stopped with a strong show of force.

I ask unanimous consent that this article by William Henry Chamberlin be included at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Russia Since Stalin—The Changes in the Past Decade Have Been More in Style Than in Substance

(By William Henry Chamberlin)

Ten years ago today, the death of Josef Stalin ended one of the longest and most frightful reigns of terror in recorded history. For a quarter of a century, from the time when Stalin eliminated his last political rivals until his death in the mystery-haunted Kremlin, scene of more than one bloody palace coup in medieval Russia, Stalin ruled the vast Soviet Empire with a pitiless savagery that challenges comparison with the most notorious Asiatic despots, Genghis Khan and Tamerlane, and, in Russian history, with Ivan the Terrible.

By comparison with Stalin's dictatorship, the reign of terror in the French Revolution was shortlived and seems almost humane. The number of his victims easily exceeds 10 million—4 million peasants deliberately starved to death in 1932–33 to break the resistance to collective farming; whole national communities uprooted and banished to slave labor; a million "kulak" families liquidated; many millions consigned to the bleak concentration camps of North Russia and Siberia; a huge number of veteran Communists slaughtered during his paranoid purges in the 1930's; 15,000 Polish war prisoners slaughtered in the Katyn Forest and elsewhere.

Two facts testify to the degree of terror which even the dead Stalin inspired. It was 3 years after his death before a word of criticism was publicly uttered in the Soviet Union, before Khrushchev delivered a much expurgated indictment of his crimes before a secret session of the 20th Congress of the Communist Party. Much more time elapsed before Stalin's embalmed body was removed from the Communist shrine which it had formerly shared with Lenin's on Moscow's Red Square. And it is only within the last few weeks that one of Stalin's greatest crimes, his slave labor concentration camps, was exposed in print in the Soviet Union in a grim novel by a former inmate.

CHANGES OF STYLE

During the 10 years since Stalin died, amid rumors that he was preparing still another purge, there have been unmistakable changes in the Soviet Union, some of substance, more of style and manner.

Stalin remained secluded in the Kremlin, many foreign ambassadors leaving Moscow without having met him. Khrushchev, on the other hand, strikes a gregarious pose, receiving individuals and delegations from abroad, making the round of embassy receptions, slapping journalists on the back and joking with them. Tension in everyday Soviet life has relaxed; an early morning knock is more likely to be the milkman than the policeman. Living conditions have improved, although not as fast as in the United States and Western Europe.

There is more, although strictly rationed, freedom of expression. Editors and poets like Tvardovsky and Yevtushenko can voice thoughts that would have got them sent to a concentration camp in Stalin's time.

Yet, with full recognition of these changes, the totalitarian framework of Soviet society remains basically untouched. A self-perpetuating Communist bureaucracy is the source of all power. There is no freedom of political discussion. Elections are farces, with one handpicked list of candidates to vote for. The Iron Curtain is no empty figure of speech. Moscow is the only large European capital where it is impossible to buy the leading newspapers of the United States and Great Britain. An enormous amount of labor and technical resources is devoted to jamming foreign radio broadcasts in Russia.

The status of the peasants remains what it has been since the introduction of collective farming, that of serfs, with the state as their landlord, telling them how they must work, what they must plant, how much they may receive for their produce, although, again like the serfs who were liberated a century ago, they are permitted to sell their garden produce freely.

The death penalty for "economic offenses," in many cases for what would be called initiative under a free economy, has been extended. A new instrument of tyranny is the organized youth group, going about and checking up on so-called antisocial behavior, from decadent jazz to western hairdos. Although the wilder excesses of Stalinism have abated, the Soviet Union remains a tightly governed police state, with a minority of rulers dictating to a majority of ruled.

ATTEMPTS AT INTIMIDATION

Subtler and more sophisticated than Stalin in his methods, Khrushchev loves to repeat such attractive sounding words as peace and coexistence. Yet, ever since the Suez crisis, he has tried again and again to use Soviet possession of missiles and rockets as a means of intimidation. In 1961 he threatened to blow up the Acropolis. More recently, in an insulting communication to Chancellor Adenauer, he boasted that West Germany, in the event of war, would "burn like a candle."

Since Suez, the "peace loving" Soviet Government has threatened 20 countries, on 130 occasions, with its nuclear weapons. Khrushchev repeatedly tried, fortunately without success, to frighten the United States out of standing by its treaty obligations to the Chinese Nationalists and to West Berlin. The memory of his attempted nuclear blackmail in Cuba is much too recent to be forgotten, especially in view of the continuing Soviet effort to turn Cuba into a hostile military and subversion base against the nations of the Western Hemisphere.

There have been changes in the Soviet Union since Stalin's death and there will probably be more. But there has been no basic alteration in the nature of the Soviet State or in the ambitions of its rulers which would warrant the least letting down of America's guard. In periods of comparative lull, our policymakers would be well advised to remember the shrewd observation of Britain's famous Foreign Secretary, Lord Palmerston, to another Victorian statesman, Lord Clarendon:

"The policy and practice of the Russian Government have always been to push forward its encroachments as fast and as far as the apathy or want of firmness of other governments would allow it to go, but always to stop and retire when it met with decided resistance, and then to wait for the next favorable opportunity to make another spring on its intended victim."

IMMIGRATION POLICY AND ECONOMIC GROWTH

Mr. HART. Mr. President, on February 8 I proposed legislation, on behalf of myself and 34 other Senators, to replace the national origins quota system of the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952. Several Members of the House have introduced similar bills. And from across the country there is a growing favorable response to our proposed legislation—S. 747—from private organizations and individual citizens. As I said in my introductory remarks, the impressive support for S. 747 evidences a growing public awareness of the need for immigration reform, and an evolving consensus as to the kind of reform that is needed.

The bill is based on a reasonable and factual approach to the problem and need of determining an equitable and useful immigration policy for America. It is the product of diligent and serious thought. It follows the counsel of America's foremost immigration specialists. It is in line with the estimates of our leading economists, both in government and the private sector, regarding the number and kind of immigrants this country's economy can profitably absorb.

I want to emphasize this latter point, Mr. President, because there is a sincere concern in some quarters over the potential economic impact of our proposed legislation. Unquestionably, the economic aspects of immigration are complex—I would be the first to say it. But I would also make it abundantly clear that S. 747 has not been introduced without thoughtful consideration by its sponsors of our economic situation and the hard facts of our complex technological economy. We believe this program would enhance our economic growth, help stimulate our economy, and generate employment opportunities during this decade of development. The best data available substantiates our conviction. And I am hopeful that when hearings are held on the bill, the facts will be spread on the record in greater detail.

In this connection, Mr. President, I call to the attention of Senators two excellent statements on the economic aspects of immigration. The first, by Raymond D. Larson, assistant to the Director of the Labor Department's Office of Manpower, Automation, and Training, is the substance of an address before the annual meeting of the American Immigration and Citizenship Conference in October 1962. The second, by

Frank L. Mott, also of the Office of Manpower, Automation, and Training, appeared in the November 20, 1962, issue of Manpower Report, a publication of the Department of Labor.

These statements boil down to two points. First, immigration can help alleviate our shortage of manpower in the central age range of 24 through 44. Secondly, immigration can bring to the United States large numbers of people who possess skill and talent our economy sorely needs. Recent trends indicate clearly that an increasingly high proportion of immigrants are in the central age range of 24 through 44, the prime years of their working life, and, as Mr. Larson points out, "that the proportion of immigrants with a high degree of skill has gone up significantly in the last 10 years." Additionally, it has been determined that on the average only 47 percent of the yearly influx of immigrants enters the labor force.

That America will continue to need the economic stimulation immigration historically has given was graphically pictured before a House subcommittee studying this problem last fall by Dr. Seymour L. Wolfbein, Deputy Assistant Secretary for Employment and Manpower of the Department of Labor. He pointed out that the favorable prognosis for job opportunities over the next decade would not be upset if the current level of immigration is maintained. He even suggested a slight increase in admissions during this period would be a boon, in terms of economic growth, if the skill level and occupational composition of added immigration fell in categories of need. A major objective of S. 747 is to eliminate present obstacles to the admission of such immigrants.

Mr. President, if recent immigration trends continue, and we have every reason to believe they will, the enactment of S. 747 is highly desirable from the standpoint of economic growth. It removes the discriminatory aspects of the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952, and updates this law to conform with the needs of our time. It stresses the admission of exceptional immigrants, in addition to the reunion of families. It does not substantially alter the current level of immigration, which, incidentally, is not being achieved under the act of 1952 but through a series of special enactments to circumvent the strictures and inequities of our basic statute.

I commend to Senators the timely statements of Mr. Larson and Mr. Mott, and ask unanimous consent that they be printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the statements were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REFUGEES AND IMMIGRANTS CONSTITUTE A PEACE CORPS IN REVERSE, HELPING US WITH THEIR SKILLS

(By Raymond D. Larson)

The basic philosophy and ideas behind the Peace Corps, it seems to me, are closely related to those of the groups which favor liberalization of American immigration policies. The Peace Corps believes that by sending people with skills and knowledge to developing nations we can help them to develop their economies, create a better life for their citizens.

If this idea works for the Peace Corps—and it does—then it must also work in reverse; it must be true that people with skills and knowledge coming from other countries can help us to improve our economy and to raise the cultural and material levels of our people. It was hardly necessary to say this to the groups represented at the recent annual meeting of the American Immigration and Citizenship Conference. They have broadcast this idea for many years and have furnished thousands of dramatic examples of persons who have contributed enormously to the welfare and security of the United States. Indeed, it is difficult to understand, with all the examples of invaluable contributions on the part of immigrants, why it is so hard to sell liberalized immigration. However, let us look at one argument often used by those who oppose it.

Ignoring the people who are against liberalizing immigration because of prejudice and intolerance, there are those who are opposed because they strongly believe that additional immigrants will add to our problem of unemployment. This argument, while it appears logical, does not stand up when subjected to reasonable analysis. It is similar, as a matter of fact, to the argument—so often presented—that the way to solve our unemployment problems is to deny jobs to women.

The people who use this approach seem unaware that the elimination of women from the labor force would result not only in the loss of most of our elementary school teachers, nearly all our nurses, and virtually 100 percent of our stenographers and secretaries, but would bring about no discernible reduction in the number of unemployed. Unemployment does not always mean a shortage of jobs; it sometimes indicates lack of knowledge, skills, and abilities on the part of those who are unemployed.

We in the Department of Labor are becoming increasingly conscious of the fact that it is possible for substantial unemployment and numerous job openings to exist side by side. We are now moving into high gear on the retraining programs passed by Congress in the last couple of years and have discovered that even in labor surplus areas there are many jobs available for persons with proper training. To date the record of placement under the Area Redevelopment Act's training program, for example, has been about 60 percent of those who have been trained. Sixty percent does not seem like a remarkable achievement until we remind ourselves that this training and job placement is taking place in areas of the United States where economic activity is at its lowest ebb and where there has been a surplus of workers over a period of many years.

It is clear from this experience that there are a great many jobs in the United States that go unfilled because persons with proper skills are not available. To the extent that immigrants coming into the United States have these needed skills, they do not affect the number of persons on the unemployment rolls. Actually, finding jobs for refugees and immigrants has been much easier than was expected.

FOUR POSITIVE VALUES

Having said that the effect of the immigrants on unemployment is not nearly as serious as is commonly supposed, I should like to outline very briefly four positive values that the United States gains from its immigrants. I should like to make clear that these are economic values and that the obvious and important humanitarian and democratic values are barely touched upon.

1. During the next decade the immigrants can help us to make up for a shortage of people in the central age ranges from ages 25 through 44. This shortage has arisen because during the 1930's, the depression decade, the number of children born in the United States fell off sharply. The babies of the 1930's are now the men and women who are between 30 and 40 years of age. This age group is the one which supplies many of the skilled workers, foremen, executive trainees and middle management personnel in the United States, an age group relied on very heavily by employers. A much higher proportion of our immigrants are in the 25 through 44 age range. This is demonstrated by the age distribution of the immigrants in 1961 compared with the age distribution of our national population.

Age distribution of population in the United States and of immigrants admitted to the United States

	U.S. population in 1960 (thousands)		Immigrants admitted to United States, 1961 [1]	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Total	179,323	100.0	271,344	100.0
Under 15	55,786	31.1	61,562	22.7
15 to 24	24,020	13.4	74,414	27.4
25 to 34	22,818	12.7	66,832	24.6
35 to 44	24,081	13.4	32,617	12.0
45 and over	52,618	29.3	35,919	13.2
Male	88,331	100.0	121,380	100.0
Under 15	28,358	32.1	31,102	25.6
15 to 24	11,906	13.5	26,772	22.1
25 to 34	11,179	12.7	31,412	25.9
35 to 44	11,756	13.3	16,049	13.2
45 and over	25,132	28.5	16,045	13.2
Female	90,992	100.0	149,964	100.0
Under 15	27,427	30.1	30,460	20.3
15 to 24	12,114	13.3	47,642	31.8
25 to 34	11,639	12.8	35,420	23.6
35 to 44	12,326	13.5	16,568	11.0
45 and over	27,486	30.2	19,874	13.3

[1] Data on immigrants are compiled on a fiscal year basis. For 1961, the period covered is July 1, 1960, through June 30, 1961.

Source: Age Distribution of U.S. Population, Department of Commerce, Bureau of Census, U.S. Census of Population, 1960. Age Distribution of Immigrants Admitted to United States, annual report of the Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice, 1961.

2. The second point which makes the immigrants valuable to us from an economic point of view, is that they are bringing to the United States in large numbers the kinds of skills we need. For example, one of our most serious occupational shortages has been a lack of engineers. During the last decade 31,000 immigrant engineers have entered our country. While this does not seem like such a large figure by itself, it does represent 80 percent of the number of engineers graduated from U.S. schools in the year 1961. Moreover, during the last 10 years more than 100,000 immigrants entering this country have possessed skills declared to be in critically short supply in the United States. Finally, in this connection, it is interesting to note that the proportion of immigrants with a high degree of skill has gone up significantly in the last 10 years. There were, for example, 20 percent more engineers entering the country in 1961 than in 1952 and 84 percent more technicians.

VALUE OF EDUCATION

3. A third point in favor of immigrants, and one which is receiving increasing attention from economists, is the economic value of educated people. In recent years economists and other social scientists have begun to recognize that much of the wealth which we had formerly attributed to resources and capital equipment really came from education. It has been demonstrated,

for example, that solely from the point of view of the individual, investment in elementary education provides a rate of return upward of 30 percent, and high school education a return of about 15 percent, and college a return of nearly 10 percent. These calculations exclude the value of educated persons to the community, which is probably much greater than the value to the individuals themselves. If this is true, then every educated immigrant who comes to our shores brings with him a potentially significant contribution to our economic and social welfare.

4. Finally, and perhaps most important, the value of immigrants to the United States increases as nations reach out to their neighbors more and more with each passing year. Increasing internationalism makes the immigrant of today much more valuable to the United States than the immigrant of 50 years ago in terms of our relationships with and our understanding of the rest of the world. Our diversified national backgrounds provide the United States with a national asset of incalculable value, both economic and humanitarian. In many parts of the world we have a deep reservoir of good will which is directly related to the fact that the people have direct personal ties with our citizens. Admission of immigrants from additional countries would enable us to share similar warm basic relationships with other people.

[From USDA Manpower Report, Nov. 20, 1962]

MANPOWER AND IMMIGRATION

The number of immigrant workers entering the United States in any single year in the postwar period represented a small proportion of the total labor force. However, many immigrants who came in the prewar and postwar periods were able to make important contributions to our economy because, before they arrived, they were fully trained for occupations which were in great demand. While the individual contributions of such notable figures as Enrico Fermi, Albert Einstein, Felix Frankfurter, Igor Sikorsky, and Eugene Ormandy are outstanding, this country has also benefited from the day-to-day work of the many lesser-known professional, technical, and skilled workers who have entered America in recent years.

IMMIGRANT CHARACTERISTICS

In the late 19th and early 20th century, the flow of immigrants satisfied the needs for unskilled and semiskilled labor in developing industries such as coal mining, steel, apparel, meatpacking, and transportation. In contrast, many of the post-World War II immigrants were equipped to satisfy the occupational requirements of our more complex and advanced economy. Of all immigrant workers arriving since 1947, about one of every three reported that his occupation was in a professional, technical, or skilled category.

Of the 3.5 million immigrants who entered the United States from 1947 through 1961, about half were reported as having occupational attachments. (See table 1.) The remainder were primarily housewives, young persons, and retired people.

OCCUPATIONAL DISTRIBUTION

About 16 percent, or more than a quarter of a million of the immigrants who reported their occupations during the 1947–61 period were in the professional and technical categories, whereas, professional and technical workers in the Nation's employed labor force averaged only about 9 percent during that period. About one of every six immigrants in the postwar period was reported as a skilled worker. Approximately one out of every eight American workers was employed as a craftsman from 1947 through 1961. The proportion of all immigrant workers classified as professional and technical workers has been consistently higher than the percentage of American workers classified in these occupations, for every year since 1947. For skilled workers, this has been true since 1949.

Unskilled laborers accounted for about 10 percent of the immigrant group. In the Nation as a whole, laborers average about 6 percent of the civilian labor force during this 15-year period.

The occupational distribution of post-World War II immigrants coincided with the needs of our economy and also reflected somewhat, some of the changes made in immigration policy. The Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952 gave first preference to immigrants "of special skills or ability who would be substantially beneficial to the national economy, cultural interests or welfare of the United States." This contrasts with the first preference which was given to skilled agriculturists in the 1924 Immigration Act.

IMMIGRANTS IN CRITICAL OCCUPATIONS

The potential contribution to the Nation's workforce is illustrated by the number of immigrants who entered with occupations similar to those classified as critical, or those considered to be in short supply by the Technical Committee on Critical Occupations of the U.S. Department of Labor. These occupations are used by the Selective Service System in determining deferments in the national interest. From 1952 to 1961, over 100,000 immigrants in such critical occupational areas as engineering, physics, nursing, and tool- and die-making entered this country. (See table 2.)

The proportion of immigrants in the occupations in short supply has been higher in recent years than in the early 1950's. Although the number of immigrant workers admitted in 1952 was about the same as in 1961, the number of engineers was 20 percent higher in 1961, and the number of technicians was 84 percent more than those who entered in 1952.

Some immigrants first enter occupations which require less skill, education, or training than those in which they had worked in their native lands. After overcoming problems such as language and licensing requirements, they are frequently able to move into the occupations for which they were originally trained.

In some cases, immigrants may not be able to make their full contribution to our economy and society until they receive special assistance in the form of retraining and education. Efforts have been made in many localities to help immigrants make the necessary adjustments to their new environment. Some of these programs have been particularly successful in assisting immigrants to secure employment in occupations which are the same, or related to, the occupations in which they had experience in their native countries. Localities which establish training programs can, in many cases, help expedite and increase the contributions of immigrants to our society.

The training of professional and technical workers represents a heavy economic investment for the people of a country. As indicated earlier, many immigrants are fully trained when they arrive. The receiving country benefits from the education and training which were acquired in the country of the immigrant's origin. Thus, the United States received immigrants who brought with them not only a willingness to work but a diversified knowledge, education, and training which were needed throughout the economy.

During the 1952–61 period, the United States profited when its supply of engineers was increased by more than 30,000 immigrants with training in the engineering field. (See table 2.) In this same period, over 300,000 U.S. students earned their first degree in engineering. The immigrant engineers, during this 10-year period were almost equivalent in number to the entire 1961 graduating class of U.S. engineers (35,860) who earned their first degree.

Some 14,000 immigrant physicians and surgeons and about 28,000 nurses helped alleviate the shortage of trained workers in the critical medical field in the 1952–61 period. About 4,900 chemists and nearly 1,100 physicists contributed their technical know-how to industry and government. According to the recent National Science Foundation publication, "Scientific Manpower from Abroad," (NSF 62–24), 15 of the 40 U.S. Nobel Prize winners in the fields of chemistry and physics were foreign born. Six of the foreign born received their prizes before immigrating to this country.

More than 12,000 immigrant technicians, the vitally needed workers who assist and support scientists and engineers, were also admitted during the 1952–61 period. About 9,000 machinists and 7,000 tool and die makers added their skills to our supply of craftsmen.

In terms of year-to-year occupational changes, the number of trained and educated immigrants who enter the country may be significant. For example, if all the professional and technical workers who entered the United States in 1961 worked in their respective occupations that year, they would account for nearly 10 percent of the increase over the preceding year in that occupational group. The comparable figure for skilled craftsmen would be an increase of 28 percent.

AGE DISTRIBUTION

A higher proportion of immigrants are in the prime years of their working life than the U.S. population as a whole. About 37 percent of all immigrants who entered the country in 1961 were in the 25–44 age group. Only about 26 percent of the U.S. population was in that age group in 1960. Approximately 40 percent of the male immigrants were between the ages of 25 to 44, whereas, only about 26 percent of the U.S. men were in that age group.

As shown in the following table, if recent trends in the age distribution of immigrants continue throughout the 1960's, immigrants could contribute significantly to alleviating the expected shortage in the prime working age group 35–44 in the United States in the coming decade.

Estimated changes in the number of workers in each age group from 1960 to 1970, with and without immigration

[In millions]

	With immigration	Without immigration
Total, all ages	12.6	11.1
Under 25	6.2	5.9
25 to 34	1.6	1.1
35 to 44	−.3	−.7
45 and over	5.1	4.8

Workers in the 35–44 age group represent a crucial group whose leadership, management know-how, skills, and experience are needed in our economy. Because of declining birth rates during the 1930's, the number of workers expected in this age group would be 700,000 fewer in 1970 than in 1960 if there were no immigration. With immigration continuing at the current level, however, this key age group would decline by only 300,000.

FRANK L. MOTT,
Division of Manpower Requirements and Resources.

TABLE 1.—*Number and percent distribution of immigrants by broad occupational groups for 1947–61 and for selected years*

[Fiscal years]

Occupational groups	Total, 1947 through 1961		1961		1954		1947	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Total admitted	3,542,189	100.0	271,344	100.0	208,177	100.0	147,292	100.0
With occupation	1,671,003	47.2	123,688	45.6	96,110	46.2	65,583	44.5
No occupation	[1] 1,871,186	52.8	135,704	50.0	[1] 112,067	53.8	[1] 81,709	55.5
No occupation reported	(1)	----------	11,952	4.4	(1)	----------	(1)	----------
With occupation [2]	[1] 1,671,003	100.0	123,688	100.0	96,110	100.0	65,583	100.0
Professional, technical, and kindred workers	263,018	15.7	21,455	17.3	13,817	14.4	10,891	16.6
Farmers and farm managers	87,083	5.2	3,002	2.4	3,846	4.0	3,462	5.3
Managers, officials, and proprietors, except farm	83,346	5.0	5,363	4.3	5,296	5.5	5,886	9.0
Clerical, sales, and kindred workers	283,432	17.0	25,198	20.4	16,018	16.7	13,961	21.3
Craftsmen, foremen, and kindred workers	268,555	16.1	17,679	14.3	15,396	16.0	8,726	13.3
Operatives and kindred workers	238,141	14.3	13,288	10.8	16,755	17.4	10,580	16.1
Private household workers	129,643	7.8	8,811	7.1	8,096	8.4	4,922	7.5
Service workers, except private household	95,851	5.7	8,399	6.8	5,203	5.4	3,882	5.9
Farm laborers and foremen	53,792	3.2	4,799	3.9	1,622	1.7	442	.7
Laborers, except farm and mine	168,142	10.1	15,694	12.7	10,061	10.5	2,831	4.3

[1] "No occupation" includes "No occupation reported" group.

[2] Includes immigrants age 14 years and over.

Source: Annual reports of the Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice.

TABLE 2.—*Number of immigrants in selected critical occupations admitted each year, 1952–61* [1]

[Fiscal years]

Occupation	Total, 1952–61	1961	1960	1959	1958	1957	1956	1955	1954	1953	1952
Biological scientists	420	48	53	57	56	51	35	36	23	34	27
Chemists	4,899	551	504	645	626	668	494	351	383	276	401
Dentists	1,271	119	110	99	129	132	159	113	116	103	191
Engineers	30,373	2,868	3,338	3,936	4,008	4,524	2,794	2,067	2,391	2,059	2,388
Geologists and geophysicists	474	66	42	59	58	62	51	41	34	31	30
Mathematicians	243	24	31	29	32	35	17	18	14	22	21
Nurses	28,235	3,449	3,828	3,620	3,729	3,517	3,064	1,864	1,502	1,796	1,866
Physicians and surgeons	14,340	1,683	1,574	1,630	1,934	1,990	1,388	1,046	1,040	845	1,210
Physicists	1,096	151	162	155	145	128	75	75	74	73	58
College professors and instructors	3,147	500	367	340	352	372	290	173	184	252	317
Teachers, not specified	19,278	2,686	2,532	2,670	2,471	2,304	655	1,549	1,356	1,227	1,828
Technicians	12,217	1,635	1,632	1,821	1,346	1,553	1,095	840	804	602	889
Machinists	9,025	819	993	1,476	836	1,393	1,106	594	488	583	737
Toolmakers, diemakers and setters	7,250	460	706	654	858	1,150	894	587	760	675	506
Pattern and model makers, except paper	501	26	34	25	63	123	118	60	32	13	7

[1] The occupational categories listed in this table are those which immigrants reported on their arrival in the United States. It was not possible in a few instances, because of lack of sufficient occupational detail to make a precise match with the occupations which appear on the list of currently critical occupations as determined by the Technical Committee on Critical Occupations of the U.S. Department of Labor. For this reason, totals are not shown.

Source: 1959 through 1961: Annual reports of the Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice. 1952 through 1958: Data furnished by the Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice.

JOHAN LUDVIG RUNEBERG

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, Tuesday, March 5, marked the 159th anniversary of the birth of Johan Ludvig Runeberg, the great 19th-century Scandinavian poet. A Finn who wrote in Swedish, Runeberg is honored as the national poet of Finland, and his writings are also well known in Sweden.

Runeberg's father was an impoverished merchant sea captain, so the talented young man supported his studies at the University of Abo by giving private instruction. Runeberg later combined a distinguished academic career with belles-lettres. He also founded a Helsinki newspaper, which he edited with great success. In 1847 he became rector of an advanced secondary school in Borga—now Porvoo—and a year later the first part of his greatest work was published. This is a series of narrative poems whose motif is the Finnish war of independence in 1808. The poem adopted as the Finnish national anthem appears in this patriotic work.

These poems brought Runeberg great fame, and he was proclaimed Finland's national poet. They also forged strong ties with Sweden by recalling the role which Sweden has played in the Finnish war of independence. As a Finn writing in Swedish, Runeberg remains one of the main sources of friendship between the two Scandinavian neighbors. Blessed be the memory of this great poet who combined the qualities of patriotism and national amity.

THE GRAND RIVER BASIN OF MISSOURI

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, in the northwest part of our State a great newspaper is determined that the decline and fall of the Middle West is not inevitable; and therefore this paper is doing its best to acquaint the citizens of that area with the facts, so these people in turn can gather together, and work together, to prevent occurring in the 1960's what has happened to that area in the past decade.

During that time every county but one of the some 17 counties in the Grand River Basin in Missouri lost population—a tragic situation indeed in this the most prosperous Nation in world history.

In this connection, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a recent article "What's Ahead for the Grand River Basin" from the St. Joseph News-Press be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHAT'S AHEAD FOR THE GRAND RIVER BASIN?—ENGINEERS ENVISION NOT ONLY FLOOD CONTROL BUT ALSO CREATION OF A VAST WATER RECREATIONAL AREA

(By Robert L. Slater)

A comprehensive plan for development of the water resources of the Grand River Basin may hold the key to the future prosperity of northwest Missouri.

This plan, now nearing completion in the Army Corps of Engineers offices in Kansas City, offers far more than flood control benefits for the area, located east of St. Joseph.

Flood control itself is a highly significant factor, of course. In a 20-year period from 1942, Grand River Basin floods have caused more than $60 million in estimated damages.

But the six-reservoir development plan, including also 230 miles of levee and channel improvement work, goes far beyond flood control.

RECREATIONAL AREA

It would mean creation of a recreational area with a potential comparable with that of the Lake of the Ozarks. Six manmade lakes resulting from the dams built along the Grand and its major tributaries would provide water for swimming, boating, water skiing, fishing, and fish and wildlife conservation.

They also would provide a guarantee of an adequate water supply for the entire area, a vital point in the highly competitive battle to attract new industry.

It would mean a relative stabilization of the now erratic flow of the Grand River, with a consequent improvement in the quality of the water supply.

Fulfillment of the minimum plan would be at an estimated cost in excess of $170 million, with most of the expense borne by the Federal Government.

INTEREST NEEDED

But the multiple benefits to be derived from this plan would more than offset the costs, according to data now being compiled by the Engineers in Kansas City.

Whether this entire plan will be realized depends on how much the people in this part of the State are interested in its tremendous possibilities.

It depends in many respects on their vision: How well they may be able to see what this completed plan will mean for an area that now is suffering from a population decline, an area that now is fighting an uphill battle in the effort to attract new industry.

The Grand River Basin is an area 150 miles long and 90 miles wide, starting in southern Iowa and extending south toward the Missouri River as it flows across the State to the east.

On maps prepared by the Corps of Engineers, the western edge of the leaf- or fan-shaped Grand River Basin is only about 20 miles east of St. Joseph. The basin takes in the northwest Missouri counties of Worth, Harrison, Mercer, Gentry, Daviess, Grundy, Livingston, Caldwell, Linn, and Sullivan; substantial portions of De Kalb, Clinton, Putnam, Carroll, and Chariton, and small sections of Nodaway and Ray Counties.

It is an area where development of water resources is falling far behind.

The accompanying map indicates the many projects either already completed or under way in the Kansas City district of the Corps of Engineers. Throughout northwest Missouri, there is a clear absence of such improvements.

A POPULATION LINK

And many people will insist there is a significant relationship between this and the decline in population in northwest Missouri from 1950 to 1960. While the rest of the Nation was achieving a rapid population growth, and Missouri itself was showing an 8.6 percent rise, every county in the Grand River Basin suffered a population loss in the decade.

The Grand River Basin project is described by Sam Farney, a planning engineer in the Kansas City district, as "a long-range opportunity to change the economy of the area."

The Grand River itself begins in Iowa, near Greenfield, and empties into the Missouri at Brunswick. The comprehensive plan for development of the Grand River Basin would mean work also on the major tributaries of the Grand, including the Weldon and Thompson Rivers and Locust, Yellow, and Shoal Creeks.

The Grand River project is similar to, but on a smaller scale than, the mammoth one now nearing completion on the upper Missouri River. The Grand River project, as the one on the Missouri, fits into the Corps of Engineers aim to gain maximum benefits from the Nation's water supplies.

These goals were explained to Arthur V. Burrowes, editor of the News-Press & Gazette, and this reporter on recent trips to the Missouri River division offices of the Corps of Engineers, at Omaha, and the district office in Kansas City.

Through development of the six reservoirs and 230 miles of levee and channel improvements, the Army Engineers hope to accomplish these results in the Grand River Basin:

Flood control, with significant flooding no more frequent than once each 50 years.

Recreational use, including boating, fishing, and swimming.

Adequate regulated water supply, sufficient for municipal and industrial demands.

Improvement of water quality.

Preservation of fish and wildlife.

How the Engineers hope to do this, what it will mean to the area, and other significant facts will be discussed in subsequent articles.

Development of the comprehensive basin plan would mean setting up a minimum flow of perhaps 1,000 cubic feet per second on the Grand River. "We can do it" says Mr. Farney, planning engineer in the Kansas City district of the Corps of Engineers.

The Grand River Basin plan, Engineers are convinced, offers help toward meeting many of the problems now facing this entire area.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, just as no nation can survive without an adequate supply of clean fresh water, so no area can maintain its position unless that water is made available to its citizens.

I am certain my colleagues will be both willing and anxious to allow the residents of the great Grand River Basin of Missouri the benefits of the same water development that has been and is being granted to other parts of our State and Nation.

ANNIVERSARY OF BIRTH OF "CHAMP" CLARK

Mr. LONG of Missouri. Mr. President, today marks the 113th birth anniversary of the late Speaker of the U.S. House of Representatives, James Beauchamp "Champ" Clark, 12-term Congressman from my home district in northeast Missouri—the same district that has, for the past 40 years, been served so ably by our dear friend and trusted colleague, Representative Clarence Cannon.

The legend of "Champ" Clark has been told many times. It is the story of a man whose devotion to public duty so far transcended the ordinary that it will still be retold over and over in generations yet unborn. And when the day comes, as surely it must for every mortal man, when his name is lost in the obscurity of time, "Champ" Clark's contributions to the free and democratic institutions of government will continue living as never-ending service to his fellow man.

Bowling Green, Mo., was his hometown—as it is mine. We in Bowling Green are proud of our fellow townsman, as are all Missourians proud of this man from our State, who gave so much to our Nation. Many of our colleagues will also remember his son, the late Joel Bennett Clark, who served Missouri here in the Senate from 1933 to 1945.

But there is something beyond pride that we feel—and that is a feeling I am certain is shared, consciously or unconsciously, by all Americans today, and in all of the future. That is deep thankfulness for his leadership and guidance in helping to formulate and construct the very foundations of freedom, justice, and dignity in the institutions of our great system of American Government.

FOREIGN POLICY PROBLEMS IN THE WESTERN HEMISPHERE

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, one of America's outstanding editors, Mr. William R. Mathews, of the Arizona Daily Star, is at the same time one of our most perceptive students of foreign policy. No armchair reasoner, Mr. Mathews backs up his arguments with annual trips to the remote and not so remote corners of our world to gain firsthand information on the status of our policy and at the same time to further his understanding of those corners. Recently he and 12 other editors visited Venezuela during the course of which visit he wrote of his observations in a series of articles for his newspaper published in Tucson, Ariz. He also made an address before the Pan Am Management Club touching on our responsibilities in this hemisphere and on the problems of our neighbors to the south.

I ask unanimous consent that these articles and Mr. Mathews' address be printed in the Record at this place in my remarks.

There being no objection, the articles and address were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Arizona Daily Star, Tucson, Ariz., Jan. 26, 1963]

Editors Off on Tour of Venezuela—They'll Get To Listen to the Opposition

(By William R. Mathews)

(Note.—This is the first article of several which will be written by William R. Mathews, editor of the Star, on a trip to Venezuela. Others will appear as they are received.)

En Route to New York and Caracas, Venezuela, January 20.—This is the first story on a junket of 13 editors from around the country, and 2 magazines, but no newspaper editors from New York City. We come from Montreal, Buffalo, Detroit, Memphis, Seattle, Los Angeles, Vancouver, Wash., Salt Lake City, and Tucson. We have just taken off in a Convair 880 at 3:50 p.m. and are due to arrive in Caracas at 8 p.m.

Tomorrow, Monday, we will start going to school again. For a week we are going to listen to lectures on Venezuela by college professors of Venezuela, political leaders, including the official opposition, economists, and finally by President Betancourt. The following week we will spend touring the country from Lake Maracaibo, the great oil-producing region, to the iron-ore mines on the Orinoco River to Island Margarita, which lies off the north shore of Venezuela. Everywhere we go we will meet and talk with very important Venezuelans, and, not the least, all travel will be deluxe.

We are traveling as guests of the Venezuelan Government in a study group sponsored by Stanford University. Of course, the objective is to brainwash us on Venezuela. However, President Betancourt, who some years ago was a Communist in Costa Rica, and who looms up as the first President in the history of Venezuela to finish his 5-year term, to which he was elected in December, has insisted that his opposition be heard by us.

My trip from Tucson to New York yesterday was interesting. We made Chicago in 2½ hours, thanks to a good tailwind. But we landed in Chicago amidst a typical Chicago winter snowstorm. It was 10 above, with only a 500-foot ceiling amid the falling snow. In the airport, it was interesting to see how men, women, and children of Chicago and points north manage to live like polar bears. They dress for it with galoshes, furs, heavy coats and headdress, mittens, and gloves.

All I saw looked vigorously healthy and quite unconcerned about the snow and cold, and that included babies in their mothers' arms.

Ninety minutes after we took off for New York, the picture changed. The ceiling was 800 feet. We landed in a light rain. The temperature was above freezing. Most everybody wore heavy overcoats, but there were few furs and galoshes.

This morning as I was going down to breakfast in the Waldorf who should I run into but Jim Farley. He recognized me and called me by name. Only Arizona's Henry Ashurst could excel him in connecting names with faces. Although he is 75, he looks as trim and fit as a man of 60. This meeting reminded me of his numerous phone calls of 1932 "B.C."—before the convention that nominated F.D.R. He used to address me, "Hello, Mr. Editor."

This morning he asked, "How do you account for the way that Barry Goldwater runs so strong in Arizona, while Carl Hayden gets such a good vote?"

My answer was "It's the women's vote."

[From the Arizona Daily Star, Tucson, Ariz., Jan. 28, 1963]

Tension Mounts as Venezuela Ballot Nears—So Far President Betancourt Has Been Able To Weather Leftwing Trouble

(By William R. Mathews)

(Editor's Note.—This is the second article of several which will be written by William R. Mathews, Star editor, on a trip to Venezuela. The third will appear Tuesday.)

Caracas, Venezuela, January 23.—There is a bit of political tension in this capital city that may come to a head today on the fifth anniversary of the overthrow of the dictatorship, and the rise of the democratic government headed by President Betancourt.

The tension has been growing steadily. Last week was marked by the bold theft of several paintings, loaned by the French to the local museum, by 10 armed men and 3 women. The trail led to the Central University of Venezuela. Three of the thieves were caught and the pictures recovered. The thieves were university students belonging to a leftwing Communist organization. Two were wounded by gunfire.

Sunday afternoon, the day we arrived, Ambassador Allan Stewart, who 35 years ago was the Star's sports editor, narrowly escaped assassination when he spoke at a public meeting in Maracaibo. The bomb exploded in a store next to where he spoke.

Monday evening, January 21, extremist students tried to stage a demonstration on the university campus. They were met by an opposing group. The police were called. There was some shooting. A professor and a girl were wounded slightly by ricochet bullets.

Yesterday, Tuesday, January 22, a couple of buses were stopped and burned. There was some shooting, but no one was injured. The administration of the university announced the closing of the school for 4 days. High schools also were closed as a precautionary measure.

Extreme leftwing organizations were denied permission to stage a protest meeting in the public square, the name of which is Silencio. There is a probability that they will try to demonstrate today.

It is quite evident that the Communists, whose party has been recognized legally until recently, have orders to carry on a terrorist policy. The idea is to provoke the army leaders into overthrowing the Betancourt government. Amid the resulting chaos, the Communists would hope to seize power themselves.

The university has been a strategic point, because under its charter of autonomy, the government is forbidden to enter its grounds without a warrent showing probable cause. The university is administered by the faculty and students. The government has no power over its administration. The head of the journalism department is a well-known Communist. This autonomy was granted by the provisional government after Betancourt was elected, but before he took office.

Until recently the extreme leftwingers had their way, but their conduct, with its terror, disgusted other students, who have organized an opposition. But the university is a haven and an arsenal, and a rendezvous, for the Communists. Until recently Castro of Cuba was admired greatly, and the Communist students thrived with a growing prestige. The tide now definitely has turned against them.

What happens today is important, because it will determine whether, for the first time in Venezuelan history, an elected president will be allowed to finish his term. This year is election year, the last year of President Betancourt's 5-year term. The election will come in December. If Betancourt can finish his term—he is not eligible for reelection—he will make a historical achievement.

He was a Communist party member and organizer 25 years ago in Latin America. But as president, he has proven so far to be a man of unusual ability in developing and maintaining a successful parliamentary government—one that has a recognized democratic opposition.

I visited the city in 1955, and interviewed the dictator, President Perez Jiminez. The change that has taken place in Caracas is refreshing to me, despite the prevailing tension.

[From the Arizona Daily Star, Tucson, Ariz., Jan. 29, 1963]

Venezuelan Terrorists Are Busy—Newspapermen Hear Shots in Night

(By William R. Mathews)

(Editor's Note.—This is the third of a series of articles written by William R. Mathews, Star editor, on a trip to Venezuela. Others will appear as they reach Tucson.)

Caracas, Venezuela, January 24.—The 23d of January, which marked the 5th anniversary of the overthrow of the 10-year dictatorship of Venezuela, came and went without any big public meetings or organized demonstrations.

The terror was stepped up a bit. The papers this morning announced 12 wounded and 1 death. Two service stations were set afire.

Purely by chance I saw how one phase of the terror works. John McClelland, of the Longview, Wash., News, and I were returning to our hotel about 7 p.m. We passed through the Plaza El Silencio in the heart of the city. A little farther on we heard three shots, "Bang, bang, bang." Our driver stepped on the gas. Someone close by was shooting. We did not stop to investigate.

Back at the hotel, the Tamanaca, my open window looks over the city. It was 8 p.m. Through the night air came a distinct "boom" and a minute later, another one. That was all. The lights of the city continued to blaze while the congested auto traffic moved on as usual. No fires broke out.

The day ended in relative peace. The government had met the challenge. But the terror can go on. It is so easy to shoot a few shots from a window into the auto traffic. It is easy to hand a package with a bomb in it to a loafer, and pay him to deliver it to an assigned target and leave it to explode.

[From the Arizona Daily Star, Tucson, Ariz., Feb. 2, 1963]

Betancourt Is Calm, Quiet—Venezuela's Leader Is Ex-Communist

(By William R. Mathews)

(Editor's Note.—This is the fourth of a series of stories about a trip to Venezuela made by the Star's editor, William R. Mathews. Other articles will be published as they are received.)

Caracas, Venezuela, January 25.—Late this afternoon our group interviewed a man who, 25 years ago, was a Communist Party member and organizer, but who today is president of the Republic of Venezuela, serving his last year of a 5-year term.

His name is Romulo Betancourt, and the interview was on the record. Each of us had a chance to ask him a question of our own and to each question he gave an answer, usually a long one. It was a TV-radio affair given in one of the large reception rooms of Miraflores Palace. After the press conference, he gave us a reception in an adjoining room. He mixed freely with us and others.

He is a small, corpulent man, in his early fifties. He exercised perfect self-control, and spoke his long answers calmly, and very slowly. He is a quiet sort of a man, but one quite able to take care of himself.

His left hand still was bandaged from the injury he suffered when assassins attempted to kill him. In his right hand he carried a pipe, and at times, although he never lit it, he drew on it. A couple of times he reached down and knocked it against the leg of his table. If there had been any ashes or tobacco they would have gone on the rich, thick carpet of the room. The pipe was empty.

This interview touched on hot political issues, which might be summarized as follows:

1. The phrases "leftwing" and "rightwing" should be changed to "progressive" and "reactionary." Communists at times work with rightwing extremists. Since 1958 there has been an essential shift of forces. Some that were for him now are opposing him, and some who opposed him then are supporting him now (which is conspicuously true).

2. As President it is his duty to govern. The Constitution provides that parties must regulate by law, but the legislature has failed to enact such a law. It is his duty to see that fundamental constitutional rights are maintained, but when some people threaten the existence of the Government by violent acts, and the legislature refuses to convene, it is his duty as President to suspend constitutional rights in order to protect the rights of the law abiding. This power has been used only partially, he explained. (For some months the President has been ruling by decree).

3. Former dictator Perez Jiminez now under arrest along with some of his friends, absconded with an estimated $13 million. It is necessary to set a precedent that such public officers who flee with state funds should be punished. Stolen funds are entitled to be recovered. The treaty of 1920 between the United States and Venezuela provides for mutual extradition of those charged with crimes of peculation.

It is up to the Supreme Court of Venezuela. He is willing to vouch for the safety and a fair trial for Perez Jiminez when he is returned to Venezuela.

4. Betancourt will not participate in choosing the nominee for the presidency to succeed him. Choice will be made by the Democratic Action Party. The President of Venezuela cannot campaign for a candidate the way the President of the United States can. When he ends his term, he expects to take up his old profession as a writer for periodicals in Venezuela and abroad.

5. The decree adopted by the provisional government (before he took office), giving autonomy to the Central University at Caracas, must be revised. The elected officials of the university are opposed to it being used as a political center. The university cannot be allowed to convert student buildings into refuges and asylums for either political criminals or common criminals.

6. When the proposal was made to enact a tax on the dividend payment of corporations doing business in Venezuela, he opposed it because it would adversely affect the inflow of capital from foreign investors. No such tax will be enacted while he is President.

7. Contrary to rumors, the plan of 1963–66 does not call for the nationalization of public utilities owned by private investors. Betancourt went into a long explanation of this plan as a project that will be used to achieve the goals of the Alliance for Progress.

[From the Arizona Daily Star, Tucson, Ariz., Feb. 3, 1963]

ARIZONIANS MEET IN CARACAS—AMBASSADOR WAS STAR SPORTS EDITOR

(By William R. Mathews)

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—This is the fifth of a series of articles by the Star's editor and publisher, William R. Mathews, on his trip to Venezuela. Another will be published Monday morning.)

CARACAS, VENEZUELA, January 27.—This evening the American Ambassador entertained our group, and who should he be but Allan Stewart, who in 1927 was the Star's sports editor. He was such a good one he was stolen by Gen. Frank Hitchcock of the Citizen. He recounted this incident and its ending. When the big depression hit in 1931, his salary was cut and later he was fired. He asked to be remembered to Alex Parker, Jack Weadock, and Clare Ellinwood. He has happy memories of his sports column, "Mulligan by Stew."

There was another delightful surprise. The American consul general in Caracas also is a University of Arizona graduate. He is George W. Skora of the class of 1935. He took his master's degree in 1936. He was a Star carrier boy while going to high school.

The night before, I met Oscar Morales, whose family used to live on North Stone Avenue. He was born in Tucson and graduated from the University of Arizona. He, too, was a Star carrier boy, and carried old route 37. He teaches music in a private school.

The day before, I went out with still another University of Arizona graduate. He is Lloyd Allyn, formerly of Phoenix and Clifton, where his father was a superior court judge.

As he explained it, he has been in Caracas for 23 years. He worked for an oil company, but when he and the manager disagreed on how the company should be run, he got fired. He and his wife liked Caracas. The fact that all eggs had to be imported prompted him to become an egg farmer. He was the first one to keep laying hens on a mass-production basis. Now he has numerous competitors.

His farm is 65 miles southwest of Caracas. He drove me down there over a fine six-lane highway. We crossed a mountain range at 60 miles an hour.

He has developed quite an egg factory, and he loves his chickens. He knows all their ills and habits. He markets 6,000 eggs a day to good customers in Caracas. He has a fine home in Caracas in an excellent neighborhood, to which he commutes for weekends. At the farm, he has a little colony of his own workers living in neat, small houses.

To get back to Ambassador Stewart's briefing and reception. He is a bull on Venezuela. Things are much better than they were, and are getting better. The Alliance for Progress really is taking hold. It has stimulated Venezuelans into helping themselves.

Betancourt, the President, will finish his term. The Communists are discredited completely. Their influence is waning. The terror is their last gasp in their program to cause the military to interfere and overthrow Betancourt. The President is a good friend of the United States and today is the leader of the anti-Communist and prodemocracy forces. Whereas the former dictator, Pérez Jiménez, spent money in and around Caracas, Betancourt is spending it out in the country.

On a recent trip to Merida, Stewart met with a small group of Peace Corps workers. They are doing a fine job. They have organized a B–5 Club that corresponds to our 4–H Clubs. There are some 90 Peace Corps workers in the country.

The Venezuelan Army consists of 14,000 personnel; the Navy 6,000; Air Force 2,600. There is a National Guard of 9,000 to 10,000, but it is strictly a police force whose mission is to support municipal police forces all over the country.

The future candidate of the Government's coalition party will not be named for awhile. It would be a political mistake to nominate him too soon. He will become a target when he is nominated, and he will have to be a man commanding a wide respect.

[From the Arizona Daily Star, Tucson, Ariz., Feb. 4, 1963]

FARM REFORMS MOVING AHEAD IN VENEZUELA—IN FERTILE VALLEY OF MARACAY MORE THAN 20,000 PERSONS HAVE SETTLED ON LAND

(By William R. Mathews)

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—This is the sixth of a series of articles by the Star's editor, William R. Mathews, written while on a trip to Venezuela.)

MARACAY, VENEZUELA, January 28.—We flew down to this beautiful city yesterday, 80 miles southwest of Caracas. It was a favorite resting place of the old dictator, Gomez, who ruled for 27 years. It is the capital of the state of Aragua and is located in the valley of the Aragua River. This is a fertile valley.

Maracay has its problems: In 2 years, more than 20,000 persons have settled on approximately 640 acres of land owned by the municipality. These several thousand families stampeded onto this land and staked out their lots, measuring approximately 30 by 80 feet. On them, they have built their shacks, varying in size up to 15 by 25 feet.

When word spread around that a few had done it without being disturbed, the stampede took place. They came from miles around, not only seeking a better place to live, but the ownership of a piece of land. Many of them already had humble homes, but saw this chance as an opportunity to enrich themselves. The shacks are built mostly of corrugated iron sheets, along with paperboard and other pieces of lumber the people could find.

Before the city, state and national governments could act, 6,405 of these shanties were built, and they are a shocking looking affair. The city also found out there were 4,700 other units that should be replaced.

We visited one of the groups, known as El Pinonal. It had no sewerage and no running water. We inspected a couple of these shanty homes. One was about 15 by 25 feet, with two rooms. As we walked in the front door, the husband greeted us from a hammock he had stretched across the room. His wife was sitting on the floor. There was no other furniture.

A couple of pigs grunted when disturbed, but this couple had brought a batch of guinea pigs who also enjoyed the freedom of the room. There was a crude pallet or bed in the other room. This couple had come from the llanos in southern Venezuela. Behind the house was a crude water closet, which, of course, the pigs did not have to use.

The other one was a bit better. The mother was a much better housekeeper, but there was no running water or sewage disposal.

Adjoining this development, the government, which means a combination of city, state and national ones, had gone to work on a project that was creating a model, but modest, residential district of small austere homes built largely by their inhabitants. The project calls for 1,228 houses, of which several hundred are already built and inhabited.

Part of this area has been cleared of shanties. In some cases where space permitted the new houses were built in front of the shanties. Some of the shanties evidently had been rented to a new family by the original builder.

The fine thing about the rehabilitation project is that the members of the families chosen to occupy these homes have to contribute their work. The people of Maracay contributed $13,400; the state government $67,000; the Workers Bank $335,000. The plan calls for the government to build the first two rooms and the foundation of the other two rooms. The other two rooms have to be built by their occupants, who become the owners.

Loans are granted to low-income residents with large families. Repayment is made over a period of 19 years at a monthly rate of $7.25. Each house has running water and sewerage connections. Each is wired for electricity. Construction is sturdy. The rooms are small, something like 8 to 9 feet square. A school is being built to handle 300 students in 2 shifts. The cost of each house runs to about $1,000.

Only a short distance away, in another neighborhood, we visited an "agrarian reform project." Each family that is chosen has to be agrarian. The project is called La Julia Agricultural Colony. Eighty-five farm families have been settled on a fertile area of 650 acres.

Their homes have been built on 60- by 100-foot lots. The idea is that they can keep chickens and some pigs, and can grow fruit and vegetables. They work the farmland they have received, and in offseasons seek other work to supplant what might be called subsistence on the homesteads. They have a three-room school.

When they are chosen, they have to sign notes for their houses, and they have to contribute their work to building the houses. When husband and wife split up, the one who assumes the responsibility for the children gets the home. Since more than 60 percent of the marriages are common-law marriages, this responsibility for the children was invoked. All families chosen must have children.

All of this work toward decent housing is in the pioneer stage, but should go forward much faster in the future as more administrative talent is developed.

These two projects in housing qualify for help under the Alliance for Progress, but that contribution is a very small one, unless the requirement for self-help, which is working, might be considered as an influential contribution.

[From the Arizona Daily Star, Tucson, Ariz., Feb. 5, 1963]

LAKE MARACAIBO OIL OPERATIONS ARE BIG, RICH—ABOUT 3 MILLION BARRELS OF PETROLEUM TAKEN DAILY FROM BENEATH WATER

(By William R. Mathews)

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—This is the seventh of a series of articles, written by William R.

Mathews, editor of the Star, on his trip to Venezuela.)

MARACAIBO, VENEZUELA, January 30.—This growing city of 400,000 people is the administrative center of one of the biggest and richest oilfield operations in the world. Look at the map of South America and note Venezuela at the north, fronting on the Caribbean Sea. In the northwestern section of this country is a great lake, 100 miles long and 60 miles wide. It is Lake Maracaibo.

From under the waters of this lake is taken around 3 million barrels of oil each day, which amounts to more than a billion barrels a year. It comes mostly from the eastern part of the lake, in an area something like 60 miles north and south by 30 miles east and west.

The Shell Oil Co. was the discoverer when in 1922 its original well, drilled offshore, blew in with a roar of 100,000 barrels a day. Three days later it caved in to stop the flow, but it proved the field. Many of the Shell wells drilled on land close to the shoreline in previous years had proven the presence of oil, and many of them are still producing on the pump.

Because Shell's concession was limited to this land area and a kilometerwide area in the lake, other oil companies saw the opportunity to get concessions from the Venezuelan Government out beyond the Shell's 1-kilometer limit.

Today Creole Oil Co., owned 96 percent by Standard Oil of New Jersey, has become the biggest single producer, with 1.3 million barrels of the total by all companies of 3 million a day. Next comes Shell. Mine Grand, a pioneer company owned by Gulf Oil, is next. Then comes some of the newcomers like Superior, Phillips, Signal, and Richmond.

There is a forest of 12,000 derricks out in this lake, of which 9,000 are producing oil. Most of the wells produce from a depth ranging from 600 feet—the old ones—to 6,000 feet. The average is 3,600, but many others are 10,000 to 12,000 feet. The lake is only a bit more than 100 feet deep. There are wells, wildcats, that have gone down below 15,000 feet that were duds.

Lake drilling is expensive. To erect the drilling platform costs some $75,000. The total cost of wells runs up to $600,000, but that is only a beginning. When the wells produce, the oil has to be gathered at what might be called delousing stations, but in the lake where the gas and water is taken out of the oil, much of the gas is saved and pumped back in wells. These lake stations cost a mere $25 million each to build and equip. The Creole Oil Co., whose guests we have been, has four of these stations, and it has to maintain 2,400 miles of pipelines lying on the mud in the bottom of the lake.

These pipelines vary from 3 to 40 inches. The latter is actually 50 inches because it is encased all around with a concrete coat 5 inches thick. This big boy is the one that finally delivers the oil to the refinery miles away, or to the storage tanks on the shore.

Creole maintains a crew of deepwater divers to repair leaks in the pipes. All the pipes underwater have a concrete protective jacket, but there are as many as 50 breaks a day.

These delousing or gathering stations perform another service. They store the gas taken out of the oil and put it under high pressure. Then the gas, under pressure, is piped back to wells that have ceased to flow naturally. This gas pushes up the remaining oil.

The average daily well production of Creole is 440 barrels. More than half of the wells flow naturally, with some producing 3,500 barrels a day.

These stations out in the lake also carry on what is known as water flooding. Lake water is pumped down into some wells to cause the oil to rise. This is a common practice in all oilfields, but this lake provides an abundant supply of water.

There are also lots of fish in the lake. Small, tender, delicious shrimp are abundant.

Creole maintains quite a navy of tugs and launches. It operates 175 of them for transporting personnel and 200 more for transporting supplies. It has a shipyard and drydocks that would command the approval of any admiral. It also maintains electric generating plants with capabilities totaling 375,000 kilowatts, which is nearly as much as the Tucson utility has.

All of Creole's labor is Venezuelan. Of its staff of 800 administrative executives, 500 are Venezuelans.

The pay of the oilfield workers is good. The lowest are paid $7.50 a day, plus fringe benefits that amount to another $7.50. Included are good housing, for which they pay $2.50 a week; all medical and hospital expenses for the entire family, and low prices on what they want to buy from the company commissary. The company provides good schools.

The workers show their good living conditions in their generally robust physiques. They are more mentally alert than the average Venezuelan worker.

The oil industry pays 60 percent of the nation's annual national budget of $1.5 billion. The industry's tax bill amounts to a division of 70 percent of its profits to the Government and 30 percent for itself.

[From the Arizona Daily Star, Tucson, Ariz., Feb. 6, 1963]

OPPORTUNITY APPARENT IN VENEZUELA—BREADBASKET AREA COULD BE DEVELOPED

(By William R. Mathews)

(EDITOR'S NOTE—This is the eighth article in a series written by William R. Mathews, editor of the Star, while on a trip to Venezuela.)

BARINAS, VENEZUELA.—A 2-hour flight from Maracaibo in a veteran DC-3 brought us south to this small, but growing, city located at the western end of the great plains, the "llanos" of Venezuela. From the foothills of the low Andes these plains stretch to the delta of the Orinoco.

Their development is barely beginning. The soil is rich. There are many fine forests of valuable timber. Imagine 50,000 square miles of land of such quality lying relatively idle and undeveloped in the United States.

The underground water level is shallow. All the land needs is some human initiative and muscle to make it produce an abundance. It could be the breadbasket of Venezuela and change that paradox of poverty in the midst of potential abundance, that characterizes Venezuelan life.

Until recent years malaria has prevented or dulled initiative, but malaria has been conquered. It is true that 15 or so traditional landowners have great haciendas. But it is equally true that much of the land is public domain.

If it were opened for settlement, the way the Homestead Act opened the West in the United States, these great plains soon would be producing a wealth of food and raw materials each year. Two young men from North Carolina, who know how to grow tobacco, have established a tobacco farm that is successful. A few others are growing cotton on some 10,000 acres.

American oil scouts found a small oil field which is producing 80,000 barrels a day near this city. Such initiative has been blighted by the Government's new oil policy of making no more concessions.

Instead of formulating a program that could stimulate a vast increase in wealth production, the Government, under the excuse of agrarian reform, has begun a program to divide the great haciendas, and their animals. Small 30-acre farms are the result. This amounts to establishing a system of subsistence homesteads and merely dividing existing wealth. Such a program will defeat rather than take care of the problem of doubling of Venezuela's population within the next 25 years. Today its 4-percent annual increase in population is the highest in the world.

Barinas has grown from a small town of 1,500 in 1945 to a city of more than 25,000 today. In many respects it reminds me of Tucson in 1924, although it has many more paved streets than Tucson had then. It has two hospitals, numerous schools, a teachers club, and an adjoining workers club, built by the state, and two beautiful buildings a few centuries old.

They are the Commandante and the Catholic church, whose early Spanish colonial architecture stand out as beautiful treasures of the past. They are both kept in good condition and are serving the same purposes they have for centuries.

The excellent hotel is a real beauty in its rambling architecture. It was planned and built under the administration of Dictator Perez Jimenez, as a part of a string of tourist hotels.

It does not have air conditioning, but it does have ceiling fans. The climate is tropical, but not nearly as hot as Tucson has been during the past few days.

The Governor of the state, which also is named Barinas, is a young man between 35 and 40, and his name is Luciano Valero. He gave us a reception at the hotel last night. All of the Governors we have met so far are young men, and appear to be dedicated public servants.

Barinas has something like 5,000 Italians and Portuguese. They have added to the life of the community in their enterprise and willingness to work. They are the gardeners, some also are storekeepers.

Barinas is distinctly a progressive community. It has comparatively little poverty, and is one we would be proud to have in Arizona.

[From the Arizona Daily Star, Tucson, Ariz., Feb. 7, 1963]

PORT CITY BOASTS BIG STEEL MILL—ORE LIES EXPOSED IN VENEZUELA

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—This is the ninth of a series of articles written by the editor of the Star, William R. Mathews, while in Venezuela.)

(By William R. Mathews)

PUERTO ORDAZ, VENEZUELA.—This is a new port city of Venezuela, upstream 187 miles from the Atlantic Ocean on the big Orinoco River. It is a raw, booming mining camp that would compare to some of the old ones in the United States, but it is destined to become one of the most important cities in Venezuela.

It lies at the eastern edge of the great "llanos." Yesterday morning we flew the 800 miles from Barinas over these great plains with the forests and rivers. Whenever the Venezuelan Government will permit human beings to exercise their initiative in developing these great plains, Puerto Ordaz and the new developments that surround it will make it the market point and seaport.

The new developments are one of the most modern steel mills in the world, with an 800,000-ton annual capacity, and two great iron ore deposits that lie 45 and 90 miles south of the city. One is owned by Bethlehem Steel, the other by United States Steel. They are mining 62 and 58 percent iron ore, respectively. The ore lies exposed. All that has to be done is to dig it up with electric shovels, dump it onto trains, which run it to the docks, where the ore again is dumped into oceangoing ships bound mostly for Chesapeake Bay ports.

The steel mill was a revelation to me, because I had never been through one before. This mill is an integrated, automatic one, that takes the raw ore, converts it into pig iron, which in turn is converted into steel, and the steel converted into various shapes ranging from bars to pipe. The mill employs 2,500, of whom only 500 are Americans or foreigners. Its operation is distinguished by the fact that sheer force of circumstances has compelled it to recruit labor so raw that much of it has never been in a big city, or done any labor other than farmwork.

The management has done what our Navy did so successfully during World War II. It has broken down the operations into numerous simplified jobs, and trained these raw, young men to perform simplified tasks with professional skill. Much of the work is done from consoles, where levers and buttons are pushed. Highly skilled Americans, along with similar Venezuelans, are on hand to supervise the work.

The plant is an efficient one, despite the fact that it is government-owned. The ore trains are pulled by diesel locomotives with only one man in the cab. The iron-ore smelter looks much like the copper smelter at Douglas with its great overhead cranes handling the big buckets of ore and liquid iron.

The steel mill was unique to me. One of the American superintendents picked me out, as our group lined up to watch its operations, and took me right up to the open-hearth furnaces. He gave me some pink-colored glasses to wear so I could look through the peephole into the furnaces. It was hot up there, standing a couple of feet away from those furnaces raging internally with 2,800° heat, as they took the iron ore and melted it with various other things that go into making steel.

At the first furnace, only flames blazing under high pressure could be seen. Four furnaces down, I could peep in and see a great white mass of something bubbling rather contentedly. That was the steel. It was very hot, being so close. Automatically, the steel would be run out into molds and, also automatically, would be transferred to the blooming mill, where it would go through big rollers that would squeeze it out into various shapes. I saw enough quickly.

At one of these big rollers stood a man, who looked like an American. It was his job to keep the slabs of pink-hot steel in their groove as they skidded into the roller. One of them was a bit obstinate, whereupon with his right hand this man picked up a big sledgehammer. With one hand and arm he slugged that pink-hot billet back into its groove, with as much ease as an ordinary man would use a tack hammer.

This steel mill was built under the orders of Dictator Perez Jimenez, and completed by the Betancourt government. Its big pipe mill has a market in the oil fields, but it now faces world competition in finding customers for most of its other shapes. Its development is, to say the least, a bit premature, and its annual deficit will have to be made up by the taxpayers of Venezuela. The mill will have to cut its prices, if it expects to sell the shapes other than pipe.

However, it could be a valuable asset, when and if the Venezuelan Government allows the great llanos to be opened for settlement and development. In this vast Orinoco basin lies the future of Venezuela, and it will take much more than socialistic government development to do the development job. It is too big a job for any government to do.

[From the Arizona Daily Star, Tucson, Ariz., Feb. 8, 1963]

VENEZUELA MINE LIKE AJO, BUT UPSIDE DOWN—OPERATIONS BEGIN ATOP MOUNTAIN OF ORE AND WORK TOWARD BOTTOM

(By William R. Mathews)

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—This is the 10th of a series of articles written by William R. Mathews, editor of the Star, on his trip to Venezuela.)

EL PAO (OR PIAR), VENEZUELA.—This community is a company town, beautifully laid out and developed, of the Orinoco Mining Co., a subsidiary of United States Steel. El Pao is 90 miles south of Puerto Ordaz and 390 nautical miles north of the Equator. It is the site of a big hill of iron ore.

Interestingly enough, the boss man of the operation is a former University of Arizona man, Arthur W. Ruff. He got his master's degree in mining in 1952 and worked at Cananea. Joe Davis, superintendent of production, is still another University of Arizona man; while another man, Wayne Davis, wrote in my notebook, "Tell Dr. Forester and Dr. Morris hello for me."

This mountain of iron ore is 4½ miles long and nearly 1 mile wide. It was discovered in 1947. Operations began in 1952. It is estimated to have 1.5 billion tons of ore, averaging 58 percent iron.

The operation is much like Ruff described it—"This is an upside down Ajo operation"—because it was started at the top of the mountain and works down, instead of starting at ground level and going down.

Numerous electric shovels with 8- and 9-yard dippers dump their loads into 90-ton railroad cars, or into brandnew 65-ton dump trucks, that in turn dump their loads into the railroad cars. Strings of 10 or 12 cars are pulled from the shovels by diesel locomotives to form 100- to 125-car ore trains, that take the ore down to the docks at Puerto Ordaz. Oceangoing ships take about 70 percent of it to the United States, with the remainder going to various world markets.

The operation is working at about half capacity, producing some 10,000 tons of ore a day. Only 150 of the 896 employees are Americans. The others are Venezuelans. All of the work is skilled or semiskilled. From all appearances, the tempo of the work compares with that in Arizona open-pit mines. The Venezuelans have been trained successfully to do the skilled mining, while numerous other Venezuelans do staff work.

Since the site is some 2,500 feet above sea level, the railway to Puerto Ordaz is downhill. There is one long 3.5-percent grade close to the summit, which compels the three diesel locomotives to do a reverse job. They have to furnish the air to tighten the two sets of brakes per wheel. Each of the ore cars has an air reservoir of its own in reserve. When the ore trains get underway at night, the sparks from the brakes and wheels make them look like big Fourth of July pinwheels. Friction heats the wheels to 390°.

This enterprise is operated as a concession, with 50 percent of its net profits going to the Venezuelan Government. The ore body has an estimated life of 50 years, but "there are other ore bodies not far off," one official added.

Although close to the Equator, this community has a delightful climate. It happens to be the dry season now, but there have been sufficient rains to bring out a lot of green on the plains and knolls. The area looks much like that of the Sonoita country after a rain. There is all kinds of wild game, including snakes. There are pythons and boa constrictors as well as an abundance of rattlesnakes.

The community has its own airstrip and a paved highway to Puerto Ordaz. After lunch at the community country club, our plane took us in 2 hours due north to Porlomar, a seaside community on Santa Margarita Island off the coast, where we found a good hotel right on the beach of the blue Caribbean. With the sun shining and the cool trade winds blowing gently, it was wonderful, and a good place to wash off the iron ore dust we had accumulated in nearly every nook and corner of our clothes and skin.

[From the Arizona Daily Star, Tucson, Ariz., Feb. 9, 1963]

TURBULENCE IS RIFE IN VENEZUELA—RURAL POPULATION MOVING TO CITIES

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—This is the 11th in a series of articles written by William R. Mathews, editor of the Star, while on a trip to Venezuela.)

(By William R. Mathews)

CARACAS, VENEZUELA.—The country is undergoing a social revolution caused primarily by the historic transition of a society based on agriculture with an aristocratic governing class, into one based increasingly on industry with a growing middle class, seeking to govern.

The change is a turbulent one. The population is increasing at the rate of 4 percent annually, and thus will double in 20 to 25 years. Much of this increase is moving into the cities. Here in Caracas the movement is spectacular. The people, know as rancheros, are swarming over the foothills of the mountains, and building shacks on tiny plots of hillside land, which they claim as their own, and are called ranchos.

Most of the land belongs to the municipality or the public domain. No government dares to drive the rancheros off, even though at times they squat on privately owned land. These little one- and two-room shacks are built of any kind of material that can be found or stolen. The city government has piped water to various localities where these people can get it by the bucket or oil can. Most of these areas have no sewers.

The local privately owned public utility has extended its services to those who want electricity. In one case an armed group of rancheros moved in on a local substation and by force diverted electricity to their area, for which they now refuse to pay. The company dares not change this lawless diversion, and neither does the city.

More than 300,000 human beings live in this manner, and the number is increasing steadily. The attraction of city life brings them in; and, deplorable as their habitations are, they are said to claim they are living better than they did out in the country.

Dictator Perez Jimenez sought to meet the situation by bulldozing away the shacks and building scores of gigantic high-rise apartments for the people. This helped out, but the stream continued to pour in as a kind of endless tide, covering more and more great empty places that remained on the foothills.

Some of these older rancho neighborhoods show improvement over the way I saw them in 1955. A few have put in sewage systems and have connected with city water mains. Others have planted flower gardens, and painted their shacks, which they have gradually remodeled into small homes.

Life goes on at a pretty low level. A mother may have three children, but the father of each one may be a different man. Some of these shacks have television sets. Bad as the worst may be, it represents an improvement over the life they lived in the country.

Never have I seen anywhere else in the world such a spectacular demonstration of this historical movement, which is going on nearly everywhere, of human beings leaving their agricultural existence to seek a better life in the city.

Venezuela is just waking up to the implications of this great change. No government by itself can meet the challenge. A government in some way must give incentives to its people to use their creative ability as well as to work harder than ever.

[From the Arizona Daily Star, Tucson, Ariz., Feb. 10, 1963]

EDUCATION BOOMS IN VENEZUELA—GREAT STEPS TAKEN UNDER BETANCOURT

(By William R. Mathews)

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—This is the 12th of a series of articles written by William R. Mathews, Star editor, as a result of his recent trip to Venezuela. It also is the first of two articles discussing education in Venezuela.)

Since I have returned home from Venezuela, if I were asked what is the most outstanding accomplishment of the Betancourt government, my answer would be the magnificent job that it has done in elementary and secondary education.

If I were asked what were the two most dangerous situations I saw there, it would be the weak, amateur police force, which Communist terrorists make look like old Keystone Cops Comedy police; and the intellectual anarchy and irresponsibility of most of the universities of the country.

Now as to the elementary and secondary schools. The Betancourt government in 4 years has built more schools than up to that time were built since the discovery of the country. Dr. R. Leandro Mora, minister of education, gave us editors a first-hand account, and submitted to a tough third-degree examination afterwards. The following figures are his:

During the period of the Perez Jiminez dictatorship there were always 500,000 children without schooling; in 1957 the enrollment in the elementary schools was 751,571. In 1962 the enrollment had increased to 1,346,751. The dictatorship took no interest in training teachers. Normal schools for training teachers were closed.

The job of expanding Venezuela's educational program had to be done by all kinds of improvisation, because fully qualified teachers took time to train, and school buildings took time to build. In some schools there would be three sessions a day. In 1958, there were 883 school buildings. Since then 1,322 school buildings have been built.

We saw a number of these new school buildings, when we made our circuit of the country outside of Caracas. They were well built, and already were overflowing with students. At present, 86 percent of those who are eligible to attend primary schools are in school.

As to secondary education, in the year 1957–58 there were 68 high schools in the country. Today there are 135. Previously there were 93 technical schools. Today there are 194. Enrollments increased from 55,194 in 1957–58 to 137,823 in 1962.

Increasing emphasis is being placed on technical schools. These have increased in enrollment from 19,330 in 1957–58 to 50,651 in 1962.

In this same period, teachers in training have increased from 346 to 2,744. Elementary teachers have increased from 20,221 to 38,187.

In 1958 of those over 15 years of age, 2,426,100 were illiterate, unable to read or write. This has been reduced to 1,163,814. The minister said it has been done by the Office of Adult Education and the educational program applied to military personnel.

He expressed some concern about the increasing percentage of women teachers. "They have babies and have to leave," he explained.

The educational budget for the year 1962–63 is 638,000 bolivars—the bolivar is worth 22.2 cents—or slightly over 10 percent of the total government budget of 63 billion bolivars. However, the state governments contribute the equivalent of what amounts to another 10 percent.

There is no question that this new educational program has helped to snap the country out of its lethargy. The response to it shows that. As an eyewitness I can vouch for it.

[From the Arizona Daily Star, Tucson, Ariz., Feb. 11, 1963]

RUN BY COMMITTEES, HIGHER EDUCATION IN VENEZUELA IS SORRY MESS—UNDER GUISE OF AUTONOMY, STUDENTS, FACULTY—NOT PRESIDENTS—RUN SCHOOLS

(By William R. Mathews)

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—This is the 13th of a series of articles written by William R. Mathews, Star editor, as a result of his recent trip to Venezuela. It is the second of two articles on education in Venezuela.)

Yesterday I discussed elementary and secondary education in Venezuela, and praised it. But in contrast to the good program at those levels, the program of higher education is a sorry mess and, indirectly if not directly, is involved in helping to carry on the reign of terror that prevails.

The provisional government that assumed power before the election and inauguration of President Betancourt, entered a decree giving the universities what is called autonomy. The idea was to keep politicians from exercising influence over them.

Just the opposite results have followed. Under the guise of autonomy, the universities were to be governed by their students and faculty. Each group elects their representatives to what might be called the administrative committee. This committee elects the president, and it can also dismiss him. It hires faculty members and fires them.

The universities have a long tradition of sympathy for Marxist socialism as the ideal way to bring about that eternal dream of providing wealth, happiness, and peace for all. Private enterprise is something whose greed and corruption must be tolerated, pending the time when the righteous government will take over all enterprise, and end all troubles. Such is the popular philosophy.

This long-prevailing atmosphere—which exists in most other Latin American countries—is one that makes it easy for trained Communist revolutionaries to have a continual picnic. It takes only a few Communist Party professors to develop a sympathetic group of students. It is easy to divert student love of pranks into the mysteries of making bombs, staging holdups, and carrying on a program of terror.

The director of the school of journalism at the Central University of Venezuela in Caracas is a known Communist Party member. My contacts with seminars at the University of Zulia in Maracaibo and the University of Carabobo in Valencia indicated the presence of faculty members who spoke out in our seminars with the same old Communist singsong and slogans.

Their attempts to monopolize each of these two seminars, where only students or working journalists were supposed to have been invited, by asking questions, which were turned into anti-American speeches, made me boil over. At each place I had to rise and make a point of order, to shut them up, and give some others a chance to ask questions. In each case the faculty chairman let these men run on and on, until I acted.

Later on one faculty member came up and thanked me for doing what I did. When I lamented at the weakness of the faculty chairman, he explained very kindly, "Why he did not dare stop those men from talking. They are important political figures. Our universities are political institutions."

When, during our brief 2 weeks in the country, two of the universities closed—the one in Caracas and the one in Merida—because of student disorders and closely allied terror acts, the status of higher education under the autonomy of student-faculty administration, spoke for itself. They were closed not by the government, but by their own administration.

Government peace officials cannot even enter the grounds of a university, unless they go before a court and get a special warrant describing what their reasons are.

That is one reason why I asked President Betancourt in his open press conference with us, if these universities are going to be permitted to carry on in this manner of allying themselves with thugs, criminals, etc. He gave a long-winded reply, but in it he mentioned twice that the decree of the provisional government in establishing autonomy "must be revised."

The incompetency of the police force has its roots in the fact that with the fall of Dictator Perez Jimenez, the new government replaced his police with new personnel, most of it completely amateur, and much of it political.

Combine this inadequacy with equally inexperienced judges and prosecutors, and the stage is set for a criminals' festival, plus an unusual opportunity for trained Communists to have lots of fun.

There is good reason to believe that the situation is improving, as these new government employees get more and more experience. It is part of the price that evidently has to be paid when a democratic government composed mostly of amateurs takes over from what was one of the tightest police-state dictatorships in the world—a dictatorship that lasted for 10 years.

[From the Arizona Daily Star, Tucson, Ariz., Feb. 12, 1963]

VISIT SUMMARIZED—PROGRESS MADE DESPITE WOES IN VENEZUELA

(By William R. Mathews)

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—This is the 14th and last of a series of articles written by William R. Mathews, editor of the Star, as a result of his trip to Venezuela.)

This is a summary of my 2-week visit to Venezuela, during which a group of us editors had the red carpet rolled out to meet every wish we expressed. We saw much of the country and quite a bit of the people.

Venezuela is going through a social revolution in which a society based largely on agriculture and a government by aristocrats, is changing into an industrial society, with a government largely dominated by the middle class. This middle class has much to learn about the art of government, but progress is being made.

President Betancourt is doing everything that any president of the country could do in the present circumstances. Conditions are improving, despite the turbulence in a few critical spots like Caracas and the universities.

Although he has suspended constitutional decrees as a means of meeting trouble, a wide degree of freedom prevails. We ran into no censorship. There is complete freedom of the press.

Venezuela is one of the richest countries in Latin America. It has an annual per capita income of $700 a year, which is the highest in all of South America. Its potential wealth is enormous, but its development will be a lethargic affair, if left to government initiative alone.

The Government has gone into the oil business and brought an end to all concessions. The result is that the government is the only one performing any new development and scouting for new oil deposits. By a more liberal policy, it could have a dozen oil companies scouting for oil all over its territory.

In striving to take care of the hundreds of thousands of people who are flocking to the cities, the Government is working at its agrarian reform program, which amounts to providing for mere subsistence homesteads. A more enlightened policy could reverse this flight to the cities by opening the vast "llanos," 50,000 to 50,000 square miles of undeveloped plains and forests, for settlement the way we opened our own West.

The oil company production is the backbone of Venezuelan life. Taxes on it, at a rate of 70 percent, pay more than 60 percent of the nation's annual budget. Its workers live the closest to an American standard of living that can be found in the hemisphere, unless it be Canada.

Education has been the big deficiency, as is shown by the fact that there have been more schools built since Betancourt came into power than in all of the previous centuries. That progress is going on at full speed.

The Catholic Church plays a minor role in Venezuela as compared to the influential role it plays, for instance, in Colombia. Most of the marriages of the men and women streaming into the cities from the interior are common-law marriages. Churches and priests are not seen as frequently in the cities of Venezuela as they are seen in most Latin-American countries.

Venezuela has, what the officials admit, is the highest rate of net population gain, 4 percent a year. The population will double in the next 20 to 25 years. This situation has been brought about by a reduction in the death rate, by much better health controls. Malaria has been completely conquered.

Since in all of its history no President of Venezuela has finished his term of office, the present political situation calls for close watching. Betancourt has only 1 more year to serve, and he cannot succeed himself.

The election campaigns are getting underway, although the parties have not held conventions to nominate their candidates. The elections are scheduled for the period from October to December. The new President is scheduled to take office a year from now, in February 1964. If this peaceful transfer of political power can be made, it might easily prove to be as big a stabilizing effect as the transfer by Cardenas in Mexico of his Presidential power to an elected candidate back in 1942.

Since the only way that Venezuela can pay for what she buys abroad is by the sale of her oil, a more liberal American policy, particularly on heavy fuel oil, would nearly eliminate the need for American foreign aid. If, on top of that, the peaceful transfer of power can be made, a more sympathetic policy can be taken toward foreign capital to encourage more than $100 million of fugitive bank accounts of Venezuelans to return home and an official recognition be made that an active and vigorous sector of private initiative and investment needs to be developed to work with the slow-moving Government sector, Venezuela could supplant the present system of poverty amidst potential abundance.

Allan Stewart, the American Ambassador, who was the Star's sports editor in 1927, is doing a good job. So is George W. Skora, American consul general in Caracas, who used to be a Star carrier. Both of them graduated from the University of Arizona, and both of them for many years have specialized in Latin-America affairs. The Ambassador is optimistic, and did not hesitate to speak out and say so.

I forgot to say that Venezuela has one of the best climates in the world. It rarely it ever freezes, except in the mountains. Venezuela gets a steady flow of trade winds from the northeast which keep the temperature at a warm, delightful level, day and night.

SPEECH OF WILLIAM R. MATHEWS BEFORE PAN AM MANAGEMENT CLUB, FEBRUARY 19, 1963

When President James Monroe proclaimed the Monroe Doctrine in 1823, he made Latin America a matter of primary interest to the United States. A matter involving national security. The record through the next 113 years, to 1936, reflects this. Never was this doctrine compromised. To the contrary, it was enforced. While our Government had to accept the French invasion of Mexico in the 1860's, as soon as the Civil War was over, we used our influence to bring an end to that French expansion of imperial power.

Under President Grant we toyed with the idea of annexing what was then Santa Domingo, but which is now known as the Dominican Republic. In 1896, President Grover Cleveland spoke out emphatically declaring that our word was fiat on international matters affecting the Western Hemisphere. Two years later we went to war to break Spain's power in Cuba, and also in the Pacific.

We acquired the Guantanamo Naval Base from Cuba. We made Puerto Rico a kind of principality which might become our 51st State. We bought the Virgin Islands in 1915 to keep them from falling into the hands of imperial Germany.

We built the Panama Canal primarily as a naval effort. We intervened in numerous Central American Republics, including Cuba, Santa Domingo, and Haiti.

The Panama Canal is an artery of life, whose security should never be compromised. It should never be internationalized. Never should we tolerate any interference in its operation, in an effort to please some hungry politicos of Panama. Our record in making certain concessions in recent years has not made us any better liked. Respect for us has been reduced, rather than enhanced. The time has come to stop such trifling with its security and without any apologies to anyone, let the world know that it belongs to us, and that we are going to keep it and protect it.

In 1936 President Franklin Roosevelt sent Secretary Hull to Buenos Aires to negotiate what became known as the Treaty of Buenos Aires. It forbid intervention in any form, either direct or indirect, unless it was done after receiving full consent of the various signatories.

This treaty was an unfortunate one. It compromised a matter of primary interest which has through time become clearly recognized as the Caribbean area, as distinguished from Latin America. Today in Cuba we are paying the penalty for the compromise this treaty imposed on both the Eisenhower and Kennedy administrations. Not until the danger assumed the proportion of threatening our destruction, did our political leaders feel free to mobilize our military power and challenge Moscow with a timed ultimatum.

For the future it seems to me that we Americans should distinguish between the Caribbean Sea area, and South America south of the equator. The former is vital to our security, while the latter has relatively little strategic importance. We must never compromise our control of the Caribbean and the Panama Canal.

This brief outline of the impact of the past on what we face today is necessary as a background to answer that question, Where does America go from here in her relations with Latin America? Our first task is to take care of our security.

Events of the past few years have spectacularly emphasized that we Americans, as part of our destiny, have a job to do in the whole of the Western Hemisphere. The Alliance for Progress is our first organized effort. The job is a difficult and delicate one. It must at all times acknowledge scrupulously the independent sovereignty of all of these nations, large and small. At the same time it requires huge aggregations of capital, and the best brains and administrative ability to make the mountains, jungles, deserts and plains yield the hidden resources of this vast area.

Any discussion or planning on what we should do, or can do, must be based on the stern realization that it is the job of a lifetime. It will probably last as long as we are a great power. We might as well realize that there is no miraculous quick solution that mere money can buy, although billions of dollars will be needed. Latin America is not a vending machine where one can drop in some coins, press a button or pull a lever, and get what we want to buy.

Two basic challenging facts confront us. We must deal with people who have a different culture, heritage, ambitions and outlook than our own. Secondly, we begin this job at a tough period in history when throughout the world a great historic change is taking place, and particularly in Latin America. What has been a civilization, based largely on an agricultural economy with aristocratic governments of a relatively few people doing the governing, is now going through a transition into an industrial civilization, governed by a rising middle class.

There is a wide variation of this transition in the many governments of Latin America. Such a situation means that governments in Latin America are going to go through many phases of instability as they strive to meet this change. Their cultures reflect wide differences in literacy, competency, ambitions, aptitudes and skills. No one rule can be laid down that can be applied uniformly to all of them.

Bolivia, for example, is a relatively primitive nation composed largely of Indians with only a small intelligentsia of Spanish origin. We Americans with our know-how could make Bolivia bloom because we have the know-how and the capital to make the jungles and the mountains of that country yield their hidden wealth. The first thing we would do would be to start educating the Bolivians by training and educating them, while we went ahead with development projects by the efforts of individuals, rather than Government. As it is we have been in Bolivia for 10 years, but so far we have little to show for what we have done.

Uraguay on the other hand is a highly developed social welfare state that needs no help whatever. Its people have probably the highest standard of living in all of Latin America, and the most stable government. But the Uraguayans are a nation of homogeneous people of Latin heritage. They have no Indians. As a nation of well educated people they can take care of themselves just as easily as Switzerland does.

Peru has nearly 5 million Indians living in the high Andes. That is nearly one-half of Peru's population. Who are we to tell the Peruvians how to treat their Indians? The American Indians are not integrated in the life of our Nation despite all of the money we have spent on them.

We must not be too gullible in swallowing that old, old issue of agrarian reform. Certainly large, unproductive estates, whether they are owned by the Catholic Church or private individuals, should be broken up. On the other hand, should large areas of productive land be broken up into small plots, experience elsewhere in the world shows that productivity will decline sharply. As we Americans have proven, the greatest productivity comes from large-scale production. Since the vast eastern areas of Colombia and Bolivia, which are nearly uninhabited, do offer an opportunity for development, the lack of initiative, lack of willingness to adventure and pioneer, creates the ironic situation of poverty amidst a potential abundance. If agrarian reform is to better the peasantry and the country as a whole, it must be carried out by agricultural experts and not by political experts, or dogooder reformers.

These wide disparities in a basic culture we will be compelled to recognize. We must remember to be cautious about assuming that perfectly constructed and other legal institutions and reforms, that work well with us, will not necessarily bring peace, stability, democracy, and prosperity to these many nations.

The fact that most of their constitutions have been modeled after our own, but have failed to work continuously should caution us that we cannot impose American ideas of government on them. We must expect ups and downs with periods of democratic government followed by periods of dictatorial government.

Since the education of most of the intellectuals has been European, the doctrine of socialism has wide acceptance as a guiding gospel to follow. Too many of the intellectuals think in terms of national socialism as a means of national independence. Freedom means national freedom as distinguished from the individual freedom we cherish. We will have a difficult job inspiring the free enterprise that we take for granted at home.

Latin culture has a different standard of morals than our own. It teaches respect for authority and by implication teaches that the will of a majority is so righteous that it can scorn the rights of minorities. Most of the people do not know how to make a parliamentary government work. They respect strength and have only contempt for weakness. Too often they take generosity and extreme patience as a sign of weakness.

Because socialism has the reputation of promising the ideal society of abundance for all with peace and prosperity, it naturally makes a moving appeal to politicians in search of a campaign issue, and masses of people looking for an easy answer to their ills. Therein lies the appeal of communism with its promise to build Socialist societies, but instead of doing it peacefully, do it by creating the dictatorship of the proletariat. Its glorification of the use of dictatorial power makes an attractive appeal to Latin American politicos.

We must foster public education as a basic necessity in developing workers who can take their necessary place in the development of modern industrial societies. The same muscle and energy that have gone into the building of churches should now be called upon to build schoolhouses.

The increase in wealth production must be our main goal. Only by that means can the lot of the masses be improved. That will require not only enormous aggregation of capital from abroad, and the best technicians and administrative talent, it will require much harder work on the part of the people themselves. It cannot be achieved with a 6-hour day and 5-day week that prevails today in too many places in Latin America.

We can no longer tolerate expropriation of wealth creating American investments. Such action nullifies the fact that unless foreign capital is attracted, the Alliance for Progress program will languish. All help should be withdrawn immediately from any nation that carries out expropriations. It is just as necessary to help create a climate that will attract foreign capital as it is to furnish help by our Alliance for Progress program. The latter cannot do the job alone.

We must see that all funds granted by our Government, or its agencies, be wisely spent. It is not enough to make grants and assume that each government will spend such money wisely.

The population explosion that has been going on throughout the world is taking place in Latin America with more increase than perhaps any other locality in the world. That means increased number of mouths will have to be fed. Increasing importance requires the means to earn a livelihood, which must come from increased industrial production. Certainly, there are needs that will require the toil of every adult worker available.

Where is the capital and technical and administrative ability coming from to make this possible? Without an enormous increase in productivity, 30 years from now people will be less better off. We will have to run in order to stand still, as Alice would say.

Consequently, if the Alliance for Progress is to be successful we must approach this job with a fair but firm attitude and our eyes open. We must expect, and have, full cooperation of those whom we plan to help. We must take steps to see that the dollars we provide are not used to finance the flight of monetary wealth of wealthy people of these countries. There is good authority for the statement that some $10 billion have been sent by the wealthy people of Latin America to Switzerland.

The most encouraging thing I can say about the Alliance for Progress is that so little appears to have been done during its first year. That is a welcome sign that we are making progress. It will take time, several years, for wealth-creating projects to take form, and still more years to make their productivity available to the masses.

All of what we might try to do, in both the economic and social welfare fields can be defeated, unless the political and intellectual leaders of Latin America zealously assume a financial responsibility that can bring the widely present inflation under control. Only where this is done should funds be advanced to finance economic development. Unless we are willing to act with such realism, we will be wasting our taxpayers' money.

Spending a few billion dollars as a kind of dole to individuals would be spectacular while it lasted, but it would obviously be unwise and harmful. Our job is a tough one but it is a wonderful challenge to our own heritage. Out of it we can hope will emerge the American substitute for what in the past has been known as imperialism. We will not be plundering. We will not be colonizing. We will be trying to prove that by helping others we will help ourselves.

THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, when I first entered this body some 10 years ago, it fell my lot to be placed on the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee. From the very beginning, the steady file of witnesses appearing on behalf of labor was starred by the now Associate Justice of the Supreme Court, Arthur Goldberg. While he and I have seldom seen eye to eye on matters concerning the relationship of management, labor and the public, nevertheless, I have always respected his integrity and his ability. He has, it seems to me, a genuine interest in the problems of these groups and he at no time has expressed this interest better than in his speech made on the occasion of the 50th anniversary of the Department of Labor. In this speech Mr. Goldberg has stated what has long been overlooked in the balance between both sides of the bargaining table, that no worker can get something for nothing; that we must work, "not less but more;" "that in increased productivity, labor, industry, and the public can all benefit and share."

This is an exceptional speech made at a time in our history when its impact, if accepted, can work in only one direction and that is the good of America. I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY ARTHUR J. GOLDBERG, ASSOCIATE JUSTICE, SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES, 50TH ANNIVERSARY CELEBRATION OF THE DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

I am glad to participate with the President, Secretaries Wirtz, Perkins, and Mitchell, representatives of labor and management, and former colleagues in the Labor Department in this jubilee celebration.

An occasion, such as this, transcends the traditional anniversary of a governmental department, important as all anniversaries are. For today we, whether government servants, labor officials, or management executives count our blessing as free Americans dedicated to free enterprise and free labor.

While the goal of the Department of Labor has remained constant since its establishment 50 years ago, the world today is far different from the world of a half century ago.

Circumstances change: no period in our economic development is like another, and the trials of understanding are renewed in different form for each generation.

Today, two obvious challenges confront our labor-management system. The first is external—the continuing pressure of an economic opponent, the Communist bloc, always striving to match and surpass us as the leading innovators, producers and consumers of the world.

This is a challenge that I believe we can meet and master as we have—in full stride. Our free system of enterprise and of democratic unionism consistently out-produces the Communist controlled system of both enterprise and so-called unions. The wealth of our factories and farms and mines and businesses will continue to stand second to none, as will the economic power generated by the skill and energy of our people who find their own incentives and seek their own rewards.

But the second challenge will, I believe, demand a refocusing of purpose and productive will on our part. It comes, happily, from our friends and it represents, at its heart, the triumph in the free world of the American concept of fair and earnest competition. We are no longer the vast island of haves in a sea of have nots. We are engaged, instead, by strong free economies, by rising productive might, and by determined competitors.

And even though the work and wage and living standards of our free competitors are rising toward the eventual levels of our own, we cannot at this time compete successfully without a reexamination of our own methods and goals. I consider this the basic challenge today to American labor and American business and to the institution of collective bargaining that has served us so well in the past.

I believe this challenge carries its own moral. We must work, not less, but more. We must work not only hard but well, increasing our productive capability as we increase our production.

There are no shortcuts and no panaceas to relieve us of the necessity for finding our own security in abundance, not in a sharing of scarcity. The only lasting security for both labor and management is in dedicated work at fair wages, in more sales at fair prices, in products of dependable quality, in meeting the markets of the world on terms that guarantee an increasing share of the world's business.

The attainment of this already difficult goal is made more complex because we must strive for it during a period of rapidly advancing technology. The dilemma that results is that yielding to technological demand creates many problems, often severe, often of a personal nature, for the American labor force, while not yielding to technological demand is sacrificing our best opportunity to improve our competitive position.

This dilemma has led to the proposals for scarcity sharing, for sharing work and distributing available markets among major producers. This solution is apparent rather than real. Expansion rather than contraction is the solution to the problems of both labor and management. In an expanding economy, we can advance technologically and protect human values. We must do both. In increased productivity, labor, industry and the public can all benefit and share.

We have, and I am confident always will, rejected compulsion as the instrument for serving the national interest. Legal strictures and statutory regulation are poor servants of a free economy.

Our policy must be not to stifle but to stimulate collective bargaining to an awareness of the full context of interests within which it operates, and which it influences. We must bring home to the parties and to the American people, that bargaining, while remaining free, must also be realistic. This, I believe, is still our best hope for the future.

This policy has thus far worked. It has not worked perfectly, of course, as no policy ever will. There should be no tampering with our free institutions, no deprivation of responsibility, no prerogative of labor and management denied or questioned, and no interference in the final judgment of the parties. But to enjoy this freedom, the parties to collective bargaining must exercise responsibility. No one has the monoply to define the public interest; everyone has the obligation to serve it.

I would summarize the past 50 years of labor-management relations in the United States by saying that having done well, we must strive to do better; having achieved much, we must determine to achieve more; always mindful that our goal is not material but spiritual—to safeguard and advance the dignity of the individual, this is the high purpose for which the Labor Department was established. May it continue its great service in the interests of mankind and our beloved country.

WHAT GOES ON?

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, during his hour-long television interview on December 17, 1962, President Kennedy had some remarks to make about onsite inspections of Communist countries that I believe deserve some attention in light of current disarmament negotiations going on at Geneva. At that time, it will be remembered, the President informed the Nation that this country had, in effect, backed down from its demand for onsite inspection of Cuba to make sure all the Russian missiles had been removed. He was asked whether an onsite inspection of Cuba might have provided a breakthrough in efforts to bring peace in the world. This was his reply—and I quote:

> No, I don't think that would have materially affected it, because I don't think we would have gotten the kind of inspection which is really necessary, because a totalitarian system cannot accept the kind of inspection which really is desirable. What you are saying, really, is that Cuba be opened, the Soviet Union be opened. They are not going to open it, because a totalitarian system must exist only in secrecy.

Now, Mr. President, let me call particular attention to the President's assertions, first, that a totalitarian system cannot accept the kind of inspection that is desirable and, second, that a totalitarian system must exist only in secrecy.

Given this conviction on the part of the Chief Executive, what are we to think of the actions of the United States in the nuclear test ban negotiations? Much of the present discussion in these negotiations is over how many onsite inspections there are to be in Russia if the United States should suspect the Soviet of cheating on a nuclear test ban agreement.

What goes on? If the President really feels that a totalitarian system cannot open up, cannot permit the kind of inspections that are desirable, cannot exist in any state other than secrecy, what are we doing negotiating in an attempt to get them to accept onsite inspections?

Under the circumstances, Mr. President, I believe it is proper to ask if the administration is actually engaged in an attempt to arrange a test ban without any inspections. When you take a look at the concessions we have already made in this area, you can see that we certainly are headed in that general direction. For example, our original position at Geneva in 1958 demanded the right to inspect all seismic events of undetermined origin above 5 kilotons and 20 percent of all such events under the 5-kiloton level. By February 1960, we had reduced this original demand to 20 on-site inspections a year no matter how many seismic events of undetermined origin occurred. Now we have chipped away at our original demand until we are talking at Geneva about as few as five or six on-site inspections. I believe our official position still calls for seven but hardly a day goes by that the newspapers do not tell of an intention on the part of U.S. negotiators to reduce this figure in an effort to get closer to the Soviet position calling for only three onsite inspections.

Mr. President, in light of our past performance it seems logical to assume that eventually we will find some excuse for accepting the Soviet's offer of three onsite inspections. Assuming we go this far, or assuming that the Russians meet us halfway or even accept as many as eight on-site inspections, the question arises as to whether they would be the kind of inspections that would insure the United States against Soviet cheating and, thus, protect the security of the free world. For the answer to this, I refer you to the President of the United States and his television remarks of December 17 when he said "a totalitarian system cannot accept the kind of inspection which is really necessary."

In this I agree with the President. I do not believe that a totalitarian system can accept the kind of inspection required to guard the strategic interest of the United States. And I do not believe that the Soviet Union is likely to turn into something other than a totalitarian system in the course of the Geneva negotiations.

In short, we should bring our negotiators home and get on with the job of keeping America strong.

TRIBUTE TO MRS. VIRGINIA L. MATHIAS, OF WAIAKOA, MAUI

Mr. FONG. Mr. President, this past week in a little town in my State of Hawaii, a gentle lady of 63 years passed on to eternal rest. My distinguished colleagues in the Senate probably have not heard of Mrs. Virginia L. Mathias, of Waiakoa, Maui, and I want to tell them about her and pay tribute to her because she had attained a significant and praiseworthy role in our postal service.

Two years ago in an all-State survey, the Postmaster's Gazette found that Mrs. Mathias held the unmatched record in length of service. No other postmaster in the entire United States outranked Hawaii's own Mrs. Mathias in years of service as a postmaster. Since 1917 and for 46 consecutive years, she performed duties with dedication as postmaster of Waiakoa on the slopes of Haleakala, a dormant volcano which is part of our national park system.

She looked forward to retirement which would have begun in a matter of weeks—on March 30 to be exact. But one night last week, the call of her Creator came to her in slumber and she heeded that call, slipping away in quiet and solitude.

It was my privilege to have met this gentle lady last December while on an inspection tour of Hawaii postal facilities as a member of the Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee. Mrs. Mathias expressed great joy in anticipation of a well-earned retirement, but asked my assistance in clearing a matter prior to her retirement.

When she first started with the postal service, Waiakoa was a fourth-class post office for which she was obliged to purchase—with her own personal funds—certain equipment such as desks, safe, post office boxes, and other office equipment.

Mrs. Mathias wanted to dispose of her equipment still in use but no authority exists for transference of her property to the Government. This is indeed an unusual but not a unique situation and I have called this matter to the attention of the committee asking consideration to allow for purchase of such equipment at a fair appraised value for the sake of other postmasters in this predicament.

Somewhat of a pioneer in the service, Mrs. Mathias first served the Post Office Department as a young bride. Tragedy befell her almost immediately after her marriage to the postmaster of the Waiakoa Post Office. Within 15 months, during which time she substituted without pay for her husband as postmaster, she was a widow with a 2½-month-old daughter.

At age 18, Mrs. Mathias was appointed Waiakoa postmaster during President Woodrow Wilson's administration and subsequently served under six more Chief Executives—Harding, Coolidge, Franklin Roosevelt, Truman, Eisenhower, and Kennedy.

She received her first Presidential appointment signed by President Roosevelt and Postmaster General James A. Farley on June 25, 1940.

By 1933 the Waiakoa Post Office had grown to third-class status and on July 1 this year is scheduled to become a second-class postal facility.

In those early days, mail was delivered to Maui only twice a week for Mrs. Mathias' 11 customers. The ensuing years have seen her salary grow from $7 to about $500 a month; service extended to 600 families plus a subpost office and rural and star routes; and a staff of one to a postmastership with two clerks and a rural carrier.

It is with a heavy heart that we of Hawaii say "aloha oe" to an outstanding citizen who has served our people and our country so well.

To her family, I wish to extend my heartfelt condolences. I know that even in their period of sorrow they have found some measure of solace in the loyal and dedicated manner in which she performed her duties as postmaster at Waiakoa for 46 years.

ANNIVERSARY OF THE BIRTH OF THOMAS MASARYK, CZECH PATRIOT

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, in a few of history's chosen men, there glows a fire that is unquenchable.

Abraham Lincoln was such a man. Despite the most savage and inflammatory denouncement by his critics during his lifetime, he has emerged through the years as a wellspring of truth and honesty, of trust in the people, of the concept of government by consent of the governed.

Even now, a century after his death, there continue to arise little fragments of something Lincoln had written, or something someone wrote about him, or perhaps it is a letter, long lost, which sheds some new meaning on the gentle and serene wisdom and faith that was his.

Czechoslovakia had such a man. His name was Thomas Masaryk and March 7 is the 113th anniversary of his birth.

During the first years of the Czech Republic, monuments to him were erected in the village squares. Now that that unhappy land is no longer free, the Communists have undertaken a campaign to demolish the monuments.

But the campaign is not completely successful. It frequently backfires because, according to the newspaper, Svet Prace, the more desperately a government tries to "take Masaryk's halo away from him, the more vividly Masaryk's figure emerges in the minds of the people; so under this aspect, at least, the people are satisfied with the government."

This little story is part of an absorbing article Stanislav Koutnik wrote last fall for the Christian Science Monitor. I wanted to share it with the Senate today and to salute Mr. Koutnik for reminding us of the greatness of Masaryk, a greatness that still has an impact more than a quarter of a century after his death.

As Senator DODD observed in a tribute to this great Czech patriot on the 25th anniversary of his death, Masaryk believed with George Washington that nothing can be politically right that is morally wrong.

Thomas Masaryk told his people to "be honest; tell the truth." And when because of illness, he was forced to lay down the burden of his office, he cautioned, "I shall continue to watch over you, to see that you know what to do."

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD on this anniversary of Masaryk's birth, the article by Stanislav Koutnik from the November 5, 1962, edition of the Christian Science Monitor.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MASARYK: THORN TO REDS

(By Stanislav Koutnik)

During the early years of the Czechoslovak Republic, when the communal elections were on, the candidates for the various offices even in the most remote villages were in the habit of promising their electorate: "I'll do what I can do to see that we can soon have a Masaryk monument."

This was so clinching an argument that it often sufficed to get a man elected. So it is not surprising to know that for years now the population of Czechoslovakia has waged small battles to preserve these monuments. Towns and villages which still have a monument standing are very proud of them.

If the Communist regime does destroy these monuments only in secret, it is evident that their gesture is unpopular. When people wake up in the morning, they may suddenly find only the base of the statue left. People entrusted with the task of demolishing them come stealthily into the villages and wait until the population is asleep before setting about their business.

One morning, at Brno, Czechoslovakia's second-largest city, students on their way to school found only the pedestal of the monument standing. Instead of proceeding toward their school, they picked flowers and silently put them on the mutilated base. Naturally the police stepped in at once, but hundreds of workers and women instantly came running to protect the students.

PITCHFORK PROTECTION

Sometimes the government even apologizes for what happens. At Litvinov the monument was demolished under the pretext that a new road had to pass precisely where it was standing. At Lovesice near Prerov the authorities were able only to lop off the head on Masaryk's statue during the night, and for a long time the monument remained there without its head.

In Moravia, where the peasants would keep watch during the night, armed with pitchforks to defend their parish priests against the police in the past, they now keep watch in turn to protect the monument. It is really a grotesque situation. Every time March 7 is approaching—the anniversary of Masaryk's birthday—the Government is forced to give special instructions to the police. For a long time now, the tomb of Masaryk has been sealed off for some distance all about it by barbed wire, to prevent passers-by from putting flowers on it.

When Indian Prime Minister Jawaharlal Nehru came to Prague the Government wished him to visit the imposing mausoleum of Gottwald during his stay. But Mr. Nehru answered: "I did not know Gottwald, so I do not think it necessary for me to visit it. I would rather you show me the tomb of Thomas G. Masaryk." For obvious reasons, this visit was postponed until the police had had time to put the grave in order. But the people of Czechoslovakia are fond of Mr. Nehru not only becasue he honored Masaryk's memory but also because he expressed the wish that the largest possible number of Communist ministers went with him to the tomb.

VIVIDLY REMEMBERED

From the historic point of view Masaryk was one of the founders of the Czechoslovak Republic. In popular legend he was a wise father to the nation, a servant of justice, a defender of the oppressed, and their leader in dark days. The slightest hostile allusion to him could cause a riot, and the Communists are aware of it.

In the beginning they tried to convert Masaryk into a forerunner, a prophet of communism, as they had already done with such heterogeneous people as Ivan Hrozny, Avicenna, and Leonardo da Vinci, calling them "Communists prior to the Communist era." But Masaryk is still so vividly remembered a figure that he represents a danger for every totalitarian government. All the weapons of communism are impotent in the face of his influence on individuals.

Yet the Communists had to begin sometime. One morning the Prague radio, after broadcasting the Soviet anthem, launched its first effort: "The people should by now have understood that Thomas Garrigue Masaryk was not a herald of humanities, a friend of the working people * * * but was really an agent of the Western imperialists and the instrument of the bourgeoisie against the interests of the people * * *." The mechanism of propaganda was in motion. An official history against Masaryk appeared, and the Communist paper, Rude Pravo, opened its campaign: "Destroy his legend."

Documents on Masaryk's alleged intrigues against the Soviets were published, while the press and the radio endeavored to elaborate the theme: "The party liberates workers from the influence of Masaryk thought." University professors have been called into action, a book on the antirevolutionary policy of Masaryk and Beneš against the Soviet was published, and special courses to debunk Masaryk were established at the universities. The entire administrative machine of the country has been reeducated in order that it may reeducate the other citizens. In the name of this anti-Masaryk crusade a colossal structure has been built: state bureaucracy against Masaryk.

COMMUNISM DENOUNCED

But the population recalls how Masaryk had warned them: "Bolshevik aggression must be rejected as forcefully as possible. That is all the Bolsheviks understand." They know that his historic analysis of "Russia and Europe" is more alive today after 67 years than when it first appeared. Nor do they forget that in the "Social Question" Masaryk said: "If socialism means love of my neighbor, then I am a socialist"—while elsewhere he had written: "Reject communism. In a true democracy neither the individual nor the community can exploit its fellow citizens, because men cannot ever become just an instrument to the state." And again: "There is only one remedy against any evil springing from political freedom and freedom of the press: and that is a still greater freedom."

The whole of this anti-Masaryk campaign is a singular paradox in the history of Marxist dialectics. The more desperately a government tries to take Masaryk's halo away from him (according to the newspaper Svet Prace), the more vividly Masaryk's figure emerges in the minds of the people; so under this aspect at least, the population is satisfied with the government.

BE HONEST—TELL THE TRUTH

The problem of how to get rid of him still exists in all its impact. Learned and scientific men have already examined every known letter which Masaryk ever wrote, have even shown that a leaflet against him was circulating among workers during his lifetime. But an overzealous scholar brought out the fact—by mistake—that this leaflet was written in Moscow. They have proved that Masaryk had learned the trade of blacksmith, but did not succeed in this business so he became a university professor.

"I shall continue to watch over you, to see that you know what to do," Masaryk said, when in 1935 he abdicated from the office of President of the Republic. Even though the people of Czechoslovakia only remembered that Masaryk constantly repeated in his inspiring way, with uplifted finger: "Be honest—tell the truth," he would be their leader in their present situation by reason of this alone.

At Brandys on the Elbe the monument of Masaryk is placed so that he is looking right toward the windows of the building where the STB (the secret state police) now officiate. For some years the Communists have been asking one another: "How can we get rid of him?" The last time they tried to do so was on the occasion of the celebrations for the 12th anniversary of the Communist regime. But an old local Communist woman who for 30 years had sold vegetables near the monument in the square has succeeded in persuading the Communist committee of the area to allow Masaryk to remain where he is. "I'm so used to him that I'd feel sad without him," she argued in her application.

But so that Masaryk would not continue to stare into the windows of the offices of the political police force, and repeat his motto to the police there day and night: "Be honest—tell the truth," they have draped the windows with new curtains.

MR. HOOVER OF THE FBI

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, J. Edgar Hoover is about a year short of completing four decades of service as Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, but this year marks his 50th anniversary of Federal Government service, since it was in 1913 that he began his career in the Library of Congress.

Few men in the Federal service, now or in the past, can match the sterling record of J. Edgar Hoover and the organization he heads.

A tribute to this service appears in the March 4 issue of Newsweek in which columnist Raymond Moley recounts from Don Whitehead's excellent book, "The FBI Story," the scene in which the gruff and frosty New Englander, Harlan Fiske Stone, offered young Hoover the job as Director of the FBI.

I should like to share with the Senate a sort of sequel to that scene and one which will have special significance to Members of this body.

Young Hoover had made it eminently clear that politics would play no part in the selection or promotion of an agent. This policy was tested when he transferred an agent from Washington to the Southwest.

A Senator with considerable influence and prestige called on Hoover to remonstrate with him, explaining that the agent was needed to help with the Senator's coming campaign. Hoover said:

> I'm very sorry, Senator, but I think it would be best for the agent and best for the Bureau if he gets away from his political ties. This will give him a new chance.

The ruffled Senator threatened to take the matter up with Attorney General Stone and later executed that threat.

Stone shortly called in the Director and asked Hoover what were the facts in this case.

Hoover explained the situation. Mr. Stone said, "I think you are not entirely on sound grounds." Hoover's heart sank and he thought to himself, "Here's where I resign." And then the Attorney General added, "I'm surprised you didn't fire the fellow at once."

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Record Mr. Moley's column from the current issue of Newsweek.

There being no objection, the column was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

The Faith of the FBI

(By Raymond Moley)

As J. Edgar Hoover is completing four decades of service as Chief of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, it might be suggested that the letters FBI could stand for fidelity, bravery, and intelligence. For scores of FBI men in fierce and sometimes bloody encounters have shown rare courage. And on other occasions the fine intelligence of Hoover's men has outwitted and frustrated the sharpest crooks in the underworld and the elite among alien subversives.

But what most distinguishes the career of J. Edgar Hoover is his fidelity to the limited function of his organization and to constitutional restrictions. Americans should remind themselves from time to time that the FBI is largely an investigative agency. It does not prosecute. It does not judge. It finds the facts and submits them to agencies responsible for doing something about them. The FBI lets facts speak for themselves.

This concentration of function has marked J. Edgar Hoover as more than a superdetective, more than an uncommonly capable executive, more than a protector of American security against alien enemies. He has the essential qualities of a statesman. For true statesmanship is found in an individual who when in power understands the limitations within which that power should be prudently used. He can live with power without succumbing to its narcotic effect.

NO POLITICS

In a government where the expansion of authority and the growth of the establishment are the rule, the FBI has provided a luminous exception. Its size has grown to 16,000 employees, but every addition has been made in response to congressional action on urgent problems.

On many occasions Hoover has been asked to step beyond the limits of his assigned duties and literally take over functions of a State or county prosecutor or police force. Often this demand has been accompanied by great political pressure. Unusual integrity and discretion have resisted such pressure.

Serving under his sixth President, Hoover has survived 12 Attorneys General. In 1933, when party control in the executive department changed, the political nabobs around Roosevelt demanded his job for this or that ambitious police chief of their ilk. Attorney General Cummings asked for time, and after a month demanded and received Presidential authorization to keep Hoover where he had been and where he is now.

LIBERTY PROTECTED

After the sad days of the Department of Justice under Harry Daugherty, Harlan F. Stone was appointed Attorney General in 1924. The Bureau in which Hoover was a young subordinate was ridden with politics and encumbered with bureaucratic hacks. Stone offered Hoover the job of rehabilitation. Hoover made a condition of his acceptance that the Bureau should be completely divorced from politics, that he should be responsible only to the Attorney General, that appointments should require high standards of merit, and that promotions should be determined only on proven ability.

Stone, never a demonstrative man, said coldly that he would have made the offer only with that in mind. "That's all. Good day."

Hoover transformed the Bureau into a "tight ship." He emphasized quality rather than quantity in employing operatives. New procedures were introduced. Fresh methods of operation were determined. Scientific methods built up over the years have had incredible usefulness.

As long as Hoover or the Hoover tradition is on guard, Americans need not fear the perils of a police state. He has said: "The secret of crime eradication lies not in a national police force but in solidarity and the linking of all law-enforcement agencies." He has gained that solidarity, better called cooperation, by never usurping but in helping local, State, and other Federal authorities through mutual respect and trust.

Finally, he and his extraordinary staff have indefatigably guarded the liberties of Americans against the hot blood of overzealous pursuers of alleged wrongdoing. He has kept in mind the old rule that not only must there be guardians, but that someone must guard the guardians.

MEMBERSHIP OF DISTRICT JUDGES ON JUDICIAL COUNCILS

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, on Friday, March 1, the distingushed chairman of the Subcommittee for Improvements in Judicial Machinery, the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. Johnston], introduced S. 979 which will strengthen the Federal court system by adding district judges to the membership of the judicial councils of the circuits. I was pleased to cosponsor the measure.

The judicial councils have a key function in the operation of the Federal courts. Under section 332 of title 28, United States Code, they have been given the responsibility for the effective and expeditious administration of the business of the courts within their respective circuits. The statute empowers the councils to make all necessary orders to that end and provides that the district court judges shall promptly carry these orders into effect.

Although the activities of the judicial councils directly concern the operations of the district courts, only circuit judges serve on the councils. Under the present law, the membership is composed of the chief judge and each of the circuit judges for the circuit. The bill introduced today would expand this membership to include district judges.

In this manner, the councils would be given more ready access to the views and experience of the trial court judges. Since these judges are involved in the day-to-day operations of the district courts, they have a close familiarity with the problems which arise and hence could contribute a great deal to the deliberations of the councils. This consideration becomes particularly important when we realize that many of the circuit judges have never served as district judges.

It is also felt that giving the district judges a voice on the councils will lead to closer cooperation between the judges and the councils and will enable them to better coordinate their efforts. In 1957, district judges were added to the Judicial Conference of the United States, and the experience there has been very gratifying in terms of the effectiveness of that organization.

The present bill is identical to H.R. 6690 which was passed by the House and was reported out favorably by the Senate Judiciary Committee during the last Congress. It provides for the addition of two district judges to the judicial council of each circuit having five or more circuit judges in regular active service. One of those new members would be the district judge who represents the circuit in the Judicial Conference of the United States, and the other would be chosen by his fellow judges for a 3-year term.

In a circuit which has fewer than five circuit judges, only the district judge who represents the circuit in the Judicial Conference of the United States would be added to the council. This provision would apply only to the first circuit since it is the only circuit not having at least five judges serving on its court of appeals. In all of the other circuits two district judges would be added.

The bill also provides that the clerks of the U.S. courts of appeals shall serve as secretaries for the judicial councils of their respective circuits.

This legislation has been the subject of discussion for several years by various committees of the Judicial Conference of the United States. On September 20, 1961, and again on March 8, 1962, the Judicial Conference voted its approval of H.R. 6690.

The Senate Judiciary Committee reported H.R. 6690 to the Senate on September 7, 1961. Because of some objections that the bill had not been adequately considered, it was subsequently recommitted to the committee for hearings and further study, and was then again reported out favorably on September 20, 1962.

Since this measure was thoroughly considered during the last Congress, I hope that it will be possible for the Senate to take action on it early in this session.

NOTRE DAME BIOLOGISTS ASK THAT INDIANA DUNES BE SAVED

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, nearly all those who would destroy the Indiana dunes for the benefit of two steel companies and a few other selfish interests make the extraordinary—because it is wholly untrue—claim that there is nothing about the dunes worth saving.

Thirteen members of the faculty of the department of biology of the University of Notre Dame, which is located in northern Indiana, have recently put the lie to these false assertions of the dunes despoilers.

In a letter to the South Bend, Ind., Tribune which appeared in that newspaper's Voice of the People column on February 22, these 13 Indiana scientists stated that in their opinion, the Indiana dunes is "perhaps the most outstanding natural resource of Indiana, or for that matter any of our Midwestern States." They continue:

> It is, therefore, with the deepest concern, amazement, and regret that we have observed the ever-increasing efforts of those who are attempting to do away with this priceless asset. Once removed, Indiana will have forfeited one of its most valuable recreational areas. Once removed, the country will have been deprived of a unique and wondrous geological and biological phenomenon.

They conclude by advancing the really basic argument for locating a new Indiana harbor elsewhere saying:

> The paramount justification for the placement of the port at any of the other more suitable Indiana sites is provided by the dunes themselves.

Mr. President, I hope this expert counsel will be read by many people in Indiana and the country, and I ask unanimous consent that this letter be printed in the Record along with my remarks.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

THE UNIQUE DUNES

It would appear that anyone who opposes the development of a deep-water port at the Burns Ditch site is either an agent of an out-of-State interest group or a bird watcher, but most certainly is against Indiana. At the risk of being so labeled, we wish to go on record as favoring the preservation of the dunes through the establishment of a national monument in this area.

An informative history of the Burns Ditch area, including a most enlightening discussion of the principal individuals and interest groups supporting a port at this site, may be found in the February 1963 Atlantic Monthly. To be sure, no bird watchers are found among the supporters of the Burns Ditch port site, although out-of-State interests are well represented.

Perhaps the most outstanding natural resource of Indiana, or for that matter any of our Midwestern States, is the dunes. It is, therefore, with the deepest concern, amazement, and regret that we have observed the ever-increasing efforts of those who are attempting to do away with this priceless asset. Once removed, the dunes would be irrevocably lost. Once removed, Indiana will have forfeited one of its most valuable recreational areas. Once removed, the country will have been deprived of a unique and wondrous geological and biological phenomenon.

As residents of Indiana and as professional biologists, it is our sincere belief that the loss of the dunes would be tragic to this and to future generations. Our strongest wish and recommendation is that this great natural area be saved. The paramount justification for the placement of the port at any of the other more suitable Indiana sites is provided by the dunes themselves.

G. T. A. Benda; Harvey A. Bender; George B. Craig, Jr.; James P. Doll, C.S.C.; Ronald J. Downey; Robert Gordon; Robert P. McIntosh; Morris Pollard; Karamjit S. Rai; Ralph E. Thorson; Joseph A. Tihen; Kenyon S. Tweedel; Bro. Raphael Wilson, C.S.C., Department of Biology, University of Notre Dame.

ADDRESS BY SENATOR KEATING BEFORE NATIONAL COUNCIL OF CHRISTIANS AND JEWS

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. President, it was my great pleasure earlier this week to attend the annual award dinner of the National Conference of Christians and Jews held in Wilmington, Del., at which Senator Kenneth B. Keating was the principal speaker.

The national conference is an outstanding civic group which seeks through education and discussion to promote cooperation and mutual understanding among men of good will of all religious faiths. It has accomplished a great deal of good not only in my State but throughout the Nation, and its work has earned the praise of many citizens concerned with the basic problems of justice and brotherhood.

Senator Keating was an ideal choice to be this year's speaker. He is one of outstanding leaders in the struggle to break down the barriers of discrimination which separate Americans on the basis of race or creed. His efforts in the field of civil rights have been acclaimed on many occasions and continues to be one of his principal concerns in the Congress. He is a man dedicated to fairplay and to equal justice, and one of the most eloquent defenders of the principles of our Constitution ever to serve in the Senate.

His remarks at the annual dinner were a stirring reminder of the importance of human dignity and individual rights in the American tradition. He received a tremendous ovation from those in attendance at the dinner—not only because of what he had to say that night, but, I am sure, also in tribute to the magnificent record he has achieved in the areas of such deep concern to the national conference.

Mr. President, because I know that many Members will be interested in reading Senator Keating's speech to the national conference, I ask unanimous consent that the text of his remarks be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Address by Senator Keating

Mr. Chairman, Senator Boggs, Mayor Smith, distinguished officers, and members of the Delaware region of the National Conference of Christians and Jews, it is indeed a pleasure to be with you on this meaningful occasion. Mayor Smith, I am deeply pleased to join with your legion of friends—both those here with us tonight, and those in the wider circle of your friendship and your humanity—in congratulating you on the most gratifying tribute of recognition represented by the splendid and richly deserved award you have received tonight.

* * * * *

My pleasure in being here with you tonight in this good company is intensified, enriched, by the nature and purpose of this conference.

The most epochal, most meaningful treaty in the history of the world is an unwritten treaty. It is the pact of brotherhood. It is a pact entered into freely by the human mind, the human heart—in response to an inbred need, to a sense of oneness—of common destiny that knows no distinction of land, of race, of creed, or color.

Nature created mountains and seas which, historically, have impeded brotherhood. Man himself, in his ignorance, in his self-betrayal has erected walls to keep brotherhood out, or to fragment brotherhood—which is to deny it. But humanity is not long a prisoner of distrust and enmity. Its innate urge is to level walls not to build them.

Our presence here tonight bears witness—living witness—to the success toward which we are moving in the great struggle to assert and to vivify the concept that in this voyage of life we all travel together on the same flight—a flight which has no first class, second class, or third class—because the travelers, by right of birth, are traveling together, not separately.

For true brotherhood is not a complex of clubs. Not in its fullest, richest, truest sense. It is rather a universal club every individual is born into, by the very fact of birth.

This need for the solidarity, the unity, and the cooperation of men of good will, springs from no body of law. It springs from the highest, finest impulses of the human heart. It distinguishes man, the spiritual being, from man the physical being. It is a priority project of the soul.

There are those today who speak loftily of human dignity but who conceive of it only as something they possess, not as something they must share, as though the sharing would dilute the force and meaning of the sacred term, as though if human dignity were accorded to all, it would be a devalued wealth, a stone less precious, a gold alloyed.

Such people, in a sense, presanctify themselves, while denying sanctity to others. They protest their love of freedom while denying the very core and basis of freedom. They are for America 100 percent, but not for Americans 100 percent, which is an anomaly that never seems to pierce the fog of their self-delusion.

In any age, in any time, the dignity of the individual must rightly be a reality rather than a slogan. But in our present times, as never before, that reality must be made to live, to shine, to triumph, for it is being challenged in a manner and on a scale unparalleled in recorded history.

For danger stalks the world today—danger not so much of material destruction, but the planned campaign of conquest that has as its target the spirit, the identity of man as a free individual in a free society.

I speak of the mass operation to dehumanize, to despiritualize the individual—to establish in his place one omniscient, omnipotent, inexorable deity—the state.

* * * * *

Actually, as history has so clearly recorded, the Russian revolution has become the most extensive prison system in the history of the world—locking in not merely the physical body of man but clamping chains on his mind, his heart, his very soul.

The historical significance for the rest of the world lay in the fact that communism was not marketed for domestic consumption only—it was conceived as an ideological article of export, and its salesmen are now found wherever on this globe the product can advantageously be pushed.

This global marketing leads sometimes to the fatal error that because communism is bad, freedom is perfect—or at least, the practical working out of freedom particularly in such citadels of freedom as our own United States.

The mistake we make, I believe, is that we too often and too readily conceive of the danger to our free way of life as coming wholly from without, as though freedom were a walled city and its defenders were massed as one man to prevent infiltration and conquest.

* * * * *

Communism's weakness is that it is not an affirmation, it is a denial. It is not the wave of the future, it is the wave of the past. It is not dynamic, it is sterile. And the heart of its error lies in the concept that people are statistics, not souls; that man is a creature of the state, not a creature of God; that an individual has only the worth that is stamped on him, like a price tag.

If we did not believe these values were false, we would not be here tonight. But we are not here passively, to personify brotherhood as a realization.

We are here militantly, in a fight to extend the frontiers of brotherhood, to create an awareness that no enemy we face as a nation is a greater enemy, a more dangerous enemy than the often well dressed, soft-spoken, proper, respectable agents of bigotry, intolerance, discrimination and hatred.

There is, today, in the public mind, a tendency to compute national strength in terms of armaments, of nuclear thrust, of payload potential, of satellites in orbit. This kind of calculation is fallacious, it is misleading, it is dangerous.

The arithmetic of booster strength is not a way of life. At best it is but a reflection of one facet of life—the physical adaptation of man to the climate of danger in which he lives. The essence of life, after all, is not to be able to defend, but to have something to defend—something precious beyond arsenals, armies or navies, something, indeed, which gives these elements their only reason for existence.

Here in Delaware, your fine organization has not merely cherished the high concepts of good will, of unity, of brotherhood. You have made those concepts operational. In the field of religion and public affairs, your dialog group meetings constitute a dynamic and hopeful fusing force.

In education, the summer workshop program has been brought to vibrant life here, extending and deepening the base study of human relations. I was impressed to note that your region alone has provided 75 of these invaluable workshop scholarships for educators.

* * * * *

So many people wonder: What can I do for my country? The answer is simple. It does not call for heroics—it calls for no spectacular demonstration of patriotism. What anyone can do—and should do—is precisely what you are doing—daily, devotedly, dynamically—helping to build the sense of oneness, of common fraternity, of common destiny that is the true and indispensable foundation of the structure of freedom, of the vast home we call America.

The true America is not measurable in the brute power of megatons. It is measured, rather, in the power of principles, of values, of ideals—in the rights to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness—and in those rights without qualifications, without amendments, without reservations.

Because this is so, men have loved America enough to die for it. Because this is so, this conference of Christians and Jews is not a mere name, but a living act of faith, not yet a fulfillment but a striving, a dynamic, dedicated, tireless striving to assure that this great Nation of ours, like the hand of God, finds room for all, and touches all, indiscriminately with the common indelible mark of human dignity.

UNIVERSITIES IN LATIN AMERICA

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, the Washington Post on March 5 carried two articles on universities in Latin America. Anyone who has studied the troubled lives of many South American nations in recent years knows only too well that the Communists have been quite successful in utilizing the energy and impatience of youth for their own ends.

These two articles show that the United States is beginning to compete very effectively in the universities for the sympathies of the students. I am sure that once the propaganda is stripped away that these students will realize that freedom of choice and action as represented in the democratic way of life is the only system that can bring permanent liberty to their countries.

One article deals with student activities and the other with a real increase in the cooperation between universities and colleges in the United States and those in Latin America. These cooperative programs should do much to make Latin American higher education an effective support to the new and diversified economies now rapidly developing in these nations.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have these two articles printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, Mar. 5, 1963]

Central American Universities Ease Away From Reds' Clutches

(By Bert Quint)

Tegucigalpa, Honduras.—What could be a trend away from Communist control of the universities of Central America is becoming faintly noticeable in two countries of this strategic region.

They are Honduras, where a majority of the 2,000 students of the national university voted a few days ago to break away from the Prague-based International Students Union, and El Salvador, where extreme leftist deans of two schools of the Salvadoran national university were voted out of their jobs by the student body of 2,400.

For more than a generation, the Communists have concentrated on the area's universities. Communists work their way into key faculty posts and until recently had little serious competition in gaining positions of student leadership.

Three years ago, youths influenced by Communist agitators controlled the University of Honduras, and they pushed through a vote to join the Communist-front International Students Union.

But since then, the non-Communist United Democratic University Front (FUUD) has been winning student elections and gradually increasing its strength. Last July, it won by some 200 votes.

SWAN ISLAND OCCUPATION

Still, these students hesitated to take the issue of a break with the Communist-front union to a student assembly. Finally, in February, they risked it—after making use of a subterfuge that some say was suggested by the U.S. Embassy.

The FUUD sent a delegation to an International Students Union convention in Leningrad. There it tried to bring up the question of U.S. occupation of the Swan Islands, off the Honduran coast, so as "to denounce American imperialism." Suspecting a trick, the convention organizers refused to permit the topic to be raised.

That was what the youths wanted. They thus were able to say that the Communist group refused to discuss a "legitimate complaint of Honduran students."

The student assembly backed rupture with the union by a large majority.

At El Salvador University, where administrative officials are elected by students, Communists had held absolute power. Anti-Communists were frightened into inactivity.

DEANS REPLACED

But this year, in elections in January and February, Communist deans of the schools of economy and humanities were replaced by leftist, but non-Communist, educators.

A man considered a Communist, Fabio Castillo, was elected rector, replacing a left-wing intellectual. But Castillo has stated that students should study rather than get involved in politics.

In both countries, the Caribbean crisis, which showed that the Soviet Union is the real boss in Cuba, also contributed to the students' disenchantment. They are now beginning to seek a third position—neither pro-Communist nor pro-American.

An equally important factor, one that U.S. officials are reluctant to discuss publicly, is the effort to get the American side of the story across. In some countries—and El Salvador is one—young Americans attached to the U.S. embassies devote their full time to mingling with the students and trying to win them over. In others, the public affairs officer or cultural attaché does the job.

[From the Washington Post, Mar. 5, 1963]

THIRTY-SEVEN U.S. UNIVERSITIES ARE AIDING INSTITUTIONS IN 16 LATIN NATIONS

(By Dan Kurzman)

U.S. universities have begun to play an important role in the development of education in Latin America.

Increasingly aware that today's 550,000 Latin university students may determine the continent's future ideological orientation, the universities are vying to help sister institutions south of the border.

Thirty-seven U.S. universities have already entered into aid contracts with 57 Latin institutions in 16 countries under a U.S. Government-financed Alliance for Progress program. These account for more than one-fourth of the 200-odd universities in Latin America, and many new contracts are expected to be concluded in the future.

The extreme interest of United States and Latin American universities today is in marked contrast to their reluctance to deal with each other in pre-Alliance years when an annual average of only 5 to 10 contracts were in force.

U.S. institutions preferred to help other areas, while Latin academic centers devoted themselves mainly to prestigious liberal arts training conducted in traditional ways.

ADJUST TO NEW TEMPO

But with the telescoping of economic and social development under the Alliance, it has become clear to hemisphere educators that Latin universities would have to gear themselves to the new tempo.

One of the principal obstacles to the Alliance today is the lack of trained technicians to plan and implement development programs. The American universities are now helping to remedy this situation, as well as to engender greater good will toward the United States on the part of Latin students, who tend to distrust this country for its past imperialism.

The Agency for International Development (AID) has committed $24 million in aid to the 57 Latin university projects for expansion of training in such technical fields as agriculture, education, public and business administration, engineering, and economics. Another $50 million is likely to be expended to bring these projects, about 40 of which are already underway, to completion.

In addition, the U.S.-contributed Social Trust Fund administered by the Inter-American Development Bank has earmarked $25 million for such educational schemes. The Ford, Rockefeller and other foundations, as well as the United Nations Special Fund, are also contributors.

UNIVERSITIES LISTED

Among the American universities that will send professors and educational technicians to Latin institutions are California, Chicago, Columbia, Minnesota, Pittsburgh, Texas A. & M., Iowa State, North Carolina State, Michigan, Michigan State, Purdue, Southern California, Indiana, Louisiana State, Tennessee, Cornell, Catholic University, Syracuse, Stanford, and Tulane. Most of these institutions have arrangements with only one or two Latin universities.

Recently, Pittsburgh and the Central University of Ecuador reached the most comprehensive agreement ever concluded between a United States and a Latin American university. Pittsburgh will send more than 20 professors from 9 different fields to Quito and bring some 100 Ecuadoreans to its own campus for training under a $1 million AID-financed project. Ecuador will provide local facilities under the grant.

The professors, like those from other American institutions, will provide technical advice and guidance in their particular fields for improvement of academic programs, for the development of teaching laboratories and basic libraries, and inservice training.

"A year ago we had to look for American universities to aid Latin American institutions," said Marvin Weissman, Director of the Office of Institutional Development, which is operating the AID program under the Alliance. "Today more U.S. universities are asking to help than we can accommodate immediately."

Latin American universities have shifted a considerable share of their normal resources from such fields as law, medicine, and fine arts to new technical fields. In many cases the salaries of professors have been increased permitting them to teach and conduct research full time, as they had not been able to do previously.

Students are receiving more scholarships, have been supplied with new facilities and equipment, and are being instructed with new teaching methods.

From a political standpoint, the raising of educational standards is expected to encourage students to devote more time to study, reducing their interest in the demagoguery of Communists who have helped to turn many Latin campuses into sanctuaries for youthful rioters.

INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT IN WYOMING

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, the traditional headgear for the State of Wyoming has been the 10-gallon hat. But in the past few years this versatile hat has had to share a peg on the hatrack with the "hard hat" on heavy industry and construction.

For Wyoming is undergoing a revolution and is finding that under her rich rangelands lie vast mineral deposits of inestimable value. Many of these deposits had been thought of little value until men with imagination and new techniques took a second look and now progress is a way of life.

As one who has spent long hours in seeking to develop Wyoming's potential I am naturally highly pleased with these recent developments in my State. An article in the Rocky Mountain News, of Denver, Colo., on February 17, called Wyoming the emerging "Ruhr of the United States."

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in the RECORD. It is a fine account of our State's progress and I commend it to the Members of this body.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WYOMING EMERGING AS RUHR OF UNITED STATES

(By Morton L. Margolin)

CHEYENNE, February 16.—Wyoming, a land long associated in the minds of many as country fit only for cattle and cowboys, is beginning to emerge as the potential Ruhr Valley of the West.

New mineral discoveries, coupled with new technologies for their extraction and use, have brought some of the Nation's biggest industries to the high plains of Wyoming.

In the past 4 years, new plants costing a total of $192 million to build, have begun operations in the vast stretches of the Equality State. And the experts say it's only the beginning.

The economic future is bright, and it gets rosier the further ahead the projection extends.

Full development?

"We probably won't see it in our lifetime," says J. A. (Buck) Buchanan, director of the Wyoming Natural Resources Board. "But it is coming as sure as anything. There is no stopping it."

Comments Harry Evans, of Casper, special representative for the Burlington & Colorado and Southern Railroads: "We may have the last frontier, but we've got the natural resources, and the space for the people who will be needed to develop them. Other areas, like California, are filling up fast. Where else are people to go for opportunity?"

Except for the oil industry, which has been Wyoming's big ace in the hole for decades, most of the other developments are still pretty much in the pilot plant stage.

But at this point they look like successful operations which will eventually lead to much bigger operations. The roll of owners includes some of the biggest industrial names in the Nation.

In the South Pass area, near Lander, where the ruts of the westbound wagon trains are still visible, the Columbia-Geneva division of United States Steel started operations in its new $60 million taconite beneficiating plant at Atlantic City last September.

The low grade ore, which comes out of the ground less than 30 percent iron, is concentrated in the plant, and emerges at better than 60 percent iron concentrate. The plant, the most modern in the Nation, is one of the new technological developments and depends for success on the high magnetic properties of the Wyoming ore.

In July, the Stauffer Chemical Co. dedicated its $10 million trona mine and soda ash plant in the Green River Basin of western Wyoming.

Trona is trisodium phosphate, commonly known as soda ash. The Stauffer plant will produce 150,000 to 200,000 tons annually. Reserves are estimated at 200 million tons.

The chemical, in almost pure state, is found about 900 feet below the surface in layers interlaced with easily disposable shale.

A year earlier, Food Machinery Corp., which had been mining and processing soda ash at Green River, completed a $4 million expansion of its facilities, running its Wyoming investment to $30 million.

Early in 1962, Petratomics, opened a $2 million uranium mill in the Shirley Basin. It is the State's sixth and newest uranium mill. In 1961, Wyoming mills turned out $28.2 million worth of uranium.

Other major industrial developments of the past year saw:

Completion of a $1 million fertilizer plant by American Humates, Inc., near Glenrock. The process uses low grade coals in the area.

Similar coal deposits near Glenrock are the reason for the location of the Pacific Power & Light Co.'s huge electric generating plant there. Using local coal, strip mined on the site, the plant will eventually cost $67 million and produce 400,000 kilowatts. Two stages have been built. The third is to be finished in 1964.

Utah Power & Light Co. passed the 85-percent complete mark on the first 150,000-kilowatt unit of its new coal burning electric generating plant near Kemmerer. An automatic coal-handling system, designed to handle local coal from a nearby mine, will deliver fuel to the plant.

Food Machinery Corp. in a joint venture with United States Steel developed a process for making metallurgical coke from Kemmerer's noncoking, low-ash, subbituminous coals. The plant produces 250 tons a day.

Western Nuclear Co. completed a 110-ton-per-day sulfuric acid plant at Jeffery City in November. The $700,000 operation provides the acid for Western Nuclear's uranium milling operations.

So much for the promise of the future. What about the present?

Art Roberts, of Casper, executive vice president of the Wyoming Oil Industry Committee, points out the oil industry along with agriculture, is still the backbone of the Wyoming economy.

New technologies for secondary recovery are extending the life of some of the old oilfields. They are expected to produce well beyond the year 2000. In addition, new discoveries give Wyoming one of the highest success ratings in the country.

With an average production of 40 barrels per day per well, Wyoming ranks fifth in the Nation in oil production, and explorers are spending $250 million a year to find new wells.

Sinclair is modernizing its refinery near Rawlins, and plans to build a new pipeline to supply the Denver market, with completion set for 1964.

Jack Knott, manager of the Associated General Contractors of Wyoming forecasts a heavy construction year of around $38 million worth of work for 1963. That would be slightly ahead of 1962 as work proceeds on interstate highways, reclamation projects, and city improvements such as sewage and water facilities.

State Representative Ed Breece, Republican, of Lander, noting Wyoming's agricultural development is limited by water, altitude, and a short growing season, forecasts a big step forward if and when the State can get some local feedlots and packing plants.

Russ Beamer, of Riverton, spokesman for the mining industry, agreed with Breece that Wyoming's greatest opportunities lie in further development of its own resources.

"If the people in Wyoming have the opportunity to utilize their resources, they'll do a better job for themselves than Uncle Sam will," Beamer commented.

ADDRESS BY VICE PRESIDENT LYNDON B. JOHNSON AT JEFFERSON-JACKSON DAY DINNER, DETROIT, MICH.

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, on Saturday, March 2, the State of Michigan was honored with a visit by the Vice President of the United States, LYNDON B. JOHNSON, and his charming wife, Lady Bird, who came to Detroit as guests of honor at the 1963 Jefferson-Jackson Day dinner of the Michigan Democratic Party.

We were particularly appreciative of their visit since it took place on the anniversary of Texas Independence Day, and we know that Texans do not lightly absent themselves from Texas on the observance of this important State holiday.

But we are glad they did, because their presence in Detroit made the Jefferson-Jackson Day dinner an outstanding success.

The highlight of this dinner was the inspiring address by the Vice President. Many of the points he made in his remarks have such widespread application that they deserve to be shared with more than the 2,400 persons in the hall.

I therefore ask unanimous consent that the text of the address by the Honorable LYNDON B. JOHNSON, Vice President of the United States, be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS BY VICE PRESIDENT LYNDON B. JOHNSON, JEFFERSON-JACKSON DAY DINNER, DETROIT, MICH., MARCH 2, 1963

I have been sitting here tonight basking in the warm glow of peace and harmony that Democrats always enjoy right after a convention and just before an election.

I have been following with some interest the communiques on the engagement at Grand Rapids. I understand the Grand Rapids Chamber of Commerce has commemorated that affair by adopting a new slogan: "The City of Brotherly Love."

In view of what has been happening lately here in Michigan, it is especially appropriate that we meet to honor two great Democrats: Thomas Jefferson and Andrew Jackson.

Both were sturdy, unabashed partisans who believed in speaking their minds, and they founded the tradition of our party—that when people differ, they go to the mat.

So, while Republicans can never understand it, I take it that Michigan Democrats have been busy doing what has always come naturally for Democrats—just warming up on each other in practice for the main event.

As Will Rogers once said: "I am not a member of any organized party, I am a Democrat."

But lambasting fellow Democrats is not the only activity in our party. Democrats also know how to unite—how to unite our party, and most important of all, how to unite the Nation in its hours of trouble. Because Democrats do have this ability, we have—and we will continue to have—a record of success.

You have another opportunity for success coming up very soon. And I know that every one of you is going to work your fingers to the bone to insure the election or the reelection of men like your distinguished educator, Dr. Lynn Bartlett, and such distinguished jurists as Justice Paul Adams and Justice Eugene Black. These represent the high caliber of men that the Democratic habit of success has brought to the people.

I am told that here in Michigan the Republicans want to change things and get around the Democratic habit of success. They are plugging a new constitution which would cut down the frequency of elections and reduce the number of elected officials.

In other words, "If you can't win them, cancel them."

But I did not come here tonight to talk about Republicans. They do enough of that themselves. I came here to talk about your party and my party—and, what is more important, your country and my country.

The day after tomorrow will mark the 30th anniversary of the start of the most vital period of social and economic democracy in our century. It was on Monday 30 years ago that the United States inaugurated as its President Franklin Delano Roosevelt.

On that cold, gray day in 1933, Franklin Roosevelt told a doubting and despairing America, "The only thing we have to fear is fear itself."

From that moment, American courage and American confidence were reborn. Through three decades since, Americans have been at work moving forward—moving not to the right, not to the left, but moving upward to a better life for all the people.

Today some say that the New Deal was an experiment. Some say that it was a failure. Some say that it has now become outmoded and obsolete.

I say that the philosophy of government which helps the people to help protect themselves against depression, against unemployment, against old age will never be outmoded or obsolete. I say that the program which protects family bank accounts, which protects against worthless stocks, which protects against 60-hour weeks and pittance wages is not a failure. And, I say that a program which survived 8 years of Republicanism with only one minor bill being repealed cannot be described as an experiment.

What Franklin Roosevelt stood for—and fought for—is forever and eternally a part of American life and a part of the values of freemen throughout the world.

That work for the people begun three decades ago is being carried forward today by the President of the United States, John F. Kennedy.

It is being carried forward by vigorous Democrats from your State like your two outstanding Senators, PAT McNAMARA and PHIL HART.

Let me say of your two Senators—they are good for Michigan and they are very good for the country.

It is good for America to have a man in the Senate who will quietly but effectively work to protect the consumers from mislabeling, work to protect our families from untested drugs, work to solve the difficult problems of human rights as does PHIL HART.

The real hallmark of a Democrat is that he cares about people—and that is the hallmark of PHIL HART.

In Michigan—and in all parts of our country—Democrats believe in the concept that our country is best served through partnership—partnership between research and industry; education and business; government and the productive system; the Nation and the State.

Here in Michigan you realize full well that selfishness does not pay—that it takes a healthy national economy to have a healthy State economy. That is the attitude which makes good Americans out of all of us regardless of the State that we call home.

The work begun under Franklin D. Roosevelt is far from finished. The challenges to a free society are always with us and they face this generation of Americans as much as the generation of 30 years ago. So long as men and women through no fault of their own are treated as second-class citizens, or cannot support their families, or educate their children, or receive decent medical care and live their declining years in decency and dignity, there will be a need for leadership with a heart and a need for a united Democratic Party.

Freedom does not confer on us only the right to starve or to be exploited. The policies of the Democratic Party have been born in the knowledge that so long as one man is in chains, none of us is truly free.

And freedom must be fulfillment—not just promise.

This administration is seeking to make freedom meaningful by making available to all, without regard to irrelevant considerations of ancestry, the blessings of equal opportunity in every legitimate area of human activity. The only test applied to a man or a woman in our democracy must be merit—not race, not color, not creed, not national origin.

But equal opportunity is a hollow shell if its only meaning is to share with others the right to be hungry, the right to be insecure, the right to raise children in hopelessness, the right to go bankrupt, the right to die in poverty. Such rights do not represent the fulfillment of the American promise.

That is why your President and your administration are committed to the achievement of a full employment, full production economy where every person who wants work can find it. It is our goal that people have equal opportunity to share life's blessings as well as life's trials.

In the past 2 years we have made a start on the problem of getting the country moving again. Under Democratic leadership, our Congress has passed a widespread housing bill, a $1.25 minimum wage, an Area Redevelopment Act (and those of you from the northern peninsula know how much this means), a Manpower Retraining Act for those who have been left in the backwash of modern technology, a Farm Act, relief for the children of unemployed workers, and other measures based upon our deep concern for people.

And now President Kennedy has recommended a sweeping program of tax reduction—to put additional billions of dollars into the hands of consumers and producers and raise the level of economic activity to new heights.

I am aware of the criticisms leveled against this program. I would be surprised if there were none. This is part of the Democratic dialog—the discussion of issues, methods, and means.

But we discuss to resolve issues—not to create them. And I am convinced that we will—as Democrats always do—find a solution to our differences and spur the forces that will lead to a more prosperous economy.

This administration is also determined to work for the enactment of a program of medical care for our aged through the social security system. There is no greater moral imperative and no greater economic necessity than to lift some of the grinding burden from our senior citizens who have made their contribution to America and who are entitled to dignity in their advancing years.

Human rights, full employment and full production, medical care for our older citizens, security for our freedoms in the world—these are the immediate goals of this administration and with your active support, and the support of those you represent, we can begin to complete America's unfinished business.

I would remind you, however, that the final judgment always rests with the people. It is to them that we must turn, for their consent is the mainspring of democracy.

It was to the people that President Kennedy turned in the dark days of October when it became clear that the Soviet Union had begun to probe the Western Hemisphere and had in fact installed offensive weapons in the Caribbean. And the people, as they always do when they are given the facts, responded positively in support of freedom.

In the Cuban threat, President Kennedy acted with speed and courage. He was fully aware of the risk, but he acted in the secure knowledge that he was backed by a strong, united people determined to preserve their liberty.

Franklin Roosevelt more than 20 years ago faced with a similar, although far less immediate threat to our security, said: "We, too, born to freedom and believing in freedom, are willing to fight to maintain freedom. We, and all others who believe as deeply as we do, would rather die on our feet, than live on our knees."

It was this spirit which extinguished the ugly fires of nazism and fascism—and it is this spirit which will lead to the eventual triumph of liberty over the forces of darkness and tyranny which exist today.

I would say to you—and to all our countrymen—that now, as 30 years ago, there is a leader of courage in the White House—a leader who is not afraid to act and not afraid to be patient for he knows that he leads a strong and prepared nation.

In these times, as in times past, the only thing we have to fear is fear itself. America can—and America will—survive the enemies of freedom if America is not made victim of the fears of the few who for reasons of partisanship would have our people mistrust their own leaders.

No debate over principles and issues can hurt our land. A democracy is always strengthened by the free exchange of ideas, no matter how far apart those ideas may be.

But when debate degenerates into a squabble over motives, when we allow legitimate differences of opinion to descend to the level of name calling, when any of us decide that those who disagree with us are unpatriotic, when any of us seek to tear down confidence in the integrity of our own leaders, then we are playing, however unwittingly, the game of our adversaries by dividing our strength instead of multiplying it.

I do not think any policy of any administration should be so sacred that it cannot be challenged by those who disagree. But neither do I think partisan disputes should be permitted to become so irresponsible that we challenge the good faith and the motives of those who are responsible for guiding our affairs.

A little more than 10 years ago, I met with the Democratic Senators who had just accorded me the honor of being their leader. Our party had just lost control of the executive branch for the first time in 20 years. Congress belonged to the opposition and statehouse after statehouse had fallen.

At that time I said:

"We are now in the minority. I have never agreed with the statement that it is 'the business of the opposition to oppose.' I do not believe that the American people have sent us here to obstruct.

"I believe we are here to fight for a positive program—a program geared not just to opposing the majority but to serving America. I think that is the real desire of every Democrat—even though we may disagree as to methods."

Today, after the passage of 10 years, I think I can say that philosophy is the desire of every American—and has been proved at the polls.

I can also say to you: Be proud of your party. Be proud not just because it wins elections but because it serves the people, whether we are in the majority or in the minority. Be proud because it is a constructive party with constructive leadership. Be proud because we seek to preserve America—and not just destroy the opposition.

The doubters and the doomsayers will always be with us. The overeager partisans will never depart.

But so will the Democratic Party always be with us—a party that is not afraid to carry America's banner in the dark hours as well as the hours of prosperity.

In our national efforts to make this a world of peace and freedom and justice for all men, we have made much progress. We are far nearer success than some want Americans to recognize.

At the peace tables in Geneva, we hold the initiative. In the Atlantic community, in Africa, in Asia, it is the force of freedom that is moving forward irresistibly toward unity, toward prosperity, toward greater human freedom. In our own hemisphere, it is the alliance of independent American Republics which will shape the future, not the forces which seek to betray freedom to its foes.

The tide runs with us today. We must move forward on that tide as a people confident, a people united, a people fearing only fear itself.

REMOVAL OF REGIONAL OFFICE OF THE INTERNAL REVENUE SERVICE FROM NEW YORK TO BOSTON

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I join with a number of my colleagues in the protests directed at the removal of the regional office of the Internal Revenue Service from New York to Boston. I think it is quite fitting that the Secretary of the Treasury should have announced today that he intends to review that question.

New York is the biggest tax-paying unit in the United States. It is inconceivable that removal to Boston of a regional office can be justified.

The move is not justified by the fact that data processing equipment exists at Lawrence Mass., because there are regional offices in other parts of the country which are not located near data processing equipment of the IRS.

I have asked today that the Treasury Department afford us an open hearing. I think the matter is important and critical to warrant it.

Secretary Dillon's announcement that he will review this proposal to reorganize a number of Internal Revenue Service offices is most welcome. I predict that if Mr. Dillon conducts a thorough review, even to the extent of granting a public hearing—to hear the views of public officials, community leaders, bar associations, tax practitioners, and taxpayers—the result will be that the regional tax office will remain in New York City, where it has been since regional offices were established by the Internal Revenue Service in 1952, and where it belongs.

RAIL MERGER CRITERIA

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I want to take this opportunity to commend the President for the recent statement of rail merger criteria developed by his Interagency Committee on Transport Mergers, which he has made a part of his transportation message. Many of us concerned with this present move toward monopolies in the transportation industry have been eagerly awaiting these recommended criteria, which now are officially the administration's policy on rail and air mergers and will become the guidelines for the Department of Justice in presenting the public interest record in merger cases before the regulatory bodies, and in the courts.

It was little over a year ago that I recommended in a letter to the President that he establish an executive commission to investigate and recommend safeguards in connection with the rapidly moving merger trend in the transportation industry. This Interagency Committee, although falling far short of what we had hoped would be established, nevertheless is a step in the direction of a needed examination of this problem in the public interest.

I am particularly pleased that the criteria suggested placed considerable emphasis on the necessity for the preservation of competition between carriers in the same mode of transport, as well as between carriers of different modes. I was indeed impressed with the demand that inquiry be made as to whether the economies sought by the mergers could not be achieved by devices short of merger, such as leasing, joint terminals, maintenance facilities, and the like. I am glad that this Committee has recognized the danger that increased market power of a merged carrier might have substantial undesirable repercussions on other carriers. Certainly this criterion should be explored at length by the Department of Justice in the Pennsylvania-Central case, and the Pan American-TWA application, among others.

Finally, I am pleased to see the recommendation that each merger must assure the public of lower fares and rates, better and more frequent service, and longrun innovations and improvement in an overall transportation network, rather than the mere satisfaction of the desires of controlling financial interests.

Much of these recommended criteria, though general in nature, have nevertheless been brought out in the hearings before the Subcommittee on Antitrust and Monopoly and in speeches and letters by many interested Members of Congress during the past year. A perceptive expansion on the need for greater safeguards and the testing of merger cases can be found in the recent report from the Subcommittee on Antitrust and Monopoly, entitled "The Railroad Merger Problem," issued March 4 of this year. The views of the President's group are but a part of a growing series of expressions of serious concern over the proposed concentration of economic power in the transportation industry.

Although generally pleased with the tone of the report, I was deeply disturbed over the lack of any suggestion or support for the effectuation of a merger moratorium on those crucial transportation cases presently pending before regulatory bodies, so that the administration can have the time to develop fully their criteria, and the Congress can have time to implement such recommendations into effective law. Except for the Pennsylvania and Pan American mergers, most major merger or control cases have wound up their records. Coming at such a late date, these perceptive criteria may well be academic. In any event, the fact that the President has authorized such criteria to be put into effect, is indeed an implied warning to us all to "stop, look, and listen" before we continue on this road to consolidation, from where there will be no turning back.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD the press release from the White House setting forth recommendations of great interest, and also the report of the Interagency Committee on Transport Mergers to which I have referred.

There being no objection, the press release and report were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PRESS RELEASE FROM THE OFFICE OF THE WHITE HOUSE PRESS SECRETARY, THE WHITE HOUSE

The White House released today the report of the Interagency Committee on Transport Mergers, containing a statement of the general criteria applicable to mergers in the railroad and airline industries. The report specifies the lines of inquiry which should be pursued in the evaluation of proposed mergers in order to determine whether they are in the public interest.

In his 1962 transportation message to the Congress, the President directed the Departments of Commerce, Justice, and Labor, and the Council of Economic Advisers to form an Interagency Committee to develop such criteria. The report issued today was submitted by that Committee, composed of Clarence D. Martin, Jr., Under Secretary of Commerce for Transportation, Chairman; Walter H. Heller, Chairman, Council of Economic Advisers; Lee Loevinger, Assistant Attorney General, Antitrust Division, Department of Justice; and James J. Reynolds, Assistant Secretary of Labor.

The merger criteria, expressed in the form of questions, are as follows:

1. Will the proposed merger restrict effective competition in the provision of transportation services in the areas affected?

2. Will the proposed merger permit an economically more efficient use of resources, through fuller utilization, over a period of time, of plant and equipment and/or reduction in direct costs per unit of output, which will reduce costs while maintaining or improving the general quality of service offered to users?

3. Can the economies sought by the proposed merger be achieved by alternatives more easily revocable which promise to be of comparable effect in accomplishing the improvement in overall efficiency?

4. Will the cost and quality benefits resulting from the merger be reflected in benefits to the public?

5. Will the proposed merger, with the increased market power of the merged carrier, have substantial undesirable repercussions on other carriers in the industry?

6. Will the proposed merger serve the longrun interests of both the public and the carriers concerned, or is it merely an attempt to meet a short-run crisis arising either because of unfavorable economic conditions in general or a particular transitory problem?

7. Is the merger proposed, in part, because of the imminent failure of one or more of the merging carriers, and is it the most appropriate solution to this difficulty?

8. Are the legitimate interests of existing creditors and equity holders of the merging carriers adequately protected?

9. Does the merger provide adequate protection and assistance to affected employees, and take into account community employment effects?

10. Will the proposed merger serve other objectives of public policy, including a reduction in public subsidies?

In forwarding the report to the President, the Committee pointed out that the criteria "will be useful to the Department of Justice in its efforts to clarify the issues involved in individual merger applications before the regulatory bodies. As a statement of the public interest factors in transport mergers, it could be utilized by the regulatory agencies as suggested guidelines. Moreover, it should prove of value to the industries involved by providing an authoritative statement of the criteria by which agencies in the executive branch will assess proposed mergers."

CRITERIA TO IMPLEMENT THE MERGER PROVISIONS OF THE PRESIDENT'S TRANSPORTATION MESSAGE—REPORT OF THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORT MERGERS PROVIDED IN THE PRESIDENT'S TRANSPORTATION MESSAGE OF APRIL 5, 1962

INTRODUCTION

This report is addressed to the task assigned by the President in his transportation message of April 5, 1962, to the Interagency Merger Committee. It consists of three parts. The first part contains a brief summary of existing law applicable to mergers in the rail and air transport industries, which is the premise upon which the Committee has formulated its criteria. The second part states the basic principles governing the formulation and intended application of the criteria. The report concludes with the statement of the criteria themselves. In spelling out the broad criteria stated by the President, the Committee has thus far concentrated its attention on rail and air transportation and its criteria were developed with reference to these two industries.

Both rail and air transportation are experiencing severe problems of adjustment to changing economic and technological conditions. The impact of these changes has not been uniform throughout each industry, but for a variety of reasons has affected some companies and territories more than others. The leaders of these industries, in seeking constructive means of solving their problems, have turned to merger as one of the possible opportunities for improvements in earning power and technical performance, including cost savings. The Committee respects the efforts of leaders in the railroad and airline industries to improve their positions and solve their problems. It offers this elaboration of the President's criteria partly as a means of providing guidance concerning the manner in which the public interest should be interpreted with respect to presently proposed and prospective mergers.

While the Committee believes that these criteria have general applicability to mergers occurring in other modes of transport, it recognizes that the particular character of one or more of these other modes may call for some modification of the criteria here set forth. Actual experience with rail and air merger cases may also indicate needs for revision.

I. SUMMARY OF EXISTING LEGISLATION UPON WHICH THE CRITERIA ARE PREDICATED

The creation of this Committee underscored the special public interest in transportation. The special public interest aspects of transportation have many formulations in legislative history and in present statutes. The objectives and criteria of the Interagency Committee are based on those objectives and standards already included in existing laws. The principal enactments involved are the Interstate Commerce Act governing domestic surface transportation and the Federal Aviation Act governing air transportation.

The Interstate Commerce Act

In applying the Interstate Commerce Act, the Interstate Commerce Commission must observe standards and criteria that are implied and those that are stated specifically.

The legislative history of the act implies that the basic structure of the transportation industry shall be based on the initiative of the carriers, subject to the monitoring of the Interstate Commerce Commission in order that the public interest shall be protected. This standard is implied in the provisions of the Transportation Act of 1940 which repealed those provisions in the Transportation Act of 1920 calling for extensive public determination of railroad industry structure.

The Commission also has the obligation to weigh a proposed merger in the light of the policies of the antitrust laws, particularly the maintenance of competition and prevention of monopoly to the extent feasible. The Commission is thus obliged to make the proper accommodation of the Interstate Commerce Act and the antitrust legislation.

In administering the Interstate Commerce Act the Commission must give effect to the national transportation policy contained in the preamble to the act. This provides for the maintenance of the optimum transportation system for public needs and for preserving the inherent advantages of the several transportation modes.

Under section 5 of the act governing mergers and acquisition of control the Commission is bound to make a finding in each case that the action proposed is in the public interest and may establish such conditions as are just and reasonable. In considering the public interest the Commission must give weight to four specific criteria: (1) the effect of the proposed transaction upon adequate transportation service to the public; (2) the effect upon the public interest of the inclusion, or failure to include, other railroads in the territory involved in the proposed transaction; (3) the total fixed charges resulting from the proposed transaction; and (4) the interest of the carrier employees affected. Each of these criteria has a definite legislative history which requires a finding by the Commission. The Commission, however, is not restricted to the criteria listed, but may consider other aspects of the public interest.

The maintenance of a reasonable degree of competition appears implicit in the act itself, although such a criterion is not specifically stated. For example, in the sections of the act regulating rail ownership of motor or water carriage, the Commission is required to observe that competition not be unduly lessened. The preservation of inherent advantage of individual modes and adequate transportation service to the public implies a degree of competitive effort. The public interest concept itself implies sufficient competition where practicable between carriers in the same mode of transportation, as well as between different modes.

The Federal Aviation Act

The Civil Aeronautics Board is required to give consideration in its determinations to general public policies and legal standards, including the principles of the antitrust laws. In addition, a specific standard in the Federal Aviation Act applicable to mergers is in section 408(b) which provides "That the Board shall not approve any consolidation, merger, purchase, lease, operating contract, or acquisition of control which would result in creating a monopoly or monopolies and thereby restrain competition or jeopardize another air carrier not a party" to the proposed combination.

In aviation, as in domestic surface transportation, there is an obligation to respect the initiative of the carriers themselves in shaping the structure of the industry, so long as the public interest is protected.

The Civil Aeronautics Board is required to evaluate merger proposals on the basis of the public interest standards of the act. Section 102 sets forth these standards as follows:

"In the exercise and performance of its powers and duties under this Act, the Board shall consider the following, among other things, as being in the public interest, and in accordance with the public convenience and necessity:

"(a) The encouragement and development of an air-transportation system properly adapted to the present and future needs of the foreign and domestic commerce of the United States; of the Postal Service, and of the national defense;

"(b) The regulation of air transportation in such manner as to recognize and preserve the inherent advantages of, assure the highest degree of safety in, and foster sound economic conditions in, such transportation, and to improve the relations between, and coordinate transportation by, air carriers;

"(c) The promotion of adequate, economical, and efficient service by air carriers at reasonable charges, without unjust discriminations, undue preferences or advantages, or unfair or destructive competitive practices;

"(d) Competition to the extent necessary to assure the sound development of an air-transportation system properly adapted to the needs of the foreign and domestic commerce of the United States, of the postal service, and of the national defense;

"(e) The promotion of safety in air commerce; and

"(f) The promotion, encouragement, and development of civil aeronautics."

II. BASIC PRINCIPLES GOVERNING THE CRITERIA STATEMENT

The underlying philosophy which has guided our traditional national attitudes toward mergers in this country is reflected in the President's transportation message of April 5, 1962, and has guided the Committee in developing these criteria. Mergers among carriers in transportation industries must be viewed in the light of the special character of these industries, particularly the fact that they are regulated by public agencies. Such public regulation has been developed because it was recognized that the characteristics of these industries, plus the vital public interest in the manner in which they are operated, have made undesirable the complete reliance on a free market system. Thus, in considering mergers in the transportation industries it must be recognized that the rate charged for the services rendered, entry into the industry and into particular markets, the quality, type and frequency of service, plus numerous other decisions, are all subject at present to some degree of regulation.

However, the President recognized in his message that changes in recent decades require a reappraisal of the role of public regulation. As a result of impressive changes in technology and in the structure of transportation industries, including the development of important new modes of transportation in the past half century, much greater reliance upon competition is now possible. Recognizing these developments, the President made clear the desirability of relying whenever, and insofar as, possible on competition to provide the necessary protection of the public interest. This goal is reflected in the general criteria suggested in the message on transportation and in the more detailed criteria which follow.

The more closely a proposed merger comes to meeting all the standards of the criteria and guidelines set forth herein, the more likely it is to serve the public interest. The application of these criteria to any proposed merger may, however, produce results which are mixed. Since these criteria cannot be measured on a single scale, no objective weighting system is possible and judgment must be relied upon, not only in the application of each criterion separately, but in the overall assessment of their joint application to any given merger.

In applying the criteria, specific and detailed information should be obtained and analyzed. In connection with certain criteria, statistical analysis, based on historical data and engineering and marketing projections, should be employed. Each proposed merger must be considered in the light of the possible longrun structural patterns of the industry, taking into account the transportation requirements necessary for the longterm economic development of the Nation as a whole and particular regions thereof. Information as to the underlying motives for the merger of the carriers proposing it will be useful in evaluating certain criteria.

While public policy clearly relies on the initiative of private firms in proposing and implementing specific mergers, it is not inconsistent, and is indeed desirable, for the Government to develop overall guidelines pointing to the range of acceptable structures of transportation industries deemed consistent with the public interest. Thus, continuing study of the evolving pattern of the industry, its problems and potential, will provide the appropriate background against which to evaluate particular merger proposals.

III. CRITERIA TO BE EMPLOYED IN EVALUATION OF TRANSPORT MERGERS

The criteria are based on the three broad criteria laid down by the President as general guidelines for the evaluation of mergers by the Committee. These criteria as stated by the President are:

"1. Effective competition should be maintained among alternative forms of transportation, and, where traffic volume permits, between competing firms in the same mode of transportation.

"2. The goals of economical, efficient, and adequate service to the public—and reduction in any public subsidies—should be secured by the realization of genuine economies.

"3. Affected workers should be given the assistance to make any necessary adjustments caused by the merger."

In applying the criteria set out by the President and seeking to ascertain the public interest, the Committee will seek detailed facts that will enable it to arrive at some conclusions with respect to the following lines of inquiry. It is believed that these lines of inquiry are based upon the Presidential criteria and specify the data that must be known in order to determine whether or not a particular proposal meets the criteria and serves the public interest. In addition to indicating the questions which the Committee will ask in formulating a position with respect to any particular proposal, the following questions also set forth the Committee's view of the considerations that should be taken into account by carriers and other private parties in deciding whether or not to propose or urge a particular merger. The determination of a position respecting a particular proposed merger requires sufficient information to afford an answer to the following lines of inquiry:

1. Will the proposed merger restrict effective competition in the provision of transportation services in the areas affected?

This criterion is based on the fundamental proposition that competition among suppliers is ordinarily the best guarantee of maximum benefits to consumers of transportation, as well as other goods and services. Among the benefits of competition are pressures to lower prices, to improve service, to introduce innovations of all types including technical, managerial and marketing. This criterion sounds a warning that a reduction of competition may result in reduced benefits to users and that the possibility of this result must be considered in evaluating a proposed merger. It is appropriate in connection with the application of this criterion to consider the impact of competition from modes of transportation other than that in which the merging firms operate.

2. Will the proposed merger permit an economically more efficient use of resources, through fuller utilization, over a period of time, of plant and equipment and/or reduction in direct costs per unit of output, which will reduce costs while maintaining or improving the general quality of service offered to users?

This criterion recognizes that a merger may make possible a reduction in fixed overhead expense per unit of output and also may make possible lower variable cost, resulting, for example, from lower advertising and customer service costs such as those related to ticketing, baggage, and freight handling, more efficient management, or lower maintenance expense.

3. Can the economies sought by the proposed merger be achieved by alternatives more easily revocable which promise to be of comparable effect in accomplishing the improvement in overall efficiency?

This criterion requires explicit examination of alternative devices such as lease arrangements, joint operation of terminals, maintenance facilities, etc., for achieving any desirable results the merger promises to yield. Many such arrangements short of merger may be capable of realizing the desired economies without reducing the number of enterprises capable of exercising independent initiative.

4. Will the cost and quality benefits resulting from the merger be reflected in the benefits to the public? To what extent will potential passengers or shippers retain a choice of services from this or other modes of transportation?

Public interest justification of a merger which substantially increases the market power of the companies involved requires that cost and quality benefits be translated, at least in substantial part, into definite benefits to the users of the services. Merger proposals should set forth with specificity a practical program for the transfer of these benefits to the public.

Over the long run, effective competition is ordinarily the best guarantee of transfer of benefits. The effect of competition from modes of transportation other than that in which the merging firms operate, should be considered in this context.

5. Will the proposed merger, with the increased market power of the merged carrier, have substantial undesirable repercussions on other carriers in the industry?

This criterion implies that any given merger proposed should be evaluated in the light of the overall structure of the industry and the probable effects upon the anticipated future development of the industry.

6. Will the proposed merger serve the long-run interests of the public and of the carriers concerned, or is it merely an attempt to meet a short-run crisis arising because of unfavorable economic conditions in general, or a particular transitory problem?

7. Is the merger proposed, in part, because of the imminent failure of one or more of the merging carriers, and is it the most appropriate solution to this difficulty?

While the failing firm doctrine is well established as a reason for merger, it should not automatically imply that the merger is in the public interest. The underlying reasons for the imminent or probable failure of the carrier(s) should be examined and alternative solutions should be considered, including reorganization or dissolution. In any case, the failing firm justification does not eliminate the need to evaluate the merger in the light of other criteria included herein.

8. Are the legitimate interests of existing creditors and equity holders of the merging carriers adequately protected?

9. Does the merger provide adequate protection and assistance to affected employees, and take into account community employment effects?

This criterion should be viewed in the light of statutory requirements for employee protection and of evolving concepts as to the nature and extent of such protection. Any proposed merger should, as a minimum, provide protection commensurate with statutory requirements as interpreted or applied by the regulatory agencies in similar prior merger cases. The application of standards equal to statutory requirements should not preclude reasonable changes in the form of structure or protection which may be warranted due to the particular characteristics of a given situation or to changes in conditions over a period of time. Arrangements developed through collective bargaining (either in a given case or in an agreement having more general application) should be recognized and encouraged. Such arrangements should assure equitable treatment for all employees adversely affected. Effective administrative and procedural machinery should be provided for expeditious, equitable, and final resolution of disagreements which may arise in the formulation of such arrangements.

In addition to consideration of the effect of the merger on particular employees, attention should be given to its effect on employment opportunities in particular communities. The possibility that a merger will create unemployment in a community should not preclude merger. However, appropriate steps should be taken to lessen the employment impact of the merger upon communities substantially affected. Advance notice to, and consultation with, community leaders, phasing out operations on a gradual basis, where practicable, and similar steps to cushion the impact of discontinued facilities or service abandonments would all serve to reduce the effects of employee displacement. Such steps would afford community leaders the opportunity to avail themselves of services offered by appropriate State and Federal economic redevelopment and retraining agencies.

10. Will the proposed merger serve other objectives of public policy?

Such objectives include, but are not limited to: (a) The maintenance of a common carrier system; (b) protection of the national security interest and the maintenance of an efficient service; and (c) protection of the public health and safety.

CLARENCE D. MARTIN, Jr.
WALTER W. HELLER.
LEE LOEVINGER.
JAMES J. REYNOLDS.

URBAN MASS TRANSPORTATION—A SUGGESTION TO THE WALL STREET JOURNAL

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, today's issue of the Wall Street Journal carries an editorial expressing opposition to the administration-supported urban mass transportation bill I have sponsored with 22 other Senators.

The problem of traffic congestion and deteriorating transit service is, they blithely assert, a local problem that should be solved by the cities themselves with "their comparatively ample financial and engineering resources." Why, they ask, should the Federal Government be asked to share part of the burden?

The interesting thing is that the answer can be found right on the front page of the very same issue of their own newspaper.

The lead article tells the story right in the first paragraph with the statistic that "Spending by State and local governments has increased nearly 400 percent since World War II."

This is in contrast to "the much tamer Federal increase—up 69 percent since 1946."

The article goes on to explain that:

> The increasing concentration of families in urban centers is driving up the expenses of non-Federal governments. Some 70 percent of the population is bunched in towns and cities today, compared with only 64 percent in 1950, Government figures show, and experts foresee no reversal of this trend.
>
> The urban concentration is causing sharp increases in costs of such largely non-Federal services as police, sanitation, and firefighting facilities.

And of course the big State and local expense comes in public education.

This information alone should have been sufficient to temper the outlook of the editors of the Wall Street Journal, but I suppose that as they gaze out on the bustle and physical display of wealth in the world's greatest financial center in which they are located, they assume that our cities as a whole must be rolling in dough.

CITY WEALTH

However, if they had happened to come across the extensive study on taxation and urban land use published recently by the very reputable Urban Land Institute, they would have read that:

> Although the central cities continue to sustain a large proportion of regional employment, these municipalities do not possess fiscal resources commensurate with their economic responsibilities. Chapter II demonstrated clearly that the per capita value of real property in core A communities (the highly builtup centers), is well below that of other parts of the region. This finding is a flat contradiction of the ubiquitous impression that the big cities are wealthy—an impression based largely on the perspective of the central business district. Beyond the office buildings and department stores are extensive gray areas where the combination of low-value residential property and extremely high population density cancels any fiscal benefits of nonresidential property.

So I have a suggestion to make to the editors of the Wall Street Journal. I suggest they at least read the articles in their own news columns before taking pen to paper, and perhaps even a little more.

I have one other suggestion—that the editors strive a little harder for accuracy and completeness in their editorial columns.

CHAMBER OF COMMERCE ON TRANSIT

For example, today's editorial states that less than 2 percent of the chamber of commerce's 2,700 State and local members support the administration's transit program, according to a recent survey.

A number of points must be made. First the figure was 3 percent, and the number of responses to the survey was 1,254, not 2,700. In addition, another 23 percent favored some kind of Federal assistance in this field.

But the significant information can be found in who did not reply to the chamber's survey. One of those who did not reply was the Greater Boston Chamber of Commerce, which embraces the entire Boston region of more than 3 million people, or half of the entire Massachusetts population.

The Greater Boston Chamber of Commerce strongly supports this legislation. In fact it has testified for the last 2 or 3 years to that effect during Senate and House hearings.

In addition, the legislation enjoys the support of the New York, Atlanta, Philadelphia, Pittsburgh, Chicago, and San Francisco chambers of commerce, among others.

This is surprising enough in the face of the heated opposition of the parent body. And I am willing to bet that the chambers which do support the legislation embrace metropolitan areas with more than half of the Nation's population.

Does this mean that only the big city chambers favor Federal assistance? No. On the contrary, according to the chamber's own testimony more than half of those favoring the administration's bill come from communities with less than 50,000 population. Two-thirds of those favoring Federal loans come from communities smaller than 50,000.

Finally we come to the most important point and that is the fact that the chambers of commerce do not speak for the people of our urban communities. They speak for the business interests. To the extent that anyone speaks for the people. It is the responsible elected officials, the mayors and the county officials. The national organizations of each are firmly in support of this legislation.

I personally am gratified to see such a large degree of chamber of commerce support for this legislation, but I do not think one can draw too many conclusions from the fact that perhaps a numerical majority of its members are in opposition.

I shall ask unanimous consent that some excerpts from the hearings this year on the chamber's position be included in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks. These do not include such statements as the one made in 1961 by the Pennsylvania State Chamber of Commerce, that:

> As a general principle, the Pennsylvania State Chamber believes that governmental problems should be handled by that level of government which is most closely concerned with the problem, and that it is unwise to request Federal help until it is certain that the local governments concerned have done what they can to solve the problem themselves. We are satisfied that the present proposal is in agreement with this principle, and that this is an appropriate field for Federal action.

BIG CITY PROBLEM?

One final point, dealing with the editrial's assertion that the support for this program comes only from a "few huge metropolitan centers, where almost everybody will concede transit problems exist."

I am tempted to ask: So what if it were true?

There are more people living in just the New York metropolitan area than there are farmers in the entire Nation.

Frankly, I am growing sick and tired of the way some people brush off the crushing problems facing the millions of people living in our large metropolitan areas, as though it were just a trifling problem affecting just a small number of people.

But the fact is that the problem is not limited to a few huge metropolitan areas.

During the hearings held during the past several years, we have heard in addition to the giants from Atlanta; Dade County, Fla.; Detroit; St. Louis; Seattle; Baltimore; Laurel, Mississippi; Pittsburgh; Cape Canaveral; Oakland; Cleveland; and Montgomery, Ala., among others.

In addition, since enactment of the mass transportation provisions in the Housing Act of 1961, the agency has received inquiries and requests for assistance from more than 250 cities across the Nation.

On top of that, there are 69 cities and towns with populations of 25,000 or more which have no public transportation service at all, despite the large percentage of people who must depend on public transportation to meet their travel needs—those too old, too young, too poor or to infirm to drive, say nothing of the millions of moderate income working families who may have two jobs but only one car.

In addition, the American Transit Association estimates that since 1954, more than 400 transit companies have been sold or abandoned, resulting in no or sharply reduced service for the communities.

Mr. President, these problems are critical and nationwide, and I certainly feel that if we can pour out about $6 billion a year on agriculture, we can spend $500 million over a 3-year period to improve transit service and reduce traffic congestion in our urban areas—which would not only bring great relief to the millions of this Nation's bus and rail commuters, but also make it easier and cheaper for the farmer to get his product from the farm to the market by reducing city traffic congestion and making more highway funds available for construction in the outlying suburban and rural communities.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Wall Street Journal's article and editorial, to which I have referred, together with the excerpts from the hearings to which I have referred, be included in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article, editorial, and excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Wall Street Journal, Mar. 7, 1963]

SPENDING GIANTS: GOVERNMENTS OF STATES, LOCALITIES LIFT OUTLAYS FAR FASTER THAN U.S.—SURGE IN SCHOOL-AGE CHILDREN, MIGRATION TO CITIES CITED; NON-FEDERAL PAYROLLS SOAR—RISING TAXES AND RESISTANCE

(By Alfred L. Malabre, Jr.)

Spending by State and local governments has increased nearly 400 percent since World War II.

The increase is greater by far than the postwar rise of Federal expenditures. It has triggered a steep climb in State and local tax rates and, despite mounting taxpayer resistance, is continuing unabated.

"State and local spending constitutes about the only area where we economic forecasters can always predict correctly what's going to happen next," says William M. Burke, a senior economist at the National Industrial Conference Board (NICB).

The table traces the sweeping climb of non-Federal spending in the postwar era, and also shows the much tamer Federal increase (up 69 percent since 1946). Dollars are in billions and the years are fiscal periods ending June 30.

[In billions]

Fiscal year	State	Local	Federal
1946	$6.2	$7.0	$66.5
1954	15.8	17.8	77.7
1962	29.2	33.0	112.2

The extra-steep climb of State and local spending, compared with Federal spending, reflects partly the fact Federal expenditures were abnormally high in 1946, from lingering World War II expenses.

REFLECTS POPULATION SHIFTS

But the dramatic State and local rise stems also from basic postwar population trends: A sharp increase in persons of school age and a massive migration of families to cities and towns from the country.

"There's no question that State and local governments are bearing the brunt of the school-age population bulge, as well as of the increasing concentration of persons in urban centers," says Robert W. French, president of the Tax Foundation, Inc., a research organization.

In the last decade, enrollment in public elementary and secondary schools has soared by nearly 50 percent to above 40 million. Total U.S. population has increased only 20 percent in the same span.

Costs per pupil are rising rapidly; they are up 70 percent since the 1952–53 school year. Teachers' salaries, on average, have climbed at about the same pace. And the expense of school construction keeps mounting; capital outlays, up 75 percent in a decade, will top $3 billion for the first time this year.

BURDEN OF SCHOOL COSTS

State and local governments pay for about 96 percent of public school costs, reports the National Education Association. The table below outlines the rise of public school expenses and of yearly costs per pupil. The total cost figures are in billions.

School year	Total cost	Cost per pupil
	Billions	
1954–55	$9.8	$275
1958–59	14.3	350
1962–63	19.5	432

School costs will continue to mount, talks with educators suggest. Government projections indicate 25.4 percent of the 1970 population will be of school age (5–17). That's up slightly from the 1960 school-age rate of 25.2 percent and well above 1950's 20.3 percent level.

"Education costs, I'm afraid, have nowhere to go but up and up some more," says an NEA official.

The increasing concentration of families in urban centers is driving up the expenses of non-Federal governments. Some 70 percent of the population is bunched in towns and cities today, compared with only 64 percent in 1950, Government figures show, and experts foresee no reversal of this trend.

The urban concentration is causing sharp increases in costs of such largely non-Federal services as police, sanitation and firefighting facilities.

"On the farm, there was no need for a big, professional police force or fire department," notes NICB's Mr. Burke. "But in the city, you can't do without them."

HUGE COST OF SERVICES

The Federal Government, of course, maintains some key urban services, such as certain prisons and health facilities. These make up only a fraction of Federal spending, however; as the table below shows, such services are a major expense for State and local authorities. Figures are in billions.

[In billions]

Service	Federal support	State and local support
Police		$2.0
Fire		1.1
Prisons	$0.1	.8
Health and sanitation	1.0	6.1

Non-Federal Government payrolls are expanding much faster than the Federal one. Since 1954, the number of civilians employed by the Federal Government has increased by 5 percent, to about 2.5 million, while the State and local job force has leaped nearly 40 percent, to almost 7 million.

In Government, the increase of non-Federal spending outpaces the rise of State and local tax receipts. In fiscal 1962, State and local tax revenues amounted to about $44 billion, far less than the non-Federal spending total of $62.2 billion. Federal grants in aid and funds from nontax sources helped close the gap.

State and local debt is piling up rapidly. The table below, computed from Government data by the Tax Foundation, shows the climb of per capita public debt at State and local levels, as well as the reduction of per capita Federal debt.

	State	Local	Federal
1946	$18	$102	$2,034
1954	61	185	1,713
1962	118	325	1,630

Above $80 billion for the first time last year, total State and local government debt is now a quarter the size of the Federal debt. In 1950, it was less than a tenth the Federal total.

Official concern is increasing over the pileup of non-Federal debt.

Gov. James Rhodes, of debt-ridden Ohio, for instance, not long ago fired more than 3,000 recently hired State employees, ordered all State departments to cut spending back about 10 percent and requested all State employees to work on Lincoln's and Washington's birthdays.

Many States, at the same time, are considering sharp tax boosts this year.

Before Nebraska's Legislature, for example, are proposals to eliminate some property tax exemptions and institute a personal income tax. Other possibilities facing Nebraska taxpayers: A gas tax boost of up to 8 cents per gallon and a new 2-percent sales tax.

The 47 State legislatures meeting this year are expected to consider measures that would add $1.5 billion to the States' tax bills, the Tax Foundation estimates.

Tax collections in many States would receive an added boost if the Kennedy administration's proposal to reduce Federal tax rates becomes law. In 19 States, Federal tax payments may be deducted from income subject to State taxation. And in many States curbs on personal deductions, proposed by the administration, would mean similar curbs on State tax deductions, without any offsetting cut in State tax rates.

The following table breaks down the major sources of State and local revenues. The percentages are based on Department of Commerce data.

Source of revenue	*Percent of total*
Property tax	33
Sales tax	21
Income tax	5
Vehicle tax	3
Corporation tax	2
Other	36

The most rapidly rising source of State tax revenues: Receipts from taxes levied on tobacco sales, now above the $1 billion mark and twice the 1956 total.

The relentless climb of State and local spending is encountering increased taxpayer opposition in some areas.

Example: Residents of Ridgewood, N.J., one of New York City's wealthiest suburbs, recently rejected school board plans to boost sharply the community's school budget. The voters later approved a school budget scaled down by $151,422.

Despite such taxpayer efforts, however, overall non-Federal governmental spending—and taxes—will surely keep mounting, most experts agree. Expressing the view of many, NICB's Mr. Burke says: "So long as the need for education facilities and for municipal services continues to grow, State and local taxpayers will have to keep digging deeper into their pockets."

[From the Wall Street Journal, Mar. 7, 1963]

WHO NEEDS IT?

The administration's 3-year half-billion-dollar urban mass transit bill, just dispatched to Congress for the second time, would make possible Federal subsidy of public transportation in communities of 2,500 or more.

Yet a recent survey by the Chamber of Commerce of the United States among 2,700 local and State chambers indicates that less than 2 percent approve such a plan. These communities either don't have much of a transit problem or are taking care of it themselves.

So what agitation there is for this sprawling program obviously isn't coming from the grass roots but from a few huge metropolitan centers, such as New York and Philadelphia, where almost everybody will concede transit problems exist. And even some of the major metropolitan complexes aren't looking to Washington for a subsidy. In the San Francisco area, for example, voters have approved a $792 million bond issue to set up a rapid transit rail system.

Now if a few other large cities, with their comparatively ample financial and engineering resources, can't figure out what to do about their own transportation, it's doubtful still another Washington handout will do the trick.

It's also a trifle unreasonable to expect taxpayers of the Nation's thousands of smaller communities to pay for problems big-city politicians have brought on themselves and their long-suffering constituents.

MASS TRANSPORTATION AND THE CHAMBER OF COMMERCE

(Note.—Excerpts from testimony given at hearings on mass transportation bills, S. 6 and S. 917, Senate Committee on Banking and Currency, February 28–March 7, 1963.)

TESTIMONY OF RICHARD SULLIVAN, COMMUTER TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE, GREATER BOSTON CHAMBER OF COMMERCE

Mr. Sullivan. The Greater Boston Chamber of Commerce in the past has suggested and has supported programs relating to the need for balanced transportation facilities in urban areas including Federal aid to mass transportation. We did in fact appear before the subcommittee last year in support of such Federal aid.

The chamber would like to take this opportunity to again urge that action be taken this year by Congress to enact a program of Federal assistance for mass transportation as outlined in S. 6. and S. 917.

* * * * *

Mr. Sullivan. I had been advised that the U.S. Chamber of Commerce is opposing the bill, but I wish to assure you they do not represent the feeling of the Greater Boston Chamber of Commerce in this matter, nor I daresay would they represent the voice of the chamber of commerce on the other major urban cities who are most likely affected by such things.

We are so solidly fixed on the other side, sir, I do not think there is any question. We know that the life of Boston depends upon getting rail rapid transit extensions to extend out beyond their present stubs. Our system was built years ago. It stopped within 5 miles of the city. Now we have to run those extensions out beyond that to at least Route 128, which is the circumferential highway around the city of Boston, and there, with huge parking lots, we should be in a position to afford good coordinated transportation for the people in the Greater Boston area.

Senator Williams. I believe we have had expressions of support for this legislation from other local chambers of commerce.

Senator Sparkman. We had last year I know.

Senator Williams. Yes. New York, Philadelphia, Atlanta, San Francisco, and it is, of course, interesting to us.

TESTIMONY OF GRANT ARNOLD, VICE PRESIDENT, E. J. LAVINO & CO., PHILADELPHIA, PA., ON BEHALF OF THE CHAMBER OF COMMERCE OF THE UNITED STATES

Senator Douglas. Now, may I ask Mr. Arnold: Do you represent the Philadelphia Chamber of Commerce in your statement?

Mr. Arnold. No, I do not, sir. To be truthful——

Senator Douglas. Do you know the attitude of the Philadelphia Chamber of Commerce?

Mr. Arnold. Yes. I was about to say they are supporting this program.

Senator Douglas. They are supporting the Williams bill?

Mr. Arnold. I believe they are; yes sir.

Senator Douglas. That is what I thought. So that you are speaking for the national chamber, not for the local chamber?

Mr. Arnold. That is right.

TESTIMONY OF SENATOR RIBICOFF

Senator Ribicoff. But in all due respect to the United States Chamber of Commerce, who sits here in Washington and makes its pronunciamentos, you talk to the chambers of commerce strung along the rights-of-way of every urban area and I think you would find a completely different attitude as to whether this is or is not needed.

I would be willing to try to see what the chambers of commerce strung along the New Haven Railroad's right-of-way would say as to whether this was or was not needed. Or along the New Jersey.

Yet all these chambers of commerce are members of the United States Chamber of Commerce.

I do not think the position of the United States Chamber of Commerce always reflects the thinking of their individual memberships. They too are bureaucratic, and it is a bureaucracy in Washington that sometimes does their thinking for them and not the thinking of the local groups that may be scattered across the width and breadth and byways and highways of our own Nation.

TESTIMONY OF JAMES M. SYMES, CHAIRMAN OF THE BOARD AND CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER, PENNSYLVANIA RAILROAD CO.

Mr. Symes. The other thing I would like to comment on is the testimony that was presented by the United States Chamber of Commerce, I believe last week, before this committee.

The chamber is apparently not concerned with the public interest but, rather with biased actions which appear to be dictated primarily by certain self-centered interests.

The chamber has been most inconsistent in the implementation of its transportation policies. Some of its basic policies are logical, such as equality of treatment for competitive modes of transportation, an application of user charges to cover the costs of publicly provided transport facilities.

If the chamber believes in equality of treatment as it alleges, then this urban mass transportation legislation represents a principle which the chamber should have supported in an attempt to provide a small measure of equality in the transport picture.

The chamber has contended that the problem of urban transportation is primarily local in nature. By so doing it ignores the fact that other Federal expenditures and actions have created transportation problems particularly in our urban areas.

The Conference on Freeways and the Urban Setting, sponsored by the Automotive Safety Foundation, in Hershey, Pa., in June of 1962, reported that the highway program being carried out under the Federal Highway Act of 1956 constitutes the largest form of Federal assistance to urban development.

In this area the Federal Government has intervened extensively in local affairs, and in connection with other subsidies has created the urban mass transportation problem.

Yet there has been no campaign by the United States Chamber to oppose Federal financing of highways in the urban areas, even though radial highways and especially those designed with multiple lanes to carry large peak-hour commuter loads are obviously a local matter.

Helicopter air services duplicating surface transportation in urban areas, and between airports, are also local matters.

The chamber has not opposed the Federal subsidy granted these carriers in the local areas of New York, Chicago and Los Angeles, much less waged any extensive campaign against these subsidies.

Furthermore, the chamber has never opposed the billion dollar a year subsidy to aviation which helped create a problem for the railroads handling large commuter loads.

The proposed urban mass transportation bill would provide funds only to public bodies, not to private bodies, not to private corporations, and the public would benefit. However, helicopters, airlines, bus companies, truckers and commuting motorists in local areas are receiving similar but more extensive aid, and this is for their personal benefit.

There is, therefore, a very important principle involved, and I hope from the facts that other witnesses and I have presented at these hearings that you recognize that this is more than just a local problem.

Senator WILLIAMS. Well, we emphasize the fact that this is U.S. Chamber inconsistency. But down at the local level we have had strong and increasing support from the local chambers of commerce speaking from the communities where the problem is.

So where the problem is, people are for this bill. And the national group just did not seem to pipe in very clearly. They had a survey. No mandatory requirement that the individual members reply. And on that survey where the replies were very spotty they launched this conclusion which you have certainly——

Mr. SYMES. I was asked this morning before the House whether I thought because of what this one Congressman thought might be a limited number of people that would benefit whether or not it should be done nationally. And I said it is a national problem because all of the people of this country are going to benefit whether they use this service or not, because if they do not they are going to have to put up tax dollars which they otherwise would not have to do if your bill goes through.

[From the Pittsburgh (Pa.) Press, Jan. 18, 1963]

CHAMBER VOTE BACKS TRANSIT LEGISLATION

(By William Allan)

The Greater Pittsburgh Chamber of Commerce backs the proposed mass transit legislation, now before Congress.

Chamber board members favoring the Federal legislation fought and won on the basis that mass transit right now is the Greater Pittsburgh area's No. 1 problem and it cannot be solved without Federal aid.

Its officers right now strongly favor the Federal legislation and are in close contact with Washington in connection with aid.

It is no secret here that financing is the big drawback to the port authority's plan to acquire and integrate into one system the 30-odd mass transits operating in the county.

Federal aid, therefore, could be the key which unlocks the problem.

LETTER TO SENATOR WILLIAMS, FEBRUARY 1, 1963, FROM THE COMMERCE & INDUSTRY ASSOCIATION OF NEW YORK

The board of directors of Commerce & Industry Association, the largest service chamber of commerce in the East, and recognized as the voice of New York business, last year adopted a policy position based on recommendation of its commuter transportation committee, in support of Federal legislation to provide assistance for the development of mass transportation systems in urban areas. We are thus able to give such support as may be helpful during this session of Congress toward enactment of S. 6.

STATEMENT OF GERALD T. HORTON, DIRECTOR OF RESEARCH, ATLANTA CHAMBER OF COMMERCE, TO HOUSE COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY IN HEARINGS ON MASS TRANSPORTATION LEGISLATION, 1963

I represent the Atlanta Chamber of Commerce, the organization of the business and economic interests of our city. The Atlanta chamber established a rapid transit committee in 1960 and since that time it has actively pursued the construction of a mass transportation system. We have a six-point program of work for the chamber and the establishment of a rapid transit system is one of those six points.

The members of that committee have investigated all manner of rapid transit systems and the means for financing their construction. It is the considered opinion of the committee that Federal assistance will be needed if Atlanta is to have a rapid transit system and still carry out its local functions of building schools, sewers, local thoroughfares, and the many other projects that demand the local tax dollars.

DISPOSITION OF GOVERNMENT-HELD STOCK OF GENERAL ANILINE & FILM CORP.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, on March 3, Attorney General Robert F. Kennedy announced that the Department of Justice had secured an agreement in principle with Interhandel, a Swiss holding company, which would allow the Attorney General, without further litigation, to sell the Government-held stock of the General Aniline and Film Corp.

Should this agreement be approved by the Interhandel stockholders and by the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia, a competitive sale of the stock authorized by legislation last year will go forward promptly. There will thus be concluded perhaps the most complex and extensive litigation in which the Federal Government has ever participated.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that two editorials commenting on this settlement be printed at the conclusion of my remarks. One editorial comes from the Washington Post-Times Herald for March 5; the other from the western edition of the New York Times for March 6. Both editorials concentrate wisely on the major factors involved in this settlement. They note that the competitive position of the General Aniline and Film Corp. is vastly improved by the announcement of this settlement; that their ability to compete within the framework of the free enterprise system is now fully guaranteed for the first time since World War II. They note that the entire procedure of disposing of the stock of the firm will be subjected to the most strict overseeing by both the Department of Justice and by the courts. They note that the Federal Government will be quickly withdrawn from the operation of a commercial enterprise, and they might have noted that the Attorney General has expressed due concern that payments to the Swiss firm will be conducted in such a manner that the U.S. balance of payments will not be adversely affected.

Certainly these factors are of major concern to the Federal Government and to the American people.

As a lawyer, I am aware that any out-of-court settlement is subject to conflicting evaluations. But as a lawyer, I also subscribe to the view that all the facts in any dispute should be known intimately before one is competent to comment meaningfully on them.

I hope that if this settlement is to be the subject of further discussion by those in or out of Government that the settlement's broad impact on our economy will be duly noted, and that due regard will be paid to all the many complexities of this suit.

In short, the settlement, like many other settlements, should be subject to the closest critical inspection, but its intimate involvement in the national interest requires that that inspection be conducted on the most informed and statesmanlike basis.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times western edition, Mar. 6, 1963]

BACK TO THE PUBLIC

The agreement permitting the public sale of General Aniline & Film Corp., which was seized as enemy property in 1942, has been so long in the making that it seemed as if it would never materialize. But the Justice Department has at last come to terms with Interhandel (the Swiss holding company that claims ownership of General Aniline) in order to get the U.S. Government out of the business of managing a private enterprise.

There may still be considerable dispute over the disposition of the proceeds of the sale, but the Justice Department has provided sufficient safeguards to protect American interests. It has arranged that Interhandel must defend and pay on any claims upheld in the courts. The company will be sold only to Americans.

General Aniline will now go where it belongs—into the hands of private owners. While the company has made money under Government control, its board of directors has been something of a sinecure for politicians, and its management has not had an opportunity to diversify or grow as rapidly as its private competitors. In selling General Aniline to the public, the Government will be acquiring cash and will also be giving the company a chance to prosper in a free competitive atmosphere.

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald, Mar. 5, 1963]

ENDING A LAWSUIT

The litigation involving the General Aniline and Film Corp. might have been disposed of in any one of at least three different ways. The Justice Department could have sold the company and settled the claims of the Swiss holding company Interhandel in subsequent litigation. It could have continued the company under Government ownership and let the litigation drag on. Or it could have taken the method announced Monday—the sale of the company to a private bidder with an out-of-court agreement on the distribution of the sale price.

The Justice Department has taken the course that is the most hazardous politically. Any out-of-court settlement of litigation involves matters of judgment on which authorities are bound to differ and the Justice Department never will be able to prove that it made a better settlement than it could have reached in court. Its critics will have the advantage of comparing the real out-of-court settlement with a conjectural settlement in court as advantageous to this country as their own imaginations will allow. Why did it take the course that is most dangerous politically?

For one thing, either other course probably would have involved the Government in litigation lasting years or even decades. While it lasted, the company would have been inhibited in its own plans for expansion and development, if the Government had retained control. It might not have been entirely free to proceed while any legal cloud rested upon its ownership, if the Government sold the company in advance of settlement.

The out-of-court settlement, it is said, is on terms more favorable than those hitherto obtainable. It has the virtue of cleaning up the long litigation surely and swiftly. It has the advantage of freeing the company for successful operation under new American private ownership, determined by sealed competitive bidding, and subject to the approval and confirmation of the courts.

The Justice Department also can cite the first rule of the law—a poor settlement is better than a good lawsuit.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KENNEDY in the chair). Is there any further morning business? If not, morning business is closed.

OUTDOOR RECREATION

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar Order No. 6, S. 20.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 20) to promote the coordination and development of effective Federal and State programs relating to outdoor recreation, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Minnesota.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, with amendments, on page 2, line 10, after the word "United", to strike out "States, including to the extent practicable the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, Guam, and American Samoa" and insert "States"; on page 3, line 10, after the word "and"; to insert "private interests including"; in line 18, after the word "such", to strike out "purposes without regard to the limitations of section 3648 of the Revised Statutes (31 U.S.C. 529) concerning advantages of funds when he considers such action in the public interest;" and insert "purposes"; and on page 4, after line 16, to insert a new section, as follows:

SEC. 3. The term "United States" as used in this Act shall include the District of Columbia; and, to the extent practicable in carrying out the provisions of this Act, the terms "United States" and "States" may include the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, Guam, and American Samoa.

So as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States in Congress assembled, That the Congress finds and declares that the general welfare of the Nation requires that all American people of present and future generations shall be assured such quantity and quality of outdoor recreation resources as are necessary and desirable, and that prompt and coordinated action is required by all levels of government and by private interests on a nationwide basis to conserve, develop, and utilize such resources for the benefit and enjoyment of the American people.

SEC. 2. In order to carry out the purposes of this Act, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized, after consultation with the Recreation Advisory Council and with the heads of Federal departments and agencies concerned, to perform the following functions and activities:

(a) INVENTORY.—Prepare and maintain a continuing inventory and evaluation of outdoor recreation needs and resources of the United States.

(b) CLASSIFICATION.—Prepare a system for classification of outdoor recreation resources to assist in the effective and beneficial use and management of such resources.

(c) NATIONWIDE PLAN.—Formulate and maintain a comprehensive nationwide outdoor recreation plan, taking into consideration the plans of the various Federal agencies, States, and their political subdivisions. The plan shall set forth the needs and demands of the public for outdoor recreation and the current and foreseeable availability in the future of outdoor recreation resources to meet those needs. The plan shall identify critical outdoor recreation problems, recommend solutions, and identify the desirable actions to be taken at each level of government and by private interests.

The Secretary shall transmit the initial plan, which shall be prepared as soon as practicable within five years hereafter, to the President for transmittal to the Congress. Future revisions of the plan shall be similarly transmitted at succeeding five-year intervals. When a plan or revision is transmitted to the Congress, the Secretary shall transmit copies to the Governors of the several States.

(d) TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE.—Provide technical assistance and advice to and cooperate with States, political subdivisions, and private interests including nonprofit organizations with respect to outdoor recreation.

(e) REGIONAL COOPERATION.—Encourage interstate and regional cooperation in the planning, acquisition, and development of outdoor recreation resources.

(f) RESEARCH AND EDUCATION.—(1) Sponsor, engage in, and assist in research relating to outdoor recreation, directly or by contract or cooperative agreements, and make payments for such purposes; (2) undertake studies and assemble information concerning outdoor recreation, directly or by contract or cooperative agreement, and disseminate such information without regard to the provisions of section 321n, title 39, United States Code; and (3) cooperate with educational institutions and others in order to assist in establishing education programs and activities and to encourage public use and benefits from outdoor recreation.

(g) INTERDEPARTMENTAL COOPERATION.—(1) Cooperate with and provide technical assistance to Federal departments and agencies and obtain from them information, data, reports, advice, and assistance that are needed and can reasonably be furnished in carrying out the purposes of this Act; and (2) promote coordination of Federal plans and activities generally relating to outdoor recreation. Any department or agency furnishing advice or assistance hereunder may expend its own funds for such purposes, with or without reimbursement, as may be agreed to by that agency.

(h) DONATIONS.—Accept and use donations of money, property, personal services, or facilities for the purposes of this Act.

SEC. 3. The term "United States" as used in this Act shall include the District of Columbia; and, to the extent practicable in carrying out the provisions of this Act, the terms "United States" and "States" may include the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, Guam, and American Samoa.

SOUND FISCAL POLICIES

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, for the first time in many moons a President of the United States has recommended a tax cut. And he says it should have the characteristics of a mountain and not a mouse. What a pleasure it would give me to vote to lighten the far too heavy tax load, provided I could do so with a clear conscience. But I feel that if all of the spending schemes recommended by the President are implemented we shall have a deficit of $10 to $12 billion without a tax cut. I could not with a clear conscience vote to impose a $10 billion tax cut on top of a deficit of those proportions.

Since the President has abandoned the proposal of the Treasury Department to accompany a tax cut with an increase on certain individuals and corporations totaling more than $3 billion—sometimes pleasingly referred to as a tax reform—at least it seemed that he had abandoned it, until yesterday, when the President made a statement indicating that he would still like to have the reforms—there are many well-informed observers of political trends who confidently predict that before adjournment this Congress will pass the type of tax cut recommended by the President. It therefore behooves all Members of the Congress who believe in economy and the preservation of a stable dollar to give careful consideration to the need for a reduction in the proposed spending program.

In 1932, I was elected to the House of Representatives on a platform which bitterly criticized the extravagance of the previous administration and pledged the Democratic Party to a reduction of 25 percent in Federal spending. As a freshman Member of the House one of my first votes was to cut my own pay and that of all Government employees. During the intervening years, upon seeing a complete reversal of the philosophy on which I was first elected to the Congress and to which I have since adhered as faithfully as any Member of the Congress, I have been well aware of what old Ulysses meant when, returning from foreign travels, he said, "Many things have I seen—a part of which I was."

Not because I believed in high taxes but because I was terribly opposed to the deficit being created by spending which I could not stop, I helped to write 12 tax bills during a service of 10 years on the Ways and Means Committee, each of which was higher than the preceding one and the last of which, with respect to income taxes, is still the law. However, I can take some pride in the fact that as burdensome as those income tax rates are, they are not nearly so burdensome as they would have been had we followed the insistence of the then Secretary of the Treasury Henry Morgenthau. He advocated an income tax bill that would increase the burden on the middle and higher incomes by $8 billion and leave practically untouched the then average salary of industrial workers.

Realizing that wage earners in the middle income brackets, to say nothing of those in the low brackets who had never paid income taxes, would never save enough out of current earnings to meet the heavy tax bill that would be presented to them in March of the following year, I sponsored the pay-as-you-go provision. Under that provision all the normal tax due after exemptions and deductions would be withheld at the source from those who were not self-employed.

And realizing how difficult it would be for those who had never filed tax returns before to fill out the complicated form then being used, I sponsored the provision for a very short form. In order to provide for that form, I proposed and the Congress adopted, a uniform exemption for spouse and dependent children and a 10-percent deduction for gifts to charity if the taxpayer did not desire to enumerate such gifts.

I refer to this legislative history to emphasize two pertinent facts:

First. No one is more familiar than I with the history of tax legislation during the past 30 years, because, as I have said, "A part of which I was."

Second. I have consistently opposed pump priming and deficit financing. I have continued to support the heavy burden of income taxes, originally imposed to finance World War II, only because I thought that in the long run higher taxes would cause less hardship upon the people of the great State I represented and of the Nation at large than the galloping inflation which undoubtedly would have resulted had we continued to spend regardless of the deficits being created.

As I indicated in brief remarks to the Senate on February 28 on the proposal to fix the debt ceiling at $308 billion, the spend and spend, elect and elect philosophy of the late Harry Hopkins was actually inaugurated with a $4,880 million relief and recovery bill in 1935. At that time we embarked upon a trial of what has later been known as the "pump priming" theory. The pump priming theory is based upon the assumption that an increase in Government spending will automatically increase prosperity. At the time the theory was adopted during the depression of the thirties, we heard little about the gross national product and nothing about the sine qua non of a growth rate in the gross national product in excess of 3 percent per year. The first pump priming was designed primarily to make jobs for the unemployed, which some unkind critics called "leaf raking."

If we learn anything from history—and Edmund Burke said nations never do—we defintely know that the pump priming theory was a failure. Our real recovery from the terrible depression of the thirties did not start until we started spending in 1940 for military hardware—what might be called durable goods—in anticipation that we might become involved in the war then raging in Western Europe.

Of course, when we entered that war we made—as we should have made—an all-out effort to win it. The Congress appropriated so much money for the President to spend in winning the war that at the end of the war the Secretary of the Treasury had on hand an embarrassing surplus. The surplus was, of course, properly applied to a reduction of the war debt that had been incurred.

But there were other inflationary factors in the Second World War besides deficit financing. An unprecedented number of workers were withdrawn from civilian production for military service, leaving an acute labor shortage. The demand of our allies upon our steel, oil, and other basic resources was so great that home building was stopped, the production of automobiles for civilian use was reduced to a trickle, and the consumption of gasoline for pleasure travel was virtually prohibited.

In other words, the full employment and great prosperity generated by the war effort that started in 1940 and continued for some years after the end of that war proved a great economic truth—certain types of public spending result in creating new jobs and others do not.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield on that point?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I yield.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I am delighted that the Senator is delivering this speech today. It is one which should be made. It is very important that an outstanding Senator like the Senator from Virginia, the chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency, should speak his strong convictions on economy in Government.

The point which the Senator has made about spending can also be made in terms of quantity as well as quality. The Senator is correct in highlighting the quality of spending, as to the kind of spending involved. But is it not also true that the deficits in the 1930's, though enormous in terms of the gross national product at that time, would be equivalent to about $20 billion a year today, and were wholly dwarfed by the fantastic deficits in the period of the war, which would be equivalent to about $100 billion a year? Obviously, when one considers such fantastic deficits as those we had in 1942, 1943, and 1944—the years in which the deficits were so enormous—he realizes that, of course, there was a stimulation of the economy.

The Senator from Virginia is absolutely correct. There was a stimulation of the economy because of the quality of spending, spending of a different kind from that being now considered. To derive, from what happened in the war experience, a conclusion to prove that all we have to do to solve the problems of the moment is to run a deficit and spend more money, would mean talking about a deficit figure in the area of $100 billion, in the first instance; and, secondly, of a quality of spending quite different from the kind being discussed today.

Mr. ROBERTSON. The Senator from Wisconsin is absolutely correct. First we must consider the quality of spending. As I tried to point out, not until there was spending for what were in effect durable goods was there a significant effect.

Secondly we must consider the quantity of spending. The gross national product at that time was only about one-third of what it is now. One would have to multiply the spending now three or four times to get the effect which then took place.

Our gross national product is now approximately $555 billion and still rising. I recall that some economists, in the midst of the depression, estimated that the entire wealth of our Nation was only $300 billion. That shows the great difference.

The Senator is quite correct. One cannot draw an inference from prosperity which resulted from huge wartime deficit spending, and reach the conclusion that a possible $10 billion, $15 billion or $20 billion deficit now, will guarantee full empoyment and be an answer to what in some sections of the country is chronic unemployment.

Mr. President, with that truth, as Senator PROXMIRE and I have explained it, I challenge what may be called the Walter Reuther theory that a $10 billion tax cut geared primarily to those in the low income brackets and superimposed upon a larger spending public program than that advocated by the President will automatically relieve the problem of unemployment.

The theory of Dr. Heller and other Presidential advisers, that without the tax cut we shall have a serious recession, has apparently been largely abandoned. In its place we find a new theory that an automatic growth of the gross national product in excess of 3 percent a year is a categorical imperative. I likewise challenge that theory.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I am pleased to yield to my friend, the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I have in my hand a booklet carrying the proceedings which were had last November by the fiscal and monetary policy committee gathered to give advice to the President on how our fiscal and monetary affairs should be run. This was the President's Advisory Committee on Labor-Management Policy.

Mr. Heller was one the principal participants.

In the booklet, on page 77, there appear the figures for the fiscal situation in 1961 actually, in 1962 actually, and the estimate for 1963. The deficit in 1961, according to the report, was $3.9 billion. In 1962 the deficit was $6.3 billion. Next is the significant figure. It is that the surplus for the fiscal year 1963 was estimated to be $500 million.

Mr. ROBERTSON. The Senator is correct.

Mr. LAUSCHE. That is the estimate which was made. What is the actual fact?

Mr. ROBERTSON. The actual fact is that the deficit will be more than $8 billion. Dr. Heller, who advised the President to make that report, missed his guess as to the gross national product by more than $20 billion. That is why he became so concerned about giving a booster to the gross national product. It had not moved up as fast as he predicted it should move, and therefore everything had gone helter-skelter.

Mr. LAUSCHE. He was one of the participants at the conference, and a rather active one.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Yes. I remember the position held by Dr. Heller when he and I first started writing tax laws before World War II. He was a very able economist at the Department of the Treasury at that time. I would say he then had his feet on the ground. I do not know where his feet are now, but I sometimes think his head is in the clouds.

Mr. LAUSCHE. It was estimated that by June 30, 1963, there would be a $500 million surplus for this fiscal year, but, instead, there will be a deficit of how much?

Mr. ROBERTSON. $8 billion, as well as we can now estimate. I think that is the official estimate.

Mr. LAUSCHE. So they missed the figure by $8 billion. Does the $8 billion estimated deficit include the additional deficit that will come if the President's tax reduction is carried into effect?

Mr. ROBERTSON. Not unless the tax reduction applies to some part of fiscal 1963. I am not too sure when they want the tax cut to apply, but I did not understand that much, if any, of it was to be retroactive.

Mr. LAUSCHE. It will apply primarily in the next fiscal year. It was originally intended to apply for the first 6 months of this year.

Mr. ROBERTSON. That is correct.

Mr. LAUSCHE. So if the bill is passed and it is to apply to a part of this fiscal year, the amount lost as a result of the tax reduction will have to be added to the $8 billion.

Mr. ROBERTSON. That is correct.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Now I should like to point out another important aspect of this conference. There must have been 150 participants in it, many labor leaders, some businessmen, some bankers.

When the conference assembled, after some discussion, they broke into panels or roundtables.

I am directing the Senator's attention to two panels, especially, one led by a Dr. Rees and another led by Dr. Colm.

When these two panels reported back, the one led by Dr. Rees, chairman of the Department of Economics of the University of Chicago, it was stated by Dr. Rees, speaking to the assembly:

> Our group spent part of the afternoon discussing monetary policy. We were fortunate to have in the group several representatives of banking institutions. The discussion of monetary policy was perhaps somewhat more restricted to certain members of the group than the discussion of fiscal policy had been in the morning session. I will say, first, that those who were informed on the subject felt that the so-called twist policy, the policy of keeping long-term rates relatively low and short-term rates relatively high, was a desirable policy and that it had been possible to carry it out to a substantial extent.
>
> It was also pointed out that there had been a substantial growth in bank credit over the past year, but that almost all of it had taken the form of increases in time and savings deposits, rather than in the form of demand deposits. This was considered to be related to the increase in interest rates permitted on time deposits.

I am coming to the crucial part of it now:

> There was quite some concern in the group that if we do get a tax cut, which has been promised, and which all groups have urged, the effects of the tax cut on the economy should not be negated by a tightening of monetary policy. There was very considerable agreement on this.
>
> We recognize that the tax cut has to be financed—

Listen to this:

> we recognize that the tax cut has to be financed, that one of the initial impacts of the financing of a tax cut or an increased deficit might be some upward movement in interest rates. But the feeling was that this upward movement in interest rates should be restrained, and in effect, the tax cut should be largely financed through the creation of additional money rather than through pulling money away from other uses.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, that raises a very serious economic problem. If we have a deficit of $18, $20, or $22 billion, by imposing a $10 billion tax cut upon a deficit which, I think, if we implemented all the spending schemes proposed, will be $10 or $12 billion, somebody will have to buy those bonds.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Who is going to buy them? That is the question.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Well, if the commercial banks buy them, they could theoretically extend $6 or $7 in credit for each dollar of bonds they buy. That would be inflationary. But the Federal Reserve Board, which is responsible for maintaining the stability of our dollar, might turn around and increase the Federal Reserve requirements, which would cut down on what the banks could lend, and this would increase interest rates.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Dr. Rees reported that his Panel had concluded the tax cut deficit should be financed through the creation of additional money. Does not that mean printing-press money, in effect?

Mr. ROBERTSON. Yes. In that regard, I have been invited to have lunch with the Finance Minister of Brazil. The Brazilians are going to entertain the Secretary of State and the Secretary of the Treasury. Because I was in Brazil and looked into the fiscal and monetary problems in Brazil, they invited me to the luncheon. I have read in the papers that they want new credit of $400 to $500 million.

Brazil has been having problems with inflation. Brazil has been financing one-half of its expenditures with printing-press money. The Government of Brazil owns and controls the Bank of Brazil. The Government gives the Bank of Brazil an I O U, and the bank employs a firm in America to print their money on the basis of these I O U's. This method of making money is all too easy. So more and more money is printed and the prices in Brazil go up and up.

The result is that a bank in Brazil will not ordinarily lend anyone money for more than 1 month. The going interest rate is from 25 to 35 percent a year. In other words, we have an illustration of what happens when a country resorts to printing press money. Brazil is a country whose land area is greater than ours, whose population is one-fourth of the entire population of Latin America, a country which is the largest producer of coffee in the world, and the second largest producer of cocoa, a land which has one of the largest known iron ore reserves, a land which has inexhaustible resources of timber, a land with such a varied climate that it can produce any kind of agriculture—and yet what has happened? Brazil is faced with a runaway inflation. Let us be frank about it. I do not want to see that happen to this country.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, in fairness, I point out that, when Secretary Dillon made his presentation, he said these deficit bonds should be bought by the public, but if there is a $20 billion deficit one year and another one of that type the second year, and if the public does not buy the bonds, then the banks and the Federal Reserve will have to buy them. When that is done we, in effect, have printing-press money.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I have said that I anticipate we are going to have a tax cut, and, if we had it, I thought it would soften the inflationary impact if we cut some of the spending programs.

There will be plenty of time, before we finally act, to discuss the issue of who is going to buy the bonds, whether the Federal Reserve Board is going to raise the interest rates, and whether or not the Federal Reserve Board is going to "print" the money. Those issues will come up, although they are not essential to the discussion I am undertaking today.

All that I am trying to say now is that if we are going to have a tax cut—and it is likely that we will have one—we ought to cut spending to some extent. I will indicate where I believe $6 billion could be trimmed.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Yes. To return to Dr. Colm and the roundtable group. Dr. Colm is the chief economist of the National Planning Association. He reported back that the members of his panel got into an argument as to who will buy the bonds. He makes this statement:

> Toward the end we got a sort of 99-percent agreement when I think the latter group agreed, at least one of them—the other kept quiet—that bank financing might be tolerated, if necessary, as an interim measure if, then, out of the growing gross national product, income, and increased profits, more savings funds would be forthcoming so that in the long run the financing could be shifted entirely to private savings. That was a discussion from this particular panel which I found very interesting.

In this panel they argued that the banks should not be made to buy the bonds out of their current fluid assets, but that the bonds should be bought by the Federal Reserve, and that the Federal Reserve requirements on banks be lessened. In my opinion that again would lead to what I call printing-press money.

Mr. ROBERTSON. That process is bound to be inflationary, because we must remember that a currency is sound, whether geared to gold or not, as long as money is issued solely with reference to the money-work to be done, that is, the production it finances. If we greatly increase that supply of money artificially without any relation to the money-work that is to be done, it is like having goods in a warehouse and issuing tickets, and providing that five tickets, let us say, will get out a pair of shoes. If we double the number of tickets, then it will take 10 tickets to get a pair of shoes out. It is as simple as that. That is what happens if we flood the country with money without relation to the money-work to be done.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I commend the Senator from Virginia for his presentation. I may vote for a tax cut, but it must be accompanied by a reduction in expenditures. I will go along with the Senator from Virginia in his efforts to reduce the expenditures.

Mr. ROBERTSON. The Senator from Virginia has not yet announced that he is in favor of a tax cut, but he has said that if we are going to have one—and apparently we will have one—then we should cut spending first.

Of course when we get down to the question of who is to buy the bonds, and what action the Federal Reserve Board is to take, that will give an opportunity for more speeches on this subject.

I now return to the text of my speech.

To be sure, I am not unmindful of the problem of unemployment. I am concerned to see it solved, although I do not think that boys who drop out of high school, housewives who have never had and do not want full employment, and certain others who have become firmly wedded to rocking-chair money, should be included with the chronically unemployed such as we have in the coal mining fields of southwest Virginia and elsewhere in the Nation. More than that, I fear that many who blithely talk about the growth rate of the gross national product do not clearly understand what the gross national product means.

The gross national product represents the total national output of goods and services measured in current market prices. The Nation's annual output is expressed through the GNP in terms of the expenditures by which the goods that have been produced are acquired. Expenditures are classified under four major headings:

First, personal consumption expenditures; second, gross private domestic investment; third, net exports of goods and services; and, fourth, Government purchases of goods and services.

By and large, the goods and services included in the GNP, with the exception of net changes in inventories, are actually bought for final use in legal markets. Thus, intermediate products are excluded, and double counting of the value of products is avoided. The gross national product does contain a number of imputed items, that is, items not in fact sold in markets but evaluated as if so sold. The most important of these is the imputed rental value of owner-occupied dwellings. Also, some elements of production are omitted from the gross national product because of the difficulty of imputing a market value.

A familiar example is the omission of the value of the services of housewives. Thus, if a man marries his housekeeper, this is a reduction in the gross national product.

To turn to the components of the gross national product, personal consumption expenditures measure the sum of money plus the imputed expenditures made by consumers—individuals, nonprofit institutions such as hospitals, and so forth—for goods and services. Such expenditures are subclassified into durables, nondurables, and services. "Durable goods" are those items which generally last 3 years or longer in use. "Nondurable goods" are tangible commodities with a shorter life. "Services" include housing, telephone, electricity, shoe repair, gas and water, and also such expenses as those of handling insurance and banking services. "Net exports of goods and services" measures the net contribution of foreigners to the purchase of the U.S. output for a given period. It is estimated by evaluating "exports" of goods and services—that is, the domestic output which is sold abroad, plus the production abroad which is credited to resources owned by the United States—and subtracting "imports"—that is, U.S. purchases of foreign output plus production in the United States credited to foreign-owned resources, plus net private cash remittances to other countries. The rationale of the concept of net exports of goods and services is that such expenditures represent a part of the gross demand for U.S. production.

Only Government purchases representing current productive activity are included in the gross national product. Transfer payments—social security, veterans' payments, and so forth—are excluded. Moreover, Government purchases of goods and services in the gross national product accounts differ from Government expenditures as they appear in the Federal budget. Some items in the gross national product do not appear in the Federal budget. Also, appropriations in the Federal budget may not generate expenditures that are recorded in the gross national product accounts in the same year as appropriated.

The gross national product is described as "gross" because it includes expenditures for the replacement of the Nation's tangible reproducible capital. Net national product subtracts from gross national product the amount of replacement of capital. Approximately one-eleventh of the gross national product is devoted to replacement.

The following are the components of the gross national product:

Personal consumption expenditures: durable goods, nondurable goods, and services.

Gross private domestic investment: new construction—residential nonfarm and other business construction—producers durable equipment, and change in business inventories.

Net exports of goods and services.

Government purchases of goods and services: Federal, State, and local.

Suffice it to say, the formula of the GNP is so complicated that the average layman cannot understand it. Even our best economists admit that the formula is not a perfect measuring rod of national production, though they claim it is the best measuring rod which up to this time they have been able to devise.

But the limitations of the GNP concept are vitally important to keep in mind in setting budget and tax policy. To illustrate what a poor measuring rod the GNP may be in reflecting employment levels, we may take the case of Trinidad. I learned last October in Trinidad that the growth rate of the GNP for that island had been 10 percent a year for the past 2 years, yet the current rate of unemployment was 20 percent. The explanation, of course, was the tremendous expansion during the past 2 years in the output of oil and asphalt which was accomplished with few additional workers.

The lesson of Trinidad applies to us. For example, the output of domestic oil companies, operating in Texas, for instance, could be increased 300 percent with present equipment and very few additional workers. And this is only one of many examples in which GNP growth need not mean employment expansion.

Not only is the tax program based on such new untried theories as that of the Heller growth rate. The proposal to embark upon what I consider to be a permanent program of deficit financing involves also the repudiation of a number of early American concepts. They include what has recently been termed the Puritan ethic of living within one's means, and the constitutional concept of leaving to the States and the people thereof all functions which they can better discharge than the Federal Government. And last, but by no means least, the new spending programs of the budget represent a serious inroad upon the American concept of the system of private enterprise.

The threat to our American system of continued increases in Federal spending is gradual, but therefore all the more important to reflect upon and combat with determination. Our Nation, as the life history of nations go, is a very young nation. The city-state of Athens, in which the population—exclusive of slaves—was less than the District of Columbia, dominated a large section of the Hellenic world for several hundred years, during which time it produced some of the world's greatest philosophers and some of the world's greatest artists. Fewer Italians lived in Rome in the days of Julius Caesar than we have in New York City today, but Rome dominated the great area conquered by Caesar for some 400 years after his assassination. In contrast, the first Congress of the United States of America convened in 1789, only 174 years ago. In the relatively brief span of less than two centuries we have become not only the most powerful nation in the world but likewise the richest and the freest; and if we are not the happiest nation in the world, it is our own fault.

Throughout the major part of the development from 13 weak and struggling colonies with a population of 3 million people to 50 proud and sovereign States with a population of more than 185 million, our economy has been based upon a system of free competitive enterprise—more frequently called private enterprise—which was firmly imbedded in the Philadelphia Constitution of 1787. Certain of the ratifying States—notably the two largest, Virginia and New York—to make that fundamental principle secure for all time to come, insisted on an amendment to the Constitution, now known as the 10th amendment which provided that all powers not delegated to the Federal Government nor prohibited to the States should be "reserved to the States respectively or to the people."

In recent years every branch of the Federal Government has openly and unblushingly violated that fundamental provision of the Constitution. President Roosevelt threatened to pack the Supreme Court when it held that both NRA and the law imposing a processing tax on wheat for distribution to farmers violated the 10th amendment. The following year the Supreme Court, in the case of Helvering against Davis, abolished the 10th amendment so far as Federal spending was concerned. In doing so, it not only authorized the Congress to incur terrific deficits for any type of spending it chose, but also made implicit in many of those spending schemes a radical departure from the fundamental concept of private enterprise.

No good purpose will be served by indicating at this time the clear intent of those who framed the Constitution and those who ratified it that the general welfare clause was to be a limitation upon the powers expressly delegated by the Constitution to the Federal Government. Suffice it to say that the Congress can now spend for anything it pleases and does not even have to resort to the previous hocus-pocus of a preamble saying the sugarplums proposed to be distributed are for the general welfare. That brings me to the current problem confronting us. We are told that:

First. The gross national product is not rising fast enough.

Second. A faster rate of growth will increase prosperity and economic employment.

Third. A tax cut without any reduction in spending is the most vital domestic need of our Nation today.

It is not clear that a tax cut without spending reductions will increase the growth rate of the GNP; economists appearing before the Joint Economic Committee already have expressed their doubts as to the numerical value and timing of so-called "multiplier" and "accelerator" effects that are supposed to bring this about. Moreover, it is not clear that a faster rate of growth in the GNP total, even if achieved, would in itself solve our unemployment. Therefore, if tax cuts are desirable for their impact on business and consumer incentives, I am convinced they should be enacted only with corresponding reductions in spending that also enhance incentives by restoring confidence in the soundness of our fiscal policy on the part of business investors in durable goods, which themselves generate jobs, income, and prosperity.

Let us therefore turn to the budget for fiscal 1964 and carefully examine its spending proposals. In a year with no recession and no shooting war, the fiscal 1964 budget proposes the expenditure of an alltime high of $98.8 billion and seeks new spending authority totaling $107.8 billion. Personnel increases projected in the 1964 budget in nondefense agencies total 47,000 people.

I digress to point out what an increase in Federal employment of 47,000 persons means. That is equivalent to adding each year to the Federal payroll the population of a city the size of Lynchburg, Va., in which I lived when I was a boy. And assuming that each worker can support three people on the salary he receives, it means a county as big as Arlington County, which adjoins the District of Columbia.

When we talk about 47,000 persons being added to the Federal payroll in one single year, we do not realize what a burden we are loading upon the taxpayers. Perhaps they could conceive its meaning better if we said we would support everyone in Arlington County with the taxpayers' money from now on.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Virginia yield?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I yield.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The Senator from Virginia is talking about the 1964 budget, is he not?

Mr. ROBERTSON. That is correct.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Is it not true that the only department of the Federal Government which will not increase the number of its employees is the Department of Defense? That is the conviction of the Senator from Wisconsin, which is based upon the budget, which breaks down the increases for each department. It seems to me that that document indicated that only the Department of Defense—I believe there was one minor department also—would not increase the number of Federal employees.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I assume the Senator is speaking about civilian employees.

Mr. PROXMIRE. That is correct.

Mr. ROBERTSON. The Defense Department does contemplate another increase in military personnel.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Oh, yes; I am speaking only of civilian employees.

Is it not true that the Department of Commerce will increase its personnel about 11 percent?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I think that is correct. I have not tried to estimate the percentage for each department; but I will indicate some major cuts which could be made in the various departments.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Is it not also true that the Department of Agriculture will increase its large number of employees by 5,000?

Mr. ROBERTSON. That is correct, according to my understanding.

Mr. PROXMIRE. It seems to me, despite the fact that the President of the United States has wisely and properly said that he will try to maintain expenditures and not increase them in nondefense and nonspace areas, that every department of the Government, with the exception of the Department of Defense, plans to increase its personnel, the number of employees, and the size of its payroll. So is it not clear that we will be increasing our effective spending in these other areas?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I think the Senator is correct. He will recall that one phase of the pay raise bill provided that this year attrition among Government employees would offset the pay raise; yet all Government departments are asking for new money to provide for the 7-percent pay increase.

Mr. PROXMIRE. These are increases in the number of persons employed by each department.

Mr. ROBERTSON. That is correct. Besides not offsetting the pay raise by not filling vacancies which occur by reason of death or retirement, the departments and agencies propose to add a total of 47,000 new employees, although not in the Department of Defense, as the Senator has pointed out.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Virginia yield?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I am again reading the figures from the booklet which reports the conference of labor and management advisers. It shows that the budget expenditures for the fiscal year 1961 were $81.5 billion; for 1962, $87.7 billion; for 1963, they are estimated to be $92.5 billion; and the Senator from Virginia has just pointed out that the budget for fiscal 1964 will be $98.8 billion.

Mr. ROBERTSON. That is correct.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Yes.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I also pointed out that the new spending schemes will automatically raise that amount in the next fiscal year to about $107 billion.

Mr. LAUSCHE. So in the most recent 3 years our governmental expenditures will have risen approximately $17.3 billion, from $81.5 billion to $98.8 billion.

Mr. ROBERTSON. The Senator from Ohio is correct. The increase is entirely too much.

Mr. President, beyond the personnel increases to which I have referred, the 1964 budget projects presently modest expenditures on a series of new projects requested for the first time which, if enacted, would have an eventual annual cost of over $2 billion.

Over the short period of the past 3 fiscal years, already high budget expenditures have gone up by one-fifth and new spending authority requested has risen by an astonishing one-third. Any objective observer looking at these facts would surely have to ask whether funds are not being appropriated and spent faster than agencies can absorb them. The time has come to slow down this process of spending increases, to consider no item in the budget untouchable in doing so, and to examine with great care even the most critical governmental functions.

I have diligently examined the budget for fiscal 1964 and wish to offer specific reductions for the consideration of the Members of the Senate.

I agree with President Kennedy, in his speech on Tuesday before the Labor Department, that no category of spending is untouchable, and so I recommend reductions in both nondefense and defense appropriations. I propose to indicate how the budget can be reduced at least $6 billion to accompany any tax cut which may be passed in order to move toward the goal of a sound fiscal policy.

In the area of nondefense spending, reductions can be made in proposed new spending programs, several existing loan programs, civilian research programs, foreign aid spending, and civilian personnel expansion.

Reductions can be achieved in spending requests for new programs because their need is not established as being sufficiently vital to justify an increase in the deficit, their cost impact on the 1964 and later budgets is by no means fully determined, and insofar as the objectives of these programs may be desirable, they can be met privately or by State or local governments.

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Virginia yield?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I gladly yield to the distinguished Senator from Georgia.

Mr. TALMADGE. I congratulate the distinguished Senator from Virginia on the speech he is making.

I ask him: What is the purpose of taxes?

Mr. ROBERTSON. To pay the necessary expenses of government.

Mr. TALMADGE. From the standpoint of the taxpayers, then, the ideal government would require no taxes at all; is that not true?

Mr. ROBERTSON. It would require a minimum of taxes. That would be the ideal government, I assume. I believe that under the government of Athens, which was a pure democracy, there were no paid government officials. But they would all get together, and sometimes there would be a thousand men on the jury. They would not get any pay. Still, they brought in a mighty poor verdict when they told Socrates he had to drink the cup of hemlock.

It does not necessarily follow that if government employees work for nothing, the government is better. However, Jefferson said that the least governed are the best governed. He advocated economy.

Our other patron saint, Andrew Jackson, paid off all the public debt while he was President.

So I think the Senator from Georgia is correct when he says that we look upon the government which does not burden us too much as being a good government.

Mr. TALMADGE. Does it not necessarily follow that if we had no government, we would have no taxes?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I presume that is true; but I do not believe that we could have 185 million people in this land of ours and have government without taxes.

Even in the period of the Revolution, when the population of the Nation was about 3 million, several thousand were living in New York. I heard the colloquy this morning concerning the removal of the tax collection agency from New York to Boston. I do not believe so many people could live together without being taxed.

Mr. TALMADGE. Is it not true that taxes are occasioned by the necessary expenses of government?

Mr. ROBERTSON. That is correct.

Mr. TALMADGE. Whatever the Government spends, either the present or future taxpayers must pay.

Mr. ROBERTSON. That is correct. We are already placing a burden of $300 million on future taxpayers.

Mr. TALMADGE. Is it not the opinion of the Senator from Virginia that no budget is sacrosanct, and that expenditures can be reduced?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I agree to that.

Mr. TALMADGE. Has the Senator from Virginia visited, as I have, many of the Federal office buildings in Washington and seen hundreds, sometimes thousands, of persons at their desks, not looking very busy?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I have seen entirely too many. I did not make a count, but there were certainly a great many of them.

Mr. TALMADGE. Has the Senator had occasion to read the books of the distinguished economist C. Northcote Parkinson? Parkinson has written some books in recent months and years showing how expenditures tend to rise to meet income.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I read that discussion. It is very interesting. That was one of Parkinson's laws, was it not?

Mr. TALMADGE. Yes; it was.

Is it not true that it has been the history of bureaucracy in government from the days of ancient Rome and Greece to the present time that when bureaus are organized, they tend to perpetuate themselves and tend to obtain increased salaries and increased authority?

Mr. ROBERTSON. That is correct. The Senator from Georgia knows that when his father was Governor of Georgia, he once saw an old man on the square in the capital. Finally the Governor gave him a job. But about 60 days later the Governor saw him out in the square again. He said to him, "John, didn't I give you a job?"

John replied, "Yes, boss. But I ain't got nobody under me."

The regular attitude of bureaucracy is, "What is the use of having a job if you do not have someone under you? You are not getting very far if you don't."

Mr. TALMADGE. Has not that been the history of government throughout the ages?

Mr. ROBERTSON. Undoubtedly it has.

Mr. TALMADGE. Does not the distinguished Senator from Virginia think that if Congress makes up its mind to have reduced expenditures, and if it pursues that policy with determination, a great deal of reduction can be made in the budget—not only in the budget for the fiscal year 1964, but also in the budgets for the years to come?

Mr. ROBERTSON. That is absolutely correct. Although I am proposing only a $6 billion reduction in the spending program at this time, in the future it could amount to a reduction of $12 billion to $15 billion, because such things will pyramid.

Mr. TALMADGE. Does not the Senator from Virginia think the field of foreign aid, in which we have sent about $105 billion to nations all over the world—non-Communist nations and Communist nations, alike—is a fertile field for reduced expenditures?

Mr. ROBERTSON. Yes; and I shall recommend a reduction of about $1.8 billion in that regard.

Mr. TALMADGE. I agree with my friend. Nothing so greatly distresses the taxpayers—and I may say it also distresses me—as to see appropriations made year after year for Communist countries such as Poland, Yugoslavia, and other countries of that type. Does not the Senator from Virginia think the American taxpayers are fed up with expenditures of that kind?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I am sure the taxpayers in Virginia are, and I am sure that the taxpayers throughout the Nation feel more or less the same way. We have not made friends by our lavish giveaway programs; neither have they converted anyone to Christianity or to democratic principles.

Mr. TALMADGE. Does not the Senator from Virginia think it is utterly impossible for the American taxpayers to bring the people of the world up to our standard of living and to recreate nations in our own image?

Mr. ROBERTSON. Absolutely so. In these remarks I have pointed out that in 174 years, based upon a system of private enterprise, and, of course, with a goodly amount of natural resources, and by hard work and by admitting that we are a Christian nation and by living up to a code of ethics, we have become the richest nation in the world. But by spending billions of dollars we cannot lift up a nation that does not have our principles and does not have education and does not have ambition. That is simply impossible.

Mr. TALMADGE. Does the Senator from Virginia recall that last year he and I were privileged, together with other Senators, to visit Latin America as official Senate delegates to the conference of the International Parliamentary Union, in Brasilia?

Mr. ROBERTSON. Yes; and I recall distinctly the wonderful speech the Senator from Georgia made in Rio de Janeiro. I hope he will tell the Senate about it.

Mr. TALMADGE. I am complimented by the Senator's remark; but let me ask whether he recalls that when we were in Buenos Aires, and saw there much evidence of great wealth, and made inquiry as to what the people of Argentina were doing with their capital, we were advised that most of them were sending it—in fact, to the extent of about $5 billion—overseas, for investment, and that a great deal of it was coming to the United States.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Yes; and it was coming to the United States for safekeeping and for investment in sound dollars.

Mr. TALMADGE. Was that being done because the people of that nation did not have enough confidence in their own country to be willing to make the investments in their own land?

Mr. ROBERTSON. That is correct. We said we were willing to help Brazil, but that neither God nor any nation on earth could help a nation that did not help itself.

Mr. TALMADGE. That is correct.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Virginia yield?

The **PRESIDING OFFICER** (Mr. BREWSTER in the chair). Does the Senator from Virginia yield to the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I yield.

Mr. CURTIS. I wish to commend the Senator from Virginia for his remarks and for his proposal. A copy of his speech has come to my office, and I have examined it. What he is proposing certainly merits the support of all Senators.

In my opinion, the budget can be balanced. What is needed is the will to do so on the part of each and every person connected with the Federal Government. If that exists, the balancing of the budget can be accomplished.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I appreciate that friendly comment.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Virginia yield?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I yield to the Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. STENNIS. My comment must be brief, Mr. President; but I am on the floor at this time because of my interest in the speech of the distinguished Senator from Virginia. I have already had the privilege of reading it.

I wish to expressly and generously commend the Senator from Virginia for putting together the substance of his speech, and for the fine analysis he has prepared, and for dealing with the problems to which his speech relates. He is eminently qualified, because of his fine background, inasmuch as formerly he was a member of the Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives, and later he became a member of the Senate committee which deals with financial matters.

I commend him for his analysis, which I believe to be the best which has been made this year, and I do not believe its high quality will be exceeded. Certainly if we followed the substance of it—even though all of us may not agree as to all the details—I am sure we would be on a sound basis, and would have a balanced budget, and certainly would be on the road to sounder fiscal policy.

I also note that in connection with this matter, he has not played favorites in so far as the departments are concerned. He is familiar with them, and he has recommended these reductions, regardless of the department involved or what its position may be.

I wish to ask him a question: With reference to the importance of achieving a sound economy, does the Senator from Virginia believe that unless we restrict foreign aid expenditures—assuming that we have to have some foreign aid program for the time being—and unless we exercise economy in that field, we shall ever achieve economy in connection with our domestic affairs?

Mr. ROBERTSON. First, Mr. President, let me say that I appreciate very much the commendation by the Senator from Mississippi, particularly in view of the fact that only today I read in the newspapers that one of his colleagues has nominated him for membership on the U.S. Supreme Court. I am sure he deserves that praise. Certainly, Mr. President, any man as qualified as he for service on the Appropriations Committee and for membership on the U.S. Supreme Court must be a man of well-rounded judgment and great ability.

The Senator from Mississippi has referred to a very important point. He said that if we had the will to balance the budget, we could balance it—some day, of course, for I do not propose that it be balanced overnight. But the Senator from Mississippi is not as old as I am, and he may not remember the great evangelist named Billy Sunday. He started as a great baseball player. He ended by getting thousands of people to "hit the sawdust trail," as it was then called.

Billy Sunday, speaking in Roanoke, Va., said, "I would rather be one step from hell headed toward heaven than a thousand miles from hell headed in the wrong direction."

All I ask is that we start heading in the right direction. Let us cut down something. We cannot balance the budget immediately, but let us show the American people that we do not intend to spend them into bankruptcy.

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the Senator.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is a good story.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Perhaps we could turn around.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, the Senator from Arkansas has said that perhaps we could turn around. He has reminded me of the man in Scotland who was lost. He said to another, "My friend, is this the road to Edinburgh?"

The man said, "Yes, Mister, but you will get there sooner if you turn around and go in the other direction."

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I yield to my friend from Utah.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I commend my friend, the junior Senator from Virginia, for the responsible task he has undertaken today. It has been my privilege for the past 12 years to serve with him on the Committee on Banking and Currency.

I have come to have a high respect for his understanding of the Nation's fiscal and monetary problems. There is nothing wrong with the will of the Senator from Virginia. I wish all the rest of us in this body had as much will. After having read the statement that the Senator prepared for delivery today, I was inspired to respond with a statement of my own. I shall not impose on my friend's good nature to ask him to sit still while I read it. I shall deliver it when the Senator has concluded.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I thank my friend from Utah.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Before the Senator from Virginia proceeds to point out where the budget can be cut, I think it would be appropriate for the RECORD to show that in the past 2 years the debt limitation has been lifted three times. It is now proposed that in this year of 1963 it be lifted a fourth time.

At the end of 1961 the debt limitation was $293 billion. On June 30, 1961, it was increased to $298 billion. On March 13, 1962, it was increased to $300 billion. On July 1, 1962, it was increased to $308 billion. Thus, in 2 years, the aggregate lifting of the debt ceiling was from $293 billion to $308 billion. It is now proposed to raise the debt ceiling again this year to the figure of $320 billion.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Let me put it this way. On June 30 the debt limit goes back to the permanent limit of $285 billion. But it stands today at $305 billion. We have a temporary limit of $308 billion. It is requested that that temporary limit be carried forward to June 30 instead of letting it go back to $285 billion. We know that we cannot possibly get the debt down to that figure.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I agree with that statement.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Then if we should enact a $10 billion tax cut and place that amount on top of all the other proposed expenditures, our next debt limit would have to be $320 billion. But that has not yet come.

Mr. LAUSCHE. It has not come, but the signs are with us, and unless we cut spending, it will be up to $320 billion.

Mr. ROBERTSON. That is a fair assumption.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I yield.

Mr. McCLELLAN. When we consider bringing back a balanced budget in our fiscal situation, does not the Senator from Virginia agree with me that in circumstances such as those in which we now find our spending program, a wise course for the Congress to pursue would be not to enact more new legislation which would incur additional obligations until our revenues catch up with our spending?

Mr. ROBERTSON. The Senator is eminently correct. As I continue I shall point out that first one and then another new program is proposed. Such programs might be very desirable if we had ample money; but certainly to put them into operation with an escalator clause which would require them to double and triple in future years and to be paid for in borrowed money is not a sound fiscal policy.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I yield.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Does the Senator agree with me that those of us who have the responsibility of public affairs today in both the legislative and the executive branches of the Government have a moral responsibility to future generations not to unduly and unnecessarily encumber their heritage?

Mr. ROBERTSON. There is no doubt about it. If we act, in violation of intellectual honesty, to debase our currency in a manner that cannot be justified, we are certainly acting in an unmoral, if not in an immoral way.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I should like to ask the Senator one further question. When we as a government live as we are now living—beyond our income and beyond our ability to pay or beyond our willingness to pay, if we have the ability—are we not doing an injustice to those who will inherit the debt?

Mr. ROBERTSON. In 1935, when it was proposed that we approve a $4,800 million recovery program, and the debt was then something over $19 billion, I said that if we started spending in that manner, we would live to see the debt go to $50 billion, and that if we did so, we would be mortgaging the future of generations yet unborn. Since then we have run the debt over $300 billion. I agree with the Senator.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I yield.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I should like to make the observation that whatever is necessary to spend for the defense of our country and the preservation of our liberties, if we have to spend in that category, is also spending for the welfare and security of those who will follow us.

Mr. ROBERTSON. The Senator is correct.

Mr. McCLELLAN. But if, on the other hand, we must spend to the limit of our resources to sustain and maintain our national security, does not common prudence dictate that in other areas of spending we should forgo things which perhaps we would like to have, but which we cannot afford without charging the expenditure to others?

Mr. ROBERTSON. The Senator is entirely correct. The Senator is correct in saying that we should not put a price tag upon our security and our survival. For that reason, last year, as acting chairman of the Defense Subcommittee, I introduced a $50 billion defense bill. I justified that action because, as I said at the time, the weapons which would be produced in the program would stay the hand of a potential aggressor. Since there is no adequate defense in nuclear war, and 35 million or more may be killed in the first day of such a war, it is highly essential for us to maintain our nuclear superiority over Russia; and on that ground I justified the defense budget.

But today, when the proposed budget is more than $55 billion, I am going to suggest items with respect to which I think we might safely cut it by $1,258,800,000.

I shall not do that categorically. I shall await the proof. If clear and convincing proof is presented that such a cut would imperil us, I shall not offer the amendment.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I commend the Senator for his address, what he has said in the debate. I hope it will attract interest. I also express the hope that it will have influence with many of the Senator's colleagues.

I say that not in a desire to join remarks in a spirit of criticism, for I know the distinguished Senator from Virginia is not speaking in that spirit. I share the Senator's sentiments, which he has so well expressed, and I do so out of a conscientious duty of service and obligation to my country.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I thank my colleague. Later in my prepared speech I say I am speaking as a loyal Democrat. I think I owe it to our great Chief and to all his department heads to specify where I think the budget can be cut. Being forewarned, they may be forearmed, and put their best foot forward when they present the budget.

I do not know what would be good for our party in all of the States, but I know what would be good in Virginia. I know economy in government is a good policy in Virginia. I would think that if we should have inflation by the fall of next year, in all of the 50 States, it would be a party liability everywhere we went before the people.

I thank the Senator.

Mr. President, almost $2 billion can be saved by eliminating new programs in the fiscal 1964 budget. An appropriation of $1.2 billion is proposed for a large scale Federal aid to education program that would plunge the Federal Government ever more deeply into financing public school and college aids to education. An appropriation of $100 million is proposed as the first in a series intended for a 3-year, $500 million matching grant plan by which the Federal Government is to donate money to help the Nation's biggest cities finance mass transportation improvement. An appropriation of $100 million for 1964 is proposed for a youth employment and training program which is surely only the beginning of a more and more expensive effort, even though retraining methods are as yet untried, their results wholly untested and their sponsorship by government rather than in industry open to serious question. Appropriations for a long list—medical school construction and medical scholarships, nursing homes, hospital renovation, housing for the elderly, rural housing credit insurance, and funds for rural recreational facilities—totaling more than $200 million are proposed. They can surely be postponed without grave risk to the Nation in a year of near-record if not new-record deficit. And there are other new appropriation requests of a miscellaneous nature, which I shall not enumerate now.

The budget for fiscal 1964 proposes funds for loan programs which are unneeded and competitive with private lenders. The Rural Electrification Administration requests $495 million of new loan funds for electrification and telephones in 1964. Yet, today, 98 percent of the Nation's farms now have electric power. And five out of every six of the new member customers of REA-financed electric cooperatives in recent years have been industrial, commercial, and nonfarm residential consumers. Without specifying the amount to be cut from these requested funds, I am certain that a sizable reduction can be achieved if such spending is held to the proper purpose of the REA. To be sure, we should do everything necessary to extend services to farmers under this long accepted program. But the steady shift of REA activity into direct competition with industrial, commercial, and urban facilities is patently unneeded and unwarranted, and it should be halted.

An increase in loan authorization ceilings for area redevelopment of $350 million is proposed in the budget for fiscal 1964. I urge that this request be rejected. Proponents of the legislation in 1961 asserted that the $300 million which Congress authorized at that time would be adequate to meet the objectives of the legislation. Now we find a request that might more than double the original authorization and that would expand the Federal Government's activities in this area of local activity and local responsibility all over the Nation with its corresponding threat to local initiative and control in local affairs.

The recent rapid growth of large scale civilian research activities of the Federal Government raises questions of whether funds for such programs proposed in the budget for fiscal 1964 can possibly be used to best advantage. The National Science Foundation requests $589 million, an increase of $267 million or 80 percent over 1963. Appropriations for the National Institutes of Health have been increased from $733 million to nearly $1 billion in 2 fiscal years. In every single year since 1952, the Congress has provided more money for the NIH research programs. Such rapid growth raises the threat of funds being wasted. It also encourages expensive research methods whose results are not commensurate with their costs.

Another category in the budget requests that can be reduced is foreign aid, which should be cut by $1.8 billion. Funds requested in the fiscal 1964 budget total $4.9 billion, an increase of $1 billion over 1963. The increases proposed include $151 million for a contingent fund for unforeseen emergencies, $175 million for development loans under the Alliance for Progress, another

$273 million for other development loan funds, and $880 million for a food-for-peace program. I urge that the Senate reduce aid funds by at least $1.8 billion because of the growing criticisms of the administration of our aid funds, which reflect a public recognition that we have not been getting our dollar's worth from this expensive, cumbersome, and confused undertaking.

Finally, in the area of nondefense spending, I urge my colleagues to insist upon a 5-percent reduction of personnel in every department of the Federal Government. The budget for fiscal 1964 again reflects an increase in Federal employment in nondefense agencies which is only another in a long series of such increases. The 1962 Federal pay increase legislation provided that the Federal agencies should absorb the pay increase, but throughout the fiscal 1964 budget, appropriations are requested to cover such increases. The discipline imposed upon Federal agency administrators by a 5-percent employment reduction would, without question, increase the efficiency of agency operations. And also, without question, such a reduction could be achieved with dispatch in many agencies whose current requests seek an increase in personnel.

I now turn to the budget requests for the Department of Defense, which total $53.7 billion exclusive of the requests for civil functions of the Department of the Army. This total of $53.7 billion includes funds for the military functions of the Army, Navy, and Air Force, including military construction and family housing and funds for the civil defense and military assistance programs.

I have made a preliminary study of the budget for the Department of Defense and have concluded that reductions totaling $1,258,800,000 can be made without seriously impairing our present military posture.

I have frequently said, "We cannot place a price tag on our security," and in proposing these reductions, I am not abandoning that principle. If during the hearings for the Senate Committee on Appropriations compelling and convincing evidence is presented in support of any of the programs where I have proposed a reduction, I will withdraw that particular proposed amendment. However, during this period when serious inflation could be caused by tremendous deficits, we must look at the Defense budget with the view in mind of making all reductions that are possible without impairing our present defense posture.

Specific reductions which I shall recommend are as follows:

First. Defense procurement programs, $633 million.

This amount represents the total net increase in procurement funds requested for fiscal 1964 over those available in fiscal 1963. In my opinion, these reductions, made in all three services, should be accomplished in the area of conventional warfare, which I have discussed in my detailed statement which I now ask unanimous consent to have included in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request by the Senator from Virginia? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I continue the listing of items:

Second. Military construction, $123 million.

This represents a reduction of 10 percent in the request, certainly a modest amount when one considers the fluidity of the construction program and that the increases for the Army and Navy alone over last year total over $200 million.

Third. Family housing, $137 million.

In making this recommendation, I have limited the appropriation to the same amount as was appropriated for fiscal 1963.

Fourth. Civil defense, $217.8 million.

Of the total request of $300 million for civil defense, $217.8 million is for the shelter program. I recommend that this be deleted. We either need a far greater shelter program or none at all.

Fifth. Military assistance, $148 million.

This is a relatively modest reduction of 10 percent in a program which would cost us another $1,480 million. It might help to impress upon the 60 nations to whom we contribute funds in the name of defense that cooperation is not a one-way street.

Mr. President, taking defense and nondefense spending requests together, my preliminary study of the budget indicates it is perfectly feasible, giving all due consideration to national defense and welfare, to reduce the budget—spending authorizations—by at least $6 billion in fiscal 1964. This can be achieved by a $1.3 billion cut in defense spending requests and a cut in nondefense spending requests of $4.6 billion before allowance is made for the saving from a 5-percent reduction in force of Federal employees across the board.

In conclusion, I desire to make it crystal clear that in making suggestions for eliminating or curtailing some of the President's spending proposals, I am acting as a loyal Democrat who has never left his party and who wants to help and not harm his party's success in the elections of 1964. I may not know what will help the party in all of the 50 States, but I definitely know what will help to carry Virginia for a Democratic candidate next year, and I likewise feel safe in assuming that if we have serious inflation as a result of deficit financing such an issue in 1964 would be a definite party liability in every State, especially those States where even with inflation, unemployment may not have been much reduced.

I also wish to make it clear that in indicating specific items that I think could be cut and suggesting tentatively, of course, the amount of such cuts, I have neither the desire nor the intention to prejudge the action of any Appropriations Subcommittee of either the House or the Senate. However, if a Senator is to approach an economy program from a friendly standpoint, he owes it to the head of his party to specify the items that he thinks can be cut in order that each Department head being forewarned can be forearmed and thus put his best foot forward when he appears in support of the programs under his jurisdiction. Some of the cuts I have suggested have much popular support, but I shall not undertake to be all things to all men. I shall make a public stand for the economy that I advocate and that also will enable the public, if it favors a program of freewheel spending, to deluge the Congress with spending pleas.

I also feel that I owe it to the distinguished and popular head of my party to give my alternative to a $10 billion tax cut without any reduction in spending.

In the first place, while the economy may be said to be sluggish, the gross national product—for whatever that may be worth—is at an alltime high and so is the national produced income. Therefore, if we admit that the economy is on a plateau it is still the highest plateau in the history of our Nation.

In the second place, if some booster, as is used to accelerate the takeoff of a jet plane, is necessary to move our economy from the present plateau to some higher peak of achievement, it will be found in verse 15 of the 14th chapter of Exodus, where God said to Moses: "Speak unto the children of Israel that they go forward." The atheists, Communists, and other deniers of God and the Bible, will be unfamiliar with this reference but members of our Senate breakfast group know it relates to the time when Moses was leading a million and a half Jewish captives out of Egypt and into the "promised land." The multitude had made fine progress until it reached the shore of the Red Sea and then it came to a sudden and painful halt. What was the element needed for further progress? The answer, of course, is "confidence." Let our President restore the confidence of American businessmen in the perpetuity of constitutional liberty and free competitive enterprise and they will go forward without the "shot in the arm" of a $10 billion tax cut to be financed with borrowed dollars.

The problem confronting us is not a new one. A neighbor in Springfield watched Abraham Lincoln striding by with his two boys, both of them crying. "What's the matter with your boys, Mr. Lincoln?" asked the neighbor. "Just what's wrong with the whole world," said Lincoln. "I've got three walnuts, and both of 'em want two."

Lincoln gave the answer to that problem which is as true as when he uttered it more than a hundred years ago:

> No man living is more worthy to be trusted than those who toil up from poverty—none less inclined to take or touch aught which they have not honestly earned.
>
> Nor should this lead to a war upon property or the owners of property. Property is the fruit of labor, property is desirable, is a positive good to the world.
>
> That some should be rich shows that others may become rich, and hence is just encouragement to industry and enterprise. Let not him who is houseless pull down the house of another, but let him labor diligently and build one for himself, thus by example assuring that his own shall be safe from violence when built.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Exhibit 1

Department of Defense

I now turn to the budget requests for the Department of Defense which total $53.7 billion exclusive of the requests for civil functions of the Department of the Army. This total of $53.7 billion includes funds for the military functions of the Army, Navy, and Air Force including military construction and family housing and funds for the civil defense and military assistance programs.

I have made a preliminary study of the budget for the Department of Defense and have concluded that reductions totaling $1,258,800,000 can be made without seriously impairing our present military posture.

I have frequently said, "We cannot place a price tag on our security," and in proposing these reductions, I am not abandoning that principle. If during the hearings for the Senate Committee on Appropriations compelling and convincing evidence is presented in support of any of the programs where I have proposed a reduction, I will withdraw that particular proposed amendment. However, during this period when serious inflation could be caused by tremendous deficits we must look at the Defense budget with the view in mind of making all possible reductions that are possible without impairing our present defense posture.

The budget for the Department of Defense for fiscal year 1964 includes a substantial increase for the strengthing of our conventional forces, i.e., those forces that we would rely on in a military operation short of general nuclear war. These conventional forces include most of the Army's combat and combat support units; virtually all Navy units (the Polaris fleet being the major exception); all Marine Corps units; the tactical units of the Air Force; the airlift and sealift forces; and the Reserve and National Guard forces.

The Secretary of Defense in his appearance before the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives in discussing "General Purpose Forces" (those forces enumerated above exclusive of the airlift and sealift forces and the Reserve and National Guard forces) said:

"In addition to the general purpose forces study and the unilateral service studies, we also had the advantage of strategic evaluations of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. Drawing on all of these sources we have concluded that:

* * * * *

"(4) The presently programed forces, in general, could by nonnuclear means alone, counter a wide spectrum of Sino-Soviet bloc aggressions in regions other than Europe.

"(5) With regard to Europe, the presently programed U.S. forces, together with the present forces of other NATO countries, would not be able to contain an all-out conventional Soviet attack without invoking the use of nuclear weapons."

It is clear that our existing conventional forces are adequate for any situation other than the defense of Western Europe against an all-out Soviet attack. Earlier in his statement the Secretary of Defense said:

"Fortunately, most of our NATO allies are now in a much better position to support adequate military forces and thereby make a larger contribution to the collective defense."

Frankly, I have been disappointed by the failure of our allies in the North Atlantic Treaty Alliance to meet their commitments. In reporting the Department of Defense appropriation bill for the current fiscal year, the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate stated:

"In past years, this committee has expressed the view that the matter of defense against the Communist threat is a collective one; that is, responsibilities and burdens should be shared equally among the nations of the free world to the extent that such nations have the economic resources to bear such burdens.

"Again, the committee recommends that the executive branch of the Government on all levels do its utmost to secure from our allies the cooperation necessary to support this policy of collective defense" (S. Rept. No. 1578, 87th Cong.).

In making this preliminary study of the Defense budget I asked the Secretary of Defense for information on the contribution of funds and resources of the member nations of NATO. I regret that the Department has seen fit to impose the classification of "secret" on most of this information.

I ask unanimous consent to have included in the Record following these remarks, a letter I addressed to the Secretary of Defense on March 4 in which I indicated that I will try to develop this information for the public record.

The fact that the European member nations of NATO have never met their commitments is not classified information. Mr. President, they have not met their commitments based on relatively small NATO force goals that are to be supported by nuclear weapons. Consider then how much greater the gap between goals and actual forces would be if a defense of Western Europe without the use of nuclear weapons were envisaged. Since the other members of NATO have failed to reach those limited goals which are supported with nuclear weapons, one would be blindly sanguine to anticipate the greatly enlarged conventional forces on the part of our European allies necessary for a defense of Western Europe without the support of nuclear weapons.

We should give a careful look at the cost of defending Western Europe without the use of nuclear weapons, because based on the past experience of our NATO allies, it is clear that we will have to carry the cost of this burden, and it will be a tremendous cost.

None of the reductions I am proposing will be directly applicable to our nuclear forces such as the Polaris submarine fleet; the ICBM's; and the manned-bomber forces of the Strategic Air Command. It is my view that the Secretary of Defense in canceling the Skybolt air-launched ballistic missile; by refusing funds appropriated by the Congress for the development of the RS–70 as an operational weapons system; and his refusal to use fiscal year 1692 funds for the procurement of additional on-range bombers has seriously impaired our one area of superiority—nuclear forces. I want to make it clear that I am willing to support a program, if it is not too late, to develop an operational manned weapons system as a followon for our present long-range bomber force.

I have dealt at length with this matter because it is so important to an understanding of the first of a series of recommendations which I wish to make in the budget for the Department of Defense.

DEFENSE PROCUREMENT PROGRAMS

The budget includes requests totaling $16,724,800,000 in new obligational authority for the three services and the defense agencies. However, it is anticipated that $948 million will be available from other sources for a total procurement program of $17,672,800,000, which is an increase of $633 million over the total available for the current fiscal year. I suggest that the fiscal year 1964 procurement program be held to the current year's level of $17,039,800,000 which will result in a reduction of $633 million in new obligational authority which is to be applied to the various procurement programs in those areas that represent a substantial increase in conventional forces. It is not my intent to limit this reduction to any one or any two services, since all three military branches request substantial funds for conventional warfare.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION

The budget contains a request for $1,232 million in new obligational authority for military construction (Budget, p. 194). Increases for the Army and Navy alone total over $200 million over last year. I recommend that the total request be reduced by $123 million, a reduction of 10 percent. This need in no way interfere with the vital construction associated with new missile bases. However, it might impress upon our military spenders the need for economy insofar as it relates to the possible utilization of existing facilities wherever possible. The fluidity, flexibility and uncertainty of this program are demonstrated by the fact that although the budget was presented almost 2 months ago, with the total military construction figures provided, no breakdown of these figures has as yet been submitted to the Congress. Under such conditions, there is no doubt in my mind that substantial adjustments can and will be made.

FAMILY HOUSING

For family housing of our Armed Forces, the budget requests $734,400,000. These funds would provide for the construction of 12,100 new family units and for the maintenance and operation of 370,000 units, as well as for interest payments on Capehart and Wherry housing (Budget, p. 195). I believe that it is the duty of the Congress to provide adequate housing for our military personnel in all areas where other housing is not available. But, I do not believe that it is advantageous to either the military or the economy of the country to burgeon forth with a greatly expanded housing program at a time when the fluidity of the international situation and the rapid changes in our technology may well render weapons—and the posts, camps, and stations which serve them—obsolete, virtually overnight. We are all too familiar with instances where installations have been built only to find that history has passed them by. Nor, do we wish to aggravate economic distress through the failure to utilise existing civilian facilities available to the military. Therefore, I propose that a reduction of $137 million be made in this area. This would provide the same amount of funds as was appropriated during the present fiscal year and should certainly be sufficient to maintain the existing forces, which themselves are not expanding.

CIVIL DEFENSE

The 1964 budget requests of $300 million in new obligational authority for the civil defense program includes $217.8 million for the shelter program. The statement is made (Budget appendix, p. 315) that this program provides for incorporation of shelters in the facilities of nonprofit institutions and in existing Federal structures, for the construction of protected regional centers for Federal emergency operations in the field, and for experimental shelter programs.

If we are to embark on a shelter program at all, we should admit that this amount is but a drop in the financial bucket compared to what would be needed to protect even a relatively small proportion of our population. And if history were to repeat itself, and "H" hour were to occur at approximately the same time and day as the last such surprise attack—Pearl Harbor—we would find most of the shelters indicated above would be either closed or unoccupied.

The appropriation of such funds would in no wise deter war. Rather, it might tend to lull our civilian populace into a false sense of security. Mr. President, at this time I do not believe the appropriation of these funds would be either wise or profitable, and

I suggest that the request of $217.8 million for the shelter program be disallowed.

MILITARY ASSISTANCE

The 1964 budget calls for new obligational authority of $1,480,000,000 for military assistance to some 60 nations. The budget states that the emphasis in such assistance is "shifting to the less developed nations, where more attention is being placed on building up units trained and equipped to maintain internal security and to contribute constructively to local development." The statement is also made that most NATO nations now provide full financial support for their own military forces—that our military assistance fulfills only prior U.S. commitments. In other words, if I interpret these statements correctly, we are being asked to appropriate over a billion dollars to maintain and develop backward nations and to fulfill obligations to NATO countries, many of which have not lived up to their own promises. I believe that mutual defense of the free world should no longer be considered—as it evidently is in many quarters—as a one-way street. I have the highest regard for those nations which value their national sovereignty. No other nation in history can pride itself on the care which we have exercised—even under extreme duress—to protect that sovereignty in all free world countries. But, this does not mean that we should not expect cooperation. It does not mean that other nations should willfully flout solemn commitments when they are well able to fulfill them. And it does not mean that the undeveloped areas of the world should expect us to pick up the check for their future military development beyond that which is in our Nation's specific interests. I see no reason to maintain our troops in such countries as Vietnam unless full cooperation is extended to our efforts.

Therefore, I recommend that a modest reduction of $148 million be accomplished in our foreign assistance budget and that these reductions be accomplished in those areas where cooperation is most needed.

I am certain that the statement will be made that such reductions as are proposed herein for the Department of Defense will jeopardize our defenses. If I believed that this were so, I would be the first one to refuse to make any such reductions. But I know that this is not necessarily the case. In most of the areas touched upon in this presentation, the program is highly flexible. Let me give you a couple of illustrations. We are all aware that in the military assistance request there is a multitude of specific programs which have not yet been formulated. I have already indicated that the Department has not as yet been able to weld together a specific program for military construction to present to the Congress. Yet, the totals for such programs are locked in the budget. The same may be said of some other programs. I asked the Department of the Army recently for specifics in regard to one of their major items of procurement, funds for which were included in the budget. They were unable to tell me anything. They had not as yet made up their minds as to what quantity of what weapons to purchase. Yet, this is one of the most important items of the Army hardware.

I do not say this necessarily in criticism of these programs. In an undertaking of this magnitude, it may well be that it is impossible to formulate to the last dollar—or even to the last hundred million dollars—the items which ultimately will make up that budget. A certain flexibility is not only understandable, it is advisable. The frequency and size of reprograming actions which the Department of Defense makes annually is an indication of this. My point is that the budget figure, at this stage in the game, is in many, many cases not firmly fixed in detail. It is, therefore, subject to change. The Office of the Secretary of Defense and the Bureau of the Budget have annually cut billions from the service presentations prior to presentation to the Congress. I believe that the Congress is sufficiently knowledgeable to make relatively minor reductions in programs totaling half of our national budget.

U.S. SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS,
March 4, 1963.

Hon. ROBERT S. MCNAMARA,
Secretary of Defense,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: In response to my letter of February 18, in which I asked eight questions concerning funds included in the Department of Defense budget for fiscal year 1964, I have received a letter dated February 27 from Mr. David E. McGiffert, Assistant to the Secretary, a portion of which has been classified as "secret."

I regret that the Department of Defense has seen fit to impose the classification of "secret" to the answer to "How many military men (Army, Air, Navy, and Marine Corps) are now committed to NATO?" and to "What is the total commitment of our NATO allies?"

In considering the budget for the Department of Defense for fiscal year 1964, the Congress is asked to provide a substantial increase in funds to support an increase in the size of our conventional forces which are primarily required for the defense of Western Europe. It is my view that the American taxpayer is entitled to know just what the countries of Western Europe, allied with the United States in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, are contributing to the defense of this area.

During your appearance before the Department of Defense Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations of the U.S. Senate in open session, I will attempt to develop for the public record the dismal failure of the other member countries of NATO to meet their commitments. It is my hope that you will reconsider the Department's classification of "secret" to the answers to the two questions quoted above.

Sincerely yours,
A. WILLIS ROBERTSON,
U.S. Senator.

SUBSTANTIAL SPENDING CUTS MUST GO WITH TAX CUTS

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, the people of America are being subjected to an unprecedented propaganda barrage by the Kennedy administration calling at the same time for massive deficit financing and major tax cuts. The purported objective of this remarkable program is to stimulate the economy. Initially, we were told that it was designed to increase economic growth and employment, but evidently this was not considered to be dramatic enough to inspire the American people and Congress to turn their backs on fiscal responsibility; so the new strategy is to claim that the goal is to prevent an economic recession soon.

Every thinking American is concerned with the sluggishness of the economy. This concern has been increased by the fact that the New Frontier spending programs which were touted as sure cures for this sluggishness have failed miserably. Apparently the administration now turns to the opposite side of Government policy in the hope that a tax reduction, combined with massive spending and deficits can do what spending increases alone could not. In the name of economic growth, we are asked by the New Frontier to return to the reactionary policies of the 1930's which failed dismally. For, after 8 years of New Deal pump priming and deficit financing, there were 10 million unemployed in 1940.

Evidently President Kennedy's economic advisers are prisoners of the past and cannot rise above the discredited policies of the 1930's.

UNDISCIPLINED NEW FRONTIER

Frankly I am alarmed at the total lack of fiscal discipline and responsibility, and the complete refusal of the administration to develop any system of priorities to guide Federal spending. A multitude of new programs is thrown at Congress almost daily, and all are billed by the New Frontiersmen as of earthshaking importance. There is no indication whatever that they are aware that there is such a thing as economy in Government and that some programs may not be as important as others.

Furthermore, there is no indication that the administration's economists recognize that we have high taxes because spending is high, and that the best way to cut taxes is to first cut spending. In his tax message President Kennedy said, "Our choice today is not between a tax cut and a balanced budget." I agree. The ideal solution would be a tax cut following a balanced budget, and the next best thing would be a tax cut tied to and dependent on a reduction in Government expenditures. Since we have had two Kennedy deficits without a tax cut, the American people might accept a third Kennedy deficit created in part by a tax cut, if the extent of the deficit were drastically reduced by all-out administration support for the elimination of waste and the curtailment of unnecessary programs, particularly those programs which were tried in the first 2 years as stimulants to progress and have failed.

RECORD SPENDING

The evidence of this total lack of fiscal discipline and responsibility is abundantly manifested all about us here in Washington. The President has submitted a budget to Congress calling for a $98.8 billion expenditure in fiscal year 1964. This is the highest spending level in the history of our Nation, even higher than any year during World War II. This represents an increase of $17 billion in our annual rate of spending since Mr. Kennedy took office.

But this is just the beginning, for the $98.8 billion does not include spending for such programs as social security, highways, and other trust funds. When these are added, total spending will hit the staggering level of $122.5 billion, another record.

We in Congress understand the difference between actual expenditures and requests for "new obligational authority" to spend. This new spending authority requested by the President for fiscal year 1964 totals $108 billion, a fantastic leap of $27.2 billion, or 34 percent higher than for the last Eisenhower budget, submitted just 2 years ago. It is this new obligational authority which is particularly significant since it forecasts an ever-increasing spending level by the Kennedy administration for the future.

This sad situation is further compounded by the staggering total of unexpended balances in appropriations available to the administration over which Congress has little or no control. These will total after June 30, 1963, $87.2 billion. Total appropriations and other expenditure authorizations—including those for back-door spending—available for spending beginning July 1 are estimated at $195 billion.

WELFARE SPENDING UP

Administration officials make the fallacious claim that we cannot make cuts without harming our defense and space programs. However, nondefense and welfare state expenditures generally have gone up $7.5 billion since President Kennedy took office. Moreover, nondefense spending since fiscal year 1954 has gone up almost $20 billion; so it can hardly be argued that there are no opportunities to cut nondefense spending. This is further highlighted by seven new spending programs which the President has included in his budget calling for an overall expenditure of $1.5 billion, of which $245 million would be spent during the coming fiscal year. These include 24 Federal aid to education programs, many of them new.

It is obvious that the administration has done some of the fanciest figure juggling on record in an effort to give the false impression that it has attempted to economize in nondefense and space areas. This has been most evidenced in alleged reductions of about $2 billion on such programs as farm price support payments, anticipated sales of surplus cotton, sales of Export-Import Bank loans to private investors, and purported reductions of a similar nature for FNMA, FHA, REA, and defense production. As the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] has said:

> It is highly doubtful that such so-called deductions as these should be regarded as bona fide reductions in expenditure estimates.

Moreover, we must not regard defense and space spending as sacred cows. Stories of substantial waste in these programs come to light almost daily, and it is obvious that cuts could and should be made without endangering in any way our national security.

FEDERAL CIVILIAN PAYROLL UP 215,000

Further evidence of fat in the budget is the fantastic increase in the number of people on the Federal payroll added by the Kennedy administration. Through the coming fiscal year 215,000 civilian Federal employees will have been added. This is in addition to the 220,000 added or to be added to the armed services. Elimination by attrition of just half of these positions would save $866 million a year.

DEFICIT FINANCING —DEBT INCREASES

The other side of the spending coin is the fantastic increase in deficit financing and the ever-rising national debt under the Kennedy administration. The predicted deficit for the coming fiscal year is $11.9 billion, but it could go much higher if any or all of the many doubtful assumptions used in estimating the deficit should not hold true. This danger is real since the President predicted a budget surplus for the current fiscal year whereas we shall have a deficit in the vicinity of $8.8 billion. From fiscal 1960 through the estimates for fiscal 1964, deficits under the New Frontier will total at least $27 billion. This is $5 billion more in that short period than the total net deficit of the 8 fiscal years of the Eisenhower administration.

DELIBERATE DEFICITS

The New Frontier has introduced something entirely new and terribly dangerous into our national economic policies. For the first time, an administration has embarked on a policy of deliberate deficits. Indeed, Secretary Dillon admits that the budget probably will not be balanced until 1967, if then. The Chairman of the President's Council of Economic Advisers, Walter Heller, has attempted to shroud this irresponsible policy beneath the phrase "Deficits of Strength" in contrast to unplanned deficits which he calls deficits of weakness. He, with the President, openly disparages those who believe that we should balance our budget and live within our means, particularly during times of prosperity. The President describes such people as being guilty of "stereotype thinking" and of succumbing to "myths." Mr. Heller, on the other hand, inveighs against those of us who believe in what he calls the Puritan ethic. He obviously does not believe that the Puritan principles of hard work, thrift, and living within our means as a nation have any validity today. Yet these are the very principles which have made this country great, which have made us the richest and most powerful nation in the world, and which have brought us the greatest economic growth of any nation in history. These principles are to be cavalierly dismissed by Mr. Heller as a discarded relic of our past, a Puritan ethic. If we give place to this shocking doctrine, then in economic affairs this Nation shall indeed be on the "high road to Heller."

VIRTUOUS PUBLIC SECTOR

Moreover, the administration has embraced the philosophy that a dollar spent in the public sector of our economy rather than in the private sector is somehow more virtuous and effective. Therefore Federal spending must be expanded sharply under this view. Evidently Democratic politicians and Federal bureaucrats somehow know better how to spend our money than we do. The private citizen and taxpayer is not to be trusted. Wherein is this different from the socialism except in modest degree? Already the Federal Government monopolizes a fifth of our gross national product, and the New Frontiersmen want even more.

ALARMING GOLD OUTFLOW

This regrettably is just a beginning of our problems. The Kennedy administration's utter lack of fiscal discipline is fully understood abroad. This has been reflected in the loss during the last 2 years of $2 billion of our rapidly shrinking gold supply which went abroad to foreign countries. Even more would have gone had not several friendly nations made advance payments on their obligations to us. This is unlikely to happen again. At the end of 1960 our gold reserves totaled $17.9 billion. A year ago they totaled $17 billion, and they are now down to $16 billion.

Twelve billion dollars in gold is required to back our money. We now have only $16 billion available. Thus, we are within $4 billion of the amount required to back the dollar, and the gold outflow still continues at an alarming rate. This is a most serious problem and is brought about in large part since foreign countries are losing their confidence in the dollar because of our continuous domestic deficits, our increasing national debt, and the decline in the value of the dollar.

NATIONAL DEBT LIMIT INCREASE

The sharp rise in our national debt and in deficit financing is dramatically illustrated by the expected request of the Kennedy administration to hike the national debt limit from the present level of $308 billion to $320 billion by next June. It was scheduled to drop to $285 billion on July 1, 1963. Instead, it will be $35 billion higher. This, of course, is easily the highest level our national debt has ever reached. Fully 8.4 percent of this increase will have occurred under the Kennedy administration budgets introduced thus far. This occurred in a time of great relative national prosperity. If we cannot balance the budget now, when will we ever balance it?

SPENDING CUTS OF $6 TO $10 BILLION

Yet in the face of all of these problems, the Kennedy administration proposes a net tax cut of $10 billion. Such a step would merely compound problems unless substantial cuts are also made in spending. I wish to commend the junior Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON] for taking the lead today in listing, after a careful study, substantial cuts which should be made in the Kennedy budget. The total reduction which would result by the adoption of these proposals would be at least $6 billion in fiscal 1964. In my opinion, he has rendered a great national service in the Senate today.

I want to assure him that he shall have my cooperation in this effort, as well as that of nearly all of the Republicans in Congress. This support will be reflected and brought to bear on each of the appropriation bills as they come up and on each of the many new spending programs which President Kennedy has or will ask Congress to authorize. Since appropriation bills originate in the House, the Republican activity thus far has been largely concentrated there, but we in the Senate will shortly have our turn.

REPUBLICAN ECONOMY PROGRAM

A Republican task force in the House has just completed a detailed study of the Kennedy budget. The conclusion reached is that new obligational authority to spend can be reduced by at least

$10 billion, while actual spending can be reduced by from $4 to $6 billion during the coming fiscal year, and by $6 to $9 billion in subsequent years.

I am fully convinced that taxes are too high and are a drag on our economy and therefore on our economic growth. They should be reduced, and I am anxious to have them cut sharply. But this must be preceded by a concerted successful effort to make substantial slashes in Federal spending, which has reached fantastic levels under the Kennedy administration. We must not finance tax cuts by borrowing money and resorting to the Government printing press. We must not finance tax cuts by feeding the fires of inflation through massive deficit financing.

INFLATION THREAT

In his tax message the President claimed that "inflationary forces need not be revived by this tax program." But any program, whether based on tax reduction or increased expenditures, which will produce an admitted deficit of $12 billion and which may climb to $15 to $20 billion, is bound to be inflationary.

Inflation is the most vicious regressive tax of all. If there is even so much as a 1-percent increase in the consumer price index, which would likely result from such newly created inflationary pressures, all of the increase in real purchasing power from tax cuts would be wiped out. This is no idle fancy, since the Consumer Price Index went up over 1.1 percent in 1962.

I commend my colleague from Virginia. He will have my support in his efforts to make sound cuts in Federal spending followed by sound tax cuts. But with or without tax cuts, we must cut spending, deficits, and debt.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. ELLENDER obtained the floor.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I should like to suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I will yield for that purpose with the understanding that thereafter I shall retain my right to the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Senator from Louisiana may yield for the purpose of the Senator from Ohio suggesting the absence of a quorum, with the understanding that the Senator from Louisiana will retain his right to the floor.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that further proceedings under the quorum call be suspended.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Louisiana is recognized.

SPENDING BY STATE AND LOCAL GOVERNMENTS

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield to me in order that I may make a brief insertion in the RECORD?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, we hear a great deal these days about the national debt, and we are all greatly concerned from time to time about the increase in the national debt and the problems of managing the national debt.

Sometimes, however, we are prone to overlook another debt that is rising much faster than the national debt. That is the debt of our States and municipalities. Just yesterday, in the Joint Economic Committee, I proposed that, in connection with a study we planned to make of the national debt, we also study the problem of State, municipal, and local indebtedness.

As it happens, one of the lead articles in the Wall Street Journal of today deals with that very subject, under the title "Spending Giants: Governments of States, Localities, Lift Outlays Far Faster Than United States."

The article points out that since the end of World War II the increase in the debt of States and local governments has been 400 percent. That presents a problem with which we ought to be concerned, particularly at this time when we are talking about the possibility of tax reduction. We ought to give a balanced consideration to that problem also.

Therefore, I ask unanimous consent to have included in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks the article from the Wall Street Journal to which I have referred.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SPENDING GIANTS: GOVERNMENTS OF STATES, LOCALITIES, LIFT OUTLAYS FAR FASTER THAN UNITED STATES—SURGE IN SCHOOL-AGE CHILDREN, MIGRATION TO CITIES CITED; NON-FEDERAL PAYROLLS SOAR—RISING TAXES AND RESISTANCE

(By Alfred L. Malabre, Jr.)

Spending by State and local governments has increased nearly 400 percent since World War II.

The increase is greater by far than the postwar rise of Federal expenditures. It has triggered a steep climb in State and local tax rates and, despite mounting taxpayer resistance, is continuing unabated.

"State and local spending constitutes about the only area where we economic forecasters can always predict correctly what's going to happen next," says William M. Burke, a senior economist at the National Industrial Conference Board (NICB).

The table traces the sweeping climb of non-Federal spending in the postwar era, and also shows the much tamer Federal increase (up 69 percent since 1946). Dollars are in billions and the years are fiscal periods ending June 30.

[In billions]

Fiscal year	State	Local	Federal
1946	$6.2	$7.0	$66.5
1954	15.8	17.8	77.7
1962	29.2	33.0	112.2

The extra-steep climb of State and local spending, compared with Federal spending, reflects partly the fact Federal expenditures were abnormally high in 1946, from lingering World War II expenses.

REFLECTS POPULATION SHIFTS

But the dramatic State and local rise stems also from basic postwar population trends: A sharp increase in persons of school age and a massive migration of families to cities and towns from the country.

"There's no question that State and local governments are bearing the brunt of the school-age population bulge, as well as of the increasing concentration of persons in urban centers," says Robert W. French, president of the Tax Foundation, Inc., a research organization.

In the last decade, enrollment in public elementary and secondary schools has soared by nearly 50 percent to above 40 million. Total U.S. population has increased only 20 percent in the same span.

Costs per pupil are rising rapidly; they are up 70 percent since the 1952–53 school year. Teachers' salaries, on average, have climbed at about the same pace. And the expense of school construction keeps mounting; capital outlays, up 75 percent in a decade, will top $3 billion for the first time this year.

BURDEN OF SCHOOL COSTS

State and local governments pay for about 96 percent of public school costs, reports the National Education Association. The table below outlines the rise of public school expenses and of yearly costs per pupil. The total cost figures are in billions.

School year	Total cost	Cost per pupil
	Billions	
1954–55	$9.8	$275
1958–59	14.3	350
1962–63	19.5	432

School costs will continue to mount, talks with educators suggest. Government projections indicate 25.4 percent of the 1970 population will be of school age (5–17 years). That's up slightly from the 1960 school-age rate of 25.2 percent and well above 1950's 20.3-percent level.

"Education costs, I'm afraid, have nowhere to go but up and up some more," says an NEA official.

The increasing concentration of families in urban centers is driving up the expenses of non-Federal governments. Some 70 percent of the population is bunched in towns and cities today, compared with only 64 percent in 1950, Government figures show, and experts foresee no reversal of this trend.

The urban concentration is causing sharp increases in costs of such largely non-Federal services as police, sanitation, and firefighting facilities.

"On the farm, there was no need for a big, professional police force or fire department," notes NICB's Mr. Burke. "But in the city, you can't do without them."

HUGE COST OF SERVICES

The Federal Government, of course, maintains some key urban services, such as certain prisons and health facilities. These make up only a fraction of Federal spending, however; as the table below shows, such services are a major expense for State and local authorities. Figures are in billions.

[In billions]

Service	Federal support	State and local support
Police	----------	$2.0
Fire	----------	1.1
Prisons	$0.1	.8
Health and sanitation	1.0	6.1

Non-Federal Government payrolls are expanding much faster than the Federal one. Since 1954, the number of civilians employed by the Federal Government has increased by 5 percent to about 2.5 million, while the State and local job force has leaped nearly 40 percent, to almost 7 million.

In government, the increase of non-Federal spending outpaces the rise of State and local tax receipts. In fiscal 1962, State and local tax revenues amounted to about $44 billion, far less than the non-Federal spending total of $62.2 billion. Federal grants-in-aid and funds from nontax sources helped close the gap.

State and local debt is piling up rapidly. The table below, computed from Government data by the Tax Foundation, shows the climb of per capita public debt at State and local levels, as well as the reduction of per capita Federal debt.

	State	Local	Federal
1946	$18	$102	$2,034
1954	61	185	1,713
1962	118	325	1,630

Above $80 billion for the first time last year, total State and local government debt is now a quarter the size of the Federal debt. In 1950, it was less than a 10th the Federal total.

Official concern is increasing over the pileup of non-Federal debt.

Gov. James Rhodes of debt-ridden Ohio, for instance, not long ago fired more than 3,000 recently hired State employees, ordered all State departments to cut spending back about 10 percent and requested all State employees to work on Lincoln's and Washington's birthdays.

Many States, at the same time, are considering sharp tax boosts this year.

Before Nebraska's legislature, for example, are proposals to eliminate some property tax exemptions and institute a personal income tax. Other possibilities facing Nebraska taxpayers: A gas tax boost of up to 8 cents per gallon and a new 2 percent sales tax.

The 47 State legislatures meeting this year are expected to consider measures that would add $1.5 billion to the States' tax bills, the Tax Foundation estimates.

Tax collections in many States would receive an added boost if the Kennedy administration's proposal to reduce Federal tax rates becomes law. In 19 States, Federal tax payments may be deducted from income subject to State taxation. And in many States curbs on personal deductions, proposed by the administration, would mean similar curbs on State tax deductions, without any offsetting cut in State tax rates.

The following table breaks down the major sources of State and local revenues. The percentages are based on Department of Commerce data.

Source of revenue:	*Percent total*
Property tax	33
Sales tax	21
Income tax	5
Vehicle tax	3
Corporation tax	2
Other	36

The most rapidly rising source of State tax revenues: Receipts from taxes levied on tobacco sales, now above the $1-billion mark and twice the 1956 total.

The relentless climb of State and local spending is encountering increased taxpayer opposition in some areas.

Example: Residents of Ridgewood, N.J., one of New York City's wealthiest suburbs, recently rejected school board plans to boost sharply the community's school budget. The voters later approved a school budget scaled down by $151,422.

Despite such taxpayer efforts, however, overall non-Federal governmental spending—and taxes—will surely keep mounting, most experts agree. Expressing the view of many, NICB's Mr. Burke says: "So long as the need for education facilities and for municipal services continues to grow, State and local taxpayers will have to keep digging deeper into their pockets.

REPORT BY SENATOR ELLENDER ON HIS AFRICAN TOUR IN THE FALL OF 1962

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I present to the Senate my report on U.S. foreign policy and our many and varied operations on the continent of Africa, as submitted by me to the Senate Appropriations Committee.

This is the 11th such report to the Senate Committee on Appropriations over the past 14 years. Last year I chose to tour Africa to find out how the wave of independence that has engulfed the continent during the last 5 years has affected our American operations.

The impact has been very noticeable. In 1957, our State Department had only 404 Americans stationed in Africa. By June 30, 1962, the number had increased to 781. USIS American employees have increased from 71 to 143, and in our AID program American employees have increased from 305 to 850 in the same period. That means an overall increase from 780 in fiscal year 1957 to 1,774 in fiscal year 1962.

Those figures related to American personnel only. There has been a corresponding increase in the number of locals employed by our missions in each country. In fiscal year 1962, the total number of persons employed by the State Department, USIS, and AID on the African Continent amounted to 4,037.

Furthermore, the number is growing larger each day. In 1963, it is estimated that the number of American State Department personnel in Africa will increase from 781 to 994; USIS will increase from 143 to 172; and the number of AID personnel will rise from 850 to 1,039. These figures relate only to our own American nationals. Thus, if all these increases are countenanced by the Congress, the total number of Americans in these three missions alone will rise from 1,774 in 1962 to 2,105 in 1963. Will it never end? How long must we continue to support a large and growing number of Americans overseas?

Since 1946, we have directly contributed a total of $1.8 billion of foreign aid to Africa. Prior to this decade, the yearly amount has been small in relation to our efforts in other parts of the world. Our aid program now threatens to grow like Topsy. We are gradually assuming burdens that should be borne by some of the countries of Western Europe that are well entrenched and deeply interested in the domestic and foreign commerce of that great continent. They also own and control the lion's share of its immense mineral resources. Africa has been within their sphere of influence for over a hundred years.

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, will the distinguished Senator yield at that point?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield for a question.

Mr. TALMADGE. I desire to congratulate my distinguished friend and colleague in the Senate on the energy and perseverance which he has demonstrated each year in going to various portions of the world and observing the activities of the Government of the United States in operation at the grassroots level, so to speak.

I do not believe there is a Member of Congress who is more familiar with what our Government has done in every area of the world, particularly in the field of foreign aid, than the distinguished Senator from Louisiana. He has pointed out time after time on the floor of the Senate the gross waste and extravagance and abuse of discretion that has been going on throughout the world.

Did the able Senator from Louisiana find evidences of that in Africa on this visit, as he has throughout other areas of the world on previous visits?

Mr. ELLENDER. More so, as I will show and as my report will indicate. The report contains 803 pages. It contains my diary and my observations. I am sure that the Senator from Georgia will be very much interested to read and to learn about the various programs that have been started in Africa which, in my opinion, are of no use. If the Senator is able to remain in the Chamber a little while, I will point out a few of those programs.

Mr. TALMADGE. Indeed, I look forward to that with much interest.

Mr. ELLENDER. I was also curious to discover just what we had obtained for this $1.8 billion expenditure, and what we might hope to get in the future. I was curious to discover what had been done to help the native African in his strugggle against illiteracy, disease, and poverty.

I must say that I was disappointed. The comments of the esteemed investigating committee, headed by our majority leader, recently confirmed conditions that I reported to the Senate continually during the past several years. Though the comments of that committee were addressed only to Western Europe and southeast Asia, they apply as well to our African operations. I am of the firm belief that a reevaluation of our present policy must be made, and made quickly, if we ever expect to realize goals in Africa set by our planners. In fact, the goals themselves must be reexamined to determine if they are actually realistic.

Senators will find a copy of my report on their desks. I will submit copies to the State Department and all other departments of Government that may be interested. I express the hope that the report will be read and studied, not only by the departments affected, but also by a fair segment of the American people.

Mr. President, in compiling this report, I have elected to use a slightly different approach than I used in the past. This report is divided into three parts. I have added an appendix. Part 1 consists of a short historical background of Africa, along with a general summary of my observations, conclusions, and recommendations. Part 2 contains excerpts from my day-to-day comments in each of the countries I visited. Part 3 summarizes some of the information I gathered from my interrogation of the mission heads and staff members of our agencies abroad. I have also attempted to analyze these data and present them in a meaningful form.

Mr. President, the appendix of the report contains a wealth of statistical data which has been furnished by our Government agencies abroad in response to comprehensive questionnaires which had been sent to our embassies in each country, in advance of my visit.

These data include exhibits for each of the countries I visited. Exhibit A is concerned with the operations of our embassies and consulates; exhibit B covers the operations of the U.S. Information Service; and exhibit C details the operations and programs of the Agency for International Development.

That section of the appendix marked "exhibit C," which deals with our foreign aid operations, is, in my opinion, the most valuable part of the document I am presenting to the Senate today. It might also be pointed out that this section of the appendix makes up by far the greatest portion of the report. It is valuable in that a comprehensive treatment of our foreign aid programs is put together in one printed volume and made available for dissemination to the public.

Mr. President, I am not unmindful of the fact that I have frequently been criticized in respect to these reports which I have made almost annually during the past 14 years. I have often been accused, for example, of having an overexalted opinion of my ability in writing, and that I fancy myself as a real author. I can assure you, Mr. President, and Senators, that I make no claims to being an accomplished writer. I have no talents at writing deathless prose, and I make no pretense at doing anything but putting into plain, everyday language which I hope all who are interested in the subject matter can understand, the on-the-spot observations I have made in the course of my tours of investigation.

I have also been accused of including entirely irrelevant material into my reports. I do not believe this particular charge is warranted.

I believe that when trying to present the effectiveness of our far-flung aid operations in a particular country, the observation on the sanitary conditions of its cities has a place.

If, after we have been aiding a nation for the past 16 years, as we have Ethiopia, and if we have spent hundreds of thousands of dollars on public health programs, is it not relevant to note that unsanitary and filthy conditions still prevail in its capital city of Addis Ababa? Also, when one learns that we have been aiding a country, such as Liberia, since 1946, to the tune of $131.5 million, and when it is noted that this country is using borrowed money—not to aid its people but to erect grandiose and pretentious public buildings and executive mansions—should that not have an impact on the reader? It should tell a story all its own, a story which in my opinion will be much more powerful than any mass of statistics and justifications. It should cause even the most fervent advocates of our foreign aid programs to pause and think and ask themselves the questions: Are our aid policies really wise? Are they actually bearing fruit? Is there hope that they will do so in the future?

Liberia, which I said we have been aiding since 1946, should by now be one of the showplaces of democracy. I fear it is a vast understatement when I say that it is not.

But, Mr. President, I am glad to say that I have let the harsh words of slanted criticism bother me but little, if at all. I can take it. At least I can say that all of the comments I have made in the past, and am making in this report, have been made in the spirit of objectivity. I have leaned over backward to be fair, and have passed out praise and criticism wherever I believed them to be due. It pleases me to note how this effort at strict objectivity over years is now beginning to return home to the fold.

Again and again, my observations have been proven to be correct. The words I wrote in 1956 concerning the conditions and progress of our aid program in Korea were proved right by an audit of the General Accounting Office last year. In my report of 1958, I was one of the first to call a spade a spade and Castro a Communist. For my efforts with respect to both Korea and Cuba, I was subjected to a full attack by many segments of the national press, but it took only a few years for my views to be vindicated. I will dwell on this aspect at greater length further in this presentation, and in future days on the Senate floor.

On this inspection tour of our operations in Africa, I visited the former Belgian Congo. For me, it was a return trip, for I had been to that unfortunate section of the world almost 10 years ago, in 1953. At that time it was not unfortunate, for I felt it had one of the greatest potentials of any of the underdeveloped sections of the world. The potential is still there, but I believe it will be a long and hard pull before that country, now independent, can be put back on the road to progress.

The results of having no explicit criteria for independence, save the desire for it, can easily be illustrated by the situation prevailing there. I refer to my notes from my trip in 1953, when I visited that section of Africa.

At that time I gave attention to the 1952 budget of the Belgian Congo. I found that receipts were $129,460,000 with expenditures at $125,180,000. There was a surplus of $4,280,000 in 1952.

Ten years later, what did I find? There is no budget for the Belgian Congo. Over the past 2 years and for all practical purposes, there has been no Congo, Belgian or otherwise. Instead of any surplus being created, it has been necessary for the wealth of other nations to be poured into this most unfortunate former colony.

According to figures furnished to me by our AID representatives in Léopoldville, the free world has actually furnished to the Congo since independence and through June 30, 1962, $262,260,584, of which our contribution was $222,072,243. Although we have paid the full amount of our commitment to the U.N., other member nations of the U.N. have paid only $40,188,341 on a total obligation of $125,510,710.

I wish to repeat those figures. Out of a total of $262,260,584 which was paid to the new government for its upkeep, the United States paid $222,072,243, while other countries have paid only $40,188,341 up until now. I was informed that for fiscal year 1963 we plan to contribute $37,800,000 in economic assistance and $100 million to the purchase of U.N. bonds. I was unable to obtain information as to the amount of contributions, if any, which other nations of the free world would make.

In 1953, the Belgian Congo was enjoying a $2 million favorable balance of trade, with exports aggregating $408 million and imports $406 million. It will be a long while before such a situation again occurs. Traffic on the Congo River in 1953 gave evidence of a busy, thriving, expanding economy. In November of last year, that traffic was virtually nonexistent. On this trip I stood on the French side of the Congo River, in Brazzaville, and looked across to the imposing skyline of Léopoldville, built by the Belgians. It was very impressive from that distance, indicative of great strides having been made since my visit in 1953.

However, once the river was crossed, I was confronted with heartbreaking sights. The European section of the city is dead or dying. It is like walking through a graveyard. Many of the towering buildings have few occupants. Shops and stores are virtually empty, and the streets are deserted. The once thriving city of Léopoldville is now a ghost town.

Looking over my day-to-day notes of 1953, I found this observation:

> If ever Belgium got out of this territory, the natives would suffer.
>
> To my way of thinking, it will require years of schooling and training before the natives are able to govern themselves.
>
> Darkness would return here, if the settlers leave and permit the natives to take over entirely.

Here again my views have been vindicated. Darkness has returned. In the years immediately preceding independence, the Belgians had made some effort to educate and train the natives. Given time, their efforts would have borne fruit, but unfortunately time was not given. It may appear to some that the Belgians were slow in training the natives, but the problems confronting them were so enormous that one must be there and see for himself to believe.

It would be well if those advocating immediate independence for other areas of Africa—and here I mean primarily the racial agitators—could visit the Congo. What they would say upon their return would provide a reflection of their real intentions. It would indicate whether they have the interests of their people at heart, or their own aggrandizement and lust for power.

Due to the conflict that has come about in the Congo, famine has struck much of the country. The ones who went hungry and the ones who lost their means of livelihood were the natives. While Belgium governed the Congo, the natives may not have had the vote, but they had full stomachs and were from all appearances happy and content.

I express the hope—a hope which cannot be expressed too strongly—that the Belgians, who developed the colony and gave it economic substance, will be permitted to return. Those now heading the Government should bury their pride and receive the Belgians with open arms.

I also express the hope that no more Congo situations will be allowed to develop in other parts of Africa. But it appears to me that our present policy is leading in the direction of such developments. If we give support, either public or private, to the few native agitators who are trying to gain control in the Portuguese colonies of Angola or Mozambique, as well as in the Republic of South Africa, we shall see the development of events similar to those which occurred recently in the Congo. If the whites of South Africa are forced to hand over control of government to the South African natives, the result will make the Congo situation pale to insignificance. It must be remembered that the South African whites are as native to the area as is any other group. They were the first to arrive in the Cape Colony, and they found the country virtually empty. They took nothing from anyone. They used the land and resources to build up from the earth the most flourshing economy to be found in the continent.

Much of the same is true of the Portuguese in Mozambique and Angola. The Portuguese have been in those areas since the 1500's. The progress made there is due to their efforts. Instead of our Government's condemning policies of the Portuguese and South African government with which we may not agree, we should bend our efforts in an attempt to encourage them to do more and more for the Negro population. Already a good start has been made in the fields of housing, education, and health. We should beseech and encourage them to step up the pace. The problems these governments face in their attempts are almost insurmountable. But, as I have said, a good start has been made.

In my opinion, we should use the offices of the U.S. Government to stand behind Portugal and South Africa in the arena of world opinion, even if that position is not politically expedient. Since we are paying by far the greatest cost of the United Nations, it seems to me that we should be able to make our voice—based on logic, experience and history—heard and heeded by the U.N. policymakers who apparently are attempting to bring on more chaos in the African Continent.

Mr. President, I should like to direct the attention of my colleagues to the information found in the appendix to this report. If there are those who do not believe that my analysis is correct, let them make their own analyses. Let them review and present to the public the material supplied by our State Department, the U.S. Information Agency, the Agency for International Development, and the Peace Corps. Let them be objective in their criticism. This is the information that should be brought to the attention of the public. These are the facts that should be presented to a wide audience of the American people. Let them delve, for instance, into our aid operations in the Republic of Somali. They will note that currently we are building a deepwater port in Somali, at a cost of $7,518,000. This sum represents 99.8 percent of the entire project's cost. The host country is contributing $20,000. Neither this port, nor this multi-million-dollar expenditure can in any way be justified. The port is being built supposedly to export surplus agricultural commodities. At present, there are no surplus agricultural commodities in Somali.

The construction of this port is based upon and justified by studies which show that in 20 years, and under the most favorable conditions, these agricultural surplus commodities might come into being; but at present the only agricultural commodity that Somali exports in any amount is bananas. The production of those bananas is subsidized by the Italian Government.

In 1960, the corn production in Somali was 2 million bushels; and corn or maize is the staff of life for the 1.2 million population of the country. In 1961, corn production dropped to 1.6 million bushels; in 1962, it was again at 2 million bushels. Mind you, Mr. President, this is total production, not export corn. As a point of contrast, it might be noted that our little State of Delaware last year produced 7.4 million bushels. Yet, here we are, building a port at a cost of $7.5 million. How can grain be exported, in view of the fact that grain is now grown there in quantities barely sufficient to feed the native population?

Wheat is another commodity which we hoped to bring into production there, according to the justification for this port. At present, the Foreign Agricultural Service has no figures relating to the production of Somali wheat. I could ascertain only that its production was nominal.

Of course, there is an explanation for our construction of this facility. It is not a good one; it is by no means a valid and businesslike justification; but here it is:

In 1960, when I talked with the Prime Minister of Somali, I was warned that if the West did not rush in and give his country substantial and increased amounts of aid, he would turn to Russia.

This, he has done; so the Eastern bloc has promised aid, and supposedly there is nothing for us to do but rush in and try to outdo and counteract it. I devote several pages of this report to a discussion of the dogfight which has developed between East and West in Africa, and its probable consequences.

In my opinion, a great deal of credit must be given to the Russian intelligence. It has refined to a high degree the pattern of cause and effect. Here is the pattern: All the African countries need aid; they come to us, and automatically receive a certain amount; and then they turn to Russia, or threaten to, for more aid. Russia acts as if it would be granted. There is the cause; here is the reaction: Like Pavlov's dog, we bark when the bell rings. We rush forward to grant every bit of aid we can, whether the country can use it or not. We build projects that are far beyond the underdeveloped nations' ability either to finance, operate, or maintain.

A few minutes ago, I mentioned Ethiopia. This country is truly a classic example of what not to do in respect to foreign aid. Here, too, is an example of my prediction, as long as 10 years ago, of exactly what would happen.

Our aid program in Ethiopia has been going on since 1946. Through the fiscal year 1962, our contributions totaled $83 million. One would think that given 16 years in which to improve conditions in that country, some results should by now be apparent.

What do we find in Ethiopia? No comprehensive development plan currently exists. We have actually abandoned most of the ambitious—too ambitious—plans which were so bravely started years ago. One need point only to the agricultural extension program which was tried in Ethiopia, to realize the miserable failure that has been the fruit of our effort. Ten years ago, I advised that we initiate only very simple and basic programs of education and health in Ethiopia. Instead, we wasted many millions of dollars in an agricultural college and in other programs much too advanced for the natives. In 1960, when I visited Addis Ababa, I reported that the markets I visited there were as filthy as any I had seen in any corner of the world, with the possible exception of those in Haiti.

Today, at long last, we have decided to concentrate on education—as I advised 10 years ago—at the bottom rung of the ladder. I point out, parenthetically, that, in some instances, in this connection we are providing teachers through our own Peace Corps. Those teachers are under the supervision of the Ministry of Education of Ethiopia, Mr. President, so that we are to a certain extent actually subsidizing the educational system of that country.

I could go on reciting what has happened to every project that was so hopefully started years ago in Ethiopia—agricultural projects abandoned because of a lack of cooperation by the people and the government; health conditions improved very little, if at all; and so on.

But we are still there, Mr. President, searching around for something to do to show results in this unhappy land.

I found a similar situation in many of the newly independent countries, where we have sizable crews of Americans merely to look into possibilities, to investigate, to study, to survey, and to suggest what to do to assist. It stands to reason that those people will come up with programs—as they have already done in many instances—and quite frequently exactly the type of projects which have been shown to be miserable failures in such countries as Ethiopia.

I have said many times, Mr. President—and I repeat it now—that more employees in the field beget more projects. If for no other reason, these people will have to come up with suggestions to justify their continued employment.

Turning again to Somali, which I have mentioned before in connection with the $7½ million port we have agreed to build there, these statistics, I believe, are revealing: when I was there in 1960 we had 59 Americans authorized for 1961; in 1962, we had 68 positions authorized; and for 1963 a request was made for 70 Americans and 104 locals, making a total of 174 employees. Is there any wonder why our program has increased there?

Let us take the case of Tunisia. In the 5 years since its independence, we have made available to that small country a total of over $300 million in development grants, supporting assistance, development loans repayable in local currencies, and through Public Law 480. For 1963, there are 189 employees authorized for that country, 72 of whom are Americans, 115 locals and 2 contract. This is solely the AID program I am talking about and in the administrative section alone there are 22 Americans. I am convinced that a much better job could be done in this small country with less than half the number of employees. Many of our aid projects in Tunisia, moreover, are exactly the type we have since abandoned in Ethiopia. Libya is another place where we have carried on projects that were ill-advised, to say the least. I was pleased to learn that it is intended to phase out our AID program there in a short period of time. Information furnished me indicated that we have made $122.6 million available to Libya through 1962. Since 1960, we have been paying the local government $10 million for our air base in that country—$9 million from AID funds and $1 million from Air Force funds. We pay all expenses and our presence there has been a boon to the economy, yet we are being held up for rentals. We have had an outrageously large number of Americans piddling around, and yet no progress of any note has been made in agriculture, for instance. This is just another example of where our big-eyed operators tried to foster programs not in keeping with the ability of the local people to absorb or the capability of the country to keep up after we leave. I know of no program we undertook that will be continued by the host government.

Mr. President, again I point out that we have conducted programs there for years. We have sponsored agricultural programs which I criticized 10 years ago. Today they are being abandoned. The money has been spent with no good results.

The list of countries in Africa is long, Mr. President, and the list of projects still longer—and yet in very few places could I find any definite plan of action or attainable goal suggested by our planners. They are still floundering about, still surveying, still searching for ways to spend our hard-earned tax dollars.

Let me say here and now, that I am not unalterably opposed to the granting of aid in the technical field to the underdeveloped countries of Africa. There is no question but that they need it and will need it for years and years to come.

Few places on earth have I seen such abject poverty and as high a rate of illiteracy, to name only two of the problems that must be faced and dealt with. The emerging nations cannot successfully deal with those problems by themselves. But what I am attempting to do is to direct our aid into the most productive channels. I think this will be apparent to anyone reading this report. I am trying to forestall the construction of large capital facilities which have not worked in the past in other countries and will not work now in Africa. I am trying to forestall the conditions that bring on graft and corruption, such as happened in Korea. By now we all know that story; there is no need to recap it. I might say, however, that in 1956 I pointed out exactly what the conditions were in Korea and further said that all our aid was going into velvet-lined ratholes. For my trouble, as I said before, I was maligned by the press of the country for criticizing a stanch friend of the West. It took an audit by the General Accounting Office to prove that my observations were correct.

Turning now to a few observations on some of our other missions, I am aware that this wave of independence has made it necessary for the number of our oversea personnel in all categories to increase substantially. In my view, the increase in almost every case has been far beyond the actual needs. Be that as it may, I cannot fathom the method used to scatter the available personnel among the newly independent countries. For instance, the following four nations in tropical Africa are contiguous.

They lie one beside the other and I visited them in this order—Chad, Central African Republic, Cameroon, and Gabon. In looking over the answers to my questionnaires as I arrived in each country, I was amazed to find the difference in the number of State Department personnel stationed in each. There seems to be no correlation between the number of State personnel in each country and that country's area or population. The countries of Togo and Dahomey lie side by side on the West African coast. They are almost exactly equal in size, population, and in every other respect. Yet in Togo our Embassy has 13 Americans and 15 locals employed. In Dahomey there are only 8 Americans and 7 locals. Surely there can be no substantial difference in the amount of work at the two Embassies.

Chad, for a further example, has an area of 450,000 square miles and a population of almost 3 million. In Chad we find eight Americans assigned to the Embassy.

The Central African Republic has an area of 238,000 square miles and a population of 1.2 million. There we also find eight Americans assigned to the Embassy.

In Cameroon, with an area of 184,000 square miles and a population of 4 million, we find a total of 20 State Department personnel on board, while neighboring Gabon, with an area of 102,000 square miles and a population of 421,000, again has an Embassy staffed with eight Americans. Surely this allotment is nothing short of arbitrary.

These countries all have the same general resources and approximately the same amount of business taking place. Yet here we have Gabon, with less than 500,000 people, with the same number of State Department Americans assigned as does Chad with almost 3 million and the Central African Republic with 1.2 million. Again, while there are only 8 Americans in the Embassy at Chad, there are 20 in neighboring Cameroon though the difference in population is only about 1 million. If the 8 State Department representatives in Chad, the Central African Republic and Gabon can fulfill their duties without being strained by an unduly large workload—as I am sure they are not—I can see no reason for Cameroon to have a complement of 20 State Department people. I doubt very much that these people can find enough work to keep them busy in such a post.

Similar examples could be cited and I invite Senators to study the table appearing in the appendix giving the number of Americans at each Embassy in Africa, as well as my comments as to each country.

Mr. President, at this point I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the table which appears on page 803 of my report.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Summary of American personnel, U.S. State Department, serving in African countries as of June 30, 1957

Algeria	14
Angola	4
Cameroon	4
Congo	13
Egypt	84
Ethiopa	36
Federation of Rhodesia and Nyasaland	7
Ghana	15
Ivory Coast	2
Kenya	15
Liberia	19
Libya	35
Morocco	56
Mozambique	5
Nigeria	11
Senegal	9
Somali Republic	4
Sudan	13
Tunisia	18
Uganda	2
Union of South Africa	38
Total	404

Source: State Department.

Summary of American personnel serving in Africa[1] *with the State Department, U.S. Information Service, and Agency for International Development—actual totals for fiscal year 1962 and estimated totals for fiscal year 1963 (excluding contract personnel)*

Country	Fiscal year 1962				Fiscal year 1963			
	State	USIS	AID	Total	State	USIS	AID	Total
Angola	6	0	0	6	6	0	0	6
Burundi	12	2	0	14	15	2	0	17
Cameroon	20	2	12	34	26	4	17	47
Central African Republic	8	2	0	10	9	3	3	15
Chad	8	2	0	10	10	2	6	18
Congo:								
Brazzaville	14	2	2	18	19	3	3	25
Léopoldville	42	9	18	69	60	18	20	98
Dahomey	8	2	5	15	9	2	9	20
Egypt	82	14	39	135	76	15	42	133
Ethiopia	46	6	111	163	43	8	84	135
Gabon	8	1	0	9	8	2	7	17
Ghana	48	7	48	103	58	8	68	134
Guinea	23	3	15	41	26	3	34	63
Ivory Coast	22	2	30	54	23	2	32	57
Kenya	21	6	30	57	23	7	34	64
Liberia	32	3	102	137	34	3	107	144
Libya	22	12	76	110	24	12	55	91
Malagasy	14	2	7	23	14	2	7	23
Mali	17	3	18	38	18	3	28	49
Mauritania	0	0	0	0	4	0	0	4
Morocco	80	12	42	134	77	13	46	136
Mozambique	6	0	0	6	8	0	0	8
Niger	8	3	4	15	9	3	5	17
Nigeria	39	14	104	157	62	20	160	242
Rhodesia and Nyasaland	19	5	25	49	21	7	33	61
Rwanda	0	0	0	0	6	0	0	6
Senegal	20	4	11	35	22	4	14	40
Sierra Leone	15	1	16	32	19	2	28	49
Somali	22	4	48	74	24	4	70	98
Tanganyika	10	3	11	24	12	3	12	27
Togo	13	2	8	23	19	2	18	39
Tunisia	29	6	58	93	29	6	72	107
Uganda	8	3	6	17	12	3	15	30
Union of South Africa	49	4	0	53	56	4	0	60
Upper Volta	10	2	4	16	13	2	10	25
Total	781	143	850	1,774	894	172	1,039	2,105

[1] Compiled from responses to Senator Ellender's questionnaire.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, turning now to our USIS activities, the Government of Mali is most critical of our U.S. Information Service and has gone to great lengths to restrict the scope of its functions. Unfortunately, they have not restricted the number of personnel that may be sent, but only the activity that may be engaged in. Our library has been closed; the press of the country will not accept our releases; and, in general, we are being told to cease any activities which might be classified as propaganda. Yet we find two Americans stationed in Mali to handle the duties of the U.S. Information Services. These duties consist of handling such matters as setting up exhibits, or making personal contact with the people. The same is true in Guinea, where the Government has also restricted U.S. Information Service activity. There are three Americans assigned to USIS in Guinea. Why could not this limited USIS work be handled by our Embassy? Why must we have these people stationed abroad where they can be of little value. Again I invite Senators to read my comments as to our information program in each country I visited.

I was most gratified for the opportunity to observe on this trip the workings of our Peace Corps. I believe I am the first American outside of the Peace Corps organization who has had an opportunity to view these operations at first hand and in a comprehensive manner.

I found many reasons to be proud of our young people in the Peace Corps operation. Generally they are working under the most adverse conditions and with a high degree of self-sacrifice and fortitude. However, it became apparent to me as I progressed in my inspection tour that the Peace Corps stands in very real danger of moving away from its original objectives. What I want it fully understood that I am in complete agreement with the ideals and objectives of the Corps, I do not want these objectives and ideals to be forgotten. When Mr. Sargent Shriver, Jr., was testifying before Congress at the inception of the Peace Corps program, he made it plain, and promised emphatically, that as nearly as possible the Peace Corps would use the administrative setup that was already in existence in our missions abroad. I took this to mean, and I do not see how any other meaning could be read into it, that the officers of USIS, AID, and primarily of the Embassy in each country, would be used for administrative support. According to Mr. Shriver's testimony, there would be no reason to send large numbers of administrative personnel to look after the Peace Corps volunteers. I was wholeheartedly in favor of this objective, for as we all know, the great amount of money that goes into the administration of all our missions does little real good to any persons other than the administrators. However, on this tour, and contrary to what I had been led to believe would be the case, I found many Peace Corps administration personnel on board. There were supervisors and deputy supervisors, and in many cases, the universities which trained the volunteers had sent their own supervisors at Government expense. I do not believe that this number of directors, administrators and supervisors is necessary. The volunteers should be more or less on their own. They should be sufficiently trained to look after themselves and if they are not capable of doing so, they should not be sent abroad. The administrative rents alone in the country of Nigeria amount to $50,000 per year, and if the latest request for Peace Corps vehicles is approved, there will be one vehicle for every 4.5 Peace Corps volunteers in 1963. I do not believe there is one vehicle for each 4.5 Nigerians.

The initial goal of the Peace Corps was to live near the level of the people they were working with, or only a few notches above them. This is commendable, and every effort should be made to see that this principle is adhered to and that the goal is realized.

Furthermore, Mr. President, I found that in many countries the Peace Corps is doing little more than subsidizing the educational system of the country. In other words, the host country uses the Peace Corps to obtain teachers at far less expense than they could be obtained otherwise. This may be all right in itself, but many times these teachers operate strictly under the Ministry of Education of the host country and confine their activities to teaching in the elementary and secondary schools of the large cities. This is a mistake. In my judgment, they should be sent into the bush, so to speak, where education is needed much more desperately than in the cities. Better yet, they should be used to train the native teachers.

Finally, while the Peace Corps program is gaining in popularity, I believe that an across-the-board policy should be laid down governing what share of the cost will be borne by the host countries. The present policy varies from nation to nation, and I am fearful that this may cause us trouble in the future. Also, if countries are eager to receive volunteers, they should be willing to supply a larger share of the cost than many are now doing.

To sum up, the Peace Corps operation is in the majority of cases very commendable. I am all for it. However, there is a very great danger that another little empire will be built overseas. The bureaucracy is likely to grow more and more stifling and the red tape will be wound tighter and tighter. Vehicles will be sent which will require mechanics and technicians to maintain; supervisors and administrators will require secretaries, chauffeurs, and housing which is far better than that available to the natives of the country. I know from long experience how these programs work. I express the hope that everything possible will be done to keep the Peace Corps volunteers at the level of the people and keep the program close to its initial ideals and objectives.

Mr. President, I would now like to draw particular attention to part I of my report, which is a general summary of my observations, conclusions and recommendations. In it, I attempt to give some broad, general outline of African history, which is no small task in itself. I then try to point out some of the many difficulties that face our aid efforts in Africa and will make the building of stable and viable economies very, very difficult. I attempt to make plain that our dollars alone will not do the job. What is needed is a working partnership between the European developers and the native African leaders.

It is contended by some that the attention of the world and the attention of the American aid effort in particular, should now be focused on the Dark Continent. I disagree. I have long advocated that our aid effort should be focused on Latin America. In South and Central America we have the resources necessary to keep our industry going and for that reason we should concentrate our efforts there to improve the living conditions of the citizens. In Africa, as I pointed out many times in my report, all of the business and much of the foreign policy has remained in the hands of Europeans. It would be almost impossible to provide an economic aid program to help the native African without the major benefits accruing to those European nationals who are in control of almost all aspects of the business and economic life of the continent. Aid that we provide must be directed toward developing the human resources of the continent.

Europe has historic trade and economic ties with Africa just as we have with South and Central America. The development of Africa should fall to the Europeans and not to us. Africa is out of our sphere of influence.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at the end of my remarks there be placed in the RECORD part I of my report. It is very short, and I would like to have it placed in the RECORD at the end of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit I.)

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, a portion of my report is devoted to the question of military aid to Africa. Needless to say, I am against such aid in all its shapes and forms.

It will be devastating to the African nations if they have to expend even a small amount of their meager revenues to support armies. It is to be hoped that none of them will endeavor to build up their armed forces for use in expanding their territories, and everything possible should be done to promote lasting peace. I am convinced that any amount of military aid to the newly independent countries will serve only to bring on chaotic conditions. Here is a most important field where the United States could play a definite, beneficial role, by staying out of Africa. No military aid in any way, shape, or form should be tolerated.

Although we are now supposedly giving military aid only for internal security, one does not have to look too far to find programs which started out as internal security blossoming into full-fledged military support. The question is always where to draw the line. How is internal security to be defined? When do weapons furnished for internal security become weapons to be used for external aggression?

We are at present, or have been in the recent past, engaged in training paratroopers in Mali, at a cost of over $600,000. Can this be called internal security. Are paratroopers needed to maintain order?

While at the present we have no large military aid program in Africa, especially south of the Sahara, it must be remembered that these countries are new ones. Give us time. After all, Latin America was not armed overnight.

Military advisory groups, which can be expected to form the nucleus of any forthcoming military aid program, are already in evidence in a few countries where their presence cannot in the least be justified.

It is pleasing to note that many of our ambassadors have resisted, and are resisting with all their might, the establishment of military missions, as well as service attachés. Others, however, have been forced to buckle under to pressure from the Washington level.

In Senegal, our military mission is there for the express purpose of teaching the Senegalese soldiers to build roads, bridges, and other public works projects. It might be noted that we are paying all the expenses of this mission—the salaries, rent, office space, and administration costs—as well as providing the necessary equipment.

In Liberia, we have had a military mission since 1959, consisting of five officers, two warrant officers, and six enlisted men. Our military aid program in this country is growing.

I hope that military aid in all its shapes and forms will be withdrawn from Africa. No MAAG's should be established there, and plans for future military aid should be scrapped.

As I now speak, the entire continent of Africa is at peace, due perhaps primarily to the fact that the new countries do not have the ability to wage modern warfare. We should be certain that if this ability is ever gained, it is not through the offices of the United States of America. It goes without saying that if MAAG's are established, the military aid program will increase. Experience shows that in many instances the MAAG's serve for little but to stir things up and then make it necessary for the host country to call for aid.

Mr. President, for many years I have been opposed to the granting of independence to the underdeveloped countries of the world unless certain requirements were met, but my voice has been a mere cry in the wilderness. The wave of independence which has swept over Africa in the last 6 years has been greeted with many outpourings of applause from certain quarters in our Government. I cannot help but feel that a great deal of that applause was based on political expediency and little more. From the many writings and speeches by personnel high in our State Department, it seems apparent that these policymakers believe that the mere desire for self-determination is sufficient grounds for the granting of political control.

In my opinion, this political control has been attained without nearly enough self-control. In my judgment, it requires much more than a desire for independence to make a country truly self-determining. There must be sufficient trained human resources as well as a reasonable amount of natural resources to go along with desire. I cannot believe that any country can ever become truly independent and self-determining unless a minimum of prerequisites are met.

The conditions which have prevailed and are prevailing in the Congo, and which I predicted in 1953, are the direct result of having no explicit requirements for independence except a desire for the same on the part of a few native agitators. It should be the task of the United Nations to adopt some such requirements and criteria, and I believe that our country should lead the way in advocating the adoption of such criteria.

In my opinion, the requirements for independence should contain at least the following points:

First, the country should have a reasonable number of trained leaders;

Second, it should have sufficient trained manpower to perform at least the basic and semiskilled tasks;

Third, it should have a pool of sufficiently trained civil servants and administrators to handle the ordinary chores of government;

Fourth, it should have a primary and secondary education system that will insure its future growth and development;

Fifth, it should have sufficient land and other natural resources to assure its population a reasonable chance to establish a more or less balanced economy.

In none of the new nations of Africa which I have visited have even a majority of these requirements been met. I fear that our taxpayers will be called upon to bear the burden and suffer the consequences of our own and the U.N.'s present policy for decades to come.

In too many instances in Africa, these prerequisites not only have not been met, they have been ignored. The United Nations' policy, which has the blessing of our Government, makes it plain that inadequacy of political, economic or educational facilities should not serve as a pretext for delaying independence. In my report, I point out the fallacy of such reasoning and try to show that it may soon lead to the undermining and downfall of the United Nations. I firmly believe that some "independence limiting" mechanism should be adopted by the U.N., for we can continue to see our voice and power in the General Assembly grow weaker and weaker as the number of nations who are not able to manage their own affairs grows larger and larger. Also, we may see the General Assembly turn into an auction barn, where votes will be sold to the highest bidder. Many of the new nations are already successfully playing the East against the West, and I ran into much of this thinking in interviews with many of the African leaders. Too many of these leaders are not mature enough to see the danger of what they are doing. The danger is not only to their own countries, but to the entire free world. Too often, I fear, my own country has fallen into the trap by granting their demands and encouraging this type of thinking. We should not meet these demands, and should have no truck with any such bargaining.

Mr. President, while I was in Salisbury, the capital of the Federation of the Rhodesias and Nyasaland, I held a press conference in response to requests from reporters of several newspapers. It was one of several in which I participated on my African tour. A few days after that press conference, and because of statements attributed to me by the press throughout East Africa, I became the object of controversy and I was subsequently banned from visiting the countries of Uganda, Tanganyika, Somali, and Ethiopia. I said that I was banned because of statements attributed to me in the press. That is not correct. In my estimation, I was banned not because of my statements—which I believe to be the truth and do not retract or deny—but because of a single headline that appeared over a long story in the Salisbury Sunday Mail newspaper. The story covered several subjects. The press conference itself lasted more than an hour. In the reports which appeared in the Rhodesian newspaper, and far down the page, this quotation appeared:

> If you can get somebody to stay with you for 50 years, you might be able to take over, but believe me, you won't be able to do it overnight.

I was referring, of course, to the new nations in Africa that are still heavily dependent upon European civil servants and other forms of outside aid for the operation of their governments. In particular, I was referring to an independence move that was currently taking place in the federated territory of Nyasaland. Nyasaland is one of the three territories that make up the Federation of the Rhodesias and Nyasaland. The other two are Southern Rhodesia and Northern Rhodesia. Nyasaland was attempting to secede from the Federation and become independent. The country has no natural resources. Ninety percent of the native population are subsistence farmers and only 1 percent of those native farmers use anything other than a hoe and a rake to work their land. It was obvious to me that should this territory be allowed to secede and become independent, it would require large amounts of foreign aid for decades to come. It would require a Santa Claus to keep it going.

Further down on this page of the newspaper report I am referring to, there appeared this quote:

> The African people in some countries like Nyasaland will not reach the goal their leaders aim for in 50 years.

As I said, both of these statements, which I do not deny having made, appeared far down in the story which dealt with an interview that lasted more than an hour, yet, above the story, a banner headline across the page read: "You Will Need White Help for 50 Years."

Mr. President, I am confident that this press conference I held in Salisbury, Rhodesia, would have had no more importance than any of the others I held throughout Africa during my visit, but for one thing—the banner headline covering this article employing the word "White." I deny having ever used the word "white," and that, Mr. President, is the sum and substance of my denial. Though later reports indicated that I denied the whole of my statement, I did no such thing.

At our Embassy in Usumbura, the capital of Burundi, I tried to clear up the matter for I had seen that inflammatory headline, and I attempted to set the record straight. Through faulty reporting, the record became even more confused and I was purported to have made a retraction of my entire statement. This, I repeat, was not the case at all. The stories that appeared in newspapers outside the Rhodesias were based primarily on that one headline. The Prime Minister of Uganda made the first move to ban me and the other countries above mentioned followed like sheep.

I was further quoted as saying that the "average African is incapable of leadership without white assistance." Again, I did not use "white." I did say that if there is any place in Africa where brick and mortar had been used by the natives to build a civilization through no assistance or without the assistance or guidance of Europeans, I had yet to see it. The sentence was not mine, but was based upon that Salisbury headline. I was also quoted as saying that I have yet to see any part of Africa where Africans are ready for self-government.- I did say that; I repeat it here; it is the truth.

But, Mr. President, I have no quarrel with full independence or self-government for any country if that country has the capability to achieve and maintain that independence, and here I mean capability in resources, both human and economic. I did not visit one newly formed government that did not need outside aid on a grant basis and where technical assistance was not badly needed and provided by Western Europeans and American. France and Britain are involved in developing the economies of most of the countries, and we too have programs in all of them.

Mr. President, I am making no apologies for what I have said because none are needed. It may be that I said the right thing in the wrong place. At that time there was a great furor in the politics of the Federation. It may be that I should have refused to give my opinions as to the outcome, but since I had been in the area only 2 months before the Federation was created in 1953, I felt that my views might have some merit.

Be that as it may, I only hope that the controversy that arose will not detract from the value of this objective report on our foreign operations in Africa.

In this report I have made several specific recommendations which I hope will be closely studied by the representatives of the Agency for International Development, the State Department, the U.S. Information Agency, the Peace Corps, and the Department of Defense. Therefore, Mr. President, based on all data gathered by me, I submit the following summary of recommendations.

FOREIGN AID

First. Our aid should be confined to technical assistance. Programs must be simple and basic, and should not be permitted to degenerate into the construction of capital facility projects. Technicians should be assigned on a regional basis, wherever practicable.

Second. Whenever possible, development planning should be done on a regional basis, and development aid furnished should be multilateral.

Third. As nearly as possible, any loans made should bear the same rate of interest and have similar terms of repayment as those which are made by other participants in financing projects on a multilateral basis. In this connection, I found that some of our loans were made at a rate of three-fourths of 1 percent with 10 years' grace, whereas other countries made regular commercial loans bearing from 3½ to as much as 6 percent interest.

Fourth. To accelerate the development of the whole of Africa, it is suggested that the European Economic Community be encouraged to band together in a consortia to undertake the construction of feasible development projects, particularly in the fields of transportation and communication, as well as in the generation of electric power, irrigation, and flood control.

Fifth. All commitments for aid and/or loans should be made in strict accord with laws enacted by Congress.

Sixth. Our aid programs, especially those dealing with the construction of capital facilities, should be concentrated in the Western Hemisphere where we have developed close economic ties over the years.

STATE DEPARTMENT, USIS, AND SERVICE ATTACHES

First. We should not embark upon a building program in Africa, except in case of absolute necessity. Should any construction be undertaken, every effort should be made to build in keeping with the architecture of the country, with simplicity as the keynote.

Second. The personnel at all Embassies, particularly in the new countries, should be kept at a minimum. All missions in any country should be administered through the Embassy under the direct supervision of our Ambassador. The political, economic, and consular sections should be consolidated and placed in the office of the chief of mission, wherever practical.

Third. The Ambassador is our Nation's highest representative where he serves, and his advice and counsel should be followed in respect to all programs. Under no condition should personnel be sent to the field except at his request and after justification. The practice of some agencies of sending personnel to an Embassy when there is no request should not be tolerated.

Fourth. Should it become necessary to establish consulates in any country, all consular reporting should be channeled through the embassy, rather than sent directly to Washington. These reports could be used by our ambassador in making direct reports to Washington.

Fifth. To prevent "gouging" of our personnel and friction among foreign nationals, the administrative section of each embassy should handle all the rental accommodations for all of our Government personnel in the country. They should not compete one against the other.

Sixth. In countries where there is only a small USIS or AID operation, all functions should be under the dirction of our ambassador, and no separate missions should be established.

Seventh. Should programs other than technical aid be engaged in, they should be administered on a regional basis.

Eighth. Binational centers such as we have established in many Latin American countries and in Spain should be established in Africa. All USIS libraries, if continued, should be located in the native quarters and not in the European sections of the cities.

Ninth. The number of service attachés should be held to a minimum, and under no condition should they be sent to a country except by and with the consent of the ambassador.

PEACE CORPS

First. While the Peace Corps program is growing in popularity, a firm policy governing the share of the volunteer's living and traveling expenses to be paid by the host country should be spelled out.

Second. The training program for the volunteers should be sufficient to enable them to look after themselves in the field, thus making it unnecessary to send large numbers of administrators, supervisors, and field personnel.

Third. The volunteers should in all cases be encouraged and required to live among the people they train and at a level just a bit higher than their counterparts.

Fourth. Every effort should be made to have the host country furnish transportation, thereby making unnecessary our sending a large number of vehicles which in time will require a staff of mechanics and other technicians for maintenance. Already the number of vehicles is steadily growing.

Fifth. The volunteers should not be placed under the direction and supervision of the local government, as is the case with many teachers in various countries. I do not believe it was ever the intention of Congress to pay a heavy subsidy to any country to augment the teaching staff in its elementary and secondary schools.

Sixth. The administrative policies of the Peace Corps should be reexamined with a view toward creating an administrative mechanism, among the volunteers themselves, which will not require a large and self-defeating bureaucracy.

GENERAL

A complete reevaluation of all reporting by our missions—State, AID, USIS, service attachés—to Washington should be made at once. Much of it is useless and entails much expensive paperwork. More authority should be given at the country level. Much time and effort could be saved, and many employees in the field as well as on the Washington level could be dispensed with.

EXHIBIT I

U.S. FOREIGN OPERATIONS IN AFRICA

PART I. A SHORT HISTORICAL BACKGROUND OF AFRICA AND A GENERAL SUMMARY OF OBSERVATIONS, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Any attempt to gain some understanding of present-day Africa through a study of its history is at once seen to be complicated and frustrating. For the most part, its history is still being written. Even now there is much disagreement among students of history, anthropology, and archeology who are striving to solve the many riddles that exist. The remains of cities have been discovered, but no satisfactory explanation has been found for their construction or their disintegration. Evidences of lost cultures have been uncovered from the earth, but they are still covered by a shroud of mystery.

The history of Africa must necessarily be divided into Africa north of the Sahara—and Africa south of the great desert barrier. On the Mediterranean shore many civilizations flourished and fell, leaving behind records of their passing. Many of them served as springboards for conquering cultures, so that their knowledge and arts were assimilated and finally spread through the Western World. The Phoenicians, the Egyptians, and finally the Moors, are examples of peoples who conquered, built, then dwindled and fell, but left great contributions in the cultural repository of the West.

What we know today of Africa south of the Sahara comes mainly from the writings of these people, the Arabs and Phoenicians in particular. Caravan routes across the Sahara led the Mediterranean peoples to the interior of the continent and became avenues for trade in ivory, precious stones, gold, copper, and slaves. They later became highways of conquest as the Arabian forces swept south into west Africa and as far east as Lake Chad, down the coast from the Arabian Peninsula. They gained control of the southern trade terminals, and left in the interior a lasting imprint of Moslem religion.

Beyond the ancient writers who speak of African explorations and adventures, little that can be classified as historical fact is known about the continent. None of the many types of people developed a written language, and though kingdoms and empires existed and were conquered by their neighbors, there seems to have been no clear transmission of any advanced form of culture. No assimilation, no strengthening of the conqueror's life with possible progress made by the conquered, is evident. The destruction of any higher way of life, such as was once found in east Africa and in the Zimbabwe area of Southern Rhodesia, seems to have been complete.

Kingdoms flourished particularly in west Africa, where Timbuktu was the southern terminus of the primary Sahara trade routes. Many of the modern states such as Ghana, Mali, and Dahomey take their names from powerful ancient tribes.

On the east coast of Africa, both Arab and Indonesian influence made itself strongly felt. The Arabians moved down the East Coast, seeking raw materials for trading with India. Soon after the birth of Christ, the Indonesian people settled in the empty island of Madagascar.

From all accounts, the interior of Africa was sparsely settled. It is believed that Indonesian traders first brought to the continent many food plants, including cassava and other root crops, which spread across from east to west. This source of food made possible a large population increase from the Guinea coast to other areas under the African hump. According to some writers, this explains the population concentration along this coast, and particularly in southern Nigeria. It was from this area that the greatest migration, known as the Bantu expansion, originated. From here numerous tribes with a common language structure migrated east around the great African lakes and then south and southeast in Africa. The Bantus succeeded in overpowering many of the Nilotic people who had spread south along the upper reaches of the Nile. Those who held their ground, however, developed a relatively high culture in the area of Uganda and in the region of Lake Victoria. The terracing of the native farms in this area, a technique not found in other sections, is perhaps a holdover of Egyptian-Arabian influence.

The European scramble

But, for all practical purposes, the history of Africa begins with the European scramble for territory in the 1870's. The lines that form the borders of almost every African country were drawn during this period. A good example is the whole of west Africa, where the French, after their arrival on the coast, began moving into the interior. Either by force of arms or by treaties with the African chiefs, they in time spread their influence more than 2,000 miles into the interior. All of French West Africa was governed by the equivalent of the territorial governors who had control of vast areas of our own country before the lands west of the Mississippi were carved into States.

Although colonies or outposts of one sort or another had existed on the African coast since shortly after the Portuguese successfully rounded the Cape of Good Hope on their way to India in the 15th century, no exploration of consequence was made until about 1870. After the decline of the slave trade, which flourished principally in the British colonies, European interest in Africa abated and was confined mostly to missionary and scientific societies.

Then Stanley's famous words to Dr. Livingstone climaxed the successful end of a spectacular search that had attracted the attention of almost all the civilized world. European leaders were suddenly reminded that here lay a virgin continent, with resources to supply the industrial revolution that was beginning to boom, and with the necessary markets to absorb the finished products. It was theirs for the taking. Southward rolled the crest of empire and we are even now feeling, or perhaps just beginning to feel, the dangerous eddies and undertows created by the powerful surf receding from the rocks of independence.

The European powers came desperately close to war over Africa in the 1870's. Great Britain, France, Belgium, Portugal, and newly united Germany had all staked claims to vast chunks of territory containing indefinite promise of profit and bounded by less definite borderlines. The powers set out to consolidate their holdings in some cases, to explore and expand in others. But in no case were they willing to give up or share what they had taken as their own. Border conflicts broke out and threatened to spread to the mother countries proper. A conference called in Berlin in 1884–85 settled the major differences. From then until 1890, and to some extent after the turn of the century, individual treaties ironed out other disputes. By 1890, almost all of Africa had been arbitrarily partitioned among the major powers.

Unfortunately, the boundaries were drawn more to suit each particular nation's prestige than to please an intelligent and logical geographer. The boundaries which were the children of conflict in the past can be depended upon to bear more conflict in the future.

The boundary question

Actually, the lines of demarcation setting out each nation's sphere of influence—that is, French West and Equatorial Africa, the Belgian Congo, Portuguese Mozambique and Angola, British Nigeria, and the Union of South Africa to name but a few—would today be little cause for concern. In recent years many of them have ceased to exist, at least on maps if not as a matter of practical fact. What is likely to cause concern is the manner in which these vast tracts of territory were politically subdivided by the colonizers. To examine this, we might return to the territorial governors of French West Africa mentioned earlier.

These governors, sent into the interior in the wake of French forces were immediately faced with the problem of not knowing exactly what they were to govern. Accordingly, the governors met and drew up informal agreements as to the boundaries of their particular authority. These were sometimes based on geographic features, and sometimes represented an attempt to delineate as nearly as possible the then existing tribal boundaries. The lines drawn by the territorial governors for their own convenience today represent the borders of the West African states.

Superimposed on the resulting hodgepodge, one finds little bits and pieces of territory colonized by one power, but living wholly within an area colonized by another. Portuguese Guinea, little more than a speck on the map, lies between the former French colonies of Senegal and Guinea.

How the boundary question may be expected to cause trouble in the future can be found in the Gambia-Senegal situation. The territory of Gambia is at present a British colony, and is a long finger of land running from the ocean on each side of the Gambia River into Senegal. The Gambians and the Senegalese are alike in almost every respect, save that of language. Gambia, however, has no means of subsistence except a low level of agriculture. If it were granted independence, as the British are threatening to do at the moment, even against the wishes of the Gambian leaders themselves, it would be ruinous to its people and do violence to the laws of geography and economics. There are indications that Gambia and Senegal may be united into one country. Certainly it is to be hoped that this takes place.

A further example can be noted in the Togo-Ghana dispute. This dispute led, at least in part, to the assassination of one of the ablest African leaders—Togo's President, Sylvanus Olympio.

At one time the country of Togo, as well as the area to the west as far as the Volta River, was under the control of Germany and known as Togoland. After the First World War, the territory of Togoland was administered jointly by the United Kingdom and France. Shortly before independence was granted by the French to what is now Togo, the area under the United Kingdom's domination was incorporated into Ghana. Although this incorporation was ostensibly the will of a plebiscite, it had the effect of giving Ghana complete control of the Volta River and its valley. More importantly, it split almost directly in two the powerful and numerous Ewe tribe of natives living along the coast. Ghana is now making noises concerning the annexation of Togo, and this will no doubt cause trouble in the future.

Of perhaps more long-range importance than disputes arising over the boundaries which once lay between two colonies but now separate two independent nations, is the lasting effect of the colonials' policy of administration. Current boundary disputes can and should be settled without much ado. Though French West Africa, for example, or the Belgian Congo, were subdivided for governing convenience, they were developed economically as integral and interdependent units. The wave of independence has broken these interdependent areas into flotsam which will likely prove unable to survive the seas of national difficulty.

The economy of a colony was developed according to the needs of the territory as a whole. The construction of ports, the building of roads, the laying of tracks and communication lines were all guided by the principle of interdependence. This principle has held fast in the face of political independence. If it can remain in force and continue in its development, it will be a great boon for the area as a whole. But there are signs in both West Africa and the Congo that this will not be possible.

Our African aid policy

It is contended by some that the attention of the world and the attention of the American aid effort in particular should now be focused on the continent of Africa. This continent, which comprises some 10 million square miles, is over three times the size of the United States. The Sahara Desert alone is the size of the United States, and the Belgian Congo is almost as large as the Indian subcontinent. It has a total population of approximately 215 million people, which is about 15 percent greater than the population of our own country, yet its gross national product amounts to only about 3 percent of ours.

Current statistics reveal that 99 percent of all the industrial diamonds of the free world are produced in Africa; 66 percent of the cobalt; 66 percent of the gold; 36 percent of the antimony; 45 percent of the chromite; 42 percent of the manganese; and 25 percent of the mined copper. In addition, Africa is a major exporter of such agricultural commodities as coffee, cocoa, palm oil, sisal, peanuts, tea, hides, and lumber. What these statistics do not reveal is that all the industry and the great proportion of agricultural export production are in the hands of Europeans. Nor do they show that Africa's wealth is concentrated in a relatively few spots, and that vast tracts of land are empty, virtually uninhabited, and worthless.

The annual per capita gross national product of tropical Africa (which includes the Torrid Zone and portions of the Tropics of Cancer and Capricorn where most of the new African countries were carved, and containing approximately two-thirds of the population of the whole continent) averages between $80 and $90, about one-third of what it is in Latin America. The literacy rate averages approximately 10 percent, well below the level of some of the most backward areas of the world. Notwithstanding the fact that tropical Africa's exports account for only 3 percent of the world's total, it still is an important source of certain raw materials and agricultural commodities.

But is this mineral and agricultural wealth, plus the wave of independence that has swept over the continent, sufficient reason to justify the pouring of our borrowed dollars into an expensive, long-range, and almost fruitless attempt to raise the average African's standard of living, particularly in tropical Africa?

Our NATO allies are deeply rooted in the development of Africa. Their nationals have virtually complete control of much of the natural resources of the continent. Practically all commerce, both domestic and foreign, is in the hands of Europeans. Why should we further strain our economy in attempting to develop such a backward area of the world, when the resources with which this could be done are controlled by Europeans, and when the benefits that will accrue will be reaped by those same Europeans?

We are out of our sphere of influence. Let us remain closer to home. Long have I pleaded that our efforts for social and economic growth be concentrated in Latin America. We have had little to do in Africa. Most of our historical trade ties are not there, but to the south of us. If our own industrial progress is to continue at its present pace, we must look to the south for the raw materials necessary to feed our hungry industries.

To say that no aid should be granted in any instance would be to do ourselves and the Africans a grave injustice. But our aid program should be conducted not in hopeful and open-eyed innocence, but simply with open eyes. There is literally not enough money in our Treasury to raise the average African's standard of living to any appreciable extent, especially, I repeat, in tropical Africa. Furthermore, the reasons brought forward to justify our giving aid to Africa, as well as in other areas of the world, are often faulty. Bad motives usually lead to bad results. Our purveyors of burgeoning aid programs endeavor to get us into every area of the world to render assistance by using the argument that if we do not go in and pour our wealth into the laps of the underdeveloped countries, the Sino-Soviet bloc will move in.

If this be so, then let the Communists try. Already we have seen evidence of the results of Communist influence in some parts of Africa. In Guinea, for instance, the greatest inroads were made soon after that country gained independence from France. Today its President, Sekou Toure, has had his eyes opened. It is obvious that the Communist aid projects were not in keeping with the proper development of an infant nation.

In Guinea a huge vocational education building is now under construction, but little effort has been directed by the Communists toward the building of a sound and solid elementary and secondary school system. A huge printing plant has been completed and has proved to be far beyond Guinea's needs. Part of it now stands idle and the machinery is deteriorating. The objective of this aid, of course, was to make a big splash and create a showplace.

It will be necessary to build stable governments and establish viable economies in the independent countries of Africa wherever possible. But this cannot be done by American aid. Leadership, guidance, and assistance must come from the former colonial powers that have already established close economic ties with these countries, coupled with the cooperation of the heads of the newly formed governments. The politicians must be made to realize that the economy of any country cannot be developed except through hard word and with competent and knowledgeable leaders. European leaders must be made to understand that without the assistance of native workers, their efforts will be in vain. They must be made to realize the importance of improving the education, the health, and the living standard of the workers—that by so doing in the long pull they will be the beneficiaries. In short, the European leaders and the natives must work as a team. They need each other if real development is to come. It will require much time, effort, and above all, patience and understanding.

Foremost among the obstacles to development and progress is illiteracy. It is the main roadblock. As pointed out before, the average literacy rate for the continent as a whole approximates 10 percent, though in some areas and cities it may run to 25 percent or higher. What this means in the day-to-day life of government cannot be fully understood unless one tours the continent itself.

The leaders—and there are some good ones—are without the benefit of technicians, and the vast structure of civil servants that bulwark the heads of every country in the world that could be called progressive.

The bringing of education to these people, to any real degree, can only be handled by the nations themselves. In many cases, it will be complicated by the nomadic habits of large portions of the population. In others, it will require large capital outlays, which are simply not available. This field is surely one of the few in which we could give guidance and where our dollars could be spent wisely and effectively. Too often, however, our education effort, much like the Russian projects, gets bogged down in the production of more or less useless facilities.

It must be pointed out that in the underdeveloped nations a dozen one-room school buildings are infinitely more valuable than a dozen full-blown universities. To see an example of aid fallacy, one need only look at a country such as Ethiopia, where we have provided such a university when there exists no network of worthy feeder schools. In addition, we built a college for training agricultural extension agents, but it did not work. Most of the graduates sought white collar jobs, and those who tried to teach extension work soon found out that they had nothing to work with by way of human resources.

The improvement of the literacy rate in Africa through the expansion of basic education facilities is the first problem to be faced in the education field. At present the countries of Africa lack even the sufficiently trained manpower to perform the simplest tasks. In some countries it is necessary to teach the natives how to use a simple hand plow, since they currently lack this knowledge.

To get an idea of the enormity of the problem, let us take the country of Chad for example. Ninety-five percent of the people of this country derive their income from agriculture. Yet less than 7 years ago the average Chadien farmer was unaware of the existence of the plow, the wheeled cart, or of the use of animal in place of human power.

To increase agricultural production in this country the Chad Government is presently building a network of centers, known as paysannats, for teaching farmers the use of the plow, the wheeled cart, and animal traction. Based on these programs for fiscal year 1962, the U.S. contribution, made out of development grant funds, is estimated to be 80 percent of the initial cost of each center.

Further examples of the rudimentary nature of projects carried on in Chad may be found in the appendix to this report.

In other countries of Africa the same basic problems which confront Chad are also in evidence.

Further complicating our hope for attaining real political and economic stability are the tribal ties which separate groups within nations, and which almost invariably transcend any feelings of nationalism.

Nigeria is one of the largest independent countries in Africa, with the greatest population. Though there are many benefits to be gained through unity, there is a possibility that this country—to which we are now giving the biggest share of our African aid funds—may split into three separate countries. The probability is that each one will then demand an even larger proportionate share of our largess.

Each of the three regions of Nigeria is dominated by a tribe. Efforts have been and are being made to break down the tribal ties, to encourage all natives to think of themselves as Nigerians rather than Yoruba, Ibo, or Hausa. But the efforts have so far been largely unsuccessful.

The jealousy and rivalry which exist among the three dominant tribes are already causing greater expenditures than would otherwise be necessary, and this situation will no doubt become further aggravated. An example of such added expenditure is the agriculture station which was begun by the British and whose work is now carried on with territorial funds and American help.

Before independence the one station served all the regions. After independence the western region demanded a station of its own, and as a consequence, the research station was split in two, and one-half of it moved literally and merely across the road. There was, of course, an increase in the administrative and support cost borne by us.

There are countless examples of how the tribal ties and customs are retarding any real unification within the various countries of Africa, such as in the Congo, Rwanda, Burundi, and others. Where tribal loyalties do not cause the conflict, religious differences often do.

Although, as I pointed out previously, there are some good leaders among the African natives, for the most part they are selfish and inexperienced. Many do not have the best interests of their people at heart; instead they look for their own aggrandizement. The age-old principle of "survival of the fittest" militates against the development of unselfish leaders.

The problems of transportation and communication in Africa need little discussion. These facilities, particularly in the interior, are almost nonexistent. It goes without saying that what is there has been provided by the French in West and Equatorial Africa, the Belgians in the Congo, the Europeans of South Africa, and the Portuguese and British in other areas. As has been mentioned before, these countries developed their areas as an integral whole.

Now, since independence, the problem of getting maximum benefit from an already insufficient transportation and communications network is complicated by the fact that many of the new nations refuse to get along. Here again absence of leadership and experience causes the people to suffer. The finger of example can be pointed to a rail line connecting Mali to the sea and running through Senegal.

These two countries are at present in disagreement over ideology. As a result, Mali's access to the ocean through Senegal has been terminated. The small amount of exports from Mali must now be trucked by a longer route through another country, the Ivory Coast, at considerably greater expense. This example could be multiplied many times over.

There are those who say that these problems do not actually amount to much; that American know-how and the American dollar will soon cause them to diffuse and disappear into thin air. Is there truth in this? I believe not.

Consider the Republic of Liberia. It has been independent since it was created 150 years ago. Since 1946, beginning with our grant-aid program, we have extended $172.2 million of economic aid to this small country. Today, there is little in Liberia that has been built without our aid dollars, the dollars of the Firestone Tire & Rubber Co. which has invested extensively in the production of natural rubber, or the dollars of others who are investing in mining and forest products.

Furthermore, leaders of the country do not seem to learn. Monrovia, the capital city, is desperately in need of a potable water supply. A sewer system is also needed so that the many open ditches now used for disposal can be closed. Monrovia also needs an increased supply of electricity. Have the Liberian leaders made an effort in this direction? Apparently not.

Instead they have invited us to come in and do it for them, but while they are refusing to meet these primary needs, there is being constructed a lavish and pretentious executive mansion for the President, and a large court of law building, completely out of line with the needs of the country. When these buildings are completed, it might be added, they will stand directly across from some of the worst slums in the city.

Ethiopia is another country that has enjoyed independence for a considerable period. Except for the years 1936 to 1941 when it was occupied by the Italians, it has been an independent country since its founding in approximately 1000 B.C. And what do we find in Ethiopia?

Conditions there have not improved appreciably under present and past leadership. We have been aiding Emperor Haile Selassie for decades. Most of the teachings of our technicians have failed to take root, particularly in the agricultural field, and most of the projects started by us in years past have been abandoned. The simple machinery, such as plows and other metal goods, as well as machines donated by us and the U.N., are rusting in the fields. Our agriculture research station, begun so hopefully several years ago, has failed to fulfill even its original intent. Many of the buildings are not in use for the purpose intended. It seems that we never learn.

Military aid

It will be devastating to the African nations if they have to expend even a small amount of their meager revenues to support armies. It is to be hoped that none of them will endeavor to build up their armed forces for use in expanding their territories, and everything possible should be done to promote lasting peace. I am convinced that any amount of military aid to the newly independent countries will serve only to bring on chaotic conditions. Here is a most important field where the United States could play a definite, beneficial role by staying out of Africa. No military aid in any way, shape, or form should be tolerated.

Although we are now supposedly giving military aid only for "internal security," one does not have to look too far to find programs which started out as internal security blossoming into full-fledged military support. The question is always where to draw the line? How is internal security to be defined? When do weapons furnished for internal security become weapons to be used for external aggression?

We are at present, or have been in the recent past, engaged in training paratroopers in Mali, at a cost of over $600,000. Can this be called internal security? Are paratroopers needed to maintain order?

To see other effects of the consequences of our military aid program, one need only look at the dispute between Morocco and Mauritania. Morocco has been armed, if not to the teeth at least to the belt buckle, by our military aid. Now it is rumored that Hassan II is eyeing the iron mines and oil explorations in the Mauritania desert. Basing his claim on historical migrations back to the 11th century, he is trying to annex Mauritania by one means or another.

The Mauritanian president has said that Morocco's claim to Mauritania is "much like France claiming Britain because the English once occupied France in the time of Joan of Arc."

Be that as it may, arguments have been known to have little effect against an oil-and-armament combination. If trouble breaks out here, our country must share a part of the blame.

While at the present we have no large military aid program in Africa, especially south of the Sahara, it must be remembered that these countries are new ones. Give us time. After all, Latin America was not armed overnight.

Military assistance advisory groups, which can be expected to form the nucleus of any forthcoming military aid program, are already in evidence in many countries where their presence cannot in the least be justified.

It is pleasing to note that many of our Ambassadors have resisted and are resisting with all their might, the establishment of military missions, as well as service attachés. Others, however, have been forced to buckle under to pressure from the Washington level.

In Senegal, our military mission is there for the express purpose of teaching the Senegalese soldiers to build roads, bridges, and other public works projects. It might be noted that we are paying all the expenses of this mission—the salaries, rent, office space, and administration costs—as well as providing the necessary equipment.

In Liberia, we have had a military mission since 1959, consisting of five officers, two warrant officers, and six enlisted men.

Our military aid program in this country is growing.

It is hoped that military aid in all its shapes and forms will be withdrawn from Africa. No MAAG's (Military Assistance Advisory Groups) should be established there, and plans for future military aid should be scrapped.

At this writing the entire continent of Africa is at peace, due perhaps primarily to the fact that the new countries do not have the ability to wage modern warfare. We should be certain that if this ability is ever gained, it is not through the offices of the United States of America. It goes without saying that if MAAG's are established, the military aid program will increase. Experience shows that in many instances the MAAG's serve for little but to stir things up and then make it necessary for the host country to call for aid.

If it proves impossible to cancel military aid entirely, our leaders should make sure that any war materiel given is obtained from our excess stocks, which should prove ample for internal security purposes. This policy would do much to hold down the threat. Through fiscal year 1962, military aid to Africa totaled $119,002,000 and, of this amount, only $11,740,000 was obtained from excess stocks. For fiscal year 1963 it is proposed that we give Africa military aid to the tune of $38,325,000 and only $765,000 of this will come from excess stocks.

Prior to the creation of the new countries of Africa, our foreign aid program there was negligible in amount. With the advent of these new countries our aid program has been stepped up, and through fiscal year ending June 30, 1962, totaled $1,776,700,000. A breakdown of this aid is shown in the tabulation below:

U.S. aid to Africa by country, obligations and loan authorizations, cumulative, fiscal year 1946 through fiscal year 1962—preliminary

[Millions of dollars]

Country	Total economic and military	Total military	Economic assistance													
			Total economic		AID programs				Other economic assistance							
										Food for peace—Public Law 480				Export-Import Bank medium- and long-term loans	Social progress trust fund	Other economic programs
											Title I		Other food for peace			
			Total	Of which loans	Total	Technical cooperation/development grants	Development loans	Other AID	Total	Total	Total sales agreements	Planned for country use				
Total	1,776.7	112.0	1,664.7	683.2	1,036.9	259.9	226.2	550.8	627.8	380.5	(57.7)	46.4	334.1	179.2		68.1
Algeria	15.0		15.0		.3			.3	14.7	14.7			14.7			
Cameroon	15.6	.3	15.3	9.2	14.6	.9	9.2	4.5	.7	.3			.3			.4
Central African Republic	.2		.2		.2	.2										
Chad	.4		.4		.4	.4			(1)	(1)			(1)			
Congo (Brazzaville)	1.3		1.3		1.3	1.3										
Congo (Leopoldville)	94.6		94.6		69.5	6.1		63.3	25.1	25.1	(12.2)	11.0	14.1			
Dahomey	5.6		5.6		2.7	2.7			2.9	2.9			2.9			
Ethiopia	185.3	67.5	117.8	52.5	83.0	42.5	29.6	10.9	34.8	10.9			10.9	22.5		1.4
Gabon	.5		.5		.5	.5			(1)	(1)			(1)			
Ghana	156.5		156.5	147.0	88.1	6.1	82.0		68.4	2.9			2.9	65.0		.5
Guinea	14.3		14.3	4.3	8.3	2.7		5.6	6.0	6.0	[2] (5.7)	4.3	1.7			
Ivory Coast	4.6		4.6		4.2	4.2			.4	(1)			(1)			.4
Kenya	18.5		18.5		8.3	4.4		3.9	10.2	10.2			10.2			
Liberia	131.5	4.3	127.2	87.9	40.0	33.6	3.2	3.2	87.2	4.0			4.0	74.8		8.4
Libya	191.7	4.5	187.2	8.5	122.1	23.5	5.0	93.6	65.1	34.7			34.7			30.4
Malagasy Republic	1.3		1.3		1.2	1.2			.1	.1			.1			
Mali, Republic of	6.1	1.0	5.1		5.1	.2		4.8								
Mauritania	1.6		1.6	1.4	1.4	(1)		[3] 1.4	.2	.2			.2			
Morocco	352.0	(4)	352.0	233.5	239.9	3.7	23.0	213.3	112.1	112.1	(14.2)	10.6	101.5			
Niger	3.2		3.2		3.2	3.2			(1)	(1)			(1)			(1)
Nigeria	43.6		43.6	5.9	38.9	34.4	3.7	.7	4.7	.5			.5	2.0		2.2
Rhodesia and Nyasaland	36.1		36.1	32.4	13.7	3.7		10.0	22.4	(1)			(1)			22.4
Ruanda-Urundi	6.1		6.1						6.1	6.1			6.1			
Senegal	4.6		4.6		4.2	4.2			.4	.4			.4			(1)
Sierra Leone	3.5		3.5		2.2	2.2			1.3	.5			.5			.8
Somali Republic	27.4		27.4	2.0	23.3	16.9	2.0	4.3	4.1	3.7			3.7			.4
Sudan	65.0		65.0	14.3	61.5	20.5	12.0	29.0	3.5	3.5	(4.6)	3.4	.1			
Tanganyika	17.6		17.6	1.9	5.0	2.9	1.9	.2	12.6	12.3			12.3			.3
Togo	5.8		5.8		2.3	2.0		.3	3.5	3.4			3.4			.1
Tunisia	293.3	(4)	293.3	69.8	166.1	17.2	54.5	94.4	127.2	124.5	(21.0)	17.1	107.4	2.4		.3
Uganda	5.2		5.2		4.4	4.3		.1	.8	.8			.8			
Upper Volta	3.2		3.2		3.1	3.1			.1	.1			.1			
Zanzibar	.1		.1		.1	.1			(1)	(1)			(1)			
Other French communes and possessions	6.0		6.0		6.0	1.0		5.0								
Other Portuguese possessions	12.8		12.8	12.5	.3	.3			[5] 12.5					12.5		
Other British territories	.9		.9		.3	.1		.2	.6	.6			.6			
Regional	45.4	34.3	11.1		11.1	9.5		1.8								

[1] Less than $50,000.
[2] Data include 1 year only of multiyear agreements signed in fiscal year 1962.
[3] Loan to France for Mauritania.
[4] Military data classified and included in regional total.
[5] Loan to Portugal for Mozambique.

The "physical measure of achievement"

Now our aid program threatens to grow like "Topsy." The administrators assure us that the foundations of economic and social growth can be established to insure political stability in that troubled continent. It is amazing, however, that these administrators simply cannot detach themselves from incorporating into the African program the showplace type of aid that has failed so dismally in the past. It seems to me that by now it should be fully understood that dollar diplomacy is not the solution to the world's ills. We are told that, in addition to the development of economic and human resources in Africa, our aid must also provide a physical measure of achievement to give a sense of direction and accomplishment to our program. Our past experience has proven this concept of aid to be fallacious because it is so wasteful and only invites corruption. In other areas of the world we have rushed into the underdeveloped countries to give this aid that gives a "physical measure of achievement." And what have we obtained for this type of aid?

Let us take, for example, the aid program we have conducted for the past decade in Korea. Through fiscal year 1962, we have extended aid totaling $5,453,600,000 to this tiny nation, and it has been shown that much of this has been wasted as a result of the construction of ill-planned facilities and the corruption and graft that ran rampant under the regime of Syngman Rhee. I have visited Korea on several occasions, my last visit being made in 1956. On each occasion when I returned, I faithfully reported to the Congress the orgy of waste and corruption I found. However, little attention was paid to my warnings, and we continued to pour our good dollars down the rathole. For my efforts, I was accused by the press of insulting our friends.

We must not commence any aid program in Africa that will repeat our performance in Korea. However, if such a fate is to be avoided, our present concept of aid to the new countries must be revamped.

Many of the aid programs initiated in the past and now being carried on in the African area have simply not been planned for the real needs of the people.

In 1960, I included in my itinerary the Republic of Somali, which had attained independence about 3 months before my visit. In reporting my findings to the Senate Committee on Appropriations, I stated:

"What this country needs most of all is water conservation—just a simple, effective program. Emphasis should be placed on those projects that are needed. The most immediate task should be to develop more water for irrigation and livestock."

I stated further that—

"Our programs should be kept very simple, in keeping with the ability of the people to assimilate, and of the new Republic to take over and maintain. Education projects should be confined to elementary type schools for the time being, plus some vocational schools where people can be taught to use their hands. Under no circumstances should a program of advanced training be begun. People should be taught to do a better job than they can now do, using the materials readily available."

Thus, it seemed clear to me in 1960 that the great needs of the people in the Republic of Somali were water and elementary education. Therefore, before attempting any elaborate types of projects in Somali, I felt it was essential that these particular needs be met.

During my recent visit I found that we were in the process of constructing a port in the city of Chisimaio, which is about 150 miles south of the capital, Mogadiscio, at an estimated cost of $7,518,000. The host country will contribute only $20,000. Our contribution will be 99.8 percent of the total cost. It is being constructed to carry agricultural products for export and it is hoped that the port will be kept busy.

The justification for this project is as follows:

"The purpose of this activity is to design and construct at Chisimaio a small deepwater port with facilities to permit dockside cargo handling, servicing of vessels, and storage of goods in transit. This port will serve as the major outlet to the area between the Giuba and Uebi Scebeli Rivers, one of the most hopeful areas for economic improvement of the Somali Republic. The country has no deepwater port, all existing ports being lighter ports involving inefficient and costly operations. The port at Chisimaio would open up the interriver area to development and become the focal point for all additional commerce resulting from such development."

There exists in Somali, at the present time, a mere subsistence agriculture. What is really needed in this country is increased agricultural production, if that is possible, to take care of the needs of the population.

Nevertheless, our foreign aid administrators insist on placing the cart before the horse, building a port to export products that have little or no chance of being produced. Once again they are trying to start at the top rung of the ladder. To show how high this top rung is and how offbase is the avowed justification for the building of this port to export surplus agricultural products, the following figures might be relevant:

In 1960, the corn production in Somali was 2 million bushels; in 1961, a year of drought, it dropped to 1.6 million bushels; in 1962, it was again at 2 million bushels. This is total production—not export corn—and this grain is the staff of life for the Somali population. As a point of contrast, it might be noted that our little State of Delaware last year produced 7.4 million bushels. Yet we are building a port to export grain that is now grown in barely sufficient quantity to feed the native population.

Construction of this port may be explained in large part by conversations I had with the Somali leaders in 1960. It was indicated then that if Somali did not immediately get substantial quantities of aid from the West, it would turn to Russia. This came about as, approximately 100 miles north of Mogadiscio, the Soviet bloc is proposing to build another port which has little more chance of success than our own endeavor. I was informed that they hope to develop a system of state farms for agricultural resource exploitation, particularly wheat. At present the production of that commodity is nominal. We have little to fear from this quarter. If the principle of state agricultural labor has had only partial success among the Russian people, its success can be expected to be much, much less among the Somalis.

What is disturbing is that Somali has been successful in playing both ends against the middle. It is receiving from two sources misguided aid in the construction of capital facilities that are not needed and that cannot possibly be justified. Aside from that the country is not capable of operating the port either financially or otherwise.

In addition to the Chisimaio port project, we have a number of other projects that are being financed out of development grant funds of the AID. These projects are mostly in the category of technical assistance, and are concerned with research in the agricultural field, road construction, assistance to the Somali national police force, the training of teachers at the secondary level, and the refurbishing of the port at Mogadiscio.

I stated in my report of 1960, that—

"At the time of my visit, 59 Americans and 64 locals were assigned to USOM/Mogadiscio, a total of 123 people.

"There were 10 officers in the administrative section, when 5 or 6 would be ample.

"Program officials here include a director and a deputy director; a program officer and a program analyst; an executive officer, a general service officer, a supply adviser, a record supervisor, a controller, and a budget and fiscal officer—a total of 10 highly paid officers. This number should be cut in half.

"Aside from these 10 officers, there are 3 clerks assigned. There are 13 Americans assigned to the agricultural program, of whom 11 are advisers and 2 are food and agriculture officers. It is ridiculous to have so many people in such a small country, each with separate duties to perform. With such a large force, the program is bound to mushroom."

The fears I entertained in 1960 have become a reality. In 1962, we had a total of 68 American positions authorized, with 48 of these positions filled, plus 87 locals, for a total of 135 employees. For 1963, a request has been made for 70 Americans and 104 locals, for a total of 174 employees. Is there any wonder why our aid program just goes on and on? American personnel stationed in a country beget more aid for that country. It is human nature that employees overseas will do everything possible to justify the positions that they are filling.

Again turning to Liberia, it can be shown that our burgeoning aid program there has been caused by an increasing number of AID employees. There are at present 448 employees of the Agency in Liberia, as opposed to 282 in 1961. The Agency estimates that its expenditure in 1963 will almost triple the 1961 figure.

Premature independence endangers United Nations

For many years I have been opposed to granting independence to the underdeveloped countries of the world unless certain requirements are met, but my voice has been a mere cry in the wilderness. This wave of independence is being fostered by idealists in our Government who consider independence without reservation or qualification the most desirable of goals. They seem to believe that the mere desire for self-determination is sufficient grounds for the granting of political control.

It requires much more than a desire to make a country truly self-determining. There must be sufficient trained human resources, as well as a reasonable amount of natural resources to go along with the desire for self-determination, before a country can achieve political maturity.

It occurs to me that the United Nations organization should change its present policy: "That inadequacy or political, economic, social or educational unpreparedness should never serve as a pretext for delaying independence." It should assume the responsibility now and establish criteria to be met before an area can become eligible for membership.

I would not presume to recommend precise guidelines to be followed, but what I have said in the preceding pages should certainly be taken into consideration in establishing minimum requirements. At the risk of appearing repetitious, I would like to summarize these points briefly, as follows:

1. The country should have a reasonable number of trained leaders.
2. It should have sufficient trained manpower to perform at least basic and semiskilled tasks.
3. It should have a primary and secondary education system that will insure its future growth and development.
4. It should have a pool of sufficiently trained civil servants and administrators to handle the ordinary chores of government.
5. It should have sufficient land and other natural resources to assure its population a reasonable chance to establish a more or less balanced economy.

If some such "independence limiting" mechanism is not adopted, the effectiveness of the U.N. stands in danger of being sapped further by forces which are already at work. Given the possibility that the large colonial holdings remaining in Africa may splinter into several states as has happened in West Africa and is happening in the Federation of the Rhodesias and Nyasaland, the U.N. will be burdened by a growing number of nations unable to pay their own way, while their influence, by weight of numbers in the General Assembly, may be expected to increase.

As this influence increases, and as they strive to overcome the economics of underdevelopment, the temptation to use their U.N. vote as a fulcrum for Eastern and Western foreign policy levers will no doubt grow. There are signs that it is growing already. The instance of Somali has already been cited, and throughout my tour and in conversations with African leaders I ran into this thinking on many, many other occasions.

It goes without saying that votes in the U.N. should be cast on principle and not for the nation or nations involved offering the most. This is an idea which has not been totally embraced in the domestic policy of our own country. Whether it is followed internally by the various nations is of little concern to us; on the international level attempted bidding between the East and West becomes of the utmost concern. We should have no truck with it.

The Congo

The results of having no explicit criteria for independence, save the desire for it, can easily be illustrated by the situation prevailing in the Belgian Congo. I again refer to my notes from an earlier trip—this one in 1953, when I visited that section of Africa.

At that time I gave attention to the 1952 budget of the Belgian Congo. I found that receipts were $129,460,000 with expenditures at $125,180,000. As will be noted, there was a surplus of $4,280,000 in 1952.

Ten years later, what is the picture? There is no budget for the Belgian Congo. Over the past few years and for all practical purposes, there has been no Congo, Belgian or otherwise. Instead of any surplus being created, it has been necessary for the wealth of other nations to be poured into this most unfortunate former colony.

According to figures furnished to me by our AID representatives in Léopoldville, the free world has actually furnished to the Congo, since independence through June 30, 1962, $262,260,584, of which our contribution was $222,072,243. Although we have paid the full amount of our commitment to the U.N., other member nations of the U.N. have only paid $40,188,341 on a total obligation of $125,510,710. I was informed that for fiscal year 1963 we plan to contribute $37,800,000 in economic assistance and $100 million to the purchase of U.N. bonds. I was unable to obtain information as to the amount of contributions, if any, other nations of the free world would make.

In 1953, the Belgian Congo was enjoying a $2 million favorable balance of trade, with exports aggregating $408 million and imports $406 million. It will be a long while before such a situation again occurs. Traffic on the Congo River in 1953 gave evidence of a busy, thriving, expanding economy. In November of last year, that traffic was virtually nonexistent. Today one can stand on the French side of the Congo River, in Brazzaville, and look across to the imposing skyline of Léopoldville, built by the Belgians. It is very impressive from this distance, indicative of great strides having been made since my visit in 1953.

However, once the river is crossed, one is confronted with heartbreaking sights. The European section of the city is dead, or dying. It is like walking through a graveyard. Many of the towering buildings have few occupants. Shops and stores are virtually empty and the streets are deserted. The once thriving city of Léopoldville is now a ghost town—this is the fruit of independence granted prematurely. God forbid that such a situation develop in any other part of Africa.

Looking over my notes of 1953, I found this observation:

"If ever Belgium got out of this territory, the natives would suffer.

"To my way of thinking, it will require years of schooling and training before the natives are able to govern themselves.

"Darkness would return here, if the settlers leave and permit the natives to take over entirely."

Darkness has returned. In the years immediately preceding independence, the Belgians had made some effort to educate and train the natives. Given time, their efforts would have borne fruit, but unfortunately time was not given. It may appear to some that the Belgians were slow in training the natives, but the problems confronting them were so enormous that one must be there and see for himself to believe.

It would be well if those advocating immediate independence for other areas of Africa—and here I mean primarily the racial agitators—could visit the Congo. What they would say upon their return would provide a reflection of their real intentions. It would indicate whether they have the interests of their people at heart, or their own aggrandizement and lust for power.

Due to the conflict that has come about in the Congo, famine has struck much of the country. The ones who went hungry and the ones who lost their means of livelihood were the natives. While Belgium governed the Congo, the natives may not have had the vote, but they had full stomachs and were from all appearances happy and content.

There is no question but that Katanga should have been reunited with the Central Government. The Congo as a whole could be developed into a most flourishing and thriving state under proper guidance. It has the land and other natural resources. What it lacks are trained leaders and technicians. These will require time to obtain. Katanga may be able to develop fairly well under a copper economy at present, but in the long run it will need the resources of her five sister states. Aside from the economic question, had Katanga succeeded in its secession attempt, we would no doubt have been faced with quests for independence by each of the other provinces which now make up the nation. All would have required separate programs of outside aid. And, due to tribal loyalties which supersede the provincial boundaries, the Congo might easily have splintered into as many as 10 separate nations.

I express the hope—a hope which cannot be expressed too strongly—that the Belgians, who developed the colony and gave it economic substance, will be permitted to return. Those now heading the Government should bury their pride and receive the Belgians with open arms.

A paradox of policy

But, comparing our foreign policy stand on the Katanga question and the situation confronting the Nyasaland-Rhodesia Federation, which is equally important if less dramatic and expensive, we run into a strange paradox. On the one hand we have strongly advocated the integration of Katanga with the Central Government, while on the other hand we have expressed support for, or at least expressed no objection to the British policy of granting independence to the territory of Nyasaland—all in the name of self-determination.

Nyasaland is as poor as Katanga is rich. The native leaders of the Nyasaland territory are attempting to break away from the federation of which it is a part. Ninety percent of Nyasaland's population makes its living through subsistence agriculture of the lowest level. Some of its needed revenues for governmental operations are obtained from the mineral-rich Rhodesias. Where will these revenues come from once Nyasaland is independent? Who will be the Santa Claus? The suspicion is that much of the burden will be ours, for how can taxes be laid on a people to whom the plow is little known, who do all of their farming with the hoe and rake, who have scarcely used an ox or a burro for transportation or traction, even though these animals are available?

Who will suffer because of independence? The natives. What shall it profit them to gain independence if, in the process, they lose the means by which their government can be sustained and operated for their benefit. I suppose they feel that we will come in to provide them with a new source of revenue. Of course, this should not be permitted. Now it may be that Nyasaland is not obtaining sufficient aid from the Rhodesias, and that the present leadership in that territory does not feel secure, but that problem could no doubt be met when independence for the federation becomes a reality.

It is often charged that those who do not favor immediate independence for all the peoples of Africa are excessively concerned with economics. I found this attitude prevailing in many quarters when I was on my tour. Perhaps the concern on my part, and on the part of others, is excessive. But the fact remains that without a stable and productive economic system there is a little chance of any real development.

It is true that our aid may build some of the schools and a few hospitals; it may train a few teachers, or a few technicians. But our total effort can amount to no more than a drop in the bucket. Teachers must be paid, students must have books, and technicians must have the tools with which to work. These will be necessary as long as any country remains in any coherent form. They cannot be provided by us forever. The best we may do is point the way and provide a very small beginning.

The drive for true self-determination requires an economic base from which to move, and many new countries in Africa, including Nyasaland, do not have it. It requires a population that may be taxed and it requires, above all, the historical background and the continuing facilities needed to provide a long succession of responsible leaders.

The faulty parallel

The advocates of immediate independence are fond of pointing to the story of America's struggle for independence against the British. They delight in saying, "In the opinion of Great Britain, your own country was not ready for independence when you sought it." This much of the analogy between our country and the peoples of Africa is no doubt true; beyond this point, however, it breaks down completely.

A people who can produce a Declaration of Independence; a people who can produce the Federalist Papers; and a people whose leaders draw up these documents with the certain knowledge that a great proportion of the population will be able to read them, is eminently prepared for independence. A nation whose population by nature contains the habits of thrift necessary for capital accumulation, whose population, because of environment if nothing else, has gained the necessary habits of hard work, is certainly ready for independence.

At the time of the inception of American independence, our people were bound together by a common language. In hardly a nation in Africa south of the Sahara is there a national population sharing a lingua franca outside of that necessary for the carrying on of trade and commerce. While in some cities English or French may predominate, 20 miles out into the bush the lines of oral communication break down almost completely.

Change in colonial policy

The natives of Portuguese Angola and Mozambique, as well as those of the Nyasaland-Rhodesia Federation and the Republic of South Africa could not be observed to be suffering unduly under the bonds of reactionary colonialists. Efforts over the last few years have been and are being made to train the natives, to educate them, to generally prepare them for citizenship, and to break down the tribal and superstitious beliefs which pose gigantic problems for the creation of a new civilization.

These efforts are in evidence in the Portuguese Provinces of Angola and Mozambique. In recent years, a great deal of capital has been invested by Portugal in these areas and two development plans involving millions of dollars have been put into operation. These plans embrace a wide field, but they lay particular emphasis on the development of hydroelectric power, communications and industrial expansion.

In the social area the Portuguese have been most progressive, and in August 1961 extended full citizenship rights to all the inhabitants of Angola. As the result of the past efforts they had put forth, it was felt that there had been established in Angola a sufficiently broad base of literate, westernized native voters to guarantee the maintenance of civilized processes and public order.

I learned on my recent visit that the following measures have been put into effect in the Province of Angola:

1. The indigenato law was repealed and full political and civil rights were granted to all natives.

2. The local efforts of the municipalities and small rural communities are being reorganized so that the administrators will be elected by the local inhabitants.

3. The natives are permitted to acquire individual property in vacant lands and have been granted squatters' rights, so to speak.

4. To improve labor-management relations, the labor laws have been revamped so that the climate for collective bargaining and minimum wage regulations will promote harmony.

5. An inspection system has been put into effect in all the provinces to prevent unfair labor practices by individuals and companies.

6. Production and marketing agencies which handle the products of Angola have been moved from Lisbon for the purpose of improving the regional economy of the area and to prepare for the establishment of a common market for all Portuguese territories.

7. The problem of education has been attacked with vigor, and the building and equipping of new schools is taking place as quickly as possible.

I feel that great progress has been made and will continue to be made in the Portuguese Provinces of Angola and Mozambique if the racial agitators can be prevented from interfering. I believe we should find ways and means to encourage the Government of Portugal in the work it is doing and solicit it to step up the pace. No doubt the Congo incident will spur the Portuguese and others in more quickly providing a better way of life for the natives.

It should be noted that the territories of Angola, Mozambique, and the Republic of South Africa are the only countries in Africa where we have no aid program. It appears to be the policy of our Government to confine itself to condemning certain practices of responsible governments instead of encouraging these governments to meet squarely the problems they face.

Especially have policymakers been quick in the condemnation of South Africa. It is true that the severe application of apartheid by the South African Government may leave much to be desired, but even in South Africa, much progress toward native betterment has been made.

The slums of Johannesburg and other cities have been largely cleared and development of the native reservations is being speeded up. Although in my opinion much more could be done in this direction, it should be remembered that the 3 million Europeans of South Africa would have little hope of political survival if the 10 million natives were given the vote. If political equality were granted today, an economic system 250 years old would begin to disintegrate tomorrow.

It should also be remembered that when the Dutch colonists whose descendants are the Boers of today first arrived in South Africa in 1652, there were few, if any, native inhabitants on the Cape. They did not take anything away from anyone. The only occupants were remnants of the Hottentot people who were few in number and who had been driven south by the encroaching Bantus. South Africa offered little inducement for native settlement. The lands were largely arid and a living was much harder to obtain than in other areas farther to the east and into the interior. Actually, the Boers are in large part the native people of South Africa.

It was only when the British began to exert their influence over the Cape Town Colony that the Boers—seeking to retain their self-determination, if you will—began their trek into the interior and encountered the southward migration of the Bantus. The experience of the Voortrekkers, as they were called, closely parallels the experience of our own western pioneers. Fierce battles were fought with the Zulu and other tribes, even as our ancestors fought against the Cheyenne and Apache. The flourishing economy of South Africa today is the result of both Voortrekker and English activity.

If we take the unequivocal position in the United Nations and elsewhere of supporting the self-determination of one people against another—for this is what it amounts to—these policies cannot fail to lead to the withdrawal of the Portuguese from Mozambique and Angola and of the Dutch and English (as well as a large population of Indians who have built a flourishing commerce) from the Union of South Africa.

In the case of the Boers of South Africa, they have no place to which they may withdraw. South Africa is their homeland. If the Europeans are forced out, we shall see situations develop that will make the Congo pale into insignificance.

* * * * *

I have often expressed the view that we should never have embarked on unilateral programs of aid to Africa. If, however, we are to continue aid programs there, they should be reevaluated in the light of the many complex problems that face the natives of that continent. It is essential that such aid be for their benefit and not for that of the European nationals who still control most of the economies, including domestic and foreign commerce of the recently created independent nations.

We should draw heavily on past experience in establishing a new sense of direction for our activities. We should insist that administrators adhere closely to the legislation and intent of Congress. We should not embark on any grant aid program for the development of capital facilities in the underdeveloped countries of Africa. Our prosperous allies in Western Europe, who more or less dominate and control the extensive natural resources of the Continent, should undertake that task. Should loans be requested, the intended borrowers should offer some security, and the rate of interest should be at the level of what our Government must pay, plus cost of administration.

Emphasis should be placed on technical assistance programs designed to develop the human resources of the newly independent countries of Africa. Such programs should not be permitted to degenerate into the construction of capital facilities. Too often in the past technical assistance funds have been diverted to construction purposes, rather than used for the payment of technicians. The capital facilities recommended by technicians are too often projects that we think necessary, rather than what the country's inhabitants need or desire or themselves wish to maintain. The facilities recommended are frequently beyond the country's ability to finance, manage, or operate. It would be best, therefore, for our technicians to relegate their work to the field of instruction and advice.

The technical programs we undertake in Africa should be simple and basic. Technicians should endeavor, as much as possible, to teach those things that will be of immediate use to the native, using those materials that are readily available.

In the field of education, emphasis should be placed on primary schools before secondary, and on secondary before university or advanced education.

In the field of agriculture, which ranks second in importance only to education, emphasis should be placed on projects which will give the natives physical evidence of simple but new ways of doing for themselves. The operation of a few small experimental farms in selected locations, where some of the natives could be both employed and brought in from nearby areas to learn by seeing and doing, is one field that should be encouraged. The promotion of an elaborate extension service such as we have in our country is, in my opinion, doomed to failure. Even if it could succeed against the many difficulties, such as lack of transportation and the language barrier, it would be very costly and would take too long to show any appreciable results. We have tried it in many underdeveloped countries and have failed.

It is in the field of agriculture that "showplace" type of aid can be made effective. It is in this area that the natives have the most familiarity and where there is a fair chance that immediate results can be realized. We can quickly teach the natives how to use the plow and other simple tools. We can instruct them in new and better methods of producing their requirements of food and fiber. We can introduce simple sanitary techniques, such as whitewashing huts or even building better huts. Since the farmers live in villages and not on their farms, a few villages could be selected, with the hope that our technicians' advice will take root.

In the fields of transportation and communications, development of power, and construction of large capital facilities, the planning should be done on a regional basis where possible, with the understanding that aid furnished in these areas will be on a multilateral basis. In this connection, as I indicated earlier, I feel that all the aid should be furnished by our Western European allies who have over the years developed trade patterns and close economic ties with the many new African countries.

As I mentioned before, and as I have been advocating for many years our economic aid should be concentrated in the Western Hemisphere, where we have developed over the years close economic ties. Any aid programs we can afford should be expended in behalf of our neighbors to the south. Even there we should do all possible to encourage private enterprise to invest heavily since our own Government's resources are not sufficient to accomplish the results desired. Our foreign aid should serve only as a catalytic agent to stimulate the interests of private enterprise. Further, our efforts should be exerted to insure that the private entrepreneurs will not exploit the area in which they have investments, but on the contrary they should be compelled to use a large percentage of their gross returns to benefit the native population. Decent wages, comfortable housing, a fair amount of education and hospitalization, should be encouraged. This applies to all the underdeveloped countries.

As we should concentrate our own aid efforts in the Latin American areas, so should we urge, prod, spur, prevail upon, coerce, or do whatever is necessary to get our European allies to concentrate their efforts in the African countries, where they are now deeply interested. If this is done, there might be sufficient funds to go around and the benefits would inure not only to the natives of the undeveloped areas but to the entire free world. Surely if we continue to spread our wealth in an aid effort throughout the entire world, then we ourselves will be seriously weakened, with dire consequences for all the nations which are allied to protect freedom.

To accelerate the development of the whole African Continent, I would suggest that the European Economic Community band together in a vast consortia to undertake the necessary developmental projects, while we concentrate our efforts in our own hemisphere, all to the end of developing these vast areas primarily for the benefit of the local inhabitants. By increasing their purchasing power and bringing to them happiness and contentment, the whole world would be benefited.

The concentration of our own aid resources in Latin America and those of the European Economic Community in Africa would provide for a more uniform distribution of assistance. Interest rates and terms of repayment on loans similar in nature should be more or less uniform.

Aid could be furnished on a regional basis, taking full cognizance of the economic interdependence of the many new countries thereby resulting in a considerable reduction in the administrative costs of the programs for the entire free world.

One of the main purposes of my African tour was to study the overall operations of our many new embassies, also our Information Service and Service attachés, as well as our military missions.

In many of the new countries there is no need of a full embassy complement. We might provide regional centers for administration, and the establishment of a consulate in some countries might be ample. If, however, we must have an embassy in each country, then our Ambassador should direct all the operations of our Government in the country. He should be prepared to do political as well as economic reporting. He should also take a hand in the management of our AID program and the conduct of USIS. In many places, particularly where we have only a small AID or USIS program, this would make the services of highly paid AID directors or public affairs officers unnecessary.

In countries where we have consulates in addition to our embassy, consular reports relating to political and economic matters should be channeled through the embassy, and used by the Ambassador as a basis for reporting.

The economic section of the embassy could well take over the duties of agricultural attachés.

These last two recommendations alone would do much to cut down on both the excessive load of paperwork that is required and the large number of employees now stationed abroad.

I found that the rents being charged our personnel for housing, and our Government for office space, are almost without exception extremely exorbitant. It is true that housing is in short supply, but there is no need for us to accept the situation as a cow accepts the slaughterhouse.

In the first place, our personnel should not be permitted to compete one against the other for housing, as is the case. Often they scramble around for the best accommodations, with the result that those who have the benefit of high allowances can afford to meet unreasonable demands in order to get the best quarters. This has the tendency of pegging rents at exorbitant rates. It makes it difficult for diplomatic personnel of other countries to obtain adequate housing, since they do not have allowances which compare with those of our employees.

This recommendation is already being followed at a few embassies. It lessens this senseless gouging that often takes place, and has a salutary effect on other foreign personnel who blame us for hiking the rentals.

Turning to our U.S. Information Service, in several countries—notably Guinea, Mali, and Ethiopia, as well as others—our activity is frowned upon by the host Government. The scope of activity is severely limited by restrictions of one sort or another placed upon our personnel. Unfortunately, restrictions are not placed upon the number of our personnel, but rather upon their activity. We continue to send employees that are far beyond our needs. As pointed out previously, the functions of the U.S. Information Service, particularly in those countries where the activity is limited to the production of pamphlets, or the setting up of exhibits, could easily be handled by our Embassy.

In almost every case, the Embassy and information operations could be both physically and administratively consolidated to provide a great saving to the taxpayers. There are at present, or planned for the future, libraries maintained at the sole expense of our Government in every African capital. In many countries, these libraries are located in the European section of the city. Now here is a strange paradox. The professed purpose of our information program is to inform the natives of our way of life and the culture of the more advanced sections of the Western World. Yet our libraries are placed where natives rarely visit. This paradox should be resolved.

It would appear to me that binational centers, such as are located in Spain and many countries in South and Central America, could well be established throughout the continent of Africa. The advantages would be many. The local political and cultural leaders would be given a sense of belonging or shaping the program and carrying the load; they would be brought into closer contact with our officials. In some instances, the host government could bear a share of the expense, but even where this proved to be unfeasible, the benefits of maintaining a binational center as opposed to simply a unilateral library, would be much greater. Indeed, in many countries, the establishment of one or several binational centers should constitute our entire USIS program. It is extremely questionable whether the vast bulk of the native population is vitally interested in the happenings in Berlin or Cuba. In those countries where our allies are already firmly established, they should be allowed to carry the load of presenting the Western point of view.

I was particularly interested to observe at close hand the workings of the Peace Corps. I found much to give me pride in our young people, but also much to cause concern. It is apparent that the Corps is in danger of moving away from its original purpose of providing close contacts with the natives and living only a few notches above those who are being taught and helped.

Although the program is in its infancy, the administrative costs are already growing unduly. Bureaucracy is burgeoning and another little empire is being built. The administrative rent for the Corps in Nigeria already amounts to $50,000 per year. The administrative costs of the Nigerian program account for 28 percent of the Peace Corps funds spent there. In Togo, 6 Americans and 2 locals are employed to look after 45 corpsmen. In addition, one more American is authorized but the postion has not been filled.

The volunteers should be more or less on their own and able to take care of themselves. That was the original intent of the program, as I recall the presentation made to Congress. There should be no need to send large numbers of supervisors, administrators, and deputy administrators, as is being done here and there.

Also there is evidence that the initial ideals of the Corps are beginning to wane. Turning again to Nigeria, if the latest request for vehicles is approved, it will mean that there will be one vehicle for every 4.5 volunteers. I do not believe there is a vehicle available for every 4.5 Nigerians.

The great majority of the Peace Corps members are teachers. In most instances, they are being used to teach in elementary and secondary schools. They are under the direct supervision of the ministry of education in several countries. This seems to be contrary to our original purpose. Our young men and women, it appears to me, should be more on their own and be in closer contact with the natives who live away from cities. If they serve merely as grade teachers, let us say, under the supervision of local officials, how can they get next to the people living in the bush or in small villages? Those are the ones who need guidance and whom I thought we were making an effort to reach.

When Mr. Sargent Shriver, Jr., Director of the Peace Corps, appeared before the Senate Appropriations Committee on the 1962 budget, he said, among other things:

"The purpose of the Peace Corps is to make available a pool of trained Americans to help other countries meet some of their urgent needs for skilled manpower. * * *

"Peace Corps volunteers will work closely with the people they help and will provide on-the-job training for cooperating country workers, who will carry on the work after the volunteers leave. Volunteers, for example, will serve as surveyors in Tanganyika, secondary school teachers in Ghana, teachers' aids in the Philippines, agricultural workers in the Federation of the West Indies, community development workers in Colombia, and health workers in Pakistan.

"Volunteers can help to raise the standard of living or to improve educational and social levels in the less-developed areas or the world."

I again pose the question, How can volunteers work closely with the people they help and provide on-the-job training for cooperating workers, if they become ordinary teachers under the supervision and direction of officials of the host country?

From what I was able to learn and observe, most of the volunteers in Africa are grade teachers, and we are in effect partially subsidizing education in many countries.

Finally, while this program is so popular, the recipient countries should be asked to bear more of the living expenses of each volunteer. The policy varies between Ghana, where the country pays all, to Liberia, which bears approximately half of the living expenses, to Nigeria, which pays almost nothing. There should be some definite policy set out before the program gets too involved in the future.

Recommendations

Based on all data gathered by me and particularly the foregoing statement of facts, examples, and the conclusions I have drawn therefrom, I submit the following summary of recommendations:

Foreign aid

1. Our aid should be confined to technical assistance. Programs must be simple and basic, and should not be permitted to degenerate into the construction of capital facility projects. Technicians should be assigned on a regional basis, wherever practicable.

2. Whenever possible, development planning should be done on a regional basis and development aid furnished should be multilateral.

3. As nearly as possible, any loans made should bear the same rate of interest and have similar terms of repayment as those which are made by other participants in financing projects on a multilateral basis.

4. To accelerate the development of the whole of Africa, it is suggested that the European Economic Community be encouraged to band together in a consortia to undertake the construction of feasible development projects, particularly in the fields of transportation and communication, as well as in the generation of electric power, irrigation and flood control.

5. All commitments for aid and/or loans should be made in strict accord with laws enacted by the Congress.

6. Our aid programs, especially those dealing with the construction of capital facilities, should be concentrated in the Western Hemisphere where we have developed close economic ties over the years.

State Department, USIS, and service attachés

1. We should not embark upon a building program in Africa, except in case of absolute necessity. Should any construction be undertaken, every effort should be made to build in keeping with the architecture of the country, with simplicity as the keynote.

2. The personnel at all embassies, particularly in the new countries, should be kept at a minimum. All missions in any country should be administered through the Embassy under the direct supervision of our Ambassador. The political, economic, and consular sections should be consolidated and placed in the office of the Chief of Mission, wherever practical.

3. The Ambassador is our Nation's highest representative where he serves, and his advice and counsel should be followed in respect to all programs. Under no condi-

tion should personnel be sent to the field except at his request and after justification. The practice of some agencies of sending personnel to an Embassy when there is no request should not be tolerated.

4. Should it be necessary to establish consulates in any country, all consular reporting should be channeled through the Embassy, rather than sent directly to Washington. These reports could be used by our Ambassador in making direct reports to Washington.

5. To prevent "gouging" of our personnel and friction among foreign nationals, the administrative section of each Embassy should handle all the rental accommodations for all of our Government personnel in the country. They should not compete one against the other.

6. In countries where there is only a small USIS or AID operation, all functions should be under the direction of our Ambassador and no separate missions should be established.

7. Should programs other than technical aid be engaged in, they should be administered on a regional basis.

8. Binational centers such as we have established in many Latin American countries and in Spain should be established in Africa. All USIS libraries, if continued, should be located in the native quarters and not in the European sections of the cities.

9. The number of Service attachés should be held to a minimum, and under no condition should they be sent to a country except by and with the consent of the Ambassador.

Peace Corps

1. While the Peace Corps program is growing in popularity, a firm policy governing the share of the volunteer's living and traveling expenses to be paid by the host country should be spelled out.

2. The training program for the volunteers should be sufficient to enable them to look after themselves in the field, thus making it unnecessary to send large numbers of administrators, supervisors, and field personnel.

3. The volunteers should in all cases be encouraged and required to live among the people they train and at a level just a bit higher than their counterparts.

4. Every effort should be made to have the host country furnish transportation, thereby making unnecessary our sending a large number of vehicles which in time will require a staff of mechanics and other technicians for maintenance. Already the number of vehicles is steadily growing.

5. The volunteers should not be placed under the direction and supervision of the local government, as is the case with many teachers in various countries. I do not believe it was ever the intention of Congress to pay a heavy subsidy to any country to augment the teaching staff in its elementary and secondary schools.

6. The administrative policies of the Peace Corps should be reexamined with a view toward creating an administrative mechanism, among the volunteers themselves, which will not require a large and self-defeating bureaucracy.

General

A complete reevaluation of all reporting by our missions (State, AID, USIS, Service attachés) to Washington should be made at once. Much of it is useless and entails much expensive paperwork. More authority should be given at the country level. Much time and effort could be saved and many employees in the field as well as on the Washington level could be dispensed with.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, in view of the great amount of work done by the distinguished Senator from Louisiana [Mr. Ellender], I believe that the copies of his report which now are in the Chamber should be gathered by the Senate attendants and should be sent to the offices of Senators, because I am sure that, as time permits, they will wish to examine the report. It is a very substantial study, and it deserves the attention of every Senator.

So, Mr. President, I respectfully suggest—I do not believe a request for unanimous consent is required—that the Chair instruct the Senate attendants to collect the copies of the report now in the Chamber and see that they reach the offices of Senators.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the attendants will see to it that the copies of the report of the Senator from Louisiana are sent to the office of each Senator.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I wish to join the distinguished minority leader in commending the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. Ellender] on the very great effort he has devoted to the preparation of the report.

Earlier today, he suggested to me that I might improve my general education by at least examining the introductory pages of his report—which I did. Mr. President, I already knew that the Senator from Louisiana had many fine qualities and talents; but never before did I know that he was such a remarkable historian, anthropologist, sociologist, and political scientist. I assure him that although there may be parts of the report—as is true of any report—with which some of us may not agree or which some of us may not support, nevertheless the report represents a distinct contribution by a very able, experienced, and hardworking U.S. Senator. The amount of work going into such a report is nothing short of monumental.

I compliment the Senator from Louisiana on the report and on other reports which he has made. The writing of such a report represents, not a junket, but a study mission. Certainly the Senator from Louisiana deserves the commendation of all his colleagues; and I am delighted that the minority leader has suggested that a copy of the report be sent to the office of each Senator, for his attention.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

NEED FOR LEGISLATION TO INCREASE PUBLIC INFORMATION ON AWARDING OF LARGE DEFENSE CONTRACTS

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, the continuing headlines, emerging from the hearings of the Senate Investigating Subcommittee, on the award of the TFX airplane to the General Dynamics Corp., of Fort Worth, Tex., and the Grumman Aircraft Corp., of New York, are almost perfect evidence of the need for legislation to increase the public's information about how these multimillion-dollar and multibillion-dollar contracts are awarded.

Already these hearings have produced charges and at least partial denials of congressional intervention in the process of selection of the recipients of a contract. They have also featured charges and at least partial acknowledgment of tremendous arithmetical errors amounting to millions and millions of dollars.

Both of these important facts—certainly important to the taxpayers of the Nation, who will foot the bill, which is expected to total more than $6.5 billion—would have been in the public realm many weeks ago if the legislation which I have proposed had been in force.

I am delighted that several of my colleagues, from both sides of the aisle, have joined in cosponsoring these bills, S. 960 and S. 961.

S. 960, which is also sponsored by Senators Dominick, Douglas, Neuberger, Proxmire, and Williams of Delaware, would establish a Joint Committee on Defense and Space Contracts, to review defense and space contract awards, with primary attention to renegotiated contracts. This watchdog committee would consist of a Democrat and a Republican appointed from each of the following committees: the Senate and the House Armed Services Committees, the Senate and the House Appropriations Committees, the Senate and the House Government Operations Committees, and the Senate and the House Space Committees.

This joint committee would have its own continuing staff, as well as assistance from the General Accounting Office. I would suggest that the chairman of the committee be a Republican, during a Democratic administration; and a Democrat, during a Republican administration.

S. 961, which is also sponsored by Senators Dominick, Douglas, Kuchel, Neuberger, Proxmire, and Williams of Delaware, would require that in regard to a defense or space contract, there be maintained a record, open to public inspection, of all ex parte communications, whether written or oral, by anyone, including Members of Congress or the executive branch, other than the bidder. It would also require full and complete public disclosure of the basis on which a negotiated contract award is made, except for information classified for security provisions or where forbidden by existing law.

The fact that there is a great deal of public concern about this problem is evidenced by the amount of attention which the press is giving to the current TFX hearings and the several editorial comments which have appeared on my legislative proposals and on the general problem. I ask unanimous consent to have the text of the articles which have come to my attention printed in the Congressional Record.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Ribicoff in the chair). Without objection, the articles will be printed in the Record.

The articles submitted by Mr. CASE are as follows:

[From the Washington Post, Mar. 6, 1963]

PROBE REVEALS AF IN ERROR ON TFX COSTS

(By Laurence Stern)

Senate investigators resumed their quest yesterday for evidence of favoritism in the Pentagon's handling of the $6.5 billion TFX fighter aircraft program as the entire controversy headed toward a noisy political showdown.

Chairman JOHN L. McCLELLAN, Democrat, of Arkansas, of the Senate Investigation Subcommittee, brought out during questioning of military evaluation officers that the Air Force made a $31.8 million mistake in computing research and development costs for the TFX. But the censored hearing transcript failed to show how this error influenced the award of the fighter contract to the General Dynamics Corp. over its sole competitor, Boeing Aircraft.

As McCLELLAN pressed the search, his inquiry into Pentagon's decision came under sharp attack in the House from Representative JIM WRIGHT, Democrat, of Texas, in whose home district much of the fighter contract work will be carried out.

WRIGHT said it would be unfortunate "if a great investigating committee * * * should degenerate in the public mind to a body attempting to exercise its power to influence the selection of contracts as between competing firms."

PROMPTED BY INSINUATIONS

WRIGHT'S lengthy floor statement was prompted, he said, by insinuations growing out of the Senate inquiry that "mysterious and undisclosed political influence" dictated the award of the contract to General Dynamics.

The Texas Democrat frankly acknowledged that he tried to be "as persuasive as I know how to be" in seeking to convince military and civilian officials to award the fighter project to his home district company.

At the same time he challenged Senator HENRY M. JACKSON, Democrat, of Washington, in whose home State Boeing has major installations, to acknowledge that JACKSON'S office initiated at least seven separate contacts with top officials in Boeing's behalf prior to the award.

It was JACKSON who initially sounded the call for a Senate investigation into the General Dynamics award. The Washington Senator, nicknamed "the gentleman from Boeing," is sitting in on the McClellan probe as a Senate Investigation Subcommittee member.

WHERE WORK WILL BE DONE

The TFX will be assembled at General Dynamic's Fort Worth, Tex., plant and the Long Island plant of its partner in the project, Grumman Aircraft. Boeing planned to do most of the work, had it won the contract, at Wichita, Kans., and the Seattle home plant.

During yesterday's House debate WRIGHT was sharply challenged by Representative K. W. (BILL) STINSON, Republican of Washington, who jibed that the TFX is sometimes known as the LBJ aircraft—a sally at the Texas site of the winning contractor.

As the controversy unfolded on Capitol Hill, it became apparent that the TFX battle was shaping up as another major tug-of-war between Defense Secretary Robert S. McNamara and the military men under his command on unification of Pentagon procurement practices.

ROLE SLATED FOR TFX

As envisioned by McNamara the TFX advanced the goal of "commonalty"—Pentagonese for interservice pooling of equipment and programs—to the Nation's most ambitious fighter aircraft development program. The new plane is to be used jointly by the Air Force and Navy for a broad variety of tactical missions, including delivery of nuclear warheads if necessary.

Air Force Secretary Eugene M. Zuckert, in defending the award to General Dynamics last Sunday, despite contrary recommendations of four military evaluation boards, said Boeing was in effect "proposing two different airplanes * * *."

There was considerable sentiment among the military men in the Pentagon at the outset of the TFX project for separate planes to serve the separate services, a point of view that flew directly in the face of McNamara's drive for economies through integrated weapons programs.

A spokesman for McCLELLAN said yesterday that the subcommittee expects to begin taking testimony next week from top-level civilian administrators at the Pentagon, presumably including McNamara.

TFX JET BRAKING SEEN ADDING MILLIONS TO COST

(By Cecil Holland)

Investigating Senators released testimony today indicating that millions of dollars would be added to the cost of the TFX warplane if General Dynamics Corp., of Fort Worth, Tex., the winning bidder, is required to install thrust reversers on the aircraft.

The Boeing Aircraft Co.'s rejected bid included this braking in its proposal.

This was developed by the Senate Investigations Subcommittee during closed-door questioning yesterday of Col. Charles A. Gayle, program director for the multipurpose TFX project.

The subcommittee, headed by Senator McCLELLAN, Democrat, of Arkansas, is undertaking to determine whether any favoritism or faulty judgment figured in the award to General Dynamics. The subcommittee has received testimony that Boeing offered to produce a better plane for less money.

Colonel Gayle, the transcript showed, testified that Pratt & Whitney Co., which will manufacture engines for the supersonic fighter, had been approached on developing thrust reversers for the aircraft.

CALLED FOR DIVE BRAKES

The General Dynamics design called for dive brakes and spoilers for slowing the plane it proposed to build. According to expert testimony before the subcommittee, the thrust reversers would be more desirable.

The Air Force colonel testified that he was unable to estimate what the additional cost would be if the reversers were included on the General Dynamics plane, but he added: "It is probable * * * that we would have to negotiate a cost increase with the contractor."

According to subcommittee members and staff, it would cost $22 million for research and development work on the thrust reversers and $100,000 or $200,000 per plane to have them installed.

Subcommittee Counsel Jerome Adlerman estimated that the total additional cost for the 1,700 planes proposed under the TFX program would total $340 million.

Air Force Secretary Zuckert earlier acknowledged using wrong figures in his justification for awarding the controversial plane contract to General Dynamics.

In a letter to Senator McCLELLAN the Secretary said the error occurred through "some slipup."

According to evidence produced before the subcommittee, Mr. Zuckert in the justification used figures more nearly applicable to the aircraft proposed by Boeing than to the General Dynamics design. The Secretary's explanation was included in a censored version of yesterday's closed-door testimony before the subcommittee.

SECOND ERROR NOTED

The testimony, showing numerous deletions for security reasons, was released by the subcommittee and covered detailed questioning of Colonel Gayle on the relative merits of the designs.

While Mr. Zuckert's letter explained one error, Senator McCLELLAN during the questioning of Colonel Gayle turned up another. He said the Air Force had made a $31.8 million mistake in computing the research and development costs of the TFX.

The transcript revealed no explanation of the error and, it was indicated, Mr. Zuckert would be asked about that when he testifies.

FIGURES MIXED UP

Military experts four times recommended the Boeing proposal for the plane, but in the end were overruled by Defense Secretary McNamara, Mr. Zuckert, and Navy Secretary Korth. It was in a memorandum for the record on the reasons for the decision that Mr. Zuckert became mixed up on his figures and was asked by the subcommittee for an explanation.

The Secretary wrote that it was not the intention originally to deal with the merits of either the Boeing or General Dynamics versions but to compare the performance of the TFX type of aircraft to the best existing fighters. Then, he added, it was better to use the figures of one of the two versions and those of General Dynamics were selected.

"Unfortunately," the Secretary wrote, "through some slipup, the old figures were retained and the error was not caught. I regret very much that this oversight has resulted in confusion."

QUESTIONS AWAIT M'NAMARA

Senator JAVITS, Republican, of New York, a new member of the subcommittee, suggested asking Mr. Zuckert if he would have come to another conclusion on the award if he had known the figures were erroneous.

The civilian secretaries who participated in the decision are to be questioned by the subcommittee probably next week.

Senator MUNDT, Republican, of South Dakota, said the Pentagon leaders "are going to have to engage in some pretty eloquent testimony" to convince him any breach of security would be involved in using such descriptions.

As the Senate hearings continued, the investigation came under a sharp attack from Representative WRIGHT, Democrat, of Texas. He said it would be unfortunate "if a great investigative committee * * * should degenerate in the public mind to a body attempting to exercise its power to influence the selection of contracts as between competing firms."

The Texan said his comments were prompted by insinuations growing out of the Senate inquiry that "mysterious and undisclosed political influence" figured in the award of the contract to General Dynamics.

JACKSON CHALLENGED

He acknowledged that he had tried to be "as persuasive as I know how to be" in getting the contract for the Fort Worth firm in his district. He also challenged Senator JACKSON, Democrat, of Washington, to acknowledge that he "initiated at least seven separate contacts with top officials" in Boeing's behalf.

Senator JACKSON is a member of the investigating subcommittee and requested the inquiry now underway.

The contract eventually is expected to total more than $6.5 billion for 1,700 of the all-purpose supersonic warplanes.

[From the Camden (N.J.) Courier-Post, Feb. 5, 1963]

DEFENSE CONTRACTS AND POLITICAL PULL

In his television interview with Richard Strout, of the Washington Bureau of the

Christian Science Monitor, over channel 13, Senator Case dwelt on a subject of the highest immediate interest to some of New Jersey's leading industries and their employees, including several in this area.

Strout observed that $60 billion of President Kennedy's budget involved defense contracts and asked Case if these contracts are not "very, very valuable for Congressmen to bring back to their districts if they can get them, and to their States?"

Senator Case made the obvious answer: "They're enormously important to districts and areas, cities, counties, and States because they're enormously increased in size, and are a greater and greater part of our whole economy * * * and it's perfectly true that defense spending is the biggest single chunk of business in many, many areas."

"Is there any danger," Strout asked, "that these will be considered political plums, that suspicion will * * * well, I hear suspicions now, voiced already, that politics plays its part in distributing these contracts?"

Case answered quite truthfully that "there has been very little hiding of the fact that in the last political campaign, for example, candidates were openly boasting that if they were elected, they'd do a better job of influencing the Defense Department to get business for their constituents. And this promise has not been made quietly, it's been made very, very openly, and it's very disturbing."

The New Jersey Senator said he is greatly concerned over this situation and over "constant suggestions that influence for other purposes can be effective in getting business from one place to another from the Federal Government."

Several suggestions that Case said he has in mind as remedies include enforced publicity for every statement made by a Member of Congress, any politician, anybody in the executive branch or anybody else to defense or space spending agencies. He believes that public opinion would then serve as a great corrective against wire-pulling or the back-door approach to these agencies.

Case said he wants to see New Jersey get its fair share of Government business and points to the important contributions it makes to the defense and space efforts. But he wants us to get such business in the future, as in the past, only on our merits. He believes, as every Jerseyite must, that if the competition for defense and space contracts is "in the open and on the record," we can take our chances of getting our fair share.

Whether Case can get Congress to go along with his publicity plan is a question. He believes it may be hard to do so at first, but that he will succeed in the end.

It is unnecessary to name names, but there is no doubt that candidates' claims that they could do more for their States at Washington than their rivals—whether or not in connection with Government contracts—have been and should be disturbing to the public.

If such claims are followed up by major shifts in defense and space contracts away from certain States apparently deficient in political influence at Washington to others that have an apparent abundance of it, there is still more reason for the public to be disturbed. The States that stand to suffer from such a situation should do all they can to turn the spotlight of publicity on it, as Case proposes.

[From the Plainfield (N.J.) Courier-News Feb. 4, 1963]

Sky Cavalry

A story we published recently about the conversion of the Westfield National Guard unit to "sky cavalry," and recent statements of Defense Secretary McNamara about the trend to increase the air transportability of conventional ground forces, put emphasis again on the need for cooperation among the different arms and services. The situation is not new. It requires cooperation and prior planning among ground forces, the ordnance department that supplies weapons and equipment for ground forces, and the air forces that supply the air transportation to move men and equipment.

Senator Clifford P. Case, Republican, of New Jersey, a member of the Senate Armed Services Committee, touched lightly on the subject yesterday in a statement regarding the awarding of defense contracts. Case said that Secretary McNamara had said the right thing in his statement to the House Armed Services Committee that defense contracting policy is to procure what we need when we need it at the lowest cost to the Government, quality and delivery schedules considered.

Case said there is confusion in the public's mind when it tries to reconcile McNamara's statement with speeches by other leaders boasting of the number of defense contracts brought to one area or another. Case said he hopes to get McNamara's support for making public the factors involved in the awarding the billions of dollars of defense contracts each year.

Getting back to "sky cavalry," it is an interesting fact that as early as 1942, when the first U.S. airborne units were activated at Fort Bragg, N.C., a helicopter battalion was planned on paper. The helicopters were never made available to ground forces since the priority was for fighter and bomber aircraft.

After the war, in 1946, a small number of Bell helicopters were assigned to the 82d Airborne Division for evaluation and test. The tests proved that the helicopter was an air vehicle of great versatility, and the idea of "sky cavalry" for reconnaissance, screening, and exploitation was again revived. But again the helicopter procurement had low priority in the Air Force's program.

It was the Navy Department and the Marine Corps that proved the versatility and the value of the helicopter in the Korean conflict. Now the Army is "discovering" the tactical wonders of "sky cavalry" many years late.

As we develop our mobility in the air, under the present program, and in space in the future, it is necessary to strive for an overall strategy that should be a "strategy for peace." Perhaps by awarding our contracts properly, and by coordinating our efforts, a highly mobile "sky cavalry" can help to maintain order and to prevent war. If Secretary McNamara and Senator Case can produce that result, they will make a great contribution to history.

[From the New Brunswick (N.J.) Daily Home News, Feb. 8, 1963]

U.S. Contracts Irk the Senator

U.S. Senator Clifford P. Case, Republican, of New Jersey, made two points last night in Washington as he spoke during the annual congressional dinner of the New Jersey State Chamber of Commerce.

First, he called for closer scrutiny of the awarding of Government contracts—especially space age contracts—because the winning of one contract can make a company successful in one area of the Nation while the loss of the same contract can wreck a company, or at least a plant, in another section.

The second point is that while every Government agency wants bright and shiny new quarters when it starts out on a new project, it would be well for Uncle Sam to check around his holdings before stamping "OK" on the plans for something new.

Both points have a special meaning to Middlesex County, if not central New Jersey.

Dealing with the first point, Case became aware of the situation when he realized how the loss of Raritan Arsenal would affect 2,600 jobholders at the area base to be closed by mid-1964. He realized that the greater hold a Government installation has on an area, the greater the effect of any closing on employees and businesses dealing with the installation.

He tried unsuccessfully to drive through legislation that would tend to ease the closing impact if the area already was in trouble economically. That he failed 2 years ago has not eliminated the threat nor, apparently, his interest in the problem.

His second point also recalls the arsenal situation. At different times, it was known the Government was planning to build new space for Federal agencies while, all along, adequate modernized space has existed at the arsenal.

Boston is to be the site of a new Federal basic electronic research center with a starting cost of $6½ million and a payroll for about 2,000 people. Eventually, the cost will be $50 million.

Meanwhile, there exists in the same area the Air Force Flight System Development Center, and Case thinks it could be used. He thinks there should be a full disclosure, at least, of the contract awarding procedures.

Finally, Case told the visiting New Jerseyites last night, he hasn't liked the ring of the political boasts that have accompanied announcements that new Federal installations are coming into a certain area.

He mentioned Texas, for instance. There the line has been so finely drawn, he said, that Houston papers touted wildly their now multimillion-dollar manned space center.

But in Dallas, there have been complaints over reports that a $26 million Federal center—already approved—was put into deep freeze by the administration for as long as a Republican Congressman is in office.

Case warned with disdain:

"There is clearly a growing feeling that considerations other than actual requirements and absolute economy are entering into the selections of successful bidders on contracts."

[From the Newark (N.J.) Evening News, Feb. 11, 1963]

The Sole Criterion

Senator Case charges that politics, influence, and other extraneous considerations are involved in selecting contractors for defense and space work.

He cites one project awarded to a Houston construction firm, although it was rated least qualified of three contractors by one National Science Foundation panel, and least qualified of five by another panel. A similar topside reversal of evaluation panels, Mr. Case continued, is involved in a major Defense Department aircraft contract award.

Running into many billions of dollars, defense and space production has grown into a significant factor in the economy. For Congress it appears to have become a second pork barrel. Governors and congressional delegations scramble to get as much of this work as possible for their States.

A campaign theme of Senator Kennedy, of Massachusetts, was the not too subtle implication that he would be in a position to get more for Massachusetts. Immediately after his election he started contract-seeking forays into other States that brought indignant protest from Senator Keating, of New York.

If existing circumstances encourage such provincial competition, it nevertheless presents pernicious possibilities, including substantial waste of taxpayers' money. As Senator Case says, the national interest should be the sole criterion in awarding contracts. This means they should go to the best qualified, regardless of location or other considerations.

Senator Case is under no illusion about his ability to obtain drastic reform. Too many formidable interests are arrayed against him. But he does see a chance to improve matters by blunting the impact of improper influence. He plans to introduce legislation which would, among other things, require disclosure of all the facts on which negotiated contract awards are based, consistent with security considerations.

His proposals are modest enough and deserve support in Congress. For if contracts are awarded on the basis of influence rather than merit, wide-scale corruption is an ever-present possibility.

[From the Evening Bulletin, Feb. 11, 1963]

Letting U.S. Contracts—Case Would Have Defense, Space Agencies Keep Public Records

(By Anthony Day)

Washington.—Senator Clifford P. Case, Republican, of New Jersey, wants to let some light into those shadowy rooms where the Government's defense and space contracts are negotiated.

Case thinks there are too many signs that political and private lobbyists influence the Government's choice of contractors.

His proposals are simple.

He would have defense and space procurement agencies keep public records of all communications made to them about any contract by anyone, private lobbyist, Members of Congress, administration officials.

He would require the Government to disclose the reasons for which negotiated contracts are awarded.

MINORITY WATCHDOG

To oversee the awarding of contracts, he would establish a congressional watchdog committee under a Democratic chairman when the Republicans hold the White House and under a Republican chairman when the Democrats are in office.

Case points out that in the past fiscal year the Defense Department awarded $28 billion worth of contracts, of which about $18 billion were negotiated, the rest let through competitive bidding. Bidding is used when specifications of the job to be done are sufficiently precise; negotiation is required when the job is vague, the moon program, for instance.

The official policy of the Defense Department is to give negotiated contracts to the companies that can do the best and cheapest jobs.

"But recent actions and statements in high official circles, indeed in the highest, raise some doubts about whether what actually goes on conforms with official policy," Case told a meeting of the New Jersey Chamber of Commerce here last week.

As a Republican serving in Congress while a Democrat sits in the White House, Case cited examples of contract awards under the Kennedy administration. The $43 million Mohole project to drill into the earth's crust was given to a Texas firm rated low by two National Science Foundation panels, he said. An expensive research center is planned for Massachusetts in spite of the presence of a similar existing center that might be used instead, he said.

KEYSTONE SAMPLE

Pennsylvania can find plenty of hints about influence on contracts in their own State.

Last fall the President, campaigning for the Democratic ticket in Pennsylvania, broadly implied that he had brought more defense contracts to Pennsylvania and would give the State yet more with Richardson Dilworth as Governor.

Governor Scranton has appointed former Representative James E. Van Zandt to head a State office here whose job it is to obtain more defense and space contracts for the State. In order to obtain more political leverage, the Republicans will approach the administration behind the shield of a predominantly Democratic committee of Pennsylvania Congressmen.

Maybe there is more rumor than substance to reports of political influence. Politicians and private lobbyists are inclined for the sake of their constituents and clients to take credit for contract awards, even though they know their attempts at influence came to nothing.

Nevertheless, the rumors persist. As Case says, they are bound to when the enormous contracts now common may mean life or death for a company, and economic health or economic sickness for a city or a State.

SIMPLE, BUT OH MY

Case's proposals, though simple, could be devastatingly effective. As he said last week, the awarding of contracts is done so secretly that the public cannot now judge whether it is done well. But full disclosure, he said, would inform the public, and an informed public would exert irresistible weight against improper influence.

Case will introduce his proposals as bills shortly. The only trouble is that it will probably be a long time before Congress passes them, if it ever does. The Senator has said he knows they look revolutionary, even Utopian. To Members of Congress who thrive on promises of influence, they must seem dangerously subversive.

[From the Washington Post, Mar. 1, 1963]

Congress and Contracts

The practice of letting favored Congressmen announce the award of Government contracts in their districts may have some partisan advantages, but the cost is high in terms of the longrun public confidence. Of course Senators and Members of the House are delighted to make known that so many millions of dollars will be spent in their States or districts because their constituents will assume that the announcer has wielded a potent influence in the matter. The difficulty with the practice is that such an inference is often false and that if it were true it would suggest a scandal.

The official policy of the Defense Department is the antithesis of favoritism. It provides: "Our first and paramount objective is to acquire weapons and materiel which fully meet our qualitative, quantitative and delivery requirements—at the lowest overall cost. Whenever our specifications are sufficiently precise, we must obtain competition through formal advertised bidding procedures as required by law." But when the Department announces the awarding of contracts through Democratic Congressmen and denies a comparable privilege to Republican Congressmen, it seems to fly into the face of its own policy.

The effect on Congressmen is likely to be especially unfortunate. Certainly it tends to intensify the pressures on the Department from legislators who want a larger share of the huge defense budget spent in their districts. The net effect is to encourage legislators to think of defense expenditures, not in terms of the maximum national security, but in terms of swinging lucrative contracts to their home towns.

Instead of cultivating the impression of a cozy liaison between the Defense Department and Members of Congress in the letting of contracts, Congress ought to be strengthening the safeguards against special influence and favoritism. Senator Case of New Jersey, has proposed a bill requiring that all ex parte communications in regard to defense or space contracts by persons other than the bidder be recorded for public inspection. He would also require, in the case of negotiated contracts, the disclosure of the basis on which the contract was made, except for classified information, and set up a House-Senate watchdog committee to review such contracts.

This is the direction in which Congress ought to be moving. With billions of dollars flowing from the Treasury to defense and space contractors, it is of the utmost importance to avoid favoritism and even the appearance of using defense projects as political bait.

[From the Hackensack (N.J.) Record, Mar. 2, 1963]

Taxing the Hinges Off the Back Door

Senator Case has produced a depressingly impressive bill of particulars in support of his legislation to let light and air into the defense contracting system. The nature of the legislation is familiar: it requires that a record, open to public inspection, be kept of all communications, written or oral, respecting a defense or space contract, by any one except the bidder, and that means Members of Congress and the Executive; it requires, within the framework of security and law, the full and prompt disclosure of the basis on which a negotiated contract award is made; and it sets up a congressional board of review to keep an eye on the negotiated contracts which total 65 percent of the Defense Department's $28-billion-a-year awards to private business.

He has said before, this is what he proposed to do by way of corrective. Mr. Case had not so relentlessly specified why something corrective has to be done.

Item: the $43.6 million initial Mohole contract, in which a hole is to be drilled in the floor of the sea to the earth's interior, went to Brown & Root, Inc., of Houston, Tex., although the firm was rated third best in a field of three by one National Science Foundation panel and another panel rated four firms as better qualified. The contractor is running behind schedule. Costs are running ahead. He mentioned contracts' being steered toward Texas simply as an example.

Item: campaigning in West Virginia last fall, the President pointed out that four times as much defense money was being spent in that State as was spent in 1960.

Another: campaigning in Pennsylvania, the President said:

"In fact, military prime-contract awards to Pennsylvania for fiscal 1962 were nearly 50 percent higher than they were in 1960, and this is the kind of progress and collaboration which Dick Dilworth (the Democratic candidate for Governor of Pennsylvania) can continue as Governor."

Another item: still campaigning and still in Pennsylvania, said Mr. Kennedy:

"Working with Governor Lawrence since 1960, we have increased by 50 percent the number of prime defense contracts that come to Pennsylvania—job retraining, cleaning our rivers, area redevelopment, increasing our food supplies for those on relief, all these measures which can be brought about with a progressive Democratic Governor."

That was John F. Kennedy. Ted Kennedy is the one whose posters said flatly that he was the candidate who could do more for Massachusetts.

Now, it might in a pinch be argued that defense money should be used for pump-priming, for political and social purposes. Senator Case argues to the contrary, that if we don't get our dollar's worth of defense the money is wasted. Yet his legislation would not inhibit the use of defense money for therapeutic purposes in backward States. It would merely insure that the record of the benign flimflam would be open to public inspection and evaluation. It does seem rational that we know what it is we're doing with our money. Mr. Case mentioned 28 billion excellent reasons.

[From the Harrisburg (Pa.) Evening News, Mar. 5, 1963]

SENATOR CASE HAS THE RIGHT IDEA—DEFENSE DOLLARS SHOULDN'T BE USED AS POLITICAL BAIT

New Jersey's liberal Republican Senator, CLIFFORD CASE, has proposed three-point legislation to provide better protection for the integrity of the huge Federal defense spending program with its multimillion-dollar contracts that bedrock the prosperity of so many American communities.

Senator CASE is concerned with the increasing public feeling that politics, influence, and other extraneous considerations are involved in the $60-billion defense and space programs. Many Americans share his concern. Too many of our politicians and public officials are stressing the "I can get it for you wholesale" prosperity of Government contracts.

Supporters of EDWARD M. (TEDDY) KENNEDY hammered at the slogan, "he can do more for Massachusetts," throughout his successful campaign for U.S. Senator last year. Republicans complained that because of his family ties with the administration TEDDY KENNEDY, as a candidate, was able to make the first public announcements on some $100 million in defense contracts and other Federal aid funneled into Massachusetts.

The President himself embraced this "we can do more for you" pitch in his Pennsylvania campaigning last year for Richardson Dilworth, Democratic candidate for Governor. During his 2-day western Pennsylvania swing, President Kennedy pointed at defense spending in the first years of his administration:

"In fact, military prime-contract awards for Pennsylvania for fiscal year 1962 were nearly 50 percent higher than they were in 1960—and this is the kind of progress and collaboration which Dick Dilworth can continue as Governor."

The very next day, he said it even more strongly:

"Working with Governor Lawrence since 1960, we have increased by 50 percent the prime defense contracts that come to Pennsylvania—job retraining, cleaning our rivers, area redevelopment, increasing our food supplies for those on relief—all these measures which can be brought about with a progressive Democratic Governor. So I am hopeful that you are going to elect in this State Dick Dilworth."

Senator CASE pointed at these Presidential statements in the heat of the campaign and bemoaned the political reality that "the cry, 'I can do more,' has been made respectable."

Governor Scranton, the man who beat Mr. Dilworth, is putting heavy emphasis upon a drive to get Pennsylvania a larger share of the multibillion-dollar defense spending. This campaigning knows no party lines. And what is being said and done in Pennsylvania is only typical of all the States.

Senator CASE has a lot of company when he wonders out loud how much public confidence has been shaken in the integrity of our huge defense-space spending program.

He calls for full disclosure—a public record of all communications, written or oral, by anyone other than the bidder in regard to a defense-space contract. This would include Members of Congress. He calls, too, for full public disclosure of the basis on which negotiated contract awards were made without bids. And he urges the establishment of a special congressional watchdog commission with authority to ride herd on all defense and space contracts. He suggests that it be chairmaned by a Republican during a Democratic administration and vice versa.

Senator CASE's proposals are good ones. This public business, involving billions of dollars of public funds, must be transacted in the open. And every possible protection must be erected against plunging our vital defense-space program into the political spoils system.

[From Western Aerospace, March 1963]

WATCHING WASHINGTON—STANDBY ADVICE TO DEFENSE CONTRACTORS: "SMILE; YOU'RE BEING INVESTIGATED ON TV"

(By Arthur Kranish)

Several years ago Washington was in the midst of a sensational series of investigations which disclosed a nasty blend of social, political and financial influence-peddling in the granting of television licenses.

The hearings disclosed case after case of local and national pressures on Federal officials who were bound by law to dispense lucrative franchises to the "best qualified" applicants. Their decisions were to be based, according to the rulebook, on carefully prepared presentations by the interested parties, on judicious examination of all the facts, and by an overriding concern with the public's welfare.

We soon learned, however, that the right to operate a television station in a prosperous community was not always awarded according to the rulebook. We learned that congressional intervention, White House interest, political ties, personal friendships, private loans, free inspection trips and other considerations could tip the balance in favor of one applicant or the other.

The resulting scandals, now almost forgotten, brought about a drastic series of reforms in Federal regulatory agencies—reforms which were opposed by many at first, but are now widely accepted as necessary and proper.

This bit of recent history is worth recalling because signs are now appearing that similar events are on the verge of coming to light in aviation, space and defense industries, and similar demands for investigation and reform are already beginning to be heard.

Although the pattern of events seems to be the same, the dimensions of the stage on which this new drama is to be played are inconceivably larger. Where we once worried over the misallocation of a television franchise worth millions, we must now be concerned over the awarding of contracts totaling billions. Where we once expressed concern over the welfare of a community as a function of its television viewing diet, we must now share concern over the effect of a contract on the welfare and safety of the Nation and indeed the entire free world. Where we once shuddered at the dubious morality of a ward heeler, we now must look with discomfort at men in public life who pledge to do more for their community or State or region in matters which affect our very national survival.

In our times, in the past few years alone, the burden and the power of the Federal budget have become a veritable whirlwind, sweeping from almost nowhere, and growing to immense and dangerous proportions before we were quite aware of its growth, its size, its danger. This can be said quite comfortably without quarreling with a single penny of this immense sum. And of all the funds involved, defense and space activities comprise more than half.

The poor soul on the Federal Communications Commission who had to spend many months or even years wrestling with his conscience over a television license award is, today, an almost inconsequential figure when compared with the power and authority of a bureaucrat or politician who holds the power to grant or withhold contracts in the billions.

The power these men hold is beyond question—for last year two out of every three dollars in defense and space contracts were awarded—as they often must be—through negotiated contracts rather than through competitive bid procedures. This is not an argument for more competitive bidding, which can be awkward, time consuming and unproductive. It is, rather, an illustration of the vast responsibilities which we have entrusted to the man who makes the deal.

Even greater power resides with the Federal official who can, more or less, make vast decisions affecting the safety or welfare of millions of Americans long before the time comes to negotiate a contract. In the space agency this type of power was amply illustrated—rightly or wrongly—in the decision to establish Houston, Tex., as a center of the manned spacecraft effort; and in the more recent, sudden decision to present the State of Massachusetts with a $50 million electronics research center.

We say rightly or wrongly because we have never received much in the way of solid evidence to support or negate either of these controversial decisions. In the few cases where evidence is available, the facts have often set off new controversy. Witness the congressional investigation of charges that topside in the Defense Department or White House overrode expert recommendations in the award of recent aircraft contracts; and the evidence that the National Science Foundation awarded a $44 million contract for geology research to a firm rated third and fifth in repeated evaluation processes.

Even in minor matters, considerations beyond those of statutory merit seem to appear. The space agency recently, for example, established a pilot program to disseminate the results of space technology to industry. By coincidence, the Institute which will run this program will concentrate in five States—including two which were fortunate to have powerful spokesmen in the Senate committee which oversees the space agency's programs. Someday, perhaps, the residents of the other 45 States of the Nation may come to have the same advantages.

If any of these decisions are questionable, it must be realized that human beings have frailties, and react to pressures which are an inevitable part of the democratic process. This was the case in the Federal Communications Commission several years ago, and there is no reason to believe that the counterpart officials in the Defense and space agencies are any less human. Only the scope of the problem has changed, and a whim which would affect a few thousand Americans a few years ago can affect a few million as easily today.

One of those in Congress who is free enough of "back home" pressures to take a careful look at these problems is Senator CLIFFORD P. CASE, a thoughtful, liberal New Jersey Republican, who has explored some of these recent decisions and has concluded that there may be some truth to the charges that politics, influence, and other extraneous factors are involved.

Based on his experiences on the Armed Services, Space, and Appropriations Committees, he is recommending legislation which—by coincidence—is similar to that adopted for the scandal-ridden FCC a few years ago. He suggests:

1. A complete record be maintained, open to public inspection, of all communications, whether written or oral, in regard to a defense or space contract by anyone, including Members of Congress or the executive branch, other than the bidder.

2. Require full and complete public disclosure of the basis on which a negotiated contract award is made, except for information classified for security purposes or forbidden by existing law.

3. Establish a special joint House-Senate committee authorized to review defense and space contract awards, with primary attention to negotiated contracts. This watchdog committee would have a special investigating staff and would be headed by a Republican under a Democratic administration, and by a Democrat when the Republicans are in power.

This is not the whole answer, to be sure. But it is becoming increasingly apparent that the defense and space pork barrel is too tempting a target for politicians in both parties, and in all branches of the Government. Given this fact, it is only a matter of time before a truly major scandal comes into public focus, with all the devastating effects on our defense or space program—and perhaps even on the free enterprise system—that such a scandal will inevitably bring. The time to give serious thought to proposals for review and reform is obviously at hand.

[From Aviation Week and Space Technology, Oct. 22, 1962]

Expanding Political Factor

(By Robert Hotz)

Politics have always had an influence in Government spending and indeed they should. Politics are an integral part of the Nation's business, not something that only becomes important when major elections loom. Other considerations being equal, a judicious distribution of the Federal spending of the taxpayers' dollars can contribute to a healthy and expanding economy. However, during the past year the political factor in defense and space contracting has been multiplied to the point where it may already be outweighing the technical and management skills needed to produce the required weapon and space systems. If this trend continues, it can only lead to the production of shoddy weapons and flimsy space systems which will drain the national resources without producing any useful results.

We may be able to survive the results of poorly built schools, cracking highways, and the other standard results of public works contracted for solely on political considerations. But we cannot survive the production of inferior and unreliable weapons that will be the inevitable product of this same philosophy. There is also a new trend in the announcement of defense awards that borders on chicanery. These announcements are so sparse in facts and detail and are distorted so badly as they grind through the political mill that they create a deliberately false impression of how much defense business is really going to any particular area. Some of the so-called defense contract awards, when announced by Congressmen and Senators, are cleverly designed to withhold the whole truth without actually lying, while a false and temporary optimism is generated just long enough to tide some embattled officeseeker through a critical campaign.

This Nation faces far too serious a menace all around the globe to be able to defend itself adequately with policies no more enlightened than ward politics or civil strife in the Pentagon.

[From Aerospace Management, December 1962]

Politics, Progress, and Profits

(By Tom MacNew)

The spoils system and aerospace contracts—do they go together? After the recent election, people from all ranks within the industry are wondering. Naturally, official Washington says no. But, that isn't the way the politicians played it during the campaign. Election speeches had the two stroll the same bridal path to blissful prosperity.

While companies built a managerial and technical competence, crafty campaigners tore down the image of offering constituents more defense dollars. Claims were made by both parties as though they, the politicians, were the sole marketing and technical arm of the aerospace industry. Unfortunately, the companies made no claim to the contrary to set the record straight.

It must be as frustrating as the fires of Beelzebub for professional men of industry to have the public believe that contracts are not based on capabilities, but are a part of that trite phraseology, "the political football." The administration has done the industry a disservice by not only permitting the situation to exist, but by fostering it. Even the competent men within Government who are responsible for the proper selection of contractors have been placed in a secondary role as individuals without portfolio.

How come? A main reason goes back to the early days of 1961. A ruling was handed down, that Senators and Congressmen should be the first informed on contract awards within their respective States. This permits the party to claim, "See what we've done for you." Winning contractors were supposed to be informed later. It was often much later. Then, the most-kicked-of-all footballs, the socioeconomic Government contract. This kind of contract carries provisions for small business, depressed areas and equal opportunity; it was dealt with in almost every political speech. What the campaigners didn't touch on was how they like to interfere with companies and unions alike at the bargaining table.

Contract awards should be released through the contracting agency and the winning contractor simultaneously. Plant employees should be told what was bid on and why the bid was won. The same story should be passed on to the public. Dates should be fixed by the Government on the award announcement. If an award is not made on that date, there should be a public statement. We've got to get it across that neither the people nor the industry fuel the glib whirl of the political turbine.

[From U.S. News & World Report, Feb. 18, 1963]

How Much Politics in Contract Awards?

Are politics and influence entering into the award of Government defense and space contracts that now total some $60 billion a year?

The question was raised by Republican Senator Clifford P. Case, of New Jersey, in a speech on February 7.

Contracts supposedly are awarded on the basis of merit, Senator Case said, "but recent actions and statements in high official circles, indeed in the highest, raise some doubts about whether what actually goes on conforms with official policy."

Senator Case specifically questioned recent decisions involving Massachusetts, the home State of the Kennedys, and Texas, the home State of Vice President Lyndon Johnson.

THE BOSTON CASE

The Senator urged very close scrutiny of an administration proposal to establish a $50 million basic electronic-research center in the greater Boston area. As a member of the Senate Space Committee, Mr. Case said he would insist on the fullest possible airing of the need for this facility.

THE DALLAS CASE

In Texas, according to Senator Case, Dallas—which has a Republican Congressman—fares worse than Democratic Houston in its dealings with the Government. "In Dallas," he said, "the newspapers are complaining that a $26 million Federal center, approved by the General Services Administration and the House and Senate Public Works Committees, has been put in deep freeze by the administration for as long as its Republican Congressman is in office."

THE HOUSTON CASE

In Houston, which already has a multimillion-dollar manned space center, "there has been continuing good news," Senator Case said. One recent plum awarded Houston: the $43.6 million contract for the Mohole project to drill a hole in the bottom of the sea. A Houston firm got this contract, the Senator said, "despite the fact that one National Science Foundation panel rated this firm third best in a field of three, and another NSF panel rated four firms as better qualified."

THE REMEDY

The Senator's remedy for the situation is to open up to public inspection all communications—including those from Members of Congress or the executive branch—on defense or space contracts.

[From U.S. News & World Report, Mar. 11, 1963]

Officials of companies with defense and space contracts say it is no secret in the trade that the White House plays an increasingly active role in awarding contracts. Some companies have concluded that they must convince defense officials that they can fulfill the contract, and then pass a White House screening for political acceptability.

OUTDOOR RECREATION

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 20) to promote the coordination and development of effective Federal and State programs relating to outdoor recreation, and for other purposes.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I have discussed the Outdoor Recreation Act of 1963, Senate bill 20, with the majority leader, the minority leader, the distinguished Senator from New Mexico [Mr. Anderson], and other Senators. It appears to be the consensus that we would be well advised to take our final vote on the bill on the coming Monday, with the understanding, of course, that the Senate will be in session tomorrow, so that further debate can be had on the outdoor recreation bill, as well as on other items.

Therefore, Mr. President, after appropriate consultation, I ask unanimous consent that, under the usual form of such requests, the Senate vote at 4 p.m. on Monday next; and that, following conclusion of the morning hour, the time be divided equally between the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. Anderson], the proponent of the bill, and the distinguished minority leader.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator wish to waive the requirement under rule XII for a quorum call?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes, I ask unanimous consent that the requirement be waived.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Minnesota? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The unanimous-consent agreement was subsequently reduced to writing, as follows:

Unanimous-Consent Agreement

Ordered, That effective on Monday, March 11, 1963, at the conclusion of routine morning business, further debate on S. 20 (a bill to promote the coordination and development of effective Federal and State programs relating to outdoor recreation, and for other purposes) or any amendments, motions, or appeals relative thereto (except a motion to lay on the table) shall be equally divided and controlled by the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] and the minority leader [Mr. DIRKSEN]: *Provided,* That no amendment that is not germane to the provisions of the said bill shall be received.

Provided further, That the Senate proceed to vote on the final passage of the said bill at 4 o'clock p.m.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

A NUCLEAR TEST BAN AND NATIONAL SECURITY

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I wish to address myself to the subject of the nuclear test ban and our national security.

Disarmament in general, and the current effort to achieve a nuclear test ban in particular, are a vital part of our total national effort to gain both security and peace. Far from being an abstract ideal or a purely humanitarian dream, the program of the United States for controlled disarmament, starting with a treaty to ban the testing of nuclear weapons under adequate safeguards, is solidly rooted in our vital national interests.

In defining disarmament and a nuclear weapons test-ban treaty as a vital national interest, it is essential to be clear on the limitations as well as the possibilities of limitations on armaments. In the first place, arms control is only one of the essential means by which we seek to bolster our national security while maintaining the peace. Equally important in terms of their contribution to peace and security are such programs as our military and economic assistance to the less developed free nations, our new trade policy under the trade act adopted by the Congress last year, and, above all, our continuing efforts to expand military, political, and economic cooperation in the NATO alliance and other alliances. I point to these in order to stress the point that a test-ban treaty is not a panacea but rather one vital element in an overall national strategy for security and peace.

It is equally important to recognize that the arms race is both the cause and reflection of a world struggle for power. It follows that a test ban treaty cannot be expected to resolve existing international tensions but it might certainly ameliorate them to a significant degree. In the words of Prof. Hans Morgenthau, eminent scholar in the field of international relations:

> Disarmament, no less than the armaments race, is the reflection of the power relations among the nations concerned. Disarmament, no less than the armaments race, reacts upon the power relations from which it arose. As the armaments race aggravates the struggle for power through the fear it generates and the burdens it imposes, so disarmament contributes to the improvement of the political situation by lessening political tensions and by creating confidence in the purposes of the respective nations. Such is the contribution disarmament can make to the establishment of international order and the preservation of international peace. It is an important contribution, but it is obviously not the solution to the problem of international order and peace.

PARTISAN DEBATE IS OUT OF PLACE

Because disarmament and a test-ban treaty are matters of the national interest they are not an appropriate subject of highly partisan debate. Throughout the postwar era Congress has usually, if not always, made a clear distinction between those issues which involve diverse interests within our own country and which are therefore legitimate subjects of partisan controversy and those issues of foreign affairs which involve the security of the Nation as a whole. The latter have with few exceptions been approached in a spirit of bipartisan unity. The bipartisan approach to vital questions of foreign policy is based on our recognition of the fact that when partisan controversies are permitted to divide us in the face of a resolute adversary, only our adversary can profit. No American, Republican or Democrat, wishes to repeat the tragic error of 1919 when irrational and shortsighted partisanship forced the United States to repudiate the League of Nations and with it the best hope for peace in the 20th century.

The test ban negotiations are indeed a legitimate subject of discussion and debate. But because they involve critical questions of the national security we are all under the strongest obligation to conduct this debate with reason and responsibility. We must resist the temptation to seek short-term partisan or personal advantage in an issue that has long-term implications for the peace and security of the United States.

U.S. TEST-BAN POLICY: BIPARTISAN PRECEDENTS

In this respect, the present Democratic administration has the right to ask for the same bipartisan responsibility that the preceding Republican administration asked for and received. President Eisenhower was no less committed than is President Kennedy to the search for a workable test-ban agreement, and, if I may say so, I believe that the Disarmament Subcommittee of the Foreign Relations Committee, of which I have been privileged to serve as chairman, provided him with the fullest measure of assistance and support.

As for myself, I supported President Eisenhower on most questions relating to disarmament and occasionally offered specific comments and suggestions which he graciously accepted. I recall, for example, a letter which I wrote to President Eisenhower on May 16, 1958, in which I offered the administration certain seismological data which had been collected by the subcommittee. My letter ended with these words:

> The Disarmament Subcommittee is eager to cooperate with the executive branch on this most vital and complex question of arms control.

In his reply of May 30, 1958, President Eisenhower reiterated his support for an effective and controlled arms-limitations agreement and expressed his appreciation for the information provided by the subcommittee. The bipartisan spirit which prevailed in 1958 is equally necessary in 1963. It requires sustained effort and a high degree of responsibility and self-discipline on the part of both Republican and Democratic Members of Congress working in cooperation with the national administration.

TEST-BAN SERVES U.S. NATIONAL INTEREST

I turn now to some of the specific reasons why an effective test-ban treaty is in the national interest of the United States. The fundamental reason is that on the basis of sustained and exhaustive study of the implications of a test ban, it is clear that an effective test-ban treaty will make a greater contribution to the security of the United States than the continuation of unrestricted testing. This conclusion is not a hypothesis or a speculation but a conclusion based on the most rigorous analysis of the advances which the United States might make through further testing balanced against the restraints which a treaty would impose on the Soviet Union.

It is the consensus of expert opinion that a test-ban treaty would tend to preserve the existing balance of military power, which is favorable to us, while unrestricted testing might enable the Soviets to close the gap. In the words of Paul A. Nitze, Assistant Secretary of Defense for International Security Affairs:

> Overall, the trend, with unlimited testing, will be toward equality in major nuclear forces between the United States and the U.S.S.R. In the field of tactical forces, continued testing would permit the Soviet Union, in time, to match the more diversified, and presently more numerous U.S. nuclear arsenal * * * both sides might develop the pure fusion weapon which could be very much cheaper in nuclear material than present weapons and would free the U.S.S.R. from her dependence on fissionable material for weapons.

I suggest to my colleagues that the statement of this highly respected officer of the Department of Defense should be carefully weighed and studied.

Another reason for an effective test ban treaty is the contribution it might make toward limiting the spread of nuclear weapons. No informed supporter of a test-ban treaty is so ingenuous as to suppose that its adoption would be quickly followed by the adherence of France and China. It would, however, represent a significant step toward preventing the proliferation of nuclear weapons. It is in any case clear that in the absence of a test ban treaty there is little or no chance of preventing the acquisition of nuclear arsenals by other powers, including some which are hostile to the United States.

I emphasize that the proliferation of nuclear weapons is a threat to the security of the United States. It increases and intensifies the danger of accidental war.

A test-ban treaty with the indispensable provision for onsite inspection within the Soviet Union could have constructive effects in other areas of Soviet-American relations. Honestly and fairly administered, an inspection system would disprove Soviet allegations that inspection is a disguise for espionage. It might thus open the way to broader measures of disarmament in an atmosphere of reduced tensions. It might also serve to lessen the pathological secretiveness of the Soviet Union and thus, indirectly, to strengthen such movements as exist in Soviet society for freer communication and cooperation with the West in a number of fields.

Another reason why a test-ban treaty would advance our national interests is that it would eliminate the dangers, whatever they are, of nuclear fallout. Whether or not nuclear fallout is in fact a hazard to present and future generations—and the consensus of scientific opinion is that it is such a hazard—we are at the very minimum gambling with the lives and health of our progeny in allowing the atmosphere to be contaminated with nuclear debris. The issue, moreover, is one which bestirs worldwide agitation, complicating the relations of the United States with its friends all over the world.

The overriding interest of the United States in its relations with the Soviet Union is to demonstrate to that powerful nation that it cannot pursue a policy of aggression without bringing disaster upon itself and at the same time that if it abandons its ambitions for expansion, it has nothing to fear from the West. A test ban treaty would help demonstrate to the Russians that there are, from its point of view, acceptable alternatives to continuing conflict with the West and to an onerous arms race with unforeseeable consequences. This, after all, is at the very core of our national interest: to influence Soviet policy toward the modification and ultimate abandonment of those ambitions which threaten our own peace and security—and which, I might add, threaten their own survival.

TEST-BAN ADVANTAGES OUTWEIGH RISKS OF CHEATING

There are risks in a test-ban treaty—risks of secret Soviet preparations for renewed testing and risks of successful cheating on a small scale. We must recognize these risks, and discuss this subject as objectively and honestly as we can. We can cope with the first of these risks by maintaining our own capacity to renew testing with little delay should the Soviets violate the treaty.

As to the danger of secret undetected testing, it is the consensus of expert opinion that the risk—while it is there—is small, and that in any case it is extremely unlikely that the results of cheating could have an important effect on the military balance of power. The controlling consideration must be an objective weighing of the risks of a treaty against those of unrestricted testing. On the basis of available evidence, the balance is heavily in favor of a treaty, which, though not the panacea that overzealous advocates might contend, can nevertheless make a solid contribution to the peace and security of our country.

Thus far in the discussion we have heard primarily of the difficulties involved in a ban on further testing. Almost all of the criticism has been leveled at the possibility of cheating. The other alternative or risk has seldom been mentioned, namely, the risk of unrestricted nuclear testing, which would give the Soviet Union nuclear parity with the United States and would alter the balance of power.

As of this date, the balance of power is in our favor. The balance of power 5 years ago was even more in our favor. Ten years ago it was unmistakably in our favor. Had we been able to obtain a test-ban treaty 6 years ago, the Soviet Union today would be, for all practical purposes, a second-rate power.

But some of the criticisms leveled today against a test-ban treaty were leveled against the same basic proposal 6 or 8 years ago. I held hearings of the Disarmament Subcommittee on this subject. Time after time, year after year, I have heard exactly the same thing. Yet it is now an accepted fact that had the United States of America been able to get the Soviet Union to agree to stop nuclear testing 6 years ago, the Soviet Union would never have been able to equal the power of the United States, or even come close to it.

It is interesting to me that the Soviet Union never seems to want a test-ban agreement. I gather that I know why, because I have helped to negotiate with the delegates of the Soviet Union. I know their representatives. I have sat across the conference table from them. I know that they do not want a test ban agreement, because, had the Soviet Union agreed to such a test ban some years ago, the Soviet Union today would be a second-class military power as compared with the United States of America.

I make the charge and claim that the longer the unrestricted testing goes on, the more our security is imperiled, because unrestricted testing permits the Soviet Union to catch up—just as we have been able to gain on the Soviet Union in terms of outer space research.

Had the Soviet Union been able to get us to agree to no outer space research after they launched sputnik, where would we be today?

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. I agree wholeheartedly with the Senator from Minnesota. It is obvious that a number of our colleagues do not. They have, well within their rights, made some rather strong statements in the press and on the floor of the Senate in opposition to a test-ban treaty. I wonder how the Senator would answer the contention they make—that there is an almost indefinite future in the proliferation of nuclear devices of destruction; that we are ahead, and in order to stay ahead, we must keep on testing. Is it not a fact that scientists think we are approaching the law of diminishing returns in what testing can yield in giving a further lead, and that the almost inevitable result of continued testing is that we have reached pretty nearly the ceiling of where we can profitably go, whereas the Soviet Union is almost certain to catch up? They are so far behind that they are almost certain to catch up, whereas we are so far ahead that it would be most difficult for us to maintain our lead.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I would say that we have reached this stage in the nuclear contest, namely, that these two nations share the basic technology of nuclear weapon manufacture and use. The problem is the ratio of weight of such weapons to yield. The last series of Soviet tests, which were in the seventies, undoubtedly took the Soviet Union as close as any nuclear power has gone in this respect.

I am saying that once a country has arrived at a point where the basic knowledge of nuclear science is commonplace among the scientific community, and the technology of fabrication and nuclear production is also well known, and all that goes with the intricate apparatus of conducting nuclear tests has been developed, it is only a matter of a short time before that country is able to equal the achievements of even the most advanced power, because that country has moved beyond the immediate hurdles and obstacles and to nuclear development and testing.

Make no mistake about it—the Soviet Union has done a remarkable job of catching up, just as the United States has done a remarkable job in the case of space exploration and in many instances actually have surpassed the Soviet Union.

A few years ago we were talking from the highest councils of the United States about the missile gap. There came a time when the missile gap was not so big. Then there came a time when there was no gap. The reason why there was no gap was that we had gone ahead and were able to put tremendous efforts behind our missile program. Once we acquired the basic knowledge and technology, all that was needed was to put it all together. This is where we stand in the field of nuclear weapons development.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. I agree with what the Senator has said about the Soviet potential for catching up, but I call attention to what appears to be a reasonable assertion, that while they are moving forward, we shall be moving forward, too, and will therefore keep our lead. It is said that we must keep up testing in order to maintain our lead, and, for example, develop the neutron bomb.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I think that what the Senator has said is correct. The critics of the position held by the Senator from Minnesota, and I believe by the Senator from Pennsylvania, and by President Kennedy, President Eisenhower, and by the Government of this country since 1946——

Mr. CLARK. And by the Secretary of Defense, and by the Secretary of State, and by the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and by the Atomic Energy Commission—am I not correct?

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator is correct. The critics of the position of those who speak of the importance of a nuclear test ban treaty is that the only way for the United States to stay ahead is by keeping ahead, by testing and testing and testing.

The fact of the matter is that the nuclear gap is closed in terms of basic knowledge and know-how. I do not say the gap is completely closed. I do not believe that anyone can make that statement. I say it is much easier to shorten the gap as compared to a highly sophisticated position. However, when we reach the point where both nations have sophisticated science or nuclear technology, the gap has a tendency to close much more slowly; and it is then that it is advantageous for the leading nation to slow down in order to inhibit the progress of the second-place nation.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. The extent to which the gap closes will depend to a large extent on whether the power which is behind it is free to expend an enormous amount of treasure in closing the gap. If that power is bound by a treaty, the nation which is ahead has the advantage. Is that correct?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes. Those who have been responsible for the security of the Nation—Presidents Truman, Eisenhower, and Kennedy, and the officers of the State Department, the Defense Department, the Central Intelligence Agency, and also the Atomic Energy Commission, in all three administrations—all have agreed to what we have said, namely, that if we are ahead, the time to obtain a test-ban treaty is now, when we are ahead.

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. PELL. I hope the Senator will explain in his speech, as he goes along, why, when each side has the power to demolish the other, it makes any difference whether it is done with sophisticated weapons or not.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes. As we proceed in this discussion I will point out that the treaty would not prohibit the development of an accurate missile. It would not prohibit defense research in electronics, which is so necessary. The Senator from Rhode Island has made it manifestly clear—and it is a matter which every citizen ought to know—that the Soviet Union and the United States—and we can add to that Great Britain and France—have enough atom bombs and hydrogen bombs to devastate the earth and destroy humanity. We have what is called an over-kill capability.

That is not what we are talking about. Some Americans are concerned—and I respect their concern—that we may not have the most modern weapons.

I will get to the neutron bomb shortly. This is one item that is constantly being brought up as an argument against a nuclear test ban.

If ever there was a subject in which the United States should have an interest, it is this bomb, because this is the poor man's bomb. We have invested in the high-cost bomb. If we want a world in which unlimited testing is permitted, the only sure way is not to have a treaty which prohibits testing. Then a moderately underdeveloped nation, with capable scientists, will develop the neutron bomb. That will mean that everything we have in stock will be immediately downgraded, or at least will lose some of its effective deterrent power.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. I assume the Senator will deal in his speech with the charge, which I believe to be unfounded, that we need to continue testing in order to have a perfect antimissile missile.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes.

It would be a matter of national policy to maintain our atomic and nuclear laboratories. I wish to underscore that statement. We do not close up shop. We maintain a constant state of readiness.

It would be a matter of national policy to maintain in full operation our atomic and nuclear laboratories and to maintain full readiness for renewal of testing in case the Soviets or any other nation engages in secret testing. It would be necessary for our Government to maintain a state of readiness and to keep competent scientific talent on the job in our nuclear laboratories. This in itself would not prevent Soviet violation, but it would minimize or limit the possibility of the Soviets being able to gain any advantage as a result of a surprise abrogation of the treaty.

I warned two administrations to be constantly ready to test in case the Soviets, during the recent moratorium period, should violate the moratorium and start testing. I wrote to the Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission 2 or 3 years ago, and again a year ago, and said, "Are you ready to test on a moment's notice in case the Soviets violate the moratorium?"

We can keep our laboratories and our testing facilities in a state of readiness, just as we do our Navy and Air Force. We can keep our scientists on the job in the laboratories, just as we keep our pilots on the job and alert for action. That is what a nuclear test-ban treaty would require.

The only real possibility of Soviet cheating is in the area of underground tests. The difficulties in the detection in outer space are greater than those in the atmosphere or under water. However, our Government has on two occasions expressed its willingness to sign a test-ban treaty in the environments of outer space, atmosphere, and under water without any international inspection or system of international control and verification. The problem area is in underground tests. It is because of the difficulties in detection and identification in underground testing that we have insisted upon a broad system of inspection and verification, including onsite inspection.

The test that would prove most useful to the Soviets and be of the greatest danger to the United States would not be a single test but rather a series; but a series of tests is more readily detectable. I shall refer to this at a later point in my remarks.

What we need to keep in mind, however, is the need for balancing of these risks of Soviet cheating against the advantages which would accrue to us from a test ban. It is the view of the responsible officials of this Government, the President and his chief military and foreign policy advisers that our national security is best protected by the conclusion of an effective test-ban agreement, despite the risk of cheating.

I repeat that whenever we have evidence of cheating we are released from the obligations of the treaty and could engage in nuclear testing on whatever scale we deem necessary.

The basic position of the United States at the Geneva disarmament negotiations, which I attended only recently, is that a treaty effectively banning nuclear weapons tests is a question of the utmost priority. A vital ingredient of this position, however, is that any system banning nuclear weapons tests must be subject to adequate verification. It must, to the greatest extent possible, be self-enforcing. Before any such treaty can be placed before the U.S. Senate for ratification, we must be certain—as must all parties to the treaty—that each signatory power is observing the provisions of the pact and is not testing nuclear weapons in secret.

Yesterday the President of the United States in his press conference repeated the position of the administration. I stated this very same thought as an observer at the Nuclear Test Conference in Geneva just 2 weeks ago. I was privileged to be there with Mr. William Foster, the Director of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency. Mr. Foster was handling our negotiations in the 18-nation Disarmament Conference. I pay my respects to Mr. Foster. He did remarkable work, and gave an admirable performance. He was there to protect and to advance the security of the United States. But I should say that his position was not made any easier by the news stories constantly coming out of the United States that our position had changed or that we were going to yield on this point or yield on that point, or that the Senate would never ratify a treaty.

It is not very easy to be a negotiator for the United States when the U.S. negotiating position appears on the front pages of the newspapers 24 hours before he even has official notice of the Government's position.

It seems to me that somebody in this Government had better find out why there are so many leaks of highly confidential, highly sensitive information which is essential to the conduct of our negotiations with foreign powers.

When I attended the conference at Geneva, I knew the position of the Government and I knew what modification had taken place. I had to stand before delegate after delegate and deny that I had any special information, because our Government was not ready to present it at the negotiating table.

Nevertheless, newspapers in the United States published the U.S. position 24 hours before a single American delegate was permitted to acknowledge he had the information.

I talked with the Italian Ambassador, the Ambassador from Sweden, the Ambassador from Brazil, the Ambassador from Canada, and the Ambassador from the United Kingdom. Everyone of those ambassadors asked me, "Senator, we hear that your Government is now going to offer 7 on-site inspections instead of 8 to 10. Is this true?" I happened to know that it was true at that hour, but my Government had not permitted me to say it was true, because we were not yet ready to expose our position at the conference table. We wanted to get something in return before revealing our hand. But the story appeared the day before in the Washington Star, in the Paris edition of the New York Herald Tribune, and in the European edition of the New York Times.

Mr. President, one of our distinguished allied representatives later wrote to me saying, "Senator, you lied to me." But if I lied, I did so at the insistence of my Government. I was not there as a private citizen.

If anyone at the White House, or the FBI, or anywhere else, should read these remarks, I hope he will seek out the professional leakers instead of chasing down every alleged leftist under every sagebrush. Let us find out who are some of the citizens who cannot keep their mouths shut, when it comes to the official negotiating positions of the United States, merely for the sake of a headline.

Mr. President, that was a digression, but I wanted to get it off my mind early, simply because I felt so sorry for Mr. Foster. I repeat: the head of our delegation at Geneva did a remarkable job.

ADVANTAGES OF U.S. VERIFICATION PROPOSALS

Much of the controversy swirling around the test-ban question these days is precisely related to this all-important subject of verification. What is the verification system currently proposed by the United States? Is it an improvement upon our earlier proposals or does it detract from the safety of a test ban agreement? To what extent does this system correspond to recent scientific and technical advances in national detection capabilities? Is the U.S. verification proposal sufficiently reliable to justify the cessation—one would hope the permanent cessation—of a program of nuclear testing? What are the answers?

First of all, there are certain general features of the U.S. verification proposal which commend themselves on simple grounds of expediency. Not only does it provide convincing assurance that no power could get away with conducting a meaningful series of secret underground tests, but it would be considerably cheaper and less complicated than the system which we proposed back in 1958. Those critics who insist on our returning to the relatively more cumbersome position of 1958 should take this fact into consideration. The 1958 system—although the best that could be devised at the time—would not have provided timely protection against a violation of a test-ban agreement.

Some people have dwelt on our so-called concessions to the Soviet Union. I returned from Geneva on a jet plane of the newest design. It can carry more than 336,000 pounds. It can carry 80 tons of fuel. It can fly more than 16 hours nonstop. Its engines are much smaller than were the first jet engines. I suppose someone might say that this plane was unsafe; that concessions had been made because the engines were smaller than the ones which were in use 6 years ago. The engines may be smaller in size and weigh less, but they generate about 500 more horsepower. These planes are better; they are safer. Science has improved the technology of jet flight.

In like manner, science has improved the technology of the inspection and detection of seismic events.

There has been an improvement in seismographic implementation, in the capacity to detect.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. Does not the Senator's argument go to this length: That those who make lists of alleged concessions in our position in the test-ban negotiations—12 separate concessions, one Senator pointed out on the floor a little while ago—are really missing the point of the argument, because these concessions, so-called—the word is inappropriate—are merely an acknowledgment of progress in the art of seismic detection?

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator from Pennsylvania is correct. We have made many "concessions" to the Soviet Union. We have put all our big battleships in mothballs. It is hard to imagine that the U.S.S. *Missouri*, the U.S.S. *South Dakota*, and the U.S.S. *Iowa*, mammoth 55,000-ton battleships, are now in mothballs. But no one to my knowledge has said that the Chief of Naval Operations has sold out the security of the United States by putting the battle fleet in mothballs.

It so happens that the Polaris missile, the submarine, the missile cruiser, the fast missile-firing destroyer, and the nuclear aircraft carrier are far superior to the old battlewagon. We have made no concession to the Soviet Union; we have made a concession to science; we have made a concession to technology.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, at this point will the Senator from Minnesota yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McGovern in the chair). Does the Senator from Minnesota yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. Is it not true that as recently as 5 or 6 or 7 years ago, there were only two really qualified seismic experts in the United States, and that we had no meaningful national system which could distinguish between an earthquake and a seismic explosion?

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct.

Mr. CLARK. But as the art has progressed, our country has constructed additional stations and has trained additional men in the art, so that as of today—with the exception of a very few persons in the scientific community, such as Dr. Teller—it is almost universally admitted that tests in the atmosphere and those under water and those in outer space can be detected without establishing within the Soviet Union any stations or means of control.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is entirely correct.

Let me point out that when the so-called Berkner report was prepared—and, by the way, it was conveniently "leaked" to many sources—I received a copy of it. I had it locked in the vault in my office. Members of the Disarmament Subcommittee had seen it; but I could not release it. When I wanted to speak on that subject in the Senate, all the material I needed was marked "secret." Finally, I served notice that, if need be, I would ask that the galleries be cleared, the doors to the Senate Chamber be closed, and the Sergeant at Arms guard the doors, and then I would disclose the report to the Senate under these extraordinary circumstances. The Berkner report provided considerable information which was needed in order to improve seismology.

As a result of that difficult and hard-fought battle, we were able to put millions of dollars into advance research programs for the improvement of seismographic instrumentation. It was planned to spend, over some 5 years, approximately $200 million to improve seismology. But unless some of us had stirred up a fuss, at that time, the Berkner report would have stayed in the archives, gathering dust. However, I am happy to say that we were able to flush the report out into the open.

Today, I have in my office, for my personal use, document after document which is labeled "secret." I am told, "Do not use it; just look at it." But when I wish to engage in debate with those who hold a different point of view on the issue of nuclear tests, and when I need the evidence—such as evidence on the Vela project or data on research by the Department of Defense, and particularly by the Air Force—I am told, "You cannot do that; it is secret." Mr. President, I do not know how one can possibly come to an understanding regarding this issue if all the evidence is labeled "secret."

Mr. President, the people of the United States are getting sick and tired about this so-called secrecy. We find that, despite such claims, most of the information we need finds its way into the newspapers, because most of the press know that the information does not need to be kept secret and indeed cannot be kept secret.

So I should like to have the Defense Establishment and other agencies declassify some of this information as quickly as the Atomic Energy Commission has declassified some of its information.

In 1958, when the amount of knowledge about detection was much less than it is today, United States and Soviet scientists thought it would be necessary to construct a totally new and elaborate international detection system around the globe, with some 180 control posts, including some 19 in the Soviet Union. This system would have taken 4 to 6 years to install, would have required the hiring and training of scores of international technicians, and would have cost, according to reliable estimates, about $2 billion to build and several hundred million dollars a year to maintain.

Today, as a result of careful observation by an outside and distant detection system of seismic events in the Soviet Union, it has been ascertained that no new international system needs to be developed in order to detect events. This is a tremendous advance.

How accurately and how reliably can nuclear weapons tests be identified at the present moment? It is common knowledge that the United States, the Soviet Union, and other countries have highly effective systems of detecting and identifying nuclear weapons tests in the atmosphere, under water, and in outer space. That is the chief reason why I have called repeatedly for a separate agreement banning all tests in these environments, and why our Government has proposed such a treaty. We could detect and identify any Soviet violation of such a limited agreement through means currently available and in operation. We do not need to ask the Soviet Union or any other power for permission to "turn on the switch," so to speak, that will yield us this information. We never have. Indeed, I have just finished reading David Lilienthal's gripping account, delivered in a recent lecture series, of the measures taken by the United States, as far back as 1948 and 1949, to make sure that we knew when the Soviet Union exploded its first atomic fission device. I can assure you that our present-day detection capabilities are vastly improved over the relatively primitive air-sampling techniques of the late 1940's.

Of course, it is somewhat more difficult to detect Soviet tests in outer space than it is to detect tests above ground or under water. But even here we can rely upon a national detection system; the Soviet Union could not, I assure you Mr. President, conduct a militarily significant series of tests in outer space without our ascertaining it, not through one, but through several detection systems.

The Geneva talks have stuck on the problem of the detection and identification of underground tests. Underground tests below certain magnitudes or thresholds can be too easily confused with natural earthquakes. I do not blame the Members of Congress or the public for becoming confused by the ever-changing, abstruse arguments that often seem to becloud, rather than to clarify, the issues. On no other feature of a test ban has there been more heat and less light. Considerable light can be shed on it, however, if one simple proposition is kept in mind: With today's improved methods of detection and identification of seismic events, it is possible to reduce the paraphernalia of verification—that is, the number of detection stations and the number of onsite inspections—without increasing the vulnerability of the United States to a surprise violation by the Soviet Union of a test ban.

Mr. President, as set forth this morning in the Washington Post, President Kennedy is quoted as having said yesterday:

> We have suggested that we would not accept a test ban which did not give us every assurance that we could detect a series of tests underground. We would not submit a treaty which did not provide that assurance to the U.S. Senate. Nor would the Senate approve it.

Mr. President, we should make crystal clear the care with which we have proceeded in connection with these negotiations.

Indeed, the system as now devised would be extraordinarily effective in deterring the Soviet Union or any other power from attempting to violate the agreement. Combined with an unavoidable provision for onsite inspection of suspicious events on the territory of a country in which the event occurred, the verification system put forward by the United States and the United Kingdom fits the requirements of 1963.

Let us get down to brass tacks. If an event is detected in the Soviet Union, how does one determine whether the event is a nuclear explosion or some natural occurrence, such as an earthquake?

SUBSTANTIAL IMPROVEMENT IN DETECTION CAPABILITY

Senators will be interested to know that the ability of the United States to identify earthquakes in the Soviet Union has improved substantially over the past 5 years. It has improved to the extent that in any given year, after an analysis of all events—including their location—has taken place, only a few dozen at most remain completely unidentified and are likely to be more suspicious than others. Each of these unidentified events—earth movements—would be subject to inspection under the treaty proposed by the United States and Great Britain.

I have taken my job as chairman of the Subcommittee on Disarmament as a very serious and heavy responsibility. I would not address the Senate on the subject of the desirability of a nuclear test ban agreement unless I thought it was in our national interest to do so. I do not favor "concessions" that would in any way jeopardize our national security. Over the past 4 years this Senator has admonished negotiator after negotiator not to be so eager for a test ban agreement that we would in any way, knowingly or unknowingly, offer concessions which we might later regret. The security of our country is too important to be bargained with merely in order to reach an agreement with the Russians. Thus, every Member of this body should have a clear answer to this very important question: Just how good is the current U.S. system for detecting and identifying seismic events?

The Joint Atomic Energy Committee has just heard some revealing testimony on this very point by several witnesses, one of whom was Dr. Carl F. Romney, Assistant Technical Director of the Air Force Technical Applications Center.

Dr. Romney described how, as a major part of the Vela-Uniform program, the Defense Department constructed five very high quality detection stations in various parts of the United States. According to his testimony, the station at Fort Sill, Okla., appeared to be capable of detecting 90 percent of all magnitude 4 events at distances of 2,000 miles or more.

He said, "all magnitude 4 events" that is, a force equal to an explosion of about 1.8 kilotons. Two additional stations also appeared to have detection thresholds of about magnitude 4 for distant seismic events.

A third station, at McMinnville, Tenn., has a detection threshold near magnitude 4.5, and a station scheduled to become operational in April, at Payson, Ariz., is expected to have a detection threshold near magnitude 4.0. Then, after citing some less favorable results of the Vela research program, Dr. Romney made the following significant comments, which I wish to insert in the RECORD at this point without abridgment or alteration:

I remind Senators that Dr. Romney works for the Air Force. The Air Force has not received any Oscars for its work in the field of disarmament. And it is not supposed to. The Air Force has its own mission. I am not being critical of the Air Force. I am merely saying that Dr. Romney does not work in an environment that day after day would brainwash him in the quest for disarmament. He works in an environment that says, day after day, "Be on guard. Be alert, Doctor. Watch out."

What did Dr. Romney have to say? He said:

> From our improved knowledge of the detection thresholds of the large seismic research stations, and of the signals expected from underground nuclear explosions, we can determine the capabilities of various seismic detection systems. Based on all the information now available, we can conclude that it is feasible to design a detection system, based entirely outside the Soviet Union, which is capable of detecting explosions of about 1 kiloton in granite, 2–6 kilotons in tuff, and 10–20 kilotons in alluvium. This requires no new research. The primary requirement is to select the sites for these stations very carefully, at locations where the noise level is very low. This implies that the stations must be distant from cities, heavy industrial machinery, and other sources of manmade noise. Similarly, the stations must not be in coastal areas, in regions of high average wind velocity, or near other sources of natural noise.
>
> The system might consist of about 15 stations surrounding the Soviet Union, each equipped with arrays of 10–20 seismographs—similar to the equipment in our existing Vela research stations. Seismographs in deep wells could substitute for arrays in some locations. The existing Vela research stations could well form the nucleus for such a system. Additional stations in Europe and Asia would be essential, however. We believe that existing mobile seismographic stations could be placed in such foreign locations within a few months, and replaced with permanent stations having the full capability indicated within 2–3 years. The stations would each cost about $1 million. There would, of course, be additional costs for operating the stations and for analyzing the data. Tentative estimates indicate that the system might require an annual operating budget on the order of $10 million.

Let us be clear about the fact that the United States now has the capability of detecting essentially seismic events in the Soviet Union which would be equivalent to a magnitude of 4.0 on the unified scale for measuring the size of earthquakes. Although tests in "soft" alluvium give the smallest signals—far smaller than tests in hard rock—high-yield tests in alluvium would probably form craters which would be detectable by onsite inspection. Moreover, the U.S. system is capable of detecting some seismic events below the presumed "threshold," so that no nation could be sure that its clandestine tests would go undetected. Uncertainty, I might add, is a powerful deterrent to the would-be perpetrator of any kind of mischief.

I add, Mr. President, that when my colleagues read the secret reports and read what the senior Senator from Minnesota has said, they should also read the material from which I drew this conclusion.

I wish especially to bring to my colleagues' attention what I have just stated, so I repeat the sentence: "Moreover, the U.S. system is capable of detecting some seismic events below the presumed 'threshold,' so that no nation could be sure that its clandestine tests would go undetected."

That is a masterpiece of understatement. The fact is that our detection capability is much greater than the press has led us to believe on the basis of the information it has received from the U.S. Government.

Moreover, the excavation of large holes for the purpose of conducting tamped explosions in alluvium is both expensive and difficult to conceal. The excavation of a smaller hole to obtain decoupling in a hard medium is more feasible logistically, but it too suffers from a major disadvantage: namely, that underground cheating of this type might allow a country to get away with one test, but it would not allow the undetected conduct of a whole series of tests. A nation bent on violating a nuclear test ban for military purposes would almost certainly want to conduct a series of tests—particularly if there had been a long period of nontesting by the nuclear powers, such as in the years preceding the unilateral violation of the nuclear test moratorium by the Soviet Union in 1961.

UNITED STATES OVERESTIMATED SOVIET EARTHQUAKES

In addition to improving our ability to identify earthquakes in the Soviet Union, the United States has found that the number of earthquakes in the Soviet Union of a certain magnitude is much lower than was originally expected. In fact, it is at least 2½ times lower than we had earlier calculated. When the question came up at Geneva, the Soviet representatives tried to tell the United States that we were exaggerating the number of earthquakes that took place in the U.S.S.R. but we refused to believe them.

I ask unanimous consent to place at this point in the Record two tables entitled "Annual Numbers of Earthquakes in Territory of the U.S.S.R." which were submitted by Dr. Carl Romney of the Air Force, on March 5 in testimony before the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

There being no objection, the tables were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

ANNUAL NUMBERS OF EARTHQUAKES IN TERRITORY OF THE U.S.S.R.

(Focal depth less than 60 kilometers)

TABLE 1.—*1960 estimates* [1]

Yield (kilotons) explosions in tuff	Numbers of earthquakes larger than given explosion		
	Estimated minimum	Best estimate	Estimated maximum
2	225	(450)	900
5	110	(216)	430
19	50	(97)	195
40	25	(55)	110
80	20	(36)	70

[1] Based on Rand Corp. study. AFTAC estimates 25 percent higher.

TABLE 2.—*1962 estimates*

Approximate yield (kilotons)			Numbers of earthquakes larger than given explosion		
Explosions in granite	Explosions in tuff	Explosions in alluvium	Estimated minimum	Best estimate	Estimated maximum
1	2-6	10-20	125	(170)	250
2	5-15	35-70	55	(78)	110
10	19-(?)	70-150	25	(39)	55
20	40-(?)	~200	17	(24)	35
40	80-(?)	~400	11	(16)	22

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the first table is based on 1960 estimates of the Rand Corp. The second table consisting of 1962 estimates, of the number of earthquakes in the U.S.S.R., represents, in Dr. Romney's words, "a new systematic study of the seismicity of the Soviet Union." The study was conducted since the beginning of the test ban negotiations and particularly since the beginning of the Vela research program. The 1962 results are believed to be, according to Dr. Romney, a "substantial improvement over all earlier estimates." In fact, the later estimates prove that we previously overestimated seismicity in the Soviet Union, and they make us look disingenuous, to say the least.

That word "disingenuous" is a nice, polite way of saying that it looks as though we did not know what we were talking about.

It should be noted that the Commission on Seismology of the Soviet Academy of Sciences published a book in 1961, entitled "Earthquakes in the U.S.S.R.," which confirms most of our later estimates for the regions of the U.S.S.R., except for estimates of low-magnitude events in the Far East region, which is highly prone to earthquake activity.

In other words, our estimates in 1960 were wrong. The Soviet estimate was correct. Dr. Romney now says that we were from 2½ to 3 times wrong. So, when someone comes around now to say, "You are proposing fewer onsite inspections now than you proposed 2 years ago, and this represents a concession to the Soviet Union," we should say, "2 years ago the number of onsite inspections we were proposing was related to the unidentified seismic events in the Soviet Union which, according to our calculations, were from 200 to 300 percent larger than we now know them to have been."

In other words, we were wrong. When a person finds out he is wrong, he ought to admit it. We have admitted it. We have therefore reduced the number of onsite inspections we thought were necessary in the light of the reduced estimate of unidentified seismic events in the Soviet Union. This is a matter of science, not of polemics. This is a matter of scientific technology, not of oratory.

Mr. President, the book "Earthquakes in the U.S.S.R." was not available to us until the summer of 1962, but the point is that generally speaking it bears out earlier Soviet assertions; it does not bear out our own. In the words of Dr. Romney before the joint committee on March 5:

> The importance of the research described above is that we can now conclude with high confidence that there are fewer natural earthquakes in the Soviet Union equivalent in size to a given underground nuclear explosion detonated under Hardtack II coupling conditions than had been previously estimated. Considering only this factor, one can also conclude that there will be fewer unidentified events as large as or larger than such explosions than had previously been thought.

In identifying underground events in the Soviet Union as part of the verification system to monitor a test ban agreement, the U.S. position gains from the fact that earthquakes occur in very limited areas in the U.S.S.R. About 80 percent of all earthquakes—earthquakes which might be confused with nuclear explosions—in the Soviet Union occur in the extreme eastern areas of the country, that is, in the Kamchatka peninsula or in the Kurile Islands. If the Soviets attempted to test in the Kurile Islands, they would be subject to observation either from neighboring countries or from aircraft or ships in international lanes or waters nearby. The Soviets could find it somewhat easier, I must say, to cheat in the Kamchatka Peninsula, but this area is extremely rugged, and effective testing would be extremely difficult. The more difficult it is to attempt to cheat, the more likely it is that the cheating will be detected, if not always by seismic instruments, then almost certainly by normal methods of intelligence.

We have more than one way of detection. We do not rely entirely on seismographs. We have electronic equipment. We have acoustical equipment. There is atmospheric analysis. There are onsite observations. There are many ways of inspection and detection.

Almost all of the remaining earthquakes in the Soviet Union occur in a small part of the area near the southern border in the central part of the country—in a region known as the Pamir Mountain area. This is also rugged country, but nuclear testing in the Pamirs is at least a feasible proposition.

When all of these factors governing the identification of underground events are analyzed, that is, first, those that can be identified positively or partially as earthquakes, using various kinds of seismic indicators; second, those that occur in exposed geographical areas or in rugged terrain; and, third, those that occur in areas more subject to certain intelligence detection methods; there are at most only a couple of dozen or so each year that are sufficiently suspicious as to require inspection for adequate verification.

I use that rather clumsy phrase, "a couple of dozen," because the cloak of secrecy demands that I cannot say to this Senate what we know. So I say to Senators, "Take a guess."

I have never heard of a more inappropriate phrase to convey scientific evidence than "a couple of dozen," but this is the parlance of the current discussion of seismic events and detection and inspection under a nuclear test ban treaty.

The number of unidentified events is important, as many of my colleagues know, because there should be a reasonable relationship between the number of such events and the number of inspections to be permitted. If no events were unidentified, then no inspections would be needed. But with some events unidentified, some inspection is necessary. It is not necessary to inspect all unidentified events. What is necessary is to be able to inspect some unidentified events—at our choice, at our selection—in order to deter a nation from attempting to cheat by testing secretly. As any undergraduate statistician knows, you can learn more from a sample than you can from a minute examination of a large volume of data. The secret is to select the right sample. This problem has been largely solved in my opinion, if the current United States-United Kingdom proposal for verification procedures, supplemented by onsite inspection, is accepted as the basis for a test ban agreement.

This question of the identification of underground events has become of such interest to my colleagues and others that I have requested the administration to make available to the public the abovementioned 5-year study of the detection and identification of underground events in the Soviet Union. This covers the period from 1958 through 1962 and it shows precisely how many events were detected, and the ways in which they can be judged to be identified in varying degrees, and the geographical areas in which they occur. This study shows clearly why the number of inspections and the number of detection stations can be reduced without in any way diminishing the effectiveness of verification. In the words of a competent administration official in whom I repose the highest confidence, the major conclusion of this 5-year analysis is that the present capability of the United States to detect and identify seismic events is so effective that primary reliance should be placed by the United States on this system, or its equivalent, to monitor a test ban agreement.

I digress for a moment to state when the Air Force wanted to prove that the Skybolt was what was needed to supplement our defense posture, newspaper stories were spread all over the United States saying what a marvelous weapon it was, even though later the President of the United States had to tell the American people it was "off target," that it was not all the Air Force said it was. But the Air Force wanted to publicize it, and they used it to shoot the President out of his negotiating chair at Nassau.

But when it comes to the issue of advances in seismology, we are handcuffed. I will abide by the law, but I do not like it. I have said to the President and to those responsible for our position on nuclear tests that the American people need to know the facts. Tell the American people of our detection system. Tell them what we have. We are always telling them what a big bomb we have. Tell them what a good detection system we have. I do not say it is foolproof or perfect. I merely say the results in 3 years of research are phenomenal, and I challenge anyone to prove the contrary.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. I am about to make a statement which may be provocative. Perhaps my friend will not agree, but I shall make it, anyway.

Not too many months ago President Dwight D. Eisenhower warned this country about the power of the military-industrial complex in our economy and in our political life. I think that warning was well justified. I share the concern of my friend that the industrial-military complex in this country is such an effective agent for promoting expenditures in the defense system, in the interest, really, of keeping the arms race going, that they blanket the press with propaganda that they want to give to the American public, in the interest of why we are for tests. The other position is not given to the American public, and we are led to believe, by columnist after columnist, by scientists, even by Senators, that those who seek a test ban treaty seek something that is dangerous to our security, and that no patriotic American would dare to stand up for an agreement which the Senator from Minnesota and I know would be a sensible agreement for the President to propose to this body. I noticed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a statement by Dr. Teller warning against a Munich-type agreement.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I assure all those who feel that way that only a few weeks ago I sat across the table from the Deputy Foreign Minister of the Soviet Union, who is fighting against this test ban agreement. He is a real patriot. His name is Vasily Kuznetsov. His partner was Mr. Semyon Tsarapkin. I had lunch with them. I spent day after day with them. They are as firmly opposed to a test ban guarantee as anyone could be. They would seem to fit the definition of "patriot."

I do not contest the patriotism of any Member of this body. I may question his judgment. He has a right to question mine. Frankly, many Members of this body feel strongly in opposition to our test ban policy. Possibly they have not read the secret material. Perhaps they have access to some secret material I do not have. There is so much secret material, particularly in the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, that it is pretty hard for an ordinary Senator to get in there. That is the trouble with secrecy. We get so secret that we do not dare to talk among ourselves or think for ourselves. But I have read a good many secret documents, and I am going to read some more in my capacity as a U.S. Senator. I am a member of this Government. I have all the clearance anyone can possibly have. I intend to be able to discuss the relevant portions of this "classified" information, at least in terms of their general conclusions.

For months I have wanted to release a document showing that the industrial leaders of our country favor disarmament; that the industrial leaders of 365 of the largest corporations of this country have demonstrated that we could enter into a disarmament agreement without any serious domestic economic impact. The report cannot be released. It is labeled "confidential." The Senate Committee on Foreign Relations will not release it. Some Members fear that something in it will help the Soviet Union.

The Soviet Union has all the economic data on the United States that it needs. It can obtain such data from weekly publications, from trade literature, or from the Government Printing Office. Corporations are required to publish their balance sheets. There is no problem about obtaining that kind of information.

But I will tell the Senate that the United States of America and certain other free countries are the only countries that have been able to disarm and have prosperity. The Soviet Union has never disarmed. It has been a police state. It has been a military camp since 1917. Military preparations and the arms race are an integral part of the economic life of a totalitarian dictatorship. But civilian and peaceful production are a part of the life and core of a free country. Yet I could not obtain my colleagues' consent to join me in releasing that document.

Mr. President, I wish to give my colleagues in the Senate an example of what we can do under our national detection system. Again I must say that I can reveal only a part of the relevant information. I ask my colleagues in the Senate to read this 5-year analysis of Soviet seismicity in the privacy of their offices and then to lock it up again.

In 1960 it was estimated that there would be over a 100 earthquakes in the U.S.S.R. annually of magnitude 4.75, which would be about equal to a 20-kiloton explosion detonated in a relatively soft rock, called tuff. According to our scientists at that time, even several international seismic stations installed on Soviet territory could not guarantee that more than a small percentage of these events could be positively identified as earthquakes in accordance with criteria specified in the treaty.

Actual experience since 1960, however, has demonstrated that these estimates were far too generous. In other words, wrong. The number of such seismic events which occurred over a 12-month period in the Soviet Union was reduced by a factor approaching 3. This was considered to be an average year in terms of seismic activity in the Soviet Union. Of the few events which occurred, still fewer—only a quarter to a third—gave no seismic evidence of being an earthquake. Moreover, the United States has the ability to detect and identify these seismic events without using any information from stations in the Soviet Union.

Basing our position on the estimates subsequently discovered to have been erroneous, we proposed 12 to 20 inspections a year in the Soviet Union. Today, having sharply downgraded our estimates of unidentifiable events in the Soviet Union, we are proposing seven inspections.

Our position today is tougher and stronger than it was in 1960 or earlier. I want my friends in the Senate and those who may listen to or read what I have to say to understand this. In 1960, when we were talking about 12 to 20 onsite inspections—and this was under the previous administration—we were working on the assumption that the number of earthquakes in the Soviet Union, or unidentified events in the Soviet Union, was two and a half to three times larger than we later determined them to be. The 1962 estimates of seismic events in the Soviet Union show them to be one-third to one-fourth of what we assumed in 1960. In 1960 we said that we could get by with 12 to 20 inspections. That was President Eisenhower's position.

That number of seismic events is now reduced from 20 to 7. We are no worse off now. In fact, our position is stronger and firmer than it was 3 years ago. We have made no concession. That is what the Soviet Union keeps telling us. The Soviet delegates pointed out quite clearly, "The United States is not making a concession. The only concession you have made is that you must now admit you were wrong about the number of seismic events in the Soviet Union."

I hasten to add, however, that there are many unidentified events in the U.S.S.R. below the magnitude of 4.75. I believe this number to be between 30 or 40, as I have said. But in 1960–61 the previous administration was willing to forgo inspecting any of these events for a 3-year period and at the same time was willing to participate in a moratorium whereby we gave our word not to test such small weapons.

I am not being critical of that position. This is a matter of history. I believe that President Eisenhower knew how to protect the security of this country. I do not believe anyone can question his patriotism. I do not believe anyone can question the patriotism of John Foster Dulles. I do not think anyone can question Allen Dulles' patriotism, or the patriotism of the former Secretary of Defense, Mr. Gates, or others. They are all patriots. They were perfectly willing to forgo inspecting any of these events below magnitude 4.75. Today we are proposing that all detected but unidentified events be eligible under an agreed-upon quota of inspections. This would include even the small events which were apparently of so little concern to us in 1960 and 1961. For example, in the 5-year study I have referred to—that is, the study which is still secret—the number of detected events was—and this is a very round number—100 in the low year and around 300 in the highest year. The range includes even some detected events which were the equivalent of tests in the subkiloton range.

Under present thinking, inspections would be conducted in the Soviet Union by non-Soviet personnel, although the United States has proposed that Soviet observers could accompany an inspection mission. The area to be inspected would be limited and would be located by using the records of the detected event from at least four detection stations. Under this procedure the Soviets could not legally circumvent an inspection. However, if the United States called for an inspection and the Soviet Union flatly refused, this would be a blatant violation of the treaty—just as it would be if the Soviets had been caught in the act of a secret test. If it wished, the United States could then withdraw from the treaty and renew testing.

SUMMARY OF U.S. POSITION ON VERIFICATION

To summarize: The verification system proposed for a test ban treaty contains two basic elements: first, stations operated and supervised by United States-United Kingdom nationals to detect events in the Soviet Union, and, second, a quota of inspections to investigate those few underground events that are thought to be highly suspicious. Finally, as supplementary to the system being operated by the United States and the United Kingdom, records from other stations would be available; first, some automatic recording seismic stations in the Soviet Union which would contain sealed records and which would be serviced and picked up a few times a year by non-Soviet personnel—these are what is sometimes referred to as the "black boxes"; second, some stations in countries bordering on the United States and U.S.S.R., and, third, some stations in the United States and U.S.S.R., the records of which would be submitted to each party for analysis.

These stations are supplementary, not essential elements of the verification system. Records from such stations could not be used to deny an inspection. But they would give us greater confidence regarding which events were more suspicious than others. And they would definitely reduce the number of unidentified events.

ANSWERS TO SPECIFIC CRITICISMS

Some of my colleagues have raised specific questions about the U.S. test ban position. These questions have been discussed in my remarks, but in order to pinpoint answers to specific questions I shall review the major questions and give specific answers.

First, it is argued that the United States should not enter into a test ban agreement because we should develop the neutron bomb, a bomb which is free from fission products.

Now what is the answer to this claim: The main interest of the United States in the neutron bomb is in preventing the Soviet Union and other countries from developing it. That is our first interest. The test ban agreement would prevent the development of such a weapon. The neutron bomb, if it can be developed, would be more useful to countries which did not have already a heavy stockpile of high cost nuclear weapons, because the neutron bomb would be cheaper. The Soviets and other countries are more likely to obtain a neutron bomb with continued testing than under an agreement, because with no inhibitions on testing nuclear weapons, nuclear technology is more likely to spread. The neutron bomb may be technically feasible to develop and produce. But the United States has such a large stockpile now of various kinds of nuclear bombs and nuclear warheads that there is no great military need for this weapon. And in terms of obtaining a pure neutron bomb, this is considered extremely difficult, next to impossible, to develop.

It is difficult. I do not believe it is impossible to do anything. If one is talking about a bomb with fewer fission products involved, the United States has already made substantial advances in this field. The point I wish to make is that we do not need to test and develop a neutron bomb. We already have a huge stockpile of highly sophisticated bombs—strategic and tactical nuclear weapons—and the neutron bomb can be developed only by means of tests. It would be to the advantage of the Soviet Union, which has fewer resources than we have and fewer quantities of fissionable material than we have, to develop the neutron bomb.

Second. It is argued we need to continue to test in order to perfect an antimissile missile.

The answer: This is not correct. The perfection of the antimissile does not rest primarily on nuclear weapons tests. It rests primarily on other kinds of activities such as reliability of guidance, distance, performance, electronics. In addition, the nation sending a missile to its target has the advantage over the nation trying to erect a defense against such a missile. The efforts to build antimissile missiles and then to build better missiles to counteract antimissile missiles is a sure way to add another $20 to $25 billion to the Nation's armament effort, which we will do in the absence of any agreements to curtail such weapons.

I have heard several speeches today about how we could reduce our defense budget. I have read in the press how our defense budget could be reduced to $3 billion. We will not be able to cut our defense budget by getting into a race to see who can build an antimissile missile to intercept a missile, in order that we can build another antimissile missile to intercept a new missile. If, as we are told, we already have the best missile system, the largest number of missiles with the highest degree of accuracy, and the largest supply of nuclear weapons, it seems to me that it is in our interest to stop testing. I, for one, would rather see effective agreements to stop this constantly spiraling arms race than to see both the United States and U.S.S.R. exhaust their economies in such efforts, which will give neither an absolute military advantage.

Third. It is argued that the Soviet Union has already perfected the antimissile missile by test. There has been no demonstration of such a capability. We have no such information. Furthermore, an antimissile missile knocking down an incoming missile launched under ideal conditions for being intercepted is not proof of an anti-missile-missile capability under wartime, surprise attack conditions. It is not an adequate demonstration that an effective anti-missile-missile system has been developed.

Fourth. It is argued that we need to continue to test to develop bigger weapons in order to overcome such obstacles as antimissile missiles or missiles hardened in the ground. It is argued that we need to test to develop more tactical nuclear weapons to use in limited war situations. It is argued we need to test to reduce the weight of a given yield of nuclear warheads of specific missiles. My answer to such assertions is that as long as there is an arms race, the United States must stay in it and build a military force strong enough to deter the Soviets from starting a nuclear or massive conventional war. But our objective is to limit the Soviets and to slow them down, not merely to keep adding to our stockpiles. It is our stated goal as a nation, as a government, as a Congress, and as a people to end this mad arms race under adequate safeguards.

President Kennedy made this clear in one of the greatest Presidential speeches in our history—his speech at the United Nations in 1961 entitled "The Peace Race."

Fifth. It it is argued that if the Soviets cheat on an agreement to stop testing they can force the United States into surrendering completely to the Communists. That is poppycock. I do not think it even requires an argument. This is utterly false and ridiculous. In the first place, it would be difficult for the Russians to conduct even one clandestine test without considerable risk. In the second place, it would be extremely difficult to cheat on a series of tests, which is what any violator would want to do to attempt to gain a military advantage. In the third place, our Defense Department believes that no amount of cheating under the kind of verification system being proposed by the United States, and now in operation, could alter the strategic military balance.

Sixth. It is argued that the verification system proposed by the United States is less effective than that proposed previously. In many ways the verification system is more effective, given the advances made in the art and science of detection and identification of weapons tests and events which might be confused with weapons tests. The verification system would come into operation sooner than the ones previously proposed. The system would be operated or supervised by United States-United Kingdom nationals and, therefore, would not have to await the training of a new corps of technicians. The system detects underground events in the Soviet Union and identifies them better than was estimated in any previous control system proposed.

Seventh. It is argued that the verification system is weaker because it does not include stations on Soviet territory. The United States no longer needs internationally manned detection stations on Soviet territory, because our ability to detect and identify makes this unnecessary. However, the United States and the U.S.S.R. have both proposed as a supplement to the basic verification system that automatic recording stations for increased detection and identification of underground events be installed on each other's territory. The sealed instruments and records of these would be picked up and serviced, respectively, by personnel who are not nationals of the territory on which the stations were located. The United States, as I have said, has proposed seven such stations; the U.S.S.R. has proposed three.

Eighth. It is argued that the number of inspections being proposed by the United States is not adequate. The number of inspections is adequate when one compares the number with the total number of events in the Soviet Union that would be highly suspicious. At one time the United States proposed to have 12 to 20 inspections when it thought there might be as many as 70 to 100 unidentified underground events equal to a 19-kiloton explosion. At the same time we proposed not to inspect for 3 years any event which was below this size. In other words, for a 3-year period we were willing to forgo inspection altogether for all small underground tests. And we were proposing to inspect roughly 1 out of 5 unidentified events above the equivalent of 19 kilotons.

Today we are proposing that all unidentified events be subject to inspection—no more moratorium; no threshold—even though we presumably are not worried about small tests any more than we were then. We simply think this provides greater deterrence to a cheater. As to large seismic events, the number of those that are really most suspicious, that is, that give no indication of being an earthquake, number only about a dozen, as compared with the previous estimate of from 70 to 100. We can easily maintain the same ratio of inspections to number of events and have some inspections left over for the smaller events.

I repeat: Our present inspection system is an advance over what we proposed in other days. Recently—in fact, in this morning's Washington Post—a letter to the editor by the distinguished Senator from Connecticut [Mr. Dodd] raised some new arguments. Among other things it was said that the United States had abandoned the cardinal principle of adequate onsite inspection and control. The United States has not abandoned this principle. In fact, we are so wedded to this principle that we have insisted on an adequate number of onsite inspections. These inspections would be conducted whenever it was felt that an unidentified event should be investigated to see whether it might be a nuclear explosion. So the principle has been preserved and is being preserved.

It has been stated that the United States position now gives the Soviet Union a veto on a control body for a test ban treaty. The Soviet Union would have no veto over the conduct of an inspection. This has never been proposed. What has been proposed since 1959 is that the three permanent members of the control commission—the U.S.S.R. the United Kingdom, and the United States—must agree on the total budget for a control system. But the United States has always maintained that there could not be a veto over individual items in the budget. We have tightened up rather than conceded. The United States would pay for its own detection stations and its own participation in onsite inspections. We would not rely on a tripartite arrangement.

This position has not changed since 1959. What has changed, however, is that the control body would not have the same degree of authority under the verification system now proposed by the United States. The United States would pay for its own detection stations, and it would pay for its own participation in onsite inspection. We would not rely on a tripartite arrangement. Therefore, any control commission over a test ban treaty would not have authority over this expenditure. In this sense, the current U.S. test ban position gives a greater degree of flexibility to the United States than under previous positions.

I know about this, because it is one point about which the Soviet delegates became very angry when it was presented to them. When we reduced our required number of onsite inspections from 8 to 7, we also tightened up on the method of inspection, the question of the composition of the inspection team, of access to the site of the inspection, of the duration of the inspection, and, finally, of the analysis of the data yielded by the inspection.

Mr. President, I am not discussing a theoretical subject; neither is my discussion presented on the basis of an argument with several Senators. For hours I sat across the table from one of the most able and determined men I have ever met, the Deputy Foreign Minister of the Soviet Union, Mr. Kuznetsov. He was educated in the United States, and has lived 30 years in the United States. He speaks English well. He knows America well. He is tougher than steel—his name means literally "Blacksmith"—and he is highly competent. He represents his country brilliantly. He knew what we were doing. If Senators do not know what the Government of the United States is proposing, I assure them that they can find it out from Mr. Kuznetsov. When we reminded him—because we wanted to retain a negotiating position—that we wanted to preserve an area of agreement, he reminded us that we were toughening our position and were making it more difficult. He was a good deal more correct than were some of our critics in the United States.

Ninth. It has been stated that Mr. Foster, before hearings of the Stennis subcommittee of the Armed Services Committee, testified that there had been no significant breakthrough or advancement in our ability to identify events in the Soviet Union. This is a quotation taken completely out of context. The quotation referred to is a follows:

> Mr. KENDALL. I was glad you made it clear, Mr. Foster, that it is important that we make a distinction between our ability to detect and our ability to identify whether an event is nuclear or nonnuclear. I believe you said, if I understand you correctly, that there had been no significant breakthrough or advancement of our ability to identify. Is that correct?
>
> Mr. FOSTER. That is correct.

This has been taken out of context, because the quotation refers to an earlier question in those hearings by the counsel to the subcommittee, which was "Do I understand that you are saying that we do not significantly increase our ability to detect or identify by having stations on Russian soil as opposed to not having them on Russian soil?" Mr. Foster's response, "I said that we did not significantly increase our ability to identify," refers only to the difference between having stations on Soviet soil or not having them on Soviet soil. This point then proves the opposite—that one can have an effective system without having internationally manned stations on the territory of the Soviet Union. The United States ability to identify events in the U.S.S.R. from a distant network of stations has definitely increased, as studies made by the executive branch have shown, and which I have referred to earlier. Just to repeat one example: In 1960 and 1961, we were proposing 12 to 20 inspections, when we thought the number of unidentified events equal to a 19-kiloton explosion were 70 to 100. But today we know that the number of events that would not be in any way identified using seismic indicators is not 70 to 100, but is closer to 12. This is one example of our increased ability to identify events in the Soviet Union.

It is contended that we need to develop the neutron bomb, because the nation that has such a bomb can "destroy opposing armies without risk of fallout or damage to the property of friend or foe." As I have stated, it is difficult to know whether such a pure fusion bomb can be developed, and, even if it could be developed, to know whether this would in any significant degree alter the balance of power. But, perhaps even more important, if the United States had the neutron bomb and if the Soviet Union did not, how much comfort would it be to us to be able to use fallout-free weapons on the Soviet Union, when the response of the Soviet Union would consist of nuclear bombs, dropped on our people, which would have radioactive fallout. Is this development the comfort that the proponents of the neutron bomb wish to make it? Let not anyone pretend that either the United States or the Soviet Union has such power that it could devastate the other with nuclear weapons, without being devastated in return.

My position is that our present nuclear stockpile is an adequate deterrent, unless testing continues. If testing continues, we cannot tell what will happen.

It is claimed that the test ban policies pursued by the Eisenhower and the Kennedy administrations have cost the United States a lead in nuclear weaponry. Actually it would have been more in the U.S. interest if a nuclear test ban treaty could have been achieved in 1958 and 1959. It would have been better to have stopped nuclear developments at that point in time, rather than to have the current situation, in which there is no treaty and both the United States and the Soviet Union have conducted several additional tests. Both administrations have recognized realistically that no disarmament or nuclear test ban agreement would be without risks. President Eisenhower stated on more than one occasion the view that it would be better to proceed with an agreement which involved some risks, rather than to drop all hope of any agreement at all. Let me quote some previous statements of President Eisenhower. I shall refer to statements made at a news conference on October 15, 1958—long before we had a detection system as good as the one we have now.

> Well, as you are going smaller, you are obviously posing less danger than is inherent in one of the big bombs. But the technicians were trying to establish a system that would work for all practical purposes, I mean a technical system. They were technically advising.
>
> Now, to get 100 percent of perfection in this kind of a thing would unquestionably demand mechanisms, organisms, agencies and men of really very, very large size, and I think that you could come to the old law of diminishing returns, that you just put too much to gain too little. I really believe that they feel there is little danger in the kind of a thing which you are talking about.

These are news conference remarks of President Eisenhower on June 17, 1959:

> We would be foolish if we expect 100 percent from any system.

Of course, he was referring to a detection and control system.

Then he said:

> There is no system, whether it be defensive or detection or intelligence or planning or anything else, that is 100 percent perfect. What we have to do is to refine the process to the point where we minimize risks and indeed bring them down below the level where they could be truly dangerous to the country.

The arms race, including nuclear testing, is buying the United States less security than we would have with effective arms control and disarmament agreements, one of which would be an effective treaty banning nuclear weapons tests.

The position of the United States at this time is a position that has been carefully developed by all of the interested agencies of the Government, and it is supported by those agencies—the Department of Defense, the Atomic Energy Commission, the Department of State, and the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, all of which have responsibilities in the field of our national security. All support the U.S. position now being advanced, and each of these agencies has participated thoroughly in all aspects of that position. Furthermore, it is a position that is basically similar to the position taken by the previous administration. Therefore, this is a nonpartisan position, and one that should command the support of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle.

BENEFITS OF PUBLIC DISCUSSION

Mr. President, I have clearly indicated that I welcome public discussion of the pros and cons of a test ban, even if not all of the arguments advanced appeal to me either rationally or emotionally. This is a question on which honorable men can differ honorably. The important thing is for the Congress to be informed and for the Senate to fulfill its constitutional role as a partner of the executive branch in the determination of our foreign policy. I believe the present discussion is contributing to this end.

No one, I hope, will jump to conclusions about my own position. I do not advocate a nuclear test ban for the sake of a test ban alone. I do not support the United Nations just because I believe in the brotherhood of man. I support these goals and this institution because in my view they can be of positive benefit to the United States. Never has the Senator from Minnesota uttered a word advocating the slightest weakening or diminishing of our national defense posture. I have always said that disarmament or arms control is the other side of the coin of national defense. Without the capacity for self-defense, we could not long survive in the world of today. In the world of tomorrow we may find that the arms race itself has become the principal threat to our national existence. In anticipation of that day, in full cognizance of the need for safeguards, I have taken the floor to urge that Senators give thoughtful consideration to the factors involved in a test ban agreement. I can assure Senators that if the issue is decided on the basis of emotion, rather than reason, we shall inflict a self-administered defeat upon the United States.

In the preceding remarks, I have suggested that no aspect of the test ban question should be dodged or neglected by the Congress. The relevant committees and subcommittees should delve with meticulous care into the complex technical, military, strategic, and policy questions which are involved. Nor should this question be approached except from the standpoint of United States national interest. This has been my guiding principle. That is why I have welcomed the current hearings of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy and am looking forward to the hearings reportedly planned by my colleague, the chairman of the Subcommittee on Preparedness.

CONFUSING DIVERSITY OF TEST BAN HEARINGS

Yet the very diversity of these hearings, Mr. President, brings me to what is perhaps the major point of my remarks today. Is it necessary, is it in the national interest, is it in the interest of Senate efficiency and productivity, that a matter which falls under the jurisdiction of three separate Senate committees be handled by each of them separately with no means of coordination? Are we not unnecessarily muddying the waters, thoughtlessly confusing the public, and heedlessly stirring up passions and rivalries among ourselves by adopting this procedure?

There was a time, Mr. President, when disarmament and arms control was considered to be a fit subject for joint consideration by the representatives of the three committees most directly involved in national security policy. I am speaking of the years 1955 to 1958, when the special Disarmament Subcommittee under my chairmanship consisted of representatives of the Committee on Foreign Relations, the Armed Services Committee, and the Joint Atomic Energy Committee. Several members of this joint subcommittee served on more than one of the parent committees, thus permitting a high degree of continuity and a maximum of intercommittee coordination. It was possible then to synthesize conflicting viewpoints. At that time there was no question but that matters pertaining to a nuclear test ban, the discussion of which was in its infancy, were properly under the jurisdiction of the Disarmament Subcommittee. Much important work was done in those years—work which is still useful and which is still referred to by the students of arms control. The subcommittee had a permanent staff which was free—and I should add "competent"—to follow through on all questions of interest to the chairman and the members.

On July 31, 1958, this amalgamation of talents and goals dissolved. As a result of Senate Resolution 241, which was approved by the Senate on January 29, 1958, it was decided to merge the Disarmament Subcommittee with the Committee on Foreign Relations. Gone was the organic link with the armed services and Joint Atomic Energy Committees. Gone, too, was the separate professional staff which had served the Congress so faithfully and competently between 1955 and 1958. The Disarmament Subcommittee was reduced to the status of just another ad hoc subcommittee of the Committee on Foreign Relations. From that time onward, Mr. President, the Disarmament Subcommittee has rightly been called moribund. It has undertaken little work of real national significance. Its one important study completed since 1958 was classified "confidential" by the full committee and has remained unseen by the public—despite the fact that it was cleared twice by the Department of Defense and despite the fact that it contains data applicable to 1959 at the latest. I refer to the report—already well known by its title alone—called "The Economic Impact of Arms Control Agreements."

Mr. President, there would be less confusion surrounding the test ban today if the Disarmament Subcommittee as previously constituted were still in existence. I regret exceedingly that there is no forum in which members of the Committee on Armed Services, the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, and the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations can meet to iron out their differences—differences which are undeniably hampering the President in his conduct of foreign relations. I regret that the small staff of the Foreign Relations Committee, despite the able dedication of its members and the best will of its chairman and its chief of staff, is simply not in a position to do the work on disarmament and arms control that needs to be done. It is not enough—not by any means enough—to rely exclusively on the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency of the executive branch. The ACDA can be and has been of significant help to Senators who stand on both sides of the nuclear test ban issue. But do we need to be reminded that we are members of the legislative, not the executive branch? Do we have any illusions as to the ability of an executive agency to perform a function which properly belongs to the legislative branch?

I have no doubt as to the right answer to these questions. As regards the Disarmament Subcommittee, however, this is all water over the dam. I resisted those changes, but to no avail. The subcommittee must continue to languish in its present relatively inactive status. It is not for me to renew the lost battles of nearly 4 years ago.

JOINT COMMITTEE ON NATIONAL SECURITY AFFAIRS

I cannot stand by, however, while the gravest issues of national security are being tossed about on the Senate floor like a volleyball. The test ban is one example and Cuba is another. What we need—and I state this in all seriousness—is coordinating machinery which will help to keep the debates within the bounds of responsibility, if not of objectivity.

Now taking the test ban as an example, our policy on this vital question has been decided for years by what is known as the Committee of Principals—a group representing the heads of the various Government agencies which would be directly concerned in the negotiation or the implementation of a test ban agreement. The President, of course, makes the final decision. He can take the advice of the Principals or leave it; he can resolve any differences that remain among them or he can send a problem back to the agencies for further deliberation.

In the overall area of national security we have established, by act of Congress, the National Security Council. The National Security Council brings together the principal officers and agencies of the executive branch which are vitally concerned with problems of defense, foreign policy, and national security affairs in general. The executive branch, therefore, is organized for appropriate consultation and coordination in the realms of national security policy and decisionmaking.

Since the Congress also has specific responsibilities in the areas of national security, it is necessary that its structural organization bear some relation to that of the Executive, but without in any way infringing the responsibilities or the jurisdiction of the standing committees of the Congress. It is imperative that a Joint Committee on National Security Affairs be formed by this Congress. This committee in the legislative branch would be the counterpart of the National Security Council in the executive branch. This joint committee should include representatives of the majority and minority membership of at least the Senate and House Committees on Foreign Relations and Foreign Affairs, the Committee on Armed Services, and the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

Experience teaches that the new joint committee must have its own professional staff, free from Executive interference and the jurisdiction of the standing committees. The joint committee should have as its principal function that of advice and counsel on overall national security policy to the Congress and should be empowered to make its recommendations to the appropriate standing committees of each House of Congress.

Its mission would cover the spectrum of national security as it pertains to international relations, defense policy, and nuclear development. A committee of this type would satisfy a demonstrated need. It would not be a panacea for our problems, but it would go far toward eliminating the jurisdictional disputes which already threaten to divide committee from committee and Senator from Senator.

Mr. President, let us make no mistake. The Armed Services Committee sees these problems in a different light than does the Committee on Foreign Relations. The Joint Committee, cloaked in secrecy, sees these problems differently from the Committee on Foreign Relations, and even the Committee on the Armed Services. Yet all three committees are hearing the same witnesses. They are asking the same witnesses to appear for cross-examination. It seems to me that what we need is a synthesis of activity in the Congress on national security affairs. We at least ought to have one Joint Committee on National Security Affairs that could bring together the respective points of view or the conclusions and recommendations developed by the Committee on Foreign Relations, the Committee on Armed Services, and the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

The last thing we want is a frozen hierarchy of committees jealously guarding their prerogatives over matters which unavoidably cut across committee lines. Even worse is the prospect of a Senate fragmented into warring cliques whose hardened points of view on national security affairs preclude the possibility of consensus.

For all these reasons I commend to Senators' favorable attention the suggestion of forming a Joint Committee on National Security Affairs consisting of representatives of the above-mentioned three committees.

The proposed congressional joint committee could then act as the legislative counterpart of the National Security Council. We could better harmonize and synthesize our efforts in the Congress to promote the national security of this great Republic.

I have taken a good deal of time today to answer some of the arguments that have been made on the question of a nuclear test ban. I thank Senators for their indulgence. I hope that what has been said here today will at least be of some help to the public and to the Members of Congress in the all-important debate that is now underway.

I have one more point to make before yielding the floor. It is a point which in its simplicity is all too easily overlooked.

There are those who charge that the United States and the United Kingdom have made too many concessions to the Soviets in our effort to obtain a workable, safeguarded agreement to prevent nuclear testing, and that we are thereby weakening U.S. security.

If this is true, why has not the Soviet Union jumped at the chance to sign such an agreement?

If our proposals would weaken our security and strengthen the hand of the Soviet Union, then logically the Soviets would accept them.

The fact is that the Soviets have refused reasonable test ban agreements since the Baruch plan of 1946. The Soviets have found that unlimited nuclear testing is to their advantage.

Once, we had a monopoly of nuclear weapons. Today, we face the prospect of Soviet equality of nuclear power.

Why? Because nuclear testing permits the nations that are behind to catch up.

It would be reasonable to conclude that those who oppose a nuclear test ban are unwittingly and unknowingly encouraging a situation which permits the Soviets to gain new power.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record at this point an article which appeared in today's Washington Post under the headline "Kennedy Gives A-Ban Position," written by Howard Simons.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Kennedy Gives A-Ban Position

(By Howard Simons)

President Kennedy yesterday sought to assure Congress that his administration has no intention of signing a nuclear-test-ban agreement with the Soviet Union that would imperil American security.

The President's remarks came as congressional concern heightened following continued Defense Department testimony pointing up scientific and technological limitations of present U.S. capability to detect and identify secret underground nuclear tests from afar.

Setting forth the administration's position in the current test-ban negotiations at his news conference, Mr. Kennedy said:

"We have suggested that we would not accept a test ban which did not give us every assurance that we could detect a series of tests underground. We would not submit a treaty which did not provide that assurance to the U.S. Senate. Nor would the Senate approve it."

EXPERTS TESTIFY

At about the same time yesterday morning that the President was clarifying his position, Defense Department experts appearing before the Joint Congressional Committee on Atomic Energy were continuing to chip away at any suggestion that today's seismic or earthquake detection methods, by themselves, enable experts to distinguish between earthquakes and explosions.

It is for this reason that the United States has repeatedly insisted upon a certain number of onsite inspections of Soviet territory. As Mr. Kennedy put it yesterday, "We have not been able to make discriminations so effective that we can do without onsite inspections and without a sufficient number to prevent a series of tests carried out which would be undetected."

Basically, what the Joint Committee heard yesterday was an assessment of present U.S. capability to detect and to identify seismic events occurring in Russia using detection stations outside Soviet territory. The assessment came largely from Carl Romney of the Air Force Technical Application Center and amounted to the following:

Of the seismic events that can now be detected from afar with good reliability, about 170 occur on the average in the Soviet Union every year. Of these, 20 can be definitely ruled out as earthquakes.

Of the remaining 150, about 75 will still be suspect; that is, they cannot be easily identified as either an earthquake or a secret underground nuclear explosion. But these 75 events will give enough telltale signs to be partially identified as one or the other.

Of the last 75 events, there would be no information whatsoever to give detection experts a clue as to the true nature of these events. It is for these reasons that onsite inspections are necessary.

Replying to questions, Romney said that a potential cheater would be able to test 1-kiloton devices in granite; 2- to 6-kiloton devices in tuff (a volcanic ash); and 10- to 20-kiloton devices in dry alluvium (a sandy material), with no seismic means presently available to catch the cheater.

PROGRESS POSSIBLE

In previous testimony before the committee it was noted that the majority of U.S. underground nuclear tests being conducted in Nevada involved devices of 4 kilotons or less, indicating that atomic weapons progress can be made using devices of these sizes.

The President and Joint Committee members essentially agreed yesterday in their separate commentaries that detection was only one of the problems to be resolved with Russia. Many more exist, some as difficult to solve as seismic detection, including, as was noted yesterday, the number of onsite inspections, the kind of such inspections, and the circumstances under which the inspections would be carried out.

At one point in yesterday's Joint Committee hearings, the chairman, Senator John O. Pastore, Democrat, of Rhode Island, apparently reacting to the many recent Republican attacks on the President's handling of the test-ban talks, said the record should show that the first "giveaway," if that term is appropriate, began during the Eisenhower administration.

Pastore was referring to the Eisenhower administration's acceptance of a Soviet proposal in 1960 which would have amounted to an unpoliced moratorium on all nuclear tests below a certain magnitude.

"Where were those loud voices in 1960 that we are hearing today?" Pastore asked.

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield to the Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. PELL. Would the Senator's proposed committee have jurisdiction, as well, over intelligence activities? If there was one conclusion to which we came after the Bay of Pigs, it was that intelligence collection and intelligence operations should be separated, that they should not be under the same roof. There was some talk at that time of such a decision being made, yet it is almost 2 years later, and none has been made, to all intents and purposes. This brings me back to the thought that the proposed committee, if it had such jurisdiction, could meet the demands suggested by similar resolutions which call for a Joint Committee on Intelligence.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the Senator very much for that suggestion. The Senator may recall that I said the committee should at least have representatives of the majority and minority of the three committees mentioned. Obviously it should have some jurisdiction over the intelligence operations of our Government. I believe this is much needed.

I do not believe that one can discuss national security in the Congress without having a good idea of the intelligence estimates of the Central Intelligence Agency and of the other intelligence offices of our Government, and of what those intelligence estimates mean in terms of the policy decisions of the executive branch of the Government.

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, I wish to congratulate the eloquent Senator from Minnesota upon his speech today. I think that we as a body should be grateful to him for bringing our attention to peace, and his emphasizing to us that peace is as noble an objective as war. As is seen in the seal overhead with its American eagle, the palm leaves of peace occupy as much a prominent position as do the arrows of war. I think the Senator from Minnesota has placed in perspective the discussion which prevails on the subject of disarmament at this time.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. The Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PELL] has made a very important suggestion. If we are to have such a committee as that suggested by the Senator from Minnesota—and the idea has great merit—I think certainly it should have jurisdiction over our intelligence services.

In a speech earlier this afternoon the Senator from Minnesota talked about the serious problem which confronts us with respect to secrecy, and he pointed out, very rightfully, in my judgment, that we have entirely too much secrecy in the operations of a government which ought to belong to a free people, but who cannot be free if they do not know what is going on in their Government, no matter what semantics one may use to try to pretend that they have freedom.

The Joint Committee which the Senator from Minnesota has proposed ought to be formed with the distinct understanding that it would be given jurisdiction over our intelligence departments as a congressional check, because I think there is growing across this country an increasing demand on the part of more and more people that the Congress stop abdicating its rights under the check and balance system of this form of government, and that the intelligence agencies, which now are responsible really only to the executive branch of the Government, be made responsible to the legislative branch of the Government as well.

I highly commend the Senator from Minnesota for a very important speech—one of the most important, I believe, to be delivered to this session of the Congress. I think the Congress must face the challenges of the speech, and I congratulate the Senator for it.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am very grateful to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CLARK. I congratulate the Senator from Minnesota for a very closely reasoned, analytical, and intelligent demolition of the arguments which have been made in this body and outside this body during the past weeks and months, to the effect that we dare not enter into a test ban agreement because of the fear of underground nuclear testing conducted by the Russians.

It seems to me that no one who has listened to the speech this afternoon or who will read it in the RECORD or about it in the newspapers tomorrow can longer be of the view that the President of the United States and his principal advisers are taking unacceptable risks with the security of our country by advancing the position for the kind of a test ban agreement which we have been proposing at Geneva, as I know from having been at Geneva last November and December, and as the Senator from Minnesota knows from having only recently returned.

In my opinion, there can be no answer to the arguments made by the Senator from Minnesota today that we are in good hands when we follow the guidance and recommendations of the President of the United States and his duly authorized agents, who are conducting these negotiations.

I shall have something to say on this subject myself at some length within the next few days, but I congratulate the Senator from Minnesota for putting the debate back into perspective and, I say again, for demolishing the arguments which have been made against the position of the President of the United States.

Second, the Senator from Minnesota with great ability has put his finger on another of the many organizational inadequacies of this body. It has been my privilege to talk in the past at some length—and, really, frequently to bore my colleagues with strong views—about the fact that we must update the procedures of the Senate of the United States if the Senate is to play its part in the constitutional form of government laid down by our Founding Fathers and to perform its responsibilities as our upper legislative body in the modern world.

The Senator from Minnesota has indicated the complete inadequacy of a very important segment of our system, in that this whole problem of national security is broken up into little pieces—a part of it in the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy; a part of it in the Committee on Armed Services, and in the Preparedness Subcommittee; and a part of it in the Committee on Foreign Relations.

I deplore particularly the way in which the fine work the Senator from Minnesota has been doing for so many years with respect to his disarmament subcommittee has gradually been whittled away until little is left, in terms of authority or in terms of funds, for the magnificent and brilliant work the Senator from Minnesota has been doing so long.

The Senator from Rhode Island and I happen to serve on the Committee on Rules and Administration. There are other members of that committee, I am confident, who are as concerned as we are with respect to the inadequacy of our present organizational system. I plead with my friend from Minnesota that he promptly draft, in this regard, the kind of rule which he thinks would adequately serve the needs of this great and important problem and this great and continuing task of providing for our national security. Although I am a very junior member of that committee, as the Senator well knows, I think I can almost assure the Senator that prompt and adequate hearings will be held on such a resolution. I should like to have the honor of cosponsoring it.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the Senator. I should like the Senator to know that I am asking the Legislative Drafting Service to be of help to me in this regard. The discussion today will be exceedingly helpful in getting a proper interpretation of the jurisdiction and the role of such a committee.

I add my appreciation for the remarks of my colleagues and for their attention today, because these debates really ought to command attention—not because the Senator from Minnesota speaks, but because this is a matter of national security and of survival. I do not believe that the debates read as well outside, in the newspaper columns, as they actually sound in this Chamber, where such matters ought to be discussed.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, I should like to associate myself with the remarks made by the Senator from Minnesota this afternoon. I agree with the Senator from Oregon that we have heard one of the most significant statements—and I think the most significant statement—made on the floor of the Senate in this session of the Congress.

The Senator from Minnesota has addressed himself to the most important single problem facing us—that is, the problem of controlling nuclear energy for our survival and for the preservation of the peace.

We all recognize that the Senator speaks from an unusual background of experience and knowledge in this field, which ought to prompt all of us to give careful consideration to everything he has had to say.

I fervently hope that every Member of the Congress will read the address, and that it will be read very carefully by the American people, since I think the question involved is the most crucial of all questions.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the Senator very much.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Idaho.

Mr. CHURCH. I join in commending the distinguished Senator from Minnesota. I may say to the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] that one of the defects in the Senate rules is that sometimes we do not get notice of significant addresses to be made on the Senate floor. Thus, it was not my privilege to hear entirely the Senator's address. I entered the Chamber near the conclusion of his remarks, and I was very much impressed by them.

I take it one of the objectives the Senator is attempting to accomplish with his proposal is to place the national security in better perspective insofar as the Congress is concerned.

It was my privilege, only yesterday, to listen to the very able address by Mr. Adrian Fisher. He said we are attempting, through the nuclear balance of terror, to prevent smoking in the room we live in by stacking around a great many open barrels of gasoline. This for a time may prevent smoking, but it is hardly a way that has the approval of most fire wardens for preventing ultimate destruction of the room. Sometime, someone will slip.

So if there is some element of risk involved in attempting to open the door out of the room that leads toward a stable peace in the world, we must measure that risk against the risk of remaining in the locked room, trying to prevent smoking by placing around the room open tins of gasoline.

That is what is so hard to get into perspective. If we focus all our attention on the element of risk that may be involved in the course before us in a nuclear test ban, and pay no attention at all to the terrible risks involved if the arms race continues indefinitely on its present course, we shall never achieve national security, for the present course is one that is hardly designed to preserve the safety of the Nation. In the long run, unless we find a way to turn the arms race down, there will come a time, and mathematical odds assure it, when some misstep, some miscalculation, some error of judgment, will trigger a missile. Once that happens, there will be no nation left to secure, either on this side of the Atlantic or the other.

Therefore, in the broadest sense, we must measure the national security against all the risks we are taking, and we must judge the proposed course that leads the country toward a nuclear test ban in that light.

The proposal of the Senator from Minnesota deserves commendation, because it may give Congress the machinery to do the job—machinery which is not now available through a multiplicity of committees that have attacked this problem on a piecemeal basis.

I join my colleagues in commending the Senator from Minnesota for the service he has rendered this afternoon.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank my friend. If ever I was grateful for the processes of free elections that permitted a distinguished Senator to return to his post of duty, it was when the people of that great State of Idaho, in their good judgment and wisdom, returned to the U.S. Senate the Senator from Idaho. The Senator from Idaho is a champion of freedom, justice, and peace, at a time when all too few voices are raised in this country for the concepts of social justice and peace within the framework of freedom.

Every time I hear the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. McGOVERN], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PELL], the Senator from Utah [Mr. MOSS], and other Senators—and I do not limit myself to those Senators exclusively—speak in the Chamber and raise their voices for peace and social justice in the cause of freedom, it is a happier day; for all too often, we hear nothing but voices speaking about a terrible new weapon or about how we can destroy this or that, when the people are crying out for some voice, some nation, some power, someone, to lead in the path of peace, without appeasement, without loss of principles, without prostrating ourselves before evil.

Senators who have joined me in this discussion today—have made a real contribution to the elevation of the moral tone of this Nation, because America ought to stand for peace through strength and strength through peace, for social justice and freedom.

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield to the Senator from Utah.

Mr. MOSS. I should like to add my commendation for the address delivered by the senior Senator from Minnesota. He has called to our minds with eloquence the moral position that this Nation must occupy if we are able to find a solution for the ever-increasing tempo of the collision course on which we seem to be embarked.

I concur with the senior Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH] in his remarks. I thought it was apt for him to recall the remarks of Mr. Fisher, that so far all we have done is stack gasoline cans around a room to stop smoking.

I commend the Senator from Minnesota for his address and for his great leadership in this field. It is something which must enter into the thinking of this body and in the thinking of the whole country.

A FREE DOMINICAN REPUBLIC AND A NEW PRESIDENT

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, on February 27, 1963, I was privileged to attend the inauguration of President Juan Bosch, the first freely elected President in the Dominican Republic in 30 years. It was a memorable event for all those believing in free government in this hemisphere. After 30 years of dictatorship under Trujillo, the election of President Bosch has now brought to the people of the Dominican Republic a great opportunity to build strong, stable democratic institutions, buttressed by economic and social progress.

The importance of this event was duly recognized by the leaders of this hemisphere. The presence of many of the leading democratic leaders of this hemisphere is both a high tribute to President Bosch and to the Dominican people. President Kennedy recognized the importance of this event in sending as his representative the distinguished Vice President of the United States, LYNDON JOHNSON, who represented our country with dignity, honor, and warmth. Included in the group attending the inauguration were President Betancourt, of Venezuela; President Orlich, of Costa Rica; President Villea-Morales, of Honduras; President Bustamante, of Jamaica, ex-President Jose Figueres, of Costa Rica; and Governor Muñoz-Marín, of Puerto Rico. The successful accomplishment of the transition from Trujillo rule to a democratically elected government was accomplished through the effort of the Council of State.

When one considers the conditions in the Dominican Republic immediately after the downfall of the dictator, conditions resulting from 30 years of dictatorship which had destroyed any initiative and any experience in representative government, one can appreciate the whole scope of the Council of States achievement. The preservation of order in a society left without trained internal security forces and without the administrative mechinery required for the normal operation of society, is in itself a great accomplishment. I salute Chairman Bonelly and his colleagues on the Council for their work .

The U.S. officials have made it unmistakably clear, both during President-elect Bosch's visit to Washington and at his inauguration in Santo Domingo, that the new Dominican Government will have the firm and full support of the U.S. Government in implementing President Bosch's proposed social and economic projects through the Alliance for Progress. The Dominican Republic will enjoy a high priority through the Alliance. In the next few months, I would hope that we would display great patience, tolerance, and understanding of the problems that will be confronting the new government. We can expect some difficult times ahead. There will be repeated attempts to embarrass the government. There may be a good deal of demagoguery and a good deal of antagonism expressed toward the United States. Lacking administrative experience, the new government will have to feel its way in dealing with the pressing problems of the country.

In encouraging and working with the new Government in achieving its social and economic programs, we must help to guide the Government toward a new appreciation of the role that private capital can play in developing the Dominican Republic. We must encourage U.S. businessmen working in the Dominican Republic to be patient and tolerant toward the Government and to be aware of the many difficulties facing it.

In the Dominican Republic, with its large number of unemployed and increasing unrest, immediate impact projects will have to be stressed even more than in most other Latin American countries. It may be necessary for the United States to share direct operational responsibility in some of the social programs in the fields of health, education, and housing, perhaps through servicio-type institutions that have proved effective in other Latin American countries in early stages of their development. In this rich, fertile, country, rural development must not be slighted. People from the rural areas are flocking to the cities from neglected undeveloped rural land—only to become part of the unemployed urban masses. If the problems of the city are to be kept within manageable proportions, the exodus to the city must be slowed. The development of the interior will require solving the water problem. Trained technicians in the field of agriculture must be available, together with the capital machinery needed for the development of modern farming including substantial amounts of supervised farm credits—small loans for small farms.

With the help of the United States and other member nations of the OAS, and guided by the able and dedicated

leadership of President Bosch, the Dominican Republic stands a chance of becoming a model democratic island republic in a troubled Caribbean. Mr. President, at this point in my remarks I ask unanimous consent to introduce into the RECORD the inspiring inaugural address of President Bosch and the statement of President Kennedy's representative at the inauguration, Vice President LYNDON JOHNSON, upon his arrival in Santo Domingo.

There being no objection, the address and statement were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PRESIDENT JUAN BOSCH'S INAUGURAL ADDRESS

Dr. Segundo Armando González Tamayo and I have just sworn that in our capacities as Vice President and President of the Republic we will fulfill and will have fulfilled the constitution and the laws that govern us; and we say accurately that they govern us, because in a democracy there should be no more government than that of the law, and men, whatever may be their positions, are called to be nothing more than the executors of those laws.

Fine enough, at the same time, as the executors of the laws, it behooves us to be representatives and defenders of the people; and in the name of those people that are here before us and also far away in cities and isolated towns we request indispensable laws from the National Congress to insure in this country not only democratic policy but also economic democracy and social justice. From you senators and deputies elected by the people, whatever your party may be, the Government that begins today expects a continued effort to give the Dominicans a place in the sun among the advanced countries of America.

America watches us with interest and with love as the presence of leaders of the hemisphere and distinguished visitors who have come from all areas of the Americas to this testify. Never before have so many illustrious men, elected by their people for the highest functions of government, so many leaders of popular parties, so many legal representatives of continental culture been assembled in the Dominican Republic. The happy reunion of these great gentlemen of politics and thought, to whom we all owe gratitude for the eagerness with which they helped us to be free, is only a sample of that interest and the love with which our brothers of the hemisphere are watching us. As an American country we should make intelligent use of our political resources to give that interest and that love official character within the regional system of pacts and treaties that unite the entire continent, without forgetting that our people want to act jointly in defense of their democratic liberties but at the same time they have a lively sense of pride for the legacy of national sovereignty that they received from their Founding Fathers.

As an American country we find ourselves in the center of the great revolutionary current that is shaking the New World, and if we take into account that that powerful force is more forceful in countries that have not been able to develop in time because tyrannies or other social forces, negative to progress, impeded it, we must admit that in the Dominican Republic we are obliged to advance rapidly, as rapidly as possible without leaving democratic norms at any time, which insist that other rights be respected, because without respect to others' rights there cannot be peace, and without peace there cannot be well-being for the millions of Dominicans that insist on a better life.

We want political peace and for that reason we offered posts in the Cabinet to five parties. Four refused to accept those posts, and as that which begins today is an authentic democracy, we should all respect the wishes of those parties—National Civic Union, National Revolutionary Democratic Party, Revolutionary Vanguard, and Social Democratic Alliance—but the entire country should know that we have not wanted to form a government based only on the party that won the elections of the 20th of December of last year, as we did not not wish to form a government based only on those that joined us before the 20th of December. We have wanted that those who yesterday fought among themselves would be united today, each one giving the best of his efforts to the people that are ours as well as theirs. We do not want power to govern with friends against enemies, but to govern with Dominicans for the good of Dominicans.

A democratic leader must have his ears open to hear the truth, alert his eyes to see evil before it is done, a vigilant mind so that nothing could put the liberty of each citizen in jeopardy and a heart free of hates dedicated day and night only to the service of the people. We swear here on this solemn day that if our limited capacity keeps us from having open ears, alert eyes, a vigilant mind, our nature and our history assure the Dominicans that we have a heart free of hate. Let no one expect the use of hate while we are governing. We are here with the decision to work, not to hate, disposed to create, not to destroy; to defend and to shelter, not to persecute. Let us join our hearts together in the task of doing away with hate among Dominicans as one does away with weeds in the field that is going to be sown; let us join our hearts together in the task of building regimes that will give shelter to those that never had it, that will give work to those who seek it not finding it, that will give land to those farmers that need it, and will give security to those born here and to all those that wander the earth in search of shelter from misery and persecution.

The world in which we live seems to be full of pride and hate; but when we enter it with a clear view, of one without bitterness we find that millions and millions of persons are working quitely for a better tomorrow. We Dominicans must unite ourselves to that legion of men and women who march toward the future, because if God's creature was not given the faculty to remake his past, he was given on the other hand the faculty of shaping his future, and the future of the people is the work of their children more than of their parents, of those that live and of those who are going to live more than those that performed their task and left with the ages. The good work of those dead, like their evil work belong to history; but the good work of the future is the fruit of the good intentions and the capacity to convert those intentions into deeds.

And we must convert our good wishes into deeds. Self-respecting people like men with moral stature seek to give, not to receive; seek to help, not to ask for help. If, due to the tragic fate which was ours during 32 years, we have been obliged to travel throughout the democratic world in search of help, we must not become accustomed to live depending on such help. We have received and we are loyally grateful for it as those who are well born. But we should prepare ourselves to become self-sufficient, elevate ourselves through our own forces, to mold the statue of our future with Dominican hands. Just as there was a time when the democratic minded citizens of this country wandered the world with their heads bowed in shame, let us now take steps so that the democratic minded citizens of the Americas will raise their heads in wonder to see how, in this land, the very same people who once suffered under tyranny are building a home for dignity, for freedom, for abundance, and for culture.

Nothing can be accomplished overnight; according to the Bible, it took God himself 6 days to create the world and to settle it with human beings, to bring trees and light to it. But everything can be accomplished through work, perseverance and faith. Perseverance and faith where the attributes of those who founded this Dominican Republic, on one part of an island and with a very small population—like a premature baby among nations; faith and perseverance were the attributes of those who went to war, 100 years ago, to regain their lost sovereignty; faith and perseverance were the attributes of those who won back our country's freedom in 1924; faith and perseverance were the attributes of those who fought until they overthrew tyranny. Without the perseverance and the faith of one and all, without their valor and their martyrdom, we would not be assembled here today. That is why it is proper that, at this time, we think of them and thank them with the devotion of the son for the mother who bore him; for the heroes of liberty are like the mothers of men, and we owe them the respect and love that is a mother's due.

Just as nothing is accomplished overnight, nothing is accomplished without struggle. We must struggle and we will struggle against the obstacles which stand in the path of the Republic. The next few months will be months of austerity for many, because we are in the position of attempting to avoid the collapse of our national economy as a result of uncontrolled expenditures. But we live in a country of great riches, which sells more than it buys, and if Dominicans cooperate with the government so as not to make unnecessary expenditures, we could soon see ourselves with unlimited foreign exchange. Also if you, senators and deputies, work with perseverance, as we are sure you will, to approve the measures that will permit the government to carry out the agrarian reform and have the indispensable means for increasing agricultural production, we will be able to avoid the threat of inflation.

Our country is rich and our people are intelligent. We have a fertile land and people that want to work it. In other countries of America the major land areas are found in private hands, but here the most extensive farms belong to the state. We are going to join man with the land, the intelligent Dominican man with the rich Dominican land and let us be sure that that is done or there will not be democracy in this country.

We Dominicans begin today to be actors in our own drama and all of America is there across the continent as an anxious spectator. Let us work for our people and for America. Let us work with tenacity and with humility. This day of Juan Pablo Duarte, of Francisco del Rosario Sanchez, of Ramón Matias Mella in whose memory we offer this act is also by coincidence, Ash Wednesday; and on Ash Wednesday when the sign of the cross is made on the forehead, the faithful hear the eternal worlds: "Remember man that thou art dust and unto dust thou shall return."

We will all be dust someday; and we will only be remembered if we give to these people and to America what the Dominican people and America expect of us.

Tenacity for the struggle, and humility to receive the opinion of adversaries and the judgment of history is what we offer you, illustrous visitors who have had the kindness to come to testify that in the Dominican Republic a democracy is being born; to you representatives of friendly governments who give us the support of your presence; to you gentlemen, senators and deputies brought to these illustrious functions by popular vote, to you Dominicans of the cities and the country, the reason of all our struggle the object of tenacity and receivers of the humility that we offer.

Besides this, you, the visitors, may count on the affection of this people; you will notice that with civilian or military dress all Dominicans look on you with affection and remember that with civilian or military dress all came together, each one within his function, to guarantee the freedom of men and women of this land to vote according to his conscience. All of them then, uniformed members of the armed forces and people with work or farmers clothes or middle class, gave the unexpected example and to them and to you the motive for gathering together today under the sky of a little piece of America.

Don Romulo Betancourt, Don Ramón Villeda Morales, Don Francisco Orlich, Don Lyndon Johnson, Don Alexander Bustamante, Don Luis Muñoz Marin, your excellencies diplomatic representatives of friendly countries; professors, writers, poets, newsmen, political leaders who are visiting us; friends that have come from afar to be with us in this solemm hour; to all of you, those who govern, those who represent, and those who lead, those who beautify with their works, to all we bid you a most cordial welcome and we ask you all as you return to your countries that you take and spread the words with which we end this message; "while we govern, liberty will not perish in the Dominican Republic."

ARRIVAL STATEMENT OF VICE PRESIDENT LYNDON B. JOHNSON IN THE DOMINICAN REPUBLIC

You do my country a great honor by your welcome. We are most grateful.

It is my privilege to come today both as chairman of the official delegation from the United States and as the personal representative of the President of the United States, John F. Kennedy.

As your neighbors, friends and wellwishers, the people of the United States have, during the past year, observed with gratification and admiration the triumph of the democratic processes in your country. Tomorrow we will celebrate with you the rebirth of representative democracy with the inauguration of your Republic's first freely elected President in 39 years, Juan Bosch.

This event is a historic triumph for the Dominican people. It is, also, a triumph for our hemisphere. It is a triumph for that philosophy of freedom—born in this New World—that governments should derive their powers from the consent of the governed.

We recognize—as you and your elected leaders recognize—that formidable problems must be solved. If the Dominican people are to enjoy lives blessed with a full measure of freedom, justice, and peace, cures must be found for the ancient ills of poverty, hunger, disease, unemployment, poor housing, and poor schools. I come today to tell you that in the efforts you make under freedom, you of the Dominican Republic can count on the United States for our help and support.

We offer to the Dominican people and to their chosen leaders our full cooperation in their struggle for economic progress and social justice. We do so in a spirit of mutual cooperation and mutual respect among the nations of our hemisphere—the spirit of the Alliance for Progress.

Our purpose—the only purpose of the United States—is to help the Dominican people build for themselves and their children a better life and to fulfill the highest hopes which live in the hearts of Dominicans. Oppression and tyranny did not extinguish the flame of freedom here. That flame will burn evermore brightly as you—and all in this hemisphere who love freedom—work together to fulfill the opportunity and promise of the Dominican Republic in the future.

INAUGURATION OF PRESIDENT BOSCH OF THE DOMINICAN REPUBLIC

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] has reported on his mission to the inauguration of President Bosch in the Dominican Republic, in which visit I was included with him and Representative BRADEMAS, of Indiana, as a guest of the Dominican Government.

The Vice President of the United States represented us there, together with the Honorable George Backer, of New York, Assistant Secretary of State Edwin M. Martin, and the Honorable Teodoro Moscoso, U.S. coordinator for the Alliance for Progress.

I wish to pay tribute to our Ambassador to the Dominican Republic, His Excellency John B. Martin, who is doing an outstandingly fine job.

The Dominican Republic is part of the island of Hispaniola, one of the earliest settled by Europeans in our hemisphere, going back to its settlement in 1494. Incidentally, it was ruled by Diego, the son of Christopher Columbus, from 1509 to 1523. It has great traditions of history. It has great resources. It has a small population. It has every opportunity to make a big success. It was literally destroyed—ground into the dust spiritually—by the dictator, Trujillo, in 32 years of tyrannical rule. During that time it was exhausted, physically, spiritually, and in every other way. President Bosch has many challenges, but he has one big advantage. The great economic and social miracle of our continent could be performed in the Dominican Republic in an enormous success for freedom after over three decades of tyranny—and this on an island right next to Cuba.

We could not have a more dramatic juxtaposition than that. President Bosch understands that he must work with private enterprise as well as with the United States and other countries, European—I am very much interested in bringing European effort into Latin American development—as well as in our own hemisphere. I think President Bosch is entitled to all the support, sympathy, and understanding that we can give him. Together with the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] and others, I hope to invoke that support.

An opportunity for democracy to perform its own miracle in a dramatic way—to completely outshine all of Castro's machinations directed at the very heart and jugular vein of the Americas—is possible in the Dominican Republic in the dramatic contrast between three decades of Trujillo tyranny and a freely elected government having the strong support of the Dominican people, as they showed in the election last December.

It is our responsibility, as well as that of President Bosch and his associates, first, for him to be true—as I know he will be—to his pledges of respecting free institutions in every way, to work with public and private enterprise, and, on our part and to understand the critical importance of the success of the Dominican Republic in this great historical hour when that nation has an opportunity to succeed not only for its own freedom, but also for freedom throughout the Western Hemisphere.

FOOD FOR PEACE AT WORK

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, one program already having a great impact on the people of the Dominican Republic is the surplus food program administered by the Catholic Relief Services under the foor-for-peace program.

This year over 300,000 people will be fed from surplus food stocks. Through the efforts of this voluntary organization, surplus food is getting to those who need it and it is doing much to alleviate food shortages during this difficult transitional period. This is another good example of the success of our food-for-peace program in meeting the urgent needs of people in a neighboring land.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this article, which describes in further detail this program in the Dominican Republic, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CARITAS DE SANTO DOMINGO-DOMINICAN REPUBLIC CATHOLIC RELIEF SERVICES, NCWC

Caritas de Santo Domingo, the first Alliance for Progress program in the Dominican Republic has been operating for the past 15 months.

The first program was planned to feed 30,000 people. By the spring of 1962 Caritas was servicing 150,000 and the new program planned for 1963 will provide foodstuffs to over 330,000 people—one-tenth of the total population of the Dominican Republic.

Total amount of food received by Caritas de Santo Domingo up until today has reached the incredible figure of 40,798,331 pounds. This figure includes, in pounds:

Corn	8, 215, 632
Cornmeal	13, 729, 050
Flour	8, 938, 600
Milk	5, 444, 010
Cheese	797, 839
Oil	1, 983, 544
Shortening	693, 504
Beans	996, 152

The Dominican Government has provided storage space and free inland transportation from the docks in Santo Domingo to 14 main distribution points located at Santa Domingo, Barahona, San Juan, Azua, Hato Mayor, La Romana, La Vega, Bonao, Sanchez, Nagua, San Francisco de Macoris, Santiago, Monte Cristi, and Puerto Plata.

Caritas de Santo Domingo has over 2,000 Dominicans working as volunteers throughout its 128 distribution centers all over the country. These volunteers investigate needy cases, keep records and prepare the food for distribution. In addition to distributing food to individual families, these centers have provided foodstocks to 23 institutions, 17 schools, 21 hospitals and 32 milk stations. The food supplies were transported throughout the country by a group of 1,500 trucks and drivers paid for by the Dominican Government. In the future Caritas de Santo Domingo will distribute bulgur wheat and butter oil. Over 80,070 pounds of used clothing and 31,059 pounds of used shoes received in March 1962 from the annual Thanksgiving clothing collection in Catholic parishes all over the United States have been distributed. Another shipment of 280,000 pounds of used clothing and shoes is scheduled to arrive next month.

There is small loss from ship to distribution points. All distribution is completely controlled at the storage warehouses by the volunteer workers. Individual families are issued ration cards which allow them to collect exactly what they need and no more. Placards have been printed that inform the recipients that this food is a gift from the people of the United States to the Dominican people, and the Alianza para el Progreso handclasp symbol is shown. This is also stated on the individual family card of the recipient.

Officials agree that this cooperation between the people of the United States and the Governments of the United States and the Dominican Republic is truly a humanistic people-to-people effort with little or no Government intervention, except for bearing the financial burden of shipping and local transportation.

THE SATURDAY EVENING POST AND INTEGRATION

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record a fine editorial entitled, "The Post and Integration," which was published in a recent issue of the Saturday Evening Post.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

The Post and Integration

In recent months we have received many letters from our readers asking us to state our position on integration. We have been accused with considerable vehemence of being pro-Negro, perhaps because we have felt it necessary to deal at great length and depth with the problem of the Negro in America.

Let us put it as frankly as possible. Of course we are pro-Negro. We are also pro-white, pro-Jew, pro-Catholic, and pro-Protestant. We believe, as we frequently said, that the promise of American democracy will never be fulfilled so long as any citizen is deprived of his rights because of his race or religion. Private relationships are matters of conscience, but every American is entitled to full enjoyment of the benefits of citizenship.

We do not suggest that integration is easy. We know very well that there are many forms of discrimination in the North as well as the South. But there is a difference. The Negro in the North is not as frequently reminded of any "inferior" status. He can eat in the restaurants and drink from the fountains and not be publicly humiliated because of his color.

Even if we were not convinced of the moral necessity for ending segregation, we would favor it for another reason, one that is every bit as compelling. We are a nation of laws, and it is the law. Southern Governors such as George Wallace of Alabama (p. 11) may delude themselves into believing that they can interpose the authority of a State, but the supreme law is the Federal law. That point was settled a hundred years ago.

There is a third reason, more practical than either of the others, for favoring peaceful integration. It is the utter futility and the self-destructive waste of attempting to check the relentless march of history. Governors Orval Faubus and Ross Barnett proved the point. They swore eternal opposition to the law of the land, but Little Rock today is integrated, James Meredith is attending the University of Mississippi, and all that Faubus and Barnett have to show for their obstruction is bloodshed, sufferings and the shame that was heaped upon their States. Gov. George Wallace, Bull Connor, and other diehards in Alabama should profit by these examples. It is time we stopped fighting the last century's battles here at home and closed ranks against the common enemy abroad—communism.

As editors of a national magazine, we at the Post have a very special responsibility to report on the progress of major events in this Nation and the world at large. The emergence of the Negro is one of the most profound developments in American history. His rise from economic and political bondage in this Nation and his momentous migration to the North and West are stories that compare in importance with the great westward migration of the 19th century, the two world wars and that great American tragedy, the Civil War. School integration, sit-in and freedom rides are so much a part of the fabric of our times that responsible editors could not conceivably ignore them. The migration of the Negro is staggering in its social, economic and political ramifications for the entire Nation. Negroes used to vote—when they could vote—Republican. Some experts, such as Theodore H. White, in his book "The Making of the President" contend now that this new Negro population in the Northeast actually swung the 1960 election to Democrat John F. Kennedy.

It is essential that all of us understand these things and place them in proper historical perspective. The Post has covered the story of the American Negro with responsible, illuminating reports. The first and most memorable of these was a five-part series by John Bartlow Martin "The Deep South Says Never" (June 15–July 13, 1957). In recent months we have described the strategy of the Negro youth's new march on Dixie (September 8, 1962). In November we devoted 13 pages to the dramatic, costly desegregation at the University of Mississippi (November 10, 1962). We have published articles on the Negro aristocracy and the Negro hate group, the Black Muslims. Recently we published "Speaking Out" by Carl T. Rowan, Negro Assistant Secretary of State, on "The Travesty of Integration."

This week the Post is proud to publish a moving and penetrating report on the mood of Birmingham by Joe David Brown (pages 11–19). Birmingham faces the prospect of forced integration. Alabama is the only remaining State where not a single Negro has yet been integrated. Birmingham, as the piece makes clear, is an explosive situation, the next great arena in the integration struggle. It is this kind of dramatic, incisive reporting that is the role of the Post in our rapidly changing era.

EDITORIAL SUPPORT FOR HUMANE TREATMENT OF VERTEBRATE ANIMALS IN LABORATORY TESTS

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, a few weeks ago I introduced for the Senator from Oregon [Mrs. Neuberger] and myself a bill (S. 533) to promote the humane treatment of vertebrate animals in laboratory tests. I am pleased to note a favorable editorial in the Christian Science Monitor of February 27, 1963, endorsing the bill.

Those inclined to scoff at the need for this legislation should read the news item which appeared in the March 6, 1963, Washington Evening Star, concerning the deaths of hundreds of dogs and cats at a farm in Gainesville, Va., which was supplying laboratory animals to the National Institutes of Health. I ask unanimous consent that the editorial and news story be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial and article were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Hundreds of Dogs and Cats Are Found Buried on Farm

(By Hugh Wells and Jack Kelso)

Discovery of the bodies of several hundred dogs and cats on a Prince William County farm today was under investigation by Virginia animal welfare officials.

The dead animals were found in trenches behind a huge two-story barn on a former dairy farm near Gainesville, Va.

The property, a section of Cloverland Farms, was sublet to Zoological Worldwide, Inc., a corporation that collected dogs for sale to medical schools and research institutes.

Richard G. Turner, accountant for Zoological Worldwide, said the dogs and cats were sold to Bethesda Naval Hospital, the National Institutes of Health and medical schools in the Baltimore area.

BARN CLEANED OUT

When a Star reporter visited the site today, he found that the operation no longer was in existence. The barn had been cleaned out—only one dead cat remained in the building.

But behind the barn, three trenches about 70 feet long were found. Two of the trenches appeared filled with the bodies of dogs, cats, and rabbits. A third trench was covered with water, making it impossible to tell what was underneath.

The bodies of a collie dog and a cocker spaniel puppy were clearly visible on top of the piles.

Still alive outside the barn were a few ducks, a hutch with 10 rabbits in it and 1 shivering, tan and brown hound in a cage 2 feet by 2 feet.

OPERATION CLOSED

Mr. Turner said the operation had been closed down by the end of last week, after a visit by Mrs. Pearl Twyne, president of the Virginia Federation of Humane Societies and of the Animal Welfare League of Arlington, and other various officials.

"This has been quite unfortunate and I recommend they immediately close the place up," Mr. Turner said, adding that the corporation is "trying to do the right thing."

Mr. Turner said he had not known, until it was pointed out to him, that the water pipes to the building had frozen and there was no heat in the building.

The corporation, he said, had tried to convert the barn into a proper kennel to hold the animals for shipment but that it was impossible.

The corporation now has shut down its operation and will not open again until proper kennels, possibly like those used by NIH and the Arlington Welfare League, can be built, Mr. Turner said.

TEN STOCKHOLDERS

All the dogs that remained when the operation was closed down have been sold, he said.

"The animals," he said, "originally were picked up from dog pounds and from registered animal dealers."

About 10 stockholders comprise the corporation, Mr. Turner said, but he declined to identify them.

Mr. Turner said that some of the dogs had died of distemper and that others had contracted distemper and had to be destroyed. Some of the dogs were shot, he said.

He said he understood that only about 40 to 50 dogs had died in about a year.

The operation was brought to light by a woman who declined to be identified. She told animal welfare officials she saw a truck with some dogs in the back.

The woman said she asked the driver if she could buy one of the beagles and he said she would have to talk with the lawyer of the corporation.

Rather than do that, the woman recounted, she drove to the farm, where she saw conditions there. She said there was no heat, windows were broken and there were dead dogs among the live ones.

NEIGHBOR MOVED

Mrs. Marie Moore, who formerly lived next door to the farm, said her family had to move down the road because she couldn't stand the situation any longer.

"Just a little warm wind would make you sick," Mrs. Moore said.

She said her son, Stanley, had gone to the farm himself and buried some of the dogs once because the odor was so bad.

When the corporation first began trucking animals to the farm, Mrs. Moore said, the dead animals were buried. Last fall, the trenches were dug with a bulldozer, she recalled.

By November, she said, she had to move down the road.

PROTECTION FROM CRUELTY AND NEGLECT

In the midst of national and international crises, there is an important job that the 88th Congress should not neglect. That is to bring to vote, and to pass, bill S. 533, introduced January 25 by Senators JOSEPH S. CLARK, of Pennsylvania, and MAURINE NEUBERGER, of Oregon.

This is an amended and clarified form of a bill on which congressional hearings were held last fall. Its object is to insure humane treatment of animals used for experimental purposes in research laboratories. It does not seek to abolish animal experimentation, but to safeguard against unregulated performance and against needless cruelty and neglect. Among its provisions are included: licensing of each person who uses animals, with provision for loss of license for inhumane acts; registration of premises; recordkeeping; adequate food, water, comfortable resting places and normal exercise for the animals; unannounced inspection of laboratories.

That such legislation is urgently needed was amply evidenced in last September's congressional hearings, which brought to light facts as authentic as they are shocking—facts which many medical doctors deplore.

The public, many of whose tax and Community Chest dollars are channeled into animal experimentation, has a right to demand that this experimentation be regulated to insure the greatest possible humanity.

THE MENACE OF RUSSIAN SEAPOWER

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, while we are spending billions to keep the Soviet Union from surpassing us in space, let us not lose sight of the importance of shoring up our supremacy on land and sea.

Although it is not as true as it once was that the nation which controls the seas controls the world, mastery of the seas can still be a most decisive factor—as was well demonstrated to us in the October Cuban crisis. The Soviet Union knows this all too well, and is racing for the control of the seas which encircle the world as well as the space around it. She is challenging us in the construction of merchantmen, tankers, and in general shipbuilding, as well as in research and naval power.

Look magazine recently carried a comprehensive survey entitled "The Menace of Russia's Seapower," which was written by Fletcher Knebel. I ask unanimous consent that it be carried in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE MENACE OF RUSSIA'S SEAPOWER

(By Fletcher Knebel)

Soviet Russia, for centuries a giant land turtle, suddenly is striking out to sea with an agility and determination that surprise some U.S. military strategists and alarm others. While the eyes of the world have been focused on feats of rocketry in outer space, the Kremlin's orders have resulted in startling Communist progress in the far more familiar element of water. With its recent maritime surge little noticed save by marine experts, Russia now looms as a powerful bidder for supremacy on the high seas. The facts are not comforting:

Navy: The U.S.S.R. has passed Great Britain and now boasts the world's second largest war fleet, outranked only by that of the United States. Russia's 750,000-man Navy floats 25 cruisers, 165 destroyers, 430 submarines, including some missile-firing and atom-powered subs, 275 frigates, 500 motor torpedo boats, 900 minesweepers, a host of auxiliary craft and sizable shore-based naval aviation.

Merchant marine: Soviet freighters and tankers, their stacks decorated with the hammer-and-sickle emblem, now call at 60 major ports. Russia's merchant fleet continues to expand at an ever-growing pace, while that of the United States shrinks. Its 1,050 oceangoing merchant ships, totaling about 5 million deadweight tons, now rank Russia high on the list of maritime nations.

Fishing fleet: The Soviet Union operates the world's largest and most modern high-seas fishing fleet, with 3,000 ships plying all major fishing banks around the globe. The Russians now outfish U.S. commercial fishermen in waters off Cape Cod and Alaska and are even building a fishing port in Cuba. Many Soviet trawlers double as floating intelligence centers, with electronic and sonar gear collecting data on our radar installations, Pacific atom tests and shore defenses.

Shipbuilding: No nation is building more ships faster than the Soviet Union. In addition to a recent huge expansion of its Black Sea shipyards, Russia has more than 200 freighters, tankers and passenger-cargo ships on order in the free-world yards of Japan, Italy, Sweden, Finland, Denmark, and West Germany and also in the Communist-bloc yards of East Germany, Yugoslavia, Bulgaria, and Poland. Smaller craft are even being built in landlocked Czechoslovakia. By 1980, Russia aims to have a 20 million ton merchant fleet, matching or surpassing the commercial tonnage of Great Britain, now the merchant marine leader.

Oceanography: Russia already owns the largest and most modern marine-laboratory fleet afloat. Its 100-plus scientific vessels outnumber the 57 research ships operated by Government and private institutions in the United States. Premier Nikita S. Khrushchev has channeled some of Russia's best scientific brains into underwater research.

Marine technology: Russia is in the forefront of experimentation in design and gadgetry. A completely automated vessel recently made a trial run in the Black Sea. Some of the newest Soviet tankers can load or discharge oil with one man operating the automated console. Some freighters have closed-circuit TV for docking operations. Hydraulic hatches, an atom-powered icebreaker, hydrofoil ships carrying passengers at 40 knots, gas turbine engines, 70,000-ton tankers, fiberglass hulls, all figure in the new face of Russia on the high seas. Like the United States and Britain, Russia is even experimenting with hovercraft vessels that never touch the waves.

While Russia's missile strength is far below that of the United States, as reported in the November 6 issue of Look, Russia's rise to sea power causes grave concern at the Pentagon. "The Soviets have built the world's second-largest navy since World War II," says Adm. George W. Anderson, Jr., Chief of Naval Operations, "and their merchant marine of smart, large, modern, clean ships is becoming a powerful tool for economic and political expansion."

"The trend alarms us," says Capt. D. A. Scott of the Navy's progress-analysis group. "It used to be a rare sight to see a Russian freighter. Now, two or three can be seen in almost every major port. It will be no surprise to see Russian warships maneuvering off Cape Henry (near Norfolk, Va.) in the years ahead."

"The Russians," said Assistant Secretary of the Navy Kenneth E. Belieu in a May speech, are moving "at flank speed to develop the sea-transport system they will need in order to pursue their goal of world domination. Most important of all, at this critical point in history, our own merchant fleet is declining in strength, versatility, and vigor, just when we appear to need them most."

Russia's new boldness on the high seas was flaunted under America's nose this summer when, within the space of a few weeks, the U.S.S.R. sent more than 60 ships into Cuba and unloaded heavy stocks of tanks, weapons, motor torpedo boats, and even guided missiles. Only about half of the freighters that carried arms, Communist "technicians" and supplies to Castroland were Russian. Indeed, some of the chartered bottoms belonged to our Western allies.

There was no doubt in the minds of U.S. officials, however, that Russia could have sent the entire expedition in Russian hulls had Khrushchev so desired. The Soviet maritime fleet could have handled Operation Castro easily. It was speculated that the Kremlin chartered some free world ships primarily to embarrass the United States and to make any interference with the supply line diplomatically distasteful to this country. It would have been one thing to turn back an arms-laden Soviet ship from Havana Harbor, had the Kennedy administration the appetite for such a venture, but quite another to seize and search the vessel of a NATO member.

If Russia used the seas with audacity en route to Cuba, it was no less ambitious this spring in its invasions of U.S. fishing grounds off Cape Cod in the Atlantic and off Alaska in the Pacific. The Interior Department's Bureau of Commercial Fisheries in June tallied no less than 169 Soviet ships on Georges Bank, just east of Cape Cod, and 107 Communist fishing vessels in the gulf of Alaska. This record encroachment of almost 280 Red ships on traditional American fishing grounds represented a dramatic change in a short time. As recently as 1954, there were no sightings of Russian vessels off the east coast, and never until this year had Soviet fishing fleets ventured into the gulf of Alaska. This spring, two Russian vessels even tested fishing off North and South Carolina.

Soviet trawlers form formidable fishing fleets, with modern facilities and techniques far surpassing those in use by the United

States. The Russian boats are fueled and serviced by repair ships, and transfer their catches to factory ships that process and pack the fish for market and to 19,000-ton mother ships that freeze them.

Many of the trawlers double as ocean intelligence agents, measuring American H-bomb tests in the Pacific, watching Atlantic naval maneuvers, pinpointing coastal radar beams and charting harbors, banks, and shelves along U.S. coasts. Navy patrol planes have pictured Russian trawlers bristling with electronic gear. Navy intelligence has learned that some trawlers carry scientific and espionage teams. American fishermen on infrequent visits aboard Russian trawlers have been barred from certain secret quarters. In 1960, the Russian trawler *Vega* had to be chased from its observation post by U.S. Navy ships. The *Vega* stood close by a Navy task force, including a nuclear Polaris submarine, during missile-firing tests off the east coast.

Along with its intelligence catch, Russia takes a tremendous quantity of fish from the ocean and has moved ahead of the United States in total annual catch. The United States now ranks fifth as a fishing nation, behind Japan, Red China, Russia, and Peru.

"The United States," Senator Warren G. Magnuson, Democrat, of Washington, chairman of the Senate Commerce Committee, told the Senate in August, "has no mother ships, no factory ships, no stern-ramp trawlers, no refrigerated transport ships, no large fisheries vessels of any kind. No modern U.S. fishing fleet exists."

To help remedy the situation, Magnuson joined with two other Democratic Senators to sponsor bills offering larger construction subsidies for U.S. fishing boats and authorizing the Government to build two ultramodern trawlers for pilot purposes.

It is perhaps ironic that the United States, with its historic pride in competitive free enterprise, finds itself being overtaken on the high seas by state-operated commercial fleets of a Communist power. It is even more ironic that Government subsidies are being proposed as the chief answer. But what is true of fishing vessels is also true of the merchant marine.

Russia's armada of merchant ships, crowned by glistening new tankers running up to 70,000 tons, has tripled since the opening of World War II and is expected to increase threefold again by the end of this decade. Before the war, Russia carried only 10 percent of its own trade in Soviet ships. Now, it carries about 60 percent of its trade, which has ballooned in volume. With more than 140 tankers in service and many more building, Russia powers a Communist oil offensive that is undercutting Western producers in a number of free world countries.

At the same time, our own merchant marine is dwindling. The active U.S. merchant fleet is contracting at the rate of 31 ships a year, according to the authoritative Marine Engineering Log. Our huge reserve fleet from World War II, while still largely intact, rusts into obsolescence at river and harbor anchorages. Of the 907 active ships flying the U.S. flag, 300 belong to 16 lines that receive a Government operating subsidy. Another 412 ships, aggregating almost 11 million tons, have gone under foreign flags of convenience or necessity, depending on the point of view.

Early this year, Donald W. Alexander, the Maritime Administrator, urged a revolutionary approach to the American merchant marine in the face of "competition that could destroy it." He spoke of automated ships, such as the Russians are building, and of assembly-line shipyards patterned after one in Sweden. Thus far, however, no general revolution in American methods has erupted, despite marked progress symbolized by such ships as the nuclear-powered cargo vessel, the *Savannah*, and the 106,500-ton tanker *Manhattan*.

Caught between high wages and high costs at home and foreign subsidies and state control abroad. American commercial shipping would appear to have three alternatives: (1) Slash operating costs and trim down drastically for world competition; (2) enlarge Government subsidies, or (3) suffer a continued decline in both the merchant marine and the shipbuilding facilities that support it. Which of these alternatives the Kennedy administration will choose remains unclear.

In the field of oceanography, Russia now leads the world. The U.S. Bureau of Commercial Fisheries calls the Soviet Government's marine research a vast program and says that thousands of scientists and technologists are working for the All-Union Scientific Research Institute of Marine Fisheries and Oceanography. The research is coordinated by two large institutes at Murmansk and Vladivostok.

In simple terms of naval might, the United States still sails unchallenged on the seas, but Russia has built rapidly since World War II. The United States has 26 carriers on active duty. Russia has none, active or inactive. The United States has 240 destroyers to about 165 for Russia. But in other categories, Russia leads with 25 cruisers to 13 for the United States, 400 patrol-type craft to 70 in the active U.S. Fleet, and about 430 submarines to 118 U.S. subs. In addition, Russia maintains a flotilla of 500 motor torpedo boats, a few of which were sent to Cuba this summer. The United States no longer maintains the mosquito fleet that boosted President Kennedy to fame.

It is the huge Russian submarine force that worries American Navy strategists. Hitler opened World War II with only 57 U-boats, yet they scourged the sealanes and sank millions of tons of allied shipping. Should war break out today, Russia could fling more than 400 subs around the world to paralyze our merchant and warships. Though we lead Russia in the undersea missile-firing capability of the American Polaris submarines, it will be only a matter of a few years until the U.S.S.R. can threaten our inland cities with hydrogen-tipped missiles hurled from submarines hidden beneath the waves.

The duel between the submarine and the ships and planes that prey upon it is always a delicately balanced one, but right now, the submarine holds clear superiority. Nuclear power permits the sub to lurk beneath the surface for weeks. The Polaris-type missile gives it the hidden striking power of millions of tons of TNT.

Swift progress in antisubmarine warfare is a paramount task facing the U.S. Navy. Some admirals, indeed, believe it deserves the type of intense civilian-miltiary cooperation found in the space program. Unless the answer is soon found, Russia's subs may some day take control of the seas without firing a shot.

Russia's bid for mastery on the high seas presents American leaders with an unwanted challenge; for, at the same time, the Soviet Union is racing for the upper hand in space. Yet the marine challenge is total—in merchantmen, in tankers, in research, in naval power, in fisheries and in shipbuilding. Whether Russia's seapower bid will be met in the sweeping fashion in which it has been made remains a question the Kennedy administration has yet to answer.

THE TYRANNY OF THE MINORITY

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, under date of February 2, 1963, there appeared in the New York Times an editorial entitled "The Tyranny of the Minority." I believe that this subject should be brought to the attention of all Senators, as well as to thoughtful people throughout the country. Therefore I ask unanimous consent that the editorial may be printed in the Record at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

The Tyranny of the Minority

Those who dismiss as a capricious and meaningless waste of time the losing fight by Senator Joseph S. Clark, of Pennsylvania, to alter the size of and representation of committees of the Senate miss the point of a profoundly serious conflict. The real issue is not who will serve on which committees, and how they will be chosen, but rather whether the Senate—and the Congress as a whole—can be forced out of the path of obsolescence to which it is stubbornly adhering.

Essentially, the issue is this: The congressional committee structure as it has evolved over the last half century and more has inverted one of the basic concepts of democratic government—from rule of the majority to rule by a minority. This is a palpable fact of congressional life today; it is not simply a slogan of liberal soreheads.

Command of the legislative process is in control of, comparatively speaking, a handful of legislators on the individual major committees of the House and Senate. More often than not, command is wielded not even by this small group but by the individual chairmen themselves.

The chairmen and/or the clique of committee seniors whom they control—usually a bipartisan clique—can and do withhold from floor consideration bills of which they personally disapprove. The devices for this arbitrary action are manifold: a chairman can simply pocket a bill referred to him and not bring it before his committee; he can kill it by the tactics of delay; he can kill it, or emasculate it, by the choice of witnesses brought in to testify on it. There are no really effective means of forcing a reluctant committee to act.

These chairmen and their cliques are fortified in their intransigence by the rule of seniority, and most of them in a Democratic Congress come from the safe and conservative districts of the South. In terms of Senator Clark's indictment, they represent the establishment. And in terms of the Kennedy administration, they represent the real as opposed to the titular opposition.

The question is not merely whether individual items on the Kennedy program will or will not be enacted by this Congress. The greater question is whether President Kennedy—or any President—can have his program submitted to the whole Congress to be tested fairly and expeditiously in the scales of majority rule.

The bicameral system was deliberately designed to check the tyranny of the majority. It was never designed to foster the tyranny of a minority. But this tyranny has been established through the evolution of the committee structure, and there it rests today, a wasting, corroding growth on our system of government.

THE WELFARE STATE AND THE WARFARE STATE

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, my colleague from Idaho, the distinguished senior Senator Frank Church, spoke recently at the University of Utah on "The Welfare State"—a subject not of his own choosing, but one on which he chose his words and arguments exceedingly well.

He pointed out that our present high Federal spending levels are not the result of the welfare state, but of what he called the warfare state. His eloquent and comprehensive treatment of this broad subject deserves widespread reading and consideration.

I ask unanimous consent that the excellent address made by Senator Church at the University of Utah on February 28 of this year be carried in the Congressional Record.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

The topic which has been assigned to me is "The Welfare State." Evidently, it is the gift of your "committee in charge of persecuting guest speakers."

If the words, taken in the context of their current political usage, carried only their literal meaning, I would have no cause for complaint. Governments which are heedless of the welfare of the people usually fall to a violent death. The right of the people to overthrow such governments is one of the self-evident truths proclaimed by our own Declaration of Independence, while the affirmative obligation to promote the general welfare is listed among the express purposes for which the Federal Government was established, in the preamble to the Constitution of the United States.

But the term "welfare state" has come to connote something quite different from the wholesome concept of a government rightfully concerned about the welfare of its citizens. Extremists on the radical right use the phrase as a label for the villain in their well-oiled political spook show, now on the road from coast to coast. For them, "welfare state" means:

The do-gooders are at it again. They want the Government (meaning the Federal Government) to act as wet nurse for the whole population, from the cradle to the grave, insuring that every want is uniformly satisfied, and that the shiftless, the improvident, and the lazy are taken care of at the expense of the steady, the foresighted, and the energetic. They either don't know, or don't care, that to do this will destroy the fundamental qualities of character—known to the old frontier—which have made our country great. They are extracting, through ever-higher taxes, the good citizens' hard-earned money (which he can certainly spend for better purposes than the Government can devise) and they are doling it out to bad citizens.

In the process, the Government has become insolvent, the Nation has been brought to the brink of bankruptcy, and a monstrous bureaucracy has arisen which engulfs Congress and stretches its tentacles around the 50 States, slowly squeezing them to death. This bureaucracy, best typified by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, is dedicated to socialism, determined to destroy free enterprise, and undermine the liberties of the people. Further, it has been designed by the do-gooders as a means for perpetuating themselves in power by buying the votes of the no-gooders. Shades of the Roman circuses. And finally, we suspect these do-gooders are actually fellow-travelers whose purpose it is to so weaken the country from within that the Communists can take it over without ever firing a shot.

Now, if there are any among you who believe in this nightmare version of "the welfare state," there is little I can say to awaken you. I might just as well try to defend the Inquisition or medieval methods of torture.

So I must speak to the unspooked among you—to those of you who would rather pull the sheets off would-be ghosts than quail before them. With you, then, who are the open-minded and inquiring students, let me proceed to examine each of these hobgoblins, one by one.

To begin with, what accounts for the big Government we have in Washington today, and for the relatively high level of Federal taxation needed to support it? Take a look at the Federal budget for 1963, and the answer is at once evident. Big Government on the Potomac is chiefly the product of warfare, not welfare. Over half the total budget goes directly to the Armed Forces.

In order to emphasize the magnitude of our military spending, allow me to relate it to something with which we are all familiar. We see, every day, impressive evidence of the effort and expense required for the education of our youngsters. In nearly every small town, in your State and mine, the largest buildings are the public schools. For every 25 or 30 youngsters, there is a full-time, professional educator. Teachers' salaries alone are a big chunk of the State and local taxes we must pay. Yet the Federal Government is spending, every year, for defense, more than treble the cost of all the educational programs in the country—including the school buildings themselves, the salaries of teachers and administrators, the books and supplies and lab equipment, the janitorial and upkeep services, light and heat, the gymnasiums and stadiums, down to the last football helmet and catchers mitt. Three times as much. It is this tremendous expenditure, which we have had to sustain, almost without letup, for more than 20 years, that mainly accounts for the big Government in Washington today.

But, before you accuse me of telling only half the story, let's turn the Federal tax dollar over and have a look at the nonmilitary side. You may be surprised to find, on this side of the taxpayer's dollar, that most of the spending once again relates to warfare requirements, past and prospective, not to welfare programs. Our Space Technology, Atomic Energy, and Central Intelligence Agencies are all directly linked to our national security. The swollen costs of diplomacy and foreign aid, including military assistance to our allies, also relate to the security needs of the United States. Add these along with the continuing cost of our involvment in past wars, veterans' benefits and interest payments on the war debt, to what we spend each year on the armed forces, and the grand total accounts for a staggering 80 percent of all Federal spending.

This leaves 20 cents out of each Federal tax dollar still to be accounted for, much less than half of which goes to pay the costs of the Federal health, education, and welfare programs which lie at the heart of the controversy over "the welfare state." To be exact, 7 cents out of each taxpayer's dollar is all that is being spent by the Federal Government on welfare, which is a lesser percentage of our gross national product than the Government spent on welfare 25 years ago.

What are these welfare programs? They include Federal grants-in-aid to the States for aged, blind, and disabled citizens, and dependent children; Federal grants, usually given on a matching basis, for public health, hospital construction, water and sewage pollution, and food and drug administration. Also included are all forms of Federal aid to education, Federal impact funds, the school lunch program, vocational rehabilitation, and the special assistance to schools and students made available through the National Defense Education Act. Also the costs of administering unemployment compensation, policing of unions, and financing research for medical cures of cancer, heart disease, infantile paralysis, multiple sclerosis, and a host of other diseases of mind and body.

Meat-ax these programs, if you will, eliminate most of them in their entirety, and cut the remainder to ribbons, and you might save 5 percent on your Federal income tax—for such is the relative cost of all the welfare programs to the total cost of the Federal Government today. I submit that the Federal budget establishes, beyond question, that big government on the national level, as we know it today, is the creature of the warfare state, not the welfare state.

Some of the other hobgoblins of the radical right, to which I earlier referred, can now be discarded with relative ease.

What about the burgeoning Federal bureaucracy spreading through every State and stifling the scope of State government? Actually, Federal employment no longer keeps pace with the growth of the country. In 1952, there were 16 Federal employees for every thousand of population. By 1958, this number had dropped to 14, and it will be 13 in fiscal 1964. In the decade from 1952 to 1962, total Federal civilian employment fell 3 percent, while employment by State and local governments increased by 63 percent. If creeping socialism is measured by the rising tide of government employees, the sentinels better station themselves closer to home.

What then of the hobgoblin of fiscal irresponsibility and imminent insolvency? Is the Federal Government spending itself into bankruptcy? The national debt, accumulated mainly through our participation in two world wars, is very large indeed. In 1947, at the close of World War II, the national debt exceeded our national wealth, as measured by the value of all the goods and services produced by the American people in that year. In 1963, though the debt had climbed still higher, our national wealth had doubled, and more. A person who has a $10,000 income is in a better position to carry a $5,000 debt than a person with a $4,000 income. The same is true of a nation. Right after World War II, our national debt was nearly 130 percent of our GNP. Today it is just under 50 percent. In 1947, the national debt per person amounted to $1,900. Today it is $1,600. While we would all like to see the Federal debt reduced, our growing wealth has steadily improved our capacity to handle it, and the debt per person is substantially less today than at almost any time in the last 25 years.

I think you will find it of interest, also, that while the total debt of the Federal Government has increased by 15 percent since 1947, the aggregate debt of State and local governments has increased an astonishing 332 percent, in the total amount of $56 billion. Private business debt has increased, in this same period, by $271 billion, reflecting the tremendous expansion in all business activity. Again I must conclude that if deficit spending is the measure of fiscal irresponsibility, as most conservatives would have us believe, then the Federal Government is coming off best these days, when compared with either State and local governments, or with the private sector of the economy.

Now that we have put into somewhat better perspective some of the facts about our "welfare state," it is apparent that we are not dealing with such a monster as might first have been supposed. Most of the Federal giant's bulk is made up of muscles for our defense. He spends less of his income coddling us than he used to; he is not growing so fast as we are; and the lesser monsters at the State capital and the county seat are running us into debt faster than he is.

But he is big. Let us now ask ourselves how and why he got that way. Was it the result of some conscious conspiracy to concentrate power in Washington at the expense of the States? Was it the product of some alien doctrine? Was it really a plot for perpetuating politicians in office?

These questions seem to have some plausibility, because we tend to compare the size and scope of the Federal Government, in our time, with the limited role originally assigned to it by the Founding Fathers. We remind ourselves of Thomas Jefferson's famous admonition, "that government rules best that rules least," overlooking the fact that the standard was meant to apply to the life and times of a rural and sparsely populated Colonial America. Nor was it wholly believed even then, for had it been, the Founding Fathers would hardly have spent that hot summer of 1787 in Philadelphia. They would have had no need to draft the Federal Constitution there. The Government established by the Articles of Confederation would have been quite adequate. It would have been, in fact, ideal, for one can hardly imagine a government which did less governing.

The men who lived in colonial times could not foresee the sweeping changes the future held in store for their infant country. They could not possibly have envisioned how our lives would be transformed by stampeding science, by mammoth industry, and by the burgeoning growth and urbanization of America.

Would Adam Smith recognize our free enterprise system today, where the classical capitalism of his time has been so largely supplanted by the corporate capitalism of ours?

Would Alexander Hamilton, who believed public affairs should be handled by an educated elite, the rich and well-born, ever have thought it possible that his countrymen would come to adopt a system of socialized education, that is to say, a tax-supported universal system of free public schools?

What questions would George Washington be most apt to put to John F. Kennedy, if he could visit him today in the White House? Would he look out over the teeming city that bears his name, in and around which there are more people thickly settled than lived in all the country when he became our first President, and ask, "Why has the Government grown so large?"

I very much doubt it.

I think, rather, that he would look with wonder at the 35th President of the United States, whose jurisdiction extends from the Atlantic seaboard Washington knew, northward as far as the Arctic Circle and westward across a mighty continent and beyond as far as the mid-Pacific itself, and he would say to him, "Mr. President, how is it that our little Republic ever endured? Through all of this, what miracle has preserved a constitutional system we designed two centuries ago to meet the simple needs of 13 backwoods Colonies?

I submit that our constitutional system has survived, because it has found the means to accommodate the changing needs of the people. The Federal Government has grown up with the country, and its role has expanded in order to protect the public interest in finding satisfactory solutions for the new problems thrust upon us by a highly-industrialized payroll economy, dominated by gigantic corporations and equally gigantic labor unions, and increasingly characterized by the growing interdependence which results from congested urban life.

Today, Federal agencies regulate the rates which may be charged by railroads, trucking companies, airlines, electric and gas utilities, and telephone and telegraph companies. Others supervise the use of the airwaves to assure the orderly transmission of radio and television broadcasts. Still others see that certain drugs are not dispensed without a prescription, and that others are properly labelled, and that the public is not cheated by false advertising claims. All of these regulatory activities are connected in a certain way with our welfare; none of them presented a problem, for local, State, or National Government, when the Federal Union was first joined.

Why have we created, over a long period of time, a welfare state, at least to the extent of assigning these particular functions to the Federal Government? Isn't it because the advances of science and industry, of trade and commerce, created novel problems unknown before, which were beyond the effective reach of State or local government, and which had to be solved in some way?

Can the airwaves be usurped without any kind of regulation in the public interest? If not, can the State of Utah stop a broadcast from Denver at the State boundary line? Can the State of Texas insure that consumers of natural gas in Illinois are not overcharged? I suggest these questions answer themselves.

We in the West, living in the less developed region of our country, have especially benefited from the expanded role of the Federal Government. To speed our development, we need the advantage of investment from without, investment of both private and public capital. Outside investment of public capital must come from the Federal Government, and its role has been of crucial importance to the growth of the West.

Take, for example, the interstate highway system, now under construction to meet the projected needs of the Nation's economy. Over 90 percent of the money is furnished through the Federal Government. In Idaho, some 65 percent of the money for our secondary highways and farm-to-market roads, comes from the Federal Government. In States like ours, where there are fewer than 10 persons per square mile, if the population were evenly spread over the area across which roads must be built, Federal money is essential to the construction of a modern road system. Without it, we would still be driving in the dirt.

And the same is true of much of the reclamation that causes our deserts to bloom. The Federal Government alone had the capital necessary to finance its great reclamation projects. Private sources could not furnish it, and neither could our State governments. Today, in Idaho, the Federal Government has begun the construction of a dam which will exceed the cost of the entire State budget for the next 2 years. Yet, the dam will be a sound investment; it will nourish our regional economy, and it will pay for itself, with interest, in 50 years. The point is, had we left such dams to the States to build, we might just as well have left them to the beavers.

Don't fool yourselves. The West has profited more from Federal investment than any other section of the country. More Federal money is today being spent in Utah, on a per capita basis, than any other State in the country. Yet you send to Congress a crop of candidates who say they are against this spending. Somehow, you have managed to have your cake and eat it too.

But if Congress has been willing, over the years, to expand the role of Federal investment in the West, it has been reluctant, on the whole, to extend the range of Federal intervention in the general economy. Fifteen million people stood in breadlines, in the dark, desperate days of the great depression, before Congress at last realized that our economy had outgrown effective local control, and required sufficient national regulation to police the nation's stock exchange, to stabilize the national banks, and to protect the people against the total collapse of the nation's business. Unemployment compensation, social security, minimum wage and hour laws, were then made the instruments of reform, as we began the long climb back to recovery.

Our own history is the basis for my contention that the Federal Government has grown bigger, assuming a larger role in the life of the people, not because anyone planned it that way, not in pursuit of any conspiracy to concentrate power on the Potomac, not, indeed, because any body of doctrine required it, but simply because the country grew and changed, problems arose which existing machinery could not solve, and new ways were worked out, usually on a trial-and-error basis, to meet them. What I am saying is that we have not been doctrinaire, holding something to be good or bad as soon as some label could be affixed to it, but pragmatic, looking for the solution most apt to work, whatever it might be.

And I would say that the pragmatic method has served us well. Indeed, I would go further, and offer the judgment that it is a key source of strength and viability in the system we have evolved together for solving the problems of the 20th century.

Contrast it, if you will, to the approach to problem solving in Communist lands. It is there that dogma rules supreme. There it is supposed that one formula exists which offers the correct answer to every question; it is the fixed and final mold of a perfect society. When new problems arise, solutions are sought by searching the writings of the Communist prophets, and if one faction dislikes what another proposes, they attack it by saying that it is not in accordance with the principles of Marxist-Leninist doctrine. This straitjacket, since it leaves little room for change and adjustment, must eventually be torn asunder, by the inevitable pressures of new problems that cannot find solution within the rigid pattern of dogma handed down from an earlier, and much different, period.

This is why the best minds in the free world are confident that time is on our side in the struggle with communism, while it is the timid and the troubled among us, who seek the comfort of conformity, and want to solve all problems of the present by reciting the ritual slogans of the past, who fear that communism, being inflexible and disciplined by dogma, will soon overwhelm us.

You may accept it as the liberal view that neither the formulas of the radical left, nor those of the radical right, offer us acceptable blueprints for the future. This does not mean that we lack values, as some have rudely charged; it means only that we do not claim to be prophetic. We do not presume to know what the future holds, and so we strive, from day to day, to keep our society open and free, knowing that in this way we can continue to apply the same pragmatic test to the problems of the future, as has served us so well in the past.

This brings us to an examination of the last hobgoblin in the political spook-show version of the welfare state, with which I commenced this discourse, the familiar assertion that the huge Federal octopus is crushing our basic freedom. This question ought to be paramount in any appraisal of the larger role the Federal Government has come to play in our society.

Has the expanding activity of the Federal Government infringed upon the freedom of the individual? If by freedom one means the bundle of individual rights guaranteed to each citizen by the Federal Constitution, then there is no evidence to support the charge. The whole movement of our history has been in the direction of enlarging the bundle: slavery has been abolished, women's suffrage has been won, the many restrictions that once made voting the privilege of the propertied few, have been steadily sloughed away. The complaints I get about current decisions of the Supreme Court are not to the effect that the Court is giving too little attention to the rights of the individual, but too much.

I confess I most often hear the cry that our freedom is being lost, in some sumptuous living room or beside some sparkling private swimming pool. In this setting, it is usually a fancy way of saying, "Taxes are too high." Now, despite the fact that our free enterprise system seems to be surviving the heavy burden of taxes it carries, I agree that a tax cut would very likely stimulate our economic growth and further reduce unemployment. I wish conditions in the world were such as might permit us to cut taxes massively. But as long as external danger forces us to hold up the heavy shield of a warfare state, massive tax cuts will not occur.

Nevertheless, I must remind you that, over the past decade, the trend in Federal taxes has been moderately downward, while the trend in State and local taxes has been sharply up. In 1953, the Federal income tax was reduced 10 percent, and the rates will probably be reduced again in this session of Congress. During the same period, in my own State of Idaho, per capita taxes increased by more than 100 percent.

Still, candor obliges me to acknowledge, that neither this disposal of the question of taxes, nor the spreading scope we are giving to individual rights under the Constitution, quite suffices to remove the lingering doubt that somehow our freedom is being impaired. This is an emotion many people share. Again I suggest it may spring from traditional and historic roots.

The ideal of freedom which motivated the founders of our Republic was based upon a way of life that has long since disappeared. The social and economic order they knew and valued was founded on land ownership. They envisioned a society of freeholders, each producing on the land nearly everything he and his family needed, and consuming nearly everything produced. They conceived that the independence, industry, and self-reliance of these farmer-freeholders, supplemented by a small minority of equally independent craftsmen and artisans, would yield a maximum of freedom. In such a society, there was need for only a minimum of government, which was suspect anyway, owing to the tyranny of the King. The natural attitude was to hold government down, permit no interference with freedom of speech and religion, insure fair and orderly judicial proceedings, keep the tax collector away, and all will be well. This early concept of freedom remains very much a part of our birthright.

We westerners have nurtured an even more windswept notion of freedom, drawn from the legend and romance of the old frontier. We recall the mountain men who roamed the vastness of the West in the early days. Here indeed was freedom. The mountain man needed only his rifle and his knife, the wide, empty world to live in, and to be left alone—and he had all these things. By himself he wrested from the wilderness what he needed for food, for clothing, and for shelter. True, he knew nothing of books or finery; he was often cold and hungry; and if he got sick, he usually lived or died alone. But he was as free as the wild animals he preyed upon.

Now, the modern man, who works for wages in a factory or an office, or who tractors a big spread of land on which he grows only wheat or potatoes, is both more and less free than his mountain predecessor and the self-sufficient freeholder of the 18th century. In some ways, he is a wheel within a wheel within a wheel, pulling the same lever on an assembly line, or bearing the same leather dispatch case, full of papers, which is one of those status symbols of the organization man. He has come to need many things which his ancestors didn't even know about, and couldn't possibly have imagined. He is hemmed in by laws and regulations, and he pays taxes.

In exchange, his life is longer, fuller, and easier. He is literate, and if he avails himself of the opportunity, he may know the pleasures of good books, good music, and good drama. He has leisure time for travel and recreation, and he can readily know much about what goes on in the big world around him. If he is taken sick, there are doctors, nurses, and well-equipped hospitals to care for him. Wherever he may live, he can easily stay in touch with his parents or grandparents, children or grandchildren. And he is conscious, if he ever stops to think about it, that his fellowmen, whether they are engaged in chipping away at the malignant mysteries of cancer, or giving penicillin to the diseased children of Africa, or probing the alien darkness of outer space, are being sustained, in part, by the product of his labor.

Who is to say whether freedom has been gained or lost through the upheaval of science and industry that has so changed the character of our lives? The form of the free life known to the old frontier is disappearing, and there is no way to recapture it. Of this, I am sure. We stand upon what President Kennedy has chosen to describe as a New Frontier. It is a time of peril and of promise for the human race. Science has given us the tools to either cinderize the earth in the witchfire of nuclear war, or make of it man's footstool to the stars.

God only knows what our fate is to be. But on this earth He has left our destiny in our hands. We can best prepare for it, by facing the future, by recognizing that our welfare state, as we know it today, has been fashioned by the effort of free men to regulate their affairs in response to the needs of the changing times. Let the process continue, for it cannot be stopped. And let us pray that it will be directed, in the future as it has in the past, by unbigoted and pragmatic men, who have no fear of hobgoblins, and who are dedicated to the everlasting quest of keeping our society open and free.

DR. HOWARD R. DRIGGS

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, one of Utah's most illustrious sons, Dr. Howard R. Driggs, died recently in New York City at the ripe old age of 89, and made the long trip back to his hometown of Pleasant Grove for his final resting place.

The author of more than 50 books on western pioneer life, Dr. Driggs was clear minded and hearty up to his last years, publishing "Money Rock, a Drama of the Pony Express," in 1960.

He was a supervisor of English at the University of Utah School of Education from 1906 to 1912, and later served as English education chairman at New York University. In this post he was one of the first educators in the country to use radio in the classroom.

During all of the years he was teaching he was also writing about the part of the country which was his first love—the West. Among his best known books were "Red Feather," "Deadwood Gold," "The Pioneer Life," "The Rise of the Lone Star," and "Westward America." He also edited and produced the "American Trails" film series.

The Ogden Standard Examiner and the Salt Lake Tribune both carried brief but eloquent editorials on Dr. Driggs and his contribution to America, and I ask unanimous consent that they be printed in the Congressional Record.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Standard Examiner, Feb. 19, 1963]

HISTORIAN H. R. DRIGGS

Utah's Howard Roscoe Driggs is one man who definitely will go down in American history.

Definitely because Howard Driggs wrote many of the best histories of the western part of our Nation.

Mr. Driggs, who died Sunday at 89, was the author of 20 books of his own and coauthor of 12 more. The Pleasant Grove, Utah, native taught history and English 45 years before his retirement in 1942 as professor emeritus of English education at New York University.

When he was graduated in 1897 from the University of Utah, Howard Driggs was named "class poet." In the 66 active years that followed his graduation, he was more than a poet although his writings had the "ring" of fine poetry.

Howard Driggs in his full life contributed greatly to the understanding of the West—past, present and future.

[From the Salt Lake Tribune]

DR. HOWARD R. DRIGGS

American awareness of the role of the West in U.S. history is largely due to the work of scholars like Dr. Howard R. Driggs, who died in New York Sunday at the age of 89.

Dr. Driggs, professor emeritus of English education at New York University, devoted much of his time, especially since retirement 21 years ago, to collecting and publishing the stories of western pioneers. He wrote more than a score of books and was coauthor of a dozen. His last work was "Money Rock, a Drama of the Pony Express," which appeared in 1960.

But it was probably as president of the American Pioneer Trails and Landmarks Association that Dr. Driggs had the greatest impact in bringing the history of the West to the attention of the Nation. He edited and produced films for the association until shortly before his death, and he was widely known as a speaker on such subjects as the Utah handcart pioneers. His constant theme was that a country's true wealth is based upon the character and heritage of its people.

Many honors came to Dr. Driggs, among them election to the Western Hall of Fame. He was respected and admired as an educator, scholar, and historian. He was an outstanding citizen whose death will be mourned across the Nation. The Tribune joins in saluting the memory of this eminent son of Utah, who will be laid to rest this week at Pleasant Grove where he was born in 1873.

U.S. RESIDUAL FUEL OIL IMPORT POLICY

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, Utah and other coal-producing States of the Nation, asking only fair treatment in the marketplace and a reasonable and stable oil import policy for long-range planning, are worse off already in 1963, than last year.

On January 30, 1963, Secretary of Interior Udall announced an increase of 6.5 million barrels of imported residual oil for the remainder of the quota year. This meant an increase of 108,000 barrels daily during the months of February and March 1963. This blow, defended by the Interior Department on the basis of cold weather and unexpected decline in domestic production, had an effect on the coal industry comparable to throwing pails of water in the face of a drowning man.

Already economically sick from excessive residual oil imports, the coal-producing areas of the country had better brace themselves for a possible knockout punch. The recommendation of the

Office of Emergency Planning to relax import controls on residual oil sets the stage for the momentous decision as to the level of imports in the coming quota year beginning April 1. U.S. dollars to Venezuelan doughnuts, the decision may be the bitterest pill the coal industry ever has been obliged to swallow. The betting is on President Betancourt of Venezuela to score another victory for his country's oil economy over the economy of the coal- and oil-producing States of our country.

Utah produces about 5 million tons of bituminous coal annually, with a coal industry payroll estimated at over $10 million. The value of production of Utah coal runs to more than $30 million. The coal industry employs about 2,200 persons. Utah's railroad industry benefits from hauling coal. In 1961 the estimated railroad revenue derived from Utah coal shipments was $15,994,000.

Just think how these figures would skyrocket if the Federal Government should adopt a policy of promoting the coal industry on equal terms with atomic energy, for example, not to mention imported residual oil and the sales of interruptible gas.

Utah possesses close to 14 billion net tons of recoverable reserves of coal, assuming 50 percent recovery. Other States possess even greater volumes of reserves. The United States has sufficient coal reserves to keep our vast industrial machine going for many centuries.

However, the coal industry of Utah and other coal producing States apparently is not going to get much sympathy or help from Washington.

For some reason, which I am unable to fathom, the administration has turned its back on the American coal miner in a time of danger to the national security. The American coal miner has never let this country down in wartime or any other emergency.

One does not have to be a military expert to perceive that the present government of Venezuela is living under a continuing threat imposed by Castro. Oil wells are blown up, the power supply dynamited, and ships are hijacked by the Communists.

In time of war, and if Russia intervened, the east coast fuel supply certainly would be jeopardized.

Oblivious to the risks and perils of depending upon a foreign fuel in these days of crisis in the Caribbean, there are loud voices from New England clamoring for more and more residual oil and actually demanding an end to import quota restrictions of any kind.

I am sure that just about any major coal producing States that could be named, buys more products of New England manufacturing plants than does Venezuela. I am sure that the United States will never solve its balance-of-payments problem if it relies upon Venezuela to buy as much or more from us than we buy from her.

On February 7, 1963, 102 Members of the House of Representatives signed a letter to the President of the United States. They told the President:

> It is our firm conviction that controls on imports of residual oil must not only be retained but they must also be strengthened and made effective. The close correlation between excessive residual imports and the ability of domestic fuels and fuels transportation to meet the demands of national security is just as true now as it was when the control program was established.

I am in complete agreement with this statement, as well as the following one in the letter to the President:

> The coal, railroad, and related industries, and those millions of people dependent directly and indirectly upon them for a livelihood, urgently need assurances that the residual import control program will be retained and strengthened. There must be a certainty that reasonable controls will be in effect for a period of several years and that the program will be administered in a realistic manner. Import quotas should permit imported oil to share in the increase in the Nation's total fuel needs, but not to fill all of the increasing demand, as has been the case in recent years.

The Office of Emergency Planning report has not only alarmed the coal industry but also domestic oil producers, because the report declared that the Nation should not depend on resources within its own borders for security. They interpret this statement to mean that the report's author sees no justification for retaining import restrictions on crude petroleum and products, as well as residual oil.

I feel strongly that if the Office of Emergency Planning, Interior, and other Government agencies are unable to solve the residual oil import problem to the satisfaction of the domestic coal and oil industries, then it will be up to the Congress to do so.

The friendship of Venezuela and support of its Government against Communist pressures is greatly to be desired. I do not believe that it is necessary to wreck the economy of our coal-producing States to retain this friendship.

AFRICAN STUDENTS IN BULGARIA

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, the startling exodus of a number of African students from Bulgaria points up vividly the fact that the Communists have stumbled over their own shortcomings in wooing students from the developing nations. The students' disenchantment with conditions in Bulgaria—the racial discrimination, active segregation, and overt Communist indoctrination—demonstrates once again the imperfections of the Communist world, which has boasted so often of its racial tolerance.

Now we are faced with the very real problem of our own reaction to this situation. In a true sense, the challenge is to our own responsibility. We have been meeting it to a large degree, as the statistics point out quite clearly. Students from non-European nations presently studying in the West number well over 120,000, whereas those in the Eastern bloc countries are less than one-sixth; in number, approximately 18,000. The United States has been carrying a large share of this burden. We are taking 43,000 students of the 120,000 total; 8,277 from the Near and Middle East; 21,568 from the Far East; and 9,915 from Latin America. This is a significant share of the total. Can and will we go beyond it?

A group of young American students have reacted to the situation in a manner that must surely make us proud. The Brown University African Students Committee, comprised of David A. Lovenheim, Alan I. Brenner, Jonathan Kagan, Jeffrey Liss, and David London, has organized a drive to finance the education of at least one qualified African student who has fled from Bulgaria. These students gathered over 1,600 petitioners in support of such a move. Even more commendable is the fact that they have raised more than $3,000 by private contributions to pay the educational expenses of any student brought over. I am told that the president of Brown University, Barnaby Keeney, has responded to this student effort by pledging a dollar for dollar matching grant toward tuition costs. And I am informed that any contribution to the university for this project is eligible for matching funds on a one for two basis under the Ford Foundation challenge grant program.

Mr. Lincoln White, the State Department press officer, stated on March 1 that his department is coordinating its activities through the Institute of International Education. An official of this organization is being sent to Europe to interview these African students with a view toward determining which are eligible for admission to American universities and colleges, and which institutions have room and offer the curriculum these students are interested in. His findings may lead to the selection of students who are qualified to respond to Brown's generous offer.

Brown University in Rhode Island is the first American college to undertake such a project. The student committee, the student body as a whole, and the faculty has responded to the challenge in a spirited and positive fashion. They have set the guidelines, and they are to be much commended. I would hope that other American colleges will make this a nationwide effort so that, unlike the Communist nations, we may be judged by our sincere efforts.

HOSPITALIZATION FOR MEDAL OF HONOR RECIPIENTS

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, recently my attention was directed to the fact that there is an omission in the law relative to veterans benefits to recipients of the Medal of Honor Award.

I became aware of this omission for the first time when Mr. Gene W. Rossman, the very capable Executive Director of the Housing Authority of Portland, Oreg., wrote to inform me that an Oregon resident, Mr. Jacob Volz, who was awarded the Medal of Honor in 1911, is in urgent need of hospitalization and medical care and is without funds to defray the expenses of such care.

As soon as I learned of Mr. Volz' problem, I directed an inquiry to Administrator Gleason, of the Veterans' Administration, and asked for full information concerning the possibility of obtaining help for Mr. Volz through the facilities of the Veterans' Administration. The report I received from Mr. Gleason was most discouraging. It indicated that Mr. Volz did not incur a disability in the line of duty and that he did not receive service-connected injuries which would entitle him to receive disability compensation.

Mr. Rossman was informed of the information supplied by the Veterans' Administration, and in response he told me that Mr. Volz' case is one involving great urgency, calling for the immediate service of a doctor and hospital care. Mr. Rossman added:

> If this man is allowed to die for lack of VA medical and hospital care, it will serve as a sad commentary on the meaning of the Congressional Medal of Honor.

Because of the persuasive nature of Mr. Rossman's comments, I asked Administrator Gleason to review Mr. Volz' case and to provide me with the draft of a bill designed to provide medical and hospital assistance under the program of the VA for recipients of the Medal of Honor. The Administrator supplied a draft which I intend to introduce today in slightly amended form.

Mr. President, in my opinion it is unthinkable that a member of our Armed Forces who has performed outstanding acts of valor and who demonstrated his willingness to sacrifice his life for his country, should be deprived of medical and hospital benefits in the closing years of his life. I feel that a veteran who has thus demonstrated his love for his country should, in turn, have some help from his country when that help is needed most urgently.

Jacob Volz' valor, in the service of his country, is beyond question. His Medal of Honor certificate recites that the Medal of Honor was awarded to him "on the 13th day of December 1911, for service while attached to the U.S.S. *Pampang* during action against the Moros on the island of Basilan, Philippine Islands, on September 24, 1911. Volz was one of a shore party moving in to capture Mundang."

At my request, the Department of the Navy supplied further details concerning Jacob Volz' outstanding acts of courage. The Department stated:

> While attached to the U.S.S. *Pampang*, Volz was one of a shore party moved in to capture Mundang, on the island of Basilan, Philippine Islands, on September 24, 1911. Investigating a group of Nipa huts close to the trail, the advance scout party was suddenly taken under point blank fire and rushed by approximately 20 enemy Moros attacking from inside the huts and other concealed positions. Volz responded instantly to calls for help and, finding all members of the scout party writhing on the ground but still firing, he blazed his rifle into the outlaws with telling effect, destroying several of the Moros and assisting in the rout of the remainder. By his aggressive charging of the enemy under heavy fire and in the face of great odds, Volz contributed materially to the success of the engagement.

Jacob Volz ably displayed his courage and valor and clearly demonstrated his willingness to serve far above and beyond the call of duty. The fact that the United States was not technically at war in 1911, in my opinion, is immaterial. The important point is that Volz engaged in the kind of heroism of the same magnitude as heroic acts that are performed by our military forces in time of war.

We have an obligation to our valiant men who have received the Medal of Honor, and I believe this obligation extends to providing medical and hospital assistance when the need is clearly demonstrated. The omission in the law which precludes such assistance to Medal of Honor winners, deserves thorough review by the Congress.

Mr. President, the Library of Congress has supplied me with information concerning the number of Medal of Honor Awards that have been issued since the inception of the award. I ask unanimous consent that the table be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

	Deceased recipients	Living recipients
Department of the Navy	729	59
U.S. Marine Corps	236	51
Department of the Army	2,199	180
Department of the Air Force	4	0
U.S. Coast Guard	1	0
Total	3,169	290

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, for those who are interested in the fiscal effects of my bill, the Veterans' Administration informed me that of the 290 living recipients of the Medal of Honor only 16, including Jacob Volz, could conceivably qualify for benefits under the bill I am about to introduce. Obviously, therefore, the cost of the benefits to be conferred under the bill would be relatively minor.

Therefore, to make provisions for situations such as those in which Jacob Volz, a holder of the Medal of Honor, finds himself, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to provide the necessary corrective legislation. This bill would give to veterans holding the Medal of Honor, whether awarded in time of war or not, all of the medical, hospital, and veterans' domiciliary benefits now enjoyed by veterans who served in time of war and who are eligible for benefits under the Veterans' Benefit Act.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record at the conclusion of my remarks a letter dated July 30, 1962, addressed to me by Administrator Gleason of the VA; my letter of January 7, 1962, addressed to Mr. Gene W. Rossman; and Administrator Gleason's letter of January 24, 1963, supplying helpful comments on this case.

I also ask unanimous consent that a copy of the Medal of Honor Certificate issued to Mr. Volz on December 13, 1911, be set forth in the Record.

I also ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed at the conclusion of my remarks.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

July 30, 1962.

The Honorable Wayne Morse,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Morse: Thank you for your letter of July 19, 1962, concerning the possibility of Veterans' Administration medical benefits for Mr. Jacob Volz who holds a Congressional Medal of Honor which entitles him to pension of $100 a month.

Unfortunately for Mr. Volz, the basic law relating to the Medal of Honor makes no provision for medical benefits. As a result, since Mr. Volz has peacetime service only, one of the following requirements would have to be met before we could furnish hospitalization:

(a) He must be separated (this term includes discharge, release, or retirement) from active military, naval, or air service for a disability incurred in line of duty; or

(b) He must be in receipt of compensation, or but for the receipt of retirement pay would be entitled to receive disability compensation.

Since Mr. Volz was not discharged for disability incurred in line of duty and service connection has not been established to a compensable degree, he does not meet either requirement of the law. Therefore, under the law as it now exists, he is not entitled to medical benefits from the Veterans' Administration.

I most sincerely regret that the Veterans' Administration is unable to be of assistance to Mr. Volz at this time.

Sincerely,

J. S. Gleason, Jr.,
Administrator.

January 7, 1962.

Mr. Gene W. Rossman,
Executive Director, Portland Housing Authority, Portland, Oreg.

Dear Mr. Rossman: Many thanks for your letter of January 3 in which you commented further on the Jacob Volz case.

The executive branch of the Government, speaking through the Veterans' Administration, has taken the position that no medical benefits can be made available to Mr. Volz under the program of the Veterans' Administration. The reasons are set forth in Administrator Gleason's letter of July 30, a copy of which I forwarded to you on August 16.

In view of your suggestion that we obtain congressional action to provide Mr. Volz with the requested medical benefits, I am doing some checking to see whether such legislation would have a chance of passing the Congress. As soon as my review of this matter has been completed, I shall get in touch with you again.

With kindest regards,

Sincerely,

Wayne Morse.

Veterans' Administration,
Washington, D.C., January 24, 1963.

Hon. Wayne Morse,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Morse: Thank you for your letter of January 8, 1963, concerning medical benefits for Mr. Jacob Volz and other holders of the Medal of Honor who did not serve during a period of war as defined in laws governing our hospital and medical program.

With the recent enactment of Public Law 87–583, a veteran may be granted necessary hospital or outpatient treatment for a service-connected condition regardless of whether it arose within a period of war. Moreover, any veteran who was separated from service for disability incurred or aggravated in line of duty or who is receiving compensation for a service-connected disability, but requires hospitalization for a non-service-connected condition, may be furnished such care if Government beds are available. In addition, a veteran who has had service during one of the war periods as defined in our laws may be admitted on a bed-available basis to a Veterans' Administration facility for hospital treatment of a non-service-connected disorder if he is unable to defray the cost of private care.

Eligibility for outpatient treatment is generally limited to a service-connected condition, even as to veterans who served during a period of war. There is a special concession in the law to veterans of the Spanish-American War or the Indian wars whose disabilities are presumed to be service-connected when they apply for outpatient treatment.

We assume from the circumstances in which Mr. Volz finds himself that the chief problem is obtaining needed hospital treatment for extensive non-service-connected disabilities, rather than occasional outpatient treatment which might not present the same problem of expense to him. In compliance with your request, we are therefore enclosing a draft bill which would amend sections 610 and 624 of title 38, United States Code, to authorize needed hospitalization, if a Government bed is available, to one who holds the Medal of Honor, who is unable to defray the expense of private hospitalization, and does not qualify at present because he did not serve in a period of war as defined in VA laws. If you should desire this expanded to include a provision for outpatient treatment, we shall be glad to draft additional language to that effect.

As to my views on this matter, I can state at this time that there is strong appeal in this proposal for the benefit of an outstanding group of veterans needing extensive hospital care when they are financially unable to provide it for themselves. A very small number would be affected since we understand that the great majority of those heretofore awarded the Medal of Honor served during one of the war periods defined in title 38. However, I have some misgivings about the policy of granting this preference, even to a small and singularly worthy group, in view of the fact that many other seriously disabled and aged veterans of peacetime service would continue to be excluded.

You may be sure that if a bill of this kind is introduced and is referred for a formal report, it will be most carefully considered and our official comments submitted to the appropriate committee after clearance with the Bureau of the Budget under established procedures.

We hope that this will help you in your further consideration of this matter.

Sincerely,

J. S. GLEASON, Jr.,
Administrator.

MEDAL OF HONOR CERTIFICATE ISSUED UNDER THE PROVISIONS OF THE ACT OF CONGRESS APPROVED APRIL 27, 1916

To Whom It May Concern:

This is to certify that Jacob Volz was enlisted on the 22d day of January, 1908, to serve 4 years, and was discharged on the 18th day of March, 1912, by reason of honorable discharge while holding the rating of Cm3c; that a Medal of Honor was awarded to him on the 13th day of December 1911, for service while attached to the U.S.S. *Pampang* during action against the Moros on the island of Basilan, Philippine Islands, on 24 September 1911. Volz was one of a shore party moving in to capture Mundang; that his name was entered and recorded on the Army and Navy Medal of Honor Roll on the 31st day of March 1955, as authorized under the provisions of the act of Congress approved April 27, 1916, and that he is entitled to receive the special pension granted by that act.

Given at the Navy Department, Washington, D.C., this 31st day of March, 1955.

By authority of the Secretary of the Navy:

J. L. HOLLOWAY, Jr.,
Chief of Naval Personnel.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, it will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1046) to provide hospital, domiciliary, and medical care for non-service-connected disabilities to certain recipients of the Medal of Honor, introduced by Mr. MORSE, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That paragraph (2) of section 601 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by inserting immediately after "Indian Wars" the following: ", or any veteran awarded the Medal of Honor."

ORCHARDISTS OF THE YEAR AWARDS BANQUET AT HOOD RIVER, OREG.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, Mr. George D. Bartch, manager of the Hood River County Chamber of Commerce, has brought to my attention a news release issued by his organization concerning the annual Orchardists of the Year awards banquet recently held at Hood River, Oreg. At this banquet outstanding men and women are accorded recognition by their associates.

I ask unanimous consent that the news release containing the names of the award winners be printed at this point in my remarks. I welcome this opportunity to extend to each of the award winners my heartiest congratulations.

There being no objection, the news release was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOOD RIVER HONORS CITIZENS

Hood River had one of its most successful annual awards banquets Monday night when 350 men and women filled the Elks Temple banquet room for a full program of civic recognition.

Alan Bickford was named 1962 Orchardist of the Year. He is a member of a pioneer business and farming family.

McDon Bonta, of Cascade Locks, was awarded the Senior Citizen of the Year plaque.

Mrs. A. J. Brunquist, of Parkdale, was selected Woman of the Year.

Mr. R. B. Leavens received the Junior First Citizen honor.

The capacity crowd heard T. S. Prideaux, vice president, United States National Bank, deliver the principal address. J. E. Klahre, general manager of the Hood River Apple Growers Association, acted as toastmaster for the banquet, which is a highlight of the mid-Columbia region.

The Orchardist of the Year was introduced by Ross Hukari, agriculture director of the Hood River County Chamber of Commerce. According to Hukari, Orchardist of the Year Alan Bickford has grown to become a vital adjunct to the family organization and to the orchard industry. He has served his community through 10 years on the volunteer fire department, cub scoutmaster, irrigation district board member, county farm labor committee, county extension advisory committee, Little League baseball program, Riverside Church, valued service to the Oregon and Washington Horticulture Societies.

Numerous achievements and service to his county and to the Cascade Locks area were cited in the presentation of the senior citizen of the year by Hood River County Chamber of Commerce President Arch Tainer. Senior Citizen McDon Bonta has served his community as chairman of the local school board; scoutmaster of Cub Scouts; moderator and treasurer of his church; past commander of VFW; neighborhood commissioner, District of Columbia Boy Scouts of America; recorder for city council; PTA worker; past master of Masonic Lodge No. 117; city light manager; deputy director for civil defense; member of Hood River School Board District No. 1.

Mrs. Charles Richie, president of American Association of University Women, introduced Mrs. A. J. Brunquist as their woman of the year. She has a long history of service to her county and to the citizens of Parkdale. In 1931 she organized 4-H clubs in Parkdale and was a leader for many years. She has actively taught Red Cross courses, German lessons, home extension, and for 43 years has been a working member of her church school program. A charter member of Hood River American Association of University Women, she also served the pioneer association, garden club, historical society, United Nations Association, and the Hood River Writer's Club.

R. B. (Lefty) Leavens, Jaycee Junior Citizen of the Year, was presented by their president, Percy Jensen. Leavens has had a distinguished career during the past 5 years he has resided in Hood River County. Chief engineer for the apple growers association, he is a director of the chamber of commerce; secretary of the North Slope Ski Club; a charter member of Hood River Meadows Ski Area; secretary of the Hood River Improvement Corp.; a past vice president of the Hood River Jaycees and has traveled internationally for the jaycees; he is also a member of the Rotary club, Elks lodge, Crag Rats, the Pine Grove Methodist Church; the number of community projects he has worked on during the past 3 years are too numerous to mention. The Hood River Jaycees are proud to announce this year's winner of the Distinguished Service Award is the chief engineer of the apple growers association, Mr. Lefty Leavens.

OREGON TURKEY PRODUCTION AND FEED GRAINS

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the February 2 issue of the Oregon Journal carried an editorial regarding Oregon's turkey industry. The editorial was occasioned by the fact that although turkey production has increased by 3 percent nationally, Oregon turkey growers intend to raise 3 percent fewer turkeys in 1963 than they did in 1962. The major reason for this decline in production, as given in the editorial, is the penalty costs of feed grains.

My Senate colleagues are aware that the senior Senator from Oregon has more than once addressed himself vigorously to the Department of Agriculture in an effort to get the Department to give more equitable treatment to our northwest livestock and poultry producers. At this time he simply wishes to assure the Department of Agriculture and his colleagues that he intends to continue to do everything he can to obtain for his constituents the simple justice to which they are entitled.

The coming wheat referendum, from all indications, is going to be a touch-and-go proposition. I suggest to the Department that if feed grain legislation can be adopted before the wheat referendum, much uncertainty can perhaps be allayed. I know the wheat producers of my area have worked long and hard to get the two-price wheat program enacted. I fear that unless the administration pushes for, and is successful in achieving the passage of a feed grain bill which includes wheat as a feed grain before the wheat referendum occurs, much of the hard work will have gone down the drain, and with it might very well go permanently the two-price wheat program.

Grain producers in my section of the country, I believe, want desperately to raise wheat for food on diverted acres, but they feel that there is no assurance that the two-price wheat legislation will be of any help if noncertificate wheat is to be priced at $1.30 per bushel while effective supports on corn will be $1.07, the figures mentioned in many of the discussions to date.

I trust that the administration and the Department of Agriculture will give serious consideration to this problem, and that, as a result, they will take immediate and vigorous steps to secure feed grain legislation which will apply to the 1964 crops in the very near future.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial to which I have referred be printed at this point in the RECORD, in connection with my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LET 'EM GOBBLE OREGON GRAIN

Think of turkeys and, if you are imaginatively inclined, you think of brown and savory drumsticks, marching agreeably onto Thanksgiving tables.

Oregon people have for quite a long time been proud to make an annually increased count of the marching drumsticks. Our producers have made quite a go of the broad-breasted bronze.

Now comes the Oregon Crop and Livestock Report Service to say "Oregon turkey growers intend to raise 3 percent fewer turkeys in 1963 than in 1962."

By contrast, the Nation's turkey growers intend to raise 3 percent more than last year.

The reason for the reduction in Oregon, it seems, is not deficiency in quality, which is as high as ever, but the penalty cost of feed grains. Feed grains for Oregon flocks cost about $16 to $20 a ton more than in the Middle West and along the Atlantic coast. The differential, which represents freight costs, can present a real challenge to turkey economy.

Once Oregon turkeys were sent to the tables of the Middle West and the Atlantic coast. Now, the principal market is in and around Portland with the second-best market around Seattle. California produces most of its own holiday birds and even sends selected sizes to the shopping centers of Portland.

We hate to think of those marching Oregon drumsticks in shorter columns. Some hope can be seen in the plan for wheat marketing on which the Nation's wheat farmers will vote this year. If the grain growers approve it, the Department of Agriculture would set a lower price for feed wheat than for wheat used for human consumption. And if that feed price is favorable, it could be a boon to Oregon turkey growers and wheat farmers alike.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, under the order previously entered, I move that the Senate now stand in adjournment until tomorrow at 12 o'clock noon.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 7 o'clock and 8 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, March 8, 1963, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATION

Executive nomination received by the Senate March 7, 1963:

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

Fred Gates, of Minnesota, to be a member of the Advisory Board for the Post Office Department, vice William C. Doherty.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, MARCH 7, 1963

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rabbi Maurice Lamm, Floral Park Jewish Center, Floral Park, N.Y., offered the following prayer:

Supreme and Allwise Lawgiver: Thou who hast endowed men with the noble ambition and blessed ability to lead fellow men in the paths of right in the affairs of state, and hast inspired them to serve the people of these United States with honor:

Invest those legislators gathered here in august assembly with deep souls so that, by personal example, they may illustrate the finest and most worthy traditions of this great Republic to the end that they will lead not by pointing to high ideals but by standing for them.

Grant them great hearts so that through their kindness and care they may bring on a time of healing for the multitude of lives emptied of meaning, for the multitude of souls scarred with the weary search for peace and rest, for the multitude of hearts stabbed with the frustrations of our incredibly complex existence.

Bless them with powerful hands so that, with the practical sagacity which is their hallmark, they may unite and solidify a globe jigsawed with boundaries, separated by Iron and Bamboo Curtains, cut up into airspace, divided by latitude numbers, and fenced with radar screens.

Bestow upon these servants of the public Thy blessings, O Lord.

May the Lord grant strength unto His people.

May He bless His people with peace. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

RAPID EROSION OF OUR NATIONAL INTELLIGENCE EFFORT

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I shall ask the President, the Vice President, and the Speaker of the House to undertake to coordinate a course of action for the purpose of halting the rapid erosion of our national intelligence effort. The present situation is outrageous and intolerable.

There has been talk of an intelligence gap. There is an intelligence gap. The gap is in the intelligence of those who are daily revealing the secrets of the intelligence operations of the U.S. Government. In recent weeks there has been a great excess of talk about the procedures of our intelligence apparatus. Critics have made public statements on matters which should never be discussed in public. The administration has mistakenly allowed itself to be goaded into revealing information detrimental to our best interests.

Along with many other Americans I am tired of these demonstrations of bad judgment. Every day some high ranking intelligence officer is quoted in the newspapers on one subject or another. These are men who, from the standpoint of the general public, should neither be seen nor heard. A passion for anonymity is an integral part of their jobs. Members of both the legislative and executive branches have publicly discussed matters which should only be discussed behind closed doors. Headlines are not so precious as to warrant jeopardizing our national security.

The deterioration of secrecy in regard to our intelligence-gathering techniques began in 1960 when a U-2 plane was shot down over Russia. Neither the executive branch nor the legislative branch is blameless in revealing secrets. Both Democrats and Republicans must share the blame. The question, however, is not so much who is to blame for the past, but where do we go from here?

To be successful, intelligence activities must be secret. To let the enemy know just how many of his secrets we know and just which ones we do not know, gives him a priceless advantage. Today's headline may cost the lives of the human sources of information. The enemy can find our intelligence sources much more easily when he knows what we have found out. This knowledge helps to pinpoint the location of intelligence activities, and once knowing the location, the discovery of the means is much easier and as a result intelligence sources dry up.

Our immaturity and indiscretion in these constant disclosures is making us the laughingstock of the world. Officials in Moscow, Peiping, and Havana must applaud our stupidity in announcing publicly facts which they would gladly spend huge sums of money endeavoring to obtain. Responsibility on our part is urgently required. Let us be silent with respect to these sensitive matters.

Mr. John McCone, as Director of CIA, is charged with protection of intelligence sources. Public Law 253, 80th Congress, 1st session, states:

> *And provided further,* That the Director of Central Intelligence shall be responsible for protecting intelligence sources and methods from unauthorized disclosure.

I call on him to fully carry out the difficult and important duties of his office in this respect. A governmentwide coordination of effort is required.

The American people are interested in our intelligence activities. They are interested in all phases of the workings of their Government and their curiosities are aroused by the aura of mystery and adventure which surrounds the intelligence business. But we are not playing games. Our national survival to a great extent depends upon our knowledge of our enemies' activities. The price we pay for the luxury of public disclosure of intelligence activities is the further erosion of our capabilities in this field. It is difficult enough to obtain information from closed Communist societies. The American people, the press, and the officials of the executive and legislative branches of the Government must stop making a most difficult task more difficult.

There is room for plenty of discussion and criticism of our Government without revealing sensitive intelligence information.

COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking and Currency have until midnight Saturday to file a report on H.R. 3872, the Export-Import Bank, along with minority views.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. McMILLAN], I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the District of Columbia have until midnight Saturday, March 9, to file certain reports.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDER TO PAY TRIBUTE TO THE LIFE AND IDEALS OF ELEANOR ROOSEVELT

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I have just received permission for a special order to address the House for 2 hours on Wednesday, March 27. The purpose of this special order is to afford an opportunity to all Members of the House to pay tribute to the life and ideals of Eleanor Roosevelt, who because of her great contribution to humanity came to be known as the First Lady of the World. Since Congress was not in session at the time of her death last November, I think it is fitting that we pause to pay our respects to the memory of the beloved and revered Eleanor Roosevelt.

CONGRESS MUST RENEW PUBLIC CONFIDENCE IN CIA

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, the entire scope of this Nation's intelligence operations have come under serious discussion in recent weeks. It is true that a vital need exists for coordinating the intelligence functions of the CIA, State Department, and the Departments of the Army, Navy, and Air Force. Clearly, this need has come forth in the wake of each new phase of the current Cuban crisis.

But as responsible Americans and elected officials we must address ourselves to the responsibilities inherent in citizenship in our Nation. The proper arena for coordinating the daily classified actions of the CIA and other intelligence agencies is not on the floors of the House and Senate, but within the sanctity of a joint congressional watchdog committee composed of Members of both the House and Senate.

House Joint Resolution 211, which I introduced, proposes such a committee, as do the growing number of companion bills being introduced almost daily by Members of both the House and Senate.

The establishment of this watchdog committee would cure the ills which have resulted from poorly coordinated intelligence information, and serve a twofold purpose:

First. It would allow Congress to give regular scrutiny and constant review to our intelligence operations.

Second. It would reestablish public confidence in our Nation's intelligence community.

Support for this committee is growing as its need becomes more evident. The reasoning for congressional check on intelligence operations is clearly put forward in the very fine editorial in today's Washington Daily News.

This joint watchdog committee was recommended by the Hoover Commission, the bipartisan panel created by Congress to study ways of bringing greater efficiency to our Government. I urge all these who have not yet done so to join the movement now underway to perfect our Nation's intelligence affairs.

Whistle Up the Watchdog

> Senator KEATING, of New York, was the first to sound a warning about the Soviet buildup in Cuba. He has been the most persistent, and consistent, of those declaiming on the way the Kennedy administration has handled this hot cigar.
>
> This week the Senator was at pains, in remarks on the Senate floor, to say our intelligence services—and specifically the mysterious Central Intelligence Agency—have been "hard at work, producing accurate information."
>
> According to him, there is no "intelligence gap," as some have alleged. The gap, the Senator charged, is not in the fact-gathering but in what he called the failure of the administration to pass the facts along to the people.
>
> Coming from Senator KEATING, this applause for the CIA—about which so few know so little—is comforting. And it helps make the point that Congress should set up a "watchdog" committee to keep track of what that hush-hush Agency is doing. Its operations are secret, necessarily, but if the public can hear from men like Senator KEATING, who is a Republican, that the job is being properly done, it can feel more secure.
>
> Also, if a bipartisan committee of Congress is "in the know" with the CIA, it will be less easy for any administration to hold back facts the public should know.
>
> The CIA watchdog committee was recommended 8 years ago by a Hoover Commission task force headed by Gen. Mark W. Clark, World War II hero. It has been urged at this session of Congress by such Democrats as Senators McCARTHY, of Minnesota, and SMATHERS, of Florida, and by Congressman PAUL ROGERS, of Florida.
>
> The idea is sound, safe, urgent, necessary.

PROPOSAL FOR COMMEMORATIVE POSTAGE STAMP HONORING CUSTOMS MEN WHO LOST THEIR LIVES IN THE SERVICE

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, on August 1, 1964, the Bureau of Customs of the Treasury Department is planning to celebrate the 175th anniversary of the creation of the customs service by the First Continental Congress. The month of August 1964 will mark the culmination of 1¾ centuries of unbroken dedication to the advancement and protection of the American people by the Bureau of Customs.

It is interesting to recall that three of the first five statutes enacted by that First Congress dealt with customs matters. The first statute enacted by the First Congress provided for the time and manner of administering the oath of office for Members of the Federal Legislature, certain executive officers, and certain officials of the several States (1 Stat. 23, approved June 1, 1789). The second statute was approved on July 4, 1789, and provided for levying duties on imported merchandise. This was the first Tariff Act (1 Stat. 24). The third law imposed duties on tonnage of ships and vessels (1 Stat. 27, approved July 20, 1789). The fourth enactment established an executive department called the Department of Foreign Affairs (1 Stat. 28, approved July 27, 1789). And the fifth statute established the customs service. It was entitled "An act to regulate the collection of the duties imposed by law on the tonnage of ships or vessels, and on goods, wares, and merchandise imported into the United States" and was approved on July 31, 1789 (1 Stat. 29).

The role played by the customs service in molding the United States to its preeminent position in world history has largely been unrecognized by the principal beneficiary—the American people themselves. Since the Continental Congress established the first uniform duties, imposts, and excises throughout the United States, the customs service has systematically and indefatigably dedicated itself to our Nation's development. When our industries were just getting started, the customs laws protected them against foreign competition until they grew to the point where they are a bulwark of democracy. The customs service provided the major share of our Nation's revenue before the income tax was passed by Congress in 1916. Today, customs collections account for $1¾ billion which still represents a sizable chunk of our national revenue.

The United States has not been extravagant in the use of commemorative stamps as a means of recognition of service to our people, perhaps rightfully. However, it seems to me that our customs service, which has been doing a magnificent job in administering and enforcing our complex tariff laws, combating smuggling, assisting many other U.S. agencies in enforcing their laws and performing countless other important duties, deserves the recognition of a commemorative postage stamp to honor its surpassing performance.

Very few Americans are aware of the fact that many customs officials have sacrificed their lives in carrying out their official duties down through the years since the customs service was born. No better illustration of this exists than the memorial plaque which hangs in the office of the U.S. Commissioner of Customs in Washington. This plaque consists of 17 mounted photographs of officers who lost their lives in the service.

There was the case of Bert Ellison, a mounted inspector from San Antonio, Tex., who lost his life in 1930 while pursuing five Mexican bootleggers. Then there was John Henry Heard, of El Paso, who died from gunshot wounds inflicted in line of duty while investigating horse smuggling, and Loy C. Henry who was shot to death by a paid assassin while combating a ring of narcotics smugglers. There are others from many other States who also laid down their lives in the line of duty.

Since 1900, 42 customs officers were killed in line of duty by violators of customs laws or by accident while on duty; 49 were seriously wounded or injured by violators; 68 were seriously injured while on duty. During this period 95 smugglers are known to have been killed in gun battles with customs enforcement officers.

It seems fitting that the customs service which entails for some the most hazardous kind of duties, is deserving of recognition in the form of a commemorative postage stamp to be issued on the occasion of the 175th anniversary of the Bureau of Customs. Of course, many branches of the customs service are not hazardous under today's conditions. However, the spirit of dedication is equally strong in these, and members of these branches would sacrifice their lives if the occasion arose.

Mr. Speaker, I request permission to publish in the Record for the first time a list of the customs officers who were killed by smugglers, killed in line of duty, or who were wounded by smugglers. I have today introduced a bill authorizing the Postmaster General to issue at such time and for such period in the year 1964 as he shall deem appropriate, a special postage stamp in commemoration of the 175th anniversary of the U.S. Bureau of Customs and those employees who were killed in line of duty. I believe this would be particularly appropriate that special recognition thus be given to the forthcoming celebration:

CUSTOMS OFFICERS WHO HAVE DIED IN THE PERFORMANCE OF DUTY

Frank Chapman, Lajitas, Tex., July 21, 1908.

John S. H. Howard, Pilares, Tex., February 10, 1913.

Joseph R. Sitter, Valentine, Tex., May 24, 1915.

Fred Tate, Brownsville, Tex., August 11, 1918.

Robert S. Rumsey, Laredo, Tex., August 19, 1922.

Gunther J. Jones, Mercedes, Tex., October 1, 1922.

James A. Wallen, Rio, Tex., March 6, 1923.

Orville Preuster, Niagara Falls, N.Y., March 1, 1925.

E. B. Webb, Colchester, Vt., March 10, 1926.

John W. Parrott, El Paso, Tex., December 30, 1926.

Gerardo Pescara, San Juan, Puerto Rico, January 17, 1927.

Stephen S. Dawson, El Paso, Tex., February 27, 1928.

Thomas S. Morriss, Fabens, Tex., December 23, 1928.

C. N. Titcomb, Perch Point, Mich., January 15, 1929.

Arthur M. Beaman, Detroit, Mich., July 23, 1929.

Charles W. Rogers, Vero Beach, Fla., September 24, 1929.

R. J. Sandlands, Detroit, Mich., July 3, 1930.

Bert Ellison, San Antonio, Tex., August 9, 1930.

John L. Kelly, New Orleans, La., February 9, 1931.

L. E. Babcock, Lake Champlain, N.Y., August 17, 1931.

Arnold W. Gilbert, St. Albans, Vt., November 2, 1931.

Clyde M. Bristow, Tucson, Ariz., January 2, 1932.

Daniel A. Romberger, Dania Beach, Fla., April 25, 1932.

John Henry Heard, El Paso, Tex., May 2, 1932.

Herff A. Carnes, Ysleta, Tex., December 2, 1932.

Ralph E. Bowden, El Paso, Tex., March 19, 1932.

R. C. Nichols, El Paso, Tex., November 24, 1933.

Earl Brown, Fort Pierce, Fla., February, 1933.

Loy C. Henry, San Antonio, Tex., June 20, 1934.

Herbert O. Plasman, Bridgeton, N.J., April 12, 1935.

Wilson Bourland, Terlingua, Tex., October 13, 1935.

Matthew Kononen, San Francisco, Calif., March 5, 1939.

Joseph T. Brown, Sebastian, Tex., April 2, 1940.

Vernon E. Thompson, Limestone, Maine, February 1, 1943.

George E. Spencer, Rio Grande River, Tex., February 24, 1945.

John E. Fasset, Blaine, Wash., February 21, 1945.

Anthony Cozza, Blaine, Wash., February 24, 1945.

Clarence Trask, Washington Camp, Ariz., April 8, 1947.

Benjamin B. Stone, Brownsville, Tex., October 7, 1957.

John Sellenthin, New York, N.Y., September 2, 1962.

George M. Bacon, Norfolk, Va., February 4, 1955.

THE TWO-PRICE COTTON PROGRAM

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include a resolution adopted by the General Assembly of North Carolina.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, on numerous occasions I have called to the attention of the House the critical situation existing in the American textile industry by reason of excessive textile imports and the inequity existing in our two-price cotton program.

I was very pleased, therefore, when the General Assembly of North Carolina adopted a resolution on March 5, 1963, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to take immediate action to eliminate the inequity existing in the two-price cotton program. The members of the North Carolina General Assembly are to be commended on taking a very forthright and sound position in regard to this extremely important matter.

Over 200,000 North Carolinians owe their livelihood to the textile industry. One out of every two manufacturing employees in the State of North Carolina works in a textile mill. The future of the textile industry is vital to our State, and indeed to every State in our Union. The producers of cotton and the manufacturers of cotton in our country have an inseparable interest in an overall healthy cotton economy.

If our cotton economy is to continue to enjoy its vital role in the economic life of our Nation the Congress must take action as quickly as circumstances will permit to remove the advantage enjoyed by foreign textile manufacturers in the purchase of American cotton. The House Agriculture Committee has legislation under consideration on the subject. It is my hope that it will be possible for us to secure enactment of a sound cotton bill without undue delay.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include the resolution adopted by the North Carolina General Assembly on March 5, 1963, in the Record at this point as a part of my remarks:

HOUSE RESOLUTION 16

Joint resolution memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to take immediate action to eliminate the inequity of the two-price system of cotton cost

Whereas on September 6, 1962, the President of the United States, following the

Tariff Commission's rejection of the Department of Agriculture's recommendation for an import fee of 8½ cents a pound on the raw cotton content of textile imports to offset the difference between the price of raw American cotton to foreign mills and the price which American mills are required to pay for the same cotton, stated the following:

"Thus, the inequity of the two-price system of cotton costs remains as a unique burden upon the American textile industry, for which solution must be found in the near future.

"I am, therefore, requesting the Department of Agriculture to give immediate attention to the formulation of a domestic program that would eliminate this inequity. I am also instructing all other departments and offices of the executive branch to cooperate fully to this end. Such a program will undoubtedly require enabling legislation"; and

Whereas in his farm message of January 31, 1963, the President stated, a healthy, growing cotton industry is vital to the strength and prosperity of our Nation. Over a million persons are engaged in producing our cotton crop. Another million and a half are employed in converting the raw cotton into consumer items. Additional millions supply goods and services to this industry. Cotton exports contribute significantly to our balance-of-payments position.

"Our cotton industry—both producers and mills—is confronted with many problems which it alone cannot resolve. Because domestic prices are much higher than those of foreign producers, our cotton mills must pay substantially more for cotton than their offshore competitors. Domestic cotton textile products are being displaced not only by substitute fibers in consumer products but also by increased cotton imports. Cotton exports are sharply lower.

"Loss of markets for U.S. cotton increases surplus stocks held by the CCC, causes higher and higher Government costs, and reduces the cotton farmer's income"; and

Whereas the textile industry in North Carolina is and has been the backbone of the economy of our State, directly employing 219,000 persons or nearly 1 out of every 2 manufacturing employees in the State; and

Whereas many additional thousands of North Carolinians are employed in supplying services and goods to the textile industry and hundreds of thousands more are dependent on it for a livelihood; and

Whereas imports of foreign cotton textiles have reached an alltime high and are increasing at an alarming rate; and

Whereas these imports of foreign cotton textiles and the unjust inequity of the two-price system for cotton have created a situation that seriously threatens the entire economy of our State and Nation and are responsible for the loss of hundreds of thousands of textile jobs, curtailment of the hours worked in the textile industry, and the closing of many textile plants; and

Whereas it is acknowledged that the welfare of all North Carolinians is vitally independent on a healthy, growing textile industry: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the house of representatives (the senate concurring):

SECTION 1. That the North Carolina General Assembly implores the President and the Congress of the United States to take whatever steps are necessary to make American cotton available to American purchasers at the same price American cotton is made available to foreign purchasers.

SEC. 2. That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the President of the United States; the Secretaries of Agriculture, Commerce, State, Labor, and Treasury; and the North Carolina congressional delegation.

SEC. 3. That this resolution shall be in full force and effect from and after its ratification.

In the general assembly read three times and ratified, this the 5th day of March 1963.

T. CLARENCE STONE,
President of the Senate.
H. CLIFTON BLUE,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.
Examined and found correct:
DAN L. DRUMMOND,
(For committee).

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the general subcommittee of the Committee on Education and Labor be permitted to sit during general debate this afternoon.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

A JOB STILL TO BE DONE

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, the President's message on civil rights was a compelling and forceful presentation relative to this most basic national problem. The address was at once both encouraging in its factual description of recent progress toward securing equal rights for all American citizens, and sobering in its realistic assessment of the progress which must still be made.

The President has outlined major gains in the civil rights area through active and intensive efforts of both Government and private groups. More progress has been made in the continuing struggle to achieve equal opportunity for all people regardless of race, creed or national origin in the last 2 years than in any comparable period in our national history since the passage of the 13th, 14th, and 15th amendments to the Constitution of the United States. Unquestionably the Executive is wholly committed in both word and deed to the venerable principle of equal opportunities for each individual, free from invidious and arbitrary distinctions. Concrete achievements have become quite evident in education, employment and transportation as a result of such conviction.

Once having recognized the forward strides in the field of civil rights, a more critical analysis is needed. Based upon the day-to-day administration and execution of civil rights legislation, and substantial deficiencies in the laws have been recognized, and thus in his message the President has recommended the passage of several items of legislation essential to the securing of constitutional rights and opportunities demanded by moral imperatives.

The message has placed greatest emphasis upon the right to vote. It is through the free and equal exercise of this right that the gains so demanded in other areas can be achieved, but this right has been frustrated by delay and arbitrary use of discretion by election officials. The legislation recommended by the President is directed at eliminating these abuses.

The President has further proposed the enactment of legislation to financially assist educational districts engaged in the process of desegregation, to extend the life of the Civil Rights Commission for 4 years, and to make that Commission a clearinghouse for technical information and advice to requesting agencies. The enactment of these proposals will represent substantial increments to existing civil rights legislation.

In his conclusion, the President made it abundantly clear that his proposals do not constitute a final answer to the problem of racial discrimination in this country. He added:

> Other measures directed toward these same goals will be favorably commented on and supported, as they have in the past—and they will be signed, if enacted into law.

While I wholeheartedly applaud the President's message, I was nevertheless disappointed that he did not mention specifically the Federal Equal Employment Opportunity Act, which I introduced (H.R. 405) to prohibit discrimination in employment because of race, religion, color, national origin, ancestry, or age. To fulfill its purpose, the bill proposes to establish a commission to enforce fair employment practices. Indiscriminatory employment practices are as much a part of American values concerning liberty and equality of opportunity as are equal access to public facilities and integrated schools. Passage of such legislation is a necessary and vital adjunct to a program for obtaining full civil rights for all our people.

The goal will be only partially attained should we obtain universally uniform voting rights, free and equally accessible education, and integration of all public facilities—only to discover that qualified persons are being restricted in opportunities for employment due to irrational and obstinate policies of discrimination. This is a most fundamental problem. If not solved, it will result in economically established segregation when all other vestiges of prejudicial discrimination disappear. Educated, trained, and skilled members of minorities are rejected from their rightful place in the labor force, and are justifiably bitter. Unskilled members of these same groups are placed below similarly untrained white workers, and suffer first and most extensively from unemployment. Here again I would like to quote from the President's stirring message:

> Race discrimination hampers our economic growth by preventing the maximum development and utilization of our manpower. It hampers our world leadership by contradicting at home the message we preach abroad. It mars the atmosphere of a united and classless society in which this Nation rose to greatness. It increases the costs of public welfare, crime, delinquency, and disorder. Above all, it is wrong.

I would like here to note my pleasure at the colloquy between several members of the minority party relating to civil rights. The President, I am sure, will be equally pleased inasmuch as he urged bipartisan support for his civil rights program. Noting this support, I urge that we now get along with the task of enacting meaningful civil-rights legislation under the aegis of bipartisanship.

Progress is being made by a conscientious and energetic Federal administration, and by extraordinarily courageous and dedicated individuals and private groups. More is needed. In accordance with declared congressional policy and American principles of justice, it is incumbent upon this body to enact into law legislation along the foregoing lines.

ARMS CONTROL AND DISARMAMENT AGENCY

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced a bill today to amend the Arms Control and Disarmament Act to eliminate the ceiling upon amounts that may be appropriated for the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency. Section 49 of the Arms Control and Disarmament Act (75 Stat. 639) now provides that the total appropriations for the Agency is not to exceed $10 million.

Mr. Speaker, the search for disarmament with effective international controls is the most important endeavor of this Government and, indeed, of mankind. We are at a stage in history in which nations are capable of destroying civilization as we know it. The recent Cuban crisis brought home this fact. In his eloquent address to the United Nations on September 25, 1961, President Kennedy warned the world:

> Every man, woman and child lives under a nuclear sword of Damocles, hanging by the slenderest of threads, capable of being cut at any moment by accident or miscalculation or by madness. The weapons of war must be abolished before they abolish us.

The Agency charged with the responsibility for disarmament should not be hamstrung by an arbitrary limit upon its appropriations. Under the present law the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency cannot receive more than $10 million during the life of the Agency. The Congress appropriated $1.8 million to the Agency for fiscal year 1962. For fiscal year 1963 we appropriated $6.5 million for the Agency. Out of the total appropriation of $10 million allowed under the act, the Congress has already appropriated $8.3 million, which leaves a $1.7 million for all future efforts. Unless the law is amended, the situation will be intolerable. Compare the more than $50 billion we spend for defense in a single fiscal year with $1.8 million remaining under present law for the future life of the Disarmament Agency. The budget for fiscal year 1964 calls for $15 million for the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency. This will require a change in the law.

I urge all my colleagues to support this measure and hope that it will receive favorable consideration in the very near future.

U.N. SPECIAL FUND AIDING RED YUGOSLAVIA

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include certain tables.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, in continuation of my remarks to this House about United Nations aid to Communists, which Americans are subsidizing, I want to say that I am heartened by the developments in New York City yesterday afternoon. As you know, the United States has served notice on the United Nations that we now will pay only our assessed share of future peacekeeping operations—and nothing more—unless other countries meet their part of the costs.

It is high time the United States got around to taking this stand. In light of what our investigation has shown to be the situation with regard to U.N. aid to Cuba and other Communist nations, I sincerely hope that yesterday's "cracking down" by our delegation to the United Nations is only the first step in a complete reappraisal of American aid to the world body.

Now, back on my investigation topic and concerning the United Nations Special Fund, I wish to point out to our colleagues two little-known projects which the Special Fund supports in Communist Yugoslavia.

As we in this House now realize all too well, this is the United Nations fund which is financed 40 percent by the contributions of American taxpayers. And, this is the fund which leads the way for the U.N.'s aid that has involved American taxpayers in the contradictory position of paying to strengthen our enemies.

My colleagues will remember that in recent weeks I have advised the House of Special Fund aid for nuclear research in this same Yugoslavia, of Special Fund aid in the field of aviation for Red Cuba, and of Special Fund and other U.N. aid to Poland and to Cuba in a number of other fields ranging from building of "fishing boats" to development of social security system and of Communist teaching techniques.

Today I turn from the sad state of the enslaved peoples of Cuba to a nation much nearer to the center of the Communist menace and deeply committed as a satellite of that bury-the-Americans ideology.

Let us talk, then, about Yugoslavia where there are two projects receiving U.S.-subsidized United Nations aid:

1. YUGOSLAVIA—LAND RECLAMATION PROJECT

The Special Fund now is conducting a 4-year project entitled "Pilot Land Reclamation," which is costing the Special Fund a total of $1,037,100. Forty percent of that—the American subsidy—is $414,840.

This project was started just last May 1962, and has as its purpose, according to the U.N.:

> To establish an experimental farm and to undertake land reclamation investigations in order to determine the technical and economic feasibility of land utilization in the area of the Lower Neretva Basin.

The Food and Agriculture Organization—FAO—of the U.N. is administering the project. It may be that many Americans will recall that the FAO also is concerned with that $1.2 million agricultural project in Cuba.

I find upon investigation that the Neretva, a river in the southwest of Yugoslavia, runs into the Adriatic Sea in an area where it is estimated that 70,000 hectares of land could be reclaimed. To quote the U.N.:

> The government considers that the lower Neretva plain is particularly suitable for experimental and demonstration work in land reclamation * * * the area has a good climate, promising soils, good markets, and an industrious population.

May I ask my colleagues to mentally underline that phrase "The government considers." Nobody has asked what the American taxpayer considers. We have not been consulted even 40 percent's worth.

The Yugoslav view is continued, in a restricted U.N. Special Fund pamphlet, to the effect that the real, long-range goal for the Neretva River is a large-scale program of flood control, drainage and irrigation. No doubt the Special Fund expects to be asked to help pay for that big job just as soon as the Special Fund-financed land study proves flood control feasible. I hope they do not call in our U.S. Department of the Army Corps of Engineers.

We are told the preliminary study consists of:

> A series of investigations in two selected polders, one on saline land and one on peaty soils.

The investigations are being conducted in the fields of water control, drainage, irrigation, reclamation, soil analysis, agronomy and farm economics.

The Special Fund is providing a total of 21½ man-years of expert services, 6 man-years of fellowships, plus equipment and vehicles. All of this coming from the nearly bankrupt United Nations—if the United States keeps bailing it out financially—and going to strengthen a Communist nation.

Besides, Mr. Speaker, by what logic have we come to the place where we reclaim land and raise food for the enemy bellies any army travels on?

2. YUGOSLAVIA—TRAINING OF VOCATIONAL INSTRUCTIONS

The second Yugoslav project which I wish to discuss today involves a Special Fund contribution of $905,000 and is entitled "Training of Vocational Instructors." It began in January 1960, and apparently is not so important as the preceding project since this one is discussed in a Special Fund document classified only for limited distribution.

Or maybe limited is worse than restricted. Only the United Nations knows for sure—certainly not our taxpayers.

Anyhow, this project is being administered by the International Labor Organization—ILO. And I hope they are doing as well on this one as they are on that project I discussed here recently on setting up social security for Cubans.

The 4-year project is designed, the U.N. says: "to establish training institutes for instructors in vocational schools."

We are told in the Special Fund document that the Yugoslav Government is seeking to place greater emphasis on training of both those already employed and those who are entering industry for the first time.

Let us keep in mind that it is the Red Yugoslav Government who wants to increase its industry and its communistic national strength—not the nonconsulted Americans who are subsidizing the project while suffering increasing percentages of uemployment.

I find that the ILO has had, in the past 6 years, a program under which a large number of Yugoslav foremen have been sent abroad as worker-trainees in foreign factories. That fits in well with the Communist design involving the exporting of the Red ideology.

And, once again, we are told that—

> The Government has decided that, in order to increase the facilities for vocational training, a network of vocational training schools should be established.

How nice that the Government of Yugoslavia can decide that. Could we expect them to decide otherwise? And, who asked the opinion of those Americans who hold 40 percent of the Special Fund stock in this venture?

Nobody, that is who.

This project plans specifically for setting up of a centrally located school and of several functional institutes for the training of instructors. The functional institutes are for metal, building, wood, commerce, and agriculture. U.N. experts are provided for them.

The training institute for metal workers is for instructors in electric welding, lathe operation, shaping machine operation, fitting, moulding, and electromechanics. Equipment cost is $230,000.

The training institute for the building industry is for masons, concrete workers, operators of building construction equipment, carpenters, painters, plumbers, and electricians. Equipment cost is $70,000.

The training institute for the wood industry would be for foresters, loggers, sawmill workers and cabinetmakers. Equipment cost is $75,000.

There also would be an agriculture training institute for instructors in farm machine maintenance and tractor driving. Equipment cost is figured at $45,000.

One of the most interesting projects of all is for a commercial institute for instructors to train retail salesmen. It would be attached to the Yugoslav Federation of Chambers of Commerce and supplied with equipment costing $40,000.

So, here we Americans are, placed in the position of supporting the chamber of commerce activities of a communistic nation. Activities which, I suppose, involve promotion of the benefits of the Red ideology and the joys of living in their nation. As a former president of the Missouri State Chamber of Commerce I stand aghast at this simplemindedness with which American taxpayers are being saddled.

I wonder if the CCC proposal we hear talk about today in Washington means "Communist Chamber of Commerce?"

Mr. Speaker, I have asked unanimous consent to include in the RECORD tables detailing these Yugoslav special fund projects. I only wish that this could be the last of my talks here about this fund. Unfortunately, we still must deal with the U.N. aid going to Communist Poland. I will address myself to that topic in coming days.

Financial provisions, Yugoslav project

PILOT LAND RECLAMATION

It has been estimated that the total special fund allocation will be $1,037,100 over 4 years, as follows:

	Total cost (in U.S. dollars)	Phasing of expenditure			
		1st year	2d year	3d year	4th year
Experts	[1] $385,000	$96,200	$96,200	$96,300	$96,300
Fellowships	30,000	15,000	15,000		
Equipment	540,000	300,000	240,000		
Miscellaneous	23,100	5,800	5,800	5,800	5,700
Total project cost	978,100	417,000	357,000	102,100	102,000
Executing agency overhead cost	59,000				
Total special fund allocation	1,037,100				

[1] Gross cost, representing 21 man-years and 6 man-months.

TRAINING OF VOCATIONAL INSTRUCTORS

The total cost to the special fund would be $905,000. This would be spent as follows:

	Experts	Fellowships	Equipment	Total
1st year	$60,000			$60,000
2d year	120,000	$50,000	$500,000	670,000
3d year	70,000	100,000		170,000
4th year	5,000			5,000
Total	255,000	150,000	500,000	905,000

RESTRICTING COMPETITION ON BIDS

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous material.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I brought to the attention of my colleagues a most serious and wasteful purchasing practice of our Defense Department—a sole source method that is disguised to appear competitive. The case I bring to you today is identical to that of yesterday, only this time it came to my attention in a different manner.

A reputable manufacturing firm called me yesterday, stating its desire to bid competitively on the manufacture of the USM–116 multimeter, whch in simple terms is a voltage tester. This item is listed for competitive purchase, but a wall has been built around it that restricts the bidding to one firm. This wall is called a QPL—Qualified Products List. To bid on the equipment you must be on the list. To be on the list you must make a model. To make a model you must have the drawings, but this firm was told no drawings are available. As I said yesterday you cannot get from here to there. Only one firm has the plans and is on the QPL list—the firm that had a prior sole-source and development contract.

Upon contacting the contract negotiator for this procurement, Mr. Griffith Jones, Naval Purchasing Office—telephone: Oxford 6–3768—I was told the same story as the manufacturer—no drawings available. This simply did not make sense to me. As in the past I was not willing to take no for an answer. I proceeded to contact higher authorities, in this instance, Capt. J. A. Scott, assistant to the Chief of the Office of Naval Material. Less than 10 minutes after I contacted Captain Scott, the company I refer to here today was told over the telephone that plans and specifications were available for their use.

Who told the company? Raymond Usilton, engineer—telephone: Oxford 6–2010—the same engineer I spoke of here yesterday. While the contract negotiator, Jones, who gets his technical information from Usilton, had been telling people that no drawings were available, Usilton suddenly discovered there were.

This method of operation makes it almost impossible to bring competition into this sort of procurement. It is most certainly not conducive to providing our Nation with the best defense at a reasonable cost. State and municipal governments could not operate this way, and this method explains the high cost of defense.

This purchase I speak of today is for 3,592 of these multimeters. The last time they were bought, it was a sole-source deal and the unit price was $300, so it is easy to see this is a million-dollar matter. The Navy should be ordered to issue drawings to any responsible industry, and real competition should be induced in this purchase.

Mr. Speaker, the Defense budget can be cut, and materially so, and at the same time we can have greater security through the force of competition on government contracts and development.

As this matter developed yesterday, Mr. Charles Nicodemus, a reporter for The Chicago Daily News, was in my office. Here is his account of the matter:

Washington.—The Pentagon has promised to "straighten out" a Navy civilian official whom Representative Earl Wilson says he caught trying to restrict competition on a pending, $1 million electronics contract.

Wilson, Repubilcan of Indiana, quoted Capt. J. A. Scott, special assistant to the chief of the Office of Naval Material, as saying:

"This man [the civilian official] made a mistake. He's a relatively new employee. He's being straightened out."

Wilson said the official, a contract officer named Griffith Jones, told the Washington agent for an Indiana firm that there are no manufacturing drawings available for an electronics item on which the firm wants to bid—making a competitive bid impossible.

The Indiana Republican said that when the firm sought his help, and his aid double-checked with Jones, the contracting officer again insisted no drawings of the equipment existed.

A veteran critic of waste and abuses in defense buying, Wilson said he knew this was untrue. For a quick check with his sources in the electronics industry had shown that the Navy had bought the same equipment for the first time last April from a Cleveland firm and had routinely required the contractor to provide drawings.

Wilson, who has learned from experience where to complain of Navy procurement abuses, said he immediately contacted Captain Scott, explained the problem and demanded an explanation. Scott said he would check.

Wilson disclosed that 10 minutes later, the agent for the Indiana firm, Model Engineering Co. of Huntington, was informed by telephone by a Navy engineer named Ray Usilton that drawings existed and were indeed available. Wilson said Usilton works with Jones.

Scott then called back a half hour later, Wilson said, and gave him the statement about getting Jones "straightened out."

Wilson suggested, however, that "the facts in this case indicate that we need to fire some people in Navy procurement—not just straighten them out."

Wilson said that under the supervision of Jones and Usilton, the Navy had set up a requirement that anyone wanting to bid on the equipment must first build a model and submit it to the Navy for approval. Firms winning approval were to go on a "Qualified Products List" of manufacturers who would be permitted to bid.

"But of course, Jones was telling people there were no drawings available," Wilson said. "That meant no one could get on the qualified products list except the Cleveland firm that had done the first production and still has copies of the drawings."

On the April contract, a sole-source (noncompetitive) award, Wilson said the Navy paid $300 each for the equipment—a "multimeter" used to test voltage and current in other electronic devices.

Under the procurement now planned, records show the Navy will buy up to 3,592 of the units.

"This means that a neat, $1 million contract—which the Navy tries to say is 'competitive'—actually was being channeled to a favored past producer," Wilson declared, "instead of being put out in the open, so that competition would bring the price down."

On Wednesday, Wilson disclosed that the same engineer who is handling the multimeter contract—Usilton—had successfully recommended the same type of restriction on availability of drawings for another procurement now underway, for purchase of 927 oscilloscopes.

WHY IS REGIONAL OFFICE OF INTERNAL REVENUE DEPARTMENT BEING TRANSFERRED FROM NEW YORK TO BOSTON?

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include a letter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, the Commissioner of Internal Revenue has just announced that the regional office in New York is being closed down and its functions transferred to the regional office in Boston, Mass. This is being done, it is said, as part of a reduction in number from nine to seven of the regional offices in the United States. I am all for streamlining the Federal bureaucracy, but why Boston over New York? If there is to be one regional office it should be located in New York City. The tax collections in New York are 2 to 3 times the volume of collections of all the New England States put together. The U.S. Tax Court schedules 15 calendars in New York to every 1 in Boston.

Mr. Speaker, it becomes increasingly clear that an offensive political slogan, "I Can Do More for Massachusetts," is being translated into U.S. Government policy.

The city of New York and my own congressional district will be prejudiced by this move. We can ill afford to lose employment to another area for political reasons, to say nothing of the inconvenience caused our citizens and our commerce and trade.

I urge the Secretary of the Treasury to reconsider.

Mr. Speaker, I am introducing in the Congressional Record at this point the letter that I received from the Commissioner of Internal Revenue which gives no reason whatsoever for the selection of Boston over New York:

March 5, 1963.

Dear Congressman: About noon today, Secretary Dillon will announce publicly a series of changes he has authorized me to make in Internal Revenue Service field offices. I believe these changes will be of interest to you so I am taking this means of giving you advance information on them.

The changes we are announcing will result in total savings of over $5 million annually, when they are fully implemented. Taxpayers will not be disadvantaged in any way by these changes; they will continue to receive all of the services they now receive. The changes are mainly in behind-the-scenes activities.

In response to President Kennedy's call upon all Federal agenices to achieve "lean, fit" organizations, I have recommended, and the Secretary has authorized me to make, the following changes in the field office structure of the Service.

I. DISTRICT OFFICE CHANGES

A. Reduction of overhead in 12 small districts:

Since the 1951–52 reorganization, our basic operating unit has been the district offices. As we have 1 in each State, and more than 1 in some of the more populous States, district offices range in size from Anchorage with 94,000 tax returns and 65 employees, to the Manhattan district with 3.8 million tax returns and 2,800 employees.

Despite these disparities in size, the basic organization structure of all districts has been fairly uniform. For example, there is a chief of audit in each district. Yet in Manhattan the chief supervises 1,400 employees; while the chief in Anchorage supervises 26 employees. Consequently, the ratio of overhead personnel to frontline enforcement personnel has been much higher in the small districts.

On the basis of a recent study, however, we concluded that we can eliminate many "overhead" positions in our 12 smallest districts, simply by modifying their organizational structure. What we plan to do in these districts is eliminate most of the managerial positions under the district director by having the nearest large district provide the necessary technical staff support and perform the other processing and support activities.

Taxpayers will continue to file their returns with the district director in these districts, and will continue to receive all of the services they now receive.

The districts involved are listed in attachment No. 1.

B. Merger of four multi-State districts:

Our studies have also demonstrated that existing workload does not justify having 62 separate district offices in the 50 States. Therefore, operations of four district offices located in States with more than one district will be merged with those of nearby districts in the same State. Large field offices will be maintained, however, in cities affected by this change, and taxpayers will continue to receive substantially all the local service they now have.

The districts involved are also listed in attachment No. 1.

II. REGIONAL CHANGES

This modification in district structure makes it possible for us to operate effectively with seven regional offices, instead of the present nine.

The regional offices to be eliminated are those now located in Omaha and New York City. The resulting regional boundaries and headquarters cities are shown in attachment No. 2.

Since most parts of our regional offices have very little contact with taxpayers, these regional realinements will not affect taxpayers significantly. The only parts of the regional office that do have substantial contacts with taxpayers are the Appellate and Chief Counsel field offices, and we will continue to render these services in those present locations.

III. SERVICE CENTER CHANGES

As you probably know, the Internal Revenue Service is now installing an automatic data processing system that will permit us to use electronic machines to perform the millions of record-handling operations involved in the maintenance of taxpayer accounts, the issuance of bills and refunds, the matching of information documents and the many other data processing activities we must conduct.

Since we need one ADP center in each region to perform this work, our decision to reduce from nine regions to seven means that we will need only seven centers instead of the nine we had planned.

IV. IMPLEMENTING THE CHANGES

Most of these changes will be put into effect gradually and the timing probably will vary from one district to another according to local circumstances.

While most taxpayers probably will not even be aware of these changes, those of your constituents who are employed by us, will be very much aware of them and some of those affected may very well write to you about them. If they do, you can assure them, as we are, that we will try to reduce the adverse impact on them as much as we can. We feel obligated to do this since most of the officials and employees whose positions will be eliminated or transferred as a result of the changes are people who have been with us for a long time, who have risen to their present positions by doing their work well, and who have experience and skill that the IRS does not want to lose.

Fortunately, because the changes will be put into effect gradually, we expect to be able to handle most of the cutbacks by attrition and transfers. However, in many of the affected districts, attrition is slow and many of the employees are both too young to retire and unwilling to move for personal reasons. Consequently, we cannot promise that no one will be hurt. We do promise, however, that we will try to minimize the hardships to our employees in every way that we properly can.

In summary, we believe that these changes will save the taxpayers substantial amounts of money, without diminishing in any way the services they are now receiving. At the same time, they enable us to take a significant step toward the President's goal of a "lean, fit, and efficient Federal establishment."

Sincerely,

MORTIMER M. CAPLIN,
Commissioner.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute for the purpose of inquiring as to the legislative program for the balance of this week and next week since a number of Members have been making inquiry of me, and if the majority leader could announce the program at this time, it would be very helpful.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ALBERT. In response to the inquiry of the distinguished minority leader, I would advise that we have no further legislative business for this week.

The legislative program for next week is as follows:

Monday is District Day. There are nine bills which I am not able to enumerate just at this moment, but which will be printed in the RECORD. They will be as follows:

H.R. 39, District of Columbia Armory Board appointment.

H.R. 682, deeds of trust, new trustees.

H.R. 1933, registration of nurses.

H.R. 1935, authorization, Metropolitan Police dogs.

H.R. 1937, Life Insurance Act.

H.R. 1982, Traffic Act, collision of vehicles.

H.R. 2485, prevention and control; communicable and preventable diseases.

H.R. 2696, municipal court, small claims.

H.R. 3537, municipal court, change of title.

These bills may not necessarily be called in the order listed.

Also on Monday, the bill H.R. 2438 will be taken up. That is a bill to extend the universal military training and service act. I am advised by the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, the gentleman from Georgia, that he will ask for a rollcall vote on final passage on that bill on Monday.

On Tuesday, H.R. 2440, authorization of aircraft missiles and naval vessels, Armed Forces. I have also been advised by the gentleman from Georgia that he will ask for a rollcall vote on the passage of that bill.

Also on Tuesday, the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER], chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, has advised me that he will ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 4374, conferring honorary citizenship on Sir Winston Churchill. There may be a rollcall vote on that day.

Wednesday and the balance of the week: The program will be announced later.

I make this announcement, of course, subject to the usual reservation that any further program may be announced later.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY, MARCH 11

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that we have completed the legislative business of the week, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS DISPENSED WITH

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that business in order under the Calendar Wednesday rule may be dispensed with on Wednesday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

INDIVIDUAL INCOME TAX RATE AND RATE STRUCTURE

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, all Members of the House are concerned about the steadily increasing income tax, and the killing of incentive in the upper brackets. I call the attention of my colleagues to a statement made before the Ways and Means Committee this morning by Prof. William H. Peterson, of New York University. His statement is entitled "Individual Income Tax Rate and Rate Structure." I call it to the attention of my colleagues for their interest.

The statement referred to follows:

INDIVIDUAL INCOME TAX RATE AND RATE STRUCTURE

My name is William H. Peterson and I am an associate professor of economics at New York University's Graduate School of Business Administration.

My concern in the President's tax proposals is broad, for I believe they touch upon practically every aspect of national economic growth and individual well-being. For the purposes of this statement, however, I wish to look at but one phase of the President's tax plans—namely, the remaining steepness in individual income tax rate progression (from 14 to 65 percent of taxable income) under the proposed administration program when it would become fully effective in calendar year 1965. And I wish to show how this steepness, especially when linked to the proposed 5 percent rule on itemized deductions, affords virtually no tax relief to the middle and little to the upper brackets. I regard the middle and upper brackets as prime sources of America's capital formation and hence of economic growth.

In this statement I seek to make but three points: First, to demonstrate the nonscientific and antieconomic growth deficiencies of rate progression in general. Second, to show how the President's tax proposals reflect these deficiencies and are hence self-defeating of their stated goal of economic growth. And third, to give support to maximum correction at this time of the deficiencies of graduation.

I stress economic growth, taking a cue from the President's tax message to Congress on January 24, 1963, in which he said that our present tax system is "the largest single barrier to full employment of our manpower and resources and to a higher rate of economic growth." And I stress the need for flattening the rate structure to the maximum extent possible, taking another cue from the President, this time from his television address of August 13, 1962, in which he said that our tax rates "are so high as to weaken the very essence of the progress of a free society—the incentive for additional return for additional effort."

The first point to be considered is the lack of scientific evidence in support of the theory of graduation—a point recognized by many but, admittedly, by no means all economists. Yet scientific evidence appears to be lacking on presumptions of equality of sacrifice, ability to pay, benefits conferred, economic stabilization, economic equalitarianism, and Federal revenue needs.

The unscientific nature or even sheer caprice of graduated rates and income brackets over time or at any one time is amply seen in the history of the income tax since passage of the 16th amendment in 1913. Originally the rate on highest incomes was but 7 percent. In 1929 the top rate was but 24 percent. But out of the social turbulence of the thirties emerged a top rate of 79 percent. World War II brought an upper rate of 94 percent, and it is virtually at this rate under which we live today, with the 50-percent level reached at but $16,000 of taxable income for the unmarried individual.

So the Federal income tax rate structure in its relatively brief life of 50 years has grown like Topsy, subject to no end of whim and pressure, producing rates which Dan Throop Smith, former special assistant to the Secretary of the Treasury in charge of tax policy, has said "are not only repressive but appear to be excessive by almost all ethical standards except those based on extremes of equalitarianism."[1] Smith's raising of the question of ethics is indeed a pertinent question. For does not graduation constitute discrimination against a minority? And was not this the fear that impelled the Founding Fathers to incorporate in article I, section 9, of the Constitution the restriction that no direct tax should be levied by the Federal Government "unless in proportion to the census"? I believe the use of the word "proportion" in the foregoing constitutional phrase is of significance. Proportionality is nondiscriminatory. It recognizes ability to pay. It recognizes equality before the law. It gives no vent to envy and vindictiveness, to—to use a blunter phrase—"soaking the rich."

Surely the history of Federal graduation attests to the wisdom of Scottish economist John Ramsay McCulloch who noted:[2]

"The moment you abandon * * * the cardinal principle of exacting from all individuals the same proportion of their income or their property, you are at sea without rudder or compass, and there is no amount of injustice or folly you may not commit. In such matters the maxim of obsta principiis should be firmly adhered to by every prudent and honest statesman. Graduation is not an evil to be paltered with. Adopt it and you will effectually paralyze industry and check accumulation, at the same time that every man who has any property will hasten, by carrying it out of the country, to protect it from confiscation. The savages described by Montesquieu, who to get at the fruit cut down the tree, are about as good financiers as the advocates of this sort of taxes."

The McCulloch observation seems to be based upon sound economic logic. No proponent of graduation has ever been able to prove just how much faster, if at all, ability to pay is supposed to increase than income. No demonstrably scientific method appears to be used to determine the height of the graduated scale or the brackets of income covered. At best the graduated rate structure becomes the result of rule of thumb, arbitrary conjecture, and conflicting pressures of different groups and organizations. Contrast this makeshift and complex result with the simplicity of proportionality, seen, for example, in the Judaeo-Christian practice of tithing, with the tithe at 10 percent, varying proportionately with a man's income and with good times and bad.

Frequently it is argued that apart from ethical and scientific considerations, the Government has budgeting needs that can only be satisfied by rate progression. Dan Throop Smith has noted that progression beyond 50 percent of taxable income yields the Treasury only about $1 billion, or about enough to run the Government for 4 days.[3]

Indeed, it is arguable that rates beyond 50 percent, and likely much less, do not in fact yield long-term revenue but reduce it because of their inhibiting effect on incentives to produce and invest.

Incentive is the thing. It accounts for enterprise and ingenuity. It is the secret of American prosperity. And yet we seem to be killing off this tremendous force for social good for a relative pittance in terms of Federal revenue. For it has been well established that all the graduation—the 71 percentage points above the bottom personal rate of 20 percent—yields but 15 percent while the bottom rate yields 85 percent of the personal income tax revenue. This means that a flat 20 percent rate on all taxable income would still yield 85 percent of the present personal tax revenue, even assuming no increase in income as a result of rate reductions. This assumption, however, is not tenable because of the effect of released incentives on production and investment, and of released funds presently consumed by taxation that could otherwise be used for capital formation.

Thus the logic or illogic of rate graduation strongly suggests that a reduction from present rate levels is more likely to increase revenue than to reduce it. As Geoffrey H. Moore of the National Bureau of Economic Research noted in the "American Economic Review," high tax rates have "no doubt operated to reduce income before taxes in the upper income groups."[4] Simon Kuznets of Harvard University reached much the same conclusion in his 1953 study,[5] "Shares of Upper Income Groups in Income and Savings," observing that, among other things, the top 5 percent has incurred a marked decline in its share of total income. Further, the top 1 percent of the population received 13 percent of the total income in 1919–38; in 1947–48, however, the top 1 percent received 8½ percent of total income. The contrast is even more striking in terms of average income. To wit: the per capita income of the top 1 percent in 1913 was some 20 times greater than the per capita income of the lower 99 percent, but in 1948 it was but 10 times as great.[6]

Let me stress that steep progression has meant more than mere redistribution of income; it has meant, I am convinced, reduction of income—the national income. In other words, not only reduced income for the rich and hence reduced capital formation, but reduced income thereby for the poor—for everybody.

So it would appear that we have somehow managed to hamper financially and psychologically the most productive, inventive, talented, and venturesome members of our society. We have also forced many of these doers, builders, and job creators to divert much of their energy and talent to ways and means of outwitting the tax collector, to cut back on their output, or to quit work entirely. As the late Summer Slichter, of Harvard University remarked in 1942: "The tax history of the United States in recent years has been fairly sensational. A visitor from Mars would suspect that a Communist fifth columnist was writing the laws for the purpose of making private enterprise unworkable."

To be sure, Federal revenue needs are vast but this fact should not blind us to the diminishing rate of revenue return on high graduated rates, or to the necessity for not succumbing to the elastic ethic that the end justifies the means. For clearly there are different means to the same end of achieving the Government's revenue needs. Let us consider one of these means—a flat rate.

Economist Milton Friedman of the University of Chicago demonstrates that a flat rate of 23.5 percent on taxable income as presently reported, defined, and with presently allowable deductions would produce as much revenue as the current highly progressive rate structure of 20 to 91 percent. Indeed, argues Dr. Friedman, this flat rate would yield a greater revenue for three important reasons: less tax avoidance, meaning less incentive to adopt legal but costly schemes to reduce the amount of reported taxable income; less tax evasion, that is less incentive to fail to report income that legally should be reported; and less disincentives to production and investment and hence to greater national income and Federal revenue.[7]

Another argument put forth in defense of rate graduation is the argument of the welfare school of economics employing the theory of diminishing personal utility of added increments of money, which in turn is used to buttress the equal sacrifice theory of rate progression. This theory leads to a Robin Hood frame of mind among prominent economists on both sides of the Atlantic. Hence, says Prof. A. C. Pigou, of Cambridge University: "It is evident that any transference of income from a relatively rich man to a relatively poor man of similar temperament, since it enables more intense wants to be satisfied at the expense of less intense wants, must increase the aggregate sum of satisfactions."[8] And Prof. Abba P. Lerner, of Michigan State University, states: "The probable value of total satisfactions is maximized by dividing income evenly."[9]

But the plausibility of this kind of economic thinking leaves much to be desired. It is not at all demonstrable that the satisfactions of different people can be measured through a common denominator. Each individual is a unique entity with varying emotions and values—emotions and values which change with time and with changes in income. Nor is it demonstrable that the marginal utility of an additional increment of $1,000 to A, whose annual income is at the $30,000 level, is less than the marginal utility of a similar increment to B, whose annual income is at the $5,000 level. Of course, we could ask A and B how each would react to an additional $1,000. It's quite possible that A would insist that his individual satisfactions would be more fully maximized by the increment than B's satisfactions. B might insist that he got the most satisfaction at the margin. Who can be sure that A is wrong and B is right? Certainly there is nothing in such a mere opinion-culling method that would provide scientific evidence. Interpersonal utility comparisons simply cannot be measured scientifically.

Furthermore, the theory of diminishing utility of income tends to blur into a theory of equalization or semiequalization of income, or, more bluntly, a redistribution of income.

But redistribution assumes a standard of distributive justice different from the standards of our market economy. It assumes that the market knows least and Government knows best. But what is our market economy but the American people, constantly and voluntarily adjusting the incomes of each and every one of us, financially rewarding those who produce more and financially penalizing those who produce less? This democratic market system, this incentive system, is precisely the means by which, I am convinced, we have become the richest and freest people in all the world.

Even the Russians seem to be catching on to this incentive idea—deviating sharply from the Marxist-Leninist concept of from each according to his ability and to each according to his need—for a recent issue of Voprosy Ekonomiki, official periodical of the Soviet Institute of Economics, disowns "petty bourgeois egalitarianism" and explains in an article:[10]

---

[1] Proceedings, 1963, National Tax Association, p. 541.

[2] John Ramsay McCulloch, "Taxation and the Funding System," (1845), quoted by Walter J. Blum and Harry Kalven, Jr., in "The Uneasy Case for Progressive Taxation" (Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 1953), pp. 45–46.

[3] Morgan Guaranty Survey, July 1960.

[4] Geoffrey H. Moore, "Secular Changes in the Distribution of Income," "American Economic Review," May 1952, p. 542.

[5] National Bureau of Economic Research, New York, 1953, pp. xxxv, xxxvi, 619, 635.

[6] Moore, op. cit., p. 581.

[7] "Capitalism and Freedom" (University of Chicago Press, 1962), p. 175.

[8] A. C. Pigou, Economics of Welfare, 4th ed., Macmillan, New York, 1948, p. 89.

[9] Abba C. Lerner, The Economics of Control, 3d ed., Macmillan, New York, 1947, p. 32.

[10] First National City Bank of New York Monthly Letter, December 1959.

"The many years of experience in the organization of social labor under socialism have shown that equalitarianism is incompatible with the interests of the development of socialist production. In order to create the abundance of products the principle of personal material incentives to all personnel is of major significance. * * * It is necessary to give industrial and institutional management the right to raise the salaries of persons showing maximum initiative, capacity, and conscientousness. At the same time, it is necessary to improve the system of bonuses to managerial, engineering, technical, and office personnel."

So much for my first point on graduation; now for my second and third points on the administration's proposed graduation in particular and on what I believe to be an improvement on the administration's approach.

To be sure, the administration program gives the appearance of meeting some of the objections to graduation by offering a lower top rate. The rub is, however, that the top rate of 65 percent is still the culmination of 23 as yet steeply progressive steps which afford little or no relief to the middle brackets, that the administration tax program seeks primarily to stimulate consumption through a magical multiplier, which presumably will expand total demand by an amount several times greater than the amount of the tax cut.

It is clear that the administration, because of alleged industrial overcapacity, is not seeking to directly stimulate investment—the very investment which is the taproot of economic growth.

The trouble with the administration emphasis on consumption is that, coupled to deficit finance as it is, it raises the danger of further inflation and of a worsening in our already precarious international balance of payments situation. Another trouble with the deficit financed-consumption emphasis is that it employs in effect the rather illusory addition of money income as the stimulus to the economy as opposed to the addition of real income, which would be the upshot of an increase in the capital formation rate—that is, in the rate of investment.

I believe the Herlong-Baker bill is the only fiscally feasible and responsible alternative to our present income tax structure. It stresses investment, whereas the administration stresses current consumption. In sharp contrast to the administration's program, it would reform the present steep schedule of rate graduation while—over a longer period of time—providing substantially as much tax relief as the administration at the lower income levels. The Herlong-Baker bill provides a top rate of 42 percent as contrasted with a top of 65 percent in the administration program. But the gap of 23 percentage points between the two bills in no way tells the full story, inasmuch as the Herlong-Baker bill has but mild progression in the income brackets between its top and bottom rates, and does not carry the administration feature of the 5-percent rule on deductions. The absence of this rule plus the lower scale in Herlong-Baker means that the upper and especially the middle brackets get a better tax break than they do in the administration program and thus have a better chance to apply their demonstrated resources and capabilities toward expanding the national product, toward accelerating economic growth, toward creating more jobs.

The proof of this statement lies in a comparison of the rate structure in the two approaches. The slope which the two curves of rate progression would have is significant. The administration would put even more tax pressure, relatively, on the middle-income brackets than under present tax legislation, while Herlong-Baker would ease it. Under our present graduated taxes, the midpoint of graduation (56 percent) is reached at the $20,000 income level for the single individual, while it requires another $180,000 of income to reach the maximum 91-percent rate. Under the 14- to 65-percent range of the administration program, the new midpoint of graduation (40 percent) in its scale would be reached in the bracket beginning at $16,000; thus half of the climb in rates is reached at a lower point. Under Herlong-Baker's 15- to 42-percent spread the midpoint (29 percent) is reached at $38,000.

Again, under the administration's proposed rate structure, 77 percent of the revenue would come from the bottom rate of 14 percent on taxable income and 23 percent would come from graduation. Herlong-Baker, on the other hand, would provide only 7 percent from graduation and 93 percent from the 15-percent bottom rate. Herlong-Baker, then, promises the greatest capital formation rate.

Capital formation is, clearly the road to growth. There is, practically speaking, no other way. The more capital, the more economic growth. The sluggish American economy is deficient mainly on the score of inadequate capital formation. Our gross capital formation rate is one of the lowest among the industrialized countries of the world. We apply but 16 percent of our gross national product to gross capital formation. By contrast, according to Central Intelligence Agency estimates, Western Europe shows the following rates in 1960: West Germany 24 percent, Austria 24 percent, Italy 22 percent, France 18 percent, and Belgium 18 percent. The CIA has also reported that 30 percent of the U.S.S.R. gross national product goes into gross capital formation. The rate for Japan in 1960 was 31 percent.

And the U.S. capital formation situation seems to be getting worse. Economist Simon Kuznets pointed out in his National Bureau of Economic Research study, "Capital in the American Economy," published in December 1961, that net capital formation as a percentage of gross national product has been falling for a long time. The fall has been from 14.6 percent of GNP in the period 1869–88 to 7 percent of gross national product in 1946–55, measured in constant prices. It follows that the saving rate has similarly fallen off. Ironically, as the rate of saving has been falling, the rate of technological advance has been apparently rising, with the result being a relative shortage of capital and the shelving of many fruitful investment projects—projects which could create jobs and more of the good things of life at less cost for more people. As Dr. Kuznets observed, the persistent bottleneck in the exploitation of new technical knowledge has been the scarcity of capital funds. And noting the U.S. population boom upon us, especially of new entrants into the labor force and of new family makers, he writes: "The demand for capital over the coming two and a half or three decades is likely to be large."[11]

To be sure, there are economists who hold that consumption and not direct capital investment is the right road to growth. Their argument seems to be mainly one of overcapacity (euphemistically, "economic slack")—overcapacity in railroads, textiles, steel, coal, lead, zinc, paper, timber, and so on. It should be noted that overcapacity statistics are generally deficient, as the joint congressional committee's subcommittee on economic statistics held in its report last year on measures of productive capacity. The subcommittee's distinction between engineering capacity and economic capacity is significant.

So I believe the administration's stress on overcapacity misses the point. For the real point is not simply overcapacity, but the nature and causes of excess capacity—the composition of capacity, the relative age and efficiency of plant and equipment, and the cost structure, including wages, of output. Overcapacity, in short, seems to be a function of price and of cost. If cost and price are excessively high—that is, high in the mind of the purchaser or the consumer—there will be but a partial sale or perhaps no sale at all.

Why, for example, do we have overcapacity in cotton, wheat, and virtually all other price-supported farm products? Because the price is propped beyond the interest of many buyers who shift to substitute sources abroad or to substitute products. Were the price to come down, the long-term trend would show that, I think, inefficient high-cost producers would shift to more remunerative ventures, the quantity demanded would expand, production would advance, overcapacity would decline, and the farmer, the taxpayer, and the consumer would be much happier for it.

Basically, then, overcapacity is a matter of inefficiency. Much of our overcapacity stems from marginal, high-cost, obsolescent plant and equipment. To an extent, but not by any means to a great enough extent, the new equipment tax credit and the Treasury's accelerated depreciation schedules ameliorate this situation. More should be done on this score.

Much of our overcapacity also stems from obsolete work practices and excessive union bargaining power which raise the unit cost of production and lessen effective demand. This latter problem, I know, is not a direct legislative concern of this committee; nonetheless, inasmuch as tax reform and tax cuts have been made the fulcrum of economic growth, I believe, it would be a mistake to assign to tax measures, however important, the full burden of economic growth.

In sum, Herlong-Baker is a fiscally sound corrective of the present unsound tax structure.

UNESCO BOOKLET

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, on February 13 the newspapers of this country reported that UNESCO, United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization, had issued a booklet which held the Soviet Union as a nation of free people.

The United Press International and the Chicago Tribune reported as follows:

> A United Nations body, whose largest financial support is given by the U.S. Government, has published a booklet denouncing "colonialist oppression" by Western nations and describing the Soviet Union as a "brotherhood of free and equal peoples," it was learned today.
>
> It was the Communist Party which showed the peoples of Russia the true way to free themselves from social and national oppression, the booklet asserted.

This intrigued me, so I wrote to Mr. Adlai Stevenson, Ambassador to the United Nations, on February 14, 1963, and asked him to provide me with a copy of the booklet. This morning I received a letter from the Ambassador to the United Nations and I would like to read to you the first sentence:

> I wish I could oblige you with a copy of the UNESCO booklet entitled "Equality of

---

[11] National Bureau of Economic Research, New York, 1961, pp. 391 and 459.

Rights Between Races and Nationalities in the U.S.S.R.," but, alas, I have not been able to lay hold of one myself.

Mr. Speaker, I would still like to get my hands on a copy and if worst comes to worst I shall be constrained to ask the distinguished Speaker of the House, the distinguished majority leader, and the distinguished minority leader to lend me a hand to help get a copy of this Communist propaganda booklet which has been published and is being circulated throughout the world with American taxpayers footing a substantial part of the bill.

REMAGEN BRIDGE ANNIVERSARY

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. Hechler] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Speaker, on March 7, 1945—18 years ago—a small band of courageous American armored infantry, tankers, and armored engineers came upon a railroad bridge over the Rhine River at the little resort town of Remagen, Germany.

In the face of determined German efforts to blow up the structure, the heroic American troops stormed across the Remagen Bridge under fire and thus captured the first crossing of the Rhine River in World War II.

This great feat resulted in the saving of thousands of American lives, and materially shortened the war.

Augsburg, Germany.—Sfc. Joseph A. DeLisio, the bantam rooster infantryman who won the U.S. second highest award for valor, the Distinguished Service Cross, for his part in capturing the Remagen Bridge during World War II, is looking for the two Germans who were his enemies in March of 1945.

The Bronx, N.Y., career soldier, now serving as a weapons squad leader with the 24th Infantry Division's 2d Battle Group, 2d Infantry, in Germany, wants to shake hands with former German Army Capts. Willi Bratge and Karl Freisenhahn.

"I want to have a reunion," says the sergeant, "right there at Remagen on March 7 of this year, 17 years after my outfit secured and held the only bridgehead on the Rhine River."

But Sergeant De Lisio doesn't know how to reach the two Germans who opposed his platoon of Company A, 27th Armored Infantry Battalion in 1945.

"I got the names out of a book of Ken Hechler," adds De Lisio, "and he says that in 1954 Mr. Bratge was a schoolteacher in a small town near East Germany."

The other former German Army captain identified in the book, "The Bridge at Remagen," Karl Freisenhahn was last placed in Koblenz where he supervised an athletic club.

According to former Army Historian Hechler, the Germans would look forward to a reunion at the site of the Remagen Bridge. In his book he quotes Captain Bratge as saying that "we can use a reunion as a symbol to express and demonstrate the friendship between America and Germany today, and also our human friendships as individuals."

"If we could only meet and shake hands," added the captain, "at the very point where we shed our blood in 1945, I believe it would emphasize our feeling of good will, one toward another."

Sergeant De Lisio and the other Americans who were decorated for the Remagen Bridge crossing are held in high esteem by at least one other of their former enemies.

Captain Friesenhahn, when told by author Ken Hechler that the group had been decorated with the Nation's second highest award, said in 1954:

"They deserved them—and then some. They saw us trying to blow that bridge, and by all odds it should have blown up while they were crossing it. In my mind, they were the greatest heroes in the whole war."

So Taro Leaf soldier Joseph De Lisio wants a reunion. And if there is anyone who knows where ex-German Army Capts. Karl Friesenhahn and Willi Bratge are today they might get the word down to the 24th Infantry Division.

And then perhaps the sergeant and the two ex-captains can shake hands by the stone pilings on the Rhine that are all that remains of the bridge at Remagen.

Sergeant DeLisio Locates Former Enemies; Remagen Bridgehead Reunion Scheduled for March 7

Augsburg.—Sfc. Joseph A. DeLisio, the 24th Infantry Division's Remagen bridgehead veteran, will be at Remagen on the Rhine on March 7. His search for the German soldiers who opposed him 17 years ago with death dealing fire is over.

Through the combined efforts of German and American newspapers the defenders of the bridge were finally discovered.

Former German Army Capt. Willi Bratge who has exchanged his military title for the more peaceful one of "Lehrer," teacher, has contacted the Bronx, N.Y., Victory Division weapons squad leader.

And in a letter from the town of Remagen itself, a former German Army sergeant, Gerhard Rothe, writes "I was a member of the Bridge Security Company as a master sergeant and served there until March 7, 1945."

"And this day I was wounded," continues the former German sergeant, "and was perhaps the last soldier to cross the bridge before you took it. Doing so my thoughts were likely similar to yours, as the bridge was supposed to be destroyed already at this time."

Herr Rothe, now owner of a hotel in Remagen, has invited Sergeant DeLisio and other participants in the reunion to be his guests.

Both Rothe and Bratge have confirmed that former German Army Capt. Karl Friesenhahn, another of the defenders of the Remagen Bridge died several years ago.

Sergeant DeLisio, on duty with the 24th Division's 2d Battle Group, 19th Infantry, first planned this reunion at the pilings which are the only remnants of the strategic World War II route, after reading a book written by West Virginia's Congressman, Mr. Ken Hechler.

It was Congressman Hechler's authoritative "The Bridge at Remagen," written on facts garnered as a World War II Army historian, and subsequent visits to Remagen, that sparked DeLisio's reunion idea.

Author Hechler noted in his book that Captain Bratge said, "If we could only meet and shake hands at the very point where we shed our blood in 1945, I believe it would emphasize our feeling of good will, one toward another."

DeLisio was one of 13 men who received Distinguished Service Crosses, the United States second highest award for valor, for their part in the Remagen Bridge crossing.

The late Captain Freisenhahn, when told by Author Hechler in 1954 that the group had been decorated said:

"They deserved them * * * and then some. They saw us trying to blow that bridge, by all odds it should have been blown up while they were crossing it. In my mind, they were the greatest heroes in the whole war."

Former President Eisenhower commenting on the exploits of the World War II GI's at Remagen said:

"It wasn't the biggest battle of all times, but it represents the dash, ingenuity, and readiness to seize opportunity that characterizes the American soldier."

Former Enemies Shake Hands at Remagen Bridge Reunion

Remagen, March 7, 1962.—This town's historic bridge site was the scene today of a reunion between a 24th Infantry Division soldier and three German veterans of World War II.

Sgt. Joseph A. DeLisio and former Capt. Willi Bratge and former Sgts. Gerhard Rothe and Jakob Kleebach were reunited in ceremonies commemorating the 17th anniversary of the unexpected capture of Remagen Bridge by American forces.

On March 7, 1945, Sergeant DeLisio, then a member of the 9th Armored Division, earned this Nation's second highest award for valor, the Distinguished Service Cross, when he singlehandedly captured a German machinegun crew that had pinned down the American advance over the bridge.

REMINISCED

Speaking at the Central Hotel owned by Gerhard Rothe, the four men described their feelings on the same date 17 years before. "I came to the top of a bluff overlooking the Rhine and I saw the bridge below me. The sight was so beautiful that for that moment I forgot about the war," Sergeant DeLisio remembers.

In the wake of the American advance, Rothe lay on the bridge wounded attempting to crawl his way back to the German side. Misunderstanding the American order to halt, he was shot at and wounded a second time after having crawled more than 100 feet. "I thought that I was going to be killed," Rothe recalls. "I'm afraid we all had the same thought," DeLisio added, "we were thinking about living."

BRATGE

Bratge, in charge of the Remagen defense, surrendered to the Americans when explosives failed to topple the only bridge left over the Rhine. Seizing the advantage, enough American troops and equipment poured over the bridge to shorten the war by 6 months. The weakened structure collapsed 10 days later of its own accord, and Bratge, an American prisoner, learned that the German high command had put a sentence of death on his head for surrendering the vital structure.

Following the meeting at the hotel, the party moved to the bridge site where Sergeant DeLisio, with a mixture of joy and sadness, presented the German veterans with mementoes of the reunion "signifying that one-time enemies can be joined together in a common bond of peace."

SPEECH

In an emotional speech describing the last 17 years, Bratge concluded, "A bridge of steel and iron has collapsed, now let the bridge of friendship last forever."

The reunion, covered extensively by major German and American press, was arranged for by the 24th Infantry Division Public Information Office at the request of Sergeant DeLisio. "It exceeded anything I had hoped for," DeLisio said.

THE TEXTILE INDUSTRY OF THE SOUTH AND THE TWO-PRICE COTTON SYSTEM

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. HEMPHILL] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to again discuss a problem which is an increasingly serious problem in this Nation having to do with the textile industry, involving what we call the two-price cotton system which the President has called a system of inequity.

Today I have met the situation as I see it head on. I have introduced two pieces of legislation. One of these pieces of legislation would do away entirely with the 8½-cent subsidy presently enjoyed by foreigners who purchase our cotton.

I would like to say here that I have no objection to any of the programs which have been proposed by the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture, whom I admire, or any of those members of the Committee on Agriculture who not long ago paid us the great honor of visiting North and South Carolina to look into the textile industry and the two-price cotton situation in fact and in reality. I admire what they did, and I thank them for coming.

May I say also I will support any legislation that committee reports out which is of a curative nature, insofar as the two-price cotton system is concerned.

But the problem has to be met head on. As we know now, not only are our textile mills and their ability to produce affected, but we are getting into a transition period from the use of cotton fibers to manmade fibers to the degree that if this trend is to continue, and it will continue unless the two-price cotton system is done away with, it is my prediction the cotton farmers of this Nation will soon reach the place where they do not have an adequate domestic market for the cotton they produce.

Mr. Speaker, I have also introduced another bill which is a piece of legislation stemming from the failure of the Tariff Commission to act when we had the section 22 hearing on the import fee which the Department of Agriculture, under the direction of the President, had promoted. The Commission failed to honor the necessities of the domestic textile industry by imposing an import fee. As we prepared this particular piece of legislation, the thought occurred to me we ought to have these pieces of legislation in the alternative. I say in the alternative or any substitute that will get rid of the two-price cotton system, either by some equalization in the form of an import fee or, better still, do away with the system entirely. I prefer the latter.

Let me commend the gentleman from North Carolina who has read into the RECORD a very timely resolution of the North Carolina General Assembly.

The gentleman is with us today although he had an important delegation meeting. I am sure the textile people of his district and mine know that he is always with us in meeting this problem.

Mr. Speaker, I might call to the attention of the Members of the House the fact that the situation has become so serious that one of the banks in my district put into its show window a bale of cotton and there appeared in the newspaper this particular headline: "Lint Inequity Fight Spreads to Camden as Banks Join In."

Of course, Camden is located in South Carolina and is a very lovely town in my congressional district.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to include in my remarks at this time the story of that particular effort on the part of the business community to alert the people to the growing inequity and the growing harm of the two-price cotton system.

The article referred to follows:

TWO-PRICE COTTON—LINT INEQUITY FIGHT SPREADS TO CAMDEN AS BANKS JOIN IN

Camden's two banks have now entered the flurry over two-price cotton.

Citizens & Southern National Bank and South Carolina National Bank are displaying cotton bales in their lobbies with signs tacked to them that call attention to the fact that foreign mills pay $42.50 less per bale for U.S.-produced cotton than our local mills.

The bale-in-the-bank idea is spreading throughout the Southeast, and Pierce Cantey, of South Carolina National Bank, and Hugh Chapman, of Citizens & Southern National Bank, are in hopes that all banks of the two statewide chains will follow Camden's lead in this State and help tell the textile industry's plight.

It is believed that the cotton bale display originated with Swift Spinning Mills and the Fourth National Bank at Columbus, Ga. Two North Carolina banks picked up the idea and it has since spread throughout the Tar Heel State.

"Seventy percent of the industrial economy of South Carolina depends on the textile industry, and we feel this inequity in price should be of great concern to every one of our citizens," said Citizens & Southern National Bank Vice President Hugh Chapman.

"Actually both Senators OLIN D. JOHNSTON and STROM THURMOND, and Congressman ROBERT HEMPHILL are foursquare behind the textile industry and the National Cotton Council in this fight, but we feel that if the general public knew the situation, and would write these officials en masse, it would strengthened their hand with the administration," Mr. Chapman said.

Mr. Speaker, on this bale of cotton in large figures is the price that the American manufacturers, the domestic users, pay for a bale of cotton. That price is approximately $182.50. On this particular bale the price that the foreign purchaser pays is approximately $140, a differential of $42.50.

In the photograph which, of course, cannot be included in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I find this question: "Is this fair to you?"

I am asking the Congress of the United States, and I think I should sound forth for my district—I am asking the Nation—is it fair to anyone dependent upon the textile industry as a source of income and as a source of livelihood? Is it fair? Of course not. It is not fair.

I say to the Members of the House that 1 million American textile people depend upon this industry. I say to you also that these people who are buying this cotton in foreign nations do not pay 1 cent of tax to support this Government, its ambitions or its defense, or the way of life that you and I enjoy under this great Government in a great and free land.

Something has to be done about it. Only this morning I was down at the Department of Agriculture attending a meeting at which many of us had opposed the plan of the Department of Agriculture to change the method which the Commodity Credit Corporation presently practices in the storage of cotton where it is convenient to the farmer and convenient to the purchaser on a local level. This change, of course, would cost a lot of money. But I might say also that looming in the background at that meeting I could not help but sense the fact that unless something is done about this two-price cotton system I do not believe the Congress in the future will support an agricultural program with such inequities included.

I believe, if my experience here has taught me anything, and my observation has been, that agricultural programs are becoming less and less popular just because of situations like this which we can no longer justify. It is not only unfair; it is not right. It represents an imposition on the American cotton producer and upon the textile mills themselves.

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HEMPHILL. I am always happy to yield to my distinguished friend, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. WHITENER]. I had hoped he would be here and am pleased that he did so notwithstanding an important meeting of his delegation.

Mr. WHITENER. I came back from the very important meeting because I knew the gentleman would make a very excellent contribution today, as the gentleman always does on this problem.

Mr. Speaker, I think what the gentleman is saying about agricultural legislation and its future possibilities in the Congress is certainly sound. When I look in our own section of the country—which is a heavy textile as well as agricultural area—and see for the first time a side-taking operation going on between agriculture and industry, I think this indicates the seriousness of the situation confronting agricultural legislation in the future.

I might say to the gentleman that just last Saturday night I had a discussion with a high-ranking official in the Department of Agriculture along this line. While I have a great affection for the gentleman with whom I was speaking on Saturday night, I must say that I was quite shocked to find that one in such high place in the Department of

Agriculture could be so totally disoriented to the true facts with reference to the cotton agricultural economy and its relationship to the textile industry in America the main source of sales of American-grown cotton.

As the gentleman well knows the General Assembly of North Carolina on March 5 passed a resolution on this subject imploring the Congress and the President of the United States to take immediate and positive action to eliminate the inequitable situation confronting every living soul who makes his living in the textile industry by reason of this two-price cotton situation. This was a timely plea from the general assembly of my State. I was delighted that they had taken this action.

There are many who think that we are talking about this matter to entertain ourselves. There are many who take the position that it is a political issue. And since I have not called the name of this agricultural official with whom I was talking Saturday night I must say to the gentleman that I was utterly amazed at the statement he made during the course of my conversation with him when he said:

> You know, there were not but two counties west of Raleigh that went Democratic in North Carolina on the national level.

I immediately asked him the question:

> What does that have to do with the issue? Are you saying that the domestic economy is placed upon a political platter, that the jobs of over 200,000 North Carolinians in textile plants are in jeopardy because in a democratic society a majority of the people in a textile area did not see fit to vote a certain way?

I say to you, Mr. Speaker, and to those who listen, that I have no intention whatever of walking down the path that some folks expect us to walk in agricultural legislation unless a realistic, intelligent, fairminded, honest attitude is taken by those who lead in the Department of Agriculture today. Some of these men have been close personal friends of mine for years, but they are wrong. They have misled the people of my section of the country. They have misled the leaders in the textile industry as well as the workers in the textile industry. And unless the Congress asserts itself quickly they will mislead the American people and do great violence to our economy.

I am sorry that I must say this. I have been patient, as have all other Members of Congress, with the promises and the hopes that have been held out, with the unfortunate paths down which some of the textile people. I can only say—without criticism of those who went down those paths—that I today am happy that in some way I had the inspiration, or whatever you may call it, not to be misled. And I say that those who are unaware of the seriousness of this situation had better wake up because there are bad days ahead in the textile industry unless something is done. I might say that unless something is done there are bad days ahead for the cotton farmers in this country.

In the districts of the gentleman from South Carolina a press release was issued this week that the Springs Cotton Mills were building a multi-million-dollar textile plant, not to run cotton, but to run synthetic fibers.

Throughout the industry the use of synthetics as the total content of fabrics is increasing. More frightening, or it should be frightening to those charged with the responsibility of aiding the cotton farmer, is the great increase in the blending of a little bit of cotton with a great deal of synthetic to make a fabric. It is high time that some of those who are so blind, who have responsibility in some of these administrative agencies, wake up to the seriousness of the problem.

I am sorry I took so much of the gentleman's time, but I do appreciate what he is doing for the people of his district and for the people of the Nation, including the people of my own congressional district.

Mr. HEMPHILL. I want to thank the gentleman and say that when he takes up time from me it is for the good of the Nation. I thank him for taking part here at considerable personal inconvenience.

I might comment on his remarks. I am going to yield to some other friends from North Carolina in just a second. We are not talking just to entertain ourselves. I am happy there are a few of us left who are determined to keep talking about this. The gentleman from North Carolina is certainly among those.

As far as this being a political issue, this is not a political issue, but is an issue of bread and meat, an issue of economic life or death to a great industry and a great segment of people whom I love, because they have done me the honor of electing me politically time after time, and they have been my friends.

Mr. WHITENER. I should like to point out one other thing in line with what the gentleman has just suggested. In the past week I would estimate we have received in my office at least 50 letters written by folks who described themselves as textile workers in my congressional district. Some of these letters are written with pencil, some with pen, but none typewritten. In these letters they are begging us to do something because their jobs are falling by the wayside.

I say to the gentleman that unless something is done to eliminate the two-price cotton situation it will not be many months until we will begin to get letters from cotton farmers saying, "Do something to equalize this problem so that we can produce this crop and have a market for it."

I may say to the gentleman that it has been reliably estimated that if the Department of Agriculture would place on the market in this country some of this $1,049 million worth of cotton that they say is involved in the last year's crop at the world price, I am told by one of the leading textile men the world, by telephone yesterday, that if that were done within a week at least $400 million worth of that cotton would move immediately into the domestic textile industry.

Yet they came in here a few days ago and asked us to vote an additional $500 million so that they can bring in some $368 million underestimated cotton in the Commodity Credit Corporation program instead of saying to our people in America that we are going to let you have this American cotton at the same price that a Japanese or a German or some other foreigner can buy it.

I say this is a comedy of errors, and it is time that folks quit just entertaining themselves by pointing at some of us who are concerned about it and saying we are unduly excited, and look at the true facts of the matter.

Mr. HEMPHILL. I thank my colleague.

Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HEMPHILL. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina. I would like to say to my friend, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. WHITENER], that I was on the floor when he made the remarks about his conversation with the gentleman from the Department of Agriculture. Certainly, being one who benefited from the trend there toward the other party, I want to say to him that this problem certainly is not a political problem because it certainly is serious and it is one that requires a bipartisan approach. I certainly would like to say this: You know the textile industry is a friend—the best friend of the American cotton farmer. This is the thing we need to realize, that the textile industry buys the great majority of its raw material requirements from the American farmer. If both of them are to stay in business, certainly something needs to be done. I agree with these remarks. This is a situation and a problem that has been created by Federal policies which have attempted to be all things to all people. What we will see is the wreckage of an industry along the way unless we can solve it here. The continuation of the two-price cotton policy also is going to bring grave retribution on the cotton farmer himself.

Mr. HEMPHILL. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HEMPHILL. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. WHITENER. I have heard with interest the remarks of my friend from the district adjoining mine. I want to say that my remarks earlier about the comment made to me by this Agriculture Department official was not made in a partisan way, and I did not mean to give my colleague any opportunity here to brag about the mistake made by so many of our people at the polls in the last election. I am not saying that, of course, with reference to the gentleman himself. But I take no pride in that and I just point that out to indicate that this is a problem that transcends political parties. I do not think how people vote in a particular area should enter into how we handle the public's business. I know the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BROYHILL] will agree with that even though he and I may have serious differences as to the wisdom of folks voting for his party and for my party. I would hope by reason of positive action that we can take here in the Congress that there will be such a deep appreciation on the part of all our people that they will see that this party of ours, that is, the Democratic Party, has had the wisdom to undo that which was done by the party of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. Broyhill] over a period of time under the leadership of former Secretary Benson.

Mr. HEMPHILL. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. KORNEGAY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HEMPHILL. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. KORNEGAY. I would simply like to say, I want to commend the gentleman from South Carolina for again forcefully bringing to the attention of the House this most vital matter. This is a matter that is vital not only to the gentleman's district, but to my congressional district and to many other districts and to the country as a whole, and to the textile industry as a whole and to the people who work in that industry and to the cotton farmers. I think the gentleman from South Carolina is certainly due a great deal of commendation for the time and effort he has put into this presentation and for his untiring efforts and undying interest that has been exhibited through the years in doing everything he can and in urging others to follow him and to help in the salvation of the No. 2 industry in the United States of America.

Mr. HEMPHILL. I thank my colleague. I just hope the people of the gentleman's district recognize and appreciate the fact that since he has come to the Congress he has been untiring in his efforts, and I thank him for the many times that he has supported us here in trying to tell our textile story again and again, and like the gentleman from Gastonia who asked me to yield, we hope and pray that we will not have to be getting up on the floor of the Congress to talk about this because we would like to see some solution to this problem.

We have been working for some solution and voting to trying to get some solution. It is a funny thing—I have been sitting in the Congress here only 6 years, which is a very short time, and I recognize that I am one of the younger Members here, but it has been my policy when some other area or some other industry was in trouble to help them, because it seemed to me to be a pretty poor thing when you will not lend a hoe to a neighbor to kill a snake.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HEMPHILL. I yield to the distinguished Speaker.

Mr. McCORMACK. I have followed for several years the matter about which the gentlemen from North Carolina and South Carolina have been addressing the House. I think it is well known that I do not have one farm in my district. My Republican friends up my way occasionally refer to me as the urban farmer, which title I accept with the greatest of pleasure.

Several years ago in reading an article on this very subject I was impressed with the fact that cotton was sold abroad at 8 or 8½ cents per pound less than the price American industry could buy it for. Is my recollection correct?

Mr. HEMPHILL. It is eminently correct.

Mr. McCORMACK. I was so impressed that I introduced a bill to try to bring about an equalization so that American industry would receive the same benefits that were given to foreign industry. I introduced a similar bill in the succeeding Congress. I remember on one occasion shortly after I introduced the bill a measure relating to agriculture was before the House. I went to the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. Cooley], and to the ranking Republican member, and spoke to them about offering my bill as an amendment to the pending bill. What happened? My bill was not germane to the pending bill but they said they would not raise a point of order and that they would accept the amendment. So I offered the amendment. Unfortunately, however, one of our Members, not a Democrat, and not a member of the Committee on Agriculture, exercising his rights under the rules of the House, made a point of order and, of course, the point of order was sustained.

I refer to the fact that on two occasions in past Congresses I have introduced bills because I feel that there is injustice in the treatment of textiles. Any situation which results in injustice should be corrected so that one of America's principal industries will at least be on a comparable basis with this same industry in other countries.

Mr. HEMPHILL. I want to thank the distinguished Speaker and say that I speak with the gratitude of the people of my State and area. The Speaker certainly has made a contribution today. I am happy to have his support, and thank him from the bottom of my heart.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HEMPHILL. I yield.

Mr. HOEVEN. I am quite sure the gentleman knows that the Cotton Subcommittee of the House Committee on Agriculture recently held several days of hearings on a cotton bill introduced by the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. Cooley]. It was soon discovered that the mill operators, and the processors, and the growers were in complete disagreement; whereupon the chairman issued a public statement saying that until and unless those interested could agree upon some specific program the hearings would be suspended. It has also been intimated that there might not be any cotton legislation at this session unless some agreement was reached.

In view of the circumstances as they pertain to the Committee on Agriculture, does the gentleman see any hope of an agreement which would make it possible to pass a bill at this session of Congress?

Mr. HEMPHILL. May I say to the gentleman I am happy to have his question. While he did not come out with any legislation, I want to thank him and every member of his committee for even considering the problem. It was a noble thing to do. I had hoped you would come here with legislation that the House could support. I had hoped that the effort would be nonpartisan because this is an issue that affects the American economy.

I may say to the gentleman I do not think we have reached an agreement, but I think an agreement can be reached. In my opinion, the Committee on Agriculture, with its distinguished members on both sides of the aisle, has the ability and the experience, and because of the fact some of those very fine men on both sides of the aisle visited North Carolina and saw what we are doing, certainly could bring out legislation. That is my hope.

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HEMPHILL. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. WHITENER. I was so proud of the fact that as a result of the remarks of the gentleman from South Carolina and the special order he got today, the distinguished Speaker of the House has again said, as he has stated for many years, that this inequitable situation should be eliminated in this country. The Speaker of the House is from an area which is very heavily involved in the textile industry and has been from the early days of this Nation. Knowing him as I do, I know that he would be just as concerned about this situation as if there never had been a textile plant within the State of Massachusetts. He has shown that by his interest in the farmers. As he has pointed out, he has no farmers in his district. I think it is magnificent that we have here by our side and on our side the great American who now serves us so capably as Speaker of the House of Representatives. I know that when the people of our respective districts, yours in South Carolina and mine adjoining in North Carolina, are again made aware of the fact that one of the most able soldiers on the legislative front has gone to war again to preserve their jobs and to preserve a great industry, they will rise up and say a word of thanks from their hearts to him.

Now, if I might impose upon the gentleman briefly to say something about what our dear friend and my neighbor in the House Office Building, the gentleman from Iowa, said, I too appreciate the problems which have confronted the committee.

I know that the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Hoeven] as the ranking member on the Committee on Agriculture, by nature and by general traits of character on this and on other matters of legislation will not be partisan in his approach and will not be influenced whatever by the fact that in the great area from whence he comes the textile industry is not a big economic factor.

However, with reference to the gentleman's question as to agreement, I daresay that seldom do we have legislation of any consequence on which all people involved agree thoroughly. I see no area for disagreement in this proposition, however. There is no area for argument.

As the Speaker of the House of Representatives has just pointed out, we have a situation where American-grown cotton can be bought by a foreigner at 8½ cents a pound cheaper than it can be bought by an American manufacturer. That in itself is the problem. There is no room for argument. The only way to eliminate the inequity is to in some way make it possible for the domestic manufacturer to buy this American cotton at the same price that his foreign competition can purchase it.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, when we talk about disagreement, let me remind you that there was none when the Secretary of Agriculture filed a section 22 petition with the Tariff Commission in which he sought to have an 8.5-cent-a-pound offset fee set upon the incoming cotton textile fabrics from foreign nations placed upon the cotton equivalent of those fabrics. Now, we proceeded with the common understanding and with the common knowledge of the 8.5-cent disparity. Yet, as the gentleman from Iowa knows, to the surprise of everyone, on one bright morning the Department of Agriculture representatives appeared before the gentleman's great Committee on Agriculture and started talking about a 5-cent and 6-cent adjustment to take care of this problem. That is why I said earlier, if my friend, the gentleman from Iowa, will remember, that if the people in the domestic textile industry working at the machines and who are engaged in textiles at all levels had not been doublecrossed by somebody, they would have had unanimity in meeting the problem.

Mr. Speaker, I hope we can get around to this matter in the Congress and do something about this question without a lot of argument, dilly-dallying, and reading a lot of fine print published by the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HEMPHILL. I would be happy to yield to my distinguished friend, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS].

Mr. GROSS. There may be an inequity in this situation, but there are a lot of other inequities dealing with agriculture alone. There are a lot of other inequities with respect to imports of foreign products into this country. The thing that I protest in this legislation is this: I hope it will be brought out to the floor under an open rule so we can offer amendments to the bill to take care of other inequities, and if we cannot get the other inequities taken care of I am ready, willing, and able to vote against the gentleman's proposition.

Mr. HEMPHILL. I might say to the gentleman that I am happy now to hear that the gentleman is going to help us and I will tell him that I am going to held him, because the gentleman and I have stood together on this import situation time after time. May I also say to the gentleman how much I appreciate the fact that the gentleman is a champion of the buy-American proposition and the American producer. I thank the gentleman for his contribution here today.

I now want to bring to the attention of the Members of the House certain things which came out in the magazine called the Textile Reporter. I commend it to the Members of the House because it is concerned with the industry. It is published in Greenville, S.C., which is not in my district, but it is a good magazine and it keeps up with the textile industry. It represents one of the ways in which I try to keep up with the industry from day to day.

There are certain facts that came out in a recent issue which are significant.

> Manmade fiber-fabric imports soared by 57 percent to 63.4 million yards last year from 40.5 million in 1961. The Census Bureau reports the value of these goods rose 52 percent to $22.2 million from $13.3 million. Japanese shipments accounted for most of the increases rising from 33 million yards in 1961 to 56 million yards in 1962.

Not only are we having to compete with the Japanese, who seem to have our State Department at its mercy in any trade negotiations—they can outsmart them or out-trick them—not only are we having to compete in the cotton cloth fabrics, but we are getting in competition now in the manmade fibers. The reason for this is obvious. The Japanese apparently sense the trend or the transition from the use of cotton to the use of manmade fibers and they are getting ready to make their effort to keep the markets they have taken from us or which have been given away by the erroneous policies of the United States, in trying to buy friends, or something of that kind.

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HEMPHILL. I am delighted to yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the gentleman on the very strong statement he has made and the firm stand that he has taken in respect to the cotton textile situation with which he is very intimately concerned. I want to join him in expressing concern not only in this instance, but I am sure the gentleman from South Carolina is aware of the bipartisan interest that his problem has raised in our Committee on Agriculture. I would also recall to the gentleman the present difficulty that our country is now involved in with regard to sugar. Our very excellent chairman, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY], last year tried to bring out a program that would give equitable consideration to the consumers and the producers and our offshore supplies of sugar. I am sure the gentleman is aware of the difficulties that have arisen. I could cite other instances of equal merit. It seems to me, in accord with what the gentleman has just said, that the State Department certainly has lost sight of the fact that the first concern of our country ought to be that our own economy be preserved and permitted to grow.

I thank the gentleman.

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his support. I certainly agree with him that the American economy is our first concern and should be the first concern of the State Department. I thank him again for participating.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HEMPHILL. I am delighted to yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Committee on Agriculture I should like to compliment the gentleman for bringing public attention to this very critical problem. Truly I believe the cotton farmer is in deep trouble and has a very bleak future ahead unless something is done by Congress. Second, I would like to support the suggestion of the gentleman from Iowa that the approach has been on a bipartisan basis. I believe the gentleman will recall, during the hearings of the Subcommittee on Cotton, I did present what I considered to be a constructive approach to the problem in an effort to try to meet some of the critical problems the cotton farmer faces. Further I would like to speak a word in regard to the role which the gentleman from North Carolina, Chairman COOLEY, of the House Committee on Agriculture, has played. I think he has been quite proper in delaying consideration because apparently the other interests involved, primarily from the administration, cannot agree upon an approach which they will back.

I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his support of our position in our problem and say to him that I commend him for taking a great and patriotic interest in a problem which really affects my part of the country more than other parts of the country because of the concentration of textiles there.

Let me assure the gentleman that I look for an opportunity to be of service to help him with the problems in his district.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have here from America's Textile Reporter of the 28th of February two articles which I shall include at this time in my remarks. One is called "Let's Knock It Off." It talks about making cotton available at the same price to our mills as to the foreign mills. This article reads as follows:

LET'S KNOCK IT OFF

> Commenting on the National Cotton Council's agreement to make U.S. cotton available to American mills at the same price it is made available to foreign mills (through additional subsidies), Seton Ross of the Cotton Trade Journal said the council did the practical, and therefore, the logical thing.
>
> He added: "We don't like export subsidies, but they are recognized as a necessary evil. We don't like domestic subsidies, but they too have become a necessary evil. Some delegates to the National Cotton Council convention mourned what they termed a 'surrender of principles' the council had long and vigorously upheld but we don't see it that way. It was retreat—not a surrender; a retreat before the compelling pressures of lost markets and the threat of rebuilt sur-

pluses. And to those who insist on calling it a surrender, we put this question: Which would you rather surrender—a belief, or an industry?"

Now, that question is rather all encompassing with finality. We don't believe we have to do either, in the first place. But why are export subsidies and domestic subsidies necessary evils? Should we condone evil by labeling it necessary? They are not necessary. As a millman wrote to Congressman BASIL WHITENER, of North Carolina, the reason for these necessary evils simply is: "It is easier for our representatives to legislate this money away rather than to drop these farm subsidies at the risk of losing some votes."

The way to get rid of these "necessary evils" is offered by another millman who said: "I believe we should take off the 8½ cents per pound allowed foreign purchasers and make them pay the same amount as the American market; let the cotton farmer paddle his own canoe if he overproduces, or let him sell his surplus to foreign countries at less money if he chooses to overproduce."

The answers are simple but the courage is lacking.

But back to Mr. Ross' comments on "principles" about which he speaks so lightly, we would remind him that whenever this country has made even the slightest "retreat" on principles, Marxist doctrines gain another foothold. There was principle behind the Monroe Doctrine—now look at Cuba.

If it is possible to compare principles upon which our many American freedoms were founded with principles involving commodities in a free market, then analogically Mr. Ross is subscribing to a reversal of the wording (where cotton is concerned), "I'd rather be dead than Red."

There is no conceivable reason why the Federal Government should make another mistake to help cover up an original mistake.

If such errors are compounded past the present utterly ridiculous point, this thing could turn into a perpetual game of drop the handkerchief.

As the Charlotte Observer said in a recent editorial: "Cotton's troubles need surgery, not first aid. A new subsidy in the cotton program would be nothing more than a feeble excuse for the failure of Congress to face up to its duty. It must have the political courage to begin the surgery that in a few years would get the Government out of the cotton business, except for the production advice it gives to growers."

Every honest man knows the answer, so let's knock it off.

The second article is part 1 of an article in three parts. I am not sure I agree with all of this, but I think in any approach to this problem if somebody has some reason on the other side of it I am happy to present it here, because we should know all of the reasons and we should always be sure that what we are saying is for the good of the country. I feel today that these people who have contributed have done so for the good of the Nation.

This article is as follows:

Cotton Textiles—A Square Industry in a Round Economy?—Part One of an Article in Three Parts by Peter M. Strang

In these days of the New Frontier, businessmen frequently do not see eye to eye with modern welfare economists. The business structure has such numerous and varied ramifications that disastrous repercussions may take place when persons who lack a thorough knowledge of business force the adoption of ill-advised but well-intentioned programs. This thought has been well expressed by Sylvia Porter who recently used the following introduction in a financial column for the Boston Herald.

"A little learning is a dangerous thing;
"Drink deep, or taste not the Pierian spring."

"When Alexander Pope wrote these familiar lines more than 2 centuries ago, he of course never dreamed that they could be applied to the state of the U.S. economy and the safety of the U.S. dollar, circa 1962, but I think it's about as apt a poetic reference to a serious economic situation as could be found today.

"For confusion is being compounded, fears being spread which could bring about the very event feared by homemade economists and amateur financiers who overnight are pretending to be experts in subjects they hadn't even heard of—much less carefully studied—a year ago."

Businessmen may take consolation from the fact that similar conditions have appeared in other vocations. With reference to art, John Canaday, art editor of the New York Times, has written: "The true artist has been replaced by the amateur in a cushy atmosphere of patronage by an amateur public."

Has the staid science of economics acquired an entourage of inexperienced practitioners whose schemes receive support from a gullible, superficially educated public? This question should be legitimate for the business world to ask. To many who read the newspapers and listen to the pontifications of some politicians, or radio and television commentators, the answer will be "Yes."

This is especially true of engineers and manufacturers engaged in the production of goods not directly connected with or of immediate importance to the space age. Men who have spent their lives in the cotton textile industry foresee the death of their industry together with greater maladjustment in the national economy if some present Government programs are not modified.

REASONS FOR SKEPTICISM

It is natural for businessmen to look skeptically upon the ready acceptance of untried economic theories because in a historical social science, such as economics, new theories cannot be proved or disproved within the controlled conditions of a laboratory. For businessmen, advanced degrees are often obtained in the school of hard knocks. The formal education of one of the most successful businessmen the writer ever met consisted of four grades in grammar school. Yet this man had acquired an uncanny knowledge of economic principles. This is not to imply that a sound education in business, economics, or liberal arts is not a good foundation upon which to build an industrial career. The point to be stressed is that in sciences which involve the behavior of living people, theory without practice furnishes a questionable background for making decisions either in business or Government.

A review of the history of Great Britain and the United States during the last 60 years spotlights many instances in which the prophecies and panaceas of economists were not infallible. It is ironical to observe that usually whenever one economist gained acclaim with a new theory possessing popular appeal another economist of repute would promptly point to the flaws in that theory. In 1910 by studies of economics that were translated into 11 languages, Norman Angell proved that a war involving the major powers of the world was impossible. Four years later World War I completely discredited him. Roger Babson was the only eminent economist to predict the collapse of the stock market in 1929 but he failed to foresee the debacle which took place a few years later. During the 1930's Keynes promulgated surprising tenets which, according to modern economists, proved to have many deficiencies but inaugurated new concepts in their science. Attempts made to alleviate the depression in accordance with Keynes' theories were ineffective. In this same decade agricultural economists with supposedly advanced theories guided the enactment of laws to aid the farmers in this country. Without reaching the roots of the agricultural problem these laws, with subsequent modifications, have created conditions whereby mills in foreign countries purchase this Nation's cotton 25 percent cheaper than the taxpaying mills in the United States. After World War II when the Armed Forces disbanded, the dire predictions of many economists regarding business and unemployment did not materialize.

The transitions of this country's cotton textile industry illustrate economic principles in operation and also the effects of fallacious economic theorizing and tinkering. The industry grew under a protective tariff and reached its maximum size about 1929. However, in the 1920's several unrelated developments began to alter the textile picture. The styles of women's clothing changed radically so that the well-dressed woman required smaller quantities of fabrics made from yarns of medium count. Producers of fine dress goods or coarse ginghams lost their markets. Bags of paper and plastics began to replace cotton bags in the cement and grocery trades. The rubber companies built mills of their own to make simplified tire fabrics. The chemical companies added to the complications by introducing synthetic fibers to compete with cotton in dress goods. By operating 24 hours a day, chemical plants demonstrated to cotton manufacturers that continuous operation with three shifts was cheaper than partial operation each day with one or two shifts.

In a very short time these factors helped to transform a growing industry into an industry with far too much productive capacity. As three-shift operation became general, fewer spindles were required to supply the market, and as the average yarn became heavier greater output per spindle-hour was obtained. In their struggle to survive, cotton manufacturers entered into a continuing war of economic attrition. Today there are but 19 million spindles in this country to supply 180 million inhabitants whereas in 1929 there was 37 million spindles for 120 million people.

TARIFFS AND COTTON MANUFACTURING

Due to economic attrition the bulk of the remaining industry has gradually concentrated in the Southeastern States. It is safe to say that cotton manufacturing has survived in this country during the last 30 years and can exist today only because of a protective tariff. The drop in textile employment which followed the recent GATT agreements in Geneva furnishes ample evidence that any reduction in the textile tariffs affects some manufacturers adversely.

In theory, tariffs should be abolished because they raise the price of the protected goods in the home market and hamper the flow of world trade. In theory, low-wage industries such as cotton manufacturing should be eliminated from the United States. In theory, it may be of great advantage in the long run to become closely associated with the European Common Market. In theory, textile mills form a logical base for the industrialization of an undeveloped country. However, when there are large numbers of unemployed and the rate of economic growth is not adequate for the increasing population, the immediate and the long-term effects on the Nation should be considered before the rigorous application of any economic theory is attempted.

Bearing in mind that cotton manufacturers employ 353,000 persons directly, purchase 55 percent of the output of some 509,000 cotton growers, and together these industries also give employment to thousands for services and supplies, examination of the past experience and the present status of cotton manufacturers and cotton growers provides the basis for one such study. In analyses of this type it must be remembered that the average American prefers a steady job even though the working conditions and wages are not superlative rather than long-term unemployment benefits.

Cotton manufacturing is the oldest mass production industry in the world and its development was largely responsible for the industrial revolution in the 19th century. No other mass production industry has reached the stage of development where standardized mills with standardized processes and standardized machines, for which the operations of the workers have also been standardized, can be erected anywhere on the globe. Consequently American manufacturers continually have to balance their costs plus their tariff protection against the selling prices of foreign competitors who benefit through lower wage rates and cheaper raw material cotton.

In the United States, a federation of States where there is free trade among members, where the same tariff protects all, where cotton is uniformly priced, where the same language is spoken, and where the same customs prevail, the center of gravity of the cotton textile industry has gradually shifted from New England to the Southeastern States in a period of 30 years because restrictions as to operation were fewer and at the outset wage rates were about 20 percent lower. There are cities in New England that have never fully recovered from the loss of their textile plants. Is there any wonder that the surviving cotton manufacturers in the United States see ruin ahead in governmental policies which tend to reduce their tariff protection when, even in the most advanced nation of the European Common Market, mills can buy American cotton 25 percent cheaper and process this cotton with workers whose wage rates and fringe benefits are 60 percent lower than those here?

Before becoming aware that an overcapacity to produce was their stumbling block, the manufacturers clamored for a higher tariff and the Smoot-Hawley Act resulted. In retrospect it can be seen that the increased rates did not aid the cotton processors and that a reduction in rates at that time would have caused greater unemployment during the depression. In the early 1930's the National Recovery Act aimed to spread the work and increase the purchasing power of labor, limit the hours of labor, determine minimum wage rates, restrict the hours of machine operation, etc. From the date the NRA was declared unconstitutional in 1935, the main assistance that the cotton textile industry has received from the Government has been tariff protection, although the Federal budgets of 1961 and 1962 show that the Commodity Credit Corporation has made miniscule payments "designed to protect the competitive position of the domestic cotton industry in relation to sales of cotton products manufactured abroad from American cotton purchased at export prices."

In order to survive, manufacturers have been required to strengthen management, to reduce costs, to improve old products, and to find new products. Costs were reduced through the direct purchase of cotton at gins, better methods of selling, the purchase of new machines or of modifications to improve old machines, and the scientific utilization of labor by means of job classification and job assignments. Severe competition has forced manufacturers to pass most of their savings in costs to the consumers in lowered prices or to labor in higher wages. The percentage increase in price of some common cotton fabrics has been less than that of the average hourly earnings of textile workers or of the cost of living.

NATIONAL PROBLEMS

While the cotton manufacturers face extinction through a governmental policy to reduce tariffs, the cotton-growing industry faces extinction because of the failure of the numerous governmental policies directed toward its aid. Cotton has become so high priced that the export market has been adversely affected and synthetic fibers are replacing cotton in the home markets in snowballing amounts. For decades two related industries, cotton manufacturing which consumes over 50 percent of the annual 14 million-bale American crop, and cotton growing which now produces about 30 percent of the world's supply, have been plagued with the problem of overproductive capacity. Mechanization has continuously freed more land for raising cash crops on existing farms as the need to produce food for work animals has diminished. An estimate made in the 1930's indicated that the substitution of tractors for horses and mules in the Cotton Belt in 1929 had released from the production of fodder, farmland equal in area to 5.9 percent of the cotton acreage harvested that year. Federal irrigation projects have also made large tracts of fertile new farmland available for cotton production.

The manufacturers have attempted to solve their problem by means of economic attrition behind a tariff barrier but the growers still face the problem which has been worstened by well-intentioned agricultural economists who have instigated a hodgepodge of conflicting laws presumably to aid farmers—laws which will be difficult to untangle or repeal. Today in comparison with 1929, there are one-third as many cotton farmers, the acreage harvested is one-third as great, the average yield per acre has more than doubled, the average man-hours to produce a bale has been halved, but the price of cotton is maintained through legislation which involves parity of income based upon the purchasing power of commodities between 1909 and 1914, price supports, acreage allotments, soil conservation payments, export subsidies, and even a tariff on cotton which has a staple length of 1⅛ inches or more.

The overall effects of existing agricultural legislation should be examined before too great an effort is made to increase the export of American cotton in a world where the annual per capita consumption is decreasing and greater quantities of the staple are being grown abroad. Although American mills are the chief consumers of this country's cotton little thought has been given to what must be done with more than half of the crop if these manufacturers pass from the picture.

The following changes are occurring across the Nation. Farmworkers in the Southeast are being displaced as more and more cotton is produced on the huge mechanized farms in the West; the numbers of unemployed in cities are being augmented by the influx of displaced farmworkers; factories in the North are moving to the Southeast because of the abundance of labor and lower operating costs, and workers in the North are thus made jobless. Should not facts such as these receive consideration when negotiations are conducted to extend trade with nations whose traditions, customs, methods of business, and wage scales differ widely among themselves and more widely from those of the United States? Should not defects in existing legislation be remedied before greater complications are added to the economy of the Nation by trying to increase foreign trade in agricultural commodities through promiscuous reductions in tariff and subsequently by providing subsidies to the industries adversely affected?

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. Whitener] has discussed the fact that we were offered a 5-cent subsidy. I might say I agree with him that the subsidy ought to be 8.5 cents, but I also must say that we are looking for any kind of relief we can get. While it is not my political philosophy to have just half a loaf, still half a loaf is better than none. We need so much relief. Maybe it would give us a little confidence in the future, because we need that confidence if we are going to expand and continue, and if the people who have the capital investments are to continue to operate.

Let me talk about the Springs Mills in my area. I was in New York the other day when they dedicated a 21-story building. I put an article about that in the Record. This great company went down into the garment district of New York City and built there a beautiful building. There they exhibited the fabrics created by the workers in my district. Every one of their mills is in my district, and I am proud of it.

They have the finest profit-sharing system I have ever heard of. It so happens that every man who is working there, weaving, grinding, carding, or whatever he is doing, has an investment because he is a profit sharer. What he has made of his life and his work because of his savings in the profit sharing is there invested and it involves his family's future. The decisions which the management must make must be based on what the future will bring to the textile industry, what the Congress will do with the two-price cotton system, what the Congress will do with the import system. So we have a responsibility right here. It is just as American as any question ever could be.

When the president of that great organization made the statement at that dedication—and I have here an article about it—that the Springs Mills had a plan for synthetic operation, I knew that they were forced into it. I knew they did it with the great courage they have always exhibited. They are building a new plant. When I think of the thousands of people employed and the thousands of people whose future depends on what happens with this transition and what happens with the two-price system, it means we are dealing with human lives and human fortunes as well as the economy of our Nation.

Mr. FINDLEY. If the gentleman will yield further, I should like to inquire of the gentleman if another possible way to approach this problem and to help relieve the serious problem that faces the textile firms would be to move toward a lower level of price support on domestic cotton. Would that not have the same, equivalent effect in aiding the textile mills? I realize it would present problems to the cotton farmers, but insofar as the textile mills are concerned would this not be a helpful step for the textile firms?

Mr. HEMPHILL. I think any reduction at this time would work such havoc on those people who have the small acreage allotments and it would create a great inequity. I do say to the gentleman that I do think it is proper that his great Committee on Agriculture look into that with a great deal of care.

Certainly, there may be room there for elasticity or some change.

I just had not intended to discuss that today. I wish I had the answer. As a matter of fact, I wish I did not have to get up here in the well of the House and present to the Nation time after time our problem. But someone's voice has got to be heard about this thing, and we are getting more and more of a hearing. I want to commend the gentleman for the bipartisan support we have received from his side of the aisle and from him personally.

Mr. Speaker, I hold in my hand a letter from a textile manufacturer in my area. He is not the largest textile manufacturer. It is a very moderate sized operation. But you know to the fellow who is working in that mill or to the fellow who is selling his cotton to the mill or to the merchant uptown who is dependent upon the income that the people get to buy his products and, yes, let us say to the preacher and to the church—that mill is important. Its continuation is a necessity in the local community. If you throw 200 people out of work in a community and recognize the impact it has on the lives of the people involved—let us say there are 5 people to a family—that would be 5,000 people in distress overnight plus the merchant and everybody else and then you will know how everybody suffers.

I put in the RECORD at this point the wonderful letter that he wrote to Secretary Freeman about this problem.

The letter is as follows:

FEBRUARY 20, 1963.

Hon. ORVILLE FREEMAN,
Secretary of Agriculture,
U.S. Department of Agriculture,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. FREEMAN: The cotton textile industry appreciates the efforts of your Department in pursuing the recent section 22 case before the Tariff Commission, and also your efforts in following the President's directive regarding the elimination of the two-price cotton system.

The matter has not been resolved, however, and we have experienced some disruption in our markets because of uncertainty regarding the future price of cotton. This future is dependent upon the action of your Department and the Congress. We were hopeful that the President's speech on agriculture indicated that a start would be made in lowering the price supports of cotton, and that purely as an emergency measure, equalization payments would be used to make American cotton fully competitive with foreign cotton and with rayon in the domestic market.

Instead, we have seen action taken which maintains price supports at the present level and the Department now is unwilling to go along with the idea of making cotton fully competitive. We have borne and are bearing the burden of $42.50 per bale cost disadvantage over foreign spinners. A reduction to $20 per bale cost disadvantage will cost the taxpayers money over the present situation and still not get the job done.

Cotton is in trouble—consumption is down, and the customers are confused because of the uncertainties, complexities and unreality of the program. Mills which formerly were completely loyal to cotton are now using rayon and will continue to do so unless cotton is fully competitive in price. Rayon sells for 26 cents per pound, contains no foreign matter, is sold on net weight, 30-day terms and is uniform running. In blends with cotton, the product gives a good appearance and is serviceable. The real people who will suffer from an unrealistic pricing and marketing policy are the farmers.

A crash program of research to perfect techniques for complete elimination of the boll weevil and control of grasses will enable the farmer to compete with rayon and foreign growths of cotton. They will then be in a position to compete because their costs will be materially reduced. Any action which does not get to the root of the problem—lower prices through reduced costs—will only result in increased surpluses and higher costs for the taxpayer.

We do not feel that continued high supports is the answer. Cost reduction and quality improvements will increase consumption and keep the cotton farmer in business—anything less than this will mean his gradual demise. We in the textile industry have followed the policy of quality improvement and cost reduction. We have had to in order to survive, and we know it will work.

All that we ask now is that a way be devised temporarily to make cotton available to the U.S. spinners at world prices while a crash program of cost reduction and quality improvement enable the cotton farmer to effectively compete with other fibers and foreign growths without subsidies and equalization payments.

Finally, the employees of our mill have been receiving reduced paychecks because our operations have been curtailed. We feel this is directly because the uncertainties regarding cotton's future have disrupted normal planning and marketing. We feel textile employees interests, as well as the interests of the cotton farmer should be considered by the administration seeking solutions to these problems.

Yours sincerely,

CHERAW COTTON MILLS, INC.,
WM. MANNING MALLOY,
Vice President and Secretary.

Mr. Speaker, I recently received a thing called Cotton Comments and I just want to read from it. It says:

DEMAND FOR ONE-PRICE COTTON INCREASES

There is good reason for the cotton trade to be in a depressed mood. The whole industry backs a one-price system, and the administration counters with a 32.47 percent loan and states they want an 8½-cent subsidy for export, with a lesser subsidy to the domestic mills, all of which adds up to a three-price system for cotton. Unless the subsidy is paid to the producers—where it rightfully belongs—or to the first buyer, for camouflage reasons, a three-price system will result and will destroy the merchant trade and cotton futures market. It will continue to force mills to use synthetics and reduce the potential market for U.S. cotton and hence involve U.S. taxpayers in making a further unknown and unwanted speculation in cotton. At present the taxpayers have a financial speculative investment in about 10.5 million bales, or upward of $1.7 billion, and the prospects are for a reduced market for the 1963 crop unless cotton is priced competitively. So, the outlook for the cotton industry and the taxpayers is bleak. Who is responsible for this situation?

I subscribe to that and I commend them for saying it. I certainly hope it continues. There is good reason for the cotton trade to be in a depressed mood. The whole industry backs a one-price system and the administration can with a 32.47-percent loan.

Let me say to my wonderful friend from Illinois, if this trend continues and if the mills go to manmade fibers, I do not think we are going to have the question any more of price supports for cotton so far as our agricultural commodities are concerned because if this can ever be done, if we ever reach the situation where manmade fibers can duplicate all the advantages and qualities of cotton, and surely research is on the way to doing that, then it would be my prediction that it would be so much easier and cheaper and quicker and cleaner to use synthetics and that cotton will go out of the picture. Cotton has gone out of the picture in so many areas of the country.

Let me read to you just a few remarks from people who have written to me and with whom I have corresponded.

Here is the president of the National Cotton Council who happens to live right outside of my district, but whom the people of my district love and admire. He says:

> I agree with you we have failed to convince the cotton producing areas of the South that textile mills can substitute synthetic fiber for cotton and will do so if the price differential favors it.

Think of that.

Think of that. He recognized that and he is president of the National Cotton Council of a great country.

Then I find here a letter from a fine friend who was such a wonderful host when we went down to North Carolina, Mr. Charles A. Cannon, the head of the Cannon Mills Co., when the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY] made available transportation to us as members of the subcommittee. This is the letter he wrote to the Under Secretary of Agriculture but I think it is sound and I include it at this point in my remarks.

The letter referred to follows:

FEBRUARY 12, 1963.

Re my letter to you of January 22; Mr. Joseph C. Moss' reply of February 8.

Hon. CHARLES S. MURPHY,
Under Secretary of Agriculture, U.S. Department of Agriculture, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. MURPHY: I realize that action was so fast in Washington on February 6 and 7 that Mr. Moss' letter of the 8th did not take into consideration the condition of cotton on February 8, which is the date of his letter.

It seems to me we are simply shadowboxing and are not getting down to the facts of one of the most critical situations we have ever faced.

In the President's farm message of January 31, 1963, under the heading of "Cotton," he mentioned a healthy growing cotton industry is vital to the strength and prosperity of our Nation. He further stated that "over a million persons are engaged in producing cotton, another million and a half are employed in converting raw cotton into consumer items," and "additional millions supply goods and services to this industry," and that "cotton exports contribute significantly to our balance-of-payment position."

These statements certainly show the President's complete understanding of the importance of the cotton economy from the grower to the retail counter, to this country, and to our employment problems, as well as the importance of the export of cotton to our balance of trade.

The increased imports of cotton textiles, largely manufactured from foreign-grown cotton, help create an unfavorable balance of trade and a drain on our gold reserve.

Further, in the President's message he states, and I quote, "I urge that Congress give early consideration to cotton legislation that will make this important fiber more competitive and help recapture its market. I feel it should be signed into law before the end of February and made applicable to the planting of the 1963 crop."

The delay which is now being caused, apparently, by the dissension as to allowing the American mills a price equal to the price paid by foreign mills for cotton and the dissension between some of the growers as to how the increased acreage and support price should be handled, is doing irreparable damage every day to the distribution of this year's cotton crop.

This delay is depriving the workers in the textile industry of full-time employment through reduced hours or, in some cases, through loss of jobs. All of this is bound to reflect back on the industries that supply the textile industry and create a drag on the economy, which the President's statement of September 1962 and his farm message of January are both intended to avoid.

If the one-price system for cotton could be established immediately, we would, at once, increase the daily consumption of American cotton, and, on this point, we have unanimous approval of our entire industry, backed by the President's statement. It seems to me the importance of this is being reflected by the fact that for the first 5 months of the cotton year ended December 1962, the American consumption of cotton, as compared with the year before, had decreased by 359,417 bales. The alarming part of this decrease is the fact that for the month of November the daily consumption was off 3,866 bales; and for the month of December, 3,711 bales. Considering the state of the market, I see no reason to think that January will show any improvement.

The red herring that has been drawn across the path with reference to freight should not be allowed to disrupt immediate action to put the American mills back on a competitive basis with the foreign mills.

When the export subsidy on cotton was established, there was no consideration of any freight rate differential. When the loan value for cotton was established, the price differentials were put into effect, based on the delivery charges to the American mill points from the ginning or shipping areas. The sad part of this situation is that the California cotton, which has become some of the most desirable cotton from a spinning standpoint, is best located for Oriental shipment; therefore, they not only get the benefit from the 8½ cents, but they start out against a support price, which is lower because of the distance of California from American mill consuming points.

This statement as to the freight differential's being a red herring is backed by the fact that for many years every bale of foreign cotton that the American mills have purchased has been delivered to the American mill at a lower price than the same quality of cotton could be bought in the American market. Please understand that this fact is true, in spite of the fact that the loading charges, water freight, import charges at the ports in America, tariff, insurance, as well as the transportation charges from the ports to the American mills, are all taken into consideration. As further evidence that this freight problem is a red herring, when we esablished an export payment on cotton textiles shipped out of this country to equalize the export fee on cotton, no consideration was given to freight rate differentials. If, in fact, the American mills were able to secure their American cotton at a more favorable freight rate than the foreigners, it seems to me only logical to conclude that our exports of cotton textiles would have been more attractive to our foreign customers, and our exports would have increased. The reverse has been true. With a full equalization fee of 8½ cents, plus waste differentials being allowed on goods being shipped out of this country, we have declined steadily in the volume of our export business.

We should never overlook the fact that the American mills' consumption far exceeds our export market for raw cotton. While we recognize we must export cotton and we are willing to pay a subsidy of 8½ cents a pound, according to my information, we did not export for dollars but about one third of the number of bales of cotton consumed in the United States. The figures I have indicate exports for dollars of about 3.2 million bales, and American mills' consumption of 9 million bales. The balance between the 3.2 million bales exported for dollars and the total exported was made up by exports under Public Law 480 and longtime barter or credit. If this information is correct, then our export business is not costing us 8½ cents a pound, but nearer 17.14 cents a pound, less whatever value we may ultimately get out of Public Law 480 or the barter and long-term-agreement money.

Mr. Moss, in his last paragraph, indicates that the carryover, from your viewpoint, may be smaller than indicated in my letter to you of January 22. At that time, January 11, 1963, statistical figures show you had 9,757,000 bales of cotton on loan or owned by the Government in CCC. On February 1, this Government-held cotton had increased to 10,338,000 bales.

Between February 2, 1962, and July 27, 1962, the CCC's stock of cotton decreased by 768,325 bales. If the same amount should be repossessed between now and July 27, 1963, the Government's stock would be 9,569,000 bales; however, I see no reason to expect the American mills to be in the market for anything like the normal requirements for cotton during this period unless we do get relief from the two-price system at once.

Your export figures for this year show that the exports are running at less than 50 percent of the export figures for last year. In my judgment, the combination—decreased American consumption and the present fact that the exports are way below expected figures—indicates that the Government-held stock on August 1 will be exceedingly high.

I should like very much to see some overall cotton program adopted that would contribute to an expanding production, expanding consumption, and, certainly, at a much lower cost to the Government.

I do not see how this can be accomplished by choking American mill consumption while debate goes on as to whether or not the cotton farmer is going to be given some relief from the present 16 million base acreage. Every day that the mills fail to consume cotton makes the farmers' position more critical, and, certainly, the one-price system for cotton for the American mills now would do him no harm.

If the present condition is allowed to continue and if Congress has not enacted one-price legislation within the next few months, the question will be whether or not the cotton farmer will have more acreage than he needs at 16 million rather than an increased acreage for the following year.

I hope that everyone realizes that every bale of cotton that goes into the Government's hands as of August 1, 1963, will never come out above the world price unless we have a war or some other emergency. This certainly cannot be an economical or a sensible way to handle the present emergency.

Sincerely yours,

C. A. CANNON.

Now I might just call again upon the magazine I mentioned before for some information I got out of it, because I do not want to plagiarize and say these are my statements. They come from this magazine, the Textile Reporter:

> U.S. cotton fabric imports in the first 3 months of the long-term international cotton textile agreement rose 47 percent over the same period of the 1-year pact. Census Bureau figures indicate 117.3 million yards were shipped in between October 1 and January 1 compared with 79.7 million a year earlier. Imports during October, first month of the long-term agreement, amounted to 53.5 million yards, which prompted U.S. Government restraints on further shipments from Hong Kong, Taiwan, and Portugal. Result: General fabric imports dropped to 28.4 million yards in November. But there was an increase to 35.5 million in December.

I do not know how much of that was cotton purchased in this country at 8½ cents below what our local industry could purchase it for, but the remarkable thing is that cheap cotton accounts for 75 percent of the cotton imports.

Of course we cannot export and pay higher wages with an 8½-cent differential against us.

Here is another quotation from the Textile Reporter:

> Failures among textile mill products manufacturers rose to 11 in January with $8,685,000 in liabilities from 7, with $339,000 in liabilities, a year earlier. Although failures among producers of apparel and other finished products rose to 32 in January from 31 a year earlier, liabilities soared from $1,803,000 to $2,524,000 Dun & Bradstreet reports. The number of failures in textile and apparel retailing dropped to 115 from 147 but liabilities rose to $8,806,000 from $6,553,000.

So there are many failures. I think this system is conducive to failure. When we first started the two-price cotton system it worked for a time. I do not criticize those who were the originators and initiators of this policy but I say we have outgrown it and the Nation is past that stage.

At the same time I find this:

Japan complains that U.S. restraints on 39 categories of cotton textile imports are unreasonable. So-called voluntary controls are sufficient, Japanese representatives told the GATT Council meeting in Geneva last week. Textile interests say the U.S. proposal to limit 1963 imports is unfriendly and ignores Japan's sacrifices through 7 years of self-restriction. They threaten to cut back use of American raw cotton if import ceilings are lowered.

I think it is unreasonable for them to complain. They take our cotton at 8½ cents a pound below what our producers have to pay for it, then come back in here and sell the finished product to us.

When we went up to the Tariff Commission hearing under section 22 there sitting in the room were the Japanese. It was a terrible thing to me, because I was thinking about the people back home who have confidence in their Government and this great system of freedom. I saw foreign competitors being given a preference—were given a preference. It was one of the black days of decision for the textile industry the day the Tariff Commission brought out their 3-to-1 decision; it was a terrible thing for the industry.

Here are two other quotations of interest in this connection:

Increase in the use of manmade fibers appears to be worldwide. World production of man-mades in 1962 reached 3,940,000 metric tons against 3,525,000 in 1961, an increase of 12 percent. U.S. output was up 22 percent. Other countries showed the following increases: Spain, 21 percent; Italy, 17 percent; Germany, 14 percent; United Kingdom and Nordic countries, 10 percent; France, 9 percent; Benelux and Austria, 8 percent; and Japan, 2 percent.

Manmade fiber fabric imports soared by 57 percent to 63.4 million yards last year from 40.5 million in 1961. The Census Bureau reports value of these goods rose 52 percent to $20.2 million from $13.3 million. Japanese shipments accounted for most of the increase, rising from 30 million yards in 1961 to 56 million in 1962.

Finally, I would like to conclude with a word about wool, although I do not have any woolen manufacturers in my district. I do, however, have them in my State, and we are glad to have them. They are doing a great job. They give a lot of employment and their payrolls are very important to certain sections. They sent me an article entitled "We Have Been Flooded With Imports," and on the second page of this release is the statement, "Town Loses 300-Job Payroll as Main Industry Closes." Then they give some statistics.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include this article and the accompanying table in my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

The matter referred to follows:

Yale Woolen Mills Closed, 1963—Founded 1881

("We have been flooded with imports."—Robert E. Andreae, secretary-treasurer, Yale Woolen Mills.)

("The mill has been the lifeblood of Yale and the surrounding territory."—Hoard A. Pelton, mayor, Yale, Mich.)

("There are a lot of heartsick people here. Everyone has been hit. You can't escape it."—Mrs. Pearl Knapp, city clerk, Yale, Mich.)

Packed into this press story of a mill closing are the stark, cruel consequences to management, the workers, and the townspeople. It is all the more grievous because it was needless, and because others will follow unless Government acts promptly with respect to unbridled, unfair import competition.

Town Loses 300-Job Payroll as Main Industry Closes

Yale, Mich., January 24.—Subzero thermometer readings were minor irritations compared to the cold fear gripping this St. Clair County town of 1,600 today.

Yale Woolen Mills, the main industry for miles around, has gone out of business. With it went 300 jobs, an annual payroll of about $1 million, and a quarter of the local tax base.

If this weren't bad enough, Yale citizens—many of them now without jobs or prospects—will be forced to pay for a new sewage plant ordered by the State health department. Its cost has been estimated at more than $400,000.

Then, there's the $1 million issue for a new school. It's slated for the April election. Turned down by the voters once before, it has little, if any, chance of going through this time.

The nub of the problem revolves around the woolen mill. Founded here in 1881, it halted operations Tuesday.

"Believe me," Robert E. Andreae, secretary-treasurer and descendant of the founders, said, "we in management did a lot of soul searching before deciding we simply had to close down.

"The bottom's been dropping out of the wool and textile industry for years.

"We kept in business against increasing odds merely to provide employment. So many depended on us we felt we couldn't stop as long as there was any hope."

The decision to close was based on changing patterns of world commerce, the trend of laws governing imports and inroads made in the wool business by synthetic fibers.

"Understand this," Andreae said. "We're not blaming labor, industry, or the law as such. We simply can't meet the competition in wools from countries where costs are cheaper. We have been flooded with imports.

SELL EQUIPMENT

He said the company, founded by Charles Andreae and still controlled by the family, would sell its equipment.

"We will hold the buildings, however," he said.

He said management was anxious to rent or lease them to a new industry if one can be found to move into the community. Yale is in the northern part of St. Clair County, which adjoins Macomb County.

"We want to help the community recover from this blow," he said. "We'd sell the property if it would be advantageous to Yale but, as long as we retain title, we can protect the people."

HUNT FOR INDUSTRY

He said the company had refused to sell everything outright "because there are a lot of professional manipulators who would buy it all and then dump everything.

"Nobody would win that way," he said.

The mill has been working with the Port Huron Industrial Development Corp. and the Michigan Economic Development Committee in efforts to find a new industry to take over the buildings.

Working with them is Mayor Hoard A. Pelton, local hardware merchant.

"The mill has been the lifeblood of Yale and the surrounding territory," Pelton said. "We're trying to see what we can do to get the property into the hands of someone who can use it for industrial work."

The millhands come from several nearby small communities, such as Valley Center, Melvin, Brockway, Avoca, Fargo, Roseburg, and Brown City.

Yale's business district, 2 blocks long, has 5 empty stores among about 30 commercial firms and professional offices.

"Unless something turns up pretty soon," a local resident said, "we may wind up with only five places going, including gas stations."

"This is going to be mighty tough to get over," Louis J. Joyce, a city council member and mill supervisor said.

A veteran of 24 years with the mill, he is one of the few supervisory employees still working. Their employment will terminate by April.

"It's going to mean increased taxes, for one thing," Joyce said.

"Someone's got to take up the slack now that the mill has gone, and that can only mean the rest of the taxpayers. The retired folks and those on fixed incomes are going to be hit hard, I'm afraid."

He said the company officials had kept supervisory employees informed of the situation for months.

"We've been going kind of thin for the last 5 years, as far as work is concerned," he said.

LINGERING DEATH

The mill's peak payroll of more than 550 persons was reached in about 1940. Since then, things have been declining as the competition, at first a pinch and then a vise which squeezed the mill dry, became overpowering.

It was somewhat akin to having a relative die of a lingering illness. It was expected. But, when the end came, it was still a shock.

William Salerno, shoe merchant and former councilman, noted that Yale has only two other industries, both small.

"We had a community improvement association organized awhile back to bring new business here," he said. "They got a machine shop out of New Haven but that only has jobs for seven or eight men.

"Another small factory moved in from Imlay City and hired six or seven. We'll really have to get busy again—and on a much bigger scale."

Of the 300 workers on the last payroll, about 100 were women.

"I don't know what these people are going to do now," Mrs. Pearl Knapp, city clerk, said, "but the mill's down for good. Committees are looking around for a new buyer but that's just a dream, I'm afraid.

"There are a lot of heartsick people here. Everyone has been hit. You can't escape it. You just tighten up the belt and work harder to find work."

Older employees are doubtful that they would be hired by a new industry.

Howard Barr, 57, had worked 41 years in the mill. His wife, Verna, 58, worked there 40 years.

Barr pointed out that neither are old enough for social security benefits but too old to go out and get other jobs easily.

Mr. and Mrs. Lavern Carl worked 35 years at the mill. Carl is 62, Mrs. Carl, 59.

"At our age, there isn't much you can do," Mrs. Carl said.

Donald Winkler, 43, secretary-treasurer of local 980, Textile Workers of America, the union at the mill, finds himself unemployed with eight children to support.

Winkler said wages averaged $1.70 an hour, with an average weekly check of $67.

Imports into United States for consumption of selected semimanufactures and manufactures wholly or in chief value of wool and similar hair

[All figures in thousands]

Period	Total (pounds)	Tops (pounds)	Yarns (pounds)	Woven cloths				Knit cloths (pounds)	Blankets and robes (pounds)	Wearing apparel	
				Pile (pounds)	Tapestry and upholstery (pounds)	Other				Knit (pounds)	Not knit or crocheted (pounds)
						Pounds	Square yards				
1951	24,490	10,390	1,605	12	19	8,983	18,697	12	239	2,557	664
1952	41,967	23,122	2,385	8	14	12,491	24,031	23	447	2,675	802
1953	24,067	5,638	2,113	9	19	12,053	24,276	73	420	2,988	759
1954	14,861	448	1,642	19	18	9,288	19,528	60	195	2,555	636
1955	21,017	365	2,032	31	26	14,318	29,221	70	151	3,190	834
1956	27,795	1,173	2,401	46	50	17,295	34,852	70	119	5,078	1,563
1957	26,072	926	2,308	49	59	15,897	32,235	110	159	4,820	1,744
1958	27,032	1,222	2,420	40	64	16,391	34,331	125	191	4,693	1,886
1959	44,310	4,145	5,230	50	132	22,488	46,431	118	291	6,394	5,462
1960	54,039	4,592	5,250	26	240	29,332	62,019	646	233	8,065	5,655
1961	43,822	3,396	5,496	126	298	[1] 18,910	[1] 42,921	1,594	296	8,661	5,045
1962 [2]	68,200	5,700	9,200	100	300	[1] 27,600	[1] 64,200	2,300	300	12,700	10,000

[1] Includes imports of woven cloths in part of braid or through the Virgin Islands in 1962 of 6,000,000 pounds or 14,000,000 square yards and in 1961 of 120,000 pounds or 260,000 square yards.

[2] Preliminary.

Source: U.S. Bureau of Census FT 110, U.S. Imports of Merchandise for Consumption.

Mr. HEMPHILL. Finally, Mr. Speaker, let me say that I do not claim that either of the bills I have introduced offers a final solution. I do say that they are here for your consideration. For my part, I subscribe openly to the abolition entirely of the two-price cotton system.

Any other solution is a temporary proposition, and no other solution will adjust the inequities that the President described and to which our distinguished Speaker gave voice today.

COTTON UNDER BENSON AND FREEMAN

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 5 minutes, to revise and extend my remarks and to include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, I did not ask the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. HEMPHILL] to yield to me during his special order for the purpose of my remarks at this time for reasons I wish to explain. I wish to speak in respect to the program for cotton which was inaugurated under Secretary of Agriculture Benson.

Mr. Benson's name was brought into the discussion, not by the gentleman from South Carolina, but by a Member of this body to whom the gentleman from South Carolina had yielded. I, therefore, did not think it fair to impose upon the time of the gentleman from South Carolina for this purpose.

Mr. Speaker, the suggestion was made that cotton today is in trouble because of alleged mismanagement under the Benson administration. I would like the RECORD to show that cotton indeed was headed down the right road toward a sound and profitable basis under Secretary Benson.

When Secretary Freeman took office as Secretary of Agriculture, he raised the level of price supports for cotton. Under the program inaugurated by Secretary Benson the support levels were moving down toward the market levels, where they should be. This trend was reversed under Secretary Freeman. He saw fit to increase the level of price supports for cotton to 32½ cents a pound. He did this in his first year in office, and he announced just a few weeks ago that he was keeping the level at the same high, unrealistic rate. As a result, today we have more Government cotton in warehouses than we did when Secretary Freeman took office, and by August of this year, it is estimated that warehouses holding Government cotton will have about 10 million bales either owned by the Commodity Credit Corporation, or under loan by the Commodity Credit Corporation. In either event, the responsibility and probably the ultimate property of the American taxpayer.

So one could not honestly and properly conclude that the American cotton farmer is in a better situation today than he was under Secretary Benson. He is indeed in a worse fix, and moving in the wrong direction.

The gentleman from South Carolina spoke of the desirability of eliminating the two-price system for cotton. That, indeed, was the objective and the final goal of the Benson program for cotton. Cotton was proceeding in that direction in an orderly manner until the advent of Secretary Freeman.

Since the 1930's, U.S. taxpayers have tried manfully to help the cotton farmer by: first, paying heavy export subsidies to keep U.S. cotton moving in world markets; second, buying, handling, and storing mountains of cotton through Commodity Credit Corporation; and, third, paying premium prices for cotton products.

Despite all this the cotton farmer has severe income problems, textile firms are at a disadvantage, and so are consumers and taxpayers.

Because taxpayers subsidize export prices, U.S. cotton sells much lower abroad than at home. This raw material differential causes U.S. textile firms to lose out to foreign competitors. Meanwhile the cotton farmer has restricted plantings and loses markets at home and abroad to synthetic fibers.

This Committee on Agriculture has considered a proposal which ostensibly would get cotton product prices back where they belong and at the same time help textile firms meet foreign competition.

Known as the Gathings bill, it would set in motion a new round of subsidies. It would let the Secretary of Agriculture pay a subsidy to mills, handlers, or retailers in order to make possible a cut in cotton product prices.

Under this proposal the taxpayer would continue to pay out money to keep raw cotton prices high, but would also start forking over—from the same hard-pressed pocketbook—other dollars to bring these prices back down, once the cotton leaves the farm.

Why does the bill specify that the new subsidy must go to somebody other than the cotton farmer?

Certainly, it would be a lot simpler, less costly, and more straightforward to send each farmer a Treasury check for 8½ cents for each pound of allotment cotton he raises. At least Congressmen and other taxpayers would then have a clearer notion of what is going on, and what it costs.

However, if other Congressmen find out this bill actually proposes to use tax dollars to force down prices that other tax dollars are forcing up, I doubt that it will pass. If made to mills, this subsidy would mean huge checks to big nonfarm enterprises. Wherever spent, the subsidy would increase Government costs at a time when we are confronted with a budget $11 billion in the red.

It would leave the small cotton farmer about where he is now.

The bill would permit above-allotment planting only if this does not increase stocks. Consensus seems to be this would rule out increased planting.

In my judgment the proposal is inadequate and ill-advised whether it passes or not. At best, it would leave both the textile mill and the farmer on an artificial base, subject to the changing whims of Government and unable to build a sound future in a realistic marketplace.

It would call for a new army of Federal inspectors, and make the land of cotton's legislative briarpatch even thicker.

HOW TO END THE COTTON HEADACHE

What is needed is legislation which will ultimately:

First. Enlarge income opportunities for the cotton farmer.

Second. Reestablish a one-price cotton market.

Third. Permit the cotton farmer to compete fairly with foreign competitors and synthetics.

Fourth. Get Government out of the cotton business.

To achieve these goals, I propose a 3-year program during which Uncle Sam would, first, sell the cotton surplus back to the cotton farmer at an attractive price in exchange for 1-year land-conserving agreements; second, step down the level of price supports to world price; and, third, increase plantings, with unrestricted planting after 3 years, at which time crop loans would be authorized at 90 percent of U.S. market price.

HOW IT WOULD WORK

Before planting time each year, the Secretary of Agriculture would make contracts with farmers owning allotment land. This would be on a voluntary basis—first come, first served.

The contract would entitle the farmer to buy at harvest time a quantity of Government cotton equal to his own annual production of allotment cotton. The price—just low enough to get the desired participation—would be specified in the contract, with allowance for grade, condition, and location.

At harvest time the farmer would receive a cotton certificate. He would either sell it, or use it to claim the cotton at the designated place of storage.

In return for the attractive price, the farmer would agree not to raise any cotton that year, and to put to soil-conserving uses an acreage sufficient to produce a like amount of cotton. This acreage would be in addition to land he would normally leave idle or fallow.

The Secretary could not sell in any one year a quantity of cotton greater than 30 percent of the U.S. annual production would minimize hardship on industries and services dependent upon the cotton farmer.

Present estimates indicate the August 1 Government carryover of cotton will be over 9 million bales. Total Government commitment today is 8.2 million bales—4.7 owned, 3.5 under loan. Present production of cotton is about 14 million bales.

I propose that the surplus cotton be sold back to farmers at the rate of about 3 million bales a year.

In order to ease the transition from the present artificial pricing to competitive levels, I suggest these changes in price supports and acreage limits:

Crop year	Price support	Acreage limit
1963	30 cents	16 million.
1964	28 cents	17 million.
1965	26 cents	18 million.
1966 and after	90 percent of market price.[1]	No limit.

[1] Ultimately a 3-year U.S. market average.

ADVANTAGES

Farmer income would be protected during the transition period, and after 3 years he would have the opportunity to compete fairly for expanding markets. He would no longer be hobbled with acre limits and artificial pricing.

The cotton farmer would, for the first time, be able to compete efficiently and effectively with synthetics.

Cotton mills would no longer be placed at a disadvantage by an export subsidy.

Today's surplus cotton would be converted to cash.

Government would be out of the cotton business in 3 years.

The heavy tax cost of buying, handling, and storing cotton would end.

Cotton supplies would not be disturbed during the sell-back period. Government cotton would not enter market channels until harvest time, and each bale entering then would be matched by a bale cutback in production.

Government domination of cotton would end. This proposal would grant no authority for Government to dump cotton on the market. It would place the marketing of Government cotton where it belongs: in the hands of the cotton farmer.

Taxpayers would have more money in their pocketbooks, and consumers would find shelf prices lower.

THE EXCEPTIONAL CHILDREN'S ACT OF 1963

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore (Mr. LIBONATI). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. **FOGARTY**. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing for appropriate reference a bill to encourage the expansion and improvement of State programs of special education and related services for exceptional children through Federal financial assistance to such programs; to assist colleges and universities to provide special courses of instruction and scholarships; to establish research grants and special projects; and for other purposes. The short title of this bill is the Exceptional Children's Act of 1963.

If enacted into law, this bill would meet a long apparent and pressing need by making it possible for States and local communities to provide more adequately for the special education of their exceptional children—the physically and mentally handicapped and the gifted. In short, it would provide for a comprehensive program for the special education of physically and mentally handicapped children similar to the comprehensive program for handicapped adults already established under the Vocational Rehabilitation Act for many years.

We all know the outstanding record of the Federal-State vocational rehabilitation program over the years, and we are justifiably proud of the accomplishment of this partnership between the Federal Government and our respective States in restoring a steadily growing number of our handicapped citizens to the working force of the Nation as useful and productive citizens. We know that this program has paid for itself many times over in terms of tax dollars these individuals gladly pay and in terms of welfare payments they do not have to receive. In calculating the true value of this program to our Nation, we must not overlook the rapidly increasing demand for skilled manpower which the technological age is making. Now and increasingly as we progress, the need for highly skilled workers regardless of physical handicap, will be great; and the vocational rehabilitation program is doing its part to fill this need.

Yet, we seem to have overlooked a vital step in this entire process—the provision of an adequate basic education to large numbers of physically and mentally handicapped children, so that they can progress into the vocational rehabilitation program with the fundamental education and skills which can be built upon through advanced education and training programs to provide the kind of productive people who have made our country grow and prosper.

Briefly, my bill would do the following: First, establish a program of Federal grants-in-aid to the States on a matching fund basis to assist them to establish and operate programs of special education for handicapped and gifted children; second, provide for extension and improvement grants to the States for special education programs; third, provide for a program of grants to colleges and universities as well as to State educational agencies for scholarships and fellowships to train teachers and other specialized personnel needed in the education of exceptional children; and fourth, establish in the Office of Education a research and demonstration projects program in the education of exceptional children.

Most of these provisions embody the essential elements which have made the Federal-State vocational rehabilitation program so successful for handicapped adults. In fact, the scholarship and fellowship provisions merely extend provisions of existing law to train teachers and leadership personnel needed in the education of mentally retarded and deaf children to cover teachers and other specialized personnel needed in the education of all types of exceptional children. I was pleased to be able to play a part in the enactment into law of these programs for mentally retarded children in 1958 and for deaf children in 1961; and I am proud to be associated with this equally meritorious effort to extend these programs to the blind, the orthopedically disabled, and other types of exceptional children.

The Council for Exceptional Children, in consultation with the major national organizations devoted to the welfare of specific disability groups played a major role in developing the provisions of this bill. Thus, the bill has extensive support from most of the national organizations concerned about the education of exceptional children—and their numerous local affiliates—interested in the special educational problems of handicapped and gifted children.

I commend this bill to all of my colleagues in the U.S. House of Representatives as one worthy of the support of every Member in meeting a serious nationwide need.

BRIEF ANALYSIS OF THE BILL

Title I contains general provisions and declares that the maximum development of the potentialities of exceptional children through adequate provision of special education and related services is in the national interest. It further declares that Federal assistance in these programs is necessary and in the national interest but prohibits any Federal control over the curriculum, instruction, administration, or personnel of any education system or institution.

The term exceptional children is defined to include blind, partially sighted, deaf, hearing impaired, speech defective, crippled, cerebral palsied, mentally retarded, emotionally handicapped, and gifted children.

Special education is defined as the provision of special educational materials, facilities, testing and evaluation, and special courses of instruction conducted by personnel with special qualifications to meet the special needs of exceptional children.

A State allotment percentage and the Federal share are determined by formulas based on the State per capita income related to the national per capita income. The Federal share ranges from 50 to 70 percent of the cost.

The bill authorizes an additional Assistant Commissioner of Education and other personnel to carry out its provisions. It establishes in the Office of Education an Advisory Council on Special Education for Exceptional Children consisting of 15 to 25 members. The bill also directs the Commissioner of Education to establish technical advisory committees and authorizes appropriations to carry out the provisions of title I.

Under title II, covering financial assistance to the States for special education and related services, the bill authorizes an appropriation of $1 million for the fiscal year 1964 to develop State plans. The bill authorizes appropriations of $20 million for the fiscal year of 1964, $30 million for fiscal 1965, and such sums as the Congress may thereafter determine for payments to the States to provide special education and related services for exceptional children.

States desiring to receive Federal payments for special education and related services must submit State plans including provisions that funds will be spent solely for special education and related services by public elementary and secondary schools for exceptional children and for residential school and preschool services, whether provided directly by the public schools or through contracts with public or other nonprofit organizations. Among other provisions, State plans must provide for financial participation by the State after the close of the fiscal year 1965.

Title III of the bill authorizes appropriations of $3 million for the fiscal year 1964, $4 million for the fiscal year 1965, and such sums as the Congress thereafter determines to be necessary for extension and improvement grants to State or local school systems for extension and improvement grants to finance improvement of special education projects for a specific period of time.

Title IV of the bill authorizes appropriations of $12 million for fiscal 1964, $12 million for fiscal 1965, and such sums as the Congress may determine thereafter to be necessary for personnel training and special projects. The Commissioner of Education is authorized to make grants to public and other nonprofit colleges and universities to provide training of special education teachers and other specialized professional personnel. To receive grants, colleges and universities must be accredited for the training offered and must offer fellowships and stipends for the training.

The Commissioner is also authorized to make grants to State educational agencies to improve the qualifications of personnel engaged in, or preparing to engage in, administration or supervision of special education and related services. These grants may be used for scholarships and fellowships with appropriate stipends and for seminars and other special training programs.

The bill also authorizes the Commissioner to make grants to public and other nonprofit agencies or organizations for special short-term training projects needed in the education of exceptional children.

Title V of the bill authorizes appropriations of $5 million for fiscal 1964, $10 million for fiscal 1965, and such sums as the Congress may thereafter determine to be necessary for research and demonstration grants to State agencies, colleges and universities, or public and other nonprofit educational or research organizations for projects which hold promise of improving special education and related services to exceptional children.

PRESIDENTIAL TRANSITION ACT OF 1963

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 10 minutes and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill entitled the "Presidential Transition Act of 1963." This is similar to H.R. 12479 which I introduced in the 87th Congress.

This bill was introduced by me to carry out a recommendation made to the Congress by President Kennedy on May 29, 1962, along with certain other proposals dealing with the financing of presidential election campaigns. The various proposals resulted from a study and report prepared by the President's Commission on Campaign Costs. This was a bipartisan committee made up of members with varied and extensive experience in political finance, such as Alexander Heard, Chairman; V. O. Key, Jr.; Dan Kimball; Malcolm C. Moos; Paul A. Porter; Neil O. Staebler; Walter N. Thayer; John M. Vorys; and James C. Worthy.

My bill deals with the transfer of executive power when there is to be a change of administration. It is related to the problem of campaign financing because it was estimated by the Commission that in 1952–53, the cost to a special Republican committee of the transition period between the election and the inauguration of President Eisenhower exceeded $200,000. In 1960–61 the cost to the Democratic National Committee for the transition period preceding the inauguration of President Kennedy totaled at least $360,000.

These figures cover only a proportion of the costs involved in the transition period between changes of administration. During this time the President-elect must select his Cabinet, the Ambassadors to man diplomatic posts all over the world, top echelon administrative officials, as well as key personnel to staff governmental and White House executive offices.

Some of the individuals chosen by the President-elect to fill crucial roles in the construction and maintenance of the new administration, in the past, have been able to do so only at considerable personal sacrifice. Transportation of such individuals is in itself an expensive item. Housing during the conference period is also costly. When the conferences end in an appointment, the new appointee in most cases must incur hotel expenses until permanent housing is procured. The requirement to work without pay for 2 or 3 months while incurring the increased personal expenditures is an unreasonable demand upon persons of limited means. Some of the special studies requested by President-elect Kennedy were produced through the generosity of his consultants, not only with respect to their own time but with respect to the substantial clerical and administrative costs as well. Such costs in 1960-61 totaled almost $1 million, in addition to the $360,000 payment by the Democratic National Committee.

The time is long since past when an American President may dispense with all but a few preliminaries in assuming office. The size and complexity of today's Federal Government, the pressing domestic and international problems facing the President, all combine to make it imperative that the machinery of transition be as efficient as possible and sufficient resources available for the required orientation of the new leader.

This orientation can only be provided by the outgoing administration. Therefore, it must be recognized as a legitimate function of government and a legitimate expense of government. Under present conditions, a new President, in one sense, begins working for the Government the morning after the election.

It is understood that both President-elect Eisenhower and President-elect Kennedy were given the cooperation of their predecessors and access to needed information. This is a tribute to the intelligent and friendly attitude of all these gentlemen. But at this period of our history, I believe it more fitting that we establish a formal process supported by law. Rather than leave this important matter to the discretion or whim of the individuals concerned, it would seem wisdom to guard against the dangers of noncooperation, remote as they may be. Under certain circumstances, such as a campaigning incumbent defeated by the President-elect in a hard fought campaign, such dangers could arise.

I submit that the vital transition of Executive power from the outgoing to the incoming administration is a matter of bipartisan national interest. The use of political party funds for such an activity is not desirable. Nor can we escape the fact that there is a lack of dignity in a system which requires party solicitors to seek out private funds to support the necessary activities of the President-elect of the United States.

Briefly, the bill I am bringing before you does the following:

Section 1 gives the title: "The Presidential Transition Act of 1963."

Section 2 declares its purpose to promote the orderly transfer of Executive power during the several months of transition from one administration to the other.

Section 3 authorizes certain services to be provided by the General Services Administration to President-elect and Vice-Presidents-elect, such as office space, compensation for staff personnel and experts, travel expenses, and so forth.

Section 4 authorizes necessary services, office space, and so forth to outgoing Presidents and Vice Presidents for 6 months following the expiration of their terms.

Section 5 authorizes the Congress to appropriate such funds as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of the act.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, may I draw your attention to the fact that this bill to provide Federal Government funds for the vital transition of Executive power from the outgoing to the incoming administration has received the endorsement of President Kennedy and former Presidents Harry S Truman and Dwight D. Eisenhower, as well as former presidential candidates Thomas E. Dewey, Adlai E. Stevenson, and Richard M. Nixon.

John M. Bailey and Congressman WILLIAM E. MILLER, the chairman of the two major political parties, have also lent their full endorsement and support.

Mr. Speaker, I can see no valid reason why this body should not enact the necessary legislation to meet this kind of transition as a matter of organized procedure and as a matter of law in order to orient and in order to effect the orderly transition of power into the new Government, particularly, Mr. Speaker, at a time when it is extremely necessary for a new Government taking over this Government of ours to be able to meet almost immediately the challenges which are constantly hurled at us, the American people, every hour of the day.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

CUBAN CAVES

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. CLEVELAND] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, on February 28, I made a statement concerning Cuban caves which appeared on page 3251 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. At the time, I stated I had written to the Legislative Reference Service asking for any available information on Cuban caves. The information I received was fragmentary and inconclusive.

At the end of my statement, I called upon the administration to release any information it possessed concerning Cuban caves. I did this because the administration had set a precedent in releasing aerial photographs of missile sites last fall. Also, the gravity of the situation led me to believe that the American people should know—one way or another—about Cuban caves.

This morning, the Chicago Tribune has a large headline, "Cuban Caves Hide Arms." The article was written by the distinguished journalist, Willard Edwards, of the Chicago Tribune press service. The Edwards article is based on testimony by Army Intelligence Chief Maj. Gen. Alva R. Fitch before the Senate Armed Services Committee yesterday.

Mr. Edwards says in the article:

> Aerial photography has further revealed the building of new roads to cave locations, Major General Fitch testified, and it is considered highly probable that much military equipment and supplies are being stored underground.

I wish to insert the complete Chicago Tribune story at this point in my remarks:

CUBAN CAVES HIDE ARMS—AERIAL PHOTOS BARE BUILDING OF NEW ROADS—RUSSIAN TROOPS SHOW MUCH ACTIVITY

(By Willard Edwards)

> WASHINGTON, March 6.—The Army's intelligence chief reported to Senate investigators today that Russian troops in Cuba are showing much activity in connection with caves throughout the island.
>
> Aerial photography has further revealed the building of new roads to cave locations, Maj. Gen. Alva R. Fitch testified, and "it is considered highly probable that much military equipment and supplies are being stored underground."
>
> MISSILE CREWS LEAVE
>
> "To date, there are no indications that Russian ground force units have departed from Cuba other than those associated with the missile systems which were removed last fall," Fitch said.
>
> This information was contained in a statement released as Fitch went into a closed session with the Senate Preparedness Investigating Subcommittee, headed by Senator JOHN STENNIS, Democrat, of Mississippi, which is probing all angles of the Cuban threat.
>
> "Cuban refugees continue to report that strategic missiles were not all actually removed from Cuba and that they have been stored in caves and underground installations," Fitch stated.
>
> "While all such reports receive exhaustive analysis, it is our belief that the Soviets did, in fact, remove all strategic weapons systems that were in Cuba at the time of the quarantine last October 22.
>
> "From the large volume and frequency of reports concerning the underground storage of ammunition, supplies, vehicles, and even aircraft, it is certain that there is considerable activity in connection with underground installations throughout the island.
>
> "In numerous cases, reports indicate that this activity is being carried out solely by Soviet personnel and that Cubans, including highly placed military, are not permitted access thereto."
>
> AIR-CONDITIONED CAVES
>
> "There are several thousand caves in Cuba and many have been used for storage over the years. With the reported addition of dehumidification and air-conditioning equipment, many would be suited to storage of both large and delicate electronic items."
>
> Fitch said there had been "a substantial increase both in quantity and quality of heavy military equipment in Cuba in the last year.
>
> "Modern tanks, artillery mortars, and motor transport vehicles have been noted, including the free rocket overground [Frog] missile which has a nuclear capacity," Fitch reported. "Other missiles and armored personnel carriers are similar to those in use by American forces," he said.
>
> INCLUDES T-54 TANKS
>
> "Other modern items in Cuba include the T-54 tank with a 100 mm. gun, similar to our M-60 main battle tank with 105 mm. gun," he told the committee. "There are also medium tanks, truck-mounted multiple rocket launchers, and amphibious personnel carriers.
>
> "With the introduction of this equipment into Cuba, the potential firepower and mobility of ground forces has been increased considerably. We do not believe any of the sophisticated equipment—rocket launchers and tanks—have yet been turned over to the Cubans.
>
> "Training activities have been intensified, improving the capabilities of Cuban personnel to utilize soviet equipment. No nuclear warheads are believed to be in Cuba although it is possible that they could be used by some of the weapons systems there."

Today's Washington Post & Times Herald carried an article on page 2 entitled "Army Gives Report on Cuba Caves." Staff Reporter John G. Norris quotes Major General Fitch as saying:

> Cuban refugees continue to report that strategic missiles were not all actually removed from Cuba and that they have been stored in caves.

General Fitch goes on to say:

> While all such reports receive exhaustive analysis. It is our belief that the Soviets did, in fact, remove all strategic weapons systems that were in Cuba at the time the quarantine was imposed.

Although General Fitch conceded that "ammunition, supplies, vehicles, and even aircraft" might be stored in "several thousand caves," he was unable to confirm or deny that Soviet missiles had been completely removed from Cuba.

The complete Washington Post article follows:

ARMY GIVES REPORT ON CUBA CAVES

(By John G. Norris)

> The Army's intelligence chief testified yesterday that thousands of caves in Cuba are being used to store Soviet weapons. But he voiced doubt that the hidden war stocks include offensive missiles or bombers.
>
> Maj. Gen. Alva R. Fitch, reporting to the Senate Preparedness Subcommittee in its investigation of the Russian military buildup there, gave the most detailed official report yet on what American intelligence knows about underground weapons storage in Cuba.
>
> A censored version of his testimony in closed session, released to the press, also declared that:
>
> To date there are no indications that Soviet ground force units have left Cuba

other than those associated with the withdrawn missile forces.

No nuclear warheads are believed to be in Cuba, although they possibly could be used by some of the Soviet weapons systems now there.

REFUGEE REPORTS

In his discussion of the underground weapons storage, Fitch said that "Cuban refugees continue to report that strategic missiles were not all actually removed from Cuba and that they have been stored in caves."

"While all such reports receive exhaustive analysis," he went on, "it is our belief that the Soviets did, in fact, remove all strategic weapons systems that were in Cuba at the time the quarantine was imposed."

But Fitch said that in light of the large volume and frequency of intelligence reports about the underground storage of ammunition, supplies, vehicles, and even aircraft it is certain that there is much activity in connection with the several thousand caves in Cuba.

Reports indicate, he said, that such underground storage is handled by Russians and that Cubans—including high-ranking military men—are not allowed access to the caves.

SUITABLE FOR STORAGE

Intelligence reports tell of the use of dehumidification and air-conditioning equipment in the caves, which would make them suitable for storage of both large and delicate electronic items. Aerial photography, Fitch reported, has revealed that roads have been built to both known and suspected cave locations.

In the 6-month period before the mid-October Cuban crisis, Fitch said, military intelligence received about 3,000 reports that were evaluated and coordinated with the data obtained from aerial reconnaissance.

Fitch listed the following heavy modern army equipment introduced into Cuba: T-54 tanks mounting a 100-milimeter gun; SU-100 assault guns of similar caliber on tracks; truck-mounted multiple rocket launchers; Snapper wire-guided antitank missiles: new (1961 model) 8-wheeled armored personnel carriers; Frog missiles, similar to the U.S. Honest John rockets, with a nuclear capability; artillery motars, and amphibious personnel carriers.

This equipment, Fitch said, increases considerably the potential firepower and mobility of Communist forces in Cuba. But he added that it was doubted that any of the more sophisticated weapons had as yet been turned over to the Cubans, although training to this end has been intensified.

Major General Fitch's testimony before the Armed Services Committee yesterday gives us little to be happy about. However, I applaud the fact that this administration has seen fit to tell the American people just what it knows about Cuban caves.

I hope as time goes on that we will have more precise information concerning Soviet weapons in Cuba. The American people have a right to know the nature and extent of the Cuban threat to this hemisphere.

HOW STRONG IS THE DOLLAR?

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. Cleveland] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, on March 5 the Washington Post and Times Herald had an article on page 8 entitled "De Gaulle Considering Purchase of U.S. Bonds."

This story, filed in Paris, states that our Government is trying to get the French Government to buy $100 million to $150 million in short-term U.S. Treasury bonds. The reason given for this action is:

> The American Government anticipates possible difficulty in defending the dollar toward the end of 1963 or the beginning of 1964.

The complete article as follows:

De Gaulle Considering Purchase of U.S. Bonds

Paris, March 4.—President Charles de Gaulle is considering whether to authorize the purchase of U.S. Treasury bonds to support the dollar, it is reported here tonight.

The result may be made known after Tuesday's weekly Cabinet meeting.

France's decision may depend on whether the American Government is willing or able to curb America investments in key sectors of the European economy. Officials here fear control of these sectors may be purchased by foreign capital.

America's request for financial aid from France was formally presented last Thursday to Finance Minister Valery Giscard d'Estaing by Robert Roosa, American Under Secretary of the Treasury. Roosa is understood to have asked for the purchase, in francs, of $100 million to $150 million worth of short-term (15 month) Treasury bonds. Switzerland, Italy, and Germany have all bought bonds in their own currencies under similar arrangements.

Financial circles here interpret the offering of these short-term bonds as an indication that the American Government anticipates possible difficulty in defending the dollar toward the end of 1963 or the beginning of 1964.

It is felt here that the request may give De Gaulle a good opportunity to bring pressure on the United States to restrict investment in French fields where American capital has recently become unwelcome—oil, real estate, automobiles, and the food industry.

It seems paradoxical, French experts are remarking, that the U.S. Government should be obliged to seek foreign support for its currency at the same time that private companies in America are exporting large sums, thus aggravating the balance of payments situation for the United States.

Not only are these American companies exporting funds for new investments, these observers say; they are also holding in Europe profits made on previous investments, placing them chiefly in Swiss holding companies, instead of repatriating them to the United States.

The question is raised here whether present American legislation permits the U.S. Government to curb foreign investment. Present French legislation in most cases does not enable the French Government to bar it directly.

An organization just set up may be regarded by the French as a possible channel for regulating a flow of funds that for the moment neither country seems able to control. This is Eurofinance, a group of five European banks, including the French Société Générale, and five American banks, ostensibly simply a research center to provide information to Americans or Europeans or Europeans desirous of investing in Europe.

If true, this story raises the specter of inflation—inflation spelling bad news for Americans living on fixed incomes.

It seems paradoxical to me, that our Government is proposing deficit financing at a time when we are forced to buy foreign exchange. Perhaps we should consider surplus financing or, at the very least, a solidly balanced budget.

PROBLEMS OF URBAN AREAS

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. Morse] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, at the present time the Congress of the United States is engaged in the study and consideration of a number of matters of vital importance to our fast growing metropolitan areas. Hearings are just being completed on proposals to aid mass transportation; other studies are underway on a variety of subjects including juvenile delinquency, air pollution, and crime. What has struck me about all of this activity is the lack of coordination between these areas of inquiry. Two years ago, I introduced a resolution to creat a select committee composed of 13 Members of the House of Representatives. This committee was to "conduct a full and complete investigation and study of the problems of urban areas, including housing, urban renewal, slum clearance, prevention and elimination of urban blight, air and water pollution, water supply, sewage facilities, transportation, and other problems of urban areas."

Little progress seems to have been made in coordinating these studies. Therefore I am again submitting this resolution in the hope that a study, such as the one proposed, will enable the House to act on the basis of informed, coherent judgment in dealing with these problems. The areas of concern which I have mentioned are necessarily related; they can thus be considered most profitably together. I urge my colleagues to turn their attention to this matter.

UNFAIR COMMERCIAL ACTIVITIES

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. Lindsay] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, I introduce today for appropriate reference a bill to provide civil remedies to persons damaged by unfair commercial activities in or affecting commerce. This is a revised version of previous bills which I have introduced on the same subject.

The text has been rearranged so that some of the sections appear in a different order and a few additional alterations have been made in language in a continuing effort to allay the fears which have been expressed by certain persons that this proposed legislation would interfere in some way with the power of the States to continue to enforce their own laws in the field of unfair competition. This view is based on a misconception of the purpose of the bill.

It is not the intention of this proposed legislation to take away from the courts of the several States their jurisdiction over unfair competition cases between citizens of the same or different States. The purpose of the legislation is to establish a Federal cause of action for unfair competition in addition to the existing common law right of action and to grant to Federal courts exclusive jurisdiction over actions under this legislation. The States retain full jurisdiction to enforce their own standards, and this bill leaves an aggrieved party who believes he has a cause of action under State law perfectly free to proceed in a State court if that is his preference.

The bill uses the term "unfair commercial activities" instead of the more usual expression "unfair competition" in order to avoid the possible limiting effect of the latter term. The proposed legislation is designed to establish uniform Federal rules of fair practice in all forms of commercial activity. These rules will be enforcible in the Federal courts by any person who is damaged or likely to be damaged by the unfair act or practice; provided, of course, that the commerce affected is within the proper scope of congressional regulation under the Constitution.

I am pleased to announce that an identical bill has been introduced by Senator JAVITS in the other body, and I wish to commend the Committee on Trade Marks and Unfair Competition of the Association of the Bar of the City of New York for their fine assistance in the drafting of this legislation.

Finally, I enclose the text of a memorandum which explains the bill in greater detail:

MEMORANDUM TO ACCOMPANY BILL TO PROVIDE CIVIL REMEDIES TO PERSONS DAMAGED BY UNFAIR COMMERCIAL ACTIVITIES IN OR AFFECTING COMMERCE

The accompanying bill essentially is the same as H.R. 7833, 86th Congress, 1st session (1959); H.R. 4590, 87th Congress, 1st session (1961); S. 1036, 87th Congress, 1st session (1961); H.R. 10038, 87th Congress, 2d session (1962); and S. 2784, 87th Congress, 2d session (1962). Although no hearings were held on any of these bills, they have been the subject of considerable study within the legal profession which has led to various modifications, culminating in the present version. The original bill was drafted by the Committee on Trade Marks and Unfair Competition of the Association of the Bar of the City of New York, which also has prepared each of the successive variations in response to comment and criticism from other bar associations, trade associations and the like.

The basic purpose of the bill is to create a Federal statutory cause of action that could be invoked by an injured party as an alternative to the common-law tort of unfair competition in cases where interstate commerce is affected.

In the absence of such a statute, there can be no uniform Federal rules in the law of unfair competition. This comes about because of the decision of the U.S. Supreme Court in 1938 in the famous case of *Erie R. Co.* v. *Tompkins* (304 U.S. 64), which held that there is no Federal common law. As a result, Federal courts that have jurisdiction of cases because of the diversity of citizenship of the parties must apply the law of the State in which they sit; and this extends to unfair competition cases.

There are many branches of law where the rule of *Erie* v. *Tompkins* has salutary effects because it prevents the accidental availability of Federal jurisdiction from affecting the law applicable to a given controversy. In the field of unfair competition, however, the effect of this decision has been to prevent the development of uniform nationwide rules of business fairplay and this situation has been widely criticized.

As communication and transportation become increasingly rapid, business activities tend more and more to be interstate in character and even local operations more often than not will have an effect on the interstate business of someone else. Accordingly, there is a clear need for uniformity in the law applicable to unfair commercial activities, and this has been recognized by many eminent authorities. However, uniformity cannot be secured under the present checkerboard system where the specific legal principles of the individual States must be applied even by the Federal courts. This bill would make unfair commercial activities an offense cognizable in the Federal courts as the violation of a right created by a Federal statute. As a result, a uniform body of law would be created. This would provide certainty for businessmen, prevent forum-shopping and tend to raise the level of commercial morality in the country as a whole.

The bill does not favor any particular class, group, or industry as against any other. It is an effort by disinterested lawyers to improve the administration of justice in the important field of unfair competition.

Section 1 states the intent of the bill, which is to protect any person engaged in interstate commerce against unfair commercial activities by making actionable in a Federal forum all unfair commercial activities set forth in the bill, whether used or committed locally or in interstate commerce. Section 1 is designed to invoke the fullest possible scope of congressional power under the commerce clause of the Constitution. This statement of intent is somewhat reminiscent of the corresponding provision in the Lanham Act, the Trademark Act of 1946 (15 U.S. sec. 1127; Intent of Act), but is even more explicit in its language.

Section 2 sets forth the scope of relief to be available under the bill. The right of action is for an injunction; no damages may be recovered. There are two main reasons for the limitation to injunctive relief. It is believed that plaintiffs in most cases of this nature are interested primarily in bringing about the cessation of the unlawful acts rather than in collecting damages, which may be difficult to prove even in the best of circumstances. Furthermore, the absence of any provision for damages should prevent the use of the new right of action as the basis for "strike" suits. At the same time, a party with a genuine claim should not be deterred from bringing an action because of its expense; accordingly, section 2 provides for reasonable attorneys' fees in the discretion of the court, in addition to taxable costs and disbursements. Such a judgment is available not merely to a successful plaintiff, but to the "prevailing party," so that a successful defendant also is entitled to make an application for counsel fees, as well as to recover statutory costs and disbursements.

Section 3 lists the "unfair commercial activities" that are made actionable. The expression "unfair commercial activities" was selected deliberately because it was felt that "unfair competition" might be construed as a limitation, since some "unfair competition" cases have required a showing of actual competition, in addition to a showing of unfairness, as a prerequisite to relief. Section 3 contains only four subsections. This brief list of unfair commercial activities that would violate the statute represents a carefully chosen compromise. On the one hand, it would be a practical impossibility to define in detail every type of conduct sought to be prohibited; as the U.S. Supreme Court said in the case of *Federal Trade Commission* v. *Gratz* (253 U.S. 421, 437 (1920)), "An enumeration, however comprehensive, of existing methods of unfair competition must necessarily prove incomplete, as with new conditions constantly arising, novel unfair methods would be devised and developed." On the other hand, a simple statement that all unfair acts in commerce shall be unlawful would not have been sufficiently precise to serve as a basis for the desired uniformity of decision throughout the Federal judicial system.

Section 3(a) is framed in terms of the "commission" of an act or practice, or the "use" of a statement. This introductory language is intended to embrace all forms of activity, including the unfair use of a statement prepared by a third party. There are three parts to subsection (a); the first two of these cover confusion as to the affiliation, connection, or association of the defendant, and confusion as to the origin, source, or sponsorship of the goods or services of the defendant. The concept of confusion is the basis of trademark infringement under the Lanham Act (15 U.S.C. 1114 (1); the bill would extend this concept to confusion caused by means other than the use of colorable imitations of a trademark. In addition, section 3(a)(2) would codify the law of confusion of sponsorship, which (under that designation) has developed largely in cases involving questions of the registrability of trademarks, and make it available in nontrademark cases as well. Section 3(a)(3) would be a Federal antidilution law, paralleling similar enactments in recent years in Georgia, Illinois, Massachusetts, and New York. This liberal doctrine thus would become available in any trademark or trade name case where interstate commerce was affected.

Section 3(b) prohibits the use of false or misleading statements about the goods or services of either party. It is limited to statements "of fact" in order to avoid prohibiting anyone from stating his opinion. Since section 3(b) applies to statements about the goods or services of "either party," it covers not only false advertising of what the defendant is offering, but also trade libel or disparagement directed against the plaintiff's products or services. Doubts about the availability of injunctive relief against disparagement, caused in some jurisdictions by false analogies to libel and slander, thus would be removed. Section 3(b) specifically contemplates the possibility that a statement may be false or misleading by reason of the omission of a material fact as well as by an actual misstatement of fact. In this respect, it resembles the definition of a false advertisement in the Federal Trade Commission Act (15 U.S.C. sec. 55(a)(1)).

Section 3(c) is a deliberate catchall. It is directed against "the commission for purposes of profit of any other act or practice which is likely to deceive or which violates reasonable standards of commercial ethics." This language resembles the provisions of two multilateral treaties to which the United States is a party: Article 10 bis, paragraph 2, of the International Convention for the Protection of Industrial Property, which provides, "Any act of competition contrary to honest practices in industrial or commercial matters constitutes an act of unfair competition"; and article 20 of the Pan-American Trade-Mark Convention, which provides, "Every act or deed contrary to commercial good faith or to the normal and honorable development of industrial or business activities shall be considered as unfair competition and, therefore, unjust and prohibited."

Section 3(d) is a provision against the institution in bad faith of an action under the proposed new act itself. This is considered to be an obviously desirable protective feature to avoid possible abuses of the statutory right.

In summary, section 3 has for its purpose the establishment of guideposts for the Federal courts that are explicit enough to identify the principal types of unlawful activity and yet will allow the flexibility of interpretation that is essential in a field where rapid technological advances in business and communications constantly create new opportunities for exploitation by the unscrupulous few.

Section 4 is designed to provide additional assurance of a broad, liberal construction for the bill. It states that, "Absence of competition between the parties * * * shall not be a defense to an action brought under this act." Section 4 also assures the widest possible access to the benefits of the statute by providing that no showing of actual damage shall be a prerequisite to relief and that absence of any public interest in the subject matter of the action shall not constitute a defense.

Section 5 protects innocent publishers and broadcasters by making the absence of knowledge or intent a defense in an action against such a party in respect of the contents of "any news, literary, educational, advertising, or entertainment medium." Section 6 provides that relief under the statute shall not be available when the injunction would delay the dissemination of a particular issue of a periodical, the broadcast of a radio or television program, or the showing of a motion picture, after the regularly scheduled time therefor. These provisions are similar to the corresponding section in the Lanham Act (15 U.S.C. sec. 1114(2)) and also resemble the provisions of the Federal Trade Commission Act (15 U.S.C. sec. 53(b)).

Section 7 limits the substantive offense by providing that the statute is not to be so construed as to "extend or enlarge the rights and remedies provided under the patent or copyright laws of the United States." The purpose of this provision is to guard against possible attempts that might otherwise be made to use the new statute as a device for increasing the scope or duration of a patent or copyright monopoly. Trademarks are not mentioned in section 7 because they stand on a different footing from copyrights and patents. The bill does broaden the rights of trademark proprietors; and the possible criticism about extending the duration of the right that might have been made (in the absence of sec. 7) with respect to copyrights and patents is inapplicable to trademarks, because a trademark remains valid indefinitely under existing law so long as it is not abandoned.

Sections 8 and 9 should be considered together. Section 8 grants exclusive jurisdiction to the Federal courts of all actions arising under the statute, without regard to diversity of citizenship or jurisdictional amount. However, this does not mean that State law is discarded. Section 9 of the bill provides that the relief available under the statute "shall be in addition to and not in exclusion of those rights and remedies otherwise available under the common law or pursuant to the statutes of any State or of the United States." Section 9 goes on to state explicitly that the statute shall not be construed in such a way as to preempt the jurisdiction of any State to grant relief against unfair commercial activities. The net effect of these provisions is to create a new right of action cognizable exclusively in the Federal courts, but at the same time to preserve existing State law in the same field. Most cases of unfair competition tend to be brought in the Federal courts and it is expected that in the future such cases would invoke the new statute. However, a plaintiff who wished to invoke State law would be free to proceed in the State court based on the same facts that also would create a right of action under the new Federal statute; such a party would be entitled to all the benefits of State law if he chose to pursue them, either in addition to or in substitution for the Federal right of action, entirely unaffected by the provisions of the bill.

Section 10 contains definitions of a number of terms used in the bill. Most of these are borrowed almost verbatim from the definition section of the Lanham Act (15 U.S.C. 1127).

Section 11 is the customary saving clause for partial invalidity.

Section 12 provides that the new statute shall take effect immediately upon its enactment, but that it shall not affect any proceeding pending at that time.

Section 13 provides a short title for the statute, viz, the Unfair Commercial Activities Act.

FREE ENTERPRISE — THE TRUE FOUNDATION OF A FREE WORLD

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. YOUNGER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, recently one of America's leading industrialists and builders was honored for his contributions to the free enterprise system we cherish so much. The man selected to receive the first International Broadcasting Award was Henry J. Kaiser. Mr. Kaiser has played an important role in the growth of the industrial might of this country, and more recently, the developing nations of the world.

True to his credo, "Find a Need and Fill It," Mr. Kaiser is searching the corners of the earth for opportunities that will help all mankind enjoy a fuller, more rewarding life. It has been said that Mr. Kaiser never looks back upon his accomplishments—instead, he constantly is looking ahead, seeking out new areas of need.

As he accepted the Free Enterprise Award he presented such an inspiring appraisal of the future that I wanted to call your attention to his enthusiastic forecast. I ask unanimous consent to place into the body of the RECORD his remarks at the International Broadcasting Award dinner on February 26 in Hollywood:

FREE ENTERPRISE—THE TRUE FOUNDATION OF A FREE WORLD

(By Henry J. Kaiser)

Tonight I salute the great world of broadcasting and advertising, embracing, as you do, drama, entertainment, music, song, art, the printed and spoken word—the most powerful force of all time to bring pleasure, enlightenment, and the fruits of free enterprise to people.

I am grateful with all my heart for the award you have presented me. Yet after saying "thank you more than I can voice"—I would prove unworthy of the honors if I didn't say—"now let's get on with our jobs ahead."

What kind of a tomorrow are we going to build?

What will the United States be like in the mid-1970's and by the year 2000?

Fortunately we have some solid forecasts in figures. Our Government joined two national planning associations in predicting what Americans will achieve in the last one-third of this century.[1]

Their report, just issued, stimulates me tremendously. The experts look at the long-pull trends.

The trouble with short-run estimates often is that forecasts just for this year may be conflicting and confusing, perhaps influenced by a temporary situation or clashing theories. Under short-range estimates, the forecaster may miss the forest for the trees.

But this long-range forecast takes account of the historic past performance of our economy and projects the trends that should prevail.

So here are highlights of this official forecast for the year 1976:

Only 13 years from now—this country's annual output of goods and services will reach about one thousand billion dollars.

Our employment will exceed 92 million with the labor force one-third again as large as now.

Almost 70 percent of American families will be earning, at current prices, more than $6,000 a year.

America's population will top 235 million people.

Two-thousand-miles-an-hour planes will fly us from Los Angeles to New York in 90 minutes—New York to Moscow in 2 hours.

Those are some of the official forecasts.

To me they emphasize that there lie immediately ahead times of spectacular change, challenges of revolutionary impact, yet undreamed-of opportunities.

Science and industry are jet propelling this generation into lightning progress of material civilization far outmatching anything mankind has ever known.

Scientists and free enterprisers are making breakthrough in every field.

In electronics alone, you well know how millions of robots are at work for us in our daily lives with computers and pushbutton control systems making it possible to do jobs in factories, offices, and laboratories that before have been too complex or laborious for humans. In television, there are the wonders of transistors and of Telstar spanning the continents, as man learns how to send messages millions of miles along a beam of light.

Our lives will be affected by the peaceful use of atomic energy and new, vaster sources of power by amazing discoveries in chemistry, drugs, and living cells by new uses of metals and other materials and new processes providing us with thousands of new products for you to advertise and sell.

---

[1] "Projections to the Years 1976 and 2000: Economic Growth, Population, Labor Force and Leisure, and Transportation," reports to Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission, to the President and Congress; U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C.

I have just quoted you the forecasts for 13 years from today. Now let's consider the forecasts that this same important report makes for the year 2000.

Here are some of the things that the able economists state will take place in the next 37 years:

The Nation will have 350 million people—almost twice as many as today.

The goods and services produced annually will be almost four times our current gross national product. They will reach $2,000 billion.

Just imagine what this 2-trillion-a-year economy will mean in more of all the things for the people who produce, market, and consume the abundance of a fabulous age.

The average family's yearly income—after taxes and in 1959 dollars, mind you—will soar to $14,750, the survey states.

Fifteen times as many families will be earning $20,000 a year and up.

I don't for a minute blink at staggering forecasts like these. I remember being warned years ago, "Henry, don't be fantastic; don't soar into the wild blue yonder," when I urged—let's set our goals for the postwar at 60 million jobs and a 400-billion-a-year economy in the United States. Yet that target has been well exceeded. These forecasts force us to raise our sights.

Spending for housing will triple, the report forecasts.

Five times as much probably will be invested in plant and equipment.

By the turn of this century, we are told we will almost double today's number of jobs. There will be 135 million people gainfully employed.

Their average workweek will be 30 to 31 hours—some 8 hours less than now.

They will have month-long vacations as a rule. They will travel nearly three times as much as now—on the average 11,000 miles a year per person.

Turning to California, I dug into the 434-page book of projections and thought back 15 years ago when skeptics scoffed when I predicted this State's population by 1970 would gain 50 percent and would reach 20 million. I was too conservative. California is headed for 18 million people this year and more than 22 million by 1970. Then what? The forecast is that California in a mere 37 years will have 41 million people.

Now I'm leaving the figures on the magnitude of the growth ahead, and looking to the deeper meanings.

More skills and knowledge than ever before will be called upon in coming years.

The psychologist Walter Pitkin showed that not more than one-fifth of the average man's brain is ever used as it might be, and perhaps half of one's brain remains unused from birth to death. We should not be satisfied with that.

For the future that's right upon us, our youth must be educated to their maximum capacities trained to the skills that will be in serious shortage for this age of science. And equally important—they desperately need to be grounded in the humanities—in human relations—and the realms of the spirit.

The jobs ahead call for more ideas and ideals—more courage and will—more zest for work—more brainpower. There always will be still tougher so-called "impossibles." Personally, I occasionally look back on the past only to goad myself to the faith that the pending "impossibles" can be done. We should take the "t" out of "can't."

The skeptics said a new cement plant could not make it in northern California which they claimed already had too much capacity. Yet that company's capacity has been multiplied seven times.

Doubting Thomases said the west coast could not mass-produce ships; it didn't have the shipbuilders. Yet ships were built at record low cost at a rate of one a day.

Hardheaded men argued that the west coast had neither the raw materials nor the markets to build its own integrated steel industry. However, a 3-million-ton-a-year steel plant today feeds the industrialization of the West.

Sixteen reasons were given why a newcomer would flop trying to enter the aluminum industry. Two hundred firms turned down operating the wartime aluminum plants, convinced "aluminum will be running out of our ears." Yet that aluminum business has multiplied nearly six times.

Opponents said that they would kill a "new economics of medical care." Yet some 60 hospitals and medical clinics now provide care to 1 million health plan members.

These examples illustrate this credo—find a need and fill it.

At this time of new and unprecedented opportunities, find the needs for tomorrow—to make life fuller, richer, more meaningful, more satisfying to the inner individual.

The revolt is rising to rebuild our huge but decaying, traffic-clogged, nightmarish cities.

Let us resolve that increasing affluence and leisure shall not bring wasteful idleness, heedlessness, and the rot of soft living.

A tremendously greater number of people will engage in a gigantic upsurge of the service businesses and trades. We will spend far more for all the cultural arts. We seek to create a climate more rewarding to the life of the intellect, and the arts, the adventure and learning of travel—all the self-fulfillments of human growth.

Man is discovering through research and science so many ways for people to live longer, and one of the vital ingredients is to keep young at heart.

A towering strength of the American people's free way of life is our system's ability to meet constant changes.

Freedom for Americans means nothing is ever finished.

We are not under dictator rule that we cannot improve ourselves as individuals. The worth and dignity and freedom of the individual are paramount.

The people's right to vote in free elections guarantees the people's veto over the abuse of power and the right to accomplish changes to meet the public will. It is the genius of the people that they have proved they can make democracy work, however fierce are the onslaughts against it.

It is my abiding faith that our system of freedom under law and justice will endure and prevail, both at home and ultimately around the world.

The talent for struggling through and coming up with ever-better solutions should mean, for one thing, that employers and employee unions can find a better way than crippling strikes to arrive at an equitable sharing of the fruits of productivity.

Kaiser Steel employees and management—with the public represented in the program—are experimenting to find better answers to sharing gains of productivity and to cushioning the impact of technological advances.

Our slogan "Together We Build" could be applied to every citizen, because to live up to our opportunities in this land and win the victory for lasting peace and freedom require everlasting teamwork.

No people in history have given so much to assist other peoples shake off slavery and poverty in mind, body, and spirit.

I was awakened to how much American free enterprise can do to help other peoples when I flew 75,000 miles on industrial development missions in 1954–55 through Latin America.

We were told all the stock, scare reasons that it couldn't be done. Yet in Argentina and Brazil, there were established full automotive manufacturing industries, employing the people's skills, making nearly all the parts there, raising living standards, earning profits, filling needs.

This is done under the "partnership pattern" which is proving itself so much also in other hemispheres.

The grandest achievement that could usher in the 21st century would be that our age should succeed in extending the benefits of civilization to the entire human race.

Win we must—and it's my faith we will win mankind's ceaseless struggle to avert another world war and to attain peace and freedom.

This dip into the future suggests a lot for each and every one of us to do our part.

The world of broadcasting and advertising can carry a powerful message to the people, spurring on the limitless potentials immediately ahead.

The prospects are as limitless as the minds and hearts of men, yet as real as the bold imagination, the faith, the love, and the will to work that men can unleash.

"To be alive in such an age!
With every year a lightning page,
When miracles are everywhere,
And every inch of common air
Throbs a tremendous prophecy
Of greater marvels yet to be.

"To be alive in such an age—
To live in it,
To give to it!
Give thanks with all thy flaming heart—
Crave but to have in it a part."[2]

And may you never underestimate the part you yourself can take. For—

"We never know how high we are,
Till we are called to rise;
And then if we are true to plan,
Our statures touch the skies."[3]

CUBA AND THE PLATT AMENDMENT—OR FORMER PRESIDENT HARRY S. TRUMAN SUFFERS A MENTAL LAPSE

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CRAMER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, former President Harry S. Truman came forward with a suggested solution to the Cuban crisis which, insofar as it relates to the Platt amendment, would be about as effective as the present administration's handling of this matter.

For clarification of the record, I am herewith including a copy of an article by R. H. Shackford, Scripps-Howard staff writer, on Mr. Truman's proposal in which he points out that the Platt amendment was actually partially repealed in 1934 and a new treaty was substituted on May 29 of that year. I also include a memorandum from the Library of Congress on the subject of the Platt amendment and a copy of the treaty of May 29, 1934, which superseded it, believing it is important to keep the record straight as it relates to Cuba. I am glad to see, however, that the former President did recommend that the Monroe Doctrine should be one of the guiding principles of our actions on Cuba, which is consistent with House Joint Resolution 227, which I introduced calling for the restatement and implementation of the Monroe Doctrine:

---

[2] Angela Morgan, "Today."

[3] Emily Dickinson, "Aspiration."

"DEAD" PLATT AMENDMENT ON INTERVENTION INVOLVED—MENTAL LAPSE ATTRIBUTED TO TRUMAN ON CUBAN CRISIS

(By R. H. Shackford)

Former President Harry S. Truman, who prides himself as a scholar of American history, had a major lapse last weekend which should leave him blushing.

In a copyrighted newspaper article on the Cuban crisis he suggested that the Platt amendment was still in effect. Actually, Franklin D. Roosevelt abrogated the Platt amendment in 1934 when he proposed a new treaty with Cuba to supersede the 1903 treaty which included the Platt amendment.

His proposal was ratified by the Senate on June 9, 1934, about 6 months before Mr. Truman became a U.S. Senator.

RIGHTS

The amendment reserved the right of the United States to intervene militarily in Cuba whenever necessary. On May 29, 1934, in asking Senate consent to ratification of a new treaty with Cuba, Mr. Roosevelt said:

"I have publicly declared 'that the definite policy of the United States from now on is one opposed to armed intervention.' In this new treaty with Cuba, the contractual right to intervene in Cuba is abolished, and those further rights, likewise granted to the United States in the same instrument, involving participation in the determination of such domestic policies of the Republic of Cuba as those relating to finance and to sanitation, are omitted therefrom.

"By the consummation of this treaty, this Government will make it clear that it not only opposes the policy of armed intervention, but that it renounces those rights of intervention and interference in Cuba."

CARRIED FURTHER

While Mr. Truman was President this renuncition of U.S. intervention was carried further under the Rio Mutual Defense Treaty. In this pact, intervention anywhere in the hemisphere was renounced.

Mr. Truman's apparent forgetfulness of American history showed up in his article after he had cited the various provisions of the Platt amendment. Then he added:

"It seems to me that when it appeared that the situation in Cuba (under Castro) was getting out of hand and that a threat to the security of this hemisphere was clearly in the making, we should have considered that the basic implications of the Monroe Doctrine were at stake, as well as the reservation imposed by the Platt amendment, which anticipated precisely such a move.

"These provisions, the Monroe Doctrine and the Platt amendment, were there as much for the welfare and protection of Cubans as for the security of all the other nations of this continent."

But the Platt amendment was not "there." It has been dead for almost 30 years.

TREATY OF RELATIONS BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES AND CUBA, SIGNED AT WASHINGTON, MAY 29, 1934

(Department of State, Treaty Series, No. 866. The treaty was ratified by the President of the United States, June 5, 1934)

The United States of America and the Republic of Cuba, being animated by the desire to fortify the relations of friendship between the two countries and to modify, with this purpose, the relations established between them by the Treaty of Relations signed at Havana, May 22, 1903, have appointed, with this intention, as their plenipotentiaries:

[Names of plenipotentiaries]

Who, after having communicated to each other their full powers which were found to be in good and due form, have agreed upon the following articles:

ARTICLE I

The Treaty of Relations which was concluded between the two contracting parties on May 22, 1903, shall cease to be in force, and is abrogated, from the date on which the present treaty goes into effect.

ARTICLE II

All the acts effected in Cuba by the United States of America during its military occupation of the island, up to May 20, 1902, the date on which the Republic of Cuba was established, have been ratified and held as valid; and all the rights legally acquired by virtue of those acts shall be maintained and protected.

ARTICLE III

Until the two contracting parties agree to the modification or abrogation of the stipulations of the agreement in regard to the lease to the United States of America of lands in Cuba for coaling and naval stations signed by the President of the Republic of Cuba on February 16, 1903, and by the President of the United States of America on the 23d day of the same month and year, the stipulations of that agreement with regard to the naval station of Guantanamo shall continue in effect. The supplementary agreement in regard to naval or coaling stations signed between the two Governments on July 2, 1903, also shall continue in effect in the same form and on the same conditions with respect to the naval station at Guantanamo. So long as the United States of America shall not abandon the said naval station of Guantanamo or the two Governments shall not agree to a modification of its present limits, the station shall continue to have the territorial area that it now has, with the limits that it has on the date of the signature of the present treaty.

ARTICLE IV

If at any time in the future a situation should arise that appears to point to an outbreak of contagious disease in the territory of either of the contracting parties, either of the two Governments shall, for its own protection, and without its act being considered unfriendly, exercise freely and at its discretion the right to suspend communications between those of its ports that it may designate and all or part of the territory of the other party, and for the period that it may consider to be advisable.

ARTICLE V

The present Treaty shall be ratified by the contracting parties in accordance with their respective constitutional methods; and shall go into effect on the date of the exchange of their ratifications, which shall take place in the city of Washington as soon as possible.

In faith whereof, the respective Plenipotentiaries have signed the present Treaty and have affixed their seals hereto.

Done in duplicate, in the English and Spanish languages, at Washington on the 29th day of May 1934.

[SEAL] CORDELL HULL,
[SEAL] SUMNER WELLES,
[SEAL] M. MÁRQUEZ STERLING.

THE PLATT AMENDMENT

Following the Spanish-American War, Cuba was occupied by American soldiers until 1902. In 1900, Governor Leonard Wood, acting under orders from Washington, announced an election of an assembly which would draft a constitution for a Cuban government to which the United States would transfer authority. When this assembly was eventually convened, it met with American stipulations. These stipulations, largely drafted by Secretary of War Elihu Root, were introduced in the Senate by Senator Orville H. Platt, of Connecticut, as an amendment to the Army appropriation bill of March 2, 1901, and was adopted by Congress in that form. According to one historian, the Platt amendment "was designed to place such limits upon the island Republic's activities as to make her a safe and tractable neighbor."[1] The amendment authorized the President to terminate the military occupation of Cuba as soon as a Cuban government should have been established under a constitution which "either as a part thereof or in an ordinance appended thereto," would define future relations with the United States as follows:

1. Cuba should never make any treaty with any foreign power which would impair its independence, nor permit any foreign power to obtain "lodgement or control over any portion of said island."

2. Cuba should agree not to contract any debt beyond the capacity of its ordinary revenues to pay.

3. Cuba should consent that the United States might intervene "for the preservation of Cuban independence, the maintenance of a government adequate for the protection of life, property, and individual liberty," and for the discharging of treaty obligations which would now devolve upon Cuba from the United States.

4. Cuba should ratify all the acts of the U.S. military government.

5. It should agree to execute the sanitary program instituted by the military government.

6. Title to the Isle of Pines (an island south of the western end of Cuba) should be left to future adjustment by treaty with the United States.

7. Cuba should sell or lease to the United States the lands necessary for coaling or naval stations at points to be agreed upon.

8. These provisions should be embodied in a permanent treaty with the United States.

The American demand that these stipulations be included in the Cuban constitution were at first resisted by the constituent assembly, but were eventually accepted after Secretary Root assured the Cubans that the intervention contemplated in the third article would take place only in the event of foreign threat or domestic disturbance. The amendment was added as an annex to the Cuban constitution, and embodied in a permanent treaty between the United States and Cuba in 1903.

OCCASIONS FOR INTERVENTION

The first test for the Platt amendment came in 1906. The first President of Cuba, Estrada Palma, had been reelected, but within a few months there was a revolution. Little fighting actually took place, but Estrada Palma appealed for help to President Theodore Roosevelt. President Roosevelt sent William Howard Taft to Cuba to try to get the quarreling Cuban factions to settle their differences. This mission failed, the President of Cuba then resigned, the Cuban Congress received his resignation and then adjourned without choosing a successor.

With Cuba thus left without any effective government, Taft proclaimed a provisional regime. President Roosevelt appointed Charles Magoon provisional governor of Cuba. A "handful of soldiers" occupied Cuba, while Magoon strove to carry out various reforms. After reasonably honest election in 1909, the United States withdrew.

---

[1] Herring, Hubert, "A History of Latin America." New York. Knopf, 1959. p. 404.

In 1911, dissension, riots, and armed uprisings flared again in Cuba. The United States took measures preparatory to intervention. These measures consisted of the dispatch of a few companies of marines to Guantanamo, to aid the established Government in the event anarchy threatened.[2] As events worked out, no greater troop movements were necessary at the time.

Again in 1917, intervention followed on the heels of a disputed election. Declaring that this Government would not recognize a regime established by violence, Secretary of State Lansing urged Cubans to refrain from civil war. Marines were landed to preserve order, and the rebellious faction was defeated. This was the last direct military intervention by the United States in Cuba.

However, we did subsequently send a financial adviser to Cuba, Gen. Enoch Crowder. In 1922 our Government asked Cuba to recognize our right, under the Platt amendment, to investigate certain departments of the Cuban Government. Despite Cuban protests, Crowder proceeded to carry on such an investigation. Under Crowder's direction the budget was cut, crooked contracts uncovered, and the formation of an "honest cabinet" imposed. This latter step was the U.S. requirement for consent to a loan to Cuba by a New York bank. Crowder left Cuba briefly, returned in 1923 as American Ambassador, and this advisory form of intervention was over.

ABROGATION OF THE AMENDMENT

During the late 1920's and early 1930's the regime of President Gerardo Machado grew steadily more repressive. However, President Hoover's administration in this country refrained from intervention. When the administration of Franklin D. Roosevelt assumed office, Sumner Welles was sent as Ambassador to Cuba, as Dr. Julius Pratt wrote, "ostensibly to mediate between Machado and his enemies; really, there is reason to think, to secure Machado's resignation."[3] In any event, Machado did resign and flee the country on August 12, 1933. Several short-lived regimes followed. The United States eventually recognized the regime of Col. Carlos Mendieta, and in May 1934, negotiated a treaty with his government by which the Platt amendment was abrogated, with the United States reserving only the right to use the naval base at Guantanamo Bay until that right might be set aside by mutual consent. The treaty was signed on May 29, 1934, and approved by the Senate 2 days later without a dissenting vote. According to one source, it represented a growing sensitivity to Latin American opinion, and an attempt on our part to convince Latin America of our good and anti-imperialist intentions.[4]

U.S. TAXPAYERS DOLLARS USED IN CUBAN PRISONER EXCHANGE MARCH 7, 1963

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CRAMER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, after a 5-month delay the General Accounting Office has finally answered my inquiry addressed to the Comptroller General on October 9, 1962, relating to the Cuban prisoner blackmail proposals by Castro and the action of the U.S. Government relating thereto.

It appears that contrary to what has been reported to the American people by the Kennedy administration the Government of the United States did participate financially in the Cuban prisoner exchange.

This becomes apparent as a result of the reply I received from Joseph Campbell, Comptroller General, dated March 1.

The Comptroller General's answer, though 5 months late in coming, did reveal "the U.S. Government provided 5 million pounds of nonfat dried milk solids."

This is in complete contradiction to the President's statement that no U.S. goods were included and that the American taxpayer was not involved in the prisoner exchange.

The Comptroller General reported to me that administrative costs of Government services, such as the use of telephones, transportation and salary and overtime expenses were also incurred.

Not even the Comptroller General could find any authority for these expenses; but, and quoting the Comptroller General:

> We do not propose to pursue the matter further.

Campbell wrote me that further supplies of dried milk may be requested by the American Red Cross if it appears that supplies from private contributors are insufficient.

I am hereby protesting any further use of taxpayer's goods for indemnity to Castro and am calling for a full disclosure of this Government's participation in the ransom deal.

Most of my other questions were also answered by the Secretary of State within the context of this letter from the Comptroller General, and those replies are most revealing. I am, therefore, reprinting the letter in full for the information of the Members of the House.

MARCH 1, 1963.

Hon. WILLIAM C. CRAMER,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. CRAMER: This is in response to your telegram of October 9, 1962, questioning U.S. participation in the recent negotiations for the release of Cuban prisoners from a policy standpoint as well as from the standpoint of legal authority for using Government funds for such purpose. You raised the following specific questions:

1. How much in U.S.-owned foodstuffs and other things of value are being made available for this purpose?

2. What authority exists for anyone to negotiate for payment in U.S.-owned foodstuffs to Castro and the Communists?

3. What right does Donovan or any other private citizen have to negotiate with Castro and an enemy government?

4. If Donovan is negotiating on behalf of private citizens only, what right does he have under the Logan Act, 18 U.S.C. 953, to do so—let alone a violation of recent policy statement of the Congress? Doesn't his visit to Cuba require Government approval?

5. If Donovan is negotiating in a manner that obligates the U.S. Government to make up the difference between contributions and the $60 million demanded, is he doing so as an agent of the U.S. Government?

6. Why hasn't a full disclosure of all the facts been made before the deal is closed between Donovan and Castro?

The Secretary of State has reported to us that the release of the prisoners was accomplished by the Cuban Families Committee, a private organization composed of the relatives and friends of the prisoners, assisted by a citizen committee under Gen. Lucius Clay and with the cooperation of private firms and the American Red Cross. The Secretary stated that Mr. James B. Donovan was the principal negotiator for the committee and that the main role of the U.S. Government was to insure that the private effort was not hampered by procedural problems within the Government and to expedite and coordinate the governmental and private aspects of the effort. In answer to the specific questions which you raised there is presented below the information which the Secretary of State furnished us and our comments thereon:

"1. The U.S. Government has provided 5 million pounds of nonfat dried milk solids from Commodity Credit Corporation stocks through the American Red Cross upon the latter's request under general statutory authority (7 U.S.C. 1431) providing for donations to needy peoples, in order to fill any gap that may exist in private donations of goods for the exchange. Representatives of the American Red Cross and the Cuban Red Cross will supervise distribution of the milk in Cuba to insure that it will reach children and other needy persons. The Red Cross has indicated that the Cuban Families Committee expects to raise funds to reimburse the Department of Agriculture. Further supplies of dried milk may be requested by the American Red Cross if it appears that the baby food obtainable from private contributors is insufficient to complete the shipment of goods for the Cuban prisoners' exchange and the Department of Agriculture is prepared to make additional quantities available on such request. The terms of that Department's action were described in its release of January 8, 1963.

"Other than the commitment of dried milk from the surplus stocks of the Department of Agriculture, no U.S. Government funds were used in the prisoner exchange project save for minor administrative costs of Government services, such as use of telephones, some transportation, and some salary and overtime expense. The Government hopes to recover the cost of these services. No unvouchered funds have been used at any time. No tax rulings were issued to contributing companies which were not clearly authorized or required by law or governing court decisions."

Section 1431 of title 7, United States Code, provides, in part, that:

"In order to prevent the waste of commodities whether in private stocks or acquired through price-support operations by the Commodity Credit Corporation before they can be disposed of in normal domestic channels without impairment of the price-support program or sold abroad at competitive world prices, the Commodity Credit Corporation is authorized, on such terms and under such regulations as the Secretary of Agriculture may deem in the public interest: * * * (4) to donate any such food commodities in excess of anticipated disposition under clauses (1), (2), and (3) above to nonprofit voluntary agencies registered with the Committee on Voluntary Foreign Aid of the Foreign Operations Administration or other appropriate department or agency of the Federal Government and intergovernmental organizations for use in the assistance of needy persons outside the United States * * *."

There does not appear to be any question but that the donation as described by the

---

[2] Bemis, Samuel Flagg, "A Diplomatic History of the United States." 4th edition. New York. Henry Holt & Co., 1955, p. 506.

[3] Pratt, Julius W., "A History of U.S. Foreign Policy." New York. Prentice-Hall. 1955, p. 613.

[4] Thomas, Ann Van Wynen and A. J. Thomas, Jr. "Nonintervention." Dallas. Southern Methodist University Press. 1956, p. 28.

Secretary of State of nonfat dried milk solids through the Red Cross to needy persons in Cuba is, policy considerations aside, authorized under the quoted statutory provisions. However, we could not find any authority for incurring telephone, transportation, salary, and overtime expenses to the extent that such expenses were not related to the donation under section 1431, above. The Department of State reports that such expenditures were nominal; therefore, in view of the time and effort which undoubtedly would be required to isolate the costs involved and since the violations are clearly of a nonrecurring nature, we do not propose to pursue the matter further.

"2–3. The Cuban Families Committee, which was organized in June 1961, continued the negotiations with Cuban officials for exchange of the prisoners which were begun by the Tractors-for-Freedom Committee in May 1961. The President stated the following on May 24, 1961, in support of the tractors-for-freedom movement:

" 'The U.S. Government has not been and cannot be a party to these negotiations. But when private citizens seek to help prevent suffering in other lands through voluntary contributions—which is a great American tradition—this Government should not interfere with their humanitarian efforts.

" 'Neither law nor equity calls upon us to impose obstacles in their path as they seek to save those who fought to restore freedom in our hemisphere. I am advised that the Logan Act is not involved, * * * that tax exemption is granted as a mater of course to any charitable organizations engaged in the rehabilitation and assistance of needy refugees; and that export licenses are routinely granted for humanitarian reasons, to ship farm produce and medicines to Cuba.'

"The views of the President in regard to the tractors-for-freedom movement may be applied as well to the efforts of the Cuban Families Committee. With regard to the latter the President restated the position that the U.S. Government could not be a party to negotiations for this purpose. However, he has stated on more than one occasion his sympathy with the efforts of the Cuban Families Committee to obtain the prisoners' release.

"No U.S. official participated in Mr. James B. Donovan's discussions with Cuban officials of the terms and arrangements for exchange of the invasion prisoners. The U.S. Government was not represented in any way at these meetings.

"4. Permission to visit Cuba was granted Mr. Donovan by the Department of State in view of his humanitarian mission. The Logan Act, 18 U.S.C. 953, is not in question since Mr. Donovan's discussions with Cuban officials were not 'in relation to any disputes or controversies with the United States or to defeat the measures of the United States.'

"Further, the U.S. embargo on trade with Cuba was not circumvented by the terms of the prisoners' exchange since the embargo provisions excepted most foodstuffs, medicines and medical supplies, and almost all of the products pledged in the prisoners' exchange are items that are currently permitted to be shipped to Cuba under general license. Some items involved in the prisoners' exchange do require individual validated licenses under existing export control regulations. These are chiefly foodstuffs, medicinals, pesticides for household and agricultural purposes, and medical equipment, which would help to fill an evident need of the Cuban people but not otherwise aid the Cuban economy. However, offers to donate insecticides valued at approximately $2 million and suitable for use on sugar crops—Cuba's primary export commodity—have been rejected even though Cuba does not use insecticides on its sugar crops.

"Further, the total amount and nature of the goods involved in the transaction do not constitute any significant or lasting benefit to the political position of the Castro regime in Cuba. The major item in the transaction is pharmaceuticals (approximately $24 million). Cuba used to consume about $85 to $100 million of pharmaceuticals annually, of which over $60 million was imported. Therefore, the pharmaceuticals to be supplied constitute less than 6 months' normal imports. The Castro government had budgeted approximately $1 million in foreign exchange for the importation of pharmaceuticals—consequently, the delivery of pharmaceuticals to Cuba will release only this comparatively small amount of foreign exchange."

The Logan Act provides, in pertinent part, that "Any citizen of the United States, wherever he may be, who, without authority of the United States, directly or indirectly commences or carries on any correspondence or intercourse with any foreign government or any officer or agent thereof, with intent to influence the measures or conduct of any foreign government or agency or officer thereof, in relation to any disputes or controversies with the United States, or to defeat the measures of the United States, shall be fined not more than $5,000 or imprisoned not more than three years or both."

This provision of law, in that it contains fine and imprisonment terms, is criminal in nature and not within the purview of the General Accounting Office to enforce. Responsibility for application of the Logan Act lies with the Department of Justice.

"5. The U.S. Government was in no way committed by Mr. Donovan's agreement with Cuban officials, and Mr. Donovan had no authority to commit the United States during his discussions in Habana.

"The final terms of the prisoner exchange agreement reached as a result of Mr. Donovan's efforts call for the delivery by July 1, 1963 of $53 million worth of goods, c.i.f. Habana. Cuban officials accepted 15 percent as the calculation for charges of handling freight and insuranace which is to be included in the $53 million total. The wholesale value of the goods eventually to be delivered is therefore estimated at approximately $46 million. In addition, before the transaction could be consummated, the fines for the 60 wounded prisoners who were released on credit in April 1962 had to be paid in cash by the Cuban Families Committee. The amount of the fines, totaling $2,925,000, was raised primarily by Gen. Lucius Clay on behalf of the committee entirely from private sources.

"6. A full disclosure of the facts concerning the Cuban invasion prisoner transaction could not be made by the U.S. Government before agreement was reached (1) because the U.S. Government was not a party to the negotiations; (2) while the negotiations were still in progress, it was not known what the final terms of the exchange arrangements might be, or how soon the negotiations would be successfully terminated, if at all; (3) it was not possible to say before the terms were agreed upon whether the private committee planned to request U.S. Government assistance in meeting these terms; (4) premature disclosure of information available to this Government would have constituted U.S. Government intervention in the matter and might have prejudiced the negotiations.

"The position of the U.S. Government toward the prisoner exchange has been fully and currently reported in the press, except during the period in which there was a hazard that publicity might endanger the safety of the prisoners. Attention can be called to the extensive and generally accurate reports printed immediately after the exchange in the Washington Evening Star of December 24, the Washington Post of December 25, and the New York Times News Service of December 26, 1962."

In summary, it appears, aside from the nominal administrative costs that may have been involved, that the entire transaction so far as the Government's interest was concerned involves matters of policy and the applicability of criminal statutes within the jurisdiction of the executive branch of the Government to determine. Regarding the provisions of the Trading With the Enemy Act, 50 U.S.C. App. 1–39, and Presidential Proclamation 3447 of February 3, 1962, 27 F.R. 1085, declaring an embargo on all trade with Cuba, it should be noted that provisions are made in paragraphs 2 and 3 of the Proclamation for the Secretary of the Treasury and the Secretary of Commerce to make exceptions to the restrictions on imports from and exports to Cuba. In view of all of the facts and circumstances as disclosed by the report of the Secretary of State and since the essential basis for controversy over the transaction as finally consummated lies in the realm of policy and statutory considerations outside the scope of the jurisdiction of this Office, we do not propose to take any action in the matter.

Sincerely yours,

JOSEPH CAMPBELL,
Comptroller General of the United States.

THE 1963 LINCOLN BANQUET

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SCHWENGEL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, on the evening of February 5, 1963, the Lincoln Group of the District of Columbia again sponsored their annual Lincoln banquet in observance of the birth of our most American American, Abraham Lincoln. This year it was held at the National Press Club. Some 150 avid, interested, and recognized students of Lincoln were present to enjoy the occasion and to learn more about the life and work of this great American.

The president of the group is Dr. Paul Gantt who pointed out that there was reason for us to commemorate the anniversary of Lincoln's birth on the 5th of February rather than the 12th as is our custom when it can be arranged. He pointed out some of Lincoln's activities on February 5 which included the following:

February 5, 1861, while still in Springfield, Ill., Lincoln visited with Horace Greeley.

February 5, 1862, Lincoln received his salary warrant of $2,083.33. Mrs. Lincoln gave an unprecedented White House ball and 633 people filled the East Room.

February 5, 1863, he again received a salary warrant, this time amounting to $2,022.33. On the same day he wrote to Gen. Franz Sigel:

> General Schurz thinks I was a little cross in my late note to you. If I was, I ask pardon. If I do get up a little temper I have no sufficient time to keep it up.

February 5, 1864, he again received a salary warrant of $2,022.33. On the same day he wrote to Secretary Edwin M. Stanton:

> On principle I dislike an oath which requires a man to swear he has not done wrong. It rejects the Christian principle of for-

giveness on terms of repentance. I think it is enough if the man does no wrong thereafter.

February 5, 1865, at 7 p.m., the President read to the Cabinet a proposal to pay $400 million to 16 States pro rata on their slave population in return to cessation of all resistance to national authority by April 1, 1865.

The "Lincoln Day by Day" book tersely notes:

> Cabinet unanimously disapproves.

After these remarks he extended the greetings of the group, paid tribute to the committee, and then introduced the master of ceremonies for the occasion, Mr. Eldon Billings, the vice president of the Lincoln group, a student of history, an authority on Lincoln, and a very capable economist at the Library of Congress. His background and capabilities fit very well the opportunity he was given to be master of ceremonies. He performed this task with tact, appropriateness, and dignity.

The group heard the Singing Sergeants give several renditions which were interesting and appropriate. Again we were reminded of the great talent and sense of dedication that the young men in our armed services have and were impressed once more with the ability of our leaders to bring out and display in a very fine manner the talents that are present among those who serve us in our Defense Establishments. They were given a generous hand and were appreciated beyond measure by all who heard them.

One of the features of the banquet each year is the announcement and presentation of the Lincoln Award of the Year to someone who, in the opinion of the awards committee of the Lincoln group, has through the years made contributions in the general area of Lincolniana. This year we were pleased to honor a man who was most deserving of this recognition—Ralph Geoffrey Newman—for 30 years of unselfish devotion to the Lincoln story, and those who tell it. Servant, student seeker, scholar, discoverer and discerner, propagator and expositor, counselor and critic and comrade, editor, writer, collaborator, publisher, often fastidiously anonymous, always the happy, the generous participant, formulator, fashioner and founder of tables round, bookman rare and bibliographer learned, acknowledged authority and changeless, exuberant, eager amateur, friend to the Lincoln men, preceptor of the past for the enlightenment of the present.

SPEAKERS

As is our custom, we again had outstanding speakers who talked from both great knowledge and feeling for the heritage of our country as reflected in the life and work of this noble citizen in our heritage.

This being the 100th anniversary of the Proclamation of Emancipation, it was natural that Carl Haverlin, last year's winner of the Lincoln Award, should talk on the Proclamation of Emancipation. Because what he said is so meaningful and is worthwhile for us to know about as we contend with the complex problems of this age, I am asking that this be placed in the RECORD so that every Member of Congress and all who receive the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD may have the opportunity of reading this splendid dissertation in which he points up the salient fact that Lincoln regarded our kind of democracy as "the last best hope of earth." And, because Lincoln had such strong feelings about this he was moved to issue the Emancipation Proclamation at a time when it could be implemented and in a way that made it legal. In pointing out its many ramifications and great impact he quotes Dr. John Hope Franklin, who was our principal speaker 2 years ago when he said:

> The ramifications as well as the implications of the Emancipation Proclamation seem endless.

When we think of this great state paper we are aware that this, as is true with so many things in our heritage, had an impact that went far beyond the immediate objective. And, we are reminded again, as we should often be, of the importance of applying the lessons that we have learned in history to our present day problems. Mr. Speaker, this speech by Mr. Haverlin was indeed a great contribution to the Lincoln story and it is worthy of our study and consideration today.

The second speaker on this occasion, Mr. Speaker, was a colleague of ours, the gentleman from Illinois, Representative PAUL FINDLEY, who represents the district in which Lincoln lived so long and where he made preparation for the statesmanship that he later displayed so eloquently as President of the United States. PAUL FINDLEY not only represents the Lincoln district but he also lives in Pittsfield, Ill., the home town of John G. Nicolay, one of Lincoln's confidants and secretaries during that critical period in our Nation's history. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FINDLEY], spoke of the fact that Nicolay had so many advantages that no other man in that time had and that is because he was privileged to be present when Lincoln brought forth so many ennobling, uplifting and moving statements that helped to shape the direction and destiny of our system and form of government and which did so much to not only preserve but to promote the great ideals that were a major part of the thinking and action of our earlier patriots who Lincoln honored and respected so much. The splendid speech given by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FINDLEY] was the result, I am sure, of much research and study and because it reveals Lincoln through one of his secretaries and through a distinguished and able Representative from Illinois 100 years later, I take great pleasure in placing it in the RECORD with the hope that what this young man said on that occasion will be read and thought on by many people today and in the future. The speeches follow:

CARL HAVERLIN'S TALK BEFORE LINCOLN GROUP OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, FEBRUARY 5, 1963

To know what this Nation stands for, and not just what it stands against, the world need not look beyond our wholehearted observances of the centenary of the Emancipation Proclamation. With Magna Carta and our own Declaration of Independence and Constitution, the proclamation stands with the imperishable capstones of liberty.

By their very nature, they are profoundly moving documents, and meaningful to all men everywhere, regardless of color. Whether we be descendant of slaves, descendant of their masters, or of those who detested or those who condoned slavery, all mankind is the fortunate legatee of the proclamation.

For as Lincoln said so logically in his second annual message to Congress, "In giving freedom to the slave, we assure freedom to the free—honorable alike in what we give and what we receive."

Abraham Lincoln has been called throughout the world the most beloved American. Other peoples throughout the world have affection and respect for him as deep as our own. He stirs their emotions not only because he freed the slaves, but because he was ever a mighty spokesman for people like themselves and for democracy. Our example has made it clear to them that the placement of the concerns of the citizen above the concerns of the state is the veritable foundation of a democracy. They know that we hold the sole purpose of the state is to guarantee and preserve inviolate the existence of the individual.

Lincoln often expressed his faith not only in our democracy, but in the ultimate power of the individual citizen, but never more explicitly than in his first inaugural address. In it he asked, "Why should there not be a patient confidence in the ultimate justice of the people? Is there any better or equal hope in the world?"

He regarded democracy as "the last best hope of earth" and termed it that form of government which promised "that in due time the weight would be lifted from the shoulders of all men." He coupled his antagonism to slavery with his fervor for popular government. While he held slavery to be a monstrous injustice in itself, he hated it even more because, he said, "it enables the enemies of free institutions, with plausibility, to taunt us as hypocrites."

In his preliminary Emancipation Proclamation he promised that 100 days thereafter the slaves in the States then still in rebellion against the Federal Government "shall be then, thenceforward, and forever free."

On the hundredth day, January 1, 1863, that promise was fulfilled insofar as the power of the Presidency could fulfill it; but in the final proclamation the moving phrase of freedom rang—"are, and henceforward shall be free."

However, the dual proclamations were but the first two notes of a major triad. The cadence of freedom was resolved in December 1865, when the 13th amendment was adopted and the slaves were guaranteed their freedom under constitutional law.

For the sake of our domestic conscience and our repute abroad, it is sad that I cannot go on to say that the newly enfranchised came at once into the full sunlight of all their civil liberties. But in the face of history, we must acknowledge our human imperfections, past and present. We must admit that the new laws, by themselves, could no more lead to full freedom than the old laws, which they replaced, could made for total slavery.

Though the proclamations and succeeding legislation did bestow freedom on the slave, the grant was not everywhere complete—for beyond the power of the law was the power of prejudice. Although the law could set the Negro free, there was no law that could free a man from prejudice. Its cruel shackles can be unlocked only with the keys of understanding and compassion—and those two keys lie buried deep within the minds of the prejudiced.

It is cold comfort for us to reflect that the struggle for human rights which still agitates this Nation is not unique to us nor to the century just concluded.

Rare and blessed is that country which can affirm it has not been and is not so troubled. Since the dawn of history, minorities have been forced to eat the bitter fruit of prejudice; and those of good will among the majorities who have been unable to make it sweet for the few have found this failure equally bitter.

Though, admittedly, we have not achieved completely all our objectives for all our citizens, the world knows our vast majority has tried earnestly to achieve the long-set goals. Most important, it knows that we shall never cease in our efforts until they are reached—for this is the popular will.

In preparing my thoughts for this address, I had before me a copy of John Hope Franklin's "The Emancipation Proclamation." The Lincoln Group may take pride in the fact that the chapter which nobly resolves the book, "Victory More Certain," is the address delivered before this organization by Dr. Franklin on the 11th of February 1961.

I commend his book to you. In a forthcoming review, Bruce Catton terms it "a scholarly and thoughtful examination of a great state paper." I believe it to be the finest exposition of the Emancipation Proclamation yet published.

While reading Dr. Franklin's preface I came upon this sentence: "The ramifications as well as the implications of the Emancipation Proclamation seem endless, and many of them have doubtless escaped me." Reading his book with this point before me led inevitably to a theory which I propose for the consideration of Dr. Franklin and other historians.

We are now in the second century since the Emancipation Proclamation. For 100 years its friends and its enemies have considered it a military necessity. But was that proclamation issued only as a war measure? Was it only the superficial expression of an indeterminate military necessity? Indeed how heavy was the weight of the military need for emancipation? How compelling was congressional pressure upon the President? Were these two elements the primary forces that impelled him on September 22 and January 1?

Or had the heat of war and the chill of defeats weakened the bulwarks of slavery as the weathering years soften the stones in old gardens, letting seeds and roots long buried and restrained send out their tendrils to the sun?

Was the proclamation, in short, imposed by the Commander-in-Chief of the military forces wholly as a strategic device that would at once weaken the enemy and quiet the radical Congressmen?

Or, on the contrary, as I shall propose, did not Abraham Lincoln, remembering his long thoughts about slavery and sensing the convictions of the humane majorities in both the North and South, take advantage of the situation to render justice to the slave, lift a burden from his master, and cleanse the consciences of all? If these suggestions have merit, then the emancipation's military significance would have been of secondary importance to him.

I hope these considerations will bring us closer to the solution of what I believe to be the underlying mystery of the Emancipation Proclamations.

Although the two proclamations are themselves in evidence, the open facts about them are unchallenged, and the testimony of the principles is before us, nevertheless in my opinion, the motivation of the President is not yet entirely clear.

Over the years, and indeed to this very day, cynical men have sought to minimize the import of emancipation. They have quoted with relish, from the overt evidence, to prove to their satisfaction that slavery was either embraced or tolerated by a careless people and a callous President until a transcending fear rather than a transcending sympathy for human misery and respect for human dignity caused its abolition. That fear? The fear of military defeat.

I have heard men sneer at Lincoln on these same grounds and call him a hypocrite. In fact, within the week an acquaintance, learning that I would speak here, offered to supply my text:

"The Devil was sick—the Devil a monk would be.

"The Devil was well—the Devil a monk was he."

I have said I think there is a mystery surrounding the two proclamations. It is this: I cannot find the voice of Lincoln the poet in either of them, though I have every reason to expect it since his great gift of lyric utterance, in matters that stirred him, shines out from so many other state papers. Not once does the lightning flicker nor the thunder roll, and excepting "forever free," no phase is memorable.

So eminent and qualified a judge as Allan Nevins, in his recent excellent article in the Saturday Review, flatly terms the two proclamations "Lincoln's two immortal documents." Immortal they are indeed, but from a literary viewpoint they are at best only examples of clear and forthright exposition. In reading them I am reminded of the magician's greatest ally—misdirection. It is what he does in seeming innocence with one hand while with the other he does the impossible.

In the final proclamation even these are not the words of Lincoln, but were the suggestion of Salmon P. Chase: "and upon this act, sincerely believed to be an act of justice * * * I invoke the considerate judgment of mankind and the gracious favor of Almighty God." More significantly, in the same paragraph Lincoln struck out Chase's phrase, "an act of duty demanded by the present condition of the country," and replaced it with "upon military necessity."

I need not labor the point that Lincoln was deeply conscious of the profound importance of emancipation nor that he was fully aware that he would be remembered by it. He said so.

Nor do I need to do more than remind you that when he was moved by event, occasion, or emotion, Lincoln could summon up a lyric eloquence that has never been surpassed.

Why then did this Prospero choose on this occasion to "drown his book deeper than did ever plummet sound?"

I think an early clue may be found in the browning pages of the house journal, 10th general assembly, 1st session of the Illinois Legislature, pages 817 and 818. Under date of March 3, 1837, a protest signed by Dan Stone and Abraham Lincoln was presented to the house, read and ordered to be spread on the journals. It reads in part:

"Resolutions upon the subject of domestic slavery having passed both branches of the general assembly, the undersigned hereby protest against the passage of the same.

"They believe that the institution of slavery is founded on both injustice and bad policy; . . . they believe that the Congress of the United States has no power under the Constitution, to interfere with the institution of slavery . . ."

Certainly these paragraphs were written neither cynically nor expediently. Opposing Stone and Lincoln was an overwhelming majority. These two protested from personal conviction. Over the next quarter of a century. Lincoln continued to be exquisitely balanced between the poles of the juridical and the humane. These two poles were neither antithetical nor antonymous. But they provided a constant dilemma for Lincoln until the last years of his life. Did he believe it to be a Gordian knot that could be released only by the sword; that is, by the invocation of the magic phrase "military necessity"?

Throughout all of the speeches and letters of the next 25 years in the monumental Complete Works of Abraham Lincoln, I find nothing that shows any deviation from Lincoln's early abhorrence of slavery and his profound respect for the law. He sounds both notes over and over again.

It is my belief that in September of 1862 he felt the time was ripe for him to strike at slavery with legality and with a stroke of his pen transfer the United States to the column of freedom from the column of slavery—where it stood with only two other nations, Cuba and Brazil. After careful deliberation I think he decided to do so wholly on presumed military merits and without benefit of emotional appeal or psychological coloration.

Nothing that I or anyone else can say or write will add or subtract from the magnitude of the author or the work. But it may be that if my suggestion is found to have merit, more competent men may tell us later why the heart of Abraham Lincoln sang on September 22, 1862, and January 1, 1863, though his pen did not.

Whatever the motivation of the President, we may take pride in emancipation and all our momentous milestones of human freedom and in the globe-circling spread of our spirit of national independence. During the past century the two have walked hand in hand.

For as Lincoln is a polestar of freedom for the individual, so have the United States of America, the mother of republics, pointed out the road to independence for the new nations.

The world is still troubled by national birth pangs. Since that day upon which emancipation was promulgated, more than one hundred new countries have joined the sovereign powers of the globe. All of them have followed us into democracy or at least have assumed the coloration of a democracy as the first step in their road to national freedom. Each transition from the old to the new has been accompanied by stress and tribulation—not only for the emerging nations, but for their citizenry.

As a nation, we ask all those who have human kindness, all men of conscience, all who are devoted to the common good, whoever they may be and wherever they may live, to dedicate themselves to help us finish the task that Lincoln began.

In so doing, we shall add our strength to the solution of a global problem—for the freedom of the individual and the guarantee of his rights is still the major unfinished business of the world.

This is the centenary of a promise made 100 years ago by Abraham Lincoln. It is my profound conviction that as a nation, within the law and under the benign providence of an Almighty God, we shall yet make that promise good.

In the closing pages of Carl Sandburg's one-volume "Abraham Lincoln," he quotes from Bishop Matthew Simpson's words at the interment of Abraham Lincoln in Oak Ridge Cemetery on May 4, 1865. Bishop Simpson said: "There are moments which involve in themselves eternities. There are instants which seem to contain germs which shall develop and bloom forever. Such a moment came in the tide of time to our land when a question must be settled, affecting all the powers of the earth. The contest was for human freedom. Not for this Republic merely, not for the Union simply, but to decide whether the people, as a people, in their entire majesty, were destined to be the governments or whether they were to be subject to tyrants or aristocrats, or to class rule of any kind. This is the great question for which we have been fighting, and the result of this contest will affect the ages to come. If successful, republics will spread in spite of monarchs all over this earth."

Mr. Sandburg closes with:

"And the night came with great quiet.

"And there was rest.

"The prairie years, the war years, were over."

They were indeed over for Abraham Lincoln, but for our forefathers and for ourselves, the war had just begun. Not a hundred years' war, but perhaps an endless war. Not a war of violence, of guns, bullets and bayonets, but a quiet war of ideas, ideals and thoughts and prayers.

THE LIVING LINCOLN

(By Representative PAUL FINDLEY, Illinois)

One hundred thirty-one years ago Abraham Lincoln was elected to the Illinois Legislature. He was 23 years old, a citizen of New Salem. It was his first public office. From that moment on, he was in the public eye—either in office, or running for office or campaigning for someone or on some issue of public interest. From that moment on, that is, until Good Friday, 1865, when he was shot in the back of the head while attending a play at Ford's Theater in Washington.

He was carried to the little Peterson house across the street and spent the long hours of the night hovering between life and death. At 7:22 in the morning he heaved his last breath. Following the custom of the day the attending surgeon fished two silver coins from his pocket, placed one on each of Lincoln's eyes and said, "He is dead."

Secretary of War Edwin Stanton, who had been running the country from an adjoining bedroom during the long night, announced tersely, "Now he belongs to the ages."

Now he belongs to the ages—Stanton could not possibly have known the accuracy of his appraisal.

In the 98 years since Lincoln's death, he has become perhaps the most fascinating personality since history began.

More books have been written about Lincoln than anyone in history except Christ. In 1945 the State of Illinois published a listing of all books about Lincoln. The listing was so great that two large volumes were required. All told, 3,975 titles. And the pace quickens with passing years. Every year brings new studies into his life, and it is now estimated over 5,000 books have been published about Lincoln.

There are specialists who have spent a lifetime studying this man. An example of the intensive research into his life is the 3-volume set "Lincoln Day by Day." It lists each day in Lincoln's life, giving all that is known concerning his activities on that day.

Lincoln is an absorbing hobby for hundreds of thousands of people throughout the world. Several quarterly publications are issued exclusively for Lincoln collectors. There is also a weekly newsletter for Lincoln fans, "Lincoln Lore."

And you ask why? Why a century after his death, Lincoln is the most written-about person, the center of a farflung hobby, more inspiring and better known today than during his own lifetime?

Was it his rise from log cabin to White House? his position of near dictatorial power in a time of crisis? his ability as a military commander and as an executive? his homespun ways, his wit, his sense of humor?

Other men have had these qualities and responsibilities, yet none reached Lincoln's pinnacle of fame.

The answer to his greatness lies—I believe—in his speeches, speeches which a young country editor from Pittsfield, Illinois, had the rare privilege of hearing firsthand.

The young editor was John G. Nicolay, an immigrant from Bavaria, who first met Lincoln in Pittsfield when the future President was traveling circuit as a lawyer.

Young Nicolay had come to Pittsfield as a printer's devil, learned the trade, became part owner of the newspaper where he worked, and at the same time became a leader in Whig politics.

He was a delegate to the convention of 1856 in Bloomington where the Republican Party of Illinois was born from a splinter of the old Whig Party. There he helped nominate his neighbor, O. M. Hatch, of Griggsville, as candidate for Illinois secretary of state. At the convention, Nicolay heard Lincoln's "Lost Speech," in which Lincoln was on fire for the first time over the slavery issue. His speech was so electrifying the reporters dropped their pencils and forgot their work. Only brief passages were reported. Nicolay heard Lincoln say: "We must put aside all our prejudices and march shoulder to shoulder in the great army of freedom."

Two years later Nicolay moved to Springfield, where he got a political plum, appointed as clerk by Illinois' newly elected and first Republican secretary of state.

Thus Nicolay was on hand in Representatives' Hall, Springfield, where Lincoln gave his historic "House Divided" speech, which foretold so clearly the impending struggle over slavery and set the stage for the debates with Douglas.

In it, Lincoln declared, " 'A house divided against itself cannot stand.' I believe this Government cannot endure, permanently half slave and half free. I do not expect the Union to be dissolved—I do not expect the house to fall—but I do expect it will cease to be divided. It will become all one thing, or all the other."

Nicolay was assigned by a St. Louis newspaper to cover the 1860 Republican nominating convention in Chicago's Wigwam. He was there to witness the all-night struggle between the Seward and Lincoln forces, observe firsthand the final dramatic rollcall and hear the thunderous applause which greeted Lincoln's nomination to the Presidency.

Nicolay returned to his clerk's job in the State capitol building in Springfield. There he was touched again by the hand of destiny. Lincoln established campaign headquarters in the Governor's office, and hired Nicolay as his secretary—his only paid staff member of the campaign. Salary? Seventy dollars a month.

It was a difficult assignment. National passions were running high. Lincoln the candidate vowed he would say or write nothing to aggravate these passions. Delicate tasks lay on young Nicolay. He handled the assignment so well that when election day was over, Lincoln chose Nicolay to go with him to the White House as his private secretary.

February 11, 1861 when Lincoln went to the railway station in Springfield for the trip to Washington, Nicolay was with him and heard his masterful extemporaneous farewell. When the train pulled out of the station a New York newspaperman asked Lincoln for a copy of his remarks. He had no written text, but took a pencil and paper and began to write. The train began shaking and he assigned the writing task to young Nicolay, dictating the remainder. Thus Nicolay had the privilege of recording these great phrases: "I now leave, not knowing when, or whether ever, I may return, with a task before me greater than that which rested upon Washington. Without the assistance of that Divine Being, whoever attended him, I cannot succeed. With that assistance I cannot fail. Trusting in Him, who can go with me and remain with you and be everywhere for good, let us confidently hope that all will yet be well."

But all was not well. The train rolled on through a troubled land. The clouds of war were gathering. The Confederacy was already a month old. Assassination rumors were common. When Lincoln stepped to the inaugural platform in Washington, he was in an outpost of the north, surrounded by areas sympathetic to the South. The only land connection to the North was by way of Baltimore, and it was weeks before it was clear that Baltimore would permit Federal troops to come to the rescue of the Nation's Capitol. We cannot today appreciate the tense, ominous feeling which prevailed when Lincoln stepped to the inaugural platform.

Two seats away was Nicolay. If the farewell to Springfield was Lincoln's benediction, his first inaugural was his prayer for conciliation.

Nicolay heard him say, "We must not be enemies. Though passion may have strained, it must not break our bonds of affection. The mystic chords of memory, streching [sic] from every battlefield and patriot grave, to every living heart and hearthstone, all over this broad land, will yet swell the chorus of the Union, when again touched, as surely they will be, by the better angels of our nature."

At the White House, Nicolay became Lincoln's confidant, closer in his counsels than any member of the Cabinet. He shared with Lincoln the tortures of the Presidency: the mounting toll of civil war as fellow countrymen drew each other's blood; the discouragement of military inaction and reverses; the search for a military commander who could win.

Finally, the tide of battle turned—in the bloody conflict at Gettysburg. Shortly thereafter, the battlefield was to be dedicated as a national cemetery, and Lincoln was invited to speak.

The day before the ceremony, Nicolay accompanied Lincoln to Gettysburg. The next day he heard these closing words:

"It is rather for us to be here dedicated to the great task remaining before us—that from these honored dead we take increased devotion to that cause for which they gave the last full measure of devotion—that we here highly resolve that these dead shall not have died in vain—that this Nation, under God, shall have a new birth of freedom—and that government of the people, by the people, and for the people, shall not perish from the earth."

Nicolay was on the platform to hear this most famous of all speeches.

And finally Nicolay was on the platform to hear Lincoln's great sermon, the second inaugural. It was a different scene from 4 years earlier. There was victory in the air. It was only a matter of time before the war would end. A note of triumph might have been expected. There was none. No malice. Only mercy and charity, plus a clear defense of Lincoln's conduct of the war.

Nicolay heard Lincoln read these words, "Fondly do we hope—fervently do we pray—that this mighty scourge of war may speedily pass away. Yet, if God wills that it continue, until all the wealth piled up by the bondman's 250 years of unrequited toil shall be sunk, and until every drop of blood drawn with the lash, shall be paid by another drawn with the sword, as was said 3,000 years ago, so still it must be said 'the judgments of the Lord, are true and righteous altogether.'

"With malice toward none, with charity for all, with firmness in the right, as God gives us to see the right, let us strive on to finish the work we are in, to bind up the Nation's wounds, to care for him who shall have borne the battle, and for his widow, and his orphan—to do all which may achieve and cherish a just, and a lasting peace among ourselves, and with all nations."

There is the living Lincoln. In these great speeches Lincoln lives on, more vital, more influential than in his own lifetime. Here is supreme example of the conservation of values beyond death—positive evidence of a hereafter for those who humbly serve the Master.

In these speeches, Lincoln uttered the deep yearnings of the American people their passion for liberty; their willingness to fight and die for freedom; their belief in the supreme importance of the human spirit; their deep and abiding faith in God.

In them, Lincoln expressed the American ideal a government that protects liberty and provides equal justice for all; a durable and majestic federal union that keeps sovereignty in the hands of the individual citizens.

And he did so in such rich clear phrases they are read and reread and memorized year after year for their content and because they are great pieces of literature.

Lincoln lives on, just as surely as our Federal Union and freedom itself live on.

He was—and still is—the living symbol of our pledge of allegiance: "One nation under God, indivisible with liberty and justice for all."

OUTLAW UN-AMERICAN SYMBOLS

Mr. WELTNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, in Miami Beach last week there occurred the latest in a series of outrages by a group of fanatics calling themselves the American Nazi Party.

This small group set off a near riot outside the Fontainebleau Hotel at a State of Israel bond banquet at which the distinguished Trygve Lie, First Secretary General of the United Nations, and the Honorable HUBERT HUMPHREY of the U.S. Senate were in attendance as guests.

These so-called American Nazis were not gathered for a peaceful demonstration, but for the obvious purpose of provoking trouble and attracting attention to themselves.

This is the second such incident which has occurred in the Dade County, Fla., area within recent months. Earlier, members of this group were arrested on our main Miami street for disturbing the peace and were confined to the city jail.

In addition to these incidents, these people are now carrying on an active cold war of hate through the U.S. mails, with obnoxious un-American printed materials. One such item is a gummed label with the Nazi swastika in black print against a bright red background. I don't know how many thousands of pieces of mail these labels have been affixed to, but the number is said to be staggering.

I, personally, have been the victim of this vicious smear campaign and have received such items through the mails with the Nazi swastika affixed. I have also received other mail from equally disturbing elements which have adopted the Communist hammer and sickle as their torch.

A few months ago, our distinguished State attorney, Richard E. Gerstein, and members of his capable staff, placed behind bars in the Florida State Penitentiary, a man whom they convicted of leading a terror group in the county which was involved in suspected bombings of places of worship. The home of the editor of the Miami Herald was one of the victims of this bomber and his hate group.

There was discovered in this man's possession, a considerable amount of this Nazi hate literature.

I have introduced in this honorable House today, a bill to amend the United States Code by providing that—

> Whoever displays (other than for entertainment purposes) any flag, insignia, emblem, or other device bearing or constituting a replica of a swastika or of a hammer and sickle shall be fined not more than $1,000 or imprisoned not more than 1 year, or both.

I should like to call attention of the House to an article which appeared in the Miami Herald of Sunday, March 3, 1963 with regard to the latest incident, and an article which appeared in the Miami News, Monday, March 4, with regard to this activity.

I should also like to call attention of the House to two typical letters from people in Dade County who have been writing me about this matter.

The above-mentioned material follows:

[From the Miami (Fla.) Herald]

POLICE GRAB NAZI PICKETS, AVERT RIOT AT BOND RALLY

(By Gene Miller)

Two American Nazis calling themselves "storm troopers" set off a near riot Saturday night outside the Fontainebleau Hotel at an Israel bond banquet.

Taxi drivers and carhops, seething with hatred, tore into the uniformed Nazis, trying frantically to grab them away from police.

Police saved the Nazis' necks.

"They would have killed them," said Chief Mike Fox.

The Nazis, realizing they would need protection, telephoned ahead of time, both to the FBI and to Beach police, telling their plans to picket the banquet.

At 7:32 p.m., as 1,500 Jewish community leaders attended the 15th annual national inaugural conference for bonds for Israel inside the Fontainebleau, a blue station wagon pulled up to the sidewalk.

Out jumped khaki-clad medal-bedecked John McClure, 23, and David Peterson, 21, both wearing swastika armbands and paratrooper boots.

They carried cardboard picket signs and scrawled in red was "Zionism Is Treason," "Death to Traitors," "Buy U.S. Bonds, Not Israel Bonds," and "Forget Israel, Free Cuba."

They walked hurriedly, obviously frightened, in a tight 10-yard oval. Their walk lasted perhaps a minute.

Cabbies from the waiting line along Collins Avenue ganged along the pink concrete sidewalk, then moved in.

A burly ex-Marine, a carhop from the Fontainebleau, jumped a line of bushes and muttered, "I'll get the s--."

"OK," said Sgt. John Tighe to the Nazis. "We're taking you in for protective custody."

Chief Fox had 4 detectives and 6 uniformed men on the sidewalk—and another 22 motorized men a block away.

But as police moved in so did a cabbie.

He landed a haymaker. The Nazi dropped his sign and put his hands to his head.

The scuffling suddenly was a brawl of perhaps 10 or 15 men, the police trying to pitch the Nazis into waiting squad cars and the carhops and cabbies wanting to handle things their own way.

Sergeant Tighe radioed for reinforcements and seconds later three squad cars screeched to a halt, blocking traffic in three lanes of eight-laned Collins Avenue.

No arrests of the attackers were made. "I don't know who they were," said Chief Fox.

McClure and Peterson were taken to headquarters and released. They gave their address as 327 NE. First Avenue, room 504, the new headquarters of the American Nazi Party in Miami.

"I understand one of those cabbies was a former president of the Jewish War Veterans," said Beach Councilman Bernie Frank, who was in the Fontainebleau driveway when the fighting stopped.

"It's a strange thing," he said. "Only 18 years ago they gave out medals for killing those guys.

Inside the hotel, Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY, a speaker at the $1,000-bond-a-plate banquet, declined comment. "I didn't see it," he said.

Trygve Lie, first Secretary General of the United Nations, spoke at the banquet of the establishment of Israel as "one of the epic events of history."

He also spoke of the "unparalleled loss of Jewish life during the Hitler era."

Israel bond sales for the 1963 campaign already total $19,750,000, said Samuel Rothberg, national campaign chairman.

[From the Miami (Fla.) News]

RAID STARTS DRIVE TO OUST NAZIS

(By Dick Nellius)

Miami City Attorney Robert D. Zahner pulled a surprise "raid" on the American Nazi Party headquarters here today in an effort to shut it down.

Zahner said later he would try to get canceled the Nazis' 1-year lease for a tiny office in the Pacific Building, 327 NE. First Avenue, across from the Federal Building.

INCITING TO RIOT

Failing this, he added, he would have the Nazis arrested for wearing the swatiska armband, around town.

"In view of our large Jewish community, this is inciting to riot," Zahner said.

Three young Nazis, one in unform and two in civilian clothes, were in the office (room 504) when Zahner and his chief legal investigator, Clarence Hall, came bursting through the unlocked door.

Waving a copy of the lease issued to ANP Deputy District Commander John McClure, 23, to operate a political office in his own name, Zahner demanded to know if the ANP is a registered political party in Florida.

SPORTS CUT EYE

McClure, sporting a cut near his eye received in a fight Saturday night when he and David Peterson, 21, picketed the Israel bond drive banquet on Miami Beach, said no.

Asked about the loaded 45-caliber pistol Peterson was carrying, McClure said he just returned from having it registered.

Just before the raid the Nazi said they have no intention of being forced out of Miami.

MIAMI, FLA., *January 6, 1963.*

DEAR SENATOR PEPPER: I would like to know if you would consider outlawing the use of the swastika through an appropriate bill in the 88th Congress? As you are aware, the formation and activities of the American Nazi Party is a matter of grave concern to many of your friends in the Third Congressional District, and it occurred to me that you might want to consider action along this line.

This ominous sign has frightening memories for thousands of Americans, and they should not be senselessly and needlessly subjected to the hate literature with the swastika emblazoned thereon.

As you know, I am an assistant State attorney, and it was the pleasure of our office to place behind bars a person associated with this group.

Sincerely,

ELLEN J. MORPHONIOS.

MIAMI, FLA., *March 4, 1963.*

Hon. SPESSARD HOLLAND,
U.S. Senate,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR HOLLAND: Recently there have been several very small but extremely important publications in our local Miami, Fla., newspapers, referring to the opening of a Nazi office in our downtown area. This office is to be headed by John McClure, a storm trooper and brilliant protege of the famed horror, Adolf Hitler.

This may seem unimportant to some, but World War II is still very clearly imprinted in my mind, enough so that these articles disturbed me. I am particularly concerned that our local political leaders have allowed this situation. I can see absolutely no justification in this, or any other subversive group being allowed to open an office in the heart of our city, or any other, for that matter. In fact, I was under the impression that the Nazi Party met its defeat when Germany lost the last war. Am I to believe, that the leaders of our U.S. Government, as well as our local political powers, have forgotten what happened some 20 years ago, to say nothing of the recent situation in Cuba? Believe me, I am not so smug as to believe that this situation could not come about again, especially if we allow this sort of thing to continue.

I would most certainly appreciate your assistance in both defining the activities of this organization and its useful purpose.

Very truly yours,

MRS. JANE O'GRADY.

(Cc: Senator GEORGE SMATHERS, Hon. DANTE FASCELL, Hon. CLAUDE PEPPER, Miami Herald, Miami Daily News.)

HUMANE TREATMENT BILL

Mr. WELTNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ASHLEY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. ASHLEY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take a few brief moments to call the attention of my colleagues to a bill which I am introducing today, the purpose of which is to insure that animals used in institutions wholly or partly supported by taxpayers' money are not experimented upon in cruel ways and that they do not suffer through neglect, abuse, or excessively close confinement.

This is not a new proposal, Mr. Speaker. Humane treatment bills have been introduced in the 86th Congress and again in the 87th Congress. Hearings were held last year by a subcommittee of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. It has come to my attention, however, that such a bill has not been reintroduced in the 88th Congress and I am prompted by the appalling article, which appeared in yesterday's Washington Evening Star, to resubmit this proposed legislation for the consideration of this body. I am more firmly convinced than ever, Mr. Speaker, that this is necessary and desirable legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I have received voluminous correspondence on this matter which clearly indicates a mounting public concern for corrective legislation. I am sure that many of my colleagues have also. I ask prompt committee consideration of the bill I have offered and urge its support by my colleagues on both sides of the aisle.

The newspaper article, to which I referred, follows:

HUNDREDS OF DOGS AND CATS ARE FOUND BURIED ON FARM

(By Hugh Wells and Jack Kelso)

Discovery of the bodies of several hundred dogs and cats on a Prince William County farm today was under investigation by Virginia animal welfare officials.

The dead animals were found in trenches behind a huge two-story barn on a former dairy farm near Gainesville, Va.

The property, a section of Cloverland Farms, was sublet to Zoological Worldwide, Inc., a corporation that collected dogs for sale to medical schools and research institutes.

Richard G. Turner, accountant for Zoological Worldwide, Inc., said the dogs and cats were sold to Bethesda Naval Hospital, the National Institutes of Health and medical schools in the Baltimore area.

BARN CLEANED OUT

When a Star reporter visited the site today, he found that the operation no longer was in existence. The barn had been cleaned out—only one dead cat remained in the building.

But behind the barn, three trenches about 70 feet long were found. Two of the trenches appeared filled with the bodies of dogs, cats and rabbits. A third trench was covered with water, making it impossible to tell what was underneath.

The bodies of a collie dog and a cocker spaniel puppy were clearly visible on top of the piles.

Still alive outside the barn were a few ducks, a hutch with 10 rabbits in it and one shivering, tan and brown hound in a cage 2 feet by 2 feet.

OPERATION CLOSED

Mr. Turner said the operation had been closed down by the end of last week, after a visit by Mrs. Pearl Twyne, president of the Virginia Federation of Humane Societies and of the Animal Welfare League of Arlington, and other various officials.

"This has been quite unfortunate and I recommended they immediately close the place up," Mr. Turner said, adding that the corporation is "trying to do the right thing."

Mr. Turner said he had not known, until it was pointed out to him, that the water pipes to the building had frozen and there was no heat in the building.

The corporation, he said, had tried to convert the barn into a proper kennel to hold the animals for shipment but that it was impossible.

The corporation now has shut down its operation and will not open again until proper kennels, possibly like those used by NIH and the Arlington Welfare League, can be built, Mr. Turner said.

TEN STOCKHOLDERS

All the dogs that remained when the operation was closed down have been sold, he said.

The animals, he said, originally were picked up from dog pounds and from registered animal dealers.

About 10 stockholders comprise the corporation, Mr. Turner said, but he declined to identify them.

Mr. Turner said that some of the dogs had died of distemper and that others had contracted distemper and had to be destroyed. Some of the dogs were shot, he said.

He said he understood that only about 40 to 50 dogs had died in about a year.

The operation was brought to light by a woman who declined to be identified. She told animal welfare officials she saw a truck with some dogs in the back.

The woman said she asked the driver if she could buy one of the beagles and he said she would have to talk with the lawyer of the corporation.

Rather than do that, the woman recounted, she drove to the farm, where she saw conditions there. She said there was no heat, windows were broken and there were dead dogs among the live ones.

NEIGHBOR MOVED

Mrs. Marie Moore, who formerly lived next door to the farm, said her family had to move down the road because she couldn't stand the situation any longer.

"Just a little warm wind would make you sick," Mrs. Moore said.

She said her son, Stanley, had gone to the farm himself and buried some of the dogs once because the odor was so bad.

When the corporation first began trucking animals to the farm, Mrs. Moore said, the dead animals were buried. Last fall, the trenches were dug with a bulldozer, she recalled.

By November, she said, she had to move down the road.

HOUSE COMMITTEE ON THE CAPTIVE NATIONS

Mr. WELTNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, 2 years ago tomorrow, March 8, 1961, I submitted House Resolution 211 for the purpose of establishing a House Committee on the Captive Nations. Referred to the Committee on Rules, the resolution was not reported through the remainder of the 87th Congress. However, a motion to table it was defeated. This year, on January 10, I reintroduced the same resolution which is now known as House Resolution 14. It has been most gratifying that so many of my colleagues from both sides of the aisle in the House have joined with me by sponsoring this measure. Unfortunately, in the 2 months that have elapsed since the introduction in this session of the Congress no action has been taken on my resolution or similar resolutions.

On the eve of this second anniversary of House Resolution 211 and House Resolution 14, I looked up the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for several years and discovered that in the past both the Committee on Rules and the whole House used to act with much greater speed on similar resolutions where the captive nations were concerned. Mr. Speaker, I shall take but a few minutes to pass in review the most important of these resolutions.

In the 82d Congress, 1st session, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MADDEN] submitted House Resolution 390 establishing a select committee to conduct an investigation and study of the Katyn

Forest Massacre. On August 15, 1951, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Rules. The very next day it was reported by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. Smith] as a privileged resolution. The committee made no amendments.

Two years later, on July 21, 1953, the gentleman from Wisconsin, Mr. Kersten, submitted to the 83d Congress, 1st session, House resolution 346 establishing a select committee to investigate Communist aggression and forced incorporation of the Baltic States into the U.S.S.R. On July 27, it was called up for consideration. Our present distinguished Speaker, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCormack], associated himself with the resolution, and it was passed unanimously.

During the debate, no evidence came to light that the Department of State opposed the establishment of the so-called Baltic Committee, contrasting with the Department's present attitude toward the establishment of a Committee on the Captive Nations. Moreover, evidence became available soon after the passage of House Resolution 346 that the Department was highly complimentary of the job the Baltic Committee had been doing and that it favored the expansion of its work scope. I shall quote in this connection from a memorandum, signed on February 8, 1954, by the then Under Secretary of State, Walter B. Smith:

> 1. The Department considers that the work of the House Committee has been wisely planned and effectively conducted. It is apparent that the hearings held to date have made a valuable contribution to U.S. objectives in disseminating impressive evidence of Soviet disrespect for the rights and sovereignty of small nations.
>
> 2. The Department believes that it will be beneficial to broaden the scope of the committee's work to provide for inquiry into similar cases where communism has extended its domination over free peoples. Careful, well-documented investigation of such cases would be valuable (a) to assure the captive peoples behind the Iron Curtain that they are not forgotten and that the United States does not endorse their captivity; and (b) to educate public opinion in the free world regarding Communist techniques in seizing power and the terrible realities of life under Communist rule.

This memorandum was written in response to the draft Resolution 438, the purpose of which was "to conduct a full and complete investigation and study of the subversion and destruction of free institutions and human liberties" not only in the Baltic States, but also "in all areas controlled, directly or indirectly, by world communism, including the treatment of the peoples in such areas."

Submitted by the gentleman from Wisconsin, Mr. Kersten, to the 83d Congress, 2d session, on February 9, 1954, House Resolution 438 was reported by the Committee on Rules on February 25, and passed by the House on March 4. Provided with this vehicle, the committee covered with its investigation of Communist aggression, in addition to Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia, also Poland, Hungary, Czechoslovakia, Bulgaria, Rumania, East Germany, Russia, and other non-Russian nations of the U.S.S.R. It took depositions from dozens of witnesses here and abroad, examined hundreds of pertinent documents, and published thousands of pages of its findings.

Even today the committee's reports offer an invaluable source of material for researchers. For example, a scholarly study, "Soviet Policy Toward the Baltic States, 1918–40," by Dr. Albert N. Tarulis, of the Library of Congress, is largely based on materials assembled by the committee in addition to other hard evidence. It was published by the University of Notre Dame Press. Through such studies, the committee has achieved its objective of "disseminating impressive evidence of Soviet disrespect for the rights and sovereignty of small nations."

Speaking on the same subject, I would also like to quote the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Madden] who disclosed during the debate that the Voice of America had carried the Karsten committee's proceedings behind the Iron Curtain, and that hearings in London and Frankfurt, lasting 6 days in each locality, attracted 60 to 80 newspaper reporters and commentators every day. No wonder the Kremlin got mad. I further quote the gentleman from Indiana:

> The Baltic Committee is probably the only one established by the House in recent years to win 14 attacks in 3 weeks by the big guns of the Moscow propaganda machine.

Mr. Speaker, the same concern about the plight of the captive nations guided the 86th Congress when it concurred in Senate Joint Resolution 111 on July 9, 1959, designating the third week of July as "Captive Nations Week." In this case, too, the House acted with great speed. The resolution was received from the Senate on July 7. Two days later, our distinguished Speaker, then majority leader, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCormack], asked unanimous consent for consideration of the resolution. He himself conducted the debate. The resolution was passed the same day. On July 17, it became Public Law 86–90, and Captive Nations Week has been observed every year since then. The impact of Public Law 86–90 on the Kremlin has been overwhelming. I quote from House Resolution 211:

> Following the passage of the Captive Nations Week resolution in 1959 by the Congress of the United States and again during the observance of Captive Nations Week in 1960, Moscow displayed to the world its profound fear of growing free world knowledge of and interest in all of the captive nations, and particularly the occupied non-Russian colonies within the Soviet Union.

The reaction was violent every year. Mr. Khrushchev himself found it necessary to engage in a public debate over the issue. Our Senators, Congressmen, Governors, and even the Senate Chaplain were ridiculed for their support of the captive nations' rights to self-determination.

The reaction could have been easily predicted, as was the case with the Katyn Forest Massacre Committee, the Baltic Committee, or the Committee on Communist Aggression. Nevertheless, at no time did the Department of State raise any objections.

Since the language of Senate Joint Resolution 111 and of House Resolution 211 and House Resolution 214 is similar in many places, and their spirit is the same, the change of mind at the Department of State between 1959 and 1961, as exemplified in Secretary Dean Rusk's well-known letter to the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Rules, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. Smith], written on August 22, 1961, is truly surprising.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Derwinski], and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Feighan] have conclusively proven the utter lack of substance in Mr. Rusk's arguments against the passage of House Resolution 211 and House Resolution 214. I also repeatedly took the floor for the same purpose, and I shall avail myself of another opportunity to dwell on the background of Mr. Rusk's opposition.

Mr. Speaker, on this second anniversary of the introduction of House Resolution 211 on March 8, 1961, it is my earnest hope that the Committee on Rules once again will display the same consideration about the captive nations that had prompted it to report favorably on the various resolutions referred to in the foregoing. House Resolution 14 is one such resolution. It still awaits action, and I wish the Committee on Rules would stop looking over the shoulder at what the Department of State likes or dislikes in the discharge of our duties. After all, we are not an adjunct to the Department of State.

STORM DAMAGED TIMBER IN OREGON

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. Libonati). Under previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Oregon [Mrs. Green] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the gentlemen from Oregon, Representative Al Ullman and Representative Robert B. Duncan, and myself, I wish to place in the Record a certified copy of Senate Joint Memorial 1, a memorial relating to timber damaged by the November storm. This memorial was enacted by the Oregon Legislative Assembly now in biennial session at Salem, the State capital.

I think it is evidence of deep concern by the duly elected State legislators over the conditions in one segment of the forest-related industries which play a major role in the economic life of Oregon:

Senate Joint Memorial 1

(Introduced by Senator Chapman and Representative Back)

To His Excellency, John F. Kennedy, President of the United States, and to the Honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America, in Congress assembled:

We, your memorialists, the 52d Legislative Assembly of the State of Oregon, in legislative session assembled, most respectfully represent that:

Whereas the standing timber which was blown down in the severe storm of October 12, 1962, is an economic loss to the State; and

Whereas the loss will become greater as a result of infestation if the timber is not salvaged; and

Whereas the downed timber constitutes a severe fire hazard; and

Whereas much of this salvageable timber is located in an economically depressed area of this State; and

Whereas the salvage operation is one well suited to the small operator. Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Legislative Assembly of the State of Oregon:

1. The U.S. Departments of Agriculture and Interior are urged to expedite the salvage and sale of the downed timber by:

(a) Authorizing sale of small tracts, particularly those located adjacent to existing access roads.

(b) Establishing scaling stations to determine the quantity of timber removed and thus avoiding the time and cost of recruising.

(c) Authorizing local supervisors to make sales of timber up to $10,000 estimated value without lengthy public advertisement.

(2) The Congress of the United States is urged to enact any necessary enabling legislation which may be required.

3. The Oregon Members of the U.S. Senate and House of Representatives are urged to encourage action on the part of the Departments of Agriculture and Interior and to promote and support any needed legislation.

4. The secretary of state shall send a copy of this memorial to the President of the United States, to the Secretaries of the Departments of Agriculture and Interior, and to each member of the Oregon congressional delegation.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. Pike, for Monday, March 11, to Friday, March 15, on account of official business (representative of Hon. Carl Vinson to Annapolis Board of Visitors).

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. Fogarty (at the request of Mr. Albert), for 15 minutes, today, to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. Ryan of New York, for 2 hours, on March 27.

Mr. Findley, for 30 minutes, on Tuesday, March 12, 1963.

Mr. Derwinski (at the request of Mr. Findley), for 30 minutes, on Tuesday, March 12.

Mrs. Green of Oregon (at the request of Mr. Weltner), for 5 minutes, today, to revise and extend her remarks and to include extraneous matter.

Mrs. Green of Oregon (at the request of Mr. Weltner), for 30 minutes, on March 11, to revise and extend her remarks and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. Whitener (at the request of Mr. Weltner), for 60 minutes, on Monday, March 18, to revise and extend his remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the Congressional Record, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. Poage and to include a speech delivered by the Vice President in Waco, Tex.

Mr. Staebler.

Mr. Sikes.

Mr. Pucinski.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. Findley) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. Derounian.

Mr. Schwengel.

Mr. Pillion.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. Weltner) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. Rooney.

Mr. Brademas.

Mr. Flood.

Mr. Marsh.

Mr. St. Onge.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. WELTNER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 39 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, March 11, 1963, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

520. A letter from the Director, Office of Emergency Planning, Executive Office of the President, transmitting a copy of the statistical supplement, stockpile report to the Congress, for the period ending December 1962, pursuant to Public Law 520, 79th Congress; to the Committee on Armed Services.

521. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting the report on a study of the relative financial advantages of purchasing over leasing of electronic data processing equipment in the Federal Government; to the Committee on Government Operations.

522. A letter from the President of the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to establish in the Treasury a correctional industries fund for the government of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

523. A letter from the President of the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XXIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. ROGERS of Texas: Committee on Interior and Insular affairs. H.R. 2821. A bill to authorize modification of the repayment contract with the Grand Valley Water Users' Association; with amendment (Rept. No. 73). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ADDABBO:

H.R. 4619. A bill to provide under the social security program for payment for hospital and related services to aged beneficiaries; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ASHLEY:

H.R. 4620. A bill to provide for the humane treatment of animals used in experiments and tests by recipients of grants from the United States and by agencies and instrumentalities of the U.S. Government and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BERRY:

H.R. 4621. A bill to provide for the conveyance of certain real property of the United States to the Senator Francis Case Memorial Park Committee, Rapid City, S. Dak.; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. BOLAND:

H.R. 4622. A bill to provide for assistance in the construction and initial operation of community mental health centers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 4623. A bill to assist States in combating mental retardation through construction of research centers and facilities for the mentally retarded; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BURKHALTER:

H.R. 4624. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for the payment of pensions to veterans of World War I and their widows and dependents; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. CAREY:

H.R. 4625. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide an additional $2,400 exemption from income tax for amounts received as annuities, pensions, or other retirement benefits; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CLARK:

H.R. 4626. A bill to amend the Federal Trade Commission Act, to promote quality and price stabilization, to define and restrain certain unfair methods of distribution and to confirm, define, and equalize the rights of producers and resellers in the distribution of goods identified by distinguishing brands, names, or trademarks, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CONTE:

H.R. 4627. A bill to provide for the establishment of a national cemetery at Westfield, Mass; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. DENT:

H.R. 4628. A bill to provide for the desegregation of public schools, with all deliberate speed, including nationwide first-step compliance by 1964, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 4629. A bill to establish a National Institute of the Arts and Humanities, to authorize programs of information, education, advisory services, and financial assistance for the encouragement and advancement of artistic and cultural activities, and for the development of a more widespread appreciation of America's cultural heritage and accomplishments, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 4630. A bill creating a commission to be known as the Commission on Noxious and Obscene Matters and Materials; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 4631. A bill to provide for the establishment of the Bureau of Senior Citizens within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare; to authorize Federal grants to assist in the development and operation of studies and projects to help senior citizens; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. DOWDY:

H.R. 4632. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for the payment of pensions to veterans of World War I and their widows and dependents; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 4633. A bill to provide financial assistance to State governments for public education; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FARBSTEIN:

H.R. 4634. A bill to amend the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H.R. 4635. A bill to amend the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H.R. 4636. A bill to amend the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H.R. 4637. A bill to amend the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. FASCELL:

H.R. 4638. A bill to promote the orderly transfer of the executive power in connection with the expiration of the term of office of a President and the inauguration of a new President; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. FINO:

H.R. 4639. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to repeal the excise tax on communications; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FOGARTY:

H.R. 4640. A bill to encourage the expansion and improvement of State programs of special education and related services for exceptional children through Federal financial participation in the cost of development and implementation of such programs and in the cost of colleges and universities in providing special courses of instruction and scholarships for persons preparing for professional participation in such programs, and for establishing research grants and special projects and by establishing and providing for consultation with a National Training and Research Council and technical advisory committees on education of exceptional children in the administration of this act; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. GONZALEZ:

H.R. 4641. A bill to permit the State of Texas to obtain social security coverage, under its State agreement entered into pursuant to section 218 of the Social Security Act, for policemen in cities of 250,000 or less; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GRABOWSKI:

H.R. 4642. A bill to amend the National Housing Act to prohibit the use of foreign lumber or other wood products in any construction or rehabilitation covered by Federal Housing Administration-insured mortgages; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. HAGEN of California:

H.R. 4643. A bill to provide for an appropriation of a sum not to exceed $75,000 with which to make a survey of a proposed Sierra Way in the State of California; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HEMPHILL:

H.R. 4644. A bill to discontinue export subsidies on cotton; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 4645. A bill to impose import fees on cotton and cotton goods equal to the export subsidy paid on cotton exports by the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HUTCHINSON:

H.R. 4646. A bill to declare a portion of the Benton Harbor Canal, Benton Harbor, Mich., a nonnavigable stream; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. JOHNSON of California:

H.R. 4647. A bill to provide for an appropriation of a sum not to exceed $75,000 with which to make a survey of a proposed Sierra Way in the State of California; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. KEOGH:

H.R. 4648. A bill to repeal the last sentence of section 48(d) (relating to certain leased property), and section 48(g) (relating to adjustments to basis of property), of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KING of California:

H.R. 4649. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to authorize the use of certain volatile fruit-flavor concentrates in the cellar treatment of wine; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LANGEN:

H.R. 4650. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for the payment of pensions to veterans of World War I and their widows and dependents; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. LINDSAY:

H.R. 4651. A bill to provide civil remedies to persons damaged by unfair commercial activities in or affecting commerce; to the Committee on the Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MACDONALD:

H.R. 4652. A bill to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 to make certain public housing agencies eligible for donations of surplus personal property; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. MACGREGOR:

H.R. 4653. A bill for the establishment of a commission to study and appraise the organization and operation of the executive branch of the Government; to the Committee on Government Operations.

H.R. 4654. A bill to provide for the establishment of a commission on congressional reorganization; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. MILLS:

H.R. 4655. A bill to amend title IX of the Social Security Act with respect to the amount authorized to be made available to the States out of the employment security administration account for certain administrative expenses, to reduce the rate of the Federal unemployment tax on the calendar year 1963, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin:

H.R. 4656. A bill to amend title IX of the Social Security Act with respect to the amount authorized to be made available to the States out of the employment security administration account for certain administrative account for certain administrative expenses, to reduce the rate of the Federal unemployment tax for the calendar year 1963, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MONAGAN:

H.R. 4657. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to exclude from gross income gain realized from the sale of his principal residence by a taxpayer who has attained the age of 60 years; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. NIX:

H.R. 4658. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NORBLAD:

H.R. 4659. A bill to amend the National Housing Act to provide that only lumber and other wood products which have been produced in the United States may be used in construction or rehabilitation covered by Federal Housing Administration insured mortgages; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. O'BRIEN of New York:

H.R. 4660. A bill to authorize reimbursement for certain moving expenses and property losses to any person who is compelled to relocate his home or business because of the acquisition of property by the United States; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. O'HARA of Michigan:

H.R. 4661. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide a credit against the Federal income tax for State and local income taxes paid by an individual during the taxable year; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. OLSEN of Montana:

H.R. 4662. A bill to donate to certain Indian tribes certain submarginal lands of the United States, and to make such lands parts of the reservations involved; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. PEPPER:

H.R. 4663. A bill to assist States in combatting mental retardation through construction of research centers and facilities for the mentally retarded; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 4664. A bill to provide for assistance in the construction and initial operation of community mental health centers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 4665. A bill to prohibit the display of the swastika and the hammer and sickle; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PERKINS:

H.R. 4666. A bill to amend the Classification Act of 1949 to place in grade 18 of the general schedule the position of hearing examiners of the Social Security Administration in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 4667. A bill to amend chapter 15 of title 38, United States Code, to provide for the payment of pensions of $100 per month to World War I veterans, subject to a $2,400 and $3,600 annual income limitation; to provide that retirement income such as social security shall not be counted as income; to provide that such pension shall be increased by 10 percent where the veteran served overseas during World War I; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. ROONEY:

H.R. 4668. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp in commemoration of the 175th anniversary of the establishment of the Customs Service, and of custom employees killed in enforcing the customs law; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. ROOSEVELT:

H.R. 4669. A bill to amend the Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act of 1959 and the Welfare and Pension Plans Disclosure Act with respect to the filing of reports by surety companies with the Department of Labor; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 4670. A bill to amend the bonding provisions of the Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act of 1959 with respect to the nature of bond required; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 4671. A bill to amend the bonding provisions of the Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act of 1959 to permit bonding by foreign surety companies and to permit alternative methods of bonding in certain cases; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. RYAN of New York:

H.R. 4672. A bill to amend the Arms Control and Disarmament Act to eliminate the ceiling upon amounts that may be appropriated to carry out that act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H.R. 4673. A bill to incorporate the Eleanor Roosevelt Foundation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SICKLES:

H.R. 4674. A bill to authorize the establishment of a Youth Conservation Corps to provide healthful outdoor training and employment for young men and to advance the conservation, development, and management of natural resources and recreational areas; and to authorize local area youth employment programs; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. SISK:

H.R. 4675. A bill to provide for an appropriation of a sum not to exceed $75,000 with which to make a survey of a proposed Sierra Way in the State of California; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. STAFFORD:

H.R. 4676. A bill to amend the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 to provide for more effective evaluation of the fiscal requirements of the executive agencies of the Government of the United States; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. UDALL:

H.R. 4677. A bill to amend title 13, United States Code, to provide for a mid-decade census of population, unemployment, and housing in 1965 and every 10 years thereafter; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. WALTER:

H.R. 4678. A bill to provide for the loss of U.S. citizenship by persons convicted for evading military service; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POFF:

H.R. 4679. A bill to provide for the loss of U.S. citizenship by persons convicted for evading military service; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GONZALEZ:

H.J. Res. 311. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States granting representation in the electoral college to the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KORNEGAY:

H.J. Res. 312. Joint resolution to establish a Joint Committee on Foreign Information and Intelligence; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. MONTOYA:

H.J. Res. 313. Joint resolution to establish a Joint Committee on Foreign Information and Intelligence; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. WYMAN:

H. Res. 285. Resolution relating to anti-back-door spending; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. MORSE:

H. Res. 286. Resolution creating a select committee to conduct an investigation and study of the problems of urban areas; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII,

Mr. HARRISON presented a Memorial of the House of Representatives, 37th State Legislature of the State of Wyoming, memorializing the Congress of the United States to provide legislation designed to return to the State of Wyoming additional sections of land from the public domain, which was referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ASHBROOK:

H.R. 4680. A bill to require, in the alternative, delivery and return of property of the estate of John F. Hackfeld, deceased, vested by the Alien Property Custodian, on the basis of ownership by an enemy alien, or the repayment of income and estate taxes to said estate, collected on the basis of American citizenship; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BENNETT of Florida:

H.R. 4681. A bill for the relief of CWO James A. McQuaig; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia:

H.R. 4682. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Fred T. Winfield; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BURKE:

H.R. 4683. A bill for the relief of Kuo Chew Toy, his wife, Kwong So Kuen Toy, and their daughter, Mabel Toy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4684. A bill for the relief of Antoine Nasrallah; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CASEY:

H.R. 4685. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Joseph Faludi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FARBSTEIN:

H.R. 4686. A bill for the relief of Jan Piotr Spolnik; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GIAIMO:

H.R. 4687. A bill for the relief of Giuseppe Esposito and Eduardo Amodio; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GROVER:

H.R. 4688. A bill for the relief of James Panarites; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4689. A bill for the relief of Peter Panarites; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4690. A bill for the relief of Sofia Gargiulo Tinalli, Gennero Tinalli, and Italo Tinalli; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4691. A bill for the relief of Paolo Scaffedi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4692. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Kerstin Margareta Codrington; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NIX:

H.R. 4693. A bill for the relief of Juana V. Cadorna McNinch; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PUCINSKI:

H.R. 4694. A bill for the relief of Georgios Vilis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WEAVER:

H.R. 4695. A bill for the relief of Dr. Eusebio N. Gayol; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Congressional Staffs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED SCHWENGEL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 7, 1963

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, this year the issue of minority staffing has received more attention and discussion than ever before. Republican members are becoming increasingly aware of the injustice of the present circumstances. On February 23 the Washington Post published an editorial critical of Republican efforts. Congressman WILLIAM B. WIDNALL has done much to clarify some of the distortions of the Post editorial. Under unanimous consent I include this letter in the RECORD:

CONGRESSIONAL STAFFS

On February 23 you published an editorial chastising the Republican Party for asking for additional minority employees on congressional committee staffs. It appears to me this editorial overlooks two important points.

First, there is an assumption implicit within the editorial that all staff positions can be equated somehow with nonpartisan appointment. There is no more reason to introduce this assumption into the area of committee staffing than there is to appoint all Cabinet and sub-Cabinet posts through civil service. The executive department, as well as the Legislative Reference Service set up by Congress, provide the great majority of factual material for congressional use, outside of committee investigations. The Legislative Counsel is available for aid in bill drafting.

What is needed, particularly if you concede the Congress its proper role as the originator of laws and policy, is staff members with the knowledge and experience to interpret the facts into legislative proposals according to the policy position of the political party in control. At the same time, if there is to be a responsible opposition, it must have access to staff personnel attuned to its political philosophy as well.

No doubt there are exceptions. Clerical and secretarial staff people, for instance, although even here the designation of such personnel as minority or majority staff, however chosen, creates an invaluable priority system in terms of their time and availability. An additional exception would be staffs of a subcommittee such as the House Foreign Operations and Government Information Subcommittee. In certain instances special outside counsel brought in for investigatory purposes would be appropriate.

The second point overlooked is the simple matter of the present situation. Even assuming a totally nonpartisan staff operation was appropriate, what precisely is the minority party to do while waiting for a benevolent majority not only to increase the capacity of the opposition but decrease their own partisan advantage as well? Some balance must be obtained if only as a temporary expedient.

It is rather puzzling to me that the Washington Post concerns itself with partisan appointments on the Hill which have some justification, and yet ignores the revelation of last week that henceforth patronage considerations will intrude into the summer job picture for high school and college students in the face of an existing nonpartisan personnel system—the civil service.

WILLIAM B. WIDNALL,
Representative, Seventh District,
New Jersey.

The Anniversary of the Birth of Thomas Masaryk

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NEIL STAEBLER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 7, 1963

Mr. STAEBLER. Mr. Speaker, although Czechoslovakia today is under Communist rule and has been for 15 years, there are men in that country's past who we can hold up as ideals for those of us today to attempt to model ourselves after.

Just 113 years ago—March 7, 1850—Thomas G. Masaryk was born in Moravia, marking a point of utmost importance for the people of Czechoslovakia. For it was Thomas Masaryk who 68 years later was elected first President of the Republic of Czechoslovakia after a long struggle displaying the intelligence and extreme bravery of the man.

Thomas Masaryk, a philosopher and highly perceptive viewer of society, was elected to the Austrian Parliament in 1891, only to courageously resign his position 2 years later in a protest over treatment of Czechoslovak nationalists.

There followed years of writing on history and philosophy, aiming penetrating criticism at Karl Marx and his ideas. With the coming of World War I, Masaryk fled to Paris and, with Dr. Eduard Benes, formed the Czechoslovakian National Council, which became the recognized government of Czechoslovakia.

Czechoslovakia was recognized as a republic in 1918 and formally proclaimed in October of that year. Masaryk became President and was reelected three times before finally resigning his leadership in 1935 at the age of 85 and with a lifetime of devotion to a cause he saw as all-important—the freedom of his country.

We must constantly be alert to dangers to the element of freedom, now so abundant but always in danger of being lost by those who do not jealously guard it. This is why today, the anniversary of the birth of Thomas Masaryk, should be important to us all.

Address Delivered by Senator Hartke at Conference of National Association of Broadcasters

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN O. PASTORE

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 7, 1963

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, last week the conference of presidents of the State broadcasters' association assembled in Washington under the auspices of the National Association of Broadcasters.

At their luncheon session at the Shoreham Hotel on Tuesday, February 26, the conference had the good fortune to have as its luncheon speaker, our colleague Senator Hartke, of Indiana.

As a member of our Senate Commerce Subcommittee on Communications, Senator Hartke is most knowledgeable in the area of broadcasting. His address on that occasion was instructive and provocative, couched in apt phrasing, and I feel it should be a part of the record of this Senate where we do give a great deal of thought and attention to the responsibilities of broadcasters and our own legislative responsibility in the mass media of communication.

I ask unanimous consent that Senator Hartke's address be printed in the Record at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

SENATOR HARTKE ADDRESSES STATE BROADCASTERS' ASSOCIATION PRESIDENTS CONFERENCE

If the broadcaster feels puzzled or lost today, if he feels caught in the crossfire of laws, regulations, orders, community needs, and the necessity of making money, he is not alone. Many people feel lost today in a world they do not understand.

Perhaps we all stand a little too close to the proverbial forest and, thereby, have difficulty with the trees. Maybe we ought to back off and have a look at the whole from a new perspective.

Your industry is unique in our system. On the one hand, the American way insures free speech, the right to criticize, and the other constitutional guarantees we hold so dear. On the other hand, for reasons which you know well, the licensing of broadcasting is necessary and proper since the spectrum is limited and since the ether belongs to all of us. The basic consideration in granting a license is, of course, public service. And one man's public service is another man's poison—especially under our system.

I would, however, like to share some views with you on the service that I think should be performed by the broadcasting industry and the role which I think you and your colleagues and their stations should fill in today's world.

The inherent regulation of the business and the early growing pains have had a lasting effect. But I think there has been no trauma. Rather, I think, the patient need only to examine his past to understand his present so that he can face the future.

As I see the broadcast industry, a radio or television station is not a newspaper of the air, except to the extent that both media ought to be dedicated to public service—the newspaper because of the obligation implicit in the constitutional guarantees and the radio or television outlet because the law says so.

There are today, as you know, many communities in which there is no daily newspaper while there is a local radio station. In these cases, the need to serve the public interest—to fill the gap, if you will—transcends that required by law. There is a moral requisite which equals, if not exceeds, the legal requirement.

If you do not accept this, look at it this way: The holder of a license to broadcast holds a valuable commodity given to him by the Government of the people. The mere issuance of the license turns a paper corporation into a business which can be sold, traded, used, misused, milked, and bilked. Or it can be put to the highest service.

I do not want you to think that I believe that radio and television must broadcast nothing but public service programs. I certainly know that we who own the 55 or 60 million television sets of the country and the 200-odd million radio sets, neither want nor expect continuous doses of news, panels, public affairs, and public service. I like these; they are concerned with my business which is government. I also like steak, pork chops, fried chicken and hamburger. But, as I prefer my steak, pork chops and hamburger to be varied with occasional fish, salads, cheese, roast beef and other dishes, so I prefer my news and public affairs to be varied with entertainment of various kinds. I love music of all types. I enjoy westerns. I respect the rights of my teenage children to indulge in the twist and rock-and-roll.

It is easy to understand why, in a market like Washington or any other big city, the broadcast media tend to specialize. It is, I suppose, like the big city physician or dentist. But I think we are tending to overspecialization in all of these. I don't think a dentist should specialize exclusively in the care, cleaning and repair of back teeth only. I don't think a physician should turn away a neighbor with a stomach ache because he specializes only in treatment of broken arms. And I certainly don't think that it is necessary for a station to cater exclusively to devotees of rock-and-roll, long-hair music or anything else. Specialization in certain markets—maybe. Specialization to the exclusion of any variety—no.

I do not think any hard and fast rules can be or should be laid down. I think it's a matter for the industry to suggest in keeping with your own policing activities through the broadcasting code.

I do not think you serve the public interest by confining your public service programing to weekends, to class C time, and other offpeak listening and viewing periods. There is nothing to hide or be ashamed of in these programs. If there is, it's the station's fault for airing that kind of program. Government, religion, news and public affairs need not be dull. If a station is to serve the public interest and the needs of the community and the Nation, it has a duty not just to log some air time for this kind of program, but to put a little effort into making it palatable to the listener and viewer. The networks have—ever since the "vast wasteland" speech if not before—shown increasing awareness of these needs. And, in the fine public affairs programs now being aired, they have found new commercial commodities. A good, comprehensive news or public affairs program need neither be dull nor sustaining to be interesting.

In meeting this public service need, a station should be aware of the viewers and listeners beyond the shadow of its antenna. I think this is particularly true now that we have the controversy over the size of a listening area and the issue of interference in the context of the sign-on and sign-off times of daytime radio stations. If a station is going to claim some kind of squatters rights over a vast territory, it ought to be prepared to serve that vast territory, and not just with entertainment or even news of national interest. I think the public service obligation grows with the area being served. After all, the commercial possibilities and the rates grow with the size of the area.

When the broadcast industry recognizes these needs and meets them, it most effectively blocks the critics who feel that radio and television are not grown up. These critics are the ones who fear the lifting of Section 315 permanently, for instance. These critics think that radio and television must remain spoon-fed forever. I do not.

I like to think that a grownup, affluent and responsible free-enterprise broadcast industry has had long enough to learn its obligations in the straitjacket of regulation and ought now be turned as loose as possible. But such action would have to be tempered by the industry's own demonstration of increased responsibility and by government's insistence that the day of reckoning—the day of permit renewal—will be something more than a pro forma thing.

The broadcast industry ought to dare to experiment, dare to be different, dare to educate, enlighten, entertain, explain and criticize. I think stations, which now number 2½ times the number of newspapers in the United States, ought to dare to be more colorful, more complete and more objective than newspapers. Too many newspapers today have fallen or thrown themselves into the chasm of carping criticism. Too many seek to promote selfish ends by blinding themselves to the other side or other viewpoint. I know one newspaper that, during a recent political campaign dig at the opposition, printed on page 1, "read both sides in the ———." Responsible journalism has reached low ebb when this is necessary. I challenge my friends in the electronics journalism field to move into this vacuum and to provide the ingenious and objective coverage of news and public affairs that some people cannot get otherwise. Fortunately, this is not a common need. But it happens too often.

You will recall that I was one of the leaders in the drive to free the industry from the shackles of restriction imposed by section 315. My bill in 1959 would have repealed this section. It was the forerunner of hearings to suspend the section in part or in whole temporarily. It led to the suspension that allowed the famous Kennedy-Nixon debates of 1960.

The President has now proposed that the section be set aside for the 1964 campaign. I, personally, see no reason why section 315 should shackle coverage of any campaign or any news for that matter. The final decisions on news value and coverage should be left to the experts in the newsrooms of radio and television stations and networks. If stations are competent to make other decisions and judgments, surely they can make these.

A section that has been bypassed once and partially shelved and which the President feels should again be partly set aside, is not serving the public needs. I think it's obvious that a law which needs to be lifted in whole or part from time to time is not a good law.

I think if the suspension can be afforded in the contest for the highest office in the land, it can be for all contests for all offices.

I shall propose the repeal of section 315 together with the requirement that there be continuous study of the way in which the industry treats its new freedom.

I appreciate having the equal time accorded to me to tell you broadcasters my views of your business as some of you have told me your views of my business. And I don't mind that as long as it is a fair comment based upon factual information or sincere thought.

I do not want people to be unconcerned with what we say or do here. I would prefer that people agree with me, but if they can't, then I prefer that they disagree with me. For it is important that people be concerned about politics and government. If people neither agree nor disagree with what I do or say, they are, in effect, failing to be concerned about our country and its future. I do not ask people to love me, but only to share with me and my colleagues the responsibility of a great government and a great system.

Remarks of Vice President Lyndon B. Johnson, Chamber of Commerce Dinner, Waco, Tex., Thursday, February 21, 1963

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. R. POAGE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 7, 1963

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by Vice President JOHNSON at Waco, Tex., Thursday, February 21, 1963:

REMARKS OF VICE PRESIDENT JOHNSON, CHAMBER OF COMMERCE DINNER, WACO, TEX., THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 21, 1963

Several weeks ago one of your Waco leaders called me long distance to invite me to have dinner with him at this annual chamber of commerce banquet. Now I like the chamber of commerce. But I am very happy with Lady Bird's food, and I began to tell him that my calendar was rather crowded. But he said, "LYNDON, we have a special honor in mind for you if you can come."

Needless to say, that put things in a different light.

I perked up when I heard that.

He began explaining, "We know that Texas has moved to the forefront of the space age, and we feel it would be appropriate this year for us to give credit where credit is due."

I was really listening by then.

My caller went on—"We think it's time to recognize the Texan who has been out in front in space from the beginning—a man who has risen from a humble Texas background to one of the most commanding positions in the Nation."

I was all smiles by then—and thinking how good the food would taste in Waco. "Why didn't you tell me what you had in mind from the beginning," I said. "Naturally, I'll be there."

Then he said, "Why, thank you LYNDON. I'll tell the board tomorrow that you have accepted and will be on hand for the honor of introducing that distinguished Texan, General Schriever."

Now, you realize, of course, that is just who I thought he had in mind all along.

So, I am here—and let me make it clear, I did not hike the last 50 miles. I told the President in 1960 I would go all the way with J.F.K.—but, if it were all the same to him, I would prefer to ride.

I am sure that you will agree that two of the finest things that ever happened to this part of our State have been BOB POAGE—and that great American, Tom Connally. But, historically, two of the greatest things to happen to this region of Texas have been these: First, the influx into the fertile valleys of central Texas of the great migrations of hardy settlers of all nationalities who populated the region in the 19th and early 20th centuries.

The second most important thing is just beginning to happen—that is the space age.

Your guest of honor tonight personifies both chapters of this history. As a very young boy, Bernie Schriever was brought to this country and this State by his parents. Like so many others of the same origins, he has returned much to his adopted country—and Texas and America are richer for it. I would think that even the Baylorites and the ex-Longhorns could forgive him his Aggie days.

Before General Schriever speaks, let me say a few words to you.

Many here remember the days when cotton was king, and these black lands were cotton's empire. In recent years, some have been quick to say that this region is on the decline—that its future is behind it. Like the reports of Mark Twain's death, such gloomy views of central Texas are highly premature.

Where once the future of this region lay at the edge of a plow, today, the future lies in the explorations out among the stars. Waco stands at the center of a vast new complex of space activities. As the triangle—Houston to San Antonio, and Fort Worth and Dallas—grows, Waco is destined to grow and prosper and fill an increasingly important role in the life and leadership of Texas and the Nation.

The industrious people of Waco—led by the kind of community leaders and builders present tonight—are the kind of people America counts on to build a better future for themselves and their children.

Our generations living today are greatly challenged. We live in a time of trial and a time of peril. But the revolution which began on these shores 200 years ago is the revolution of independence and freedom which still is the greatest force in the world.

Fifteen years ago all of Europe, all of the Middle East, all of Asia lay prostrate at the feet of the Red armies. There seemed to be nothing which could stand in the way of consolidation of the Communist empire from the Bering Straits to the Rock of Gibraltar and from the North Pole to the Cape of Good Hope. At that moment, the American people stood behind their President—President Harry S. Truman—when he drew the line at Greece and Turkey and Iran.

We drew the line at the edge of the Communist empire. We said to the aggressor, "This far and no farther." Fifteen years have passed. That line has never been crossed. That frontier of freedom has never been breached. Today within the empire of communism, a great division and dissension has begun between the Russian Communists and the Chinese Communists. While we stand firm, we can responsibly believe that the first stages of disintegration and deterioration of the Communist bloc have begun.

Men of little faith—men of little courage—men blinded by partisan ambition may cry out their prophecies of gloom and doom. But when we see the strength of Western Europe, when we see the commitment to freedom of the new nations of Africa, when we see the valiant stand of the freedom-loving people of Asia, when we see the courage of our friends south of the border, we cannot responsibly conclude other than that the tide of this century is running with us. Communism will not bury us and cannot bury freedom.

The cause for which we stand—the cause to which we are committed—is opening the grave and rolling away the headstones where man's highest aspirations have too long been buried. Our side is the winning side and the knowledge of this should both make us all feel more secure in our homes tonight and give us new incentives to support our country and its cause in the years ahead.

This generation of Americans—like all generations before us—is dedicated to peace. We want a world of peace in which justice and freedom will be part of the lives of all mankind. That fact that the world is now at peace, the fact that freedom is now strong is due in no small measure to the vision, dedication, and determination of men like your guest tonight, who have done and are doing so much to keep the peace and make possible the building of a stronger, safer, and saner world.

It is my privilege to introduce to you Gen. Bernard Schriever.

Brotherhood of Silence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 7, 1963

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I have often stood here before my colleagues in this House to tell them of the gallant efforts of the captive people behind the Iron Curtain in Eastern Europe who fight, in silence and anonymity, to remain the captains of their souls. In the forefront of this battle are the undergrounds, the resistance movements in each country that still exist despite everything the Communist state can do. Year in, year out, the secret war between the Red rulers and the anti-Communist undergrounds go on.

Now a book has been published that tells far more eloquently than I of the courage and drama of the resistance. It is called "Brotherhood of Silence" and it is the thrilling story of the anti-Communist underground in Slovakia. It was written by a leader of the Slovak underground who now lives in the West, Stefan Ilok, with an American journalist, Lester Tanzer. Stefan Ilok is not the author's real name, but it is one by which he is known to many members of the Slovak underground. Through his trips to Europe, through the flight of Slovaks to the United States, through an elaborate network of couriers, Mr. Ilok has amassed firsthand reports of men and women who have risked their lives to harass, sabotage, and thwart the oppressive rulers of their native land. Their names have been changed to protect the identities of those who now carry on the dangerous fight for freedom, but the stories that appear in this book are documented in the files of the underground leaders.

In the days right after World War II, the underground organized itself as a secret state. It had its own general staff and army—the guerrillas; its own communication system, built around the couriers; its own labor unions, intelligence network, and division of psychological warfare. But sabotage and large-scale guerrilla warfare seemed to advance the Slovaks' cause little if any. Conventional sabotage was but a thorn in the Communists' side: bothersome but not particularly dangerous. Such tactics had succeeded in preserving the ideal of freedom in Slovakia but they had not toppled the Red rulers.

So the underground struggle had to enter a new phase. Now, the resistance must throw its resources into the broader struggle between East and West. More particularly, into the new war for supremacy in science and technology, a bloodless war with vast significance to the future of the world. Now the underground seeks to tap the scientific strength of the Communist empire for the benefit of the West. Now it engages in scientific and military espionage, probing for information to help keep the West abreast of Communist accomplishments—and weaknesses. I think it is no secret that such information from the Slovak underground has already found its way into committees of this House.

How the underground has evolved in Slovakia is graphically told in Brotherhood of Silence. But underlying the more violent activities of the underground is the Church of Silence, to my mind the most fascinating and most meaningful section of Brotherhood of Silence. Men of all faiths will be uplifted by the account of the brave Catholic priests who, driven underground by the Communist rulers, clandestinely minister to the devout Catholics of Slovakia, performing the sacraments, conducting masses in caves, basements, and mountain hideouts. So long as a man believes in a power greater than his own, so long as he believes in God, his mind and soul has not succumbed to communism. It is the members of the Church of Silence, the secret church, who keep religion alive in the shadow of the godless police state, and by so doing nourish the people's hope of eventual freedom.

The Washington Star has called "Brotherhood of Silence" "a story of vast courage and heroism." Richard Cardinal Cushing, Archbishop of Boston, has called it "an inspiring piece of literature." Doctor Daniel Poling has said of "Brotherhood" that—

> In its field as of now, this is the one and just about the only book. * * * In these flaming pages, the cause of freedom, both physical and spiritual, takes on proportions of grandeur.

I would like to add one final word. Though "Brotherhood of Silence" deals primarily with Slovakia, it is more than just a book about the Slovak people. The struggle of Slovakia is not a unique story, but a universal one. Over the years we have seen the people of Hungary, Poland, and East Germany rise against their rulers. In recent weeks and months, the activities of anti-Communist undergrounds in Cuba and Communist China have made the headlines. There have even been food riots and demonstrations against suppression of religion within the Soviet Union itself. Nowhere, not even at the heart of the Communist Empire, can the spirit of man forever remain shackled.

This is the moral, the lesson of "Brotherhood of Silence." In Mr. Ilok's closing words—

> I have told the story of the Slovak underground not to glorify my native land, but to exalt man's indomitable resistance to tyranny everywhere, his unquenchable yearning to be free.

Keep the Flame of Freedom Burning

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN BRADEMAS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 7, 1963

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, our colleague, the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. MONAGAN], who has taken a vigorous role in the study of the plight of captive nations under Communist domination, was a speaker at a dinner February 14, 1963, at the Waldorf-Astoria Hotel in New York. The dinner was sponsored by the American-Bulgarian League honoring the Free Europe Committee and Radio Free Europe. With permission to extend my remarks at this point, I include the text of Mr. MONAGAN's speech:

SPEECH OF REPRESENTATIVE JOHN S. MONAGAN, DEMOCRAT OF CONNECTICUT, AT WALDORF-ASTORIA HOTEL, NEW YORK CITY, AT DINNER SPONSORED BY AMERICAN-BULGARIAN LEAGUE HONORING THE FREE EUROPE COMMITTEE AND RADIO FREE EUROPE

I am honored to have this opportunity to talk with a group of people who by birth, nationality, background, or human sympathy are interested in the fate and future of the hapless and historic people of the great country of Bulgaria.

I am also pleased to join in this ceremonial which does honor to Radio Free Europe and the Free Europe Committee. I have just returned from a trip behind the Iron Curtain and I know the importance and the potential of the work done by this committee and this service.

Unfortunately, in this world of feeble human beings, power often bulks larger than principle and fate too often seems to be on the side of the big battalions. It is also regrettably true that even the most worthy cries of the oppressed and the downtrodden with the passage of time frequently seem to lose urgency to the average citizen and even to the average nation in spite of honest sympathy and good will.

That is why it is so important for interested citizens to meet regularly in order to refresh the recollection of the people of our country and of the world with a repetition of the facts of the Communist takeover of central Europe and to recall to their sympathies the present tragic and persistent condition of the friendly and downtrodden men and women of the captive nations.

It is frequently said that time heals all things and with the passage of the months and years there is a danger that the world will become complacent about the fate of these brothers behind the Communist border and that the rough edge of their tragedy will become smooth in our memories through forgetfulness.

This, my friends, must never be. Self-determination and freedom are not mere catchwords to be bandied about without thought or consideration. They are living principles upon which our Nation and associations of freemen everywhere are based. They are as valid today as they were when enunciated in our Declaration of Independence and their appeal to the victims of tyranny is stronger today than ever because these unfortunate human beings have greater cause than ever to understand their soundness and the need for their realization if the common aspirations of these imprisoned populations are to be realized.

And let there be no question about the fact that these peoples are imprisoned and that these nations are rightly termed captive nations.

I have seen the obscene wall in Berlin. I have seen the barbed wire, the watchtowers, the guards, the automatic rifles, and the dogs at the boundary between free Austria and captive Czechoslovakia.

We know that these barriers have been erected to prevent the wholesale desertions that would occur and have occurred through the departure of eager fugitives from the blessings of the Communist system.

These regimes were not fully chosen by the people. They were imposed by force and have been maintained in the same fashion. In Hungary and even recently in Russia, itself, the Communist overlords have demonstrated that they will not shrink from using the ultimate force in order to maintain their control.

This reality of the willingness to use force is the ultimate and basic fact of life in the guardhouse state.

Bulgaria has been the tragic victim of this imposition of forced control. Through mistaken reliance upon Russian assurances of free elections, the Communists were permitted to take control, and this control—in the now well-known pattern of Communist conduct—has never been relinquished.

I am sorry to say that American credulity and innocence were substantial factors in this takeover.

Partly for this reason, but particularly because we are the most powerful guardians of the liberties of the world, do I feel that the United States has an obligation to work for the restoration of freedom and self-determination to Bulgaria and other similar nations.

It is true that we cannot take up arms for this purpose, but there are many measures, short of war, which we can legitimately take to achieve this end.

During the recent hearings of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs on the Captive Nations which I was privileged to conduct, some of these measures were emphasized and recommended to the executive branch.

First of all, we must keep this question of the seized countries alive. We must take every opportunity in the United Nations and in other forums to emphasize that this problem remains unsettled, but that it should be settled in accordance with the principles of the United Nations.

We must seize this and other opportunities to put pressure on the Russians. They do the same to us at every opportunity. Why should we be so punctilious?

We should not be dissuaded by the lack of enthusiasm of some of our allies. The fact remains that the fate of human brothers is at stake and we must never admit that we can become bored or restless at the repetition of claims for freedom and self-expression.

We must also do everything to keep the hopes of the captive peoples alive.

They have fought the good fight. They have remained steadfast. They have resisted both force and blandishments. Our expression of support will encourage them to hold out further toward the day of the inevitable victory.

As our committee recommended, our Government should step up the use of our informational media—to proclaim our support to the world.

This recommendation has a particular application to the Voice of America and Radio Free Europe. It is not only the volume of broadcasts which should be increased, but also the force and the scope of these broadcasts—both in electric power and in political content. After all, this is a war that we are fighting.

Either we mean what we say and we do support the people of Bulgaria and we turn our support into definite actions or we bow to tyranny, change our policy, and permit these good and loyal friends to sink beyond redemption into the Communist quagmire.

I believe that we do mean what we say; that we do support the people of the captive nations and that we are gradually realizing more clearly the folly of attempting to deal on principle with a Communist regime.

I believe that our support will increase and grow and I am convinced that this support and the natural instinct of the captive peoples for freedom and self-improvement will sap the strength of the sterile Leninist creed and will bring a new birth of freedom to the people of central Europe.

Five to Ten Billion Dollars Lost Annually by Wastages and Mismanagement in U.S. Executive Departments

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN R. PILLION

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 7, 1963

Mr. PILLION. Mr. Speaker, I consider it to be my duty to direct the attention of the citizens of this Nation, the President, the members of the Cabinet, all administrative officials of our Government, and the Members of this Congress to the reports of the General Accounting Office—GAO.

The General Accounting Office is an independent, nonpolitical, and reliable source of information on the fiscal and management operations of Federal agencies. Its reports contain findings on inefficient and uneconomic functioning in the administration of the executive department.

The GAO is directed by the Comptroller of the United States, Hon. Joseph Campbell. The Comptroller General and his staff are performing a most valuable public service in finding and disclosing the inefficiencies, the maladministration, and the mismanagement that exists throughout the huge Federal bureaucracy.

The GAO reports are based upon investigations, examinations, and audits of Federal agencies. It issues hundreds of reports annually to the Congress, the President, and various executive agencies. These reports reveal a uniform pattern of gross maladministration and mismanagement that permeates our Federal operations. There are literally thousands of areas of Federal activity where shocking and massive wastages repeatedly take place.

Mr. Speaker, the following are five briefs extracted from the Comptroller General reports issued between February 26 and February 28, 1963.

U.S. MILITARY IN JAPAN FAIL TO PROPERLY UTILIZE CIVILIAN MANPOWER

In 1961, U.S. military installations in Japan were staffed by about 1,800 Japanese nationals in excess of accepted manning guides at an annual wasted cost of $2.7 million.

Despite this overstaffing, many facilities had not been adequately maintained and large backlogs of work had accumulated. Part of this backlog, which should have been performed by station forces, was performed under contract in fiscal year 1961 at an additional cost of about $465,000.

The Comptroller General's Office reported that the Army, Navy, and Air Force had failed to develop complete and valid manning guides as to the number of personnel required to maintain facilities and operate utilities in Japan.

The GAO cited inadequate management controls, inefficient use of personnel, lack of adequate work standards, and failure of management personnel to properly perform their duties, as contributing factors to this deplorable situation.

U.S. ARMY FAILURE TO PROTECT RUBBER TRACKS FOR TANKS AND COMBAT VEHICLES

In 1960, the U.S. Army incurred an unnecessary cost of $5 million to rebuild rubber tracks for tanks that were allowed to deteriorate.

The deteriorations were caused by the failure of the U.S. Army to (a) issue and use the oldest tracks first; (b) furnish unused tracks to manufacturers of new tanks; (c) protect the tracks by inside storage.

The General Accounting Office report states: "The management weaknesses disclosed in this report on rubber tracks are the type that could pertain to all of the Army's replacement parts which are subject to deterioration."

U.S. ARMY ENGINEERS DISPOSAL OF STEAM SHOVELS

From April 1960 to April 1962, 103 10-ton crane shovels purchased by the U.S. Army Engineers were released for disposition. These shovels had an acquisition cost of more than $2 million.

Twenty-five crane shovels were sold for $207,850, which cost the U.S. Army Engineers $541,200.

Eight crane shovels sold for $56,000, although their cost to the U.S. Government was $173,000.

A large portion of the shovels were completely new, unused shovels.

During the same period, the U.S. Army Engineers sold $350,000 worth of repair parts for its crane shovels.

While these new and serviceable shovels and parts were being given away or sold for bargain prices, the U.S. Army Engineers had full knowledge of their future need for these shovels.

A study by the U.S. Army Engineers dated April 18, 1962, recommended the purchase of several hundred similar shovels for the period 1965 to 1967, at a cost of $12 million. There have been no technological improvements in these crane shovels and none were expected in the near future.

The Comptroller's report describes these transactions in the following language:

"Improvident disposals," "undoubtedly result in substantial waste," "inconsistency indicates a lack of coordination and control within the Corps of Engineers."

U.S. ENGINEERS UNNECESSARILY EXPEND $575,000, AND PLAN TO SPEND ANOTHER $321,000 FOR OUTBOARD MOTORS

In 1959, the U.S. Army Engineers had 1,400 25-horsepower outboard motors on hand. These were completely new and unused motors.

At the same time in 1959, the U.S. Army Engineers unnecessarily purchased 925 25-horsepower motors at a cost of $575,000. They also planned to purchase 553 new 25-horsepower motors to replace new or slightly used motors.

There was no indication of technical obsolescence of the 1,400 new motors on hand.

The Comptroller's report refers to these transactions as: "Unnecessarily bought." "We recommend no further disposal of 25-horsepower motors for which there is a foreseeable need."

U.S. ARMY ENGINEERS PURCHASE AND SALE OF GENERATORS

From July 1959 to September 1960, the U.S. Army Engineers sold 316 30-kilowatt generators in excellent or in good condition at an average price of $150 per generator.

At the same time, it purchased a larger number of 45-kilowatt generators at a replacement cost of $4,879 each. The 30-kilowatt generators were, at the same period, classified by the U.S. Army Engineers as acceptable substitutes for the 45-kilowatt generators. The cost of the new 45-kilowatt generators for which the U.S. Army Engineers had acceptable substitute 30-kilowatt generators was $1.5 million.

In 1960, the Navy was disposing of 10-kilowatt generators as excess. At the same time, the U.S. Army Engineers were purchasing new generators at a cost of about $1,500 each. The Comptroller General's office found that the capacity and specifications of the Navy generators being sold were the same as those that the U.S. Army Engineers were purchasing.

Although appropriation and taxing power is vested in Congress by our Constitution, the executive department is charged with the responsibility for the efficient administration and management of public funds.

The critically dangerous fiscal insolvency of this Nation, both at home and internationally, is the result of the failure of both Congress and the executive department to faithfully discharge their respective constitutional responsibilities.

I would like to emphasize that the irresponsible dissipation of tax funds has existed and grown over many past administrations. But, today's rampant administrative fiscal abuses and mismanagements are the prime responsibility of today's executive department and its administrative officials.

Based upon the reports of the Comptroller General of the United States, I am convinced that the wastages and the squandering of public funds in the executive department exceeds $5 billion annually.

Mr. Speaker, the 1964 budget appropriations of $107.9 billion recommended by President Kennedy could be reached by upward of $5 billion if the President and the executive branch of our Government were to dedicate themselves to the exercise of reasonably good business practices.

This enormous saving could be realized for the taxpayers of this Nation without in any way reducing our military power, or sacrificing any present public service.

This sorely needed fiscal relief for our economy and our taxpayers cannot be gained without a clear, immediate public demand and the coordinated efforts of the Congress and the executive department.

Virginia Maple Sirup

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN O. MARSH, JR.

OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 7, 1963

Mr. MARSH. Mr. Speaker, it is maple sirup time in Virginia. Yes, with all proper deference to the reputations of sister States which produce this delicacy, Virginia claims preeminence in quality and flavor for its maple sirup.

For many years, we kept this treasure to ourselves, savoring it in secret, and left the ballyhoo of commerce to mapletree tappers elsewhere. More recently, however, we have found it possible to spare some of this superb product of the Virginia highlands for visitors to the Commonwealth. It is a pleasure, therefore, to extend an invitation from Highland County, Va., to attend the fifth annual Highland Maple Festival, to be held the weekends of March 16–17 and 23–24.

Highland County, which styles itself pridefully and with ample scenic reason as "The Switzerland of Virginia," is a center of maple sirup production. The festival, concentrating on informal hospitality, is sponsored by the Highland County Chamber of Commerce. Dr. T. E. Billingsley, chairman this year, has announced that four sugar camps will be open to the public.

To see maple-sugaring operations at their best, and to taste maple sirup at its finest, therefore, the public is invited to head for Monterey, the county seat of Highland County, on one of the festival weekends, and watch for the welcoming buckets which the festival committee will have in place on maple trees along the main highway leading to Monterey.

I am confident that all who accept this invitation will return home bearing a new realization that, on the basis of taste appeal, Virginia maple sirup takes first rank.

West Virginia State Legislature Adopts Resolution Making Sir Winston Churchill an Honorary Citizen of the State of West Virginia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, March 7, 1963

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, on January 14, 1963, I introduced Senate Joint Resolution 3, which would confer honorary citizenship of this country on Sir Winston Churchill of Great Britain.

In the 87th Congress it was my privilege to present a similar measure, as did my capable colleague, Senator STEPHEN M. YOUNG, and others. Members who cosponsored this legislation (S.J. Res. 218) which I introduced were Senator ESTES KEFAUVER and Senator FRANK J. LAUSCHE.

My colleagues who cosponsored Senate Joint Resolution 3 are Senators ROBERT C. BYRD, ERNEST GRUENING, THRUSTON B. MORTON, WINSTON L. PROUTY, HUGH SCOTT, and JOHN G. TOWER.

I am happy to have the opportunity of announcing in the Senate of the United States that the West Virginia State Legislature, February 22, 1963, adopted a resolution making Sir Winston an honorary citizen of the State of West Virginia, and memorializing the Congress to award him honorary citizenship as an American.

It is gratifying to know that the citizens of West Virginia share our esteem of Sir Winston and recognize his personal and official contribution to the cause of freedom and justice, not only to his country but throughout the world, including America.

House Concurrent Resolution No. 24 was introduced in the House of Delegates of the West Virginia State Legislature on February 7, 1963, by the Honorable J. F. Bedell, Jr., a delegate from Kanawha County. It was adopted by the house on that date; amended—in a minor way—and approved by the State senate on February 21. The house agreed to the senate amendments and adopted the resolution on February 22, 1963.

I commend the members of the West Virginia State Legislature for their expeditious and conclusive consideration of the resolution and for their judiciousness in adopting it on one of the most significant dates in the history of our Nation—February 22—the birthdate of George Washington, the first President of the United States.

The resolution reads as follows:

> HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 24 MAKING SIR WINSTON CHURCHILL AN HONORARY CITIZEN OF THE STATE OF WEST VIRGINIA
>
> Whereas Sir Winston Churchill, a citizen of Great Britain by birth, has close ties with the United States of America; and
>
> Whereas said Sir Winston Churchill has demonstrated during the strife and turmoil of two World Wars that he is a friend and ally of the United States; and
>
> Whereas he also has demonstrated his loyalty and devotion to the aims, purposes, and aspirations of this Nation at peace conferences, world trade meetings, the United Nations, and elsewhere; and
>
> Whereas there is now a proposal before the Congress that he be made an honorary citizen of the United States; and
>
> Whereas it is appropriate that this great soldier, world statesman, and noted historian and writer be made a citizen of our State prior to being made an honorary citizen of the United States; Therefore be it
>
> *Resolved by the Legislature of West Virginia*, That said Sir Winston Churchill be made an honorary citizen of West Virginia and that the Congress of the United States be memorialized to award him honorary citizenship as an American.

President Kennedy favors making Sir Winston Churchill an honorary citizen of the United States. At a news conference on January 24, 1963, he stated that honorary citizenship would not be essential to show the high regard that Americans have for him.

> But I would be delighted if the Congress passed a resolution, whether it is (for) honorary citizenship or an expression of esteem.
>
> Some way or other it would be appropriate, perhaps to remind Sir Winston Churchill of our high regard for him. It is written very large in any case, but this would be a gracious act at this time.

Although there has been no action in the Senate Committee on the Judiciary on my resolution—Senate Joint Resolution 3—or on other pending similar legislation, the House Committee on the Judiciary approved a measure for this purpose on March 5 and early approval by the House of Representatives is expected.

I am hopeful that the Senate will act expeditiously on this proposal and provide a symbolic memorial to a great statesman and leader whose bond with the United States of America is further enhanced because his mother, Jennie Jerome, was an American.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD:

Editorials from the Washington Post, "Honoring Sir Winston" on March 4, 1963, and "Citizen Churchill," March 6, 1963, excerpts from an article in the Washington Post by Edward T. Folliard, "Urgency Noted on Citizenship for Churchill," January 13, 1963, and my exchange of correspondence with Sir Winston Churchill.

There being no objection, the material was order to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, Mar. 4, 1963]

HONORING SIR WINSTON

Now that Sir Winston Churchill has indicated that he would be delighted to accept honorary U.S. citizenship, Congress should act with all speed to bestow the honor. Since Sir Winston had said in 1958 that he might be disposed to decline such a "remarkable compliment," there had been some understandable hesitation on Capitol Hill. With the great British statesman now declaring that he would be "deeply moved by such an honor," it would be ungracious of Congress not to grant what almost every American citizen would like to bestow.

It is not, of course, a matter of trying to claim for the United States this great leader who did so much to save the free world. To be sure, the American people do lay some claim to him because his mother was an American, and there is a feeling in many countries that Churchill, like Lincoln, "belongs to the ages." But there is no thought here of rivaling Britain in Sir Winston's allegiance or affections. Rather, the movement to confer honorary citizenship upon him reflects a general desire to pay tribute to a great Briton who has rendered immeasurable service to mankind.

Nor are the obligations of American citizenship involved. What would be conferred upon the revered former Prime Minister of Britain would be all the honors of American citizenship and none of its responsibilities. Whether or not he would ever come to these shores to accept the honor would naturally be left to his own discretion and would have to be governed in any event by the state of his health. The only question that should concern Congress is the prompt completion of a gracious gesture that will convey to Sir Winston the warmth of the American feeling toward him. Nothing short of unanimous approval in both the House and Senate will do justice to the occasion.

[From the Washington Post, Mar. 6, 1963]

CITIZEN CHURCHILL

The House Judiciary Committee has moved with gratifying speed to complete its action on the resolution conferring honorary citizenship upon Sir Winston Churchill. It is to be hoped that Congress will speed the measure toward final enactment.

The esteem and affection in which "a certain naval person" is held by the people of the United States has not been kept a secret. It is already so well known that no formal act is required to advertise it. It has been demonstrated on one occasion after another. His every visit to this country has elicited from citizens in every walk of life, from officials and from Congress evidences of affection and regard that citizens and officials usually reserve for the most honored and loved of our own countrymen.

Such manifestations of sentiment, however impressive and universal, do not diminish the need for or the wisdom of a formal act of Congress that will place upon the public records of this country an imperishable acknowledgement of a free country's devotion to one who in the gravest of trials spoke, not only for his own compatriots, but for free men in this and every other land.

It has been said that republics are notoriously ungrateful, but it is not true of this Republic. It is equally false to say that the gratitude of democracies is an impulse aroused by the expectation of future favor. These cynical assumptions of ignoble impulse are belied by a thousand evidences that the people of this country have a sure and instinctive response to greatness and a swift and generous reaction to sacrifice in the public good.

The Congress that passes this resolution will speak for a people who are united in their sentiments toward this great man, unanimous in their respect for his genius and wisdom and universally in favor of national tribute as unique as the man it honors.

[From the Washington Post, Jan. 13, 1963]

URGENCY NOTED ON CITIZENSHIP FOR CHURCHILL

(By Edward T. Folliard)

The campaign to make Sir Winston Churchill an honorary citizen of the United States is being waged again in Congress, this time with more urgency.

The need for urgency is obvious. Sir Winston is now 88, and as time goes on seems more and more prone to afflictions—his latest being a broken hip, complicated by a bronchial infection. The great Englishman, whose mother was an American, Jennie Jerome, has seemed to be indestructible; but he is well aware of the aphorism, "We all owe God a death."

There can be little doubt that President Kennedy hopes Congress will approve a joint resolution declaring Sir Winston an honorary American citizen. He backed such a move on April 15, 1959, as a Senator from Massachusetts.

Said Mr. Kennedy on that occasion:

"I believe, now that Sir Winston has left active political office, that a grant of honorary U.S. citizenship to him would be a worthy and fully deserved gesture." * * *

Action by Congress authorizing President Kennedy to proclaim Sir Winston an honorary American citizen, is of course, essential.

* * *

Mrs. BOLTON reintroduced her joint resolution in the House on the day the 88th Congress convened. Senator YOUNG intends to reintroduce his this week, but he will not be alone. Senator JENNINGS RANDOLPH, Democrat, of West Virginia, also will offer such a resolution, as he did last year.

In the last session, Senators FRANK LAUSCHE, Democrat, of Ohio, and ESTES KEFAUVER, Democrat, of Tennessee, joined in sponsoring the resolution.

Senator RANDOLPH, commenting on a January 9 editorial in The Washington Post headed "Citizen Churchill," which endorsed the idea of honorary American citizenship for the old British lion, said in a letter to this newspaper yesterday that the editorial was "an eloquent and moving tribute to one whose imprint on the pages of history will inspire and challenge uncounted future generations."

The West Virginian recalled Sir Winston's role in World War II and said:

"And yet, his heroism in war is only a small part of the bountiful legacy of Winston Churchill. We think of him today as an astute political leader, an international statesman, philosopher, artist and learned man of letters. He is revered as a man of peace."

Senator RANDOLPH said that the praise given Churchill in the Post editorial would be "echoed in the minds and hearts of all our countrymen." He said he would reintroduce his resolution and press for its adoption.

"May we soon bring to pass this meaningful recognition which tangibly expresses the heartfelt gratitude and affection, which the American people hold for Sir Winston Churchill," he concluded.

To judge from the Gallup poll, Senator RANDOLPH is not exaggerating when he writes of American admiration for Sir Winston. Over the years, Gallup's agents have asked a cross section of Americans to list the 10 men in the world they most admire.

Year after year, beginning in 1957, the former British Prime Minister was second, topped only by President Dwight D. Eisenhower.

In a poll taken in December 1962, he was the third "most admired." President Kennedy was first and General Eisenhower second.

There must be many things Americans like about Sir Winston—his courage and stirring oratory in the war years, his brilliance as a writer, his eloquently expressed affection for United States—but his wit certainly should not be overlooked.

U.S. SENATE,
Washington, D.C., September 5, 1962.

The Right Honorable Sir WINSTON CHURCHILL,
London, England.

DEAR SIR WINSTON: On August 16, 1962, it was my privilege to introduce in the Senate of the United States, legislation which would confer on you the ultimate recognition of esteem and gratitude which the American people may officially offer—that of honorary U.S. citizenship.

Believing that your life and works have ever been devoted to the cause of peace, as well as to brotherhood and cooperation between this Nation and the United Kingdom, this proposed honor would have added significance as a further pledge of cooperative effort by both countries. Especially today, when the need for harmony and unity of action are of paramount importance, would such a pledge be meaningful.

Having genuinely admired your contributions in a variety of fields and unfailing courage in times of stress, I felt that you would not deem it inappropriate to include a copy of my remarks when introducing Senate Joint Resolution 218.

With hope for the continued improvement of your health, I am

Truly,

JENNINGS RANDOLPH.

LONDON, *September 7, 1962.*

My Dear SENATOR: I am indeed obliged to you for your letter of September 5, and for the gracious and complimentary terms in which you refer to me. Pray accept my very good wishes.

Yours very sincerely,

WINSTON CHURCHILL.

Society for the Propagation of the Faith Raises $5,000

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN J. ROONEY

OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 7, 1963

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, recently the Columbian Squires, which is the Junior Order of the Knights of Columbus, of which you and the gentleman of New York addressing you are members conducted a service-type activity for the

Society for the Propagation of the Faith. Squires throughout the United States participated in various kinds of fund-raising projects with all proceeds going to the society. When the final tabulation was made, over $5,000 had been raised. A check for the amount raised was presented to His Excellency the Most Reverend Fulton J. Sheen, national director of the society, by the New York State Chief Squire, Robert W. J. Wysocki, a resident of the 14th Congressional District of New York, in behalf of the Squires throughout the Nation.

Appropriation for U.S. Coast Guard Academy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM L. ST. ONGE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 7, 1963

Mr. ST. ONGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert into the RECORD the text of a statement which I submitted today, to the Treasury-Post Office Subcommittee on Appropriations in support of the 1964 appropriation for the U.S. Coast Guard Academy at New London, Conn., which is in my congressional district. The statement follows:

Mr. Chairman and distinguished members of the subcommittee, I appreciate this opportunity to present to you a brief statement in connection with the annual appropriation which you are now considering for the U.S. Coast Guard Academy, located at New London, Conn., which is in my congressional district.

The Coast Guard Academy provides professional instruction to cadets who, upon the completion of a 4-year course of studies, become eligible to receive commissions as ensigns in the Coast Guard "in the service of their country and humanity." There are some 600 cadets enrolled at the Academy, coming from all parts of the country. They are fine, upright, and dedicated young men.

We in the eastern part of Connecticut are extremely proud of the Coast Guard Academy, its record of fine achievements over the years, and its role in training young men in seamanship, in the sciences, and in the service of their Nation. This is true in wartime, as well as in peacetime.

As a result of a comprehensive survey conducted by an architectural and engineering firm in 1961, an 8-year long-range program was undertaken for the expansion and modernization of the Academy. The improvement program scheduled for the fiscal year 1964 will cost a total of $1,750,000. The biggest part of the project calls for modernization of athletic facilities. The present indoor athletic facilities of the Academy are contained in a gymnasium building known as Billiard Hall and a small fieldhouse of temporary construction during World War II. These facilities are crowded and inadequate for the Academy's physical education program.

It is proposed to build a new wing to Billiard Hall which will provide more indoor athletic space, as well as the construction of adjacent outdoor athletic fields. In addition, there will be replacement of the heating and plumbing systems, rehabilitation of the electrical system, construction of the first phase of a fieldhouse, alterations of space in Billiard Hall, and the building of roadways and exterior utilities.

All of this is part of a forward planning program which will considerably help to improve the Coast Guard Academy and make it a modern institution for training our youth in this very important service to the Nation.

The U.S. Coast Guard Academy was established in 1876. In the year 1910 it was set up at Fort Trumbull in New London, and in 1932 it was relocated to its present plant. Thus, the Academy has been in New London for the past 53 years. It has become a very important factor in the community and the surrounding area, economically and in other ways.

I have been honored recently when our distinguished Speaker, the Honorable JOHN W. MCCORMACK, appointed me as a member of the Board of Visitors of the Coast Guard Academy. I am now looking forward to the official visits as a member of the Board to inspect the physical facilities of the institution, the morale of the cadets, and the progress of the modernization and improvement program at the Academy. In due time, we shall report back to Congress our findings and recommendations.

Mr. Chairman, in the interests of national security and the continued need for this specialized training, I strongly urge you and the members of this subcommittee to approve the full budget requested for the Coast Guard Academy for the coming fiscal year. Any reduction of the sum requested will only delay the realization of this program of improvement in the time specified and will hinder the work of the Academy in meeting the Nation's goals prescribed for it.

Report to the People of the Third Congressional District of New York

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 7, 1963

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, here is my first report for 1963 to the people of my congressional district, bringing them up to date with factual information on the activities of this Congress:

YOUR WASHINGTON REPORT FROM STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN, REPRESENTATIVE, THIRD DISTRICT OF NEW YORK, MARCH 1963

DEAR FRIEND: What actually goes on in Washington? You must often wonder. During my 10 years in Congress, it has always been my policy to keep my constituents fully informed. Now, at a time when you have indicated increasing interest in so many things that bear directly upon your lives and pocketbooks, it has become increasingly difficult for all of you to get an accurate and true picture.

With "managed news"—a situation being widely criticized in the press—it's harder than ever to separate fact from fancy. Assistant Defense Secretary Sylvester has said that deliberate distortion of the news is justified. I disagree—100 percent. Democracy can't work unless the people know the truth.

That's why I've decided to send you a factual, personal report from time to time, discussing public affairs and explaining where I stand, and why.

I'm a member of the House Ways and Means Committee, which must originate all tax and tax-related legislation. In the last Congress, our committee handled the tax, trade, and debt-limit bills, social security and unemployment compensation proposals, customs and excise bills, and other important legislation. Our 25-member committee is currently holding hearings on the President's tax message of 1963.

What about your taxes? The President's new tax proposals are just part of the entire fiscal picture. They must be considered in the light of his evermore lavish spending program. And, although his tax reduction program urges cuts of $13.5 billion over 3 years, his matching tax reform program, to a great extent, is nothing more than the shifting of the tax burden from one group of taxpayers to another. For many Americans, these so-called reforms would actually mean higher taxes.

How about Federal spending? Here are some startling—and alarming—facts you should know: In 1961, the U.S. budget deficit was $3.8 billion. In 1962, Mr. Kennedy's first full year as President, it rose 68 percent to $6.4 billion; for 1963, it will be an estimated $8.8 billion—up another 37 percent. And now, by the President's own estimate, the fiscal 1964 budget will mean an $11.9 billion deficit—up 35 percent again, and 3 times bigger than 1961's.

Remember the story about the bachelor whose blanket was too short to cover his feet? He cut some off the top of the blanket, sewed it on the bottom, and then wondered why the blanket was shorter than ever. This seems to be the way the President's thinking has run on the tax-spending-deficit question. Senator John F. Kennedy, campaigning in Philadelphia on October 31, 1960, promised that "we are pledged to maintain a balanced budget except in times of national emergency or severe recession. Furthermore, we will seek to maintain a budget surplus in times of prosperity, as a brake on inflationary forces." Walter Heller, the President's No. 1 economic adviser, said in 1961 that if the budget deficit ever reached $4 billion, he would recommend "higher taxes to offset the impact of spending," i.e., to prevent inflation.

What has happened here? Both the President and Mr. Heller have said, rightly, that deficits contribute to inflation—and promised that deficits would not be incurred except in national emergency or to stop recession. But, although he does not claim that either situation now exists, the President now proposes not only a tax cut but also this tremendous, inflationary $11.9 billion deficit. Why this switch?

Every time an American child is born, he or she inherits a $1,600 debt liability, his or her share of our staggering $308 billion national debt, highest in history. Treasury Secretary Dillon has said that he will ask Congress to authorize increasing this debt to at least $320 billion. We taxpayers now pay almost $10 billion of deadweight annual interest, with no debt reduction.

Many of you have written to me, supporting my constant demand that the Federal Government curtail needless expenditures. The President's proposals mean more inflation, an unsound dollar, greater drains upon our already strapped gold reserve, an unstable economy and increased unemployment.

Middle-income taxpayers would be hurt by certain of the President's tax reform proposals, for example:

(1) The 5-percent "floor" on itemized deductions: A taxpayer (say his annual income is $7,000) now may take full deductions, if itemized, for mortgage interest and other interest payments, real estate taxes, charitable contributions, and unreimbursed casualty losses. If his total expense here comes to $1,000, he may now deduct it all.

Under the President's proposal, the first $350 (5 percent of the $7,000 income) could not be deducted. The taxpayer could deduct only $650 of the $1,000 he had actually spent for these purposes.

(2) No more 4-percent, $50 dividend income exclusion: In 1954, I voted for the tax law permitting taxpayers to exclude from taxable income a part of their dividend income. This was intended to encourage investment in our Nation's economy, especially by people with limited incomes—and it did. Since 1954, the number of investors has risen from 7,400,000 to 17,100,000, more than double. President Kennedy now wants to repeal this investment growth incentive.

(3) No more $600 exemptions for people over 65: The President's tax reform program would knock out the present extra $600 exemption for people over 65 years of age, yet he publicly pleads for aid to the aging.

(4) Profit-sharing funds taxed as ordinary income: Under the President's plan, the value of your retirement nestegg will be materially reduced. Profit-sharing funds, when withdrawn, would be taxed at ordinary income rates rather than the lower capital gains rates at which such funds are now taxed.

(5) Small estates will be taxed: The President proposes, for example, that a widow, not liable for Federal estate taxes under present law, would be subject to a capital gains tax upon her husband's death, even though no sale of his property has taken place.

I will oppose all five of these Kennedy proposals, because they discriminate against the homeowner, the generous giver, the investor, the elderly person, and the workingman who plans to retire.

Here are some of the constructive proposals I have made:

The Derounian tax-reduction bill, designed not as a flashy "shot-in-the-arm" for a weak economy, but to free a great economic potential from the straitjacket of our punitive tax structure, would reduce personal and corporate tax rates over a 5-year period, provided that the budget be kept in balance.

To keep your tax money from dribbling out "the back door," a term describing administration spending for unauthorized purposes from the Treasury, I've introduced House Resolution 89, assuring congressional control over spending.

The Derounian commuter bill, H.R. 2387, allows deductions for income tax purposes of expenses for transportation to and from work.

Removal of the present 10-percent excise taxes on phone calls and telegrams, on jewelry costing under $5, and on basic cosmetics and other toilet preparations, is another objective of my tax-reduction program. President Truman asked for, and got, these "wartime" taxes on a temporary basis; they should be repealed.

Tax relief for widows is provided by my bill which states that a widow 65 or older may sell or exchange the home in which she has lived, without including the gain therefrom in her gross taxable income, if the home is worth $30,000 or less.

The Derounian school prayer amendment has been introduced as House Joint Resolution 29, an amendment to the Constitution authorizing the States to permit the offering in any public school or any other public place of the same simple, nondenominational prayer used in New York State's schools until the Supreme Court forbade it: "Almighty God, we acknowledge our dependence upon Thee, and we beg Thy blessings upon us, our parents, our teachers, and our country."

The right to a secret strike ballot is essential to protect labor union members and the public against arbitrary exercise of power by union bosses. I have proposed legislation requiring majority approval, by secret ballot of the union membership involved, before a strike may be called. In addition, I am one of the cosponsors of the comprehensive civil rights bill introduced in Congress.

Removal of the limitation on outside income for social security recipients is proposed in another of my bills, permitting senior citizens to earn what they can while receiving social security benefits they have paid for over the years. The Social Security Act was never intended to prohibit people from working—to force older people into unwanted idleness. Equally important, their living costs keep rising, without comparable increases in their social security benefits.

What's going to be done about Soviet-occupied Cuba? On February 7, President Kennedy, speaking of dangerous situations, said "I cannot set down any time in which I can clearly see the end to the Castro regime. I believe it is going to come, but I couldn't possibly give a time limit." Yet Senator Kennedy pledged in 1960 that "we must let Mr. Khrushchev know that we are permitting no expansion of his foothold in our hemisphere."

Are we going to have to live with the Soviets in Cuba indefinitely? Our President says that the Russian planes, tanks, guns and missiles there are all of a defensive character, and therefore no threat to us or to Latin American nations. The Russian troops? They are technicians. I say they are technical experts in subversion, now fanning out from Cuba to all of Latin America.

Has President Kennedy made another Yalta deal with Khrushchev? Why is it that we do not now insist, as we once did, upon onsite inspection of Red missile bases in Cuba? Have we promised not to invade Cuba? Why have we been withdrawing our missiles from around the world? Why have we reduced our nuclear testing requirements to a very dangerous minimum, about which we have been warned by Dr. Edward Teller, the world's outstanding nuclear physicist?

What are the answers to these questions? Only the President and his advisers know, and they aren't letting you and me in on the secret.

We do know that the world situation won't ease until the Russians are made to get out of Cuba. We do know that we can't tolerate the presence of the second most powerful—and exclusively Communist—military force in this hemisphere, just 6 jet minutes from Miami. The American people, if told the facts, can face any situation with courage and determination. The President must face it, too.

I supported the extension of the draft, as absolutely necessary to our national defense in these perilous times.

The House Committee on Un-American Activities, prime target of U.S. Reds and their sympathizers, won another overwhelming victory as its 1963 funds were voted by a vast bipartisan majority in the House. Only 20 Democratic Members voted "nay." I voted for this appropriation, because I believe that the committee has helped to alert the American people to the dangers of subversion in the United States.

I opposed the President's effort to "pack" the House Rules Committee by adding to its membership.

Backers of President Kennedy's "revised" medicare proposal rarely mention cost, but its cost will determine whether or not the whole social security system goes bankrupt. Even the higher 1963 taxable wage base of $5,000 would bring in only about $1.5 billion annually to finance medicare—but medicare cost estimates go as high as $7 billion per year.

How much can you afford? Right now, without medicare, just under 10 percent of a man's pay, in employer-employee contributions, goes to social security taxes. Take a man with a wife and four children, earning $4,000 a year. He pays $5 income tax—but $145 social security tax. Can he afford the added tax burden of medicare? Can you?

I am in favor of medical care for the aged, but not the President's plan. I voted for the Kerr-Mills law, a Democratic-sponsored proposal now in successful operation in New York and most other States. I will support any responsible plan of improvement if done through the private sector of our economy. We have the finest medical system in the world. Why toss it into the ashcan for a will-o'-the-wisp socialized medicine program that means lower quality medical care, on a compulsory basis, at tremendous additional cost to the American people?

When you come to Washington, please try to include a visit with me at my office, No. 1627 in the New House Office Building, across the street from the Capitol. I'll see to it that you will get passes for the sessions of Congress, and I will be happy to arrange visits to the FBI and other places of interest in the Federal Government.

And I look forward to meeting and chatting with you.

In the meantime, your views on any issue will be most welcome. Your letter will receive my immediate attention and a prompt reply.

Your Congressman,
STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN.

Midwinter Conference of Reserve Officers Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 7, 1963

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, on last Friday evening the 1st of March many of the Members of the Congress and the leaders of our military services joined the Reserve Officers Association of the United States at the Reserve Officers Association's annual midwinter banquet. This banquet climaxes a 3-day midwinter conference of the leaders of this association who come here from throughout the United States and oversea theaters to discuss matters of vital importance to them and to our national defense.

This was a particularly significant meeting for many reasons. First, this association gathered to do honor to one of the Members of the Congress who had given great and outstanding service to the cause of national defense before his death only this last fall. The Reserve Officers Association gave to the widow of the late Dennis Chavez, onetime Member of this House, its annual Minute Man Award as the citizen who has contributed most to national defense. Many of us recall the outstanding service of the late Mr. Chavez in the House and later in the other body and it was our privilege to join in honoring his memory and paying our respects to his lovely widow.

The occasion also marked the award by Reserve Officers Association of its Chaplain of the Year citation to Lt. Col. Maurice Kleinberg, who flew to Washington from his post of duty in Korea, to receive this award and to receive the recognition of all those hundreds who were present and who also were happy and privileged to do him honor.

Also, in the group was a representative party from the Confederation of Inter-Allied Officers representing the countries who joined with the United States under the Atlantic Pact in a mutual treaty of defense. This group was lead by His Royal Highness, Prince Peter of Greece, who appeared in the United States as a lieutenant colonel in the Greek Army Reserve.

Prince Peter's brief remarks to the banquet stirred us all and made us all aware of the deep commitment of the NATO Allies including especially our friends from the European countries who have fought by our side in the past to the cause which our great Nation is committed.

Prior to the banquet the national officers of the Reserve Officers Association together with Prince Peter and the other 12 officers from the European countries were received at the White House where President Kennedy, Maj. Gen. John H. Foster, the president of the Reserve Officers Association of the United States and Prince Peter, as president of the Confederation of Inter-Allied Reserve Officers—NATO, exchanged their views of their mutual commitment to this program of allied effort for the peace and security of the Western World.

Mr. Speaker, because these events do and will have a lasting effect on our security and because of the fact that all of these events have some significance in our current history, I am presenting for publication in the RECORD, the remarks of the various individuals involved in these happenings.

I should like to point out that the principal speaker at the banquet on last Friday evening was the great majority leader of this House, the Honorable CARL ALBERT, of Oklahoma. Mr. ALBERT's remarks were a simple and outstanding tribute to the cause for which the Reserve Officers Association works and to which all of us as Members of the Congress are committed. I am asking these various remarks to be presented in the order in which they were given.

REMARKS OF HIS ROYAL HIGHNESS PRINCE PETER OF GREECE AND DENMARK, LIEUTENANT COLONEL OF THE GREEK ARMY RESERVE, AND PRESIDENT OF THE CONFEDERATION OF INTER-ALLIED RESERVE OFFICERS, BEFORE THE ANNUAL MIDWINTER BANQUET OF THE RESERVE OFFICERS ASSOCIATION OF THE UNITED STATES, MARCH 1, 1963, WASHINGTON, D.C.

Mr. Secretary of State for the Army, Mr. Secretary of State for the Navy, admirals, generals, fellow officers, ladies and gentlemen: The cold war is a tragic event, but it has had this advantage, that it has brought us together. It has brought us together, us from the old countries of Europe and you the extension of Europe into this continent and we are proud that you should be an extension from our continent, because fancy what it would be if the Chinese had got here first. And because you are an extension from us, you have, after the last war with the tragic events of the Second World War and with the enormous development of armaments, been drawn into the inevitable vortex of world affairs to which we in Europe have been used to for many centuries. Especially us who live in the southeast part of Europe, in Greece, where for 2,500 years already, we have been in the frontline of the East-West conflicts. Unfortunately situated at a crossroad between three continents of Europe, Africa, and Asia, we have first already in the fifth century, B.C., repulsed the advance of central Asian hordes, and as you know the Persian wars against Greece were halted at Marathon, Salamis, and Plataea. Then with Alexander the Great we pushed back Asia as far as India and thus allowed Rome to develop in the Mediterranean, which eventually took over from us.

I should say that our relations with yours are very much those of the ancient city-states of Greece, or the Hellenistic states and of the Roman Empire. They bear a parallel I think which exists today. After the fall of the Roman Empire, Byzantium carried on the struggle guarding Europe against the East and it was only with the fall of Constantinople in the 15th century that we were eventually overrun, but this advance of the central Asians caused the expansion of Europe overseas and in this way was this continent peopled.

With the last war we have again come back to the same situation. Our civilization of the West versus that of central Asia today, represented by the Soviet Union, and the struggle thus goes on with weapons, which we never had before, which oblige us on both sides of the Atlantic to try to avoid an open conflict with our hereditary enemies because of the terrible effect that this would have, and in his cold war I think the role of Reserve officers has changed from what it was before because the reserves must be ready much quicker and be on their toes continually.

The Secretary of Defense, Mr. McNamara, who received me yesterday and I was honored to be received by him, mentioned to me how much he thought it was important that Reserves were ready immediately and available at any moment's notice. And thus again in the tradition of the citizen-soldier of the city-states of Greece, where Demonthenes, Xenophon, where Epaminodas fought in the front ranks of the city-states army, we the reserves must be ready at any moment to help, especially in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, and that is why we are so pleased and privileged to have been been invited over here to see how your organization works.

The last 2 days have been very important, very interesting for us. We go back with a feeling, when we go to Europe, that we should like to work in closer with you; and that our organization, the CIOR, of which I am privileged to be the president for 2 years, is entirely at your disposal to tighten the bond between us for this common defense.

REMARKS OF GEN. JAMES E. FRANK, U.S. ARMY RESERVE, NATIONAL VICE PRESIDENT OF THE RESERVE OFFICERS ASSOCIATION OF THE UNITED STATES IN PRESENTING THE CHAPLAIN OF THE YEAR AWARD TO CHAPLAIN (LT. COL.) MAURICE S. KLEINBERG

The chaplain to whom I am honored to make this presentation has flown here, especially to receive this award, from Korea where he is now serving his second tour. He is a man of considerable intellectual attainment and has served in several pulpits throughout this country. He is currently assigned to Headquarters 8th Army in Korea and has served the Army well in the Office of the Chief of Army Chaplains and also in the Military District of Washington. I would like to now read the award from the Reserve Officers Association of the United States:

"AN ASSOCIATION RESOLUTION, WITH RESPECT TO THE SERVICE OF CHAPLAIN (LT. COL.) MAURICE S. KLEINBERG

"Whereas, Maurice S. Kleinberg, an officer and leader in the Chaplain Corps in the Military Force of the United States has at personal sacrifice and with exemplary devotion to duty given unselfishly of himself, his talents, and his energies, to provide meaningful spiritual development in the Armed Forces, and has contributed substantially to the welfare of personnel both in precept and example: Therefore be it

"*Resolved,* That this association awards to Chaplain Kleinberg, in meaningful recognition and sincere gratitude to him as representative of the corps this citation as Chaplain of the Year.

"For the association, the national council, March 1, 1963,

"JOHN H. FOSTER,
"*Major General, Air Force Reserve, National President,*
"JOHN T. CARLTON,
"*Colonel, U.S. Army Reserve, Executive Director.*"

It gives me a great deal of pleasure, Chaplain Kleinberg, to present this award to you in the name of the Reserve Officers Association of the United States and particularly as representative of the Army section of this great association.

ADDRESS OF CHAPLAIN (LT. COL.) MAURICE S. KLEINBERG IN RESPONSE TO CHAPLAIN-OF-THE-YEAR AWARD BY THE RESERVE OFFICERS ASSOCIATION OF THE UNITED STATES ANNUAL MINUTEMAN BANQUET, MARCH 1, 1963

Honored guests, I don't know when it will come to my lot again to address such an august gathering as this and I have completely forgotten the protocol. There are altogether so many dignitaries, so many great people, members of the Armed Forces, beginning with the Secretary of the Army and other Secretaries of services, we have the Congress with us, we have the Senate with us, we have almost every dignitary you can about imagine.

I am like the old prophet who looked out upon a great audience once and he said, "I am astounded and confounded, dazed and amazed."

I couldn't anticipate what would be in my lot tonight and I am really surprised despite the fact that I've known of this award for some time.

I am sure I can't read the manuscript in front of me because the light shining in my unphotographic countenance, and so I am going to extemporize to you tonight and bring you a message that I feel keenly ought to be said to such a tremendous and influential group as this.

Some of you men who have been in the service long before I have, remember the time when the chaplain had difficulty establishing his position. In fact, nobody knew quite what to do with the chaplains in the service. There was a time, I was told, when the chaplain had to be the special service officer on the side. He had to be in charge of some athletic functions. Yes, sometimes even to be in charge of monitoring the post exchange activity.

I am happy to tell you tonight that that has long been changed.

The chaplain's work and the chaplain's service has been recognized as it is tonight by the generous award of the Reserve Officers Association in giving annually a chaplain's citation.

I think this is tremendously important because it represents a tremendous amount of progress in appreciation of the value of religious forces in our great and glorious country.

The chaplain has found his place. He is welcome and there isn't a commanding officer today worth his salt who doesn't appreciate the position of the chaplain and his value on the training team of young men who serve in the Armed Forces of our country and who serve under circumstances where their character is being challenged, their emotions are being in a state of upheaval and all the rest of their background is being disturbed.

The chaplain functions as a builder of character, as a guardian of the basics of this great and glorious country.

Now, I want to say that it is because we have had high standards in the chaplains' branch beginning with the Chiefs of Chaplains, who have set up the standard that they would not compromise with, and they have set up and they have programed for the finest interfaith activity that we enjoy in this country.

They have established an esprit de corps where rabbis, priests, ministers, march shoulder to shoulder under the motto of cooperation without compromise.

It is the greatest opportunity for a young clergyman to find life unfolding in the full; rich and poor live side by side, the races, the colors, and the creeds are mingled, as we find the finest and the best in each individual.

This is the job of the chaplain; this is the job of religious forces in our great and glorious services; and this is the privilege that has been mine to be a part of throughout these many years.

I want here publicly to give expression of thanksgiving to those Chiefs of Chaplains beginning with Chaplain Dr. Ivan L. Bennett, Msgr. Patrick J. Ryan, Rev. Dr. Frank A. Toby, and our present Chief of Chaplains, who happens to be with us, Chaplain (Maj. Gen.) Charles E. Brown, Jr.

Those men have offered me in my career as a chaplain an opportunity to test my strength and to test my faith, and I am grateful to them for the opportunities for service which they have given me over these many years.

I want to say here and now that it is a great privilege to bear this honor tonight and I trust that I shall deserve it as my career goes on. I hope that all of us together may go from strength to strength so that we may be a part of expanding the free world where men can grow from being brother's brother to becoming our brother's brother's brother.

House Majority Leader Carl Albert, of Oklahoma, Before Reserve Officers Association Banquet

Mr. President, Mrs. Chavez, Mr. Secretary Vance, Mr. Secretary Korth, Senator Russell, Chairman Vinson, General Lemay, General Wheeler, Prince Peter and fellow reservists of the Confederation of Inter-allied Reserve Officers, ladies, fellow Members of Congress and fellow members of the Reserve Officers Association of the United States.

We gather here tonight in the name of the Nation's Minute Man—the symbol of every citizen's commitment to serve his country in war and in peace—to do honor to a tradition, and to pay tribute to those who have helped to build this tradition.

We of the Reserve Officers Association, now in its 41st year, take pride in our contribution toward the building of "a military policy which will provide adequate national security."

Our organization strives to implement this goal in both the national and international areas, through the use of conventional methods and again through such innovations as its grassroots exchange program with the European allies of the United States.

It is an honor to have with us tonight Prince Peter of Greece and Denmark, who is also a lieutenant colonel in the Greek Army Reserve, and the president of the Confederation of Inter-allied Reserve Officers.

He has been accompanied to the United States by 11 CIOR leaders from European nations. It has been a unique and valuable experience to have had these outstanding allied officers with us for the ROA conference and banquet. We have gained much from their visit which will contribute to the establishment of greater understanding and harmony among reserve leaders and ultimately toward the strengthening of the free world alliance.

Many of us in this room have served in uniform, some of us have served in the Congress, and some of us have served and are serving in both the legislative and the military branches of the Government.

Many years ago we were reminded by a great citizen-soldier—George Washington—that "when we assume the soldier, we do not put aside the citizen."

Those who are here as civilians, those who are here as professional military men and women, and those who are here as Reserve officers, can say they fully share in an understanding of that dual responsibility in their lives.

The implementation of this responsibility is the primary goal of this association.

The Reserve Officers Association since its inception has consistently sought to focus both public and governmental attention upon our national requirements for modern, well-trained and well-equipped, Ready Reserves. This has never been an easy assignment. In the post World War I period, the public tendency was to look away from the need for military preparedness, toward a more pacific way of life, even toward disarmament. Again, after World War II, there still remained, although to a lesser degree, some apathy toward sustained reservist readiness.

The experience of Korea prompted the Reserve Officers Association to ask for the development of high priority, instantly ready for action, fit and trained Reserves—available for call within the hour. The state of world affairs since that time has accentuated the need for this kind of readiness. There is not, within the foreseeable future, a time when we will have no requirement for a competent Reserve force.

One of the former national presidents of ROA, present tonight, as long as 8 years ago urged that a limited force be selected, organized, trained, and equipped.

The administration's new programs, about which we have heard so much lately and about which there has been some misunderstanding, had their inception in our association's programs.

The Reserves have changed and are changing—the military equation overall has changed—and we must respond accordingly.

In the words of General MacArthur, the Reserves became "truly professional in World War II."

Military capabilities and requirements being what they are today, nothing short of a truly professional standard of training would enable the Reserves to function in a crisis. For that reason it is desirable that the patterns of the regular services and the Reserves be almost identical—since in crisis their missions will be identical.

More than a decade after World War II, the active forces of the military still included within their temporary structure reservists who constituted a majority of the officer corps on duty. It was in this period that the career reservist came into being.

The changed makeup of our overall military strength, both regular and reserve, and the importance of both to our national defense, make it incumbent upon the Congress in writing legislation to provide for their equal treatment under the law.

The Reserve Officers Association had a share in the development of the one-Army concept—which, of course, applies to the other services as well, and in the same manner and spirit. The Reserve Officers Association read the signs of the times and acted accordingly. An articulate spokesman for the modern Army was Gen. Bruce Clarke, who is with us tonight. General Clarke was among the first to advocate the one-Army concept.

The broad base of our citizen-reservist forces must be maintained. I know that President Kennedy is going to see that it is maintained. I know that the military leaders and the leaders of the Congress who are here tonight—and those who are not here—are going to see that it is maintained.

We have heard some suggestions about the ROTC programs. The ROTC units are the wellsprings for the development of competent military personnel. They also must keep pace with modern-day concepts.

Far from abandoning our high school and college ROTC programs, we should foster and encourage their role in preparing our young men to participate in the defense of our country.

The role of the Reserve, its importance within our overall defense effort, and our entire concept of preparedness, all of which mean so much to the security of the free world today, have had many great champions in the Congress of the United States. Among these, few have played such a significant part over so long a period of time, as the great national leader to whose memory we pay tribute tonight.

The career of Senator Dennis Chavez in the Congress had many distinctions but none more noteworthy than his commitment to the cause of strength as the path to peace and security.

His legacy to unborn generations cannot be measured.

His image will remain as real to us as that of the minuteman whose symbolic cloak it is our privilege to drape about him.

Before I read the resolution which our association has addressed to honor the memory of this great man, I would like to ask his beloved companion and helpmate, Mrs. Chavez, to stand beside me.

"Whereas, throughout his lifetime, (a) his devotion to the purest concept of duty to country; (b) the nobility of his purpose in leadership for adequate national security; (c) the steadfastness of his dedication to the citizen-reservist tradition; (d) the clarity of his judgment to insure strength, effectiveness, and high morale in the Nations military force, have given confidence to his generation, inspiration to posterity, and safety to this Nation's institutions and ideals: Therefore, be it

"*Resolved,* That in the name of the minuteman, whose genius in patriotism gave our citizens the will to exist as a free people, in recognition of his great service to the United States, the Reserve Officers Association dedicates to the memory of Dennis Chavez its annual minuteman award as the citizen whose career contributed most to the national security of these times."

In the name of our association, it is with a deep sense of privilege—and it is my sincere personal pleasure—to present to you, Mrs. Chavez, this award.

Remarks of Senator Leverett Saltonstall Before the Reserve Officers Association of the United States Annual Minuteman Banquet, March 1, 1963

General Foster, Mrs. Chavez and Dennis Chavez' family, Chaplain Dummet, Colonel Kleinberg, Secretaries of the Services, my colleagues in the House and the Senate of Congress, officers of our armed services, Reserve officers and their ladies, and the Reserve and members of the confederation of Reserve officers from abroad, it is a great honor for me to be asked to respond on behalf of the lovely widow of Dennis Chavez to the honor that has just been presented in his memory, a citizen who has contributed most to national security.

Truly, Dennis Chavez has contributed most all of his life to the national security.

Because while he was born in humble circumstances in New Mexico, he worked hard to get an education and he succeeded in getting sufficient education to come to Washington and take over a small position in the U.S. Senate while he worked to get his degree as a lawyer from Georgetown University.

Eleven years later he came to Congress, in 1931, and there he has been practically all the rest of his life.

What appealed to me most about Dennis Chavez was his patriotism and his insistence on building our national security.

We served together as members of the Senate Appropriations Committee on Defense.

He was chairman of that committee and I was a senior minority member for a number of years, I think 6 years. During that time we became fast friends.

Now his concern also was for the welfare of the military man—his housing, the hospital facilities, the opportunities to carry out the good family life and especially to see that he was adequately paid for his services.

Dennis Chavez' concern was more for the personalities that were concerned with the military, perhaps even more than the procurement and other parts of providing for our services.

And then too, what appealed to me was his concern for the small men, the private and the corporal in the military services and the small industry, the small leader in industry throughout the country.

I know I remember of one instance where a small manufacturer with plants in New Jersey and Massachusetts, far from New Mexico, was being put out of business because of the product that came from Japan.

So Dennis Chavez did much to put into the act the provision of "buy America," and incidentally, in the case of that industrial leader, he found that after he had this "buy America" in, the product of that man was better than the product that they were getting from Japan.

During our service together we had many friendly discussions. We grew to have respect for each other's opinions. At times we disagreed, but not often, and when we disagreed we always worked in a calm quiet manner to settle and compromise on our differences of opinion.

And so, when Dennis was no longer with us this year, I felt that I had lost a real friend.

And I have got to continue in the days to come my discussion with Mrs. Chavez to reach a conclusion on a question that Dennis and I were never able to decide.

We discussed many times whether the Spanish from whom he was descended came up through Mexico into New Mexico before the Anglo Saxons from whom I've descended came into Plymouth and Salem in Massachusetts.

So, Mrs. Chavez, you and I have something to discuss in the future and it is a great honor and privilege for me to respond in behalf of Mrs. Chavez to this very distinguished award which was given to your late husband, a gentleman whom we will always remember in the U.S. Senate as a patriot and a lover of his country and a fine, fine public servant in the best sense of that word.

An Amendment To Lower the Draft Age to 22

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 7, 1963

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, next week when H.R. 2438, a bill to extend the Universal Training and Service Act for another 4 years, comes up for action before the House, it is my intention to introduce an amendment which would reduce the draft age to 22.

Under existing law, all young men, ages 18½ to 26, must register under the selective service program.

Testimony before the Armed Services Committee during 2 days of hearings on this very important bill discloses that while there are more than 10 million American youths now registered under the draft and while an additional 1,500,000 more young men who reach the registration age of 18½ annually are added to the list of those eligible for the draft, only 76,000 American youths are expected to be drafted during the current fiscal year. Assistant Defense Secretary Norman Paul, the Pentagon manpower chief, estimated that about 90,000 young men would be drafted during each of the next 4 years if current Army strength is maintained.

It appears to me somewhat cruel and illogical to subject more than 10 million American young men to the shadow of the draft for a period of 7½ years when we only take an infinitesimal fraction of these young men into the Army every year.

It might be well to point out that of the 76,000 young men who will be drafted this fiscal year, nearly half of those drafted will have volunteered for induction so that actually, Mr. Speaker, we are drafting into military service in this country at this time 38,000 young Americans.

Mr. Speaker, I am quite sure we are all very much impressed with the depth of concern and understanding President Kennedy has shown for the young people of America. The President has proposed various programs to Congress to try to alleviate the problems of unemployment among young people in this Nation.

It is significant to note that out of 4 million people unemployed in this country, 800,000 of these are young men of draft age. These young men constitute the largest single group of unemployed in this country, and I submit, Mr. Speaker, that the Selective Service Act in its present form has seriously contributed toward this large rate of unemployment among our young people.

As a member of the House Committee on Labor, I have had an opportunity to study this entire subject of unemployment among our young people; and several witnesses, men high in this Government, have agreed that employers are reluctant to hire young men of draft age for two basic reasons:

First. An employer is reluctant to invest in the training of a young worker whom he will lose to the military service within a relatively short time.

Second. Employers do not like to commit themselves to keeping a job open for 2 years, as required under the law, when a young man is drafted into the service.

This second point is extremely important to remember. I have talked to employers who have stated they could reconcile themselves to the idea that when they hire a man of draft age they may lose him to the military but their great objection is that when this young worker does go into the service, the employer must freeze this job for 2 years so that it will be available to the young man when he returns from military service. If an employer hires another worker to fill the gap, he is confronted with a difficult decision of either carrying both these workers when the selectee returns or dismissing the second worker, even though his work may be acceptable.

I have talked to many young men in my district of 1–A status who have told me the first question they are asked when they apply for a job is their draft status. These young men have stated that when they tell a potential employer they are 1–A, they are politely told that there is no work available for them.

Mr. Speaker, we are dealing with human beings, not chattels, in this legislation. These are young Americans who I am sure are perfectly willing to make whatever sacrifices are necessary, just as have their forebears, in the defense of freedom and survival of America. I do not know of a single young man who has tried to intentionally or willfully shirk his responsibility to his country. On the contrary, many of these young men have come to me and stated they want to volunteer for military service so they can get their 2 years over with as quickly as possible; but in many instances throughout the country, even those who want to volunteer for the 2-year enlistment under the draft have to wait for a very long time before sufficient quota numbers are available for 2-year voluntary enlistment.

It appears to me that the amendment which I intend to offer would in no way disturb the present Defense Establishment. My amendment provides that:

> After July 1, 1963, no person shall be inducted into the Armed Forces pursuant to this Act except as provided in section 4(i) and section 6(h) of this title, after he has attained the age of 22 years. This paragraph shall not apply during any period of national emergency hereafter proclaimed by the President.

It is clear from this amendment that the stimulus which the Defense Department claims it needs to encourage young Americans to volunteer for military service would remain. Certainly those Americans between the ages of 18½ and 22 who do not want to take their chance on being drafted would continue to volunteer for any of the defense services as they do at the present time.

Under my amendment, any time the President felt we needed more young men than are being drafted, he could restore this act to its original status with all of its present provisions simply by declaring the need for a return to the original legislation.

My amendment in no way disturbs the present system of deferments, and those young men who want to go on to college to continue their education would continue getting the same deferments as they do under existing law.

The only change that would occur under my amendment is that an estimated 2,500,000 Americans who now must wait before they are called up for duty would be exempt after they reach the age of 22.

The practical effect of this amendment would be that those young Americans who are not called up for military duty before they reach their 22d birthday could then proceed to plan their lives in an orderly manner and could also have new job opportunities made available to them. They would remain registered under the draft, however, for any possible national emergency when, of course, all Americans would respond.

Mr. Speaker, I am well aware of the argument presented by the Defense Department that any changes in the present Selective Service System would reduce the voluntary enlistments which constitute the overwhelming majority of our military personnel.

Secretary Paul told the Armed Services Committee that it is the local obligation for military service that has enabled the Air Force, Navy, and Marine Corps to maintain their strength for years without using the draft, and for the Army to maintain a force of five volunteers to each draftee in recent years. Mr. Paul believes that without the spur of the draft, the armed services would be unable to fill the National Guard and Reserve ranks, the ROTC route to officer status, or get enough doctors and dentists to care for the men in uniform.

It would appear to me that my amendment would in no way disturb this conclusion. But my amendment would help the military get the type of soldier it needs more efficiently.

It should be a source of great concern to us that out of 1,110,000 Americans who became 26 years old last year, 300,000 or 27 percent were ruled physically or mentally unfit under our present service requirements; 11 percent or 130,000 were permanently deferred because they were fathers; and 40,000 or 4 percent held student or other deferments.

While it is true that 640,000 or 58 percent of this group of 1,110,000 who became 26 had had or were undergoing military service, this particular group represents less than 60 percent of the total. From these figures we gather that as these men become older, their potential use to the Armed Forces diminishes in direct proportion.

I submit, Mr. Speaker, that our present policy of drafting men up to the age of 26 is wasteful and creates indescribable sociological problems in this country.

It is wasteful because I am sure we can all agree that a man in his middle 20's does not have the stamina to stand up to basic military training as the young man in his teens. Under present law we are faced with this dilemma of providing the military with selectees whose average age gets higher every year, when in the modern Armed Forces of America the great need is for younger men with greater stamina. It is unfortunate that the Pentagon has not been able, or willing, to face up to this reality.

If we are to talk about inequities under the present act, I should like to cite a figure which appeared in the Washington Post on March 6, which revealed a total of 123,000 men above the age of 26 who now hold no deferment of any kind but are not being called because the Army wants younger men. These men who are put near the potential of the induction priority system escaped induction at the normal 23-year-old induction age because they then held deferments and did not lose them until they were past 26.

Mr. Speaker, the present act imposes an unfair burden on draft boards throughout America. These draft boards realize the tremendous backlog of potential selectees that is building up in their respective communities. It is entirely conceivable that these draft boards would want to draft younger men to meet the modern needs of the services. However, under the present law the draft board has no choice but to take the selectees off the top, and as a result, older men are being called up.

Recently my attention was called to a directive sent out by the State selective service director in Illinois, in which he urged local draft boards to be as lenient as possible in granting deferments because of the tremendous backlog of potential selectees that is being built up in this one State alone. His directive stated that as of last September, there were 60,000 young men registered under the draft in the State of Illinois between the ages of 18½ and 26 classified as 1-A. The State's draft quota has been averaging around 260 selectees for the entire State of Illinois, and half of this monthly quota was being filled by volunteers. We are receiving several thousand new registrants every month, and so the State director called this problem to the attention of local draft boards. He pointed out in his directive that the State of Illinois was compelled to select men at the age of 23, 24, and 25 to fill the meager State quota when in fact the military is asking for younger men.

I am sure the same problem exists in every State in the Union.

Under the amendment which I intend to propose, it is true that younger men would be selected. But it is also true that those who are not called by the time they reach their 22d birthday would in fact be able to plan their future in a more orderly manner unless some major catastrophe besets this country.

Mr. Speaker, this amendment will not in any way interfere with the present impetus to get volunteers. However, I would not be fair with myself and my constituents if I did not take this opportunity to register a strong protest against the manner in which the Defense Department has been conducting its recruitment program.

In this period of labor surplus in America, I feel sure thousands more of our young men would give serious consideration to voluntary enlistments in the military service if the recruiting program was being carried out in a more effective manner. I submit, Mr. Speaker, that some of the recruiting practices now border on sheer fraud, and the word has gotten around to the young men in this country that those fancy posters which the military uses to induce enlistments too often cannot be believed.

Just the other day I had one of my constituents fly to Washington from Germany at his own expense. I believe he told me it cost him $390 of his own money for air passage to fly to Washington during his furlough to try to unscramble his mixed up military career. This young man volunteered a year and a half ago under the 3-year voluntary enlistment program, which has as its slogan, "Choice—not chance." This young man was attracted to voluntary service because he had been told if he volunteers for 3 years, he can select his assignment and the school he wants to attend. It is unfortunate, Mr. Speaker, that I must report to this House that during the past year and a half, while stationed in Germany, this young man's glamorous assignment was to serve as an orderly in a recreation barracks. It should come as no surprise that under these circumstances, a soldier can become very bitter and pose serious discipline problems to the military.

I have any number of letters, and I am sure other Members have similar letters, from young men who have been attracted to the military service by these fine slogans and multicolored signs on how one can get a career in the military service—only to find when they signed on the dotted line, that they were misled.

If the military wants to increase voluntary enlistments, let the Defense Department take a hard look at its recruiting practices and let it assure young Americans that the least they can do is have faith and confidence in the integrity of the military service for which they volunteer.

Mr. Speaker, it is my firm hope that the House will face up to the problem we have in America today. The Armed Services Committee itself admits that surely by 1967, basic changes will have to be made in this entire approach of selective service. Their own statistics show that by that time the post-World War II bumper baby crop will have reached military age, and there will be far more men available than the Armed Forces of the present size could use, allowing for father, student, and other deferment policies.

I submit, Mr. Speaker, that we need not wait 4 years. The House ought to face up to the problem today because we already have more than 10 million men whose lives are being seriously disrupted. I do not know of a single one of these young men who would want to avoid his responsibility to his country, and I am sure these young men are not seeking any avoidance of their military responsibility. But the point is crystal clear that it is a mathematical impossibility for these young men to be called up during their early years because of a system that is erroneous in its basic premise. Millions of these young men cannot make adequate plans for the future.

I served in World War II. I volunteered long before Pearl Harbor and so, Mr. Speaker, I never was a part of the draft. Should this Nation go to war again, I certainly would not hesitate to again offer my services. I mention this merely to emphasize that I am fully aware of the great sacrifice men who serve our country make, and I have the highest respect for these men. But keeping the draft age in its present form from 18½ to 26 in my judgment does not serve the best interest of the country and creates not only unemployment problems, but to a certain extent, Mr.

Speaker, accelerates our rate of juvenile delinquency. It would not surprise me one bit to find a direct correlation between this inability to get jobs among young men, on the one hand, and their decision through restlessness to follow a path to young delinquency.

Mr. Speaker, I hope the committee will accept the amendment, particularly since the President can negate this action at any time he feels that a reduction in draft age is either impeding voluntary enlistments or there exists a need for larger numbers for military personnel. We are the only nation in the world that drafts men into the Army at the ripe age of 26; all other nations draft their soldiers at much lower ages. Is it not time we ended this foolishness and folly? I hope we do by adopting my amendment.

SENATE

FRIDAY, MARCH 8, 1963

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, and was called to order by the Vice President.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father, God, in this moment of quietness, hushing all discordant noises, that we may hear Thy voice, we would ponder the pattern our lives are weaving, as we bow in Thy searching presence, O God, unto whom all hearts are open, and from whom no desires or secrets are hid.

When in the light of Thy righteousness and truth we examine ourselves, our hearts are filled with regret and discontent, for we confess with sorrow that we have so often missed the shining marks of our high calling which beckon us even from the valley of defeat.

Yet even in all our failure to attain, we are lured by the haunting creed that life is capacity for the excellent. Help us to make it a pursuit of the best, and, casting aside all counsels of despair, to press on with buoyant feet, firm in the faith that for ourselves, our Nation, and our world, the best is yet to be in a golden tomorrow for all mankind.

In the Redeemer's name we ask it. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, March 7, 1963, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

LIMITATION OF STATEMENTS DURING MORNING HOUR

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, statements during the morning hour were ordered limited to 3 minutes.

COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the Internal Security Subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

APPOINTMENTS BY THE VICE PRESIDENT

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair announces the following appointments.

To the Board of Visitors to the Military Academy: Senators PASTORE, KEFAUVER, and KEATING.

To the Board of Visitors to the Naval Academy: Senators ROBERTSON, BARTLETT, and BEALL.

To the Board of Visitors to the Air Force Academy: Senators HOLLAND, HUMPHREY, and GOLDWATER.

To the Board of Visitors to the Merchant Marine Academy: Senator BAYH.

To the Board of Visitors to the Coast Guard Academy: Senator DODD.

To the National Fisheries Center and Aquarium Advisory Board: Senators MAGNUSON (4-year term) and PROUTY (2-year term).

To the Franklin Delano Roosevelt Memorial Commission: Senator NEUBERGER.

To the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations: Senators ERVIN, MUNDT, and MUSKIE.

To the Battle of New Orleans Sesquicentennial Celebration Commission: Senators ELLENDER, LONG of Louisiana, COOPER, MORTON, EASTLAND, STENNIS, KEFAUVER, and GORE.

To the Senate Office Building Commission: Senators JORDAN of North Carolina, CANNON, and DIRKSEN.

To the National Memorial Stadium Commission: Senators HARTKE and DOMINICK.

To the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures: Senators Long of Louisiana, vice Senator Kerr, deceased, and Saltonstall, vice Senator Dirksen, resigned.

To the U.S. Territorial Expansion Memorial Commission: Senator HRUSKA, to fill the vacancy caused by the expiration of the term as Senator of Mr. Capehart.

CRIMINAL JUSTICE ACT OF 1963

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to promote the cause of criminal justice by providing for the representation of defendants who are financially unable to obtain an adequate defense in criminal cases in the courts of the United States, which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Illinois; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

"SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 4

"*Resolved by the Senate of the 73d General Assembly of the State of Illinois (the House of Representatives concurring herein)*, That this general assembly respectfully petitions the Congress of the United States to call a convention for the purpose of proposing the following article as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States:

" 'ARTICLE—

" 'SECTION 1. Article V of the Constitution of the United States is hereby amended to read as follows:

" ' "The Congress, whenever two-thirds of both Houses shall deem it necessary, or, on the application of the legislatures of two-thirds of the several States, shall propose amendments to this Constitution, which shall be valid to all intents and purposes, as part of this Constitution, when ratified by the Legislatures of three-fourths of the several States. Whenever applications from the Legislatures of two-thirds of the total number of States of the United States shall contain identical texts of an amendment to be proposed, the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives shall so certify, and the amendment as contained in the application shall be deemed to have been proposed, without further action by Congress. No State, without its consent, shall be deprived of its equal suffrage in the Senate.

" ' "SEC. 2. This Article shall be inoperative unless it shall have been ratified as an amendment to the Constitution by the Legislatures of three-fourths of the several States within seven years from the date of its submission" '; and be it further

"*Resolved,* That if Congress shall have proposed an amendment to the Constitution identical with that contained in this resolution prior to January 1, 1965, this application for a convention shall no longer be of any force or effect; and be it further

"*Resolved,* That a duly attested copy of this resolution be immediately transmitted by the secretary of state of Illinois to the Secretary of the Senate of the United States, the Clerk of the House of Representativs of the United States and to each Member of the Congress from this State.

"Adopted by the Senate, January 29, 1963.

"SAMUEL H. SHAPIRO,
"*President of the Senate.*
"EDWARD E. FERRANDES,
"*Secretary of the Senate.*

"Concurred in by the House of Representatives, March 5, 1963.

"JOHN W. LEWIS, Jr.,
"*Speaker of House of Representatives.*
"FREDRIC B. SELCKE,
"*Clerk of House of Representatives.*"

By Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota:

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of North Dakota; to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

"HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION Q-1

"Concurrent resolution requesting Congress to investigate and study the policymaking procedures, methods of assessing foreign developments, and personnel practices of the U.S. Department of State

"Whereas all Americans are disturbed about conflicting reports and contradictory policies emanating from the State Department of the United States in these times of recurring crisis; and

"Whereas the U.S. House of Representatives has before it for consideration House Resolution 104 authorizing and directing their Committee on Foreign Affairs to conduct a full and complete investigation and study of the policymaking procedures, methods of assessing foreign developments and the personnel practices of the Department of State: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of North Dakota (the Senate concurring therein)*, That the 38th session of the Legislature of the State of North Dakota respectfully requests the 88th Congress of the United States, to authorize its House Foreign Affairs Committee to conduct an investigation and study the policymaking procedures, methods of assessing foreign developments, and personnel practices of the U.S. Department of State; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the Secretary of State forward copies of this resolution to our congressional delegation, and to the chairman of the House of Representatives Rules Committee.

"STANLEY SANGRANT,
"*Speaker of the House.*
"GERALD L. STAIR,
"*Chief Clerk of the House.*
"FRANK A. WINSTROM,
"*President of the Senate.*
"HOWARD F. DOHERTY,
"*Secretary of the Senate.*"

RESOLUTION OF SOUTH CAROLINA STATE SENATE

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, recently Secretary of Agriculture Orville Freeman announced the support price on 1963 upland cotton at 32.7 cents per pound. This announcement came as good news to cotton farmers for it means their income will be sustained.

There have been attempts by some who want prices dropped to say that farmers were not pleased with the action holding the support price at this level. Nothing could be further from the truth. Farmers in South Carolina well remember the "sliding down" price-support program under former Secretary of Agriculture Ezra Taft Benson. They have not forgotten what it did to their income.

Anyone doubting South Carolina's satisfaction with Secretary Freeman's price-support program for cotton should read the senate resolution adopted and approved by the South Carolina Senate March 5 commending Secretary Freeman for his program and clearly pointing out the material importance of this resolution to our State and cotton farmers for whom he has done so much.

Mr. President, in this connection I send to the desk this senate resolution and ask that it be printed in the RECORD along with my remarks on behalf of myself and my colleague, the junior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND].

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, as follows:

SENATE RESOLUTION 190

Senate resolution to express the appreciation of the members of the Senate of the State of South Carolina to the Honorable Orville L. Freeman, U.S. Secretary of Agriculture, for his action in holding the support price on 1963 upland cotton at 32 and 47 hundredths cent per pound

Whereas cotton farmers will take a 10 percent reduction in the 1963 cotton acreage allotment and there is all indication that the cotton production cost per acre will continue at high or higher levels than the 1962 crop; and

Whereas it is becoming increasingly difficult for family size farms to exist and provide the necessities of life for such families; and

Whereas the U.S. Secretary of Agriculture has announced the 1963 support rate on Middling 1-inch upland cotton as 32.47 cents per pound and this decision of the Honorable Orville L. Freeman, Secretary of Agriculture, is of material importance to cotton producers of South Carolina and the economy of the State; and

Whereas any reduction from this base support price would be punitive to the State's cotton growers and general economy: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the senate, That the members of the Senate of the State of South Carolina express appreciation to the Honorable Orville L. Freeman, U.S. Secretary of Agriculture, for his action in holding the support price on 1963 upland cotton at 32.47 cents per pound; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the Presiding Officer of the U.S. Senate and to each Senator from South Carolina and to the Honorable Orville L. Freeman.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. BOGGS:

S. 1048. A bill to amend section 5899 of title 10, United States Code, to provide permanent authority under which Naval Reserve officers in the grade of captain shall be eligible for consideration for promotion when their running mates are eligible for consideration for promotion; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. CHURCH:

S. 1049. A bill relating to the Indian heirship land problem; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. CHURCH when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mrs. NEUBERGER:

S. 1050. A bill to make permanent the provisions of law authorizing certain suspension of section 27 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1920, with respect to the transportation of lumber; to the Committee on Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mrs. NEUBERGER when she introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MUSKIE (for himself, Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. ERVIN, Mr. MCCARTHY, Mr. MCGEE, Mr. MOSS, Mr. MUNDT, Mr. NELSON, Mr. PEARSON, Mr. PROUTY, Mr. RANDOLPH, Mr. TOWER, and Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey):

S. 1051. A bill to amend section 314 of the Public Health Service Act, by providing greater flexibility to States in the use of certain public health grants-in-aid, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. MUSKIE when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. McINTYRE:

S. 1052. A bill for the relief of Carlo Dimino; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

INDIAN HEIRSHIP BILL

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, I send to the desk a bill relating to the Indian heirship land problem, and I ask that it be appropriately referred.

Mr. President, the Subcommittee on Indian Affairs, of which I am chairman, has been engaged for several years in an effort to resolve one of the most complex problems in the field of Indian affairs—the multiple ownership of Indian allotments. The Indian heirship land problem arises from the fact that the United States holds in trust for Indians about 41,000 tracts of allotted land—approximately 6 million acres—that are in fractionated ownership. This situation arose when, upon the death of the original allottee, his or her estate was probated and the heirs were given undivided interests in the tract.

Through the years, successive probates have taken place affecting the same tract until at the present time there may be anywhere from 2 to 200 heirs holding fractional interests in the same piece of trust land. This fractionation of ownership has created serious problems for the heirs themselves, the tribes, and the Bureau of Indian Affairs, which has responsibility for managing trust land.

In an effort to learn all the facts relating to the multiple ownership of Indian land, the staffs of the Senate and House Committees on Interior and Insular Affairs, in conjunction with the specialists of the Library of Congress, made extensive studies of the problem, beginning in 1959. In 1961, two heirship land survey reports were published by the House and Senate. These documents contain the most complete and up-to-date information on what the heirship problems are and where the problems exist. The reports also reflect suggested solutions by Indian owners of these lands, as well as administrators in the Bureau of Indian Affairs.

Based on the committee studies, I introduced S. 1392 on March 21, 1961, and that bill was used as a vehicle for exploring further the viewpoints and wishes of the people most affected by this problem. Hearings were conducted in August 1961, and valuable testimony was received from Members of the Senate and House, the Interior Department, the Justice Department, the General Accounting Office, Indian organizations, and Indian tribes.

At the completion of the hearings there was a mass of materials, suggestions, and recommendations. I instructed the staff to study the hearings thoroughly and redraft the bill or amendments thereto based on the excellent material then available. Unfortunately, due to the excessive congressional workload, there was no opportunity for further hearings on proposed amendments.

In February 1962, I introduced a second bill, S. 2899, relating to the Indian heirship land problem. The provisions of S. 2899 included many of the recommendations that had been made to the committee during the hearing in the preceding year on S. 1392. Again extensive hearings were held and published and widely distributed to Indian tribes and others concerned with the problem. Since the close of hearings on S. 2899 the staff has been busy consulting with the various Indian organizations, tribal representatives, and Federal agencies over changes that would make the bill more effective and acceptable.

The recommendations and suggestions made during and after the hearings have been sifted and analyzed at great length, and the bill that I am sponsoring today is the product of many months and years of investigation into the extent of heirship and the solutions needed to resolve this most difficult problem in the administration of Indian affairs. Every effort has been made in drafting the bill to authorize and implement an effective program to alleviate the heirship problem. Particular attention has been given in designing a bill to maximize the opportunity to return multiple-owned land to individual Indian ownership or to tribal ownership and to preserve its trust status.

The language of this new measure gives the Secretary of the Interior sufficient latitude to solve the problem but allows him enough discretion to protect the best interests of the Indian owners. The most controversial sections of the earlier bills have been modified or eliminated completely, but the Secretary is still provided the necessary tools to relieve what has been a worsening problem, one that has adversely affected many Indian owners of allotted lands.

Mr. President, our committee has had two complete hearings on two separate bills, and they have been so productive I want to have additional comment and suggestions, not only from the executive departments but from representatives of Indian tribal organizations and the tribes themselves. It is my intention to schedule hearings at an early date, and I feel certain that, with the cooperation of all of those who have a vital interest in this matter, we will be able to report corrective legislation to the Senate early in this session.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill I am introducing today may be printed in full following these brief remarks and that a section-by-section analysis of the bill, as prepared by the staff of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, may also be included in the Record.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill and section-by-section analysis will be printed in the Record.

The bill (S. 1049) relating to the Indian heirship land problem, introduced by Mr. Church, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) the owners of not less than a 50 per centum interest in any land, where ten or fewer persons own undivided interests, or the owners of not less than a 25 per centum interest in any land where eleven or more persons own undivided interests, where all of the undivided interests are in a trust or restricted status, may request the Secretary of the Interior (hereinafter referred to as the "Secretary"), and the Secretary is hereby authorized to partition the land in kind, or to partition part of the land in kind and sell the remainder, or to sell the land if partition is not practicable and a sale would be in the best interest of the Indian owners.

(b) When any of the undivided interests in a tract of land is in an unrestricted status, the owners of not less than a 50 per centum interest in the remaining undivided trust or restricted interests, where ten or fewer persons own such undivided interests, or the owners of not less than a 25 per centum interest in the remaining undivided trust or restricted interests, where eleven or more own such undivided interests, may request the Secretary, and the Secretary is hereby authorized, to sell all trust or restricted interests if a sale would be in the best interests of the Indian owners. The Secretary may also partition the land in kind, partition part of the land in kind and sell the remainder, or sell all interests if authorized to partition or sell the unrestricted interests by a power of attorney from the owner of the unrestricted interests.

Sec. 2. Whenever the Secretary, after receiving a request to partition or sell any tract of land under subsection (b) of section 1 of this Act, is unable after due effort to obtain the approval of an unrestricted interest in such tract, he shall, upon application of the persons making the foregoing request, consent to judicial partition or sale of such tract if in his judgment such action is in the best interests of the Indian owners. Where such consent is granted, jurisdiction over the land is hereby conferred on any State court of competent jurisdiction to hear and determine the partition or sale proceedings and to render judgment for partition in kind or judicial sale in accordance with the law of the State wherein the lands are situated. The United States shall be an indepensable party to any such proceeding with the right of removal of the cause to the United States district court for the district in which the land is located, following the procedure in title 28, United States Code, section 1446. The proceeds of sale of the trust or restricted interests shall be paid to the Secretary for distribution unless he waives this requirement as to any of the owners thereof. If the land so partitioned or sold is acquired by an individual Indian or an Indian tribe, title thereto shall be taken in the manner prescribed in subsection 5(d) of this Act.

Sec. 3. (a) If, with respect to any land transferred pursuant to this Act there is in existence an exemption from taxation which constitutes a vested property right, such exemption shall continue in force and effect until it terminates by virute of its own limitations.

(b) Any trust interest in oil, gas, or other minerals that is reserved to an Indian owner in any sale of land made pursuant to this Act shall be reserved in a trust status. No sale made under this Act shall include any mineral estate that has been reserved to any Indian tribe by any provision of law.

Sec. 4. For the purposes of this Act, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to represent any Indian owner (1) who is a minor, (2) who is non compos mentis, (3) whose ownership interest in a decedent's estate has not been determined, or (4) who cannot be located by the Secretary after a reasonable and diligent search and the giving of notice by publication.

Sec. 5. The Secretary shall give actual notice or notice by publication and provide an opportunity for a hearing before partitioning in kind or selling land pursuant to this Act. All sales of lands made by the Secretary pursuant to this Act shall be in accordance with the following procedure:

(a) Upon receipt of requests from the required ownership interests, the Secretary shall notify the tribe and each owner of an undivided Indian interest in the land by a letter directed to his last known address that each such owner and the tribe has a right to purchase the land for its appraised value, unless one of the owners or his authorized representative objects within the time fixed by the Secretary, or for a lower price if all of the owners agree, and that if more than one owner or if one owner and the tribe wants to purchase the land it will be sold on the basis of sealed competitive bids restricted to the owners of undivided interests in the land and the tribe unless one of the owners or his authorized representative objects within the time fixed by the Secretary.

(b) If any Indian owner or his authorized representative objects to a competitive sale restricted to the owners of undivided interests and the tribe, the Secretary shall offer the land for sale by sealed competitive bid with a preferential right in the tribe or any Indian owner to meet the high bid, unless one of the Indian owners or his authorized representative objects within the time fixed by the Secretary. All bids shall be rejected if no bid substantially equal to the appraised value is received.

(c) If any Indian owner or his authorized representative objects to a sale by sealed competitive bid with a preferential right to meet the high bid, the Secretary shall offer the land for sale by sealed bids: *Provided,* That, after notice to all interested parties including the tribe, the land shall be sold at auction immediately after the opening of the sealed bids, and auction bidding shall be limited to the Indian owners, the tribe, and persons who submitted sealed bids in amounts not less than 75 per centum of the appraised value of the land. The highest sealed bid shall be considered the opening auction bid. No sale shall be made unless the price is equal to the highest sealed bid and substantially equal to the appraised value: *And provided further,* That the term "appraised value" as used in this section shall mean the current appraised value of the land, said appraisal to be not more than one year old.

(d) Title to any land acquired by a tribe or an individual Indian pursuant to this Act shall be taken in trust unless the land is located outside the boundaries of the reservation or approved tribal consolidation area. Title to any land acquired by a tribe or an individual Indian that is outside the boundaries of the reservation and approved consolidation area shall be taken in the name of the purchaser without any restriction on alienation, control, or use.

Sec. 6. (a) In order to assist tribes that wish to purchase land offered for sale under the provisions of this Act, the Secretary is authorized to make a loan to any tribe under the conditions stated below, provided the tribe does not have funds available in an amount that is adequate to make the purchase and is unable to obtain a loan from any other source. Such loans shall be made from the revolving funds referred to in section 10 of this Act.

(b) The amount of the loan shall not exceed the appraised value of the land plus the value of any other property the tribe may mortgage or pledge as security for the loan.

(c) The tribe shall give to the United States a mortgage on the land purchased by the tribe with the loan, and on any other tribal property which the Secretary deems necessary to adequately secure the loan.

(d) A loan shall be for a term of not to exceed thirty years, and shall bear interest at a rate to be determined by the Secretary. A loan need not require repayment in equal installments, but it shall require repayment according to a schedule that will fully amortize the loan within the time specified. In the event of a default in the repayment of the loan, the Secretary of the Interior shall take such action as he deems necessary to protect the interests of the United States. If during the period of repayment the tribe is awarded a money judgment against the United States, and if the payment of any installment on the loan is in default, the installment(s) in default shall be collected from the appropriation to satisfy the judgment insofar as the amount of the appropriation will cover the same.

(e) Before a loan is made under this Act the tribe shall submit for the approval of the Secretary of the Interior a master plan for the use of all lands to be purchased. No plan shall be considered by the Secretary unless it has been first considered at a general meeting of tribal members called for that purpose, upon due notice to all adult members of the tribe, and approved by a majority of the adult members present and voting at that meeting. Any tribe preparing a plan may call upon the Secretary for technical assistance, and the Secretary shall render such assistance as may be necessary. Such plan shall include provisions for consolidation of holdings of the tribe, or acquisition of sufficient lands in conjunction with those held to permit reasonable economic utilization of the land and repayment of the loan. Such plan may be revised from time to time with the approval of the Secretary.

SEC. 7. Any tribe that adopts with the approval of the Secretary a plan pursuant to subsection 6(e) of this Act, or any other plan that does not involve a loan from the United States but which provides for the consolidation, management, use, or disposition of tribal land, is hereby authorized, with the approval of the Secretary, notwithstanding any other provision of law, to sell or encumber any tribal land or other property in furtherance of such plan.

SEC. 8. The Secretary shall approve no plan pursuant to this Act that contains any provision that will prohibit or delay a termination of Federal trust responsibilities with respect to the land during the term of the plan.

SEC. 9. This Act shall not repeal any authority of the Secretary under other law, but it shall supersede any limitation on the authority of the Secretary that is inconsistent with this Act.

SEC. 10. (a) All funds that are now or hereafter a part of the revolving fund authorized by the Act of June 18, 1934 (48 Stat. 986), the Act of June 26, 1936 (49 Stat. 1968), and the Act of April 19, 1950 (64 Stat. 44), as amended and supplemented, including sums received in settlement of debts of livestock pursuant to the Act of May 24, 1950 (64 Stat. 190), sums collected in repayment of loans heretofore or hereafter made, shall hereafter be available for loans to organizations of Indians, Eskimos, and Aleuts (hereinafter referred to as Indians), having a form of organization that is satisfactory to the Secretary, and to individual Indians of one-quarter degree or more of Indian blood who are not members of or eligible for membership in an organization that is making loans to its members, for any purpose that will promote the economic development of such organizations and their members, or the individual Indian borrowers.

(b) The appropriation authorization in section 10 of the Act of June 18, 1934 (48 Stat. 986), as amended by the Act of September 15, 1961 (75 Stat. 520), is hereby amended by increasing it from $20,000,000 to $55,000,000.

SEC. 11. The Secretary is authorized to execute such patents, deeds, orders, or other instruments as may be necessary or appropriate to carry out the provisions of this Act.

SEC. 12. The terms "owner" and "owners" as used herein include, wherever applicable, any tribe, band, group community, or pueblo of Indians, Eskimos, or Aleuts, and also include any federally chartered organizations of Indians, Eskimos, or Aleuts.

SEC. 13. (a) Sections 1 through 9 of this Act shall become effective one year after the date of its enactment.

(b) The Secretary shall, prior to the effective date of sections 1 through 9 of this Act, notify by publication Indian tribes and owners of undivided interests in Indian trust or restricted land, of the rights of such tribe or owners, under this Act.

SEC. 14. (a) The Secretary shall, prior to the conclusion of any probate proceeding conducted on or after the effective date of sections 1 through 9 of this Act, notify each heir or devisee having an interest in such proceedings of his rights under this Act.

(b) Beginning one year after the effective date of sections 1 through 9 of this Act, the Secretary shall submit an annual report to Congress setting forth the progress made in the preceding year in carrying out the purposes of this Act.

The section-by-section analysis presented by Mr. CHURCH is as follows:

ANALYSIS OF S. 1049 SECTION BY SECTION

Section 1(a): This section applies only to that heirship land where all the undivided interests are in trust status, and subdivides that land into two categories. The first category would be tracts owned by up to 10 heirs and the second, tracts owned by 11 or more. Where there are up to 10 owners any 1 or more owning a 50 percent or larger interest may request the Secretary of the Interior to sell or partition the land. In those tracts where there are 11 or more owners the requirement is reduced to 1 or more owning at least 25 percent of the land. The Secretary is authorized to partition the entire tract, partition part of the land and sell the remainder, or if this is not practicable he may sell the entire tract if the sale would be in the best interests of the Indian owners.

Section 1(b): This subsection applies to those tracts of land where there are interests in nontrust status. Generally this means that a non-Indian has inherited a share in the estate. The same categories are present as in (a) with a 50-percent minimum ownership required for authority to request partition or sale in tracts with up to 10 owners and a minimum of 25 percent in tracts with 11 or more owners. The Secretary may sell the trust or restricted interests and may, with the approval of nontrust owners, partition all of the land, partition part of the land and sell the remainder, or sell the entire tract.

Section 2: If the Secretary is unable to obtain the approval of owners with unrestricted interests to sell or partition the land he may, upon request, transfer jurisdiction to State courts for judgment to partition in kind or judicial sale in accordance with State law. The United States reserves the right of removal to the U.S. district court. Title to any land partitioned or sold that is acquired by an Indian or tribe shall be taken in trust under certain conditions (see 5(d)).

Section 3(a): Some questions in the past have been raised concerning whether tax exemption of Indian properties is a vested property right. This section is designed to protect such rights, if they exist.

Section 3(b): Provides that any trust interest in oil, gas, or other minerals that are reserved shall be held in trust, and tribal mineral interests will not be affected under this act.

Section 4: The Secretary is authorized to act for Indian owners who cannot act for themselves.

Section 5: Provides that notice by publication must be made and the interested parties provided a hearing before action is taken under this act. Procedures to carry out sale or partition are stated as follows: (a) When a request to sell or partition has been received each owner and the tribe is notified. Each is allowed to purchase the land at appraised or lower value unless one owner objects. If more than one is interested there will be sealed bids among them. (b) If action in (a) is objected to there shall be sealed competitive bids with right of tribe or owner to meet the high bid, unless there is objection. All bids will be rejected if no bid is substantially equal to the appraised value. (c) If there is objection to (b) the land shall be offered for sale by sealed competitive bids, and after notice to all parties including the tribe, it will be sold at auction. Auction is limited to owners, tribe, and those bidding more than 75 percent of appraised value. Highest sealed bid is the opening auction bid. Sale price must be substantially equal to current appraised value. (d) Land acquired by Indians or tribes under these procedures will be taken in trust if within the reservation and tribal consolidation areas.

Section 6(a): If a tribe does not have money to purchase such lands they can borrow it from the Government under certain conditions. The Government shall be given security, hold a mortgage on the land and other property. Maximum loan for 30 years with interest set by Secretary. If the tribe receives a judgment any payments in default shall be collected therefrom. A master plan for land consolidation shall be drafted by the tribe and approved by the adult membership before presentation to the Secretary. The Secretary shall render technical assistance in preparing a plan if requested.

Section 7: Any consolidation plan involving a Federal loan or not will carry with it approval to sell or encumber any tribal land or other property to carry out the purposes of the plan.

Section 8: In an effort to avoid any programs that might tend to confuse any termination activities, no plan can be approved that will prevent or delay such actions.

Section 9: The purpose of this act is to add to the Secretary's powers and shall not repeal any present authority.

Section 10: All funds presently authorized for loans to Indians would be consolidated into one revolving fund. This is in keeping with a recommendation of the Senate Appropriations Committee. An additional $35 million is authorized for loans, making a total of more than $55 million in authorizations for this purpose and other requirements.

Section 11: Provides general authority for the Secretary to execute all necessary documents to carry out the purposes of this act.

Section 12: Definition of the terms "owner" and "owners" as used in the bill.

Section 13(a): A delay of 1 year is provided during which time the Secretary can notify the tribes and they can plan their programs. This period can also be utilized by the Department to formulate necessary regulations, etc., to implement the program.

Section 13(b): The Secretary is to notify by publication heirship landowners and the tribes of their rights under this act.

Section 14(a): At all probate hearings after 1 year the Secretary shall notify each interested party of their rights.

Section 14(b): Provides that the Secretary shall submit an annual report to Congress on the workings of this act.

NORTHWEST LUMBER PRODUCTION

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, one day early next week a cargo vessel will dock at the port of San Juan, P.R., to discharge 1,400,000 board feet of Douglas-fir and hemlock lumber—1,400,000 feet of lumber from Oregon forests, cruised, logged, hauled, sawed, and loaded by Oregon workers.

This event would have been of little note a decade ago when Oregon and Washington forests supplied the entire

Puerto Rican need for Northwest softwood. Yet this vessel will be delivering the first shipload of Northwest U.S. lumber to Puerto Rico in more than 2 years.

What had happened to this traditional U.S. market? The answer is not obscure. Section 27 of the Merchant Marine Act, the Jones Act, decrees that domestic vessels shall enjoy a monopoly in the transportation of goods from one American port to another. Because of these restrictions, the American lumber producer was forced to pay freight charges as much as $30 per 1,000 board feet greater than his competitors, the lumber producers of neighboring British Columbia, who were free to shop in the world market for steamship charters.

The Jones Act was designed to nurture and protect the domestic coastal shipping trade. During the first half of the century the protection which it furnished was both meaningful and adequate; but changing patterns of commerce transformed the Jones Act into an instrument of destruction, not only of domestic industries such as the lumber industry, but of segments of the shipping industry itself.

Despite the supposed protection of the Jones Act, domestic shipping has suffered a steady and relentless decline from its postwar highs. As late as 1955, 101 ships and 4,300 men were employed in the intercoastal trade. There are today not more than 22 vessels exclusively devoted to intercoastal shipping, employing less than 1,000 men. There are today no common carriers left to serve Northwest lumber shippers, although two private lines offer, from time to time, space to lumber producers. This month neither line had space to offer.

The shipload of lumber which arrives in Puerto Rico next week owes its very existence to the adoption by the last Congress of an amendment which I offered to permit the suspension of Jones Act restrictions on lumber shipments to Puerto Rico. The Maritime Administrator, charged with the implementation of this amendment, made the following crucial finding in granting the first of several suspensions under the terms of the amendment:

> We have here two segments of American enterprise both of which are sorely beset by foreign competition. The record of this proceeding shows that under the preexisting legislation banning the use of foreign-flag vessels in domestic shipping, no lumber from the Pacific Northwest has moved to Puerto Rico during the last 2 years, due in some part to the lower foreign-flag transportation rates which have assisted Canadian producers in capturing this formerly American-held market. Thus, the Congress decided to lift the ban under certain conditions in order to relieve the distress of at least the lumber industry. To have continued the prohibition would have had the effect of perpetuating the depression in both industries.

By next month, Mr. President, sales of Northwest U.S. lumber to Puerto Rico will have exceeded 7 million board feet—sales translated concretely into jobs for northwest lumber and sawmill workers.

But we cannot afford to stop with Puerto Rico. The distress—and there is deep distress—in the coastal lumber mill towns of Oregon and Washington arises primarily from the loss of traditional Atlantic coast markets to Canadian lumber producers. Last year British Columbia sawmills shipped 875 million board feet of lumber to the east coast, while Washington and Oregon producers shipped only 524 million board feet. The Canadians have thus gobbled up nearly two-thirds of the Atlantic coast market, though as recently as 1951 the Canadians' share of this stable market was a bare 7 percent.

Last week, I received from a Vancouver, British Columbia, newspaper a clipping heralding the sailing of a vessel laden with the largest single lumber cargo in history—more than 11 million board feet of packaged lumber "all consigned to U.S. Atlantic coast ports." One day later, I received the following grim telegram from Newport, Oreg.:

> Just received report on lumber shipment by water for month of January. Our mill is 90-percent water shipment to east coast market. Pacific Lumber Inspection Bureau report shows British Columbia shipped east coast 90,252,829 board feet; total U.S. shipments 26,751,307 board feet. British Columbia shipped approximately 75 percent of all lumber going to east coast market. We need help.
>
> L. H. Anderson,
> *President, Lincoln Lumber Sales, Inc.*

Between 1947 and 1962, employment in Oregon sawmills and planing mills alone dwindled from 45,000 to 28,000.

Was the Jones Act the culprit? The State Department, in a report prepared last year for western Senators, thought so:

> There is no question but that the 600 million board feet of lumber which moved by water from the U.S. Pacific Northwest in 1961 to the east coast was at a serious competitive disadvantage with respect to waterborne shipments from British Columbia as a result of higher transportation costs. The average margin of difference in 1961 is reported to have been on the order of $10 per thousand board feet for shipments to the Atlantic seaboard. Data are not available on comparative costs for shipments to southern California and Hawaii, but the margin of difference was probably proportionate. In the case of shipments to Puerto Rico, where Canadian lumber has also made inroads in 1960 and 1961, the difference is reported to have been about $26 per thousand board feet.
>
> During the past 5 years, there has been a decline amounting to 400 million board feet per year in the level of waterborne shipments from the U.S. Pacific coast mills and a corresponding increase in the level of waterborne shipments from British Columbia mills. While other factors may have contributed to the shift, it appears that the substantial difference in freight costs has been principally responsible. There is no reason to believe that the trend will be reversed so long as the cost difference prevails.

The Commerce Department made a similar finding; and, several weeks ago, the Tariff Commission refused to find that concessions granted under trade agreements were a principal cause of the woes of the domestic lumber industry, although the Commission did find that the trend of imports of softwood lumber is upward:

> Although imports of softwood lumber by water currently account for only about one-fourth of the total imports of such lumber, the very large and rising disparity in cargo rates favorable to imports by water has obviously contributed much more to the recent increase in imports of softwood lumber than has the aggregate of the trade-agreement concessions applicable thereto.

President Kennedy has acknowledged the need for Jones Act reform, in order to alleviate the hardship of the Northwest lumber industry. Last July, the President called for amendment of the intercoastal shipping laws to permit use of foreign vessels when those conditions exist which indicate severe hardship to American shippers. This amendment will reduce the handicaps suffered by American producers in the intercoastal shipment of lumber.

It is for these reasons, Mr. President, that I again introduce proposed legislation to suspend the provisions of the Jones Act. As I have often said in the past, I have no desire to damage what is left of the coastal shipping trade. I deeply regret that even a handful of seamen may be displaced by Jones Act reform; but I cannot in good conscience ignore the fact that the nearly 1 billion board feet of lumber shipped by Canadian watermills into our markets means the loss of at least 7,000 prime jobs for Northwest workers and support for their families and the services and trades that depend upon prime payrolls. Problems of the domestic merchant marine will not be solved by continuing conditions that put lumber and sawmill workers on the unemployment rolls.

The action of the northwest lumbermen in boldly reentering the Puerto Rican market immediately upon the lifting of the Jones Act restrictions proved beyond any reasonable doubt that the Jones Act was the crucial anticompetitive factor excluding northwest lumber from its traditional market. West coast lumbermen have shown that when they are given a chance to compete upon a basis of equality, they need no subsidy. This is demonstrably true of the Puerto Rico market. It is no less true of the Atlantic coast market and other domestic markets.

The bill which I now introduce and send to the desk represents as narrow an inroad upon the Jones Act restrictions as I could devise and still provide meaningful relief to the lumber industry. Surely Wesley Jones, for many years a distinguished Senator from the State of Washington, little dreamed that the lumber industry of his own State and of neighboring States would be crippled by the act which bears his name.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill, together with various newspaper articles and editorials, be printed in the Record at the close of my remarks, and that the bill be held at the desk for 3 days, in order to provide an opportunity for other Senators to join in sponsoring it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill, articles, and editorials will be printed in the Record, and the bill will lie on the desk, as requested by the Senator from Oregon.

The bill (S. 1050) to make permanent the provisions of law authorizing certain suspension of section 27 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1920, with respect to the transportation of lumber, introduced by Mrs. Neuberger, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Commerce, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the first sentence of subsection (a) of section 4 of the Act entitled "An Act to amend section 502 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, and for other purposes", approved October 24, 1962 (76 Stat. 1201) is amended by striking out all through "the United States" and inserting in lieu thereof "The provisions of section 27 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1920 (46 U.S.C. 883), shall be suspended with respect to the transportation of lumber between any ports or terminal areas".

Sec. 2. Subsection (b) of section 4 of such Act of October 24, 1962, is amended by striking out ", or upon the expiration of the one-year period which begins on the date of enactment of this Act, whichever first occurs".

The articles and editorials presented by Mrs. Neuberger are as follows:

[From the Oregonian, Dec. 20, 1962]

Northwest Once Supplied All of Puerto Rico's Lumber

The Puerto Rican lumber market, which Oregon and Washington lumber shippers hope to reenter by means of foreign-flag ships, was entirely a U.S. market until 1950 when British Columbia began shipping to that island country, according to records of the Pacific Lumber Inspection Bureau.

The bureau's reports show that Oregon and Washington lumbermen had Puerto Rico to themselves, as far as the fir region was concerned until 13 years ago. Between 1934 and 1949, west coast shipments to Puerto Rico ranged up to 21,800,000 board feet a year except during the war years of 1943 and 1944 when no shipments were recorded.

Before World War II, Oregon and Washington loaded an average of 14,500,000 board feet a year for Puerto Rico.

Then in 1950, the PLIB reports show, British Columbia stepped in with shipments of 7,700,000 board feet to Puerto Rico while Oregon and Washington were shipping 17,300,000 board feet. The British Columbia movement dropped back to 1,200,000 board feet in 1961 but stepped up to 8,100,000 board feet in 1952 and have increased rapidly every year since.

SHIPMENTS DIP

Meanwhile, Oregon and Washington shipments gained to 22,300,000 board feet in 1953, and dropped off rapidly from that point to 1961 when no lumber went from the west coast States.

British Columbia increased its shipments to Puerto Rico to 42 million feet by 1956, to 62,800,000 by 1959, and hit 73 million board feet in 1961, the year the west coast States bowed out entirely.

During the first 10 months of 1962, British Columbia shipped 65,400,000 board feet to Puerto Rico, an average of 6,500,000 feet a month. At this rate, British Columbia may hit 78 million board feet, a new annual record, this year.

FIRMS SEEK OK

Oregon and Washington lumber firms are seeking authority from the U.S. Maritime Administration to use foreign-flag ships to haul their lumber to Puerto Rico, and one of them, Georgia-Pacific Co., has been given authority to do so, but only after U.S. flag operators have been allowed 5 days in which to match foreign-flag shipping rates.

The authority was granted by invoking provisions of the Neuberger amendment to the Jones Act which confines shipping between American ports to American bottoms.

Several other firms have applied for similar authority and were heard by a Maritime Administration examiner last week.

The lumbermen have objected to any waiting time in favor of U.S. ships because they claim they cannot hold space in foreign vessels while American owners are making up their minds.

[From the Oregonian, Mar. 4, 1963]

Canadian Lumber Producers Rebound With Increased Shipments to United States

Canadian lumber producers, who eased up on their recordbreaking shipments into the United States, while the American Tariff Commission was considering putting a brake on imports, are back strong as ever, according to Canadian and American reports.

Evidence of the stepped-up shipments to the United States appeared in Vancouver, British Columbia, this past week where lumber shippers loaded the all-time record single shipment of 11.2 million feet net, aboard the Greek ship *Paros* for the U.S. east coast market.

The new record broke a record established only a short time earlier by a sister ship, the *Signos,* also loaded with Canadian lumber.

TRUTH BROUGHT HOME

The truth of the shipping handicap facing American lumber shippers was brought home clearly by the two record loads. The Canadian mills were able to hire these vessels at rates aproximately $14 a thousand below the cheapest rates offered the American mills.

Under the Jones Act, American shippers must use only American vessels and the rates on the American vessels are $10 to $14 a thousand higher than on the foreign vessels used by Canadians in capturing the market.

The big push on the Canadian shipments was also pointed up in Crow's Weekly Lumber Letter this past week where the Pacific Lumber Inspection Bureau figures showed the Canadians shipped 90.2 million feet to the U.S. east coast in January. The American mills shipped only 25.7 million feet in the same period.

Compounding the rate differential facing the American mills was the fact that the only two U.S. lines hauling lumber cargoes intercoastal, Calmar and Weyerhaeuser, were not offering space for shipment next month.

Weyerhaeuser hauls its own lumber cargoes and does not always have space for other shippers. Calmar is a line owned by Bethlehem Steel and is used primarily for hauling steel products westward.

Senator Maurine Neuberger, with her amendment to the Jones Act, opened up Puerto Rico to foreign vessels carrying U.S. lumber earlier this year and already several loads of U.S. lumber have gone into that market, the first shipments from the U.S. mills in several years.

Now Mrs. Neuberger is planning to reintroduce a bill for the elimination of the Jones Act, a move recommended by President Kennedy and a move the American lumber shippers say they must have if they are to continue in competition with the Canadian imports.

[From the Daily Astorian, June 22, 1962]

Something Else Is Needed

Maritime interests have protested repeal of the Jones Act as a relief measure for distressed Northwest lumbermen.

This illustrates the almost inevitable fact that adjustment of governmental economic controls to benefit one segment of the economy will cause distress to some other segment, and that some compensating adjustment must be made. Which of course can lead to distress and readjustment in still a third segment, and so on.

A Government-controlled economy is full of headaches, inequities, adjustments, and readjustments.

The purpose of the Jones Act, which requires cargoes from one U.S. port to another to be carried in U.S. ships, is to keep our merchant marine alive. It just barely achieves that purpose, since foreign competition has virtually driven the U.S. merchant marine out of the offshore trade.

Lumbermen suffer under the Jones Act, which virtually requires them, as well as other coastwise or intercoastal shippers, to subsidize the merchant marine.

But obviously repeal of the act will almost put the U.S. merchant marine completely out of business, unless some compensating form of subsidy is provided.

No one wants the U.S. merchant marine eliminated. Its existence is considered essential to the national defense.

Since it cannot compete economically with foreign ships, and since it is manifestly unfair to have U.S. shippers subsidize it as they do now under the Jones Act, the only alternative seems to be repeal of the Jones Act and substitution of some form of subsidy that will enable U.S. ships to offer freight rates competitive with those of foreign ships.

[From the Oregon Statesman, July 25, 1962]

It Seems to Me

(By Charles A. Sprague)

Senator Maurine Neuberger has proposed what seems to be the most practical method of providing through Government some aid to the distressed lumber industry of the Pacific Northwest. She introduced a bill which would lift the bar in the Jones Act which prevents foreign-flag vessels from engaging in carrying freight or passengers between U.S. ports. Applied to lumber shipping this would mean that U.S. mills could compete even stephen with Canadian mills as far as freight costs to to the Atlantic coast are concerned.

Senator Magnuson would let the bar stand but would offset it by a subsidy from the Treasury to equalize shipping costs. Since he is chairman of the Senate Committee on Commerce where the matter is under consideration, it is probable that his approach will be preferred over that of Senator Neuberger. It is not, in my opinion, as satisfactory a method of helping the lumber industry, and has slim chance of adoption.

This provision of the Jones Act is a form of protection to domestic shipping and to seamen. But it imposes a considerable cost on domestic shippers. Repeal of the provision would make for open competition both in shipping and in the lumber business.

In her statement before the Commerce Committee Senator Neuberger listed the following as points agreed on:

1. A significant segment of the lumber industry is depressed.
2. A major cause has been the loss of the Atlantic coast market to Canadian producers.
3. The Jones Act gives Canadian lumber producers a substantial cost advantage in competing for this market.
4. Despite the protection offered by the Jones Act intercoastal shipping has been in progressive decline.

As to the invasion of the U.S. market Mrs. Neuberger stated that British Columbia mills' share of the Atlantic coast market for waterborne shipments of Douglas fir and hemlock had increased from 7 percent in 1951 to 57 percent in 1961 and 72 percent in June 1962. Canadian shippers, free to use ocean tramp steamers, are able to lay down their lumber on the east coast at $13 below the American conference rate.

The argument for subsidizing our merchant marine is to have merchant vessels available in event of war. But, as the junior Senator from Oregon stated, only 22 vessels are exclusively engaged in the intercoastal trade. Of these, 20 are Liberty ships of World War II vintage, of which we have many in the "water bank."

The protective feature of the Jones Act hasn't maintained intercoastal shipping. The once big steamship lines like Luckenbach and American-Hawaiian have quit running from coast to coast. Mrs. Neuberger thinks the Jones Act has hurt rather than helped this shipping. She expressed the view that under the spur of foreign competition American operators may exercise American ingenuity and be able to compete.

It does seem absurd to retain a provision which hasn't worked. And it seems eminently sensible to drop it since it would provide virtually immediate benefit to U.S. lumber producers without making any draft on the Treasury.

[From the Walla Walla Union Bulletin, Jan. 1, 1963]

Priced Off the Seas

Even with Federal subsidies, few U.S. maritime concerns are in a competitive position with carriers under other flags and the situation reacted, in recent months, to the disadvantage of lumbering, one of the principal industries of the Pacific Northwest.

When Canada devalued its dollar and, with more favorable freight rates, was able to lay down lumber in the east and south of this country at prices substantially below those the mills of the Pacific Northwest could afford, petitions for modifying the Jones Act were filed with the Maritime Commission. Relief was granted, in part, when the Commission gave permission for U.S. lumber to move to Puerto Rico, a U.S. possession, in foreign ships.

In the next few weeks, as a result of that step, the first American lumber cargo in 43 years to go to an American port in a foreign ship will load 1,400,000 board feet of Douglas-fir and hemlock lumber at Coos Bay to go to San Juan, P.R.

Before negotiations were closed with a Japanese line, opportunity was required to be given owners of U.S. vessels to compete for the business. The best offer, so Georgia-Pacific, the shipper, reported, was about $17 per thousand above the winning bid. Lower ship costs and lower operating expenses of foreign vessels are factors that U.S. shipping cannot meet.

The 1920 Merchant Marine Act was written to preserve the American merchant marine coastal fleet for times of national emergency. What once was a sizable fleet now is down to about a dozen vessels, employing fewer than 500 seamen. The men who sail our vessels are the best paid of any in the world, but foreign aid by this country has at the same time helped some of our allies to modernize their merchant marine and, operating at wage scales far below those applying here, they have gained competitive advantage that, as with lumbering, has adversely affected the U.S. economy.

[From the Washington Post, July 10, 1962]

Trade Restrictions

The current difficulties of the softwood industry in the Pacific Northwest provide a graphic illustration of how an ancient restrictive practice can threaten the welfare of a large number of people and hamper the Government's efforts to expand international trade.

As recently as 1959 more than 60 percent of the lumber shipped, largely by water, to the Atlantic coast came from the States of the Pacific Northwest with British Columbia supplying most of the balance. Since then the shares have been reversed. At stake is the production of about a half billion board feet of American lumber and the loss of more than 3,000 jobs.

The difficulties of the softwood industry are attributable to three factors: the devaluation of the Canadian dollar which works to the advantage of the British Columbia lumbermen; the slightly more favorable terms on which the Canadians can purchase Government-owned timber; and the shipping cost advantage which the Canadians enjoy.

According to the Merchant Marine Act of 1920, known as the Jones Act, all cargoes shipped between Pacific and Atlantic coast ports must be carried in American-flag vessels. This ancient practice of "cabotage," or reserving the coastal trade to American vessels, originated in the reign of Edward III of England (1327–77). The British have wisely abandoned this practice long ago, but laws barring the use of foreign vessels in the American coastal trade have been in force since 1808. As a consequence, the American softwood producers must pay about $36 per thousand board feet on shipments between the Columbia River ports and Brooklyn while the Canadians, who are permitted to charter ships in the highly competitive world market, can ship at rates ranging from $4 to $11.

Clearly this is a case in which the welfare of the many is being sacrificed in order to protect the interests of the few. There are now only 13 American-flag vessels on the coastal lumber run which employ a total of 455 men. Thus 455 jobs in the maritime industry are protected at the cost of more than 3,000 jobs in the softwood industry.

We hope the current efforts to repeal or modify the restrictive provisions of the Jones Act will succeed and that the recent appeals to establish a temporary import quota for Canadian softwood will be rejected. The erection of another trade barrier can only work to the disadvantage of both the American and Canadian economies, for such an act would surely touch off a series of retaliations. The public interest will be better served by permitting the Northwest softwood producers to compete on a more equal footing.

[From the Washington Evening Star, June 23, 1962]

Equalizing Competition

As recently as 1957 the lumber producers of Oregon and Washington supplied 77 percent of the waterborne lumber needs of the east coast. By April of this year they had lost all but 28 percent of the monthly total to Canadian suppliers. The loss has cost the west coast industry some 3,500 jobs. It is not surprising that the administration has come under increasing pressure to equalize the competitive position of the American firms.

The advantage has swung to British Columbia lumber operators for a variety of reasons, as the extensive hearings before the Senate Commerce Committee have brought out. They can ship more cheaply by water. Their new money-exchange rate favors them in the U.S. market. Their wage costs are lower, and so are the prices they pay for timber. Of these, Senator Neuberger of Oregon, thinks the most important is the fact that the Canadians are free to use the chartered ships of any nation, while the west coast producers are bound by the provisions of the Merchant Marine Act of 1920 which require the use of the American merchant fleet in shipment of cargoes between American ports. The difference in charter costs, according to Mrs. Neuberger, ranges from $4 to $11 per thousand board feet on lumber. Accordingly, she wants Congress to repeal the 1920 provision—an action which she contends would do no real harm to the maritime industry since the use of lumber ships in intercoastal trade already has dwindled in size from 12 shipping lines at the end of World War II to only 3 lines today, utilizing 13 ships and employing only 455 men.

Whether this proposal would provide sufficient relief to justify the action is a matter for the administration and for Congress to determine. For it is not at all likely that this alone would solve the problem completely. But it deserves consideration, along with any other means of easing the setback suffered by the west coast firms. There is no apparent sentiment, and understandably so, to impose quotas on Canadian lumber. In pursuing the worthy goal of expanded international trade, however, the administration has the obligation to find means wherever possible to sustain the competitive position of our own industries.

[From the Oregonian, Dec. 6, 1962]

One Step Forward

The quick favorable ruling by Maritime Examiner Paul N. Pfeiffer on the Georgia-Pacific Corp.'s application for permission to use foreign shipping in moving lumber from the Pacific Northwest to Puerto Rico may be an indication that the Kennedy administration is prepared at last to help the Northwest's lumber industry meet severe competition from Canada.

The examiner's ruling must be approved by the Maritime Commissioner and the Secretary of Commerce, but lumber shippers here appear confident that approval will come quickly.

If Northwest lumber shippers take advantage of this first dent in the Jones Act to recapture the 73 million board foot Puerto Rico market from Canada, their case for exemption from the restrictive maritime laws in the Atlantic coast trade will be strengthened. In the recent session of Congress, the Senate Commerce Committee reported favorably on a bill permitting use of foreign ships in the intercoastal trade, but the bill did not come up for passage. Senator Maurine Neuberger managed, however, to obtain an amendment to the Merchant Marine Act permitting the use of such ships in moving lumber to Puerto Rico. It was under this amendment that the Georgia-Pacific application was made.

Other firms have made similar applications and presumably will receive equal opportunties. Mr. Pfeiffer's decision, if approved, will permit a shipper to obtain a firm offer from a foreign line at a stated shipping rate. If American-flag lines cannot or will not meet that rate in 3 days, he will be free to use the foreign vessel.

Puerto Rico, of course, is a small part of the world and domestic market for lumber, though an important one. There are other vital factors in the Pacific Northwest's present inability to compete favorably with Canada in these markets. Among them are stumpage costs and procedures for buying Government timber, which U.S. lumbermen contend place them at a serious disadvantage.

Higher loading costs in the United States also affect the total expense of shipping lumber, though some Northwest lumber producers assert this could largely be overcome by construction of specialized carriers. Foreign shipowners appear more ready to build or convert vessels specifically for lumber and log carrying than are the American owners who have a protective umbrella in the form of the Jones Act and subsidies in the offshore trades.

The cheaper Canadian dollar is another factor.

The ruling on the Puerto Rico shipments, if approved, will not solve the problems of Northwest lumbermen. But it is a step which could lead to removal of other Government-imposed restrictions that hamper this region's free competition in marketing its basic product. Pressure cannot be reduced until the industry is completely unshackled.

[From the Crow's Lumber Digest, Dec. 20, 1962]

THE BREAK IN THE DIKE

The announcement on December 14 that Secretary of Commerce Luther Hodges had approved the first application under the Neuberger amendment for usage of foreign vessels in the Puerto Rican trade comes as a pleasant surprise to the industry. Even though the Secretary attached a rather sticky requirement to the permit (giving U.S. lines 5 days to match the freight rate quoted by the foreign shipowners), this action must still be regarded as a break in the dike which has been built up around U.S. cargo-shipping mills.

Puerto Rico is a U.S. possession, yet due to antiquated shipping laws the American mills slowly lost 100 percent of this market over the past 10 years. That country will take 70 to 80 million feet of lumber this year, all from Canada. Now, following months of controversy, U.S. mills have a chance to get back a little of this business.

The Puerto Rican market, however, is a drop in the bucket compared to the volume lost in the U.S. east coast market over the same period of time. In the year of 1952, the U.S. east coast took 1.275 billion feet of lumber by cargo shipment, with 1.053 billion coming from U.S. mills and the remaining 222,000 coming from Canada. In the present year, the east coast market will take approximately 1.400 billion (based on figures available for the first 10 months), and the U.S. mills will have supplied only 500,000 feet. Net loss to the U.S. mills: 500,000 feet per year. Net gain to the Canadian mills: nearly 700,000 feet per year.

This huge loss of east coast volume, coupled with the small victory on the Puerto Rican case, should give the U.S. lumber industry the needed incentive to fight for complete removal of the Jones Act restrictions as they apply to lumber. During the past year, this fight was carried on by relatively few people, with the majority of the industry taking a disinterested viewpoint. Yet all of the industry is affected, since lumber displaced on the east coast eventually seeks other markets, and the entire lumber community is forced to readjust. In many cases, this readjustment is fatal to the mills and wholesalers involved.

The hemlock, which was displaced from the east coast cargo market, found new outlets in the Midwest and in the South, very often at the expense of other established species. This big change seriously affected the price structure on all dimension items including those in the Western pine and Southern pine regions. The Douglas-fir displaced from the east coast has moved in heavier volume to California, disrupting the traditional suppliers to that important market.

The Jones Act, as we see it, is everybody's business. The removal of this restriction could, in due time, gain back some of the 500 million feet per year lost in the east coast markets. We fail to believe that there is any serious shortage of timber in the U.S. producing region, or that American lumber is inferior to Canadian stock as was reported by some eastern distributors at the Tariff Commission hearings. The simple fact remains that our mills are at a huge freight rate disadvantage, due to an outmoded shipping act aimed at preserving the merchant marine.

The industry has tried one approach to the Canadian problem (the suggested quota and tariff), and in so doing created hard feelings in many quarters. The case for complete removal of the Jones Act will also cause friction, but the stakes are large, and the entire industry is involved. Secretary Hodges' decision last week proves that the industry at least has a fighting chance.

[From the Seattle Times, Dec. 5, 1962]

ANOTHER VICTORY IN LUMBER AID BATTLE

An important step toward enabling American west coast lumbermen to overcome a competitive advantage held by Canadian lumber shippers in the prime American east coast market has been taken by a Maritime Administration examiner.

The examiner ruled that a ban on foreign-flag ships in domestic trade could be relaxed under certain conditions in the movement of lumber cargoes from the Northwest to Puerto Rico.

Canadian lumbermen now monopolize the Puerto Rican market because they can send cargoes to the island at less cost in foreign-flag ships denied to their American competitors.

This advantage has helped the Canadians to expand greatly their share of the lucrative Atlantic market.

If the examiner's ruling is upheld there will be a precedent that we hope will be followed in regard to lumber shipments to the east coast.

The hard-pressed Northwest lumber industry cannot follow up any such precedent merely by filing new applications with the Maritime Administration, however. Any further relaxation of existing maritime law will require additional congressional action.

That is why it is vital that the Washington and Oregon congressional delegations fight lumber's battle as vigorously in the new Congress, in a nonelection year, as they did in the recent preelection session.

And renewed White House support is equally vital. The amending of laws to permit use of foreign vessels in intercoastal lumber shipments was one of six points set forth by President Kennedy last July as possible means of aiding the Northwest lumber industry.

Much of that six-point Kennedy program still remains in the category of unfinished business.

SIMPLIFICATION OF FEDERAL GRANTS-IN-AID TO STATES FOR PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICES

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, for myself and Senators BARTLETT, ERVIN, MCCARTHY, MCGEE, MOSS, MUNDT, NELSON, PEARSON, PROUTY, RANDOLPH, TOWER, and WILLIAMS of New Jersey, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill which would simplify Federal grants-in-aid to States for public health services and provide greater flexibility in the allocation of certain categorical public health service funds in the States. Similar legislation has been introduced in the House of Representatives.

This proposed legislation was drafted as the result of the second report to the President by the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, of which I am a member.

Last year, on August 1, 1962, I introduced S. 3592, legislation designed to simplify grants-in-aid to the States for public health services to permit greater State flexibility in the use of public health allotments. I plan to reintroduce that measure now.

The proposed legislation originated under the title S. 1467, a bill I introduced on March 29, 1961. S. 3592 included technical changes in the bill. It reflects both the judgment of the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, of State health officers, and other experts in the field. Formal resolutions urging enactment of the measure have been adopted by the Governors' conference, the executive committee of the National Conference of State Legislative Leaders, the National Association of State Budget Officers, Midwestern Regional Conference of the Council of State Governments, the National Association of County Officials, the American Municipal Association, and the National Legislation Conference of the Council of State Governments.

The bill which I have introduced today would amend the Public Health Service Act of 1944, to permit States, at the discretion of the Governor in each case, to transfer up to one-third of the Federal funds granted in any one of five health categories to one or more of the other four such categories. The following five categorical grants are involved: General health assistance, cancer control, heart disease control, tuberculosis control, and venereal disease control. The bill would not affect the remaining categories of mental health, maternal and child health, and crippled children's services.

In addition, the bill would establish a uniform allotment and matching formula for Federal grants to States in the special categories listed above. A number of different formulas now apply to these five categories.

Under the bill, funds would be allocated to the States on the basis of population, with matching requirements established according to per capita income in the individual States. Matching requirements would range from one-third State funds to two-thirds Federal funds for the lowest income States, to two-thirds State funds to one-third Federal funds for the highest income States. This formula follows the general principle established under the Hill-Burton program.

This proposal, Mr. President, is designed to improve the flexibility of federally supported public health service programs administered by the States, without removing the present overall direction of these programs in accordance with the priorities set by Congress. Initially, several of these categories were established to allow the Federal Government to stimulate State activity. Today the major cost is borne by the States, with the Federal Government playing an important supporting role.

By allowing the States to transfer up to one-third of the funds in the five categories listed, we would provide sufficient flexibility for State administrators in meeting peculiar and changing local needs, without endangering the integrity of the overall program. It should be noted that the proposed allowance for transfers would not be applied to the categories of mental health, maternal and child health, and crippled children services, since functional lines of responsibility between the Federal Government and the States do not coincide in these categories.

This bill, Mr. President, represents the considered opinion of members of the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, State and Territorial health and budget officers, and other experts in this field. It offers a sensible improvement in an important facet of intergovernmental relations.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1051) to amend section 314 of the Public Health Service Act, by providing greater flexibility to States in the use of certain public health grants-in-aid, and for other purposes; introduced by Mr. Muskie (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

MONUMENT COMMEMORATING THE INDEPENDENCE OF MEXICO—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILL

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when there is a second printing of S. 944, a bill to provide for the presentation by the United States to the people of Mexico of a monument commemorating the independence of Mexico, that the name of the junior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. Scott] be added.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXTENSION OF DAVIS-BACON ACT TO CONTRACTS FOR THE MAINTENANCE OF FEDERAL INSTALLATIONS — ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILL

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when there is a second printing of S. 945, a bill to amend the Davis-Bacon Act to extend its application to contracts for the maintenance of Federal installations, that the names of the junior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. Scott], the senior Senator from New York [Mr. Javits], the junior Senator from New York [Mr. Keating], and the senior Senator from Alaska [Mr. Bartlett] be added.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

HOUSING FOR MIGRATORY LABOR—ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILL

Under authority of the order of the Senate of March 1, 1963, the names of Senators Clark, Douglas, Inouye, Javits, Long of Missouri, McCarthy, Morse, Nelson, Randolph, Ribicoff, Yarborough, and Young of Ohio were added as additional cosponsors of the bill (S. 981) to amend title V of the Housing Act of 1949 to assist in the provision of housing for domestic farm labor, introduced by Mr. Williams of New Jersey (for himself and other Senators) on March 1, 1963.

PROBLEMS OF UNCHECKED GOVERNMENT SPENDING

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, as we all know, this week marks the anniversary of the beginning of what we know as the New Deal program. Just 30 years ago saw the inauguration of a massive effort to tax and spend our way out of a worldwide depression which was to pave the way for Federal intervention into almost every field of American endeavor. At that time, Mr. President, we really had a depression. Millions were unemployed, hundreds of factories lay idle, banks were closing, and soup kitchens and apple vendors were constant reminders of our economic plight. In other words, at that stage in our history there was need for action by the Federal Government in the national interest. I do not agree with the action that was taken, and history has proven that it was not the right kind of action. Make-work projects buttressed by heavy Government control over private endeavor did not do the job. Many years after the advent of the New Deal and its programs, the depression with all its attendant unemployment and human misery was still with us. And it remained right up until the outbreak of World War II, when the necessity to rearm in a hurry put our people and our factories back to work.

Now, Mr. President, I believe it is important for us today to understand the difference between that period and the one in which we now live. Today, for example, we have a high level of employment but a persistent and nagging problem of technological unemployment. Today, we have the highest level of savings and consumer purchasing power in our history. We have the highest standard of living in the world. We also have some very tough problems largely because of unchecked Government spending and a demonstrated policy of fiscal irresponsibility related to deficit financing. We have a serious adverse balance in our international payments, a sorely threatened gold reserve, a dollar which has lost much of its former standing in world financial circles, and a growing problem with foreign competition.

And today, Mr. President, we find another New Deal—this time called the New Frontier—offering the same old answers that we got 30 years ago. Despite the vastly changed conditions, we find the Government today parceling out PWA projects and funneling funds into so-called depressed areas as though the soup kitchens had returned. We find the Congress debating what amounts to a new 1963 version of the Civilian Conservation Corps. We find the administration pushing new social security legislation designed to subject the American people to Federal paternalism "from the cradle to the grave." We find the Executive reaching again for more and more power to regulate the national economy.

When we get right down to it, the New Frontier's idea of meeting our economic problems is the same one the New Deal used—bigger Government and heavier public spending.

Mr. President, this is not only a negative response to the pressing economic problems which face us as a nation; it is a reactionary response. It is a return to old methods—methods which were thoroughly tried in the 1930's and which were found wanting. This whole idea of trying to ease unemployment and growth problems through the use of printing press money will get us into more trouble than we are in already.

Let us say goodby to the 1930's and the depression-born economic thinking which has no application to the problems which confront us in a time of record consumer spending. Let us remember that panaceas and Government-financed nostrums did not work 30 years ago because they were not sound. Let us today profit from those mistakes and begin attacking our economic problems with realism and responsibility.

PROGRAMS TO ASSIST FISH FARMERS

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, the 64th General Assembly of the State of Arkansas recently passed a resolution urging the acceleration of programs designed to assist fish farmers. The fish farming industry has a great future but much information is needed on proper production, processing, and marketing techniques before the industry can develop its full potential. I was the author of the legislation which led to the establishment of the Fish Farm Experiment Station at Stuttgart, Ark. The work that is being carried out under the jurisdiction of this station, and other related facilities of the Fish and Wildlife Service, is designed to solve many of the problems which have hampered the growth of the fish farming industry.

I am hopeful that the work of both the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries and the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife on fish farming problems can be expedited in the next fiscal year. This work is of great importance to all States having fish farming potential.

I ask unanimous consent that the resolution adopted by the Arkansas General Assembly be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Senate Concurrent Resolution 5

Concurrent resolution memorializing Congress and Federal agencies to accelerate research programs with respect to harvesting, processing, and marketing of farm-produced fish, and to establish uniform laws and regulations defining fish farming

Whereas the State of Arkansas has 4,500,000 acres of idle land which is ideally suited to the production of farm grown fish; and

Whereas experts have estimated that such idle land is capable of an annual production of farm grown fish having a value of $100 million; and

Whereas the United States is presently importing 50 percent of its fish and fish products, thereby indicating a great need to increase domestic fish production to halt the flow of U.S. dollars which are going to other countries for the purchase of fish; and

Whereas there is presently approximately 100,000 acres of privately owned reservoirs in the State of Arkansas that contain several million dollars worth of valuable fish which are not being harvested due to the lack of technical knowledge of harvesting, processing, and marketing; and

Whereas the laws of the Federal Government, and the regulations of a number of Federal administrative agencies, are conflicting with regard to fish farming, and because of such conflicting laws the production of farm-produced fish is being handicapped at the present time: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate of the 64th General Assembly of the State of Arkansas (the house of representatives concurring therein), That, the General Assembly of Arkansas respectfully requests the Congress of the United States, and the appropriate Federal agencies, to take necessary steps to accelerate research programs applicable to farm-produced fish, with such research to especially determine economic means of harvesting, processing, and marketing farm-produced fish to the end that the obviously great potentials and possibilities of this new farm crop may be realized and thousands of acres of idle land may be put into production with the resulting increase in employment and business activity attendant thereto; be it further

Resolved, That the Congress of the United States and all Federal agencies are urged to enact and promulgate a common and uniformly accepted definition of fish farming to the extent that fish farming may be recognized, for the various Federal purposes, as any other agricultural pursuit; be it further

Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution a copy thereof shall be furnished, by the secretary of state, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, the President of the Senate, and the appropriate Agriculture Committees of the House and Senate of the Congress of the United States, to the U.S. Department of Agriculture, and to each member of the Arkansas congressional delegation.

GRAND TETON NATIONAL PARK

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, there are not superlatives enough to describe the beauty of my State of Wyoming and in particular the majesty of Grand Teton National Park. People who visit there often are completely transformed by their contact with the works of God and nature.

To illustrate this point I cite an article in the March issue of Redbook magazine written by a Detroit housewife who, with her family, spent 2 weeks at the park. Her account of that trip is concrete testimony of the wonders of that park. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WYOMING: WILD AND WONDERFUL

(By Mary Augusta Rodgers)

Two weeks was all the time we had last summer, and we went from Detroit, Mich., to Jackson Hole, Wyo. It's a long trip—more than 3,000 miles there and back, the way we did it—and we were tried and travel stained when we returned. A neighbor, very natty in a white shirt and Bermuda shorts, observed our homecoming. "This was a vacation?" he inquired, puffing judiciously on his pipe.

Ah, but it was. One of the best we've ever had.

We had first seen the Jackson Hole country on a long trip the year before, and ever since, we had wanted to return. The scenery is magnificent, of course, but that's not the whole story; our first trip left us with the impression that the West is a vast area of incredible beauty and we were dazzled by it. But some places have that indefinable, vital note of particular personality, just as some people do, and Jackson Hole turned out to be the place for us. Those mountains, those lakes, that valley, that sky. We could hardly wait to see it all again.

We left Detroit on a Friday, behind schedule. Packing turned out to be more of a job than we had anticipated—it always is, but we never learn. "Off at dawn," my husband and I cry hopefully the night before; the boys listen, smile, and make bets about how late we'll actually be; and the most cynical among them is the one who wins. At 17 (Pete), 16 (Billy), and 14 (Mark), they naturally are prepared for the worst. Only Kitsy, who is 7, still regards her parents with absolute confidence. For example, we were 50 miles on our way when she mentioned that she had let the cat back into the house.

"But don't worry," she said cheerfully. "Daddy'll fix it."

Two hours later we were on our way. Again.

We dipped down to Chicago to pick up our seventh passenger, my husband's younger brother; this gave us five drivers for our caravan—a station wagon and a compact bus—so we took turns driving through the night, had breakfast in Wisconsin, lunch in Minnesota, and dinner in South Dakota. We camped for the night at a roadside park, and the next morning we drove through Pierre and headed for the Badlands National Monument. This was our first official sightseeing stop, and we had plenty of company. I remember watching a boy who was taking a picture of his father, who was taking a movie shot of his wife, who was taking a picture of the Badlands. It is a desertlike landscape, strangely colored and shimmering in the heat, the hills eroded into shapes resembling spires and towers and battlements.

Another night at a roadside park, this time in Wyoming, and we awoke to a brilliant summer day, hot and clear, with sunflowers and black-eyed Susans blooming along the highway. The land was beginning to look authentically western—sagebrush, grazing herds of cattle, cottonwood trees growing by sparkling streams, mesas grayblue in the distance.

The drive through the Big Horn Mountains was spectacular. "Wow," Uncle Larry cried, giving up on the search for the mot juste. Granite Pass, Shell Canyon, Greybull, Shoshone—the very names sounded like a beating drum, and the views were thrilling almost everywhere.

By the time we drove around Yellowstone Lake at twilight, though, we were having trouble reacting to anything but the thought of a sandwich and a cup of coffee. Night fell, the road ran on endlessly, a bear appeared for a moment in the headlights of the bus—but we'd already seen 10 bears and a herd of elk. There was no moon and the sky was dark. We couldn't see the mountains, but we could feel them looming, like hidden giants. When we reached the Jenny Lake campground in the Grand Teton National Park, we were greeted by a sign which stated positively: "Camp Area Full."

We parked near the entrance and fell asleep just as we were. At 6 o'clock in the morning a ranger, looking clear-eyed, neat, and outrageously rested, emerged from the ranger station and removed the sign. The rush that followed was something like the opening of the Cherokee Strip. We were seized by the homesteader's fever, and when we finally found a good site and started driving in tent pegs, we felt triumphantly: This land is ours. We didn't even take time to look around until we had signed in at the ranger station. No matter. The mountains were still there.

They rise without foothills, dominating the valley, the peaks splendid in the light of a summer morning, glaciers shining in the sun. Their reflections lie on the surface of the lakes, their shadows fall across meadows full of wildflowers and the Snake River winds at their feet. The wind, blowing over the mountain slopes, smells of snow and pine. Remote from the big cities and the crowded States, the valley of Jackson Hole has the feeling of a high-altitude oasis, a natural version of Shangri-La.

Headquarters of the Grand Teton National Park are at Moose, 7 miles away, but much park activity centers at Jenny Lake. There is a log-cabin museum, a little shop, a boat dock, a horse corral and the Exum School of Mountaineering. Fishermen have Jenny Lake to themselves; the swimmers go down to String Lake or follow the trail beyond it to Leigh Lake. During the day, cars from nearly every State line the road near the ranger station, but there never seem to be crowds of people milling about. This is vigorous country, and even the most settled, sedentary, suburban types are irresistibly drawn to be out and doing.

Besides the Jenny Lake campground, there are others at Colter Bay, Jackson Lake and Gros Ventre (pronounced Grovont, unless you want to be considered a tenderfoot and a square). Since these are all national park campgrounds, there is no fee for the tent sites. Each site is a large space shaded by pine trees, with a parking turnout, a cooking grate and a picnic table; and there are chipmunks and ground squirrels to add to that lived-in look. Every area has a community woodpile and rubbish is collected every day. Comfort stations are maintained—although camping is camping, after all, and there is nothing especially comfortable about getting there from your tent at 6 a.m. in the rain. A sense of adventure helps—one girl told me that when leaving the Ladies' one evening, she opened the door, and before she could step out a bear stepped in. "I like to think," she added piously, "that it was a lady bear."

There are other facilities in the park, however, besides free camping sites. At Colter Bay, the Grand Teton Lodge Co. operates a trailer park with utility connections for 112 trailers, a compound of heated log cabins with baths, a tent village. The tents are set on concrete, backed with logs and equipped with electric lights; each is furnished with an outdoor grill, a wood-burning stove, double-deck bunks, a table and benches; all other housekeeping necessities, from sleeping bags to coffeepots, are available for rental; and thus it is at last possible to camp a la carte.

There is a visitors' information center at Colter Bay, an outdoor amphitheater, a swimming beach, a lakeside marina, a horse corral, a grocery store, coffee shop, taproom and (here's where it gets really exciting) a laundry with automatic washing machines and adjoining shower rooms. The showers cost 35 cents, slightly more if you forget your own towels, and all campers know that there are times when a hot shower is an event so luxurious that it verges on a debauch. Even a wait in the laundry can be a pleasure; there is always the bulletin board to study. People want to share rides, swap equipment, advertise the lost and found, leave messages for friends. The messages often provide food for thought—"Dot and Sandy: Sorry we missed you, second honeymoon, Mother off for Las Vegas, love, Betty and George"—but the most arresting in my experience was a notice written on a file card in a flowing Palmer penmanship hand that said quite simply: "Wanted, old garter. Need not be in working order." A local telephone number followed.

(My husband felt that garter was obviously a misspelling for guitar. I felt that life is mysterious and who are we to know?)

The Jackson Lake Lodge and the Jenny Lake Lodge are located as their names indicate, both operated by the Grand Teton Lodge Co. The Jackson Lake Lodge has cottages in addition to the main house, hotel service, a dining room, bar, and barber and beauty shops. In the main lounge, huge windows frame a spectacular view of the mountains behind Jackson Lake, and ordinarily energetic guests have been known to sit there for hours, fascinated by the play of light and shadow. A variety of programs is presented in the lodge auditorium; the Laubins, a couple who are experts on Indian culture, give a popular recital of Indian dances every Friday night.

At Jenny Lake, 35 log cabins, many of them the carefully restored cabins of original settlers, cluster around the lodge, which is small, cozy, and famous for its food and service. Every Sunday there is a buffet, with hors d'oeuvres packed against an ice swan, a lavish supply of entrees and salads, and the offerings of a reckless and gifted pastry chef. The buffet is open to the public for the price of the meal, and many campers avail themselves of the opportunity, granting that hot dogs and beans taste great over an open fire but feeling that there is no reason to be fanatical on the subject.

Finally, there are a number of privately owned dude or guest ranches within the boundaries of the Grand Teton Park, and hotel and motel accommodations in the town of Jackson.

Our own tents at the Jenny Lake campground looked like a small village. There was a wing tent for the children's dormitory, a pup tent for Uncle Larry's bachelor quarters, and the bus for Mother and Father. The bus, fitted out with water tank, icebox, table, storage shelves, a couch that converted into a double bed and even tie-back plaid curtains at the windows, was known as the Officers' Club. As camp cook and housekeeper, I need a lot of equipment, although I have improved since our first camping trip, when—inspired by heaven knows what dream of gracious living among the tall pines—I took along a souffle pan and a steam iron.

Those who love this country give many different reasons, but essentially what they all are saying is the same. A businessman who has been bringing his family to the same dude ranch for 15 years talked about what he liked to do—the fishing, the pack trips—and then, with mounting enthusiasm, about what he liked not to do. "No television, no radio—I hardly even read letters. And the telephone connections are so lousy," he added ecstatically, "that the office finally quit trying to get in touch with me."

The most famous visitor last summer was Astronaut John Glenn. We were in Jackson buying groceries when we heard a hubbub in the next block, inquired about it and learned that Glenn and his family were there. As long as they were in town they couldn't move without attracting an admiring crowd, but that afternoon they left for a week's camping trip in the mountains. The ranger who guided them up to their first night's campsite said afterward that John Glenn slid off his horse, looked at the mountain meadow—unchanged since the days it was known only to the Indians—and said suddenly, "For the first time in a year I feel free."

It was August and the weather was superb. As the days went by it was hard not to feel that we all were better people, in some basic way, just for being in such beautiful country. Certainly we were healthier. We used String Lake as a bathtub—in such a setting, a pretty glorious bathtub—but Leigh Lake was our favorite and we went there nearly every day. It was 2 miles through pine woods to the sandy spit where we liked to settle down and sun bathe and swim. The first time, this felt like a real hike, but in a few days the 2 miles meant no more than a stroll to the corner mailbox back home. The lake water was cold, clear, amazingly invigorating after the first breathless plunge, and it was wonderful to lie in the sun, gazing up at the grandeur of Teewinot Mountain against a brassy summer sky, lulled by a piny breeze and the sound of birds.

We seldom planned more than a day ahead, and yet the time fell into a pattern. Breakfast and dinner were substantial meals, eaten at camp; lunch was usually a picnic of bread and cheese and fruit wherever we happened to be. At night we sometimes strolled over to the amphitheater to hear nature talks by the park naturalists. One night the climbing ranger discussed mountaineering and illustrated his talk with color slides. A particularly dizzying shot showed a climber inching his way up what appeared to be a sheer wall of ice. The audience gasped, and the ranger remarked amiably, "You know that is much harder than it looks."

The country absorbed us. We went riding and saw a moose. The boys and Uncle Larry tried the fishing at the Gros Ventre River and took an all-day fishing trip down the Snake; it rained that afternoon, and they were interested to see the rubber rafts from Jackson Lake Lodge float majestically by, the passengers shielded from the rain by plastic sheets and the rafts looking like big, gift-wrapped packages. One day we hiked along the Indian Paintbrush Trail to the Continental Divide. It seemed odd to ask first at the ranger station about snow conditions in August, but a snow cornice may block the divide at any time. Another day we took the Glacier Trail to Amphitheater Lake, which begins at Lupine Meadow and ends at timber line after a 3,000-foot rise in 5½ miles of trail. (A booklet called "Teton Trails," for sale at the visitors' centers in the park, is very useful; and so is another, "Yellowstone and Grand Teton Wild Flowers." You're not supposed to pick the wildflowers, but you might as well peer at them knowingly.)

One long day we went to Yellowstone. A day is not nearly long enough to see all the areas of interest, but we saw Old Faithful and the geyser basins and the great canyon of the Yellowstone River. The stones are yellow; the lodgepole pines are dark green; the river roars furiously in the canyon; the ground steams and bubbles and boils and shoots forth geysers. It's wild, weird country; the Indians thought it was inhabited by devils and ghosts, and no wonder. We saw mule deer and a couple of coyotes and bears, bears, bears. Kitsy never failed to shriek happily at the sight of a bear, even the 18th that afternoon—she was looking for Yogi Bear (who's always in the ra-a-anger's hair).

It is hard to imagine the excuse for many of the adult tourists, who behave as if the bears were stuffed and provided solely to serve as props for comic photos. Every season about 10 or 15 visitors to the park are mauled or bitten by the bears, and the wonder is that the figure is so low. Some people do incredible things; one man put his baby in a bear's arms and then stepped back to snap a picture. (The bear, fortunately, dropped the baby.) We were particularly fretful about the motorists who at the sight of a bear slammed on brakes and stopped in the middle of fast-moving highway traffic. Impervious to the cars piling up behind them, they rolled down their windows and teased the bear with sandwiches and candy bars, all the while yelling, "Get a picture of him with his mouth open like that" and, "Oh, isn't he cute."

In Grand Teton Park we went to see the park museum at Menors Ferry and exhibits at the park headquarters at Moose, and to see where the famous Gros Ventre Slide occurred. The scar is still clearly visible where a mountain fell, like an avalanche of snow, into the valley, even without the explicit park sign: "The Gros Ventre slide occurred June 23, 1925. It dammed the river and created Lower Slide Lake. On May 18, 1927, the dam broke and the rushing water flooded the town of Kelly 4 miles below. Six lives were lost, ranch homes destroyed, livestock drowned, and other extensive damage was caused." And one afternoon we took a picnic lunch up to the top of Signal Mountain. On one side is a view of the Teton range, on the other a magnificent view of the valley, green with trees, blue in the shadow of the mountains, gray with sagebrush. The park sign begins like a poem: "Here glaciers met and melted."

It is my unsolicited opinion that the taxpayer's dollar seldom returns to him in more benign form than in the services of the national parks and their staffs. Their constant effort is to achieve two opposing goals—to preserve what little is left of this countrys' natural wilderness and to enable the public to use and enjoy it. The public—that's all of us—loves its parks, but its embrace can be as crushing as the bear's. A wrangler, leading a group on horseback up the trail to Lake Solitude, was heard to mutter, "Any day now they'll change the name to Lake Multitude."

A. B. Guthrie's novel "The Big Sky" is full of feeling for the Teton country, and at the end one of the characters says, "There was beaver for us and free country and a big way of livin' and everything we done it looks like we done against ourselves and couldn't do different if we'd knowed. We went to get away and to enjoy ourselves free and easy, but folks were bound to foller and beaver to get scarce and Injuns to be killed or tamed, and all the time the country gettin' safer and better known. We ain't see the end of it yet."

Like the South, the West is half history, half legend, and they have a good time with both in the town of Jackson. Every night at 7 at the main intersection, they try Clover the Killer. The stage clatters in; there is a holdup; the blank bullets blaze and the horses rear; the Cache Creek posse rides again. Clover is captured and dragged before the bar of justice, an archway made entirely of elk horns. "Hang him?" the announcer-judge asks, his scarf not entirely concealing the cord of the microphone around his neck "Hang him, hang him," the kids (some of them age 60) holler. In the interests of mercy and the next night's show, Clover is allowed to shoot it out with the sheriff instead. Bang, bang. Clover falls and twitches artistically. The crowd applauds. Overhead the traffic light goes back on.

It's a great show. Old hands in Jackson will tell you that if you're planning to go to a restaurant, 7 o'clock is the time to get there and order dinner.

There is the Pink Garter Theater, the Cowboy Bar, and the Silver Dollar Cafe. When the stagecoach is not being used for holdups, a young man (known as Killer Clay on the nights he substitutes for Clover) sells tickets for rides around the square. Some gaudy cowboy outfits are seen on the boardwalks of Jackson, the most resplendent usually worn by big-city citizens who wouldn't know a corral from a calaboose, but the man who set my hair in a local beauty shop had on a rather striking outfit too, complete with sombrero and gun and holster set. When he bent to roll up the back curls, he looked as though he should be shoeing a horse.

But it's not all enjoyable claptrap, the essence of 10,000 cowboy movies and TV dramas and Frankie Laine singing, "Ghost Riders in the Sky." Look anywhere. This is the country of John Colter, who had been with the Lewis and Clark Expedition and who set out for the unknown Western mountains to see what the fur trapping might be like and if the Indians were interested in trading. That was—well, there was an argument, not only about the date but about Colter's ever reaching Jackson Hole. Then in 1930 a plow, turning over virgin homestead land, uncovered a piece of dirt-covered rock, crudely carved to resemble a man's head. On one side was scratched a name, "John Colter," and on the other side the date, "1808."

This is the country of hunters and trappers, scouts and guides, and men prospecting for gold—men like Bridger and David E. Jackson, and Beaver Dick Leigh with his Shoshonean wife named Jenny. The settlers and the farmers came last. But they stayed.

By the end of our first week in the Teton country we felt like settlers ourselves. Suntanned and hearty, the boys wore blue jeans and cowboy hats with ease and just the proper hint of swagger, and were talking about coming back another summer and getting ranch jobs on their own. Even Kitsy decided to give up her lifelong ambition to be a nurse and grow up to be a lady wrangler instead. Uncle Larry, whose previous idea of hardship was a Martini with too much vermouth in it, had formed the habit of having a swim in String Lake every morning before breakfast, about 7 a.m. Year-round mountaineering men were amazed. "Are you out of your mind?" they asked frankly. "That water is cold."

When everybody else in the family decided to go to mountain-climbing school, I decided to go along. And that was a mistake. First we went by boat to Hidden Falls, hiked to a lovely spot—I am always one to notice the view—and learned how to tie knots and handle a rope. "No, no, Mary," the guide said. "Your other left hand." The fact of the matter is that I have always detested rope tying in any form since Girl Scout days, and besides that I am afraid of heights and nobody should really expect me to cope with this sort of thing. Nevertheless, the next thing I knew, I was scraping all the skin off my knees and elbows trying to get up a steep slab of rock, while the guide stood above and shouted down, "Listen to me, Mary—stop cowering and come on." We went over three or four pitches, each worse than the last, and then it was time for lunch. After lunch we were going to try rappelling. It was explained to me, the class coward, that rappelling was different. Lots of fun—in fact, a real lark. I was just beginning to feel optimistic when the sky darkened, thunder rolled, rain began pouring down and the lark aspect of the afternoon dimmed. The other members of the class began to rappel and I observed the procedure. There is this rope, see, and you put it around you in a certain fashion, and then you step backward off a cliff. The rain poured and the wind grew cold and I huddled on a little ledge on the side of the cliff and wondered just what turn I had taken on life's highway to land me in this particular spot. Finally it was my turn. Taking the rope, I tried to hold it in the approved manner. I looked down. Then I slipped in the mud and cut my knee on a rock. I looked down again. And then—let's put it this way: I know enough to come in out of the rain.

It is only fair to emphasize that everyone else in the family felt different. They thought that climbing was exhilarating and challenging and generally terrific and mother was chicken. My husband and the two older boys immediately made plans to climb "the Grand"—the Grand Teton, highest peak in the range at 13,766 feet, and a 2-day venture with a guide.

The morning they left was beautiful, but by early afternoon the sky was cloudy and by dusk it was raining again. "Raining here, it's snowing up there," someone said.

It was a long night—I awoke with a start, looked at my watch, and saw that it was 4 a.m., just the time the climbing party would start toward the peak—and a longer day; and then about 4 o'clock they came into view along the Garnet Canyon Trail. They'd had everything—snow, hail, and electrical storm. "We were bombed," the guide said wearily.

"Never again," my husband announced, back at the camp, and started to drift off to sleep before he'd finished pulling his boots off.

"One of the greatest days of my life," was his version of the climb the next morning.

Even I felt that this was the climax, and it was just as well that the time had come to leave. Following our own quaint custom, we planned to leave at 10 in the morning, and actually got away about 3 that afternoon. It was strenuous work, breaking camp; at one point Uncle Larry stopped and directed our attention to the boys, who were lounging comfortably at the picnic table, reading magazines.

"Note that," he muttered. "The coffee break at the OK Corral."

Going home, the way seemed quicker, and more tiring. We went through Nebraska and Iowa, driving through the night again. I found myself thinking about the things that we'd wanted to do and hadn't had time for. We'd wanted to take the trip to Alaska Basin on horseback; we'd wanted to see the melodrama at the Pink Garter in Jackson; and ride the chair lift; and ride to Wilson, just a few miles beyond Jackson, to see the Saturday night rodeo; and go over to the Jackson Lake Lodge and take the all-day float trip down the Snake; and try a week of wilderness camping in the Wind River Mountains, part of the Bridger National Forest. * * *

Next time, next time.

Thinking about what we had done, I found that I was remembering moods and odd moments: the sun and the clear, cold water at Leigh Lake; a turn in the path toward Paintbrush Divide, a breathtaking view, and the sudden notion that it promised all sorts of things; simplicity and freedom and the natural rhythm of the changing seasons and the sun and moon and stars. The frontier is gone but the lure is still there, and in the Tetons the mountains and lakes and forests still remain, beautiful and unchanged.

TRIBUTE TO RABBI FERDINAND M. ISSERMAN

Mr. LONG of Missouri. Mr. President, tonight, Rabbi Ferdinand M. Isserman will enter the pulpit and deliver his last sermon at Temple Israel in St. Louis, where he has served God, his congregation, his city, and his fellow man since 1929.

Among his major interests have been combating prejudice against Negroes and building interfaith relationships, and the great progress St. Louis has made in these areas is flaming testimonial to the effectiveness of his efforts.

Mr. President, I am sure our colleagues would find the story of Rabbi Isserman's 33 years in St. Louis interesting and inspirational, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record at the conclusion of my remarks an excellent feature article from the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of February 21, written by Clarissa Start and entitled "Rabbi Isserman—Always on Side of the Angels."

The rabbi says he considers himself lucky to have spent such a long span of years in St. Louis. While I agree wholeheartedly with that sentiment, for St. Louis is indeed a beautiful and wonderful city in which to live, I would add to his comment a further note: "Rabbi Isserman, St. Louis is lucky that you chose her for your home, and St. Louisans are thankful that you chose them to be your neighbors."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Rabbi Isserman—Always on Side of the Angels

(By Clarissa Start)

"I was very lucky," said Rabbi Ferdinand M. Isserman, as he tilted back in his chair, glanced ceilingward and let his mind revert to the past. "I came to St. Louis at the time of the golden age of the liberal clergy in this city. There were such men as Jay Stocking at Pilgrim Congregational, George Campbell at Union Avenue Christian, Bishop Will Scarlett and Dean Sidney Sweet at Christ Church Cathedral, Ivan Lee Holt of St. John's Methodist, William Bitting at Second Baptist, Father William Mullally of St. Mary Magdalen and Father Russell Wilbur of Notre Dame de Lourdes Catholic Churches."

No list of the liberal clergy of St. Louis would be complete without the name of Rabbi Isserman himself. The senior rabbi at Temple Israel, who is retiring next month, has been an active, constructive force in the community since he came here in 1929.

His ministry has been such a successful one that it is hard to believe he hesitated to come to St. Louis from Toronto for fear he wouldn't make the grade.

"I felt secure there and was afraid to come here," he recalls. "My predecessor at Temple Israel, Rabbi Leon Harrison, was a great orator. People crowded the temple to hear him speak. I was sure I could never take his place."

Rabbi Isserman was only 31 years old at the time but he had made a name for himself with his first three congregations.

Because he came to St. Louis from Canada, many people assumed he was Canadian, but actually he was born in Antwerp, Belgium, and came to this country with his family when he was 8. He attended school in Newark, N.J., and then went to Hebrew Union College in Cincinnati, Ohio, the University of Cincinnati and the University of Pennsylvania, where he took his M.A.

He served as rabbi in Paducah, Ky., Philadelphia and then Toronto, where he made news by participating in the first Christian-Jewish pulpit exchange in Canadian history and by heading a campaign to abolish corporal punishment in Toronto schools.

Despite his trepidation about coming to St. Louis, he finally decided to accept the invitation and the challenge, and arrived here on September 1, 1929. His first duty here was to participate in the funeral services for Sigmund Baer. A few weeks later, he performed his first marriage ceremony in St. Louis, that of Louis Rothschild and Emily Bettman. On September 27 he was formally installed, with the late Rabbi Stephen S. Wise acting as installing officer and Julius Glaser representing the congregation.

The new rabbi soon found St. Louis to be a friendly place, especially in its interfaith relationships.

"The thing that has made mine a very rich ministry," says Rabbi Isserman, "is the liberal attitude of the community and the friendliness to differences. I think this climate was created by the Forty-eighters, those German immigrants who came here in 1848—men like Carl Schurz, who believed in civil liberties. They kept Missouri from becoming a slave state and going with the Confederacy. The temper of the community was hospitable to other points of view."

He remembers with special warmth his first meeting with Dean (later Bishop) Scarlett, of whom he had heard so much.

"I went to Bishop Tuttle Memorial and got permission to go upstairs; he lived in an apartment on the fifth floor," Rabbi Isserman recalled. "When he came to the door, I said, 'I'm Rabbi Harrison's successor.' He said, 'I'm Will Scarlett—call me Will.' I said, 'Call me Ferd,' and that was it."

The two men conferred with Archbishop Glennon and out of the meeting came plans for the St. Louis Seminar of Christians and Jews, held in the spring of 1930. It was a 2-day discussion period, with an audience comprised of 333 Catholics, 333 Jews, and 333 Protestants, with Gov. Henry S. Caulfield making the 1000th member.

"We called it our religious prejudice disarmament conference," said Rabbi Isserman. "It had a terrific impact on the community, and paved the way for much good interfaith work which followed. Teams of rabbis, priests, and ministers visited schools and went around the State on pilgrimages.

"Today, of course, the National Conference of Christians and Jews performs this work on a national scale and in a more intensive way, but in this community we were the pioneers. And I think the results have been evident. I remember when Louis P. Aloe ran for mayor how big a part prejudice played in his defeat. Last year Larry Roos—a boy whom I confirmed—was elected county supervisor and the issue of religion, to my knowledge, was not raised."

Also in the early 1930's Rabbi Isserman founded and became chairman of the Social Justice Commission of St. Louis, an organization of 15 clergymen and 10 professors. The late Dean Joseph Husslein of St. Louis University was a member and so was Wiley Rutledge, who went on to become a U.S. Supreme Court Justice.

"We found that rabbis, priests, and ministers often saw eye to eye on the social gospel on which the great prophets had spoken," he said. "In our union we had a great deal of strength."

Most of the accomplishments of the Social Justice Commission were in the settling of labor disputes. The commission settled a dispute between a large dairy and its milk producers; it settled a taxicab strike and a milk wagon drivers' strike and it averted a streetcar strike.

"We tried unsuccessfully to settle a quarrel between rival coal mine unions," Rabbi Isserman recalled. "John L. Lewis came to this meeting and I still remember his dramatic speech."

Rabbi Isserman visited Nazi Germany in 1933 and was so moved that he wrote a book, "Sentenced to Death," predicting the wholesale slaughter of Jews, a prophecy which was looked on as exaggerated at the time.

He had served with the Central Infantry Officers at Camp Grant, Ill., in World War I, and in World War II was granted a 6-month leave of absence to serve with the American Red Cross in the Tunisian campaign. At the end of the war he was outspoken on the subject of world peace and atomic control.

In recent years, one of his major interests has been combating prejudice against Negroes. But his stand was made clear long ago. The death of Henry Bibb, Negro janitor of Temple Israel for 47 years, occurred early in Rabbi Isserman's ministry Funeral services for the faithful employee were held in the temple with Rabbi Isserman officiating.

He has had Negro singers and speakers at Temple Israel. One of the achievements of which he is proudest is the nursery foundation, interracial nursery.

"Some people said this would create an uproar," Rabbi Isserman recalled, adding drily, "It created such an uproar that 3 years later the United Fund took it over."

Occasionally some of the members of his congregation have differed with him, but in all the years there have been few resignations over principle.

"Many disagreed with me but respected my right to my own opinion," says Rabbi Isserman.

The Reform congregation has more than doubled since he became its senior rabbi. In the 1930's, in the midst of the depression, it seemed that plans to build Temple Israel house next to the temple at Kingshighway and Washington Boulevard were stalled. But Rabbi Isserman secured a pledge from the late Charles Stix that his firm would float a bond issue to lend the temple $250,000. Rabbi Isserman obtained from members of the congregation personal pledges for $65,000 to underwrite the interest on the bonds for 5 years, and the project went ahead.

Last fall the new Temple Israel house of worship at Ladue and Spoede roads was dedicated. Appropriately enough, monumental sculptures were given to the temple by Christ Church Cathedral, a gracious reciprocal gesture for the baptistry doors which the temple had given the cathedral on the 10th anniversary of Bishop Scarlett's consecration.

"There are Old and New Testament symbols on the doors," said Rabbi Isserman, "symbolic of the fact, that, as the doors swing side by side without conflict, so can the faiths work side by side."

In addition to his many other interests, Rabbi Isserman is an art collector, and the walls of his home at 82 Arundel Place are covered with paintings, both the abstracts which he admires and the more conventional works which his wife prefers.

The Issermans have two children, a daughter, Mrs. Stanley B. Gertz, who lives on Long Island, and a son, Fred, Jr., vice president of an advertising agency, who lives in Highland Park, Ill.

On March 8, Rabbi Isserman will preach his last sermon at Temple Israel, but he is not retiring from the active ministry. He will be guest rabbi to the Jewish community in Hong Kong, and plans to study Buddhism and Confucian thought during his year there.

Appreciation of other religions has been a special interest which he has not only pursued himself but has instilled in his congregation. A requirement of confirmation at Temple Israel is the study of comparative religions, and representatives of other faiths are brought in to tell the children of their beliefs.

"I think tolerance is bad," says Rabbi Isserman. "Appreciation of other faiths—that's the thing for which we should aim."

Rabbi Isserman will be succeeded at Temple Israel by Rabbi Martin E. Katzenstein. Although Rabbi Isserman will be leaving St. Louis, at least for a year, he hopes to keep in touch with his adopted city by means of taped programs which he will send back to KSD as a continuation of his radio program of many years. There is no doubt that St. Louis will always have a great claim on him.

"St. Louis, in my opinion," he says, "is the capital of interfaith relationships."

QUADRIPARTITE TAX RELIEF

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, without an assist from the Congress or the Treasury Department, Mr. and Mrs. Phillip Axe, of Lima, Ohio, have, with the help of the good Lord, provided for themselves a considerable tax cut and at the same time contributed substantially to our gross national product.

I am pleased to extend my sincere and warm congratulations to Mr. and Mrs. Axe, who are the proud parents of quadruplets born at St. Rita's Hospital, Lima, Ohio, on Monday, March 4, 1963. The quadruplets, who are reported to be getting along nicely, range from 2 pounds 9 ounces to 4 pounds 2 ounces.

THE DEBT POOLING RACKET

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, last Sunday the Washington Post carried an article by Leslie Whitten exposing the abuses in the rapidly growing and flourishing debt pooling racket in Washington, D.C. As described in the Washington Post, these so-called debt pooling firms, "offer to organize all debts, set a weekly or other regular payment from the debtor to themselves, and from this payment pay themselves a fee and send the rest out to the various creditors."

In short, the debt poolers offer to help the unwary or unfortunate consumer by charging him a stiff fee and pushing him even further into debt.

I must say that the fact that there are so many people so deeply in debt that they cannot meet their credit obligations is no surprise to me. For 3 years my subcommittee of the Banking and Currency Committee has held extensive hearings on various truth-in-lending bills which would require disclosure of the cost of consumer credit contracts before the consumer signs on the dotted line. The record of those hearings conclusively demonstrates to me that most consumers today are not adequately aware of the finance charges and interest rates they incur when they borrow money or buy on credit. Indeed, one of the managers of a local pooling firm explains their mushrooming growth by saying that—

> It is too much easy credit. As long as you have people borrowing so much money you will have a need for [debt consolidation] agencies.

However, it is not clear that these debt pooling firms are helpful to lenders or creditors in collecting their debts. For instance, the better business bureau in Kansas City surveyed lenders and creditors on their attitudes towards these debt pooling firms. The better business bureau found that:

> The firms were not useful or beneficial, according to 95 percent of the creditors.
>
> Proraters do not pay creditors as promptly as debtors pay proraters, according to 70 percent of the creditors.
>
> All but 2 percent of creditors said the proraters, for one reason or another, do not usually keep up payments until the entire balance of the debtor's account is paid.

Most important, the manager of the Kansas City Better Business Bureau has concluded that, "debtors are too often misled concerning the services which the prorate company is in a position to render."

On the basis of the figures supplied in the Washington Post article, it should be clearly understood that these debt poolers are charging those they are supposedly counseling and aiding as much as a 25-percent fee on the declining unpaid balances on their obligations for these services. This is in addition to the charges by the original creditors.

Of course, there is a vital need for genuine debt counseling services for those who find themselves overburdened with credit obligations. Many creditors are quite willing to provide these services themselves to customers without charge.

Many credit unions long ago established programs of debt counseling for their members. In other instances employers have offered free debt counseling services for their employees. In addition, legal aid societies as well as many types of public service agencies have in the past provided such services to the unfortunate, or unwary, without charge.

However, it is hard to see how those firms described in the Washington Post article could possibly be providing any services which would justify the very steep charges which the debtor is required to pay.

If the facts that the Washington Post have disclosed are true, these firms correctly deserve to be called debt pyramiders, not debt counselors.

I hope the Federal Trade Commission will very carefully examine the advertising these firms doing business in the District of Columbia have engaged in to make sure their representations to the debtor are truthful and accurate. Second, I hope that the District Committee will very carefully investigate this situation to see whether or not the District of Columbia should follow those many other States who have outlawed the debt pooling racket.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article from the Washington Post be printed in its entirety at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PRORATING DEBT FIRMS THRIVE HERE

(By Leslie H. Whitten)

Debt consolidators are banned in Virginia and several other States, regulated in still others, but neither regulated nor prohibited in the District. Recently, they have mushroomed here.

There was only one debt consolidation firm here in 1959. Now there are at least five.

They offer to organize all debts, set a weekly or other regular payment from the debtor to themselves and from this payment pay themselves a fee and send the rest out to the various creditors.

They are called proraters because they generally disburse the funds on the basis of which creditor is owed most—or howls loudest.

Their advertising is vigorously aimed at those whose debts have put them against the wall, and thousands of area residents have put millions of dollars in debts in the proraters' hands.

"No matter how much you owe, even if you are past due everywhere—we can get you back on your feet without borrowing," asserts a direct-mail card sent by National Budget Services, Inc., a firm set up in 1959, to a couple plagued with debts.

"Get out of debt today," says an advertisement by Budget Counsellors, Inc. "All you need is a sincere desire to get out of debt," says Credit Advisors, Inc.

The fact is, the better business bureau points out, that although a debtor who can follow the prorater's payment schedule can eventually get out of debt, the net effect of going to a debt consolidator is a bigger total debt.

For example, Credit Advisors, Inc., set up last year, charges a fee of 12½ percent of gross debt. This means a man with $1,000 in debts is taking on an additional debt of $125.

A CASE HISTORY

Eddie Moore, 32, a porter taking home $50 a week to his family, had this experience with National Budget Services:

Moore, of 5437 C Street SE., owed some $1,000 to a clothing firm, a furniture store, and two finance firms. His wife, Ella, 22, heeding an advertisement, went to National Budget and signed a contract.

The fee set was $70 plus a weekly service charge of 35 cents a creditor. The Moores were to pay to National Budget $21.25 a week with a portion to go toward the fee according to the contract.

"The remainder of said weekly sums," said the contract, "will be disbursed by the company among the applicant's creditors."

The contract went on to say that should the Moores miss a payment for 5 days, they would be liable for the $70 fee plus service charges. And, the contract continued, the payments could be increased if the creditors insisted.

The Moores paid on time for 4 weeks, a total of $85, according to their receipts. Of this, according to the firm's own records, only a single check—$15 to a finance firm—was sent out to creditors.

During the time the Moores did business with National Budget, they paid it $170, but only $60 was paid out to creditors, according to National Budget's records. When the Moores protested, they were refunded $16 as payment in full, the firm said.

The box score: $60 to creditors, $94 to National Budget.

M. D. Calahan, manager of National Budget, said the firm tries to get its fee from the debtors' payments first, but he said this often is not possible.

In contrast to the Moore's case, National Budget's files, and those of other debt consolidation firms, show records of regular payments over long periods to creditors by the proraters.

HANDLING NOT ILLEGAL

Nothing in the Moore case was illegal. On the contrary, it followed the contract to the letter. There is no regulatory law in the District to make it otherwise.

The contracts of all five major debt firms specify fees and debtor's payments, but none specify when the first funds start to go out to creditors.

All have provisions for payments to the firm in case of cancellation by the client. These range from $25 on Credit Advisors contracts to the entire fee on National Budget's.

COMPLAINTS REGISTERED

The better business bureau said it gets about five or six written complaints a month against the debt consolidators. About one telephoned complaint comes in a day, said Leland S. McCarthy, bureau managing director.

In addition, there are eight or nine telephoned inquiries a day, he said. McCarthy said his workers inform callers that the consolidators' service will put them deeper in debt and that the proraters cannot guarantee a reduction in payments already agreed to by the creditor.

Beyond that there is little the Bureau can do. It has no enforcement powers.

The complaints against proraters, said McCarthy, take two general forms.

One, he said is that the prorater is not making an adequate disbursement to creditors and that queries to the prorater just "get put off."

The other, McCarthy said, is that customers say they are told "creditors will be off your back," and that nevertheless dunning calls continue. The proraters deny they make such promises, he said.

McCarthy said he is closely watching the development of the industry, but he has not taken any general action against it as was done by the Bureau in Kansas City.

There, Joe E. Birkhead, manager of the Bureau, polled banks, loan offices, finance firms, stores, and other merchants. His findings:

The firms were "not useful or beneficial," according to 95 percent of the creditors.

Proraters do not pay creditors as promptly as debtors pay proraters, according to 70 percent of the creditors.

All but 2 percent of creditors said the proraters—for one reason or another—do not usually keep up payments until the entire balance of the debtor's account is paid.

Birkhead, in an article in the Bureau's Quarterly Report last year, concluded that "debtors are too often misled concerning the services which the prorate company is in a position to render."

OREGON'S EXPERIENCE

The National Better Business Bureau, in a 1955 survey of the then infant industry, warned that too often laws regulating proraters tend to lend them dignity "as State-licensed organizations while affording little real protection to the public."

Regulation in Oregon did not prevent a debt consolidation firm from closing its doors leaving some 400 debtors holding the bag for $22,000. A similar case is reported in Chicago.

The alternative to regulation in some States has been outright prohibition. Virginia, for example, outlawed debt consolidation in 1956 except by lawyers.

"Debt poolers were making rash promises," said R. E. Booker, secretary-treasurer of the Virginia State Bar. "There were fly-by-night firms."

In the District, there is no regulatory requirement at all although Representative JOEL T. BROYHILL, Republican of Virginia, introduced a bill to prohibit debt consolidators in 1958. At that time, however, there was only one major firm in Washington.

FIRMS BACK REGULATION

Against this background, all the managers of the five major firms in the District say they favor regulation.

Bob Abramson, executive vice president of Credit Advisors, which operates here and under various other names in 20 States, said he did not want the situation here to develop as it did in Michigan.

There, he said, such abuses as a prorater taking $180 and paying out only $10 led to legislation in 1961.

Abramson said his firm helped push the Michigan law through and said Credit Advisors follows it even where similar statutes are not in force. It has bonding, licensing and some other provisions.

"I would love to see regulations here with strong controls," he said. "But it would still have to let us operate. I don't want a confidence man in our business. I don't want a well-intentioned jerk in our business."

Robert J. Davids, owner of Debt Help Service, who worked in the District for years with Budget Counselors, the city's oldest firm, is even more explicit.

"I see a danger developing here * * * without regulations we'll have people opening up on every corner. You will be getting places which make false promises and then skip."

Davids, who charges a maximum 10 percent of gross debt plus a service fee of 50 cents monthly per account to a maximum of $5, said fees should be strictly regulated.

Ten to twelve percent of gross debt plus a small service fee should be maximum, he said, and no more than 15 percent of the fee should come out of the debtors payments in any one month. As with other firms, he feels licensing should make sure only responsible persons enter the business.

B. H. Feldman, owner of Budget Counselors, said the money he receives one day from clients goes out the same day. Feldman, as with all the agencies but National Budget, said his policy is not to try to collect the fee at the beginning, but in small prorated portions.

Feldman pointed out that he is a local businessman and "is deeply concerned lest new firms hurt the image of our business."

BAN IS PROPOSED

Many members of the credit community, including some loan companies—which often make loans to consolidate several debts in one obligation—finance firms and collection agencies would prefer to see the industry put out of business entirely.

John K. Althaus, general manager of the Credit Bureau, Inc., a firm which records credit ratings and does collection work, said bluntly "They're taking from the man who has nothing but bills.

"They delay payment by debtors of legitimate bills," he said.

Althaus met last fall and again last month with representatives of major stores and other businesses and the matter was discussed, but no public action taken. The retailers, however, have referred the prorating question to a special committee for research and a report.

The consensus, so far, Althaus said, is that many creditors would themselves give the type of advice that debtors get from proraters.

One furniture store spokesman said when a pro-rating firm informs it that they plan to cut a debtor's payments from say $25 to $15 a month, the furniture store will often simply cancel the account and move to repossess the furniture.

"It is often uneconomical for us to allow an account which is already overdue to extend still more months because the amount of the payment is cut," said the furniture man.

In fact, some proraters say, they must seek to get reductions in debtors' payments from stores in order to draw up a budget for the debtor. Loan and finance firms, they explain, often refuse flatly to cooperate with them in reducing the amount of payments due each week or month from debtors.

WHY BUSINESS GROWS

Why has the debt consolidation business begun to mushroom?

David Shanks, Financial Arrangers manager, said "it is too much easy credit. As long as you have people borrowing so much money, you will have a need for (debt consolidation) agencies."

His own firm, he said, has offices in various parts of the country and is opening new ones at the rate of two a month. National Budget claims 10 offices around the Nation. Abramson's Credit Advisors claim a national business of $6 million paid out each year to creditors.

In Washington, National Budget claims 1,700 accounts, Credit Advisors more than 1,000 and Financial Arrangers 700 although it is just over 3 months old. Debt Help maintains about 300 active cases.

These totals indicate that debtors are increasingly attracted to the firms.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, is there further morning business?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed.

OUTDOOR RECREATION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the unfinished business be laid before the Senate and be made the pending business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 20) to promote the coordination and development of effective Federal and State programs relating to outdoor recreation, and for other purposes.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business, to consider the nominations on the Executive Calendar, beginning with the new reports.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States submitting the nomination of Maj. Gen. James Karrick Woolnough, U.S. Army, to be assigned to a position of importance and responsibility designated by the President, in the grade of lieutenant general, which was referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

CONSULAR CONVENTION WITH KOREA—REMOVAL OF INJUNCTION OF SECRECY

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the injunction of secrecy be removed from Executive B, 88th Congress, 1st session, a consular convention between the United States and Korea, which the President transmitted to the Senate today, and that the convention, together with the President's message, be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and the President's message be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The message from the President is as follows:

To the Senate of the United States:

With a view to receiving the advice and consent of the Senate to ratification, I transmit herewith the consular convention between the United States of America and Korea signed at Seoul on January 8, 1963.

I transmit also, for the information of the Senate, the report by the Secretary of State with respect to the convention.

JOHN F. KENNEDY.

(Enclosures: (1) Report of the Secretary of State; (2) consular convention with Korea, signed January 8, 1963.)

THE WHITE HOUSE, *March 8, 1963.*

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. FULBRIGHT, from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Horace G. Torbert, Jr., of Massachusetts, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to the Somali Republic;

William R. Rivkin, of Illinois, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Luxembourg;

Outerbridge Horsey, of the District of Columbia, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic;

C. Vaughan Ferguson, Jr., of the District of Columbia, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to the Malagasy Republic;

Donald A. Dumont, of New York, a Foreign Service officer of class 2, to be Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary to the Kingdom of Burundi;

William C. Doherty, of Maryland, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Jamaica;

Olcott H. Deming, of Connecticut, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Uganda; and

Sigurd S. Larmon, of New York, to be a member of the U.S. Advisory Commission on Information.

The VICE PRESIDENT. If there be no further reports of committees, the nominations on the Executive Calendar, beginning with the new reports, will be stated.

AMBASSADORS

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of ambassadors.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that these nominations be considered en bloc.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nominations will be considered en bloc; and, without objection, they are confirmed.

WORLD HEALTH ORGANIZATION

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Dr. James Watt, of the District of Columbia, to be the representative of the United States of America on the Executive Board of the World Health Organization.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

UNITED NATIONS

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations to the United Nations.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that these nominations be considered en bloc.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nominations will be considered en bloc; and, without objection, they are confirmed.

U.S. ARMS CONTROL AND DISARMAMENT AGENCY

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Archibald S. Alexander, of New Jersey, to be an Assistant Director of the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the diplomatic and Foreign Service which had been placed on the Secretary's desk.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that these nominations be considered en bloc.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nominations will be considered en bloc; and, without objection, they are confirmed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of these nominations.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

USE OF MH-30 ON TOBACCO

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, for several years there has been agitation in some circles of the tobacco industry and within some areas of the Department of Agriculture to outlaw the use of MH-30, a chemical used to control suckers in tobacco. No evidence whatsoever to show that the use of the chemical MH-30 reduces the quality of tobacco has been offered. It is a substitute for hand labor, the expense of which would be at least $50 to $75 an acre. Furthermore, hand labor would not be available if this chemical were not used in connection with the production of tobacco.

Mr. President, I think the best evidence that the use of MH-30 is not harmful to the quality of tobacco is the fact that during the calendar year 1962, only 2.38 percent of Georgia's tobacco crop went into the loan. The marketplace is the best evidence of quality. The Secretary of Agriculture has recently promulgated new grade classifications for tobacco; and if there were any defect in the quality, these grade classifications, plus the marketplace, would show it up.

Mr. President, the general assembly of Georgia has passed a joint resolution on this subject. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

H.R. 188

Resolution opposing a move being made through official channels to require the identifying by tagging of tobacco treated with maleic hydrazide (MH-30)

Whereas the production of tobacco is a major source of livelihood for thousands of farmers and modern methods of production are a necessity in the competition of our times; and

Whereas the use of chemicals and other modern aids are primarily the reasons for the high level of the American standard of living; and

Whereas the use of the chemical maleic hydrazide (MH-30) as a growth inhibitor for controlling suckers in tobacco is a necessity if the farmer is to compete under contemporary economic conditions; and

Whereas the tobacco manufacturers and exporters have given no valid scientific and/or medical reasons for outlawing the use of chemical MH-30 in tobacco production; and

Whereas during recent long and costly hearings called by the Secretary of Agriculture Orville L. Freeman, and conducted for the States producing flue-cured and burley tobacco, no new evidence was brought out indicating that MH-30 was a causal agent harmful to smokers; and

Whereas despite these public hearings and despite a biased report on MH-30 by a U.S. Department of Agriculture interagency committee, the tobacco companies failed in their efforts to get a 50-percent discount rate on the 1963 tobacco crop; and

Whereas the latest attempt by the manufacturers and exporters to force their will on the tobacco growers by influencing through executive decree for identifying purposes the tagging of its tobacco treated with MH-30 and place the farmers completely at the mercy of the buyers; and

Whereas the fine cooperative spirit that has long existed between the farmer and buyer has been virtually destroyed by the aforementioned unscrupulous tactics: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the General Assembly of Georgia, That this body condemn the subtle, insidious and secret methods attempted to discriminate against the tobacco farmers of the flue-cured and burley tobacco areas; and be it further

Resolved, That this body does hereby invoke censure upon all of those responsible for the behind-the-scenes battle to arbitrarily impose their unjust scheme to achieve economic gain at the expense of the farmer; and be it further

Resolved, That this body does hereby deplore the circumventing of democratic processes in this matter relating to the use of MH-30; and be it further

Resolved, That this body does hereby recommend, urge and request that congressional investigation be conducted immediately into all aspects of this matter; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be transmitted to the U.S. Senators and Representatives, the Governors and commissioners of agriculture of the States affected and to all companies purchasing tobacco in these tobacco belts.

In senate, read and adopted, March 5, 1963.
GEORGE D. STEWART,
Secretary.

In house, read and adopted, March 4, 1963.
GLENN W. ELLARD,
Clerk.

CUBAN DISCLOSURES AND FOREIGN POLICY

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I have spoken many times on the floor of the Senate on issues of foreign policy. It has never seemed to me that any reasonable concept of bipartisanship ruled out discussions—full and frank discussions—of such issues.

There is a distorted concept of bipartisanship which abhors Senate discussion. I am frank to say that it is sometimes espoused by Democrats in a Democratic administration just as readily as it is sometimes espoused by Republicans in a Republican administration. Bipartisanship, in this distortion, suggests that if you have something nice to say about the way foreign policy is being conducted, say it; otherwise do not say anything.

I think the record will show that I have never subscribed to that concept of bipartisanship in any administration, Republican or Democratic. Nor do I subscribe to it now. Mr. Kennedy did not subscribe to it as a Senator; nor does he now as President of the United States.

Cuba or any issue of foreign policy which may be of concern to the American people is of concern to the Senate. Bipartisanship does not constrain silence in these matters in the Senate. On the contrary, it compels consideration. But the highest interest of the people does place the restraints of national responsibility—not Democratic, not Republican, but national responsibility—on all of us. We need to select our words with caution and speak them with care. It does not matter whether we call these restraints bipartisanship, patriotism, common national sense or whatever. What does matter is that we remain ever aware that the margin for error is close in critical foreign policy issues, and we cannot afford to fill it up with politics as usual.

I question the motives of no Senator who may raise the Cuban question. It would be wise, however, if each Senator who deigns to speak on this dangerous matter examined consciously and conscientiously his own motives. Each of us might well ask himself three questions: First, am I talking for a partisan purpose? Second, am I talking with the full realization that my words may help to drive the people and the President's course toward war, limited or unlimited? Third, am I talking with the belief that my words will help the President in his primary task of safeguarding the security of the United States and its national reputation for honesty, integrity and decency while he attempts to exert a constructive influence for freedom and peace, not only with respect to Cuba, but throughout the hemisphere and the world?

I ask the Senate to ponder these questions. I ask each Senator to ponder them and his own silent responses to them, for these are questions which sooner or later each of us will have to answer to our own conscience, if not to our electorates.

I would ask all Senators to ponder the statement of the late Senator from Michigan, Mr. Vandenberg:

> I think the Senate is entitled, at any time it pleases, to use the advice clause of the Constitution to tell the Executive what it thinks concerning foreign affairs. But I think it would be a tragic and unfortunate thing if the habit ever became general or too contagious because I respectfully submit, * * * only in those instances in which the Senate can be sure of a complete command of all the essential information prerequisite to an intelligent decision, should it take the terrific chance of muddying the international waters by

some sort of premature and ill-advised expression of its advice to the Executive.

If there is to be public criticism of policy, in short, let it be wise, dispassionate and constructive criticism. If the President's course is to be questioned, let reasonable alternatives be offered and let them be reasonably debated.

With that as background, Mr. President, let me say that I looked with favor on the revival of Senate discussion of the Cuban question some time ago. It seemed to me that in defusing the Soviet missile threat on the island—I would suggest that all of us, in the Senate and in the Nation, recall our feelings at that time—the President had also set the stage for useful Senate discussion of the Cuban situation. It seemed to me that wise and dispassionate consideration in the Senate would open up new thought and new ideas from which the President might benefit in discharging his grave responsibilities on behalf of all of us.

There has, indeed, been discussion of Cuba, but little of it has been dispassionate and even less of it has been constructive. What has evolved, instead, has been a trial of policy by press releases, with the size and sensationalism of the headlines which they produce serving as evidence, judge and jury. Some days ago I cautioned against the course this discussion was taking. I made a plea on the floor for consideration of the President's grave burdens. I did not argue against discussion. I argued for discussion couched in the restraints of reason, the restraints of high national interest. These restraints have not been visible. In my opinion, much of the discussion of Cuba by Members of the Congress is not helping this Nation; it is hurting it. It is not helping the President; it is hindering him. We have indeed had discussions of Cuba, but a discussion steeped in politics, panic, and the perversion of fact.

I have been reluctant to reach this conclusion, for it reflects no credit on the Senate. Nevertheless, I am compelled to it by the recent discussion of the report that four American flyers lost their lives during the ill-fated Bay of Pigs invasion.

I did not wish to reveal the contents of the report which I am about to reveal, but I see no alternative. When the distinguished minority leader noted that he had just learned of the death of the four flyers, I was asked by the press to confirm it. I did so. I did not know why the distinguished minority leader raised the matter, but since it was raised by him—and he is a most responsible man—I saw no point in refusing to confirm the fact. I thought that would be an end to it, for I could not conceive of any earthly advantage to the Nation in a public delving in detail into this matter. And I could conceive of many, many disadvantages to the Nation.

But I was mistaken—very much mistaken—Mr. President, if I thought that would be an end to it. On the contrary, the matter has been pressed and pressed, and to what end? Are we going to get closer to a solution of this critical problem of Cuba if we know every gruesome detail of the death of these unfortunate men, if we ascertain that 4, 8, or 16 Americans lost their lives in the ill-fated Bay of Pigs venture? Just what is it—what national purpose is served by this macabre fixation? Do we serve our own purposes or those of our adversaries when we take a dark and obscure function and throw so much light on how it operates that whatever value it may have for the security of this Nation is seriously compromised thereby? Do we serve our own purposes or those of our adversaries when we suggest—as this fixation does—that Cuban liberty can be bought with hired, well-paid American pilots, if only we hire enough and then not only hire them to fly but also give them a free hand to determine by their actions the course of U.S. policy? In this connection, I read from a UPI story of March 7, 1963—only yesterday:

> When failure of the invasion appeared sure * * * one of the American pilots proposed a plan to bring the United States into the conflict. Aircraft with Cuban markings would strafe runways and drop a few bombs on areas inside the naval base at Guantanamo.

This is no secret. This is from the news files of the United Press International, March 7, 1963—in other words, on yesterday.

Is this the way those who are looking for political profit in this affair would have the life-and-death questions of the Nation decided? Or will they stop playing with fire and get behind the President, the one man, the only man, whom the American people, in their wisdom, have chosen to make the critical decisions?

No, Mr. President, I see no national purpose served by this discussion. But I do see others. Examine for a moment, Mr. President, the context in which the drums have been struck and struck again on this matter of the death of the flyers. Clearly, the impression was permitted to gain national and international credence—and if Senators do not believe it, they can read the front pages of any newspaper in the Nation—that the tragic news of the loss of these men was suppressed by the Kennedy administration. And if the Kennedy administration would suppress this information, how much more, indeed, might it not be hiding in the dark archives of the White House and the State Department?

I now read to the Senate, Mr. President, a report which I have obtained on what occurred:

> Four Americans flying for anti-Castro forces apparently were killed during the ill-fated Cuban invasion when their cargo plane crashed in the Caribbean.
>
> A spokesman for a Miami concern that had put the Cuban rebels in touch with the fliers said the four had been missing since about April 19 and are presumed to have perished.
>
> The spokesman, Alex E. Carlson, a Miami Springs lawyer, said he represented the Double Check Corp., a concern that acted as a broker in locating fliers for Cubans attempting to overthrow Premier Fidel Castro.
>
> Mr. Carlson identified the missing fliers as Riley W. Shamburger, the pilot; Thomas W. Ray, copilot; Leo F. Baker, engineer; and Wade C. Gray, radioman, all residents of Birmingham.

That report, Mr. President corroborates the story which has recently been revealed to the press by Members of the Congress. It was this report which I have in my possession which more than anything else led me to confirm the story recently released with all the tense trappings of an uncovered skeleton in the closet of the Kennedy administration. Where did I get this report which I have just read, Mr. President? Did I copy it from those who have recently revealed it with such shocking impact? Did I ferret it out of the White House or the State Department? What is its classification? "Secret"? "Top Secret"? "Eyes only"?

I read the source, Mr. President: Dateline Birmingham, Ala., May 4—AP—from the New York Times, May 5, 1961—1961—page 11.

One year and 9 months ago, Mr. President, in the public press, we find the same story that is now being used as an uncovered secret to cast doubt on the veracity and honesty of the administration. This then is the great new revelation, the sensational new discovery, which set the tone for the revival of a great debate on Cuba, a news item which first appeared in the press a year and 9 months ago. Is this the sort of thing that helps the Nation? Is this the sort of thing that sheds light on a most difficult and complex and dangerous situation? Is this the sort of thing that represents a responsible contribution by a responsible opposition to the Nation's policies on which the security and good name of the Nation depend? Or is it a glaring example of irresponsible politics, of panic politics at its worst? That is a cruel thing, Mr. President, to do to the families of those who died, and it is a reckless thing to do to the conduct of foreign policy. It would seem to me that those who have sought to build this matter into a mountain of suspicion and distrust of the President owe an apology to Mr. Kennedy. But even more, they owe an apology to the people of this Nation.

Mr. President, the CIA, under it Director, John A. McCone, performs a useful and necessary service for the people of the Nation. It has been very frank in attempting to put the facts before the Congress—in my opinion, too frank, considering the nature of its work. I think it is about time that those who directly or by innuendo charge that the administration is "managing the news" on Cuba acknowledge that these demands, if met, can only lead to a total compromising of the work of this Agency, an embarrassment not of the President but of the Nation. Perhaps that is not too large a price to pay for full information. Each Senator will have to make that equation for himself. But it seems to me that if full disclosure is what is desired, Senators might well consider drastically curtailing this function and this agency. For, in my opinion, the Nation will be done less harm by that course than by a public examination of each and every detail of these operations.

I say once more what has been said before, it would be best for those who have a penchant to play CIA Chief, Secretary of State and Defense to turn their attention to the legislative chores which confront them, to the needs of the people of the United States. If we must be the sleuths, let us find the culprits in the state of the Nation's sluggish economy. Let us get on with a tax cut which will strengthen the financial position of millions of Americans. Let us take an honest look at the principle of equal opportunity for all Americans, and how it is operating in practice. Let us probe in depth the educational needs of the Nation and the health and hospitalization needs. Let us take a hard look at the strangulation and the decay of our cities. Let us penetrate in depth into the questions posed by automation and persistent unemployment now at a 6.1-percent figure.

These are matters of immense concern to the present and future of this Nation, no less serious than Cuba or any other problem of foreign policy. And it will take Senators and Representatives, not sleuths, to deal with them. It will take a hard wrestle with reality to face these facts and to devise public policies for dealing with them. The President has proposed. It is about time that this Congress began to dispose.

Let me reiterate, Mr. President, that the Senator from Montana still has no objection to dispassionate discussion of the Cuban situation on the floor of the Senate. However discouraging this political prowling over the dead may be, the Senator from Montana is still hopeful that reason will prevail in this body on Cuban policies and that this body will yet make the contribution which it can make. And so he welcomes the continuance of the discussion. But let me say again, if we are to call shots in this delicate arena as we see them, let us be reasonably certain that we have seen them before we call them. And if we are to try to move the cautious and deliberate policies of the President off the course of national peace, national security, and international decency, on which he has tried to set them, let us be sure of our intentions. If there are those who would continue with this reckless flaming of public emotions, let them at least acknowledge what they are about. This is not a child's game. It is not a TV thriller. To continue to toy with these questions as has been done in the recent past is to toy with the life of the Nation.

HARTKE URGES SUPPORT OF OPERATION FREE ENTERPRISE

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, on my return from Africa last December, I urged through correspondence, Hon. Luther Hodges, the Secretary of Commerce, to consider the establishment of a Senior Peace Corps, comprised of retired businessmen who could devote some of their time to teaching their know-how to businessmen in the underdeveloped countries of the world.

Everywhere I went in Africa, there was a desire for American business methods, which are admired by nearly all Africans. Also, they seem to be impressed with the hard work that is a badge of most American businessmen.

I assumed that if this were true in Africa, it must be true in other underdeveloped countries, such as some of our neighbors to the south of us in Latin America and South America.

For several weeks now Secretary Hodges, his assistant, Dr. Jack N. Behrman, officials of the Agency for International Development, the State Department, and I have discussed this most important project.

Recently the Agency for International Development announced that a pilot project, using the idea of a peace corps, comprised of senior or retired businessmen, could be created in Liberia and in Nigeria.

Dr. Behrman plans to contact leaders in the business community soon to get their reaction to a proposed Senior Peace Corps. A recent article in the Washington Evening Star of March 6, 1963, by Mr. Robert Hochstein, contributing writer, covers some of these facts in a story headed "Business Peace Corps Wins Behrman Support," and I ask unanimous consent to have this article printed in the Record at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

BUSINESS PEACE CORPS WINS BEHRMAN SUPPORT

(By Robert Hochstein)

Assistant Secretary of Commerce Jack N. Behrman plans to contact leaders in the business community soon to get their reaction to a proposed Senior Peace Corps.

Mr. Behrman said the idea to utilize the skills of retired businessmen overseas suggested by Senator Hartke, Democrat, of Indiana, is an excellent one but that the initiative must come from the business community.

The Commerce Department official will get in touch with the businessmen on an informal basis. He said some businessmen have previously suggested their know-how be used in the manner proposed, but no one ever picked them up on the idea.

Mr. Behrman said costs for such a program should be on a shared basis between business and Government, but indicated the bulk of the financing should be by business.

PILOT PROJECT PROPOSED

Meanwhile, Senator Hartke, who proposed the concept of a business peace corps, said he had been informed that the Agency for International Development would like to set up a pilot project in Liberia or Nigeria.

An AID spokesman said these countries have been suggested for two reasons.

Because the knowledge of English is widespread, barring any language problem for the retired businessmen; and because the private business sector is strong in both countries.

Mr. Behrman said if a business peace corps becomes a reality, it should not function on only one continent. He said many problems are inherent in such a program, "but the Peace Corps also had problems in the beginning."

Mr. Behrman has been in contact with the State Department, as well as AID, about the proposal.

Senator Hartke, a member of the Senate Commerce Committee, suggested the idea of a businessmen's peace corps to Commerce Secretary Luther Hodges in January after returning from a 5-week factfinding mission in Africa.

LACK CALLED APPALLING

"The absence of American participation in the business communities of Africa is appalling," he told Mr. Hodges.

The Senator said that since many skilled and knowledgeable businessmen are retired on pension, they would be able to serve abroad on modest salaries. The only other costs involved, he said, would be transportation.

Everywhere he went in Africa, Senator Hartke said, there was a desire for American business methods which are admired by nearly all Africans.

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, I predict that Dr. Behrman will find the reaction good. I have received many, many letters from retired businessmen throughout the country supporting this proposal. Indicative of this support are some representative letters, which I now ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

January 24, 1963.

Hon. Vance Hartke,
Washington, D.C.

Sir: Congratulations on your idea of a peace corps of businessmen. I feel this proposal has merit and I hope it snowballs into something.

Gobs of money, doled out in the form of foreign aid, to so-called emerging nations does no good. With the help of experienced and successful businessmen, they could be taught to help themselves.

Thank you,

Paul B. Atwood.

Indianapolis, Ind.

Oskaloosa, Iowa,
January 14, 1963.

Senator Vance Hartke,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Sir: Re your recommendation as to utilization of retired businessmen makes real sense.

As a retired businessman, I feel that my ability as an executive in many lines of business in the wholesale jobbing field could be put to practical use.

I am 73 years old, married, no children, in good health; own my own home. Would move if the right opportunity presented itself.

I use a typewriter, but thought you would prefer to see my handwriting.

Let me hear from you.

Yours truly,

V. B. Reisman.

Irwin Union Bank & Trust Co. of
Columbus, Ind.,
January 28, 1963.

The Honorable Vance Hartke,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Hartke: I am delighted to know that you have added my name to your mailing list.

Your idea on organizing retired businessmen and manufacturers to work with people in the underdeveloped countries, I think is indeed commendable. It certainly should bear fruit.

Sincerely,

S. E. Lauther,
President.

St. John's University Graduate School,
Jamaica, N.Y., January 14, 1963.

Hon. Vance Hartke,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Sir: I want to congratulate you on your plans for a businessmen's peace corps.

In Africa especially this is needed because the greatest weakness of colonial rule is the lack of administrators. America can and should supply a large share of this deficit and it cannot be adequately met by the young. As you know, you can't teach administration—it must be learned.

Wishing you success with your proposal, I am

Yours,

HUGH C. BROOKS, Ph. D.

ALBANY, GA.,
January 15, 1963.

Hon. VANCE HARTKE,
U.S. Senate, Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

GREETINGS: I read your article with deep interest in January 14, 1963, Newsweek. I was with U.S. Government (civil service) 1940 to few months ago when I retired on nice annuity. Other assignments consisted of auditing, time and study, policy and procedure, etc.; last assignment being comptroller of large air base here.

I have three children—all college graduates—one an attorney with his master's degree associated with solicitor here (Malone & Drake). Other son, a contractor, graduate from Georgia Tech, in his own business at Pensacola, Fla. The baby, Katherine, a schoolteacher at Pensacola, also.

I am also a World War I veteran and prior to 1940 I was in pecan business, three of us having promoted pecan sales and production from about 15 million pounds to about 100 million pounds yearly.

I like leadership and promotion, big deals and the businessmen's peace corps appeals to me and as my past was entirely supervisory and management, I feel on the ground floor I could build with you.

Sincerely,

JULIAN R. DRAKE.

All references you want: Senators RUSSELL, TALMADGE know me personally—especially DICK RUSSELL.

COUNTY GOVERNMENT MAGAZINE,
New York, N.Y., January 17, 1963.

The Honorable VANCE HARTKE,
U.S. Senator, Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR HARTKE: I have just read with great interest that you are planning to propose a businessmen's peace corps. The idea is most intriguing and deserves careful study. May I wish you much luck in its fulfillment.

You may be interested in reading the article on page 16 entitled "Operation Can Do" in the enclosed issue of County Government magazine, an official New York State publication. This article although it does not propose a peace corps of retired business executives, it does suggest a way whereby business and private enterprise can help the progress of less developed nations. Although your suggestion and the substance of the article are different, I feel that to a great extent the proposals are parallel.

I would be very grateful to be given the opportunity of hearing more of your proposal, and, if you have the time, to have your reactions on "Operation Can Do."

With kind regards, I am

Respectfully yours,

JAMES H. HEINEMAN,
Editor and Publisher.

SEATTLE, WASH., *January 11, 1963.*

Hon. VANCE HARTKE,
U.S. Senate,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR HARTKE: The attached news article published in the Seattle Times of January 6, 1963, was of interest to me since my wife and I had an opportunity to spend about 4 months in Africa (South Africa, Rhodesia, Tanganyika, Kenya) in 1961. Our visit was sponsored by the cultural exchange program of the State Department and the South African Nature Union.

Although my activities in Africa related to other than business affairs our impressions were similar to yours, as expressed in this article. In my opinion your suggestion has considerable merit. No doubt you will also agree that opportunities for beneficial cooperative efforts of this kind extend to areas other than business and industry.

Our interest in Africa—its problems and opportunities—was greatly enhanced as a result of our visit. We have given some consideration to returning following my probable retirement in about 5 years if there is any likelihood of our making some contribution in my particular field. I am professor of forestry, College of Forestry of the University of Washington, and previously spent about 20 years as park naturalist with the U.S. National Park Service. Thus, my interest and abilities revolve about natural resource conservation with emphasis on recreational land planning and administration. It was our thought that upon my retirement we might associate ourselves in some manner with some sort of educational institution such as Makerere College in Entebbe, Uganda. Unless something unforeseen develops financial considerations would not be a dominant factor—the main idea being the satisfaction of contributing a bit toward better understanding as well as greater knowledge of American methods in my particular field of interest.

Current planned retirement age is 65 (my wife is about 8 years younger). My health and physical ability is and always has been good since my work over many years demanded considerable self-sufficiency and outdoor activity. If your suggested program meets with approval and can be expanded to include people with a background such as mine, I may contact you when my retirement plans become more definite.

Very truly yours,

C. FRANK BROCKMAN.

[From the Seattle Times, Jan. 6, 1963]

AFRICAN AID BY RETIRED MEN IS URGED

WASHINGTON, January 5.—Senator HARTKE, Democrat, of Indiana, recommended today that the Government send retired businessmen from this country to the emerging nations to advise their business leaders.

HARTKE made the suggestion in a statement and letter to Secretary of Commerce Hodges.

The Senator said a recent trip to Africa convinced him that leaders there need advice on business and production techniques.

"Everywhere I went there was a thirst for knowledge of American business methods, which are admired by nearly all Africans," he said.

In his letter, HARTKE added:

"Businessmen and industrialists * * * would have the chance to serve the cause of freedom and free enterprise. * * * They would contribute to the expansion of our own trade; develop a business community capable of increased world trade and increase the standards of living and purchasing power of their peoples."

SYRACUSE, N.Y., *January 14, 1963.*

Re Businessmen's Peace Corps.

DEAR SIR: I have been reading with keen interest your program relative to the businessmen's peace corps. As I am semiretired I should care to offer my services, gratis, relative to recruitment.

This being contacts with businessmen, groups, and organizations, and giving talks before such groups.

I am well acquainted with business groups throughout New York State, Pennsylvania, and eastern Ohio. Presently, my time is devoted to presenting talks and writing speeches for business and professional men.

If you feel that I can be of any service to this project—I wish no salary—only my expenses—please advise me.

Very truly yours,

EDWARD J. MICHEL.

BERGDAHL, MCCARTHY, COURT ASSOCIATES,
New York., January 22, 1963.

Senator VANCE HARTKE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR HARTKE: Recently I read in Newsweek that you were intending to propose a businessmen's peace corps to be recruited for Government use in consulting and advisory capacities in foreign lands.

This writer is a retired executive with extensive experience and believes that your idea is an excellent one. Many retired executives would undoubtedly be glad to offer their services on the basis you have suggested if they felt they were really contributing something for the benefit of backward countries as well as for U.S.A.

The writer sincerely hopes that you will push this idea.

Yours very truly,

H. O. BERGDAHL.

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, in addition to the letters, there have been telephone messages and telegrams urging that such a program be initiated.

Each year, Mr. President, the Congress of the United States appropriates millions of dollars for foreign aid. Some of it, unfortunately, is not spent wisely; so that today there is in some quarters of our citizenry a hue and cry to stop all foreign aid. But our American businessmen, who have proved that their know-how can make them successful businessmen, are now free in retirement to impart their know-how to their foreign businessmen, so that they can begin to stand on their own feet and not rely on American foreign aid for assistance. I view this businessmen's peace corps as a project which could be rightfully termed "Operation Free Enterprise," an operation destined to bring to these new nations of the world the opportunity to develop, under their own system of government, a free business economy and one in which men can produce their products in a free economy—not a controlled economy.

This type of project is one more way that the tide of communism can be stemmed, and I urge my colleagues of this great deliberative body to lend support to this program and to work closely with Dr. Behrman and other Government officials to get these new nations moving forward under the free enterprise system.

MARYLAND MOVES TOWARD 17-YEAR-OLD SCHOOL ATTENDANCE TO END HIGH SCHOOL DROPOUTS

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, this morning the newspapers revealed that unemployment has reached the level of 6.1 percent, the highest level of unemployment we have suffered for a long time, more than a year. One of the reasons why unemployment is so high is that a very large number of young people are out of school and out of work. As a group these young people were the most heavily unemployed of any age group. The problem of high school dropouts is a serious one throughout the Nation. This is why earlier this year, in January, I submitted a resolution calling on school authorities to use their influence to raise the mandatory school-leaving age to 17.

I am delighted that this morning I can announce that I have a letter from the chairman of the House Education Committee of the Maryland House of Delegates, at Annapolis, who has informed me that as of the date of the letter, February 20, he was intending to introduce a bill to raise the mandatory school-attendance age to 17 in Maryland. I notice, on the basis of press reports, that the bill was introduced yesterday.

I am delighted to see progress being made. Although my resolution, submitted in January, has not had a hearing and has not been acted on yet, it appears it is having some influence. I commend the chairman of the House Education Committee of the Maryland House of Delegates.

I ask unanimous consent that his letter to me and my reply to Mr. Dillon be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MARCH 7, 1963.

Hon. R. SAMUEL DILLON, Jr.,
Chairman, House Education Committee, House of Delegates, Annapolis, Md.

DEAR MR. DILLON: Many thanks for your thoughtful note.

I'm delighted that you and a large number of the house education committee will submit a bill to the general assembly within the next few days to raise Maryland's compulsory attendance to 17 or completion of the 12th grade.

You deserve much credit for taking this step. You not only serve well the interests of the youngsters involved and their parents, but of your State and our Nation too.

The high school dropout and teenage unemployment problem is unquestionably one of our most serious. You are taking a long step toward correcting it.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM PROXMIRE,
U.S. Senator.

HOUSE OF DELEGATES,
Annapolis, Md., February 20, 1963.

The Honorable WILLIAM PROXMIRE,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR PROXMIRE: Thank you very much for the copy of your resolution requesting the States to raise the compulsory school attendance to age 17.

I, and probably a large number of the members of the house education committee, with the support of the Maryland State Department of Education, will submit a bill to the general assembly within the next few days to raise Maryland's compulsory attendance to 17 or completion of the 12th grade.

With all best wishes, I am

Most sincerely,

R. SAMUEL DILLON, Jr.,
Chairman, House Education Committee.

EXTRAVAGANCE AND WASTE IN STATUARY IN WASHINGTON

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, earlier in this session I introduced a joint resolution supporting Secretary of the Interior Udall's plea that we establish a commission to study proposals for memorializing distinguished statesmen. I pointed out that if we did not do something like this, Washington is going to become a jumbled and endless sea of statuary, without much relationship to esthetic values or planning. This joint resolution has been supported by a number of newspapers throughout the country.

I ask unanimous consent that an editorial from the Marinette (Wis.) Eagle-Star, supporting my resolution, and an article from the Rockford (Ill.) Register-Republic, reporting my resolution, be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the editorial and article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Marinette (Wis.) Eagle-Star]

PROXMIRE AGAINST CLUTTERING CAPITAL

Senator WILLIAM PROXMIRE, Democrat, of Wisconsin, has in effect joined forces with Interior Secretary Stewart Udall in an effort to discourage undiscriminating erection of statutes and memorials in Washington. Udall made a preliminary sortie against promoters of Capital statuary soon after he joined President Kennedy's Cabinet. Without help from Congress his efforts undoubtedly will prove futile.

PROXMIRE's immediate target is a proposed $39 million memorial to former President James Madison. The Senator called it a multimillion-dollar boondoggle and predicted that opposition to it would be denounced as an insult to a father of the Constitution and fourth President of the United States. He foresaw resentment by spokesmen for Virginia, Madison's birthplace.

PROXMIRE is taking a stand that others should support to get behind Udall in bringing some kind of order out of the chaos of Washington statuary and memorials. It is time that some kind of a critical organization, such as the Capital Parks Memorial Board, PROXMIRE proposes, be established to exercise some judgment over what is accepted for installation in the already cluttered Washington scene.

[From the Rockford (Ill.) Register-Republic, Feb. 16, 1963]

WASHINGTON'S MONUMENTAL PROBLEM: PROXMIRE ASKS CURB

(By Joe Fisher)

WASHINGTON.—Senator WILLIAM PROXMIRE, Democrat, of Wisconsin, has waded into a monumental problem. He wants to put a lid on Federal spending for massive memorials and monuments in the Nation's Capital.

PROXMIRE opened his campaign this week when he introduced a joint resolution to create a National Capital Parks Memorial Board. The board would evaluate all memorial proposals and recommend guidelines and policies to Interior Secretary Stewart L. Udall.

Already, there are 96 memorials on hand in the National Capital Parks System, and each session of Congress brings a rash of proposals for bigger and better monuments. In the 86th Congress (1959–60), at least 17 bills were introduced for memorial construction. In the 87th Congress, 8 memorial bills were offered.

PROXMIRE said it has become a custom to tag a revered American name to some unnecessary building or monument that leaves Congress with the dilemma of spending another $30 to $40 million for a monument, or failing to show due respect for the departed statesman.

"In such a clash, reverence for the departed statesman always clobbers economy," said PROXMIRE.

A case in point is the $39 million James Madison Memorial. While the project has not yet won congressional approval, members of the Memorial Commission have been appointed. The memorial will cost $15 million, but will be combined with a $24 million underground annex to the Library of Congress.

PROXMIRE said the Madison Memorial was a "multimillion-dollar boondoggle." At the same time, he said "any opposition will be viewed as an affront to the father of the Constitution, and probably as a calculated insult to Virginia, President Madison's birthplace.

Aside from the dollars involved in memorial construction, there are other important considerations. Who is to say whether a particular memorial blends with the overall Washington plan? Where are the new memorials to be placed?

The Franklin D. Roosevelt Memorial Commission still is trying to come up with a design which will appeal to the National Fine Arts Commission. Representative JOHN H. KYLE, Republican, of Iowa, has proposed swapping the 10-acre site reserved for the $30 million National Cultural Center for the 27-acre site set aside for the F.D.R. Memorial. As KYLE sees it, the site for the cultural center is "the worst in the Nation's Capital from almost every point of view."

One of the big objections to the F.D.R. Memorial is the design calling for eight slabs of assorted sizes set at odd angles to each other. The design certainly would be out of harmony with the nearby Jefferson and Lincoln Memorials. KYLE has suggested a Franklin D. Roosevelt festival hall as a substitute for a monument. Such a building, requiring adequate parking facilities, would be even less harmonious.

Washington is a beautiful city with broad streets and wide expanses of park land. The indiscriminate placement of memorials can do nothing but detract from that beauty.

PROXMIRE's proposal seems reasonable. Without some guidelines for memorial construction, Washington could become a city cluttered with stony statutary and, as PROXMIRE suggests, economy will be clobbered.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

THE RIGHT TO VOTE

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, in the March 4, 1963, issue of the Dallas Times-Herald there appeared a compelling editorial entitled "The Right To Vote." The editorial rightly describes the sense of outrage Americans feel when their fellow Americans are denied the right to vote. It concludes with this reflection:

> We must ask ourselves why the situation is such that Americans need special help from the Federal Government to obtain rights that were extended to them nearly a century ago.

Perhaps we can take further steps to remedy this situation during the 88th Congress, Mr. President. Certainly the support of newspapers such as the Dallas Times-Herald will help us to take these steps, just as the work of the Presiding Officer of the Senate, Vice President LYNDON JOHNSON, of Texas, was instrumental while majority leader in securing the first Federal laws protecting voting rights in 80 years.

I ask unanimous consent that this editorial may appear in the body of the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Dallas (Tex.) Times-Herald, Mar. 4, 1963]

THE RIGHT TO VOTE

The President's civil rights message deals in the main with a matter that should have been settled 100 years ago—the right of every American citizen to vote.

People have been shot in this country, not in 1863, but in 1963, because they believe the Constitution, because they think every amendment to the Constitution is basic to to whole document. One man was shot last week in Mississippi as he tried to help others obtain a place in the voting booth, a place so many of us take for granted.

President Kennedy is not asking the Congress to say who should associate with whom. The question is, do the rights guaranteed Americans in the Constitution apply to all citizens of the United States?

Congress can pass the laws that will make the answer an emphatic "yes."

States rights is not the question; it is individuals' rights. And the rights of an individual, guaranteed by the Constitution, should be of paramount concern.

The pity of the situation is not that the Federal Government is considering such legislation. The true concern should transcend even its passage. We must ask ourselves why the situation is such that Americans need special help from the Federal Government to obtain rights that were extended to them nearly a century ago.

OUTDOOR RECREATION—MODIFICATION OF UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, yesterday the distinguished minority leader and the senior Senator from Minnesota worked out a unanimous-consent agreement relating to a vote on S. 20, a bill to promote the coordination and development of effective Federal and State programs relating to outdoor recreation.

There was an agreement to vote at 4 o'clock on Monday. However, some problems have arisen with respect to that agreement, and I would like now to modify the agreement, and, indeed, to offer a new unanimous-consent request, in the regular order of the unanimous-consent statement, that the Senate vote on the outdoor recreation bill, S. 20, Calendar No. 6, at 3 o'clock on Tuesday.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. HUMPHREY. That would mean that the time following the completion of morning business, whatever hour that might me, would be divided equally between the minority leader and the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], or the Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON], whichever Senator was handling the bill at that time.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I reserved my right to object only to say that this request is indicative of the fact that there will be a session on Monday, and that there will be an opportunity on Monday to discuss this question, which is highly controversial. Therefore, the vote will go over until 3 o'clock on Tuesday, and the time after the morning hour on Tuesday and before 3 o'clock will be equally divided.

Mr. HUMPHREY. At the conclusion of the business of the Senate today, I will move that the Senate adjourn until Monday. Therefore, there will be notice with respect to this unanimous-consent request. I ask action on the request.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The unanimous consent as previously agreed upon yesterday contained some other provisions. Is it the Senator's intention to eliminate those other provisions?

Mr. HUMPHREY. No.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator merely wishes to modify the order originally entered.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes; that the vote be at 3 o'clock on Tuesday.

The VICE PRESIDENT. He wishes to modify the unanimous-consent agreement only in that respect. Is that correct?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I was not aware that there were other provisions in the unanimous-consent request agreed upon yesterday.

The VICE PRESIDENT. It also provided "that no amendment that is not germane to the provisions of the said bill shall be received." The Senator from Minnesota asks that the order be modified to substitute, instead of "Monday, March 11, 1963, at the conclusion of the routine morning business," the following: "Tuesday, March 12, 1963"; also, to change the hour of voting from 4 o'clock p.m. to 3 o'clock p.m. Is that correct?

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the order is entered.

COMMISSION ON SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of S. 816, Calendar No. 14.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 816) for the establishment of a Commission on Science and Technology.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I should like to express my support of the enactment of S. 816 to establish a Commission on Science and Technology.

The Senate has unanimously approved this legislation previously. It is not, therefore, necessary to reiterate the case for it in great detail.

In my view, a Hoover-type commission is an essential mechanism for taking an independent look at this vast problem: how to organize, or, if need be, reorganize, the U.S. Government so as to meet the formidable problems of science and technology in our time.

It is not enough that the executive branch can and does make studies of this nature on selected scientific issues. It is not enough that the President's Science Advisory Committee has made numerous important reports in the last 2 years, and that many distinguished panels are now at work.

These panels are chosen by the executive branch. They report to the executive branch. The report may or may not be released by the executive branch. I am not questioning the caliber of men who have been appointed to make these studies; they comprise many of the greatest scientific names in the land.

I am merely stressing the need for an independent "look-see"—to which the Congress has direct access and in which it, itself, participates.

I want to mention this, too, as regards the membership of these distinguished panels. There has been a feeling in some quarters that a sort of game of musical chairs goes on. Relatively small numbers of approximately the same numbers of able scientists are over and over again called upon by Government to appraise governmental programs. Many of them have formally served in Government. They invariably are men of outstanding caliber, but there is still concern in many quarters that the most candid and independent judgment may not always be obtained.

A so-called mixed commission along the lines of the Hoover Commission could secure independent judgment. It could review Federal policies on scientific manpower. It could look at the haphazard way in which certain scientific functions have evolved within some of the newer and older line agencies of the executive branch. It could look at the vital activities of the National Academy of Sciences-National Research Council. Many of us feel that the Academy-Council have not, for a variety of reasons, fulfilled a fraction of their potential usefulness to the U.S. Government.

I particularly invite attention to the fact that the Commission could take an important new look at the organization of the Federal Government for science information purposes. On pages 16 to 19 of Senate Report 16, I have personally presented a statement based upon my findings during work as chairman of the Senate Reorganization Subcommittee. I point out, for example, on page 19, that an independent Commission could make the type of root-to-branch analyses of the information confusion and disuniformity which still tends to characterize so much of the activity within the executive branch.

Many important information improvements have been made by individual agencies. An extremely important report has been prepared by the panel of the President's Science Advisory Committee on Information. There is, however, not the slightest reorganization or consolidation of Federal information services as yet in sight. There is not yet in sight any executive plan for a national network of information systems and services which this subcommittee has so long recommended.

I hope, therefore, that the Senate will enact this Commission bill and I trust that our colleagues in the House of Representatives will approve it this time.

The bill has been unanimously reported by the Committee on Government Operations, and it was previously unanimously reported on two or three other occasions. It has wide support.

It is a good measure. The Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN] is its main author, and has been for several years. The senior Senator from Minnesota held hearings on this subject. I hope the Senate will approve the bill.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, if there is other material in the report accompanying the bill, which might be explanatory and worthwhile, I respectfully suggest that it be inserted at this point in the RECORD.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I have marked in the committee report relating to the bill certain passages which I now ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD. I believe these statements make very clear the objectives and purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpts from the report were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ANALYSIS OF PROVISIONS OF S. 816

DECLARATION OF POLICY

This bill proposes the creation of a Commission to be known as the Commission on Science and Technology. Section 1 of S. 816 declares it to be the policy of the Congress to strengthen American science and technology as an essential resources toward the attainment of the highest potential of Government contribution toward (a) the promotion of the national security; (b) continued national progress in an era of universal scientific and technical development; (c) the procurement and training of the best qualified leadership to maintain and promote world peace; and (d) insuring the maximum utilization of all available scientific know-how and information by coordinating the research and development programs of the Federal departments and agencies with those of American business and industry and with nonprofit organizations, including universities and other educational or technological institutions.

Section 1 also emphasizes the importance of formulating a program for the establishment of national policies which will require coordination of science and technology programs and operations of the Federal Government, through necessary reorganizations of existing departments and agencies which relate directly to Federal science, scientific research and technology, increased efficiency in establishing systems for perfecting a scientific information program, and for the improvement of policies for recruiting, training, and utilizing Federal scientific and engineering manpower.

The bill includes, also, a special provision relating to, and assessing, the importance of how the executive and legislative branches can more effectively achieve common objectives for the advancement of science and technology in the legislative process, as recommended by witnesses appearing at the hearings on an identical bill in the 87th Congress, held on May 10 and July 24, 1962.

OBJECTIVES

Section 2 sets out precise objectives to which the Commission might direct its attention to include, among other areas of study, the following:

1. The establishment of programs, methods, and procedures for the effective reorganization of Federal departments and agencies operating, conducting, or financing scientific programs and supporting basic research in science and technology, with the objective of insuring more effective performance of these essential services, activities, and functions;

2. The elimination of undesirable duplication and overlapping between Government departments and agencies engaged in scientific and technological research, and in information storage, processing and distribution services, activities, and functions, with particular emphasis upon effecting the maximum utilization of the resources of private industry and nonprofit research organizations, including universities and other educational or technological institutions; and

3. The assurance of the conservation and efficient utilization of scientific and engineering manpower.

The Commission would be further authorized and directed under section 2 to make a determination as to the need for establishing within the executive branch of the Government a Department of Science and Technology, or for the reorganization of existing scientific and technological functions through the transfer of such functions to existing or new executive departments or agencies, to provide more effective and better coordinated Federal science programs and operations. The bill provides that, if such a Department of Science and Technology is deemed necessary, the Commission should, in so recommending, determine what existing functions or agencies should be transferred to the new Department, or to other departments, and which functions and operations, now performed by Federal departments and agencies, can more properly be performed by private industries or nonprofit organizations, including universities and other educational or technological institutions.

The Bureau of the Budget interposed objections to certain committee guidelines contained in section 2 of the previous bills to create a Commission on a Department of Science and Technology (S. 1581, 86th Cong., and S. 2771, 87th Cong.), on the premise that it might be construed as a directive to the proposed Commission to submit such a recommendation. The committee feels, however, that inasmuch as practically all witnesses, and numerous statements, articles, and extracts from publications and books which were inserted in the RECORD of the hearings, advanced or dealt at length (either for or against), with recommendations that a Cabinet officer for science and technology should or should not be appointed, the proposed legislation should contain a specific directive that the Commission determine whether such a department is necessary.

Some of the members of this committee have indicated that they were inclined to support the creation of such a department, but have been unable to recommend legislation to achieve this objective. There was no agreement among the expert witnesses who have testified as to what functions or agencies should be included in such a department, if it is established. All witnesses were in agreement that many of the scientific and technological functions of the Government should remain a part of the mission of existing departments, and that certain of those agencies established to perform functions in specialized areas of science, education, or research and development might operate better as independent agencies, or as presently constituted. None made specific proposals as to which agencies or functions should be included or which should continue to operate outside of such a department. Accordingly, the bill also directs that the Commission recommend, if it should determine that such a department is necessary, what functions and operations should be transferred to the new department, which should remain independent, or remain as an essential component of existing departments as essential to the primary mission of the department in which they are presently located.

GENERAL PROVISIONS

Section 3 of the bill waives the application of conflict-of-interest statutes for members or employees of the Commission while serving on a part-time or full-time basis with or without compensation.

Section 4 provides that the Commission shall be composed of 12 members of whom (a) 4 are to be appointed by the President, 2 from the executive branch of the Government who are participating in Federal scientific or technological activities, and 2 from private life who are eminent in one or more fields of science or engineering, or who are qualified and experienced in policy determination and administration of industrial scientific research and technological activities; (b) 4 to be appointed by the President of the Senate, 2 from the Senate and 2 from private life who are eminent in one or more fields of science or engineering, or who are qualified and experienced in policy determination and administration of industrial scientific research and technological activities; and (c) 4 appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives, 2 from the House of Representatives and 2 from private life who are eminent in one or more fields of science or engineering, or who are qualified and experienced in policy determination and administration of industrial scientific research and technological activities.

Sections 5 and 6 provide that the Commission shall elect a Chairman and a Vice Chairman from among its members, and that seven members of the Commission shall constitute a quorum.

Section 7 provides that Members of Congress and members of the Commission who are in the executive branch of the Government shall serve without compensation in addition to that now received, but shall be reimbursed for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of the duties vested in the Commission. Other members of the Commission shall receive $100 per diem when engaged in the actual performance of such duties, plus necessary expenses.

Section 8 authorizes the Commission to appoint and fix the compensation of such personnel as may be required in accordance with provisions of the civil service laws and Classification Act of 1949; and that the Commission may procure, without regard to the civil service laws and the Classification Act, temporary and intermittent services at rates not to exceed $75 per diem for individuals.

Under this section, the Commission would also be authorized to negotiate and enter into contracts with private business and nonprofit research organizations, including universities and other educational or technological institutes; to conduct such studies and prepare such reports as the Commission feels necessary to discharge its duties; and that financing and administrative services may be provided to the Commission by the General Services Administration.

ESTABLISHMENT OF A SCIENCE ADVISORY PANEL

Section 9 provides that the Commission shall establish an advisory panel, including competent and experienced members of the scientific and technical communities of the United States, to serve on request as consultants to the Commission or to individual members thereof while performing the duties of the Commission. The panel would consist of such number of qualified persons drawn equally from Government, private industry, and nonprofit organizations, including universities and other educational or technological institutions as the Commission deems to be adequate, who shall be chosen on the basis of competence, experience, integrity, availability, and ability to communicate not only to professional scientists but to laymen.

REPORTS, HEARINGS, AND TERMINATION OF COMMISSION

Section 10 requires that the Commission shall submit interim reports to the President and the Congress as it deems advisable, and that its final report shall be submitted to the President and the Congress not later than January 1, 1965. The final report of the Commission shall propose such legislation and administrative actions as in its judgment are deemed necessary to achieve its recommendations.

Sections 11, 12, and 13 authorize the Commission to hold hearings and take testimony as may be deemed advisable to secure required information and other data from executive departments or agencies upon request made by the Chairman or Vice Chairman; the necessary appropriations; and that the Commission shall terminate 30 days after submitting its final report.

SIGNIFICANCE TO PROPOSED COMMISSION ON SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY

Mr. HUMPHREY. As chairman of the Subcommittee on Reorganization, I expressed the view that the shortcomings in science information which the subcommittee has brought to light represent one of the many important reasons for the establishment of a Commission on Science and Technology, concluding as follows:

> A Commission on Science and Technology could serve as an important instrument for the examination of problems relating to the processing of science information. Only an independent Commission could make the type of root-to-branch analyses of the information confusion which continues to characterize the executive branch.
>
> Experience indicates that no Federal agency is likely to take the initiative of recommending the reduction of its own size. Thus, none is likely to recommend the transfer even of those of its information functions which bear no inherent relationship to the agency's central mission. Yet, some interagency information functions can be consolidated in the interest of economy, efficiency, and service—and without the slightest impairment of individual agency missions.
>
> No one claims that coordinating information is a cure-all for management ills; but few ills will be cured if information is too late, too disuniform, too fragmented, too hard to get, too unreliable.
>
> Five years ago, the doubters looked askance when the Committee on Government Operations and this subcommittee claimed that the information explosion had precipitated an information crisis. Today, most of these doubters are quoting our very words. But today, the doubters deny that a reorganization of information services is necessary. I believe that the future will prove them just as wrong as has the past.

Mr. President, I also wish to include the following extracts from a speech by the distinguished Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN], chairman of the Committee on Government Operations, when he introduced the bill in the Senate on February 18, 1963.

He said:

> One of the basic objectives of the bill is to provide a medium through which individual Members and committees of the Congress can obtain information which is not now available to enable them to take appropriate legislative action to establish definite Federal policies in the field of science and technology. The reports and recommendations of the Commission will also provide a basis for an evaluation of programs which are presently in operation as well as those which are being proposed.
>
> Evidence was also submitted at the hearings on S. 2771 in the 87th Congress which indicated that the Bureau of the Budget has reported that a detailed evaluation of existing science and technological operations of the numerous agencies operating in these fields has been found to be too difficult. The result has been that the agencies interested in procuring appropriated funds are not required to submit an evaluation of achievement under existing programs, but merely attempt to justify further appropriations of funds. Under this procedure, it was pointed out that Congress is required to appropriate funds on faith alone, since the appropriate committees and individual Members of Congress have no information which would permit them to evaluate the programs or to take the necessary action to eliminate excessive duplication and waste.
>
> Should the Congress enact this measure, it will be provided with a means of obtaining information and facts that will better enable it to perform its appropriate constitutional function. The Committee on Government Operations is firmly convinced that there is a real need for a bipartisan commission to study all of the science and technological programs of the Federal Government as proposed by this bill. It is further convinced that its enactment will insure maximum utilization of the resources of private industry and nonprofit research organizations, including universities and other educational or technological institutions, in the formulation of a properly coordinated program with the maximum utilization of the resources of private industry, nonprofit, and other technological institutions at a reduced cost.
>
> The committee in recommending this legislation in past Congresses considered it to be an essential first step in achieving these objectives so that the Congress and the President may have the benefit of the recommendation of qualified experts in the fields of science, engineering, and technology upon which appropriate legislative action may be taken to promote more efficiency in the operation of these programs and to effect economies that are essential in conserving Federal funds and technological manpower.
>
> In view of our current fiscal difficulties, I am sure all of my colleagues are sympathetic to any measures which seek a balanced budget. Nevertheless, our science and technological programs must not be hampered or neglected. I submit that this measure should result in material savings through a freer exchange of ideas and a better coordination between the various Federal agencies dealing with science and technology. It should eliminate much of the current duplication of effort. I, therefore, urge enactment of this measure during the 88th Congress.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

DECLARATION OF POLICY

SECTION 1. It is hereby declared to be the policy of the Congress to strengthen American science and technology as an essential resource toward the attainment of the highest potential of Government contribution toward (a) the promotion of the national security; (b) continued national progress in an era of universal scientific and technical development; (c) the procurement and training of the best qualified leadership to maintain and promote world peace; (d) insuring the maximum utilization of all available scientific know-how and information by coordinating the research and development programs of the Federal departments and agencies with those of American business and industry, and with nonprofit organizations, including universities and other educational or technological institutions; (e) the establishment of national policies which will require coordination of Federal science and technology programs and operations of the Federal Government through necessary reorganizations of departments, bureaus, agencies, boards, commissions, foundations, offices, independent establishments, and instrumentalities of the executive branch of the Government which relate directly to Federal science generally, scientific research, and technology; (f) insuring increased efficiency in establishing systems for acquiring, translating, storing, documenting, indexing, retrieving, and distributing scientific information through the establishment of the most modern systems of technology and automation; (g) improvement of policies for recruiting, training, and utilizing Federal scientific and engineering manpower; and (h) assessment of how the executive and legislative branches can more effectively achieve common objectives in the legislative process.

OBJECTIVES

SEC. 2. To determine the action necessary for implementing this policy, the Congress hereby declares that immediate consideration should be given to studying the means for attaining the following objectives:

(1) The establishment of programs, methods, and procedures for the effective reorganization of Federal departments and agencies operating, conducting, or financing scientific programs and supporting basic research in science and technology, with the purpose of insuring more effective performance of these essential services, activities, and functions;

(2) The elimination of undesirable duplication and overlapping between Government departments and agencies engaged in scientific and technological research, and in information storage, processing and distribution services, activities and functions, with particular emphasis upon effecting the maximum utilization of the resources of private industry and nonprofit research organizations, including universities and other educational or technological institutions;

(3) The assurance of the conservation and efficient utilization of scientific and engineering manpower;

(4) The determination of the need for establishing within the executive branch of the Government a Department of Science and Technology, or for the reorganization of existing Government scientific and technological functions through the transfer of such functions to existing or new executive departments or agencies, in order to provide more effective and better coordinated Federal science programs and operations; and

(5) If the establishment of a Department of Science and Technology is found to be necessary, the determination of functions now exercised by other departments or agencies of the Federal Government which should be transferred to that or other departments and what, if any, new functions should be given to such departments, as well as those which more properly should be transferred to and performed by private industry or nonprofit organizations, including universities and other educational or technological institutions.

SEC. 3. (a) In order to carry out the purposes of this Act, there is hereby established a commission to be known as the Commission on Science and Technology (in this Act referred to as the "Commission").

(b) Service of an individual as a member of the Commission or employment of an individual by the Commission as an attorney or expert in any business or professional field, on a part-time or full-time basis, with or without compensation, shall not be considered as service or employment bringing such individual within the provisions of sections 281, 283, 284, 434, or 1914 of title 18 of the United States code, or section 190 of the Revised Statutes (5 U.S.C. 99).

MEMBERSHIP OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 4. (a) NUMBER AND APPOINTMENT.—The Commission shall be composed of twelve members as follows:

(1) Four appointed by the President of the United States, two from the executive branch of the Government who are participating in Federal scientific or technological activities, and two from private life who are eminent in one or more fields of science or engineering, or who are qualified and experienced in policy determination and administration of industrial scientific research and technological activities;

(2) Four appointed by the President of the Senate, two from the Senate and two from private life who are eminent in one or more fields of science or engineering, or who are qualified and experienced in policy determination and administration of industrial scienscientific research and technological activiand

(3) Four appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives, two from the House of Representatives and two from private life who are eminent in one or more fields of science or engineering, or who are qualified and experienced in policy determination and administration of industrial scientific research and technological activities.

(b) VACANCIES.—Any vacancy in the Commission shall not affect its powers, but shall be filled in the same manner in which the original appointment was made.

ORGANIZATION OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 5. The Commission shall elect a Chairman and a Vice Chairman from among its members.

QUORUM

SEC. 6. Seven members of the Commission shall constitute a quorum.

COMPENSATION OF MEMBERS OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 7. (a) MEMBERS OF CONGRESS.—Members of Congress who are members of the Commission shall serve without compensation in addition to that received for their services as Members of Congress, but they shall be reimbursed for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of the duties vested in the Commission.

(b) MEMBERS FROM THE EXECUTIVE BRANCH.—The members of the Commission who are in the executive branch of the Government shall serve without compensation in addition to that received for their services in the executive branch, but they shall be reimbursed for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of the duties vested in the Commission.

(c) MEMBERS FROM PRIVATE LIFE.—The members from private life shall each receive $100 per diem when engaged in the actual performance of duties vested in the Commission, plus reimbursement for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of such duties.

ADMINISTRATION OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 8. (a) The Commission shall have power to appoint and fix the compensation of such personnel as it deems advisable, in accordance with the provisions of the civil service laws and the Classification Act of 1949, as amended.

(b) The Commission may procure, without regard to the civil service laws and the classification laws, temporary and intermittent services to the same extent as is authorized for the departments by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (60 Stat. 810), but at rates not to exceed $75 per diem for individuals.

(c) The Commission is authorized to negotiate and enter into contracts with private business and nonprofit research organizations, including universities and other educational or technological institutions, to conduct such studies and to prepare such reports as the Commission feels necessary in order to discharge its duties.

(d) Financial and administrative services (including those related to budgeting, accounting, financial reporting, personnel, and procurement) may be provided the Commission by the General Services Administration, for which payment shall be made in advance, or by reimbursement from funds of the Commission in such amounts as may be agreed upon by the Chairman of the Commission and the Administrator of General Services: *Provided,* That the regulations of the General Services Administration for the collection of indebtedness of personnel resulting from erroneous payments (5 U.S.C. 46d) shall apply to the collection of erroneous payments made to or on behalf of a Commission employee, and regulations of said Administrator for the administrative control of funds (31 U.S.C. 665(g)) shall apply to appropriations of the Commission: *And provided further,* That the Commission shall not be required to prescribe such regulations.

SCIENCE ADVISORY PANEL

SEC. 9. (a) The Commission shall establish an advisory panel, including competent and experienced members of the scientific and technical communities of the United States, to serve on request as consultants to the Commission or to individual members of the Commission while performing the duties of the Commission.

(b) The panel shall consist of such number of qualified persons drawn equally from Government, private industry and nonprofit organizations, including universities and other educational or technological institutions, as the Commission deems to be adequate, who shall be chosen on the basis of competence, experience, integrity, availability, and ability to communicate not only to professional scientists but to laymen.

(c) Any member of such panel who is a Government officer or employee shall receive no compensation for his services as such a member, but shall be reimbursed for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred in the performance of his duties as such a member.

DUTIES OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 10. (a) INVESTIGATION.—The Commission shall determine means of attaining the objectives of this Act as stated in section 2.

(b) REPORT.—The Commission shall submit interim reports to the President and the Congress at such time or times as the Commission deems advisable, and shall submit its final report to the President and the Congress not later than January 1, 1965. The final report of the Commission shall propose such legislation and administrative actions as in its judgment are deemed necessary to achieve its recommendations.

POWERS OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 11. (a) HEARINGS AND SESSIONS.—The Commission, or any member thereof, may, for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this Act, hold such hearings and sit and act at such times and places, and take such testimony, as the Commission or such member may deem advisable. Any member of the Commission may administer oaths or affirmations to witnesses appearing before the Commission or before such member.

(b) OBTAINING OFFICIAL DATA.—The Commission is authorized to secure directly from any executive department, bureau, agency, board, commission, office, independent establishment or instrumentality information, suggestions, estimates, and statistics for the purpose of this Act; and each such department, bureau, agency, board, commission, office, independent establishment or instrumentality is authorized and directed, to the extent permitted by law, to furnish such information, suggestions, estimates, and statistics directly to the Commission, upon request made by the Chairman or Vice Chairman.

EXPENSES OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 12. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such amounts as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act.

TERMINATION OF COMMISSION

SEC. 13. The Commission shall cease to exist thirty days after submitting its final report as required under section 10.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, is the Senate still in the morning hour?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Morning business is closed.

FEDERAL COORDINATION IN DRUG POLICY

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, on March 20 and 21, 1963, the Senate Subcommittee on Reorganization and International Organizations will resume hearings on Federal drug policy.

As before, these hearings will examine interagency coordination in drug research and regulation.

We will explore administrative and scientific problems, primarily within the Food and Drug Administration, but also extending to the entire Federal scientific community, including the U.S. Public Health Service and other agencies.

The principal examination of Food and Drug Administration organization and policy will not come until next month, however. At that time, the committee will hear testimony from Federal agency officials, including Mr. Boisfeuillet Jones, Special Assistant for Health and Medical Affairs to Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare Anthony Celebrezze, and Commissioner George Larrick of the Food and Drug Administration.

By contrast, in our March hearings we will receive expert testimony from largely private witnesses on selected drug issues confronting Federal agencies and also of great consequence to the health of the American people.

The list of witnesses will be announced as soon as the final confirmations have been received.

The subcommittee has compiled a mass of scientific evidence and judgment—far more than our other commitments will permit us to cover orally during the presently scheduled hearings. Much of this additional material will be printed verbatim, as heretofore, in supplementary exhibit volumes.

REPORT ON ONE-FIFTH OF A MILLION DRUG ARTICLES YEARLY

Included are several factual compilations, prepared at our request by Federal agencies. One, to be released shortly, is an important survey, "The Nature and Magnitude of Drug Literature." This report was prepared by the National Library of Medicine. It estimates there are around 200,000 original professional articles and papers in the world's pharmaceutical literature each year.

The report also briefly summarizes the extent of other printed outlets of the "drug explosion"—in the form of direct mail, detail men's brochures, as well as books, desk references, abstracting and indexing publications, and so forth.

RECENT PROGRESS PLAN FOR WHO SYSTEM

Since the subcommittee's hearings in August 1962, following the worldwide Thalidomide tragedy, certain important and favorable developments have occurred.

In some of these developments, observers have stated that the reorganization subcommittee has played a helpful role. For example, at this very time, experts convened by the World Health Organization are preparing recommendations for a formal, pioneering program in international exchange of drug information. This was a key goal of our past hearings and of subsequent subcommittee correspondence with governments and scientists throughout the world.

FDA NEEDED TIME FOR ACTION, REVIEW

In our own country, the past several months have afforded the Food and Drug Administration much-needed opportunity to propose new regulations under the Kefauver-Harris Act of 1962 and to consider the recommendations contained in the report of the second Citizens' Advisory Committee on FDA.

The time is at hand to take stock of progress to date and to examine continuing problem areas.

ADDITIONAL MEMBERS OF SUBCOMMITTEE

Fortunately, the subcommittee now includes, in addition to all of its previous members, three additional distinguished and able members, including Senator ABRAHAM RIBICOFF, former HEW Secretary, as well as Senators CLAIBORNE PELL and JAMES PEARSON.

INTEREST OF OTHER COMMITTEES

As before, the Senate Reorganization Subcommittee will study those phases of Federal drug policy appropriate to our jurisdiction of interagency coordination. Other committees of the Senate and House will be taking up problems pertinent to their respective fields. We have been happy to forward our past findings to each of them, including the House Government Operations Subcommittee on Inter-Governmental Relations.

In this period, the Food and Drug Administration will be presenting its case for the expanded 1964 fiscal year appropriations, recommended by the President.

Speaking personally, I feel confident that the expert Senate and House Appropriations Subcommittees for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare will examine the President's budget recommendations most sympathetically. I believe that the Congress is now well aware that FDA cannot possibly fulfill the enormous burdens which have been placed upon it, unless it is given more adequate resources.

But Federal drug actions involve more than levels of appropriations; they involve policy decisions and administrative and scientific implementation.

It is the subcommittee's task to submit to the Congress and the Nation the best judgment which can be mobilized from America's healing arts on these topics.

NATIONAL CONFERENCE ON RELIGION AND RACE

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, last year I introduced a resolution (S.J. Res. 200) to establish a Century of Freedom Commission that would have provided nationwide coordination in developing and executing suitable plans to commemorate the 100th anniversary of the Emancipation Proclamation. President Lincoln's historic proclamation took effect on January 1, 1863. Today it stands as one of the most significant actions ever taken by a President of the United States in the never-ending struggle for human freedom and justice.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the Emancipation Proclamation be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the Emancipation Proclamation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE EMANCIPATION PROCLAMATION, JANUARY 1, 1863

Whereas, on the twenty-second day of September, in the year of our Lord one thousand eight hundred and sixty-two, a proclamation was issued by the President of the United States, containing, among other things, the following, to wit:—

"That on the first day of January, in the year of our Lord one thousand eight hundred and sixty-three, all persons held as slaves within any State, or designated part of a State, the people whereof shall then be in rebellion against the United States, shall be then, thenceforward, and forever free; and the Executive Government of the United States, including the military and naval authority thereof, will recognize and maintain the freedom of such persons, and will do no act or acts to repress such persons, or any of them, in any efforts they may make for their actual freedom.

"That the Executive will, on the first day of January aforesaid, by proclamation, designate the States and parts of States, if any, in which the people thereof respectively shall then be in rebellion against the United States; and the fact that any State, or the people thereof, shall on that day be in good faith represented in the Congress of the United States by members chosen thereto at elections wherein a majority of the qualified voters of such State shall have participated, shall in the absence of strong countervailing testimony be deemed conclusive evidence that such State and the people thereof are not then in rebellion against the United States."

Now, therefore, I, Abraham Lincoln, President of the United States, by virtue of the power in me vested as commander-in-chief of the army and navy of the United States, in time of actual armed rebellion against the authority and Government of the United States, and as a fit and necessary war measure for suppressing said rebellion, do, on this first day of January, in the year of our Lord one thousand eight hundred and sixty-three, and in accordance with my purpose so to do, publicly proclaimed for the full period of 100 days from the day first above mentioned, order and designate as the States and parts of States wherein the people thereof, respectively, are this day in rebellion against the United States, the following, to wit:—

Arkansas, Texas, Louisiana (except the parishes of St. Bernard, Plaquemines, Jefferson, St. John, St. Charles, St. James, Ascension, Assumption, Terre Bonne, Lafourche, St. Mary, St. Martin, and Orleans, (including the city of New Orleans), Mississippi, Alabama, Florida, Georgia, South Carolina, North Carolina, and Virginia (except the forty-eight counties designated as West Virginia, and also the counties of Berkeley, Accomac, Northampton, Elizabeth City, York, Princess Ann, and Norfolk, including the cities of Norfolk and Portsmouth), and which excepted parts are for the present left precisely as if this proclamation were not issued.

And by virtue of the power and for the purpose aforesaid, I do order and declare that all persons held as slaves within said designated States and parts of States are, and henceforth shall be, free; and that the Executive Government of the United States, including the military and naval authorities thereof, will recognize and maintain the freedom of said persons.

And I hereby enjoin upon the people so declared to be free to abstain from all violence, unless in necessary self-defence; and I recommend to them, in all cases when allowed, they labor faithfully for reasonable wages.

And I further declare and make known that such persons of suitable condition will be received into the armed service of the United States to garrison forts, positions, stations, and other places, and to man vessels of all sorts in said service.

And upon this act, sincerely believed to be an act of justice, warranted by the Constitution upon military necessity, I invoke the considerate judgment of mankind and the gracious favor of Almighty God.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, unfortunately Congress did not act on my Century of Freedom resolution to establish machinery to provide for appropriate commemoration of this important anniversary. Nevertheless a number of such events have already been held; others are planned for this year.

Today I would like to draw special attention to one such event of unusual importance, the National Conference on Religion and Race that was held in Chicago, January 15–17. The National Council of Churches, the National Catholic Welfare Conference, and the Synagogue Council of America sponsored this conference to explore the contemporary forms and effects of racial discrimination and segregation. This cooperative effort constituted an impressive demonstration of interfaith concern for this country's most urgent human problem.

This conference held on the anniversary of the Emancipation Proclamation did not dwell on the significant achievements of Negro citizens during the past century, or the progress that has been made in the quest for racial equality, but rather concentrated on the vast problems that still exist. The American dilemma described by Gunnar Myrdal still remains with its far-reaching impact on American life and society. An examination of these fundamental and unresolved questions of human dignity, equality, and justice constituted the principal work of the National Conference on Race and Religion.

The speeches and discussions exhibited a common realization that the time for mere words, ideas, and intentions had passed. The imperatives of the present situation could only be met through dedicated, courageous, and sacrificial personal action and deeds. This theme characterized major addresses by such individuals as Archbishop Cardinal Meyer, Rev. Martin Luther King, Rabbi Abraham J. Heschel, Franklin H. Littell, R. Sargent Shriver, Jr., Rabbi Julius Mark, and J. Irwin Miller. Small working and discussion groups disclosed a similar determination. Concrete ideas for the improvements of race relations in this country were explored with unusual frankness and honesty.

Few participants coming to the conference brought the illusion that total solutions to such vast problems could emerge from 3 days of the most intense study and discussion. But lesser objectives were realistic and feasible, and the conference accomplished many of these. It brought the precise nature of the race problems in this country into sharper focus. It demonstrated that persons of all religious faiths actively seek the eventual resolution of these problems. It identified new channels and opportunities for such activity. It generated a feeling of commitment among the many religious faiths and denominations in attendance.

This commitment was given tangible form through the adoption of "An Appeal to the Conscience of the American People" by the conference delegates. This moving statement by persons representing all principal religious faiths is an action without parallel in the social and religious life of this country.

This appeal condemns no section of the United States. It admits that the churches themselves have often evaded and rejected their responsibilities. It recognizes that progress has been achieved in certain areas; but it asserts that far more remains to be accomplished. It closes with a call to every American to act courageously in the cause of human equality and dignity while the opportunity for such action remains.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this historic affirmation, "An Appeal to the Conscience of the American People," be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AN APPEAL TO THE CONSCIENCE OF THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

(From the National Conference on Religion and Race, January 17, 1963, Chicago, Ill.)

We have met as members of the great Jewish and Christian faiths held by the majority of the American people, to counsel together concerning the tragic fact of racial prejudice, discrimination, and segregation in our society. Coming as we do out of various religious backgrounds, each of us has more to say than can be said here. But this statement is what we as religious people are moved to say together.

I

Racism is our most serious domestic evil. We must eradicate it with all diligence and speed. For this purpose we appeal to the consciences of the American people.

This evil has deep roots; it will not be easily eradicated. While the Declaration of Independence did declare "that all men are created equal" and "are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights," slavery was permitted for almost a century. Even after the Emancipation Proclamation, compulsory racial segregation and its degrading badge of racial inequality received judicial sanction until our own time.

We rejoice in such recent evidences of greater wisdom and courage in our national life as the Supreme Court decisions against segregation and the heroic, nonviolent protests of thousands of Americans. However, we mourn the fact that patterns of segregation remain entrenched everywhere—North and South, East and West. The spirit and the letter of our laws are mocked and violated.

Our primary concern is for the laws of God. We Americans of all religious faiths have been slow to recognize that racial discrimination and segregation are an insult to God, the giver of human dignity and human rights. Even worse, we all have participated in perpetuating racial discrimination and segregation in civil, political, industrial, social, and private life. And worse still, in our houses of worship, our religious schools, hospitals, welfare institutions, and fraternal organizations we have often failed our own religious commitments. With few exceptions we have evaded the mandates and rejected the promises of the faiths we represent.

We repent our failures and ask the forgiveness of God. We ask also the forgiveness of our brothers, whose rights we have ignored and whose dignity we have offended. We call for a renewed religious conscience on this basically moral evil.

II

Our appeal to the American people is this:

Seek a reign of justice in which voting rights and equal protection of the law will everywhere be enjoyed; public facilities and private ones serving a public purpose will be accessible to all; equal education and cultural opportunities, hiring and promotion, medical and hospital care, open occupancy in housing will be available to all.

Seek a reign of love in which the wounds of past injustices will not be used as excuses for new ones; racial barriers will be eliminated; the stranger will be sought and welcomed; any man will be received as brother—his rights, your rights; his pain, your pain; his prison, your prison.

Seek a reign of courage in which the people of God will make their faith their binding commitment; in which men willingly suffer for justice and love; in which churches and synagogues lead, not follow.

Seek a reign of prayer in which God is praised and worshipped as the Lord of the universe, before whom all racial idols fall, who makes us one family and to whom we are all responsible.

In making this appeal we affirm our common religious commitment to the essential dignity and equality of all men under God. We dedicate ourselves to work together to make this commitment a vital factor in our total life.

We call upon all the American people to work, to pray and to act courageously in the cause of human equality and dignity while there is still time, to eliminate racism permanently and decisively, to seize the historic opportunity the Lord has given us for healing an ancient rupture in the human family, to do this for the glory of God.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the conference provided for local follow-up committees throughout the country. Groups have already been established in Chicago, Atlanta, Detroit, New Orleans, Pittsburgh, St. Louis, San Antonio, San Francisco, and Oakland. Other local committees will be formed when administrative funds become available. Moreover, the secretariat of the conference will continue to function for a period of time in order to transmit the work of the conference to these local groups.

Two excellent articles describing the work of the National Conference on Religion and Race also have been brought to my attention. One appeared in Christianity and Crisis, the outstanding journal founded by Dr. Reinhold Niebuhr and his associates at Union Theological Seminary in New York City. The other report appeared in the respected weekly journal, the Christian Century. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that both these articles be printed at the conclusion of my remarks.

I also ask unanimous consent that an editorial appearing in the Minneapolis Star relating to this conference be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles and the editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From Christianity and Crisis, Feb. 4, 1963]

SPECIAL REPORT ON RELIGION AND RACE

(By Stephen C. Rose)

CHICAGO, ILL.—Which biblical prophet is more relevant to the American dilemma, Amos or Jeremiah? I found myself forced to this question in attempting to understand the significance of the National Conference on Religion and Race, held in Chicago, January 14–17, on the 100th anniversary of the Emancipation Proclamation.

Both Amos and Jeremiah predicted the worst for Israel, but they differed in their estimate of Israel's capacity to extricate herself from national sin. Amos proclaimed the devastating lion's roar but suggested that man could turn from evil to good. Two centuries after the prosperous time of Amos, Jeremiah surveyed the wreckage of Israel and concluded that his nation was incapable of repentance.

Israel, in the person of the three major faiths, met in the land of Lincoln to bewail the national sin of race—the publicists ascribed a positive significance to this being the first such meeting—and to propose solutions to the problem. On the very first day the issue was drawn.

Jeremiah's mantle was donned by New York Attorney William Stringfellow who told the 600 delegates that the conference was, in his opinion, "too little, too late, and too lily white." A Jewish delegate arose to condemn the prospect of "4 days of breast beating and self-flagellation." And Rabbi Abraham Heschel, the keynote speaker, responded to Stringfellow by saying, "The greatest heresy is despair of man's power to goodness."

It was this latter note that dominated the conference and was reflected in the unanimously approved "Appeal to Conscience." History will determine whether this modern Israel—the American religious establishment—was, in fact, able to repent.

There was some substance to the allegation that the conference was too lily white. Only 1 of the 11 major addresses was given by a Negro, Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. Dr. King's speech came on the last day when major deliberations had been completed.

Although there were many Negroes present, certain significant groups did not attend: The National Baptist Convention refused the invitation of the conveners. CORE and the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee were not invited because they were not considered religious organizations. Perhaps the Black Muslims should have been represented, either in person or through a presentation of the threat that they offer to advocates of peaceful change.

Nevertheless the conference did bring together top representatives of 70 religious organizations in a determined effort to speak out in unequivocal terms against the sin of race. The 4-day session ended with a question common to many religious meetings: How are insights to be translated into action?

To some extent the conference was organized to answer this question. Although speeches were numerous, major emphasis was placed on hours of deliberation in small work groups, designed for frank discussion and the formulation of specific proposals. Although the conference was not organized with the authority to promulgate and implement specific policies, numerous suggestions were offered in the hope that they would provide a solid foundation for witness in specific situations.

Among them were the following: Whites should seek membership in Negro congregations and vice versa; the formation of small, direct action groups of laymen to meet problems; solicitation of open-occupancy pledges and sponsorship of voter-education drives; unequivocal preaching; rejection of offers of free land for church construction from promoters of segregated developments; elimination of discrimination in hiring qualified Negro employees in schools, hospitals, etc., operated by religious institutions; use of pension funds and other investments as weapons in the racial struggle by withholding investments from institutions that practice discrimination and consciously investing in Negro banks in order to increase available mortgage funds and integrated housing developments; purchasing only from companies with nondiscriminatory employment clauses; encourage members who are teachers to work in ghetto area schools; spark revision of textbooks that give an outmoded picture of the Negro; begin a "justice corps" of young people to augment the direct-action approach of the student nonviolent movement and CORE; encourage similar interfaith meetings on a local level.

These proposals are not new. But it was hoped that the setting of the meeting, the expressions of cooperation on the race issue by the major faiths and unanimous commitment of the "Appeal to Conscience" would operate to give impetus to a new effort by the religious establishment to speed the end of racism in America.

The 3-page "Appeal to Conscience of the American People" was approved with full awareness of the potential hypocrisy of another religious pronouncement. It embodies both repentance—"With few exceptions we have evaded the mandates and rejected the promises of the faiths we represent"—and a call to obedience—"Seek a reign of courage in which * * * men willingly suffer for justice; in which church and synagogues lead, not follow."

On paper, at least, the three faiths have now stated together what each has said separately in the past. The appeal also endorses the heroic, nonviolent protests of thousands of Americans as an evidence of greater wisdom and courage in our national life.

The ecumenical significance of the meeting is difficult to determine. It was suggested more than once that such a meeting—involving intimate conversation and mutual policymaking—could not have taken place during the pre-Vatican II era, and there is little question that the spirit of Pope John XXIII increased its ecumenical spirit. A clearer indication of the ecumenical trends will be given when the effect of the conference on a local level is known.

In preparation for the conference, pilot interfaith groups to deal with the race problem were formed in several cities, and it is hoped that such efforts will increase. The conference secretariat will continue for four months, primarily to disseminate insights to the local level. A permanent steering committee has been formed to forward the work of the conference and determine the need for future efforts on a national level.

The addresses were generally of high quality. Speaking for the Government, Peace Corps Director Sargent Shriver (whose journey to Chicago was regarded by the press in a political rather than religious context) minced few words: "The Government," he said, "looks to the religious community for its share of the task and encounters, too often, a bland philosophy of laissez faire."

In an excellent discussion of religion and race in its historical perspective, Prof. Franklin Littell observed, "Racialism has the same meaning where found among American Protestant churches as have the bitter anti-Catholicism and anti-Semitism which so frequently accompany it. They mark and mar a religion which has lost faith in the author of history, which is anxiously striving to retain old ways rather than retool to meet the challenges of the new age."

Another thrust at the conference was a largely unexpressed undercurrent; namely, that the time may come when the white community in America (and those elements of the Negro community that make their livelihood in white-sponsored race relations work) will no longer be able to take the initiative in the racial crisis. The shadow of Malcolm X was not absent from the corridors of the Edgewater Beach Hotel, and one suspects that subconscious fear was among the motivations of the assembled delegates.

In the wake of a potentially significant conference, filled with prophetic utterances and declarations, the Amos-Jeremiah dichotomy remains. Has the judgment been passed? Is it too late to achieve the American dream to which Martin Luther King referred so eloquently?

The tension between optimism and pessimism about religion's role in the solution of the racial dilemma remains with me, because at moments it actually seemed that the tremendous force represented by the Protestant, Catholic and Jewish communities might finally rise up and reverse the years of apathy and neglect. For a moment it seemed that the delegates might become evangelists of justice armed with the insight of James Baldwin's remark, "It's not a matter of acceptance or tolerance. We've got to sit down and rebuild this house." Only on the basis of such a radical response—rooted finally in the mystery of God's action in history—will the conference attain its high purpose.

[From the Christian Century, Jan. 30, 1963]

Religion and Race

(By Kyle Haselden)

One hundred years after the Emancipation Proclamation the religious organizations in the United States finally came together in one body to discuss the moral problem of racial discrimination and segregation in specific and concrete terms. Six hundred fifty delegates from 70 religious groups met in the first National Conference on Religion and Race at the Edgewater Beach hotel, Chicago, January 14–17. This interreligious conference, the first of its kind in the Nation's history, was convened by the Department of Racial and Cultural Relations of the National Council of Churches, the Social Action Department of the National Catholic Welfare Conference and the Social Action Commission of the Synagogue Council of America. The conference thus had the approval and support of the highest representative officers of the participating bodies. In addition to the delegates, several hundred observers and visitors attended the open sessions.

In the depth of the planning for the conference, the efficiency of its machinery, the comfort and conveniences of the housing provided for it, the mood of congeniality and cooperativeness which pervaded it, the earnestness of the delegates in grasping the problems which called them together, the auspices under which it met—in all of this the National Conference on Religion and Race was extraordinarily successful. But the tests of the true success of this gathering run deeper.

Whatever the values of the conference in the solution of the racial problem, it made a deep and far-reaching contribution to the solution of the interfaith problem. This was the most cosmopolitan gathering of religious leaders under religious auspices in American history. What Will D. Campbell said and William Stringfellow and others implied was in some measure accomplished: it is more realistic to seek a true inner life for church and synagogue through the race problem than to seek a solution to the race problem through the inner life of church and synagogue. The Nation's No. 1 domestic problem called together and introduced to each other people who on religious grounds have long been estranged. What else could have put in one room representatives of the American Ethical Union, the Christian life commission of the Southern Baptist Convention, the Greek Orthodox Archdiocese of North and South America, the Polish National Catholic Church, the Rabbinical Council of America, the Unitarian Universalist Association, the National Council of Catholic Men?

If a family so big is to gather in peace in one room, it has to be a room big enough to hold all its members. Particularities had to be submerged; generalities had to be avoided and the greatest common denominators sought. The harmony and the mutual dedications which were achieved were paid for in patience, restraint, understanding, courtesy, and a willingness not to say everything that could be said. It was an open conference, but the delegates operated on the healthful Pauline principle that though all things are lawful, not all are expedient. Brought together by a great cause, the delegates stayed together and arrived at mutual dedications despite the theological chasms dividing them.

But was it a successful conference on race? No, if it is supposed that such gatherings solve problems. Yes, if it is assumed that the meeting of minds and hearts on a vast and grave human problem is a beginning rather than an ending. Such conferences do not solve problems; they discover problems. They lift up the unresolved issues, identify the unused talent and resources, dramatize the unfinished business, renew the faltering commitments. In these respects the National Conference on Religion and Race was successful not only in the interfaith but also in the interracial quest. Two, three, five years from now will be soon enough to ask what good came of it.

From the brilliant, scholarly opening address by Rabbi Abraham J. Heschel to the moving plea of Martin Luther King, Jr., at the close the accent was on action. In the plenary addresses by Archbishop Cardinal Meyer, J. Irwin Miller, Rabbi Julius Mark, Franklin H. Littell, Robert Sargent Shriver, Jr., in the forums and work groups the accent was on action. Who, indeed, can say anything more than has been said? Who can resolve anything more than has been resolved? The conference declared explicitly and implicitly that what is lacking in human relations is not ideas, instructions, resolutions, but deeds—deeds such as picket lines, sit-ins, freedom rides; the less dramatic but equally creative deeds of love and justice in our homes, our neighborhoods, our churches and synagogues, our public and private facilities; the personal deeds of prayer, faithful obedience, courageous individual witness to the will of the God who set the solitary in families and made all men one.

Provision was made for a followup committee and, temporarily, for a continuing secretariat to put the resources of the conference at the disposal of local groups which want to transform words, ideas, and plans into action. The life of the secretariat, without which the accumulated values and resources of the conference will be inadequately used, will depend on the availability of funds for its support. But this is not the action the delegates had in mind; it is merely a means to such action. Already 10 follow-up local committees have been or are being formed—in Chicago, Atlanta, Detroit, New Orleans, Pittsburgh, St. Louis, San Antonio, San Francisco, and Oakland.

What were the complaints about the conference? It was said, largely unjustly, that Negroes were not adequately represented on the program and in the number of delegates. There is a measure of truth in the first part of this criticism. President Benjamin E. Mays, of Morehouse College, Atlanta, was chairman of the conference. With the exception of him and Martin Luther King, Jr., the talent and insight of the Negro were neglected. But it is incorrect to say that Negroes were not proportionately represented. All the religious groups in the Negro community were invited to send delegates. Although some of the groups did not accept the invitation, roughly one-fourth of the delegates were Negroes. Since delegates were selected on a religious rather than a racial basis, the Negro contingency was disproportionately large.

There were more serious omissions. A conference on religion and race should not—as this one did—ignore the Indian and other minority racial groupings. It would have been fitting to have paid some attention to the plight of Spanish Americans in the United States. Although most Spanish Americans are identified as Caucasians, their speech and physical traits subject them to the same kind of oppressions suffered by Negroes in American society. But even more serious was the failure to give recognition, credit, and responsibility to women. With the exception of Mahalia Jackson, who sang, and the Reverend May Yoho Ward, who gave an invocation, no woman appeared anywhere on the program. Yet the fact, which some of the delegates and participating groups seemed not to realize, is that the women of the United States have been far in advance of men in the field of interracial activity. This was a regrettable oversight, but fortunately it will not halt the courageous, far-sighted services of women and women's organizations.

The conference, tied to the nationwide celebration of the centennial of the Emancipation Proclamation, was the brain child of a young Roman Catholic layman, Mathew Ahmann of the National Catholic Conference for Interracial Justice, who deserves immense credit for the quiet, efficient work which brought this meeting to fruition. With the cooperation of Rabbi Marc H. Tanenbaum, of the American Jewish Committee, and J. Oscar Lee, executive director of the department of racial and cultural relations of the National Council of Churches, he initiated, planned, and directed the development of this historic gathering. He placed himself—and often the religious group to which he belongs—in the background and brought off without bitterness, rancor, or envy on the part of anyone an interreligious gathering which may prove to be epochal.

[From the Minneapolis Star, Jan. 17, 1963]

THE CHURCHES AND RACE

The National Conference on Religion and Race in Chicago found R. Sargent Shriver, Jr., appealing to churches and synagogues to "bury religious laissez faire in racial problems." The need, the Peace Corps Director said, is for social action programs which will produce concrete gains. Such programs could end segregation in churches where it now exists, Shriver suggested, and "introduce Negroes to every social and community event which the church sponsors or participates in."

It is difficult to generalize about the role of the churches in combatting the evils of discrimination. Even in the Deep South, where strictly segregated congregations are the rule, there is a wide range of opinion among laymen as to the morality of discrimination and many religious leaders have spoken out courageously against it.

But we think it will be generally agreed that even in the North, the example set by such leaders often does not reach deeply enough into congregations. As Shriver suggests, the example is frequently not translated into social action on behalf of basic principles.

It has been our impression, one sustained by inquiry, that Minneapolis churches and synagogues are generally outstanding in their dedicated work on behalf of these principles. The part played by various religious groups in combatting residential segregation and their efforts to educate the citizen to his responsibilities under Minnesota's newly effective Fair Housing Act, clearly suggests the presence of a powerful leaven of conscience which does not stop short of action.

We do not mean to imply that much more could not be done by these groups or by the congregations which they represent. But the picture often drawn of a spiritual leadership reluctant to war on discrimination, and of a lay leadership indifferent to inequalities of racial opportunity does not, in our opinion, apply to this community.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the National Conference on Religion and Race was a most relevant expression of the same concern for human values that prompted President Lincoln to promulgate the Emancipation Proclamation. I commend the persons responsible for conceiving and organizing this interreligious conference of historic significance.

A BIPARTISAN FOREIGN POLICY—CUBA

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I was conducting an executive hearing of the Internal Security Subcommittee. In consequence, I was late in getting to the floor, and therefore did not hear the statement made by the majority leader with respect to a continuing discussion of certain problems relating to Cuba. He was kind enough to let me see the manuscript of his remarks. I believe it is appropriate that I make at least this one comment.

I was curious, when, 20 months after the Bay of Pigs incident, and after it had lain dormant all that time, the Attorney General should see fit to bring the matter out on the front page of the newspapers. I was curious as to the reason and why, after it had languished for 20 months, new life was being breathed into what was, at the time it happened, a controversy.

I have an interest only in the truth. It was written on the ancient parchment, long ago:

> Ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free.

I think that is good gospel and that is good philosophy and that is sound doctrine for government.

It was in pursuance of that doctrine that I laid the matter before the policy committee of my own party and asked whether they thought it ought to be explored and whether a further report should be made on it. I have been exploring it, although it has not been necessary for me to energetically explore it, because it has explored itself from time to time. The letters, telephone calls, and telegrams and other material which have come to me bearing upon the matter indicate that there is a high degree of public interest in this subject. I have been exceedingly circumspect in anything I have said with respect thereto. I have sought under no circumstances to prejudge the matter. I leave that to take place after an appropriate committee of the Senate, where both parties have representation may, after an evaluation of the testimony, has come to a conclusion, and when one can ask any member of the newspaper fraternity. That is as much as anyone has received from the minority leader on this point.

It was only when a distinguished Member of the Senate, on a television performance, indicated that it was "spilled milk" that I, perhaps inadvertently, mentioned that spilled milk is one thing, but spilled blood is quite another. When he said, "What do you mean by spilled blood?" I said, "Well, I simply mean that perhaps Americans were killed in the Bay of Pigs operation, and you don't lightly cast aside spilled American blood."

I left it right there. But they worked their own will. They worked their own thinking upon that little morsel. May it be said to the everlasting commendation of the majority leader that he did then state on the floor of the Senate or in a press conference that four American flyers had been killed at the Bay of Pigs.

I asked nobody for confirmation. I was no party to any conference or any session, at the White House or elsewhere, where such a disclosure was made. But the majority leader stated, so that all the world could note, that four American flyers had been killed at the Bay of Pigs fiasco.

Of course, it is no wonder that this disclosure has seized upon the imagination of our people. It is small wonder that it has intrigued the interest of the press. So people continue to conjecture: What was the truth? What is the truth? What did happen? That is the only interest I have in the matter. I do not like to see a gap in contemporary history that may someday be referred to as the Bay of Pigs gap.

If there is any merit in the old expression, it would have merit now; that is, that open confession is good for the soul. So why not lay all the facts upon the record and let us have done with it? Then the whole truth shall have been told, and our people shall have been satisfied on that point. If there are other questions appertaining to Cuba which need discussion, they can be raised when the distinguished Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS], who is chairman of a subcommittee which is investigating the question, will finally make his report.

So, Mr. President, for myself, I must insist that my own approach to the matter has been most circumspect. I have at no time and under no circumstance undertaken to prejudge the matter. I leave it right there until such time as an appropriate group or subgroup of this body can go into the subject further.

OUTDOOR RECREATION

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 20) to promote the coordination and development of effective Federal and State programs relating to outdoor recreation, and for other purposes.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I was very sorry to read in the morning newspapers that the Republican leadership has announced its determination to fight the bill which is now before the Senate—S. 20. I think it would be well for the Senate, particularly the Republican leadership, to understand the background and origin of S. 20 and exactly what it seeks to do.

Public Law 85–470 of the 85th Congress, signed by Republican President Dwight D. Eisenhower on June 28, 1958, created an Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission.

The Commission was composed of four Senators and four Representatives, equally divided between the two political parties, plus seven public members appointed by President Eisenhower. Mr. Eisenhower appointed as the Chairman of the Commission Mr. Laurance Rockefeller, of New York. Senator CLINTON P. ANDERSON and I served on the Commission. Republican Senators BARRETT, of Wyoming, and WATKINS, of Utah, served on it for a time. They were succeeded by Senator Henry Dworshak, of Idaho, and Senator Thomas Martin, of Iowa. Senator Martin was succeeded by Senator JACK MILLER, of Iowa.

In 1961, when President Kennedy took office, Senator ANDERSON asked him to retain the Commission as it was constituted, even though it was predominantly Republican. This was done.

The Commission reported on January 31, 1962, after a 3-year study, including many detailed research projects. The Commission found—and I wish to emphasize that the findings were unanimous:

> The [recreation] demand is surging. Whatever the measuring rod—visits to the Federal and State recreation areas, fishing license holders, the number of outboard motors in use—it is clear that Americans are seeking the outdoors as never before. And this is only a foretaste of what is to come.
>
> Not only will there be many more people, they will want to do more, and they will have more money and time to do it with.

Recreation "activity occasions" ran 4.4 billion in 1960. It is estimated that by 1976 they will run 6.9 billion. They will be more than 12.4 billion—tripled—by 2000. These calculations are based on extensive studies, including a poll of 16,000 persons by Census Bureau for the Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission.

The report continues:

> After 3 years of research, and an aggregate of some 50 days of discussion among the Commissioners, the Commission has developed specific recommendations for a recreation program. The 15 members brought differing political, social, and resource-use opinions. During the course of the study and discussion, views of the individual members developed, and the collective opinion crystallized. The final recommendations are a consensus of the Commission.

Here on the very first page of the report are the personal signatures of every one of the 15 members—proof of their individual agreement to the statement and to the fact that the report was the unanimous consensus of all of us.

I invite the attention of Senators to the names of members of the Commission who signed the report, which is the basis for the proposed legislation which is now before the Senate.

The Chairman was Laurance S. Rockefeller, chairman of the Rockefeller Brothers Fund, New York, N.Y.

From the U.S. Senate: Senator Clinton P. Anderson, of New Mexico; the late Senator Henry C. Dworshak, of Idaho; the junior Senator from Washington, Senator Jackson; and Senator Jack Miller, of Iowa.

From the House of Representatives, Representative John P. Saylor, of Pennsylvania, the ranking Republican member of the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs; former Representative Gracie Pfost, of Idaho; Representative Ralph J. Rivers, of Alaska; and Representative John H. Kyl, of Iowa.

The Presidential Commissioners appointed—and I again emphasize that they were appointed by former President Dwight D. Eisenhower—were:

Samuel T. Dana, dean emeritus of the School of Natural Resources, the University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Mich.

Mrs. Marian S. Drvfoos, associate director of special activities, the New York Times, New York, N.Y.

Bernard L. Orrell, vice president, Weyerhaeuser Co., Tacoma, Wash.

Joseph W. Penfold, conservation director, Izaak Walton League of America, Washington, D.C.

M. Frederik Smith, vice president, Prudential Insurance Co. of America, Newark, N.J.

Chester S. Wilson, former Minnesota State Commissioner of Conservation, Stillwater, Minn.

All these individuals were appointed by President Eisenhower, with the exception of Mrs. Marian S. Dryfoos, who was appointed by President Kennedy in, I believe, 1961 by reason of the death of one of the members.

Mr. President, the names to which I have just now referred give the background and parentage of the recommendations which are before us. Certainly this group is composed of distinguished Americans who have been appointed without regard to party. The entire burden of the effort of the Commission was to do an effective, nonpartisan job, so that we could get a report which would result in general agreement.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Washington yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. RIBICOFF in the chair). Does the Senator from Washington yield to the Senator from Vermont?

Mr. JACKSON. I am happy to yield to my friend, the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from the State of Washington for yielding to me.

I wish to say that I think the Commission, which was appointed by President Eisenhower without regard to party, was an excellent one, and made an excellent report to the present administration.

I had hoped, and I still hope, that the extremely important recreation industry and its development and expansion will not become involved in any way in party politics. It would seem to me to be very shortsighted, indeed, to let that happen.

Recreation is one of the most rapidly growing industries in the United States today, and it shows signs of growing in the future at an even more rapid rate.

With the development of technology and assembly-line production, it has become possible for our industrialists to turn out the same amount of equipment of all kinds with much less labor than the amount previously required. Now we must find some way to take up the slack in employment which automation is creating; and the recreation industry lies immediately before us, waiting to be developed to several times its present size. That is particularly true in the part of the country which I represent.

Not only would the recreation industry take up the slack in employment, insofar as operating recreational areas goes, but in recent years there has been developed in the recreation field a demand for much new equipment which was not even on the market a few years ago; and this demand creates new industries and new employment in them.

The recreation industry has created a great new field for investment in this country. Even in our small State of Vermont we see millions of dollars of new money being put into recreation areas annually and thus creating new markets for recreational articles and new jobs for persons who otherwise perhaps would be unemployed. All of this, Mr. President, contributes to the taxable income of the country. I know small towns in my State which 10 or 20 years ago contributed virtually no taxes to the State, but now make very substantial tax contributions, not only on the property there and not only through the employment taxes on those who work in these areas, but also through the tobacco taxes, the gasoline taxes, and all the other taxes. If that tax income were to be lost, its loss could spell disaster to the economy of the State.

In addition, Mr. President, we must consider the agricultural situation of the country. In that connection, in order to keep in economic competition, farmers have had to change their way of doing business. They have had to double or treble the size of their farms, and they have had to purchase new machinery. All this has meant that thousands of small, uneconomic farms have had to be taken out of production. Then how were the small farms used? They were used as residential property; and more particularly, they now contribute to the recreation industry, for today there is a great demand for living accommodations for people who wish to come for a week or a month, or even to live there indefinitely.

In one ski area in Vermont, the manager of the operations told me that presently there is a shortage of 2,500 beds in that one area, and that 2,500 additional beds are needed in order to take care of those who wish to come from other parts of the Nation to visit or live there.

Mr. President, if we were to restrict this development in any way, if we were to turn down cold the recommendations which this Commission, appointed by President Eisenhower, has made, we would literally be taking the bread out of the mouths of our people, and possibly the recovery from the economic shock and loss caused by such action would not occur during this generation.

So I wish to support the Senator from Washington, and to state that I hope there will be no partisan position on this legislation or on legislation of this type. I hope we shall—as we did last year—enact this bill unanimously, so there could be no question about where we stand, and so that no one could charge any of us with obstructing the development of what is possibly one of the most rapidly growing industries in the Nation.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I should like to associate myself with the remarks of the distinguished senior Senator from Vermont. As usual, he has approched this problem—as he has approached so many other problems—in a statesmanlike way.

It would be most unfortunate if this matter were to become a subject of bitter partisanship. Actually, Mr. President, if the objective is economy and saving money, then the implementation of this proposal, by both the Federal Government and the States, will be a way to achieve it. It will avoid a waste, both of human and of material resources. The States are undertaking all sorts of programs in this area; and those programs need to be coordinated with the programs of the Federal Government. We have an opportunity through S. 20 to utilize the resources of the Federal Government, and also those of the States, to carry out a long-range, coordinated program to deal with problems arising out of what has been so commonly referred to as the great population explosion.

As the Senator from Vermont has pointed out, many great problems which are arising socially, economically, and politically as a result of our rapidly changing industrial technology. Our need is to find proper areas for recreation, not only for the youth of the country, but also for our older citizens. This bill—S. 20—is part of a desire on the part of all citizens—Republicans and Democrats alike—to meet sensibly this great demand which faces us.

This is not a wild-eyed program. I do not think Laurance Rockefeller and other businessmen on the Commission would jump off the deep end with a program which would hurt the economy of the Nation. This is a realistic program.

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] pointed out that a number of industries in our country have been growing and flourishing—in fact, they are called growth industries—because they are oriented toward the recreational needs and requirements of our people. Recreation is giving employment and new opportunities for business and for working men and women throughout America. I wish to commend the Senator for the point that he has made.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. JACKSON. I am happy to yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I am speaking not only for myself personally, but I am also speaking for my State, which supports the bill (S. 20) and the subsequent bill (S. 859) which was introduced by the Senator from Washington, and upon which hearings are now being held. The State Director of Forests and Parks for Vermont had intended to testify in favor of that proposed legislation before the Interior Committee, but unfortunately we had too much snow, sleet, and rain, so that the planes did not fly and he did not get here. But he has sent me his testimony, which I have asked to have inserted in the record of the hearings. So I wish it understood that I am speaking not only for myself alone—although I believe everything that I have said—but I am also representing the position of my State.

Mr. JACKSON. We appreciate that. I think it should be brought to the attention of Senators that the bill before the Senate is a bipartisan bill. It is supported not only by the distinguished senior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] and the junior Senator from Washington, but also the junior Senator from Iowa [Mr. MILLER], the senior Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], the junior Senator from California [Mr. ENGLE], and the junior Senator from Montana [Mr. METCALF], as well. We hope that the whole problem can be approached from that point of view. If we fail to do so, I think we will be rendering a great disservice to the country as a whole.

Mr. President, I should now like to turn to some of the recommendations made by the Commission.

The Commission made extensive and very detailed recommendations to meet the tremendously expanded recreation demand which is ahead.

They recommended not only a national recreation policy—by unanimous consensus of all the members—but also many specific steps which should be taken to implement that policy.

The national recreation policy unanimously recommended on page 6 of the report before me states:

> It shall be the national policy, through the conservation and wise use of resources, to preserve, develop, and make accessible to all American people such quantity and quality of outdoor recreation as will be necessary and desirable for individual enjoyment and to assure the physical, cultural, and spiritual benefits of outdoor recreation.
>
> Implementation of this policy will require the cooperative participation of all levels of Government and private enterprise. In some aspects, the Government responsibility is greater; in others, private initiative is better equipped to do the job.
>
> The role of the Federal Government should be:
>
> 1. Preservation of scenic areas, natural wonders, primitive areas, and historic sites of national significance.
> 2. Management of Federal lands for the broadest possible recreation benefit consistent with other essential uses.
> 3. Cooperation with the States through technical and financial assistance.
> 4. Promotion of interstate arrangements, including Federal participation where necessary.
> 5. Assumption of vigorous, cooperative leadership in a nationwide recreation effort.

To implement this policy, the Commission recommended, among many others, the following specific steps:

It recommended that we set up and adopt a national classification system for outdoor recreation areas, to facilitate understanding, planning and management.

It recommended that every State develop a statewide recreation plan.

It recommended systematic and continuing research, both fundamental and applied, to provide the basis for sound planning and decisions.

At page 9 of the voluminous report it recommended as follows:

> ### A BUREAU OF OUTDOOR RECREATION
>
> A Bureau of Outdoor Recreation should be established in the Department of the Interior. This Bureau would have overall responsibility for leadership of a nationwide effort by coordinating the various Federal programs and assisting other levels of Government to meet the demand for outdoor recreation.
>
> Specifically, the new Bureau would—
>
> 1. Coordinate the recreation activities of the more than 20 Federal agencies whose activities affect outdoor recreation.
> 2. Assist State and local governments with technical aid in planning and administration, including the development of standards for personnel, procedures, and operations.
> 3. Administer a grants-in-aid program to States for planning and for development and acquisition of needed areas.
> 4. Act as a clearinghouse for information and guide, stimulate, and sponsor research as needed.
> 5. Encourage interstate and regional cooperation, including Federal participation where necessary.

WHAT S. 20 WOULD DO

The Secretary of the Interior established the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation on April 2, 1962, in response to the report, issued January 31, 1962.

In other words, Secretary of the Interior Udall carried out the specific recommendations of the unanimous report of a bipartisan commission headed by Mr. Laurance Rockefeller.

The Bureau will do exactly what the Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission recommended.

Secretary of the Interior Udall transferred planning and State cooperation functions to it from National Park Service—duties imposed on that Service, as we all know, under the act of June 23, 1936. These functions were transferred and placed in the new Bureau. Secretary Udall did not have the other powers and authorities, as recommended by the Commission, to transfer to the new Bureau. So Congress has been asked to provide the authorities. The bill (S. 20) now before the Senate would direct and authorize the Secretary, through the Bureau, to first, maintain an inventory; second, prepare a system of classification of types of recreation areas; third, develop a nationwide plan, built on State plans; fourth, provide technical assistance as ORRRC proposed; fifth, encourage interstate and regional cooperation; sixth, sponsor, conduct, and assist in research; and seventh, encourage Federal departments and agencies to cooperate.

Incidentally, I might comment here that, the wonderful cooperation that now exists between Secretary of the Interior Udall and Secretary of Agriculture Freeman is to be most highly commended. They appeared jointly before the committee yesterday to testify together in support of other proposed legislation in this same general field.

Eighth, to encourage donations to the cause—money, lands, and other property that may be of help.

BUREAU IN EXISTENCE

The next point I wish to make is that the Bureau is in existence. Last year $1.1 million was transferred to it from the Park Service budget. In other words, the funds that the Park Service had for the functions that I have mentioned were transferred to the new Bureau. In the 1964 budget, which is now before the Congress, the request is for $2.2 million. What I desire to emphasize is that this will be a small bureau, a service organization, and not a land-management agency. The director, Dr. Crafts, has testified that, as far as he can see, at the very outside the budget will never go beyond $5 million. It will probably be considerably less than that, as a matter of fact at the peak.

There is no money authorization in the bill, because the Bureau is already in existence; and is a budgeted agency.

Mr. President, I do not think there is any question about the fact that this will be a sound, sensible, first step toward carrying out the unanimous recommendations of a very able commission, a commission which has approached the problem without regard to partisanship. I think it would be a serious mistake if the proposed legislation were even to pass the Senate by a narrow vote. Certainly it will pass, but I do not think it would encourage fairminded citizens, regardless of party, to undertake work in behalf of such important programs as the matter now pending before the Senate, if the programs are to be turned into partisan political footballs.

President Eisenhower tried to select people uniquely qualified to serve on the Commission, to approach the problems without regard to partisanship. President Kennedy has followed the same approach, with the same attitude. President Kennedy is now seeking to carry out recommendations made by the original Eisenhower Commission.

Mr. President, I hope that when the Senate votes on Tuesday, it will give a resounding vote of confidence and support to all Americans, to all of our citizens who are interested in dealing with our recreation resources, and the future well-being of our children. I hope the Senate will give a large, healthy—even overwhelming—majority vote in support of the pending bill, S. 20.

BAY OF PIGS

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, yesterday I adverted to certain incidents surrounding the Bay of Pigs invasion in Cuba in April 1961, and I expressed then, as I express now, my sympathy to the widows and children of the four Americans who were killed in that ill-fated incident.

Reference has been made in this Chamber today, to that invasion, and reference has also been made to it by the former Vice President of the United States, Mr. Nixon. I should like to make some supplementary remarks on this same subject.

It is exceedingly unfortunate that any American men were killed in that abortive invasion. It is a matter of great regret that four fine American young men had the misfortune to be shot down.

The facts are that all of the fouf were mature men. One had been a test pilot, and a former World War II pilot. He was 37 years of age. His name was Riley W. Shamburger, Jr. It is stated that he received $2,100 per month while he was training Cubans as aviators preliminary to the invasion, presumably in Nicaragua and Guatemala.

The second man referred to in the news item was, Thomas Ray, I find, 30 years of age at the time, and had just returned from military duty. Evidently he was not employed at the time he enrolled at $1,900 a month to train Cubans.

The third, Wade C. Gray, was unemployed at the time he was hired. He had been a radio and electronics technician. He was 33 years of age.

The fourth man, Lee F. Baker, was 35 years of age. He operated a pizza establishment, and also had worked as a pilot.

So, Mr. President, they were mature men. They were either recruited, or offered their services; one at $2,100 a month and the others at $1,900 a month. Their recruitment was for the purpose of training Cuban exiles. Their recruitment was not for the purpose of combat duty. Evidently in the excitement of the moment at the time of the invasion, realizing there was a need for trained pilots, they voluntarily took over the controls of two planes. Unfortunately, both of them were shot down.

Since that time there have been statements back and forth regarding these men. Let us accept the statements of the unfortunate widows, the mothers of their children, that their husbands were not soldiers of fortune. But they were mature men who entered this perilous work, one might say, at high salaries. Their widows are presently receiving $487 a month.

Mr. President, I have done some research on the subject of pensions for widows of servicemen killed in combat. If a captain in the Air Force serving in World War II were shot down, as these men serving in the invasion were, the widow of that captain, without a child, would be entitled to receive approximately $164 a month from a grateful government until such time as she remarried.

Unfortunately, during World War II many Air Force officers with the rank of captain who had little children were shot down.

If the widow had one child, she would be receiving, from a grateful government, $205 a month up to the time that the child reaches 18 years of age. With two children, the widow would receive $225 from our Government. When her children reach 18—and presumably they have by this time—the payment of the pension to the widow, if she has not remarried, would revert to $164.

I stated yesterday that some of the widows of our men in World War II, who left their comfortable homes and loved ones and made the ultimate sacrifice for their country, and who today are receiving $164 a month, must be somewhat surprised to read in the papers that the widows of these four unfortunate pilots who were killed at the Bay of Pigs invasion in April of 1961 are receiving $487 a month and expect to receive that amount as long as they remain unmarried.

I make these remarks only to show what our Government has done and what is being done—I do not know for sure by whom. It may be the Central Intelligence Agency or an organization of Cuban freedom fighters, many of whom are sons of men of wealth in Cuba who were dispossessed. Presumably it is not from that source. I have no knowledge on the subject, but my view is that it may be the Central Intelligence Agency that is making the payments.

That leads me to the conclusion that it would be an excellent idea for the Congress to legislate and select a joint watchdog committee to keep the CIA under observation and see that the expenditures of the organization are properly made. Sometimes, when agencies of our Government have ample funds to spend, some of the officials may not always be zealous in the interest of saving taxpayers' money. My belief is that our Central Intelligence Agency is over staffed and is spending too much of the taxpayers' money. Frankly, I could not prove that. No Member of Congress could. This is another reason why there should be a joint committee of Congress to act as watchdog, and to keep the expenditures and operations of the CIA under constant scrutiny.

Frankly, Mr. President, I have supported appropriations for the defense of our country, which includes tremendous sums for the CIA. I am fearful that having available such huge funds and being top heavy with executives has encouraged this agency to be spendthrift on occasions. It is high time we become more vigilant and work hard to cut out unnecessary spending and lop off unneeded personnel in the CIA and other agencies.

Mr. President, I wish to add one concluding thought which comes to me because I have just taken from the bulletin board a report of a statement by former Vice President Nixon, who said in an interview that he has changed his mind about withdrawing from public life.

That is not surprising, and he certainly has the right to change his mind about retiring from public life. It occurs to me it is quite likely that he will try to continue in public life and in the end become California's Harold Stassen. Richard Nixon and Harold Stassen have both in the past been the wonder boys of the Republican Party. I recall that Harold Stassen served as Governor of Minnesota, and then sought the presidential nomination of that Grand Old Party, of which I am not a member, but which I hold in the highest respect. He later occupied an exceedingly high position in the Eisenhower administration.

Finally, as I recall, I believe he ran for the city council in Philadelphia and was defeated.

Mr. President, Mr. Nixon, according to this news item, charged that President Kennedy blundered by failing to provide air cover for the invasion that could have toppled, he says, the Fidel Castro regime, and, he says, former President Eisenhower would never have made that mistake.

The fact is that in 1960, when General Eisenhower was President of the United States, and this California Stassen, Mr. Nixon, was Vice President of the United States, the Castro regime suddenly, and without warning, seized the property of American citizens in Cuba; seized, for instance, millions of dollars of the property of American corporations which were lawfully in Cuba.

Fidel Castro made no pretext then, and has made no pretext since, of giving any payment whatever to corporations owned by American stockholders, or to American individuals when he despoiled them of their properties.

Was there a peep out of the Vice President at that time about a quarantine against Cuba? Was there an utterance from the then President of the United States about invading Cuba? Firm action would have been justified. Vice President Nixon did not utter one yelp, one cry of protest at that time. Now he is talking big. He wants to be a War Hawk in 1963, but he was extremely silent in 1959 and 1960, when the then administration and its leaders also had a real grievance against Castro's Cuba.

I support the firm, determined, resolute, and unyielding policy toward Cuba of our Commander in Chief, the President of the United States. I am proud of the fact that his policy caused Khrushchev to turn tail last October and to withdraw the aggressive missiles and the aggressive planes from that little island.

I am proud, as a supporter of the foreign policy of the administration, that we are pursuing a policy of isolation and insulation against Castro's Cuba. In the end, despite what the new War Hawks, such as Mr. Nixon, have to say, I am certain that Castroism and Castro himself will be ousted entirely from the Western Hemisphere, due to the wise policy of the administration.

I yield the floor.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I do not rise for the purpose of answering my very able friend from Ohio, except to say that the hazards which confront this Nation are common to all the American people and that the incorrect decisions which are attributable to the man in the White House—any man in the White House—concern all of us. No one devoted more zeal or more courage to the cause of America and a just peace in the world than the gallant man from Gettysburg, Dwight D. Eisenhower.

I remember that when Eisenhower finally decided to break off diplomatic relations with the infamous Castro regime this Chamber resounded with imprecations from some quarters against him for taking that step. I remember how proud I was when I stood on the floor to see the Democratic majority leader join the Republican minority leader in urging the Senate to approve legislation in the field of sugar and sugar quotas, by which that ugly Communist island would be prohibited from profiting from the sale of its sugar to this country. The Senate approved the Eisenhower bill only to see it die in the House. It is to the credit of the present Chief Executive of the United States, John F. Kennedy, that when he became President he asked Congress to enact the same kind of law recommended by a Republican administration and Congress did at long last do so.

Therefore, I simply say that in my opinion there is no need for anyone to defend the illustrious career in the White House of Dwight Eisenhower and of the Vice President at that time, Richard Nixon.

TRIBUTE TO THE LATE GALLANT NANCY BOYD

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, during its brief period of operation, the Peace Corps has won global admiration for the devotion, perseverance, willingness, and zeal of self-sacrificing men and women, of all ages and from every walk of life, who answered a unique call to service in the interest of democracy and of humanity.

The performance of the Corps indeed has demonstrated in remote corners of the earth the lofty ideals of America and the limitless sympathy which our Nation feels for those in less fortunate circumstances.

When they responded to the call, the Peace Corps volunteers signified a complete readiness to assume extraordinary responsibilities. They eagerly underwent rigorous training. They were content wtih unusually modest compensation. They were prepared to undergo physical hardship and to embark upon a mode of living far removed from the comfortable circumstances to which they were accustomed.

Now, in a tragic airplane accident in a foreign land, two members of the Peace Corps have given their lives. A resident of my State of California, Miss Nancy Boyd, of Martinez, the daughter of Mr. and Mrs. Paul C. Boyd, was one. The other was Philip Water Maggard, of Buffalo, Wyo.

Miss Boyd early joined this constructive program because she felt she could make a worthwhile contribution as a teacher, carrying the message of independence and self-determination and the dignity of man to younger generations who ultimately will be charged with keeping the flame of freedom glowing. In less than a year, as a member of the seventh contingent of volunteers sent to the Philippine Republic, this young woman, who received her training at San Jose State College in California, lay dead in the wreckage of a commercial airliner which crashed on Mindanao Island.

This patriotic young Californian, motivated by thoughts of the great opportunity offered in inculcating a love of liberty along with precious knowledge in children of another race and in a distant country, will be long remembered as a heroine of the cold war. I wish to pay tribute to her loyalty and her dedication to the cause for which she gave her life.

With these remarks, I wish to extend deepest sympathy to her parents and as evidence of the esteem and appreciation felt for her I ask unanimous consent to include in my remarks a message of sympathy from the President of the Philippine Republic, along with a letter from the Acting Director of the Peace Corps, and a press release issued by that agency relating the tragic circumstances of her death.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

The President,
The White House:

We express the profound grief of entire Filipino nation at the death of two fine young persons, Nancy Boyd and Philip Maggard, of the Peace Corps, in airplane crash here. Their work in our country will long live in the hearts of our people. Kindly convey our sorrow to the American people.

President Diosdado Macapagal.

Peace Corps,
Washington, D.C., March 6, 1963.

Hon. Thomas H. Kuchel,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Kuchel: As you know, Nancy Boyd had served with the Peace Corps since June 1962. She graduated in 1960 from Alhambra Union High School in Martinez, Calif., where she was a fine student and an active member of the student council. She worked two summers for the Contra Costa County Library in Pleasant Hill and had served as a practice elementary schoolteacher in Martinez. Nancy was studying for a degree in history from the University of California in Santa Barbara when she joined the Peace Corps last summer.

From the time she arrived at San Jose State College to participate in the Peace Corps training program for the Philippines, Nancy impressed members of the Peace Corps staff, the San Jose faculty, and her fellow volunteers with her warmth, enthusiasm, imagination, and her deep concern and interest in other people. She successfully completed the 8-week course in late August and left for the Philippines in September.

Nancy served as a teacher's aid in the small town of Mabini in Davao Province on the island of Mindanao. There, teaching science and English to elementary school children and deeply engaged in the work of the community, she won the hearts of all with whom she worked. One of 630 Peace Corps volunteers in the Philippines, she was making a significant personal contribution to the development of the nation's educational system.

Returning to Mabini on March 3 from a Peace Corps training seminar in Zamboanga, the plane in which Nancy was flying crashed on a remote mountain in eastern Mindanao leaving no survivors.

Some time ago, describing her reasons for serving in the Peace Corps, Nancy wrote: "I think that understanding between peoples cannot help but lead to peace. * * * I believe that I could find much common ground with other peoples and that we are basically alike in many ways. Because of this belief in basic similarities I feel that by serving in the Peace Corps I could have a part in preserving the peace."

Nancy lived this part she described admirably. She was an outstanding Peace Corps volunteer. Her death represents not only a great personal loss to the Boyd family but a loss to our country as well.

If you can think of any way in which we can be of further assistance to Mr. and Mrs. Boyd, please do not hesitate to call me.

Best wishes.

Sincerely,

Bill Moyers,
Acting Director.

Peace Corps Press Release,
Washington, D.C.

The Director of the Peace Corps, the Philippine Ambassador to the United States, and the superintendent of the schools in which they worked, paid tribute today to two Peace Corps volunteers who were killed Friday in the crash of a Philippine airliner on Mindanao Island.

The volunteers were Nancy Ann Boyd, 20, daughter of Mr. and Mrs. Paul C. Boyd, of 805 Lafayette St., Martinez, Calif., and Philip Walter Maggard, 22, son of Mr. and Mrs. J. Merida Maggard, of 207 S. Lobban Avenue, Buffalo, Wyo.

Both Miss Boyd and Mr. Maggard entered Peace Corps training in June 1962, as members of the seventh contingent of volunteers to be assigned to the Philippines.

After completing training at San Jose State College in California, they arrived in the Philippines in September and were assigned as elementary school teachers on the island of Mindanao.

Sargent Shriver, Peace Corps Director, said: "I extend my deepest sympathies to the parents and friends of these fine young people. Nancy and Phil were both outstanding volunteers who were performing a valuable service to their country and to the Philippines."

The Philippine Ambassador to the United States, Amelito R. Mutuc, said the death of the volunteers "is a great and irreparable loss, not only to their parents, their country, and the Peace Corps, but also to the townspeople among whom they worked and to the people of the Philippines, for whom they dedicated their time, energy, and youthful ideals." He added: "Their loved ones should find consolation, indeed, inner satisfaction, in the fact that they have died in pursuit of the highest ideals of their country and the free world."

The volunteers were described as outstanding Americans who were doing highly commendable work by the superintendent of schools of Davao Province, in which they worked. "They were very popular with our people," he said. "They will be missed greatly."

Funeral services for Miss Boyd will be held Saturday at 11 a.m. at the Connelly and Taylor funeral chapel, 1124 Ferry Street, Martinez, Calif. In lieu of flowers, contributions may be made to the Nancy Boyd Philippine Scholarship Fund, care of Mert Cerri, Bank of California, Martinez.

Miss Boyd graduated from Alhambra Union High School, where she was a member of the executive committee of the student council. She attended the University of California at Santa Barbara, majoring in history. She had worked during summers as a clerk-typist in the Contra Costa County school department and as an apprentice library assistant in the Contra Costa County library.

In her application for service as a Peace Corps volunteer, she noted that, as a history major, "I have a high interest in peoples of all countries, and wish to learn all I can about them." She added: "Also, I have a strong desire to do my part for my country."

Volunteer Maggard had planned on a career in the priesthood. An Episcopalian, he had been a member of the Acolyte Guild at the University of the South, Sewanee, Tenn., and vice president of the Canterbury Club at his church in Buffalo, St. Luke's. During one summer he had been church organist.

Of his plan to become a priest, he wrote on his application: "I have only 1 year of college left, and the idea of immediately entering seminary is rather frightening. For example, I would be ordained a clergyman at the age of 26 with practically no experience in the world itself. Since my ministry would be concerned with an attempt to help humanity, I feel that the Peace Corps would provide a way of gaining experience that would make that attempt more feasible."

He concluded: "And, having worked with the Peace Corps, I should hope to feel that I had left my area better than I had found it."

Besides the University of the South, he had attended the University of Wyoming at Laramie. During summers he had been employed as a State highway department crewman and as a printer's devil at the Buffalo Bulletin. He also had taught piano and organ to beginning students.

A CRITIQUE OF THE LAUSCHE TRANSIT BILL

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, recently the distinguished senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. Lausche] introduced an urban transit bill, S. 807.

Since a number of observations were made during the course of his introductory statement about the administration's urban mass transportation bill I have sponsored with 23 of my colleagues, I thought Senators might appreciate a few reflections on this important problem.

First, let me say how gratified I am to see this latest confirmation—notwithstanding the Senator's assertions to the contrary—that the problem of deterioration and decline of transit service in our cities and towns is truly a national crisis. How else can we explain the introduction of this extraordinary billion-dollar bill of direct and indirect Federal support to perhaps every single public or private transit company in the United States?

The bill speaks for itself as to the gravity and national scope of the transit crisis. It makes me wonder whether the administration has not been entirely too modest and conservative in its approach to the problem.

Another important feature of the bill is its recognition of the fact that the severity of the problem is so great it requires what the Senator from Ohio described "at first blush would appear to be indirect Federal subsidies." And indeed the bill does provide subsidies, at first blush and at last blush.

But, Mr. President, while these are important concessions, coming from the leader of the opposition to effective Federal legislation in the field of urban transit, I must regretfully say that this is fundamentally bad proposed legislation, the justifications for which are filled with inconsistencies and contradictions.

I cannot help concluding that a vote for the bill will be a vote against helping our cities to alleviate the growing problem of traffic congestion and to provide genuinely improved public transportation service for the millions of bus, rail, and rapid transit riders of the country who want and need modern, dependable, and reasonably priced transit service.

I shall now discuss some of the contraditions that have been presented, and explain why the bill is so ill-conceived, unsound, and extreme.

I believe the analysis will demonstrate without doubt that the administration's proposed is infinitely more modest and sound.

I believe the analysis will also demonstrate that it is the bill of the Senator from Ohio, not the administration's bill, which runs the grave risk of wholesale intervention by the Federal Government into the rights and responsibilities of State and local governments and private enterprise—Federal intervention into everything from profits to working conditions in local transit systems.

THE CONTRADICTIONS

The Senator from Ohio charges that the administration's bill is a permanent subsidy program, whereas his does "not involve the Federal Government in a costly and permanent subsidy program."

The fact, is, if Senators will take the trouble to examine both bills, that the exact reverse is true.

A subsidy is a form of Federal financial assistance given directly to a private enterprise. The administration's bill provides capital grants to public bodies for mass transportation facilities and equipment. The bill of the Senator from Ohio is a genuine subsidy through the granting of tax relief to potentially every private transit company in the country, regardless of need.

The administration's bill clearly terminates at the end of 3 years. The bill of the Senator from Ohio provides tax relief which, once granted, is permanent. It provides another form of Federal involvement which, once enacted, will last a minimum of 50 years.

The Senator from Ohio asserts as evidence that no national crisis exists—which his own bill belies—the claim that only the larger metropolitan areas, a few smaller ones, and organizations with a vested interest have expressed support for the administration bill.

I suppose none of us is free from some kind of vested interest. But the fact is that the mayors of the Nation support the administration's proposed legislation, the county officials of the Nation support it, many Governors support it, many chambers of commerce support it, organized labor supports it, the rail and bus operators support it, the planners support it, the housing and redevelopment officials of the country support it, homebuilders support it, savings bankers support it.

The fact is that not only Los Angeles, San Francisco, Chicago, Boston, Philadelphia, New York, and a few other lesser sized communities have expressed support for the bill. Over the course of the last 3 years, Congress has heard as well from Atlanta; Dade County, Fla.; Detroit; St. Louis; Seattle; Baltimore; Laurel, Miss.; Pittsburgh; Cape Canaveral; Oakland; Cleveland; and Montgomery, Ala.; among others. In addition, since the enactment of the mass transportation provisions in the Housing Act of 1961, the Agency has received inquiries and requests for assistance from more than 250 cities across the Nation.

FLAWS OF THE GUARANTEE APPROACH

What is proposed under title II of the Senator's bill, S. 807?

Briefly, the bill proposes that the Federal Treasury guarantee revenue bonds issued for the construction of wholly new rapid transit systems, or extensions thereto.

It is suggested that such guarantees would be available to either public or private transit agencies, but it is quite clear to anyone familiar with the subject that we are only talking about public agencies, for no private company is in a position to undertake such a large endeavor, and no city in its right mind would allow a private company, with the aid of the Federal Government, to walk in and on its own authority build a major new rapid transit system which would have profound effects on every aspect of that city's life.

This kind of transit operation has historically been a public responsibility, and actually it cannot be otherwise.

But the public transit authorities are public bodies, and, therefore, their bonds are tax free. What the bill provides, then, is a solid-gold windfall to private investors, who would enjoy not only tax-free interest on the bonds, but also no risk on their investment because of the Federal guarantee.

This proposal has several consequences, aside from providing such a luxurious windfall to the investors. For one thing, because it eliminates the element of risk, it eliminates the safeguards of prudence and careful scrutiny we normally expect from private investors when they are laying their money on the line.

But more serious is the fact that it opens up an entirely new type of investment opportunity—an investment involving no tax and no risk. Naturally, funds in the private money market will be drawn to such an opportunity, and the consequence will be that the Treasury Department will have to pay higher interest rates on the bonds it is trying to issue, which are not tax exempt. Then, of course, this type of guarantee could be extended to any number of other worthy public endeavors, and Pandora's box would really be opened. Who would pay for this indirect subsidy? The taxpayer, of course, but he would never know how much he was paying because it would all be so indirect, unlike the administration proposal.

A second drawback lies in the fact that this type financial assistance puts maximum pressure on the farebox, which will have to bear the whole burden of the capital and operating costs of the transit system. This would require exceedingly high fares, which would have to be increased should the revenue be insufficient to pay off the principal and interest on the bonds. But this is an absolutely self-defeating effort, because the higher the fares, the fewer the riders. The whole point of mass transportation is to help to alleviate rush-hour traffic congestion by attracting as many riders as possible. This, above all, requires reasonably priced fares.

A third drawback involves a question of basic public policy. Under the bill, whether we are talking about public or private transit agencies, it would be entirely possible to have a major new rapid transit system imposed on a city without the responsible elected community officials or the people having a single word to say about it. Most transit authorities are independently managed by appointed officials, who I have no reason to doubt are perfectly capable, but who are, nonetheless, not directly responsible to the people of the community nor its elected officials. Under the administration bill, we can be sure that any new rapid transit system built in any city in the country will have the support of the people and their elected representatives, because they will be required to share a substantial part of the cost of the system with a cash contribution. This would not be the case under the bill of the Senator from Ohio.

THE DANGER OF FEDERAL CONTROL

Then we come to what is undoubtedly the most serious aspect of the guarantee approach—the cost and the likelihood of far greater Federal intervention in and control of the very things the sponsors of this bill presumably seek to avoid.

In essence, this proposal leaves the Federal Government holding the bag for the entire life of the transit agency's bond issue, probably 40 or 50 years.

Perhaps because the FHA guarantee program on home loans has been so successful over the years, we tend to think of Federal guarantees generally as relatively safe and inexpensive ways of getting something done which could not otherwise get done without the credit of the Federal Government backing it.

But I can assure Senators that the transit industry is not the housing industry, and we generalize at our own peril when we assume that the success of guarantees in one field assures success in every other.

As a matter of fact, we need not look any further than the $15 million federally guaranteed private loans on which the New Haven Railroad defaulted, requiring the Federal Government to pick up the tab.

Given the present trends of declining transit ridership and revenue, I think the Members of Congress would be well advised to think twice before committing the Federal Government to a permanent program of loan guarantees amounting to between $750 million and $1 billion in the transit field, depending on interest rates, should the program prove effective. It could be very expensive in the long run, by which time if there was widespread defaulting, there would be no alternative but for the Federal Government to bail the transit systems out.

This is not to say that the Federal Government should assume no risks in this field. I think the problem of traffic congestion demands that we must, but it should be with our eyes open.

Under the administration bill, the Federal Government must weigh the proposals submitted by the States or local governments, which will be demonstrating their confidence in the wisdom of the project through the willingness to assume at least one-third of the cost in cash. The Federal Government will make a grant on the basis of its best estimate of the likelihood that the project will be sound and successful, based on careful local planning—a provision lacking in the bill of the Senator from Ohio.

And then the Federal responsibility terminates.

If the project proves in later years not to be as successful as original estimates indicated, it will be the responsibility of the State or local government—not of the Federal Government.

In other words, we are not faced with a choice of an expensive way, through grants, as opposed to an inexpensive way, through guarantees, of accomplishing the same thing.

We are faced with assuming a known and limited Federal expenditure as opposed to an unknown long-term risk, which may or may not be more costly than the administration approach.

But in addition to assuming an unknown, long-term risk under the guarantee approach, we are also running a grave risk of large-scale Federal intervention in local transit affairs.

The reason is very simple. Since the Federal Government is holding the bag for the life of the bond issue, it cannot escape the responsibility of taking every possible step to insure that it does not end with a huge bill at the end of life of the bond issue.

Obviously, the amount that any local transit agency will have available to pay the principal and interest on the bond will be its net revenue—the amount left over after the operating expenses are subtracted.

But equally obviously, in order to insure that the net revenue will remain sufficient over the life of the bond, the Federal Government will have to intervene to make sure that fares are kept at necessary levels. The Federal Government will have to intervene to make sure that unwarranted wage increases are not granted. The Federal Government will have to intervene continuously to make sure that managerial efficiency remains at a peak. It will have to intervene on questions of how much service is to be provided by the system to the community. It will have to intervene to make sure that the most economical maintenance procedures are followed and that equipment purchases are not excessively costly or unnecessary. Where private transit agencies are involved, it will have to intervene to make sure that profits are not excessive and that the executives are not getting paid too much for their service. And so on and on.

Is this the kind of situation that we want the Federal Government to get into? I do not think so. That is why the administration's proposal is so much more sound.

Not only does the Federal Government's financial responsibility terminate when a grant is made; its interest terminates, as well. Once the grant is made, all responsibility for the matters I have just mentioned remains where it belongs—at the local level.

I feel confident that the vast majority of the Members of Congress would prefer this much cleaner and more prudent approach.

USELESSNESS OF THE GUARANTEE APPROACH

Finally, I come to the crowning irony of S. 807.

Not only does it suffer all the potential liabilities I have just discussed; it also suffers the fatal liability—and that is its almost complete uselessness.

I know that the distinguished Senator from Ohio, in his introductory statement, stated that transit authority officials from Los Angeles testified last year that the bond guarantee financing approach would make it possible for them to build and pay for a transit system costing over $600 million without a Federal loan or grant.

The Senator from Ohio concluded that—

> It is only logical to believe, therefore, that if Los Angeles, the most auto-oriented city in the world, can support a complex system of the kind contemplated for that area out of the farebox, then cities having a less auto-oriented population should be able to support their own transit improvements.

However, I must point out several factors which render this conclusion wholly invalid.

In the first place, the officials testified only about the feasibility of constructing one segment of a much larger transit system through the bond guarantee. This was the so-called backbone route, a 22-mile rapid transit line running along the most heavily traveled and highly built-up corridor of the metropolitan area, the cost of which would have been $288 million, not $600 million.

The point is that this segment represented the cream of the crop, so to speak, and these officials did not—and I am sure would not—testify that it would be possible to build any of the planned extensions out into the lower-density suburbs with bond guarantee financing. The revenues simply would not cover the capital costs of such extensions, guarantee or no guarantee.

But the most significant and overlooked fact is that the only reason why this project came within even close distance of being feasible with a bond guarantee is that the Los Angeles Transit Authority has jurisdiction of the surface bus system in Los Angeles, and the surplus revenues from the bus system, as well as the rapid transit system, would have been necessary to repay a substantial part of the principal and interest on the bond.

Thus without the revenues from the bus system, even this backbone project probably would not have been feasible. Also, quite obviously the same bus revenues would not be available to finance further extensions of the rapid transit system.

Then we must ask how many other cities have transit authorities which would have jurisdiction over both rapid transit and bus operations? And where this situation exists, how many of the bus systems enjoy sufficient revenue to help finance a rapid transit system, assuming that it were desirable to do so? Almost none.

The fact is that history and the experience of almost every other city fly in the face of the assumption that major capital improvements can be supported from the fare box, even with the help of a bond guarantee.

The European countries, with much more compact cities and far fewer cars per capita, have long since recognized the futility of relying exclusively on the fare box, and almost without exception they use public funds to cover the capital costs of their systems and fare box revenue to cover operating costs. I might add that New York City does exactly the same thing. It is, in fact, the only sensible solution.

THE TAX RELIEF PROPOSALS

As for the tax relief proposals, I have already pointed out that they are, of course, subsidies. From the standpoint of the general taxpayer, he still pays the bill, whether Federal expenditures are increased by x dollars or whether Federal revenues are decreased by x dollars, as would occur under my colleague's tax relief subsidies.

Again, however, it is interesting to note that under the administration bill the taxpayer knows exactly what he is paying. Under the other approach he does not, though I am informed that the tax relief measures might amount to somewhere between $15 million and $50 million a year.

Furthermore, not only does the taxpayer know what he is giving under the administration bill, he knows what he is getting. He is getting $500 million worth of actual modernization and construction of mass transportation facilities and equipment. And this amount is, of course, multiplied by the State and local contribution, as well as the private investment which the program would trigger.

But when the taxpayer pays for tax relief to purely private companies, how does he know what he is getting? Instead of improved transit service, he may be getting higher paid transit executives and richer stockholders.

I have long advocated that State and local governments give greater tax relief to faltering transit carriers. For reasons I shall not discuss here, I am quite confident that the administration's program will stimulate that effort.

But there is no doubt that a number of questions are involved in these tax proposals.

The foremost of them is, as I indicated, what assurance we will have that the tax relief will in fact result in better transit service?

In cities where there are a number of separate bus systems, or a mixture of transit systems, this financial assistance could possibly lead to greater confusion and lack of coordination of service, which is a problem that plagues many of our cities today, since the bill provides no planning requirements as the administration bill does.

On the value of the proposals to exempt transit carriers from Federal taxation to the extent they are granted tax concessions by State or local governments, I only question the belief of the Senator from Ohio that this would stimulate "considerably more action" on the part of the State and local governments.

Perhaps there is some reluctance to grant tax relief for fear full value may not be received by the private carriers because of the Federal tax laws, but I rather suspect that the reluctance is more basic than that—stemming from the fact that most of our State and local governments are themselves in very difficult financial straits, and simply cannot afford except under most compelling circumstances to give up any more tax revenue than they absolutely have to.

As for the proposal to establish tax-free reserve funds for new equipment, it is my impression that most State and local regulatory agencies already allow the establishment of such reserves. But more important is the fact that this proposal would be of benefit only to those transit companies which are making money and thus paying Federal taxes. It would be of no use to those who might need it most—the companies that are losing money.

AGENCY JURISDICTION OF TRANSIT PROGRAM

Finally, we come to the question of which agency shall have jurisdiction of whatever urban mass transit program is enacted.

The Senator from Ohio suggests that we dismiss the 2 years of experience the Housing Agency has acquired in administering this program, and that the President's considered judgment on the matter be overturned by transferring existing functions and any additional functions to a new Division of Urban Transportation to be located in the Commerce

Department's Office of the Under Secretary for Transportation.

I think it should be sufficient to ask, Who is better qualified to decide questions of executive branch organization than the President of the United States?

But let me make these additional observations.

First, as the Senator from Ohio himself acknowledged, we already have a variety of transportation activities which are not lodged in the Department of Commerce—from the ICC to the FAA. I would think that if we are to reorganize all the transportation activities of the Federal Government, it ought to be done in some comprehensive manner, rather than on this sort of piecemeal basis.

As for the suggestion that jurisdiction of the program was placed in the Housing Agency to avoid the "prohighway influence of the Bureau of Public Roads" let me say that the Senator from Ohio has never heard me make that statement. On the contrary, the Bureau of Public Roads and the Housing Agency have established an excellent working relationship with each other on their common concerns.

But, the basic point is that transit problems are fundamentally an urban problem, not a transportation problem. And this legislation has essentially nothing to do with interstate or intercity transportation, as for example between Boston and Washington.

This legislation is concerned with the movement of people within the urban area and you simply cannot deal with transit apart from the land uses of the urban area. The reason why many of our transit systems are having trouble today is that we have neglected the land-use aspect of the problem. The location and densities of commercial, industrial, and residential land uses are heavily involved in the determination of sound transit policies and in the administration of an effective transit program.

If this is, then, an urban problem, an inseparable facet of the shape and form of our cities, as I believe it is, then I think the logic of placing this program in the Housing Agency is inescapable.

And in fact, when the Housing Subcommittee was first considering this legislative area, back in 1961, we asked a wide array of witnesses about this relationship and the question of Agency jurisdiction.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that excerpts from this testimony be printed in the Record at the end of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, I sincerely believe that anyone who carefully considers this whole subject and the proposed legislation that is before Congress will agree that the administration's bill is sound, well conceived, modest, and better designed than any other to meet the urgent transit problems facing the country in a fashion that will strengthen and uphold the traditions and values that have made our Nation such a success.

Exhibit 1

Excerpts of Testimony on S. 345 on the Importance of Relating Mass Transportation to Other HHFA Programs Affecting Urban Land Use

DR. WEAVER TESTIMONY

(House hearings, April 4)

Senator Williams. I don't want to prolong my part of this but I do want to deal with two other aspects of your statement, Dr. Weaver, which I certainly applaud you for. I think that the President in his objectives in terms of housing speaks of the necessity for the sound growth of our rapidly expanding metropolitan areas and I was very interested in your statement on page 13 that increased emphasis would be given to the transportation and open space aspects of comprehensive urban planning. Now you are talking planning here in the 701 part of your legislation. I wonder can we conclude that there is also developing an attitude that following the planning and with the planning will go program? I take it that is true certainly in open space.

Dr. Weaver. Yes.

Senator Williams. And land reserves where the President spoke of the urgency and the need to get underway immediately.

Dr. Weaver. Yes.

Senator Williams. I would think that you would agree that the same program effort must come in transportation, which is so vital to land use and the proper, as the President says, sound growth of our rapidly expanding metropolitan areas.

Dr. Weaver. I think there is no question that the administration is fully cognizant and very much concerned with the problem of mass transportation, realizing that it is a very, very vital part of the development of the communities and of the way in which housing and community development would mature as time goes on. I think also that there is complete agreement on the fact that we have to start and do more in the area of planning. There is also, I think, agreement that further action is required. There has not yet been any determination as to what that further action should be, but this is something which we are certainly cognizant of and certainly are trying to work out.

* * * * *

Senator Sparkman. While we are talking about community facilities, community development, etc., I would like to ask Mr. Slayton this question, and it bears directly upon this mass transportation program that Senator Williams asked a few questions about a few minutes ago. We did hold hearings in this subcommittee last year on this mass transportation problem that the big cities, primarily the big cities, have. But many people wonder why it was before the Housing Subcommittee. As a matter of fact, Mr. Slayton, or both of you, the community facilities and the urban renewal do; doesn't it tie right into your programs?

Mr. Slayton. Well, certainly it does, Senator. In the urban renewal program, transportation, mass transportation, becomes an extremely important part of your planning of the projects, and in the 701 planning assistance program this becomes an extremely important part. It ties into both very definitely.

Senator Sparkman. As a matter of fact, isn't a great part of the problem that you usually find with the deteriorating central city area the mass transportation problem?

Mr. Slayton. It is indeed.

Senator Sparkman. Do you feel—and I believe Dr. Weaver has already indicated—that if such legislation is passed you would be perfectly willing to take over the administration of it, and Dr. Weaver do you agree with what has been said as to its being inherently a part of our urban renewal and community development?

Dr. Weaver. I think it is a very crucial part, Senator, and I think a very necessary part and one which, if we are going to do this job, we have to pay a lot of attention to it.

Senator Sparkman. Yes.

Dr. Weaver. Of course it would be no burden to take over the administration of it.

Senator Sparkman. Of course, I am not asking you to testify on it now, because we have had some hearings already in this subcommittee on the separate bill that Senator Williams introduced, but it is contemplated that if it is passed in anything like the form that Senator Williams has introduced it, that its administration will go to the HHFA, and I thought it well to put in the record some reason for that justification, and it is really a part of the program that we are carrying on.

MAYOR DILWORTH TESTIMONY

(Housing hearings, April 5)

Senator Williams. Just one more line of inquiry. Yesterday there was some discussion about mass transportation and its importance to the objectives of the various programs here, housing and urban renewal, community facilities and the college program. First, is it your feeling that improved and efficient mass transportation facilities are vital to the success of the objectives of the program here in the housing bill?

Mayor Dilworth. Without immediate help—and I really mean immediate help—for mass transportation, and as I say, it is not just in the large cities, I think there is 400 cities, isn't there—

Mr. Gunther. Yes.

Mayor Dilworth. Four hundred small cities, and by that I mean from 25,000 to 100,000 and 150,000, have lost all their mass transportation since World War II—have none, and it has hurt them terribly. In the larger cities I don't think—my own personal opinion would be that no plan for renewal of anything resembling the center city should be approved unless an area can come up with a decent mass transportation program because otherwise the renewal may prove valueless.

As you said, when we were testifying down here, we had a meeting at the request of the President, to spur up building, and a group of store owners came to us, builders of apartment houses, office buildings, theaters, and all of those things, and said to us that if they could be assured not only of continuity of the redevelopment program, and they were quite sure of that, but if they could be assured they were going to get some real help on mass transportation, they would be willing to pledge themselves to a total private expenditure in excess of a half billion dollars in the next 10 years in our center city. * * *

We can, with your bill, really solve our mass transportation problems, and again I think it is important to point out that the cities are doing their utmost. We are spending just on commutation alone now $1,600,000 a year to get better commutation service. We are paying that direct to the railroads. We are going to spend this year and next year a total of $14 million for capital improvements to commutation, for cars, improving the stations, parking and all of those things. But if we could get this additional Federal help we could really shoot ahead because in our own city one of the things that we have got to do is link together our two big commutation roads and make it a loop instead of two dead end operations. The result of that would be to save $2 million in operation, give us much more efficient service, permit interchange of cars using the same amount of car, also permit us to use subways, permit us to improve our whole big shopping area subway situation. The total cost would be $40 million, the saving in excess of $2 million. We can finance one-half of it but we cannot swing the other half. And if we could swing the whole deal we would immediately have a tremendous redevelopment and revival of our great heart of the city area.

Senator WILLIAMS. Thank you, Mayor. Just one final question. I wonder if you would comment on the logic of the method of approach in dealing with mass transportation. Now the bulk of this housing legislation before us deals with the sound growth and development of metropolitan areas. The Housing and Home Finance Agency with old tools and with improved tools and some new tools is dealing with that problem. Transportation is vital to the success of it. Would you comment on the logic or the wisdom of giving mass transportation a place in this metropolitan program of Housing and Home Finance?

Mayor DILWORTH. I think, Senator—and this is as president of the United States Conference of Mayors and Vice President of the American Municipal Association—I think there is absolute unanimity on the part of the mayors, on the part of the staffs of both of our organizations—they both have excellent staffs—that there is only one logical place for the mass transportation program and that is in the Housing Administration. I don't think there is a dissent from any single mayor of a city of any size on that. The staffs of both groups are absolutely unanimous on it. It's just—well—it's just inconceivable to us that it could go any place else and be effective, and here it can be tremendously effective, because every renewal program, particularly for cities, ought to be studied in connection with the mass transportation program and the two ought to go hand in hand if they are to be effective.

Senator WILLIAMS. Thank you very much, Mayor Dilworth.

HEARINGS ON S. 345 (MARCH 20–22)

William C. Wheaton, policy committee, National Housing Conference, and director, Institute for Urban Studies, University of Pennsylvania:

"We support the provisions of the bill and stress these functions in the Housing and Home Finance Agency where they would be closely tied to the related programs of urban renewal and urban development. The Housing Agency now conducts a program of grants to the city and metropolitan planning which, in some cities like Philadelphia, have been of assistance in developing the kind of transportation plans to which Mr. Symes made reference.

"The bill contains incentives for the kind of metropolitan action which is certainly needed in the long run. The question in my mind is as to whether or not the bill might not also authorize interstate compacts in advance to solve transportation problems, but we believe that these functions can well be performed in the Housing Agency, which has experience with this kind of loan, fully repayable loan programs which has experience with grant programs; which has established ties with all the Government agencies and which is sympathetic to the objectives of providing transit service in connection with urban renewal programs for our central cities."

O. Roy Chalk, president, D.C. Transit:

"I would emphasize the very great need for the closest possible coordination between urban redevelopment on the one hand and mass transportation on the other hand.

"Urban redevelopment and mass transportation must and do go together hand in hand. Mobility of people and mobility of goods are prerequisites for large metropolitan areas. Without mass transportation to move large numbers of people from place to place, there could be only villages. Without mass transportation, we could not have large industrial areas, extensive distribution centers, adequate housing facilities, recreational facilities, or any form of community life. * * *

"It is no exaggeration to say that most of the difficult problems facing our city and metropolitan area planners have their roots in the field of mass transportation. Transit is at the heart of such matters as population density, school locations, central city business stagnation, shopping center locations, airport locations, taxation policies, local governmental structures, and the like.

"Yet, billions of dollars are being and will be spent, publicly and privately, for massive suburbs and for urban redevelopment without taking into account the tens or hundreds of millions required for mass transportation needs.

"When properly tied in with investment for adequate mass transportation, our huge development and redevelopment expenditures more than justify their cost. In fact, the joint results are worth more than the separate outlays; it is an example of $2 plus $2 equaling $6.

"As this subcommittee well knows, every house that is built requires a road, and every road requires a transit system to serve it directly or indirectly. Housing and transit are mutually interdependent. United and coordinated, both survive and flourish. Separated, neither can survive.

"The importance of mass transportation in urban redevelopment program is so great that the mass transportation plan for any given area should be made an integral part of the urban redevelopment program. Unless the mass transportation plan is integrated with the urban redevelopment plan, urban redevelopment programs will be obsolete before they are even instituted."

William B. Saunders, president, Transportation Research, and consultant for the Department of Commerce:

"My first reaction was a negative one last year when this came up, but I have really wrestled with that and I have concluded that certainly for the moment it makes more sense to give HHFA the basic responsibility for running this program. * * * I do have the feeling that as time goes on we will want to devise techniques for integrating the administration and the planning of our total transportation. This is going to have to be worked out slowly, both at the Federal Government level as I see it, and also at the local level. We are going to be creating new organizations as we go along in this field. * * * Yes, I think for the moment it ought to be given to HHFA to get the ball started rolling."

Edward J. Logue, development administrator, Boston:

"The Senate's passage of the predecessor to S. 345 last year was the first indication we had that the Federal Government took this problem as seriously as we in the major metropolitan areas knew it would become. We would also like to register ourselves in favor of the administration of this program by the Housing and Home Finance Agency and eventually by the proposed Department of Urban Affairs.

"Any major, any urban mass transportation program in the older cities is closely linked with an urban renewal program and I may say that every single major older city has recognized need for a far greater, more comprehensive urban renewal program than they have undertaken today, but because of the metropolitan character and technical nature of the transportation problem it cannot be solved in a purely urban renewal context but it must be solved with the two of them together.

"This belongs, therefore, in the Housing Agency."

Anthony Celebrezze, mayor, Cleveland:

"Leave one end loose and you are going to get into difficulty, and if you leave mass transportation loose, you are going to be in real difficulty in the years ahead of us. * * *

"I firmly believe that this would be a proper function of the Department of Urban Affairs, if and when such a department is created. But I presume that if such a department is created, the HHFA would be part of it anyway, and the tying of the two under one administrative head would be essential. I think in the absence of such a department, because we have to work so closely with HHFA on urban renewal and on loans and so forth, this would be a proper department for it at this time."

Harold S. Wise, chairman, national legislative committee, American Institute of Planning:

"We support the program of planning that is incorporated in this bill. Then it recognizes the importance and key role of local planning of metropolitan and regional organization, and it recognizes also that there are other Federal agencies that are involved that are concerned with the development of the urban environment in our metropolitan areas, and seeks to achieve a coordination as between these agencies as transit is being planned. * * *

"We support the fact that you intend to place this agency within the framework of the Housing and Home Finance Agency, because they are familiar, increasingly so, with the urban development problems in our metropolitan areas."

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE MALLORY CASE

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, last Saturday, the Washington Evening Star published an editorial in which it paid its disrespects to me because I believe in following the Constitution of the United States and upholding the great decision of the Supreme Court of the United States in the Mallory case. I ask unanimous consent that the editorial criticism of me, which was published last Saturday, March 2, in the Washington Evening Star, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MALLORY CHAMPION

One might search far and wide without finding a pledge more superfluous than that given this week by Senator WAYNE MORSE, of Oregon. The Senator told his colleagues that "I shall strenuously oppose any change whatsoever in the Mallory rule." This, in our judgment, is roughly comparable to a pledge from Horatius to the Romans that he would strenuously defend the bridge. After all—what else? If Horatius had fallen back, or if Senator MORSE should sheathe his pro-Mallory sword, who would be left to defend the people and slay the dragons?

The Mallory rule has its main impact and its principal adverse effect on law enforcement in the Nation's Capital. A test case on this question is shaping up in the Senator's home State of Oregon. But as of now the Oregon courts do not outlaw a voluntary confession merely because there has been a delay in arraigning the criminal. Yet the Oregon Senator will strenuously resist any change in the Federal rule which, merely because of delay in arraignment, has freed rapists and killers in the Nation's Capital.

In his remarks the other day, Senator MORSE said he would not yield to pressure of a police department. Who has said that he should? He invoked the pre-Revolutionary specter of the British Crown, police-state methods, and the tyrannical fashion of the King's officers. Doubtless these are, or were, awesome instrumentalities. But what have they to do with the Mallory rule and 1963?

The proposed change in the Mallory rule would provide that a voluntary confession shall not be held inadmissible at a trial merely because of a reasonable delay in arraigning the person who made the confession. This is all that it would do. It would not revive the star chamber. It would not establish tyranny in this country. It would not license the King's agents to torture citizens and extort confessions from them. Everyone, or almost everyone, knows this to be so. The proposed change would simply establish in the city of Washington the same criminal law which prevails in the States. A confession which is voluntary could be used as evidence. A confession which is coerced or which, for some other reason, is involuntary, could not be used.

In 1958 a law to this effect passed the House and almost passed the Senate. It died on a point of order in the Senate at 4:10 a.m. on the closing Sunday morning of the session.

Senator MORSE did not raise the point of order. He had, however, been active in organizing a small group of liberal Senators to talk the Mallory-change bill to death in that last night. In this connection, a friendly writer described Senator MORSE as follows: "A fighting liberal of the last-ditch variety who is one of the Senates champion filibusterers."

This is puzzling. We had thought that the champion filibusterers came from the South and that they were illiberal, not liberal. But, on second thought, this characterization of Senator MORSE may make as much sense as the ban in the Nation's Capital on voluntary confessions which would be admissible in the States, including the State of Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I pass along a bit of friendly advice to the Washington Evening Star: if it wishes to remove me from public life, a way to do it would be to publish a really favorable editorial about me. I might suffer a heart attack, and in that way it might be possible to get me out of the Senate.

I responded to the editorial by sending to the editors of the Star a letter which the Star got around to publishing today. I ask unanimous consent that my response to the Washington Evening Star be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DUE PROCESS OF LAW

The tongue-in-cheek tone of your March 2 editorial does not disguise the issue at stake in the current effort to overturn the Mallory rule and to perpetuate arrests for investigation, a practice the District of Columbia Commissioners admit is unconstitutional.

It is, of course, naive to expect the Star to be interested in the historic reasons why "due process of law" was required in Federal cases by the Constitution, or in the wisdom of our constitutional fathers in realizing that the techniques of a police state have timeless qualities, as have the essentials of personal liberty. To impress your editorial writer, I should have referred instead to the heavy reliance by Castro's secret police and the Soviet Committee for State Security upon the very same practice of detention of individuals at the pleasure of the police. Arrest for investigation is only our more polite name for it.

Let the Star and its readers be assured that there is great interest among citizens of Oregon in this general subject. In nearby Mountain Home, Idaho, a case involving a U.S. Air Force airman has brought many protests to my office. It concerns the detention of an Air Force enlisted man (white) in connection with the rape and murder of a Mountain Home housewife and the murder of her 2-year-old son. Airman Anderson was held and questioned off and on for 8 days by the Air Force. He, too, made a "voluntary" confession. He was then turned over to civil authorities and arraigned. Before his trial he repudiated his confession, and another man in civil custody on another charge confessed to the Mountain Home murders. Airman Anderson has been released and honorably discharged from the service.

However this case turns out, the Air Force has much to answer for; so does the Defense Department. The ambiguous conditions under which Anderson was held and the allegation by an Idaho judge that "gestapo" tactics of browbeating were used to obtain the confession, are under investigation by the FBI.

The question of what is "voluntary" is the entire issue in these cases. I am delighted that State practice in this area is to come under the scrutiny of the Federal courts, because the Constitution's 14th amendment requires the States, too, to follow due process of law. For the information of your editorial writer, it requires a test to be brought to the Federal courts by a complainant before a decision can be made by the Federal courts on the practice in Oregon or any other State on arrests and arraignment.

Your writer should also be informed that a U.S. Senator does not fix the laws and police procedures in his own State. His jurisdiction is limited to Federal laws. But I shall welcome the application of the same due process requirement to the States—including Oregon—as is required in Federal jurisdictions.

The Star is free to put the word "voluntary" in front of any kind of confession it wishes. For my part, I shall stand with the Federal courts in their determination of what can be presumed to be voluntary and what cannot. I continue to hope that someday the Star will join in encouraging respect for law and order in the District of Columbia by upholding the definition of law instead of flouting it.

As for the filibuster, I shall not embark on any defense of the Mallory rule through prolonged debate without first offering again my resolution to permit a simple majority of Senators to terminate debate. I always offer that proposal when I participate in prolonged debate. It would afford about 2 weeks for a minority to present its case before a vote is taken on the merits of the measure under consideration. Any time the Southern Senators beloved of the Star want to vote such a rule into effect, they will have my help.

WAYNE MORSE,
Senator From Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the Washington Evening Star has complimented me by publishing another editorial attacking me. This editorial is entitled "Our Verbose Correspondent." I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OUR VERBOSE CORRESPONDENT

Our chief regret in printing Senator WAYNE MORSE's letter is the amount of space consumed by his windy irrelevancies. His appraisal of the Star's position on the Mallory rule and arrests for investigation is unfortunate hyperbole—not because it is directed at the Star, but because it exemplifies a brand of political liberalism which handicaps valid law enforcement in the District of Columbia of obscuring the points at issue.

Instead of abdicating its legislative function to Federal judges of various persuasions in this jurisdiction, Congress should amend or clarify, as to its intent, rule 5(a) of Federal procedure. The broadening judicial interpretations of this rule and its basic principle since Mallory reflect more inventive genius than hitherto accepted precedent. Congress should also review and make more precise local statutes relating to police interrogation and detention in criminal investigation. The inadequacies in this field contribute to an uncertainty and confusion that discredit the police and make more difficult their prevention and solution of crime.

A determined search by Congress for appropriate and needed legislation would be of more benefit in dealing with a dangerous and disgraceful crime condition in Washington than any amount of pointless breast beating about due process under the Constitution by the verbose senior Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I deeply appreciate this kind of political support, and I am accustomed to it. For years, the daily newspapers of my State which engage in the same kind of half-baked journalism in which the Washington Star engages have opposed me—except for a new newspaper in Portland called the Reporter, the Coos Bay World, and the Medford Mail-Tribune. I have also enjoyed the support of a highly select group of weeklies in Oregon, the Capital Journal in Salem, the Record-Courier in Baker, and one or two others. The opposition of so much of the Oregon press brings me thousands of votes, because the journalists of America do not fool the American people. The people of the country know that American journalism, by and large, has failed in its responsibilities under the first amendment to tell the truth. They also know that American journalism has—with some notable exceptions—succumbed to the powerful commercial interests which own the American press. So we find Pravda-like propaganda published in most American newspapers, such as the Washington Evening Star.

Let me say that I happen to be one politician who for 18 years in the Senate has not hesitated to "take on" the press, because I do not recognize the members of the press as particularly superior men. Their reading is generally limited to their own writings, and as a result we get from them such misrepresentations of fact and ad hominem arguments, which are so typical of the editorials of the Washington Evening Star.

This failure of the American press to tell the truth is becoming so widely accepted by the general public that the press is playing a smaller and smaller role in American politics, especially in political campaigns. My difference with Mr. Nixon on the role of the press is simply that I think he was defeated in spite of the press, not because of it. Most of us are coming to welcome the opposition of the press because we have found so much distrust among voters of what they read in the papers.

The editorial which the Star has published today is particularly delightful; but after reading it and then reading my so-called "verbose" letter to the editors—to use the language used by the Star—one finds that at no point in the editorial do the editors of the Star join issue with me. They do not come to grips with the point I raised in support of the unanimous decision by the U.S. Supreme Court.

Of course in its editorial of last Saturday, the Star's editors talked about a voluntary confession; but they missed entirely the point of the decision by the U.S. Supreme Court in the Mallory case. I say to the editors of the Star that their calling a confession a voluntary one does not make it voluntary. That is the very essence of the great constitutional issue which confronts Congress with respect to the Mallory case, for we find that when a person is arrested, and then is subjected to hours of "cross-examination" by a police department instead of being arraigned, presumptively he does not give a voluntary confession.

It was to protect that precious right of the American citizen against a situation which would permit of the third degree that the Supreme Court of the United States wrote its great historic decision involving the Mallory rule in regard to Federal jurisdiction.

Mr. President, we know what happens when mere men are given unchecked power, even though those mere men may be policemen, police chiefs, detectives, or police departments. For years I worked in the field of crime investigation. I know what the record throughout our history shows in relation to what flows from unchecked police departments across our country, and how sound the U.S. Supreme Court was in the famous Mallory decision.

If we are going to protect the liberties of the American people, we must see to it at all times that adequate checks are placed upon police departments so that they cannot exercise arbitrary power. Thus, the U.S. Supreme Court in unanimous decision has held that when an American citizen is arrested by a Federal officer—and I shall come to the State problem in a moment—that citizen shall be taken without delay to a committing magistrate to determine whether or not he shall be held or released. What is wrong with that?

As I said some years ago, if a U.S. Senator were willing to waive immunity so that he would be subject to arrest, and would walk out of the Senate Chamber some night and have a District policeman put his hand on his shoulder and notify him that he was under arrest, and then take him to a police station, those who are so anxious to change the Mallory rule might for the first time appreciate the Mallory rule, for it is a rule that seeks to protect all, the innocent as well as the guilty.

Are we ready to waive another precious protection of free men—the presumption of innocence—and the requirement that the State and the Federal Government must establish guilt, or waive such rules as those that pertain to a requirement of immediate arraignment that protect the precious presumption of innocence?

I would not expect nonreading editors to familiarize themselves with constitutional history. If there ever was a collection of ignoramuses in regard to constitutional rights that surpassed the collection that comprises the editorial board of the Evening Star, I should like to see that collection of human beings, because in all the discussions of the Evening Star, in carrying on its propaganda drive to try to change this important U.S. Supreme Court decision, I have yet to read the first intelligent evidence that they are even aware of our constitutional history in the field of civil liberties and the protection of the guarantees, such as the guarantee of a presumption of innocence.

But I have come to expect such action from the Evening Star. Its editors amuse me, although I pity them for their ignorance. I am sad that a newspaper that ought to be a great defender of the precious right of freedom of the press would so abuse that right as to publish the kind of propaganda—Pravda-like in its nature—that it is publishing in respect to the Mallory case.

But in the editorial of last Saturday, the Evening Star irreleventl commented on the law of Oregon. The editorial staff again showed their gross ignorance, for it is the law of Oregon that after one is arrested, he must be arraigned "without delay." They refer to a case that is shaping up in the State of Oregon which allegedly, according to the Washington Star, raises the principle of the Mallory case. They ought to read the case. It is being appealed to the U.S. Supreme Court to determine whether or not a procedure that was followed in connection with the arrest of the person involved in the case in any way affected a confession that was elicited from the defendant.

Oregon statute 133.510 declares that after arrest upon warrant for felony:

> If the crime charged in the warrant is a felony, the officer making the arrest shall take the defendant before the magistrate who issued the warrant or before some other magistrate as provided in ORDS 133.530.

The Oregon statute 133.550 states:

> The defendant shall in all cases be taken before the magistrate without delay.

The Oregon case being brought to the U.S. Supreme Court involves a defendant held overnight before arraignment who claims that such delay was in violation of the statute.

Yet if Senators should read the editorial that appeared in last Saturday's edition of the Evening Star, they would be left with the impression that the police in Oregon can hold an arrested person for whatever period of time the police desire to hold him. That does not happen to be the law of the State of Oregon.

But suffice for now, Mr. President. I do not expect that this is the last time that the editors of the Washington Evening Star and the senior Senator from Oregon will exchange their disrespects.

I only wish to point out that if Senators today read the editorial to which I have referred, and my letter to the editor published on the same page, it would become crystal clear that the editors could not meet me on the issues involved in the Mallory case. Therefore they resorted to their ad hominem arguments, for which I thank them, because if the time ever comes when I find the editors of the Evening Star writing anything favorable about the Senator from Oregon, I shall take a look at myself and see why I slipped so far. I am proud of the fact that I am not one of the favorites of the editors of the Washington Star.

As I say in my letter to the editors today to show how important the precious safeguard of the Mallory rule is, one only has to look to the Anderson case involving the Air Force in the State of Idaho, a case to the everlasting shame of the U.S. Air Force. In that case, Air Force officers held a man under examination for hours and wormed out of him a confession of double murder only sometime later to discover that he was not the guilty party. They found the guilty party, but he was not the one who had been subjected to the third-degree methods of the U.S. Air Force.

I am interested by the failure of the Star even to mention this case in its editorial of today.

The principle for which the senior Senator from Oregon is fighting goes back to the founding of this Republic, for it was one of the abuses of the star chamber proceedings of the British Crown, which led to the Revolution and brought this Republic into being.

It is so easy for us in these times to forget what was sacrificed to win these precious legal rights. I thank God that within a stone's throw of where I speak there is a great citadel of justice which can determine for the American people what is due process of law and can hand down great landmark decisions such as the Mallory case.

When there are such journalistic "pee wees" as the editors of the Evening Star sniping at the heels of that great Court, they make themselves look truly ridiculous.

Mr. President, in a city with 54 percent of the population colored, with all the racial problems which are constantly arising, with unemployment at an exceedingly high rate and at an exceptionally high rate among the colored, we particularly need to be on guard to see that human rights under the law are protected for all, irrespective of the color of their skin.

In an executive session the other day I raised an alleged hypothetical case involving the handling of colored people in the District of Columbia by the Washington, D.C., Police Department, and I asked the Chief of Police, if such a hypothetical were in fact a reality, whether or not he could justify it. He said that if those facts took place, it would be a mistake. Those facts did take place.

That case is not singular in the District of Columbia. Just as Mallory, a Negro, needed the protection of the principle of the Mallory case, which the U.S. Supreme Court gave him, let me say on the floor of the Senate today that the Washington Police Department must not be given unchecked power in the District of Columbia. It needs to be checked by the principles of the Mallory case, and needs to be constantly checked also by all the other precious safeguards of Anglo-Saxon jurisprudence in respect to criminal justice administration.

The senior Senator from Oregon is not going to be silenced, diverted, or intimidated by the ignoramuses who comprise the editorial board of the Washington Evening Star on any issue involving human rights in the District of Columbia or in the entire Nation.

I am well aware of the fact that there are forces in the District of Columbia not too happy about the fact that the senior Senator from Oregon uses his seniority rights to stay on the District of Columbia Committee of the Senate. Because of my long years of service on the District of Columbia Committee, I know how important it is to have continuity of service on that District of Columbia Committee. I know how important it is to have serve on that committee one who is aware of the need for seeing to it that these precious safeguards protecting human rights and liberties in the District of Columbia have an ever-present guardian on the committee to maintain constant vigilance to see to it that wrongs are not committed.

It would be a great wrong, may I say, to change the Mallory rule in the District of Columbia and to give to the Washington, D.C., Police Department the unchecked power for abuse that would flow from the eradication or elimination of the Mallory rule.

There will be more later on this subject from the senior Senator from Oregon not only in future replies to the Evening Star but also in future replies to others who for some reason think that a police department cannot enforce the law unless it is given unchecked power.

I take pride in the fact that I have always supported the strengthening of the Washington, D.C., Police Department in terms of its funds, as to enlarging its staff, and as to giving it the assistance for which it asks within the framework of constitutional guarantees. But let me make clear to the chief of the Washington Police Force today that I do not intend to go along with the drive which he is heading, with the assistance of the editorial board of the Evening Star, seeking to give to his Police Department the unchecked power for the abuses that I am sure would result therefrom by the elimination of the rule in the Mallory case.

Mr. President, I turn to another subject.

COMMENDATION OF HOWARD MORGAN—RESOLUTION OF MULTNOMAH COUNTY, OREG., DEMOCRATIC CENTRAL COMMITTEE

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a communication I have received from Mr. Frank L. Roberts, chairman of the Multnomah County, Oreg., Democratic Central Committee, Portland, Oreg., setting forth certain resolutions which were passed at the last meeting of the committee.

There being no objection, the communication was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MULTNOMAH COUNTY DEMOCRATIC CENTRAL COMMITTEE,
Portland, Oreg., March 4, 1963.

The Honorable WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear SENATOR MORSE: I have been asked to inform you of the following resolution which was adopted by the Democratic Central Committee of Multnomah County at its regular monthly meeting on February 28, 1963:

"Whereas the Democratic Party traditionally has fostered the conservation and development of the Nation's resources for the benefit of all the people, and thereby has greatly advanced the well-being of the Pacific Northwest in particular; and

"Whereas President Kennedy's administration has marked a return to the best traditions of the Democratic Party in subordinating special privilege to the general public interest; and

"Whereas Howard Morgan has demonstrated, in national and State office, and in public and party office, those qualities of integrity, vigor, fearlessness, and intellectual capacity which are especially important in the protection of the public interest in the Nation's resources: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That the Multnomah County Democratic Central Committee commends Howard Morgan for his outstanding service as Federal Power Commissioner in the promotion of sound public power policies, expresses its regret that he has decided to remove himself from this position of great public trust, and voices its hope that this action represents but a temporary retirement from public life; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That this body urges the President of the United States, in his search for a successor to Howard Morgan, to seek out and to appoint a man who has demonstrated in practical application the same qualities of character in the discharge of public trust; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That a copy of this resolution be transmitted to the President of the United States, to Commissioner Morgan, to the U.S. Senators from Oregon and to the Congresswoman from Multnomah County."

Sincerely yours,
FRANK L. ROBERTS,
Chairman.

DEATH OF DR. JUAN MARIN

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, Mr. Richard Butrick, a retired Foreign Service officer residing in the District of Columbia, has informed me of the death in Chile of Dr. Juan Marin.

Dr. Marin's passing is a genuine loss to the United States. On December 8, 1941, while serving as Chilean Chargé d'Affaires in China, he immediately offered his services in representation of the several hundred Americans, both official and private, and their interests in Shanghai, and carried on in that capacity, at considerable personal danger from inflamed Japanese, until the U.S. Government several weeks later appointed the Swiss Government as its official representative.

Dr. Marin, whose broad-faceted career included service as a doctor, naval officer, diplomat representing Chile in China, India, Egypt, and San Salvador, and distinguished contemporary writer, at the time of his death was on leave from his position as Director of Cultural Affairs of the Organization of American States and serving as director of the summer school of the University of Chile, which was dedicating this session to a study of inter-American relations and the operation of the Alliance for Progress.

In his many posts abroad and in Washington since 1956, Dr. Marin and his wife, Milena, established a wide circle of devoted American friends who will greatly miss him and whose sorrow at his passing merges with that of his widow.

THE LUMBER SITUATION

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, recently a number of bills were introduced designed by the National Lumber Manufacturers Association to assist in dealing with the subject of lumber imports.

I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks the following items: A letter of February 25 from Mr. Mortimer Doyle, of the National Lumber Manufacturers Association; my letters of January 7 and March 1 to Mr. Doyle; a letter to the editor of the Oregonian by a lumberman who is a member of the Oregon State Legislature, Mr. Sidney Leiken; an Oregonian article of February 22 on the timber capital gains tax; a memorandum by the Western Forest Industries Association on the lumber standards issue; an Oregonian story on ICC action to reduce the transcontinental rail rates on lumber; and five news stories and editorials regarding the efforts by western lumber marketers to secure what they believe to be equitable treatment in the shipment of lumber by rail through return of the freehold privilege.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibits 1 through 12.)

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, in connection with the ICC action on rail rates, I note that southern lumber producers objected to this action, which would benefit western lumber shippers and consumers nationally to the extent of $20 million annually.

It is interesting to note that the large lumber operators oppose the efforts of the smaller operators in the Northwest to secure a railroad freehold opportunity while the large operators appear to have certain advantages of their own.

One Oregon lumber producer told me, and I quote him:

> The dual nature of these large industry giants has reached proportions where the

smaller operators and wholesalers are being quietly clubbed to death under the noisy banner of concern over our poor, beleaguered Northwest lumber industry.

At the identical time that these large lumber giants who support and dominate the major industry trade associations were petitioning the Congress and Maritime Commission for Jones Act relief, they were fighting our widely supported rail petition which would grant relief to hundreds of smaller rail mills from pressures created by decisions of the past 2 years which have restricted the marketing freedom by rail of these smaller mills. As the Tariff Commission has denied the recent application for restriction of Canadian imports, these smaller mills need every bit of internal domestic assistance possible to stay alive in this age of consolidations, mergers, and bigger business. We, as an association, as lumber businessmen, and as private citizens are more greatly disturbed than ever at the ability of these giants to stifle a service which would have been of continued assistance to the entire lumber industry; whereas, the denial of this service could only serve to the advantage of those who are blessed with the resources and vast sales apparatus to be able to avoid in-transit sales.

At the San Francisco public hearings on this tariff, 11 mills appeared in opposition to this proposal and they included such giants as Weyerhaeuser, Georgia-Pacific, Simpson Timber, International Paper, etc. What was significant to me was that their opposition to this proposal was not based on any grounds that it might be harmful to the Northwest lumber industry, but rather their opposition concerned itself with the railroads profit plight, boxcar shortages, and other objections one step removed from the problems of the Northwest lumber manufacturers.

The letter from Mr. Sidney Leiken, included as one of my exhibits, points out his causes of concern, and he is especially disturbed over the position taken by some in the industry regarding the Federal Wage and Hour Act.

In addition, the Western Forest Industries Association expresses strong concern over efforts to change lumber standards. The association contends, for example, that one facet of the proposal being advanced by the National Lumber Manufacturers Association, if adopted, would mean that the shipper of green lumber would be required to pay the additional freight for an extra thickness of lumber. He would be required to pay additional freight as compared to the dry lumber producer, and the impact upon the green lumber producer would be close to $10 million in additional freight rates. It is the position of this organization that the present data on lumber shrinkage and strength is inadequate, and they urge that there be a thorough and careful review so that the overall result would be beneficial to the entire lumber industry and to the users of wood.

On the tax front, the administration has proposed a substantial revision of the present capital gains afforded timber. The Treasury Department data indicates that a possible two-thirds or even more of the benefits of this provision of law is enjoyed by 25 out of 7,500 corporations. I have not yet reached a conclusion on the extent to which the Treasury tax proposal will affect the overall lumber situation, but I would hope that what can be achieved will be an equitable spread of the taxload and the elimination of favoritism to a select few in the tax laws.

There is one final item on which I would like to comment briefly, and I ask unanimous consent that a statement on national forest timber sale activities for calendar year 1962 be placed in the Record at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 13.)

Mr. MORSE. Last June 12 the Senator from Washington [Mr. Magnuson], on behalf of all the northwest Senators, asked that the Forest Service provide a better reporting on its activities. This has been done and I call to the attention of those in the forest products' industry both the overall picture and, for the benefit of those in particular areas, the situation where they operate.

In my judgment, this report is extremely encouraging, while, at the same time, providing the basis for improvement. The timber harvest during 1962 was the highest ever on the national forests, exceeding the 1959 record by 300 million board feet. The record shows a continued strong interest in the purchase of national forest timber and a continuation of bidding by the industry, often in amounts substantially in excess of Forest Service appraised rates.

I take particular note of the candid manner in which the report presents data and the statement that "improvement is needed in a few localized situations." On certain national forests in Oregon, there is evidence that sale of timber can be improved, and I trust that rapid action will be taken in those locations to do this to the full extent that there is a market for the timber.

These exhibits form an interesting panorama for they give some insight into the diverse points of view in the highly competitive lumber industry. Even more, they indicate, as I did in my letter to Mr. Doyle on March 1, the difficulty of getting a definition of the true situation, the causes, and the best solutions to existing problems.

It is my intention to do all I can to help our domestic lumber industry, for I am convinced it does have problems. It would be a disservice for me to do less than show that the course to be taken is not easily chosen.

I welcome the introduction of the several bills to deal with lumber matters and hope that as we proceed with the legislative process we can identify the real problems and select reasonable solutions.

Exhibit 1

January 7, 1963.

Mr. Mortimer B. Doyle,
National Lumber Manufacturers Association,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Doyle: Many thanks for your good letter of November 26. I have been giving a great deal of thought to the facts contained in that letter and the overall aspects of the problems facing our domestic lumber industry.

I believe it would be most useful to have prepared an analysis of the various steps which might be considered. Such an analysis should include those things which can be done by the industry itself, those things which might be done by local and State governments and those things which might be done in cooperation with private organizations and groups and those steps which might be undertaken by the Federal Government.

In the field where the Federal Government would be involved, it would be useful to include discussions of the steps which would be taken administratively and those which would require legislation. Such an analysis should be set forth in as succinct a form as possible with appropriate references to the laws applicable and the exact changes in legislation which might be considered. This would form an extremely useful basis for future definitive consideration.

In my talks with numerous people during the fall, I have become convinced that the best possible course to take is the one which produces long-range solutions, but at the same time there must be very careful selection of the steps which can be taken immediately so that long-range solutions will have the opportunity to be fully effective.

Inasmuch as the Tariff Commission has not yet made the recommendation, there is no way to ascertain the conclusion it may reach, and thus it would be useful to chart a course based on steps which would be desirable in the event of an affirmative finding by the Tariff Commission and the steps that would be desirable if their finding is negative.

It seems to me that the association and my colleagues in the Senate and House should continue to stress the importance of industry divided solutions which involve the minimum intervention on the part of the Government.

I say this because while I have no personal objection to the Government participating in those facets of economic and social affairs where this participation is indicated, I firmly believe that the best effort occurs when the individuals concerned make a maximum contribution to their own welfare.

I would be pleased to discuss further steps with you when you have had a chance to prepare the material suggested. I recognize that this is a substantial request to make, but I do not think it more than you would want to do yourself in the light of the situation confronting the industry.

Sincerely yours,

Wayne Morse.

Exhibit 2

National Lumber
Manufacturers Association,
Washington, D.C., February 25, 1963.

The Honorable Wayne Morse,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

My Dear Senator Morse: Thank you for your kind letter of January 7 requesting information on the lumber industry's major problems, and the programs which it has recommended and is pursuing in an effort to effectively resolve these problems.

Some of these matters are, of course, more urgent than others, and, of course, it would be impossible in a letter to evaluate thoroughly all aspects of our industry's numerous and complex problems. However, I sincerely hope that the material set forth in the following paragraphs of this letter will be of some assistance to you.

In analyzing our problems, I cannot avoid feeling—particularly in the light of our existing economic problems—that unless something is done to bring about immediate action to resolve these problems we will suffer an economic decline during the next few years far worse than the rate which we have experienced in the recent past.

It is axiomatic that an industry to be prosperous must enjoy continuing and sustainable growth attended by an ever-rising level of overall demand for its products. Only under such circumstances will it be able to supply job opportunities for a steadily growing population and make the reasonable profits necessary to encourage adequate investment. Our industry has urged and will strongly support an economic program that (1) leads to expanding employment; (2) encourages private investment; (3) creates rising productive efficiency and lower costs; (4) provides better prices and greater buying demand; and (5) increases production and is a source of reasonable profits.

As you point out in your letter, an essential quality of self-government is that the private individual is permitted to have the largest practicable degree of decision making and, in accordance with this principle, that government is best which interferes least, so long, however, as such individual's actions are consistent with those national purposes which are considered central to the welfare of our society.

On the other hand, we must recognize that government is an agency of the people and must be utilized to serve those purposes and do those things which individuals cannot and should not do. The international ramifications concerned with our import problem, for example, preclude individuals from taking any direct action to resolve this problem. The government must do this.

Some of our problems admittedly are very difficult, but their difficulty does not mean that they can be ignored. President Kennedy has said that "this Nation has not come to its present position of leadership by avoiding hard problems. We are at a point in history when we must face and resolve these problems." We firmly believe that the administration is aware of our industry's dilemma, and that it is sympathetic. Indication of this may be found in a statement on the lumber problem prepared by the Forest Products Division of the Business and Defense Services Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, copy of which is enclosed. Although we would not agree with it in its entirety, it is, overall, a good report.

To date, however, our Government has prescribed hardly any medicine for our malady except exhortation. We strongly urge that our Government now examine its own responsibility to the American lumber industry and its employees, and following this with the affirmative action that is needed to improve the economic position of our industry, and those communities and their citizens which are dependent upon a prosperous forest products industry for their continued existence.

Briefly outlined, the major problems of our industry, and our recommendations for their equitable solution, include the following:

TAXATION

The primary issue with respect to taxation, insofar as the timber industry is concerned, relates to the application of capital gain treatment to timber proceeds. To assure the equitable tax treatment of forestry and timber operations the industry supports the programs conceived and advanced by the forest industries committee on timber valuation and taxation. This committee vigorously opposes any proposals which endanger the equitable tax treatment of timber income.

We were quite shocked to learn that among the administration's tax revisions proposed to the House Ways and Means Committee on February 6 by Secretary Dillon was a repeal of the capital gains treatment of income from timber.

Under the changes proposed by Secretary Dillon, net proceeds from timber sales exceeding $5,000 (regardless of the kind of transaction involved) would be treated as ordinary income and taxed accordingly. Some industry spokesmen assert that repeal of the capital gains treatment would place the lumber industry in a worse position than prior to 1944 when the law was enacted. Even then, they say outright sale of timber was afforded the capital gains treatment. The new proposals would have no such provision.

Enactment of this proposal, coupled with the problem of constantly mounting imports, could easily result in the destruction of our industry as a major element of the American economy, and the primary source of industrial employment in thousands of American communities.

Other tax problems also exist. The lumber industry believes it is inequitable for its trucks, using private roads, or roads privately constructed and maintained, to be required to pay the taxes used to construct and maintain the Interstate Highway System. So far, our efforts to get Congress to enact legislation to eliminate this tax have been unsuccessful. We intend, however, to continue to press for equity in this area.

LUMBER IMPORTS

Our country imported approximately 4.5 billion board feet of softwood lumber from Canada last year or approximately 17 percent of U.S. softwood lumber markets as of the close of the year. This percentage is expected to rise substantially in 1963 unless counteraction is taken.

In an effort to reasonably resolve the unemployment and operation problems imposed upon the American lumber industry by an unchecked flood of imported Canadian softwood lumber, the industry constantly seeks the assistance of Congress and other responsible public officials. It has held a number of informal congressional conferences. It has pursued congressional and administrative hearings. It instituted an unsuccessful escape clause appeal before the U.S. Tariff Commission.

Among the possible solutions to its import problem, the industry has consistently recommended: (1) Establishment of an import quota on softwood lumber by direct legislative action; (2) that measures be taken to require that all imported lumber be marked to show country of origin (Canadian lumber has been specifically exempted from this requirement); (3) that lumber be made eligible under the quota provisions of section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act so that quantitative limitations could be placed on the importation of forest products into the United States; (4) implementation and extension of the buy-American principle as may be necessary to assure that all lumber and wood products used in construction federally financed or federally insured (as in FHA-insured housing) is of domestic manufacture; and (5) that a thorough market study in foreign countries should be made in cooperation with the Department of Commerce, with the specific objective of expanding the export of American forest products.

RIGHT-OF-WAY (NATIONAL FOREST INGRESS AND EGRESS)

I have written you separately, February 21, on the matter of rights-of-way across national forest land to permit access to private land. Clearly, the Government should agree not to demand a reciprocal right-of-way of greater value than the value of the right-of-way across Federal land a private owner requests. Also, provision for immediate access to inholdings, where needed, must be included in recommended legislation and the determination of values of rights-of-way must be placed in impartial hands.

APPEALS PROCEDURES

The Forest Service in its management of the national forests is not subject to the requirements of the Administrative Procedures Act. The present appeals procedure is slow and expensive, and the final decision in any dispute over timber sales matters remains with the seller—the Forest Service.

On February 21, 1962, the lumber industry presented the Secretary of Agriculture with a program to help improve the timber management and sales practices of the U.S. Forest Service. One of these points was a request for a more equitable method to appeal administrative decisions of the Forest Service.

Although the Secretary of Agriculture has ample authority to establish a new appeals procedure, enactment of special legislation may be necessary to insure that corrective action is taken. Such a law would assure a timber operator an appeal to a level higher than the one with which he is dealing on his contract, and additionally, there should be a further appeals board established within the Department of Agriculture.

WILDERNESS LEGISLATION

The lumber industry, generally, is not convinced that general wilderness legislation is necessary. During the last Congress a bill to set aside up to 15 million acres (there would be an additional 45 million acres of land that could be affected and eventually might become wilderness lands) of wilderness, wild canoe, and primitive lands for the national wilderness preservation system was the subject of much action, and, in fact, it passed the Senate.

However, while not advocating legislative action, lumbermen will generally support wilderness legislation which includes a requirement for (1) a review of primitive lands before they are recommended for inclusion in a wilderness system; and (2) positive congressional approval of any wilderness additions.

FEDERAL TIMBER SALES PROCEDURES

At present, the Forest Service manages timber under the basic law of 1897 which requires only that timber be "designated and appraised" and advertised and sold. Under this authority Secretaries of Agriculture have so far written 29 regulations, some of which have been withdrawn or superseded over the years. The Forest Service timber management program is governed by these regulations.

The first proposal in this area which the industry endorses has to do with management of national forest timber and would establish standards of performance for national forest management. It would require an annual report in the nature of an accounting which could be used to appraise the productivity of the national forests.

The second has to do with timber appraisal practices and is intended to allow the Forest Service to sell Government timber without taking advantage of its monopoly position where there are no alternative sources of timber supply.

The third proposal is a request for a new appeals procedure. It proposes a prompt and impartial procedure for resolving contract and contract administration and performance differences. The present appeals procedure is slow and expensive, and the final decision remains with the seller, the Federal agency.

The fourth proposal is a request for a complete revision of the timber sales contract form in order to establish a normal buyer-and-seller relationship between the Forest Service and the industry. At the present time, the contract form permits a one-sided relationship of the seller, permitting arbitrary, unilateral seller domination of the buyer-and-seller relationship. With the exception on the appeals procedure matter, no new legislation is recommended at the present time.

WOOD PROMOTION

The erosion of the domestic lumber market in the mid-1950's had a different and alarming ring than previous short-lived fluctuations and resulted in the first move toward the formation of a national wood promotion program, and the beginning of efforts to analyze the industry's current and prospective merchandising, research, and promotion program at all levels.

It was determined during this period that a positive stepped-up sales promotion, plus a comprehensive product development and marketing program, was needed to halt lumber's loss of volume. A vital action program involving at the present time expenditures amounting to an estimated $10 million or more annually, and financed through national, regional, and company sources, is being carried forward actively. While the industry has been heartened by the results of this overall effort, there is much work to be accomplished before its success can be measured. Currently, the NWPP is devoting its efforts to gaining the cooperation and support of all groups interested in increasing the demand for lumber and wood products.

LUMBER GRADES AND STANDARDS

The industry's recommendations for resolving problems concerned with lumber grade simplification and standardization call for (a) standardization of industry grade names for all species of softwood lumber used in residential construction to facilitate ease of specification by the home building industry; (b) grade descriptions to supply comparable quality based upon end-use requirements to make lumber more economical and less confusing to use; (c) standardized sizes for seasoned and unseasoned lumber which will place lumber standards on a sound technical and more meaningful basis; (d) a new size of boards (five-eighths inch thick) for sheathing and subflooring to make lumber more competitive with other materials which are only one-half inch or less in thickness and which are presently making strong inroads into lumber housing markets; and (e) a simplified method of presenting span tables for joists and rafters. We are actively working toward these goals.

Quite frankly, Senator, we could go on ad infinitum with a monolog of the problems of our industry and their recommended solutions. We are, however, aware that your keen interest and concern has made you quite knowledgeable about our industry and its problems. Because of this, I have attempted only to highlight in writing those areas which at the moment are of the most serious concern to lumbermen throughout the Nation and our proposals for equitably and immediately resolving them.

Admittedly, our industry is faced with some problems created by the thrust of new technology and automation. These obstacles are minor, however, for our economic difficulties have not been due primarily to the lack of a skilled labor force or to a lack of managerial skills or inventiveness. The greatest deterrent to the growth of a strong domestic lumber industry lies in the threat of inequitable tax treatment by our Government, and in a flood of foreign lumber, particularly at a time when it is not needed. The problems of our industry are economic problems and not technological problems.

Unless a reasonable limitation on lumber imports is immediately effected, we firmly believe that (a) lumber imports will flow into this country in ever-mounting quantities, disproportionate to the quantities needed to supplement domestic supply; (b) there will be a resultant discouragement of, and decrease in, domestic production, and (c) this Nation may, perhaps, someday regret to find itself without a domestic lumber industry able to meet its lumber and wood products needs.

Jobs and job opportunities are declining in our industry. Our profit rate is also declining. The demand for U.S.-produced lumber is insufficient to meet existing productive capacity. We cannot hope to grow in technology without a higher rate of investment, and entrepreneurs simply will not invest in an industry unless they see growing markets for its products.

Any member of our NLMA staff will be glad to discuss further with you, or any member of your staff, the chronic rise in idle manpower and plant capacity in our industry, and our recommendations for coping with the serious economic slack which has gripped our industry during the past few years. I am enclosing a copy of the several proposed laws that we believe will be of help to do that which you have said is so important, "to keep the cash registers ringing on Main Street" in our lumber-dependent communities.

Your interest and concern in the American lumber industry and its employees is, of course, greatly appreciated.

Sincerely,

MORTIMER B. DOYLE.

PROPOSED REFUND OF HIGHWAY USE TAXES IN THE CASE OF OFF-HIGHWAY USE OF VEHICLES

The attached proposed bill is based on the premise that highway users should pay for the expanded highway construction program; and the converse of this, that nonhighway users should not pay for the expanded highway construction program.

"It is no more proper that those who do not ride the facility be charged for a ticket on it than for everybody to be forced by law to buy a season round-trip ticket every year on the B. & O. Railroad whether they ever ride that or any other train." (C. D. Martin, Jr., Under Secretary of Commerce, before the House Ways and Means Committee, March 14, 1961.)

The forest products industries own and operate thousands of trucks for logging purposes that move largely on privately owned or privately maintained road systems in the forested regions of the United States. It is unfair for these trucks to support an interstate highway system which they will never utilize when at the same time the owners of these vehicles are expending large sums of money to build and maintain their own road systems.

The proposed amendment is not an exemption from the highway-user taxes. It does, however, provide a refund of such taxes based upon the extent to which vehicles operate over privately owned or otherwise privately maintained roads.

As in other tax refund circumstances, the burden is upon the taxpayer to maintain the necessary records to prove his entitlement to the refunds. Experience under comparable State tax refund statutes demonstrate the administrative feasibility of such a refund system.

The proposed amendment is in complete accordance with the Federal pay-as-you-go highway program and actually implements the user-tax principle of the highway trust fund.

PROPOSED BILL, 88th CONGRESS, 1st SESSION

A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide a refund of the highway use tax in the case of trucks and other vehicles which do not operate on the Interstate Highway System, and for other purposes

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 6416(b)(2) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to special cases in which tax payments are considered as overpayments) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(R) If a highway motor vehicle, whether licensed to operate upon a public highway or not, operates over (1) any road, thoroughfare or property in private ownership, or (2) any public road or thoroughfare constructed by, or maintained by, the owner of such motor vehicle who is not otherwise reimbursed for such construction or maintenance, or (3) any road or thoroughfare pursuant to an agreement with any agency of the United States or of any State or with a licensee of any such agency, or both, if the agreement imposes upon the user of such road or thoroughfare the obligation either to construct such road at his own expense, to maintain the same at his own expense, or to pay any such agency or its licensee a reasonable consideration for the use of such road or thoroughfare, and such highway motor vehicle uses or consumes articles in respect of which tax has been imposed under section 4041, subsection (a) (1), (3) or (4) of section 4071, or section 4081, or such highway motor vehicle is one in respect of which tax has been imposed under section 4481, the Secretary or his delegate shall refund (without interest) to the ultimate purchaser of such article or to the person in respect of whom tax has been imposed under section 4481, a proportionate part of such tax based upon the number of miles traveled by such highway motor vehicle over such road, thoroughfare or property as compared to the total number of miles traveled by such vehicle. The Secretary or his delegate shall have authority to prescribe regulations and recordkeeping requirements in respect of such refund."

PROVISIONS OF FUEL AND MOTOR VEHICLE USE TAXES OF THE STATES OF OREGON AND IDAHO

OREGON

Tax imposed	*Refunds or credits*	*Recordkeeping*
A "mills per mile" use tax for different weight categories "for use of the highways," the tax to be used for public highway construction. (O.R.C. 767.325.)	Excludes application of tax to persons or motor vehicles "when operating over any road or thoroughfare in private ownership" or "when using any road or thoroughfare, other than a State highway or county road, pursuant to an agreement with any agency of the United States or with a licensee of such agency, or both, if the agreement imposes upon the user of such road or thoroughfare the obligation either to construct or maintain it at his own expense, or to pay such agency or licensee of such agency a reasonable consideration for the use * * * of such road. * * *". (O.R.C. 767.035.)	Requires daily mileage record on all vehicles and monthly report thereon; gives commissioner other broad supervisory powers—"Regulatory and Enforcement Provisions." (O.R.C. 767.405–767.990.)

PROVISIONS OF FUEL AND MOTOR VEHICLE USE TAXES OF THE STATES OF OREGON AND IDAHO—Continued

Tax imposed	*Refunds or credits*	*Recordkeeping*
	IDAHO	
A "mills per mile" use tax for different weight categories of commercial vehicles based on mileage operated over State highways. (I.C. 49-127.)	Allow deduction at time of payment for "miles traveled on roadways maintained with private funds by agreement with the public agency or agencies having jurisdiction over the same." (I.C. 49-127.)	Quarterly report required on mileage operated over State roads; vehicle owner required to maintain records and to purchase documents to justify use of rate schedules in code; penalties provided. (I.C. 49-127a.)
	OREGON	
Six-cent-a-gallon tax on gasoline and motor vehicle fuels usable as fuel for operation of motor vehicles. (O.R.C. 319.000.)	Provides refund to person using fuel for operating a motor vehicle, whether licensed to operate upon the public highway or not, if used over privately owned, or privately built or maintained roads, such refunds being based upon a proportionate part—"The proportionate part shall be based upon the number of miles traveled over such roads" as compared to the total vehicle mileage. (O.R.C. 319.320.)	Authorizes secretary of state to impose recordkeeping and refund requirements. (O.R.C. 319.320.)
	IDAHO	
Six cents a gallon on special fuel used in "any motor vehicle while operated upon the highway" (tax is collected at time of sale by the seller from the user). (I.C. 49-731, 730.)	Allows refund to person who has paid fuel tax, either directly or indirectly, where fuel has been "used for purposes other than for the propulsion of motor vehicles upon the public highways. * * *" (I.C. 49-736, 737.)	Licenses required of special fuel dealers; records and monthly reports required of both dealer and user; penalties provided for failure to keep records. (49 I.C. 733, 734, 735, 746.)
	OREGON	
Six-cent-a-gallon use fuel tax imposed on motor vehicle fuels (diesel, etc.). (O.R.S. 319, 520, 530.)	Provides exemption for fuel used in propelling vehicle "over any road or thoroughfare in private ownership," or over any road built or maintained by the user at his own expense under agreement with any agency. (O.R.S. 319.540.)	Use-fuel tax license required of user; faithful performance bond required; emblem required to be displayed upon vehicle; monthly reports required. (O.R.S. 319, 550, 570, 600, 690.)

EXHIBIT 3

MARCH 1, 1963.

Mr. MORTIMER B. DOYLE,
Executive Vice President, National Lumber Manufacturers Association, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. DOYLE: Your good letter of February 25, responding to the suggestion in my January 7 letter to you regarding lumber industry problems, was very much appreciated. As I have told you in the past, I think that we can work together on those points upon which we are in agreement, and we need not be disturbed should we not be in full agreement on every issue.

On the matter of taxation, as it relates to both capital gains and road use, I have not reached a final decision. Should there be information and material which the forest industrial committee on timber evaluation and taxation feels would be useful to me, I would be very pleased to have it. I am taking the liberty of transmitting the material on the road-use tax to the Secretary of the Treasury for analysis.

On the matter of lumber imports, it is my view that action should be taken which will protect our domestic lumber industry against unfair competition from outside. Already the administration has done a number of things which I believe have proven useful. These include the $25 million change in depreciation allowance schedules and the recent decision by the Interstate Commerce Commission on lumber freight rates from the Pacific Northwest, estimated by the ICC to have an effect of $10 million annually. The Federal agencies have been proceeding vigorously with a domestic lumber procurement program; the Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary of the Interior have not only increased allowable cuts from the public forest but have taken positive action on the blowdown situation in the Pacific Northwest. In addition, the modest amendment in the Jones Act has been of considerable value to our Northwest shippers.

However, in my judgment, much remains to be done. It is my hope that the Northwest Senators will be able to get together in the very near future and outline a program of constructive action which will place us in a position where we can evaluate which of the several measures restricting imports would be best calculated to be most effective and least onerous to other segments of our economy.

For example, I am concerned that the buy-American principle, if applied to FHA housing, would pose some problems for the homebuilding industry. I do not want to imply by this statement that I would oppose such a provision but I want to weigh most carefully whether it is something that I should urge at this time. My present feeling is that we may want to press for a somewhat more substantial quota than is suggested by your legislative staff, but again, I wish to evaluate this situation a little further.

In a separate letter I have discussed the right-of-way issue.

On the appeals procedure, I am informed there is an understanding between the Forest Service and your association that further action will be deferred until the small working party which has been discussing possible revisions of the Forest Service timber sale contract has completed its work and circulated its suggestions for broader industry approval.

On the wilderness legislation, I must be frank to state that my view here is that we should have such legislation. I would further say that if we in the Congress are going to have the time to take care of the basic economic problems confronting our lumber industry it is essential that we follow the pattern of last year's Senate-passed legislation which, in my judgment, provides for an adequate review of primitive areas and does not burden the Congress with approval of each and every one of them. As you know, the legislation definitely contemplates that there will be congressional approval on any new additions to the wilderness system. I think there is much merit in this suggestion since the wilderness legislation would come before the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, which is composed mainly of western Senators who are from the heavy lumber producing regions of our Nation.

On Forest Service timber sale procedures, I am of the opinion that substantial progress is being made. On the first proposal made by your organization last year dealing with the management of national forest timber and annual reports, Secretary Freeman has taken the necessary action. On timber appraisal matters, I am advised by the Department of Agriculture that a committee of three experts in the field will commence its review this March, soliciting cooperation of the industry as its proceeds in this complex technical subject. The third proposal in this category has already been discussed in my letter as has the fourth on which substantial progress, I am told, is being made.

I would like at this point to deal collectively with the two items you entitle "Wood Promotion" and "Lumber Grades and Standards." Expressions of concern have been voiced by a number of Northwest lumber producers on the question of lumber grades and standards. I believe that some improvements could be made in this field and the proposals that have been made seem to be pointed in this direction. On the other hand, I am inclined to agree with the people from the Northwest who have spoken to me on this issue, that a thorough study should be made before lumber grades and standards are changed and that we should have the best possible technical information at our disposal. Also, I think that it is essential that any new program of such broad dimensions be carefully analyzed before it is put into effect in order that we do not disrupt producers who are not presently geared to the manufacture of the type of lumber which would be more preferred under the suggested program.

On wood promotion, I believe there is a definite Government responsibility to be of positive assistance. For this reason, I would support an enlargement of the legislation that Senator MAGNUSON introduced last year which would allocate a part of our tariff collections from Canadian lumber to the benefit of the wood-using industry. One step which I think would be useful would be to allocate a portion of the tariff collection to checking the lumber grades and standards of incoming Canadian lumber. Even more important, I think, would be the allocation of a part of the funds to wood promotion and market development. In my judgment, the entire tariff collected should be placed at the disposal of the domestic lumber industry through a coordinated program operated by the proper agencies in the Federal Government.

I am especially interested in finding all of the constructive steps that can be taken domestically which will improve per capita consumption of lumber. I hope that the steps that I have outlined, limited though they may be, are indicative of the type of things which I think would be useful.

It is my hope that we will have an early report from the Secretary of Agriculture on the access matter and from the Secretary of the Treasury on the road use tax matter. When these reports arrive, I would like to schedule a meeting with you and your associates so that we may review exactly where we stand on the question of Canadian lumber imports and the condition of the domestic lumber industry.

The several draft bills which you submitted to me dealing with Canadian lumber imports on a restrictive basis have been introduced by Members of the Senate. The question, therefore, is now properly before the appropriate Senate committees. My judgment is that it will be necessary to decide which of these bills would be most effective, taken together with other constructive action, in dealing with the situation. In the final analysis, you can be assured of my support of whatever action is reasonable and proper.

Your views on the suggestions that I have made here would be most helpful. Your further suggestions at any time will certainly be welcome.

With best personal regards.

Sincerely,

WAYNE MORSE.

EXHIBIT 4

[From the Oregonian, Feb. 22, 1963]

WEST VERSUS SOUTH

To the EDITOR:

The February 13 edition of the Oregonian carried a letter from Mortimer B. Doyle, executive vice president, National Lumber Manufacturers Association, in which he sought to explain away the opposition of his organization to a proposed amendment to the Federal Wage and Hour Act that would require equal pay for women who do work equivalent to that performed by men. In his letter, Mr. Doyle purported to speak for lumbermen and the lumber industry.

There is a substantial segment of the lumber industry in the West that is not a part of Mr. Doyle's organization, that does not share Mr. Doyle's views, and for which Mr. Doyle certainly does not speak.

Canadian lumber, alone, is not the sole problem of the western lumber industry. Of equal concern is the southern pine industry, whose views on this occasion are reflected in Mr. Doyle's letter. The southern pine industry may not like Canadian lumber imports, but it likes even less the producers of lumber in the Western States. Hence, it is the southern pine industry that urges retention of the Jones Act whereby the Government prohibits west coast lumber producers from using available ships of foreign registry. This prevents west coast lumber producers from regaining their east coast markets. It is southern lumber producers, now joined by a few westerners, who are pressuring the Federal Government to discriminate against the sizes of lumber that our great water shipping mills produce and ship. And it is the southern mills that pay low wages and now resist efforts to see that women are paid fairly for the work they do.

Mr. Doyle says the core issue is whether individuals with limited skills should be forced into unemployment by a Government requirement for payment of high wages. Lumber manufacturers of Oregon and Washington pay decent hourly wages that enable families to live with the dignity of American citizens. We do not complain, but we cannot compete in the eastern and middle western lumber markets with manufacturers of southern pine who want to manufacture lumber with cheap labor

Mr. Doyle's organization wants the Government to force the rejection of the products of our water shipping mills. But Government interferes too much, he says, when it compels a decent minimum wage.

Mr. Doyle speaks for the National Lumber Manufacturers Association. He reflects accurately the wondrous views of the southern wing of that association. But he certainly does not speak for me or the many other western lumbermen like me.

SIDNEY LEIKEN,
Oregon State Representative and President, L. & H. Lumber Co.
SUTHERLIN.

EXHIBIT 5

[From the Oregonian, Feb. 22, 1963]

BILL WOULD PLUG TIMBER TAX HOLE

(By Julius Duscha)

WASHINGTON.—A little-noticed provision in President Kennedy's tax program would plug a loophole that has provided big timber, lumber, and paper companies with hundreds of millions of dollars in benefits for nearly 20 years.

The loophole was placed in the law to encourage good forestry practices, but for the most part it has had the opposite effect.

Since 1944 all profits from the sale of timber have been treated as capital gains and taxed at the low capital gains rate of 25 percent.

When the capital gains rate was applied to all timber sales it was argued that small timber operators would benefit the most and that the change would foster good timber practices.

But large corporations have been the big beneficiaries. According to a Treasury Department study, they have used the provision to speed up the cutting of their timber holdings in a manner not conducive to the good forestry practices of selective cutting and reforestation.

Here are some examples from the Treasury study of the effects of the timber loopholes in 1959, the latest year for which complete figures are available.

In the timber industry, 3 companies received 42 percent of the $44 million in tax benefits given timber operators, while 12 companies out of a total of 2,427 in the industry got more than half of the benefits.

In the plywood industry, 2 companies got more than 90 percent of the $11 million in timber capital gains benefits received by the industry, 4 firms got all but 5 percent of the benefits and the other 1,400 firms in this industry received less than $500,000 in capital gains benefits.

Of the 3,464 companies in the paper industry, the 15 largest ones got more than 82 percent of the timber capital gains benefits given that industry.

Before 1944 a farmer or timber grower who owned timber and cut it for his own business or who had someone harvest the timber under a cutting contract could not treat his profits as capital gains. To get the capital gains treatment the timber and the land had to be sold outright.

Under the best timber-cutting practices timber is harvested selectively and the land is carefully reforested so that over a period of years timber can become an annual crop.

But before 1944, the tax laws encouraged the outright sale of timber, which generally means the denuding of timberland, and penalized the careful cutting and reforestation practices.

A Treasury Department analysis of the timber capital gains provision points out that lumber, pulp and paper companies buy timberlands to assure themselves a permanent supply of timber.

"For these buyers," the Department said, "capital gains treatment on a portion of their profit margin * * * is an essentially fortuitous tax advantage * * * this advantage bears little or no relationship to conservation and good forestry management."

The Treasury study also said that capital gains treatment for timber is "facilitating the wholesale cutting of accumulated timber stands in order quickly to pay off debt financing" and calls into "grave question the effect of this feature of the tax laws on resource conservation."

The President has asked Congress to remedy this situation by treating the timber income of corporations as ordinary income and limiting the capital gains treatment on timber to $5 thousand annually in the case of individuals.

"This level of coverage * * * will still provide a full capital gain opportunity to over 99 percent of the forest land owners," the Treasury Department said.

EXHIBIT 6

MEMORANDUM ON THE LUMBER STANDARDS ISSUE

WESTERN FOREST INDUSTRIES ASSOCIATION,
Portland, Oreg., February 22, 1963.

The purpose of this report is to clarify issues and to discuss certain remarks as presented by Representative E. Y. BERRY, Republican, of South Dakota, before the House of Representatives and as reported on page 2232 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of February 14, 1963. The subject pertains to proposed new lumber standards and the desire by a segment of the lumber industry to establish new dimensions for studs, joists, rafters, and other framing lumber.

It is important to place the controversy over lumber standards in its true economic perspective. The basic push for changed lumber standards stems from the difficult economic problems facing the lumber industry highlighted at this time by the controversy over increased imports from Canada. With the domestic demand for softwood lumber at a stationary low level and with a realization that the domestic demand for lumber will probably continue at this stationary low level for several more years, the proposed change in standards is a device being pushed by one segment of the lumber industry to gain significant competitive advantage over another segment of the lumber industry. The purpose of this competitive advantage is to protect existing domestic markets for one segment in the face of the onslaught of Canadian exports at the expense of another segment of the domestic lumber industry. The controversy on lumber standards was probably inevitable and stems directly from the economic difficulties forced by our industry.

Clearly, a major segment of the western lumber industry is not in favor of changed lumber sizes which have as a result the real possibility of tremendous economic hardship. Accordingly, Western Forest Industries Association has been and is opposed to the proposed changes in lumber sizes. However, Western Forest Industries Association is always ready to assess any proposed changes from the standpoint of facts. This memorandum will go into a factual analysis of the proposed changes. The method by which proposed new dimensions of lumber have been promulgated is open to serious challenge. The establishment of new dimensions for framing components must be tied to the ability of such dimensions to meet the strength and performance requirements specified by present span tables. The claimed ability of the new proposed dimensions to meet these strength requirements has been premised upon the application of certain values for the shrinkage of lumber that have heretofore been casually accepted by producers and consumers of lumber. Acceptance of these values has been casual because of what has been a relative lack of their application to the everyday problems of manufacturing and using framing lumber. With the current attempt to compare new sizes for lumber to sizes that have been in use for many years the order of magnitude of shrinkage that occurs during the natural seasoning of lumber immediately gains new and important significance.

The values for shrinkage used in arriving at new recommended sizes for dimension lumber were provided by the U.S. Forest Products Laboratory at Madison, Wis. In providing these values for shrinkage, the laboratory at Madison called upon its own resources of data and information that were derived through research activities conducted more than 25 years ago. The research work from which these data were obtained did not have as its objective the establishment of shrinkage values that would be applied to the determination of relative sizes and strength of lumber. Because this work had as its purpose the solution of another problem, the methods of procedure and the analysis of results were only indirectly related to the problem at hand. The determinations of shrinkage were based upon the amount of shrinkage that occurred at equilibrium moisture content of the test specimens. This is as opposed to the practical everyday use requirement of determining shrinkage at a condition of average moisture content throughout the cross section of a piece of lumber. Further departures from practical application of the research results are to be found in that drying conditions did not approximate those related to the natural seasoning of lumber and the test specimens were very small in size and represented limited and ideal conditions of wood structure. The procedure that was applied failed to give deserved consideration to geographic location of growth area, rapidity of growth, relationship of sapwood to heart wood, direction of grain, and proportion of summer wood to spring wood. These are factors that logically should be given close consideration by any program of research having as its objective the determination of shrinkage values to be applied with accuracy as a basis for recommending new product sizes for the lumber industry throughout the entire United States and to assure that those new sizes can satisfy the span tables as presently enforced by FHA.

A recent independent study (and the first of its kind for the present application) of the shrinkage of Douglas-fir lumber conducted under the auspices of the Western Forest Industries Association confirmed that the shrinkage values applied in arriving at the proposed new dimensions of lumber were roughly 100 percent greater than were developed during actual seasoning of lumber from a green condition (30 percent or above in moisture content) to an average moisture content value of 15 percent. The values of shrinkage applied were in the immediate vicinity of 4 percent whereas the values for shrinkage exposed by the independent study were found to be less than 2 percent. It should also be pointed out that the study referred to indicated a shrinkage value to 19 percent average moisture content of something over 1 percent. These seemingly small percentile figures gain economic significance when it is understood that 1-percent shrinkage amounts to ten one-thousanths of 1 inch per inch of lumber, or one sixty-fourth of 1 inch for lumber that is 1⅝ inches in thickness. The difference between 2-percent shrinkage and 4-percent shrinkage represent one thirty-seconds of 1 inch of lumber. If the recommended new dimensions for lumber were adopted, it would mean that the shipper of green lumber would be required to pay the additional freight for an extra one thirty-second of 1 inch of lumber for each nominal 2 inches of lumber thickness he shipped. The producer of dry lumber would be allowed to remove this amount of material from each piece of lumber and thus gain considerable benefit by reduction of his shipping weight. On the west coast alone, the impact of this upon the producer of green lumber will be to incur additional tens of millions of dollars per year in payment of freight as compared to the lower cost of shipping dry lumber of smaller dimension. This economic relationship between the shipment of dry and green lumber points up an absolute necessity for establishing accurate values for the shrinkage of wood during seasoning if indeed any change is made.

The importance of premising values for shrinkage of lumber upon the practical circumstances related to the manufacture and use of lumber cannot be overemphasized. The use of shrinkage values based upon the physical response of wood when drying to an equilibrium moisture content (the same moisture content throughout the entire cross section area) is academic and not applicable to the practical problem at hand. Shrinkage values must be based upon the determination of average moisture content for it is on the basis of average moisture that dried lumber is sized to its finished dimension. Also, the application of existing span tables is based upon average moisture conditions.

To relate new dimensions for lumber to an excessively high shrinkage value will, as explained, give the producer of dry framing lumber an economic advantage in his competitive position with green producers. What is not generally recognized is that this same high value for shrinkage, when applied to the relationship of dry to green sizes for lumber, can have a thoroughly detrimental effect upon the dry producer as well. Referring back to the significance of span tables, it is important to keep in mind that the tables that are presently accepted and in use have been derived through empirical means. They are not premised upon the actual physical testing of pieces of lumber, but they have been found adequate and applicable over a good number of years of use. A letter addressed to Mr. R. J. Canavan, Assistant FHA Commissioner, and written by Edward G. Locke, Director of the U.S. Forest Products Laboratory states, "Our calculations indicate that the proposed new dry sizes, 1½ inches in thickness and present ALS widths are equal or slightly greater in strength and stiffness than the present standard ALS sizes dressed green." This letter, appearing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD following Mr. BERRY's remarks, fails to state that the calculations mentioned were premised upon shrinkage values in the area of 4 percent. The shrinkage value used in the development of such calculations is vital. The calculations are evolved by relating an assumed piece of lumber of the desired size (machined dry) to the assumed shrunken size of a piece of lumber that had been machined when green. By using this comparative situation it is apparent that as the order of magnitude of shrinkage is increased, the assumed dry (15 percent moisture content) size of the piece that was sized when green will be increasingly smaller. By relating back to the practices of applying span tables now in use, it follows that whatever the dry (seasoned) size of a piece of lumber that was machined when green, it will have adequate strength to meet the requirements of the span tables. So, in relating the machined dry size to the shrunken dry size, it becomes obvious that as the "calculated" shrunken size becomes smaller there will be an ever closer strength relationship between it and some arbitrarily selected smaller new size for dry dressed lumber.

The fact that the user of lumber has been completely ignored by the application of unrealistically high shrinkage values becomes evident as soon as it is realized that the recommended new dimensions for framing lumber seem to have been theoretically compared to an artificially small dry size for lumber that was dressed when green. This means that the strength of lumber sized when dry to the new recommended dimensions could well be below strength requirements as enforced today by FHA. Without a realistic value for shrinkage upon which to base calculations of strength, it is incongruous to say that the proposed new dry size of 1½ inches in thickness will meet the requirements of existing span tables.

Credence is given to the claimed lack of data and information concerning the shrinkage of lumber by the fact that the Forest Research Laboratory of the State of Oregon has undertaken a study of shrinkage of Douglas fir. This study was originally requested by the west coast lumber inspection bureau as a result of information brought to its attention that evidenced reasonable doubt as to the validity of applying the high shrinkage values used in the development of the proposed new sizes for framing lumber.

The same technical and economic information presented before WCLIB was exposed to the National Lumber Standards Subcommittee at its Chicago meeting on January 23 and 24. This exposure resulted in the committee postponing action on endorsement of the proposed 1½-inch dry lumber size pending further study and resolution of the percent of shrinkage of lumber during seasoning. Proposed size equivalents between green and dry lumber could not be acted upon because of the lack of applicable information and data upon which to establish a relationship.

On January 28 and 29, a group of spokesmen for a major segment of the western lumber industry that questions the proposed new sizes met with officials of FHA and the Office of Technical Standards, Department of Commerce, for the purpose of exposing the same information previously presented to WCLIB and ALS. It is partly on the basis of these meetings and the resulting exposure of true economic and technical facts that FHA has seen fit to withhold its approval of a 1½-inch size for dry lumber. When the Department of Commerce learned that the Forest Research Laboratory of Oregon had agreed to conduct a study of the shrinkage of lumber for the specific purpose of applying information derived to a logical determination of new sizes for lumber, it volunteered to support a technician to observe the conduct of the study. It was expected that this technical observer would be provided by the Madison Forest Products Laboratory and that the Department of Commerce would pay per diem and travel expenses for the individual. It was later learned that when the Madison Forest Products Laboratory was confronted by the Department of Commerce and FHA with a request for cooperation and the services of a qualified individual, the request was rejected.

That the forest research laboratory, an official activity of the State of Oregon, considers existing information concerning the shrinkage of lumber to be inadequate is evidenced by the fact that the laboratory is using State funds for the conduct of the current research study. It is expected that this study will reach a point that will yield significant results sometime toward the end of April. The study, incidentally, is premised upon a determination of the shrinkage of lumber when it reaches various average moisture content values not an equilibrium moisture content value.

The accusation by Mr. Berry that the Federal Housing Administration has become responsive to political pressure seems uncalled for in view of the serious technical discrepancies pointed out above. These discrepancies are obvious to anyone who studies the matter, as is an understanding of the economic impact imposed by these technical considerations. The inference that FHA presently accepts $1\frac{9}{16}$-inch lumber on an equal status with $1\frac{5}{8}$-inch lumber is incorrect. Span tables state specifically that $1\frac{9}{16}$-inch lumber can be used only under reduced strength values. In view of this, it seems incomprehensible that FHA would be expected to give consideration to accepting $1\frac{1}{2}$-inch lumber at a par for strength with $1\frac{5}{8}$-inch lumber. FHA is consistent in recognizing the fact that lumber thinner than $1\frac{5}{8}$-inch does not qualify under existing span tables.

With an understanding of the true nature of the problem of sizing lumber it is obvious that no change can be tolerated until exact technical information is developed and all of the manifestations of the problem at hand are on record. It follows that if the forest research laboratory at Corvallis, Oreg., finds that shrinkage values at average moisture content are significantly below the shrinkage values applied in the development of new size recommendations, then the U.S. Forest Products Laboratory at Madison, Wis., must undertake a comprehensive study of the shrinkage of framing lumber. Such a study must be applied to all commercially important species and must include considerations of the natural variability of wood, its physical structure, its growth location, and the size of the pieces being tested.

The problem of strength of wood by species and sizes is of overriding importance in terms of ability of consumers to specify lumber for its various uses with assurance that lumber will adequately do the job. The Western Forest Industries Association has been studying intensively the existing status of information being used by the Government bearing on the question of existing span tables and strength ratings for various species and sizes of lumber. While our information is not yet complete it would appear that the present span tables and strength determinations are not based on actual tests of the strength of lumber presently being used by the American consumer. If our investigation bears out that we do not have existing studies to support the strength characteristics for softwood lumber, then clearly we will insist that such studies be conducted and completed prior to any changes in lumber standards or sizes which carry with them such tremendous economic significance both to the manufacturers of lumber and the consumer.

The American Lumber Standards Subcommittee at the January meeting in Chicago adopted a position that in determining the shrinkage values for naturally seasoned lumber shrinkage should be determined to an average moisture content of 15 percent. The 15 percent figure was adopted on the assumption that kiln dried framing lumber in the West was in fact dried on the average to 15 percent moisture content. Again no reliable statistical data confirms this assumption. Western Forest Industries Association is now engaged in an intensive analysis of the average moisture content of kiln dried framing lumber on the west coast. If our research should indicate that the average moisture content of kiln dried framing lumber is higher than 15 percent, we will then insist that shrinkage factors be applied to that higher percentage.

The American Lumber Standards Subcommittee also adopted a recommendation that the grading rules for kiln dried framing lumber be changed so that kiln dried lumber will have a maximum moisture content of 19 percent. Existing grading rules for kiln dried framing lumber provide for a maximum of 19 percent moisture content with an allowance that 10 percent of the pieces can be up to 25 percent moisture content. If this recommendation is adopted by the American Lumber Standard Committee in May, the dry lumber manufacturers in the West will be economically disadvantaged in relation to the producers of southern lumber. Such a proposal would add to the costs of producing dry lumber in the West.

We hope it is clear from this memorandum that Western Forest Industries Association and the Government agencies involved in this question are concerned with the facts and will insist upon adequate facts where such facts are not today available. Once the facts are determined we can then make meaningful decisions. It is the National Lumber Manufacturers Association who tried to railroad a change in size standards based upon inadequate factual information. As the inadequate base of NLMA's facts came to light and the Government agencies decided accordingly to not act in haste, National Lumber Manufacturers Association decided apparently to make a political issue of the matter with the obvious purpose of trying to politically force the Government to adopt its proposals. Representative Berry's remarks on the floor of the House may reflect the start of this political pressure.

EXHIBIT 7

[From The Oregonian, Feb. 22, 1963]

ICC GROUP APPROVES REDUCED RATES ON LUMBER SHIPMENTS BY RAILROADS

WASHINGTON.—A 3-member division of the Interstate Commerce Commission Thursday approved reduced rates on railroad shipments of lumber from Pacific coast to eastern points.

The decision which may be appealed to the full 11-man Commission, was regarded as a major victory for railroad interests in their fight with water barge owners for the lumber shipping business.

The ICC division approved a reduction of 7 cents per 100 pounds on lumber and related items shipped from the west coast to the east, provided shipments are made in minimum carload units of at least 55,000, 70,000, or 75,000 pounds—depending on type of car used.

Present minimum weight requirements involved in lumber shipping charges are 38,000, 44,000, and 54,000 pounds.

An example of the effect of the decision is the lowering of the $1.61 rate to $1.54 a 100 pounds of lumber shipped from Portland, Oreg. to New York City.

Joining intercoastal water carriers in opposing the reduction were southern and southwestern lumber producers and some port of New York interests.

The water carriers contended the reduced rates would be lower than necessary to meet competition. Railroads said the proposed rates were intended to encourage heavier carloadings, rather than to drive water carriers out of the lumber shipping business.

The differentials between the new rail rates and water carrier rates "are less than those found to be necessary and proper in some rail-water competitive rate cases," the ICC division said.

But any greater differential would "hobble" the railroads, which have an inherent advantage in lumber shipping, and would impair "their ability to transport the existing volume of rail lumber traffic at lower rates while increasing their net revenues," the division said.

In Portland, Ken Batchelder, traffic manager of West Coast Lumbermen's Association, said the rate reduction would mean a savings of $20 million a year for western lumber shippers.

He said the rate has been in effect since December of 1961 but has been under fire from southern pine lumber interests.

Western pine, Douglas Fir Plywood Association, California Redwood Association, and the WCLA participated in the initial battle to get the rate reduction and have since been active in defending it, Batchelder stated.

EXHIBIT 8

[From the Portland (Oreg.) Daily Journal of Commerce, Feb. 15, 1963]

FREEHOLD SERVICES AND LUMBER

Distance from midwestern and eastern markets has always been a problem to producers in the Pacific Northwest, and this is particularly true when bulky products, such as lumber and other wood products, are involved.

Regulatory groups have the problem of striking a balance between an industry which is very sensitive to freight rates, and transportation, which seems to have a chronic condition resulting from a variety of reasons.

The Jones Act was formulated to aid American water shipping, and not until the act had completely eliminated services to some areas was the act modified.

In order to aid the railroads, the historical hold services which railroads granted western lumber shippers was dropped. Now, with the pinch from Canadian lumber competition, lack of this service is proving detrimental to those who ship western forest products by rail, and particularly the smaller operators. As a result the Western Lumber Marketing Association sought to have reinstated, on a reduced scale, the hold services.

Last week this was denied by the Western Railroad Traffic Association. In Portland this week Hershal M. Tanzer, WLMA president, dealt with the subject, and possible results of the denial, at some length.

There seems little doubt that if the competition from Canadian lumber continues, many of the small mills face a problem which may be insurmountable. The hold services are a definite marketing aid.

Reduction of lumber shipments cannot work to the advantage of railroads, and failure to restore limited freehold services on eastbound shipments may well reduce the railroads' share of lumber shipments. The Jones Act, designed to aid American shipping, almost eliminated waterborne lumber cargoes; failure to make modification in rail tariffs could have the same effect upon lumber shipments by rail.

EXHIBIT 9

[From the Portland (Oreg.) Daily Reporter, Feb. 12, 1963]

MARKETING ADVANTAGES SAID LOST TO LUMBER

Another one of the lumber marketing advantages has disappeared with the recent decision of the Western Railroad Traffic Association turning down the 5-day freehold of transit operators. This was emphasized by Hershal M. Tanzer, Portland, vice president, Buckeye-Pacific Lumber Co. and Western Lumber Marketing Association president, at a Tuesday press conference at the Benson Hotel.

"This is a tremendous compromise on the part of the shippers from the railroad services that had been standard for 80-odd years," Tanzer told the Portland Reporter. "We felt that this tariff would finalize the long struggle and prolong bickering that has taken place within the industry and resolve the issue in a final and fixed tariff with which all parties could live and which would be a great service to our industry. We felt that this would bring order out of a confused situation."

The proposal which was turned down by the WRTA executive committee requested a reduction in the hold time on lumber from 15 days, formerly granted, to 5 days with 7 additional days at a $3-per-day charge. Regular penalty demurrage would go into effect at the expiration of this time.

Lyle Baker, editor of the Lyle Baker Reports, KPTV, explained that while there has been abuses of transit privileges he and other western lumber industry representatives feel that the railroad industry has gone too far in eliminating a marketing tool which is of vital necessity to certain industry segments.

Roland Wirt, Portland, WLMA traffic commission chairman, said, "If western rail lumber is to compete with other producing sections of the country some marketing assistance of a definite nature is necessary."

EXHIBIT 10

[From the Portland Reporter, Feb. 16, 1963]

GIVE SMALL OPERATORS A BREAK

A decision has been made affecting the Northwest lumber industry as important, in an adverse way, as the Jones Act revision was in a positive sense.

It is the recent decision of the executive committee of the Western Railroad Traffic Association to deny tariff application No. 60-1 for restoration of limited freehold services on eastbound shipments of western forest products.

WLMA's proposal requested a reduction in the hold time on lumber from 15 days, formerly granted, to 5 days with 7 additional days at $3 per day charge. At the expiration of this time, regular penalty demurrage would go into effect.

The request was supported by over 250 American lumber manufacturers and over 200 midwestern and eastern wholesalers, jobbers and retailers of lumber products. They argued the historical hold services, which railroads have granted western lumber shippers for 80 years and were instrumental in keeping western products competitive, should be reinstated.

Hershal M. Tanzer, WLMA president, stated: "This rejection has dealt a severe blow to hundreds of small and middle-size mills who need every bit of support and assistance possible to remain competitive in a market in which Canadian exports are increasing and in which cost factors are rising. It is ironic to note that on the very date that the first foreign vessel loaded with lumber from an American port for Puerto Rico under Jones Act modification, an act of assistance for the large water mills, the WRTA rejected this vital rail proposal which would have granted a significant measure of assistance to hundreds of smaller mills who must ship by rail rather than by water."

The rail group's executive committee disapproved: Any hold period free of charge; the restriction on granting any hold period with or without charge to lower grade cars; the restriction on any hold period, with or without charge, to cars not over 40 feet 6 inches in length and doors not to exceed 6 feet in width, under tariff provisions which would permit of no substitution of equipment.

The committee did, however, leave one loophole, stating: It is impossible at this time to arrive at any conclusion as to whether a hold period could be granted, subject to any particular detention charge, until final decision is made upon proposals now pending before the Association of American Railroads for per diem charges graduated upon age and condition of cars. Therefore any further action was held in abeyance until such a decision is reached.

WLMA spokesmen, however, feel any decision on per diem charges is an idle dream. It has been, and will be, discussed for years. For all practical purposes, WLMA's request is denied.

Railroads, of course, traditionally have objected to tying up cars in transit, though their policy is not always consistent in that such services are still granted grain and coal shippers and hold services and lower demurrage rates are maintained for lumber shipments destined for export by water.

Railroads say shippers' use of cars in transit, in effect, supplies them with warehouses, a charge the smaller shippers cheerfully admit. The small shippers say they lack the capital to build extensive warehouse facilities, that in-transit selling gets products on the way quickly, it has been traditional, and it helps keep little operators in competition with the giants.

Both sides in the controversy present valid arguments. But with lumbering facing a declining and more competitive market, it would appear there is merit in reinstating the time-honored practice. Railroads likewise are experiencing financial troubles and they might well be advised to take a less discriminatory look at problems of the medium and small lumber firms.

Anything which will benefit the rapidly disappearing little businessman will in turn benefit the railroads. The conclusion that lack of cooperation will help only the big operators, who don't have to worry about warehouse costs is hard to ignore.

We think the WLMA's request has merit.

EXHIBIT 11

[From the Portland (Oreg.) Oregon Journal, Feb. 13, 1963]

WLMA STUDIES FREEHOLD ALTERNATIVES

(By Paul Manley)

Introduction by the Nation's railroads of expedited schedules for forest products—guaranteeing delivery at their destination at a specified time—may someday supersede the present practice of transiting in the lumber industry.

This hope was extended Tuesday to members of the Western Lumber Marketing Association by their president, Hershal M. Tanzer, in the wake of a setback for the organization's efforts to restore limited freehold privileges on eastbound shipments of forest products.

The WLMA had petitioned the Western Railroad Traffic Association to allow 5 days' freehold on carloads of lumber destined for points in the East, with an additional 7 days' storage at $3 per day.

Denial of the petition refocused attention on the plight of the lumber wholesalers and small sawmill operators who constitute the membership of the WLMA. They had become accustomed to the practice of seeking buyers for their lumber while it was aboard boxcars en route to the East, and if they didn't line up a purchaser immediately, they could count on 15 days of free storage in the rail car while they shopped around. Last year the freehold practice was ordered discontinued.

Tanzer pointed out Tuesday that many agricultural products other than lumber enjoy expedited schedules, enabling shippers to accept firm delivery contracts, and suggested that application of this practice on forest products consignments might relieve small western mills of the necessity of transiting.

He contended that lack of a definite delivery date actually fosters the practice of starting carloads of lumber rolling eastward without a specific destination, because the frequently lengthy travel time makes it practical to line up a buyer while the cargo is in transit.

Tanzer said elimination of the freehold has forced WLMA members to use "what circuitous routings are legitimately available" and to do a greater portion of their business on firm orders.

But he defended in-transit selling as "one of the most successful and efficient methods of getting western lumber to market."

"It has been an important factor in making forest products more accessible and attractive in the consuming area of the Midwest and East," the WLMA president maintained. "It has been an important method of keeping western production competitive with lumber from Southern States, which is already close to its consuming market."

"I know of no other commodity that has such a high percentage of distribution cost," Tanzer added, estimating that about 40 percent of the cost of western lumber in eastern markets is represented by freight charges, against 15 to 20 percent for southern pine.

He also claimed that rejection of the freehold renewal application "will make the purchase of lumber from many Canadian origins more attractive to the American buyer."

Tanzer expressed the belief that the railroads, by refusing to adopt a modified freehold, are opening the door to stepped-up competition from trucklines for lumber traffic.

He said this would become evident as the highway system is improved and as lumber buyers become more fussy about deliveries.

He predicted a major break, sooner or later in the Jones Act restrictions to allow foreign vessels to carry lumber between ports in the United States, and speculated that when this takes place it will be cheaper to ship lumber by water to the east coast and then backhaul it hundreds of miles by truck than it will be to route the same cargo from mill to market entirely by rail.

"Even today it costs more to ship lumber from Portland to New York by rail than it does by water," he observed.

The WLMA president deplored the operation of warehouses in the East and Midwest by large integrated lumber producers contending that the practice increases distribution costs, which ultimately are passed on to the consumer.

For this reason he rejected a suggestion that WLMA members pool their marketing efforts through central warehouses, claiming it would be neither efficient nor economical, and the additional handling would raise the cost to the consumer.

Indicating that the search will continue for alternatives to the freehold, Tanzer stressed, "None of us are going out of business."

EXHIBIT 12

[From the Portland (Oreg.) Oregonian, Feb. 17, 1963]

UP TO CONGRESS

The U.S. lumber industry never had much of a chance of obtaining Government restrictions on Canadian lumber imports. Such quotas violate the free-trade policy President Kennedy urges and preceding administrations supported. And, besides, Canada buys much more of all goods from the United States than we buy from her.

If the U.S. Tariff Commission had not rejected the request for lumber quotas on the ground it was not proved increasing imports were caused in major part by past tariff concessions, chances are some other reason would have been found.

The U.S. lumbermen's best hope for relief from serious Canadian competition now lies with Congress. A bill already introduced would require all FHA-financed construction projects use U.S.-made lumber. Whether this is sound legislation may be open to argument. But there are restrictions, placed by law or regulation, on American lumber, such as the Jones Act and perhaps too extreme requirements for investments in harvesting Government timber, which could be eased. The Jones Act was modified slightly by Congress last year to permit shipping lumber to Puerto Rico in foreign vessels. If shipping to Atlantic coast ports could also be by other than American-flag ships, a considerable advantage now held by Canadian tidewater mills would vanish.

Of course, the U.S. industry is not of one mind as to what form relief should take. Small Northwest mills that ship by rail and sell in transit wish reinstatement of freehold privileges on railroads which were abolished recently after 80 years. This freehold was for 15 days. Last week, the Western Railroad Traffic Association denied a compromise proposal, that a hold time of 5 days, with 7 additional days at $3 a day, be granted. Canada dropped its 15-day freehold under pressure last year. But officials of the Western Lumber Marketing Association contend this did not put small western lumbermen back in a competitive position with Canadians. Lumber from many Canadian origins remains more attractive to American buyers, they say.

Large mills, which have their own distribution facilities, are opposed to freeholds, which permit their smaller competitors to use freight cars for storage. There are also many differences of opinion between western and southern producers.

What the lumber industry needs most of all is a boom in home building. If there were a brisk demand for lumber, there would be little worry about Canadian competition. Even now some operators are doing well, as annual reports prove.

One can expect continued pressure on Congress for needed remedial legislation, more squabbling among the various segments of the industry itself and continued concentration of lumbering into large, integrated plants better equipped to achieve full utilization of the log.

EXHIBIT 13

NATIONAL FOREST TIMBER SALE ACTIVITIES FOR CALENDAR YEAR 1962

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
FOREST SERVICE,
Washington, D.C., March 7, 1963.

This report has been prepared in response to Senator MAGNUSON's request expressed in his statement to the Senate on June 12, 1962.

The timber harvest of 9.6 billion board feet in 1962 is the highest rate of cutting yet otbained in any calendar year on the national forests. It exceeds the previous record high year of 1959 by 300 million board feet. The attainment of this new record during a year when domestic lumber production was at a relatively low ebb is particularly gratifying. For the 6-month period ending December 31, 1962, timber harvesting totaled 600 million board feet more than for the same period in the preceding year. This accelerated rate of cutting is indicative of a new record for calendar year 1963 in excess of 10 billion board feet.

The tables in this report show for each national forest allowable cutting rates, cut and sell objectives used in the allotment of timber sale funds to each national forest, the actual volumes cut and sold and the backlog of timber under contract on December 31, 1962. Also shown is the volume of timber offered but not sold and average prices at which timber was advertised and average prices at which it was sold.

Since accomplishment goals from timber sale funds made available to each national forest are set by fiscal years, it has been necessary to assume that the planned rate of cutting and sales for calendar year 1962 is equal to one-half of the established goals for fiscal year 1962 and one-half for fiscal year 1963. Over a series of years, this assumption will average out. It is not precisely correct for a single year. A high rate of sales activity is scheduled for the last half of the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, particularly on the 42 national forests of the Pacific Coast and Inland Empire States where timber demand-supply relationships are critical. This sales activity for this current 6-month period is expected to bring sales up to planned goals on the 42 national forest group. On the other national forests, the possibility of catching up on indicated sales accomplishment below goals will be dependent upon local markets.

The first table in the report is a special summary of the situation on the 42 national forests of the Pacific Coast and Inland Empire States where timber demand-supply relationships are critical. This is a group of forests to which special attention and analysis was given in the forest service statement to the Senate Commerce Committee on June 15, 1962. These 42 national forests account for approximately 75 percent of the allowable cut for saw logs.

Details for every national forest are shown in the series of tables following this summary table. The full statement for each forest is presented in two adjoining sheets. A discussion of the highlights shown by these records follows the table presentation.

This report is the first of a planned series of annual reports on timber sale activities. The Forest Service will be glad to have comments or suggestions for arrangement or subject coverage which would make the report more useful in subsequent years.

HIGHLIGHTS FOR 1962

The 42-national-forest area

The first table of this report summarizes timber sale activities on the 42 national forests of the Pacific Coast and Inland Empire States where timber demand-supply relationships are critical.

During calendar year 1962, the actual cut of 7,032.7 million board feet amounted to 98 percent of the allowable cut as of January 1, 1962, and represented 98 percent of planned work. A volume of 7,112.5 million board feet was sold. This is 99 percent of the annual allowable cut and 92 percent of the planned sell. In addition 145.3 million board feet or 2 percent was advertised, but not sold.

There are some variations from the overall levels of accomplishment that indicate local problems. For example, both sales and cutting are depressed on the Clearwater National Forest in north Idaho because construction of a major road into the North Fork Clearwater River is not yet completed. Accelerated construction to provide access in this area is scheduled for fiscal year 1964. Volume cut on the St. Joe National Forest in Idaho has declined because a major producer shifted cutting from that forest to company-owned and other private and State lands.

Cut and sell accomplishments in California have been variable by forests due in part to changing plans of local operators. On the Sequoia National Forest planned sales have been delayed because of issues raised by organizations opposed to timber cutting on portions of the forest It is expected that this controversy will be settled in time so that the planned sale offerings for fiscal year 1963 will be made before June 30. On the Tahoe National Forest a cut of approximately 50 million board feet in excess of allowable cut rates was expected to result from salvage of timber burned in the last 2 preceding years. The salvable amount proved to be less than anticipated. Cut volume on the Stanislaus National Forest was only 46 percent of planned volume because two major mills were strike bound.

Adjustment of programs on the national forests of Oregon and Washington, and to a lesser extent in northern California, have been necessary to meet the blowdown situation caused by the October 12, 1962 storm. These adjustments are not reflected in the tabulations for calendar year 1962. An accelerated program of salvage sales is now underway which will meet or exceed previously planned sale volume objectives for fiscal year 1963.

Those national forests having a backlog of timber uncut under contract at least twice the annual allowable cut are considered to be in good condition from a sales standpoint. In the 42 forest area, 14 national forests have built up such backlogs. This indicates a need for an expanded sales program on the remaining 28 national forests. For the 42 national forests as a group, the uncut volume under contract equals 1.7 times the annual allowable cut.

The annual allowable cut for the 42 national forests was increased from 7,159 million board feet to 7,706 million board feet on October 12, 1962. These increases will be taken into account in scheduling sale objectives for fiscal year 1964.

General performance in the 42-national-forest area is considered satisfactory though improvement is needed in a few localized situations. The rate of sales during the period January 1 to June 30, 1963, is such that sale volume objectives for fiscal year 1963 generally will be achieved.

National forests outside the 42-national-forest area

There are 112 national forests outside of the 42-national-forest area. Insofar as timber production is concerned, these 112 forests can be grouped into the Rocky Mountain and Intermountain States; the Southwest; the Lake States, Northeast and Southern States; and Alaska. The allowable cut for these 112 national forests is 4.1 billion board feet or 37 percent of the total allowable cut as of January 1, 1962. This includes pulpwood and other products of less than saw-log size for the national forests east of the Great Plains. The 2.6 billion board feet cut in 1962 amounted to 27 percent of the total volume harvested from all national forests.

Rocky Mountain and Intermountain National Forests

Lodgepole pine, Engelmann spruce and Douglas-fir are the predominant species on this group of forests. In addition, there are substantial stands of ponderosa pine in the Black Hills of South Dakota, in southwestern Colorado and on the Dixie National Forest in Utah. In general, this timber is small in size, low in value, and remote from centers of lumber consumption. The rate of lumbering activity is strongly affected by the price swings of the lumber market. Local industries have experienced considerable difficulty in maintaining profitable production during 1962. Appraised timber prices are relatively low and there is little competitive bidding. Installed milling capacity is generally less than permissible allowable cut rates. Additional timber access roads are needed to expand current cutting rates. The rate of sales in 1962 was lower than anticipated because of adverse market conditions. Uncut timber under contract is generally ample and averages more than twice allowable cutting rates. Progress toward marketing the full allowable cut is dependent upon improved markets and increased accessibility through timber access road construction.

Southwestern area

Ponderosa pine is the predominant species in New Mexico and Arizona. Installed milling capacity and allowable cuts are generally approximately in balance. The adequacy of timber supply for mills in this area is demonstrated by nominal competition for national forest timber sale offerings. Timber quality is lower than for ponderosa pine of the Pacific Coast and Inland Empire States. For a variety of economic reasons, the lumber industry of the Southwest has operated on rather narrow margins and is strongly affected by the swing in lumber prices. Because of these factors, sales and cutting in 1962 were not as high as anticipated. Saw log timber under contract but not yet cut is approximately double allowable cut rates. Substantial cutting on a large pulpwood sale to the first pulpmill in the Southwest began in 1962. Sales in this area can be maintained at a rate adequate to supply existing industry. Expansion of sales and cutting rates is dependent primarily on a recovery in the lumber market.

Lake States, northeast and southern forests

In the forests east of the Great Plains, there are substantial markets for material less than saw-log size, primarily for pulpwood. Because of such markets, a separate calculation of allowable cut for material of less than saw-log size is established. This amounts to the equivalent of more than one billion board feet. It was possible to market only 56 percent of this allowable cut in 1962.

In the areas east of the Great Plains, national forest timber is generally a minor portion of the total timber resources available to local plants. During 1962 many purchasers either reduced cutting or shifted operations to other timber ownerships. As a result, the rate of cutting was 89 percent of the anticipated rate. Ninety-seven percent of the planned sales were offered but approximately 200 million board feet or 12 percent of such offerings were not purchased.

Approximately 8 percent of the total allowable cut in this broad area is not yet considered to be marketable. This is primarily hardwood material of less than saw log size, which is not yet in demand by pulpmills. A rise in sale and cutting activity to the levels which had been planned for in 1962 is dependent upon market recovery for lumber and other forest products.

Alaska

Approximately 40 percent of the allowable cut for the national forests in Alaska is now being harvested. The primary markets for this material are the two major pulpmills now in operation. Cutting and sales activity in Alaska in 1962 were substantially on schedule. A major increase in the timber harvesting program is dependent upon additional pulpmill installation. Capacities of the two existing plants have been increased, but there appears to be no immediate prospect for installation of additional pulp plants in Alaska.

Summary of timber sale accomplishment and allowable cut on the 42 national forests of the Pacific coast and inland empire States where timber demand-supply relationships are critical, calendar year 1962

Region and State	National forest	Allowable cut of sawtimber, Jan. 1, 1962	Financed cut, sawtimber (millions of board feet)			Financed sell, sawtimber (millions of board feet)			Advertised, not sold	Uncut volume under contract, Dec. 31, 1962	Average appraised price	Average sold price
			Planned	Accomplished	Percent accomplished	Planned	Accomplished	Percent accomplished				
Region 1: Idaho	Clearwater	211	121.0	98.7	82	142.5	63.5	45		248.9	$2.37	$4.50
	Coeur d'Alene	151	131.0	145.4	111	149.0	123.9	83		191.7	4.85	5.98
	Kaniksu	140	133.5	145.2	109	165.0	193.4	117		313.6	4.72	7.28
	Nezperce	112	87.0	81.1	93	113.5	130.5	115		282.5	2.73	6.25
	St. Joe	100	67.5	47.8	71	88.0	110.8	126	4.2	251.4	3.47	3.97
Montana	Flathead	137	128.4	129.7	101	137.5	146.4	106		214.1	4.46	13.01
	Kootenai	185	167.5	168.4	101	191.5	163.2	85	13.0	302.9	2.46	5.31
	Lolo	162	110.5	113.9	103	147.5	195.0	132	1.0	240.3	3.64	6.39
Washington	Colville	80	62.5	71.2	114	103.0	103.5	100		167.5	4.04	7.23
Subtotal		1,278	1,008.9	1,001.4	99	1,237.5	1,230.2	99	18.2	2,212.9		
Region 4: Idaho	Boise	130	135.0	141.9	105	132.5	87.7	66	4.6	145.2	5.61	9.19
	Payette	91	80.3	65.6	82	134.9	63.7	47	13.2	185.5	4.05	4.65
Subtotal		221	215.3	207.5	96	267.4	151.4	57	17.8	330.7		
Region 5: California	Eldorado	116	102.9	74.5	72	130.4	112.7	86	5.9	97.0	7.73	15.48
	Klamath	185	200.7	161.7	81	219.2	153.9	70		206.7	4.85	6.73
	Lassen	99	107.8	109.3	101	114.1	67.4	59		127.1	9.53	16.10
	Mendocino	81	95.7	73.0	76	102.8	79.5	77		78.0	3.96	4.75
	Modoc	51	57.7	48.4	84	67.1	74.2	111		88.0	6.65	10.83
	Plumas	183	193.6	151.8	78	201.6	209.0	104	.3	247.2	10.66	14.35
	Sequoia	101	63.5	39.5	62	90.8	10.0	11	16.9	172.3	6.46	6.46
	Shasta-Trinity	218	221.7	210.1	95	249.7	286.0	115	.6	322.7	10.73	15.92
	Sierra	114	115.2	154.9	134	138.4	117.9	85	18.2	119.5	5.54	7.21
	Six Rivers	156	141.7	133.1	94	179.9	201.4	112	4.7	255.0	9.52	13.73
	Stanislaus	123	128.2	59.4	46	135.4	135.9	100		103.3	7.08	8.38
	Tahoe	130	186.7	123.5	66	108.6	77.4	71		70.0	7.09	13.19
Subtotal		1,557	1,615.4	1,339.2	83	1,738.0	1,525.3	88	46.6	1,913.8		
Region 6: Oregon	Deschutes	136	136.7	136.2	100	158.5	102.7	65		259.1	12.77	16.93
	Fremont	126	128.7	91.4	71	103.7	160.2	154	20.8	209.1	14.23	14.41
	Malheur	171	162.3	142.6	88	140.3	193.9	138		353.4	8.61	8.82
	Mount Hood	315	351.7	369.9	105	305.1	334.2	110		560.0	12.94	21.64
	Ochoco	98	121.6	140.2	115	73.1	35.4	48	.3	143.0	7.25	9.56
	Rogue River	126	164.7	209.1	127	174.0	181.3	104		158.8	11.89	15.83
	Siskiyou	179	183.4	177.2	97	188.8	152.3	81		277.6	13.64	18.54
	Siuslaw	327	359.4	345.9	96	318.4	330.4	104	.2	433.6	20.86	25.57
	Umatilla	129	124.4	109.4	88	117.5	93.2	79		290.2	7.99	11.28
	Umpqua	340	352.6	386.1	109	339.5	424.2	125		807.8	15.36	18.74
	Wallowa-Whitman	160	135.0	117.5	87	173.6	162.6	94	13.8	244.8	7.05	7.48
	Willamette	566	599.2	812.5	136	593.3	637.9	108		987.2	15.71	23.68
	Winema	90	100.4	74.8	74	119.8	161.7	135		403.7	14.08	19.84
Washington	Gifford Pinchot	395	475.8	442.8	93	506.8	433.2	85	3.5	925.5	11.20	19.50
	Mount Baker	201	236.4	226.8	96	217.9	209.7	96		438.0	5.07	11.19
	Okanogan	90	77.4	83.0	107	118.0	115.1	98	3.2	98.0	6.48	7.44
	Olympic	341	293.5	273.4	93	377.4	186.1	49		881.2	6.62	8.49
	Snoqualmie	207	221.3	222.6	101	352.0	183.9	52	19.6	433.7	13.39	18.55
	Wenatchee	106	134.0	123.2	92	117.1	107.6	92	1.3	174.5	8.56	9.83
Subtotal		4,103	4,358.5	4,484.6	103	4,494.8	4,205.6	94	62.7	8,069.2		
Grand total		7,159	7,198.1	7,032.7	98	7,737.7	7,112.5	92	145.3	12,526.6		

Summary of timber sale accomplishment and allowable cut on the national forests, calendar year 1962

[Millions of board feet]

Region and national forest	Annual allowable cut									Financed cut, calendar year 1962					Financed sell, calendar year 1962				
	Jan. 1, 1961			Jan. 1, 1962			Jan. 1, 1963			January-June	July-December	Total		Percent accomplished	January-June	July-December	Total		Percent accomplished
	Saw-timber	Convertible products	Total volume	Saw-timber	Convertible products	Total volume	Saw-timber	Convertible products	Total volume			Planned	Accomplishment				Planned	Accomplishment	
Region 1:																			
Clearwater	158.0		158.0	211.0		211.0	212.0		212.0	66.0	55.0	121.0	98.7	82	65.0	77.5	142.5	63.5	45
Coeur d'Alene	127.0		127.0	151.0		151.0	145.0		145.0	66.5	64.5	131.0	145.4	111	73.5	75.5	149.0	123.9	83
Kaniksu	132.0		132.0	140.0		140.0	147.0		147.0	66.0	67.5	133.5	145.2	109	82.5	82.5	165.0	193.4	117
Nezperce	98.0		98.0	112.0		112.0	110.0		110.0	45.0	42.0	87.0	81.1	93	60.0	53.5	113.5	130.5	115
St. Joe	52.0		52.0	100.0		100.0	99.0		99.0	37.5	30.0	67.5	47.8	71	42.5	45.5	88.0	110.8	126
Beaverhead	35.4		35.4	35.4		35.4	36.4		36.4	5.0	5.5	10.5	6.3	60	12.5	2.5	15.0	5.7	38
Bitterroot	26.0		26.0	26.0		26.0	45.7		45.7	20.0	22.5	42.5	76.8	181	32.5	23.5	56.0	34.1	61
Custer	10.2		10.2	18.2		18.2	18.2		18.2	1.4	1.5	2.9	1.6	55	3.3	7.5	10.8	1.8	17
Deerlodge	39.0		39.0	39.0		39.0	39.0		39.0	10.0	10.5	20.5	11.6	57	13.0	13.0	26.0	2.0	8
Flathead	116.0		116.0	137.0		137.0	136.0		136.0	65.0	63.4	128.4	129.7	101	67.5	70.0	137.5	146.4	106
Gallatin	43.0		43.0	47.0		47.0	49.9		49.9	12.5	12.0	24.5	32.9	134	27.5	25.0	52.5	44.5	85
Helena	35.7		35.7	35.7		35.7	36.5		36.5	10.0	9.5	19.5	17.0	87	27.5	22.5	50.0	24.0	48
Kootenai	164.0		164.0	185.0		185.0	182.0		182.0	85.0	82.5	167.5	168.4	101	95.0	96.5	191.5	163.2	85
Lewis and Clark	52.5		52.5	56.2		56.2	57.5		57.5	6.7	7.5	14.2	20.2	142	15.0	7.5	22.5	14.6	65
Lolo	157.0		157.0	162.0		162.0	162.0		162.0	58.0	52.5	110.5	113.9	103	75.0	72.5	147.5	195.0	132
Colville	68.0		68.0	80.0		80.0	79.0		79.0	32.5	30.0	62.5	71.2	114	55.0	48.0	103.0	103.5	100
Total	1,313.8		1,313.8	1,535.5		1,535.5	1,555.2		1,555.2	587.1	556.4	1,143.5	1,167.8	102	747.3	723.0	1,470.3	1,356.9	92
Region 2:																			
Arapaho	21.5		21.5	21.5		21.5	28.5		28.5	9.0	9.0	18.0	25.7	143	18.5	20.5	39.0	19.6	50
GrandMesa-Uncompahgre	17.5		17.5	17.5		17.5	40.0		40.0	9.0	7.0	16.0	10.5	66	22.5	25.0	47.5	10.2	21
Gunnison	29.5		29.5	29.5		29.5	29.5		29.5	5.0	4.0	9.0	2.0	22	27.5	25.5	53.0	2.8	5
Pike	4.6		4.6	4.6		4.6	10.0		10.0	2.0	2.5	4.5	3.3	73	2.0	5.5	7.5	1.3	17
Rio Grande	28.8		28.8	28.8		28.8	28.8		28.8	12.5	5.0	17.5	10.3	59	22.0	20.5	42.5	34.4	81
Roosevelt	21.0		21.0	21.0		21.0	28.3		28.3	5.0	4.0	9.0	11.6	129	11.5	17.5	29.0	5.4	19
Routt	32.7		32.7	50.7		50.7	50.7		50.7	13.5	11.5	25.0	29.8	119	27.0	32.5	59.5	49.8	84
San Isabel	9.0		9.0	9.0		9.0	10.0		10.0	2.0	2.0	4.0	3.7	92	6.5	2.5	9.0	1.8	20
San Juan	50.0		50.0	50.0		50.0	50.0		50.0	25.0	25.0	50.0	38.4	77	76.0	85.0	161.0	134.9	84
White River	9.0		9.0	9.0		9.0	38.8		38.8	6.5	5.0	11.5	11.3	98	37.5	11.5	49.0	32.4	66
Nebraska										.5	.2	.7	.6	86	1.5	.5	2.0	.8	40
Black Hills	60.1		60.1	60.1		60.1	60.1		60.1	32.5	25.0	57.5	49.1	85	32.5	50.0	82.5	58.1	70
Bighorn	15.0		15.0	15.0		15.0	15.0		15.0	7.5	4.0	11.5	4.6	40	29.0	15.0	44.0	3.9	9
Medicine Bow	50.0		50.0	60.1		60.1	60.1		60.1	25.0	20.0	45.0	30.9	69	59.5	25.5	85.0	7.1	8
Shoshone	15.0		15.0	15.0		15.0	15.0		15.0	6.0	5.5	11.5	16.7	145	19.0	17.5	36.5	37.5	103
Total	363.7		363.7	391.8		391.8	464.8		464.8	161.0	129.7	290.7	248.5	85	392.5	354.5	747.0	400.0	54
Region 3:																			
Apache	69.7		69.7	68.7		68.7	68.7		68.7	39.1	43.0	82.1	50.5	62	9.2	7.9	17.1	3.4	20
Coconino	56.8		56.8	56.8		56.8	56.8		56.8	31.6	42.2	73.8	66.6	90	29.2	29.1	58.3	14.1	24
Coronado	6.0		6.0	4.0		4.0	4.0		4.0	2.0	2.0	4.0	1.4	35	2.0	1.5	3.5	1.3	37
Kaibab	44.3		44.3	54.0		54.0	54.0		54.0	31.4	35.0	66.4	45.9	69	24.5	19.8	44.3	33.8	76
Prescott	4.0		4.0	4.0		4.0	4.0		4.0	2.5	2.2	4.7	3.0	64	2.9	2.2	5.1	15.9	312
Sitgreaves	56.2		56.2	56.2		56.2	56.2		56.2	34.8	37.5	72.3	76.4	106	7.2	14.4	21.6	15.8	73
Tonto	7.0		7.0	7.0		7.0	7.0		7.0	5.4	8.5	13.9	15.1	109	.7	.4	1.1	2.1	191
Carson	21.9		21.9	29.7		29.7	29.7		29.7	25.8	31.1	56.9	18.5	33	6.0	4.0	10.0	21.5	215
Cibola	18.0		18.0	18.0		18.0	18.0		18.0	4.5	3.0	7.5	4.9	65	5.0	3.2	8.2	6.5	79
Gila	30.3		30.3	30.3		30.3	30.3		30.3	15.2	16.6	31.8	6.1	19	14.2	19.1	33.3	3.0	9
Lincoln	12.0		12.0	10.3		10.3	10.3		10.3	4.7	7.0	11.7	5.3	45	10.3	9.4	19.7	5.5	28
Santa Fe	44.4		44.4	44.9		44.9	46.6		46.6	22.1	21.7	43.8	13.5	31	27.3	24.4	51.7	22.1	43
Total	370.6		370.6	383.9		383.9	385.6		385.6	219.1	249.8	468.9	307.2	66	138.5	135.4	273.9	145.0	53
Region 4:																			
Boise	130.0		130.0	130.0		130.0	135.0		135.0	68.0	67.0	135.0	141.9	105	64.0	68.5	132.5	87.7	66
Caribou	8.0		8.0	7.8		7.8	7.8		7.8	.3	1.5	1.8	2.2	122	.1	1.2	1.3	2.1	162
Challis	10.0		10.0	25.8		25.8	10.0		10.0	1.7	1.7	3.4	2.6	76	1.4	4.4	5.8	2.8	48
Payette	91.0		91.0	91.0		91.0	95.0		95.0	40.0	40.3	80.3	65.6	82	80.4	54.5	134.9	63.7	47
Salmon	20.0		20.0	24.5		24.5	24.5		24.5	9.4	12.0	21.4	18.9	88	10.4	16.5	26.9	14.1	52
Sawtooth	21.0		21.0	21.0		21.0	21.0		21.0	5.7	8.6	14.3	12.6	88	27.0	8.8	35.8	22.4	63
Targhee	40.0		40.0	69.0		69.0	50.0		50.0	7.2	16.5	23.7	11.0	46	7.5	11.4	18.9	19.0	101
Humboldt													.1					.1	
Toiyabe	7.0		7.0	25.0		25.0	17.7		17.7	4.0	4.5	8.5	2.0	24	2.4	6.0	8.4	.9	11
Ashley	18.5		18.5	32.4		32.4	24.2		24.2	6.4	6.0	12.4	9.2	74	4.0	9.5	13.5	1.4	10
Cache	8.0		8.0	5.0		5.0	5.0		5.0	1.3	1.4	2.7	2.0	74	.6	2.2	2.8	.9	32
Dixie	30.1		30.1	30.1		30.1	32.1		32.1	13.5	13.3	26.8	25.0	93	13.0	19.5	32.5	47.9	147
Fishlake	3.0		3.0	12.7		12.7	12.7		12.7	1.1	1.6	2.7	1.4	52	4.1	4.5	8.6	.4	5

Manti-La Sal	7.5	--------	7.5	11.2	--------	11.2	31.3	--------	31.3	7.4	5.5	12.9	14.3	111	1.6	3.0	4.6	2.1	46
Uinta	3.0	--------	3.0	13.8	--------	13.8	13.5	--------	13.5	2.3	4.0	6.3	3.7	59	3.2	7.6	10.8	4.2	39
Wasatch	16.0	--------	16.0	15.0	--------	15.0	27.5	--------	27.5	12.5	5.7	18.2	6.5	36	19.2	9.6	28.8	2.3	8
Bridger	54.8	--------	54.8	54.8	--------	54.8	51.5	--------	51.5	10.6	9.5	20.1	11.7	58	4.1	20.0	24.1	3.7	15
Teton	16.0	--------	16.0	25.1	--------	25.1	29.5	--------	29.5	4.6	5.8	10.4	13.0	125	17.5	15.4	32.9	3.2	--------
Total	483.9	--------	483.9	594.2	--------	594.2	588.3	--------	588.3	196.0	204.9	400.9	343.7	86	260.5	262.6	523.1	272.5	52
Region 5:																			
Angeles	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	3.4	--------	3.4	3.7	.7	4.4	.7	16	1.6	.5	2.1	1.2	57
Cleveland	--------	--------	--------	.2	--------	.2	.2	--------	.2	.1	.1	.2	.1	50	.1	.1	.2	.1	50
Eldorado	96.0	--------	96.0	116.0	--------	116.0	130.0	--------	130.0	50.7	52.2	102.9	74.5	72	63.4	67.0	130.4	112.7	86
Inyo	19.2	--------	19.2	19.2	--------	19.2	19.2	--------	19.2	8.5	7.0	15.5	11.7	75	4.2	6.0	10.2	5.5	54
Klamath	183.0	--------	183.0	185.0	--------	185.0	238.0	--------	238.0	100.2	100.5	200.7	161.7	81	103.2	116.0	219.2	153.9	70
Lassen	95.0	--------	95.0	99.0	--------	99.0	170.0	--------	170.0	51.9	55.9	107.8	109.3	101	55.1	59.0	114.1	67.4	59
Los Padres	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	3.6	--------	3.6	.1	2.3	2.4	4.6	192	3.2	--------	3.2	6.3	197
Mendocino	76.0	--------	76.0	81.0	--------	81.0	89.0	--------	89.0	49.7	46.0	95.7	73.0	76	45.3	57.5	102.8	79.5	77
Modoc	51.0	--------	51.0	51.0	--------	51.0	62.0	--------	62.0	29.1	28.6	57.7	48.4	84	31.6	35.5	67.1	74.2	111
Plumas	169.0	--------	169.0	183.0	--------	183.0	218.0	--------	218.0	100.1	93.5	193.6	151.8	78	100.6	101.0	201.6	209.0	104
San Bernardino	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	11.0	--------	11.0	5.0	10.2	15.2	10.1	66	5.9	9.0	14.9	5.3	36
Sequoia	86.0	--------	86.0	101.0	--------	101.0	110.0	--------	110.0	32.8	30.7	63.5	39.5	62	51.8	39.0	90.8	10.0	11
Shasta-Trinity	218.0	--------	218.0	218.0	--------	218.0	284.0	--------	284.0	107.7	114.0	221.7	210.1	95	124.2	125.5	249.7	286.0	115
Sierra	91.0	--------	91.0	114.0	--------	114.0	152.0	--------	152.0	48.3	66.9	115.2	154.9	134	63.4	75.0	138.4	117.9	85
Six Rivers	162.0	--------	162.0	156.0	--------	156.0	198.0	--------	198.0	65.0	76.7	141.7	133.1	94	87.4	92.5	179.9	201.4	112
Stanislaus	102.0	--------	102.0	123.0	--------	123.0	139.0	--------	139.0	61.3	66.9	128.2	59.4	46	63.4	72.0	135.4	135.9	100
Tahoe	109.0	--------	109.0	130.0	--------	130.0	149.0	--------	149.0	119.5	67.2	186.7	123.5	66	58.1	50.5	108.6	77.4	71
Total	1,457.2	--------	1,457.2	1,576.4	--------	1,576.4	1,976.4	--------	1,976.4	833.7	819.4	1,653.1	1,366.4	83	862.5	906.1	1,768.6	1,543.7	87
Region 6:																			
Deschutes	136.0	--------	136.0	136.0	--------	136.0	138.0	--------	138.0	75.0	61.7	136.7	136.2	100	72.1	86.4	158.5	102.7	65
Fremont	126.0	--------	126.0	126.0	--------	126.0	129.0	--------	129.0	70.5	58.2	128.7	91.4	71	40.1	63.6	103.7	160.2	154
Malheur	138.0	--------	138.0	171.0	--------	171.0	171.0	--------	171.0	81.4	80.9	162.3	142.6	88	54.6	85.7	140.3	193.9	138
Mount Hood	315.0	--------	315.0	315.0	--------	315.0	330.0	--------	330.0	185.9	165.8	351.7	369.9	105	134.5	170.6	305.1	334.2	110
Ochoco	96.0	--------	96.0	98.0	--------	98.0	98.0	--------	98.0	70.8	50.8	121.6	140.2	115	22.9	50.2	73.1	35.4	48
Rogue River	135.0	--------	135.0	126.0	--------	126.0	176.0	--------	176.0	90.3	74.4	164.7	209.1	127	89.5	84.5	174.0	181.3	104
Siskiyou	185.0	--------	185.0	179.0	--------	179.0	191.0	--------	191.0	90.2	93.2	183.4	177.2	97	100.4	88.4	188.8	152.3	81
Siuslaw	315.0	--------	315.0	327.0	--------	327.0	334.0	--------	334.0	187.6	171.8	359.4	345.9	96	155.4	163.0	318.4	330.4	104
Umatilla	110.0	--------	110.0	129.0	--------	129.0	135.0	--------	135.0	56.4	68.0	124.4	109.4	88	61.8	55.7	117.5	93.2	79
Umpqua	303.0	--------	303.0	340.0	--------	340.0	357.0	--------	357.0	172.0	180.6	352.6	386.1	109	161.0	178.5	339.5	424.2	125
Wallowa-Whitman	121.0	--------	121.0	160.0	--------	160.0	168.0	--------	168.0	71.4	63.6	135.0	117.5	87	71.9	101.7	173.6	162.6	94
Willamette	529.0	--------	529.0	566.0	--------	566.0	615.0	--------	615.0	288.4	310.8	599.2	812.5	136	296.9	296.9	593.3	637.9	108
Winema	90.0	--------	90.0	90.0	--------	90.0	91.0	--------	91.0	58.9	41.5	100.4	74.8	74	70.2	49.6	119.8	161.7	135
Gifford Pinchot	395.0	--------	395.0	395.0	--------	395.0	381.0	--------	381.0	237.7	238.1	475.8	442.8	93	294.6	212.2	506.8	433.2	85
Mount Baker	201.0	--------	201.0	201.0	--------	201.0	164.0	--------	164.0	121.9	114.5	236.4	226.8	96	117.3	100.6	217.9	209.7	96
Okanogan	70.0	--------	70.0	90.0	--------	90.0	90.0	--------	90.0	37.7	39.7	77.4	83.0	107	58.0	60.0	118.0	115.1	98
Olympic	341.0	--------	341.0	341.0	--------	341.0	343.0	--------	343.0	148.2	145.3	293.5	273.4	93	228.7	148.7	377.4	186.1	49
Snoqualmie	207.0	--------	207.0	207.0	--------	207.0	229.0	--------	229.0	117.0	104.3	221.3	222.6	101	167.1	184.9	352.0	183.9	52
Wenatchee	107.0	--------	107.0	106.0	--------	106.0	125.0	--------	125.0	69.4	64.6	134.0	123.2	92	63.2	53.9	117.1	107.6	92
Total	3,920.0	--------	3,920.0	4,103.0	--------	4,103.0	4,265.0	--------	4,265.0	2,230.7	2,127.8	4,358.5	4,484.6	103	2,260.2	2,234.6	4,494.8	4,205.6	94
Region 7:																			
Cumberland	24.9	13.5	38.4	24.9	13.5	38.4	24.9	13.5	38.4	11.5	12.0	23.5	20.5	87	12.5	15.5	28.0	28.7	85
White Mountain	11.0	12.0	23.0	11.0	12.0	23.0	15.0	40.0	55.0	12.5	12.0	24.5	24.8	101	8.0	12.5	20.5	16.4	80
Allegheny	9.3	64.0	73.3	25.0	73.8	98.8	25.0	73.8	98.8	13.5	13.0	26.5	27.5	104	17.5	19.0	36.5	27.0	74
Green Mountain	7.0	8.0	15.0	7.0	8.0	15.0	18.0	22.5	40.5	5.1	5.0	10.1	9.9	98	6.0	6.5	12.5	10.6	85
George Washington	25.7	64.6	90.3	20.0	52.0	72.0	20.0	52.0	72.0	15.5	13.5	29.0	25.5	88	13.5	14.5	28.0	23.4	84
Jefferson	13.6	28.4	42.0	13.6	28.4	42.0	13.6	28.4	42.0	8.0	7.5	15.5	13.8	89	10.0	10.5	20.5	19.2	94
Monongahela	31.0	44.0	75.0	31.0	44.0	75.0	31.0	44.0	75.0	17.0	16.5	33.5	29.5	88	20.5	21.5	42.0	38.7	92
Total	122.5	234.5	357.0	132.5	231.7	64.2	147.5	274.2	21.7	83.1	79.5	162.6	151.5	93	88.0	100.0	188.0	159.0	85
Region 8:																			
Alabama	43.1	11.5	54.6	42.8	16.5	59.3	45.3	21.3	66.6	34.5	27.5	62.0	57.3	92	26.5	29.0	55.5	52.8	95
Ouachita	89.9	43.1	133.0	89.2	42.4	131.6	89.2	42.4	131.6	72.5	65.0	137.5	120.7	88	67.5	68.0	135.5	134.2	99
Ozark-St. Francis	35.6	4.7	40.3	36.5	4.6	41.1	36.5	4.6	41.1	24.0	20.0	44.0	34.9	79	22.5	22.5	45.0	54.6	121
Florida	14.3	47.1	61.4	14.3	46.6	60.9	14.3	46.6	60.9	41.5	35.0	76.5	72.8	95	39.5	42.0	81.5	87.4	107
Georgia	38.0	5.9	43.9	44.0	5.9	49.9	44.0	5.9	49.9	26.5	22.5	49.0	42.5	87	28.0	29.0	57.0	47.8	84
Kisatchie	40.8	25.1	65.9	44.9	27.5	72.4	44.9	27.5	72.4	43.5	31.5	75.0	69.5	93	41.0	42.0	83.0	56.1	68
Mississippi	96.3	53.7	150.0	99.4	75.9	175.3	102.1	73.0	175.1	77.5	75.0	152.5	159.1	104	84.5	87.0	171.5	158.4	92
North Carolina	42.5	19.2	61.7	43.3	18.4	61.7	38.9	10.2	49.1	27.5	25.0	52.5	45.4	86	32.0	33.0	65.0	60.8	94
South Carolina	39.4	23.1	62.5	39.4	23.1	62.5	39.4	23.1	62.5	45.0	45.0	90.0	93.2	104	50.0	53.0	103.0	115.3	112
Cherokee	23.5	1.5	25.0	22.1	1.7	23.8	20.9	5.2	26.1	19.5	17.5	37.0	32.6	88	19.5	23.0	42.5	35.6	84
Texas	69.6	38.9	108.5	69.5	39.0	108.5	69.5	39.0	108.5	70.0	50.0	120.0	89.3	74	54.0	62.5	116.5	70.4	60
Total	533.0	273.8	806.8	545.4	301.6	847.0	545.0	298.8	843.8	482.0	414.0	896.0	817.3	91	465.0	491.0	956.0	873.4	91

Summary of timber sale accomplishment and allowable cut on the national forests, calendar year 1962—Continued

[Millions of board feet]

Region and national forest	Annual allowable cut									Financed cut, calendar year 1962					Financed sell, calendar year 1962				
	Jan. 1, 1961			Jan. 1, 1962			Jan. 1, 1963			January-June	July-December	Total		Percent accomplished	January-June	July-December	Total		Percent accomplished
	Sawtimber	Convertible products	Total volume	Sawtimber	Convertible products	Total volume	Sawtimber	Convertible products	Total volume			Planned	Accomplishment				Planned	Accomplishment	
Region 9:																			
Chequamegon	8.4	60.6	69.0	8.4	60.6	69.0	8.4	60.6	69.0	17.6	15.3	32.9	27.0	82	20.2	18.5	38.7	42.0	109
Nicolet	5.2	32.9	38.1	5.2	32.9	38.1	5.2	32.9	38.1	18.7	17.2	35.9	34.9	97	20.4	22.1	42.5	35.4	83
Chippewa	4.3	43.7	48.0	8.4	70.9	79.3	8.4	70.9	79.3	18.4	20.3	38.7	30.2	78	20.0	22.8	42.8	50.6	118
Superior	13.2	170.1	183.3	13.2	170.1	183.3	13.2	170.1	183.3	52.5	47.5	100.0	73.0	73	90.2	90.1	180.3	56.9	32
Missouri	47.0	5.8	52.8	50.0	9.4	59.4	50.0	9.4	59.4	17.4	16.5	33.9	23.7	70	20.5	22.1	42.6	27.0	63
Hiawatha	7.5	49.3	56.8	7.5	49.3	56.8	7.5	49.3	56.8	20.9	18.3	39.2	36.1	92	26.5	25.0	51.5	48.1	93
Lower Michigan	6.0	53.0	59.0	6.0	53.0	59.0	6.0	53.0	59.0	29.2	26.5	55.7	48.0	86	25.4	25.7	51.1	51.3	100
Ottawa	10.7	32.2	42.9	10.7	32.2	42.9	10.7	32.2	42.9	22.6	24.0	46.6	40.4	87	25.6	26.1	51.7	40.8	79
Shawnee	5.8	--------	5.8	10.1	2.0	12.1	10.1	2.0	12.1	2.7	3.6	6.3	14.3	227	2.0	2.3	4.3	17.2	400
Wayne-Hoosier	10.4	.9	11.3	9.7	2.5	12.2	9.7	2.5	12.2	5.0	5.2	10.2	8.2	80	6.7	5.8	12.5	9.1	73
Total[1]	118.5	448.5	567.0	129.2	482.9	612.1	129.2	482.9	612.1	205.0	194.4	399.4	335.8	84	257.5	260.5	518.0	378.4	73
Region 10:																			
Chugach	79.0	--------	79.0	79.0	--------	79.0	79.0	--------	79.0	6.3	3.5	9.8	7.2	73	3.3	4.3	7.6	1.0	13
North Tongass	530.1	--------	530.1	530.1	--------	530.1	530.1	--------	530.1	85.0	79.8	164.8	177.2	108	83.9	49.6	133.5	59.6	45
South Tongass	270.0	--------	270.0	294.2	--------	294.2	293.8	--------	293.8	93.6	91.2	184.8	189.2	102	48.2	28.3	76.5	137.8	180
Total	879.1	--------	879.1	903.3	--------	903.3	902.9	--------	902.9	184.9	174.5	359.4	373.4	104	135.4	82.2	217.6	198.4	91
Grand total	9,562.3	956.8	10,519.1	10,295.2	1,016.2	11,311.4	10,959.9	1,055.9	12,015.8	5,182.6	4,950.4	10,133.0	9,596.2	95	5,607.4	5,549.9	11,157.3	9,532.9	85

[1] All conifers except hemlock, white pine and red pine measured as cordwood. Aspen and balm of gilead measured only as cordwood.

Region and national forest	Advertised but not sold, calendar year 1962 (millions of board feet)			Uncut volume under contract, Dec 31, 1962 (millions of board feet)	Average appraised price per thousand sold, calendar year 1962						Average sold, price per thousand for advertised sales sold, calendar year 1962					
					Sawtimber			Pulpwood			Sawtimber			Pulpwood		
	January-June	July-December	Total volume		January-June	July-December	Entire year	January-June	July-December	Entire year	January-June	July-December	Entire year	January-June	July-December	Entire year
Region 1:																
Clearwater	--------	--------	--------	248.9	$2.37	--------	$2.37	--------	--------	--------	$4.50	--------	$4.50	--------	--------	--------
Coeur d'Alene	--------	--------	--------	191.7	4.52	$5.30	4.85	--------	--------	--------	4.99	$7.32	5.98	--------	--------	--------
Kaniksu	--------	--------	--------	313.6	5.37	4.33	4.72	--------	--------	--------	8.42	6.61	7.28	--------	--------	--------
Nezperce	--------	--------	--------	282.5	2.42	4.51	2.73	--------	--------	--------	6.28	6.10	6.25	--------	--------	--------
St. Joe	4.2	--------	4.2	251.4	2.24	4.56	3.47	--------	--------	--------	2.84	4.97	3.97	--------	--------	--------
Beaverhead	--------	--------	--------	76.2	--------	1.95	1.95	--------	--------	--------	--------	2.24	2.24	--------	--------	--------
Bitterroot	--------	--------	--------	60.3	2.91	3.61	3.20	--------	--------	--------	5.61	7.36	6.33	--------	--------	--------
Custer	--------	.7	.7	8.4	5.00	--------	5.00	--------	--------	--------	5.01	--------	5.01	--------	--------	--------
Deerlodge	--------	--------	--------	89.7	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------
Flathead	--------	--------	--------	214.1	3.13	6.07	4.46	--------	--------	--------	12.36	13.78	13.01	--------	--------	--------
Gallatin	--------	5.5	5.5	72.7	1.97	3.57	2.17	--------	--------	--------	1.97	3.58	2.17	--------	--------	--------
Helena	4.4	--------	4.4	87.7	2.04	--------	2.04	--------	--------	--------	2.04	--------	2.04	--------	--------	--------
Kootenai	8.5	4.5	13.0	302.9	2.45	2.50	2.46	--------	--------	--------	5.75	3.74	5.31	--------	--------	--------
Lewis and Clark	--------	--------	--------	142.1	2.27	2.00	2.24	--------	--------	--------	3.41	3.20	3.30	--------	--------	--------
Lolo	--------	1.0	1.0	240.3	2.70	6.08	3.64	--------	--------	--------	5.53	8.63	6.39	--------	--------	--------
Colville	--------	--------	--------	167.5	4.42	3.62	4.04	--------	--------	--------	8.44	5.85	7.23	--------	--------	--------
Total	17.1	11.7	28.8	2,750.0	3.06	4.65	3.63	--------	--------	--------	6.15	7.31	6.56	--------	--------	--------
Region 2:																
Arapaho	--------	20.0	20.0	44.0	2.00	2.00	2.00	--------	--------	--------	4.80	2.00	3.78	--------	--------	--------
Grand Mesa-Uncompahgre	--------	.6	.6	63.3	2.54	5.49	3.63	--------	--------	--------	8.58	6.49	7.85	--------	--------	--------
Gunnison	--------	3.2	3.2	156.7	2.00	2.62	2.17	--------	--------	--------	5.05	5.86	5.28	--------	--------	--------
Pike	--------	--------	--------	15.8	--------	6.75	6.75	--------	--------	--------	--------	6.75	6.75	--------	--------	--------
Rio Grande	--------	--------	--------	86.3	8.20	2.70	2.78	--------	--------	--------	8.30	2.71	2.80	--------	--------	--------

Roosevelt		76.8	76.8	43.3		4.38	4.38					4.43	4.43			
Routt				48.5	2.58	3.57	2.67				3.57	3.33	3.35			
San Isabel		.2	.2	10.6		4.13	4.13					3.45	3.45			
San Juan				338.1	2.73	2.00	2.17				4.35	6.14	5.72			
White River		11.6	11.6	70.3		2.13	2.13					2.17	2.17			
Nebraska				.3												
Black Hills	6.0	48.3	54.3	132.2	5.11	5.42	5.26				5.26	5.94	5.58			
Bighorn		14.4	14.4	32.2		3.37	3.37					3.37	3.37			
Medicine Bow				192.4	2.00		2.00				2.00		2.00			
Shoshone				51.0	1.89	1.82	1.85				2.64	1.91	2.26			
Total	6.0	181.9	187.9	1,285.0	2.68	2.48	2.56				4.27	6.28	5.50			
Region 3:																
Apache				1,369.0	6.55	6.84	6.80				6.55	6.84	6.80			
Coconino				666.0		5.17	5.17					5.20	5.20			
Coronado				1.4	9.85		9.85				9.85		9.85			
Kaibab				572.2	3.00	4.63	4.38				3.00	4.63	4.38			
Prescott		.8	.8	12.6		3.09	3.09					3.09	3.09			
Sitgreaves				645.0	8.30	4.29	8.15				8.36	8.31	8.36			
Tonto				305.0	3.00		3.00				3.00		3.00			
Carson				78.0	[2] 1.11	4.16	2.75				2.05	4.10	2.70			
Cibola				2.5	5.19	4.88	4.92				8.29	5.51	6.06			
Gila				21.6	4.86	2.53	3.28				4.86	2.53	3.28			
Lincoln				17.0	8.70	6.34	7.52				10.35	8.21	9.28			
Santa Fe		13.1	13.1	42.3	2.75	2.70	2.72				2.75	2.70	2.72			
Total		13.9	13.9	3,732.6	3.99	4.07	4.04				4.18	4.13	4.15			
Region 4:																
Boise		4.6	4.6	145.2	5.36	6.60	5.61				9.59	7.56	9.19			
Caribou				.4	4.20	3.90	4.05				4.48	3.90	4.19			
Challis				11.0	3.00	2.80	2.86				3.00	2.80	2.86			
Payette		13.2	13.2	185.5	4.98	2.64	4.05				5.05	4.04	4.65			
Salmon	3.6		3.6	25.8	3.51		3.51				3.59		3.59			
Sawtooth				45.2	3.85	3.85	3.85				7.88	3.97	5.87			
Targhee		2.8	2.8	372.7		2.32	2.32					2.32	2.32			
Humboldt																
Toiyabe				9.5		2.32	2.32					2.83	2.83			
Ashley				25.7	5.50	4.10	4.84				5.50	5.35	5.42			
Cache				1.3	3.00		3.00				3.00		3.00			
Dixie		1.8	1.8	34.3	5.83	4.27	5.12				5.91	4.27	5.17			
Fishlake				5.1		4.40	4.40					4.40	4.40			
Manti-La Sal	1.2	.4	1.6	8.9		3.51	3.51					4.62	4.62			
Uinta	.5		.5	.2	2.79		2.79				2.98		2.98			
Wasatch		28.2	28.2	17.6		5.20	5.20					5.25	5.25			
Bridger		7.4	7.4	25.5	3.50	3.69	3.60				4.95	3.69	4.32			
Teton		.7	.7	9.5		1.90	1.90					1.90	1.90			
Total	5.3	59.1	64.4	923.4	5.32	3.80	4.80				7.27	4.30	6.26			
Region 5:																
Eldorado	5.9		5.9	97.0	6.79	10.00	7.73				14.56	17.70	15.48			
Inyo				4.0		1.40	1.40					1.40	1.40			
Klamath				206.7	4.51	5.34	4.85				7.50	5.64	6.73			
Lassen				127.1	9.65	5.00	9.53				16.11	16.10	16.10			
Los Padres				1.8	2.65		2.65				2.65		2.65			
Mendocino				78.0	5.19	3.44	3.96				5.50	4.43	4.75			
Modoc				88.0	2.91	9.14	6.65				10.31	11.17	10.83			
Plumas	.3		.3	247.2	10.36	11.33	10.66				14.66	13.65	14.35			
San Bernardino				6.5	3.70		3.70				3.70		3.70			
Sequoia		16.9	16.9	172.3	8.45	6.03	6.46				8.45	6.03	6.46			
Shasta-Trinity		.6	.6	322.7	9.33	14.33	10.73				14.90	18.55	15.92			
Sierra	9.8	8.4	18.2	119.5	5.06	8.74	5.54				6.42	12.49	7.21			
Six Rivers		4.7	4.7	255.0	8.90	12.29	9.52				13.31	15.62	13.73			
Stanislaus				130.3	7.70	5.39	7.08				8.16	8.98	8.38			
Tahoe				70.0	7.22	6.57	7.09				12.89	14.35	13.19			
Total	16.0	30.6	46.6	1,926.1	7.87	8.83	8.17				12.13	11.65	11.98			
Region 6:																
Deschutes				250.1	15.21	9.63	12.77				18.80	14.53	16.93			
Fremont	8.3	12.5	20.8	209.1	14.52	12.78	14.23				14.58	13.53	14.41			
Malheur				353.4	7.80	9.62	8.61				8.14	9.67	8.82			
Mount Hood				560.0	11.15	18.15	12.94				18.96	29.44	21.64			
Ochoco		.3	.3	143.0	6.99	7.30	7.25				8.76	9.70	9.56			
Rogue River				158.8	11.53	13.00	11.89				14.44	20.18	15.83			
Siskiyou				277.6	12.65	15.10	13.64				16.75	21.20	18.54			
Siuslaw		.2	.2	433.6	20.33	23.07	20.86				25.33	26.56	25.57			
Umatilla				280.2	8.31	6.28	7.99				11.75	8.81	11.28			
Umpqua				807.8	13.45	16.56	15.36				16.49	20.14	18.74			
Wallowa-Whitman	1.0	12.8	13.8	244.8	6.23	10.35	7.05				6.77	10.36	7.48			
Willamette				987.2	14.40	18.26	15.71				21.16	28.56	23.68			

[2] Spruce salvage.

Summary of timber sale accomplishment and allowable cut on the national forests, calendar year 1962—Continued

Region and national forest	Advertised but not sold, calendar year 1962 (millions of board feet)			Uncut volume under contract, Dec. 31, 1962 (millions of board feet)	Average appraised price per thousand sold, calendar year 1962						Average sold, price per thousand for advertised sales sold, calendar year 1962					
					Sawtimber			Pulpwood			Sawtimber			Pulpwood		
	January-June	July-December	Total volume		January-June	July-December	Entire year	January-June	July-December	Entire year	January-June	July-December	Entire year	January-June	July-December	Entire year
Region 6—Continued																
Winema				403.7	$15.72	$10.42	$14.08				$23.65	$11.36	$19.84			
Gifford Pinchot	0.2	3.3	3.5	925.5	10.21	15.62	11.20				18.93	22.07	19.50			
Mount Baker				438.0	6.17	3.66	5.07				15.51	5.66	11.19			
Okanogan		3.2	3.2	98.0	4.62	7.42	6.48				6.52	7.92	7.44			
Olympic				881.2	6.32	6.82	6.62				9.00	8.16	8.49			
Snoqualmie	.3	19.3	19.6	433.7	12.46	13.89	13.39				18.67	18.48	18.55			
Wenatchee	1.3		1.3	174.5	7.56	14.25	8.56				8.57	17.01	9.83			
Total east side					10.39	9.41	10.07				12.48	10.75	11.90			
Total west side					12.80	14.85	13.55				19.11	20.67	19.68			
Total	11.1	51.6	62.7	8,069.2	12.14	13.53	12.64				17.30	18.26	17.64			
Region 7:																
Cumberland	1.3	1.0	2.3	16.3	14.29	14.89	14.51		$3.00	$3.00	15.63	16.24	15.85		$3.39	$3.39
White Mountain		.1	.1	30.9	16.07	15.42	15.65	$8.64	1.26	4.74	20.11	16.36	17.65	$10.96	1.29	5.85
Allegheny	5.5		5.5	32.9	42.56	40.05	41.73	1.08	1.67	1.29	52.01	53.73	52.59	1.08	1.67	1.29
Green Mountain	.1		.1	9.9	25.19		25.19	3.00		3.00	32.77		32.77	3.04		3.04
George Washington	.4	3.2	3.6	55.4	20.11	18.91	19.84		1.46	1.46	20.11	19.01	19.86		1.46	1.46
Jefferson	.2		.2	18.2	11.33	16.05	13.36		1.30	1.30	16.98	19.33	17.99		1.53	1.53
Monongahela	4.9	1.8	6.7	37.3	18.72	18.64	18.69	.82	1.05	.87	21.38	18.65	20.29	.95	1.25	1.01
Total	12.4	6.1	18.5	200.9	23.47	21.39	22.75	2.59	2.46	3.08	28.09	25.77	27.93	3.04	1.55	2.38
Region 8:																
Alabama	1.8	5.5	7.3	80.0	22.28	24.33	22.69	4.31	4.11	4.20	24.83	28.90	25.64	4.83	4.38	4.58
Ouachita		1.9	1.9	105.3	23.64	26.02	24.22	2.44	3.44	2.74	28.31	32.20	29.27	2.78	3.66	3.04
Ozark		.3	.3	42.5	15.89	16.95	16.09	5.76	5.25	5.62	19.09	20.34	19.33	6.44	5.32	6.13
Florida	4.5	.7	5.2	130.0	29.95	29.03	29.64	10.78	10.64	10.72	33.40	31.08	32.69	11.98	13.18	12.56
Georgia	.8	.5	1.3	33.7	21.05	24.89	22.32	12.16	11.13	11.36	27.42	30.76	28.52	13.06	11.88	12.15
Kisatchie	4.6	3.7	8.3	73.5	20.78	20.51	20.67	7.22	7.24	7.22	22.27	22.34	22.30	7.76	7.58	7.70
Mississippi	10.1	15.5	25.6	126.7	20.34	21.28	20.58	7.06	7.39	7.15	22.37	23.11	22.53	7.48	7.41	7.46
North Carolina	.5	.5	1.0	70.8	17.72	16.78	17.54	4.46	8.74	4.85	19.96	17.01	19.37	5.23	9.61	5.62
South Carolina		.5	.5	128.4	28.51	27.07	28.07	10.67	10.21	10.51	33.60	32.95	33.40	13.13	13.20	13.15
Cherokee	3.7	2.5	6.2	52.8	14.14	17.97	15.60	5.17	3.32	4.63	15.73	18.11	16.64	5.21	3.25	4.67
Texas	16.7	4.6	21.3	56.0	21.57	19.07	20.94	8.10	6.70	7.12	22.07	19.21	21.35	8.10	6.72	7.14
Total	42.7	36.2	78.9	899.7	21.56	22.72	21.86	7.85	8.54	8.11	24.69	26.13	25.07	8.89	9.02	9.28
Region 9:																
Chequamegon	2.0	1.3	3.3	91.1	23.83	13.25	16.68	4.46	3.00	3.68	31.40	13.78	19.48	6.22	3.42	4.74
Nicolet	5.4	2.0	7.4	81.8	25.71	25.33	25.53	4.34	3.28	3.96	43.04	39.69	41.47	5.12	3.42	4.50
Chippewa	2.7	3.4	6.1	87.4	17.58	18.63	18.03	2.90	2.92	2.90	18.62	19.85	19.15	3.68	2.98	3.30
Superior	19.6	39.0	58.6	502.8	11.69	9.59	10.60	3.56	3.60	3.58	24.51	13.56	18.71	4.76	4.46	4.66
Missouri	3.3	.3	3.6	54.6												
Clark					6.95	7.22	7.03				8.54	7.72	8.30			
Mark Twain					9.23	7.39	8.62				12.04	10.98	11.69			
Hiawatha	9.2	.8	10.0	87.0	13.38	13.47	13.40	5.06	3.36	4.74	23.26	22.06	23.00	6.34	5.58	6.20
Lower Michigan	9.7	1.5	11.2	153.5	8.61	5.83	7.18	3.84	5.38	4.30	8.85	6.59	7.69	4.22	5.60	4.62
Ottawa	2.5		2.5	81.0	14.05	20.39	16.14	3.54	3.58	3.56	24.47	36.03	28.28	3.68	4.34	3.88
Shawnee				28.3	14.87	6.80	10.99				18.73	6.98	13.08			
Wayne-Hoosier	1.0	.7	1.7	17.9	9.53	9.75	9.64				10.06	10.19	10.13			
Total	55.4	49.0	104.4	1,185.4	11.85	12.26	12.00	3.98	3.48	3.82	16.82	16.81	16.81	4.94	3.98	4.58
Region 10: [3]																
North Tongass	14.8	3.8	18.6	8,005.7	2.45	1.71	2.18				2.62	1.71	2.28			
South Tongass	1.3		1.3	7,413.0	2.83	2.02	2.13				2.83	2.02	2.13			
Total	16.1	3.8	19.9	15,418.7	2.57	1.98	2.14				2.69	1.98	2.18			
Grand total	182.1	443.9	626.0	36,391.0												

---

[3] Large pulpwood sales (80 percent) included as sawtimber.

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that further proceedings under the quorum call be suspended.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KENNEDY in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

FARMERS HOME ADMINISTRATION

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, President Kennedy in his budget message singled out a few agencies for special commendation for the manner in which they had increased the efficiency of their operations.

One of the agencies so recognized was the Farmers Home Administration. The President pointed out the remarkable increase in the past 2 years in the number of loans processed per employee.

But this is only a part of the story about that organization and its accomplishments. Let me take the Senate back a few years in history.

When the Republican administration assumed power in 1953, the Farmers Home Administration was a well-established agency doing a good job of helping family farmers adjust to changing conditions and helping veterans become reestablished in farming. It was a solid and extremely useful agency.

What happened under the Benson administration?

The Farmers Home Administration was gutted. The staff of the agency was sharply reduced and a blanket was spread over its operations. If any progress was made at all during those long 8 years it was because the staff that remained kept on serving the needs of farmers despite every effort on the part of the administration to discourage such service.

With the advent of the Kennedy administration in 1961 the Farmers Home Administration took a new lease on life.

During its hibernation many dreadful things happened to American agriculture.

The farm population declined at the rate of 1 million persons a year.

Hundreds of rural communities lost large parts of their populations.

Net farm income spiraled downward.

Farm people and rural problems were swept into the ashcan of neglect.

Let me remind Senators of some of the steps the Farmers Home Administration has taken on its comeback trail.

In the first spring of the Kennedy-Freeman administration the Farmers Home Administration, through the intervention of the President, obtained $85 million in funds that had been frozen by the previous administration.

These funds were used to help small farmers finance their 1961 farming operations and to help farmers obtain better housing.

Before the spring was over Secretary Freeman, in recognition of the special problems rural communities face in their struggle to avoid extinction, had established a rural areas development program and placed the Farmers Home Administration in a leadership position.

During the summer of 1961 the Farmers Home Administration received its first appropriations under the Kennedy administration. The amounts were hard to come by, for the Eisenhower budget had reduced FHA expenditures to the minimum. But the results were satisfying; a 60-percent increase was obtained. The agency moved ahead.

Then came the agriculture and housing bills for 1961.

The Agricultural Act literally remade the Farmers Home Administration. The ceiling on loans for farm operating expenses was increased. With this liberalization many farmers who had been shut off from the capital they needed received new hope. Loans to buy and enlarge farms were extended to cover the full range of family farms.

Loans were authorized to provide rural community water systems. As a result, during the past year and one-half, thousands of rural families have acquired a decent supply of good water.

Generally speaking, the whole program was made more flexible.

The insured loan program was reorganized in a manner that made it really workable for the first time.

The rural housing program was extended to enable the agency to serve the housing needs of families living in small rural communities. A special program to provide housing for domestic farm laborers was authorized.

In the spring of 1962 the agency announced a new forestry loan program. Drawing upon the authorities it possessed, the Farmers Home Administration worked out a special program of low-interest, deferred payment loans that matched the needs of family farmers who want to build their farm forests into income producing enterprises.

Last fall brought a further modernization of agency activities.

Under the Food and Agriculture Act of 1962 the Farmers Home Administration was authorized to make loans to farmers for recreational enterprises and to make loans to associations serving farmers and other rural people to shift cropland into recreation areas, grassland, forest land and other uses. Authority also was provided for the development of rural renewal projects.

Under the Senior Citizens Housing Act of 1962, the Farmers Home Administration was authorized to make special loans to elderly people in rural areas so they may build or buy homes suited to their special needs. Loans for the development of rental housing for the elderly in rural areas also were authorized.

It is a gratifying experience for the people that form an agency of Government to see the need for their special services recognized and to receive additional authorities in a more or less continual stream.

And it is equally gratifying to find that some additional funds have been provided so that the responsibilities newly acquired can be met. But while the supply of loan funds has increased, there are still many urgent demands that cannot be met.

Currently there is an urgent need for operating loan funds. In this area the agency has not grown as it should have grown. It needs at least $50 million more for loans to help farmers buy equipment, livestock, feed, and fertilizer this spring.

The agency also is in real difficulty in the matter of funds for personnel.

In fiscal 1963 the Farmers Home Administration will loan approximately $820 million. In fiscal 1960 the FHA loaned $309 million. This is a 166-percent increase.

In fiscal 1963 the agency will have on June 30 about $2 billion of loans outstanding. This is nearly double the amount outstanding on June 30, 1960. I hasten to add that losses on loans, however, are less than 1 percent of the principal advanced.

Despite the tremendous increase in lending, the Farmers Home Administration has a staff today that is only slightly larger than the staff it had in 1960.

Let me summarize what has happened.

In the 1950's the agency was cut down, far more than any other agency in the Department of Agriculture.

During the past 2 years the agency has really forged ahead.

But the whole burden of new business has fallen on the shoulders of the reduced staff of employees who already had all they could handle.

The present staff is carrying an extremely heavy workload and is doing so to a large extent by personal sacrifice. The extent of personal sacrifice is illustrated by the fact that in 1962 employees put in over 260 man-years of voluntary noncompensated overtime. Forty-five percent of the employees lost annual leave.

To fully appreciate the extent of the demand for the services of the Farmers Home Administration, it is necessary to look beyond the statistics of loans and collections. These are impressive. The volume of lending has more than doubled since 1960. In fact, at the rate the organization is progressing the volume of its loans in 1964 will be three times as large as the 1960 program. But these figures are only a crude measure of the service rendered by the agency.

The Farmers Home Administration provides much more than a credit service. Each of the loans made by the agency is accompanied by technical supervision in farm and financial management.

The county supervisors of the Farmers Home Administration spend hours with every applicant helping him develop a farm plan that will make the most of his resources. And they work with their borrowers until they reach a point where they can qualify for credit from other services.

This type of work is becoming more difficult each year. The cost-price squeeze has cut profit margins in farming to such a low level that it is no easy task to help a family farmer figure out how to keep his head above water.

More and more of the farmers who call at the county offices of the Farmers Home Administration have, in their efforts to keep going, acquired a long string of debts. The time spent in helping these farmers work out a debt management program, including a budget that when followed will gradually get them back on their feet, is monumental.

We cannot afford to see the caliber of the work performed by the staff of the Farmers Home Administration diminished in any respect. This agency is the bulwark between family farmers and the forces that continually threaten their existence. If it is not properly staffed and funded, thousands of family farmers will be forced into contract farming. This agency is most responsive to the needs of the times. It has proved a most responsible caretaker of public funds. The losses on loans in the many programs it currently is administering run to less than 1 percent of the principal advanced.

The importance of the Farmers Home Administration to rural communities is growing daily. Through the years, the dollars loaned to farmers by the agency and the increased incomes and net worths of borrowers have done much to stimulate the economies of small towns. Now, with the additional authorities the agency has received in the past 2 years, it has even more to offer rural areas. The new programs that finance rural community water systems, homes for elderly rural people, income producing recreational enterprises, and rural renewal programs, give direct and much needed support to the small towns of our country.

I have recommended to the Committee on Appropriations that at least $800,000 be provided to the Farmers Home Administration for the remainder of this fiscal year, so that a start can be made in raising the size of the FHA staff to a level commensurate with the demands for their services.

SUPPORT FOR HUMPHREY YOUTH BILL

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I am sure that every Member of the Senate shares my deep concern over the February unemployment figures which were recently released by the Department of Labor. I shall comment further, at another time, on the relationship between the overall rise in the percentage of unemployed to total employment from 5.8 percent to 6.1 percent and the President's tax proposals.

Of course, it is my view that the President's tax program will do as much as any one thing that we can do to stimulate our economy and thereby improve the employment picture.

But today I wish to emphasize the dramatic increase that again occurred among young people. The unemployment rate among teenagers rose from 13.9 to 15.6 percent, an increase so large that it accounted for almost half of the total increase.

The relationship of this increase to the need for prompt action on my Youth Employment Act is obvious. I regret that I must stand on the floor today and cite such evidence in behalf of this legislation. Nothing would be more gratifying to me than a steady declining rate of youth unemployment. But, as the February figures indicate, this is not likely to happen without some specific employment assistance directed toward this age group.

The hearings on the Youth Employment Act have concluded in both the House and the Senate. The testimony in these hearings highlighted the particular difficulties encountered in solving unemployment problems in the 16 to 21 age group.

During the Senate hearings the Secretary of Labor, the Attorney General, the Secretary of Agriculture, the Secretary of the Interior, and the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare appeared simultaneously in support of S. 1 before the Labor Subcommittee on Manpower and Employment chaired by the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK]. The burden of the testimony presented by this impressive array of Cabinet officials, and numerous other persons from public and private life, indicated overwhelming support for the principal concepts embodied in the Humphrey youth bill. Several important aspects of the total youth employment program envisioned in this legislation should be emphasized.

First, as the principal author of this legislation, I do not advocate its passage with the unrealistic notion that the Youth Conservation Corps and the Hometown Youth Corps, in themselves, offer an ultimate solution to the problem of youth unemployment. What I do see this legislation providing is a sensible, reasonable, and tested method whereby a major start will be made toward meeting this critical problem.

Regarding title I of this legislation that establishes the Youth Conservation Corps, the results achieved through the Civilian Conservation Corps of the 1930's provide compelling evidence of what such a program can accomplish. It provides precisely what most unemployed young people lack: self-confidence, maturity, responsibility, and the mental health that only comes from hard physical labor. I maintain that until many of our young people acquire these personal qualities they will be unable to function as self-supporting and productive members of society. This fact is no less true in the 1960's than it was in the 1930's.

The Youth Conservation Corps will provide the opportunity to develop these personal qualities, but it will also do much more. There will be both on-the-job training and vocational training supplemented by certain basic academic instruction.

I mentioned this point because some critics of the Youth Conservation Corps have said that we ought to have more education in this program. Regrettably, sometimes these same critics vote against Federal aid to education. These critics say there ought to be more vocational training in the bill, so that the young people who come into the program will be equipped by training and experience to move into regular jobs once they have left the Youth Conservation Corps.

I agree. However, this program, which is supported by the President, and was outlined in his youth message, and which I was privileged to introduce in the Senate, provides vocational and technical training, which will make it possible for young people to get this very valuable training so they can move into the regular employment force once they leave the Youth Conservation Corps. I repeat that there will be both on-the-job training and vocational training, supplemented by certain academic instruction. It will be worked out in conjunction with the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, in cooperation with the State boards of education or commissioners of education, and in cooperation and in coordination with local school authorities.

The Youth Conservation Corps offers not only the opportunity for gainful employment; it also offers the greatest opportunity that we can give to young men between the ages of 16 and 21 for advanced training in vocational and technical areas of our present educational needs.

No one denies the crucial importance of these additional training and educational opportunities. The Secretary of Labor and the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare offer firm assurances that such training will be provided.

One other complaint that has been made against the Youth Conservation Corps by some of its critics is that it is too small; that it ought to be bigger; that if unemployment is as large as some of us say it is—and what we say, of course, is based on statistical facts—the program ought to be much bigger.

I am delighted to hear that statement made. I think the program ought to be much larger. The same critics who say that, however, also want to cut the budget.

Mr. President, it is not possible to cut the budget and cut out new programs and cut down old programs, and still have a Youth Conservation Corps larger than is proposed here. The truth is that as this bill was developed, we worked very closely with the people in the White House, the special assistants to the President, and with the Department of Labor and Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare and with the Bureau of the Budget. We tried to come up with a program which was reasonable and was not too costly, and represented a beginning of a program which would encourage State and local governments to take on additional responsibilities.

We get the criticism, much of it in the hearings, at least from limited sources, to the effect that the program is not big enough, and that it does not offer enough education. The same critics are asking that the budget be cut and are not supporting the programs for aid to education.

There are numerous ways this training could be organized. For example, those enrollees who demonstrate an aptitude and interest in electronic repair work could be sent to a camp where this specialty is provided. Those interested in auto mechanics could be directed to a camp specializing in this vocation skill. Or they could be directed to camps where the facilities in the local schools nearby will meet these requirements. Enrollees desiring to become proficient in handling of heavy machinery could go to a camp where work projects called for such machinery. This is one approach whereby meaningful vocation training could be provided.

Coupled with this training received in camps, the local employment service personnel who recruited the enrollee will have the responsibility of either locating a job or providing the opportunity for additional vocational training. When the YCC enrollee completes his period of enrollment, he will return with a record of personal accomplishment that will go a long way toward opening doors that were previously closed. He will have demonstrated his ability and willingness to work long, hard hours; he will have made a real beginning toward acquiring job skills. And in many cases, he will have experienced for the first time the thrill of self-fulfillment and self-satisfaction that only comes from a job well done.

I was much gratified by President Kennedy's endorsement of S. 1 made at his Wednesday press conference. I would like to quote from his opening statement:

> First, hearings are being completed in both Houses on the youth employment opportunities bill and I hope this measure can be enacted before the Easter recess. One million of our youth are out of school and out of work, creating an explosive social situation in nearly every community. This bill would put their hands to work, and minds, in our parks and forests, manning our hospitals and juvenile centers, and developing skills and work experience which will help them in later life.

President Kennedy's plea for action before the Easter recess represents the feelings of many Members of Congress, assuming we have an Easter recess—which is a rather doubtful assumption.

I suggest to the three Members of the Senate who are on the floor that they might wish to call this little passage to the attention of their beloved colleagues.

I certainly intend to do everything in my power to bring this legislation to a successful conclusion as promptly as possible.

I was also most pleased to learn of the statement of support for the Youth Employment Act adopted by the AFL–CIO Executive Council during their recent meetings at Bal Harbour, Fla. This statement is direct, hard hitting, and argues the case for prompt passage of S. 1 in a highly persuasive fashion. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the statement by the AFL–CIO Executive Council be printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

STATEMENT BY THE AFL–CIO EXECUTIVE COUNCIL ON YOUTH EMPLOYMENT BILL, BAL HARBOUR, FLA., FEBRUARY 21, 1963

This country cannot afford any further postponement in dealing with the employment needs of its young people. Delay now, in the face of the rapidly increasing numbers of youths pouring into the labor market, is unthinkable. For this reason, the AFL–CIO urges prompt action on the youth employment bill.

In 1962, nearly 1 million youths, 16 to 21 years old, who were in the market for jobs, were unable to find them. They represented nearly 25 percent of the total unemployed.

In addition to these 1 million unemployed young people, several hundred thousand more youths were compelled to work part time, because full-time employment was not available. Moreover, thousands more, indeed, tens of thousands, were not only out of school and out of work, they were also out of the labor force, not even bothering to look for work, because they had lost hope of finding jobs.

This is truly a situation loaded with social dynamite, and one which time alone will not remedy. The number of new young workers entering the labor force is increasing steadily; by 1970, young people will be entering the labor force at the rate of 3 million each year. This contrasts sharply with the decade of the 1950's, when the annual average of new young entrants into the labor force was less than 2 million.

A substantial increase in jobs is needed generally—for all those who are willing, able, and seeking work. But even in an improved economic climate, many young people will find it impossible to obtain jobs, because they will not possess the skills or education that modern technology requires. Thirty percent of the new entrants into the labor force in this decade will not have completed high school, and another 45 percent will end their education with only a high-school diploma. As a consequence, three-fourths of these new jobseekers, who will number 3 million a year by 1970, will be looking for work with inadequate preparation, in a period of rapid technological change, when employers are demanding a more skilled and a more educated work force. The amount of unemployment among youths that can result in the next 10 years is a bone-chilling prospect.

The most expensive course that can be taken now is inaction—to be impassive about a very real problem that is with us already and is growing each year.

The youth employment bill will channel the energies of some of these young people—albeit a modest number—into productive employment. It will provide jobs for youths—15,000 during the first year and up to 60,000 thereafter—in outdoor conservation work. In addition, the bill would also enable some young people—up to 50,000 during the first year and whatever numbers Congress determines for subsequent years—to enroll for such community service work as libraries, playgrounds, and hospitals.

Measured against the size of the problem, the youth employment bill is a most modest effort. The number of openings authorized for young people should be greatly increased. But at least it is a start. It will enable young people to gain some practical job training and some employment experience, and thereby ease their transition from school to work. At the same time, the proposed bill will permit the participants to make a positive contribution to the Nation and its communities, by their work to conserve and develop our natural resources and to participate in community service programs.

The job problem of our youth population is critical, and left unattended it will get worse. The time to act is now, and the action needed is to adopt the youth employment bill.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I have received similar indications of support from all sections of the United States and from all segments of society. Never before in the long history of this struggle has public attention been so directly focused on the critical need for constructive and sensible programs to begin an attack on the problem of youth unemployment.

I have received literally thousands of letters from associations, societies, commissions, committees, and individuals concerned with problems of our young people. The percentage endorsing the passage of S. 1 is certainly over 98 percent. A number of these letters were reproduced in the Senate hearings and I urge my colleagues to glance through them when printed copies are released in the near future.

There also have been many editorials in newspapers and magazines supporting passage of S. 1, the Humphrey youth bill. A number of excellent feature articles have appeared during the past weeks.

Mr. President, from this welter of letters, editorials, articles, and statements supporting the Youth Employment Act I have gleaned several that are of special significance. In particular, I have received a marvelous letter from my good friend Frederick Manfred, the eminent Minnesota author. He describes in glowing language the importance of providing ways by which our young men expend their normal enthusiasm and drive in constructive channels. I ask unanimous consent that this letter from Frederick Manfred be printed in the Record at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

JANUARY 30, 1963.

Hon. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. HUMPHREY: I have now had a chance to study your bill, Youth Employment Act of 1963, which contains two principal proposals: the creation of a Youth Conservation Corps and a program of youth local area employment.

Many colleges and universities have set up scholarship programs to help out the bright boy or girl coming from a poor or needy family. This is all to the good. It will help to keep our democracy fresh and vital.

But it is not enough. Many a young man still graduates from high school who hasn't quite made up his mind what to do with his life. He doesn't particularly care to go to college, though he might be bright enough, and he hasn't particularly made up his mind what kind of trade he should go into. He finds himself at loose ends, with no goal in mind, at the same time that he is loaded with energy. Such a boy, no matter how good he might be, very possibly can be headed for trouble. He is looking for something real to do, and it just isn't there to be done.

In the old days, before 1900, much of this kind of aimless energy of young men was taken care of by the needs of our expanding economy, particularly all along the western frontier. We always had a real safety valve in our Far West. But those days are gone. We now need to look for new frontiers for these kind of young fellows.

In my researches for my books about the old Far West, and about prewhite Indian times, I've often been struck by the interesting way that the old chiefs handled their young men with itchy natures. They let the young braves expend their extra energy in little sorties against the enemy in the form of horse-raiding parties or war skirmishes. None of these "attacks" were ever intended to be serious. In fact, the old chiefs and shamans, when telling of their exploits to little boys, made it a point to stress that a successful raid was one where horses were taken without loss of life to either side. The greatest coup of all was the one in which a young brave entered an enemy camp stealthily at night, touched an enemy brave with his spear or bowtip, and then successfully got away without being caught. Touching the enemy without getting caught, a sort of white man's tag, was the great thing. Actual scalping and killing was far down the lists of accomplishments. This pretty well took care of the young antsy braves in those days.

I was 17 and full of exploding beans myself once. I had so much of it I could shock grain all day from 5 in the morning until 6 in the evening, and still have enough drive left to pitch a 9-inning game of baseball. And after the ballgame still have enough of a whistle left to want to paint the town red until 2 in the morning. So I can readily appreciate what some of these young fellows are up against these days.

It seems to me that the YCC answers many problems. It keeps the young man busy, it gives him some money and as such financial freedom, and it allows him to work at something that in his mind has some meaning, is worth doing, can be bragged about amongst the boys. He will be outdoors, he can flex, and yes, even tire, his muscles, he will be close to his original mother, nature, and he will have a chance to see himself as a worthwhile part of a great nation.

Meanwhile, we, the Nation, are the real gainers. We will not only be getting some necessary and worthwhile work done, we shall be growing men in our midst.

Sincerely yours,

FREDERICK MANFRED.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I also have for insertion in the RECORD some of the editorials that have recently appeared in favor of the Youth Employment Act. Included are editorials from the Saturday Evening Post, Forbes Business and Finance, the Chicago Daily News, and the Washington Post. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that various editorials supporting the Humphrey youth bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Saturday Evening Post, Feb. 9, 1963]

UNEMPLOYMENT AND THE READING PROBLEM

Unemployment in the United States continues at a disturbingly high level, about 5.5 percent. In the age of automation it is most severe among the unskilled, causing a nationwide chorus of advice to young people to stay in school. Yet of the 26 million who will come into the labor market during the next decade, nearly one-third, if present trends continue, will not have a high-school diploma. The Bureau of Labor Statistics reports that the 300,000 increase in unemployed late in 1962 was made up almost entirely of teenagers.

Among several reasons for school dropouts, one of the most important is that the student never really learned to read. In a New York State training school for young lawbreakers one-third of the boys from 12 to 15 could read only at the second-grade level. Dr. Emery Stoops, of the University of Southern California says, "Poor reading ability handicaps students in all subjects, poor readers tend to get poor marks, and students with poor marks get discouraged and drop out of school." Dr. James B. Conant recently reported: "In the slums one finds today an incredibly large percentage of pupils who may properly be designated as slow and very slow readers." In a Negro slum in a large American city, Dr. Conant found 70 percent of the boys and girls over 16 out of school and unemployed. Joblessness for those under 21, he reported, is 2½ times as high as for the whole population. Today there are an estimated three dropouts for every two unskilled jobs—a really alarming figure. Among the poor readers a good proportion have intelligence well above the average.

The dropouts are very likely to become delinquents. Dr. Melitta Schmideberg, a psychiatrist doing research in this field, says, "Reading retardation makes it almost impossible for the delinquent to find a job and unemployment aggravates his delinquency."

In Chicago half the people on relief are "functional illiterates"—either they cannot read at all or can read so little as to be useless. Similar facts were unearthed in Detroit and Philadelphia. In some cities those on relief are compelled to study reading. In many communities it is being taught by television, early in the morning; some people who are too proud to join classes are willing to learn in this way.

In regions with very high chronic unemployment, where retraining programs have been instituted, about one-third of the potential retrainees are barred because of illiteracy. In some universities 20 percent of the freshmen have to take remedial reading; obviously the percentage of those who need the remedy is higher among dropouts from elementary or secondary school.

A bitter battle is raging in the educational world over methods used in the United States to teach reading. Few laymen are competent to judge the merits of the battle, but they can see that it is time to abandon prejudices and solve the reading problem.

Arthur S. Trace, Jr., in "What Ivan Knows That Johnny Doesn't," notes that no such difficulty exists in the Soviet Union. Educators who have studied the question report that most Russian children learn to read early and well. The countries of Latin America, Africa, and Asia say there is rarely any problem, once a child—or an adult—has been given a chance to learn.

It is embarrassing that the greatest nation on earth should have such a high rate of unemployment that can in large measure be associated with a failure to teach many of our young people anything so fundamental as reading. The 87th Congress passed the Manpower Retraining Act to cope with the problem of training unskilled workers but failed to act on two other important measures: the adult basic education bill and the youth opportunities bill. The 88th Congress should pass both of them.

[From the Chicago Daily News, Feb. 15, 1963]

SENSIBLE PROPOSALS FOR YOUTH

There may be room for debate on the mechanics of President Kennedy's new youth program, but certainly it strikes at the heart of the problem with its central proposition: Give the idle hands something constructive to do.

Particularly promising is the proposal for a Youth Conservation Corps of 15,000, to work and be trained in national forests and recreational areas. As part of the same program the Federal Government would provide matching payments to communities that established similar local projects.

To the extent that these programs were wisely conceived and implemented, they could make a considerable contribution.

They would provide a practical means of attacking the high school dropout problem and the juvenile crime and delinquency associated with that problem. Virtually every community is struggling to get this generation's outside horde of dropouts off the streets and into some kind of constructive pursuits. As the President said, the communities have primary responsibility for their own, but the Federal Government has unique facilities to care for a portion of these hapless youngsters.

Of all the depression-born agencies created to take up the job slack, the Civilian Conservation Corps (on which the new Youth Conservation Corps will obviously be modeled) was the most successful. It provided work and pay over the years for some 2 million men, but more than that, it gave them a chance to learn useful skills in a healthful, body-building regimen.

In this time when lack of skills contributes so heavily to unemployment, the new program could provide invaluable training, as well as a livelihood, for thousands of potentially useful young people.

Among the President's other youth program proposals, we welcome the suggestion that the Juvenile Delinquency Act be extended for another 3 years. Delinquency is manifestly a nationwide problem, and the Federal Government has a proper role in coordinating research and disseminating knowledge.

As to the National Service Corps—the long-heralded domestic Peace Corps—we will need some convincing. The President says volunteers in this Corps would serve in hospitals, mental health centers, on Indian reservations, and in slums. There is urgent work to be done in all these areas, of course. We would like, first, to know just how the young corps men and women are to be trained and put to useful service.

[From the Mankato (Minn.) Free Press, Feb. 16, 1963]

THE YOUTH PROPOSAL

President Kennedy's proposed youth legislation is different from previous attempts in this area in that it attacks the problem from a new angle. The President didn't say so directly, but his proposed program recognizes that mounting delinquency is the product of industrial progress and automation.

For the past two or three decades people who spent their youth in the days of the wood burning stove, the horse and buggy and the family cow, have looked longingly back on those years and said that was the kind of life the modern youngster needed. There was more truth to those statements than we frequently have been willing to admit.

No matter what else may be said, one of the prime causes of problems among youngsters is idleness. When we ceased living close to the land we had trouble finding enough for our boys and girls to do. Recently has been added the difficulty in getting a job if you do not have advanced education. This is what is known now as the dropout problem.

The President's program, which if we remember correctly was first proposed by Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY of Minnesota several years ago, recognizes first of all the necessity for keeping young people busy. He called for a youth conservation corps to work in national parks and forests. He also urged what he called a hometown youth corps.

The objective of both of these plans is to put youngsters to work. Those who are unable to find jobs because they have left school at too early an age will have something to do in the field of manual labor. The youngsters who have been idle for possibly other reasons and only have been getting themselves into trouble can be induced to join the youth corps.

The question certainly will be raised as to what might be the ultimate cost of this project. It is sure not to be small. But weighed against the outlay of dollars must be the saving of young people who otherwise stand to cost the Nation and the various States many millions of dollars by pursuing lives of crime. It doesn't seem reasonable to dismiss this proposal merely on the grounds that it costs too much.

[From the Mesabi Daily News, Virginia, Minn., Jan. 8, 1963]

THE YCC BILL: A BOON TO NORTHEASTERN MINNESOTA

(By Ham and Herm)

Questionable as some relief acts may have been for producing material of lasting value, it goes without saying that the Civilian Conservation Corps (CCC) of depression days in the 1930's did northern Minnesota a lot of lasting good. It came at a time when the State's conservationists, a mere handful of them at the time, saw no way of doing anything about the sad plight into which our State's land, timber, and waterways had deteriorated.

With the CCC program launched, Minnesota's Department of Conservation had long-range plans off drawing boards and ready for reconstruction of our woodlands and waterways, just waiting for an opportunity to be put into effect. Consequently, Minnesota got off to a real good start in its reforestation program, woods-road building, and improvement of its canoe routes and portage trails. Minnesota led all States in having a program of improvement ready.

History has recorded the untold wealth this program brought to our section of the State. Work done on our forests in those days has paid off thousandsfold already, and real earnings are still being harvested. In plain dollars and cents, timber operators, resort owners, wilderness canoe outfitters, sporting goods outlets, guides, boatmakers, pulpcutters, and dozens of related enterprises have received bounteously and directly from the comparatively small investments made in the CCC program.

With the advent of war, the program ceased. Occasionally trial balloons for resuming the program have been sent up without any great result. Bills have been introduced in the Nation's Capitol at varied times to reactivate the program, which have either died in committee or were voted down.

Now Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY has again introduced legislation to reactivate the program, under the banner of a Youth Conservation Corps, which would provide youth of the country an opportunity to work for board, room, clothing, and modicum pay at camps in areas of the country where there are national parks and great demands for improvements on waterways and soil erosion districts. With serious unemployment having hit certain sections of the country, northeastern Minnesota being one of them, it is believed the bill now may have a better chance of going through Congress and receiving approval of the President.

For many years, off and on through this column, we have suggested that such a program, especially for northeastern Minnesota, would be a fine thing. We have observed through the years what wonders many of our young men developed in their characters as a direct result of having served in the CCC for a year or two.

On occasion while on canoe trips along the Border Chain we have met canoeists from big cities outside this State, who were making visits again in the country where they had worked in CCC camps, and where they had learned their first valuable lessons in woods and lake lore. The tremendous upswing in family camping trips developing in the country today largely can be laid to a generation of boys having learned something of the outdoors and its wonders through the old CCC program. These boys now are family men. They are now exposing their wives and children to the same outdoors they had received so much from as young men.

Of all the relief programs there were in effect in the United States in the days of the old depression, none still holds its values as greatly as does the old CCC program. Men now, who took advantage of the CCC as boys, are proud of having been in it. The value of their work can be appreciated in bas relief today.

Where in the 1930's only windfall-strewn areas, held up by blackened stumps of past devastating forest fires, covered thousands of acres of our wild land and surrounding sections of lakeshores there now grow beautiful stands of timber. Where our streams flowed only in trickles in the 1930's, navigable waters now tumble, twist and wind through fascinating ever-increasing woodland acreages.

The thousands of canoeists who every summer take to the canoe-pack trails along our great chain of historical waterways, are perpetual reminders of what the CCC program of old has done for our people, not only in providing places for great recreation and spiritual replenishing, but also providing the climate for a thriving vacationland commerce.

If the present YCC bill up before the Nation's lawmakers is passed this year, it will be a great boon to our vacationland, farming and timber industries. And perhaps more valuable, but not to be measured in dollars and cents, it will provide another generation of young men and boys another great opportunity of finding the lasting spiritual and character-building values which the great out-of-doors reveals to those who will visit her and live with her for a time.

Let's send some messages to our lawmakers. They already are sold on the proposal, but no doubt they would welcome encouragement. Northeastern Minnesota of all places in the country would profit most from the program. The time, for here, is ripe.

[From Forbes Business & Finance, Feb. 15, 1963]

POIGNANT UNEMPLOYMENT

(By Malcolm S. Forbes)

The disastrous impact of lengthy unemployment of family breadwinners needs no documentation. As in the case of the other fellow's toothache, it is easy to extend one's sympathy without feeling the pain.

Rightly, most attention and most attempts to tackle unemployment emphasize the dire situation confronting a workless man with a family to support. His problems are immediate and imperative.

Less pressing, but perhaps wreaking greater individual havoc, is unemployment of the quite young—the teenagers out of school or no longer able to afford school. For youth, with a vitality unvitiated by age, drift often means disaster. The young have to be doing, and if it cannot be the doing of work, it is sometimes the doing of bad. A man of more years, and particularly a man with a family, has the maturity of experience. He doesn't seek to solve his galling idleness with what the psychologists call antisocial activities. It is established that among the 4.7 million of unemployed, 709,000 are under 20 years of age. Before these young people have the habit of work, they have had to learn to cope with idleness, to develop a busy life doing nothing. Sourness and cynicism are the inevitable accompaniments.

Fortunately for many in this category, it is an ideal time to put in the required military service in the course of which, often, useful skills are learned.

But for a large number of these young unemployed there must be some other avenue. Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, Democrat, of Minnesota, has placed a Youth Conservation Corps bill before the Senate. It seeks to provide outdoor training and employment for young men in the conservation of natural resources, similar in principle to the former Civilian Conservation Corps. Enlistment in this program would be for 6 months to 2 years. Another feature of the bill is a youth public service employment program wherein the Federal Government could match State funds for the local employment of youngsters.

The bill is a sound, good concept.

[From Aberdeen (S. Dak.) American-News Dec. 27, 1962]

BETTER FOR YOUTHS TO KEEP BUSY

The recent rise in unemployment is ominous in a special way because it has occurred largely among young people. In a plea for speedy action on his youth employment opportunities bill when Congress reconvenes, Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY noted that unemployment rates among adults were not significantly changed, but the rate among teenagers rose from 13.3 percent in October to 15.2 percent in November.

Idle youth is likely to be youth in trouble. And it is likely to entail a tragic frustration and waste of the Nation's potentially most valuable asset. Senator HUMPHREY's bill, which would put young men and women of good character from 16 through 21 years of age to work on useful conservation projects in Federal and State forests or on local public service programs, is itself a soundly sensible and constructive conservation measure. It aims at conservation of human resources. There is now an alarmingly abundant demonstration of need for this pragmatic program.

[From the Washington Post, Dec. 19, 1962]

IDLE YOUTH

The recent rise in unemployment is ominous in a special way because it has occurred largely among young people. In a plea for speedy action on his youth employment opportunities bill when Congress reconvenes, Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY noted that unemployment rates among adults were not significantly changed, but the rate among teenagers rose from 13.3 percent in October to 15.2 percent in November.

Idle youth is likely to be youth in trouble. And it is likely to entail a tragic frustration and waste of the Nation's potentially most valuable asset. Senator HUMPHREY's bill, which would put young men and women of good character from 16 through 21 years of age to work on useful conservation projects in Federal and State forests or on local public service programs, is itself a soundly sensible and constructive conservation measure. It aims at conservation of human resources. There is now an alarmingly abundant demonstration of need for this pragmatic program.

[From the Washington Post, Feb. 19, 1963]

IDLE YOUTH

"Idle youths on our city streets create a host of problems," said the President the other day. It is not alone that they are adrift and unable to find their way and thus be a problem to themselves; from the point of view of the Nation, the economy is deprived of their potential contribution, and because they cannot find lawful employment, they are all too likely to occupy their time unlawfully.

"Unemployment among young workers today is 2½ times the national average, and even higher among minority groups and those unable to complete their high school education," the President reported to the Congress. "During the 1960's 7½ million students will drop out of school without a high school education, at present rates, thereby entering the labor market unprepared for anything except the diminishing number of unskilled labor openings."

This is, in itself, a national scandal, of course, and needs to be countered by a dramatic strengthening of the public school system. In the meantime, however, there is an immediate and urgent need for Federal action to rescue these unhappy castaways. President Kennedy has, therefore, asked Congress to enact a double-barreled program.

One part of it is patterned on the Civilian Conservation Corps which proved such a boon to idle youth during the depression years of the New Deal. It would consist of a Youth Conservation Corps and a Home Town Youth Corps—both proposed in the last Congress by Senator Hubert Humphrey—to give young people healthful employment at tasks of genuine usefulness to the Nation.

The other part is a National Service Corps, patterned on the Peace Corps, save that it would enlist the latent enthusiasm of young persons for domestic instead of foreign service. Like the Peace Corps abroad, it can do immensely important work in underdeveloped urban neighborhoods—and do it to the immense benefit of the Corps members as well as the people they help.

The need for these projects is now, and it is an extremely pressing need. Congress ought to give these Presidential recommendations priority and a swift, hearty endorsement.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, finally, I ask unanimous consent that a copy of my prepared testimony before the Clark subcommittee and a transcript of remarks by Secretary of Labor Wirtz and myself as delivered on a recent television report to Minnesota be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the testimony and the transcript were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

The Youth Employment Act

(Statement of Senator Hubert H. Humphrey, Democrat, of Minnesota, before Subcommittee on Employment and Manpower, Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, February 25, 1963)

Mr. Chairman, I am honored and privileged to open the Senate hearings on the Youth Employment Act of 1963. I am particularly pleased to testify before the subcommittee chaired by my good friend from Pennsylvania, Senator Clark. His concern for problems of young people has been a distinguishing feature of his outstanding service in this body.

My testimony before the appropriate subcommittee of the Labor and Public Welfare Committee has become something of a biannual ritual. This is the third time I have appeared to urge the passage of legislation to establish the Youth Conservation Corps and the Hometown Youth Corps. While the earlier two sets of hearings did not lead to legislation, they were most valuable in gathering evidence, facts, opinions, and statements relating to the desirability of programs designed to fight the growing problem of youth unemployment.

But unless I read the signs and sentiments of the country incorrectly, I believe that the time has arrived for the prompt enactment of the Youth Employment Act. As you know, it was the first bill introduced in both the Senate and the House of Representatives. I have pledged myself to making it the first major item of legislation in the 88th Congress. I deeply hope that this objective will be achieved before the Congress adjourns for the Easter recess.

It might be helpful for the committee if I briefly reviewed the past history of this legislation. I first proposed the establishment of a pilot Youth Conservation Corps program in the 85th Congress. However, no action was taken on this pilot proposal and the bill died. In the 86th Congress, despite the opposition of the Eisenhower administration, the Youth Conservation Corps bill was reported favorably by the Labor and Public Welfare Committee, largely through the fine efforts and leadership of the senior Senator from West Virginia, the Honorable Jennings Randolph. The Senate passed this bill, S. 812, by a narrow margin of 47 to 45 in August 1959. The House of Representatives failed to act and once again the legislation died at the end of the 86th Congress. In the 87th Congress, my original bill to create a Youth Conservation Corps, S. 404, was supplemented with President Kennedy's proposals to establish a broader youth employment opportunities program. This committee amended S. 404 to include a Hometown Youth Corps and favorably reported the bill in September 1961. The legislation remained on the Senate calendar throughout the 2d session of the 87th Congress waiting for favorable action in the House. Once again, this action was not forthcoming.

Mr. Chairman, this brings us to the 88th Congress and the introduction of S. 1. As you know, hearings have been underway in the House of Representatives for 1 week. The Senate hearings begin today. The President has endorsed this legislation and sent a special message on youth urging prompt enactment of S. 1. This morning I am here with the same message.

MAJOR PROVISIONS

Mr. Chairman, I believe the members of the subcommittee are quite familiar with the provisions of the Humphrey youth bill. Title I provides for a Youth Conservation Corps "to provide healthful outdoor training and employment for young men and to advance the conservation, development, and management of natural resources and recreational areas." The Youth Conservation Corps will be established in the Department of Labor under the immediate supervision of a Director who will be appointed by the President with the advice and consent of the Senate.

Enrollment in the Youth Conservation Corps will be open to young men 15 through 21. Minimum enrollment period will be 6 months with a maximum enrollment of 2 years. Enrollees will receive $60 per month in wages and also receive board, lodging, clothing, tools, and equipment, medical care, and other necessities. The present legislation calls for a YCC not to exceed 15,000 enrollees during the first fiscal year of operation and thereafter such size as Congress may determine through appropriations but not to exceed 60,000 enrollees at any one time during the next 4 years. I will comment further on the size of the YCC later in my testimony.

Two-thirds of the YCC will work on lands of the national forests, national parks, and other Federal conservation agencies. One-third of the Corps will be available for similar work on State forests and parks on a 50–50 matching funds basis.

Mr. Chairman, I ask that a summary of the provisions of S. 1 be printed in the hearing record at this point in my testimony.

* * * * *

OPPORTUNITY FOR A NEW LIFE

I am not here to provide the subcommittee with masses of statistical and technical data demonstrating the need for enactment of the Youth Employment Act. I willingly defer in this task to the many experts from the executive agencies and private life who will appear in the coming days. But I am here to reaffirm the need for the programs contained in the Humphrey youth bill in view of the rising number of unemployed youth in this Nation and in view of the vast amounts of useful and productive work that exist for such young people to do.

There are obvious similarities between the Youth Conservation Corps and the highly successful Civilian Conservation Corps that existed during the 1930's. Certain critics of the YCC have alleged that the problems of unemployed youths today are greatly different from the unemployment problems that existed during the great depression. Therefore they oppose the YCC as being inadequate to the needs of today. I would like to take several minutes to spell out why I reject this argument.

Most of the young men who will enroll in the Youth Conservation Corps will have dropped out of high school prior to graduation. They will have failed in the job of getting a basic education. Having dropped out of school, they will have attempted to secure some manner of employment to support themselves. Lacking adequate education and job skills, they have been unable to find steady employment. Once again, they will have failed. Now they are loafing around the streets, staying at home, getting in the way, and are reminded repeatedly of their failures in school and employment.

In short, their lives have been little more than a succession of failures. As one of its important functions, I see the Youth Conservation Corps providing these young men with an opportunity to break this pattern of defeat and frustration and substitute for it an experience of accomplishment and self-fulfillment. I recently encountered a study made of 272 boys who participated in the Civilian Conservation Corps. In some detail this study explored the operation of the corps and its effect on this selected group of enrollees. I would like to quote from the conclusions of this study: "The values which these 272 boys received from their camp experiences seem to fall into two general classifications: those having to do with the more or less concrete factors of improved physical health, increased weight, and financial gains, and those having to do with the intangible but significant factors of greater maturity, increased self-confidence and general security. As we review the experiences and comments of these boys, we are impressed with the values from which many of them benefited, but we are impressed, too, by the responsibility placed on the individual boy for seeing and obtaining these values."

Mr. Chairman, I would also like to include in my testimony portions of case studies of individual boys that relate to this specific point. This study, "The CCC Through the Eyes of 272 Boys," is highly objective. It does not praise every phase of the corps operation; it contains a number of constructive suggestions. Those persons charged with organizing the YCC could learn a great deal from this study. But, in all objectivity, the burden of this study is highly favorable to the total results achieved through the Civilian Conservation Corps.

I believe this opportunity to create self-confidence in discouraged young men, to bring forth maturity in the immature, and to provide accomplishment in place of failure, will have lasting impact on the lives of many enrollees in the Youth Conservation Corps. Do young men ever outgrow the need for such feelings of self-confidence, maturity, and accomplishment? The answer to this question is self-evident.

If the Civilian Conservation Corps succeeded in providing such an opportunity to young men in the 1930's, I believe the Youth Conservation Corps can fulfill a similar need in the 1960's.

There are, of course, numerous other reasons to support the Humphrey youth bill. The enrollees will receive job experience and training that will vastly improve their chances of obtaining steady employment once they leave the Youth Conservation Corps. Let me cite some of the specific jobs that would have to be done by YCC enrollees: building fences, carpentry work, planting trees, driving trucks and tractors, stringing telephone lines, painting camps, jack-hammer jobs, fighting forest fires, fighting blister rust, surveying, machine maintenance, pick and shovel work, laying brick and stone, mixing cement, camp maintenance work, etc. Some of the work will be hard manual labor; other aspects of the work program will consist of more advanced and skilled training.

A minimum of 10 hours per week of more formalized training will supplement the on-the-job experience. This training will be provided through the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and State and local school officials. It will consist of supplementary academic subjects, such as writing, reading, and basic mathematics skills, and vocational subjects relating to future job opportunities. Also included in the total program available to each YCC enrollee will be the active efforts of the local State employment service to have a suitable job situation ready when the tour of duty has been completed.

This last factor is most important to the success of the total program. I intend to insist that no effort be spared by the local employment officers in every State to provide every YCC enrollee with at least one opportunity to demonstrate to the community what he has achieved through his enrollment.

CONTRIBUTIONS TO NATION'S RESOURCES

Mr. Chairman, up to this point in my testimony I have concentrated entirely on the benefits that will accrue to the young men who will enroll in the Youth Conservation Corps. That is entirely proper since we are primarily concerned with bringing unemployed young men back into the mainstream of society. But we should not overlook the great contributions these young men will make to the preservation and conservation of our national forests and parks. These are the dividends that will accrue to this country for many generations to come.

I am confident that the Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary of the Interior will provide full documentation of the extensive work that is ready and waiting in our national forests and parks. The figure runs to many billions of dollars and this is the type of work that will have direct financial return to the Government for many future generations.

In the 87th Congress this committee assembled figures relating to the comparable costs of conservation work performed by regular employees and YCC enrollees. On the basis of the data submitted by various departments, it would cost $5,120 to support one regular worker per year; the comparable cost per YCC enrollee would be $3,640. This suggests that the Federal and State Governments will be getting a good bargain for the funds they invest in this program.

If those persons who criticize the Youth Conservation Corps because of so-called excessive cost would only deduct the eventual financial benefits from the initial operating cost figure, they would be hard pressed to continue their opposition on the basis of finances. I have always said that the entire Youth Conservation Corps program could be justified merely on the financial benefits that would eventually accrue to the United States. This would certainly be an extremely shortsighted view of the problem, but it could be done.

I am confident that testimony presented by the executive departments will fully confirm this statement.

MODEST SIZE OF YCC

I must also emphasize the relatively modest size of the YCC provided for in S. 1. As the Senators know, I have advocated a much larger corps in earlier versions of this legislation. S. 404, for example, provided for a YCC that would eventually enroll 150,000 young men. However, the administration felt unable to support a YCC of that magnitude. A number of Members of Congress likewise had some hesitation about establishing a corps of that size. The present legislation provides for a YCC not to exceed 15,000 enrollees in the first fiscal year and thereafter such size as Congress may determine through appropriations but not to exceed 60,000 enrollees at any one time during the next 4 years. I believe this represents a size that all interested parties can accept in good faith. Moreover, I am confident that Congress will be sufficiently impressed with the success of the YCC to increase its authorized strength considerably at the end of 5 years.

I wish to emphasize that President Kennedy supports the size of the YCC established in S. 1. The identical legislation has been introduced in the House of Representatives. Never before in the history of this legislation has there existed such unanimous agreement over the particular details of the program. This, in itself, is impressive testimony to the fundamental soundness and reasonableness of the Humphrey youth bill.

LOCAL AREA EMPLOYMENT PROGRAMS

I do not wish to conclude my testimony before I comment on title II, the local area youth employment programs or the hometown youth corps. This program provides an extremely important complement to the Youth Conservation Corps; namely, an opportunity for both young men and women to receive the benefits of supervised and planned job opportunities in local public service agencies.

Enrollees will remain in their home communities and work on a full-time or part-time basis. Hopefully those persons working part time will also maintain a relationship with their local schools. Those working full time will be encouraged to return to school at the conclusion of an enrollment period. The program will be geared to providing sufficient job skills and training to enable the enrollees to maintain steady employment on their own or to reawaken in the enrollees a desire to resume their formal education.

This legislation provides that these local employment programs will be initiated by the State or local community. Specific programs will be proposed to the Secretary of Labor for his approval. Once approved, the Federal Government will provide half the funds necessary to operate the entire program. It is projected that enrollees will receive approximately $40 per week for their services.

What type of jobs will be available to the enrollees? There are a wide variety of jobs existing in the local public service agencies participating in the program. Let me suggest some that come to mind: secretaries, hospital and laboratory technicians, kitchen assistants, playground workers, gardeners, truckdrivers, office helpers, athletic instructors, maintenance employees, etc. As in the Youth Conservation Corps, the actual job experience would be supplemented by personal counseling after hours, educational opportunities, and assistance in obtaining regular employment at the conclusion of the program.

S. 1 authorizes a Hometown Youth Corps of 50,000 enrollees on a 50-50 matching basis for a period of 3 years. I have as much faith in the success of the Hometown Youth Corps as I do in the Youth Conservation Corps. I predict that Congress will establish the program on a permanent basis once the initial 3-year authorization has expired.

Mr. Chairman, I desire to keep my testimony brief. I know that members of the Labor and Public Welfare Committee are intimately familiar with the fundamentals of this legislation. It has been through the mill several times before, as they say.

However, with the permission of the chairman, I would like to submit for inclusion in the record of these hearings a number of documents that relate to the Humphrey youth bill. For example, I have located a short pamphlet that outlines the accomplishments of the Civilian Conservation Corps in my home State of Minnesota. This pamphlet provides compelling evidence for the establishment of a Youth Conservation Corps. I have a number of personal letters that testify to the great merits of this legislation.

In closing, I have this final comment: These proposals have been before the Congress for 6 years. There is nothing novel, radical, unknown, or irresponsible about them. While Congress has been considering these proposals, the problem of youth unemployment has become extremely grave. Recent unemployment figures relating to young people show that the problem is about to get totally out of hand. Therefore I say to the Congress, let us procrastinate no longer. The time has come for decisions, not additional years of consideration.

The opportunity is ours. Let us seize it with firm determination.

Report on Youth Unemployment

(By Willard Wirtz, Secretary of Labor, and Senator Hubert H. Humphrey, Democrat, of Minnesota, Senate majority whip)

Introduction: This is Washington, and this is Senator Hubert H. Humphrey, of Minnesota. Today the Senate majority whip has a special and distinguished guest to report on some important questions of vital interest to the people of Minnesota, as well as the Nation. Now, here is Senator Humphrey.

Mr. Humphrey. Today I want to visit with you and to inquire of our guest about the Department of Labor, one of the important Cabinet level Departments in our Government. The Department of Labor has special responsibilities for the welfare of the American working man and woman, and it has special obligations relating to the enforcement of certain labor-management laws that have been enacted by Congress. This Department obviously has a great concern about problems such as unemployment and the lack of the proper and full use of our plant capacity.

Today I have as our guest a good friend, a gentleman I've known for many years, and one of our most distinguished national leaders and public servants. His name is Willard Wirtz and he is the Secretary of Labor. Secretary Wirtz is a fellow midwesterner. He comes from De Kalb, Ill., and he was educated in the Midwest at Beloit College, in Beloit, Wis. He received his law degree at Harvard University, which surely qualifies him for a prominent place in this administration, and later taught at the University of Iowa and at Northwestern University as a professor of law. Secretary Wirtz has had more than 20 years of good, substantial experience in labor-management relations. In January of 1961 he was appointed Under Secretary of the Department of Labor. With the appointment of Arthur Goldberg to the position of Associate Justice of the Supreme Court, Mr. Wirtz last year became the Secretary of Labor by appointment of President Kennedy.

We are honored to have you with us today, Mr. Secretary. But I'm going to toss you a few "hot ones," as they say, because you preside over one of the most interesting, and I think important departments of our Government—the kind of department that's in the midst of controversy, not of your own making, but because of the very nature of our economy.

First, Mr. Secretary, let's take a moment of your time to ask you: How do you describe your job?

Mr. Wirtz. Senator, it's interesting. The Department of Labor is going to be 50 years old next week. I was checking back the other day on the original statutes describing the responsibilities of the Department of Labor. They are clearly defined. Our obligation in the Department of Labor is to develop, preserve, and promote the interest of the wage earners, and particularly to do anything we can to increase job opportunities for wage earners. We figure most of us in this country are wage earners, so I do not think that this is any narrow partisan interest at all. The answer to your question is really that our principal interest is in seeing to it that there is the fullest possible opportunity for a person of this Nation to enjoy the basic right to work, in the truest sense of the term. That would be the common denominator of most of our concerns.

Mr. Humphrey. You also have administrative responsibilities in the field of labor-management relations due to public law.

Mr. Wirtz. Yes. There is the minimum wage law, the 1959 act establishing the responsibility of labor unions, the unemployment insurance program, the apprenticeship program, the Bureau of Labor Statistics research program, and an international program.

Mr. Humphrey. Isn't it your department that always comes out at least once a month with the cost of living index?

Mr. Wirtz. We come out with either good news or bad news twice a month. Once in connection with the cost of living index, which is administered and worked out by the Bureau of Labor Statistics, and then again on these monthly reports on employment and unemployment.

Mr. Humphrey. Now I want to get down to an issue that's before the Congress. The first bill that was introduced in this Congress, and one that has now received the active support of President Kennedy and the administration is the bill which I was privileged to sponsor, along with many other Senators, known as the Youth Employment Act of 1963. Your department will have real responsibilities under that act. How do you see the Youth Employment Act? Do you consider this important legislation? Does this have any real contribution it can make to our overall economic and social problems?

Mr. Wirtz. From the standpoint of our interests, Senator, it is one of the two important programs this year. The other is the tax program. We think it is essential to get the economy moving to that point where there will be job opportunities for everybody. But beyond that, with respect to the unemployment problems specifically as it affects the younger members of the work force, the Youth Employment Act is at the top of our list of priority measures. I can't tell you how grateful we are for the support that has come for programs of this kind from you and from others who realize as you do the importance of this situation. If you don't mind one statistic, I'd like to suggest the importance from that standpoint of this Youth Employment Act. In the decade of the 1960's, before we are through, there are going to be 6 million more age 14 to 24 people in the work force than there were in 1960. That isn't so important unless you realize that in the previous decade that number went up only 425,000, which means that we have to find jobs in the next 8 years for 15 times as many youngsters as we did in the previous decade. Now statistics always bother me when you start applying them to people, but the impact of this one alone is enough to suggest that we simply have to meet this youth unemployment problem as a separate problem.

Mr. Humphrey. And it would be a tragedy if our Nation, with all of its wealth, and all of its scientific and technological know-how is incapable or unable to meet the job opportunity problem, or the provision of work opportunities for our young people. I noticed the other day a statistic that was shocking—and this is one of the reasons I feel so strongly about the Youth Employment Act—that there are between 800,000 and 1 million young men and women who are unemployed. They are out of school, and they are out of work. It is to that problem that the Youth Employment Act is directed in part—to get these young people out into the forests, out into our national parks and State parks to give them constructive work along the lines of the old Civilian Conservation Corps program. And there is the second feature that you feel so strongly about, as I do—the public service feature.

Mr. Wirtz. Yes, the community employment program. We are working out projects for both boys and girls in urban communities. If this act is passed, they will be able to live home and find employment opportunities. That will be in addition to this extremely attractive program to put young men into camps for work on conservation programs.

Let me mention one thing about what you said. You talked about the dropout problem. It is hard for me to realize, but I know it's true that there are fewer kids dropping out of school today, in percentage terms, than used to be the case. It isn't that the dropout problem has become worse. It's that there are fewer job opportunities when they do drop out, because in this automated economy that we're moving into, the number of unskilled jobs is going way down. It used to be true that if a boy or a girl who wanted to work dropped out of school, there was an unskilled job. There won't be now. That's what complicates this problem. That's what makes this legislation so vitally important.

Mr. Humphrey. That—along with the Manpower Retraining Act to train people in new skills when they lose old jobs.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, S. 1, and H.R. 1890, are now being considered and evaluated by the respective committees in both Houses. I have been advised by the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. Clark] and Representative Carl Perkins, of Kentucky, chairman of the House subcommittee considering H.R. 1890, that they expect their committees to complete their work in the near future. I congratulate both Members of the Senate and the House for their thoughtful and intelligent consideration of this legislation during the recent hearings.

I congratulate the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. Clark] upon the enthusiasm he has demonstrated for this particular proposed legislation and the diligence which he has demonstrated in the hearings. He has done a masterful job.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Two weeks ago I held the third of the hearings which I have held in Chicago on the employment problems of youth. On that occasion, as on all the previous occasions, there was a unanimous vote in favor of the bill which has been sponsored for so many years by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. Humphrey]. The hearing was a representative one, with about 100 persons from various groups in the city in attendance. The discussion was not only interesting, but also constructive. I have forwarded to the respective committees a transcript of the hearings.

I congratulate the Senator from Minnesota upon the work which he has done. I only hope that it will eventuate in legislation, and that the Youth Conservation Corps and the civilian group in the various cities and localities will come to fruition. In order that that may happen, some hard hearts must be touched, and public sentiment aroused.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am grateful to the Senator from Illinois for those comments, and more so for the fine work he has been doing to elicit public comment about the proposed legislation. A large number of organizations have been conducting surveys in their respective areas concerning the proposed legislation and everyone, without exception, has come out in strong support of it. I remind the Senate that I know of no organization of any size or of any national distinction in the United States which has not expressed interest in or support for the Youth Conservation Corps concept as a way of meeting some of the problems of our young people.

I understand we may have difficulty in passing the proposal. But I am an optimist. I believe the people want it. I believe Congress can make an impressive record and a great name for itself by doing something concrete, constructive, and positive for the young people of our country.

We ought at least to be willing to make this beginning.

Mr. MORTON. Mr. President, I, too, was very much disturbed by the employment figures issued by the Department of Labor yesterday, and which we all saw in the press this morning. This is a problem that is with us, a problem which we must face up to as Members of Congress.

However, as I listened to the distinguished Senator from Minnesota, I could not help recalling his statement on a program which has gained some prestige in this country, the program called Meet the Press. As I recall, it was in January 1962, that the Senator from Minnesota said:

> I predict that by the end of the coming calendar year, by December 30, 1962, the problem of unemployment in the United States will be a page in the history book, rather than a living fact.

I believe I participated in that program with the Senator from Minnesota. I raised some questions at that time. I am glad that he now agrees with those questions.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator from Kentucky has expressed today the thought that I had at that particular moment. He has done so in much more beautiful and decorative words than the Senator from Minnesota was able to use on that program.

The statement of the Senator from Kentucky was clear; it was persuasive. He has almost made me say it all over again.

I say to the Senator from Kentucky: I was wrong. One of the things I have found out is that when one is wrong, he might just as well admit it.

I had hoped we would get willing cooperation from our Republican friends during the last Congress, the 87th Congress. I was hopeful that they would help us with youth conservation. I was hopeful that they would help us pass a much larger public works program than was passed. I was hopeful that they would help us enthusiastically with the area redevelopment program. I was hopeful they would help us to pass a better tax bill than was passed. I simply had such a sense of optimism and faith in my country and faith in my Republican friends that I thought they would help us more. But my faith was misplaced. I grieve over that, because it is difficult for a man to foresee these emotional shocks in these trying and difficult days.

For example, I had hoped that the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON] would lead the fight to strike down the dangerous beast called unemployment. When the proposed legislation for area redevelopment and unemployment compensation, for public works, for small business and expansion, and many other fine programs, was offered, much of which had to be cut back because of the combination of conservative opposition in the Senate, I was hopeful that our Republican friends would stand with us as the defenders of the Republic, the protectors of the good life, the champions of full employment. I was hopeful that they would help us to overcome these difficulties.

But alas and alack, we received little or no help. Despite that, we did better than our predecessors. That is not much of a standard by which to measure oneself, but we did a little better than those who preceded us.

Mr. MORTON. Many of us Republicans stood by the Democrats. Considered by Republican standards, the Democrats have a workable majority in this body. The fact that the Democrats cannot make their programs succeed is not the fault of the Republicans. If we had as much of a majority as the Democrats have, or even half as much, in my opinion we would make some of the programs work.

I agree with the Senator from Minnesota. I, too, have been wrong. I was even so wrong that I organized Willkie clubs in 1940 and thought we were going to win.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That was pretty wrong.

Mr. MORTON. I was wrong in 1960.

Mr. HUMPHREY. So was I. [Laughter.]

Mr. MORTON. I understand that the repayment of the debt to West Virginia has so far consisted of the presentation of an autographed copy of "Profiles in Courage" to the library at St. Albans. I know that some of my coal mine friends there find the situation today worse than it was when the Senator from Minnesota made his heroic, courageous effort in 1960.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Would the Senator like to add the word "futile," too?

Mr. MORTON. No; I think the Senator from Minnesota rendered a great service. In all fairness and honesty, I think the Senator from Minnesota rendered a great service.

However, because the Senator from Minnesota is so understanding, has such a keen sense of humor, and is one of the great Members of this body, one who can "take it" as well as "dish it out," I could not help reminding him of our joint appearance on "Meet the Press," when he so adamantly said that unemployment would be a page in history by the time the calendar year had ended.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Now that the Senator from Kentucky has been so kind as to remind me of that statement once, I hope he will forget it from here on out. [Laughter.]

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator from Minnesota has spoken of unrequited hope. I wonder if he remembers the somewhat well known quatrain in poetry, which has become somewhat moth-eaten by now:

> Truth, crushed to earth, shall rise again;
> The eternal years of God are hers;
> But error, wounded, writhes in pain,
> And dies among his worshipers.

Does not the Senator from Minnesota believe that that is an apt characterization of the two political parties—the party of hope and the party of error?

Mr. MORTON. It is simply a question of which is which. I am the one who needs hope now.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I appreciate that confession. [Laughter.] This is one of the signs of the rebirth of the Republican Party—when Republicans speak with such sincerity of hope. I wish to commend the Senator. [Laughter.]

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, if there is no other business to come before the Senate at this time, I move that the Senate adjourn until 12 o'clock noon on Monday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 3 o'clock p.m.) the Senate adjourned until Monday, March 11, 1963, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATION

Executive nomination received by the Senate March 8, 1963:

IN THE ARMY

The following-named officer under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 3066, to be assigned to a position of importance and responsibility designated by the President under subsection (a) of section 3066, in grade as follows:

Maj. Gen. James Karrick Woolnough, O18709, U.S. Army, in the grade of lieutenant general.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate March 8, 1963:

AMBASSADORS

William J. Porter, of Massachusetts, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Democratic and Popular Republic of Algeria.

Charles D. Withers, of Florida, a Foreign Service officer of class 2, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Rwanda.

Carl T. Rowan, of Minnesota, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Finland.

Edward M. Korry, of New York, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Ethiopia.

WORLD HEALTH ORGANIZATION

Dr. James Watt, of the District of Columbia, to be the representative of the United States of America on the Executive Board of the World Health Organization, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate.

UNITED NATIONS

Jonathan B. Bingham, of New York, to be the representative of the United States of America on the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations.

Sidney R. Yates, of Illinois, to be the representative of the United States of America on the Trusteeship Council of the United Nations.

Charles F. Baldwin, of the District of Columbia, Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to the Federation of Malaya, to serve concurrently and without additional compensation as the representative of the United States of America to the 19th session of the Economic Commission for Asia and the Far East of the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations.

U.S. ARMS CONTROL AND DISARMAMENT AGENCY

Archibald S. Alexander, of New Jersey, to be an Assistant Director of the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency.

IN THE DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

The nominations beginning Edward Glion Curtis to be a consul general of the United States of America, and ending Miss Catherina Van Lier Ribbink to be a consul of the United States of America, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on January 15, 1963.

* * *

SENATE

MONDAY, MARCH 11, 1963

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, and was called to order by Hon. E. L. BARTLETT, a Senator from the State of Alaska.

Rabbi Albert Shulman, national chaplain, the American Legion, South Bend, Ind., offered the following prayer:

Our Heavenly Father: Life is essentially a matter of human relations. Human relations is the art of living together. And living together is a matter of sharing our love, our talents, and our blessings for the betterment of mankind. These are embodied in the general welfare of our country and our people.

Through the wise use of the mind and the heart, our America can be made into the great dream that vests every man with dignity, freedom, and promise.

We are grateful that this body of lawmakers is dedicated to the principle that only freemen living in a free society can live with dignity, freedom, and promise. We are grateful that we have fashioned a nation in which every individual is considered a child of God, and every human being is entitled to share the blessings of our American way of life.

May our America always stand for all that is good, just, and right. May our America always be the symbol of man's eternal struggle to achieve the good life. May our America always stand for a grateful people ever mindful of the many treasures that make up our American way of life. Amen.

DESIGNATION OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
Washington, D.C., March 11, 1963.

To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate, I appoint Hon. E. L. BARTLETT, a Senator from the State of Alaska, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

Carl Hayden,
President pro tempore.

Mr. BARTLETT thereupon assumed the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. Mansfield, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Friday, March 8, 1963, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

REPORT OF COMMISSION ON INTERNATIONAL RULES OF JUDICIAL PROCEDURE — MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which, with the accompanying report, was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

To the Congress of the United States:

Pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 85-906, as amended, I transmit herewith for the information of the Congress the Fourth Annual Report of the Commission on International Rules of Judicial Procedure covering the period ending December 31, 1962.

John F. Kennedy.

The White House, *March 11, 1963.*

MANPOWER REPORT—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which, with the accompanying report, was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

The White House,
Washington, D.C., March 11, 1963.

The Honorable the President of the Senate.
The Honorable the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

Sirs: I am transmitting herewith my manpower report as required under the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962.

In preparing this report, I have had the advice and assistance of the Secretary of Labor, who in turn, has had the assistance of members of the Cabinet, heads of independent agencies, and the National Manpower Advisory Committee appointed under this act.

Together with my report I am presenting the report of the Secretary of Labor on manpower requirements, resources, use, and training required by section 104 of the Manpower Development and Training Act.

Respectfully,

John F. Kennedy.

CALL OF LEGISLATIVE CALENDAR DISPENSED WITH

On request of Mr. Mansfield, and by unanimous consent, the call of the Legislative Calendar was dispensed with.

LIMITATION OF STATEMENTS DURING MORNING HOUR

On request of Mr. Mansfield, and by unanimous consent, statements during the morning hour were ordered limited to 3 minutes.

COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. Mansfield, and by unanimous consent, the Banking and Currency Committee was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business, to consider the nominations on the Executive Calendar, beginning with the new reports.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. If there be no reports of committees, the nominations on the Executive Calendar, beginning with the new reports, will be stated.

AMBASSADORS

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of Ambassadors.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that these nominations be considered en bloc.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nominations will be considered en bloc; and, without objection, they are confirmed.

ENVOY

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Donald A. Dumont, of New York, a Foreign Service officer of class 2, to be Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Kingdom of Burundi.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

U.S. ADVISORY COMMISSION ON INFORMATION

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Sigurd S. Larmon, of New York, to be a member of the U.S. Advisory Commission on Information for a term of 3 years expiring January 27, 1966, and until his successor has been appointed and qualified.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of these nominations.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

Report on Construction of an Electronics, Instrumentation, and Materials Laboratory at Mississippi Test Facility

A letter from the Deputy Administrator, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, Washington, D.C., reporting pursuant to law, on the construction of an Electronics, Instrumentation, and Materials Laboratory at the Mississippi Test Facility; to the Committee on Aeronautical Space Sciences.

Report on Reprograming of Funds Relating to Construction of Load Test Annex at Marshall Space Flight Center

A letter from the Deputy Administrator, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, Washington, D.C., reporting, pursuant to law on the reprograming of funds relating to the construction of a load test annex at the Marshall Space Flight Center; to the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences.

Report of Federal Crop Insurance Corporation

A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation, for the calendar year 1962 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Amendment of Title 10, United States Code, Relating to the Appointment, Promotion, Separation, and Retirement of Members of the Armed Forces

A letter from the Deputy Secretary of Defense, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend title 10, United States Code, relating to the appointment, promotion, separation, and retirement of members of the armed forces, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Armed Services.

Statistical Supplement, Stockpile Report

A letter from the Director, Office of Emergency Planning, Executive Office of the President, transmitting, pursuant to law, a statistical supplement, Stockpile Report, for the period July–December 1962 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

Report of Comptroller General of the United States

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, his report on the activities of the United States General Accounting Office, during the fiscal year ended June 30, 1962 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

AUDIT REPORT ON U.S. STUDY COMMISSION ON CERTAIN RIVER BASINS, STATE OF TEXAS

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report on the U.S. Study Commission on the Neches, Trinity, Brazos, Colorado, Guadalupe, San Antonio, Nueces, and San Jacinto River Basins and intervening areas, State of Texas, for the period August 28, 1958, through August 28, 1962 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORT ON REVIEW OF SELECTED PURCHASE ORDERS ISSUED BY SANDIA CORP., ALBUQUERQUE, N. MEX.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the review of selected purchase orders issued by Sandia Corp., Albuquerque, N. Mex., under contract AT(29-1)-789 with the Atomic Energy Commission, dated March 1963 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

AMENDMENT OF FEDERAL PROPERTY AND ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES ACT OF 1949, TO IMPROVE THE ADMINISTRATION OF TRANSFERS AND CONVEYANCES OF CERTAIN REAL PROPERTY

A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, Washington, D.C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, to improve the administration of transfers and conveyances of certain real property for various public uses, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Government Operations.

RELIEF OF CERTAIN NAVAL OFFICERS

A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation for the relief of certain officers of the naval service erroneously in receipt of compensation based upon an incorrect computation of service for basic pay (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

AMENDMENT OF SECTION 1825, TITLE 28, UNITED STATES CODE, TO AUTHORIZE PAYMENT OF CERTAIN WITNESS' FEES

A letter from the Director, Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts, Washington, D.C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 1825 of title 28 of the United States Code to authorize the payment of witness' fees in habeas corpus cases and in proceedings to vacate sentence under section 2255 of title 28, for persons who are authorized to proceed in forma pauperis (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

TEMPORARY ADMISSION INTO THE UNITED STATES OF CERTAIN ALIENS

A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of orders entered, granting temporary admission into the United States of certain aliens (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ADMISSION INTO THE UNITED STATES OF CERTAIN DEFECTOR ALIENS

A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of orders entered granting admission into the United States of certain defector aliens (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS TO CLASSIFY STATUS OF CERTAIN ALIENS FOR FIRST PREFERENCE

A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, petitions to classify status of certain aliens for first preference (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

INCREASE OF APPROPRIATION FOR CONTINUING WORK IN THE MISSOURI RIVER BASIN

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to increase the authorization for appropriation for continuing work in the Missouri River Basin by the Secretary of the Interior (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Public Works.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Montana; to the Committee on Finance:

"SENATE JOINT MEMORIAL 9

"Joint memorial of the senate and house of representatives requesting that the Federal portion of cost on Federal aid primary highways and secondary highways be increased from about 57 percent to 75 percent

"Whereas in recognition of the heavy interstate traffic on highways built and maintained by the various States, the Federal Government now contributes 50 percent of the total costs of construction on highways designated as Federal aid primary highways; and

"Whereas in recognition of the additional financial burden which would be placed on the various States having large areas of land owned by the Federal Government, an additional payment is made, in the case of Montana about 7 percent, to compensate for the Federal lands; and

"Whereas having a large area, sparse population, and being a bridge State for interstate traffic, Montana highways contribute a great deal to the welfare and pleasure of the entire Nation; and

"Whereas due to these conditions, the citizens of Montana must make very high per capita contributions to build and maintain this system; and

"Whereas the additional 7 percent contribution now made by the Federal Government for Federal aid primary highways and secondary highways is entirely inadequate to cover the costs of construction and maintenance borne by Montana as a result of heavy interstate traffic: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the State of Montana, That the Legislative Assembly of Montana hereby respectfully requests that Congress take action to increase the additional payment made to Montana for Federal aid primary highways from 7 to 20 percent; and be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of state is instructed ot send copies of this memorial to the President of the United States, to the Secretary of the Senate and Clerk of the House of Representatives of the U.S. Congress, to the Secretary of Commerce, to the Commissioner of the Bureau of Public Roads, to each member of the Montana congressional delegation, and to each member of the Montana Highway Commission.

"DAVID F. JAMES,
"President of the Senate.
"——— ———,
Speaker of the House."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Montana; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

"SENATE JOINT MEMORIAL 3

"Joint memorial of the Senate and House of Representatives of the State of Montana to the President of the Senate and to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States; to the Honorable MIKE MANSFIELD and the Honorable LEE METCALF, Senators from the State of Montana; to the Honorable JAMES BATTIN and the Honorable ARNOLD H. OLSEN, Representatives from the State of Montana; to the Secretary of the Interior and to the U.S. Bureau of Reclamation, urging the passage of legislation to amend the Reclamation Act and any other laws or rules, to waive the application of the land limitation clause in the area above Canyon Ferry Dam in the State of Montana

"Whereas the Reclamation Act of 1902 applied primarily to public lands; and

"Whereas in an effort to limit the application of this Act to family sized farms, the maximum holding of land in a single ownership was fixed at 160 acres or less; and

"Whereas the present reclamation laws requiring acreage limitations are based on outmoded, half-century-old farming methods of the walking plow and horse team days; and

"Whereas the present farm acreage that one man can handle is two to five times the amount that could be handled at the time the reclamation laws were passed in 1902; and

"Whereas the gross income has not kept pace with the total acres that one man can handle; and

"Whereas the area above Canyon Ferry Reservoir on the Missouri River is at high elevations which limits the crops to stock raising purposes, requiring large acreages for a balanced economy; and

"Whereas present acreage limitations will not permit farmers in the area above Canyon Ferry to own sufficient crop acreage to give them full employment and a gross income sufficient to maintain the standard of living generally provided in farm areas of the humid or subhumid regions; and

"Whereas since the passage of the original Reclamation Act in 1902, it has been amended to include furnishing supplemental waters to lands already irrigated; and

"Whereas in order to establish a realistic family sized farm in this area, the acreage allowed in a single holding often must be greater than 160 acres: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, by the Legislative Assembly of the State of Montana as follows:

"1. That the land limitation provisions of the Reclamation Act, and any other laws and rules, be waived and not applied in the area above Canyon Ferry in the State of Montana; recognize the difference in types of farming and crop production and provide for flexibility in acreage found to be needed for farm units.

"2. That such legislation provide for relaxation of the acreage limitation provisions as to supplemental water supply projects for established farming areas.

"3. That any legislation amending the land limitation provisions shall not be retroactively applied to areas now exempt from such land limitation provisions.

"4. That the acreage allowed in a single holding may be determined by the Bureau of Reclamation; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded by the secretary of state of the State of Montana; to the President of the Senate of the United States; to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United

States; and to the Honorable Mike Mansfield and the Honorable Lee Metcalf, Senators from Montana; and the Honorable Arnold H. Olsen and the Honorable James Battin, Representatives in the Congress from Montana; to the Secretary of the Interior; and to the U.S. Bureau of Reclamation.

"David F. James,
"President of the Senate.
"——— ———
"Speaker of the House."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Montana; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

"Senate Joint Resolution 15

"Joint resolution of the Senate and House of Representatives petitioning Congress to call a convention for the purpose of proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States

"Whereas the authority to apportion the legislative body of each State properly belongs to the legislative assembly, or to the people of that State, and

"Whereas through its decision in *Baker v. Carr* the Supreme Court of the United States has attempted to extend the judicial power of the courts into an area which is traditionally, properly, and constitutionally a prerogative of the legislative branch of State government.

"Whereas article V of the U.S. Constitution provides that Congress, 'on the application of the legislatures of two-thirds of the several States, shall call a convention for proposing amendments': Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the State of Montana, That the legislative assembly petitions the Congress of the United States to call a convention for the purpose of proposing the following article as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States:

" 'Article —

" 'Section 1. No provision of this Constitution, or any amendment thereto, shall restrict or limit any State in the apportionment of representation in its legislature.

" 'Sec. 2. The Judicial power of the United States shall not extend to any suit in law or equity, or to any controversy relating to apportionment of representation in a State legislature.

" 'Sec. 3. This article shall be inoperative unless it shall have been ratified as an amendment to the Constitution by the legislatures of three-fourth of the several States within 7 years from the date of its submission.'; and be it further

"Resolved, That if Congress shall have proposed an amendment to the Constitution identical with that contained in this resolution prior to January 1, 1965, this application shall no longer be of any force or effect; and be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of state is instructed to send copies of this resolution to the Secretary of the Senate and the Clerk of the House of Representatives of the United States, and to each member of the Montana congressional delegation.

"David F. James,
"President of the Senate.
"——— ———,
"Speaker of the House."

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of West Virginia; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

"House Concurrent Resolution 24

"Resolution of the West Virginia Legislature making Sir Winston Churchill an honorary citizen of the State of West Virginia

"Whereas Sir Winston Churchill, a citizen of Great Britain by birth, has close ties with the United States of America; and

"Whereas said Sir Winston Churchill has demonstrated during the strife and turmoil of two World Wars that he is a friend and ally of the United States; and

"Whereas he also has demonstrated his loyalty and devotion to the aims, purposes, and aspirations of this Nation at peace conferences, world trade meetings, the United Nations, and elsewhere; and

"Whereas there is now a proposal before the Congress that he be made an honorary citizen of the United States; and

"Whereas it is appropriate that this great soldier, world statesman, and noted historian and writer be made a citizen of our State prior to being made an honorary citizen of the United States: Therefore be it

"Resolved by the Legislature of West Virginia, That said Sir Winston Churchill be made an honorary citizen of West Virginia and that the Congress of the United States be memorialized to award him honorary citizenship as an American."

A resolution of the Legislature of the State of Minnesota; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

"Resolution 3

"A resolution ratifying a proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America to outlaw the poll tax

"Whereas, both Houses of the Congress of the United States by a joint resolution proposed an amendment to the Constitution of the United States which reads as follows:

" 'Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the qualifications of electors

" 'Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled. That the following article is hereby proposed as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which shall be valid to all intents and purposes as part of the Constitution only if ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States within 7 years from the date of its submission by the Congress:

" ' "Article —

" ' "Section 1. The right of citizens of the United States to vote in any primary or other election for President or Vice President, for electors for President or Vice President, or for Senator or Representative in Congress, shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or any State by reason of failure to pay any poll tax or other tax.

" ' "Sec. 2. The Congress shall have power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation" ': Therefore be it

"Resolved by the Legislature of the State of Minnesota, That the proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States is hereby ratified by the Legislature of the State of Minnesota.

"The secretary of state is directed to forward copies of this resolution to the presiding officer of the Senate of the United States and the Speaker of the House of Representatives and transmit an official notice of this resolution to the Secretary of State of the United States as provided by the law of this State.

"——— ———,
"Speaker of the House of Representatives.
"A. W. Keith,
"President of the Senate.

"Passed the house of representatives this 19th day of February in the year of Our Lord one thousand nine hundred and sixty-three.

"G. H. Leahy,
"Chief Clerk,
"House of Representatives.

"Passed the senate this 27th day of February in the year of our Lord one thousand nine hundred and sixty-three.

"——— ———,
"Secretary of the Senate.

"Approved March 6, 1963.

"Elmer L. Andersen,
"Governor of the State of Minnesota."

A resolution of the Senate of the State of South Carolina; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

"Senate Resolution 190

"A Senate resolution to express the appreciation of the members of the Senate of the State of South Carolina to the Honorable Orville L. Freeman, U.S. Secretary of Agriculture, for his action in holding the support price on 1963 upland cotton at 32.47 cents per pound.

"Whereas cotton farmers will take a 10-percent reduction in the 1963 cotton acreage allotment and there is all indication that the cotton production cost per acre will continue at high or higher levels than the 1962 crop; and

"Whereas it is becoming increasingly difficult for family size farms to exist and provide the necessities of life for such families; and

"Whereas the U.S. Secretary of Agriculture has announced the 1963 support rate on middling one inch upland cotton as thirty-two and forty-seven hundredths cents per pound and this decision of the Honorable Orville L. Freeman, Secretary of Agriculture, is of material importance to cotton producers of South Carolina and the economy of the State; and

"Whereas any reduction from this base support price would be punitive to the State's cotton growers and general economy: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate: That the Members of the Senate of the State of South Carolina express appreciation to the Honorable Orville L. Freeman, U.S. Secretary of Agriculture, for his action in holding the support price on 1963 upland cotton at thirty-two and forty-seven hundredths cents per pound; and be it further

"Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the presiding officer of the U.S. Senate and to each Senator from South Carolina and to the Honorable Orville L. Freeman."

A resolution of the Senate of the Commonwealth of Kentucky; to the Committee on Finance:

"Senate Resolution 11

"A resolution petitioning the President of the United States to reject reports favoring relaxation of import controls on foreign residual oil

"Whereas the mining of bituminous coal is one of Kentucky's major industries, and, as such, contributes substantially to the overall economy of the Commonwealth and particularly to the economic well-being of thousands of Kentuckians whose livelihood is dependent upon the coal, railroad, and related industries; and

"Whereas the coal industry in Kentucky and elsewhere is now and has been for some time in a depressed condition, which would be further compounded by any cause which would lessen coal's ability to compete in the fuels market; and

"Whereas the importation of foreign residual oil (waste) in an increasingly excessive volume at unrealistic prices has adversely affected coal's competitive position, and, thereby, has been and is now responsible for the displacement of millions of tons of American coal, and, hence, thousands of jobs and millions of dollars of wages to workers; and,

"Whereas the President of the United States has received a report from the Office of Emergency Planning recommending that there be a gradual relaxation of import controls on foreign residual oil; and

"Whereas the supporting reason given by Mr. Edward A. McDermott, Director of the Office of Emergency Planning, is that such relaxation will not adversely affect the security of this Nation; and

"Whereas this supporting reason is based on the statement that, in conventional-type warfare, oil tankers from Central and South America could deliver crude and residual oil to the east coast, which is extremely difficult, if not impossible, to justify and substantiate, especially if the experience to the contrary in World War II, when Germany with only 75 submarines did great damage to oil tankers in the Atlantic Ocean, is projected to the present-day situation with Russia having a reported 600 or more modern submarines: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the senate of the General Assembly of the Commonwealth of Kentucky,* That the senate, in special session assembled, does hereby petition the President of the United States to completely reject the report from the Office of Emergency Planning regarding the relaxation of import controls on foreign residual oil, and, further, that he utilize existing legislative authority to implement a program which will keep these imports within limitations that will permit domestic coal and oil to maintain production at a level which will protect the security and economy of this Nation, and thereby halt further economic hardship upon the coal industry, the coal-hauling railroads and related industries, and upon the Kentuckians and other Americans whose employment is provided by these industries; and be it further

"*Resolved,* That the clerk of the senate transmit a copy of this resolution to the President of the United States, the President of the U.S. Senate, the Speaker of the U.S. House of Representatives and the Members of Congress from the Commonwealth of Kentucky.

"Attest:

"John W. Willis,
"*Clerk of Senate.*"

A resolution of the house of representatives of the Commonwealth of Kentucky; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

"House Resolution 26

"A resolution respectfully urging the U.S. Senate to pass the bill to establish a Youth Conservation Corps

"Whereas the U.S. Senate is considering a proposal to establish a Youth Conservation Corps; and

"Whereas a serious problem has been created by the 1 million youths from the ages of 16 to 22 years that are out of school and unemployed; and

"Whereas these young people lack the necessary skills to obtain employment; and

"Whereas the seriousness of the situation is evidenced by the actions of the President and the testimony of five Cabinet officers who appeared before the Senate labor subcommittee urging passage of the bill; and

"Whereas the program would provide training for approximately 1,800 of Kentucky's unemployed youths: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the house of representatives of the general assembly of the Commonwealth of Kentucky:* That the U.S. Senate be and hereby is respectfully urged to pass the Youth Conservation Corps bill; and that the clerk of the house of representatives transmit copies of this resolution to Kentucky's U.S. Senators and to the presiding officer of the U.S. Senate."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Idaho; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

"Senate Joint Memorial 10

"*To the Honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the United States, in Congress Assembled:*

"We, your memorialists, the members of the Senate and House of Representatives of the Legislature of the State of Idaho, assembled in the 37th session thereof, do respectfully represent that:

"Whereas it is known that one of the most pressing problems facing all areas of the United States and in fact all areas of the world today is the securing of the maximum beneficial use of land and water resources for the further progress of our people, of our State, and of our Nation, not only to realize the most from our present resources for the immediate problems of today, but also to meet our future needs for the long-range future; and

"Whereas the area of southwestern Idaho known as the Mountain Home Snake River plain area contains a large body of land which is both economically and engineeringly feasible for the development of a highly productive and economically desirable potential for the further development of the people of this area and of the Nation and which would add greatly to the overall economy and assist in stabilizing the existing economy of this State and of the Nation, and would present many opportunities to stimulate the economic growth of the State and of the Nation; and

"Whereas adjacent to this fine body of potential irrigated land there are adequate supplies of water in the Snake River which are now running off and unused in the State of Idaho to the detriment of the State and Nation's economy; and

"Whereas upstream developments have been demonstrated to be in the long-range interest for providing the best and most comprehensive plan of development for the utilization of the water and land potential of our river basins; and

"Whereas the Bureau of Reclamation, in cooperation with local interests, has been making engineering, water resource, and land classification studies which have indicated economic and engineering feasibility of a development of this area under a plan known as the Guffey plan of development; and

"Whereas the orderly continued investigation and ultimate construction and development of a water resource program for the irrigation of this potentially productive area of the State of Idaho will inure to the benefit of the State and of the Nation at large: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the 37th session of the Legislature of the State of Idaho, now in session, the senate and house of representatives concurring,* That the Congress and President of the United States be respectfully petitioned to give early consideration to the continued investigation and construction of the Mountain Home division, Snake River project, Guffey plan of development; be it further

"*Resolved,* That the secretary of state of the State of Idaho be, and he hereby is, authorized and directed to forward certified copies of this memorial to the President and Vice President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress, the Department of the Interior, the U.S. Bureau of Reclamation, and to the Senators and Representatives representing this State in the United States.

"This senate joint memorial was adopted by the senate on the 21st day of February 1963.

"W. E. Drevlow,
"*President of the Senate.*

"This senate joint memorial was adopted by the house of representatives on the 25th day of February 1963.

"Pete T. Cenarrusa,
"*Speaker of the House of Representatives.*"

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Idaho; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

"Senate Joint Memorial 9

"*To the Honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the United States in Congress assembled:*

"*Be it resolved, by the thirty-seventh session of the Legislature of the State of Idaho, now in session, the senate and house of representatives concurring,* That we most respectfully urge the Congress of the United States of America to call a convention for the purpose of proposing the following amendment to the Constitution of the United States:

" 'Article —

" 'Section 1. A $350 billion limit to be set on the U.S. Federal Government indebtedness.

" 'Sec. 2. Upon a declaration of a national emergency, approved by 75 percent of the House and Senate, this debt limit can be temporarily extended but the amount of debt temporarily extended must be retired within 10 years after the cessation of hostilities or declaration of an emergency.

" 'Sec. 3. All national debt commencing with the year 1970, whatever the sum, as of July 1, 1970, shall be retired at the rate of $3 billion a year in addition to payments of interest.

" 'Sec. 4. The national debt limit of $350 billion may be raised beyond said sum, upon being approved by Congress and ratified by two-thirds of the States, exclusive of those amounts defined in section 2.'

"The secretary of state is hereby directed to send duly authenticated copies of this memorial to the President and Clerk of the U.S. Senate, the Speaker and Clerk of the U.S. House of Representatives and to each Member of Congress from the State of Idaho, and to the presiding officers of the senate and house of representatives of the several States."

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Hawaii; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

"Senate Concurrent Resolution 1

"Concurrent resolution ratifying a proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the qualification of electors

"Whereas the United States is proud to be considered one of the world's leading democracies, and Hawaii is equally proud to share in that great tradition; and

"Whereas the preservation of the great traditions nurtured and passed on by our forefathers requires the constant vigilance of an enlightened population; and

"Whereas there have been injustices in our country which demand the attention of our people and require action by those who have been entrusted with the authority to govern by the people; and

"Whereas one of the most flagrant injustices has been the artificial barrier to participation in the electoral process provided by the imposition of the poll tax in some of these United States; and

"Whereas the Congress of the United States has taken steps to remove one of these injustices by initiating an amendment to the Constitution of the United States through U.S. Senate Joint Resolution 29 which reads as follows:

" 'S.J. Res. 29

" 'Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the qualification of electors

" '*Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That the following article is hereby proposed as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which shall be valid to all intents and purposes as part of the Constitution only if ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States within seven years from the date of its submission by the Congress:

" ' "Article —

" ' "Section 1. The right of citizens of the United States to vote in any primary or other election for President or Vice President, for electors for President or Vice President, or for Senator or Representative in Congress, shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or any State by reason of failure to pay any poll tax or other tax.

" ' "SEC. 2. The Congress shall have power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation" ': Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the Senate of the Second State Legislature of the State of Hawaii, General Session of 1963 (the house of representatives concurring)*, That the article proposed as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States as set forth in United States Senate Joint Resolution 29, dated August 27, 1962, be and it is hereby ratified; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That a certified copy of this concurrent resolution be transmitted to the Administrator, General Services Administration, and that copies of this concurrent resolution also be transmitted to the President of the Senate and to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States and to the members of Hawaii's delegation to the Congress of the United States.

"We hereby certify that the foregoing concurrent resolution was adopted by the Senate of the second Legislature of the State of Hawaii, general session of 1963, on March 6, 1963.

"NELSON K. DOI,
"*President of the Senate.*
"SEI CHI HIRAI,
"*Clerk of the Senate.*

"We hereby certify that the foregoing concurrent resolution was adopted by the House of Representatives of the second Legislature of the State of Hawaii, general session of 1963, on March 6, 1963.

"ELMER F. CRAVALHO,
"*Speaker, House of Representatives.*
"SHIGETO KANEMOTO,
"*Clerk, House of Representatives.*"

A resolution of the Senate of the State of Hawaii; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

"Whereas the State of Hawaii possesses a history and development unlike that of other States in the United States; and

"Whereas the United States of America through its Congress and its Department of Interior has seen fit to recognize this unique history; and

"Whereas Congress has implemented this recognition by the appropriation of $175,000 for the restoration of the City of Refuge; and

"Whereas pursuant to said appropriation, the Department of Interior through its National Park Service has begun the restoration of the historic trails and general area abounding the City of Refuge; and

"Whereas this project will preserve in living form a part of the history of these isles, for the enlightment and education of our own people as well as our visitors; and

"Whereas this project is also providing employment for a great number of citizens: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the Senate of the Second Legislature of the State of Hawaii, general session of 1963*, That sincere appreciation and Aloha be extended to the Congress of the United States and the Department of Interior for its continuing interest in these fairest of all islands; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That a certified copy of this resolution be forwarded to the President of the Senate of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, the Secretary of the Interior and to each of Hawaii's delegation to the Congress of the United States."

A resolution of the Senate of the State of Alaska; to the Committee on Commerce:

"SENATE RESOLUTION 21

"Resolution relating to the promotion of State commercial fishery research and development projects

"Whereas the several States of the Union have taken the initiative in fishery research and development; and

"Whereas the off-shore fishery resources of the United States are the proper concern of both the Federal and State governments; and

"Whereas the Federal Government has an obligation to encourage and assist in State research and development programs; and

"Whereas a bold program to assist the States in their efforts to develop their fishery resources is essential to the proper conservation and utilization of this basic resource: Therefore be it

"*Resolved*, That the Congress is respectfully requested to give favorable consideration to H.R. 3738 introduced by the Honorable RALPH J. RIVERS, U.S. Representative from Alaska, a bill to promote State commercial fishery research and development projects; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the Honorable LYNDON B. JOHNSON, Vice President of the United States and President of the Senate; the Honorable JOHN W. MCCORMACK, Speaker of the House of Representatives; the Honorable WARREN G. MAGNUSON, chairman of the Senate Committee on Commerce; the Honorable HERBERT BONNER, chairman of the House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries; and the Members of the Alaska delegation in Congress.

"Passed by the senate March 4, 1963.

"FRANK PERATROVICH,
"*President of the Senate.*

"Attest:

"EVELYN K. STEVENSON,
"*Secretary of the Senate.*"

A resolution adopted by the Council of the City of Marysville, Calif., protesting against the proposed subsidy formula of the Civil Aeronautics Board; to the Committee on Commerce.

A resolution adopted by the Oklahoma Association of Electric Cooperatives, relating to the death of the late Senator Robert S. Kerr, of Oklahoma; ordered to lie on the table.

By Mr. MUNDT:

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of South Dakota; to the Committee on Finance:

"SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 8

"A concurrent resolution, memorializing Congress to take all necessary steps in promoting the sale of grain and to guarantee continuing access of U.S. wheat to the Common Market countries

"Whereas the production and sale of wheat forms a vital part of the economy of South Dakota;

"Whereas the countries now involved in the formation of the European Economic Community—including West Germany, France, Italy, Belgium, the Netherlands, and Luxemburg—represent one of the best cash customers of U.S. wheatgrowers;

"Whereas there is a danger that the European Economic Community may develop policies which would curtail the importation of U.S. wheat;

"Whereas the adoption of protectionist and inward-directed trade restricting agricultural policies would seriously damage the economy of South Dakota and other major wheat growing States of the Great Plains and would greatly hamper the free exchange of goods between the United States and the Common Market countries: Be it

"*Resolved*, That the South Dakota Legislature hereby urges the U.S. Government to take all necessary steps to guarantee continuing access of U.S. wheat to the Common Market countries in line with the spirit of the Trade Expansion Act of 1962; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That a duly attested copy of this resolution be immediately transmitted to the U.S. Secretary of Agriculture, the Secretary of the Senate of the United States, the Clerk of the House of Representatives of the United States and to each Member of the Congress from this State.

"Adopted by the Senate February 19, 1963.

"Concurred in by the House of Representatives February 25, 1963.

"NILS A. BOE,
"*Lieutenant Governor,*
"*President of the Senate.*

"Attest:

"NIELS P. JENSEN,
"*Secretary of the Senate.*
"PAUL E. BROWN,
"*Speaker,*
"*House of Representatives.*

"Attest:

"W. J. MATSON,
"*Chief Clerk,*
"*House of Representatives.*"

(The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of South Dakota, identical with the foregoing, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.)

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of South Dakota; to the Committee on Government Operations:

"HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 8

"A concurrent resolution, memorializing the Congress of the United States to amend the Federal statutes in order to provide for payments in lieu of property taxes imposed on land prior to acquisition by the Federal Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife and Wildlife Agency

"Whereas the State game, fish, and parks department, supplied with Federal matching funds, has and will continue to purchase wetlands and marshlands for the State of South Dakota for the purpose of protecting present breeding and feeding areas of migratory waterfowl;

"Whereas this State, vested with the titles to such lands as the game, fish, and parks department has purchased, provides to the several counties and their school districts, within which wetlands owned by the State of South Dakota are located, payments and grants in lieu of property taxes;

"Whereas the Federal Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife has and will continue to purchase similar tracts of land for identical purposes and is not subject to county or school district tax levies or required to make payments in lieu of property taxes;

"Whereas the tax burden of the people of South Dakota and the landowners residing within the several counties and their school districts in which certain land titles are held by the Federal Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife in the name of the Federal Government is necessarily increased in direct proportion to the amount of land purchased by the Fish and Wildlife Agency: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That the House of Representatives of the 38th Legislature of the State of South Dakota, the senate concurring, do hereby memorialize the Congress of the United States to amend the Federal statutes in order to provide payments in lieu of property taxes no longer able to be levied on those wetlands and marshlands acquired by the Federal Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife in order to equalize generally the tax burden of the citizens of the State of South Dakota and specifically the tax burden of the citizens of the several counties and their school districts; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That a copy of this memorial be transmitted to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States, and to the Senators and Congressmen representing the State of South Dakota in the Congress of the United States.

"Adopted by the house, February 16, 1963.

"Concurred in by the senate, February 25, 1963.

"Nils A. Boe,
"*President of the Senate.*
"Niels P. Jensen,
"*Secretary of the Senate.*
"Paul E. Brown,
"*Speaker of the House.*
"W. J. Matson,
"*Chief Clerk of the House.*"

(The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of South Dakota, identical with the foregoing, which was referred to the Committee on Government Operations.)

Two concurrent resolutions of the Legislature of the State of South Dakota; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

"Senate Concurrent Resolution 5

"A concurrent resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States; His Excellency, the President of the United States; the Secretary of the Interior of the United States; and the Secretary of the Treasury of the United States; to allow singing at Mount Rushmore by nonprofessional student workers and to remove the restrictions imposed in 1962 which caused this to cease

"Whereas singing at Mount Rushmore by student help at the concession is a source of enjoyment to the more than 1 million persons who annually visit the shrine of democracy; and

"Whereas the nonprofessional singing student waiters have voluntarily inaugurated this custom for their own pleasure and the enjoyment of those they serve without this being a part of their duties; and

"Whereas the figures of Washington, Jefferson, Lincoln and Theodore Roosevelt are symbolic of freedom and the democratic way of life; and

"Whereas impromptu singing by young people at work is a manifestation of the joys of freedom inherent to the United States and the free world; and

"Whereas this singing is an additional source of inspiration to all visitors in the true meaning of democracy as exemplified by this showplace of freedom: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved,* That the Senate of the State of South Dakota, the house of representatives concurring therein, do memorialize the Congress of the United States; His Excellency, the President of the United States; the Secretary of the Interior of the United States; and the Secretary of the Treasury of the United States, that in the interests of the millions who seek this inspiration at Mount Rushmore and as a source of encouragement to the youth of America to enjoy their freedom of choice of endeavor, the National Government allow this singing on a voluntary basis by nonprofessional student workers and remove the restrictions imposed in 1962; which caused it to cease; be it further

"*Resolved,* That the secretary of the senate be instructed to forward enrolled copies of this concurrent resolution to His Excellency, the President of the United States, to the presiding officers of both Houses of Congress, to the Secretary of the Interior of the United States, to the Secretary of the Treasury of the United States, to U.S. Senators Karl Mundt and George McGovern, and to U.S. Congressmen E. Y. Berry and Ben Reifel.

"Adopted by the senate February 23, 1963.

"Concurred in by the house of representatives March 4, 1963.

"Nils A. Boe,
"*Lieutenant Governor,*
"*President of the Senate.*
"Attest:
"Niels P. Jensen,
"*Secretary of the Senate.*
"Paul E. Brown,
"*Speaker,*
"*House of Representatives.*
"Attest:
"W. J. Matson,
"*Chief Clerk,*
"*House of Representatives.*"

"Senate Concurrent Resolution 12

"A concurrent resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States; His Excellency the President of the United States to support construction of the Crazy Horse Memorial near Custer, S. Dak.

"Whereas the Black Hills of South Dakota is one of the outstanding recreation areas of the United States of America; and

"Whereas the Government of the United States of America has assisted greatly with development of the Black Hills as a recreation area through its program of national parks, shrines, and monuments; and

"Whereas continued development of the Black Hills is necessary so future generations can enjoy the same outdoor natural beauties as their predecessors; and

"Whereas one of the outstanding attractions of the future Black Hills development is being developed by a private group through the carving of Crazy Horse Memorial, a tribute to the heritage of the American Indian; and

"Whereas the Sioux Indians of South Dakota will benefit educationally, socially, and esthetically when the monument is completed; and

"Whereas funds from the self-supporting Crazy Horse carving on Thunder Mountain by Sculptor Korczak Ziolkowski are inadequate to complete the monument expeditiously: Now therefore be it

"*Resolved,* That the Senate of the State of South Dakota, the house of representatives concurring, therein, do memorialize the Congress of the United States, the Secretary of the Interior, and His Excellency the President to assist the Crazy Horse Memorial Foundation Commission in speeding completion of the monument by providing funds to be repaid from admissions and concession sales during and after construction of the mountain carving; and be it further

"*Resolved,* That the secretary of the senate be instructed to forward copies of this concurrent resolution to His Excellency, the President of the United States, to the presiding officers of both Houses of the Congress, to the Secretary of the Interior of the United States, to U.S. Senators Karl Mundt and George McGovern and to Congressmen E. Y. Berry and Ben Reifel.

"Adopted by the senate, March 2, 1963.

"Concurred in by the house of representatives, March 5, 1963.

"Nils A. Boe,
"*Lieutenant Governor,*
"*President of the Senate.*
"Attest:
"Niels P. Jensen,
"*Secretary of the Senate.*
"Paul E. Brown,
"*Speaker,*
"*House of Representatives.*
"Attest:
"W. J. Matson,
"*Chief Clerk,*
"*House of Representatives.*"

(The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate two concurrent resolutions of the Legislature of the State of South Dakota, identical with the foregoing, which were referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.)

Two concurrent resolutions of the Legislature of the State of South Dakota; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

"Senate Concurrent Resolution 9

"Concurrent resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States, relative to the so-called right-to-work laws of the respective States of this Union

"Whereas the people of the sovereign State of South Dakota have adopted as an integral part of their State constitution the following section in their bill of rights:

" 'Article VI—Bill of Rights

" 'Sec. 2. No person shall be deprived of life, liberty or property without due process of law. The right of persons to work shall not be denied or abridged on account of membership or nonmembership in any labor union, or labor organization'; and

"Whereas the Legislature of the sovereign State of South Dakota has implemented said section of the State constitution with statutory law to enforce this constitutional provision.

"Whereas 20 States in this Union have the same or similar constitutional or legislative enactments: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved,* That the members of the Legislature of the State of South Dakota respectfully request that the Congress of the United States refrain from any legislation abrogating the rights of the respective States in this field of civil rights; and be it further

"*Resolved,* That the Secretary of the Senate be instructed to send out a duly attested copy of this resolution to the Secretary of the Senate of the United States, the Clerk of the House of Representatives of the United States, and to each Member of the Congress from this State.

"Adopted by the senate February 21, 1963.

"Concurred in by the house of representatives February 28, 1963.

"Nils A. Boe,
"*Lieutenant Governor,*
"*President of the Senate.*
"Attest:
"Niels P. Jensen,
"*Secretary of the Senate.*
"Paul E. Brown,
"*Speaker, House of Representatives.*
"Attest:
"W. J. Matson,
"*Chief Clerk, House of Representatives.*"

"Senate Concurrent Resolution 13

"Concurrent resolution requesting the Congress of the United States of America to propose an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to provide for the appointment of electors of the President and Vice President on a basis similar to the election of the Congress of the United States

"Whereas under the Constitution of the United States election of the President and Vice President is by electors in the several States, appointed in each State as directed by its legislature, with each State having an elector for each of its Senators and Representatives in Congress; and

"Whereas the legislature in each State has directed that the appointment of its electors be by popular election on a statewide basis, a method that is not representative of the division of the voters within most of the States; and

"Whereas the whole body of electors (the electoral college) is the exact counterpart of a joint session of the two Houses of Congress in the representation of the States as units as well as the population of the States, and should be elected on a comparable basis so as to give the President and the whole Congress the same form of voting constituency; and

"Whereas the executive and legislative branches of the Government of the United States rest upon nationwide constituencies so altogether different as to make presidential U.S.A. and congressional U.S.A. two different countries within one national boundary: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, that the Congress of the United States of America is respectfully requested to propose the article of amendment as proposed in Senate Joint Resolution 12, now pending in the U.S. Senate, as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That duly attested copies of this resolution be transmitted immediately to the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States, directed to the Secretary of each body; to the Members of Congress from this State; and to each house of the legislature of each of the other States.

"Adopted by the senate February 26, 1963.

"Concurred in by the house of representatives March 4, 1963.

"NILS A. BOE,
"*Lieutenant Governor,*
"*President of the Senate.*

"Attest:

"NIELS P. JENSEN,
"*Secretary of the Senate.*
"PAUL E. BROWN,
"*Speaker, House of Representatives.*

"Attest:

"W. J. MATSON,
"*Chief Clerk, House of Representatives.*"

(The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate two concurrent resolutions of the Legislature of the State of South Dakota, identical with the foregoing, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.)

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of South Dakota; to the Committee on Public Works:

"SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 14

"Concurrent resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to provide financial relief either through amending Public Law 81–874 or direct grants to the Fort Pierre Independent School District, Stanley County, S. Dak.

"Whereas the program of the U.S. Corps of Army Engineers for the construction on the Missouri River in central South Dakota of Oahe Dam, an important link in harnessing the upper Missouri River, necessitated a peak employment of thousands of skilled and unskilled personnel during the past decade, which caused the population of Fort Pierre, a small, historic community within immediate proximity to the dam construction site, to explode with the rapid influx of Federal and Federal-contractor employees, their wives, and, of immediate consequence to the Fort Pierre Independent School District, their children; and

"Whereas the housing patterns of Government and private personnel employed in the construction of Oahe Dam resulted in substantial numbers of mobile homes being moved into Fort Pierre, with relatively few permanent dwelling structures being constructed, while the school population increased by 234 percent, thereby decreasing the equity and effectiveness of the property tax, Fort Pierre's normal tool for financing education; and

"Whereas under Public Law 81–874, as amended, the Fort Pierre Independent School District received payments from the Federal Government to ameliorate the sudden and massive increase in school enrollments which continued through the past decade but which the Corps of Army Engineers discontinued upon the completion of Oahe Dam, no longer requiring the services of large numbers of personnel; and

"Whereas the completion of the construction of the Oahe Dam should have resulted in the community losing the temporary population gained in the beginning of the last decade, but with a similar dam being constructed only 66 highway miles downstream, many workers lingered in the community commuting to the new damsite, and continuing to educate their children in Fort Pierre schools, despite the school district's loss of impacted area funds; and

"Whereas the burden of supporting the community's educational facilities now rests entirely upon State aid and the property taxes paid by established, home owning and permanent community residents who are already taxed at the maximum constitutional amount and who have, lacking other alternatives, turned to the State for immediate and emergency assistance; and

"Whereas the constitution of the State of South Dakota prohibits the State legislature from enacting special appropriations to relieve the plight of the Fort Pierre Independent School District; and

"Whereas the Federal Government remains the only remaining source of assistance and aid to solve the community's rapidly deteriorating school district financial condition arising from the construction of the Oahe Dam and the subsequent and sudden withdrawal of financial support: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That the Senate of the State of South Dakota (the House of Representatives concurring therein), do memorialize the Congress of the United States, to take immediate and necessary action to recognize the ignored responsibility of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare or the U.S. Corps of Army Engineers and provide financial relief, either through direct financial aid or an amendment to Public Law 81–874, as amended, to the Fort Pierre Independent School District, Stanley County, S. Dak., to be effective until the construction employment patterns of the U.S. Corps of Army Engineers and its contractors no longer affect the enrollment of the school district; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the chairmen of the Committee on Education of the U.S. Senate and the U.S. House of Representatives, the chairmen of the Appropriations Committees of the U.S. Senate and the U.S. House of Representatives, the chairmen of the Committees on Public Works of the U.S. Senate and the U.S. House of Representatives, the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, and the members of the South Dakota delegations to the U.S. Senate and the U.S. House of Representatives.

"Adopted by the Senate March 5, 1963.

"Concurred in by the House of Representatives March 6, 1963.

"NILS A. BOE,
"*Lieutenant Governor,*
"*President of the Senate.*

"Attest:

"NIELS P. JENSEN,
"*Secretary of the Senate.*
"PAUL E. BROWN,
"*Speaker, House of Representatives.*

"Attest:

"W. J. MATSON,
"*Chief Clerk, House of Representatives.*"

(The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of South Dakota, identical with the foregoing, which was referred to the Committee on Public Works.)

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, without amendment:

S. Res. 95. Resolution to provide funds for additional staff for the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare (Rept. No. 42).

By Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, without additional amendment:

S. Res. 14. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Banking and Currency to make certain investigations (Rept. No. 20);

S. Res. 15. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Banking and Currency to investigate matters pertaining to public and private housing (Rept. No. 21);

S. Res. 22. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare to examine, investigate, and study matters pertaining to migratory labor (Rept. No. 43); and

S. Res. 75. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Armed Services to investigate certain matters relating to national defense (Rept. No. 18).

By Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, with an additional amendment:

S. Res. 74. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences to make a study of matters pertaining to aeronautical and space activities of Federal departments and agencies (Rept. No. 17); and

S. Res. 79. Resolution to authorize a study by the Committee on Armed Services on strategic and critical stockpiling (Rept. No. 19).

By Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, with an amendment:

S. Res. 16. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs to investigate certain matters within its jurisdiction and authorizing certain expenditures therefor (Rept. No. 28);

S. Res. 20. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service to employ additional clerical assistance (Rept. No. 44); and

S. Res. 64. Resolution to investigate national penitentiaries (Rept. No. 37).

By Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, with amendments:

S. Res. 12. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Public Works to investigate certain matters (Rept. No. 46);

S. Res. 13. Resolution to study certain aspects of national security operations (Rept. No. 27);

S. Res. 17. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Government Operations to make certain studies as to the efficiency and economy of the operations of the Government (Rept. No. 24);

S. Res. 18. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service to investigate the postal service and the civil service system (Rept. No. 45);

S. Res. 23. Resolution extending the Special Committee on Aging through January 31, 1964 (Rept. No. 49);

S. Res. 25. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Foreign Relations to examine, investigate, and make studies of matters pertaining to the foreign policies of the United States and their administration (Rept. No. 23);

S. Res. 26. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Foreign Relations to continue its study of the activities of nondiplomatic representatives of foreign principals (Rept. No. 22);

S. Res. 27. Resolution to provide funds for the study of matters pertaining to interagency coordination, economy, and efficiency (Rept. No. 25);

S. Res. 45. Resolution authorizing a study of intergovernmental relationships between the United States and the States and municipalities (Rept. No. 26);

S. Res. 49. Resolution authorizing the Select Committee on Small Business to make a study of American small and independent business problems (Rept. No. 48);

S. Res. 55. Resolution to study administrative practice and procedure (Rept. No. 29);

S. Res. 57. Resolution authorizing a study of matters pertaining to constitutional amendment (Rept. No. 30);

S. Res. 58. Resolution to investigate matters pertaining to constitutional rights (Rept. No. 31);

S. Res. 59. Resolution to consider matters pertaining to Government charters, holidays, and celebrations (Rept. No. 32);

S. Res. 60. Resolution to study matters pertaining to immigration and naturalization (Rept. No. 34);

S. Res. 61. Resolution to study and examine the Federal judicial system (Rept. No. 33);

S. Res. 62. Resolution to investigate the administration, operation, and enforcement of the Internal Security Act (Rept. No. 35);

S. Res. 63. Resolution to investigate juvenile delinquency (Rept. No. 36);

S. Res. 65. Resolution to examine and review the administration of the Patent Office (Rept. No. 38);

S. Res. 66. Resolution to investigate problems created by flow of escapees and refugees from communistic tyranny (Rept. No. 39);

S. Res. 67. Resolution to study revision and codification of the Statutes of the United States (Rept. No. 40);

S. Res. 68. Resolution to investigate the administration of the Trading With the Enemy Act (Rept. No. 41); and

S. Res. 73. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Rules and Administration to make expenditures and to employ temporary personnel (Rept. No. 47).

By Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary, without amendment:

S. 92. A bill for the relief of Hom Wah Yook (also known as Hom Bok Heung) (Rept. No. 51);

S. 97. A bill for the relief of Purificacion Siat (Rept. No. 52);

S. 208. A bill for the relief of Young Wai (Rept. No. 53);

S. 234. A bill for the relief of Harold and Sylvia Freda Karro and their three minor children, Allan Karro, Jennifer Karro, and Michelle Karro (Rept. No. 54);

S. 436. A bill for the relief of Stanislaw Bialoglowski (Rept. No. 55);

S. 506. A bill for the relief of Panagiota Makris (Rept. No. 56);

S. 574. A bill for the relief of Antonio Gutierrez Fernandez (Rept. No. 57);

S. 596. A bill for the relief of Roswitha Seib (Rept. No. 58); and

S. 688. A bill for the relief of Ronald Whiting (Rept. No. 59).

By Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment:

S. 193. A bill for the relief of Michelina Lanni (Rept. No. 60).

By Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary, with amendments:

S. 195. A bill for the relief of Isabel Loretta Allen (Rept. No. 61);

S. 421. A bill for the relief of Ho Koon Chew (Rept. No. 62); and

S. 635. A bill for the relief of Krystyna Rataj (Rept. No. 63).

By Mr. DIRKSEN, from the Committee on the Judiciary, without amendment:

S.J. Res. 4. Joint resolution to provide for the actual participation of the United States in the West Virginia centennial celebration (Rept. No. 50).

TO REPRINT COMMITTEE PRINT, 87TH CONGRESS, ENTITLED "PART 1 OF CONCENTRATION RATIOS IN MANUFACTURING INDUSTRY, 1958"—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. KEFAUVER, from the Committee on the Judiciary, reported an original concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 30); which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there be printed for the use of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary two thousand additional copies of part 1 of its committee print of the Eighty-seventh Congress entitled "Concentration Ratios in Manufacturing Industry, 1958", a report prepared by the Bureau of the Census for the Subcommittee on Antitrust and Monopoly.

APPOINTMENT AS MEMBERS OF JOINT COMMITTEE ON PRINTING AND JOINT COMMITTEE OF CONGRESS ON THE LIBRARY—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. JORDAN, of North Carolina, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 107); which was placed on the calendar, as follows:

Resolved, That the following-named Members be, and they are hereby, elected members of the following joint committees of Congress:

Joint Committee on Printing: Mr. HAYDEN, of Arizona; Mr. JORDAN, of North Carolina; and Mr. SCOTT, of Pennsylvania.

Joint Committee of Congress on the Library: Mr. JORDAN, of North Carolina; Mr. Pell, of Rhode Island; Mr. CLARK, of Pennsylvania; Mr. COOPER, of Kentucky; and Mr. SCOTT, of Pennsylvania.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON UTILIZATION OF FOREIGN CURRENCIES AND U.S. DOLLARS

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, in accordance with the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the reports of the Committees on Public Works; Labor and Public Welfare; the Judiciary; and the Joint Economic Committee concerning the foreign currencies and U.S. dollars utilized by those committees in 1962 in connection with foreign travel.

There being no objection, the reports were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Report of expenditure of foreign currencies and appropriated funds by the Committee on Public Works, U.S. Senate, expended between Jan. 1 and Dec. 31, 1962

Name and country	Name of currency	Lodging		Meals		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Senator Jennings Randolph: Mexico	Peso	400	31.10	140	11.20	900	72.40	528	42.30	1,968	158.00
Senator Ernest Gruening: Mexico	do	460	36.50	350	28.00	950	76.00	520	41.80	2,280	182.30
Theo W. Sneed: Mexico	do	350	28.00	200	16.00	800	64.10	430	34.40	1,780	142.50
Lorenzo E. Tapia: Mexico	do	460	36.90	350	28.00	800	64.10	330	26.50	1,940	155.50
Herbert W. Beaser: Mexico	do	350	28.00	100	8.00	800	64.10	237	19.00	1,487	119.10
Total			161.50		91.20		340.70		164.00		757.40

RECAPITULATION

	Amount
Foreign currency (U.S. dollar equivalent)	757.40

PAT MCNAMARA,
Chairman, Committee on Public Works.

MARCH 4, 1963.

Report of expenditure of foreign currencies and appropriated funds by the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, U.S. Senate, expended between Jan. 1 and Dec. 31, 1962

Name and country	Name of currency	Lodging		Meals		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Pat McNamara: Switzerland	Franc	512	128	488	122	4,122	1,030.50			5,122	1,280.50
Total			128		122		1,030.50				1,280.50

RECAPITULATION

	Amount
Foreign currency (U.S. dollar equivalent)	1,280.50

LISTER HILL,
Chairman, Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

FEBRUARY 27, 1963.

Report of expenditure of foreign currencies and appropriated funds by the Committee on the Judiciary, U.S. Senate, expended between Jan. 1 and Dec. 31, 1962

Name and country	Name of currency	Lodging		Meals		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Senator Kenneth B. Keating:											
Austria	Schilling							165.90	6.83	165.90	6.83
Belgium	Franc	1,285	25.70			425	8.50	250	5.24	1,960	39.44
Germany	Deutsche mark							96	24.00	96	24.00
Italy	Lira					11,178	18.00			11,178	18.00
Nigeria	Nigerian pound							1/10/0	4.23	1/10/0	4.23
Poland	Zloty	1,115	44.60					407	18.82	1,522	63.42
United Kingdom	Pound					4/17/6	13.65			4/17/6	13.65
Netherlands	Dutch guilder					3934.17	[1] 1,094.65				[1] 1,094.65
Subtotal			70.30				1,134.80		59.12		1,264.22
Milton Eisenberg:											
Nigeria	Pound	17	48.00	7	20.00			2/2/5	6.00	26/2/5	74.00
Netherlands	Dutch guilder					3,496.96	973.00				973.00
Subtotal			48.00		20.00				6.00		1,047.00
Paul L. Laskin:											
France	Franc					5,438	1,109.74			5,438	1,109.74
Italy	Lire	47,330	76.20	21,000	33.82	3,870	6.23	10,800	17.40	83,000	133.65
Subtotal			76.20		33.82		1,115.97		17.40		1,243.39
Phyllis T. Piotrow:											
Germany	Deutsche mark	208.35	52.09	28.60	7.15	143	35.75	24.80	6.20	404.75	101.19
Italy	Lira	9,793	15.75	4,310	7.00	2,200	3.55	2,352	3.75	18,655	30.05
United Kingdom	Pound	18/1/10	50.65	2-2-10	6.00	1-19-6	5.55	1-4-11	3.50	23-9-1	65.70
Netherlands	Dutch guilder					2,425.95	[2] 675.00				[2] 675.00
Subtotal			118.49		20.15		719.85		13.45		871.94
Total			312.99		73.97		3,943.62		95.97		4,426.55

[1] Certain portions of this ticket were not used and refunds for such will be made by airlines.

[2] Ticket not used; amount will be refunded by airline.

RECAPITULATION

	Amount
Foreign currency (U.S. dollar equivalent)	4,426.55

JAMES O. EASTLAND,
Chairman, Committee on the Judiciary.

MARCH 8, 1963.

Report of expenditure of foreign currencies and appropriated funds by the Joint Economic Committee, U.S. Senate, expended between Jan. 1 and Dec. 31, 1962

Name and country	Name of currency	Lodging		Meals		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Hon. Martha W. Griffiths:											
Panama	Balboa	60	60.00	18.75	18.75			3	3.00	[1] 81.75	81.75
Costa Rica	Colón	350	52.60	203	30.50			145	21.80	[1] 698	104.90
Guatemala	Quetzal	18.40	18.40	13.55	13.55			5	5.00	[1] 36.95	36.95
Mexico	Peso	525	42.00	432	34.60	440.00	35.20	45.50	3.60	1,442.50	115.40
Netherlands	Guilder					1,513.8	420.50			1,513.8	420.50
Subtotal			173.00		97.40		455.70		33.40		759.50
Ann Cooper Penning:											
Panama	Balboa	60	60.00	16.70	16.70			3.35	3.35	[1] 80.05	80.05
Costa Rica	Colón	163.20	24.50	134.30	20.20			47	7.10	[1] 344.50	51.80
Guatemala	Quetzal	18.40	18.40	11.50	11.50			3	3.00	[1] 32.90	32.90
Mexico	Peso	525	42.00	420	33.60	365	29.20	37.90	3.10	1,347.90	107.90
West Germany	Deutsche mark					1,866	466.55			1,866	466.55
Subtotal			144.90		82,00		495.75		16.55		739.20
William H. Moore:											
Panama	Balboa	60	60.00	19.75	19.75			6	6.00	[1] 75.75	85.75
Costa Rica	Colón	163.20	24.50	126.20	19.00			45	6.90	[1] 334.50	50.40
Guatemala	Quetzal	18.40	18.40	13.50	13.50			6	6.00	[1] 37.90	37.90
Mexico	Peso	525	42.00	406	32.50	295	23.60	71	5.70	1,295	103.80
West Germany	Deutsche mark					1,866	466.50			1,866	466.50
Subtotal			144.90		84.75		490.10		24.60		744.35
Hon. Jacob K. Javits:											
Germany	Deutsche mark			60	15.00			40	10.00	100	25.00
Netherlands	Guilder					2,078.28	577.30			2,078.28	577.30
France	New franc			1,343.70	268.74					1,343.70	[2] 268.74
Total					283.74		577.30		10.00		871.04
Belle Notkin, France	do	615.65	125.64	474.50	96.83	195	39.80	230.50	47.05	1,515.65	309.32
Ettore Lolli,[3] Italy	Lira					125,000	201.29			125,000	201.29
Jurg Niehans,[3] Switzerland	Franc					4,411	1,019.64	119.75	27.69	4,530.75	1,047.33
Alan Day,[3] United Kingdom	Pound sterling	35-0-0	94.50	22-0-0	59.40	334-5-0	936.54	0-2-10	6.10	391-7-10	1,096.54
Subtotal			94.50		59.40		2,157.47		33.79		2,345.16

See footnote at end of table.

Report of expenditure of foreign currencies and appropriated funds by the Joint Economic Committee, U.S. Senate, expended between Jan. 1 and Dec. 31, 1962—Continued

Name and country	Name of currency	Lodging		Meals		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Harvey J. Winter:											
Italy	Lira	35,200	56.77	33,100	53.38	7,300	11.77	9,400	15.16	85,000	137.08
France	New franc	465	93.00	445	89.00	5,472.95	1,107.80	55	11.00	6,437.95	1,300.80
Subtotal			149.77		142.38		1,118.57		26.16		1,437.88
D. B. Hardeman:											
Netherlands	Guilder					4,818	1,340.82			4,818	1,340.82
Poland	Zloty	760	31.67	1,043	43.46			639	26.62	2,442	101.75
Yugoslavia	Dinar	60,425	90.57	33,820	45.09	39,405	52.54	16,350	21.80	150,000	200.00
Subtotal			112.24		88.55		1,393.36		48.42		1,642.57
Hon. Henry S. Reuss:											
France	New franc	350	70.00	215	43.00					565	113.00
Switzerland	Franc	195.50	48.88	85	21.25					280.50	70.13
Belgium	do					88	22.00			88	22.00
Subtotal			118.88		64.25		22.00				205.13
Harold A. Levin:											
Belgium	Franc	260	5.20	125	2.50	23	.46	100	2.00	508	10.16
England	Pound	10-10-9	29.49	3-7-9	9.47	0-10-0	1.40	0-7-6	1.04	15-16-0	44.20
West Germany	Deutsche mark	170.55	42.64	54.45	13.61	4,168.75	[4] 1,044.80			4,393.75	1,101.05
Subtotal			77.33		25.58		1,046.66		5.84		1,155.41
Thomas H. Boggs, Jr.:											
France	New franc	313.6	64.00	362.6	74.00	65	13.27	58.8	12.00	800	163.27
Italy	Lira	25,900	41.11	32,130	51.00	5,040	8.00	6,930	11.00	70,000	111.11
Germany	Deutsche mark					4,921	1,224.00			4,921	1,224.00
Subtotal			105.11		125.00		1,245.27		23.00		1,498.38
Philip Patman:											
Belgium and Luxembourg	Franc	3,040	60.80	4,120	82.40	2,661	53.20	420	8.40	10,241	204.80
Germany	Deutsche mark	285	71.25	360	90.00	5,810.66	1,381.20	100	25.00	6,556.66	1,567.45
Austria	Schilling	1,560	60.00	1,325	50.95	105	4.00	310	11.95	3,300	126.90
Greece	Drachma	1,755	58.50	1,680	56.00	155	5.15	410	13.70	4,000	133.35
Italy	Lira	24,800	39.35	30,250	48.00	3,850	6.15	6,100	9.65	65,000	103.15
France	New franc	641	130.80	535	109.20	204	41.65	60	12.20	1,440	293.85
Subtotal			420.70		436.55		1,491.35		80.90		2,429.50
W. Andrew Carothers, Jr.:											
Belgium	Franc	3,950	79.00	4,400	88.00	900	18.00	355	7.10	9,605	192.10
France	New franc	724	147.75	552	112.65	348	71.02	196	40.00	1,820	371.42
West Germany	Deutsche mark	364	91.00	408	102.00	6,126.66	1,437.20	125	31.25	7,023.66	1,661.45
Greece	Drachma	1,755	58.50	1,595	53.17	650	21.66	500	16.67	4,500	150.00
Italy	Lira	25,000	39.66	32,000	50.78	5,800	9.20	7,200	11.48	70,000	111.12
Turkey	do	360	40.00	415	46.11	97	10.77	128	14.23	1,000	111.11
Subtotal			455.91		452.71		1,567.85		120.73		2,597.20
Robert G. Williams:											
Luxembourg and Belgium	Belgian franc	4,843	96.80	5,000	100.00	776	15.52			10,619	212.32
West Germany	Deutsche mark	465.39	116.34	500	124.60	6,100.75	1,532.85	74.61	18.65	7,140.75	1,792.44
Austria	Schilling	1,361.30	51.40	1,639	63.35	300	11.55			3,300	126.30
Greece	Drachma	1,117	37.25	1,483	49.41			400	13.34	3,000	100.00
Italy	Lira	27,520	44.70	43,070	69.00	9,470	15.50	95.70	15.50	90,000	144.70
France	New franc	298.20	81.23	500.20	102.08	6,180	12.44	40	8.16	1,000	203.91
Subtotal			427.72		508.44		1,587.86		55.65		2,579.67
Vernon A. Mund:											
Belgium and Luxembourg	Belgian franc	4,800	96.00	5,900	118.00	1,273	44.52	2,200	44.00	14,757	302.52
Germany	Deutsche mark	384	96.00	384	96.00	7,016	1,664.70	382	95.00	8,166	1,951.70
Austria	Schilling	1,600	61.80	1,600	61.80			1,800	69.50	5,000	193.10
Greece	Drachma	2,250	75.00	2,050	68.00			1,100	36.00	5,400	179.00
Italy	Lira	30,000	48.39	35,000	56.45			35,000	56.45	100,000	161.29
France	New franc	490	100.00	441	90.00			169	34.00	1,100	224.00
Subtotal			477.19		490.25		1709.22		334.95		3,011.61

---

[1] Purchased with Mexican pesos.

[2] Represents cost of luncheon meeting of the NATO Parliamentarians' Economic Committee, of which Senator Javits is Chairman, at Pavillon Dauphine in Paris.

[3] Witnesses brought to United States to testify at hearings.

[4] Less unused portion of ticket.

RECAPITULATION

	Amount
Foreign currency (U.S. dollar equivalent)	22,325.92

PAUL H. DOUGLAS,
Chairman, Joint Economic Committee.

MARCH 8, 1963.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
JOINT ECONOMIC COMMITTEE,
March 8, 1963.

Hon. CARL HAYDEN,
Chairman, Committee on Appropriations, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR HAYDEN: In conformity with section 502(b) of the Mutual Security Act, enclosed is the report on foreign currencies expended under authorization of the Joint Economic Committee for the period January 1–December 31, 1962.

These expenditures were authorized by the chairman of the Joint Economic Committee who held that office during the 87th Congress.

Faithfully,

PAUL H. DOUGLAS,
Chairman.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. ENGLE:

S. 1053. A bill to amend chapter 79 of title 10, United States Code, to provide that certain boards established thereunder shall give consideration to satisfactory evidence relating to good character and exemplary conduct in civilian life after discharge or dismissal in determining whether or not to correct certain discharges and dismissals; to authorize the award of an Exemplary Rehabilitation Certificate; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 1054. A bill for the relief of William Radkovich Co., Inc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCOTT:

S. 1055. A bill for the relief of Jack Baer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOUGLAS:

S. 1056. A bill to amend section 4071 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. EASTLAND (for himself and Mr. Hruska):

S. 1057. A bill to promote the cause of criminal justice by providing for the representation of defendants who are financially unable to obtain an adequate defense in criminal cases in the courts of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. NEUBERGER:

S. 1058. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act, as amended, with respect to survivor annuities; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

(See the remarks of Mrs. Neuberger when she introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. CARLSON:

S. 1059. A bill to provide for the establishment of the Old Fort Hays National Historic Site in the State of Kansas; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. Carlson when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. DOMINICK:

S. 1060. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Annie Yang; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCOTT (for himself and Mr. Clark):

S.J. Res. 58. Joint resolution establishing a commission to participate in the 100th anniversary of the Battle of Gettysburg and the 100th anniversary of Lincoln's Gettysburg Address; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. Scott when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

CONCURRENT RESOLUTIONS

TO PRINT, WITH ILLUSTRATIONS, A "REPORT ON U.S. FOREIGN OPERATIONS," BY SENATOR ALLEN J. ELLENDER

Mr. ELLENDER submitted the following concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 29); which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there be printed, with illustrations, as a Senate document, a report entitled "A Report on United States Foreign Operations in Africa", submitted by Senator Allen J. Ellender to the Senate Committee on Appropriations and that four thousand additional copies be printed for the use of that Committee.

TO REPRINT COMMITTEE PRINT, 87TH CONGRESS, ENTITLED "PART 1 OF CONCENTRATION RATIOS IN MANUFACTURING INDUSTRY, 1958"

Mr. KEFAUVER, from the Committee on the Judiciary, reported an original concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 30) to reprint copies of the committee print, 87th Congress, entitled "Part 1 of Concentration Ratios in Manufacturing Industry, 1958," which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

(See the above concurrent resolution printed in full when reported by Mr. Kefauver, which appears under the heading "Reports of Committees.")

RESOLUTION

APPOINTMENT AS MEMBERS OF JOINT COMMITTEE ON PRINTING AND JOINT COMMITTEE OF CONGRESS ON THE LIBRARY

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 107) providing for members on the part of the Senate of the Joint Committee on Printing and the Joint Committee of Congress on the Library, which was placed on the calendar.

(See the above resolution printed in full when reported by Mr. Jordan of North Carolina, which appears under the heading "Report of a Committee.")

LIBERALIZATION NEEDED IN CIVIL SERVICE RETIREMENT SURVIVORSHIP

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, Congress in 1948 wisely provided survivorship benefits for those retired under the Civil Service Retirement Act. This was an important step forward. Last year Congress liberalized the survivorship formula so as to decrease the reduction in annuitants' retirement in order to provide for survivors. Health benefits have also been extended to eligible survivors.

One of the serious weaknesses of the survivorship program is that when a person retires with a reduced annuity with a survivorship annuity provision, the survivorship provision covers only benefits for the spouse living at the time of retirement. If this spouse should die prior to the death of the annuitant, there is no way in which survivorship benefits, under present law, can be extended to a new husband or wife. This is indeed cruel, and creates extreme hardship in many cases.

I have received heart-rending letters from all parts of the country pointing out this hardship situation. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to include at this point in my remarks just two of the many recent letters I have received.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Hackettstown, N.J.,
January 28, 1963.

Senator Maurine B. Neuberger,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Neuberger: I enjoyed reading your comments on retirement legislation in the January issue of Retirement Life magazine. We are deeply grateful for the interest you have taken and the bills you have introduced to benefit us.

My former husband, who served as a letter carrier for 39 years, died in 1940. In 1958 I received a monthly pension of $50, granted to the "forgotten widows." I lost my annuity when I remarried in 1960.

My present husband, a retired letter carrier, who served 33 years, designated his former wife for survivor benefits. He is still receiving a reduced pension even though she predeceased him.

My husband feels that since he is paying for survivor benefits, and since I gave up survivor benefits when I remarried, that he should be able to name me as his beneficiary and thus provide for me in the event of his death. This, I know would give him peace of mind.

I hope this session of Congress will pass a bill to solve this problem. I waited 18 years for the "forgotten widows" bill to pass. Now I don't have that much time left.

Again, may I say we are deeply grateful for your efforts in our behalf. Somehow, I feel that when the sunset of your life rolls around, you will be blessed for your kindness to us.

Very truly yours,

Charlotte A. Geis.

Spartansburg, S.C.,
January 7, 1963.

Hon. Maurine B. Neuberger,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Neuberger: I was deeply interested in the reproduction of your recent address to the Portland, Oreg., chapter of retired civil employees, which appeared in the January issue of Retirement Life magazine. It was especially interesting to read what you had to say relative to survivorship provisions.

My husband and I were married 10 years ago, 1953, and I am his second wife, and we were married after his retirement. His first wife was designated as his beneficiary and since her death he has been paying on his first wife, as beneficiary, since his retirement on February 1, 1950, and will have to continue to pay under the present law.

I am sure that there are similar cases such as mine and it would be most helpful to thousands of retirees if this injustice could be corrected. We appreciate all that you have done, and are doing for retirees. We are also grateful to you for the assistance given in the last raise of 5 percent; however, it would have been more helpful toward the high cost of living had your more liberal bill been passed.

Wishing you much success in all of your undertakings in the 88th Congress,

Very truly yours,

Nanna P. Harrison.

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I am introducing today proposed legislation to alleviate this hardship situation. My bill provides that an annuitant retired on a reduced annuity with a survivor annuity may, in the event of death or divorce of his spouse and remarriage continuing for at least 2 years, designate the second wife or husband to receive survivor annuity benefits. I realized that more liberal bills have been introduced previously, and while they have merit they have failed of enactment. I am aware that my bill is more restrictive, but because of the reduced cost involved I am hopeful that it will stand a good chance of favorable consideration.

Other governmental retirement laws such as social security and railroad retirement do provide adequately for survivorship, without the restrictions imposed by the civil service retirement system. It is my hope that Congress will give favorable consideration to liberalizing the survivorship provisions along the lines which exist in social security and railroad retirement.

Under present law when an annuitant retires and provides survivorship benefits by taking a reduced annuity, the reduced annuity remains in force even though the spouse precedes in death and no benefits are derived from survivorship reduction.

As a member of the President's Commission on the Status of Women, I feel that present civil service survivor provisions are unduly restrictive and primarily cause grievous injury to widows, who are oftentimes left destitute in old age. I ask Congress to extend simple justice to our retired Federal employees by liberalizing the survivorship provisions.

Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act as amended with respect to survivor annuities.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. NELSON in the chair). The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1058) to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act, as amended, with respect to survivor annuities, introduced by Mrs. NEUBERGER, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

DESIGNATION OF THE KANSAS HISTORICAL PARK AS A NATIONAL HISTORIC SITE

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, the formation and development of the Midwest and West of the United States produced many shining examples of bravery and heroism. Kansas, the center of the United States, played a most important part in this development.

Its brilliant history resplendent in courage, stamina, and character helped to make it a great State—and this a great Nation. Many of the great historical events in the development of our country took place within the boundaries of Kansas. I sincerely believe some of the events and the sites upon which they happened should be memorialized and preserved for future generations.

One of these is Old Fort Hays, Kans.

Established in 1867, Fort Hays played an important role in the opening of the West to settlement and to the building of the Kansas Pacific Railroad across the Plains country. It was one of the last important outposts established for protection of railroad workers and settlers from the Indians who inhabited the Plains.

Many of the famous military men who had fought in the Civil War were stationed here: General Philip Sheridan; General Forsyth; General Armstrong Custer; the famous 7th Cavalry unit and many famous officers of lesser rank. The fort was active for 22 years and in 1889 was abandoned because, it was said, the West had become civilized and there was no longer danger from foes within the Nation.

Two buildings, the famous Block House and the Guard House, both constructed in 1867 of native sandstone, are still in perfect state of preservation and attract tourist attention continuously. The Block House was the headquarters building when the fort was active.

Two highways intersect at the corner of the reservation, U.S. 40 and 183, and there is a constant flow of visitors to the reservation. The story of the fort is known across the Nation and it attracts general attention. In 3 months' time last summer when the Old Fort Hays Museum, in the Block House, was open, more than 19,000 visitors registered. They were from both coasts and many foreign countries. These buildings are now a part of the Kansas Frontier Historical Park. I believe it should be made a national center of interest to all people. Therefore, Mr. President, I am introducing, for appropriate referral, a bill which would designate the Kansas Historical Park as a national historic site.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1059) to provide for the establishment of the Old Fort Hays National Historic Site in the State of Kansas, introduced by Mr. CARLSON, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

COMMISSION TO PARTICIPATE IN 100TH ANNIVERSARY OF BATTLE OF GETTYSBURG AND LINCOLN'S GETTYSBURG ADDRESS

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, this year Americans everywhere will observe the centennial of the Battle of Gettysburg and the centennial of Lincoln's Gettysburg Address, two of the most important events in our Nation's history.

I am offering a bill today that would authorize the President to appoint a commission of 10 persons to cooperate with the commission appointed by Governor Scranton, of Pennsylvania, to plan and carry out the ceremonies relating to those events. It also would authorize the Secretaries of the Army, Navy, and Air Force to provide for the participation of the armed services in the observances.

The State of Pennsylvania has already allocated $105,000 for use by the State commission and this bill authorizes up to $150,000 for Federal participation.

My senior colleague from Pennsylvania, Senator CLARK, is cosponsoring this bill, and Congressman GEORGE A. GOODLING, of Pennsylvania, is introducing an identical measure in the House.

Although the center of activity for these observances is in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, the Battle of Gettysburg and Lincoln's address at the battlefield are integral parts of American history. I am hopeful that the Congress will recognize the great national interest in these events and act favorably on this bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 58) establishing a commission to participate in the 100th anniversary of the Battle of Gettysburg and the 100th anniversary of Lincoln's Gettysburg Address, introduced by Mr. SCOTT (for himself and Mr. CLARK), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

APPOINTMENTS BY THE VICE PRESIDENT

The PRESIDING OFFICER. In behalf of the Vice President the Chair announces the appointment of the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. McINTYRE] to be a delegate to the Mexican parliamentary meeting, in place of the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS]; and also the appointment of the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MILLER] in place of the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT] to the same meeting.

Also, on behalf of the Vice President, and pursuant to the provisions of section I of Public Law 87-883, the Chair announces the appointment as members of the Battle of Lake Erie Sesquicentennial Celebration Commission, the following Senators: LAUSCHE and YOUNG, of Ohio, KEATING, of New York, and SCOTT, of Pennsylvania.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILLS

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, it had been the belief of the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN] and me that I was a cosponsor of Senate bill 287, placing the transport industries under the antitrust laws, and Senate bill 288, prohibiting strikes at missile sites, but making provision for compulsory arbitration.

An examination of the RECORD shows we were both mistaken in that belief.

Having obtained the consent of the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN] to become a cosponsor of both bills, I ask unanimous consent that my name be added to the bills as a cosponsor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LAUSCHE. I yield.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I wish to thank the distinguished Senator from Ohio. We are very happy to have his support of these measures. I think they are important. I think they are measures which this Congress should act on. I do not think we can continue indifferently and permit some conditions that exist now in the labor-management field. I think both of these measures are necessary for the Congress to meet its responsibilities in meeting the problems involved. I thank the Senator for his support and great concern in this field.

ASSISTANCE TO STATES IN FISHERY RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS—ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILL

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at its next printing, the names of the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BREWSTER] be added as cosponsors to my bill S. 627, which will assist States in their fishery research development programs.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

By Mr. RANDOLPH:

Article entitled "U.S. and Burma Reach Accord in Working Road to Mandalay," appearing in the Washington (D.C.) Post of March 8, 1963; also, an adaptation by Senator ERNEST GRUENING, of Alaska, of Kipling's poem, "On the Road to Mandalay."

PROBLEMS OF SECRETARY OF DEFENSE

Mr. **MANSFIELD.** Mr. President, in the March issue of Armed Forces Management appears an excellent editorial on the current problems which confront the Secretary of Defense and the manner in which he has gone about dealing with them.

No job in this Government—other than the Presidency—is more complex or more taxing than that of Secretary of Defense. Secretary McNamara has been exceptional in discharging its responsibilities. As is to be expected of anyone in public office, he is subjected from time to time to criticism. But as Secretary of Defense he has to look at defense from every angle, and at the total cost of defense in juxtaposition with the total problem of defense. He cannot afford the luxury of putting on blinders and not considering all aspects of defense and all elements in its cost. And let me say that we, as a Nation, cannot afford that luxury, either.

It is for that reason, Mr. President, that I was struck by this editorial. It provides some understanding of the immense scope of the Secretary's current organizational tasks, and a well-balanced evaluation of the way in which he is trying—with great dedication—to discharge them.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THIS HORRENDOUS STATE OF AFFAIRS

Packs of nasty little academic debates have been scurrying around military circles, and even beyond, recently over a tongue-twisting polysyllable mouthful called the "trend to centralization of decisionmaking authority" in the Pentagon.

While we sympathize with the subjective reasons for this fretting, we find little objective fact to support the argument that McNamara's mailed fist is creating in the ranks, all by itself, a truly horrendous state of affairs.

Having just finished an analysis of the 15-year evolution in how the Defense Department has been run, we are convinced today's apprehensive palaver (that "the trend" must be reversed) is largely overloaded with nonsense.

Part of the complainer's difficulty comes from their being forced to view the total national defense need from somewhere below the top level. Properly, but unfortunately for their peace of mind, the nature of the challenge and of the resources we have to meet it can be evaluated best only from Defense Secretary McNamara's office—and this would be so, incidentally, whether he or someone else was warming the chair.

On top of that, the cause of good personnel relations is boosted little when the job itself is such that a new Secretary, whether he wants to or not, must operate not unlike, interestingly enough, Boston Celtics Basketball Coach Red Auerbach. Said Auerbach recently, describing why his ball club has for years been so successful, "They [the team] must adjust to me. I don't have to adjust to them."

It is hardly surprising then that McNamara faces a raft of internal communications problems. The manned bomber force is being told it has precious little life expectancy left. The fleets are under serious challenge to prove they have any mission worth their expense. The Army is struggling with an organizational shakeup greater than anything it has faced in recent history.

Drop into that environment a hard-driving leader who analyzes problems and options with cold, unemotional logic and makes rapid-fire decisions based on cost-effectiveness facts—all of which are changing drastically the former decisionmaking routine of the services—and some human turmoil is bound to result.

Significantly, much of the chatter has cropped up at budget hearing time on Capitol Hill. Thus Pentagon veterans write about 20 percent of the talk off to "Gamesmanship," that grand old military art of setting the proper congressional stage for stating why a particular program should be given by the legislators better than it got from its own military review.

Not that the Secretary's office is executing its decisions these days with unchallengeable excellence. Its sledgehammer implementation in some very detailed areas has caused considerable consternation; discouraged all but the most courageous crusaders from responding to a key McNamara philosophy (printed in AFM 2 years ago) that he expected "prompt decisions from Defense personnel who accepted responsibility and did not seek excessive advice."

But translating philosophy into procedure in as complex a setup as Defense takes quite a while. Until McNamara closes the large-sized information gap which exists, particularly at the working military level, over who is supposed to do what and why, he will probably have to continue to make many decisions on details. (The fact that they haven't bogged him down so far is a break for the rest of the organization.)

However, this understandable lag in awareness has been twisted around lately by some incomprehensible thought process into a set of qualifying credentials for criticizing McNamara. Even more ridiculous: he's being charged, basically, not with incompetence but with having the audacity to do what the law says he's supposed to do—run the Defense Department.

If you inspect the record, it is clear that most, if not all, the barbs being thrown at McNamara accuse him of doing today what a Defense Secretary was being chastized for not doing just 3 years ago.

Understandably, observers who don't have their emotions all jangled up in this debate are considerably confused by the flip-flop nature of the protagonists' new viewpoint, find few facts to support it and know many facts that don't.

For instance, this ridiculous business that he ignores his professional military leaders' views, apart from being an incredibly suspect charge on the face of it, ignores a couple key points:

1. McNamara is pushing programs which were not that popular before. The reason, said one general, "There have been too many problems critical to the total national defense interest which we and the other services, with limited resources and our own rating of mission priority, could only be half interested in before."

2. His highly skeptical questioning of service statements on new weapons has soured a lot of military types but considering the current, generally poor military track record for estimating hardware cost, development time, and performance, he can hardly be blamed for that.

Unless this complaining is allowed to well up into a crusade, we have little doubt that the internal hassle over decisionmaking will ease off eventually if (1) McNamara and his team stick with the job another couple years and (2) all levels—McNamara's immediate staff, the service staffs, the field installations—bend over backward a little to view problems as seen by the rest of the outfit.

To nurture understanding (which in final analysis is the only real problem) will require the highest kind of statesmanship. But we can hardly expect much progress when reasonable, responsible people are tangled instead in a distracting separatist argument full of high-flown theorizing and ghostly managerial abstractions which have no fact-supported substance except in their own minds.

C. W. BORKLUND.

ADMINISTRATION POLICY OF CONCEALING INFORMATION FROM THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

Mr. **WILLIAMS** of Delaware. Mr. President, this administration is adopting a policy of concealing from the American people far too much information which has no bearing on our security. It is becoming a habit to conceal waste of the taxpayers' money, under the stamp of a confidential or secret classification.

Today, I call the attention of the Senate to a typical example of unnecessary secrecy. Under date of February 15, 1963, the Comptroller General of the United States submitted to the President of the Senate and to the Speaker of the House of Representatives a report in which the first paragraph reads as follows:

COMPTROLLER GENERAL OF THE
UNITED STATES,
Washington, D.C., February 15, 1963.

To the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives:

Enclosed is our report on the review of license fees being charged the U.S. Government for the right to produce the SS-11 antitank guided missile mutually developed by France and the United States under the mutual weapons development program.

The report then proceeds to describe an expenditure of several million dollars, which should have been wholly unnecessary had the Department been exercising the proper degree of caution in the administration of previous programs.

All of this information, however, is marked "confidential." Under this formula the information is for the use of the committee members only, and is not to be repeated to the American people.

I should emphasize that my criticism here today is not directed against the Comptroller General, since it is my understanding that he does not have the jurisdiction of releasing information which is classified as confidential by the

Department of Defense or the State Department.

The final paragraph of this report, however, is "unclassified," and it reads as follows:

> Copies of this report are being sent to the President of the United States, the Secretary of Defense, and the Secretary of the Army.
>
> Joseph Campbell,
> *Comptroller General of the United States.*

These two paragraphs—the first and the last paragraph of the report—are the only ones which are not classified.

Mr. President, I do not blame the Department for being ashamed of these unnecessary expenditures, but I disagree completely with their right to keep the information from the American people.

THE COAST GUARD SHOULD NOT BE THE ATTORNEY GENERAL'S PRIVATE GUARD

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, today I wish to discuss a new policy of the Kennedy administration under which the Attorney General of the United States has commandeered the U.S. Coast Guard to act as his special nursemaid when sailing his sloop on the Chesapeake Bay. He is demanding this special attention even to the extent of having the Coast Guard ignore calls from other boats in distress.

The U.S. Coast Guard has over the years established an enviable record in protecting the lives and safeguarding the property of those in distress. It has always been the rule of the Coast Guard that people in distress would be helped, without regard to their social or political position.

With this historical background of service, it is with regret that I find that in the present administration there are those who have taken it upon themselves to order the Coast Guard to give special protection to them and their friends, even to the point of ignoring a distress call from others.

This new policy was forcibly called to my attention when a constituent who was cruising in the Chesapeake Bay last October 14 had his motor stall, and appealed to the Coast Guard for assistance. Utilizing his two-way radio, this man called the Tilghman Island Light Attendant Station, and asked for assistance.

His message was intercepted by the Coast Guard auxiliary boat which was cruising in the area. The Coast Guard cutter soon arrived alongside the boat in distress, and the one in charge discussed its problem, but stated that he was unable to render any assistance, due to the fact that he was under special orders to trail the yacht or sailing sloop of the Attorney General of the United States around the bay, just in case his boat developed some trouble. He left after telling the man in the broken down boat that he would try to send someone else to help.

The result was that the man and his party were left with a stalled motor, to await assistance from some other source, which hours later came from a private company which towed them to port.

Adm. E. J. Roland, Commandant of the U.S. Coast Guard, has confirmed that the reason for this was that orders had been received the week before, from the Attorney General's office, instructing that the Coast Guard make arrangements to provide communication with the yacht *Honya*, which would be sailing on Chesapeake Bay during the 13th and 14th with the Attorney General of the United States on board.

Based on this request, *CG–40572*, from Tilghman Island Light Station, was assigned the special mission of surveillance of the *Honya*, the Attorney General's sailing yacht, on October 14. It was while the Coast Guard cutter was carrying out this special assignment that a boat in distress was ignored and was left to wait and hope for assistance from some other source.

It is true that the weather was calm and clear at the time; so, in the absence of any sudden squall, the boat was in no danger; but this is all the more reason why the Attorney General did not need an escort.

Neither the Attorney General of the United States nor any other member of the President's Cabinet nor any Member of Congress has any right to order that the services of the Coast Guard be devoted to his exclusive protection.

It was highly improper for the Attorney General, even though he is a brother of the President of the United States, to allow the Coast Guard to disregard a boat which was in distress, just to trail him around as a special nursemaid.

This administration has said much about businessmen who charge off on their expense accounts the cost of operation of their yachts. But in my opinion it is even worse for an official of the U.S. Government to charge to the American taxpayers the expense of having a Coast Guard cutter operate exclusively just to trail his own yacht around the Chesapeake Bay.

It has always been the responsibility of the Coast Guard to patrol these waters and to stand ready to assist anyone in distress; and over the years they have established an enviable record in that connection.

I am not criticizing the Commandant of the Coast Guard; I appreciate the position in which he found himself when he received such orders from the brother of the President of the United States. But I sincerely hope that in the future he will instruct the Attorney General—who should know the law—that he is not entitled to any consideration different from that accorded any other boating party cruising in the area.

We all recognize that the President of the United States and the immediate members of his family do, and very properly should, have special protection. No one takes exception to that point, but I doubt that even he would ask the Coast Guard to ignore a boat in trouble.

Not only do I very much regret that this incident happened, from the standpoint of the unnecessary inconvenience to my constituent, but this incident is even more regrettable from the standpoint of the embarrassing position in which it placed the Coast Guard.

I sincerely hope that in the future the Attorney General will be more discreet.

At this point I ask unanimous consent that a letter signed by Adm. E. J. Roland, Commandant of the U.S. Coast Guard, confirming these special arrangements, be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

December 14, 1962.

Hon. John J. Williams,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Williams: This is in further reply to your letter of October 22, 1962, concerning the failure of the Coast Guard to assist Mr. ———, of Wilmington, Del., when he requested them to do so.

I have received a full report of this matter from the commander, 5th Coast Guard District. This report discloses that the Attorney General's Office requested the Coast Guard to make arrangements in case of emergency to provide communications with the yacht *Honya*, which would be sailing on Chesapeake Bay during October 13 and 14, 1962, with the Attorney General of the United States on board. Based on this request, the *CG–40572* from Tilghman Island Light Attendant Station (rescue) was assigned the mission of surveillance of the *Honya* to provide communications as necessary on October 14.

At about 1445 hours the *Helen R* is reported to have called for Coast Guard assistance on 2182 kilocycles. This signal was not received by the Tilghman Island station. However, it was heard by the Coast Guard auxiliary boat *Black Jack III*, which immediately relayed the call to the Tilghman Island station. The Tilghman Island station was unable to contact the *Helen R* directly, therefore the *Black Jack III* acted as a relay station and forwarded the necessary information to Tilghman Island station. The Tilghman Island station then notified the *CG–40572* on 2702 kilocycles that the *Helen R* was anchored off Wade Point with engine trouble. The *CG–40572*, which was en route to the *Honya*, at this time, proceeded to the *Helen R* to investigate.

At 1455 hours the *CG–40572* arrived alongside the *Helen R* which was safely anchored and in no immediate danger. The weather at the time was clear with light airs and a calm sea. The coxswain of the *CG–40572*, because of his assigned surveillance duties, called the Baltimore group commander and advised him of the circumstances and conditions. The group commander, when advised of the situation, called the Tidewater Fisheries Service and inquired if that organization could provide assistance to the *Helen R*. The group commander was advised that the Tidewater Fisheries patrol boat at St. Michaels, Tilghman Island, could provide the necessary assistance and would get underway immediately.

In view of the fact that the *Helen R* was in no danger and that the Tidewater Fisheries vessel would take her in tow, the *CG–40572* was ordered to proceed on its assigned mission. This information was given by radio to the *CG–40572* and the coxswain of the boat advised Mr. ——— that a Tidewater Fisheries vessel had been called to tow them in. The Tidewater Fisheries patrol boat got underway at approximately 1520 hours and arrived alongside the *Helen R* at about 1600 hours. It towed the *Helen R* into Claiborne Harbor, arriving there at approximately 1630 hours.

From the investigative report, it does not appear that the safety of the *Helen R* was jeopardized by waiting for the Tidewater Fisheries boat. However, it does appear that a clear understanding of the actions of the crew of the *CG–40572* and the Coast Guard in calling for assistance for the *Helen R* was not fully made known to Mr. ———.

Sincerely yours,

E. J. Roland,
Admiral, U.S. Coast Guard,
Commandant.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware subsequently said: Mr. President, earlier today I called the attention of the Senate to an incident that happened last October in which the Attorney General of the United States had ordered the Coast Guard to follow him around and act as a nursemaid for his yacht during a little sailing cruise in the Chesapeake Bay. Since I made my statement the Attorney General has issued a statement, which I should like to read:

> In a statement, Kennedy's office said the Attorney General "took the normal precautions that any boatowner would do and advised the Coast Guard of his proposed course." The statement said Kennedy's "only request of the Coast Guard was 'that they be able to locate him in the event of an emergency.'" It said the Attorney General had no knowledge of any boat in trouble and found it strange that WILLIAMS would put out 5 months later "this distorted version of the incident."

First I answer the Attorney General as to why it took me 5 months to develop the facts. The answer is very simple—I do not have the entire FBI at my disposal where I can order them out in the middle of the night to interview prospective witnesses.

I understand that in his reply the Attorney General also pointed out the fact that the incident occurred in a period in which there was a grave crisis with Cuba. Presumably this was an argument to support his ordering the Coast Guard to stand by.

I wish to keep the record straight for the Attorney General, whose memory apparently slipped. The report which I put in the RECORD was confirmed by the Commandant of the Coast Guard himself, who said that during the week before the Attorney General took his October 13 and 14 cruise, which was on a Saturday and Sunday, his office had been called and asked to stand by for surveillance of the yacht of the Attorney General, which would be cruising in the bay on those dates.

I understand that the Attorney General now claims that one of the reasons he had his office call was that he was inexperienced in sailing. I recognize the danger of sailing when one is inexperienced, but that fact would not give the Attorney General the right to take over the Coast Guard and ask them to trail him around. On that same day the Coast Guard had to bypass a vessel that was in trouble.

As to the Attorney General's reference to a crisis at that time in Cuba, I am glad to know that he has belatedly recognized the crisis, but he certainly must not have known anything about it on this particular occasion because this trip took place on the 13th and 14th of October. He called the Commandant of the Coast Guard and set up the arrangements a day or two before, but based upon the statement of the President of the United States as made to the country on October 22, the President himself did not receive any information about the real problem in Cuba until October 16, which was Tuesday morning. So unless the Attorney General of the United States knew more about the fact that Russia had offensive weapons in Cuba than did the President of the United States or his Secretary of Defense he certainly cannot use that as any excuse.

On October 22, the President said:

> Upon receiving the first preliminary hard information of this nature last Tuesday morning at 9 a.m., I directed that our surveillance be stepped up. And having now confirmed and completed our evaluation of the evidence and our decision on a course of action, this Government feels obliged to report this new crisis to you in full detail.

That is a quotation from the President's speech to the country on October 22. The Tuesday to which he referred was October 16.

Furthermore, Secretary of Defense McNamara, in his press conference on Tuesday, October 23, said:

> The first evidence, the first hard evidence was received by me at 10 p.m. a week ago last night and was presented to the President at 9 o'clock Tuesday morning. This was the first hard evidence giving any indication, and that was but partial of the movement of offensive weapons into Cuba.

Here we find the Secretary of Defense saying he knew nothing about the buildup in Cuba with offensive weapons until 10 p.m., Monday evening, which was October 15. The President was advised, based upon both statements, the following Tuesday morning at 9 a.m.

But we now find the Attorney General, who was cruising in the Chesapeake Bay on the Saturday and Sunday before, using this crisis as an excuse for having the Coast Guard stand by. Either the administration was kidding somebody then, or he is kidding them now.

I flatly refuse to accept any such excuse.

I wish to make the record very clear that I still think this was an arrogant usurpation of power by the Attorney General. By what line of reasoning does he think that when he takes a cruise on the Chesapeake Bay he has the authority to order a Coast Guard cutter in service to trail him around just in case he might have trouble when at the same time other boats which may be in trouble would be bypassed.

Mr. President, I should like to read from the letter written by the man who was left drifting around the Bay on that particular day. The letter states:

> DEAR SIR: I recently had an experience that I believe will be of interest to all boatowners. Five of us went out fishing in Eastern Bay, a branch of the Chesapeake, on Sunday afternoon, October 14. Due to an oversight, the marina that installed a new engine last spring failed to place a resistor in line with the coil. The overburdened article finally burned out when we were approximately one-half mile offshore from Claiborne Harbor. We tried to signal some passing yachts without success, so I finally called the Coast Guard at Tilghmans Island. To my surprise a boat, *Black Jack III*, answered my call saying I could not get through to the Coast Guard but that they would relay my message. This was very unusual. I had never heard of a situation in which the Coast Guard Station could not be reached by radio using the emergency frequency, unless some disaster had rendered their communications system inoperable. However, even more unusual things were to follow.
>
> We gave our description, location, number of passengers and nature of our trouble to *Black Jack III*, who called back in a few minutes to inform us the Coast Guard boat would be along shortly. After 20 minutes had elapsed, we sighted the Coast Guard 40 footer across Eastern Bay and signalled to him. When he came along side, the skipper informed us that he could not help us then because he had to watch the "Secretary General" who was taking a sail. He hung around for a few minutes about 50 feet away and we could hear him across the water talking with someone on the radio describing our boat.
>
> Without any further word, he left and followed a sloop of about 30 feet that was taking a leisurely sail back and forth across Eastern Bay. We watched until both boats were completely out of sight beyond Poplar Island.
>
> Two and one-half hours later, a Maryland Tidewater Fisheries boat came by and asked if we were broken down. They very courteously gave us a tow into Claiborne harbor which took between 5 and 10 minutes. There we found a mechanic who quickly installed a new coil and we were finally on our way again. The skipper of the fisheries boat informed us that Bobby Kennedy was taking a sail that afternoon in Eastern Bay.
>
> There are some implications in this incident that bother me a great deal. Perhaps my background is partially to blame for my concern. I was born and raised on the North Carolina coast. There the life saving service had its origin and subsequently was expanded into the U.S. Coast Guard. The men in that service were the heroes in our section. They were the ones who willingly risked their lives to give assistance to boats in distress. They never refused, regardless of the conditions. They were always on call.
>
> Now I wonder what has been done to that wonderful organization? Has it become a political football to be used as a private babysitter for political appointees? Of one thing we can be sure. Someone ordered that Coast Guard boat to follow Bobby Kennedy. They did not close down a whole Coast Guard station on their own initiative. Who issued such an order and from where came the authority to do so? What would have happened if a real emergency had occurred and the skipper tried in vain to reach a Coast Guard station that was not monitoring the emergency channel?
>
> As I mentioned previously, I am bothered and I believe a number of the boating fraternity will be also.
>
> Sincerely,
>
> —— ——.

Mr. President, certainly the Attorney General did not know the week before that he was going to break down on the following Sunday. If he did, he should have stayed in the harbor. Furthermore, he cannot say that he was out in the bay at a time when there was fear of a Cuban crisis. If there was he should have been in Washington attending to his business.

In addition, I should like to know how he knew so much about what would happen in Cuba the following week, when the President of the United States and the Secretary of Defense disclaimed any knowledge until the following week as to what was happening.

I still think that what occurred was an arrogant action on the part of the Attorney General. I hope he will be more discreet in the future.

HIGHER INTEREST RATES NO SOLUTION TO BALANCE-OF-PAYMENTS DIFFICULTIES

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, one of the difficulties of the proposed tax cut is bound to be an adverse effect on our international balance of payments, which is already adverse. That is true because the increase in spending at home is sure to increase imports. At the same time testimony before the Joint Economic Committee by economic experts is that a tax cut would also be likely to increase costs and prices, which would decrease our exports. The administration has proposed that one way to counteract this tendency would be to increase interest rates in order to encourage investment of capital in our country. Such a procedure has many weaknesses and difficulties.

I was very much impressed by the fact that the Wall Street Journal, which has been consistently in favor of high interest rates, published this morning an article by the able and accomplished commentator George Shea on that very issue. Mr. Shea points out that the great difficulties involved in trying to improve our balance-of-payment situation by increasing interest rates. He suggests that such action aimed primarily at short-term interest rates would be sure to increase long-term interest rates and tend to slow down the economy. That position was corroborated by economic experts brought before the committee, some of whom said that if we persisted in the monetary policy suggested by Secretary Dillon and Chairman Martin, the multiplier effect of the tax cut would be sharply reduced, and that whatever stimulating effect a tax cut might have on the economy would be very greatly diminished.

In that connection, I ask unanimous consent that the thoughtful and authoritative article by Mr. George Shea on the front page of the Wall Street Journal be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Appraisal of Current Trends in Business and Finance

The Kennedy administration seems to be leaning toward higher interest rates on borrowed money as a means of combating the deficit in the Nation's international payments. However, causing or permitting interest rates to rise entails some difficult problems.

The theory is that higher interest rates would help reduce our deficit because they would cause investors, businesses, banks—foreign as well as domestic—to lend their cash here instead of abroad where interest rates now are higher than they are in this country. The sending of such money abroad has been a substantial factor in the size of the deficit in the last few years. Also, the administration has noted that England and more recently Canada have found their international deficits shrinking rapidly when they raised interest rates at home substantially.

However, one problem that faces the money managers if they decide to raise the cost of borrowed money is that they would like to concentrate the boost in rates on short-term funds. It is this kind of money that moves most quickly across international borders in search of the most attractive interest rates. Long-term money likes high interest rates, too, but it is also influenced by other important considerations.

In addition, high rates on, and restricted supplies of, long-term credit are supposed to be bad for general business, whereas the rates on short-term loans are not so important. Businessmen, it is widely believed, hesitate to commit themselves to pay high interest rates for years ahead to build a new plant or apartment house, or to buy new equipment, but they don't mind so much in the case of a loan that will be repaid in a few months.

The questions are whether it is possible to change rates on one kind of money only and how it can be done. The answers are, first, that it isn't entirely possible, but that short-term rates can be changed much more quickly and widely than long-term rates; and second that the only measure that works at all well is a change in the supply of credit—which sooner or later affects long as well as short rates.

Long rates almost always move with short rates because lenders or borrowers can switch from one to another. If short-term rates soar to 6 percent while long-term rates stay at 4 percent, lenders will stop offering money at long term, tending to cause the rates on long-term money to rise, and will offer their money at short term, tending to cause those rates to fall.

The fact that short-term rates fluctuate more sharply than long-term rates is clear from the record of recent years. The following table gives average rates by years through 1962 and so far this year on U.S. Treasury 3-month bills and U.S. long-term bonds:

[In percent]

	Bills	Bonds
1963	2.9	3.9
1962	2.8	4.0
1961	2.4	3.9
1960	2.9	4.0
1959	3.4	4.1
1958	1.8	3.4
1957	3.3	3.5
1956	2.3	3.1
1955	1.8	2.9
1954	1.0	2.7

In that period of more than 9 years the short-term rate has fluctuated between 1 percent and 3.4 percent, or 2.4 points, whereas the rates on long-term bonds have an extreme range only between 2.7 and 4.1 percent, or 1.4 points. Put another way, the differential between the long and short rates has been as wide as 1.7 in 1954 and as narrow as 0.2 in 1957.

The causes of these fluctuations in the differential provide a good answer to how such changes can be engineered. Since late in 1960 the Federal Reserve Board and the U.S. Treasury have been seeking jointly to keep short-term rates strong for the same balance-of-payments reason that now concerns them. They've tried to do it by keeping the supply of Treasury bills available in the market especially large by selling such bills whenever they could. But at the same time the "Fed" has kept the Nation's banks supplied with substantial unlent reserves.

The measure of their success has been that the differential has narrowed from 1.8 late in 1960—when bills paid 2.2 percent and bonds 4 percent—to 1.2 now. In contrast, note what happened in 1954–57 or 1955–57, when there was no particular effort to stiffen short-term rather than long-term rates, but when the supply of unused bank credit was gradually restricted as business boomed. The differential then narrowed from 1.7 in 1954 and 1.1 in 1955 to 0.2 in 1957.

Another means of raising short-term rates, being mentioned aside from restrictions on bank credit, is boosting the Federal Reserve discount rate. That's the interest banks pay when they borrow from the Reserve banks. By itself that probably wouldn't work well either. The discount rate is effective when banks are borrowing heavily in order to make loans, and at such times they want to earn more than the discount rate of any loans or securities they hold. At present the bill of 2.9 percent is below the 3-percent discount rate, because the banks aren't borrowing much. Just raising the discount rate now would be acting almost in a vacuum.

Thus one problem the Government faces is that the only way it can engineer the boost in short-term rates is to restrict credit generally, and it hesitates to do it at present because of a fear it might hurt business. That's why Secretary of the Treasury Dillon the other day brought forward as a new argument for a tax cut that it would strengthen business enough to stand higher interest rates, which he said were needed to reduce the international deficit.

There is another problem, too. A lot of the short-term funds that have gone abroad in search of higher interest rates have gone to England, as well as to other European nations. The difference is that while the nations of the Continent seem pretty well able to stand a reversal of the flow of funds back to the United States, England is regarded as vulnerable, its balance of payments being precarious like ours. After this newspaper had reported on the new interest-rate plan of the administration last week, the British pound weakened in the foreign exchange market.

George Shea.

MILWAUKEE JOURNAL SUPPORTS RESOLUTION FOR MEMORIAL COMMISSION

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I have introduced proposed legislation to support the appeal of Secretary of the Interior Udall for a commission which would consider proposed statuary to commemorate distinguished statesmen. A number of newspapers around the country have supported my proposal. I am happy to see that some newspapers in our own State of Wisconsin are included among those.

One of the recent editorials on that subject appeared in the Milwaukee Journal. The editorial pointed out that among those who have been honored by statuary in the District of Columbia are Charlie Kutz, Joe Darlington, Frank Newlands, Sam Hahnemann, Joe Henry, Andy Downing, Bill Schuetz, Julie Jusserant, Sam Gross, and the original patentees of the District of Columbia.

The fact is that whenever a proposal to honor almost anyone is made by a Senator or Representative in behalf of a friend or a person he supports, it is difficult and embarrassing for a Member of Congress to oppose the proposal. That is why I think the commission suggested by Secretary Udall makes sense, not only from the standpoint of the District of Columbia, but also particularly from the standpoint of the American taxpayer, because it could discourage wasteful expenditure of funds. I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Milwaukee (Wis.) Journal, Mar. 6, 1963]

Clutter of Statuary

"Unless we exercise some discrimination in honoring our great departed statesmen, Washington will become a clutter of stony statuary," Senator Proxmire, Democrat, of Wisconsin, said in criticizing the continuing practice of his congressional colleagues in approving monuments.

Proxmire is backing up Interior Secretary Udall, who wants a curb on new monuments and a commission to make sure that any that are approved are deserving.

Ever hear of Charlie Kutz, Joe Darlington, Frank Newlands, Sam Hahnemann, Joe Henry, Andy Downing, Bill Schuetz, Julie Jusserant, Sam Gross or "The Original Patentees of the District of Columbia"?

The Interior Department, according to the Washington Post, reports that these individuals are among those honored by some 96 statues or memorials in District of Columbia park land. They stand as evidence that memorials often don't stir memories after a generation or so. And they argue for being extremely selective in deciding upon future memorials to give pigeons a roosting place.

LITHUANIAN INDEPENDENCE

Mr **KEATING**. Mr. President, on February 17, 1963, there was a mass meeting of Lithuanian Americans in New York City under the auspices of the Lithuanian American Council of New York commemorating the 45th anniversary of restoration of Lithuania's independence.

Mr. President, this dedicated group, all citizens and permanent residents of the United States, are seeking independence and freedom from the tryranny and evil of Soviet colonialism for those who remain in Lithuania. They seek the liberation of those with whom they have ancestral and close family ties.

This was a sad occasion for this group. As free people themselves, they know that the chains of communism cannot bind the hopes of men nor hold back the desire of people, who were once self-governing, again to attain the sacred goal of independence and freedom.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD following my remarks the resolution adopted by the Lithuanian rally of February 17, 1963.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

We, Lithuanian Americans of Greater New York, citizens and permanent residents of the United States, gathered on February 17 of this year of grace 1963 at Webster Hall in New York City to commemorate the 45th anniversary of the restoration of the Independent Lithuanian State;

Voicing once more our indignation and our protest against the brutal suppression by Soviet Russia of Lithuania's independence and freedom and her subjugation by Soviet colonial rule;

Acclaiming the firmness and determination of the President of the United States during the Cuban confrontation and his unequivocal attitude toward the evil of Soviet colonialism, as expressed in the state of the Union message last January;

Acknowledging with gratitude the stand taken by the U.S. delegation in the United Nations on self-determination for Lithuania and the other captive European countries;

Pointing out that the global surge toward national independence poses a particular challenge to the United States and other Western countries to press for the restoration to Lithuania and to all other captive European nations of a free exercise of their right to self-determination and the respect of human rights and fundamental freedoms;

Resolved:

1. To appeal to the President, the Secretary of State, and the Congress of the United States firmly to restate and vigorously to promote in the United Nations and elsewhere the established U.S. policy of the restoration of the independence and freedom of Lithuania through free and unfettered elections after the withdrawal of Soviet armed forces and agents, and to reaffirm the determination of the Government of this great country not to be a party to any agreement or treaty which would confirm or prolong the subjugation of Lithuania, now held in bondage by the U.S.S.R.;
2. To ask the President of the United States to designate the third week of July 1963, as Captive Nations Week;
3. To urge that the Radio Free Europe extend in its broadcasts the use of the Lithuanian language;
4. To rededicate ourselves to the just cause of Lithuania's independence and freedom and to combating communism, Soviet imperialism and colonialism;
5. To assure the Lithuanian people under Soviet occupation of the indissolubility of our ties and of our unswerving determination to spare no efforts and sacrifices for the attainment of the sacred goal of the Lithuanian nation—its independence and its freedom;
6. To support actively the policy of the U.S. Government aiming at the establishment in Europe and elsewhere of a just and durable peace based on the inalienable right of the respective peoples to government of their own choice.

J. KIAUNE,
President.
A. SKERYS,
Secretary.

THE 245TH NIKE MISSILE BATTALION

Mr. **KEATING**. Mr. President, in the reorganization of the Army National Guard, one unit that has been designated for elimination in New York State is the 245th Nike Missile Battalion. This unit has a particularly long and fine tradition of service to the Nation, dating all the way back to 1654.

Naturally, changing defense needs call for continued reevaluation and planning but in my judgment, it is most unfortunate when a unit with such a historic background is told it can no longer play its honored role in national defense.

I am asking the Department of Defense for a full report on this matter, but in the meantime I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD follow my remarks a brief history of the regiment.

There being no objection, the history was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THIS IS YOUR REGIMENT

In 1654, a company of "Minute Men" was organized by the Dutch burghers in Breucklen (Brooklyn), to suppress lawlessness and smuggling in their village and nearby communities along Long Island Sound.

To that early body of Dutch "Minute Men", the present 245th Nike Missile Battalion traces its proud lineage, and can well boast as being one of the oldest continually active units in U.S. Military Establishment.

When, in 1776, the 64th Regiment of Foot was organized as a part of the Continental Army, this same Brooklyn unit of "Minute Men" was given the signal honor of becoming the "Right Flank Company" of that regiment and fought as such throughout the Revolutionary War and the War of 1812.

Old family records and authorized histories establish a continuity of service of individuals through this "Right Flank Company" of the 64th Regiment of Foot to the "Old Village Guard" which, later, when the village of Brooklyn became an incorporated township, consolidated with the Nassau Guards to form the "Brooklyn City Guard."

In 1847, the New York State militia was composed wholly of independent companies without any battalion or regimental organization. This heterogeneous composition finally attracted the attention of the State legislature with the result that a new division of 12 distinct regiments was authorized for Brooklyn alone.

One of the leading companies in point of numbers and efficiency, at this period, was the aforementioned "Brooklyn City Guard." Through the efforts of this company, 8 other independent companies joined with them in forming a regiment which was embodies into State service on July 5, 1847, as the first of the 12 newly authorized regiments and designated as the 13th Regiment of Infantry.

To conform to the regulations of this period, the assignment of the companies was as follows:

Right flank company of light artillery, Brooklyn City Guard; Company A, Pearson's Light Guard; Company B, Washington Horse Guard; Company C, Brooklyn Light Guard; Company D, Williamsburg Light Artillery; Company E, Williamsburg Light Artillery; Company F, Oregon Guard; Company G, Washington Guard Rifles; Company H, Jefferson Guards.

The two companies of Williamsburg Light Artillery shortly after withdrew and two other companies were admitted: City Cadets as Company D; Greenwood Rifles as Company E.

In the present organization of the 245th Nike Missile Battalion, Battery A is the direct lineal descendent element of the old right flank company of that original 13th Regiment of Infantry.

The first time this 13th Regiment of Infantry was called for active Federal duty was for Civil War service when it was the first New York militia regiment to volunteer to a man for service and was in the field for three known periods from April 23 to August 6, 1861, May 28 to September 12, 1862, and June 20 to July 20, 1863. It has been confirmed that the records covering the regiment's further periods of service in the Civil War were lost in the unfortunate fire which destroyed the old armory on Hanson Place in Brooklyn.

The regiment's next tour of Federal service was in the Spanish-American War when it was mustered in on May 24, 1898, as part of the 22d New York Volunteers with which it served until it was mustered out on November 23 of the same year.

The regiment remained as the 13th Infantry until 1900, when it was organized as artillery and designated the 13th Heavy Artillery and companies then became batteries. This designation was changed on September 1, 1906, to the 13th Coast Artillery. On June 23, 1908, they were changed to the 13th Artillery District and on August 10, 1914, to the 13th Coast Defense Command. During the disintegration of the regiment at the time of World War I, this number and title were temporarily discontinued, but were revived on the reorganization of the National Guard in 1919.

In World War I, the regiment entered the Federal service on July 23, 1917, and was assigned to Forts Wadsworth, Hamilton, and Tilden, in the New York Harbor defenses. The command was shortly after broken up, the greater part forming the nucleus of the newly organized 59th and 70th Coast Artillery regiments, and officers and men were also assigned to the 38th, 46th, 50th, and 74th Coast Artillery, 119th Field Artillery, Trench Mortar battalions, ammunition trains, motor transport and the 6th Antiaircraft Light Artillery. A great majority of these organizations served with distinction and efficiency in combat action in France, particularly in the St. Mihiel and Meuse-Argonne offensives and the defensive sector of the 1st Army, the Lorraine sector. After the departure of the regiment for World War I action, the

13th Coast Artillery Corps, New York Guard, was formed for emergency State service as infantry and was disbanded when the National Guard was reorganized at the war's end, the return of the war personnel who again resumed normal peacetime service as the 13th Coast Defense Command, which designation continued until January 1, 1924, when the regiment was given the number and title, 245th Coast Artillery.

Under the Presidential proclamation of national emergency in 1940, the 245th Coast Artillery was once again called to Federal service and sent to garrison the artillery fortifications at Fort Hancock, Sandy Hook, N.J. After the Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor in December of 1941, most of the senior noncoms and officers of the regiment were sent to various training camps over the country as cadres to train the rapidly expanding Army that was to eventually carry the United States to victory over the Axis Powers. The remainder of the regiment was brought to full combat strength and served throughout World War II. Members of the 245th saw action in all parts of the globe during the monstrous conflict; in all theaters of the war, from Bataan to Okinawa. Some older veteran officers and noncoms of the regiment became the nucleus for the 13th Regiment of Infantry, New York Guard, formed for State duty in 1941 and deactivated in 1945 with the reorganization of the 245th at the end of World War II.

Once more the "call to arms" was sounded, this time in 1951 when the Communist forces of North Korea attacked South Korea, and a United Nations force was alerted, and the 245th was again called to service until the cessation of hostilities in 1955.

Over the years, the regiment has been called for State service in aid of civil authorities as follows: New York draft riots, 1863, when it was rushed from Gettysburg, immediately following that battle to help quell the bloody riots in New York City; the orange riots of 1871; railroad riots in 1877; Buffalo railroad strike in 1892; Fire Island, 1892; Brooklyn trolley strike, 1895; guard for public property, 1917.

At the present time, the 245th Nike Missile Battalion is serving the Nation at missile bases on Long Island, proud of the fact that from the early company of Dutch "Minute Men" to the present battalion of "Missile Men," this staunch and venerable organization of American fighting men has ever been ready to serve its country's call, and will, in the words of the late Gen. Sydney Grant, one of its beloved commanding officers, always "Carry On."

AFRICAN STUDENTS LEAVE BULGARIA

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, a constituent of mine—a young man from Rochester—has written to me about a commendable project which has been undertaken by the students at Brown University. Recently, 12 students from Ghana and 6 from Ethiopia fled from Communist Bulgaria, where they were attending a university as exchange students. They charged racial bias on the part of the Communists and asserted that they had encountered forced political indoctrination, police brutality, arrest and constant insults behind the Iron Curtain.

Upon reading of this incident, students at Brown decided that the situation presented them with a golden opportunity to demonstrate America's good will and interest in the education of African students. A petition was circulated requesting the administration of the university to offer a scholarship to one of these African boys. Within hours, 200 Brown and Pembroke undergraduates signed the petition and over the weekend, the university administration acceded to their request. The university has pledged to match any funds which are raised by the students themselves, and to offer admission to one of the Africans who is qualified. The students, have raised a substantial share and hope that the full amount will be raised in time for the exchange student to come to this country in September.

I call this incident to the attention of the Members of the Senate, because I feel it is a fine example both of American initiative and the good will of our youth toward the many visiting students we welcome to our shores each year. It is exactly this kind of spirit which gives me assurance that the recipient of this scholarship will be far happier in the United States than he was in Communist Bulgaria.

GIRL SCOUTS OF AMERICA

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, it is an honor and a privilege for me today to pay tribute to the Girl Scouts of America during this the week of their 51st birthday.

We all welcome the sight every spring of those familiar figures in brown and green in groups of two's and three's, laden with boxes of cookies, beginning their annual sale. The event serves to underline the fact that the organization which developed out of the Girl Guides of England is another year older.

It was on March 12, 1912, in Savannah, Ga., that Juliette Gordon Low founded the first troop of Girl Scouts in this country with 12 members. Since that time the Girl Scouts have captured the imagination of millions and become an American institution.

In those early days of the Scouting movement, the Girl Scouts waived tradition and moved into the realm of outdoor activities such as camping and active sports previously reserved for their male counterparts. One of their prime aims has always been to develop the whole worth and dignity of the individual, not merely one segment of it.

Today the Scouting program for girls from 8–18, Brownies to Senior Scouts, is carried on in 51 nations of the world. Its interesting and worthwhile projects, its ideal of service to community and country have directly affected the lives of over 18 million girls in the United States alone, and have had an indirect influence on countless others.

I feel that I should say something, too, about the indebtedness of the organization to the millions of men and women who have volunteered their time and energies as leaders and administrators to help make the Scouting program a success.

The Scouting program has helped to guide girls into the path of maturity by offering them a solid basis upon which to build for the future. The Girl Scout laws set forth an ethical code by which to live and develop into responsible citizens of a free democracy, willing to assume the task of making our country a better place in which to live. To quote the Girl Scout Council of the Nation's Capital:

> Girl Scouting is more than fun. It opens windows to knowledge, doors to skills, and provides opportunities for friendship and service across the Nation and around the world. Girl Scouting is learning by doing and living by the best ideals of democracy.

ONE HUNDREDTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE RHODE ISLAND HOSPITAL

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, perhaps never in our national history has medical care been of such universal concern as in this year of 1963. Fortunate are those areas where the people enjoy abundant hospital facilities and a dedicated medical profession.

Such an area is my State of Rhode Island and particularly its capital city of Providence.

This year—this very week—is the centennial of one of the great centers of medical concern and service to both the city and the State.

The Rhode Island Hospital is celebrating its 100th anniversary.

One hundred years ago this week the General Assembly of Rhode Island passed the act to incorporate the hospital and on March 13, 1863, the then Governor of Rhode Island put his signature to the document.

As the Rhode Island history of that month of March 1863 is intertwined with the history of this Senate, it seems appropriate to present the record here in a single paragraph.

There had been a quick change of command in Rhode Island. The man who was Governor on March 13, 1863, had been merely a State senator 2 weeks earlier. He had succeeded to the presidency of the State senate and then to the Governorship only because both the Governor and Lieutenant Governor of Rhode Island in March 1863 were in this U.S. Senate recently removed to this Chamber. On March 4, 1863, Gov. William Sprague succeeded Lt. Gov. Samuel Greene Arnold who had been U.S. Senator from December 1, 1862. Samuel Greene Arnold was the granduncle of our beloved former colleague, Theodore Francis Green, who was born only 4 years after Rhode Island Hospital was founded.

March 1863 was indeed an historic period. In the words of a speaker at the dedication of Rhode Island Hospital—

> the Civil War was at the height of its grim and desolating fury. It was a time when, if ever, men are inspired with generous sentiments and are ready to acknowledge the high humanities and duties that bind them to each other and to their race.
>
> But an institution for the healing of the sick and the care of the injured must be an expression of something more than Christian benevolence alone. It must also be the embodiment of every device and arrangement which science has discovered or art has contrived for the alleviation of suffering and the restoration of health. Philanthropy prompts the enterprise but it is science that presides over its accomplishment and fits it for its high ends. Civilization must lavish upon it its choicest treasures both of humanity and knowledge, in making it all that it ought to be.

For all this century Rhode Island Hospital has taken the spirit of that oration as an obligation. Out of the generosity of individuals and with the cooperation of the official community there has been built upon the gift of land and buildings—extended land and expanding buildings—one of the largest voluntary hospitals in all our land.

It has assumed what might have been immediate burdens of city and State and in an annual cost of $10 million has given more than a million dollars in free services to the community.

Last year 20,000 of its neighbors were admitted for bed care and over 40,000 more received emergency treatment. Seven hundred thousand bed patients have known Rhode Island Hospital's care.

Its medical and surgical staff have made important contributions to the advancement of medical science—it has been a center of teaching and research; and Brown University has honored its staff in the projection of their new medical studies. In every respect the hospital has the potential for meeting the needs of a modern progressive medical school.

The original incorporators were all physicians but its practical encouragement came from all segments of our people and that close affinity has prevailed through this century of substantial cooperation.

We of Rhode Island are proud that the hospital bears the name of our State, but is as independent as the independent man who stands atop our state house. Our Governor and our general assembly by proclamation renew this week their enthusiasm of March 1863.

Every man, woman, and child, of every race and faith, salutes Rhode Island Hospital for its century of superlative service.

TRIBUTE TO A DEPARTED MOTHER

Mrs. SMITH. Mr. President, the loss of a loved one is an experience that everyone of us must have. While it is a loss and grief that our friends share with us, no one can ever really know the true meaning of the loss to the individual.

We cannot capture the inner emotions of the individual and we keenly feel our own inadequacy to express our sympathy.

That distinguished writer and commentator, Tris Coffin, has written a tribute to the mother of a mutual friend of ours. It is a moving tribute that comes the nearest to capturing the inner emotions of one's sorrow that I have ever read or heard.

Because I think it has a very deep and meaningful message for most everyone, I ask unanimous consent that it be placed in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the tribute was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TRIBUTE BY TRIS COFFIN

I have a friend who drives 15 miles to work every morning and then the same 15 miles home again. In the morning, the drive isn't bad, for this is a new day. He sees the frost glistening on the ground if it is winter, or if the time is spring he has been walking in the dew, or if summer picking wild strawberries. This gives a tang to the day, and he leaves the country in good spirits. This pulls him through even the terrible traffic snarl at the point where all the suburban roads dump into one overcrowded city street, to the tune of impatient horns.

The evening is different. My friend works hard and in a very competitive society, the Congress. He is conscientious to an extreme, has a great generalship for plotting and conducting the sieges and countersieges. And what is also rare, he is intelligent and daring. This means that by the end of the day, 6 o'clock or even as late as 9, much of his emotional energy has been spent, he is weary beyond account, and still intent on the wars of the day.

An associate who rides with him tells me my friend, Bill, may drive all through the horrible rush-hour traffic of the city saying nothing but an occasional terse, ironic phrase, and grim faced.

There is a point, an exact point, when he changes, throws off the mask of the office. This is when the city is left behind—its noise, its confusion, its overbright signs, its deceits, and he can see open spaces. Perhaps they are overgrown with weeds and the owner is waiting to sell for a good price, but it is country.

My friend Bill begins to relax. His fingers on the wheel loosen. The hard lines of his face fall away and he smiles.

His mind has sped ahead to the moment when the car will pull in the driveway of the house with the white fence around it, and he will get out, and look up at the window. A face will smile at him, perhaps waving a hand or nodding, depending on how she feels this night. This face is beautiful, it seems to me, and indeed it is, for it shows always, steadfastly a joy in life. No matter what has happened, her face is proud of living.

She is my friend's mother, and she has been an invalid for a number of years, sitting in the chair at the window, watching the bluebirds, the squirrels scampering across the snow, the wind tossing the upper branches of the trees, the pattern of the clouds, the gathering gray of dusk. She had been an active, talented woman, a lawyer and a beauty. Sickness altered her life, as much as if she had been picked up by a storm and sent spinning off to Timbuktu. More, because she had to accept quietness, reflection, the knowledge that death may fall with the next shadow.

To hear him tell of her, with great admiration, the new life has not shrunken but enlarged, nobled, and given an almost cosmic dimension. She discovered joys lost to most of us, joys dearer than all those we pursue so madly. My friend was able to share some of these joys with her, and this is why when the city was gone and only the stretch of country left, he smiled in secret enjoyment.

He might wonder what it was she had seen today to make her life more exciting, sitting there by the window. Would it be that the bluejays came again, big and brilliant and comic, or a rabbit crossing the yard had paused to look up at her and stare, his nose twitching? He looked forward eagerly to hearing from her. The end of the day always had this promise for him.

But no joy is ever eternal. Bill and his mother understood this, she better than he. This is what he tries to remember now when, driving in the evening, he leaves the rumble of the city. He knows that when he enters the driveway and looks at the window, there will be no smile for him. She has left him, as she knew she would. Still she is there in all the things she loved outside her window.

This is the essence, perhaps, of death and transfiguration. No one ever dies completely, but remains in the rose tumbling over the arbor, the evening star, the first call of the song sparrow.

EXPANSION OF JUNIOR ROTC

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, many Americans have been shocked by the proposal of the Secretary of Defense to cut back or eliminate the junior ROTC program. In my judgment, this is one of the finest youth programs in our country. Under the program, young men are taught discipline and love of country. I believe the program has instilled in our youth a desire to participate in the national defense program.

I have seen many young men who were in the junior ROTC programs go on to college, further their ROTC education, become some of the finest officers in the military organization of our country, and serve for long periods of time in the defense of the Nation. Probably the desire to perform this service was inculcated during their participation in the junior ROTC program.

It is strange indeed that we would be considering programs for a domestic Peace Corps and for a youth program and at the same time the Secretary of Defense would be discussing eliminating or abolishing the ROTC program, which I believe costs the magnificent sum of approximately $5,500,000. I am informed through articles in the press that the Secretary of Defense is considering or is reappraising this program. I hope he will reach the conclusion that the program not be abolished.

Mr. President, the General Assembly of Georgia has adopted a resolution on this subject. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATE RESOLUTION 68

Resolution opposing the proposed cutback and urging the expansion of junior ROTC; and for other purposes

(By Senator Hunt of the 26th)

Whereas the Defense Department has recommended a proposal to eliminate the Reserve officer training program in our high schools and to streamline the college ROTC program; and

Whereas military service is still compulsory in the United States; and

Whereas money now being spent on compulsory training could be diverted into an expanded junior ROTC program to sustain summer training; and

Whereas the money would be reasonable pay to the young men involved which could eliminate financial hardships; and

Whereas summer military training would reduce the summer influx on the labor market and reduce juvenile delinquency; and

Whereas in many cases the present system is harmful to many of our young men because they postpone making decisions on their future education, training, or professions because of their service obligation; and

Whereas under a new and expanded program the military could select volunteer military personnel who excel in ROTC; and

Whereas through a system of promotions and further inducements the military would produce high-type personnel who were trained during the years when they learned best and excelled most; and

Whereas the rigors of an intensive and thorough military training program would give our young men an outlet for their energies which would be used to a productive and healthful advantage; and

Whereas under this program training would be continuous until completed rather than interrupted as at present (or no training at all) until the youth enlists or is drafted under the current compulsory military training program; and

Whereas the best soldiers are generally between the ages of 18 and 25 when given the proper training and leadership; and

Whereas if we discontinue high school ROTC this will mean raising our average training age several years which will be a decided deterioration of our military potential: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the General Assembly of Georgia, That we go on record as opposing any cutback in the present junior ROTC program and further go on record as recommending a proper and adequate expansion of junior ROTC; and be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of the senate is hereby instructed to transmit a suitable copy of this resolution to each Member of the Georgia delegation of the U.S. Senate and U.S. House of Representatives.

Approved in senate March 5, 1963.

Approved in house March 6, 1963.

IN GOD IS OUR TRUST

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, I would like to call to the attention of the Senate a speech prepared by Mr. Ed Webster, a senior at Cody High School, Cody, Wyo. Eddie is an outstanding young American who is presently the president of the Cody High School student body and an active member of his church. He is truly a student of Americanism as indicated by his keen insight into the things that have made this country the envy of the world. He has prepared a speech entitled "In God Is Our Trust," which points out the anguish suffered by the God-loving people of America when the Supreme Court recently ruled that the 22-word nondenominational New York school prayer was unconstitutional.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of this speech be made a part of the Record.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

In God Is Our Trust

We are citizens of the greatest Nation in the world today. A nation which offers untold opportunities for man to better himself. A nation who proclaims to the world:

"Give me your tired, your poor,
Your huddled masses yearning to breathe free
The wretched refuse of your teeming shore;
Send these, the homeless, and tempest-tost to me,
I lift my lamp beside the Golden door."

This Nation was founded by the people seeking an opportunity to worship God, how, when, and where they would. This factor was so important to these founders of yesteryear that they inscribed into almost every national document an assurance that this loyalty to, and fraternization of God, would continue as long as these United States should endure.

The worship of God as one deems fit, and the guarantee that all others have the same right is insured in our Bill of Rights; on every coinage of this country is the statement, "In God we trust"; the Declaration of Independence is believed by many to have been inspired of God; in the national anthem is reference to our trust in God.

Belief and worship of God has been a factor of strength and hope throughout our Nation's history. This belief was so strong as to induce thousands to leave their homes and come to this promised land when it was hard, cruel, treacherous, and unknown. The army of George Washington, as it fought for our independence, is reported to have had a minister in the lines; and throughout the years the soldiers of the United States have had a chaplain with them to give them spiritual guidance and comfort.

From the very beginning of the First Continental Congress, a prayer has been said at the beginning of every day's session of the Supreme Court, and of Congress. As late as 1954, the line "under God" was inserted into the Pledge of Allegiance to the U.S. Flag, again proving the devotion of the American people to Almighty God.

It might be well to remember that when Adolf Hitler came to power in Germany, his first move toward world conquest was the expulsion of religion from the schools. Slowly and methodically he succeeded in doing away with religion in the schools, the government, and lives of the German people. It would seem that this example, and others of godless nations who rose to great power and then toppled, would serve as sufficient warning to the wise; however, today we find ourselves facing an alarming situation: Dateline 1962: The Supreme Court of the United States ruled it unconstitutional for a 22-word prayer to be said at the beginning of every schoolday in New York schools. This prayer read:

"Almighty God, we acknowledge our dependence upon Thee, and we beg Thy blessings upon us, our parents, our teachers and our country."

This prayer was repeated at the beginning of each schoolday along with the Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag. Those who did not wish to participate, could remain silent or be excused from the room; or even come late to miss the prayer. There was no possible way that anybody could take offense at a prayer which was set up in this way; yet, because one family took a dislike to this prayer, it was ruled unconstitutional.

Justice Stewart, who gave the one vote for the constitutionality of the prayer, remarked: "Is the Court suggesting that the Constitution permits judges and Congressmen and Presidents to join in prayer, but prohibits schoolchildren from doing so?"

Nearly half the States require or authorize either prayers or Bible reading in their schools, however, steps are now being taken by the American Civil Liberties Union, who sponsored the New York case, to bring these cases into question, along with the legality of a Christmas program in the schools, recitation of the Lord's Prayer, and baccalaureate services.

Presently there is question being raised as to the constitutionality of saying a prayer at the beginning of each day of Congress, action is also being taken against the last verse of the national anthem which states: "And this be our motto; in God is our trust."

But this is not the end, if these measures are allowed to be ruled unconstitutional, there will be an ever-ending flow of cases concerning the coinage, Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag, and every Bible reading, or religious holiday observances in the 35,000 schools which now participate in such practices.

Now, I ask you, Will this great Nation, founded under a strong faith in God, now deny that same faith—that same God? Will this great Nation, who has prospered above all other nations, forsake the very creed on which its prosperity has flourished? A strong and unwavering faith in the Almighty has grown to be one of the predominating factors in America's greatness. What were our forefathers looking for when they stepped ashore on the desolate, windswept shores of America of yesteryear? A place where they could worship their God in peace, without censor or magistrates. Freedom of worship—foremost among all the freedoms we hold so dear.

Tyrants and dictators throughout the ages have denied the existence of the Almighty—have tried to replace His hallowed presence with the false image of greatness they have built around themselves. Allegiance to a cause, rather than to God, and they have failed miserably.

Will our beloved America follow in the foosteps of these godless tyrants?

The voices of millions of Americans, raised in unison, thunder a defiant "No." And as silently, these millions bow their heads together, and in the faith that makes them great whisper in humility, "In God we trust."

JOINT RESOLUTION OF WYOMING LEGISLATURE

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, I bring to the attention of the Senate a joint memorial adopted by the State Legislature of Wyoming memorializing the Congress of the United States of America with reference to limiting and reducing the threat of communism in the Western Hemisphere.

Mr. President, I request that the memorial be made a part of the Record.

There being no objection, the joint resolution was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Enrolled Joint Memorial 19

Joint memorial memorializing the Congress of the United States of America with reference to limiting and reducing the threat of communism in the Western Hemisphere

Whereas the people of the Western Hemisphere have for over 100 years had the privilege of determining, without outside intervention, their own form of government; and

Whereas the United States of America has supported their privilege through enforcement of the principles of the Monroe Doctrine; and

Whereas there now exists within this hemisphere a militant and aggressive arm of international communism, that has formed its roots in Cuba; and

Whereas the existence of the Communist government of Cuba is dependent upon support from outside this hemisphere; and

Whereas the avowed purpose of the Communist government of Cuba is to export its revolution throughout the Americas, with the aid of governments beyond our hemisphere; and

Whereas this situation is not conducive to the continued peace, harmony, and progress among nations of free peoples in this hemisphere: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, by the house of the 37th Legislature of the State of Wyoming (the senate of such legislature concurring), That the President and Congress of the United States of America be and they are hereby memorialized to consider the welfare and interest of the people of Wyoming, the United States of America, and our sister republics throughout the Western Hemisphere who favor a strong and vigorous action through every available means to limit and reduce the Communist threat to our safety and well-being; and be it further

Resolved, That certified copies hereof be promptly transmitted to the President and Vice President of the United States, Speaker of the U.S. House of Representatives, Senator Gale W. McGee, Senator Milward L. Simpson, and Representative in Congress, William Henry Harrison.

Approved February 13, 1963.

Clifford P. Hansen,
Governor.
Charles G. Irwin,
President of the Senate.
Marlin T. Kurtz,
Speaker of the House.

NATIONAL SECURITY STAFFING AND OPERATIONS—STATEMENT BY GEN. LAURIS NORSTAD

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, Gen. Lauris Norstad made a brilliant and able statement before the Subcommittee on National Security Staffing and Operations this morning. I ask unanimous consent that his statement be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY GEN. LAURIS NORSTAD, FORMER SUPREME ALLIED COMMANDER, EUROPE; MEMBER, BOARD OF DIRECTORS, OWENS-CORNING FIBERGLAS CORP., AND PRESIDENT, INTERNATIONAL DIVISION; CHAIRMAN, ATLANTIC COUNCIL, BEFORE SENATE SUBCOMMITTEE ON NATIONAL SECURITY STAFFING AND OPERATIONS, SENATOR HENRY M. JACKSON, CHAIRMAN, MONDAY, MARCH 11, 1963

I am honored to appear as the opening witness in your study of national security staffing and operations.

Until now my experience has been entirely in the armed services, and what I have to say this morning will be based on that experience. I have had the good fortune to participate in some interesting enterprises. When I was in the War Department shortly after the last war, I worked with one of the most distinguished military leaders of our time, the late Adm. Forrest Sherman, on a number of studies which helped to clear away some of the final obstacles to the reorganization of the Nation's Military Establishment in 1947. These studies included worldwide military command arrangements, roles and missions of the three services and finally the details of the agreement between the War and Navy Departments which was the basis or starting point of the Unification Act itself.

But an unusually large part of my experience has been overseas—with American and Allied commands. Since I first put on a uniform 37 years ago, more than half of my service has been abroad—which may be a record of some sort—and perhaps living and working far from our shores has given me a certain kind of perspective as it has many others who have shared this experience—a perspective which is not necessarily better but one which comes from a slightly different angle.

An outstanding characteristic of the years since the Second World War has been the steadiness of purpose and action of the United States in building strength in the free world. The Soviets have pursued their ambitions with determination. But they have encountered a will at least as firm as their own. The confrontation we call the cold war has, right from the start, involved a test of wills. On the outcome of this test depends in good degree the future of the freedom we hold dear.

For many years we were preoccupied with the weakness of Western Europe. For years to come we will be adjusting to the fact of its strength. In great part, the problems ahead—and there are and will be great problems—arise from the success of our policies. But I would far rather live with such problems than to be wrestling with the difficulties that would have grown out of continued European weakness.

Sometimes people talk as though success were a state of affairs in which there were no problems. But as I see it a successful country, like a successful man, will never see the day that does not bring a fresh quota of problems, and the mark of success is to deal with them effectively.

We learned some important lessons from World War II, and we have shown a capacity to go on learning. That is the important thing. I have no qualms about the future so long as we can examine the past coolly in order to improve our performance in the future.

Along with other democracies, we learned at great cost in the thirties that a foreign policy is no more impressive than the force that exists to back it up. It took us a long time to learn this elementary principle of international affairs. Back in 1911 Admiral Mahan said to a congressional committee:

> It appears to me that the three functions of Government—the diplomatic, the Army, and the Navy—work now in what you might call watertight compartments. * * * It seems there is very little appreciation in the country of the relation between diplomacy and Army and Navy. * * * Our military and naval policy depends substantially upon what we conceive our relation to be with foreign countries, a forecast of the future, and what the probabilities of the future are. * * * I think what is very much needed in this country is to bring the three functions into necessary relation with one another.

In 1947, when Congress passed the National Security Act, creating the Department of Defense and the National Security Council, we took a substantial step in the direction indicated by Admiral Mahan in 1911.

The President has always had full authority over the armed services, and still does. No President, however, can give the management of military affairs the time the job requires. He needs a deputy who can. If we did not have a Secretary of Defense with authority, a President could, in times like the present, spend all of his energy dealing with military issues—and still not get the job done.

It is sometimes said, I know, that the 1947 act did not unify the armed services but instead further divided them. The charge does not stand up. The National Security Act with its amendments has created a strong Department of Defense and has given strength and authority to the Office of the Secretary of Defense. We can, we should, we do criticize when criticism is warranted but it seems to me that the structure of the Military Establishment permits us to have strong military services, balanced internally and in relation to one another, and all under the supervision, direction, and control provided for by law. If we sometimes have difficulties, what would be the situation, today, with all its complexities, if we had not taken the road to unification in 1947? It is hard to imagine, frightening to contemplate.

I have served in unified commands—and although I know that you of this committee appreciate the significance of this development, I do not believe that there is a full understanding in the country of the degree to which the services are now organized and operated according to the tasks to be performed and not according to the color of a man's uniform. Unified commands were, of course, established in World War II but the progress in this field, in the last 10 or 15 years, although it has been so quiet that many people have not noticed it, has in fact been quite dramatic.

The creation of the Department of Defense, the 1947 Reorganization Act and all that has flowed from it, have not only improved our military posture but have made it far easier to relate defense to national policy as a whole.

The creation of the National Security Council was another part of our national effort to learn and apply the lessons of the Second World War. Congress charged the Council with the task of advising the President "with respect to the integration of domestic, foreign, and military policies relating to the national security so as to enable the military services and the other departments and agencies of the Government to cooperate more effectively in matters involving the national security."

It is obvious that we have not always achieved a successful integration of domestic, foreign, and military policies. And I think this committee is doing a most interesting and important work in studying our policy processes with a view to improving them. There is most certainly room for improvement, and some will consider this a notable understatement. But we should also keep in mind that the National Security Act of 1947 has served us well. On the whole our Military Establishment has effectively served our foreign policies and has meshed effectively with allied forces. The contrast with earlier periods—the approach to World War II for instance—is striking.

But you are interested in possible improvements. And here I would like to draw mainly on my NATO experience. Looking at the policy process in Washington from overseas, I have drawn a few conclusions that may be of interest to the committee in its work.

1. In thinking about problems of administration, too much attention tends to be paid to system and perhaps to little to men and their relationships. System is obviously important. But policy is not the product of a system. It is the product of responsible men who are in touch with one another.

A crisis highlights this fact, for it engages the attention of the highest authority and by stripping away the nonessential from the essential relationships, it identifies the men who are in fact his advisers and helpers, whatever the organization charts may say. Authority attracts authority. Responsible men attract responsible men around them. I have never known it to fail that when the going gets rough, responsible authorities are drawn to each other.

This is just as true and as necessary in allied relationships as in national. When one has command responsibilities, he feels a need to be in personal touch with key allied leaders. In a crisis, authority comes to have a very personal meaning, and one must go to the sources of authority before taking action. Things have to be done that way. A commander has got to know, of course, where the top political authorities stand, but more than this he must have a "feel" for their attitudes, a sense of their moods. A direct contact, therefore, is most useful.

At a time like the Cuban crisis last October the President, it seems to me, acts virtually as a commander, personally assuming direction of detailed operations on which depend peace and war. He is in frequent and intimate touch with his assistants in Washington and the field. And decisions are made as they go along.

Involving the highest authority in this degree of detail is, I suppose, a new departure. Certainly the President's title as "Commander in Chief" evokes a picture of larger and grander units than those with which he sometimes has to concern himself at the early stage of a serious development. We in the military service may sometimes feel that this is "getting into our business." But in my judgment the power and the speed we deal with today makes it necessary. At time of crisis, when the issue is peace or war, there is no substitute for direct, person-to-person relationships between the highest political and military authorities, and this inevitably involves the Commander in Chief, the President, in considerable detail.

A key factor is the quality of the relationships between the men who carry responsibility. No one can write directives fast enough to meet a crisis situation, like a Berlin or a Cuba. The man in the field may have to make decisions—and it is essential that he be in direct contact with the political authorities. In terms of my own experience, the NATO machinery works but it can and should be improved in this respect. I have tried to suggest some ways in which this could be done. But the machinery is less important than the personal relationships that have been built up over the past 14 years among leaders in the allied countries.

I speak emphatically—and freely—on this subject because my own experience in this respect has been a most satisfactory one. My own work as Supreme Allied Commander Europe was made possible by the understanding and support of the leaders of the 14 countries with whom we are allied in NATO, and, when necessary, by direct contact with the President of the United States in the two administrations under which I have served.

2. The second point I wish to raise is really a question of definition. To say that any issue or policy—economic, military, cultural, or whatever—which bears directly on our relations with other countries is essentially political, will startle no one who has thought about the subject. Our military forces, for instance, serve political ends. The limits or constraints within which we act are political in nature—as recent events in Europe eloquently demonstrate. The most powerful military force is helpless without the will to use it and the political ability to control and direct it.

One of our real problems in formulating policy at any level is that too many people become involved in it, with too many preconceived ideas, producing too many little policies.

Policy—and here I speak of what we might call grand policy—must be established at the top. That is the only way clarity as to our objectives can be achieved—and without such clarity day-to-day decisions on this or that particular issue will lack focus and coherence. Moreover, the higher policy is made the less likely it is to be a pale concoction of warmed-over ideas. One of the things I have learned over the years is that the higher one's responsibilities, the less one can afford the luxury of preconceived ideas.

Grand policy, or national policy, can be coordinated in a committee, a board, or a council but it cannot be developed there. Someone has to think through the problems and propose what our policy should be—for consideration and decision at the highest level. In the foreign field, for example, Defense and other agencies make contributions, and proposals can and should be examined and debated in groups or committees. But the particular responsibility belongs to the Secretary of State and his associates. If this conclusion, because it is so obvious, falls short of being a notable one, perhaps we should ask ourselves whether our practice faithfully reflects it.

One sentence in the committee's staff report struck home with great force. It is that "the nature of concrete policy issues and the character of governmental action processes push for a pragmatic one-thing-at-a-time-on-its-own-terms approach" to policymaking. And of course this is true. When a specific issue arises, we so often shop around for a solution to the problem in its own terms rather than in terms of our larger purposes.

Good staff work is supposed to insure the careful and broad look at a problem—and we should gratefully take advantage of whatever help it can provide. Clarity at the top is probably a precondition to good staff work, for if your staff does not know what you are trying to accomplish, how can the staff advise you about the consequences of this or that particular decision?

But given a clear understanding of objectives, then a staff of knowledgeable persons, tuned to the political realities, who have developed over the years the ability to sense the full implications of a situation, can be extremely helpful.

3. Another conclusion I have reached is that we Americans talk too much, especially when we are abroad. Paris was a good place to observe this phenomenon, for almost everyone came to Paris, sooner or later, and almost everyone had something to say.

It seemed to me that we sometimes spoke with too many voices. On a number of occasions important European officials asked me how seriously to take what appeared to be a statement of a new American position on a subject of interest to NATO, made by someone just off the plane from Washington. I could always say quite honestly that the American position remained as it had been stated to NATO bodies by the appropriate American representatives. Nevertheless, such episodes can lead to serious misunderstandings.

I think we should strictly follow the established procedures for making known the American position on policy questions.

In my experience, our officials who travel about the world saying that American policy is this or that rarely say it in exactly the same way. It comes out differently each time, and this is quite understandable.

It is a rather pleasant American habit, in some ways, to do our thinking out loud, but it is not a way to conduct affairs with other governments.

My own rule at SHAPE was to report facts but not to try to make news. In the first place, SHAPE was not supposed to be a policymaking organization, and I did not want it to be thought of as an important source of news. My public relations officers sometimes got a little impatient with me about this, but I am sure that had we talked more, it would have made it more difficult for us to do the jobs we were sent there to do.

We were able to speak with great frankness to allied governments, and when necessary to express sharp disappointment at their policies. We could do this because they knew the discussions were confidential and would not be spread all over the morning papers or even reported to other official agencies which had no need or right to such information. I think that we often accomplished a good deal because they were grateful that delicate matters were not aired too freely.

4. A closely related point is that reappraisals of our policies should be made as quietly as possible. Of course, we must review our policies from time to time. A new administration, for instance, certainly has an obligation to do so. I have always thought that it is useful to throw the policy papers away every so often, and reexamine things from the ground up. Unless one does this, the tendency is to work on producing a better mousetrap instead of asking whether a mousetrap is the best way to catch the mouse.

But it should be done privately. For as soon as one begins an analysis, reappraisal, or reassessment, one attacks, or at least brings into question, the validity of one's plans, policies, or strategy. And, furthermore, it may be that once the basic concepts are opened up for reassessment, one will find that some people want to go in one direction and others in exactly the opposite direction. This is especially true in dealings with allies. Some may want to reduce their commitments at the very time we think that their commitments ought to be increased. In that case reappraisals may become agonizing indeed.

I am afraid that we tend to involve too many people in such reassessments. There are too many Indians writing too many papers. The fewer the people, the better their product is likely to be. I once created a planning staff at SHAPE and assigned five colonels to it. It was a planning group that was all chiefs and no Indians. The idea was to get fewer papers but a better product. Believe me, it worked.

5. The last point I want to raise is that we should make a deliberate effort to develop our most promising talent.

A good man is still hard to find. When we find one with judgment and courage, with intellect and intuitiveness, we should do everything we can to bring him along fast, to put him in situations where he can develop—especially situations where he is called upon to carry responsibilities at least as heavy as he can carry, even a little heavier.

I remember that back in the thirties a lieutenant I knew received a promotion to captain. He had been a lieutenant for almost 20 years. I congratulated him, but did not get a warm response and asked him why he wasn't happier about his promotion. I will never forget his reply. He said: "Norstad, don't you know that a man who has been a lieutenant for 20 years will always be a lieutenant?"

When we find a good man, therefore, we ought to push him ahead rapidly, even if this means some preferential treatment. For men grow when they have to make decisions and carry responsibility.

I might also add that we should make every effort to build up and give support to our officials, civilian and military, who serve in allied groups. I am not talking about press-agent techniques, but about the marks of confidence and support that say much more about personal trust and reliance.

We want our officials in allied groups to have influence and to be effective advocates of our interests. There is no better way to help them than to show that they have influence in our own counsels and have the respect and confidence of the men for whom they work.

Finally, the tasks of national security, I believe, may well be more complex and demanding today than ever before. Foreseeing as early as 1946 our basic dilemma, Henry Stimson said these wise words:

"The sinfulness and weakness of man are evident to anyone who lives in the active world. But men are also good and great, kind and wise. Honor begets honor; trust begets trust; faith begets faith; and hope is the mainspring of life. I have lived with the reality of war, and I have praised soldiers; but the hope of honorable, faithful peace is a greater thing, and I have lived with that, too. That a man must live with both together is inherent in the nature of our present stormy stage of human progress, but it has also many times been the nature of progress in the past, and it is not reason for despair."

The choices before us are profoundly difficult and they lie within firmly fixed limits: we must devise the means that will discourage and prevent war with its terrible destructiveness, but we cannot weaken the guarantees of freedom, we cannot forfeit the means of defending the future of our Nation and of the individual liberty without which we could not live.

THE TASK OF IMPPROVEMENT OF U.S. BALANCE OF PAYMENTS

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, on Thursday, March 7, Secretary of the Treasury Dillon addressed the 10th Annual Monetary Conference of the American Bankers Association on the subject "Our Unfinished Task of Improving the U.S. Balance of Payments."

This address is a very fine exposition of the relationship between the President's tax program and the balance-of-payments problem, and I commend it to the attention of the Senate especially in this respect.

I ask unanimous consent that the address and an editorial commenting on it, published in the Washington Post of March 11, 1963, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address and editorial were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

OUR UNFINISHED TASK OF IMPROVING THE U.S. BALANCE OF PAYMENTS

(Remarks by the Honorable Douglas Dillon, Secretary of the Treasury, at the 10th Annual Monetary Conference of the American Bankers Association, Princeton, N.J., Thursday, March 7, 1963)

A year ago, in Rome, I reviewed with you our balance-of-payments problem and the measures we were taking to deal with it. Today, I would like to appraise the record of the past 12 months in the perspective of the hard tasks still before us, and discuss the contributions which can be made to equilibrium in our international accounts by the President's tax proposals.

While last year's progress toward our goal of overall balance was disappointing, we continued to move ahead, and the groundwork for further improvement was laid. I am convinced that tax reduction, prudently financed and accompanied by persistent and firm expenditure control, can play a major role in that improvement. It will also free the hands of American monetary authorities to deal more vigorously with any contingencies that may arise—thus reinforcing our already strong defenses against pressures on the dollar during the difficult period until balance is fully restored.

Last year's overall balance-of-payments deficit amounted to $2.2 billion—the smallest annual deficit since 1957, and only a little more than half the total 2 years ago. But, measured against the $2.4 billion deficit of 1961, progress was limited, and the gold outflow continued at close to $900 million.

However, it must be remembered that during 1962 we absorbed the full impact of the rebound of imports from the abnormally low, recession-induced levels of 1961. As business recovered at home, imports increased by $1.7 billion, or 12 percent. Exports also rose substantially during the first part of the year, but then tapered off, reflecting the slower growth of our export markets in Europe and Japan. The Canadian tariff surcharges, together with adjustments in the Canadian exchange rate also, had a measurable adverse effect on exports during the latter part of the year since Canada is our single, largest foreign market. As a result, our commercial trade surplus (which excludes aid-financed shipments) declined by about $1.2 billion from the exceptionally favorable 1961 figure. While this surplus, at $2 billion, was still larger than that of any other Nation, its decline last year offset almost all of the improvement in our other accounts.

A major source of improvement during 1962 reflected our persistent efforts to curtail the outflow of dollars stemming from our commitments for defense and aid. Taken together, the net balance-of-payments drain from these two programs was reduced by more than $700 million. Much of this improvement stemmed from implementation of the cooperative logistics agreements with West Germany, providing for increased purchases of American military goods and services, while simultaneously strengthening the defense capabilities of both countries.

The vigorous efforts of the Department of Defense to economize in its own foreign exchange outlays were unfortunately offset by rising local costs and the full-year impact of the "Berlin buildup" on the size of our forces based in Europe. Moreover, the usual long interval between foreign aid commitments and actual spending obscured the progress that has been made in supplying a larger share of American assistance to the developing countries in the form of American goods and services.

However, on the basis of current policies and directives, there is a clear prospect of further savings in these two areas in the years ahead. For example, more than three quarters of AID commitments during this fiscal year will be directly reflected in purchases in this country, and that percentage is being raised still higher. A new agreement with Italy provides for the purchase of American-produced military equipment in an amount in excess of the foreign exchange costs of maintaining our forces in that country during 1963. And the Defense Department is continuing to reduce its foreign exchange outlays.

Smaller outflows of short-term capital also contributed to last year's improvement. However, the outflow was larger than we had expected. Much of it was submerged among unrecorded transactions making it difficult to pinpoint the precise cause and the source of these outflows. Certainly, our effort to maintain a structure of short-term rates in the American market that would reduce the incentive to shift funds abroad in search of higher interest returns—an effort that was greatly facilitated by downward rate adjustments in some important European markets—appeared to be reasonably successful, and the upward trend of trade financing and foreign bank loans tapered off. However, the total of short-term and unrecorded outflows, placed at more than $1½ billion in preliminary reports, remained uncomfortably high and clearly indicated an area where much further progress is required.

Outflows of longer term private capital, approximating $2½ billion, continued in undiminished volume, although the composition shifted somewhat as direct investment fell off moderately while the total of new foreign bond issues on the New York market rose. In discussing this problem at Rome last year—when the anomalous pattern of borrowers in Western European countries with strong payments positions seeking large amounts of long-term funds in the United States was already becoming clear—I suggested that much of the difficulty stemmed from the absence in Europe of an efficient, fully effective capital market mechanism, freely open to potential foreign borrowers and capable of absorbing new issues in the required volume. The fact that roughly 45 percent of the total official European, Australian, and New Zealand flotations in New York last year were taken up by foreign buyers—in some instances located in the same country as the borrower—provides further confirmation of this analysis.

It has been gratifying to us that during the past year a number of European countries have begun to reexamine their capital market mechanisms, recognizing their own internal need for more efficient means of mobilizing and distributing savings to support further rapid growth. Italy has made particular progress in developing and strengthening its capital markets and has also found it possible to open them to a few international institutions, as well as to initiate measures to free portfolio investment abroad by its own residents. I have also been glad to see signs of greater interest on the part of American commercial and investment bankers in participating in this process of strengthening European capital markets. That is an area where efforts to provide better service to your customers operating abroad by assisting them to raise local capital and credit can also have important benefits, both for the host country and the United States. Dramatic results cannot be expected within a limited period of time, but over the years ahead, the result will be a healthy freedom from dependence on the New York market, with a consequent lessening of one drain on our balance of payments.

Other factors of basic, long-run strength became more apparent during 1962. For instance, the flow of earnings from our $60 billion of private foreign investment rose by almost 10 percent to a new record of more than $3.5 billion—a figure that will continue mounting in the years ahead. Even more important, for it underlies our whole international trading position, has been the sustained stability in the prices of our industrial goods and materials. Unit wage costs have not risen since 1961, and the index of wholesale prices has now been virtually unchanged for 5 years. In contrast, pronounced upward cost pressures have developed in most industrialized countries in Europe, squeezing profits and bringing price pressures of the sort that have been all too familiar in this country.

A few years ago, there was much talk of a deterioration of the international competitive position of the United States. Today, that talk is diminishing—and for good reason. Our share of world exports of manufactured goods, after declining substantially during the fifties, has been essentially stable since 1959.

At the same time, however, we must recognize—as our alert competitors did long ago—that our competitive position depends on more than price alone. Knowledge of markets and willingness to search them out, product design, sales and servicing facilities, and export credit facilities are all vitally important. Recognizing the key role of commercial exports, the Government is improving and strengthening the facilities of the Export-Import Bank, as well as the export programs of the Department of Commerce. But, in the last analysis, it is the American businessman who must make the sale—and I should add that alert banks can play an important role as catalysts.

Now let us see how our program of tax rate reduction and reform can help to reinforce and support these various developments that are contributing to longer run balance of payments improvement. First of all, it will provide new incentives for investment and intelligent risk taking—increasing profits directly through lower tax rates, and indirectly through enlarged domestic markets and the establishment of a better atmosphere for growth. This is the best way—and ultimately the only way consistent with our free market system—to encourage the productive employment of American capital at home, and to attract more foreign investment to our shores.

It is clear that enlarged domestic spending for plant and equipment will help to employ the abundant supply of savings that today is aggressively seeking longer run investment—and at times seeping out in excessive volume abroad. An attempt to dry up those savings through severe credit contraction would run a serious risk of impeding domestic expansion. The far more constructive route toward the same objective is to bring about the sort of conditions in which these savings can be fully and productively utilized at home—and in which increases in interest rates are a reflection of the improved profitability of investment opportunities.

The more rapid growth fostered by tax reduction will, to be sure, generate further increases in our imports. To the extent that this results in higher foreign exchange earnings by the developing countries, we can expect larger demands for our exports as well. But more directly, the tax program can also help to sharpen the competitive position of our industries in world markets. Our export effort must be concentrated on new and sophisticated manufactured goods, for it is there that export markets are strongest, and there that the needed expansion in our foreign sales must be centered—but it is also there that our foreign competitors have made their greatest strides. We must redouble our efforts to remain at the very forefront of technological progress by applying our scientific abilities to industrial products and processes, and incorporating our new technology in new investment. The President's proposal to permit equipment used in research and development to be charged off as a current expense will directly support this objective. But far more important is the basic encouragement tax rate reductions can give to investment and growth, so that our industry can be better equipped to pour out in ever-increasing volume the new products the world wants.

Thus, there are sound reasons for believing that the tax program will, as it becomes fully effective, reinforce the fundamental longer run factors that are moving our payments position toward equilibrium. But I would not want to lull anyone into a false sense of confidence over the immediate outlook. The sound medicines of more profitable investment at home, stable prices, and a dynamic industry penetrating new export markets can work their cure only with time.

The immediate prospect, as nearly as any one can judge, is for another year of deficit in 1963, and for further gold losses. Faced with this prospect, it is vitally important that we redouble our efforts to reduce further the drains related to our Government programs overseas, and to achieve the kind of performance of our market economy that will bring higher exports and move attractive investment opportunities at home. At the same time, to meet our immediate problems, we need to maintain sound defenses for the dollar. That is why we have worked so steadily, in full cooperation with our friends abroad, to test and develop a wide variety of techniques designed to head off speculative disturbances in the gold and exchange markets and to absorb temporarily excessive supplies of dollars passing into the hands of foreigners.

We fully recognize that these devices are not substitutes for balance-of-payments equilibrium. Indeed, their success ultimately depends upon confidence in our ability and willingness to deal with our fundamental payments problem. But they are an important bulwark for the international payments system upon which all free nations depend, and which ultimately rests upon the free interchange of gold and dollars. Moreover, the usefulness of these arrangements in meeting potential or actual pressures on the dollar and on other currencies has now been amply demonstrated—for example, at the time of the stock market break, the Canadian crisis, and last fall's Cuban showdown.

But, during this critical period, we also need flexible monetary policies, alert to possible strains on the dollar and free to respond promptly in time of need. The difficulty today is that in the absence of expansionary fiscal or tax policy, a sharp and substantial tightening of credit could present real risks to the domestic economy. But, as the President has emphasized on several occasions, and specifically in his tax message, "a nation operating closer to capacity will be freer to use monetary tools to protect its international accounts, should events so require." In short our immediate balance-of-payments situation offers one of the most telling arguments in favor of a tax policy designed to stimulate the economy and thus give greater freedom to those who bear the heavy responsibility of administering monetary policy.

I do not pretend that the tax program alone can meet all of our problems at home or abroad, or that it entails no risks. That would be nonsense. Fiscal policy is not a tool to be used with abandon. We would much prefer to have been able to present our tax program within the context of a balanced budget, and we had hoped to do so. But we cannot afford to wait—and the prospect of budgetary balance in the years ahead will be enhanced, rather than reduced, by soundly conceived tax reduction. Our unsatisfactory growth of recent years, the sluggishness of our investment, the pressures on profits, our idle capacity and manpower, and the failure of revenues to expand with more vigor, can all be traced in good part to the restraining effects of a tax structure unsuited to today's needs. I am firmly convinced—along with a broad cross section of the business community—that to continue operating with the present tax structure would not be consistent with true fiscal responsibility.

We have arranged the phasing of the proposed tax reductions over 3 fiscal years in a manner, consistent with earlier proposals by business groups, that will minimize the transitional budgetary deficits. In fiscal 1964, the great bulk of the anticipated $12 billion deficit would face us in any event, and has no connection with the tax program. The critical need is to finance this deficit in a way that will not give rise to renewed inflationary pressures as we move closer to full employment and reasonably full capacity operations. This is what we have done in financing the deficits of the past 2 years—and what we mean to do in the future.

Our latest figures on the distribution of the public debt, those for January 31, show that the entire increase over the preceding 12 months was financed outside the banking system—an increase of $1.8 billion in Federal Reserve holdings being fully offset by an equivalent decrease in commercial bank holdings. Furthermore, the increase in the outstanding marketable debt maturing in 5 years or more was larger than the total deficit. This policy of working persistently toward a balanced debt structure can be symbolized in a short-hand way by the fact that on March 15, after taking into account the results of our current advance refunding, the average maturity of the marketable debt will be 5 years and 1 month, 11 percent longer than at the end of 1960, and the longest since the fall of 1958.

Some observers have felt that we have been over zealous in our desire to maintain a debt structure that will avoid the danger of excessive liquidity and a future inflationary problem. But this view, in my judgment, underrates the continued availability of new savings in amounts more than adequate to meet the current borrowing requirements of business, individuals, and State and local governments, as well as the essential need to forestall any rebirth of inflation as the stimulus from the tax program takes hold. Moreover, the techniques available to us—and especially the device of advance refundings—have enabled us to attract longer term funds with a minimum of market disturbance.

As I look ahead, I see no reason to believe that we cannot continue for some time to finance the deficit largely from savings, without bringing strong upward pressures on market rates, for there is today a vast flow of funds through our financial institutions seeking longer term commitments. Of course, as investment activity increases in response to the stimulus of tax reductions, private credit demands will also expand, and the available supply of savings will be more fully absorbed. As I have suggested, this is one of the primary reasons why the tax program can be helpful to our balance of payments. We must also recognize that under these conditions, interest rates may rise in response to market forces—even though savings, too, can be expected to rise with incomes.

I can assure you that we have no intention of retreating at that point to excessive monetization of debt to meet our financing needs. When the economy approaches more closely the limits of its capacity, we will need to redouble our guard against potential inflationary pressures. Even more to the point, the higher revenues generated by economic expansion would be directed toward achieving budgetary balance and surplus, thereby releasing savings for productive use by other sectors of the economy.

The President has repeatedly stated that, after enactment of the tax program, a substantial portion of the increased revenues that can be expected in the years ahead will be devoted to reducing and eliminating the budgetary deficit. This policy is an integral and essential part of our financial and tax program. In recognition of the need to accompany tax reduction with rigorous expenditure control, several billions of dollars were cut from estimates developed only a few months ago. Programs that in other circumstances might have been expanded were cut back or deferred. Efforts to achieve economies—including those within the Defense Department—were intensified. And we are proceeding vigorously with efforts to substitute private for public credit wherever feasible.

Nevertheless, a realistic appraisal of the international situation has compelled a further increase in our spending for defense. And our program to put a man on the moon in this decade required an increase of $1.8 billion in space expenditures. These items, together with interest costs, account for more than 70 percent of our entire budget, and for all of the increase in fiscal 1964. Total spending for civilian programs is scheduled to decline. In a longer perspective, it is worth noting that, of the total increase of $17.3 billion in administrative budget expenditures over the 3 fiscal years from 1961 to 1964, $12.6 billion is for defense, space and interest on the public debt, while not much more than a quarter, or $4.7 billion, is for civilian programs. In the 3 preceding fiscal years—excluding temporary unemployment compensation and all the other antirecession expenditures incurred by this administration during the closing months of fiscal 1961—the rise in civilian spending was over $4 billion, or almost as large.

Our Defense Establishment is now approaching the new level of readiness set by the administration, and Secretary McNamara has expressed his confidence that the upward spending trend will taper off after fiscal 1964. If our lunar exploration timetable is to be met, another sizable—but probably smaller—increase in spending for space will be necessary in fiscal 1965, but the prospect here also is for a leveling trend thereafter. This will substantially ease our budgetary task, but we recognize that it will not relieve us from the need for continuous rigorous screening of domestic civilian programs.

A compelling case can be made for increased spending for certain of these civilian programs, some of them new, that are vital to the national interest, but it is our job to find the savings in other areas that will make these programs possible within the confines set by our target of budgetary balance. In undertaking our program of tax reduction we have committed ourselves to do just that. But to defer the tax program to some indefinite future point in the hope that budgetary balance can somehow be achieved with present tax rates—when it is those very rates that stifle the growth we need—seems to me to be self-defeating, and to carry grave risks both for domestic expansion and the balance of payments.

There are simply no easy solutions to our multiple problems at home and abroad. The challenge, for both Government and business, is to appraise these problems realistically, and to seek together in a spirit of partnership the kinds of answers that are fully consistent with our traditions of free markets and free enterprise. The special role of Government, beyond intensive efforts to economize in its own oversea spending, must be to provide an environment of monetary stability, responsible budgetary and debt management policies, and freedom from oppressive taxation in which private enterprise can find renewed incentives to invest at home and to seek our profitable export markets. The special responsibility of business is to make extra efforts—consistent with its own longrun interest—to develop foreign markets and sources of foreign finance, to exercise appropriate restraint in wage and pricing decisions, and—by no means least—to contribute to a process of serious discussion and debate from which intelligent public policy can emerge. Over the past 10 years these monetary conferences sponsored by the American Bankers Association have provided a forum for just such discussion, and I am especially grateful to have had this opportunity to discuss our thinking with you today.

[From the Washington Post, Mar. 11, 1963]

GROWTH AND PAYMENTS

Treasury Secretary Douglas Dillon's speech at the annual monetary conference of the American Bankers Association in Princeton provides an effective antidote to the unfounded fears that a tax cut and a larger fiscal deficit will aggravate the balance-of-payments problem and accelerate the outflow of gold.

The Secretary's cogent analysis provides a timely rebuttal to the argument advanced by a segment of the banking community which holds that there is a direct and inexorable series of causal links between fiscal deficits, increases in the domestic money supply, balance-of-payments deficts and gold losses. According to this view, which has an articulate proponent in John Exter, vice president of the First National City Bank of New York, a balance-of-payments equilibrium can only be achieved by restrictive monetary and fiscal policies. But this view flies in the face of both logic and the dreary monetary experience of the 1930's. Far from solving the balance-of-payments problem, restrictive monetary and fiscal policies would at this juncture plunge the economy into a recession and do irreparable damage to confidence in the international dollar.

Mr. Dillon was on firm ground in insisting that the only hope for improving our balance-of-payments position lies in accelerating the growth of the American economy. By expanding the volume of activity and increasing the demand for domestic investment funds, the tax cut will strengthen our international payments position by reversing outflow of capital. And the Secretary added that "it is clear that the enlarged domestic spending for plant and equipment will help to employ the abundant supply of savings that today is aggressively seeking longer-run investment—and at times seeping out in excessive volume abroad. An attempt to dry up those savings through severe credit contraction would run a serious risk of impeding domestic expansion. The far more constructive route toward the same objective is to bring about the sort of conditions in which these savings can be fully and productively utilized at home."

Mr. Dillon also said tax reduction will "free the hands of the American monetary authorities to deal more vigorously with any contingencies that may arise." This remark has strengthened the speculation that the monetary authorities may act to raise short-term interest rates after the passage of the tax bill. But since high interest rates have hardly been successful in stanching the outflow of short-term capital, other alternatives should be exhausted before measures which arrest domestic activity are adopted.

EDUCATION AND LAW ENFORCEMENT

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, recently, there came to my attention a notable address delivered to the graduating class of the Connecticut State Police, by Samuel F. Pryor, Jr., vice president of Pan American Airways, who resides in Greenwich, Conn. There were 34 graduates, 4 being sons of State police officers and the majority being former members of the U.S. Marine Corps.

Mr. Pryor's address centered around the point that if we are to save our society from crumbling from within we must give much more attention to the professions of education and law enforcement.

It was an address filled with good sense, from a man who is not only one of the most outstanding businessmen in the country, but one who has also given so generously of his time and energy to civic causes.

I ask unanimous consent that the address be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY SAMUEL F. PRYOR, JR.

I thank your commissioner for inviting me to say a few words on law enforcement to this graduating class. In addition to the privilege he has given me of cooperating with your State police force and the privilege Chief Robbins has given me for many years of cooperating with our Greenwich police force, I have for some years had the honor of being an official adviser to the Bureau of Narcotics of the U.S. Treasury Department. I attended their Advanced Narcotics Training School, and just last year represented the commissioner at the interpol convention in Copenhagen. This experience has convinced me that Edgar Hoover was right in saying that law preserves the heart of our democracy and freedom; but the existence of law itself is no guarantee that it will be administered effectively. You must play your part in effective administration. How law is administered is the safeguard to democracy and freedom, which each and everyone of us treasure so deeply. I strongly believe that if the moral fiber of our country is to be maintained—if we are to survive in a competitive world—we must have greater citizen cooperation and assistance in support of our law enforcement agencies. Crime is a community problem, not just a police problem.

My business takes me to 81 countries of our world, so possibly I see law enforcement at work in many countries, cities, and towns—in many ways—good and bad—more than the average citizen. It has been my privilege to visit many of the ancient cities, which are now either in ruins or buried under desert sands, not only in the European countries but also in the pre-Christian kingdoms, and on our own continent, the Mayan civilization, the Aztec, and the Inca. Some of these civilizations have been dead now over 2,000 years. Each of these nations, at its peak, stood in the forefront of civilized achievement and accomplishment. Each asserted its influence throughout the then known world. Each was the leader of its time.

Pondering over these ruins caused me to wonder about ourselves. What is happening to us today—right now in this year 1963. Crime in the United States increased five times faster than the Nation's population in the 5 years preceding 1962. Some 7,800 law-enforcement agencies in the country reported an estimated 1,926,090 serious crimes in 1961, 3 percent more than in 1960. On the average there was a murder, forcible rape, robbery, aggravated assault, burglary, major larceny, or automobile theft every 16 seconds in 1961.

Preliminary statistics for 1962 show a continuing upward surge. A 5-percent increase was recorded in the first 9 months of 1962 over the same period of 1961.

A major increase has occurred in one of the more serious types of crime—bank robberies, burglaries, and larcenies in 1962. There has been an average of 100 such crimes each month for an increase of about 25 percent over 1961.

An analysis of crime statistics reveals that the crime rate—number of offenses per 100,000 inhabitants—generally is higher in the areas with the largest population increase. The crime rate in metropolitan areas—cities over 50,000 and their fringes—is three times greater than in rural areas, and twice that of smaller cities.

Over half the cash and property stolen in robberies, burglaries, larcenies, and auto thefts in 1961 was recovered through effective law enforcement work. Also, the vast majority of crimes committed directly against individuals were cleared by arrest, ranging from 93 percent of all murders to 73 percent of all forcible rapes.

There is an average of just under two police employees for every 1,000 inhabitants in the United States. This should leave no doubt that greater citizen cooperation and assistance is needed by law enforcement agencies in protecting the safety and welfare of the Nation and its citizens. Every citizen should do what they can to combat crime. A great help would be the taking of simple precautions with property of value. Of the burglaries committed in 1961, 21 percent took place in buildings to which some means of access had been left open. A great reduction in the $22 billion annual crime bill could be effected if citizens merely took normal, intelligent steps to protect their property.

Crimes reported from agencies within our State of Connecticut for the first 9 months of the 1962 calendar year were up 18 percent from 1961—the increase primarily attributable to the increase in burglary and larceny categories. The percentage of reported crimes cleared by arrest for this same period was approximately 38 percent, which is above the national average.

As each of you goes out from here to join the ranks of law enforcers, you will come to wonder how the citizens of this country can be so unaware as to virtually invite the committing of crime daily. The fact remains that the public is often naive, and this will be a constant irritant to you in the days and years ahead.

Yet you must never lose sight of the need—indeed, the duty—to teach the everyday citizen to help you safeguard his freedom. This aspect—education—can be as important in your new role as that of actual crime detection and prevention.

If you will permit me a bit of pride as a resident of Connecticut, let me emphasize to you the State's program of education, for example, in the area of motor traffic alone. Whereas many States appear to welcome speeders as a potential source of income, laying traps for the unsuspecting (and unwarned) driver, Connecticut does everything it can to educate the driver to exercise prudence before it cracks down. This genuine attempt to help citizens protect themselves is a goal to keep before you always. Law-enforcement agencies reflect the spirit of their communities.

As I mentioned before, I have had an interest in a special area of law enforcement—narcotics. In no other area can education do so much to prevent the thrill-seeker, the depressed, the experimenter from becoming a rotting shell of a human being.

While the Soviet countries have us all looking into space, they are encouraging the distribution of narcotics, not in their countries, but in all other countries around the world including our own. A teenager can become a dangerous criminal by becoming an addict to heroin. Governments can fall or surrender to the Communists easily if enough government officials, using bad judgment, should come under the influence of narcotics.

Nationwide attention was directed to this problem in the latter part of September, during the White House Conference on Narcotic and Drug Abuse. It was my privilege to be a representative at this Conference. The Conference, which was held on September 27 and 28, brought together 400 experts in the various fields of medicine, the social sciences, and law enforcement.

Two aspects of the Conference are particularly noteworthy. First, the President announced his intention to appoint a special committee to advise him regarding a program for the civil commitment of narcotic addicts and their rehabilitation. Second, it was pointed out that the abusive use of dangerous drugs (i.e., barbiturates and amphetamines) may be a more serious problem than the abusive use of narcotic drugs. The President's advisory committee is to inform him regarding any needed Federal legislation in this area.

Arnold Toynbee has documented, in the case of civilization after civilization, that complete destruction comes from within. Egypt, Babylon, Crete, Greece, Assyria, Rome—and in our own hemisphere the Mayas and the Incas—were not destroyed from without. In each and every case the conquerer found a civilization which had begun its self-destruction from within. We can look back through the long, long vista of human history and we can see that today the whole cause of human freedom is in the greatest danger mankind has ever known.

Thinking about this has brought me to the conclusion that there are two professions that we in this country must encourage and strengthen to the utmost—teaching and law enforcement. I do not think we are going to have a nuclear war. Our one enemy capable of waging nuclear war against us realizes that there is no such thing as victory today; if they attacked us, our country would be half dead, but they themselves would be three-fourths dead. Therefore, the war in which we will engage will be a war of minds, so education of our young must be greatly strengthened. The teaching profession must be a chosen profession with much greater respect and remuneration. However, this cannot be accomplished without first our law enforcement profession being also a most honored and respected profession. This is the profession you have chosen.

In the Marine Corps the highest honor that one can wish for is to be called a good marine. You as police officers must have spotless integrity, uncommon bravery, and complete devotion to duty—then you will be judged by your community with what should be one of the highest community honors—you will be called a good police officer. We need you.

Good luck to you and God bless you.

MORE INDIANA SCIENTISTS PLEAD THAT DUNES BE SAVED

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, the vigorous support of the scientific community for the effort to save the Indiana Dunes is heartening. This support, which has come from the universities and colleges of Indiana, and from throughout the free world, should put to rest the completely untrue claim made by Bethlehem Steel Co. and the other dunes despoilers that nothing of value remains in the dunes to be saved.

On March 7, I had printed in the Record at page 3666, the fine letter of the members of the biology department of Notre Dame University which clearly states the uniqueness and irreplaceability of the dunes.

On February 4, I discussed in the Senate the appeal made by 166 scientists and educators working within the State of Indiana that the central section of the dunes be preserved because of the high scientific and recreational values.

Last July, some of the most famous zoologists, biologists, and ornithologists of the world appealed to Northwestern University and other participants in the planned destruction of the key section of the dunes to reconsider their actions. I put a full account of this appeal by European and American scientists in the Record of July 27, 1962.

Numerous other individual scientists and scientific associations have written to me and to the Senate Subcommittee on Public Lands, stating their expert opinions that the Indiana Dunes are unique, irreplaceable, and of inestimable scientific and recreational value.

Now, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to add to this irrefutable record by having printed in the Congressional Record a letter written by 19 members of the faculty of Purdue University, Lafayette, Ind., which appeared in the Lafayette Journal-Courier of February 22, 1963.

This letter from prominent Hoosiers corrects some of the propaganda of the dunes destroyers and Burns ditch harbor proponents and takes the position which more and more Indiana people are expressing, namely, "We favor combining all the economic benefits, including tourism, by having the port elsewhere, and having a great lakeshore park where it belongs."

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Dunes Versus Port

The charge is being made that opposition to the State's Burns ditch port plan is heavily financed by Chicago interests attempting to impede Indiana's economic development. None of this is true. The Save-the-Dunes Council has a $19,000 annual budget derived from dues and contributions from its 3,000 members, and from sale of Christmas cards. The attempt to portray this group of dedicated volunteer workers for conservation, without paid officers, as a sinister economic octopus is ludicrous when one considers the combined forces of officialdom, industry, press, and political power arrayed on the other side. Nevertheless, the undersigned council members and sympathizers deny and resent these reckless accusations against their intregity and motives.

Many pertinent facts have been obscured in the public furor over the proposed Burns ditch port site. Only after persistent urging by Indiana citizens unable to enlist support for dunes conservation from Hoosier politicians did Senator Douglas reluctantly consent to assist the largely Indiana organization, the Save-the-Dunes Council. The unjustified campaign of vilification against him has put our State in a very bad light. If we resent "interference in our sovereign business" by out-of-Staters, we should stop agitating for Federal funds to build our port.

Far from opposing another lake port in Indiana (although we now have four, two of which are open to public use), Senator Douglas has pledged his influence to obtain generous Federal funds for one, anywhere except in the contested dunes and beach area. It is a question of where, not whether. Specifically, he has accepted (1) the tricity site, for which the 87th Congress appropriated funds for a thorough Army Engineers feasibility study, and (2) the Burns ditch compromise plan drawn up by the Lake Michigan Region Planning Council, an affiliate of the American Institute of Architects. This plan calls for a canal leading inland to an excavated port behind the strip of dunes in question.

The economic argument for a port at the Burns ditch site is unconvincing. The number of new jobs it would bring about is variously claimed as from 25,000 to 100,000 These figures were picked out of the air, they are hardly confirmed by Bethlehem Steel's announcement of about 2,000 employees for the automated mill it has planned and for which the land is being prepared. Professor Efroymson, Butler University economist, wrote that more economic benefit for Indiana would result in the long run by a lakeshore park to stimulate our tourist industry, than from a port at Burns ditch. Other economists judge that the new jobs there would be more than offest by resulting increased unemployment in the less automated steel mills in Indiana farther west. The United Steelworkers, representing 65,000 Hoosiers, have declared against the Burns ditch site.

The legislators who were given the recent conducted tour have never seen the land in question except in the dead of winter and with the earth scorched by fires set to facilitate clearing and bulldozing. Is their judgment of parkland quality better than that of Interior Secretary Udall and National Park Service authorities who found that the area meets the exacting standards of quality for inclusion in the national park system? Or better than that of the 165 outdoors-oriented Indiana scientists who wrote President Kennedy jointly urging the lakeshore?

We favor combining all the economic benefits, including tourism, by having the port elsewhere, and having a great lakeshore park where it belongs.

Preston Adams, Irving W. Burr, Marjorie K. Eisinger, Raymond E. Girton, Clarence J. Goodnight, Marie L. Goodnight, Arthur T. Guard, Joseph A. Kuc, Alton A. Lindsey, James S. Lovett, Phyllis K. Martin, Melvin G. Mellon, Russell E. Mumford, Elroy L. Rice, Sumner A. Rifenburgh, Oscar G. Ward, Jr., Barbara Webster, Grady Webster, and Arthur H. Westing.

THE PRESIDENT'S TAX PROGRAM

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, the Assistant Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. Stanley Surrey, spoke recently before the Juristic Society of Philadelphia about the President's tax program.

As there is so much misinformation about the program, I think it important that Members of the Congress and the public generally have access to Mr. Surrey's remarks where he explains factually just what many of the proposals would do.

I ask unanimous consent that his speech be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

The Tax Program in Perspective

(Remarks by Stanley S. Surrey, Assistant Secretary of the Treasury before the Juristic Society of Philadelphia, Philadelphia, Pa., February 28, 1963)

THE BACKGROUND—WIDESPREAD CRITICISM OF THE TAX STRUCTURE

Throughout the postwar period there has been increasing recognition that the Federal income-tax structure deserved revision. It has been criticized on the ground that its high rates are a heritage of war and postwar inflationary pressure, and that these rates dull initiative, destroy incentives, and inhibit risktaking.

There have also been charges that our tax law contains special preferences, which discriminate without justification among taxpayers and contribute to gross unfairness. The many exclusions and deductions have been blamed for unduly narrowing the tax base, contributing to the need for high rates. The tax system has been blamed for showing favoritism to some industries and transactions, and distorting the allocation of resources in the economy as well as interfering with the free play of market forces. As a result of all this, the energies and talents of many people—including a great number of highly skilled executives and professional people—have been taken up devising intricate schemes to take maximum advantage of opportunities for tax reduction.

It is hardly surprising, then, that criticism of our tax system became more insistent as the postwar period lengthened. The Congress took account of such criticism in 1955 and 1959, when, under the leadership of Chairman **Wilbur Mills**, of Arkansas, noteworthy studies of our tax system were made. Considerable testimony from professional experts was compiled in these studies, not merely on the criticisms themselves, but on the possible lines of improvement which might be taken.

That was the situation when President Kennedy took office. He immediately set tax revision as one of the major domestic goals of his administration. He made his views clear in his first tax message to the Congress, in April of 1961. In that message he urged the adoption of an investment tax credit as a stimulus to spur investment and accelerate growth, proposed a series of specific tax reforms, and ordered a Treasury study of additional, broader changes in the income tax structure.

The Congress responded with the Revenue Act of 1962, containing both the investment tax credit and significant reform provisions in almost all of the areas recommended by the President—in all nearly a billion dollars of tax reform to roughly match the revenue lost by the investment credit. A significant first step in revision of the tax structure was thus accomplished.

YEAR 1963—THE CASE FOR TAX REVISION BECOMES IMPERATIVE

The year 1963, however, brought a new dimension to the situation. The tax revision that all had agreed was one of our desirable domestic goals came to be recognized as imperative to our economic health.

We have seen four recessions since the end of World War II. We have seen unplanned deficits resulting from a failure of the economy to achieve levels of operation consistent with its potential in terms of capital, manpower, and productivity. The gap between our potential and our actual performance—now about $40 billion in terms of lost gross national product per year—is evident in unused industrial capacity, high unemployment, and a lagging rate of capital formation. As a result we are running the risk of recessions that could cut deeper and last longer, followed by shorter recoveries. Furthermore, the America we all want—with full employment, with more and better schools, health facilities, and public services, with urban redevelopment on a faster and larger scale, with better living standards for all—will come about far more quickly through an economy yielding us all that our resources in men and capital are capable of producing.

The overwhelming weight of economic analysis indicates that the income tax structure presses too heavily on the economy. Its especially high individual income tax rates, starting at 20 percent, sweep too much out of private hands in relation to our GNP, so that consumer demand is kept throttled down in periods of recovery. The rate structure, rising to 91 percent, means high marginal tax rates that deter incentive, risk taking, and personal effort, thereby lessening the contribution that private initiative is able to make. The corporate tax rate, at 52 percent, unduly limits the profitability of corporate investment and presents corporate management with the fact that the shareholders are the lesser and the Government the greater partner in the enterprises they guide. Added to all this is the waste arising from the distortions induced by the special preferences—the uneconomic allocation of resources, the talents and time lost in the pursuit of tax schemes, the resentments created by the gross unfairnesses.

We thus come to these conclusions—the America we want and the America we must have to meet our international obligations and hazards can be obtained only by a more productive economy. We possess the resources required for a higher level of economic activity. Our task is to secure the full utilization of those resources. The most effective way to achieve that full utilization is to revise the tax system. Tax revision, by removing the present tax restraints on the private sector, will enable it to provide the force and initiative so necessary to economic vitality. Tax revision—for long acknowledged as a desirable thing to do—is now of paramount economic importance.

THE NATURE OF THE PROPOSED REVISION—THE RATE REDUCTIONS

In full recognition of the imperative of tax revision, the President's tax program recommends large reductions in the rate scale and significant structural changes. Combined these mean, in full operation, a reduction of $10.3 billion in tax liabilities—about 15 percent of our present individual and corporate tax liabilities. Let us start with the major reform of the tax structure, the reduction in tax rates. The present individual rates run from 20 percent in the bottom bracket of $2,000 to $4,000 for a married couple—to 91 percent at the top. President Kennedy's tax program would start the tax scale at 14 percent on the first $1,000 to $2,000 for a married couple—and rise to a maximum of 65 percent. The intermediate rates are all pulled down—the present marginal rate of 30 percent for the $15,000 married man would be 24 percent, of 43 percent for the $25,000 man would be 34 percent. The 50-percent marginal rate now reached at $32,000 would be reached at $52,000. The 60-percent marginal rate now reached at $52,000 would not be reached until $140,000. These large reductions in the marginal tax rates—the rates on added dollars of income—show the significant increase in incentives inherent in the program.

The resulting rate scale means a reduction of $11 billion in individual income tax liabilities.

On the corporate side our present rates are 30 percent on the first $25,000 of income and 52 percent on the remainder. The proposed tax rates would be 22 percent on the first $25,000 and 47 percent on the balance. The 22 percent rate for small business—a rate which would apply to 80 percent of all taxpaying corporations—is a reduction of 27 percent. It means a significant lift for a large segment of American enterprise. The 47-percent rate is a 10-percent reduction, so that the reduction for the corporations above $25,000 ranges in between—it is 16 percent for a $50,000 corporation, 12 percent for a $100,000 corporation. The overall reduction in corporate tax liabilities is $2.6 billion. This reduction is about the same as that obtained in 1962, when over $2 billion of corporation tax liabilities were removed through the combined effect of the investment credit and administrative revision of the depreciation rules. The resulting total would mean that overall corporate tax liabilities would be reduced by nearly 20 percent.

These reductions would thus achieve a sizable lowering of the individual and corporate rate structures. In terms of increased incentives, of increased private resources available for consumer spending and capital investment, of a significant lessening of the weight of the tax system on all private enterprise and activity, of the impetus given to cost cutting and improvements in productive efficiency, the new rates represent the most significant of the reforms of the tax system that the program embodies. They are a direct and effective response to the need for loosening the present tax restraints on the economy. They recognize that the achievement of a greater level of economic recovery and more rapid growth cannot rest either on increased consumer spending alone or on increased incentives and savings for investment alone. Both are vitally needed, consumer demand to press on existing and future capacity to bring us to full employment and lead to a higher level of investment; the investment incentives to stimulate us to go on to a higher level of capital formation and economic growth. The rate reductions pull back the entire rate structure, individual and corporate, from top to bottom.

THE NATURE OF THE PROPOSED REVISION—THE STRUCTURAL CHANGES

The major reform in the tax program is thus the large reduction in tax rates. These reductions are complemented by—and their revenue cost partially offset by—a number of proposed structural changes. These structural changes are not all in one direction—some involve revenue losses and some revenue gains, some affect corporations and some individuals, some are directly associated with changes in the rate structure and some are required by the objectives of eliminating hardships, unfairness, and unjustified preferences.

Individual structural changes that lose revenue: On the individual side, a number of structural changes are proposed to remove particular hardships and unfairnesses that rate reduction by itself will not rectify. Thus, at the lower end of the scale, the insistence by many that exemptions be raised has been prompted by the realization that an income tax reaching as low as $667 for single persons and $1,333 for married couples taxes persons in the area of real poverty. Rate reductions alone obviously cannot meet this problem. Yet the solution of raising exemptions by $100 would mean a revenue loss of $2.5 billion under proposed rates and remove 3 million taxpayers from the rolls; an increase of $200 in exemptions means a revenue loss of almost $5 billion and removal of 6½ million taxpayers. This exemption approach is wasteful of revenue, since its effects reach beyond the lower levels where the particular relief is needed, and is often overgenerous where family size is large. Of the $2.5 billion of revenue that would be lost through a $100 increase in exemptions, only 20 percent or $550 million would go to the group below $5,000.

As a more appropriate solution the program proposes a minimum standard deduction of $300 for a single person and an additional $100 for a spouse and for each dependent. As a consequence, single persons below $900, married persons below $1,600, and married persons with two dependents below $3,000 cease to be taxable—as compared with $667, $1,333, and $2,666 levels of today. The revenue loss is only $310 million, concentrated almost entirely in the group below $5,000. Yet this approach achieves in the lowest income range the equivalent of an exemption increase of as much as $233 for a single person, of as much as $133 for each spouse of the married couple, and of as much as $83 for each member of the family of four. About 1.5 million persons would become nontaxable by this proposal.

In short, the minimum standard deduction proposal uses the deduction factor of the tax computation as a technique to achieve a fair adjustment of the tax burdens at the lowest levels of income, in preference to the more traditional, yet wastefully expensive technique, of raising exemptions.

Another hardship that tax rate reduction alone cannot meet is the present complex and discriminatory treatment of the aged. Present law embodies an extra $600 exemption—which at higher income levels is unneeded and thus a revenue waste—and a complicated retirement income credit designed to give pensioners and those receiving investment income a tax reduction somewhat comparable to the exclusion of social security benefits from income. Its effect is to discriminate against all those over 65 who receive earned income—about three out of every four taxpayers over 65. The consequent unfairnesses among the aged in the income levels below $10,000, depending on source of income, are too great to tolerate—a tax of zero for a $3,000 income from interest and rent, but a tax of $300 if wages are the only source of income. And again the credit is unneeded in the upper levels.

The tax program proposes to substitute for all this a flat $300 credit against tax for each person over age 65. Recognition of the present social security exclusion is taken account of in the proposal. This is done by reducing the credit by an amount based on one-half of social security benefits times the taxpayer's bracket or marginal tax rate. This procedure reflects the fact that both the employee and employer contribute equally to the benefits. The cost of this change is $320 million, one-half of which goes to persons below the $5,000 income level and most of the balance to those with incomes between $5,000 and $10,000. This change would thus continue the present policy that age is a factor justifying tax relief, and then provide a mechanism which both grants that relief in a fair and simple way and confines it to the income levels where it is needed most.

A third structural change under the individual income tax also meets a hardship which rate reduction cannot solve—that faced by the person with fluctuating yearly income. While fluctuating incomes may be more characteristic of people in certain occupations, such as authors, artists, actors, athletes, ranchers, fisherman, farmers, architects, and individual business proprietorships, it obviously may be experienced in many other situations. The combination of graduated tax rates and an irregular pattern of income produces more tax today over a period of years than does a stable income pattern. The tax program meets this hardship by a uniform averaging formula applicable to all, under which income is, in effect, averaged over a 5-year period whenever the current year's income is significantly higher than the average of the preceding 4 years. The revenue cost is about $40 million.

A fourth structural change, involving a revenue cost of $50 million, is aimed at meeting the hardship experienced by persons who must incur moving expenses for themselves and their families as a consequence of a change in employment. The burden can often be severe and its impact, apart from hardship, can be such as to place an undesirable restriction on labor mobility. The tax program proposes a deduction for these moving expenses, both for a transferred person who continues to work for the same employer and for a person who changes his employer.

The remaining individual structural changes that lose revenue smooth out or extend existing provisions respecting certain expenditures. One change would expand the benefits of the child-care provision (revenue cost 20 billion); another would apply the 30-percent limitation uniformly to all publicly supported charities, thereby replacing the present distinctions between a 20-percent and a 30-percent limitation for these charities (revenue cost nominal); and a third would clarify and simplify the medical expense deduction (revenue cost nominal).

In sum, this group of reforms, which in total involve a revenue cost of $740 million, will thus meet some of the persistent and well-founded complaints regarding the hardships resulting today, not from the present rate scale but from the operation of the tax structure even under a reasonable rate scale. They deal with specific unfairnesses requiring specific reforms for their cure. It is just as important to the persons affected, in terms of fairness under an income tax, that their problems be met as it is to those whose objections are directed to the present rate scales. Moreover, these changes have a considerable bearing on the economic scene in terms of labor mobility and allocation of individual skills. This group of reforms or structural changes thus contributes significantly to the insistent urgings for improvement in the tax structure.

Individual structural changes that gain revenue: The remaining individual structural changes involve revenue gains. The most significant from a revenue standpoint is the proposed floor on deductions for personal expenses—interest, charitable contributions, State and local taxes, medical expenses, casualty losses. Under this proposal only the total of those expenses above 5 percent of adjusted gross income would be deductible. A consideration of this proposal in its proper perspective requires that we go back to the origin and effect of the standard deduction. The Congress in 1944 adopted our present standard deduction of 10 percent of adjusted gross income up to a $1,000 maximum as a device to simplify the tax law. Since the 10-percent figure chosen was somewhat above the average of those expenses then being itemized as deductions, the policy also eliminated any distinctions between itemizers and nonitemizers among taxpayers below or around the average level.

Since 1944 there has been a considerable growth in the average amount of these personal expenses, as a result of rising income levels, rising costs, and changing habits. In 1944, about 35 million returns used the standard deduction and only 8 million used itemized deductions; in 1962 the figures were 26 and 25 million respectively. In 1944, the standard deduction represented 63 percent of the total of all deductions for these personal expenses; in 1962 this figure had dropped to 23 percent. In 1944 the itemized and standard deductions combined represented about 10 percent of adjusted gross income; in 1962 they represented about 15 percent. The standard deduction now comes to $12½ billion. The itemized deductions come to $41 billion, used by taxpayers with an adjusted gross income of $217 billion, or about 20 percent. In 1944, the itemized deductions amounted to only $4.6 billion, used by taxpayers with $32.5 billion adjusted gross income, or about 14 percent. This is the key figure, for it indicates the persistent narrowing of the tax base that has occurred in postwar years as a result of the large increase in amount of itemized deductions—from 14 percent to 20 percent of the adjusted gross income of the returns involved. Parenthetically, by contrast the total of personal exemptions has dropped from about 40 to 27 percent of adjusted gross income.

The standard deduction represents a congressional policy of eliminating distinctions between itemization and nonitemization of expenses at the level of average expenses for taxpayers with incomes below $10,000. Underlying this policy was a desire for simplification and a willingness to recognize that some of the rental expenses of the renter reflected personal expense akin to those of the howeowner. In view of the increase in these personal expenses relative to gross income, it is obvious that if we were today adopting the policy of the standard deduction for the first time, the appropriate figure would be about 15 percent instead of 10 percent, with a limit perhaps of $1,500. But in the meantime we have seen that the narrowing of the tax base represented by the rise in personal expenses is a factor in keeping marginal rates at an excessively high level. A standard deduction at 15 percent would also have a base-narrowing effect and mean a loss of revenue. The intent behind the standard deduction, however, can be as well expressed through a different mechanism, that of placing a floor under itemized deductions. Instead then of a standard deduction of 15 percent, the objectives can be achieved by continuing the standard deduction of 10 percent and adopting a 5-percent floor under itemized deductions. This policy would, of course, gain revenue. Since it would be adopted to keep the base from narrowing and thereby keeping or forcing tax rates up, it is appropriate that the revenue gained be devoted to a lowering of the rates.

The policies behind the standard deduction—simplification and a balanced allowance to all taxpayers of the average of personal expenses—today in the light of the great increase in personal expenses would thus appear to require either a rise in the standard deduction or a floor under itemized deductions. The expression of that policy through an increase in the standard deduction would contribute to further narrowing of the tax base and would necessitate higher rates. An expression of that policy in the 5-percent floor will broaden the tax base and permit a far larger reduction in marginal tax rates. Some may feel that the continuation, through the use of a floor, of this policy of achieving some balance in the recognition of personal expenses raises problems, especially in those brackets where the itemizers and nonitemizers are both significantly represented. Expression could be given to this viewpoint by combining a floor on itemized deductions with some comparable reduction in the standard deduction.

The combination of the 5-percent floor and rate reduction will leave itemizers with significant tax reductions. Further, the 5-percent floor will not reduce the incentives that the deductions for personal expenses seek to encourage, such as home ownership or charitable contributions. Itemized expenses today average about 20 percent of adjusted gross income, so that most of present expenses and, of course, all new expenses are above the floor. Those, for example, who have expressed fears over reduced charitable or educational giving should be relieved of their worries when they study the facts. Clearly for most itemizers the present nondiscretionary expenses of State taxes, mortgage interest, and medical expenses are obviously above a 5-percent floor. Voluntary charitable contributions, therefore, would be fully deductible. Moreover, despite the forebodings of some of these institutions in 1944 when the standard deduction was adopted—and 80 percent of taxpayers were shifted to that method—charitable giving was not adversely affected. Finally, the volume of charitable giving appears to depend primarily on the level of income—for years it has been about 2 percent of national personal income despite changes in tax rates and structure. The tax program will not only increase the after-tax incomes of individuals but through its effect on the economy will greatly increase national personal income. A rise in that income from the present $440 to $525 billion—which could be achieved under the tax program—would alone increase charitable giving from its present $8.8 to $10.5 billion.

The 5-percent floor is thus not only in keeping with the policies behind the standard deduction, but it also expresses those policies in a manner that permits a larger tax rate reduction than would otherwise be possible. The revenue gain from the floor is $2.3 billion. If this $2.3 billion were not thus available, then the rate scale would have to be raised, primarily in the middle and upper brackets if the revenue involved were to be distributed in the same fashion as reflected by the floor. This would mean top bracket marginal tax rates would be scaled to 75 percent and not 65 percent.

The 5-percent floor, while keeping the essential policies underlying the deductions for personal expenses, also contributes to a rate scale more conducive to personal incentives and economic well being. The basic point is to preserve and strengthen all of the incentives that are important—both those involved in the deductions for personal expenses and those involved in lower marginal tax rates—and the combination of the 5-percent floor and the lower rate scale it permits achieves this result.

The remaining individual revenue-raising changes raise about $700 million—an amount equal to the revenue-losing changes. Two of the changes are associated with reductions in the rates, especially the top rates, and would remove preferences or escapes not justifiable under lowered top rates. The proposal to eliminate the dividend credit and exclusion would alone recover $460 million in tax revenue. Nearly 80 percent of the benefits of these provisions presently goes to taxpayers over $10,000, and over 50 percent to those over $20,000. Even as to the exclusion only 15 percent of its benefits goes to persons under $5,000, with 60 percent of the benefits to those over $10,000. This, of course, is merely a reflection of the concentration of corporate ownership and dividends in middle and upper income groups. In 1960 only 5 percent of the returns under $5,000 reported dividends, which dividends amounted to one percent of the total adjusted gross income on these returns; these returns accounted for 14 percent of dividends reported. Returns over $20,000 accounted for 60 percent of the dividends, and almost all returns reported some dividends; these dividends represent 10 percent of adjusted gross income at $20,000, 20 percent at $50,000 and 40 percent above $200,000.

It is appropriate to eliminate this special preference for dividends, which has achieved no useful economic purpose, at a time when the individual rate scale is being lowered and the corporate rate also reduced. The incentives for investment and risk-taking which these lower rates provide would be far more significant in their impact on the economy than the dividend credit and exclusion. Moreover, the 5-point proposed reduction in the corporate rate will give more relief from double taxation than does the 4 percent credit for incomes up to $186,000. The credit reduces double taxation by amounts ranging from 4.3 percent for taxpayers in the first bracket to 10.4 percent in the proposed top bracket. The five-point reduction in the corporate tax rate would reduce double taxation by 10 percent for everyone. The other proposal related to the rates is a tightening of the personal holding company rules, to end the escapes from individual taxation now available through the use of these devices to shelter investment income or income from personal efforts.

The other revenue-gaining changes would eliminate undesirable or inequitable preferences that now exist and improve existing rules. These involve elimination of the sick-pay exclusion; the taxation to the employee of the value of the economic benefit of employer-provided group term life insurance above a minimum figure, in keeping with the present tax treatment of other forms of employer-provided insurance; the institution of a 4-percent floor under casualty losses comparable to that under medical expenses, and the elimination of the unlimited charitable deduction.

In sum, the revenue-raising structural changes in the individual area—seven in number—involve about $3 billion, of which $2.3 billion is concentrated in the 5 percent floor and $700 million in the remaining items. They offset to this extent the $11.7 billion revenue loss involved in a rate scale running from 14 to 65 percent and the $740 million of changes needed to eliminate hardships that cannot be reached by rate reduction. They represent reforms responsive to the persistent urgings that our tax structure be altered to keep the tax base from constantly narrowing and to eliminate unfair preferences. They involve no departures from basic income tax concepts and no complications of technical implementation. They clearly do not broaden the individual tax base as much as some have urged. At the same time, they represent significant improvements in the tax structure. Together with the changes designed to eliminate hardships, they contribute to a balanced program of revision in the tax structure.

Corporate structural changes: The structural changes in the corporate tax are few in number. Two are associated with the reduction of the normal tax on the first $25,000 of corporate income from 30 to 22 percent. The normal tax concept represents a policy designed to assist "small business" and the reduction in this rate—a 27-percent reduction—will strengthen that assistance. It is important that this tax benefit—and the consequent revenue loss—be confined to what are truly small businesses. However, we find that enterprises and activities which are conducted with multiple corporate structures could obtain this small business tax benefit many times over if each corporation in the structure were taxed at only 22 percent on its first $25,000 of income. It is obvious that a rational application of a tax policy designed to assist small business requires aggregation of corporations under common ownership before the $25,000 test is applied. This is so whether the multiple corporations serve genuine business purposes or are simply tax motivated. It may be observed that eligibility for the other nontax small business benefits accorded by the Congress is determined on such a consolidated basis.

The tax program, in order to make possible the reduction of the small business rate to 22 percent, thus proposes only a single surtax exemption for multiple corporation enterprises, the change to be phased over 5 years. The revenue gain is $120 million. At the same time, in further application of this policy of neutralizing the tax effect of multiple corporate structures, it is proposed that the two percent additional tax on consolidated returns be eliminated and that intercorporate dividends between affiliated corporations not be taxes. The revenue cost is $50 million.

These two structural changes are thus directly linked to the new corporate rate structure. Of the remaining structural changes, one that costs revenue ($50 million) would permit the current expensing of equipment used in research and development activities, with the objective of encouraging the expansion of private civilian research. A change that would gain revenue (about $250 million, of which $10 million comes from individuals) involves improvements in the taxation of natural resource activities designed to carry out the purposes behind the existing depletion policies.

In sum, these corporate structural changes, few in number, involve revenue costs of $100 million and gains of $360 million. They reduce the $2.63 billion of corporate rate reduction to about $2.3 billion. Here also a balance is preserved, with the changes proposed being either necessitated by the new rate structure or designed to meet particular problems in the corporate area. A further significant structural change—the acceleration in the current corporate tax payment of larger corporations—would yield $1.5 billion in annual budget receipts in the next 5 years but would not increase tax liabilities.

THE NATURE OF THE PROPOSED REVISION—THE CAPITAL GAIN CHANGES

The final set of recommendations in the tax program relates to the area of capital gains and losses. This area has always involved complex tax issues, since it is necessary to give proper weight to a number of factors that do not all work in the same direction—the fact that capital gains accrue over time and arise from a variety of economic causes; the importance of encouraging private risk-taking and initiative; the importance of maintaining the flow and mobility of capital, and the need to maintain on equity grounds an appropriate relationship to the taxation of other types of profit and income. Our present system, for individuals, is to include only 50 percent of capital gains, limit the taxation of the gain to a maximum rate of 25 percent, and permit the gain represented by appreciation accumulated until death to escape income taxation entirely.

The tax program proposes several basic changes, whose primary objective is to achieve increased mobility of capital and encourage private risk-taking. First, it would reduce the present 50 percent inclusion ratio to only 30 percent of the gain. With a proposed basic rate scale running from 14 to 65 percent, capital gains would thus be taxed at a scale running from 4.2 to 19.5 percent. This is far lower than the present range of 10 percent at $2,000 of taxable income to 25 percent at about $32,000 and higher on a joint return. The proposed rate at $32,000 of taxable income would only be 12 percent. The combination of reducing the 50 percent inclusion to 30 percent, and then reducing the basic rate scale, thus involves reductions in capital gains tax ranging from 58 percent for first-bracket taxpayers to 52 percent for taxpayers at $32,000, 40 percent at $52,000, 30 percent at $100,000, on down to 22 percent for top-bracket taxpayers. The benefits would be concerned mainly in the middle and upper income groups. Nearly 50 percent of present capital gains are realized by persons with incomes between $10,000 and $100,000, and these gains represent 3 percent of adjusted gross income at $10,000 and about 20 percent at $100,000. A complementary provision would extend the present 5-year carryover of capital losses to an unlimited carryover (revenue cost of $20 million). The corporate capital gain rate would be reduced from 25 to 22 percent.

A significant obstacle to the mobility of capital today, and one which "locks in" many an investor, is the inducement under present rules to hold an appreciated asset until death so that the gain will escape tax. The tax program would end this lock-in effect by treating as a taxable capital gain any gain present in assets transferred at death. The advantage in capital mobility, with consequent benefits to increased initiative and risk-taking, would be highly beneficial to economic growth. The revenue gain involved would offset the cost of the lowered capital gain rates and make those rates possible. The result is an integrated treatment of capital gains and losses that should have a large positive effect on increasing investment and capital formation.

Necessarily the proposal to tax gains transferred at death—which will affect annually only about 3 percent of decedents—must be implemented by technical rules designed to permit as fair and as practical an application of this approach as is possible—such as the exemption of the gain on a residence and on personal or household effects, the exemption of gains passing to a wife along the lines of the present estate tax marital deduction, a blanket $15,000 exemption of gain to eliminate small estates, an exemption of transfers to charity, an averaging device, provisions to ease the time of payment of the tax, a transition period before the new rule is to become fully effective, and so on.

The benefits to taxpayers and the economy of the new low rates on capital gains turn also on one other necessary change, that of a reexamination of the definition of capital gains. If something called a capital gain is to be included to the extent of only 30 percent of the gain—as compared to a 100-percent inclusion for wages, salaries, business profits, interest, dividends, and so on—it becomes imperative that the present eligibility rules defining capital gains be considerably tightened. It is in this area, even under the present capital gain rates, that the suggestions for reforms to end the special preferences resulting from ordinary income items being classified as capital gain have been perhaps the most insistent. With capital gain rates being reduced by 22 to 58 percent, the existing definitional rules would involve intolerable special preferences and inequities. The tax program therefore proposes a number of definitional changes which can be grouped into three categories: One, the proposal that the holding period be extended from 6 months to a year. Two, changes affecting the interrelationship of ordinary deductions and capital gain, designed to extend the approach of the 1962 act under which that part of the gain on the sale of an asset that represents prior deductions would be treated as ordinary income—these changes affect the real-estate shelter, sales of oil and other natural resource interests, and certain sales of cattle and farm assets. Three, changes affecting ordinary income items now treated as capital gains, designed to reverse this characterization where appropriate—these changes affect such items as employee stock options, lump-sum distributions under pension and profit-sharing plans, the sale of patents, the cutting or sale of timber, and the sale of life estates. Some of these provisions either came into or remained in the law as an offset to the high marginal top rates. With a reduction in those rates to 65 percent and lower, for this reason alone these provisions are no longer justifiable.

The direct revenue effect of all the changes is a gain of $100 million, assuming the present character and volume of transactions. However, the increased turnover of assets resulting from the unlocking of asset holdings, together with the net effects on transactions of the other changes, is expected to yield an additional $650 million.

These then are the main details of the tax program. We believe the program is a balanced one, treating all levels of income and all types of taxpayers as fairly as possible. It is difficult to obtain any precise measure or index of the distribution of its benefits. Some may point to the percentage change in tax liability at each income level, and show that the highest percentages of reduction are in the bottom and the lowest at the top. Whether one likes or dislikes this result we must remember it fails to reflect the proportion of total tax liabilities paid at each level. Some may point to the percentage increase in after-tax incomes, and show that the highest percentage is at the top. Whether one likes or dislikes this result, it does fail to reflect the impact of the present rate scales which, under almost any program, would produce such an after-tax effect. Moreover, in any allocation of the benefits, it is necessary to remember that the corporate rate changes and the capital gain changes will yield large benefits to the middle and upper income groups, first through the increase in dividends consequent upon higher corporate after-tax profits and second through lower capital gain rates combined with increased mobility of capital. It is difficult to quantify these benefits.

We believe that when all the changes are considered, and their effects weighed as carefully as possible, the overall result is a distribution that bears a close relationship to the present pattern except where relief for the extremes of low income hardship or old age are involved.

It is at this point that we must consider the final dimension of the tax program, that of its relationship to the current economic climate. Three aspects stand out: One, we are faced with an economy which while sluggish is still moving slowly upward. This means that the program need not be geared to a shot-in-the-arm approach to ward off an immediate recession threat. Instead, the tax program can be responsive to the insistent demands for a basic tax revision that will make a lasting contribution to economic growth and lessen the risk of recurring recessions. It also means that while tax reduction is an imperative, there is legislative time to work out this year, with effective and expeditious action, a properly constructed bill.

Second, we are faced with a deficit for fiscal 1964 that, apart from the tax program, would be $9.2 billion. While this deficit is the direct consequence of an economy moving at a slow rate, which the tax program is intended to accelerate, care must be taken that the costs of tax reduction are handled in a fiscally responsible manner to keep the transitional deficit within prudent bounds. The tax program meets this requirement, one additional to the substantive issues of tax revision, in three ways: One, the rate reductions are staged over 3 years, commencing in 1963, with the structural changes starting essentially in 1964; two, appropriate structural changes keep the overall revenue cost of the rate reductions within a prudent figure of $10.3 billion; three, another structural change—the proposal to accelerate under a 5-year transition the payments of estimate tax of the larger corporations—will improve the budget picture by about $1.5 billion so that the budgetary cost of the program is an overall $8.8 billion before any feedback.

A third aspect of our present situation is that we must end our unplanned deficits and move on to a budget balance at a high level of employment. As far as the tax program is concerned, this means an effect on the economy that will produce sufficient revenues for this purpose. It is believed that the large rate reductions and the effects of the entire program on consumer spending and investment incentives will permit the economy rapidly to move to new heights. At these higher levels of gross national product, the resulting revenues even under reduced rates will be in excess of our present revenues. The difference, of course, is that the resulting dynamic economy will be able to maintain these higher revenues, whereas our present sluggish economy finds the tax structure an impediment to growth.

But revenues are only one side of the budget. The other requirement is firm control over expenditure policy. The President and the Budget Director have made these matters clear: one, civilian expenditures will be firmly controlled, and in the 1964 budget have been reduced; two, defense and space expenditures should begin to level off; and third, as the tax reduction becomes fully effective, and the economy moves upward, a part of the revenue increases must go to eliminating the deficit.

Under this combination of revenue increases and a budgetary policy of firm expenditure control, we can move on to a balanced budget and full employment. To be sure, certain assumptions and expectations respecting the economic response to the tax program underlie this belief. But we must remember that the alternative course would not be without its set of assumptions and expectations. Indeed, in the light of the history of our business cycles, without tax action the risks become far greater of a recession coming and of its lasting longer and cutting deeper. Such a recession would increase the deficit far more than the program, without affording even any hope of improvement or offset.

CONCLUSION

The tax program is responsive to two main requirements. First, it responds to the imperative need for the large reductions in individual, corporate, and capital gain rates required now to enable the economy to reach its full potential for output and growth, while at the same time permitting these rate reductions to be achieved in a fiscally responsible manner compatible with the deficit condition of the budget. Second, it responds to the long-felt need for a revision of the income tax structure that would scale down the rates, broaden the tax base, eliminate serious hardships, and end unjustifiable abuses and preferences. The program thus fits into the efforts that commenced with the Revenue Act of 1962 to achieve the tax revision which the earlier studies of the Congress delineated as vitally necessary.

As the President has firmly and consistently stated, the core and central theme of the tax program are the large reductions in all the tax rates—reductions that remove the restraints now imposed by the tax system on the economy and on incentives for private initiative. The cost of these reductions, plus the elimination of hardships which the rate reductions cannot reach comes to over $14 billion. The revenue gained from structural changes, important in themselves as contributing to equity and economic growth, and from increased mobility through capital gains revisions will bring that cost down to $10.3 billion. A further structural change, the acceleration of corporate payments, reduces this figure to a budgetary cost, before feedback, of $8.8 billion. The structural changes thus bring the rate reductions within a budgetary cost that is clearly fiscally responsible. If these structural changes are to be substantially altered, the overall program would, therefore, have to be reshaped by significantly limiting the rate reductions—so that we would not achieve an individual rate scale running from 14 to 65 percent, a corporate rate reduction to 47 percent, and elimination of hardship for the poor and the aged—thus significantly lessening the effect on the economy and on incentives; or it must be reshaped by increasing the cost and budgetary impact of the program, or by some combination of these approaches. Naturally, it is not necessary to enact all the changes exactly as proposed. But a measure designed to provide the maximum effect on the economy through rate reductions and to do so in a manner most consonant with appropriate fiscal responsibility would involve some structural changes of one sort or another.

These are decisions which must and will be made in Congress. The Committee on Ways and Means has commenced its consideration of the tax program. It will shape a tax bill that takes account of the helpful criticisms and suggestions which the legislative process produces. The Treasury Department will fully cooperate in this process.

In the process of moving forward with a tax program so vitally needed, we must not let all of the detailed bits and pieces inevitable in tax legislation obscure the objectives we are seeking to accomplish. The total is far more than the bits and pieces, far more than how each of our individual pocketbooks is affected, far more than how much tax reduction this or that person gets in

1963, or in 1964 or in 1965. The total is a revision of our income tax which will enable us to achieve, as far as it lies within the power and effect of the tax system, the strong and growing economy which is vital to the kind of America we all desire.

THE McNAMARA MONARCHY?

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, the latest issue of the Saturday Evening Post contains an excellent article by Hanson W. Baldwin entitled "The McNamara Monarchy." Mr. Baldwin is one of the world's foremost military affairs writers. He is the military editor of the New York Times where he has worked since 1929. In 1944 he won a Pulitzer Prize for his reporting on the war in the Pacific.

Mr. Baldwin's article raises questions that have been giving serious concern to many of us in recent months. We have no objection to bright young men participating in the military affairs of this country. On the other hand, some of us believe that there is a tendency to disregard the experienced military advisers in the Defense Department. The TFX contract is now under investigation. Without passing on the merits of that controversy, a question is naturally raised when four evaluation boards are reversed. The controversy of the Skybolt is well known. Some members of the Armed Services Committee and the Appropriations Committees of the House and the Senate bowed to the slowup on the RS-70 on the assurance that the Skybolt would give the B-52 a longer life. This was done, I am sure, with some misgivings. But the Skybolt, notwithstanding previous assurance to our committees, has been canceled.

Four committees of the Congress consistently urged the development of the B-70—now called the RS-70—as a complete weapons system. Those committees are the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations and the House and Senate Committees on Armed Services. Repeatedly, we have given Secretary McNamara more money than he requested but he has refused to spend it.

I believe that Members of Congress would be interested in what Mr. Baldwin has to say in his article. I believe that the questions he raises will be matters of continuing discussion here in the Congress. I call the article to the attention of my colleagues and ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE McNAMARA MONARCHY

(By Hanson W. Baldwin)

The unification of the armed services sponsored by Secretary of Defense Robert S. McNamara poses some subtle and insidious dangers—creeping dangers that are political, military and administrative. And they could present, in their ultimate form, almost as great a threat to a secure and free nation as the attempted military coup, envisaged in the recent novel, "Seven Days in May."

For the kind of unification being practiced and preached today has ominous overtones. It is dangerous to the Nation's political system of checks and balances, dangerous to the continued development of sound military advice and effective military leadership, dangerous to managerial and administrative efficiency.

Mr. McNamara is, first and foremost, trying to make the armed services speak with one voice and attempting to reduce greatly or eliminate altogether interservice competition.

He has established tremendous Defense Department superagencies, such as the Defense Intelligence Agency, which has taken over most of the intelligence functions formerly performed by the individual services.

This centralization of intelligence has made service dissent on intelligence more difficult, and it has facilitated the molding of intelligence estimates to preconceived policies. In the Cuban situation, the primary reason for delay was the insistence of the Kremlinologists that it won't happen here, that Mr. Khrushchev would not take the risk. There's not much doubt that intelligence was influenced by this atmosphere of certainty. In fact, this centralization facilitates top political and policy control of military intelligence. And this is politically dangerous—domestically and internationally.

But this is only one area where Mr. McNamara is attempting to have the Pentagon speak with one voice. The Defense Supply Agency, a huge superagency, is procuring so-called common items for all the services. A Defense Communications Agency is being groomed for further expansion into a National Communications Agency which might well place virtually all of the Government's long-line communications systems under military control. Budgeting, the selection of weapons systems, contracting, personnel standards, uniforms, codes of justice, administrative procedures—all are now tailored to the pattern set by the Secretary of Defense.

Objections or dissent, even to Congress, are discouraged, muted or, when possible, stifled. Mr. McNamara has pressured the Joint Chiefs to sign written statements testifying to Congress that the administration's defense budget is adequate. He has censored, deleted, and altered statements to Congress by the chiefs of the services and their secretaries. He has downgraded, ignored, bypassed or overruled the advice of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. Gen. Maxwell D. Taylor, the chairman of the Joint Chiefs, is a known advocate of the abolition of the Joint Chiefs of Staff system. He favors a single voice.

PROGRESS MEANS PERIL

Mr. McNamara has not yet succeeded in forcing all the services to speak, officially or unofficially, with one public voice. But he has come much closer to it than anyone before him, and he is still trying. And the progress he has made carries its own political dangers.

For 175 years of our history, separate Army and Navy Departments (and then an Air Force) provided a natural interservice system of checks and balances. The services did not speak with one voice, and politically this was a desirable safeguard. They balanced each other, and their secretaries provided contrasting viewpoints at Cabinet level. Now only the Secretary of Defense is a Cabinet officer; the service secretaries as well as the uniformed chiefs of the services are submerged in an immense Pentagon hierarchy.

The latest reorganization of the State-controlled National Guard, still opposed by some Governors, may ultimately extend Washington's power over the Guard. Such developments represent dangerous weakening of our traditional military checks and balances.

Equally threatening to the Nation's future is the concentration of politicomilitary power, not merely in Washington but in one department. It places more and more power over the military-industrial complex in the hands of a few men in the executive branch of Government. The dollar volumes of military contracts amount to more than $20 billion annually, with billions more in backlog orders outstanding. The individual services no longer have the final power to contract. The rewarding or cancellation of contracts—which may make or break companies and affect thousands of workers—is now ultimately controlled by a very few men in the top echelons of the Defense Department.

Perhaps the greatest military danger in this centralization and unification is that it overrides the voice of professional experience and substitutes a military party line, a single strategic concept. The opinions of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, unless they happen to coincide with Mr. McNamara's, are usually given short shrift. Managerial techniques, computer analyses, cost-effectiveness yardsticks—rather than judgments learned on the battlefield—dominate decisions on strategy, weapons choices, even force levels.

Alternatives, variations, disagreements are the breath of life in any organization; imposed solutions, inflexible strategies, a party line from which no deviation is permitted could mean disaster. Mr. McNamara's policies are ostensibly intended to provide alternatives and increase flexibility, but there are many who feel they are having exactly the opposite effect. As Air Force magazine noted in its January 1963, issue, the decision of the Secretary of Defense to phase out the manned bomber will mean that by 1970 the Nation will be almost entirely dependent upon missiles for strategic nuclear delivery.

"We will have substituted rigidity for flexibility," states the magazine. "There will be fewer, rather than more, options for a future President to exercise."

The "one voice" unification trend in the Pentagon presents another potential danger: the development of future generations of officers who will be essentially military yesmen and conformists. They may be wizards of the new techniques of operational analyses and computer calculations, but without the moral courage of leadership qualifications required by the battlefield.

COMPROMISES ON WEAPONS

The single-voice concept is also enforcing—in the name of conformity and standardization—undesirable compromises in weapons systems. Technical competition between the services is being discouraged despite the lessons of the past. The air-cooled and liquid-cooled aircraft engines which ultimately gave us air supremacy in World War II were a direct result of differing Army and Navy technical concepts and interservice competition. In the Cuban crisis of last fall, a Navy camera used in low-level reconnaissance flights over Cuban missile sites proved to be far superior to a camera used by the Air Force low-level flights. The Air Force planes were hastily reequipped with the Navy camera.

Yet, ever since Mr. McNamara took office his slide-rule statisticians have been pressuring both industry and the services into designing and producing a single, all-purpose aircraft supposedly capable of doing the varied jobs of all the services. The objective is economy, but the indications are that the attempts to force all into a single mold, may ultimately cost more—in combat-effectiveness, if not in dollars. The so-called TFX tactical fighter has been delayed for 2 years while the Defense Department tried to force a design for a fighter that could perform equally well from carrier decks and land airfields. The final result—though officially described as a standard airplane—is actually two variants, of them probably compromised in effectiveness by enforced conformities. The obvious danger of this approach is the production of a series of hybrid weapons rather than the kind of equipment the men who do the fighting and dying would like to have.

Finally, what about administrative efficiency; what has Mr. McNamara's brand of unification done to the Pentagon? Not only policy formulation, but operations and administration are directed from the office of the Secretary of Defense.

A program called the 5-year force structure and financial management program, dubbed "the book" in the Pentagon, attempts to chart and elaborate nearly every detail of weapons systems and force structures required by the Armed Forces for the next 5 years. Any significant change in this plan requires an elaborate process of justification, review and approval all along the line from lowest to highest echelons. Contracting budgeting, progress on weapons systems—even lawn cutting—is programed and controlled in detail from various echelons of the Secretary's office.

The reporting and analytical system required has resulted in a tremendous burgeoning of paper work and great increase in numbers and rank of both civilian and military personnel assigned to echelons above the fighting services in the Department of Defense. But there has been no commensurate reduction, as yet, in administrative personnel and their workloads in the services.

When Mr. McNamara took office, he set out, as the Army-Navy-Air Force Journal and Register put it, "Courageously and confidently to streamline top echelon Department of Defense management." Instead he has added more to top overhead—the apex of the Defense pyramid—than any Secretary before him. There were 15 Presidential appointees of Assistant Secretary of Defense rank or higher in January 1961; there are 16 today, though responsibilities and functions have been rearranged. There were 11 Deputy Assistant Secretaries of Defense 2 years ago; there are 26 today.

The Joint Chiefs of Staff is limited by law—a law approved by a Congress wary of the development of a "greater general staff"—to 400 officers. But the restriction has been evaded by assigning at least 250 other officers to an amorphous division, called the Organization of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. The total military personnel assigned to the Joint Chiefs of Staff today is about five to six times as large as it was a decade ago. Yet one of the tentative plans discussed in the Pentagon contemplates a further considerable increase in the Joint Staff and the Organization of the Joint Chiefs.

There has been a steady increase in the numbers of top-ranking, high-salaried personnel—particularly civil service top grades—assigned to the Office of the Secretary, the Department of Defense, and the Pentagon. As of June 30, 1959, there were 3,009 civilians in the GS-14 to 18 brackets (the top-salaried brackets); last June there were 3,950. Moreover, their salaries had gone up from a minimum of $11,355 to a top of $17,500 in 1959 to a minimum of $12,845 and a top of $20,000 in 1962.

This topheavy system has obviously built-in delay factors, and, as the record of the McNamara administration shows, it is far harder to start a new project or weapons system than it is to cancel or curtail an old one. In the first 18 months of the McNamara regime, no major new weapons system was started. Even today the Defense Department can find no military requirement for man in space, and it has curtailed, eliminated, or held back such important development projects as a future manned-bomber system (the RS-70), the Skybolt air-to-ground missile, and the Nike-Zeus anti-ballistic-missile system.

Though Mr. McNamara has centralized to a far greater degree than any other Secretary, he alone is by no means responsible for the trend toward a monolithic Department of Defense. It has been going on ever since the war.

CONGRESS SHARES BLAME

Concentration of power in the hands of the Secretary of Defense has been hastened by the loosening of congressional control over the Pentagon. The power to raise and maintain armies and navies, conveyed to the legislative branch by the Constitution, has been watered down as a result of the sheer immensity and size of the Defense Department, the tremendous increase in executive power, and the weakness and mistakes of Congress itself. In the Senate and the House, intercommittee jealousies and the small size of the staffs of these committees—which have not matched, in any way, the growth in size of the armed services—have hampered examinations and control. And Congress, by loose legislation, conferred upon the President and the Secretary of Defense such immense power to reorganize the Pentagon that it has, in the view of some legislators, virtually abandoned its former power to check, control and approve every detail of defense policy and organization.

The process of centralization in the Pentagon has gone so far there is very considerable doubt that the service departments can remain separate at all.

Both Adm. Arleigh A. Burke, retired Chief of Naval Operations, and Gen. Lyman L. Lemnitzer, former chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, now NATO Supreme Allied Commander, Europe, have publicly opposed a single chief-of-staff system, and have endorsed the separate service "techniques of land warfare, naval warfare and air warfare." Former Secretary of the Navy, later Secretary of Defense, Thomas S. Gates has warned against centralization and has said that to "submerge * * * honest differences of (service) opinion and free expression * * * in any monolithic system would be a fatal mistake."

Gen. Matthew B. Ridgway, U.S. Army (retired), spoke in 1960 against reduction of "everything to its lowest denominator, one service, one uniform * * * to the dead level of mediocrity, jacks of all trades, masters of none, a group of 'Yes' men always in unanimous agreement—what an insidiously dangerous philosophy."

If the Pentagon ever does speak with one voice, if the Nation's Armed Forces do come, as the trend now indicates, to represent a monolithic military-political point of view, both freedom and security will be in jeopardy through the slow erosion of domocracy into a garrison state and the stagnant conformity that leads to combat ineffectiveness.

EXPORT AND TOURISM EXPANSION PROGRAM

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, last Monday, March 4, the President's E Award for export promotion was conferred upon the Air Transport Association of America in recognition of that organization's significant contribution to our Nation's export and tourism expansion program.

The Air Transport Association, which was founded in 1936, is the national trade and service organization of the U.S. scheduled airlines, both domestic and international. It has long been a leader in our country's endeavors to facilitate and promote international travel and trade.

In presenting the E Award to ATA's President Stuart G. Tipton, Secretary of Commerce Luther H. Hodges said this:

> The Air Transport Association of America has worked continuously to develop travel to the United States. Its international promotion efforts, through a wide variety of programs, have stirred interest in tourism overseas, and its program to streamline requirements and procedures to visitors has resulted in the elimination of many time-consuming formalities. It has worked assiduously to promote exports and obtain more simplified shipping requirements. These efforts reflect credit on the organization and our private enterprise system, and constitute a substantial contribution to the export expansion programs of the United States.

Secretary Hodges echoes precisely my own sentiments and, I am certain, those of many other Members of this body. As one who has long urged increased efforts to increase American trade and thereby improve our balance-of-payments position and stem the gold flow, I commend the Air Transport Association for its constructive program and the Department of Commerce for its work in promoting exports and attracting tourists. I think the conferring of this award is a timely reminder to all of us of the tremendous importance to the Nation of the U.S. flag air transport industry and of its conspicuous achievements in international commerce and trade.

SOUTH DAKOTA SIOUX INDIANS POINT THE WAY TO BETTER LIFE

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, one of the most urgent challenges confronting the Nation today is the necessity of raising standards of life on our American Indian reservations. It is well known that health, housing educational and job opportunities for the American Indian lag far behind conditions for our citizens as a whole.

It is gratifying to note that with the cooperation of public authorities, the Indian tribes have been making an effort to build a better life for themselves and their children. I am especially pleased with progress that has been made by the South Dakota Sioux Indians on the Pine Ridge reservation. This reservation became the center for the first public housing program for American Indians when the Kennedy administration declared Indians eligible for such assistance under the public housing authority. The Pine Ridge reservation has also pioneered in the field of industrial job development.

Both of these encouraging steps have been well reported in a series of articles by Mr. Aubrey A. Graves, staff reporter for the Washington Post. As Mr. Graves points out, attorney Richard Schifter of Washington, D.C., who represents the Oglala Sioux, was a prime mover in instigating these two hopeful developments. I commend the Washington Post, and I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Graves' two articles to date appearing in the Washington Post of March 10 and March 11 be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, Mar. 10, 1963]

IN WELTER OF CITIES, THE RED MAN WITHERS

(By Aubrey Graves)

An almost complete about face has occurred in the past decade in the Federal Government's manner of dealing with Indians living on reservations.

During the 1950's, policies pushed by Indian Commissioner Dillon Myer were put into effect looking toward early termination of the Government's trusteeship. The Bureau of Indian Affairs undertook a national program of relocation assistance for Indian "volunteers." Carried out in cooperation with State and Federal employment services, it was focused at first on seasonal employment in agriculture and on the railroads.

Indians were given help in moving permanently away from the reservations. They were shipped off to large cities, particularly Chicago, Denver, Los Angeles, and San Francisco.

Help provided the Indian jobseekers and their family dependents included transportation to the relocation destination, subsistence grants prior to receipt of the first paycheck and guidance in community adjustment. These grants averaged $1,700 for single Indians, $3,500 for family groups.

In 1953, as a result of increased appropriations made available by Congress, the bureau increased both the geographic scope of the program and the range of services provided. Three years later, Congress gave the program additional impetus by authorizing the bureau to provide Indians, chiefly between the ages of 18 and 35, with vocational training, on-the-job training and apprenticeship training.

During the 1950's, the BIA was held largely to a custodial, recordkeeping function. Little was done about housing needs or human resource development on the reservations and previously existing bureau services (except for education) were severely curtailed.

Seeking relief from poverty and miserable living conditions on the reservations, Indians by the thousands ventured, or were pushed, into the white man's world. Here, many felt discriminated against and, in the slums to which their economic and social position consigned them, they were unable even to see the sky.

Homesickness set in. In their frustration, many heads of families took to drink and lost their jobs. Others decided it was better to live without comforts in a hovel, out of which a man could step into wide, open, sunny places where, at least, congenial companionship could be found.

Forty percent of the tribesmen drifted back to the reservations, some after having been resettled two and three times.

Toward the end of the Eisenhower administration, Assistant Secretary of Interior Roger Ernst decided that the experiment had failed. It had become evident that, under the resettlement policy, the more skilled and enterprising people moved away and the less enterprising stayed on, or came back to, the reservation. The effect was to distill off the most competent people, generation after generation. With the support of Interior Secretary Fred A. Seaton, Ernst called off the pressure for assimilation.

WORK, NOT WELFARE

Today, the emphasis has shifted from resettlement to improvement of the Indian in his natural habitat. Health and educational services have been stepped up, decent housing is beginning to be provided and vocational training is being expanded.

"There is very little wrong in the Indian picture," said Indian Commissioner Philleo Nash, "that jobs won't fix. The Indian people want work, not welfare. Our goal is to train the Indian workers and get them connected with opportunities, wherever they may be. It means teaching the Indians, on and off the reservation, a trade or a vocation for which there is a real demand in the job market."

In short, the white man's world, with some of its comforts and opportunities, is being taken to the reservations.

Last month, in order to observe the effects of the shift of emphasis, I spent 4 days and nights on the Oglala Sioux Indian Reservation at Pine Ridge, S. Dak. During that period, it was slowly thawing out after a spell of 40-below-zero temperatures. This winter, I was told, has been colder than most. But at Pine Ridge, all winters are cruel.

SITE OF LAST MASSACRE

The Pine Ridge Reservation—about 40 miles wide and 100 miles long—was chosen because it is one of the largest in both acreage and population. Here, members of the Oglala Sioux Tribe have lived in peace—and most of them in extreme poverty—since buffalo hunters killed off the herds and the U.S. Army crushed the Indian warriors.

The massacre at Wounded Knee in 1890, the last engagement in which U.S. soldiers killed Indians, took place on Pine Ridge. It is a living and bitter memory to men who are still walking and talking today.

The population of the reservation is now about 1,900 families—(8,303 people at the last count). Two-thirds or more live in shacks, tepees and canvas tents that are dirty, draughty, and overcrowded. A 1961 survey by the Public Housing Administration showed 98 percent of all the habitations to be substandard. Two-thirds of the heads of families are unemployed.

But on Pine Ridge I saw also a glimmer of hope in 51 modern residences nearing completion. For the first time, public housing is being made available to Indians living on a reservation.

For these new dwellings, the Indians owe thanks in large measure to attorney Richard Schifter, who represents the Oglala Sioux and three other tribes in Washington. In 1961, Schifter persuaded the Public Housing Administration, which since its inception had done its work in larger centers of the country, that it had the legal authority to help Indian reservations as well.

With money borrowed from the Federal Government, the newly created, tribally controlled Oglala Sioux Housing Authority proceeded to clear land, lay out streets, and construct homes.

CHARACTER A QUALIFICATION

Twenty-four of the houses have 4 bedrooms, 22 have 3 bedrooms each, 3 have 2 bedrooms, and 2 have only 1. The homes were built on 60- by 100-foot lots at an average cost of $8,000. These are said to be equal in value to privately constructed off-reservation homes costing from $11,000 to $12,000.

The dwellings are being rented by the OSHA on the basis of need and character, particularly sobriety. Preference is given to displaced or homeless families, war veterans and the disabled or handicapped.

A few have been assigned to families on permanent relief. Rent, which includes electricity, water, propane gas, and maintenance, ranges from $28 to $58 a month, depending on ability to pay.

With the exception of the sheet metal work, Indians performed all the labor. Of 135 who initially applied for work, only 2 could be classified as journeymen carpenters. Most had no tools at all; some had only hammer and saw. None had any experience in laying cement blocks.

Under the tutelage of the two carpenters and Federal Housing Inspector Charles Heintzelman, the novices learned as they worked. A lone plumber and a lone electrician likewise taught their trades to others.

Heintzelman soon discovered that it was costing 50 cents each to lay foundation blocks. He told the Indians they would have to do much better or non-Indians would be brought in.

"This work is for Indians only," he was reminded. "Only for Indians who work," Heintzelman countered.

The effect of the warning was good. Soon the cost of laying blocks dropped to 17 cents each. Reviewing his work at the end of the year, Heintzelman said: "Indians can do good work, skillfully, with their hands after a little training. Never before in my experience have I seen such a change in a group of men."

Now all the Indian construction workers own their tools. Soon they are to begin work on 76 similar homes on the reservation.

OWN INTERIOR DECORATORS

Emil Redwing, with his wife and children, moved into the first completed house. Emil had taken the carpenter trainee course. Into the second went a widow, Athelia Yellow Boy, and her five children. Another was assigned to Margaret Fills Pipe, a widow with four young ones. Ten houses now have tenants, another 10 are scheduled to be occupied by April.

Few of the families to whom houses were assigned had any belongings to speak of. So the tribal council appropriated $500 to buy old and broken furniture and new upholstery supplies. In a workshop conducted by a State home demonstration agent, Bessie T. Cornelius, Indian men and women repaired and refinished their own secondhand beds, tables, lamps, and chairs.

Hovelwives about to become housewives were shown how to take care of floors and walls, bathrooms and electric refrigerators, and how to operate washing machines. In sewing classes, the women learned to make their own curtains, draperies, and slipcovers.

Classes were conducted in time management (the Sioux language contains no word meaning "time"); the women were shown the advantages of budgeting their hours and days. Instruction was given in family and neighbor relations, first aid and personal hygiene, and in the preparation of balanced, nutritious meals.

HOUSEPROUD TENANTS

There is some skepticism about how these houses will look after they have been lived in 6 months or so. The tenants I interviewed showed extreme pride in their new abodes; the homes I visited were sparsely furnished but immaculate.

Last October 28, a message to the Oglala Sioux from President Kennedy expressed his "fervent hope that these new homes, built by your own people, are the beginning of a better life for your community. As industry, commerce, and tourist trade develop, poverty and disease can be stamped out and the people of the Pine Ridge Reservation can at last enjoy a standard of living comparable to that of the country as a whole."

[From the Washington Post, Mar. 11, 1963]

FISHHOOK INDUSTRY GIVES SIOUX A LIFT

(By Aubrey A. Graves)

What has been the effect of the Federal Government's decision to call off its emphasis on early termination of its trusteeship over the American Indians, and instead to start creating employment and improving living conditions on their reservations?

On the Pine Ridge Reservation in South Dakota, I found that more Indians are gainfully employed today than at any time since the Civilian Conservation Corps of the 1930's.

Here, a simple, inexpensive item—a fishhook—has given the Oglala Sioux Tribe a substantial economic lift and many secondary benefits.

MINIMUM WAGE

Two hundred and twenty-four heads of families are now employed in three plants established by the Wright & McGill Co. of Denver. Bare fishhooks are sent to the reservation, where the Indians snell (tie leaders on) them. Then the finished product is shipped back to Denver.

Paid the minimum wage of $1.15 an hour, the Indian workers draw $46 a week. Many receive bonuses for overquota production. This adds up to a weekly payroll in excess of $10,000 in an impoverished community where 1,300 of the 1,900 heads of families are still unemployed.

These incomes have enabled some of the workers to move their families out of canvas tents and log shacks into some of the 51 modern dwellings being built at Pine Ridge with Federal funds.

Seventy-six similar homes are to be started soon at Wounded Knee and Kyle, within walking distance of the Wright & McGill plants at those two centers.

The tribesmen have developed high skill at this work. The men tie from 80 to 100 dozen hooks a day, the women average about 60 dozen.

"Nothing has happened since tribal days to so boost the economic situation and morale of the Sioux," declared Leslie Towle, superintendent of the Bureau of Indian Affairs at Pine Ridge.

ENTER TRAINING

Seven hundred and thirty-one Indians entered training for the jobs; 439 successfully completed the course. As of May, 1962, 388 were working. Excess inventories at the Denver factory have since caused 164 to be laid off. The training program cost the BIA $66,000. The apprentices were paid 57½ cents an hour, out of BIA funds, during the learning period.

The Indians have taken great pride in their success. "It used to be a great honor when one of our fellows came home with a buffalo," said Emil Redfish, manager of the three plants. "Songs were sung for him, there was dancing, and powwows were given in his honor. Strangely, these celebrations are coming back with this industry."

PRIDE WONDERFUL

Redfish said the Denver office was bewildered when the payroll was sent in containing such names as Many Cartridges, George Respects Nothing, Return From Scout and Afraid of Hawk. "A Wright & McGill lady telephoned," he recalled with a chuckle, "and asked if these were the real names that were supposed to go on the paychecks."

It is wonderful, Redfish said, to see the pride displayed by his people when they come out of the plant on Friday with that check in hand. "One man told me it was the first time he was able to walk into a store, pick out what he wanted and pay for it."

Redfish said that about one-third of the employees are women. He explained that "we have a lot of women who need jobs who have families. Mrs. McGill, the head of the company, insists on women having equal opportunity. Believe me, when the boss says put this many women on, you don't answer her back."

In one respect, the women proved superior to the men. "We have 44 machines in use," explained Redfish. "We had men on these machines and they handled them like they would a truck. They were banging them around and it was costing a little money to keep them in repair every month, so we switched over to women and we haven't had one cent of repair expense since."

AREA DIRECTOR

All workers must punch a timeclock. When one is late, he is docked. When he is absent from work more than once and doesn't call in or have a valid excuse when he comes back, he is fired. "The Wright & McGill Indians," said Redfish, "now understand what time is."

The area director for BIA in Aberdeen, S. Dak., Martin Holm, made a survey of benefits resulting from the existence of the plants. They had resulted, he reported, in increased school attendance. The children are better dressed and better fed. Study habits and classroom work have improved.

"When parents get up in the morning to go to work," he wrote, "they naturally send the children to school more regularly. And, because their parents work near home, they no longer drag their children out of school to the potato fields at harvest time."

Because of the new employment, general assistance payments dropped at Pine Ridge from $53,864 during 3 winter months of 1961 to $41,226 during the same 3 months in 1962, when the plants were operating. The names of 74 families on relief rolls in 1961 were not on them in 1962.

One adverse effect has been noted. Because the Indians have more money to spend, drinking has increased in the locale of the plants, particularly among single male workers. "They are prone to dissipate their checks for alcoholic beverages," the report said. "The married workers tend to use their checks for self and family improvement."

MRS. LYNDON B. JOHNSON HELPS TO DRAMATIZE FEDERAL AID TO ECONOMICALLY DEPRESSED AREAS IN WEST VIRGINIA

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, West Virginians will not soon forget the March 1, 1963, visit of Mrs. Lyndon B. Johnson to the cities of St. Albans and Charleston, W. Va. The Vice President's wife, braving a heavy rain, cheerfully participated in groundbreaking ceremonies for a new library, the construction of which is made possible by an accelerated public works program grant of $69,000.

On that same day, and with none of her good spirits diminished, Mrs. Johnson toured the Food Machinery Corp. plant in Charleston, W. Va., presenting diplomas to previously unemployed workers who were retrained, under the area redevelopment administration program, for the good jobs they now hold with FMC.

To West Virginians who saw her in action on that memorable day, Mrs. Johnson was a lovely, gracious, and spirited symbol of the continuing high interest which President Kennedy's administration holds for the people of the Mountain State. None of us who accompanied her will ever forget the affection which she engendered and the encouragement she imparted to the many people she met and to those who turned out to hear her inspiring words.

The story of Mrs. Johnson's visit to West Virginia is excellently related in the Wednesday, March 6, 1963, edition of the Christian Science Monitor by Staff Correspondent Josephine Ripley. If anything, Miss Ripley's account stirs one with appreciation for the Vice President's wife, and for the many thoughtful ways in which she is serving the Nation. I ask unanimous consent to have Miss Ripley's article printed at this point in the Record so that Mrs. Johnson's fine efforts on this occasion in West Virginia can be universally read and admired.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

United States Lends Help in West Virginia

(By Josephine Ripley)

Charleston, W. Va.—The visit of Mrs. Lyndon B. Johnson, wife of the Vice President, to West Virginia in the beating rain dramatized the helping hand which the Federal Government is extending to this mountainous State with its long unemployment lines.

While a local official held a huge umbrella over her head, Mrs. Johnson participated in the groundbreaking ceremonies on March 1 for a new library in St. Albans, turning over a ladylike spade full of mud.

But the scene was by no means dreary. A crowd had turned out for the occasion. It was a big day in St. Albans, if not a bright one.

BOOKS PRESENTED

Massed umbrellas roofed the small stand where speakers one by one, including Senator Robert C. Byrd, Democrat, of West Virginia, stepped to the microphone, and Mrs. Johnson presented the new library with a dozen or more books autographed by the President, the Vice President and others.

There was a pause after announcement of each book as someone groped for it under the cover placed over the carton to protect the volumes from the rain.

But despite the dripping umbrellas, the muddy site of the new library, and the damp costumes of the majorettes whose act was canceled by the weather, the occasion was not a dismal one.

On the contrary, the ground breaking represented a $69,000 public works grant by the Federal Government. It heralded a construction project which will give jobs to nearly a hundred townspeople. It will mean a real library in St. Albans for the first time—a civic project toward which the town has worked for the past 7 years.

Officials regard it as symbolic of some $15 million worth of public works projects in West Virginia designed to spur employment. These are projects toward which the State contributes half the necessary amount with the Federal Government making up the rest.

Mrs. Johnson's next official stop in her 1-day trip to Charleston was at the FMC plant where another form of aid, under the Area Redevelopment Administration is being extended to the State.

RETRAINEE CEREMONY

The huge, cavernous factory clattered, clanged, and spat blinding flame as acetylene torches bit into steel. At the end of the assembly line stood a lumbering, tractor-like vehicle known as a personnel carrier.

These carriers are being manufactured under a defense contract for the transportation of military troops.

Mrs. Johnson's task, surprisingly, was to preside here in the factory at a kind of graduation ceremony for retrainees to whom she presented diplomas.

These were former miners, construction workers, and laborers of various kinds—all unemployed—who had taken the ARA retraining course to become machinists, welders, metalworkers of various kinds, and qualify for work in the FMC plant.

The men who put down their tools to step up and receive the diploma inscribed with their name and their newly acquired skill studied it closely—and liked what they saw.

FORMER MINEWORKER

A former mineworker who had earned no more than $5 a day, and sometimes as little as 40 cents a day, at his old job, is now making $2.08 an hour with a 40-hour week. Others told of similar wage improvement.

West Virginia's unemployed now total 66,800. Retraining of miners for whom there is now no mining and for others whose jobs have been eliminated by changing times is a slow process.

The FMC plant employs 230 retrained workers today, with the number expected to increase to 1,000 eventually as the program turns out more qualified "graduates."

In the State as a whole, more than 2,000 men have been retrained for new employment.

The FMC itself, whose home plant is in California, opened its West Virginia branch under the ARA which encourages plants with defense contracts to locate in States with heavy unemployment, if conditions warrant such a move.

The company here moved into an abandoned ordnance plant built in World War I.

West Virginia has received $4,300,000 in aid under the ARA program over the past year.

"Much has been done," as Mrs. Johnson put it when she presented diplomas to the FMC retrainees, "much more needs to be done. The problems in the depressed areas of the country didn't spring up overnight, and they will not be cured overnight. But we have started."

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, is there further morning business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed.

OUTDOOR RECREATION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be laid before the Senate and made the pending business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request by the Senator from Montana? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 20) to promote the coordination and development of effective Federal and State programs relating to outdoor recreation, and for other purposes.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

APPOINTMENT OF HON. OREN E. LONG TO THE SOUTH PACIFIC COMMISSION

Mr. FONG. Mr. President, it was with a great deal of personal pleasure that I noted the appointment a few days ago of my longtime friend and former colleague, Oren E. Long, as senior U.S. member of the South Pacific Commission.

His appointment recognizes Oren Long's special knowledge, background, and longtime interest in the important problems of the Pacific Basin. He has expressed his pleasure in accepting this appointment, since it would enable him to continue his residence in his beloved Hawaii. Nevertheless I am sure his legion of friends realize his qualifications merit even greater honors.

Six months ago, near the close of the 87th Congress, I delivered a farewell tribute on the Senate floor to Oren Long, who had announced earlier his decision not to seek reelection to the Senate. Oren and I worked closely on numerous problems involving the new State of Hawaii—problems that faced the 50th State as it shed its territorial status and assumed new and heavier responsibilities of statehood. We attained a fine working relationship—a relationship which I am happy to say is being continued on the same high plane and mutual cooperation by Oren Long's successor, my friend and distinguished colleague, Dan Inouye.

I fervently hope that the President's appointment of Oren Long will be the forerunner of more appointments to come for others in Hawaii who, like Oren, have given so much to their State and country. I regret to say that the 50th State has been conspicuously overlooked in the matter of major appointments in the national administration. We have among our population outstanding men and women who have demonstrated their talents and capabilities in government, the professions, business, agriculture, and industry. As the Pacific crossroads, Hawaii has developed a reservoir of educated and specialized persons who are particularly knowledgeable about the Orient and the Occident, the East and the West.

We are disappointed that Hawaii has been bypassed by the White House, especially when we note that our island friends in Puerto Rico and Guam have received recognition in appointments to high posts in the U.S. Government. We salute such appointees from Puerto Rico as Dr. Arturo Morales-Carrion, the Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for Inter-American Affairs, and Mr. Teodoro Moscoso, Chief of the Alliance for Progress; and from Guam, Mr. Richard F. Taitano, Director of the Office of Territories, Department of the Interior.

There are men and women in Hawaii, talented, dedicated, and skillful in special fields, who are ready and eager to serve. They ask not what America will do for them but rather what they can do for their country. I say to President Kennedy: Give these islanders the opportunity to work for their country. They will more than prove their merit, especially in problems involving Asia and the Pacific basin.

DISPOSAL OF ELLIS ISLAND TO TRAINING SCHOOL AT VINELAND, N.J.—STATMENT BY SENATOR CASE

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, the distinguished senior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. Case] is unable to be present in the Senate today. He has been called away from Washington by reason of his duties as a member of the Board of Visitors of the U.S. Naval Academy, and he is in Annapolis at the present time.

He had prepared a statement for the Record dealing with the disposal of Ellis Island to the training school at Vineland, N.J.

I ask unanimous consent, in the absence of the distinguished Senator from New Jersey, that the full text of the remarks which he had prepared be inserted in the body of the Record.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Remarks Prepared for Delivery by Senator Case, Monday, March 11, 1963, on Senate Floor on Disposal of Ellis Island to the Training School at Vineland, N.J.

There are three recent developments which encourage me to reintroduce a bill to authorize the disposal of Ellis Island to the training school at Vineland, N.J.

First, Senator Edmund S. Muskie, of Maine, chairman of the Senate Subcommittee on Intergovernmental Relations, has written me of the "effective presentation" made by Author Pearl Buck, chairman of the training school's board of directors, and another official of the Vineland institution for retarded children at hearings conducted late last year by the Muskie subcommittee. I recognize fully that this letter does not constitute a commitment for the bill, but it does point up the decided advantages of the Vineland program.

Second, President Kennedy has focused on the enormous effort that needs to be made if mental retardation is to be effectively prevented and controlled. On February 5, the President sent a special message to Congress dealing with mental illness and mental retardation in which he recommended an impressive expenditure of Federal funds for the expansion of facilities throughout the Nation. The President's program emphasizes the need for diagnostic and other facilities of the very type proposed by the Vineland school, which is an internationally recognized private institution, willing to pay the Government for the privilege of taking the idle island off its hands.

Third, I have been joined in sponsoring the bill by Senator Philip A. Hart, of Michigan, who is deeply interested in the problems which the Vineland Training School seeks to meet.

The full text of the letter written by Chairman Muskie is as follows:

March 1, 1963.

Dear Cliff: I have your good letter of March 1, advising of your tentative plans to reintroduce legislation similar to S. 2852 of the 87th Congress, which authorized the disposal of Ellis Island to the training school at Vineland, N.J.

As of this moment, the subcommittee is awaiting the printing of the record of the hearings held last year on the disposition of Ellis Island. I anticipate that these hearings should be printed within the next 2 weeks, and I hope that in the very near future we can move to further consideration of this matter.

You will be pleased to know that Miss Buck and Dr. Jacob made a very effective presentation at our New York City hearings in behalf of the proposed disposal of the island to the training school at Vineland, N.J. Certainly, the Vineland plan is one of the best developed proposals which has been presented to the subcommittee and it has the added advantage of emanating from a long-established institution which enjoys an outstanding reputation in the field of mental retardation.

I assume that the subcommittee will decide to give further study and consideration to the matter of the disposition and future utilization of Ellis Island. If that is the case, I am confident that the plan presented by the training school at Vineland will be carefully examined.

Hoping that we may look forward to further counsel and advice from you on this very complicated question, and with warmest personal regards, I remain,

Yours sincerely,

Edmund S. Muskie,
U.S. Senate, Chairman.

In his special message, President Kennedy emphasized the magnitude of the problem of mental retardation when he noted:

"The care and treatment of mental retardation, and research into its causes and cure, have—as in the case of mental illness—been too long neglected. Mental retardation ranks as a major national health, social, and economic problem. It strikes our most precious asset—our children. It disables 10 times as many people as diabetes, 20 times as many as tuberculosis, 25 times as many as muscular dystrophy, and 600 times as many as infantile paralysis. About 400,000 children are so retarded they require constant care or supervision; more than 200,000 of these are in residential institutions. There are between 5 and 6 million mentally retarded children and adults—an estimated 3 percent of the population. Yet, despite these grim statistics, and despite an admirable effort by private voluntary associations, until a decade ago not a single State health department offered any special community services for the mentally retarded or their families.

"States and local communities spend $300 million a year for residential treatment of the mentally retarded, and another $250 million for special education, welfare, rehabilitation, and other benefits and services. The Federal Government will this year obligate $37 million for research, training and special services for the retarded and about three times as much for their income maintenance. But these efforts are fragmented and inadequate.

"Mental retardation strikes children without regard for class, creed, or economic level. Each year sees an estimated 126,000 new cases. But it hits more often—and harder—at the underprivileged and the poor; and most often of all—and most severely—in city tenements and rural slums where there are heavy concentrations of families with poor education and low income."

There is every reason to believe, as the President does, that we are on the threshold of important advances in this field. Fifteen to twenty-five percent of the cases of mental retardation can now be identified as to cause. But many specific causes are still unknown. Preventive steps are wholly inadequate. Lack of prenatal care can be tied directly to resultant cases of mental retardation. Community services are not sufficient to the task. Frequently, they are outmoded in concept.

New institutional services are needed. Public understanding of the problem must be improved. Diagnostic, health, educational, training, rehabilitation, employment, welfare, and legal aid services need to be strengthened. We need to improve our research facilities. There is a need to expand special education, training and rehabilitation services. Due to a lack of trained teachers, supervisors and the rest, only about one-fourth of the Nation's 1,250,000 retarded children of school age have access to the special education they require.

Several years ago Ellis Island was declared surplus to the needs of the Federal Government and the General Services Administration was authorized to arrange for disposal of this white elephant. In 1960 the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare invited applications for acquisition of Ellis Island at up to 100 percent public discount to groups acting in the field of health, education or welfare or a combination thereof. After reviewing the applications submitted at that time, the Department rejected them all and, in effect, returned the problem of disposing of Ellis Island to the General Services Administration.

Early in the first session of the last Congress several bills were introduced in both the House and the Senate, each directing the head of the General Services Administration to convey Ellis Island to a particular organization for a particular purpose. My own bill was S. 2852.

The training school sought to purchase Ellis Island outright from the General Services Administration but was informed that inasmuch as these bills were pending in the Congress, the agency could not consider any bids.

It is apparent that GSA is looking to Congress to make the policy decision both as to the purpose to which Ellis Island shall be devoted in the future and as to which organization should acquire the island to carry out this purpose.

The training school at Vineland is a nonprofit corporation of the State of New Jersey and has pioneered in the field of mental retardation since 1888. Diagnosis is necessarily the first step in any program of training or treatment. The school was one of the first institutions in the world to establish a laboratory for basic research in mental retardation and also a school for the training of teachers in this field. This has led to the development of techniques of special education which are commonplace today. The result is that the training school has become a demonstration center receiving annually more than 5,000 visitors from all over the world to study these techniques and methods in action.

The training school seeks to acquire Ellis Island to expand its programs in this vital area by establishing there an international diagnostic center for development and exposition of efficient methods of diagnosis of mental deficiency. Such a center would also afford greatly expanded clinical study and examination in a comprehensive variety of fields related to mental deficiency. A research and professional training program in the field of mental retardation would be developed in cooperation with universities and other organizations interested in mental deficiency. All of these services would be made available on an international basis, with worldwide dissemination of the information acquired.

The bill we have introduced would direct the Administrator to convey Ellis Island to the training school at a price equaling the appraised value as determined by the administration of the General Services Administration, less such public discount as may be recommended by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

The training school is an outstanding institution which has been advancing the frontiers of knowledge in mental deficiency for nearly three-quarters of a century and has achieved a worldwide reputation in this field. For much of this period, arrival at Ellis Island, in the shadow of the Statue of Liberty, represented the achievement of years of work and hope on the part of millions of people yearning to be free—free from tyranny, free from persecution, free from lack of opportunity.

Freedom from the handicaps of mental retardation is still another freedom to which historic Ellis Island can yet be the gateway.

Mr. **MANSFIELD**. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. **DIRKSEN**. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that further proceedings under the quorum call be suspended.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MUST THE ALLIANCE FOR PROGRESS FAIL?—THE ACID TEST IS AT HAND

Mr. **GRUENING**. Mr. President, the Alliance for Progress was one of the great, constructive, imaginative proposals of President Kennedy. It proposed, through U.S. financial aid, plus U.S. know-how, expertise, and cooperation, to help the Latin American countries move into the mid-20th century. It proposed, by means of a cooperative understanding, based on a willingness on the part of the Latin American governments, to establish long overdue reforms—taxation, anti-inflation measures, cessation of usurious lending practices, land distribution, a willingness to increase the efficiency and integrity of government operation to prevent aid funds from being wasted or misappropriated—and thereby to achieve, by evolutionary means, a peaceful economic and social revolution. Such a peaceful revolution is essential if a violent, bloody revolution is to be obviated.

The fact is that many of the countries of Latin America are ripe for revolution. At the top of an antiquated feudal structure is entrenched a power elite who control both government and the financial and economic resources of the nation. Theirs is the power monopoly that maintains the archaic political, economic, and social structure which makes the majority of Latin American countries a fertile ground for revolution by the exploited, ill nourished, ill housed, virtually destitute and hopeless vast majority.

Such countries—in the absence of the needed reform and in the failure by those on top to provide it—should have revolutions. Unfortunately, any revolution today is promptly infiltrated by international communism—as in Cuba—directed by Moscow or Peking and diverted from its legitimate goals.

Mexico furnishes an illustration in point. Its long overdue, needed revolution began in 1910 and was concluded at the end of the century's second decade. It was both a political and social revolution. It abolished usurped continuity in the presidential office, such as that of Parfirio Diaz, who had overthrown existing constitutional provisions and kept himself—a dictator—in the presidency for a generation, by providing one 6-year term for the president and no reelection. It provided for the breakup of the vast latifundios, or land estates, and the distribution of the land to the peasantry. The ideology and motivations of the Mexican revolutionaries—Madero, Zapata, Carranza, Obregon, Calles, and their associates—were wholly indigenous. They were drawn out of Mexico's own experience and responded to Mexico's needs. There was no foreign infiltration, either ideologically or materially.

But we may be certain that had the Mexican revolution taken place a quarter of a century or more later, it would have been invaded by Kremlin agents, who would have attempted to take it over and to spread their subversion throughout Latin America.

The sad fact, however, is that the noble concept of the Alianza para el Progreso is about to fail, because those in power in Latin America have not, in the great majority of cases, initiated or carried through the needed reforms. It was perhaps a bit naive to expect those entrenched in power—politically, economically, and socially—to yield in any substantial degree their vested prerogatives, their palaces, their landed estates, their "conspicuous consumption", to borrow a phrase from Thorstein Veblen, in order that the people on whose backs and shoulders their affluence rested might be lifted from their abject misery. Nevertheless, that was the hope, and President Kennedy's prescription of such action on the part of the Latin

American power elite was supposedly a sine qua non of the Alliance.

A large part of the fault, however, is ours. The administration itself has been inveigled into giving without receiving its stipulated quid pro quo. It has continued to pour our dollars into unstable and uncooperative regimes, to buttress their follies, to give them budgetary support, to finance their deficits. By doing this it has not merely wasted our substance, but actually, by supporting the feudal edifice, given encouragement and comfort to the very subversive forces which seek to overthrow the existing regimes and enthrone Communist-dominated leadership in their place.

The time has passed when lipservice from these power elites should suffice to turn on the numerous spigots—variously, grants, development loans, and other so-called loans or credits, or refunding operations.

The issue is pertinently and crucially posed by the presence in Washington of a high-powered financial delegation from Brazil which seeks to persuade President Kennedy that just once more the pitcher should go to the well of American financial assistance and rescue the Government of Brazil from its past extravagances and follies.

It will be argued—as it has been argued before—that this time it is different. It will be eloquently pleaded that President Goulart has a new mandate to establish an austerity regime; that he has already taken and proposes to take such-and-such steps.

On the basis of such or similar previous promises, the United States has poured over $2 billion into Brazil. What is there to show for it?

If the Alliance for Progress is to succeed, it is imperative that for once our Government stand firm and wait at least 6 months or a year to see how these promises are carried out and whether the Goulart government is capable of seeing them through into the realm of tangible results.

If again we weaken—as we did in the case of Peru after our 1 week's firm stand against the military takeover—and as we have repeatedly "refunded" Brazil's financial chaos, our Government itself can take to itself a large share of the blame for the collapse of the Alianza.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that various articles bearing on this subject be printed at the conclusion of my remarks. They are: An article from the Washington Post of March 10, entitled "Dantas Due Here for Talks Vital to United States-Brazilian Ties"; an article from this morning's Washington Post, by its distinguished columnist, Marquis Childs, entitled "Brazil's Choice: Reform or Ruin"; an article from the Miami Herald entitled "Alliance Makes Little Headway in Four Key Latin Countries."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, the last article mentioned does not deal with Brazil. It deals with four other countries—smaller countries—Venezuela, Colombia, Ecuador, and Peru—where, certainly in the case of the first two, the efforts of their governments to meet President Kennedy's prescriptions have been valiantly attempted. Even there the difficulties and problems are great. But if in the case of Brazil we now again become soft and an easy touch before the evidence of compliant action by the Brazilian Government is crystal clear and demonstrable after adequate trial, we shall be making the task of successful implementation of the Alianza in other countries even more difficult, if not virtually impossible.

Our action now in the case of Brazil—and for the sake of Brazil—will constitute, in my judgment, at least, the acid test of whether the Alianza Para El Progreso can be made to succeed.

EXHIBIT 1

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Mar. 10, 1963]

DANTAS DUE HERE FOR TALKS VITAL TO UNITED STATES-BRAZILIAN TIES

(By Dan Kurzman)

Brazilian Finance Minister Francisco Clementino de San Tiago Dantas will arrive here this evening on a mission that could determine the future pattern of American-Brazilian relations.

Ties between the two Nations have been strained in recent months owing to U.S. dissatisfaction with Brazil's efforts to stabilize its inflation-ridden economy and contain extreme leftist activities.

This friction was underscored when Attorney General Robert Kennedy made a hurried trip to Brazil earlier this year. Kennedy let President Joao Goulart know that Washington's inclination to aid Brazil under the Alliance for Progress will hinge on Brazil's willingness to help itself.

Since the Kennedy mission, the Brazilian Government has shown signs of embarking on a serious endeavor to strengthen its economy and its resistance to far leftist infiltration. And the visit of Finance Minister Dantas reflects American satisfaction with this progress.

In Dantas, the most powerful man in the Brazilian Cabinet, the United States will be dealing with a man who does not always see eye to eye with Washington's hemisphere policy.

FAVORS CUBA NEGOTIATIONS

He has often said that the American Republics should negotiate with Cuba instead of isolating it. As Foreign Minister in an earlier Goulart government, he opposed the ouster of Cuba from the Organization of American States (OAS) in early 1962. He also pushed for the renewal of Brazilian diplomatic relations with the Soviet Union in 1961.

In his new role of Finance Minister, Dantas, who will meet with President Kennedy, Secretary of State Dean Rusk, and other U.S. officials, is not expected to discuss Cuba on a formal basis. But the subject may come up informally in the course of the conversations.

With the United States edging toward a coexistence policy regarding Cuba, the views of Brazil and this country are probably closer than they had been in the past. The United States, however, may suggest that the Brazilian Government tighten up its efforts to control Castroite subversion in Brazil, particularly travel to and from Cuba by agents and trainees.

The main purpose of Dantas' visit, however, is to solicit American assistance in stabilizing Brazil's finances and implementing development projects under a newly blueprinted 3-year plan.

SEEKS DEBT REVISION

Dantas will ask the United States to reschedule repayment of debts falling due in 1963, 1964, and 1965 over a period of about 20 years. Of Brazil's total world debt of $2.8 billion, $1.5 billion must be repaid with interest in the next 3 years.

About two-thirds of this $1.5 billion is owed the United States, the remainder to European countries and several international financial organizations, including the International Monetary Fund and the World Bank. Dantas will ask the other creditors as well as the United States for rescheduling of debt payments.

The foreign exchange liberated by agreement of the creditors to this request, Dantas will argue, could be used to finance development projects.

U.S. officials indicate they may consider such a request for rescheduling, but that in most cases refinancing would be more feasible. That is, Brazil would be required to pay off its debt on time and then would be offered new credits.

Such credits may come from a release of part of the $338 million committed to Brazil in 1961. Eighty-four million dollars of this has been held up because of Brazil's apparent lack of effort until recently to take effective anti-inflationary and other economic measures.

The changing U.S. attitude toward Brazil can be attributed to a number of measures taken since full presidential powers were restored to Goulart following a plebiscite in early January.

Goulart, because of his leftist tendencies, had been denied these powers by Congress when he took over the government following the dramatic resignation of President Janio Quadros in 1961. Brazil's Armed Forces had pressed for such limitations.

Having regained these powers with the help of the far left, Goulart has increasingly dissociated himself from the extremists. These groups now are accusing the President and Dantas of conservatism.

Economically, the government has, despite the political dangers, adopted an anti-inflationary program calling for a 35 percent slash in government spending.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Mar. 11, 1963]

BRAZIL'S CHOICE: REFORM OR RUIN

(By Marquis Childs)

The Government in Brazil got hold of some secret documents the other day that illustrate the depth of the split between the hard-line Chinese Communists and the followers of the Khrushchev line of coexistence. Throughout Latin America the split is developing into more or less open conflict.

The seized documents reveal a quarrel between hard-line leaders over funds believed sent from Havana for carrying out propaganda and subversion in Brazil's poverty-ridden northeast. The accusation was that somewhere along the way sticky fingers held back part of the money. As word of the documents got around, an emissary of the Moscow coexistence faction approached the Government with a request for copies—they would be useful in blasting the enemy.

Cuba, as seen from Brazil, has quite a different look than the perspective from Washington. The blacks and the whites are not nearly so well defined. President Joao Goulart has told recent visitors of his concern that the United States by directly attacking Cuba might bring the quarreling factions together and thereby put an end to the greatest hope since 1917 of permanently dividing the world Communist movement.

To see ourselves as others see us—or, more important, in the current struggle to see the world as it looks to others—is a difficult task as we become increasingly preoccupied with our own immediate troubles. This applies to all of Latin America and particularly to Brazil, which has just sent an important mission to Washington headed by Minister of Finance Francisco San Tiago Dantas.

As India is the key to the future in Asia, so Brazil is the test for Latin America. What Guatemala or Nicaragua have to say may serve the purposes of American foreign policy. But what Brazil says—and does—is likely to be decisive. And so critical is Brazil's raging inflation that perhaps no more than 2 to 2½ years of choice remain.

This is not to suggest any real parallel between the economies of the two nations. São Paulo has industry as advanced as anywhere in the world, and Rio de Janeiro is a modern capital in every sense of the word.

But the desperate poverty in Brazil's northeast, where in some areas per capita income is no more than $50, bears a close resemblance to the problem of India with its average per capita income of $69.

In presenting his case for rescheduling $89 million of loans and for further economic assistance to American and international loan and monetary agencies, Dantas is pointing to stern measures to curb inflation. These include a major tax reform, a cut in the Federal budget of 35 percent, eliminating subsidies on imported wheat and fuel and an effort to put some sense into the chaotic government-owned transport and communication system with a raise in rates.

Stringent efforts are being made to check the flight of capital. Since the plebiscite in January ending the political crisis and giving Goulart authority, Brazil's currency has strengthened.

Dantas claims wide support from the non-Communist left for the anti-inflationary program, with workers realizing that a 52-percent inflation, as in 1962, robs the rich more than the poor. At the same time he is pushing the 3-year development program, with two-thirds of new investment to come from the private sector.

In Brazil, as in most of Latin America, there is a growing skepticism over the Alliance for Progress. On a TV program in Rio the other day a speaker said:

"The Alliance for Progress is dead, however much I should hope for its resurrection. The main reason for its failure seems to be the following: It was necessary to establish close coordination between help from the Alliance and basic reforms.

"But unfortunately the rich in Latin America talk too much about reform and label as Communists all those who would enforce it. This is easy to understand: The rich in Latin America go on holding 80 percent of the land on the continent. Often they control parliament and have the intensity of their idealism and hope in the future gaged by the bank deposits kept in their names in the United States and in Europe."

These words were spoken not by a radical leftist but by Dom Helder Camara, the Roman Catholic Archbishop of Rio. They underscore how very late the hour is. In Brazil, with its furious economic and political currents, time is rapidly running out.

[From the Miami (Fla.) Herald]

ALLIANCE MAKES LITTLE HEADWAY IN FOUR KEY LATIN COUNTRIES

(By Dom Bonafede)

LIMA, PERU.—After almost 2 years, the Alliance for Progress has hardly made a ripple in four strategic countries in Latin America.

An on-the-scene assessment of the program in Venezuela, Colombia, Ecuador, and Peru indicates that little, if any, headway has been made toward the original concept of the Alliance—to promote social and economic reforms for the betterment of the Latin masses within a decade.

For the most part the humanitarian objectives of the program have been amended. Instead of working at the bottom of the social structure, Alliance funds and manpower are concentrated in the rarified atmosphere of higher economics, apparently on the theory that political stability and industrial growth must precede help for the common man.

Large doses of money are being poured into these countries to prop up the national economy, balance budgets (including those top-heavy with military expenditures), and improve balance-of-payments deficits.

"In order to pay for the social improvements envisaged under the Alliance there must be a significant increase in economic production," reported an official of the Agency for International Development (AID) in Quito, Ecuador.

CAMPESINO MUST WAIT

Meanwhile, the illiterate, barefoot campesino with the tubercular wife and famished children is waiting for help to filter down to him.

In many cases claims made by AID officials are distorted since the amount of money earmarked for a country and the actual funds disbursed vary greatly, the latter being considerably less.

Here is a summary of how each of the four countries are faring under the Alliance:

Venezuela: In 1961 the country was scheduled to receive $115 million. Of this $80 million from the Export Bank was mainly used for bolstering the balance-of-payments structure, $3 million went for housing. Last year $92 million was available on paper but only $6.5 million has been put into use—$5 million for aqueducts and $1.5 million for rural housing.

Colombia: This is the country which AID portrays as the showcase for the Alliance in South America. But Alliance funds have been used in most part to plug the economic gap caused by falling coffee prices. An agrarian reform program is bogged down in politics, lack of trained administrators, and peasant disinterest.

Banditry and violence in the rich coffee-growing regions have frightened many campesinos into leaving their small farms. Lower income workers complain that there is too much redtape involved in getting into the new housing projects near Bogotá, including the one visited by President Kennedy during his trip there. Yet, the Alliance appears to have the best chance of succeeding here, if only because of the all-out effort.

Ecuador: Of $64.5 million made available, less than a third has actually been disbursed. Despite the pitiful plight of Indian sharecroppers an agrarian reform program has not yet come out of the planning stage. AID officials say that a few hospitals and schools have been built under the Alliance but no houses. A recently approved loan has been granted to open up the dark jungle interior. And a loan application of $4 million is pending for the construction of 2,000 classrooms and 700 teacher lodgings.

Peru: Suspension of United States-Peruvian relations in July 1962 interrupted the AID program. With the lifting of the suspension aid has been resumed but is only beginning to trickle in. Palace spokesmen maintain that Jorge Grieve, Peruvian member of the "nine wise men" who pass on Alliance economic proposals, is opposed to the ruling junta and is blocking credit for the country.

"We would rather deal with North Americans than Latins," declared Julio Vargas Prado, secretary to the military government.

Plans have been drafted to develop the Communist-infiltrated Convencion Valley. The Peace Corps, which feeds 182,000 Peruvian children through a school lunch program, is making a favorable impression.

OFFICIALS PLEAD FOR TIME

In each country AID officials plead for time. However, the high birth rates of these countries, the flight of foreign capital and the drop in basic commodity prices means that injections of money cannot keep pace with the vast needs of the people.

In Venezuela, which boasts a 3.6 percent annual population explosion—the highest in Latin America—President Romulo Betancourt has resettled some 53,000 families under an agrarian reform program, started incidentally prior to the launching of the Alliance. But the country's housing shortage is estimated at more than 700,000 units with an annual demand of about 60,000 units.

Declared an AID executive in Caracas: "There is no organized resistance here. But a feeling of urgency does not permeate all levels of government, especially at the lower levels. We're ready to go whenever they are."

While visiting the new housing projects it was found that some of the tenants had refrigerators and gas stoves but no electricity or gas to operate them.

Disenchantment with the Alliance has led to Latins blaming the United States and AID officials blaming the Latins.

In Peru, international politics is said to take precedence over the need for help.

"We have received practically no money under the Alliance for social development since the junta look over last year," reported Vargas Prado.

The Kennedy administration is known to be cool towards the junta government. The relationship between the two governments points up the unresolved problem whether aid should be dispensed along humanitarian lines unaffected by political bias.

Many Latins complain that the Alliance is not revolutionary enough. Yet when innovations are introduced with which they are unacquainted, such as savings and loan associations, they are slow in accepting them.

THE U.S. QUARANTINE OF CUBA

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, we are all aware of the forthright action taken by President Kennedy last October to force the removal of Russian missiles and bombers from Cuba. I think we all agree that the President acted properly, in view of the fact that the national security of the United States as well as that of the entire free world was at stake. What the President did was necessary, even though at the time there was probably no chance to make a careful study of its legality.

A scholarly article has recently been written, however, which demonstrates that the U.S. quarantine of Cuba violated neither the Charter of the United Nations nor the established rules of international law. This article, written by a member of the New York Bar, appeared in the February edition of the American Bar Association Journal.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the body of the RECORD, immediately following these remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE LEGALITY OF U.S. QUARANTINE ACTION UNDER THE UNITED NATIONS CHARTER

(By Eustace Seligman)

(NOTE.—In this article, Mr. Seligman examines the legal position of the action of the United States in imposing a quarantine on shipments to Castro at the height of the Cuban crisis. His analysis indicates that the U.S. action was consistent both with the U.N. Charter and with established principles of international law.)

The question of whether the quarantine action taken by the United States was or was not a violation of its obligations under the U.N. Charter is one of great importance, and not merely to lawyers. We profess to believe in sanctity of obligations, we demand that of other nations, and yet we hear it frequently stated in connection with the Cuban quarantine that, since our national security was involved, we could not be deterred by legal niceties.

Was our action in imposing the quarantine of this nature in violation of our written word? It is believed not, for the reasons hereinafter set forth.

ARTICLE 2(4) OF THE CHARTER

The basic restriction on the use of force in the U.N. Charter is article 2(4). This article does not expressly prohibit all use of force—but only force of specific kinds. It reads as follows:

"All members shall refrain in their international relations from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any state, or in any other manner inconsistent with the purposes of the United Nations."

In order for a use of force to come within the prohibition of article 2(4) it must be of a kind enumerated unless the enumeration is to be deemed surplusage and ignored, which would appear to be unjustified by any sound rule of construction.

As is stated in Bowett, "Self-Defense in International Law," 1958, at page 151: "This, in effect, was the construction which the U.K. agent, Sir Eric Beckett, sought to place on the article in contending before the International Court of Justice in the Corfu Channel case that Operation Retail, the subsequent minesweeping operation, was not contrary to article 2(4). He said: 'But our action on the 12th and 13th of November threatened neither the territorial integrity nor the political independence of Albania. Albania suffered thereby neither territorial loss nor any part of its political independence.'

"As previously indicated, the finding of the Court against the United Kingdom on this point, made no specific reference either to this argument or indeed to article 2(4)."

Writers on international law have expressed conflicting views on the question. However, Bowett, after weighing them, concludes at page 152: "Despite these reasons it is submitted that, the phrase having been included, it must be given its plain meaning. Moreover, to give it its plain meaning coincides with the limitations on the obligation of nonintervention which traditional international law recognizes."

Unless article 2(4) is construed to prevent all use of force, it is difficult to conceive of any use of force which would be more clearly excluded from the scope of article 2(4) than a quarantine to prevent the introduction of offensive weapons. The quarantine was not a use of force, (a) against the territorial integrity of Cuba; or (b) against the political independence of Cuba; or (c) in any other manner inconsistent with the purposes of the United Nations—of which the paramount one under article 1 is to maintain peace and security—the objective of the quarantine.

It would, therefore, appear that under the sound construction of article 2(4), which has heretofore been advocated by Britain, the U.S. quarantine did not violate its obligations under the U.N. Charter.

SELF-DEFENSE

Even if article 2(4) could be construed to include in its prohibition the use of force involved in a quarantine, it is well recognized that it cannot properly be construed to prohibit a quarantine or any other use of force, if carried out in self-defense.

This question is fully discussed in Bowett, op. cit., who concludes at page 186: "For these reasons we would maintain that the obligation assumed under article 2(4) is in no way inconsistent with the right of self-defense recognized in international law."

However, the use of the words "armed attack" in article 51 of the charter raises a further question as to whether the charter as a whole should be construed to forbid "anticipatory" self-defense—that is, action prior to an actual armed attack. Article 51 reads as follows: "Nothing in the present charter shall impair the inherent right of individual or collective self-defense if any armed attack occurs against a member of the United Nations, until the Security Council has taken the measures necessary to maintain international peace and security."

There is a full discussion of this question also in Bowett, who concludes at page 191: "It is not believed, therefore, that article 51 restricts the traditional right of self-defense so as to exclude action taken against an imminent danger but before an 'armed attack occurs.' In our view such a restriction is both unnecessary and inconsistent with article 2(4) which forbids not only force but the threat of force, and, furthermore, it is a restriction which bears no relation to the realities of a situation which may arise prior to an actual attack and call for self-defense immediately if it is to be of any avail at all. No state can be expected to await an initial attack which in the present state of armaments, may well destroy the state's capacity for further resistance and so jeopardize its very existence."

The traditional right of self-defense which it is believed was preserved by the charter has been described by Westlake, "International Law," second edition 1910, part I, page 312, as follows: "A state may defend itself, by preventive means if in its conscientious judgment necessary, against attack by another state, threat of attack, or preparations or other conduct from which an intention to attack may reasonably be apprehended. In so doing it will be acting in a manner intrinsically defensive even though externally aggressive."

From this it follows that the legality of the quarantine depends upon whether it was an act of genuine self-defense even though anticipatory, or in fact an unprovoked act of aggression. The answer to this is clear: The conveying to Cuba by the Sino-Soviet powers of offensive weapons was the initiating cause which led to the U.S. reaction and was a threat to U.S. security. The unprovoked and unjustified secret installation of offensive nuclear weapons in an area previously free from them and close to another state, creates a threat to such other state justifying under the right of self-defense the use of force in order to cause their removal.

Applying the test laid down by Westlake quoted above, the installation of such weapons under all the attendant circumstances, including Castro's threats against Guantanamo and various Latin American countries, was conduct from which an intention to attack may reasonably be apprehended." Who outside the Kremlin knows what the purpose was of secretly building up nuclear offensive weapons in Cuba, located so as to be able to bypass our DEW line radar detective network? Was another Pearl Harbor planned? Or was it intended once the installation was completed to deliver to us an ultimatum to withdraw from West Berlin, Europe, Turkey, or elsewhere? Surely the possibility of this was sufficiently great so as to justify our taking immediate action to remove the danger.

Furthermore, the limited nature of the U.S. reaction confirms that it was defensive only and solely designed to eliminate the threat to its security caused by the introduction of the offensive weapons. Consequently, the quarantine was not an act of aggression prohibited by the obligations we have entered into when we signed the U.N. Charter.

One of the problems raised by the claim of self-defense is the difficulty of deciding when it is false and when legitimate. The justification of anticipatory self-defense has frequently been falsely advanced—as in the case of Hitler's claim in September 1939, that Germany had been attacked by Polish troops. This, however, is no reason for denying reliance upon it when it is in fact justified.

The U.N. Charter has endeavored to solve this problem by recognizing the necessity of an immediate unilateral decision by a threatened state of when and how to react, but under article 51 requires it to report immediately to the Security Council the action taken. This is clearly set forth in Oppenheim's "International Law," eighth edition, 1957, edited by Lauterpacht, volume 1, at page 299: "The reason of the thing, of course, makes it necessary for every State to judge for itself, in the first instance, whether a case of necessity in self-defense has arisen. But, unless the notion of self-preservation is to be eliminated as a legal conception, or unless it is used as a cloak for concealing deliberate breaches of the law, it is obvious that the question of the legality of action taken in self-preservation is suitable for determination and must ultimately be determined by a judicial authority or by a political body, like the Security Council of the United Nations, acting in a judicial capacity. The Charter lays down expressly that measures taken in the exercise of the right of self-defense must be immediately reported to the Security Council."

This obligation to report to the Security Council was complied with by the United States.

Oppenheim (op. cit. p. 299) gives the following example of the exercise of the right of anticipatory self-defense, of a far more extreme nature than the quarantine: "After the peace of Tilsit of 1807, the British Government was cognizant of a secret article of this treaty, according to which Denmark should, in certain circumstances, be coerced into declaring war against Great Britain, and France should be enabled to seize the Danish fleet so as to make use of it against Great Britain. As Denmark was not capable of defending herself against an attack of the French Army in North Germany under Bernadotte and Davoust, who had orders to invade Denmark, the British Government requested Denmark to deliver up her fleet to the custody of Great Britain, and promised to restore it after the war. Denmark, however, refused to comply with the British demands; whereupon the British considered that a case of necessity in self-defense had arisen, shelled, Copenhagen, and seized the Danish fleet."

In a footnote on the following page Lauterpacht states that: "The action of Great Britain in this case, while condemned by most continental writers, is approved by many British and American writers."

One of the British writers who states that this action is "justifiable in our opinion" is Westlake (op. cit. p. 315).

Two other arguments should be considered in connection with our reliance on self-defense. First, it has been urged that the Russian-Cuban action was not a threat of the use of force, but itself justified by self-defense of Cuba to prevent a U.S. invasion. This contention is clearly fictitious. The Castro regime has been in power for almost 4 years and yet no attempt has been made by U.S. forces to invade the island. On several occasions Cuba has appealed to the Security Council to ask protection against a threatened invasion, but has never been able to adduce any evidence in support of its claim. Finally, proof conclusive of its falsity was furnished when at the time of the landing at the Bay of Pigs by the returning Cubans we refused to give them the assistance of our Air Force which they desired.

Second, it has been suggested that if the position of the United States is sound, it follows that the action which the United States took in establishing a base in Turkey was similarly a threat to the peace in violation of the Charter.

This suggestion is without merit for the following reasons:

The action we took in Turkey was not the initiating action of an aggressive nature, but our response to the prior aggressive steps taken by Russia in its expansionist program, and was of a defensive nature. As has been well stated by Mr. Frank Altschul, vice president of the Council on Foreign Relations, in a letter to the New York Times of October 29, 1962:

"There are few things less in keeping with our national tradition or desires than to have, in time of peace, Armed Forces of the United States stationed far from home at distant points around the globe. Yet we have felt obliged to break with tradition and preference in response to Soviet conduct, which has, ever since the fall of Czechoslovakia, in and out of the United Nations carried the conviction that the Soviet Union has in no sense placed limits on its well-advertised determination to spread its dominion to the farthest corners of the earth.

"Our bases, accordingly, represented an important, if by no means the only, contribution we have made to the defense of the non-Soviet world against the overweening ambitions of the Kremlin.

"The Soviet missile base in Cuba, on the other hand, is of quite a different character. Our history, as Mr. Kennedy said in his eloquent address, unlike the Soviet's since the end of World War II, demonstrates we have no desire to conquer or dominate any other nation or impose our system on its people.'

"The masters of the Kremlin know as well as we do that the missile base, so furtively under construction in Cuba, cannot possibly be regarded as essential either to the defense of the Soviet Union or Cuba. Located close to our shores, it is purely aggressive in nature and furnishes evidence that the Soviet Union still regards the threat of a nuclear holocaust as a useful instrument for advancing Soviet objectives."

THE ACTION OF THE OAS

It has been suggested by our State Department that there is a different legal basis for the quarantine in the resolution adopted on October 23, 1962, by the Council of the OAS authorizing action which would include and go beyond the quarantine. The argument advanced is that the Charter specifically recognizes regional organizations and assigns to them an important place in carrying out the purposes of the United Nations in that article 52(1) states that "Nothing in the present charter precludes the existence of regional arrangements or agencies for dealing with such matters relating to the maintenance of international peace and security as are appropriate for regional action, provided that such arrangements or agencies and their activities are consistent with the purposes and principles of the United Nations."

It is urged that this article gives to regional organizations the right to use force collectively for the removal of threats to the peace in their region in a situation where an individual State would not have the right to use force.

This position seems to be of doubtful validity. Certainly the wording of article 52 (1) above quoted gives it no support. Nor do the debates at the San Francisco Conference and the discussion there of the Act of Chapultepec support the suggested construction, for that act specifically provided only for the collective use of force "to prevent or repel aggression."

It would therefore seem that under the charter the resolution of the OAS would not justify the quarantine action by the United States if it had not been justified, absent the resolution.

The resolution does, however, have very real weight on the issue of the validity of the contention of the United States that the quarantine was in fact an act of self-defense. Instead of relying on a unilateral decision of the United States that it was acting in self-defense, there is now the unanimous judgment of the 20 members of the OAS after considering the evidence that the peace of the continent was threatened and that the United States and the other members should take necessary action including the use of armed force to stop the flow of offensive missiles into Cuba.

In addition the resolution of the OAS furnishes convincing refutation to the asserted claim referred to above, that the United States was contemplating an invasion of Cuba to overthrow Castro and that the installation of even offensive weapons was defensive and not a threat of aggression. Surely it could not be claimed that the 20 members of the OAS all contemplated joining in an invasion of Cuba; nor could they have believed that the United States had such a plan in mind when the resolution of October 23 was adopted by them. On the contrary, this resolution constitutes their unanimous judgment that this excuse for the introduction of missiles in Cuba is unjustified.

This action of the OAS is thus of the greatest importance in confirming that the quarantine was an act of self-defense and that the action of the United States was not in violation of its obligation under the Charter.

MILITARY AID TO WESTERN EUROPE

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, I would like to call the attention of my colleagues to an editorial appearing recently in one of the largest and most influential newspapers in the West, the Salt Lake Tribune. This editorial alerts the paper's readers to the disproportionate burden the United States is carrying in providing an adequate system of European defense. The editorial shows that our NATO allies are not meeting their share of this burden, either in terms of money or manpower.

The editorial points out that the United States is now supporting about the same number of men under arms as all of the NATO countries put together, even though the population of the NATO countries is almost 100 million larger than that of the United States. In addition, defense spending in the United States is currently about $52 billion a year, or $277 per capita, while the current spending of all NATO countries is only $15 billion, or $53 per capita.

The editorial concludes with a plea that this relationship between the United States and our NATO allies be corrected. And correct it we must.

As I have pointed out on numerous occasions in the past, there is no justification for the United States to continue subsidizing the armed forces of our prosperous NATO allies. Congress stopped further substantial economic aid to these countries some 9 years ago, when it was recognized that they had fully recovered their capacity to be self-supporting.

Yet, since 1950, the United States has given to the nations of Western Europe, in the form of outright military assistance grants, a sum approaching $15 billion. This vast sum is in addition to our contribution to the NATO infrastructure. These countries have long since recovered their capacity to support their own armed forces without further help from us. The United States, however, continues to extend these military grants, to the tune of $314½ million in fiscal 1963 alone. Must the taxpayers of this country pay this bill indefinitely? Is there to be no end to the subsidy?

I am certainly aware, Mr. President, of the great wealth of the United States, and I am also aware that our per capita gross national product is much higher in the United States than in Western Europe. But is this difference in wealth proportionate to the burden being carried by the United States? The figures indicate otherwise. The per capita GNP in the United States is about 2.6 times as great as that of Western Europe. But, as I mentioned before, the average American taxpayer spends $277 yearly for defense purposes, while his West European counterpart pays only $53 yearly for defense purposes. The average American taxpayer is therefore spending over 5 times as much for defense purposes than the average taxpayer in Western Europe, which is almost twice the burden that would be warranted by comparing the individual income of each. This leaves no conclusion but that the American taxpayer has a legitimate complaint, and that it is high time for the financially successful NATO countries to assume a somewhat more equitable share of their own defense burden.

To demonstrate further the level of prosperity that has now been achieved by most of our NATO allies in Western Europe, we need look only to the unemployment figures for the United States and for the NATO countries. A study has been made which compares the unemployment levels of the United States with the countries of Western Europe, during the period from 1953 through 1961. Figures were available for all of the NATO countries except Greece, Portugal, and Turkey. In 1953, the average number of unemployed persons in Western Europe—Belgium, Luxembourg, Denmark, France, Germany, Netherlands, Italy, Norway, and the United Kingdom—was about 4.1 million of the total labor force. This number has steadily decreased over the years, until in 1961 the total unemployed in these same countries was only about 2.2 million persons. In the United States, on the other hand, our citizens have not been so fortunate in finding needed jobs. In 1953, the United States had about 1.9 million unemployed persons in our labor force, while in 1961 we had an average of over 4.8 million unemployed persons. The unemployment trend in the United States is up; in Europe, it is down.

For these reasons, I think the Tribune editorial, entitled, "Sharing Burden of Defending Freedom," is particularly appropriate. It is time for our NATO allies to pay their own way, and for this result to be realistically accomplished, it is essential that this year's foreign aid bill be amended to express such a policy by congressional action. If we continue unwarranted subsidies to rich NATO members, we not only disserve ourselves, but the alliance as well. In the long run, it will be greatly weakened, because it will lack the strong internal respect that comes from each member doing its share. This Congress should terminate further military grants to the individual NATO countries that have no further need for them.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point the editorial in the February 4, 1963, issue of the Salt Lake Tribune.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SHARING BURDEN OF DEFENDING FREEDOM

Something of an "agonizing reappraisal" of relationships within the Western Alliance is now in progress. It is related to the fair sharing of the burden of European defense, both in terms of money and manpower.

The reappraisal was in process well before France's brutal action in vetoing expansion of the European Common Market. But this French withdrawal from closer British and United States association is bound to further exacerbate strained relations and divergent views among the allies on defense policies and proper burden shares.

That dispute was dramatized by the furor in Britain over the United States decision to abandon the Skybolt missile. Hardly had that been ironed out at the Nassau Conference between President Kennedy and Prime Minister Macmillan, than new controversy erupted over British responsibility to pay part of the cost of the improved Polaris missiles offered as a substitute for Skybolt.

Meanwhile France insists on going its own way as a nuclear power and downgrades its commitment to NATO by assigning a puny division and a half to NATO forces—contrasted with Britain's 55,000-man NATO Army and the 400,000 men the United States has committed to NATO.

In Britain, meanwhile, the influential Manchester Guardian is challenging the whole plan to have six British Polaris submarines as not worth the estimated $1 billion cost.

At the same time the United States is challenging all its European allies to take over more of the task of defending themselves. Defense Secretary McNamara put the case quite bluntly at a recent meeting with the allies in Europe.

And there is reason for a blunt presentation.

The United States with a population of about 188 million is now supporting about the same number of men under arms as all the European NATO countries with their population of some 280 million.

The United States is the only large NATO power with a 2-year draft. Britain has none, most others 18 months or less.

The monetary comparison is even more weighted against this country. United States defense spending currently is at the rate of $52 billion a year, or $277 per capita. All 12 of our European allies spend only $15 billion, or $53 per capita.

With such a disproportionate share of the defense burden, it is no wonder America's groaning taxpayers can't provide enough tax revenues to balance the national budget; or that the international balance of payments continues to be against this country; or that the American economy and its rate of growth remains sluggish in comparison with most European nations.

This relationship must be, and it is being, reappraised.

As President Kennedy said recently, it is really fantastic what the United States has done to defend freedom around the world and to rebuild the economies of war-shattered countries, including our former enemies. This magnificent effort has undeniably halted the advance of communism and built the foundations of Europe's present prosperity.

But other nations of the Western World are now capable of resisting communism themselves, and their economies need no more support. It is time for them to accept a more equitable share of the burden of defending freedom.

Failure to resolve this problem on a basis of commonsense and reasonableness could so weaken the alliance as to make its members easy prey to Communist takeover.

OUTDOOR RECREATION

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 20) to promote the coordination and development of effective Federal and State programs relating to outdoor recreation, and for other purposes.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, the bill—S. 20—is now before the Senate. I ask unanimous consent that the committee amendments be now considered, and I ask unanimous consent that they be agreed to en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendments en bloc.

The amendments were agreed to en bloc.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I also send to the desk an amendment which was very carefully studied by the committee and agreed to by the members of the subcommittee, which I ask the Senate to adopt at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 3, line 21, after the word "purposes" it is proposed to delete the semicolon, insert in lieu thereof a comma and add the following: "including advance payments without regard to section 3648 of the Revised Statutes—39 U.S.C. 4154—for initial costs of such research to any educational institution or other nonprofit organizations when necessary and in the public interest;".

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, after consultation with the distinguished minority leader and the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] concerning the unanimous-consent agreement entered last week, I ask unanimous consent at this time that the unanimous-consent agreement for a vote at 3 o'clock tomorrow be vacated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the reason for making the request at this time is that it is my understanding there will be no yea-and-nay vote on the measure now pending; that it is agreeable to all sides; and that the measure can be disposed of today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, those who may oppose S. 20, to promote the coordination and development of effective Federal and State programs relating to outdoor recreation, have done a very real service, whether it was intended or not. The bill will receive more careful study, and our recreation problems will become better understood as a result.

The Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs held a 1-day conference on the bill on February 5, during the debate on the Senate rules, which claimed all the headlines. The committee subsequently decided to regard its February 5 proceedings as a hearing, and printed them as a hearing record.

The committee then considered the bill at its first executive session, adopted three minor amendments, and unanimously ordered the measure, as amended, reported to the Senate. Since that time, agreement has been reached to amend one of the committee amendments in regard to advance payments for research, which we have now done.

Bringing the measure to issue and debate affords us an opportunity to use the floor of the Senate to lay before the country a little more of the background and the dimensions of the outdoor recreation problem.

In the last two decades the United States has seen a phenomenal growth in use of outdoor recreation facilities.

Their use was growing some prior to World War II, but not so tremendously that it could not be handled by the addition of a new national park occasionally, or the development of a few picnic grounds and campgrounds in the national forests.

AN OPPORTUNITY MISSED

During the depression days in the thirties, Secretary of the Interior Harold Ickes foresaw the need for preservation of some areas to meet growing recreation demand. At his direction, the National Park Service made a survey of the shores of the Atlantic and the Gulf of Mexico to determine if steps should be taken to reserve part of them for recreation.

The Park Service recommended that at least 10 percent of the 4,025 miles of oceans and gulf shore should be reserved. It consequently recommended that the Federal Government acquire 12 tracts of land, totaling 600,000 acres with 400 miles of water frontage, at an estimated cost of $12 million. The tracts stretched all the way from Barnegat Inlet in New Jersey to Padre Island, Tex.

It is a very regrettable fact of history that the pressure for recreation facilities was not sufficient at that time to push the program through. The Nation could have acquired the 12 sites, with their 400 miles of frontage, for a very small fraction of what considerably less frontage is going to cost us today.

Only 1 of the 12 sites was acquired in the years just after the Ickes' survey—a part of Cape Hatteras off North Carolina. We are now in the process of buying a part of a second one—80 miles of the 117-mile Padre Island off Texas. It is going to cost us eight times the estimated cost of the whole 117 miles of Padre Island in 1935.

All of the other 10 sites recommended in the thirties have now been developed by private developers. A resurvey of them in 1955 showed that land values had multiplied many times in the two decades. One of the areas, Bogue Island off North Carolina, is a 30-mile island which could have been acquired in 1935 for $260,000. In 1935 there was only 9 miles still undeveloped and its value was put at more than $1 million—an increase of 1200 percent in valuation in two decades. The story at the other sites is the same. At one of them, which had been subdivided, values in 1955 were up from $26 an acre to $65 per front foot for a building lot.

WARTIME DECLINE

Part of the reason for our failure to act at that time was the approach of World War II, rising employment, and economic activity. When the war engulfed us, demand on recreation facilities plummeted.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the Record a table showing the number of visitors at National Park Service areas and at the national forests from 1941 through 1961.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be be printed in the Record as follows:

Visits to national park areas and national forests

Year	Park Service areas [1]	National forests
1941	21, 236, 947	18, 004, 785
1942	9, 370, 969	10, 407, 120
1943	6, 828, 420	6, 274, 659
1944	8, 339, 775	7, 151, 953
1945	11, 713, 852	10, 074, 089
1946	21, 752, 315	18, 240, 677
1947	25, 534, 188	21, 330, 751
1948	29, 858, 828	24, 010, 964
1949	31, 736, 402	26, 080, 255
1950	33, 252, 589	27, 367, 797
1951	37, 106, 440	29, 950, 252
1952	42, 299, 836	33, 006, 885
1953	46, 224, 794	35, 403, 050
1954	47, 833, 913	40, 304, 037
1955	50, 007, 838	45, 712, 868
1956	54, 923, 000	52, 556, 084
1957	59, 285, 000	60, 957, 273
1958	58, 677, 000	68, 449, 500
1959	62, 812, 000	81, 521, 000
1960	72, 288, 000	92, 594, 500
1961	79, 040, 000	102, 000, 000
1962	88, 000, 000	112, 762, 000

[1] National park areas include parks, monuments, historical sites, and related areas.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, this table tells only a part of the story of recreation demand in the United States. But it shows how demand declined during World War II, and then literally skyrocketed.

The national parks had 21 million visitors in 1941. That fell under 7 million in 1943, jumped back past 21 million in 1946, and has quadrupled since the immediate post-war period.

The Forest Service story is even more striking.

Visits to the national forests ran 18 million in 1941. They fell off to about 6 million in 1943, climbed to 10 million in 1945, and they were 10 times 10 milion in 1961—102 million. The gain alone in 1962 is now estimated to be greater than the total attendance back in 1945.

GROWTH UNDERESTIMATED

We became aware of the tremendous growth in use of recreational facilities in the Nation in the fifties, when visitors and tourists started overflowing not only old facilities for recreationists, but all the new ones we could build. Our old pace of providing recreation areas and facilities wasn't keeping up with demand.

In 1954, Stephen Raushenbush of the Public Affairs Institute here in Washington went to a natural resources conference in Canada and told the participants that demand on recreational facilities was growing a great deal faster than population; that multipliers were at work. Raushenbush related rising per capita income and shorter working hours to the rising demand to explain why the increase was exceeding population growth. He made a very interesting attempt to startle the natural resources experts into a realization of the dimensions of the recreation problem they confronted by projecting demand ahead to 1960 on the basis, not just of population growth, but population growth times increased income and increased leisure. Raushenbush's projections were for a 32 percent to 50 percent increase in visits to park and forest recreation areas between 1953 and 1960. The actual increase was in the order of 110 percent. The U.S. parks and forests had 77.7 million visitors in 1953 and 164.9 million in 1960.

Raushenbush was not the only estimator in the fifties who was later shown to be overly conservative. Agencies across the country, in the recreation business, were awakening in this period to the situation which confronted them and planning to handle increased visitors, but they almost invariably set their sights too low. One factor they overlooked was the effect that post-war road building would have on recreation demand—the increased mobility of the increased numbers of people with higher incomes and more leisure time.

The 50 million visitors to National Park Service areas in 1955 were twice the capacity of facilities available to service them. Vacationists who were turned away from the crowded camping grounds and picnic areas grumbled, and they grumbled so loudly even those of us here in Washington could hear it. It came to us through the press and in our mail.

SCENIC AREAS ENDANGERED

The overload of park visitors was not only a public relations problem, it was resulting in damage to the natural and historic features of the park areas which the Park Service was supposed to protect and preserve. Campers who were unable to get into regular camping areas pitched their tents, built their fires, and left their garbage in the most scenic and interesting spots they could find. They were often right beside or even astride the finest attractions in the parks. An inadequate force of park rangers was unable to police them all.

The National Park Service has a dual responsibility under its basic charter, the National Parks Act of 1916. One is to preserve and protect the great natural scenic areas entrusted to it for the undiminished enjoyment of future generations. The other is to provide reasonable access to the areas for the pleasure and recreation of the present generation.

The 50 million visitors to the parks were making it impossible for the Park Service to discharge its preservation responsibility, and so, in 1956, it submitted to Congress a 10-year $600 million program to provide facilities to handle 80 million visitors. That was the number of visitors anticipated in 1966 under the project, known to all of us now as Mission 66.

If Senators will refer to the table I have placed in the Record, they will find that the number of visitors to the Park Service areas went beyond 80 million in 1962—4 years ahead of the predicted time schedule. It should have been Mission 62 instead of Mission 66.

THE FOREST SERVICE RESPONSE

The National Forest Service responded to the recreation pressure on its facilities in the midfifties with Operation Outdoors, developed in 1956 and initiated in 1957.

Operation Outdoors was less than a one-tenth part of the program for the national forests submitted to Congress in 1957. The total program for the forests was estimated to cost $1.7 billion. Out of that total, $123 million was for 102 new family camping units and similar recreational facilities.

In 1961, when demand had overrun the original estimates and after President John F. Kennedy had called for greater emphasis on natural resources conservation, mentioning the forests specifically, the Forest Service revised its program upward by 50 percent to a $2.5 billion level. But it more than tripled the share of the recreational programs in the new allocation of funds. Instead of $123 million for recreation, the revision contained $409 millions for that purpose. To handle its more than 100 million annual visits, the Forest Service proposes the reconstruction and rehabilitation of 2,000 existing campgrounds; development of 28,000 new camping and picnic areas; development of 4,000 recreation sites where boating, swimming, winter sports, and other recreational uses can be served; and special developments at outstanding scenic and recreational areas which attract unusually large crowds.

Thus, the bold new programs of the fifties, proposed by both the Park Service and the Forest Service—Mission 66 and Operation Outdoors—proved overly conservative.

It should be said, in fairness, that program proposals which reach Congress are almost invariably more modest than the original agency proposals. There is a Budget Bureau between the agency and Congress, with an eye on the dollar and the budget balance, and too little contact with the realities of life out where people live. For example, the Bureau for some years vetoed any appropriation request in behalf of the Fish and Wildlife Service for recreation, although millions of visitors were pouring into the game ranges and refuges every year. The visitors had to be policed, the garbage picked up and essential recreation services performed by staff and facilities pirated from other budget items.

Unquestionably, the Park Service and the Forest Service originally sought more adequate programs than those which were finally proposed to the Congress.

By 1958 it had become apparent even to us in the Congress that we had a bear by the tail—almost literally. We were trying to handle a bigger problem than we had realized by a handle which was wholly inadequate to the situation.

Congress enacted a bill which I was privileged to introduce in the Senate and which Representative **WAYNE ASPINALL**, of Colorado, introduced in the House, establishing a national Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission.

We instructed that Commission to inventory and evaluate the outdoor recreation resources and opportunities of the Nation, to determine the types and location of such resources and opportunities which will be required by present and future generations; and in order to make comprehensive information and recommendations leadings to these goals available to the President, the Congress, and the individual States and territories. Also the Commission shall compile such data and in the light of the data so compiled and of the information available concerning trends in population, leisure, transportation, and other factors, shall determine the amount, kind, quality, and location of such outdoor recreation resources and opportunities as will be required by the year 1976 and the year 2000, and shall recommend what policies should best be adopted and what programs initiated, at each level of government and by private organizations and other citizen groups and interests, to meet such future requirements.

The chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, Senator **JACKSON**, made a splendid, concise statement on Friday last of the nature of the Commission, its membership and its recommendations leading up to the presentation of the measure before the Senate, S. 20, and of the contents of the bill.

The Commission, appointed by President Dwight D. Eisenhower, followed the mandate of the bill. It was bipartisan, including four Senators and four Representatives equally divided between the parties. The seven citizen members appointed by Mr. Eisenhower were, as the bill directed, "citizens known to be informed about and concerned with the preservation and development of outdoor recreation resources and opportunities, and experienced in resource conservation planning for multiple resource uses."

The report of the Commission was a conscientious effort to find the best possible solutions to growing recreation demands.

This is not a Kennedy new idea measure, although the President is to be highly praised for the strong support he has given it and the whole recreation program.

S. 20 is the product of two decades of national experience with burgeoning recreation demands followed by one of the finest examples of bipartisan—indeed, nonpartisan—study and planning that will be found in the history of our country.

Seldom have a group laid their partisanship aside so completely, outlined factual studies, enlisted technicians and experts in the field, and made so thorough a study of a major national problem.

The bill which created the Commission was introduced on February 5, 1957, by Senators Anderson, Murray, Watkins, Carroll, Barrett, Kuchel, Allott, Neuberger, Morse, Mundt, and Goldwater—six Republicans and five Democrats.

The congressional posts on the Commission were divided equally between the parties. The politics of some of the commissioners appointed by President Eisenhower aren't known to most of us.

We can assume that the Chairman of the Commission, Mr. Laurance Rockefeller, brother of the Republican Governor of New York, is a Republican. One or two other of the citizen members of the Commission could be suspected of being Republicans by their identities outside the Commission, but within the Commission there was no way to tell whether Joe Penfold of the Izaak Walton League, Dean Samuel Dana, of the University of Michigan, and any of the others were Democrats or Republicans. I can testify that they have acted on this work without political or partisan prejudice.

The whole group—including the congressional members—were citizens and conservationists working together to dig out the facts and develop a sound national recreation policy and program to supplant the piecemeal and inadequate efforts of the individual agencies of government at both the Federal and State levels.

The adjectives "piecemeal" and "inadequate" are used here without any implication of criticism whatever.

The National Park Service and the Forest Service were criticized for asking as much as they did in Mission 66 and Operation Outdoors. No one can properly do anything but commend them for their early responses to the emerging problem of surging recreational demand.

Congress was not so farseeing that we pressed extra authorizations and appropriations on them with an injunction to do more than they had proposed.

Nor is Congress to be criticized. When we realized the size of the problem, we made arrangements to get the facts by the creation of the Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission.

The report of the Commission is, to my way of thinking, one of the finest ever submitted to Congress. It was expensive. The Nation invested more than $2 million in its preparation. It is worth every penny if we carry it out. It is backed up by an extensive inventory of outdoor recreation areas in the Nation, including the names of approximately 10,000 of them, plus the managing agency, acreage, county location, facilities available and much other data. It is backed up further by 25 studies of special problems involved in planning a proper recreation program. There are studies of the place of wilderness in a recreation program, of shoreline resources, hunting, and fishing. There is an extensive study of the types of recreation people enjoy and of the quality required to give the users satisfaction. More than 16,000 people were questioned extensively on their recreation activities, reactions, and aspirations to determine accurately the nature and extent of public demand.

The Commission studied the proper role of each level of government in meeting recreation needs. Study No. 11 is of the private role in supplying outdoor recreation demand, a careful appraisal of how far the Government should go, and how much of the load private agencies and private enterprise can meet.

There was detailed analysis of Government agencies involved in the recreation field, and of how Government could best organize itself to carry on a recreation program.

Copies of the Commission report were sent to every Member of Congress and I hope that every Member will get out his copy and examine it carefully before we vote on S. 20. Its thoroughness cannot fail to impress any openminded person.

It is to the credit of the Commission that it did not do as so many commissions do, and dodge the tough, controversial questions.

The Commission outlined a recreation policy for the U.S. Government and then it blueprinted in detail how that policy should be translated into action programs. It made recommendations on where responsibilities should be assigned, what should be done, and how the bill for such work should be paid.

The Bureau of Outdoor Recreation established by Secretary of the Interior Udall in April last year was not only recommended by the Commission, but its functions were outlined in detail—the very same functions that S. 20 proposes to have it discharge.

The citizen members of the Outdoor Recreation Resources Commission served without compensation. They were all able people, unselfishly contributing many, many days of their time to their Government. We met for 50 days. It took at least that many more days to study over the reports and prepare for the meetings.

Those of us in Congress are accustomed to harsh comment. But I would deeply regret that men like Dean Samuel Dana, of the University of Michigan; Bernard Orell, of Weyerheuser Lumber; Frederick Smith, of the Prudential Life Insurance Co., and some of the other citizen members might have been disturbed by a stern statement in opposition, as their first recommendation comes to the floor. They deserve our very great gratitude.

Mr. President, we frequently need the assistance of gifted citizens in the solution of major problems. We have used such commissions of citizens many times. They have the ability to take problems outside the partisan arena and study them objectively. None has ever done a finer job than this group, headed by Laurance Rockefeller. None has ever done a more conscientious job.

I am sure that the minority leader with his usual fairness, did not intend to indicate a lack of appreciation for what the citizen members of the Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission did. S. 20 is not a "bright new idea" of the Kennedy administration; in reality it is the thoughtful, carefully considered and unanimous recommendation of a bipartisan group including some very splendid and outstanding citizens.

There will be at least one more measure following this one before the present Congress to implement the ORRRC report. It is now before the Interior Committee. There has been some objection to some features in it. We are going to study them carefully in the committee. I am hopeful that a fine bill will finally be presented to the Senate.

So, the sharp comment which has been made about S. 20, may ultimately serve an excellent purpose in identifying the source of this piece of recreation legislation and the impelling reasons why it has come before us with strong bipartisan support.

I trust that it will pass and I am gratified that the minority leader has relented somewhat on his call for all-out resistance to the bill.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, as indicated by the majority leader, I had intended to ask for a yea-and-nay vote; and by unanimous consent it was determined that that vote would come on Tuesday, March 12, at 3 o'clock p.m.

I prefer to have the yea-and-nay vote come on an implementing bill which, so far as I can tell, will shortly be reported by the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. That bill is S. 859. It provides the sinew and the substance to give real validity to the pending bill.

However, I am still opposed to the bill, as such, which is before the Senate. I am opposed to it because, in effect, it enlarges the functions of a bureau which was created by an order of the Secretary of the Interior last year. The bill now contains a congressional finding and, in addition, spells out a vast variety of authority that shall be handled through the Bureau for Outdoor Recreation. The only allusion in the bill to funds is that the Bureau shall have authority to accept donations and contributions.

I believe we are faced with the enactment of a bill which would authorize Treasury advances, over a period of 8 years, of a maximum of $60 million a year. Those advances would be interest free; and if the whole potential were authorized and were utilized, it would mean that this Bureau in the Department of the Interior could then expend up to $480 million to advance moneys for the purpose recited in the pending bill. There would be no requirement to repay out of the so-called fund, to be established in the companion bill, until the 11th year. That is just another method of back-door financing.

I do not know why these bills were not combined. I do not know why the whole package, including the authorization and the funds to be used to cover those authorizations, was not set before us in a single bill. However, the fact is that the bill before the Senate is a naked authorization and a finding. That is extremely interesting, because in the very first section of S. 20 the bill recites:

> That the Congress finds and declares that the general welfare of the Nation requires that all American people of present and future generations shall be assured such quantity and quality of outdoor recreation resources as are necessary and desirable.

Mr. President, that is a pretty big package, I must say, when we talk about the quantity and the quality which are needed and are desirable . It reminds me of a former British Prime Minister, of whom someone once asked, "Why don't you let the country live like gentlemen?"

The Prime Minister replied, "To let the country live like gentlemen would soon mean bankruptcy for the Empire."

Mr. President, there ought to be some limitations provided in the bill. The bill contains rather fancy words, when it extends a finding by Congress as to how far we shall go in this field.

Mr. President, in the order issued on April 2, 1962, by the Secretary of the Interior, the so-called spending functions of the National Park Service were transferred to the new Outdoor Recreation Bureau. This, then, under S. 20, now before us, is an expansion and the creation of a great many new functions which this agency would undertake. In a sense it is, then, a new function; and, as such, it will require new obligational authority, which will come in a later bill, in the form of advances.

Mr. President, I would be the last Member of the Senate to be opposed to the development of the outdoor resources of this country. I was born in the country; I sort of grew up in the country; I have the same deep desire to enjoy the outdoors that anyone else does; and I do wish to see those functions properly developed. But I have to measure the undertaking of a vast function at this time—and I emphasize the words "at this time"—against the fiscal problems presently before us.

We are confronted with what is popularly referred to as a $99 billion budget. But, Mr. President, actually we are not confronted with a $99 billion budget; we are confronted with a $108 billion budget, because the $99 billion budget, as has been emphasized, is the administrative budget; it is the spending budget. However, it does not include the new obligational authority, which amounts to a little more than $9 billion. So let us be realistic about this matter, and put the budget in the correct light, and call it what it is; namely, a $108 billion budget.

We are confronted with an amazing deficit—estimated various at up to $12 billion—for the fiscal year 1964.

The rest of the fiscal program embraces the recommendations of the President that there be tax reduction and tax reform, scattered over a 3-year period; so that probably the net budget deficit might be in the $10 or $11 billion range.

Mr. President, what a strange thing to make a request for tax reduction and a $108 billion budget, and then undertake $9 billion of new functions and activities, and in so doing jeopardize the solvency of our country. That is the matter which concerns me; and I intend to lift my voice against these new authorizations. Furthermore, others will be requested, including some for the domestic Peace Corps, which presently is in the making.

I am advised that at 736 Jackson Place, in Washington, D.C., applications for the domestic Peace Corps are being accepted—although, in fact, Congress has not acted on that subject, and there is no domestic Peace Corps. But one can go to that address on Jackson Place—only a stone's throw from the White House—and can procure a form 57, to make application for work in an agency which does not exist.

That situation reminds me of the old ditty:

> The other day upon the stair,
> I saw a man who wasn't there.
> He wasn't there again, today.
> I hope that man will go away.

In short, Mr. President, this agency "isn't there," but, notwithstanding that fact, it is accepting applications. I think that is a rather astonishing state of affairs. It is in the field of new obligational authority, new functions, and new activities, along with the Youth Corps and others.

So, Mr. President, in light of our fiscal responsibilities and the obligations which will be placed upon the Government and upon the country's taxpayers, I do not see—in all good conscience—how Congress can undertake to authorize new functions and to spend additional sums and to derive them by a very interesting and appealing back-door method, because the companion bill, on which hearings have been held, and which I apprehend will in the not-too-distant future inch itself to the floor of the Senate, for consideration, contains an authorization for advances from the Treasury over an 8-year period, interest free. If my arithmetic is worth anything, I find that eight times $60 million is $480 million. Furthermore, the bill provides that repayment will not begin until the 11th year. So $480 million in advances from the Treasury, interest free, would be authorized; and then there would be a hiatus or a grace period of 3 years, before certain revenues would be supposed to be available out of the conservation fund, in order to be able to make reimbursement.

Mr. President, that is an ingenious proposal; but it occurs to me that the appropriate way would be to come in with this bill and with a request for the required appropriations, and then permit the Senate to work its will upon the proposal, because that is not only the simple approach; it is also the accepted approach; and, in my judgment, it is the constitutional approach.

Mr. President, returning to the bill now before us, let me point out that it would do the following, among other things: It would provide for an inventory of the needs and resources of our people in the field of outdoor recreation. It calls for an evaluation of those needs and resources. It provides for a system of classification of those resources. It calls for a nationwide plan of needs and "demands."

Mr. President, I presume there are a great many things that could be demanded; but, after all, the criterion should be whether we can afford them in the light of the program the President has submitted to Congress. Among other things, another function or activity would be "to identify outdoor problems." Mr. President, that is a mouthful.

We could gather a whole team of people—in fact, battalions of people—put them on the payroll, and send them forth in the country to identify outdoor problems, and they would never run out of identification work.

Then, of course, comes the crux of the thing—to recommend solutions for the problems. Those problems could be legion. I presume the solutions would be legion, too. Then to identify desirable actions by local governments—what an endless job that would be.

Then they would submit a so-called 5-year plan. It seems to me that I have heard of 5-year plans before in other areas of the earth. After the first 5-year plan, the program would doubtless require modification; so there would be authority to adduce and submit a second 5-year plan, with all necessary future revisions.

Then our old friend appears—research. Research is one of those words which have crept into the contemporary lexicon. It can cover a multitude of sins as well as a multitude of virtues.

Then they will be authorized to contract for studies. What kind of studies? Education programs, technical assistance, and other agencies. Other agencies would be allowed to spend their own money to help, with or without reimbursement. There is latitude like a 40-acre field when we say to an agency of government, "Any other agency can help you with its own funds." That has about it an aura of indirect appropriation in my book.

Perhaps it would be interesting to test out a point of order on some of the language that we find in Senate bill 20 now before us.

Mr. President, all the new authority proposed would be meaningless unless it were implemented with money. The necessary money is not provided in the pending bill. It will come in Senate bill 859. Senate bill 859 is, to say the least, an interesting bill. It is called the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1963. It contains wording which is similar, identic, and comparable to what is contained in Senate bill 20, now before us. There again appear the words "quality and quantity as are necessary and desirable." Then the bill provides funds for "Federal acquisition of certain land and water areas."

Mr. President, where are the funds to be obtained to give implementation to Senate bill 20? The related provision begins on page 2 of Senate bill 859, which was introduced on February 19 of this year by quite a number of cosponsors. What is the first source of funds? It would be "entrance and user fees." These are the entrance and user fees that cover our national outdoor resources, our parks, and recreational areas; and it would be for the President to determine what the fees and charges should be.

Among other things, the bill provides:

> The proceeds from fees or charges established by the President pursuant to this subsection for entrance or admission generally to Federal areas shall be used solely for the purposes of this act.

So we see in that provision a grant of authority to the President of the United States to impose a fee, an admission charge, or a user charge. It is not unlike providing authority to impose a tax.

When that suggestion was made in a larger frame last year, Congress got its hackles up about the idea of giving the President authority to modify taxes at its own will and desire. But now we see again proposed a grant of authority to the President of the United States to impose charges at the very same time that deep concern has been manifested to make sure that people in the low- and middle-income tax brackets get their full and fair share of the tax cut. So it is suggested that we put the cut for those people in one place, and put a new charge on them in another. No wonder that item begot such animated conversation and discussion in the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. No wonder the committee members fulminated about user charges and admissions.

Mr. President, there is a broader grant of authority with respect to fees and user charges. These would apply to the National Park Service, the Bureau of Land Management, the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife, the Bureau of Reclamation, the Forest Service, the Corps of Engineers, and the U.S. section of the International Boundary and Water Commission.

This is the authority:

> The President is authorized to provide for the establishment, revision, or amendment of entrance, admission, and other recreation user fees and charges at any land or water area administered by or under the authority of the Federal agencies listed in the preceding paragraph: *Provided*, That this subsection shall not authorize Federal hunting or fishing licenses, nor shall it authorize fees or charges for commercial or other activities not related to recreation.

Mr. President, in S. 859 and I think in S. 20, there is a provision for utilization of some of these areas for commercial purposes.

I point out the grant of power, and I point out the sources of funds to go into the so-called conservation fund with which to reimburse that fund after 8 years of interest-free advances; the reimbursement not to begin until the 11th year.

There is another source of funds, Mr. President, and that is surplus property sales. If I read that section correctly, it would take in what we receive on all sales of real property and related personal property, with an exception. And, insofar as I can tell, that exception is nothing more than the $8½ million of administrative expenses which are authorized in the independent offices appropriation bill.

In addition, there is another source of funds. That is the motorboat fuels tax.

Finally, there may be one or two other items in the bill of no particular moment.

But those, Mr. President, are the funds which are to be taken from Treasury receipts, and at some time 11 years from now to be used in order to reimburse the Treasury Department for these recreation and conservation purposes.

This is an astonishing approach, Mr. President. It could not have been more complicated if they had set out to make it so. I do not know whether the commission which was set up in the nature of an advisory commission in the Eisenhower administration to make all these recommendations did so or not, but they certainly could have brought it within the frame of simple appropriations, instead of 8 years of tax free advances.

I emphasize one other thing, and that is that this is essentially and definitely a new function. We ought to be pretty careful about expanding the functions of government at a time when the whole fiscal fabric is so uneasy, when there is a hope that a huge and deep tax slash can get the country from its sideways motion and get it to moving again, a hope so earnestly expressed some 2 years ago, shortly after the inauguration.

One should not trifle with the solvency of the country at a time like this, and I do not propose to do so. So I am opposed to what is before us today, though not because I oppose the objectives as such. I think those are desirable. The question is, What can we afford in the country at a given time?

Government financing in a sense is not unlike family financing. If a family is to spend out of pocket for the things which are desirable, as the bill points out, how long can it remain solvent? How long can the family maintain solvency and credit?

How long will it be before government credit will become a little shaky, in view of the fact that the Congress in this session will be confronted with a request to boost the public debt to perhaps $320 billion or $325 billion, and to accept a deficit, and to put the imprimatur of approval upon not a $99 billion budget, Mr. President, but upon a $108 billion budget? Let us be honest about it, because the new obligational authority may begin with a little money this year, but it will become the predicate for increases year after year, and year after year, and the budget will then start going into orbit all over again. That is what we are confronted with at the present time.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a brief observation?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. This morning I appeared before the Committee on Banking and Currency, with respect to the mass transportation bill. That supposedly involves a 3-year expenditure of $500 million by way of gifts, but it was thoroughly apparent during the questions that were asked that the program will not be a 3-year program but, in all probability, a permanent program. There is an example of the built-in authorizations and what eventualy occurs—growing larger and larger all the time, making us more and more incapable of reducing the debt and more and more incapable of reducing the deficits, precipitating us into fiscal trouble of graver and graver consequence all the time.

Mr. DIRKSEN. If my friend from Ohio wants a classic example, I point out to him that the Peace Corps started with $5 million of borrowed funds. The next year they asked for and received $30 million. The following year they received $58 million. If the Senator will take a look at that unexpurgated Sears, Roebuck catalog we call the U.S. budget he will find that for fiscal year 1964 they do not want $5 million, or $30 million, or $58 million—they are asking for $108 million.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. If one wants an example of classic growth, there it is.

I yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. LAUSCHE. In the 6 years I have been in the Senate I have repeatedly listened to the argument that the initial expenditure for a proposed new program was inconsequential; but during those 6 years it has repeatedly been shown, time after time, that what in the beginning was inconsequential grew into proportions of great consequence as the years went by. Not a single one of the programs that began in a sort of miniature size failed to grow. They never stayed at that small size. They never got smaller. They grew and grew all the time, like Topsy. That has been my experience in the 6 years I have been in the Senate.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I remind my distinguished friend from Ohio that some years ago—and I think my figures are correct—there was an interesting little board in Government called the Board of Geographic Names. It was in the Department of the Interior, as I recall. In that bureau were three persons. Their job was to examine and to ascertain where our soldiers were serving, to find the names of villages, towns, and so forth, and have diacritical marks placed on the names so soldiers could pronounce them.

I am not positive, but the next time I looked into the matter, it did not have 3 employees; there were 100 persons in that bureau.

Talk about getting liquidated—it is like pulling teeth. The best medicine is not to let them get out of hand in the first instance. Then we will not have to fight all over hell's half acre to get them liquidated.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The aspects of the problem pointed out by the Senator from Illinois are serious, but there is another facet to the problem which, in my opinion, is graver. Those who say we spend little, that we should not worry about it, are making that argument knowing in their minds that next year they are going to ask for substantial increases. That is the grave aspect of the problem. It is grave because on one side we are fighting juvenile delinquency, badness of youth, while on the other side, by our example, by our approach to problems, we are showing a base, a twisted, a deceptive mind, knowing, as time goes on, that the innocent presentations made at the beginning are going to become entirely false by what, in our expectation, is going to be done in the future.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Well, I can say to my friend from Ohio that when I came here 30 years ago the Federal budget was a little over $4 billion for all purposes, including national defense. I do not ask the country to stand still. I do not expect it to stand still. I expect funds to be expended, that appropriations will grow from year to year; but I do expect, in connection with annual appropriations and the contingent liabilities of Government, that the Government will maintain a posture which does not jeopardize our solvency, for if the time ever came when we had to use a peremptory weapon like a moratorium, I would not like to see the shudder in the chancelleries of the world and what would happen to credit. It would make October 29, 1929, look like a picnic before we got through.

Let us stop for a moment to consider the commitments that have been made. We owe the civil service retirement fund $37 billion. We agreed solemnly as a Congress that we would put in half and match the fund for every Federal employee. There are over 600,000 former Federal employees living in a retired status. They paid their share because we took it out of their pay checks. The Government has not paid its share. We owe that fund $37 billion. Perhaps we can put a moratorium on it. Perhaps we can engage in fancy financing if we like. But we still owe it, and it is a Government obligation. We owe the military funds and a great many other funds. There are so many contingent liabilities we have that it will probably amount to $450 billion before we get through.

We know the status of our fiscal structure. We cannot duck it. We cannot continue to put straws on the camel's back, under those circumstances, without inviting trouble.

Mr. President, there is little I need add to what I have said. This is a new function that is proposed. I am quite familiar with provisions for matching and the division as between the Federal Government and the States. I know about the payback provisions. I know the differences between matching and planning as distinguished from acquisition and development. But the fact of the matter is that this is a new authorization for expenditure. The provision for the money will come very shortly out of the same committee that sent this bill to the Senate floor. It will mean new obligations at a time when our fiscal problems are of the most solemn and serious nature.

Deep as my devotion is to the whole question of outdoor recreation, I still believe our first obligation is to the continuing solvency of the United States of America. That is the overriding consideration. That is the reason why I raise my voice with respect to the bill that is before us today.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I wish to address myself for a few moments to the pending business, S. 20, which expresses the interest of the Congress in recreational facilities throughout this country.

The rapid progress which our Nation is making on all fronts—in automation, transportation, technology, education, and research—tends to provide increasing amounts of leisure for our people. It is most appropriate for us to recognize that our increased time from labor can cause us many headaches in the future unless we make every effort to see that it will be used in a healthy fashion. We must be sure that it will not evolve into simply time on our hands—into an excuse for boredom and lethargy.

We all know how difficult a problem the blessings of agricultural surpluses has become for us. We do not know what to do with good fortune; and the situation will grow worse until we make preparations to meet it.

So it is with leisure. We must be prepared to use it wisely, or it will confront us with seeds of decay.

Recreation, and its handmaiden, tourism, is a most important industry in my State of Vermont. I believe most sincerely that these two luxuries will soon become a very important necessity both to our economy and to the well-being of the American people. Vermonters have recognized this, and we have been making great strides to provide increased recreational and tourist facilities throughout our State.

Turning to the bill, S. 20, itself, I want to make two comments.

First, I am glad to see that the committee has amended the bill to include private interests, in its technical assistance provisions, and not simply to limit such assistance to State and political subdivisions.

Second, I am happy to note that the bill requires the Government to cooperate with educational institutions in research and other educational programs and activities to encourage wise use of leisure through recreation.

Mr. President, this bill is a step in the right direction. We recognize the perils of ever increasing leisure time unless we seek means to provide for its wise use. I am sure Vermont will play an ever increasing role in the rapidly expanding recreation and tourist industries. Already my State is well on the way with its plans for the future in this area. Fortunately, with a program such as is contemplated in this bill, coupled with the energies of the people of Vermont and other sections of the country, we will be prepared to prevent leisure from becoming an excuse for idleness.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I wish to add a few words on the general subject covered by Senate bill 20, though probably not exactly in line with what the distinguished minority leader has said. I also wish to make a few remarks with respect to Senate bill 859 while I am speaking.

In the first place, I want to make it perfectly clear that I shall support the bill now that it includes the amendment which the distinguished Senator from New Mexico added earlier in the day, which provides that Revised Statutes section 3648, 39 U.S.C. 4154, will not be wholly done away with in the operation of the proposed act. That section provides that the United States may not pay for services or for goods until they have been performed or delivered.

The bill now pending, S. 20, as originally written, authorized the Secretary of Interior to make payments without regard for the provisions of section 3648 of the Revised Statutes. In my opinion, such a provision was unthinkable, and I have never been shown any real reason why the exemption should be allowed with the exception of educational institutions.

In committee we struck out that portion of the bill, and the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. Anderson] has submitted—and the Senate has adopted—an amendment which provides that it shall apply only with respect to research with regard to educational institutions or other nonprofit organizations.

While this particular amendment is satisfactory to me, I believe that we should make exceptions to the original act only in most unusual circumstances. We do in this instance with respect to educational institutions and nonprofit organizations, upon the basis that they cannot get these projects started unless in some instances the Government does provide funds with which to start them.

For the sake of legislative history on the bill I wish to call attention to the fact that the amendment as adopted refers to "initial" costs of such research. It provides an exemption for initial costs of such research if the Secretary deems it necessary. It is not an accident that the word "initial" is included. It is in there because it is meant to be in there. It means that the Government shall not finance these projects in advance, carte blanche, but that only the initial cost shall be taken care of, and then only with respect to educational institutions and other nonprofit organizations.

Upon this basis I will support the bill. It should be observed, however, that what we are really doing is to give legislative sanction to a bureau already established and in operation—this one was set up a year ago. Our action today is ex post facto, a practice we have had to engage in many times in the last 2 years.

I must say that the gentleman who heads this Bureau, Mr. Crafts, is one of the most capable Government employees I have ever met. I have great faith in his integrity and in his ability to do a good job with respect to these recreational resources.

I wish to say, too, that what the Senator from Illinois [Mr. Dirksen] has said is accurate. We are now operating, without any authority from Congress, with something like 75 people, if I recall correctly, in this unauthorized Bureau of the Federal Government, set up by the Secretary of the Interior. Mr. Crafts says that if the bill is enacted there will be 200 employees by the end of the year. Therefore, Parkinson's law is in operation.

When we get to the consideration of S. 859, which is the land funding portion of this bill, and which provides for a system of user fees to all national parks and all national forests, for a tax on motor fuel, and then goes to the absurdity of providing that all money realized from the sales of Federal surplus property, real and personal, will also go into this fund, I expect to have a little more to say. I wish to say right now that when that bill comes on the floor it is going to be discussed at great length. I do mean great length. It violates many basic principles of taxation, and in my opinion, as it now reads, in its present form, it is wholly unacceptable.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I would be the last person to suggest that there are not some good things which would flow from the passage of S. 20 and that there are not some worthwhile groups and individuals interested in this subject.

Certainly what I am about to say does not reflect upon the fine Senators who have interested themselves in the proposed legislation.

I shall oppose the bill, and my reason is quite simple. I believe that we are so far in debt, that our deficit is so large, that we have to say no to some desirable things. At this time I will not try to establish a priority of what proposals are most desirable. The simple fact remains that our national debt will have increased in the first 4 fiscal years of this administration by $30 billion. I called the Treasury to ask what was the average rate of interest paid on the debt, and, as I recall it, I was told it was 3.288. This means that the Government of the United States in 4 years has placed upon the backs of the people an additional billion dollars a year in interest alone. It means that year after year after year, unless at some time we start paying off this debt, it will carry a penalty for the mismanagement of Government in these 4 years of a billion dollars a year.

Frankly, I am concerned about the people who are entitled to some recreation. I think they can get a little more enjoyable recreation if the burdens of Government are not quite so heavy.

Therefore, I shall not support the pending bill.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that that portion of the outdoor recreation resources review report appearing at page 122, entitled "Its Creation and Composition," be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Its Creation and Composition

The Bureau of Outdoor Recreation should be created by vesting it with authority to carry out the functions proposed for it and transferring to it those national recreation planning responsibilities now lodged in the Secretary of the Interior and exercised by the National Park Service under the Park, Parkway, and Recreational Area Study Act of 1936.

The new Bureau should be headed by a Director and should have a small, highly qualified planning and administrative staff in Washington. Wherever possible, the Bureau should be staffed by transfer of experienced personnel from existing agencies. Regional offices should be located so as to provide effective assistance to other Federal and State agencies.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, on January 31, 1962, the Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission submitted a report to the 87th Congress and to President Kennedy. The report was based on an exhaustive 3-year study by that Commission, a Commission, incidentally, created by the 85th Congress during the previous administration, bipartisan in composition, headed by Laurance Rockefeller, and numbering its members several of my distinguished colleagues here present. The several citizen members of that Commission were appointed by President Eisenhower.

This report made a number of specific recommendations designed to assure adequate outdoor recreational opportunity for living Americans—today—and for generations yet unborn—tomorrow. Prominent among these recommendations was one to establish in the Federal Government a bureau to act as a focal point for the planning and coordination of outdoor recreation programs. The need for such an organization was so obvious and so urgent that the administration, acting under the authority of the Reorganization Act of 1950, shifted certain funds and certain functions from other bureaus and established in the Department of the Interior, the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation.

A bill introduced in the last Congress, which passed the Senate, would have given formal congressional sanction to this action. That bill, however, included an additional provision for grants to the States for outdoor recreational planning, and at the late stage in the session when it reached the House, it was not possible for that body to explore sufficiently all the ramifications of the proposal, so the measure was not enacted. This bill we are considering today, S. 20, does not include that provision. Its purpose is to give congressional recognition to the establishment of the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation and to delineate what its functions and responsibilities shall be.

Attempts have been made to demonstrate a relationship between this measure and S. 859 which would establish a land and water conservation fund and provide how such a fund would be used. But at this time I want to point out emphatically that there is no connection between these two measures other than that both relate to outdoor recreation. This bill, S. 20, gives specific statutory status to a small bureau which can coordinate the outdoor recreational activities of more than 20 Federal and more than 500 State agencies which have responsibilities in this field. Further, this Bureau will act as a focal point for the planning needed to assure the orderly development of the facilities required to meet the mushrooming demands of Americans for outdoor recreational opportunity. Its budget request is moderate, only $1,115,000 more than has been appropriated in the past for two National Park Service functions now being performed by that Bureau.

Yet it has the mission of developing a national outdoor recreation plan, of coordinating State recreational planning, of aiding the States in all aspects of outdoor recreation, of reviewing and coordinating the outdoor recreational programs of some 20 Federal agencies to prevent overlap, eliminate unnecessary expense, and to assure that Federal investment in this field is best designed to meet national needs, of stimulating needed research, and of disseminating needed information and educational material.

It contemplates a staff of only 225 employees to perform its broad responsibilities.

This is a long-needed planning and coordinating agency in the outdoor recreation field. It will prevent waste and duplication of effort. It will see that Federal, State and local recreation programs follow an orderly pattern. Its formation follows the recommendation of a bipartisan commission established during the last administration. I urge passage of S. 20.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, and was read the third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill having been read the third time, the question now is, Shall it pass?

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I ask for a division.

On a division, the bill was passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Congress finds and declares that the general welfare of the Nation requires that all American people of present and future generations shall be assured such quantity and quality of outdoor recreation resources as are necessary and desirable, and that prompt and coordinated action is required by all levels of government and by private interests on a nationwide basis to conserve, develop, and utilize such resources for the benefit and enjoyment of the American people.

Sec. 2. In order to carry out the purposes of this Act, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized, after consultation with the Recreation Advisory Council and with the heads of Federal departments and agencies concerned, to perform the following functions and activities:

(a) Inventory.—Prepare and maintain a continuing inventory and evaluation of outdoor recreation needs and resources of the United States.

(b) Classification.—Prepare a system for classification of outdoor recreation resources to assist in the effective and beneficial use and management of such resources.

(c) Nationwide Plan.—Formulate and maintain a comprehensive nationwide outdoor recreation plan, taking into consideration the plans of the various Federal agencies, States and their political subdivisions. The plan shall set forth the needs and demands of the public for outdoor recreation and the current and foreseeable availability in the future of outdoor recreation resources to meet those needs. The plan shall identify critical outdoor recreation problems, recommend solutions, and identify the desirable actions to be taken at each level of government and by private interests. The Secretary shall transmit the initial plan, which shall be prepared as soon as practicable within five years hereafter, to the President for transmittal to the Congress. Future revisions of the plan shall be similarly transmitted at succeeding five-year intervals. When a plan or revision is transmitted to the Congress, the Secretary shall transmit copies to the Governors of the several States.

(d) Technical Assistance.—Provide technical assistance and advice to and cooperate with States, political subdivisions, and private interest including nonprofit organizations with respect to outdoor recreation.

(e) Regional Cooperation.—Encourage interstate and regional cooperation in the planning, acquisition, and development of outdoor recreation resources.

(f) Research and Education.—(1) Sponsor, engage in, and assist in research relating to outdoor recreation, directly or by contract or cooperative agreements, and make payments for such purposes, including advance payments without regard to section 3648 of the Revised Statutes (39 U.S.C. 4154) for initial costs of such research to any educational institution or other nonprofit organizations when necessary and in the public interest; (2) undertake studies and assemble information concerning outdoor recreation, directly or by contract or cooperative agreement, and disseminate such information without regard to the provisions of section 321n, title 39, United States Code; and (3) cooperate with educational institutions and others in order to assist in establishing education programs and activities and to encourage public use and benefits from outdoor recreation.

(g) Interdepartmental Cooperation.—(1) Cooperate with and provide technical assistance to Federal departments and agencies and obtain from them information, data, reports, advice, and assistance that are needed and can reasonably be furnished in carrying out the purposes of this Act; and (2) promote coordination of Federal plans and activities generally relating to outdoor recreation. Any department or agency furnishing advice or assistance hereunder may expend its own funds for such purposes, with or without reimbursement, as may be agreed to by that agency.

(h) Donations.—Accept and use donations of money, property, personal services, or facilities for the purposes of this Act.

Sec. 3. The term "United States" as used in this Act shall include the District of Columbia; and, to the extent practicable in carrying out the provisions of this Act, the terms "United States" and "States" may include the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, Guam, and American Samoa.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed.

Mr. MORSE. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to table was agreed to.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT UNTIL THURSDAY AND PROGRAM FOR THURSDAY

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate concludes its business today it stand in adjournment until 12 o'clock noon on Thursday next.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, on Thursday next, it is the intention of the leadership to call up the money resolutions which affect the conduct of affairs of the various committees during the year.

A DES MOINES NEGRO VIEW

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the Record an article entitled "District of Columbia Negro Paper Backs Powell," written by Richard Wilson and published in the Des Moines Sunday Register of March 3, 1963.

The article relates some of the problems with respect to the recent furor over the actions of a Member of the House of Representatives, and also includes an editorial entitled "A Des Moines Negro View," which first appeared in the Iowa Bystander, a weekly newspaper published at Des Moines by and for Negroes. The editorial takes a point of view of the situation entirely different from that expressed in a Washington, D.C., newspaper published for Negroes.

There being no objection, the article and editorial were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Des Moines Sunday Register, Mar. 3, 1963]

District of Columbia Negro Paper Backs Powell

(By Richard Wilson)

Washington, D.C.—Critics of Adam Clayton Powell should not indulge in the illusion that he lacks prestige in the nationwide Negro community, or that the recent attacks on Powell have shaken this prestige very much.

Powell is much admired as a symbol even by those who may deplore some of his acts. He seems to many Negroes to be one of their race who has broken through racial prejudice to stand on his own as an individual.

In Washington, with its 54 percent Negro population and its 84 percent Negro school enrollment, criticism of Powell rasps on raw nerves in the Negro community.

REACTED ANGRILY

The Washington Afro-American, one of the chain of newspapers which strongly affects Negro opinion, reacted angrily to the attempt of Clark R. Mollenhoff of the Register's Washington bureau to pin down Powell at a press conference. The prize-winning investigative reporter was probing Powell on the charges of Senator John Williams, Republican of Delaware, who accuses Powell of extensive abuses of his congressional position with the connivance of Kennedy administration officials.

The reporter, a Drake University football star once optioned to the New York Giants, was criticized in a page 1 story in the Afro-American both for his questions and his physical condition.

"The pasty-faced Mollenhoff, who resembled a former shotputter who has let himself go to pot, tried repeatedly with just a trace of preciousness in his slightly lisping voice to put Powell on the spot," the article stated. It continued with its derision of the reporter but told little of either the questions or answers at the press conference.

An editorial in the Afro-American elaborated on these views, centering its attack on Senator Williams and Columnist Drew Pearson. The editorial predicted the day would come when "this great civil rights fighter [Powell] attains even greater heights."

"When he does," the editorial continued, "18 million colored thumbs are going to go up to 18 million colored noses to remind Drew Pearson and Senator Williams that 'what's good for you white geese is sure good for us colored ganders.' "

The editor of the Washington Afro-American is C. Sumner Stone, Jr., who signed his name to the page 1 news article as "Chuck Stone."

Stone will not long remain as editor of the Afro-American. He has been appointed public affairs officer in the U.S. Information Service and will be placed in charge of the office in Tanganyika. His responsibility there will be to carry out programs of USIA intended to give to the residents of the former British colony in east Africa a clear and accurate picture of conditions, opinions, attitudes, and culture of the United States.

Stone says that he expects to go to Tanganyika in April. He reinforces in conversation his views stated in the Afro-American.

"I could take you into the bars and barber shops and street corners in Washington and show you that 95 percent of the colored people think that the attack on Powell was clearly racial," he says.

"Powell has pulled a lot of deals we don't like, but if he is going to be criticized it has got to be on the Negro's terms."

ANOTHER NEGRO VIEW

It is impossible to convince Stone and most Negroes within sound and sight of Powell that Williams was inspired by anything but racial feelings in spite of his long record to the contrary, and in spite of the role he has played over many years in the exposure of serious abuses in Government.

Negroes sharing the view of Stone, and only grudgingly aware of Powell's long and flagrant violation of generally accepted congressional standards, white or Negro, cannot conceive of any but a racial reason for William's attack.

This is saddening. It is more saddening that Powell can play upon the misguided Negro racism which is so evident in the words and tone of the Washington Afro-American.

The dialog between the races in Washington does not seem to be improving in anywhere near the measure that the circumstances justify. Nor is it reassuring that the well-mannered, well-dressed, but passionately spoken Stone is going to Tanganyika to interpret America to the people and officialdom of an emerging nation.

DIFFERENT VIEW

Wet get quite a different view than Stone's of Negro attitudes when another Negro journalist, Simeon Booker, of Ebony magazine, speaks. Booker is writing a book which he intends to make a balanced account of the need for Negro self-improvement as well as a plea for the opening of fairer opportunities.

He points out that Powell does not have much support or sympathy "among people who think." Booker's tool is rationality; Stone's is emotion; Powell's is flimflam.

[From the Des Moines Sunday Register, Mar. 3, 1963]

A Des Moines Negro View

(The following editorial appeared in the Iowa Bystander, a weekly newspaper published at Des Moines by and for Negroes.)

It often happens that some people, placed in a position of responsibility and prominence, use this situation to abuse it by doing things a far less prepared citizen does. Representative Adam Clayton Powell, of New York, is an excellent example of this.

A minister of one of the largest churches in America, elected from a district comprising mostly Negroes and Puerto Ricans, Powell has moved up to chairmanship of the Health, Education, and Welfare Committee. In this post, he could be a power in Congress and serve as an example for younger people to point to with pride that a Negro had attained such a commanding position.

There are those who opposed his elevation to that high post but the system of seniority made the choice automatic.

However, Representative Powell, unlike some other Negroes serving in Congress, has abused his position by his continued absenteeism from duty, by loading up his staff far out of proportion to the other chairmen. He has abused the expenditure of public funds and he has failed or refused to pay his taxes to the Government which pays his salary.

These derelictions of duty have brought stern criticism from Members of both Houses to the extent never before witnessed, and all because the charges lodged against him are true.

Here is a public servant, a minister who, instead of conducting himself in a straightforward manner, has done many things which bring disgrace, distrust, and shame, while representing a district whose people are entitled to a leader who should bring honor and prestige to the position which he holds. There is no excuse for Representative Powell's conduct. It should not be condoned.

ADLAI STEVENSON'S UNDERSTANDING OF THE SOVIETS

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the Record an article entitled "Wilson Finds Adlai Slow To Understand Soviets," written by Richard Wilson and published in the Des Moines Register of March 7, 1963.

In his article, Mr. Wilson, a distinguished columnist, indicates some concern over the fact that the U.S. representative to the United Nations has apparently taken such a long time to come to grips with the nature of the international Communist conspiracy.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Wilson Finds Adlai Slow To Understand Soviets

(By Richard Wilson)

Washington, D.C.—In an interview with the Associated Press, Adlai E. Stevenson has revealed the attitude of mind toward Russian negotiations which so many have found hard to understand.

With 2 years' experience as U.N. Ambassador, Stevenson says that he has changed his mind about the Russians. He has discovered that they will stubbornly support positions which they seem fully prepared to reverse when it is expedient to do so.

It seems odd that Stevenson would have had to learn such a lesson, for this has been the uniform experience of Secretaries of State for the last quarter of a century. Stevenson has been a student of foreign affairs for at least that long.

EXPECTED RUSSIA TO ACCOMMODATE

Stevenson's statement is implicit confirmation that the Kennedy administration came into office with the belief that a new set of conditions with Russia could be created. The United States should be able to accommodate itself in some ways to Russian policy, and, in turn, if the negotiators were skillful enough, Russian policy would make accommodations, too.

Thus Secretary Rusk began his "quiet" diplomatic moves. President Kennedy conferred with Premier Khrushchev. New thoughts were formulated by Walt W. Rostow, McGeorge Bundy, and Paul Nitze.

Under almost all conditions new solutions were pursued. About all this has proved was that the American political administration had changed, but the Russian political administration had not.

Still, the idea that the Russians could somehow be made to see the light was hard to put down. This frame of mind has persisted right through the Cuban crisis, manifesting itself in the care exercised in not pushing Khrushchev too far, too fast when he was so obviously on the run.

THINKS RUSSIANS CAN BE HANDLED

The result, to borrow a phrase from Columnist Arthur Krock, has been half-won victories, which the administration continually advertises as great triumphs.

In the wake of Khrushchev's withdrawal of missiles from Cuba a wave of euphoria washed over Washington. Large but poorly described changes were foreseen. There were premonitions of some new order in the world based on Khrushchev's back down and his quarrel with his Chinese allies. It was supposed that the noncommitted nations were losing their fascination with Russia. Administration officials spoke of the missile withdrawal as if it were some historic turning point.

But now all the airy castles built on the shifting sands of the imagined new world order are coming tumbling down. The cold war seems to have been renewed. Khrushchev is seen to have achieved important objectives in Cuba, though not all he sought. The test ban negotiations are again in a state of collapse. We are warned once again that Russia will burn us up if we touch Cuba.

TROOPS ARE STILL THERE

It does not appear that there is much to be gained by not pressing advantages against the Soviet Union to their full limit when it was possible to do so, as in Cuba. Now, months after the fullest pressure could have been brought, Russian troops are still in Cuba. We do not know how many are being taken out. Nor have we achieved all the aims we sought when we confronted the world with the imminent prospect of nuclear war.

There is enough now to confirm Stevenson's new-found wisdom about the Russians. We should keep the pressure on them when we can and gain the most from it. Only too soon they will have found new ways to move toward their unchanging general objectives.

SUMMERTIME STUDENT JOBS IN THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the Record an editorial entitled "Plum Jam," published in the Milwaukee Sentinel of March 7, 1963. The editorial relates to the recent announcement that appointments of student trainees to Federal jobs during the summertime will be cleared through the White House.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Plum Jam

Each year, more than 10,000 students are given summer jobs by the Federal Government. The jobs mainly are in Washington. Quite a bit of personal political patronage is involved, although the Civil Service Commission requires applicants to pass civil service examinations for clerical, typist, and stenographer jobs. In the case of student trainee jobs, in which college students take Federal summer employment in what the Government hopes will be their Federal professions after graduation, they are selected from civil service registers.

Now a storm of protest has blown up in Congress following a report in the Washington Star that the White House has taken control of student job patronage. A clearance system reportedly has been set up whereby the names of all students who have filed applications for summer employment in Government agencies will be sent to the White House, along with information as to home States and the college attended (if any).

Assuming that it is essential in the first place to hire 10,000 students for summer Federal work, the action of the White House in having them all run through the Presidential funnel for clearance fouls the civil service system. Worse yet, this latest action appears to be but another example of a New Frontier attitude that is disdainful of the spirit, if not the law, of Federal civil service.

In a Senate speech rapping the White House student patronage plan, Senator MILLER, Republican, of Iowa, accused the administration of having "an irresistible urge to play politics with our civil service system."

"First," Senator MILLER recalled, "there was the shocking directive to civil service employees that they should be expected to participate in trying to sell proposed new programs to the general public. This was belatedly and grudgingly withdrawn due to the revulsion of the public in general and carreer civil service employees in particular. Next our civil service employees were pressured to buy $100 tickets to the Democratic fundraising dinner here through the clever device of having them invited to cocktail parties of their bosses if they had purchased a ticket. * * * And now, this administration apparently is not going to wait until people have civil service status for an opportunity to engage in partisan political activities."

The Kennedy administration defends the plan by saying that its primary concern is that the student talent be put to the best use possible and groomed for regular Federal employment when the youths graduate.

Despite this high sounding explanation, the plan is highhanded. It's something new in the way of harvesting political plums—pick 'em while they're green.

DELAY SOUGHT ON FEED GRAIN PROGRAM UNTIL AFTER WHEAT REFERENDUM

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD an article entitled "Shuman Asks Congress To Wait Until After Wheat Referendum To Write Farm Laws," published in the American Farm Bureau Federation's official newsletter of March 4, 1963, together with table 1, which indicates the various factors which have ocurred in the reduction of the carryover of feed grains. The table points up in an excellent way why the reduction of the carryover in feed grains is due in very minute part to the emergency feed grain program of the last 2 years.

There being no objection, the article and table were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SHUMAN ASKS CONGRESS TO WAIT UNTIL AFTER WHEAT REFERENDUM TO WRITE FARM LAWS

Charles B. Shuman, president of the American Farm Bureau Federation, has urged Congress to delay any decision on the type of feed grain program to be in effect after 1963.

He said the legislators should wait until after the signup under the 1963 feed grain program has been completed and the result of the forthcoming wheat referendum is known.

At a House Agricultural Subcommittee hearing last Thursday, Mr. Shuman said that if the wheat referendum carries, "there still will be ample time to consider and adopt a feed grain program for 1964.

"If the wheat referendum does not carry, which we think more likely, then by all means this committee and the Congress should consider wheat and feed grains together.

"There is urgent need for a more effective, less costly, and less disruptive program," the Farm Bureau president declared.

"We pledge our support in helping to develop such a program when the results of the wheat referendum are known."

Here is the full text of Mr. Shuman's statement at the hearing:

"We appreciate the opportunity to discuss the operation and results of the 1961 and 1962 feed grain programs. We also would like to comment briefly on the 1963 feed grain program and its implications. Finally, we would like to discuss with this committee a course of action which we believe would be wise and best for farmers.

"Before we get into a detailed discussion of the feed grain program, we would like to urge strongly that this committee delay any decision on the type of feed grain program to be in effect after 1963, until (1) the signup under the 1963 feed grain program has been completed and announced and (2) the multiple-price wheat referendum has been held and the result is known.

Our reasons for asking the committee to delay any decision on a feed grain program are:

1. Most feed grains are spring planted. There will be ample time, after the wheat referendum, for action by Congress on a future program for feed grains.

2. The signup for the 1963 feed grain program will continue until at least March 22 (or later if the time is extended). No one knows until then what feed grain producer reaction will be to the 1963 compensatory payment program.

3. If the complicated, restrictive, multiple-price wheat program is approved in the upcoming referendum, one set of circumstances will prevail. On the other hand, if it is voted down, this will create substantially different conditions for wheat, feed grain, and livestock producers. If this happens, this committee and the Congress would then most certainly want to reanalyze the entire wheat, feed grain, and livestock problem in order to do justice to all producers. This committee should not tie its own hands by acting prematurely, without having all the facts necessary for sound judgment.

You are well aware of the fact that Farm Bureau has a membership of over 1,607,000 farm families in 49 States and Puerto Rico. Most of our members produce feed grains and livestock although many, of course, have a larger economic stake in other commodities. A large number produce wheat and feed grains. Our members strongly believe that feed grain and wheat legislation are closely related and that both affect livestock production and prices. We strongly believe that any future programs for feed grains and wheat should be considered together.

RESULTS OF 1961 AND 1962 FEED GRAIN PROGRAMS

The administration claims that the so-called emergency feed grain program has been a great success, since the buildup in supplies has been halted and some progress has been made in reducing carryover stocks. What are the facts?

Fact 1. A sizable majority of the eligible producers gave the program a "no confidence" vote by staying out, both in 1961 and 1962.

In 1961 only 42 percent of the farmers with corn and grain sorghum bases signed program contracts. In 1962 contracts were signed by 44 percent of the producers with corn and grain sorghum bases and 29 percent of those with barley bases.

Fact. 2. The acreage that was diverted under the program did not result in a corresponding reduction in feed grain plantings.

In 1961 the Government contracted for approximately 4 acres for each 3 acres by which corn and grain sorghum plantings were reduced from the 1959–60 base. In 1962 it contracted for approximately 5 acres for each 3½ acres by which corn, grain sorghums, and barley were reduced from the 1959–60 base.

In 1959–60 the total acreage planted to the four principal feed grains averaged 151.3 million acres.

In 1961 farmers planted 129.3 million acres to feed grains and were paid for diverting 26.7 million acres. Thus, the total of 156 million acres planted or diverted in 1961 was 4.7 million acres greater than 1959–60 plantings.

In 1962 farmers planted 125.9 million acres to feed grains and were paid for diverting 32.7 million acres. Thus, the total planted plus the acreage diverted rose to 158.6 million acres, or 7.3 million acres more than the average planted in 1959–60.

The increase in feed grain acreage (including diverted acreage) under the program reflects increased plantings by nonparticipating farmers and adjustments in the base acreage of participating producers.

Fact 3. The production of feed grains was reduced less than the reduction in acreage planted because yields increased.

Apologists for the program have attributed most of the 1961 increase in yields to weather. But yields rose again in 1962. (Per-acre corn yields averaged 53.8 bushels in 1959–60 and rose to 62 bushels in 1961 and 64.1 bushels in 1962.)

In 1961, as compared with the base period 1959–60, the acreage devoted to four feed grains was reduced 14.5 percent and the production of four feed grains (total tonnage basis) was reduced 7.9 percent.

In 1962, as compared with the 1959–60 base, the acreage devoted to four feed grains was reduced 16.8 percent and the production of four feed grains was reduced 6.2 percent.

Fact 4. The reduction in feed grain stocks has been due almost entirely to increased utilization and not to the Government program.

At the beginning of the 1961 marketing year, feed grain stocks totaled a record of 84.7 million tons.

By the beginning of the current marketing year stocks had been reduced to 71.8 million tons. Only a very small part of this reduction of 12.9 million tons can be attributed to the feed grain program.

The production of feed grains was reduced 15 million tons in 1961, but barley and oats—which were not included in the 1961 program—accounted for 3.1 million tons of this reduction.

One of the most significant factors in the feed grain situation is the increase in utililization which has been occurring. Domestic consumption and exports of feed grains increased 8.1 million tons in the marketing year 1961 (as compared with 1960).

To summarize, under the 1961 program, stocks were reduced 12.9 million tons, but if there had been no increase in utilization and no reduction in the production of feed grains not covered by the 1961 program, the reduction in carryover would have been less than 2 million tons.

It now appears that stocks will be reduced 10.8 million tons (from 71.8 to 61 million) during the 1962 marketing year. This reduction is almost entirely accounted for by increased utilization and a reduction in the production of oats. As compared with 1961, total production of feed grains increased 2.5 million tons (from 140.6 million tons to 143.1 million tons) and exports are expected to decline by about 1.7 million tons this year.

By the fall of 1962, feed grain stocks will have been reduced by a total of approximately 23.7 million tons from the 1961 level. But, if there had been no increase in utilization and no reduction in production of crops not under the program, the total reduction in stocks would be only a little over 2 million tons (see table I). Thus, 90 percent of the reduction in feed grain carryover was due to factors other than the effect of the emergency program.

Fact 5. The total direct cost—$1.7 billion—of the 1961 and 1962 feed grain programs cannot be justified by what has actually been accomplished under these programs.

MARKET PRICES DEPRESSED

Early in 1961, when this committee was discussing the 1961 feed grain program we spoke out against one of its most disturbing features. We called this the obvious threat to use the Government's huge surplus stocks to beat down the market price of feed grains. We denounced this proposal as a brandnew and fallacious concept. We continued to oppose the dumping of CCC feed grain stocks during the 1962 program. We have continually pointed out that this use of CCC stocks is bad for our market system for grain and that it severely penalizes producers who want to sell their feed grains on the market.

As we have already pointed out, considerably more than 50 percent of all feed grain producers stayed out of the feed grain program in 1961 and in 1962. Dumping CCC feed grains on the market held down their market price and, of course, lowered their incomes.

We also pointed out early in 1961 that dumping feed grain stocks onto the market would ultimately adversely affect poultry, dairy, and livestock production and prices for these commodities. Let us review briefly what has happened in this regard.

Poultry and dairy production have continued above what they would have been if CCC stocks of feed grains had not been dumped. Prices of both these commodities have been depressed because of this unwise action.

Numbers of hogs coming to market and cattle on feed and being marketed are also up considerably. Hog prices are down, and top cattle prices have taken one of the sharpest drops in history—over $7 per hundredweight since last fall. This, too, has been caused in part by the dumping of CCC stocks of feed grain.

We realize that some persons have supported the feed grain program on the ground that it has been an effective way of pouring "free money" from Washington into the feed grain areas. But what is happening currently to livestock, dairy, and poultry prices would indicate a loss in income to feed grain, poultry, dairy, hog, and cattle producers of several times the payments made to feed grain growers under the 1961 and 1962 programs.

THE 1963 FEED GRAIN PROGRAM

As we stated previously, it is too early to determine the reaction of feed grain producers to the 1963 program and the results that can be anticipated from its operation. The signup period has several weeks to run.

The 1963 program has most of the bad features of the 1961 and 1962 programs and, in addition, contains a provision for Brannan-type compensatory payments. Since payments are to be made on the "normal" yield of planted acres, they encourage producers to participate on a minimum basis and to divert their poorest acres.

As members of this committee know, we are opposed to the compensatory payment concept. Our reasons for opposing payments are spelled out in our 1963 policies as adopted by the voting delegates of the member State Farm Bureaus:

"Compensatory payments are proposed in a variety of forms. Regardless of the form in which presented, the payment approach is unsound and dangerous to our economic and political system. It would be fantastically expensive and would stimulate production, increase unit costs, depress market prices, lead to tight production controls, and make farmers dependent on congressional appropriations for a substantial part of their total income.

"Limitations on payments to individuals would place a ceiling on opportunity and level farm incomes downward.

"Payment programs would socialize the production and distribution of food and fiber by having consumers pay a part of the cost through taxes—rather than full value at the store. This is a trap for producers. Ultimately, the payment approach also would be a trap for consumers, since it would encourage inefficiency and thereby result in high real costs of food and fiber.

"We vigorously oppose any system of compensatory payments for agriculture."

In summary, we strongly urge this committee to delay any further action on a feed grain program until after the multiple price wheat referendum. If the wheat referendum carries, there still will be ample time to consider and adopt a feed grain program for 1964. If the wheat referendum does not carry (which we think more likely), then by all means this committee and the Congress should consider wheat and feed grains together.

Finally, we have pointed out why we believe the 1961, 1962, and 1963 feed grain programs have not, and will not, solve the basic problem in feed grain and livestock agriculture. There is urgent need for a more effective, less costly, and less disruptive program. We pledge our support in helping to develop such a program when the results of the wheat referendum are known.

TABLE I.—*Factors in the reduction of feed grain stocks*

[In million tons]

	1961	1962	Total
Reduction in production from 1960 of crops covered by program:			
Corn	7.9	7.4	15.3
Grain sorghum	4.0	3.1	7.1
Barley	------	0	0
Total	11.9	10.5	22.4
Reduction in production from 1960 of crops not covered by program:			
Barley	.8	------	.8
Oats	2.3	2.0	4.3
Total	3.1	2.0	5.1
Increase in utilization from 1960 marketing year	8.1	8.3	16.4
Net effect of reduction in production of crops not covered by program and increase in utilization on carryover	−11.2	−10.3	−21.5
Total reduction in carryover	12.9	10.8	23.7
Reduction in carryover due to feed grain program	1.7	.5	2.2

NOTE.—It may be argued that the carryover would have increased if there had been no feed grain program. The point, however, is that the program has done little except to stop the buildup. The reduction in accumulated stocks is almost entirely due to increased utilization and reduced production of feed crops not covered by the program.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

VENEZUELAN FARMERS WANT TO HELP THEMSELVES

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, recently I received a copy of the January 16 issue of the South Dakota Union Farmer, a publication of the Farmers Union in the State of South Dakota. In that issue I found a splendid article entitled "Assignment in South America—Venezuelan Farmers Want To Help Themselves." The article was written by Arlene Schley, education director of the South Dakota Farmers Union, who had visited in South America.

I had the privilege of being in Venezuela last November; and I visited many of the rural areas, and took a great deal of interest in the rural development program.

The Government of Venezuela, under President Betancourt, is doing an admirable job in the area of what we call agrarian reform, including not only land distribution, but also—and of equal importance—the development of farm cooperatives and the development of supervised credit, at reasonable rates of interest, over a long period in which the farmers can make repayment. In these rural areas I also found the development of housing, public health, and general community programs. It was very encouraging to see people truly helping themselves. The remarkable record of educational development in the rural areas of Venezuela should give all of us encouragement.

In the article Miss Arlene Schley tells—for example—how people there would meet in the out-of-doors—"under the trees," as she writes—while they were working on the construction of new buildings to accommodate their community activities. Her article also points out some of the shortcomings, such as the lack of proper youth programs in the rural areas.

I believe the article will commend itself to the attention of every person who is really interested in what is developing under the Alliance for Progress, and also to the Members of Congress who recognize that rural development in these essentially agrarian countries is of the utmost importance.

I wish to compliment Arlene Schley upon her splendid article and upon the excellent sense of understanding and the perception which she has exhibited in the article. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the South Dakota Union Farmer, Jan. 16, 1963]

VENEZUELAN FARMERS WANT TO HELP THEMSELVES

(By Arlene Schley)

In Venezuela, the cooperation exhibited to us between the Federcion Campesino (FCV), the Instituto Agraria Nacional (IAN), and the Ministerio de Agriculture (MAC) stands out as one of the most gratifying aspects of the entire mission. Apparently, at times, there are some areas of disagreement between these groups as any country has overlapping of responsibilities and personality problems. I firmly believe that the way they worked together on our behalf may have far-reaching effects on their close working relationships in the future.

Prior to our visit to Venezuela and during our first week in Caracas, each of the three agencies contacted their offices in the field to notify them of our visits and urged them to plan our itineraries and to set up meetings for us. In this way, they were prepared for us and our only difficulty was to try to reduce the number of activities that they had planned so that our health could stand up for the length of time that we were to be there. In many places, we were presented with written resolutions of welcome and brotherhood to further emphasize the cordiality with which we were received.

The campesinos (farmers) are eager for improvement but at the same time appear to be somewhat frustrated. Now that action has been started by the government on their behalf, in the area of land reform programs, they are impatient for this transitional period to settle down into a way of life fair to all, with fulfillment of their demands for economic and social democracy and human dignity.

We worked in 7 states in Venezuela and during this time we contacted people from 12 states. We traveled in the interior (anywhere outside of Caracas) by Mercedes-Benz autobus for 3 weeks and by plane the fourth week. This car was furnished by IAN as well as the driver. The main highways between cities are good-surfaced roads, but in the course of the 4,000-odd miles we traveled, we covered dirt roads and paths leading from one land reform settlement to the next.

MEETS UNDER TREES

We attended and conducted approximately 35 meetings, ranging in attendance from 25 to 500 people, including get-togethers in the shade of a tree to state conventions of delegates. Our second day in the interior, we conducted three meetings between 4:30 p.m. and midnight. By doing this, we were able to meet with more people because we went to their communities, rather than expecting them, with their limited modes of transportation, to come to a central place to meet with us.

In each state, the FCV officials had preselected candidates for us to interview in their area for the second phase of our program. This includes inviting a total of 75 campesinos from six Latin American countries to spend 6 months in the United States next year.

The procedure of our meetings varied as much as the situation, location, and attendance at the meetings. In one State, approximately 200 delegates had gathered in a meeting hall on Sunday noon for our meeting. At this time, each of us, with the assistance of our interpreter, explained the various phases of the Farmers Union program, with heavy emphasis on education and cooperatives.

LACK JUNIOR PROGRAM

I found that it was very difficult at times to explain our youth education program because of the complete lack of familiarity with this type of thing. Our background is such that we automatically understand that any organization's education program is completely separate from the formal education of our schools.

Yet, in Venezuela, where the highest local educational level is six educational grades, and many only attend from 2 to 4 years, they immediately identified any education program with the special agricultural schools that they have for young farm boys. Therefore, my presentations usually took the general form of the importance of family participation in an organization that involves a family occupation, as does agriculture.

FAMILY TIES STRONG

I found this to be very well received as family ties, for security and other reasons, are very strong. Therefore, they readily accepted the concept of a family organization for family farmers.

The first day, we visited La Morita, the settlement that President and Mrs. Kennedy had visited and we received firsthand the feeling of the tremendous admiration and hope that these people have in Kennedy and his Alliance for Progress. Our reception is beyond description in the warmth and enthusiasm exhibited by the people. The reason for this enthusiasm is easy to explain in very simple terms when you consider the skepticism of these people because of their experience with broken promises in the past. But here, Kennedy had visited and promised assistance.

ARLENE-JACKIE

Then we came, not just as a Farmers Union team, but in their minds we were the Alliance for Progress and we were fulfilling a promise of President Kennedy and the United States. We were inviting 25 Venezuelan campesinos to the United States. As a strictly personal note, I would like to say that at this place, they called me "Jackie."

I would also like to insert that it was a little difficult at first, but soon I began to accept the uncanny feeling that I was something of a museum piece to these people. I'm very certain that in most areas, I was the first North American woman to visit them as a member of a project team. That a woman should be on this team was strange to them in itself because it is somewhat apart from what they ordinarily think of as being the accepted role of women in this world. However, I feel that the presence of a woman, in farm organization work, is very essential in rural community development in Latin America; not only in the areas of home and family development but also in the workings of the organization.

VISIT OFFICIALS

In several States, arrangements had been made for us to meet and talk with the Governors of the States. In this way, we received not only the welcome from the farm organization and Federal Government agencies, but also from State governments. The graciousness of their receptions included dinners at the Governors' mansions in some cases as each was extremely interested in what our program could do for his people.

One of our most interesting experiences was in Yaracuy State at a land reform settlement named Santa Maria. While meeting with the officers of their farm production cooperative there, we noted with pleasure that in the office were displayed posters depicting the Rochdale principles of cooperatives. We observed sugarcane being cut by hand with machetes and this was the beginning of a most interesting human interest story.

LOST GLASSES

Later that day, Arnold Ackermann, my fellow team member from Willmar, Minn., discovered that he had lost his glasses and determined that they must have slipped from his pocket in the sugarcane field while he was wearing his sunglasses. Since this was only the second week of our project in Latin America, the replacement of his glasses as soon as possible was of great concern to him. The cane field was a large one and the cut cane was laying from 8 to 12 inches deep and finding them seemed like an impossible task. However, the next morning at 8 a.m., the president of the cooperative and a couple of campesinos arrived at our hotel to return his glasses. A large group of campesinos had formed a "callapa" which is similar to our "harvesting bees" in the Midwest. They all got together for no pay and combed every inch of that field until they found the glasses. What a terrifically moving experience this was for all of us to have been extended such friendship and such great assistance. We are attempting to find a candidate for our program from Santa Maria as a gesture of appreciation.

EDUCATION

We observed a great deal of fine work being done by the extension service people in Venezuela. Their home demonstration agents are teaching people to make simple furniture for their homes, to boil their water to help prevent disease, and to make room dividers for their homes for a certain amount of family privacy. There are also many handicraft projects, all of which are useful in the home. County agents are beginning to develop 4-H Clubs, which they call 5-V Clubs, and have even had achievement days in some areas. But there is so much work to be done and so little money and people with which to do it.

But I will always remember the determination and impatience on the faces of the campesinos. They know that there are better ways of living and more modern methods of farming. They are going to get these things for themselves in whatever manner they can. If the United States is not willing or able to assist in the development of Latin America, then someone else is, and the time is short. As Theodoro Moscoso, Director of the Alliance for Progress, has said, "It is 1 minute to midnight in Latin America."

PUBLIC SERVICE BY MINNEAPOLIS RADIO STATION KDWB

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I am proud to report that a Minneapolis radio station has performed a magnificent public service—a deed of compassion—which deserves the highest commendation. The station is KDWB, of Minneapolis.

Last Thursday, a brief wire service story came into the KDWB office and newsroom. It told of a 17-year-old Oklahoma boy ill with hemophilia in a Dallas, Tex., hospital, and of his desperate need for blood transfusions.

Station KDWB did more than offer a simple report of the story. Its staff immediately phoned the Dallas hospital, to ask: "What can we in the Twin Cities and throughout Minnesota do to help?"

The answer—a need for blood donations—brought an immediate and continuing response from KDWB. Through its radio facilities, KDWB urged blood donations by Minnesota citizens. In addition, the station sent some of its own staff members to Dallas, to make blood donations.

The result is that hundreds of pints of blood plasma have been made available for the individual case in Dallas, plus hundreds more for the general blood bank available to others.

I am pleased to note that station KDWB related this effort to the continuing need for blood donations, and stressed the general need for support of the Red Cross blood donor program during the whole year, and particularly during National Red Cross Month, this month.

Mr. President, I wish to emphasize the point that this is National Red Cross Month, and again it gives us an opportunity to express our eternal gratitude and appreciation to the Red Cross for all the wonderful work it undertakes and accomplishes. I wish to salute the American Red Cross and also the International Red Cross for their humanitarian activities—for the lives they have saved, for the communities they have helped, and for the encouragement they have given to so many persons. In my opinion, these activities are the finest examples of compassion and humanitarianism.

Mr. President, I also salute the effective public service exhibited in the effort of station KDWB; and I ask that a brief chronology of this effort be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CHRONOLOGICAL REPORT ON CREATION OF KDWB RADIO'S FLIGHT FOR LIFE

On Thursday, March 7, 1963, a national wire service carried the following story:

"A 17-year-old Oklahoma boy needs help. He needs blood. Fred Wallace is a victim of hemophilia or 'Bleeder's Disease.' Officials at Baylor University Medical Center, Dallas, Tex., say Wallace has been given more than 800 pints of blood and blood plasma since he entered the hospital last October. This, they believe, is the largest amount of blood received by a single patient in the history of medical transfusion. Wallace is now receiving four transfusions a day. An urgent call is out for voluntary donors. Fred's family has been able to replace only about 250 pints of blood so far."

Upon receipt of this news story KDWB went to work to see what Twin Citians and Minnesotans could do to help this unfortunate family in Texas. KDWB news immediately telephoned Dr. Fred Souls, assistant director of the Wadley Research Institute and Blood Bank in Dallas and asked: "What can we in the Twin Cities and throughout Minnesota do to help?" Dr. Souls, in a specially recorded telephone conversation, outlined how people could go to the Red Cross blood bank in St. Paul and donate blood in the name of Fred Wallace.

This tape recording and story were put on the air on KDWB immediately, and immediately interested people started calling the radio station for more information. The story was repeated a couple of more times on Thursday. On Friday morning the St. Paul office of the Red Cross blood bank contacted KDWB for further information on the entire story. It seems a number of people had expressed an interest to them to donate their blood for Fred Wallace in Dallas, Tex.

KDWB's public service director, in talking with Twin City Red Cross officials, realized that this public response to a couple of news stories could mean a lot more; possibly a big public service campaign drawing public attention to (1) Fred Wallace's needs, and (2) the Red Cross blood donor program, during this, National Red Cross Month.

Through KDWB management and Mr. Lou Schaefer at Braniff International Airways, tickets were purchased for six members of the KDWB air staff to fly to Dallas, Tex., and personally donate a pint of blood each to Fred Wallace. Meeting the KDWB air personalities in Dallas will be members of Dallas radio station KBOX and the Dallas Red Cross. (The KDWB personnel leave Minneapolis-St. Paul International Airport at 8:35 a.m., Monday, March 11, via Braniff flight 51; they return Monday evening arriving at 10:30 p.m. in the Twin Cities.)

During the entire time the six KDWB air personalities are flying to Dallas to donate this blood, Louis (Lou) Riegert, another KDWB staff member, will run an all day marathon on the air in the Twin Cities. Throughout the day he will be announcing names of people in Minnesota who have called their local Red Cross blood bank and offered their services as a volunteer worker or offered their blood in hopes of saving somebody's life—possibly Fred Wallace's.

KDWB views this public service campaign as a sort of "domestic people to people friendship," doing, as has been mentioned, two primary things. No. 1, KDWB hopes it will draw national public attention to the Red Cross and their blood program, now during Red Cross Month. No. 2, and equally important, KDWB hopes to play some small part in possibly helping Texas medical men save the life of Fred Wallace.

STATEMENT OF SECRETARY OF STATE RUSK ON NUCLEAR TEST BAN

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, earlier today the Secretary of State Mr. Dean Rusk appeared before the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations. The committee had met to hear the testimony of our Secretary of State on the very important subject of the U.S. treaty proposals relating to a test ban on nuclear weapons testing.

This subject has been one of great importance, of considerable public interest, and of much controversy.

The Secretary of State appeared before our committee for about 2½ hours. He gave us a prepared statement which I believe is one of the most cogent and well-reasoned statements as to national policy relating to nuclear weapons and the position of this administration relating to agreeing to a nuclear test ban treaty to which I have ever listened.

The Secretary of State is a man of good judgment. He is a prudent man. He is always very careful in his testimony. At the same time, he is thoughtful and persuasive. I am very much impressed with the integrity of the Secretary of State and his grasp of the intricate problems which confront this Nation.

The Secretary of State has to be informed on many issues of both national and international importance. The proposed nuclear test ban treaty is only one of a dozen or more important problems and issues on which he must be informed, yet Dean Rusk demonstrated a mastery of the subject matter of nuclear weapons testing which was nothing short of amazing.

I take this brief moment to commend the Secretary of State and to thank him for the manner in which he explained the position of this administration and, may I say, of the previous administration. He properly pointed out that this was not a matter of partisan debate or even of partisan controversy. He appropriately pointed out that both the previous Eisenhower administration and the present Kennedy administration have endorsed as a matter of national policy the proposals in the form of a treaty which would make possible a prohibition upon further nuclear testing.

The Secretary of State called our attention to improvements in detection of underground nuclear tests. He pointed out in a convincing manner the national interest our country has in obtaining a treaty which would prohibit further tests—I might add, an enforcible treaty, a treaty with safeguards so as to minimize the risks which might be involved in any such arrangement.

The Secretary pointed out, first, that "a nuclear test ban treaty would constitute a significant step in the direction of the slackening the pace of the arms race"; and he documented his statement.

Secondly, he said that "an effective nuclear test ban treaty would be to the military advantage of the United States"; and he went on to document that conclusion.

Third, he pointed out that "a primary advantage of an effective nuclear test ban treaty to the United States in relation to the Soviet bloc is a political one." He also said:

> I have repeatedly emphasized in my public statements in the United States and at the Geneva Disarmament Conference, and in previous statements before this committee, my conviction that disarmament and secrecy are incompatible.

The Secretary went on to point out how important were the onsite inspections to the United States and, indeed, to the total relationship between the United States and the Soviet Union.

The Secretary, with his customary candor, called to our attention the fact that "a test ban would not of itself solve the problem of proliferation of nuclear weapons," but he did say that "a nuclear test ban could lead to further steps which would deal more directly with the proliferation problem."

The Secretary also called to our attention the fact that "a nuclear test ban would be fully consistent with the possibilities for increased participation in the multilateral control of nuclear forces dedicated to NATO by our partners in the Alliance."

This was a remarkable statement, and I believe that in the main it answers many of the criticisms which have been leveled at the proposed nuclear test ban treaty.

The Secretary cited the increase in our technical ability to detect seismic events at long distances, thereby permitting us to rely upon seismic stations outside the Soviet Union to detect underground nuclear explosions inside the Soviet Union. He called to our attention the fact that "an effort has been made to increase the effectiveness of our present proposals over previous positions."

In conclusion, the Secretary cited that it was the considered judgment of the President and of his chief advisers in the national security area "that clandestine testing which might escape detection, in spite of the verification system, would not result in developments which would significantly alter the military balance." He also said:

> An announced national policy of maintaining our readiness to test will minimize the risks to the United States stemming from

the possibility of Soviet abrogation of the treaty and an open resumption of testing.

He believes, and he called to our attention, the fact that "the cessation of nuclear weapons tests would advance the interests of the foreign policy of the United States."

The Secretary also said that "the present proposals of the United States for a nuclear test ban provide a sound basis for negotiation of an effective treaty."

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this well-reasoned, brief, thoughtful, and excellently documented statement by our able and conscientious Secretary of State, Mr. Rusk, be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SECRETARY RUSK BEFORE THE SENATE FOREIGN RELATIONS COMMITTEE, MARCH 11, 1963

Mr. Chairman, I am very glad to have this opportunity to talk with the committee today about a most important aspect of our foreign policy, our long-continued effort to achieve agreement on a safeguarded nuclear test ban treaty.

Since the summer of 1958 the U.S. Government has consistently adhered to the view that a safeguarded cessation of nuclear weapons testing would be in our national interest. Periodic policy reviews in the light of shifting patterns of foreign policy, of changes in the negotiating situation, and of technical developments have always produced the same answer: that an effective test ban treaty is in our national interest.

Indeed, it is worth recalling that in 1945–46, at the very birth of the nuclear age, it was clearly perceived that a nuclear arms race would create the greatest dangers for all mankind. Consequently, President Truman directed the most serious and diligent effort to prevent such a race by bringing atomic energy under international control. Unhappily, the Baruch proposals did not succeed.

Today, I would like to discuss a nuclear test ban with you from the standpoint of our relations with the Soviet bloc and with countries outside the bloc, including our allies. I would also like to discuss what I believe to be the basic requirements for a nuclear test ban treaty to be effective. For it is clear that an illusory set of obligations on this sensitive subject ought never to be entered into by the United States.

In my judgment, the conclusion of an effective nuclear test ban treaty would have three advantages of primary importance in our relations with the Soviet Union.

First a nuclear test ban treaty would constitute a significant step in the direction of slackening the pace of the arms race. Once this step had been taken with satisfactory results, new opportunities for further steps toward turning the arms race downward might well be more within the realm of reality than at present. For the past 16 years during which the cold war has been waged, we have experienced the effect of an almost unlimited arms race on our national security and on our position in relation to the Soviet Union in the world arena. Although our position has been preserved and Communist aggression has been effectively deterred to a large extent by the buildup and deployment of our military forces, our security in that position has not necessarily been improved. Indeed, our military position might well be more secure today if we had successfully achieved agreement on a test ban treaty several years ago, earlier in the negotiations.

Because of the extensive history of past negotiations on this particular question, the narrowing of the issues that has resulted from these negotiations and the worldwide interest, I believe that this problem may be more ripe for solution than perhaps any other first step in the arms control and disarmament field. It is clear that unless at some point we are able to step off in a new direction, the upward spiral of the arms race will continue unabated. The prospects of such a future for both ourselves and the Soviet Union are not attractive.

Second, an effective nuclear test ban treaty would be to the military advantage of the United States. At the present time we feel confident in our nuclear capabilities. We have today a stockpile of nuclear weapons which ranges from a few tens of tons of TNT, equivalent to many megatons. These weapons are useful for a variety of strategic and tactical uses. The Soviet Union has a stockpile of its own.

In certain areas of the spectrum of explosive power, namely the extremely large yields, the Soviets have developed weapons for which I am informed we do not have a present military requirement. In other areas, namely in the development of intermediate and lower yield weapons, we believe that we have a more varied arsenal than the Soviet Union. The President and his chief national security advisers, including myself and the Secretary of Defense, believe it doubtful that either side would, through further testing, achieve major advances in any significant area which could be translated into a military advantage without the other side making either a similar or offsetting gain. There is one proposition which we must keep in mind despite confidence and understandable national pride: Nature does not yield up its secrets with political favoritism. The list of Nobel Prize winners in the sciences over the past half century shows that major breakthroughs in knowledge come from many directions and have little to do with national frontiers. If our present assessment of the military situation is correct, and I believe it is, now would be an opportune time from our point of view for the conclusion of a treaty to halt further nuclear weapon testing.

The third primary advantage of an effective nuclear test ban treaty to the United States in relation to the Soviet bloc is a political one. I have repeatedly emphasized in my public statements in the United States and at the Geneva Disarmament Conference, and in previous statements before this committee, my conviction that disarmament and secrecy are incompatible. The Soviet Union has reasons of its own for its penchant for secrecy. Regardless of the merits of their case, however, it is clear that a closed society breeds suspicion and distrust on the part of other nations. Such an atmosphere is not conducive to taking steps to treat the symptoms of international tensions or to come to grips with the causes of these tensions.

A nuclear test ban treaty would obviously not lift the veil of secrecy from the Soviet Union. It would not even result in any substantial opening up of Soviet society. It could, however, have a very important impact on the Soviet attitude toward secrecy, especially as it relates to problems of arms control and disarmament. The carrying out of onsite inspections on Soviet territory would provide the United States with not only the necessary assurance that unidentified seismic signals were not underground nuclear explosions but also additional advantages. If a test ban treaty can operate effectively and in ways which demonstrate that the inspection connected with it does not jeopardize Soviet security or result in any particular embarrassments to the Soviet Union and its people, then the Soviet leadership may be more inclined to enter into other similar agreements. The first step seems to be the most difficult. If it can be made successfully then further steps in the same direction might be taken with less difficulty than the first.

Therefore, in our relations with the Soviet Union I believe that a nuclear test ban treaty would have both political and military advantages. In addition, an effective nuclear test ban would have advantages in our relations with countries outside the Soviet bloc.

Among the dangers to the United States from continued testing by both sides I would consider the danger of the further spread of nuclear weapons to other countries of perhaps primary importance. Unlimited testing by both the United States and the Soviet Union would substantially increase the likelihood that more and more nations would seek the dubious, but what some might consider prestigious, distinction of membership in the nuclear club. The risks to the security of the free world from nuclear capabilities coming within the grasp of governments substantially less stable than either the United States or the Soviet Union are grave indeed.

A test ban would not of itself solve the problems of proliferation of nuclear weapons. It should be recognized that at least one present nuclear power and one power apparently bent on developing nuclear weapons might not be persuaded to subscribe to the test-ban treaty from the outset. However, many potential nuclear powers might at this stage be induced to accede to the treaty.

Moreover, a nuclear test ban could lead to further steps which would deal more directly with the proliferation problem. I am referring here to the possibility of an agreement on the one hand by the nuclear powers not to transfer control of weapons nor to give assistance in weapons development to countries not already possessing them, and on the other, by the nonnuclear powers not to produce or acquire nuclear weapons of their own. Another possibility would be an agreement to halt further production of fissionable materials for use in nuclear weapons and to transfer agreed quantities of such materials to peaceful uses. What should be emphasized here is that while a nuclear test ban by no means offers a total solution, it would be a necessary first step.

What I have just said is, I believe, applicable both to the problem of the spread of nuclear weapons outside the North Atlantic alliance and to the problem of the development of additional national nuclear capabilities by NATO members. I believe that a nuclear test ban would be fully consistent with the possibilities for increased participation in the multilateral control of nuclear forces dedicated to NATO by our partners in the alliance.

Of secondary, but nevertheless significant importance is the problem of radioactive fallout. In large part because of real or assumed dangers from fallout, nuclear testing has become a key political issue in a great many countries around the world. Our relations with those countries are sometimes adversely affected when our tests produce fallout outside our own borders. On the other hand, our initiatives in seeking a test ban agreement have been well received by not only our allies but by the uncommitted countries.

I have pointed out what I believe to be the primary advantages to the United States in an effective nuclear test ban treaty in terms of our relations with the Soviet Union and with other countries around the world. However, I would like to make it clear that I believe there may also be advantages to the Soviet Union in a nuclear test ban.

A certain degree of mutuality of interest is an obvious prerequisite for any agreement.

I have stated that an effective nuclear test ban would be to the military advantage of the United States. This should not exclude the possibility that the Soviet Union could at the same time have valid military reasons for entering into a nuclear test ban treaty with the intention of carrying it out. The United States and the Soviet Union have to date apparently pursued somewhat different objectives in their testing programs. This difference in emphasis appears attributable to different strategic concepts, as well as technological considerations. Therefore, while we may be assured that our own retaliatory capability in the event of nuclear attack is sufficient to deter such an attack, the Soviet Union could at the same time believe that it has a sufficient nuclear capability for its own security requirements without the need of further testing. Similarly, the possibility of the future spread of nuclear weapons is a legitimate concern not only to ourselves, but to the Soviet Union as well.

I have thus far attempted to demonstrate why and how an effective nuclear test ban treaty would serve the foreign policy interests of the United States. I would now like to address the question of what makes a nuclear test ban treaty effective.

Three requirements are, in my judgment, basic to an effective nuclear test ban treaty.

First, the verification arrangements must provide an adequate deterrent to violation on the part of the Soviet Union. However, no verification system, no matter how elaborate or intrusive, could be foolproof. Therefore, the second requirement of an effective treaty is that the scope of any violation which might escape detection must not be so extensive that it would substantially affect the military balance. Finally, a nuclear test ban treaty will be adhered to only so long as a mutuality of interest in the agreement persists. If the Soviet Union were ever to conclude that a test ban were no longer in its interests, we can be sure that the Soviet leadership would not hesitate to abrogate the treaty and resume testing. Therefore, an effective test ban treaty must not leave the United States in a state of unpreparedness in the event of a Soviet change of attitude.

In my opinion, our present test ban proposals meet these three requirements for an effective treaty.

Last week the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy held a series of illuminating hearings on developments in the field of detection and identification of nuclear explosions and their relationship to the nuclear test ban negotiations. These hearings explored in considerable depth the scientific and technical basis for the present U.S. position with respect to a nuclear test ban. The efficacy of the technical underpinning for our test ban proposals is certainly an important factor in determining the overall effectiveness of a treaty based on these proposals. However, the effectiveness of the verification arrangements associated with a test ban do not depend entirely upon numbers or locations of detection stations. Nor is any particular number of onsite inspections the key to effectiveness. The verification arrangements must be considered as a totality. The effectiveness of the total system should be judged in the light of the entire geographic, technical, military, political and economic environment in which it would operate.

The increase in our technical ability to detect seismic events at long distances permits us to rely upon seismic stations outside the Soviet Union to detect underground nuclear explosions inside the Soviet Union. Moreover, a decrease by a factor of two and one-half in a previous estimate of the number of earthquakes of a given seismic magnitude occurring annually in the Soviet Union has enabled us to reduce the number of onsite inspections on Soviet territory to seven. But perhaps more important than a particular number of onsite inspections in determining its effectiveness as a deterrent to cheating is the manner in which an onsite inspection would be carried out. Our present position with respect to the number of onsite inspections which would be acceptable to us has, therefore, been very clearly stated by Mr. Foster in discussions with the Soviet representatives to be conditional upon further agreement on such important matters as the method of selecting particular earth tremors for inspection, the size and composition of inspection teams, the area and duration of search, and logistical arrangements. Finally, an effort has been made to increase the effectiveness of our present proposals over previous positions by vesting control over the installation and operation of the detection network, and control over the carrying out of onsite inspections in the Soviet Union, more completely in the hands of the United States and United Kingdom. This has resulted in a proposal for a simpler and more economical system. It would also permit us to evaluate a greater range of factors in determining whether the Soviet Union was honoring its treaty obligations than would be the case under a treaty providing for more complete international operation and control of the verification system.

I will leave to officials of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency the discussion of the details of this proposal. But it is the conclusion of the President and his chief advisers in the national security area that clandestine testing which might escape detection, in spite of the verification system, would not result in developments which would significantly alter the military balance.

Finally, an announced national policy of maintaining our readiness to test will minimize the risks to the United States stemming from the possibility of Soviet abrogation of the treaty and an open resumption of testing. Indeed, such a policy would be a deterrent to abrogation and would reinforce the effectiveness of the treaty itself.

In conclusion, I believe that the cessation of nuclear weapons tests would advance the interests of the foreign policy of the United States, and that the present proposals of the United States for a nuclear test ban provide a sound basis for negotiation of an effective treaty. In reaching this conclusion I am aware of the risks involved in an undetected Soviet violation of the treaty or its surprise abrogation. I am also aware, however, of the graver risks to our security and the security of the free world implicit in a future without any multilateral restraint on the development of nuclear weapons. In addition to the risks with and without a test ban which must be carefully weighed against each other, we should also consider the opportunities created by taking a step in the direction of controlling the arms race. I believe that if these new opportunities are placed in the scale, it will be tipped decisively in favor of our present proposals for a ban on the further testing of nuclear weapons.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL THURSDAY

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate—and I know of none—under the order previously entered, I move that the Senate stand in adjournment until next Thursday at noon.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 2 o'clock and 27 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned, under the previous order, until Thursday, March 14, 1963, at 12 o'clock meridian.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate March 11, 1963:

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

AMBASSADORS

William C. Doherty, of Maryland, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Jamaica.

C. Vaughan Ferguson, Jr., of the District of Columbia, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Malagasy Republic.

Outerbridge Horsey, of the District of Columbia, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic.

William R. Rivkin, of Illinois, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Luxembourg.

Horace G. Torbert, Jr., of Massachusetts, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Somali Republic.

Olcott H. Deming, of Connecticut, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Uganda.

ENVOY

Donald A. Dumont, of New York, a Foreign Service officer of class 2, to be Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Kingdom of Burundi.

U.S. ADVISORY COMMISSION ON INFORMATION

Sigurd S. Larmon, of New York, to be a member of the U.S. Advisory Commission on Information for a term of 3 years expiring January 27, 1966, and until his successor has been appointed and qualified.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, MARCH 11, 1963

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Proverbs 22: 6: *Train a child in the way he should go; and when he is old, he will not depart from it.*

Eternal God, who art the Father of our hearts and our homes, in this moment of prayer, we would earnestly beseech Thee that the family and homelife of our beloved country may rise to its sacred shrines of influence and power as it seeks to mold and develop into beauty and strength of character and conduct the children and youth of our day and generation.

Grant that in our high calling as homebuilders, whether living in a castle or cottage, we may strive during this Lenten season to cultivate the fine and congenial virtues and attributes of love and kindness, of considerateness, and thoughtfulness, of peace and joy, so that childhood and youth may not be reared and spent in an atmosphere pervaded and poisoned by contention and discord.

May the children and teenagers learn and practice the noble and necessary art of self-discipline and appreciate more fully that they also are challenged and privileged to have a glorious share in contributing to the greatness and glory of our Republic and to help build a healthier and happier social order.

Hear our prayers in Christ's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, March 7, 1963, was read and approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Sundry messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the House by Mr. Ratchford, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on the following date the President approved and signed a joint resolution of the House of the following title:

On March 6, 1963:

H.J. Res. 284. Joint resolution making supplemental appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, and for other purposes.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. McGown, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 816. An act for the establishment of a Commission on Science and Technology.

The message also announced that the President of the Senate, pursuant to Public Law 86-420, had appointed Mr. MANSFIELD, Mr. SPARKMAN, Mr. MORSE, Mr. LONG of Louisiana, Mr. DODD, Mr. SMATHERS, Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey, Mr. MUSKIE, Mr. BREWSTER, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. ALLOTT, Mr. MECHEM, and Mr. KUCHEL to be members of the U.S. group of the Mexico-United States Interparliamentary Group.

The message also announced that Mr. MAGNUSON, chairman of the Committee on Commerce, pursuant to title 14, United States Code, section 194(a), had appointed Mr. BARTLETT and Mr. BEALL to be members of the Board of Visitors to the U.S. Coast Guard Academy.

The message also announced that Mr. MAGNUSON, chairman of the Committee on Commerce, pursuant to title 46, United States Code, section 1126(c), had appointed Mr. ENGLE and Mr. SCOTT to be members of the Board of Visitors to the U.S. Merchant Marine Academy.

The message also announced that the President of the Senate, pursuant to section 1, Public Resolution 32, 73d Congress, had appointed Mr. HRUSKA as a member of the U.S. Territorial Expansion Memorial Commission.

The message also announced that the President of the Senate, pursuant to Public Law 250, 77th Congress, had appointed Mr. LONG of Louisiana and Mr. SALTONSTALL to be members of the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures.

The message also announced that the President of the Senate, pursuant to section 1, Public Law 523, 78th Congress, had appointed Mr. HARTKE and Mr. DOMINICK to be members of the National Memorial Stadium Commission.

The message also announced that the President of the Senate, pursuant to section 1, Public Law 87-759, had appointed Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. LONG of Louisiana, Mr. COOPER, Mr. MORTON, Mr. EASTLAND, Mr. STENNIS, Mr. KEFAUVER, and Mr. GORE to be members of the Battle of New Orleans Sesquicentennial Celebration Commission.

The message also announced that the President of the Senate, pursuant to section 3, Public Law 86-380, had appointed Mr. ERVIN, Mr. MUNDT, and Mr. MUSKIE to be members of the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations.

The message also announced that the President of the Senate, pursuant to section 1, Public Law 372, 84th Congress, had appointed Mrs. NEUBERGER to be a member of the Franklin Delano Roosevelt Memorial Commission.

The message also announced that the President of the Senate, pursuant to Public Law 87-758, had appointed Mr. MAGNUSON and Mr. PROUTY to be members of the National Fisheries Center and Aquarium Advisory Board.

The message also announced that the President of the Senate, pursuant to title 14, United States Code, section 194, had appointed Mr. DODD to be a member of the Board of Visitors to the Coast Guard Academy.

The message also announced that the Vice President, pursuant to title 10, United States Code, section 9355(a), had designated Mr. HOLLAND, Mr. HUMPHREY, and Mr. GOLDWATER to be members of the Board of Visitors to the U.S. Air Force Academy.

The message also announced that the Vice President, pursuant to title 10, United States Code, section 4355(a), had designated Mr. PASTORE, Mr. KEFAUVER, and Mr. KEATING to be members of the Board of Visitors to the U.S. Military Academy.

The message also announced that the President of the Senate, pursuant to title 46, United States Code, section 1126c, had appointed Mr. BAYH to be a member of the Board of Visitors to the U.S. Merchant Marine Academy.

The message also announced that the Vice President, pursuant to title 10, United States Code, section 6988(a), had designated Mr. ROBERTSON, Mr. BARTLETT, and Mr. BEALL to be members of the Board of Visitors to the U.S. Naval Academy.

RESIDUAL OIL IMPORTS

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, as I have done in the past, I rise today to speak on residual oil imports. I am not going to let this matter drop, and will continue to speak for the interests of New England and the entire eastern seaboard.

I am greatly disturbed with the administration's attitude on this topic. Apparently the pressure exerted on President Kennedy has been too much for the former junior Senator from Massachusetts.

As a member of the party in power in 1959, I rose to speak immediately against the import quotas placed on residual and crude oil by Mr. Eisenhower. As a new Republican in the House, this was not an easy thing to do. I was joined by the then Senator Kennedy, who said he believed in the rightness of this cause.

Now the President has decided to turn a deaf ear to the subject—except to listen to the coal barons, who keep reminding him of campaign promises. The fact of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, that New England has been losing $30 million a year because these quotas prevent most of our hospitals, large apartment homes, schools, and industries from using this very practical cheap oil.

Another very direct and most important issue is the President's intellectual honesty in this issue. Just 2 weeks ago he promised President Betancourt that he would do everything he could to help the economy of that country. Now Venezuela is crippled economically because it cannot send oil to this country. The country is fighting, almost alone, Castro militancy in Latin America.

The showdown on this issue is about to come. The President cannot keep walking on both sides of a perilous street. He must walk on the humanitarian side, on the side of the people, and not the coal barons. I speak briefly today, Mr. Speaker, to say simply that the fight, from my standpoint, is just beginning.

GAS AND OIL PERCENTAGE DEPLETION TAX

Mr. NYGAARD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include a statement.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. NYGAARD. Mr. Speaker, I wish to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a statement made by Ernest R. Fleck, president, North Dakota Oil & Gas Association, in which he calls attention to the deficiencies in the proposals made by the administration for revisions of tax laws governing oil and related industries:

The proposed tax reduction and reform program presented by President Kennedy, and which is now being considered by the Congress, provides a back-door method of reducing percentage depletion. It hits the North Dakota oil and gas producing industry at its most vital point, that of exploring for and developing new reserves. If accepted by Congress, these changes will immediately reduce the incentive for the exploratory drilling which is essential to the health and future growth of North Dakota's second largest industry.

The provisions of the program are highly technical and the full ramifications can only be determined after careful and extensive study. Nevertheless, it has been stated by the administration that the proposed changes will increase the taxes of the mineral industries by over $300 million, of which $280 million will come from the petroleum branch alone. The brunt of this will be borne first and hardest by the companies, large and small, who are exploring for new oil and gas reserves. Still more taxes cannot be justified for an industry whose national drilling activity is already at the lowest point in 19 years, and at the lowest ebb in North Dakota since the beginning of oil development.

In a recent interview, Secretary of the Treasury Dillon stated that existing tax provisions have been built into the economy of the oil industry, and that oil industry earnings, after taxes, were no greater and even less than many other businesses. He further stated "that without these provisions there could be do doubt that gasoline and oil products of the oil industry would have to be priced somewhat higher."

In these critical times of world unrest it is completely without logic that the administration should propose measures which will seriously cripple the major energy producing industry of the United States, and in so doing endanger our preparedness to meet national defense emergencies.

The policies and attitudes of our Government will be a major factor in the long-range outlook for the U.S. oil supply. This attack on the sound and time-tested tax policies of the petroleum industry can only serve to seriously endanger the means of providing that supply.

SOCIAL SECURITY REFORM

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, some textile workers in my district have worked in the textile mills for more than 30 years and still cannot draw social security, though disabled to continue on that job. I have known textile employees, men and women, who worked 40 years and some even more, and still could not draw their social security because of that provision of the law which states that to be disabled, a person must be unable to engage in any other work at all.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that this provision of the law is unfair and should be changed. When a person works for 30 years in a textile mill and becomes disabled because of injury or ill health, then I say, Mr. Speaker, that person should start drawing social security.

It is a hardship and it is wrong for such a person to have to go around knocking on doors seeking other employment. Ladies and gentlemen of the House, you know and I know it is next to impossible for this person to get another job.

I am speaking today primarily of textile workers because I have such a great textile industry in my congressional district. More people are employed in the textile industry in my district than all other employment combined. Although I have mentioned my textile workers as an example, I think any worker in the United States regardless of what industry should be able to draw social security after 30 years on the same job when disabled.

I have today introduced a bill which would permit a person to draw social security after 30 years on the same job when that person becomes disabled to continue on that job. I hope the Congress will consider this bill this year so as to permit our folks who have worn themselves out on the same job after 30 years to start drawing social security.

RESIDUAL OIL IMPORTS

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, I was slightly amused at the indignation of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CONTE] about the President's order on residual oil. He kept talking over and over about coal barons. I wonder if he will be one of the same ones who next week, with others in his party, who will talk about the outflow of gold. I wonder why he is not indignant about the oil barons, such as the Rockefellers—I do not want to mention other names—who are benefiting from the dumping of this residual oil in the United States. I think that he should get upset about the plight of the coal miners, thousands cf whom have lost their jobs because of this residual oil rather than referring to the plight of Venezuela, which is not doing too badly at this time, if you will look at the figures and the amount of money they get from the United States.

U.S. POST OFFICES

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, last week I called attention to some plans that were underway for the building of federally owned post office buildings. I also called attention to the inconsistencies that were evident in this program.

During the past week it has been called to my attention that in the northern part of the State of Missouri, in a town of 1,900 people, they are proposing to build a federally owned post office building costing $377,800. In an adjoining county, in a town of 12,000 people, more than 6 times as large, with post office receipts of 7 times as much, they are building a lease-type building which will cost less than $300,000, probably around $250,000.

May I also call attention to the fact that where these buildings have been built, and extravagant waste resulted, they are being criticized even by the people and the newspapers of the town where this is being done.

At Perryville, Mo., there was a post office building built in 1935, at a cost of $35,000. More than 2 years ago they came out with a proposal to modernize and enlarge that building at a cost of $275,000.

I raised cain with the Department for that, and they revised their estimate and came out with a new estimate of $175,000. They are now spending $178,400 to remodel, enlarge, and modernize a building that originally cost about $35,000. The newspaper out there said, "It could have been admitted also that it erred in having the old building practically gutted, serviceable floors torn out, and unnecessary extras added, a waste of many thousands of dollars."

No administration can make friends and gain support through a policy of profligate spending.

THE INTERNATIONAL SECRETARIAT OF THE PEACE CORPS

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, on February 18, 1963, I noticed in one of the Washington newspapers a reference to the International Secretariat of the Peace Corps.

This appeared to be something new to me, so I wrote to Mr. Sargent Shriver, Director of the Peace Corps, and asked him about this International Secretariat. His letter, dated March 2, was received in my office last Saturday. It reads in part as follows:

> The International Secretariat which you mentioned is not part of the Peace Corps. The International Peace Corps Secretariat was established for a trial period of 1 year by the act of the nations and international organizations attending the International Conference on Middle Level Manpower in San Juan, P.R., last October.
>
> You will remember that this was the meeting at which the Rockefeller Hotel reduced the rate from $56 a day to about $26 a day.
>
> The Secretariat was not established by the United States, although the U.S. delegation to that Conference did vote in favor of the resolution establishing a Secretariat and did agree to furnish it with its chief administrative officer and other personnel and funds to meet the expenses of the Secretariat during the trial period.

That is all we did, just vote the money—$150,000—to take care of the International Secretariat for the Peace Corps, and the Secretary is paid at the rate of $19,650. All the representatives of this country did was vote to provide all the money for this new outfit. Now they are coming to Congress, Mr. Shriver says, to set this up as a permanent organization. I think the Members of Congress would be interested to know how they got that way and where they are going to get the next $150,000 to pay some jackanape $19,650 a year.

FOURTH ANNUAL REPORT OF THE COMMISSION ON INTERNATIONAL RULES OF JUDICIAL PROCEDURE

The **SPEAKER** laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

To the Congress of the United States:

Pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 85–906, as amended, I transmit herewith, for the information of the Congress, the Fourth Annual Report of the Commission on International Rules of Judicial Procedure, covering the period ending December 31, 1962.

JOHN F. KENNEDY.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *March 11, 1963.*

MANPOWER REPORT — LETTER FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The **SPEAKER** laid before the House the following letter from the President of the United States, which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Education and Labor:

The Honorable the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE.

The Honorable the SPEAKER OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

SIRS: I am transmitting herewith my Manpower Report as required under the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962.

In preparing this report, I have had the advice and assistance of the Secretary of Labor, who in turn, has had the assistance of members of the Cabinet, heads of independent agencies and the National Manpower Advisory Committee appointed under this act.

Together with my report I am presenting the report of the Secretary of Labor on manpower requirements, resources, use, and training required by section 104 of the Manpower Development and Training Act.

Respectfully,

JOHN F. KENNEDY.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA BUSINESS

The **SPEAKER**. This is District of Columbia Day. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. MCMILLAN].

Mr. **McMILLAN**. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that after the passage of each bill, the chairman or subcommittee chairman may have permission to submit for the RECORD an explanation of the bill.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CANINE CORPS

Mr. **McMILLAN**. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (H.R. 1935) to authorize the acquisition, training, and maintenance of dogs to be used in law enforcement in the District of Columbia, and ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, acting through the Chief of Police of the Metropolitan Police force of the District of Columbia, are authorized to acquire, train, and maintain as many dogs as may be necessary to be used in connection with law enforcement in the District of Columbia.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. **McMILLAN**. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this bill is to authorize the expansion of the canine corps of the Metropolitan Police force.

The use of dogs in urban police work originated in Belgium more than 50 years ago, and has since spread to many other countries. Today, more than 40 police departments in the United States are utilizing dogs in patrol work, and the number is increasing very rapidly.

The canine corps was first established in the District of Columbia in December 1959, and on April 19, 1960, six dogs went on the streets of the city with their handlers. By the end of that year, the number had increased to 20 such teams, and today the corps consists of 59 dogs on the streets and 11 more in training, for a total strength of 70.

The effectiveness of the canine corps as an arm of the Metropolitan Police force may be evaluated from the following statistics for the calendar year 1961, which were submitted to this committee by the Police Department:

Number of arrests made by men with the assistance of dogs, classified according to types of offenses

Housebreaking	62
Robbery	37
Assault	21
Larceny	13
Disorderly	14
Homicide, assaults on police officers, destroying property, etc	50
Total	197

This total consituted 40 percent of all the arrests made by these men during that year.

This remarkable record was accomplished by a corps which ranged from 19 to 42 man-dog teams during the year. In addition to their actual participation in these arrests, the dogs of the canine corps have proved invaluable on many other occasions by the deterrent effect of their mere presence at the scene of actual or potential trouble. The dogs' keen sense of smell enables them to locate fugitives hiding in buildings, junkyards, and other places where the policemen would otherwise have a most difficult and dangerous task in apprehending them.

At a public hearing on April 4, 1962, one of our subcommittees heard testimony on this bill from the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, the Chief and other members of the Metropolitan Police force, the trainer of the canine corps, and spokesmen for community organizations. No opposition whatever was expressed against the bill, and the success of the program was described in terms of highest praise.

Actually, the committee was told that for several reasons the program of expansion of the corps cannot be made to proceed too rapidly. First, the recruitment and selection of the dogs must be accomplished carefully and deliberately. Then the training itself takes 14 weeks, and the nature of the training work forbids too large groups. In this connection also, each dog is assigned to one particular man, and this patrolman and his dog must be trained together. Thus, any rapid acceleration in the training program would take too many patrolmen off their regular beats at one time, to the detriment of law enforcement in the city. In addition, each man-dog team in service must be brought back for 1 day of refresher training every 2 weeks. For these reasons, the Police Department estimates that not more than 25 new dogs can be acquired, trained, and added to the corps each year. Thus, it is their plan to take about another year to build the organization up to a total of 100.

Thus far, all the dogs in the canine corps have been donated, and thus have cost the police department nothing. However, if the contemplated program of expansion necessitates the purchase of any of the new dogs, it is estimated that they may cost as much as $250 each. An item of expense is involved in the fact that the policemen who handle these dogs must transport them daily in their own cars, and also must keep the dogs at their homes. This calls for fenced yards, and extra cleaning. Also, most of the work of these policemen must be performed at night. For these reasons, these men are paid additional compensation in the amount of $538 per year, as grade 2 technicians.

The cost of adding 25 man-dog teams to the present canine corps, which will take a year to accomplish, is estimated to be $19,000. This includes the patrolman's extra compensation as a technician, and the food and veterinary care for the dogs, but not any cost of purchase.

This committee strongly endorses the expansion of this arm of the District of Columbia Police Department, which in its 3 years of existence, despite its limited size, has proved such an invaluable asset as a weapon against the appalling crime situation in the District of Columbia.

The House approved this same bill last year.

LOWERING AGE LIMIT FOR REGISTERED NURSES

Mr. **McMILLAN**. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (H.R. 1933) to amend the act of February 9, 1907, entitled "An act to define the term 'registered nurse' and to provide for the registration of nurses in the District of Columbia," as amended, with respect to the minimum age limitation for registration.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the second and fourth sentences of section 4 of the Act of February 9, 1907, entitled "An Act to define the term 'registered nurse' and to provide for the registration of nurses in the District of Columbia" (D.C. Code, sec. 2–404), as amended, are amended by striking "twenty-one" wherever it appears therein and inserting in lieu thereof, "nineteen."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this bill is to lower the minimum age for registered nurses in the District of Columbia from 21 to 19 years.

The original statute providing for the registration of graduate nurses in the District of Columbia, enacted February 9, 1907, specified that "no nurse shall be registered in the District of Columbia who has not attained the age of 21 years." It is provided also that no applicant may take the examination for licensure in the District unless she is 21 years of age or will attain that age within 6 months after the date set for the examination.

Until a few years ago, we are informed, students under 18 years of age were not admitted to schools of nursing, and therefore were not being graduated below the age of 21. Thus, the above-mentioned statute posed no problem. However, as high schools began graduating persons of 16 and 17 years, the admission age to schools of nursing was lowered to 17 years. Also, diploma programs have decreased in length from 36 months to 32 and 33 months, which has increased the problem relating to age.

According to "Facts of Nursing," published by the American Nurses' Association, 20 States presently have no minimum age requirement for registration of nurses; and the age requirements in the other States, with the exception of North Dakota and the District of Columbia, range from 18 to 20 years.

The disadvantages to the District of Columbia resulting from this situation are twofold. First, it handicaps local recruitment of the best qualified students. The better students graduate from high school at an earlier age, and they prefer to take their nursing training in jurisdictions which allow them to become registered immediately upon completion of their training program. Second, the younger student who does decide to take her nursing training course in the District of Columbia must go to the additional expense of taking her licensing examination in another jurisdiction. This will qualify her to practice as a registered nurse in that locality, whereas she is prohibited from registration and practice in the District of Columbia until she becomes 21 years of age. The result is that such nurses usually remain elsewhere to work, and the District thus loses the services of many young registered nurses.

At a public hearing conducted on September 17, 1962, testimony in favor of this proposed legislation was presented by the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, the Capital City School of Nursing, the Washington Hospital Center School of Nursing, and the Graduate Nurses' Association of the District of Columbia. No opposition was expressed.

Passage of this bill will not involve additional expense to the District of Columbia government.

A bill identical to this was approved by the House on September 24, 1962.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA ARMORY BOARD

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (H.R. 39) to amend the act of June 4, 1948, as it relates to the appointment of the District of Columbia Armory Board, and ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered in the House as in the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I do not think I will object, I would like to ask the gentleman from South Carolina a question or two concerning this bill.

What is the necessity for increasing the membership of this board?

Mr. McMILLAN. The three members of the present board came to our committee and asked that we add two additional members because they already have three members on the board who are connected with the District government, and they want two additional members who are not connected with the District government.

Mr. GROSS. Solely because they want two additional members who are not connected with the District government?

Mr. McMILLAN. That is my understanding.

Mr. GROSS. May I ask the gentleman this question: Is this some kind of a preliminary to coming to Congress for funds to take care of that white elephant stadium which the District of Columbia has on its hands?

Mr. McMILLAN. If it is, they did not let it be known at the hearings.

Mr. GROSS. Would the gentleman think that this was directed toward a program to do what they could not do before; that is, to get Congress to dump a bunch of money into the stadium operation?

Mr. McMILLAN. I cannot see how this would be any assistance to them in getting any District funds for the stadium.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman does not think that is the purpose of the bill?

Mr. McMILLAN. I do not think so.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the first sentence of section 2 of the Act entitled "An Act to establish a District of Columbia Armory Board, and for other purposes", approved June 4, 1948, as amended (D.C. Code, sec. 2–1702), is amended by striking out "a third person not employed by the Federal or District Governments who shall be appointed" and inserting in lieu thereof "three other persons not employed by the Federal or District Governments each of whom shall be appointed",

SEC. 2. The amendment made by the first section of this Act shall not affect the term of office of any person serving on the Armory Board on the date of enactment of this Act.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 2, line 1 insert the following: ", and by inserting immediately before the period at the end thereof the following: ': *Provided,* That of the two persons initially appointed to the Board after the effective date of this proviso, one shall be appointed for a term of two years, and one for a term of three years'."

Page 2, line 7, insert immediately after the word "shall" the following: "take effect as of October 12, 1963, but shall".

Page 2, line 9, insert immediately after the period:

"Any member appointed to the Armory Board to fill a vacancy shall be appointed only for the unexpired term of the member whom he succeeds."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this legislation is to increase the membership of the District of Columbia Armory Board from three to five members, with the terms of the three non-Government-employed members to be staggered so as to provide for some continuity of membership.

Under existing law the President of the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, the commanding general of the District of Columbia Militia, and a third person not employed by the Federal or District Governments, is appointed by the chairman of the District of Columbia Committees of the U.S. Senate and the U.S. House of Representatives, to serve for a term of 3 years. Two of the present members of the Armory Board are ex officio members and have other duties of a substantial and time-consuming nature.

This legislation would simply increase from one person to three persons, not employed by the Federal or District Governments, to be appointed by the chairman of the District of Columbia Committees of the Senate and House of Representatives for staggered 3-year terms. This legislation has the strong endorsement of the present District of Columbia Armory Board, and at a public hearing held by a subcommittee of the

House District Committee on Thursday, July 26, the three members of the Board testified to this fact.

There is no objection to the enactment of this legislation and there is no cost involved to the District of Columbia government since all the members of the Board serve without compensation.

A bill identical to this passed the House in the last Congress.

APPOINTMENT OF NEW TRUSTEES IN DEEDS OF TRUST

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, at this time I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER] to call up a bill from Subcommittee No. 3 of the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill, H.R. 682, to amend the act of March 3, 1901, to permit the appointment of new trustees in deeds of trust in the District of Columbia by agreement of the parties.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) section 522 of the Act entitled "An Act to establish a code of law for the District of Columbia", approved March 3, 1901, as amended (D.C. Code, sec. 45-603), is amended by inserting immediately after "a new trustee" the following: "by agreement of the parties pursuant to section 538(b) (D.C. Code, sec. 45-614(b)) or", and by striking out "or trustee" in the proviso and inserting in lieu thereof the following: ", trustee, or new trustee".

(b) Section 534 of such Act of March 3, 1901, as amended (D.C. Code, sec. 45-611), is amended by adding at the end thereof the following: "Nothing contained in this section shall prevent the appointment of a new trustee pursuant to section 538(b) (D.C. Code, sec. 45-614(b)) and the execution of the trusts of said deed of trust by such new trustee."

(c) Section 537 of such Act of March 3, 1901, as amended (D.C. Code, sec. 45-619), is amended by adding at the end thereof the following: "Nothing contained in this section shall prevent the appointment of a new trustee pursuant to section 538(b) (D.C. Code, sec. 45-614(b)) and the execution of a deed of release by such new trustee."

(d) Section 538 of such Act of March 3, 1901, as amended (D.C. Code, sec. 45-614), is amended by inserting "(a)" immediately before "In case of the refusal" and by adding at the end thereof the following new subsections:

Notwithstanding the provisions of subsection (a) of this section, and notwithstanding any provision in a deed of trust to the contrary, whenever the grantors named in, and the persons secured by, the deed of trust (or their successors in interest) so desire, they may by written agreement executed and acknowledged in the same manner as an absolute deed substitute any trustee named in the deed of trust with a new trustee. No written instrument entered into pursuant to this subsection shall be effective as to any person not having actual notice thereof until a notice of the appointment of the new trustee signed, sealed, and acknowledged by the parties agreeing to the appointment of the new trustee shall be recorded among the land records in the Office of the Recorder of Deeds.

"(c) Notwithstanding any provision of a deed of trust to the contrary, the owner of the debt secured by such deed of trust may, by a written designation signed, sealed, and acknowledged by him, appoint substitute trustees, and such designation shall be effective from and after the tenth day following the filing of such designation in the United States District Court for the District of Columbia and the service of a copy thereof upon the debtor in the manner provided for the service of a petition by section 534 of this subchapter, unless within such ten-day period the debtor shall file in said court an objection to the appointment of any such substitute trustee. In the event any such objection is filed in said court, further proceedings shall be in accordance with section 534 or 537 of this subchapter, or subsection (a) of this section, whichever is appropriate. The clerk of the court shall maintain a separate docket in which there shall be kept a record of designations of substitute trustees filed under this subsection."

SEC. 2. The amendments made by the first section of this Act shall apply to all deeds of trust, whether entered into before, on, or after the date of enactment of this Act.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of the bill is to provide for the substitution of trustees under deeds of trust in the District of Columbia by means of a written instrument entered into by all the parties or their successors in interest, notwithstanding any provision of the deed of trust to the contrary.

The bill affects two situations whereby new trustees to a deed of trust can be appointed. One is where the parties to a trust agree in writing to the appointment. Provision is included that before any such instrument is effective, notice of the appointment of the new trustee, bearing the signatures under seal of the parties, and acknowledged by them, shall be recorded among the land records in the Office of the Recorder of Deeds. This affords notice to other parties not having actual notice of the designation of the new trustee.

The other situation covered by the bill is where the owner of the debt secured by a deed of trust may, unilaterally, acting on his own, and without the prior agreement of other parties to the deed of trust, appoint a new trustee by written designation signed, sealed, and acknowledged by said owner of the debt. However, in such case, such appointment of new trustee is effective only after the lapse of a 10-day period following the filing of such designation with the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia and service thereof an the debtor. If the debtor within the 10-day period files an objection to the appointment of such trustee, court proceeding would follow as are provided under the District of Columbia Code for appointment of a substituted trustee in the event of death of the designated trustee, under which proceedings the court may appoint a new trustee.

In the 2d session of the 87th Congress, a bill on this subject, H.R. 8988, was amended to conform with the views expressed by the District of Columbia Commissioners, in the form of a new bill, H.R. 11698. The current bill, H.R. 682, is identical to H.R. 11698 of the last Congress as it passed the House on August 13, 1962.

INCREASE JURISDICTION FOR DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA MUNICIPAL COURT

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, at this time I yield to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DOWDY] to call up any bills which he may have from Subcommittee No. 4 of the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. DOWDY. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on the District of Columbia I call up the bill H.R. 3537 and ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, do I understand that this is made necessary—this legislation—partly because of the importance and dignity of the court?

Mr. DOWDY. I might say to the gentleman that the purpose of this bill is to correct what was done last year. Last year the House and Senate passed a bill which was not correctly enrolled but which was sent to the President and signed into law. This bill contains in it the provisions that the Congress of the United States passed last year.

Mr. GROSS. Then it is not alone for the purpose of increasing the importance and dignity of the court; is that correct?

Mr. DOWDY. Not alone; no, sir.

Mr. GROSS. But that is one subsidiary effect of the bill?

Mr. DOWDY. It increases jurisdiction from $3,000 to $10,000 and that would have that effect.

Mr. GROSS. The bill would extend the power of the court, as I understand, to issue and serve subpenas for attendance to anyone within a 25-mile radius of the District of Columbia. This poses no problem with respect to the States of Maryland and Virginia, is that correct?

Mr. DOWDY. As I understand from our colleagues who represent Maryland and Virginia, it is all right with them.

Mr. GROSS. I did not hear the gentleman.

Mr. DOWDY. Our colleagues who represent those two States, I understand it is all right with them. I do not know what my attitude would be if it affected the State of Texas, but it does not.

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, there is no opposition from the States of Virginia and Maryland. The situation is simply that last year when we first passed the legislation, it provided a radius of 100 miles. When the bill passed the other body, our junior Senator from Virginia had the bill called back in order to reduce that radius from 100 miles to 25 miles. That is what caused the slipup in the enrollment of the legislation and caused the President to sign it in error. That is what we are attempting to correct at this time.

Mr. DOWDY. I think that is the only effect this bill has.

Mr. GROSS. Then it is safe to say that to extend the jurisdiction into Maryland and Virginia has the approval of those States—that is, to extend the jurisdiction of the District of Columbia Municipal Court into those States?

Mr. DOWDY. Yes, but I raised that question myself in the hearings.

Mr. GROSS. And by increasing the dignity and importance of the court by changing the name of the Municipal Court of the District of Columbia, it does not mean that Congress will be asked to increase the salaries to come up to the new status, does it?

Mr. DOWDY. Mr. Speaker, I might say to the gentleman that all of this was done last year. The real objective of this bill is to decrease that radius from 100 miles to 25 miles as the new bill provides.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the court established by the first section of the Act entitled "An Act to consolidate the Police Court of the District of Columbia and the Municipal Court of the District of Columbia, to be known as 'the Municipal Court for the District of Columbia', to create 'the Municipal Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia', and for other purposes", approved April 1, 1942, as amended (56 Stat 190; D.C. Code, sec. 11–751), hereafter shall be known as the "District of Columbia Court of General Session". Whenever reference is made in any Act of Congress (other than this Act or the amendments made by this Act) or in any regulation to the Municipal Court for the District of Columbia, such reference shall be held to be a reference to the District of Columbia Court of General Sessions.

SEC. 2. Subsection (a) of section 4 of such Act, approved April 1, 1942, as amended (D.C. Code, sec. 11–755(a)), is amended to read as follows:

"(a) The District of Columbia Court of General Sessions, as established by this Act, shall consist of the criminal, civil, and small claims and conciliation, and domestic relations branches. The court and each judge thereof shall have and exercise the same powers and jurisdiction as were heretofore had or exercised by the Municipal Court for the District of Columbia or the judges thereof on the day before the effective date of this amendatory subsection, and in addition the said court shall have exclusive jurisdiction of civil actions commenced after the effective date of this amendatory subsection, including such actions against executors, administrators and other fiduciaries, in which the claimed value of personal property or the debt or damages claimed, does not exceed the sum of $10,000 exclusive of interest and costs, and, in addition, shall have jurisdiction of all cross-claims and counterclaims interposed in all actions over which it has jurisdiction regardless of the amount involved: *Provided, however,* That nothing herein shall deprive the United States District Court for the District of Columbia of jurisdiction over counterclaims, cross-claims, or any other claims whether or not arising out of the same transaction or occurrence and interposed in actions over which the United States District Court for the District of Columbia has jurisdiction. The District of Columbia Court of General Sessions shall also have jurisdiction over all cases properly pending in the Municipal Court for the District of Columbia on the effective date of this amendatory subsection."

SEC. 3. Subsection (a) of section 5 of such Act approved April 1, 1942, as amended (D.C. Code, sec. 11–756(a)), is amended to read as follows:

"(a) If, in any action, other than an action for equitable relief, pending on the effective date of this amendatory subsection or thereafter commenced in the United States District Court for the District of Columbia, it shall appear to the satisfaction of the court at or subsequent to any pretrial hearing but prior to trial thereof that the action will not justify a judgment in excess of $10,000, the court may certify such action to the District of Columbia Court of General Sessions for trial. The pleadings in such action, together with a copy of the docket entries and of any orders theretofore entered therein, shall be sent to the clerk of the said Court of General Sessions, together with any deposit for costs, and the case shall be called for trial in that court promptly thereafter; and shall thereafter be treated as though it had been filed originally in the said Court of General Sessions, except that the jurisdiction of that court shall extend to the amount claimed in such action, even though it exceed the sum of $10,000."

SEC. 4. Subsection (c) of section 5 of such Act approved April 1, 1942, as amended (D.C. Code, sec. 11–756(c)), is amended to read as follows:

"(c) The District of Columbia Court of General Sessions shall have the power to compel the attendance of witnesses by attachment and any judge thereof shall have the power in any case or proceeding whether civil or criminal to punish for disobedience of any order, or contempt committed in the presence of the court by a fine not exceeding $50 or imprisonment not exceeding thirty days. At the request of any party subpenas for attendance at a hearing or trial in the District of Columbia Court of General Sessions shall be issued by the clerk of the said court. A subpena may be served at any place within the District of Columbia, or at any place without the District of Columbia that is within twenty-five miles of the place of the hearing or trial specified in the subpena. The form, issuance and manner of service of a subpena shall be as otherwise prescribed by Rule 45 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure."

SEC. 5. (a) Section 1114 of the Act entitled "An Act to establish a code of law for the District of Columbia", approved March 3, 1901 (31 Stat. 1189; D.C. Code, sec. 11–1520), is hereby repealed.

(b) The paragraph relating to witness fees under the heading "District of Columbia" in the Act entitled "An Act making appropriations to supply deficiencies in the appropriations for the fiscal year ending June thirtieth, nineteen hundred and two, and for prior years, and for other purposes", approved July 1, 1902 (32 Stat. 552, 561; D.C. Code, sec. 11–1520a), is amended by striking "cases in the police court of the District of Columbia" and inserting in lieu thereof "criminal cases in the District of Columbia Court of General Sessions".

(c) The fees and travel allowances to be paid any witness compelled by subpena to attend any branch of the District of Columbia Court of General Sessions other than the criminal branch shall be the same amount as paid a witness compelled to attend before the United States District Court for the District of Columbia.

SEC. 6. The court established by section 6 of the Act of April 1, 1942 (56 Stat. 190; D.C. Code, sec. 11–771), hereafter shall be known as the "District of Columbia Court of Appeals". Wherever reference is made in any Act of Congress (other than this Act) or in any regulation to the Municipal Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia, such reference shall be held to be a reference to the District of Columbia Court of Appeals.

SEC. 7. This Act shall take effect as of January 1, 1963.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. DOWDY. Mr. Speaker, public hearings were held on similar legislation—H.R. 12708—during the 87th Congress. At those hearings testimony was received from representatives of the judicial conference for the District of Columbia, the U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia, the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia, the Municipal Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia, the Municipal Court for the District of Columbia, the Office of the Corporation Counsel, and the Bar Association of the District of Columbia. Full support for the legislation was expressed and no objections were heard by the committee.

Following the approval of the legislation—H.R. 12708—by the House, it was amended by the Senate. The House agreed to the Senate amendments. However, the text of the bill as enrolled for and approved by the President contained the text of the original unamended House bill. The pending bill, H.R. 3537, carries the text of H.R. 12708 as amended and as approved by the House and Senate in the 87th Congress. Its enactment will result in law conforming to that which was intended and approved by the House and Senate in the 87th Congress. The effective date, January 1, 1963, of H.R. 3537 is the same as that provided in H.R. 12708 of the 87th Congress, which was numbered Public Law 87–873.

The following statement of the purposes of H.R. 3537 and the section-by-section analysis are identical to those contained in House Report 2137 accompanying H.R. 12708 of the 87th Congress except for the inclusion of the amendments to that bill approved by the House and Senate and a provision for the same effective date.

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

H.R. 3537 proposes, first, to increase the maximum jurisdictional amount of the Municipal Court of the District of Columbia from $3,000 to $10,000; second, to extend the power of the court to issue and serve subpenas for attendance to any point within a 25-mile radius of the District of Columbia; third, to change the name of the Municipal Court to the "District of Columbia Court of General Sessions"; and fourth, to change the name of the Municipal Court of Appeals to the "District of Columbia Court of Appeals."

In 1958, the Congress, to relieve the U.S. district courts of the increased burden of judicial business, approved legislation to increase the jurisdictional amount of such courts from $3,000 to $10,000—Public Law 85–554; 72 Stat.

415. However, the maximum jurisdictional amount for the Municipal Court of the District of Columbia—District of Columbia Code, section 11–755(a)—established at $3,000, has remained unchanged. The bill will place the courts of local and Federal jurisdiction within the District of Columbia into the same relationship as to jurisdictional amounts as exists between such courts in the other States.

The renaming of the Municipal Court and the Municipal Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia to the District of Columbia Court of General Sessions and the District of Columbia Court of Appeals, respectively, is believed to be more suitable in view of the importance and dignity of these courts.

The power of the court of general sessions to serve process within 25 miles is felt to be proper and desirable in view of the close interrelationship between the District of Columbia and the metropolitan area.

SECTION-BY-SECTION ANALYSIS

The first section of the bill amends existing provisions of law to provide that the Municipal Court established under present law shall be renamed and wherever in the existing statutes reference is made to the municipal court of the District of Columbia, such reference shall be held to refer to the "District of Columbia Court of General Sessions."

Section 2: This section amends existing law to provide that the District of Columbia Court of General Sessions shall consist of criminal, civil, small claims and conciliation, and domestic relations branches, and that the court and each judge thereof shall have the same powers and jurisdiction as were had by the municipal court prior to the effective date of the amendment. In addition to such jurisdiction, the court of general sessions shall have exclusive jurisdiction of civil actions, including those against executors, administrators, or fiduciaries, where the value of the personal property, debt, or damages in controversy does not exceed the sum of $10,000 exclusive of interest and costs. Further, the court shall have jurisdiction of all cross-claims or counterclaims, regardless of the amount involved, which are interposed in actions over which the court shall have jurisdiction. Finally, it is provided that nothing in the amendment shall deprive the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia of its jurisdiction over counterclaims, cross-claims, or any other claims which are interposed in actions over which the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia has jurisdiction.

Section 3: Section 3 amends existing law to provide that in any action, other than actions for equitable relief, pending on the effective date or thereafter commenced before the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia, if the district court determines at or subsequent to any pretrial hearing but before the trial of the matter that the action will not justify a judgment in excess of $10,000, may certify the action, together with the pleadings, any deposits, docket entries, and order issued in connection therewith, to the court of general sessions. The jurisdiction of the court of general sessions in such case shall extend to the amount claimed even though it exceeds the amount of $10,000.

Section 4: Section 4 of the bill amends subsection (c) of section 5 of the act of April 1942. It empowers the Court of General Sessions to compel the attendance of witnesses by attachment, and grants to the judges of that court power to punish for disobedience of any order or contempt committed in the presence of the court by a fine not to exceed $50 or imprisonment not to exceed 30 days. It further provides that at the request of any party a subpena for attendance at a hearing or trial in the Court of General Sessions shall be issued by the clerk of that court. A subpena may be served any place within 25 miles of the place of the hearing or trial specified in the subpena. The form, issuance, and manner of service of the subpena shall be that prescribed by rule 45 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure.

Section 5. Subsection (a) of this section repeals existing law regarding the payment of witness fees in civil cases.

Subsection (b) continues the present municipal court fees for witnesses in the criminal branch of the Court of General Sessions.

Subsection (c) is new language providing that the fees and travel allowances for witnesses compelled to attend any branch of the Court of General Sessions other than the criminal branch shall be the same as those provided for witnesses compelled to attend the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia.

Section 6: Section 6 provides a new name for the Municipal Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia which shall hereafter be known as the District of Columbia Court of Appeals.

Section 7: This section provides that the effective date of the act shall be January 1, 1963.

TREATMENT OF MINORS FOR COMMUNICABLE DISEASES

Mr. DOWDY. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on the District of Columbia, I call up the bill H.R. 2485, to amend the act entitled "An Act to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to make regulations to prevent and control the spread of communicable and preventable diseases," approved August 11, 1939, as amended, and ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Act entitled "An Act to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to make regulations to prevent and control the spread of communicable and preventable diseases", approved August 11, 1939 (53 Stat. 1408), as amended (sec. 6–119 et seq., D.C. Code, 1961 ed.), is amended by renumbering section 13 as section 14 and by inserting the following new section immediately following section 12:

"IMMEDIATE TREATMENT OF MINOR WITH VENEREAL DISEASE

"Sec. 13. If a minor appears in any clinic, hospital, or other facility of the Department of Public Health of the government of the District of Columbia, and the Director of Public Health or his authorized agent, after having caused a medical examination to be made of such minor, has probable cause to believe that such minor is affected with a venereal disease or is a carrier of a venereal disease, and if, as a result of such examination, the Director of Public Health or his authorized agent determines that immediate medical treatment of the minor will adequately control the disease of the minor so as to protect his health and the health of others without having said minor detained as provided in this Act, the Director of Public Health or his authorized agent shall present to such minor a paper, upon which such minor shall state either (1) that he consents to such treatment, in which event such treatment shall be given to the minor forthwith, or (2) that he refuses to consent to such treatment, in which event no such treatment shall be given to him pursuant to this section."

Sec. 2. So much of section 3 of the Act entitled "To amend the Act entitled 'An Act to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to make regulations to prevent and control the spread of communicable and preventable diseases', approved August 11, 1939", approved August 8, 1946 (60 Stat. 919), as reads "renumbered as section 13" is amended to read "renumbered as section 15".

Sec. 3. Nothing in this Act shall be construed so as to affect the authority vested in the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia by Reorganization Plan Numbered 5 of 1952 (66 Stat. 824). The performance of any function vested by this Act in the Board of Commissioners, or in any office or agency under the jurisdiction and control of said Board of Commissioners may be delegated by said Board of Commissioners in accordance with section 3 of such plan.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. DOWDY. Mr. Speaker, the Committee on the District of Columbia, to whom was referred the bill H.R. 2485 to amend the act entitled "An act to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to make regulations to prevent and control the spread of communicable and preventable diseases," approved August 11, 1939, as amended, having considered the same, report favorably thereon without amendment and recommend that the bill do pass.

The purpose of this bill is to authorize the Department of Public Health of the District of Columbia to treat minors for venereal disease upon their own consent, when they present themselves voluntarily to the Department's health centers, rather than having to obtain such permission from their parents or guardians.

At present, minors for whom parental consent for treatment of gonorrhea cannot be obtained are given only oral antibiotics, which are relatively safe to administer but are not the drugs of choice, since effective treatment is assured only by injections, and also because oral medication is impractical in patients who are irresponsible or careless. In the case of syphilis, there is no prophylactic agent other than penicillin, and hence minors who have been exposed to this disease receive no treatment whatever without parental consent. According to testimony presented in a public hearing on August 10, 1962, this legal impediment to the administration of adequate treatment has resulted in the loss of 35 percent of the minors who are found in the Health Department clinics to have contracted or to have been exposed to venereal disease, with no treatment of any kind.

The seriousness of this situation is graphically illustrated by the following statistics which were reported to this committee by the Bureau of Disease Control of the District of Columbia Public Health Department.

District of Columbia Department of Public Health—Treated venereal disease cases age 20 and under for fiscal years 1959, 1960, 1961

	1959	1960	1961
Total syphilis	132	192	217
Primary and secondary	38	90	126
Early latent	72	68	75
Congenital	20	24	13
Other syphilis	2	10	3
Gonorrhea	3,089	3,263	[1] 2,539
Lymphogranuloma venereum	16	81	93
Chancroid	12	11	12
Granuloma inguinale	5	6	4
Total treated	3,254	3,553	2,865

[1] Notes a decrease. The basic reason for this is that in order to devote more time to the epidemiology of syphilis, it was decided that effective July 1, 1960, field investigative epidemiology of gonorrhea would not be conducted.

Venereal disease: District of Columbia, fiscal years 1956–62

Diagnosis	1956	1957	1958	1959	1960	1961	1962
Grand total	12,420	11,825	10,979	12,760	14,098	11,761	10,484
Total, syphilis	1,900	1,967	1,670	1,942	2,500	2,420	1,927
Primary and secondary	36	109	153	199	472	550	701
Early latent	263	301	268	356	432	396	331
Late latent and other	1,569	1,519	1,213	1,350	1,555	1,432	857
Congenital	32	38	36	37	41	35	38
Gonorrhea	10,418	9,781	9,231	10,679	11,215	8,901	8,295
Other venereal disease	102	77	78	139	383	440	262

NOTE.—According to the latest available statistics, the District of Columbia ranks 1st among cities of the United States in the incidence of early and infectious syphilis per 100,000 population, and 3d in the incidence of gonorrhea

Source: District of Columbia Department of Public Health, Bureau of Disease Control, Preventable and Chronic Diseases Division.

We were further informed that between the dates of August 28 and November 10, 1961, a total of 74 minors who were in need of treatment for venereal disease presented themselves to the Northwest Central Clinic without written parental consent for treatment. Of this number, 44 were treated at the discretion of the examining physician with oral antibiotics for clinical or bacteriologic gonorrhea or because they were designated sexual contacts to this disease. The other 30 were denied treatment at the time, for lack of written consent. Five of these returned the following day with signed permission and were treated; however, 24 hours had elapsed during which further infection might have been spread and irreparable damage done to the patient. The remaining 25 were never treated.

The difficulties involved in obtaining written parental permission for treatment are numerous. The minor who lives with one or both parents is said to pose few problems, provided that one parent can be readily contacted. Frequently, however, both parents are working. In other instances, a minor may be residing here with a relative other than his parents, or with a friend, and thus the required consent is extremely difficult to obtain. The most common source of difficulty, however, is probably the fact that in most cases, these minors fear the reaction on the part of their parents when the presence of these diseases is revealed to them.

The health of the community is seriously endangered by failure to treat this group of patients promptly. Through fear of their parents' displeasure, these minors frequently seek the advice of friends, older people, and thus often become the victims of quackery. Very often they allow their disease to spread through ignorance or neglect. Because they are in a very active sexual period of their lives, they are often promiscuous and are even a greater menace than the older adult who has some knowledge of venereal disease.

A survey conducted by the District of Columbia Department of Public Health revealed that treatment of minors for venereal disease upon request or presentation, without parental consent, is authorized in California, Florida, Georgia, Hawaii, Massachusetts, Mississippi, Montana, Oregon, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, South Carolina, Virginia, Wyoming, North Carolina, Idaho, and the territory of Puerto Rico. In their replies to the District of Columbia Health Department's questionnaire, the health departments of many of these States stressed the fact that while they do have this authority, they prefer in such cases to contact the parents and obtain their consent for treatment, and make every effort to do so. This committee is assured that the District of Columbia Health Department will pursue this same course, and will use this authority to treat without parental consent only when necessary.

The Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia have endorsed this bill, and no one has expressed any opposition to its passage.

A bill identical to this passed the House in the second session of the last Congress.

FALSE STATEMENTS ON INSURANCE LICENSE APPLICATIONS

Mr. DOWDY. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on the District of Columbia, I call up the bill, H.R. 1937, to amend the act known as the Life Insurance Act of the District of Columbia, approved June 19, 1934, and the act known as the Fire and Casualty Act of the District of Columbia, approved October 3, 1940.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That sections 26 and 29 of chapter II of the Life Insurance Act approved June 19, 1934, as amended (48 Stat. 1139, 1141; sec. 35-425 and sec. 35-428, D.C. Code, 1951 ed.), are hereby amended by adding after the second sentence of each such section the following: "Any such applicant who willfully files with or otherwise submits to the Superintendent, orally or in writing, any material statement, knowing such statement to be false, shall, in addition to any other penalty prescribed by law, be guilty of perjury and subject to the penalties thereof."

SEC. 2. The second sentence of section 32 of chapter II of the Fire and Casualty Act approved October 9, 1940, as amended (54 Stat. 1078; sec. 35–1336, D.C. Code, 1951 ed.), is amended to read: "The person to whom the license may be issued shall file sworn answers, subject to the penalties of perjury, to such interrogatories as the Superintendent may require."

SEC. 3. Section 35 of chapter II of said Fire and Casualty Act, as amended (54 Stat. 1079; sec. 35–1339, D.C. Code, 1951 ed.), is amended by adding: "Any applicant who, in connection with such application for renewal of an expiring license, willfully files with or otherwise submits to the Superintendent, orally or in writing, any material statement under oath, knowing such statement to be false, shall, in addition to any other penalty prescribed by law, be guilty of perjury and subject to the penalties thereof."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. DOWDY. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of the bill is to make the District of Columbia perjury statute applicable to those persons who make false statements under oath when applying for licenses or renewal of licenses as insurance agents and brokers in the District of Columbia.

This legislation is made necessary by a recent decision of the U.S. court of appeals—*Nelson* v. *U.S.*, U.S.C.A. D.C. No. 15726, decided January 12, 1961—which held that a person swearing falsely to the Superintendent of Insurance in an application for agent's license was not subject to the perjury statute of the District of Columbia.

The Superintendent of Insurance, in a memorandum to the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, dated January 16, 1961, reported as follows:

> The urgent necessity for such a bill arises from the decision * * * of the U.S. court of appeals in the Nelson case. * * * In that case, it was decided that a person swearing falsely to the Superintendent of Insurance in applying for an agent's license is not subject to the penalties of perjury.
>
> The danger to the public in the present situation is obvious from the facts of the case * * *. Nelson obtained from the De-

partment of Insurance a license to act in the District of Columbia as a life insurance agent. In his application he falsely swore that he had never been convicted of any offense against the laws of the District of Columbia, or of any other jurisdiction. Actually, at the time of his application he had recently been paroled from the penitentiary where he had served a sentence upon conviction of a felony involving a money transaction, and he was still reporting to the parole officer.

* * * * *

The business of insurance is a highly technical one, which is not understood by the average policyholder * * * (who) * * * may easily be deceived and defrauded by a dishonest salesman. There is obvious danger to the public * * * in the situation * * * whereby felons may not be convicted of perjury when they are found to have obtained licenses through false representations.

The District of Columbia perjury statute, applicable under the proposed bill, is found at section 858 of the act approved March 3, 1901 (31 Stat. 1329; sec. 22-2501, D.C. Code, 1951 ed.), and provides a penalty, upon conviction, of imprisonment in the penitentiary for not less than 2 nor more than 10 years. The perjury statute has already been made applicable by the Congress to certain violations of the insurance laws of the District of Columbia at section 27 of chapter II of the Life Insurance Act, as amended (72 Stat. 21; sec. 35-426, D.C. Code, 1951 ed., supp. VIII), and at section 9 of chapter 11 of said act (48 Stat. 1132; sec. 35-408, D.C. Code, 1951 ed.). The former provision declares that any person testifying falsely under oath at a Superintendent's hearing to determine whether a license should be suspended or revoked "shall be subject to the penalties of perjury." The latter provision states that any director, officer, agent or employee of any insurance company who willfully and knowingly makes oath to any false annual statement or other statement required by law "shall be guilty of perjury."

The proposed bill makes no change in these sections. It adds the penalty of perjury in the additional cases of false, sworn statements in applications for agents' and brokers' licenses and applications for renewal of such licenses.

The Board of Commissioners favor the bill, and its enactment will not result in additional expense for the District of Columbia.

REPORTS OF MOTOR VEHICLE COLLISIONS

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, at this time I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. WHITENER] to call up a bill from his subcommittee.

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on the District of Columbia, I call up the bill H.R. 1982, to amend section 10 of the District of Columbia Traffic Act, 1925, as amended, so as to require reports of collisions in which motor vehicles are involved.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That subsection (a) of section 10 of the District of Columbia Traffic Act, 1925, as amended (43 Stat. 1124; sec. 40-609(a), D.C. Code, 1951 ed.), is amended (a) by adding at the end of the first paragraph the following: "In addition to the preceding requirements with respect to the action to be taken immediately in cases involving personal injury or substantial damage to property, every person who, in the District of Columbia, operates a motor vehicle which is involved in a collision, which has resulted in damage to the property of any one person in excess of $100 or in bodily injury to or in the death of any person, shall immediately make a written report thereof to the Chief of Police, on a form prescribed by him. Such written report shall be made without regard to the degree of personal injury resulting from such collision. In the event the operator of a motor vehicle involved in a collision is injured or otherwise disabled to such an extent as to render him incapable, in the opinion of his attending physician, of making any report of the collision as required by this subsection, such operator shall make such report within forty-eight hours after the date on which, in the opinion of his attending physician, he can reasonably be expected to have recovered from his injury or other disability to the extent of being able to prepare and submit the required report."; and (b) by striking "substantial" in the third paragraph.

SEC. 2. Nothing in this Act shall be construed so as to affect the authority vested in the Commissioners by Reorganization Plan Numbered 5 of 1952 (66 Stat. 824). The performance of any function vested by this Act in the Commissioners or in any office or agency under the jurisdiction and control of said Commissioners may be delegated by said Commissioners in accordance with section 3 of such plan.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. WHITENER. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, may we have a brief explanation from the gentleman from North Carolina of this bill?

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, I shall be happy to try to explain it to my friend. This is an identical bill to one the House passed last year. It was not passed by the other body.

It merely corrects a deficiency in the existing law of the District of Columbia so as to require that persons involved in motor vehicle accidents doing property damage in excess of $100 shall make a report to the Chief of Police of such collision and such damage.

Under the present law the Metropolitan Police Department does not necessarily receive complete reports upon such collisions which occur in the District. The Department of Motor Vehicles does get those reports. We feel that the Police Department should have this information. I might say to the gentleman that this provision which we would invoke into the law of the District of Columbia is consistent with the law of most States.

Mr. GROSS. Do I understand this deals only with the handling of reports and does not change the amount of $100? Is the present requirement that those cases involving property damage to the amount of $100 must be reported?

Mr. WHITENER. The present law, as I indicated, requires that all accidents be reported to the Department of Motor Vehicles within 5 days. This agency is concerned primarily with the financial responsibility of the parties. Only accidents involving personal injury must be reported to the police at the present time. The police under the present law must send to the Department of Motor Vehicles copies of all reports which they get involving personal injury, but the Department of Motor Vehicles does not have to reciprocate as to property damage accident reports received by the Department of Motor Vehicles.

Mr. GROSS. Does this for the first time establish the amount of $100? If there is damage of $100 or personal injury it must be reported? Does this add a $100 provision? I am not clear on that.

Mr. WHITENER. This bill would for the first time establish the requirement that an operator of a motor vehicle make a report to the Police Department where property damage is involved. We merely reached the arbitrary figure of $100. As we all know, most any kind of bump today will do $100 worth of property damage to present-day automobiles.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this bill is to require that all collisions involving motor vehicles in the District of Columbia which result in property damage in excess of $100, or in personal injury of any degree, be reported immediately to the District of Columbia Chief of Police.

Under present law, motor vehicle collisions as described above must be reported within 5 days to the safety responsibility officer of the District of Columbia, who functions as a part of the Department of Motor Vehicles and whose primary responsibility is to determine the financial responsibility of the various parties to such accidents. However, only those collisions which result in personal injury are required to be reported to the Chief of Police. Although the Police Department is required to forward copies of all their accident reports to the safety responsibility officer, the latter does not send his reports to the Police Department.

At a public hearing conducted on July 16, 1962, this committee was informed that during fiscal year 1962, while approximately 31,000 motor vehicle collisions were reported to the safety responsibility officer, only about 22,000 were reported to the Chief of Police. Thus, during this year some 9,000 motor vehicle accidents involving property damage in excess of $100 were never reported to the police.

Two glaring weaknesses are inherent in this situation. First, whereas copies of all the Police Department's reports are sent to the Bureau of Traffic Engineering and Operations of the District of Columbia Highway Department, where they serve to reveal dangerous areas in the city's street system and thus guide the Highway Department in effecting corrective measures, the safety responsibility officer's reports are not adaptable for this purpose and hence are not sent to the Bureau of Traffic Engineering. Thus, the facts involved in 9,000 serious collisions per year are not made available to the Highway Department for this very valuable purpose.

The second major point of weakness which H.R. 1982 seeks to correct is the matter of the chronic offenders among the drivers involved in the 9,000 collisions per year of which the police are not apprised. When any driver becomes involved in accidents with sufficient frequency to cause suspicion as to his fitness to operate a motor vehicle, the safety responsibility officer reports the case to the Director of the Department of Motor Vehicles, who orders a hearing to determine the person's fitness status, both physical and with respect to attitude. An adverse finding as a result of this hearing brings about a suspension or revocation of the offender's permit to drive. However, the safety responsibility officer and the Department of Motor Vehicles do not and cannot act in any way to initiate legal prosecution against any such offender, for this is a police function. It is obvious that a chronically negligent driver, utterly lacking in a normal sense of responsibility, may become involved in frequent motor vehicle collisions and thus become a real hazard to the public; and while suspension or revocation of the operator's permit may be effective in some such cases, certainly in many others nothing short of legal prosecution can provide the protection to which the public is entitled.

H.R. 1982 therefore, is designed to bring about a degree of accident control and traffic safety which is not possible under existing law.

This same bill passed the House last year.

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, that concludes the business of the Committee on the District of Columbia.

MEXICO-UNITED STATES INTERPARLIAMENTARY GROUP

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of section 1, Public Law 86–420, the Chair appoints as members of the U.S. delegation of the Mexico-United States Interparliamentary Group for the meeting to be held in Guanajuato, Republic of Mexico, beginning on Monday, March 18, 1963, the following members on the part of the House: Mr. NIX, of Pennsylvania, chairman; Mr. MONTOYA, of New Mexico; Mr. McDOWELL, of Delaware; Mr. ZABLOCKI, of Wisconsin; Mr. MACDONALD, of Massachusetts; Mr. WRIGHT, of Texas; Mr. JOHNSON, of California; Mr. WHALLEY, of Pennsylvania; Mr. DERWINSKI, of Illinois; Mr. HOEVEN, of Iowa; Mr. NORBLAD, of Oregon; and Mr. SPRINGER, of Illinois.

EXTENSION OF DRAFT LAW

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules I call up the resolution (H. Res. 287) providing for the consideration of H.R. 2438, a bill to extend the induction provisions of the Universal Military Training and Service Act, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

> *Resolved*, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 2438) to extend the induction provisions of the Universal Military Training and Service Act, and for other purposes. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill, and shall continue not to exceed two hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Armed Services, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. TRIMBLE] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. SMITH] and pending that I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 287 provides for the consideration of H.R. 2438, a bill to extend the induction provisions of the Universal Military Training and Service Act, and for other purposes. The resolution provides an open rule with 2 hours of general debate.

H.R. 2438 has five objectives of vital importance to our national security. These five objectives are as follows:

First, it will extend the authority to induct individuals into the Armed Forces from July 1, 1963 to July 1, 1967, a period of 4 years;

Second, it will extend the suspension on strength limitations of the Armed Forces from the present termination date of July 1, 1963 to July 1, 1967;

Third, it will extend the Dependents Assistance Act from July 1, 1963 to July 1, 1967;

Fourth, it will extend the so-called doctors draft law from July 1, 1963 to July 1, 1967; and

Fifth, it will extend from July 1, 1963 to July 1, 1967 the authority to grant special pay to physicians, dentists, and veterinarians who are ordered to active duty before that date.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of House Resolution 287.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time and now yield to my colleague, the gentleman from California [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may use.

Mr. Speaker, as stated by the distinguished gentleman from Arkansas, House Resolution 287 will provide for the consideration of H.R. 2438 on an open rule with 2 hours' time limit. As is usual in connection with this distinguished Armed Services Committee, they have a very fine report setting forth in detail just what the bill does and what the legislation to be considered here will do. The purpose of the legislation is set forth rather succinctly on page 15 where it says:

> The principal purpose of the proposed legislation is to extend the induction authority of the Universal Military Training and Service Act, as amended (50 App. U.S.C. 451 et seq.), and the authority to make special calls for the induction of persons in the medical, dental, and allied specialist categories, until July 1, 1967.

On page 1 of this report, there are listed the five different sections of the law which will be extended for this period of time, all being presently existing laws which are being extended. It came out of the committee, as I understand it, by unanimous vote of 37 to 0. I have received a letter from one member stating that he contemplates offering an amendment to limit the age to 22.

Mr. Speaker, I suppose we have to have legislation like this in the present precarious position that we find ourselves in in the world today. I would certainly hope, Mr. Speaker, that the time will come, if we are at peace, where we can get away from this Universal Military Training and Service Act. This law causes the teenagers to become upset and concerned. As time goes on and they are waiting to finish college or to go into college and they do not know for certain what their future may be, this causes some of them to lose their incentive a little bit, Mr. Speaker, and it is a little difficult for them to make their plans for the future so that they can go ahead in the American way of life which they would like to do. So I do hope, Mr. Speaker, that in due time the situation can be worked out throughout the world so we can do away with this particular act and let American youth of today go ahead and develop their future in accord with what I believe they would like to do.

Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON].

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Iowa makes the point of order that a quorum is not present.

Evidently, a quorum is not present.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 7]

Ashley
Belcher
Bolling
Bromwell
Burkhalter
Celler
Daddario
Davis, Tenn.
Derwinski
Diggs
Dingell
Ellsworth
Flood
Fogarty
Fulton, Tenn.
Glenn
Griffin
Griffiths
Gurney
Healey
Henderson
Joelson
Johnson, Wis.
Kee
Macdonald
Madden
Matthews
May
Michel
Miller, N.Y.
Morrison
O'Brien, Ill.
Patten
Pepper
Philbin
Pike
Powell
Rains
Reid, Ill.
Rhodes, Ariz.
Roosevelt
St. George
Sullivan
Teague, Tex.
Thompson, N.J.
Tupper
Walter
Watson
Wright
Zablocki

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall, 384 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

EXTENSION OF DRAFT LAW

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 2438) to extend the induction provisions of the Universal Military Training and Service Act, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H.R. 2438, with Mr. SIKES in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 20 minutes, and ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, this bill, H.R. 2438, is one of the most vital legislative items the Congress will consider during this session. Its enactment is indispensable to the maintenance of our security.

Let me explain exactly what this bill seeks to accomplish:

First, it will extend until July 1, 1967, the authority to induct men for training and service into the armed services.

Second, it will extend until July 1, 1967, the present law which suspends other provisions of law that impose restrictions on the authorized personnel strengths of the armed services.

Without suspending these provisions of law which impose ceilings on the number of personnel who may serve on active duty in our Armed Forces, the Army would be limited to 837,000 personnel; the Air Force to 502,000; the Navy, 500,000 enlisted personnel, plus the authorized number of line and staff corps officers; and the Marine Corps, 400,000.

These strength ceilings have been suspended since August 3, 1950.

As of December 31, 1962, we had an Army of 952,000 personnel; a Navy of 581,000 enlisted personnel and 74,000 officers; an Air Force of 863,000; and a Marine Corps of 188,000. Thus, if we do not extend the law which suspends these ceilings, the Army would be reduced by 115,000 personnel; the Navy by 81,000 enlisted personnel and a corresponding number of officers; and the Air Force would be reduced by 361,000 personnel.

It is obvious, therefore, that we must continue to suspend these ceilings.

Third, the bill would extend the Dependents Assistance Act to July 1, 1967.

This act is the authority under which we pay enlisted members of the uniformed services who are in pay grades E-4 with 4 or less years of service, E-3's, E-2's, and E-1's an increased basic allowance for quarters because they have dependents.

Under this law, an enlisted man, when he allots $40 of his pay, is entitled to amounts ranging from $55 a month for one dependent, $83 for two dependents, and $105 for three or more dependents. Unless we extend this provision, these enlisted men would only be entitled to a quarters allowance of $45 a month, regardless of the number of their dependents, and, in addition, would only be entitled to such an allowance if quarters were not furnished to the enlisted man.

Fourth, the bill will extend until July 1, 1967, the authority vested in the President to provide for the special selection or induction for service in the Armed Forces of persons qualified in needed medical, dental, veterinary, or allied specialist categories. This is popularly known as the Doctors Draft Act.

Actually what happens is that under the draft law all persons who are deferred for any reason remain liable for induction up to age 35. Almost all medical, dental, and veterinary students are deferred in order to complete their training and under existing law the President, until July 1, 1963, may select for induction persons in this category who are qualified in needed medical, dental, veterinary, or allied specialist categories.

In other words, the President may induct physicians, dentists, veterinarians, or allied specialists who are over the age of 26 and have been deferred to complete their educations without regard to other persons who are in these age groups.

This provision of law must be extended until July 1, 1967, because it is the only way we can meet the medical, dental, and veterinary requirements in our Armed Forces.

Finally, the proposal would extend until July 1, 1967, the authority to grant special pay to physicians, dentists, and veterinarians who are ordered to active duty before that date.

This special pay amounts to $100 for physicians and dentists who serve on active duty for a period of 2 years; $150 a month for physicians and dentists who serve on active duty for more than 2 years; $200 a month for physicians and dentists who serve on active duty for at least 6 years; and $250 a month for those physicians and dentists who have completed at least 10 years of active duty.

Veterinarians are entitled to a flat $100 a month.

I might add that this special pay is applicable to physicians, dentists, and veterinarians for the remainder of the time that they may serve on active duty, but no physician, dentist, or veterinarian entering on active duty after July 1, 1963, would be entitled to this special pay unless we extend the date to July 1, 1967, which is proposed in the bill before us. Without this special pay we would be unable to retain the experienced medical, dental, and veterinarian personnel so vital to the health needs of our Armed Forces.

Now, I would like to briefly describe the operation of the draft law.

All male persons in the United States must register with their local boards after they attain the age of 18.

Men are liable for induction from age 18½ to age 26.

Any person who is deferred remains liable for induction up to age 35.

After an individual registers with his local board, the board classifies each man as to his availability for service. There is an appeal procedure provided in the law for those who feel that they have been improperly classified.

There are also certain statutory deferments provided in the law for college students, which permits them to finish an academic year when they have been ordered for induction, and for high school students which permits them to stay in school to graduate or until they attain the age of 20. You might be interested to know that 363,000 students are now in a deferred status.

The law also permits the President to provide for deferments because of an individual's occupation or because of his dependency status. However, an individual may not be deferred under the law on the basis of marriage alone, except in cases of extreme hardship. Two million men are now deferred because of their dependents; 118,000 men have industrial deferments; and 18,000 men have agricultural deferments.

In addition to deferments for college students, high school students, occupations and dependency, there are also certain statutory deferments for individuals who satisfactorily participate in ROTC programs, as well as Reserve and National Guard activities. This accounts for 912,000 deferments.

In addition to deferments, there are also certain statutory exemptions, including sole-surviving sons, ministers and students of the ministry, and conscientious objectors who are opposed to both combatant and noncombatant service. At present there are 17,000 conscientious objectors, and 71,000 ministers or divinity students. Conscientious objectors may be ordered to perform 2 years of service in the national interest.

Any person who has served honorably on active duty for a period of 1 year or longer is not liable for induction except in time of war or national emergency, and a person who has been discharged for the convenience of the Government is also exempt from induction if he has served at least 6 months on active duty.

Persons who have served satisfactorily as members of the Organized Reserve since February 1, 1951, are also exempt from induction, and, as I have indicated, persons who enlist in the National Guard are deferred from induction so long as they perform satisfactorily in the National Guard. However, these persons remain liable for induction should they cease to perform satisfactorily in the National Guard, up to age 28.

All persons who are inducted are required to serve 24 months on active duty unless sooner released.

At present, the average age of induction is about 23, and men are being called in the following sequence:

First, those men who are declared delinquent for failure to comply with the law;

Second, the next to be called are those needed to fill local board quotas, or men who have volunteered for induction. Men may volunteer for induction at age 17 with parental consent, and without parental consent after age 18. Almost 50 percent of all draft quotas are being met by young men who volunteer for induction;

Third, after that the local boards call nonfathers between the ages of 19 and 26 with the oldest being called first. I might add that this group makes up the major portion of the I-A pool and will fill all needs short of a heavy mobilization; and

Fourth, after the nonfathers are called for induction, local boards, if necessary, would order fathers in I-A between the ages of 19 and 26 with the oldest first, then men over 26 who have been deferred, and finally men between the ages of 18½ and 19.

Insofar as physicians and dentists are concerned, the law provides them with an opportunity to apply for commission and they are then ordered to active duty in a grade commensurate with their professional education, experience and ability.

These are the major provisions of the Universal Military Training and Service Act which has now been in almost continuous operation since 1940.

For a brief period after the 1940 act expired in March of 1947, we did not have a draft law. We soon found that we could not maintain our Armed Forces on a voluntary basis, and in June of 1948 we enacted the Selective Service Act, which was renamed the Universal Military Training and Service Act in 1951.

Thus, for practical purposes, we have had an almost continuous draft law since 1940.

From the testimony we received from the Secretary of Defense and the Joint Chiefs of Staff, we know that we could not maintain our present recruiting rates without the draft law.

During fiscal 1962, we inducted 157,000 men, almost twice the number that had been originally planned. To this must be added the thousands of men who voluntarily enlisted in the regular services or in a Reserve component.

Without the stimulus of a draft law, many of these men would not have volunteered for service.

Without the draft, it is clear that we could not get the needed manpower for our armed services.

Without the special provisions in the draft law dealing with physicians, dentists, and veterinarians we would be unable to meet the health needs of our armed services.

I might also add that the special pay for physicians, dentists, and veterinarians seeks to compensate them for their expensive educational training and the years of service they spend in colleges and universities, while their line counterparts of comparable ages are advancing in grade and obtaining longevity credit on active duty.

Certainly we must continue to suspend the strength ceilings that would otherwise require a reduction in the size of the Army, Navy, and Air Force.

And, finally, I am sure there is complete agreement that we must extend the Dependents Assistance Act so long as we maintain a draft law.

Mr. Chairman, no one likes a draft law. But, I am sure that almost all of us will agree that we have no practical alternative.

First, about 1,400,000 young men register for the draft each year;

Second, at any one time there are about 9½ million men between the age of 18½ and 26 who are registered and eligible for classification;

Third, by the time any age group attains the age of 26, about 58 percent of these young men will have served in the Armed Forces in one capacity or another; and

Fourth, the remaining 42 percent will consist of those who are physically or mentally disqualified, fathers, agricultural and industrial employees in essential occupations, and those who are exempt from induction by law, such as ministerial students and sole-surviving sons.

I sincerely hope the House will pass this bill unanimously, and again demonstrate to the world our firm determination to remain strong and ready, at all times.

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. AVERY. I apologize for interrupting the gentleman during his statement, but I do have a question which relates to the matter he has been discussing before the committee.

I was in my home State a few weeks ago to meet with a group of young people. They were visiting me about joining the Peace Corps and related their contemplation as connected with their military obligations. I said:

> You understand that joining the Peace Corps is not a substitute for your military obligation?

They responded like this:

> Yes. But we understand by the time our Peace Corps service is over, Congress will act, and our service in the Corps may be counted in lieu of our military obligation.

The reason I ask the question at this time, I think the record ought to be made indelibly clear if this has been contemplated by the Committee on Armed Services or suggested by the administration.

Mr. VINSON. It has never been discussed by the Committee on Armed Services, and it is not contemplated by the Committee on Armed Services. In addition the gentleman has just stated good reasons why the draft should be extended 4 years instead of 2 years.

Mr. AVERY. I agree with the gentleman. If this is being used as a recruiting device by the Peace Corps, I deplore it.

Mr. VINSON. The gentleman need not worry. No man will be exempted on account of being in the Peace Corps.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. What was that good reason for extending it 4 years?

Mr. VINSON. The good reason is: First, it has been done three different times. When the gentleman offers an amendment later on——

Mr. GROSS. It may be offered by somebody else. I will offer it if someone else does not.

Mr. VINSON. We will discuss it at that time, and I will offer satisfactory reasons to the House why it should be extended 4 years instead of 2 years.

Mr. GROSS. Why not explain that now to the House?

Mr. VINSON. I will do that under the 5-minute rule. You can rest assured that there is no contemplation on the part of the Committee on Armed Services to give any consideration at all to granting an exception by statute to any member who joins the Peace Corps.

Mr. AVERY. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. VINSON. The testimony we received from the Secretary of Defense and from the Joint Chiefs of Staff all was to the effect that it is absolutely essential, with world conditions as they are, that the draft be extended. I hope the committee will vote to extend it for 4 years. Each one of these laws must be extended 4 years. So, therefore, if the Committee this afternoon decides to accept an amendment to make it 2 years, it should apply to each one of these extensions. But I certainly hope when we debate that we can convince you we are on firm ground to let it remain like we have done in the three previous extensions of the draft.

The draft has been in operation since 1940, practically. There was only a short period when this country did not have the draft. We have agreed on this 4-year program. It enables the young men back in the Nation to map out their course without as much uncertainty as the 2-year proposal would create. So I hope when the proposition comes up of 2 years it will be the wisdom of the House not to accept the 2 years.

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. LINDSAY. I thank the gentleman.

I just want to ask the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Armed Services whether he proposes to discuss at all the 6-month program.

Mr. VINSON. If an inductee or volunteer serves 6 months in the Armed Services, he is not liable to the draft.

Mr. LINDSAY. I understand that; but what is the future of the 6-month program?

Mr. VINSON. We will extend it, I am confident. I have referred that bill to the distinguished gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. HÉBERT], and on Wednesday of this week we will start hearings on extending the 6-month program.

Mr. LINDSAY. The proposed 4-year extension of the draft has nothing to do with it, then?

Mr. VINSON. Nothing at all; it has no relation to it. If a boy volunteers for 6 months under the law, he gets deferred from the draft.

Mr. LINDSAY. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. I would like to advise the distinguished chairman of some difficulty that I have had in my congressional district in relation to the 6-month program. Now, I have had numerous young men come to see me and inform me that the list of those who seek entrance into the 6-month program is so long that they see no possibility of ever being granted deferment.

Mr. VINSON. Well, as I stated to the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. LINDSAY] this whole matter will be opened up by our distinguished colleague from Louisiana [Mr. HÉBERT] on Wednesday. We will go into it thoroughly. I certainly hope that the committee will see fit, in their wisdom, to recommend an extension of it, and I feel confident that they will.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. May I also suggest, not alone extend the program but also the number of young men that can enter the program.

Mr. VINSON. Yes.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. VINSON. Let me give the House this information. There are about 1.4 million young men registered for the draft each year. At any one time, and at this time, there are over 9.5 million men between the age of 18½ to 26 who are registered and eligible for classification, and by the time any age group attains the age of 26, about 58 percent of those registered either enter the service under the draft or as volunteers.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. OSMERS].

Mr. OSMERS. Mr. Chairman, the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Armed Services has given a very clear and complete explanation of the bill before us which extends the Draft Act. As Members of the House we have no real choice except to extend the Draft Act in view of our defense needs. An amendment will doubtless be offered to reduce the length of the extension from 4 years as proposed by the committee to 2 years. It would be most unwise for us to extend the draft for less than 4 years, for two very simple reasons: First, a 4-year extension enables the young men affected to better plan for their futures and, second, of course, it seems most unlikely to me that a drastic change will occur in our defense manpower needs during the next 2 or 3 years. For these reasons, we should extend the act for 4 years.

With respect to the 6-month active duty Reserve program, the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON] has announced that a subcommittee headed by the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. HÉBERT] will start hearings on this program on Wednesday.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, in view of the fact that the gentleman made some reference to the 6-month training program, the committee should understand that there is imposed a 5½-year Reserve obligation on the person who takes the 6 months' training.

Mr. OSMERS. The gentleman from Georgia has wisely added this important fact to the remarks he made in response to a previous question about the 6 months' program.

Mr. Chairman, some of us who originally sponsored the 6 months' active-duty Reserve program have concluded that the program is not now fulfilling its basic intended purpose.

Many Members of the House may have forgotten but this 6-months' active duty, 6½-year Reserve program when first proposed was to apply only to young men between 18 and 19½ years of age. The thinking behind the original proposal was to provide a means for young men to get their active duty obligation fulfilled between high school and college, or between high school and joining the work force.

As we all now know, by raising the age limit to 26 for the 6-month training program, we defeated to a considerable extent one of its major purposes. We now find that young men who have graduated from college at age 21, 22, and 23 are seeking places in the 6-month program as a substitute for serving 2 years under the Draft Act. We cannot criticize any young man for this for the simple reason that present law gives him a clear right to apply for the 6-month program.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. OSMERS. Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ARENDS] yield me 1 additional minute?

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. OSMERS. Mr. Chairman, it is my hope that the Hébert subcommittee will give very careful consideration to reducing the age of those admitted into the 6-month program. It might also add to the effectiveness of the program if the active duty period is increased from 6 months to a year. This would still allow a young man to get his active military duty out of the way before he starts college or his career yet provide for a longer active duty period.

Mr. Chairman, in conclusion, let me say that the Nation owes a debt of gratitude to our volunteer local draft boards who administer the Draft Act. Throughout the entire Nation, these boards perform wonderful service to the Nation and its youth. Without the dedicated help of these citizens the administration of this act would be impossible.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. GUBSER].

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Chairman, naturally I rise in support of this bill.

I would like to point out that these hearings, though concluded in a very few days, afforded every person interested in this bill the opportunity to present his views.

Mr. Chairman, we heard conscientious conscientious objectors and I suspect we heard some who were not quite so conscientious. We heard people who believe that the road toward peace necessarily involves a demonstration of our good will by abandoning the draft and universal military training. We heard these views and every other shade of opinion that the mind of man could conceive.

The interesting part about all that testimony which was patiently listened to by members of our committee was that we did not hear one single new point against the draft that we did not hear 4 years ago.

Mr. Chairman, I remember one of the points raised 4 years ago was the fact that we could get civilians to replace military men. We heard further that we are not properly utilizing our manpower.

I sat through lengthy hearings as a member of a Subcommittee on Manpower Utilization, headed by the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PRICE]. Though we found room for improvement in the utilization of manpower, though our report did influence the military, did effect some very notable improvements, we still found that it was absolutely impossible for the needs of the military forces to be fulfilled except for the Universal Military Training Act.

Mr. Chairman, we heard a lot of talk about how military men were being utilized in a servant status. As we went into that subject in great depth we found that most of it was just talk, and there was little abuse of this situation by the military.

Mr. Chairman, we also found at the same time that the needs of the military must be geared to military requirements and we could not expect civilians to perform a military task.

And so I say in conclusion that there were fair, adequate, and complete hearings held on this bill. There is a requirement for the extension of this draft. Manpower is being efficiently utilized, progress is being made toward even better utilization. We should extend this draft for 4 more years.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GUBSER. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Has the gentleman been over to the Pentagon lately to see how military personnel is used for purposes other than combat duty?

Mr. GUBSER. I have been to the Pentagon quite frequently. I would not say that it is the most perfect example of utilization of manpower that one could find, but I would say that probably it is a lot better than we are giving it credit for.

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GUBSER. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. BECKER. Among the people who came before our committee as conscientious objectors I think it is interesting to note that some of those conscientious objectors who came before our committee and opposed any bill are on the Federal payroll right here in Washington.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California [Mr. Gubser] has expired.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 8 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Gross].

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I shall vote to extend this for 2 years, but I do not see how I can vote for an extension of 4 years. The gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. Osmers] made a good argument for an extension for 2 years. The chairman added to that argument for a 2-year extension. On the grounds that the Hébert committee is going to go into the 6 months' training program and may increase it to 1 year.

Mr. VINSON. That has no relationship to this bill.

Mr. GROSS. It has every relationship to this bill, because the conscription program is used as a club to get men into the present 6 months' program. With the conscription program, and its 2 years of obligated service, the gentleman well knows that it is used in that fashion. It is one of the prime reasons for the continuation of the conscription program. There is every reason to extend this for 2 years, and no solid reason for extending it for 4 years. There has been talk about planning. If this is a valid argument why do we not establish all governmental programs on a 4-year basis and appropriate for 4 years? That argument falls of its own weight.

Mr. Chairman, I should like to ask the chairman a question or two. As I understand, we have some 2.5 million men in the various branches of the uniformed services; is that about correct?

Mr. VINSON. I think the strength of the three services totals about 2,700,000.

Mr. GROSS. When does the gentleman expect to cut back on the 2,700,000 in view of all the missiles that are available?

Mr. VINSON. With world conditions as they are now I think the gentleman will agree with me that it would be very unwise to talk about cutting back the size of the armed services.

Mr. GROSS. I will say to the gentleman that it is about time that somebody gave some attention to it, because in this country the taxpayers cannot continue to support these huge conventional forces and at the same time stockpile and overstockpile nuclear warheads. I wish somebody in the armed services would explain this to me, the need for these huge conventional forces if we are going to fight a war with nuclear weapons? Can the gentleman tell me how he relates these two?

Mr. VINSON. I think it would be shortsighted on the part of the Government to put all of its weapons in one basket. I think that to be on safe ground we must have the capability of meeting the challenge of conventional warfare as well as nuclear warfare. Notwithstanding the fact that we have a great many missiles, nevertheless the enemy might not fight with missiles. Therefore, if you put all your eggs in that basket you could be helpless. We must have a ground force, an Air Force, a Navy, a Marine Corps, missiles, and all of these things.

Mr. GROSS. Let me ask the gentleman this question: How many divisions does the United States have in NATO today?

Mr. VINSON. Five or six.

Mr. GROSS. How many total divisions are there in NATO?

Mr. VINSON. Twenty-four, I believe.

Mr. GROSS. Does the gentleman think that 24 divisions can contest in conventional warfare with 240 divisions?

Mr. VINSON. It all depends on how they are used. If they use the ground forces, I think we can give a pretty good account of ourselves. We are well armed, we are not cowards, and we are going to fight if necessary.

Mr. GROSS. But if these troops do not use nuclear warheads, how can 24 divisions compete with 240 divisions?

Mr. VINSON. I find myself today in much disagreement with our learned friend from Iowa, whom I oftentimes follow. He attempts to lead me down the primrose path of defending this country with one kind of defense. That is the way to defeat.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman knows I am not suggesting that. However, I hope the gentleman will take me with him on one of those trips through the White House rose garden. I would like to take a sniff of them and find out what goes on there.

Mr. VINSON. I am now trying to lead the gentleman in the rose garden of the House.

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. BECKER. I think the gentleman should point out to us the change in the size of the military forces that came about in the advent of this administration. Prior to the advent of this administration we were building on the basis that we would at any time use all the forces at our command. President Eisenhower said at the time of the crisis of 1959 we would use any military force at our command, including nuclear weapons. But the new course now is to have more conventional forces to meet the great conventional challenge of the Soviet Union. This requires more manpower. Under the old concept it required less manpower. That is why we started a number of years ago to build what was called a pentomic army, to reduce the size of the military.

Mr. GROSS. What has happened to the men who have been made available through the recent abandonment of foreign bases?

Mr. BECKER. If the gentleman will let me follow this thought, under this concept now we must realize we have let the enemy choose the weapons and the kind of warfare. He is going to fight a conventional war, so we are to prepare for a conventional war. Therefore we need all these additional weapons and manpower to meet that challenge.

Mr. GROSS. I did not know we are actually fighting the Russians.

Mr. BECKER. We are not, except that there is the threat.

Mr. GROSS. All right, but if our troops in Europe are going to fight a conventional war with the Russians we are whipped before we start.

Mr. BECKER. I do not agree with the gentleman that we are going to fight a conventional war at any time with anybody.

I would say this, that the concept that we were following a few years ago is one that I believe many military leaders believe is the ideal one, namely, that we always hold the threat of using nuclear weapons, if we are attacked anywhere.

Mr. GROSS. Well, then, what is the shooting all about?

Mr. BECKER. That is a different version. I cannot tell you that. Maybe the chairman can answer that one—I cannot.

Mr. GROSS. I would like to have the chairman—I would like to have somebody—tell me how it is planned to fight the next war and how this country expects to win the next war unless our forces use thermonuclear weapons.

Mr. VINSON. It is my belief that the philosophy that there is more than one way to fight a war is a sound philosophy and that philosophy, as has been so ably pointed out by the gentleman from New York [Mr. Becker] was inaugurated some years ago. There is today in the Department a different concept which is something that worries me and it hurts me to see my learned friend, the gentleman from Iowa, falling into the trap of this new concept of this new philosophy. I, on the other hand, adhere to the previous and the older philosophy and I hope the gentleman from Iowa will get back on the track and stay there.

Mr. GROSS. I am on the track. It is others who are off the track and trying to have it both ways.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. Pirnie].

Mr. PIRNIE. Mr. Chairman, the real question before the committee is the extension of the draft and its necessity.

Mr. Chairman, current and foreseeable national defense requirements impose upon the Congress the vital responsibility of maintaining Armed Forces exceeding 2½ million men.

From experience we have learned that these manning levels cannot be sustained by enlistments alone. We allowed the Selective Service Act to expire after World War II, but were obliged to reinstate the program only 17 months later. Volunteers could not fill the gap and since that time Congress has found it necessary to continue the Selective Service System.

The more modest manpower requirements of the cold war permit a relatively high degree of selectivity. Thus, all our young men are not forced to fulfill military obligations. It is said that many are classified, but few are chosen. However, this is not the measure of the success of the legislation. Although the draft today does not impose universal military training, it has served effectively to stimulate widespread voluntary participation in other branches of the Military Establishment. Including all forms of military service such as the ROTC, National Guard, and Reserves, 58 percent of American men under 27 years of age have had or are undergoing military training. The remainder were either rated ineligible because of rigid peacetime standards or were deferred because they were fathers or students.

Few claim that the system produces complete equity, but even fewer say that it has not served the Nation well, both in war and in peace. Furthermore, no acceptable alternative has yet been presented which will assure accomplishment of the required objectives. No doubt future adjustments will be necessary, but for the next 4 years, we will need the selective service system. H.R. 2438 is essential to the national defense and merits our complete support.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PUCINSKI].

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Chairman, at the appropriate time it is my intention to offer an amendment to this bill being reported out today by the Armed Services Committee, which would provide that no person shall be inducted into the Armed Forces pursuant to this act except as provided in sections 5(a) to 6(h) of this title after he has attained his 22d birthday. But this paragraph shall not apply to any period of national emergency hereafter proclaimed by the President.

Mr. Chairman, in offering the amendment to H.R. 2438, sponsored by the distinguished chairman of the Armed Services Committee, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON], one cannot help having a very distinct feeling of how David felt when he met Goliath. I yield to no one in my respect for the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON].

I am convinced that when the final chapter of our Nation's victory over international communism is written, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON] and the members of the Armed Services Committees on both sides of the aisle will be listed among the chief architects of that great victory.

It has been my great pleasure, my honor, and my privilege to support this committee in virtually every single bill it has brought to the House because I know how diligently this committee has worked to preserve that very precious commodity of freedom which we Americans love so dearly. In this particular instance, however, I hope the chairman will not oppose my amendment.

We now have in this country 10 million young men registered under the draft. We are now receiving, and will receive even more with the baby boom now coming in, one and one-half million additional young men every year as registrants under the draft. Testimony before this committee shows that in this fiscal year, 1964, we will draft only 76,000 young men out of the reservoir of 10 million; and half of those 76,000 will come from volunteers.

In each of the 4 succeeding fiscal years we expect to draft into the Armed Forces only 90,000 young men a year, again out of a backlog of well over 10 million; and, again, more than half of that 90,000 will come from volunteers. Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I submit that while I am basically for this bill—and whether my amendment is adopted or not I shall vote for this bill—I think we are imposing a very cruel hardship on the young men of this country by keeping them in the shadow of the draft for 7½ years, from the age of 18½ to 26—when we cannot possibly use all of these men in the Armed Forces short of a major catastrophe.

My amendment permits the President to go back to the old law any time he feels such action is necessary. Before my committee, the House Labor Committee, we have ample testimony to show that there are in this country in the unemployed labor force 800,000 young men of draft age.

Employers have written to me repeatedly saying they hesitate to hire a young man of draft age for two basic reasons: because they lose him to the draft; but more important, because the employer must commit himself to a 2-year obligation once this young man goes into the service; and, therefore, employers prefer not to hire young men of draft age.

Under my amendment cutting it down to 22 years, a young man reaching the age of 22 would be exempt from service thereafter unless there was a national emergency. He would remain on the rolls but would be called only in the event of an emergency proclaimed by the President. I know we cannot completely eliminate the draft at this time. Everyone knows that the draft stimulates voluntary enlistment. My amendment would not interfere with that concept one iota; you would still have five million men between the ages of 18½ to 22 in the reservoir. These younger men would stimulate voluntary enlistments but it would give the older men a chance at permanent employment and an opportunity to plan their lives in a more orderly manner once they reached their 22d birthday and have not previously been called up for the draft. After their 22d birthday, they would be exempt except if they had taken a previous deferment. In the case of the latter, they would remain subject to the draft just as they are under existing law.

Why in heaven's name keep them under the draft until they are 26? We would actually be doing a great favor to the college students. My amendment does not disturb the formula at all. A young man who is in college and is now subject to the draft can get a deferment; but once he gets that deferment he remains liable to military service until the age of 35. When this young man gets through with his college training, gets his degree and goes out to practice law or whatever he wants to do, he is subject to draft until he is 35 years old. Under my amendment, it is true, these young men, if summoned for the draft and enrolled in college before reaching their 22d birthday, could continue to take the deferment as they can under existing law and be subject to the draft at a later age.

However, if this young man has not been called up by the time he reaches his 22d birthday, and he is attending college, the young man then is exempt from the draft, as would any other young man. We would have parity between those going to college and those not fortunate enough to go to college. We would be giving the armed services the young men they need instead of the older men.

In Illinois my attention was called to a directive that was sent to all draft boards urging them to be as lenient as possible on deferments, because in Illinois we have a backlog of 60,000 1-A men, when we are drafting only 230 a month from the whole State, half of them volunteers. So they said to the draft board, "Be as lenient as possible in deferments." But this is not meeting the problem. A deferment still leaves them subject to the draft at a later age.

Under existing law there is some question as to whether or not the President has the right to change an age bracket. Perhaps he does. But the sense of Congress can fortify the whole concept. It is my hope that this amendment will be accepted so we can go on record as being for a lowering of the draft age. While at the same time we serve notice on our allies that we are ready to help, and on our enemies, that we are going to keep our armed services ready.

As reasonable men, we can see the havoc this prolonged draft call is creating to millions of young Americans. I do not know of a single young man who is not ready and willing to serve his country. I do not know of any young men who are unwilling to make their sacrifice. But the fact remains, Why keep these men on the hook, so-called, up to the age of 26 when there is not a chance in the world under the existing backlog of recruits that we can use them.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PUCINSKI. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. VINSON. As I understood the gentleman's statement, in his proposed amendment he wants to change the draft age from 18½ to 22 years?

Mr. PUCINSKI. Thas it correct, I want them subject to the draft at age 18½ and exempt from the draft when they reach their 22d birthday if they have not been called up by then.

Mr. VINSON. The law today is 18½ to 26?

Mr. PUCINSKI. That is correct. If we bring the maximum age limit down to 22, any older young man, whether he is in college or out of college, and he has reached his 22d birthday, if he has not been drafted by that time he is then excused. You are going to have to do this sooner or later, you might as well realize that.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. Goodell].

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Chairman, I simply wish to express my agreement with one aspect of the remarks made by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Pucinski].

We Republicans on the Committee on Education and Labor last Friday presented to the public and to the Congress what we called a constructive alternative to the Youth Opportunities Employment Act. We listed some seven recommendations to replace the President's proposal for a Youth Conservation Corps. One aspect was trying to encourage enlistments and selection of some of the younger boys in this 18- and 19-year-old category, who in certain parts of our country are adrift, looking for job training, looking for jobs. They are uncertain as to when they will be called. This does now present a problem, and it is very acute with many of these young people.

I am not sure but what the amendment to be offered by the gentleman from Illinois will involve some other complications. If so, I intend to offer a softer type of amendment, which will simply say it is the sense of Congress, if possible, that they select younger men for the draft.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOODELL. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. QUIE. I want to commend the gentleman from New York on his position here, because from the studies we made in our subcommittee on youthful employment you can see there were young people 18 years of age who did not know exactly what they ought to be doing, and they have not seen fit to enlist, and I think with the draft at an earlier age it would lessen youthful unemployment and present a requirement to young men which would lessen unemployment.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOODELL. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. VINSON. As I understood the gentleman, he proposes some amendment with reference to the policy section.

Mr. GOODELL. That is correct.

Mr. VINSON. Would the gentleman be kind enough to let us see what that amendment is?

Mr. GOODELL. I certainly will, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. VINSON. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. GOODELL. I will read the amendment to the Members in the remaining time I have:

On page 1, and after line 6, insert the following new subsection:

> Section 1 of the Universal Military Training and Service Act is amended by inserting the following subsection (f): "It is the sense of the Congress that, in the selection of men for induction for training and service under this Act, greater emphasis should be given to the selection of the younger registrant non-fathers who have not entered regular employment or continued their formal education."

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentlewoman from Illinois [Mrs. Reid] may extend her remarks at this point in the Record.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mrs. REID of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I am in favor of H.R. 2438, which calls for extension of the Universal Military Training and Service Act, since I feel that such extension of the draft is necessary if we are to maintain our military strength and thereby insure our national security.

As a mother of two sons—one currently serving in the Marines and another certain to be eligible for military service in the near future—I would be the first to vote against this measure if I believed that present world conditions permitted a weakening of our defenses.

I shall, of course, strive for peace in the world—but peace with honor and with freedom—so as to make any further extension of the draft unnecessary in the future. In the meantime, however, I am convinced that it is vital to the preservation of our freedom to remain strong militarily—especially when we are faced with the Communist menace only 90 miles from our shores; and I believe that extension of the draft is vital to maintaining that strength.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. Reuss].

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate, as always, the courtesy of the great chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Vinson], in giving me this time, and I take this time because it seems to me there is an important issue of policy present in the bill before us.

Mr. Chairman, I intend at the proper time to offer a very simple amendment which would extend the draft not for 4 years but instead for 2 years, so that the next Congress, the 89th Congress, may likewise have an opportunity to examine and debate the underlying questions involved. I say that as one who, ever since he has been here, has supported the draft law, in 1955 and 1959.

But I think that there are present in the world today some considerations which were not present on those earlier occasions.

If we look at the nations of Europe, our friends and allies over there, seized, as many of them are, with the new nationalism, we hear them making demands that they conduct a larger part of our joint defense themselves. Well, the natural corollary of this is that they ought to commit more ground troops, particularly to the defense of the great ground mass of Europe. If that were done in the next 2 or 3 years, the need for an armed service level at our present level would diminish.

Secondly, I am glad to know that the Committee on Armed Services shortly is going to consider the question of pay and emoluments generally for our armed services. Action in this field could mean that the armed services become a more attractive voluntary career, and hence that the draft would one day prove to be unnecessary. I am certainly not trying to predict that in 1965 we can do away with the draft. But I am saying that the 89th Congress, in 1965, ought to have the opportunity to reach its own judgment on that.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REUSS. Very briefly. I only have 5 minutes.

Mr. LAIRD. I share the position of my colleague from Wisconsin and can well understand his concern that the draft activities be reviewed every 2 years. However, in the event that his amendment fails, it is important to me as a member of the Defense Appropriations Committee that this legislation be enacted. If the 2-year amendment fails, I will then be in a position where I must support the 4-year extension.

Mr. REUSS. I agree with the gentleman from Wisconsin that it is important that the draft law be extended and be continued for 2 years. In the case of my own vote on this question, if and when we come to that point in the proceedings, I am going to be guided very largely by the debate between then and now, but in principle I certainly agree with the gentleman.

The one reason that appears from the committee report and the testimony for not amending the bill so that the draft law would be continued for 2 years rather than 4 years is that—and here I quote the Department of Defense:

> To do so would create an element of uncertainty.

I am not sure I know just exactly what this means. But I take it the element of uncertainty that would be created would be the possibility that in 1965, due to world events, a draft would not be necessary. Common sense tells me that it is better to be uncertain about whether things will get better than certain that there will be no improvement.

Mr. Chairman, I note also that there is considerable uncertainty now in the life patterns of our young people between the ages of 18 and 25. I do not think that amending the bill to create a 2-year extension rather than a 4-year extension would in any way add to the uncertainty.

Mr. Chairman, the 89th Congress—the one that will be sitting in 1965—is entitled to the opportunity to debate and to vote on the draft.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. Kastenmeier].

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman yield in order to permit me to ask the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services a question?

Mr. KASTENMEIER. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, how many men have been deferred now?

Mr. VINSON. Well, of course, they have been deferred in different groups and for different reasons.

Mr. GAVIN. In different categories?

Mr. VINSON. I said in my statement what those groups were. I do not have the figures right before me, but I did give those figures.

Mr. GAVIN. What is the total?

Mr. VINSON. My recollection is that in one group there were 3,500,000; in another group there were 2 million, and in another group of students there were 363,000. I am sorry I cannot pinpoint the groups more accurately at this time.

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Chairman, 4 years ago when we considered whether or not to extend the Universal Military Training and Service Act for another 4 years, it was quite properly pointed out that we are living in a dangerous world and the dangers are not apt to be significantly lessened in the foreseeable future. Today, we are no closer to a peaceful settlement of world problems than we were in 1959.

It is a big jump, however, from the proposition that we are living in dangerous times to the conclusion that we must maintain a permanent system of military conscription. In fact, no one of those who support the extension for another 4 years of the draft maintains that conscription ought to be permanent. The fact that we extend the draft for only 4 years at a time is an indication of this feeling. We in America have traditionally resisted the concept of a permanent large Military Establishment. We may tolerate the draft, but we do not approve of it.

The question, then, is not whether we need to maintain strong defenses in today's uncertain world but rather whether we need to extend the draft for an additional 4 years.

Is the draft bill necessary? Many people say "No." Many others say "Yes." Between these divergent opinions, however, there remains a large area of agreement.

First. We can all agree that, in the present world situation, we must maintain a strong, efficient military force.

Second. We can all agree that we must spend as much money as necessary to maintain a sufficient military force. At the same time we would all agree, I think, that we should spend no more money than absolutely necessary to provide adequately for the defense of this Nation. Money that is wasted, or that is not used as efficiently as possible, does nothing to add to our safety; it only puts more of a burden on the taxpayer.

Third. We can all agree that the draft is not a desirable way to raise men for military duty. All three branches of the service have said this many times, as have the Armed Services Committees of both Houses of Congress. The most that can be said for the draft is that it is necessary.

Mr. Chairman, it had been my intention to offer an amendment similar to that which my distinguished colleage, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. Ruess] plans to offer, but I shall not offer my own amendment. Rather, I shall be pleased to support the amendment which will be offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. Reuss]. My amendment would have differed only insofar as it would have created a Presidential commission to study the problem relating to manpower utilization so that, if possible, it could then be determined whether in the years ahead it would be possible to phase out the draft.

Mr. Chairman, for one thing, every time we extend the draft for an additional 4 years, we increase the likelihood that the draft will become permanent, that the 4-year review will be pro forma. Yet there seems to be unanimous agreement that this is what we do not want.

Second, the review of our military establishments, published in what has become known as the Cordiner report, is about to bear fruit. Some time soon hearings will be held on a new military pay raise bill, designed to make military life and military service more equitably compensated, and therefore more attractive. This bill appears to have a good chance for passage. What effect it would have on the enlistment and reenlistment rates in the services cannot now be predicted with any degree of accuracy. But certainly within 2 years the effect will be felt.

Thirdly, even more than was true 4 years ago, modern warfare has become a technical and exacting business. Since 1959 we have launched a fleet of nuclear submarines, which require the greatest degree of skill to man on the part of every member of the crew. Since 1959 we have installed an entire arsenal of missiles, including intercontinental ballistic missiles, that are launched and directed by the use of complex electronic equipment. It is far clearer now than it was in 1959 that large, mass armies no longer are the mainstay of a nation's defenses. Even in those areas of the world where the use of conventional weapons is practical—and the present administration has placed much stress on the need for flexibility—the troops that are needed are small groups of highly trained fighters, expert in the use of ever more sophisticated weapons.

It is important, therefore, to ask in 1963 whether the draft serves any useful purpose in meeting today's military needs. There are many who believe there is no clear-cut answer. I am not proposing to end the draft immediately. Let us err, if we must, on the side of caution. I am suggesting, however, that we must find out if it is necessary. I believe 2 years is enough time to find out. A civilian study would, in my opinion, eliminate any possibility that competing interests of the different services, and the understandable human desire to supervise as many others as possible, will color the report.

The draft is an expensive way to run a defense program. It is expensive in terms of the people it takes away from constructive work for largely nonproductive labors. It is expensive in terms of taxpayer dollars; to train boys to be soldiers and then to have to train new boys to do the same jobs because the old ones have returned to civilian life is a waste of money.

This Nation spends over a billion dollars a week on defense. At such a rate the taxpayers have a right to ask that their money not be spent wastefully. In terms of maintaining an efficient defense program, the draft may very well be wasteful. At least we ought to find out.

I propose the establishment of a President's Commission on the Utilization of Military Manpower which would be made up of civilian experts in the field of military manpower procurement—former Secretaries of Defense, business executives, educators, psychologists, students of military affairs. This Commission would conduct a study of our present military situation, our military manpower needs, and the possible alternatives to the draft for meeting our manpower defense needs. Among other questions, the Commission would seek to answer the following:

First. What tasks do the 2.7 million men in our armed services now perform? Which of these are necessary from a military point of view; which would better be performed by civilian employees.

Second. Are men in the services adequately trained for the tasks they are now performing? How long should it take to train men to use the modern equipment for our defense? Can it be done in 6 months? In two years? How long after being trained should a serviceman serve in order to be worth the money spent to train him?

Third. What alternatives to the draft as a method of encouraging enlistment and reenlistment can be devised? What positive incentives can be offered. What would be the effect of a pay raise? How much of a pay raise would be needed to provide adequate incentive? What would the cost of such positive incentives be to the taxpayer?

Fourth. How many men would be used in a modern war? Do we now have more men under arms than we could possibly need in any foreseeable conflict? What exactly are our military manpower needs?

Fifth. What are the effects of the draft on our civilian economy? Are the armed services taking needed skills out of our Nation's manpower pool? Could these skills be supplied to the military any other way?

Sixth. What are the psychological effects of the draft? How does the military life effect those who are drafted? Those who are not? Are those who are drafted efficient soldiers, or does their unwillingness to be in uniform make them a drag on the whole Military Establishment?

These are the questions that require answers if the American people are going to get the maximum protection for their defense dollar. Merely extending the draft another 4 years does nothing toward answering the questions that remain unanswered. We must know if the draft, which no one really wants, is necessary in today's world. Our Nation must not be burdened with either the cost or the disruptive effects of conscription 1 day longer than necessary.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. Kastenmeier] has expired.

Mr. **ARENDS.** Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute to answer a question.

Mr. **LAIRD.** Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. **KASTENMEIER.** I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. **LAIRD.** Mr. Chairman, I am sure that my colleague from Wisconsin will admit that it is necessary for us to extend the draft at this time and if the 2-year amendment does fail, I hope he will join with us in extending the draft. It is absolutely necessary that some action be taken. Does the gentleman concur in that point of view?

Mr. **KASTENMEIER.** Mr. Chairman, let me say this to the gentleman from Wisconsin; it is my position that a 2-year extension should be enacted.

Mr. **LAIRD.** And the gentleman feels that it is necessary?

Mr. **KASTENMEIER.** I feel it is most desirable that the extension be for 2 years.

Mr. **LAIRD.** But the gentleman feels it is necessary to extend it for 2 years?

Mr. **KASTENMEIER.** For 2 years.

Mr. **LAIRD.** But if that amendment does fail it is my hope that those of us on the floor of the House who do favor the 2-year review will agree that we cannot adjourn this Congress without extending the draft. This is particularly true in this year 1963 with the cold war challenge we as a nation face.

Mr. **KASTENMEIER.** Let me say to the gentleman from Wisconsin that I have thought that the draft in some form will be extended, and I think the gentleman need have no fear on that point.

Mr. **ARENDS.** Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Alger].

Mr. **ALGER.** Mr. Chairman, I am interested in getting answers to questions that puzzle me. Of course, I recognize that we all start at the same point, that we need military strength, we need manpower; people must serve and if they will not serve voluntarily, they have to be conscripted. But there are some things that disturb me. I have been reading the hearings as much as I could, since coming on the floor. For example, on page 168 and the next few pages thereafter there is the testimony of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. Curtis]. He raised some questions and problems that I cannot answer; and I am not arguing with anyone so much as I am arguing with myself. I am trying to find out. These bother me.

We are disrupting our youth and their education. We are encouraging draft dodging in every possible way, just as though we want them to dodge the draft. Of course, we do not want that. Is this universal military training or is it not? As legislation, this is an extension of a wartime bill. We are affecting many civilian programs and certainly the educational institutions in our country. We are taking 90-percent men who will be noncombatant and do not need to have A-1 physical condition. Take these men who are driving staff cars. They are drafted to do what? Drive cars? Be PX salesmen, clerks, warehousemen, cooks, and countless other services. We need to get the best men we can and use their civilian skills. These jobs can be done as civilians. Why take a man out of civilian life and make him do something he would do as a civilian?

Has the committee gone into why the Seabee technique was disbanded? Why have they not considered the use of men who do the same jobs, as civilians. They may not measure up physically, but could run bulldozers. This is but one example. That is what we took them in for, to do necessary civilian work. The 90-percent noncombatant men who are not going to fight are going to be doing jobs they might do as civilians. Frequently, today's civilians could do a much better job than men trained as military personnel.

I am asking for information from the chairman, the ranking member of the minority, or anyone, because I am just trying to find answers. Are we trying to get civilian skills through the draft? Do we have any studies that will help us use the Seabee technique and use civilian skills rather than force men into the military? Is there any study about doing this, reinstating the Seabee technique where we take men to do civilian jobs, what they were doing as civilians and did so well? Why do we not reimpose that technique?

Mr. **VINSON.** Because we do not think we properly should. The gentleman is perfectly right about the use of the military for civilian purposes. A study of that kind has been going on, and we have been trying to eliminate that.

Mr. **ALGER.** Can the gentleman tell me if we are moving at all toward a more voluntary system by offering better pay and better conditions in order to get men into the service?

Mr. **VINSON.** We are going to have a pay bill coming up this week, and I certainly hope the House will adopt it. It is a very warranted and justifiable bill. But we must have the selective system to maintain our Armed Forces.

Mr. **ALGER.** The gentleman said there were 2.7 million men in the Armed Forces, in answer to a question a few minutes ago. We are talking about draftees numbering 100,000 a year. Half of those would be volunteers. They would not all be drafted. Are we talking about getting 50,000 men under this bill for a 2.7-million-man armed force?

Mr. **VINSON.** Of course, we would not attain the necessary strength if we relied on a voluntary force.

Mr. **ALGER.** I was referring to page 168 of the hearings and the pages thereafter that were testified before the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Vinson]. I am drawing for this discussion today from that testimony.

Mr. **BECKER.** Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. **ALGER.** I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. **BECKER.** I would like to say this about those who have talked today, that the basic argument is the proper utilization of military manpower. If we did have proper utilization, would we need this draft bill? The distinguished chairman of the Committee on Armed Services appointed a special committee to investigate this feature. It is a most frustrating procedure to try to get to the bottom of proper utilization.

When we were in executive session discussing the vote on this bill and to vote it out of the committee, I raised this issue again with our good chairman on this proper utilization, and the chairman has stated he was going to reconstitute that committee on proper utilization. I would say to the gentleman from Texas, I would hope this time we may be more successful and probably get to the point where we get the type of utilization out of the men in the service rather than have to get more all the time and have to have a draft and have to do all sorts of things to keep them in, and that we would probably utilize the men we have in the service. This is a frustrating job that you are trying to do and, as has been suggested, I hope the committee under the leadership of the subcommittee chairman will try once again.

Mr. **GROSS.** Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. **ALGER.** I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. **GROSS.** The chairman of the House Committee on Armed Services, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Vinson] said or implied that you had been weaned over to the idea of placing reliance on missiles. It seems to me that only a year ago the gentleman from Georgia, after taking his famous walk through the White House rose garden, came back here and went against the RS-70. He placed his faith in missiles, did he not at that time?

The **CHAIRMAN.** The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. **ARENDS.** Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 additional minute to the gentleman.

Mr. **ALGER.** Mr. Chairman, I shall not endeavor to answer the question raised by the gentleman, but I would like to make plain to the chairman as well as to the gentlemen addressing me, I am sure the gentleman from Georgia and the gentleman from Texas both use their best judgment at all times on the problems confronting them. I am not on the Armed Services Committee and there is much that I do not know, I am sure. But I do not mind making inquiry, even to showing my ignorance, in asking questions.

Mr. **VINSON.** Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. **ALGER.** I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. **VINSON.** I think it is very important that the Record show this clearly. The committee is deeply concerned about the matter of military personnel being used in occupations that could be performed by civilians, and is planning another complete study on that whole subject matter, and it may be possible that there can be a reduction of military personnel in that regard and that military personnel can be transferred to the support part of the forces instead of being used in commissaries and things of that nature. This committee is going to make a study of this matter. I am satisfied we can do something in this regard. But remember this—that would have no relation whatsoever to the draft because the bulk of these people are in the Air Force and they are not in the Army, and the Army is the only one that uses the draft.

The **CHAIRMAN**. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. **ARENDS**. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 additional minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ALGER].

Mr. **FOREMAN**. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. **ALGER**. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. **FOREMAN**. Referring to the remarks of my fellow Texan, do not be alarmed—Texas has not given up. He is not going over to the side to turn over our forces under the Arms Control Act and the Disarmament Act or to go along with the administration and try to roll over and play dead to the Communists. I think he is just raising some questions he has here in his mind concerning this. I feel sure he will be behind us in supporting this draft bill. I think he realizes as well as you and I do that in order for us to maintain freedom for this country and for around the world, we must maintain our military strength. Now, one thing you brought up a while ago on this utilization—it is not the question we are faced with here on extending this draft bill. This is something we have been assured will be brought up in committee later to study more efficient manpower utilization. Further, you stated the draft would only bring in 100,000 and that is right, but for us to be able to continue to get volunteers in the Air Force and in the Navy and the Marines, we have to continue this draft and it has been proven that we continue to bring people in.

Mr. **ALGER**. I thank the gentleman.

I feel I must reply to the point the gentleman from Texas raises concerning my questions. Some of you may be surprised at my inquisitiveness, but I do take a dim view of shipping American boys overseas to fight and die in a war that is not labeled a war in South Vietnam. If I knew of a way to keep from putting our men in uniform to send them over for death in an undeclared war I would heartily support it.

Mr. **VINSON**. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute. I do want to congratulate the gentleman from Texas [Mr. FOREMAN], a member of the Armed Services Committee, who is making an outstanding record.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to my distinguished colleague from California [Mr. DOYLE].

Mr. **DOYLE**. Mr. Chairman, with one exception I sat through every session of the Armed Services Committee as a member thereof during the study of this important subject, and while I feel that the draft as such is repugnant to our American way of life—and that has always been my position, that we must not get any thought in mind of making the draft a permanent policy of this Nation, we ought to try to set up some system whereby the American boys who are needed for our national defense and security against aggression are available without being under some compulsory system except as a last resort—I, of course, shall vote for further extension of the draft the way my committee has recommended it. I voted for the bill in committee and I shall vote for it in the House. It appears to me that there is a real necessity for it for the present.

I wish it were possible safely to reduce the period to 2 years, but I do not believe it is safe under the circumstances in which we find the world at this time. I think the world is in such shape that we in this country should at this time extend the draft for 4 years and not a day less. At any time we wish we can repeal the act or the President of the United States can order ceasing of any age group or all of the ages.

I have in mind one fact that has not been brought out so far in this debate. It is mentioned in our committee report and I call your attention to paragraph 1, page 3, which says:

> For the next 4 years, after giving full allowances to the estimates of voluntary recruitments, it is anticipated that the Army will require an annual average of 90,000 inductees to maintain its approved strength.

I again asked some of the top military personnel before our committee at that time, and I have asked the same question frequently, whether or not the Air Force and the Navy needed the draft to get their personnel. At all times the Joint Chiefs of Staff answered me, and the Secretaries answered likewise, that the only segment of the military that needed the draft was the Army, not the Navy or the Air Force. I do hope the time will come before too long when the inducement, the pay, the conditions under which they serve, and other factors, will make it so it is not necessary for the Army even to have the draft in order to obtain the number of men it needed.

When I came to the floor today two Members of this great body asked me, because they knew I was interested especially in the subject of conscientious objectors, the status of the conscientious objectors at the present time. I will not take time to read here what occurred on that subject in the Armed Services Committee, but in that committee I asked General Hershey—you all know who he is—about the subject of conscientious objectors, and whether or not it was a major problem.

I call attention to our committee hearings, page 93, and that brief discussion between General Hershey and myself, in which he stated that the question of conscientious objectors is no longer a major problem but is working out satisfactorily.

He replied as follows:

> We have, of course, two kinds: One kind are conscientiously opposed to killing people, but they are willing to go into the service and perform what they can, and do.
>
> We have had several thousand in the last 15 years that have served abroad, and I don't believe you have ever heard much about it, which is a pretty good indication that it is working. The religious groups have paid their way, so the Government hasn't had to worry about the money. I was the person who had to decide and be responsible whether what they were doing was in the national safety and interest. I think my association with the religious groups—I am very proud of it—but they better speak about how well they like it. I think we are getting along very well indeed, and I think you would hear more about it in the paper if we weren't.

Mr. Chairman, one set of figures my distinguished chairman, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON], did not call attention to and I want to give them to you. These figures are quite shocking. Let me call attention to page 12. There is one item there. The number of men disqualified, on account of physical and related reasons, is 3,598,160. In other words, the greatest number of deferments of applicants or boys called for the draft are disqualified because of physical, mental, or related reasons. It seems to me that we as a nation ought to take notice of the fact that this is not evidence of good national health. It is not evidence of good public health, when the largest number of proposed draftees who are deferred are deferred on account of physical reasons. This needs immediate and adequate provisions against its continuance.

I want to compliment the local draft boards for the work they have done. They have done a magnificent job.

I have also found that, generally speaking, in these hearings before our Committee on Armed Services, you can pretty well believe what the high-ranking military personnel reports to us as the actual facts. The high-ranking military personnel said to our committee they needed this draft, that they need it now, and they need it for 4 years. While I respect the judgment of my colleagues who propose to offer amendments, I feel I cannot go along with these amendments, with the world in the state it is in now, with any recommendations other than what the military has recommended in this case. In this case I feel I must go along with the urgent request of the military, although I recognize these amendments would have some meritorious appeal contained in them.

EXTENDING UNIVERSAL MILITARY TRAINING ACT

Mr. **CLANCY**. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. RHODES] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The **CHAIRMAN**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. **RHODES** of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, if I were present and voting today I would support House bill 2438 to extend the Universal Military Training Act as a necessary continuation of our all-out effort towards victory in the cold war. I only hope that the sense of duty shown by the American youth today serving under the provisions of this act will be matched by an equal determination on the part of all Americans to continue United States and free world supremacy in a military, an economic, and a political sense over the foe which has sworn to destroy us.

No one regrets more than I the necessity for once again approving a continuation of this legislation. However, the facts of the matter are plainly written for all to see. The Communist enemy can be impressed only by a clear dedication on our part to develop a positive strategy to make America strong, and adequate strength to make this positive strategy work now and in the future. For these reasons, I today am expressing my support for this legislation, and if I had an opportunity to vote, I would join my colleagues who cast an "aye" vote.

Mr. CLANCY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CONTE] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask this afternoon for a general discussion on the floor of this House and a continuing discussion in this country regarding the present draft laws and their relationship to the President's theories of youth employment.

This is a serious matter, and I am proud of my colleagues in this House who have been seriously discussing a number of important questions today, and throughout this debate.

I would like to ask whether or not an earlier draft age would help stem the rising tide of juvenile delinquency? I think it would.

We have been receiving reports that one of the prime purposes behind the youth domestic corps is that it would take a number of young men off the streets and place them in meaningful surroundings.

As the present draft laws are constituted, the average age of the draft is in the 21–23 age groupings. It comes at a difficult time for a number of young men who are right in the middle of deciding on a future career. Or, as Members have suggested in this debate, at an age like 25 and 26 when careers have already begun.

The Selective Service Act and system insures that manpower from which military manpower would be mobilized is registered and classified and that it can be delivered to the Armed Forces in numbers limited only by the capacity of the Armed Forces to deliver it.

Since the operation of the system informs each young man that he does have an obligation to serve, why is it not possible to draft at 18? This, I suggest, would go a long way toward easing unemployment of youth.

It would give younger men an opportunity to take up various trades, and obtain course work in valuable subjects. These young men, I feel, would be better soldiers and ideal for career assignments—which the Army wants its young draftees and enlisted men to think about, as soon as they enter the service.

In many cases, people will not hire young men who have finished college and face the draft before they reach 26. With an earlier draft age, these young men will be more conducive to full-time employment.

Another point at issue here, is that many outstanding young men enter the other services when they complete high school as enlisted men. They do not desire to wait until they are 22 or 23 to be drafted, so they enter the Navy, Marines, and Air Force.

It is my opinion, also, that the 6-month program serves no meaningful purpose. By keeping men in a Reserve unit after 6 months of training invariably means that we have weak Reserve units and even weaker training for the 6 months.

It is the theory of the Selective Service people in Washington that the later draft age stimulates younger boys to enlist. This is true, but as I have mentioned, they do not enlist in the Army but in other services.

With a lower draft age, and I understand that the President does have the authority to draft at 18½, I think we could go along toward meeting increasing unemployment among youth and at the same time, strengthen the solid base of the military.

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Chairman, during public hearings conducted by the Armed Service Committee in connection with the extension of the Draft Act in 1959, the Committee on Armed Services became aware of a belief that there would be no necessity for the provisions of the Draft Act if manpower resources available to the armed services were more efficiently utilized.

As a consequence of this assertion, the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services recommended the establishment of a special subcommittee to inquire into the utilization of manpower by the Deparement of Defense.

The resolution approved by the full committee provided the widest possible jurisdiction to the subcommittee, and authorized it to inquire into every aspect of manpower administration and utilization.

I was given the honor and privilege of being the chairman of that special subcommittee, and I would like briefly today to relate to the Members of the House some of the efforts of that subcommittee together with its findings and recommendations on the subject of military manpower.

Public hearings on this subject were initiated by the subcommittee on the 12th day of May 1959. Because of the desire of the subcommittee to avail itself of the views of the various Members of the House on this subject, a written invitation was extended to every Member of the House to appear before the subcommittee on this subject.

I am happy to advise that a large number of Members availed themselves of this opportunity, and provided the subcommittee with the benefits of their views. The recommendations of these Members was an invaluable adjunct to the efforts of our subcommittee.

The subcommittee also entertained the views of numerous representatives of the executive branch, industry, education, organized labor, and various other private citizens who could make a contribution to the subcommittee's efforts.

The subcommittee completed its hearings on February 4, 1960, after which time it went into executive session to assess and analyze the information made available to it. The subcommittee report was issued on June 15, 1960, and contained four recommendations pertinent to the subject of utilization of military manpower.

The Department of Defense took immediate action to implement the subcommittee's recommendations. In anticipation of an interest in this subject in connection with extension of the Draft Act, I have requested the Department to provide me with an up-to-date summary of the action taken by the Department on the subcommittee's recommendations. If there is no objection, I will insert the letter together with its enclosures, in the RECORD at this point.

Briefly, the Department's letter indicates that on the basis of the subcommittee's recommendations, it has effected a reduction of approximately 2,300 military personnel assigned to commissaries throughout the world. In addition, it has issued a strong directive limiting the use of enlisted personnel on the personal staffs of senior officers.

The Department has also recently completed an extensive study into the rotation base of the various military departments with a view toward identifying those jobs in the military departments which can be filled by civilian personnel rather than military personnel. I understand that this study may ultimately result in the replacement of approximately 15,000 military personnel by civilians.

As I have previously mentioned, the subcommittee hearings and studies were most comprehensive. The printed hearings reflect a portion of the work done by the subcommittee, and consists of more than 800 pages of printed testimony taken by the subcommittee. Despite this intensive effort on the subcommittee's part, it was unable to uncover any evidence which would support the allegation that the more efficient use of military personnel would render unnecessary a continuation of the induction provisions of UMTS.

In that connection, I would like to read to the House the views of the subcommittee on that particular subject:

> The subcommittee wishes to make quite clear its views on the relationship of military manpower savings to the continuance of the induction provisions of the Universal Military Training and Service Act.
>
> As is evident throughout this report, the subcommittee is of the opinion that military manpower savings can be achieved by a continued emphasis on the more efficient use of military personnel. However, it should be kept in mind that this saving in military manpower in the support forces will:
>
> (1) Permit the transfer of such personnel from the support forces to the actual operating forces; and
>
> (2) Result in an attendant increase in the manning strength and overall combat capability of the operating forces which, in many instances, are presently undermanned.
>
> Therefore, these savings cannot, and should not, be translated into any overall decreased requirement for military personnel. On the contrary, the subcommittee has become aware that, notwithstanding the popular concept of pushbutton warfare, the

increased complexity of our modern weapons system together with related defense considerations has, in fact, generated increases rather than decreases in the total manpower requirements of our armed services.

Stated another way, the subcommittee was unable to develop, during the course of its inquiry, any evidence which would justify or support the contention that the more efficient use of military personnel would render unnecessary continuation of the induction provisions of universal military training and service.

The report of the subcommittee was unanimous on all of these recommendations including the views relating to continuation of the Selective Service Act.

There has been no development to my knowledge which would justify any change in the stated position of the subcommittee. I therefore recommend that the Members of this House unanimously support an extension of the provisions of the Selective Service Act.

Assistant Secretary of Defense,
Washington, D.C., March 8, 1963.

Hon. Carl Vinson,
Chairman, Committee on Armed Services,
House of Representatives.

Dear Mr. Chairman: Mr. Frank Slatinshek of your staff requested a report on actions taken to implement the recommendations of the Special Subcommittee on Utilization of Military Manpower, 86th Congress. The Department previously reported on this subject on February 13, 1962.

The subcommittee's four recommendations were on these subjects: (1) The use of enlisted personnel on personal staffs; (2) military personnel rotation requirements; (3) implementation of policies on the use of civilian personnel; and (4) the relationship of manpower provided by contractors to manpower provided by direct Government employment. A copy of the Department's memorandum which initiates implementing actions is enclosed. The Department's actions taken on each of the subcommittee's recommendations are summarized below:

Pursuant to the subcommittee's recommendations, the Department issued Department of Defense Directive 1315.9 on the Utilization of Enlisted Personnel on Personal Staffs. The directive restricts the use of enlisted personal staff to the performance of duties which are within the scope of the military and official responsibilities of the officer to whom they are assigned. A copy of the directive is enclosed.

A review of the rotation requirements of the individual military departments, as recommended by the subcommittee, was completed. The study was made available to the Secretary of Defense for consideration in connection with fiscal year 1964 force level decisions.

The subcommittee's recommendation to institute measures to enforce Department of Defense policies on the use of civilian personnel was carried out by surveys of compliance during July–November 1960, and by reemphasis of the policies in May 1961. In this connection, pursuant to the subcommittee's objective of reducing the number of military personnel in commissaries, the Department has accomplished a total reduction of approximately 2,300 military personnel in these activities between June 30, 1960, and June 30, 1962.

In accordance with the subcommittee's recommendations to develop policies for the use of contract manpower and to consider contract resources in the development of manpower ceilings, the Department has made considerable progress, particularly in such major functions as maintenance and research and development. A copy of policies which govern contracting for maintenance is enclosed. Subsequent to a Government-wide study on contracting for research and development, a comprehensive action program to strengthen the competence of Department of Defense research and development laboratories was directed by the Deputy Secretary of Defense on May 3, 1962. Among the actions taken were an increase in the number of high-level scientific positions and a significant increase in education and training to assure a steady flow of quality personnel in Government laboratories.

I can assure you that the availabilities of contractor, as well as Government resources, are fully considered in developing manpower ceilings.

For your convenience, the enclosures mentioned in my letter are in the attached folder. Please advise me if you desire additional information on this subject.

Sincerely yours,
Norman S. Paul.

Assistant Secretary of Defense,
Washington, D.C., July 22, 1960.

Memorandum for the Assistant Secretary of the Army (M.P. & R.E.), Assistant Secretary of the Navy (P. & R.F.), Special Assistant to the Secretary of the Air Force (M.P. & R.F.).

Subject: Implementation of Price subcommittee report.

References: (a) Report of Special Subcommittee on Utilization of Military Manpower of the House Committee on Armed Services, June 15, 1960. (b) Memo, Assistant Secretary of Defense (M.P. & R.), subject: Price subcommittee report, dated June 27, 1960.

Distribution of the subject report was made under reference (b) and a meeting with your representatives on this subject was held July 6, 1960.

In accordance with the discussion during this meeting, it is requested that action indicated below be taken on each of the cited recommendations and the necessary reports be submitted to this office on or before the dates indicated: (numbers below correspond to recommendations in Price subcommittee report).

1. Each military service is requested to advise this office on or before August 26, 1930, of the actions taken or proposed to implement Price Subcommittee Recommendation No. 1.

2. Each military department is requested to designate a liaison officer as soon as practicable to work with the Office of Manpower Requirements and Utilization, Office of Assistant Secretary of Defense (M.P. & R.) in the planning of a review of rotation base requirements of the military departments, both as to numbers and skills, with the objective of more efficient utilization of military and civilian manpower. In this connection, reports previously made in response to Assistant Secretary of Defense (M.P. & R.) January 8, 1960, request subject: Price subcommittee request for skills and numbers of military personnel involved in the rotation base will be used as a point of departure for development of these plans in order to avoid duplicate reporting.

3. Each military service is requested to review its policies and procedures which implement section IV, Director of Defense Directive 1100.4, as concerns civilian staffing, to determine their adequacy to detect and correct deviations from this policy. Specific consideration should be given to the policies and procedures by which the use of military personnel in civilian-type jobs because of budgetary or manpower ceiling limitations are or can be identified, reported, and considered. A report of the foregoing review is requested no later than November 1, 1960.

4. Each military service is requested to nominate a principal and an alternate member to serve on an ad hoc working group to develop and assess the manpower implications of contract procurement and to recommend an appropriate statement of policy and implementing procedures. The ad hoc working group will develop, initially, a term of reference for its operation for the approval of the Assistant Secretary of Defense (M.P. & R.). The names of service representatives to serve on this group should be reported to this office not later than August 1, 1960.

Charles C. Finucane.

Department of Defense Directive

Subject: Policies governing the use of commercial and military resources for maintenance of military materiel.

References: (a) Department of Defense Directive 3232.1, "Department of Defense maintenance engineering program"; (b) Department of Defense Directive 4100.15, "Commercial and industrial type facilities"; (c) Department of Defense Directive 3232.8, "Industrial and commercial technical services"; (d) Department of Defense Instruction 3232.6, "Commercial and industrial facilities allocation planning to accomplish depot maintenance of materiel during mobilization."

I. PURPOSE

The purpose of this directive is to establish basic management policy and related criteria for the effective and efficient use of commercial and military resources for accomplishment of materiel maintenance requirements of the Department of Defense.

II. APPLICABILITY

This directive is applicable to the Departments of the Army, Navy, and Air Force. The policies and criteria contained herein are in consonance with the policies of references (a) and (b) and serve to further delineate these policies with respect to the accomplishment of maintenance by contract. This directive does not conflict with, or otherwise alter, reference (c).

III. DEFINITIONS

The following terms and definitions are applicable to this directive:

(A) Contract maintenance: That maintenance (i.e., modification, modernization, rebuild, overhaul, repair, or servicing of materiel) performed under contract by commercial organizations (including original manufacturers) on a one-time or continuing basis without distinction as to the level of maintenance, as defined by reference (a). Included within this term is that contracting for services to augment military capability for the direct maintenance support of materiel.

(B) Military maintenance: That maintenance performed by a military department under military control utilizing Government-owned or controlled facilities, tools, test equipment, spares, repair parts, and military or civilian personnel.

(C) Materiel: Materiel consists of all tangible items (including ships, tanks, self-propelled weapons, aircraft, etc., and related spares, repair parts, and support equipment; but, excluding real property, installations, and utilities) necessary to equip, operate, maintain, and support military activities without distinction as to its application for administrative or combat purposes.

(D) Mission-essential materiel: Consists of those weapons, equipments, and systems (including spare components and support equipments) which have been determined to be vital to a primary defense mission; the unserviceability of failure of such materiel to meet design performance would jeopardize a basic defense assignment or objective.

(E) Direct maintenance support: Refers to that maintenance performed to materiel while it remains under the custody of the using military command. Upon restoration to serviceable condition, the materiel normally is returned directly to service.

(F) Indirect maintenance support: Refers to that maintenance performed to materiel after its withdrawal from the custody of the using military command. Upon restoration to serviceable condition, the materiel is returned to stock for reissue, or returned directly to the user under conditions authorized by the military department concerned.

(G) Maintenance capability: Consists of those resources, namely: facilities, tools, test equipment, drawings, technical publications, trained maintenance personnel, engineering support, and an assured availability of spare parts, required to modify, retain materiel in, or restore materiel to, serviceable condition.

(H) Maintenance capacity: Is the quantitative expression of maintenance capability.

IV. BACKGROUND

(A) Materiel maintenance capability is essential to, and is an integral part of, the national defense capability. Two basic sources for materiel maintenance are available to Department of Defense activities; namely, military maintenance, and contract maintenance. It is in the public interest that the use of these sources in peacetime be planned in such manner as to provide maximum effectiveness under emergency or war conditions.

(B) Military maintenance provides a controlled source of technical competence and the necessary resources to assure the operational readiness and sustained operation of military materiel under emergency or war conditions. Such maintenance must be organized and ready to meet the requirements of primary military missions of the Department of Defense in fulfilling the national security objective.

(C) Contract maintenance provides an effective means for augmenting the resources of the Department of Defense in accomplishing maintenance of its materiel. Properly applied and administered, it can: (1) release military maintenance capability and capacity for more essential work; (2) reduce the requirement for Department of Defense investment in facilities, equipment, and training of personnel; (3) provide a cushion of flexibility to maintenance programs; (4) increase the dispersal of maintenance capability; and (5) result in net benefits to the Government without compromising basic military mission responsibilities. However, to be most beneficial, contract maintenance should be planned well in advance of the requirement; its application should not produce uneconomical utilization of existing facilities which must otherwise be retained for the maintenance of mission-essential materiel, nor should it increase overall costs to the Government through the necessity for larger pipeline inventories. Most important, contract maintenance must not prevent the timely attainment of required military maintenance capability.

(D) Contract maintenance has its greatest application for accomplishing indirect maintenance support requirements at the depot (industrial) level of maintenance. For example, original equipment manufacturers have an inherent capability of performing modernization and major modifications to their products. Also, commercial maintenance service companies normally are equipped to perform major repairs and overhauls at their plant locations. Contract maintenance is normally well suited for accomplishing maintenance requirements when quantity size lots are involved, or when a steady maintenance workload can be anticipated.

(E) Contract maintenance has a limited and specialized application for accomplishing direct maintenance support requirements at the intermediate and organizational levels of maintenance. Normally, when used for direct maintenance support at the intermediate and organizational levels, contract maintenance is intended to provide services to be performed at an operating site, under military control, and to be used to augment military capability.

(F) Interservice support arrangements offer a means of providing maintenance for materiel common to two or more departments, including mission-essential items beyond the required maintenance capability of a using military department, when capacity exists in another department.

V. POLICY

(A) It is the general policy of the Department of Defense to utilize private industry for the accomplishment of maintenance of military materiel to the maximum extent practicable, recognizing that maintenance in support of military missions is a vital part of military capability which shall not be compromised.

(B) Each military department shall develop and/or retain an in-being military depot level maintenance capability for only that mission-essential materiel which would require continuing depot level maintenance to sustain operations under emergency or wartime conditions or which would require such depot maintenance in peacetime to assure operational readiness. This policy should not be construed as requiring a complete capacity when materiel is determined mission-essential. The extent should be only the minimum capacity necessary to insure a ready and controlled source of technical competence and resources to meet military contingencies. Contractual sources or interservice support may be used for the depot maintenance of mission-essential materiel to any extent beyond the established minimum capacity.

(C) Each military department shall determine which of its items shall be designated as mission-essential materiel and shall determine the extent of depot level military maintenance capability to be developed and/or retained to meet minimum requirements for support of mission-essential materiel.

(D) Each military department shall assure an efficient level of operation for that military capacity retained for the depot maintenance support of mission-essential materiel.

(E) Each military department shall attain a self-sufficient military capability and capacity for the direct maintenance support of its tactical elements.

(F) When contract maintenance is to be used for new equipment, it shall be planned well in advance of the equipment introduction into the operating inventory in order that there will be sufficient leadtime for the contractor to obtain the required facilities, tooling, test equipment, and maintenance personnel.

(G) Contract maintenance shall be planned and employed in a manner to provide maximum effectiveness under emergency or wartime conditions, particularly with regard to long-term or continuing-type maintenance contracts. The policies and guidance for planning with industry for maintenance under emergency conditions are provided by reference (d).

(H) Contracts for maintenance shall incorporate, by reference, such work specifications and quality standards as may be required to adequately assure that materiel upon repair and return is fully satisfactory for service.

(I) Contract maintenance shall not be employed when adequate safeguards cannot be effected to protect security information from disclosure in any manner prejudicial to the interests of the United States.

(J) Contract maintenance for requirements beyond the established minimum retained capacity will be considered practicable only when it is available at reasonable price, as provided in the armed services procurement regulation, and when compared with the estimated cost of military maintenance, if performed at existing military facilities, the contract cost would not be disproportionately higher as computed under the provisions of the Bureau of the Budget Bulletin 60-2, as amended, and as implemented by reference (b).

(K) When contract maintenance is not considered practicable (par. (J) above) interservice support arrangements will be fully considered before the requiring department utilizes additional in-house capacity.

VI. CRITERIA

Within the policy statements above, contract maintenance has its principal applications in the following areas:

(A) For accomplishment of indirect maintenance requirements which exceed the military capacity retained to support mission-essential materiel.

(B) For accomplishment of direct maintenance requirements in support of nontactical elements when the military control and performance of such work is not required for military effectiveness, personnel training, or the maintenance of a rotation base.

(C) For direct maintenance support of materiel as may be necessary to augment the military capacity, normally on a one-time basis to accomplish a specific task.

(D) When it is desirable to augment military maintenance capability for an interim period to attain an earlier operational status for new military materiel being introduced.

(E) When its interim use for analytical overhaul and modification of new military materiel entering the inventory will lead to future effectiveness and efficiency in military maintenance operations by the refinement of requirements for initial spares and repair parts, maintenance tooling, testing equipment, and technical data, or through product improvement of materiel under current production.

(F) For economical quantities of materiel, or when a steady workload of overhaul and/or modification maintenance can be anticipated.

(G) When the extent or complexity of modification or modernization work to be accomplished requires the inherent technical qualifications of the original equipment manufacturer.

(H) When the inherent leadtimes and processes of maintenance by contract would not result in substantially increased cost for procurement of spares to fill an enlarged repair cycle pipeline.

(I) When the administrative cost of contracting for small lots of materiel would not be disproportionate to the cost of the maintenance to be accomplished.

VII. IMPLEMENTATION

(A) It is intended that the redistribution of maintenance workloads between industry and the military departments resulting from the implementation of this directive will produce within the departments the minimum practical levels of manpower and facility requirements for maintenance consistent with military necessity.

(B) The military departments will take action to implement this directive as follows:

(1) Applicable directives regulations, and instructions within each department will be reviewed and revised for compliance to the policy and intent of this directive.

(2) The guidance expressed herein will be analyzed for adaptability to internal departmental use. Prior to promulgation, it may be restated or expanded as considered appropriate to more effectively carry out the policy and intent of this directive.

(3) Contract maintenance shall be identified in the supporting information for budget estimates and apportionment requests in accordance with the guidance provided by the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Comptroller).

(4) Furnish such reports as may be requested, in accordance with DOD Directive 7700.1, to the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Supply and Logistics) for review and evaluation of contract maintenance program management.

(5) When extenuating or other special circumstances exist which may warrant an exemption or deviation to the policy and intent of this directive, a military department will submit such cases with supporting justification to the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Supply and Logistics) for review and approval of the Office of the Secretary of Defense.

(6) Within 120 days of the date of this directive, two copies of each document implementing the above actions will be transmitted to the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Supply and Logistics).

(C) The Assistant Secretary of Defense (Supply and Logistics) will perform such reviews and evaluations of implementing documents and management by the military departments as to assure the uniform and effective application of the policy and intent of this directive within the Department of Defense.

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, in these troubled times when Communist aggression is an ever-present possibility, there is no question that our highly qualified and efficient military forces must be maintained in readiness. The United States must be continually prepared to confront such aggression with well-trained and experienced military forces. For this reason I will support extension of the draft law.

Although I support the President and the efforts of the Congress to maintain American military readiness of the highest quality I believe more attention should be given to better manpower utilization.

The experience of the past 12 years has demonstrated that the draft law has not been effective in maintaining the desired pool of trained manpower for emergencies. As far back as 1957, the famous Cordiner report pointed this out. Part of the problem which the Cordiner report referred to stemmed from the unreasonably low rate of military pay. Then, as now, if I understand correctly the arguments for the proposed military pay raise bill before the Armed Services Committee, military pay rates for qualified technicians were too low to attract and retain adequate numbers of the skilled personnel who currently form the backbone of the armed services.

Another weakness of the present draft law is the fact that very few of those who were inducted into the services reenlist. Thus, the existing Universal Military Training and Service Act has not fulfilled one of the major purposes for which it was designed.

An even more serious objection to the UMT is the fact that it is simply not universal. In 1957 well over 60 percent of those of draft age were not being drafted and I understand that the percentage has not decreased.

It seems to me Mr. Chairman, that military service should be made attractive enough to recruit all the manpower required effective for national defense.

New methods of warfare require not only well-trained troops but the development of brainpower to meet the challenge of this nuclear age. A GI bill of rights would make peacetime service more attractive for many young men.

Many young men who are not able to adjust themselves to military life have the capacity to contribute far more substantially in other ways to our national defense.

Proper manpower utilization therefore, is essential for the most effective national defense.

Each time this act has been renewed serious deficiencies have been well stated and often acknowledged, but the doubts always give way to inertia and the press of immediate military needs. This is a short-sighted approach to a serious and continuing problem. Congress should do everything possible in making conscription unnecessary except in time of emergency.

One obvious course is to increase the attractiveness of military service as a career to people in and out of the service. Thus we should support the new military pay bill which is designed to improve the pay and allowances at those ranks in which men are most likely to make a decision as to their future, and in those jobs which require skills much in demand in private industry.

There is no doubt in my mind that Congress will extend the draft law for another 4 years. But there is no good reason why we should not plan ahead so that we can build an even stronger military force on a voluntary basis.

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Chairman, it is my understanding that an amendment will be presented today proposing that the extension of the Universal Military Training Act be made for only a 2-year period rather than a 4-year period and that a Commission be established to study thoroughly changes that might be advisable in the program.

I also understand that an amendment will be presented to lower the ceiling age limit from 26 to 22 in order that our young men can have 4 years of their lives returned to them in which they can plan for the future and make decisions regarding employment, family and other aspects of normal living which are now denied them.

I shall support these amendments, but feel that they are wholly inadequate and that the whole draft program is wrong. We have departed a long way from the historic principles of a free society upon which the United States was founded.

I do not believe there are any basic reasons which justify the perpetuating of compulsory military service during peacetime by the United States. The two proposed amendments show that there is a great deal of discontent with the present situation.

In spite of this, we will undoubtedly approve a 4-year extension today that will continue the existing system without change—without questioning the wisdom or necessity of our action very strenuously. Neither Canada nor England find compulsory military training to be necessary to maintain their armed forces at desired strength.

The primary excuse given for the present draft is that it serves as a club over the heads of young men in order to force them into enlisting in the armed services. If it is actually a fact that we cannot fill our needs through enlistments, then the draft is necessary only because we do not provide incentives or conditions of service which are attractive enough. We are substituting compulsory training to avoid our responsibility for allowing our citizens a free choice when we are not in a period of national emergency.

In addition to this basic premise that the entire program is wrong, it is actually creating social problems that require corrective legislation.

The young man who is in jeopardy of being drafted during 8 years of his life is not a good risk for a prospective employer. It is not wise for him to hire a prospective employee who is subject to the draft and then hold this job open for 2 years—as he is required to do—while the employee serves his time.

The young man between the ages of 18 and 26 is left trying to put some order into the loose ends of a life over which he has lost control of some very basic decisions.

In addition to these points I must voice here and now—as I will on many future occasions on this floor—my conviction that almost the entire thrust of our national policy as it involves our security today is destructive of that security. We have put our faith in the power of force, violence and destruction to create a world of peace, freedom and security. These means are incompatible with our goals.

We can neither suppress the ideology of international communism by force nor spread the ideology of freedom for all men by force. To imagine that we can do this merely blinds us to the constructive efforts which we must make to create the world of the future which we seek.

I am more than willing to give my life in the battle for this better world—as I am sure we all are. Yet, to give our lives and still lose our goals is, indeed, the height of folly. This is the course we are pursuing.

I feel that universal military training in peacetime is a part of that destructive thrust which I must oppose.

For these reasons, I shall vote against any extension of the Universal Military Training Act today.

The CHAIRMAN. There being no further requests for time, the Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of American in Congress assembled, That section 17(c) of the Universal Military Training and Service Act, as amended (50 App. U.S.C. 467(c)), is amended by striking out "July 1, 1963" and inserting in place thereof "July 1, 1967".

SEC. 2. Section 1 of the Act of August 3, 1950, chapter 537, as amended (73 Stat. 13), is amended by striking out "July 1, 1963" and inserting in place thereof "July 1, 1967".

SEC. 3. Section 16 of the Dependents Assistance Act of 1950, as amended (50 App. U.S.C. 2216), is amended by striking out "July 1, 1963" and inserting in place thereof "July 1, 1967".

SEC. 4. Section 9 of the Act of June 27, 1957, Public Law 85–62, as amended (73 Stat. 13), is amended by striking out "July 1, 1963" and inserting in place thereof "July 1, 1967".

Sec. 5. Sections 302 and 303 of title 37, United States Code, are each amended by striking out "July 1, 1963" wherever that date appears and inserting in place thereof "July 1, 1967".

Mr. VINSON (interrupting the reading of the bill). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the bill be dispensed with, that it be printed in the Record at this point, and open to amendment to any section of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Vinson]?

There was no objection.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Pucinski: On page 1, line 3, after the word "That," insert "(a)", and immediately below line 6 on page 1, insert the following:

"(b)) Section 4(a) of the Universal Military Training and Services Act (50 App. U.S.C. 454(a)) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"'After July 1, 1963, no person shall be inducted into the Armed Forces pursuant to this Act except as provided in section 5A and section 6(h) of this title, after he has attained the age of twenty-two years. This paragraph shall not apply during any period of national emergency hereafter proclaimed by the President.'"

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PUCINSKI. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. It there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Chairman, under this amendment, which is a very simple amendment, all we are saying is that if this amendment is adopted the draft boards and the Defense Department would have 3½ years in which to select a young man for the military service between the age of 18½ through his 21st birthday; that when he reaches the age of 22 and has not previously been deferred from military service, he is no longer subject to the draft short of a national catastrophe.

Under existing law, young men are subject to the draft over a period of 7½ years, from 18½ to 26 years of age. This amendment, however, does not preclude the President from resorting to this original legislation at any time he feels that such action is in the national interest.

I have heard mention made here of a sense of Congress amendment. However, the fact remains that the draft boards under existing law cannot give priority to young men 18½ to 19, because if you look at your committee report on page 7, section 5, we have six categories of priority under existing law: The first category are delinquents; second, volunteers; third, men between 19 and 26 who are nonfathers; the fourth category, men between 19 and 26, who are fathers; fifth, men over 26 years of age; sixth, men between 18½ and 19 years of age.

In every draft board in the country there are young men who come to the board and say, "Look, I want to go in now; I want to discharge my responsibility; I want to get it over with." But, these young men cannot be taken, even if the draft board wants to take them, under existing law, because the draft board must take eligibles off the top. My amendment in no way hurts the present draft program; we are in no way denying the Defense Department the impetus it needs to get men to volunteer for the service, because we would continue the existing draft program for 18½- to 22-year-olds. Under my amendment, we would give a young fellow who cannot afford to go to college the same opportunity to serve or not to serve that we are now giving the young man going to college. Today, under this law, a man can take course after course in college; go into postgraduate work, and conceivably, because he has prolonged his college career, escape the draft. In my remarks in the Record of March 7, in testimony before the Armed Services Committee, I showed that there are now 126,000 young men in this country not being drafted because they have passed the age of 26 through various deferments. And, they are fully qualified, but the military does not want them only because they are too old. If you accept this amendment, it gives the President the full right to go back to the original law any time he feels that the manpower needs of this country are such that we need this law and take them up to the age of 26. In the meantime, if we really want to give these young Americans an opportunity to plan their lives in an orderly manner, let us exempt them from the draft after they reach their 22d birthday. I am sure that these young men would be willing to serve their country and discharge their responsibility at an earlier age so that they can plan their adult lives in a more orderly manner.

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PUCINSKI. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. BECKER. Does not the President now have the right to reduce the age to 22 or 21?

Mr. PUCINSKI. There are those who claim he does. Let there be no question; I support President Kennedy. I also supported President Eisenhower in his defense efforts. But, this is the legislative branch of Government, and I think the time has come when the Congress ought to assert its own views on what it thinks. In my opinion, if we say the age for selectees should be 18½ to 22 years of age—this is going to be the intent of the Congress.

Mr. Chairman, we give the President all the authority that he may feel he needs if in his judgment this amendment is not going to serve the best interests of the country.

I think if the Congress went on record as stating it is going to give the Department of Defense 3½ years instead of 7½ years to make up its mind as to whether it needs these young Americans for military service, I am sure that the administration would not find such a pronouncement objectionable. I strongly urge my amendment be adopted so that we can have a more effective method for filling our Nation's defense needs.

For a more detailed analysis of this entire subject, I should like to refer my colleagues to page 3786 of the Record of March 7.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Pucinski].

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman yield just briefly in order for me to finish the question which I previously propounded to the gentleman from Illinois?

Mr. VINSON. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. BECKER. As I see it, this amendment does nothing than what is the law today. The President has the right——

Mr. VINSON. No——

Mr. BECKER. Now, wait a minute. I mean this: The President has the right to reduce the age at any time. On this he is going to be restricted in his use of it. At the same time the amendment is going to give him the right to increase it. I can see no merit in that method of operation.

Mr. VINSON. That is the reason I am asking the committee to vote it down. The facts and circumstances do not warrant, in my judgment, favorable consideration of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, what does the amendment which has been offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Pucinski] do? As pointed out in my statement on the floor of the House it reduces the draft age from 18½ years of age to 22 years of age. The law today is 18½ years of age to 26 years of age. The President, under section 5 of the Draft Act, can exercise the authority given him to call within age groups. Therefore, the President could call in the 22-year age group.

Mr. Chairman, the first I heard of this amendment was when it was sent out in the mail. We had a hearing. It was published before the Congress. Witnesses came here from all over the United States. I want to say that the Committee on Armed Services regrets that the learned gentleman from Illinois did not give us the benefit of time to study his amendment when we were having our hearings. However, I am satisfied we would all have been of the same opinion we are now, and that the proper thing to do is to defeat this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I therefore ask the committee to vote this amendment down.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Pucinski].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Reuss: On page 1, line 6, after "place thereof July 1," strike out "1967" and insert "1965."

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REUSS. I yield to the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Armed Services.

Mr. VINSON. I would like to see if we could not agree on a time limit on the debate on this amendment since it was debated at quite some length during general debate.

Mr. REUSS. The gentleman has been very generous and I am sure we can agree on a short space of time.

Mr. VINSON. I do not desire to debate it but 5 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. REUSS] be recognized for 5 minutes, and 5 minutes be reserved for the Committee on Armed Services.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I object.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is heard to the unanimous-consent request of the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and any amendments thereto be limited to 15 minutes.

Mr. GROSS. Let us see how many desire to be heard on the amendment. Let us not get in too much of a hurry.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 25 minutes.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, I object.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is heard. The gentleman from Wisconsin is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Chairman, this amendment would limit the extension of the draft to 2 years. I believe that the draft should be continued now for that period only.

In 1955 and in 1959 I vigorously supported extending the draft for 4 years. Now as then, I stand ready to do anything necessary to build up our strength to combat the Communist drive for world conquest. We must, of course, maintain our military power.

But in 1963, the situation we face is different. The world is unsettled. The Atlantic alliance has been shaken in disputes over trade and defense. The Common Market has grown to be a great factor in world affairs. The European nations have reached new heights in their spectacular economic advances. They speak of conducting more and more their own defense. Nationalisms old and new have asserted themselves. The full impact of these facts has not yet been felt.

No prophetic gift is needed to predict that the period ahead will be marked by rapid and profound changes. One change we would all cheer would be a miraculous increase in the willingness of our European allies to take over a just share of their own defense. That would allow withdrawals of American troops and would go a long way toward ending our bedeviling balance-of-payments deficit. Withdrawal of troops from Europe and many other events that we cannot foresee in a fluid world might also make unnecessary a continuation of the draft.

The world is in a state of flux. Therefore we should limit our commitment to a fixed policy to the shortest reasonable period. In the present situation, a 2-year extension is long enough. The speed with which H.R. 2438 is moving through the House shows that we can quickly extend the draft if it is still needed in 1965.

If the draft is no longer needed in 1965, we should have the opportunity to get rid of it. If needed, it is a necessary evil; but we should not and cannot long ignore its undesirable effects on our society or cease to look for the day when we can be done with it.

Now what is to be said against a 2-year extension? Not much, apparently. I have looked long and hard to find an explanation of why the draft should be continued for 4 years. I find only this from the Defense Department:

> It would create an element of uncertainty in the minds of millions of young men in this country as to the future of their military service liability—as to whether they will be needed.

Does anyone suppose that the youth of this country will be put upon the rack of doubt because of a possibility that none of them will be compelled to service after 1965? Common sense, Mr. Chairman, tells us how much better it is to be uncertain about whether things will get better, than to be certain that there will be no improvement. This type of uncertainty will be cherished by the Nation.

And, in any case, who can believe that this new uncertainty is worse than the uncertainty that haunts our youths now? The uncertainty they know while the draft continues creates real distress, doubt, and distortion of natural bents—as the mail of every Member will reveal.

Is the draft board hot on my heels? Can I beat the system? Can I escape by plunging into marriage or graduate school? Has my draftsmanship put me in the nearly one-half of my age group that will never serve? Will I be the 1 in 10 actually caught in the draft's loose net?

Those are the questions that create the uncertainty that actually, presently hurts our youth and our society. In a continuance of the draft there is not only plenty of uncertainty but also significant injustice and misuse of human resources.

And I would point out that the weight of the inequities of the draft falls most heavily on youths who lack the money or knowledge to practice skillfully the degrading game of draftsmanship.

What is the reason for the draft? Apparently it is not primarily the 90,000 men who would be drafted into the Army in each of the next 4 years. If it lost them, the Army would lose its least effective, worst trained elements. In many cases, their jobs could be done by civilians.

But could the services get the 300,000 volunteer enlistments they need, if the threat of being drafted did not hang over the heads of the Nation's youths? The Defense Department says that recruitment would suffer. In the absence of any other information, we must accept this judgment.

Yet there is reason to think that 300,000 truly voluntary enlistments might be obtained if the effort were really made to get them. We are to be asked to increase military pay during this Congress. Higher pay could make military service more attractive. Other steps might be taken also to encourage volunteer service.

At a time when military technology demands highly trained, professional soldiers, and allows no time for great mobilizations, we could gain in strength from a switch to all volunteer forces. The machinery of the Selective Service System could be kept in good shape for emergency use in case of need.

Certainly the Congress should give more careful study to this possibility.

Mr. Chairman, to end the draft, if it would weaken our forces, would be inconceivable; but to retain the draft among a free people, beyond a time when it is really needed, would be intolerable.

The 89th Congress—the one that will be sitting in 1965—is entitled to the opportunity to debate and vote on whether the draft then needs to be continued for another period. This Congress should not deny it that opportunity.

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REUSS. I yield.

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Chairman, I am sure the gentleman will agree that if the law is extended for an additional 4 years the 89th Congress will have the opportunity of repealing that law and consequently will have the opportunity of working its will on draft legislation.

Mr. REUSS. No, I regret that I cannot agree with the gentleman. The 37 members of the House Committee on Armed Services, who are all distinguished Members of this House, voted unanimously for a 4-year extension, and I would view it as not within the range of expectation that they would change their mind and bring out a bill in 2 years which would enable us to vote on it. Therefore, the practical alternative to 4 years is 2 years. I hope it will be 2 years.

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this amendment. If for no other reason, it should be adopted to force a review of the use of manpower, and where the draft fits in and our educational and military needs for the coming decade.

On Friday of last week I tried to get a set of the hearings on this issue, which is one of the most important issues which will be discussed in this session of the Congress. The hearings were not available. I tried again on Saturday and the hearings were not available. The hearings finally became available in printed form at 10:30 this morning. I question whether this is the proper way for the Congress, either on the majority or the minority side, to be debating an issue of such vital importance.

The chief argument for the 4-year extension has been, first, precedent. "We have always done it this way," it is said. I would like to know why precedent is so sacred in the 1960's. With scientific and technological advances in the armed services and in the conduct of warfare this is no time to take refuge in the safe harbors of custom. This is a hydrogen atomic age, a mobilized mechanized age, and the manpower needs of 8, 6, 4 or even 2 years ago were quite different from what they are today.

The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. Reuss] has raised the question of an entirely new and different situation in Europe which may impose upon our European armed manpower posture an entirely different focus than it has in the past 2 years. I looked in vain through the hearings to see where I could find a solid discussion before the Committee on Armed Services on manpower needs and the question of the future of the draft. In short, Mr. Chairman, I am not persuaded by the argument of "precedent"—that a 4-year extension of the draft is necessary. We owe it to this country to subject this matter to critical examination in the light of today's conditions at home and abroad.

The second argument that is raised for the 4-year extension is "uncertainty." The Assistant Secretary of Defense for Manpower, in testimony, said that anything less than 4 years "would create an element of uncertainty in the minds of millions of young men in this country as to their service liability." That is the chief reason given for a 4-year extension. This is Alice in Wonderland. What could be more uncertain than the draft lottery that exists today? Boys that ought to be drafted are bypassed; others that ought to be exempt are taken. I think it is necessary to have a thorough and complete review of the whole subject. This has not been done, either in the presentation that has been made today, or in the hearings—hearings which were unavailable to the Members of Congress until 10:30 in the morning of the day a major bill is discussed. When this occurs, it is the function of the minority to object.

It seems to me further that this whole matter is tied into the problem of Reserves. The reason I asked the question earlier as to the future of the 6-month program, is that I believe this is one of the areas of fat and waste that could be cut from a massive budget. The entire reserve program should be reviewed. Everybody knows there is a vested interest in the Reserves in every congressional district in the United States, but it cannot be examined in the abstract. There is a relationship between the draft extension and the reserve program that ought to be examined on the floor right now. I wonder how much the security of the country is being safeguarded by the paunchy reservist who spends one evening a week at the Reserve center chewing the fat with the boys, thereby escaping from the dishes at home and building up a very expensive—to the taxpayers—pension.

I would rather put that money into a bigger, tougher, better paid, technically competent standing army.

It seems to me that starting today and going throughout the week, there should be a complete discussion as to where we are headed in our draft, our posture in Europe related to the draft, the difficulty we have in educating young men to run some of the complicated machinery of the 1960's.

For these reasons, Mr. Chairman, I intend to support the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin, and I hope that it will receive the support of the House. If the amendment fails, I shall vote for the bill convinced as I am that a 4-year extension of the draft is still preferable in these perilous times to no draft at all.

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the hearings, in my opinion, are thorough on this subject. The only person quoted so far in regard to the extension for 4 years instead of 2 was the Secretary of Defense. He spoke on technical things in this bill.

On page 87 of the bill you will find General Hershey testified—I think it would be well for the House to hear what he said:

> I do really think that we have our adulthood being delayed, and not only that, but there are more and more reasons why the man in the Armed Forces could very well have the addition of college before he serves.

I will get back to some other language he used on page 87 in just a minute, but in amplification of what he said there, at the bottom of page 88 he said:

> On the other hand, there is also the problem that the man brings away from training what he brings to it. The more he knows when he comes to training, the more meaningful becomes the training and the more you are integrating training into a personality that has some other capability, where sometimes when we were young we didn't bring much to it and we didn't have many buckets to carry anything away with.

Returning to page 87, the next point General Hershey makes is this:

> The second thing is if you are not going to take all of them, if you determine, by lotteries, at 19 or 20, that you are going to take them, as far as any enlistment of people after that you are very much like the girl who said to the boy, when he said, "May I have the last dance?" and she said "You have had it."

That is not a very appropriate way to take them into the service.

Then he goes on in the very next paragraph to say:

> Well, you can't recruit, after you have made a determination in an age group of who will serve. I don't like to have people say to a kid after he finishes 2 years, "You are through," because he isn't.

General Hershey also went on to testify to our committee in some fullness about the question of trying to fit the time of the draft in with the total utilization of manpower for what is necessary. He pointed out it is difficult for these young men to have an education in science, developing them in that or some other way, and get them while they are still very young, and find out any ability to work into the service.

Some are deferred so that they can get an education. Some are channeled to scientific development. Anyway many of them come into the armed services with much better training and capacities and knowledge and abilities that are of great interest to the National Government and much more helpful to themselves as far as they individually are concerned in their ultimate service to their country. It seems to me that after hearing this testimony which was quite thorough, and every Member of the Congress had an opportunity to testify, that General Hershey made a very strong case for the 4-year draft at this time.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. REUSS. I would appreciate my friend, the distinguished gentleman from Florida telling me where General Hershey on pages 86 or 87 or 88 or on any other page said that the 4-year extension was essential or said that the 2-year extension would be a bad idea. I cannot find any such testimony.

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. If you read the whole page, starting on page 86, you might be able to see it. He replied where the gentleman from Indiana asked a question whether it would not be better if they could get the men as young as possible. The Secretary showed the need earlier all through his testimony. General Hershey felt, for the reasons I stated, that the system that we now have, even though it delays some people from going into the service, many of these people when they do go into the service have additional attainments and are more valuable to the services. Suppose your son was to be called to the service and he was a man capable of making a real contribution in the field of nuclear physics or something like that. Would it not be better for him to go on to get his education and bring that kind of ability and education to the threshold of the service of our country and to the military rather than coming in as a youngster right out of high school with none of those attainments?

I think the arguments General Hershey made on page 87 are in point, although they were made in response to a question as to coming in earlier into the service and I took it as one of the main reasons for the 2 years instead of 4 was to get them earlier, and that is the reason I quote this from General Hershey:

"After all what would be all of the effects of reducing this bill from 4 to 2 years? One, of course, might be to cast some doubt in the minds of the world that we are being firm in the present dangerous situation, but the point I have been attempting to discuss relates to the quality of service which the young men might be expected to perform. Assume that the amendment would end the draft in 2 years, a 2-year extension only would seem to me to bring pressure on the draft boards to call the young men at an earlier age because otherwise these people in the young age bracket might escape service to their country altogether and calling them earlier might have the adverse effects I have already discussed.

"Our country must not only maintain its present national defense power but must increase it. The chief bulwark for our national security and for international peace is in fact our national defense. We should do nothing that in any way minimizes this. In doing so we should be as fair as possible between people equally situated, and it seems to me that the 4-year extension would be preferable to the 2-year extension for all of these reasons."

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I listened attentively to the gentleman from Florida. I did not hear him, when asked the question, point to any portion of the hearings or testimony on the part of General Hershey as dealing with the specific question of the extension of the draft for 2 years or for 4 years. This is the issue and nothing else: Are we going to extend conscription of American youth for 2 years or for 4 years? I am in favor of 2 years. I cannot understand for the life of me, with all the stories we hear about unemployed youths in this country, why the military services are unable to get on a volunteer basis the manpower needed. I wonder if somebody on the Committee on Armed Services would tell me why, in view of all the unemployed youths in this country and the furor that is being raised about that, why the military services cannot get the manpower needed on a voluntary basis?

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield briefly to the gentleman.

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. We went into that in our committee. We have an actual example of this. In the decade last past, there was a period of some 2 years when there was no draft. The actual result of this was that we did not have enough people.

Mr. GROSS. Will the gentleman tell me why?

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. The gentleman yielded, so I want to answer him. I will not take up too much of his time.

Mr. GROSS. Tell me why. Tell me why you cannot get them. I do not want a recital of past history. Just tell me why you cannot do it now.

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. They did not do it then and the reason I presume is because the young men of our country feel that we people who are sent to the Congress of the United States should have the courage to enact laws to bring the needed manpower into the services at the proper time and that is what I ask you to vote for today.

Mr. GROSS. And I am asking you why the unemployed youth does not volunteer for the military service today?

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. I think, perhaps, the answer might be that they do not like the pay they receive.

Mr. FOREMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. FOREMAN. I think one reason they do not volunteer under the draft——

Mr. GROSS. I am talking about unemployment.

Mr. FOREMAN. One reason they do not volunteer is that, in the first place, they are not paid enough money, and in the second place under our unemployment compensation policy this man can be gainfully unemployed. So they are going to be unemployed rather than to enlist.

Mr. GROSS. I think the gentleman has something. Congress approves the Peace Corps, the Domestic Peace Corps, and organizations like the "Sons and Daughters of I Will Arise To Take Care of Them"; and, of course, they will not do any military service. Furthermore, I cannot understand why with all the enormous increase in prosperity in Europe where we have poured out billions of dollars to get them on their feet—why we cannot withdraw our five or six divisions and bring them back to this country. Can someone tell me why? Some of these countries are abandoning their conscription systems; and others are lowering the obligated service of their conscripts. They are prosperous, their industries are humming. Why can we not withdraw our five or six divisions and let them provide their own troops? Why do they not take care of their own military obligations in Europe?

That is one of the questions for which I get no answer.

I am for an extension of the draft but not for 4 years. Let it be extended until July 1, 1965, and then let Congress take a good solid look to see whether it should be continued. I am opposed to fastening universal conscription on this country and this is what is happening on the basis of these 4-year extensions.

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Chairman, as a member of this committee, I have listened to all the testimony from 1959 to 1963; to all the briefings on the posture of the Military Establishment of this Nation and conditions in the world.

The same arguments have been used here today that were used before the committee in reference to the length of time of the extension and as to whether or not we should have a Selective Service System.

I do not like the draft any more than anyone else, and I am quite sure we would all like to get rid of it if we could. That is not at issue here today. The issue is 2 years as against 4 years. I believe 2 years is too short a time. I believe 4 years is needed not only from the point of view of the Military Establishment but from the point of view of the young men of this country who go to either high school or college. Then they would know what was ahead of them in the next 4 years; whether they would be subject to military service, whether they could complete college with or without deferment.

I listened to all the testimony of Gen. Hershey and others on this bill and to those who have done the planning. It is not a question of whether we should uphold the Committee on the Armed Services or the chairman of the committee. The question is one of training, and I believe, therefore, we should extend this selective service for the next 4 years

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. BECKER. I yield.

Mr. COLLIER. Whatever time it is extended, how different would the man toward the end of the extended period be than the man who was faced with being drafted a year ago, a year prior to the expiration of the last extension? In other words, he cannot do any planning until he knows what the intent or the action of the Congress will be. Is that a fair statement?

Mr. BECKER. We have had many wars——

Mr. COLLIER. We are now talking about training. A year ago there was no one in the military service nor any young man in the country who could know what the action of Congress would be when the Selective Service Act expired. There can be no certainty until the young men know what the action of the Congress will be.

Mr. BECKER. That is what I am talking about. We are trying to take the indefiniteness out of it and express the intent of Congress. That is exactly what we are doing.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield I think for the information of the gentleman from Illinois that is exactly what Congress did when we extended it in 1951, 1955, and 1959.

I think in all fairness to these boys we should say that this is an extension of the draft for 4 years, not because we want the draft but because of the necessity of the situation, rather than to come back in 2 years and do the same thing all over again.

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Chairman, I would like to make this particularly clear to everyone. Much agrument has been raised. Do we need a draft? Why do not more volunteer? We are faced with the fact that they do not volunteer. The draft is a threat. There is no question about that in my mind. I want to be perfectly honest about that. Because we have the draft we are getting a great many more volunteers than we would if we did not have the draft. I believe that. Consequently, we need an extension. I think we would be making a mistake if we did not make it for 4 years.

Mr. GROSS. Should you not then have in here a bill providing for a permanent conscription setup? If that is what you want, why do you not come in with it?

Mr. BECKER. I hope we can sometime, perhaps not in the foreseeable future, eliminate the Selective Service, but we cannot do it now.

Mr. GROSS. Let us take a good hard look at it every 2 years.

Mr. BECKER. I think we are taking a good hard look at it all the time.

Mr. ARENDS. I was here a few years ago when several of us led the fight against compulsory military training. Nobody wants military training.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pending amendment.

All of us know, certainly anyone who takes the time at all to look at history, that military power is the decisive force in the settlement of world affairs. Certainly we have seen this in our lifetime. Certainly we know that friendship between nations in the final analysis comes down to the point of which nation has the greatest strength in determining the course that smaller nations may take.

As we look at our hemisphere plans, as we see what is happening in Cuba, as the President of the United States begins his trip in just a few days to Central America, it is urgent that we in the Congress be responsible in extending the draft for 4 years and let the nations of this hemisphere know that we are determined to remain strong and the leader for solidarity in this hemisphere against communism. I hope we can allow the President to keep strong the military forces of our country.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pending amendment.

Mr. Chairman, right now we are living in a very critical and chaotic world. If we attempt to cut this back from 4 years to 2 years, it will mean to the rest of the world we are receding. It will affect the morale of the people of the world. So let us not cut back from 4 years to 2 years at this critical time.

You know after World War I we let down our guard; we sank our battleships, we destroyed our fortifications, and we put our trust in treaties with people we thought were as rightminded as we were, and after that we went down the pathway of pacifistic peace. After they dumped tons of dynamite on our battleships and fortifications and wiped out 50 percent of our fleet and 3,300 lives, we were in another war, and we were again caught with our guard down, not prepared.

We demobilized after bringing World War II to a close; we demobilized our Army and Navy and Air Force, and we went down the pathway of pacifistic peace, and again we found ourselves suddenly thrust into Korea. And, what did we have? We were totally unprepared, and if it had not been for the Reserves who fought in World War II, we would have been in a terrible predicament. We called them back after they had fought in World War II, after they had started to raise their families and started their businesses, we sent them into Korea, and we were very nearly pushed back into the sea at Pusan, the most humiliating incident that ever happened in the history of this Nation. After that we passed this legislation on two different occasions each time extending the law for 4 years. Now you want to cut it back to 2 years, telling the world that we are receding and receding instead of building the greatest national strength that this country has ever known to meet any and all emergencies that may arise at any time anywhere in the world. Let us pass this bill as it is for 4 years. It is needed.

Take a boy at 18 years of age. Supposing he gets out of high school at that age. By the time he gets through with his college, being deferred for college, he is over 22. The gentleman wants to make an exception, but you certainly will have yourselves in a lot of trouble, wanting to make exceptions. Take 18 to 22. So he is deferred. But, it is all right for the boy who has not the means and wherewithal to go to college, to take him and draft him.

Now, this law has worked in a very, very satisfactory manner for a number of years, and I suggest to the Members of this House that we have confidence in the chairman of this committee who has brought this legislation before us, and let us pass it as it is. I am quite certain that we will then be able to state that we are showing the world that we are not reducing or receding or cutting back in any way, but we are going to build the greatest national defense that this country has ever had.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I wonder if we can agree on time for debate on this amendment. I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Collier] for 2½ minutes.

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Chairman, that will be more than ample time.

Mr. Chairman, I have no predeterminations about whether this extension should be 4 years or 2 years. But it seems to me when someone offers an argument in justification of either 2 or 4 years, there should be some validity to the argument.

All I am trying to find out here today is this: If the reasoning which has been offered in support of a 4-year extension is, in fact, valid and if all the things which have been said before in justification of 4 years are valid, then why 2 years ago did not this committee come forward with a bill to extend the draft for 4 years? As of 2 years ago the committee had no more assurance as to what would happen, regardless of the military posture, than it has today if we passed this bill extending it for 2 years.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLLIER. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. GAVIN. We did not pass it for 2 years. We passed it for 4 years.

Mr. COLLIER. Permit me to tell the gentleman from Pennsylvania that I was here and I voted to extend it for 4 years. I am quite aware of that.

What I am saying is this: If you need a 4-year planning period, then perhaps we were derelict 2 years ago in not having extended it to 4 years, because 2 years ago we were in no different position than you would be today if you passed it for 2 years.

Mr. Chairman, I seek light out of darkness; that is all. If the argument is good for 4 years, then why is not the argument good for 10 years? Then, we would really have a long range planning period.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLLIER. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. GAVIN. I might say to the gentleman from Illinois that as far as I am concerned I can support it for a period of 10 years, until there is some peace and stability restored to this troubled, discontented world in which we live. I just want us to remain strong. If this bill passes today providing for a period of 2 years, it will indicate to the Soviets that we are cutting back.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. Ryan] for 2½ minutes.

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment. It seems to me we have lost sight of what is proposed by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. Reuss]. The gentleman is simply proposing that the present law as it now exists be extended for a period of 2 years. The committee proposes its extension for a period of 4 years.

Mr. Chairman, the question is not the age at which a young man shall be subject to induction. The question is not whether or not the draft age should be reduced from 26 years to 22 years, which question was disposed of earlier. The question is simply whether or not we are going to extend this law for 2 years or for 4 years. It seems to me that by extending the law for 2 years we at the same time say to the Department of Defense that there should be a thorough review of our military manpower requirements. The important thing is to have a thorough review. By extending the draft for 4 years, we are postponing the day when this review will be undertaken.

The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. Kastenmeier] has proposed the establishment of a Presidential Commission on the Utilization of Military Manpower to study our military manpower situation and the effectiveness of the draft in meeting our needs in an age of technological revolution. That makes good sense. And Congress should undertake a thorough study of the operation of the draft and gather information from educators, behavioral scientists, trade unionists, military experts and others.

The draft affects more homes and families in our country than almost any other single piece of legislation this Congress will consider.

I am not impressed by the argument that there should be a 4-year extension because of precedent. The world is moving too rapidly for us to be bound by precedent. Nor am I impressed by the emotional appeal that a 2-year extension will be interpreted as a sign of weakness. The real weakness is to cling to precedent and refuse to reevaluate past policy.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RYAN of New York. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. GAVIN. Would the gentleman vote for an extension of 2 years?

Mr. RYAN of New York. I intend to vote for the extension of the draft, if the amendment——

Mr. GAVIN. I am asking the gentleman a direct question which the gentleman can answer "yes" or "no."

Mr. RYAN of New York. If the gentleman will listen, the gentleman will hear the answer. I intend to vote for the extension of the draft for 2 years if that amendment is adopted, and for the committee's bill if the amendment is defeated. But I do believe it is important to have a thorough review of this question.

Mr. GAVIN. If the gentleman will yield further, will the gentleman vote for the bill if the period of extension is 4 years?

Mr. RYAN of New York. I said so.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. Gubser] for 2½ minutes.

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, one of the most striking things about our hearings this year was that they were almost exactly a carbon copy of the hearings on the same bill 4 years ago, and in all probability those hearings were carbon copies of the hearings held 4 years before that.

Mr. Chairman, inevitably the argument is "let us have a thorough review." We gave you a thorough review last year under the able chairmanship of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Price]. I devoted days, hours and weeks, just as did every other member of that committee, going into the question of manpower utilization.

Mr. Chairman, the question is this: Are we going to take the hours and weeks of work and labor that went into that report and throw them out the window and start all over with another one?

We plan Polaris submarines 44 months in advance. Is it not wise to plan the utilization of the manpower to man those expensive implements of war at least 4 years in advance?

Mr. Chairman, we conduct a review, and we find nothing new. In my opinion, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Gavin] has given to the Members of the House a most compelling and persuasive argument: that now of all times we should not say to the world that the United States is receding from its strong position of readiness.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GUBSER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HALL. Would not the gentleman agree also that there are five additional parts to this extension of the so-called Selective Service and Universal Military Training Act? In addition to the draft law there is the suspension of other laws, the extension of the Dependents Assistance Act, the Doctors Draft Act and the specialist incentive pay. I should think for administrative planning it would be important that the department that has submitted this bill to the Congress have these things finalized as to the length of time in which this can happen. And further, a last point. I would like to point out that the corollary is also true to some of the objections that have been raised here. Many of the advanced technical people who are well trained and seasoned and whom we need in the armed services of today and who are serving us so beautifully need this additional time in which to complete their training, and therefore they must know that they will have a full 4 years of training.

Mr. GUBSER. That is very true.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the distinguished gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Vinson], the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I trust that the Committee will overwhelmingly reject this amendment. Of all times to talk about letting the world think that we are reducing our forces, this is the wrong hour, this is the wrong time. Every chancery in the world would be astonished and uncertain if the word went out that the House of Representatives today had changed the period for extending the draft. What change has come over the Congress of the United States? they will say. In three different times over a period of 12 years the draft has been extended for 4 years. Now, when no one knows what the morrow will bring, we are asked to come in here and change the period of extension from 4 years to 2 years.

I certainly hope that this House under no condition will change that extension of time. I hope the Committee will reject this amendment overwhelmingly.

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Chairman, I support the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. Reuss], which would limit the extension of the draft to a period of 2 years, rather than the 4 years proposed in the bill before us.

I most certainly agree that during these most perilous times, it is absolutely necessary that we continue the draft. In this age of manpower versus mechanization, in this nuclear pushbutton age, I agree that we must maintain our military strength, not only for the protection of these United States, but to honor our military commitments in other farflung areas of the world. If it is necessary that we enlarge our Armed Forces, and increase our military strength to prevent further Communist aggression, I would gladly support such a program.

However, with world conditions as unsettled as they are today, with some of our allies willing to assume additional responsibilities insofar as the defense of their own country is concerned, with so many new nations emerging which are willing and anxious to take their own places in the union of free countries, we cannot be sure of what our manpower or military requirements might be in the future. Certainly an extension of 2 years at the present time would give us the necessary time and an opportunity to thoroughly review and reconsider our military needs in the light of current and future developments. And, if as a result of the investigation and study it is determined that the draft must be continued, then it would be a fairly easy task to ask the Congress in session at that time to extend the appropriate legislation.

If this amendment is defeated, I shall, of course, vote for the committee bill, to extend the draft for a period of 4 years.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. Reuss].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. Reuss) there were—ayes 43, noes 154.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Goodell: On page 1, after line 6, insert the following new subsection:

"Section 1 of the Universal Military Training and Service Act is amended by inserting the following subsection (f):

" 'It is the sense of the Congress that, in the selection of men for induction for training and service under this Act, greater emphasis, consistent with the needs of the individual services, should be given to younger registrant nonfathers who have not entered regular employment or continued their formal education.' "

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOODELL. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 20 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Chairman, let me emphasize first of all that there is a problem. I am not going to belabor this, but our present selective service laws are in themselves in many instances creating a problem with our young people who reach the age of 18 or 19 years, and they are not under general circumstances going to be called into the draft until they are 23. That is the average age today. Many of these young people are adrift in our city streets. They are not going to enlist in the services.

We are talking about programs in our Committee on Education and Labor to try to take these youngsters off the city streets when they are 18 or 19 years old. One of the few good ways of taking some of these off the streets at a time when they are adrift is through the Selective Service System.

I am not proposing here by this amendment to require that the selective service officials take registrants at any specific age, 18, 19, 20, or any other time. I am simply offering as the sense of Congress that we feel, that where possible and where consistent with the needs of the individual services, they should take more youngsters at the age of 18½ or 19, as the law permits them to take them. This is something that will and can be done for these young people, taking some of the uncertainty out of their lives during this period. There is a job gap for them now. There is no question that at 18, 19, or 20 there is less disruption in the personal lives of these young men to go into the military service than later; there is less disruption in the fabric of our society, if it is possible, all other things being equal, to take them in the service.

This is an amendment to the policy section of the law. It requires nothing of the Selective Service Board or the President. It simply notifies them that this is a problem from our viewpoint, a problem to which we wish they would give some attention. At the moment the last people to be called under the present regulations are those 18½ and 19 who are nonfathers. This would presumably raise that category up to the third category, after the delinquents and those who volunteer.

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOODELL. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. GUBSER. I have noticed that in the amendment the gentleman offered there was a slight change made from the version he read during general debate. Apparently the new version takes into consideration the individual requirements of the services and implies, as I interpret its meaning, that this could vary from service to service.

For example, the Air Force may need men who are more mature than the Marine Corps. This would allow the service to consider their own individual needs.

Mr. GOODELL. That is right. At the suggestion, which I appreciate, of several members of the Committee on Armed Services, I added that phrase, "consistent with the needs of the individual services." It is not my intention to disrupt in any way the interests of national defense. But I think in our Committee on Education and Labor we wish to notify the people of the country and the Congress that this is a real problem.

The Selective Service Act could be used to take some of these people off the streets and contribute significantly to a solution of this problem.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN].

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I should like to supplement what the gentleman from New York has brought out. We on the Committee on Education and Labor have been concerned with the so-called Youth Employment Act. This is an effort to see if in some way we might do something about some 700,000 young people who are presently out of jobs and out of work. Many of them are young men. About half of that number are presumably young women, who would not be primarily concerned either with the Selective Service Act or the Youth Employment Act.

It was our feeling that one of the problems in connection with the 18- and 19-year-old group is that they have not found a regular niche for themselves. The jobs available to them are relatively few in number, partly because they do not have sufficient training of a specialized nature. It was felt that one of the reasons why we have juvenile delinquency problems in some of our cities is that these unemployed youths find ways to keep busy which are not desirable.

It is for this reason that I rise in support of the suggestion that we encourage—but we in no sense direct—that we encourage the utilization of this younger age group as participants in the draft.

Mention was made earlier, during the discussion with respect to the length of the program, that there should be no disruption of planning on the part of the Military Establishment.

I would like to point out this resolution gives the feeling of Congress only. It would in no way disrupt the planning of the individual services. The language reads that it should be consistent with the needs of those services. I do think, if we insert such language, that it suggests there are constructive ways in which these young people may be utilized in our Military Establishment at an earlier age than they are now actually called upon.

When General Hershey was questioned on this, the general said, and unfortunately he was not questioned closely enough, that one of the reasons for the older draft age, and I quote from page 88 of the hearings:

> The more he knows when he comes to training, the more meaningful becomes the training and the more you are integrating training into a personality that has some other capability.

Of course, from the point of view of the military, I can see how a well-educated man, who is perhaps a college graduate, is of more value than one who has not received that training. However, that does not mean as a matter of public policy, that there is not a place in the Military Establishment for more young people. For that reason I rise in support of the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. QUIE].

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this amendment to a bill which on the surface extends the draft 4 years from the age of 18½ to 26 years of age. However, at the present time the draft really is between 23 and 26 years of age. If anybody proposed that we should have a draft law in this country between the ages of 23 and 26, you would wonder what was wrong with them. But really that is what we have right now. We are drafting men between 23 and 26 with jobs and leaving younger men who do not have jobs. It says on page 8 of the report:

> Should the President determine that the best interest of the country would be served by reducing the national average age of induction, which is now 23, he could, under this provision of law, insert after the second category a new category providing that, following the call of delinquents and volunteers, persons of any particular age group could be called.

We by this amendment say it is the sense of the Congress that he should begin calling younger men. The President sent up to us the Youth Employment Act. He is concerned because young men of an age younger than 23 do not have employment. Some of them need a change of environment so he proposes to send them to forest camps in order to develop at that place better work habits and better study habits and develop some discipline. But we have a going program of the military now which is different from the thirties. In the thirties, we had hardly any military system. Now we have one that is virtually at a wartime level and I think it would be well to permit young men and to induce young men who have not seen fit to enlist at this early age to come into the military.

This is the time they are unsettled, not knowing what they ought to do with their lives, what kind of vocational schooling they ought to adopt. Many of them do not choose to enlist. Also they find that employers are reluctant to hire or train these young men. We are talking about training. Let us not forget that the employers of this country are doing the biggest job of training, and they are reluctant today to hire those young men who have not performed their military service.

So I think this is an opportunity for us to express a desire to help these young men who because of lack of motivation, lack of help, be it in their homes, their schools, their communities, are unemployed, creating a problem for us through delinquency or getting in some other trouble. If we would draft them under a policy which is clear and understood by all we could be helping them.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. QUIE. I yield.

Mr. GOODELL. The gentleman understands we are not saying to the selective service boards: "You have to draft young people."

Mr. QUIE. That is right.

Mr. GOODELL. We are just saying we feel this is a problem which the military should take into consideration since they have the establishment there to utilize these young people at a time when they are adrift in our society. If military requirements changed they do not have to do anything to take these 18½- and 19-year-olds.

Mr. QUIE. That is right. We recognize that the military has need for more highly educated people, who are older; but they can certainly utilize more of the young men rather than take only those aged 23 and above, as they do now.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia, chairman of the committee.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I would like to ask him this question: Would not the implementation of this amendment make even more severe the disparity between the young man who cannot go to school and the one who can?

Mr. VINSON. The gentleman is absolutely correct; and for that very reason in the various sections of the Draft Act we have refused to put the arm of protection around any group. That is exactly what would happen by this proposed amendment to the policy section, and I will tell you what will happen. More directives and authority will come out of Washington if this amendment is adopted, than do today.

This is the policy section. Nowhere in the policy section is there one line written today about who will be drafted and who will not be drafted. Here is what is said in this section:

> It is the sense of the Congress that in the selection of men for induction for training and service under this act greater emphasis shall be given to the selection of the younger registrants, nonfathers, who have not entered regular employment or continued their formal education.

Here is what the gentleman is trying to do by his amendment; he is trying to say that you must not pass a uniform method of drafting, in which we deal with all alike. Congress is very deeply concerned about this. Nowhere in the policy section have we tried to indicate who will be drafted; we want to treat them all fairly and alike.

Mr. Chairman, I think this Committee and this House has made a magnificent record here in the matter of amendments that come to us every 4 years. Similar amendments have been offered, but none adopted, since 1951. They have all gone down to defeat. The House in its wisdom has rejected them. I hope the House in its wisdom rejects this one today. Then we will go before the country with a draft law that has not been changed, a draft law that the country knows, and the country understands.

The **CHAIRMAN**. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. GOODELL].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. GOODELL) there were—ayes 59, noes 134.

So the amendment was rejected.

The **CHAIRMAN**. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. SIKES, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2438) to extend the induction provisions of the Universal Military Training and Service Act, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 287, he reported the bill back to the House.

The **SPEAKER**. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The **SPEAKER**. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. GROSS. I am, Mr. Speaker, in its present form.

The **SPEAKER**. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Mr. GROSS moves to recommit the bill, H.R. 2438, to the House Committee on the Armed Services with instructions to report the bill forthwith with the following instructions: "On page 1, line 6, strike 1967 and insert 1965, and in sections 2, 3, 4, and 5 of the bill strike 1967 wherever it appears and insert in lieu thereof 1965."

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion to recommit.

The previous question was ordered.

The **SPEAKER**. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The question was taken, and the Speaker announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The **SPEAKER**. The Chair will count. [After counting] 233 Members are present, a quorum.

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The **SPEAKER**. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 388, nays 3, not voting 43, as follows:

[No. 8]

YEAS—388

Abbitt
Abernethy
Adair
Addabbo
Albert
Alger
Anderson
Andrews
Arends
Ashbrook
Ashmore
Aspinall
Auchincloss
Avery
Ayres
Baker
Baldwin
Baring
Barrett
Barry
Bass
Bates
Battin
Becker
Beckworth
Beermann
Bell
Bennett, Fla.
Bennett, Mich.
Berry
Betts
Blatnik
Boggs
Boland
Bolling
Bolton, Frances P.
Bolton, Oliver P.
Bonner
Bow
Brademas
Bray
Brock
Brooks
Broomfield
Brotzman
Brown, Ohio
Broyhill, N.C.
Broyhill, Va.
Bruce
Buckley
Burke
Burleson
Burton
Byrne, Pa.
Byrnes, Wis.
Cahill
Cameron
Cannon
Carey
Casey
Cederberg
Celler
Chamberlain
Chelf
Chenoweth
Clancy
Clark
Cleveland
Cohelan
Collier
Colmer
Conte
Cooley
Corbett
Corman
Cramer
Cunningham
Curtin
Dague
Daniels
Davis, Ga.
Dawson
Delaney
Dent
Denton
Derounian
Devine
Dole
Donohue
Dorn
Dowdy
Downing
Doyle
Dulski
Duncan
Dwyer
Edmondson
Edwards
Elliott
Everett
Evins
Fallon
Farbstein
Fascell
Feighan
Findley
Finnegan
Fino
Fisher
Flood
Flynt
Ford
Foreman
Forrester
Fountain
Fraser
Frelinghuysen
Friedel
Fulton, Pa.
Fuqua
Gallagher
Garmatz
Gary
Gathings
Gavin
Giaimo
Gibbons
Gilbert
Gill
Gonzalez
Goodell
Goodling
Grabowski
Grant
Gray
Green, Oreg.
Green, Pa.
Grover
Gubser
Hagan, Ga.
Hagen, Calif.
Haley
Hall
Halleck
Halpern
Hanna
Hansen
Harding
Hardy
Harris
Harrison
Harsha
Harvey, Ind.
Harvey, Mich.
Hawkins
Hays
Hébert
Hechler
Hemphill
Henderson
Herlong
Hoeven
Hoffman
Holifield
Holland
Horan
Horton
Hosmer
Huddleston
Hull
Hutchinson
Ichord
Jarman
Jennings
Jensen
Johansen
Johnson, Calif.
Jonas
Jones, Ala.
Jones, Mo.
Karsten
Karth
Kastenmeier
Keith
Kelly
Kilburn
Kilgore
King, Calif.
King, N.Y.
Kirwan
Kluczynski
Knox
Kornegay
Kunkel
Kyl
Laird
Landrum
Langen
Lankford
Latta
Leggett
Lennon
Lesinski
Libonati
Lindsay
Lipscomb
Lloyd
Long, La.
Long, Md.
McClory
McCulloch
McDade
McDowell
McFall
McIntire
McLoskey
McMillan
MacGregor
Mahon
Mailliard
Marsh
Martin, Calif.
Martin, Mass.
Martin, Nebr.
Mathias
Matsunaga
May
Meader
Miller, Calif.
Milliken
Mills
Minish
Minshall
Monagan
Montoya
Moore
Moorhead
Morgan
Morris
Morse
Morton
Mosher
Moss
Multer
Murphy, Ill.
Murphy, N.Y.
Murray
Natcher
Nedzi
Nelsen
Nix
Norblad
Nygaard
O'Brien, N.Y.
O'Hara, Ill.
O'Hara, Mich.
O'Konski
Olsen, Mont.
Olson, Minn.
O'Neill
Osmers
Ostertag
Passman
Patman
Pelly
Pepper
Perkins
Philbin
Pike
Pilcher
Pillion
Pirnie
Poage
Poff
Pool
Price
Pucinski
Purcell
Quie
Quillen
Randall
Reid, N.Y.
Reifel
Reuss
Rhodes, Pa.
Rich
Riehlman
Rivers, Alaska
Rivers, S.C.
Roberts, Ala.
Roberts, Tex.
Robison
Rodino
Rogers, Colo.
Rogers, Fla.
Rogers, Tex.
Rooney
Roosevelt
Rosenthal
Rostenkowski
Roudebush
Roush
Roybal
Rumsfeld
Ryan, Mich.
Ryan, N.Y.
St Germain
St. Onge
Saylor
Schadeberg
Schenck
Schneebeli
Schweiker
Schwengel
Scott
Secrest
Selden
Senner
Shelley
Sheppard
Shipley
Short
Shriver
Sibal
Sickles
Sikes
Siler
Sisk
Skubitz
Slack
Smith, Calif.
Smith, Iowa
Smith, Va.
Snyder
Springer
Staebler
Stafford
Staggers
Steed
Stephens
Stinson
Stratton
Stubblefield
Taft
Talcott
Taylor
Teague, Calif.
Thomas
Thompson, La.
Thompson, N.J.
Thompson, Tex.
Thomson, Wis.
Thornberry
Toll
Tollefson
Trimble
Tuck
Tuten
Udall
Ullman
Utt
Van Deerlin
Vanik
Van Pelt
Vinson
Waggonner
Wallhauser
Watts
Weaver
Weltner
Westland
Whalley
Wharton
White
Whitener
Whitten
Wickersham
Widnall
Williams
Willis
Wilson, Bob
Wilson, Charles H.
Wilson, Ind.
Winstead
Wydler
Wyman
Young
Younger

NAYS—3

Abele
Brown, Calif.
Gross

NOT VOTING—43

Ashley
Belcher
Bromwell
Burkhalter
Clausen
Curtis
Daddario
Davis, Tenn.
Derwinski
Diggs
Dingell
Ellsworth
Fogarty
Fulton, Tenn.
Glenn
Griffin
Griffiths
Gurney
Healey
Joelson
Johnson, Wis.
Kee
Keogh
Macdonald
Madden
Matthews
Michel
Miller, N.Y.
Morrison
O'Brien, Ill.
Patten
Powell
Rains
Reid, Ill.
Rhodes, Ariz.
St. George
Sullivan
Teague, Tex.
Tupper
Walter
Watson
Wright
Zablocki

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Keogh with Mrs. Reid of Illinois.
Mr. Walter with Mr. Rhodes of Arizona.
Mr. Rains with Mr. Gurney.
Mr. Morrison with Mr. Miller of New York.
Mr. Fogarty with Mr. Belcher.
Mr. Patten with Mr. Ellsworth.
Mr. Zablocki with Mrs. St. George.
Mr. Teague of Texas with Mr. Michel.
Mr. Daddario with Mr. Derwinski.
Mr. Diggs with Mr. Glenn.
Mr. Powell with Mr. Curtis.
Mr. Joelson with Mr. Tupper.
Mrs. Sullivan with Mr. Bromwell.
Mr. Dingell with Mr. Griffin.
Mr. O'Brien of Illinois with Mr. Clausen.
Mr. Davis of Tennessee with Mr. Watson.
Mr. Macdonald with Mr. Fulton of Tennessee.
Mr. Johnson of Wisconsin with Mr. Wright.
Mrs. Griffiths with Mr. Ashley.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the bill just passed.

The **SPEAKER**. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

DRAFT LAW EXTENSION

Mr. **SMITH** of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KASTENMEIER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. **KASTENMEIER**. Mr. Speaker, I voted today to extend the draft for an additional 4 years. I did so with a heavy heart. I do not know whether we really need the draft in order to meet our manpower defense needs, and I do not believe that anyone in this Congress knows. I had asked the Armed Services Committee to consider a 2-year extension of the draft and a study to determine whether alternative methods of meeting our military manpower needs could be devised—methods that would be less costly, in terms of taxpayers' dollars and interrupted lives, and more equitable. My suggestion was not heeded by the committee.

This Committee of the Whole House has just rejected my Wisconsin colleague's proposal to limit the extension to 2 years. I voted for that amendment. We were left with the simple choice of voting for or against a 4-year extension. In 1959, faced with the same choice, I voted against the 4-year extension. Today, with great reluctance, I voted for it.

The fight that was made on the floor today for a 2-year extension was a good one, as the considerable support for that proposal showed. It was not passed today, but the fight is not over. We in America cannot settle for a permanent system of compulsory conscription. Sooner or later an alternative system must be found. I will do whatever I can to see that the present method of conscription is questioned and challenged constantly, so that a future Congress can find, in its wisdom, that the draft can eventually be terminated.

INDONESIA

Mr. **JARMAN**. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. **JARMAN**. Mr. Speaker, I read with great interest an article in the March 3 edition of the Washington Post by Chalmers Roberts which described the deep economic troubles of Indonesia. Mr. Roberts had recently spent several days researching the islands of Indonesia, and indicated in some detail the powerful financial and economic problems he found there.

It is with this background that I read, with no little surprise, in the Post on March 6 that President Sukarno has given approval to a contract for the purchase by Indonesia of three luxury American jet aircraft. They will be Convair 990's purchased from General Dynamics Corp., and must be paid for in hard cash, half of which is due by January 1, 1964.

I am not quibbling in the least with the purchase of American equipment—that is to be commended—but it does strike me as downright peculiar that the acquisition of these planes can be justified in the light of Mr. Roberts' findings. The purchase of jet aircraft has proved to be quite a financial burden for even our most prosperous U.S. carriers and an investment which does not begin to pay for itself in the initial years of use.

Obviously, Indonesia expects these new jets to pay off. However, the question arises as to how they can pay for themselves without being put into service over lucrative transatlantic routes. Over routes where our two U.S. international flag carriers must compete with each other, as well as 25 other foreign carriers. These luxury jets are supposed to add to the prestige of Indonesia and to its airline and give it a place of prominence in the field of international aviation. I am wondering whether this is a luxury that either they or we can afford.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD the following articles which appeared in the Washington Post of March 3 and March 6, 1963:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Mar. 6, 1963]

INDONESIA SIGNS FOR THREE JETLINERS

DJAKARTA, March 6.—Beset by financial woes, Indonesia has nevertheless just closed a $20 million deal for three luxury American jetliners for its deficit-ridden airline.

The contract for the Convair 990's has prompted critical economic experts to speak of extravagance in the name of national pride. They question the seriousness of the government's recovery program.

President Sukarno gave final approval to the jet contract last week at a meeting with a representative of General Dynamics Corp. The agreement calls for Indonesia to pay the full amount in hard currency, half of it by January 1, 1964.

This week Foreign Minister Subandrio is expected to sign a $17 million aid agreement aimed at providing emergency first aid for the nation's crippled economy.

Some critics say that the two deals are basically in conflict and raise a question of how determined the government may be in pursuing its announced plan to fight inflation, get industry rolling, and provide adequate food and clothing for 100 million people.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Mar. 3, 1963]

RICH INDONESIA IN DEEP TROUBLE ECONOMICALLY

(By Chalmers M. Roberts)

DJAKARTA.—Indonesia is in economic trouble so deep that something probably is going to happen, and happen sooner rather than later.

This reporter has spent 10 days in Indonesia, chiefly in Java, where 65 million of the nation's estimated 100 million people live. Few lands are more lush or richer in natural resources. But Indonesia is more frustrating than most nations when it comes to trying to estimate where it is headed.

In talks with Indonesians, high and low, and with foreign observers of several nationalities, it is evident that economic conditions have greatly deteriorated in the past 6 months. Rice, the basic staple, is in short supply and prices have been rising erratically.

Copra, the coconut product, lies rotting or is burned because of price problems and disorganized transportation. Communists are alleged to be behind the burning of some sugarcane in the fields. People lack sugar and oils, and margarine has about disappeared. Indonesia is the world's No. 1 importer of rice, yet it is the world's fourth largest producer.

AN ELASTIC CURRENCY

The exchange rate of the Indonesian currency, the rupiah, reflects these economic troubles. The official rate is 45 to $1, the figure at which the United States must spend the rupiah it receives in exchange for the food it sends her under Public Law 480. At the Hotel Indonesia here in Djakarta, the nation's one first-rate hostelry, there is a 500 to $1 rate for food but room bills for foreigners must be paid in dollars or other hard currencies. The black market rupiah rate both here and in Singapore, however, has advanced in the past 6 months from 600 to $1 to about 1,300 to $1.

The result is too much money in circulation, too few goods for the rank and file to buy, inflated prices of rice in the free market (which is used to supplement the absolutely vital rice allowances supplied to Government and many other employees) and a vast amount of smuggling. It has been learned, for example, that half the Indonesian imports into nearby British Singapore are smuggled there from Sumatra or the islands off its coast.

Indonesia is still 80 percent agricultural and rural, only 20 percent industrialized, and few of the industries employ even 1,000 people. Yet industry as a whole is estimated to be running at only around 20 percent of capacity. This means less goods badly needed at home and less for exports to earn dollars to pay for badly needed imports. Smuggling, too, cuts deeply into foreign exchange earnings.

AID HAS BEEN MASSIVE

American aid to Indonesia since independence in 1949 has totaled around $665 million, of which about 45 percent has been in farm surplus items. Aid from all free world nations (of which Japanese reparations, credits and grants together slightly top the American total) has amounted to more than $1.5 billion, compared to an estimated $665 million in economic aid from the Communist bloc. This excludes the massive Soviet military aid.

The U.S.-built cement plant, Indonesia's biggest, is one of the few places now running at 100 percent capacity, and the United States is building a urea fertilizer plant. Each was financed by an Export-Import Bank loan and each will provide about one-third of the national need for its output. The World Bank won't do business here, so poor is Indonesia's credit rating and so shaky its economic structure.

With such a dismal picture so evident, one would expect an explosion of some sort. But Indonesians seem to have a low boiling point; the farmer somehow manages to eat and the city worker frequently resorts to graft and stealing.

A WEST IRIAN SEQUEL

The optimists here, both Indonesian and foreign, argue that these serious economic conditions are about to be faced. They say that the military rebellion against the Government has now been liquidated and the issue of West Irian (West New Guinea) will be finally solved May 1 when that territory comes under Indonesian rule by way of the

United Nations from the Dutch. Hence now is the time to tackle the economic problems.

Indonesian life, of course, is dominated by President Sukarno, as it has been since independence. He recently said that the time had come to concentrate on the economic problem and the Cabinet is reported to have formulated "a basic strategic economic principle for surmounting present economic difficulties."

Critics contend that Indonesia's economic problems are self-made, though they concede that recent floods have added to the woe. Last summer's massive buildup (for a country such as this) for the projected attack on West Irian resulted in commandeering much of the transportation equipment, including the shipping, so vital in a nation of some 3,000 islands stretched across an area the width of the continental United States.

Incidentally, senior military officials have told me that some 30,000 men were within 2 or 3 days of D-day when the Dutch-Indonesian agreement was signed.

Now that some shipping, at least, is coming back to its normal commercial uses, there is an obvious need for a revaluation of the rupiah and a currency stabilization scheme on an international basis. The hopeful think this will happen; the pessimists do not think that Sukarno, whom they rate as an economic illiterate however high they regard his political prowess, will buckle down to the job and enforce the tough decisions, if, indeed, he makes them.

POSSIBLE RED MAJORITY

Such an economic situation, of course, is ready-made for the Communists. The PKI, the Communist Party of Indonesia, and its related labor organization, known as SOBSI, are very powerful. The party now claims 3.5 million members, up from an earlier 2 million claim.

No one knows how strong they really are, but one measure is the fact that a high official remarked to me that if elections were held today, the PKI would win an absolute majority. Some outside observers tend to think he could be right and not merely justifying the lack of elections. At any rate, Indonesia is still under martial law, though it is supposed to be lifted May 1.

Ten political parties are legal, but they operate in something of a vacuum since no election is in sight. Sukarno has talked vaguely of an election in 1963; other officials say perhaps in 1964, but the franker ones concede that date is illusory, too.

As long as Sukarno is alive—he is now 61—he probably will continue to be the boss. Officials here tend to throw up their hands when you ask what will happen if he disappears, but the general view is that the military would take over with a civilian figurehead.

Sukarno has built his "guided democracy" on what we might call the principle of consensus; that is, of getting all rival forces to agree. Since he can enforce a high degree of cooperation, Sukarno has made the Communists keep within bounds.

Of late, Sukarno has been talking a good deal about something he calls NASAKOM, an alphabet soup word meaning nationalism, religion, and communism. The third element used to be socialism; the change seems to reflect the growing power of the PKI. Sukarno's proclaimed aim is to run Indonesia on this three-legged stool principle.

The Communists' aim is to increase the strength of their leg and in due course to upset the stool in their direction. Currently, they are pressing for posts in Sukarno's inner cabinet, from which so far they have been excluded though they hold posts in the so-called outer cabinet.

The Communist Party of Indonesia is said to want the Finance and Information Ministries, and the reason is obvious enough; to make more economic troubles and to control the already left-tinted public utterances of the Government and the press.

The Communist Party of Indonesia, incidentally, is officially oriented toward Peiping in its ideological dispute with Moscow, but there appears to be no evidence of a split below the Politburo level. The rank and file party members are concentrating on exploiting the economic misery. Nor is there any sign that Peiping is attempting to steer the Communist Party of Indonesia into military opposition to the Sukarno regime, a move which, now at least, probably would be as disastrous for the party as was the Stalin-ordered revolution here in the early post-World War II years.

The press in Indonesia is a disgrace by any democratic standard. News of the outside world is at a minimum and often is quite slanted. Newsprint is imported and publishers are under the Government's heel. In this capital of Djakarta, with a population estimated at 3 million, the 15 papers have a combined circulation of 360,000, of which the five Communist or far left papers have about half the total.

The radio is state-owned. Television, which Indonesia can ill afford but which is a status symbol, has begun in Djakarta, where there are an estimated 10,000 imported TV sets.

This is not a land for dissent by any democratic standard. Dissent runs afowl of the Sukarno philosophy of government, which is based on the ancient village system of concensus and which therefore has wide public appeal.

Marxist terminology abounds. When Sukarno received an honorary degree February 2 at the University of Indonesia here, he was praised for having denounced "individualism, liberalism, capitalism, imperialism, feudalism, fascism as sources of explotation of man by man." Communism was missing from the list. Any enemy of Indonesia will quickly be branded as an imperialist or neocolonialist or capitalist.

Some of this is explicable for reasons other than the power of the nation's Communist Party. As able American Ambassador Howard P. Jones, a man with 7 years' experience here, recently put it in a speech: "To the majority of Indonesians—in fact to most of the newly emerging peoples of the African and Asian world—the word 'capitalism' brings forth an immediate and vivid picture of foreign control of their economy and not infrequently, of foreign exploitation and oppression."

The Dutch, who exploited the wealth of the Indies during 300 years of rule, are still unpopular although some Indonesians want enough of them to come back to help revitalize the largely Dutch-built farm and factory equipment. The Japanese, who occupied the country from 1942 to 1945, are looked upon as liberators from the Dutch.

Those who worry publicly about communism in Indonesia are accused of having a Communist phobia. The more democratic leaders will tell you, as foreign observers also do, that the PKI's power is balanced by the military, which is rated as highly anti-Communist.

Large numbers of army, navy and air force officers have been to the United States and the resulting friendship, from the sample I have had, is impressive. The same can be said for the several thousand students and technicians who have been sent to the United States.

Indonesians talk a lot about their poorness despite their great wealth of little-tapped resources, which include the biggest oil source in Asia, much rubber, copra, tin and other items. In moments of frankness, they will say they have their hands out to both East and West—and that they expect to have their wants met.

The people, of course, are the greatest resource. They are not as aggressive as the Japanese or as hard working as the many Chinese among them, on whom they look with suspicion and often with envy despite the official Indonesian friendship with Red China. Yet Indonesians are industrious; they must be to survive, especially in Java, the most crowded major area in the world after Belgium.

They are not naturally very adept mechanically, but they are trying, or at least the upper echelon is trying, to propel the nation into the 20th century industrial revolution. Sukarno has in motion, at least, a massive education program with three shifts in the schools. But the lacks are everywhere—trained teachers, buildings, books, paper. And it costs the university student far more to board than to study.

Indonesia's problem today quite obviously is to get its economic house in order. Perhaps the optimists are right and the necessary moves will now be made. But the pessimists are correct in demanding to see the evidence.

One would be more of an optimist, despite the nation's obvious shortcomings and the massive power of the Communists, if it were not for the lurking suspicion that Sukarno would prefer another foreign policy adventure. The row with Malaya over the British colonial possessions along the northern fringe of Borneo is the subject for another article.

Then, too, the Portuguese hold half of the island of Timor, an anachronism which Indonesians hint they will get around to in due course. To many, Sukarno is a permanent revolutionary who needs such foreign issues to keep his momentum.

In short, this is an attractive yet often baffling nation where many are seeking real progress but where the machinery of government socialism is clearly inadequate to the need. Indonesia's future is questionable, yet it is full of vital people who are trying to shed the colonial past with all its inhibitions in order to come to grips with the future.

CENTENNIAL ANNIVERSARY OF BATTLE OF GETTYSBURG

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include a statement.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, this year Americans everywhere will observe the centennial of the Battle of Gettysburg and the centennial of Lincoln's Gettysburg Address, two of the most important events in our Nation's history.

Congressman WALTER and I are offering bills today that would authorize the President to appoint a commission of 10 persons to cooperate with the commission appointed by Governor Scranton of Pennsylvania to plan and carry out the ceremonies relating to those events. It also would authorize the Secretaries of the Army, Navy, and Air Force to provide for the participation of the armed services in the observances.

The State of Pennsylvania has already allocated $105,000 for use by the State commission and this bill authorizes up to $150,000 for Federal participation.

Pennsylvania's two Senators, CLARK and SCOTT, are introducing identical measures in the Senate today.

Although the center of activity for these observances is in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, the Battle of Gettysburg and Lincoln's Address at the battlefield are integral parts of American history. I am hopeful that the Congress will recognize the great national interest in these events and act favorably on these bills.

Mr. Speaker, the Congress in the past has recognized the two events as part of our American history and helped provide funds to implement appropriate commemorations.

Under unanimous consent I insert as part of my remarks, prior actions by the Congress as they apply to the two events:

The following bills and/or legislative enactments relate to the 75th anniversary celebration of the Battle of Gettysburg (Congressional Record, 75th Cong., 3d sess., Jan. 3, to June 16, 1938):

1. Public Law 518 (H.R. 9784) authorized an appropriation to aid in defraying the expenses of the observance of the 75th anniversary of the Battle of Gettysburg, at Gettysburg, Pa., from June 29 to July 6, 1938.

2. Public Law 501 (H. Rept. 8039) authorized the attendance of the Marine Band at the observance of the 75th anniversary of the Battle of Gettysburg at Gettysburg, Adams County, Pa., on July 1, 2, and 3, 1938.

3. Public Resolution 103 (H.J. Res. 693) appropriated aid in defraying expenses to the observance of the 75th anniversary of the Battle of Gettysburg.

4. H.R. 9265 authorized an appropriation to aid in defraying the expenses of the observance of the 75th anniversary of the Battle of Gettysburg.

Fiftieth anniversary of the Battle of Gettysburg (Congressional Record, 62d Cong., 3d sess., Feb. 27, to March 4, 1913; 63d Cong., 1st and 2d sess., Apr. 7 1913, to Oct. 24, 1914):

1. Public Resolution 4 (H.J. Res. 103) appropriated $4,000 to defray traveling expenses of soldiers of the Civil War, residing in the District of Columbia, from Washington, D.C., to Gettysburg, Pa., and return.

2. House Resolution 179 accepted the invitation and appointed a committee from the House to attend the reunion celebration at Gettysburg, Pa., July 1, 2, 3, and 4, 1913 (approved June 20, 1913).

3. Senate Resolution 115 accepted the invitation to attend the reunion celebration at Gettysburg, Pa., July 1, 2, 3, and 4, 1913 and provided for a committee of eight to attend on behalf of the Senate (approved June 21, 1913).

4. S. 570 (H.R. 1742) provided for the erection of a memorial amphitheater in the Gettysburg National Cemetery, Pa.

5. S. 571 authorized the construction of a Lincoln Memorial Highway from the White House, Washington, D.C., to the battlefield in Gettysburg, Pa.

6. S. 8031 provided for the presentation of medals to all surviving soldiers of the Battle of Gettysburg.

7. S. 1751 provided for the presentation of medals to all surviving soldiers of the Battle of Gettysburg.

8. H.R. 5395 appropriated $2,500 for transportation of soldiers of the Civil War to the celebration of the Gettysburg anniversary.

9. H.R. 5848 provided for the erection of a monument on the battlefield of Gettysburg to commemorate services of the U.S. Signal Corps during the War of the Rebellion.

10. H.R. 5895 appropriated $3,500 for the tranportation of soldiers of the Civil War to the celebration of the Gettysburg anniversary.

11. H.R. 11112 created the Gettysburg Peace Memorial Commission, charged with the duty of locating the memorial on the Gettysburg battlefield to commemorate the 50th anniversary of that battle, July 1, 2, 3, and 4, 1913.

NEED TO SEPARATE KERR-MILLS FROM WELFARE PROGRAMS

Mr. BAKER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. Speaker, on March 6, 1963, I introduced a bill—H.R. 4511—to amend the Social Security Act so as to allow the States to administer separately the medical assistance for the aged program under the recent Kerr-Mills law if they so elect. For some time I have had the feeling that the statutory prohibition preventing the program from operating on its own has impeded its success. Earlier in the session I prepared the above bill which I then introduced March 6.

The Kerr-Mills law—also known as medical assistance for the aged—was originally enacted into the Social Security Act in 1960 under the cosponsorship of former Senator Kerr, of the Finance Committee, and Representative Mills, chairman of the Ways and Means Committee. The Kerr-Mills law provided for a program of medical aid for the aged with Federal matching funds, which could be adopted by any State. Moreover, it provided that where a State had both the old age assistance program—OAA—under earlier legislation and the Kerr-Mills program for medical assistance for the aged—MAA, both programs had to be administered, or at least supervised, by a single State agency. In practical terms, this has meant that in those States which have adopted both OAA and MAA, the programs are being administered by the respective State's department of welfare—or a similar agency.

This has resulted in an extremely undesirable and unintended situation. A State's department of welfare is an agency which, as the name denotes, handles the welfare programs—most of which are Federal-State participating or matching-of-funds programs. Clearly, the MAA program under the Kerr-Mills law is not and was never intended to be a welfare program. While the OAA program, aid to dependent children and the like are programs to aid the indigent, the MAA program is intended to aid those—who although they are not indigent—are medically-in-need due to sudden or catastrophic illness. These individuals are able to meet their day-to-day living expenses, and under no stretch of the imagination can they categorically be classified as indigents.

With MAA being administered by the same State agency that handles the true welfare programs, it has in the eyes of the public taken on the features of a welfare program. This has been bad in that it is not a welfare program. People who avail themselves of its benefits should not be made to feel that they are indigents. In other words, it has been psychologically damaging to have it under a welfare agency.

MAA has had to compete with other programs handled by the agency both as to money and personnel. Because it is not truly a welfare program, obviously it has not fared too well in competition for the necessary personnel and money with the regular welfare programs within a State department of welfare.

Although I recognize that a separate State agency can administer the MAA program under current law if it is supervised by the State department of welfare, I feel that a change is needed. In those too few States where the department of health administers the MAA program, the department of welfare maintains such control as to seriously weaken any autonomy that could and should exist. This is not the fault of any State so involved, as the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare prefers to work with a single State agency in all Federal-State programs of this sort. Due to the complications and uncertainty involved in establishing a MAA program, almost all States enact simple enabling legislation. The State department of welfare then draws up a contract for Federal participation. If the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare does not see fit to approve the contract, then there can be no program. In the case of MAA, I have been led to understand that unless a high degree of control is vested in the department of welfare where a second State agency is brought into the picture, HEW approval will not be forthcoming.

This means that the details of the MAA program are left to the principal State agency, which in all cases is the department of welfare. It is the position of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare that in all cases where the State enacting legislation does not provide specific provisions, the State department of welfare must set the standards. This means that the department of welfare would determine eligibility, the items of care to be provided, the amount of care—that is, the days of care—and the amount of payment to those eligible. Therefore, where the department of health is involved it is left to provide the services. The best description of the department of health in these situations is that it merely acts as a vehicle of the department of welfare. Thus, although a second agency can participate under present law, it is apparent that such participation is limited.

Other than the fact that MAA is not an indigent program there are other reasons for distinguishing it from OAA and other welfare programs. Even the method of payment in the case of MAA is different. The MAA program is handled entirely by vendor payments—direct payments to the provider of the particular service being compensated for. On the other hand, the OAA program and kindred welfare programs provide for direct payments to the recipients of the aid in addition to vendor payments. Moreover, MAA is under a separate matching of funds arrangement with the Federal Government—both the matching formula and the percentages are different from the other aid programs.

Under title XVI of the Social Security Act, MAA, OAA, aid to the blind, and aid to the disabled may be combined into a single program under a single State plan. Some might wish to argue that allowing for the separation of MAA in such cases will disrupt the unity or solidarity of the program. However, in anticipation of such, let me state that under that title the aid for the blind program can be separately administered if certain conditions exist; namely, if aid for the blind was separate on the date of the passage of title XVI—January 1, 1962—and on the date the State submits such combined plan to HEW for approval.

Therefore, I cannot possibly see how the separation of MAA could weaken the purposes of title XVI when an exception already exists.

The MAA program under the Kerr-Mills law has the potential to become a program sufficient to meet the medical needs of those not able to provide for themselves and those not eligible for the bona fide welfare programs. In order for it to meet with success it needs to be given a fair chance to operate on its merits—or to stand on its own feet, so to speak.

Apart from the enactment of this bill—H.R. 4511—the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare should face up to the task that it has before it; effective and comprehensive implementation of the Kerr-Mills law in accordance with the express intent of the Congress.

The Kerr-Mills law recognizes the problem of adequate medical care for the aged very definitely exists throughout the Nation and that the individual States are best suited and equipped to determine the most effective types of implementation. It recognizes the broad national scope of the problem by direct appropriations from the Federal Treasury to be matched by State and local contributions.

The logical State agency to administer this program is the department of public health because the Kerr-Mills program is a health program, especially designed to meet the health needs and problems of our aged citizens.

Responsibility for the success of the administration of this program should be placed squarely where it belongs; that is upon the departments of public health of the States, counties, and municipalities.

I believe that the various departments of public health throughout the Nation, State and local governments are ready and willing to assume this responsibility and to efficiently and successfully administer the program of meeting the health needs of our aged population.

UNITED STATES HELPS MAKE COMMUNISM WORK BY SPECIAL FUND ASSISTANCE IN POLAND

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous material.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, today I wish to call the attention of the House to a farm problem. Not our American farm problem—although we have a "doozie" on our own hands.

I wish to address myself to the farm problem of Communist Poland. And, I think it may be of some considerable interest to this House and to the American taxpayers to know that we are paying to help improve communism's most colossal failure—a failure they even admit.

My colleagues, under the United Nations Special Fund, American taxpayers are contributing to a project designed to teach Communists how to feed their people adequately. That is something they never have been able to do before.

We Americans are paying to help make communism work.

I refer this House to two projects of the Special Fund of the United Nations now being conducted in Red Poland. One allocates more than $1 million to aid Polish agriculture; the other allows at least $700,000 to help Polish industry. Forty percent of those grants equals some $688,000—the amount American taxpayers are coughing up under a deficit budget to help make communism work.

It might be noted here, Mr. Speaker, that Polish Communist Premier Joseph Cyrankiewicz is right next door in Mexico this week talking to Mexican officials with the announced purpose of pressuring them to lay off of Castro.

Let us also note that this Polish agriculture program is not a food-for-peace plan we Americans are subsidizing. Nor is it a plan whereby our surplus agricultural materials are used to benefit needy persons. It is a program for which we get no credit, into which we put our dollars and by which we are helping the Reds learn how to feed their people—with them getting credit for any improvement.

We are helping the Reds make a success in areas where they never have done so under their own steam. We are helping strengthen Red Cuba in agriculture and in aircraft operations, as I have discussed here. We are helping Red Yugoslavia in nuclear research, as I have shown this House.

Under this amazing second foreign aid plan Americans are giving money to the U.N., letting the U.N. spend its anywhere it wants, and abdicating any chance to check on how our money is spent.

Let us consider in more detail the Polish food project:

POLAND—FOOD PRODUCTION PROJECT

Last January the Governing Council of the U.N. Special Fund approved expenditures in Poland of $1,020,500 for a 4-year project entitled "Research and Extension Services for Food Production, Processing, and Utilization." The project goal involves establishment of a national center of nutritional research, education, and food extension services, and technical advisory services to the food industry.

The Food and Agriculture Organization—FAO—of the United Nations—remember that farm project in Cuba?—is the executing agency. The discussion of this project in a Special Fund document marked for "restricted" distribution notes that Poland wishes to bring: "special emphasis to bear on questions of nutritional policy as related to communal feeding."

This document says the Polish Government needs help to provide its people a balanced diet, palatable foods at low cost and high-grade proteins and vitamins.

Poland, the U.N. says: "has embarked on a policy of coordination, extension, and upgrading of the research now being done on food production and processing, with a view to solving the most pressing nutritional problems."

No doubt the Reds are feeling some pressure from the spirited Polish people who are getting a little hungry, but more pointedly—resent being levied on in kind. No doubt the Reds would in this case welcome a few capitalistic dollars to help them over this rough, Red spot. They also ask the U.N. to give them money for revision of courses in food technology at the Warsaw College of Agriculture.

The U.N.—without asking the American taxpayers—has agreed to help solve this Communist problem and has provided for a project to include: "Research on major food problems, nutritional surveys, study of institutional feeding, development of extension services directed toward better family feeding and broad education programs in nutrition, and advisory services to the Government on food production, processing, storage, distribution, and consumption."

The U.N. plan for institutes to carry out food research and to train Poles—no question but that they will be Poles selected by the Communist government—to understand nutritional matters. The U.N. plans to improve facilities in a Department of Food Technology at the College of Agriculture at Warsaw and also to give assistance at separate institutes on meat, fish, fats, fruits, and vegetables.

The special fund will provide 14 man-years of experts including a project manager, 9 man-years of fellowships and equipment.

Then, as a final glorious note, the restricted United Nations document observes that once the United Nations has paid to help get this program and these institutes set up the Red Polish Government will be glad to keep on using them after the U.N. has left.

How considerate that is of the Communists, especially even when Napoleon knew that armies travel on their stomachs.

But, solving the Red food crisis is not the only spending concern of the American-buttressed United Nations. Let us see what the U.N. is spending on Red Polish industry:

POLAND—TRAINING CENTER FOR INDUSTRY

In a 3-year project administered by the International Labor Organization—ILO—the Special Fund is providing at least $700,000 for a project entitled "National Center for Training Supervisory Personnel in Industry."

The American share of that grant—40 percent—is $280,000. I wonder if there are any American cities which have improvement projects needing $280,000 worth of help?

This industry project started in 1959 is designed, the U.N. says, in a document marked for "limited" distribution: "To develop a center to provide research, consulting services, and specialized training in supervisory techniques, with initial emphasis on preparing personnel to serve as instructors in regional centers."

We are told that an ILO mission to Poland estimated that there were 140,000 Poles in supervisory grades in industry, who could benefit by having specialized training. In addition the ILO estimated that 15,000 Polish engineers require further training.

Gentlemen, let us remember that it was the United Nations who decided this Communist nation's engineers need more training—not the American taxpayers.

The U.N. tells us that: "The Government of Poland is preparing to establish a series of training centers in productivity and supervisory techniques to meet both the country's short range and longer range needs."

We in the United States have heard about some of the long range goals of communism. They involve world domination and a threat to bury the free West.

The assistance which the Polish Government asked for, and which the U.N. special fund is providing, amounts to making available foreign exchange to pay for the services of international experts, for fellowships and for equipment. It is much more than total contributions to the special funds from this Red satellite.

The international staff consists of four long-term and three short-term experts a year, over the 3 years. The long-term experts are authorities on industrial cost accounting, work study, materials handling, plant transport systems, and inventory accounting.

And, in a burst of generosity, the special fund reminds us that:

> The (Communist Polish) Government will assume full financial responsibility for the maintenance and operation of the center after the special fund's grant has expired.

Is not that just grand. The Reds assure us that not only will they listen politely while we tell them how to whip us, but they also will be glad to keep on using against us all the facilities and intellect we help them to obtain.

Mr. Speaker, would it be too much to suggest that at the very least the American taxpayers may want to take a look at how the United Nations spends their money and to insist upon a careful check to see that it goes where they want it to go?

FINANCIAL PROVISIONS

Polish project—Research and food production

It has been estimated that the total special fund allocation will be as follows:

	Total cost (in U.S. dollars)	Phasing of expenditure			
		1st year	2d year	3d year	4th year
Experts	273,000	39,000	87,750	87,750	58,500
Fellowships	45,000	10,000	25,000	10,000	
Equipment	637,000	200,000	300,000	137,000	
Miscellaneous	16,000	3,000	5,000	5,000	3,000
Total project cost	971,000	252,000	417,750	239,750	61,500
Executing agency overhead cost	49,500				
Total special fund allocation	1,020,500				

FINANCIAL PROVISIONS

Polish project—Center for Industry Training

The Special Fund's contribution of $700,000 will be allocated, as follows:

	1st year	2d year	3d year	Total
Experts	$67,000	$66,500	$66,500	$200,000
Fellowships	28,000	36,000	36,000	100,000
Equipment	250,000	150,000		400,000
Total	345,000	252,500	102,500	700,000

THE LATE ROBERT LEE STOWE, SR.

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include an article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday, March 9, 1963, one of North Carolina's most stalwart sons, Robert Lee Stowe, Sr., of Belmont, N.C., passed from the earthly scene. Mr. Stowe would have attained the age of 97 years had he lived until April of this year.

During the long life of this great North Carolinian much of the Nation's history was written. Robert Lee Stowe helped write that history.

More than 60 years ago he brought about the building of the first textile plant in the city of Belmont, N.C. Later he was at the front in the organization of many other great textile manufacturing companies. Because of the leadership that he gave in the early days in Belmont's industrial growth there are now 27 textile plants in his home community.

Mr. Stowe was not content to merely participate in the industrial development of our area. He was one of the most public-spirited individuals that I have ever been privileged to know. His service upon the board of education of his home community extended over a period of many years. His interest in government was indicated by his service on the Board of County Commissioners of Gaston County for more than 40 years. His record of service as chairman of the governing board of my home county of Gaston for a period of 33 years is, as far as I know, an unparalleled accomplishment in the State of North Carolina.

Mr. Stowe was a very outstanding Christian layman. The Presbyterian Church, or which he was a member, always had his interest, service, and support. The institutions of that church were the recipients of his philanthropy on countless occasions.

In his private life Mr. Stowe was equally outstanding. The three children born of his marriage to the former Mrs. Nellie Lee Rhyne and their personal accomplishments bear testimony to the quality of leadership which their distinguished father gave in the home. I know of no more outstanding family anywhere.

The passing of Robert Lee Stowe leaves me with a feeling of great personal loss because of the opportunities that I had to know and appreciate his wonderful attributes of character. I have said on many occasions that one of the great privileges that I have had in life was to have had the friendship of this outstanding man. His interest in my activities of a political and personal nature from the time that I returned to my home county as a young man to commence the practice of law was most helpful to me. I shall always remember his many acts of kindness with deep appreciation.

North Carolina and the Nation have lost a great leader in the passing of Robert Lee Stowe.

The newspaper report of the death of Mr. Stowe, which appeared in the Charlotte Observer on March 11, 1963, follows:

R. L. STOWE FUNERAL IS TODAY

R. L. Stowe, 96, pioneer textile industrialist, merchant, and public servant of Belmont, who died Saturday night, will be buried today at 11 a.m. In failing health for several years, he would have been 97 on April 5.

During the more than 60 years of his full productive vigor, Stowe became something of a town and an economy unto himself. A score of Gaston County institutions are the lengthened shadows of this one man.

Twenty-seven textile plants in Belmont, 16 of them cotton-spinning firms, bear his name or organizational imprint. Stowe Mills, Inc., literally made McAdenville. Stowe was the founder and, for more than half a century, the president of the Bank of Belmont.

He was elected to the Gaston County Board of Commissioners in 1914 and became its chairman 8 years later. He was chairman for 33 years.

Stowe was an incorporator of Belmont and served on its town council for many years. For better than half a century he was chairman of Belmont school board.

For 60 years Stowe was treasurer and deacon of Belmont's First Presbyterian Church.

That church's pastor, Dr. Eugene D. Witherspoon, and Dr. W. M. Currie of Greensboro's First Presbyterian Church, will preach graveside services for Stowe at 11 a.m. today at Greenwood Cemetery in Belmont.

He is survived by his wife, the former Nellie Lee Rhyne; a daughter, Mrs. William J. Pharr, of McAdenville; sons, R. L. Stowe, Jr., and Daniel J. Stowe, both of Belmont; a brother, J. W. Stowe, of Belmont; and a sister, Mrs. H. P. Stowe, of Belmont.

THE COTTON TEXTILE INDUSTRY

Mr. KORNEGAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. KORNEGAY. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday, March 7, my distinguished friend and colleague in the North Carolina delegation, the Honorable BASIL WHITENER, was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and to include a resolution adopted by the General Assembly of North Carolina, memorializing the President and the Congress to take immediate action to eliminate the inequity of the two-price system of cotton cost.

I am sure that all the members of the North Carolina delegation to whom this resolution was sent by our secretary of state, the Honorable Thad Eure, were happy to receive this corroboration of the conviction pervading our State that it is imperative to take action to offset the detrimental effects of this inequitable system in order to preserve the cotton textile industry of this Nation.

As I have said on several occasions on the House floor, through the various news media, and before committees of the Congress, an equalization fee to offset the raw cotton export subsidy is an urgently needed rectification of an inequity which has too long gone uncorrected. Our domestic industry is suffering under an unjust and indefensible penalty placed upon it which violates every concept of reasonable and fair competition.

Recently I had the privilege of presenting testimony to the Cotton Subcommittee of the House Agriculture Committee in behalf of legislation sponsored by the chairman of that great committee, and in the course of my testimony concerning the manifest unfairness of the two-price system, I stated:

> This evil is ordinarily associated with the disadvantage which it imposes upon the cotton textile manufacturers in this country, but a careful analysis of the situation reveals that the ill effects of the two-price cotton system permeate the entire cotton business; that is to say, the grower or producer, the ginner, the seller, the manufacturer, the exporter, and finally the consumer himself. Thus the evil is endemic and self-perpetuating.

I repeat these remarks here for the purpose of underscoring my deep concern for the future of the whole cotton culture complex and for the purpose of reiterating—at the risk of being considered repetitious—my unalterable conviction that this Congress should and must take action that will remedy this situation, which in May 1961, was recognized by President Kennedy as comprising one of the items in his seven-point enunciated program for the recovery and preservation of our cotton textile industry in the United States.

In the colloquy which took place on the floor last Thursday, I was heartened and personally gratified that our distinguished Speaker of the House, who is happy to be described as an "urban farmer," took occasion to join with the Members from cotton-producing States in expressing his hope that injustices in the cotton textile industry will be corrected. Our great Speaker described his personal efforts in previous years to have a bill considered which would, to quote his own words, "bring about an equalization so that American industry would receive the same benefits that were given to foreign industry."

So here we have the President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, the chairman of the House Agriculture Committee, the chairman of the Cotton Subcommittee, and numerous Members of Congress from cotton-growing and cotton-manufacturing States all in agreement that it is imperative that action be taken to correct what is now an insuperable impediment to a healthy cotton industry. This atmosphere of agreement and mutual conviction should augur well for remedial action and should, it seems, give the "go" sign to such action at the earliest possible time. But still we do not have a measure reported on this vital subject.

I want to commend the chairman of the House Committee on Agriculture for his efforts to put together a measure to report to the House and at the same time to express the hope that there will be no intransigent attitude on the part of any officials in the executive departments to prevent the House from working its will to effect the best possible solution to this entrenched inequity.

And I want to express the further hope that when the committee has concluded its arduous efforts and deliberations, the reported measure will have the most interested attention of my colleagues in the House for the purpose of solving a problem which impedes the welfare of an industry which is the second largest in the United States and which at present is truly a potential giant shackled in the chains forged by the two-price cotton system.

SUMMARY OF NET BUDGET RECEIPT AND EXPENDITURE TRENDS IN CURRENT FISCAL 1963 COMPARED TO FISCAL 1962 AND TO BUDGET ESTIMATES FOR FISCAL 1963

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Appropriations each month makes a concise summary of current budget results in relation to the previous year and the current budget estimates.

For the information of Members and others who may find it of interest, I ask unanimous consent to include in the RECORD a synoptic tabulation of the trend of net budget receipts and expenditures in the current fiscal year 1963 with comparisons to the official budget estimates for the fiscal year 1963 and to corresponding actual data for the previous fiscal year 1962.

The **SPEAKER.** Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

BUDGET RECEIPTS

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, budget revenues are officially projected at $85,500,000,000 for the fiscal year 1963 ending this June 30—an increase of $4,091,000,000 over fiscal 1962. Through the first 7 months—to January 31, 1963—actual budget revenues exceed the corresponding 7 months of fiscal 1962—to January 31, 1962—by $3,474,000,000.

BUDGET EXPENDITURES

Budget expenditures are officially projected at $94,311,000,000 for the fiscal year 1963 ending this June 30—an increase of $6,524,000,000 over fiscal 1962, of which $1,901,000,000 is for national defense and $4,623,000,000 is for other than national defense.

Through the first 7 months—to January 31, 1963—actual budget expenditures exceed the corresponding 7 months of fiscal 1962—to January 31, 1962—by $4,737,000,000, of which $2,230,000,000 is for national defense and $2,507,000,000 is for other than national defense.

AVERAGE MONTHLY EXPENDITURES

Using straight averages in both instances, the table discloses that expenditures during the first 7 months of fiscal 1963 averaged $7,899,000,000—slightly more than the projected average of $7,859,000,000 for the full year based on the budget estimate of expenditures—a little less for national defense items but slightly overbalanced for nonnational defense.

BUDGET DEFICIT

The official budget estimate of the deficit for fiscal 1963 is $8,811,000,000, or $2,433,000,000 larger than the actual deficit in fiscal 1962.

Through 7 months of fiscal 1963, the actual deficit is $10,640,000,000, or $1,263,000,000 larger than the deficit during the corresponding 7 months of fiscal 1962.

The comparisons and the trends will of course vary each month between January and June in relation to the full-year amounts and in relation to each other. The table follows.

Net budget receipts and expenditures (the administrative budget) 7 months of fiscal 1963 versus 7 months of fiscal 1962 and comparison with full year estimates

[In millions of dollars]

	Actual for 7 months			Budget estimates for fiscal 1963 compared to actual for fiscal 1962		
	Fiscal year 1963	Fiscal year 1962	1963 compared to 1962	Budget estimate, 1963	Actual, 1962	Estimate for 1963 over actual 1962
1. Budget receipts (net)	$44,658	$41,184	+$3,474	$85,500	$81,409	+$4,091
2. Budget expenditures (net):						
(a) National defense (per official budget classification)	30,501	28,271	+2,230	53,004	51,103	+1,901
(b) Other than national defense	24,797	22,290	+2,507	41,307	36,684	+4,623
3. Total expenditures	55,298	50,561	+4,737	94,311	87,787	+6,524
4. Net surplus (+) or deficit (−) (line 1 minus line 3)	−10,640	−9,377	−1,263	−8,811	−6,378	−2,433
5. Average monthly expenditures, actual 7 months of fiscal 1963 versus full year average for 1963 based on budget estimates:						
(a) National defense	4,357			4,417		
(b) Other than national defense	3,542			3,442		
Total monthly average	7,899			7,859		

Sources: Budget for 1964 and monthly Treasury statement for Jan. 31, 1963.

PERMISSION TO INCLUDE STATEMENT EACH MONTH OF THE SESSION

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that we may have leave to insert a similar type of statement each month of the session.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

LEGISLATIVE CONFLICT OF INTEREST

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Oregon [Mrs. GREEN] is recognized for 45 minutes.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, for the last 3 weeks while we have had various discussions in this House on abuses of one sort or another, I have remained silent. I have decided I can no longer remain silent. I realize this is not a popular subject to discuss and, yet, it is one which I think needs discussion.

Mr. Speaker, the Congress of the United States has a tremendously important role in the free world's combat against tyranny. In many sectors of the world we are engaged in a wide variety of costly military and economic ventures designed to protect ourselves, our allies and the developing nations of the world against the imperialism of the Soviet Union. Imbedded in the professed ideology of the Soviet Union and the litany of its founding triumvirate, Marx, Engles, and Lenin, is a contempt for parliamentary institutions. In their discussion and in nations where they have seized power, the Communists treat parliamentary institutions as a historical bourgeoise apparatus that reflects, they claim, the oppressive forces of capitalistic production. The Communists seek to persuade us and the less sophisticated peoples of the world that parliamentary institutions are a sham, a fraud masking greed and exploitation, and meaningless in terms of providing economic and social justice for all.

We, on the other hand, are attempting to nurture representative government in lands that have not yet fully developed and to strengthen representative government in industrial lands across which falls the intimidating shadow of Soviet and Chinese power. This, I suggest, is what the ferocious cold war is about. We have appropriated billions—$98 billion in loans and grants for military and economic foreign aid since World War II—to effect our just cause.

But our larger purpose is to abort tyranny and injustice wherever they are found. And tyranny cannot flourish in any land where there is a healthy, flourishing, responsible parliamentary institution. We are attempting to lead and to demonstrate that, to use a shorthand phrase, "our way of life," is superior. And we are carrying out these vast programs as if situated in a show window along any main street in any village, town, or city of the United States. It is a show window because our proceedings here in the Congress of the United States are, when open, reported, analyzed, and criticized by the constitutionally protected rights of free press, assembly and speech. And this is as it should and must be.

Now the United States cannot, in these circumstances, adopt an attitude of "do as I say, not as I do." And I suggest that our cause is being impaired because of the growing concern both within and without Congress as to how effective our Congress is: with rules of procedure drawn in the horse-and-buggy days, while the demands of the space age press upon us; with more and more questions being asked about possible legislative conflicts-of-interest; with continuing criticisms of unjustified expenditures by Members of Congress traveling overseas and injudicious behavior while there; with the misuse of committee appropriations; with periodic outbursts of disgust about flagrant abuses in the area of nepotism. Indeed, I believe that this situation threatens to blunt the effectiveness of our message of democracy and to turn upon the Congress both the derision of the very people we seek to influence and the American people themselves.

To bring about the reform or elimination of "Senator Egoman" or "Congressman Everyone" may be a worthy cause, but not the ultimate goal, because there will be more such ones to take their places. The job for each and every one of us is to so conduct the Nation's business that the confidence of the country in the National Legislature is maintained—yes, and strengthened. And I suggest we must go deeper in order to reach the major underlying problems, and perhaps perform some major surgery instead of applying the "band-aid" to cover and protect the wound that has been inflicted and is so painful at the moment.

None of us is blameless in these developments either because of direct participation in improper activities or by acquiescence. I might say, parenthetically at this point, that some of this criticism about particular Members' performance has been unfair, and, I suspect, is generated not by concern for legislative propriety but rather for other less defensible reasons.

Nevertheless, I believe it is high time that Democrats and Republicans alike here in this Congress clean our own house lest the erosion of public confidence become a real threat to the democratic process and our own people wonder if their Government condones greed and exploitation. How can we ask for greater public interest, larger voter turnout, a more informed citizenry when the image becomes so blurred—and too often the honest, conscientious citizen reacts with "a plague on both your houses." I do not believe the real problem lies with any one Member of Congress or with any one committee. I do not believe the whole problem is resolved by restricting funds available to any one Member or committee. And to treat the current situation confronting us these days in such isolated fashion is, in effect, to dodge a problem that I feel should and can no longer be dodged.

Others have eloquently spoken of the need to establish guidelines regulating conduct of Members of Congress in cases where their public duties may conflict with their private financial interests—or where the public has cause to wonder if this is or is not the case.

The Bar Association of the City of New York in a "seedbed" report in 1960 spelled out during a 5-year study, entitled "Conflict of Interest and Federal Service," the tangled web of legislative conflict of interest with these melancholy sentences:

> The congressional conflict-of-interest problem * * * is current, complex, and controversial. It is also largely unresolved.

Today, Mr. Speaker, 3 years later, these statements still hold true.

Inside the Congress, Members are wrestling with the problems. Outside the Congress the questions are being asked: What are the proper limits on the power of a Member of Congress to appoint his staff from among his family? What kinds of outside employment and income are compatible with what kinds of committee assignments? How far should a Member of Congress go in voting on matters in which he has some personal stake?

Now I suppose that no one believes a Member of Congress should disqualify himself from taking part in a housing bill because he owns a house. But what if he is president or a member of the board of directors of a local urban renewal agency or a large residential construction company?

No Member of Congress should disqualify himself from taking part in legislation involving oil or gas because his house is heated by gas or oil. But what if he is a major stockholder or officer in a gas transmission line, or the owner of a dozen oil wells?

No Member of Congress should disqualify himself from taking part in legislation involving our major carriers because he travels to and from his State to Washington by train. But what if he might sit on a committee that deals with this legislation and at the same time maintains connections with a law firm that has a major railroad as a client?

No Member should disqualify himself from shaping commodity legislation because he owns a farm or a ranch. But what if this Member serves as a consultant to an economic interest that seeks to knead and shape the legislation to its own ends?

Members of Congress should not disqualify themselves from accepting campaign contributions or speaking out on legislation before professional and trade organizations. But what if the speaking fee received is so inordinately large that it points to the conclusion the fee is, in effect, a campaign contribution not reported?

What of the Member of Congress who is defeated for election and then suddenly evidences during his lame-duck period a great interest in visiting the countries of the world? Is there legitimate work to justify such an expenditure?

And what of the Member who, ostensibly traveling abroad on congressional business, spends more time seeing night sights than sighting on the business at hand? And using taxpayers' dollars or counterpart funds while doing so, and later has printed at taxpayers' expense a voluminous, vacuous account of his travels?

What of a Member who may represent business interests on a retainer fee, and also is required by committee assignment to vote on tax bills, ostensibly with complete objectivity?

Where should the lines be drawn?

Neither the law nor custom provides many answers, although there are statutes relating to bribery, acceptance of compensation for services in connection with proceedings before Federal agencies and procurement of Government contracts.

The discussions on and off the floor in recent weeks have, I think, been necessary and productive.

But as the sometimes very acrimonious debate continues, I am reminded of a stanza of doggerel that probably came into being during the life of the notorious Enclosure Acts in Great Britain. My memory tells me that it runs this way:

> The law locks up the man or woman
> Who steals the goose from off the Common
> But lets the great felon loose
> Who steals the Common from the goose.

By all means let us take action on the individual offenses—let us do our best to see that every dollar is spent as wisely as possible—and I will have more to say about that a little later.

But as we save the dollar, let us not become so engrossed that we overlook the larger problems.

Do we in Congress have a double standard of conduct?

Last fall we passed a major revision of the outmoded conflict-of-interest code to govern behavior of the flood of part-time advisers to our various governmental agencies of the executive branch. It also toughened the restrictions on employment of Federal employees after they leave the Federal service.

President Kennedy in February 1962, in keeping with a campaign speech in October 1960 at Springfield, Ohio, issued a memorandum to all heads of executive departments and agencies directing them to take administrative steps to assure compliance with existing statutes, rules, and regulations governing conflicts-of-interest problems. In recent times, as a condition of confirmation, Congress has required Secretaries of Defense to divest themselves of stock in companies doing business with the Government. But no Senator or Congressman is required to dispose of any stock, even when he becomes a member of a committee particularly concerned with his investments.

Now there are some here among us who believe that continuous surveillance by the press and the election campaigns committee constitute a thorough and continuous discipline of the House and of the Senate and make specific regulations unnecessary. I think that there have been occasions when the inadequacy of these safeguards is apparent.

The topic of legislative conflict-of-interest has generated bipartisan attention and concern. Others in both the House and Senate have arisen to discuss the matter in detail and with eloquence and insight that I do not have. The suggestions I now put forward, in the form of bills I shall introduce, today or shortly thereafter, are not all new. Senators MORSE, CLARK, and CLIFFORD CASE, to mention the names of those that come most readily to mind, have for years attempted to convince their senatorial colleagues of the wisdom of congressional reform. Another distinguished colleague, Representative JOHN LINDSAY, of New York, this very session has addressed himself to the matter.

Senator CASE 2 years ago noted that Congress is diligent in holding the executive branch to strict accountability but that "at the same time, however, the whole process would be more seemly, in our view, if Members of Congress as well were subject to the requirements of disclosure as officials in the executive branch. The public has a right to know the facts in either case."

Recently, the distinguished Chief Justice of the United States, Earl Warren, proposed a new profession be developed for these complex times—the profession of "ethics counselor," available to advise businessmen, labor leaders, politicians, and others. He said:

> The man of character, sensitive to the meaning of what he is doing, will know how to discover the ethical path in the maze of possible behavior.

In the fledgling years of the United States, Thomas Jefferson wrote by hand in 1801 a strict rule of conduct for legislators. It reads in part:

> Where the private interests of a Member are concerned in a bill or question, he is to withdraw. And where such an interest has appeared, his voice has been disallowed, even after a division. In a case so contrary not only to the laws of decency, but to the fundamental principle of the social compact, which denies any man to be a judge in his own cause, it is for the honor of the House that this rule of immemorial observance should be strictly adhered to.

Alas, less than a generation later, this "immemorial observance" was breached by Daniel Webster who wrote the Biddle Bank in Philadelphia for money at the height of a battle in the Senate over renewal of the bank's controversial charter. In unminced words, Senator Webster wrote Nicholas Biddle:

> I believe my retainer has not been renewed or refreshed as usual. If it be wished that my relation to the bank should be continued, it may well be well to send me the usual retainers.

And, alas, in April 1874, House Speaker, James G. Blaine, ruled that Congressmen can vote their private interests if the measure is not for their exclusive benefit. My understanding is that Blaine's precedent remains in the rule books of the House today.

Now I am not talking about dishonesty in the general way laymen interpret it. But each passing year it becomes harder for a Congressman with legitimate outside interests to keep his eye on the ethical guideposts.

So many times I have heard Mr. Sam say, "I love this House."

I also love this House—and I count it a great good fortune that I have been allowed to sit here and represent the Third District of Oregon. I have never, never before had the opportunity, the privilege to serve with, to work with so many great people—and I mean just that—great in ability, great in desire to be of service, great in selflessness, and great in dedication to the public interest. The 40-hour week is unknown. The pressures are great. The requests and demands are voluminous. And satisfaction very seldom comes in the form of thank you letters, but only in the realization that perhaps in some small way you have had a part in drafting legislation that may make better the lives of millions, or by law or action you have removed an inequity that is onerous to a single individual.

But the discussions of the last few weeks—and the events leading to the debates have been most painful—because not just individuals have been hurt, but the Congress of the United States has been hurt. With the greatest admiration for the vast majority of my colleagues, and not impugning the motives of a single one, may I make some suggestions.

ETHICS

That there shall be established a Commission on Legislative Ethics to be composed of 15 members: 4 Members of the Senate and 4 Members of the House to be drawn in equal numbers in each body from each of the major political parties, and 7 members from the public at large, at least one of whom shall come from the field of law; at least one from the field of journalism, and at least one from the field of political science.

The Commission shall make a thorough study of conflicts-of-interest problems and relations with executive and other agencies which confront Members of Congress. The Commission, provided with whatever funds are necessary, shall submit a final report of its activities within 18 months. I would think it desirable the Commission be a permanent one with authority to issue progress reports from time to time.

FINANCIAL INTERESTS OF MEMBERS OF CONGRESS

Each Member of the Senate and House and each and every employee of the Congress who receives a salary at a rate of $12,500 or more, shall file yearly with the clerk of the Senate and Clerk of the House a report which shall be made public containing a full and complete statement of first, the amount and resources of all income and gifts more than $100 from any one person received during the preceding calendar year. This includes speaking fees, which as I indicated earlier, are sometimes inflated so as to serve as hidden campaign contributions. Second, the value of each asset held by or entrusted to him or by him and to him and any other person, including spouse. Third, the amount and source of all contributions during the preceding calendar year received by him or by anyone, including spouse and minor children, on behalf of him or subject to the direction or control of the person. Fourth, annual reports listing all dealings in real estate, securities, and commodities by the member or by any person, including spouse, acting on his behalf. Fifth, the name of any relative who is also an employee of the Federal Government.

CLEAN ELECTIONS

Legislation in regard to election has previously been introduced by several, including myself, and given major attention only when scandal becomes public or crisis occurs. I think it is high time and past time the House came to grips with the issues posed by the clean elections bill. I hope the 88th Congress will not adjourn without having given to the people of the United States some assurance that the election of Federal officials will be conducted under better ground rules than the 1925 ones now in force.

The bill covers general, special, primary, preferential primary and convention or caucus of a political party held for the purpose of nominating candidates for President, Vice President, Senator, or Representative. A candidate for Senator or Representative-at-Large may spend up to $50,000 in each primary, nominating convention, caucus, or general or special election. A candidate for Representative may spend up to $12,500. Candidates for election as President and Vice President shall not make expenditures in excess of an amount equal to the amount obtained by multiplying 20 cents by the largest number of voters casting votes for presidential electors in any one of the last three preceding elections. This includes expenditures made by or on behalf of either or both candidates. A candidate for nomination for the office of President or Vice President in a nominating campaign shall not make expenditures in excess of 50 percent of the amount permissible in the general election for the position. Political committees which spend or receive more than $2,500 in any calendar year shall keep a detailed account of all such sums in excess of $100 for a period of 2 years. Every candidate for House and Senate shall file complete reports of receipts and expenditures with the Clerk of the House or the Secretary of the Senate. All prescribed filings shall be open to public scrutiny and be on file for 6 years.

Violations of any of these provisions of the bill shall carry a fine up to $5,000, or up to a 5-year jail sentence. Willful violations shall carry a maximum fine of $10,000 and a maximum of 2-year prison term.

COMMUNICATIONS WITH EXECUTIVE BRANCH

It seems to me we need legislation on the statute books that all written and oral communications made by a Member or a member of his staff to an officer or employee of an executive branch department or agency shall become part of the public record of any case upon which a query is made. The record shall include the name of the caller, the time, the matter queried, the proceeding, if any, involved and the nature of the inquiry. If the query indicates other than a point of information this, too, shall be noted.

I suggest serious consideration be given to laws prohibiting any use of congressional influence with any regulatory agency. And I also suggest that this would serve to protect the Members of Congress, because then when pressures mount from the homefront from special groups the answer is obvious and can be short and direct: "The law prohibits me from acceding to your request."

And so, I hope, Mr. Speaker, that these proposals engender discussion that gives off light not heat. I am not adamant about the details of these proposals, but I regard them as a provisional framework within which we should enter and assume the overdue task of regulating our own store.

But before I close let me also refer briefly to two other matters. I think we and members of the executive branch have been engaging in a lot of gobbledygook, when we blithely talk about counterpart funds, as somehow not related to tax dollars. I did not realize until this last week, when I asked for a conference with Treasury and State Department people, that there are only eight countries in the world where the United States has an excess of foreign currencies, and where the term "counterpart" might be honestly used and that in all other countries—when Members of the Congress or the executive branch travel—the U.S. Government must go out to buy the foreign currencies with American tax dollars. I undoubtedly should have known, but I believe this misinformation or misunderstanding is shared by many of my colleagues.

This makes it far more incumbent on us to make even more sure that these travel privileges are not abused either by us, or the executive branch, or the military, and if I may say so, I think that any military or State Department transportation that is requested or given to Members of Congress should be required to be reported to the House Administration Committee, the same as so-called counterpart travel is now required. Let me add that I think legitimate travel is to be encouraged.

If, as a matter of national policy, it is desirable to have, in the words of the Fulbright-Hays Act, "a better understanding of the United States and other countries and to increase mutual understanding between the people of the United States and the people of other countries," then I certainly think it is desirable to have the elected representatives visit areas where we have farflung commitments. And it seems to me, Members of Congress can vote far more intelligently on foreign policy matters if they have some first-hand knowledge, some first-hand experience, with some facets of our foreign operations.

We do not expect the Governor of a State to sit in his State capitol office and not travel to brief himself on matters within his concern. And so with Members of Congress. But let us be sure that funds appropriated for either the executive or legislative branch be spent wisely.

One other matter, Mr. Speaker. The phrase "affluent society" has been facilely accepted by us as a descriptive of the economic state of most Americans. Recent studies show that there are substantial pockets of poverty throughout our country. A recent book entitled "The Other America: Poverty in the United States," suggests that millions of Americans are living in old-fashioned poverty. These are the invisible Americans—the Americans you and I here in the Congress are not effectively representing. They do not write us—indeed, some cannot write or even read. They do not visit our offices—they do not have the money to even take a bus to an employment office. They are atomized, without face, without voice, without well-heeled, supporting lobbies writing us on fancy stationery.

I talked earlier of the "image" that this Congress is creating for the American people and the Communists abroad.

I just received a letter from a 39-year-old resident of my home city explaining in devastating detail his inability to obtain a job. His family without enough food, and about to be a family without shelter. Last Saturday, I received still another letter from an elderly constituent explaining that he was injured in a fall and is trying to keep body and soul together and mend his body as well on a social security allotment of $71.80 a month.

Will anyone in this body tell me how you and I can justify to these people—and countless others—the expenditure of funds to provide kitchen facilities and refrigerators for every suite in the New Office Building?

I suppose in a budget of billions this is a small matter—but I think a very important one. To so many of our constituents the ringing words of Franklin Delano Roosevelt, spoken during the early years of his Presidency, are still so true:

> That poverty walks hand in hand with the most lavish living this world has ever known.

Let us take care of the major problems I referred to earlier, but in putting our own house in order, let us also be sure that other extravagances, other items, do not become a symbol of a bourgeois legislative body that does not care. Let us instead live up to the challenge as the greatest parliamentary body in the world.

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman from Oregon yield?

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. I yield to the gentlewoman from Ohio.

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, may I thank my colleague from Oregon for bringing these matters to our attention. It is very evident that she has given them vast study, that they have been very close to her heart, that they have troubled her conscience, as they have mine. I am very happy that I was here to hear her very fine contribution to these matters.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. I thank my friend and colleague from Ohio.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, I, too, want to compliment the gentlewoman from Oregon on her superb presentation here this afternoon. When she says that she loves this House we all know that she speaks the truth and that she is sincerely interested in seeing that this great legislative body be the finest in the world. She looks around the world, as we all do, and sees many parliaments, some of them once proud and of ancient history that in recent years have been brought to their knees. We see legislative bodies of newly fledged countries which at this moment look as if they may not make the grade. For just that reason it is so tremendously important that the Congress of the United States and this coordinate branch thereof be one that all the people of the United States may be fully proud of.

The specific remedies the gentlewoman from Oregon suggests deserve considered attention from the committee to which they will be referred. Without having the opportunity myself to consider the details of them, I can say this right at the outset, that they take advantage of one very wholesome and salutary principle of public life; which is, let the good bright light enter into public affairs, and the public will be the gainer.

I happen to be a member of a very fine subcommittee of the House Committee on Government Operations, the Committee on Foreign Operations and Governmental Information. Our task there is to see that the light and the truth are cast upon the operations of the executive branch. This is very important. This work must continue. What the gentlewoman suggests here is that some of that same light ought to be brought to bear on the affairs of this body. In that general philosophical position I heartily support her. I am glad she brought the matter up today.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. I thank the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. I yield.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. I join in commending the gentlewoman for her thoughtful remarks and her sound suggestions. I think we do need in the Congress a code of ethics. May I say, Mr. Speaker, that not in a code of ethics itself do you find the soul of dedication and integrity. That is in the soul and the mind of each individual Member.

Since I have been in Congress I have made it a rule to listen to no gossip, and I have requested every person in my office to remember that we have the job of serving our constituents, that another Member may have different problems and different methods. It is for that Member to decide, and if he makes mistakes it is for his constituents to judge and not his colleagues in this body.

May I say, Mr. Speaker, what I think this House needs is someone skilled in public relations. I do not know a Member of this House who does not work hard. I marvel at the work they do. Then I hear some comedian getting a big salary at a night club making a target of the Congress.

Yes, we are human here. Yes, we make mistakes. But I think there is more integrity, more hard work in this historic body, the House of Representatives, than in any group in government service anywhere in the world. I know that the gentlewoman from Oregon, for whom I have the highest admiration, and if I need not be misunderstood—I may be—the warmest affection, agrees with me on that.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. I thank the gentleman for making his usual good observations.

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. EDWARDS. I too join my colleague in complimenting the gentlewoman from Oregon on the views expressed here today. I think it can be said as an axiom that where there is a conflict of interest the public suffers, and the public suffers and will suffer even if the affected legislator is completely honest in what he is trying to do, because there is no way to measure the subconscious influence on a man whose personal interests are at stake in a piece of legislation that is pending.

Here in the House of Representatives we are entitled to the truth and when a Member speaks on the floor on a piece of legislation, a portion of the truth is whether or not he has a personal stake in the legislation. Members are entitled to these facts in judging what he says. I am in favor of the principles which the gentlewoman from Oregon has espoused today. I feel very grateful that I have had the opportunity to be here.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. I thank my colleague.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. Duncan] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, with her usual courage and directness, the gentlewoman from Oregon [Mrs. Green] has put her finger on a problem which I am sure has disturbed everyone who has been closely connected with the legislative process. She is seeking to reestablish the reputation and prestige of the Congress, which many feel has been tarnished.

With her efforts I would like to associate myself, recognizing how easy it is to set the goal but how difficult it is to prescribe the mechanics for achieving that goal. How can we eliminate the conflicts of interest which inevitably must occur in any citizen government without denying ourselves the knowledge and experience which our Members can bring to the solution of a problem? This is much more easily said than done, but again the gentlewoman from Oregon [Mrs. Green] has made suggestions which should have the careful consideration of this body.

Without delaying consideration and action on these specifics to which the gentlewoman from Oregon [Mrs. Green] has directed our attention, I should like to suggest that this is only one—albeit a most important—aspect of the need for a reexamination of the entire legislative branch of the Federal Government.

As a new Member, I attended the very fine series of indoctrination lectures arranged for us by older Members of the House. Throughout these lectures—by senior and respected Members of both the Senate and the House, by respected members of the press, and others—runs the recurrent theme of congressional reorganization. Few deny the need; few are disposed to take the action required.

The problems raised by my colleague demand immediate attention. Without delaying action thereon, however, I would hope that we could move concurrently toward the appointment of a commission which would include the Members of both Houses together with distinguished laymen—if I may use that term—to make recommendations to this or succeeding Congresses as to how best to meet the problems of governing the largest and most powerful nation on earth during a most critical period of its leadership of the free world.

I hesitate to make this suggestion—and presume to do no more than make it. I would not do so had not similar sentiments been expressed by those with much experience and great knowledge of the traditions and procedures of this body.

The gentlewoman from Oregon [Mrs. Green] deserves the thanks and support of all of us as she seeks the solution to these very difficult problems.

NEWS REPORTING

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Johansen] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Speaker, the Washington Post made some unique news in its own editorial column this morning.

This unremitting and ofttimes grossly intemperate opponent of the House Committee on Un-American Activities tendered an "unequivocal apology" to the committee's able staff director, Mr. Francis J. McNamara.

In so doing, the Post very properly repudiated a shoddy piece of untruthful reporting and a sneering, venomous and derisive editorial based on the distorted news story.

I welcome this editorial retraction and apology—as I am sure my colleagues on the committee and in this House likewise do.

I entertain the restrained hope that this action augurs a greater degree of accuracy in news reporting and a newly found moderateness in editorial comment as both relate to the committee's compliance with its recently renewed mandate from the House of Representatives.

In any event, I believe the House is entitled to a résumé of the essential facts regarding this incident which has resulted in an embarrassing denouement for the Washington Post.

On February 28, Mr. McNamara addressed the Metropolitan Washington Council of Young Americans for Freedom. In the course of his remarks, the staff director of the House Committee on Un-American Activities stated that top officials of the Department of Justice as well as leading Communist Party officials are agreed that the Communist Party today has approximately 10,000 members.

Mr. McNamara added that it would be a serious mistake, however, to judge total Communist strength, the danger of communism, and the extent of its influence in this country merely on the basis of this figure of 10,000 formally or technically enrolled members.

Thereafter in this speech, Mr. McNamara stated that on the basis of reports filed with the Post Office Department just three Communist publications which could be described as "hard core"—The Worker, People's World, and National Guardian—had a combined average paid circulation per issue of about 50,000 during the year ending October 1961.

Mr. McNamara pointed out that during the same period, domestic foreign-language publications which have been officially cited as Communist had a circulation of about 46,000 and publications of unions which have been found to be Communist-controlled and expelled from the CIO as such, a circulation of about 150,000. The combined circulation of these various categories of publications, he added, is roughly 250,000.

He said that in estimating readership on the generally accepted ratio of three persons per publication, it would appear that between 700,000 and 800,000 persons in this country regularly read either hard-core party literature or party-line publications.

Mr. McNamara further qualified his estimate with the statement that this is not to be considered a gage of Communist strength because many paid subscriptions to these publications are accounted for by Government security agencies and anti-Communist organizations and individuals, and also by the fact that many Communists and fellow travelers would obviously subscribe to more than one Communist or party-line publication.

And Mr. McNamara concluded that even if as much as 25 percent was to be deducted from the total for these types of readership, we are still faced with the fact that several hundred thousand people in this country are apparently sympathetic readers of hard-core and party-line propaganda.

From the foregoing, Mr. McNamara offered the valid observation that it would be obviously unrealistic to judge the totality of Communist strength and influence in this country by the figure of 10,000 members.

Under leave to extend and revise my remarks, I enclose at this point the Washington Post news report on this speech, published the next day, March 1:

Over 700,000 Reds Believed in United States

Francis J. McNamara, staff director of the House Committee on Un-American Activities, said last night there was reason to believe there are 700,000 to 800,000 Communists in the United States.

McNamara said he arrived at these figures by totaling the circulation of publications officially cited as subversive and then tripling this number.

He tripled the number in line with standard advertising practice, which estimates there are three readers for every copy, he said.

McNamara admitted this method was vague and nebulous and said the committee did not know for sure the exact number of Communists in the United States.

He pointed out, however, that the figure of 10,000 generally cited as the total of registered Communists, was misleading.

Addressing a meeting of the Metropolitan Washington Council of Young Americans for Freedom, McNamara acknowledged that there was a growth in sentiment to abolish the Un-American Activities Committee. But he cited recent House votes to show the committee was in no danger of being abolished.

The first Washington Post editorial, based on this false news story, appeared March 6. It was as follows:

Seeing Reds

Francis J. McNamara, the staff director of that remarkable research organization, the House Un-American Activities Committee, let it be known recently that there are 700,000 to 800,000 Communists in the United States. This is in rather striking contrast to assertions by J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, that the Communist Party reached a top strength of 80,000 in 1944, has declined every year since then and nosedived in 1961 to between 8,000 and 10,000.

Before anyone gets excited and starts talking about tossing Mr. Hoover out of his job as an incompetent, it might be worth while to look critically at Mr. McNamara's computations. He said he arrived at his estimate by totaling the circulation of all publications officially cited as subversive and tripling this number in accordance with the usual advertising hypothesis that there are three readers for every subscriber.

Estimates of this kind used to be arrived at, somewhat haphazardly, by looking at tea leaves or examining the entrails of sheep or multiplying the ambyranth of Q by the coefficient of means square contingencies. But there was always an element of error in such calculations; and anyway the Communists kept complaining that they were being underestimated. Mr. McNamara's method is much more scientific. Naturally it costs a little more money. This, evidently, is why the House of Representatives last week voted, 385 to 20, to give the House Un-American Activities Committee $360,000 for its scientific investigations this year. The 20 dissenters seem content to hobble along with that old-fashioned FBI.

Meanwhile, 2 days prior to the appearance of this editorial, the following letter to the editor of the Washington Post was mailed by Mr. Vernon W. Holleman, Jr., chairman, Metropolitan Washington chapter of Young Americans for Freedom, protesting the distorted news report.

This letter was published in this morning's Washington Post, in the "Letters to the Editor" column adjoining the editorial of retraction and apology, and is as follows:

Communists in the United States

The headline and lead paragraphs of your March 1 report about the February meeting of the Metropolitan Washington Council of Young Americans for Freedom were completely false and grievously misleading. You quoted Francis McNamara, staff director of the House Committee on Un-American Activities, as asserting there is reason to believe that there are "700,000 to 800,000 Communists in the United States."

This is not the truth and it is not what Mr. McNamara said at the meeting. What he did say was that there are approximately 250,000 people in this country who subscribe to Communist publications like the Sunday Worker, foreign-language pro-Soviet publications, Communist-front publications, and party-line publications.

Taking the normal ratio of three readers for one subscriber he estimated that the readership of hard-core Communist publications, plus those who read general party-line material, totaled about 750,000. Mr. McNamara emphasized that some of these readers were anti-Communist, some were teachers and students, some were American security personnel; but that even discounting as much as 25 percent there were still a good many thousands of Americans reading the party line every week or month.

Granted his calm, analytical talk was not a "sensational" one, but it was warmly applauded by YAF members in search of the truth—which, unfortunately, they did not find in the Washington Post the next morning.

VERNON W. HOLLEMAN, Jr.

The editorial of apology—acknowledging, in effect, that the distortion in the news report and the admitted bias, venom, and irresponsibility of the early editorial were too much even for the Washington Post to attempt to defend—was carried this morning. It reads as follows:

SEEING RED FACES

A letter from Vernon W. Holleman, Jr., appearing elsewhere on this page today asserts that the Washington Post did an injustice to Francis McNamara, staff director of the House Un-American Activities Committee, in reporting a recent speech by him. A subsequent editorial, Seeing Reds, based on the news story, compounded the injustice. Inquiry has satisfied us that the news story and the editorial were mistaken in imputing to Mr. McNamara the implication that all readers of Communist publications are Communists. We genuinely regret the imputation and the derisory tone of our editorial comment concerning it, and we tender to Mr. McNamara an unequivocal apology.

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include a news story from the Washington Post, two editorials from the Washington Post, and a letter to the editor.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

CUBAN REFUGEE SITUATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced in the House the following resolution as a declaration of the sense of this House:

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States, That it is the sense of the House that the entry of Soviet armed forces into Cuba was and the continued presence of such Soviet armed forces in Cuba is a violation of the Monroe Doctrine and a menace to the security of the United States; that the entry of such armed forces into Cuba was and the continued presence there is in violation of the principles of the Organization of American States and a menace to the security of all the American States; that the entry of Soviet armed forces into Cuba was and the continued presence of such forces in Cuba is in violation of the Charter of the United Nations because the presence of such armed forces in Cuba constitutes a threat to the peace of the world:

Wherefore the Government of the United States, in such manner as the President shall determine, should call upon the Organization of American States and the United Nations to join the United States in a demand that the Soviet Union shall forthwith remove all of its armed force from Cuba.

I have also introduced the following joint resolution having to do with the resettlement forthwith of the excess of Cuban refugees now living in Dade County, Fla., which includes my district:

JOINT RESOLUTION TO PROVIDE FOR THE ESTABLISHMENT OF A COMMISSION ON CUBAN REFUGEES

SHORT TITLE

SECTION 1. This Act may be cited as the "Cuban Refugee Commission Act".

ESTABLISHMENT OF COMMISSION ON CUBAN REFUGEES

SEC. 2. (a) There is hereby established a commission to be known as the Commission on Cuban Refugees (hereinafter referred to as the "Commission").

(b) The Commission shall be composed of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, the Secretary of Labor, and the Secretary of Commerce. The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare shall serve as Chairman.

(c) The members of the Commission shall serve without compensation in addition to the compensation for their services as head of a department, but they shall be reimbursed for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of the duties of the Commission.

(d) The Commission may utilize the facilities and personnel of the departments under the respective jurisdictions of the members of the Commission.

Duties of the commission

SEC. 3. (a) The Commission shall establish, operate, and maintain a program for the orderly relocation of refugees from Cuba from the Dade County, Florida, area to such other areas within the United States as may be appropriate. Such program shall be conducted with due regard to the job opportunities, housing facilities, public educational facilities, and other pertinent factors existing in each relocation area to the end that an excessive burden shall not be placed on any one relocation area.

(b) The Commission shall initiate and conduct a study, on a continuing basis, of the respective problems involved in the relocation and resettlement within the United States of refugees from Cuba. Such study shall devote particular attention to the economic and social factors involved in such relocation and resettlement with particular reference to job opportunities, housing facilities, educational facilities, and opportunities and facilities in general for adaptation of such refugees in each relocation and resettlement area to the way of life in the United States. The Commission shall submit an annual report to the President for presentation to the Congress of the results of such continuing study together with such recommendations as the Commission deems advisable.

SEC. 4. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated annually to the Commission, to remain available until expended, such sums (not to exceed the amount of $25,000,000 annually) as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this Act.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that those who have criticism to offer about the present threatening and disturbing situation in Cuba owe it to the country to try to do something constructive or to offer criticism which will be helpful in the solution of the grievous burdens respecting that unhappy island which our President now has to bear. We all know the awesome responsibility the President has had to bear to meet the challenge of communistic imperialism in Cuba and to remove from power in the unhappy island of Cuba that creature whose regime has been the source of aggression and subversion against all the American States. The President deserves the commendation of the country—indeed he has received the acclaim of the Nation—for the courageous and effective manner in which he confronted aggressive communistic imperialism in Cuba and forthwith required before the observing eyes of the world the removal of the offensive missiles and planes which constituted a dangerous threat to the safety of the American people. And the President has received and continues to enjoy the gratification of the country that he is steadily bringing about the removal of Soviet armed forces from Cuba and in his announced determination that the remainder of such forces shall be withdrawn as the spearhead of communistic imperialism in the Western Hemisphere.

But the coming of such Soviet armed forces into Cuba and their continued presence in Cuba is a matter of concern not only to the United States, but to every state in the Western Hemisphere and to every peace-loving nation in the world. Such forces strengthen the hand of communistic subversion and aggression in the Western World; they constitute a dire menace and threat to the security of every American State; their presence in Cuba constitutes a distinct and dangerous threat to the peace of the world. That is the reason, Mr. Speaker, I have introduced today a resolution expressing the sense of this House that the Government of the United States in such manner as the President should determine should call upon the Organization of the American States and the United Nations to join us in a demand that the Soviet Union forthwith remove all of its remaining armed forces from the island of Cuba. The added strength of the Organization of American States and the United Nations to our own demand will give it greater force and power and abate the breach of the Monroe Doctrine, the breach of the principles of the Organization of American States and the breach of the United Nations Charter which their presence in Cuba constitutes.

Mr. Speaker, on the first day this House met in the 88th Congress, I introduced a resolution declaring it to be the sense of this House, among other things, "that the fair isle of Cuba must and shall be freed of the curse of Castro and communism." I have been assured of an early hearing by the subcommittee of the House Foreign Affairs Committee upon this resolution. It does not attempt to prescribe for the President of the United States the method by which this high purpose shall be achieved but it does unreservedly and irrevocably declare the sentiment of the Congress of the United States that Castro and communism must go from Cuba and that we shall never falter in our determination that this isle formerly called the jewel of the Carribean shall be freed of this curse and the Western Hemisphere of this menace.

I am sure when our President speaks shortly in Costa Rica among those most endangered by the threat of Castro and communism from Cuba he will spell out many ways by which the American States can cooperate with other freedom-loving and peace-loving nations of the world in eradicating Castro and communism from Cuba. It would seem to me that other of the American States would wish to break all diplomatic relations with Cuba as the United States has done; close their ports to Cuban ships and Cuban exports; require the closing of all Cuban embassies, ministries and consulates in the respective American countries to stop them from continuing to function as hotbeds and spawning grounds of communistic aggression and subversion in the several American States; that the several Latin American nations should cooperate more closely with the United States in the coordination of their political, economic and military policies respecting Cuba as long as Castro's or any Communist government shall be in power; that the United States should also call upon all friendly states everywhere in the world to stop commerce with Castro or communistic Cuba and if such states persist in giving aid, strength, and comfort to our enemy in Cuba that we should advise them that neither their ships nor their commerce can enter the United States; that we should not extend economic assistance or cooperation even through international financial institutions to states which manifest that they prefer the friendship of Castro and communistic Cuba to that of the United States. I know we can depend upon our President to do what is the best thing to accomplish the objective upon which we are all united to free Cuba, the Western Hemisphere and the free world from the curse of Castro and communism and to remove the bridgehead of communistic, imperialistic aggression from the Western Hemisphere.

Mr. Speaker, Castro and communistic tyranny in Cuba have brought to Dade County, Fla., some 200,000 Cuban refugees fleeing from communistic terror; many already robbed of all their possessions before they departed, others giving up everything they had in order to breathe the air of freedom in America. Our Government has willingly and gladly given sanctuary to these exiles from communistic persecution and horror; more than that we have been glad and proud to give them succor and sustenance in our country; we have extended to them the hand of fellowship in freedom and given them words of encouragement that we shall hasten the day when they may return to a free Cuba again. But, Mr. Speaker, the congregation of over 200,000 of these refugees in Dade County has imposed a very serious economic burden upon the people of our county. In spite of the some $70 million a year the Federal Government has given for the sustenance and care and education of the children of these refugees, they still have felt it necessary in order to enjoy a higher level of living or subsistence than the funds federally provided enable them to enjoy to go into our economy and take by responsible estimate some 30,000 jobs. We already had a labor surplus in Dade County. It is inevitable that the refugees willing to work at almost any wage have not only taken the jobs of many of our local citizens, but have lowered the wage scale for all of the people who work in our county. I wish we had jobs enough for our people and a surplus adequate to meet the needs of the refugees.

I have striven in every way I could to induce the Federal Government to help us to provide more jobs in Dade County; to provide funds to assure Federal participation in Interama which would immediately provide thousands of additional jobs for the people of our county; to aid us in getting defense contracts for which we are in so many ways so much suited; to declare us eligible for the benefits of the area redevelopment program; to aid our small business and otherwise. We are striving to get space-age industries located in Dade County, a natural and highly desirable location for them; we have labored to increase social security benefits, welfare assistance, educational aid and, in short, we have been trying in every way we could to assist our people in the hope that after our own citizens had gainful employment of suitable character there would be a surplus of jobs for the Cuban refugees. But we have not yet reached that point.

The Federal Government has not yet given us the assistance which we feel we are entitled to receive in giving jobs to the unemployed among our own citizens let alone the refugees. We are continuing to struggle to achieve this end. But meanwhile, thousands of our people are out of work, many of them having had their jobs taken by Cuban refugees. Until we can provide enough jobs for our own people and a surplus for the refugees, it is imperative that we immediately institute a resettlement program which will remove to other parts of America—which, I am sure, will also hospitably receive them—the surplus refugees beyond our ability to absorb them in jobs not required by our local people.

The agencies have been working upon the problem, but too little has been done and what has been done has been done too late. Accordingly, I have today introduced a resolution to set up a high level Cabinet committee to institute and immediately to effectuate a resettlement program for the Cuban refugees which will relieve this excessive burden and pressure upon our own people. I hope the Congress will take prompt action upon this resolution and give our people the relief to which we have been long entitled and avoid an unhappy increase in tension which has grown up in Dade County between our displaced citizens and the Cuban refugees on account of their natural effort to better themselves above the level of bare subsistence almost which the bounty of our Government provides.

Mr. Speaker, before I conclude, I want to commend to every Member of this House and the Congress a letter entitled "A Communication," appearing in the Sunday, March 10, issue of the Washington Post by the Honorable John C. Wiley, former Ambassador of the United States to Columbia, Iran, Portugal, and Panama, and who, though in retirement, remains an able and wise counselor of his country:

A COMMUNICATION

The public parade of Soviet missiles into Cuba and the complacently public parade of the same missiles out of Cuba appear too obvious for a simple explanation. The Soviet missile operation clearly had ulterior purposes.

The Soviet Union in Cuba is faced with a variety of problems, but the Cuban thorn in the Soviet foot is Castro himself. He is probably not more popular in the Kremlin than in the White House. Impossible to get along with, it has so far been impossible for the Kremlin to get along without him.

Soviet armed forces are in Cuba neither to attack the United States nor to defend Cuba against the United States. They are not even a saber to rattle. Actually they are a sword over Castro's head.

Monolithic communism exists only when sheltered by Red bayonets. This explains why Soviet garrisons were established in the Baltic States for "mutual security" months before the takeover. It also explains the successful rejection by China, Yugoslavia, and Albania of the primacy of the Kremlin.

The first schismatic was Trotsky. A refugee in a foreign country, armed only with ideas, he was easily disposed of. Mao Tse-tung is no Trotsky. His elimination, were it possible, would not close the chasm with China. Mao represents a massive, organized movement in a great country. When he disappears from the scene his cadres will survive.

But can the Soviet garrisons in Cuba in this late date successfully impose the Kremlin's authority in a remote island under a native leader, a self-anointed Communist and domineering authoritarian who achieved power, like Mao and Tito, without active Soviet assistance?

In Cuba, Soviet authority is, of course, great but it is limited. It has long been clear to Moscow that Castro has quietly become the ally of Mao. Throughout Latin America, the young, fiery Communists are much more attracted by the revolutionary ardor of both Mao and Castro than by, to them, the staid coexistence of Khrushchev. True, Castro's Cuba is dependent on the Soviet Union for desperately needed economic aid and for arms, munitions and military support. In this area, Mao Tse-tung can neither replace nor compete with Khrushchev, but at the same time, Moscow cannot prevent the covert financing of Castroism by China and the clandestine collaboration of Castro with Mao throughout Latin America.

Effective foreign policy is based on alternative courses of action. This is a principle followed by the Soviet Union as demonstrated over long years by frequent zigzags. What alternative policies can the Kremlin pursue toward Castro; what zigs and which zags?

Only three alternatives seem to exist. The first would be for the Soviet Union to wash its hands of the whole Cuban affair. This is obviously out of the question, if only for compelling reasons of prestige. The second alternative would be for the Soviet Union and Communist China to divide the world into two noncompetitive geographical spheres of influence. Such a pact would be difficult to negotiate and still more difficult to carry out. Neither could trust the other. The third alternative is draconian, the harsh decision to eliminate Castro and replace him with someone subject to monolithic Kremlin discipline. This move is doubtless the only feasible choice, but it is one that requires subtle and careful preparation and great operational skill.

The elimination of Castro would not be foreign to Soviet procedures, but it would now be premature. First, Castro is still an asset internally in Cuba and his departure might precipitate the open break with Peiping that Moscow wishes to postpone until the moment arrives for a still harsher decision: what to do to prevent Communist China from developing sophisticated atomic weapons, and when to do it.

However, the Soviet Union is certainly preparing the elimination of Castro at the opportune moment, namely when it becomes either convenient or unavoidably necessary. This would probably be accomplished by one of two techniques: (1) a connived military coup by trusted elements of the Cuban Army and militia, or (2) to have Castro suddenly and officially declared insane, to which an element of plausibility would not be lacking. Then Castro would be immediately incarcerated in padded luxury on the shores of the Caspian.

Hopes rampant among Cuban refugees that disaffection in the Cuban armed forces will lead to the overthrow of Castroism are as illusory as the conception that led to the fiasco of the Bay of Pigs. Without a simultaneous invasion by the United States, any anti-Castro initiative within Cuba, not contrived by the Kremlin, could and would be quickly suppressed.

But what about the Soviet missile bases in Cuba? Surely Khrushchev did not need missile bases within Cuba itself in order to keep Castro in line.

Obviously not, but they have served as a supremely astute stratagem with Castro for the introduction of Soviet armed forces into Cuba, not merely forces to defend the Communist regime against internal disaffection, but primarily to deal with Castro whenever desirable or necessary.

The missile bases in Cuba were indeed a magnificent multipurpose example of Soviet guile. They were a tit for the tat of American missile bases on the very fringes of Russia. Moreover, in addition to their intrinsic military value, they constituted excellent bargaining pawns for the removal of our bases from Italy and Turkey. And whether the missiles introduced into and removed from Cuba were genuine or Potemken stage settings, they were excellent weapons for psychological (political) warfare. Now, the only effective opposition to Castro in Cuba is the Soviet Union itself. In any event, Khrushchev deserves credit for having perpetrated the most brilliant stroke of international chicane of the of the present century.

The Soviet Union continues to threaten war on the American mainland if the United States attacks Cuba. This is putting dry froth on stale beer. The Soviet Union knows perfectly well that the United States has no intention of attacking Cuba, just as we know perfectly well that the Soviet Union has no intention of attacking us with nuclear weapons should we do so. However, there is always the dangerous possibility that American activities with regard to Cuba might help to incite the old, perhaps compulsive urge of the messianic Russians to seek new pastures—pastures and warm waters—and serve as a precedent for so doing. This possibility has not been diminished by developments in Iraq and Yemen.

Middle East petroleum, or rather the threat of its denial to the West, could easily press the button of the holocaust. Under existing circumstances, Cuba does not involve the vital interests of any, except the Cubans themselves. On the other hand, the Middle East touches the vital interests of many. A cradle of civilization, it could be its deathbed.

JOHN C. WILEY,

Former Ambassador to Colombia, Iran, Portugal, and Panama, who retired from the Foreign Service in 1956.

UNIVERSAL MILITARY TRAINING AND SERVICE ACT

Mr. CLANCY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DERWINSKI] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the action of the House this afternoon in approving the extension of the Universal Military Training and Service Act serves a necessary and practical need. With world tensions growing rather than lessening, our Armed Forces remain the protectors of peace in the world, serving as they do not only in defense of the United States but also protecting the security of all free world nations.

The Soviet Union, in its consistent propaganda, attempts to don the mantle of peace but their policies remain clear to observers, that is, the hope for world domination.

America is free, America maintains leadership in the world because of our tremendous military establishment. The extension of the draft is necessary, and I commend my colleagues of the House Armed Services Committee for the rapid manner in which they processed this proposal, the first major legislation approved by the House.

AIDING RUSSIA AND NEWS MANIPULATION

Mr. CLANCY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HARSHA] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARSHA. Mr. Speaker, the news managers are back in rare form. They have left no stone unturned in trying to hoodwink the public. The Brazilian Government previously announced it was sending a mission, headed by Finance Minister San Thiago Dantes, to Washington to seek liberalized terms on existing loans and $1.5 billion in new U.S. loans and investments over a 3-year period. Part of the 3-year plan the United States would be asked to help finance was a $160 million per year long-term agreement between Brazil and Russia, but this fact is being cleverly concealed.

Previously, a meeting between the State Department and the Brazilian mission was scheduled for March 4. This meeting was postponed until today. I had previously requested an explanation from Secretary of State Rusk as to why the U.S. Government would entertain any transaction or negotiation for any sum, whether it be $1.5 billion or $1, to enhance trade negotiations between Brazil and Russia. To date, I have received no answer.

The State Department's foreign policy with Latin America is "an exercise in futility." The administration is calling for $11 billion to be spent in curtailing the Communist threat in Latin America and now the State Department is entertaining negotiations with Brazil to help finance and expand a trade program with that country and Communist Russia. The result of such a deal would enhance the Reds' position in Latin America and make our expenditures futile.

Last Monday, a release was issued that the U.S. Government and Brazil were planning to start high level, economic talks in Washington, March 11, to determine America's disposition toward new aid commitments to Brazil. Nothing in the release indicated that any part of U.S. funds would be used to help finance the trade agreement between Brazil and Russia, although State Department officials knew this to be true.

I have made inquiries to the State Department concerning this matter and have been told that Brazil probably would not get as much as she was asking for. Subsequent to this, another release was issued pointing out that Brazil's finance minister would be here today to negotiate further loans and a "qualified source" indicated the sum would be in the neighborhood of $450 to $500 million. Here again, nothing was said as to what plans had been developed for the expenditure of this money. Whether it is $1.5 billion, $450 million, or $1 makes no difference. The American taxpayer does not want his money used to expand Russian trade with any country.

The camouflaged releases prove once again that the news managers are working at their best. A commitment like this is preposterous and to delude the American taxpayer by deliberately managing the news, when the officials in the State Department know that portions of these funds will be used to help finance and expand Communist trade with Brazil, is not in the best interests of our national security and under no circumstances can it be justified.

Not only is any negotiation that would enhance Red trade foolhardy and detrimental to our national security, but in direct conflict with the stated purposes of our tremendous defense budget and foreign aid outlays. Managing the news is most dangerous and detrimental to our national security, and it is done for one purpose and one purpose only and that is to control our thinking.

We should not be treated as a mass unable to comprehend. The American taxpayer is entitled to know where his money is going, he's paid enough tuition. News manipulators should be ferreted out along with those who are advocating such a disasterous loan. I believe Congress should take a long, hard look at any such policy. The administration should state publicly that it does not advocate a policy of enhancing the Soviet economy and call a halt to such ludicrous negotiations.

SPEND, SPEND, SPEND TODAY SO YOU CAN SPEND TOMORROW, TOO

Mr. CLANCY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. CUNNINGHAM] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I think I would be naive indeed to say that we in Congress are not aware of the unwritten law of bureaucracy that requires the spending of all appropriations so that future requests for larger appropriations can thus be justified.

Seldom, however, do we find that this unwritten law has been put down in writing. But I have at hand a column written by Maj. Gen. Frederick M. Warren which appeared under the title "The Chief's Column," in the February issue of the Army Reservist.

General Warren, who is Chief of Army Reserve and ROTC Affairs, exhorts all unit commanders to draw all equipment to which they are entitled on paper, apparently without regard to the needs of the units or whether they are at full strength or half strength.

Writes General Warren:

> Failure to draw this equipment not only could have an adverse effect on future equipment budgets, but also on programs for increased storage facilities, maintenance technicians, spare parts and tools.

The important thing, according to this message, is to draw the equipment so that it will all be used up and therefore justified. I suggest that the Appropriations Committees will want to examine this activity most closely, especially since we were told that high school ROTC had to be sacrificed due to budget needs. General Warren is in charge of Reserve and ROTC. It is apparent to me that ROTC was to be sacrificed to the bureaucratic habit of drawing all equipment, spending all the money, and making a good justification in the ledger books on which to base future budget requests.

I understand the Pentagon has backed down some on its plan to abolish high school ROTC. Indeed they had better do that and also see that the old army game of "spend today so you can get more tomorrow" is given even closer attention.

The article referred to will be inserted at the end of my remarks, but I would call the attention to two other passages which clearly indicate to me that the instructions in this case are based solely on the desire to show Congress that there is a need for more money because all the previously appropriated money was used up.

Note these two passages:

> An additional danger in the conversion of functional use of space is that failure to use space for functions prescribed in approved space criteria, can bring about the elimination of that space on the basis that it is not required since it is not used for the designated purpose.
>
> In the end, by having the equipment on hand, the need for additional supporting technicians, spare parts and the required extension of facilities will be clear for all to see.

Copies of this material will be directed to the Armed Services and Appropriations Committees. I am certain it will be of value and interest in both committees.

The entire article is as follows:

THE CHIEF'S COLUMN

A matter of vital concern to all of us is the amount of equipment available to support the Army Reserve. Equipment must be available in Army Reserve centers to conduct proper home station training on a year-round basis.

Additional equipment is essential to meet the expanded requirements of summer camp training. The Berlin callup emphasized the need for equipment to meet mobilization requirements.

As a direct result of the Berlin callup, additional funds have been provided in Army budgets for acquisition of equipment for the Army Reserve to meet these requirements.

Unit commanders are therefore encouraged to draw their full complement of organizational equipment for home station training; that is, to the level specified in "Organizational Equipment Guides" (OEG's).

Failure to draw this equipment not only could have an adverse effect on future equipment budgets, but also on programs for increased storage facilities, maintenance technicians, spare parts and tools.

For the future improvement of the Army Reserve program, unit commanders should draw and accept equipment, unless it is infeasible rather than merely inconvenient or difficult to store and maintain it.

Where absolutely necessary, because of extreme limitation at home stations, arrangements may be made, on an interim basis, to store unit OEG equipment at summer camp training sites.

A related subject is the management of space in Reserve centers. It is extremely important that unit commanders conserve use of administrative space in Reserve centers. Reserve center design is predicated upon scheduled, overlapped use of administrative space in Reserve centers, not upon individual offices for each Reserve unit.

Maximum use should be made of field desks and tables. Encroachment on the unit supply areas reduces the capability to draw equipment needed for training. Elimination of lockers to create administrative space forces storage of individual equipment, which should be stored in lockers, into the already overcrowded unit supply rooms.

An additional danger in the conversion of functional use of space is that failure to use space for functions prescribed in approved space criteria, can bring about the elimination of that space on the basis that it is not required since it is not used for the designated purpose. This applies particularly to space provided for double tier lockers in the present series of standard plans.

Now is the time to build up the stocks of Reserve equipment to meet requirements. In the end, by having the equipment on hand, the need for additional supporting technicians, spare parts and the required extension of facilities will be clear for all to see. Upon attainment of equipment goals an immeasurably stronger Army Reserve will result.

FREDERICK M. WARREN,
Major General, U.S. Army, Chief, U.S. Army and ROTC Affairs.

THE NORTH DAKOTA 38TH LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY URGES INVESTIGATION OF THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE

Mr. CLANCY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. SHORT] may extend his remarks at this point and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, I have received from the North Dakota Legislature, House Concurrent Resolution Q-1, passed unanimously, to all intents and purposes, by both houses of the legislature, urging that a full-scale investigation be launched of the Department of State's role in developing and executing foreign policy and how the Department has functioned in carrying out this vital role. Under unanimous consent I insert this resolution in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, so as to bring it to the attention of my colleagues in the House, since there are several resolutions providing for such study and investigation introduced in the 88th Congress; among them, House Resolution 67, House Concurrent Resolution 60, House Resolution 104, and House Resolution 210:

HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION Q-1

A concurrent resolution requesting Congress to investigate and study the policymaking procedures, methods of assessing foreign developments, and personnel practices of the U.S. Department of State

Whereas all Americans are disturbed about conflicting reports and contradictory policies emanating from the State Department of the United States in these times of recurring crisis;

Whereas the U.S. House of Representatives has before it for consideration House Resolution 104 authorizing and directing their Committee on Foreign Affairs to conduct a full and complete investigation and study of the policymaking procedures, methods of assessing foreign developments and the personnel practices of the Department of State: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of North Dakota, the Senate concurring therein, That the 38th session of the Legislature of the State of North Dakota respectfully requests the 88th Congress of the United States, to authorize its House Foreign Affairs Committee to conduct an investigation and study the policymaking procedures, methods of assessing foreign developments, and personnel practices of the U.S. Department of State; and be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of state forward copies of this resolution to our congressional delegation, and to the chairman of the House of Representatives Rules Committee.

STANLEY SAUGSTAD,
Speaker of the House.
GERALD L. STAIR,
Chief Clerk of the House.
FRANK A. WINSTROM,
President of the Senate.
HOWARD F. DOHERTY,
Secretary of the Senate.

Mr. Speaker, there is no question that many people feel there could well be a greater order, competence, and efficiency in the Department of State, to erase the image brought to light by "The Ugly American," some of which was fiction and as such exaggerated, but still possessing a lot of truth.

My mail reveals an ever-increasing number of people seriously disturbed and concerned over what seems to be State Department policy, and I agree with their contention that it is downright ridiculous to pursue a policy of seeming concern for the welfare of foreign nations above that of our own country.

An investigation and study would do one of two things—dispel doubts now existing in the minds of many people as to the effectiveness of our present foreign policy, or it will vividly point up the need for a more realistic approach in the handling of our foreign policy.

CRITICISM AGAINST REPUBLICANS

Mr. CLANCY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. YOUNGER] may extend his remarks at this point and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, apparently the reaction over the country to Senator MANSFIELD'S recent criticism against Republicans has not been well received as evidence by the following editorial in the March 10 issue of the Washington Star and Abe Mellinkoff's article in the San Francisco Chronicle on February 27 which is also inserted:

FACTS WANTED

> Senator MANSFIELD, in our opinion, is a man of great integrity and competence. Nevertheless, we think he missed the real point in his impassioned appeal to the Senate to refrain from "politicking" on the Cuban question.
>
> The majority leader has suggested that recent Republican attacks were based on a news story that was published on May 5, 1961. He also has expressed the belief that these attacks are injurious to the national interest—that to "toy" with such things as the details of who bungled the Bay of Pigs operation "is to toy with the life of the Nation."
>
> This is an argument which overlooks a basic point. The American people have been encouraged to believe that "no U.S. forces" were involved in the Cuban invasion, and that President Kennedy would not permit them to be involved under any condition. In the strictest sense, this is true. But it also strikes us as the finest kind of hairsplitting—if news reports in addition to those mentioned by Senator MANSFIELD are correct.
>
> These additional reports, coming from presumably responsible and informed individuals, indicate that the May 5, 1961, news account told only a small part of the story. These reports suggest that 16—not 4—Americans were involved as pilots or in training capacities in the Cuban invasion. Some of them certainly were National Guard officers, evidently recruited by the Central Intelligence Agency on some kind of informal or "civilian" basis. If this is so, the statement by Attorney General Kennedy that "no U.S. forces" took part in the invasion needs very careful scrutiny.
>
> Our feeling about this matter is not that it was wrong to use Americans to train the Cubans, or even to fly combat missions. It is a great pity, we think, that the effort at the Bay of Pigs failed because too few Americans were used, and because their equipment, including planes, was inadequate to the task.
>
> What disturbs us is that this continuing leakage of information which, if true, casts doubt on the accuracy of former official statements, can hardly fail to make most Americans wonder whether their Government is telling the truth or is trying to brainwash them. Certainly it is necessary to protect our intelligence structure. At the very least, this means that the public cannot be told all. But when a mish-mash of conflicting information gets into the public domain, it is desirable that all of the facts—consistent with protecting national security—be put on the record. We do not believe that this has been done in the Cuban affair. On the contrary, we think that facts, undoubtedly known to Castro, are being covered up or distorted to protect individuals in this country from their responsibility for the monumental blunder at the Bay of Pigs. This is unwise and—within the limits of legitimate security considerations—unnecessary

MORNING REPORT

> Senator MIKE MANSFIELD is getting after the Senate for not voting on any of President Kennedy's legislative programs. I'm not sure the lawmakers are goofing off. Maybe they're just too busy reading it.
>
> So far they have been given programs for the sick, the aged, those overtaxed and undertaxed, commuters, wheat growers, teachers, pupils, our friends and enemies abroad, young people who need work in the cities, and also those who could better work in the woods.
>
> But even if Congress takes none of his advice, President Kennedy hasn't wasted his time. He can always use those messages as campaign speeches in 1964.
>
> ABE MELLINKOFF.

FISCAL NEEDS OF VA MEDICAL PROGRAM

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, the Independent Offices Subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee has recently spent a week with Mr. Gleason, the very able Administrator of Veterans' Affairs and his competent staff, reviewing their financial needs in all departments for 1964.

Administrator Gleason and his staff have done a tremendous job in all fields of VA activities. Perhaps one of the most outstanding accomplishments of the VA Administrator has been the great success of the VA medical program with its 170 hospitals. It is true the cost of the medical program will be over $1 billion in 1964; and that the cost of the medical program has increased about $300 million over the last 5 years; and during that time there has been a bed limitation in the system of 125,000 beds. But in the last 2 or 3 years an increase of at least 10 percent in bed occupancy has occurred, which means more veterans have received medical service than in years past. It is generally recognized that VA medicine throughout the entire system is excellent. In fact, no better hospitals exist in our country or any other.

The Administrator has a vast responsibility. The act of September 2, 1958, revising and codifying the laws relating to veteran benefits, states:

> The Administrator, under the direction of the President, is responsible for the proper execution and administration of all laws administered by the Veterans' Administration and for the control, direction, and management of the Veterans' Administration.

In each of the VA programs, including veterans' benefits, insurance, medicine and the others, the Administrator is continuing to move them forward. In exercising his responsibilities, Mr. Gleason receives help from many sources. In matters relating to medical care the Administrator relies on outstanding professional help and advice both within and without the VA. He works hand and glove with his Chief Medical Director in all professional and other medical matters, but he does not attempt to practice medicine. The rapport that exists between the Administrator and his medical experts is one of the reasons the VA has such a successful medical program.

The committee has urged the Administrator for several years to decentralize the medical department. Hospital managers are in a far better position on a day-to-day basis to run their respective hospitals than anybody sitting in an area office or the District of Columbia. If a hospital manager is incapable of running his hospital on a day-to-day basis under general guidelines from the Administrator and his medical chief, the manager should be replaced by someone who is. The one big complaint the average hospital manager offers is that his day-to-day operation of the hospital is slowed down, hampered, and restricted by the regional and the District of Columbia offices.

The VA in recent years has had a regional medical setup of seven offices. The staff in the area medical offices has grown year by year. In 1963 the cost will be $3,710,000 for 286 positions. This is an unnecessary layer of administration and paper shuffling, which is not an asset but a hindrance, to the practice of medicine in each of the local hospitals. As the matter recently stood, before a hospital manager could make a decision on even trivial matters such as travel, he must contact the area office and get the area office manager's approval. In most instances the area officer had to contact Washington before a final decision could be given. The result is delay, delay, delay.

The Administrator has recently moved the area medical directors and their staffs into Washington. This is a good first step, but does not go far enough. This layer should be eliminated entirely and the area medical directors and their staffs should be reassigned to the various hospitals so that they can practice medicine. The veterans throughout the country will profit by this move.

GOLD MEDAL TO EDDIE CANTOR

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. ROOSEVELT] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday, February 21, 1963, I introduced House Joint Resolution 276, which would authorize the President of the United States to express the high esteem and appreciation of the American people through the issuance of a gold medal to Eddie Cantor.

Twenty-five years ago my father, who suffered so severely from polio himself, called upon Mr. Cantor to help inaugurate a campaign to combat infantile paralysis. Mr. Cantor suggested that every American send in one dime to the White House and coined the phrase "March of Dimes." That first campaign in 1938 successfully focused public attention to the terrible tragedy of polio and got the national foundation underway.

Now on the silver anniversary of the March of Dimes, polio has been virtually eradicated as a public health problem. Since the introduction of the Salk vaccine in 1955 the number of persons struck down by polio has been reduced by 97 percent, and the national foundation has been able to turn its energies and funds to attack virus diseases, arthritis, birth defects, and central nervous system disorders.

All through the years Mr. Cantor has helped to raise funds for the March of Dimes. How large a part his efforts have played in the achievements of the national foundation cannot even be measured.

Mr. Cantor's humanity and love for his fellow man is always radiated through his wonderful wit and humor, which have entertained so many millions of people all over the world. His activities for all kinds of charitable and religious organizations are almost too numerous to mention. But perhaps his feeling about his giving of his time, talent and energy can best be summed up in something he once wrote:

> I have learned that service is the rent we pay for our room on earth, and I try to be a good tenant. I have learned that he who believes that charity begins at home is right, but he is wrong if it ends there.

Certainly Mr. Cantor's life has been an example of what he preaches. At this stage of his life, though, Mr. Cantor is not a well man and has been so weighed down by the loss of his wife, his devoted companion and childhood sweetheart.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to urge that the Committee on Banking and Currency act favorably and expeditiously on House Joint Resolution 276, authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to strike a medal in recognition of such outstanding humanitarian service of someone who has a permanent place in all of our hearts, Mr. Eddie Cantor.

YOUTH EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITIES BILL, H.R. 1890

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I was pleased and honored to submit the following statement in support of the administration's Youth Employment Opportunities Act to the general Subcommittee on Education on March 5, 1963:

Thirty years ago on March 4, 1933, in his first inaugural address President Franklin Roosevelt said:

"This Nation asks for action and action now. Our greatest primary task is to put people to work. This is no unsolvable problem if we face it wisely and courageously. It can be accomplished in part by direct recruiting by the Government itself, treating the task as we would treat the emergency of a war, but at the same time through this employment, accomplishing greatly needed projects to stimulate and reorganize the use of our natural resources."

Less than 1 month ago in his youth message, President Kennedy, after surveying our current economic trends, found it necessary to nearly echo the words of President Roosevelt:

"This bill (the youth employment opportunities bill) is a measure of the first priority. The effects of unemployment are nowhere more depressing and disheartening than among the young. Commonsense and justice compel establishment of this program, which will give many many thousands of currently unemployed young persons a chance to find employment, to be paid for their services, and to acquire skills and work experience that will give them a solid start in their working lives."

I urge the speedy enactment of the Youth Employment Opportunities Act, H.R. 1890.

The Youth Employment Opportunities Act is a double-barreled proposal. Simultaneously, it will fire strength back into the economy in two areas—the training and utilization of idle manpower and the preservation of our somewhat neglected natural resources and the achievement of neglected public works projects.

As a powerful nation, we cannot afford a backlog of undone conservation and public works.

In a publication, "Social Dynamite," of the National Committee of Children and Youth which addresses itself to the young urban, unemployed high school dropout, the following remark is made:

"In 1950 youth unemployment was relatively minor. Many young men of 20 and under had been drafted for the Korean war. The country had practically full employment. Automation was a term only just coming into use, no more then than handwriting on the wall. In the records of the Midcentury White House Conference (on Children and Youth) the word 'dropout' is not to be found (this latter absence probably because a high school diploma was not yet a near exigency for obtaining a good or steady job)."

Or more directly in terms of the job market is a statment in an analysis of youth unemployment published last January by the Center for Information on America in its publication entitled "Vital Issues":

"The long-term trend has been toward the expansion of occupations which require college education or technical training, while jobs which require no prior education or skill have actually been declining. There are today about 16 professional and technical jobs for every 10 that existed in 1950; but only about 8 jobs for unskilled laborers for every 10 that existed 12 years ago."

Yet, while the complexity of the economy increases to the point where in 1970 only 5 percent of all jobs will be in the unskilled classification, the output of high school graduates (often a minimum requirement) is still below 70 percent of all youth and increases only slowly each decade.

Thus, the 1961 and 1962 figures stack up like this: one of every four dropouts was unemployed of the group that dropped out between January and October 1961; one-sixth were unemployed for one-half year or longer; 20 percent of the dropouts employed, moreover, are employed only part time.

Saddest of all, however, is one-tenth of this group have even faded from the statistical picture. Because they are no longer looking for work or desiring to work, they are not even classified as unemployed; they just exist and only very special and thorough surveys uncover them.

Title I of H.R. 1890 would get these boys out of the city, the only environment they know, and place them with new friends in radically different and serene surroundings—our parks and open spaces. Moreover, it would place these young people in a daily routine where work and study are the staples.

It must be remembered, these boys to be reached are not hardened delinquents. At worst, they will be sometime offenders or potential delinquents. We must assume some latent eagerness on their part, which will manifest itself when listlessness no longer suits their new environment.

There is precedent for those who need further proof. The Attorney General mentioned in his testimony the Lane County, Oreg., project of 1961 for potential dropouts not yet delinquent. After a summer working for the State forestry department and achieving one-third more work than the adult crews, they all returned eagerly to school.

And, in West Virginia, some 95 already delinquent boys performed $200,000 worth of conservation work. To enable this production, the State had to invest $50,000—an investment incidentally far less than would have been necessary to keep the same 95 youths confined.

The question raised here, of course, is why send them to camps after they're delinquent. We should enact this bill and do it before that happens.

As for title II, the success of one public urban youth work project in New York struck me as my most cogent argument in favor of it.

The summer teen work project in 1961 in uptown Manhattan placed delinquent and predelinquent boys in various public work capacities—painting, plastering, simonizing, and repairing. Although only boys were involved, delinquency dramatically subsided in the neighborhood (the two leaders of rumbles participated in the project).

Sheldon Seller, the director, reported his evaluation in the following manner:

"The best worker a Puerto Rican boy, evaluated his experience, saying, 'I used to think I was lazy.' Two boys were helped to find part-time jobs and one a full-time job. Two boys were encouraged to remain in school, and a third enrolled in night school. One boy for the past 5 months has been tutored. Two boys left school and refused counseling, but one recently returned for counseling. We found a job for him with a city brokerage firm, and other boys now want jobs with the same firm."

To me this is a success story. The Youth Employment Opportunities Act must be passed now by the 88th Congress. It offers the prospect of more such success stories and quickly, before we form a backlog and hard core of youth who have not only never worked, but who will be inured to the impossibility of ever learning.

THE NATIONAL EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT ACT, H.R. 3000

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. **MULTER**. Mr. Speaker, I was pleased to demonstrate my support for the proposed general education bill by submitting the following statement to the Education and Labor Committee on March 5, 1963:

Mr. Chairman, thank you for the opportunity to present my views on H.R. 3000, the proposed National Education Improvement Act of 1963.

This bill is unique in its field in both its comprehensiveness, and in its intelligent selectivity of areas in our educational structure which most need assistance and which are most eligible for improvement. A very successful precedent exists, however, for an omnibus education bill; the National Defense Education Act was passed in 1958 and its multipurpose measures have been praised ever since. But praiseworthy as its provisions may be, it should be noted that they were aimed at remedying mainly the technological shortages of our schools.

When one speaks of the responsibility for education, most often the subject is the local school district or the State education department. But I would suggest that the responsibility lies with the people, and that we have chosen the more local political bodies as a matter of historical necessity and also as the method best calculated to leave the maintenance of responsibility with the people. It does not follow that the revenues collected by the Federal Government either should not or cannot be returned to those administrative bodies for the benefit of those who have paid the taxes. It is the minds of our children that will suffer from the refusal to so act, and, collectively, it is our Nation whose intellectual development will otherwise be stunted.

H.R. 3000 recognizes the need and the importance of improving education at all levels. It will help correct, for example, the fact that in the elementary and secondary school systems in 1962 there was an excess of 1,666,711 students over the classroom capacity; it will help accommodate the 7 million college students expected by 1970, double the 1960 enrollment; it will go a long way toward making up the current additional $1 billion annually which institutions of higher education should be spending for the improvement and expansion of their physical plants. These institutions should be investing $2.3 billion annually instead of the current $1.3 billion.

The vision of H.R. 3000, and the potential of the educated energies it would unleash, can only be realized by a review of its provisions.

Title I of H.R. 3000 provides an extension of the student loan program initiated by the National Defense Education Act. Its $90 million ceiling is increased to $135 million or "necessary sums," in order to meet the demands not satisfied under the previous program. To encourage a greater number of students to enter the teaching profession, up to 50 percent of the loans may be forgiven for all who become teachers.

To provide an additional source for student financial assistance, the bill provides for the encouragement of commercial loans to students, by authorizing the Federal guarantee of such loans. Still another source of financial assistance to the undergraduate is to be provided by authorizing the payment of up to 50 percent of the wages to the needy student employed on campus in work of an educational character. Graduate fellowships and summer session fellowships also begun under the NDEA, are to be increased in number, thus assuring the continuation and magnification of the number of competent teachers returning to the college and university campus.

Pleased as I am by this bill's provisions for loans to full-time students, I would encourage the part-time student who, usually by financial necessity, is restrained from undertaking a full-time course of study. In 1962 it was estimated that it cost, on the average, $1,480 for a student to attend a public institution of higher education; of this amount, it was estimated that $370 came from student earnings. This indicates to me that there is a great source of initiative among our college students, and I can find no reason to stifle that initiative or to penalize it by discriminating against the part-time student. The terms of the NDEA loan program and those of the new insurable loan program should be amended to encourage our ambitious part-time students.

Such an amendment should provide that part-time students receive the same loan and loan insurance benefits as full-time students if they meet the criteria in all other respects save the fact that they are not pursuing a full-time course of study. The Association of University Evening Colleges supports this proposal and informs me that at the present time 50,000 undergraduate and more than 40,000 graduate students are enrolled in part-time evening programs.

To deprive these students of the benefits of the proposed legislation appears to be wholly unjustified and I might point out that it is a discrimination that many of the States do not practice. In New York, for example, there is a program established to guarantee the repayment of student loans from private banks. Part-time students qualify for these loans on the basis of a formula keyed to the limits fixed for full-time students.

Title II of H.R. 3000 provides for the expansion and improvement of educational facilities at institutions of higher education, both public and nonprofit private, and provides for the development of a new program of assistance to institutions of higher education for 2-year college level programs to train semiprofessional technicians in engineering, science, and health occupations.

The modern foreign language area centers and studies program of title VI of the NDEA is to be extended, and its authorization of funds is to be increased.

Title III of H.R. 3000 is aimed at the improvement of educational quality with emphasis placed on the preparation and continuing education of teachers. Through the teacher institutes, preparation programs, cooperative research programs and specialized training programs of this bill, we will reflect the value that all of us place on the teaching profession and on its continued improvement. The extension of the NDEA programs in new educational media research and demonstration, and in the improvement in the States' collection of educational statistics, and tools available to the teacher and the school administration will be strengthened.

For the fall of 1962 the States reported to the Office of Education that there was a shortage of 121,235 classrooms in their public elementary and secondary schools. In the administration's fact sheets on the National Education Improvement Act, it was pointed out that teacher salaries in many of our Nation's school districts are insufficient to attract and retain good teachers.

As I said earlier, I believe the States and the school districts have performed an excellent job in the establishment and financing of our tremendous system of public education. But areas of inadequacy still exist and unfortunately these are not equitably spread throughout the United States. The administration's fact sheets state, "National defense, population mobility, and our interdependent economy make these disparities cause for national concern." Title IV of H.R. 3000 accurately reflects this necessary concern.

Under title IV, a 4-year, $1.5 billion program for "the selective and urgent improvement of public elementary and secondary education" would be begun. The funds would be used to increase maximum teacher salaries, raise low starting salaries and raise low average salaries in economically disadvantaged districts. The funds would also support critical classroom construction needs, caused by overcrowding, and fire and health hazards. Special projects would also be financed to improve educational quality, particularly in disadvantaged rural and urban areas. The funds authorized for teachers' salaries are to be phased out over a period of 4 years, so that in each State, the areas of most urgent need may receive the needed assistance, while the State stabilizes and develops its own resources to carry on independently after the Federal assistance comes to an end.

Title IV of H.R. 3000 also recognizes the special needs and duties of our country by authorizing the 2-year continuation of titles III and IV of the NDEA, and the 4-year extension, with some equitable and purposeful modifications such as the inclusion of the District of Columbia, of the federally impacted areas legislation, of Public Laws 815 and 874.

Vocational education, long an accepted and needed program in our country, is treated in title V. Today's program enrolls 4 million young people and adults in courses that train them in skills necessary to our changing economy. The bill would increase the authorization of appropriations to $73 million in 1964, and necessary sums thereafter, this Federal contribution being somewhat closer to the $206 million invested yearly by the States and local communities in the program.

Title V also authorizes a program of Federal grants for assistance in the training of teachers for America's 6 million handicapped school-age children who need special education.

Title VI of H.R. 3000 concludes the complementary program of assistance envisioned in the bill. It authorizes grants for the expansion of university extension courses, for the basic education of adults up to the level of the eighth grade, and the expansion of the Library Services Act to encompass assistance to public libraries in all areas of the States.

The importance of the continuing education of our citizens cannot be overemphasized—whether in complex skills at the university, in basic knowledge at the grade school, or in the knowledge of the world and the ages at our local public libraries.

H.R. 3000 will certainly motivate the continuance of the debate over the need or lack of need of our Nation's schools, teachers, and students. I am hopeful, however, that its new approach will foster new insights into what the United States can and should accomplish—in short, emphasize what we can do and not that what we have done is good enough.

A nation's investment in its education is its most certain means of obtaining a nationwide return in development and enlightenment of its people, and in an appreciation of the working principles of the democracy that made it possible.

The argument is that which Thomas Jefferson once made in support of a proposal for student scholarship assistance: "But of the views of this law, none is more important, none more legitimate, than that of rendering the people the safe, as they are the ultimate, guardians of their own liberty."

"HONESTY TODAY AND TOMORROW": THE VIRGINIA JUNIOR CHAMBER OF COMMERCE INITIATES A PROGRAM TO DISCOURAGE CLASSROOM CHEATING AND ENCOURAGE HONESTY AMONG STUDENTS

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BRADEMAS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, I rise to commend the members of the Junior Chamber of Commerce of the State of Virginia and, in particular, the Jaycees of Richmond, Va., for initiating a program worthy of the attention and, I believe, support of all Members of Congress.

The Virginia Jaycees are showing splendid leadership in offering a fresh approach toward meeting what is unfortunately an apparently widespread problem, cheating by students in the classrooms of our country.

The Virginia Jaycees have launched a program entitled "Honesty Today and Tomorrow," aimed at encouraging high schools throughout the State to undertake programs for stimulating honesty among students.

I should point out that theirs is a positive program for developing honesty and not simply a negative "stop cheating" program.

Clearly the project proposed by the Virginia Jaycees is not the complete answer to this problem but it does provide the impetus for an attack on classroom cheating. The Virginia program is directed at helping individual high schools develop their own appropriate solutions for encouraging honesty among their students.

The originator of the honesty today and tomorrow program and its most articulate advocate is a dedicated and outstanding Richmond, Va., businessman, David R. White.

VIRGINIA NEWSPAPERS SUPPORT PROGRAM

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I include in the RECORD several articles and editorials from Virginia newspapers describing and endorsing the program:

[From the Richmond (Va.) Times-Dispatch, Dec. 18, 1962]

A CAMPAIGN AGAINST CHEATING

Given the national administration's open defense of "the right to lie," the admirable campaign against cheating in school and college being waged by a committee chairman of the Virginia Junior Chamber of Commerce takes on added importance. David R. White, Richmond businessman, is the originator of this program and its director. He hopes it will become national in scope—and so do a lot of other people.

Thousands of Virginians, and other Americans are appalled by the open acknowledgment of cheating in the classrooms of this country. A Gallup poll early this year reported that "American youngsters are not really convinced that classroom cheating is dishonest."

But as a matter of fact, the word "cheat" means to "practice fraud" or "to swindle." Isn't it astonishing that so many young people regard this as something of a game—instead of something to be deeply ashamed of? What is the difference between cheating on a test or examination and cheating at cards? The principle is the same; yet some of those who unhesitatingly condemn cheating at cards seem to think cheating in class is almost a sign of sophistication.

An article published a few years ago in This Week magazine said that "cheating is often the first step to delinquency." Even when it isn't, it is a practice that undermines the moral fiber of anyone who indulges in it.

Richmond area high schools, and high schools in other sections, have active and positive programs to promote honesty. The problem is that cheating is so widespread in so many high schools, as well as institutions of higher learning, that a long period of education is essential if significant results are to be had. There is no gainsaying the difficulties in the way.

A minority of secondary schools, as well as of colleges and universities, have effective and smoothly working honor systems. Persons who desire to see these systems adopted elsewhere would do well to study carefully the manner in which they have been made to function successfully at a limited number of institutions.

An honor-system tradition is an important element here, and this cannot be created overnight. The first prerequisite is to get the idea across that cheating in school is on a par with cheating anywhere else.

Parents can do a great deal to help. A parent who chisels on his income tax or tells untruths to his children about this or that, can't expect to influence those children to be strictly honest themselves. Fathers and mothers must set the proper example for their sons and daughters, if they expect those sons and daughters to be upstanding citizens.

So, David White will have to appeal to parents, as well as to their children, and the teachers of those children, in his campaign to combat the nationwide practice of classroom cheating. He has undertaken a formidable task, indeed. Yet its very difficulty makes it doubly worthwhile. We wish him every success.

[From the Richmond (Va.) Times-Dispatch, Dec. 10, 1962]

STATE PROJECT—JAYCEE FIGHTS SCHOOL CHEATING

(By Lon Savage)

A young Richmond businessman, working as a committee chairman for the State junior chamber of commerce, has set out to help solve what he describes as a widespread problem of classroom cheating.

He is David R. White, 33, securities salesman for Mason-Hagan, Inc. He originated and directs a statewide Jaycee project which he hopes will become national in scope, focusing the attention of 250,000 Jaycees on the problem.

Cheating, White said, goes on in Richmond area high schools as well as nearly everywhere else in the country.

He based that conclusion upon reading, on conferences during the past 3 months with area school officials, and upon conversations with students.

White's program including mailing of a pamphlet, which he prepared, to all Jaycee chapters in the State. It outlined the causes of cheating and programs to combat it.

He also sent out a questionnaire to 26 leading high schools in the State to find out what they are doing to promote honesty among students.

He and his committee plan to assemble the answers in a booklet and send it to educators to show them honesty programs that are working.

The State Jaycee organization, he said, plans to submit the project for consideration by the national Jaycees as a nationwide project.

White, a VMI graduate and former Marine officer, said he has approached many students in area schools and questioned them about the cheating problem.

Speaking to them, he said, he has taken the position that nearly everyone, being human, has done things he considers somewhat dishonest.

After he spoke to them in this vein, he said, an "impressive percentage" of students told that they had cheated in class.

"They were not proud of it," he added.

What causes a student to cheat?

Most reasons, White said, fall into one of these categories: "To get into college"; "the teacher didn't prepare us properly"; "family pressure"; "to avoid memorizing a lot of useless details"; "to make the grade," and "everyone was doing it."

The last reason—that "everyone does it"—is the one "we have to fight the most," White said. In his pamphlet sent to Jaycee chapters, he wrote of his contacts with Virginia teenagers:

"Among all the teens we talked to * * * the same statement came up over and over again in different words, different schools: Everybody cheats a little.

"A girl panics in an exam and looks at the paper in front of her to 'check the answer.'

"A boy afraid of flunking sticks a crib sheet down his sock 'just in case.'

"A friend signals for help in a quiz and though you think it's wrong to give her the answer, you also think it's wrong not to; so you casually hold up your paper."

There are other factors, he said: Emphasis on grades; parents who expect too much from their children; a teacher's laxity about the problem.

In addition, he wrote in the pamphlet, "adults have often been accused of teaching you to cheat by a 'nibbling dishonesty' that has become so common it's hardly even considered dishonest any more.

"The little bit of hedging on the income tax return, the occasional speeding on the highway, the fibbing to get a 13-year-old into the movies for half price."

What can be done about it?

RICHMOND PROGRAMS

Richmond area high schools, he said, have active and positive programs to promote honesty.

Some involve teacher counseling with students caught cheating. Others involve student honor groups serving as judges of cheating cases and recommending courses of action. (In this program, the offenders remain anonymous to the student-judges.)

Some area students, he said, have reported fellow students for cheating, although many students—and their parents—believe this is wrong.

One Norfolk teacher, White said, has told his class that anyone caught cheating flunks the course. "There is no cheating in that class," he added.

"That is one man's answer," he said. But he added that there is no single answer for all classes or schools.

[From the Petersburg, Colonial Heights, and Hopewell (Va.) Tri-City News, Nov. 13, 1962]

JAYCEES HONESTY IN CLASSROOM PROGRAM GIVEN WIDE APPROVAL

A junior chamber of commerce program to encourage honesty in high school classrooms was met with approval in Colonial Heights last night when a four-man Jaycee committee presented the program to C. G. Smith, Jr., city school superintendent.

The project, called "Honesty—Today and Tomorrow," is being sponsored statewide by the Jaycees State committee on education and school development. The purpose of the project is to have each Jaycee chapter work with local high school students, teachers, and parents, in an effort to cut down on classroom cheating. The Jaycees and local school authorities are cooperating on the program in which the students are encouraged to be honest in their work.

The Jaycees are attempting to help local schools provide preventive measures against dishonesty and to promote the honest approach. They are acquainting students and parents of the serious consequences of cheating and are suggesting courses of action.

Smith said, "Any effort on the part of any person or group to promote personal integrity is very gratifying. I would commend the Jaycees for their work which you offer to our school age citizens. I shall be happy to pass the idea and materials to our schools. I believe that our students will be impressed by the fact that your organization has taken the time and energy to present these ideas and ideals to them."

Commenting on cheating in city schools, Smith stated that no specific problem had been brought to his attention. He said, however, that school officials were making every effort to cut down the size of classes so that teachers will have more opportunity to work individually with students.

Last night, the Colonial Heights Jaycees recommended that their program be made known in the high school newspaper, that their committee work with the student honor society, and that pamphlets be distributed to teachers, and parents.

[From the Richmond (Va.) Times-Dispatch, Nov. 13, 1962]

Program of Jaycees Is Lauded

The endorsement came after a four-member committee of the Colonial Heights Jaycees met the superintendent to outline the statewide project of cautioning students against cheating and make them aware of the consequences.

Smith told them, "Any effort on the part of any person or group to promote personal integrity is very gratifying. I commend the Jaycees for this program which you offer to our school-age citizens and I will be happy to pass this idea and material to our high school."

"I believe that our students will be impressed by the fact that you are taking the time and energy to present these ideas and ideals to them."

The Colonial Heights High School has an honor code and Jaycee officials said their program to make students aware of cheating "would be an aid to the code."

[From the Harrisonburg (Va.) Daily News-Record, Dec. 11, 1962]

Virginia Jaycees Launch Drive To Curb Classroom Cheating

Richmond.—"Everybody does it" and the Virginia Junior Chamber of Commerce is out to stop it.

The "it" refers to classroom cheating.

The Jaycee project was originated and is headed by David R. White, a 33-year-old securities salesman who is a graduate of Virginia Military Institute and a former Marine Corps officer.

White said he hopes to bring the widespread problem to the attention of the 250,000 Jaycees in this country and make it a national project.

He recently completed a 3-month study of the problem, which included reading, conferences with school officials, and conversations with students.

In approaching the students, White said, he has taken the position that nearly everyone has done things he considers somewhat dishonest. He said an "impressive percentage" admitted they had cheated in class.

"They were not proud of it," he said.

What causes a student to cheat?

White said he found most reasons fall into one of these categories:

"To get into college"; "the teacher didn't prepare us properly"; "family pressure"; "to avoid memorizing a lot of useless details"; "to make the grade"; and "everyone does it."

White and his committee have prepared a pamphlet which was mailed to Virginia Jaycees. It outlines the causes of cheating and how to combat it.

White also plans to issue a booklet on the promotion of honesty programs based on answers to a questionnaire sent to 26 high schools.

[From the Newport News (Va.) Daily Press, Dec. 18, 1962]

Cheating Under Jaycees' Fire

The Virginia Junior Chamber of Commerce has set itself to an important and imposing task in its campaign to eradicate cheating or "cribbing" in the classroom. The group holds that though "everybody does it" there's no good reason why anybody should and will endeavor to see that nobody does.

It is hardly to be expected that the Jaycees will succeed fully in their undertaking. The pressure to cheat to make a good showing is too heavy on fond parents who want to see their children get along—at least appear to get along—as well as or better than their associates. Moreover, many parents are not above a bit of cheating on their own and set poor examples to their young. The cheater in school also is under similar pressures including those from parents who insist on junior bringing home top grades and when he doesn't to put pressure on him or run to his teacher to complain that Johnny hasn't had a fair shake.

But some pressure can be put on also by the Jaycees who hope to make their anticheating crusade national for the 250,000 members of Jaycee chapters throughout the country. Already David R. White, who heads the movement, has consulted with school officials and students to develop a background for action and to determine the scope of his project. His approach to students is that almost everyone has done things he deems somewhat dishonest and cites an "impressive percentage" of students who admit cheating in class, but they are not proud of it, he adds, and that, we think, holds out hope for developing a good climate for reform.

Most frequent reasons for cheating were found to be to get into college, family pressure, seeking to avoid having to memorize a lot of useless details, to make the grade whether they deserved it or not—and finally the resort of most people who do not want to take responsibility—"everybody does it."

The subject is most aptly chosen. Every cheater and potential cheater would do well to remember the almost invariable fate of his kind. He may cheat to get into college, cheat to make grades high enough to stay there but when he gets out into the world as a breadwinner and cheats there he soon goes into the discard for lack of basic knowledge that he would have had if he had studied rather than cheated. And finally, he is a failure because of the distrust of those with whom he deals.

That is just the material side of cheating. It does not include the moral value of being honest and able to live with respect and clear conscience with one's self. Which, of course, is the greatest of all the values of honesty.

URGE NATIONAL JAYCEE CONSIDERATION OF THE VIRGINIA PROGRAM

Mr. Speaker, as a member of the junior chamber of commerce in my home city of South Bend, Ind., I want to salute the Jaycees of Virginia and to express the hope that local and State junior chamber chapters throughout the United States will encourage similar programs in their own jurisdictions. It is this kind of local leadership in working with young people that I think is heartily to be applauded.

I want also to say that I hope that delegates attending the National Convention of the U.S. Junior Chamber of Commerce in Tulsa, Okla., in a few days will give serious consideration to adopting the Virginia Jaycee "Honesty Today and Tomorrow" program as a national project of the U.S. Junior Chamber of Commerce.

"CLASSROOM CHEATING; WHO'S TO BLAME"

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I insert at this point in the Record an article from the magazine, Seventeen, "Classroom Cheating: Who's to Blame?":

Classroom Cheating: Who's To Blame?

Is it the teacher? your parents? society? college pressures? or you?

During final exam week last year several teenagers in three large schools had their friends sit in and take their tests for them. In one suburban school, students who helped mimeograph the tests took copies home. In another high school, teenagers paid A students to ghostwrite their term papers. In other schools, students sold history papers to the class behind them or paid to have book reports written.

Shocking? Scandalous? Is paying someone to write a book report for you so very much worse than using a hand-me-down from a friend in an upper class? Is bringing crib sheets to an exam so different from taking a copy of the test home? Among all the teens we talked to, in piecing together the puzzle of high school cheating, the same statement came up over and over again in different words, different schools: Everybody cheats a little. A girl panics in an exam and looks at the paper in front of her to "check the answer." A boy afraid of flunking, sticks a crib sheet down his sock "just in case—for an emergency." A math teacher has the class correct one another's papers and everyone fills in the right answers. Book reports are handed down from class to class. Homework copied or bartered: "I'll do English tonight if you do algebra." A friend signals for help in a quiz and though you think it's wrong to give her the answer, you also think it's wrong not to; so you casually hold up your paper.

"I don't think it's cheating if you help someone who knows the subject but just can't think of an answer," one honor student told us. "You give a little and take a little. It's friendship." "I'd be ashamed to cheat—to have my friends know I did," a 15-year-old from a suburban girls' school reported. "Well, cheating's never right, but when you see other kids doing it," a teen said, "you think, 'Why should they get a higher mark than I do?'" "Cheating is justified if the test isn't fair," was the attitude of one pretty sophomore from Tennessee. "It's never justified," a young West Point candidate said. "Your work should be a record of what you can do, whether it's homework or a test, a term paper—it doesn't matter. Cheating is cheating."

Perhaps one of the teens described or quoted above feels just as you do, perhaps not. If you're bursting to interrupt here with a "that's not it at all," we couldn't be less surprised. Attitudes and statistics about cheating vary not only regionally but from school to school and even from class to class. In two schools we visited, cheating was widespread among certain students and almost nonexistent throughout the rest of the school. "They all do it sometimes," one teacher informed us. There is no clear-cut, across-the-State picture, no neatly pigeonholed pattern of behavior, no tidy percentages of those who cheat and those who don't. And it really doesn't matter. The important thing, we think, is not how many teenagers cheat, or how, but:

THE REASONS WHY TEENAGERS CHEAT

Betty, 14, feels pressure from home is the main reason for cheating in her school. "Some parents say, 'If you fail, you can't go out for a month.' I know one boy whose father keeps threatening to take him out of the school if he doesn't do better."

"All the kids are afraid of what their families say if they don't get good marks."

Evelyn, 16, admits her class cheats regularly. "Kids get in a tight spot and cheat once. If they're not caught, they do it again and again. It's an atmosphere. No one cheated freshman year; then it started, very little at first, but it spread tremendously. I was kind of shocked in the beginning. Everyone does it, though. It grows on you. First, it's a glance at somebody's paper, then giving answers, then crib notes."

Once in a while a teenager gave a reason like laziness or spite for cheating. Some teens said they cheated "to put something over on the teacher" or "just for kicks—to see what I could get away with." But most of the reasons fell into these categories: "To get into college." "The teacher didn't prepare us properly." "Family pressure." "To avoid memorizing a lot of useless details." "To make the grade." "Everyone was doing it."

More significant perhaps than the reasons you have for cheating, if you do, are the reasons that cropped up repeatedly for not cheating. Boys, girls, seniors, freshmen—almost everyone we talked to started with the same six words: It all depends on the teacher.

"If the teacher's strict, no one cheats." An English teacher in junior high school made it clear at the beginning of the year that he would give anyone who cheated a zero in the test, call in the parents, and put it on the student's record. No one cheated. A Spanish teacher cracked down on the weekly test cheating and made anyone caught stay for Saturday detention. After the first few Saturdays, no one cheated. A science teacher told his class that no one who tried her best would fail; anyone who cheated would automatically flunk. No one cheated. Is the system to blame?

"There's too much emphasis on grades and tests, not enough on individual ability. Lots of kids cheat because they just can't do the work." Though that may sound like a teenager talking, it's a high school teacher.

Some students are hustled up from grammar school with barely third-grade reading ability. Others reach freshman class in high school with college-level reading ability. One teenager has an IQ of 150, the boy or the girl at the next desk has an IQ of 90. And yet, in many schools everyone is expected to do the same work, take the same tests and progress at an equal pace.

ARE PARENTS TOO DEMANDING?

Some are, and even the most understanding parents often exert hidden pressure simply by expecting too much. But the pressures aren't always hidden. Few parents can be objective enough to admit the limitations of their children: If marks are poor, parents are always sure their teens could do better if they tried harder. Perhaps they could. Perhaps not. Often, an honest appraisal of a student's capabilities could clear the air at home but many teachers complicate the situation by giving parents soothing cliches instead of facts. Impossible standards are raised, then privileges are denied—the pressures pile up. In some communities where the "name" colleges are part of the status symbols, parental pressure for high scholastic averages becomes one of the major reasons given—by teens and educators—for cheating problems.

ARE COLLEGE PRESSURES TO BLAME?

For many of you, the answer would seem to be "Yes." The demands of college with all the tensions and outside pressures are undeniable—but often unrealistic. Or at least avoidable. This year there were about 50 schools turning away qualified applicants and about a thousand that still had room for qualified students, according to Mr. Douglas Dillenbeck of the College Entrance Examination Board. "The competition for college admission has been overestimated and overpublicized. And any student bright enough to profit from college," adds Mr. Dillenbeck, "should be bright enough to realize you can't bluff your way in."

The most widely used college entrance exam is the college board's scholastic aptitude test, which measures a student's potential, his ability, his capabilities. About a hundred colleges use the board's achievement test, too. In either case, it's ability and real knowledge that count.

WHAT IS SOCIETY'S RESPONSIBILITY?

Adults have often been accused of teaching you to cheat by a nibbling dishonesty that has become so common it's hardly even considered dishonest any more. The little bit of hedging on the income tax return, the occasional speeding on the highway, the fibbing to get a 13 year old into the movies for half price, the payola, the expense account padding—the list is endless. "In the last 10 years something has happened to the American public," Juvenile Court Judge Philip B. Gilliam of Denver, Colo., said recently. "People claim it's all right to be a little bit of a thief, to do a little wrong. It's a new kind of crime that's sweeping the country." What's to be done about it? You, as teenagers, can't reform the adult delinquents, but you can change the ethics of your own generation. And whether you do it or not is going to make a difference in the world for a long time to come. The standards you set, good or bad, are the standards your children will live by and pass to their children.

ON YOUR HONOR

In spite of society and the system, in spite of poor teachers, bad examples, pressures, temptations, and tensions, the final responsibility for cheating rests with you. And there are many ways that only you can stop it. Honor systems are one. Only 36 percent of the high school students in a recent national survey had tried honor systems. Did they work? "Yes," said 65 percent. In the other 35 percent lies the crux of the honor system problem: It can't work unless you want it to. The report clause (students must report other students for cheating) is one of the principal reasons most students don't want an honor system. But the report clause is not always necessary. At Scarsdale High School in New York's Westchester County, the pledge system is used instead. No student is required to inform on another. If a student hands in an unsigned pledge—"I did not cheat nor did I witness any cheating"—after an exam (none are proctored) the teacher simply reports it to the Student Honor Committee. The committee reports the violation to the class; if the class votes 100 percent to try the honor system again, it gets one more chance.

The basic problem in preventing cheating is the attitude of teenagers, which among many students, is "What's so wrong about it?" To answer the question: It's a problem of personal integrity and honesty. When teenagers pull up their averages by cheating and win a scholarship or honors that other students really deserve, there is clearly an injustice involved.

JUVENILE DELINQUENCY IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. STAGGERS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, juvenile delinquency is not a bad dream; it is a reality and we cannot ignore it.

Many men and women of this Nation, especially of the District of Columbia and in particular of Capitol Hill, have been personally confronted with this terror.

On February 26, 1963, the well-known and reliable WMAL TV-radio commentator and respected member of the House of Representatives radio and TV gallery, Mr. Joseph McCaffrey, presented to the public his "Joseph McCaffrey's Commentary."

This timely and forthright broadcast regarding "juvenile delinquents but their delinquency is adult" is herewith made a part of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD with the hope it will aid our leaders in formulating plans and laws to combat and erase the causes of juvenile delinquency:

JOSEPH MCCAFFREY'S COMMENTARY, WMAL-TV, FEBRUARY 26, 1963

Good evening. The joint congressional hearings on District crime will probably explore many of the back alleys of Washington before sitting down to write some firm legislative recommendations.

As yet the committee hasn't dug into one of the worst problems—the young offender. They are called juvenile delinquents but their delinquency is adult.

In the fiscal year of 1962 the total crime in the District dropped a little more than 1 percent. Yet during those same 12 months juvenile delinquency increased more than 17 percent. Almost half of the increase was due to repeaters.

A curb on the young criminal in Washington would sharply reduce the local crime record. The best way to curb the young criminal might be to redefine the term juvenile delinquent. For example, at the present time juvenile operators are tried in juvenile court for traffic violations. Some who have studied the District crime situation believe this is ridiculous. The juvenile driver has been given an adult privilege, but he is given special handling when he breaks the law.

Juvenile delinquency is judged now on age. It might be well if the laws were rewritten to determine whether a youth goes before the juvenile court judge or an adult court judge on the basis of the crime involved. Bringing yokers, knife wielders, and rapists into juvenile court is making a mockery of justice.

The joint congressional hearing should explore the role of the so-called juvenile in rocketing District crime to its present high level.

It should seriously question the value of bringing repeaters 16 and 17 years of age back, again and again, to juvenile court.

But most important, the committee should consider whether it is time to redefine the term "juvenile delinquent."

Our problem is that there is nothing, nothing juvenile about the delinquency which is blackening the reputation of the Nation's Capital.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. PATTEN, for March 11, 12, 13, and 14, on account of official business away from Washington with the Subcommittee on Manned Space Flight.

Mr. DADDARIO (at the request of Mr. GIAIMO), for Monday, March 11, through Thursday, March 14, on account of official business.

Mr. GURNEY (at the request of Mr. HALLECK), for today, on account of official business.

Mr. HEALEY (at the request of Mr. MURPHY of New York), for Monday, March 11, 1963, on account of illness.

Mrs. SULLIVAN (at the request of Mr. ALBERT), for Monday, March 11, 1963, on account of official business in her district.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon, for 45 minutes, today, instead of the 30 minutes previously granted her.

Mr. JOHANSEN, for 30 minutes, today.

Mr. HEMPHILL (at the request of Mr. SMITH of Iowa), for 30 minutes, on Wednesday, March 13, and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida (at the request of Mr. SMITH of Iowa), for 30 minutes on Tuesday, March 12, and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. HALPERN, for 1 hour on Wednesday, March 13.

Mr. CAHILL, for 30 minutes on Tuesday, March 12.

Mr. PEPPER, for 10 minutes, today.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. HAYS and to include an article.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. CLANCY) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. HOSMER.
Mr. CUNNINGHAM.
Mr. SHORT.
Mr. NYGAARD.
Mr. ALGER.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. SMITH of Iowa) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. COHELAN.
Mr. EVINS.
Mr. BURKE.
Mr. EVERETT.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 816. An act for the establishment of a Commission on Science and Technology; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 52 minutes p.m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, March 12, 1963, at 12 o'clock noon.

REPORTS OF EXPENDITURES OF FOREIGN CURRENCIES AND APPROPRIATED FUNDS INCURRED IN TRAVEL OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Speaker, section 502(b) of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended by section 401(a) of Public Law 86-472, approved May 14, 1960, and section 105 of Public Law 86-628, approved July 12, 1960, require the reporting of expenses incurred in connection with travel outside the United States, including both foreign currencies expended and dollar expenditures made from appropriated funds by Members, employees, and committees of the Congress.

The law requires the chairman of each committee to prepare a consolidated report of foreign currency expenditures and also dollar expenditures from appropriated funds within the first 60 days that Congress is in session in each calendar year, covering expenditures for travel outside the United States during the previous calendar year. The consolidated report is forwarded to the Committee on House Administration which, in turn, prints such report in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD within 10 legislative days after receipt. The deadline for filing expenditure reports for travel during the calendar year 1962 was March 9, 1963.

House Committees on the District of Columbia, House Administration, Interior and Insular Affairs, Post Office and Civil Service, Rules, Un-American Activities, and Select Committee on Small Business have stated that no Members or employees traveled outside the United States on committee business during 1962.

There are submitted herewith the reports from the House committees which were received within the prescribed time limit: Agriculture, Appropriations, Armed Services, Banking and Currency, Education and Labor, Foreign Affairs, Government Operations, Interstate and Foreign Commerce, the Judiciary, Merchant Marine and Fisheries, Public Works, Science and Astronautics, Veterans' Affairs, and Ways and Means.

Report of expenditure of foreign currencies and appropriated funds, Committee on Agriculture, U.S. House of Representatives, expended between Jan. 1 and Dec. 31, 1962

Name and country	Name of currency	Lodging		Meals		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Harold D. Cooley:											
France, April and November	Franc	3,000		1,658.75				1,360.10		6,018.85	1,228.00
Harold B. McSween:											
France	do	950		750.00		2,000.00		1,043.67		4,743.67	968.10
Italy	Lire	70,000		45,000		83,917		185,000		383,917	918.20
United Kingdom	Pound	110		42		80.17.6		48		280.17.6	786.98
Total											3,601.61

HAROLD D. COOLEY,
Chairman, Committee on Agriculture.

MARCH 8, 1963.

Report of expenditure of foreign currencies and appropriated funds, Committee on Appropriations, expended between Jan. 1 and Dec. 31, 1962

Name and country	Name of currency	Lodging		Meals		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Defense Subcommittee	Dollar		998.01		1,247.28		3,211.85		1,066.77		6,523.91
Foreign Operations Subcommittee	do		939.00		673.65		7,796.20		351.75		9,760.60
Labor, Health, Education, and Welfare Subcommittee	do		272.00		181.40		457.40		46.60		957.40
Interior Subcommittee	do		241.66		266.23		1,819.54		193.06		2,520.49
State, Justice, Commerce, and Judiciary Subcommittee	do		797.00		568.60		5,357.37		156.45		6,879.42
Full Committee	do		943.65		921.22		7,774.74		419.20		10,058.81
Survey and Investigations Staff	do		2,248.68		2,671.97		11,069.00		222.98		16,212.63
Total			6,440.00		6,530.35		37,486.10		2,456.81		52,913.26

CLARENCE CANNON,
Chairman, Committee on Appropriations.

MARCH 8, 1963.

Report of expenditure of foreign currencies and appropriated funds, Committee on Appropriations, U.S. House of Representatives, Subcommittee on Department of Defense, expended between Jan. 1 and Dec. 31, 1962

Name and country	Name of currency	Lodging		Meals		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
George H. Mahon:											
United States	Dollar		35.00		20.18		408.73		12.50		421.23
Mexico	do		16.50		6.65		.80		4.00		59.98
Guatemala	do		16.50		17.50				1.75		24.90
Costa Rica	do		45.00		17.70				4.05		38.05
Panama	do		28.00						3.30		66.00
Jamaica	do						2.40		2.00		32.40
Subtotal			141.00		62.03		411.93		27.60		642.56
D. J. Flood:											
United States	Dollar		19.40		411.50		1,071.41		463.79		1,966.10
Peru	do		61.46		97.24		91.06		227.34		477.10
Ecuador	do				2.50		20.00		7.00		29.50
Canal Zone	do		12.00		4.13				15.56		31.69
Colombia	do						12.00				12.00
Subtotal			92.86		515.37		1,194.47		713.69		2,516.39
Harold C. Ostertag:											
United States	Dollar		55.15		69.05		108.15		29.00		351.35
Jamaica	do		15.00				2.40		6.00		23.40
Haiti	do		13.20		19.25				10.25		42.70
Subtotal			83.35		88.30		200.55		45.25		417.45
William E. Minshall:											
United States	Dollar		71.40		61.33		509.55		54.45		696.73
Mexico	do		35.00		30.20		2.00		6.29		73.49
Guatemala	do		16.50		19.90				8.75		45.15
Costa Rica	do		16.50		22.80		2.00		5.60		46.90
Panama	do		45.00		33.00				4.50		82.50
Jamaica	do		28.00		4.25		2.90		3.15		38.30
Haiti	do		13.20		21.00				13.00		47.20
Subtotal			225.60		192.48		516.45		95.74		1,030.27
Robert L. Michaels:											
United States	Dollar		73.40		67.50		431.70		47.65		620.25
Mexico	do		35.00		29.20		4.00		4.15		72.35
Guatemala	do		16.50		19.10				7.14		42.74
Costa Rica	do		14.50		22.90		2.00		4.35		43.75
Panama	do		45.00		30.10				6.00		81.10
Jamaica	do		28.00		4.50		2.90		2.40		37.80
Cuba	do		2.00		.50						2.50
Haiti	do		13.20		13.00				10.25		36.45
Subtotal			227.60		186.80		440.60		81.94		936.94
Samuel R. Preston:											
United States	Dollar		73.40		73.30		431.95		61.25		639.90
Mexico	do		35.00		28.85		11.50		4.25		79.60
Guatemala	do		16.50		19.10				9.10		44.70
Costa Rica	do		14.50		23.90		2.00		2.50		42.90
Panama	do		45.00		31.90				5.95		82.85
Jamaica	do		28.00		5.00		2.40		6.50		41.90
Cuba	do		2.00		.50						2.50
Haiti	do		13.20		19.75				13.00		45.95
Subtotal			227.60		202.30		447.85		102.55		980.30
Grand total	Dollar		998.01		1,247.28		3,211.85		1,066.77		6,523.91

GEORGE H. MAHON,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Department of Defense.

Report of expenditure of foreign currencies and appropriated funds by the Committee on Appropriations, U.S. House of Representatives—Subcommittee on Foreign Operations, expended between Jan. 1 and Dec. 31, 1962

Name and country	Name of currency	Lodging		Meals		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Hon. Otto E. Passman (includes 1 trip to Western Europe and 1 trip around the world):											
Italy	U.S. dollar		54.00		27.20		4.75		20.60		106.55
Switzerland	do		64.00		48.35		6.50		39.30		158.15
Spain	do		90.00		76.55		20.75		77.00		264.30
Lebanon	do		36.00		25.95		4.75		5.15		71.85
Thailand	do		54.00		33.65		5.90		8.25		101.80
Hong Kong	do		100.00		87.65		17.25		47.80		252.70
Japan	do		30.00		27.45		5.50		11.25		74.20
United States	do		48.00		33.35		12.50		9.30		103.15
Transportation (2 trips)	do						3,425.30				3,425.30
Subtotal			476.00		360.15		3,503.20		218.65		4,558.00
Kenneth Sprankle:											
Italy	U.S. dollar		36.00		22.80		2.75		5.95		67.50
Switzerland	do		24.00		19.45		4.30		7.20		54.95
Spain	do		36.00		18.65		2.80		8.30		65.75
United States	do						4.50				4.50
Transportation	do						1,100.80				1,100.80
Subtotal			96.00		60.90		1,115.15		21.45		1,293.50
Francis G. Merrill (includes 1 trip to Western Europe and 1 trip around the world):											
Italy	U.S. dollar		36.00		21.80		3.00		6.25		67.05
Switzerland	do		57.00		39.25		6.25		12.25		114.75
Spain	do		87.00		50.20		11.50		38.05		186.75
Lebanon	do		33.00		27.25		3.50		7.50		71.25
Thailand	do		48.00		31.20		4.80		9.50		93.50
Hong Kong	do		80.00		55.60		6.75		15.90		158.25
Japan	do		26.00		17.55		3.50		8.20		55.25
United States	do				9.75		25.00		14.00		48.75
Transportation (2 trips)	do						3,113.55				3,113.55
Subtotal			367.00		252.60		3,177.85		111.65		3,909.10
Grand total			939.00		673.65		7,796.20		351.75		9,760.60

OTTO E. PASSMAN,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Foreign Operations.

Report of expenditure of foreign currencies and appropriated funds by the Committee on Appropriations, U.S. House of Representatives—Subcommittee on Labor-Health, Education, and Welfare, expended between Jan. 1 and Dec. 31, 1962

Name and country	Name of currency	Lodging		Meals		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
John E. Fogarty:											
Switzerland	U.S. dollar		144.00		99.25				11.20		254.45
Israel	do		128.00		82.15				35.40		245.55
Transportation	do						457.40				457.40
Total			272.00		181.40		457.40		46.60		957.40

JOHN E. FOGARTY,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare.

Report of expenditure of foreign currencies and appropriated funds by the Committee on Appropriations, U.S. House of Representatives—Subcommittee on Interior and Related Agencies, expended between Jan. 1 and Dec. 31, 1962

Name and country	Name of currency	Lodging		Meals		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Michael J. Kirwan:											
United States	US. dollar		66.83		90.70		43.55		68.97		270.05
Panama	do		18.00		18.45		4.00		8.75		49.20
Mexico	do		36.00		41.50		5.00		36.08		118.58
Round trip transportation	do						874.22				874.22
Subtotal			120.83		150.65		926.77		113.80		1312.05
Eugene B. Wilhelm:											
United States	US. dollar		66.83		68.60		18.55		41.36		195.34
Panama	do		18.00		12.30				5.90		36.20
Mexico	do		36.00		34.68				32.00		102.68
Round trip transportation							874.22				874.22
Subtotal			120.83		115.58		892.77		79.26		1208.44
Total			241.6		266.23		1819.54		193.06		2520.49

MICHAEL J. KIRWAN,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Interior and Related Agencies.

Report of expenditure of foreign currencies and appropriated funds, Committee on Appropriations, U.S. House of Representatives, Subcommittee on State, Justice, Commerce, the Judiciary, and Related Agencies, expended between Jan. 1 and Dec. 31, 1962

Name and country	Name of currency	Lodging		Meals		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Hon. John J. Rooney:											
Italy	Dollar		72.00		53.90				23.00		148.90
Austria	do		36.00		24.60				13.40		74.00
Poland	do		82.50		58.45				12.60		153.55
Germany	do		65.00		54.60				6.75		126.35
England	do		40.00		38.00				18.30		96.30
Transportation	do						1,157.90				1,157.90
Subtotal			295.50		229.55		1,157.90		74.05		1,757.00
Hon. Frank T. Bow:											
Japan	Dollar		35.00		20.65						55.65
Hong Kong	do		45.00		22.60				3.60		71.20
Thailand	do		64.00		32.15				4.65		100.80
India	do		32.00		16.80				2.15		50.95
Italy	do		36.00		19.60						55.60
Transportation	do						3,033.37				3,033.37
Subtotal			212.00		111.80		3,033.37		10.40		3,367.57
Jay B. Howe:											
Italy	Dollar		60.00		52.50		2.90		19.25		134.65
Austria	do		28.00		19.00				5.25		52.25
Poland	do		72.50		55.25				14.50		142.25
Germany	do		45.00		43.50		1.70		11.50		101.70
England	do		84.00		57.00		3.60		21.50		166.10
Transportation	do						1,157.90				1,157.90
Subtotal			289.50		227.25		1,166.10		72.00		1,754.85
Total			797.00		568.60		5,357.37		156.45		6,879.42

JOHN J. ROONEY,
Chairman, Subcommittee on State, Justice, Commerce, the Judiciary, and Related Agencies.

Report of expenditure of foreign currencies and appropriated funds, Committee on Appropriations, U.S. House of Representatives, expended between Jan. 1 and Dec. 31, 1962

Name and country	Name of currency	Lodging		Meals		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Hon. John M. Slack, Jr.:											
United States	Dollar		92.48		80.53		16.50		47.50		237.01
Japan	do		60.57		58.34		22.34		25.94		167.19
Korea	do		4.00		17.10				8.00		29.10
Okinawa	do		4.50		15.68		4.50		8.80		33.48
Taiwan	do		25.00		17.25		4.00		11.75		58.00
Hong Kong	do		43.07		47.70		21.50		22.90		135.17
Thailand	do		67.94		57.80		24.71		31.59		182.04
Vietnam	do		34.86		29.22		7.50		6.90		78.48
Transportation	do						2,503.21				2,503.21
Subtotal			332.42		323.62		2,604.26		163.38		3,423.68
Hon. George E. Shipley:											
United States	Dollar		61.54		58.58		10.50		42.26		172.88
Japan	do		28.03		27.21		10.59		15.30		81.13
Korea	do		4.00		17.10				8.00		29.10
Okinawa	do		4.50		15.68		4.50		8.80		33.48
Taiwan	do		25.00		19.08		4.00		11.00		59.08
Hong Kong	do		53.07		42.83		19.70		23.89		139.49
Thailand	do		52.71		43.81		116.80		23.02		136.34
Vietnam	do		34.86		28.65		7.50		7.39		78.40
Guam	do		15.10		29.40		10.00		16.60		71.10
Transportation	do						2,619.60				2,619.60
Subtotal			278.81		282.34		2,703.19		156.26		3,420.60
George A. Urian:											
United States	Dollar		92.48		79.50		10.25		23.33		205.56
Japan	do		60.57		57.34		12.69		16.68		147.28
Korea	do		4.00		16.60				8.00		28.60
Okinawa	do		4.50		15.25		4.50		8.80		33.05
Taiwan	do		25.00		16.58		4.00		5.05		50.63
Hong Kong	do		43.07		46.39		12.50		15.42		117.38
Thailand	do		67.94		56.10		12.64		15.69		152.37
Vietnam	do		34.86		27.50		7.50		6.59		76.45
Transportation	do						2,403.21				2,403.21
Subtotal			332.42		315.26		2,467.29		99.56		3,214.53
Total			943.65		921.22		7,774.74		419.20		10,058.81

Report of expenditure of foreign currencies and appropriated funds, Committee on Appropriations, U.S. House of Representatives, surveys and investigation staff, expended between Jan. 1 and Dec. 31, 1962

Name and country	Name of currency	Lodging		Meals		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Curtis O. Booher:											
Japan	Dollar		88.00		127.00		1.80		5.00		221.80
Germany	do		92.00		114.00				3.00		209.00
Spain	do		75.00		99.00		1.95		3.00		178.95
Transportation	do						1,293.13				1,293.13
Subtotal			255.00		340.00		1,296.88		11.00		1,902.88
Rowland C. Halstead, Japan	Dollar		91.50		132.50		1,036.75		7.25		1,268.00
Willie C. Law:											
Japan	do		51.08		62.42		2.65		54.90		171.05
Okinawa	do		34.31		41.94						76.25
Germany	do		104.40		127.60		25.12		5.20		262.32
Italy	do		41.85		51.15		17.90		2.15		113.05
France	do		56.10		45.90		11.65				113.65
Transportation	do						1,268.35				1,268.35
Subtotal			287.74		329.01		1,325.67		62.25		2,004.67
E. Huyett Magee:											
England	Dollar		63.00		56.50		4.30		1.20		125.00
France	do		73.50		42.75		2.10		3.15		121.50
Mexico	do		64.80		54.45		3.10		1.40		123.76
Transportation	do						629.90				629.90
Subtotal			201.30		153.70		639.40		5.75		1,000.15
Hugh B. McGahey:											
Japan	Dollar		86.00		129.00		6.80		11.00		232.80
Germany	do		82.00		124.00				1.00		207.00
Spain	do		70.00		104.00		5.30				179.30
Transportation	do						1,270.15				1,270.15
Subtotal			238.00		357.00		1,282.25		12.00		1,889.25
Joseph N. Milici:											
Japan	Dollar		60.98		74.52		4.80		3.00		143.30
Okinawa	do		25.31		30.94						56.25
Germany	do		100.80		123.20		5.83		3.00		232.83
Italy	do		41.85		51.15		16.15		6.18		115.33
France	do		47.70		58.30		6.10		3.00		115.10
Transportation	do						1,263.70				1,263.70
Subtotal			276.64		338.11		1,296.58		15.18		1,926.51
William B. Soyars, Jr.:											
France	Dollar		33.75		39.30		5.15		4.65		82.85
Germany	do		16.90		36.90		6.10		4.20		64.10
Spain	do		42.00		44.40				4.25		90.65
Transportation	do						619.20				619.20
Subtotal			92.65		120.60		630.45		13.10		856.80
Eugene W. Vahey:											
Japan	Dollar		94.95		116.05		4.65		7.00		222.65
Germany	do		91.25		111.50				2.90		205.65
Spain	do		79.65		97.35		4.65				181.65
Transportation	do						1,278.80				1,278.80
Subtotal			265.85		324.90		1,288.10		9.90		1,888.75
Virgil R. Walker:											
Japan	Dollar		45.70		54.80		9.90		13.00		123.40
Okinawa	do		31.50		41.70				3.50		76.70
Germany	do		73.80		123.65		19.87		8.60		225.92
Italy	do		43.70		56.90		17.90		6.75		125.25
France	do		57.60		52.25		18.90		13.90		142.65
Transportation	do						1,268.35				1,268.35
Subtotal			252.30		329.30		1,334.92		45.75		1,962.27
Leonard M. Walters:											
England	Dollar		36.00		27.00		10.25		1.05		74.30
France	do		102.50		72.00		15.85		27.95		218.30
Germany	do		12.00		62.10		13.30		4.60		92.00
Italy	do		64.40		33.85		19.20		6.05		123.50
Transportation	do						651.00				651.00
Subtotal			214.90		194.95		709.60		39.65		1,159.10
Harold D. Watkins, Mexico	Dollar		72.80		51.90		228.40		1.15		354.25
Grand total			2,248.68		2,671.97		11,069.00		222.98		16,212.63

Report of expenditure of foreign currencies and appropriated funds, Committee on Armed Services, U.S. House of Representatives, expended between Jan. 1 and Dec. 31, 1962

Name and country	Name of currency	Lodging		Meals		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
James A. Byrne:											
Appropriated funds:											
United States	Dollar				21.20		1,324.14		208.30		1,553.64
Ireland	do				4.74		5.70		51.73		62.17
Great Britain	do								11.00		11.00
Germany	do		17.50		51.57		8.02		55.50		132.59
Italy	do				2.62		12.13		21.53		36.28
Greece	do						10.00		10.00		20.00
Spain	do				5.02				13.81		18.83
Madeira	do				1.25				4.85		6.10
Total appropriated funds (Army)			17.50		86.40		1,359.99		376.72		1,840.61
Counterpart funds:											
Ireland	Pound	8-0-0	22.80	1-13-3	4.74	33-16-3	96.36	18-4-0	51.79	61-13-6	175.69
Great Britain	do	34-14-3	98.82			3-0-0	8.55	6-7-6	18.05	44-1-9	125.42
Germany	Deutsche marks	56.00	14.07	168.00	42.21	93.00	23.26	402.33	100.24	719.33	179.78
Italy	Lire	23,000	36.80	15,434	24.70	7,200	11.52	64,831	103.73	110,465	176.75
Greece	Drachma	990	33.00	482	16.07			1,432	47.73	2,904	96.80
Spain	Peseta	720	12.00	3,665.58	61.10	720	12.00	5,594.42	93.24	10,700	178.34
Total counterpart funds			217.49		148.82		151.69		414.78		932.78
Total funds expended by Mr. Byrne			234.99		235.22		1,511.68		791.50		2,773.39
Jeffery Cohelan:											
Appropriated funds:											
United States	Dollar		127.00		88.95		1,929.87		58.70		2,204.52
Fiji	do		15.24		6.61		1.00		3.58		26.43
Australia	do				1.92		1.64		1.12		4.68
Indonesia	do		53.24		7.90				5.69		66.83
Singapore	do				2.58						2.58
Malaya	do		15.84		5.96		2.97		25.03		49.80
Thailand	do				40.00				1.93		41.93
Vietnam	do								3.20		3.20
Hong Kong	do				1.25		1.00		4.50		6.75
Philippines	do				.63		2.50		8.90		12.03
Total appropriated funds (Army).	do		211.32		155.80		1,938.98		112.65		2,418.75
Counterpart funds:											
Australia	Pound	23-2-0	51.97	8-5-6	18.62	8-18-0	20.02	4-1-7	9.17	44-7-1	99.78
Indonesia	Rupee	1,800	2.25	2,063.75	2.60	12,050	15.07	5,773	7.21	21,686.75	27.13
Singapore	Dollar	45	14.85	16.08	5.31			43.92	14.52	105.00	34.68
Thailand	Baht	400	19.37	715.59	34.66	200	9.64	749.41	36.33	2,065	100.00
Vietnam	Piaster	2,700	38.57	3,239	46.27	1,500	21.43	3,681	52.58	11,120	158.85
Cambodia	Riels	565	16.22	508	14.58	750	21.53	1,451	41.66	3,274	93.99
Hong Kong	Dollar	120	21.13	127	22.36	125	22.01	528	92.95	900	158.45
Philippines	Peso	140	35.90	42.25	10.83	10	2.56	47.75	12.25	240	61.54
Total counterpart funds			200.26		155.23		112.26		266.67		734.42
Total funds expended by Mr. Cohelan.			411.58		311.03		2,051.24		379.32		3,153.17
John J. Courtney (counsel):											
Counterpart funds:											
Sweden	Kroner	386	74.37	939	180.92	160	30.82	175	33.71	1,660	319.82
Austria	Schilling	1,400	54.44	1,300	50.54	700	27.21	780	30.32	4,180	162.51
Italy	Lira	20,000	32.13	10,000	16.64			2,000	3.18	32,000	51.95
Greece	Drachma	1,800	60.00	1,900	63.10	900	30.00	600	20.00	5,200	173.10
Turkey	Lire	275	30.55	225	25.00	100	11.11	115	12.77	715	79.43
Lebanon	Pound	80-0-0	26.15	73-0-0	23.87	41-0-0	13.40	20-0-0	6.53	214-0-0	69.95
Jordan	do	5-0-0	17.77	8-0-0	28.44	7-0-0	15.64			20-0-0	61.85
Israel	Lirat	25	8.33	32	10.66	55	18.33	48	16.00	160	53.32
France	Franc	150	30.61	185	37.76	50	10.20			385	78.57
Total funds expended by Mr. Courtney (counterpart).			334.35		436.93		156.71		122.51		1,050.50
Durward G. Hall:											
Appropriated funds:											
United States	Dollar		90.68		164.04		833.51		95.46		1,183.69
Japan	do				39.18		2.39		26.31		67.88
Korea	do		2.70		8.84				12.13		23.67
Ryukyu Islands	do		2.00		.45				12.60		15.05
Philippines	do		1.50		3.11				11.78		16.39
Total appropriated funds. (Army).			96.88		215.62		835.90		158.28		1,306.68
Counterpart funds:											
Japan	Yen	23,908	67.16	36,643	102.93			91,724	257.65	152,275	427.74
Hong Kong	Dollar	88.00	15.49	247.00	43.49	185.74	32.70	322.51	56.78	843.25	148.46
Saigon, Vietnam	Piastre	1,799.70	25.71	1,791	25.58			3,927	56.10	7,517.70	107.39
Total counterpart funds			108.36		172.00		32.70		370.53		683.59
Total funds expended by Mr. Hall.			205.24		387.62		868.60		528.81		1,990.27

Report of expenditure of foreign currencies and appropriated funds, Committee on Armed Services, U.S. House of Representatives, expended between Jan. 1 and Dec. 31, 1962—Continued

Name and country	Name of currency	Lodging		Meals		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Porter Hardy, Jr.:											
Appropriated funds:											
Italy	Dollar				24.00				19.06		43.06
France	do				17.79						17.79
United States	do						1,085.60				1,085.60
Total appropriated funds (Army).					41.79		1,085.60		19.06		1,146.45
Counterpart funds:											
Italy	Lira	49,941	80.42	25,042	40.33	18,717	30.14			93,700	150.89
France	Franc	80	16.23	126.4	25.63			23.6	4.80	230	46.66
Total counterpart funds			96.65		65.96		30.14		4.80		197.55
Total funds expended by Mr. Hardy.			96.65		107.75		1,115.74		23.86		1,344.00
Philip W. Kelleher (counsel):											
Appropriated funds:											
United States	Dollar						568.00				568.00
Austria	do		30.30		15.08		8.00		6.00		59.38
Denmark	do		36.00		20.00		6.00		5.00		67.00
Sweden	do		12.40		7.25						19.65
Norway	do		7.60		9.00				1.50		18.10
Total appropriated funds (Air Force).			83.60		51.33		582.00		12.50		732.13
Counterpart funds:											
Denmark	Kroner	68.80	10.00	144.48	21.00	55.04	8.00	41.28	6.00	309.60	45.00
France	Franc	490.00	100.00	343.00	70.00	171.50	35.00	171.50	35.00	1,176.00	240.00
West Germany	Deutsche mark	68.83	17.25	141.65	35.50			2.99	.75	213.47	53.50
Sweden	Kroner	46.67	9.00	51.85	10.00					98.52	19.00
Total counterpart funds			136.25		136.50		43.00		41.75		357.50
Total funds expended by Mr. Kelleher			222.55		187.83		625.00		54.25		1,089.63
Alvin E. O'Konski:											
Appropriated funds:											
United States	Dollar						166.38				166.38
Ireland	do		59.94		49.00				48.75		157.69
Total appropriated funds (Air Force)			59.94		49.00		166.38		48.75		324.07
Counterpart funds:											
Denmark	Kroner	2,900	414.00	1,500	218.00	700	100.00	350	50.00	5,600	782.00
Sweden	do	290	58.00	170	34.00	60	12.00	80	16.00	412	120.00
Norway	do	196	39.00	125	25.00	100	20.00	100	20.00	500	104.00
Poland	Zloty	960	40.00	480	20.00	480	20.00	960	40.00	3,000	120.00
France	Franc	1,900	380.00	900	180.00	200	40.00	200	40.00	3,000	640.00
Germany	Deutche mark	400	100.00	200	50.00	100	25.00	100	25.00	800	200.00
Netherlands	Guilder	260	60.00	130	30.00	45	10.00	45	10.00	359	110.00
Total counterpart funds			1,091.00		557.00		227.00		201.00		2,076.00
Total funds expended by Mr. O'Konski			1,150.94		606.00		393.38		249.75		2,400.00
L. Mendel Rivers:											
Appropriated funds: (Air Force)											
England	Dollar		72.31		36.00		9.15		19.00		136.46
Germany	do		6.00		45.00		4.30		12.00		67.30
Total appropriated funds			78.31		81.00		13.45		31.00		203.76
Counterpart funds: England	Pound	46-12-2	130.50	22-15-5	63.75	26-10-0	74.20	14-2-7	39.55	110-0-0	308.00
Total funds expended by Mr. Rivers			208.81		144.75		87.65		70.55		511.76
Total funds expended by House Committee on Armed Services			2,865.11		2,417.13		6,810.00		2,220.55		14,312.79

RECAPITULATION

	Amount
Foreign currency (U.S. dollars equivalent)	6,340.34
Appropriated funds:	
H. Res.	
Other	
Government Department: (identify each)	
Department of Army	6,712.49
Department of Air Force	1,259.96
Total	14,312.79

Carl Vinson,
Chairman, Committee on Armed Services.

March 5, 1963.

Report of expenditure of foreign currencies and appropriated funds, Committee on Banking and Currency, U.S. House of Representatives, expended between Jan. 1 and Dec. 31, 1962

Name and country	Name of currency	Lodging		Meals		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Hon. Seymour Halpern: Argentina	Argentine peso	5,400	53.00	5,800	57.00			5,600	55.00	16,800	165.00
Hon. James Harvey:											
Japan	Yen	30,000	83.33	35,280	98.00	8,800	24.44	10,200	27.78	84,280	233.55
Taiwan	New Taiwan dollar.	1,000	25.00					586	14.65	1,586	39.65
	Yen			12,720	35.33					12,720	35.33
Philippine Islands	Peso	51.28	12.82	120	30.00	36	9.00	42.32	10.58	249.6	62.40
Hong Kong	Hong Kong dollar.	340	59.64	453.72	79.60	143.28	25.14	155	27.20	1,092	191.58
Thailand	Baht	352	17.05	315	15.25	1,032.5	50.00	100.5	4.87	1,800	87.17
India	Rupee	287.87	60.78	160	34.04	52.70	11.11	111.43	24.54	612	130.47
Turkey	Turkish lira	207	23.00	332	36.88	69.98	7.75	62.64	6.96	671.2	74.59
Italy	Lira	30,106	48.48	50,922	82.00	16,320	26.28	13,103	21.10	110,451	177.86
West Germany	Deutsche mark	290.9	72.91	316	79.00	78	19.50	57.1	14,09	742	185.50
Do	Lira							6,113	9.84	6,113	9.84
Spain	Peseta	1,800	30.00	3,606	60.10	900	15.00	891	14.85	7,197	119.95
Portugal	Escudo	1,600	55.94	1,344.2	47.00	1,075.8	37.61	270	9.45	4,290	150.00
Hon. Leonor K. Sullivan:											
Austria	Schilling	2,086	81.03	1,210	47.05	509	19.79	375	14.59	4,180	162.46
Italy	Lira	85,000	136.88	65,620	105.67	22,000	35.42	10,000	16.10	182,620	294.07
Germany	Deutsche mark	410	102.50	325	81.25	180	45.00	85	21.25	1,000	250.00
Belgium	Belgian franc	2,250	45.00	2,100	42.00			900	18.00	5,250	105.00
Do	Lira			10,000	16.10	9,00.	14.50			19,000	30.60
France	New franc	449	91.63	269.81	55.06	124	25.31	75	15.31	917.81	187.31
Do	Lira			12,000	19.30					12,000	19.30
England	Pound	38	106.40	35/7/4	99.03	15/12/8	43.77	11	30.80	10.	280.00
Hon. Charles A. Vanik:											
Brazil	Cruzeiro		19.00		15.00		5.00				39.00
Argentina	Peso		78.20		40.00		15.00		9.30		142.50
Hon. Harold M. Ryan:											
France	New franc	93.75	19.13	73.50	15.00			20.34	4.15	187.59	38.28
Greece	Drachma	378.25	12.60	1,753.80	58.46	465.25	15.50	302.70	10.09	2,900	96.65
Turkey	Turkish lira	222.50	24.72	321.10	35.68	349.90	38.88	202.50	22.50	1,096	121.78
Italy	Lira	41,290.30	66.49	47,537.55	76.55	6,210	10.60	9,962.15	16.04	105,000	169.68
Germany	Deutsche mark	320.63	80.16	371	92.75	65.06	16.25	63.37	15.84		205.00
Spain	Peseta	2,202.60	36.71	3,448	57.47	378	6.30	1,271.40	21.19		121.67
Portugal	Escudo	1,890.00	66.09	1,329	46.48	208	7.28	863	30.15		150.00
Hon. Edward R. Finnegan:											
Japan	Yen	41,672	116.00	61,138	169.83	8,650	24.03	9,240	25,67	120,790	335.53
Taiwan	New Taiwan dollar.	2,066	51.65	1,438	63.95			680	26.00	4,184	141.60
Philippines	Peso	49.72	12.43	212	53.00	48.52	12.13	94	23.50	404.24	101.06
Hong Kong	Hong Kong	812.40	142.53	1,008.70	176.97	146.40	25.68	142.50	25.00	2,110	370.18
Thailand	Baht	358	17.34	96	4.80	900	43.57	250	11.99	1,604	77.70
India	Rupee	472.50	94.50	102.50	20.50	160	32.00	60	12.00	795	159.00
Turkey	Turkish lira	282.25	31.36	355.75	39.53	192	21.35	140	15.56	970	107.80
Italy	Lira	46,863	75.47	62,905	101.30	84.20	13.55	10,200	16.42	128,388	206.74
Germany	Deutsche mark	521.20	130.30	604.80	151.20	1,292	323.00	220	55.00	2,638	659.50
France	New franc	160.18	32.69	131.61	26.86	134.26	27.40	73.95	15.09	500	102.04
Spain	Peseta	860	14.17	2,712	45.20	34,014	566.90	2,116	35.26	49.702	661.53
Hon. William A. Barrett:											
Japan	Yen	46,230	128.42	62,950	174.83	8,500	23.63	8,120	22.56	125,800	349.44
Taiwan	New Taiwan dollar.	2,102	52.55	3,328	83.20			1,370	34.25	6,800	170.00
Philippines	Peso	10,480	26.20	241.20	60.30			100	25.00	446	111.50
Hong Kong	Hong Kong dollar.	1,101.60	193.30	1,056.60	185.40	204.10	35.85	202.70	35.58	2,565	450.13
Thailand	Baht	352	17.06			900	43.56	233	11.30	1,485	71.92
India	Rupee	448.50	89.70	77.50	15.50	134	26.80	50	10.00	710	142.00
Turkey	Turkish lira	338.25	37.59	345.50	38.38	288	32.00	117	13.00	1,088.75	120.97
Italy	Lira	53,830	86.69	63,500	102.25	9,100	14.65	3,570	5.75	130,000	209.34
Germany	Deutsche mark	334.73	83.69	360.87	90.21	190	25.00	84.40	21.10	880	220.00
Spain	Peseta	2,328.45	38.81	3,516	58.60			930	15.50	6,774.45	112.91
Portugal	Escudo	1,948	68.12	1,682	58.83			660	23.05	4,290	150.00
Robert R. Poston:											
Japan	Yen	26,464	73.45	42,300	117.50	2,460	6.91	3,376	9.37	74,600	207.23
Taiwan	New Taiwan dollar.	1,320	33.00	628	15.70	1,610	40.25	130	3.25	3,688	92.20
Philippines	Peso	41.80	10.40	223.20	55.80	30.60	7.70	47.40	11.85	343	85.75
Hong Kong	Hong Kong dollar.	579.20	101.60	710.80	124.70	119.80	21.00	89.20	15.70	1,499	263.00
Thailand	Baht	365	17.68	159	7.71	900	43.57	210	10.16	1,634	79.12
India	Rupee	459.25	91.85	25.20	5.00	69.75	13.95	12.80	2.60	567	113.40
Turkey	Turkish lira	236	26.22	100.50	11.17			322	35.78	658.50	73.17
Italy	Lira	39,386	63.42	44,539	71.66	5,525	8.95	12,050	19.42	101,500	163.45
Germany	Deutsche mark	279.40	69.85	310.60	77.65	90	22.50	40	10.00	720	180.00
Spain	Peseta	1,398	23.30	2,821	47.02	890	14.83	744	12.40	5,853	97.55
Portugal	Escudo	1,780.70	62.28	1,552.30	54.25	206	7.20	687	24.02	4,225	147.7
Orman S. Fink:											
Japan	Yen	24,000	66.67	48,000	133.33	3,600	10.00	10,400	28.88	86,000	238.88
Taiwan	New Taiwan dollar.	1,573.80	39.35	1,350	33.75	320	8.00	986.20	24.65	4,230	105.75
Philippines	Peso	43.22	10.81	200	50.00	24	6.00	120.68	30.17	387.90	96.98
Hong Kong	Hong Kong dollar.	390.20	68.46	776	136.14	120	21.05	200.80	35.23	1,487	260.88
Thailand	Baht	352	17.05	200	9.68	929.25	45.00	40.75	1.97	1,522	73.70
India	Rupee	240.57	50.78	120	25.35	100	21.11	18.43	3.89	479	101.13
Turkey	Turkish lira	207.50	23.06	200	22.22			57.50	6.39	465	51.67
Italy	Lira	24.355	39.22	61,000	98.23	11,000	17.71	10,645	17.14	107,000	172.30
Germany	Deutsche mark	178.68	44.67	380	95.00	80	20.00	111.32	27.83	750	187.50
Spain	Peso	1,782	29.70	3,500	58.34	600	10.00	818	13.63	6,700	111.67
Portugal	Escudo	1,615.50	56.49	1,900	66.43	390	13.64	384.50	13.44	4,290	150.00
Robert G. Stephens:											
England	Pound	10-0-0	27.44	41-7-8	115.60	17-17-4	50.00	13-3-0	38.00	82-10-8	231.04
France	New franc	325	76.28	425	85.00	150	30.00	99	20.00	1,031	211.28
Italy	Lira	35,000	55.96	62,000	99.00	16,000	25.00	9,400	15.00	123,850	194.96
Germany	Deutsche mark	343	87.18	352	88.00	80	20.00	63	16.00	838	211.18
Spain	Peseta	2,155	35.93	3,694	61.60	600	10.00	480	8.00	6,926	115.53
Portugal	Escudo	2,315	80.86	2,270	79.20	599	20.00	345	12.00	5,217	192.50

Report of expenditure of foreign currencies and appropriated funds, Committee on Banking and Currency, U.S. House of Representatives, expended between Jan. 1 and Dec. 31, 1962—Continued

Name and country	Name of currency	Lodging		Meals		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Abraham J. Multer:											
Japan	Yen	47,708	133.00	35,280	98.00	30,960	86,00	11,044	30.70	124,992	347.70
Taiwan	New Taiwan dollar.	4,599.50	115.00	2,810	70.25	3,650	91.25	1,300	33.50	1,235,95	310.00
Hong Kong	Hong Kong dollar.	1,232	216.09	567	99.50	233.70	41.00	165.70	29.00	2,198.40	385.59
Philippines	Peso	1,188	297.00	386.72	96.68	4,825.12	[1] 1,206.53	204	51.00	6,604.84	1,651.21
Guam			23.50		8.00				6.00		37.50
Hawaii			49.68		60.02		33.60		39.18		182.48
Los Angeles			124.25		65.00		22.00		32.64		243.89
Thomas L. Ashley:											
England	Pound	70/0/3	207.20	23/4/1	65.00	9/9/0	26.49	3/19/4	11.56	110/14/7	310.25
France	New franc	980	200.00	882	180.00	490	100.00	148	30.20	2,500	510.20
Total			5,797.74		5,865.17		3,936.77		1,695.35		17,295.03

[1] Includes cost of converting airplane transportation from tourist to 1st class.

NOTE.—Check for $518.38 has been forwarded to State Department for counterpart drawn in excess of that charged.

WRIGHT PATMAN,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Banking and Currency.

MARCH 9, 1963.

Report of expenditure of foreign currencies and appropriated funds, Committee on Education and Labor, U.S. House of Representatives, expended between Jan. 1 and Dec. 31, 1962

Name and country	Name of currency	Lodging		Meals		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Powell, Adam C.:											
Great Britain (9 days)	U.S. dollar		80.00		70.00		[1] 5.00		[2] 76.50 [3] 12.00		243.50
France (5 days)	do		110.00		87.50				[4] 48.00		245.50
Italy (6 days)	do		150.00		99.00				[5] 64.00		313.00
Greece (11 days)	do		192.50		181.50		75.00		[6] 88.00 [3] 10.00		547.00
Spain (4 days)	do		72.00		66.00		[7] 10.00 [7] 10.00		[8] 37.00		195.00
Zelenko, Herbert:											
Italy	Lire	52,164	84.00	37,260	60.00			19,872	32.00	109,296	176.00
France	Franc	563.5	115.00	392.0	80.00			147.0	30.00	102.5	225.00
Dent, John H.:											
Japan	Yen	44,000	122.67	41,000	114.33	14,706	41.00	2,510	7.00	102,216	285.00
Hong Kong	Hong Kong dollar.	915.50	160.63	715	125.40	380.50	66.76	96.90	17.00	2,107.90	369.79
Philippines [9]	Peso	216	54.00	260	65.00	64	16.00	108	27.00	648	162.00
Giaimo, Robert N.:											
Japan	Yen	45,000	125.00	41,133	115.00	8,467	23.52	5,400	15.00	100,000	278.52
Hong Kong	Hong Kong dollar.	868	155.00	740	125.00	308	55.00	84	15.00	2,000	350.00
Rome	Lire	99,468	162.00	110,520	180.00	55,260	90.00	34,384	56.00	300,000	488.00
Brademas, John:											
Switzerland	Franc	269.35	54.97	125.00	25.51	107.80	[10] 22.00	50	10.20	552.15	112.68
France	do	807.70	164.84	1,176.00	240.00	1,077.10	[11] 219.80	387.05	79.00	3,447.85	703.64
Poland	Zloty	4,229.25	176.22	3,049.40	127.06	2,088.00	87.00	4,241.90	176.75	13,608.55	567.03
Kearns, Carroll D.:											
Great Britain	Pound	68-5-0	191.10	30-5-0	84.70	20-0-0	56.00	41-0-0	114.80	159-10-0	446.60
Netherlands	Guilder	314.10	93.41	295.00	82.09	100.00	27.83	300.00	83.49	1,009.10	286.82
Denmark	Kroner	600	87.00	500.00	72.50	150.00	21.75	550.00	79.75	1,800.0	261.00
Returned										−300.0	−43.50
Total										1,500.00	217.50
Germany:											
West Berlin	Deutsche mark	304.19	76.05	204.00	51.00	100.00	25.00	200.00	50.00	808.00	202.05
Munich	do	631.90	157.97	250.00	62.50	100.00	25.00	308.00	77.00	1,289.90	322.47
Austria	Schilling	7,000.00	273.00	2,800.00	109.20	1,200.00	46.80	3,000.00	117.00	14,000.00	546.00
Returned										−2,990.00	−116.61
Total										11,010.00	429.39
Switzerland	Franc	318.90	73.83	190.00	43.98	320.00	74.08	200.00	46.30	1,028.90	238.19
Returned										−200.00	−46.30
Total										828.90	191.89
Wingate, Livingston L.:											
Jamaica	Pound	55	155.00	34	95.40	28	78.40	58.95	165.09	175.95	493.89
Argentina	Peso	11,572.10	78.65	5,200	35.37	4,704	32.00	10,916.56	72.60	31,345	218.62
Brazil	Cruzeiro	26,000	193.30	29,500	219.33	19,300	143.49	25,200	185.87	100,000	741.99
Wall, Tamara J.:											
Great Britain, (4 days)	Pound		100.00		85.00		23.00		72.00	100	280.00
France (5 days)	New franc		110.00		82.50		12.00		45.50	1,250	250.00
Italy (9 days)	Lira		205.00		148.50		25.00		71.50	286,300	450.00
Greece (4 days)	Drachma		80.00		70.00		15.00		35.00	6,000	200.00
Austria (5 days)	Schilling		65.00		52.50		12.00		22.50	3,800	152.00
Germany (3 days)	Deutsche mark		55.00		51.00		14.00		30.00	600	150.00
Denmark (5 days)	Kroner		75.00		62.00		8.00		26.00	1,200	171.00
Berens, Donald F.:											
England	Pound	17.3	48.56	16.9	47.42	9.9	27.90	7.9	21.72	52	145.60
Germany	Deutsche mark	205	51.25	438.00	109.50	137	34.25	110	27.50	890	222.50
France	New franc	286	57.20	590.00	118.00	190	38.00	184	36.80	1,250	250.00
Switzerland	Swedish franc	170	42.50	255.00	63.75	71	17.75	104	26.00	600	150.00
Italy	Lira	86,730	139.66	108,150	174.15	95,368	[12] 155.18	23,630	38.05	313,880	507.04

See footnotes at end of table.

***Report of expenditure of foreign currencies and appropriated funds, Committee on Education and Labor, U.S. House of Representatives, expended between Jan. 1 and Dec. 31, 1962*—Continued**

Name and country	Name of currency	Lodging		Meals		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Kearns, Carroll D.:											
Italy	Lira	33,577	50.03	40,000	64.00	46,132	73.81	38,758	62.85	158,467	250.69
France	New franc	1,361.55	272.31	696	139.20	100	32.00	400	80.00	2,617.55	523.51
Dargans, Louise Maxienne:											
United Kingdom	U.S. dollar		15.50		12.00		6.25		16.00		49.75
Spain	do		32.00		22.50		17.75		11.50		83.75
Italy	do		35.00		30.50		40.00		14.00		119.50
France	do		25.00		18.50		20.00		17.00		80.50
Morocco	do		15.00		10.00		8.00		4.00		37.00
Portugal	do		14.50		12.00		12.00		15.00		53.50
Gamser, Howard: [13]											
Japan	Yen	43,044	120.00	39,457	110.00	15,065	42.00	2,434	6.52	100,000	278.52
Hong Kong	Hong Kong dollar.	855	150.00	684	120.00	370.50	65.00	91.20	16.00	2,000	351.00
Philippines	Peso [14]										
Huff, Corrine A.:											
Great Britain (4 days)	U.S. dollar		80.00		17.50		28.00		168.00		293.50
France (5 days)	do		110.00		82.50		12.00		46.00		250.50
Italy (5 days)	do		150.00		99.00				56.00		305.00
Greece (11 days)	do		192.00		181.50		75.00		84.00		532.50
Spain (4 days)	do		72.00		76.00				37.00		185.00
Denmark (4 days)	do		72.00		66.00				37.00		175.00
McNeal, E. Zelda:											
England	Pound	32	90.00	45	126.00	13	36.00	6	16.00	96	268.00
France	Franc	2,000	400.00	1,600	320.00	1,000	200.00	400	80.00	5,000	1,000.00
Italy	Lira	70,000	112.00	65,000	104.00	15,000	24.00			150,000	240.00
Bullard, Theo H. Jr.:											
Denmark	Kroner	160	24.00	200	28.00	140	20.00	180	26.00	694	98.00
Russia	Ruble	157	165.00	82	90.00	48	56.00	61	69.00	348	380.00
Austria	Schilling	500	22.00	650	27.00	350	11.00	600	24.00	2,100	84.00
Italy	Lira	3,600	56.00	3,200	48.00	2,800	40.00	3,200	48.00	128,000	192.00
France	New Franc	900	168.00	780	144.00	660	132.00	960	180.00	3,240	624.00
England	Pound	18	48.00	18	48.00	12	36.00	15	42.00	63	174.00
Total			6,768.65		5,677.89		2,620.32		3,400.79		9,298.02

---

[1] Taxi fare: District of Columbia, $3; New York, $2.

[2] Tips: Between District of Columbia and Great Britain. District of Columbia Skycap, $1; New York Skycap, $1; pier porter, $2; deck steward, $3; cabin steward, $15; waiter, $15; dining room captain, $10; night steward, $5; dockside porter, $2; hotel bellman, $4; hotel doorman, $1; hotel waiter, $10.50; wine steward, $5; London Skycap, $2.

[3] Telephone.

[4] Tips in France: Meals, maitre d'hotel concierge, $30; Skycap, bellman and doorman, $8; miscellaneous, $10.

[5] Tips in Italy: Skycap, bellman, and doorman, $16; meals, capo cameriere, portinaio, $36; miscellaneous, $12.

[6] Tips in Greece: Skycap, bellman and doorman, $88.

[7] Taxi.

[8] Tips in Spain: Skycap, bellman, and doorman, $8; meals, majordomo, portero, $24; miscellaneous, $5.

[9] Paid staff expenses in Philippines. No funds drawn by staff, 2 days for staff ($91.00).

[10] Transportation—Stuttgart-Basle.

[11] Transportation—Paris-Warsaw-Paris.

[12] Includes railroad transportation throughout Italy; and from Rome, Italy, to Paris, France.

[13] Traveling with Ad Hoc Committee on Impact of Exports and Imports on Domestic Employment, Dec. 1-14, 1962.

[14] All foreign currency expenditures met by subcommittee chairman.

RECAPITULATION

	Amount
Foreign currency (U.S. dollar equivalent)	18,963.52

MARCH 8, 1963.

ADAM C. POWELL,
Chairman, Committee on Education and Labor.

Report of expenditures of foreign currencies and appropriated funds, Committee on Foreign Affairs, U.S. House of Representatives, expended between Jan. 1 and Dec. 31, 1962

Name and country	Name of currency	Lodging		Meals		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Thomas E. Morgan:											
France	Franc	1,804.70	368.31	732.55	149.50	298.90	61.00	147	30.00	2,983.15	608.81
Germany	Mark	732.15	183.03	228	57.00	100	25.00	84	21.00	1,144.15	286.03
Italy	Lira	45,610	73.56	39,215	63.25	37,510	60.50	11,160	18.00	133,495	215.31
Spain	Peseta	4,200	70.00	2,880	48.00	5,601.80	93.33	480	8.00	13,161.80	219.33
Wayne L. Hays: Bermuda	Pound	38.12	108.50	15	42.00	6.10	18.60	16.10	46.32	76.12	215.42
Leonard Farbstein:											
Spain	Peseta	5,628	93.80	4,734	78.90	9,360	156.00	918	15.30	20,640	344.00
Italy	Lira	110,500	177.94	75,630	121.79	116,748	188.00	7,670	12.35	310,548	500.08
Israel	Pound	589.46	196.49	564.19	188.06	675	225.00	83.35	27.78	1,912.00	637.33
France	Franc	380	77.39	295.45	60.17	667.76	136.00	168.49	34.32	1,511.70	307.88
United States	do					4,382.67	892.60			4,382.67	892.60
Cornelius E. Gallagher:											
Switzerland	do	233.26	54.00	149.89	34.70	340.38	78.80	46.40	10.74	769.93	178.24
France	do	196.40	40.00	116.36	23.70	268.67	54.72	48.12	9.80	629.55	128.22
Italy	Lira	89,424	144.00	54,753	88.17	37,198	59.90	16,891	27.20	198,266	319.27
Germany	Mark					4,381.18	1,100.80			4,381.18	1,100.80
John S. Monagan: Bermuda	Pound	35	98.56	14	39.42	5	14.06	14.15	41.53	68.15	193.57
Robert B. Chiperfield:											
Mexico	Peso	850	68.00	748	59.84	468.75	37.50	367.38	29.39	2,434.13	194.73
Netherlands	Guilder					1,074.72	298.70			1,074.72	298.70

Report of expenditure of foreign currencies and appropriated funds, Committee on Foreign Affairs, U.S. House of Representatives, expended between Jan. 1 and Dec. 31, 1692—Continued

Name and country	Name of currency	Lodging		Meals		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Chester E. Merrow:											
France	Franc	2,604	530.34	376.03	76.58	129.20	26.32	63.15	12.87	3,172.38	646.11
Netherlands	Guilder					1,999.34	556.30			1,999.34	556.30
Walter H. Judd: Bermuda	Pound			12.50	34.49	3.00	8.45	13.00	36.60	28.50	79.54
William S. Broomfield: Bermuda	do	35.00	98.56	14.00	39.42	5.00	14.08	22.00	61.95	76.00	214.01
Robert R. Barry:											
France	Franc	825.00	168.02	389.17	79.26	522.17	106.34	88.88	18.10	1,825.21	371.72
Netherlands	Guilder					1,686.58	469.80			1,686.58	469.80
Philip B. Billings: Bermuda	Pound	33.00	92.93	13-6-10	37.45	6.00	16.90	53.43	150.08	105.10.13	297.36
Total			2,643.43		1,321.70		4,698.72		611.33		9,275.18

RECAPITULATION

	Amount
Foreign currency (U.S. dollar equivalent)	9,275.18

THOMAS E. MORGAN,
Chairman, Committee on Foreign Affairs.

MARCH 7, 1963.

Report of expenditure of foreign currencies and appropriated funds by the Committee on Foreign Affairs, U.S. House of Representatives, Subcommittee on Europe, expended between Jan. 1 and Dec. 31, 1962

Name and country	Name of currency	Lodging		Meals		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Hon. Edna F. Kelly:											
Austria	Schilling	2,088	80.39	1,320	50.82	2,085.23	80.28	410	15.78	5,903.23	227.27
Italy	Lira	83,350	137.44	55,150	88.81	76,050	122.47	20,330	32.74	236,880	381.46
Germany	Deutsche mark	253.05	63.26	236.95	59.24	135	33.75	95	23.75	720	180.00
Belgium	Franc	1,860	37.20	3,650	73.00	2,400	48.00	1,115	22.30	9,025	180.50
France	do	450	91.65	246.75	50.26	177	36.05	125	25.46	998.75	203.42
United Kingdom	Pound	40-10-0	113.40	25-5-8	70.79	60-19-0	170.66	19-4-4	53.81	145-19-0	408.66
Netherlands	Guilder					3,766.54	1,037.90			3,766.54	1,037.90
Hon. John S. Monagan:											
Germany	Deutsche mark	141.45	35.36	116.28	29.07			48.55	12.14	306.28	76.57
Denmark	Kroner	161	23.30	92	13.31	47.19	6.84	32	4.63	332.19	48.08
U.S.S.R	Danish kroner	831.74	120.35	150	21.71	72	10.42	78	11.29	1,131.74	163.77
Poland	Zloty	295	12.30	349	14.54	2,477	103.30			3,121	130.14
Do	Danish kroner	234.50	33.93	120.40	17.42					354.90	51.35
Austria	Schilling	2,094	80.62	1,210	46.58	2,018.82	77.72	463.57	17.85	5,786.30	222.77
Spain	Peseta	4,556	75.93	4,930	82.17	10,630	177.17	1,434	23.90	21,550	359.17
Portugal	Escudo	1,337	46.91	523	18.35	40	1.40	301	10.57	2,201	77.23
Hon. Peter Frelinghuysen, Jr.:											
Italy	Lira	20,308	32.70	53,600	86.31	76,050	122.47	16,092	25.91	166,050	267.39
Germany	Deutsche mark	251	62.75	240	60.00	105	26.25	64	16.00	660	165.00
Belgium	Franc	909	18.18	3,570	71.40	1,515	30.30	1,120	22.40	7,114	142.28
France	do	404	82.28	225	45.82	170	34.62	110	22.40	909	185.12
United Kingdom	Pound	29-6-6	82.11	24-10-0	68.60	53-14-0	150.36	8-2-0	22.68	115-12-6	323.75
Netherlands	Guilder					3,709.93	1,022.30			3,709.93	1,022.30
Hon. Robert R. Barry:											
Austria	Schilling	2,094	80.62	1,310	50.43	2,085.23	80.28	380	14.63	5,869.23	225.96
Italy	Lira	54,461	95.75	54,400	87.60	71,050	114.41	22,000	35.43	206,911	333.19
Germany	Deutsche mark	291.12	72.78	282	70.50	220	55.00	164.29	41.07	957.41	239.35
Belgium	Franc	1,272	25.44	2,930	58.60	2,046	40.92	985	19.70	7,233	144.66
France	do	400	81.46	384.75	78.36	260.92	53.12	141	28.72	1,186.67	241.66
United Kingdom	Pound	30-12-0	85.68	24-15-0	69.30	238-14-0	668.36	7-1-6	19.81	301-2-6	843.15
Hon. Harris B. McDowell, Jr.:											
Germany	Deutsche mark	497.03	124.26	527.70	131.92	5,479.80	1,369.95	336	84.00	6,840.53	1,710.13
Denmark	Kroner	161	23.30	104	15.05	835	120.82	329	47.61	1,429	206.78
U.S.S.R	Danish kroner	831.74	120.35	150	21.71	72	10.42	78	11.29	1,131.74	163.77
Poland	Zloty	1,499	62.46	1,667.70	69.52	5,019	209.13	1,188	49.49	9,373.70	390.60
Do	Danish kroner	157.50	22.79							157.50	22.79
Austria	Schilling	2,094	80.62	2,949	115.46	5,013.92	195.82	1,624	63.82	11,680.92	455.72
Italy	Lira	58,178	93.68	54,700	88.08	102,105	164.42	52,052	83.82	267,035	430.00
Belgium	Franc	1,417	28.34	3,620	72.40	2,100	42.00	2,143	42.86	9,280	185.60
France	do	736.60	148.97	534	107.80	471.85	95.41	475.50	96.44	2,217.95	448.62
United Kingdom	Pound	52.18	148.12	32-18-0	92.12	208-7-1	583.45	35-18-0	100.52	330-1-1	924.21
Hon. Chester E. Merrow: Belgium	Franc	2,337	46.74	2,283	45.66	351	7.02	567	11.34	5,508	110.76
Hon. William S. Broomfield:											
Germany	Deutsche mark	141.45	35.36	122	30.50	45	11.25	52.55	13.14	361	90.25
Denmark	Kroner	163.00	23.58	102	14.76	152.19	22.02	40	5.79	457.19	66.5
U.S.S.R	Danish kroner	831.74	120.35	150	21.70	65	9.41	85	12.30	1,131.74	163.76
Poland	Zloty	295	12.30	409	17.04	2,577	107.38	450	18.75	3,731	155.47
Do	Danish kroner	140.56	20.33	120.40	17.42					260.96	37.75
Austria	Schilling	2,094	80.62	1,150	44.27	2,109.82	81.23	488.57	18.81	5,842.39	224.93
Spain	Peseta	4,635	77.25	5,620	93.67	10,779	179.65	2,125	35.42	23,159	385.99
Portugal	Escudo	607	21.30	480	16.86	206	7.23	285	10.00	1,578	55.39
Franklin J. Schupp, staff consultant:											
Netherlands	Guilder	34.75	9.66	57.60	15.96	3,834.40	1,065.11	15.20	4.23	3,941.95	1,094.96
Denmark	Kroner	87.25	12.65	119.72	17.35	218.08	31.06	89.70	13	513.75	74.06
Sweden	Swedish kroner	125.60	24.38	293.55	57.50	118.66	17.80	32.19	6.25	570	105.93
Germany	Deutsche mark	195.50	48.88	321	80.25	350.50	87.50	52	13	918	229.63
Marian A. Czarnecki, staff consultant:											
Germany	do	390.50	97.63	716.40	179.04	5,642.10	1,410.52	127	31.75	6,876	1,718.94
France	Franc	737.50	149.28	507.22	102.35	457	92.40	178.70	36.09	1,880.42	380.12
Austria	Schilling	1,742.95	68.15	2,187.5	85.96	2,923.87	113.48	1,053.57	41.52	7,97.89	309.11
Poland	Zloty	849	35.38	1,375.70	57.32	3,830	159.58	863.30	35.97	6,918	288.25
Poland	Danish kroner	117.25	16.97	100	14.47					217.25	31.44
Sweden	Swedish kroner	146	28.61	306	59.98	308	60.37	63	12.35	823	161.31
Netherlands	Guilder	29.90	8.28	62.10	17.20	4,095.68	1,128.78	24	6.65	4,211.68	1,160.91

Report of expenditure of foreign currencies and appropriated funds by the Committee on Foreign Affairs, U.S. House of Representatives, Subcommittee on Europe, expended between Jan. 1 and Dec. 31, 1962—Continued

Name and country	Name of currency	Lodging		Meals		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Marian A. Czarnecki, staff consultant—Continued											
Belgium	Franc	1,077	21.54	3,510	70.20	1,525	30.50	902	18.04	7,014	140.28
Italy	Lira	32,290	52.00	52,900	85.18	77,650	125.04	16,195	26.08	179,035	288.30
United Kingdom	Pound	29-6-6	82.11	21-0-0	58.80	61-0-0	170.80	8-16-6	24.71	120-3-0	336.42
Denmark	Kroner	138	30.97	106.65	15.43	180.19	16.07	27	3.91	451.84	66.38
U.S.S.R	Danish kroner	831.74	120.35	150	21.70	64	9.27	76	11.00	1,121.74	162.32
John P. White, State Department escort officer:											
Germany	Deutsche mark	78.20	19.55	104.52	26.13	20	5.00	46	11.50	248.72	62.18
Denmark	Kroner	70	10.13	95	13.75	117.19	16.96	30	4.34	312.19	45.18
U.S.S.R	Danish kroner	831.74	120.35	150	21.70	74	10.71	80	11.58	1,135.74	164.34
Poland	Zloty	295	12.30	420	17.50	2,777	111.54	259	10.79	3,651	152.13
Do	Danish kroner	76.36	11.05	120.40	17.42					196.26	28.47
Austria	Schilling	1,047	40.31	1,050	40.42	2,518.82	96.97	316.57	12.19	4,932.39	189.89
Spain	Peseta	2,898	48.30	4,620	77.00	10,537	175.62	625	11.25	18,730	312.17
Portugal	Escudo	380	13.33	405	14.21			145	5.08	930	32.62
Total			4,044.67		3,565.75		12,456.04		1,579.65		21,646.11

RECAPITULATION

	Amount
Foreign currency (U.S. dollar equivalent)	21,646.11

EDNA F. KELLY,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Europe.

Report of expenditure of foreign currencies and appropriated funds, Committee on Foreign Affairs, U.S. House of Representatives, Special Study Mission to Latin America, expended between Jan. 1 and Dec. 31, 1962

Name and country	Name of currency	Lodging		Meals		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Hon. Armistead I. Selden, chairman:											
Peru	Sol	1,328	49.48	296	11.04	6,931.75	258.65	338.62	12.63	8,894.37	331.8
Ecuador	Sucre	841	38.23	397	18.05			202	9.18	1,440	65.46
Colombia	Peso	640	60.95	135.50	12.89			66.50	6.35	842	80.19
Panama	U.S. dollar		68.00								68.00
Costa Rica	do		60.00								60.00
Hon. William S. Mailliard:											
Panama	do		34.00								34.00
Costa Rica	do		60.00								60.00
Guatemala	do		64.00								64.00
Netherlands	Guilder					758.93	211.40				211.40
Hon. Marguerite Stitt Church:											
Peru	Sol	657.27	24.50	954.62	35.63	6,913.75	257.99	208.23	7.75	8,733.87	325.87
Ecuador	Sucre	283.40	12.88	175.50	7.98			81.10	3.69	540	24.55
Columbia	Peso	640	60.95	57.50	5.48			22.50	2.14	720	68.57
Panama	U.S. dollar		68.00								68.00
Costa Rica	do		60.00								60.00
United States	Dollar						131.09				131.09
Hon. Laurence Curtis:											
Peru	Sol	817.4	30.50	931.3	34.75	6,931.82	258.65	239.86	8.95	8,920.38	332.85
Ecuador	Sucre	585.31	26.13	394.24	17.60			203.84	9.10	1,407.39	52.83
Colombia	Peso	673.50	60.95	133.6	12.09			68.5	6.20	875.6	79.24
Mexico	do	1,031.25	82.50	926.12	74.09	551.25	44.10	231.25	18.50	2,739.87	219.19
Panama	U.S. dollar		68.00								68.00
Costa Rica	do		60.00								60.00
Guatemala	do		96.00								96.00
United States	Dollar						63.42				63.42
Albert C. F. Westphal (staff consultant):											
Panama	U.S. dollar		34.00								34.00
Costa Rica	do		60.00								60.00
Netherlands	Guilder					758.93	211.40				211.40
Rosita Rieck Bennett (staff assistant):											
Peru	Sol	322.22	12.03	761.13	28.40	6,913.75	257.99	157.50	5.87	8,154.60	304.29
Ecuador	Sucre	863.10	39.23	181.80	8.26			79.51	3.61	1,124.41	51.10
Colombia	Peso	582.75	55.50	85.7	8.16			23.1	2.20	691.55	65.86
Panama City	U.S. dollar		68.00								68.00
Costa Rica	do		60.00								60.00
Total			1,413.83		274.42		1,694.69		96.17		3,479.11

RECAPITULATION

	Amount
Foreign currency (U.S. dollar equivalent)	2,424.60
Appropriated funds: H. Res. 61, 87th Cong	1,054.51
Total	3,479.11

Report of expenditure of foreign currencies and appropriated funds, Committee on Foreign Affairs, U.S. House of Representatives, Subcommittee for Review of the Mutual Security Programs, expended between Jan. 1 and Dec. 31, 1962

Name and country	Name of currency	Lodging		Meals		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Bullock, Roy J., senior staff consultant:											
France	Franc	1,453.30	296.60	1,044.50	213.16	313.50	63.97	154.38	31.51	2,965.68	605.24
Netherlands	Guilder	88.25	24.51	49.58	13.77	4,123.71	1,145.47	0	0	4,261.54	1,183.75
Denmark	Krone	848	122.72	799.75	115.73	291.83	42.23	66.91	9.68	2,006.49	290.36
Norway	do	697.37	97.53	595.86	83.33	379.33	53.05	82.33	11.51	1,754.89	245.42
Germany	Deutsche mark	384.26	96.06	457.81	114.45	57.33	14.33	30.66	7.66	930.06	232.50
Italy	Lira	151,592	242.54	146,721	234.75	33,668	53.86	17,311	27.69	349,292	558.84
Belgium	Franc	4,088	81.76	2,228	44.56	475	9.50	0	0	6,791	135.82
United States	Dollar		(1)		[1] 32.		[1] 39.22	0	0		[1] 71.22
Brandt, Robert F., investigator-consultant:											
France	Franc	1,453.40	296.60	1,044.50	213.17	233.50	47.66	154.39	31.50	2,885.79	588.93
Netherlands	Guilder	88.25	24.52	49.59	13.77	3,906.88	1,085.24	0	0	4,044.72	1,123.53
Denmark	Krone	848	122.72	799.75	115.75	291.84	42.24	66.93	9.69	2,006.52	290.40
Norway	do	697.39	97.55	595.87	83.35	379.34	53.06	82.34	11.52	1,754.94	245.48
Germany	Deutche mark	384.28	96.08	457.81	114.46	57.34	14.34	30.67	7.68	930.10	232.56
Italy	Lira	151,594	242.56	146,721	234.76	33,668	53.88	17,311	27.71	349,294	558.91
United States	Dollar				[1] 32.00		39.72				71.72
Chile	Escudo	173.99	123.39	303.38	215.16	131.76	93.44	47.87	33.95	657.00	465.94
United States	Dollar						971.63		2.00		973.63
Iran	Rial	2,760	36.30	1,406	18.50	152	2.00	182	2.41	4,500	59.21
Jordan	Dinar	26.300	73.90	22.334	62.76	8.142	22.88	5.083	14.27	61.859	173.81
Lebanon	Pound	131.10	43.88	233.60	73.83			22.66	7.58	374.35	125.29
Afghanistan	U.S. dollar		(2)		(2)		27.02				415.02
Germany	Deutsche mark					7,526.14	1,886.25			7,526.14	1,886.25
United States	Dollar						10.25		2.50		12.75
Harry C. Cromer, staff consultant:											
France	Franc	1,453.30	296.60	1,044.50	213.16	233.50	47.65	154.38	31.51	2,885.68	588.92
Netherlands	Guilder	88.25	24.51	49.58	13.77	3,906.77	1,085.21			4,044.60	1,123.49
Denmark	Kroner	848	122.72	799.75	115.73	291.83	42.23	66.91	9.68	2,006.49	290.36
Norway	do	697.37	97.53	595.86	83.33	379.33	53.05	82.33	11.51	1,754.89	245.42
Germany	Deutsche mark	384.26	96.06	457.81	114.45	57.33	14.33	30.66	7.66	930.06	232.50
Italy	Lira	151.592	242.54	146,721	234.75	33,668	53.86	17.311	27.69	349,292	558.84
United States	Dollar				[1] 32.00		42.72				[1] 74.72
Total			3,387.18		2,836.45		7,110.29		326.91		13,660.83

[1] 2 days per diem.

[2] 22 days per diem, Kabul, at $16; 4 days per diem other than Kabul, at $9; $388.

RECAPITULATION

	Amount
Foreign currency (U.S. dollar equivalent)	12,041.77
Appropriated funds:	
H. Res. 60 and 61, 87th Cong	1,204.04
Government department: Department of State	415.02
Total	13,660.83

THOMAS E. MORGAN,
Chairman, Committee on Foreign Affairs.

MARCH 6, 1963.

Report of expenditure of foreign currencies and appropriated funds, delegation to 8th NATO Parliamentarians' Conference, expended between Jan. 1 and Dec. 31, 1962

Name and country	Name of currency	Lodging		Meals		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Anfuso, Victor L.:											
France	Franc	1,371.31	279.86	630	128.57	170	34.69	700	142.86	2,871.31	585.98
United States	Dollar						44.50				44.50
Arends, Leslie C.:											
France	Franc	1,371.31	279.86	630	128.57	170	34.69	680	138.77	2,851.31	581.89
Germany	Deutsche mark	280	70.00	136.84	34.21	100.23	25.06	93.47	23.36	610.54	152.63
Italy	Lire	29,127	46.89	16,382	26.26	37,677.40	60.77	11,320	18.26	94,506.4	152.18
Spain	Peseta	3,427.20	57.12	1,929	32.15	5,200.20	86.67	380.40	6.34	10,936.60	182.28
United States	Dollar		64.00				112.42				176.42
Denton, Winfield K.:											
France	Franc	1,340.8	273.63	639.45	130.50	172	35.10	685	139.80	2,837.25	579.03
Germany	Deutsche mark	280	70.00	140	35.00	110	27.50	105	26.25	635	158.75
Italy	Lira	29,210	47.11	17,150	27.66	37,677.4	60.77	10,511	16.95	94,548.4	152.49
Spain	Peseta	3,610	60.17	2,150	35.83	5,000	83.33	328	5.47	11,088	184.80
United States	Dollar		64.00				99.98				163.98
Devine, Samuel L.:											
France	Franc	1,350.31	275.57	660.8	134.86	201.8	41.10	661	134.90	2,873.91	586.43
Germany	Deutsche mark	280	70.00	138.8	34.70	118	29.50	101	25.25	637.8	159.45
Italy	Lira	29,190	47.08	16,790	27.08	37,677.4	60.77	11,619	18.74	95,276.4	153.67
Spain	Peseta	3,508	58.46	2,079	34.65	5,400	90.00	420	7.00	11,407	190.11
United States	Dollar		16.00				57.54				73.54
Hays, Wayne L.:											
France [1]	Franc	1,713.51	349.69	765.15	156.15	2,000	41.00	700	142.86	3,379.56	689.70
Germany	Deutche mark	296	74.00	126.44	31.61	100.23	23.06	95.2	23.80	617.87	154.47
Italy [1]	Lira	71,291.60	114.98	40,290.6	64.98	37,677.4	60.77	12,517	20.18	161,776.6	260.91
Spain	Peseta	3,678	61.30	1,958.4	32.64	5,600	93.33	398.30	6.64	11,634.7	193.91
United States	Dollar						[1] 2,108.41				2,108.41
Lindsay, John V.:											
France	Franc	1,350.31	275.57	625	127.55	185	37.55	646.8	132.00	2,807.11	572.67
Germany	Deutche mark	275	68.75	138.75	34.69	95	23.75	91.8	22.95	600.55	150.14
Italy	Lira	27,132	43.69	15,190.8	24.46	37,677.4	60.70	11,285	18.17	91,285.2	147.02
United States	Dollar						[1] 938.39				938.39

See footnotes at end of table.

***Report of expenditure of foreign currencies and appropriated funds, delegation to 8th NATO Parliamentarians' Conference, expended between Jan. 1 and Dec. 31, 1962*—Continued**

Name and country	Name of currency	Lodging		Meals		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Rodino, Peter W., Jr.:											
France	Franc	1,340.02	273.59	570.90	116.51	185	37.76	700	142.86	2,795.92	570.72
United States	Dollar						22.35				22.35
Smith, Frank E., United States	do						976.87				976.87
Westland, Jack:											
France	Franc	1,350.31	275.57	664.34	135.58	187.43	38.25	670	136.73	2,872.08	586.13
Germany	Deutsche mark	275	68.75	135.8	33.95	115	28.75	95.7	23.92	621.5	155.37
Italy	Lire	18,130	29.24	10,127.7	16.33	18,838.7	30.38	7,950	12.82	55,046.4	88.77
Spain	Peseta	1,350	22.50	565.8	9.43	1,800	30.00	375.8	6.26	4,091.6	68.19
United States	Dollar		32.00				309.95				341.95
Crawford, Boyd:											
France	Franc	1,371.31	279.86	630	128.57	170	34.69	700	142.86	2,871.31	585.98
Germany	Deutsche mark	280	70.00	126.44	31.61	100.23	25.06	81.63	20.41	588.30	147.08
Italy	Lire	29,127	46.89	29,760	48.00	37,677.4	60.77	10,630	17.15	107,194.4	172.81
Spain	Peseta	3,427.20	57.12	2,349	39.15	2,750	45.83	290	4.83	8,816.2	146.93
Billings, Philip B.:											
France [1]	Franc	1,773.60	361.96	793.85	162.01	315.56	64.40	864.99	176.53	3,748	764.90
Germany	Deutsche mark	280	70.00	126.44	31.61	100.23	25.06	81.63	20.41	588.3	147.08
Itlay	Lire	47,500	76.61	53,754	86.70	37,677.4	60.77	74,462	120.10	213,393.4	344.18
United States [2]	Dollar		159.75		49.25		[1] 1,290.17				1,499.17
Drakert, Marcelle:											
Germany	Deutsche mark	250	62.50	136.84	34.21	100.23	25.06	39.80	9.95	526.87	131.72
Italy	Lire	23,132.25	37.25	15,525	25.00	37,677.4	60.77	6,751	10.87	83,085.65	133.89
Spain	Peseta	3,060	51.00	1,800	30.00	2,200	36.67	247.8	4.13	7,307.8	121.80
United States	Dollar		32.00				39.94				71.94
Krim, Marie H.:											
France	Franc	1,340.02	273.59	570.9	116.51	170	34.69	500	102.04	2,580.92	526.83
Germany	Deutsche mark	280	70.00	136.84	34.21	100.23	25.06	80	20.00	597.07	149.27
Italy	Lire	11,000	17.74	4,950	7.98	19,061.2	30.74	6,200	10.00	41,211.2	66.46
Litten, Jean:											
France	Franc	1,340.02	273.59	570.9	116.51	170	34.69	515	105.09	2,595.92	529.88
Germany	Deutsche mark	280	70.00	136.84	34.21	100.23	25.06	47.92	11.98	564.99	141.25
Italy	Lire	23,132.25	37.25	15,525	25.00	37,677.4	60.77	8,689	14.01	85,023.65	137.03
Spain	Peseta	3,060	51.00	1,800	30.00	2,750	45.83	306	5.10	7,916	131.93
Peak, Patricia E.:											
France	Franc	1,340.02	273.59	570.9	116.51	170	34.69	600	122.45	2,680.92	547.24
Germany	Deutsche mark	280	70.00	136.84	34.21	100.23	25.06	51.35	12.84	568.42	142.11
Italy	Lire	23,132.25	37.25	15,525	25.00	37,677.4	60.77	9,237	14.87	85,571.65	137.89
Spain	Peseta	3,060	51.00	1,800	30.00	2,200	36.67	297	4.95	7,357	122.62
Delegation expenses:											
Hotel office, France	Franc							3,109.78	634.65	3,109.78	634.65
Gratuities, France	do							250	51.02	250	51.02
Transportation, France	do					462.39	94.37			462.39	94.37
NATO reception, France	do							92.16	18.81	92.16	18.81
Overtime costs, France	do							1,144.04	233.48	1,144.04	233.48
Official luncheons and meals, France.	do			1,749.3	357.00					1,749.3	357.00
Total			5,999.33		3,187.17		8,125.25		3,281.67		20,593.42

[1] Includes attending meetings of NATO Parliamentarians Conference Standing Committee.

[2] Includes NATO Parliamentarians' visit, U.S. bases.

RECAPITULATION

	Amount
Foreign currency (U.S. dollar equivalent)	14,175.90
Appropriated funds: Other, Public Law 689, 84th Cong	6,417.52
Total	20,593.42

WAYNE L. HAYS,
Chairman, Delegation to the 8th NATO Parliamentarians' Conference.

MARCH 8, 1963.

Report of expenditure of foreign currencies and appropriated funds, delegation to Canada-United States Interparliamentary Group, expended between Jan. 1, and Dec. 31, 1962

Name and country	Name of currency	Lodging		Meals		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Broomfield, Hon. William S.: Canada	Dollar		39.00		12.34				53.00		104.34
Curtis, Hon. Laurence: Canada	do		39.00		9.02		41.86				89.88
Gallagher, Hon. Cornelius E.: Canada	do		157.50		13.19				14.35		185.04
Giaimo, Hon. Robert N.: Canada	do		70.50						3.54		74.04
Harvey, Hon. James: Canada	do		52.50								52.50
Inouye, Hon. Daniel K.: Canada	do		56.00						2.75		58.75
Johnson, Hon. Harold T.: Canada	do		70.50		7.69				13.12		91.31
Murphy, Hon. William T.: Canada	do		73.50		14.71				1.25		89.46
Robison, Hon. Howard W.: Canada	do		39.00		8.03				1.85		48.88
Slack, Hon. John M., Jr.: Canada	do		71.50		4.12				1.84		77.46
Tupper, Hon. Stanley R.: Canada	do		52.50		14.81				.51		67.46
Jellison, Mr. Fred: Canada	do		48.00		5.48				7.00		60.84
O'Brien, Mrs. Mary L.: Canada	do		50.00		5.52				3.25		58.77
Westphal, Mr. Albert C. F.: Canada	do		47.00		36.59				4.91		88.50
Delegation expenses, Canada	do								833.33		833.33
Total			866.50		131.86		41.86		940.34		1,980.56

RECAPITULATION

	Amount
Appropriated funds: Public Law 86-42	1,980.56

CORNELIUS E. GALLAGHER,
Chairman, House Delegation, Canada-United States Interparliamentary Group.

Report of expenditure of foreign currencies and appropriated funds, Mexico-United States Interparliamentary Group, expended between Jan. 1 and Dec. 31, 1962

Name and country	Name of currency	Lodging		Meals		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Hon. Harris B. McDowell, United States.	Dollar		138.15		19.23		194.10		12.88		364.36
Hon. Edward J. Derwinski, United States.	do		144.20		31.38		436.39		5.50		617.47
Hon. Robert B. Chiperfield, United States.	do		54.00				205.10				259.10
Hon. Ben Reifel, United States	do		60.00		9.75		399.95		1.08		470.78
Delegation expenses (host expenses such as meals, interpreters, official visits, etc.).	do								7,333.26		7,333.26
Total			396.35		60.36		1,235.54		7,352.72		9,044.97

RECAPITULATION

	Amount
Appropriated funds: Public Law 86-420, 86th Cong.	$9,044.97

D. S. SAUND,
Chairman, House Delegation, Mexico-United States Interparliamentary Group.

Report of expenditure of foreign currencies and appropriated funds, U.S. Group, Interparliamentary Union, U.S. House of Representatives, expended between Jan. 1 and Dec. 31, 1962

Name and country	Name of currency	Lodging		Meals		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Hon. Harold D. Cooley: Italy	U.S. dollars		137.50		41.91		609.60		5.16		794.17
Hon. Martha W. Griffiths: Italy	do		45.83		65.00		1,104.40		60.00		1,275.23
Hon. W. R. Poage:											
Mexico	do				1.00				1.50		2.50
Peru	do		28.68		4.03		1.50				34.21
Argentina	do		35.07		104.09				18.37		157.53
Brazil	do		86.82		130.64		9.03		75.71		302.20
Trinidad	do		10.53		4.60				1.60		16.73
Hon. Paul C. Jones:											
Mexico	Mexico		69.63		18.21				6.00		93.84
Peru	do		31.09		58.80				5.00		94.89
Argentina	do		35.07		58.08				10.39		103.54
Brazil	do		96.38		128.12		3.22		40.64		268.36
Trinidad	do		16.05		10.05				1.60		27.70
Hon. Lucien Nedzi:											
Mexico	do		48.03		10.72				17.90		76.65
Peru	do		32.00		13.38						45.38
Argentina	do		35.07		85.83				34.88		155.78
Brazil	do		92.79		164.39		8.89		137.66		403.73
Trinidad	do		16.05		42.88				1.60		60.53
Hon. Thomas Downing:											
Mexico	do		32.02		13.61				.16		45.79
Peru	do		48.03		52.00		9.32		8.80		118.15
Argentina	do		35.07		61.98				16.50		113.55
Brazil	do		92.79		163.68		6.45		130.55		393.47
Trinidad	do		16.05		6.78				1.60		24.43
Hon. Phil Weaver:											
Mexico	do		48.03		38.99				16.00		103.02
Peru	do		30.84		18.08		6.80		10.26		65.98
Argentina	do		35.07		18.07		1.20		13.68		68.02
Brazil	do		96.38		213.98		3.22		33.08		346.66
Trinidad	do		16.04		21.00		5.00		1.60		43.64
Total			1,266.91		1,549.90		1,768.63		650.24		5,235.68

Report of expenditure of foreign currencies and appropriated funds, Committee on Government Operations, U.S. House of Representatives, expended between Jan. 1 and Dec. 31, 1962

Name and country	Name of currency	Lodging		Meals		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Foreign Operations and Monetary Affairs Subcommittee.			369.32		252.81		1,315.83		109.51		2,047.47
Total			369.32		252.81		1,315.83		109.51		2,047.47

RECAPITULATION

	Amount
Foreign currency (U.S. dollar equivalent)	2,047.47

WILLIAM L. DAWSON,
Chairman, Committee on Government Operations.

MARCH 5, 1963.

Report of expenditure of foreign currencies and appropriated funds, Committee on Government Operations, U.S. House of Representatives, Subcommittee on Foreign Operations and Monetary Affairs, expended between Jan. 1 and Dec. 31, 1962

Name and country	Name of currency	Lodging		Meals		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Robert P. Griffin:											
Germany	Deutsche mark	135.70	33.93	105.00	26.25	45.00	11.25	48.30	12.08	334.00	83.51
Denmark	Kroner	161.00	23.30	97.00	14.04	151.19	22.02	47.00	6.80	457.19	66.16
U.S.S.R.	do	831.74	120.35	150.00	21.70	68.00	9.84	82.00	11.87	1,131.74	163.76
Poland	Zloty	295.00	12.30	419.00	17.46	2,577.00	107.38	380.00	15.83	3,671.00	152.97
do	Kroner	76.37	11.05	120.40	17.42					196.77	28.47
Austria	Schilling	2,094.00	80.62	1,370.00	52.74	2,224.82	85.66	603.57	23.24	6,292.39	242.26
Spain	Peseta	3,988.00	66.47	5,150.00	85.83	10,699.00	178.32	1,766.00	29.43	21,603.00	360.05
Portugal	Escudo	607.00	21.30	495.00	17.37	190.00	6.66	292.50	10.26	1,584.50	55.59
Total			369.32		252.81		421.13		109.51		1,152.77

RECAPITULATION

	Amount
Foreign currency (U.S. dollar equivalent)	1,152.77

WILLIAM L. DAWSON,
Chairman, Committee on Government Operations.

MARCH 5, 1963.

Name and country	Name of currency	Lodging		Meals		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Mr. Albion Ross (American citizen presently residing in Beirut, Lebanon) c/o American Embassy, Beirut, Lebanon							894.70				894.70
(Mr. Albion Ross was summoned in April 1962, through the American Embassy, Beirut, Lebanon, to come to Washington, D.C., to appear before the Foreign Operations and Monetary Affairs Subcommittee for pertinent testimony. Arrangements were made through the Secretary of State, Washington, D.C., for round-trip economy jet air transportation be purchased from 19FT561 funds for this purpose, pursuant to the provisions of Section 502(b) of the Mutual Security Act, as amended.)											

RECAPITULATION:

	Amount
Foreign currency (U.S. dollar equivalent)	894.70

WILLIAM L. DAWSON,
Chairman, Committee on Government Operations.

MARCH 5, 1963.

Report of expenditure of foreign currencies and appropriated funds, Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, U.S. House of Representatives, expended between Jan. 1 and Dec. 31, 1962

Name and country	Name of currency	Lodging		Meals		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Oren Harris:											
France	Franc		48.00		36.54		11.75		5.75		102.04
Germany	Deutsche mark		27.50		46.00		17.55		7.75		98.80
England	Pound		58.80		38.87		50.46		6.00		154.13
Total			134.30		121.41		79.76		19.50		354.97
Walter Rogers:											
France	Franc		290.00		120.00		80.00		30.00		520.00
Italy	Lira		101.06		114.10		106.36		32.60		354.12
England	Pound		140.00		112.00		50.40		28.00		330.40
Total			531.06		346.10		236.76		90.60		1,204.52
William L. Springer:											
France	New franc		20.40		22.84						43.24
Switzerland	Franc		32.48		32.58						65.06
Germany	Deutsche mark		29.00		32.14						61.14
Total			81.88		87.56						169.44

Report of expenditure of foreign currencies and appropriated funds, Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, U.S. House of Representatives, expended between Jan. 1 and Dec. 31, 1962—Continued

Name and country	Name of currency	Lodging		Meals		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Peter F. Mack:											
France	Franc		56.05		44.20		64.22		39.61		204.08
Italy	Lira		76.25		93.70		195.33		71.59		436.87
Austria	Shilling		55.00		57.21		58.36		24.29		194.86
Total			187.30		195.11		317.91		135.49		835.81
Milton W. Glenn:											
England	Pound		126.00		98.00		28.00		28.00		280.00
Germany	Deutsche mark		100.00		125.00		12.50		12.50		250.00
Italy	Lira		150.00		80.00		26.00		16.00		272.00
Spain	Peseta		90.00		140.00		50.00		25.00		305.00
Greece	Drachma		66.00		66.00		13.00		20.00		165.00
Total			532.00		509.00		129.50		101.50		1,272.00
Morgan Moulder:											
Colombia	Peso		295.00		285.49		60.40		28.00		668.89
Mexico	do		288.20		276.12		65.00		21.00		650.32
Total			583.20		561.61		125.40		49.00		1,319.21
James C. Healey:											
France	Franc		437.00		63.94		138.00		21.00		659.94
Germany	Deutsche mark		75.00		124.94				50.00		249.94
Total			512.00		188.88		138.00		71.00		909.88
Hastings, Keith:											
Mexico	Peso		15.00		20.00						35.00
Peru	Sol								76.49		76.49
Total			15.00		20.00				76.49		111.49
Samuel L. Devine:											
Italy	Lira				47.50		17.00		16.00		80.50
Spain	Peseta				42.00		27.00		23.00		92.00
Total					89.50		44.00		39.00		172.50
W. E. Williamson:											
France	Franc		72.00		103.50		16.50		12.08		204.08
Germany	Deutsche mark		27.50		39.26		8.75		8.15		83.66
England	Pound		58.80		48.40		7.80		11.00		126.00
Total			158.30		191.16		33.05		31.23		413.64
Andrew Stevenson:											
Japan	Yen		107.40		12.35		31.57		8.40		159.72
Hong Kong	Dollar		52.26		15.42		6.84		4.02		78.54
Philippines	Peso		6.67		7.10		2.57		3.33		19.67
Australia	Pound		143.66		71.55		25.31		6.98		247.50
Total											
Andrew Stevenson:											
Thailand	Baht		29.24		6.83		6.78		4.12		46.97
India	Rupee		44.52		7.14		7.77		2.52		61.95
Lebanon	Pound		37.95		12.54		4.95		2.97		58.41
Jordan	do		8.68		1.12		13.72		4.48		28.00
United Arab Republic	do		19.32		3.68		12.65		3.45		39.10
France	Franc		54.59		16.74		13.67		10.61		95.61
Spain	Peseta		65.95		33.38		21.18		13.80		134.71
Total			570.24		187.85		147.41		64.68		970.18
Torbert H. Macdonald:											
Australia	Pound		205.00		150.95		46.00		15.00		416.95
Hong Kong	Dollar		130.00		154.18		61.00		14.00		359.18
Indonesia	Rupiah		30.00		15.11		6.00				51.11
Singapore	Dollar		40.00		25.48		6.00				71.48
Vietnam	Piaster		75.00		40.45		11.00				126.45
Total			480.00		386.17		130.00		29.00		1,025.17
Dan Rostenkowski:											
Australia	Pound		140.00		105.00		28.00		5.64		278.64
Hong Kong	Dollar		80.00		60.00		20.00		15.46		175.46
Indonesia	Rupiah		24.00		20.00		4.00		3.00		51.00
Singapore	Dollar		18.00		15.00		7.00		4.76		44.76
Vietnam	Piaster		75.00		40.00		7.00		4.45		126.45
Total			337.00		240.00		66.00		33.31		676.31

OREN HARRIS,
Chairman, Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commmerce.

MARCH 8, 1963.

Report of expenditure of foreign currencies and appropriated funds by the Committee on the Judiciary, U.S. House of Representatives expended between Jan. 1 and Dec. 31, 1962

Name and country	Name of currency	Lodging		Meals		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Hon. Francis E. Walter:											
United Kingdom	Pound	34-6	96.04	38/4	106.96	10/9	29.26	9-0	25.20	91-19	257.46
France	New franc					4,991.40	1,018.66			4,991.40	1,018.66
Switzerland	Franc	696.20	163.80	994.24	222.17	249.56	58.72	210	49.41	2,100	494.10
Walter M. Besterman:											
United Kingdom	Pound	34-18	97.72	28/2	78.68			7/0	19.60	70-0	196.00
France	New franc	893	178.60	741	148.20	5,645.30	1,129.06	185	37.00	7,464.30	1,492.86
Switzerland	Franc	571	134.40	418	98.40	272	64.00	136	32.00	1,397	328.80
Hon. Michael A. Feighan:											
Japan	Yen	41,254	114.60	42,999	119.44	9,547	26.52	5,987	16.63	99,787	277.19
Taiwan	New Taiwan dollar.	1,280	32.00	1,208	30.20			598	14.95	3,086	77.15
Manila	Peso	38	9.50	274.40	68.60	20	5.00	91.60	22.09	424	106.00
Hong Kong	Hong Kong dollar.	817.20	143.36	787.70	138.20	208.60	36.60	109.85	19.27	1,923.35	337.43
Thailand	Baht	310.70	15.05	296.95	14.38	900	43.57	306.35	14.85	1,814	87.85
India	Rupee	418.50	83.70	86	17.20	122.50	24.50	60	12.00	687	137.40
Turkey	Lira	253.75	28.20	233.98	25.98	49.65	5.52	109.80	12.20	647	71.90
Italy	do	41,024	66.05	56,575	91.10	12,141	19.55	13,630	21.96	123,360	198.65
Germany	Deutsche mark	341.91	85.48	338.89	84.72	88	22.00	98.20	24.55	867	216.75
Spain	Peseta	2,335.20	38.92	3,157.20	52.63	600	10.00	1,200	20.00	7,292.40	121.55
Portugal	Escudo	2,096.40	73.30	1,573	55.00	1,327	46.40	620.60	21.70	5,617	196.40
Hon. Peter W. Rodino, Jr.:											
Switzerland [1]	Franc	420	97.19	448	103.77	110	25.45	22	5.01	1,000	231.42
Do	Deutsche mark					4,035.89	[2] 1,011.50			4,035.89	1,011.50
Hon. Byron G. Rogers:											
France	New franc	350	71.40	368	75.08	112	22.85	22	4.49	850	173.82
Belgium	Franc	4,200	84.45	495	99.50	550	11.00	300	6.19	10,000	201.14
Germany	Deutsche mark	340	84.96	364	91.00	50	12.50	46	11.48	800	199.94
Italy	Lira	40,000	64.00	50,500	81.00	15,000	24.00	7,500	12.00	112,500	181.00
Hon. Frank Chelf:											
France	New franc	159	31.80	66	13.20			25	5.00	250	50.00
Netherlands	Guilder					3,932.76	1,093.00			3,932.76	1,093.00
Switzerland	Franc	626.80	147.24	765.50	179.80	888	209.00	238	56.00	2,518	592.04
Italy	Lira	81,351	131.00	58,374	94.00			15,525	25.00	155,250	250.00
Hon. George Meader:											
Austria	Schilling	1,964	76.20	2,830	109.80	1,933	75.00	773	30.00	7,500	201.00
France	New franc	116.20	23.24	108.80	21.76			25	5.00	250	50.00
Germany	Deutsche mark	250	62.50	312	78.00	137	34.50	80	20.00	780	195.00
Netherlands	Guilder					19,321	532.00			1,913.21	532.00
Switzerland	Franc	462.19	108.75	538.26	126.65	529.55	124.60	170	40.00	1,700	400.00
							[3] 300				300
Hon. James F. Battin:											
France	New franc					4,996.90	1,019.78			4,996.90	1,019.78
Switzerland	Franc	433.50	102.00	140.25	33.00			63.75	15.00	637.50	150
Miss Ruth Miskell:											
Netherlands	Guilder					3,971.13	1,102.40			3,971.13	1,102.40
France	New franc	163	32.60	207	41.40	80	16.00	50	10.00	500	100.00
Switzerland	Franc	325.57	76.60	110.50	26.00	100.18	23.57	63.75	15.00	600	141.17
Italy	Lira	72,036	116.00	67,689	109.00			15,525	25.00	155,250	250.00
Hon. Peter W. Rodino, Jr.:											
Belgium Holland	Franc	4,200	84.45	4,900	98.54	600	12.09	300	6.04	10,000	201.12
Germany	Deutsche mark	340	84.96	360	89.98	56	14.00	44	11.00	800	199.94
Greece	Drachma	1,350	45.01	1,500	50.02	540	18.00	310	10.30	3,700	123.33
Italy	Lira	100,000	161.03	120,000	193.24	52,260	84.18	23,150	37.32	295,410	475.77
Spain	Peseta	3,000	50.03	3,600	60.03	1,500	25.01	1,200	20.00	9,300	155.07
Portugal	Escudo	1,500	52.45	2,000	69.95	500	17.48	220	7.70	4,220	147.58
Do	Lira					70,000	[3] 112.72			70,000	112.72
Do	Franc					4,373.20	[2] 892.49			4,373.20	892.49
Charles J. Zinn:											
Italy	Lira	31,550	50.50	24,400	39.00	7,810	12.50	6,240	10.00	70,000	112.00
Germany	Duetsche mark					4,392.19	1,100.80			4,392.19	1,100.80
Hon. Francis E. Walter:											
France	New franc	178	35.60	192	38.40	80	16.00	50	10.00	500	100.00
Netherlands	Guilder					4,517.24	1,259.90			4,517.24	1,259.90
Switzerland	Franc	555.90	130.80	845.07	198.84	796.49	187.41	212.50	50.00	2410	567.05
Italy	Lira	91,163	146.80	48,562	78.20			15,525	25.00	155,250	250.00
Walter M. Besterman:											
France	New franc	1,175.90	235.18	1,144.10	228.82	380	76.00	300	60.00	3,000	600.00
Netherlands	Guilder					4,184.25	1,161.60			4,184.25	1,161.60
Italy	Lira	86,071	138.60	3,132.32	[4] 504.40	340,929	[4] 549.00	80,730	130.00	820,962	1,322.00
Switzerland	Franc	649.66	152.86	779.74	183.47	192.10	45.20	178.50	42.00	1,800	423.53
Hon. Roland V. Libonati:											
Germany	Deutsche mark			1,097.25	275.00	305.23	76.50	240.04	60.16	1,642.52	411.66
France Switzerland	Franc do			327.07	66.75	173.95	35.50	267.20	54.53	768.22	156.78
Hong Kong	Hong Kong dollar.			448.23	78.50	236.68	41.45	110.89	19.42	795.80	139.37
Thailand	Baht			948.67	45.50	625.50	30.00	490.81	23.54	2,064.98	99.04
Vietnam	Piaster			5,566.90	76.50	1,523.81	20.94	2,909.35	39.98	10,000.06	137.42
Total			4,038.92		5,009.96		13,965.28		1,266.37		24,280.53

---

[1] Invited as congressional observer to Geneva Disarmament Conference.

[2] Air passage from United States and return.

[3] Approximate cost of return transportation. Exact figure and foreign currency not immediately available.

[4] Including expenses for transportation and meals for self, committee members and other staff members.

EMANUEL CELLER,
Chairman, Committee on the Judiciary.

MARCH 8, 1963.

Report of expenditure of foreign currencies and appropriated funds, Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, U.S. House of Representatives, expended between Jan. 1 and Dec. 31, 1962

Name and country	Name of currency	Lodging		Meals		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
John D. Dingell, Bimini, The Bahamas. (Per diem in lieu of actual expenses, $192.00.)	Dollar						207.06				399.06

RECAPITULATION

	Amount
Appropriated funds: H. Res. 99, 87th Cong.	$399.06

H. C. BONNER,
Chairman, Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

MARCH 5, 1963.

Report of expenditure of foreign currencies and appropriated funds, Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, U.S. House of Representatives, expended between Dec. 24 and 31, 1962

Name and country	Name of currency	Lodging		Meals		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
John D. Dingell, Bimini, The Bahamas. (Per diem in lieu of actual expenses, $192.00.)	Dollar						207.06				399.06

RECAPITULATION

	Amount
Appropriated funds: H. Res. 99, 87th Cong.	$399.06

JOHN D. DINGELL,
Acting Chairman, Subcommittee on Oceanography, Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

MARCH 4, 1963.

Report of expenditure of foreign currencies and appropriated funds, Committee on Public Works, U.S. House of Representatives

Name and country	Name of currency	Lodging		Meals		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Frank E. Smith:											
France	Franc	545	111.09	272	55.45	410	83.57	103	21.01	1,330	271.12
United Kingdom	Pound	33/6	93.87	26/4	73.81	28/7	79.90	12/3	34.26	100/0	281.84
T. A. Thompson:											
Spain	Peseta	12,140	202.33	14,270	237.84	23,800	396.67	8,870	147.84	59,080	984.68
Italy	Lire	143,575	231.20	97,310	156.70	59,802	96.30	59,915	96.48	360,602	580.68
France	Franc	985	201.03	695	141.84	910	185.73	172.08	35.10	2,762.08	563.70
United Kingdom	Pound	97/0	272.57	45/0	126.45	308/12/6	866.73	34/2	95.82	484/14/6	1,361.57
Richard J. Sullivan: Spain	Pestea	2,700	45.00	4,860	81.00	12,200	203.70	5,440	90.66	25,200	420.36
	Deutsche mark [1]					3,902	975.50			3,902	975.50
Joseph R. Brennan: Spain	Pestea	7,837	130.62	10,200	170.00	20,650	344.17	2,963	49.38	41,650	694.17
Clifton W. Enfield: Spain	do	7,924.50	132.08	9,765.50	162.76	20,525	342.00	3,310	55.17	41,525	692.01
Total			1,419.79		1,205.85		3,574.27		625.72		6,825.63

[1] Transportation paid in German currency.

RECAPITULATION

	Amount
Foreign currency (U.S. dollar equivalent)	$6,825.63

CHARLES A. BUCKLEY,
Chairman, Committee on Public Works.

MARCH 8, 1963.

Report of expenditure of foreign currencies and appropriated funds, Committee on Science and Astronautics, U.S. House of Representatives, expended between Jan. 1 and Dec. 31, 1962

Name and country	Name of currency	Lodging		Meals		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Victor L. Anfuso:											
Portugal	Escudo	2,657.20	92.80	1,227	43.82	787	28.10	286.30	10.00	4,957.50	174.72
Spain	Peseta	12,730	212.20	6,850	114.26	1.920	32.00	1,800	30.00	23,300	388.46
Italy (transportation)	Lira	243,760	392.60	139,500	225.00	315,055	507.33	16,740	27.00	715,055	1,151.93
Netherlands	Guilder					837.31	233.00			837.31	233.00
Total			697.60		383.08		800.43		67.00		1,948.11

Report of expenditure of foreign currencies and appropriated funds, Committee on Science and Astronautics, U.S. House of Representatives, expended between Jan. 1 and Dec. 31, 1962—Continued

Name and country	Name of currency	Lodging		Meals		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Corinne Riley:											
Great Britain	Pound	18	50.40	6	16.80	21	58.80	6	16.80	30	142.80
France	New franc	458	91.60	190	38.70	120	24.50	87	17.70	855	172.50
West Germany	Deutsche mark	183	45.75	100	25.60	--------	--------	168	40.50	450	111.25
Austria	Schilling	3,411	137.00	1,300	52.00	909	35.36	1,163	47.00	6,783	271.36
Italy	Lira	65,000	105.00	24,490	39.00	74,300	112.50	30,380	49.00	119,870	305.50
Spain	Peseta	472	8.00	720	12.00	--------	--------	600	10.00	1,792	30.00
Bermuda (transportation)	Pound	35	98.00	9	25.20	--------	--------	9	25.20	53	148.40
Netherlands	Guilder	--------	--------	--------	--------	4,317.95	1,201.43	--------	--------	4,317.95	1,201.43
Total		--------	535.75	--------	208.70	--------	1,432.59	--------	206.20	--------	2,383.24
Raymond Wilcove:											
Great Britain	Pound	17	47.60	7	19.60	--------	--------	6	16.80	30	84.00
France	New franc	458	91.60	190	38.70	120	24.50	87	17.70	855	172.50
West Germany	Mark	183	45.75	100	25.60	--------	--------	168	40.50	450	115.50
Austria	Schilling	3,410	136.00	1,300	52.00	--------	--------	1,162	46.00	5,872	234.00
Italy	Lira	65,000	105.00	24,490	40.00	--------	--------	30,380	49.00	119,870	194.00
Spain	Peseta	472	8.00	720	12.00	--------	--------	600	10.00	1,792	30.00
Bermuda (transportation)	Pound	35	99.00	9	25.20	--------	--------	9	25.20	53	148.40
Netherlands	Guilder	--------	--------	--------	--------	4,317.95	1,201.43	--------	--------	4,317.95	1,201.43
Total		--------	532.95	--------	213.10	--------	1,225.93	--------	205.20	--------	2,177.18
Charles F. Ducander:											
Austria	Austrian schilling.	3,003	116.79	1,525	59.32	800	31.12	552	21.40	--------	--------
Greece	Drachma	248	8.27	150	5.00	52	1.73	0	0	450	15.00
Italy	Lira	30,100	48.47	28,600	46.05	12,200	19.65	1,200	1.93	72,100	116.10
France	New franc	542	110.62	405	82.66	117	23.88	186	37.96	1,250	255.12
England (transportation)	Pound	25-0-0	70.01	16-0-0	44.80	6-0-0	16.80	2-0-0	5.60	49-0-0	137.21
Germany	Deutsche mark	--------	--------	--------	--------	5,154.80	1,288.70	--------	--------	5,154.80	1,288.70
Total		--------	354.16	--------	237.83	--------	1,381.88	--------	66.89	--------	2,040.76
Frank R. Hammill, Jr.:											
Austria	Austrian schilling.	2,965	115.28	1,552	60.35	835	32.47	508	19.75	5,860	227.85
Greece	Drachma	205	6.83	490	16.33	260	8.67	45	1.50	1,000	33.33
Italy	Lire	29,200	47.02	30,200	48.63	14,100	22.70	2,100	3.38	75.600	121.73
France	Franc	515	105.12	422	86.13	110	22.45	143	29.18	1,190	242.88
England (transportation)	Pound	25-0-0	70.01	1-60-0	44.80	4-0-0	11.20	2-10-0	7.00	47-10-00	133.01
Germany	Deutsche mark	--------	--------	--------	--------	5,154.80	1,288.70	--------	--------	5,154.80	1,288.70
Total		--------	344.26	--------	256.24	--------	1,386.19	--------	60.81	--------	2,047.50
Emilio Q. Daddario:											
Italy (transportation)	Lira	218,240	352.00	119,040	192.00	49,600	80.00	21,520	34.70	408,400	658.70
France	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	5,438	1,109.79	--------	--------	5,438	1,109.79
Total		--------	352.00	--------	192.00	--------	1,189.79	--------	34.70	--------	1,768.49
Emilio Q. Daddario:											
United Kingdom	Pound	50	140.00	25	70.00	17.7	49.80	7.3	20.20	100	280.00
France (transportation)	Franc	696	142.00	294	60.00	205.8	42.00	89.1	18.00	1,176	262.00
Germany	Deutsche mark	--------	--------	--------	--------	2,061.63	516.70	--------	--------	--------	516.70
United Kingdom	Pound	--------	--------	--------	--------	38.7	107.45	--------	--------	--------	107.45
Total		--------	282.00	--------	130.00	--------	715.95	--------	38.20	--------	1,166.15
Grand total		--------	3,098.72	--------	1,620.95	--------	8,132.76	--------	679.00	--------	13,531.43

RECAPITULATION

	Amount
Foreign currency (U.S. dollar equivalent)	13,531.43

GEORGE P. MILLER,
Chairman, Committee on Science and Astronautics.

MARCH 9, 1963.

Report of expenditure of foreign currencies and appropriated funds, Committee on Veterans' Affairs, U.S. House of Representatives, expended between Jan. 1 and Dec. 31, 1962

Name and country	Name of currency	Lodging		Meals		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Hon. Horace R. Kornegay:											
France	New franc	821.25	176.78	515	110.58	9-5	1.97	120-75	27.70	1,552	317.03
Italy	Lire	58,840	94.78	75,500	120.95	46,627	75.26	9,460	15.60	190,427	306.59
Germany	Deutsche mark	386	96.17	540	135.06	72	18.14	95	23.94	1,093	273.31
Great Britain	Pound	22-3-9	62.22	25-0-0	70.00	3-10-0	9.80	3-6-3	9.28	54-0-0	151.30
The Netherlands	Dutch guilder	--------	--------	--------	--------	49.21	196.25	--------	--------	49.21	196.25
Total counterpart funds		--------	429.96	--------	436.59	--------	301.42	--------	76.52	--------	1,244.48
Appropriated funds (Defense)	Dollar	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	305.60	--------	--------	--------	305.60
Total expenditures, Mr. Kornegay.	--------	--------	429.96	--------	436.59	--------	607.02	--------	76.52	--------	1,550.08

Report of expenditure of foreign currencies and appropriated funds, Committee on Veterans' Affairs, U.S. House of Representatives, expended between Jan. 1 and Dec. 31, 1962—**Continued**

Name and country	Name of currency	Lodging		Meals		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Hon. Robert F. Ellsworth:											
France	New franc	535	109.18	755	154.28	35	7.08	180	36.90	1,505	307.44
Italy	Lira	27,745	30.67	52,750	89.94	44,127	75.04	64,007	108.05	188,627	303.70
Germany	Deutsche mark	304	75.61	576	145.15	241	59.52	150	37.52	1,271	317.80
The Netherlands	Dutch guilder					49.21	196.25			49.21	196.25
Total, counterpart funds			215.46		389.37		337.89		182.47		1,125.19
Appropriated funds (Defense)	Dollar						330.40				330.40
Total expenditures, Mr. Ellsworth.			215.46		389.27		668.29		182.47		1,455.59
Billy E. Kirby:											
France	New franc	475	97.32	350	71.45			175	35.57	1,000	204.34
Italy	Lira	31,557	45.78	71,409	120.00	34,128	54.96	21,534	34.64	158,628	255.38
Germany	Deutsche mark	252	62.25	225	56.20	93	23.25	40	10.75	610	152.45
Great Britain	Pound	6—7—0	17.78	5—8—0	15.20			2/0/0	5.60	13—5—0	38.58
The Netherlands	Dutch guilder					49.21	196.25			49.21	196.25
Total counterpart funds			223.13		262.85		274.46		86.56		847.00
Appropriated funds (Defense)	Dollar						314.40				314.40
Total expenditures, Mr. Kirby			223.13		262.85		588.86		86.56		1,161.40
John R. Holden:											
France	New franc	471-75	96.41	492	100.36	90	18.45	133/25	27.32	1,167	242.54
Italy	Lira	32,259	50.94	87,467	140.00	43,500	69.46	17,902	31.22	181,128	291.62
Germany	Deutsche mark	309/88	77.51	197/12	49.17	133	33.52	30	7.26	670	167.46
Great Britain	Pound	6-14-8	18.89	6/0/0	16.80			1-5-4	3.59	14-0-0	39.28
The Netherlands	Dutch guilder					49.21	196.25			49.21	196.25
Total counterpart funds			243.75		306.33		317.68		69.39		937.15
Appropriated funds (Defense)	Dollar						314.40				314.40
Total expenditures, Mr. Holden			243.75		306.33		632.08		69.39		1,251.55
Total			1,112.29		1,395.14		2,496.25		414.94		5,418.62

RECAPITULATION

	Amount
Foreign currency (U.S. dollar equivalent)	$4,153.62
Appropriated funds: Department of Defense	1,264.80
Total	5,418.62

OLIN E. TEAGUE,
Chairman, Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

FEBRUARY 27, 1963.

Report of expenditure of foreign currencies and appropriated funds, Committee on Ways and Means, U.S. House of Representatives, expended between Jan. 1 and Dec. 31, 1962

Name and country	Name of currency	Lodging		Meals		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Hon. Herman T. Schneebeli:											
Belgium	Franc	2,400	48.00	2,000	40.00			660	13.20	5,060	101.20
England	Pound	30.7	85.00	14.6	40.00	3.12	10.00	3	8.50	51.5	143.50
Total			133.00		80.00		10.00		21.70		244.70

RECAPITULATION

	Amount
Foreign currency (U.S. dollar equivalent)	$244.70

W. D. MILLS,
Chairman, Committee on Ways and Means.

FEBRUARY 20, 1963.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

524. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to promote the cause of criminal justice by providing for the representation of defendants who are financially unable to obtain an adequate defense in criminal cases in the courts of the United States"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

525. A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting the 1962 Report of the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation, U.S. Department of Agriculture, pursuant to the Federal Crop Insurance Act; to the Committee on Agriculture.

526. A letter from the Deputy Secretary of Defense, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, relating to the appointment, promotion, separation, and retirement of members of the Armed Forces, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

527. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the audit of the U.S. Study Commission on the Neches, Trinity, Brazos, Colorado, Guadalupe, San Antonio, Nueces, and San Jacinto River Basins and intervening areas, State of Texas; to the Committee on Government Operations.

528. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the review of selected purchase orders issued by Sandia Corp., Albuquerque,

N. Mex., under contract AT(29-1)-789 with the Atomic Energy Commission; to the Committee on Government Operations.

529. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting the annual report of the activities of the U.S. General Accounting Office for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1962, pursuant to the Budget and Accounting Act of June 10, 1921; to the Committee on Government Operations.

530. A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, to improve the administration of transfers and conveyances of certain real property for various public uses, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Government Operations.

531. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to increase the authorization for appropriation for continuing work in the Missouri River Basin by the Secretary of the Interior"; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

532. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill for the relief of certain officers of the naval service erroneously in receipt of compensation based upon an incorrect computation of service for basic pay"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

533. A letter from the Director, Administrative Office, U.S. Courts, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to amend section 1825 of title 28 of the United States Code to authorize the payment of witness' fees in habeas corpus cases and in proceedings to vacate sentence under section 2255 of title 28, for persons who are authorized to proceed in forma pauperis"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

534. A letter from the Deputy Administrator, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, transmitting a report to the Committee on Science and Astronautics of the House of Representatives pursuant to section 3 of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration Authorization Act for the fiscal year 1963 (76 Stat. 383); to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

535. A letter from the Deputy Administrator, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, transmitting a report to the Committee on Science and Astronautics of the House of Representatives pursuant to section 3 of the act of July 21, 1961 (75 Stat. 216, 217); to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

536. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice, transmitting copies of the orders entered in the cases of certain aliens who have been found admissible to the United States, pursuant to the Immigration and Nationality Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

537. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice, transmitting reports concerning visa petitions which this Service has approved according the beneficiaries of such petitions first preference classification under the act, pursuant to the Immigration and Nationality Act, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

538. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders entered in cases where the authority contained in section 212(d)(3) was exercised in behalf of such aliens, pursuant to the Immigration and Nationality Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, pursuant to the order of the House of March 7, 1963, the following bills were reported on March 8, 1963:

Mr. McMILLAN: Committee on the District of Columbia. H.R. 682. A bill to amend the act of March 3, 1901, to permit the appointment of new trustees in deeds of trust in the District of Columbia by agreement of the parties; without amendment (Rept. No. 74). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. McMILLAN: Committee on the District of Columbia. H.R. 1933. A bill to amend the act of February 9, 1907, entitled "An act to define the term 'registered nurse' and to provide for the registration of nurses in the District of Columbia," as amended, with respect to the minimum age limitation for registration; without amendment (Rept. No. 75). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. McMILLAN: Committee on the District of Columbia. H.R. 1935. A bill to authorize the acquisition, training, and maintenance of dogs to be used in law enforcement in the District of Columbia; without amendment (Rept. No. 76). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. McMILLAN: Committee on the District of Columbia. H.R. 1937. A bill to amend the act known as the "Life Insurance Act" of the District of Columbia, approved June 19, 1934, and the act known as the "Fire and Casualty Act" of the District of Columbia, approved October 3, 1940; without amendment (Rept. No. 77). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. McMILLAN: Committee on the District of Columbia. H.R. 1982. A bill to amend section 10 of the District of Columbia Traffic Act, 1925, as amended, so as to require reports of collisions in which motor vehicles are involved; without amendment (Rept. No. 78). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. McMILLAN: Committee on the District of Columbia. H.R. 2485. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to make regulations to prevent and control the spread of communicable and preventable diseases," approved August 11, 1939, as amended; without amendment (Rept. No. 79). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, pursuant to the order of the House of March 6, 1963, the following resolutions and bills were reported on March 8, 1963:

Mr. TRIMBLE: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 287. Resolution providing for the consideration of H.R. 2438, a bill, to extend the induction provisions of the Universal Military Training and Service Act, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 80). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. COLMER: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 288. Resolution providing for the consideration of H.R. 2440, a bill, to authorize appropriations during fiscal year 1964 for procurement, research, development, test, and evaluation of aircraft, missiles, and naval vessels for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 81). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. McMILLAN: Committee on the District of Columbia. H.R. 39. A bill to amend the act of June 4, 1948, as it relates to the appointment of the District of Columbia Armory Board; with amendment (Rept. No. 82). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. McMILLAN: Committee on the District of Columbia. H.R. 3537. A bill to increase the jurisdiction of the Municipal Court for the District of Columbia in civil actions, to change the names of the court, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 83). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

[Submitted March 11, 1963]

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. ROGERS of Texas: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H.R. 131. A bill to provide for the renewal of certain municipal, domestic, and industrial water supply contracts entered into under the Reclamation Project Act of 1939, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 84). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. PATMAN: Committee on Banking and Currency. H.R. 3872. A bill to increase the lending authority of the Export-Import Bank of Washington, to extend the period within which the Export-Import Bank of Washington may exercise its functions, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 86). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar as follows:

Mr. JONES of Missouri: Committee on House Administration. House Joint Resolution 234. Joint resolution to provide for the reappointment of John Nicholas Brown as Citizen Regent of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution; without amendment (Rept. No. 85). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina:

H.R. 4696. A bill to amend title 37, United States Code, to increase the rates of basic pay for members of the uniformed services, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. ASPINALL (by request):

H.R. 4697. A bill to amend section 2455 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (43 U.S.C. 1171), and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. DORN:

H.R. 4698. A bill to provide for the establishment of the Old Ninety-six Star Fort National Monument in the State of South Carolina; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. DULSKI:

H.R. 4699. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to increase from $1,200 to $2,400 the amount of outside earnings permitted each year without deductions from benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HARRIS:

H.R. 4700. A bill to exempt certain carriers from minimum rate regulation in the transportation of bulk commodities, agricultural and fishery products, and passengers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 4701. A bill to provide for strengthening and improving the national transportation system and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 4702. A bill to establish a uniform system of time standards and time measurement for the United States and to require the observance of such time standards for all purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. JARMAN:

H.R. 4703. A bill to amend the Federal Trade Commission Act, to promote quality and price stabilization, to define and restrain certain unfair methods of distribution and to confirm, define, and equalize the rights of producers and resellers in the distribution of goods identified by distinguishing brands, names, or trademarks, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. LIBONATI:

H.R. 4704. A bill to establish a basic workweek of 35 hours for Government employees, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. McDOWELL:

H.R. 4705. A bill to amend the provisions of law relating to the disposition of surplus real property for park and recreational area, historic monument, and fish and wildlife conservation purposes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. MILLER of California:

H.R. 4706. A bill to amend the act redefining the units and establishing the standards of electrical and photometric measurements to provide that the candela shall be the unit of luminous intensity; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

H.R. 4707. A bill to designate the Veterans' Administration hospital at Martinez, Calif., as the Charles C. McGonegal Memorial Hospital; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. PEPPER:

H.R. 4708. A bill to amend section 18 of the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to provide free transportation on any railroad carrier subject to that act for individuals receiving pensions or annuities under that act, and for their dependents, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. QUIE:

H.R. 4709. A bill to provide assistance to certain States bordering the Mississippi River in the construction of the Great River Road; to the Committee on Public Works:

By Mr. ROUDEBUSH:

H.R. 4710. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide that service of a veteran in any campaign or expedition involving armed conflict shall be considered wartime service for the purposes of all laws granting benefits to veterans and their dependents; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. SHRIVER:

H.R. 4711. A bill to amend section 312 of title 38, United States Code, to provide that Parkinson's disease developing a 10-percent degree of disability after separation from the service shall be considered to be service connected; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. ASPINALL:

H.R. 4712. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to set aside certain land within the National Capital Parks System in Washington, D.C., for construction of a building by the Bureau of Water Resources of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia:

H.R. 4713. A bill to amend section 103, title 31, of the District of Columbia Code of 1961, as amended; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H.R. 4714. A bill to amend section 207, title 31, of the District of Columbia Code of 1961, as amended; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. CELLER:

H.R. 4715. A bill to incorporate the Eleanor Roosevelt Memorial Foundation, Inc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DENTON:

H.R. 4716. A bill to provide for the striking of medals in commemoration of the 150th anniversary of the statehood of the State of Indiana; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 4717. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp in commemoration of the 150th anniversary of the admission of the State of Indiana to the United States to be celebrated in 1966; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 4718. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to increase the amount of outside income which a blind individual may earn without suffering deductions from his or her benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 4719. A bill to amend titles X and XVI of the Social Security Act to prohibit any State from imposing a lien on a blind individual's property as a condition of aid or assistance thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DEROUNIAN:

H.R. 4720. A bill to amend subsection (b) of section 512 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (dealing with unrelated business taxable income); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DORN:

H.R. 4721. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide, for individuals who have spent substantially all of their working lives in one trade or industry, a more realistic definition of "disability" for purposes of entitlement to disability insurance benefits and the disability freeze; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DOWNING:

H.R. 4722. A bill to provide for the appointment of one additional district judge for the eastern district of Virginia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FINO:

H.R. 4723. A bill to provide coverage under the old-age, survivors, and disability insurance system (subject to an election in the case of those currently serving) for all officers and employees of the United States and its instrumentalities; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 4724. A bill to amend the Social Security and the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that a fully insured individual may elect to have any employment or self-employment performed by him after attaining age 65 excluded (for both tax and benefit purposes) from coverage under the old-age, survivors, and disability insurance system; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 4725. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to grant an additional income tax exemption for a taxpayer supporting a dependent who has attained age 65 or is blind; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GILBERT:

H.R. 4726. A bill to provide under the social security program for payment for hospital and related services to aged beneficiaries; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GRABOWSKI:

H.R. 4727. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide an additional income tax exemption for a taxpayer or dependent taking advanced training in a Reserve Officers' Training Corps; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HARVEY of Indiana:

H.R. 4728. A bill to provide for the striking of medals in commemoration of the 150th anniversary of the statehood of the State of Indiana; to the Committee on Bank ing and Currency.

H.R. 4729. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp in commemoration of the 150th anniversary of the admission of the State of Indiana to the United States to be celebrated in 1966; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. HUDDLESTON:

H.R. 4730. A bill establishing a presumption of death where an individual is shown to have been near the site of a nuclear explosion in time of war and no evidence of his existence has been found or received for at least 1 year after such explosion; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MACDONALD:

H.R. 4731. A bill to amend section 402(d) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MACDONALD (by request):

H.R. 4732. A bill to change the name of the U.S. Olympic Association to the U.S. Olympic Committee; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NEDZI:

H.R. 4733. A bill to provide under the social security program for payment for hospital and related services to aged beneficiaries; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. O'HARA of Illinois:

H.R. 4734. A bill to provide for the establishment of the Indiana Dunes National Lakeshore, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. PATMAN:

H.R. 4735. A bill to permit Federal employees to purchase shares of Federal or State chartered credit unions through voluntary payroll allotment; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. PIKE:

H.R. 4736. A bill to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, to provide for marketing quotas on Irish potatoes through establishment of acreage allotments; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina:

H.R. 4737. A bill to amend chapter 5 of title 37, United States Code, to provide special career incentive payments for enlisted members of the uniformed services; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 4738. A bill to amend chapter 7 of title 37, United States Code, providing for quarters allowances when husband and wife are members of the uniformed services; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 4739. A bill to amend section 406 of title 37, United States Code, with regard to the advance movement of dependents and baggage and household effects of members of the uniformed services; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. ROUSH:

H.R. 4740. A bill to provide for the striking of medals in commemoration of the 150th anniversary of the statehood of the State of Indiana; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 4741. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp in commemoration of the 150th anniversary of the admission of the State of Indiana to the United States to be celebrated in 1966; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 4742. A bill appropriating the sum of $4,647,467.67 to satisfy the final decree of the Indian Claims Commission against the United States in favor of the Miami Tribe; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. SIKES:

H.R. 4743. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to set aside certain land within the National Capital Parks System in Washington, D.C., for construction of a building by the Bureau of Water Resources of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. STAGGERS:

H.R. 4744. A bill to repeal section 13a of the Interstate Commerce Act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. STRATTON:

H.R. 4745. A bill to establish on a 1-year emergency basis a program of incentive payments to dairy farmers who voluntarily reduce their milk production below their 1962 production levels; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. WALTER:

H.R. 4746. A bill to amend chapter 223 of title 18, United States Code, to provide for the admission of certain evidence, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. GREEN of Oregon:

H.R. 4747. A bill to revise the Federal election laws, to prevent corrupt practices in Federal elections, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

H.R. 4748. A bill to amend chapter 2 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to extend the period within which certain ministers, members of religious orders, and Christian Science practitioners may elect coverage under the old age, survivors, and disability insurance system; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 4749. A bill to establish legislative standards for the guidance of Members of Congress and to promote public confidence in the integrity of Congress thereby; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. HALPERN:

H.R. 4750. A bill to improve, strengthen, and accelerate programs for the prevention and abatement of air pollution; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ANDERSON:

H.J. Res. 314. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GOODLING:

H.J. Res. 315. Joint resolution establishing a commission to participate in the 100th anniversary of the Battle of Gettysburg and the 100th anniversary of Lincoln's Gettysburg Address; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KING of New York:

H.J. Res. 316. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States pertaining to the offering of prayers in public schools and other public places in the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LONG of Maryland:

H.J. Res. 317. Joint resolution to establish a Joint Committee on Foreign Information and Intelligence; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. PEPPER:

H.J. Res. 318. Joint resolution to provide for the establishment of a Commission on Cuban Refugees; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. QUIE:

H.J. Res. 319. Joint resolution designating the 6-day period beginning April 15, 1963, as "National Harmony Week," and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCHADEBERG:

H.J. Res. 320. Joint resolution designating the 6-day period beginning April 15, 1963, as "National Harmony Week," and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WALTER:

H.J. Res. 321. Joint resolution establishing a commission to participate in the 100th anniversary of the Battle of Gettysburg and the 100th anniversary of Lincoln's Gettysburg Address; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RYAN of New York:

H. Con. Res. 110. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing as a House document of a Spanish edition of "Infant Care"; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. WALTER:

H. Con. Res. 111. Concurrent resolution providing for the annual observance of the Liberty Bell anniversary; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PEPPER:

H. Res. 289. Resolution creating a nonlegislative select committee to conduct an investigation and study of the aged and aging; to the Committee on Rules.

H. Res. 290. Resolution calling upon the Organization of American States and the United Nations to join the United States in demanding the Soviet Union to remove its armed forces from Cuba; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By Mr. BERRY: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of South Dakota, relative to the so-called right-to-work laws of the respective States of this Union; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of South Dakota, to provide financial relief either through amending Public Law 81–874 or direct grants to the Fort Pierre Independent School District, Stanley County, S. Dak.; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of South Dakota, to allow singing at Mount Rushmore by nonprofessional student workers and to remove the restrictions imposed in 1962 which caused this to cease; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of South Dakota, urging the construction of the Crazy Horse Memorial near Custer, S. Dak.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HARRISON: Memorial of the House of Representatives, 37th State Legislature of the State of Wyoming, a joint memorial, memorializing the Congress of the United States of America with reference to limiting and reducing the threat of communism in the Western Hemisphere; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. LIBONATI: Memorial of the 73d General Assembly of the State of Illinois, Senate Joint Resolution 4, proposing an amendment to the Constitution; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REIFEL: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of South Dakota, memorializing the Congress of the United States to amend the Federal statutes in order to provide for payments in lieu of property taxes imposed on land prior to acquisition by the Federal Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife and Wildlife Agency; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of South Dakota, requesting the Congress of the United States of America to propose an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to provide for the appointment of electors of the President and Vice President on a basis similar to the election of the Congress of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of South Dakota, memorializing Congress to take all necessary steps in promoting the sale of grain and to guarantee continuing access of U.S. wheat to the Common Market countries; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Alaska, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to the promotion of State commercial fishery research and development projects; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Hawaii, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to ratifying a proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the qualification of electors; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Idaho, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to give early consideration to the continued investigation and construction of the Mountain Home division, Snake River project, Guffey plan of development; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Idaho, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to call a convention for the purpose of proposing an amendment for a national debt limit of $350 billion; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Illinois, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to call a convention for the purpose of proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Minnesota, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to ratifying a proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States to outlaw the poll tax; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of South Dakota, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to amend the Federal statutes in order to provide for payments in lieu of property taxes imposed on land prior to acquisition by the Federal Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife and Wildlife Agency; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of West Virginia, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States, relative to making Sir Winston Churchill an honorary citizen of the State of West Virginia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BOGGS:

H.R. 4751. A bill for the relief of Dr. Louis van den Berghe; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BRADEMAS:

H.R. 4752. A bill for the relief of Reni Vardalos Skoufis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4753. A bill for the relief of Theodora Vlahakis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia:

H.R. 4754. A bill for the relief of Mehmet Ozguler; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4755. A bill for the relief of Azizeh Abdallah Ayoub; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BRUCE:

H.R. 4756. A bill for the relief of Jesse J. Locke; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CAREY:

H.R. 4757. A bill for the relief of Giuseppe Basile; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DENTON:

H.R. 4758. A bill for the relief of George A. Grabert; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOWNING:

H.R. 4759. A bill for the relief of W. V. Grimes, James A. Powell, and Frank Groves; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOYLE:

H.R. 4760. A bill for the relief of Elizabeth Mary Martin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FASCELL:

H.R. 4761. A bill for the relief of Dr. Olga Marie Ferrer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FINO:

H.R. 4762. A bill for the relief of Loreto and Giuseppina Puccia and their two minor children, Carmelo and Lucia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4763. A bill for the relief of Louisa Victoria Arledge; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. GRIFFITHS:

H.R. 4764. A bill for the relief of Gabriela C. Arnold; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JONES of Alabama:

H.R. 4765. A bill to authorize and direct the Administrator of the Farmers Home Administration to quitclaim certain property in Jackson County, Ala., to Skyline Churches Cemetery, a corporation; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. KORNEGAY:

H.R. 4766. A bill for the relief of the Boren Clay Products Co.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McDOWELL:

H.R. 4767. A bill for the relief of Hee-Sa Kim; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MONAGAN:

H.R. 4768. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Gertrude Reskin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MURPHY of Illinois:

H.R. 4769. A bill for the relief of Maria Loncaric; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROYBAL:

H.R. 4770. A bill for the relief of Efstahia Giannos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RYAN of New York:

H.R. 4771. A bill for the relief of Yonah Maabari; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Texas:

H.R. 4772. A bill for the relief of Dr. Tao Ping Li; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILLIS:

H.R. 4773. A bill for the relief of referee in bankruptcy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

63. By Mr. HANNA: Petition of the (1) Committee for the Monroe Doctrine and (2) Liesure World Democratic Club; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

64. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Henry Stoner, Avon Park, Fla., relative to employers making income tax deductions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Secretary Dillon Emphasizes Small Business Provisions of President's Tax Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 11, 1963

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the House Small Business Committee, I am deeply interested in the effect of the President's tax proposals on the small business segment of our economy. Tax reductions and revisions which are of benefit to small business are long overdue.

The Treasury Department has submitted to me as chairman of the House Small Business Committee a memorandum which summarizes the principal points in the President's tax program, which affect small business. It appears that the benefits to small business under the proposed program will be extensive.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that Secretary Dillon's letter and the Treasury Department's memorandum be reprinted in the RECORD.

The letter and memorandum follow:

THE SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY,
Washington, March 11, 1963.

Hon. JOE L. EVINS,
Chairman, House Select Committee on Small Business, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I am enclosing pursuant to your request a memorandum which summarizes the principal points in the President's tax program which affect small business. Since small business plays a part in virtually every segment of the economy, all the proposals in the President's program may have some direct or indirect effect, but I believe the memorandum covers the major provisions and provides a good starting point for those interested in the impact of the program on small business.

I understand that John E. Horne, Administrator, Small Business Administration, will shortly submit a more detailed analysis of the proposal as it affects small business to the Committee on Ways and Means. This statement, when it is released, may also be of use to you and the committee.

Sincerely yours,

DOUGLAS DILLON.

The 4½ million small business enterprises in the United States are very important to the economy. They account for about 95 percent of all business organizations, employ about 30 million people, and are responsible for about 40 percent of total business volume.

President Kennedy's proposed tax program would benefit small business directly in a number of ways. The most important one is lower taxes. Under the program small business enterprises, whether they are corporations, partnerships or sole proprietorships, will enjoy substantial rate reduction.

Corporate income tax rates for companies with a net income of $25,000 or less will be reduced this year from 30 to 22 percent. In 1963, corporations with taxable incomes of $25,000 or less will get reductions of about 27 percent, compared with reductions of about 10 percent at $50,000 and 4 percent at $100,000.

The overall reduction in corporation tax rates will be proportionately larger for small companies. Reductions in the surtax paid by large corporations will go into effect in 1964 and 1965. But even when all three steps of the corporate tax cut are in effect, the tax reduction for small companies would be greatest. The reduction for companies with profits of $25,000 or less would amount to about 27 percent; for those earning $100,000 to $1 million, it would amount to about 11 percent; and for those earning more than $1 million annually, it would be about 10 percent. For the 467,500 corporations with incomes of $25,000 or less, the annual tax saving would total about $233 million.

Small business will also benefit directly from the individual income tax rate cuts, which will average considerably more than 20 percent. The reductions will be made over a 3-year period and will scale down the present range of 20 to 91 percent to a range of 14 to 65 percent. These rate cuts will help particularly the millions of individual proprietors and partners whose main, and sometimes only, source of income is from a business.

The tax program will also benefit small business indirectly in a number of ways. The reductions in individual tax rates will release a large volume of additional consumer purchasing power. More than 90 percent of the tax reduction will quickly find its way into consumer buying, boosting retail sales and, then, in turn, wholesalers' and manufacturers' sales. The resulting improvement in the business climate and confidence should be an important factor in sustaining an expanding economy.

The corporate and individual tax cuts would result in higher after-tax profits and retained earnings. The tax program will thus help remove one of the most persistent deterrents to the growth of small business—a lack of adequate capital. Because of their inability to obtain conventional long-term financing for expansion and modernization, small businesses are forced to rely on clostly short-term credit, which they must continually refinance, to supplement their limited internally generated funds. Tax reduction would increase the volume of earnings which can be plowed back into small businesses to sustain their healthy growth. Tax cuts would also attract new investment to small businesses, since the profitability of such enterprises would increase. At the same time, increased profit prospects would improve their borrowing power.

Inequities which now discriminate against small business will be removed by the tax program. For example, a small business may be competing with a wholly-owned subsidiary of a large corporation; the subsidiary is a legal entity, hence able to take advantage of the benefits of the $25,000 surtax exemption. A company with a number of such wholly owned subsidiaries can reduce substantially its effective tax rate compared with enterprises that have equal income but are organized as a single corporate entity. Chains of multicorporate units are in effect paying small business tax rates, yet benefiting from economies inherent in large businesses. The new law would allow only one surtax exemption to multicorporate enterprises, and thus improve the competitive position of small enterprises.

OTHER TAX PROPOSALS THAT INFLUENCE SMALL BUSINESS INCLUDE

Income averaging: If a taxpayer's individual income in a given year should rise materially compared with previous years, he may find himself in a higher tax bracket. Under the administration's proposal, a taxpayer in this situation could average his current income with that of the past 4 years and if the current income amounts to more than 133 percent of the average, he would be allowed in effect to treat the excess over 133 percent as though it were earned over a 5-year period. Thus he would be taxed at a considerably reduced rate. Incomes of small unincorporated businesses, farmers, ranchers, writers, and artists vary widely from year to year; they would benefit especially from the averaging provision.

Cost of research and development machinery and equipment to be treated as current expense deduction: Present law requires capitalization of such assets, although other business expenses for R. & D. may now be deducted as incurred. The proposed law would allow a company to treat as a current expense deduction all expenditures for machinery and equipment used directly in research and development.

Special provisions are included in the proposal to meet the needs of some small businesses with moderate R. & D. budgets that would not otherwise qualify for the current expense treatment. For larger enterprises claiming the R. & D. deduction, equipment used only part time for research and development purposes, or used in the performance of a Federal contract, would not qualify. Under the special provisions for small business, any expenditures for equipment used directly for research and development could be expensed in an amount up to 4 percent of $500,000 of total expenditures for research and development. For purposes of the special small business provision, equipment used only part time but at least 50 percent of the time for research and development would qualify to the extent of 50 percent of its cost. Moreover, research and development equipment not used exclusively in the performance of a Federal contract would qualify. The maximum deduction under this small business provision would be limited to $20,000 annually.

The proposed changes in the tax treatment of capital gains will also directly and indirectly aid small firms. The capital gains changes include:

Rate reduction: Under the program, 30 percent of long-term capital gains of individuals, instead of the present 50 percent, is includible in taxable income. Combined with the individual tax reductions this means that capital gains would be taxed at an effective rate of 4.2 percent, instead of the present 10 percent, in the lowest bracket and progress to a maximum of 19.5 percent, instead of the present 25 percent. In addition, the corporate rate on capital gains would be reduced from 25 to 22 percent.

These reductions should increase investment in small companies as investments which are now retained solely for tax reasons become "unlocked" and as the overall tax program increases the prospects for profitable investment in small business.

Extension of the holding period: The holding period for long-term capital gains would be increased from the present 6 months to 1 year. Small business investments typically require several years to mature. This change would limit long-term capital gains to bona fide investors, rather than short-term speculators and would encourage investors to devote more funds to investment in small firms.

Taxation of capital gains at time of death or gift: Under the program, net gains on capital assets would be taxed at the time of transfer at death or by gift. This change would increase the mobility of capital by reducing the tax inducement to hold assets until death.

Since the principal estate asset of a small businessman is often his business, special provisions have been included to insure that estates will not be forced to liquidate a small business to pay a capital gains tax. The first $15,000 of gain would be excluded from tax as would the gain on any property transferred to a surviving spouse, up to a maximum of one-half the gain in the estate. These exclusions are expected completely to eliminate payment of capital gains tax upon death for all but 3 percent of those who die each year. For those who would become subject to some tax, a 5-year averaging provision would reduce the effective rate of tax on the gain and the tax could be paid in installments over a period of 10 years. Redemption of stock in the company to pay the capital gains tax would be allowed without additional tax.

Unlimited capital loss carryover: The present 5-year limitation on carryover of capital losses against capital gains and up to $1,000 of ordinary income would be eliminated. The change would especially help the small investor who may not have the portfolio diversity that would make it feasible to match capital gains and losses in only 5 years. The extension of time would mean greater opportunities to offset losses, with a tax saving, for those who make substantial investments in small business, and thus increase the supply of risk capital for such enterprises. Moreover, the unlimited capital loss carryover should encourage risk investment generally, which would benefit small business.

Just as small business stands to gain in a special way from tax reforms which encourage economic growth, it stands to lose more heavily from inaction on the tax front, which would increase the chances of an early recession or continued slack in the economy. Small business lacks the resources available to larger companies to withstand an economic downturn. Therefore, the mortality rate among small firms in a recession would be heavy. The President's 1963 tax program will make a major contribution toward providing an environment that will foster the vigorous growth of the small business sector as part of a strong and expanding economy.

Fair Housing for All

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JEFFERY COHELAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 11, 1963

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, on this centennial year of the Emancipation Proclamation, the city of Berkeley, in the Seventh California District which I have the privilege to represent, is facing a significant test of whether "all men are created equal," of whether "they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights."

These are, of course, promises of our Declaration of Independence; they are promises which are guaranteed by the Constitution of the United States. But Berkeley, like too many cities throughout our country, is confronted with the fact that our practices do not always match our precepts, that our deeds are not always as good as our words.

On April 2, the residents of Berkeley will vote on an ordinance recommended by a distinguished and representative 18-member citizens committee, and adopted by the city council, to establish a fair housing ordinance—to establish an ordinance prohibiting discrimination in the sale, rental, or lease of housing because of race, color, religion, national origin, or ancestry.

This ordinance is sound because it is designed to correct a demonstrated inequity. As the citizens committee stated in its report:

> Accumulated evidence shows that discrimination in housing within the city is widespread and general, in both rental and sale of housing.

This ordinance is sound because it stresses the moderate approach of education, conferences, conciliation, and persuasion, with only final resort to public hearings and court action.

This ordinance is sound because it does not mean that an individual must sell or rent to a minority group member because he is a member of that group. It means rather, that housing cannot be withheld only because the applicant is a member of a minority group.

Finally, this ordinance is workable on the actual experience of 10 States and 3 cities which have similar laws.

Mr. Speaker, discrimination is economically wasteful. It is dangerous to our position in the world community. It is contrary to the standards upon which this country has risen to greatness. Above all, it is morally wrong.

As President Kennedy stated it so clearly in his civil rights message last month:

> Let it be clear, in our own hearts and minds, that it is not merely because of the cold war, and not merely because of the economic waste of discrimination, that we are committed to achieving true equality of opportunity. The basic reason is because it is right.

Mr. Speaker, the citizens of Berkeley have an opportunity with this fair housing ordinance to make a major attack on the dread disease of discrimination. They have an opportunity to further insure the basic civil rights promised and guaranteed by the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution. They have an opportunity to practice one of the fundamental precepts of America—the equal worth of every human being regardless of his race or color.

As an advocate of home rule, as a resident of Berkeley—one of our pioneering American cities in the field of good government—and as an American citizen, I am supporting this fair housing ordinance as an important step toward true equality of opportunity.

I urge my fellow Berkeleyans to continue their great tradition of leadership in the field of social justice and approve overwhelmingly the fair housing ordinance.

Activities of the Department of State

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HJALMAR C. NYGAARD

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 11, 1963

Mr. NYGAARD. Mr. Speaker, at another point in the RECORD today, Congressman DON L. SHORT is including in his remarks, House Joint Resolution Q–1, passed by both houses of the North Dakota State Legislature without a dissenting vote.

The resolution requests Congress to investigate and study the policymaking procedures, methods of assessing foreign developments, and personnel practices of the Department of State. In other words it calls for an investigation of the activities of the State Department as it relates to our foreign policies as they in turn affect our internal welfare.

This opinion is shared by many people in and out of the Congress, and it is hoped, therefore, that for the good of this Nation and the good of the State Department the problems can be reviewed and aired in order that there may be a complete understanding among the State Department, the Members of Congress, and the citizens of this country.

Washington Post Article Recalls Adaptation of Kipling's "On the Road to Mandalay" by Senator Ernest Gruening, of Alaska

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 11, 1963

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, in the Washington Post of March 8, there was an article "United States and Burma Reach Accord on Working Road to Mandalay." Apparently this project, about which there was considerable discussion several years ago, is being reactivated.

During a hearing in May 1960, on Alaska highways before the Subcommittee on Highways of the Senate Committee on Public Works, a witness from Alaska was telling of the difficulty in getting Federal cooperation in a highway program for Alaska. The consultant the Alaskans wished to employ was being sent to Asia to cooperate in the building by the International Cooperation Administration of a road from Rangoon to Mandalay, a matter of 450 miles.

At that point Senator GRUENING said:

> I have been so touched by this foreign aid project for a road to Mandalay paid for by American dollars which recalls "On the Road to Mandalay" by Rudyard Kipling, which has been famed in verse and song, that I was tempted to bring it up to date, and if it would not be undue levity, I would like to read it at this point.

I asked Senator GRUENING "Have you composed a parody?" to which he replied "I have an adaptation." Senator COOPER of Kentucky said he would be glad to listen. Senator LONG of Hawaii suggested that the adaptation should be sung and not merely recited. But as an accompanist was not present the Senator from Alaska read the poem, which, I feel, deserves to be immortalized in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Possibly the poem should be brought up to date. Since the Administration for International Development has replaced the International Cooperation Administration, perhaps Senator GRUENING's second verse, written 2 years ago, should read "Where the AID'ers play" rather than "Where the ICA'ers play." In any event, American dollars are now being used to build this highway. I ask unanimous consent that the article from the Washington Post of March 8, 1963, be inserted in the RECORD, followed by Senator GRUENING's adaptation of Kipling's verses.

There being no objection, the article and poem were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, Mar. 8, 1963]

UNITED STATES AND BURMA REACH ACCORD ON WORKING ROAD TO MANDALAY

The United States and Burma yesterday announced agreement on rebuilding a part of the road to Mandalay.

Engineering studies are to begin immediately on a 42-mile stretch from north of Pegu, it is hoped that construction will start with the Burma dry season which begins in December.

Funds for the road, once the cost is determined, will come from some $28 million the United States set aside to assist the road to Mandalay as long ago as the spring of 1959.

For the past year, agreement on a go-ahead has been held up by General Ne Win's government because of differing views on which route the road should take north of Pegu and on to Pyu.

Ne Win has wanted to follow the foothills along the Sittang River valley to avoid flood dangers. The United States suspects this route would be far more costly than a route along the valley floor and bypass all the population centers along the old Road to Mandalay.

Under the agreement reached yesterday, Burma and the United States decided to confine their attention to the Rangoon-Pegu stretch and face up to their Pegu-Pyu differences at a later date. Agency for International Development officials want the Pegu-Pyu stretch to follow whichever route is found to be most economical and technically feasible.

MANDALAY—1960 (WITH APOLOGIES TO RUDYARD KIPLING)

By the old Mulmein Pagoda, lookin' eastward to the sea,
There's a Burma project settin', and I doubt it works for me.
But the White House says we've got to, and the foreign echoes say
Come you back, you Yankee dollar, come you back to Mandalay.

On the road to Mandalay,
Where the ICA'ers play,
Can't you hear their 'dozers chunkin' from Rangoon to Mandalay?
On the road to Mandalay
Just another giveaway
And the dough comes up like thunder from the good old U.S.A.

Detection and Inspection or Deception and Destruction?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 11, 1963

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, this is what the Eisenhower test ban position was in 1958 when the Geneva test ban negotiations began, any treaty would include only a ban on the kinds of testing which would be subject to detection, identification, location, and verification.

It was recognized that underground testing which produced seismic shock signals of less intensity than 4.75 on the Richter seismic scale could not be detected reliably, let alone identified as possible cheating, located and then verified by on-site inspection.

Therefore, only events of greater magnitude were to be prohibited by the treaty.

This was in accordance with President Eisenhower's declaration:

> We can have no confidence in any treaty to which the Communists are a party unless that treaty contains within itself self-enforcing mechanisms.

Notwithstanding the above, this is what the Kennedy test ban position was on August 27, 1962, when at the Geneva Conference table—the administration proposed signing a treaty that would ban all underground tests, whether or not cheating could be detected and policed in the low-yield ranges.

This is what the AEC's Director of Military Applications, Maj. Gen. A. W. Betts, U.S. Army, told the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy on March 7, 1963, could be developed by cheat testing in the low-yield ranges below which neither individual tests nor a whole series of them could even be detected by any seismic detection system, let alone identified or located:

First. Relatively low-yield weapons of the tactical type.

Second. Higher yield tactical weapons up to a much larger yield—by extrapolation—"almost any tactical weapon one has in mind"—with such confidence that proof testing of the weapon would not be required.

Third. Much higher yield battlefield tactical weapons by extrapolation from events as small as 1 kiloton with such confidence as not to require proof testing before safely placing the new weapons in stockpile.

Fourth. At least one-half of all tactical weapons of all yields and types of interest to the military, also with such confidence as not to require proof testing before stockpiling.

Fifth. A substantial fraction of all large-yield strategic weapons of interest, by the simple expedient of testing in underground cavities which muffle explosions down to seismic effects below the 3 kiloton threshhold of detectability by "decoupling" their shock from the surrounding earth.

Although not discussed by Betts at the hearings, U.S. Ambassador Arthur Dean at the Geneva talks has affirmed that development of the pure-fusion, neutron bomb can be carried out below the threshold of detectability. The military significance of this new weapon has been described as "equal to or greater than" development of the H-bomb. Naturally, the remaining one-half of all tactical weapons of interest which could not be tested without decoupling could be tested using the technique.

What the Kennedy administration proposes to do, even in the new draft treaty presently under preparation by the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency for offer to the U.S.S.R. within a few weeks, is wholly to forgo U.S. testing and advances in all such weapons categories and simply to trust the Soviets to keep their word not to test them and develop them clandestinely underground.

This is what President Kennedy said about such unpoliced test ban situations on March 2, 1962, just a few days more than a year ago:

> A nation which is refraining from tests obviously cannot match the gains of a nation conducting tests.
>
> The basic lesson of some 353 negotiating sessions at Geneva is this—that the Soviets will not agree to an effective ban on nuclear tests as long as a new series of offers and prolonged negotiations, or a new uninspected moratorium, or a new agreement without controls would enable them once again to prevent the West from testing while they prepare in secret.
>
> If all testing can be halted—then the nuclear arms race would be slowed down at last. But this must be a fully effective treaty. We know enough now about broken negotiations, secret preparations and the advantages gained from a long test series never to offer again an uninspected moratorium.

This is what President Kennedy said on March 6, 1963, last Wednesday:

> We would not accept a test ban which did not give us every insurance that we could detect a series of tests underground. That is the administration's position. We would not submit a treaty which did not provide that assurance to the U.S. Senate.

So, what is the administration's position today?

Notwithstanding what Mr. Kennedy says his administration's position is, notwithstanding Mr. Kennedy's denunciation of uninspected moratoriums, that is exactly what the administration's position is today. It is not proposing a fully effective treaty. It is proposing one full of obvious cheating holes.

This inconsistency between actual position and described position is great cause for concern. It should be quickly resolved.

Americans have a right to an answer to the test ban question:

> Detection of Soviet cheating and inspection of Soviet soil or deception by Soviet duplicity and destruction by Soviet nuclear superiority?

ABCD Mail Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ROBERT A. EVERETT

OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 11, 1963

Mr. EVERETT. Mr. Speaker, on February 25, 1963, Postmaster General J. Edward Day inaugurated a new major postal service innovation—ABCD, standing for accelerated business collections and delivery—in the Washington metropolitan area.

This new service will provide 4-hour delivery of local first-class mail in the downtown business area from Monday through Friday. By the end of this calendar year, 273 cities in this country will have the advantages of accelerated business collections and delivery service, a step forward in mail service comparable in importance to the start of free city delivery a century ago.

In launching the accelerated business collections and delivery service here in Washington, Postmaster General Day paid richly deserved credit to the architect of this innovation in mail service, Assistant Postmaster General Frederick C. Belen, by presenting him with the Post Office Department's first annual Benjamin Franklin Award.

As head of the vitally important Bureau of Operations of the Post Office Department for the past 2 years, Mr. Belen is publicly credited with an impressive record of accomplishments that have resulted in numerous major improvements of national significance in the Post Office Department. His imaginative and dynamic approach to problems that have long beset the Postal Establishment has brought about improved efficiency, lower cost, and, most important, better service. He has played a major role in developing a number of progressive programs, similar to accelerated business collections and delivery designed to maintain our postal service as the most modern and efficient in the world.

I am sure my colleagues will be interested in the tribute paid to Mr. Belen by Postmaster General Day, which follows:

EXCERPT FROM THE ADDRESS BY J. EDWARD DAY, POSTMASTER GENERAL

> Introduction of the accelerated business collections and delivery program here in the Washington area provides an ideal occasion for special recognition of the architect of this very successful program of 4-hour business mail service.
>
> It is my genuine pleasure to honor Assistant Postmaster General Frederick C. Belen as the first Post Office Department official to receive the Department's esteemed Benjamin Franklin Award.
>
> The Benjamin Franklin Award is a new top honor award of the Department reserved for officials in noncareer positions whose outstanding leadership and accomplishments have resulted in major improvements of national significance in the work of the postal service.
>
> I am rather unusual among Postmasters General, because I have never been national chairman of my party or even particularly active in politics at all. In fact, when President Kennedy announced my appointment—as the first Cabinet member ever from Southern California—he emphasized that it was not because of my very incidental past political activity but because of my management experience, in State government and in business.
>
> I was associated for a number of years with one of the largest and finest law firms in the country. After that I was a senior officer for 8 years of a giant insurance company which is the third largest private corporation in the world.
>
> And yet I can state unequivocally that I have never been surrounded with such talent as I am right now that I am serving in the Federal Government. Every day I work with Federal executives who demonstrate superb imagination, energy, good judgment and practical idealism. With few exceptions I have found that the Federal executive sees himself in context with the great complicated world we live in, he has a lively interest in new ideas and in wider horizons—and he does not take himself too seriously.
>
> Fred Belen has all these qualities. He has been Assistant Postmaster General heading the Department's key Bureau of Operations since the beginning of President Kennedy's administration and for the past 8 months he has additionally carried, with distinction, many of the responsibilities of the Office of Deputy Postmaster General.
>
> Before assuming his present post in January 1961, Mr. Belen had been counsel and chief counsel of the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee for 14 years and was already widely acknowledged as one of the Nation's foremost authorities on postal administration.
>
> In developing and spearheading major programs of service improvement and economy, Mr. Belen has brought imaginative new approaches to the solution of longstanding problems of the postal service. Accelerated business collections and deliveries is but one example.
>
> He has shown outstanding leadership in enlisting the cooperation of the Nation's large volume business mailers, and has demonstrated that such cooperation benefit both the mailer and the Department.
>
> He has provided expert and energetic direction to the Post Office programs of cost reduction and management improvement, giving concrete expression to the President's goals of economy and manpower utilization. He has been a major contributor at the executive level to the Department's accomplishments in holding to a minimum manpower increases in the postal service, in the reduction of Christmas temporary employees from 295,000 in 1960 to approximately one-half that number in 1962, in the return of $37 million of our Department appropriation to the Treasury in fiscal 1962, and in the Department's capacity to absorb this year $40 million of the recent postal employee pay increase.
>
> Mr. Belen first inaugurated the accelerated business collection and delivery program on a pilot basis last August 14 in his home city of Lansing, Mich.
>
> In designating Frederick C. Belen as the first official to be honored with the Benjamin Franklin Award, I am proud to recognize Mr. Belen's exceptional contributions to the operation of the postal service. I now present to him this beautiful plaque of unusual three-dimensional design featuring an inset bust of the first Postmaster General, Benjamin Franklin, and a genuine specimen of the very first postage stamp issued by the U.S. Government—in 1847.
>
> The stamp carries Benjamin Franklin's portrait—and it is interesting to note that it is a 5-cent stamp.

Classroom Teachers Medals Awarded

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JAMES A. BURKE

OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 11, 1963

Mr. BURKE. Mr. Speaker, Freedoms Foundation at Valley Forge, Pa., has singularly honored Hyde Park High School, Boston, Mass., in awarding classroom teachers medals to two of the school's staff. Miss Marie E. A'Hearn was presented with the medal for her work during the school year 1961-62, and Dr. William J. Reid, head of the history department, received his award for 1960-61.

Miss A'Hearn teaches the principles of democracy course at Hyde Park High School. She conducts her classes on the theory that participation is the key to both knowledge and citizenship. Her classes learn about democracy in practice as well as in theory. When issues of a national scope are considered, the class invites its Congressman, Hon. JAMES A. BURKE, to speak to them. On State issues the representatives to the general court are asked to come and talk. On local issues, a member of the city council discusses city matters with them.

These sessions are not the usual high school assembly talks. These are working sessions. The class invites the speaker and suggests the topics to be discussed. The guest presents his talk and then is subjected to a barrage of questions. The result is some increase in knowledge, some enlightenment on the issues and, most important, increased respect by the students for our public office holders.

Arrangements for these visits are made by the students. They choose the moderator, secretary, photographer, class hostess, and all who have anything to do with the program. The students develop questions and topics and decide who should be invited.

No student passes a principles of democracy course unless he has actually worked in a political campaign. Some students who are most reluctant to participate in practical politics become some candidate's most enthusiastic workers. Concerned about the failure of more women to participate in politics, the class contacted various persons in public life, including all the ladies in the U.S. House of Representatives and the Senate, to find out why this was so. The class secretaries summarized and mimeographed the results. The pupils then discussed the issue on a Boston radio program. Under the strong guidance of Miss A'Hearn, Hyde Park students are learning that democratic government depends on effective participation.

Dr. Reid's contribution lies in a somewhat different area. The Boston public schools began teaching about the menace of communism, as well as fascism and nazism, in 1939. In 1941, the Boston schools published one of the first documents about the isms used in any school system. After the war the program was expanded.

Concerned about the fact that too many youngsters leave high school before graduation and may become easy prey to the glib teachings of others, the Boston schools, in 1954, began development of a program to increase patriotism and knowledge of our democratic republican government in grade nine. This program was instituted on an experimental basis. A committee under Dr. Reid's leadership, developed material that would help pupils to understand our government on the local, State, and national levels. It also produced a curriculum guide for the ninth grade, that would make our American boys and girls aware of the menace of communism. As the preliminary projects proved successful, the program was extended to include every ninth grade student in the Boston school system. In his position as coordinator of civic education for the Boston public schools, Dr. Reid is responsible for the effectiveness and growth of the program.

At special assemblies of the student body and the faculty, Mr. Charles J. Keelon, headmaster of Hyde Park High School, congratulated the recipients on the honor they had brought to the school by their contributions to furthering our American ideals. Assistant Superintendent of Schools Frank J. Herlihy, on behalf of the Freedoms Foundation, presented the Classroom Teachers Medal to Dr. Reid on Flag Day, 1961, and Deputy Superintendent William H. Ohrenberger awarded Miss A'Hearn her medal on October 10, 1962.

Washington Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRUCE ALGER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 11, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following newsletter of March 9, 1963.

WASHINGTON REPORT

(By Congressman Bruce Alger)

NEW FRONTIER PROGRAMS IGNORE TECHNOLOGY

President Kennedy completely ignores technology in the social and welfare programs he is trying to impose on the country and therefore fails to understand they cannot work. In a major speech on the floor of the House this week I pointed out that in the programs he has submitted to Congress, the President seems to be acting on impulse rather than on any sound technical basis. I focused attention on the welfare part of the New Frontier program, which, in spite of suggestions to the contrary, is being expanded at a faster rate than most other segments of the budget, including national defense. The justification for this expansion is political rather than logical or reasonable. The New Frontier is trying to capitalize on a formula developed by the New Deal—a formula that reads (1) Many persons are in need, (2) The Nation has resources with which to meet the need, (3) The Federal Government should use the resources to meet the need.

It is my contention that points 1 and 2 do not justify the conclusion implied by point 3. Technologically, no standards or criteria can be developed by which to administer Federal social welfare programs to produce the results which the administration promises when it proposes Federal financial involvement. The only reasonable way to measure the effectiveness of public services is to measure them only in terms of results achieved. In my speech I outlined where desired or promised results have fallen far short in such programs as urban renewal, area redevelopment, advancing civilian technology, and in studies in connection with Federal aid to education. In order to get some idea of the complexity of trying to impose Federal participation in the social and welfare fields, try to write a formula for Federal aid which will work and which will come within the framework of the Constitution.

EXPERT WITNESSES QUESTION PRESIDENT'S TAX PROPOSALS

Some of the best tax minds in the Nation appeared before the Ways and Means Committee this week. The development of their testimony clearly indicates the fallacies of President Kennedy's tax proposals. The first such witness was Roswell Magill who, 25 years ago, was Under Secretary of the Treasury in Franklin Roosevelt's Cabinet. Mr. Magill's statement substantiated my own challenge to the President's tax program. He said: "President Kennedy's tax program is contradictory to its announced objectives in four basic ways. First, the investment capital incentive is penalized because consumer purchasing power is overly stressed; second, the structural reforms defeat rate cuts; third, the timing is bad, there being no immediate stimulus as intended; fourth, the budget is further imbalanced through lack of expenditure control."

CONSTRUCTIVE RECOMMENDATIONS

Mr. Magill listed a constructive program, sensible as I see it. (1) Lower individual income tax to 50 percent for highest bracket and 16 percent in the lowest bracket; (2) Let Korean taxes expire—corporate tax drop from 52 percent to 47 percent; (3) Study structural reforms separately; (4) Lower Federal spending, balance the budget.

G. Keith Funston, president of the New York Stock Exchange, under my cross examination developed these constructive recommendations: (1) Eliminate double taxation; (2) Eliminate capital gains tax, and redefine capital gains; (3) Relate Federal spending to income—balance the budget. These recommendations are much more likely to prevent recession, of which the President warns, than the President's recommendations.

ECONOMICS PROFESSOR HITS PROGRAM

William H. Peterson, associate professor of economics, Graduate School of Business Administration of New York University, was more blunt: He said: "In this statement I seek to make but three points: First, to demonstrate the nonscientific and antieconomic growth deficiencies of rate progression in general. Second, to show how the President's tax proposals reflect these deficiencies and are hence self-defeating of their stated goal of economic growth. And thirdly, to give support to maximum correction at this time of the deficiencies of graduation." Professor Peterson pointed out again that the President's program is self-defeating. The steepness in individual income tax rate progression, especially when linked to the proposed 5 percent rule on itemized deductions affords virtually no tax relief to the middle and little to the upper brackets. The professor said he regards the middle and upper brackets as prime sources of America's capital formation and hence of economic growth. An amazing figure in this testimony showed that tax rate progression beyond 50 percent of taxable income yields the Treasury only about $1 billion (out of a $98 billion budget) or about enough to run the Government for 4 days. So the excessive rate is not designed to raise revenue, but to penalize and, in effect, stifles initiative or, in Professor Peterson's words, "Incentive is the thing. It accounts for enterprise and ingenuity. It is the secret of American prosperity."

REDISTRIBUTION OF INCOME HURTS OUR SYSTEM

The theory of the social planners around President Kennedy upon whose judgement his tax proposals are based, would have us believe our free economy can best be developed by a redistributon of income (the theory of equalization). But redistribution assumes a standard of distributive justice different from the standards of our market economy. "It assumes," Peterson said, "that the market knows least and Government knows best." He then reminds us, "This democratic market system, this incentive system, is precisely the means by which we have become the richest and freest people in all the world."

The only way we can insure the health of the economy is to insure the rate of capital formation—that is, in the rate of investment. This is the theory of the Alger-Baker-Herlong bill. A number of witnesses, including Professor Peterson, believe this bill is the only fiscally feasible and responsible alternative to our present income tax structure. It stresses investment, whereas the Administration stresses current consumption. In sharp contrast to the Administration's program, it would reform the present steep schedule of rate graduation while, over a longer period of time, provide substantially as much tax relief as the Administration at the lower income tax levels. Capital formation is clearly the road to growth. There is no other way. Without capital, there will be no goods for consumers to purchase.

OVERCAPACITY RESULT OF INEFFICIENCY

The administration planners stress the overcapacity of American industry. Professor Peterson points out the administration's stress on overcapacity misses the point. The real point is not simply overcapacity, but the nature and causes of excess capacity. A careful study of all the factors shows that basically, overcapacity is a matter of inefficiency. The principal criticism of the President's proposals, brought out by many witnesses in their direct testimony and in my discussion with them under cross-examination, is the lack of confidence and knowledge of our system displayed by the President, his continued efforts to downgrade the United States. Unfortunately, the results are the President's statements of problems and legislative solutions that downgrade the system and successes of the United States.

A fine representation of Dallas and Texas was made to the site subcommittee of the Republican National Committee in an effort to get the 1964 Republican Convention in our city. The Chamber of Commerce would have been proud of the quality of the presentation. John Leedom, Peter O'Donnell, Mrs. Ike Kampmann, Harry Bass, Al Fay, Senator Tower, and Ed Foreman created a remarkable impression on the committee. All Dallas is proud of this effort to bring a meeting to our community which will result in $5 to $6 million in revenue. This presentation was in the true spirit of Dallas that our people can accomplish any job, no matter how tough or how big. It is this spirit that built our city.

Meaningful Suggestions for Action Against Cuba Short of War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GLENN CUNNINGHAM
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 11, 1963

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I reject the idea advanced by high administration officials that the only choice is to do nothing in regard to Cuba or to go to war. I believe there are a number of effective and positive alternatives. I believe further that the vast majority of Americans support these alternatives, because they know that regardless of whether there are "defensive" or "offensive" jet fighters and missiles in Cuba, it is a base for exporting of communism into the other American countries.

We cannot simply let the situation drift; all reports from our own Government and other American governments clearly show that Cuba is being used as a vast training ground for Communist agents. We need only to read the report by the Organization of American States, entitled "Subversion in the Western Hemisphere" to learn what is taking place. This report says hundreds of Latin American youths have attended Cuban training centers where they have received instructions not only in Marxist-Leninist theory, "but also in propaganda techniques, the use of arms and explosives, sabotage, guerrilla warfare, and so on."

There is danger from Cuba right now to the Governments and peoples of Venezuela, Peru, Brazil, Guatemala, and other nations. The leaders of the other American countries are far ahead of our own in seeking action against Castro. We simply cannot afford to wait until Castro's henchmen and their Kremlin-oriented brothers in arms have established themselves in Central or South America before we act.

I suggest that the following steps be given serious consideration. They are not especially original with me or with my party; they come from the Nation's responsible press, from the people, and from our friends in South and Central America who are looking and waiting for action.

Many of the following suggestions are related to the serious economic situation in Cuba and would frankly be intended to increase unrest by the people there due to the continued shortages of basic goods.

First. Close the Panama Canal to any ship trading with Cuba.

Second. Close all U.S. ports to any ship trading with Cuba.

Third. Use the pressure of cutting off foreign aid to countries whose ships trade with Cuba.

Fourth. Encourage concerted action through the Organization of American States to cut off all trade with Cuba in this hemisphere.

Fifth. Encourage OAS nations to act against Communist propaganda as recommended in the OAS report.

Sixth. Demand onsite inspection of missile sites and storage areas, the sixth of President Kennedy's requirements in his October 22, 1962, speech.

Seventh. Demand fair compensation for American property seized by Castro.

Eighth. Seize all Cuban assets in this country.

Ninth. Notify Castro that we will not permit any expansion of his form of dictatorship in this hemisphere.

Tenth. Furnish arms and training to Cubans in this country and other countries so they can aid other hemisphere governments in rejecting armed force used by Castro-trained guerrillas.

Eleventh. Recognize a Cuban Government-in-exile.

Twelfth. Demand that Russian troops leave Cuba.

Thirteenth. Reinstate the blockade or quarantine of Cuba.

The last two points are strongly supported by the American people, according to pollster Samuel Lubell, writing in the Washington Star earlier this month. Points seven, eight, and nine were suggested by the President himself during the 1960 campaign.

Other suggestions could no doubt be added to this list, for there are many ways available to put pressure on a nation when it is desired to do so. But, to repeat, it is time to do something.

President Kennedy has pledged to act when the Communist revolution is exported from Cuba to the rest of the hemisphere. Is not the time for action now?

Let's Keep the Record Straight—A Selected Chronology on Castro and Cuba, January 2 to January 14, 1963—Part 12

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DON L. SHORT
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 11, 1963

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, my last remarks on "Cuba in 1933" appeared in the February 21 RECORD and served as a sequel to the previous chronologies parts 1 through 10. The "Cuba in 1933" speech was to serve as part 11, preceding today's part 12. Part 11 was a kind of flashback in history and I hope a pointed reminder that our problem with the Communists in Cuba did not originate—as many seemed to feel—with the overthrow by Fidel Castro of the Batista regime in Cuba. Instead, it could be traced back to the time when the Communists failed in their efforts to subvert Germany and cast around for a more profitable base of operations from which to spread their deadly doctrine of dialectical materialism, or as some term it materialism opposed to idealism or state opposed to God. Never has there been a more materialistic doctrine preached than that of communism and never a more idealistic doctrine preached—if admittedly not always practiced to the letter by individual believers—than the Sermon on the Mount. In comparing that inspired writing with the hate motif of the Communist materialism, it is clear that something far deeper than a mere political philosophy or type of ideology is involved in the struggle between Communist and free nations of the world for the minds of men.

The beginning of the year 1963 brought disheartening reports to the American people. Instead of victory, we found containment. Instead of a relaxing of tension we found increased tension, following publication of reports that on the island of Cuba there remained, in addition to the thousands of Soviet troops described in part 10, 500 Russian antiaircraft missiles, 144 missile launchers, 24 bases at different spots on the island, 60 surface-to-surface short-range missiles, over 100 Mig jet fighters, some 3,000 antiaircraft guns, mortars, field artillery pieces, and assault guns, 350 medium and heavy tanks, 34 subchasers, and missile and motor torpedo boats, as well as 70 helicopters.

We were threatened once again by the Soviet Union with war if we made any attempts to stage provocations around Cuba. Castro displayed ground-to-air missiles during his fourth anniversary celebration in Cuba. Our President was called a vulgar pirate chief by the acknowledged pirate of all pirates. The ransom paid by American citizens and businessmen for the Bay of Pigs invasion prisoners was thrown back into our faces—not literally, but verbally—by Castro. And again the Communists—this time the Chinese Communists—proved themselves past masters at twisting facts by virtuously announcing that they strongly opposed—the sacrifice of another country's sovereignty as a means of reaching a compromise with imperialism. They accused the Soviets of 100-percent appeasement, a Munich pure and simple in withdrawing missiles from Cuba.

By this time the American people were not at all sure that our triumph was anything of the sort. Instead it began to appear what Khrushchev himself termed it, a triumph of the Soviets, in that while some 40 missiles may have been removed, the island of Cuba had been successfully turned into a bristling arsenal, and any Cubans remaining who might wish to throw off the yoke of Castro's communism would find themselves in the same predicament as the Hungarians who tried to throw off communism in Hungary.

Although on January 6 both the United States and the Soviet Union requested the United Nations to close the book on the Cuban controversy. It did not seem possible to do this. Some of the Cuban exiles even accused President Kennedy of being politically motivated in his Orange Bowl appearance on December 29 of last year. And the Cuban Government set aside 10 percent—213.7 million pesos—of its record 2 billion peso budget for 1963 for national defense and public order. While Cuba was planning to defend the Castro regime against its own unhappy citizens, our American citizens were once again digging down into their jeans to raise from $10,000 to $15,000 to pay the ransom still being demanded by Castro for uninterrupted return of Cuban invasion prisoners. And an unknown donor was rumored to have been urged successfully by Attorney General Kennedy to donate $1 million for this cause.

We then found ourselves in the peculiar position of being maneuvered at the same time into helping build a $30 million agricultural experiment station in Cuba, through the United Nations voluntary Special Fund, 40 percent which was provided by the United States. This project, approved in 1961, would allocate something over $1.1 million to the Food and Agricultural Organization of the United Nations for a 5-year project in Cuba. Cuba was to put up $1.8 million, and the uneasy suspicion began to spread that not only were we to provide 40 percent of the aforesaid fund, but our ransom money would provide the other $1.8 million as well. The collective blood pressure of thousands of Americans began to rise, along with the number of protesting letters to congressional offices about the Cuban agricultural deal.

As in most Soviet-bloc countries, it became apparent that for some reason communism and agricultural abundance had nothing in common. Adlai Stevenson admitted that although the United States opposed this agricultural aid to Cuba, there was apparently nothing we could do about it and of the $1.2 million, the U.S. taxpayers probably would find themselves paying $480,000. However, the United Nations later postponed, although temporarily—the controversial agricultural survey project for Cuba, much to the relief of the congressional Members who had been hearing some pretty strenuous objection from the American people.

Senator KEATING, known now as the man who was right last fall about Cuba, contended that Castro was now 10 times better equipped militarily than he was last spring and stated that 20,000 troops were in Cuba, along with 144 missile launchers, 24 bases, and some 500 antiaircraft missiles.

President Kennedy stated that while a danger continued, a deadly threat has been removed from Cuba. He praised the United Nations for its value in serving the cause of peace for its use as a forum in the Cuban crisis and for its task of unification in the Congo—none of which seemed to convince a goodly segment of the American people.

A chronology follows:

A SELECTED CHRONOLOGY ON CUBA [1]

(Jan. 2, 1963 to Jan. 31, 1963)

January 2, 1963:

An article by David Kraslow in the Miami Herald stated that "Cuba has 500 Russian antiaircraft missiles and 144 missile launchers at 24 bases ringing the island.

"The list is current and is based on what the U.S. Government believes to be solid intelligence.

"Other items include over 60 surface-to-surface short-range missiles; over 100 Mig jet fighters; some 3,000 antiaircraft guns, mortars, field artillery pieces, and assault guns; 350 medium and heavy tanks; 34 subchasers and missile and motor torpedo boats, and 70 helicopters."

January 2, 1963:

The Soviet Union's leading theorist, Mikhail Suslov, pledged today that his country would "actively resist any attempts to stage provocations around Cuba," Tass news agency reported.

Communist Party Secretary Suslov told a Moscow audience that "the forces of peace and socialism must vigilantly watch over the scrupulous observance by the United States of its commitment not to attack Cuba and to restrain its allies from doing so."

January 2, 1963:

The ground-to-air missile, not generally known to have been in Castro's possession, came into view at the tail end of an hour-long display of military hardware, part of the celebration of the bearded Prime Minister's fourth anniversary of power.

In a 90-minute anniversary speech, Castro referred briefly to the missiles, saying that "today, the first ground-to-air rocket artillery crews in training have paraded past here."

He said the rockets would be used to keep Cuban airspace free of intruders.

Castro assailed President Kennedy as a "vulgar pirate chief," and claimed he forced Washington to pay indemnity for the release of Bay of Pigs invasion prisoners who were liberated for $53 million worth of food and drugs sorely needed by the Cuban regime.

"They call it ransom, but the fact is that they had to accept the payment of indemnifications. For the first time in its history, imperialism paid an indemnification of war."

Castro repeated his demand that the United States get out of its Guantanamo Bay Naval Base at the eastern tip of Cuba, but he did not intimate that any other than legal means would be employed to oust the United States.

The Prime Minister also repeated that Cuba would never accept inspection on its soil to verify the removal of land-based offensive Soviet missiles, as the United States has demanded. He made no criticism of Moscow for the withdrawal of the missiles and jet bombers, but stressed Cuba's sovereignty.

January 2, 1963:

An editorial in the Peking People's Daily stated that "Those who accuse China of opposing peaceful coexistence also attack the Chinese people for supporting the just stand of the Cuban people in their struggle against U.S. imperialism. When the heroic Cuban people and their revolutionary leader Premier Fidel Castro resolutely rejected international inspection as an infringement on Cuba's sovereignty and advanced their five just demands, the Chinese people held gigantic mass demonstrations and parades throughout the country in accordance with their consistent stand for proletarian internationalism, and firmly support the Cuban people's struggle in defense of their independence, sovereignty, and dignity.

"How can one possibly interpret the resolute support which the Chinese people gave to the Cuban people in their struggle against international inspection and in defense of their sovereignty as meaning that China was opposed to peaceful coexistence or wanted to plunge others into a thermonuclear war? On more than one occasion we have made it clear that we neither called for the establishment of missile bases in Cuba nor obstructed the withdrawal of the so-called offensive weapons from Cuba. We have never considered that it was a Marxist-Leninist attitude to brandish nuclear weapons as a way of settling international disputes. Nor have we ever considered that the avoidance of a thermonuclear war in the Caribbean crisis was a 'Munich.' What we did strongly oppose, still strongly oppose, and will strongly oppose in the future is the sacrifice of another country's sovereignty as a means of reaching a compromise with imperialism. A compromise of this sort can only be regarded as 100 percent appeasement, a 'Munich' pure and simple. A compromise of this sort has nothing in common with the policy of peaceful coexistence of the socialist countries."

January 4, 1963:

A split within the Cuban invasion brigade broke into the open today with charges by one of its members that the liberated prisoners were being used as political fodder.

The charges revealed for the first time that 100 prisoners boycotted President Kennedy's Orange Bowl appearance on December 29.

Enrique Llaca, Jr., one of the invaders recently released from Castro's prisons, singled out Manuel Artime, civilian commander of Brigade 2506, and Joe Miro Cardona, head of the exile Cuban Revolutionary Council, for criticism.

"They are using the brigade for their personal benefit," declared Llaca, 27-year-old former Cuban attorney. Both Artime and Miro Cardona denied it.

---

[1] Unless otherwise stated excerpted from the Washington Post and the Washington Star; reproduced with the permission of the Washington Post and Washington Star.

Llaca attacked President Kennedy's Orange Bowl visit to meet the brigade members as politically motivated.

January 6, 1963: Time magazine today listed the U.S. companies that contributed to the $53 million ransom paid to Premier Fidel Castro for the 1,113 Cuban invasion prisoners.

The list, including pledges, accounts for most of the $53 million ransom although in some cases only the value of goods already shipped rather than the company's full commitment, is known.

The United States and the Soviet Union asked the United Nations today to close the book on the Cuban controversy.

The two powers made their request in a terse, joint letter sent to U.N. Secretary General U Thant and signed by U.S. Ambassador Adlai E. Stevenson and Vassily V. Kuznetsov, the Soviet First Deputy Foreign Minister.

Today's message made no effort to conceal the deadlock in American-Soviet negotiations. But it hailed the fact that war had been avoided and expressed hope other tensions might be eased.

Stevenson and Kuznetsov suggested that the Cuban item be wiped off the Security Council agenda "in view of the degree of understanding reached" and "the extent of progress in the implementation of this understanding."

The statement ended on a note of hope:

"The Governments of the United States and of the Soviet Union express the hope that the actions taken to avert the threat of war in connection with this crisis will lead toward the adjustment of other differences between them and the general easing of tensions that could cause a further threat of war."

Carlos M. Lechuga, Cuban Ambassador to the U.N., delivered Cuba's objections in another letter 2 hours earlier.

The Cuban objections were summarized in one paragraph:

"As you know, Mr. Secretary General, the negotiations carried on with your generous intervention have not led to an effective agreement capable of guaranteeing, in a permanent way, the peace of the Caribbean and in liquidating the existing tensions."

Lechuga repeated the Cuban attacks on American "aggressive and interventionist policy."

January 7, 1963: The Cuban Government today announced a record 2 billion peso budget for 1963. About 10 percent of it—213.7 million pesos—was earmarked for "national defense and public order."

American business made a substantial contribution to Fidel Castro's last minute demand for $2.9 million in cash to assure uninterrupted return of the Cuban invasion prisoners.

A check of 25 of the Nation's largest companies indicated today that individual contributions to the special cash fund raised by Gen. Lucius D. Clay ranged from $10,000 to $150,000 and more.

Castro claimed the $2.9 million was owed him for the release of 60 prisoners in April. Of the total, $1 million was pledged by an unknown donor solicited by Attorney General Robert F. Kennedy.

The cash fund was separate from the $53 million in drugs and food pledged to Castro.

The Kennedy administration set up special machinery yesterday to handle future policy toward Cuba.

Sterling J. Cottrell, a veteran Foreign Service officer who formerly headed a task force on the Vietnam question, was named coordinator of Government activities dealing with Cuba. He was given the title of Senior Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for Inter-American Affairs.

As part of its economic squeeze on Cuban Premier Fidel Castro, the United States will demand that the United Nations cancel a project to help build a $3 million agricultural experimental station in Cuba.

U.S. sources said today that Ambassador Adlai E. Stevenson has been instructed to fight right down the line to halt previously approved plans under which the U.N. Special Fund would grant more than $1 million for the project. The United States, which contributes 40 percent of the money spent by the Special Fund, voted against the grant on the grounds that the project could not be carried out because of the large number of Cuban agricultural technicians fleeing the country. U.S. sources said this situation was even more complicated now because of Soviet technicians in Cuba.

Under the plan approved in 1961, the Special Fund would allocate something over $1.1 million to the Food and Agricultural Organization (FAO) to finance the U.N. part of the project over a 5-year period. Cuba would put up $1.8 million.

The United States argues that Castro is neglecting the economic and social development of the country to concentrate on political problems and has, therefore, forfeited any right to U.N. aid.

January 8, 1963: Cuba was pictured as a land plagued by growing food shortages "where tightening of the vest is now a normal way of life."

This view of the Cuban food situation was contained in a U.S. Foreign Agriculture Service report that said the Premier Fidel Castro regime has just about wrecked the island's agriculture in 4 years.

The report described the food situation there as the poorest in years and added that it may get worse this year. Farm production, it reported, has fallen off 20 percent since Castro took over.

January 8, 1963:

United Nations Ambassador Adlai Stevenson said today the United States has opposed from the beginning a plan to send Cuba $1.2 million in U.N. funds for an agricultural project.

But if the U.N. governing board approves the plan there isn't much that can be done about it, Stevenson said.

Of the $1.2 million, $480,000 probably would come from U.S. taxpayers.

January 9, 1963: President Kennedy talked for an hour yesterday with Vasily Vasilevich Kuznetsov, First Deputy Foreign Minister of the Soviet Union. They discussed the settlement of the Cuba crisis and took a look at disarmament and Berlin as problems that remain to be solved. The conversations, it was said, were held in a very cordial atmosphere.

January 10, 1963:

After a 2-day delay, 100 American citizens will leave for the United States Sunday on the return flight of an airliner carrying ransom supplies to Havana, a Swiss diplomat reported today.

The diplomat had no word on whether a score of Americans held in Cuban jails would follow. Thousands of Cuban relatives of the freed Bay of Pigs invasion prisoners also are anxious to leave.

Between 500 and 700 Soviet troops left Cuba during the last day or so aboard the Russian passenger ship *Baltika*, it was reported here yesterday.

Several thousand other Soviet forces are reported to have left Cuba since the end of the October missile crisis. But U.S. officials believe some 16,000 to 17,000 remain in Cuba. About 6,000 of these are known to be organized in combat units.

The reports were made as official sources said the United States is expected soon to ask the Organization of American States to consider almost total isolation of Cuba.

January 11, 1963:

Cuba trade perils aid, U.S. warns.

The United States has served notice on countries whose ships go to Cuba that they risk losing American aid.

State Department press officer Joseph W. Reap disclosed yesterday that the warnings have been conveyed in line with the new forign aid law. Congress last October attached a proviso that aid shall be cut off to countries whose ships carry goods to Cuba.

January 11, 1963:

Secretary of State Dean Rusk advised the Senate Foreign Relations Committee that even the possibility of a U.S. no-invasion pledge on Cuba no longer exists.

The administration has made clear repeatedly that President Kennedy's offer of such a pledge was conditioned on on-site inspection to verify removal of Soviet missiles and bombers from the Communist-ruled island. It has been apparent for weeks that there would be no such inspection even though negotiations to that end were not concluded until this week.

Rusk appeared before the committee yesterday, and after the closed session Chairman J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT, Democrat, of Arkansas, told reporters the Secretary covered the point like this:

"Any commitment was contingent on the exchange of letters (between Mr. Kennedy and Soviet Premier Nikita S. Khrushchev) which required on-site inspection as well as the removal of missiles and other offensive weapons.

"In view of the failure to get the inspection, the commitment no longer exists."

FULBRIGHT said Rusk assured the committee that U.S. intelligence is convinced all offensive weapons of nuclear capability have been removed from Cuba.

Cuba and East Germany will establish diplomatic relations at the ambassadorial level, the Government press reported today.

The Government newspaper El Mundo said the decision to elevate the present East German-Cuban trade mission to embassies "was due to the close and friendly present relations between our two nations and will contribute to formalize and consolidate even more the bonds of friendship between our peoples."

A newspaper editor charged today that the Kennedy administration, by "manipulating" news as a cold war weapon, is imperiling the American people's right to full and accurate information on how public affairs are being handled.

The charge was made by John H. Colburn, managing editor of the Richmond Times Dispatch, in a speech before the Arizona Newspapers Association.

The editor said the American press must shoulder much of the blame for controlled news from Government because it has too often "been complacent about its responsibility to zealously seek out the truth."

"The press today could do much more to inform the public about the open and insidious efforts to keep the truth from the public," he said.

"As the result of the furor over news manipulation during the Cuban crisis last October, thoughtful people are more concerned about truth in news. Their right to truthful news is in jeopardy because the news manipulators have grown more confident as the result of their recent successes."

The Communist daily Hoy says Cuba's 1963 sugar harvest is off to a poor start. The mills are not getting enough cane to grind, a Hoy reporter complained.

The report, covering the central Province of Camaguey, said crop work at the Patria o Muerte (fatherland or death) mill Thursday, the start of the season, was below last year's level. It said the mill would have to close Monday or Tuesday unless it got more cane.

January 12, 1963: 89 Cuban-Americans, including elderly people and children clutching toys, arrived here today on a freedom flight from Havana (Miami Herald).

January 13, 1963: A controversial agricultural survey proposed for Cuba has been temporarily postponed by the United Nations Special Fund. * * *

The decision not to act now on the Cuban project avoided a fight threatened by the United States, which puts up 40 percent of the Special Fund's resources.

Senator KENNETH B. KEATING, Republican, of New York, contended yesterday that Fidel Castro is "10 times better equipped" militarily now than he was last spring.

He said Castro "has 144 missile launchers, 24 bases, and 500 antiaircraft missiles, some of them the most modern in existence, and 20,000 troops."

KEATING made the comments on a program taped for New York television stations.

January 14, 1963: In his state of the Union message to Congress, President Kennedy said that while danger continues, a deadly threat has been removed from Cuba.

While we shall never weary in the defense of freedom, neither shall we ever abandon the pursuit of peace.

In this quest, the United Nations requires our full and continued support. Its value in serving the cause of peace has been shown anew in its role in the West New Guinea settlement, in its use as a forum for the Cuban crisis, and in its task of unification in the Congo.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, MARCH 12, 1963

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Ephesians 3:17: *That Christ may dwell in your hearts by faith and that ye may be rooted and grounded in love.*

Almighty God, as we grope our way through these ongoing days, which often seem so dark and dismal, may we cultivate a closer communion with Thee and gain a clearer conception of Thy gracious promises and generous purposes.

Grant that, as finite beings, we may be more sensitive and responsive to the appeals and pressures of Thy infinite grace and truth, which alone can transfigure us and transform us from what we are to what we ought to be.

May we yearn to have Thy spirit dwell in our spirit and may the light and love, the joy and peace of our blessed Lord become kindled and personalized in our human souls.

Hear us in His name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday, Monday, March 11, 1963, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. McGown, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 20. An act to promote the coordination and development of effective Federal and State programs relating to outdoor recreation, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the President of the Senate, pursuant to section 1, Public Law 87–883, had appointed Mr. LAUSCHE, Mr. YOUNG of Ohio, Mr. KEATING, and Mr. SCOTT to be members of the Battle of Lake Erie Sesquicentennial Celebration Commission.

The message also announced that the President of the Senate, pursuant to section 1, Public Law 86–420, appointed Mr. MCINTYRE and Mr. MILLER to be members of the U.S. group of the Mexico-United States Interparliamentary Group, vice Mr. SMATHERS and Mr. ALLOTT, resigned.

THE UNIFORM ALLOWANCE ACT OF 1954

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, the Uniform Allowance Act of 1954 provided for the first time that the Government pay the cost of uniforms required by law or administrative order to be worn by employees in the performance of their official duties. That act limited the Government's share of the cost of such uniforms to $100 annually.

Even at that time this amount did not begin to meet the actual cost of the prescribed uniforms in many instances. Since that time the cost of uniforms has gone up along with other commodities. Thus, today, many of our employees are forced to use an unjust portion of their hard-earned wages for the purchase of uniforms prescribed by law or administrative order, and which cannot be worn or used except in the performance of their official duties. This is patently unfair.

The bill I have introduced is designed to alleviate this inequity by raising the amount the Government can pay to $150 annually, except where overcoats or other special garments are required for protection against the weather, in which cases an additional $50 annually may be allowed.

BRAZIL

Mr. HARSHA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARSHA. Mr. Speaker, I am again calling on the U.S. Government to deny any financial aid to Brazil which would in any way be used to develop trade with Russia. Brazil has a delegation here headed by Finance Minister Dantas which seeks an $84 million loan from the United States to help develop a trade program between Brazil and Russia. Minister Dantas admitted in Washington yesterday that one of the purposes of the loan is to develop Brazil-Soviet trade. Although I have not been able to obtain such an admission from our State Department, he also is asking postponement of a $450 million loan repayment Brazil is scheduled to make this year to the United States.

Today we are voting on a record military construction bill calling for an expenditure of $15.8 billion designed to help the United States contain communism and protect the security of this Nation, and for the State Department to authorize loans to Brazil for purposes of developing Communist trade is patently ridiculous. We appear to be spending money in both directions. The enhancement of Red trade will only serve to strengthen the Communist economic and military posture. It will undermine our own economic and defensive efforts. Such a loan will enable Russia to take over our markets with Brazil. This will aggravate the balance-of-payments problem and our own unemployment dilemma. A loan for any such purpose is detrimental to the best interests of this Nation and cannot be justified under any circumstances. The American taxpayer does not want his money used to aid a government dedicated to the destruction of our American way of life.

FOREIGN EXPENDITURES BY ALL GOVERNMENTAL EMPLOYEES—LIMITATIONS AND REPORTING

Mr. KYL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. KYL. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday, the Subcommittee on Accounts of the Committee on House Administration will consider House Joint Resolution 245, introduced by the chairman of that full committee, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BURLESON]. This is a resolution which deserves attention of every Member of this body. It deals with the matter of foreign expenditures by all Government employees—their limitations and reporting.

On yesterday the gentleman from Texas inserted in the RECORD the report on foreign expenditures by the House which is required by law and by rule. Most Members have made full, accurate reports. But even a casual study of the RECORD indicates the necessity for adoption of the Burleson resolution.

Some of the reports are not signed. One report shows that more committee staff members traveled abroad than did members of the committee. One staff member, according to the report, spent $104 on transportation in spite of the fact that the original ticket assigned to this person was for an amount in excess of $1,400.

Members of Congress cannot perform their proper duties without firsthand examinations of foreign programs, problems, and expenditures. Trips by staff members can be completely legitimate and beneficial. But the citizens we represent have a right to know how their money is being spent by all branches of the Government. They have a right to ask, "Is this trip really necessary?" It is in our own best interest to adopt House Joint Resolution 245.

GOVERNMENT PROCUREMENT

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, though Raleigh, N.C., is not a part of my district, my study into Government procurement has led to my interest in an industry there. Due to a decision by the Comptroller General on a case I submitted last November, that industry is about to get a Government contract and save $10,000 for the taxpayers.

Due to this firm's efficiency and the Comptroller General's decision to uphold its position, a radio transceiver is going to be built for the Federal Aviation Agency at a lower cost than would have been the case. If there are more decisions with this conclusion, we can expect the cost of Government purchasing to go down in the future.

Many of my colleagues are aware that for months and months I have made a detailed study of electronics purchases by the Government. In many cases the taxpayer has been the loser. In some I have been able to report successes in changed regulations and in savings to the taxpayers. The latter is true today—a happy ending for manufacturer, taxpayer, Government and, yes, this Congressman.

Last November this firm outlined for me a problem it had with the FAA. Quoting for manufacture of a small radio transceiver, it inadvertently neglected to include a detailed description of the equipment with its proposal, as prescribed by FAA regulations. Because of this, it was ruled out of the procurement. At this very same time, this same firm was making the identical equipment for FAA under another contract, and for this reason was able to be low bidder. In other words, because of a technicality, this firm's competence was to be denied, and the price for this equipment was to rise by $10,000.

After studying the case closely, I contacted the Comptroller General and said, "While the difference between this company's bid and that of the next low bidder does not exceed $10,000, it appears to me that any award other than to this firm would be a waste of tax dollars."

After a thorough study, the Comptroller General agreed with me and advised me by letter, March 7, 1963, that he had made a determination in favor of the Raleigh firm and it should get the contract. Despite the clerical error, the Comptroller General acted in behalf of saving the taxpayers' money. It is too bad we do not have more such people.

This is another case in a long list I am going to present in this session. I will also suggest legislative corrections, such as my H.R. 4409. As these cases are compiled, I hope the Rules Committee will take heed and report H.R. 4409 to the floor for action by the House. Its enactment into law, plus enactment of other legislation I shall soon propose, would curtail many abuses now being carried out in the name of national defense and would result in tremendous savings to the taxpayer.

THE LATE MISS MARY I. BARBER

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Speaker, I have just learned, with deep regret, of the passing of Miss Mary I. Barber, of Battle Creek, Mich., an able and distinguished constituent of mine in the Third Congressional District.

Miss Barber, the Nation's first dollar-a-year woman, died Sunday in Sarasota, Fla., at the age of 76.

She established the home economics department of the Kellogg Co. in 1923 and served as its director until her retirement in 1948. She was a former president of the American Dietetic Association.

From 1941 to 1945, during World War II, Miss Barber served as a special assistant to the Secretary of War, and was in charge of menu planning for American military personnel during that period. She was also editor of an Army cookbook. In 1945 she received the highest civilian award for exceptional service.

Mrs. Johansen joins me in extending sincere sympathy to Miss Barber's sister, Miss Edith Barber, also a distinguished authority in the field of dietetics and the editor of a nationally syndicated food column.

PERSONAL ANNOUNCEMENT

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Speaker, yesterday on rollcall No. 8 I was not present. I wish the RECORD to indicate that had I been present I would have voted in the affirmative.

LOAN TO BRAZIL

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, it was with considerable concern and disappointment that I read the statement in last night's Evening Star by Brazilian Finance Minister Dr. San Tiago Dantas, that part of the financial help he is asking from the United States would be used to develop trade with all countries including Russia. It was reported in an AP story appearing in the Sunday, March 10, State Journal, Lansing, Mich., that Dr. Dantas assured his countrymen before leaving Brazil he would not trade his Government's soft policy toward Cuba for U.S. aid. Added to our knowledge of the close ties maintained by the Brazilian Government with the Castro government, and the suggestion last November by a high Brazilian official that other Latin American countries reopen relations with Cuba, the Finance Minister's statement yesterday cannot help giving rise to some very serious questions. I believe the American taxpayers have a right to the answers.

Over the years we have sent Brazil more than $2¼ billion in the form of loans and grants—a staggering sum. It is reported that Dr. Dantas is hoping to persuade the United States to add some $84 million to this figure, and to agree to postponement of the $450 million Brazil is due to pay to the United States this year on its debts.

Despite the longstanding friendship we bear for our Brazilian neighbors, is it unreasonable to ask, when we are writing such a large check, that it not be negotiable and subject to being cashed and spent in Moscow or in Havana? Surely we might expect our friends to furnish us with some assurances that we are not, by helping them, helping to finance our own enemies.

MEXICAN-UNITED STATES INTERPARLIAMENTARY GROUP

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication:

Hon. JOHN W. MCCORMACK,
The Speaker's Rooms, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: It is with deep regret that I must advise you that I will be unable to serve as a delegate to the meeting of the Mexican-United States Interparliamentary Group, at Guanajuato, Mexico, March 18-21, 1963. I am particularly sorry since I was keenly interested in attending this meeting and had so indicated to the minority leader.

I have just learned that circumstances beyond my control will prevent me from making the trip. Nevertheless, I do appreciate your kindness in designating me as a delegate, and I hope that my inability to serve will not unduly inconvenience you.

With warm personal regards, I am,
Sincerely yours,
CHARLES B. HOEVEN,
Sixth District of Iowa.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the resignation is accepted.

There was no objection.

APPOINTMENT TO MEXICO-UNITED STATES INTERPARLIAMENTARY GROUP

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of section 1, Public Law 86-420, the Chair appoints as a member of the U.S. delegation of the Mexico-United States Interparliamentary Group for the meeting to be held in Guanajuato, Republic of Mexico, beginning on Monday, March 18, 1963, the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. REIFEL] to fill an existing vacancy thereon.

PROCLAIMING SIR WINSTON CHURCHILL AN HONORARY CITIZEN OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H.R. 4374) to proclaim Sir Winston Churchill an honorary citizen of the United States of America.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to to request of the gentleman from New York?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I should like to address a parliamentary inquiry to the Chair.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state the parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, under what circumstances will this resolution be considered? Will there be any time for discussion of the resolution, if unanimous consent is given?

The SPEAKER. In response to the parliamentary inquiry of the gentleman from Iowa, if consent is granted for the present consideration of the bill, the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER] will be recognized for 1 hour and the gentleman from New York may yield to such Members as he desires to yield to before moving the previous question.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, is some time to be allocated to this side of the aisle?

Mr. CELLER. I intend to allocate half of the time to the other side.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill as follows:

> *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That the President of the United States is hereby authorized and directed to declare by proclamation that Sir Winston Churchill shall be an honorary citizen of the United States of America.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. POFF], and that he may yield such time as he desires.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I say of Winston Spencer Churchill that I know of no individual possessed of so many facets to his life and character and personality, with so many wondrous achievements in so many fields.

He is a giant in world history.

He is a man for all seasons.

His biography is like a fascinating novel.

He inspired controversy, but not without affection and respect.

His is a dazzling, stormy, but inspired career.

His public life has stretched for more than half a century from the staid and solid Victorian era to the present hopeful second Elizabethan Age.

He is a man for the ages—statesman, soldier, author and historian, artist, philosopher, naval chief, orator and raconteur, parliamentarian, war correspondent, and humorist.

The key to his character is courage, with strategic insight coming second. He is never controlled, save by himself. Generosity, candor, openness of mind come next. He has no reserves and no shams.

He scorned concealment.

He has a passion for humanity.

He wants justice done though the heavens fall and he be buried in the ruins.

He is keenly responsive to noble impulses.

His is a life and career beyond the conventional bounds of a great statesman.

He is one of the greatest Englishmen known to history—and at that, he is half American.

Historians will speak of him as the statesman to whom the whole world looked for guidance when the very skies were about to fall upon civilization. They will recount his mastery of the written and spoken word. Lord Justice Birkett said that he ever spoke with the orator's true instinct, and that he had the "sympathy and concurrence of his time." This is especially true of the speech he made after Dunkirk when we all feared the worst. He said in the House of Commons:

> We shall not flag or fail. We shall go on to the end, we shall fight in France, we shall fight on the seas and oceans, we shall fight with growing confidence and growing strength in the air, we shall defend our island whatever the cost may be, we shall fight on the beaches, we shall fight on the landing grounds, we shall fight in the fields and in the streets, we shall fight in the hills; we shall never surrender.

Note his prescience and wisdom in describing the actions of Russia as early as 1939—as they seemed to him as First Lord of the Admiralty—as "a riddle wrapped in mystery inside an enigma."

An incisive humor always accompanied him. He could create laughter with never a fault of tact or taste.

Had his father been American and his mother English, he would undoubtedly have made American history. As it was, his mother was American and his father British and he ascended to the premiership of Great Britain.

In honoring Winston Churchill, we do not confer citizenship in any technical sense. Rather, we give concrete expression of our affection for the man.

Mr. Speaker, I now yield to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. POFF] such time as he cares to use within the 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. POFF] under the unanimous-consent request, which was unusual and not a precedent, is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. POFF. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, today, the American people are speaking their respect for Sir Winston Churchill through their chosen Representatives. But we recognize that the quantity and the quality of that respect are unspeakable dimensions. So, ours is not a tribute by word; ours is a tribute by deed. What we say here is and forever will remain inadequate. What we do here, men will always remember. The richest gift is that dearest to the giver. The gift we make is the greatest treasure in the people's storehouse. It is a gift which cannot be embellished in a fancy verbal package. The gift is its own glory, untarnished by much giving. The donee is honored in the receipt and the donor is honored in the acceptance.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the distinguished minority leader, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK].

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I take pleasure in supporting this bill to confer honorary American citizenship on Sir Winston Churchill.

His magnificent contributions to the cause of freemen assure him a place in history as one of the truly great leaders of this or any other age.

As the son of an American mother he has always been a part of us, and we are, with this action, proclaiming our pride in that fact.

This legislation, I understand, is without precedent. Possibly, too, this is the first time in the record of the Congress of the United States that unique legislation of this sort has met with such unprecedented support from both sides of the aisle.

Possibly, because of his achievements, he has been instrumental in bringing about such a broad area of agreement between the Democrats and Republicans, which would not be the least of his manifold accomplishments. Certainly it is clear evidence of the widespread esteem in which this distinguished gentleman is held by our countrymen.

Beyond that, I trust Sir Winston will recognize in this gesture our admiration for his courage, our high regard for his talents, and our gratitude for his leadership of a gallant ally through one of the most severe ordeals any nation has ever faced.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, in adopting this legislation today, the House, speaking in behalf of the American people, will bestow upon Sir Winston S. Churchill, in an unprecedented way, the highest honor this land has ever bestowed upon any person, not an American, living or dead.

I shall not endeavor to recite what Sir Winston has done for his own country, for the unity of the English-speaking world, for the great Atlantic community, and for all the peoples of the West who were and are determined to remain free and never to succumb to a dictatorial or totalitarian rule. It would take a Plutarch to express in words Sir Winston's service to humanity.

> It is not the oratory of a statesman that deserves respect, nor the quality of his voice, said the great Greek philosopher Demosthenes, but his support of the policy willed by the people, and the fact that his country's friends and enemies are his own.

It could be, as Sir Winston wrote me back in 1958 when I suggested to him that I might introduce this type of legislation, that—to quote him—"the high regard and affection" in which he holds our country does not need "an official seal," as he expressed it.

It could be that it is indeed difficult to find an appropriate way of expressing our Nation's reciprocal feelings of esteem, high regard and admiration for Sir Winston.

Nevertheless, as this Republic does not grant titles of nobility nor civil honors or decorations, this is the best, the most appropriate and certainly unique way in which we as a nation can honor Sir Winston by adding to all his glory the title of honorary citizen of the United States, the first honorary citizen of the United States in our history. No less can we do to proclaim officially our feelings for the man who always stood for all that we stand for and who has led his country and with it the free world in hours of the gravest trials and tribulations.

It is most gratifying to me personally that I was given the privilege of introducing this legislation and having it brought before the House.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLMER].

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, the action being taken here today in honoring this outstanding world citizen, Sir Winston Churchill, by conferring upon him honorary American citizenship is most gratifying to me, as I am sure it is to all American citizens.

This action on the part of the Congress of the United States is an unprecedented one. In all the history of this young Republic no other citizen of a foreign government has been so honored—not even the great Lafayette, the splendid friend of this young Nation. But, I can conceive of no one who is more entitled to this signal honor than Sir Winston Churchill. Surely, no world figure who strode across the stage of history throughout the memory of man contributed more to the democratic ideals of the free people than has Sir Winston Churchill. His striking and effective leadership of the Allied cause in the recent tragedy of World War II will be recorded in the annals of history as possibly the greatest factor in the victory of free peoples over nazism and its philosophy of oppression of the liberties of mankind.

Again, Mr. Speaker, being the son of an American mother and an English father, Sir Winston, more than any other, truly epitomizes the union between the two great English-speaking peoples. In fact, when he addressed a joint session of the Congress on December 26, 1941, in this very Chamber, he referred to his birth in this humorous vein:

> The fact that my American forebears have for so many generations played their part in the life of the United States, and that here I am, an Englishman, welcomed in your midst, makes this experience one of the most moving and thrilling in my life, which is already long and has not been entirely uneventful.
>
> I wish indeed that my mother, whose memory I cherish across the vale of years, could have been here to see. By the way, I cannot help reflecting that if my father had been American and my mother British, instead of the other way around, I might have got here on my own. In that case, this would not have been the first time you would have heard my voice. In that case, I should not have needed any invitation; but, if I had, it is hardly likely that it would have been unanimous. So perhaps things are better as they are.

Nature seldoms grants to any one mortal being so many talents as she has so bountifully bestowed upon this great world figure. Certainly, he is one of the most versatile characters recorded in the annals of the history of the human race. As a writer, historian, painter, orator, warrior, and statesman, he excels.

Mr. Speaker, if I may be pardoned a personal reference in order to emphasize my own personal admiration for this truly great man, I should like to relate my own personal experience as chairman of the Postwar Economic Policy and Planning Committee during the late war. I had the unusual privilege of interviewing a substantial number of world leaders, including the late, but not lamented, Joseph Stalin. Included in this group was this most unusual and talented statesman, Sir Winston, himself. I can truthfully say that the highlight of this humble Member's existence was the high privilege of being his guest at a family dinner. The memory of that eventful occasion as well as the benefit of his thinking in reference to the necessity for a firm policy in dealing with the Kremlin masters will ever remain with me.

Mr. Speaker, I introduced a resolution in August 1962 to carry out the purposes of this resolution. But, because there was some question raised at that time as to whether this met with Sir Winston's approval, I did not press the matter. However, at the beginning of this new Congress, I reintroduced the resolution, after first corresponding with him and receiving his confidential reply to my letter. I am, I repeat, very happy that the Judiciary Committee, under the leadership of my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Pennsylvania, FRANCIS WALTER, and the gentleman from New York, Chairman EMANUEL CELLER, has finally brought this timely and appropriate action to the attention of the House. I am confident that it will pass both Houses of the Congress without marked or substantial dissent and that the President of the United States will exercise the mandate of the Congress with pleasure and alacrity.

Mr. POFF. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to our distinguished colleague, who has done so much to promote the cause of this legislation, the ranking minority member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the gentlewoman from Ohio [Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON].

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise in the hope that H.R. 4374 will be passed by this House today without a dissenting voice. I am very happy that the Committee on the Judiciary has brought the bill before us today. I realize, of course, that they have rules and regulations of long standing which make it impossible for them to use the whereas clauses which I had hoped might be attached to this bill. I had no pride of authorship in these clauses which I sent to the committee, but I hoped that they might carry to Sir Winston something of the warmth and affection of this body.

Mr. Speaker, I trust that the words we all speak here today will go to Sir Winston Churchill with the assurance that we wish him everything that is good, that we recognize him as one of the great men of our era. He has earned for himself a position of prominence among the leaders of the English-speaking world as a writer, historian, and orator; and being the son of an American mother and an English father, more than any other, truly epitomizes the closeness of spirit between the two great English-speaking peoples.

The Congress of the United States, on behalf of the American people, hereby expresses itself in high appreciation for his outstanding contribution to peace and to freedom and to the courage it takes to wage war. He has served as a challenge and an inspiration to our Nation as well as to his own.

The gift of honorary citizenship in the United States of America is one honor, one token of rare esteem and love which is within this country's power to bestow here through the House of Representatives. That it was never done before makes it all the more cherished in the hearts of all of us who had hoped that this might be brought to pass. Certainly, it is worthy of Winston Churchill's place in history. This is something no man can buy or acquire in any way except through the grateful generosity of the American people. It is the most appropriate gift we can convey to symbolize the warmth and the affection that an appreciative and an admiring people feel toward him.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that the resolution will be passed without a dissenting vote.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. CHELF].

Mr. CHELF. Mr. Speaker, those of you who have served with me in this Chamber for the past 18 years know that I rarely take the floor to speak and that when I do, I must needs feel very deeply and sincerely about the subject matter at hand. The legislation before us now not only interests me greatly but it is an honor and a privilege for me to urge all of you wholeheartedly to support this bill which would bestow honorary American citizenship upon that great, worldwide statesman, the very honorable Sir Winston Churchill.

This legislation unanimously passed our Immigration and Nationality Subcommittee and, within hours thereafter, it unanimously passed the full Judiciary Committee. I sincerely trust, therefore, that it will pass the House of Representatives unanimously today.

Every American and all free people the world over have a vast store of love, affection and admiration for this magnificent Englishman whose blood coursing through his veins is one-half American through his mother, the former Jennie Jerome, of New York.

During his 88 wonderful years, he has given unstintingly in loyal service to his beloved country. However, his admiration for the United States is well known. He has visited our Nation 16 times. Upon being made a member of the Society of the Cincinnati, composed of descendants of the officers who fought in the American Revolution, he said here in January 1952:

> I am deeply grateful and proud of my American ancestry and think it is a wonderful thing that I have the honor to rejoice in that fact, while at the same time I have never failed in the proper observance of correct constitutional duties to my own country.

His "blood, toil, tears, and sweat" speech delivered in the House of Commons on May 13, 1940, sounded the alert which stirred the hearts and inspired to action all people committed to the cause of freedom. This speech stands as a monumental challenge to liberty lovers, which may remain unmatched in brilliance and appeal "forever and a day, till the walls shall crumble in ruin and moulder in dust away."

He continued not only to lead the British people but, also, was a constant source of inspiration to all of our allies during the long, anguished years of World War II. As long as any of us shall live we shall carry the memory of the resolute, valiant Churchill, pictured on land and on sea, emerging even from the ashes of destruction and human misery, but always holding his hand aloft, with his fingers forming his famous V-for-victory sign, standing as a shining symbol of hope and man's determination to remain free. God willing, the young men and women of our own beloved country, including my own son, Frank, Junior, would try to emulate this world-renowned and famous leader.

As you may recall, the British general elections were held in July 1945, and the Conservative Government headed by Mr. Churchill unfortunately was defeated. I was in England during that campaign and it made me sick at heart to hear him criticized and to learn at that time that his own people did not really appreciate him.

At a private gathering at a home in England, during that visit I made a little speech with an impassioned plea. I told them how wrong I knew them to be in taking such an attitude toward him, that as an ally and a friend, I could most certainly understand their bitter disappointment over the lack of food, housing, and clothing, but that they knew in their hearts that these shortages were brought about by the war. I also told them that while they might be lacking in some material things, they had their honor, their integrity, and their very heads on their shoulders because of the leadership of this wonderful man. I quoted to them from the Bible:

> A prophet is not without honor, save in his own country and in his own house.

Oh, how glad I was to get a favorable reaction during my talk when they gave me several rousing "hear, hears." Later on, as I knew they would, the British people rallied around Sir Winston again and took him back into their confidence and their hearts where he has remained ever since and shall forevermore—actually, they had never let him out of their hearts.

While we in America cannot properly honor this well-loved man any more than he has already been honored, nevertheless, this action taken today by the U.S. House of Representatives is without precedent in all of our glorious history and will resound as a 21-gun salute, from those of us here who represent the 190 million Americans who love, respect, admire, and revere this extraordinary Englishman for his successful fight to preserve the peace of the world.

To find words adequate to describe properly this distinguished man is comparable to gilding the lily, bringing cotton to Alabama, the derby to England, and good bourbon to my native Kentucky.

His bravery, his fortitude, his tenacity of purpose, and his unyielding desire to win shall never be forgotten.

In my opinion, his achievements shall stand out forever like the Washington Monument, Big Ben, the Eiffel Tower, and the Pyramids. By his unselfish service to mankind, he has emblazoned his name with honor and everlasting distinction in huge letters of gold on the silver pages of world history. Why? Because during war, travail, "blood and tears and sweat," fear, want, privation, devastation, chaos, and despair—at a time when it seemed all was lost—this incomparable leader was the epitome of hope, the very embodiment of courage, the preserver of time, the protector of faith, the guardian of destiny, the inspiration for victory, and the successful negotiator of the peace.

These and many other attributes have endeared him not only to America, the native land of his sweet and gentle mother, but to all creeds and colors, the rich and the poor, in every nation of the free world, who love liberty, decency, and Christianity.

To paraphrase one of his own famous statements: "Never in the field of human conflict was so much owed by so many to one man."

May he have a full fruition of his dreams and a happy realization of all of his endeavors. "May his leaf never wither and whatsoever he doeth, may it prosper." May God in His infinite wisdom spare and protect our beloved friend, Sir Winston, for many years to come and may He who reigns as the King of Kings, the master of all lodges, nations, and men, smile graciously, abundantly, beautifully, and everlastingly from His wide blue canopy of heaven upon this, our worthy candidate for the position of the world's most honored peacemaker since that lowly Man walked the shores of Galilee many centuries ago.

It is said in the fifth chapter of Matthew:

> Blessed are the peacemakers for they shall be called the children of God.

Sir Winston was a peacemaker but only on honorable terms. And here, my colleagues, I am reminded of those beautiful lines in the wartime song "The White Cliffs of Dover"—remember?

> There will be blue birds over
> The white cliffs of Dover
> Tomorrow—just you wait and see
> And there will be love and laughter
> And peace forever after
> Tomorrow—when the world is free.

Sir Winston helped to make these words come true.

Thank the Lord, he did not place his light "under a bushel, but on a candlestick and it giveth light unto all in the house."

I trust that Sir Winston will forgive my inadequate words of praise—and I say this from a humble heart—because unfortunately, not in America nor in England nor anyplace else, on the face of the globe, is there another Churchill with the command of the King's English which he alone possesses.

May he live to be over 100 years of age and then, God willing, may we be permitted to turn the wheels of the speedometer of time back and start all over with him again.

Hail—noble Englishman.

Hail—great American.

Mr. POFF. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS].

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I am disturbed by this proposed legislation.

I should like to ask the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER], a question:

What kind of a precedent do we establish here today by voting for H.R. 4374?

Mr. CELLER. If the gentleman will yield, I will say to the gentleman that this is unprecedented. We confer honorary citizenship upon Sir Winston Churchill, but as the Department of Justice indicated—and you will find the remarks on the bottom of page 3 and top of page 4 of the report—it is not intended to confer citizenship upon Sir Winston in the technical sense of that term so as to impose upon him the legal obligations which ordinarily accompany the acquisition of U.S. nationality.

Mr. GROSS. Then the gentleman is saying, I take it, that by conferring this form of citizenship upon Churchill he will not be called upon to participate in paying some of the debt that he helped us accumulate during the war and thereafter?

Mr. CELLER. I take it that is correct. He would not pay any income taxes or assume any other obligations of citizenship.

Mr. GROSS. I will ask the gentleman if this in any way is connected with renewal of the suspension of the British debt that will have to come up pretty soon? Some 8 years ago Congress suspended all payments—principal and interest—on some $4 billion of debt that the British owe to this Government as a result of a so-called loan made to Britain following the war.

Is this in any way designed to influence another extension of the payment on the huge debt the British owe this country? This is in addition to some of their World War I debts that are still unpaid.

Mr. CELLER. This simple resolution has no relevancy in that regard, no relevancy to the subject matter the gentleman indicated.

Mr. GROSS. But Mr. Churchill then will not be called upon to help us pay off some of this war debt, under the terms of this bill?

Mr. CELLER. No, indeed. It has nothing to do with this bill at all.

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Speaker, may I ask the chairman of the full committee this question? He said there would be no obligation to pay income tax. What about estate taxes on the death of this fine man?

Mr. CELLER. I doubt very much whether there is anything in this bill that would include any obligation along any of those lines.

Mr. HALEY. No obligation along those lines?

Mr. CELLER. No.

Mr. HALEY. In conferring this honorary citizenship on Mr. Churchill; what about his heirs, would they receive anything?

Mr. CELLER. They would receive no emoluments, they would receive no benefits at all. This is limited to the person and character of the individual, Sir Winston Churchill.

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Iowa for yielding.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I have no desire to detract from the leadership that Mr. Churchill gave to the British Isles and the Commonwealth during World War II, but this, as the chairman of the Judiciary Committee frankly admits, would be an unprecedented action. This apparently would be a granting of U.S. citizenship, no matter how limited, on a basis accorded no other citizen of a foreign country in the history of this Republic. Who will be the next?

I am disturbed by this unprecedented proposal and I do not see how I can vote for it.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. WHITENER].

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, the legislation we have under consideration today in the House of Representatives to authorize the President of the United States to proclaim Sir Winston Churchill an honorary citizen of the United States of America marks a milestone in the legislative history of our country. Never before has the Congress conferred American citizenship on a citizen of another nation.

It is altogether fitting and proper that the first great figure in world history to be honored with the priceless mantle of American citizenship should be Sir Winston Leonard Spencer Churchill. No other living person is more respected, esteemed, and venerated by our people than is Sir Winston.

He was born November 30, 1874, the son of Lord Randolph Churchill and Jenny Jerome, a vivacious, young, American girl from New York City. Sir Winston has always been proud of his American heritage. The American people have shared this pride, and Sir Winston's background has been a tie that has bound him and our people together in a bond of mutual affection.

In the course of American history there has been only one other person who has captured the hearts, the admiration, and the love of the American people as has Sir Winston Churchill. He can take his place in history along with the beloved Lafayette whose life and character have left a profound and lasting impact on the American people.

The unexcelled genius of Sir Winston has made itself felt in journalism, statesmanship, diplomacy, literature, and in the science of war. In each of these fields he has been a remarkable success.

Soon after his graduation in 1894 from Sandhurst, the English West Point, as number 8 in a class of 150, Sir Winston entered the British Army. He combined the talents of a soldier with that of a journalist, and the books and articles he wrote during the late 1890's and early 1900's form a wonderful part of our heritage of English literature.

In time of crisis the English people have always turned to Sir Winston Churchill for leadership. In 1911 he was made First Lord of the British Admiralty, and with foresight and vigor he went to work to make the British Navy ready for the war he felt certain was coming with the Germans. When the fury of World War I broke over England in 1914, the British Navy was ready to defend the island kingdom, thanks to Sir Winston.

In 1916 he went to the front as a lieutenant colonel in command of the Sixth Royal Fusiliers of the British Army. The same year he was recalled from the front and made Minister of Munitions. From 1918 to 1921 Sir Winston was Secretary of State for War and Air.

Following World War I, Sir Winston combined service in the House of Commons with his literary pursuits. As the approaching storm of World War II appeared on the horizon he called upon the British people in dynamic speech after speech to prepare themselves to meet the scourge of Nazism. His was a voice in the wilderness, however, and after Munich he stood in the House of Commons and uttered these words:

> You were given the choice between war and dishonor. You chose dishonor, and you will have war.

When the storm that Sir Winston had predicted broke over the English people he was again called to a position of great leadership in his nation. He was reappointed First Lord of the Admiralty on September 3, 1939. The following year he became chairman of the Armed Services Committee and in the same year assumed the awesome responsibility of Prime Minister.

It was during World War II that Sir Winston reached the zenith of his long and illustrious career. Through his indomitable courage, his inspired oratory, and his unfailing faith in ultimate victory, he led his people, and indeed the people of the free world, to victory.

Throughout his long career Sir Winston Churchill has been an implacable foe of communism. He was one of the first world statesmen after World War II to point out the dangers lurking behind the Iron and Bamboo Curtains. He has consistently urged a strong stand against communism and has never failed to speak out against the Communist conspiracy.

Mr. Speaker, Sir Winston has demonstrated his friendship for the United States time and again in speeches, in the books and articles he has written, and in actions. I think a statement that he made on December 10, 1948, conveys the feelings of this great man toward the United States. In speaking of foreign policy he said:

> What are those major themes in foreign policy? The first is an ever closer and more effective relationship, or as I like to call it, fraternal association, with the United States. In the ever closer unity of the English-speaking world lies the main hope of human freedom and a great part of the hope of our own survival.

Again on May 12, 1949, Sir Winston said:

> We give our thanks to the United States for the splendid part they are playing in the world.

Mr. Speaker, the American people heartily approve of the action we are taking today in this House to authorize the President of the United States to confer honorary American citizenship upon Sir Winston Churchill. Sir Winston is possibly the greatest living person of our age. His accomplishments and the things for which he stands tower above the ordinary events of our day.

In the broad panorama of human history Sir Winston Churchill will be numbered among the greatest men of all time. It is certain that he will be described as the greatest Englishman.

Let us pass this bill, then, and welcome Sir Winston into the inner circle of American citizenship. In so doing we will have the sure knowledge that posterity will say that England's greatest son was also an American.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ROGERS].

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, it is only after a thorough and exhaustive search of my conscience that I take the floor to oppose this resolution to grant honorary U.S. citizenship to Sir Winston Churchill.

It is not my purpose to cause hurt or injury to anyone and especially to Sir Winston Churchill. I would not for one minute permit my remarks to be used as a reflection on those who take a position opposite to mine with reference to this resolution. My position is dictated solely by my feeling that U.S. citizenship is something sacred. It is my feeling, in keeping with the basic tenets of international law, that an individual is either a citizen of a country or he is not a citizen of a country. Citizenship does not come in varying degrees. It does not come in varying colors. It is not something that contains many fragmented facets that can be separated one from the other. Citizenship in the United States of America carries with it basic rights, privileges, powers, and immunities that have stemmed from the Declaration of Independence, the Constitution, and the Bill of Rights. These are balanced by the burdens and the responsibilities that must be assumed if the rights, the privileges, the powers, and the immunities are to be preserved and protected. To me, citizenship in the United States of America does not require an adjective before it or an explanatory phrase behind it. It is a single unit that must be viewed as such and not otherwise. It is the highest citizenship to which one can aspire. It should never be associated with a position less than first. Should we adopt this resolution granting honorary citizenship to Sir Winston Churchill we set a precedent, but more than that, we fragmentize U.S. citizenship, and we create another citizenship category by statute. This should only be done, if at all, by the people of the United States of America by amendment to the Constitution.

Sir Winston Churchill is a British subject. His first allegiance is to the British Crown. I am sure that Sir Winston is deeply proud of his citizenship and of the fact that he is a subject of the Queen. I do not believe that he would, under any circumstances, renounce that status, nor do I believe that he would support a proposal to extend honorary British citizenship to any human being unless that person would swear first allegiance to the British Crown. The first allegiance of Sir Winston Churchill will always be to the British Crown. Hence, any status of citizenship granted him by this country must be in second place. I cannot subscribe to the proposition that citizenship of the United States should ever, in whole or in part, be secondary to that of any other government.

The world and the United States are deeply indebted to Sir Winston Churchill for the great contributions that he has made as an individual who has lived during our times. I would not want to detract from his just due in the slightest. I would be one of the first to stand up and request unanimous support for a resolution paying just honor and tribute to a great statesman.

I do not criticize those of you who adhere to different views on this resolution nor do I quarrel with anyone who does not care to join me. I express my views because I feel very deeply on the subject. Whatever may be the consequences or whatever may be the choice of others, my vote will never be cast to dilute the citizenship of the United States of America, nor will it be cast to yield the sovereignty of this Nation, in whole or in part, to any other individual or entity.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. PEPPER].

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to have the privilege of joining the Members of this House today in speaking the sentiment of the American people to pay token tribute to one of the colossal figures of history, a man whose striding in seven-league boots through the pages and the record of history is one of the great stories of mankind.

Those of us who have been privileged to have some public or private contacts with this unique, this eminent man, shall cherish those as highlights of our lives, because they were the occasions when we approached near the summit of human personality. His intrepid courage, his indomitable will, his unfaltering faith in the presence of danger and difficulty not only tended to save a good old world but were largely the foundation for the building of a nobler and a grander new.

As long as men in their hearts are thrilled by the epic deeds of heroic men, as long as gallantry and courage shall be emulated by aspiring men, women, and youth, the name of Winston Churchill shall be kept warm in the hearts of men, women, and children everywhere.

Mr. Speaker, if this Republic shall last a decade or a thousand years, its glory and its grandeur shall ever be enhanced by the action of this Congress and our President and this country in our time in adding to the roster of our citizens the imperishable, the magnificent name of Winston Churchill.

Mr. POFF. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. CUNNINGHAM].

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include a resolution.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I am honored to be able to participate in these activities in which the House of Representatives offers honorary citizenship to one of the world's living legends and a man who holds a place of esteem in the hearts of Americans.

Sir Winston Churchill was given a fitting tribute by the Nebraska Legislature on February 12 of this year, when by a unanimous vote citizenship in the State of Nebraska was conferred on him. Nebraska was the first State to so honor Sir Winston.

The resolution of the Nebraska Legislature reads in part:

> Whereas Sir Winston Churchill has, by his courage, tenacity, wisdom, and leadership both in war and in peace, assured for himself a place of eminence among the great men of history—

Certainly these words sum up the characteristics which the world has come to know in Sir Winston—courage, tenacity, wisdom, and leadership. In his long career of service to his government and the free world, Sir Winston has been a guest in this country on several occasions. They have been occasions on which history was made—wartime conferences, his Iron Curtain speech, or his appearance before the Congress.

He will always have a prominent place in history, not only for his achievements, but because of his writings which will give to future generations an appreciation of the events of today and yesterday.

I am pleased to offer now the resolution passed by the Nebraska Legislature.

LEGISLATIVE RESOLUTION 12

Whereas Sir Winston Churchill has, by his courage, tenacity, wisdom, and leadership both in war and in peace, assured for himself a place of eminence among the great men of history; and

Whereas it is proper that the highest honor and acclaim be accorded Sir Winston Churchill during his lifetime; and

Whereas the greatest honor that this legislature can confer is the grant of citizenship in the great State of Nebraska: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the members of the Nebraska Legislature in 73d session assembled:

1. That full citizenship in the great State of Nebraska, with all rights and privileges appertaining thereto, is hereby granted Sir Winston Churchill.

2. That a copy of this resolution, suitably engrossed and signed by the President of the legislature be transmitted by the clerk of the legislature to Sir Winston Churchill, Vice President Johnson, Senator Young, Senator Javits, Senator Magnuson, Senator Roman Hruska, Senator Curtis, Congressmen Cunningham, Martin, and Beermann.

DWIGHT W. BURNEY,
President of the Legislature.
HUGO F. SRB,
Clerk of the Legislature.

Mr. POFF. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BEERMANN].

Mr. BEERMANN. Mr. Speaker, of course I wish to concur in the remarks made by the senior Member from Nebraska in the House of Representatives [Mr. CUNNINGHAM], and add that I, too, will welcome the Honorable Winston Churchill as an honorary citizen of the United States.

As my distinguished colleague has pointed out, Mr. Churchill is already an honorary citizen of my home State, Nebraska, by virtue of Legislative Resolution 12 passed by the 73d current session of the Nebraska unicameral. This action was noted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for February 18, 1963, on page 2388.

It is my belief that many Nebraskans, particularly those of us who took part in World War II, have a great deal of respect and admiration for Mr. Churchill's strength of character. I think it can be said that it was his hand on the ship of state in England during the 1942 and 1943 bombings that was the prime reason for England's heroic defense of her perimeter.

In addition, Mr. Churchill's indomitable will and his unyielding defiance gave the English people the strength of purpose necessary to carry them successfully through this conflict. I might also add that probably as a result of Mr. Churchill's tenacity, the United States gained a measure of time, time which was used to prepare for and later win an all-out victory.

In conclusion, I earnestly commend Mr. Churchill's strength of character and purpose to this body and urge that it confer on him the greatest honor that it can possibly bestow; namely, citizenship in the United States.

Mr. POFF. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. FOREMAN].

Mr. FOREMAN. Mr. Speaker, I should like to associate myself with the remarks made by my fellow Texan [Mr. ROGERS] in his opposition to this bill. I recognize the good that Sir Winston Churchill has done for this world, but also I recognize the sacredness and the associated responsibility of citizenship in the United States of America. We citizens of Texas are a proud people, and I think we citizens of the United States are a proud people, proud of our country and our citizenship, and the accompanying responsibility. I think that the best we could do in paying Sir Winston Churchill a true tribute would be by a resolution expressing the appreciation of this body to Sir Winston Churchill for his contribution to the things we believe in, but not by giving him honorary citizenship in the United States of America.

In May 1958, Sir Winston Churchill wrote, in answer to an inquiry from Representative FRANCIS E. WALTER asking his views on proposed legislation at that time to make him an honorary citizen of the United States of America, as follows:

> MY DEAR MR. WALTER: I was deeply touched at the great honor which you have sought to do me. I am well aware of the historical implications of what you suggested, and it is a remarkable compliment which I shall always remember.
>
> Nevertheless, after most careful consideration, I think that I should decline it. As you know, I am half American by blood. I feel that I would prefer to leave the matter thus rather than have an official seal put on the affection and high regard in which I hold your country.
>
> Pray accept my very warm thanks to you personally, and my good wishes.
>
> Yours very sincerely,
>
> WINSTON S. CHURCHILL.

I respectfully question the advisability of the initiation of this precedent in awarding honorary citizenship of the United States of America to anyone. My high respect, esteem, and honor for that great citizen of the free world and relentless fighter for individual freedom, Sir Winston Churchill, is by no means whatever lessened by my expressions in this instance.

Mr. POFF. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. MOORE].

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the legislation before the House today. In March the Legislature of West Virginia conferred honorary citizenship of our State on Sir Winston Churchill. I am well aware of the apprehension in some minds here today about the wisdom of what we are doing. I can only say, as a member of the subcommittee that recommended this legislation, that this action today does not confer upon Sir Winston United States citizenship as we know it and as it is referred to in the statutes. There will be no oath of allegiance to the laws of this Nation. This is a token of recognition, by Presidential proclamation solely. What we do today is to authorize by this declaration the bestowing of an honorary title on Sir Winston, rather than an act that would be an obligation, if he were to appear in a court and assume the rights and obligations of U.S. citizenship.

However, Mr. Speaker, it might be appropriate to add just a little footnote to what I have just said. Sir Winston is 88 years old now. But if he were born after May 24, 1934, he would have had a choice to become either a U.S. citizen at birth, or a citizen of Great Britain. Why? When he was born section 1933 of the Revised Statutes of the United States was still in effect and U.S. citizenship could be conferred upon a child born abroad only by his father, if he was a U.S. citizen. No mother, although born in the United States, could then have conferred U.S. citizenship upon her child born abroad. This is why Sir Winston had no claim to U.S. citizenship. That law was changed on May 24, 1934, and the change under which both a father or a mother, a U.S. citizen, could confer citizenship upon a child born abroad is in effect today.

Since we are writing history today rather than passing a bill, I believe that this short explanatory note might be in order, and perhaps interesting for those who seem to nurse qualms or worries about what we are doing today.

Mr. POFF. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SCHWENGEL].

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I have been listening with avid interest to the debate here today, I want to rise and voice my opposition to this proposition. I believe like many others do that the citizenship of America is a sacred thing, and I believe that anybody who is a citizen of America should want to carry his full share of the load as part of that citizenship and for that great privilege. Winston Churchill has been recognized and honored both by his people and by us in many ways. He is the only man for instance in the history of our Nation who has addressed a joint session of the Congress three times and in this we, indeed, gave him great honor. We were associated with his nation and with him in a great cause that preserved freedom and liberty. His record is established. He needs no honors that we can bestow on him.

Mr. Speaker, this is a bad precedent and we ought not to establish this precedent. It is one that may embarrass us in some future time.

Mr. Speaker, this is the man who gave to the world a great challenge in his blood and tears speech. Free people from all over the world responded. In this country people volunteered and were drafted to serve the cause of freedom, many gave the last full measure of their devotion. Among them were thousands who did not then nor do their families now have an American citizen's right to vote. We might better spend our time and effort in giving voteless citizens their rights before we indulge in giving this kind of citizenship to this distinguished world citizen.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, were Sir Winston Leonard Spencer Churchill to accept the offer to become an honorary citizen of the United States—for which there is now pending a bill in Congress—the honor would become a two-way street. This honor is the highest which we in the United States can offer. All this we feel for Sir Winston.

In the opposite direction, it would be difficult to exaggerate the honor which would accrue to the United States in the acquisition of so outstanding a citizen. A mere listing of the professions in which he has served is a source of astonishment. Yet not just in one but in many he has occupied a foremost position. Furthermore, he has served with such distinction that in a variety of fields he has received the highest honors. His tremendous versatility makes even a listing difficult. Where to begin? Statesman, soldier, author, artist, journalist, politician par excellence, lecturer, editor, chancellor or rector in three universities, bricklayer and—less professionally, but nonetheless competently—prophet and soothsayer; all these professions in one man's life, and all creditably performed.

To explain the "prophet and soothsayer" and to take the latter first, there are volumes upon the library shelves around the world consisting of excerpts from his wise remarks, quotations abounding in "The Wit and Wisdom of Winston Churchill"—as one title reads. As prophet, Winston Churchill has foreseen and advised the world about many things good and bad that have been of immense importance recognized only later by others. During World War I, from having been actually in it he retired in 1916 to become the Minister of Munitions. In that capacity he was in a position to promote the use of the tank as a weapon of war. According to Ludendorff, the latter course of the war was decided in no small measure by the development of the tank.

As early as 1925, Churchill had written an essay entitled "Shall We Commit Suicide?", in which he called attention to the potential danger of Germany. During the thirties he continually warned against German armament and aggression. He also argued both in Parliament and on the lecture platform for a powerful air force.

As statesman, Winston Churchill has been three times Prime Minister of the United Kingdom. During the first of these terms he led the Coalition Government through World War II, 1940-45. Through the darkest days in England's history, when the threat of Hitler's invasion was very real and there were no allies to help, it was largely the spirit of Prime Minister Churchill, a giant of faith, of courage, and of inspiration, which led his countrymen through their "finest hour."

As a soldier and Cabinet minister he had had outstanding preparation for the highest post in government in such a crisis. His soldiering had begun at an early age. Entering the British Army when he was 21 he had served with distinction in India, won an award of Military Merit from Spain when serving with the Spanish forces in Cuba, and taken part in the Nile Expeditionary Force, writing a book about this African experience.

As author, Sir Winston Churchill was awarded the Nobel Prize for Literature in 1953. His histories of both world wars are practically unrivaled in importance. Four volumes of the first, six of the second are only a few among the total of his literary productions. Memoirs, fiction, biography, history, political studies have flowed from his pen. His speeches alone fill volumes. So prolific is his output that it is the more amazing that he is a master of style; his writings are a literary delight.

We have mentioned but a few of his accomplishments. As you are aware, the doings of this talented and energetic personage already have filled various books. By 1945 he was considered by many as the greatest man in the world; and he never rested upon his laurels. His activities have been noteworthy, however, even more for their quality than for their quantity. The phrases that characterize him and his work are manifold and, withal, highly complimentary. He is known as a man who had the ability to do what he advocated; and he advocated patience and firmness; magnanimity to the defeated enemy in war. He said:

> We must look through other people's eyes as well as our own.

He has ever been a man of humanity, of courage, intelligence of the highest order, generosity, loyalty, geniality, humor—yes, and impudence. It is safe to say that no one has delighted more people as well as inspired them.

Among the many facets of this man of apparently limitless ability, that for which we in America may be the most thankful is his interest in the promotion of the Anglo-American alliance. He has said:

> Let us be united and let our hopes lie in our unity because we understand each other. We understand when things go wrong, or things are said, or anything like that, we really can afford to pass them by.

Sir Winston has here expressed the core of the Anglo-American alliance. Our countries need statesmen with magnanimity to carry us over the rough places. We need such vision and tolerance and geniality as he has ever exhibited to keep the Anglo-American alliance as a living reality, to keep family quarrels on the small squabble level, never letting them undermine the basic friendship so valuable to us and to the world. Sir Winston in his person has made vast contributions to that friendship. What he has done will stand as a bond forever.

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Speaker, there are few men I admire or respect more than the great British statesman, Sir Winston Churchill. In peace and in war, I would also be bold enough to say that no man has done more for his country than Winston Churchill, and my vote and decision on this resolution, certainly, is no reflection on his greatness as a man or as a British subject.

When this subject was broached to Sir Winston some time ago, he said that he would refuse an honorary citizenship in the United States and gave his reasons. I thought he was right at the time and still think he was right.

Secondly, I do not think we should open the doors to extend this honor to the national of any foreign country. Once we do and some Member of the Congress proposes someone else and we do not approve, then it becomes an insult. In all such matters as this, concerning a man of such stature as Sir Winston Churchill, it is not easy to say "no," far easier to take the easy way and say "yes."

Therefore, I want it well understood, that my vote in nowise is a vote against Sir Winston Churchill or Great Britain, as I am an admirer of both.

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. Mr. Speaker, luck is being prepared for opportunity. By such definition, Hon. Winston Churchill was a lucky man. He had prepared himself for great leadership and when world events required a man of colossal stature he was available and gave this opportunity a magnificent fruition. America, England, and all of the free world are and will always be debtors to the courage, wisdom, and superlative character of this noble man. With the enactment of this measure today there will go forward to him and his beloved wife and family the love, affection, and gratitude of every true American.

Mr. CLANCY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. Rhodes] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, I was pleased to note recent remarks attributed to Sir Winston Churchill expressing his desire to accept honorary citizenship should it be tendered to him by the United States. And I support the bill before the House today which proposes a proclamation of honorary citizenship for this great statesman.

Mankind was in one of its darkest hours when Sir Winston Churchill spoke elegant words about "their finest hour." Mankind stood close to a new dark age when Sir Winston Churchill faced a tyrannical enemy poised on the shores of the English Channel and vowed to "fight on the beaches, fight on the landing fields, fight in the fields and in the streets, in the hills; we shall never surrender." But Sir Winston did more than speak—he acted. He transmitted the required "blood, toil, tears, and sweat" to the reality of a positive strategy and strength for victory.

Winston Churchill was among the first to warn that "an Iron Curtain has descended across the Continent" as early as March 5, 1946. Today we realize that we, like the British Empire during World War II, are in a precarious position requiring the leadership of a Churchill—combining words with deeds and necessitating a will to win. For, as Churchill himself once said:

> No one can guarantee success in war, but only deserve it.

The lesson of Sir Winston Churchill to us today should give rise to policies deserving success for the entire free world now and in the future.

Mr. Speaker, I gladly support legislation tendering honorary American citizenship to Sir Winston Churchill. He said that:

> Never in the field of human conflict was so much owed by so many to so few.

One of the most valiant and gallant of those few was Churchill himself.

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this bill to bestow honorary citizenship to one of America's most cherished and respected friends. Mr. Winston Churchill, who so often expresses pride in his American heritage, was the symbol of leadership in the free world during the darkest moments of our time. It seems fittingly appropriate that during the twilight years of his variegated and abundant career that the Congress of the United States, reflecting the will of the people, extend America's highest gift—that of honorary citizenship.

When captain of the ship of state his indomitable spirit narrowed the broad expanse of an ocean that separated freedom-loving people, and through his example of courage and leadership he created a bond of unity for the peoples of the Atlantic upon which our future survival depends. Winston Churchill belongs not only to Great Britain, but to the whole world, to each man who reveres liberty and the dignity of the individual. Above all he cherished the rights of the individual. I know that we shall add to a long list this honor as an expression of gratitude and respect from an aware and appreciative Nation.

Mr. VAN DEERLIN. Mr. Speaker, with thousands of other Americans, I am gratified that Congress is about to extend honorary citizenship to Sir Winston Churchill.

No American who served overseas during the war years, and observed the gallant manner in which the British people endured not only the flaring moments of tragedy but the long, grinding years of make-do and do-without could fail to realize how their load was lightened by the never-failing confidence of "Winnie."

On behalf of the people of California, it is with pride that I welcome this great man into fellow citizenship, even though it be but honorary.

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Speaker, we have never thought that a Member is under an obligation to put in the Record his reasons for every record vote; but in the instance of H.R. 4374, which has its purpose to proclaim Sir Winston Churchill an honorary citizen of the United States, it seemed to this Member that a few words were appropriate.

We went to the floor intent upon simply voting present, and when our name was called did vote present on the first call of the roll for the first time on any matter since coming to the Congress. One of the reasons for our action was that we had not read the letter from the Justice Department in explanation of the fact this was not conferring citizenship or U.S. nationality, but emphasized it was only honorary citizenship and another reason for our preliminary intention to vote present was that we felt there were so many more important things that the Congress should consider first and so much work yet to be done that many other matters should be considered before or ahead of H.R. 4374. On the other hand, we could not vote against the bill, for to do so, would amount to a slap at a person who had been a great statesman and one of the great leaders of the free world during the terrible days of World War II. It was under the leadership of Churchill that Britain held the line until America could arm itself to enter the European theater of operations as an ally. This magnificent holding action under the guidance of Sir Winston was responsible for the ultimate saving of thousands of American lives.

We quickly asked for a copy of the brief report which accompanied H.R. 4374 and finally supported the bill, with some measure of reluctance because of the realization that American citizenship is such an invaluable thing that perhaps we should not set a precedent as we have here today. We think that Sir Winston should have our high regard, affection, and respect but to grant full citizenship is something else.

But again, a close study of the title of the bill and its content reveals an emphasis on the word "honorary." Carefully considered, this means that we are doing nothing more than an appropriate recognition of the outstanding quality of Sir Winston's leadership and his contributions to the free world. The report points out that the bill is not intended to confer citizenship, or to impose the legal obligations of making him a national. It could be said to be similar in effect to conferring a medal or decoration upon him. As the report points out, it is only an honor, or expression of esteem rather than the U.S. nationality in the technical sense.

We should consider that if this bill had been defeated, there would be those among our enemies in the world who would have interpreted this defeat as a breach among the Western allies and it could very well have resulted in damaging repercussions if the bill had failed of adoption. Although we felt that there was more important work to be done first we could not vote against the bill for the reasons mentioned above. One of our earlier decisions not to support the bill was because we were of the belief that Sir Winston had back in 1958 declined the honor in a letter to the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Walter]. We felt no person should be given such a great honor who had by letter already declined it.

Then, after a careful reading of the report, we found this situation had been changed and that in an official cable received as late as February 26, 1963, from the British Embassy, Sir Winston said that he would be delighted to be so honored and that he would be deeply moved by such an honor. Apparently, others in the Congress had similar feelings as our own because on the day following the cablegram expressing the change of attitude by Sir Winston, several identical bills were introduced as companion to H.R. 4374. In our quick investigation of the report, we recall that four American States have now offered honorary American citizenship and recalled that after all, Sir Winston is already half American by blood as a son of an American mother and an English father.

Finally, by supporting the passage of such a bill as this, we think it amounts to a backhand slap at one among our Western allies on the continent of Europe that has been engaging in action intended to weaken the European Economic Community and also NATO. The passage of this bill will let the world know that the people of the United States by the action of the Congress today honors this great man for his unswerving loyalty and steadfastness to his friends in these troubled times of 1963 as much as he did during the perilous days of World War II.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, rarely in the history of civilization has there appeared a man of the stature and caliber of Sir Winston Churchill. During his entire lifetime he has demonstrated a selfless devotion to his fellow man. His distinguished career in his own country includes service as a warrior and as a statesman. By his courageous and honorable deeds, he is revered as the inspiration and the moving force which rallied freedom loving peoples of the world during their most perilous period. World over, Sir Winston is known as a man of peace, a statesman of international repute, philosopher, political leader, artist, and a man of letters. And there is no person who has done so much, to the benefit of so many, in promoting and developing the bonds of strength which hold together the union of English-speaking peoples.

President Kennedy, when a U.S. Senator, stated:

> I believe now that Sir Winston has left active political office, that a grant of honorary U.S. citizenship to him would be a worthy and fully deserved gesture.

The President has reaffirmed that statement only recently.

Including my joint resolution, five bills were introduced in this session of Congress, both in the House and in the Senate, to honor Sir Winston by declaring him to be a citizen of the United States. A precedent for such action has been established by the granting of honorary citizenship to that great French nobleman, the Marquis de Lafayette, for his invaluable service to our cause. Only in this way is it possible for us to demonstrate formally the affection and high regard the American people hold for this grand old man of our time.

As the world's most honored man, Sir Winston already holds a number of American awards. These include honorary citizenship of Jacksonville, Fla.; the Gold Medal of the city of New York; the Franklin Medal of the city of Philadelphia; the American Freedom House Award; the Distinguished Service Medal; the right to wear a pilot's wings of the U.S. Air Force. In addition, Sir Winston has been decorated by 11 foreign countries as well as his own, and is an honorary citizen of 10 other cities.

It is indeed fitting that we bestow this added honor to illustrate our respect and admiration.

Mr. CLANCY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. Schadeberg] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHADEBERG. Mr. Speaker, I will cast my vote for granting honorary citizenship to Sir Winston Churchill, fully realizing that one could justifiably oppose this bill.

Citizenship of the United States, honorary or otherwise, should always carry with it responsibilities. Were it not for the fact that Sir Winston so valiantly stood for those precepts of freedom in the dark days of World War II, and was—and still remains—the outstanding symbol of bravery and determination and faith in victory, I would be inclined to vote against this resolution.

I would not vote for this bill if I thought it could set a precedent for conferring honorary citizenship to other persons of other nations for lesser cause or for politically inspired purposes. I will cast a favorable vote, having been assured it is not intended to set such a precedent.

In conferring honorary citizenship upon Sir Winston, we honor a man, a leader, who by his example inspired in his people the will, the determination, to bring to a successful conclusion the struggle in which they were engaged against the kind of tyranny which we in our Nation have consistently opposed.

Sir Winston did not vacillate in his determination to keep his nation free, nor did he accept any appeasement-type diplomacy that could be interpreted by others to mean that freemen lack the will to win or are unwilling to make the sacrifice for that which they believe to be right and honorable.

The tyranny of communism today is the same as the tyranny of nazism against which Sir Winston and the great people of his country, of America, and indeed of all the Allied Nations, so valiantly fought. To be sure, it bears a different name. But it is marked with the same kind of ruthless authoritarianism.

Sir Winston symbolized the truth that only he can effectively lead others to sacrifice, no matter how noble the cause, who is himself willing to share in making that sacrifice.

May I add that no nation can lead other nations to sacrifice for the noble ideal of the preservation and extension of freedom and human dignity unless that nation is willing to take the lead in that sacrifice.

We are well reminded that freedom does not come cheap. It is bought—to use the classic words of Sir Winston himself—with "blood, sweat, and tears." And no generation can ever live secure in the false belief that freedom is not its responsibility.

I feel privileged to share in conferring upon this great man of history, Sir Winston Churchill, honorary citizenship in the United States of America. I so cast my vote only after soberly weighing the proposal; after deliberating long on the responsibilities that accompany U.S. citizenship, honorary or otherwise; and after seriously considering all implications inherent in the act. I am certain Sir Winston would have it on no other grounds.

Mr. **SENNER**. Mr. Speaker, as a freshman Member of this esteemed body, it was a great privilege to join with my colleagues on the Judiciary Committee in recommending that Sir Winston Churchill be granted honorary citizenship in the United States of America.

To be able to recognize one of the world's outstanding leaders who has worked and fought for the very ideals we Americans hold so dear—love of God, love of country and love of fellow men—is an honor I shall long treasure.

By our action today, the people of America have again shown the peoples of the world that democracy is a living, vibrant force which always stands ready to embrace those who believe in freedom.

Mr. **McCLORY**. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to support the legislation honoring Sir Winston Churchill as an honorary citizen. In addition to the great service which Mr. Churchill has rendered to Great Britain and to the entire British Empire, he has contributed substantially to greater understanding between our Nation and the other English-speaking peoples around the world. This understanding and mutual respect which Mr. Churchill advocated is one of the most hopeful developments in the human quest for a peaceful world.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud and happy to associate myself with this—though it be symbolic legislation—and to salute Sir Winston Churchill, a British subject, and an honorary American citizen.

Mrs. **FRANCES P. BOLTON**. Mr. Speaker, I am informed by a friend of mine that General Eisenhower has authorized the following statement of his views on the proposal to make Sir Winston Churchill an honorary American citizen:

> Sir Winston Churchill has been my warm personal friend for more than 20 years. I have known him both in wartime and in peace as an inspirational leader and a man dedicated to the promotion of Anglo-American friendship and the solidarity of the English-speaking community. In a long and varied career he has many extraordinary achievements to his credit, of which his reputation as the political leader of Great Britain during World War II, and his brilliance as an author are unquestionably the most widely known.
>
> All these facts, to which must be added the circumstance that his mother was of American birth, clearly justify in my opinion the awarding to him of an honor that has previously been given to only one other, General Lafayette. It is my further opinion, that in taking this action, the Congress would not in anyway create a precedent. I believe that the circumstances are such as to make the case so exceptional as to stand as practically unique.

Mr. **PIRNIE**. Mr. Speaker, by granting Sir Winston Churchill honorary American citizenship, the House pays a great man a singular and well-deserved tribute.

His contributions to the preservation of American freedom in a time of supreme crisis, for all of Western civilization, fill the pages of modern history. In the 1930's he courageously defied the appeasement policies of his own country which culminated in the Munich capitulation and the advent of World War II. In the early months of the war, when Hitler's armies had triumphantly subdued the European Continent, leaving England to fight on alone, his eloquent voice and masterful personality provided a rallying point for the hopes of both the free and the enslaved nations. His dogged determination sustained England during her darkest hour and held the Atlantic frontier safe until America entered the war. Thus, he gave his nation one of its finest hours.

For these and other acts born of consummate wisdom and indomitable courage, we owe Sir Winston an immeasurable debt of gratitude which House bill 4374 discharges in part. Our affection for him is deeper, not only because his mother gave him American blood and ancestors who fought side by side with General Washington in our War of Independence, but because he represents one of the finest statesmen produced by the English-speaking peoples. In addressing the Virginia House of Delegates March 8, 1946, Sir Winston gave expression to his hope for union and understanding which we will do well to recall: "Above all, among the English-speaking peoples, there must be the union of hearts based upon conviction and common ideals. That is what I offer. That is what I seek."

In honoring this great man, we also honor ourselves.

The **SPEAKER**. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The **SPEAKER**. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken.

Mr. **ASHBROOK**. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present, and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The **SPEAKER**. Evidently, a quorum is not present.

The doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 378, nays 21, answered "present" 5, not voting 30, as follows:

[Roll No. 9]

YEAS—378

Abbitt
Abernethy
Adair
Addabbo
Albert
Anderson
Andrews
Arends
Ashley
Ashmore
Aspinall
Auchincloss
Avery
Ayres
Baker
Baldwin
Baring
Barrett
Barry
Bass
Bates
Battin
Beckworth
Beermann
Belcher
Bell
Bennett, Fla.
Bennett, Mich.
Berry
Betts
Blatnik
Boggs
Boland
Bolling
Bolton, Frances P.
Bolton, Oliver P.
Bonner
Bow
Brademas
Bray
Brock
Bromwell
Broomfield
Brotzman
Brown, Ohio
Broyhill, N.C.
Broyhill, Va.
Bruce
Burke
Burkhalter
Burton
Byrne, Pa.
Cahill
Cameron
Cannon
Carey
Casey
Cederberg
Celler
Chamberlain
Chelf
Chenoweth
Clancy
Clark
Cleveland
Cohelan
Collier
Colmer
Cooley
Corbett
Corman
Cramer
Cunningham
Curtin
Curtis
Dague
Daniels
Davis, Ga.
Dawson
Delaney
Dent
Denton
Derwinski
Devine
Diggs
Dingell
Dole
Donohue
Dowdy
Downing
Doyle
Dulski
Duncan
Dwyer
Edmondson
Edwards
Elliott
Ellsworth
Everett
Evins
Fallon
Fascell
Feighan
Findley
Finnegan
Fino
Fisher
Flood
Flynt
Fogarty
Ford
Forrester
Fountain
Fraser
Frelinghuysen
Friedel
Fulton, Pa.
Fulton, Tenn.
Fuqua
Gallagher
Garmatz
Gary
Gathings
Gavin
Giaimo
Gibbons
Gilbert
Gill
Glenn
Gonzalez
Goodell
Goodling
Grabowski
Grant
Green, Oreg.
Green, Pa.
Griffin
Gubser
Hagan, Ga.
Hagen, Calif.
Haley
Halleck
Halpern
Hanna
Hansen
Harding
Hardy
Harris
Harrison
Harsha
Harvey, Ind.
Harvey, Mich.
Hawkins
Hays
Hébert
Hechler
Hemphill
Henderson
Hoeven
Holifield
Holland
Horan
Horton
Hosmer
Huddleston
Hull
Hutchinson
Ichord
Jarman
Jennings
Jensen
Joelson
Johnson, Calif.
Johnson, Wis.
Jonas
Jones, Ala.
Jones, Mo.
Karsten
Karth
Kastenmeier
Keith
Kelly
Keogh
Kilburn
Kilgore
King, Calif.
King, N.Y.
Kirwan
Kluczynski
Knox
Kornegay
Kunkel
Kyl
Laird
Landrum
Langen
Lankford
Latta
Leggett
Lennon
Lesinski
Libonati
Lindsay
Lipscomb
Lloyd
Long, La.
Long, Md.
McClory
McCulloch
McDade
McDowell
McFall
McIntire
McLoskey
McMillan
Macdonald
MacGregor
Mahon
Mailliard
Marsh
Martin, Calif.
Martin, Mass.
Martin, Nebr.
Mathias
Matsunaga
Matthews
May
Meader
Michel
Miller, Calif.
Milliken
Mills
Minish
Minshall
Montoya
Moore
Moorhead
Morgan
Morris
Morrison
Morse
Morton
Mosher
Moss
Murphy, Ill.
Murphy, N.Y.
Murray
Natcher
Nedzi
Nelsen
Nix
Norblad
Nygaard
O'Brien, N.Y.
O'Hara, Ill.
O'Hara, Mich.
O'Konski
Olsen, Mont.
Olson, Minn.
O'Neill
Osmers
Ostertag
Passman
Patman
Pelly
Pepper
Perkins
Philbin
Pike
Pilcher
Pirnie
Poage
Poff
Pool
Powell
Price
Pucinski
Purcell
Quie
Quillen
Randall
Reid, Ill.
Reid, N.Y.
Reifel
Reuss
Rhodes, Pa.
Rich
Riehlman
Rivers, Alaska
Rivers, S.C.
Roberts, Ala.
Roberts, Tex.
Robison
Rodino
Rogers, Colo.
Rogers, Fla.
Rooney
Roosevelt
Rosenthal
Rostenkowski
Roudebush
Roush
Roybal
Rumsfeld
Ryan, N.Y.
Ryan, Mich.
St. Germain
St. Onge
Saylor
Schadeberg
Schenck
Schneebeli
Schweiker
Scott
Secrest
Selden
Shelley
Sheppard
Shipley
Shriver
Sibal
Sickles
Sikes
Sisk
Skubitz
Slack
Smith, Calif.
Smith, Iowa
Springer
Staebler
Stafford
Staggers
Steed
Stephens
Stinson
Stratton
Stubblefield
Sullivan
Taft
Talcott
Taylor
Teague, Calif.
Thomas
Thompson, N.J.
Thompson, Tex.
Thomson, Wis.

Thornberry
Toll
Tollefson
Trimble
Tuck
Udall
Van Deerlin
Vanik
Vinson
Waggonner
Wallhauser
Watts
Weaver
Weltner
Westland
Whalley
Wharton
White
Whitener
Wickersham
Widnall
Williams
Willis
Wilson, Bob
Wilson, Charles H.
Wilson, Ind.
Winstead
Wright
Wydler
Wyman
Young
Younger

NAYS—21

Abele
Alger
Ashbrook
Becker
Burleson
Conte
Derounian
Dorn
Foreman
Gross
Grover
Hall
Johansen
Monagan
Rogers, Tex.
Schwengel
Short
Siler
Snyder
Tuten
Utt

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—5

Hoffman
Pillion
St. George
Ullman
Van Pelt

NOT VOTING—30

Brooks
Brown, Calif.
Buckley
Byrnes, Wis.
Clausen
Daddario
Davis, Tenn.
Farbstein
Gray
Griffiths
Gurney
Healey
Herlong
Kee
Madden
Miller, N.Y.
Multer
O'Brien, Ill.
Patten
Rains
Rhodes, Ariz.
Senner
Smith, Va.
Teague, Tex.
Thompson, La.
Tupper
Walter
Watson
Whitten
Zablocki

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Walter with Mr. Tupper.
Mr. Multer with Mr. Clausen.
Mr. Daddario with Mr. Miller of New York.
Mr. Farbstein with Mr. Rhodes of Arizona.
Mr. Gray with Mr. Byrnes of Wisconsin.
Mr. Rains with Mr. Gurney.

Mr. **BURKE** changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

Mr. **RANDALL** changed his vote from "present" to "yea."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. **CELLER**. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks in the RECORD on the bill just passed.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO SIT DURING SESSIONS OF THE HOUSE

Mr. **HARRIS**. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the subcommittees of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce may be permitted to sit during general debate this afternoon.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

AUTHORIZING APPROPRIATIONS FOR AIRCRAFT, MISSILES, AND NAVAL VESSELS

Mr. **COLMER**. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 288 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 2440) to authorize appropriations during fiscal year 1964 for procurement, research, development, test, and evaluation of aircraft, missiles, and naval vessels for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill, and shall continue not to exceed four hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Armed Services, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. **COLMER**. Mr. Speaker, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the minority, to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN], and pending that I yield myself such time as I may briefly consume.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 288 provides for consideration of H.R. 2440, a bill to authorize appropriations during fiscal year 1964 for procurement, research, development, test, and evaluation of aircraft, missiles, and naval vessels for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes. The resolution provides for an open rule with 4 hours of general debate.

H.R. 2440 provides authorization in the amount of $15,856,391,000 for defense programs for fiscal year 1964 in two major areas. It includes authorization of appropriation for the procurement of aircraft, missiles, and naval vessels in form identical to previous enactments of the fund authorizations required. It also includes a similar authorization of appropriations for the research, development, test, and evaluation of aircraft, missiles, and naval vessels as required for the first time by the amendment to sec. 412(b) contained in Public Law 87-436. This, then, is the first bill to be presented to the House in which the Armed Services Committee has exercised this additional authority.

Of the total $15,856,391,000, the bill includes $1,761,549,000 for the Army; $6,612,024,000 for the Navy and Marine Corps; and $7,482,818,000 for the Air Force.

Mr. Speaker, I shall not attempt at this time to comment on the merits of the bill. I can only say in passing that I am alarmed at the enormity of the amount of money involved. Surely the Defense Department could get along with less.

Mr. **BROWN** of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may use, and ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The **SPEAKER**. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. **BROWN** of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLMER] has explained the provisions of the rule. It is an open rule. It provides for 4 hours of general debate, to be followed by discussion under the 5-minute rule, with the offering of any and all amendments that may be germane to the measure.

Mr. Speaker, this is an important piece of legislation. I feel your attention should be called to the fact that this is an authorization bill, not an appropriation bill.

It does, however, authorize later appropriations of not more than $15,456,391,000 to be used for the purchase of aircraft, missiles, naval vessels, and other similar equipment for the use of the Armed Forces of the United States.

This is a historic report filed by this committee, if my memory serves me correctly for it is seldom any bill is ever reported out of the Committee on Armed Services which does not carry the absolutely unanimous support of all 37 Members agreeing fully with everything that may be in the bill, and especially all those provisions of a bill which are favored, of course, by the most illustrious chairman who has ever served any committee in the history of parliamentary practices in the House of Representatives of the United States, the Honorable chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON], who is credited with knowing more about the needs and the strength of our Armed Forces than any other individual in America. Yet, history has been made by this report, because I see that while there is not a minority report filed, there have been additional views filed by five members of the committee which is indeed unusual. Frankly, I do not agree with the additional views, but nevertheless I think we should mark here that there have been additional views filed by members of this committee.

After this bill is approved today, as undoubtedly it will be, and after it clears the other body and is signed into law by the President, being an authorization bill only, as I explained a few moments ago, the Committee on Appropriations of the House must then pass judgment on each and every line and item contained in this measure and determine, in its wisdom, just what appropriation should actually be made under the authorization granted.

When the chairman of this illustrious Armed Services Committee was before the House Committee on Rules asking for the rule which makes consideration of this bill in order, he did make some statements that caused some alarm among the members of our own committee and, I believe, among those who were in attendance at the hearing when he pointed out provisions of the bill which authorized the building of so-called killer submarines for the purpose of destroying Russian or some other enemy submarines that could easily attack and virtually destroy by missiles cities within 300 or 400 miles of our seacoast. That statement gave concern to all of us.

However, after some questioning, Chairman VINSON did point out, as shown in this report, that we also have a great many Polaris missile firing submarines of our own and those submarines, I understand, can send our missiles a distance of anywhere from 1,000 to 1,500 miles, and even farther. Of course, as was pointed out by the chairman, under questioning, the greatest deterrent to an all-out war is the power of retaliation, and the United States does have the power to retaliate against any enemy that might decide to attack this country and, in turn, we have the power to completely destroy the enemy.

I am saying these things today on the floor of the House not because I feel that we are giving away any military secrets, for I am sure the Russians, and other nations as well, have all the information contained in this report, and a great deal more, and probably know more about our defensive and offensive strength by far than the average Member of Congress, but rather to assure the American people that from all the information some of us have been able to obtain it appears we are not in anything like the grave danger first described by the gentleman from Georgia, Chairman VINSON, when he appeared before the Rules Committee and frightened us by his discussion of how the Russians, because of the number of submarines they have could wreak great destruction against the United States and cities near our coasts.

I hope that as general debate progresses the chairman of the Armed Services Committee, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON], and other members of the committee who speak on the bill will make it clear to the American people at least, and perhaps to the peoples of the entire world, that the United States is not defenseless as has been suggested, that this country is in position, not only to defend itself against any attack, but also to retaliate in such force as to make it unprofitable for any enemy to attack the United States at any time, and that if such an attack should come that in the end, it would not be the United States but the enemy that would be the greatest sufferer, from any mistake made by starting World War III.

I want to recommend, if I may, Mr. Speaker, in conclusion, that every Member of the House read carefully the report of the committee which has been filed with this bill, perhaps keep it on file in his or her office, because it contains information that will be of great value, not only now, but also in the future, in connection with answering questions about our own strength and these proposals of the Congress of the United States to increase our Nation's offensive and defensive strength for the future.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman has consumed 9 minutes.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. AVERY].

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Speaker, there is no reason to impose upon the House this afternoon to delineate in detail the purposes of the bill, because such detail will be clearly spelled out, I am sure, by the members of the Armed Services Committee. As I read this report and review the statements made by the chairman of the committee in his appearance before the Rules Committee it appears as though there are about four principal policy propositions enunciated in this bill: No. 1, that the military procurement program will first be authorized by the Congress before the Department of Defense proceeds to request funds from the Appropriations Committee.

Some new Members may ask, "What do you mean?" I mean this: This was the procedure previous to 1961. The executive department would submit a classified request to the Appropriations Committee and the Members of the House were pretty much kept in the dark as to the nature and extent of these requests until the Department of Defense appropriation bill, involving maybe $40 or $50 billion came on the floor. This was the first information any Member had as to what the procurement requests by the administration were going to be for any fiscal year.

This is the third authorization bill for military procurement. I think it is good for the House, and I do not think it will be any news or of any comfort to our adversaries to have this authorization. It is the right of the American people, the American taxpayers, to know for what purpose their money is being contemplated to be spent in the next fiscal year.

The second policy position deals with authorization of research and development. This is the first time that research has been specifically authorized by the Congress before it was undertaken or contracted by the Department of Defense. Have they been proceeding without authorization? No. But they have been proceeding on basic or general authorization. This is the first time, may I repeat, Mr. Speaker, that the Committee on Armed Services has outlined in detail the authorization for research and development for a fiscal year.

I wonder if you have any idea what research is costing? There will be $7 billion authorized for research in fiscal 1964. A little over $4 billion presently authorized, and there is in excess of $3 billion in new authorizations for research in this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I certainly concur with the third policy position of the committee that relates to the RS–70 bomber. Those of you who were present in the 87th Congress will remember this was a matter of considerable disagreement, we were advised, between the administration and the Committee on Armed Services. But the night before this bill was on the floor a year ago, there was some agreement reached and there was a limited amount of money made available for further research on the RS–70. But really no final decision established as far as the future of the manned bomber program is concerned.

The amount of money in this bill for the RS–70 for fiscal 1964 I understand to be some $630 million and a total additional authorization of $1.2 billion for this bomber of the future. This is a most important aspect of this section as it specifically relates to the RS–70. The most significant thing in my judgment is, it reaffirms a position of the Congress as to the future of the whole manned bomber program.

I think Members of the House are probably aware of the fact that the B–47's are now being gradually deactivated. The last L–52 was delivered in 1962. Since that time there have been no replacements in our manned bomber program or known to be contemplated for the future. It may be said that we are commencing to phase out our earlier concept of a manned bomber retaliatory force. By the inclusion in this bill of funds to program two additional RF–70's—in addition to the three that are presently authorized—and the further authorization for a weapons system to complement the craft.

I think it is a clear statement of policy by the Congress that we are not yet convinced that the usefulness of the manned bomber has been terminated. I will support the committee in this position.

In the fourth category the bill is not a clear reflection of a policy position but I think it is a very important aspect of the bill. I inquired of the chairman if there was any manifest—perhaps I should say any tangible concern on the part of the Committee on Armed Services as to the recent award of the $7 billion TFX contract, a plane with slight modification to be suitable for both Navy and Air Force employment.

The chairman replied there was not; that any tangible expression of concern on this matter was to be left to a committee of the other body. So, if that is the case, there is no need to further trespass on the time of the House this afternoon.

Mr. Speaker, those of us from the Middle West are deeply concerned about this, and for a very understandable reason. Had this contract been awarded on the basis of a unanimous recommendation by the military and to the low bidder, the contract work would have been performed in Kansas and in a Government-owned facility. So, for this reason, we do have an interest in it.

But, Mr. Speaker, certainly there is no opposition to this bill. The rule should be adopted.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may desire to the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. ST. GEORGE].

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, I am reluctant to speak here this afternoon because, for the first time, I am a little bit disappointed with a bill coming out of this great committee, and I am disappointed for this reason:

Many of us here, myself included, have been anxious to see certain cuts made in these enormous authorizations and appropriations. Now, here we have a bill which is by no means small. This bill is merely for procurement. This bill, according to the committee report, states the following:

> The fiscal year 1964 request for new obligational authority for the entire Department of Defense totals $52,180,637,000. Of this amount, $15,358,691,000 was requested

by the executive branch for authorization under the provisions section 412(b) of Public Law 86-149, as amended.

Now, this is this particular bill. The committee modified the original request by adding $497,700,000. Now, I am sure that the committee had what they considered good and sufficient reason for doing this. I am in sympathy with the committee's position as far as the manned bombers are concerned; I am in great sympathy with it. But, it does seem to me, Mr. Speaker, that if they had applied themselves a little, they could have still gotten what they wanted, with which I sympathize 100 percent, and yet perhaps shaved off a little so that they did not have to come in to this House and ask for more than the administration is asking for the Defense Department.

Mr. Speaker, that, quite frankly, is my disappointment. How can we go out to our people, the harassed taxpayers of this country—and we do, all of us, on both sides of the aisle—and tell them that things have got to be cut; that we have got to slow down on these authorizations, and then have one of our greatest committees come in and say, "Oh, yes, we are bringing a bill in to you, and we have, quite frankly, upped it almost $500 million over what was asked by the administration." For this reason I am a little disappointed.

On the other hand, Mr. Speaker, knowing well the work, the dedication, and the knowledge of this committee, I imagine that very little can be said, and I am inclined to think that the bill as written will pass.

There is one novel thing also about this piece of legislation. That is, that for the first time in the memory of many Members of this House there is a minority report. So, perhaps, some people have become a little anxious about these appropriations and, perhaps, there is beginning to be a little wave toward the side of economy, although I do not believe it is too economical when we appropriate for procurement alone and research $15,358,691,000.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 2440) to authorize appropriations during fiscal year 1964 for procurement, research, development, test, and evaluation of aircraft, missiles, and naval vessels for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Georgia.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 2440, with Mr. SHELLEY in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON] is recognized for 2 hours, and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ARENDS] is recognized for 2 hours.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON].

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 30 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to call to the attention of the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. ST. GEORGE], the fact that Secretary of Defense McNamara said in his testimony:

> Management improvement action instituted in the fiscal year 1962 and planned for fiscal year 1963 should ultimately produce annual savings of $1.9 billion. Our goal for end of fiscal 1965 is to initiate actions which will increase the rate of savings to over $3.4 billion each year.

Mr. Chairman, I am happy to advise the Committee that out of this $52 billion budget for the security and defense of the Nation, through the superb business-management that is going on in the Department of Defense, there will be and there should be large savings, because we are making better contracts.

Mr. Chairman, it does not necessarily follow that we should reduce the hardware, reduce the personnel to get the savings. We can accomplish this savings by making better contracts than in the past.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. And, when does the gentleman from Georgia say this savings will show on the books?

Mr. VINSON. It will show, based upon the statement of the Secretary of Defense—for the years following fiscal year 1963. I shall be glad to read the statement again.

Mr. GROSS. No. When does the gentleman think this saving will come about?

Mr. VINSON. He says for actions taken during fiscal year 1963—and fiscal year 1963 runs until July—should show a savings of $1.9 billion per year in the future.

Mr. GROSS. In this fiscal year?

Mr. VINSON. No; not this year. What he says here is, "and plans for fiscal year 1963 should ultimately produce savings of about $1.9 billion." Our goal for end of fiscal year 1965 is to initiate actions which will increase the rate of savings to over $3.4 billion each year.

Mr. GROSS. The figure this year, if the gentleman will yield further, is based on what? To what will the savings be applied?

Mr. VINSON. Based upon the budget of 1963.

Mr. McNamara continues, in the statement which I have been quoting from, to enumerate the many ways in which he intends to effect these savings. For example, he refers to "buying only what we need—refining the requirements calculations—increased use of excess inventories—eliminating 'gold plating' of technical specifications" and things of this kind.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. VINSON. And I think he is going to do it, because we are spending as the gentleman will note when the appropriation bill comes before us, some $52 billion on defense.

That is an enormous sum of money for defense. By good business management he should be able to make worthwhile and creditable savings, and he feels confident he can do so. But that does not mean you have to reduce the forces to accomplish that goal. But he does have to sit across the bargaining table and make better contracts and do the other things which he referred to in his statement, and which I quoted.

Mr. Chairman, the Armed Services Committee is presenting to the House today the largest, single authorization bill which it has ever reported out of the committee.

And to the best of my knowledge, it is the largest authorization bill ever presented to the House of Representatives. It totals $15,856,391,000.

I should point out that one of the reasons for its larger size this year is the fact that it contains $3,492,891,000 in authorizations for research, development, test, and evaluation of future weapons systems. This particular authority has not been contained in the armed services authorization bills before.

Naturally, this research and development work was carried on but it was under very general authorities available to the departments which required only appropriations. It was not until this past year that the law was changed so as to place this kind of activity under the jurisdiction of the Armed Services Committee.

Therefore, if we deducted the research and development authorities from the bill, we would find that the actual procurement—that is, the purchasing of aircraft, missiles, and naval vessels—comes to an amount somewhat smaller than that presented to you last year.

I mention these facts only to place the bill in proper perspective and to relate it to similar bills which have been presented to the House before.

Of the total of $15,856,391,000, the Army will get $1,761,549,000, the Navy and Marine Corps will get $6,612,024,000, and the Air Froce will get $7,482,818,000.

ARMY

Let us look at the Army first. The bill authorizes $522.1 million for aircraft for the Army. This will buy 1,598 aircraft. A list of the aircraft to be bought and a description of each airplane appears on 20 and 21 of the report.

Briefly, the Army plans to buy three kinds of operational helicopters: the Iroquois, the Chinook, and observation helicopters of the Sioux and Raven types.

The bill also authorizes two kinds of fixed-wing airplanes: the Mohawk and the Caribou.

In addition to these operational aircraft, the Army will also procure other helicopters and fixed-wing airplanes for training purposes.

I will point out, as I have pointed out before, that the aircraft used by the Army is the kind that is flown within the battlefield area. There is no duplication and no conflict in this area with the Air Force.

The Air Force will continue to provide, as it has in the past, tactical support but the Army needs its own aircraft for surveillance, to enable commanders to travel from place to place within the battle area, to evacuate the wounded, and generally to operate within the restricted battle area. Of course, also, these planes are used to move a squad of soldiers from one place to another as the situation may dictate.

Today, there are about 6,900 in Army aviation. The Army has about 6,000 airplanes in its inventory.

In the field of missiles, the bill authorizes $580.7 million for some 28,000 Army missiles. These missiles are the Hawk, Nike-Hercules, Mauler, the anti-tank missiles ANTAC and SS-11, the Honest John, Little John, the Pershing, and the Sergeant. All in all, we are purchasing some 27,888 missiles.

Of these missiles I have named, all are operational except Mauler and Pershing.

If you will look at page 22 of the report, you will see a description of each of these missiles.

In the area of research and development which, as I have mentioned, appears in the bill for the first time this year, the Army is being authorized $82.148 million for aircraft research and development and $576.6 million for missile research and development.

Much of this research and development authorization is for the improvement of existing aircraft and missiles and, of course, a very substantial portion of it looks toward the aircraft and missiles for the future. This area, looking toward the future as it does, tends to involve a great deal of classified information.

I have, however, made every effort to place in the report everything which can be told about the research and development authorization for the Army and I would suggest that you look at pages 23 through 26 in the report for a reasonably detailed description of how these authorizations will be used.

NAVY AND MARINE CORPS

The Navy and Marine Corps portion of the bill in all of its essential respects is the same as that for the Army except that, of course, it also includes authority for naval vessels.

The bill contains almost $2 billion in authority for Navy and Marine Corps aircraft. The exact figure is $1,958,700,000. This will purchase almost 700 aircraft for the Navy and Marine Corps. A glance at pages 27, 28, and 29 will show a list of the aircraft and a description of each of them.

The total amount in the bill for missiles for the Navy and Marine Corps is $1,122 million. This will procure approximately 15,000 missiles of various kinds for the two services.

A glance at page 27 and pages 29 and 30 will show a list of these missiles and a description of each of them.

Included among this year's buy are the Sparrow III, the Sidewinder, Bullpup, Tartar, Talos, and Hawk along with several others.

The bill as submitted to the Congress requested authority for the construction of 41 new naval vessels and the conversion of 35 other vessels.

The conversions were left unchanged by the committee, but the committee added two attack or "killer" submarines in the new construction category.

The total shipbuilding and conversion program, and including the two "killer" submarines added by the committee, will require authorization in the amount of $2,444 million.

The bill as presented to the Congress contained 6 of these "killer" submarines although the Navy had requested the Secretary of Defense to provide 8 of them for this year.

Because of the great importance of this particular kind of submarine in the light of the extremely large Soviet submarine force, the committee added the two "killer" submarines which the Navy felt that it needed this year and the bill now contains a total of eight of them.

This added $134 million to the bill, or $67 million for each of these submarines.

In order to give the House a picture of where we stand today in the important category of attack or "killer" submarines, I would like to point out these facts: 17 in operation, plus 1 SSG(N), Halibut—a Regulus submarine—18 under construction, 4 authorized, but contract not yet let for a total of 40.

As I have mentioned, this bill adds 8 more for a total of 48 nuclear attack submarines after this bill has been approved.

All of the types which make up the 43 total new ships are named and described on pages 31, 32, and 33.

Of the 35 vessel conversions, 26 of them are of the destroyer class.

POLARIS

Thirty-five Polaris submarines were fully funded through fiscal year 1963. The last 6 of the planned fleet—or a total of 41—are contained in this bill.

Nine Polaris submarines carrying 144 missiles are now deployed at sea. Nine more of them with 144 more missiles will become deployable during fiscal year 1964.

For a description of the capabilities of these submarines and for more details on our Polaris fleet, I invite the attention of the House to page 13 of the report wherein will be found references to the A-1 missile, the A-2 missile, and the A-3 missile—this latter one with a planned capability far in excess of the other two.

NAVY-MARINE CORPS RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

For Navy-Marine Corps Research and Development, the bill authorizes a total of $1,087,324,000. On page 33 of the report, you will see each of these various programs broken down first by major categories and second, by the research and development programs themselves.

AIR FORCE

The bill authorizes the procurement of 964 airplanes for the Air Force for a total cost of $3,559 million. A list of these aircraft and a description of each type appear on pages 36, 37, and 38 of the Committee report.

Among the planes to be procured are the KC 135 jet tanker, the F-4C tactical fighter, the C-130E and the C-141A cargo transports.

These latter two airplanes, the C-130E and the C-141A, will provide significant modernization and improved capability in the area of airlift for troops and cargo.

In the case of missiles, the bill authorizes 16,202 missiles of various kinds for a total amount of $2,177 million. These include the intercontinental ballistic missiles Atlas, Titan, and Minuteman, the Bullpup air-to-ground missile, and the Falcon and Sparrow air-to-air missiles.

A description of each of these missiles will be found on pages 38 and 39 of the report.

The total for Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation for the Air Force is $1,746,818,000. The programs which will be carried out under this authorization are described on pages 40 and 41 of the report.

I would now like to discuss the matter of the RS-70. The RS-70 represents the outstanding difference between the departmental proposal and the bill as reported by the Committee. So, this matter should be discussed in sufficient detail to permit a full understanding.

BACKGROUND

Research and development on the RS-70 began in 1955, when this strategic bomber system was known as the B-70.

From fiscal 1955 until the recent Committee hearings, a total of $1,751 million had been appropriated. Of that sum, $1,241 million had been programed. An additional sum of $50 million had been earmarked, but not allocated. Assuming that this $50 million is allocated, there remains $81 million as a carryover into fiscal 1964.

THE NATURE OF THE DISAGREEMENT

Due to the widespread misunderstanding which exists as between the recommendations of the Secretary of Defense and the House Armed Services Committee on the RS-70, the facts must be clearly stated.

The Secretary of Defense proposes to have an RS-70 development program which would produce three prototype airplanes.

In performance, they would fly some 2,000 miles per hour, for long distances, and at extremely high altitude. But under the Secretary's program, no weapons system is being developed because the Secretary's program does not provide for all the supporting systems which would be necessary in order to make a weapons system out of the RS-70.

By no stretch of the imagination would the Secretary's program develop a fighting machine.

No additional funds were requested in the fiscal 1964 budget for further work on the RS–70 program. Apparently, whatever yet remained to be done under the Secretary's program on the RS–70 would come from this $81 mililon carryover and that would be the end of the line.

The committee, on the other hand, has taken the firm position that the development program should consist of five prototypes, rather than three. It has also taken the position that with the development of the fourth and fifth prototypes, the supporting systems that would make it a weapons system would be simultaneously developed.

The committee is unable to determine why such a large sum of money should be spent merely to provide that American ingenuity can develop an airplane that will fly at three times the speed of sound, for a long distance, and at a high altitude. The scientific community concedes that this can be accomplished. So, why spend the money to prove that a flying machine with these capabilities is within our scientific and industrial capability when that point is already conceded?

It is the contention of the committee that the RS–70 program should proceed to the point where the feasibility of the RS–70 as a weapons system has been proved or disproved.

COST DIFFERENCE

During consideration of this subject in fiscal 1963, it was the position of the Secretary of Defense that his program for three prototype RS–70's would cost $1.3 billion. It was also conceded that to add two additional prototypes, as proposed by the committee, and to develop the required support systems, would cost an additional $1.2 billion. Thus, the committee's program would cost $2.5 billion as against the Secretary's program of $1.3 billion.

It must be recognized that there has been some slippage in the program due to technical difficulties, with the first flight having been delayed for a period of months. However, these relative cost projections remain valid and delineate the cost differential in the two programs.

The question arises as to whether or not the fourth and fifth prototypes as proposed by the committee, are to cost more than $500 million each. That is not the case. As a matter of fact, the cost difference clearly accentuates the importance of this disagreement. The greater part of the additional cost would be required in the development of the supporting systems such as the missiles, highly sophisticated radar, etc. It is this fact which underscores the degree of difference in the three-prototype program being pursued by the Secretary of Defense and the five-prototype program of the committee.

The committee does not now—nor has it at any time in the past—recommended the purchase of even one RS–70 from a production line. But it insists that the development program should produce all the evidence that is needed upon which the Department of Defense and the Congress can base a rational decision as to whether or not RS–70's should be produced in quantity.

This, briefly, is the fundamental difference between the recommendation of the committee and that of the Secretary of Defense.

FUTURE STRATEGIC FLEXIBILITY

Underlying this entire controversy is the basic conviction of the House Committee on Armed Services that manned strategic systems must continue to play a major role in our military capabilities.

There can be no question but that the capabilities of our conventional forces are being greatly increased.

There can be no doubt but that the current fleet of B–52's and B–58's will continue to perform a most important role during the next 5 years. But it is equally true that no nation in the free world is developing a follow-on bomber for our current strategic bombers and unless we proceed with the development of such a strategic bomber, we will today sow the seeds which will produce our strategic bomber gap in the late 1960's.

There can be no doubt that strategic missiles constitute an extremely important part of our strategic arsenal. The committee has evidenced its judgment by approving every authorization request that has ever been presented to it for strategic missiles. The concern of the committee stems from the growing tendency on the part of the Department of Defense to place more and more emphasis on the missiles and less and less on manned strategic systems. The committee considers this to be a most dangerous course of action and one with which it disagrees.

CIVILIAN CONTROL AND MILITARY JUDGMENT

In taking its position, the committee does not challenge in any degree the right or necessity of civilian control over the Department of Defense. Such control is essential.

The Secretary of Defense may completely disregard, if he chooses, the recommendations of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, even though they are his principal military advisers as a matter of law. But it is pertinent to point out some recent actions of the Joint Chiefs of Staff on the question of the RS–70.

In September 1962, the RS–70 development program was referred to the Joint Chiefs of Staff for an expression of military judgment. On that occasion, the Joint Chiefs of Staff unanimously supported the development of the RS–70. Even in the case of one member who supported its development principally as a reconnaissance vehicle, he also supported it with its other supporting systems such as missiles, and so forth.

Shortly after that decision, two new members were appointed to the Joint Chiefs of Staff and the RS–70 matter was again submitted for consideration. Again, all members of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, with the exception of the new Chairman, supported the development of the RS–70.

It is recognized that there is some difference of opinion as to precisely what the Joint Chiefs of Staff supported. But there can be no doubt that the Joint Chiefs, with the single exception noted, supported the development of the RS–70 at a substantially higher level of development than that currently planned under the program of the Secretary of Defense. Under any fair interpretation, the best military judgment available supports the development program proposed by the committee.

SUMMARY

What are the proposed capabilities of a fully developed RS–70?

First. It would be equipped with the most outstanding air reconnaissance capabilities in the world.

Second. It would not carry gravity bombs but would be equipped with air-to-ground missiles of substantial range, having nuclear warheads. Thus, it would have an offensive or strike capability.

Third. The RS–70 would have the capability of conducting a reconnaissance mission in a hostile environment, before or after an ICBM exchange, and would be capable of striking not only preplanned targets, but those targets not precisely located, as well as mobile targets of opportunity.

Fourth. While in the performance of its mission in a hostile environment, it could report back to the command post the results of not only its own strike, but previous strikes by other weapons systems.

Fifth. The current strategic bomber force provides that military unbrella under which strictly limited warfare, of any substantial magnitude, may be conducted. This capability provides that essential element of flexibility which spans the gap between limited war capabilities and the pushbutton war of long-range missiles. It embraces that highly essential element—the judgment of man.

Sixth. Finally, the effect which the development of the RS–70 weapons system would have on the enemy would be great. The current Soviet air defense system of Soviet interceptors, radar, and surface-to-air missiles would be so seriously degraded by the capabilities of the RS–70 as to become practically worthless. Those defenses could be penetrated beyond all doubt.

Assuming that the development and procurement of the RS–70 in substantial quantity would entail an expenditure of $10 billion, an equivalent or greater expenditure would be required on the part of the Soviets to develop an air defense system which had any reasonable possibility of successfully coping with this weapons system.

CONCLUSION

Now, I hope I have given a good picture of what this bill will do. I have broken it down by service and by the various programs of each of the services.

I have referred on a number of occasions by page number to detailed information contained in the report. I have also mentioned that so far as procurement is concerned, the bill is slightly smaller this year than last year although the grand total of the bill is larger because of the fact that research and development is contained in the bill for the first time this year.

I would not say that the bill is really unusual in any major respect. It is simply an authorization for fiscal year 1964 for programs which have been going on for many years within the three military departments. Quite literally, it is more of the same.

I urge the wholehearted support of all Members of the House.

SUMMARY OF BILL

In summary, then, the committee added $497,700,000 to the bill for the two "killer" submarines and the first step toward two more RS–70 airplanes.

The bill authorizes some 3,000 aircraft, some 60,000 missiles, 43 new ships, and the conversion of 35 ships.

The most important of the new 43 ships are 6 Polaris submarines, 8 attack submarines, 10 destroyer escorts, 1 submarine tender, and 10 motor gunboats.

Of the 35 conversions, 26 are destroyers and 7 of these 26 are guided missile destroyers.

The bill also authorizes a grand total of $3,129,191,000 for research and development for all three departments.

The committee hearings extended from late in January to late in February and on every day but two, the committee met morning and afternoon, sometimes until 6 o'clock in the evening. The committee went into every conceivable detail with respect to all of the programs requested for authorization.

We looked at every aircraft, missile, and ship, and we studied every research and development program. We compared the inventory of the departments today as we weighed the request for the additional items.

Now, those are the highlights of the program. It is a big one, but it is a tight one. The requests from the individual departments would have made a bill very much larger than the $15 billion contained in this bill. Large as it is, it is a lean program.

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Chairman, will my distinguished chairman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. COHELAN. Our very distinguished chairman has asked why. I would like, as one of the five majority Members who has taken the liberty to speak on this very important question, to refer the chairman and Members of the House to page 399 of the hearings wherein this very question was asked of the Secretary of Defense in the following colloquy between myself and Secretary McNamara:

> Mr. COHELAN. Now, Mr. Secretary, can you tell me now what the status of the RS–70 program is?
>
> I understand that we were supposed to have one in December.
>
> Secretary MCNAMARA. Yes.
>
> Mr. COHELAN. Supposed to have one in December and one in July.
>
> Secretary MCNAMARA. We were supposed to have the first flight of the RS–70, or the first flight of first aircraft, in December. That aircraft has not flown to date. It is uncertain as to when it will fly. The estimates range from May, I understand, through October.

Now, that is the comment of the distinguished Secretary of Defense. I wish the gentleman would comment on that.

Mr. VINSON. Yes, I will comment on it.

If we stopped every time there were some bugs or some failure in our missile program, we would have stopped building missiles a long time ago. We are getting to the point where the Atlas and the Titan in a period of time will be supplemented by the Minuteman. But even so, in the last five tests of the Minuteman it did not come up to expectations.

Mr. Chairman, this RS–70 is a most complicated plane. We know it can fly, we know it can fly at a speed three times that of sound, we know it can go very high. But when you get that knowledge you would close the book. This is where we disagree.

I say what good, what benefit to the existence of this country is it to gain that knowledge and then let it lie fallow. We say, "Get the knowledge and use that knowledge to make a weapon system out of it."

These five distinguished colleagues of mine on the Committee on Armed Services say in their separate views, "Get the knowledge, file it away, put the bushel measure over the candle light, let it die."

We say, "Carry it on, build further." If you do you will build a weapon system the like of which has never been invented by man before. There is no doubt about that. Continue the manned system. I will tell you later on what its military characteristics are. I certainly hope when we debate this at greater length we will have this Chamber full of Members. We will make all of our points, because this is a very important matter, it is a basic question of policy.

There is no doubt that the Secretary is one of the greatest men to occupy that position. The Nation respects him, I respect him, and I am going to help him save $4 billion out of this $52 billion expenditure. But 32 members of the committee simply do not agree with his position in this matter.

He came in and concluded that we do not need the B–47's. And the B–47's go out of the inventory soon. It was decided when the contract on the B–52's was finished that would be the end of the B–52's. And the same with the B–58's. They would live and fly only so long as their machinery was capable of carrying them in the air.

Thirty-two members of the Committee on Armed Services think it is not the proper thing to do to get away from manned systems. We think we should continue on with manned systems, and not put all of our offensive and defensive dependence on the Minuteman, the Titan, the Atlas, or the Polaris. We think we had better find more ways to defend this country than just one, missiles. This is the Maginot line of thinking. And a dangerous course to follow.

Now, we are not going to rush this bill here this afternoon. It will be thoroughly explained, even if it takes all week to debate this bill, because the defense of this country is at stake in what kind of policy we have and what kind of weapons systems we develop.

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. LINDSAY. I thank the distinguished chairman. On page 6 of the majority report there is one sentence that I find particularly interesting. Discussing the position of the Joint Chiefs of Staff with respect to the RS–70 the report states as follows:

> It is recognized that there is some difference of opinion as to precisely what the Joint Chiefs of Staff supported.

Would the gentleman kindly explain the background of this statement?

Mr. VINSON. That is going to be debated considerably by the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. HÉBERT] and others. But, briefly here is what happened in a general way. Last September the Secretary referred this matter of the RS–70 to the Joint Chiefs of Staff. Now, all of you know who constitute the Joint Chiefs of Staff. They are the Chiefs of their respective services. It is composed of a Chairman and the four Chiefs. In September he referred it to the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and at that time General Lemnitzer was Chairman. After consideration by the Joint Chiefs of Staff they unanimously recommended acceleration of the RS–70 program. A short time after that a change took place in the Joint Chiefs of Staff. General Lemnitzer was ordered to NATO, and General Decker's, the Army Chief, time had expired. General Wheeler was appointed from the Army, and the President's military adviser, a most distinguished officer, General Taylor, was made Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. Then the Secretary submitted it to the new group, and every member of the Joint Chiefs of Staff except General Taylor recommended for the second time that this program go forward at a higher rate.

Of course, the Secretary, under the authority, direction, and control given to him by the Congress, that is, the civilian control, has the right to disregard any recommendation of the Joint Chiefs of Staff at any time he sees fit. That is civilian control. But, we did develop those facts and I think the House should have them.

There was no hesitancy on the part of an overwhelming majority of the Members for the Committee on Armed Services to write in this provision and ask this House to follow the conclusions and recommendations of the top military authorities in the Nation, those fixed by statute with the responsibility to advise the President and the Secretary of Defense on military matters. And we decided that the heavy preponderance of military opinion, which was backed up by the scientists in the Air Force, warranted the continuation of the RS–70 program at a higher level of effort.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Chairman, will the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Armed Services yield?

Mr. VINSON. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. First, I would like to say that I agree with the distinguished chairman completely and have been a consistent supporter of the B–70 and the RS–70 program. However, in view of the attitude of the Secretary of Defense this past year when Congress approved and appropriated funds and they were not expended, can the chairman give us any assurance that we can convince the Secretary of Defense of the merits of this program?

Mr. VINSON. Let us cross every bridge as we come to it. When we get to that point, probably we may be more persuasive than we have been in the past. Let us carry out our own responsibility. I feel that is up to us to say that the policy of America and its defense is not going to be based on missiles alone. Bombers with men in them have maintained the peace for all these years. We have some 1,400 of them. They have represented a restraining influence and force that still keeps the peace today. I am unwilling in meeting my responsibility to say we are going to let all of that fade away and come to the pushbutton stage when all we have got to do is to push a button deep in the ground and shoot up a missile.

I do not wish to be understood as discounting the importance of missiles. We must have them just as we must have many other kinds of weapons. What I do want to have clearly understood as my position is that if we get to the point where we have told the enemy that the only thing he has to guard against is missiles, we will have failed in living up to our responsibilities in defending this country.

What we need is a "mix" of weapons. In this way we keep the enemy off balance at all times because he knows that we can attack him with a great variety of weapons against all of which he must spend his time and effort in guarding.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. When the gentleman speaks of 1,400 missiles, the gentleman must be talking about major missiles.

Mr. VINSON. I am talking about 1,400 bombers.

Mr. GROSS. Bombers?

Mr. VINSON. Yes; 1,400 bombers.

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. COHELAN. The chairman does not mean to imply that we are going to go out of the bomber business by his remarks?

Mr. VINSON. We are going out of the strategic bombing business and, of course, you know it.

Mr. COHELAN. Will the distinguished chairman tell the Members of the House what is the strategic bomber mission?

Mr. VINSON. The mission of any strategic force is to destroy the enemy's warmaking potential and we can do that today. But I ask the question: Will we be able to do this in the all too immediate future? Of course, there will be tactical bombers. They will continue in our inventory. However, I am directing my remarks today to the issue between strategic manned operated systems, and a sole reliance on missiles.

Mr. Chairman, we think the facts—and this will be gone into at considerable length—clearly warrant the proposal to increase the level of effort on the RS-70. We also think there is another item which is highly important: We think the amendment to provide for eight "killer" submarines instead of six warrants the same favorable consideration.

Mr. Chairman, as referred to by the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Brown], when I appeared before the Committee on Rules last Friday I did refer briefly to the capability of the Russian submarine. Of course, we know what these Russian submarines can do.

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. Ninety-four Members are present, not a quorum.

The Clerk will call the roll.

The Clerk called the roll and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 10]

Abernethy
Blatnik
Bolling
Celler
Clausen
Curtis
Daddario
Davis, Tenn.
Diggs
Farbstein
Griffiths
Gurney
Harsha
Hawkins
Healey
Herlong
Kee
Kluczynski
Madden
Miller, N.Y.
O'Brien, Ill
Patten
Powell
Rains
Rhodes, Ariz.
Rogers, Tex.
Sheppard
Smith, Va.
Teague, Tex.
Tupper
Utt
Walter
Watson
Zablocki

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. Shelley, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee having had under consideration the bill H.R. 2440, and finding itself without a quorum, he had directed the roll to be called, when 404 Members responded to their names, a quorum, and he submitted herewith the names of the absentees to be spread upon the Journal.

The Committee resumed its sitting.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 15 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, after Chairman Vinson's detailed explanation of the purpose and contents of the pending authorization bill, nothing would be gained by my again detailing the nature of the military weapons we recommend be made a part of our defense arsenal and the reasons for our recommendation. Our committee has painstakingly examined every aspect of our defense posture: What we now have, what we now need, and what we need and should have in the foreseeable future.

This bill represents our committee's considered judgment as how best to meet those needs. We have but one objective. That is to make certain that we have a national defense second to none, that we are adequately prepared for any emergency that threatens our security, whenever, however, and wherever it may arise. And, corollary to that purpose, we are determined that our people shall have a dollar's worth of defense for each dollar expended.

The measure before us authorizes an appropriation of approximately $15,857 million for defense purposes for the next fiscal year. That is a tremendous sum but constitutes only one part of our defense program—the development and procurement of weapons: Ships, planes, and missiles. As we all so well know, national security—our own Defense Establishment and related international programs—is about one-half of our entire national budget.

This is a heavy burden on American taxpayers. But it is one which they will bear without complaint so long as they have the assurance that what is being spent for defense is being spent wisely and efficiently. To the people a defense need is a must and sacrifices must be made in other areas of Federal expenditures. First things first. A prudent family first pays the rent or installment on the mortgage, that it may be insured shelter, before it makes a down payment on a new car. It is incumbent upon us, as custodians of the taxpayers money, to be no less prudent.

A prudent family also does not rent or buy a house beyond its needs. As large as this bill is, our commnittee has determined that the items it embodies are a minimum need as our National military shelter against militant international communism.

This is not to say that our military budget is so sacred, so sanctified, and so sagaciously constituted that it must not be touched. Let no one be under the illusion that the mere authorization and appropriation of dollars for each and every thing the Department of Defense wants will give us the kind of a defense we need and should have. Military strength cannot be measured in terms of dollars. And let no one hesitate to recommend a cut in defense funds where he honestly believes the funds are not essential or not fully justified.

Our national defense operations are international in scope. There are doubtless operations here at home and operations in various places around the globe that can be reduced, eliminated, or changed without in any way affecting the bone and muscle of our defense arm. We want a defense structure that is bone and muscle. We want the fat taken off. We would be stronger by so doing. And one who finds places where we can do just that is rendering a patriotic service.

All this can doubtless be more appropriately said when we take up the Defense Department appropriation bill, when dollar by dollar we take up each and every one of the innumerable Defense Department operations. The authorization bill before us does not deal with defense operations. It deals with weapons. It deals with the very sinew of our whole defense plans and posture.

Also corollary to the determination of our Committee on Armed Services that we have a military defense fully prepared for any emergency is our determination that our national defense continue to be balanced and flexible. We consider proper balance and the maximum flexibility a primary requisite to our entire defense effort. This has been and should continue to be a cardinal principle in our defense planning.

To be sure, over the years the science of warfare has changed as new weapons have been developed. The development of gunpowder had, in its day, as tremendous an impact on military strategy and plans as the development of the airplane and nuclear power has had in our day. The changes in the weapons, however, have not brought about changes in basic defense principles. They have merely forced a change of emphasis. This country's ability to adjust its defense machinery to every new development—to be able to fight a little war, a "brush war," a naval war, a land war, a small war or an all-out war—to be able to meet any military emergency on this continent or any continent, or an island or in a mountain, at some distant place or near our homeland—our ability to meet the enemy and defeat him here, there, or anywhere, at any time, place, or under any circumstances, has been the all-important fact that we have had, and must continue to have, a defense that is both balanced and flexible.

This is basic with our committee on armed services. This is why we have at all times exercised the utmost care to preserve the integrity and identity of our respective services—Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marine Corps. This is why we so carefully set up in the unification act our Joint Chiefs of Staff system, with each service having its assigned roles and missions and each having a voice in our defense plans.

I need not say how effective this system has been. It proved its worth in World War II and continues to prove its worth. And I do not think I need say that Chairman Vinson and I will resist as long as we are privileged to serve here on the Armed Services Committee any attempt by anyone to discard this system for a single Chief of Staff.

But I fear—and I think my chairman shares this fear—we have in fact, if not in name, a single Chief of Staff in Secretary of Defense McNamara. While we provided in the Unification Act for civilian control of our Armed Forces—and it is essential to our form of Government that we have such control—we never for a moment thought that civilian control would become civilian dictation of the military planning. While we feared the potential power of a military man in the role of a Chief of Staff of all our Armed Forces, we never thought that a civilian in the role of Secretary of Defense would practically make himself Chief of Staff.

This is matter that greatly disturbs me, and I believe it is a matter of greatest possible concern to our committee. It is a matter of utmost concern when we find the substitution of civilian judgment for military judgment in matters strictly military, that our whole concept of a balanced and flexible military defense is endangered.

Secretary of Defense McNamara is a dedicated public servant. To know him is to like him as a person and to admire him as a man of unusual ability. He is extremely able. He is ambitious. But "I got all the answers McNamara" is not the last word in military strategy. He may know how to manufacture military weapons, but he has had no training and experience in how military weapons might be employed or their relative value in the formulation of our defense plans.

This is not solely my opinion. Nor is it solely the opinion of most of the members of our committee. It is the view, largely unexpressed, of our professional military leaders. It is also the view of our defense experts—men who have devoted their lives to studying and writing about military matters.

Hanson W. Baldwin, military editor of the New York Times, is considered one of the world's foremost military-affairs writers. This is what he says in a recent magazine article entitled "The McNamara Monarchy." I commend your reading the entire article. I will quote two paragraphs:

> Objections or dissent, even to Congress, are discouraged, muted or, when possible, stifled. Mr. McNamara has pressured the Joint Chiefs of Staff to sign written statements testifying to Congress that the Administration's defense budget is adequate. He has censored, deleted, and altered statements to Congress by the Chiefs of the services and their secretaries. He has downgraded, ignored, bypassed or overruled the advice of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. Gen. Maxwell D. Taylor, the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs, is a known advocate of the abolition of the Joint Chiefs of Staff system. He favors a single voice.

A little further on in the article Mr. Baldwin says this:

> Perhaps the greatest military danger in this centralization and unification is that it overrides the voice of professional experience and substitutes a military party line, a single strategic concept. The opinions of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, unless they happen to coincide with Mr. McNamara's, are usually given short shrift. Managerial techniques, computer analyses, cost-effectiveness yardsticks—rather than judgments learned on the battlefield—dominate decisions on strategy, weapons choices, even force levels.

This is exactly what is involved in connection with the RS–70. It is the decision of Secretary McNamara, not of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, that the production of bombers stop, that we proceed no further with the RS–70 development program, and that we accordingly place all our defense eggs in the missile basket. To do this robs our defense of its flexibility. We are denying ourselves an alternative. We are risking our all, so to speak, on the missile—an untried weapon.

I do not intend to go into a technical discussion of the relative merits of the missiles as against the bombers. There is no question that the missile should be emphasized, but we need the bombers to complement it, to supplement it, and to give us the necessary flexibility. There is a longstanding military principle involved here that Secretary McNamara would summarily have us now reject.

In the case of the RS–70, the Joint Chiefs of Staff immediately preceding the current one, voted unanimously that the program be substantially increased.

I want to make this emphatically clear. Every Chief of Staff and the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs all voted for this increase in the RS–70 program. That was their considered military judgment, individually and collectively, as to what we should do in order to have an adequate defense looking to the future.

Shortly after this vote by the Joint Chiefs, there were two changes in the composition of the Joint Chiefs. General Decker of the Army was replaced by General Wheeler, and General Lemnitzer, the Chairman, was replaced by General Taylor who had previously been serving in the nebulous position created by the President as his military adviser.

With these two changes in the composition of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, Secretary of Defense McNamara requested the new Joint Chiefs to consider the RS–70. Again, all of the Joint Chiefs as representatives of each of the services, voted for a higher level of effort. The new Chairman relatively fresh from the military-politico climate of the White House voted against. Not unexpectedly, the new Chairman voted with Secretary McNamara's point of view.

I might add that in the case of the Skybolt the situation is very much the same, with the voting of the Joint Chiefs being essentially the same as took place in connection with the RS–70.

Our Committee on Armed Services has never allowed politics or partisanship to enter into our decisions. I say that with some pride. Whoever is President; whoever is Secretary of Defense; whatever political party controls the administration or the Congress, or both, our Committee on Armed Services has has always set aside every political consideration and sought solely to insure that we have the kind of defense we should have.

The Constitution vests primary responsibility for the kind and size of military defense we shall have in the Congress of the United States and in our Committee on Armed Services. The Secretary of Defense needs to be reminded of this all-important fact. When he impounded funds last year that we appropriated for the RS–70 he arrogated to himself not only the responsibilities of the Joint Chiefs of Staff; he arrogated to himself the responsibility of the Congress.

Our committee has weighed all this carefully. We have determined that if we are to continue to have a properly balanced and fully flexible defense we should proceed with the RS–70 program. We accordingly exercised our constitutional duty and responsibility, and we added around $364 million for the further development of the RS–70 bomber. In doing this we are following the advice of the seasoned, experienced, dedicated men who serve on the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

Our committee has also overruled the Secretary of Defense in his decision that the Navy should have only six instead of eight attack or "killer" submarines. To this end we have added $134 million to that requested for naval vessels.

With over 450 submarines, 30 cruisers, and 400 destroyer types, Russia presents a formidable threat on the high seas. This was an estimate of the Soviet naval strength given us at the recent NATO Conference. The mission of the large Soviet submarine force is obvious. They are intent upon cutting off sources of power and control between the NATO countries. We must not permit this to happen. We must maintain control of the seas. And, above all else, we must keep open the four vital gateways of the seas: Straits of Gibraltar, Suez Canal, Straits of Malaya and the Panama Canal.

This is what primarily influenced the committee to decide to grant the Navy's request for eight "killer" submarines. It should be borne in mind that a submarine is a complicated instrument of defense and cannot be built in a short period of time. We should authorize them now that we may hold the lead we now have in modern nuclear submarines.

I hope the House will support our committee in these two major decisions. If cuts are to be made in defense expenditures, this it seems to me is not the place to make them. You are here dealing with the bone and muscle of our defense arm, not the fat. You are here dealing with items that are essential if we are to be fully prepared to strike a telling military blow if and when such a need should arise.

There is no center aisle on defense matters. This bill was reported out of our committee unanimously, and I hope it will pass the House as recommended by our committee by a unanimous vote.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ARENDS. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. LAIRD. I would like to ask a question of the gentleman. In this bill there is authorized $12,363 million in the area of procurement. Certainly from the hearings going on before the Defense Appropriations Committee at the present time, although we may agree on the attack submarines, we cannot agree that there is no fat in the defense budget as submitted this year. We feel there are real possibilities of making savings in this procurement area as well as in the research and development, test, and evaluation area. I hope the members of the gentleman's committee will understand that we feel we have a responsibility to cut some of the fat that is in procurement and that is in research and development, even though this authorization may be passed at this level today or tomorrow.

Mr. ARENDS. Let me say to the gentleman from Wisconsin that I think I made it abundantly clear that if there are places where reductions could be made, that is an obligation of the gentleman's committee.

Mr. LAIRD. I am sure there are.

Mr. ARENDS. That is fine. I am glad to assure the gentlemen on the Defense Appropriations Committee that they will have an opportunity to go into many of the things involved in this bill and make cuts in the budget.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ARENDS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. VINSON. I wish the distinguished gentleman would point out to the House where the fat is so that we could be informed with respect to that.

Mr. ADAIR. Certainly, I would be very happy to if the gentleman from Illinois would yield to me.

Mr. ARENDS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. LAIRD. In the whole total area of procurement, the hearings we are presently conducting show us that only about 50 percent of the present procurement contracts in the Department of Defense are being carried out on a true competitive bid basis. We have had certain examples brought before the committee by the General Accounting Office where we feel that by forcing the Department of Defense to go on a more competitive basis we can save substantial amounts of money. I would like to call the attention of the members of the committee today to reports of the Committee on Government Operations. The Committee on Government Operations has released in the past few months some very enlightening reports in this whole area of procurement. I feel we ought not to say that everything is all right in the Department of Defense as far as procurement is concerned. I do not believe the U.S. taxpayer is getting a dollar's worth of defense for every dollar expended in the area of procurement today. The Secretary of Defense in testimony before our committee stated he feels by better management in the procurement area alone over $2½ billion could be saved. I believe it can be saved through more competitive bidding procedures. It is up to the Congress to hold the Department of Defense's feet to the fire.

Last year our committee took a very minor reduction in the area of procurement. It was 1 percent. This 1-percent reduction did not hurt the procurement department of the Department of Defense one bit. The year before we took a 3-percent reduction in the area of procurement, and it did not slow down the Department of Defense as far as long-range planning for the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force or the Marine Corps. It seems to me, it is up to the Congress through the appropriation procedures to keep the feet of the Department of Defense to the fire and to see that savings are brought about. And this can be done.

In the area of research and development, I also feel that we have a real opportunity to make some reductions. If one will just take the report of the Comptroller General and read over that particular report very carefully, I think that you cannot come to any other conclusion than that better management in this area is absolutely necessary. We have in this area a limitation which has been put on overhead. We find that some of the contracts in research and development are being funded by the Department of Defense at the present time and that the overhead costs are running as high as 85 percent of the regular contract. We have a limitation when it comes to grants in research and development, but in the contracting procedure we have no limitation on overhead costs. It seems to me it is the responsibility of the Congress to look into these matters. I do not want my vote on this bill to be a commitment in any way as to the question of appropriations, and we want the Committee on Appropriations to go over very thoroughly every dollar requested by the Department of Defense.

Mr. ARENDS. I agree with what the gentleman said, and in order to emphasize the point, let me read what I said earlier in my remarks so it will be made abundantly clear:

> This is not to say that our military budget is so sacred, so sanctified, and so sagaciously constituted that it must not be touched. Let no one be under the illusion that the mere authorization and appropriation of dollars for each and every thing the Department of Defense wants will give us the kind of a defense we need and should have. Military strength cannot be measured in terms of dollars. And let no one hesitate to recommend a cut in defense funds where he honestly believes the funds are not essential or not fully justified.

So I support the gentleman.

I now yield to the gentleman from Indiana, [Mr. HALLECK].

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ARENDS. I yield.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, I want to confirm what the gentleman from Wisconsin has just said in respect to this proposition that is before us today. Personally I do not think there is anything sacrosanct in the defense budget. As I said a few days ago, and was criticized in some quarters for having said it—but I meant it—if the military posture and the situation of the United States in the world today is so much better than it was 2 or 3 years ago, why is it that the defense budget under Eisenhower was $40 billion a year, but now we have got to have $50 billion a year?

I just want to say to the gentleman that as far as I am concerned, I, too, shall not be bound by this authorization bill, because I am sure that having regard to the protection and the security of our country we can find places in this defense budget where savings can be had, and the time will come when the appropriation bill is before us that we will have the opportunity to take that position.

Mr. ARENDS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. PIKE].

Mr. PIKE. Mr. Chairman, I am very grateful to the benevolent and kindly chairman of our committee, the gentleman from Georgia, for letting me take this time as one of the Fearful Five who have opposed some part of this mighty defense spending program. I think it is only right that I start by saying I agree with 98 percent of everything the gentleman from Georgia said as far as the money in this bill is concerned, and I am tremendously impressed by the work this committee does. I think the committee has almost always marched together. I know those of us who are members of this committee but who signed these additional views, who were members of the committee 2 years ago, marched with the committee 2 years ago when we said we would not expand the RS–70 program. We marched with the committee last year when we said we would expand the RS–70 program, and we even counter-marched with the committee when it was necessary to do that last year.

Probably no military development within the memory of the majority of the Members of this body has been subject to as many starts and stops and speed-ups and slowdowns, of agonizing reappraisals as this B–70 or RS–70 program has. It is 10 years since the first studies were undertaken, and during the decade of gestation which has followed there can be found in the record references to the following programs, all of which have been the target at one time or another: First, a 3-wing program for B–70's; second, a 200-plane program for B–70's; third, a 1-wing program for B–70's; fourth, a 1-plane feasibility study of the B–70; fifth, a 12-plane program for B–70's; sixth, a 3-plane feasibility study of the B–70; seventh, a 6-plane feasibility study of 3 B–70's and 3 RS–70's; and, eighth, a 5-plane feasibility study of 3 B–70's and 2 RS–70's.

While the almost annual changes have contributed greatly to both the confusion and the cost, they are perhaps inevitable in the light of the rapidly changing military technology of the 10-year span in question.

In 1953, when this Air Force baby, yet unborn, was first considered, there was no Atlas, no Titan, and no Minuteman in the Air Force arsenal. There was no Polaris in the Navy. Today, these are not only standard items of military hardware, but in certain configurations some of them are already obsolescent. None of them, it is true, has been proved in combat. This is a principal reason advanced for the continuation of the B–70 or RS–70 program.

We must not put all of our eggs in a missile basket. Of course we must not; we have not; and no one has recommended that we should. Our B–52 strategic bombers will be operational well into the 1970's. Our tactical aircraft now in production and soon to be in production will have bombing and striking capabilities not even contemplated when the B–70 was first considered.

We are not making any manned strategic bombers at the present time. This, too, is advanced as a necessary reason for this production.

The position is a valid one only if a manned strategic bomber can accomplish something which no other weapons system or combination of systems can accomplish, or can accomplish it more effectively and efficiently. Without such a capability there is no more validity in continuing the production of manned strategic bombers than there is in continuing to maintain horse cavalry.

The manned strategic bomber is capable of reconnaissance and the missile is not. Many other aircraft, however, are also capable of reconnaissance. In the concept of the RS–70 there have been combined the reconnaissance and striking capabilities on an almost instantaneous basis. The RS–70, while not as fast as a missile, does move fast enough so that the time involved in looking at a radar picture of a possible target, determining whether the target required a strike, and launching a missile at such a target, would be about 3 minutes. Assuming that we had the radar required to provide an accurate picture from the altitudes and ranges proposed—which we have not; assuming that we had the data processing and guidance equipment necessary to guide a missile from a launching platform moving at three times the speed of sound to such a target—which we have not; assuming we had the missile—which we have not, we would nevertheless be putting a tremendously dangerous burden of decisionmaking on a pair of radar technicians, and asking them to make that decision in an almost impossible length of time. If we assume that no target would be authorized except a target which had already been cleared by some higher echelon, there are few targets which could not be more rapidly reconnoitered by, and effectively attacked by, our tactical aircraft.

No one has asked an end to manned strategic systems. Throughout the history of military development, however, the goal of the men in any manned system has been to develop the range of his bow and arrow, his rifle, his artillery, his rockets and his missiles, in order that he can stand back as far as possible to fire his weapon so that his enemy cannot fire back at him. To say that our strategic missile systems are not manned systems does a great disservice to the tens of thousands of trained, alert, and dedicated men who are manning them in remote and lonely outposts right now. To say that any system is not manned unless it involves a pilot or a navigator or a bombardier who looks down on his target and drops a bomb or fires a missile at it is as silly as saying that artillery is not a manned system unless the artillerymen can see the targets they are firing at.

The Air Force itself, with its operational Hound Dog missiles, has certainly recognized the desirability of standing off some 500 miles in B–52's and firing at targets which it believes are there but which it certainly cannot see. This hardly makes the B–52 anything less than a manned system.

We talk about the RS–70 as if it were a bomber. Here is a plane which does not carry any bombs. The RS–70 is a missile system, and the alternative is not between manned bombers and missiles. The alternative is between one kind of a missile system and another kind of a missile system, and I am prepared to defend the proposition that it is going to be a little more difficult to hit a target from a launching platform moving at more than three times the speed of sound.

The phrase, "manned bomber," may conjure up to many Americans glorious images of helmets and goggles and silk scarves flying in the breeze, but these images will not be adequate unless they also conjure up some images of a system which can get through to its target and destroy it. It is incumbent upon the Air Force to justify such a system in terms of 1963, not 1943, or even 1953. Lest anyone say that it has been justified many times in the past, this year's program is different from last year's program and from any other program which has ever been presented, and should be required to stand on its own two legs. No one has explained why a development which the Air Force last year said would require three additional aircraft this year only requires two additional aircraft.

Finally, the subject of money. There seems to be some sort of suspicion attached to anyone who even raises the question of the cost of any military expenditure. Yet in a fiscal year when we face a possible $11.8 billion deficit, in an age when a cold war is being fought in significant part as an economic battle, and in a Congress where we have been asked to cut taxes, I feel that the cost of this system and of this amendment to the Department of Defense program is a legitimate subject of inquiry. The cost, of course, is not $363 million for these two planes, it is ultimately over a billion dollars for these two planes.

Now, we have heard a lot about the Joint Chiefs of Staff supporting this development. They did support the development of the RS–70, and they also supported the development of the Skybolt. Nobody is saying we ought to require the Air Force to produce the Skybolt. I think that if they were asked, the Joint Chiefs of Staff would undoubtedly support the development of a lot of other weapons systems not in this budget.

And, I think further this is not the right question. The question should have been, if you were going to spend $363 million additional, would you spend it for this program? Now, you cannot tell me that the admirals of the Navy would rather see this $363 million spent here than for additional Polaris submarines. You cannot tell me that the generals of the Army would not rather see this $363 million spent for the Nike-Zeus program. And, the Air Force itself did not even say at any time in our hearings that they would rather see this $363 million spent here than anywhere else. These two planes would ultimately cost more than half a billion dollars each. I feel that in view of the alternative systems available, in view of the dubious effectiveness of the system proposed, in view of the weak justification advanced for this two-plane program this year, and in view of its fantastic cost, this amendment should not have been adopted by the committee.

I believe there are 363 places where we could better spend $1 million this year or a million places where we might better spend $363. I would like to suggest that as a very last resort, there are 100 million taxpayers who would not be outraged if we did not spend this money at all.

Mr. BATES. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GAVIN].

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, I address myself to the matter of providing modern equipment in the amounts needed to the Army.

The appearance of substantial increases in Army funding in fiscal year 1962, fiscal year 1963, and fiscal year 1964 can be misleading and must be tempered by the realization of these pertinent considerations: For several years preceding, the Army funds for modernization were extremely austere and even the reserve stocks were dipped into and not replaced. This situation was further aggravated by the enlargement of active duty Army strength from 860,000 to 960,000 and the resultant increase of combat ready divisions from 11 to 16 since the end of fiscal year 1961.

Additional factors for consideration are the increasing importance of the Army in a changing strategy resulting from the possibility of nuclear stalemate; the Army's involvement in this country's response to covert armed aggressions, as in southeast Asia; the urgent need to fully equip 6 reserve divisions; and the need for increased stockage of combat consumables and replacement spares for 16 divisions and supporting forces.

In light of these considerations, there is much cause for concern that a proper share of defense spending is directed to equipping and sustaining Army ground combat forces. However, even beyond this basic provision is a more important question. Is the Army afforded the degree of technological modernization it must have to face the superior manpower and growing materiel sophistication of Communist-bloc armies?

My examination discloses that at present the Army's needs for equipping its units and providing required materiel reserves are so great that it does not desire, and cannot afford, minor marginal improvements.

The Army's Chief of Staff, Gen. Earle G. Wheeler, is vigorously pursuing all aspects of materiel throughout the Army in order to achieve simplifications, reductions, eliminations and savings as well as proper orientation to real need and cost effectiveness. The recent major reorganization of the Army is bringing about fundamental improvements in the development and procurement of Army materiel.

Further, the Army's P-day concept—P equals production; simply put, the concept of buying enough during peacetime to have enough materiel on hand until industry production lines can turn out goods to equal the rate of consumption—envisions continuous combat support after D-day with minimum peacetime expense. It develops production readiness with the least possible materiel reserves instead of relying on large stagnating stocks on hand.

The Army's chronic shortage of weapons, equipment, ammunition, and supplies required to support itself in combat has been cited by the Secretary of Defense, in presenting this budget request, as one of the most serious deficiencies in this Nation's overall defense posture.

It is commendable, indeed, that the Department of Defense has established interim procurement objectives, in this and the preceding budget, to serve as successive balanced steps toward a higher state of Army readiness.

We note, however, that the corrective action in this fiscal year 1964 budget request principally moves toward completing the initial issue of equipment for combat forces, and providing replacements and consumables to sustain them in combat. Certain shortfalls exist even when the fiscal year 1964 Army budget is approved. Therefore, many of the modernization requirements remain unfilled or postponed.

Thus, it appears that the Army's requirements are minimal, and that the fiscal year 1964 "Production of equipment and materiel, Army" budget is worthy of support. We agree with the budget's objective which is to attain a substantially better quantitive position permitting a longer initial period of sustained combat. In the coming months, however, the Congress must continue close evaluation of the Army's readiness and assure itself that technological modernization gains are stressed, as promised, in subsequent Army funding requests.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. STRATTON].

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Chairman, it is always difficult, of course, for any member of the Committee on Armed Services to take issue with the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, and, as in this case, with the chairman and with a majority of the members as well. Reference has been made on the floor that the filing of additional views on this massive authorization bill before us on the part of five members of the committee was a step without precedent in the House. I am not sure whether this is true, but it certainly is true that the deliberations of our committee have been to a very great degree conducted in a nonpartisan or a bipartisan way over the years and the divisions within the committee have not usually been along party lines. That is certainly true in this particular debate.

I do not think that the heavens will fall if five members of the committee take issue on the expenditure of some one-third of a billion dollars. But I would like to pay special tribute to the distinguished chairman of our committee who certainly throughout my experience on the committee has been more than fair to every single member of the committee; has given us an opportunity to ask questions, to express our views, and in this case to file the additional views which have been reported to be unprecedented in the history of the committee.

But when we are in a position such as we are in today, where over half of our expenditures in the Government are in the military field, it seems to me that we in this Congress have got to take a very careful look at all of these expenditures. There cannot be just one single party line about how to look at these expenditures. This House has got to have an opportunity to consider and to debate, especially when a matter of over one-third of a billion dollars is involved.

Mr. Chairman, what is the situation that we confront today? We have already had reference to it. We have the biggest Federal budget in the history of the country—$99 billion. We have a defense budget that is the fourth largest in the history of the country—$54 billion. We face the possibility of a Federal deficit of something like $12 billion, as our friends on the other side of the aisle are frequently reminding us. We have before us proposals from the executive branch for a tax cut that would amount ultimately to $13 billion. And we have had people tell us that we cannot have a tax cut unless we are prepared to cut the budget.

In fact, some of our friends on the Republican side of the aisle have said we ought to cut that budget to match the $13 billion in the proposed tax cut or that at least we ought to level off our Government expenditures. How can we possibly level off expenditures unless we are willing at the very least to hold the line on expenditures relating to the national defense?

I am inclined to agree with my distinguished friend, the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. ST. GEORGE], who said here a while ago in the discussion on the rule that it is disturbing that no effort has been made to reduce the proposals of the Defense Department in this bill, and that instead we find the unusual situation that those from the party which has loudly been calling for spending reductions, those from the party which has suggested, if I read the public press correctly, that it is even possible to reduce a billion dollars in each one of the three branches of our armed services, that not a single member of that political party on the Committee on Armed Services joined with the five of us in opposing an increase in defense spending of $363 million over the recommendations of the Kennedy administration and the Defense Department.

And I might point out that in addition we have a pay bill that is going to be coming along very shortly from our committee, and this too is going to be over the total sums recommended by the Kennedy administration. It will be interesting to see whether any Members on the other side of the aisle are going to oppose that boost.

Where are these predicted cuts going to come from then unless we are prepared at least to hold the line on defense spending and look a little bit more carefully at all the proposals that are made?

My suggestion here today is simply that under all these conditions, when we look at the RS-70, or the B-70, or whatever else you are going to call it, there must be just one simple test, what they call in the Pentagon cost effectiveness. It simply means are you getting enough in increased defense protection for all the money you are spending?

Let us look at that. Is the RS-70 really going to be worth all the dollars we are going to spend? I am not against the RS-70. It is a great concept. I voted with the committee last year and said, "Let us take a look at it for another year." I hope we can eventually have it added to our arsenal. But the experience of the past year has just not been very reassuring on this point, Mr. Chairman.

First of all, the plane does not even fly yet. We have spent $1,300 million on the program up to today and the plane just does not even get up into the air. It goes so fast, three times the speed of sound, that parts of the fuselage melt in flight. They have not quite got that particular "bug" ironed out of the plane, and so it does not even fly. We have had a slippage behind what the program was earlier. I suggest that when you have a plane that does not even fly there is not any immediate urgency to add on an expenditure of $363 million for further refinements in that particular plane.

Secondly, we have had a lot of talk about manned bombers here today. Let us not kid ourselves. The plane we are asked to spend this money for is not a manned bomber. That was the B-70. That plane has gone out of the window. The Air Force dropped it. The committee is asking us to spend the money today on the RS-70, a reconnaissance plane, designed to fly over the target after the first missiles have already struck, to take a look around at three times the speed of sound, and see if there is anything left. We are not here really taking issue with the missiles that make up our primary, strategic deterrent force. The missiles are indeed taking over that field. The committee is asking us to spend this money for a plane with a decidedly secondary mission. As the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. PIKE] pointed out, it is not even clear that if we gave the Air Force $363 million to spend they would really want to spend it first of all on this secondary reconnaissance strike aircraft that cannot even get off the deck.

And third and finally, before the idea of this kind of reconnaissance strike plane can become a reality we have to invent more sophisticated electronic gear we do not now have. When you are traveling at 2,000 miles an hour you are traveling over a lot of territory in a very short time. We simply do not have the equipment today to report back to an operator so he could know quickly enough whether there were any targets left or whether he should push the button to send out any additional missiles.

Oh, we are not filing the development work on the B-70 away, as the gentleman from Georgia suggested. I would like to see the aircraft fly. We want the development we paid for continued. But we suggest that it might be well to wait until we find out whether the plane will actually fly before we decide whether it will be worth the additional sums of money to try to get this sophisticated electronic gear into it. Incidentally, we have about $85 million available now which the Defense Department is going to spend this year to try to continue and develop this highly sophisticated radar.

But, is all this kind of thing really worth the fantastic cost? The price of this particular amendment to the bill is one-third of a billion dollars. We have already spent $1.3 billion to develop three B-70 planes. That is $400 million per plane. That is well over the cost of an aircraft carrier for just one single plane. Now the two more planes we are going to authorize if we accept the committee amendment will cost ultimately not just the $363 million you see here; they will cost $1.5 billion. In other words, they are going to cost about $600 million or $700 million per copy. And that is twice the cost of an aircraft carrier, for just one single plane. Think of it, if you believe in economy. The Air Force tells us, as a matter of fact, that before we can have a real RS-70 weapons system, we will need 11 of these planes, at a total cost of $10 billion over and above the $1.3 billion already spent.

Mr. Chairman, under these circumstances while this is a desirable aircraft and while there are a lot of other things we would love to have in the defense field if we could afford them, I submit in the financial situation we are in today, and if we really mean what we are talking about in terms of fiscal responsibility, if we really mean what we say about cutting the budget and if we really mean what we say about holding the line on Government spending, then how we can possibly suggest that for a system that is not going to be part of our top priority nuclear deterrent force we must nevertheless spend this kind of money today in this particular bill, right now, and before the plane can fly?

I, therefore, am opposing the committee amendment and I hope the committee amendment will be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. COHELAN].

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Chairman, I can only reiterate many of the things that have been recited previously by my good friends and colleagues, the gentleman from New York [Mr. STRATTON], and the gentleman from New York [Mr. PIKE].

What I propose to do in the course of my remarks this afternoon in discussing the bill is to try to put the thing in perspective. Much has been said about the fact that some of us are taking exception to this particular amendment. I prefer to state the matter affirmatively and positively. The fact of the matter is that three of the five Members who are taking the position that they are taking today have voted for the RS-70 and they voted for it in past sessions of the Congress. It seems to me, in previous sessions when we studied this question, we had put in a considerable amount of money in the bill, and the increment then suggested and proposed for this concept, known as the B-70 made economic sense.

So my good colleagues, the gentlemen from New York [Mr. STRATTON and Mr. PIKE] in separate sessions of the Congress for these and other reasons have voted for the B-70—RS-70.

So, when we come before you today and we call your attention to a very deeply felt difference with our committee colleagues and with our distinguished chairman for whom we have a deep affection and admiration, it is because we think the time has come to blow the whistle on this request for two more.

First of all, we are for this bill. Much has been said by one of our colleagues, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ARENDS] about the Secretary of Defense.

It is almost an elementary point in argumentation and debate that when you start attacking the man, you are arguing ad hominem. I would like to hear this thing argued on the terms of its merits. Nobody is arguing against this bill. We are for this bill. We are merely against adding two additional RS-70's to the present program of three.

Mr. Chairman, after lengthy hearings and study with our distinguished colleagues on the committee, we have gone into the subject of military hardware in great detail in reference to certain other things such as attack submarines. I do not want to waste the time of the House by going into detail about all these matters, but under the careful scrutiny of our chairman and knowledgeable senior members of the committee we have learned a great deal and we have formed judgments, and we feel this to be a necessary addition to the program.

But when I hear all this discussion about a man instead of an issue I think we ought to call attention to it, because at this point what some of us are talking about is the man who is bringing in the biggest peacetime program for our Military Establishment in the history of the country. This is the man who has given us a flexible defense; this is the man that our chairman says is one of the greatest Secretaries of Defense in the history of this country, and I defy anybody to say differently.

Now, I am for this bill, and I want to talk about this bill, and talk about it in terms of some of the committee issues and talk about remarks that have been made about the RS-70. Also, I want to talk about some other things besides this question of whether we ought to add two more aircraft to a program we already have.

The big issue here today is the bill that we are going to pass on. I am going to vote for it, with the exception of the RS-70 amendment. So let us remember during the debate this afternoon that the issue is only whether or not we are going to have two additional research and development aircraft added to the program we already have, which is three. The only thing, Mr. STRATTON, Mr. PIKE, Mr. NEDZI, Mr. ICHORD, and Mr. COHELAN are saying to you is that we do not think it is wise to go ahead adding to a program of research and development at enormous cost at this time. There appears to be no significant value added. There is a great deal we could say if it were not classified which has to do with reconnaissance sensors and some other systems.

But I would like now to turn to Vietnam.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, before the gentleman gets to that, will he yield?

Mr. COHELAN. I yield to my good colleague and subcommittee chairman the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS].

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Does the gentleman take the position that we cannot develop the mach 3 bomber, that it will not fly? Does the gentleman take the position that the mach 3 bomber is not an airplane?

Mr. COHELAN. The gentleman knows very well I do not take that position.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. I know you do not. I did not want the committee to believe the statement of the gentleman from New York when he said the thing would melt in flight. I hope the gentleman does not take the position that we should stop on the RS–70 before taking it to the threshold of tests. And as to the matter of the production item and the cost which the gentleman says will be $360 million or $400 million a plane, that is just like saying that a Chevrolet car costs $100 million to produce when you take into consideration all the research and preliminary effort through the years up to the car of today. I hope the gentleman will be here tomorrow because I am going to address myself to some of these statements.

Mr. COHELAN. I look forward to being here and will listen with great interest to anything the gentleman from South Carolina has to say. We are interested in the program. We earnestly hope this project does become a reality and will have a role and mission.

I regret that I cannot yield further to the gentleman because I want to talk briefly about South Vietnam.

This Nation is deeply involved in the problems of southeast Asia. I had the great privilege of being out there this year and I wish I had time to go into my findings at some length. I think Vietnam deserves discussion because it is there that the Communists are most active at the moment in fostering subversion and insurgency, as witness the daily news accounts of happenings in Vietnam.

The Chief of Staff of the Army reports that combat operations by the dozen are taking place daily throughout that country and that the offensive is on in South Vietnam. The Secretary of Defense has told us that we now have more than 11,000 military personnel engaged in the military assistance program there, and in advising, training, and aiding the Vietnamese with airlift and communications. This is a sizable military effort by our forces.

I have been most impressed with what our Armed Forces are doing in the field of counterinsurgency. The need for special training and special techniques has been recognized and our military—particularly in the Army—are tackling the problem with energy and imagination.

I stress here the accomplishments of the Army because insurgency—and counterinsugency—are elements of land warfare. The Army therefore has the prime role to play, and must shoulder the heaviest burdens. In Vietnam, as in other wars, it is the soldier that faces most directly the hazards of combat. It is the soldier in these regions of unrest, subversion, and guerrilla activities that by advice, example, and selfless labor most directly influences the outcome. In truth, he is one of the gallant men of our time.

Since 1961 the Army has been expanding its capabilities in what it calls special warfare. This covers the many endeavors and the many individual and collective skills needed for successful action in an environment such as Vietnam. In the United States and abroad the Army has a hard core of some 8,000 personnel in this program now and plans further improvements in its special warfare capabilities in the future.

In addition to enlarging its special warfare forces, the whole subject is being stressed throughout the Army. Selected battle groups have undergone a 6-week counterinsurgency training program with emphasis on counterguerrilla tactics and techniques. Counterinsurgency instruction has been increased throughout the Army school system, from the ROTC through the Army War College. Language training is being expanded, and courses for senior officers have been inaugurated. Streamlined supply procedures have been developed, and research and development in counterinsurgency weapons and equipment has been intensified, to include a limited war laboratory to concentrate on requirements unique to this type of warfare.

The bill before us today does not address itself to our counterinsurgency effort as such. It will, however, supply helicopters and aircraft which may well be used in this role. And possibly of even greater importance, it supports the research and development from which in later years will come the improved aircraft for even more effective counterinsurgency operations.

I am convinced that we must bolster our ability to deal successfully with insurgencies and all other shades of aggression whenever and wherever they may occur. I am equally convinced that the funds for which authorization is sought by this bill are necessary toward that end. In light of these convictions, I give my full support to the authorization and urge its passage with the exception of the two additional RS–70's.

In the remainder of my time I want to refer back to the subject of the B–70's and speak about some specific points. We will add to them later in the afternoon and tomorrow.

Our distinguished chairman, and others, in discussing the matter of the RS–70 have discussed the fact that the Joint Chiefs of Staff have taken a strong position on this. While this may be true I think it merits further investigation as to some of the reasons.

In the hearings—on page 975—on this very issue I was particularly concerned. I interrogated the Secretary of Defense and Admiral Anderson, Chief of Naval Operations. Among other things, I asked Admiral Anderson:

> Now I want to turn from there to a question that came up yesterday in the course of the interrogation relating to the RS–70.
>
> I am wondering, Admiral, if you could elaborate on the reasons why you took the position you did on the Joint Chiefs in regard to the RS–70.
>
> Once again I was a little puzzled at your response.
>
> Admiral ANDERSON. I would like to make this classified secret. [Deleted.]
>
> Mr. COHELAN. Well, that is what I thought you said.
>
> The CHAIRMAN. You were willing to provide for [deleted], were you not?
>
> Admiral ANDERSON. Pardon, sir?
>
> The CHAIRMAN. You were willing to provide—to go along with [deleted].
>
> Admiral ANDERSON. [Deleted.]
>
> The CHAIRMAN. Thank you.
>
> Mr. COHELAN. Well, Admiral, I am looking at the report last year, page 3170 of last year's posture hearings, and where the amount of money is discussed on what has already been spent on the RS–70 and the B–70, and it would seem to me that research and development is very definitely going on.
>
> Now, am I to understand that the only real difference then was the difference between [deleted].
>
> Admiral ANDERSON. The Air Force had proposed [deleted] and then the Air Force would have liked to have gone further.
>
> In our judgment, having heard——
>
> Secretary KORTH. Production, he said—into production?
>
> Admiral ANDERSON. No, sir. [Deleted.]
>
> We felt that we should hold this program down to research and development, but up to a level of [deleted] if that was necessary to carry out the research and development.
>
> Mr. COHELAN. Then [deleted], goes right along with your program, or your feeling in the matter?
>
> Admiral ANDERSON. If you can do the job with [deleted] fine. If it takes [deleted] to finish up the [deleted] then I would say to go to [deleted].
>
> Mr. COHELAN. Well, this is where I don't understand you, Admiral.
>
> Where would the value be added?
>
> I don't understand where the value would be added by another unit. We have [deleted] now in the works. Now where would the value be added with [deleted]?
>
> Admiral ANDERSON. Well, the Air Force can answer that technically far better than I can.
>
> But their proposal showed how they could carry on this system development to fruition, having listened to the argument, in my opinion, with a great degree of certainty with [deleted] you can do it with [deleted] that is fine as far as I am concerned.
>
> Mr. COHELAN. Well, what was your interest, Admiral, in the reconnaissance features of the later proposal?
>
> Admiral ANDERSON. Well, I believe that the United States needs a reconnaissance capability.
>
> The better reconnaissance capability that we can get I believe is good for the security of the United States.
>
> If you can at the same time provide a strict capability in the reconnaissance vehicle and don't have to pay too much for it, this also is good.
>
> Mr. COHELAN. Well, do you think it is better as a reconnaissance system or as a strategic retaliatory system?
>
> Admiral ANDERSON. [Deleted.]
>
> Mr. COHELAN. In other words, that is what your major——
>
> Admiral ANDERSON. That is my major concern.
>
> Mr. COHELAN. Your major concern with the B–70.
>
> And is that reflected in the Navy's request?
>
> Admiral ANDERSON. This is—I would like to make my position clear.
>
> The CHAIRMAN. That is a very important question. Answer that question, Admiral.
>
> Admiral ANDERSON. Sir?
>
> The CHAIRMAN. Answer his question, right on that point.
>
> Admiral ANDERSON. The Navy——
>
> Mr. COHELAN. You are asking for 700 aircraft this year and a good many of them are [deleted].
>
> The CHAIRMAN. That is right.
>
> Mr. COHELAN. You are interested in reconnaissance?
>
> Admiral ANDERSON. Oh, very definitely, yes, sir.
>
> The CHAIRMAN. That is right.
>
> Mr. COHELAN. Now Admiral, I don't want to put any words in your mouth, but is it fair for me to assume that in your judgment on the question at the time you made

your decision, at the meeting of the Joint Chiefs, that your major interest in the system is in the [deleted] of the system, is that right?

Admiral ANDERSON. That is correct.

Mr. COHELAN. OK.

Mr. Chairman, I think this colloquy speaks for itself. Clearly the admiral is interested in reconnaissance, not in a manned strategic delivery system.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 2 additional minutes.

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Chairman, let me conclude by making this statement:

Mr. Chairman, I would like to explain further some of my reasons for opposing the further appropriation of public funds for the expansion of the B–70 or RS–70 program. First of all, this program will be enormously expensive, and will offer us very little benefit. The Secretary of Defense has already assured us that the forces he has recommended can cover the targets, and one has only to look at the hundreds of ICBM's and Polaris missiles to see that this must be the case. Completion of the B–70 or RS–70 program would cost many billions of dollars. It now seems optimistic to suppose that the program could be completed and a substantial force of aircraft procured for less than $10 billion. It might be as high as $15 billion. Already, the Air Force has overrun on its estimates. Two years ago, and even as recently as last year, it assured the Secretary of Defense that it could complete the construction and tests of three aircraft for a total of $1.3 billion. Now the test program is behind schedule and delays and overruns are being experienced. It is beginning to appear that several hundred million dollars more will be required just to complete the three-aircraft program. In fact, Mr. President, I cannot help but wonder whether the reason the Air Force would like to have money for two more prototype aircraft is in order to get money to cover overruns already experienced.

Moreover, the debate on the RS–70 has contained some confusion. Some people have suggested that it is a debate between manned bombers and missiles. In fact is it nothing of the sort. Rather, it is a debate between some missile systems and other missile systems, the difference being not in the delivery system but in the platform from which the missiles are launched. The RS–70 system is to carry missiles to be launched from the P-70 airplane. Therefore, arguments about the unreliability of missiles or the fact that missiles have not been tested or that we do not have experience with missiles would apply at least equally strongly to the RS–70 as they do the Minuteman and Polaris.

In fact, the key issue, then, is whether the B–70 is a good missile launching platform by comparison with underground silos and submarines. The Secretary of Defense has advanced good reasons for believing that aircraft are not good platforms. First, they are vulnerable on their bases, soft and concentrated. A bomber base can be knocked out by one or two ICBM's. If we allow our deterrent power to be concentrated on bomber bases, we are vulnerable to a nuclear Pearl Harbor. Moreover, aircraft are moving fast and they vibrate and these factors make it hard to launch reliable, accurate missiles from them.

The B–70 is based on a 1955 design and on a concept earlier than that. In fact, it was conceived before the missile era and part of its high costs are associated with the fact that it tries to do ineffectively the things that missiles can do better. Accordingly, I do not believe that these huge additional sums should be authorized.

I hope the House is completely aware of what it is being asked to approve by increasing the RS–70 test program from three to five aircraft. In the first place, the additional two-aircraft program is estimated to cost over $1 billion. In the second place, the additional two-aircraft program is not required to flight-test the aircraft—this will be accomplished by the program already authorized and underway. The additional two-aircraft program would further develop the aircraft as a weapons system in the face of a high probability that this aircraft would not provide a significant contribution to our deterrent force in the 1970's. The two added aircraft would not, however, complete the weapons system development; as recently as last year the Air Force was asking for a total of 11 for this purpose, which is consistent with the historical requirements of other programs.

The reasons why this is so were cogently stated by the Secretary of Defense to the Armed Services Committee. I should like at this point to read—or include in the RECORD—the relevant unclassified portion of the Secretary's statement:

> The next issue I had to face was the development of the B–70, or the RS–70 as it was later called. The issue here was not the future of manned strategic aircraft in general. Rather, it was whether this particular aircraft, in either of its configurations, could add enough to our already programed capabilities to make it worth its very high cost.
>
> Many of the arguments that have been advanced in support of the RS–70 actually support the case for postattack reconnaissance in combination with an improved ICBM force. We believe that there are more promising ways of performing this mission than the RS–70, when both cost and effectiveness are considered. Other than this, the RS–70 is said to have two distinct capabilities: (1) transattack reconnaissance; that is, reconnaissance during our missile attack, and (2) the ability to examine targets and attack them on the spot with strike missiles, if required. Quite apart from the technical feasibility of developing, producing and deploying such a system within the time frame proposed by the Air Force (which we do not think possible), there are better ways, when one considers both cost and effectiveness, to obtain both of these capabilities.
>
> The principal advantage of having a "reconnaissance" and a "strike" capability in an aircraft is one of timeliness. That is, it may be possible to process and interpret enough of the "recon" data in the few minutes the aircraft is still within range of the target to permit an effective air-to-surface missile strike, keeping in mind that the aircraft would be moving at a speed of over 30 miles per minute and that the missile would have a relatively short range—i.e., a few hundred miles. If this can be done "effectively" there is the advantage of being able to deal with the target within minutes instead of an hour (or more) if the "strike" had to be accomplished by some other weapon system. Quick attack is not always important, but to the extent that it is and can be accomplished effectively, a "strike" capability in the aircraft is an advantage. However, postattack reconnaissance and subsequent strike—whether by air-to-surface missiles or ICBM's—is important in two principal cases:
>
> 1. Where fixed targets whose location was not known precisely must be attacked.
>
> 2. In "mopup" operations against fixed targets of known location that have been programed for initial attack by ballistic missiles, but which may not have been destroyed.
>
> Initial attack on targets of known location can be accomplished effectively with ICBM's which have the important advantages of shorter time-to-target, lower cost, and higher survival potential. Mobile targets simply cannot be successfully attacked with an RS–70 and, in fact, such a role has not been proposed for that aircraft.
>
> The issue, therefore, resolves itself to the question: How much could we gain from a capability to attack the two types of targets I referred to earlier, with air-to-surface missiles instead of ICBM's?
>
> With regard to the first case, if a target is known to be somewhere within a relatively small area, usually its exact location can eventually be established. Moreover, such targets can be attacked by ICBM's after postattack reconnaissance. With regard to the second case, other means are expected to be available to determine whether targets previously attacked by ICBM's have been destroyed. These targets, too, once it is known that they have not been destroyed, could be attacked again with ICBM's.
>
> The RS–70, by carrying air-to-surface missiles, would provide only a very small increase in overall effectiveness. In my judgment, this increase is not worth the large additional outlay of funds estimated at more than $10 billion above the $1.35 billion already approved.
>
> Accordingly, we propose to complete the presently approved $1.3 billion B–70 development program of three aircraft and, in addition, continue the development of selected sensor components using, in the current fiscal year, $50 million of the extra $192 million provided by the Congress last year for the RS–70 program. The Air Force has not yet completed its analysis of the effect on development costs of the 3-month delay already encountered in the flight testing of the first B–70.

Mr. Chairman, returning for a moment to the question of whether the XB–70 program should be expanded from three to five aircraft.

Serious questions have been raised as to whether the RS–70 represents the best method of accomplishing mopup strikes against Soviet targets after an initial attack by our missiles. The present configuration of the aircraft was designed as a mach 3 high altitude plane. However, it does not seem likely that the Soviet air defenses can be sufficiently degraded by our missile attack so that the RS–70 can survive at high altitudes. If penetration is to be made at low altitude, the present configuration is probably not the best. Further, the Secretary of Defense has indicated that he believes the "strike" portion of the mission can be done more effectively by missiles launched from other platforms. These "strikes" would be laid on based upon reconnaissance data attained by various means.

In view of the above, the concept of restricting the program to one of flight test for the present seems very sensible.

The immediate question before the House, which is whether we should build three or five aircraft, depends primarily on technical factors. The answer hinges on what confidence we have in attaining the desired aerodynamic data from a flight test program that involves three aircraft. It is my understanding that a three vehicle flight test program provides good confidence that the desired data will be attained, and this takes into account that there could be some bad luck. On the other hand the two additional aircraft, of which only one would be fully equipped with sensors and missile launch systems, would not adequately provide for development and evaluation of the reconnaissance-strike concept. In particular, if an accident should occur, which destroyed the fifth aircraft early in its flight test, much money will have been expended with virtually no payoff except at great expense in time and money to provide still additional aircraft.

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COHELAN. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. WAGGONNER. I would like to hear about this proposed cost of $60 million, due to slippage. Could the gentleman tell us how that would happen?

Mr. COHELAN. The Secretary of Defense was interrogated on this very question. These are his figures. The report is that the program is costing us in slippage about $15 to $20 million a month.

Mr. WAGGONNER. This proposed $81 million that is in the RS–70 development fund would no longer be necessary?

Mr. COHELAN. I am only reciting the record to the gentleman. If I said $60 million I was in error. The correct figure on slippage would be $15 to $20 million a month.

LET'S KEEP THE THE MANNED BOMBER UP TO DATE

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. WICKERSHAM] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The **CHAIRMAN.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Chairman, I should like to briefly state my reasons for backing the increased authorizations for the B–70, or RS–70, weapons system.

There are many of us in both Chambers of the Congress who are seriously concerned about the manned bomber weapons system. This fleet has been designed, built, perfected, and maintained at considerable cost in money and manpower. It has kept the balance of power safely on the side of the free world for many years.

We all understand, of course, that ballistic missiles present a revolutionary new weapons system, which is rapidly becoming the first line of defense of this Nation. But what concerns many is that this first line will become the only line of defense for the West. Recognizing the validity of some of the Secretary of Defense's arguments about the vulnerability of manned bombers, many professionals in the defense field, both within and outside the U.S. Air Force, still feel that a move toward complete dependence on missiles is a premature move which is potentially, if indeed not outright, dangerous for this Nation to undertake at this time.

Without going into all of the administration's arguments, with which I am sure all those concerned with defense problems are familiar, I shall quickly summarize the arguments in favor of maintaining our manned bomber force as a modern, up-to-date weapons system, reversing the present trend of downgrading development and phasing out existing forces.

First. The major reason given for phasing out manned bombers is that they are becoming increasingly vulnerable to surface-to-air missilery. I for one simply do not accept this as an inevitable truth. The magnificent multibillion-dollar aircraft and electronics industries in this country can, if given the go-ahead, solve just about any problem which arises in this age of explosive technological revolution.

Second. Even if we grant that industry cannot solve the bomber defense problem, which I do not grant, our bomber fleet is a continuingly valuable asset in the long-range cold war between the United States and the Soviet Union. The fact is that the existence of our bomber fleet compels the Soviets to maintain three very expensive capabilities: First, ICBM's which have our SAC bases as their targets; second, an extensive, highly elaborate, surface-to-air missile defense system to defend against the SAC bombers which we keep on air alert; and third, a very extensive system of air defense bases, jet interceptors, and radar systems to tie them all together and coordinate them.

Now, this asset of ours, this manned bomber fleet, is what requires the Russians to keep up all those expensive elements of their air defense system. Why should we phase out the manned bombers? This would allow the Soviets to phase out all of their considerable countermeasures to our bomber force.

Third. In the event of some future nuclear war, our strategy is apparently to be one of striking military targets first, holding the Soviet cities as hostages to force capitulation. Won't our first strike, which will be with missiles, do a lot of damage to the Soviet air defense system? I certainly hope so; but the point is, that a manned bomber force may be able to break through a heavily damaged defense system after an initial missile attack, even if it can't do so originally. It is probably for this reason that the Russians, far from dropping manned bombers, are continuing to develop modern, up-to-date, hard-striking air forces.

Fourth. Finally, in this fast-moving age of technological breakthroughs, who can say with certainty that a drastic new development will not be possible in the field of manned bomber missile defense, or antiradar electronics, or some other field. If we phase out all of our bombers, our formidable aircraft industries will die. Even if we do not consider the economic effects of such an unfortunate development, which as responsible public servants we must, the military effects would be disastrous if a breakthrough of the nature just mentioned should occur in the Soviet Union. We would be left without the industrial capacity to take advantage of the breakthrough.

Mr. Chairman, I should like to bring these remarks to a close with the following thought. We who are concerned about continuing our manned bomber force are not pro or anti-Air Force; we are not pro or anti-whiz kid; we are not pro or anti-administration. We are responsible Americans, concerned only about our national defense. Phasing out our manned bomber force seems to us to be predicated on at least debatable premises. The only positive action available to us at this time is to support an accelerated RS–70 program, and urge a resumption of research and development in the entire field of manned bomber weapons systems. The defense of the United States of America is not something with which we can take chances.

Mr. CLANCY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. McLOSKEY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The **CHAIRMAN.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. McLOSKEY. Mr. Chairman, under leave to extend my remarks I wish to briefly comment on H.R. 2440, the authorization bill, to authorize $15,856,391,000 for the use of the Armed Forces for procurement, research, development, test, and evaluation of aircraft, missiles, and naval vessels.

At the outset I wish to compliment both the distinguished chairman of the Armed Services Committee, and the ranking minority members, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ARENDS], for their able presentation of this highly important measure.

I particularly pay high tribute to my distinguished friend from Illinois for the position he has taken with respect to accepting cuts in the overall defense budget, and the willingness of his committee in not being obstinate in refusal of those of us who are deeply concerned about spending, to scan our recommendations for the cutting of fat where and when we can find it.

The spending or at least the authorization of such a tremendous amount of the taxpayers dollar places a real responsibility on each and every Member of this Congress.

Most certainly I for one know we must do everything in our power to keep ourselves strong. And I do not wish to do anything to reduce our military capabilities or to hinder our national security.

I am not convinced however that all the fat has been rendered from this procurement bill. I feel there are many areas where savings can be effected. While I shall support the measure as presented today, I reserve the right to do all in my power to make substantial savings, and am hopeful the Appropriations Committee will go over this bill with a fine tooth comb.

Mr. CLANCY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. Shriver] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 2440, which authorizes nearly $16 billion for the procurement of the necessary aircraft, missiles, and naval vessels for the Armed Forces during fiscal year 1964. I wish to commend the chairman and the members of the Committee on Armed Services for the thorough and exhaustive examination which they have made of our Nation's military posture.

It is particularly encouraging that the committee continues to fight hard for a proper mixture of missiles and manned bombers in the military arsenal of the United States. I heartily endorse the proposal to authorize two additional prototypes of the RS-70. The committee has made a strong and convincing case for the development of five prototypes instead of three.

We are told that the three RS-70 prototypes, which have the blessings of the administration, will essentially be used to determine that this airplane can fly at three times the speed of sound, for a long distance and a high altitude. In essence the administration is prepared to spend $1.3 billion for testing the reconnaissance ability of the RS-70, but it is reluctant to develop additional aircraft to determine the feasibility of the RS-70 as a weapons system.

In reading the hearings on military posture held by the Armed Services Committee, it was encouraging to learn that the current fleet of B-52's and B-58's will continue to perform a most important role in our Nation's defense for the next 5 years.

It is disturbing, however, when we ask what comes after the B-52 and the B-58?

Mr. Chairman, the last B-52H jet bomber came off the assembly line at the Boeing Co. plant in Wichita last fall. The final B-58 will be delivered to the Air Force this year. We have been informed that the aging B-47 jet aircraft are being gradually phased out.

We know the Department of Defense recently took the higher bid of a Texas-based aeronautics plant with intentions of developing a new fighter-bomber, the F-111—TFX. But it will not be able to do the work of the B-52.

We know the RS-70, formerly known as the B-70, still is in the development and evaluation stages but the administration has no plans to go beyond those stages.

It is very possible that in the presidential campaign of 1968 the familiar issue of "gapitis" will be with us again. We will again be faced with a bomber gap. However, unlike the missile gap of 1960, the bomber gap of 1968 will be a fact.

Although I do not claim to be a military expert and certainly do not have access to our intelligence files or those of the Soviet Union, it is only necessary to call across the street to the Library of Congress to discover that the Soviet Union continues to build both bombers and missiles.

The publication Interavia, published in November 1962, contained an article entitled "The Wide Spectrum of Soviet Airpower." This article contained pictures and descriptions of the new types of Russian aircraft.

The article states:

> In the last few months, the strategic air force (U.S.S.R.) which is grouped in three or four armies, has received medium bombers of the new Tupolev Blinder type. These have a speed approaching mach 2, and their radius of action is at least equal to their predecessor, the Tupolev Badger; they are capable of carrying supersonic missiles for use against strategic targets. It cannot at present be said with certainty whether the four-jet Miasichev Bounder supersonic bomber, on show for the first time at the last Tushino Air Show, is being built in large numbers. This aircraft could be used as a tanker as well as for important reconnaissance missions. Except for the American B-70 which will shortly be completed, this is the largest supersonic aircraft in the world, and the four turbojet engines in the Bounder can be taken to be the most powerful at present in existence. In any case, the development of the Blinder and Bounder types shows that the Soviet strategic air force still attaches importance to the manned bomber.

Mr. Chairman, the Congress of the United States has time and again authorized and appropriated funds for continued production of manned bombers. We have taken such action on the knowledgeable advice of our military authorities. However, these funds have not been used by the administration.

Time and again we have learned of the recommendations of acknowledged military experts being overruled in regard to the selection of certain weapons systems by the civilian leaders of the Defense Establishment.

The B-52 bomber is a case in point.

The RS-70 is another case in point.

The Skybolt air-to-ground missile is another case in point.

And, if I may add, apparently the contract decision for the F-111—TFX—fighter-bomber is a puzzling case at point.

Like the members of the Armed Services Committee, I do not challenge the right or necessity of civilian control over the Department of Defense. However, it seems to me that the selection of weapons systems plays an important part in the way a war may be fought. We must guard against the weakening of the military voice in this regard.

Gen. Curtis LeMay, Chief of Staff of the U.S. Air Force, eloquently enunciated some guidelines for the defense and security of this Nation which are worthy of repeating. In his testimony before the committee, he stated:

> Our national objective is to have the capability to destroy those forces which would directly threaten our survival as a viable nation.
>
> We have an enemy who will take advantage of any apparent or real, technical or strategic weakness we may possess.
>
> Until there is a change in Soviet intent and aspirations, we obviously can't afford to gamble.
>
> There are certain precautions we can take, certain things we can do.
>
> First, we must retain our flexibility of action in the event of an enemy technological breakthrough. We can do this by exploring every feasible weapon system.
>
> We must have the capability, in spite of unexpected breakthroughs, to destroy those weapons directly threatening the United States and our allies. This will save American lives.
>
> Secondly, we must also continue this exploration because we cannot accept the premise that since there is no known counter to a particular threat there is nothing that we can do.
>
> If we accept this premise, and thus indicate an acceptance of a weakness in our deterrent, we invite the Soviets to vigorously probe our determination to resist.
>
> I have believed over the years, and still do, that deterrence is a state of armed forces and also a state of mind. Standing alone they will not deter, but together they are the force for continued peace.
>
> Both must remain strong and firm and be absolutely clear to the Soviets.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore [Mr. Albert] having assumed the chair, Mr. Shelley, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2440) to authorize appropriations during fiscal year 1964 for procurement, research, development, test, and evaluation of aircraft, missiles, and naval vessels for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

TRAVEL OF STAFF MEMBERS OF HOUSE COMMITTEE INDICATE MORE CHECKING NEEDED

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, yesterday's Congressional Record contains the reports which are required by law dealing with the expenditure of foreign currencies and appropriated funds by the various committees covering the dates of January 1 through December 31, 1962. As many of you well know, I have been very critical of the expenditure of appropriated funds by the House Committee on Education and Labor, I now would like to point out some interesting deficiencies in the reports which cover the expenditure of so-called counterpart funds by this committee.

Without a doubt, great detail is shown on some of the miscellaneous expenditures. Tips to waiters and wine stewards are well documented by the committee in this report. It is most interesting, however, to see that a vital area of expenditure has not been accounted for.

I am speaking of transportation for these trips.

Let me cite two trips which were made. The gentleman from New York [Mr. POWELL] together with two staff members, Miss Corrine A. Huff and Mrs. Tamara J. Wall, conducted a factfinding mission in Europe which took the chairman to five countries, Mrs. Wall to seven countries, and Miss Huff to six countries. The total transportation bill listed for this factfinding trip comes to $100 for the gentleman from New York, $109 for Mrs. Wall, and $115 for Miss Huff. The report on this trip is as follows:

Name and country	Name of currency	Lodging		Meals		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Powell, Adam C.:											
Great Britain (9 days)	U.S. dollar		80.00		70.00		5.00		76.50 12.00		243.50
France (5 days)	do		110.00		87.50				48.00		245.50
Italy (6 days)	do		150.00		99.00				64.00		313.00
Greece (11 days)	do		192.50		181.50		75.00		88.00 10.00		547.00
Spain (4 days)	do		72.00		66.00		10.00 10.00		37.00		195.00
Wall, Tamara J.:											
Great Britain (4 days)	Pound		100.00		85.00		23.00		72.00	100	280.00
France (5 days)	New franc		110.00		82.50		12.00		45.50	1,250	250.00
Italy (9 days)	Lira		205.00		148.50		25.00		71.50	286,300	450.00
Greece (4 days)	Drachma		80.00		70.00		15.00		35.00	6,000	200.00
Austria (5 days)	Schilling		65.00		52.50		12.00		22.50	3,800	152.00
Germany (3 days)	Deutsche mark		55.00		51.00		14.00		30.00	600	150.00
Denmark (5 days)	Kroner		75.00		62.00		8.00		26.00	1,200	171.00
Huff, Corrine A.:											
Great Britain (4 days)	U.S. dollar		80.00		17.50		28.00		168.00		293.50
France (5 days)	do		110.00		82.50		12.00		46.00		250.50
Italy (5 days)	do		150.00		99.00				56.00		305.00
Greece (11 days)	do		192.00		181.50		75.00		84.00		532.50
Spain (4 days)	do		72.00		76.00				37.00		185.00
Denmark (4 days)	do		72.00		66.00				37.00		175.00

In another factfinding mission, Mrs. Louise Dargans, a committee staff member, reports only $104 in transportation for a trip which by her own account took her to the United Kingdom, Spain, Italy, France, Morocco, and Portugal. My information which I cannot completely substantiate because of the inability to get cooperation on these funds expended indicates that Mrs. Dargans sailed on November 17, 1962, on the SS *Independence* of the American Export Lines on accommodations that would cost $975. She returned on December 11, 1962.

Her expenses are listed as follows:

Name and country	Name of currency	Lodging		Meals		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Dargans, Louise Maxienne:											
United Kingdom	U.S. dollar		15.50		12.00		6.25		16.00		49.75
Spain	do		32.00		22.50		17.75		11.50		83.75
Italy	do		35.00		30.50		40.00		14.00		119.50
France	do		25.00		18.50		20.00		17.00		80.50
Morocco	do		15.00		10.00		8.00		4.00		37.00
Portugal	do		14.50		12.00		12.00		15.00		53.50

The chairman, Miss Huff, and Mrs. Wall did not travel on MATS, according to my information. The State Department listed them as sailing on the *Queen Mary* on August 8 and arriving Southampton on August 13.

The law very clearly requires that all counterpart funds expended for transportation must be reported. This is an apparent oversight which should be corrected in the filing of an amended report.

I have been told that the Committee on House Administration has advised committee chairmen that no exemption or exceptions are made to the requirement in title 22, section 1754. All funds expended should be shown whether they were received from an agency or from counterpart funds. The only exception, of course, would be the expenditure of private funds. The law states:

FOREIGN CURRENCIES—AVAILABILITY AND USE

(a) Notwithstanding section 724 of title 31, or any other provision of law, proceeds of sales made under section 550 of the Mutual Security Act of 1951, as amended, shall remain available and shall be used for any of the purposes of this chapter, giving particular regard to the following purposes—

(1) for providing military assistance to nations or mutual defense organizations eligible to receive assistance under this chapter;

(2) for purchase of goods or services in friendly nations;

(3) for loans, under applicable provisions of this chapter, to increase production of goods or services, including strategic materials, needed in any nation with which any agreement was negotiated, or in other friendly nations, with the authority to use currencies received in repayment for the purposes stated in this section or for deposit to the general account of the Treasury of the United States;

(4) for developing new markets on a mutually beneficial basis;

(5) for grants-in-aid to increase production for domestic needs in friendly countries; and

(6) for purchasing materials for United States stockpiles.

AVAILABILITY TO CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES

(b) Notwithstanding section 724 of title 31, or any other provision of law, local currencies owned by the United States shall be made available to appropriate committees of the Congress engaged in carrying out their duties under section 190d of title 2, and to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy and the Joint Economic Committee and the Select Committees on Small Business of the Senate and House of Representatives and the Select Committee on Astronautics and Space Exploration of the House of Representatives and the Special Committee on Space and Astronautics of the Senate, for their local currency expenses: *Provided*, That each member or employee of any such committee shall make, to the chairman of such committee in accordance with regulations prescribed by such committee, an itemized report showing the amounts and dollar equivalent values of each such foreign currency expended and the amounts of dollar expenditures made from appropriated funds in connection with travel outside the United States, together with the purposes of the expenditure, including lodging, meals, transportation, and other purposes. Within the first sixty days that Congress is in session in each calendar year, the chairman of each such committee shall prepare a consolidated report showing the total itemized expenditures during the preceding calendar year of the committee and each subcommittee thereof, and of each member and employee of such committee or subcommittee, and shall forward such consolidated report to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives (if the committee be a committee of the House of Representatives or a joint committee whose funds are disbursed by the Clerk of the House) or to the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate (if the committee by a Senate committee or a joint committee whose funds are disbursed by the Secretary of the Senate.) Each such report submitted by each committee shall be published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD within ten legislative days after receipt by the Committee on House Administration of the House or the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate.

An interesting situation exists regarding responsibility under the title 22, section 1754 requirements. The Committee on House Administration takes the position that the law does not charge it with the obligation to check into these reports when filed and it has neither the authority nor the responsibility to so check, even when errors are apparent on the face. I am sure the committee is correct in its position.

The State Department, on the other hand, takes the position that it is not responsible either. In a telephone conversation with Mr. John Leahy, State Department official charged with providing and reporting these funds to the Congress, I learned that his reports are made only to the chairman of the various committees who authorized the travel and to the individuals who expended the funds. As a Member of Congress, I cannot check into these funds or obtain a recapitulation of moneys expended by my committee. Mr. Leahy stated that this procedure was the result of a Department rule and not an official regulation.

It is for that reason that I take this time to call this matter to the attention of the House and request that an amended report be submitted which will fill in the gaps that were inadvertently left in the report filed yesterday which therefore makes it not in compliance with title 22, section 1754. In the event that these trips were paid for by the individuals themselves or by some private agency or individual, I believe we also should know that is the case.

The chairman, the gentleman from New York [Mr. POWELL], has indicated his full intention to file the complete report of the expenditure of these funds. In his press conference of February 20, 1963 this exact matter was brought up and the following remarks were made:

Representative POWELL. "The Senate has never followed the House in these things, we led the way a long time ago on itemizing by Members. The Senate hasn't done it.

REPORTER. Getting right down to the point, are you willing at this time to make your spending on counterpart funds available for general scrutiny just to show everyone how?

Representative POWELL. On March 1, I will, that's the date due.

REPORTER. In detail, there will be no miscellaneous this time?

Representative POWELL. No, sir.

REPORTER. It's going to be right out on the line in every respect.

Representative POWELL. Correct, I promise you that. But will the Senate do it? No.

* * * * *

REPORTER. Mr. Congressman, may I go back one moment, to the trip in September of 1961 or 1962. Will that trip be reported in your report?

Representative POWELL. Yes, sir, in detail, in detail, itemized.

REPORTER. That involved the use of counterpart funds.

Representative POWELL. Yes, sir, and not one penny of committee funds and not one penny of Federal funds. Must emphasize that.

Mr. Speaker, I trust that the RECORD will be corrected expeditiously to include these apparent oversights in the expenditures of counterpart funds.

ADMINISTRATION'S COMMITMENTS TO THE WOOLEN TEXTILE INDUSTRY

Mr. McINTIRE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maine?

There was no objection.

Mr. McINTIRE. Mr. Speaker, I am inserting into the RECORD an article from the March 12 issue of the Washington Post, this article implying that the administration is refusing to follow through on its commitments to the woolen textile industry of this country. This disturbs me deeply, and I hereby urge President Kennedy to move forward immediately with such action as will prove this article's contention false.

I am also including a statement recently adopted unanimously by the board of directors of the Northern Textile Association. This statement brings into proper focus the problem presently confronting the American textile industry, and it points up the desperate need of immediate solution:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Mar. 12, 1963]

ADMINISTRATION REPORTED VETOING WOOL RAISERS' PROTECTION DEMAND

(By Julius Duscha)

The domestic wool industry apparently has lost its 2-year fight to get President Kennedy to give it special protection against imports.

It was learned last night that the President has decided to drop for the time being any effort to help the industry by trying to limit wool imports through a system of international quotas.

Mr. Kennedy's decision was said to have been made known to the industry by Christian A. Herter, the President's special representative for trade negotiations, at a secret meeting last Wednesday in Washington.

EUROPEANS OPPOSED

Herter met with members of the U.S. Wool Textile Advisory Committee following a trip to Western Europe during which he encountered stiff resistance to suggestions that wool imports be controlled through a system similar to the international cotton textile agreement that went into effect last fall.

At the meeting Herter reportedly told the industry in soft but unmistakeable language that the Kennedy administration plans to take no steps at this time to cut back wool imports.

The President himself is reported to have told Senator JOHN O. PASTORE, Democrat of Rhode Island, last Friday that the domestic industry could expect no help.

It is understood that both Herter and the President indicated that the decision against aiding the industry would be periodically reviewed and was always open to reconsideration in the light of new facts.

Mr. Kennedy's decision will have political repercussions among the New England and Western Senators who have been putting pressure on him to provide assistance to the domestic wool industry. During the 1960 presidential campaign he promised to help the industry.

LIBERAL POLICY SEEN

But the decision will be welcomed in Western Europe, particularly in the big wool-exporting countries of Britain and Italy. Together with Japan they supply 75 percent of the wool that is imported by the United States.

In Europe and Japan the decision will be taken as a welcome indication that Mr. Kennedy is determined to pursue a liberal policy under the 1962 Trade Act even in the face of domestic pressures.

Herter is reported to have flatly told the domestic wool industry that there is no way to aid them with the new trade law unless the industry institutes a case under the escape clause in the act providing relief for domestic industries that can show they are being harmed by tariff concessions.

The wool industry has been unwilling to proceed under this clause because it does not think it could win its case. The new law provides that trade concessions must be a major factor in depressing domestic industries before relief will be given them.

Herter is also understood to have ruled out for now an international wool agreement along the lines of the cotton agreement or a finding that wool imports must be restricted because the domestic industry is vital to national security.

The domestic wool industry has favored an international agreement to limit imports, which have increased from a negligible amount 10 years ago to about 20 percent of total U.S. consumption.

STATEMENT UNANIMOUSLY ADOPTED BY THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE NORTHERN TEXTILE ASSOCIATION

We have been encouraged by the President's obvious grasp of the nature of the textile import problem, and are conscious of the efforts made by the administration to deal with a problem which adversely affects not only New England and the South, but wool and cotton-growing areas of the West and urban apparel centers.

During the first month of the present administration, a direct and forthright approach was adopted in establishing a Cabinet Committee, followed by the announcement in May of 1961 of a program that encompassed all fiber branches of the industry.

The first International Cotton Arrangement was completed in July of 1961, and a second early last year. Both provide means for preventing market disruption by the limitation of imports.

Although it was agreed that these arrangements would be followed promptly by action to restrain imports of textiles made of wool and other fibers, nothing has been accomplished, no international conference to restrain imports has been called, and no steps for control by the United States have been developed.

Meanwhile, imports of wool products in 1962 rose 78 percent over the level of 1961, and manmade textile imports rose 39 percent. An additional 18 wool mills closed in 1962, and the share of the U.S. market taken by foreign goods has increased by over 40 percent.

Direct appeal to the administration by Members of Congress and the industry to carry out the textile program have been to no avail. The program has continued to drift, jobs have continued to disappear, and conflict between agencies of Government grow. The program announced by the President appears to be more dependent for its implementation upon the whims and changing policies of foreign governments than upon domestic direction. Our own Government delays as a major American industry is eroded.

This situation is known to textile producers and textile workers, to apparel manufacturers and apparel workers, and to wool growers throughout the country.

With a deep sense of responsibility to the employees and people in the communities where textile and apparel plants are located, to those who produce the fibers we use, and to those in the Congress who have worked for a solution of this problem, the board of directors of the Northern Textile Association calls this ominous situation to the attention of the public and to those members of Government who are unaware of the situation or whose opposition to the clear intention of the President has contributed to this crisis.

EMERGENCY MILK SURPLUS REDUCTION ACT OF 1963, H.R. 4745

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I introduced legislation that will make it possible for New York State dairy farmers to undertake a program of curtailing the current milk surplus that has troubled them so much, and to do this without impairing their own income. My bill is H.R. 4745, and is known as the Emergency Milk Surplus Reduction Act of 1963.

Today the dairy farmers of upstate New York clearly face an emergency situation. The size of their milk checks is going down sharply. Many milk plants in my district are closing down. A number of milk dealers have already advised dairy farmers delivering to them that they will not accept further milk after certain specified dates, or will only accept them if the farmers assume additional costs connected with transportation. These conditions have created great concern among our dairy farmers. Something must be done to help them, Mr. Speaker, and I believe that help must come through some format that will make it possible for the dairy farmers to work together to reduce this milk surplus without damaging their own income or the stability of the industry in which they are engaged.

Mr. Speaker, a good deal of effort has already been expended by dairy farm groups in upstate New York to devise such a long-range plan. Much progress has been made in this direction. Basically these farm groups seem to be in the process of reaching agreement on a so-called two-price plan for milk production. However, Mr. Speaker, there are still many differences of opinion among our farmers and our farm cooperatives with respect to many of the specific details of this two-price plan.

I feel certain that these various differences will soon be resolved, and then our farmers will be able to make common cause before the Congress in support of this permanent long-range legislation. But the situation is urgent, and I believe that while we are working in the direction of this agreement we need fast and effective emergency relief to tide us over the gap.

I believe my bill will fill this need, Mr. Speaker. It is almost exactly the same kind of emergency dairy legislation which the House passed in the last Congress as a part of the overall farm bill, but which was stricken out in the Senate.

The bill encourages voluntary reduction in the production of milk without harming the dairy farmer's income. It would do it in much the same way as we have been doing for several years with the emergency feed grains program.

Under my bill, a dairy farmer could elect to reduce his milk production below his 1962 production by a figure of between 10 to 25 percent. In return for this reduction, the participating farmer would receive $2.50 per hundredweight as an incentive payment for his reduction.

The results of this legislation will be of real help to our upstate dairy farmers. It should contribute to an appreciable reduction in the production of milk, which will then be reflected in an easing of the pressures recently mounted against our farmers as an outgrowth of the current milk surplus.

In so doing it will help to improve the stability of our upstate dairy market, and will help to continue a stable return to the farmer for his milk. In addition, the incentive payments will protect the farmer against any serious decline in his income as a result of his voluntary reductions. And, since the incentive payment is below the cost to the Government of acquiring surplus milk products, the taxpayers will actually save money on the transaction, as well as saving additional sums in storage and warehousing costs for surplus dairy products.

The program, if adopted by the Congress, would be an emergency program pure and simple. It would continue in operation, under the terms of my legislation, until September 30, 1964. By that time I feel sure we will have devised more permanent legislation in line with the requests and pleas of our upstate dairy farmers.

Mr. Speaker, the legislation I have introduced has already received the support of substantial dairy farm groups in upstate New York, including the New York State Grange and the Eastern Milk Producers Association. It is closely parallel to a similar recommendation made by the metropolitan milk bargaining agency. I believe it has the support of a substantial majority of the dairy farmers in upstate New York. I trust the bill will be promptly enacted into law, so that the relief it provides as an emergency matter can come quickly to the dairy farmers I have the honor to represent in this body.

THE UNESCO BOOKLET, "EQUALITY OF RIGHTS BETWEEN RACES AND NATIONALITIES IN THE U.S.S.R."

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, concern has been expressed in this House, and in the other Chamber of Congress, about a booklet published by the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization which, among other things, distorted history and denounced "colonialist oppression by Western nations," and described the U.S.S.R. as a "brotherhood of free and equal peoples."

The United Nations booklet—and remember it is the American taxpayer who keeps the U.N.'s financial head above the breakers of bankruptcy—notes that:

> In 1940 the Soviet regime was restored in Latvia, Lithuania, and Estonia, which voluntarily joined the Soviet Union.

Now, Mr. Speaker, it develops that this booklet which insults the West, insults the three captive Baltic States and insults history, is rather a ghost publication.

Attempts by Members of this Congress to obtain and see it, to read it, and to study it, are being met by continued refusals by United States and United Nations officials to make it available to Congress.

Our colleague here, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS], was told by our United Nations Ambassador Adlai Stevenson that no copy of the offensive booklet is available, as the gentleman informed this House March 7. In fact, the Ambassador claimed he had not "been able to lay ahold of one myself."

I would like to report today a bit of news that seems encouraging. It just may be that very few people anywhere have been able to "lay ahold" of this UNESCO booklet.

I have received this morning a letter from Mr. Philip Deane, Director of the United Nations Information Centre here in Washington.

Says Mr. Deane:

> The UNESCO booklet, "Equality of Rights Between Races and Nationalities in the U.S.S.R.," has never been sold or stocked by any United Nations center or bookstore. Our headquarters (in Washington) does not have a copy. I regret, therefore, that we are unable to comply with your request for one.

Now, if we may believe this distinguished United Nations official charged with information about the U.N. in this Capital of the Nation that provides some 40 percent of U.N. funds, we may rest a bit more easily about this UNESCO booklet that praises communism.

If the booklet has, as Mr. Deane says, "never been sold or stocked by any United Nations center or bookstore," then it follows that at least innocent purchasers have not been offered it as an official U.N. publication at official U.N. offices.

However, it must be noted by American taxpayers that it is likely that the Communist nations of the world have arranged to distribute this booklet, through their own auspices, throughout the uncommitted world.

My efforts to obtain a copy of this UNESCO publication are continuing as are, I am sure, the efforts of other Members of this Congress. I suggest that it would be a good idea, even if this is a ghost publication, for the American Congress to take a close look at it even if the reading makes us sick.

UNITED NATIONS INFORMATION CENTRE

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago I read in part from a letter by Mr. Adlai Stevenson, the U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations, in which he said that he had been unable to lay his hands on a copy of that infamous booklet issued by UNESCO.

A few weeks ago, in February, the United Nations Information Centre in Washington, D.C.—and I call your attention to the fact that it is spelled "C-e-n-t-r-e"—sent out a propaganda letter, a mimeographed letter, to Members of the House, in which Mr. Philip Deane, the Director of the United Nations Information Centre—C-e-n-t-r-e—in Washington, D.C., tried to pooh-pooh the idea that there was anything wrong with this UNESCO booklet which my friend from Missouri [Mr. HALL] described a few moments ago. So I wrote to Mr. Deane and asked him to supply me with a copy. On March 8, I received this reply:

> MY DEAR MR. GROSS: Thank you for your letter of March 7. As I mention in my letter to which you refer the United Nations has never sold nor stocked the UNESCO booklet. Centre libraries have not received copies. Consequently we are unable to supply you with the copy you requested.
>
> With my personal regards,
>
> Sincerely yours,
>
> PHILIP DEANE,
> *Director*.

What kind of skulduggery is going on when the American Ambassador to the United Nations and the head of the United Nations Information Centre in Washington cannot provide a copy of this infamous booklet. The money of American taxpayers was used to produce this Soviet propaganda and it is especially interesting that not even the U.N. information outfit can or will produce a copy.

CIVIL RIGHTS BILL

Mr. MILLIKEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLIKEN. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced a civil rights bill which is most comprehensive in scope. Equally important, the bill is tailored to moderate application in order that it may be enacted into law this session of Congress. Of course, anyone can come forward with pie-in-the-sky proposals that sound sweet, but have the false ring of impossible accomplishment. As a Republican, I am sincere in proposing this civil rights bill, and have every intention of guiding it toward enactment. Sincerity, as I see it, is not in what you promise, but in what you accomplish. And as far as I am concerned, I intend to fight for deliverance of this bill to the people during the 88th Congress.

Before presenting an analysis of the bill, however, I would like to comment upon the Kennedy administration's recent civil rights message which has recently been presented to Congress, but which has yet to bring forward the introduction of a single bill. This message, indeed, is a puzzle to understand. For, it literally boasts that the present administration has done more in the field of civil rights than any other administration in the history of our Nation. An example of this boastfulness involves the statement that a far greater number of voting-rights suits have been instituted during the Kennedy administration than in previous administrations. There is a failure to acknowledge, however, that the only progressive civil rights legislation to be enacted since Reconstruction days occurred in the 8 years that President Eisenhower was in office. Without the passage of the 1957 and 1960 Civil Rights Acts, there would have been no suits to grant the voting franchise to every citizen regardless of his race, creed, or color. Moreover, if one were to compare the law suits brought during President Eisenhower's term in office with those during Mr. Kennedy's, it will readily be seen that the latter's record is nothing to shout about—particularly when it is realized that it took Republican Attorneys General time to implement the new legislation and to undertake exhaustive investigations. Similarly, many legal actions which the present administration has taken credit for were largely developed during the Eisenhower administration.

The Kennedy administration also has taken practically sole credit for school desegregation. Yet, the fallacy of this claim may be seen when one recalls that it was during the tenure of a Republican President that the famous 1954 Supreme Court decision was handed down. And following this decision, the Republican administration proceeded to institute desegregation in hundreds upon hundreds of school districts. To name but one significant example, the entire school system in the District of Columbia was totally and completely desegregated while President Eisenhower was in office.

In many other areas of civil rights, as well, the Republicans did what President Kennedy now takes credit for. Desegregation of transportation facilities, the Armed Forces, libraries, many southern universities, Federal employment, national parks, and national forests. Similarly, in the area of private employment, it was a Republican President who set up the Committee on Equal Employment Opportunity to make certain that, where Federal contracts were involved, employers and labor unions would refrain from discrimination in employment.

From this, it may be seen that, instead of being the pathfinder of civil rights, the Kennedy administration merely represents the homesteader. It would therefore logically appear that if the present administration wanted to prove its vigor in defending civil rights, it would have come forward with solid legislative proposals. Yet, when one is through hearing the boastful roar of the President's civil rights message, he surely must be surprised to encounter only a mouse's squeak of newly proposed legislation.

Most surprising of all, perhaps, is that the President either ignored or greatly modified three civil rights proposals contained in the Democratic platform of 1960—those involving the Civil Rights Commission; authority of the Attorney General to bring civil school desegregation actions; and legislation involving nonsegregation in Government employment and Government contracting truthfully then, the President's message does have a hollow ring.

The civil rights bill which I have introduced today seeks to make the Civil Rights Commission permanent. In addition, it grants the Commission authority to subpoena necessary documents—authority which, if denied, will tend to curb the effectiveness of the Commission's work. Furthermore, the Commission is granted the right to look into voter fraud cases—a right which is equally as important as voter discrimination. For, to not have one's vote counted is equally as discriminatory as to not be able to vote at all. And, we all know those locales in the country where fraudulent voting practices are prominent.

In contrast, however, President Kennedy only proposes that the life of the Civil Rights Commission be extended 4 years, even though his own 1960 Democratic platform calls for the Commission being made permanent. Moreover, he bases the halfhearted gesture on the principle that it would be pessimistic to consider that our country will always need a Civil Rights Commission. Perhaps, a time will come when we can do without the need of such an agency of government, but we well know that that time will not be upon us in 4 years. I, certainly, am not a pessimist. But, I am a realist and I know that we are going to have to toil long before voter discrimination and voter frauds are eliminated. Why risk the need to fight for repeated extensions of the Commission each few years when we can correct the Commission's tenuous existence during this session of Congress? In this regard, I have learned that the Commission is losing valuable personnel for the simple reason that their future looks precarious. Let us then terminate this uncertainty and pump real life into the Commission by making its existence permanent.

Second. The civil rights bill which I have introduced would grant the Attorney General the authority to institute civil rights actions in an effort to desegregate public schools. Considerable advance has been made in this area of civil rights, but there is still progress to be made. At the present, the Attorney General only has the right to bring criminal suits in this field which, if done, can cause as much antagonism as cure—particularly since a number of Southern States have begun to adopt moderate programs. In contrast to this, however, the President has failed to recommend any action along this line even though the Democratic platform of 1960 specifically called for such legislation. What must we think of the boldness of the present administration's civil rights intentions when they fail again to follow their own campaign promises?

A third part of my civil rights bill calls for the legislative creation of a Commission on Equality of Opportunity in Employment. This Commission would have authority to conduct investigations and hearings concerning charges of discrimination in employment by business organizations or labor unions who are engaged in carrying out Government contracts. Similarly, discrimination by employment agencies, supported by Federal funds, would be rooted out. There presently exists a committee to look into similar areas of discrimination. This committee was established by President Eisenhower through Executive order and performed commendably under the skilled direction of Vice President Nixon. The Kennedy administration continued the operation of the committee and has properly carried on its work. But, an organization, if necessary and desirable, can better perform its duties if created by legislation rather than by Executive orders.

For one, the present committee is headed by various cabinet officials who cannot devote much time to its operations. Its day-to-day affairs, therefore, must be delegated to lesser employees who, surely, must consider their employment temporary and tenuous. Moreover, what one administration can create by Executive order, a second administration can disband. It would seem far more preferable, then, to establish a commission of this nature by a law of Congress which will clearly show that its functions are being taken seriously. Then, too, the authority of the newly proposed commission is more fully enhanced by granting it subpena power and by permitting it to effectively deal with discrimination in labor unions and public employment agencies—powers or duties absent or attenuated in the existing committee. President Kennedy, in his message, glowingly praises the work of the present committee under his administration without acknowledging its parentage. Similarly, he makes no recommendations for its legislative creation even though the 1960 Democratic platform called for such action. This surely must seem strange to those who see and understand the need for the elimination of discrimination in employment. The old saying, "action not words" certainly must have come into the minds of many citizens, when they read the President's message.

The civil rights bill, which I have introduced today, also includes a provision which authorizes an appropriation to aid State and local educational agencies to enable them to desegregate public schools. Here, I am pleased to add, my civil rights bill and the President's message coincide to some extent. A significant difference does exist, however. Under my bill, the State or local school agency must make the request for assistance, whereas, it appears from the President's message that aid can be forced upon the schools. Since the latter approach could interject Federal aid to education where it is not wanted, I believe that my approach is to be preferred.

While on the subject of education, moreover, I should point out that the President's message proposes that separate school facilities be created on military installations where local public schools have not desegregated. This proposal, I am pleased to say, cannot be found in my bill since it is abhorrent to the concept of uniform desegregation. I may also add that the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People has come out strongly against this gimmick. And, they have done so for good reason because the effect of the proposal would be to create three categories of schools: First, integrated schools on military installations; second, all-white public schools; and third, all-Negro public schools. Anyone on the base who so desired could continue to attend a segregated school in the local community and the local community could under law continue to receive Federal funds. The harm to this plan can be readily seen and I, for one, will have no part of it. What we need and what the Republican Party is striving for is public schools which are desegregated—that is, public schools which are equally open to all because the citizens in each local community have been made aware that equality for all our citizens is a necessary adjunct to a free society. Let us also remember what President Eisenhower accomplished in his administration without the loss of life and with a minimum of force.

Finally, my civil rights bill would create a presumption that any citizen, otherwise qualified to vote, shall be deemed to have sufficient literacy, comprehension and intelligence to vote in Federal election if he has completed six grades in an accredited school where instruction is carried out predominantly in the English language. My bill is similar to a recommendation contained in the President's message. And, this is for good reason since it is known that Negroes in certain States have been subjected to discriminatory intellectual tests which have not been imposed on their white neighbors at vote registration time. The elimination of this inequity seems necessary and desirable.

In another area of voter equality, however, the President has recommended that Federal referees be appointed in order to register voters before a court has determined whether or not discrimination exists. This provision would clearly invade the rights of States to manage their own elections and cannot be supported by me. Not only that, but support for such a provision could so antagonize moderate-thinking citizens, wherever they live, as to seriously jeopardize the enactment of any civil rights legislation. As I said at the beginning of my statement, my bill is comprehensive in scope, but moderate in application. And it is moderate for the obvious reason that we Republicans are sincere in our intention to enact effective civil rights legislation this session of Congress. Anyone, of course, can look at the moon, but getting there takes painstaking care and deliberate effort.

The Republican Party is dedicated to equal rights and equal opportunity for all. As a proud representative of that party, I intend to work long and hard in seeing that we carry out our pledge to enact constructive civil rights legislation.

INTERNATIONAL PEACE CORPS SECRETARIAT

Mr. DIGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. DIGGS. Mr. Speaker, I am gratified to inform the House that in the last few months five countries have announced plans to establish national volunteer corps modeled on our own U.S. Peace Corps. These countries are Germany, Denmark, Norway, the Netherlands, and New Zealand. I am especially pleased to note that the New Zealand Peace Corps—to be known as Volunteer Service Abroad—will be headed by the world-famous Sir Edmund Hillary, K.B.E., the conqueror of Mount Everest.

These activities are, in large measure, the result of the work of the International Peace Corps Secretariat which was formed at the Conference on Human Skills in the Decade of Development which was held in Puerto Rico last October. I was one of the two congressional representatives at this Conference which was sponsored by the U.S. Peace Corps. Forty-three nations and several international organizations gathered in Puerto Rico for 3 days in order to discuss the importance of skilled manpower to the process of economic development and to find new ways of increasing the supply of such manpower. This was the largest high level conference on economic development ever held. Nearly every country was represented by cabinet level officers or higher, including the Vice Presidents of the Philippines and the Dominican Republic, the Foreign Minister of Israel, the Minister of Development of India, and dozens of other distinguished national leaders. Our own delegation was headed by Vice President JOHNSON and included the Secretaries of Labor and Health, Education, and Welfare. Moreover, this was the first such conference at which delegates from both industrialized and underdeveloped countries were brought together for a common discussion of the problems of development, and for a direct confrontation of the needs of the developing countries with the capacity and willingness to help of the economically advanced nations.

This may well have been the hardest working conference ever held. The average working day began at 9 in the morning and ended around midnight. But the results were well worth the effort.

Every delegation came away with a far deeper and more profound understanding of the problems of other nations, as well as greatly enhanced awareness that the need for skilled manpower was the single most pressing need of the underdeveloped world. There has been too great a tendency to assume that the problems of poverty and hunger and ignorance could be solved by large infusions of capital. The truth is that capital is worthless without skilled and trained men and women to man the factories, run the institutions of a growing economy, and administer the government. It became clear at this Conference that the success of a nation in improving its standard of living would depend, in large measure, on its success in training and supplying skilled manpower.

If the Conference had only served to create this new awareness, it would have been a great success. But it did more than this. It took several concrete and practical steps toward increasing the supply of skilled manpower available to underdeveloped countries.

It called upon private enterprise to make available its knowledge of training techniques to the underdeveloped world. And, in response to this call, the Business Council for International Understanding, backed by the voluntary contributions of American industry, is engaged in establishing three pilot training projects in the underdeveloped world.

The Conference also presented a series of new quick-training techniques which could be used to rapidly accelerate the training of skilled manpower. And model training centers based on these techniques—these new technologies of training—are in the process of preparation.

Perhaps most important of all, the Conference dramatically demonstrated the contribution which skilled volunteers—young men and women—could make to the almost limitless and urgent need for human skills. Our own Peace Corps, and its reception in other countries, was living proof of this. And a Secretariat was established to increase the flow of volunteer assistance throughout the world. In the few short months since its inception the Secretariat has announced the formation of five new Peace Corps. Several other countries have been working with the Secretariat and are hoping to establish volunteer organizations shortly.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure that there have been few conferences which have made such an important impact on its participants, or which have achieved such impressive results in so short a period of time. Moreover, delegates with whom I talked from all over the world were enormously impressed with the efficiency, thoroughness, and intelligence with which the Conference was organized and run. The U.S. Peace Corps is to be congratulated for having made such an important and meaningful contribution to the interests of our own country and to the hopes of the emerging nations of the world.

RECENT EVENTS IN THE NEAR EAST

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Speaker, the Members of the House have no doubt noted recent events in the Near East.

A political and military pattern is slowly emerging which could be a matter for serious concern.

I refer to: First, the proposal advanced by the new Deputy Premier of Iraq calling for a joint military command of the armies of Iraq, Syria, the UAR, Yemen, and Algeria; second, efforts looking toward a closer merger or union of Iraq, Syria, and the UAR; third, inflammatory propaganda of the new President of Yemen calling the peoples of Jordan and Saudi Arabia to overthrow Kings Hussein and Saud by releasing the trigger.

The United States has persistently encouraged closer peaceful cooperation among the countries in the area and welcomed planning looking toward coordinated economic development.

However, moves directed substantially toward a strong military alliance against a backdrop of inflammatory propaganda would not be reassuring.

The Secretary of State's restatement last Friday of our concern for the independence and security of Jordan and Saudi Arabia was therefore most pertinent and timely.

The House will recall that the formation on October 23, 1956, of the last joint command of Egypt, Syria, and Jordan, with the stated purpose of "the liquidation of Israel" in large measure triggered action by the Government of Israel in Sinai—as Israel believed its security was threatened and that its survival was at stake; thereby requiring action in self-defense.

It would be my hope that the House will give these developments its close attention; that the President will instruct our Ambassadors—as may be appropriate—in the relevant countries to reaffirm that our policy embraces friendly and peaceful relations with all countries in the Near East; and that any threat to the peace will result in prompt action by the United States consistent with the U.N. Charter.

Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following: excerpts from State Department's release of Secretary of State Dean Rusk's news conference of March 8, 1963; an article in the Baltimore Sun by Weldon Wallace—March 11, 1963; an article in the Baltimore Sun—Associated Press story, datelined Aden, March 10, 1963; an article from the Washington Post, March 12, 1963; a letter from the President addressed to Prince Faysal of Saudi Arabia, released January 8, 1963:

Mr. Secretary, during this past 6 months the regimes in Iraq, Yemen, and now Syria have changed, and each time there is immediate affiliation with the United Arab Republic—at least, a friendly spirit. In view of this, do you have some concern for the longevity of the regimes in Saudi Arabia and in Jordan?

Answer. Let me say, first, on the most recent development in Syria, we have only fragmentary reports, and I would not wish to make any judgment on exactly what that might mean. We do have information that so far as we can tell the Americans in that country are safe and that the situation does not affect them. We ourselves believe that relations among the Arab States ought to be worked out on the basis of consent, on the basis of voluntary cooperation in the normal way.

We of course are concerned about the independence of these Arab States and their freedom from external penetration. We hope, for example, that the Yemen people will be left alone to decide their own future and have been working in that direction. But we do not ourselves object to the close cooperation among the Arab States on the basis of friendly cooperation among states and in ways which do not counter the normal obligations of states in the international community. We are very much interested in the independence and the security of our friends in Jordan and Saudi Arabia and will be very much alert to any threats against them.

[From the Baltimore (Md.) Sun, Mar. 11, 1963]

FIVE ARAB STATES URGED TO LINK UP MILITARY FORCES—SYRIAN CROWD CHEERS PLAN BY IRAQI AID—ALGERIA, YEMEN, EGYPT ARE ALSO INVITED TO JOIN ALLIANCE

(By Weldon Wallace)

DAMASCUS, SYRIA, March 10.—A bold new military-political alliance of five Arab nations was proposed here today by the head of an Iraqi delegation that paid an official visit to the new Government, which seized control of Syria Friday morning.

A joint command for the armies of Egypt, Algeria, Iraq, Yemen, and Syria was urged by Ali Saleh Saadi, Deputy Premier of Iraq.

He represents the Government that came to power through a coup d'etat exactly 1 month before the coup staged by a Syrian army group in Damascus 3 days ago.

SYRIAN WELCOMES PLAN

Saadi presented his plan in a speech to the Syrian Premier, Salah Bitar, who promptly welcomed it.

To a cheering throng in front of the guest palace, the Syrian Government's reception house in Damascus, the Iraqi official said there were "other better things" to be proposed.

The proposition by Saadi would give the five countries the right to "take action and enter each other's territory whenever any of the states suffers foreign intrigue or threat of internal imperialist reactionary intrigue aimed at toppling the regimes of these five states."

REGIME IN CONTROL

His words stirred the crowd into a state of near hysteria. Meanwhile, on this sunny, brisk day in Damascus, the new Bitar regime seemed comfortably in control of the country.

During the morning hours there was considerable commotion—though no threat to the Government—when many hundreds, perhaps thousands of persons staged demonstration in various parts of the city.

The demonstrations did not originate as protests against the new regime. Their chief purpose was to link the new Government with President Gamal Abdel Nasser of the United Arab Republic and with the new regime in Iraq.

EMBASSY IS TARGET

One group evidently had more grim intentions, for it gathered outside the Turkish Embassy, where the former Prime Minister of Syria has taken refuge. This is near the American Embassy.

Communists seized the opportunity to turn these various demonstrations to their own uses. They infiltrated the chanting, flag-waving, banner-carrying ranks and began to call for the return of Khalled Bakdash, Syria's chief Communist, who fled into exile when Syria joined Egypt to form the United Arab Republic. He now is in Prague.

When the Communist elements entered the picture this morning, army units with armored cars and tanks were called into action to break up the demonstrations.

All during the day groups of people milled in the streets of Damascus, and at almost every intersection and along the streets armed soldiers were to be seen with tanks and other military equipment.

CITY'S TONE CHEERFUL

They often stopped passing vehicles to determine identification, but there was no danger or threat in the atmosphere. In fact, the tone of the city was cheerful.

The change of government Friday was accomplished almost politely, with the old forces bowing out as the new ones came in.

Like the new regime that took over in Iraq, Syria's new Government is controlled by the Ba'ath Socialist Party, a group that is moderate in nature. The Ba'ath Party is committed to Arab unity, though it has not specified on what basis.

The clearest factor in the aims of the new Government is vigorous opposition to the Communists.

COMMUNISTS FEARED

The anti-Communist bent of the new Government is in keeping with this country's tradition, for it was the menacing power of the Syrian Communist Party that prompted politicians of various orientations to unite in seeking Nasser's help, leading to Syria's joining Egypt in the United Arab Republic.

Nasser, however, overplayed his hand, for Syria felt his control too dictatorial and considered that he had made Syria too subservient to Egypt.

Syria broke away from the United Arab Republic in September 1961, with an army coup. The government that came into power then lasted until March 1962, when it was ousted in another coup.

The relationship between the latest coups in Iraq and Syria has been indicated in a number of ways. The slogans, songs and general appeal used by the Ba'athists in both countries were the same.

After the Iraq changeover, a Ba'athist delegation from Damascus went to Baghdad on a mission of friendship and remained several days.

The Ba'athists, who got their start in Syria in 1951, have had a hand in engineering coups in the past, but they have never before held the power position until the latest Iraq coup.

Observers here are saying that the rise of this party to a dominant position in both Syria and Iraq could indicate the beginning of an Arab unity development on a new basis, possibly along the lines of a Federation of Arab States.

[From the Baltimore (Md.) Sun, Mar. 11, 1963]

JORDAN, SAUDI ARABIA ARE URGED TO REVOLT

ADEN, March 10.—President Abdullah al-Sallal, of Yemen, today urged the people of Jordan and Saudi Arabia to overthrow their monarchs, Hussein and Saud.

"Do not hesitate," San'ā' radio quoted Sallal as saying. "Revolt now and those you have always feared will run away like scared rabbits and confused mice."

The Yemeni leader urged Jordanians to "release the trigger" and depose "playboy King Hussein."

"Your first bullet in Hussein's chest will send the traitors running," Sallal said in addressing a military review in the Yemeni capital of San'ā'.

The broadcast said Sallal hailed President Gamal Abdel Nasser of the United Arab Republic as "an apostle of peace and freedom." He also pledges that Yemani forces would "fight till the last drop of our blood" to uphold Nasser's dream of Arab nationalism.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Mar. 12, 1963]

IRAQI OFFICIAL EXPECTS LINK OF THREE ARAB STATES

DAMASCUS, SYRIA, March 11.—The new revolutionary regimes of Syria and Iraq and the United Arab Republic will form a "union or federation," Iraqi Deputy Premier Ali Saleh el Saadi said today.

The visiting Iraqi leader told a news conference, however, that President Nasser of the United Arab Republic was informed of the merger only last night and his reply has yet to be received.

But he emphasized that the three nations "will definitely unite."

(Iraqi Foreign Minister Taleb Hussein Shabib arrived in Cairo today and formally presented Nasser with the Iraqi unity plan. Informed sources said the proposals were welcomed warmly but that Nasser is determined to move cautiously.

(Shabib's visit aroused speculation that he is opening the way for an early summit meeting of Nasser, Syrian Premier Salah Bitar and Iraqi President Abel Salam Aref.)

Whether the merger will be a tight union was unclear. The Baath Socialists behind last Friday's bloodless coup in Damascus lost their influence in Syria when it was joined with Egypt in the United Arab Republic military coup took Syria out of the United Arab Republic in 1961.

The Baathists who engineered Iraq's coup February 8 have worked closely with those in Syria and have talked more of a loose federation with the U.A.R. than of union.

DEMONSTRATIONS HELD

While El Saadi talked with correspondents, hundreds of demonstrators in the square outside chanted pro-Nasser slogans and waved placards calling for Arab unity.

Earlier in the day, troops dispersed smaller bands of students who shouted for reunion of Syria and Egypt. The revolutionary regime has banned demonstrations and display of pictures and slogans.

(Security measures, were tightened tonight around the Jordanian and Saudi Arabian Embassies here to avert possible demonstrations, Reuters reported.

(Security forces also continued their search for wanted politicians and publishers, including anti-Nasserites and Communists.)

El Saadi indicated the movement toward an Iraq-Syria-Egypt merger will be slow.

"We shall meet frequently to coordinate efforts and work to eliminate regional difficulties in order to bring about identical conditions in the three Arab countries," he said. "These conditions will then help us to take the next step for forming a union or federation. And we will definitely unite."

UNIFIED COMMAND SEEN

El Saadi also referred to the Iraqi proposal made Sunday for establishment of a unified army command for the five liberated Arab states—the United Arab Republic, Syria, Algeria, Iraq, and Yemen.

El Saadi visited Cairo and Algeria 2 weeks ago at the head of the same Iraqi delegation now in Damascus. But he said he did not broach this subject with the Egyptian and Algerian Governments at the time.

He said the proposed five-power joint military command, for geographical reasons, basically would mean a unified command for the United Arab Republic, Iraq, and Syria. He added this does not mean Algeria and Yemen are excluded. A way will be found to include them, he added.

The Deputy Premier said the Iraqi Communist Party "is absolutely and completely banned and will never be allowed to operate again because we regard it as a fifth column of Moscow."

OCTOBER 25, 1962.

YOUR HIGHNESS: As your Highness assumes new and important responsibilities upon returning to Saudi Arabia, I wish to recall your visit to the White House on October 5. I then stated, and I want it understood clearly, that Saudi Arabia can depend upon the friendship and the cooperation of the United States in dealing with the many tasks which lie before it in the days ahead. The United States has deep and abiding interest in Saudi Arabia and in the stability and progress of Saudi Arabia. Under your firm and enlightened leadership I am confident Saudi Arabia will move ahead successfully on the path of modernization and reform which it has already charted for itself. In pursuing this course you may be assured of full U.S. support for the maintenance of Saudi Arabia's integrity.

I am fully aware that in order to accomplish your goals you must have the requisite tranquillity—an atmosphere devoid of recriminations and instigations from within or without. I share your concern at the tensions which prevail in the area and which hamper your design to strengthen the fabric of government and society in Saudi Arabia. As I indicated to you in Washington, the United States desires to be helpful in finding means of reducing these tensions.

I foresee for our two countries not merely the continuance of the cordial relationship which began so auspiciously during the reign of your illustrious father, His Majesty Abdul Aziz Ibn Saud; rather I foresee the opening of a chapter in Saudi-United States relations in which the common bond of enlightened self-interest is firmly riveted by a common dedication to the inalienable rights of man for self-fulfillment, progress, and freedom.

I wish you success and send you my warmest personal regards. May God keep you and the Saudi people and grant you peace.

Sincerely,

JOHN F. KENNEDY.

COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION STOCKS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FINDLEY] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, early today notices concerning the subject matter of my special order were sent to each member of the Committee on Agriculture as well as to each member of the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations dealing with agricultural appropriations.

On February 28, 1963, the Secretary of Agriculture, Orville L. Freeman, issued to Members of Congress a memorandum concerning the effect of wheat and feed grain programs on Commodity Credit Corporation stocks. The same data was released to news media on March 1.

It is a rare example of deceptive reasoning and misleading use of facts. It is shocking that such a document originated from a Cabinet-level officer of the U.S. Government, the head of a Department long noted for fair presentation of statistics and trends.

The memorandum was anything but fair, and I am sure its publication made the many conscientious and capable career employees of the Department blush in embarrassment.

Because of the clever deceptive character of this document, I am inserting it in the RECORD exactly as issued, except that—for the convenience of the printer—I am requesting that black brackets be used in place of the underscorings for emphasis as supplied by Secretary Freeman.

Here it is:

MEMORANDUM

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, D.C., February 28, 1963.

To: Members of Congress.
From: Orville L. Freeman, Secretary of Agriculture.

Because of numerous requests for this type of information, I am enclosing a report on the effects of the wheat and feed grain programs on Commodity Credit Corporation expenditures. The report contains the latest data available as to the size of the reduction in stocks and the savings which are being accrued as a result.

If you would like further details, we will be pleased to help you.

ORVILLE L. FREEMAN.

SUMMARY OF [EFFECT OF WHEAT AND FEED GRAIN PROGRAMS ON CCC COSTS] (ASCC, FEBRUARY 28, 1963)

[HIGHLIGHTS INDICATING SUCCESS IN CUTTING SURPLUSES AND REDUCING COSTS]

1. CCC holdings of wheat and feed grains were [1.077 billion bushels] less on February 15, 1963, than the peak quantities [held in 1961] before the new program was effective, and total stocks at the end of 1963 marketing year will be 2,509 million bushels less than they would have been if the pre-1961 programs had been allowed to continue.

2. The fact that the CCC does not now own the 1.077 billion bushels of grain it formerly owned is now saving the Government $770,000 each day in carrying charges—$280 million a year.

3. The 1964 budget includes [$246 million less] for carrying charges on these grains that was spent in fiscal year 1961, and $813 million—or $2.2 million a day—less than the annual rate that would have occurred by 1964 if the pre-1961 programs had been allowed to continue.

These and other figures show that the new programs designed to eliminate the costly and unnecessary surpluses of wheat and feed grains, that had climbed to record levels in 1961, are working.

The Congress has given the CCC the responsibility to finance all Government price-support and commodity-purchase programs through use of its own funds and a borrowing authorization limited to $14.5 billion. Each year the Corporation's realized losses are met by appropriations by the Congress for restoration of capital impairment. The amount of appropriations needed is determined by CCC's realized losses.

The realized losses of the CCC since 1960 are shown below:

[In millions]

Fiscal year	Realized loss	
	Amount	Change from preceding year
1961	[1] $2,067.0	+$454.9
1962	2,799.4	+732.4
1963 (estimate)	2,753.6	−45.8
1964 (estimate)	2,646.9	−106.7

[1] Does not include inventory revaluation loss of $1,268,500,000 applicable to 1961 and prior years.

1. Fiscal 1962 losses were higher than the previous year, primarily because of:

(a) an increased loss on commodity sales in the disposal of large quantities of corn and grain sorghums acquired from the 1960 and prior years' crops; such grain was acquired at a higher price in the 1950's than market prices in 1962. Obviously as the grain is moved out of surplus into consumption realized losses take place.

(b) increased loss on donations, due to the donation of more dairy products, wheat flour and corn meal, thus increasing benefits to millions of people at home and around the world by a more effective use of our agricultural abundance.

(a) acreage diversion payments to farmers as the [immediate] cost of launching supply adjustment programs enacted by the Congress—programs that by now have significantly reduced stocks of grain and the costs of both acquiring and carrying such stocks, while they have brought about substantial increase in farm income.

2. Estimates indicate that realized losses for fiscal 1963 will be $45.8 million less than for the previous year, and that this encouraging trend will be stepped up in 1964 by an estimated decrease of $106.7 million below that for 1963.

3. Stocks in CCC inventory in excess of needs for an adequate reserve have been substantially reduced—by a total of 1.077 billion bushels as compared with peak quantities on hand before programs for supply adjustment began to take effect. As a result, the 1964 budget estimates before the Congress show $245.6 million less for carrying charges on wheat and feed grains for the fiscal year 1964 than the actual cost in the fiscal year 1961. The fact that the CCC does not now own the 1.077 billion bushels of grain it formerly owned is now saving the Government $770,000 each day in carrying charges—$280 million a year.

4. Cumulative savings of $480 million in carrying charges on feed grains and wheat from the record 1961 level have already resulted or are budgeted as a result of the decrease in CCC stocks, as follows:

[In millions]

Fiscal year	Total carrying charges—feed grains and wheat	Savings from 1961 level
1961	$846	
1962	776	$70
1963 (budget estimate)	682	164
1964 (budget estimate)	600	246
Cumulative savings through June 30, 1964, from 1961 level		480

5. If the new supply adjustment programs had not replaced the pre-1961 programs it is a conservative estimate that carryover stocks at the end of the marketing year for the 1963 crop would have amounted to 3.8 billion bushels of corn and grain sorghums and 1.6 billion bushels of wheat, and the [annual] carrying charges on these quantities would have amounted to at least $1.4 billion by 1964 as compared with the current estimate of $587 million for these three grains in the 1964 budget. The difference is equivalent to about $2.2 million per day.

6. If pre-1961 programs had been allowed to continue and stocks had built up as indicated through 1963, it is estimated that ultimate carrying costs to the CCC before disposal of the [additional] quantities added to stocks would have amounted to approximately $3.3 billion. This would result from the time which would elapse before these added stocks would be disposed of, based on the annual rate of disposition which occurred prior to 1961. This would be 10 to 12 years for feed grains and between 6 and 7 years for wheat.

Mr. Speaker, commodity operations of the Federal Government are extremely complex. The Commodity Credit Corporation is a giant multibillion-dollar organization directed by the Secretary of Agriculture. It buys, stores, sells, and makes loans on various commodities. Data on its operations is so complicated and voluminous that Members of Congress and the press must rely upon people in positions of responsibility for interpretation.

As the administrative head of the Department controlling Commodity Credit Corporation, Mr. Freeman holds the very highest position of responsibility in this field. He is therefore the logical source of interpretation.

Let us examine the February 28 memorandum as one might expect it to be regarded by a news reporter or a Member of Congress not intimately acquainted with the details of the Commodity Credit Corporation.

What message does it convey?

Page 1 of the memorandum, personally signed by Mr. Freeman, says two things:

First. This report shows the effects of the wheat and feed grain programs on CCC expenditures.

Second. It shows how much reduction in stock has been achieved and what this means to taxpayers.

Now turn to page 2 and consider the impact of the paragraphs printed there.

The words in black brackets naturally catch the eye. Bracketed on this page: "Effect of wheat and feed grain programs on CCC costs"; "Highlights indicating success in cutting surpluses and reducing costs"; "1.077 billion bushel"; "$246 million less."

A cursory examination of this page could leave but one impression: The wheat and feed grain programs cut surpluses over a billion bushels and cut costs $246 million.

Both impressions are utterly false.

The billion-bushel figure is a fabrication of factual fragments. To put it together, Mr. Freeman did two things:

First. He told a half-truth about Government grain holdings—the part favorable to his point of view—and ignored the other part which would have put his operations in a bad light.

Second. He made the half-truth look far better than it deserved by drawing a false parallel between unrelated facts.

Few people can differentiate between grain in Government inventory and grain under Government loan. Indeed the distinction is outdated, and like the appendix in the human body is, for the most part, a useless holdover from an earlier era.

Technically, the farmer holds title to grain during the lifetime of crop loans. When the loan expires, the grain is "taken over" in title by Uncle Sam and is reclassified as Government-owned inventory. For all practical purposes, most grain becomes Government property the moment it comes under loan.

When loans were made for less than the market value of the crop, the separation of "under loan" grain from "inventory" grain had some meaning. But under the New Frontier, loans almost invariably are for more than market prices. The farmer who pays off his crop loan and reclaims his grain is as rare as a Congressman who is opposed to the family-size farm.

Secretary Freeman of course understands the technical difference between "inventory" grain and "under loan" grain, and in fairness should have counted the two as one.

He based his misleading billion-bushel figure solely on "inventory" grain. And for a good reason. Records showed the total of stock of "inventory" grain down over the past 2 years.

He ignored "under loan" grain. Again for good reason. Records showed holdings of "under loan" grain up compared with 2 years ago.

Here are the facts about "inventory" grain, based on USDA press releases 655-61 and 755-63. Oats and rye are not listed because they are not under the feed grain program. Moreover, they are extremely small in volume.

Bushels of "inventory" grain

	Jan. 31, 1961	Jan. 31, 1963
Wheat	1,115,482,882	1,035,801,588
Corn	1,465,241,760	987,136,997
Grain sorghums	555,657,933	543,172,505
Barley	54,838,365	28,197,621
Total	3,191,220,940	2,594,308,711
Change, in 2 years, down	596,912,229	

The January 31, 1963, data was released by the Department of Agriculture just last week—March 7. The full texts of both releases are appended to this report.

You will note the reduction in "inventory" grain is actually 596,912,229 bushels—about half the billion-bushel figure claimed by Mr. Freeman. These figures are from the latest available official news releases on the subject.

They show a discrepancy of 480,087,771 bushels between official fact and Freeman fantasy.

Thus, even Mr. Freeman's half-truth came out stretched beyond recognition.

Here is the other half of the truth—the half Mr. Freeman chose not to mention:

Bushels of under-loan grain

	Jan. 31, 1961	Jan. 31, 1963
Wheat	380,014,683	299,696,252
Corn	591,605,106	769,805,837
Grain sorghums	197,304,142	215,131,062
Barley	62,029,631	40,279,918
Total	1,230,953,562	1,324,913,069
Change, in 2 years, up.	93,959,507	------------

Had Mr. Freeman chosen to report on "under-loan" grain—ignoring "inventory" grain—he would have had to report an increase in Government holdings over the same 2-year period—up 93,959,507 bushels.

If he had desired to present a true picture of the trend in Government grain holdings, he would have added "inventory" and "under-loan" grain together.

This would have produced these figures, again from official USDA reports:

Total Government holdings of wheat, corn, grain sorghums, and barley as of January 31, 1961: 4,422,174,502 bushels.

Same as of January 31, 1963: 3,919,221,780 bushels.

Change in 2 years: down 502,952,722 bushels.

Now compare this with the figure the Secretary is using: down 1,077 million. Looks as if he took the true figure and doubled it.

Here are Mr. Freeman's words March 8, 1963, in a speech to Americans for Democratic Action organization at Penn-Sheraton Hotel, Pittsburgh. Speaking of the farm programs he administers, he declared flatly:

> We have already reduced our stockpiles of surpluses by 1,077 million bushels, and the cost of maintaining them by $2.2 million per day.

A fair appraisal of surplus holdings shows holdings down only a half billion bushels. Where did the other half billion cut come from? Do we have phantom bushels, as well as phantom acres in the USDA statistical department?

If he had wished to give the ADA an honest appraisal of his price support operations through Commodity Credit Corporation, Mr. Freeman should have reported that CCC has $357,252,863 more tied up in loans and inventories than when he took office 2 years ago.

These facts are from the same CCC official reports:

TOTAL INVESTMENT IN LOANS AND INVENTORIES

January 31, 1961: $8,108,132,000.
January 31, 1963: $8,465,384,863.

John Schnittker, one of Secretary Freeman's top economists, made a statement on March 4 to the Minneapolis Farm Forum. It was similar to Mr. Freeman's ADA speech, but he had the honesty to add an explanatory phrase omitted from Mr. Freeman's ADA speech. Mr. Schnittker showed the $2.2-million-a-day saving was based on speculative guesswork when he said:

> The 1964 budget includes $246 million less for carrying charges on these grains than was spent in fiscal year 1961, and $813 million—or $2.2 million a day—less than the annual rate that would have occurred by 1964 if the pre-1961 programs had been allowed to continue.

An "iffy" qualification at best, a throwback to the old political trick of setting up a ridiculous fictitious strawman, then cutting him to pieces.

"What might have been" are the most futile words in the English language. But at least the economist was straightforward enough to expose the shaky foundation on which his guesswork was based.

How did Mr. Freeman come up with the 1.077 billion bushel figure? It was not just an accident. He had to reach for it.

Instead of relating current inventory with a comparable date 2 years ago, he compared it with the peak inventory for each category in the entire year 1961.

He chose the day in 1961 when wheat inventory hit a peak for the year, and then the day when feed grains inventory hit its peak. He added these two peak figures together, and compared the result with a seasonally low single day in 1963. No wonder, with this kind of fast pencil work, he was able to come up with a billion bushel figure.

Here is how Mr. Freeman took unrelated factual fragments to come up with the billion bushel figure:

Peak day for wheat inventory in 1961 was May 31. Inventory that day was 1,276,830,000 bushels.

Peak day for feed grains inventory in 1961 was October 31. Inventory that day was 2,173,537,000 bushels.

Add the two peaks together, and you get 3,450,367,000 bushels.

This was then compared with the seasonally low inventory on February 15, 1963, for both wheat and feed grains. The figure for that day was 2,374,355,000.

Subtract this from the two peak total, and you get Mr. Freeman's 1.077 billion bushel figure.

Bear in mind these facts:

First. Mr. Freeman dealt only with inventory grain. Under-loan grain was not considered.

Second. Peak data for 1961 was not compared with peak data for another year. The highest possible inventory total for 1961 was compared with a completely unrelated item, the inventory for all grains on a single day.

Mr. Freeman's procedure was somewhat like adding cats and dogs together to find out how many cats are in the barnyard.

His reasoning violates every rule of logic and fair play. It is a supreme example of deliberate deception.

As I said earlier, I am sure this statistical skulduggery is a source of deep sorrow to the thousands of trustworthy and conscientious employees of the Department of Agriculture.

What really caused the true half billion bushel reduction in stocks?

In my opinion, it was not the result of the wheat and feed grain programs at all. It was caused by increased utilization of these grains.

But regardless of how it came to be, the actual reduction was only half the billion bushel figure mentioned repeatedly by Mr. Freeman in this memorandum, and in speeches across the country.

What of the claim that costs are down $246 million?

First of all, this alleged saving is only a budget estimate. It is not an accomplished fact, and projected savings have a habit of disappearing in the cold light of reality.

But with inventories down a half billion bushels, a cut in carrying costs could reasonably be expected. Is this necessarily a cause for taxpayers to toss their hats in glee?

Of course not. Carrying costs are just one item in the cost column.

If Mr. Freeman had ordered his entire personnel—all 121,583 of them—to switch entirely from pencils to pens in their desk work, he could also predict a drop in pencil costs. Or, if the Department of Agriculture had switched from coal-fired to gas-fired furnaces, Mr. Freeman could claim that coal expenses are down. It would be just as unfair and just as misleading.

Expenses other than carrying costs have skyrocketed during Mr. Freeman's administration. Costs for realized losses in CCC, for example, went up $454.9 million during his first year in office, and then climbed an additional $732.4 million during his second year.

His total budget request for fiscal 1964 is up a cool billion dollars from 1963.

The total direct costs of our 2-year experience with the feed grain program alone exceeded $1.7 billion. This was largely in the form of payments to farmers for idling acres, a cost item far more significant than the cost of storing and handling the Government-owned feed grain inventory. The actual stockpile reduction was bought at a terrific price—on the most conservative estimate, more than $4 a bushel.

It is strange that Mr. Freeman is now boasting about alleged savings under the wheat and feed grain programs, when just 9 months ago the same Mr. Freeman wrote to Members of the House and Senate criticizing these programs as too costly and too ineffective.

I refer to Mr. Freeman's widely circulated letter of May 21, 1962, to the chairman of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. In it, he made two major points: The present wheat and feed grain programs are too costly; and they provide no assurance that stocks will be reduced.

Here is the text of Mr. Freeman's letter:

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, D.C., May 21, 1962.

Hon. ALLEN J. ELLENDER,
U.S. Senate.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: At your request I have considered the amendments you propose to S. 3225, as reported by the Senate committee on April 27, 1962. I believe the amendments to title III, subtitle A and B would be of enormous consequence to American agriculture, to farmers, to the consumers of food and to taxpayers. They reconstitute the legislation more nearly as you introduced it in the Congress at the request of the administration on February 2, 1962.

These amendments would provide for a long-range feed grain supply management program in which all producers would participate, if, in a democratic referendum, they chose to do so; and a choice for wheat producers between a wheat program of a permanent nature or no supply adjustment just as the referendum in the feed grain amendment and in existing programs for tobacco and other commodities.

The long-range feed grain amendment will cost the Government about $4 billion less over the next 4 crop-years than extension of emergency programs as proposed in S. 3225.

Government cost of alternative programs for 1963 crops

[In millions]

	Feed grains	Wheat	Feed grains and wheat
Long-range program	$644	$1,188	$1,832
Extension of 1961–62 emergency programs	1,200	1,217	2,417
Return to 1960 programs	1,372	1,465	2,837

The long-range program will reduce surpluses at far lower cost because all producers would participate to bring production in line with needs. Diversion payments under the long-range amendments would be far lower than with the temporary programs.

Diversion payments under alternative programs

[In millions]

	1963 crop	1963–66 crops
Long-range program	$750	$1,825
Voluntary programs (S. 3225)	1,245	4,980
Difference	495	3,155

In addition to lower costs and faster surplus reduction, farm income will be increased, benefiting the total population by bringing more money into the economic bloodstream of the Nation. Consumer prices for food—stable during the past year—would not increase.

The amendment on the wheat referendum is clearly needed since the voting provision now in S. 3225 would place the responsibility of choosing a wheat program on the shoulders of the wheatgrowers when such responsibility, I believe, should be borne by the administration and the Congress. The decision which should be placed before the wheatgrowers is whether they desire a supply adjustment program with adequate supports or unlimited production with limited supports. Further considerations on this subject are contained in the attached memorandum.

In view of these facts I strongly concur in your amendments and believe they deserve the full support of all who are interested in a realistic and meaningful farm program.

Sincerely yours,
ORVILLE L. FREEMAN,
Secretary.

MEMORANDUM ON S. 3225

The farm programs of the 1950's cost far too much, and they left larger carryovers which committed the Government to continued high costs. Total budget expenditures for all programs administered by the Department of Agriculture rose from $2.9 billion in the fiscal year 1954 to $7.1 billion in 1959, and to $7.2 billion in the current fiscal year, largely because of price support, acreage diversion, storage, and surplus disposal outlays occasioned by excessive production of major farm commodities. Carrying charges alone on wheat and feed grains mounted to $900 million annually in 1961.

A steady increase in budget expenditures was certain to occur if the pre-1961 programs had been continued for 1961 and 1962 crops. If such programs were again effective beginning with 1963 crops, carryover stocks would increase by the end of the 1966 marketing year to about 4.3 billion bushels of corn and grain sorghums and 2.1 billion bushels of wheat. Annual CCC expenditures for carrying charges on these three grains would exceed $1¼ billion by the fiscal year 1967.

In contrast, the long-range programs would reduce CCC stocks of corn and grain sorghum to about 1.1 billion bushels and wheat stocks to about 655 million bushels during the same period. Carrying charges on the three grains would be reduced to $280 million annually by the 1967 fiscal year—nearly $1 billion less than if the old programs were to operate again.

The 1961–62 emergency feed grain program and the 1962 wheat program have reduced costs compared with a continuation of 1960 programs. But they are responsible programs only as temporary expedients. They were clearly better—for farmers and for taxpayers—than the programs in effect prior to 1961. But they are costly, and their results are uncertain compared with the long-range programs proposed.

Two key amendments to S. 3225 are needed to assure producers of good farm programs and taxpayers of materially lower Government costs.

1. The 1-year extension of the 1962 feed grain program should be replaced by the permanent, mandatory program about as recommended by the President and as considered by the Senate committee, possibly with some minor amendments.

2. The wheat marketing certificate program should be adopted, and the referendum choice between a 2-year extension of the temporary 1962 wheat program and the marketing certificate program should be deleted.

[REASONS FOR THE AMENDMENTS]

1. [The voluntary programs are too costly.]

(a) The additional cost to the Government of operating the voluntary feed grain and wheat programs in S. 3225 for the 1963 crops, compared with the long-range programs, would be about $600 million (table 1).

(b) If the voluntary programs were extended further, through the 1966 crops, the cumulative additional cost would be about $4 billion. This amount is equal to the average yearly Federal income tax payments of nearly 5 million taxpayers; would build 27,000 miles of modern highways; would complete 4,000 watershed projects.

(c) Future budget savings, associated with avoiding new acquisitions of grain and with stock reduction, are far higher under the long-range programs than under the temporary programs (table 2).

(d) Diversion payments alone would be half a billion dollars less in 1963, and more than $3 billion less for 4 crop-years, than with the voluntary programs (table 3).

2. [The voluntary programs provide no assurance that stocks will be reduced.] In the voluntary feed grain program, noncooperators offset much of the acreage reduction made by cooperators. In 1961, noncooperators increased their plantings by 6 to 7 million acres, offsetting about one-fourth of the acreage reduction diverted and paid for on farms of cooperators. In the voluntary wheat program, smaller carryovers depend on acreage diversion beyond the mandatory 10-percent reduction from 1961 allotments. In both programs, farmer participation is uncertain, and is dependent on crop conditions.

3. [The mandatory feed grain program is fair to farmers and the public.] It would provide producers a reasonable choice—[between good prices and incomes with production restrictions] and [no production restrictions and low price supports.]

(a) Producers of cotton, tobacco, rice, wheat and peanuts make this choice nearly every year. Feed grain producers—like other producers—should have an opportunity to approve or reject their program in a referendum. The value of feed grain production plus diversion payments under the program in 1963 would be about $6.6 billion. If the program were defeated in the referendum, so that price supports were at a level not higher than 50 percent of parity, the value of feed grain production would be less than two-thirds that level.

(b) Feed grain producers outside primary commercial feed grain areas would be largely exempt. From two-thirds to around 90 percent of the producers in most of the States in the Southeast and the Northeast could be exempt from the program because they would have allotments smaller than 25 acres (table 7). Even in States like Wisconsin and Michigan, a sizable percentage of farms could be exempt from the program because their acreages are small. Producers who chose to be exempt could not vote in the referendum.

If all of these producers eligible, chose to be exempt and to plant their 1959–60 acreages, feed grain output would not be increased materially, since so little total acreage is involved. No one can predict how many of the eligible producers would like to be exempt. But surely those producers with small acreages who elected to be subject to the program could be expected to vote in favor of it in the referendum.

(c) Many feed grain producers also have cotton or tobacco allotments. They vote to adopt a program for these crops by 90 to 95 percent majorities each year, because they know the value of a program in which all producers participate.

4. [Further reasons for amendments to the wheat section of S. 3225].

S. 3225 would provide a choice between a 2-year extension of a familiar program and permanent adoption of the marketing certificate program, which has not been in effect before.

The main fault is that it would provide a possibility of producers choosing a costly program, while turning down the less costly, more flexible certificate program.

The central advantage of the marketing certificate program over the price support program now in effect, apart from lower cost to the Government, is greater flexibility for farmers. The marketing certificates make it possible to limit the price support obligation of the Federal Government. They provide a means of distinguishing between wheat for food and export to be supported at the higher price, and wheat for feed, or for export without a subsidy cost to the Government.

The certificates provide, therefore, a practical means for continuing an attractive price support [permanently] on wheat consumed for food, and of keeping the door open for reducing the subsidy on exports gradually over time.

The Secretary of Agriculture has indicated his intention of issuing marketing certificates in connection with the 1963 crop on about 925 million bushels—approximately 85 percent of the estimated national marketing quota. CCC stocks reduction under the marketing certificate program would be an estimated 170 million bushels, while it would amount to only about 100 million bushels under the voluntary program.

The provisions permitting wheat planted on feed grain allotments to be considered as a feed grain should also be reinstated in the Senate bill. This provision would:

(a) Provide farmers with much needed flexibility to produce wheat on feed grain allotments.

(b) Provide a larger supply of quality wheats from which millers and exporters could select their supplies.

(c) Not add to feed supplies, since wheat planted on feed grain acreage would displace other grains.

Detailed comparisons of program costs, ultimate savings, and returns to producers under the alternative programs are in attached tables.

(To conserve space, tables are omitted.)

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Freeman has become widely known as an advocate of supply management, a euphemism for Government manipulation of farmers.

He is also making a name for himself as a specialist in fact management, Government manipulation of facts.

By plucking unrelated tidbits from his statistical warehouse, Mr. Freeman is striving to fool the public on the same massive scale as his effort to control farmers.

If this is typical of the propaganda being shoveled out daily by the USDA publicity machine, heaven help the American farmer as he tries to make a sensible judgment on the wheat referendum in May.

Following are texts of USDA reports on operating results and status of CCC price-support programs as of January 31, 1961, and January 31, 1963.

The reader should bear in mind that the 1961 cost-value figures were subsequently altered by a bookkeeping change effected June 30, 1961. This had the effect of separating about $1.2 billion in value from the total value shown:

U.S. Department of Agriculture,
Washington, March 7, 1961.

USDA reports status of CCC price-support programs as of January 31:

The U.S. Department of Agriculture reported today that as of January 31 investment of the Commodity Credit Corporation in price-support programs amounted to $9,436,396,000—made up of loans outstanding of $2,110,217,000 (including $888,177,234 of loans financed by lending agencies), and the cost value of inventories, $7,326,179,000.

As of January 31, 1960, the investment was $9,239,499,000 of which loans outstanding amounted to $1,944,551,000, and inventories $7,294,948,000.

Price-support operations in five commodities accounted for the bulk of the January 31, 1961, loan total as follows:

	Unit	Quantity	Value
Wheat	Bushel	380, 014, 683	$682, 708, 084
Corn	do	591, 605, 106	630, 404, 445
Tobacco	Pound	644, 660, 406	405, 078, 621
Grain sorghum	Hundredweight	110, 845, 024	172, 343, 398
Barley	Bushel	62, 029, 631	46, 882, 764
Other			172, 808, 737
Total			2, 110, 216, 649

(Included under "other" were loans on upland and extra long staple cotton, peanuts, rice, honey, oats, rye, tung oil, dry edible beans, cottonseed, flaxseed, rosin, turpentine, and soybeans, the largest being $39,383,178 on upland cotton.)

Major items in the inventory of CCC as of January 31 were:

	Unit	Quantity	Value
Wheat	Bushel	1, 115, 482, 882	$2, 908, 333, 722
Corn	do	1, 465, 241, 760	2, 438, 901, 534
Grain sorghum	Hundredweight	311, 168, 443	863, 499, 732
Cotton, Upland	Bale	4, 817, 871	806, 043, 394
Strategic materials			98, 358, 998
Barley	Bushel	54, 838, 365	67, 761, 635
Butter	Pound	66, 636, 266	40, 082, 946
Milk, dried	do	271, 454, 022	38, 477, 302
Cotton, extra long staple	Bale	58, 408	16, 610, 420
Rice, rough and milled	Hundredweight	1, 718, 408	14, 159, 942
Peanuts, shelled	Pound	60, 279, 942	10, 014, 635
Oats	Bushel	11, 093, 774	9, 108, 853
Soybeans	do	2, 799, 308	6, 678, 908
Other			13, 206, 702
Total			7, 326, 178, 963

("Other" items in inventory include rye, farmers' stock peanuts, tung oil, and turpentine, the largest of which was rye, with a cost value of $6,252,553.)

Net realized program loss on price-support operations for 7 months ended January 31, 1961, totaled $396,000,799. For the same period last year the comparable loss was $472,676,315 (revised) and for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1960, the program loss on price-support operations totaled $795,469,117.

Price-support operations of CCC are financed in large part, though not completely, by borrowings. CCC is authorized by statute to borrow money as needed, but as of January 31 total borrowings could not at any time exceed in the aggregate $14.5 billion.

CCC reserves a sufficient amount of this borrowing authority to purchase at any time all loans and other obligations held by lending agencies under the Corporation's programs. As of January 31, CCC had in use $12,939,331,000 of this authority; actual borrowings amount to $12,051 million and obligations to purchase loans financed by lending agencies amounted to $888,331,000. This left a statutory borrowing authority of $1,560,669,000.

Loans and inventory figures covered in this release do not include "purchase agreements" which provide for purchase by CCC of stipulated quantities of price-support commodities if offered by producers at the end of the loan period. These purchase agreements entered into on 1960 crops through January 31, 1961, had an estimated total value of $61,530,000. Purchase agreements entered into on 1959 crops through January 31, 1960, had an estimated total value of $57,132,000.

Price support extended (total loans made plus direct purchases plus purchase agreements entered into) on 1960 crops alone through January 31, 1961, amounted to $2,937,305,168 compared with $2,796,166,499 on 1959 crops through January 31, 1960.

[MOVEMENT INTO AND OUT OF CCC'S PRICE-SUPPORT INVENTORY]

Agricultural commodities purchased or otherwise acquired by CCC in January had a cost value of $151,214,007, bringing the total for the first 7 months of the 1961 fiscal year to $1,828,212,300. For the same 7-month period a year earlier purchases and acquisitions amounted to $3,059,863,404.

Movement of agricultural commodities out of CCC's inventories in January totaled $278,384,399, cost value basis, making fiscal year 1961 total through January of $2,084,240,797. The outmovements for the first 7 months of fiscal year 1960 totaled $2,324,492,807.

U.S. Department of Agriculture,
Washington, March 7, 1963.

CCC OPERATING RESULTS AND STATUS OF CCC PRICE-SUPPORT PROGRAM AS OF JANUARY 31

Price-support loans and inventories: The U.S. Department of Agriculture reported today that as of January 31 the total investment of Commodity Credit Corporation in price-support loans and inventories amounted to $8,465,384,863. This total investment includes loans outstanding of $3,378,296,636 (lending agencies financed $1,465,784,402 of these loans) and inventories amounting to $5,087,088,227.

The January 31 estimate of the loss which will be realized upon ultimate disposition of price-support inventories amounted to

$1,314,283,000 comprised of $128,846,000 estimated loss on commodities under loan and $1,185,437,000 estimated loss on inventories. These amounts of estimated losses are reflected as reserves for losses in the January 31 financial statements of the Corporation.

A comparison of total investment, the reserves for losses, and the net book value as of January 31, 1963, and 1962 follows:

	Investment	Reserve for losses	Net book value
Jan. 31, 1963:			
Loans	$3,378,296,636	$128,846,000	$3,249,450,636
Inventories	5,087,088,227	1,185,437,000	3,901,651,227
Total	8,465,384,863	1,314,283,000	7,151,101,863
Jan. 31, 1962:			
Loans	2,812,767,767	171,287,000	2,641,480,767
Inventories	5,042,635,646	1,395,444,000	3,647,191,646
Total	7,855,403,413	1,566,731,000	6,288,672,413

Items under price-support loan as of January 31

Commodity	Unit	Quantity		Value	
		1963	1962	1963	1962
Grains:					
Barley	Bushel	40,279,918	54,641,513	$32,732,235	$46,950,382
Beans, dry edible	Hundredweight	2,133,067	3,778,570	15,266,255	25,568,778
Corn	Bushel	769,805,837	657,481,755	859,936,462	726,472,888
Flaxseed	do	5,119,022	745,732	14,418,578	2,055,209
Grain sorghum	do	215,131,062	201,371,741	242,355,967	219,663,718
Oats	do	35,424,489	38,242,458	18,892,577	20,418,671
Rice, rough	Hundredweight	4,368,588	3,070,424	21,793,869	15,756,234
Rye	Bushel	4,503,166	2,257,643	4,114,554	2,005,855
Soybeans	do	62,706,096	105,413,790	139,854,843	239,861,295
Wheat	do	299,696,252	270,460,341	617,100,607	484,175,943
Cotton:					
Extra long staple	Bale	18,538	3,990	4,900,625	1,049,468
Upland	do	5,659,237	3,946,994	888,553,492	662,374,923
Cottonseed	Ton	12	14	558	692
Oils and peanuts:					
Peanuts, farmers' stock	Pound	220,162,789	178,515,562	24,386,463	19,391,631
Tung oil	do	101,303	2,410,257	24,313	578,461
Tobacco:					
Rosin	do	171,781,005	72,819,967	17,709,406	7,020,567
Tobacco	do	667,345,396	493,667,338	475,916,082	336,883,226
Almonds	do		10,459,659		2,091,932
Honey	do	2,749,847	3,667,424	339,750	447,694
Total				3,378,296,636	2,812,767,767

Items in price-support inventory of CCC as of January 31

Commodity	Unit	Quantity		Value	
		1963	1962	1963	1962
Grains:					
Barley	Bushel	28,197,621	35,551,365	$24,263,065	$30,773,836
Beans, dry edible	Hundredweight	772,442	381,496	5,107,650	2,409,234
Bulgur	Pound	24,418,900		1,338,538	
Corn	Bushel	987,136,997	1,307,084,249	1,148,076,131	1,624,943,239
Cornmeal	Pound		15,900		644
Flaxseed	Bushel	1,574		4,270	
Grain sorghum	do	543,172,505	586,982,770	575,561,312	624,621,329
Oats	do	15,297,460	7,530,373	9,188,763	4,651,813
Rice, rough and milled	Hundredweight	83,005	1,894,035	732,903	10,290,965
Rye	Bushel	833,710	3,232,869	865,352	3,197,504
Soybeans	do	17,873,419		42,534,889	
Wheat	do	1,035,801,588	1,108,896,598	2,016,161,189	2,191,089,212
Wheat flour	Pound	7,807,300	38,100	435,539	2,130
Cotton:					
Extra long stable	Bale	15,865	18,243	4,350,337	5,055,606
Upland	do	4,684,629	1,448,673	809,815,726	245,281,183
Dairy:					
Butter	Pound	335,843,465	219,346,064	197,728,332	132,551,560
Butter oil	do	43,587,172		35,081,437	
Cheese	do	104,412,680	58,082,926	39,158,314	22,165,977
Ghee	do	455,322		369,883	
Milk, dried	do	655,273,510	394,818,687	97,761,792	65,149,770
Oils and peanuts:					
Cottonseed oil, refined	do	8,339,550		1,014,923	
Peanuts:					
Farmers' stock	do	37,764,836		4,068,801	
Shelled	do	25,354,191	7,960,739	5,091,378	1,270,174
Tung oil	do		118,458		24,761
Vegetable oil products	do	127,362,724		23,420,782	
Turpentine	Gallon	1,275,814	1,729,744	669,451	907,639
Honey	Pound	1,045,076		130,868	
Exchange commodities: Strategic materials				44,156,602	78,249,070
Total				5,087,088,227	5,042,635,646

The loan and inventory figures do not include "purchase agreements" which provide for purchase by CCC of stipulated quantities of price-support commodities if offered by producers at the end of the loan period. The estimated maximum commitment on outstanding 1962 crop purchase agreements at January 31, 1963, was $49,168,000. The estimated maximum commitment on outstanding 1961 crop purchase agreements at January 31, 1962, was $66,542,000.

Price-support extended: The total of price-support extended on 1962 crops alone through January 31, 1963, amounted to $3,127,544,494, consisting of price-support loans made, direct purchases made, purchase agreements entered into and purchases under special purchase programs. This compares with $2,643,939,405 on 1961 crops through January 31, 1962.

Movement into and out of CCC's price-support inventory: Agricultural commodities purchased or otherwise acquired by CCC in January had an acquisition cost value of

$52,062,411, bringing the total for the first 7 months of the 1963 fiscal year to $1,610,257,113. For the same 7-month period a year earlier purchases and acquisitions amounted to $773,953,369.

Movement of agricultural commodities out of CCC's inventories in January totaled $242,049,435, acquisition cost value basis, making the fiscal year 1963 total through January of $1,023,564,875. The out-movements for the first 7 months of fiscal year 1962 totaled $1,333,387,462, acquisition cost value basis.

Borrowing authority: CCC operations are financed largely by borrowings, mostly from the U.S. Treasury, under its statutory borrowing authorization of $14.5 billion, this amount being the limit on borrowings that may be outstanding at any one time. CCC reserves a sufficient amount of this borrowing authority to purchase at any time all loans and other obligations held by private lending agencies under the Corporation's programs. As of January 31, CCC had in use $14,391,784,000 of this authority; actual borrowings from the Treasury amounted to $12,926 million and obligations to purchase loans financed by private lending agencies amounted to $1,465,784,000. This left a statutory borrowing authority available of $108,216,000.

Losses from operations: The Corporation's total net loss from all operations, including adjustments to reserves for losses amounted to $1,286,142,753 for the 7-month period ended January 31, 1963, as compared to $1,248,030,255 for the same period a year earlier.

These losses for the months of fiscal year 1963 and 1962 as of January 31, are summarized as follows:

	Fiscal year 1963 through January 1963	Fiscal year 1962 through January 1962
Realized program gains and losses:		
Commodity inventory operations:		
Losses on dispositions	[1] ($264, 910, 153)	($800, 093, 123)
Carrying charges:		
Storage and handling	[2] (223, 553, 764)	(238, 483, 745)
Transportation	[3] (59, 939, 911)	(49, 945, 970)
Total	(548, 403, 828)	(588, 522, 838)
Export payments and allowances	(82, 498, 470)	(135, 966, 604)
Special milk program for children	[4] 335, 335	(54, 918, 772)
Feed grain programs	(487, 540, 665)	(451, 193, 897)
Wheat stabilization programs	(247, 701, 657)	(46, 622, 288)
Reseal loan storage expense	(42, 832, 134)	(41, 473, 976)
Other	(1, 650, 891)	1, 151, 892
Total program losses	(1, 410, 292, 310)	(1, 317, 546, 483)
Interest and other general income and expense (net)	(259, 241, 443)	(224, 836, 772)
Total realized losses	(1, 669, 533, 753)	(1, 542, 383, 255)
Adjustment of reserve for losses:		
Price-support programs	383, 184, 000	289, 021, 000
Other	207, 000	5, 332, 000
Total	383, 391, 000	294, 353, 000
Net total loss	(1, 286, 142, 753)	(1, 248, 030, 255)

[1] This net amount includes $285,369,817 losses relating to commodities acquired from 1961 and 1962 production.

[2] Includes $66,308,013 relating to storage and handling on commodities acquired from 1961 and 1962 production.

[3] Includes $18,275,153 relating to transportation on commodities acquired from 1961 and 1962 production.

[4] Represents refund of unused amounts advanced for prior fiscal years. This program for fiscal year 1963 is not financed by CCC.

NOTE.—Parentheses indicate loss.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FINDLEY. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Did the gentleman mean to indicate that our inventory of feed grains has increased? The inventories have increased, I think, but not feed grains.

Mr. FINDLEY. I shall refer to the tables which I did not read in detail for brevity of presentation. The inventory figures which I presented for both January 31, 1961, and January 31, 1963, include wheat, corn, grain sorghums, and barley. The total change in inventory over that 2-year period, according to official Department reports, showed a decline in inventories of 596,912,229 bushels. The data which I presented on under-loan grain for these very same dates, and the same commodities—wheat, corn, grain sorghums, and barley, the only commodities under the feed grains program—showed an increase of 93,559,507 bushels in that same 2-year period.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Was it an exact 2-year period—the same months?

Mr. FINDLEY. Indeed it was.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. But the gentleman recognizes, does he not, that less than half of the grain that goes under loan is delivered to the Government?

Mr. FINDLEY. Our experience in the past 2 years I am quite sure indicates a greater takeover. I believe most of the corn that has gone under loan has gone into Government inventory, for example.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. There were over 1 billion bushels of corn under loan and only about half of that went into inventory, did it not?

Mr. FINDLEY. As of January 31, 1963, there were 769 million bushels of corn under loan, but this is not the point.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. I am sure the gentleman would not want to mislead anybody. As I tried to follow the gentleman I heard him talking about feed grains, and the gentleman is including in his figures the wheat figures also.

Mr. FINDLEY. Yes, indeed. In his memorandum Mr. Freeman was referring to wheat, too.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Not just feed grains?

Mr. FINDLEY. He was referring to wheat, too. If the gentleman will refer to Mr. Freeman's memorandum—it is entitled "The Effect of Wheat and Feed Grain Programs on CCC Costs"—he indicated the total effect of all this—this was the message he was trying to put across—the total effect of the wheat and feed grain program, was a billion-bushel reduction in stockpiles.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. In comparison with what it would have been if we had not had the program; is not that true?

Mr. FINDLEY. No. He was not dealing in predictions at this point. The peculiar thing, which I brought out in my statement, is that he did not take comparable dates. He took the peak date for wheat inventory in 1961. He took the peak date for feed grain inventory in 1961. The peaks occurred on entirely different days. He added those two figures together. Then instead of relating those peak figures to comparable peak figures in another year he chose to relate them instead to the inventory existing on February 15, 1963.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. The gentleman would not claim that we have as much corn on hand in the U.S. inventory as we would have had if we had not had the feed grain program?

Mr. FINDLEY. That is speculative. I would question your conclusion. I might point out we were moving toward a sound marketplace basis for corn when Mr. Freeman took office. Disappearance of corn was increasing. The export subsidy required to keep corn moving in foreign channels was about 5 cents a bushel. Corn was headed in the right direction when Freeman took over. Now it is in a mess.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FINDLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. DOLE. On March 1, 1963, we had an increase of over one-half billion dollars in the inventory of cotton, and on March 1, 1963, under the Department's figures the present inventory of wheat was 968 million-plus bushels, corn 823 million, and grain sorghums some 475 million. I think the point the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FINDLEY] will make is that the reduction is due to utilization. This I think is possibly more important than the feed grain program advanced by this administration.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. If the gentleman will yield further, I think the gentleman has a good point in relating utilization to this whole program. The fact is that last year we consumed more grain than we produced. That difference between consumption and production had to come from Government stocks, so we have had to reduce Government inventory, have we not?

Mr. FINDLEY. No one is denying that a reduction occurred. The Secretary in an obvious effort to try to exaggerate the amount of reduction has tried to relate two completely unrelated pieces of data, and he has thereby created the false impression that the reduction amounts to a billion bushels, when actually it is half that amount.

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FINDLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. NELSEN. I thank the gentleman for bringing these facts to the attention of the House. Let me refer to the Record of proceedings in the other body on Monday, March 4, 1963, when this very point was discussed.

I would agree with the gentleman from the sister State of Iowa that the feed grain bill has been effective in reducing the surplus. But I see no need to distort the facts by an inaccurate example of what has been accomplished. In the debate in the other body, it was pointed out that a claim was made for an approximate reduction of 1.1 billion bushels, not taking into account what was handled through Public Law 480 and not taking into account what was consumed by an additional population of livestock in this country. The comparison was not made on comparative dates of one year to another. The result was that the reduction was not 1.1 billion bushels but about 228 million bushels. I see no reason why we should use a comparison that is not a fair one. Certainly, we all want the facts presented as they should be presented.

I would like to call the gentleman's attention to another thing that is of great concern to the Midwest, not only to Minnesota but to Iowa as well and that is the feed deficit area situation. Twelve States have been declared to be a feed deficit area. Then by employment of section 22, we find that our surplus grain is now going out of Commodity Credit surplus into what has been determined to be a feed deficit area which simply means the surplus on our farms and elevators and grain terminals in the Midwest are now competing with the Federal Government in those areas where we cannot compete because we do not have a favorable rate on transportation for private industry. This grain is being sold at a rate that we cannot compete with.

The recent action by Secretary of Agriculture Freeman in selling CCC corn at reduced prices to Southeast feed interests is hurting Minnesota and other Midwest farmers.

In an announcement, never released through normal press channels, the USDA set a price for CCC corn stocks at 25 cents per bushel over the Chicago cash market price for five or more jumbo cars or 10 or more regular freight cars. This flat price was made available in 12 States in the Southeast from Maryland and Delaware south to Florida.

The use of this exclusive cutrate system is $75 to $200 per car less than normal competitive corn prices. Secretary Freeman set the price at the same level all the way from Virginia to Florida.

This is a complete rejection of the principle of a free market, and also gives an economic advantage to the Southeast feeders, especially of broilers. This Government action is lowering the price which corn farmers in the Minnesota area can receive. Private grain firms that bought corn and invested their capital in these inventories for later marketing in the Southeast area now find the market usurped by the Government. This also means that they can bid much less for corn in Minnesota.

In addition, this is providing a subsidy for the further expansion of broilers in the Southeast where most of the expansion in output occurred in the 1955–62 period. Minnesota broiler producers can compete on a fair basis, but dumping corn into Southeast at uneconomic prices is just plain unfair competition.

I have here in my hand a letter from the Minnesota Poultry Hatchery Men's Association calling attention to this fact in the Southeast and making reference to this favorable rate that we cannot compete with.

Then I have further letters here which I have written to the Secretary of Agriculture in response to a letter which I received from one of our elevators back home in Minnesota. I have yet not been able to get any figures from the Department of Agriculture as to the disparity in regional prices. I think we are entitled to this information.

I deplore the fact that we have this so-called news management, and I deplore the fact that we have been denied information which I think we are entitled to have. If there is no objection, I would like to submit for the Record this file relative to the sale of surplus corn to the southeastern feed deficit areas by the Department of Agriculture. Finally, Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman for bringing to our attention again these facts that he has so clearly related to this body.

Mr. FINDLEY. I thank the gentleman, and I ask unanimous consent that the data offered by the gentleman from Minnesota be inserted in the Record at this point.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. Albert). Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The letters and material referred to are as follows:

St. John Grain Co.,
Waldorf, Minn., January 18, 1963.

Hon. Ancher Nelsen,
New House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Congressman Nelsen: Can you tell me why it is proper for one department of the Federal Government to violate the principles of an act passed by this same Government while another department is engaged in prosecution of violators of this act in private business? I am referring to the Department of Agriculture and the Department of Justice and the Robinson-Patman Act.

Last week the Department of Agriculture announced a new program of corn sales to 12 Southeastern States which completely ignored the freight rates established for private business by the Interstate Commerce Commission. The USDA is selling this grain for a flat price of 25 cents over the Chicago cash price for 10 or more cars and 27½ cents over Chicago cash for 2 through 9 cars. This pricing system does not in any way attempt to adjust for freight rate differentials. This program apparently is allowable under section 22 of the Interstate Commerce Act which apparently permits the Federal Government to ignore published freight rates by direct negotiation with the individual railroad.

We have heard the officials of the USDA loudly proclaim that the Commodity Credit Corporation was not intended to compete with established marketing channels for agricultural products. The reason for these proclamations was the Congress of the United States has specifically instructed the USDA to avoid such competition. Can the Congressman from an agricultural district condone such actions by the USDA and let them continue to act in such a capricious and arbitrary manner?

If the Congress is going to continue to allow the Federal Government's increasing usurpation of the functions of the States, individual businesses, and the individual, let them discontinue the sham of calling our country one of free enterprise and free people. If nothing else, let the Congress be honest with the people it is supposed to represent. I have faith that you, as our elected representative, will not fail to do everything in your power to halt this usurpation of power by the Federal Government. How can this tide be stemmed?

Very truly yours,
Charles T. St. John.

January 23, 1963.

Hon. Orville L. Freeman,
Secretary of Agriculture, Department of Agriculture, Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Secretary: This has reference to an announcement issued by your Department on January 9 of this year concerning the pricing policy of the Commodity Credit Corporation on grain shipped to 12 Southeastern States.

Following is an excerpt from a letter which I have received, commenting on the effect that this pricing policy tends to have on operations of the grain trade in the Midwest:

"Last week the Department of Agriculture announced a new program of corn sales to 12 Southeastern States which completely ignored the freight rates established for private business by the Interstate Commerce Commission. The USDA is selling this grain for a flat price of 25 cents over the Chicago cash price for 10 or more cars and 27½ cents over Chicago cash for 2 through 9 cars. This pricing system does not in any way attempt to adjust for freight rate differentials. This program apparently is allowable under section 22 of the Interstate Commerce Act which apparently permits the Federal Government to ignore published freight rates by direct negotiation with the individual railroad.

"We have heard the officials of the USDA loudly proclaim that the Commodity Credit Corporation was not intended to compete with established marketing channels for agricultural products. The reason for these proclamations was the Congress of the United States has specifically instructed the USDA to avoid such competition. Can the Congressman from an agricultural district condone such actions by the USDA and let them continue to act in such a capricious and arbitrary manner?"

I would appreciate having your comments on this action.

Sincerely yours,
Ancher Nelsen.

U.S. Department of Agriculture,
Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service,
Washington, D.C., February 19, 1963.

Hon. Ancher Nelsen,
House of Representatives.

Dear Mr. Nelsen: This is in further reply to your letter of January 23, 1963, in which you quote from a letter you received regarding the Department's sale of corn for delivery in the Southeastern States, announced January 9, 1963.

The decision to make corn available in the Mid-Atlantic and Southeastern States at specific prices was based on a finding that a distortion in interregional price relationships, apparently related to the feed grain program, had begun to develop and seemed likely to widen further if no corrective action was taken.

Contrary to opinion in some quarters, the fact that reduced freight rates were available from the Southern Railway system was not considered as a justification for the action. Once the determination had been made, however, the Department in the interest of minimizing operating expenses arranged to take advantage of available reductions in transportation rates. It should be added, however, that the Department is not limiting its sales to buyers served exclusively by the Southern Railway system.

The action also is not in terms of offsetting quantitatively the effect on the area's 1962 feed grain production of program acreage diversion. The percentage of such diversion in the Southeast was approximately comparable with that in surplus-producing areas and a case could hardly be made for undertaking a quantitative offset through CCC sales. It has been and continues to be the Department's intention to conduct sales operations under the feed grain programs in a manner which would avoid, as nearly as practicable, upsetting normal competitive relationships among regions.

It is expected that feed grain prices in the Southeast can be stabilized with a rather limited volume of CCC sales. The CCC sales price is not widely different from local price levels in many localities and in some localities is clearly noncompetitive.

Meantime, the Department is keeping under review the free grain price relationships in all areas. In event distortions related to the feed grain program do develop in any area, the Department within the limits of its authority will take appropriate remedial action. Also, if it appears in succeeding weeks that a modification in the offer to the Southeast is essential to the maintenance of a normal differential with other areas, the Department will take due action. In its sales to the Southeast last year, the Department did not act to correct all of the differential since part of it appeared to have been due to variations in weather effects on 1961 per-acre yields. Selling by CCC gradually phased out as the private trade improved its competitive position through greater economies in originating and moving corn supplies.

Meantime, on January 24, the Interstate Commerce Commission approved for general availability to all shippers the reduced rate schedule requested by the Southern Railway system on multiple "jumbo" carlots. This schedule had been expected to be put into effect by the Southern in the near future, but it is now understood that such action is contingent on a decision of the Supreme Court. Thus, it is impossible to determine at this time how the final decision will relate to the feed grain price situation in the Southeast.

We are pleased to provide you with the requested information and are always ready to render further service at any time.

Sincerely yours,

H. D. Godfrey,
Administrator.

Feruary 21, 1963.

Mr. H. D. Godfrey,
Administrator, Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service, Department of Agriculture, Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Godfrey: I have your letter of February 19 in reply to mine of January 23 concerning the Department's announcement of January 9 on the sale of corn for delivery in the Southeastern States.

In your letter you refer to "a distortion in interregional price relationships, apparently related to the feed grain program." It is obvious to me that some such price disparity must have been the basis for the January 9 announcement and I had hoped that in your reply to my letter of January 23 that you would have indicated just what these interregional price relationships distortion amount to.

In that you have referred to interregional price relationships I assume that your statistical analysis of these price relationships has taken into account other feed deficit areas of the Nation as a basis for your comparison.

I would appreciate your providing me with a tabulation of price quotations and your analysis which gave rise to the action announced by the Department on January 9. Your early reply will be much appreciated.

Sincerely yours,

Ancher Nelsen.

Minnesota Poultry
Hatchery Association,
March 9, 1963.

Hon. Ancher Nelsen,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

My Dear Mr. Nelsen: A recent article taken out of the Business Management Newsletter of the Southeastern Egg and Poultry Association, Decatur, Ga., has just been brought to my attention. An excerpt from this article is as follows:

"Regional grain prices: Some members of the feed industry have stated concern about regional pricing for Commodity Credit Corporation grains. Early this year, the USDA announced a set price formula for CCC corn moving into 12 Southeastern States, plus use of section 22 freight rates to move the commodity.

"This move could give Southeast favorable grain cost in comparison with other sections, by adjusting the freight rates, feed industry observers say. It can be also used under the same system, it was pointed out, to adjust freight rates to the west coast and lower the cost of feed grains there, or the Northeast, or any other section of the country."

I would appreciate any information you might have regarding this. Needless to say that we in the poultry industry are fighting southeastern competition as hard as we can and are trying to maintain our poultry industry here in the upper Midwest and especially in Minnesota.

If the southeastern section is receiving preferential price treatment in both the corn and freight rates this will be just another straw upon the back of our already groggy poultry industry. I would appreciate any information you may have regarding this matter.

Very sincerely yours,

Lloyd Stone,
Secretary.

Mr. FINDLEY. The gentleman brought out a very significant idea when he spoke of news management. This advocate of supply management is apparently also an advocate of fact management.

Mr. Speaker, I should also like to respond to some of the comments made by the gentleman from Minnesota. He spoke of the effect of the Public Law 480 program and other factors and the increased utilization of these grains. That is undoubtedly true. However, in my criticism of the Secretary's statement, I adhere entirely to data supplied by the Department itself. Based on that data the fair and accurate figure representing the amount of reduction which actually did occur in the last 2-year period was a half billion bushels instead of the 1-billion-bushel figure that the Secretary used.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FINDLEY. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman has used certain figures and certain data and has quoted from certain memoranda. I, myself, have not been able to examine these figures and data in detail. I know the gentleman is a fair and knowledgeable member of the Committee on Agriculture. I have served with the gentleman. I think the material he has cited should stand on its own feet. I do think the gentleman has charged the Secretary of Agriculture with certain improper motives which I do not think the Secretary of Agriculture has.

I have known the Secretary a long time. I do not expect anyone always to agree with him, but I have always found him to be a man of the highest integrity. He has never misrepresented anything to me. I have always been able to rely implicitly on his word. What I am saying to the gentleman is that I think the material he gives is certainly a pertinent matter for debate, but I think the conclusions with reference to it as a matter of fairness should be drawn by those who read or hear them.

Mr. FINDLEY. I thank the gentleman. I wish to state in clarification that I have inserted the full text of the memorandum upon which I base my criticism. I have inserted the full text of the official Department of Agriculture news releases, which are the latest available official news releases on this subject.

As to Mr. Freeman's motive, each of us must draw his own conclusion, but I invite the gentleman's attention to the text of the memorandum itself, and I am sure that every Member of this body received the full text of the memorandum. In that—and I quote—he said:

> The CCC holdings of wheat and feed grains are [1.077 million bushels] less on February 15, 1963, than the peak quantities held in 1961 before the new program was effected.

All of what he says can be supported from official documents, but I ask the gentleman why he underscores parts in such manner as to convey the idea that the effect of the wheat and feed grains program of the CCC is shown to result in such a great reduction in stocks? Why did he not instead report data which has been made available to the press in the Department's latest release on the subject—why did he not take that which showed clearly the inventory reports as January 31, 1963, related to the inventory levels as of January 31, 1961? Instead of that he chose the seasonally low February 15, 1963, inventory for both wheat and feed grains, then try to relate that figure with the peak figure for wheat in 1961 added to the peak figure in 1961 for feed grains? Was this fair?

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FINDLEY. I yield.

Mr. ALBERT. Is the gentleman referring to the question of motive or interpretation? I think that is the whole point.

Mr. FINDLEY. I do not know whether the gentleman from Oklahoma heard the first part of my statement or not, but if he did he will recall, I am sure, that I referred to the full text of the memorandum and I summarized the message which the first page of this memorandum was clearly intended to convey. If the gentleman wishes I will be glad to repeat it.

I would invite the gentleman's attention further to a quotation from Secretary Freeman's speech before the ADA in Pittsburgh.

Commenting on the effect of the farm programs he was administering, Mr. Freeman said: "We have already reduced our stockpiles of surpluses by 1,077 million bushels."

That is not a correct presentation of the true facts.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FINDLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. In 1961 and 1962 the Secretary was given certificates to sell corn that would have been produced on the diverted acres. At the end of 1961, he started selling the certificates, and by January 31, 1962—that was the 1961 marketing year—he had sold about 460 million bushels out of the stockpile; but by January 31 of this year—during the 1962 marketing year—only 240 million bushels had been sold out of the stockpile. In other words, the certificates were being sold at a slower rate and by using the January 31 figure for both years would have been a misleading comparison, or would not have been an accurate measurement of the effect of the feed grain program.

Mr. FINDLEY. I did not suggest that the way for him to inform the public and the Congress as to the amount of stockpile reduction was by using the inventory figures alone. That is only a half truth, as I said. What he should have done was to total the loan figures and the inventory figures. Then he could present an honest straightforward estimate of how much the stockpiles have been reduced.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FINDLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. I would like to ask the gentleman from Illinois if I heard him correctly when he stated that the figures used by the Secretary are correct in the release but it was the inference that was left because of the comparison he made of a specific date; that is, taking the low point in other years was not proper. Am I correct in that?

Mr. FINDLEY. Those were not my words. What I intended to convey in my statement was that the Secretary reached into his statistical warehouse, if I may use that expression, and used unrelated facts, improperly related one to the other, in order to reach the conclusion that our stockpiles have been reduced by a billion bushels.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. I was asking the gentleman, did the Secretary give any figures that the gentleman says are incorrect, not in the way he used them but the figures or statistics he used? Does the gentleman contend they are incorrect?

Mr. FINDLEY. Each isolated fact presented in a memorandum by the Secretary could be substantiated, I am sure, by going through original documents in the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. If that is a fact, does not the gentleman think he is being unfair with the public, with the Secretary, and misleading the Members of Congress when he makes the statement in the letter he sent out:

> In my opinion Secretary Freeman is deliberately trying to mislead Congress, the press, and the public. The memorandum was neither fair nor honest.

Mr. FINDLEY. That is a fair statement of my opinion as to the purpose of his memorandum. That is why I took this time today. That is also why I sent to the gentleman notice so that he would have knowledge of this presentation and could come and defend the Secretary, if he wished.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. I think I can defend the Secretary, for whom I have the highest regard and in whose integrity I have the greatest confidence and whom I have been trying to support in his efforts. I think he has done a wonderful job. He has reduced the surplus, whereas Secretary Benson went around the country stating it was costing a million dollars a day to store these things, yet today we are saving $770,000 a day in storage costs that were not being carried on during the Benson administration.

Mr. FINDLEY. I might respond to the gentleman by saying that there are many items included in the cost column. Carrying charges are just one item, as I pointed out in my statement.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FINDLEY. If I have the floor, yes.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter and tables.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. DOLE. I might point out that whatever Mr. Benson may have said as Secretary of Agriculture or how much may or may not have been saved on storage costs, I think that has now been eaten up by additional employees in the Department of Agriculture. Mr. Freeman has a background for this sort of thing. I notice that during his term as Governor of Minnesota, from 1955 to 1960, the debt increased from $84 million to $211 million. This record would qualify him as a first stringer on the New Frontier team of deficit dandies.

I think we should point out, too, that Mr. Freeman, on the very first page, in the very first paragraph, flatly states there has been over a $1 billion reduction in stocks, and I think this is to be taken for what it may be worth. It is all part of the record. I have had a chance to go over it, and I certainly commend the gentleman from Illinois for making the statement today.

I noted the discrepancies you have pointed out and did a bit of checking on some of Freeman's policies dealing with his administration as Governor in the State of Minnesota.

In Minnesota in 1958 the Minnesota Legislative Research Committee, a factfinding body set up by the legislature of that State, issued a statement that Minnesota must find $72 million of additional tax revenue to meet State expenditures. Freeman on June 23 of 1958 rose in great indignation remonstrating that this was not an accurate statement and in a letter to the St. Paul Chamber of Commerce he stated, and I quote:

> To say that we must find $72 million of new revenue for the next biennium is a reckless distortion of facts.

In his attempt to put the fires out, an additional item appeared in the Duluth Labor World in August of 1958 in which fortuneteller Freeman said:

> New industries attracted to Minnesota and more people moving into the State has brought enough new revenue to eliminate the need for new or increased taxes.

But Freeman, the fortuneteller, in January of 1959 in his budget message asked for an additional $84 million in added tax revenue. This is not a good batting average in anybody's league and I submit his juggling act has improved in 26 months as Secretary of Agriculture.

During Freeman's administration from 1955 through December 1960 the Minnesota State debt increased from $84 million to $211 million. This record should qualify him as a first-stringer on the New Frontier team of "deficit dandies."

Appropriations by the legislature pursuant to requests made by the last Republican Governor preceding Mr. Freeman totaled $306.8 million; the 1959 session of the Minnesota legislature on the basis of the last Freeman budget message appropriated $476.9 million.

The family farm and the small businessman got quite a jolt because the State levy on real estate went from 9.15 mills in 1955 to the highest level in Minnesota history of 14.32 in 1960—an increase of 5.17 mills.

One is safe in predicting Freeman has a short fuse and will blow his stack when he doesn't get his own way. As evidence of that I include an editorial that appeared in the Mankato, Minn., Free Press of July 21, 1962, commenting on his outburst following the defeat of his police-state farm bill last year.

TEMPER, TEMPER

> Secretary of Agriculture Orville Freeman exhibited his usual display of temper when he told a news conference recently, that the Republican party wants to keep agriculture in what he called a mess. He said the GOP tactics, which he blamed for defeating his farm bill, have a political motive.
>
> The secretary delivered the same kind of slashing attack on his political opponents as he developed a habit of doing while he was governor of Minnesota. In his home State it resulted in a defeat for his administration.
>
> Personally, Mr. Freeman is affable and there is no more sincere or harder worker than he, but he leaves himself in a bad light when he launches tirades such as he unleashed a few days ago on the Republican party.
>
> The farm problem is one that neither party has been able to solve. Mr. Freeman's solution was to give the farmers a harsh choice between strict controls and none. Democrats, as well as Republicans, objected and

that is why his legislation failed of passage. It now is up to Mr. Freeman and his agricultural advisors to frame the kind of program that Congress and the people will accept. It cannot be done however, merely by launching political attacks on the persons who disagree with him. He will advance his cause further by taking a more moderate approach.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE—COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION

Report of price support commodities owned as of Mar. 1, 1963

[Quantity and value in thousands]

Commodity	Unit	Estimated total stocks [1]		Estimated cost value		
		Mar. 1, 1963	Change from a year ago	Dollars per unit [2]	Total, Mar. 1, 1963	Change from a year ago
Cotton: [3]						
Upland	Bale	4,685	+3,236	$172.866	$809,877	+$564,541
Extra long staple	do	16	+1	274.209	4,387	+220
Dairy:						
Butter	Pound	265,278	+59,905	.588	155,963	+31,938
Cheese	do	16,112	−26,448	.375	6,042	−10,216
Milk, dried	do	505,160	+277,429	.149	75,269	+37,693
Grains and feeds:						
Wheat	Bushel	968,468	−86,100	1.946	1,884,639	−199,187
Corn	do	823,173	−145,564	1.163	957,350	−248,033
Barley	do	28,035	+1,211	.860	24,110	+880
Oats	do	14,417	+8,089	.600	8,650	+4,739
Grain sorghum	do	475,010	−86,294	1.059	503,036	−94,191
Rye	do	528	−2,609	1.038	548	−2,554
Soybeans	do	1,549	+1,549	2.379	3,685	+3,685
Flaxseed	do	81	+81	2.712	220	+220
Oils and peanuts: [3]						
Peanuts, shelled	Pound	14,516	+12,354	.200	2,903	+2,557
Cottonseed oil, refined	do	8,340	+8,340	.121	1,009	+1,009
Naval stores: Turpentine	50 gallons	18.8	−15.8	26.200	493	−415
Total					4,438,201	92,886

Report of tobacco loans held by CCC as of Jan. 31, 1963

[Quantity and value in thousands]

Type	Unit	Quantity		Dollars per unit	Total loan value	
		Jan. 31, 1963	Change from a year ago		Jan. 31, 1963	Change from a year ago
Tobacco:						
Burley	Pound	85,268	+54,131	$0.695	$59,235	+$34,905
Fire-cured and dark air-cured	do	48,714	+4,958	.532	25,920	+2,475
Flue-cured	do	503,491	+109,554	.745	375,325	+99,137
Other	do	29,872	+5,035	.517	15,436	+2,516
Total		667,345	+173,678		475,916	+139,033

[1] Estimated quantity of stocks owned by CCC, including commitments to purchase less commitments to sell.

[2] Estimated on the basis of average costs determined from the Jan. 31, 1963, issue of the "CCC Report of Financial Condition and Operations."

[3] Estimated total stocks as of Feb. 27, 1963.

NOTE.—The estimated cost value of inventory since June 30, 1961, is based on acquisition cost of the commodity.

Mr. CLANCY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentlewoman from Washington [Mrs. MAY] may extend her remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mrs. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend my distinguished colleague from Illinois for bringing to the attention of the Congress this most serious situation. Certainly the farmers of our Nation have every right to expect that the Department of Agriculture will be completely factual in presenting the effect of wheat and feed grains programs on Commodity Credit Corporation stocks. We all have the right to expect that the Department of Agriculture will be factual at all times and if the Department is deliberately trying to mislead the farmers, the press, the Congress, and the entire public, I consider such action inexcusable.

Let me mention briefly a case in point.

The other day I received a letter from Richard Perkins, president of the Whitman County Farm Bureau in the State of Washington. Mr. Perkins informed me that farmers throughout the State are alarmed and resentful of the misrepresented information in the Department's pamphlet, "The Wheat Program for 1964." Mr. Perkins informs me this wheat referendum campaign document is definitely not a balanced presentation. He states it presents short run costs and rates to the exclusion of other factors and he states further that estimates presented by the Department of Agriculture involve highly debatable assumptions.

All rounded figures, he states, are in the direction of supporting a yes vote. As an example, the pamphlet says that the price of wheat with a no vote would be about $1.20. At the time of printing of this pamphlet, parity price of wheat was $2.45, and 50 percent of $2.45 is $1.22½.

Mr. Perkins says the pamphlet also implies that with a yes vote, a farmer would get market certificates for about 80 percent of the normal production of the farm acreage production. The statistics, however, indicate the certificates are to be issued to farmers for only 925 million bushels, or 75.8 percent of the national marketing quota of 220 million bushels.

I agree with Mr. Perkins that the information put out by the Department of Agriculture should be factual and the wheat program for 1964 which will soon be voted upon in referendum, must stand on its own merits.

I have brought my views to the attention of Secretary Freeman and I am pleased to bring my views to the attention of the House of Representatives at this time.

Again, I wish to commend my colleague, the gentleman from Illinois, for leading today's discussion. This is a serious matter which should not be allowed to continue.

POSTAL SERVICE AND FEDERAL EMPLOYEES SALARY ACT

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DERWINSKI] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill to amend the 1962 Postal Service and Federal Employees Salary Act to remove a special privilege reduction in second-class postage rates which was granted to associations of rural electric cooperatives in Public Law 87–793.

This special privilege is completely without justification and is, in effect, a subsidy and a grossly unfair one at that. This special privilege which my bill would correct is an abuse of the taxpayer, in addition to representing discrimination and, as I have stated, a subsidy contrary to the status of other publications in the second-class category.

There was a very disturbing series of events which led to this clever little windfall for associations of rural electric cooperatives.

First, may I direct to your attention that the classification into which these publications have been placed is that of religious, educational, fraternal, and other so-called qualified nonprofit organizations which are eligible for special low postage rates on second-class mail.

In this discussion I am not entering into the operations of these cooperatives which already are subsidized by the Nation's taxpayers; for example, in the interest rate subsidy on loans. Let me say in reference to this, however, that I compliment Secretary of the Treasury Dillon on his proposal to terminate the low-interest subsidies enjoyed by cooperatives at the expense of the general public.

However, to necessarily dramatize the history behind this latest rural electric cooperative windfall, I refer you to the legislative history of the 1962 Postal Service and Federal Employees Salary Act.

One of the avowed reasons for the postage increase section of that law was to alleviate at least a part of the huge postal deficit. Most of us in the Congress and many other citizens felt this was a worthwhile goal and supported the legislation.

In the House of Representatives we held almost year-long hearings on the matter without a reference to classification for these rural electric cooperatives. The matter was never presented on the floor of the House when our version of the legislation was enacted.

The matter seems to be a mystery but to the best of my knowledge certain influential Members of the other body who are evidently politically beholden to the lobbyists of rural electric cooperatives slipped this brief amendment into the bill. The matter then quietly slipped through the Senate, was accepted without discussion in the conference and was not discussed on the floor of the House when the conference report was accepted.

In effect, apparently almost unnoticed because of the serious concern expressed during the debates over the treatment of Communist propaganda mail and the consideration of pay increases for Federal employees, this amendment was cleverly inserted by the Post Office and Civil Service Committee of the other body into this 40-page public law which now results in a loss of revenue to the Post Office. These few words change the definition of a "publication of a qualified nonprofit organization" in section 4359(e) of title 39, United States Code, to include "associations of rural electric cooperatives." In this way, publications of associations of rural electric cooperatives are not only exempted from the new second-class postage rate increases applicable to other nonprofit business-type organizations, but are actually granted special new rates that on the basis of the minimum per copy rates are 75 percent lower than they were paying before enactment of the law. Instead of paying a minimum of one-half cent per copy as previously, they now pay only one-eighth cent per copy. There are 28 of these so-called statewide rural electric cooperative associations with publications having a circulation of almost 3 million, as well as the publications of the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association.

The magazine, Editor & Publisher, called particular attention to this new privilege for rural electric cooperative associations on November 3, 1962. The article quoted Mr. Sanford Smith, general manager of the American Newspaper Publishers' Association as having said there was "no justification for this special privilege."

Mr. Speaker, I wish to insert at this point in my remarks this article from Editor & Publisher:

REC Papers Get One-Eighth-Cent Rate in New Bill

Publications of the rural electric cooperatives were granted a special nonprofit rate in the Postal service bill that recently passed Congress, it was learned this week. This is a reduced second-class mailing rate one-fourth of the regular charge.

"This privilege previously was granted to certain nonprofit organizations," the U.S. Chamber of Commerce stated in its recent Washington memo. "So REA groups will now be able to enjoy a financial advantage while propagandizing against their prime target, the investor-owned private power industry. Meanwhile, the publications of the private power industry will be compelled to pay the regular rates to tell their side of the story."

NO JUSTIFICATION

Sanford Smith, general manager of the American Newspaper Publishers Association, expressed the opinion that there was "no justification for this special privilege."

Other users of second-class mail, including newspapers must pay three 10-percent increases starting January 1, 1963. According to estimates published in the Congressional Record this will amount to an increase of $9.8 million the first year and a total increase of $27.4 by the end of 1965.

Mr. Smith commented that the special rate for the REC publications was not in the postal bill as presented for public hearings and that it must have been added in subsequent Senate and House committee hearings. This was confirmed by a spokesman for the National Rural Electrification Cooperative Association, headed by Clyde Taylor Ellis, one-time Congressman from Arkansas.

THREE MILLION CIRCULATION

There are 28 monthly REC publications covering 30 States with an aggregate circulation of about 3 million. They carry some advertising, at most 20 percent of total matter, according to a spokesman for NRECA, who described them as "nonprofit lightweight monthlies serving farmers."

Formerly these publications paid one-half cent rate, and it is estimated the special rate will approximate one-eighth-cent per copy.

On January 19, 1963, the New Mexico Press Association passed a resolution stating in part that it "finds this special additional subsidy an unfair burden to other publications and taxpayers." I wish to insert this resolution also.

Resolution of New Mexico Press Association

Whereas the postal-rate legislation passed by the 87th Congress, while raising rates for most users of postage, reduced the rates for publications of rural electric cooperatives to one-fourth the regular charges for second class mail; and

Whereas all other users of second-class mail, including newspapers, must pay three 10-percent increases, starting January 1, 1963; and

Whereas the changes granting special low rates to rural electric cooperatives were not even discussed in the postal bill hearings: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the New Mexico Press Association, while recognizing the great contribution of the rural electric cooperatives to farm electrification, finds this special additional subsidy an unfair burden to other publications and taxpayers; and be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of this organization is instructed to forward a copy of this resolution to the Postmaster General and Members of the congressional delegation of the State of New Mexico.

Mr. Speaker, it is impossible to ascertain from the public record exactly why—or even how—this special privilege for these rural electric cooperative associations was slipped into the new law. During April, May, and June, 1961, the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, on which I have the pleasure of serving, held extensive public hearings on the postal-rate revision bill and not one single word that I can recall was said concerning any special privileges being granted to these rural electric cooperatives.

On January 24, 1962, the House of Representatives passed H.R. 7927 and still there was no mention of any special privileges for rural electric cooperative associations.

On May 28, 1962, spokesmen for the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association and three statewide rural electric cooperative associations finally came out and testified before the Post Office and Civil Service Committee of the other body and expressed opposition to the provisions of the postal rate increase bill passed by the House of Representatives. It is interesting to note, however, that the public testimony of this group did not request or even suggest the granting of this special privilege. They even said they were willing to pay a fair increase in their rates. Nowhere in the public record of the hearings of the other body was such a request made.

A careful study of the colloquy on the floors of both Chambers does not reveal any discussion for this new preferred status for rural electric cooperative associations. In fact, the amendment was not directly pointed out nor discussed by the floor manager of the bill. However, to the contrary, the distinguished Senator from South Carolina, the chairman of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee, did say:

> I have never been in favor of the Post Office Department's balancing its budget as long as every Tom, Dick, and Harry comes to the Congress and expects their 9,900 nonprofit organizations to bear only about one-eighth of the cost of their mail delivery. We cannot do that and at the same time be fair to the other mail users if we make them balance the budget.

And, this action is directly contrary to his statement.

Mr. Speaker, how much will this amendment cost the Post Office? Because of this new provision, rural electric cooperative associations not only are exempted from an increase in postal rates, but, as I said a moment ago, will now pay a minimum per copy rate of one-fourth of what they were paying last year for their publications. It is not possible for me to estimate exactly the total loss in postal revenues represented by this change. It is possible, however, to calculate roughly the loss to the Post Office assuming these publications pay minimum charge per copy required by these new provisions of the law. I recognize that perhaps these publications never are light enough to pay the minimum; but, at least, this assumption gives us some parameters of the problem.

According to the testimony of rural electric cooperative witnesses, there are 28 such statewide associations having publications with a circulation around 2,632,693. Normal publications of business-type organizations must pay a minimum charge per copy of 0.6 cent during 1963, 0.8 cent during 1964, and 1 cent each for pieces mailed after December 31, 1964. On the other hand, publications of these 28 rural electric cooperative associations will pay a minimum charge per copy of only 0.125 cent—or one-eighth cent—throughout this period. On the basis of these data, it can be said that the annual loss to the Post Office Department as a result of this change, and considering only these statewide publications, could approach $150,000 in 1963, $213,250 in 1964, and $276,435 in 1965 and thereafter.

When one takes into consideration the very slick propaganda publication of the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association entitled "Rural Electrification" and the multitude of other publications such as the Rural Electric Minuteman emanating from that organization, a very substantial additional loss must be added.

It is inconceivable to me how or why these associations of business-type organizations—even though they are cooperative type organizations—should have been permitted to get special privileges in postal rates when we were making an honest effort to ease the financial burden on the Post Office Department. It is even more inconceivable that the conscientious Members of this Congress will allow this situation to continue. The discriminatory nature of this special privilege is even greater magnified when one considers that the privilege was not even extended to associations of rural telephone cooperatives or any other farm cooperative associations or any other nonprofit, business-type organizations.

There are literally thousands of publications of other nonprofit business-type associations, but they do not get this special privilege. Take, for example, the magazine Nation's Business. This is the official publication of a nonprofit association of business-type organizations and should be just as entitled to special postage as the magazines of rural electric cooperatives. What about Public Power—the magazine of the American Public Power Association? Does not this prove the unfairness and discriminatory nature of the subsidy written into the law last year?

Mr. Speaker, I am not the only one who is concerned about this new special treatment for rural electric cooperative associations. The Citizen Patriot of Jackson, Mich., editorially calls it "A Strange Bit of Business." I wish to include this editorial at this point in my remarks:

A STRANGE BIT OF BUSINESS

> The postal service bill, passed by the Congress at its 1962 session, which raises the postage on your letters and the rates for newspapers and magazines, contains a strange concession to publications of rural electric cooperatives.
>
> Under a provision apparently slipped into the bill after public hearings were held, the REA groups were given a special "nonprofit organization" rate which amounts to one-fourth of the regular second class charge.
>
> It is difficult to see any justification in this privilege granted cooperatives which are in direct competition with private business. The REA publications (there are some 28 of them reaching a total of about 3 million readers) primarily are propaganda organs designed to carry on the public power advocates' fight against the investor-owned private power industry.
>
> In any event, a cooperative of this sort should pay its own way without special concessions from the Government. It is particularly unfair to grant it a postal rate reduction at a time when individuals and private business are being tapped to make up the perennial postal deficit.
>
> But it seems that, in this wonderland of Washington, if you have a bit of socialism on your side you have no trouble getting what you want.

The Oelwein Daily Register of Oelwein, Iowa, also discussed this matter in an editorial on December 18, 1962, which I wish to include at this point:

JANUARY 1 AND THE REA

> January 1, when most users of postage in America will start paying more for mailings, the Rural Electrification Administration—which borrows money from the Government at 2 percent that costs the U.S. Treasury about twice that much—will start enjoying a reduction in postage.
>
> Also in January the REA will intensify its demand on the taxpayer for more money; a record appropriation of nearly half a billion dollars.
>
> This statement was made by the late Sam Rayburn, coauthor of the Rural Electrification Act: "We are not in this bill (creating REA) intending to go out and compete with anybody. By this bill we hope to bring electrification to people who do not now have it. This bill was not written on the theory that we are going to punish anybody or parallel their lines or enter into competition with them."
>
> How the thinking in Washington changes. The bill which was authorized about 25 years ago did result in changing the face of America by bringing much-needed electric power to the Nation's farms. Today that job has been 96.8 percent completed, partly by REA, partly by investor-owned utilities. But as is characteristic of projects and bureaus set up by our Federal Government, it now seems that the REA is determined to perpetuate itself permanently.
>
> REA Administrator Norman M. Clapp is sparking the program that would move REA now into urban areas, competing with taxpaying investor-owned utilities, offering inducements to prospective industries on prospective new REA lines with cheap 2-percent money that costs the Treasury some 4 percent, the difference being made up by the taxpayers.
>
> One of these REA projects involved an REA-approved loan of $30,000 for the purchase of snow-making equipment for a ski-lift at the Chestnut Hills Resort at Hanover, Ill.
>
> REA hurts the U.S. taxpayer in several ways. By bidding against and encroaching upon investor-owned, taxpaying utilities it is extending its service with a non-income-tax-paying operation. Oh, it is true that the REA pays some taxes, but not to compare with those assessed against corporations. Their bids are difficult to overcome because of their saving on taxes and their use of 2-percent taxpayers' money. The goal obviously is the long-range plan of replacing all investor-owned utilities, depriving the Government of its tremendous revenue from corporate income taxes. The taxpayer, then, will have to make up the loss.
>
> This is all being done by an agency that was set up exclusively for rural areas. Now five out of six customers added by REA borrowers are nonfarm consumers.
>
> Moreover, REA appears to be financing a good many co-ops unnecessarily. A total of 246 borrowers boast general funds amounting to $600 million, $300 million of it in U.S. Government bonds. Significantly, of this total some $19 million is in special 2-percent REA bonds. The borrowers, in short, as pointed out in Barron's National Business and Financial Weekly, are reinvesting the Government's 2-percent money in Government bonds, which pay them a higher return. Some even have money in common stocks. But remember, this 2-percent money costs the U.S. Treasury nearly twice that much. The taxpayers make up the difference.
>
> Getting back to higher postal rates, and subsequent additional costs to the taxpayers by the REA operation. January 7 first-class letters advanced 5 cents, post cards 4 cents, airmail letters 8 cents, and airmail cards 6 cents. But in a last-minute change, not even discussed in the postal bill hearings, the bill passed allowing rural electric cooperatives a reduced second-class mailing rate, one-fourth the regular charges.
>
> Other users of second-class mail must pay three 10-percent increases starting January 1, 1963. There are 28 monthly rural electric cooperatives covering 30 States with an aggregate circulation of about 3 million. They carry some advertising. Formerly these publications paid a one-half-cent rate, and it is estimated the special rate will approximate one-eighth cent per copy. People paying the higher postage rates are helping make up the difference.
>
> REA groups will now be able to enjoy a financial advantage while propagandizing against their prime target, the investor-owned utilities. Meanwhile, the publications of the private power industry will be compelled to pay the regular rates to tell their side of the story.
>
> As stated above we commend the accomplishments of REA since the plan was adopted a quarter century ago. We do not believe it should be kept going in perpetuity at the expense of the taxpayers, and we are concerned over this evidence of encroachment on free enterprise, which is another example of creeping socialism.

Over in Lorain, Ohio, the Lorain Journal called the inclusion of rural electric cooperative associations in this "qualified nonprofit" category as "A Puzzling Concession." This newspaper said:

> It is difficult to imagine what argument was used to justify the cooperatives this concession in the face of a general postal increase.

I wish to include this editorial also:

> A PUZZLING CONCESSION
>
> To purchase a commodity at a reduced price at the very time the price is being raised is a nice trick—but not an impossible one.
>
> It is being done by rural electric cooperatives, which were granted a special nonprofit rate in the postal service bill adopted by Congress to raise postal rates.
>
> Starting January 7, 1963, the cost of mailing a letter first class will advance from 4 cents to 5 cents. Rates on most other mail services will go up. Not so, however, with the Rural Electrification Administration. Publications of the electric cooperatives, now paying a half-cent per copy, will be granted a new rate of approximately one-eighth of a cent per copy.
>
> Just why the cooperatives should be given a postage price cut in the same bill that raises rates is a problem that would require explanation from inner—and perhaps smoke-filled—committee chambers. The special rate for REC's was not in the postal bill as presented for public hearings. This means that it had to be added in subsequent House and Senate committee hearings.
>
> If privately owned electric firms are chagrined by this action, their irritation is understandable. They are frequently the target of criticism by the advocates of public ownership of electrical facilities, but they are not given a special postal rate to mail out publications to defend themselves.
>
> At present there are 28 REC publications covering 30 States, with an approximate aggregate circulation of 3 million. The postal reduction from one-half to one-eighth of a cent won't break the Post Office Department, but it certainly won't help clear up the annual postal deficit.
>
> It is difficult to imagine what argument was used to justify granting the cooperatives this concession in the face of a general postal increase.

There is another editorial which I think would be worthwhile calling to the attention of my colleagues here today. The De Pere, Wis., Journal-Democrat carried this one on November 29, 1962, and I heartily commend it to your reading:

> SUBSIDIZING THE REC
>
> Recently, Congress passed a new postal bill raising second-class rates (newspapers), first-class rates (general mail) and most other postal charges.
>
> These cost increases hold true for the Journal-Democrat, the local power utility, the local businessmen, unions, and householders.
>
> However, one group has actually "snuck" in with a postal decrease. The rural electrification co-op has been granted a special nonprofit rate in the recently passed postal bill, it was learned this week. This is a reduced second-class mailing rate, one-fourth the regular charge. This special rate was not in the postal bill as presented at public hearings and was inconspicuously included at a later date.
>
> There are 28 publications put out by REC groups with a total circulation of about 3 million. They formerly paid a one-half-cent-per-copy rate. This has been reduced to about one-eighth of a cent.
>
> The irony of the situation is that in a nation of free enterprise, the Federal Government and State government will not allow bona fide paid advertising by the taxpaying power utilities boasting that they do pay taxes (and therefore a share of the cost of government) as a business expense. Meanwhile the Federal Government gives what amounts to a subsidy to propaganda telling the story of the tax-exempt rural electrification cooperatives with our money.
>
> The American public went along with the postal increase because they felt that the postal department should be self-supporting, but as long as special privileges are being given on the sly, we defy the postal department to ever get another increase past the people.

I think my colleagues will also be interested in the following editorial from the Electrical West Industry Newsletter dated December 15, 1962:

> AU REVOIR: AN EDITORIAL
>
> This is the last newsletter. We think you will have some interest in how it came about. Some months back the Post Office Department decided that the newsletter was not a regular issue of our magazine. Thus, by post office decree, the newsletter had to be mailed at a much more costly rate. This decision put it out of the economic ball park. We will sincerely miss the chance to visit with you in the newsletter. We like its informality and the chance to keep you better posted. All this happened some months back, and we have accepted the additional mailing costs until the first of the year to fulfill commitments to advertisers.
>
> We tell you the why of the loss of the newsletter for two reasons. First, so that you will know that the change has nothing to do with our new owner, who only inherited the problem. Second, we feel that all of us can take some concern when a governmental interpretation of some fine print can make this kind of change in our private life.
>
> We cannot overlook the irony of the action of the last Congress that placed REA publications in a special postal class far below any rate we as private business have ever enjoyed. This special class has heretofore been reserved for churches and other nonprofit organizations. Nor can we quite see how the President can condone raising first-class mail rates by $320 a ton and refuse steel a $5-a-ton raise.
>
> We believe the individuals that made this decision in the Post Office Department made the decision in full conscience. Here is our point.
>
> The hand of Government, grown too mighty, grasps at each of us.

Mr. Speaker, I think we should all give some serious second thoughts to these new subsidies. These cooperatives are getting out of paying Federal income taxes and a large part of State and local taxes—at least they are generally not taxed on a comparable basis as other electric suppliers. They are borrowing money from the Federal Treasury at less than one-half of what long-term loans cost the Government. They want to build their own high-voltage transmission lines when there is no necessity for it and in most cases where they could or are purchasing their power cheaper from existing suppliers. They want to and are competing with highly regulated and highly taxed electric companies for business—including service to industries. They are operating proprietary businesses and like to refer to themselves as free enterprise. They may have started out years ago as small operations, but today they have about a 20-percent equity in a $3.8 billion investment. They want to enjoy all of the privileges of free enterprise but without the obligations. Now, somehow or other, they have slipped into a postal rate bill a provision that lets them enjoy mailing privileges for their propaganda organs at a fraction of the cost to the postal service for handling them.

If we are all interested in fairness to our free enterprise businesses and to the taxpayers, one of our first orders of business should be to correct this mistake which was made last year. Therefore, I sincerely urge my colleagues on the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee—and in this Chamber—to give serious thought and quick approval to the bill I am introducing today.

We have all seen and recognized the special interest pleading and propaganda in many of these publications. We have seen almost everyone of them calling for the enactment of legislation in their own self-interest, suggesting—if only by indirection—that the readers bring pressure on Congress for certain bills. I do not criticize them for this kind of activity. They have as much right as anybody to bring their thinking to the attention of their members. But, I do feel very strongly that Congress cannot and must not be placed in the position of further subsidizing this effort to the detriment of other taxpaying businesses or by giving them preferred postage rates to carry out their propaganda campaigns.

I am asking the chairman of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee to appoint a subcommittee to look into this matter. Under standard operating procedures in the committee, all bills referred to subcommittees receive a report from the Post Office Department, in which the Department expresses either its approval or disapproval of the proposal. In advance of this procedure, on January 28, 1963, I sent a letter to the Postmaster General requesting information on this matter.

On February 4, Assistant Postmaster General Ralph W. Nicholson, responded to my inquiry saying the Post Office Department did not recommend or suggest that associations of rural electric cooperatives be included in the definition of "qualified nonprofit organizations." In fact, the Post Office expressed its opposition in writing to this change in the law on September 13, 1962. Mr. Nicholson said the special preferential postage rates are a form of subsidy which is consequential to the Department since every piece of "qualified nonprofit" second-class mail is carried at a substantial loss.

In order that my colleagues may get the full flavor of Mr. Nicholson's reply, I wish to include the entire letter at this point in my remarks:

> FEBRUARY 4, 1963.
>
> HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI,
> *House of Representatives,*
> *Washington, D.C.*
>
> DEAR CONGRESSMAN: The Postmaster General has sent me your letter of January 28 in which you asked some questions about postal rates extended to rural electric cooperatives.

1. The Post Office Department did not recommend or suggest that these associations be defined as "qualified nonprofit organizations."

2. The staff of the Senate Committee on Post Office and Civil Service asked us for our position on this matter. I replied on September 13, 1962, saying we opposed the change.

3. We do not justify the net reduction in postage.

4. We believe the Congress is in a better position than the Department to determine the fairness or equity of this change. In setting second- and third-class rates Congress faces the same question of fairness or equity. I would point out however that preferential postage rates are a form of subsidy. In the case of nonprofit second-class rates this subsidy is consequential to the Department since each piece of mail at this rate is carried at a substantial loss. From the postal point of view it would seem desirable to make a direct subsidy to an industry that merits Federal support rather than an indirect one through postal rates. The change made a number of years ago providing direct payment of subsidies to certain airlines who previously were benefited by special postal payments is a case in point.

Sincerely yours,
Ralph W. Nicholson,
Assistant Postmaster General.

Still seeking information, I sent a letter to the Rural Electrification Administrator on January 28, 1963. I received a reply from the Honorable Norman M. Clapp on February 4. He said REA was not involved directly or indirectly in obtaining the new postage rate for associations of rural electric cooperatives. Mr. Clapp, however, I feel, was a little misleading in his reply—even though he may not have meant to be—in his explanation that the Senate committee in reporting the postage revision bill "included a provision extending the nonprofit rate established in 1917 to associations of rural electric cooperatives." The implication of that sentence—standing alone—is that the committee merely extended the nonprofit rate enjoyed by others since 1917 to the electric cooperative associations. The 1917 law to which he refers was 40 Stat. 327–328, October 3, 1917. This law merely established the classification of "qualified nonprofit organizations" and none of them were associations of business-type organizations as are the associations of rural electric cooperatives.

I will also include the full text of Mr. Clapp's letter at this point in my remarks for the benefit of my colleagues:

February 7, 1963.

Hon. Edward J. Derwinski,
House of Representatives.

Dear Mr. Derwinski: This is in response to your letter of January 28, 1963, in which you ask if REA had anything to do with obtaining a new mailing rate for associations of rural electric cooperatives.

This agency was not involved, directly or indirectly, in obtaining the new rate.

When the Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee held hearings in May 1962 on H.R. 7927, Postage Revision Act, testimony was presented by statewide associations of REA borrowers and by the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association in opposition to proposals that would increase postal rates on their publications. The Senate committee in reporting H.R. 2927 included a provision extending the nonprofit rate established in 1917 to associations of rural electric cooperatives.

The conference report on this legislation retained the Senate language and the report was adopted in the House on October 5, 1962, by a rollcall vote of 312 to 20.

Please let us know if we can be of further assistance.

Sincerely yours,
Norman M. Clapp,
Administrator.

I am also communicating with all of the members of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee in the other body, bringing this to their attention if it has escaped their scrutiny. I certainly hope they will see fit to remedy the situation.

When hearings are held, as I hope they will be, we will then be able to determine the background for these subsidies, and give the Post Office Department, the rural electric cooperative associations, and other interests Government officials an opportunity to join with us in correcting this situation.

In my opinion, congressional intent as well as congressional knowledge was flouted. The Members of the House understand the confusion which prevails in the closing days of a session, and I believe we have been duped by the inclusion of this special amendment in the 1962 act.

I urge you to join me in the necessary corrective legislation.

Mr. FOREMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DERWINSKI. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. FOREMAN. Mr. Speaker, I commend the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Derwinski] on his interest and work in saving and looking after the savings of the taxpayers themselves with reference to the unnecessary spending of tax dollars.

Mr. Speaker, recently one of our very fine weekly newspapers in southeast Texas, the Waller County Record, had an article written by Elisabet Douthitt concerning the new low postal rates for rural electric cooperatives. This is an interesting development which seems to be coming more to the fore in recent weeks.

Like Elisabet Douthitt says, I do not have any quarrel with these rural electric cooperatives either, so long as they continue to serve the function for which they were organized. But, I do question the propriety of their getting the special postal rates to which she refers in her article if the facts she points out are correct.

Mr. Speaker, I think all of us will be interested in reading her comments, so for this reason I ask unanimous consent to insert her article in the Record at this point.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The article referred to follows:

Why Low Postal Rates for Rural Electrification Co-ops?

(By Elisabet M. Douthitt)

It is to be hoped that the Texas Press Association will follow that lead of its sister State, New Mexico's press group, in adopting a resolution denouncing the sneaky postal rate concession given to the Rural Electric Cooperatives. The New Mexico association labeled the concession "an unfair burden to other publications and taxpayers."

It is certainly all of that.

I have no quarrel with these cooperatives. Quite the contrary I think they have done a terrific job of bringing electricity to farms and ranches not served by investor-owned utility companies.

I don't, however, see where they come off getting a postal rate supposedly set up for nonprofit organizations only, because I don't believe anyone in his right mind believes them to be nonprofit organizations. It must also be noted that the rate was sneaked into the bill and that no changes granting special low rates to these cooperatives were even discussed in the postal bill hearings. It was not in the postal bill as presented for public hearings. One can only conclude it was "snuck in" during subsequent congressional committee hearings.

REA borrows money from the Government at 2 percent interest, money which costs the U.S. Treasury about 4 percent. Electric cooperative users pay a membership fee when they tie in to the REC lines. After that they pay a healthy kilowatt rate for power used. I know. I averaged between $15 and $25 a month on the ranch electric bills.

This newspaper and every other publication in the profitmaking designation got a postal hike of 10 percent this year and will get two more 10-percent hikes in 1964 and 1965. Rural electric cooperatives publish 28 monthly publications covering 30 States. These class-printed jobs carry some advertising and have an aggregate circulation of about 3 million. I'm one of them who gets the paper.

Anyone with a grain of commonsense knows that advertising is for profit and any sort of publication that carries paid advertising should be grouped with profitmaking ones.

But through a, to put it mildly, very puzzling concession the electric cooperatives got a reduction in postal rates rather than the raise everyone else got. While they had been paying the half-cent rate, they now have this special rate of about one-eighth cent per copy. Publications, such as the Record, will be helping pay for their mailing and I call it ridiculous and unfair. Moreover, the REA groups will be able to enjoy a financial advantage for issuing propaganda against their prime target, the investor-owned utilities, because of this special rate. And the private power industries will have to pay the higher rate for their publications in order to tell their side of the story.

Mr. DERWINSKI. I thank the gentleman. I appreciate the widespread interest this question has received across the country. As a matter of fact, this issue is just coming to the attention of the Congress since in effect it quietly slipped through the House in the closing days of the 1962 session. In all fairness and in all logic and, let us say, in the interest of normal consistency of the Congress this should never have happened.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DERWINSKI. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I have always been impressed with the sincerity and thoughtfulness of the gentleman from Illinois; but, Mr. Speaker, he outdid himself today. I think in all honesty that his incisive analysis of the implications and ramifications of granting subsidy postage rates for publications of associations of REA co-ops is one of the finest statements delivered for the benefit of all Members of this body in a long time.

The whole Nation is concerned about the magnitude of Government spending, and we all would like to find some way to improve the situation—no matter how large or small the contribution might be. The gentleman from Illinois, in his quiet and unassuming way, has clearly set out for us a positive and constructive way of further reducing the postal deficit—which is a form of Government spending—while at the same time doing for the REA co-ops only what they asked Congress to do. They asked that postal rate increases be fair.

We Americans have always prided ourselves on fairplay and good sportsmanship. I agree with everyone here today who asked for the speedy consideration of this bill by the Post Office and Civil Service Committee and its enactment by the Congress in the name of fairplay and good sportsmanship. It is not good sportsmanship to give these associations of REA co-ops a subsidy advantage in the postage they must pay to disseminate their propaganda.

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of myself and my taxpaying constituents, I would like to say to the gentleman from Illinois, thank you for a job well done, I hope the rest of us in this Chamber can do as well by enacting your bill as soon as possible.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DERWINSKI. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I would like to compliment my distinguished colleague from Illinois on the scholarly approach he has taken on this question. Furthermore, the thoroughness with which he has presented the results of his research to us today must be commended.

After listening to the careful delineation of the facts he brought out concerning the special postal subsidies granted associations of rural electric cooperatives, I must agree with his sincere request for speedy congressional action to correct this mistake. I do not see how any of us in good conscience can procrastinate any longer than is absolutely required by the necessary legislative machinery to enact the bill he introduced today.

Mr. Speaker, I do not feel that consideration of this bill should be thought of as being either for or against rural electrification as such. Rather, it is a question, first and foremost, of fairness and equity to other free-enterprise, business-type organizations, and of fairness to the taxpayers who must make up the Post Office Department deficits.

Again I compliment my colleague from Illinois on his fine contribution to the Nation here today. And, with his kind permission, I would like to associate myself wholeheartedly with his remarks and with what he is sincerely trying to do in the best interest of the taxpayers and a financially sound Post Office Department.

Mr. ROBISON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DERWINSKI. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ROBISON. Mr. Speaker, as I sat here and listended with great interest to the statement of the gentleman from Illinois, I could not help but be reminded of those words of the immortal bard, in King Henry VIII:

> He was a scholar, a ripe and good one; exceeding wise, fair spoken, and persuading.

I think it is self-evident why these words came to mind because the gentleman's statement today indicated him to be an exceeding wise scholar, fair spoken and, at least to me, persuading.

I must admit that this special exemption which was given last year to associations of rural electric cooperatives had come to my attention in recent weeks. But, it was not until today that I realized the full significance and import of this seemingly minor change in the language of our postal laws. I compliment the gentleman for his part in alerting all of us so cogently to this situation.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New York and I should like to assure the Members that I think it behooves all of us to develop a concerted program, to have at least a very careful review of the record to determine the true intent of the Congress in processing this legislation in 1962. I think the facts and the logic and the wisdom of Congress will produce the necessary change that I propose.

A CITIZENSHIP OF CONVENIENCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. STRATTON). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. ROGERS] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, on June 20, 1955, Mr. Manuel E. Kulukundis was naturalized as a U.S. citizen. Yet companies in which this man has substantial interest account for approximately 30 percent of all current free world shipping to Communist Cuba, and the U.S. Government has underwritten his farflung shipping operations in the amount of some $32 million in insured loans.

Mr. Speaker, in recent weeks I have uncovered facts which are appalling to me as an American and a Member of Congress. As these facts are revealed, I am sure the American people and the Congress of the United States will be shocked and amazed at the extent to which the privileges of citizenship in this Nation have been violated.

From information I have obtained from the Justice Department, the Maritime Administration, and other sources, Manuel E. Kulukundis operates not only under flags of convenience, but a citizenship of convenience as well.

During the period 1951–56, after complaints were received from the Congress that some shipowners had acquired U.S. vessels from the U.S. Government under the Ship Sales Act of 1946 without meeting citizenship requirements, investigations of such sales were undertaken. One of the major corporations involved was a group controlled by Kulukundis.

Investigations disclosed that Mr. Kulukundis, while still an alien, held a direct and/or beneficial interest, often concealed, in many corporations which bought war-built surplus U.S. vessels. However, Kulukundis could not qualify for purchase of these vessels because he was an alien. Subsequently he was indicted. After lengthy negotiations, final settlement was worked out with the Department of Justice whereby the Kulukundis-controlled corporations paid fines of approximately $900,000 in cash, and consummated purchase of the vessels, on the day of June 20, 1955. Curiously, it was on that same day that Kulukundis obtained his citizenship in this country.

However, Manuel E. Kulukundis did not relinquish his shares in the family-held British shipping firm of Rethymnis & Kulukundis, Ltd. I am advised that he owns 25 of the 115 shares outstanding in that firm.

On August 27, 1958, Manuel E. Kulukundis received a U.S. Government-insured loan in the amount of $9,593,900 for the purpose of constructing a 41,000-ton oil tanker, christened the SS *Atlas*, which was registered under the American flag.

Then U.S. citizen Manuel E. Kulukundis' British firm signed a 4-year long-term shipping contract with the Soviet Union, and the first shipment of that charter took place in 1960. However, on April 27, 1960, Kulukundis received another U.S. Government-insured loan in the amount of $12,369,300 for the purpose of constructing another oil tanker, the SS *Titan*, which was registered under the American flag.

Then on June 27, 1960, Kulukundis received still another U.S. Government-insured loan in the amount of $10,792,900 for the purpose of constructing still another huge tanker, the SS *Achilles*, which was registered under the American flag.

The total amount of these loans is $32,756,100. As of February 28, 1963, Kulukundis owed a balance of $30,067,404 on his debts.

As you can see, the U.S. taxpayer has a substantial stake in this man's operations. It is shocking that a situation could occur whereby the good faith and credit of the U.S. Government could be used to keep afloat a fleet of ships owned in part by a U.S. citizen who chooses to play both ends against the middle by doing business with the Communists.

On March 1 of this year the Maritime Administration had to intercede and guarantee the wages of the crew of the *Titan*, on which is owed some $11 million, to sail the ship from the coast of Pakistan back to the United States. On that same day, the Justice Department leveled suit against Kulukundis in U.S. District Court of the Southern District of New York, because he has failed to maintain the proper security for his Government-insured loans. The suit involves some $5 million, and the Government requests sale of Kulukundis' new multistory office building at 555 Madison Avenue, New York, as part of the claim.

However, Mr. Speaker, the American people should be advised that his British company, Rethymnis & Kulukundis, Ltd., along with several companies in which it holds controlling interest, accounts for two-thirds of all current British shipping to Cuba, and is responsible for 30 percent of all free world shipping into Cuba for the first 6 weeks of this year.

Of the shipping to Cuba during the Soviet buildup of that unfortunate island in the summer months of 1962, 10 percent of all non-Communist traffic to Cuba was controlled by Kulukundis' interests. Of the 14 Kulukundis-controlled ships calling in Cuba at that time, 12 were tankers transporting vital cargo from ports located in the Soviet Union. These vessels were of British, Greek, and Panamanian registry.

A breakdown of these ships engaged in trade with Cuba during June–August 1962, is as follows:

Type	Name	Flag	Beneficial ownership	Arrival in Cuba	From—
Tanker	Aldebaran	Greek	Rethymnis & Kulukundis, Ltd.	Jan. 3, 1962	U.S.S.R.
Do	Cedar Hill	British	do	July 11, 1962	U.S.S.R.
Do	London Confidence	do	do	July 25, 1962	U.S.S.R.
Do	London Glory	do	do	June 29, 1962	U.S.S.R.
Do	London Independence	do	do	June 1, 1962	U.S.S.R.
Do	London Majesty	do	do	July 11, 1962	U.S.S.R.
Do	London Spirit	do	do	July 3, 1962	U.S.S.R.
Do	London Splendour	do	do	July 14, 1962	U.S.S.R.
Do	London Victory	do	do	do	U.S.S.R.
Do	Overseas Pioneer	do	do	Aug. 7, 1962	U.S.S.R.
Do	Overseas Explorer	do	do	July 5, 1962	U.S.S.R.
Do	Perseus	Greek	do	July 17, 1962 and Aug. 31, 1962	U.S.S.R.
Do	Sirius	do	do	June 4, 1962	U.S.S.R.
Do	Streatham Hill	British	do	June 16, 1962	U.S.S.R.

Mr. Speaker, this U.S. citizen of convenience, Manuel Kulukundis, is accustomed to operating all over the globe, and not always in the interests of the country he is foresworn to uphold. In 1962, he was able to have construction work performed on four of his ships of American registry in foreign shipyards. Our own U.S. shipyards could have used these American dollars to combat the unemployment problem in this country.

Mr. Speaker, there are many questions surrounding the operations of Manuel E. Kulukundis. One of them has a simple answer: Close U.S. ports to shipping traffic engaged in trade with Cuba. This shipping continues today under the aegis of Kulukundis and other like him who value dollars over democracy.

The Justice Department and the Maritime Administration are doing excellent work in pursuing the violations of public trust which have occurred in this case. However, much remains to be done by the State Department in pursuing the violations of our national interest which are occurring each day as ships from countries engaging in trade with Cuba put into U.S. ports for profitable American cargoes.

In the coming weeks, much will undoubtedly come to light as the Kulukundis case unfolds. Hopefully, one of the steps which will be taken will be the closure of U.S. ports to interests engaged in trade with Cuba.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. I am glad to yield to my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. FASCELL].

Mr. FASCELL. The gentleman is a members of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries and also a member of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce; is he not?

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. That is correct.

Mr. FASCELL. Is the subject matter which he has brought to the attention of this House today a matter of investigation by either of those committees at this time?

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Not at the present, but I am hopeful that the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, after we develop these facts, will go into this matter very thoroughly. I personally have gone into this and I have been shocked.

Mr. FASCELL. In other words, these facts which the gentleman brings to our attention at this time are the result of the gentleman's own investigation?

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. FASCELL. I certainly must compliment the gentleman for his diligent work in presenting these shocking facts to the Members of this House and the American people. I compliment him and I trust that this matter will be very carefully followed up not only by the gentleman but by the appropriate committees having jurisdiction.

I was interested in several facts brought out in your discussion. I do not recall, and I wish the gentleman would refresh my memory, as to when the man referred to in your remarks became a citizen. I believe you said 1955?

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Yes, he became a citizen in 1955.

Mr. FASCELL. Then, as I recall it, there was a series of steps by which this gentleman received the benefit and assistance of programs of this Government in behalf of shipping.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. That is right. In other words, he obtained loans from certain companies or banks and these loans were then insured by this Government. Undoubtedly, if there had not been Government insurance for his loan program, this man probably could never have obtained these loans.

Mr. FASCELL. When was his last loan?

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. I believe his last loan was in June of 1960.

Mr. FASCELL. When was this gentleman indicted? Did I understand correctly that he was indicted?

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. He was indicted before citizenship was granted and that is a rather unusual thing—to see citizenship granted after a man has already been indicted.

Mr. FASCELL. That would depend probably on the nature of the offense. I do not know what that was. But, actually, of paramount interest to me and to the Members of Congress and to the American people is the fact that he was able while under indictment to receive the benefits of these assistance programs; is that correct?

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. This was after settlement but it is unusual.

Mr. FASCELL. When did it follow in period of time?

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Actually they have just recently instituted suit. It has not been too long, because of the requirements of certain securities to be kept by the company in order to assure that the Government will not have to step in. Since these assurances have not been given the Government has entered the matter and it was necessary for the Maritime Administration, as I pointed out, to take the necessary steps to pay the wages of the crew to get one of the ships back from Pakistan to this country, because it is very vital for us to protect that interest if we are called upon as the U.S. Government to pay the owed amount on that ship if default on payments or anything were to happen to it.

Mr. FASCELL. I thank the gentleman and compliment him for the work he has done in bringing this to light. I certainly would hope and I am sure the gentleman will continue his own interest and investigation. Does not the gentleman agree, it falling within the jurisdiction of the committee, that perhaps there may be need for study and investigation and legislative or administrative authorization? This matter has drawn so many developments and hearings and now we find ourselves having to resort to a suit to protect the interests of the American people.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Yes. Furthermore, I am hopeful, too, this will point up to us the necessity of taking effective action such as the gentleman and I have been working for, to close ports to ships doing business with Cuba.

Mr. FASCELL. I thank the gentleman. As I understand, this man's ships are using U.S. ports.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. The British company, I am sure, does use U.S. ports, and his own American companies which ship under the American flag certainly use American ports.

Mr. FASCELL. This subject matter of closing ports, if it becomes a legislative matter, is within the jurisdiction of the committee on which the gentleman serves.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. This could possibly be done that way, or closing of ports could be done by Presidential proclamation. As the gentleman knows, I am sure, we are trying to encourage the State Department to move on this so we can quickly close our ports to ships flying the flag of any nation which allows any of its ships to trade with Cuba; and this is a case in point.

Mr. FASCELL. The gentleman has made a very good case in point. I might add that I have joined with the gentleman over a long period of time to try to get this up; as a matter of fact, if my memory serves me correctly, we did something similar to this with reference to the mutual security bill, did we not?

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. That is right.

Mr. FASCELL. So that we did in one piece of legislation try to get this body to take some action with respect to this problem.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. This has been done.

Mr. FASCELL. The gentleman is saying that there are other forms of proposed legislation, also that the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee can act, and finally through administrative action this problem can be attacked. As I understand, a proclamation has already been issued. It does not go far enough.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. That is only one step.

Mr. FASCELL. I thank the gentleman for his interesting analysis of this problem and commend the gentleman.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. I thank the gentleman for his contribution. His untiring efforts have been of great help in the study of this problem and have meant much not only to the people of his district but his work has thrown much light on this whole problem for the entire Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

PROPOSED IRS MERGER SHOULD BE ABANDONED

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. CAHILL] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. CAHILL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. CAHILL. Mr. Speaker, I have taken this time today to discuss the utter foolishness of the recently announced decision of the Commissioner of Internal Revenue concerning the merging of certain IRS offices throughout the country on the announced ground that it would save $5 million to the taxpayers of the United States. Now I do not propose to know the effect that this reorganizational plan will have on the entire country or certain parts of the country with which I am not personally familiar. It may effect some savings in these areas. But I can talk with some degree of knowledge about the proposed merger of the Newark, N.J., and Camden, N.J., offices into one office to be located in Newark, N.J. Under this plan the Camden office would be limited to investigations and all returns from all citizens in New Jersey would be mailed directly to and maintained at the Newark office. All collections would be made by the Newark office. All supervision would be located at the Newark office. In other words, the Camden office, which has been operating successfully for decades, would in effect become a substation of the Newark office and would provide little or no convenient facilities for the taxpayers of south Jersey. Now I can assure the Members of the Congress that this plan will not save the taxpayers any money. The utter foolishness of the proposed reorganizational plan and the lack of planning preparatory to its announcement is best illustrated by the fact that the Camden office had requested, and the district office had approved, additional space approximating 10,000 additional square feet for the Camden office.

This additional space was allegedly required for the additional employees necessary in the Camden office to process the increasing volume of revenue returns in the South Jersey district. Apparently the Camden office, the district office, and presumably the General Services Administration were caught by surprise by this sudden announcement of a change in plans. Had this proposal been carefully considered I am certain that a great deal of money already expended in planning for the additional space and in the many, many conferences that were held concerning it could have been eliminated and the moneys saved for the taxpayers. Aside from this, however, the merger of these two offices cannot possibly save the taxpayers money. The savings as I understand it from representatives of the Internal Revenue Service would result from the elimination of certain supervisory personnel and their followup employees in the Camden office. According to my information this work and these duties would be assigned to existing personnel in the Newark office. It has been represented to me that the existing supervisory personnel at the Newark office will be able to carry on their present work and the additional work resulting from the transfer of the Camden office without any additional personnel. Now if this is true, the supervisory personnel at the Newark office have obviously been underworked for some time. If not true, as I suspect it to be, obviously the supervisory personnel at the Newark office will, after the merger, be overworked. There is little question in my mind that additional personel will be required in the Newark office if this merger is carried out. This is so because the Camden office as of this date is processing over 1 million returns and is collecting in excess of $650 million. After a personal investigation of this matter, I am convinced, first, that the proposed saving of $5 million is strictly a publicity gimmick and has no basis in fact; and, second, that the proposed merger was announced without adequate planning and without sufficient investigation of the needs for and the impact of the proposed merger. This is best illustrated by the fact that the announcement of the proposed mergers throughout the country was made by Secretary Dillon on March 5, 1963. On March 7, 1963, 2 days later, an urgent press release titled "For Immediate Release" was issued reading as follows:

> Treasury Secretary Douglas Dillon announced today that he was giving careful consideration to protests received about proposed changes in the organization of the field structure of the Internal Revenue Service, designed to increase its efficiency and economy of operation. He pointed out that none of the changes are scheduled to become effective before January 1, 1964, which will give full opportunity to review all aspects of the matter in the light of these protests. No implementing action will be taken pending the completion of such a review.

A reading of this release is convincing, I think, that no thought whatsoever was given to the facts which prompted the many protests. What investigation was made on the local scene in Camden, N.J., to determine the impact of this merger on the local community? What study was made of unemployment in the Camden area? Does not this administration, which has been preaching the need for full employment, know that today Camden, Gloucester, and Burlington Counties have the highest rate of unemployment that they have had since 1956? Do not our Treasury experts ever talk to our labor experts? Do not the planners of the Treasury Department have any liaison with the planners of the Labor Department? Why did the Treasury Department aid in unemployment in an area already "enjoying" a 9.7 percent unemployment of the existing labor force at this particular time?

Mr. Speaker, I could go on and on to illustrate the lack of planning, the lack of investigation, the lack of thought in this ill-advised, ill-conceived proposal. The only comfort I can take and the only comfort that the people of the south Jersey area can take in this entire matter is the fact that after all the fanfare and all the publicity and all the cost involved in conferences throughout the country, which probably will reduce appreciably the estimated savings, the Secretary and the Commissioner now agree that they will "give careful consideration to the protests." I would like to point out to our friends in the Treasury Department that not only has our leading daily newspaper blasted this proposed merger but all forms of area communications have been united in criticizing this ill-conceived planning. In the event that the Treasury Department is interested, and with the hope that reconsideration will include some attention to the suggestions, I am submitting herewith certain reasons which I feel compel the rejection of the proposed merger and necessitate a rescinding of the proposal by the Secretary of the Treasury:

First. The Newark office is located in the northerly end of the State and is, therefore, farther removed from the field offices throughout the State than would be a centrally located office. If one office alone is indicated, it certainly should not be in Newark. Camden, geographically, is much more centrally located and south Jersey enjoys a higher rate of potential growth than any area in the State.

Second. The location of a single office in Newark would be extremely costly in view of the transportation involved for management, directors, supervisors, and supervisory personnel.

Third. The Camden office indeed would provide much better liaison with the State offices being so much closer to the State capitol at Trenton.

Fourth. More importantly, however, the regional office located in Philadelphia is approximately 5 miles from the Camden office and approximately 95 miles from the Newark office. Additional moneys in time and traveling expenses if multiplied similarly throughout the country would more than offset the proposed savings by the Internal Revenue Service.

Fifth. Obviously the Newark office space would be inadequate in view of the additional duties that would be imposed and since additional space would be more expensive in Newark than in Camden, again the possibility of any savings would be reduced.

Sixth. South Jersey has recently had approved a proposed rapid transit system which, it is believed, will develop even more rapidly the entire area. A jet airport is on the planning boards and a population explosion is anticipated by all knowing civic planners. Why the Internal Revenue Service would want to inconvenience so many hundreds of thousands of taxpayers is beyond understanding.

Seventh. The Newark office would be completely removed from the resort areas in the State of New Jersey where the administration-inspired organized crime drive is spearheaded. The cost of transportation and living expenses and time that would be consumed in travel by personnel on these assignments would again increase the cost of the operation and offset any possible saving by consolidation of supervisory personnel.

Eighth. The south Jersey area today is a depressed area from the standpoint of unemployment statistics and as outlined above has at the present time a 9.7 rate of unemployment. New jobs should be created for this district by the Federal Government rather than eliminated by the Federal Government.

Ninth. Automatic data processing which is utilized by the Internal Revenue Service as a time and money saver is located in the service center in Philadelphia. With a collection division and with all other facilities now working satisfactorily in the Camden office, it is again difficult to understand how the proposed merger will result in any savings.

Tenth. With the returns filed in Newark, the taxpayers of south Jersey, the accountants, the lawyers, and particularly those interested in adjusting, explaining, revising, or correcting an income tax return will, in all probability, be compelled to travel to Newark to discuss it. To do otherwise would mean the costly transfer of personnel from the Newark office to the Camden office and would require almost daily messenger service between the Newark and the Camden office.

Eleventh. All appeals from findings of the Internal Revenue Service would necessarily be held in Newark and would impose great inconvenience on the part of taxpayers and those representing them.

Twelfth. Lastly, I have not been able to determine by any real proof that any money will be saved, let alone $5 million. This is a figure right out of somebody's hat and is the result, in my opinion, of a vivid imagination on the part of some Treasury statistician. But even if I were to agree that some appreciable savings could be made in the merger, it would be entirely lost to the Treasury Department by reason of the tremendous damage that has already been done, and which would be increased appreciably if the merger were consummated, to the morale of the employees of the Internal Revenue Service in New Jersey and throughout the Nation.

My office has been swamped by complaints, by illustrations of hardship cases, by family problems which prevent moving to either Newark or to any place outside of the south Jersey area. The entire Camden office, and I suppose the personnel of all offices throughout the country are wondering, "what next?"

In one unthinking, unplanned, unnecessary swoop, the Commissioner and the Secretary have wrought untold harm to the morale of the employees of the Internal Revenue Service. The average worker is now saying: "If they can merge the Camden office with the Newark office, when will they merge the Newark office with the New York office" and then, of course, the $64 question will be: "When will all of the offices be merged into one presumably located in Boston?"

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have spoken a lot longer than I had anticipated but I could really speak much longer and outline more reasons why this proposal should be discontinued forthwith by the Secretary of the Treasury.

While the announcement indicates that the entire matter is being reconsidered, I have been informed by authoritative sources that the planning to implement this proposal is still going on. I urge the Secretary and the Commissioner to stop wasting the taxpayer's money in planning to carry out this merger and to withhold implementation until a sincere, careful, objective study is made. I am certain that when this occurs, the Secretary and the Commissioner will permit the Camden office to remain "as is" so that it may continue as it is now doing to service the needs of the people of south Jersey.

Mr. Speaker, I include the following editorial, published in the Camden-Courier newspaper under date of Friday, March 8, 1963, in full because it expresses fully the views of all the citizens of south Jersey:

Downgrading of Camden by Internal Revenue Service Merits Vigorous Opposition

Camden once again is being given second-class, back-of-the-hand treatment in the reshuffling of a governmental agency.

The Camden and Newark offices of the Internal Revenue Service are being merged to Newark's advantage and our disadvantage in a national reorganization of the IRS that affects 16 of its 62 offices.

Whereas Camden up to now has been the headquarters of an independent IRS district and has had its own district office, the Camden district will now become part of the Newark district. The office here, while not to be closed entirely, will be downgraded to a branch of Newark's.

The Camden district is one of only four in the entire country that are to be merged out of existence.

Reasons given for the national reorganization are to effect the relatively petty saving of $5 million a year in overhead and administrative costs; and to facilitate the use of the IRS electronic processing system, which is due to be in full operation by 1966.

At first, Treasury officials claimed that the reorganization would in no way inconvenience taxpayers in this area. Within 24 hours, however, they admitted that statement was in error.

Taxpayers in this area will continue to file their returns at the Camden office and receive some other services there that are provided now. However, all returns will be sent to Newark and kept there instead of in Camden, and taxpayers whose returns are questioned or reviewed may be required to travel to Newark. All records will be held at Newark instead of Camden.

Certified public accountants who aid taxpayers in making out their returns probably will be forced to make many trips to Newark to settle disputes.

Officials also claim that few, if any, IRS employees will lose their jobs and that "reassignments in nearby offices or transfers to new duties will be made."

But the first IRS statement also significantly admitted that about 93 persons in the Camden office will be affected. Of them, 33 now hold supervisory positions—including District Director William F. Culliney—and they are told that reassignments will be worked out for them to suit their personal convenience.

The number of employees here, according to a second and conflicting statement given out by regional IRS officials, will drop from 350 to 150.

Some may be moved to the Philadelphia service center, an IRS spokesman says. Others will be given the option of continuing as field agents in the Camden area or moving "to new, nearby assignments." But it also is stated, and certainly sounds like an ominous hint, that employees "who have 20 years of service and 50 years of age could retire," if they desire.

According to Treasury Secretary Dillon, the reorganization will be gradual and timed according to local circumstances. Our share of it is scheduled to be completed by next January 1.

Dillon says he and the IRS are "fully aware of the unemployment problems in the Camden area, and every effort has been made to keep the impact of this proposed change to a minimum."

Nevertheless, even if every one of the 90—or 200—Camden employees affected retains a job elsewhere with the IRS, it will mean the loss of just that many jobs to Camden. As far as the city is concerned it will be a blow, an added economic loss to an area that already is struggling against its most serious unemployment situation in many years.

Adding to our frustration is the disclosure that a plan by the IRS to enlarge its Camden quarters and increase its personnel by 150 will be postponed or canceled under the reorganization.

It now is revealed for the first time that the agency's present 50,000-square-foot headquarters at 808 Market Street, which was remodeled extensively and expensively when it took over, has become inadequate. Plans had been prepared for a new building to add 10,000 square feet of space. The plans also called for expansion of the Camden working force from 350 to 500 when the new building was completed.

Both the building and personnel expansions now must be held in abeyance. Culliney—to whom the "merger" announcement came as a surprise—does not deny that with the merger, and the resultant slash in the Camden working force, a move to smaller quarters is likely.

It may be true that what you never had you'll never miss. But it is galling nonetheless to learn that Washington had thought this expansion necessary until the reorgani-

> zation move sidetracked it, and that the city stands to lose not merely 93, or 200, jobs already existing here, but another 150 that might have been.
>
> Congressman CAHILL is dead right in his hostile reaction to the reorganization.
>
> It is hard to believe that under it, south Jersey will get "the adequate service it gets now" from the IRS, despite pious protestations to that effect.
>
> It is even harder to see any sense in "merging" this district with—rather, into—the Newark district.
>
> It would make better sense to merge Newark into Camden, since we are nearer the geographical center of the State, even though Newark is nearer the population center.
>
> It is impossible to see where the change will mean any appreciable saving to the IRS. It is possible to see where it might cost it more.
>
> This is the same kind of a deal Camden and south Jersey got from the Veterans' Administration a few years ago in a similar "reorganization" that transferred major VA functions from Camden to Newark, to the great inconvenience and distress of veterans throughout south Jersey.
>
> It is the same kind of stepchild treatment that south Jersey is accustomed to getting from various State agencies, yet to which it never has been and never will be reconciled.
>
> The Courier-Post shares Congressman CAHILL's anger at this proposed raw deal for Camden and south Jersey, and will join with him in doing all we can to prevent it.

AID TO EDUCATION

Mr. CLANCY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SKUBITZ] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. SKUBITZ. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a bill to provide for direct aid to the States and Territories for educational purposes only. Forgetting the protagonists of the Marxian panaceas for all that ails us, I feel certain the Members of this Congress will come to terms on three points, namely, first, that education is a responsibility of government that should be left forever under State control; second, that excessive Federal taxation has left the States with few, if any, new sources of tax revenue; and, third, that American education, through inadequate financing, has drifted to an alarmingly low level in academic standards in some areas of our country.

The bill I am introducing provides that the collectors of internal revenue of the several States and Territories shall return to the States, following each quarter, 1 percent of the personal and corporate income taxes collected within such State during that quarter.

I am not now, and never have been, in favor of Federal control over our educational institutions. This bill does not entail Federal control. It merely earmarks the funds for education, and leaves the States free to put them to use in localities where the need is the most urgent.

The merits of this bill may be briefly stated. It returns the tax dollars to the people who paid them and leaves them free, through their elected representatives, to use the money for school construction and for other countless educational needs. Mr. Speaker my bill calls for no new bureaus and in consequence removes the necessity of adding a horde of employees to the Federal payroll to administer the law. This bill insures a fair ratio of distribution. This bill meets the requirements of those who have been searching for a simple and direct plan to meet our educational needs without imposing another tax. It will allay the fears of those who properly oppose Federal control over American education.

CRIPPLING COMPETITION IN U.S. WOOLEN INDUSTRY

Mr. CLANCY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. CLEVELAND] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, the U.S. woolen industry is faced with crippling competition from abroad. Wool imports are up 80 percent over last year.

Until quite recently, the President took a position that the woolen industry should be treated as a thing apart. Moreover, this administration gave assurances following the February 9, 1962, International Cotton Textile Agreement, that a similar agreement would be concluded for the woolen industry.

The President's position left New England voters with the distinct impression that wool would be given at least equal treatment with cotton.

I read with great concern the following article in today's Washington Post and Times Herald:

> ### ADMINISTRATION REPORTED VETOING WOOL RAISERS' PROTECTION DEMANDS
>
> (By Julius Duscha)
>
> The domestic wool industry apparently has lost its 2-year fight to get President Kennedy to give it special protection against imports.
>
> It was learned last night that the President has decided to drop for the time being any effort to help the industry by trying to limit wool imports through a system of international quotas.
>
> Mr. Kennedy's decision was said to have been made known to the industry by Christian A. Herter, the President's special representative for trade negotiations, at a secret meeting last Wednesday in Washington.
>
> #### EUROPEANS OPPOSED
>
> Herter met with members of the U.S. Wool Textile Advisory Committee following a trip to Western Europe during which he encountered stiff resistance to suggestions that wool imports be controlled through a system similar to the International Cotton Textile Agreement that went into effect last fall.
>
> At the meeting Herter reportedly told the industry in soft but unmistakeable language that the Kennedy administration plans to take no steps at this time to cut back wool imports.
>
> The President himself is reported to have told Senator JOHN O. PASTORE, Democrat, of Rhode Island, last Friday that the domestic industry could expect no help.
>
> It is understood that both Herter and the President indicated that the decision against aiding the industry would be periodically reviewed and was always open to reconsideration in the light of new facts.
>
> Mr. Kennedy's decision will have political repercussions among the New England and Western Senators who have been putting pressure on him to provide assistance to the domestic wool industry. During the 1960 presidential campaign he promised to help the industry.
>
> #### LIBERAL POLICY SEEN
>
> But the decision will be welcomed in Western Europe, particularly in the big wool-exporting countries of Britain and Italy. Together with Japan they supply 75 percent of the wool that is imported by the United States.
>
> In Europe and Japan the decision will be taken as a welcome indication that Mr. Kennedy is determined to pursue a liberal policy under the 1962 Trade Act even in the face of domestic pressures.
>
> Herter is reported to have flatly told the domestic wool industry that there is no way to aid them with the new trade law unless the industry institutes a case under the escape clause in the act providing relief for domestic industries that can show they are being harmed by tariff concessions.
>
> The wool industry has been unwilling to proceed under this clause because it does not think it could win its case. The new law provides that trade concessions must be "a major factor" in depressing domestic industries before relief will be given them.
>
> Herter is also understood to have ruled out for now an international wool agreement along the lines of the cotton agreement or a finding that wool imports must be restricted because the domestic industry is vital to national security.
>
> The domestic wool industry has favored an international agreement to limit imports, which have increased from a negligible amount 10 years ago to about 20 percent of total U.S. consumption.

Mr. Speaker, if this story reflects the actual views of the administration, it is a sad, sad day for the American wool businesses and the thousands of jobs they provide.

According to Mr. Duscha, the President has decided against fair play for the woolen industry. He has rejected the fairplay principle of according the woolen industry similar treatment as that given the cotton industry.

He has also refused to impose quantitative restrictions pending an agreement among the major wool-exporting countries.

The only relief, suggested in the article, is under the escape clause. Now, escape-clause proceedings require time and the outcome is by no means certain.

I hope Mr. Duscha's article does not represent the final decision of this administration. Further, I hope the President will make his views known directly to the people.

On March 8, 1963, the board of directors of the Northern Textile Association unanimously adopted the following statement of policy:

> We have been encouraged by the President's obvious grasp of the nature of the textile import problem, and are conscious of the efforts made by the administration to deal with the problem which adversely affects not only New England and the South, but wool- and cotton-growing areas of the West and urban apparel centers.

During the first month of the present administration, a direct and forthright approach was adopted in establishing a Cabinet Committee, followed by the announcement in May of 1961 of a program that encompassed all fiber branches of the industry.

The first international cotton arrangement was completed in July of 1961, and a second early last year. Both provide means for preventing market disruption by the limitation of imports.

Although it was agreed that these arrangements would be followed promptly by action to restrain imports of textiles made of wool and other fibers, nothing has been accomplished; no international conference to restrain imports has been called; and no steps for control by the United States have been developed.

Meanwhile, imports of wool products in 1962 rose 78 percent over the level of 1961, and manmade textile imports rose 39 percent. An additional 18 wool mills closed in 1962, and the share of the U.S. market taken by foreign goods has increased by over 40 percent.

Direct appeal to the administration by Members of Congress and the industry to carry out the textile program have been to no avail. The program has continued to drift, jobs have continued to disappear, and conflicts between agencies of government grow. The program announced by the President appears to be more dependent for its implementation upon the whims and changing policies of foreign governments than upon domestic direction. Our own Government delays as a major American industry is eroded.

This situation is known to textile producers and textile workers, to apparel manufacturers and apparel workers, and to wool growers throughout the country.

With a deep sense of responsibility to the employees and people in the communities where textile and apparel plants are located, to those who produce the fibers we use, and to those in the Congress who have worked for a solution of this problem, the board of directors of the Northern Textile Association calls this ominous situation to the attention of the public and to those members of Government who are unaware of the situation or whose opposition to the clear intention of the President has contributed to this crisis.

Mr. Speaker, as may be seen from the foregoing, 18 woolen mills closed in 1962. The share of the U.S. market taken by foreign goods has increased by more than 40 percent.

This situation is grave and a satisfactory solution is nowhere in sight.

I hope the President's advisers will carefully consider the Northern Textile Association's statement.

As things now stand, the Kennedy administration is the court of last resort. Only this administration can save American woolen industries and the jobs they provide.

SIR WINSTON AND ROCHESTER, N.Y.

Mr. CLANCY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. HORTON] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise to commend the action of our colleagues in voting to proclaim Sir Winston Churchill an honorary citizen of the United States of America.

Because of his outstanding and distinguished record in world public life, I think we are inclined to forget the close personal ties Sir Winston has to the United States. This bond, of course, extends to his own parentage, for his maternal ancestors were citizens of this Nation.

My home community of Rochester, N.Y., is particularly proud of the fact that Sir Winston's grandmother, Clara Hall, grew up in Rochester. She later married Leonard Jerome, who came to Rochester from New York City.

While in Rochester, Leonard Jerome played an important role in the development of the Native American, a daily newspaper. In 1857, his publication combined with another to become the Democrat and American, a direct forerunner of today's Rochester Democrat & Chronicle.

For these and many other reasons, I regard my opportunity to vote in favor of this bill proclaiming Sir Winston an honorary citizen as a great privilege in behalf of a great man.

APPLICATION OF INVESTMENT CREDIT TO CERTAIN LEASED PROPERTY

Mr. CLANCY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, today I introduced a bill to amend section 48(d) of the Internal Revenue Code.

EXPLANATION OF PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO SECTION 48(d) OF THE INTERNAL REVENUE CODE OF 1954, CONCERNING THE APPLICATION OF THE INVESTMENT CREDIT TO CERTAIN LEASED PROPERTY

Under section 48(d) of the Internal Revenue Code the lessor of leased new section 38 property may elect to pass through the investment credit to his lessee, in effect placing the lessee in the same position as a purchaser of the property under the investment credit provisions. The present law contains an oversight, however, which places independent distributor-lessors at a competitive disadvantage with manufacturer-lessors.

Section 48(d) as presently written provides that the amount of the investment credit is based on fair market value in the case of a lease from a manufacturer, but on cost when the lease is from an independent distributor. Since most equipment dealers and distributors receive a discount of from 10 to 20 percent, this means that they can pass through a smaller investment credit than can the manufacturer of the same equipment.

For example, if a machine having a useful life of 8 years or more would sell to a customer for $100,000, and is leased by the manufacturer to the customer, the manufacturer can pass through an investment credit of $7,000—$100,000 times 0.07—to the customer. The independent distributor, however, purchases the same machine from the manufacturer at his regular dealer's discount, say 20 percent, and on a lease to the same customer can only pass through an investment credit of $5,600—$80,000 times 0.07. It is clearly to the customer's advantage in this situation to lease from the manufacturer, rather than from the independent distributor.

The investment credit was not intended to discriminate between industry groups, and in fact it is understood that the purpose of the investment credit pass through provisions of section 48(d) was to permit the lessee of qualifying property to be put in a position equal to a purchaser of the same equipment. The distinction outlined above is clearly the result of an inadvertent oversight.

Accordingly, the attached amendment is proposed to section 48(d). The amendment would permit both manufacturers and independent distributors to base the investment credit pass through on the fair market value of the property. The lessor's basis—ordinarily cost—would apply where the property was leased by one member of an affiliated group—80 percent common control—to another member of the same group. No revenue loss will result from enactment of the proposed amendment, since under present law the lessee can always obtain the maximum investment credit by leasing from the manufacturer. In fact, a revenue saving could result from the closing of a potential abuse in the affiliated corporation lease situation. This provision will insure that the investment credit provisions will not be abused by taxpayers through lease transactions between commonly controlled corporations.

THE McKELWAY PLAN FOR THE PRESIDENT JAMES MADISON MEMORIAL, AND OTHER MEMORIALS, IN THE NATION'S CAPITAL MAY BE ONLY WHISTLING IN A GRAVEYARD

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WIDNALL] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include newspaper articles.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, growing concern is being expressed at the lengthening list of memorials in the Nation's Capital. Many people have observed that this great city is coming to resemble a graveyard through the multiplication of memorials, some to forgotten people. While some have deplored this trend few have done much about coming to grips with the problem which is misusing the few acres which remain of Washington's once vast open spaces.

Secretary of the Interior Stewart L. Udall has, indeed, come up with a plan to create yet another board to deal with the problem but is it likely that it will be more successful in coping with this matter than the boards, commissions, and committees which already exist? True, the Udall plan will accomplish something—and that something is most likely to be a multiplication of memorials. These memorials would be built under the watchful eye of the Secretary of the Interior, and quite possibly would be dedicated to heroes of the majority party rather than leading Americans regardless of party affiliation, as in the past.

The problem has now been analyzed by John McKelway, of the Washington, D.C., Evening Star, and he has come up with a solution which, while it may not immediately gain unanimous approval, still looks promising. If it were anyone but a newspaperman doing the promising it would behoove us to examine this new plan most critically, but, as we all know, newspapers do not make promises lightly, and this McKelway plan may prove to be the answer we have all been looking forward to—that is, everyone but the marble salesmen.

In any event, it sheds light on the complex matters involved, and I include the McKelway plan for memorials in the Nation's Capital for the information of my colleagues and for the edification of others throughout the country concerned with these matters, particularly the preservation of land for open spaces, and high-rise developments.

THE RAMBLER—PUTS FORTH A PLAN

(By John McKelway)

Some 5 acres of expensive land has been lying fallow for about a year now, in the heart of the District, just south of the Library of Congress, up on Capitol Hill.

Various suggestions have been put forth for its use. But, so far, Congress—which ultimately must decide what goes up on the land—has been unable to make up its mind.

The best bet up to now seems to be a memorial to President James Madison. It would be constructed on top of an underground annex to the Library of Congress. Cost of the whole project has been set at $39 million.

The bill authorizing the structure died in Congress last year, although it was backed by such powerful personalities as Representative SMITH, Democrat, of Virginia, chairman of the House Rules Committee, and Speaker McCORMACK himself.

Judge Smith liked the idea. The relentless foe of big spending saw in the memorial a chance to impress enough people with a need to turn the country around and head back for the early 1800's. He was willing, he said, to spend $15 million on the memorial for such an experiment.

But his argument was apparently unimpressive. The plans for the memorial fell through and Congress went home.

It seems a shame, to the Rambler at least.

While wandering over the vacant land up on the Hill, the Rambler feels he hit upon a happy solution. It would lead to a remarkable, arresting structure—a tourist attraction that might even top the Washington Monument.

First, an extremely large hole would have to be excavated.

Into this would go the $10 million fish aquarium that Congress authorized last year.

It would include, on this, the basement level, an office where fish research could be conducted, and a restaurant, specializing in seafood and operated by one of the restaurant owners who were asked to leave to make room for the vacant lot.

On top of the aquarium, but still below ground, would come the much-needed annex to the Library. The floors would be of glass so that bored librarians could watch the fish.

Next, the new FBI building, to prevent all the fuss over razing buildings downtown north of Pennsylvania Avenue. This, too, should be underground to avoid any architectural difficulties with the Fine Arts Commission.

Now, above ground, and skillfully supported by the old sandstone columns removed from the east front of the Capitol, would be placed an attractive parking lot for the Supreme Court.

Then, rising from this relatively flat area, would come the Madison Memorial, a Greek-temple-like building, to show we have not lost touch with the past.

It could house Presidential papers and additional offices for librarians who felt uncomfortable doing research immediately above the fish, and under the FBI.

And, of course, to demonstrate our awareness of the future, up on top of the Madison Memorial, the eight Franklin Delano Roosevelt slabs should be situated.

These could stand proudly against the sky and support, if necessary, eight statutes of prominent individuals, yet to be named and memorialized by Congress.

It is hard to see how anyone could object to such a plan. It is a beautiful compromise, saving time, money, and talk. It provides needed space and leaves room for expansion.

It would also prevent construction—for a while, anyway—of a fourth House Office Building.

Get behind it. Write your Congressman.

ELIMINATION OF CAMDEN DISTRICT OFFICE IN THE STATE OF NEW JERSEY

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore (Mr. STRATTON). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. GLENN] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GLENN. Mr. Speaker, I am deeply concerned over the announcement by the Internal Revenue Service of the elimination of the Camden District Office in the State of New Jersey, and the transfer of this office to the Newark office, to cover the whole State of New Jersey, on January 1, 1964.

I join with my colleague, the gentleman from New Jersey, the Honorable WILLIAM T. CAHILL, in endorsing everything he has just said, and call to your attention that his First Congressional District and my Second Congressional District encompass the whole of the south New Jersey area, and that for years we have had coverage of all internal revenue matters out of the Camden office.

The Internal Revenue Department is a big branch of the Government, and undoubtedly has contact with all citizens, and particularly with those who practice law, accountancy, and specialize in this service. It is going to be a terrific hardship on our whole south Jersey area if the Camden office is closed, because the Newark office is at the other end of the State of New Jersey. Further, this will not be an economic move, and will be a disservice to the citizens of our State.

In the long run, it will cost the Government more money in expenses in sending the agents into south Jersey from the Newark office and will be of great inconvenience and expense to the taxpayers in making the long trip to Newark rather than to Camden. If there must be a comparison, it certainly will not be of great moment—considering the small amount of money that might appear to be saved in a book evaluation—when one considers the multi-million-dollar budget, and compares this to the additional expenses which will be thrust upon the taxpayers in the closing of the Camden office, and the need of all processing of income tax matters in the Newark office. I am sure that the employees in the Camden office are going to be greatly inconvenienced in that they are homeowners in the south Jersey area, and will have to sell their homes and move to the north Jersey area, if their positions are retained and transferred to the other office.

The matter of Internal Revenue Service is such an important part of our Government, and even our economy, that to make a major change of this nature just at a point when we are certainly going to need close contact with the Internal Revenue Service will only make for confusion and difficulty both to the Service and to the citizens.

I am opposed to this move, and will make my opposition known not only to the Commissioner but to the Secretary of the Treasury, and even to the President, because this is of vital importance to the welfare of the whole south Jersey area.

FLORIDA EAST COAST RAILROAD STRIKE THREATENS NATIONAL SECURITY—CUBA CRISIS MAKES TRANSPORTATION MOBILITY VITAL

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 5 minutes, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise to warn of impending crisis in the Florida East Coast Railway strike. I bring the matter to your attention in the hope of preventing a tragedy which at best could deal permanent injury to Florida's economy and at worst could derail a vital sector of the national defense program.

The direct consequences of this strike are a personal tragedy for those families involved, and possibly a serious monetary loss for the over 1,000 stockholders—reliable sources indicate losses since suspension exceed one-quarter million dollars. The number now idled as a direct strike consequence is estimated at about 2,000 persons. The number unemployed as a proximate result is inestimable, but rising.

Fruit and vegetable growers and shippers are constrained to haul their produce to far distant railheads. The damage to this group alone is estimated at $35,000 per week. This economic injury compounds the distress which the industry is experiencing from the winter freeze—the most severe in Florida history.

The construction industry, already affected, is apprehensive of long-range consequences to plant operations, employment of personnel, and cost to business. Federal, State, and local projects are jeopardized.

Tourism in its peak months will be dealt a severe blow; a blow which could scarcely be endured by a community beset with a multitude of problems brought on through absorption of 150,000 to 200,000 Cuban refugees.

The increasingly serious economic plight of the Dade County, Fla., area is well known. The official unemployment rate now stands at about 6 percent. This figure ignores the large number of unemployed Cuban refugees. It is presently under revision by the Department of Labor, in coordination with the Florida Industrial Commission. Dade County officials believe that the revised figure will more than double the present figure. Add to this malady a prolonged railway strike and you have a climate conducive to rapid deterioration.

Since the FEC railway suspended operation January 23, 1963, no progress in the negotiations is in evidence. Both parties have not agreed to bring in the National Mediation Board as a mediator—labor for, FEC no response. And as yet the Board has not taken steps to establish the existence of a national emergency.

Although the National Mediation Board has not yet certified the situation as a national emergency, it is clearly a national hazard. The Nation can ill afford a major transportation rupture in the critical south Florida area. FEC's transportation facilities would play a vital role in the mobilization of south Florida should further compounded crises from Communist Cuba arise. FEC carried approximately 50 percent of landborne military troops and hardware during the Cuban crisis of October 1962.

These rail facilities must be kept fully operational in the event needed on a moment's notice for our national defense. The apathetic manner in which the disputant parties are approaching the problem suggests that they recognize neither the local nor the national danger.

It is to be hoped that all parties will be jolted into recognition of this threat.

That the dangers implicit in this situation are clear to see, I refer you, Mr. Speaker, to an article in U.S. News & World Report of March 11, 1963, which I wish made a matter of record in order to bring it to the attention of my colleagues:

WHERE RAILWORKERS ARE ON STRIKE—AND TRAINS ARE RUNNING

(For years, the Florida East Coast Railway has been in financial trouble. Now it is battling unions over wages and a principle—the right to bargain outside of national patterns.

(The unions have been striking since January 23. Yet some trains are running, manned by supervisors instead of union crews. It's the company's way of trying to break the strike.)

JACKSONVILLE, FLA.—This is an on-the-scene report of how one railroad—the Florida East Coast—is trying to break a strike.

It is the story of a "rebel" carrier that pulled away from the 192 other class 1 railroads last year. Florida East Coast's aim is to establish its right to negotiate its own wage settlement with rail unions, independent of national bargaining patterns.

The Florida East Coast is a major line with 572 miles of track running mainly between Miami and Jacksonville. It serves, in addition, such cities as Daytona Beach, St. Augustine, and Palm Beach. The carrier's tracks run through one of Florida's prosperous citrus fruit belts. Much of its business is hauling fruits and vegetables.

For years, the railroad has been in financial trouble. It was in receivership nearly 30 years. On January 1, 1961, control of the carrier was passed to Edward Ball, 74-year-old Florida financier, who bought a majority of FEC's outstanding bonds while it was in receivership.

BIG LOSER

Although out of receivership, the road is still losing money. Last year it lost nearly $1.3 million, only slightly less than losses in 1961.

The railroad unions, despite FEC's financial troubles, are insisting that the carrier bargain along with the other railroads and settle on the same terms.

The strike began on January 23 when 1,200 nonoperating employees—including officeworkers, track crews, and shop repairmen—walked off their jobs. The 600 operating workers—the train crews—also refused to work.

STRIKERS FIRED

The FEC management promptly announced that all the strikers were fired. Then, on February 3, some freight trains started running again. Foremen and other supervisors took the place of regular crews. But passenger trains remained idle.

By the end of February, the FEC had two freight trains operating daily, one each way, between Miami and Jacksonville. Five times a week a train is run over a branch line.

With unions out of current operations, a single crew working about 8 hours a day runs the train the length of the line. Formerly three crews were required by union work rules. Now, too, the trains are running without firemen—a form of featherbedding other railroads are trying to end for good.

Getting rid of featherbedding when, and if, a settlement is reached is regarded as a side issue. The main questions, as defined by both sides in the dispute, are as follows:

1. The railroad insists on negotiating a settlement that meets its own situation. The unions are demanding the same pay raises granted by other roads in 1962.

2. Florida East Coast contends that its wages already are far above the going rate in Florida for comparable work. An example cited: FEC stenographers earn from $91 to $100 a week, compared with a general Florida average of $61 to $70. The unions say rail employees are specialists, deserving higher pay.

The company's positon in the dispute was spelled out by Winfred L. Thornton, vice president and chief operating officer.

As Mr. Thornton put it:

"You reach the place where you have to make a decision on these union wage demands. You have to decide whether to grant a pay raise you know you cannot afford, or you have to stand up and take a position against it.

"Our position is that no company can obligate itself to pay wage increases that it is financially unable to pay.

"If we agreed to pay these increases, the ultimate result could only be financial ruin.

"The wage increase triggered the strike, but the basic issue is whether a railroad can negotiate for itself or whether it has to be a part of a national handling. We feel we have the right to negotiate for ourselves.

"The union organizations want to keep everyone negotiating together. They are afraid that if one carrier steps out of line, next year others will do so."

Officials of the union strike committee had this to say:

"It would be dynamite for us to have separate wage agreements on each road. The National Mediation Board refused to give the Florida East Coast a separate emergency board at the start of this strike.

"The Board said the same issues had been covered in the national dispute, and an emergency board there had made its recommendations.

"This is the first time in history that a railroad has pulled out of the national handling of a dispute.

"Railroads that compete with the Florida East Coast have the same freight rates, fixed by the Government. There's no reason why this one road should get lower wage rates.

"As for the FEC talking poor mouth, there are other carriers that have been reporting losses, too. But they gave the same wage increases that the other railroads did."

OFFERED AND REJECTED

As for wages, FEC offered—and the unions rejected—a raise of 1⅔ percent retroactive to September 1, 1962, and equal increases in March and September of this year.

The "national" pay raise last year averaged about 4 percent—4 cents an hour, effective February 1, 1962, and 6.28 cents additionally last May 1.

Florida East Coast's offer, after being rejected by the unions, was withdrawn on January 30.

Where will the present controversy end? How will the railroad get back into full operation?

Each side says it is waiting for the other to change its bargaining position. Actually, no negotiations have been held since the end of January.

OPPOSING VIEWS

Mr. Thornton says the company expects to increase the volume of its freight operations as the supervisors become more experienced in handling the trains.

Union leaders predict a breakdown, since tracks and rolling stock are not getting normal maintenance.

Meanwhile shippers are pressing the Government to end the walkout. Growers of vegetables and citrus fruits along Florida's eastern shore are demanding restoration of full service. Communities which rely on FEC for passenger service are eager for settlement of the controversy.

Political pressure is being brought, too. Some Members of Congress from Florida are urging the White House to intervene. The Florida Development Commission is urging a prompt settlement.

Most of the traffic now being handled is piggyback freight—with truck trailers driven onto flatcars by nonunion truckdrivers. Most of this is general merchandise, although some perishables are being hauled in refrigerator cars.

Growers report that big crops of vegetables are due to go to market in the period just ahead. They say millions of dollars will be lost unless they can use the Florida East Coast.

Some firms have been shipping products by truck to other railroads, but there may not be enough trucks to do the job in the busy marketing season. Besides, growers say this adds greatly to shipping costs.

How it will all turn out cannot now be foreseen. But in the early days of March the end was not in sight.

COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. ROOSEVELT] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, I read with dismay the speech of the Honorable JOHN MARSH which appeared on page 3075 of the February 27 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

It is ridiculous for anyone to imply that those of us who expressed concern about activities and the excesses of the House Un-American Activities Committee "seem to be insisting that it is undemocratic and unconscionable for a democracy to post guards against its subversion."

As I stated in my remarks during the debate on appropriations for HUAC, there definitely is a need for a committee with jurisdiction over actual threats to our Government, such as sabotage and espionage. But we have no need for a committee which piously talks about its role as our guardian against subversion but which in reality uses that role to make a mockery of the basic rights of our citizens to be "wholly free to speak fearlessly for or against their officials and their laws." In many instances, this is presently being accomplished by wrongly correlating many legitimate causes, such as drives for peace, civil rights and civil liberties with communism, and un-American activities.

It was Charles Evans Hughes, in an address as president of the American Bar Association, who stated:

> The most ominous sign of our times, it seems to me, is the growth of intolerant spirit. It is more dangerous when armed, as it usually is, with sincere conviction.

Concluding his remarks, he stressed that "we be on our guard against varieties of false Americanism which profess to maintain American institutions while dethroning American ideals." Mr. Hughes sounded that alarm in 1925, but the warning could not be more apropos for today.

ALABAMA INDUSTRY COOPERATES

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. ROBERTS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROBERTS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to read to you and the other Members of this body a letter I recently received from the Honorable Robert Sargent Shriver, Jr., Director of the Peace Corps.

I believe that this letter indicates the cooperative spirit shown by the manufacturers of Alabama and our Nation in promoting the United States in foreign fields.

This letter reads as follows:

> Last fall when I visited Ethiopia the Peace Corps volunteers there told me the country had no street signs. The volunteers offered to undertake to mount signs if we provided them with the necessary materials.
>
> When I returned home we immediately looked for the necessary materials. To the credit of several Alabamians, we not only got the materials, but we were also able to get the street signs made at no expense to the Government.
>
> Republic Steel Corp. provided the sheet metal. Then Mr. William C. Ireland, president of the Vulcan Sign & Stamping Co. of Birmingham, offered to stamp the signs. The Nifty Manufacturing Co. of Birmingham volunteered to package them for shipment to Ethiopia. Painting materials were acquired through the efforts of Mr. William E. Hood, also of Birmingham, who is president of the National Paint, Varnish & Lacquer Association. The street signs are now on their way to Ethiopia.
>
> This is one example of many where American citizens and private organizations have responded to help the Peace Corps. In this case Alabama really did a tremendous job for us.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that this is a typical example of what can be done by the cooperation of industry and I am proud that the industries of Alabama have taken it upon themselves to be of assistance in the interest of promoting peace throughout the world.

SALUTE TO ALABAMA VETERANS

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. ROBERTS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROBERTS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of the Members of this body a letter I have recently received from the Honorable J. S. Gleason, Jr., Administrator of the Veterans' Administration, of which I am very proud. I am certain that all Alabamians are proud of this letter since the information that Mr. Gleason furnished me certainly indicates that Alabamians have done more than their share in the service of their country.

Alabama was the 22d State to enter the Union. It entered the Union on December 14, 1819. It seceded from the Union on January 11, 1861, and Montgomery became the Capital of the Confederacy in Febraury of 1861. In 1865, after the War Between the States, the Constitution of Alabama adopted and ratified the 13th amendment abolishing slavery, nullified the ordinance of secession and provided for the election of State officers.

In the ensuing years, Alabama contributed to the national welfare as a great State and the men of Alabama served in the Armed Forces of the United States with great credit.

I would like to quote a paragraph from Mr. Gleason's letter:

> The fact that 7 out of every 10 Alabama men between the ages of 35 and 39 years are war veterans is a solid testimony of the Cotton State's contribution to this Nation's successful struggle for freedom—not only for ourselves but for others—in World War I, World War II, and the Korean war. I am proud, as I know you are, to have a part in our country's effort now to "care for him who shall have borne the battle, and for his widow and his orphan."

There are some 316,000 Alabama war veterans. This means that 1 out of every 11 citizens of our fine State has served his country; one-third of the civilians over 18 years of age has served in either World War I, World War II, or the Korean war.

Eighty-three percent of our veterans are employed, of which 43 percent are craftsmen, foremen, operators, or in similar work. One out of every four is a professional or technical worker, manager, official, or proprietor. One out of seven employed veterans is a clerical or sales worker. One out of eight is a service worker, laborer, or farmworker; and 1 out of 25 is a farmowner or manager.

If you consider the number of veterans who have attained the age of 60 years or more and who have been institutionalized or are in school, there are less than 3½ percent of our veterans who are unemployed. This speaks highly for our State and we are proud of these men. The average income for a veteran—if single—is some $4,014 per year or, if head of a family, $5,395 per year.

I take this opportunity to talk to you about the great State of Alabama, the Cotton State, not only because I am most proud of my heritage and my State, but because I believe that the men and women of the State of Alabama who gave so much during the trying days of strife, have indeed honored us with their unselfish loyalty to their country and they have also indicated outstanding competence as veterans of the various wars in which they have participated.

I salute these men of my fine State and I salute all other veterans who have participated in the various wars in which the United States has been involved for they have demonstrated the true meaning of democracy and that they are willing to lay down their lives in defense of this great country of ours.

RESIGNATION FROM AND APPOINTMENT TO COMMITTEE

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication, which was read:

> HON. JOHN W. MCCORMACK,
> *Speaker of the House,*
> *Washington, D.C.*
>
> DEAR MR. MCCORMACK: I greatly appreciate having been appointed by you as a member of the U.S. delegation of the Mexico-United States Interparliamentary Group for the meeting to be held in Mexico on March 18, 1963.
>
> It was a wonderful opportunity, I thought, to help strengthen our relationship with our good neighbors to the south.
>
> I find, however, that I will be unable to attend the meeting and therefore submit my resignation.
>
> Sincerely,
>
> J. IRVING WHALLEY,
> *Member of Congress.*

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the resignation will be accepted.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of section 1, Public Law 86-420, the Chair appoints as a member of the U.S. delegation of the Mexico-United States Interparliamentary Group for the meeting to be held in Guanajuato, Republic of Mexico, beginning on Monday, March 18, 1963, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. Morse] to fill the existing vacancy thereon.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 20. An act to promote the coordination and development of effective Federal and State programs relating to outdoor recreation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. Healey (at the request of Mr. Keogh), for Tuesday, March 12, 1963, on account of illness.

Mr. Smith of Virginia (at the request of Mr. Hardy), for an indefinite period on account of illness in family.

Mr. Riehlman (at the request of Mr. Arends), for March 13 and 14, on account of official business with House Committee on Science and Astronautics.

Mr. Gurney (at the request of Mr. Halleck), for March 13 and 14, on account of official business.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. Adair, for 30 minutes, on Thursday next.

Mr. Widnall (at the request of Mr. Clancy), for 5 minutes today.

Mr. Pelly (at the request of Mr. Clancy) for 1 hour March 13.

Mr. Glenn (at the request of Mr. Clancy) for 5 minutes today.

Mr. Rogers of Florida, for 30 minutes on tomorrow, Wednesday, March 13, 1963.

Mr. Olsen of Montana (at the request of Mr. Smith of Iowa), for 10 minutes on March 14, to revise and extend his remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the Congressional Record, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. Philbin in three instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. Nedzi.

Mr. Wilson of Indiana.

Mr. Bruce.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. Clancy) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. Westland.

Mr. Findley.

Mr. Pillion.

Mr. Derounian.

Mr. Barry.

Mr. Short in two instances.

(The following Member (at the request of Mr. Smith of Iowa) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mrs. Sullivan.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 24 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, March 13, 1963, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

539. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting the Annual Report of the U.S. Soldiers' Home for the fiscal year 1962, pursuant to 24 U.S.C. 59, 60; to the Committee on Armed Services.

540. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting one copy each of certain laws enacted by the Sixth Guam Legislature, 1962, pursuant to section 19 of the Organic Act of Guam; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

541. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting amendments to the budget for the fiscal year 1964 involving decreases in the amount of $8 million in new obligational authority, and $2,225,000 in an administrative expense limitation for the Department of Agriculture (H. Doc. No. 81); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

542. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the examination of unnecessary costs incurred by the Department of the Navy in the procurement of airborne early warning search radars; to the Committee on Government Operations.

543. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the audit of the Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission for the period of its existence, June 28, 1958, through September 1, 1962; to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. PHILBIN: Committee on Armed Services. H.R. 307. A bill to authorize the sale, without regard to the 6-month waiting period prescribed, of cadmium proposed to be disposed of pursuant to the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act; without amendment (Rept. No. 87). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BARING: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H.R. 1087. A bill to release the right, title, or interest, if any, of the United States in certain streets in the village of Heyburn, Idaho, and to repeal the reverter in patent for public reserve; with amendment (Rept. No. 91). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BARING: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H.R. 277. A bill to amend the act of April 22, 1960, relative to the transfer of certain public lands to the Colorado River Commission of Nevada; with amendment (Rept. No. 92). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BARING: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H.R. 1892. A bill to repeal the act of October 22, 1919 (41 Stat. 293; 43 U.S.C. 351–355, 357–360); with amendment (Rept. No. 93). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. RODINO: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 2844. A bill to provide the same life tenure and retirement rights for judges hereafter appointed to the U.S. District Court for the District of Puerto Rico as the judges of all other U.S. district courts now have; without amendment (Rept. No. 94). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. CELLER: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 2835. A bill to clarify the status of circuit and district judges retired from regular active service; without amendment (Rept. No. 95). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. CELLER: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 2845. A bill to provide that the district courts shall be always open for certain purposes, to abolish terms of court and to regulate the sessions of the courts for transacting judicial business; without amendment (Rept. No. 96). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. FORRESTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 824. A bill to incorporate Science Service, Inc., for the purposes indicated by Public Law 85–875; with amendment (Rept. No. 97). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. TOLL: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 2842. A bill to amend section 3238 of title 18, United States Code; without amendment (Rept. No. 98). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. FORRESTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 2833. A bill to amend subdivision d of section 60 of the Bankruptcy Act (11 U.S.C. 96d) so as to give the court authority on its own motion to reexamine attorney fees paid or to be paid in a bankruptcy proceeding; without amendment (Rept. No. 99). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. CELLER: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 2849. A bill to amend section 47 of the Bankruptcy Act; without amendment (Rept. No. 100). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. FORRESTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 4715. A bill to incorporate the Eleanor Roosevelt Memorial Foundation, Inc.; with amendment (Rept. No. 101). Referred to the House Calendar.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. BARING: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H.R. 1544. A bill for the relief of David H. Forman and Julia Forman; with amendment (Rept. No. 88). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BARING: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H.R. 2291. A bill regarding a homestead entry of Lewis S. Cass; without amendment (Rept. No. 89). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BARING: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H.R. 2294. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain land situated in the vicinity of Unalakleet, Alaska, to Mrs. William E. Beltz; without amendment (Rept. No. 90). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. ASHMORE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 1230. A bill for the relief of Nicholas E. Villareal; without amendment

(Rept. No. 102). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. ASHMORE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 3623. A bill for the relief of Col. Frank D. Schwikert, U.S. Air Force; without amendment (Rept. No. 103). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. ASHMORE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 3625. A bill for the relief of Maj. Leonard H. Potterbaum, U.S. Air Force; without amendment (Rept. No. 104). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. ASHMORE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 3626. A bill for the relief of Ronnie E. Hunter; without amendment (Rept. No. 105). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. ASHMORE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 3627. A bill for the relief of Arthur C. Berry and others; without amendment (Rept. No. 106). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FEIGHAN: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 1535. A bill to amend section 2 of Private Law 87-673; without amendment (Rept. No. 107). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BARRY:

H.R. 4774. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to provide for reform of personal and corporate income tax rates, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. COLLIER:

H.R. 4775. A bill to allow a deduction for income tax purposes of certain expenses incurred by the taxpayer for the education of a dependent; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H.R. 4776. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide increased tax incentives for individuals and corporations which manufacture or produce goods for export by providing that amounts derived from an increase in exports of such goods will be excluded from gross income; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DULSKI:

H.R. 4777. A bill to amend the Federal Employees Uniform Allowance Act; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. FLOOD:

H.R. 4778. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for the payment of pensions to veterans of World War I; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. FULTON of Tennessee:

H.R. 4779. A bill to provide readjustment assistance to veterans who serve in the Armed Forces during the induction period; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. GUBSER:

H.R. 4780. A bill to amend section 84(a) of title 28, United States Code, to provide for three divisions within the northern district for the U.S. district courts in California; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HERLONG:

H.R. 4781. A bill to provide for the tariff classification of certain particleboard; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MATTHEWS:

H.R. 4782. A bill to provide for the establishment of a national cemetery on a portion of the site Camp Blanding Military Reservation, Fla.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MILLIKEN:

H.R. 4783. A bill to amend the Civil Rights Act of 1957, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MILLS:

H.R. 4784. A bill to revise the provisions of law relating to the methods by which amounts made available to the States pursuant to the Temporary Unemployment Compensation Act of 1958 and title XII of the Social Security Act are to be restored to the Treasury; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin:

H.R. 4785. A bill to revise the provisions of law relating to the methods by which amounts made available to the States pursuant to the Temporary Unemployment Compensation Act of 1958 and title XII of the Social Security Act are to be restored to the Treasury; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MONTOYA:

H.R. 4786. A bill for the relief of the State of New Mexico; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PEPPER:

H.R. 4787. A bill to provide for the designation of a highway from Tampa, Fla., to Miami, Fla., as a part of the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. TALCOTT:

H.R. 4788. A bill to amend section 84(a) of title 28, United States Code, to provide for three divisions within the northern district for the U.S. district courts in California; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WESTLAND:

H.R. 4789. A bill to provide that certain aircraft may travel between the United States and Canada without requiring the owners or operators thereof to reimburse the United States for extra compensation paid customs officers and employees; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WYMAN:

H.R. 4790. A bill to amend section 1391 of title 28 of the United States Code, relating to venue generally; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BURKHALTER:

H.R. 4791. A bill to promote the conservation of the Nation's wildlife resources on the Pacific Flyway in the Tule Lake, Lower Klamath, and Upper Klamath National Wildlife Refuges in Oregon and California; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 4792. A bill to provide for the establishment of a national cemetery within Los Angeles County, Calif.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. CURTIS:

H.R. 4793. A bill relative to application of investment credit to certain leased property; to the Committee on Ways tnd Means.

By Mr. DERWINSKI:

H.R. 4794. A bill to amend the Postal Service and Federal Employees Salary Act of 1962 and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. EDWARDS:

H.R. 4795. A bill to amend section 84(a) of title 28, United States Code, to provide for three divisions within the northern district for the U.S. district courts in California; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GALLAGHER:

H.R. 4796. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for the payment of pensions to veterans of World War I and their widows and dependents; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mrs. GREEN of Oregon:

H.R. 4797. A bill to authorize assistance to public and other nonprofit institutions of higher education in financing the construction, rehabilitation, or improvement of needed academic and related facilities in undergraduate and graduate institutions, and to provide additional student loan assistance for study in such institutions; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. GIAIMO:

H.R. 4798. A bill to amend the Davis-Bacon Act to extend its application to contracts for the maintenance of Federal installations; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. McCLORY:

H.R. 4799. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide nonrecognition of gain where a taxpayer aged 65 or over disposes of property in connection with the acquisition of right to lifelong domiciliary care in a nursing home or home for the aged; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MORRISON:

H.R. 4800. A bill to amend title 39, United States Code, with respect to advancement by step increases of certain postal field service employees; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. ROSENTHAL (by request):

H.R. 4801. A bill to amend subsection 506(d) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, regarding certification of facts based upon transferred records; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. SKUBITZ:

H.R. 4802. A bill to provide direct aid to States and territories for educational purposes only; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CAHILL:

H.R. 4803. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that an individual may deduct amounts paid for his higher education, or for the higher education of any of his dependents; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DERWINSKI:

H.R. 4804. A bill to repeal the excise tax on communications; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia:

H.J. Res. 322. Joint resolution designating March 27 as Gen. "Billy" Mitchell Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FLOOD (by request):

H.J. Res. 323. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. KELLY:

H.J. Res. 324. Joint resolution extending an invitation to the International Olympic Committee to hold the 1968 winter Olympic games in the United States; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. WHITTEN:

H.J. Res. 325. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FALLON:

H. Con. Res. 112. Concurrent resolution requesting the President to issue a proclamation designating the week of May 26 to June 1, 1963, as the third annual National Highway Week; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FLOOD:

H. Con. Res. 113. Concurrent resolution relating to Panama Canal sovereignty treaty interpretations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H. Con. Res. 114. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress on representation of China in the United Nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BENNETT of Michigan:

H. Res. 291. Resolution authorizing the payment of death gratuities in the case of certain employees under the jurisdiction of the Architect of the Capitol who are assigned to duty in the House of Representatives; to the Committee on House Administration.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Idaho, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to requesting the calling of a convention for the purpose of proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to setting a national debt limit of $350 billion; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Montana, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to urging passage of legislation to amend the Reclamation Act and any other laws or rules, to waive the application of the land limitation clause in the area above Canyon Ferry Dam in the State of Montana; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Montana, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to requesting the calling of a convention for the purpose of proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to apportionment of representation in any State legislature; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Montana, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to requesting that the Federal portion of cost on Federal aid primary highways and secondary highways be increased from about 57 percent to 70 percent; to the Committee on Public Works.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of South Dakota memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to the so-called right to work laws of the respective States of this Union; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of South Dakota, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to allow singing at Mount Rushmore by nonprofessional student workers and to remove the restrictions imposed in 1962 which caused this to cease; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of South Dakota, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to support construction of the Crazy Horse Memorial near Custer, S. Dak.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of South Dakota, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to propose an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to provide for the appointment of electors of the President and Vice President on a basis similar to the election of the Congress of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of South Dakota, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to take all necessary steps in promoting the sale of grain and to guarantee continuing access of U.S. wheat to the Common Market countries; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia:

H.R. 4805. A bill relating to the effective date of the qualification of the profit-sharing plan of the Arlington Realty Co. as a qualified trust under section 401(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4806. A bill for the relief of Ulf Heinrich Goebel; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4807. A bill for the relief of Ourania Hondros; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CASEY:

H.R. 4808. A bill for the relief of Yee Chow Choi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CONTE:

H.R. 4809. A bill for the relief of Maria Rossi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PEPPER:

H.R. 4810. A bill for the relief of Casimira Villamil Pear; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RANDALL:

H.R. 4811. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Marjorie Curtis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REUSS:

H.R. 4812. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Kosara Nikolic; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RYAN of New York:

H.R. 4813. A bill for the relief of Peter G. Corbett; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4814. A bill for the relief of Dr. Yellamaty Williams; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

65. By Mr. HANNA: Petition of the La Habra (Calif.) Chamber of Commerce opposing all plans for Federal subsidization of local transit and commuter services; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

66. By Mrs. ST. GEORGE: Petition of Dorothy N. Sutherland and 48 others to preserve the Monroe Doctrine; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

67. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Eugene M. Boyd, Jr., city clerk, Marysville, Calif., relative to protesting the proposed subsidy formula of the Civil Aeronautics Board; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Boy Scout Honors for Third District

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 12, 1963

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, the Third Massachusetts District, which I have the great honor and privilege to resepresent in the Congress, was signaled out for special recognition last month by the Boy Scouts of America during National Boy Scout Week.

Peter W. Kotilainen of Millbury was chosen as 1 of 12 Scouts from throughout the United States to deliver in Washington the highlights of scouting activities in region 1 as part of the annual Boy Scout Report to the Nation. His alternate was Jon David Naparstek of Ayer, also from the Third District, another outstanding young Boy Scout leader and Eagle Scout, who has been active in the affairs of Mohegan Council of Central Massachusetts.

Peter, who is the junior assistant scoutmaster of Troop 9, sponsored by the Millbury Federated Congregational Methodist Church, was designated to represent the entire New England region during the official weeklong ceremonies in Washington, New Jersey, and New York. In addition, he was awarded a $300 college scholarship by the Reader's Digest.

During his 3-day visit to Washington, Peter attended the 53d anniversary breakfast in the Presidential Room of the Statler-Hilton and met many leaders in national affairs who were honored as helpful friends of Scouting.

Among other Scout honors earned by Peter during his active association in the Boy Scout movement are the Eagle Scout Bronze Palm Medal and the God and Country Award. In addition, he holds 30 merit badges for achievement in various phases of Scouting.

In 1961, Peter was named Boy Scout of the Year by Troop 109. More recently, the troop, Beaver Patrol, under Peter's leadership, was designated the best camping patrol by Mohegan Council. In 1960, he was a patrol leader at the National Boy Scout Jamboree at Colorado Springs.

A junior at Millbury High School, Peter is active in the debating and science clubs and a member of the track team. He is the son of Mr. and Mrs. Toivo Kotilainen of 15 Alpine Way.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased indeed to extend my congratulations to Peter Kotilainen and Jon Naparstek and their families who may well be proud of the honors granted these young leaders by the Boy Scouts in recognition of their leadership and work in Scouting. To Peter and Jon, I also extend my very best wishes for their continued advancement in Scouting and community achievement. I predict brilliant futures for both these young men.

Physical Fitness

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL FINDLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 12, 1963

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, I have a report from Mr. Phillip Lorenc, of Macomb, Ill., a student teacher who has aided Mr. Gene Pavelonis, physical education instructor in a physical fitness program for seventh and eighth grades at Bushnell Junior High School, Bushnell, Ill.

This program was undertaken as a result of President Kennedy's recommendation for improved physical fitness. A program adopted was an 18-item motor efficiency test, without apparatus. Dr. Curiton, originator of this test, demonstrated it at Western Illinois University, in Macomb, to all the school systems in the Macomb area. Each boy was rated on each of the 18 tests and the 2 top-ranking students were Tom Franck and Mike Steelman. Tom passed all 18 and Mike all but 1.

Lithuanian Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LUCIEN N. NEDZI

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 12, 1963

Mr. NEDZI. Mr. Speaker, February 16 marked the 45th anniversary of Lithuanian Independence Day. We in Congress join freemen everywhere in observing this anniversary. We have a moral obligation to do so, for we speak not only for ourselves but for those men and women of Lithuania who must observe this anniversary in silence.

Lithuania is not a make-believe nation. It has a long and honorable history, dating back to A.D. 1009, nearly 500 years before the discovery of America. It was not only the first nation in Eastern Europe to embrace Christianity but it also was the first nation which helped stem the Tartar invasion from the East. Admittedly, the heavy Russian suppression of this small nation and the Russian reliance on deportation, execution, and colonization methods dim hopes of Lithuanian survival as a nation and as a people. Nevertheless, we should recall that Lithuania has emerged from seemingly hopeless situations in the past. During the 120-year Russian occupation, from 1795 to 1915, there were five insurrections. And when the chaos of World War I allowed Lithuania to break its chains, its people formed a free and independent government out of the ruins and amidst the opposition of its hostile neighbors. A free Lithuania affirmed its cultural traditions, and maintained a democratic form of government for 22 years until it was, once again, invaded by Russia in violation of four treaties of friendship and nonaggression.

The captive peoples of Lithuania and other Eastern European satellites stand as constant reminders to the world that it is the Soviet Union which maintains the largest colonial empire on earth today. If permitted a choice between national independence and membership in the Soviet Union, there is no doubt in my mind as to what the people of Lithuania would prefer. Let us continue to call for free elections and freedom for the captive peoples. There must be no moratorium in this struggle. I join my colleagues in expressing sympathy for the misfortune which has so often befallen the Lithuanian people, and in expressing our hope that one day they will again be free.

Fiscal Cat Is Out of the Bag

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACK WESTLAND

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 12, 1963

Mr. WESTLAND. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the March edition of my newsletter in the RECORD, so that it may have as wide a circulation as possible:

FISCAL CAT IS OUT OF THE BAG

Well, the fiscal cat is out of the bag. President Kennedy now has said that he wants a $10 billion tax cut this year, whether we get tax reforms or not, even though this means a $12 billion deficit.

This appears to me to be the old, old theory of borrowing money to spend our way into prosperity. Now, I can understand a businessman going to the bank and borrowing some money to finance the purchase of new equipment which would produce a profit for his company. But, a businessman would have to show that the new equipment would make a profit or he'd be turned down flat because, as many of you know who have borrowed from a bank, it wants assurance that it's going to be repaid. But not the Federal Government, oh no. The Secretary of the Treasury not only says it won't be paid back, but very frankly states that the Federal Government will continue at least through 1967 to have deficits.

The fact that the value of our dollars and our gold supply have reached a critical stage doesn't seem to worry the administration either. Only this week the Treasury announced it borrowed another $100 million in marks from Germany last month. This loan is in addition to the $100 million in marks Germany lent us in January and the $380 million in lire, francs and marks we borrowed from several European nations last year. Also, recently our gold supply was depleted by $100 million.

This is a sad situation for the United States, which once was the place other countries came for credit. Now we have to go out and beg for loans. How many times can we go to the well? As the saying goes, what happens when the chickens come home to roost?

Now, if I can judge by the replies I've received from my February newsletter, 99 percent of you believe this sort of fiscal policy is strictly for the birds. I agree. Almost all of you said that we must cut spending before we cut taxes. Again I agree. Well, some of us here in Congress are getting at it and when we've come up with a specific program of cutting expenditures, some people in some areas probably won't like it—and, I'll get some complaints. But, that old saying that you can't have your cake and eat it too really applies here.

Let me add, at this time, my thanks for your letters in reply to my last newsletter.

TFX HASSLE

Maybe, you've read about the TFX hassle. Briefly, Boeing and General Dynamics were competitors for a $6 or $7 billion contract for an aircraft. Despite the fact that all the military people recommended the Boeing plane, Mr. McNamara, the Secretary of Defense, and other civilians awarded the contract to General Dynamics. Politics?

General Dynamics has its plant in Texas. Boeing, of course, is in Wichita and Seattle. Senator MCCLELLAN is presently conducting an investigation into this matter, and after talking with some members of the committee, I have a hunch that the deal is going to smell to high heaven.

Certainly, if Boeing had the best proposal they should get the business even if they're not located in Texas. Y'know what some people are calling the TFX now? The LBJ. And, it costs somewhere between $80 to $400 million more.

Sincerely yours,

JACK WESTLAND.

AS I SEE IT

(By Helen Westland)

Way back in 1945 I was a member of the American Red Cross Clubmobile unit serving in Europe during World War II. Much time was spent at ports through which almost every U.S. military unit in this theater passed at one time or another. When they did, they gave me one of their shoulder patches, telling me how their unit really won the war. I finally had all these colorful patches sewed on a jacket.

Someone mentioned to me that 20 years from then this "patch jacket" would be an historical item. Recently at a dinner, I had the privilege of sitting next to Dr. Leonard Carmichael, Director of the Smithsonian Institution, where historical items are kept. I told him about my patch jacket and he asked if I would give it to the Smithsonian. I told him I'd leave it to the Smithsonian in my will. Someday you may see it listed as "Westland's Patch Jacket," worn by the wife of the Second District Congressman of Washington State in World War II. It hardly seems possible that all of that is history today.

VISITORS

Bow: Mr. and Mrs. George Hammer.

Edmonds: Mr. L. K. Pennington, Mr. William G. Hathaway.

Marysville: Mr. Ralph A. Augustavo.

Mount Vernon: Lynn A. Dale.

Port Angeles: Mr. and Mrs. Ken Peterson, Mr. R. M. Hurt, Mr. Glenn Simkins.

Arthur Krock: A True Journalist

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 12, 1963

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, as a voice crying in the journalistic wilderness, Arthur Krock is one of the great journalists of our time—independent, courageous, unmanaged. Despite his personal friendship for President Kennedy, he has properly criticized the Kennedy propaganda machine, at which Hitler would have marveled.

I have written the editor of the New York Times, expressing my appreciation of a man like Arthur Krock:

MARCH 7, 1963.

Mr. JOHN B. OAKES,
Editor, New York Times,
New York, N.Y.

DEAR MR. OAKES: Congratulations to the New York Times' columnist, Arthur Krock for his fine article on New Frontier management of news.

No more callous disregard for the intelligence and trust of the American public has ever been shown by any administration in the history of our country. I am more than a little amazed that President Kennedy, with his affinity for the memory of that predecessor, seems to have forgotten FDR's words: "The truth is found when men are free to pursue it." Does the current truth hurt so much that he would prevent us from finding it out?

As Mr. Krock points out, even more devious is the determined pursuit of "managing the purveyors of the news." It is to the great credit of many news people that some of these attempts have met with failure; but to the extent some have been successful, a gross injustice has been perpetrated on the Nation.

It is not a happy thing to witness an administration so desperately committed to self-perpetuation that it would stifle dissent by smothering "unfavorable" facts, not only from its political opponents, but its supporters as well.

The Times can be especially proud of its distinguished columnist Arthur Krock for his timely caveat of March 1963.

Sincerely yours,

STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN.

Maynard, Mass., Post Office Dedication

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 12, 1963

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, on March 2 the new modern post office at Maynard, Mass., was dedicated with an impressive and well-conducted program arranged by Postmaster Frank C. Sheridan.

Following is the text of the dedicatory address I delivered on this memorable occasion:

Maynard, Mass., Post Office Dedication

It is a very happy privilege and honor for me to be here with you today for the dedication of this beautiful, new, modern post office for the town of Maynard, and it is a special pleasure indeed, to be introduced so graciously by my old and very dear friend, Postmaster Frank Sheridan who, since the year 1935, has so conspicuously, ably, and outstandingly served this great town as its postmaster.

The Maynard Post Office goes way back in the history of our country and was first established May 30, 1850, as the Assabet Post Office. The name was changed to Maynard Post Office May 8, 1871.

Frank Sheridan has some very illustrious predecessors, Amory Maynard, one of the founding fathers, Asahel Balcom, Lorenzo Maynard, John Harriman, Abel Haynes, Benjamin and Ernest Johnson, George Flood, William R. Hall, Arthur Walker, and then the very distinguished Arthur J. Coughlan who came along in 1915, later to be succeeded by Timothy Moynihan and William Stockwell, all most worthy predecessors.

I think Frank would be interested in knowing that the salary wasn't very attractive when the office was first started. The first year, for example, the annual salary was fixed at $61.78, out of total net proceeds of $82.89, and it was 1897 before the salary went up to $1,300.

But salary or no salary, these gentlemen all gave a good account of themselves for the Federal Government and for the town, and we are proud today to acknowledge our debt of gratitude to them, and to say to our good friend, Frank, that he has left an indelible imprint upon the history of Maynard for his fine, outstanding service and spirit of dedication.

The early postmasters, obviously, had to have some other income. Amory Maynard, one of Maynard's founders, owned the big mill right across from the Town House served as a boarding house for mill employees and was subsequently taken over by the town as a municipal building. That building was torn down and our beautiful new post office has been erected on its site.

Postmaster Balcom was a successful and prosperous farmer. John Harriman ran a laundry. Abel Haynes, the general store; Ernest Johnson, a drugstore; George Flood, a livery stable; Arthur Coughlan, a man of surpassing handsomeness and personality, as well as ability, was also a selectman, and a most popular figure in the town.

The Federal Government recognizes that Maynard is a great historic community tracing back to the proudest origins of our country; its loyal devoted people stand unsurpassed in the Nation, because through the years they have given practical demonstration, not only in war but in peace, of their peerless Americanism and high patriotic motives, their reliable, industrious, enterprising habits, and their willingness to exert their very best efforts for the common good and the national well-being.

It is particularly appropriate, therefore, that today in these exercises, the Federal Government should provide this splendid new edifice under the post office lease construction program with its modern appointments and facilities, manned by a talented, devoted postmaster and a rare staff of faithful, capable postal workers, than which no finer can be found in the entire land.

The architects, engineers, and builders have done their job with great skill, capacity, and effect.

These facilities are admirably located, are charming and well constructed, are practical and functional, and are set up in every way most efficiently to serve the people and the town of Maynard.

High ranking members of our great Post Office Department are here today and I am happy indeed to congratulate them, and all others who have had any part in making these striking new facilities a reality.

I realize that today one of Frank Sheridan's fondest dreams has come to pass, because he persisted in reaching this objective when only a few of us irresponsible enthusiasts were beating the bushes for this new post office.

Fortunately, in the end, by our joint efforts, we were able to impress the Post Office Department with the need and desirability for it, and the project was finally approved. So, my friends, here we are to hail the event and to express our gratitude and appreciation to all those who helped us so generously. Surely we are making history here on this spot.

There is one more duty that we must perform today and that is to render our humble thanks to the good Lord for having guided and sustained our loyal people and our great Nation in the ways of order, security, freedom and personal liberty.

The clamors and threats of communism and materialistic philosophies may be heard through the world, and at times, they may even be heard not far from our friendly shores and reverberating through our smiling skies.

But we can be secure and confident with one thought: that if we follow the example of the gallant patriotic men and women who preceded us and stand with the same steadfastness, the same high purpose and the same firm determination which they always showed, against the disturbances, unsettlements and dangers that press upon us from time to time, that we will find the ready and successful answer to the problems of present and future, grave though they may be; that by the common efforts and the great strength that only free men and women devoted to lofty, spiritual ideals may know, we are destined to preserve and enrich the freedoms we cherish and aid the whole world in finding the blessings of universal peace.

May this beautiful, new, post office facility stand here for many years to come to serve the people of Maynard and as eloquent testimony to our great, undying faith in our beloved country.

Cost of Government Purchases To Go Down in the Future

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EARL WILSON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 12, 1963

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, though Raleigh, N.C., is not a part of my district, my study into Government procurement has led to my interest in an industry there. Due to a decision by the Comptroller General on a case I submitted last November, that industry is about to get a Government contract and save $10,000 for the taxpayers.

Due to this firm's efficiency and the Comptroller General's decision to uphold its position, a radio transceiver is going to be built for the Federal Aviation Agency at a lower cost than would have been the case. If there are more decisions with this conclusion, we can expect the cost of Government purchasing to go down in the future.

Many of my colleagues are aware that for months and months I have made a detailed study of electronics purchases by the Government. In many cases the taxpayer has been the loser. In some I have been able to report successes in changed regulations and in savings to the taxpayers. The latter is true today—a happy ending for manufacturer, taxpayer, Government, and, yes, this Congressman.

Last November this firm outlined for me a problem it had with the FAA. Quoting for manufacture of a small radio transceiver, it inadvertently neglected to include a detailed description of the equipment with its proposal, as prescribed by FAA regulations. Because of this, it was ruled out of the procurement. At this very same time, this same firm was making the identical equipment for FAA under another contract, and for this reason was able to be low bidder. In other words, because of a technicality, this firm's competence was to be denied, and the price for this equipment was to rise by $10,000.

After studying the case closely, I contacted the Comptroller General and said:

> While the difference between this company's bid and that of the next low bidder does not exceed $10,000, it appears to me that any award other than to this firm would be a waste of tax dollars.

After a thorough study, the Comptroller General agreed with me and advised me by letter, March 7, 1963, that he had made a determination in favor of the Raleigh firm and it should get the contract. Despite the clerical error, the Comptroller General acted in behalf of saving the taxpayer's money. It is too bad we do not have more such people.

This is another case in a long list I am going to present in this session. I will also suggest legislative corrections, such as my H.R. 4409. As these cases are compiled, I hope the Rules Committee will take heed and report H.R. 4409 to the floor for action by the House. Its enactment into law, plus enactment of other legislation I shall soon propose, would curtail many abuses now being carried out in the name of national defense and would result in tremendous savings to the taxpayer.

How To Reduce the World's Largest Budget—United States Loses $250 Million Annually on Electronic Computer Systems

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN R. PILLION

OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 12, 1963

Mr. PILLION. Mr. Speaker, a minimum of $250 million could be saved annually in the totally irresponsible, uncoordinated leasing of electronic computer systems by the various Federal agencies.

At least five authoritative Federal official studies and reports have proven that massive savings could be realized by the outright purchase of electronic computer systems in place of the prevalent leasing arrangements.

As of June 30, 1963, a total of 1006 electronic data processing machines will have been installed. Despite the proven recommendations and experience that enormous savings are realized under outright purchases, 867 or 86 percent of Federal computer systems were, or will be, leased instead of purchased.

Based upon a detailed study of 523 of the 1,006 computer systems, $148 million could be saved over a 5-year period by the purchase instead of the present leasing contracts. In addition to these savings averaging $29.6 million per year, $105 million could be saved annually after the 5-year period by outright purchase of these 523 systems.

Another $100 million per year could be saved by purchase procurement instead of leasing contracts on the remaining 483 computer systems, and upon excessive overcharges for maintenance contracts on the 1,006 electronic computer systems.

Another $50 million per year could be saved by the purchase instead of the rental of electronic equipment used in classified military, intelligence, surveillance operations; by advertised competitive low bidding; by coordinated Federal volume discount purchases.

Mr. Speaker, on March 6, 1963, the General Accounting Office (GAO), under the direction of the Honorable Joseph Campbell, Comptroller General of the United States, issued an investigative and audit report entitled "Financial Advantages of Purchasing Over Leasing of Electronic Data Processing Equipment in the Federal Government."

This report is a shocking indictment of our system of Federal procurement of electronic equipment. It reflects a complete breakdown of managerial and administration accountability for public funds.

Although the Budget Bureau requirement states that Federal agencies should purchase electronic equipment if rental charges exceed purchase and maintenance costs over a 6-year period, our Federal officials continue to lease nearly all needed equipment. Under the Budget Bureau regulations, each agency is permitted to avoid purchasing where, in its discretion, there may be anticipated changes in data processing requirements.

The intent of the Budget Bureau purchase regulations is continually being violated by our Federal procurement officials.

Mr. Speaker, for specific examples of gross incompetence, maladministration and mismanagement of public trust, I quote from the Comptroller General's report of March 6, 1963:

> According to the inventory of the Bureau of the Budget, by June 1963, there will be 42 IBM 7090 and IBM 7094 systems in Federal usage. Of these, 6 are to be purchased and 36 are to be leased.
>
> Total estimated savings of $57,449,000 could be achieved over an initial 5-year period of use through purchasing rather than leasing these 36 systems. It shows also that estimated savings for each year of continued use past this period would be $34,378,000.
>
> Thus if these systems were purchased, rather than rented, and used for 7 years, the Government would realize savings of approximately $126,200,000.
>
> * * * * *
>
> According to the Budget Bureau, there will be 16 IBM 7080 systems in use by June 30, 1963. Of these, 1 is to be purchased and 15 are to be leased.
>
> Estimated savings of $24,413,000 could be realized over an initial 5-year period through purchasing and there would be additional savings of $11,778,000 for each year past this period.
>
> If used for a total of 7 years, the purchase of the 15 systems would produce estimated savings of $47,696,000.
>
> * * * * *
>
> We believe the Government could save hundreds of millions of dollars in the next several years as a result of the financial benefits of purchasing.
>
> The Air Force was leasing 36 IBM 650 systems. The rentals range from $4,200 to $23,000 per month. Eight of the nine components could have been purchased for approximately the cost of 1 year's rental; purchasing would have saved $146,000 over the intended period of use.

Mr. Speaker, the audit report of the Comptroller General states that both rental prices and purchase price of electronic computer systems are set by the manufacturers and are not negotiated by our Federal agencies.

Similarly, the maintenance contracts are accepted by our agencies without negotiation.

The Federal Government is at the mercy of electronic computer manufacturers. The uncoordinated separate procurement of electronic computer equipment by each Federal agency loses for the Government huge annual savings that would accrue from volume purchase discounts.

Mr. Speaker, the whole fabric of our electronic computer systems procurement is tainted with irregularity, illegality, incompetence and mismanagement.

Part 13: Let's Keep the Record Straight—A Selected Chronology of Castro and Cuba—January 14, 1963 to January 23, 1963

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. DON L. SHORT

OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 12, 1963

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, today's continuation of my chronology on Castro and Cuba involves a rehash of Fidel Castro's five point program—which he had announced on October 23, 1962, as being the only basis on which the Cuban and U.S. crisis could be solved.

These five points were:

First. End of economic blockade and all measures of commercial and economic pressure exercised against Cuba by the United States.

Second. End of all subversive activities, dropping and landing of arms and explosives by air and sea, organization of mercenary invasions, infiltration of spies and saboteurs, "all of which actions are organized in the territory of the United States and certain accomplice countries."

Third. End of pirate attacks carried out from bases in the United States and Puerto Rico.

Fourth. End of all violations of air and naval space by U.S. planes and ships.

Fifth. U.S. withdrawal from the naval base of Guantanamo and return of this territory to Cuba.

That these five points had suddenly assumed importance to not only Castro but also to the U.S.S.R. and Red China was proved by their quick expression of support for the statements—which they ignored at the time the crisis was at fever pitch.

Castro, emboldened now by Kremlin support for his five points—publicly called for all Latin American revolutionaries to rise up against imperialism while denouncing the United States as "the most aggressive nation in the world."

His words stating that "a war was avoided, but the peace was not won," were strikingly similar to many uttered by American citizens, including those in the political field—proving that at least there was agreement between Castro and the United States on one issue.

The only ones who appeared completely happy and satisfied with the arrangements were the Soviets—because as Khrushchev so obligingly had pointed out—the Communist regime was firmly fixed on the island of Cuba—and in exchange for only 40 or so missiles, a few planes, a few Soviet troops.

Castro designated our Alliance for Progress foreign aid program for Latin America as reactionary and antiquated—declaring it would not "prosper because it is a policy of exploitation." This was a clear indication of the Communist line to be preached in South America regarding our efforts to aid them—but many North Americans—while agreeing on the term "exploitation"—felt they were the ones being exploited—not the Latin Americans.

Diplomatic immunity had its day in court—when one of our Federal judges withdrew same from a Cuban United Nations attaché—ordering him to stand trial with two other defendants for conspiracy and failure to register as foreign agents. Since our U.S. Communist Party had also been ordered some time back to register, this seemed only just to many Americans—although Communists of all nations felt it was rank discrimination and entirely unjustified.

Once again Khrushchev effectively stopped any tendency on the part of U.S. citizens toward complacency, by pointing out his principle of coexistence—which had been violently criticized by Red Chinese—had in the past given the Communists time to build strength and was essential for future victories. He again termed ours an "ultimate defeat" because Cuba still remained a Communist nation. About this time all the Communist nations of the Western World jumped on Khrushchev's bandwagon—calling for unity and a ceasing of "washing their dirty linen" in public. The Red Chinese also declared the Cuban people, with the sympathy and support of peoples of labor in America and the world," had won the victory of Cuba's independence, her sovereignty, and fruits of her revolution. This of course did not leave our American laboring people with a good taste in their mouth.

Khrushchev indulged in his favorite pastime of "rocket rattling," declaring that as many as 120 Russian missiles were now ready to be launched at the United States in case of war, and claiming that while 40 rockets had been withdrawn from Cuba, 80 or probably even 120 had been set up in other "better places than Cuba," although he failed to name the places.

So while the Communists castigated their party members for lack of unity and irresponsible attacks on their policy, our own political parties in this country were suffering the same throes because of disagreement not only as to the proper policy but the degree of information to which the American public was entitled on the Cuban issue. This of course was not an issue in the Communists' quarrels because their citizens are not guaranteed the privilege of freedom of the press or information.

Senator FULBRIGHT renounced the constitutional right of the Congress to assist in foreign policy decisions by his statement that they—the Congress—interfered with the effectiveness of the President's leadership thus becoming at one and the same time a most unpopular man with many of his colleagues and a goodly segment of the American public. He pointed out that during the October Cuban crisis the leaders of Congress were informed, but not consulted, and deemed this to be quite proper. However, many felt that he failed by not adding that the President did receive counsel and advice—although not by congressional leaders—but instead by a group called the EX COMM—made up of some National Security Council members with a few personal additions of his own.

At long last some of the questions previously raised about Adali Stevenson's part in deliberations of the Security Council during the Cuban crisis were again brought up, and by one of the same writers who originally had brought this to the attention of the public—Stewart Alsop. However, in this instance he had the guarantee of an approved summary by Clayton Fritchey, Stevenson's official spokesman at the United Nations.

Robert Kennedy, the Attorney General and President's brother, committed what some termed his worst faux pas of a series, by allowing himself to be interviewed by the Miami Herald—as well as the U.S. News & World Report—and bringing up the subject once more of the fateful Bay of Pigs invasion. Reiterating that President Kennedy had taken full responsibility for failure of the invasion plans, he stated that the President not only had approved the plan, but it had been fully cleared by the CIA and Joint Chiefs of Staff and air cover had never been promised. Whereupon Senator GOLDWATER contradicted the Attorney General, stating he had been given a definite impression by the President, during a personal interview, that air cover had been a part of the original invasion plans, and charged Bobby Kennedy with not only "rewriting of history" but attempting "news management."

This resulted in a rash of public statements by various political leaders calling for complete investigations—and as full disclosure of the facts as possible consistent with our national security, to the American public.

Senator FULBRIGHT once again accused the Republicans of "partisanship"—but for his trouble was reminded by several newspaper columnists that he had not been heard calling for a "nonpartisan" approach during either the 1960 presidential campaign, or during President Eisenhower's administration.

Senator RUSSELL promised an investigation into the military and defense issues but not into the political issues. Senator MORSE recommended a reading of the still-secret transcript of his subcommittee hearings on Latin American affairs before partisan speeches were made but the transcripts were described by Senator GOLDWATER as being "the most inconclusive testimony I have ever read."

And once again former President Eisenhower was called upon to state whether or not his administration had conceived the ill-fated plan to invade Cuba at the Bay of Pigs—stated unequivocally that it had not, but rather had contemplated a "guerrilla type of action." And this seemed to close the chapter as far as the Eisenhower administration's part in the fiasco was concerned.

But the curiosity of the American public still mounted—and it seemed inevitable to all that something had to be done to clear up the controversy.

On one hand, many public-spirited and sincere citizens indicated they felt perhaps this curiosity was being overdone. A quotation I recently found perhaps describes their emotions to a certain degree:

> Curiosity is a kernel of the forbidden fruit, which still sticketh in the throat of a natural man, sometimes to the danger of his choking.—Fuller.

However, on the other hand, equally public-spirited citizens and equally sincere took the position which might be described by this quotation:

> The gratification of curiosity rather frees us from uneasiness, than confers pleasure. We are more pained by ignorance, than delighted by instruction. Curiosity is the thirst of the soul.—Johnson.

But the American public—not bothering with semantics—seemed rather to feel that asking for official reports giving the whole truth—as long as it did not involve giving away valuable national security information to Communist countries—was only a rightful part of their constitutional guarantees of freedom of the press and freedom of speech under a republican form of government.

Part 13 of my chronology on Castro and Cuba follows:

PART 13. SELECTED CHRONOLOGY ON CASTRO AND CUBA

January 14, 1963: Soviet Deputy Foreign Minister Vassily V. Kuznetsov came to Havana last night and gave Fidel Castro fresh assurances that the Kremlin backs the five points raised by the Cuban Prime Minister at the height of the Caribbean crisis.

The points include demands that the United States give up its Guantanamo Naval base, lift trade restrictions imposed against Cuba, and give a no-invasion pledge.

January 15, 1963: Prime Minister Fidel Castro called today for the Communist world to heal its rifts and for revolutionaries of the Western Hemisphere to rise up in violent upheaval against imperialism.

In a fiery televised speech that began last night and lasted several hours, Castro sounded his most aggressive demand yet for revolution in Latin America.

Castro's speech contained the customary denunciations of President Kennedy and the United States, which he described as "the most aggressive Nation in the world."

"For us, the Caribbean crisis has not been resolved," he said. "A war was avoided but the peace was not won.

"We don't believe in Kennedy's words," he said. "But Kennedy has given no pledge (against invasion) and if he did give it he has already withdrawn it.

"The imperialists are shipping arms, saboteurs and agents into Cuba, organizing bands of pirates and retaining a piece of our territory (the U.S. Naval Base at Guantanamo) that points at the heart of our nation."

Castro also attacked the U.S. sponsored Alliance for Progress as reactionary and antiquated.

"It will not prosper because it is a policy of exploitation," he said.

January 15, 1963: A Federal judge today denied diplomatic immunity to a Cuban United Nations attaché accused of sabotage conspiracy and threw doubt on immunity for staff members of any foreign U.N. missions and even for ambassadors to the U.N.

In a lengthy and perhaps precedent-setting decision, Judge Edward Weinfeld refused to grant Roberto Santiesteban a habeas corpus writ on the basis of diplomatic immunity. He ordered the Cuban to stand trial with two other defendants for conspiracy and failure to register as foreign agents.

January 15, 1963: Soviet Premier Nikita S. Khrushchev called for a truce today in the Sino-Soviet conflict.

His call for a halt in the increasingly bitter and vocal dispute between Moscow and Peiping over the Soviet Union's peaceful coexistence policy caught the free world and probably also the Communist world off balance.

In defending his principle of coexistence, Khrushchev said that in the past it had given the Communists time to build strength and was essential for future victories.

This, he claimed, was the basis of his Cuban tactics. While admitting that some critics had called removal of the rockets from Cuba "defeat," he claimed he had only been "flexible," and that President Kennedy suffered ultimate defeat because Cuba remained a Communist nation.

January 16, 1963: With Poland's Wladyslaw Gomulka setting the stage, Communist Parties of the Western world started jumping aboard Nikita S. Khrushchev's Sino-Soviet truce bandwagon today.

In a 25-minute speech to the East German Communist Party's Sixth Congress, Gomulka said that dirty linen should not be washed in public but should be cleansed patiently and quietly in "internal discussions."

"The public polemics which are damaging the cause of international unity of the Communist movement and the irresponsible attacks on the Communist Party of the Soviet Union by the leaders of some Communist Parties increased during the crisis in the Caribbean (Cuba).

"The leadership of these parties did not want to understand that the crisis was solved favorably for Cuba and the cause of world socialism, through the policy pursued by the Soviet Union."

January 16, 1963: Cuban delegate Armando Hart-Davalos made an impassioned plea at the East German Party Congress for Communist unity.

"We Cubans regard it as a vital obligation to defend Communist solidarity. With the help of serious critical analysis we should be able to prevent the present differences of opinion from reaching a crisis."

January 17, 1963: Miami, Fla., January 18.—Ninety persons, 38 of them U.S. citizens who had been living in Cuba, arrived today aboard a Pan American airliner which had flown to Havana with a load of ransom for liberated invasion prisoners.

U.S. Immigration Service officials said the other 52 passengers were relatives of the Americans.

January 18, 1963: In a speech to the East German Communist Party Congress, chief Chinese Communist delegate Wu Hsiu-Chuan stated that all the heroic Cuban people mobilized themselves, united around their revolutionary leader, comrade Fidel Castro, persevered in the five just demands for the protection of Cuba's independence and sovereignty and waged an uncompromising struggle against U.S. imperialism, thus it was the heroic Cuban people, with the sympathy and support of the peoples of labor in America and the world, who won the great victory in defense of Cuba's independence, sovereignty and the fruits of her revolution and made a great contribution to the cause of world peace.

"U.S. imperialism bullies the fainthearted but fears the stouthearted, what it fears most is the strength of a united revolutionary people."

January 18, 1963: Soviet Premier Nikita S. Khrushchev said today as many as 120 Russian missiles are ready to be launched at the United States in case of war.

"The American imperialists know that we withdrew 40 rockets from Cuba," he told East German steelworkers at Eisenhuettenstadt. "But we have set up 80, probably even 120 rockets in other places.

"Cuba is not the most convenient place to base rockets," the Communist leader said in his most anti-Western speech since he arrived for the East German Communist Party Congress last Monday. "We have better places than Cuba.

"The United States wanted to use 300,000 men against Cuba," he said. "They bared their teeth like wolves, but still did not bite. Has American imperialism lost its appetite? No, but we are a powerful club."

January 20, 1963: The Swiss announced tonight that the way had been cleared to allow between 900 and 1,000 more relatives of Cuban invasion prisoners to leave Cuba aboard the American ship *Shirley Lykes*.

An Embassy spokesman said, "The Cuban authorities have said they will make available exit permits for between 900 and 1,000 Cuban citizens directly related to the former Playa Giron (Bay of Pigs) invasion prisoners."

January 20, 1963: Citing the Cuban crisis, Chairman J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT, Democrat, of Arkansas, of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, urged today that the powers of the President to handle foreign policy be strengthened.

FULBRIGHT said foreign policy powers in Congress interfere with the effectiveness of the President's leadership.

This was demonstrated clearly in the October Cuban crisis when there was no alternative to Presidential decision and action, FULBRIGHT said.

"The circumstances were such that it was quite impossible to seek the counsel of the leaders of Congress, who, in fact, and quite properly, were informed but not consulted," the Senator continued.

January 20, 1963: Stewart Alsop said today that Adlai E. Stevenson advised the National Security Council to consider giving up the Guantanamo Naval Base, if necessary, in exchange for the dismantling of Russian rocket bases in Cuba.

Alsop said he and the coauthor of the report, Charles Bartlett, obtained their information during three lengthy talks with Clayton Fritchey, Stevenson's official spokesman at the United Nations.

He said Fritchey approved this summary of Stevenson's position: "Stevenson was only willing to discuss Guantanamo and the European bases with the Communists after a neutralization of the Cuban missiles."

Alsop quotes from notes made by Bartlett in an interview with Fritchey: "Stevenson's general approach was to avoid military action until the peacekeeping machinery of the U.N. had a chance to function. He therefore opposed the air attack and favored the blockade. As the consensus hardened on the quarantine approach, he turned his thoughts toward the possibility of a settlement, both short term and long term."

January 21, 1963: In an interview with David Kraslow of the Miami Herald, Attorney General Robert F. Kennedy stated that no U.S. air cover was ever planned or promised for the Bay of Pigs invasion of Cuba in April, 1961.

"There never was any plan to have U.S. air cover," Kennedy said. "There never was any promise. Not even under Mr. Eisenhower was American air cover in the picture.

"From the beginning the President said no American forces would take part in the operation. It was made absolutely clear that under no condition whatsoever, would Americans be used in the invasion.

"And it simply cannot be said that the invasion failed because of any single factor. There were several major mistakes. It was just a bad plan. Victory was never close."

Kennedy confirmed that the invading force appealed to the U.S. warships for help when they were pinned down on the beach. He declined to say whether the appeals were relayed to the President.

"The decision was made that there would be no change in the ground rules," Kennedy said. "There had been a firm understanding always, accepted by everyone, that there would be no U.S. forces in the invasion under any condition. We stayed with that."

Kennedy said no invasion plan had been completed during Mr. Eisenhower's term. "There was just a general concept," he said. "The logistics and the details were worked out after the President took office.

"The President has taken responsibility for the failure and that's as it should be. He approved the plan. But it's not true that he sat down with two or three civilians and worked out this plan at the White House.

"The plan that was used was fully cleared by the CIA and the Joint Chiefs of Staff. It was war gamed at the Pentagon in whatever manner they do these things."

January 21, 1963: Senator BARRY GOLDWATER, Republican, of Arizona, charged that Attorney General Robert F. Kennedy appeared to be trying to rewrite history in the "latest example of news management by the New Frontier."

GOLDWATER said he talked with President Kennedy at the latter's request shortly after the invasion fiasco and "I certainly got the impression then that an air cover had been part of the original invasion plans."

Also, he told the Senate, "I am sure the entire American public has understood that the air cover was definitely in the invasion plans until the President was persuaded—by some still unidentified advisers—to cancel it."

GOLDWATER also took issue with a speech last Saturday in which Vice President LYNDON B. JOHNSON said the "rattlesnake in Cuba" has been defanged.

"I suggest it is a highly optimistic view and one which the United States cannot afford to adopt as a matter of policy," GOLDWATER said. "Castro's Cuba is still a menace to freedom in the Western Hemisphere."

January 21, 1963: Argentine Foreign Minister Carlos Muniz agreed with Secretary of State Dean Rusk yesterday that the Organization of American States (OAS) should follow up its unified stand in the Cuban crisis with new coordinated moves against Communist Cuba.

Muniz, in a talk with Rusk, is believed to have stressed that Argentina will back solidly any action the United States may take to weaken the Cuban Government and prevent Castroite subversion in Latin America.

January 22, 1963: Senate Republicans moved to conduct their own investigation of the ill-fated Bay of Pigs invasion. They said they wanted to get the entire story historically accurate.

Senate GOP Leader EVERETT M. DIRKSEN, of Illinois, said he proposed making such a preliminary inquiry on his own and heard no dissent when it was discussed at a GOP policy meeting, yesterday. He said his proposal was not prompted by Senator BARRY GOLDWATER, Republican, of Arizona.

DIRKSEN said he plans to make an exploration of his own, take it up with the GOP policy committee staff, and then decide whether the matter should be put up to a

Senate legislative committee for more formal investigation.

Senate Democratic Whip HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, of Minnesota, suggested that if DIRKSEN wants the entire story he should have his investigation include the circumstances that led to the coming to power in Cuba of Castro and communism.

Senator J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT, Democrat, of Arkansas, chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, said the DIRKSEN proposal has a very strong partisan aura, and any conclusion would be considered quite partisan.

January 23, 1963: Senator BARRY GOLDWATER, Republican, of Arizona, proposed a full Senate Armed Services Committee investigation of the disastrous 1961 Bay of Pigs invasion of Cuba.

Senator RICHARD B. RUSSELL, Democrat, of Georgia, the committee chairman, said if military and defense issues and not politics are involved the committee would look into them.

"It's not our function to settle political matters," he said.

Senator WAYNE MORSE, Democrat, of Oregon, whose Foreign Relations Subcommittee on Latin American Affairs has already investigated the invasion, told the Senate its members should read the still-secret transcript of those hearings before making partisan speeches.

GOLDWATER fired back that he had and "it's the most inconclusive testimony I've ever read."

GOLDWATER proposed that the Armed Services Committee have $100,000 to finance its inquiry and report no later than March 31. GOLDWATER is a committee member.

The Senator said the then Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, Gen. Lyman Lemnitzer, and Allen Dulles, then Central Intelligence Agency chief, should be called to testify.

January 23, 1963: Former President Eisenhower said the illfated plan to invade Cuba at the Bay of Pigs was not conceived during his administration, but that, instead, a guerrilla type of action was contemplated.

General Eisenhower discussed the Cuban situation and numerous other domestic and international topics during a taped interview with newsman Walter Cronkite on CBS (WTOP–TV in Washington).

When Cronkite asked the former Chief Executive whether the Cuban invasion plan had been made under his administration, General Eisenhower replied: "No, no, no."

He added: "There was no way. We didn't even know at that time whether we could do anything more, or whether these refugees would be sufficiently numerous and strong to do more than go into the * * * eastern part of the island, in the mountains, and start in the return a counterrevolution."

He said the planning was to find a leader for the Cuban people to help them to rise up and overthrow Cuban Premier Fidel Castro but "how are you going to find a man that was not a Batista man, and not a Castro man, and still be a leader?"

National Child Evangelism Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD C. BRUCE

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 12, 1963

Mr. BRUCE. Mr. Speaker, February 19 was the "National Day of Prayer for the Spiritual Needs of the Children of our Nation." In observance of this occasion, numerous churches in my district of Indianapolis, Ind., presented programs explaining the work of the International Child Evangelism Fellowship.

The week of February 17 to 24 marked the 26th anniversary of child evangelism work. Its activities under the direction of International Director Rev. Jacob DeBruin encompass all phases of Bible teaching for children. In Indianapolis, under the leadership of Mr. Joseph Hosman, chairman of the local child evangelism committee, the group offers activities such as open-air classes, summer camp, rallies, and 26 weekly good news clubs. The fellowship also offers a teacher's training program.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that the very survival of our Nation as a free and prosperous land depends in large measure upon the moral and spiritual training of our youth. No nation has long maintained such a high standard of living as we have in the United States without an equally high standard of moral conduct.

The importance of programs such as that offered by the International Child Evangelism Fellowship is manifest in any study of juvenile delinquency statistics. It is clear to me that the only way to prevent development of delinquents and the only way to insure the maintenance of high moral standards in our youth is through spiritual guidance and training. This is an area where our powerful, paternalistic Government can be of no help. This work must be done by dedicated individuals, imbued with the love of humanity and the desire to serve God. That they have been doing an excellent job I am sure, I am also sure that much more needs to be done, and the work of the International Child Evangelism Fellowship and other such dedicated groups deserves our wholehearted support.

Installation of Rector of St. John's Episcopal Church

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT R. BARRY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 12, 1963

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, March 10, 1963, President John F. Kennedy continued a tradition exercised by each President since Woodrow Wilson in signing a prayerbook in St. John's Episcopal Church located opposite the White House on Lafayette Square. Many past Presidents have attended St. John's and every President since President Madison has had the occasion to visit there at some time or another. Consequently St. John's has been traditionally called the Church of the Presidents.

Significantly, in conjunction with this historic visit, was the installation of a new rector of the storied church by Rt. Rev. William F. Creighton, bishop of Washington. The new rector is the Reverend John C. Harper, who, I am very honored to tell the House, was an immediate past resident of Westchester County, New York.

Reverend Harper, a native of Massachusetts, trained for the ministry at Harvard College and the Episcopal Theological Seminary in Cambridge. After service in Massachusetts parishes he was called in 1957 to be rector of St. Mathew's Church located in Bedford which is in Westchester County. Mr. Harper served his parishioners faithfully for 5½ years until called by the vestry of the church to become rector of St. John's.

We in Westchester are sorry to lose this fine gentleman and servant of God whose presence enriched our county. However if we must lose him, we are happy that it is the Nation's Capital which shall reap the harvest of his guidance and wisdom. On behalf of my colleagues, whom I am sure join me, I extend a warm welcome to Reverend Harper, to his wife, the former Barbara Quarles, and to their three children. We hope theirs will be a pleasant and bountiful life enriched by service to God and their fellow man.

From Westchester a fond farewell—to the Nation's Capital—hail and a fruitful tenure.

Prof. Samuel Williston, Teacher and Lawgiver

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 12, 1963

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, the entire legal and academic world was deeply saddened by recent news of the passing at the age of 101, of Prof. Emeritus Samuel Williston of Harvard University.

Professor Williston was one of the greatest law teachers and writers of our time. The list of his authorship of legal books, tracts, and law review articles is truly prodigious and constitutes a striking and enduring contribution in his special field of contracts and sales that has never been equaled in history.

I would venture to suggest that the law does not know such painstaking research, brilliant scholarship, and penetrating analysis such as typified his great work in several volumes on the subject of contracts. This work is probably the greatest of its kind that has ever been written.

Any effort I might make to describe and evaluate Professor Williston's life work and great contribution would be feeble indeed. Truly, he was a giant in his field, standing out as the unchallenged leader of the authorities on contracts and sales of his time.

His influence in clarifying, shaping, codifying, and simplifying the law in several vital fields was, in truth, a phenomenal achievement that has left an indelible imprint upon legal and judicial institutions in this country and the world.

Great, impressive, gifted, effective teacher that he was, as several generations of Harvard Law School men will testify, his epochal work was by no means confined to the classroom, the library, or the law school lecture room. Every law office, every judge's chamber, State legislatures, and the Congress were invaluably aided by his authoritative writings on the law.

His influence was felt particularly and in a monumental way, so to speak, in the restatement of the law on contracts and sales and related subjects, and in State legislatures which he invaluably served in preparing original drafts on several uniform laws on sales, warehouse receipts, liens, freight handlers and others. The range and variety of his scholarly works can be readily seen from the following partial listing of his books:

"Cases on Engineering Contracts"; selection of cases from "Cases on the Law of Contracts," edited by Samuel Williston, arranged by Bruce Wyman. Brown and Co., 1904.

"Commercial and Banking Law," prepared for the American Institute of Banking.

"Commercial Law," prepared for the American Institute of Banking.

Draft of an act relating to the sale of goods.

"The Law Governing Sales of Goods at Common Law and Under the Uniform Sales Act."

"The Law of Contracts."

Lectures on business law and the negotiable instruments law.

"Life and Law"; an autobiography.

"Negotiable Instruments."

"Selected Cases and Statutes on the Law of Bankruptcy."

"A Selection of Cases on the Law of Contracts," by Samuel Williston, prepared for use as a textbook in Harvard Law School.

"A Selection of Cases on the Law of Contracts," edited and annotated.

"A Selection of Cases on the Law of Contracts," revised and annotated.

"A Selection of Cases on the Law of Sales," by Samuel Williston and William E. McCurdy.

"A Selection of Cases on the Law of Sales of Personal Property."

"Some Modern Tendencies in the Law."

"A Treatise on the Law of Contracts."

"The Uniform Partnership Act," with some remarks on other Uniform Commercial Laws.

"The Law Governing Sales of Goods at Common Law and under the Uniform Sales Act."

"A Selection of Cases on the Law of Contracts."

Many of these words have gone into several revised editions. This brief listing by no means covers all of Professor Williston's writings. His law review articles alone would cover a period of some 60 years and many pages of bibliography.

It would be impossible for anyone to measure precisely or adequately his memorable service to the great university where he taught for so many years, to his many students who were always the sincere, compelling object of his concern and most solicitous attention, the courts of justice, the great legal profession and innumerable public causes of magnitude and importance to which he gave so willingly and unselfishly of his superb talents and untiring efforts.

We may well say of his passing that a giant oak has fallen in the forests of humanity and its reverberations are heard in many places in the world where the rule of law is treasured.

Teacher, savant, author and public servant, Professor Williston's example of dedicated devotion to his great tasks will long shine out in the world of pure scholarship, law, and jurisprudence, beaming his learning, wisdom, and high ideals for the enlightenment and advancement of man across the dark barriers of skepticism and doubt.

Of his personal qualities, his modesty, humility, generosity of impulse, and concern for his colleagues and friends, much could be said; for the greatness and fame of his achievements never swerved him from his personal loyalties or the many warm human attachments he enjoyed during his long, useful life. In the best sense, he was an illustrious American and a great human being.

It may also be appropriately said that his loss is truly irreparable, not alone for the dear ones who survive him, but for his great university, for the world of juridicial letters, and for the many fine causes he so devotedly served.

I tender my most heartfelt sympathy to his family, his close friends, his academic colleagues, and his school. The memory of Samuel Williston will long remain green with those who knew and esteemed him.

Down the long, unbroken channels of law and jurisprudence, wherever freemen seek the light of justice for all, his honored name will be gratefully remembered and imperishably enshrined.

May he find rest and peace in his heavenly home.

"Woman's Role in the Community"—Talk by Congresswoman Sullivan Before Downtown St. Louis, Inc.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 12, 1963

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, it is indeed rare for me to be away from Washington when the House is in session—I have an ironclad rule against doing so. But yesterday I broke it for what I considered good and sufficient reason: The launching in St. Louis of an annual weeklong series of events sponsored by Downtown St. Louis, Inc., an organization of our downtown business leaders, in the form of a "Salute to the Woman Who Works." As honorary chairman this year of "Downtown St. Louis Salutes the Woman Who Works," it was a pleasure for me to attend the opening luncheon and discuss "Woman's Role in the Community."

Nearly all women work—and work hard—although two-thirds of them are not gainfully employed. The one-third who are in the labor force perform work vital to the national economy. But whether employed or not, all women have many civic responsibilities outside the home, and after working hours, and these were among the points I tried to cover in my talk.

In view of the widespread interest in the subject matter of my talk, a subject which I know is under comprehensive study by the President's Commission on the Status of Women, I submit for inclusion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the text of my speech, as follows:

"WOMAN'S ROLE IN THE COMMUNITY"—ADDRESS BY CONGRESSWOMAN LEONOR K. SULLIVAN, HONORARY CHAIRMAN OF "DOWNTOWN ST. LOUIS SALUTES THE WOMAN WHO WORKS," MONDAY AFTERNOON, MARCH 11, 1963, AT SHERATON-JEFFERSON HOTEL, LAUNCHING WEEK-LONG SERIES OF EVENTS SPONSORED BY DOWNTOWN ST. LOUIS, INC.

On one of those bitterly cold days last month, when every householder could almost see the wings on his dollar bills—in the form of fuel going up the chimney—and there was snow and ice to chop away from the front walk, and the car wouldn't start and probably needed a new battery, and people's bones ached from the cold, and life was truly grim, one man who lives in the Third Congressional District probably felt he had taken as much of the grind as he could stand without finding a safety valve for letting off some steam. So he wrote to me. It was one of the most indignant letters I ever received as a Member of Congress. How dare we, he asked, let so many days go by without accomplishing anything? What were we being paid for? Why didn't we work at the jobs to which we were elected? What was the idea taking money under false pretense? Who did we think we were? How did we get that way? What right have Members of Congress to think they are above and beyond the moral responsibility to give a full day's work for a full day's pay? Why don't we pay back the salary we receive for not working? And so on and so on—for several pages.

Apparently, he had read a newspaper article commenting on the fact that with 6 weeks gone by, Congress had not passed a single major piece of legislation, and had acted on very few minor ones. Furthermore, out of deference to the annual desire of the Republicans in Congress to use Lincoln's Birthday week as a time for blasting the Democrats in speeches at fund-raising dinners all around the country, Congress was in semirecess for that week; and would have a similar week of informal recesses around the time of Jefferson's birthday so that the Democrats in Congress could return the compliment by going around the country attacking Republicans.

ORGANIZING A NEW CONGRESS IS COMPLEX

Actually, of course, it always takes at least a month, and often 2 months, in each new Congress—every 2 years—for a variety of organizational arrangements, including the adoption of new rules, agreement on committee ratios for the majority and minority parties, and assignments to committees, before the committees can even begin to get down to work. As everyone should know, the committees are the bill-perfecting workshops of Congress. By the time legislation comes to us on the House floor, for instance, it has pretty well been shaped by an appropriate committee into the form in which it will pass, and while amendments can be offered from the floor they are seldom accepted. So nothing is really even begun until the committees are organized. For nearly a month now, however, the committees on our side of the Capitol have been working very hard—and I can attest to that personally, since I am one of the Members on the House side with assignments on two House committees. And it seems they both usually schedule meetings at the same hours of the same days—but that's another story.

In any event, the terrible-tempered man who wrote me the indignant letter about Congress not earning its keep, picked just the wrong time to vent his spleen upon me for not working. After 10 years in the Congress, I am used to receiving abusive letters occasionally about the faults and inadequacies and shortcomings of Congress, or of individual Members of Congress, but usually these do not come from residents of my district, I am happy to say, since most of my constituents seem to know that I work pretty hard at the job.

But this fellow just picked the wrong day to write. His letter arrived on a day when my desk was piled high with letters which I had dictated and had to read carefully before signing. It had been a week of very heavy correspondence on every conceivable type of problem which is called to my attention by constituents in trouble, or in need of help, in connection with Federal Government activities, which are vast and diversified. The food stamp plan, which I had been responsible for having installed on a pilot basis in St. Louis, was running into all kinds of misunderstandings and, apparently, some bureaucratic rigidity—and so there was a lot of telephoning I had to do between Washington and St. Louis—to the mayor and other officials—and then to the Department of Agriculture. I finally set up a conference in my office to try to work out the details so that the plan could operate more effectively, and with less bureaucratic inflexibility, and less misunderstanding on the part of those eligible for its benefits.

ON A SUNDAY AFTERNOON

Further, I was engaged in a behind-the-scenes struggle with the Pentagon and the State Department and even with some of the people in the White House over the policies we should follow in connection with our rights in the Canal Zone—this comes under my responsibility as chairman of the Subcommittee on the Panama Canal of the House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. Earlier, I had been asked to make a quick trip with my subcommittee down to Panama—where the heat was about as oppressive as the cold was up here at the same time—for an on-the-spot investigation of the very complex, and I would say extremely important, problems in our relationships with the Republic of Panama, and our plans for either building a second canal or expanding the present one to meet the constantly increasing volume of shipping waiting in line at Cristobal or Balboa to cross from one ocean to the other.

And in the midst of all of this work—in came that letter berating me—well, there must be a stronger word than that—denouncing me, on the grounds that Members of Congress were not earning their salaries and should be ashamed of themselves because the House was not in continuous session.

What made the charge so ironic at the time was that I opened that letter and read it in my office—on a Sunday afternoon, and it is not unusual at all for me to be in the office on Sundays—or for 10, and often 12 hours on most other days, either.

I mention that incident today not in order to have all of you immediately get out your handkerchiefs and shed a few tears over Congresswoman SULLIVAN's arduous life of toil—I happen to love every minute of my job for a great many reasons, and have made a practice every 2 years of asking the voters in my district to keep me working just as hard as ever at the job. I have cited the incident of the abusive letter berating Congress for not working hard at a time when I was working very hard indeed, because it illustrates a point I think is valid about most women in this country.

SALUTE TO WOMAN WHO WORKS MUST INCLUDE MOST WOMEN

Today's luncheon, and this week-long series of events sponsored by Downtown St. Louis, Inc., salute the woman who works. While I know that the salute is aimed primarily at women who work in the downtown area, I think the accolade could well apply to most women in St. Louis—and in the Nation. Most women work. About one-third of them work for pay—are gainfully employed—but most of the other two-thirds also work, and work hard, and do very essential work. They work hard at rearing children, and at making an attractive home and good home-life for their families; they work hard at innumerable volunteer tasks in the community and in the schools. Also, among the two-thirds of our women not gainfully employed, are a sizable number who are themselves in schools and colleges training for professional assignments in the future, or acquiring a firm and solid educational background which will fit them for whatever the future brings, and enable them, too, to be better mothers of tomorrow's citizens.

Work? Yes, most of the women we know work—and work hard. So a salute to the woman who works must include the homemaker, the woman rearing a family of fine children, the many women who are assisting their husbands in all manner of endeavor without any pay, the millions who make the great nonprofit voluntary organizations operate as effectively as they do in community and in other activities—the Red Cross, formed 82 years ago by a great American woman worker, the Community Chest, the Heart Fund, the March of Dimes, church activities, and so on and so on and so on—they are all manned by workingwomen who work very, very hard, whether they receive remuneration for their efforts or not.

So when anyone says only one-third of our women in this country over the age of 14 are working, implying that the rest are not working, it is as untrue and oversimplified as the letter I received denouncing me for not earning my salary because the House of Representatives was not in daily session for the week of Lincoln's Birthday. Much of the work women do in the home is taken too much for granted by those who have never had to wear themselves out doing it.

I have been a woman who works all my life—as I know many of you also have been. I have always worked at full tilt—giving any job I ever had all of my best efforts—so I can honestly say, I believe, that I have always worked hard. But whenever I begin to feel the hours might be long, or the effort exhausting, I think back to what my mother put forth in the way of effort and energy and time—and she never worked for pay in her whole long life. But she reared nine children—and she was a strict disciplinarian, as well as a loving parent. She really worked. Today's mothers of young children have many laborsaving devices my mother did not have when she was rearing her family; but I know that being a good homemaker is still hard and never-ending and exhausting work. So no one can ever downgrade in my presence the work done by the woman who stays at home.

ADVANTAGES OF DOWNTOWN ST. LOUIS

However, the one-third of our women who are gainfully employed outside the home—working for pay—are doing important work, too; they make up a very important one-third of our total labor force, I believe most of us here are in the category of employed women. We also share the pleasure of working in downtown St. Louis—although I have the chance to enjoy that pleasure now only when Congress is not in session, and that is only a few months out of the year. But I share your enthusiasm for the joys and advantages of working in the downtown area—the nearness to the stores and theaters and hotels, and the wonderful convenience of the downtown area. Years ago, I fought hard to keep the Comptometer School, where I was employed, from leaving downtown. And now every time a new apartment building or a new office building, or a new anything goes into place here in the downtown, and particularly in the redevelopment areas, I take a double personal pride in it—for in addition to my long allegiance to downtown, I can see in stone and concrete and steel and glass—and in light and airy and pleasant surroundings—some of the dramatic results of the long hours of hearings and legislative effort I have had to invest in the redevelopment program over the years as a Member of Congress serving on the Subcommittee on Housing of the House Committee on Banking and Currency. While the downtown area has always been a wonderful place to work, it is also becoming once again now a wonderful place to live * * * and the rejuvenation which has taken place here in St. Louis of what were once depressing, dirty, airless, factory and warehouse and residential slums—into the beautiful environment now taking shape—is one of the greatest achievements of urban renewal in the entire Nation.

To the men and women of Downtown St. Louis, Inc., who have given so much time and effort and imagination, and who have invested so much money, too, toward the redevelopment of our center city, I want to address a personal salute of my own—right now. I am grateful to you.

Now, with the commercial taken care of—a bow to our sponsors—let's consider the substance of this program today: woman's role in the community, with particular reference to the woman who is employed.

WOMEN WORKING OUTSIDE THE HOME

Who are the workingwomen—we who make up about a third of all women over the age of 14 and a third of the entire labor force? There are more than half a million of us in Missouri alone and, contrary to what a lot of people seem to think, most of those women are working because they have to work—many as the sole support of families. Interestingly enough, however, there has been a very significant increase nationally in the past decade in the number of working wives, from less than 8 million 10 years ago to about 13 million now. In Missouri, for instance, although only one-third of all workers are women, and although only 1 out of every 3 married women are workers, it is interesting to note that well over half of all of those workingwomen—56 percent—are married women. The surveys indicate—with one important exception—that the higher the family income, the less likely the wife is to go out of the home to work. So it is safe to assume that a very large proportion of working wives are finding it necessary to work in order to supplement the family income for a variety of important reasons: to help a young husband with his education, perhaps, or to help him get a start on his way up the economic ladder; or to help put the youngsters through college; or to pay off debts resulting from illness or business reverses; or to make up the difference between a marginal existence and a decent standard of living. There is not too much value in trying to analyze why each and every workingwomen works, because the reasons vary among individuals. I said, however, that there was one important exception to the rule that the higher the family income, the less likely the wife is to take employment. It is this: The higher the educational level reached by the wife, the more likely she is to be found in professional or other paid employment.

Since the better educated women command higher salaries, on the average, the thesis does not hold true that all workingwomen are working entirely because of family economic necessity.

I suppose it's safe to say, however, that even where economic necessity is not a factor, families with working wives find it comparatively easy to spend at least up to the combined family income. What family doesn't?

CHANGING PATTERNS OF EMPLOYMENT

However, the facts as they have developed in recent years in relation to the workingwoman—the woman who is employed—reflect a pattern which is of great importance to the overall American economy. The idea that most women workers are casual employees—young things fresh out of school, putting in a few years before marriage, or in the early years of marriage, and will then retire from the labor force—is out of date. While it is true that the highest percentage of women workers in any age group are those between the ages of 18 and 24—45 percent of all women in that age group are employed—it is a further fact that almost as high a percentage—43 percent—of those between 33 and 44 are also employed. And 42 percent—or almost as many proportionately—of those between the ages of 45 and 64 are also employed.

So what we see here is a significant pattern: in the early years of womanhood, after schooling, before marriage, and perhaps in the first year or two of marriage, nearly half of all young women are in the labor force, working, acquiring skills, earning money for future wants, if not always for immediate needs. After age 24, however, there is a sharp drop. Only a third of our women in the age group between 25 and 34 are in the labor force. These are the years of acquiring a family, and running oneself ragged in keeping up with those human dynamos which brighten the home and exhaust the mother.

But then, gradually, more and more of these women go back into the labor force, back to work, either into new types of jobs or into the ones they worked at before marriage. There is a constant demand for trained workers; it is only the untrained woman for whom jobs seem to be elusive. But a good secretary, a nurse, a good saleswoman or manager, a business machine operator, a trained woman in many such fields, while having to meet and beat down a certain amount of age bias on the part of employers, can usually find a satisfactory position, if she has maintained her old skills or has developed new ones which are in demand in the job market. Millions of women are going in and out of the labor force each year, as family circumstances permit or require, so that from age 35 to 65, at least two out of every five women are gainfully employed. And, believe it or not, about 10 percent of all women over 65 are still working.

DECISION MUST BE A PERSONAL ONE

Many observers deplore the fact that so many women are working outside the home. Where there are young children at home, needing a mother's full time, care and attention, most of us have always felt that mother's place is at home. But sometimes the facts in individual cases may dictate otherwise. Throughout the long history of Aid to Dependent Children, from the depression days of 1935 when the program was enacted, we emphasized the importance and the desirability of enabling the mother to stay home to care for her children, with at least a bare minimum living standard assured through the assistance program. But in recent years, we have found that this policy is not always such a good one in all cases. And so, last year, in a rather historic change of direction, Congress passed a new Welfare program which is intended to encourage the ADC mothers, and other people on assistance, to acquire skills which can be used in gainful employment to become self-supporting. We need day-care centers; we need assured standards in the care of the children—particularly young children—while the mother is in training, or working, and we need more part-time job opportunities for mothers who must work but who want to be home when the children get home from school. But the point of departure from the old program was the feeling that rather than have a family of youngsters grow up living always just on the thin edge of poverty—for that's the best we really provide now through the various State welfare programs—it is better to have the family enjoy a decent standard of living, even if it takes the mother out of the home for part or most of the working day.

We can argue this point for hours, on moral and other grounds. In the final analysis, however, I think we have to agree that this is a problem each family should decide by itself, and for itself.

UNEQUAL PAY FOR WOMEN

But when a woman goes off to work, part-time or full-time, married or single, either from economic necessity or from personal preference * * * perhaps because she has skills which are valuable to the economy and which she enjoys putting to economic use—the further fact emerges that she is probably going to experience some incomprehensible discrimination when it comes to her paycheck. This is not just an impression we all have—all of us who have ever been in the business world—it is a proven fact: in job after job, there is a dual pay schedule * * * one for men, another for women, doing exactly the same work. The Post-Dispatch recently carried a Sunday article on this discrimination, and later, an editorial denouncing the practice, which I hope many of you noticed. I thought so highly of it I placed it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, as support for the principle embodied in my bill to require Equal Pay for Equal Work done in interstate commerce. We passed such a bill last year in both Houses of Congress, but unfortunately, the circumstances of its passage by the Senate in the final days of the Session were such—as a rider on a foreign embassy construction bill—that the House and Senate Committees concerned could never find the magic formula for getting together in conference to resolve the differences in the two bills. So the measure died with the end of the 87th Congress. But I am hopeful we can pass similar, or even better, legislation on equal pay this year, or at least in this Congress.

Believe me, no matter how high you stand on the occupational pyramid, you would personally benefit from the existence of such a law on the books. For there is pay discrimination, and we all know it; there is discrimination in promotions, and we all know it. One of the things all of us can do as working women is to make sure the employers all know that we know of this discriminatory policy.

FEDERAL GOVERNMENT MAY NOT DISCRIMINATE

As one righteously—and properly—indignant St. Louis working woman wrote me a few weeks ago on this issue:

"There are thousands of widows, divorcees, and even single women with as much (and sometimes more) financial responsibility to meet than some of their male coworkers, yet these women must accept a lower wage scale because they are women, and regardless of their abilities. Female teachers, office and credit managers, accountants, bank tellers, professionals in various fields, are paid substantially less than their male counterparts. Yet when these same women pay for groceries, buy an automobile, pay medical and dental expenses, and meet other such obligations, no distinction is made because they are women. There is no double standard in costs."

Naturally, I might add, her letter was written to me in support of the equal pay bill.

The Federal Government, as far as its own employees are concerned, is under a legal prohibition against the practice of wage discrimination against women, and this has been the law for many, many years. The job carries its own salary in the Federal service, regardless of who fills that job. That is the law. But, here again, practice has not always conformed to promise: because for years there have been effective barriers to the promotion of qualified women into top career civil service positions. This is just recently being broken down, thanks to the President's Commission on the Status of Women, and particularly to Margaret Hickey's committee of that Commission—the Committee on Federal Employment Policies and Practices—which uncovered a moth-eaten old ruling from a former Attorney General which permitted Government officials to specify, in filling job vacancies, whether the job should go to a man or a woman. In most instances, there was no valid reason in the world why either sex should be specified. This has all been changed, just within the past year; under the Executive order which Margaret Hickey's committee proposed, and which the Commission on the Status of Women, and the Attorney General, and the Chairman of the Civil Service Commission, all agreed the President should issue—and which he did issue—practically all jobs in the Federal service, and promotion opportunities, too, are to be open to competition from all qualified individuals, without regard to sex. This is a tremendous breakthrough toward fairer employment opportunities for women in the Federal service, and the results already have been rather spectacular; nearly all job openings—except for a very few which logically require men only or women only—are being offered on an even basis to all who can qualify, and, as a result, women are climbing up the civil service scale to positions, of increasing importance commensurate with their training and ability. This kind of open policy on employment opportunity would not hurt any employer, in my opinion, unless, of course, a particular job is simply not suited to women—or there are compelling reasons to limit crews to members of one sex.

IMPACT ON UNEMPLOYMENT

Nevertheless, some people raise the objection that such a policy takes away job opportunities for men—for men who need work in order to support their families. By and large, this objection is not valid. Of course, there are exceptions, but on the whole, the jobs which women tend to train for, and qualify for, and to prefer, are those which few men seem to want to do, or are willing to train for. This may change, as the new Manpower Development and Training Act gets into effective action, because the shortage occupations are, in many instances, in fields in which women seem to predominate. So we shall just have to wait and see how many unemployed or underemployed men are interested now in training for jobs as stenographers, office machine operators, computer programers, school teaching, nursing, the service trades, beauty operator, and so on. Frankly, I think it would be a very good thing for wage rates in those predominantly female occupations and professions if more men did go into them.

Generally speaking, it isn't a case of our having too few openings in this country for skilled people and that men and women must compete with each other for them. The situation is really quite different. We have a shortage of trained men and women in all of the professions and in the sciences and in nearly every field in which long years of preparation are necessary. Of course, this is not true in railroading and in coal mining and a few other industries. But generally speaking, we have unemployment primarily because we have so many untrained people for whom unskilled jobs are rapidly disappearing. Firing trained women will not open jobs for untrained men. So let's keep our perspective on this issue.

COMMISSION ON STATUS OF WOMEN

I mentioned very briefly the President's Commission on the Status of Women, on which St. Louisan Margaret Hickey serves with great distinction. This is the Commission which President Kennedy established a little more than a year ago with Eleanor Roosevelt as Chairman. She said at the time that it would be her last assignment in public service, and prophetically, her words were true. But she was spared long enough to develop a very comprehensive approach to all of the problems of women as citizens, as workers, as volunteers in civic activities—the problems of equal educational opportunities, equal pay, discriminatory legislation, and so on—and all of us, as women, can look forward with great anticipation to the report this Commission is assigned to make to President Kennedy by next October—a study of where we are and what the problems are, with recommendations on how best to solve them. Much of the work of the Commission, of course, is directed at the problems of working women, but not entirely so.

For as we all know, the concern of the women of St. Louis and of our country, whether employed or not, must be about far more than the availability of a job, or the conditions of employment on the jobs which are available, important as those things are. All of us, whether employed or not, have deep obligations as women to our community and to our country. Woman's role in the community is an all-encompassing one. She must be a force—politically and socially—for improvement and reform in all of our public responsibilities: schools; social welfare standards; the opportunities for youth to find a place in society—to acquire skills as well as education; the improvement of recreational programs; the proffering of understanding help for the mentally ill and hope for the handicapped; and care for the elderly—all of these, I insist, are primarily women's concern.

BE PART OF COMMUNITY'S SOCIAL CONSCIENCE

Women may not, in all cases, be in positions which enable them to solve these problems—the solutions may require political as well as community action, and women are in a small minority in positions of political power. But these problems will never be solved without constant agitation by women, insisting that solutions must be reached. When you have those circumstances, believe me, miracles can be achieved.

So every woman's first responsibility outside of her family is to be part of the community's conscience—and a conscience which acts like the one we all carry within us—a conscience which refuses to be quiet when wrong is being done—a conscience which cries out against apathy, and ignorance, and crime, and indecency, and poverty, and illness, and neglect.

"But," you might ask, "what can I do about these things? I'm just one person."

True enough. But one and one make two, and two and two make a committee or a delegation, or a task force. Enough women, indignant enough about a social ill, can organize, and stimulate the civic conscience into doing something about it. In our city, and in every city, crime is an acute and frightening reality; poverty is widespread; ignorance and illiteracy are far too common; municipal services are unable to cope with expanding needs; the voluntary organizations are swamped with demands for help; both public and philanthropic funds are always insufficient for the needs. There is so much which needs doing to make our cities better able to meet the problems of public health and safety.

ONE INDIVIDUAL CAN DO MUCH

These are the mayor's problems, of course, and the board of aldermen's problems. But they are yours, too. Whether you live in the city or merely work here, this city is the nerve center of your life and well-being. Solutions for urban problems are possible—but only if there is a will to solve them, and a willingness to contribute personally to the admittedly high costs of these solutions. Unless we solve these problems, it will require no H-bombs to wipe out our cities; they will just shrivel up and die from hardening of the municipal arteries. And this we cannot permit.

What can an individual do? Every American citizen—thank God—can do a lot: you can take more than just a voting interest in public affairs, you can take an active political role—whichever party you believe in. Work for it. Contribute to it.

Participate in the selection of candidates, not only in primaries, but in the ward and precinct organizations. Write letters to those of us in public life who may be in a position to influence public policy directly. Never underestimate what your lone letter might accomplish.

For instance—and I've told this story often—a single letter to me 7 years ago from the mother of a retarded child, pleading with me to try to help her child receive the educational opportunities that child could use advantageously—stressing that most retarded children could be helped—started me working on a legislative objective which I consider among my most important activities in the Congress—legislation to train more teachers for exceptional children of all categories—up to then a relatively untouched field. Now we have such Federal-aid teacher-training programs for mentally retarded children and for children with speech and hearing defects. My original bill for such teacher-training programs for all exceptional children, including gifted children, was introduced in 1957. Since then interest has gradually mounted until now the President of the United States has formally endorsed and recommended just such legislation.

MANY AVENUES FOR SERVICE

That one letter to me was not by itself responsible, of course, but it stimulated my own thinking to the point where I obtained expert help in drafting comprehensive legislation which later became the guideline for all of the omnibus bills subsequently introduced—and now I think we will finally pass such comprehensive legislation.

Individual letters to me from housewives who found glaring examples of deceptive packaging and misleading labeling in the stores—and every woman shops—were of tremendous help to me in drafting the first bill ever introduced in Congress to attack this serious economic problem. Other housewives wrote to other Members of Congress, and now there is widespread interest in the subject. Again, I think we will curb this abuse effectively.

A woman—a lone woman—doing her job conscientiously in the Federal Food and Drug Administration is now a national heroine—Dr. Francis O. Kelsey. What she did in the thalidomide incident paved the way for a dramatic illustration of how fast Congress can work when the problem is clear and the danger is real. I had introduced my comprehensive food, drug and cosmetic reform bill on January 3, 1961, and for months it was the only bill in Congress to meet head on some of the serious problems growing out of loopholes in our 23-year-old drug control legislation. I tried for a year and a half to stimulate interest in this great problem. So did Senator KEFAUVER. Our efforts were apparently bearing little fruit—indeed the issue seemed dead for the 87th Congress—until the public disclosures of the thalidomide case provided the public stimulus to action—and then Congress acted so quickly, and so effectively, that the results were spectacular * * * a milestone in consumer protection equal to the original drug law of 1938, which, in turn, in its time, was the tightest and most effective law of its kind in the world. It took approximately 100 deaths from a faulty drug—elixer sulfanilomide—in 1938—to spur the Congress to action that time.

CONGRESS REFLECTS PUBLIC

Just remember that Congress reflects the public—and it takes a great deal to arouse the public enough to stimulate Congress to action. You are part of the public—and you see much about you which you condemn and want to see changed and improved. Do you bother to speak up, to complain, to protest, to agitate, to insist on correction of conditions and situations which you believe are bad in our society?

If you don't act—and don't try to get action—you are not heartening to your womanly instincts; you are ignoring your social conscience; you are an accessory to the crime of public apathy. And that's one of the worst crimes of all in a democracy.

I want you to help me—and all of your other public officials—to represent you more effectively in trying to cure the ills of our society and our economy. On the job, or in handling household supplies, or in shopping in the stores, or in leisure time activities, any woman can spot a lot of things which need correcting and which can be corrected through the political processes of our national, State and local governments. Perhaps those of us close to the problems cannot always see them objectively—like the housewife who can instantly spot the dust on a neighbor's coffee table but is unaware that the pictures on her own living room walls are crooked. In public life, we sometimes see only what we want to see and we can easily find reasonable excuses for not acting, particularly if no one is nagging at us to act. Public officials, after all, are human too.

However, in every level of government, a successful official is usually one who can recognize a problem in time to join in its correction before everyone has spotted it. But always—in almost every instance—someone spotted it first—before the official did—and told him about it. So all of us in public life need reliable "spotters"—people who will take the trouble to call our attention to problems as they emerge, rather than wait until they become insuperable. Will you, then, volunteer for this civic responsibility?

If you will, then my salute to you today—heartfelt and sincere in any event—will be a great big hurrah for the women of Downtown St. Louis, Inc., the women of Downtown Activities, Unlimited. For my gratitude to you will also be just that, unlimited. Thank you.

Part 14: Let's Keep the Record Straight—A Selected Chronology on Castro and Cuba (January 23, 1963–January 31, 1963)

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DON L. SHORT
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 12, 1963

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, one of our American essayists and poets, James Russell Lowell, said something once that

I feel is apropos today in connection with our running controversy with Castro in Cuba, as well as his sponsor-dictators, Mao Tse-tung and Nikita Khrushchev, of Red China and Soviet Russia: "There is no good arguing with the inevitable. The only argument available with an east wind is to put on your greatcoat."

Our approach for quite some time now appeared to be to engage in a series of diplomatic arguments and diplomatic discussions with Castro and his henchmen, just as it seemed to be our accepted method of dealing with Khrushchev and his bodyguards.

In all our diplomatic discussions, it appears that we somehow all came out on the losing side—even when temporarily it looked as though we were winning the argument, in looking back at the Cuban quarantine by our Government. About the only time I can recall with certainty when it was apparent we won an argument with Khrushchev, for instance, has been when we stopped discussing and started taking action in accordance with what we firmly believed to be right. Witness the Berlin airlift, as a prime example, when our access routes into West Berlin were closed after a series of harassments by the Soviets of the allies. The same thing applied after the wall was built between East Berlin and West Berlin and it once again appeared that the Soviets might attempt again to close our points of access and free and open travel by the military between the two segments of the divided city. And our latest example of "putting on our greatcoat" was, of course, the act of setting up our quarantine of Cuba—in spite of the huffing, puffing, and rocket rattling engaged in by Khrushchev, Mao Tse-tung, and Castro.

My chronology today concludes the January portion of events involving Castro, Cuba, and the United States. Very soon I will go into the February events.

We find in the latter part of January that the Soviets were busily transforming Cuba into a veritable armed camp—even without the 40 missiles and 42 I–28's which had been sent back to Russia. Their actions were reported by the New York Times, January 23, and also in public statements made by Senator KENNETH KEATING—the man who stated of the Soviets and Cubans that "they are now 10 times stronger than they were on July 1 of last year," and that his information "confirmed by official Government sources" indicated the Soviets had 20,000 men in Cuba, including soldiers and technicians and the force included combat troops as well.

The President was drawn into this new controversy over the Bay of Pigs invasion when he asserted that no U.S. air cover was ever planned to help the Cuban attackers. He stated instead that the plan—which failed miserably—was a strike by B–26 bombers flown by pilots not based in the United States. He denied that there was a buildup of the military, in the sense of equipment coming in from outside Cuba, but admitted that after withdrawal of 4,500 Soviet technicians since October, there was left 16,000 or 17,000 Russians still in Cuba operating technical equipment, building barracks, and acting as a part of organized military units.

Representative MINSHALL, of Ohio, introduced a resolution which called for a joint House-Senate committee to undertake a full-scale investigation of the Bay of Pigs invasion. He indicated that he felt the controversy transcended both political parties and partisan motivations. Representative MINSHALL also asserted that at this late date, honest accurate reporting of the events leading up to, and including the invasion, could not or would not break security.

A top intelligence briefing took place on the 25th of January at which time several Senators heard reports of the buildup of a powerful military and political machine in Cuba over the previous 6 months. This briefing grew out of Senator KEATING's public report of a military buildup in Cuba and made many believe that without his prodding—such a briefing could not have taken place. A variety of comments made by Senators taking part in the briefings indicate the wide variance in their thinking, or points of view, as far as the potential threat of the military buildup. It also indicated the wide variance in the Democrat Party as far as support of President Kennedy's efforts to play down the threat of such military buildup.

Republican Senator AIKEN felt the buildup was much stronger militarily and politically than it was 6 months before. Democrat Senator SYMINGTON stated the big Soviet military complex in Cuba had been constructed over the last 3 months. But Democrat Humphrey, present at the same briefing, claimed to have heard nothing to indicate there had been a significant Soviet buildup. This had the effect of building the suspicion in the minds of the American public that someone was either stretching the truth, or had a good imagination, or that someone was being either overly partisan or overly protective.

A U.S. intelligence report was circulated a little later which described a Soviet ship, *Simferopol* as being the only one which had put in at a Cuban port with a significant amount of military equipment since last fall's crisis.

This same intelligence report indicated that Russia had supplied a great deal of military equipment to Cuba prior to July of 1962—which included the following: "About 200 tanks; around 1,500 artillery pieces; 35 Mig 15 and 17 jet aircraft; and many conventional antiaircraft guns."

During the July–October influx of weapons and personnel, the report stated that the number of Mig jet fighters had tripled to a total of 106, including 42 of the advanced Mig–21 type. The number of tanks and field pieces doubled. Major new weapons were also sent into Cuba—including surface-to-air missiles deployed among 24 bases—4 coastal defense missile systems, 12 missile-armed coastal-defense boats, and a number of self-propelled mobile field pieces

Russian manpower—according to the intelligence summary—mounted from a pre-July figure of 500 to a total of about 22,000 by late October. But when Premier Khrushchev pulled out his missiles and bombers—as a result of our quarantine—this Soviet strength was supposedly cut down by about 5,000 men. But the Soviets were known to control the new equipment delivered to Cuba.

Our Secretary of State, Dean Rusk, admitted that continued presence of heavily armed Soviet combat troops in Cuba was a matter of real concern to the United States. He also admitted remaining Russian forces on the island were a substantial military presence. He reiterated what had been said many times, that "it must be our policy that penetration of this hemisphere by a Communist regime from outside is unacceptable to this hemisphere."

The diplomatic arguments went on—the east wind continued blowing—and the American people began to feel they were indeed being placed in the position of having to "put on your greatcoat."

Our January portion of the chronology ends with statements by Pentagon spokesmen assuring the American public that missile sites were not only broken up, dismantled, not being used for any military purpose, and so forth, but that such missiles, transporters, and missile erectors had been photographed en route to and at port areas, loaded aboard ship, and were aboard ships en route to the U.S.S.R.

But those who urged that we "put on our greatcoats" in the argument being carried on with the east wind, could and would not be convinced that things were as pleasant as the public was being daily assured was the case.

Part 14 of the chronology follows:

PART 14: LET'S KEEP THE RECORD STRAIGHT—A SELECTED CHRONOLOGY ON CASTRO AND CUBA (JANUARY 23 TO JANUARY 31, 1963)

January 23, 1963: The New York Times news service said that Soviet forces in Cuba are reported working around the clock building and improving "highly sophisticated ground and air defenses."

A Washington-dated dispatch by Tad Szulo said private reports from Havana, confirmed in part by American experts on the Cuban situation, relate that large shipments of weapons and other materials are continuing to arrive in Cuba.

The Times story said: "Soviet encampments are being relocated and strengthened, and Soviet experts are directing Cubans in the construction of underground depots, hangars and runways.

"The construction work is apparently concentrated in the main defense complex between Havana and the San Antonio de los Banos Air Base in Camaguey Province, and in the Sierra Maestra area of Oriente Province.

"Soviet troops exclusively are doing the work and some sites are closed even to Cuban military personnel."

In Washington, Senator KENNETH B. KEATING, Republican, of New York, told a reporter he has information "confirmed by official Government sources" that Soviet weaponry has been pouring into the island.

"They now are 10 times stronger than they were on July 1 last year," Keating said.

"My information is that they (Soviets) have 20,000 men in Cuba, including soldiers and technicians. The force includes combat troops."

January 23, 1963: A planeload of 98 Cuban-Americans, many of them children, landed in Miami. The refugees reported growing food shortages and anti-Castro feeling in Cuba, and stepped-up reprisals against opponents of the Government.

January 23, 1963: The SS *Shirley Lykes* headed out of Havana for Florida tonight, packed with 1,160 refugees from Fidel Castro's Cuban regime, the Red Cross reported.

January 24, 1963: President Kennedy entered the new controversy over the abortive Bay of Pigs invasion with the assertion that no U.S. air cover was ever planned to help the Cuban attackers.

What was planned, and what proved to be a failure, he said, was a strike by B–26 bombers flown by pilots not based in the United States.

The invasion brigade thought that this attack would give it protection on the beach, but Cuban jets "were very effective" and the invasion brigade "was not able to maintain air supremacy on the beach," the President said.

President Kennedy also replied to questions about a reported new buildup of Soviet weapons in Cuba. He said one Soviet ship has arrived in Cuba since the October crisis "which may have arms on it, possibly military cargo."

But he said that there was no military buildup in the sense of equipment coming in from outside Cuba. "There is no evidence that this ship carried any offensive weapons," the President said.

Some 4,500 Soviet technicians have been withdrawn from Cuba since October, he said, and there are 16,000 or 17,000 Russians still there, operating technical equipment and building barracks. Some of the Russians are in organized military units, he said.

"Our scrutiny of Cuba is daily," the President said.

Senator Kenneth B. Keating, Republican, of New York, said the buildup consists of tanks, guns, fighter planes, and other weapons but not long-range missiles and bombers.

Keating said he had learned from refugee sources that Soviet military activity on Cuba is 10 times greater than it was last July 1 before the missile crisis.

In the House, Representative William E. Minshall, Republican, of Ohio, introduced a resolution calling for creation of a Joint House-Senate committee to make a full-scale investigation of the Bay of Pigs invasion.

Referring to the Attorney General's comment that no air cover was promised, Minshall said "this tremendously important controversy transcends political parties and partisan motivations. At this late date, an honest, accurate report of events leading up to and including the invasion would not break security."

January 25, 1963: Several Senators said, after a top intelligence briefing, that the Soviet Union has built a powerful military and political machine in Cuba over the past 6 months.

The Senate hearing was held to look into charges by Senator Kenneth B. Keating, Republican, of New York, that the military buildup in Cuba is 10 times greater than it was last July before the missile crisis.

Senator Keating said he knew of no offensive missiles and bombers going to Cuba. But he said tanks, guns, Mig fighters, and other arms were continuing to pour in.

After the briefing, Senator George D. Aiken, Republican, of Vermont, told newsmen that the Russians have built "an enormously powerful military and political base in Cuba—much stronger than it was 6 months ago."

Senator Stuart Symington, Democrat, of Missouri, said "there is a big Soviet military complex in Cuba" that was constructed over the last 6 months.

At the same time, Senator Hubert H. Humphrey, Democrat, of Minnesota, said he heard nothing to indicate there had been a significant Soviet buildup.

Senator Humphrey said there was plenty of blame for both Democrats and Republicans from the invasion fiasco and little to be gained by opening old sores.

January 25, 1963: New York Attorney James B. Donovan returned to Miami from a conference with Cuban Premier Fidel Castro in Havana and said that he was "most optimistic" that about 25 Americans held prisoner in Cuba would be released soon.

January 26, 1963: An intelligence summary circulating among top U.S. officials reports that a Soviet ship carrying a "significant amount of military cargo" docked in Cuba within the past 2 weeks.

The vessel, identified as the *Simferopol*, is the only one which has put in at a Cuban port with a "significant amount" of military equipment since last fall's crisis, the report says—backing President Kennedy's contention.

The summary states that U.S. intelligence agencies have observed shipping to Cuba closely since last fall.

According to the intelligence study Russia had supplied "a great deal of military equipment to Cuba prior to July 1962, including about 200 tanks, around 1,500 artillery pieces, 35 Mig–15 and Mig–17 jet aircraft and many conventional antiaircraft guns."

As a result of a July–October influx of weapons and personnel, the number of Mig jet fighters tripled to a total of 106, including 42 of the advanced Mig–21 type. The number of tanks and fieldpieces doubled. Also major new weapons were sent into Cuba, including surface-to-air missiles now deployed among 24 bases, 4 coastal defense missile systems, and 12 missile-armed coastal defense boats, as well as a number of self-propelled mobile field pieces.

During the same period, according to the intelligence summary, Russian military manpower in Cuba mounted from a pre-July figure of 500 to a total of about 22,000 by late October. This Soviet military strength was cut down by around 5,000 men when Premier Khrushchev pulled out his missiles and bombers.

"Most of the new equipment delivered to Cuba this summer is in the hands of Soviet personnel," the report states.

January 27, 1963: Secretary of State Dean Rusk said that the continued presence of heavily armed Soviet combat troops in Cuba is a "matter of real concern" to the United States.

Rusk acknowledged that Mig fighters capable of carrying nuclear warheads are being flown by Soviet pilots in Cuba. He described remaining Russian forces on the island as a "substantial * * * military presence."

The best U.S. intelligence guess, he added, is that there are no nuclear warheads in Cuba today. But without onsite inspection, he said, "this is a problem of proving the negative." Rusk spoke on the WRC–TV (NBC) program, "Meet the Press."

Although Rusk gave no hint of U.S. deadlines for Soviet troop removal from Cuba, he said, "it must be our policy that penetration of this hemisphere by a Communist regime from outside is unacceptable to this hemisphere."

January 27, 1963: A Republican and a Democratic Senator expressed concern that more politics than patriotism may become involved in investigations of the Cuban situation.

Senator Jacob K. Javits, Republican, of New York, cautioned against any partisan inquiries into the ill-fated Bay of Pigs invasion. He suggested that a special bipartisan House-Senate committee be named to study it.

Senator Hubert H. Humphrey, Democrat, of Minnesota, criticized "rash, partisan, demands for congressional investigations about past Cuban policy." Instead of an inquiry, he called on President Kennedy to propose a "manifesto of freedom" for Cuba when he meets with Central American leaders in Costa Rica next month.

Javits, appearing on New York State television stations, observed that there had been demands for "various kinds of investigations." He said there clearly ought to be an inquiry into the abortive 1961 invasion so the Nation can "profit from what occurred." But he said it must not be a partisan affair.

Humphrey, addressing a United Auto Workers' conference in New York, said partisan demands for a Cuba investigation could hurt national unity. He also said congressional investigations seldom look to the future and that is what is now needed.

Humphrey said that out of the Costa Rica conference March 18–20 should come "an announcement of determination that freedom will replace Castroism in Cuba."

He said the Cuban people have had enough of the ABC's of tyranny—Anarchy, Batista, and Castro. "Let us give them a clear message that we are determined to help them to democracy, enlightened leadership and freedom."

As for congressional investigations, Humphrey said Castro's rise was "a tragic story that will not be remedied by seeking partisan advantage of trying to assess blame on either the Eisenhower or Kennedy administration."

January 28, 1963: Two of the planned air strikes for an invasion of Cuba in 1961 were canceled by President Kennedy, Senator Frank Carlson, Republican of Kansas, told a meeting of Republican women.

Carlson stressed, however, that the United States had not promised air cover for the Bay of Pigs invasion.

Carlson, a member of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, said the Central Intelligence Agency and Department of Defense originally planned three air strikes. One strike, against Cuban planes on the ground, were carried out but the other two were canceled.

"The United States did not promise air cover," Carlson told the Kansas Federation for Republican Women, "but * * * three air strikes were planned to destroy all Cuban airpower on the ground.

"The planes to make these strikes were based on an island off Florida. Some of them were piloted by Americans, others by Cubans."

January 28, 1963: The Peruvian Foreign Ministry today announced that documents found on the bodies of Cuban Government officials killed in an air crash near Lima on November 27, 1962, link Cuba "to a conspiracy of continental dimensions."

January 30, 1963: The United States accused Cuba of declaring war against the hemisphere, and urged Latin American nations to redouble their vigilance against Castro-Communist subversion.

This was the substance of a note delivered by DeLesseps S. Morrison, U.S. Ambassador to the Organization of American States. The note was given to Ambassador Juan Bautista de Lavalle of Peru, chairman of a special OAS committee on Cuba.

Referring to a January 16 speech by Fidel Castro, the note said the Cuban Premier's statement "further defining the Cuban Government's position of encouragement and support for armed insurrection in other countries of the hemisphere * * * constitutes a declaration of war against the hemisphere.

January 31, 1963: Senator Kenneth B. Keating, Republican of New York, told the Senate that the Soviet Union is pressing a new military buildup in Cuba. He called on the Kennedy administration for the facts.

The Defense Department replied by challenging two specific statements by Keating: (1) That a Soviet ship arrived in Cuba last Friday and "unloaded a cargo of armaments," and (2) that there is "continuing, absolutely confirmed and undeniable evidence that the Soviets are maintaining" the missile bases that led to last October's crisis.

In a Senate speech, Keating said "Cuba is becoming an impregnable fortress just as fast as the Soviets can make it so," and they are building to the point where "it will be impossible to get them out with conventional weapons."

KEATING said the arms shipment reached Cuba the day after President Kennedy told his news conference last Thursday that Cuba is being kept under daily surveillance and that only one ship with possibly military cargo has docked there since October.

A Defense Department spokesman said: "Within a few days of the President's press conference last week two large Soviet ships, Kasimov and Baltica, did arrive in Cuba. There is no evidence that either carried offensive weapons."

As to KEATING's statement that the Soviets are continuing to maintain the missile sites they agreed to dismantle, the Pentagon spokesman said:

"Concrete launch pads were broken up and other parts of the installations were destroyed. There is no evidence that these sites are usable, that they are being used for any military purpose, or that they are being maintained."

The spokesman said also that after the agreement between Soviet Premier Nikita S. Khrushchev and President Kennedy for removal of offensive weapons it was observed that the missile sites in Cuba were being dismantled.

"Missiles, transporters and missile erectors were photographed en route to and at port areas, being loaded aboard ship, and aboard ships en route to the U.S.S.R.," he said.

RENO J. CONTI,
Foreign Affairs Division.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, MARCH 13, 1963

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Ephesians 5: 9: *For the fruit of the spirit is found in all that is good and right and true.*

Eternal and ever-blessed God, inspire us to meet the duties and responsibilities of this day with a mastery and a majesty bearing unmistakable testimony that we have a radiant faith which reflects Thy greatness and glory.

We humbly acknowledge that there are times when all life seems to present a withering and wintry aspect and the days are drab and dreary.

Grant that in this Lenten season our souls may experience a glorious springtime when Thy gracious spirit shall lay hold on us with a blossoming fragrance and a fertilizing power to bring forth the fruits of goodness, righteousness, and truth.

Hear us in Christ's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I am recorded as not answering rollcall No. 9 on yesterday. Had I been present I would have voted "aye."

COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN], I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking and Currency be permitted to sit today during general debate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY, SUBCOMMITTEE NO. 5

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER], I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary, Subcommittee No. 5, may sit during general debate for the balance of the week.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

SLIPPAGE IN THE RS-70 PROGRAM

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, on yesterday while in the Committee of the Whole in the debate on the bill that is presently pending before the House on aircraft, missiles, and ships, I inadvertently made an error in a response to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. WAGGONNER] in respect to the cost of the slippage of the present B-70, RS-70 program.

Mr. Speaker, I have corrected that RECORD, and it appears on page 4016 of yesterday's RECORD. I have corrected it to show that the actual slippage costs are presently from $15 million to $20 million.

This figure is based upon a ratio of increased cost to the increased time. The actual amounts involved are the already authorized $171 million, plus $36 million which have recently been released by the Department of Defense.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to note this correction.

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR SPECIAL SUBCOMMITTEE ON EDUCATION

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Special Subcommittee on Education of the Committee on Education and Labor be permitted to sit during general debate this afternoon.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

UNESCO BOOKLET, "EQUALITY OF RIGHTS BETWEEN RACES AND NATIONALITIES IN THE U.S.S.R."

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, on March 7 and again yesterday I commented on my inability to obtain a copy of the infamous UNESCO booklet, "Equality of Rights Between Races and Nationalities in the U.S.S.R."

In view of my previous comments, I now wish to announce that a copy of this booklet was delivered to my office yesterday afternoon with the compliments of Frederick G. Dutton, an Assistant Secretary of State. I have written Mr. Dutton to express my appreciation for his courtesy.

Quite frankly, I had not contacted the State Department since I was led to believe that no copies were available in Washington for distribution, except on loan from the Library of Congress. If he has an additional copy, perhaps Mr. Dutton will want to pass it along to the U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations, Adlai Stevenson, who informed me in a letter dated March 4 that he had "not been able to lay hold of one myself."

TRIBUTE TO HON. WILLIAM CHARLES DOHERTY, U.S. AMBASSADOR TO JAMAICA

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, recently I was in Jamaica and I had the pleasant opportunity of again meeting with the Hon. William Charles Doherty, the Ambassador of the United States of America, whom I had known for many years here in the city of Washington. He is still the same wonderful friend and it was good to see at first hand what a magnificent job he is doing in representing our country so ably. In my meanderings through Kingston, and because as a man in public life I was especially interested, I often stopped and asked the people whom I met just what they thought of our new Ambassador. Regardless of how humble or important the persons were, they knew him and they loved him.

Before his nomination to this diplomatic post, Bill Doherty was the president of the National Association of Letter Carriers—a career that lasted 20 years.

He become one of the most effective voices organized labor has ever had in promoting democracy and the American way of life among the trade unions of the free world. Not only was he a distinguished president of a great and respected union, he was also a most compelling advocate of the free enterprise system among the troubled peoples of Europe and Latin America. He exemplified the people-to-people approach in creating good will for the United States of America in those areas where this country was least strong. While he was still president of the National Association of Letter Carriers, two Presidents—of opposite political philosophies—called upon Bill Doherty's experience and know-how in the international field. President Eisenhower selected him for a special mission in Brazil; President Kennedy selected him to represent him at the famous economic conference at Punta del Este in Uruguay, and also to join Vice President LYNDON B. JOHNSON at the independence celebrations in Jamaica in 1962.

When Bill Doherty resigned from the position of president of the National Association of Letter Carriers, President Kennedy almost immediately tapped him for one of the most sensitive and difficult diplomatic jobs in this hemisphere—our first Ambassador to the new nation of Jamaica. The choice was both brilliant and inspired. As the first representative of organized labor ever to attain the ambassadorial rank, Bill Doherty was going to a nation in which both dominant political parties are labor parties. President Bustamente is a veteran labor leader himself—and so are the chiefs of the opposition party.

Almost as soon as he arrived, Ambassador Doherty became known to Jamaicans as "Ambassador Bill." He has been enthusiastically received and unanimously respected by those with whom he has come in contact. His is one of the great success stories in modern diplomacy, and every one in this body who knew Bill Doherty when he was doing such a grand job in representing the letter carriers of the nation will rejoice to know that he is doing an equally fine job in representing his country in this important diplomatic field. I note from the RECORD that the U.S. Senate yesterday confirmed his appointment and that this augurs well for the United States of America.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON].

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 11]

Baring
Celler
Clausen
Daddario
Davis, Tenn.
Diggs
Dowdy
Griffiths
Harvey, Ind.
Healey
Kee
McClory
McDade
Madden
Marsh
Matthews
Michel
Miller, N.Y.
Nix
O'Brien, Ill.
Patten
Powell
Rains
Riehlman
Rivers, Alaska
Smith, Va.
Steed
Stubblefield
Teague, Tex.
Tupper
Walter

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 403 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

AUTHORIZING APPROPRIATIONS FOR AIRCRAFT, MISSILES, AND NAVAL VESSELS

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 2440) to authorize appropriations during fiscal year 1964 for procurement, research, development, test, and evaluation of aircraft, missiles, and naval vessels for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H.R. 2440, with Mr. SHELLEY in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee rose on yesterday the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON] had 48 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ARENDS] had 1 hour and 29 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON].

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS].

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, this morning I would like to discuss three things which I consider to be of major importance in our military system today. They are the Polaris submarine, antisubmarine warfare, and airlifts.

Mr. Chairman, I also plan to discuss the condition of our continental defenses in this country and touch on what the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LAIRD] said about fat in the defense budget, particularly this budget that we are presenting. If time allows, I intend to discuss the RS-70 and try to put in proper perspective some of the things that were discussed on yesterday.

POLARIS

The first of these is Polaris. Polaris, the Navy's fleet ballistic missile weapon system, has been operational for over 2 years. Since U.S.S. *George Washington* (SSBN-598) sailed from Charleston, S.C., on November 15, 1960, Polaris missiles have been at sea. Constantly ready for launch within minutes of receiving the command, this concealed, yet mobile force—in being—has made a contribution, beyond reckoning, to a stable world peace. The tremendous advantages of ballistic missiles, deployed in nuclear powered submarines, have been readily grasped by the peoples of all nations. As a result, Polaris is accepted as essential to our free world strategic posture.

Soon after U.S.S. *George Washington's* pioneer deployment, she was joined by four nuclear submarines of the same class, armed with the 1,200-nautical-mile Polaris A-1 missiles. Four additional SSBN's of the larger, more powerful *Ethan Allen* class have since sailed for patrol operations, carrying the improved, 1,500-nautical-mile-range Polaris A-2 missile.

These first 9 submarines are, of course, but the vanguard of the Polaris force of 41 SSBN's, now building or planned. A still larger, more efficient class of FBM submarines will soon be operational. The *Lafayette*, launched in May of last year, will soon be ready for sea—the forerunner of a new class of nuclear submarines, larger than some World War II cruisers. Designed to incorporate recent improvements in both the submarine vehicle and in missile subsystems, these ships are about 425 feet long and displace some 7,000 tons. They will be ready to accept the third generation 2,500-nautical-mile-range Polaris A-3 missile. Every important target on the face of the earth will be within striking range of this seaborne projection of national power.

Still, research and development actively continues. Now in flight test at Cape Canaveral, the Polaris A-3 is scheduled to be ready in mid-1964 for later operational *Lafayette*-class submarines. Through extension of earlier Polaris technology, the A-3 is larger, and will be more powerful in its destructive potential. It incorporates many advances, including a new inertial guidance system, the smallest and lightest yet devised for U.S. ballistic missiles. Fully successful flights were achieved in February of this year.

With respect to the currently approved program, the major development effort of the FBM—Polaris—system will be completed during fiscal 1963. Development of a lighter, more efficient steam ejection launching system is nearing completion; improvement of missile accuracy through navigational means is being explored; and further development of techniques to enhance the penetration capability of Polaris missiles against defended targets is being pursued.

It is a source of pride to me, to the Navy, and, I am sure, to all Americans, that this magnificent weapon system has been created so quickly and successfully.

Complementing all other elements of our national military strength, it may be emphasized that these submerged, mobile, missile-launching bases are on patrol for peace.

Someone has talked about fat in this budget. Where and how would we have gotten the A-1, the A-2, and the A-3 if we did not have research and development? This brings me to the statement that without research and development, which is something you cannot even imagine or conjecture, you would have none of these things. Look at the heartaches that went on with Admiral Raborn in the days of his very austere budget in the development of the Polaris system. Had he failed, everybody would have criticized him. But the admiral never gave up even with such an austere and marginal budget as he had.

Now it has come true. It is the greatest thing we have in our arsenal today, barring none.

ANTISUBMARINE WARFARE PROGRAMS

I know that it is unnecessary for me to tell this House that antisubmarine warfare is one of the most important and complex functions for which the Navy is responsible. It cuts across all lines of Navy endeavor. It is a team effort with surface, air and subsurface forces all contributing their share.

The Navy's antisubmarine warfare capability improved during the last year. The new P-3A Orion patrol plane was introduced into the fleet and is replacing the old Neptunes. A new fixed-wing airplane, the Tracker, has started to replace the older planes on the antisubmarine warfare carrier. The same is true for the antisubmarine warfare helicopter carried aboard the CVS. The Dash, the new drone antisubmarine warfare helicopter, has joined the fleet to give the destroyer a long-range kill capability to match the new longer range sound detectors. New sonars and weapons reached the fleets in increasing numbers. Some of these new forces and equipments were used last October during the Cuban crisis to excellent advantage. They clearly demonstrated that the antisubmarine warfare road the Navy is traveling is pointed in the right direction.

Detection and identification of the submarine below the surface of the sea is still the major problem in antisubmarine warfare. Acoustics, the propagation of sound waves in water, is still the limiting factor. As long as this remains true, improvement will be evolutionary rather than revolutionary. The Navy, therefore, is continuing to increase its efforts in the field of oceanography—studying the environment of antisubmarine warfare. While we all hope for a major scientific breakthrough in the field of submarine detection, none is in sight now. Not that the Navy is leaving any stone unturned. Other methods and phenomena are being actively explored if they show any signs of promise at all.

The Navy is not doing this alone in an ivory tower. They are in close partnership with industry and the leading scientists of the country. Such organizations as the National Security Industrial Association, the Institute of Aerospace Sciences, and the National Academy of Sciences, to name a few. All have committees or people actively studying Navy antisubmarine warfare problems. With this team effort every promising avenue of approach should be covered.

The program presented this year is a sound one and should increase our Navy's antisubmarine warfare readiness and capability. Fifty percent of this year's shipbuilding program is for antisubmarine warfare ships. Nearly 25 percent of the Navy's research and development program will be in the field of antisubmarine warfare. As a matter of fact, more than 25 percent of the Navy's total procurement budget is devoted directly to antisubmarine warfare.

The shipbuilding and conversion program contains new destroyer escorts and nuclear submarines as well as modernization for some of the older ships. Further procurement of the new aircraft that I referred to, as well as modern equipment and weapons, will enhance and strengthen our antisubmarine warfare posture. Increased research and development effort will assist us to maintain that posture.

I am pleased that the Navy is stressing this important function to counter the large submarine threat that faces us. I do not want to give the impression that the Navy has solved all of its antisubmarine warfare problems or that everything is rosy. It is still a difficult and demanding problem, but I am confident that the Navy is making every effort to keep ahead of the submarine threat and that they will succeed in doing so.

We had to raise this budget. If we had done justice to the military we would have raised it more than we did. Did you know that we do not have in our arsenal today what you could call a truly modern fighter aircraft for our defenses over the F-4H made in the great State of Missouri at the McDonnell aircraft factory? We all know that we need the ablest fighter on earth implementing the other defenses we have to give us the type of defense we need.

You have heard about the TFX. We hope that from the TFX will come a modern fighter; but as you know such a plane has a comparatively short life, assuming there is no slippage. When you get sophisticated weapons systems such as we have in the RS-70—and we need the RS-70—you are bound to have slippage here and slippage there. This is the state of the art.

We hear about cutting this budget and cutting out the fat, as the gentleman from Wisconsin said. Of course, we join in this. We have the Hébert committee now that is going to be chaired by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. Hardy]. Last year we brought back to the Treasury of the United States over $40 million in contracts that were changed. It happens in all administrations, the past administration was no exception. When you have a new weapon you cannot have competitive bidding, certainly; this is impossible. Our distinguished chairman beats it into our heads every day, day in and day out: Wherever possible have competitive bidding. But this does not assure you of a firm price on an implement of warfare. Let me tell you something, war is wasteful, war is designed to kill. If war is waste, the preparation for war likewise is wasteful, and we point this out.

AIRLIFT

I have had a long and abiding interest in the question of airlift and have, I hope, contributed to the greatly improved position in which the country now finds itself in this important area.

Many of us are familiar with the old C-119 which, although specifically designed for airborne operations, is small and slow and has a short range. We will continue to use these old C-119's as part of our reserve, but I am pleased to inform the House that we are now going to acquire several additional squads of C-130E's which are much faster, much more efficient, and to a much greater extent fulfill our true requirements in the airlift area.

As these C-130's come into our inventory, they will replace an equal number of C-124's. The C-124 also is a useful aircraft and can be used quite efficiently for strategic airlift but it is not a suitable airplane for airdrop operations.

The C-123 assault transport had been planned for phasing out during fiscal year 1964. However, it has been found to be very useful in Vietnam because of its ability to take off on very short runways and similarly to land in restricted areas. Because of these capabilities, it is planned to keep them in the inventory for the time being.

The C-141 which is our newest aircraft in the airlift area is proceeding satisfactorily and we will soon see this airplane in production.

The C-141 will be able to replace our C-133 for many of the outsize items which only the C-133 can carry today.

All in all, I am happy to report that our airlift situation is vastly improved over that which we viewed so unhappily a few short years ago.

In the world today, while it is difficult to set one military capability above another, whatever order of priority might be used, airlift would be very close to the top of any such list.

The bill that we have before us today contains among other things authority for the procurement of the C-130E turboprop transport and the C-141 transport. The passage of the bill will be another step toward the enhancement of our capabilities in the area of airlift.

I trust that this bill will be passed in the same fashion as our bill of last year, and that is to say, unanimously.

We have $135 million for two more nuclear-powered submarines and $363 million for the RS-70. These figures ought to stand. At the proper time I expect to take more time to refer to the RS-70, but time does not permit me to do that now.

There is another area which should have your attention. By the simple expedient of arithmetic your fleet is going out of business over a period of years by block obsolescence of the fleet—the U.S. Navy. I include a part of a report Mr. Bates, Mr. Hardy, and I made on this subject:

VESSEL OBSOLESCENCE

There is a very real likelihood, indeed almost mathematical certainly, that our active fleet will encounter such serious block obsolescence in years to come as to raise a serious question as to its ability to perform its assigned missions.

With this in mind a special subcommittee was appointed in the fall of last year to look into this matter and make recommendations to the full committee. The subcommittee held hearings and issued a report which only fortified the belief already held by the committee that block obsolescence constituted a major threat to our naval power. The subcommittee in its report reduced its findings to an arithmetical formula which is unavoidable in its conclusion.

A portion of this report is set out below. The conclusions reached are concurred in by the full committee:

"SUBCOMMITTEE FINDINGS

"Today there are 860 ships in our active fleet. Of this number 598 were authorized during World War II. The average age of all of the ships in the active fleet is 15 years. Based on past experience a Navy ship may be expected to have an average useful life of about 20 years.

"The active fleet planned for 1973 contemplates approximately this same number of ships (although the composition of the fleet by type will be substantially changed).

"As indicated on the chart set out in the report, 387 ships were authorized between fiscal years 1948 and 1963. This is an average of 24 ships were year.

"To approach the problem arithmetically, one need but take the average number of ships constructed each year from fiscal year 1948 through fiscal year 1963 (24 ships), multiply this by the number of years between 1963 and 1970 (7 years), and add to this result the number 355 which represents the number of ships presently in being or authorized which can be considered as assets in 1973 and the formula looks like this:

"24×7[1]=168+335[2]=503

"This means that the 860 ships in our active fleet today will decline to 503 ships 10 years hence.

"This is simple arithmetic. The result is inevitable and unarguable.

"But, one would immediately contend, no one is going to let this come about. Or, in the parlance of the recent past, 'It can't happen here.' But it can. True, the fiscal year 1962 program was 36 ships and the fiscal year 1963 program was 37 ships, well above the 24-ship average. Then let us substitute 37 for the 24 in the formula and see what is the result. The formula now would be:

"37×7[1]=259+355[2]=594

"Under a shipbuilding program of this size the fleet would decline from 860 to 594, still very short of the year 1973 requirements.

"What is the answer? A simple one: We must substitute the figure 70 for the figure 24 or 37 and by so doing our fleet in 1973 will approximate the size of today's fleet. There is no other way."

In last year's bill there were 37 new ships requested. In this year's bill 41 new ships were requested and the committee added 2 more for a total of 43. It is obvious that this level of shipbuilding must be increased in the future in order to preserve the naval power of the United States. The committee urges the Department of Defense to give this matter its closest and most serious consideration.

We are bringing to you 41 new ships this year. These are not enough. We ought to have 50 plus, 60 plus, and possibly 70 over the next 6 or 7 years.

Look at some of these figures I have in my report. We have brought you only 41 ships. We have now 335 ships built within the last 15 years. This, plus 24 a year, which we are now building, gives us 503 ships. We have 860 in our inventory. Only 503 of them are not obsolete or in various categories of being modern. The life of a ship is only 20 years. If you take a ship and FRAM it—that is bringing it up to date by fleet repair and modernization—you cannot modernize a ship any more than you can bring it up to the point it was in before.

We have missiles and missiles requiring air conditioning. You cannot put that into a hull. You can only FRAM it so much.

These submarines are getting more and more obsolete every day. If we brought in a budget that did justice to this country, it would far exceed the $15 billion we are bringing to you today. We have brought to you an austere budget. You can holler about economy all you want, but I say cut your budget somewhere else, do not take it out of the hide of your military because you cannot afford to do it. And I challenge anybody to find the fat in this bill.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I will say to the gentleman that he is making a very fine, a very constructive statement. There is not a man in this House who served in World War II who does not remember the problems that the men in the battleline had because of the need for modernization of the weapon system, because we were unprepared. If we are unprepared when the time comes, if it should come, we would suffer in a manner that would be irreparable. I compliment the gentleman from Geórgia [Mr. VINSON], and the gentleman who is now speaking, for presenting to this Congress an absolutely minimum budget. I am completely convinced, although the gentleman may not get to the RS-70 problem, after reading the testimony of the committee there is no question in my mind but that it would be foolhardy if we do not adopt the committee's recommendations.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. I thank the gentleman very much.

Now, I would like to say this: Modern warfare is an expensive thing. Did you know that your Army was neglected for year upon year upon year and that we are just now getting to the point where we are modernizing our Army? Ask the distinguished gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES]. He knows. He is on the Committee on Appropriations. Ask him if there is any fat in the Army budget. The Army has been marching, literally, on half soles. We are just now in this budget bringing the Army up to the point of modernity.

Mr. Chairman, we cannot cut this budget. Take our airlift, for instance. We will have to spend over a billion dollars to modernize our airlift. Our airlift had been neglected for years. Our airlift was almost nonexistent.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from South Carolina has expired.

Mr. BURKE. Mr. Chairman, I agree wholeheartedly with the sentiments expressed by the distinguished gentleman from South Carolina. The great need at this time for research and development funds in order to improve our antisubmarine forces cannot be stressed too strongly. The fact that 25 percent of the shipbuilding funds will be directed toward research and development indicates that our Navy is not standing still and is traveling in a direction that will give this Nation a fast hard-hitting force that will be able to deal with the threat of the Soviet submarines.

Forty-one new Navy vessels are included in this authorization, also 35 conversion vessels.

It is important that our Navy construct ships that can travel faster than the present new merchant ships that are breaking all records for ocean travel. We must build ships of increased cruising range. We must develop and design antisubmarine warfare vessels that can meet the test of speed, maneuverability, lower cost in construction, and lower cost of operation. This I believe can be done with the technical know-how in our private shipbuilding industry as well as in our Bureau of Ships.

At the present time some of our shipyards are losing some of the best brains in new ideas for modern shipbuilding. I hope our Government realizes that private shipyards who have the brains and the know-how cannot always continue if every ship is going to be awarded on the lowest bidder basis. While this system may seem to be saving the taxpayer some money, the truth of the matter is that it is serving to discourage private shipbuilding industry from coming up with new ideas, and we could very well digress into having a second-class Navy. We must encourage initiative; we must recognize the ability of private enterprise to come up with new methods that can improve our Navy. The so-called statement of sharpening the pencil could very well be one of the costliest errors ever made. Let us start to amend the ways of the past few years by building the very best in quality, the very best in endurance, and the type of Navy that can meet the challenge of the day.

Mr. BATES. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. PIRNIE].

Mr. PIRNIE. Mr. Chairman, the Department of Defense of our Nation is certainly an objective of highest priority. The legislation we are debating today represents our current response to this obligation. The answer is truly bipartisan, reported out of our committee by unanimous vote. It reflects the detailed study and evaluation of our Secretary of Defense, our military leaders and Service Secretaries, as well as the Armed Services Committee. The bill did not evolve in an atmosphere of complete agreement. Differences do exist respecting the emphasis to be placed upon certain weapon systems. Most of our committee have doubted the wisdom of the decision of the Defense Department to halt production of the strategic manned bomber, thus indicating our ultimate reliance on missiles. Thirty-two members, of whom I am one, view with deepest concern the continued development of the bomber by the Soviets and can foresee a true gap in this threat by the end of the sixties. Accordingly, we have been unhappy over the foot dragging by the Defense Department in the development and construction of the RS-70.

Proper evaluation of weapons is most difficult in this age of rapid technological progress. The breakthroughs have been so numerous and so far reaching that we do not discount the possibilities of witnessing even more startling advances—it is safer to discuss when than if. Therefore, I doubt whether any talent, no matter how real, any experience, no matter how extensive, any analysis, no matter how penetrating, should arbitrarily pronounce a death sentence for a weapons system as flexible as the manned bomber. Likewise we should not be deterred by difficulties or failures. The facts are that we have now solved so many of the problems attending supersonic flight that success is in sight.

---

[1] The ships that would comprise the fleet in 1973 would have to be authorized and appropriated for by 1970. A 3-year leadtime is required between the date a ship is authorized and the date it joins the fleet.

[2] Testimony indicated that barring unforeseen, unpredictable technological breakthroughs, the Navy will have 335 ships, presently in being or authorized, that can be considered as assets in 1973.

In our planning we are troubled by the rapid tempo of obsolescence which threatens the validity of weapons systems even before they can be transferred from the drawing board to the production line. Also, we are faced with equally rapid changes in political, geographic, and strategic balances. We can count on scarcely a single factor to maintain such a status quo as to provide cornerstone reliability. So, the simple truth is that we must be prepared to defend our rights, which are, in essence, the rights of the free world, anywhere, any time and in any way.

We have learned the hard way that aggression anywhere is aggression against us. When Secretary of State Stimson sounded this alarm over 30 years ago at the time Manchuria was attacked, we ignored his warning until aggression became a repeated process culminating in World War II.

As a result, we should have learned that the only way to check aggression is to respond in a timely and effective way to each such threat as it arises. To do so requires a force that is in being and not on the drawing boards. To achieve this concept of instant capability has been the goal of your committee. We would provide weapons and manpower of sufficient strength and mobility, so strategically located as to insure prompt and decisive responses. With this objective in view, we have analyzed manning levels, weapons inventories, and transport capabilities in the light of today's threats. In scanning the zones of potential trouble, it is somewhat depressing to note how little of the world is truly at peace. Danger signals are flying in countless areas and in many of them the United States provides virtually the sole protective force of any consequence.

Responsibilities of such vast proportions entail monetary costs of disturbing size. The burden of expense can threaten the stability of our economy, hence, our ability to survive. The continuing attack on our way of life is as much political and economic as it is military. Therefore, we must keep our defense cost in balance. It is true that military pressure provides the more vivid and spectacular danger but the power of other techniques must never be underestimated. Accordingly, in programing the defense activities for fiscal year 1964, every effort has been made by your committee to insure the security we need at a cost we can accept.

Our distinguished chairman has ably outlined the vast scope of the military procurement necessary to meet our national responsibilities. He has made it abundantly clear that, in general, the committee acted upon the recommendations of the Defense Department in allocating funds for the several types of aircraft, missiles, and naval vessels. Our action is at variance with the Secretary's request in two instances. First, we have included in the bill an authorization for two additional attack nuclear submarines, believing such action to be prudent and imperative. Secondly, we have increased funds for the development of the RS–70. The majority of our committee have been disturbed over the increased emphasis of the Department of Defense on missiles, with less and less on manned strategic systems. The last Congress shared this concern and acting upon the military judgment available to it, urged the Secretary of Defense to proceed with the development of the RS–70 as rapidly as possible and appropriated funds so to do. The opposition of the Secretary to this program, so evident at that time, continues. His conviction is no doubt sincere. Equally sincere is the attitude of the 32 members of our committee who differ with him. This disagreement in no way reflects lack of confidence in the overall capability of the Secretary. Rather does it suggest acceptance of committee responsibility instead of rubberstamp approval. This is as it should be. We have on our committee many members who have served long in their assignment, participating in defense planning during the most critical years of our history. They have seen the evolution of modern warfare firsthand and also, through the eyes of our greatest military leaders for whom a real respect has been developed.

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PIRNIE. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. COHELAN. I wonder if the distinguished gentleman from New York, and my colleague on the Committee on Armed Services, could tell us why the previous administration, the Eisenhower administration, did not use this money for the then B–70 program.

Mr. PIRNIE. I could only speak for the time with which I am reasonably familiar. Perhaps the state of research in any given time period may have had some bearing on it. But whether it was in the last administration or this administration, would make no difference to me. If the military leaders, those with whom we place such responsibility, say that this weapons system has value and should be advanced, then I am accepting their advice.

Mr. COHELAN. But as the gentleman recognizes, we are not arguing the question of whether or not we go forward with the B–70, RS–70 program. We in fact have such a program at the present time, as the gentleman well knows. The question is, Should we proceed with two additional aircraft in this program, and for what purpose? Is any value added in going forward with such a program?

Mr. PIRNIE. I believe the gentleman knows the capabilities that are to be included in the fourth and the fifth planes, and he also knows the difference between the third and the other two. Those capabilities, many of which are classified, have to do with making the plane a weapons system. That is the difference, is it not?

Mr. COHELAN. The gentleman well knows that as far as the weapons system is concerned there is some doubt about whether this kind of project would ever in any sense become a weapons system. As the gentleman recalls from the testimony in our hearings, Admiral Anderson testified in a colloquy with me that his major interest in the program was strictly research and development for reconnaissance purposes.

Mr. PIRNIE. These members lay no claim to military genius, nor do they seek the role of the armchair strategist, but they do feel concern when the development of a weapon of such potential as the RS–70 is urged by virtually unanimous action of our military leaders and such recommendation is brushed aside. They and I have confidence in our men in uniform, particularly our several Chiefs of Staff.

In this world of fast-moving technology the effectiveness of weapons and of defenses can change from day to day. We cannot wait for the ultimate. We must have in being our most effective concept in each important category.

Let us consider the potential of the RS–70 as we understand it to be. This plane would have the capability of travel at three times the speed of sound for long distances and at high altitudes, in a hostile environment either on reconnaissance or striking missions. While so engaged, it would report back the results of its own strikes or those of other weapons systems. The effect of this new threat on the current Soviet air defense system would be tremendous. Present Soviet interceptors, radar, and surface-to-air missiles would become practically worthless, permitting penetration. As indicated in our report, the very existence of this threat would require the Soviets to extend their air defense system at a cost of not less than $10 billion before they would have any reasonable possibility of coping with the RS–70 weapon system. If we do not develop this threat, we are simplifying the defense problems for the Soviet.

However, it should be made clear that if the program is limited to the three prototypes presently planned, the supporting systems necessary to make a weapons system out of the RS–70 would not be developed. Hence, the full impact on the Soviet defense system would never materialize.

Our investment in the RS–70 program is far more than a bet on the effectiveness of a manned bomber as an offensive weapon. It represents our basic study and development of supersonic transport. All of the difficult problems which had to be solved in its construction are landmarks in the evolution of air or space travel. For example, we have developed structures, fuels, bearings, lubrication, and tires to meet the terrific temperature changes incident to such stresses and speeds. Each prototype has contained more instrumentation and greater capabilities. Planes 4 and 5, which we would authorize, embody highly classified and effective command and control systems with weapons keyed to radar capabilities which only a short time ago were termed impossible to achieve.

Our military advisers, who have urged development of the RS–70 with all possible speed, are concerned that the successful evolution of an effective antimissile missile will make our failure to retain a proper mix of weapons very critical indeed. Maj. Alexander P. de Seversky recently said:

> I maintain that for any predictable time the manned vehicle, whether airborne, spaceborne or orbital that can maneuver in and out of orbit will be the decisive weapon in any future war.

His statement and the attitude of our military leaders clearly emphasize that foot dragging in the development of the fullest capabilities of supersonic aircraft can upset the proper striking balance of ballistic missiles and aircraft and can be a dangerous mistake. It is not necessary or wise to take this risk.

We are cost conscious. We do not wish to expend a dollar that is not necessary, but we do feel that the present investment in the RS–70 is so great and its ultimate potential so vital, that it should not be sidetracked until its feasibility as a weapons system is established or disproved. A half-hearted effort will not provide the proper answer.

We are mindful of the size of the expenditure involved in this bill. It represents $85 for every man, woman and child in the United States. The burden of such spending at a time when we are not in an all-out conflict is unprecedented. Yet the cost in dollars is more easily absorbed than the cost in blood if our guard is lowered too far. Our force in being is designed to deter attack upon our Nation and we are convinced that it is serving its purpose well.

We have been assured that our known military strength and our display of force at the time of the Cuban crisis disrupted the Soviet timetable. If so, the additional resources provided in this bill should strengthen further our resolve to deal decisively with all threats to the peace of the world, particularly those in this hemisphere. We are reminded that a significant move of a single ship of our 7th Fleet has on occasions eased critical Asiatic situations. In time of crisis, we must have at our command an alert, well-trained force, properly deployed and equipped with modern arms. This type of security we can and must have. No longer can we rely upon a warning period within which to arm. Only a capability to respond quickly and powerfully will deter the aggressor.

Yes, the stakes are high and so is the cost. This expenditure represents a heavy burden but the heaviest burden of all is our responsibility to adequately provide for the safety of our Nation. I trust we have found the proper answer to this responsibility. Future events may suggest shifts in weapon emphasis. If so, I trust all of us charged with this great decision will be quick to react. The task demands our dedicated cooperation, not stubborn opposition or selfish promotions.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. Hébert].

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Chairman, and Members of the House, it is my intention during the next 15 minutes to do a little soul searching with you, to indulge in some plain talk, and to present to you some unvarnished facts. This issue is a very simple one with those of us who support the inclusion of the so-called RS–70 in this program. However, a principle is involved in which you are a participant, the principle of whether the Congress itself will meet its responsibility in the discharge of its duty under the Constitution to raise and maintain an Army and Navy or whether the Congress is prepared to continue its abdication of authority and failure to discharge its responsibilities.

You heard the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Arends] yesterday make a very dynamic presentation, with which I would like to associate myself. In making these comments, let me say here and now that this is not in any manner, shape, or form or by the furthest stretch of the imagination an attack on the Secretary of Defense personally. The distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. Cohelan] yesterday indicated that this was an attack on the man—it is not. I have unhesitatingly said, and I say it here now that Robert S. McNamara is, perhaps, the strongest Secretary of Defense we have ever had and I have seen them all. There is no doubt he is one of the most brilliant and one of the most dedicated men I have ever met. He is a genious—undoubtedly so. I am fond of him personally and I know I am his friend and I hope he is my friend. But I suggest to you that the greatest friend man has is fire. We cannot exist without fire. But unless we control fire, we destroy civilization. Now let us take a look at the facts. I prefer to take my stand with the professional military man who has had years of experience, who has faced the enemy on the battlefield, who has defended his country when he saw his fellow men dying around him.

I take my stand with them in preference to the striplings who are the geniuses in the intellectual community but have never heard a shot fired in anger.

This record is replete and documented painstakingly and with much effort to develop before the committee exactly the position of the military in the case of the RS–70. For the first time in my recollection the actual vote of the Joint Chiefs of Staff has been made public and is a matter of record. Each individual Chief was asked these questions by me:

> Did you at any time with the Joint Chiefs collectively discuss the pros and cons of the RS–70 with the President of the United States and the Secretary of Defense?

And each Chief answered in the negative, although Mr. McNamara's testimony would indicate that this was a great family affair and many discussions were held. On every occasion except when General Taylor was named Chairman of the Joint Chiefs, the military people unanimously decided that the RS–70 was a needed military weapon. In spite of this, in spite of the consensus of an experienced congressional committee, as of last year the man in civilian clothes overruled the man in uniform. He based it on what? I do not know. Perhaps on the scientific advance, or on the admonition of Dr. Harold Brown, a 35-year-old genius who refused to tell the committee, or identify to the committee, the names of the scientists that he had conferred with. This in contrast to General LeMay who frankly told the committee the names of the scientists who said that the RS–70 was a feasible weapons system and was needed militarily. I suggest to you that Dr. Charyk can compare with Dr. Brown in the field of science, and he thinks it is a feasible military weapon.

This brings us now to the real crux of the situation; this brings us necessarily to what we are facing today. Mr. McNamara has not abused one privilege in making these decisions; he has acted within his powers, powers that we, the Congress, gave him. It is about time we face up to the situation. We either decide what powers we want to reserve to the military or allow the civilian domination as it now exists to continue; either do that or stop squawking about it.

I was very much interested in what is taking place on the other side of this building. Mr. McNamara throws his arms up and suggests that the conduct of a congressional committee is undermining confidence in the Department of Defense officials, so he sends his hatchet man out under the cloak of anonymity to say that the committee was in effect prejudiced and would not conduct a fair and objective hearing. It took the committee to smoke out Mr. Sylvester, the so-called spokesman of the Pentagon—I prefer to refer to him as the "spooksman." A man who refuses to stand up and be counted is not worthy of being accepted.

I am very much concerned with the lack of morale in the Pentagon today. I believe that the Secretary of Defense should be equally concerned with me about the morale in the Pentagon and less concerned about a congressional committee's effect on the Pentagon officials who have some explaining to do.

In my 23 years here and 21 years' association with the Armed Forces of this country, I have never seen the morale of the Pentagon at such a low ebb. The Secretaries of the services are messenger boys. When the generals pass by, I understand some even sing "Twinkle, twinkle little star, who do you think you are?"

What are you going to do about it? Are we going to sit here and be a Congress of negation or are we going to assume a positive role?

Let me assure you that other people are concerned about this situation. Last year the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Vinson], recognizing these dangers, appointed a most adequate and competent subcommittee composed of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. Hardy] and the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. Bates] to examine the situation and find out how far the Secretary of Defense was using his powers. It is all included in this report. I will read you one paragraph from it which shows the conclusion of this committee after extensive hearings:

> Since it is not the function of the Congress to pass upon the legality of public laws, we cannot state that what has been done is illegal, but we certainly believe that it is contrary to the intent of Congress. But more important, perhaps, is that these independent agencies could lead to dangerous results.

The last paragraph says:

> We can only conclude that the Congress has lost control of the organization of the Department and cannot carry out its responsibility unless we amend the National Security Act as suggested.

The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Vinson] stated:

> I have read the foregoing report and find myself in full accord with the conclusions and recommendations.

If there is no one who will give the House an opportunity to vote on this subject, I will.

Keep in mind what we are doing here with the committee bill. Vote for the RS-70. Now what does that favorable vote really mean?

If I can judge by what has happened in the past, it is like going through a Rotary Club's dinner in Saskatchewan, in a small town. A favorable vote will mean as much as a luncheon club vote against an Egyptian loan. That is how much your expression means in the Department of Defense today.

But do not blame Mr. McNamara. You gave him the power. You wrote it into the law. And if you are satisfied, let it stay there. If you are not, take it out.

What have we found to date in the Secretary's alternate program? Nobody here can name me one weapons system that has been initiated since Mr. McNamara came into office which is now in production.

I can tell you the negation of the RS-70 was against the judgment of the military, the Skybolt canceled against the judgment of the military, the Nike-Zeus shoved aside against the judgment of the military. Now I hear rumors that the Dyna-Soar is going to be canceled out again against the judgment of the military.

In whose hands do we place the defense of this country? Civilian control, yes; but certainly not civilian abuse. I was part and parcel of the committee that wrote this act. At that time I raised the dangers involved. I am no Johnny-come-lately.

I heard Mr. Gilpatric last Sunday on "Meet the Press" very cleverly, very adroitly, suggest to the millions of people who listened to that popular program that there was no monarchy in the Pentagon; that the Pentagon was acting under the law that the Congress passed. That is the truth, but only half the truth. Certainly nobody had any idea that this power would be extended beyond what the Congress intended. If we must spell out the authority we mean and intended, then let us spell it out.

Mr. Chairman, these are trying times.

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HÉBERT. I yield.

Mr. COHELAN. As the gentleman knows, I disagree with him on this particular point. But, I would like to ask the gentleman what he would suggest the Secretary of Defense do. Are you suggesting that he should accept everything that comes down from the Joint Chiefs of Staff? What role are you going to cast him in?

Mr. HÉBERT. I would cast him in a role of weaponry to accept the advice of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, who are the military experts. When I want an operation for appendicitis, I do not go to a lawyer to use a scalpel. When I want a writ of habeas corpus, I do not go to a doctor to get one. I go to trained people. That is what I suggest now.

Now, let me say this in answer to the gentleman's question. I suggest that the law be amended in order that the Joint Chiefs of Staff be given the power of decision in weaponry. Keep in mind this. The Congress is involved here. Do you realize this, that you only have the power of negation? You do not have any affirmative power under this act in the manner in which it is being discharged. When the Defense Department comes before your Committee on Armed Services for authorization, under the procedures and under the action which has taken place, all we can do is to deny authority; deny something. But, we cannot add, because when we do add, the Executive then refuses to recognize what we have added. This is not peculiar to the present administration. It was rampant in the previous administration, and before that and before that, and that was the time I raised this question. I raised the question when the *United States* carrier was authorized, and then President Truman canceled it on the urging of the then Secretary of Defense who was supposedly cutting all the fat from a $13 billion budget, only to find that when Korea broke out he had cut the muscle, and we were in bad shape. Do not let that happen again.

Fat in this bill. Where? Name me one single item that can be taken out. And yet in two instances, in the matter of the RS-70 and the attack nuclear submarine, Congress and the committee in its wisdom has added these two items. What is going to happen to them will be of interest. Do we not have something to say about this country? Are we going to be passive people, merely listen to testimony, without contributing what our years of knowledge and service have vested in us? I am not ready to accept that suggestion at all, and I do not think you are. We must go before this country backing the Committee on Armed Services to the hilt. The chairman of the committee, who sits over there, with 49 years of service in this Congress, perhaps knows more about the military than any individual here, and he stands up and says we need this. He said it last year and we backed him, and the majority are backing him now.

Oh, yes, my colleagues, the day of decision is here. Let us be prepared to discharge our responsibility. Let us rededicate ourselves to the fact that we must have the strongest military institution in the world and that we must continue civilian control as we intended it. The Commander in Chief is in charge, but we must recognize what our professional military men say.

Why, coming out in the pay bill next week Members will find great retirement benefits given to our retiring generals. I think it is a waste if we are giving this money out to people who do not know what they are talking about. This is no disrespect to the Secretary or anyone. But it is a plea and a challenge and a hope that this Congress will protect its own integrity and will stand up for the Nation and say that we represent the people, we speak for the people, and we accept that responsibility in the name of the people.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HÉBERT. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. ARENDS. I just want to say to the gentleman from Louisiana that I hope he looks over his remarks very carefully and does not permit himself to be placed in a position where he is any way criticizing the judgment of the Secretary of Defense, for the very simple reason that on the ticker tape this morning there was a statement carried which was made by the Secretary of Defense at the National Press Club where he, apparently because of a low boiling point, thinks we are picking on him as an individual. But yesterday I said very emphatically in my remarks exactly what the gentleman from Louisiana has said today—that I respect the Secretary of Defense as an individual. But the Secretary of Defense has taken apparently the attitude that we have no right to criticize the procedures being followed by the Armed Forces and the Department of Defense.

Mr. HÉBERT. I will say to the gentleman from Illinois that I am very emphatic about this. I am not criticizing the Secretary. I again say I am very fond of the Secretary as an individual and personally I have told him already "You do not think the Congress is a necessary evil. You think it is an unnecessary evil." I have suggested even that neither Congress nor the Constitution has endowed the Secretary of Defense with the cloak of infallibility.

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HÉBERT. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Chairman, I would like to say to the gentleman from Louisiana that I have listened attentively to everything everyone has had to say during the course of this debate on this procurement authorization. However, I do not think anyone has pinpointed the circumstances that exist quite as well as the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. Hébert] has done today.

Mr. Chairman, I want to say that I wholeheartedly concur with what the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. Hébert] has had to say about the RS-70 and the Secretary of Defense, and I do not take this to be a personal attack upon the Secretary of Defense, by any stretch of the imagination. I think it is a justifiable criticism. I personally feel that he has every ability, but I think he is prone to lean upon computer statistics in arriving at his answers. I have not found a computer that has an input for human nature, and I think the present Secretary of Defense ignores human nature. However, I feel that human nature is a very important part of this operation. We simply must build manned airplanes such as the RS-70 and we must not ignore our military specialists.

Mr. HÉBERT. I will say to the gentleman in replying that I have to return to a very well-known Democratic President who speaks the language that I like so well, Harry Truman, who said:

> If you cannot stand the heat, get out of the kitchen.

Mr. Chairman, I would suggest that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Arends] suggest that to the Secretary of Defense.

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HÉBERT. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. COHELAN. I think my distinguished subcommittee chairman, for whom I have a very warm regard, and with whom on this occasion I strongly disagree, for yielding. But I would hope, and I sincerely ask this, that now the gentleman has had this exercise in exposing what he believes to be wrong with the Secretary of Defense, that the gentleman will take some further time before the afternoon is over and tell us what the gentleman thinks is wrong or is right about the B-70, RS-70 program. This, of course, is the fundamental point at issue.

Mr. HÉBERT. I intend to do exactly that.

Mr. BATES. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, we have before us a bill which authorizes in excess of $15.8 billion for the defense of our country. This represents a large sum of money and, yet, it is only a portion of the $54 billion which is to be spent on military preparedness this coming fiscal year.

War has never been a pleasant or cheap business regardless of the context in which that word is used. Its magnitude of destruction has today reached a point beyond the comprehension of man. Indecision and unpreparedness have often been the twins that have led to war. Let us be certain that in our day and time that we are decisive and that we are prepared.

In yesterday's debate there was considerable discussion concerning the solvency of the Nation and the impact of military spending. The balance between what we need and what we can afford is not difficult. The fact is that we must provide whatever is necessary to make this Nation secure. The difficult decision really rests in eliminating those items that we can properly and safely do without. All of us must constantly explore every avenue of possible saving, and this certainly applies to every program whether it is military or otherwise. I would suggest, however, that this will not be easy and I would like to cite some examples of problems that we will face.

A year ago, the Armed Services Committee expressed its dissatisfaction with the Navy's shipbuilding program and a special committee, under the chairmanship of the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. Rivers] was established. The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. Hardy] and I also served on this committee.

This committee concluded that if the Navy followed its shipbuilding program, which averaged 24 ships per year between 1948 and 1963, it would have only 503 ships in 1973, or 357 ships less than the Navy indicates it needs. If the program of last year alone was followed, which was the highest of the postwar years, there would still be a shortage of 206 ships by 1973. This year, although the number of ships increased from 37 to 43, the fact remains that the cost of the shipbuilding program is cut by almost a half billion dollars. We are only building smaller ships.

If I had any idea, or if anyone had the idea, that this was a real saving, we would have reason for encouragement. However, all we are really doing is putting off the inevitable day when a terrifically expanded fleet must be built. In the meantime, our shipyards might well close and we have already lost a large number of our skilled workers.

The committee was also advised that unless the Air Force recommendation of 45 T-39(A) jet trainers was accepted, that the production lines would close down. It would have to be reopened at a later date, and the cost of these planes would be increased by a cost of 25 percent. The money for these planes was denied in the bill.

I only wish to make this point. We must eliminate every bit of waste that can be found in the defense budget, but when we do it let us be certain we are not undermining our security or practicing false economy.

Before I close, I would like to refer to the RS-70. When the Secretary of Defense makes the bold decision to eliminate some of the huge costs connected with defense, we should bend over backwards to support him as long as we are satisfied that the security of our country is not being impaired. This I have tried to do but from the possible effects of such action I am constrained to follow an opposite course.

Years ago, in discussing matters of defense with an expert in countermeasures, I became convinced that a mix in our weapons was the best answer to our security. Once we have decided to follow one course, the problem for a potential enemy becomes much more simple and his defense costs much less.

Has Russia today a Nike-Zeus, or can it develop an effective one? If the answer to either of these questions is affirmative then in those years when the B-58 and the B-47 are obsolete, we must have a weapon system different from a ballistic missile which might be destroyed by techniques now under study and development. I would suggest, that once the decision was made to develop three RS-70 planes, we should be ready to marry the plane with a weapons system so that it can add to our offensive capabilities.

In brief, Mr. Chairman, I support the bill before us. Although we must examine every program to save every dime possible, let us also make certain that in the years ahead when the funds being spent now have become a part of our arsenal that there will be no regrets of our decisions of today.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BATES. I am glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. At the outset of your remarks you said this bill totaled $14,800 million. On page 3 of the report I read that the new total of this bill, H.R. 2440, is $15,856,391,000.

Mr. BATES. If the gentleman will excuse me, I meant to name that figure of $15,856 million plus and the gentleman is correct.

Mr. GROSS. Does this figure include the proposed $363 million for the RS-70 program?

Mr. BATES. Yes, it is in there.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. Osmers].

Mr. OSMERS. Mr. Chairman, previous speakers have explained many parts of the bill before us (H.R. 2440). Understandably, there are sharp differences of opinion among us about what the size, character, and cost of the missile, the RS-70, and the manned bomber programs should be. Without questioning the overriding importance of nuclear weapons and their delivery systems, it is my purpose to remind my colleagues that the only actual and really likely warfare in the world today is typified by such combat as we have seen at the Bay of Pigs, in the mountains of India, and in the jungles and swamps of Asia and Africa. With a nuclear stalemate of sorts apparently in existence, this situation may continue for some years to come. That is why it seems necessary to call attention to a relatively minor, but vitally significant, part of the authorizations now under consideration.

Mr. Chairman, in a world fascinated by missiles, satellites, space exploration, and possible trips to the moon, how easy it is to ignore these real situations that confront our armed services throughout the world today. Let us ask ourselves what use could we make of nuclear missiles, for example, in southeast Asia, in Africa, in Cuba, or elsewhere in Latin America? It is now clear that it is Communist policy, for the present, at least, to use subversion, sabotage, staged uprisings, and rigged revolutions to advance toward their eternal goal of world domination. To deny them success with these methods we need a mobile flexible Army that can instantly meet these threats to our security wherever and whenever they appear. These Communist tactics give Army aircraft an entirely new dimension in our overall defense.

The House Armed Services Committee in this bill, H.R. 2440, is recommending approval of an authorization of $522.1 million for the procurement of aircraft for the Army.

Army aviation has always been an integral and vital part of the organization of the modern Army. Today, however, it is needed more than ever to enhance the mobility, firepower, flexibility, and command control of our ground combat forces. The growing integration of ground and air vehicles now in progress appears to be one of the most promising developments in bringing vastly increased strength to our ground combat ability. The modern mission of Army aviation is to insure prompt, sustained, and successful combat on land by providing aerial observation, airlift for troop movement to and about the immediate battlefield, rapid movement of supplies in the forward areas, aerial delivered firepower, command liaison and communication, and combat zone casualty evacuation.

Mr. Chairman, the Army must move more and more through the air if it is to gain the decisive battlefield mobility it requires to win. This relatively new dimension of ground force mobility uses the first few hundred feet above the earth's surface for its operations. This is also the space where the shells, bullets, and some short range missiles also fly. But this air mobility permits instantaneous reaction to the enemy through the rapid deployment of combat troops without regard to the restrictions of the terrain. This permits the commander in the field to literally lift the soldier out of the mud and swiftly move him to another location for maximum effectiveness.

The very obvious need for this mobility is reflected in the increased requirements for more Army aircraft and additional related personnel provided for in the bill before us. We must also replace obsolete and wornout aircraft.

A recent study of the Army's tactical mobility requirements indicates that this need for aerial mobility will continue to grow in the years ahead. While improved ground vehicles will also play an important role, many of them will be replaced in the foreseeable future by aerial vehicles for the simple reason that aircraft possess capabilities for certain Army tasks which are not available in ground vehicles. The use of Army aircraft in the present hostilities in southeast Asia is a good example. Fixed-wing light transport companies and helicopter units are supporting South Vietnamese forces there. Army aviation has already carried over one-quarter million troops and passengers and thousands of tons of combat supplies in South Vietnam. Enemy ground fire has resulted in only four of our helicopters being totally lost because for most flights the Army provides armed helicopters or other armed aircraft as escorts. Arming these air "vehicles" is an extension of the Army's policy of arming its ground combat vehicles.

The Armed Services Committee supports the increased requirements in Army aviation provided for in this bill and recommends approval of the authorization of $522.1 million for procurement of Army aircraft. For maximum Army effectiveness this authorization is essential and deserves our strongest support.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. GUBSER].

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Chairman, I do not expect to match the eloquence and the logic of my colleague from Louisiana [Mr. HÉBERT], but I would like to pursue the same matter he spoke about so effectively a few moments ago. I shall confine my remarks to probably the most important phase of our military activity—research and development.

All of us know that to stand still in this modern atomic and nuclear age is to invite defeat and that to wait until an emergency is with us before developing the tools with which to meet that emergency is tantamount to national suicide.

Where would we be today had not Dr. Philip A. Abelson, together with Mr. Gunn, not drawn the plans for an atomic submarine even before Admiral Rickover came to the Bureau of Ships? Where would we be today if Wernher von Braun and some of his colleagues had not been evacuated from Peenemunde to give us a start in developing modern missiles?

Remember the old controversy that existed prior to World War II, when certain agencies of the U.S. Government were arguing bitterly over the advisability of developing air-cooled aircraft engines as opposed to liquid-cooled aircraft engines? Someone made the decision that we should develop both of them. That decision later proved to be fortunate as we found that our liquid-cooled P-40 fighter aircraft could not obtain enough elevation to fight the Japanese zeros over Guadalcanal. Fortunately we had planes with air-cooled engines to save the day, and regain the control of the air over Guadalcanal. Just suppose we had had a hardheaded, obstinate Research Department head at that time who said, "No, I have decided you are going to develop the liquid-cooled engine only." What might have happened? We would not have had control of the air over Guadalcanal. How long would it have taken, and how many additional thousands of American lives would it have cost to win the war?

Research and development is probably the most vital activity of the Defense Department. I have a great and deep respect for the intellect and the technical knowledge of Dr. Harold Brown. He is an able technician. But I was amazed to hear him, when questioned by the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. HÉBERT], refuse to tell a committee of Congress the name of the four or five military men whose advice he had sought on the question of the RS-70. I wish I could interpret it otherwise—but to me that was outright defiance. At this point I became seriously concerned as to how decisions are made and how much the military requirement as expressed by the military man is actually considered in making research and development decisions.

Let me relate an incident which is relatively minor. Sometime a couple of years ago the Navy, for the Marine Corps, expressed a military requirement for an assault support helicopter, and the military requirement expressed was very, very specific. It was to have a payload capability of 1,200 pounds. It was to be small enough to fit aft of a destroyer so that the Navy could carry on its Dash program on its Fram destroyers and there were other specific requirements. A private company—and it matters not which company it was—spent $1.6 million of its own money to develop such an aircraft. The Navy and the Defense Department made the decision, however, that they would prefer a much heavier aircraft which cost about four times as much.

I am sure they made this decision for good reason, because the number of aircraft to be acquired was so small that it was better to go ahead with the heavier item already in production. So, I do not question the decision.

However, following the decision not to procure this particular new type of helicopter, I suggested to Dr. Harold Brown that since one branch of the service had expressed a specific military requirement for this particular type of aircraft, that it might be wise to carry on the research and development program so that if we had such a military requirement in the future, the aircraft would be ready. And, under date of June 16, 1962, Dr. Brown, who is a technical man and not a military man, wrote to me and he said that present helicopters will fill the military requirement for the assault support helicopter mission for the next decade.

Now, I want to know, do they teach clairvoyance at MIT? How can this purely technical man tell us what the military requirement is going to be for the next 10 years?

I questioned the Deputy Chief of Staff for Logistics, General Colglazier, during the hearings. I asked him if the helicopter which was presently used in an assault support mission met the military requirement for the next decade. He said "I don't think that I could give you that assurance." Later he said, "And as we go along we may find that we have other requirements."

I questioned General Beach, who is Chief of Staff for Research and Development, and he indicated that the military "would be delighted" with a new development which would meet the military requirement at less money. Here are clear-cut statements of top military men admitting there might be such a requirement, but 35-year-old Dr. Harold Brown can tell us that the next decade does not require anything beyond what we have today. Is this type of thinking being applied in other areas and in major decisions?

I honestly and sincerely feel that military advice is being ignored and that civilians, without proper military experience and military background, are being arbitrary in their decisions and are superimposing those decisions on the long experience of tried and true military men.

I express the same concern, not as eloquently, but certainly as forthrightly, as the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. HÉBERT]. I certainly think this Congress should take a serious look at this situation so that we can have a defense policy which is the combined product of defense managerial ability and practical military knowledge.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to my very good and able friend and colleague, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Bray].

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Chairman, in my brief remarks I intend only to discuss the RS-70 program.

The question as to whether we go ahead with the development of the RS-70 weapons system involves far more than this specific program. As I pointed out in debate last year on this subject, among the other main issues at stake is the future of the manned aircraft in our Air Force. In my opinion there is no question but that Congress should authorize and appropriate adequate funds for our Air Force to continue the development of this important weapons system. Wisely, I think the Congress has for the last 2 years authorized and appropriated sufficient funds for the orderly development of the RS-70. It is no responsibility of Congress that the Department of Defense has refused to use these funds. The Defense Department, in addition to refusing to use the funds given to them for the development of the RS-70, also refused to build an additional wing of B-52 bombers although such construction was authorized and adequate funds were appropriated. So today all production of long-distance bombers has ceased and production lines have been dismantled.

No one today knows of a certainty whether the RS-70 ever will be needed. But the RS-70 is the result of the best minds and experience in our country in the field of the manned bomber. Those in our Air Force, those who have spent a lifetime learning the problems of air warfare and how to deal with those problems, those who are acquainted with the design, use and operation of manned aircraft, almost without exception believe that the RS-70 is necessary and will be well ahead of any other plane in this or any other country. The almost universal belief of the officers of our Air Force and our leading engineers and technicians in this field is that if we are to remain ahead of Russia in the air we must develop the RS-70 weapons system. For some years the United States has held a commanding lead in the development, production and operation of manned aircraft. Undoubtedly this superiority has contributed to the stopping of Russian aggression; how much none of us knows for sure.

It is disconcerting that the United States at this time is abandoning manned aircraft while Russia is building more planes and developing better planes. Despite our present lead in the field of manned aircraft, if the Soviets continue development and production and we, on the contrary, continue our failure to develop and manufacture planes, it is only a question of time until Russia is superior to us. It is merely a repetition of the fable of the tortoise and the hare—we will be the hare which stopped and Russia the tortoise which passes us.

I do not know whether we will ever need the additional B-52's or the RS-70; neither does Secretary McNamara or Dr. Brown, the Defense Department head of research and development. I do know that the fact that America remained preeminent in the ability to make conventional war, including manned aircraft, enabled us to secure the military and diplomatic triumph that we did in the Lebanon affair of July 1958. In the summer of 1958 Khrushchev was moving into the Near East and was backing his aggression with wild threats of destruction against the United States and the Western World. Russia has never been more threatening. Yet, the United States was able and willing to act and we did act. President Eisenhower moved troops by plane from Germany into Lebanon. We continued to move military personnel and equipment by air and sea. When Khrushchev saw that we had the determination and ability to resist Communist aggression, his tirade of hate and bitterness calmed. On July 24, just 9 days after we landed our first troops in Lebanon, Khrushchev attended a party at the Polish Embassy in Moscow where he visited the table of our Amassador Thompson and, in the most friendly manner, remained with our Ambassador for an hour and a half. It was a great victory for America—we had demonstrated our ability to resist aggression not only by nuclear war but by a conventional operation.

Please remember that if it had been some years earlier when we ceased the manufacture and development of manned aircraft, we would have been unable to act as we did in Lebanon. What if the United States had been inferior to Russia in manned aircraft? We would have been unable to act. We do not know what the results would have been if we had been weak in the field of manned aircraft.

Prior to the 1960 election, candidate John F. Kennedy criticized the mass retaliation policy of John Foster Dulles. Mr. Kennedy stated that the United States must not depend totally on mass destruction but must be able to handle "brush fire" wars throughout the world. Yet today we are moving in a pattern of military planning which, if followed to its conclusion, would leave us only the choice of visiting mass destruction on our enemy or doing nothing.

I want us to be able in the future to handle crises as we handled the Lebanon crisis of 1958.

Today we have in the Department of Defense certain persons to whom many refer as the "whiz kids." Please understand that I am not using this term to refer to the Secretary of Defense or the three service Secretaries. I do not want to speak disparagingly of those who are called "whiz kids." They are capable and I believe dedicated men. They certainly lack practical experience, but they are certain that they have the answers to all problems; they are certain that they could not make an error in judgment. These men have made war in their own mind an absolute science. No one will dispute the importance of science in the military field, but Mr. Chairman, history has proved that warfare is not an exact science. Through the centuries we have had those individuals, occasionally in uniform but usually not, who were certain that they had invented a weapon or plan that could insure military success. They placed all of their eggs in one basket, so to speak. They believe that they have taken the risk out of war. Many nations have fallen because their leaders' planned solution did not fit the war which actually took place.

One of the greatest dangers in military planning is to assume that you have arrived at a single perfect solution to the next military problem which will confront you. History is replete with such errors, some of them most serious. I well remember the early days of World War II. I was in the Pacific at that time, but not in the theater involved. I well remember a British officer who visited us and vividly described the failure of the operation in Burma. The British Army commander in Burma had decided that the Japanese tanks could not cross rice paddies, so no plan was made on the left flank to defend against a tank attack. The Japanese tanks could cross rice paddies and the British left flank crumbled. This failure to properly defend against the Japanese tanks was the principal reason the British Army was forced out of Burma.

I recall reading in 1938 about the brilliant plan that Maurice Gamalin had invented which would insure that France would be secure from attack. General Gamalin had decided that much of the action and planning of the French marshals of the past was in error. General Gamalin had a plan which would insure the safety of France—that plan was the Maginot line. Although he was in uniform, General Gamalin might well have been referred to as one of the "whiz kids" of that era.

I could discuss for an hour cases from history where military and political leaders have relied on some new, foolproof plan to insure victory. The problem has always been that no one can foretell what form or direction an enemy will take. War is not an exact science. The Secretary of Defense makes a very convincing defense of his policy. After listening to him, I am inclined to agree that he is right, that we will not need manned aircraft in the future. But I am not willing to put all our eggs in one basket. I am not willing to gamble that he is right. I am not willing to gamble with the security of this Nation.

I do not want to unduly continue this line of thinking, but I would like to tell a story which illustrates what I mean. In telling this story I must give credit to the great story teller, my colleague the gentleman from Florida, Billy Matthews.

Before the commencement of the Civil War, Mr. Sylvaneus Lee, of Georgia, in a speech advocating war against the North, said vehemently that the South could whip the Yankees with cornstalks. After the war, while he was making a speech as a candidate for public office in Georgia, a member of his audience took him to task, asking, "How can we trust your judgment when you told us before the war we could whip the Yankees with cornstalks?" Mr. Sylvaneus Lee quickly retorted, "Yes, we could have; but those damn Yankees didn't use cornstalks."

None of us knows exactly from what direction and in what manner danger will approach us. We do not know the plan or the weapon that a potential enemy will use. Enemies of tomorrow may not use cornstalks. Before too radical a plan is proposed for our war of the future, it might be well for us to give more thought to the trained military men of the past. Let us not gamble away our security. Let us be ready for any eventuality.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. HALL].

Mr. HALL. Mr. Chairman, it is difficult for a member of my established fiscal responsibility endeavors, and record for conserving our human and natural resources, to discuss any program involving additional or alleged excessive expenditures. I would even support across the board reductions in most procurement and R. & D. areas, but I believe experience, honesty and the record should be reported and kept straight concerning the RS-70.

Based on a visit to Palmdale, Calif., November 29, 1962, where North American Aviation continues to develop this modern and sophisticated reconnaissance-strike manned system—at their own expense with the help of occasionally released funds appropriated by this body and held by the Secretary of Defense—I should like to say: In this area we should not hide behind the age-old word game, or play musical-chair games with semantics.

The aircraft portion of the RS-70 is ready to fly. The engines are mounted and breakthroughs have been made on the new principles necessary so the honeycombed skin and tanks can be sealed, and wings welded to absorb the mach 3 plus temperature of friction and strain in atmosphere of near-space. This first craft is ready to fly, and as each of its six engines has developed a higher percentage of thrust than expected, so has each component test revealed safety factors, and proper functioning, beyond highest expectation. One should recall that the flight date of December 1962, was set by the Pentagon slip-stick experts 4 plus years ago, and not by the actual producers. Such dates ultimately depend on funds, lack of interruption and scientific breakthroughs, now accomplished.

Having crawled through the entire structure, including the titanium covered extended neck of this "bird as though in flight," plus the crew compartment and the stainless steel after two-thirds of wing and body, I am enthusiastic about it capabilities; from that of loitering ability as a manned vehicle, to speeds beyond that of interceptor aircraft, and known missile or radar reacting anticraft capability. Now, Mr. Chairman, all concepts must cease as drawing board improvements at some stage, and go into actual prototype production. This is now a fact for the RS-70. It is just as unfair to report it as being under development—or in the drawing stage—as it is to depend on missiles; four out of the last six of which have misfired and been destroyed in most recent tests. I am convinced this plane will fly, will be evasive due to its speed, altitude and other capabilities, and further that the research and cost of this prototype has and will be of greatest value in other developments.

Think, Mr. Chairman, of the inertial factors and forward momentum plus directional glide capabilities of a warhead with fins, launched at mach 3 which exceeds muzzle velocity of a bullet—to say naught of its own inherent propellant and our ability to control its on-target ability. One must consider as a whole the RS-70, side sweep capabilities, and resolution radar—already developed—which could reconnoiter and strike with existing weapons, the entire United States of America in two transcontinental sweeps, or one round trip. The same applies to the North Atlantic Ocean in four sweeps, or two round trips. Imagine this strategic value in isolated ship hunts, and seizures, if for no other reason. I would like to emphasize the features of manned control, air alert, and missile strike—Hound Dog or GAM-2—plus speed, maneuverability, and recall as an all-out initial or postretaliatory missile checkup weapon. Remember we are planning for the future which involves total annihilatory possibilities.

The RS-70 is so fast it can be currently completely evasive while economical of fuel, at high altitudes. It can also be used at low level, based on the newly approved aerodynamic principle. When not loitering and presumably on a run, there is only 6 seconds between the side-sweep or forward squint of the resolution radar, not 3 minutes. However, even amateurs like myself can react to the magnificent portrayal of this electronic sweep and squint within the weapon, and perform the necessary reflex motion to get off a retaliatory—or clean up—strike within two seconds on repeated trials. It is capable of standoff reconnaissance and clean up strike from a safe distance and even in its aft quarters and vectors—where it has already overflown.

Gentlemen, it would appear to me that having invested $1.2 billion over many years—admittedly with repeated interruptions—that we should certainly invest $343 million more for the security of our country and the pipeline or follow-on development of this excellent craft, which is in being to the extent of full equipage; and adding at least the last two RS-70's to our Nation's inventory, resources, and armament. It is fact and not theory. It will require continued divergence of Russian follow-on and dilution of their defense capabilities. Most of all, it is our controlled answer to Russian missiles if in our will we are to await the first strike, and it will indeed be our freedom platform of 1964.

Fire the Department of Defense "whiz-kids," if you will, release the Arthur Sylvesters and the Yormolinskis' and good riddance; even change again the McCormack-Curtis amendment and reduce the power of the Secretary of Defense, but, gentlemen, you cannot in conscience eliminate this vital weapons system.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. CLANCY].

Mr. CLANCY. Mr. Chairman, although I believe the need for enactment of H.R. 2440 has been clearly indicated by Chairman VINSON and my colleagues on the House Armed Services Committee, I would like to add a few words to what has already been said in support of this legislation.

The number and type of weapons authorized in this annual bill are naturally governed chiefly by the level of military preparedness the current world situation demands. The unswerving determination of those who direct the Communist conspiracy to attain their announced goals convincingly proves that we cannot risk letting down our guard. We must maintain a defense posture that is capable of meeting any crisis or emergency that may arise anywhere in the world. This need is dramatically illustrated by the Communist threat existing today only 90 miles from our shores.

The adversaries of freedom have made tremendous progress in the technology of mass destruction. We must, therefore, more than ever before in our Nation's history, have in our military inventory sufficient weapons and force to survive a massive nuclear attack and to deliver a decisive counterblow.

The Committee on Armed Services had conducted extensive hearings to determine the requirements of the military departments for new equipment and for continuing research. This bill is the result of those hearings, at which detailed presentations were made by our military chiefs and by key civilian officials of the Defense Establishment.

In this bill we are specifically authorizing research funds in addition to those for procurement. Well over $3 billion of the $15,856,391,000 expenditure authorized by H.R. 2440 is for research, development and related activities. This sum includes the committee amendment authorizing the investment of $363,700,000 for use in developing two additional airframes of the RS-70 bomber and supporting systems, designed to demonstrate this aircraft's value as a strategic weapons system. This is a wise amendment which I wholeheartedly endorse.

The committee has taken the position that our national defense effort, to be truly effective, must be based on a balanced and flexible military force—a force that can be employed at any time and at any place, either wholly or in part, to effectively counter any type of aggression, be it guerrilla warfare or nuclear attack. To that end, we have stressed the grave importance of not relying entirely on our missile capability for our military strength.

Manned strategic aircraft would greatly enhance operational flexibility by allowing recall of an attack or redirection, making possible greater control and discretion in the use of nuclear weapons, stepped-up airborne alerts and large-scale maneuvers, wartime assessment of target damage, location and destruction of mobile targets, a close matching of the weapon to the target and, if necessary, the use of very-high-yield warheads.

Those who would leave strategic bombers to die a slow death should not forget that the RS–70's strike power will be greatly enhanced by these extraordinary reconnaissance aids and by its potential in the area of communications.

I think it is important to note that the Joint Chiefs of Staff, with one exception, supported the development of the RS–70 at a substantially higher level than that currently planned under the program of the Secretary of Defense.

To demonstrate the wisdom of this program I call to the attention of the Members of the House factual information with respect to the performance of the J–93 engine which will power the RS–70. Needless to say, there are many features of this engine which cannot be disclosed at this time for security reasons.

The J–93 engine is a lightweight afterburning turbojet which has been designed for sustained mach 3 cruise operation as well as for high takeoff thrust. It will operate in an environment in which temperatures vary from subzero at sea level to intense heat at mach 3 at an altitude of more than 70,000 feet. The extensive technological developments unique to the J–93 make it, I believe, the most outstanding turbojet product in the world today.

The J–93 has completed three initial qualification tests. Additional tests were conducted to qualify improved life, hardware and reliability. Although the engine has not yet been flown, it has successfully completed over 3,000 hours of engine operation, nearly 600 of which have been at simulated high Mach conditions. This includes development testing and altitude performance tests conducted at Arnold Engineering Development Center. In the altitude performance tests the airflow through and around the engine was heated to air vehicular temperatures of more than 550° F. Results of these tests clearly demonstrate that the engine has met or exceeds performance guarantees in terms of power output and fuel consumption.

A number of engines were delivered to North American Aviation during the period of June to August 1962. The J–93, with its breakthroughs and operating temperatures, performance and environmental capabilities, provides a stepping stone of technology for the next generation of air breathing propulsion systems. Additional improvements are being studied for potential applications for large subsonic cargo aircraft to very high mach turboramjet applications.

While we recognize the capabilities of the Secretary of Defense, we do think that he has erred in his decision with respect to the RS–70, and we sincerely hope that once again Congress will approve this legislation which would make it possible to proceed with development of the RS–70 bomber as a full weapons system.

The legislation before us today is consistent with maintenance of a military posture sufficient to deter aggression on the part of those who strive for world domination. The price of national security is high indeed, but it must be paid.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CLANCY. I yield.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, may I, on behalf of the Ohio delegation, congratulate the gentleman [Mr. CLANCY] on one of the most able speeches which has yet been made on this bill. We are very proud of the services he has rendered both in the Committee on Armed Services, and on the floor, in regard to this legislation. He has helped all of us by his very able presentation and explanation of the matter before us.

Mr. CLANCY. I thank the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. STAFFORD].

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I support H.R. 2440 and the committee amendments. The total authorizations for ships, planes, missiles, and research and development, in the amount of $15,856,391,000, is, of course, an enormous amount of money. I wish the state of the world were such that a much smaller amount could be adequate. It is not.

The hearings before the Armed Services Committee have convinced this Member that any lower ceiling for authorizations would not permit the adequate arming of this country to face the possible eventualities of the next year. I support these authorizations out of an abiding conviction that these steps must be taken.

It may be asked how I can support these authorizations and continue to cry for lower national expenditures. For I have repeatedly expressed my concern at the present size of our national debt, and at the planned deficit of nearly $12 billion for the fiscal 1964 budget. Continuous deficit financing can eventually bring us to national disaster as fully as can our enemies from outside.

I recognize that the appropriations under this authorization will constitute a share of the fiscal 1964 deficit, unless offset by cuts elsewhere.

I am especially mindful of the fact that this authorization contains $497,700,000 more than the Department of Defense has requested, $363,700,000 for development of two additional RS–70 airplanes with associated electronic gear and missiles, and $134 million for two additional hunter-killer type atomic submarines.

Just recently this Member voted against a supplemental appropriation of more than a half billion dollars for the Commodity Credit Corporation. I did so knowing we had to draw the line on expenditures, knowing we had to set priorities for spending. And I believe that the authorizations in this bill here today should receive No. 1 priority.

Much has already been said by the distinguished chairman and colleagues of the Committee on Armed Services with reference to the additional items contained in this bill, and with respect to the necessity for them.

I propose to add only this. Late last fall, I spent 2 weeks with the antisubmarine forces of the Navy. As has been pointed out, Soviet submarines numbering several times the size of the group with which Hitler started World War II constitute the main threat to our use of international sealanes, and present a growing missile threat to our continent.

Preparing to meet this threat, which is beginning to contain significant numbers of nuclear Russian submarines, is not a glamorous undertaking. Our antisubmarine forces attract little public attention. But they work long, difficult hours on tasks directly related to the survival of this country. They cannot do the job without modern weapons. One such vital weapon is the nuclear attack submarine.

Six such submarines next year are not enough—eight just barely fill the need.

The necessity is so great, I believe, that our desire for a balanced budget must in this case be subordinated to the need, and reductions in spending must be made in other areas of less urgency with respect to our survival.

The same may be said of the RS–70. The case for this airplane has been most ably presented by the chairman of our committee and others. We strongly believe that our country must have the option to build the RS–70 during the latter 1960's, if circumstances require it. Without these additional funds that option will not exist and the days of the strategic bomber will be limited to the service life of existing B–52's and B–58's.

The RS–70 concept not only offers us the prospect of a very advanced manned bomber, with highly sophisticated electronic equipment, but its development will rapidly advance the state of technology in airplanes, engines and navigational gear which can be applied to the construction of civilian supersonic airplanes for the next decade.

Mr. Chairman, big as the authorization is in the bill, I urge its passage. It constitutes less than one-third of the total proposed military budget, but a most important and vital part it is. I believe it may be possible to make some cuts elsewhere in appropriations for the Department of Defense and in other governmental areas, to not only offset the additional sums contained in this bill, but to make significant reductions in the overall budget costs for fiscal 1964.

Our military hardware, however, is no place to have a clearance sale.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. FOREMAN].

Mr. FOREMAN. Mr. Chairman, too many times I believe we have been giving a blank check to the Department of Defense for any or everything they want or request. This is not good business management of either the taxpayer's money or of the establishment of the best or most effective military posture.

I am not convinced that we are getting our money's worth in our defense spending, particularly in the broad field of research, testing, and development. I am concerned that we do not have a more close coordination of the research, test, and development programs of the various services. It appears to me that there is considerable overlap of projects in the various services in this field of research, testing, and development.

Our very capable chairman of the House Armed Services Committee, the distinguished gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON], has assured me, however, that he has appointed a special subcommittee to investigate this situation and will actively pursue an immediate program to initiate efficiencies not only in research, testing, and development but in all departments of defense spending. The Defense Department and the various military departments have given us this assurance, also.

Mr. Chairman, I will support this authorization, H.R. 2440, today, but this action in no manner indicates my willingness to support an appropriation bill if studies that are now underway, confirm my thinking that this amount of expenditure is unnecessary to maintain a strong military posture.

Now, briefly, I would like to address you on the question of the necessity of the additional appropriation for the RS-70, which appears to be the greatest point of disagreement on this bill. I am proud to be known as a conservative, watchful of the Federal taxpayers' dollars expended by this great body of the representatives of our people, but I do favor the extension of the RS-70 program.

I favor the additional appropriation for the development of the RS-70 and the accompanying weapons systems for three basic reasons, and I am going to put them to you simply.

First of all, it is a good investment. We have spent $1.3 billion developing three planes, and all we have is just a plane that will fly fast. Now, where I come from, in Texas, if you were in the drilling business and you went out and spent $1.3 billion to build a big substructure and derrick for drilling oil wells, you do not have much until you hook up the complete drilling system and get it running. By investing $1.2 billion in addition to the $1.3 billion we already have, we will not only get three rigs but five rigs ready to drill, complete with pumps, pits, draw works, and related necessary equipment. I say this is a wise investment. We have the substructure; we have the derricks, and now we need the equipment to make this thing work.

The second point is in the area of enemy defense spending. The effect which the development of the RS-70 weapons system would have on the enemy would be great. The current Soviet air defense system of Soviet interceptors, radar, and surface-to-air missiles would be so seriously degraded by the capabilities of the RS-70 as to become practically worthless. Those defenses could be penetrated beyond all doubt. What we are saying is we are going to put them on the defensive for once if we develop this RS-70, and let them do a little of this defense spending. Let them start developing some new interceptors, radar, and surface-to-air missiles and try to knock these things down. Make them go into deficit spending for defense for a change.

My third point is this: All members of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, with the exception of the new Chairman, supported the development of the RS-70. And I think they know more about what is going on than civilians do. It is recognized that there is some difference of opinion as to precisely what the Joint Chiefs of Staff supported.

But in the report Members will find that there is no doubt that the Joint Chiefs, without a single exception noted, supported the development of the RS-70 at a substantially higher level of development than that currently planned under the program of the Secretary of Defense.

Mr. Chairman, these are the three reasons why I favor the continued development of the RS-70. Personally, I would like to see us include the RS-70 program and the advanced killer subs in this bill, but do it by trimming in other areas so that we stay within, or below, the administration's request.

Mr. Chairman, as for me, I can see no logic whatever, in the thinking of the fuzzy-eyed negotiators and the lily-livered diplomats who propose we stop our arms buildup and turn our military equipment and forces over to a one-world U.N. force.

Mr. Chairman, I want no part of this give-in, no-win policy toward communism.

The development of this advanced arms superiority, including the RS-70, will assure the world that we are not now only the strongest Nation in the world, but that we also intend to stay the strongest Nation in the world, the strongest, most powerful Nation, not so other nations will fear us, but so that we may be respected to have the strength and the guts and the will to stand up for freedom here and around the world.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD].

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, I want to be certain it is specifically understood that what we are considering here today is an authorization bill. Not one penny will be appropriated for expenditure if the House and subsequently the Senate enacts this bill as it is—not one penny.

Mr. Chairman, if this bill becomes law, then the Committee on Appropriations can and will take action on all of the items contained in the bill for fiscal year 1964, as well as numerous other items which will carry the Defense Department request up to the $52-billion-plus program that the President has recommended.

Then we have a third step: Even if the Congress appropriates the money, no Chief Executive under current interpretation has a mandatory obligation to spend it for any program or policy. So, this bill is the first in three steps that must be taken in the Congress and subsequently in the executive branch of the Government.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to confine my remaining remarks primarily to the committee amendment involving the RS-70. It is my intention to vote for this amendment for the reason that I believe it wise in an authorization bill for the executive branch of the Government to have ample leeway over and above what even they have programed for the next fiscal year.

As was indicated in the request by the President and by Mr. McNamara, there is no new authorization or funds in the fiscal 1964 request for the RS-70. Under current plans they will have carryover from fiscal 1963 of around $81 million, as I recall the figure. However, in this bill the committee is recommending an additional $373.7 million authorization. I see no harm whatsoever in this extra authorization being on the statute books.

Under no circumstances, however, do I want my last statement to indicate that I intend as a member of the Defense Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations to recommend or approve additional money of this magnitude in fiscal year 1964. I will make that determination as to the specific appropriation after we have concluded our hearings and considered the matter in the Subcommittee for Defense Appropriations. This will come 2 or 3 months from now. However I think it is wise to have a little leeway over and above what the President has recommended for authorization so that our committee and the Congress can have an opportunity if it wants to do so to go higher than the President and Secretary of Defense McNamara have proposed.

Mr. Chairman, there is an even more important point: Suppose the Congress did not authorize more than what the President recommended, and suppose that the Congress did not appropriate any more money than the President recommended, and then Congress adjourned? Come October or November, subsequent to adjournment, it is perfectly conceivable that circumstances might be such that the President and the Department of Defense would want to spend money for the RS-70 over and above the $81 million, which represents the current anticipated carryover of the authorization and appropriation. Unless we have an authorization for more than has been proposed they could not spend a penny more. But if we are wise enough to give them the extra leeway on the authorization, and even if we did not appropriate the extra money in the appropriation bill, there is a safety valve in the Appropriation Act. This, Mr. Chairman, this is the crux of the matter. For a number of years the Congress has included in the appropriation bill a provision known as the emergency fund. The Congress traditionally gives $150 million a year in emergency funds, not earmarked for any program, project or policy. It is for the President and the Secretary of Defense to use as they see fit to meet emergencies, to take care of breakthroughs, to handle any one of a multitude of problems which could not be foreseen when the budget was put together. In addition they have an extra $150 million of transfer authority in the emergency fund. So they have $300 million that can be utilized, providing they have additional authorization. But if you hamstring them authorizationwise then they cannot use the emergency fund to take care of the breakthroughs or problems relating thereto.

So, as I see the picture, it is perfectly sound to give a greater authorization providing we make no commitment at this time that money will be forthcoming in an equal amount. This can be decided subsequently when we consider the appropriation bill.

May I conclude by saying this. Unfortunately I was not on the floor when several of my colleagues, both Republican and Democratic, made some comments concerning the Secretary of Defense and his administration of this vast and important program. I know the members of this committee have had differences with the Secretary of Defense. May I say that I have had differences with the Secretary of Defense. And if you read the testimony, which will be forthcoming shortly from our Subcommittee on Appropriations for the Army, Navy, and Air Force you will find that we have had very serious differences, Mr. McNamara and I. On the other hand, I want to say without hesitation or qualification that in my judgment he is a most competent, conscientious, honorable, dedicated American citizen. We are extremely fortunate to have a man with those outstanding characteristics in the office of Secretary of Defense. Under no circumstances would I want these comments to be interpreted as an endorsement of all the recommendations or policies that he has submitted in the past or will for the future. I expect to differ with him many times. But such differences of opinion in no way detract from my admiration or respect for Bob McNamara. He is a fine, fine person doing a terribly tough job. It would be unfortunate for a man of this competence, this dedication and this patriotism to be pictured in the wrong light. I hope and trust, and I sincerely believe, that my colleagues who have spoken here today did not intend under any circumstances to create the wrong impression even though as members of the legislative branch they may differ and differ seriously with some of his recommendations.

In conclusion, despite my differences with the Secretary of Defense I believe he has handled a most difficult job commendably. I hope his decisions are sound because our future security rests on many of these judgments.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. Laird].

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Chairman, yesterday in the discussion on this bill I was asked to state some specifics on ways in which we could save tax dollars in the procurement account of the Department of Defense. First I would like to say that I concur in the sentiments expressed by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Ford]. I believe that it is a good idea for us to include authorizing language in this bill, a broad enough umbrella, so that if there are any breakthroughs as far as the RS–70 is concerned, we will be able to go forward with this program while the Congress is not in session.

The RS–70 program and also the two attack submarines could have been funded within the $15.3 billion authorization request which was made by the President of the United States. The President requested a total overall figure of $15.3 billion for procurement and R.D.T. & E. The Committee on Armed Services has raised this amount to $15.8 billion. This increase is subject to serious criticism which I have of this piece of legislation. I do not believe that any real effort was made in drafting this bill to establish the correct priorities within the $15.3 billion authorizing request made by the President of the United States.

Let us look at this procurement budget of the Department of Defense.

Mr. Chairman, there is no question that the procurement authorization in this bill can be cut by forcing the Defense Establishment to go to more competitive bidding. Less than 40 percent of the total defense procurement is awarded on a competitive price basis at the present time.

Over 30 percent of the total prime contract awards are done on a wasteful cost-plus-fixed-fee basis.

In the current fiscal year the Navy, on their own volition, struck from their shipbuilding program a nuclear-powered guided-missile frigate at a cost of almost $200 million.

The General Accounting Office is constantly forwarding to the Congress examples of gross waste in procurement and procurement methods in the Department of Defense. We all remember, for example, the episode of not too long ago, when the Air Force bought large numbers of firetrucks when the Army was maintaining a large number in excess of their needs and which could have been used by the Air Force.

It is not unusual for one service to procure an item on a noncompetitive high-cost basis while another service is procuring the same or a similar item on a competitive basis at a much lower cost. For example, here is a report showing Navy purchase of certain aircraft engine bearings on a noncompetitive basis from the aircraft engine manufacturer while at the same time the Air Force had advised the Navy that these items could be purchased competitively at the cost of about one-third less than the price the Navy proposed to pay.

The complex and vast armed services procurement regulations need careful monitorship to see that they assure the Government obtaining the lower price from efficient procedures. This is not always the case. For example, here is a report with reference to the procurement of certain radio sets by the Army in which the lower bidder was disqualified for a technical reason resulting in a higher cost to the Government. The bidder in this case was disqualified because he did not properly list use of some $14,000 worth of Government-owned property in his possession. The cost to the Government of awarding to the next producer was almost $200,000.

The Hébert subcommittee of the House Armed Services Committee over the past several years has pointed out time and again, as has the House Appropriations Committee, the need for more competitive purchases of aircraft spares and spare parts. You will remember many of their classic examples of where the services were purchasing costly parts when ordinary hardware types would have sufficed. Fortunately, these investigations have resulted in some savings in this area, but there is much remaining to be done.

Careful monitorship of costs presented to the Government is not always the case and requires much attention. The Navy awarded contracts to Westinghouse for pumps and casings for nuclear submarines at prices totaling $8.7 million. Westinghouse subcontracted this to one of their own departments. Cost estimates prepared by the manufacturing department of Westinghouse indicated that prices $2.2 million lower than those accepted would have covered costs and afforded a profit at the rate of 10 percent.

Of necessity the services award contracts for vast amounts of common type items, such as motor generators. Proper review is not being made in all instances of the inventory of many of these items prior to new purchases. For example, the Army proposed to purchase certain generator sets in the amount of $6.3 million. Investigation by the General Accounting Office disclosed that in the Navy and Corps of Engineers inventory there were generators which could be used in lieu of this purchase. As a result, over $6 million of available generators were found in stock to meet this requirement.

Another report with reference to the procurement of aircraft tires for the Air Force and Navy points out that in 1 year $10 million could have been saved had the services followed competitive procurement for these tires as they had in the past.

Another report with reference to the procurement of AN/SPS 10 radar shows $3.9 million wasted under original sole-source Navy procurement. Under subsequent open competition, original Navy-negotiated price dropped from $40,000 per system price to $17,083 per system price. Under original sole-source procurement, 242 units were bought at $33,297 per system.

AN/SPS 10 radar: The Navy negotiated an original $40,000 per system price with DuMont and Sylvania on this procurement. This price subsequently fell to $17,083 per system when open competition was introduced, and Daystrom, Inc. won the contract. This represented a difference of 58 percent between high and low price. As examples, contract NObsr 52321 awarded a contract to Sylvania to produce 185 units at a price of $27,000 per system, or a total price of approximately $5 million. A subsequent award, NObsr 75399, was for 57 units at a total cost of $1,898,620 or $33,297 per unit. When Daystrom won its contract in open competition, the price dropped $17,083 per unit, at which time a Bureau of Ships civilian employee, Dean S. Young, indicated in an official report that the successful bidder could not make a profit on the item. Subsequent procurement found the price in the same general area under conditions of open competition, indicating that sole-source procurement cost the taxpayers millions.

Summary: Using the price of $33,297 per unit for a total of 242 units bought under sole-source procurement methods mentioned above, the taxpayers paid out a total of over $3.9 million more than necessary to buy this equipment, almost a 50-percent overall loss in this one instance. Even using the lowest sole-source price does little to brighten the picture, proving again that open competition serves the best interest of the taxpayer and prevents any possible duplicity by procurement agency employees.

Another report with reference to the procurement of AN/APS 88 airborne radar sets shows $561,000 wasted. Original sole-source transaction had estimated price of $32,000 per system. This was adjusted downwards to $30,000 for a total of 51 systems, costing $1,440,843. Subsequently, Navy advertised for 57 additional systems of same equipment. Under open competition, price became $17,247 per system for 57 systems for a total cost of $984,000. Thus, in first sole-source award, taxpayers lost a total of $561,000 in inflated prices.

In the procurement of AN/PDR 43 radiac sets shows $600,000 wasted needlessly. Electronic Products Co. of Mt. Vernon, N.Y., developed and produced 6 preproduction units and 44 production units for total award of $87,195.76. Three follow-on awards on sole-source basis purchased substantial quantities at prices ranging from $490 to $657. When open competition was introduced, the price fell to $247.20 and still later it dropped to $217.53. Cost was thus reduced by some 60 percent. Under sole-source, Navy purchased 1,500 units with average price of $600 per set for a total expenditure of almost $900,000. Under open competition, it was established that these same sets could have been purchased for a total price of about $325,000.

In the procurement of AN/WRT 1 and AN/WRT 2 radio sets shows some $15 million wasted. Sole-source contract was awarded to Westinghouse Electric to develop the radio set. Then Westinghouse was awarded contract to produce 430 units at unit cost of $29,725 for total contract price of $12.8 million. Second procurement awarded to Westinghouse under sole-source contract also. This time for 617 radios at unit cost of $19,200 with total cost of $12.1 million. Under third procurement pressure from industry forced open competition. Unit price fell to $10,497.52. Contract was awarded to Cosmos Industries, Inc.

It is ridiculous to state that in a procurement program as large as the one being discussed by the House today that there is no possibility of reducing these estimates. This is to say that the management of this vast organization is perfect, and that there is no room for improvement. Even the most partisan of people will admit this is not so. Continued improvement in this management of the defense procurement program will result in reductions in estimates such as we are considering today.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Virginia [Mr. HARDY].

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Chairman, I am glad the gentleman from Wisconsin in his remarks a moment ago indicated what he meant by the "fat" in the bill to which he referred yesterday. I am sure all of us share with him a desire to procure our necessary weapons of war at the lowest possible cost and to accomplish a maximum of efficiency in a defense procurement system.

Mr. Chairman, I want to discuss for a few minutes the problem of block obsolescence of the fleet. The Navy has displayed growing concern over this problem for the past several years and has repeatedly stressed the fact that we must have an adequate shipbuilding and conversion program if we are to maintain the combat effective Navy which is an absolute and fundamental requirement for our national survival.

This same concern, not surprisingly, has been felt and voiced by the chairman of the Armed Services Committee, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON]. Indeed, his concern has become so great that last year he appointed a special subcommittee for the purpose of studying the composition of the fleet and the problems of block obsolescence of naval vessels.

The gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS] was appointed chairman of the subcommittee, and the other two members were Mr. BATES and myself.

The subcommittee issued a report which met with wholehearted agreement on the part of the full committee, and I call to your attention some very pertinent portions of that report quoted on pages 9 and 10 of the report which is before you today in support of H.R. 2440, the bill we are considering.

To put it mildly, the subcommittee report is not optimistic as to the future of our fleet. The evidence which we assembled caused a finding that our Navy is today headed toward block obsolescence—a block obsolescence that endangers our future.

This report states—and this was confirmed in hearings on the bill before us—that it is a statistical certainty—let me repeat that—a statistical certainty—that if we continue a shipbuilding program similar to that of the past few years, or indeed, at the rate of this year's program, or last year's program, our Navy will simply cease to exist as an effective military instrument.

The Navy is aware of this. The Secretary of Defense certainly should be aware of this. But in the last analysis, the responsibility lies with the Congress to determine the size and composition of our fleet and to provide the authorization and the funds to see that the fleet meets the needs of the country. The Navy, alone, cannot correct this situation—it can request ships of the Secretary of Defense, but if he says "No," that is final—and that is exactly what has happened.

We all realize that scientific and technological advances have had a revolutionary effect on ship design. These advances themselves accelerate the obsolescence of existing ships, but within the limits of funds and other practical considerations they must be incorporated in the new ships. We have authorized in previous programs many new ships designed to take advantage of these advances. Despite this, at the end of this fiscal year—21 years after the start of World War II—70 percent of the active fleet will be ships designed for that war.

We have authorized modernizations of these ships where it has been economically feasible to do so. These improvements have paid dividends in the form of an increased mid-period readiness posture but the weight, space and power requirements of new weapons make it either uneconomical or impractical to carry this modernization program beyond its presently projected scope.

The future holds little prospect for a reduction in the Navy's worldwide commitments which would in turn permit a significant reduction in the number of ships in the fleet. We are, therefore, faced with the problem of replacing large numbers of outdated ships at a time when responsiveness to present combat requirements and installation of complex weapons systems are required to meet increasing threats.

Our authorizations of the past few years have contributed to the modernization of the fleet. We have seen accelerated construction and deployment of the impressive Polaris weapons system, which represents a classic example of the combination of advanced developments in hull, propulsion, and weapons into a completely integrated weapons system. We have observed the superior performance of our growing fleet of nuclear attack submarines, and this past year operations of the nuclear powered surface ships *Enterprise, Long Beach,* and *Bainbridge,* have been most gratifying.

Despite these noteworthy signs of progress in fleet modernization, by 5 years from now, or 23 years after the close of World War II, when all the ships previously authorized, but currently undelivered, and those contained in this authorization will have joined the fleet, approximately 49 percent of fleet strength at that time will still be World War II products. We are making meager headway against the relentless erosion of combat effectiveness by the currents of age and technology. We cannot wait 23 years more for the complete modernization of the remaining half of the Navy if we are to maintain it as a meaningful arm of our foreign policy, and as an effective agency of national defense. The Armed Services Committee did accelerate somewhat the advances to be achieved in this year's program by writing into this authorization bill two more nuclear powered attack submarines than were contained in the defense budget request.

I do not want to paint too gloomy a picture—though heaven knows it is black enough. This year's bill does provide for substantial increases in our deterrent posture through the programing of six additional Polaris submarines and supporting ships and craft. It enhances our ASW capabilities through the programing of 8 nuclear attack submarines, 10 improved ocean escorts, and the fleet rehabilitation and modernization—FRAM—conversion of 19 World War II destroyers. It advances the combined antiair warfare and antisubmarine warfare capability of our strike forces through modernization of seven post-World War II destroyer types.

It also increases our amphibious strength through the construction of five ships and adds to our underway replenishment capabilities through both new construction and conversions. It increases our effectiveness in the field of counterinsurgency and paramilitary operations through the programing of six small, fast specially configured, motor gunboats designed for varied operations in shallow water, but also capable of operations in the open sea. It also provides for miscellaneous support through the programing of various support types. Included in these are three surveying ships which by gathering oceanographic environmental information will contribute to the effectiveness of future naval operations through increased knowledge of the oceans. Much of the data gathered also will be useful to other Government programs and to scientific research in various aspects of the national oceanographic research program.

At best, however, it is a lean program, actually an austere program. It has been slashed to urgent necessities and makes no real effort to forestall block obsolescence. Reluctantly I recommend its authorization as presented, with the added observation that with each year of just holding our own against the onrushing tide of obsolescence we are merely putting off the day when we will either have to enter upon a truly stupendous shipbuilding program or accept the realities of an obsolete fleet—a Navy incapable of carrying out its mission, unable to project the power and influence of the United States into the far corners of the world. I must point out that only through large near-future increases in authorizations and appropriations can we offset the past and present neglect of naval ship replacement. Taking into account the extent to which needed new ship construction has been deferred, and the very special problems involved in the modernization of the Navy, we may as well prepare ourselves for an extensive and costly program of shipbuilding, and the longer we put it off the more expensive it is ultimately going to be.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARDY. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. I want to compliment and commend the gentleman for bringing to the attention of the House a subject which I consider to be of the utmost importance.

I would like to ask a question or two.

As I understand from what the gentleman has said and from what I read in the report of the subcommittee last fall, as well as this report, the Navy would like to construct more ships or have an authorization to construct them than is presently provided?

Mr. HARDY. Yes. They asked for additional ships this year, but that was denied by the Department of Defense.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. It was suggested a minimum of 70 ships per year ought to be authorized over a period of 7 years?

Mr. HARDY. If we want a modern fleet, we would have to build at the rate of 70 ships per year.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. But according to a statement of the committee, even this would be a very conservative figure?

Mr. HARDY. That would be conservative.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. If we do not build more ships, and we reach the period when we will have to build a lot of them in a hurry, will they not cost more dollars than if we replaced them now?

Mr. HARDY. It would make awfully good sense to have a regular, steady flow of new ships coming in. We are converting ships as best we can, but we have reached the point where we have converted all we can economically. The only thing we have done is to put off the day when we will have to build new ones.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Florida [Mr. BENNETT].

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I heard a few minutes ago the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD] outline three steps to be taken before the RS–70 could be a reality.

The Committee on Armed Services certainly acknowledges and approves the first two steps. That is, there will have to be an authorization by Congress; and, second, there will have to be an appropriation by the Congress through the Committee on Appropriations. However, it is not the position of our committee that the Executive has the right to deny the constitutional responsibility of the Congress of the United States to provide for the national defense. So it is not the position of our committee that the Executive has the right to repudiate duly enacted laws providing for an authorization and appropriation for the RS–70.

Let me state a few things about the RS–70.

First of all, I would like to say there are specific and sound reasons given in the report for the development of the extra two RS–70's. These are necessary to develop a weapons vehicle, otherwise we will have merely an experimental airplane which will not yet have weapons of value. If we obtain the two requested additions we will have the most effective and most outstanding reconnaissance vehicle in the armed services of any country. It will have air-to-ground missile strength. It will be able to cover preplanned targets and not yet precisely located targets. It will be able to cover mobile targets. It will be able to report back what it has seen. It would provide a cover under which so called limited or nonnuclear war could be waged. We all desire to obtain a limitation upon warfare if we can. Certainly nobody can desire war just for war's sake, and if we can limit warfare, so much the better, without destroying all of mankind.

The last point, made very effectively by the gentleman from Texas, is that this will require the Soviets to expend tremendous sums to try to provide antiaircraft defense against this new weapons system.

In the back part of the report on this bill there will be found some very antagonistic remarks in regard to the RS–70. It is said that it has taken 10 years to develop; but it is suggested we should embark upon some new program, which also might taken another 10 years. It is said in the report that the striking capabilities are available today that were not available 10 years ago. Of course that is so. It is also true the RS–70 today contemplates those striking capabilities. This is not a question of going back to what the RS–70 was in the blueprint stage 10 years ago.

Opponents entirely overlook the reconnaissance value of this important development in our technological development.

With the single exception of General Taylor, already discussed, the proposal for fiscal year 1964 has the united support of the leading military authorities in the U.S. Government. I want to stress that the service chiefs, after exhaustive study of all pertinent information, are of the opinion that the RS–70 program should be accelerated by construction of the two additional prototype aircraft with associated radar and missile work.

To the contrary, we have Secretary McNamara's recommendation that a great slowdown in the development program is warranted, partly because other means may be available to accomplish the mission of postattack reconnaissance on remaining targets, with subsequent strikes upon them.

If these other means will be available and are as vastly superior to the RS–70 as the Secretary seems to think, why spend another cent on the RS–70? Yet he proposes to spend $50 million of the extra $192 million provided by the Congress last year for a purpose in which he seems to have no faith.

I think we should question the so-called alternative means. The Armed Services Committee was given only the sketchiest of information about new reconnaissance and strike means which the Secretary hopes will be available. These promises about future weapons developments are simply promises—and I, for one, can make no judgment when I lack the information on which one must be based.

The Army, Navy, and Air Force Chiefs, however, have had access to the same material on which Secretary McNamara bases his promise. Their conclusion is directly contrary to his.

It seems to me highly dangerous to reject the opinion of the highest military authorities on the RS–70 program when we have not been given a good reason to reject it. In saying this I am in no way criticizing Secretary McNamara, whom I consider to be an able, dedicated American. No man has ever been a better Secretary of Defense than he.

Mr. Chairman, on another subject I would also call attention to the testimony of the distinguished Chief of Naval Operations, Adm. George W. Anderson, before the House Armed Services Committee on the indispensability of the manned aircraft for the foreseeable future. Admiral Anderson stated that the Navy considers manned aircraft indispensable to control of the seas and support the Armed Forces of the United States.

Within the past few months we have seen manned Naval Air Force fighters gather the vital low level aerial photography confirming the rapid Soviet military buildup in Cuba. In the same period, our long-range manned aircraft played a major role in successfully keeping Soviet submarines under continuous surveillance and discouraged them from establishing a base in Cuba at the height of this buildup. Likewise, when it became necessary to cut off the Soviet input of weapons into Cuba, Naval patrol aircraft performed a vital role in the quarantine. After the threat subsided, again the Navy's long-range Lockheed Orions confirmed the removal by ship of the Soviet missiles when onsite inspections were denied.

Naval air units based in my home State of Florida had a primary responsibility throughout the entire Cuban crisis and I want to take this occasion to deliver a special accolade to them. I am especially proud that units stationed in Jacksonville, in my own district, were personally complimented by President Kennedy for their fine performance.

In every major confrontation of the Soviets since Korea, manned Naval aircraft have moved quickly to secure localized control of the air giving encouragement to our friends and deterring aggression—in the Taiwan Straits, Lebanon, Indochina, the Dominican Republic, and Cuba.

The new naval aircraft requested for authorization in this year's appropriation act are expensive. However, their increased performance gives them the necessary combat capability to cope with the best a potential adversary can bring to bear against us during the time frame in which they will be operated. These aircraft are among the finest in the world, but their superior capability does not compensate for the numbers experience has shown to be required if our Navy is to carry out its mission. As the Soviet march of technology continues, so must the capability of our naval aircraft increase to cope with this threat. There is no painless and cheap solution to the rising costs of aviation through a reduction in numbers.

This is a very austere budget for manned naval aircraft and it is the sense of the committee that the authorization for 681 of these aircraft, of which 90 percent are combatant, will provide the minimum acceptable level of procurement.

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Chairman, we are all aware of the vital role our Polaris submarines play in our national defense posture. The capabilities of this mobile, silent, invulnerable missile force are well known to you all. Today, however, I should like to point out the importance of their sister ships, the nuclear attack submarines, to the defense of our Nation.

Many of the exploits of these submarines have captured the imagination of the world in recent years. Since the first cruise on nuclear power by *Nautilus* in 1955, we have heard of the historic under-ice arctic cruises by *Nautilus, Skate, Sargo,* and *Seadragon*, the submerged navigation of the globe by *Triton,* and the performance of *Skipjack,* the fastest submarine in the world.

Each of these submarines is propelled by powerful, reliable, safe, nuclear powerplants unmatched by any other in the world, thanks to the brilliance, foresight, and dedication of Vice Admiral Rickover. The fact that these nuclear submarines have achieved a significant capability to accomplish their wartime mission—destruction of enemy ships, particularly submarines—is not so well known.

The Soviets are making a determined bid to challenge the free world's historic dominance at sea. The Soviets are racing to become a top-ranking maritime power and at the same time are continuing to expend a disproportionate amount of their resources in construction of modern submarines.

During World War II, U.S. submarines established a proud record in destruction of the enemy's mercantile fleet by accounting for well over one-half of tonnage destroyed. It can be anticipated that the submarine's effort in future conflicts will be equally effective if they are properly equipped to operate in a modern antisubmarine warfare environment. We have submarines with the capability to operate in any ocean area in the world in the *Thresher* class submarine.

The ability of these submarines and other antisubmarine forces to contain the Soviet submarine threat is of vital importance to us today. Since World War II, Soviet Russia has launched a concentrated submarine-building program which has resulted in an estimated force of over 400, the largest in peacetime history and larger than the German or United States forces during World War II which exacted tremendous losses. Included in this force are missile submarines capable of threatening the continental United States as well as long-range submarines capable of penetrating all vital sealanes and threatening our control of the sea. Most significant, however, are recent Soviet claims of large numbers of nuclear submarines in operation. Although the antisubmarine warfare capability of the U.S. Navy is far and away superior to any other in the world and is an effective system for combating the Soviet bloc diesel submarine threat, as proved during the Cuban crisis, the problem of containing large numbers of nuclear submarines in the event of war is a great one. Our modern nuclear submarines, exemplified by U.S.S. *Thresher,* promise to be most important members of the antisubmarine warfare team. *Thresher* is truly a formidable weapon. She is equipped with vastly improved sonars which permit detection of enemy submarines at great ranges. Her quiet nuclear propulsion plant permits her to utilize the submarine's primary advantage—that of stealth—yet permits the use of high continuous speeds when needed. She is capable of going deep into inner space to shield her from detection and attack and to take advantage of deep sound channels. She is equipped with acoustic torpedoes which are capable of successfully attacking a submarine even if it is running deep and quiet. By next year *Thresher* will be equipped with Subroc—a torpedo-tube-launched ballistic missile which will be effective against enemy submarines at ranges of many miles.

Thresher and her sister nuclear attack submarines have conducted numerous realistic wartime exercises to develop the tactics and weapons necessary to detect, classify, and kill both diesel and nuclear submarines. Some of these exercises have been operations in coordination with other antisubmarine warfare ships and aircraft. Others have been submarine versus submarine operations to simulate wartime operations in a hostile environment such as the enemy's home waters where only a submarine can operate. Other exercises have been conducted in the one ocean where only nuclear submarines can insure control of the sea—the arctic ice pack. Only this past summer, *Seadragon* and *Skate* conducted dog fights under the arctic ice pack. The importance of developing a capability to defend our Nation against attack from enemy submarines approaching from the arctic was vividly shown by recent photographs of a Soviet nuclear submarine at the North Pole.

Operations of our nuclear submarines to date offer convincing proof that these weapons systems are a most important member of our anti-submarine-warfare team. They are the only member of the team which can conduct anti-submarine-warfare operations in the enemy's own element, safe from the vagaries of surface disturbances of the sea. Additionally, the nuclear submarine will continue in its role as the Nation's most potent weapon if attrition of the enemy's mercantile fleet is required.

Their potential in these most vital missions is virtually unlimited provided we maintain our lead over the Soviets in numbers and in combat capability.

We must continue to recognize the unique capabilities of these marvelous weapon systems if we are to retain the free world's capability to operate freely at sea anywhere we choose. The free world is composed of maritime nations. Only by keeping our sealanes open will we be able to prosper and survive, and only by maintaining a modern submarine force incorporating our latest technological advances, will we be able to maintain control of the sea in times of conflict.

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON. Mr. Chairman, I feel that it is imperative that every penny of the proposed $363,700,000 for the RS–70 bomber be allocated for the development of this most important project.

I believe it would be a dangerous step, both physically and psychologically, if the safety of the United States depended entirely upon the faultless operation of electronic equipment by completely disbanding our manned bomber system.

I am completely in accord and wholeheartedly agree with the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON] and the majority of his Armed Services Committee, and in fact, with the best military judgment available when they ask that "all reasonable doubt be removed in order to produce all the evidence that is needed upon which the Department of Defense and the Congress can base a rational decision as to whether or not RS–70's should be produced in quantity."

It is incumbent upon every Member of this House to insure the lives of all its citizens, so it is imperative that all doubts concerning the potentiality of the RS–70 be removed, in order that we may begin positive action regarding the destiny of these United States in relation to our dependence for survival on electronic missile systems.

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Chairman, we have read and heard many statements of late about our budget problems, plus existing and predicted deficits. Many are clamoring for fiscal policies that will reduce these deficits and make an income tax cut possible. With this in mind, how can we possibly recommend an increase in spending of almost a half-billion dollars, that will do nothing but add to the deficit? Such a move is particularly strange when you realize that this half-billion is over and above the amount actually requested.

In fact, we have noted from the committee report that in every instance the committee accepted the exact amount requested on every item, without attempting to reduce a single dollar in spending. Then the half-billion dollars was added to it.

In raising this objection, I am not necessarily pointing to the specified increases listed by the committee. Rather, I object to the total figure, which, it seems to me, could well have been adjusted to a point where it could have at least stayed within the requested total. If the new programs are necessary, surely there are other areas where reductions can be made to accommodate the new programs, some of which must duplicate or supersede activities in the original request.

It is hoped that the Appropriations Committee will take a long, healthy look at the figures in this bill. I hope these figures are examined thoroughly to determine whether or not the increases, totaling half-a-billion dollars, are really necessary.

We have heard many expressions of late, by knowledgeable and reputable people, that it is going to be possible to make reductions in the expenditures proposed under the 1964 budget requests. However, the action we are contemplating today hardly appears to be following the frugal pattern thus outlined.

In light of these points, I feel it is necessary to oppose this authorization until such time as the Appropriations Committee has had a chance to explore all phases of the military procurement program in the interest of an adequate defense system that is commensurate with prudent and proper Government expenditures.

We must replace our talk of economy with action. If we approve this authorization today, we may indeed do nothing except lay the whip to an inflationary horse that is already running away at full speed. If we are ever going to control our galloping budgets, someone must get hold of the reins.

For these reasons, I hope the House will sustain actions that will limit this authorization at least to the original recommendation.

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Chairman, as I see it, the RS–70 should be developed beyond transportation level to weapons carrier and missile-launching platform and whatever other military purpose it can fulfill. There must be no gap between our present manned bomber system and a future fully capable missile program. Even at worse, we must leave no stone unturned in new weapons and also protect our present investment in RS–70.

As to the total bill, I must vote for recommittal to cut 5 percent from procurement and 12½ percent from research, development, test, and evaluation because I feel there is considerable padding, waste and inefficiency that can be cut from the bill. My proof may be found in four GAO reports and numerous examples of sole-source contracts of cost-plus-fixed-fee nature where specific sums were lost through improper procedures. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LAIRD] provided some very interesting, detailed information on the award of contracts when he pointed out the improper procedures which have resulted in increased cost wherein cost-plus-fixed-fee contracts were placed rather than contracts awarded through competitive bids.

Examples of these procedures are described in GAO reports on first,. Army generators purchase; second, Navy bearings; and, third, GSA aircraft tires. Other specific examples include the AN/SPS 10 radar $3.9 million overpayment, AN/APS 88 airborne radar $561,000, AN/PDR 43 radiac set $600,000, AN/WRT 1 and 2 radio sets $15 million. These sums were overpayment in prices between sole-source contracts and the lower prices of competitive bids; not known, however, are the untold amounts of those other contracts not awarded on competitive basis but awarded on cost plus fixed fee.

The 60 percent of contracts awarded without competitive bids cost us too much.

The views of Congressmen LAIRD and CURTIS include this material and suggestions to improve our contract award and reduction of spending to get more value per dollar expended.

As I see it, those for economy and fiscal responsibility must start with the authorization bill—rather than voting the authorization and waiting for the appropriation bill to stress fiscal responsibility. Too often at appropriation time we are told we must vote money for what was earlier authorized. Today, the recommittal cuts would not hurt our defense posture. On the contrary, we must zealously safeguard the expenditures and proper procedures. Our military strength is based on our economic strength. Fiscal responsibility is a must at all times.

Failing to take the responsible action outlined in the recommittal I could not consistently agree to final passage, and if the recommittal fails I shall vote against the bill. Under no circumstances does this mean I am opposed to military preparedness and these weapons. But I shall at the same time expect the greatest value received possible for every defense dollar.

Mr. ROUSH. Mr. Chairman, I must, in good conscience, vote against the committee amendment which authorizes the expenditure of $363 million for two additional RS–70 aircraft. I want to make it perfectly clear that I do not oppose the manned bomber concept. Certainly I do not. Nor am I opposed to continuing the work on the RS–70 concept.

But let us face it. We have already spent over a billion dollars and still do not have an RS–70 which will fly. It will take an additional billion dollars plus to go ahead with the additional two requested by this amendment. It may well be that the concept is worth while but, until we know it is going to be successful—and we will know since the development of the three now authorized will continue—I am not willing to sacrifice $363 million of the taxpayers' money. The Air Force has not pushed for this money. The administration is opposed to spending this money at this time.

If I thought for one moment we were sacrificing even the smallest element of our national security I would not hesitate to authorize these funds but this is a project still in its development stage which has not been proven.

If, with three of these aircraft, we prove its feasibility and that it will make a substantial contribution to our national defense, then my vote will unhesitantly be a vote for two and more of this type aircraft.

Mr. HAGEN of California. Mr. Chairman, I support the additional committee authorization of funds for the RS–70 program. The development of the RS–70 system as an inventory item of the Air Force is a matter of prime economic interest to my district because the testing will be accomplished at Edwards Air Force Flight Test Center. I want to make this clear because my support of the project is not based on any such narrow ground. It is my judgment that a program which has already merited the appropriation of over $1 billion should not be strangled slowly to death because the feasibility of certain components of it has not already been demonstrated. Aside from purely military values there are bound to be large benefits to commercial flying from development of an aircraft that can fly faster than a bullet and at altitudes in excess of 70,000 feet.

My main purpose in appearing here today is to comment on the Dyna-Soar program, which involves the development of a lift-type manned space vehicle and the appropriate booster to utilize it—in this instance the Titan III booster. Although this authorization bill contains some research and development authorizations for the Air Force it does not relate to the Dyna-Soar-Titan III program for the reason that at the moment it is not considered as an aircraft or missile system. As progress is made on it I think that it will be so considered. In any event omission from this bill does not denote a lack of progress. Funds for it are requested in the Air Force budget and I am hopeful that the Congress will approve that request.

Finally, I would like to point out that although the report which accompanies this bill specifically identifies certain projects for research and development, that listing is not exclusive. Other unlisted projects are covered by a general authorization of research and development funds which were supported by the military services before the committee. Included in such funds are funds for the Navy. I have a particular interest in this fact because the naval ordnance test station is in my district and they have some 200 projects in various postures of research and/or development.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Florida has expired. All time has expired.

The Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated during fiscal year 1964 for the use of the Armed Forces of the United States for procurement, research, development, test, and evaluation of aircraft, missiles, and naval vessels, as authorized by law, in amounts as follows:

Procurement

Aircraft

For aircraft: For the Army, $522,100,000; for the Navy and the Marine Corps, $1,958,700,000; for the Air Force, $3,559,000,000.

Missiles

For missiles: For the Army, $580,700,000; for the Navy, $1,107,300,000; for the Marine Corps, $14,700,000; for the Air Force, $2,177,000,000.

Naval vessels

For naval vessels: For the Navy, $2,444,000,000.

Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation

Aircraft

For aircraft: For the Army, $82,148,000; for the Navy (including the Marine Corps), $204,183,000; for the Air Force, $686,686,000 of which amount $363,700,000 is authorized only for research, development, and test of the RS–70.

Missiles

For missiles: For the Army, $576,601,000; for the Navy (including the Marine Corps), $590,133,000; for the Air Force, $1,060,132,000.

Naval vessels

For naval vessels: For the Navy, $293,008,000.

Mr. STRATTON (interrupting the reading of the bill). Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and forty-three Members are present, a quorum.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk has not completed the reading of the bill.

Mr. CURTIS. A parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. CURTIS. At what point may one move to strike out the last word?

The CHAIRMAN. The bill consists of but one section, and under the rule the entire bill must be read without interruption.

(The Clerk completed the reading of the bill.)

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the first committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 2, line 11, strike out "$2,310,000,000" and insert "$2,444,000,000".

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendment.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I wonder if we could not reach some agreement as to time on this committee amendment, which involves two nuclear-type submarines classified as killer submarines.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, I would make this point, that the Committee on Armed Services has had practically all the time in debate, and there are some of us that would like to have a few words to say about the general bill.

Mr. VINSON. I will be generous in the time, but I am just wondering if we could not reach some agreement.

Mr. CURTIS. Why not wait until we have a little debate, I suggest to the gentleman.

Mr. VINSON. I am perfectly willing that the gentleman have 10 minutes or 5 minutes or whatever time he wants, but let us do it in an orderly way and make progress.

Mr. CURTIS. That is all right, but this is an important bill.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that on the first amendment, on line 11, page 2, of the bill, debate shall not exceed 20 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

Mr. CURTIS. I object, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I know that everyone in this House is deeply concerned about the defense of our country and maintaining the preeminent position of the United States throughout the world.

However, very little has been said about one aspect of our position in this world today. We can very easily become a second-rate power, not through letting down on our military defense, but by letting down in our responsibilities in the fiscal area.

Permit me to say that it is not idle gossip to think that the dollar might be devalued. Indeed, if we continue on this course of deficit financing that can well come about. In fact, some advisers close to the President have already suggested that this might be the course. I say we have to get into the expenditure side of the budget. We have got to think in terms of what can we afford. Up to the present time there has been very little attention devoted to that in the debate. I might say that it has been very difficult to even follow what the Committee on Armed Services has presented to us. The some 1,300 pages of printed hearings are not even indexed so that the Members of the House can follow with some intelligence what might be in this bill. The entire time for debate has been absorbed by the members of this committee, with very little explanation to the Members of the House, I might state, in the way of where this money might be spent. The committee's written report deals with two areas of controversy both increasing the overall $15 billion authorization sought in this bill. What about the base $15 billion? We are distracted by the discussion over the $500 million increases. Permit me to relate this to our fiscal picture. We had an $81 billion expenditure rate the year before President Kennedy came into office. The first year he was in office that expenditure rate went up to $87 billion. This year it is going to be $94 or $95 billion. The President's projected expenditure rate for the next fiscal year is $99 billion. This is an $18 billion increase in the space of 3 years compared to—just as a comparison—the previous 6 years of an increase of $13 billion.

Mr. Chairman, the President's proposal for tax reductions—and heaven knows we need them because our tax structure is creating economic damage—must be in my judgment predicated upon expenditure reform. I have suggested that the expenditure rate must be kept to around $95 billion for the next 3 years.

Mr. Chairman, the only way we can look into the future is to see what the proposals are in this present budget containing requests for new obligational authority. This is not expenditure. This is an authorization bill paving the way for new obligational authority. New obligational authority requests under the 1964 budget are $107 billion. Here is where the amount of this particular bill we have before us would be included. If we are going to hold this expenditure line for the future, we must deal, as the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD] pointed out, with all the three steps in the appropriations process. We must look at each step, the first step being authorization like this bill, then the new obligational authority, and then the expenditure rate. Let no one tell you here that the authorization to ask for new obligational authority we are talking about is money that is going to be spent largely in 1963 or 1964. It is projected on out into the years to come.

Mr. Chairman, nowhere in the committee report, I might say, does the committee give us the carryover obligational authority voted from previous years that is unspent and some not even obligated so that we might be able to get the entire picture. I know the total budget figure. There will be $87 billion of obligational carryover as of June 30 of this year of which the military share will be the largest item. Then add to the $87 billion carryover the President's request for $107 billion new obligational authority and you will have the figure of $194 billion of authority to spend the President will have for fiscal year 1964. It is only the President's statement that he will actually spend only $99 billion in fiscal year 1964 leaving a carryover of $95 billion on June 30, 1964. The Congress, once it has voted authorization and appropriation has no control over the expenditure rate; this is the prerogative of the Executive. So we, the Congress, must get into this aspect of the expenditures. If we are to control spending, consider aggregate levels and the priorities of the components we must do so on authorization bills, such as this one, as well as on the appropriation bills.

There is very little, I repeat, for the House to go on, contained in the committee report.

One cannot get into the committee hearings with any clarity because there is no index for the 1,300 pages it contains. However, fortunately, there have been some studies made of this area in particular by experts in this field; as expert, I might say, as the members of the Committee on Armed Services who have failed in this instance to take the rest of the Members of the House into their confidence. On the basis of the outside studies, done by Members of the House—if I am recognized for the purpose—I am going to offer a motion to recommit to cut this particular authority to spend, this authorization bill, by 5 percent in the procurement section, except for U.S. naval torpedoes, and by 12.5 percent in the research and development area. This will amount to a total cut of approximately $800 million. This will not cut the two committee amendments if adopted because under the rules of the House the motion to recommit with instructions cannot amend amendments.

Let me say to my colleagues that if in your judgment we must have Federal expenditure reform, now is the time and place to begin. It does no good to put off the day of reckoning to say let us do the cutting elsewhere, and at another time.

We can wait no longer. If we pursue the fiscal course we are pursuing—deficit financing on up to at least 1972 with an additional $75 billion of debt to market, the dollar will be devalued whatever may be our wishes. Then the United States will no longer be the preeminent nation in the world; we will no longer be the world's banker. We will take our place still powerful, but no longer preeminent or the master of our destiny, along with other nations which once had their day of preeminence.

Yes, we must talk in terms of military defense. But we must also talk in terms of economic strength from whence we derive our military strength.

We have been debating neither military strength nor sound budgets—only whether we should trust the judgment of a committee which shies away from debate and showing its studies and working papers whereby the House membership might evaluate the judgment.

A recommittal motion is the only recourse open to those of us who feel expenditure reform is vital to our national security. I am satisfied that this kind of discipline is necessary. There is plenty of time in the event this cut happens to be in error in any detail—and I do not like the across-the-board approach, but if this is in error in any detail although sound study reveals it is not, let me assure you that there is plenty of time to get into any detail of this matter to correct it. But if this Congress does not begin at this point, the beginning of the expenditure process to move in on the matter of this authority for new obligational authority, we have lost this first chance and all this talk against deficit financing and for balanced budgets will be idle.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this first amendment and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this first amendment and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Georgia.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment. Mr. Chairman, I am going to support the committee amendment. I am also going to support the committee's position on the RS–70. But during this debate we have heard a lot about the obsolescence of the fleet, about the RS–70, and about the two additional attack submarines. As I sat on the committee for weeks I heard of other programs that would be very desirable. All of this indicates that if you wanted to you could add several billion dollars to this authorization.

Mr. Chairman, I want to commend the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. Curtis] for the honesty of his presentation. It is coincidental that he talked to the same matter to which I want to address myself, because I think the House should know, should have an honest presentation of what this bill actually does. We do not want to turn on the radio tomorrow and hear the minority leader claim that we are going to reduce the defense budget by $3 billion, because we have a situation to meet and I think the House will fulfill its responsibility in meeting our national security needs.

Mr. Chairman, I want to read a response to an inquiry directed to the Bureau of the Budget with respect to the effect of the new obligational authority and expenditures in 1964 of our committee action. I supported the committee. But I think we should be honest in what we do in the House and that the Members should know exactly what they are doing in the House.

The Director of the Budget advises:

> The committee, in reporting out this bill, recommended an increase of about a half a billion dollars above the amount requested by the President for authorization. Of this amount $367.7 million is for the RS–70. I am going to support this. I want to be honest with the House. But I also want the House to know exactly what it is doing so that they may take deliberate action.
>
> One hundred and thirty-four million dollars is for two additional nuclear-powered submarines. That is in the amendment that we are considering now and which I am going to support.
>
> Should this bill be enacted into law and Congress provide funds to finance these additions it would have the effect of adding half a billion dollars to new obligational authority in the President's 1964 budget and if these funds were fully used by the Department of Defense it would add $200 million to the expenditures estimated for 1964.
>
> It is our understanding—

And this is from the Bureau of the Budget—

> that the Subcommittee of the House Committee on Armed Services that considered H.R. 3006 has recommended that certain adjustments be made in the administration's bill as submitted to the Congress. The bill as proposed by the subcommittee would have the effect of adding $278.7 million to the annual cost of the legislation as proposed by the administration. If we assume the effective date of the pay increases will be October 1, 1963, the same date assumed in the 1964 budget, the more liberal provisions proposed by the subcommittee would increase the 1964 budget by $208 million in new obligational authority and $205 million in expenditures.
>
> However, it is our understanding that the subcommittee is proposing that the effective date of the bill be the first day of the month following enactment, rather than October 1, 1963. If the legislation were to become effective on July 1, 1963, NOA requirements would be increased by an additional $379 million and expenditures by $372 million.
>
> In summary, the total estimated effect of these additions could be to increase NOA requirements by $1,084.7 million, and budget expenditures and the deficit by $777 million as follows:

[In millions of dollars]

	New obligational authority	Expended
RS–70 and nuclear submarines	497.7	200
Military pay:		
Effective Oct. 1, 1963	208.0	205
Addition if effective, July 1, 1963	379.0	372
Total	1,084.7	777

> Thus the enactment of this legislation in the form discussed above would constitute a major breach of the President's 1964 budget.
>
> Also, the additional expenditure effect of the subcommittee report on H.R. 3006 beyond the administration's proposal for military compensation increases would, if effective July 1, 1963, increase our balance-of-payments deficit in fiscal 1964 by $50 to $60 million.
>
> If I can be of further assistance, do not hesitate to call upon me.
>
> Sincerely yours,
>
> Kermit Gordon,
> *Director.*

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. Joelson].

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Chairman, I think that yesterday an unfortunately partisan note was entered into the Record. Here is a statement by the distinguished minority leader. On page 4010, he asked:

> If the military posture and the situation of the United States in the world today is so much better than it was 2 or 3 years ago, why is it that the defense budget under Eisenhower was $40 billion a year, but now we have got to have $50 billion a year?

This is a very strange question. I submit that the reason the military posture of the United States is so good is that we have at long last faced up to our responsibilities and are spending the money it takes to do what has to be done.

Last year we spent, out of $94 billion, over $50 billion for defense, unanimously. We spent $3.5 billion for space, unanimously. We spent $5.5 billion for veterans' affairs, and I believe that was unanimous.

I will vote for this bill today, and I will not go home and bleat about the high rate of spending. It seems to me that those who support the spending programs most vigorously are the ones who wail the loudest about how high the cost of government is today. We act responsibly but we talk irresponsibly. I suppose that is better than the opposite situation.

If you want salted peanuts from the machine, you have to put in the penny and if we want adequate defense we simply must spend billions. We must say to the American people, "There are certain things that have to be done. If you want defense it costs billions of dollars." I believe the American people are mature enough and responsible enough to back us up on that.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the second committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: On page 2, line 17, strike out "$322,986,000" and insert "$686,686,000 of which amount $363,700,000 is authorized only for research, development, and test of the RS–70."

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, this is the amendment relating to the RS–70's, which has been discussed very thoroughly. In view of the fact that there has been considerable discussion, and that practically all of the 4 hours was used in debating this matter, I think it would be proper now to limit debate. I do not want to be generous. I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 25 minutes.

Mr. STRATTON. I object, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 25 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Georgia.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. STRATTON) there were—ayes 66, noes 91.

So the motion was rejected.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the committee amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I had the privilege the other day of listening to and seeing a very wonderful movie, "The Longest Day," which recounts the D-day operations on the coast of Normandy. Those of you who saw it may recall that about 12 hours before the invasion was to take place, the radio reported the reading of a poem which went something like this: "In the dolorous doldrums of spring, a leaf has fallen."

Or something like that which symbolized in code the fact that the invasion was about to start.

A few moments ago the distinguished gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD] took the well of the House and in code conveyed the message to his colleagues on the Republican side of the aisle that in spite of all the talk about reducing expenditures, and in spite of all the talk about cutting the Defense budget, it was perfectly okay with the leadership to vote for increasing the authorization bill because he was going to see to it that it would be cut in the Appropriations Committee.

Now, Mr. Chairman, we had a very eloquent talk here a moment ago by the distinguished gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. HÉBERT] who pointed out to the Members of this body, as he always does so eloquently, our basic responsibilities as Members of this legislative body. He said we cannot just rubberstamp the recommendations of the executive department. He said we have to exercise our responsibility. Well, Mr. Chairman, it seems to me the height of irresponsibility to urge in a serious vein, whether it is in code or in any other way, that those who are opposed to excessive spending will receive some kind of dispensation here today if they vote for increasing military authorizations and just leave it up to the boys on the Committee on Appropriations to wield the meat ax later on. It seems to me our decision and our responsibility as Members of this House applies just as much to a consideration of an authorization bill as it does with reference to an appropriation bill. If we are going to discharge our duty and exercise our authority and fulfill our responsibility as Members of Congress, then we have to vote against unnecessary increases in authorization bills, just as much as we would do in the case of appropriation bills.

We are not against the exercise of responsibility by the Congress. As a matter of fact, the five members of the committee who filed additional views supported the earlier amendment to authorize two additional nuclear submarines because this is an expenditure which will result in an increased and more effective deterrent force and will increase our capability to deal with the Soviet threat.

The effectiveness of these submarines was demonstrated during the Cuban crisis. But we who oppose this RS–70 amendment are opposed to unnecessary spending for an aircraft that is not yet even able to fly, for an aircraft that is not wanted by the Air Force as a part of our basic strategic nuclear deterrent force, and for an aircraft that in order to be transferred into even an effective secondary and support weapons system still requires the development of sophisticated electronic gear that has not even yet been invented.

So I say to you that in that situation nothing surely is going to be harmed as to the defense of our Nation if we defer these additional expenditures for 1 more year. We still have $81 million available this year, after all, with which to work for further development of that gear. So let us defer these massive expenditures proposed in this amendment until next year when perhaps the fiscal situation will be a little bit better than it is at the present time.

Mr. Chairman, let me just conclude with one more comment. I have been a little disturbed by the references that have been made here to the Secretary of Defense, and I am glad that my friend the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD] came to his support a moment ago. We have talked for years in this body, after all, about having a Secretary of Defense who had the courage to make difficult decisions; and, incidentally, when you get into the field of defense all the decisions are difficult. We had a distinguished industrialist as Secretary of Defense a few years ago by the name of McElroy, who pleaded with the Congress to "hold his feet to the fire" so that he would have an incentive to make some of these difficult decisions. I think we can be grateful today that we have a Secretary of Defense who is not only willing to make decisions, but who has the courage when he makes the hard decisions to stick by them when the flak begins to fly. This Secretary of Defense of ours has the complete confidence of the President of the United States, and I think it ought to be clear that if you vote for the committee amendment here today you are voting against the President of the United States, you are voting against the administration, and you are voting to increase the very expenditures which the administration itself is trying to hold down.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, and I shall not take a good deal of time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois is recognized.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, it has just been brought to my attention that in a speech this forenoon before the Advertising Council, Secretary of Defense McNamara charged my criticism of his dictatorial methods as being irresponsible.

He admits to arbitrarily cutting the original budget requests of the respective services. Such cuts have been made by every Secretary of Defense but not arbitrarily. But when Secretary McNamara says that I, as ranking minority member of the Armed Services Committee, am acting irresponsibly in restoring two items—the RS–70 bomber program and two additional killer submarines—he is saying in effect that our entire House Committee on Armed Services of 36 members is irresponsible.

This is committee action, not mine alone. This weapons procurement bill was reported out of our committee unanimously.

The Secretary of Defense apparently has not read the committee report on this bill and the reports of our committee on other matters under his jurisdiction.

In a choice between the military recommendations of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and the arbitrary decisions of the Secretary of Defense, our committee abides by the considered judgment of the Joint Chiefs.

Our committee is opposed to having a single chief of staff in uniform. We are also opposed to having a single chief of staff in civilian attire. That is the role Secretary McNamara presumes to be rightfully his. And apparently anyone who disagrees with him—the Joint

Chiefs of Staff or the Armed Services Committee—is in his opinion irresponsible.

Both Democrats and Republicans on our committee object to his overruling and bypassing our Joint Chiefs on military matters affecting the security of this country. Both Democrats and Republicans on our committee object to his deliberately ignoring the will of Congress.

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois is recognized.

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Chairman, frankly, I think neither my colleague from Illinois nor the Secretary of Defense need an advocate here to protect them. The discussion we have had here on this matter has generated a good deal of heat and very little light. Certainly those on the committee know the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ARENDS] performs in a responsible manner as a Member of the House and as a member of the Armed Services Committee. I happen to be one of those who also believes that the Secretary of Defense is acting in a responsible manner, although in this particular instance I am in disagreement with the Secretary.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRICE. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. ALBERT. It seems to me this thing should be put into perspective. We all appreciate the Joint Chiefs of Staff, but it was the Congress that gave the Secretary of Defense his authority. If he should not have any authority to recommend in the field of military procurement, we should take his power to make recommendations away from him and confine it to a military agency exclusively. I think it is up to the Congress to decide what to do with the recommendations of the administration. I think the Congress has the right to take the view of either the Joint Chiefs of Staff or of the Secretary. But I am certain that the Secretary has been acting within the province of his office when he made this recommendation.

Mr. PRICE. I agree with the gentleman.

I also think the gentleman from Illinois was acting in a responsible manner as a legislator as I am in opposing this particular decision on the part of the Secretary. I think the gentleman from New York [Mr. STRATTON] put it very well a moment ago when he said that this Congress for years was crying for a Secretary of Defense who had the courage to make difficult decisions. Now we have one. I have, in the Committee on Armed Services, heard compliments paid to the Secretary of Defense for his great ability and because of his courage in making decisions. The fact I disagree with him in this instance does not lower my estimate of his ability or capability or his patriotism.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRICE. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. BOGGS. I understand the gentleman fully supports the committee decision?

Mr. PRICE. That is correct, on both amendments, the two nuclear attack submarines and the RS-70. As a matter of fact, I would go further than the committee did. I would recommend a nuclear-powered aircraft project.

Mr. BOGGS. The gentleman has been on the committee for sometime?

Mr. PRICE. Yes, I have; for all but 1 year of the committee's existence.

Mr. BOGGS. The gentleman, I am sure, shares the confidence that we all have in the distinguished chairman of this committee?

Mr. PRICE. Yes; and every member of our committee does.

Mr. BOGGS. Would the gentleman say that the committee made a diligent study of the recommendations made by the administration?

Mr. PRICE. It certainly did. It studied the matter item by item for weeks.

Mr. BOGGS. The gentleman concluded that the administration had underestimated rather than overestimated the amount of money needed for the Defense Establishment?

Mr. PRICE. I would think so.

Mr. BOGGS. The gentleman supports the program which calls for an additional authorization of almost a half billion dollars?

Mr. PRICE. Yes, I support it, but the House should know exactly what the situation is.

Mr. BOGGS. Did I gather correctly that the Members on the Republican side supported it unanimously as well?

Mr. PRICE. It was a unanimous vote in committee on this legislation.

Mr. BOGGS. So that on the first major authorization bill to come before the House it is discovered that instead of the President being fiscally irresponsible, he has underestimated, according to this committee, by a half billion dollars. Is that correct?

Mr. PRICE. That appears to be the case, particularly in this instance.

Mr. BOGGS. Has the gentleman heard statements made by some Members of this body that the defense budget can be cut by $3 billion?

Mr. PRICE. I do not know of anyone who has sat in this House for the past month who has not heard them.

Mr. BOGGS. Did the gentleman hear the minority leader make that statement?

Mr. PRICE. Yes; I heard him, not only on the floor but in public speeches and public appearances on the radio and television.

Mr. BOGGS. There have been some reports in the press that in the consideration of the military pay bill, which I am happy to say I support—I think it is long overdue—the debate will be on its not being enough rather than being too much. In other words, an effort will be made to increase the amount requested by the President.

Mr. PRICE. I am not a member of that subcommittee, but I understand that the proposal of the committee would increase the estimate of the Department of Defense; yes. Like you, I am a stanch supporter of the military pay increase.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PRICE] may proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. PRICE. I yield.

Mr. BOGGS. Now, if this authorization is approved—and mind you, I am not being critical, because I have the highest regard for this committee, and I have worked very closely with a lot of members of the committee, particularly the chairman, and I know that he is anything but fiscally irresponsible——

Mr. PRICE. I say that the committee acted, in my opinion, in a very responsible manner.

Mr. BOGGS. But if we adopt this authorization and we come along with an increase in the authorization for military pay and then we talk about a reduction of $3 billion in defense, we would then have to reduce it $4 billion to come back to the original starting point.

Mr. PRICE. To do both, we will have to be magicians.

Mr. BOGGS. All this demonstrates the question of who is being fiscally irresponsible.

Mr. FOREMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRICE. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. FOREMAN. Does the administration support these two amendments?

Mr. PRICE. No; the administration did not recommend them.

Mr. FOREMAN. Do they support it now?

Mr. PRICE. No; it does not support either amendment. I will say, however, certainly the Department of the Navy gave its blessing to the addition of two attack submarines. But we are not bound 100 percent to the recommendations of the administration. I stated at the outset that in my opinion the committee acted in a very responsible fashion, responsible manner, and I supported both amendments.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRICE. I yield.

Mr. LAIRD. The gentleman from Louisiana, when he referred to this side of the House and the position that we will take on this bill, I think assumed a great deal by his comment that every Member on this side of the aisle is going to support this bill as reported out of the House Committee on Armed Services. I would like to state that there are a good many of us on this side of the aisle——

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Chairman, I will be glad to yield to any Member for a question but not for a speech.

Mr. LAIRD. Well, I thought the gentleman had yielded to the gentleman from Louisiana for a speech, and I thought his statement required an answer.

Mr. PRICE. I think the gentleman from Louisiana did a masterful job in questioning.

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRICE. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. COHELAN. Would the gentleman be willing to express, with any degree of confidence, his opinion on whether or not if we did, this afternoon—as I hope we do not approve this amendment—but if we do, that the Committee on Appropriations will fund the money.

Mr. PRICE. Well, of course, I would not dare to speak for the Committee on Appropriations. I have trouble enough when I want some little item for my district.

Mr. Chairman, since the beginning of time every weapon has had its counterweapon of defense.

Undoubtedly, prior to the bow and arrow, there were no shields. Prior to the Gatling gun, or machinegun, troops moved in close compact order, but the rapid fire of the Gatling gun required the spread of these troops over a large area. The airplane in most recent times brought on the development of the antiaircraft gun; and as the airplane became faster and more sophisticated, so did the ground defenses.

The development of the RS–70 and its ultimate production, if such appeared to be the course the country should follow, would cost a great deal of money. What is not realized, however, is that it would cost the Soviet Union very much more money to counter the very existence of the RS–70.

This money would have to be spent by the Soviet Union, perhaps some $10 to $20 billion, to develop antiaircraft defenses to counter the threat of the RS–70. These defenses would include not only entirely new concepts in rocketry but a whole new family of fighter interceptor airplanes.

The antiaircraft capability of the Soviet Union today could not even begin to counter an airplane with the capabilities of the RS–70. The tremendous expenditures which it would cause the Soviet Union to make would have to be made, I want to make it entirely clear, regardless of whether the RS–70 ever was actually used. These expenditures would place a tremendous drain on the Soviet economy. Ultimately, it is entirely possible that some years after the RS–70 was a completed weapons system, the Soviets would develop some means of countering it. That has always been true with respect to any weapon—some counterweapon is finally found.

I do not mean to convey the impression that I would recommend the building of the RS–70 merely because it would cause the Soviet Union to spend vast sums of money to counter it. The RS–70 as an airplane can stand by itself and justify itself as a manned system of tremendous capability for our country. But I do not think that we should lose sight of this great collateral benefit which would flow from its very existence. The billions of dollars, the scientific effort, the consumption of goods, and the intensity of research and utilization of manpower which would be required to counter the RS–70 is an extremely valuable collateral benefit which would flow to the United States.

Keep the Soviets busy in this area and they will have neither the resources, the time, nor the funds to be developing other weapons which could be used against us.

Now I would like to make some reference to the question asked by the minority leader during debate on this bill yesterday and give him a very simple answer to his query. His question was: "If the military posture and the situation of the United States in the world today is so much better than it was 2 or 3 years ago, why is it that the defense budget under Eisenhower was $40 billion a year, but now we have got to have $50 billion a year?"

The answer is a simple one, which I am certain, the gentleman from Indiana understands.

Our military posture is much better than it was 2 or 3 years ago, and our defense is more balanced and flexible than it was 2 or 3 years ago.

This did not occur by accident. When President Kennedy was inaugurated, one of his first acts was to evaluate our capability to meet the challenge of both a conventional type of war and a nuclear war. President Kennedy decided at the beginning of his administration that it was necessary to have effective flexibility in military.

He found it necessary to increase the Defense budget. The results show in these improvements in our defense posture:

First. A 570-percent increase in our counterinsurgency forces.

Second. Increase in our general purpose forces from 11 to 16 Army combat divisions and provided air mobility to transport those divisions quickly to a threatened area.

Third. Increase in our tactical Air Force fighter wings from 16 to 21 to support and supply our ground forces and defend our operations.

Fourth. Advanced our Polaris submarine program by 18 months.

Fifth. Increased total number of strategic delivery vehicles 52 percent and increase in the number of planes on alert by 90 percent.

Sixth. Began a modernization of military airlift, providing jet transports for the first time and increasing numbers of aircraft.

Seventh. Stepped up modernization of Army.

I submit, Mr. Chairman, these facts provide an adequate answer to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. ICHORD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee, I suppose in view of the fact that so many Members have made the statement that merely because they disagree with Secretary of Defense McNamara does not mean that they have any low regard for the man that I should say as one of the members who signed the statement of additional views that the mere fact that I disagree with the majority of the members of the Committee on Armed Services does not mean that I do not respect the competence and ability of the majority of the committee. I am in favor of H.R. 2440. I am opposed to any percentage cuts across the board as was proposed earlier this afternoon. I do not think that represents any intelligent way to effect economy. However, I do not feel that this House is justified in adopting this committee amendment adding $363 million and ultimately calling for better than $1 billion for two additional RS–70's. I think that many people mistakenly believe that those who are not in favor of this amendment are against the continuation of the manned bomber. May I take this opportunity to emphasize that the failure to go forward with two additional RS–70's does not mean the end of manned aircraft. Every member who signed the additional views recognized the indispensable need for manned bombers. We shall continue to have a need for manned aircraft for the foreseeable future. We must have, and we are planning manned reconnaissance aircraft for both strategic and tactical purposes. We must have and are planning manned fighter bombers in great quantity.

Furthermore, it is completely inaccurate and misleading to think of the RS–70 as a bomber in the conventional sense of the term. The RS–70 is not designed to drop bombs but, rather, to launch missiles. All agree that a strategic aircraft which drops gravity bombs will be of very little use in the 1970's.

Mr. Chairman, the issue is, therefore, not between bombers and missiles. The real controversy is between a particular kind of air-based missile-launching platform on the one hand and another type of missile-launching platform on the other hand; in other words, between land-based or sea-based platforms on the one hand and air-based platforms on the other hand.

I think, Mr. Chairman, that Secretary McNamara is right. The proposal just will not stand a cost-effectiveness analysis, particularly in view of the better than $300 billion debt which we now have and the tremendous deficit we face this year. This, I suggest to the members of the minority, is an excellent chance for the economy-minded Member to actually accomplish economy rather than merely talk about it.

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I deeply regret the turn that this debate has taken today. It is unfortunate that in a speech downtown today the first stone was cast and those of us on our side were forced to defend a personality whom we admire and respect and the majority was likewise put in the position of having to defend a personality whom they, too, admire and respect. It is unfortunate because the entire issue is, in my opinion, beside the point. The place to economize is in the bill that appropriates the money; the appropriation bill. I think that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Ford] made a most persuasive and logical argument this afternoon, that the Committee on Appropriations must have a flexible area within which they can operate.

Insofar as cutting the budget overall is concerned, I regret very much that the question of military pay has been raised. This seems to signal an effort to display Republican efforts at economy as inconsistent with support by Armed Services Committee Republicans for a much needed increase in military pay. Such attempts are certainly not in the best interests of our underpaid military men. There will be numerous opportunities this year for economies to be voted without engaging in the false economy of underpaying our military men who are prohibited from any lobbying activity. I hope partisanship will not lead to the tired technique of asking questions like "Have you stopped beating your wife?" We Republicans can support a stronger national defense, and higher military pay and still economize. As we vote on appropriations bills the remainder of this year the Republican Party will write a record of real, not false economy.

Speaking of flexibility, if you will remember, a couple of years ago, there was the possibility, at least a temporary possibility, that we were going to terminate the Polaris program at the 29th submarine. I stood in the well of this House and argued that if we did not authorize 6 additional submarines in that bill a couple of years ago and because of the realities of long lead-time we would be forced into a Polaris missile gap, and there would be a gap between the delivery of the 29th boat and the 30th. I was voted down. But a very few months later the Department of Defense realized that we needed to continue the Polaris missile program through the 41st boat, and so they came back to this Congress through reprograming actions, and through subsequent authorizations the end strength proposed is now 41 boats. Fortunately the action was timely and the gap is slight. But the fact remains that there will be a delivery gap between the 29th Polaris boat and the 30th, because Congress would not authorize 6 additional Polaris submarines which the Navy did not have to build and the Appropriations Committee did not have to fund. And when the 29th submarine comes off the ways and you wait 3 months for the 30th, instead of 1 month, remember that it was the failure of the Congress to authorize and to give flexibility and a realistic ceiling on the building of Polaris boats which is responsible.

This argument applies today to the RS–70. It is my considered opinion that if you do not give us five RS–70 aircraft you might as well give us none because all you are doing with three is to develop a commercial airframe. That item would properly belong in an authorization for the Federal Aviation Agency as the development of a commercial airplane. We are interested in a military bill and in developing a military weapons system. That is what the fourth and the fifth planes are for.

So I urge you to be realistic. Give us five because if you do not, you might as well strike them all out and move the three RS–70's we are authorizing over into the budget for the FAA.

I stick with the committee. We went into this at great length. We were deliberate about it. Do not run the risk of building a gap into the manned aircraft program as we did in the Polaris program.

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, as you know, we are in opposition to the amendment. May I say that with all of the argument that has gone on in favor of the committee amendment, I regret to say I have heard nothing thus far in the debate this afternoon that would persuade any of us to change our position. Rather, however, since the remarks of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Ford], a distinguished member of the Committee on Appropriations, I am more convinced than ever of the correctness of our position.

We are serving on a great legislative committee. It seems to me that when we come in with recommendations we should come in with recommendations for authorizations of moneys which will be seriously considered and acted upon soberly. It has been indicated here, and I think it is pretty obvious, that it is very doubtful that money will be appropriated. I would almost be willing to predict that if this bill passes today it will not be appropriated. Moreover, I certainly think that, unless there is some breakthrough which is not foreseeable in the immediate few months, it is doubtful whether, if appropriated, the money would be used.

I should like to confine my remaining remarks to rebuttal. There has been great discussion about an RS–70 weapons system—the fact that this is going to be a weapons system.

I should like to remind the members of the committee of what I said in reference to the Joint Chiefs of Staff the other day. The Joint Chiefs of Staff have taken a position on this, however, for quite different reasons and certainly not for a weapons system necessarily. I refer you to my colloquy with Admiral Anderson, which appears on pages 974–975 of the hearings and on page 4014 of the Congressional Record. Among other things, he made the following admission at the conclusion of our colloquy:

> Mr. Cohelan. Well, do you think it is better as a reconnaissance system or as a strategic retaliatory system?
>
> Admiral Anderson. [Deleted.]
>
> Mr. Cohelan. In other words, that is what your major——
>
> Admiral Anderson. That is my major concern.
>
> Mr. Cohelan. Your major concern with the B–70.
>
> And is that reflected in the Navy's request?
>
> Admiral Anderson. This is—I would like to make my position clear.
>
> The Chairman. That is a very important question. Answer that question, Admiral.
>
> Admiral Anderson. Sir?
>
> The Chairman. Answer his question, right on that point.
>
> Admiral Anderson. The Navy——
>
> Mr. Cohelan. You are asking for 700 aircraft this year and a good many of them are [deleted].
>
> The Chairman. That is right.
>
> Mr. Cohelan. You are interested in reconnaissance?
>
> Admiral Anderson. Oh, very definitely, yes, sir.
>
> The Chairman. That is right.
>
> Mr. Cohelan. Now Admiral, I don't want to put any words in your mouth, but is it fair for me to assume that in your judgment on the question at the time you made your decision, at the meeting of the Joint Chiefs, that your major interest in the system is in the [deleted] of the system, is that right?
>
> Admiral Anderson. That is correct.
>
> Mr. Cohelan. OK.

So I am suggesting to you here that each of the services no doubt had different reasons for taking the position they did in reference to this R. & D. program on the B–70 and RS–70.

Just a word on the fallibility of the Defense Department as opposed to the fallibility of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. If we were going to rely on a system of logic, to say nothing of the Constitution, which may I say is inherent in a suggestion which was made by one of our distinguished colleagues, it seems to me there would be much involved, based on past history. For example, who is to resolve conflicts between the services over competing weapons systems? Are we to assume that because a uniformed officer makes a commitment to a system that such a judgment is infallible?

It has been indicated here by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Ford], our chairman, and almost everybody that testified, and it hardly requires me at this juncture in the afternoon to point out, that we have undoubtedly the greatest Secretary of Defense in the history of this country. Moreover, may I say as a member of this committee and one who has been very close to the subject and who has tried to do his homework, that I can say the same thing about Dr. Brown. I think what we are doing in this day of exponential acceleration of weapons technology, where we must rely on science more and more in making decisions, this country needs excellence in every form. Mr. McNamara and Dr. Brown are men of excellence in their respective fields and this country can be proud and grateful they are in the public service.

When we get on this floor and make statements inadvertently or otherwise that cast reflections on such men I take strong exception to it.

Mr. Chairman, the Constitution provides and our long tradition firmly establishes the doctrine of civilian control. I do not think that a careful study of the facts will support the suggestion that the Joint Chiefs should make the sole decision on any weapons system. History has shown on repeated occasions, ranging from iron men and wooden ships to steam power and armored vessels, 75mm cannon against howitzer seige guns, the *Monitor* and the *Merrimac;* in fact through the whole history of military weaponry, the battle to change over from one system to another has been met with violent repercussions and resistance.

No, Mr. Chairman, the matter of weapons systems is too important to be left to the admirals and generals. This is a matter for the Congress and the executive. I do not think that either the executive or the legislative branch has in any way been penurious in its allocation of our national resources for our national defense.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment is a superfluous and unneeded addition of $363 million to the bill before us and I urge that you strike it from the bill by voting against the amendment.

Mr. NEDZI. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word and rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, yesterday my colleague the gentleman from New York [Mr. Pike] referred to those of us who voted against the committee amendment on the RS–70 as the Fearful Five. I plead guilty. It was not easy for me as a new member of the committee to vote against my chairman, the respected gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Vinson] for whose limitless experience, well-deserved and excellent reputation, and demonstrated fairness in both today's debate and throughout the hearings, I have the highest regard.

But after attending 26 of the 27 posture hearings and listening to all of the testimony very carefully, I was constrained to conclude that a case had not been made for expanding the RS–70 program.

I have opposed in committee the recommended $363 million funds increase in fiscal year 1964 appropriations for additional developments related to the experimental B–70 aircraft. The committee proposal is that these funds should be utilized, together with additional funds to be appropriated in each of the next 4 to 5 years, to buy two additional B–70 aircraft equipped in a reconnaissance-strike configuration. It must be remembered that the total additional bill in years to come would amount to over $1 billion, according to present estimates, but the Secretary of the Air Force was frank and stated that costs generally run beyond estimates in an R. & D. program.

I do not believe that this increased expenditure can be justified at this time. We have heard that the basic development of the airframe is lagging, and that initial flights have been delayed. We have heard that funds are being spent for development of sensor equipment appropriate to the reconnaissance-strike mission. We have heard that alternate means of achieving the RS–70 mission are available, that these means have been evaluated as being much less expensive, and that they are in fact being implemented.

I would recommend to the House that the add-on for this purpose not be approved, but rather that the committee continue to keep informed of our progress in the development of the B–70 airframe, in sensor developments, and in the implementation of related systems so that, if necessary, appropriate action can be taken when all the returns are in.

I fully support the thesis that it is dangerous to assume that there is only a single way of starting or fighting a war, and that it is desirable that our deterrent force be flexible and have a clear strategic superiority over any possible opponents. I do not believe that a case has been made that the RS–70 would add significantly to our capabilities to satisfy these objectives. The administration's program is to implement a strong, secure missile force to complement our already very strong aircraft force.

The B–70 was initiated in study form approximately 10 years ago, long before either the Polaris or Minuteman programs were conceived. The RS–70 modification of the B–70 would not be fully operational until approximately 10 years in the future, long after Polaris and Minuteman are fully implemented.

I believe that a new manned strategic weapon system may be required to supplement the present manned aircraft and strategic missile forces. However, its design should complement the other strategic systems and recognize the changed environment that has resulted from the possession by both sides of protected and secure missile forces.

For these reasons I recommend that the RS–70 add-on not be approved.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NEDZI. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GAVIN. I just want to call to the attention of the House that the RS–70 was very, very thoroughly discussed and when the vote was taken, it was 32 for and 5 against and the vote to report the bill out of the committee was unanimous and 36 members voted to report the bill out. I want to make that statement at this time so that my colleagues will have that in mind when they hear these arguments that are being made at this time.

Mr. NEDZI. I must remind my colleague that I stated that in my preliminary remarks. The gentleman has correctly stated the situation. I voted against the amendment. However, I voted for the authorization and I will vote for the entire bill.

Mr. GAVIN. Are you going to vote for this amendment?

Mr. NEDZI. I will not vote for the amendment; no, sir.

Mr. PIKE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I heard here this afternoon one of the great speeches that I have heard since I have been in this Congress, and I only wish I could climb the forensic heights that the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. Hébert] climbed this afternoon. He made a magnificent speech. I do not agree with his conclusions but I certainly admire his ability.

He started out by saying that he took his position only after a great deal of soul searching. I want to observe that everybody knows that the five members of the Armed Service Committee who took a position in opposition to their chairman and to the senior members of the committee, did a lot of soul searching, too. I submit, however, that the soul searching which we did was measured against the background of the performance of the system and not against the personality of the Secretary.

We heard yesterday that the Secretary of Defense is an ambitious man, and I would like to ask the gentleman from Illinois if he would enlighten us as to what the end of these ambitions is, because, after all, the Secretary of Defense is a Republican, and if he has ambitions along certain lines I would like to know about it, because I might want to join in some of the critical remarks that are being made.

We heard from the gentleman from Louisiana that the record is replete with examples of men in civilian clothes overruling the military. We sit in civilian clothes here in this room, and we sat in civilian clothes in the committee. The military came in their uniforms. We sat and waited for the military to say that if they were going to have another $363 million extra to spend they would spend it on these two RS–70 aircraft this year, and we are still waiting for them to say that. The Joint Chiefs of Staff never said that.

No admiral said that if there was going to be an extra $363 million appropriated this is where they would spend it. The admirals said they would spend it on two attack submarines, and we listened to the admirals and that is where we put it—unanimously. The Army generals did not say that this is where they would spend the $363 million if they were going to get an extra $363 million to spend.

I call your attention to the remarks of the distinguished gentleman from South Carolina who talked about the fact that we are only building one combat aircraft. Actually we are building two combat aircraft today; we are building the F–105 and the F–110.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PIKE. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. The gentleman does not want to tell us that the F–105 is a successful aircraft, does he?

Mr. PIKE. I certainly do.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. I want to tell you——

Mr. PIKE. You are not going to tell me anything on my time. If you want to ask a question I will be delighted to answer it.

I certainly do mean to say that the F–105 is a successful aircraft.

But I say to you, I say if you are interested in manned planes, manned aircraft, these are fighter bombers. You could build 100 F–110's with the money which you are talking about for these two RS–70's. You could build 200 F–105's.

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PIKE. No, I am not going to yield. I am certain the gentleman wants to say something pleasant, but I still am not going to yield.

You could build both the F–105 and the F–110's, which are complete weapons systems; and do not let anybody tell you that even with the extra money you want to spend today it is going to make a complete weapons system out of the RS–70.

The chairman himself in his release when we passed this amendment said:

> This would constitute a major step toward aircraft with most of the characteristics and capabilities of a true combat aircraft.

We waited for the Air Force to come in and say that this is where they would spend $363 million. The Air Force itself never said this is where they would spend an extra $363 million. So we civilians have dictated to the Air Force. We have told them they must spend this amount for this purpose.

Under these circumstances, I think we would, to quote the magnificent language of the gentleman from Louisiana, "be abdicating our responsibilities to support this amendment."

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Chairman, I have asked for this time in order to state why I intend to vote against the committee amendment which adds $363 million to the bill's total authorization in order to provide for the construction of two additional B–70 bombers of the RS–70 configuration. The majority of members of the Armed Services Committee have added $363 million to the requested authorization of the Secretary of Defense. Actually the committee additions are greater when you add the $134 million for two additional "killer" submarines. But the fight has centered upon the RS–70 and here I am persuaded by the arguments made by five members of the Armed Services Committee against the additional amount. I have listened to the entire debate these 2 days, Mr. Chairman, read the committee reports and most of hearings.

I am not opposed to the concept of manned bombers. There is a specific need for manned bombers of the tactical type. B–52's and B–58's are presently being constructed. These aircraft now in production and other tactical aircraft planned for production will have massive striking capabilities not even contemplated 10 years ago when the B–70 was first considered. The B–70 was ordered for development in 1955. And yet today, 8 years later, no B–70 type aircraft has yet flown. Since then there has come into being the Titan, the Atlas, the Minuteman, and the Polaris missiles. At this moment these intercontinental ballistic missiles are operational and are rapidly taking over the major burden of our primary nuclear deterrent force.

It must be remembered that the RS–70 is to be used chiefly as an air launching site for nuclear warheaded missiles. But no one on the floor of this Chamber today or yesterday has argued that the B–70 will have greater, or even equal, accuracy, range, or invulnerability for this kind of strike capability over missiles. Manned strategic bombers are more vulnerable both on the ground and in the air than are missiles. They take longer to launch. They take longer to reach their targets. In proportion to the number launched, they are much less likely to get through to their targets than are missiles.

In the last analysis, Mr. Chairman, this question comes down to economics, for no one argues that the security of the country is in the slightest endangered without the $363 million over and above what the Secretary of Defense requested. This bill, including the $363 million, calls for an authorization of $15,358,691,000. The overall Department of Defense money request, without the $363 million, is $54 billion. This is the largest military budget in our history, and it represents over 55 percent of the total Federal budget. In the coming fiscal year we face a planned deficit of $12 billion. No one can safely predict when within the next 10 years the budget will be in balance. Where, then, shall we begin to make cuts? Here is the first big money bill before us in this Congress.

Here is a perfect example of where priorities for expenditures must be stated. As stated in the minority views on this issue: "In these circumstances, any proposal to increase defense expenditures must be subjected to a very rigid cost-effectiveness test. These Members point out further, and it has not been rebutted, that the $363 million is just the ante money. According to the Secretary of the Air Force, there will be needed beyond this initial funding from $1.2 to $1.5 billion.

As was pointed out in debate, if the Secretary of Defense had found it necessary to ask for this excess additional amount for the defense of the country he would not, in all likelihood, have put it in this area. It has been made clear, further, that not even the Air Force has said it would spend the $363 million on the B–70 if it had the money to spend. Actually, Mr. Chairman, there is no end to what could be spent in any number of weapons systems. Given a free hand, the separate service chiefs undoubtedly would double their total figures. This is one reason why, fortunately, we have civilian control over the military.

I would like to point out also, Mr. Chairman, that next week the Armed Forces Committee will bring to the floor of the House an armed services pay bill which is approximately $250 million over the amount requested by the Secretary of Defense. So here we go again. Add this to the $363 million over requested amounts in the present bill and you are well over one-half billion dollars in excess amounts over requests in this year's authorization alone. And let us remember, as I said a moment ago, that this is just the ante money. It commits us in the billions in the years to come.

Mr. Chairman, under all these circumstances, and with the assurance that we do not in the slightest degree endanger the security of our country or our defense commitments abroad, if we cannot or will not cut Federal expenditures here and now, how in all honesty can we expect to make cuts elsewhere in the budget in amounts sufficient to bring the budget in even near balance?

The committee amendment, Mr. Chairman, should be defeated.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the pending amendment and all amendments thereto close in 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON]?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PUCINSKI].

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I am not a member of the Committee on Armed Services, so I would like to take this time to ask the chairman a few questions.

We have been listening to the experts on the committee explain this bill for 2 days. I have heard some fine speeches. But would the chairman clear up a few points for me?

Am I to understand the Air Force has spent in excess of a billion dollars to produce an RS–70 bomber that does not have a weapons system, and as your report states:

> By no stretch of the imagination would the Secretary's program develop a fighting machine.

Is that what we are supposed to understand today?

Mr. VINSON. The report is absolutely correct in this respect. That is the very reason we are asking to continue this program. We will have spent almost $1,300 million, and we propose to spend $81 million more for the current low level program. But even after that expenditure is made, we will have only three prototype planes. We will to a great extent have wasted our money.

Mr. PUCINSKI. With no weapons system?

Mr. VINSON. With no weapons system in the first three planes. We will have spent $1,300 million, and what do we get in return? Very little.

Mr. PUCINSKI. In your report it is stated:

> It has also taken the position that with the development of the fourth and fifth prototypes, the supporting systems that would make it a weapons system would be simultaneously developed.

In the language of the amendment you have here $686 million is being authorized with $363,700,000 earmarked for research and development and tests of the RS–70 program.

Under the language of this amendment, what assurance do we have, even with this additional money, plus the approximately $1 billion more that will be needed later that you will develop a weapons system in these five aircraft? Under the language in your amendment, what assurance do we have that even with the additional money we still won't have five aircraft without a weapons system.

Mr. VINSON. No absolute assurance, of course. There is no absolute certainty in a field like thus—How can there be? But we're most optimistic.

Mr. PUCINSKI. But in the amendment, you do not earmark it specifically for research and development and testing of a weapons system, which the gentleman tells us the airplane does not have. You merely authorize for additional research and development and testing of the RS-70 program, in the language of this amendment. I would like to know what assurance we have when you are through with the expenditure of this money that we will actually have a weapons system in these RS-70 bombers?

Mr. VINSON. We have every reason to think we will be able to do it. And all of the scientists and all of the experts say it will be an outstanding weapons system.

Mr. PUCINSKI. There is nothing in this amendment as it is now before the House that will provide $363 million additional for development specifically of a weapons system, which is the very thing that the committee tells us it wants the money for.

Mr. VINSON. But the RS-70 is by its very name aimed at a weapons system. What else would be done but make a weapons system out of it?

Mr. PUCINSKI. Is that not what we voted on when we voted the original appropriation for this program?

Mr. VINSON. Yes, we voted for a program that would lead us to a weapons system. But they did not push the program the way they should have over in the Pentagon.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I certainly do not want to do anything that would be in any way harmful to our defense system, but it seems to me, with this additional money here today, there is still no assurance that we are going to have a weapons system in these RS-70 bombers.

Mr. VINSON. Well, it is as sure as anything that science can develop. If we spend this money and bring in these two additional planes, they will be so equipped that they will constitute a weapons system. That is the objective of the whole thing.

Mr. PUCINSKI. I thank the gentleman from Georgia.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired. All time has expired.

The question is on the committee amendment.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. VINSON) there were—ayes 118, noes 99.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina and Mr. STRATTON.

The Committee again divided, and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 134, noes 109.

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I hesitate to take the time of the House at this hour; I am somewhat timid to comment on this bill because I am in no sense a military expert. I am not even a member of the Armed Services Committee.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. VINSON. I was under the impression, Mr. Chairman, that under the request that I submitted to the Committee all debate on the amendment and all amendments thereto had closed.

The CHAIRMAN. The request made by the gentleman from Georgia applied to the committee amendment, not to the bill.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Chairman, I apologize to the House for taking its time at this hour of the day, but I am concerned about an item in the bill which has to do with block obsolescence of naval ship construction. While I am not a military expert, I am interested in block obsolescence of ships. This stems from my service on the House Committee on Merchant Marine where we have had to deal with block obsolescence in our merchant fleet over a period of several years. I think history has demonstrated to the military the absolute and utter importance of seapower. The gentleman from New York awhile ago mentioned D-day. I want to say to you that D-day was delayed for a long period of time simply because the United States did not have seapower. As a matter of fact, the whole course of the war was delayed because we did not have seapower. I have never heard any military spokesman deny those statements. As a matter of fact, I am simply repeating what they said before our committee over the years.

Now, a strange thing has happened. The Russians have taken a leaf out of our book of experience and are expanding their seapower because they recognize the utter importance of it. They are in the midst of a naval and commercial ship construction program. I predict that at the end of 10 years, unless we do something about block obsolescense in the Navy the Russians will be the No. 1 seapower in the world.

I am not one to suggest that just because the Russians do something that we do that also. But I do want to point to the fact that they recognize the importance of seapower and we are neglecting it by not taking care of the problem we have now.

My interest stems from the national defense aspects, but it also stems from the dollar cost of a replacement program in the final analysis. The experience we have had in connection with the replacement of our obsolescent merchant vessels in World War II is that it cost us better than $10 billion in excess of what it should have.

In other words, our crash shipbuilding program cost us better than $14 billion. All the shipbuilding experts have told us that if we had had a regular program of ship construction and replacement it would have cost us only $4 billion. I say we will have the same experience if we let our naval ship obsolescence problem continue without doing anything about it. A crash shipbuilding program, toward which we are heading, will cost us many billions of more dollars than it would if we started to do something about the problem now.

Furthermore, any crash program of ship construction will not only cost additional money but many of the ships constructed under such a program will not be up to date when they are completed. This happened in World War I, when we had a crash shipbuilding program. When the war was over many hundreds of ships we built under the crash program ended up in the bays and the rivers, and there they rotted until they sank. They were never used. They were not up to date, and did not meet the needs of the time. They were prototype ships which did not meet the new requirements which arose with the passage of time.

I want to commend the committee for considering this problem, and I particularly want to commend the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS] and the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. HARDY], who recognize the problem and have sought to do something about it. I am only sorry that the Defense Department does not. I am hopeful that the committee in its consideration of an authorization bill next year will recommend the construction of an adequate number of naval vessels to meet the obsolescence problem.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TOLLEFSON. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. MILLER of California. I want to commend the gentleman for what he has said, and point out that what took place in World War II had previously taken place in World War I. It is about time that we learned these lessons from our many wars.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. I thank the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. SHELLEY, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2440) to authorize appropriations during fiscal year 1964 for procurement, research, development, test, and evaluation of aircraft, missiles, and naval vessels for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 288, he reported the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment?

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask for a separate vote on amendment No. 2.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the remaining amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report on the amendment on which a separate vote has been demanded.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Page 2, line 17, strike out "$322,986,000" and insert "$686,686,000 of which amount $363,700,000 is authorized only for research, development, and test of the RS-70."

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 226, nays 179, not voting 29, as follows:

[Roll No. 12]

YEAS—226

Abbitt
Abele
Abernethy
Adair
Albert
Alger
Andrews
Arends
Ashmore
Aspinall
Auchincloss
Avery
Baker
Baldwin
Baring
Barrett
Barry
Bates
Battin
Beckworth
Beermann
Belcher
Bell
Bennett, Fla.
Betts
Blatnik
Boggs
Bolton,
  Oliver P.
Bonner
Bray
Bromwell
Brotzman
Brown, Ohio
Bruce
Burke
Burkhalter
Byrne, Pa.
Carey
Celler
Chamberlain
Chenoweth
Clancy
Clark
Cooley
Cunningham
Curtin
Dague
Daniels
Davis, Ga.
Dawson
Delaney
Dent
Denton
Devine
Dole
Donohue
Dorn
Dowdy
Downing
Doyle
Dwyer
Edmondson
Elliott
Everett
Evins
Fascell
Feighan
Fisher
Flood
Fogarty
Ford
Foreman
Forrester
Fountain
Frelinghuysen
Fuqua
Gallagher
Gathings
Gavin
Glenn
Gonzalez
Goodling
Grant
Gray
Green, Pa.
Gubser
Hagan, Ga.
Hagen, Calif.
Haley
Hall
Hardy
Harris
Harrison
Harsha
Hébert
Hemphill
Henderson
Herlong
Hoffman
Holifield
Horton
Hosmer
Huddleston
Hull
Johansen
Jones, Ala.
Karsten
Karth
Keith
Kilburn
Kilgore
King, Calif.
King, N.Y.
Kirwan
Kluczynski
Kunkel
Landrum
Lankford
Latta
Lennon
Lesinski
Libonati
Lipscomb
Long, La.
Long, Md.
McDade
McIntire
McMillan
Mahon
Marsh
Martin, Calif.
Martin, Mass.
Martin, Nebr.
Mathias
Miller, Calif.
Milliken
Mills
Minish
Moore
Morgan
Morris
Morrison
Morse
Morton
Moss
Norblad
O'Neill
Osmers
Passman
Patman
Pepper
Philbin
Pilcher
Pirnie
Poage
Poff
Pool
Price
Purcell
Quillen
Reid, Ill.
Reid, N.Y.
Rhodes, Ariz.
Rich
Rivers, S.C.
Roberts, Tex.
Robison
Rodino
Rogers, Colo.
Rogers, Fla.
Rogers, Tex.
Roudebush
St. George
St Germain
Saylor
Schadeberg
Schenck
Schweiker
Schwengel
Scott
Secrest
Selden
Shelley
Sheppard
Shriver
Sibal
Sikes
Sisk
Smith, Calif.
Snyder
Springer
Stafford
Steed
Stephens
Stinson
Stubblefield
Taft
Talcott
Taylor
Thompson, La.
Thompson, Tex.
Thornberry
Toll
Trimble
Tuck
Tuten
Utt
Van Pelt
Vinson
Waggonner
Wallhauser
Watson
Weaver
Weltner
Whalley
White
Whitener
Wickersham
Widnall
Williams
Willis
Wilson, Bob
Winstead
Wright
Young
Zablocki

NAYS—179

Addabbo
Anderson
Ashbrook
Ashley
Ayres
Bass
Bennett, Mich.
Berry
Boland
Bolling
Bolton,
  Frances P.
Bow
Brademas
Brock
Brooks
Broomfield
Brown, Calif.
Broyhill, N.C.
Broyhill, Va.
Buckley
Burleson
Burton
Byrnes, Wis.
Cahill
Cameron
Cannon
Cederberg
Chelf
Cleveland
Cohelan
Collier
Colmer
Conte
Corbett
Corman
Cramer
Curtis
Derounian
Derwinski
Diggs
Dingell
Dulski
Duncan
Edwards
Ellsworth
Fallon
Farbstein
Findley
Finnegan
Fino
Flynt
Fraser
Friedel
Fulton, Pa.
Fulton, Tenn.
Garmatz
Gary
Giaimo
Gibbons
Gilbert
Gill
Goodell
Grabowski
Green, Oreg.
Griffin
Gross
Grover
Halleck
Halpern
Hanna
Hansen
Harding
Harvey, Ind.
Harvey, Mich.
Hawkins
Hays
Hechler
Hoeven
Holland
Horan
Hutchinson
Ichord
Jarman
Jennings
Jensen
Joelson
Johnson, Calif.
Johnson, Wis.
Jonas
Jones, Mo.
Kastenmeier
Kelly
Keogh
Knox
Kornegay
Kyl
Laird
Langen
Leggett
Lindsay
Lloyd
McCulloch
McDowell
McFall
McLoskey
Macdonald
MacGregor
Mailliard
Matsunaga
May
Meader
Michel
Minshall
Monagan
Montoya
Moorhead
Mosher
Multer
Murphy, Ill.
Murphy, N.Y.
Natcher
Nedzi
Nelsen
Nygaard
O'Brien, N.Y.
O'Hara, Ill.
O'Hara, Mich.
O'Konski
Olsen, Mont.
Olson, Minn.
Ostertag
Pelly
Perkins
Pike
Pillion
Powell
Pucinski
Quie
Randall
Reifel
Rhodes, Pa.
Rivers, Alaska
Roberts, Ala.
Rooney
Rosenthal
Rostenkowski
Roush
Rumsfeld
Ryan, Mich.
Ryan, N.Y.
St. Onge
Schneebeli
Senner
Shipley
Short
Siler
Skubitz
Slack
Smith, Iowa
Staebler
Stratton
Sullivan
Teague, Calif.
Thomas
Thompson, N.J.
Thomson, Wis.
Tollefson
Udall
Ullman
Van Deerlin
Vanik
Watts
Westland
Wharton
Whitten
Wilson, Ind.
Wydler
Wyman
Younger

NOT VOTING—29

Becker
Casey
Clausen
Daddario
Davis, Tenn.
Griffiths
Gurney
Healey
Kee
McClory
Madden
Matthews
Miller, N.Y.
Murray
Nix
O'Brien, Ill.
Patten
Rains
Reuss
Riehlman
Roosevelt
Roybal
Sickles
Smith, Va.
Staggers
Teague, Tex.
Tupper
Walter
Wilson,
  Charles H.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Nix for, with Mr. Healey against.

Mr. Patten for, with Mr. Roybal against.

Mr. Davis of Tennessee for, with Mr. Daddario against.

Mr. O'Brien of Illinois for, with Mr. Sickles against.

Mr. Roosevelt for, with Mrs. Griffiths against.

Mr. Tupper for, with Mr. Miller of New York against.

Mr. Becker for, with Mr. Gurney against.

Mr. Rains for, with Mr. Staggers against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Madden with Mr. Riehlman.

Mr. Casey with Mr. Clausen.

Mr. Teague of Texas with Mr. McClory.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, earlier in today's debate I voted to strike the committee amendment which added $363 million unasked for funds in the case of the RS–70. I stated my reasons in full for doing so. I regret that our efforts failed. I am supporting also the motion to recommit offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS], which instructs the Committee on Armed Services to make an across-the-board cut on procurements and a 12-percent across-the-board cut on research and development. Excepted from these instructions are naval torpedoes. This motion, if carried, would cut about $800 million from this $15 billion bill.

Mr. Speaker, such a cut will not, in the least way, prejudice the armed might of America. The figures are based on solid research by minority members of the Appropriations Subcommittee on Armed Services. This will squeeze the fat out of the Pentagon. In four separate reports, the General Accounting Office, an arm of the Congress, has pointed to specific instances of waste and duplication which add up to at least the figure we intend to save. Less than 50 percent of procurement is handled by competitive bidding on a group basis between the services. Various expert reports indicate that sums in the amount mentioned can be saved by changes in procedures alone, without cutting military hardware.

It is time, Mr. Speaker, for the Congress to force some reforms and a little bit of austerity in the military complex of America.

The SPEAKER. The question is on engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time and was read the third time.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. CURTIS. I am, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman qualifies.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. CURTIS moves to recommit the bill, H.R. 2440, to the Committee on Armed Services with instructions to report back forthwith the following amendments: On page 2, line 3, strike out "$522,100,000" and insert "$495,895,000".

On page 2, line 4, strike out "$1,958,700,000" and insert "$1,860,765,000".

On page 2, line 5, strike out "$3,559,000,000" and insert "$3,381,050,000".

On page 2, line 7, strike out "$580,700,000" and insert $551,665,000".

On page 2, line 8, strike out "$1,107,300,000" and insert "$1,051,935,000, of which amount $60,000,000 is authorized for the procurement of torpedoes".

On page 2, line 8, strike out "$14,700,000" and insert "$13,965,000".

On page 2, line 9, strike out "$2,177,000,000" and insert "$2,068,150,000".

On page 2, line 15, strike out "$82,148,000" and insert "$78,040,600".

On page 2, line 16, strike out "$204,183,000" and insert "$193,973,850".

On page 2, line 21, strike out "$576,601,000" and insert "$547,770,950".

On page 2, line 22, strike out "$590,133,000" and insert "$560,626,350".

On page 2, line 23, strike out "$1,060,132,000" and insert "$1,007,125,400".

On page 2, line 25, strike "$293,008,000" and insert "$278,357,600".

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion to recommit.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. CURTIS) there were—ayes 118, noes 201.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 149, nays 258, not voting 27, as follows:

[Roll No. 13]

YEAS—149

Abele
Adair
Alger
Anderson
Ashbrook
Avery
Ayres
Baker
Barry
Beermann
Belcher
Bennett, Mich.
Berry
Betts
Bolton, Frances P.
Bolton, Oliver P.
Bow
Brock
Bromwell
Broomfield
Brotzman
Brown, Calif.
Brown, Ohio
Broyhill, N.C.
Broyhill, Va.
Bruce
Burton
Byrnes, Wis.
Cannon
Cederberg
Chenoweth
Cleveland
Collier
Colmer
Conte
Corbett
Cramer
Cunningham
Curtin
Curtis
Dague
Derounian
Derwinski
Devine
Dole
Ellsworth
Feighan
Findley
Ford
Foreman
Frelinghuysen
Fulton, Pa.
Goodell
Goodling
Griffin
Gross
Grover
Haley
Hall
Halleck
Harrison
Harsha
Harvey, Ind.
Harvey, Mich.
Hoeven
Hoffman
Horan
Horton
Hutchinson
Jensen
Johansen
Jonas
Jones, Mo.
Kastenmeier
Keith
Kilburn
King, N.Y.
Knox
Kunkel
Kyl
Laird
Langen
Latta
Lindsay
Lipscomb
Lloyd
McCulloch
McIntire
McLoskey
MacGregor
Martin, Calif.
Martin, Nebr.
Mathias
May
Meader
Michel
Milliken
Minshall
Moore
Morse
Morton
Mosher
Nelsen
Nygaard
O'Konski
Ostertag
Pelly
Pillion
Poff
Quie
Quillen
Reid, Ill.
Reid, N.Y.
Reifel
Rhodes, Ariz.
Robison
Roudebush
Rumsfeld
Ryan, N.Y.
St. George
Schadeberg
Schenck
Schneebeli
Schwengel
Shipley
Short
Shriver
Sibal
Siler
Skubitz
Smith, Calif.
Snyder
Stinson
Taft
Talcott
Teague, Calif.
Thomson, Wis.
Tollefson
Utt
Van Pelt
Weaver
Westland
Wharton
Widnall
Williams
Wilson, Ind.
Wydler
Wyman
Younger

NAYS—258

Abbitt
Abernethy
Addabbo
Albert
Andrews
Arends
Ashley
Ashmore
Aspinall
Auchincloss
Baldwin
Baring
Barrett
Bass
Bates
Battin
Beckworth
Bell
Bennett, Fla.
Blatnik
Boggs
Boland
Bolling
Bonner
Brademas
Bray
Brooks
Buckley
Burke
Burkhalter
Burleson
Byrne, Pa.
Cahill
Cameron
Carey
Celler
Chamberlain
Chelf
Clancy
Clark
Cohelan
Cooley
Corman
Daniels
Davis, Ga.
Dawson
Delaney
Dent
Denton
Diggs
Dingell
Donohue
Dorn
Dowdy
Downing
Doyle
Dulski
Duncan
Dwyer
Edmondson
Edwards
Elliott
Everett
Evins
Fallon
Farbstein
Fascell
Finnegan
Fino
Fisher
Flood
Flynt
Fogarty
Forrester
Fountain
Fraser
Friedel
Fulton, Tenn.
Fuqua
Gallagher
Garmatz
Gary
Gathings
Gavin
Giaimo
Gibbons
Gilbert
Gill
Glenn
Gonzalez
Grabowski
Grant
Gray
Green, Oreg.
Green, Pa.
Gubser
Hagan, Ga.
Hagen, Calif.
Halpern
Hanna
Hansen
Harding
Hardy
Harris
Hawkins
Hays
Hébert
Hechler
Hemphill
Henderson
Herlong
Holifield
Holland
Hosmer
Huddleston
Hull
Ichord
Jarman
Jennings
Joelson
Johnson, Calif.
Johnson, Wis.
Jones, Ala.
Karsten
Karth
Kelly
Keogh
Kilgore
King, Calif.
Kirwan
Kluczynski
Kornegay
Landrum
Lankford
Leggett
Lennon
Lesinski
Libonati
Long, La.
Long, Md.
McDade
McDowell
McFall
McMillan
Macdonald
Mahon
Mailliard
Marsh
Martin, Mass.
Matsunaga
Miller, Calif.
Mills
Minish
Monagan
Montoya
Moorhead
Morgan
Morris
Morrison
Moss
Multer
Murphy, Ill.
Murphy, N.Y.
Murray
Natcher
Nedzi
Norblad
O'Brien, N.Y.
O'Hara, Ill.
O'Hara, Mich.
Olsen, Mont.
Olson, Minn.
O'Neill
Osmers
Passman
Patman
Pepper
Perkins
Philbin
Pike
Pilcher
Pirnie
Poage
Pool
Powell
Price
Pucinski
Purcell
Randall
Rhodes, Pa.
Rich
Rivers, Alaska
Rivers, S.C.
Roberts, Ala.
Roberts, Tex.
Rodino
Rogers, Colo.
Rogers, Fla.
Rogers, Tex.
Rooney
Rosenthal
Rostenkowski
Roush
Ryan, Mich.
St Germain
St. Onge
Saylor
Schweiker
Scott
Secrest
Selden
Senner
Shelley
Sheppard
Sickles
Sikes
Sisk
Slack
Smith, Iowa
Springer
Staebler
Stafford
Steed
Stephens
Stratton
Stubblefield
Sullivan
Taylor
Thomas
Thompson, La.
Thompson, N.J.
Thompson, Tex.
Thornberry
Toll
Trimble
Tuck
Tuten
Udall
Ullman
Van Deerlin
Vanik
Vinson
Waggonner
Wallhauser
Watson
Watts
Weltner
Whalley
White
Whitener
Whitten
Wickersham
Willis
Wilson, Bob
Winstead
Wright
Young
Zablocki

NOT VOTING—27

Becker
Casey
Clausen
Daddario
Davis, Tenn.
Griffiths
Gurney
Healey
Kee
McClory
Madden
Matthews
Miller, N.Y.
Nix
O'Brien, Ill.
Patten
Rains
Reuss
Riehlman
Roosevelt
Roybal
Smith, Va.
Staggers
Teague, Tex.
Tupper
Walter
Wilson, Charles H.

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Miller of New York for, with Mr. Walter against.

Mr. Gurney for, with Mr. O'Brien of Illinois against.

Mr. Riehlman for, with Mr. Tupper against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Casey with Mr. Becker.
Mr. Madden with Mr. Clausen.
Mr. Nix with Mr. McClory.
Mr. Daddario with Mr. Charles H. Wilson.
Mr. Teague of Texas with Mr. Roybal.
Mr. Rains with Mr. Staggers.
Mr. Roosevelt with Mr. Patten.

Mr. COLLIER and Mr. TOLLEFSON changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I demand the yeas and nays on the passage of the bill.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; there were—yeas 374, nays 33, not voting 28, as follows:

[Roll No. 14]

YEAS—374

Abbitt
Abele
Abernethy
Adair
Addabbo
Albert
Andrews
Arends
Ashbrook
Ashley
Ashmore
Aspinall
Auchincloss
Avery
Ayres
Baker
Baldwin
Baring
Barrett
Barry
Bass
Bates
Battin
Beckworth
Beermann
Belcher
Bell
Bennett, Fla.
Bennett, Mich.
Berry
Betts
Blatnik
Boggs
Boland
Bolling
Bolton, Frances P.
Bolton, Oliver P.
Bonner
Brademas
Bray
Bromwell
Brooks
Broomfield
Brotzman
Brown, Ohio
Broyhill, N.C.
Broyhill, Va.
Bruce
Buckley
Burke
Burkhalter
Burleson
Burton
Byrne, Pa.
Cahill
Cameron
Cannon
Carey
Cederberg
Celler
Chamberlain
Chelf
Chenoweth
Clancy
Clark
Cleveland
Cohelan
Collier
Colmer
Conte
Cooley
Corbett
Corman
Cramer
Cunningham
Curtin
Dague
Daniels
Davis, Ga.
Dawson
Delaney
Dent
Denton
Derwinski
Devine
Diggs
Dingell
Dole
Donohue
Dorn
Dowdy
Downing
Doyle
Dulski
Duncan
Dwyer
Edmondson
Edwards
Elliott
Ellsworth
Everett
Evins
Fallon
Farbstein
Fascell
Feighan
Findley
Finnegan
Fino
Fisher
Flood
Flynt
Fogarty
Foreman
Forrester
Fountain
Fraser
Frelinghuysen
Friedel
Fulton, Pa.
Fulton, Tenn.
Fuqua
Gallagher
Garmatz
Gary
Gathings
Gavin
Giaimo
Gibbons
Gilbert
Gill
Glenn
Gonzalez
Goodling
Grabowski
Grant
Gray
Green, Oreg.
Green, Pa.
Griffin
Grover
Gubser
Hagan, Ga.
Hagen, Calif.
Haley
Hall
Halpern
Hanna
Hansen
Harding
Hardy
Harris
Harrison
Harsha
Harvey, Ind.
Harvey, Mich.
Hawkins
Hays
Hébert
Hechler
Hemphill
Henderson
Herlong
Hoeven
Hoffman
Holifield
Holland
Horton
Hosmer
Huddleston
Hull
Hutchinson
Ichord
Jarman
Jennings
Joelson
Johnson, Calif.
Johnson, Wis.
Jonas
Jones, Ala.
Jones, Mo.
Karsten
Karth
Kastenmeier
Keith
Kelly
Keogh
Kilburn
Kilgore
King, Calif.
King, N.Y.
Kirwan
Kluczynski
Knox
Kornegay
Kunkel
Kyl
Landrum
Lankford
Latta
Leggett
Lennon
Lesinski
Libonati
Lindsay
Lloyd
Long, La.
Long, Md.
McCulloch
McDade
McDowell
McFall
McIntire
McLoskey
McMillan
Macdonald
Mahon
Mailliard
Marsh
Martin, Calif.
Martin, Nebr.
Martin, Mass.
Mathias
Matsunaga
May
Meader
Miller, Calif.
Milliken
Mills
Minish
Monagan
Montoya
Moore
Moorhead
Morgan
Morris
Morrison
Morse
Morton
Moss
Multer
Murphy, Ill.
Murphy, N.Y.
Murray
Natcher
Nedzi
Norblad
O'Brien, N.Y.
O'Hara, Ill.
O'Hara, Mich.
Olsen, Mont.
Olson, Minn.
O'Neill
Osmers
Ostertag
Passman
Patman
Pelly
Pepper
Perkins
Philbin
Pike
Pilcher
Pillion
Pirnie
Poage
Poff
Pool
Powell
Price
Pucinski
Purcell
Quillen
Randall
Reid, Ill.
Reid, N.Y.
Reifel
Rhodes, Ariz.
Rhodes, Pa.
Rich
Rivers, Alaska
Rivers, S.C.
Roberts, Ala.
Roberts, Tex.
Robison
Rodino
Rogers, Colo.
Rogers, Fla.
Rogers, Tex.
Rooney
Rosenthal
Rostenkowski
Roudebush
Roush
Ryan, Mich.
Ryan, N.Y.
St Germain
St. Onge
Saylor
Schenck
Schweiker
Schwengel
Scott
Secrest
Selden
Senner
Shelley
Sheppard
Shipley
Shriver
Sibal
Sickles
Sikes
Siler
Sisk
Skubitz
Slack
Smith, Calif.
Smith, Iowa
Snyder
Springer
Staebler
Stafford
Steed
Stephens
Stinson
Stratton
Stubblefield
Sullivan
Taft
Talcott
Taylor
Teague, Calif.
Thomas
Thompson, La.
Thompson, N.J.
Thompson, Tex.

Thomson, Wis.
Thornberry
Toll
Tollefson
Trimble
Tuck
Tuten
Udall
Ullman
Utt
Van Deerlin
Vanik
Van Pelt
Vinson
Waggonner
Wallhauser
Watson
Watts
Weaver
Weltner
Whalley
Wharton
White
Whitener
Whitten
Wickersham
Widnall
Williams
Willis
Wilson, Bob
Winstead
Wright
Wydler
Wyman
Young
Younger
Zablocki

NAYS—33

Alger
Anderson
Bow
Brock
Brown, Calif.
Byrnes, Wis.
Curtis
Derounian
Ford
Goodell
Gross
Halleck
Horan
Jensen
Johansen
Laird
Langen
Lipscomb
MacGregor
Michel
Minshall
Mosher
Nelsen
Nygaard
O'Konski
Quie
Rumsfeld
St. George
Schadeberg
Schneebeli
Short
Westland
Wilson, Ind.

NOT VOTING—28

Becker
Casey
Clausen
Daddario
Davis, Tenn.
Griffiths
Gurney
Healey
Kee
McClory
Roosevelt
Madden
Matthews
Miller, N.Y.
Nix
O'Brien, Ill.
Patten
Rains
Reuss
Riehlman
Roybal
Smith, Va.
Staggers
Teague, Tex.
Tupper
Walter
Wilson, Charles H.

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Walter with Mr. Miller of New York.
Mr. Madden with Mr. Tupper.
Mr. Roosevelt with Mr. Becker.
Mr. O'Brien of Illinois with Mr. Riehlman.
Mr. Casey with Mr. Clausen.
Mr. Teague of Texas with Mr. Gurney.
Mr. Nix with Mr. McClory.
Mr. Rains with Mr. Roybal.
Mr. Daddario with Mr. Patten.
Mr. Davis of Tennessee with Mr. Staggers.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Chairman, I rise to voice my disappointment in the House action taken on H.R. 2440, a $15.8 billion Armed Forces authorization bill for procurement, research, development, and other purposes.

This is an important bill, both in amount and nature. The total Federal budget request for fiscal year 1964 is $98.9 billion, and the total request for new obligational authority for the Department of Defense is $52.1 billion. This $15.8 billion authorization bill involves over 15 percent of the 1964 fiscal year budget requests for all planned expenditures for the Nation and over 30 percent of all defense budget requests for fiscal 1964.

No one, and certainly not this Member, would permit this Nation to cut corners on our national security. However, because we in the House of Representatives failed to meet our responsibilities, it was necessary for me, in good conscience and in the exercise of my independent judgment, to vote against this bill in the hope it would be returned to committee, trimmed of waste, and returned to the floor for passage. It is now my hope that the Appropriations Committee will give careful study and thought to ways in which the amounts might be reduced without endangering our defense posture.

While I have high respect for the Secretary of Defense and for the members of the Armed Services Committee, it is difficult to understand how, in a $15.8 billion bill, the Congress could accept each item as presented by the administration without a single cut and then add an additional $497 million.

I appreciate that the funds added were for the potentially valuable RS-70, which I believe in and opposed only because the administration has repeatedly said it would not use the funds even if authorized by Congress, and the vitally necessary two additional killer subs, which I supported. However, I am convinced that there is sufficient fat in the bill to accommodate these additions if necessary and still make substantial savings.

To be specific, the most obvious way to save on defense spending is to cut waste and improve procurement procedures. This was a poor bill because it failed to cut the waste in defense procurement; it failed to force an improvement in procedures which led to the corruption and waste in the recent Signal Corps scandal, to cite but one example; it failed to include recommendations to encourage competitive bids with a corresponding reduction in sole-source, negotiated, and cost-plus contracts.

We talk of economy. Yet by a vote of 374 to 33 the House rubber-stamped 15 percent of the Federal budget, and possibly the largest administration bill which will be before the Congress this year, without a single cut. Undoubtedly it was because defense spending is considered sacrosanct. National defense is sacrosanct, but waste in defense spending is not; and waste and inefficiency are always present in a $50-billion-plus operation. Instances of waste in defense spending are continuously being revealed by the General Accounting Office. A few examples are illustrated by the recent Sun-Times editorial of March 12, 1963, which I request permission to insert in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

Mr. Chairman, I am deeply concerned about the fiscal situation in this country and the planned budget deficit of $11.9 billion. I believe our economy needs a tax cut to bring the now confiscatory tax structure in line with the needs of 1963. Furthermore, I would desire a tax cut without the administration's misnamed reforms which would do much to discourage the homeowner, to harm educational institutions, hospitals, and other charitable institutions.

However, unless the Congress carefully but firmly cuts at least the more obvious waste out of the proposed Federal budget, whether in agriculture, defense, NASA, and even the congressional budget, and with our gold-plated third office building and certain abuses by some individuals of counterpart funds we are not free from criticism, we will not have a tax cut.

The House must not fail to meet its responsibilities. Waste is a luxury we cannot afford. We must give up some of our sacred cows. The question before the 88th Congress is, "Will we meet this responsibility or will we talk one way and vote another?"

The editorial follows:

THE MIND REELS

The way of a Government agency with a dollar is a wondrous thing to behold—if you happen not to be a taxpayer.

The watchdog of the taxpayer's pocket, the General Accounting Office under Joseph Campbell, Comptroller General of the United States, is the authority for the following brief notations of waste and general inefficiency in the stewardship of the taxpayer's money by the military.

Item: The project to build a nuclear-powered aircraft languished for 15 years at a total cost of $1 billion. No aircraft had been built when the program terminated.

The GAO did find that $17,147,000 had been spent to construct facilities that were used but little. Another $2,953,000 was spent for design and related work and never used. There were grave deficiencies in administration and a distinct lag in the making of vital decisions during the life of the program.

Item: In order to satisfy the Department of the Air Force the Defense Petroleum Supply Center negotiated eight contracts for petroleum storage in new dispersed and protected commercially-owned facilities.

Cost to the taxpayer: $10,300,000 more than if similar Government facilities had been used. There was no evidence that the Air Force had made any cost comparisons before granting the contracts.

Item: The Government incurred unnecessary costs of $5 million to rebuild unused deteriorated tracks for tanks and other vehicles because the Army had allowed these tracks to deteriorate in storage.

Item: The Corps of Engineers (Army) had spent $575,000 to purchase 925 25-horsepower outboard motors and had plans to buy another 553 25-horsepower outboard motors for $321,000. The Army had in depot stock at least 1,400 such motors that had never been used. The new purchases were intended to replace these unused motors.

President Kennedy has challenged those who criticize his budget to show where cuts can be made. It seems odd that he must ask. The GAO sends the President a copy of every one of its reports.

Mrs. REID of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I wish to comment on my vote on H.R. 2440—the bill authorizing $15,856,390,000 for defense procurement and research projects.

I voted for continuation of the RS-70 manned-bomber program since I feel most strongly that this is vital to our strategic defense.

I very definitely believe that we must remain militarily strong; and although I have advocated—and shall continue to advocate—economy in government, I do not feel that we should economize to the point where we weaken our defenses in any way. In regard to H.R. 2440, however, I believe that it might be possible to cut the amount requested—which was in excess of the amount asked for by the administration—and still maintain our military strength at a level second to none. I, therefore, voted for recommittal of the bill for further study by the Committee on Armed Forces.

When this recommittal motion failed—and because of my respect for the judgment of the Committee on Armed Services—I accepted that committee's recommendation and voted for passage of H.R. 2440.

However, I want it understood that when I have the opportunity to vote on specific appropriations in the future, I intend to vote to cut expenditures where

I feel that such cuts are sound and will not result in impairment to our national security and well-being.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

UNITED NATIONS SPECIAL FUND

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter including certain tables.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, our colleagues will remember that on March 4, I was granted unanimous consent to place in the RECORD a detailed table concerning the projects of the United Nations Special Fund. That table listed Fund projects from the Fund's inception in May 1959 until May 1962.

In my continuing investigation of the Special Fund I have obtained details about the 42 new projects of the Fund for which approval was voted at a Governing Council meeting this January. I, therefore, now wish to insert in the RECORD a table listing these details. By combining the information in the March 4 table and the information in this table, Members of the House may determine easily the status of any and every project ever carried out by the Special Fund.

May I note that the 42 projects involve a total cost of $96,632,300 and a Special Fund contribution of $43,673,500. American taxpayers will want to notice that their 40 percent of that Fund contribution comes to $17,069,400.

Over the 4 years of its existence the Special Fund now has spent a total of $250,625,800 for some 286 projects around the world. It is interesting to see that the Food and Agriculture Organization, which plans to spend $1.2 million in Castro Cuba under a Fund grant of 1961, has administered by far the most projects of any U.N. agency. The FAO has participated in 113 projects.

I might point out again that the International Atomic Energy Agency has participated in only one project—that in Yugoslavia.

I am pleased to be able to inform the House that none of the 42 projects approved this year are in Communist-bloc nations. This will be of some relief to American taxpayers who are footing 40 percent of the Special Fund bill. However, let us not forget that under continuing projects started in earlier years the Special Fund still is involved in six projects in Communist Cuba, Communist Yugoslavia, and Communist Poland at a cost to the American taxpayer of $2,249,040.

The nations and territories represented in the 42 new Special Fund projects are: Afghanistan, Argentina, Bolivia, Brazil, Ceylon, Chile, China, Colombia, Ecuador, Gabon, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, India, Iran, Jordan, Madagascar, Lebanon, Mexico, Morocco, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Panama, Peru, South Korea, Senegal, Syria, Thailand, Tunisia, Turkey, UAR, Singapore, Uruguay, and Venezuela.

3. Costs of individual projects, January 1963

Project by country	Approved by governing council	Executing agency	Duration of project (years)	Cost of projects (U.S. dollar equivalent)		
				Total	Special fund earmarkings [1]	Government counterpart contribution [1]
Afghanistan: Groundwater investigation	January 1963	U.N.	5	2,099,700	1,389,700	710,000
Argentina: Mineral survey in the Andean Cordillera	do	U.N.	4	2,410,900	1,166,900	1,244,000
Bolivia: Technological Research Institute, La Paz	do	U.N.	5	1,354,600	695,600	659,000
Brazil: Power development program for south central Brazil	do	IBRD	3	3,627,300	1,823,300	1,804,000
Ceylon: Improvement of oil handling facilities in the port of Colombo	do	IBRD	1¼	133,000	111,000	22,000
Chile: Mineral resources survey of the Province of Coquimbo	do	U.N.	1½	805,100	507,100	298,000
China:						
Metal Industries Development Center, Kaohsiung	do	ILO	5	2,040,000	1,142,000	898,000
Comprehensive hydraulic development survey of the Choshui and Wu Basins.	do	U.N.	3	1,594,800	885,800	709,000
Colombia: School of Engineering, National University, Bogotá	do	UNESCO	5	1,743,100	604,100	1,139,000
Equador: Preinvestment studies on forestry development in the northwest	do	FAO	5	1,720,600	825,600	895,000
Gabon: Iron ore transport survey	do	IBRD	2	2,892,000	2,092,000	800,000
Ghana:						
Food research and development unit	do	FAO	5	1,880,800	880,800	1,000,000
Preparation of a master plan for water supply and sewerage	do	WHO	2	2,153,300	865,300	1,288,000
Greece: Training of technical teachers for vocational industrial schools	do	UNESCO	4	3,211,500	932,500	2,279,000
Guatemala: Preinvestment study on forestry development	do	FAO	5	1,660,200	767,200	893,000
Guinea: Improvement and expansion of rice cultivation in the coastal lowlands	do	FAO	5	1,818,100	1,147,100	671,000
India: Institute of Tropical Meteorology and International Meteorological Center.	do	WMO	3	2,003,500	873,500	1,130,000
Iran:						
Animal Husbandry Research Institute, Hyderabad	do	FAO	5	4,308,100	919,100	3,389,000
Pasture and fodder crop investigations unit, Karaj	do	FAO	5	2,570,800	626,800	1,944,000
Jordan: Training and demonstration in afforestation and forest management	do	FAO	4	797,400	507,400	290,000
Lebanon: Soil survey and related irrigation schemes	do	FAO	4	1,029,700	485,700	544,000
Madagascar: Educational Training and Research Institute, Tananarive	do	UNESCO	6	2,924,200	1,435,200	1,489,000
Mexico: National Agricultural Institute, Chapingo	do	FAO	4	4,846,300	1,714,300	3,132,000
Morocco: Integrated economic plan for agricultural development of the Sebou region.	do	FAO	3	4,449,000	1,246,000	3,203,000
Nicaragua: Mineral survey	do	U.N.	2½	1,093,500	738,500	355,000
Nigeria:						
Secondary School Teacher Training College, western region	do	UNESCO	5	3,583,700	1,170,700	2,413,000
Federal Civil Aviation Training Center, Kaduna	do	ICAO	5	3,698,000	1,691,000	2,007,000
Panama: Water resources survey of the Chiriqui and Chico River Basins	do	U.N.	2	509,600	418,600	91,000
Peru: School of Technology, National Engineering University, Lima	do	UNESCO	5	2,469,800	1,194,800	1,275,000
Republic of Korea: Soil fertility survey and soil research	do	FAO	5	2,486,000	896,000	1,590,000
Senegal: Mineral survey	do	U.N.	3	1,520,600	924,600	596,000
Syria: Training of civil engineers at the University of Damascus	do	UNESCO	5	3,777,100	832,100	2,945,000
Thailand: Paper and pulp material survey	do	FAO	3	769,300	557,300	212,000
Tunisia: Preparation of an integrated rural plan for central Tunisia	do	FAO	3	2,006,600	994,600	1,012,000
Turkey: Crop Research and Introduction Center, Izmir	do	FAO	5	2,054,200	1,221,200	833,000
United Arab Republic: Vegetable Improvement and Seed Production Research Center, Dokki.	do	FAO	5	1,169,900	551,900	618,000
Singapore: Light industries service unit	do	ILO	5	1,449,100	578,100	871,000
Uruguay: Animal production and grasslands program at the Alberto Boerger Agricultural Research Center, La Estanzuela.	do	FAO	5	2,282,800	1,100,800	1,182,000
Venezuela:						
Preinvestment survey on forestry development in Venezuelan Guiana	do	FAO	4	1,721,500	598,500	1,123,000
Training Center for Telecommunication Technicians, Caracas	do	ITU	4	4,878,100	1,110,100	3,768,000
The Americas: Caribbean fishery development project [2]	do	FAO	4	2,221,200	1,448,400	772,800
Asia: Asian Institute of Economic Development [3]	do	U.N.	5	4,259,300	3,536,300	723,000

---

[1] The Government's cash payments toward local operating costs are included under "Governing council earmarkings" and not under "Government counterpart contribution."

[2] Requesting governments: Dominican, Haiti, Jamaica, Trinidad, Surinam, Netherlands Antilles, British Guiana, Barbados, Antigua, St. Kitts and Cayman, and Puerto Rico.

[3] Requesting governments: Burma, Ceylon, China, Malaya, India, Indonesia, Japan, Philippines, South Korea, South Vietnam, Thailand, Hong Kong, Sarawak, and Singapore.

THE CUBAN PROBLEM

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Hampshire?

There was no objection.

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, last night at the Statler Hilton, no less a spokesman for the administration than the Vice President publicly acknowledged that criticism of its failures in Cuban policy was hurting. The Vice President cried foul. He claimed that criticism of the Cuban situation threatens to paralyze the Government and weaken or destroy public confidence in the President.

The unhappy fact, Mr. Speaker, is that widespread lack of confidence in this administration's policy on Cuba exists throughout the country at this minute. This existing lack of confidence goes far beyond Cuban policy. But Cuba is perhaps the best and most recent example of this administration's misrepresentations, half-truths, and untruths to the American people.

It has gotten so we just do not know whether what is reported by the White House or the Department of Defense concerning pressing present issues is the whole truth. This is a tragedy of this administration's own creation. The situation was not developed by Republican criticism. This only helped bring it to view. It is the product of deliberate and intentional misconduct on the part of an administration that is so politically minded it would even play politics with the national survival.

But the Vice President last night did not confine his complaint of Republican criticism to the contention it was unpatriotic. He also raised the smokescreen of interference with separation of powers. He suggested that the problem was executive not legislative. He knows better.

Mr. Speaker, this administration is acutely sensitive to growing public awareness that the United States is in an increasingly difficult and dangerous situation because of blunders on the part of this Democrat administration. Its indecision and its abdication of the Monroe Doctrine have been interpreted by many people, some our friends, as calamitous and little short of cowardice in the face of Communist aggression in our own backyard.

Constructive public comment on these dismal facts is not partisan. It is not unpatriotic. Neither is its effects on government paralytic.

When such criticism includes positive recommendations to solve the immensely important Cuban problem by a specific recommended course of action it is in the best traditions of the doctrine of separation of powers. Such is the function of Congress. The floor of this great body is open to debate in depth should differences of opinion arise.

The immediate key to application of the Monroe Doctrine to the Cuban problem at this moment is the pressing need for on-site inspection of the island. The need to take a look in our own backyard to see what capacity for our destruction communism hides there. Beyond the immediate need for inspection lies the problem of a plebiscite for the Cuban people after a period of military government so that we can have smiles and freedom again on this once peace-loving island.

After all this it must become an essential concept of American foreign policy that this hemisphere will be kept free of communism even if it takes the promise or the use of American armed force to keep it free.

Mr. Speaker, the Vice President's speech last night is proof that the administration knows it is vulnerable; knows that we are in deep trouble because of its weakness. It seeks to still the voices of constructive criticism by crying foul. We accept the challenge. Those of us who believe deeply that our policy must show a new firmness and direction, dedicate ourselves to helpfulness rather than partisanship.

We do this because this issue is all important. It is indeed the issue of national survival. On this we know that, regardless of party, the people are with us. If this administration would mortgage the national survival on the altar of political expediency, then let us prove to America that the Republican Party will have no part of Democrat abandonment of principle and Democrat destruction of the Monroe Doctrine that is the record of the Kennedy administration to its everlasting shame.

H.R. 4831—A PLAN FOR FEDERAL AID TO HELP THE STATES SOLVE THEIR CRISIS IN CHARITY HOSPITALS

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced H.R. 4831. This legislation would amend the Hill-Burton Act to make more funds available for the exclusive purposes of helping States meet the mounting problem of providing adequate hospital care for their indigents who are recipients of public welfare payments.

This legislation has been suggested by Mr. Seymour Simon, of Chicago, who is president of the Cook County Board of Commissioners. Mr. Simon has recently been advised that the huge Cook County Hospital, which is under his jurisdiction, is threatened with the loss of accreditation if it fails to correct a serious problem of overcrowding which exists in the hospital today.

The people of Chicago and Cook County have just completed spending $35 million on a vast rehabilitation and modernization program in the Cook County Hospital. This hospital today stands as one of the outstanding institutions in the world of medical care and medical research. Only yesterday we read that the applications for internship at the Cook County Hospital far exceeded the number of interns the hospital can accept this year. This tremendous desire on the part of interns to complete their medical training at the Cook County Hospital demonstrates again what a fantastically high professional reputation this great hospital has.

However, Mr. Speaker, we have reached that point in Chicago and Cook County where the people of my community can no longer absorb the capital outlay necessary to expand the hospital's facilities in order to overcome the overcrowding.

I think it is only proper, therefore, that Mr. Simon should suggest that part of this responsibility be absorbed by the Federal Government. This is by no means a case of a local official reaching out to the Federal Government for assistance whenever a local community cannot meet its problems with its own resources.

Mr. Speaker, Seymour Simon is writing a tremendous record in Cook County as president of his county board. I wish to assure this House that he is not one of those individuals who call on the Federal Government for constant assistance. The people of Chicago and Cook County are fortunate to have Mr. Simon as president of the county board because of his thorough understanding and knowledge of the problems in our community. This House may be assured that if Mr. Simon has suggested some form of Federal assistance to meet the present crisis, it is only after carefully studying all other possible avenues of help at the local and State level. Surely his recommendation is based on the firm knowledge that this problem cannot be solved through local resources only.

It should be remembered, Mr. Speaker, that we are the most mobile nation in the world. In no other country do people move from one community to another as much as do our American citizens. This tremendous mobility creates vast problems, particularly for urban areas throughout America.

I am sure there is not a Member in this Congress who is not aware of the fact that with the exodus of America's rural residents into large urban areas, we now see the dilemma of 78 percent of the American population living in urban areas and only 22 percent residing in local communities. The movement off the farm continues, and with it the problems of urban areas mount. This, therefore, is the reason I have introduced this legislation today.

Under my proposal, Mr. Speaker, we would appropriate $150 million a year for the next 5 years to help the States meet this problem of providing hospital care to the indigent. My proposal would take the public charitable hospitals out of the present Hill-Burton Act and thus make available for distribution to the States assistance in the form of grants in aid to nonprofit hospitals the entire $150 million now included in the existing Hill-Burton Act.

The new appropriation of an additional $150 million a year for the next 5 years would be earmarked exclusively for construction of public eleemosynary hospitals. This $150 million annually would be distributed among 50 States based on a formula of the number of public assistance recipients that they have in their respective States as compared to the total U.S. population of public welfare recipients.

This means that the State of Alabama, which has 204,000 recipients of public assistance, would receive slightly more than $4 million a year because that State's public welfare recipients constitute 2.74 percent of the Nation's total population receiving public assistance, which numbers 7,642,556.

At the conclusion of my remarks, I will list all of the 50 States and the amount of money they would receive annually. Under my bill, a State would decide how its allotment is to be distributed within the State.

For the purposes of this act, the term "general assistance" means money payments or medical care received by needy individuals under a program established by State law or by an ordinance of a political subdivision of a State but does not include any such payments or care received by any inmate of any public penal or correctional institution.

The number of individuals receiving general assistance in any State and in all the States shall be the average monthly number of such individuals for the most recent year for which satisfactory data, as determined by the Surgeon General, is available for all the States.

Illinois, which has 429,000 recipients of public assistance, would receive approximately $8½ million a year. Since more than half of these assistance recipients reside in Cook County, it is reasonable to assume that Cook County would receive at least one-half of the Federal allotment. Assuming this to be true, in the next 5 years Cook County would receive somewhere in the vicinity of $20 million in Federal assistance to meet its needs at the Cook County Hospital.

With the adoption of this program, the Cook County Board of Commissioners could proceed almost immediately to build a 600-bed addition at the Cook County Hospital, for a cost estimated at $24 million, which would then meet the demands of the Hospital Accreditation Committee.

My bill provides that Federal funds can be used to finance up to 90 percent of the cost of additions or improvements or even new eleemosynary hospitals.

Mr. Speaker, I am perfectly willing to support reductions in other Government spending to make funds for my proposal available. I believe this legislation is sound. We established long ago the principle in the Hill-Burton Act that the Federal Government should assist local communities in meeting their hospital needs. However, Mr. Speaker, it is quite obvious that by commingling the needs of our public nonprofit hospitals with our public eleemosynary hospitals, the $150 million now appropriated does not begin to meet the needs of our Nation's communities.

I firmly believe that by making the present Hill-Burton appropriation available entirely as grants-in-aid to our not-for-profit hospitals and then making an additional $150 million available exclusively as grants-in-aid to the States for meeting the needs of their public eleemosynary hospitals, we will strike a more realistic balance in helping communities of our Nation.

I invite my colleagues to join in cosponsoring this legislation. A copy of the bill is included at the conclusion of my remarks today.

Distribution of $150,000,000 proposed for Federal grants to States for construction of public hospitals based on distribution of average monthly number of recipients of public assistance, calendar year 1962

State	Average monthly number of recipients, calendar year 1962	Percent of U.S. total	Distribution of $150,000,000
Total	7,462,556	100.00	$150,000,000
Alabama	204,484	2.74	4,110,000
Alaska	6,409	.09	129,000
Arizona	59,287	.79	1,192,000
Arkansas	93,345	1.25	1,876,000
California	719,433	9.64	14,460,000
Colorado	96,100	1.29	1,932,000
Connecticut	69,033	.93	1,388,000
Delaware	13,469	.18	271,000
District of Columbia	29,984	.40	603,000
Florida	206,234	2.76	4,145,000
Georgia	190,402	2.55	3,827,000
Guam	1,203	.02	24,000
Hawaii	16,745	.22	337,000
Idaho	[1] 18,550	[1] .25	373,000
Illinois	429,366	5.75	8,630,000
Indiana	[1] 73,505	[1] .98	1,477,000
Iowa	83,570	1.12	1,680,000
Kansas	65,864	.88	1,324,000
Kentucky	154,197	2.07	3,099,000
Louisiana	248,245	3.33	4,990,000
Maine	45,155	.61	908,000
Maryland	78,525	1.05	1,578,000
Massachusetts	173,469	2.32	3,487,000
Michigan	320,554	4.29	6,443,000
Minnesota	116,662	1.56	2,345,000
Mississippi	177,019	2.37	3,558,000
Missouri	246,270	3.30	4,950,000
Montana	19,886	.27	400,000
Nebraska	32,371	.43	651,000
Nevada	7,750	.10	156,000
New Hampshire	12,344	.17	248,000
New Jersey	133,356	1.79	2,681,000
New Mexico	44,057	.59	886,000
New York	571,030	7.65	11,478,000
North Carolina	188,399	2.52	3,787,000
North Dakota	17,273	.23	347,000
Ohio	384,492	5.15	7,728,000
Oklahoma	188,378	2.52	3,786,000
Oregon	63,115	.85	1,269,000
Pennsylvania	428,768	5.75	8,618,000
Puerto Rico	290,571	3.89	5,841,000
Rhode Island	34,274	.46	689,000
South Carolina	76,870	1.03	1,545,000
South Dakota	20,943	.28	421,000
Tennessee	156,129	2.09	3,138,000
Texas	341,140	4.57	6,857,000
Utah	30,830	.41	620,000
Vermont	14,051	.19	282,000
Virgin Islands	2,065	.03	42,000
Virginia	71,395	.96	1,435,000
Washington	122,082	1.64	2,454,000
West Virginia	161,059	2.16	3,237,000
Wisconsin	104,749	1.40	2,105,000
Wyoming	8,100	.11	163,000

[1] Excludes recipients under general assistance program; State agency does not report these data. Each State's allotment would be altered slightly as the figures for Indiana and Idaho become available.

H.R. 4831

A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act so as to establish a special program for the construction, expansion, remodeling, and alteration of public eleemosynary hospitals

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) section 621 of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 291d) is amended by striking out "construction of public and other nonprofit hospitals" and inserting in lieu thereof "construction of public hospitals, other than public eleemosynary hospitals, and other nonprofit hospitals".

(b) Subsection (e) of section 631 of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 291a (e)) is amended by inserting "(1)" immediately after "(e)" and by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(2) the term 'public eleemosynary hospital' means any hospital owned or operated by a State or political subdivision of a State or any agency or instrumentality of a State or such a political subdivision in which all patients are treated and attended by physicians who treat or attend such patients without reimbursement or receive reimbursement therefor only from the public entity owning or operating such hospital."

(c) Subsection (k) of such section 631 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(3) In the case of any project for the construction of a public eleemosynary hospital which is approved after the effective date of this paragraph, the Federal share shall be up to 90 per centum of the cost of the construction of such project."

SEC. 2. (a) Title VI of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C., subchapter IV) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new part:

"PART I—CONSTRUCTION OF PUBLIC ELEEMOSYNARY HOSPITALS

"Authorization of appropriations

"SEC. 671. In order to assist the States in carrying out the purposes of section 601(b) there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of $150,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and a like sum for each of the four succeeding fiscal years, for the construction of public eleemosynary hospitals.

"Allotments to States

"SEC. 672. (a) Each State for which a State plan has been submitted and approved under section 623 prior to or during a fiscal year shall be entitled for such year to an allotment of a sum bearing the same ratio to the amount appropriated pursuant to section 671 for such fiscal year as the number of individuals receiving general assistance in such State bears to the aggregate of individuals receiving general assistance in all the States.

"(b) For purposes of this section—

"(1) the term 'general assistance' means money payments or medical care received by needy individuals under a program established by State law or by an ordinance of a political subdivision of a State, but does not include any such payments or care received by an inmate of any public penal or correctional institution;

"(2) the number of individuals receiving general assistance in any State and in all the States shall be the average monthly number of such individuals for the most recent year for which satisfactory data, as determined by the Surgeon General, are available for all the States.

"Approval of projects

"SEC. 673. For each project for construction of a public eleemosynary hospital, there shall be submitted to the Surgeon General through the State agency (designated as provided in section 623(a)(1)) an application by the State or a political subdivision thereof. Such application shall set forth—

"(1) a description of the site for such project;

"(2) plans and specifications therefor in accordance with the regulations prescribed by the Surgeon General under section 622(e);

"(3) reasonable assurance that title, as defined in section 631(j), to such site is or will be vested in the applicant or in the public entity which is to operate the hospital;

"(4) reasonable assurance that adequate financial support will be available for the construction of the project and for its maintenance and operation when completed; and

"(5) reasonable assurance that the rates of pay for laborers and mechanics engaged in construction of the project will be not less than the prevailing local wage rates for similar work as determined in accordance with Public Law 403 of the Seventy-fourth Congress, approved August 30, 1935, as amended.

The Surgeon General shall approve any such application if (A) sufficient funds to pay the Federal share of the cost of construction of such project are available from the allotment to the State made under section 672; (B) it has been approved and recommended by the State agency and is entitled to priority over other projects for the construction of public eleemosynary hospitals within the State in accordance with the regulations prescribed pursuant to section 622(d); and (C) such project is in conformity with the State plan approved under section 623. No application shall be disapproved until the Surgeon General has afforded the applicant an opportunity for a hearing.

"Payments

"Sec. 674. (a) Upon approving an application under this part, the Surgeon General shall certify to the Secretary of the Treasury an amount equal to the Federal share of the estimated cost of construction of the project and designate the appropriation from which it is to be paid. Such certification shall provide for payments to the State. Upon certification by the State agency, based upon inspection by it, that work has been performed upon a project, or purchases have been made, in accordance with the approved plans and specifications, and that payment of an installment is due to the applicant, the Surgeon General shall certify such installment for payment by the Secretary of the Treasury; except that if the Surgeon General, after investigation or otherwise, has ground to believe that a default has occurred requiring action pursuant to section 632(a) he may, upon giving notice of hearing pursuant to such subsection, withhold certification pending action based on such hearing.

"(b) Amendment of any approved application shall be subject to approval in the same manner as an original application. Certification under subsection (a) may be amended, either upon approval of an amendment of the application or upon revision of the estimated cost of a project. An amended certification may direct that any additional payment be made from the applicable allotment for the fiscal year in which such amended certification is made.

"(c) The funds paid under this section for the construction of an approved project shall be used solely for carrying out such project as so approved."

(b) Clause (1) of subsection (f) of section 622 of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 291e(f)(1)) is amended by striking out the comma immediately preceding "but" and all that follows through the word "group".

Sec. 3. The amendments made by this Act shall take effect on July 1, 1963; except that such amendments, other than the amendment made by section 2(b) of this Act, shall not apply to any project for the construction of a public eleemosynary hospital, if an application with respect to such hospital was approved under section 625 of the Public Health Service Act before July 1, 1963.

RESIGNATION FROM AND APPOINTMENT TO COMMITTEE

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication, which was read:

March 13, 1963.

Hon. John W. McCormack,
Office of the Speaker,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Speaker: I deeply regret to advise you that I will not be able to serve as a delegate to the meeting of the Mexico-United States Interparliamentary Group which will meet at Guanajuanto, Mexico, March 18–21, 1963.

Circumstances have arisen which make it necessary for me to remain in Washington during those days. I particularly regret such action because of my interest in Mexican-American affairs. I was looking forward with great anticipation to this third interparliamentary meeting.

Your kindness in designating me as a delegate is most appreciated. I hope that this necessary change of plans at this late date will not cause an inconvenience to you.

With best wishes, I am,
Sincerely yours,
Clement J. Zablocki,
Member of Congress.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the resignation will be accepted.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of section 1, Public Law 86–420, the Chair appoints as a member of the U.S. delegation of the Mexico-United States Interparliamentary Group for the meeting to be held in the Republic of Mexico, beginning on Monday, March 18, 1963, the gentleman from California [Mr. Cameron] to fill the existing vacancy thereon.

TAX DEDUCTIONS FOR COLLEGE TUITION

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced a bill today to permit tax deductions for college tuition and other educational expenses.

This proposed amendment to the Internal Revenue Code is one way in which the Federal Government can offer direct encouragement of higher education. Further, it can be accomplished without Federal control or regulation.

The costs of higher education in our country have risen sharply in recent years—well above the general cost index climb. Those who shoulder this burden—parents or students, themselves—are entitled to more equitable tax treatment.

Specifically, this bill will allow a taxpayer to deduct from gross income tuition and certain other educational expenses paid for his education, the education of his spouse, or any of his dependents at an institution of higher learning.

Laboratory, library, field study, enrollment, and other fees and charges, as well as the costs of the required textbooks will be deductible under the provisions of the bill. However, it will not permit a tax deduction for unrelated expenses such as room, board, and travel.

I urge Congress to pay particular attention to this area as it deliberates the many tax reduction and reform bills which will come before it in the days ahead.

PROBE OF U.S. INTERESTS SHIPPING TO CUBA

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I disclosed on the floor of the House late yesterday afternoon that a naturalized American citizen who has received some $32 million in U.S. Government-insured loans has a substantial interest in oversea companies which account for some 30 percent of all current non-Communist shipping to Communist Cuba.

This man's name is Manuel E. Kulukundis. He was naturalized on June 20, 1955, and lives in New York. As I stated earlier, he curiously obtained a fleet of surplus World War II U.S. vessels purchased under the Ship Sales Act of 1946 the same day he obtained U.S. citizenship; and purchase of the Government surplus vessels had been previously questioned because he was not an American citizen.

Since that time Kulukundis has received some $32 million in U.S. Government-insured loans which have helped underwrite his worldwide shipping operations.

In my remarks to the House yesterday I revealed that during the summer months of 1962, Kulukundis ships accounted for 10 percent of all free world shipping to Cuba, and that 12 of the 14 Kulukundis ships were tankers carrying vital Soviet cargos from parts inside the U.S.S.R.

From facts I included in the Congressional Record last night accompanied by information now in my possession I firmly feel sufficient evidence now exists to initiate full investigation by appropriate committees of Congress into the entire operations of this citizen of convenience.

WELCOME TO ELGIN

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. Hemphill] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, March 10, 1963, South Carolina's newest industry officially held open house on the occasion of the dedication of its new watch plant at Elgin, S.C., in Kershaw County, in my district. The public was invited.

In the Columbia (S.C.) State of Saturday, March 9, 1963, there appeared an almost full-page advertisement of invitation and I quote:

> Elgin National Watch Co. cordially invites you to attend the dedication of its new watch plant at Elgin [formerly Blaney] Sunday, March 10, 3 p.m. at the plant site [Kershaw County]. Program includes an open house and plant tour. Refreshments will be served. Bring the family this Sunday and meet Elgin, South Carolina's newest industry.

We are proud to have the Elgin National Watch Co. come to South Carolina. We welcome them with all the hospitality at our command, and we salute the great efforts of all those who made the plant a reality. We were privileged to have visiting us in South Carolina, on the occasion of the opening, the president and the chairman of the board, and three directors of Elgin National Watch Co., who headed the list of Elgin executives participating in the firm's plant dedication.

Henry M. Margolis, president and board chairman, attended with his lovely wife and son.

Among the directors who attended were William C. Croft, president, Pyle National Co.—a South Carolina native who has made good in the business world; A. Phillip Goldsmith, chairman of the board, Bates Fabrics, Inc.; and Charles F. Willis, Jr., president, Alaska Air Lines, Inc. In addition, eight members of the Elgin management of the company's general offices at Elgin, Ill., participated in the dedication. The Honorable John C. West, able senator of Kershaw County, S.C., was master of ceremonies. He introduced the Reverend Dean Clyde, pastor of the Blaney Baptist Church who gave the invocation. Then, appropriately, we had "The Star-Spangled Banner." There is nothing unusual about this; in South Carolina we put God first and the country next.

Then Senator West introduced the various platform guests including those I have already named who did us high honor by attending the dedication. He also introduced ex-Gov. Ernest F. Hollings, whose efforts in obtaining the plant were saluted by Senator West and others on the program. Senator STROM THURMOND was present to honor us with his presence. Then Senator West introduced President Henry M. Margolis, who made the dedication address.

It had been my hope that I would be able to put into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the full text of the address of this great businessman, symbolic of the free enterprise system of this great Nation. Since I do not have the text, I will try to highlight the significant facts he brought out.

Of the 25 million watches sold in 1962 in the United States of America, only 1,250,000 were manufactured in the United States. Not only are we failing to produce for our own people, but we are letting imports take away from our people the possibility of jobs working in the watch factories of this Nation. Mr. Margolis significantly contrasted the production in Russia, where in 1961, the Russians produced 25 million watches, and took pride in the fact that they had developed that many technicians to do the intricate handwork necessary to assemble the watches.

He pointed out to us the problem involved in the import situation. Eighty percent of the cost of producing an Elgin watch, or any other American watch, is labor. We pay the highest prices in the world for labor, and we are proud of that fact, but we are competing with foreign manufacturers who pay as little as 30 cents an hour for their labor.

The courageous president of this company exhibited the magnificent courage which is typical of the management of his company. He stated that if his company was expendable, they were not going to cry about it, but they had to be convinced that it was in the best interest of the Nation. Meanwhile, he expressed the determination of his entire personnel to face the tasks and meet the challenges before them. They intend to put out the best watches in the world—and they will. They intend to integrate the National Elgin Watch Co. into any defense effort this country may make, and he told of the training of the fine people of the community of the work which they had to do.

He related the history of the Elgin plant coming to South Carolina. Less than 6 months before March 10, the ground had been broken, and on the occasion of the dedication, approximately 220 people were gainfully employed in the production of fine watches.

He saluted the fine people of Kershaw County, and the surrounding areas who have assimilated the training offered and are giving excellent effort in their new jobs at the plant. I am sure much of the credit for this is due Mr. A. H. Buhrow, plant manager, who was on the speakers' platform.

We were all inspired by the address of this fine businessman. He dedicated his plant to America, to usefulness for the purposes of this great country. I felt that we were listening to a big patriot of a patriotic organization.

Later he presented Gov. Donald S. Russell with a magnificent timepiece. Governor Russell responded to the dedication address in the fine fashion so characteristic of this brilliant new chief executive of South Carolina. He welcomed not only the Elgin plant, but all of its officials, to the warmth and hospitality of South Carolina, and told Mr. Margolis that we would consider him an honorary citizen of our great State, and presented to him a flag of the State of South Carolina to be flown over the new plant.

After the ceremony, Mr. Margolis made an appropriate reply. He then presented Senator John C. West with the first watch, a fitting tribute to the untiring efforts of Senator West in bringing the plant to South Carolina.

I think it significant that on the inside cover of the program, Mr. Margolis had also included a very timely statement. We quote from that statement:

> In 1864, the Elgin National Watch Co. was incorporated in Chicago and shortly thereafter its first plant was built in nearby Elgin, Ill. Since the first Elgin watch was delivered from the hands of its early craftsmen, Elgin timepieces have never ceased ticking away the seconds, counting the minutes and hours for millions of persons throughout the world. And during three wars, Elgin has contributed importantly to our Nation's defense as a producer of specialized timing mechanisms.
>
> Today, nearly 100 years later, Elgin is proud to dedicate its newest watch plant here in Elgin, S.C. This first phase of our operation here contains 72,000-square feet of space, and features the most advanced equipment, air conditioning and dehumidifying systems. Without doubt, it is the most modern and efficient watch assembly operation in the United States, and possibly the world.
>
> The role of Elgin in South Carolina is a most significant one in the company's plans to maintain and expand its preeminence in the watchmaking field in the United States. To the people who are the Elgin National Watch Co. in South Carolina, therefore, we look for the same skills and dedication that have characterized Elgin's long and successful history of fine watchmaking. We hope also that in the future plants serving other Elgin operations can be located here.
>
> As production of watches becomes a reality in South Carolina, we wish to extend our deepest appreciation for the outstanding cooperation and help from the many people and organizations who have made this new industry possible. We take great pride in becoming a member of your community and thank you for your warm welcome. And we look forward to a long and pleasant relationship with those who have worked so diligently on our behalf.

Also included in the statement was a news story released to the press on February 27, 1963, describing a significant Elgin contribution to U.S. space exploration activities. The news story is as follows:

> DOWNEY, CALIF.—The Elgin National Watch Co.'s Research and Development Division, Rolling Meadows, Ill., was selected by North American Aviation's Space and Information Systems Division to develop and build the unique timekeeping device for the Apollo command module. The device is an electronic metronome with an infallible sense of timing that will call the signals on board NASA's moon-bound Apollo spacecraft.
>
> The Apollo spacecraft, which is under the direction of NASA's manned-spacecraft center, Houston, Tex., is scheduled to take three Americans on a round trip to the moon for scientific research by 1970.
>
> The award to the Illinois firm was the 17th major selection by North American Aviation's Space and Information Systems Division, principal contractor for the Apollo command and service modules. The 17 companies have received awards totaling more than $128 million, and are located in 10 States.
>
> The electronic timekeeper will be to moon-bound astronauts what the automatic clock radio and electric timer are to the contemporary housewife.
>
> It will receive its synchronization from the on-board guidance and navigation computer. The computer solves a problem, then synchronizes the timekeeper to count cadence and send the signal to start or stop an operation.
>
> With a required flight and ground check-out operating life of about 2,000 hours, the space-age timepiece will be called upon to keep the spacecraft television, telemetry, and on-board test equipment synchronized.
>
> It will also provide clock pulses to the sequencer which will jettison the Apollo escape tower as the huge three-stage advanced Saturn C–V space vehicle breaks the magnetic bounds of earth.
>
> The electronic metronome will be a little black box about the size of a loaf of bread and will weigh less than 10 pounds. With the equivalent of 4,800 parts tucked away, some small as a pinhead, but none larger than a golf ball, the device will utilize the most recent developments in microminiature circuitry, recording for later analysis elapsed time between major events such as retrorocket firings.
>
> The robot timekeeper will have a redundancy (emergency backup feature) that will guarantee 1-million-to-1 odds against failure.
>
> Its passion for accuracy will be equaled only by the National Bureau of Standards,

with which the timekeeper will be synchronized before plug-in to the command module.

Senator West also introduced some of the ladies present: Mrs. Henry Margolis; South Carolina's first lady, Virginia Russell; Mrs. Robert W. Hemphill, and Mrs. Elizabeth Dixon; then Senator and Mrs. George McKeown, of Cherokee County, S.C., and Senator and Mrs. Dan Laney, of Lee County, S.C. Singled out in the audience were Commissioner Les Myers, of Kershaw County; E. T. Bowen, of Elgin; Howard Speaks, Ed Mitchell, and Frank Rector, of Camden, S.C., and E. C. Potter, mayor of Elgin. Time did not permit further introduction.

A crowd of 5,000 people attended the dedication. The benediction was given by the Reverend Milton McGuirt, pastor of the Elgin Methodist Church.

A silent host at the dedication was our own country. Through the magnificent efforts of the Area Redevelopment Administration of the Department of Commerce of the United States of America, a water system at Blaney, S.C., now Elgin, S.C., evolved from a dream to reality. As Senator West so gratuitously pointed out—without water we could not have hoped to have this magnificent plant. I salute the Area Redevelopment Administration, its helpful officials, its employees at the Washington level and in the Atlanta regional office, for their magnificent cooperation and help in getting water for Blaney. This is the kind of fruitfulness the Area Redevelopment Administration was designed to be a part of. Industry, investment, jobs, salaries, productivity, all a reality. And throughout all, the preservation and promotion of the free enterprise system that has made America great.

Like many others sitting on the platform on that beautiful Sunday afternoon, I could look out over the heads of the crowd and see in the distance the horizons which our eyesight limited us. I was too realistic to think that I could see beyond the horizon, or prophesy what might happen to us. I could only say a little prayer of thankfulness that we have people in industry like President Margolis and the people who came to do us honor in the dedication on that Sunday. I feel confident that with people of such caliber, together with the people of the locality who have made a magnificent stride in coming untrained from the farms and the homes, and learning the skilled talents of assembling watches.

After the ceremony a fine tour of the plant was arranged. Courtesy was the watchword and hospitality the order of the day.

It was a great day in South Carolina on Sunday.

Welcome, Elgin. We are happy to have you, proud of you, and we hope that in the future the great name of Elgin will be synonymous with the great name of the State of South Carolina.

CONSENSUS ON CUBA

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. HALPERN] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, there exists today what I believe to be a rough consensus of opinion on one of the most vexing problems with which the United States has had to deal in recent years—I am referring to the Cuban situation. This consensus has been shaped and hammered out by means of public debate; very few other foreign policy or national security issues have been submitted to such an intensive interchange of ideas and evaluations as has the Cuban problem.

Public opinion and the governmental policymaking machinery have had sufficient exposure to this problem for the past 4 years to have sifted the wheat from the chaff of this debate; to have eliminated certain extreme or rash solutions; and to have observed the effects of various actions on the part of our Government on the viability of the Havana regime. This has helped to pare the Cuban debate to the bone, to the relevant heart of the matter. I believe that it is necessary at this time to initiate an evaluation of this consensus, with a view to measuring the pertinence of the steps toward solution which our Government has taken to date, and in order to provide the basis for recommendations for future steps to which I add my own views. The debate, in other words, must move with all responsibility forward into new areas of consideration.

The role of the loyal opposition has on occasion been called into question during this debate. Let us put this behind us permanently; what is involved is the security of the United States of America. In our concern for this, we are all united. I believe that constructive debate can and does serve a vital function in a democracy—that of exposing policy to public scrutiny, in which crucible a policy survives or falls on the combined interests of the American people.

It is in this crucible of lengthy public consideration and debate that a distinguishable consensus of opinion on the Cuban problem has been distilled. I am grateful to many of my distinguished colleagues in both bodies of this Congress for providing some of the more recent and valuable debating material which has served to finally sharpen and focus the public's appreciation of the Cuban problem, and to stimulate our National Government's responsibility in meeting that problem.

Let me turn now to what is my interpretation of this consensus of opinion about Cuba. First, there seems to be wide agreement on one fundamental issue. We want to settle the problem without invading Cuba, if it is humanly possible.

This feeling is tempered by another, equally strong: The problem must be solved. The United States cannot accept the continued presence of Soviet military power in the Western Hemisphere. Containment is not enough: Soviet troops in Cuba present an intolerable situation. This is true for many reasons, and people may differ on why they agree that this is so, but they do agree that there must be a withdrawal of Soviet forces from the island. The problem of how to do this, of course, is one which can be faced when we are in agreement, and the executive branch is in agreement, that it should be done.

This brings us to the third point of consensus on the Cuban problem. And that is that our Government has not found an effective policy of solving the Cuban problem so far. I am not going to go into criticism of specific points of policy. I simply mean to point out that Fidel Castro has been in power in Cuba for 4 years, and that there has been a Soviet military presence in Cuba for some time, and that this presence brought the world to the brink last October, and that it continues to menace hemispheric security, and that Cuba as a base for the training of saboteurs and agitators is increasing, not decreasing, the security of the American States. The consensus is that Cuba is an obvious problem to which we have not found a solution, obvious or otherwise.

Another point in this consensus is that if the Monroe Doctrine has been multilateralized as an instrument of hemispheric security, then it must serve as an instrument of our security as well as our neighbors.

It has been pointed out that if the doctrine was multilateralized it was in order to keep the United States from unilaterally invoking it according to its own interpretation. There are many who disagree with this opinion.

But there can be no legal question about the security treaties between the American States, including OAS. The Rio Treaty signed to circumvent the necessity to resort to the Monroe Doctrine, must, in its stead, provide for our security. Under this treaty we can invoke any kind of sanction, including military, in order to avoid a threat to the security of the American States. It is time all the American people realize that we have a solid legal basis for our firm insistence that the Soviet military establishment get out of Cuba.

In this respect, I should point out many have found sadly lacking the support for actions against the Castro regime on the part of the organization of American States. I am speaking now not only of precipitant military actions, but even the simple diplomatic, economic, and commercial sanctions provided for in the treaty. Some nations have not even broken off relations with the Castro regime, despite the missile crisis in October, and the Cuban embassies in these countries continue to serve as focal distribution points of propaganda and subversives, continue to provide means of traveling to Cuba for guerrilla training, and continue in general to dissipate and fragment the actions of those American States which are concerned about Cuban troublemaking. An honestly debatable question is: Has the administration exerted sufficient leadership, or sufficient pressure, to bring the members of the Organization of American States into agreement about sanctions on the Cuban espionage and sabotage center?

For myself, I feel we have been sorely lacking a policy on Cuba. I don't think the administration has really developed a clear policy about Cuba or the Western Hemisphere with respect to its freedom. I feel we must emphasize to all the peoples of the world that we have made no commitments that prevent us from continuing the embargo—quarantine if you will—or from taking stronger action if it is essential to our security or to the peace and freedom of this hemisphere. The President should make it clear that his hands are completely untied as to quarantine or any action required for the security of this hemisphere. I feel we should have a powerful defense organization for the Caribbean States and Central America. I feel we should use every means at our command to curb shipments of goods to Cuba by our allies. And we have our own economic assistance program as a meaningful tool to end this sham. How ridiculous can we be to allow what is still going on daily to continue? Here we give economic assistance and maintain broad trade agreements with many countries which, in turn, assist Cuba's economy and strengthen Castro, often providing our own goods, our own machinery parts and replacements so vital to Castro's productivity. We should carry out our threat to withdraw our aid to the nations violating this basic principle of morality and justice. The President has this authority; he should use it.

I feel it is necessary to insist on the withdrawal of Soviet troops—to relieve this uncertainty which dominates our minds regarding the existence of vast Soviet troops and weapons which could strike at us or other vital points in the Western Hemisphere. I am convinced that if these Soviet forces are removed that they will take with them most of the weapons they brought there, thus removing the most potent tools Castroism has in this hemisphere. This brings me to another thought.

What on earth is this question of offensive or defensive threat? What difference does it make? The Soviets have not brought thousands of troops and millions of rubles worth of equipment into Cuba to bask in the Cuban sun. The important thing is that there is this huge Soviet military buildup in the Caribbean 90 miles from our shores—brazenly and defiantly dedicated to the subversion and the threat to security of our hemisphere. It does not matter if it is offensive or defensive. What does matter is that the Soviet buildup has turned Cuba into a base for subversion and terrorism throughout the hemisphere.

Castro, buttressed by this Soviet strength, makes no secret of his aims. "Ché" Guevara, his principal strategist said publicly just a few months ago that the Soviet Union from its Cuban base intends to use every means to spread its influence throughout Latin America, stimulating unrest and guerrilla warfare to weaken or topple neighboring governments. He emphasized that there is no solution but armed struggle to overthrow these governments. Guevara admitted that guerrillas in Paraguay, in Guatemala, Colombia, and Venezuela are already active in armed struggle and that guerrilla groups also have been inciting clashes in Nicaragua and Peru. What more do we need.

Mr. Speaker, I am aware that the Cuban problem is not a simple one, but I am convinced that it is a vital one to this Nation's security. My purpose today in bringing up these points has been to suggest that a rough sort of consensus has been arrived at about the Cuban problem, and that now, on the basis of, and operating within this consensus, we ought to turn the ongoing debate onto responsible measures to solve, or at least to reduce, the problem to acceptable dimensions.

Public concern over the Cuban imbroglio has assumed many forms and has covered a wide range of evaluations of the problem and possible avenues to explore toward its solution.

Toward this end I trust a bold policy will emanate, and I am confident that the whole country will unite behind whatever firm action the President recommends to remove this menace. Of course we should have a bipartisan policy. But, to paraphrase Senator KEATING, bipartisanship does not mean blind man's buff. It means alert, open-minded support for actions the President takes in pursuit of U.S. objectives. When the President acts—whether successfully as in October, or unsuccessfully as at the Bay of Pigs—he can expect bipartisan backing with no recriminations. However, and I emphasize this, there must be a definite policy to expect bipartisan support. When there is no policy, except wait and see, then, all citizens, yes, and Members of Congress, have a responsibility to make their views known. I believe that continued expressions of American concern over the Soviet threat in our hemisphere are very much in the national interest. They can only strengthen the President's hand in dealing with the Soviets and convincing them that we are determined to put an end to their military activities in the Caribbean.

One such expression of concern has been forwarded to me recently by a group of young citizens from my native borough of Queens in New York. It is contained in a resolution adopted by the Queens County Young Republican Association of which Gordon L. Busching, of Kew Gardens, serves as president. The resolution was drafted by Z. Michael Szaz, Ph. D., a member of the graduate faculty of the History Department of St. John's University, a noted author of numerous books and scholarly articles, and a recent panelist at the International Political Science Association's congress in Paris.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I insert the resolution at this point in the RECORD:

RESOLUTION ON THE CUBAN SITUATION UNANIMOUSLY PASSED BY THE QUEENS COUNTY YOUNG REPUBLICAN ASSOCIATION, FEBRUARY 27, 1963

Whereas the Soviet Union, by deployment of military forces, political subversion and economic domination, has established a hostile Communist base in the Western Hemisphere in Cuba in contravention of the Monroe Doctrine;

Whereas during the fall of 1962 offensive missile weapons were dispatched by the Soviet Union to Cuba and, though allegedy withdrawn the promise of a ground inspection of the dismantled bases was never implemented;

Whereas the Cuban Communist government and its Sino-Soviet and satellite experts and training personnel are actively engaged in subverting the political and social order of free countries in Latin America and are maintaining an excessive weapons arsenal;

Whereas the Communist rulers of the Cuban nation have established a totalitarian police regime against the wishes and interests of the Cuban people; and

Whereas the United States remains the main military, political and economic bulwark of free nations locked into a lethal struggle with international communism and has to act in its own and its allies' interests Therefore, be it

Resolved, That this committee recommends the following actions: The U.S. Government shall, by extending a short time limit, demand from the Cuban and Soviet Governments that a ground and air inspection of missile and air bases be permitted under the supervision of the Organization of American States.

If such a demand is not complied with, the U.S. Government should be forced to decree a complete embargo of all goods to Cuba by the ships of any nation and enforce it by all the means at our command, including if necessary the Armed Forces of the United States, and/or take any and all actions necessary to liquidate the Communist danger to the Western Hemisphere.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ASHBROOK] may extend his remarks at this point.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, I want to generally associate myself with the gentlemen who have been speaking out on this vital matter which is of such great interest to the American people. I have known Dr. Michael Szaz for many years and he brings a wide breadth of understanding to these subjects. I read with interest the resolution which has been incorporated into the RECORD by the gentleman from New York [Mr. HALPERN] and I want to commend this fine group of young Republicans for their statement. Dr. Szaz is their inspirational leader.

Looking back to the statement by the President of the United States just before the 1962 election, I well recall the firmness of the President's position. His actions did not keep up with his words. In point six of his declaration he affirmed his intention to press the blockade of Cuba until adequate on-site inspection was accomplished. His abandonment of this position before such inspection was provided for has weakened our position throughout the world and certainly given wide latitude for action to Mr. Khrushchev who will not have to fear our strong words as long as Mr. Kennedy is in the White House.

I commend the gentleman for bringing this important message to the House of Representatives.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include a resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members desiring to do so may extend their remarks at this point in the Record on this subject.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

DYNA-SOAR

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Washington [Mr. Pelly] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, earlier today the House passed H.R. 2440, a bill to authorize for the fiscal year 1964 procurement, research, development, tests, and evaluation of aircraft missiles and naval vessels for the Armed Forces. During the 4 hours of general debate on that bill the only real controversy had to do with the RS–70, previously known as the B–70. A great deal of time was consumed in discussing that project and there was not sufficient time available to me to bring up a subject which I think is also of great importance to the whole defense posture.

A new controversy seems in the making. Yesterday the Washington Daily News carried a big headline to the effect that the United States may scratch Dyna-Soar. The article in this paper indicated that Secretary of Defense Robert S. McNamara may cancel the Air Force role in either Gemini or Dyna-Soar. For the information of the Members who are not acquainted with the various space projects, Gemini is a project to develop space rendezvous and docking techniques in orbit, using a two-man capsule. Dyna-Soar, which is also called the X–20A, is an Air Force project involving a manned, winged, glide reentry vehicle of orbital capability boosted by a Titan III launch vehicle. The Gemini is scheduled for flight tests beginning late this year and the Dyna-Soar is not scheduled for testing until 1965.

Mr. Speaker, the news item which appeared yesterday followed testimony made public by the House Armed Services Committee which indicated that Defense Secretary McNamara said he would not want to prejudge statements that have been made but his guess was that Gemini, as against Dyna-Soar, has a greater military potential for us. Apparently, Mr. Speaker, the question to be decided is as to whether to continue with Dyna-Soar or modify Gemini for military purposes. Secretary McNamara is quoted as saying each spacecraft could cost $800 million and before investing $1.6 billion the Government probably would make a choice between them.

My purpose in rising today is not to tell the House that Secretary McNamara is about to make a mistake. Far from it—I have considerable respect for Mr. McNamara. One time I told him when he appeared before the Merchant Marine Committee that if he wanted to cut down a military establishment in my district and if he could show me that it was no longer needed I would support him.

In this case of the Dyna-Soar, which is being developed in the congressional district adjoining mine, I would make the same statement. However, if I think the Secretary is wrong I will oppose him with equal directness. Especially I stress the matter of justification because when you are spending public funds and administering the public business you just do not make a decision and act without letting the people know why you make the decisions you do; or that is the way it should be.

Mr. STINSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PELLY. I yield to my colleague from Washington, in whose district the Dyna-Soar is being developed.

Mr. STINSON. Mr. Speaker, I would like the gentleman from Washington [Mr. Pelly] to say if he believes there are political considerations in awarding or cancellation of contracts.

Mr. PELLY. I would say to my colleague that yesterday in the general debate it was made abundantly clear by the chairman of the House Armed Services Committee that such a controversy is being looked into at the other end of the Capitol. Such influence or political consideration has been suspected.

I will say this too, I have a high regard for Secretary McNamara. Any political motivation in my judgment would not be of his deliberate doing. He is not such a man.

But, Mr. Speaker, I would say to my colleague the public needs for facts and reassurance on this score.

For example, the President, while campaigning in support of Mayor Richardson Dilworth's candidacy for Governor of Pennsylvania last fall, speaking at the McKeesport, Pa., city hall on October 13, 1962, said:

> Working with Governor Lawrence since 1960, we have increased by 50 percent the number of prime defense contracts that come to Pennsylvania, job retraining, cleaning our rivers, area redevelopment, increasing our food supplies for those on relief—all these measures which can be brought about with a progressive, democratic Governor, working with all of us.

In other words, Mr. Speaker, the President implied very pointedly that only by the election of a Democrat Governor could Pennsylvania expect to maintain or improve its present posture with respect to defense contracts.

It is known furthermore that all decisions on contract awards are channeled through the White House. Every award over $1 million, I have been told, goes to the White House and thereafter to someone for political advantage in making a public announcement.

The public knows this. The public also knows there was an inference that if the President's brother was elected to the Senate it would be good for Massachusetts in obtaining defense business.

I would defend Mr. McNamara himself but as for this administration no one has convinced the public that there are not political considerations in these matters.

When the next election comes around, questions of this nature will be raised. Rightly so, too. I imagine my colleague will remind his constituents of what has transpired. But I certainly hold Mr. McNamara blameless—unless someone shows to the contrary. I disagree with his reasons as to his decision on the TFX. It is a costly mistake to my mind.

As was said yesterday, Mr. McNamara is no military genius, but he is an executive and as such, of course, he will make honest blunders.

I do not want him to make any such wrong decision with regard to Dyna-Soar. That is why I am raising this issue today and writing into the Record what experts have testified regarding continuation of Dyna-Soar.

I certainly do not think Mr. McNamara is motivated by political consideration but somebody on the administration team that made this decision could have been politically motivated and I think that the public interest calls for more facts than have been revealed.

Mr. Speaker, when the question as to the possible striking of the Dyna-Soar program comes up there are some facts which I think Members of this House and the public should be given. For example, I think testimony of Dr. Robert C. Seamans, Jr., who is the Associate Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, before my Committee of Science and Astronautics on February 25, 1962, made certain things very clear insofar as the interest of science in connection with both the Dyna-Soar and the Gemini.

Let me cite what Dr. Seamans said in response to a question. I will read into the Record from the actual transcript. Mr. Hammill, a staff member of the Science and Astronautics Committee asked this question:

> Mr. Hammill. Well now there are reports in the press to the effect that in view of the NASA-Air Force Gemini agreement that the Dyna-Soar program is being reevaluated within Defense.
>
> Now the question is: Can Dyna-Soar and Gemini be distinguished as to objectives, because we understand Gemini to be looking toward maneuverability in space, rendezvous in docking and landing at a small preselected land site, which seems to me to be very similar to the objectives of Dyna-Soar.
>
> Mr. Seamans. Well, it is true that all major programs are always under review and consequently Dyna-Soar is being thoroughly evaluated.
>
> We in NASA feel that the two programs are complementary and not in conflict, one with another. We look to the Gemini to push forward the frontiers in space with space-type maneuvers, the kind you referred to. However, we feel the Dyna-Soar is an extremely important part of the national effort in order to better understand the problems of very high speed maneuver during reentry, large acceleration, large L/R lift-drag ratios. This is important in systems that may involve return from orbit on a prescribed orbit, rather—in the case of Gemini we can wait an extra orbit or two to come down when we want, in the case of the Dyna-Soar we would have the ability to come down without going around the earth several times to get in a favorable position.
>
> Also the Dyna-Soar is giving this country an opportunity to gain additional information on certain very important materials under very high temperature. It would be, we feel, a loss to the country if this program were cancelled.

Mr. Speaker, it is not possible, of course, to divorce defense and the peaceful exploration of space. Military authorities have made it very clear that a major breakthrough in space on the part of the Soviets could place the United States in a position of vulnerability which we have not occupied before. We would have a gap.

From the foregoing, Mr. Speaker, it will be clear that from a scientific point of view the Dyna-Soar program is considered important. As to the testimony indicating the position of the military service let me cite Lt. Gen. James Ferguson, Deputy Chief of Staff, Research and Development, U.S. Air Force. In appearing before the Committee of Science and Astronautics on March 1, 1963, in his statement on space posture General Ferguson said:

> Military patrol capabilities for the space region could provide oncall protection for U.S. space activities, both scientific and military, in event of hostile enemy actions in the space region. This objective includes: An improved detection and tracking system; a means of inspecting unidentified space devices; and a means of disabling hostile satellites, if this should be required in the national interest.
>
> And lastly, a system for continually monitoring such space phenomena as radiation and solar flares, the latter being essential for prolonged space operations.
>
> These, plus technical building blocks. The Air Force space program also includes elements which form the basic research and development building blocks for a military man in space program. Key elements of this group already in development are: the Titan III launching system, Dyna-Soar, and the Air Force participation in the Gemini program. And in this connection, I think I made it clear that the NASA/DOD agreement of this last month on a joint Gemini program was most certainly welcomed by the Air Force. Another key element we propose is a military test space station. The technologies represented by Gemini, a military test space station, Dyna-Soar, and Titan III are fundamental to any future manned military space capability.

In subsequent questions the testimony of General Ferguson as to the Air Force position on Dyna-Soar is clear.

I will read my own questions from the transcript:

> Mr. Pelly. Mr. Chairman, while we are on Dyna-Soar could I ask a question?
>
> Mr. Karth. Yes, sir, Mr. Pelly.
>
> Mr. Pelly. General, in the February 25 issue of Aviation Weekly, on page 26, there is an article that indicates that Dyna-Soar, the whole Dyna-Soar program, is under review and that there is an indication that it will be eliminated or greatly curtailed. Can you comment on that?
>
> General Ferguson. I have read the article. It is true that we are conducting a survey of the program and we are proposing in the next 2 weeks to present to the Secretary of Defense a detailed examination of Dyna-Soar and its technical objectives.
>
> Mr. Pelly. We had testimony in here when our counsel asked a question the other day from Dr. Robert Seamans, Jr., expressing, I would say, in highest terms the importance of that project. And I think this article in Aviation Weekly indicated maybe the Air Force wasn't willing to stand up and fight.
>
> General Ferguson. Well, I can assure you the Air Force does, has, and will stand up and fight for Dyna-Soar. We think it is a most critical part of the national space program.
>
> Mark you, I said "national," because Mr. Webb and Mr. Seamans and many other key officials of NASA are on record, recently and over the years, in full support of Dyna-Soar and its technical objectives.
>
> Mr. Karth. I think what Mr. Pelly had in mind was the ordering of the review by the Defense.
>
> General Ferguson. Of course this isn't the only system under review. They are all under review, and rightly so, and they continue.
>
> Mr. Pelly. It seems to me the General's statement indicated the importance of the Dyna-Soar, and when it was indicated that the Air Force was not going to stand up and fight, as it were, for this program, I was somewhat concerned in view of the importance that is attached to it by the Assistant Administrator of NASA.
>
> Mr. Karth. Whatever doubt the gentleman had in his mind as to the Air Force's intentions, obviously have now been cleared up.
>
> Mr. Pelly. I am happy to hear it.
>
> General Ferguson. I think it is worthwhile to add that we do this with the broadest base of the scientific community, Mr. Pelly. We are, I think, very fortunate to have a very strong scientific advisory board that provides continuing assistance to the Air Force and exercising technical and scientific judgments on the validity of the various programs that we are involved in or that we propose.
>
> I was present at the October review of the Dyna-Soar program by the aeronautics panel of our advisory panel. It is composed of 10 or 12 of the best known aerodynamicists in the country. So that we have plenty of scientific and technical backup to the judgments and positions that we feel we must sustain, particularly with respect to this program.
>
> Mr. Karth. Thank you, General.
>
> Mr. Chenoweth.
>
> Mr. Chenoweth. While on the subject of Dyna-Soar, I wonder, General, if you could give us just briefly the military importance of Dyna-Soar; what is Dyna-Soar, what is the project, why are you so concerned with it?
>
> General Ferguson. Yes, sir, I would be glad to.
>
> This is another in a series of experimental aircraft that is designed to explore the problems related to lifting body reentry from orbital speeds. It is the logical follow-on to the very, very successful X–15 program that is exploring lower altitudes and lower velocities, but we have already learned, sometime before we fly the first Dyna-Soar, has added greatly to our wealth of knowledge in structures, in materials, high-temperature materials and in structures that are designed to dissipate very high temperatures for long periods of time, and problems related to stability and control.
>
> Now, while very often a research program is pretty hard to define in all its payoffs, here is one that I think, as a follow-on to the X–15, will produce for us and for this Nation some very, very useful information in this particular area. It will apply to many other programs that we have in mind for the future, including the aerospace plane that I mentioned. It could apply to recoverable boosters that we are hoping for at some time in the future. It could apply to other winged vehicles of very high velocities that we are looking for a number of military missions. It could even apply to some commercial products, perhaps a supersonic transport. But all these are hard to define in detail. Yet, based on our previous experience we are certain, we know the information available to us today as a result of ground testing has provided us this information, and certainly, intuitively and based on our experience we can project that much more of real value to the Nation will come from this program.
>
> Mr. Chenoweth. Where are you with Dyna-Soar right now?
>
> General Ferguson. Dyna-Soar is in its third year of finding. It will fly—let me see if I have the dates here.
>
> Yes, the first unmanned flights is November of 1965.
>
> Mr. Chenoweth. Thank you.
>
> Mr. Karth. Are you finished?
>
> Mr. Chenoweth. Yes.
>
> Mr. Karth. General, are you at all familiar with NASA's M–2 concept, of which there was a picture in the newspaper last night, I believe, or at least within the last 24 hours or so? And if so, how does, this in your opinion, compare to Dyna-Soar? Is it duplicative, almost identical?
>
> General Ferguson. It is in a completely different region of exploration, so far as I know. I believe it is subsonic, relative low speed, isn't it? It is a wooden model for low-speed experimentation. I have only heard of it. I haven't read anything on it.

Mr. STINSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PELLY. I am glad to yield to my colleague from Washington.

Mr. STINSON. Mr. Speaker, the people in Seattle as well as from other parts of the country have become fearful that political influence plays a part in the awarding of Government contracts. I believe that the people in this country want assurance that Government contracts are going to be awarded to contractors strictly on a basis of technical superiority and cost of production.

Surely, during the elections of 1964, my constituents and the voters throughout this Nation will be very much aware of potential political influence in the awarding of Government contracts.

Mr. PELLY. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. Shriver].

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Speaker, press reports carried yesterday afternoon and this morning indicate that the Secretary of Defense is at long last prepared to "demonstrate that the award of the TFX contract not only was proper but definitely serves the national interest."

As you know this is a matter which is under investigation by a committee in the other body and concerns the awarding of a contract to the General Dynamics Corp., for the development and production of the F–111 fighter-bomber which will be a weapons system utilized by both the Air Force and the Navy.

I can only say that such an explanation by the Secretary on this contract award will be welcomed and is long overdue. It is unfortunate that the Secretary has waited until now to submit his statement when, as he points out, public confidence in the Pentagon has been shaken.

Last month I felt it necessary to take the floor of the House to discuss just how difficult it was for me to get a reply to an inquiry which I made on January 23, 1963, to the Secretary regarding the TFX decision.

This was a matter of extreme importance to the people of my district. Like most defense contract decisions, this had great economic impact upon Wichita and Kansas. If the Boeing Co., which submitted the lowest cost estimate, had been successful the TFX would have been assembled in Wichita.

When the contract was awarded to the Texas concern there were many allegations of political considerations which appeared in the national press and in nationally syndicated columns. My constituents asked me about those allegations in letters and in my conversations with them back in my district. It was natural, I thought, that I should ask the Office where the final decision on this large contract was made for information so that I could reply responsibly.

On February 26, 1963, I related on the floor of the House how it took a month to get a reply to my inquiry from the Department of Defense and I included in the Record the correspondence which I had from the Department.

The Department of Defense did not answer my inquiry regarding political allegations in the correspondence which I received from the Office of the Secretary on February 22, 1963. However, since my remarks on the floor I have received another communication from David E. McGiffert, Assistant to the Secretary for Legislative Affairs, in which he assured me that insinuations of political influence are completely without foundation.

Mr. Speaker, I agree with the Secretary of Defense that public confidence in the Pentagon has been shaken. It has not been caused, however, by the investigation by the other body. It has been caused, in part, by the reluctance of the Department of Defense to answer head on the political allegations which have been made since the contract decision was made on November 26, 1962.

Another important factor in this controversy, which should not be overlooked by the Congress, is the fact that, evidently, the company with the lowest cost estimate did not get the contract.

It is most difficult to explain to the taxpayers why a competent firm with a long record of distinguished defense production does not get a contract when it submits costs which are at least $100 million below those of the contract recipient. At a time when we are striving for economy in Government expenditures and hoping to reduce the taxload of our citizens, the administration and the Congress should be especially accountable to the citizens for such decisions.

Mr. Speaker, defense is Government's biggest and most costly business. It is not bigger than the American people, however, and to earn public confidence our civilian and military leaders in the Defense Department must at all times be ready to fully justify their decisions to the people.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, the Members of this House of Representatives I hope will view this issue of the Dyna-Soar as something which touches on the national interest and is not a matter of mere local concern. As my colleague from Washington and the gentleman from Kansas so succinctly point out, the policy of cancellation of contracts and political aspects of awarding projects concern every employee of every defense contractor. This has to do with the confidence of each citizen in the Government. The Defense Department has a role in this issue which like Caesar's wife must be beyond suspicion.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include certain statements and other relevant material.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

FOREIGN POLICY AND THE AMERICAN FARMER

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. Libonati). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Delaware [Mr. McDowell] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. McDOWELL. Mr. Speaker, foreign policy is, of course, associated primarily with problems and situations originating in foreign countries rather than problems of a domestic nature. The American public, therefore, is prone to appraise the success or failure of U.S. foreign policy in terms of our relations with the people of other countries. We know only too well how this relationship can change from hot to warm, to cold, and vice versa.

If such a basis for the formulation and execution of U.S. foreign policy were to be governed by these standards alone, then we would indeed be left naked to the massive assault of communism.

It is because our foreign policy is always based upon the welfare, peace, and security of the American people that it has a year-in-and-year-out continuity. The success of foreign policy must always depend upon the acceptance and support of the American people.

Two articles appearing in the Washington, D.C., Post are indicative of public support of our foreign policy as well as a clear view of the domestic problems which lie ahead in the formulation and execution of the U.S. foreign policy. The first article, entitled "Foreign Aid—Lack of Popular Support Is a Myth," by Roscoe Drummond, published Tuesday, March 12, 1963, and the second article, entitled "Farmer's Shadow Falls Over Europe," by Marquis Childs, published Wednesday, March 13, 1963, are submitted for the information of my colleagues:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Mar. 12, 1963]

FOREIGN AID—LACK OF POPULAR SUPPORT IS A MYTH

(By Roscoe Drummond)

When Congress comes to vote on the foreign aid program, it ought to vote on the basis of fact, not on the basis of fiction.

The greatest fiction of all, to which President Kennedy has unintentionally made his own contribution, is that most American people are against it.

The opposite is the truth.

In his year-end TV interview the President, thinking that he was speaking with ingratiating candor, cited the foreign aid program as crucial despite the "fact" that it is a large burden not popularly supported.

This is not the fact.

The truth is that the foreign aid program is a relatively small burden (one-twentieth of the budget) and is popularly approved.

Here is the evidence.

A study of a whole sequence of findings of the Gallup polls from 1955 to 1963 shows that:

Popular support of the foreign aid program is at a high point for the entire 9-year period.

Today 58 percent of the American people record themselves as approving foreign aid, 30 percent oppose, and 12 percent are neither for nor against it.

There is no great variation between the different sections of the country: in the South 55 percent approve; East, 60 percent; Midwest, 58 percent; Far West, 59 percent.

Public backing of foreign aid is 7 percent higher than it was in 1958, 2 percent higher than in 1955.

In recent years, despite the appropriation of about $4 billion annually, popular support has not, as widely believed, been declining; voter approval has been going up and voter opposition has been going down.

Most of those who question foreign aid think that the appropriation is much higher than it is.

This, I think, gives a far different picture of American public opinion than the widespread myth that foreign aid is unpopular, even resented, by the great majority of the people.

The nearest thing to a national referendum is this 9-year sequence of Gallup polls. It shows that Mr. Kennedy has been making a mistake by talking about the unpopularity of the program. He should be talking about its popularity.

An examination of the exhaustive backup statistics and individual responses which lie behind the public reports of the Gallup findings justify these factual conclusions:

The principle of foreign aid is more strongly supported today than in 1958, and at least as strongly as any time since 1955

The percentage of people opposed to the principle of foreign aid has shown a drop of 3 percentage points since 1958; the number of people with no opinion has dropped 4 percent. This suggests that the principle of foreign aid continues to draw supporters rather than opponents.

Public support for foreign aid is highest among those who know more of the facts about the program. More than 40 percent of the people polled think the foreign aid appropriations represent 10 percent of the national budget instead of 5 percent. More than 80 percent did not know the approximate amount appropriated.

The humanitarian aspects of foreign aid have the greatest appeal to the American people. More than 65 percent of the pro-foreign aid comments of those polled gave the humanitarian reason as the basis of their support.

On the other hand more than 40 percent of those who were critical of the program were not opposed in principle—just felt it was not well administered.

Congress certainly ought to take a hard look on a country-by-country basis to determine for itself how well the program is being administered, and wherein foreign aid is being well or where badly utilized. I am not defending any particular level of appropriation. I am simply reporting that in approving the continuance of foreign aid Congress would be reflecting the judgment of the great majority of the American people.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Mar. 13, 1963]

FARMER'S SHADOW FALLS OVER EUROPE

(By Marquis Childs)

While hopefully the controversy within the Atlantic Alliance is still put in terms of a friendly debate, more and more it emerges as a contest of sheer power. A team of specialists has just left for Europe for the first preliminary soundings looking to the round of tariff negotiations due next year. Supposedly this Kennedy round will enable the United States to take full advantage of the liberalized trade act and broaden the current of commerce between the two sides of the Atlantic.

But long before this can happen, decisions may be reached within the European Economic Community that will close the door to any trade expansion. Farm products and farm prices are the great looming obstacle.

If the European farm bloc prevails and prices are fixed at the highest subsidized level of the German producer, with an external tariff wall keeping out American feed grains, the consequences are unforeseeable. The pessimists say it will mean U.S. troops will leave Europe within 2 years or less. And beyond that is the sober shadow of a new isolationism. If President de Gaulle really wants to force the United States out and establish an independent Europe as a third force, agriculture is the surest way to achieve his end.

This was the kind of plain talk Walter Hallstein, head of the Commission of the European Community, heard from Secretary of Agriculture Freeman when he was in Washington last week. Speaking for his client, the American farmer, the Secretary spelled out in the bluntest language the relationship between farm exports and foreign policy.

He used, of course, the now-famous example of the chicken exports that have been cut back within the space of a few months by more than 60 percent. This was done by raising the import duty from 4½ cents a pound to 12½ cents. Thus precipitously American chicken raisers lost $50 million of a market that they had created through assembly-line techniques of growing and shipping.

The political rub, as Freeman underscored in his private talk with Hallstein, comes from the fact that this market has been developed primarily in Arkansas, Georgia, and several other Southern States. Those States are represented in the Senate by key committee chairmen who exercise extraordinary authority over America's foreign and defense policy. With the South turning against its traditional free trade policy, as a result of the growth of textile and other industry in that region, the blow to the chicken market can have serious repercussions.

But this is nothing as compared to the issue of feed grains that are the bulk of agricultural exports to Europe adding up to $1 to $1.5 billion a year. Under the complex system of variable levies agreed to among the six European countries making up the Common Market the commodity price for one must be the price for all. Should this price be set in the next few weeks at the high, subsidized German price, ultimately European tariffs will shut out American grains.

In France, where production costs and prices are much lower, the French farmer will see a bonanza ahead. The estimate here is that 6 million additional acres can be brought into wheat production. That would mean self-sufficiency for Europe and more—an overflow such as has long embarrassed the United States.

The basic fact is that the revolution in agriculture beginning in this country 20 years ago is only getting a start in Europe. The same methods will produce the same revolutionary results we have seen here—mountainous surpluses threatening the price structure and sending the farmer into the political arena to demand his fair share of the national income.

Freeman stressed to Hallstein the importance of getting a quantitative agreement on agricultural products until in the Kennedy round of tariff negotiations a more enduring formula can be achieved. Hallstein expressed the hope that the chicken market can be shared between Europe and the United States, with action taken to undo some of the damage that followed an abrupt tripling of the tariff.

One thing in all this is certain. The revolution in agriculture cannot be halted. European farmers are beginning to copy American assembly-line techniques in chicken raising. Tinkering between country and country or even between bloc and bloc on tariff rates and production quotas will not suffice. Northing short of a world food conference facing up to the new revolution and the paradox of surpluses in the face of hunger and want will get close to solving the riddle.

RHODE ISLAND HOSPITAL, PROVIDENCE, R.I.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, today Rhode Island Hospital at Providence commemorates a century of service to meet the health needs of people in the community, and, in large measure, throughout the State of Rhode Island. It is a privilege for me to pay tribute to the spirit of dedication and the foresight that have shaped the small 70-bed general hospital founded on March 13, 1863, into the imposing medical center of today.

The 70 beds have grown to more than 670, and the services have expanded to include a children's hospital, rehabilitation facilities, care of the chronically ill, clinic services, medical—and especially cancer—research, and education. Thus, the hospital has adjusted to changing needs and kept pace with the progress of medical knowledge and techniques.

Its record of service to the community is an impressive one. Since it opened its doors, 693,520 patients have been cared for in the hospital and over 5 million visits have been made to its several clinics and ambulatory services. Last year alone, 20,620 patients were admitted for bed care and 40,915 received treatment in the emergency department.

Members of the hospital's medical and surgical staff, through research, have made important contributions to the advancement of medical science. In addition, the hospital has supplied postgraduate education and clinical training to 1,100 young physicians, of whom more than 300 are today caring for citizens throughout the State.

The Rhode Island Hospital School of Nursing, founded in 1882, has produced 3,248 well-educated and skilled professional nurses. Graduates of the school are now caring for the sick and injured in all parts of the State. More than 300 young women are now enrolled in the school.

But the past, for all its achievements, is but a forerunner of the future. And plans are in the making for the continuing development of new avenues of service. For example, through arrangements recently made with Brown University, Rhode Island Hospital now has the potential for meeting the needs of a modern, progressive medical school. This capability, together with the completion of facilities still under construction, will broaden the hospital's opportunities to serve the citizens of Rhode Island and to contribute to the advancement of medical science.

On the occasion of its 100th anniversary, therefore, I wish to commend the Rhode Island Hospital for its past accomplishments and to express my confidence in its readiness to meet the challenge of the future.

ANNOUNCEMENT OF PROGRAM AND SUBCOMMITTEES OF SMALL BUSINESS COMMITTEE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. EVINS] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege yesterday to make certain comments and observations to representatives of the press regarding the proposed work of the House Small Business Committee during the 88th Congress.

Most of the members of the committee were present and participated in this conference, which was attended by representatives of small business organizations as well as the press.

I wanted to announce the membership of the subcommittees as well as the program of the committee and, under unanimous consent, I include my statement and designation of subcommittees at this point in the RECORD.

STATEMENT OF HON. JOE L. EVINS, CHAIRMAN, SELECT COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS, PRESS CONFERENCE, MARCH 12, 1963

At the outset, I wish to welcome you gentlemen of the press and thank you for coming to this conference.

During the 88th Congress, I believe you will find that our committee will be accentuating the positive, and by that I mean that we will be seeking to find affirmative methods to help small business in many ways instead of looking primarily for ways to punish big business. I am not opposed to big business as such—I am rather pro small business. Our committee will be working for ways to make sure that all small business concerns are given every chance to succeed and, if possible, to become big business.

It will be one of our objectives to help small business obtain a larger share of Government procurement and defense contracts. Over the years, this committee has been able to be of some helpfulness. During the past year, for instance, the share of Department of Defense prime contract awards given to small business was increased slightly. Regrettably, however, there was a decline in the percentage of both the civilian procurement awards and in the field of research and development. We want to see if this latter situation can be reversed and improved. A greater percentage of research and development contracts must be given to small business.

Another objective of our committee will be to find ways whereby adequate financing assistance can be made available to those small business concerns desiring to modernize their plants, to move to shopping centers, and to otherwise maintain, improve, or increase their competitive capacity, so as to be able to match the tempo of this modern, fast-moving era in which we live today.

It shall be one of the primary goals of our committee to concentrate during this session of Congress on finding ways to assist small business to increase its participation in foreign trade under the new trade expansion program.

Our committee will inquire into the effect which the Common Market is having upon the small businessmen in this country. Last year when Congress passed the Trade Expansion Act, there were dire predictions that many small businesses would fail or go into bankruptcy. As a consequence, the Congress included two provisions in the law. One of these provides for retraining those persons who become unemployed due to imports. The other permits subsidy payments to small business concerns that have been injured by the increased foreign competition.

These new provisions and policies of the trade expansion program are being implemented and have been in operation now for several months. Our committee proposes about 2 weeks from today—that is, on March 25 or 26—to hold the first of a series of hearings relating to various small business problems, including especially the effects of the trade expansion program on small business but embracing as well some of the other small business problems previously mentioned.

I want to advise you gentlemen that at these hearings we propose to hear from officials of the Small Business Administration, the Commerce Department, the Tariff Commission, and the State Department, as well as from representatives of various small business organizations and some of the owners of small business concerns.

Turning to another area, we see that about 650 small business investment companies have now been chartered and licensed. These companies provide a small business investment potential in excess of half a billion dollars, and they are now serving as a new source of equity capital. Our committee will want to examine into the efficiency of these investment companies and their usefulness. We will want to know whether or not they are performing as intended by the Congress.

I note in an article that appeared in a recent issue of the Harvard Business Review that under present arrangements a number of these small business investment companies claim that they cannot profitably make small loans or investments—that they must make these investments or loans in large amounts. It is thus possible that there still remains a gap in the financing resources to which small business may turn for help. Further amendments to the Small Business Investment Act may be necessary. Consideration will be given to see whether the act can be amended so as to make it profitable for the small business investment companies to grant more small loans to a greater number of small business concerns instead of a few big loans to a limited number of small business companies.

Our committee will be limited initially to four subcommittees this year; namely, a Subcommittee on Foundations, a Subcommittee on Procurement, a Subcommittee on Taxation, and a Subcommittee on Distribution. As additional small business problems arise, not covered by one of our four subcommittees, it is my plan that these matters will be handled either by the full committee or by designating a special subcommittee to handle the particular problem.

A listing of the subcommittees follows:

HOUSE SMALL BUSINESS COMMITTEE, 88TH CONGRESS

Full committee and subcommittee assignments

The Honorable Joe L. Evins, chairman of the full committee, and the Honorable William M. McCulloch, ranking minority member of the full committee, are ex officio members of each subcommittee.

Full committee

Small Business Administration and small business in foreign trade—Effect of European Economic Community on small business

Hon. Joe L. Evins, chairman; Hon. Wright Patman; Hon. Abraham Multer; Hon. Tom Steed; Hon. James Roosevelt; Hon. John C. Kluczynski; Hon. John D. Dingell; Hon. William M. McCulloch; Hon. Arch A. Moore, Jr.; Hon. William H. Avery; Hon. H. Allen Smith; Hon. Howard W. Robison; Hon. Ralph Harvey.

Subcommittee No. 1

Foundations: Their impact on small business

Hon. Wright Patman, chairman; Hon. Joe L. Evins; Hon. James Roosevelt; Hon. William H. Avery; Hon. Ralph Harvey.

Subcommittee No. 2

Small business and Government procurement

Hon. Abraham J. Multer, chairman; Hon. Tom Steed; Hon. James Roosevelt; Hon. H. Allen Smith; Hon. Howard W. Robison.

Subcommittee No. 3

Taxation

Hon. Tom Steed, chairman; Hon. Abraham J. Multer; Hon. John Dingell; Hon. Arch A. Moore, Jr.; Hon. Howard W. Robison.

Subcommittee No. 4

Distribution problems affecting small business

Hon. James Roosevelt, chairman; Hon. Tom Steed; Hon. John C. Kluczynski; Hon. Arch A. Moore, Jr.; Hon. William H. Avery.

SEVENTIETH ANNIVERSARY OF HESS & CLARK

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Ashbrook] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to call attention to a company in my district in Ohio that is celebrating its 70th anniversary of making quality products in its service to American agriculture.

The company I refer to is Hess & Clark, a division of Richardson-Merrell, Inc., and makers of feed medications and animal health products.

Today's modern Hess & Clark plant in Ashland, Ohio, is a far cry from what it was in 1893 when the company came into being.

In those days, production and distribution were strictly a family affair—Gilbert Hess did the compounding and J. L. Clark did the selling. Their wives did the wrapping and packing. Both Hess and Clark were born in the rolling central Ohio farmland that surrounds Ashland.

The firm has shown exceptional growth in the 70 years since the partnership was formed for $300. Today, scientists at Hess & Clark's multimillion-dollar center are engaged in a wide variety of projects to unlock the secrets of nature, and to study all types of animal and poultry disease problems.

The research does not stop merely at the center, but spreads to dozens of State universities and experiment stations across the country in order that the company's products are tested under actual field conditions. In this manner, Hess & Clark is helping to insure that only the finest meats, eggs, and poultry reach America's dinner tables.

Hess & Clark, under the direction of its president, Dr. A. L. Andrews, is pioneering in the development of an entirely new and different class of drugs, called nitrofurans, derived from furfural, which is made from material in corn cobs and oat hulls.

Nitrofurans first came to attention in the wake of the Normandy invasion in World War II. Army doctors found that many infected wounds and burns failed to respond to treatment with any of the available antibiotics and sulfa drugs. The medics applied a furan compound, nitrofurazone, directly to the wounds and it provided rapid improvements and facilitated healing. Application for use in agriculture followed the end of World War II.

In all their years of use, scientists report that no significant bacterial resistance to the nitrofurans has developed.

Latest of the nitrofurans to score an important research success is Nidrafur. This drug, recently cleared for use by the Food and Drug Administration, is the result of 5 years of tests to find a multipurpose medication to combat poultry diseases.

On March 14, 1963, Hess & Clark introduced and explained Nidrafur to the scientists and industry representatives attending the Maryland Nutrition Conference in Washington, D.C.

I salute Hess & Clark for its many achievements and wish continued success to this fine firm in its future endeavors. I ask unanimous consent to include the following comprehensive report on this new drug.

The report follows:

Nidrafur, Broad-Spectrum Poultry Feed Additive, Now Cleared for Use

Ashland, Ohio.—A new drug application for Nidrafur, Hess & Clark's broad-spectrum nitrofuran feed additive for poultry, has been cleared for use by the Food and Drug Administration, and a food additive order has been published.

The announcement was made by Dr. A. L. Andrews, president and general manager of Hess & Clark, division of Richardson-Merrell, Inc., makers of feed medications and animal health products.

Nidrafur, which is the trade name for nihydrazone, has undergone extensive laboratory and field trials conducted by trained researchers over a 5-year period. The results of these tests show that Nidrafur is effective as a medication for broilers and replacement birds in combating several disease problems.

In the presence of air sac infection (CRD complex), Nidrafur reduces mortality and severity of infection, lowers condemnation rate and assists in maintaining weight gains and feed efficiency. Nidrafur also has proved effective for prevention of pullorum disease, fowl typhoid and paratyphoid (salmonellosis); blackhead (histomoniasis); and coccidiosis caused by *E. tenella, E. necatrix, E. maxima,* and *E. brunetti.*

Nidrafur can be fed to broilers throughout the growing period and to replacements from day-old to 14 weeks of age. Directions call for the use of nihydrazone at 100 grams per ton to complete ration. This is supplied by 1 pound of Nidrafur premix.

"As is typical with the nitrofurans, nihydrazone does not build up in body tissues," Dr. Andrews noted, "thus no withdrawal period will be necessary for poultrymen using Nidrafur medicated feed."

SAFETY AND TOXICITY OF NIDRAFUR

Tests of the new drug's safety and toxicity showed Nidrafur is well tolerated at higher than recommended use level.

In long-term toxicity tests scientists found Nidrafur does not adversely affect hatchability and fertility.

EFFECTIVENESS OF NIDRAFUR

1. CRD complex

Current USDA reports show CRD complex (air sac disease) to be the No. 1 cause of broiler condemnations. During 1961 nearly 16 million birds were condemned because of CRD.

Tests were conducted to determine the effect of the continuous feeding of Nidrafur upon the incidence of CRD complex and the condition involving the air sac which results in high dressing plant condemnations. In additon, growth rate and feed conversion were considered in evaluating the effectiveness of this compound.

In a 1,240-bird Georgia trial, birds receiving Nidrafur showed no condemnations due to airsacculitis. This compared with 2.8-percent condemnation for the unmedicated control group and 11.3-percent condemnations for a third group receiving a coccidiostat. Average weight was 3.69 for the Nidrafur group, 3.28 for the controls, and 3.21 for the birds on the coccidiostat. Feed conversion likewise favored Nidrafur—2.39 compared with 2.54 for the controls and 2.58 for the coccidiostat.

Point spread for the Nidrafur group was 130, compared with 74 for the unmedicated controls and 63 for the coccidiostat group.

2. Salmonellosis

In several battery tests, birds 2 and 3 weeks of age were experimentally infected with a broth culture of *S. gallinarum* (fowl typhoid). Half were placed on feed medicated with Nidrafur and half on the same basal ration, unmedicated.

In each of three tests, there were no deaths in the groups receiving Nidrafur. In comparison, deaths in the unmedicated control groups ran 25, 79, and 30 percent.

In several battery tests on *S. pullorum,* birds were inoculated with a broth culture of *S. pullorum* at 1 day of age. Half were immediately placed on Nidrafur medicated feed, and the other half on the same basal ration without medication. These tests, which ran 2 and 3 weeks, again demonstrated the efficacy of Nidrafur by improved weight gains and feed conversion, and reduced mortality. For example, there were 15 deaths in 1 control group of 20 birds infected with pullorum, as compared with 3 mortalities in the 20 birds receiving Nidrafur.

In battery tests for *S. typhimurium* (paratyphoid) eggs in the process of hatching were sprayed with a 24-hour-old broth culture of *S. typhimurium,* 1 day before the hatch was completed. Half of the birds were placed on Nidrafur medicated feed, and the other half received the same basal ration without medication. A significant reduction in the mortality rate was noted in those birds fed rations containing Nidrafur.

3. Blackhead

The incidence of blackhead or histomoniasis in broilers and replacement flocks is on the increase according to reports from diagnostic laboratories located where poultry rearing is concentrated. This is especially true of birds from 4 to 6 weeks of age.

Nidrafur has proved highly effective in preventing blackhead infection of chickens.

In tests by Dr. W. Malcolm Reid and associates at the University of Georgia, birds already on Nidrafur medicated feed were artificially infected with blackhead. Two weeks after infection all birds were slaughtered and examined for blackhead lesions.

Birds medicated with Nidrafur had a significantly lower lesion score than did the nonmedicated infected birds. The researchers noted that "since nihydrazone (Nidrafur) suppresses the heavier infections which result in weight loss, it appears probable that its use in large-scale broiler operations may result in better weight gains and feed conversion where blackhead disease is present."

They also noted, "if the drug is routinely used as a feed additive it should furnish protection against blackhead disease during the first and second months of age when the bird has the least natural resistance against this disease."

In one New England test, 2-week-old birds were fed Nidrafur for 7 days immediately following infection with blackhead, after which time all birds were slaughtered and examined for blackhead. No birds in the Nidrafur group showed infection. However, 19 out of 20 infected, nonmedicated control birds showed cecal infection and 13 out of the 20 showed liver infection.

4. Coccidiosis

Latest estimates of national losses due to coccidiosis place the figure at $40 million per year—despite the fact that feeding of a coccidiostat is standard in almost every flock. Nearly three-fourths of the total loss is due to morbidity—one-fourth from mortality.

Extensive field tests showed Nidrafur to be effective in the prevention of coccidiosis caused by *E. tenella, E. necatrix, E. maxima,* and *E. brunetti.*

Nidrafur successfully reduces mortality, improves gain, and allows development of immunity, which is important in replacements.

Nidrafur has been tested extensively under actual field conditions where its overall effectiveness in preventing these major poultry diseases has been amply demonstrated through better growth, feed conversion, livability and improved point spread. In a Delaware test 16,000 broilers receiving a feed containing a coccidiostat averaged 3.48 pounds with a 2.26 feed conversion and a point spread of 122. This compared with 11,000 birds on Nidrafur averaging 3.95 pounds on 2.37 feed conversion for a point spread of 158. Percent livability was the same for each group.

In another test a group of 18,300 birds on a coccidiostat showed 3.70 pounds weight, 2.37 feed conversion, 94 percent livability, and 133 point spread. The 13,700 birds receiving Nidrafur averaged 3.68 pounds, had a 2.23 feed conversion, a 99-percent livability, and a point spread of 145.

According to Dr. Andrews, the introduction of new Nidrafur represents the latest nitrofuran advancement by Hess & Clark designed to help poultrymen protect their flocks against many of the most serious diseases. It involves an important new concept in poultry medication—protect the bird, don't just treat the disease. Keep the bird healthy by preventing several diseases at once.

Nitrofurans are a unique class of drugs. Antibiotics, for instance, are properly defined as "chemical substances produced by microorganisms which inhibit life." Nitrofurans are manmade chemicals, synthesized in the laboratory. They are chemical substances which kill micro-organisms, rather than merely slow them down. They act by interrupting an important step in the utilization of carbohydrates by disease-causing organisms, causing these organisms to literally starve to death.

In their years of use, scientists report that no significant bacterial resistance to the nitrofurans has developed.

RESIDUAL OIL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CONTE] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, since 1959, I have been fighting the import quotas on residual oil on the basis of the damaging effect these quotas have on the economy of New England and the eastern seaboard. This has been a long and tedious fight, Mr. Speaker, and as I suggested Monday it is just starting for me. I have not any intentions of letting it ride, so to speak, nor do I quit easily. This is against my nature, and there is no chance of a let-up. I was not impressed with statements by my colleague, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HAYS], Monday, which attempted to becloud the issue. His attacks against the oil industry have nothing to do with the issue at stake. Larger and greater issues than partisanship or harking back to senseless arguments of another era are relevant to this issue. This is by no means a political issue, except insofar as the President has made it one. My colleague will remember, as I have been pointing out recently, that Senator Kennedy—the one now at 1600 Pennsylvania—supported the exact position that I did at that time. He joined with me—I will give my colleague from Ohio a copy of the letter if he wants one—to stop these quotas when the Eisenhower administration put them on. I was a freshman Member of Congress that year, and yet I stood against my own President. Freshmen are supposed to be seen, not heard—yet I had to defend my region in spite of any traditions.

What disturbs me most is the impression that I have been receiving in the last 2 or 3 weeks that the administration is attempting to walk on two sides of the street. Going back a bit, there was some careful wording in the Office of Emergency Planning report calling for a careful and meaningful relaxation of these import quotas. This was taken as a minor victory. The next encouraging sign was the visit of President Betancourt, of Venezuela, to this country. At that time I wired the President and asked him to dramatically lift these restrictions and help aid the sagging economy of Venezuela which exports 90 percent of crude and residual to this country. I was gratified a day later when I read the text of the joint communique between the two Presidents. Several specific points were made in this release.

The two Presidents reviewed the oil situation and recognized that "the United States has been Venezuela's largest market" and stated that were both confident that it would "continue to be on an expanding scale." They concluded that "Venezuela's position in the U.S. petroleum market is therefore a matter of continuing concern" to both Governments and that this position would be "recognized in the administration of the U.S. oil export program." The two leaders also agreed that there should be periodic exchanges of information and views at a technical level with the goal of "reaching better trade agreements" between the two countries and that they would "review in advance such substantive changes in the oil import program as the United States may contemplate in the future."

These were very definite signs of agreement, Mr. Speaker, and at the time I was convinced that the April 1st deadline for the Department of Interior report would end the restrictions.

Just a few days ago, however, the President met with Mine Workers President Boyle and "assured him" that the OEP recommendations "would not be made effective" until or unless further discussions were held with mine workers. I was, understandably, outraged by these reports and checked all over the city for confirmation. Mr. Boyle told my office that he had been quoted "exactly" and White House press officials refused to either confirm or deny the substance of the President's statements to Boyle.

All of this seemed a recapitulation to the coal magnets in this country.

I am not suggesting that the President is dutybound to his stand as a U.S. Senator, and I realize that he made a number of promises in 1960 to the various coal-producing States. I am simply asking for a pertinent review of the facts involved, and that he take into consideration the fact that condition of the New England economy is critical, and it is losing $30 million a year because these quotas prevent most of our hospitals, large apartment homes, schools, and industries from using the practical and inexpensive oil for heating.

What my colleague the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Hays] said Monday has no bearing on the issue. In fact, I am surprised that he would inject such extraneous matters into the discussion. For example, I have never talked about the outflow of gold, as he suggests I will. I refuse to make this an issue between oil and coal; in fact, there is an unholy alliance between the domestic oil producers and the coal barons. I do not know who would benefit from the lifted restrictions except the elderly patients in the New England seaboard hospitals, the children in the schools, and our poorer residents who cannot afford the expensive coal.

I would suggest to the gentleman from Ohio that he review the facts of the matter and then join the fight if he is so inclined. Surprisingly, I have heard little from him on this issue until yesterday. In passing, I might say that my homework on this subject has been intense for the last 5 years and that I would be happy to provide any background information that the gentleman desires. I must say that I am very sympathetic with the plight of the coal miners that he describes, and at the same time have figures showing that coal production was considerably up in 1962.

In fact, I would hope that a number of gentlemen in this House would begin seriously reviewing this issue. Thank you.

DECISION OF THE UNITED NATIONS SPECIAL FUND TO FINANCE AGRICULTURAL PROJECT IN RED CUBA

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Johansen] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Speaker, another highly responsible voice has been raised in the United States in protest against the recent incredible decision of the United Nations Special Fund to finance an agricultural development project in Red Cuba.

A news release under date of February 18, by Hon. Byron B. Gentry, national commander of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, urges that this action be immediately repudiated by the American people and responsible Government officials.

I welcome this pronouncement by the head of this great organization of 1,300,000 overseas combat veterans—a pronouncement which curtly and properly rejects the sophistry of arguments that the United States, as a member of the U.N., is not thereby directly aiding a Sino-Soviet dominated Communist regime in Cuba, dedicated to the takeover of the Western Hemisphere and the conquest of the United States.

Commander Gentry has exceptional credentials when it comes to calling the shots regarding the Cuban situation.

In a press release last September 28, Commander Gentry called for an immediate naval blockade of Cuba—nearly a month before President Kennedy took this unfortunately short-lived action.

In this September 28 statement, which condemned the proposed Soviet "fishing port" as "outrageous," Commander Gentry offered the singularly prophetic warning that if the administration took no action, "the situation will be much worse next month than it is now."

In view of some recent objections by top administration officials to congressional and public criticism of national policies regarding Cuba—the latest by Vice President Johnson—I suggest that Commander Gentry's current protest on U.N. aid to Red Cuba can scarcely be characterized as either "irresponsible" or "partisan."

I commend his February 18 statement to the Congress and the American people:

> The United Nations proposal to proceed with support of Communist agricultural programs in Cuba is a deliberate affront to the principles of freedom and justice, which motivated its founding. It is highly improper and embarrassing for our Nation to continue supporting a U.N. agency that is giving assistance to a Red dictator, whose purpose is the destruction of our Nation and freedom throughout the Americas.
>
> What this really means is that the United Nations is embarking on a program to strengthen the bloody and oppressive Communist government of Cuba, thus strengthening a regime that is kept in power by the Russian expeditionary force in Cuba.
>
> The VFW is not persuaded by technical explanations that U.S. financial support will not be involved in helping Castro. Regardless of such assurances, the fact remains that the U.S. taxpayers are the major contributor to the kind of endeavor the U.N. is now undertaking in Red Cuba. Directly or indirectly, it will be the U.S. taxpayers who will be footing a major portion of the bill for supporting communism in Cuba under this U.N. project.
>
> It is truly shocking that the U.N., supposedly dedicated to the protection of freedom, is actively supporting an aggressive Red regime, virtually on the doorstep of the United States. The VFW urges that the U.S. Government take every possible step to prevent the United Nations from bolstering Castro and his Communist control of Cuba.
>
> Using U.N. funds and prestige to strengthen Castro's cruel Communist government places the U.N. in a position of deliberately aiding an avowed enenmy of the United States. It is this kind of action which creates grave doubts as to the wisdom of continued U.S. membership in the U.N.

U.S. TREASURY ACQUISITION OF HARD FOREIGN CURRENCY

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. Cleveland] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, on March 7, I placed in the Congressional Record an item from the Washington Post & Times Herald concerning "U.S. Treasury Acquisition of Hard Foreign Currency." This story alleged that the U.S. Treasury was trying to float short-term bonds to the French Government for the equivalent of $100 to $150 million.

The Wall Street Journal of March 12, 1963, carried a disturbing editorial about our balance of payments situation entitled "Ignorance or Intent?" Because the strength of the U.S. dollar is important not only to Americans but to the entire free world, I commend this editorial to my colleagues. It says:

Ignorance or Intent?

> Is it possible the Government's officials really do not understand the balance-of-payments problem?
>
> The question is asked in all seriousness, for there are few economic matters more serious than this continuing deficit. The yawning gap was $2.2 billion last year, almost as huge as the year before, and the consequent gold outflow was nearly $900 million, bringing America's gold stock to its lowest level in about a quarter of a century.
>
> All hope has been abandoned of ending the drain by the end of this year, as the administration had been promising. On the contrary, Treasury Secretary Dillon now warns of more gold losses and a continuing payments deficit. In a word, we are further than ever from halting this major source of nonconfidence in the dollar, this leakage which at the whim of foreigners could turn into a calamitous flood.
>
> And what, pray, is the Government doing about it?
>
> For one thing, Mr. Dillon says tax reduction plus persistent and firm expenditure control will bring improvement in the balance of payments. His thought on taxes appears to be that rate reductions will spur domestic investment and thus keep more capital at home. To that pious hope, about all that can be said now is, we'll see.
>
> The comment about expenditure control was perhaps a joke. It is hard to see how anyone could talk like that with a straight face in view of a Federal spending budget wildly out of control and a budget deficit deliberately planned to hit nearly $12 billion.
>
> Meantime the Government continues its piddling efforts to stanch the flow: Requiring foreign-aid money to be spent here, discouraging American tourist spending abroad and the like. The continuing payments-

gold crisis is sufficient testimony to the inadequacy of these measures.

Now the officials are considering a further gimmick which they think will finally turn the tide. This would be a deliberate boost in short-term interest rates to make them more attractive in relation to foreign rates; the short-term capital outgo is one of the administration's preferred whipping-boys for the payments trouble.

A general move away from the prevailing easy-money policy would be a healthy development of itself, and even this limited tinkering might indeed stop some of the short-term capital movements. But the thinking behind the plan seems peculiar.

The technique being discussed for boosting the rates is to have the Federal Reserve raise the discount rate from 3 percent to possibly 3.5 percent, as though that would automatically increase interest rates, and short-term ones in particular. Unaccompanied by other steps, it might or it might not; in the past such changes have usually followed or accompanied market rises rather than specifically causing them.

As a part of this move, the United States would pressure Canada (hasn't the Government caused enough trouble there recently?) to lower its discount rate of 4 percent, in the hope of curbing the flow of short-term U.S. investment funds in that direction. This seems somewhat wishful; a spread between 3.5 and 4 percent is hardly great enough to matter much one way or another.

In any case, this whole device, like all the others now in operation, is a good deal less than a frontal attack on the payments problem. Short-term capital is not the main cause of the deficit; in fact, the return on foreign investment about equals the investment outgo.

The main cause is the Government's own excessive spending at home and abroad and its generally loose fiscal and monetary policies. It is as plain as can be that if the Government would ever get its financial house in order, the payments deficit and the dangerous gold drain could be made to disappear in quick time.

If the Government does understand these simple facts, its refusal to take the required action is not easily explained. Whether the trouble is ignorance or intent, it is inexcusable behavior on the part of the guardians of the people's money.

SPORTS ANTIBRIBERY LEGISLATION

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. Lindsay] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing today a bill which would make it a Federal offense to conspire, in interstate or foreign commerce, to influence by bribery the outcome of any sporting contest. It is identical to the bills introduced in the Senate by Senator Kenneth Keating, of New York, and in the House by Representative William McCulloch, of Ohio, ranking minority member of the House Judiciary Committee. The bill would apply the penalties of up to $5,000 and/or 10 years in prison to all who may be involved in such schemes. This would include players and officials, as well as gamblers and fixers. Although the Federal Government is granted authority over this subject matter, there is nothing in this bill that would in any way exclude or circumscribe the effect of any local law or the jurisdiction of any local authority over an offense over which it would have jurisdiction in the absence of this legislation.

Today, young American athletes are being subjected to steadily mounting pressures from gambling syndicates to "fix" games, "shave" points, and to turn competitive sports over to the patrons of organized crime. Although this is far from a new development on the American scene, it has increased markedly in recent years and threatens to totally undermine public confidence in all competitive sports.

There is no question but that the organized gambling and bookmaking syndicates are countrywide in the nature and scope of their activities. Further, there is no question but that the Federal Government has full jurisdictional power to act on statutory authority to assert its full strength against this outrageous condition. Enactment of this proposed legislation won't solve the problem, but it will provide our Federal law-enforcement officers with the legal machinery they have long needed to investigate and prosecute these unlawful activities. The leading athletic associations are solidly behind this legislation. They have long urged that action be taken to enact this proposal to improve the climate of athletic participation in the United States. I hope that the 88th Congress gives prompt and favorable consideration to this important legislation.

THE CREATION OF AN ADDITIONAL JUDICIAL DISTRICT IN CALIFORNIA

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. Bob Wilson] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, having represented San Diego for more than 10 years, I am very much aware of the critical need for the creation of an additional judicial district. Such a requirement is essential to the proper and orderly processes of justice that, unfortunately, are suffering in our area today.

Accordingly, I have introduced the following bill today along with Congressman James B. Utt, 35th Congressional District, and Congressman Pat Martin, 38th Congressional District, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary. Our bills provide that Imperial and San Diego Counties in the State of California shall constitute a new and separate judicial district to be known as the southern district of California and to redesignate the present southern district of California as the central district of California. The services that can be provided by the approval of this legislation are most critically needed this year. Our county alone has had an estimated increase of over 134,689 people since 1960. The Federal community of the proposed judicial district, which incorporates the full length of the California-Mexico border as well as the international port of San Diego, has had an equal rise in activity involving the Federal Government. More people are crossing the border, more trade is conducted across the border, and more tonnage and passengers are passing through our port facilities.

The unprecedented growth of San Diego and Imperial Counties continues at a rate which I am sure during the present decade will equal or surpass the record of the decade of 1950–60 when our growth rate was 86 percent.

Federal litigation in our area continues to increase; San Diego today handles nearly as much Federal criminal court business as Los Angeles, and this discounts immigration cases, which as you know are most time consuming and are of a large quantity, particularly in our district.

The 25th custom collection district has the same borders as the proposed judicial district and is the largest narcotic and border egress and ingress district in the country.

Many of the services of a new judicial district are already being provided in San Diego so that the costs of implementing this legislation are at an estimated $46,750 per year. The San Diego County Bar Association has made a careful analysis of the additional salary and expense requirements, and they find that this figure would be more than made up through per diem, travel, telephone, and duplicate filing and other administrative costs that are today required because the district offices are located in Los Angeles, some 120 miles away.

This figure, of course, does not represent any of the actual savings that will result to the litigants themselves and their attorneys, which as you can imagine can be extensive when a 120-mile commute is involved.

Our area needs a new judicial district and needs it today. I urge favorable action on this legislation, which provides that Imperial and San Diego Counties in the State of California shall constitute a new and separate judicial district to be known as the southern district of California.

COMMISSION TO REVIEW FEDERAL LAWS ON POLITICAL ACTIVITY

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. St. Onge] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. ST. ONGE. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a bill which provides for the creation of a commission to study Federal laws limiting political activity by officers and employees of Government.

The Hatch Political Activities Act was enacted by Congress—Public Law 252 of the 76th Congress—back in 1939. Since then a period of 24 years has elapsed.

It was originally designed to remove employees in the Federal service and those in Government-financed State-Federal programs from the political arena. Its primary aim was to protect public employees from various pressures exerted upon them to engage in involuntary political activity.

In the 1930's our country was still struggling with the great depression and its aftereffects. One of the major causes leading to the adoption of the Hatch Act at the time was that, because of the desperate economic situation, many citizens had to accept employment with the Works Progress Administration and similar projects. It was felt by Congress then that the dependence of large numbers of individuals upon Federal funds for their income—inadequate as this income was—could be used as an unethical political tool to force their allegiance or support to one particular political party.

Nearly a quarter of a century has passed since enactment of the original Hatch Act. Administrations of both major political parties of the Nation have held the reins of power. We have suffered the anguish of World War II and the Korean war. We have experienced considerable economic and social upheaval. Even political thinking in our country has not been at a standstill; there has been much change and a greater public awakening to political problems.

Over the years, there have been those who advocated complete repeal of the Hatch Act. There are some who advocate that the law should be revised to allow a limited degree of political activity in the governmental structure. Others believe the act should be amended in a way to reflect the changes in our political attitudes of the times, but they are not certain how this can be achieved without endangering the merit principle upon which the whole civil service system is based.

True, there have been several amendments of a liberalizing nature since the law was enacted, but they were of minor importance and none of them has come to grips with the basic problem, namely, the participation or denial to millions of public employees of the right to share in the political activity of the Nation. The question still remains: What should be the status of Federal and other public employees in the political life of our country nearly a quarter of a century after passage of the Hatch Act? In line with that question it may also be asked whether any basic changes have occurred in our thinking which would warrant a completely new look at the problem?

The effect of the Hatch Act has been interpreted in some quarters as nothing less than the equivalent of disenfranchisement. The public employee exercises the privilege of casting his ballot and thus participating in the democratic process, but not much else. He cannot participate in political activity. He cannot be a candidate for office, not even for member of a board of education. He cannot even be an officer of any political organization. He cannot solicit support or financial aid for any candidate, or even solicit people to become candidates for public office. He cannot distribute campaign material, march in a political parade, sell tickets for a political dinner, or publish a letter or article in behalf of any political party or candidate.

At the same time, it is reasonable to expect that complete elimination of the Hatch Act could seriously damage the Federal civil service system which would once again fall prey to the spoils system. We want to retain the civil service system and improve upon it, but we also would like to make it possible for public employees to have greater opportunity to be more active politically without fear of loss of their Government jobs. At the present time, with the denial of all the activities enumerated above, public employees are treated as second-class citizens. This prompted a postal worker to urge recently that a campaign be undertaken "to restore civil rights to Federal workers."

I do not believe that it was the intention of Congress to relegate public employees to a position of second-class citizenship when the law was enacted 24 years ago. Nor do I believe that the practice of political privileges granted to all U.S. citizens can be denied under our Constitution to a large segment of our population simply because they are Government employees. In our free society, political freedom, political self-respect, and the freedom of expression are cherished possessions.

For these reasons, I believe that the Hatch Act has become outdated in our time and has proved to be harmful to millions of our citizens whom it deprives from exercising certain rights guaranteed them in the Constitution. A reappraisal of national policy regarding political activities of Government employees is definitely needed. I think it is high time to make such a reevaluation of the law and its applicability today in the light of changing events.

This is the purpose of the bill I am introducing today. It calls for the establishment of a bipartisan commission to review the Federal laws limiting political activity by Government employees. It is to be known as the Commission on Political Activity of Government Personnel and is to consist of 12 members. The members of the Commission are to be appointed as follows:

First. Four by the President, two from the executive branch of the Government, and two from private life.

Second. Four by the President of the Senate, two from the Senate, and two from private life.

Third. Four by the Speaker of the House of Representatives, two from the House, and two from private life.

The duties of the Commission, as defined in my bill, shall be to make a full and complete investigation and study of the Federal laws which limit or discourage the participation of Federal and State officers and employees in political activity with a view to determining the effect of such laws, the need for their revision or elimination, and an appraisal of the extent to which undesirable results might accrue from their repeal.

The Commission shall submit a comprehensive report, including its findings and recommendations, to the President and to Congress within 1 year after enactment of my bill and the Commission shall then cease to exist. In the fulfillment of the provisions of the act, the Commission shall be empowered to conduct hearings and issue subpenas.

In view of the fact that the life of the Commission is to extend only over the period of 1 year, I do not visualize any considerable expenditure. In fact, in order to keep all expenditures at a minimum, it is prescribed in the bill that members of the Commission who are Members of Congress or Government officials shall serve without compensation, while those from private life shall serve on a per diem basis of $50. The Commission shall have the authority to appoint such personnel as it deems advisable, but it is suggested in the bill that the services of Government agencies which can be helpful in the study may be requested by the Commission.

Mr. Speaker, the time has come for a broad and impartial review of this very important but vexing problem. As now constituted and applied, the Hatch Act is outmoded, unjust, and unfair toward millions of our citizens who are loyal public servants, well educated and civic-minded persons. In the long run our country will be the loser and our democratic process will suffer if we continue to deny them the basic rights to which they are entitled. Government service should be a badge of honor and public trust, not a status of second-class citizenship.

MINE SAFETY

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. SICKLES] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. SICKLES. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a mine safety bill which will provide for Federal inspection of every underground coal mine in the United States. The amendment to Public Law 552, as contained in my bill, would benefit every coal miner and every coal operator in this country.

I am interested in mine safety and have seen what the passage of a Federal law for the inspection of mines can do. An industry which formerly numbered its fatalities in the thousands has reduced its death rate to less than 300. In 1962, 289 miners died, a far cry from what the death rate was once but still far too many.

The death and accident rate in the coal mines in America must be reduced further and I feel that one way to do it is to give Federal inspectors the right to close down any coal mine, large or small, when they find that danger of a mine explosion, mine fire, mine inundations, man-trap or man-hoist accident exists.

Under the present Federal mine safety law, workers in No. 2 mines, those that employ 15 or more men, are well protected. That same protection should be extended to the workers in No. 1 mines, those employing less than 15 men.

There is no valid reason for giving Federal inspectors the right to close down a mine containing 15 or more employees when they find an eminent danger existing and refusing the same power to the same inspectors when, after inspection, they find an eminent danger existing in a mine that employs less than 15 men. There is no logic or excuse for such a distinction. I note for the record that in 1960, No. 1 mines had over 30 percent of the fatalities while producing 14 percent of our coal and in 1961 No. 1 mines had 34 percent of the fatalities in the coal industry while producing only 12 percent of our coal.

A BILL TO AMEND THE FEDERAL COAL MINE SAFETY ACT SO AS TO PROVIDE FURTHER FOR THE PREVENTION OF ACCIDENTS IN COAL MINES

Be it enacted in the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States in Congress assembled, That Public Law 552, Eighty-second Congress, entitled "An Act to Amend Public Law 49, Seventy-seventh Congress, so as to provide for the prevention of major disasters in coal mines," approved July 16, 1952 (ch. 877, 66 Stat. 692, 30 U.S.C. 471) be amended by striking out section 201(b) thereof.

RELIGIOUS EXPRESSION IN SCHOOLS

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. WAGGONNER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Speaker, last June, when the Supreme Court handed down its regrettable decision that the Constitution of the United States was placed in peril because a group of New York children voluntarily recited a 22-word nondenominational prayer, it seemed to me that the canons and criteria of validity in thought had dipped to a nadir never before reached in this land where freedom once found its most impregnable home.

Another year has almost passed and there is now every indication that this same Court is about to plumb new depths in their zeal to probe minutiae never envisioned by the framers of the Constitution.

To bolster their findings, the Justices perch upon pedicels of logic too slim to support even a whit of their proclaimings.

How, I now wonder, are we ever to answer the tidal wave of inquiries we will receive when the Court rules that the Lord's Prayer and the Bible are banned from our schools?

What can we tell our own children as to why we have done nothing to stop the Court from this pristine heresy?

Will it be sufficient for us to say, "The Court did it. We are blameless?" I, for one, do not believe we can evade the issue in that way.

Columnist William S. White has written brilliantly of the untenable position we are inexorably being pushed into by the Court.

I commend his editorial from the March 1 edition of the Washington Evening Star to each and every Member and I echo his plaintive inquiry: "Are beauty and gentleness and tenderness to be declared unconstitutional?"

Finally, I add my own query: "What are we here in the House going to do to stop what appears now to be an inevitable 'finding' of this Court?"

RELIGIOUS EXPRESSION IN SCHOOLS—FREE EXERCISE OF BELIEF IS CONSIDERED THE TRUE ISSUE IN ARGUMENT

(By William S. White)

Another spring is to bring another bitter division within the Supreme Court—and within the United States—determining whether any chemical trace of religious feeling, however voluntary and nonsectarian, is to be allowed expression in the public schools of the United States.

The Court last June forbade as unconstitutional the voluntary recitation in New York schools of a 22-word nondenominational prayer prepared by the school authorities. Now it is to decide two other questions:

Will constitutional government be threatened if such of the children of Baltimore as may care to do so continue to open each school day with Bible reading and by repeating aloud the Lord's Prayer?

Will constitutional government be threatened if such of the children of Pennsylvania as may care to do so continue to open each school day by hearing a reading of 10 paragraphs from the Bible?

Sessions of the Supreme Court itself are opened with an invocation of God's blessing upon its work. Public officials, including the President, traditionally take oath upon the Bible. The national anthem—the one anthem of every man, woman, and child, whatever his religion or the lack of it—still recognizes the existence of God.

All this notwithstanding, however, the outlook is not too good for those schoolchildren who wish to participate in ceremonies acknowledging that divine mercy and divine justice still exist in an America of increasing materialism and private hopelessness.

For the arguments recently heard before the Justices on the Baltimore and Pennsylvania cases—which probably will be settled along in June—have strongly indicated that some at least intend to read the doctrine of "separation of church and state" in such a way as to permit God to be mentioned in the schoolhouses hereafter only under one's breath.

The first amendment to the Constitution declares, as to religion: "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof." This is where the doctrine of separation arose. But surely the true issue here is not that someone is trying to make an "establishment of religion"—namely, to set up one state church superior to all others.

Surely the true issue involved here is involved in the latter half of that amendment, that forbidding interference with the free exercise of religion.

Any minority, including the ultimate minority of one pupil, has the undoubted right to refuse to participate in any religious exercise. This columnist, for one, would support such a right to the end. But does a minority have the right to forbid the majority such an exercise, if this be their faith and choice, on the extraordinary argument that if the majority do choose to pray, this somehow invades the rights of the minority? If so, what becomes of the second half of the first amendment?

If schoolchildren violate the Constitution by voluntary prayer acknowledging a Divine Being, what of singing the Star-Spangled Banner in school, having in mind its explicit acknowledgment that "In God we trust"?

Is respect for tradition itself to be declared unlawful, on the ground that some people reject tradition? If one child chooses to pray, does he really make "an establishment of religion"? How in God's name—if the expression may be pardoned—does he harm the child who does not wish to pray? Even if, as atheists claim in immeasurable sadness, faith is only a legend, is it in any way ugly? Are beauty and gentleness and tenderness also to be declared unconstitutional?

IMPACT OF CUBAN REFUGEES CAUSES PROBLEM OF UNEMPLOYMENT

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. FASCELL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill to alleviate the conditions of substantial and persistent unemployment that exist and have existed in the district which I represent. Such conditions exist not only because of the usual reasons for unemployment but also because of the unusual economic distress and unemployment caused by the impact of approximately 150,000 refugees residing in this area who have fled the tyranny and oppression of the Communist government of Cuba. My bill will bring jobs and economic assistance to American citizens who, because of this unusual condition, find themselves unemployed and otherwise economically distressed.

Mr. Speaker, since the Castro Communist government of Cuba has enslaved the people of that unhappy country, approximately 200,000 persons have escaped the tyranny and oppression existing there and sought refuge in the United States.

The bulk of these people are in the Miami area. Despite the generous assistance of the Catholic church and others, our local citizens, individually, local governments and many voluntary agencies—it soon became obvious that the needs of these refugees could not be met solely out of local resources, no matter how willing the local citizens nor how desirable such a solution might be. I thereupon immediately urged recognition of the existence of the Cuban refugees and the problems caused thereby as being the primary responsibility of the Federal Government.

Two administrations and the Congress of the United States have generously responded to my requests to assist the people of the district which I represent in dealing with the problems, economic and otherwise, created by the Cuban refugees.

Today I must again ask my colleagues and advise the Nation that the people of Florida's Fourth District are in need of additional assistance as a result of approximately 150,000 Cuban refugees still residing in our midst. This has caused tremendous economic pressure since the refugees, very naturally, have tried to obtain and have been successful in obtaining employment. Much of this employment has been at reduced wages, tending to depress the labor market. Every refugee so employed has displaced an American normally employed so that in addition to many thousands of refugees who are unemployed, there are many thousands of Americans also unemployed.

The U.S. Department of Labor had long ago determined that there were a sufficient number of unemployed American citizens so as to qualify Dade County as a class D labor surplus market area. However, we have not been certified for assistance under Public Law 87-27, the Area Redevelopment Act specifically adopted by this body to alleviate conditions of substantial and persistent unemployment in economically distressed areas.

Mr. Speaker, since the fall of 1962 I have repeatedly requested the Department of Labor to certify that the unemployment condition in the district which I represent is sufficient to qualify the area under the Redevelopment Act. This has not yet been accomplished for a variety of reasons. Whatever the reason, the point is that we have not yet been so certified so as to be eligible for the employment and economic benefits which would be available to us under the Area Redevelopment Act.

The economic situation in Dade County is distressing. Total unemployment, both American and Cuban, is fantastically high. Citizens and refugees are in open competition for a limited number of jobs. Wages have tended to become depressed. Feelings are running high. The laboring classes, and particularly the Negro, have felt the brunt of this distress.

Mr. Speaker, the foreign policy of the United States is one of long standing and great tradition—down through history we are known as a sure haven from persecution and the upholders of individual rights and freedom. But it is this very foreign policy, in action, which has permitted these refugees—mothers, fathers, wives, and children—to escape tyranny, fear, and death and to seek refuge and security in the United States.

I have no quarrel with this policy nor does the overwhelming majority of the people in the district which I represent. But, Mr. Speaker, I submit that the American citizens who are directly affected as a result of this policy, and who are the citizens of the district I represent, are entitled to consideration in obtaining whatever Federal assistance can be made available.

Today's problem, therefore, Mr. Speaker, is to obtain additional unemployment and economic benefits for the American citizens in Florida's Fourth District, which I represent, who are without jobs and who are otherwise economically distressed. My bill, Mr. Speaker, would seek to provide employment opportunities by making the area which I represent eligible for benefits under the Area Redevelopment Act.

Mr. Speaker, I, of course, do not imply that no assistance has been rendered to the citizens of the district which I represent. I strongly supported this administration's program, now known as Public Law 87-658, the Public Works Acceleration Act. Because of the unemployment situation, the district which I represent has been certified as eligible to receive assistance under the Public Works Acceleration Act. Under this act we have thus far obtained several million dollars in approved programs. Under this act, which requires local participation, the district which I represent will secure approximately 5,600 additional man-months or 980,700 man-hours of employment. As long as the unemployment and economic distress exists in the district which I represent, we shall continue to request assistance and urge favorable consideration for approved projects under this very worthy program.

However, Mr. Speaker, the economic distress and unemployment in the Miami area arises not only from the usual sources, but also because of the tremendous number of refugees who are residing therein. Whether the refugee is employed or unemployed, his presence contributes directly to the economic distress and high unemployment of American citizens. It is this factor which my bill deals with. It is because of the persistence of these unusual factors that I have sought relief under Public Law 87-27, the Area Redevelopment Act.

I have also long sought relief under this law by administrative determination under existing criteria. Since the middle of last year, I have requested and urged repeatedly that in the criteria determination for Area Redevelopment Act eligibility, all unemployed shall be considered regardless of whether they are Americans or refugees. While the Department has had this matter before it all these many months, it has not yet been resolved.

I have urged today that immediate action be taken on this problem by the Secretaries of Health, Education, and Welfare; Labor; and Commerce. I have directed the following letters to them, respectively:

MARCH 13, 1963.

Hon. ANTHONY J. CELEBREZZE,
Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I respectfully request and urge you to certify forthwith to the Secretary of Labor and to the Secretary of Commerce the number of Cuban refugees who are residing in Dade County, Fla. Such certifications should be based on the number of Cuban refugees who have been registered through the Cuban Refugee Center, less the number of Cuban refugees who have been certified by you as having been relocated out of the Dade County area.

I would appreciate also if you would forward your estimate as to the number of Cuban refugees who are residing in the Dade County area who have not been registered through the Cuban Refugee Center.

This urgent request is made because of the obvious economic impact which the residence of the Cuban refugees has created, specifically in unemployment.

I am of the opinion that the Secretary of Labor and the Secretary of Commerce, based on the certification, have the authority and discretion to immediately certify that this area qualifies under the Area Redevelopment Act, Public Law 87-27. Thus, qualifying under the act, the people of Dade County would be eligible for consideration to receive assistance in alleviating this problem of substantial and persistent unemployment.

I respectfully urge your prompt attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

DANTE B. FASCELL,
Member of Congress.

MARCH 13, 1963.

Hon. W. WILLARD WIRTZ,
Secretary of Labor,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: You are fully aware of the problem of unemployment in my area. I have been urging you since September of 1962 to furnish to the Secretary of Commerce the findings and statistical data required by law in order to make Dade County, Fla., eligible under the Area Redevelopment Act, and thus bringing relief in the way of jobs to the people of Dade County.

I am aware of the fact that you have been seeking to obtain statistical data with the cooperation of State agencies. All of this may be well and proper and in time you may accumulate the necessary statistics and data.

However, Mr. Secretary, I respectfully point out that many months have gone by; the unemployment situation in Dade County has worsened. The area has been classified as class D labor surplus market area, with a current rate of unemployment of 6.1 percent. This did not consider at all the unemployed Cuban refugee and I have consistently urged and requested that the Cuban refugee should be considered in the compilation of statistics and that when this is done, Dade County would be clearly eligible for the benefits under the Area Redevelopment Act.

I respectfully urge you, therefore, to certify forthwith to the Secretary of Commerce the finding that this area qualifies under the Area Redevelopment Act. It is my conviction that in view of the obvious facts of the aggravated unemployment situation in the Fourth District, caused by the impact of the Cuban refugees, without regard to whether the Cuban refugee is employed or unemployed, Dade County should qualify under the act.

You have the discretion to make that determination. I respectfully urge you to make that determination forthwith and to so certify to the Secretary of Commerce. I shall appreciate your prompt attention to this request.

Sincerely,

DANTE B. FASCELL,
Member of Congress.

MARCH 13, 1963.

Hon. LUTHER H. HODGES,
Secretary of Commerce,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I know that you are fully aware of the severe condition of unemployment which exists in Dade County, Fla. The Miami standard metropolitan area, embracing all and only Dade County, Fla., has had substantial unemployment for 5 years. The unemployment rate presently stands at 6.1 percent. The area has been classified as class D labor surplus market.

This determination, however, has not included unemployed Cuban refugees. The existence of the employed Cuban refugee as well as the unemployed Cuban refugee has seriously aggravated the unemployment condition in the Fourth District, which I represent. The rate of unemployment is probably closer to 13 percent. Certainly it is obvious that this is an intolerable situation for our citizens.

We have received substantial assistance under existing programs, such as the Public Works Acceleration Act. However, we have not been declared qualified under the Area Redevelopment Act, Public Law 87–27.

In performance of your functions authorized by Public Law 87–27, the Area Redevelopment Act specifically enacted by the Congress to alleviate conditions of substantial and persistent unemployment, I respectfully request you to determine forthwith, pursuant to the authority of that law, that the Miami standard metropolitan area is eligible immediately for area redevelopment assistance.

I see no reason why this determination cannot be made forthwith. Standard labor statistics pursuant to law are available for certification to you; in addition, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare or the Department of Labor can certify immediately the number of Cuban refugees who are residing in the area. Whether the Cuban refugee is employed or unemployed is immaterial from an administrative standpoint in the determination of the question of substantial unemployment. Be that as it may, the certification of the number of Cuban refugees can be made forthwith to you by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare and I have today called upon the Secretary to make such certification to you forthwith.

The Secretary of Labor can certify to you the total number of unemployed in this area and I have urged him today to certify this fact to you forthwith.

Mr. Secretary, I would not take this unprecedented action in urging this immediate request if I had not previously exhausted all administrative possibilities.

Recent events in the district which I represent point up the seriousness of the unemployment situation, particularly as it is aggravated by the impact of the Cuban refugees. Accordingly, I respectfully urge your immediate determination that Dade County, Fla., is eligible under the Area Redevelopment Act so that our unemployed workers will have the opportunity to obtain the employment which they seek.

Sincerely,

DANTE B. FASCELL,
Member of Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I am of the opinion, as I have been since the passage of this act, that the area which I represent should be eligible under the terms, the spirit, and the intent of the Area Redevelopment Act, which was specifically adopted by the Congress to alleviate conditions of substantial and persistent unemployment in certain economically distressed areas.

Legislation which I today introduce goes one step further than the administrative action which I have been calling for, for so long. Congress has heretofore, at my request, recognized the problem of the Cuban refugees as one for national concern. This House, and I am grateful to each one of my colleagues, and this Congress have approved the authorizations and the appropriations for Health, Education, and Welfare and other costs for the care of the Cuban refugees. Without this program, the whole cost would fall on local resources which are already strained to the limit. I am now, today, again calling, urging, and requesting the sympathetic and favorable consideration of my colleagues in this legislative body to continue their recognition of the impact and economic distress caused by the residence of approximately 150,000 refugees in the district which I represent, and the adjoining one, as still of national concern. I call the problem again to the attention of this House because the problem has not yet been completely resolved. Severe unemployment still exists—almost 13 percent. There is considerable economic distress.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, my bill would provide an additional criteria for eligibility under Public Law 87–27, the Area Redevelopment Act. This additional criteria would provide benefits to those areas wherein 50,000 or more Cuban refugees have resided for 1 of the 2 preceding calendar years. Such a fact would be certified by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, who administers the Cuban refugee program, to the Secretary of Commerce, who administers the area redevelopment program. Under the bill we would also retain the criteria that the Secretary of Labor must determine and certify to the Secretary of Commerce that a condition of substantial unemployment has existed for the last 9 of the preceding 12 calendar months, which is a requirement now carried in the present public works acceleration law.

The exact language of the bill is as follows:

A bill to amend section 5 of the Area Redevelopment Act to provide that certain areas within the United States having a large number of Cuban refugees shall be designated as redevelopment areas

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That subsection (a) of section 5 of the Area Redevelopment Act (42 U.S.C. 2504) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: "The Secretary shall also designate as 'redevelopment areas' those areas within the United States where the Secretary of Labor determines that a condition of substantial unemployment has existed for at least nine of the preceding twelve calendar months, and the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare certifies to the Secretary that the number of Cuban refugees residing in such areas has equalled 50,000 or more for one of the two preceding calendar years."

Mr. Speaker, for many years now the people of the district which I represent have willingly, courageously, and generously borne the brunt of the problems brought about by the approximately 150,000 non-American refugees living and working with us. We have been and are proud of the part which we have been called upon to play in the longstanding humane concepts of a free society, indicating to the refugees and to the world, proof of its concern for the dignity and the worth of an individual. This principle, among others, separates us clearly from the Communists or any other system which seeks to enslave mankind, and holds individual worth and dignity as secondary or even unnecessary. But, Mr. Speaker, in doing all this, we must also take every step to see to it that our own citizens receive assistance from our Government, particularly and especially when such assistance is within the spirit and intent of laws already enacted by this body, and when the causes which gave rise to the necessity for such assistance were not ones over which the citizens in the local area were responsible, but which causes were the direct responsibility of a policy of our Federal Government.

Mr. Speaker, I urge that the legislative committee having jurisdiction promptly consider this legislation. I respectfully submit that extensive hearings on this matter need not be held. The problem and the necessity are so obvious and so urgent that I respectfully request the chairman to grant priority consideration.

ELEANOR ROOSEVELT—A TRIBUTE

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. BROWN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, Eleanor Roosevelt's death last November came as a sorrowful shock to a world which had come to love and admire her.

> There have been famous women known the world over for their profiles on coins of their images in light—

Wrote Archibald MacLeish—

> but the world know Eleanor Roosevelt by heart.

Indeed, her life, from beginning to end, was a living testament to the universal ideal of human love and kindness. She became the living symbol of the hopes and aspirations of millions of people in all parts of the world because they knew that she cared about them and understood their condition.

From the very first days in the White House until the end of her gallant life, Eleanor Roosevelt was never interested in personal fame or glory. Rather, she used her position and influence as a springboard for service to others. She always welcomed every opportunity to turn injustice toward justice, inhumanity toward humane consideration, selfishness toward generosity. She was unafraid to speak out for causes she felt were deserving regardless of how unpopular they might be. She rose above petty criticisms from narrow minds to become a crusader for human betterment in every dark corner she looked into.

Eleanor Roosevelt's concern for human misery and deprivation came not from books but from person-to-person contact. She never hesitated to involve herself personally with the unpleasant scenes of humans suffering from hunger or disease. Her travels, first throughout the depression-ridden United States in the early New Deal days, and later in the war-torn areas of the world, strengthened her conviction that a peaceful world could never be achieved on a lasting basis without a greater understanding between peoples.

> One curious thing—

Eleanor Roosevelt wrote in her autobiography—

> is that I have always seen life personally; that is, my interest or sympathy or indignation is not aroused by an abstract cause

but by the plight of a single person whom I have seen with my own eyes. It was the sight of a child dying of hunger that made the tragedy of hunger become of such overriding importance to me. Out of my response to an individual develops an awareness of a problem to the community, then to the country, and finally to the world. In each case my feeling of obligation to do something has stemmed from one individual and then widened and become applied to a broader area.

One of the secrets of Eleanor Roosevelt's triumph as a great humanitarian was, I think, her deep faith in people and what people working together can accomplish for world peace.

No single individual—

She believed—

and no single group has an exclusive claim to the American dream. But we have all * * * a single vision of what it is, not merely as a hope and an aspiration but as a way of life, which we can come ever closer to attaining in its ideal form if we keep shining and unsullied our purpose and our belief in its essential value.

Eleanor Roosevelt's love and compassion for all humankind will always be an inspiration and the light of her life will never be extinguished.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. Charles H. Wilson (at the request of Mr. Albert), for 10 days, on account of official business in his district.

Mr. Healey (at the request of Mr. Rooney), for Wednesday, March 13, 1963, on account of illness.

Mrs. Kee (at the request of Mr. Albert), for the remainder of the week, on account of official business.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. Ashbrook (at the request of Mr. Hall), for 15 minutes, today.

Mr. Conte (at the request of Mr. Hall), for 15 minutes, today.

Mr. Lipscomb, for 30 minutes, on March 14.

Mr. Cramer, for 30 minutes, on March 14.

Mr. Lindsay, for 60 minutes, on March 20.

Mr. Dent (at the request of Mr. Stratton), for 60 minutes on March 14, to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. Matsunaga (at the request of Mr. Stratton), for 60 minutes, on March 20.

Mr. Flood (at the request of Mr. Stratton), for 60 minutes, on March 27.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the Congressional Record, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. Hall) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. Morton.

Mr. Pillion.

(The following Member (at the request of Mr. Stratton) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. Pucinski.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 21 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, March 14, 1963, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXCUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

544. A letter from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to authorize certain construction at military installations, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

545. A letter from the President of the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to amend the law relating to material and necessary witnesses to crimes committed in the District of Columbia"; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

546. A letter from the Administratôr, General Services Administration, transmitting a report providing information on contracts negotiated for experimental, developmental or research work for the 6-month period ending December 31, 1962, pursuant to Public Law 152, 81st Congress, as amended; to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. WALTER: Committee on Un-American Activities. H.R. 950. A bill to amend the Internal Security Act of 1950; without amendment (Rept. No. 108). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BASS:

H.R. 4815. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to permit for 1 year, the granting of national service life insurance to certain veterans heretofore eligible for such insurance; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. CELLER:

H.R. 4816. A bill to promote the cause of criminal justice by providing for the representation of defendants who are financially unable to obtain an adequate defense in criminal cases in the courts of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CORBETT:

H.R. 4817. A bill to amend title 13, United States Code, to provide for a mid-decade census of population, unemployment, and housing in 1965 and every 10 years thereafter; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 4818. A bill to amend section 25 of title 13, United States Code, relating to the duties of enumerators of the Bureau of the Census, Department of Commerce; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 4819. A bill to amend section 131 of title 13, United States Code, so as to provide for the taking of economic censuses 1 year earlier starting in 1968; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 4820. A bill to amend the Retired Federal Employees Health Benefits Act with respect to Government contribution for expenses incurred in the administration of such act; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. DIGGS:

H.R. 4821. A bill to establish, in the House of Representatives, the office of Delegate from the District of Columbia; to provide for the election of the Delegate; and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H.R. 4822. A bill to provide under the social security program for payment for hospital and related services to aged beneficiaries; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GRAY:

H.R. 4823. A bill to modify the flood control project for Rend Lake, Ill.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. JENNINGS:

H.R. 4824. A bill to establish the Mount Rogers Wonderland in the Jefferson National Forest in Virginia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. VINSON:

H.R. 4825. A bill to authorize certain construction at military installations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. KUNKEL:

H.R. 4826. A bill to prevent the use of stopwatches or other measuring devices in the postal service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mrs. MAY:

H.R. 4827. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to reduce the highway use tax in the case of certain motor vehicles used primarily to haul unprocessed agricultural products; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MULTER:

H.R. 4828. A bill to amend section 6(o) of the Universal Military Training and Service Act to provide an exemption from induction for the sole surviving son of a family whose father died as a result of military service; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. MONTOYA:

H.R. 4829. A bill to provide that the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs shall construct a 500-bed neuropsychiatric hospital at Albuquerque, N. Mex.; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 4830. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, so as to revise the rates of disability and death pension authorized by the Veterans' Pension Act of 1959, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. PUCINSKI:

H.R. 4831. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act so as to establish a special program for the construction, expansion, remodeling, and alteration of public eleemosynary hospitals; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. OLSEN of Montana:

H.R. 4832. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to require the marking of lumber and wood products to indicate to the ultimate purchaser in the United States the name of the country of origin; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BOB WILSON:

H.R. 4833. A bill to provide that Imperial and San Diego Counties in the State of

California shall constitute a new and separate judicial district to be known as the southern district of California and to redesignate the present southern district of California as the central district of California; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MARTIN of California:

H.R. 4834. A bill to provide that Imperial and San Diego Counties in the State of California shall constitute a new and separate judicial district to be known as the southern district of California and to redesignate the present southern district of California as the central district of California; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. UTT:

H.R. 4835. A bill to provide that Imperial and San Diego Counties in the State of California shall constitute a new and separate judicial district to be known as the southern district of California and to redesignate the present southern district of California as the central district of California; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON:

H.R. 4836. A bill to provide for the establishment of a national cemetery in Los Angeles County in the State of California; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BECKWORTH:

H.R. 4837. A bill to provide for the payment of certain amounts and restoration of employment benefits to certain Government officers and employees improperly deprived thereof, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. CORBETT:

H.R. 4838. A bill to provide for the payment of certain amounts and restoration of employment benefits to certain Government officers and employees improperly deprived thereof, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. EDWARDS:

H.R. 4839. A bill for the relief of certain persons involved in the negotiation of forged or fraudulent Government checks issued at Parks Air Force Base, Calif.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FOGARTY:

H.R. 4840. A bill to provide standards for the humane care, handling, and treatment of laboratory animals used by departments and agencies of the United States or by recipients of grants or contracts from the United States; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. KYL:

H.R. 4841. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Army to pay fair value for improvements located on the railroad right-of-way owned by bona fide lessees or permittees; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. PATMAN:

H.R. 4842. A bill to amend the Federal Credit Union Act to extend the time of annual meetings, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. ROBERTS of Alabama:

H.R. 4843. A bill to provide standards for the humane care, handling, and treatment of laboratory animals used by departments and agencies of the United States or by recipients of grants or contracts from the United States; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ROYBAL:

H.R. 4844. A bill relating to the release of liability under bonds filed under section 44(d) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1939 with respect to certain installment obligations transmitted at death; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ST. ONGE:

H.R. 4845. A bill to create a commission to study Federal laws limiting political activity by officers and employees of government; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. WYDLER:

H.R. 4846. A bill for the establishment of a Commission on Science and Technology; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

By Mr. DONOHUE:

H.R. 4847. A bill to amend section 312 of title 38, United States Code, to provide that poliomyelitis developing a 10-percent degree of disability within 1 year from the date of discharge of any veteran shall be held and considered to be service connected; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. FASCELL:

H.R. 4848. A bill to amend section 5 of the Area Redevelopment Act to provide that certain areas within the United States having a large number of Cuban refugees shall be designated as redevelopment areas; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 4849. A bill to amend subsection (b) of section 512 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (dealing with unrelated business taxable income); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HARRIS:

H.R. 4850. A bill to repeal the commodities clause in part I of the Interstate Commerce Act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 4851. A bill to amend section 902 of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 relating to penalties for falsification of records, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HARVEY of Michigan:

H.R. 4852. A bill to amend the Civil Rights Act of 1957, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4853. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to place certain natural amorphous graphite on the free list; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HORTON:

H.R. 4854. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a taxpayer a deduction from gross income for tuition and certain other educational expenses paid by him for the education of himself, his spouse, or any of his dependents at an institution of higher learning; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LINDSAY:

H.R. 4855. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to prohibit schemes in interstate or foreign commerce to influence by bribery the outcome of sporting contests, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RANDALL:

H.R. 4856. A bill to provide for humane treatment of animals used in experiment and research by recipients of grants from the United States, and by agencies and instrumentalities of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 4857. A bill to authorize the withholding from the pay of civilian employees of the United States the dues for membership in certain employee organizations, upon consent of employee; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MONTOYA:

H.J. Res. 326. Joint resolution providing for a study by the Veterans' Administration into the problems of veterans who are elderly, chronically ill, or otherwise handicapped; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. POWELL:

H.J. Res. 327. Joint resolution authorizing and requesting the President to set aside and proclaim an appropriate day in each year as Teachers Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FARBSTEIN:

H. Con. Res. 115. Concurrent resolution to favor the establishment of an international living museum of anthropology and ethnography; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. RHODES of Arizona:

H. Res. 292. Resolution establishing a Special Committee on the Captive Nations; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BRADEMAS:

H.R. 4858. A bill for the relief of Andriana K. Anagnostopoulou; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DULSKI (by request):

H.R. 4859. A bill for the relief of Avelino Gomez Fernandez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GROSS:

H.R. 4860. A bill to revive the office of General of the Armies of the United States and to authorize the President to appoint General of the Army Douglas MacArthur to such office; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mrs. KELLY:

H.R. 4861. A bill for the relief of David Dagan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MILLS:

H.R. 4862. A bill for the relief of Kim Tricia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4863. A bill for the relief of Etsuko (Matsuo) McClellan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MURPHY of New York:

H.R. 4864. A bill for the relief of Sheila Marguerite Henderson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PILLION:

H.R. 4865. A bill for the relief of Iren Almasi and Maria Almasi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROUDEBUSH:

H.R. 4866. A bill to provide for the advancement of Hospitalman Chief Gerald Henry White, U.S. Navy (retired) to the grade of chief warrant pharmacist; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. ROYBAL:

H.R. 4867. A bill for the relief of Sun Young Choy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4868. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Chieko Takagi McKinstry; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHIPLEY:

H.R. 4869. A bill for the relief of Eugene McVaigh and others; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. UDALL:

H.R. 4870. A bill for the relief of Charles E. Gardiner and others; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WESTLAND:

H.R. 4871. A bill for the relief of Glenn C. Deitz and others; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. YOUNGER:

H.R. 4872. A bill for the relief of Emilio and Giulio Sibillo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BRADEMAS:

H.R. 4873. A bill for the relief of Anthimos Halazonitis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

68. The SPEAKER presented a petition of Clara V. Marshall and others, San Francisco, Calif., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to calling for the preservation of the Monroe Doctrine, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Congress Hoodwinked: The Billion-Dollar Boondoggle—U.S. Air Force and Atomic Energy Commission Waste $1.04 Billion on Studies Before Junking Impractical Nuclear Airplane Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN R. PILLION
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 13, 1963

Mr. PILLION. Mr. Speaker, in a period of 10 years from March 1951, to March 1961, the U.S. Air Force and the Atomic Energy Commission were jointly engaged in feasibility and research studies aimed to produce a nuclear-powered airplane.

These Federal agencies wasted $1,040 million up to the time of the cancellation of the project in March 1961. During this time, and in spite of the lavish expenditures, no usable airplane frame, engine, nuclear powerplant, or military weapons system was developed under the program.

The $1,040 million expenditure is a total loss to the taxpayers of this country, except incidental theoretical knowledge with a minimal practical value. More tragic than this wastage of tax funds, is the fact that these funds represent a useless wastage of research, engineering, and technical talent and manpower. Research and engineering manpower to this extent had been diverted from projects that could have strengthened instead of weakened the relative military power of the United States to that of the Soviet.

During these 10 years, the emphasis, direction, and end purpose of this program had shifted and changed eight different times. The emphasis shifted from flight demonstration to applied research, to military weapons systems, to experimental no-flight program, to experimental flight program, to development for all-purpose military aircraft, to nuclear reactor shielding program, to research on nuclear reactor experiments.

During this whole period, the Atomic Energy Commission and the Department of Defense had represented this project to the Congress as an urgent military weapons system. The Congress was misled and hoodwinked for 10 years concerning the actual purposes, the urgency, and the progress of this project.

After years of study, the Department of Defense, in another change of heart and mind, announced the specifications for this nebulous airplane to be: Speed, 400 to 600 miles per hour; altitude, 30,000 feet. At the same time, the United States already had the B-52 and the B-58 military bombers with the following capabilities: The B-52 with a speed of 600 miles per hour and an altitude of 35,000 feet; the B-58 with a speed of 1,300 miles per hour and an altitude of 50,000 feet.

For military purposes, this airplane was obsolete from the beginning to the end of the 10-year research project.

No military weapons system was ever seriously projected for this airplane by the Air Force, even if it could have been successfully developed and feasibly manufactured.

The General Accounting Office investigated, audited, and reported its findings on this fantastic nuclear airplane project. Comptroller General Joseph Campbell's recent report cited numerous deficiencies in purpose, direction, and management on the part of the military and atomic energy agencies which contributed to the astronomical costs and disappointing results.

The Comptroller General cited the following governmental management errors:

First. Various major facilities were constructed but never used for their intended purpose.

Second. Construction designs and plans were completed and paid for without ever being used.

Third. The Department of Defense failed to furnish timely direction and supervision of the contractors.

Fourth. The Department of Defense delayed for over 2 years in giving the Atomic Energy Commission a decision on a vital military aspect of the program.

Fifth. The Atomic Energy Commission extended a contract for producing yttrium oxide, 7 months beyond its need.

Sixth. A large negotiated contract was almost entirely subcontracted which pyramided overhead and profit costs for both prime contractor and subcontractor costs.

The prime contractors for the nuclear propulsion system were the General Electric Co. and Pratt & Whitney Division of the United Aircraft Corp.

General Electric was paid $527,384,000 under its contracts. Pratt & Whitney received $164,480,000.

The Comptroller General disclosed the following deficiencies and inefficiencies of the General Electric Co. under its contracts:

First. Ineffective equipment accountability;

Second. Physical inventories not taken regularly;

Third. Accumulation of stock outside storerooms;

Fourth. Uneconomical purchases;

Fifth. Deficiencies in accountability for certain inventories;

Sixth. Divided internal audit responsibility, thus precluding effective and comprehensive coverage of General Electric's nuclear airplane activities.

Seventh. Prompt corrective action not taken on internal audit findings;

Eighth. Accounting records did not segregate allowable and unallowable costs;

Ninth. Government audit services not utilized;

Tenth. Delay in suspending project;

Eleventh. Improper method for computing fixed fee.

The Comptroller General's review of operations of Pratt & Whitney Aircraft disclosed innumerable weaknesses in the financial and quantity controls over materials and supplies inventories, and a lack of formal accounting records to support the financial reports prepared by Pratt & Whitney.

GAO cited the following deficiencies in Pratt & Whitney's operations:

First. Physical inventories not taken regularly;

Second. Inadequate accountability for inventories;

Third. Stock records accessible to warehouse employees;

Fourth. Improper handling of requisitions;

Fifth. Absence of written procedures for inventories;

Sixth. Accumulation of excessive and obsolete inventories;

Seventh. Inadequate accounting records; and

Eighth. Prompt corrective action not taken on internal audit findings.

Mr. Speaker, the Comptroller General's revelation of this billion dollar boondoggle is a shocking example of the wastages that occur in our Federal system of administration. There are thousands of areas where sheer, clear wastages are going on.

There is no question in my mind that the 1964 budget could be reduced by from $5 to $10 billion by reasonable businesslike management in our executive and administrative agencies. This responsibility rests with the Chief Executive.

Congress cannot undertake to displace or to exercise detail supervision over the management and administrative responsibilities of the executive department.

Remarks of U.S. Congressman Charles McC. Mathias, Jr., to the Maryland Council of Farmer Cooperatives at Ellicott City, Md., on February 27, 1963

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROGERS C. B. MORTON
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 13, 1963

Mr. MORTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following remarks by the Honorable CHARLES McC. MATHIAS, JR., of Maryland, at Ellicott City, Md., February 27, 1963:

REMARKS OF U.S. CONGRESSMAN CHARLES McC. MATHIAS TO THE MARYLAND COUNCIL OF FARMER COOPERATIVES, ELLICOTT CITY, MD., FEBRUARY 27, 1963

In my remarks here today I shall not stress my longstanding interest in, and support of agricultural cooperatives. And, I will not try to give you any advice on how to operate your cooperatives so that they will be of even greater service to your members, for I know you are more expert in this field than I am. Nonetheless, I do appreciate your inviting me to share with you some thoughts I have on the future of agriculture.

There is an erroneous idea that there is an inevitable conflict between the interests of farmers and those of consumers. This idea is expressed most frequently by those who think that the prices of farm products should be pushed by Government action of one kind or another. I would agree that there is a conflict between excessive Government intervention in agriculture and the longrun interests of consumers.

But if we take a close look at the real interests of consumers and farmers there is no conflict. The idea that there is a conflict is obsolete.

Consumers have an interest in maintaining the kind of an efficient, freewheeling, vigorous, and productive agriculture that has emerged in the United States and which Maryland agriculture so well exemplifies.

That this kind of agriculture serves the interests of consumers is evidence by the steady decline in the cost of buying an adequate diet.

In 1940 the average U.S. family spent 40 percent of its income for food. In 1961 the average U.S. family spent 19.7 percent of its income for food. In fact, if it bought the same kinds and quantities of food in 1961 that it bought in 1935-39, it would only spend 14 percent of its income for food.

Consumers have upgraded their diets. They are buying more meat, poultry, dairy products, fruits, and vegetables than they did 20 to 25 years ago. They are buying more convenience foods; foods ready to cook and eat.

U.S. consumers have more income left for education, medical care, housing and recreation because of the efficiency of American farmers.

It may not always appear that the benefits of this efficiency of production are shared in equitably by farmers themselves. But despite the growing pains of the agricultural revolution, the American farmer is a proud, independent, and stable part of the American scene. Agriculture is not sick, it's not prostrate, although it is changing. The net worth of farmers on an overall basis and on an average per capita basis continues to grow annually.

American farmers today are able to provide their children with education, with medical care, with an opportunity in life as never before.

Of all industries, agriculture has been clearly demonstrated to be that industry which does poorest, from the standpoint of both farmers and consumers, when central, political management is substituted for the incentives of a free economy.

The idea that Government must get involved commodity by commodity in planning production, in controlling production, marketing, and pricing of farm products, is an antiquated, inefficient, and dangerous approach to the future of farmers, and to the interests of consumers as well.

I like to be able to quote the President of the United States—he is everyone's President. He told a recent press conference that:

"The free market is a decentralized regulator of our economic system. The free market is not only a more efficient decision maker than the wisest central planning body, but even more important, the free market keeps economic power widely dispersed."

I could only applaud the sentiment. If he could only persuade some of those Harvard faculty members in the White House that teachers should listen and learn like the rest of us. In particular, I could wish that he would tell Secretary of Agriculture Freeman of his rediscovery of the key economic principle that has made the American economy go.

I don't need to tell you about the impact of the cost-price squeeze in agriculture. But I do think I should take a minute to relate this to Government policy in the area of taxes and spending.

Farm costs, both production costs and the cost of marketing your products, continue to rise.

There is no mystery as to why this is so. Farm costs go up because of a variety of Government programs and policies.

Government spending is a major cost in all businesses and particularly in agriculture.

All Government expenditures must be paid for, either in taxes or in that most insidious of taxes, inflation.

Taxes go into the making of prices. Virtually every tax is eventually paid by the consumer of goods and services.

In a hundred hidden ways, taxes turn out to be costs and prices.

Every new or bigger spending program enacted by Congress means more costs, in taxes and in prices, to farmers and to other citizens.

Since farmers are the biggest consumers of goods and services on a per capita basis, they have a particularly heavy stake in Federal tax and spending programs. So anyone who tells you how much he loves farmers and how he wants to vote for things to help farmers, who then votes or works for a whole raft of new and bigger spending programs, is not really working for the interests of farmers. His concern for farmers' welfare is delusion and illusion, a lot of double-talk.

I am sure that you have a major interest in the European Common Market and how it is going to affect you as farmers and as marketeers of farm products. This is a major subject in itself so let me make just one brief comment.

The European Common Market is a fact of life. It may turn out to be one of the crucially important developments of history. When we look at the ECM we can only wish it well and hope that it will mature as a strong economic force and military ally against Communist imperialism. But we must also be concerned with respect to the impact of the trading practices of this economic unit on U.S. farmers and other exporters. The recent import fees established on poultry illustrates the seriousness of the problem.

Section 252 of the trade bill enacted by the Congress was specifically designed to deal with this problem. It provides that whenever a foreign country maintains nontariff trade restrictions or variable import fees which prevent the expansion of trade on a mutually advantageous basis, "the President shall * * * suspend, withdraw or prevent the application of benefits of trade agreements concessions to products of such country."

This is a tough policy. It was so intended by the Congress. It was intended as a means of giving our negotiators a means to prevent such harmful actions to U.S. farmers and other exporters as illustrated by the fence ECM has built around their poultry industry.

But this policy of the trade act is meaningless unless it is implemented. The Nation must look to the President and the State Department to implement the policy.

As yet, I have seen little indication that the policy will be forcefully and effectively implemented.

We must recognize that our Government has one major handicap in endeavoring to obtain acceptance of this policy by the ECM. This is our own Government farm policy.

The administration is busily engaged in preventing free market prices from functioning here in the United States. Consequently, when we insist that other countries should discard their protective policies we are negotiating from a position of weakness.

It is not exactly a strong bargaining position for us to tell others do as we tell you, not as we do.

It seems to me that Maryland agriculture has a great future. We have the advantages of an efficient agriculture and a nearness to the major markets of the United States.

It seems to me that this future will be best protected by building on the assets we have. These assets can be dissipated by centralized management of agricultural production and marketing which would curtail our efficiency and share our markets with areas less favored geographically.

In devising national policy relating to farm program we should copy success. With all its problems, those segments of U.S. agriculture which rely on the market as the major determinant of income and the major guide to investment, production and marketing, have a much more favorable outlook than those which have had the benefit of central planning and control.

A Tribute to the Honorable Clement J. Zablocki, Member of Congress From the Second District, Milwaukee, Wis.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 13, 1963

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, last week it was my sincere pleasure to participate in a tribute to Congressman CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI sponsored by the Department of Wisconsin, Polish Legion of American Veterans, in Milwaukee, Wis.

I am sure my colleagues will be happy to learn of the very high regard that the people of Milwaukee and, indeed, of Wisconsin have for our colleague from the Second District in Wisconsin.

Throughout the evening, it was evident that those participating in this tribute recognized CLEM ZABLOCKI's impressive contribution as a Member of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs toward helping carve an effective foreign policy for the United States.

It would be difficult to fully describe CLEM ZABLOCKI's impressive contribution toward a better understanding by all Americans of the serious problems with which the free world is faced in Berlin, in Laos, in Vietnam, in the Soviet Union, in Red China, and in Latin America.

CLEM ZABLOCKI's wise judgment and penetrating counsel have been woven deep throughout all the great decisions in the difficult field of foreign relations and international affairs made by our Nation in the past decade. I was happy to bring to the people of Wisconsin a picture of how thoroughly CLEM ZABLOCKI is respected here in Congress on both sides of the aisle and yes, Mr. Speaker, in both Chambers of the Congress of the United States.

His wise counsel and great dedication to the cause of freedom are a source of inspiration to all of us here in Washington and it gives me a great deal of pleasure to have dwelled on this particular subject at greater length to those participating in this great tribute to Clem Zablocki.

It was particularly fitting that Governor Reynolds, of Wisconsin, would personally participate in the tribute to Clem. The Governor joined the others present in extolling the impressive record of accomplishment that Clem Zablocki brings, not only to the people of his congressional district in Wisconsin, but yes, Mr. Speaker, to all the people of America.

It was with a deep sense of pride that I observed during this tribute to Clem the abiding sense of purpose in the American cause that Clem Zablocki brings to this Congress and to the United States.

Mr. Speaker, Congressman Zablocki was overwhelmed by the tribute paid him and the truly humble spirit of this great American was best reflected in his own remarks which concluded this very impressive banquet.

I should like to take this privilege to incorporate these remarks in the Record today because they so eloquently describe the greatness of our colleague from Wisconsin's Second Congressional District.

Mr. Speaker, Congressman Zablocki's remarks follow:

Remarks of Acceptance by Hon. Clement J. Zablocki at a Testimonial Dinner Given in His Honor by the Department of Wisconsin, Polish Legion of American Veterans, Sunday, March 31, 1963

Congressman Pucinski, Governor Reynolds, Mr. Firmin, Mr. Borkowski, Commander Bieganowski, Department Commander Nedweski, Mrs. Wozniak, Mrs. Zalewski, Reverend Taterczynski, the Madrigal Singers of Alverno College, and friends, some of you may remember that recently there was an attempt to name a library for me. At the time, I said it didn't seem like a good idea since public buildings are usually named for deceased persons and I was not dead yet. Tonight I am not sure whether I am really still alive. Sitting here and listening to these tributes is a little like attending one's own funeral.

Seriously, I am sincerely happy to be alive and here to receive this honorary membership citation in the Polish Legion of American Veterans. It is an honor which will be remembered and cherished always.

I only wish my wife could have been here tonight to share in these warm and wonderful proceedings. Unfortunately she could not be present.

This tribute you have paid is not, I know, purely a personal one. It is a tribute to the office I hold as Representative to the Congress of the United States, the most powerful lawmaking body on the face of the earth. It is my privilege to hold this post by the grace of God and the unstinting hard work of my family, friends, and acquaintances, many of them here tonight. I know you will forgive a personal privilege, if I single out my mother and present her to you. I attribute much to her for what I am.

To you, my friends, belongs the real praise, for you have aided me without thought of gain or personal privilege. You have trusted that I would represent you in the Halls of Congress as you would want to be represented, and I hope that I have not betrayed your trust.

I am proud to accept this tribute because to me it signifies in a true sense the basic purpose of the PLAV. Your organization's efforts to promote good citizenship and Americanism are well known.

You honor me not as one of Polish ancestry or solely for having assisted Poland in some way, but to inspire and encourage others to seek service in Government and participate in Government. And that is as it should be. For while we are proud of our national backgrounds, we are prouder still to be Americans, citizens of one of history's great nations.

Our American way of life presupposes a pluralism of racial, national and religious backgrounds. We have a country which is truly unified in its diversities. To my mind it would indeed be a tragic day for our country if all Americans conformed to the same customs, manners and culture. We are not meant to be poured out of one mold.

It is a pleasure and privilege for me to work with Congressman Roman Pucinski in Congress, one of the most heterogeneous groups in our Nation. Congressmen are of varied national backgrounds, hold varied political, philosophical and religious beliefs. They come from all parts of our Nation. The interchange of ideas and wisdom which takes place on Capitol Hill is in no small measure due to the diverse backgrounds of our national representatives.

We can be proud that our country is a melting pot; that each national group has made its contribution to our life and culture. But the process is far from over. There is still much that can be contributed to America by all of us who are interested in preserving for posterity the traditions and culture of our native lands.

As members of the PLAV you have chosen not only to preserve the heritage of America, and attend to the welfare of your fellow veterans and our way of life, but also the glories and triumphs of Poland. The latter you are conveying to your children, and sharing with those who might otherwise never know about them. In doing this you are promoting Americanism just as if you were once again fighting for the freedoms we hold so dear.

Further you are engaged in promoting a better understanding of the real image of Poland and the people of that great nation. Your organization is dedicated: to the restoration of individual human dignity to the unfortunate enslaved brethren; you are dedicated to the liberation of Poland from Communist domination and you are determined that Poland will return to the family of free nations where she rightfully belongs, for Poland has contributed much to the development and culture of the West.

I am confident your work and the efforts of all understanding citizens of this great country of ours will not be in vain.

As a Christian nation, soon to commemorate its millenium of christendom, Poland will never succumb to the pressures and wiles of communism. Poland will be free. Her people will again rise and rejoice. Their voices will again glorify God in thanksgiving and in supplication that freedom shall be through all ages and forever theirs.

To this end not only your organization but all of us are committed. Ours is a great challenge. But our task is not insurmountable. May we be inspired with the zeal and dedication to fulfill our obligation.

In closing, may I again express my sincere gratitude to all of you.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 14, 1963

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rev. Father Joseph A. Baran, St. Michael's Church, Lansford, Pa., offered the following prayer:

Lord, Eternal God, by whose grace America is free and by whose inspiration we freely choose our government and, even during these highly crucial times, enjoy a flourishment of culture, spiritual creativity, and economic welfare, we beseech Thee, in Thy infinite goodness, to bless our President, our Congress, and the whole American people without regard to race, color, and creed.

Humbly we invoke Thee to look upon us mercifully as we daily pray for those countries of many millions of people which have contributed to the strength of America. Among these countries is Slovakia, a country in the heart of Europe, which today cannot freely commemorate the grand and significant anniversities of its own glorious history. Slovakia cannot commemorate, in a manner that is fitting and just to glorify, O Lord in the highest, Thy greatness, the year 863 when the saintly brothers Cyril and Methodius, the messengers of the holy Christian mission, came into the territory of Slovakia to spread the gospel of truth in a language intelligible to the people of that country. Therefore, do we gratefully recall this great Slovak anniversary and thank Thee, Lord Almighty, Lord of the strong and the weak, Lord of the great and small nations, that Thou hast granted us the grace to live to see this happy day.

We are also happy to recall, in this House of Representatives, the 24th anniversary of the Proclamation of Independence of the Slovak nation by its duly elected representatives which happens to be this very day. Together with over 2 million Americans of Slovak descent we pray Thee, O merciful and just God, grant wisdom and courage to all free men and freedom-loving peoples, so that they might lend a helping hand to this worthy, long-suffering Christian country of the Slovak Nation to regain its liberty and freedom.

May all human malice disappear, may the forces of good, of right, and justice tear asunder the curtain of iron and steel and, under Thy protection, O God of mercy, may America and Slovakia flourish to Thy greater honor and glory. In the name of our Lord, who liveth and reigneth for all eternity. Amen.

Let us remember in a silent prayer Congressman Clyde Doyle.

In the name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

PROGRAM FOR NEXT WEEK

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I take this time in order to ask the majority leader if the gentleman can advise us as to the program for next week.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ARENDS. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, in response to the inquiry of the gentleman from Illinois, Monday is Consent Calendar Day. There are also two suspensions: First, H.R. 4715, the Eleanor Roosevelt Memorial Foundation; and, second, H.R. 2826, taxes, disposition of property.

Tuesday is the Private Calendar.

The program for Wednesday and the balance of the week will be announced later.

This is, of course, subject to the further reservation that conference reports may be brought up at any time and any further program may be announced at any time later.

Mr. ARENDS. I thank the gentleman.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY, MARCH 18

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, it appears that there will not be very much business next week; is that correct?

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, I have announced all the program that is ready for floor action next week, as of now. We may have further announcements sometime next week.

Mr. GROSS. We got up a pretty good head of steam yesterday and it was my hope that the leadership could keep the legislative machinery rolling, at least until the Easter recess, so that we could get out of here this year before October 13 or 15, or whatever the date was last year.

Mr. ALBERT. I think the gentleman will be satisfied when we will have finished this session that we will have enacted a very substantial amount of very important legislation.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman thinks we can get away sometime about August 1?

Mr. ALBERT. I hope so.

Mr. GROSS. I would like to do a little fishing this year, but unless Congress gets down to work I will again be deprived of that pleasure.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS NEXT WEEK

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Calendar Wednesday rule be dispensed with on Wednesday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

TRANSFER OF SPECIAL ORDERS TO MONDAY NEXT

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all special orders heretofore entered on behalf of Members for today be transferred to Monday next and be called first on the list of special orders for that day.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, without establishing a precedent, I ask unanimous consent that all Members of the House desiring to do so may extend their remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

ST. PATRICK'S DAY

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the distinguished Speaker may extend his own remarks at this point in the RECORD on the subject of St. Patrick's Day.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, there is some historical doubt about the place and date of St. Patrick's birth. There is no doubt whatever about the charm and force of his saintly personality, the magnificence of his lifetime achievement, or the enthusiasm with which his feast day is celebrated in Ireland, and by those of Irish descent, as well as countless others, everywhere in the world.

People frequently announce, with an air of surprise, that St. Patrick was not an Irishman. Irish people know, and Catholics know, that St. Patrick was the Apostle of Ireland; and the apostle of a country, in common understanding, is someone who has come from outside into a country, bringing the faith, as St. Boniface to Germany, or St. Francis Xavier to the Indies. In many countries, a native-born saint is adopted as patron, and many other saints, elsewhere. Ireland, however, has so great a debt to St. Patrick, and so great a love for him, that his place as patron saint of Ireland is assured forever.

Young Patrick, taken captive by pirates, and sold into slavery in pagan Ireland, escaped and devoted the rest of his life to the task of redeeming his pagan masters from the slavery of heathen beliefs and of sin. He received his seminary training in the schools of Tours and Lerins, in France, was commissioned by Pope Celestine I to undertake the conversion of Ireland, and consecrated bishop in 442. Even within his own lifetime, he saw that pagan land on fire with the love of God, the love of Christian learning, and a flaming missionary zeal. Out of St. Patrick's example, his preaching, and the efforts of devoted students and holy bishops and priests under his direction, Ireland has acquired and maintained the character of a center of Christian intellectual development and Christian charity, and a prime supplier of Catholic teachers, missionaries, and priests to the rest of the world.

In accordance with Catholic custom, we celebrate on March 17 the occasion of St. Patrick's death, just 1,470 years ago, in the year 493. This was the day on which, according to our belief, he entered into the joys of Heaven, richly merited by his joyful acceptance of God's will for him, his brave and vigorous work for the cause of Christ, and his unfailing love for all of Christ's children.

It is more than the grass under the rain that keeps Ireland green today in the hearts of those that love her—it is the memory, forever green, of that devoted servant of God and lover of humanity, St. Patrick, the man of humility and force, of kindness and courage. Wherever you see, today, the glint of green of a shamrock, or of whatever plant or fabric may do temporary duty as a shamrock, you see a visible sign of the greenness of that memory—the glow of love for the great St. Patrick, and for the land he made a land of glory and beauty and holiness.

The influence of Christian Ireland has been strong in America from early days. Long before the Revolution, in 1737, the Charitable Irish Society was organized and brought into being on St. Patrick's Day, in Boston, to enable the Irish citizens of the town to aid "their poor and indigent countrymen." We have records of the celebration of St. Patrick's Day by the Irish troops maintained in the American Colonies before the Revolution. And St. Patrick's Day obtained a special local, as well as national, significance in 1776, when the British evacuated Boston, and the American troops under George Washington marched in to take possession. Thus our local patriotism, as residents of Boston, our State loyalty, and our national patriotism, are united, in the celebration of Evacuation Day, with honor to St. Patrick, symbol of the Irish ancestry and Catholic faith in which so many of us take pride.

In the early colonial days, we find in history men and women of Irish blood emigrating to the various Colonies of America as early as 1636. Through the decades and generations of colonial and constitutional government, sons and daughters of Ireland have come to America. Their descendants today in our country constitute countless millions of our citizens.

I think it can be said that those of Irish blood, in peace or in war, have been contributors to our progress, and more, have always responded to the service of our country.

As St. Patrick was the crusader for God and mankind in his day, so can we, during this trying period of the world's history, emulate the spirit of St. Patrick in our own lives.

By doing this we will be able to make our greatest contribution to God, country, and mankind.

And it is well that we pause on St. Patrick's Birthday to honor this saint of action, and in our own minds, reflect on the lessons we can learn from his spiritual and dynamic life—making us better persons—making us better Americans.

THE LATE HONORABLE CLYDE DOYLE

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. Sheppard].

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker, as senior Representative from California, it is my unpleasant duty to announce to the House the passing of our dear friend and colleague Clyde Doyle of the 23d District of California.

The quality of the dedicated life and the invaluable work of Clyde Doyle is well known to every Member of this body in which he was serving with great distinction his country, his State, and his constituency.

His death takes from our midst a great American and an outstanding legislator. He was my close, personal friend—a friendship that I valued highly. Although the family and his circle of friends will miss him dearly, we all have the consolation of knowing that he has rendered his country great service and therein left a legacy that all of us could well emulate.

To his beloved wife, Lydia, his daughter, his grandchildren and the other family members, I extend my deepest sympathy.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to have Clyde Doyle's official biography inserted at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

(The matter referred to follows:)

A Brief Biographical Sketch of Congressman Clyde Doyle, 23d District, California

Congressman Clyde Doyle, of South Gate, Calif. (formerly of Long Beach), elected to the 79th, 81st, 82d, 83d, 84th, 85th, 86th, and 87th Congresses. Now serving his 8th term—16th year. Member of two major committees: House Armed Services Committee and House Un-American Activities Committee.

District office: 2710 Zoe Forest, Huntington Park, Calif.

Washington office: 1030 New House Office Building, Washington 25, D.C., phone: Capitol 4–3121.

Residence: 8948–A State Street, South Gate, Calif.

FAMILY BACKGROUND

Birthplace, Oakland, Calif., of marriage of Thomas and Nettie Doyle. Youngest of large family of brothers and sisters. Mother was schoolteacher before marriage and father was successful blacksmith, horseshoer, racehorse owner, farrier (before the days of automobiles or "gasoline wagons.")

FORMAL EDUCATION

Elementary schools of Oakland, Calif., and Seattle, Wash. Los Angeles High School and Long Beach High School. President of student body, champion debater, manager of high school paper. Baseball team pitcher, studied correspondence extension law course and attended night classes. Graduated from the College of Law of the University of Southern California with LL.B. degree, 1917. College baseball team pitcher. Earned his own way through high school and college years by being student janitor for schoolrooms, selling and delivering newspapers, clerking in bookstore, serving legal processes from law office, delivering post office special delivery letters and Western Union messages, assistant at Long Beach YMCA, leader and director of summer camps for boys.

THIRTY YEARS' SUCCESSFUL LAW PRACTICE AND BUSINESS RECORD

Passed California Supreme Court examination a year before graduating from University of Southern California Law College in 1917 with degree of LL.B. Established very successful law practice in Long Beach and Los Angeles for 30 years before first being elected to 79th Congress in 1945. Legal counsel for superintendent of banks California. President, Long Beach Bar Association and member board of trustees. Member, Los Angeles Bar Judiciary Committee. Member, California State Bar Legislative Committee. Member, board of directors, California Bar Delegates, State Bar of California. Chairman, resolutions committee, California State Delegates Bar Convention. Trust counsel, National Bank. Vice president and director, First National City Bank, Long Beach, Calif. Admitted to practice before U.S. Supreme Court, October 14, 1931, Washington, D.C. Legal counsel, World War I of exemption boards on voluntary basis without pay. Member, California State Board of Education. Admitted to practice in Federal courts, 1917.

OUTSTANDING COMMUNITY LEADERSHIP OVER PERIOD OF MANY YEARS BEFORE ENTERING CONGRESS

In 1936 received unanimous award of meritorious citizenship plaque by vote of all the service clubs of Long Beach, Calif., as the most valuable and useful adult citizen in Long Beach. Twice elected by popular vote of the people as member, Board of Freeholders, Long Beach. President of board in 1921 to write Long Beach City charter. First member, Long Beach Kiwanis Club and organizing president. First president, Boy Scouts of America Council in Long Beach. Several years president of Long Beach tuberculosis stamp sales. Member, board of trustees and legal counsel, Adelaide Tichenor Hospital, School and Clinic for Crippled Children. Boys secretary, YMCA, Long Beach. Member, board of directors, Long Beach YMCA. Member, board of trustees, California Junior Republic, Chino. President, Long Beach Recreation Commission for 15 years without pay. First president, Long Beach Coordinating Council, 1934. First president, Long Beach Philharmonic Orchestra Association. Honorary member of National Recreation Association. Honorary member, California Conference of Social Work. Honorary member, Long Beach 20–30 Club. President, Long Beach Trojan Club (U.S.C.). President Abraham Lincoln Club, Long Beach, for several years. Member of Abraham Lincoln Group, Washington, D.C. Los Angeles County juvenile probation officer. Examiner of applicants for position of juvenile court probation officers, Los Angeles County, under Hon. Curtis D. Wilbur, distinguished judge juvenile court (later Secretary of Navy under President Hoover). Boys counselor and instructor in government and athletics, California Junior Republic, Chino, 1911–14; member, board of trustees since 1920. Recipient of honorary plaques, awards and decorations by several veterans organizations; member, South Gate Chamber of Commerce; Huntington Park, Downey and South Gate YMCA. Member of Moose and Eagles. Many years and currently listed in "Who's Who."

CLYDE DOYLE FAMILY

Clyde Doyle and Lydia Yeomans, Long Beach high school mate, one of three daughters of prominent pioneer Long Beach family, were happily married on March 21, 1914; will soon observe their 48th wedding anniversary at the Nation's Capital where Mrs. Doyle has helped Congressman Doyle all the 16 years he has already served in Congress. Children of marriage: Lydia Louise Doyle, deceased; 1st Lt. Clyde Doyle, Jr. (U.S. Army Air Force), who died on duty in 1945; Dorothy Grace Stanton, mother of two sons and whose husband is prominent school teacher, resides in Rolling Hills, Calif. All parents, brothers, and sisters of both Congressman and Mrs. Doyle are deceased.

ALREADY ELECTED BY POPULAR VOTE OF THE PEOPLE EIGHT TIMES AS MEMBER OF CONGRESS

Member of 79th, 81st, 82d, 83d, 84th, 85th, 86th, and 87th Congresses. Twice accorded nomination by the voters of both Democratic and Republican Parties in the June primary elections under the California cross filing law which is no longer in effect. Reelected to 84th, 85th, 86th, and 87th Congresses from the 23d district by over 70 percent of votes. Member of House Armed Services Committee and House Un-American Activities Committee. Chairman under both Democratic and Republican administrations of the Rules Committee of the House Un-American Activities Committee. Has also served on House Lobby Investigating Committee, Military Reserve Committee; has traveled extensively on congressional duties in the United States and foreign countries. Author of Doyle resolution, House Resolution 151, in 84th Congress, adopted unanimously, requiring at least two members of every investigative committee present at hearings—passed the House by unanimous vote. Author of Doyle bill, H.R. 8772, dealing with less than honorable discharges; appointed chairman of Special Subcommittee on Armed Services Committee and held public hearings on said bill. Said bill passed the House of Representatives August 5, 1957, by an overwhelming standing vote of 226 ayes to 8 nays. Author of Doyle bill, H.R. 1935, which passed the House unanimously dealing with less than honorable discharges. Author of Doyle bill, H.R. 9944, filed at the opening of the 87th Congress and which bill was referred to the House Committee on Un-American Activities of which Doyle is a member. Its purpose is to outlaw the Communist Party in the United States or any Communist-action organization in the United States whether the designation of Communist is part of the name of the organization or not. It declares it to be a criminal offense to belong to such organization and provides penalties for becoming or remaining a member of Communist-action organization and penalties for violation of the bill of not more than $10,000 or imprisonment of not more than 5 years, or both, for each violation, and any organization which violates any provision of the bill shall be fined not more than $10,000 for each violation. It defines the meaning of the term Communist-action organization as one being under the direction and control of the world Communist movement. Has frequently presided over House of Representatives during debates and House proceedings by appointment of Hon. Sam Rayburn, late Speaker of House of Representatives. Has presided as congressional subcommittee chairman in many cities in United States and was chairman of Armed Services Special Subcommittee to proceed to Long Beach, Calif., to hold public hearings on the subject of subsidence at Long Beach Navy Shipyard and make report back to Congress. This was done. The essence of the Doyle Special Subcommittee report was adopted by the House and the

Senate, declaring their policies as to further appropriations for Long Beach Navy Shipyard and the subsidence problem. Has presided as subcommittee chairman of House Un-American Activities Committee in many American cities at public hearings involving subversion and subversive activities. Has traveled extensively in many foreign countries as official member of the House Armed Services Committee. Now serving his 16th year as a Member of the House of Representatives; and has earned what is recognized as very valuable seniority status on his major committees and on the floor of the House of Representatives.

CLYDE DOYLE RESIDENCE: ONE IN 23D DISTRICT AND ONE IN ARLINGTON, VA.

Congressman and Mrs. Doyle reside at 8949-A State Street, South Gate, where they lease a furnished apartment by the year. Congressman and Mrs. Doyle early purchased a suitable home for themselves at Arlington, Va., only 20 minutes by automobile, driving mostly along the beautiful Potomac River, from his home to his office on Capitol Hill in the New House Office Building, it being necessary for the Congressman to also have a home close by his Washington, D.C., office, as he is necessarily at the Nation's Capitol or working from the Nation's Capitol most of the time.

DOYLE ATTENDANCE ON THE FLOOR OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Los Angeles Times, Tuesday, December 26, 1961, publicized that Congressman Clyde Doyle was 1 of only 3 California Congressmen and 1 of only 31 House Members with 100 percent voting records during the first session of the 87th Congress.

Speaker Sam Rayburn, twice as long the Speaker of the House of Representatives as any other man in the history of the U.S. Congress before his untimely decease wrote over his own signature about Congressman Clyde Doyle as follows:

"Clyde Doyle is one of the most effective men in his committees and also on the floor of the House of Representatives. He is able, he is honest, and he has the facility for expressing himself in such a way as to impress all the Members of the House with his knowledge of the subject in hand. I think Clyde is one of the very best men we have in the House of Representatives.

"We have shown our confidence in him in many ways."

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. Miller].

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, Clyde Doyle and I came to Congress together in the 79th Congress and formed a friendship that was a lasting one. I think it is an enviable thing that when a man passes on as has Clyde he leaves behind a reputation that no man can say he was ever injured by him or that he ever willingly injured any person. He was a Christian gentleman, a kindly, intelligent man, aggressive, and a loyal public servant. This Congress and the country will be the loser in his untimely passing.

Mrs. Miller and I extend to Mrs. Doyle and the family our sincerest sympathy.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the distinguished majority leader, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. Albert].

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, Clyde Doyle was one of the finest friends I have ever had, one of the finest men I have ever known. I have known him well for 17 years. I have known him as a colleague in the House and on committee. I have known him as a great legislator. I have known him as the gentleman he was.

Clyde Doyle and I served together on the Select Committee To Investigate Lobbying Activities in the 81st Congress, known as the Buchanan Committee. This was only a few years ago and Clyde's death reaffirms in my mind the frailty of life on this earth. I am now the sole surviving Democratic member of that committee.

Clyde Doyle had rare qualities. He was one of the fairest and most judicious men I have ever known. He insisted that the business of the House be handled according to the rules. He insisted on the rights of witnesses before committees.

He was soft spoken and gentle but inside this kind, considerate, and judicious man there was a deep resolve which, when principles were at stake, could be as hard and as resolute as steel.

There is an emptiness in this Chamber without Clyde Doyle. For 19 years he almost invariably sat in the same seat. He was practically always there by the table taking notes. He was perhaps the most attentive Member of the House. He kept personal notes day in and day out on the proceedings and activities of the House, putting down his own observations, his own comments, and establishing a chronology that could never be put into the official records of the House. Clyde had thousands of pages of notes. He often talked to me about this project. He had planned on his retirement to edit his papers and to put them into a usable form. This would have been an extraordinary document on the Congress. It would have been of extraordinary benefit to students. Those of us who participate in the day-to-day activities of this House know how difficult it is to get across the story of Congress. We know how cold and unconvinced even the best and most scholarly books on the subject generally leave us. In his notes Clyde has left a lasting memorial to the human side of the House, and an on-the-scene, day-to-day portrait of the type and character and skill of his colleagues, one by one. I hope that it will be possible for his priceless contribution to congressional history to be made available to Members, to schoolchildren, and to scholars interested in this subject.

Mr. Speaker, I hope the House will excuse a personal reference. Shortly before the adjournment of the House last night, Clyde Doyle came to me and said he would like to have five extensions in the Congressional Record and asked if I would get the floor manager at the time of adjournment to obtain the order. I reached in my pocket and found that I had lost my pencil. He handed me this blue pencil and said, "I think the majority leader should be equipped with a pencil with the compliments of the gentleman from the 23d District of California." I thanked him and he said, "Here also is a red pencil which I use to indicate mistakes." This was my last conversation with Clyde Doyle. He may have made mistakes, but I would venture that his mistakes were as few as those of any among us. His attention to duty and detail, his respect for this House and for his colleagues, his character, his mind, his heart, combined to make his contribution a monument of public service. I was shocked beyond words to learn this morning of his passing. I have been told that he died in the calm serenity of sleep. What better evidence of a pure heart, of a noble character, or of a life fully and rightly lived do we need? He died composed and unafraid.

I extend my deepest sympathy to Mrs. Doyle and his family.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Vinson].

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, my heart is very heavy today.

I have lost a good friend; the Congress has lost a very distinguished Member; and the Nation has lost a man who dedicated his life to the betterment of mankind.

Just yesterday, on the floor of this House, as we were debating issues that are vital to the security of our Nation, Mr. Doyle discussed with many of us some of the items that were in controversy. He wanted the Nation to have everything that was necessary for our defense.

On Monday, he spoke in behalf of the extension of the draft law. At that time he expressed concern about the number of young men who are physically disqualified from serving in the Armed Forces.

It seems somehow fitting that among Mr. Doyle's last official words on the floor of this House are words that demonstrated his sincere interest in the welfare of the young men of this Nation.

And now he has crossed to the other side of the river. The uncertainty of life was never more evident than in the sad news I received this morning concerning the loss of this fine man.

Mr. Doyle was a gentleman in every sense of the word, but more than that he was a Christian gentleman who was dedicated heart and soul to America.

He knew the cost of freedom, for he lost his only son in World War II. And his entire life was devoted to improving the lives of his fellow man and the American way of life.

He was a sincere man with a heart that overflowed with goodness; and a man who found time to be concerned for the oppressed and the downtrodden.

He was a man with a conscience and an unparalleled sense of integrity.

Mr. Doyle had been a member of the Armed Services Committee since the 81st Congress. During this period of time he successfully fulfilled all of the important duties that were assigned to him.

Every member of our Armed Forces has lost a champion.

On each of his letters, Mr. Doyle always put these words:

> Our beloved Nation deserves the best of whatever we are.

Mr. Doyle was an example of the best that the Nation has to offer.

I extend my sincerest sympathy to his family.

I hope they will be comforted in the knowledge that his contributions to the

Nation and to mankind will stand as a perpetual memorial to his accomplishments throughout the years that were allotted to him.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHEPPARD. I yield to our distinguished Speaker.

Mr. McCORMACK. My dear friend, Clyde Doyle, was here yesterday; he is not with us today. It is most significant that yesterday a bill was acted upon and passed by this body that came out of the great Committee on Armed Services, of which he was a member for so many years. It can truly be said that Clyde died in the line of duty.

Clyde Doyle's memory will always live in the minds of those of us who knew him, whether in or out of Congress. No more dedicated Member ever served in the Congress of the United States than he. A great American, an outstanding legislator, a fine gentleman, Clyde Doyle was not only great but he was good. Possessed of an understanding mind, he symbolized everything that was noble, true, and fine in the life of humankind. How many times has he spoken to you and me who are here? And how often will we remember that fine sweet philosophical outlook of life that he had.

To me the most beautiful thing in the journey of life is to meet men and women with beautiful, good and understanding minds. Clyde Doyle possessed such a mind, an example that each and every one of us could follow.

He was a man who realized the dangers that confront our country in the world today, in this trying period of history. Clyde Doyle always stood for strength on the part of our Government. He recognized the evil mind and the intent of the Communists. He fought them with vigor. He recognized that the only force the Communists respect is what they fear—military strength and power on our part greater than the Soviet Union possesses. He recognized that the only level upon which negotiations could be had with the Soviet Union was on the level of the law of self-preservation; and every action, every thought, every voice on his part, every vote on his part concerning the national interest of our country and the improving of our position in the world was on the side of strength. How often has Clyde Doyle said to me:

> If I am going to err in judgment, I prefer to err on the side of strength, not weakness.

So while he is not with us today, the memory of Clyde Doyle will always linger in the minds of those who served with him.

To Mrs. Doyle and his daughter I extend my profound sympathy in their great loss and sorrow.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHEPPARD. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, this morning as I went to office the Capitol flag was at half-mast. A couple of words came to my mind: "Oh, no." I recognized that the half-masted flag indicated that another of our colleagues had passed to his reward.

I immediately called and learned it was my good, warm friend, Clyde Doyle.

This has left me, as it has many of his colleague in the House, with a heavy heart. I have had the privilege to serve with Clyde Doyle for many years. I got to know him well, not only as a man but as a legislator.

Clyde Doyle served as a member of the Committee on Armed Services, on which I have been privileged to serve. He was a truly diligent member, and always actively participated in the committee work. He was respected by his committee colleagues for his objective approach to all defense questions.

Clyde Doyle was a man outstanding in many respects—honorable, fair, just, and dependable—and, as has been said by the majority leader, he was a good man. That means so much when we really try to analyze what the word "good" means.

He was a great American, dedicated not only to his country but likewise to this House of Representatives which he loved. And the House of Representatives has had great affection for him. I looked upon him as a friend, and I am proud to have been Clyde Doyle's friend.

He leaves us at a time when men of his stature are needed in the Congress of the United States. He will be sorely missed, not only by those on the majority side but likewise by his many friends on this side of the aisle.

Only yesterday I had opportunity to visit with Clyde. I find it difficult to bring myself to the realization that he has now left us. I will miss him as you will.

I extend to his family my deepest sympathy, and in so doing I know I speak for each and every Member on this side of the aisle.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. Shelley].

Mr. SHELLEY. Mr. Speaker, I first met Clyde Doyle in 1936, and from that personal meeting there grew a friendship which was warm and true. Clyde Doyle was all that everyone has said about him. He had fine qualities. He was a man with an understanding attitude; he was a man of forgiveness.

Clyde served as a member of the Committee on Un-American Activities in this House, and I can recall several times when Clyde was attacked rather bitterly by those who opposed the committee and anyone connected with that committee.

At one particular time in southern California some years ago, I spoke to Clyde about this. He smiled and said, "Jack, they just do not understand. They are misguided."

I have never heard Clyde Doyle say an unkind word about those who attacked or disagreed with him. He was understanding, he was kind, he had real convictions. He was dedicated to his principles, to his family, and to his country.

It was my pleasure to consider Clyde Doyle as a friend.

All I can say now is, Let his example of life be a guide to all of us, and may his passing be a passage into the eternal life and perpetual peace.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. Willis].

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Speaker, we were shocked and dismayed with the loss of a distinguished public servant, a Member of this House, and for 12 years a member of the Committee on Un-American Activities—Clyde Doyle.

He was accustomed to close his letters with a most significant statement:

> Our beloved Nation deserves the best of whatever we are.

This was his philosophy and creed of living. I know no one of whom it could be more truthfully said that he gave his best to the service of his country.

In the many hearings of the Committee on Un-American Activities in which I have participated with him, I have observed that he performed an incredible amount of work in preparation for the particular task ahead, that he was conscientious in the performance of his duties, and that he was kind and considerate. He never lost an opportunity to speak well of his native State, of which he has justly proud. As an able and effective legislator, and a colleague whose warmth of personality inspired all of those associated with him, he deserved and now receives, the plaudits of us all. He was truly a great and good man.

His life throughout has been an inspiration, and I am sure that to his wife and family his memory will ever remain as a benediction, and to them I extend my deepest sympathy.

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHEPPARD. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Speaker, in the issue of the Congressional Record which arrived in our offices this morning, there appeared an extension of remarks entered in the Record on yesterday.

In the mysterious ways of Providence, what was yesterday a routine incident today becomes a symbol and a remembrance of a distinguished and respected colleague, the Honorable Clyde Doyle.

In this particular insertion in the Record, our colleague from California included two resolutions supporting the work of the House Committee on Un-American Activities, of which Clyde had been a member for 12 years.

It was typical of Congressman Doyle's devotion to his Representative responsibilities and to the genuinely bipartisan character of his service on this committee that one of these resolutions had been adopted by the Downey Republican Women, Federated, and the other by Local Union 2058, United Steelworkers of America, AFL–CIO—both voicing full support of the work of the House Committee on Un-American Activities.

As with his membership on the House Committee on Armed Services and all of his duties in this House, Congressman Doyle served capably, conscientiously, and devotedly.

Through my own association with Clyde on the House Un-American Activities Committee for more than 4 years, I know that he regarded this particular assignment as a stern, necessary and oft times distasteful duty. I suspect that by temperament it was extremely difficult for this friendly and kindly gentleman to accept the fact that there are men and women, nominally fellow citizens, dedicated to enmity to the United States and the American way of life, but Congressman Doyle accepted his responsibility without flinching, and I recall more than one occasion in which he severely and yet gently chided hostile and recalcitrant witnesses for accepting the benefits of citizenship and even invoking the protections of the Constitution while joining in the conspiracy seeking the violent overthrow of our Government.

I have been privileged to work particularly closely with Congressman Doyle as ranking minority member of the committee during the past few weeks when he was serving as its acting chairman. In this relationship he was always the soul of considerateness and courtesy. I am profoundly shocked and deeply grieved that he has so suddenly left us. I extend my heartfelt sympathy to Mrs. Doyle and the other members of his family and to his colleagues in the California delegation.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHEPPARD. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, the Nation and this House have suffered another irreparable loss in the passing last night in his sleep of Clyde Doyle, our distinguished colleague from California. It was my privilege to serve with him since his assignment to the Committee on Armed Services and to break bread with him often.

In the intimacy of these associations I came to value deeply his friendship and endeavored to extend unhesitatingly my friendship to him.

Mr. Speaker, Clyde was a brave man. He had successfully fought off the effects of a serious illness recently and he did this without a word of complaint and with a determination which will always be an inspiration to those of us who had the privilege to know him.

Mr. Speaker, Clyde Doyle was a man who lived his daily life with a deep faith, ready to face his Maker.

My deepest and sincerest sympathy goes out to his family, to the countless friends who kept him in the Congress over these many years, and to the Members of his distinguished congressional delegation.

Clyde was a man who, as the gentleman has just said, placed the love of his country above his personal health. He was too busy in the pursuit of safeguarding the Nation's interests, that it is no wonder his health at last failed. Like a true soldier, he dedicated his life to his country. Those of us who have served with him will long cherish his memory.

Clyde Doyle was too busy with life's problems to realize—as Tennyson says—that:

Such a tide as moving seems asleep,
  Too full for sound and foam,
When that which drew out the boundless
    deep
  Turns again home.

My colleagues, Clyde Doyle has gone home.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. Sisk].

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, it was with profound sorrow and shock that I learned of the sudden death of our colleague and my warm, personal friend, Clyde Doyle. He was a valued colleague and an effective and highly esteemed member of the California delegation. I shall miss him not only as a Member of this body, but as a good friend and a devout Christian who inspired others to become better disciples of Christianity.

Clyde Doyle was one of the kindest persons I have ever known; I never heard him make an unkind remark about anyone. As a legislator, he was extremely capable and was a hard and productive worker. He was a most conscientious Representative for the 23d District of California and kept in constant touch with his constituents by sending them personal messages. During his years in Congress, he must have sent thousands of these handwritten messages on cards and I know they will be greatly missed by the people of his district.

The Congress and the Nation have lost a truly patriotic and dedicated servant in the death of Clyde Doyle. Along with his many other friends, I extend my deepest sympathy to his wife and family. I hope they will take some small consolation from knowing in what high regard we all held him, and that their grief is shared by each and everyone of us.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. Horan].

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, I have had the privilege of serving with Clyde Doyle since the 79th Congress and I knew him well.

His life here among us was a benchmark of conduct, something for us all to remember when we may be soul searching regarding the ethics that should accompany personalities and actions of Members of this body.

Mr. Speaker, he was kind, his integrity was beyond reproach, he was industrious. He worked for the best interests of all of us.

Mr. Speaker, Clyde Doyle had real vision.

Mrs. Horan and I join my colleagues here and Clyde's friends everywhere in extending our deepest sympathy to Mrs. Doyle and their daughter.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker, I recognize the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. Boggs].

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, Clyde Doyle was a man of many parts. He was also a man of great human insight. I will explain by telling something that he did a few years ago. A young boy from my area had come here as a page. One day this lad was walking through the tunnel and our colleage met him. Unbeknown to me, he sat down and wrote the mother of this boy one of the most thoughtful letters that I had ever had the privilege of reading.

This was reassuring to this lady. All of us have had some experience, I am sure, with youngsters who come here as page boys, some of them very young. The mothers are concerned and worried about them. Clyde had the human instinct of understanding just that sort of thing.

The lady who received that letter was so pleased that when she came to Washington to see her son, the first person she wanted to see was, of course, Congressman Clyde Doyle.

He was very active in so many fields of service; I am certain many of them have been mentioned. He worked with the Boy Scouts and other youth organizations. He had time enough to raise money to help crippled children and retarded children and join in the campaigns against diseases such as tuberculosis. He worked on recreational programs. He was active in his professional associations, such as the bar association and related legal activities. In addition to that he served as a member of a draft board. He found time for all kinds of things which meant that he gave of himself to other people.

The distinguished majority leader mentioned the meticulous diary which he kept here day by day. I used to sit by him sometimes and take a look at what he was putting down. All of us know the value of that sort of thing. My wife has called my attention to a series of articles which has been running in the Washington Post, I think, written by the wife of a distinguished former Member of this body who served here over 50 years ago. I have been reading that series because this lady recounts events about Members and their families which are so similar to events which occur today. I hope that this meticulously kept diary which Clyde Doyle kept will become a part of the history of this body and the history of our great country.

I know all of us join in extending sympathy to his loved ones. Someone has said that in the knowledge that "to live in hearts we leave behind, is not to die at all." I think that best describes our distinguished former colleague.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. Gary].

Mr. GARY. Mr. Speaker, Clyde Doyle was a fine Christian gentleman. I know no one who better exemplified the teachings of the Master; and when you say that you have said all that can be said about any man, you have given to him the highest accolade of praise.

It was my privilege, only a month or two ago, to serve on a committee that nominated Clyde as vice president of our Thursday morning breakfast prayer group. He served in that group for many years with great distinction. He was a valuable member. This morning it was to attend the meeting of that group that his wife went to arouse him when she found that he had passed on.

May I say that his passing was in keeping with the even tenor of his life. I am certain that he was welcomed with the loud hosannas of the angelic choir as he passed through the portals this morning to that undiscovered land from whose bourne no traveler returns.

I pay my highest respect to him at this time and extend my deepest sympathy to his family.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. Hardy].

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Speaker, those of us who have enjoyed any intimate association with Clyde Doyle have had our lives enriched by that association. For a number of years I have been privileged to sit next to Clyde on the Committee on Armed Services. I think I have never known a man so considerate, so understanding and so kind. One of the highlights of my service in this Congress is that I have been privileged to look upon Clyde as a friend. He was a man of big heart, the kindest person I have ever known. Truly he was one of God's noblemen.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. Cohelan].

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, the news of Clyde Doyle's death leaves me personally stunned. Clyde is the second member of the California delegation with whom I have had a close and affectionate association to be taken from us during my time in this great body.

Upon arrival in the Congress in 1959 I was assigned to room 1028 in the New House Office Building, just two doors away from the office of Clyde Doyle. Because of our many common problems affecting the welfare of our State, we soon became very close personal friends. Our association was enriched in many other ways, through other activities in which we jointly participated, but particularly on the great House Committee on Armed Services on which we both served.

In the course of our friendship he treated me with the dignity and the respect of a peer and a colleague, but also with the sternness and the gentle affection of a father for his son.

Clyde was truly a gentleman. He was a gentle and a tender man. He was a man who, having lost a hero son, knew the agony of great personal loss and the heartsickness that accompanies it. In his quiet and effective way he too gave his own life for his country through his devoted service.

Clyde will be long remembered by all of us who loved him and had the privilege of serving with him. Mrs. Cohelan and I extend our deepest sympathies to his wife, daughter, and grandchildren.

Mr. Speaker, I think it would be appropriate at this point to read two poems which were particular favorites of Clyde's. The first, "A Congressman's Daily Prayer," was written by Clyde and his wife Lydia for their 1959 Christmas greeting. The second was written by Lydia Doyle for the 1962 Christmas season:

A Congressman's Daily Prayer

(By Congressman Clyde and Lydia Doyle)

As each new day, need of rededication, by me, brings
Give me, dear Lord,
An understanding heart for all mankind,
Clear thinking, to find the essential good,
Purpose, to find true goals, for lasting values,
Honesty, to hold and do what's right in Thy sight.
Humility, to know my weakness and mistakes,
Strength, to meet the increasing daily demands,
Recognition, to see the worth of a colleague's sincere plan.
Cooperation, with all who share this drive,
Confidence, to always press forward when the cause is just.
Independence, if needs be to stand alone, when my conscience says, "I must."
Gratitude, for this great privilege to serve my country and the world.
Spiritual, awareness of our Nation's pledge
"In God we trust."
And so, dear Lord,
I thank Thee for the bountiful blessing I and my loved ones have received
These dozen years and more that I have served in Congress.
I pledge, with grateful heart, my loyal service, that
Thy will shall come to pass
On earth as it is in heaven
And that
Enduring peace shall rule the hearts and deeds of all mankind.

Christmas 1962

(By Lydia Yeomans Doyle)

It's not the gifts; it's not the bustle;
It's not the excitement; nor is it the rustle
Of tissue, tinsel, and trappings;
It's not the mystery of folks about you.
But it is the belonging, the caring and sharing;
All the glad fellowship that fills the air.
It's the feeling of oneness, the spirit outreaching
For God is my Father, all men my brothers.
And Christmas means loving.
One day is a symbol;
But love is a blessing that lasts through the years.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. Smith].

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, I, too, have lost a close personal friend in the passing of Clyde Doyle. I wish to associate myself with all the fine remarks that have been made here today in tribute to the memory of Mr. Doyle, and to say that I know of no individual that I have known over the years I have known Mr. Doyle who is more deserving of these fine remarks that have been made here in tribute to his memory.

I first met Clyde some years ago, long before I came to Congress, in connection with some legal matters we had to discuss in California. At that time as a member of the bar I learned of the high respect and esteem the attorneys and the judges and the Bar Association of Los Angeles had for Mr. Doyle. Then when I came back here we became closer friends.

I certainly agree that there is no more able, honest, and pleasant individual that I have had the pleasure of associating with here than Clyde Doyle. He was well respected in California as he was in this body. He was esteemed as a great American because of the wonderful work he has done as a member of the Committee on Un-American Activities.

As my colleagues, the gentlemen from California [Mr. Shelley and Mr. Sisk], and others have said, I have never heard Clyde Doyle make an unfriendly remark against a colleague or anyone else during the time I have known him. We have lost a fine colleague and an able Member of the House of Representatives.

Mrs. Smith joins me in expressing our sincere sympathy to Mrs. Doyle and their daughter.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. Stratton].

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, it is with profound regret and sorrow that I rise to join in paying tribute to my late friend and colleague, Clyde Doyle, of California, a member of our Committee on Armed Services. It is difficult for me to realize he has left us because only yesterday when we were debating the legislation from our committee, Clyde was sitting in his accustomed seat alongside the table, and although the position which I took and the position which he took were different, I had occasion to consult with him several times during the day, and his advice and counsel were most helpful and were always given in a kindly and considerate way. In this sense his participation yesterday on his last day of service here was, I think, typical of the service he has always given in this body, a service which was devoted, a service which was informed, a service which was dedicated in its application to the questions before the House, and yet a service which was always rendered with kindly consideration and with a respect for the views and opinions of the other person.

The distinguished majority whip has referred to Clyde Doyle's diary. I had occasion yesterday to notice some of the insertions that he was making in it as the debate progressed. I would certainly agree with the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. Boggs] that it would be a great addition to the history of this body in the days to come if that diary could be published so that the American people might follow the deliberations of this body as seen through the eyes of the gentleman from California [Mr. Doyle].

I remember an example of the devotion and kindliness which have been referred to here so often today, when I first came to this body as a freshman Member. I remember Congressman Doyle taking several of us aside behind the rail and spending 10 or 15 minutes to describe to us some of the traditions of the House of Representatives and to counsel and to advise us as to how we might become effective legislators. It was a great thrill to me shortly thereafter to be assigned to the Committee on Armed Services where he was already a distinguished member and to be able to work with him on the measures relating to our national security.

The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Johansen] has already referred to the fact that although Congressman Doyle was a kindly and friendly person, he was nevertheless a very effective legislator. I recall serving on a subcommittee of which he was chairman. He proved himself to be a very effective, a very precise, and a very determined interrogator of witnesses before our committee, and he came up with a report that solved a complex and highly complicated question. In the same fashion Clyde Doyle served his country and this Congress as a member of the Committee on Un-American Activities. Anyone who knew Clyde Doyle would know it was possible to hate communism with a deadly hatred, and to be devoted to exposing the Communist philosophy and the Communist conspiracy in every possible way, while at the same time respecting the rights and the freedoms of those individuals who might be appearing before that committee. If there ever was a man who leaned over backward to be kindly and considerate to all that man was Clyde Doyle. Certainly, he embodied the combination of a determination to root out both Communist and Fascist philosophies with that fundamental sense of fairness which is so much a part of our American heritage.

Reference has already been made to the fact that he lost a son in the last war and that that fact always was in his heart and in a very real way inspired much of his activity. Certainly we can regard his service to the country in this body and his quiet passing while he was still serving here, as typical of the same kind of dedicated service and the same kind of patriotic sacrifice for one's country that had been represented by his own son.

We who are in this body, could well be proud if our service here could ever in some small way match the dedication and devotion embodied by Clyde Doyle. Of him it can well and truly be said: "Well done, thou good and faithful servant; enter thou now into the glory of thy Lord."

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Gavin].

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, it is with great sorrow that we record the passing of our very good friend and colleague, Clyde Doyle, of California.

I counted Clyde as my very dear friend. He was very conscientious in his work, deeply interested in all things that concerned the welfare of his State and Nation.

His lines of friendship extended to all elements of our social life. He was a man who contributed much to the life of the area in which he lived and the great State of California which he represented.

His service in the Congress won him deep respect and the great admiration and commendation of the Members on both sides of the aisle.

He was a very kindly, friendly man, always glad to see one, and always pleased when any act or deed of his added to the enrichment of our lives.

He had the highest concepts of citizenship; a firm believer in our American way of life with deep faith in the principles and ideals of our Government. It can be said of him that he was an outstanding Member of Congress and a great American.

In all his actions he moved with ease and courtesy and respected in others the qualities he possessed himself—sincerity of conviction and frankness of expression.

So today it is with a feeling of great sorrow that we in the House, who were privileged to serve with him, record his passing.

I shall always remember him for his many acts of kindness that indicated his friendship and good will toward me and all the Members of the House. I considered him one of my best friends.

I extend to his family my deepest and most sincere sympathy.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. Gubser].

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, a kinder man than Clyde Doyle has never lived, nor has one been more deeply respected.

The dictionary defines wisdom as "ability to judge soundly on facts as they relate to life."

Clyde Doyle was, then, the very essence of wisdom. His knowledge was great, and it was greater because he related it to life. Clyde Doyle loved life and he loved his fellow men. His every action, his total conduct, showed deep affection for humanity.

I was privileged to serve under his chairmanship on the Subcommittee To Investigate Military Discharges. Clyde Doyle's principle concern throughout those lengthy and exhaustive hearings was for the young man who was drafted at an early and tender age, committed an indiscretion and would be forced throughout his lifetime to endure the stigma of an undesirable discharge and the economic problems which go with it. Clyde Doyle's recommendations represented a wise compromise between the necessarily rigid requirements of military discipline and a delicate understanding of human frailty and dignity.

Clyde Doyle was sincerely dedicated to the service of his country. He viewed every issue with an open mind and in an entirely unbiased manner. He was always ready to listen to a colleague and give his advice when it was sought, and his advice invariably proved to be the course of wisdom. To me, Clyde Doyle was a perfect symbol of goodness, honesty, and fairness.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. Jones].

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, while it would be difficult if not impossible to add anything to the tributes that have been expressed here today, I cannot let this opportunity pass without paying my respects to the man whom I have known for the last 14 years.

When I came to Congress, Clyde Doyle and I had a mutual friend, a former Missourian, who at that time was a client of his. It was through this mutual acquaintance that we became friends. This friendship and close association has grown throughout the years.

As has been stated before, we knew Clyde Doyle as a Christian gentleman, a man who was not only kind but most considerate. It has been said previously, but it will bear repeating; he is one of the few men I know of that I never heard say an unkind thing of another individual. He was a forgiving man, and as a previous speaker said, his interest in trying to be helpful to those who were in distress has been evidenced on many occasions.

As Clyde and I discussed the operation of Congress, many times he referred to the notes he made from day to day. I often told him that some day his notes would reflect what had actually happened here in Congress. As he and I discussed this matter, I always contended that our Congressional Record is not a true reflection of what actually occurs in the House, with the extensions, the revisions, the expunging, and the various changes that take place. But in those notes that Clyde Doyle made I think he reflects what actually happened here. He has recorded the important events, as well as some of the trivialities that have made this body the interesting forum which it has become. I would commend the suggestion of our majority leader, our majority whip and others who have indicated they would like to see a record made, for posterity to enjoy from the remarks that Clyde Doyle had recorded in those notes of his.

Again, Mr. Speaker, I say that in the loss of Clyde Doyle this House has lost one of its most valuable Members; his district has lost a conscientious, hard working and understanding Representative whose value I think was known to the people there, as indicated by the results of the last election. He told me that in the last election he received the largest majority he had ever received.

Mrs. Jones and I join in expressing our deepest sympathy to Mrs. Doyle, her daughter, and grandchildren, who have lost a kind father and grandfather whose memory will be kindly cherished throughout the years by all who were privileged to know Clyde Doyle.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. Schadeberg].

Mr. SCHADEBERG. Mr. Speaker, the news of the death of Clyde Doyle came to me as a shock as I listened to my radio on the way to my office this morning.

While it was not my privilege to have known Mr. Doyle over the years, our association with each other as members of the Committee on Un-American Activities gave me a profound insight into the character and spirit of this great American who was dedicated to the service of his people and the cause of freedom.

Beneath the calm exterior of genuine and warm humility was a child of God who knew the meaning of love for his fellow man; who had concern for the principles of justice and decency; respect for the dignity and rights of all men; and who possessed an unwavering determination to do what was right as God gave him to see and know that right.

He was kind to his colleagues and associates. He was kind to those he felt impelled by conviction to oppose.

I have been with him in hearings in which he displayed compassion and patience to witnesses that characterized maturity in judgment and character befitting of the true patriot and man of faith. Many times his compassion was returned by vituperation and contempt of the meanest sort. Yet uncouth men could not soil his dignity and stature.

I do not know the denomination of the church to which Mr. DOYLE gave his loyalty and support. I suspect that it was secondary to the fact that he felt impelled to make his testimony as first of all a child of God. Indicative of his sincerity is this incident I relate to you which I am sure he never intended I should speak to others as being unusual or in any way a support of his own faith.

He told me shortly after I arrived in Congress that he tried to be present for the opening of the sessions of the House because he felt the need for the prayers offered by our good Chaplain. Mr. DOYLE was present with regularity. Today's opening of this session was marked by his absence. Yet in a truer sense he was with us and will be with us to inspire each of us to greater dedication and to acceptance of our responsibilities as those entrusted with the sacred task of representing freemen.

It is impossible for me to say any profound words in his behalf. Nothing I could say on this floor today could add to the high esteem in which he was held by those who knew him intimately nor detract from the man who so nobly served among us. He has spoken with his own life in words more beautiful and meaningful than could come from the lips of those who were recipients of his friendship but could not comprehend the depth of character that made him so beloved.

This was his faith, expressed in the words of John Lickey McCreery:

THERE IS NO DEATH

(By John Lickey McCreery)

There is no death! The stars go down
To rise upon some other shore
And bright in heaven's jeweled crown
They shine forevermore.

There is no death! The dust we tread
Shall change beneath the summer showers
To golden grain, or mellow fruit,
Or rainbow-tinted flowers.

There is no death! An angel form
Walks o'er the earth with silent tread;
He bares our best loved ones away,
And then we call them "dead."

Born unto that undying life,
They leave us but to come again;
With joy we welcome them—the same
Except in sin and pain.

And ever near us, though unseen
The dear immortal spirit tread;
For all the boundless universe
Is life—there are no dead!

May God richly bless the bereaved members of his family.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. BALDWIN].

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. Speaker, as has been mentioned earlier, CLYDE DOYLE this year, at the beginning of this session of Congress, was elected vice president of the Thursday Morning House Prayer Breakfast Club. The fact that he was unanimously elected to that position by the 40 or 50 House Members who are in regular attendance at that Thursday morning breakfast meeting is an indication of the great trust that those Members placed in CLYDE DOYLE. He was a man of deep religious and moral convictions and a man of deep compassion. The people throughout the country look to the Members of Congress to provide leadership, to provide guidance for their youngsters to follow. In CLYDE DOYLE they had a person who met that test from every standpoint, and I am sure the high school and grammar school youngsters in his district who had occasion to meet CLYDE DOYLE or to know of his background and of his moral convictions could certainly pick him as a model and their parents would be proud of that decision. Those of us who came to Congress from California, as members of the California delegation, found that CLYDE DOYLE was one to whom we would automatically look for guidance. He was a man who gave equal guidance to people on this side of the aisle as well as on that side of the aisle, because to him there was no aisle.

There was in his view just what was right and what was wrong. He fought for what was right according to the high standards that he set for himself. Yet at the same time, despite those high standards, he did not look down on any man or any woman. He shared their problems with them and tried to work with them in solving these problems.

Mr. Speaker, my wife joins with me in extending our deepest sympathy to his widow and his family.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ROGERS].

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, we were all saddened with the passing of our colleague, CLYDE DOYLE.

It was not my privilege to serve with our distinguished Member on any committee. But shortly after I came to Congress I learned to know CLYDE DOYLE. He was typical of those from the West who have an open hand, a smiling and understanding manner. He was a humble man and he expressed himself for the benefit of all mankind.

Throughout his lifetime he had the privilege of visiting and living in my area. We discussed those times, we reminisced of the West and what contributions he had made. We understand and know that he was sympathetic to those ex-servicemen whom he felt had gotten a bad break in their lifetime.

CLYDE DOYLE knew many of my good friends in the congressional district which it is my privilege to represent. Each time that we adjourned and Congress reconvened CLYDE DOYLE always asked about his friends. He wanted to know how they were doing. That was the spirit of CLYDE DOYLE.

Mr. Speaker, we shall miss him in the coming years as he has contributed so much to this Nation, its patriotism and its well-being as a good American citizen.

Mr. Speaker, I extend my sympathy to Mrs. Doyle and the family.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. CHENOWETH].

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, I was greatly shocked and saddened this morning when I learned of the passing of our beloved colleague, CLYDE DOYLE. I had visited with him just a couple of days ago and he appeared to be in excellent health. I want to join in paying tribute to his memory. I also wish to extend my sympathy to our colleagues from California in this great loss which they have sustained.

Mr. Speaker, California has not alone sustained this loss, but the entire nation has suffered an irreparable loss. All of us are going to greatly miss CLYDE and his cordial greetings.

Mr. Speaker, I have never known a more conscientious Member of this House or a harder worker than CLYDE DOYLE. He was anxious to serve his country to the utmost of his ability. I know it was a matter of great personal concern to him as to whether or not he was fully and adequately discharging his duties and responsibilities as a Member of this House.

We had mutual friends in Colorado, and we used to talk about them frequently. In fact, I seldom met CLYDE without stopping for a visit.

I recall the strenuous efforts he made to get a bill passed which would assist those who had received military discharges which were other than honorable. CLYDE felt that an injustice was being done in many of these cases, and that we owed these boys the obligation of trying to correct these discharges. I discussed this legislation with him many times and this was a matter close to his heart.

Mr. Speaker, I called upon CLYDE for a personal favor not so long ago. He went out of his way to help me in a matter which meant nothing whatever to him or to his district. CLYDE was a true Christian, and was always happy to extend a helping hand to others.

Mr. Speaker, CLYDE DOYLE was a faithful public servant and served his people well. It was a great privilege to have him as a friend and to work with him over the years. Mrs. Chenoweth joins with me in extending our sincere sympathy to Mrs. Doyle and the other members of the family.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. McFALL].

Mr. McFALL. Mr. Speaker, all of us have lost a fine friend in CLYDE DOYLE. Our country and the people of his district have lost an extraordinary Representative. Missing from the seat he always occupied will be one of the finest examples of what a Member should be and should do. He leaves a standard of ability, honesty, kindness, and gentleness for all of us to live by. As he certainly would have wished, he was with us, working for his beloved country until the very end, an end that came as gently and as easily and with the same dignity that he had lived his life. His customary chair is empty but we know he now occupies another chair of honor alongside his Maker.

My wife joins me and all of his many friends in extending to his wonderful wife and family our deepest sympathy.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois, [Mr. O'Hara].

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, my life has been enriched by my friendship with Clyde Doyle. When over the radio this morning I heard of his passing I was shocked and grieved.

I have listened to the tributes paid Clyde Doyle in this Chamber today and in every utterance has been a marked sincerity and the reflection of deep personal grief. To us all Clyde Doyle stood for the personification of the spirit of self-abnegation. We all sensed that he was never thinking of himself, but always of his mission on earth as he saw it and of his service to his God, his country, and his fellow man.

I do not think that Clyde Doyle ever thought a harsh or evil thing of another human being. Always he practiced charity and understanding. A year or two ago the committee on which he served, the Committee on Un-American Activities, had commissioned him to revise its rules. Clyde Doyle came to me several times as he did to others of his colleagues, saying, "Please go over this draft; if you can make any further suggestion to insure absolute fairness please give me that suggestion." I know how earnestly and conscientiously he worked on that task.

Mr. Speaker, I join with my colleagues in expression of deepest sympathy to his fine wife and to his daughter—and we all remember the great grief that was his and theirs when he lost his only son in World War II—and I wish also to join in expressing the faith that the soul of Clyde Doyle is now reunited with the Master whom he served with obedience, in thought and in deed, every day, every hour of his sojourn on earth. I can say no more. I am bowed with the grief that possesses me. This House has lost one of the noblest characters that ever served within its historic walls.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. Pirnie].

Mr. PIRNIE. Mr. Speaker, the tributes to which we have listened today have certainly come from the heart. The sudden death of our distinguished colleague from California is most assuredly a distinct loss to this House and the Nation.

As a fellow members of the Committee on Armed Services it has been my privilege to work with this fine man on a day-to-day basis and to observe at first hand his true character and ability.

Clyde Doyle served his district with complete dedication, bringing to his work a deep sense of personal concern. We affectionately recall his gentle manner, always expressive of a sincere consideration of others. His faithful attendance record is well known and attests his complete devotion to his task. Few Members have felt more keenly the responsibility which is ours in the Congress. He was proud of the trust placed in him by his people and he never betrayed that trust.

These fine qualities of mind and heart assure that this modest, kindly, and able public servant will be long and affectionately remembered. We extend to his fine family our heartfelt sympathy.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Montana [Mr. Olsen].

Mr. OLSEN of Montana. Mr. Speaker, the House is indeed in sorrow today. We have suffered a great loss. Clyde Doyle genuinely loved his fellow man. I think that every man has experienced, the same as I, Clyde Doyle's extending a favor without even being asked. He loved so well that he wanted me to share his friends, so he would write those whom he knew in Montana and he wrote me copies to inform me of his writing them so that I would become acquainted with and share his dear friends who live in my State.

He not only would not hurt anyone, but no one ever heard him say an unkind thing of anyone. Clyde Doyle had a kind and generous word about everyone of whom he spoke. There was once an occasion when I said in his presence an unkind word about another man whom he knew. He did not rebuke me but he corrected me. He gave me an example of how to get along better, and I think he gave all the Members that kind of example. He would go the extra mile for everyone. He gave of himself always.

I liken him to Peter the Apostle. "Silver and gold have I none, but I give what I have. I give myself." Clyde Doyle did better than that, because what little silver and gold he had he shared that, too. He was so very Christian. He pleasantly forgave. He exhibited his forgiveness from a generous heart, a happy heart, and it was exhibited by his glowing, friendly countenance. Clyde is one of God's own, and he has gone home.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. Younger].

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, we have all lost a true friend in the passing of Clyde Doyle. I was perhaps one of the last of our colleagues to visit with Clyde. We sat together at the same table with Mrs. Doyle last night at the American Legion banquet. He told us of his plans to celebrate his 50th wedding anniversary next year and of his future plans for the House prayer breakfast.

I left the table about 10 o'clock. There was no indication whatsoever of the possibility of his being called to leave on an earlier schedule. I left the table with the remark, "I'll see you at breakfast in the morning," and his cheery reply was, "I'll be there."

Clyde Doyle as a man, a husband, a father, and a colleague was a dedicated Christian gentleman in every sense of the word. Mrs. Younger joins me in expressing our deep sympathy to Mrs. Doyle and their family.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Flynt].

Mr. FLYNT. Mr. Speaker, I join the gentleman from California in this tribute to the memory of a beloved friend, and an outstanding Member of this body, the Honorable Clyde Doyle, late a Representative from the State of California. With a feeling of profound sorrow and sadness this morning we heard the news of his untimely passing. Clyde Doyle was, indeed, an outstanding Member of this body. He was also a great American. He ably represented his State and district for nine terms.

It is particularly significant that our colleague, Clyde Doyle, was present on the floor of the House on yesterday during the proceedings in this body. His attendance record was one of which any Member would well be proud. He was present and cast his vote on the last rollcall taken in this body during his lifetime.

Mr. Speaker, it is equally significant that his plans for today would have included attendance at the regular Thursday morning prayer breakfast participated in by Members of the House of Representatives.

Clyde Doyle was by some standards what might have been termed a quiet man. Notwithstanding his quietness and serenity, he possessed a truly dynamic personality.

Clyde Doyle was an able Representative. He was a truly great and patriotic American. He was a real man in the finest sense of that word. He was also a Christian gentleman. His life was an inspiration to all who were privileged to come in contact with him, to know him, and to be associated with him, and to love him.

This body in which he served, his Nation and the State that he represented are better because of his participation and the contributions he made during a long and useful life.

Mr. Speaker, Mrs. Flynt and our family join in extending our heartfelt sympathy to Mrs. Doyle and other members of his family.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. Utt].

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, once again one of our friends and colleagues has crossed the river that marks the boundary of that unknown shore. Clyde Doyle and I were very closely associated for more than 20 years before either one of us came to the Congress of the United States. He like myself was a native son of California. We shared many experiences and pleasures together. He truly was one of God's noblemen. He was sincere, he was honest, he was dedicated. I know that he will be happy in the reward to which he has gone. We had a very close relationship in the Congress and although we may have differed from time to time, there never was a time that that disagreement was not a reasonable disagreement and one which always had a happy ending.

Mrs. Utt joins me in extending to his wife and family our deepest sympathy.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Libonati].

Mr. LIBONATI. Mr. Speaker, the death of Clyde Doyle closed the career of a person who in his simplicity of understanding contributed much to the appreciation of those dedicated practices which many men feel through Americanism, a basic understanding of the common American in his acceptance of his patriotic devotion to his country.

Clyde Doyle was not an exhibitionist. We all know that he served on a committee that probably covers the most delicate area within which a legislative body can operate. Never has he personally been criticized for any practice on that committee; and it was a most difficult committee on which to serve. His service on that and other committees has contributed much to the acceptance of the procedures of the House of Representatives.

Clyde Doyle as a lawyer never placed his legal and professional abilities beyond the scope of human liberty. Clyde Doyle was a patriot because of the fact that he understood the force of Americanism that has contributed to the welfare of his fellow men. His service on the Subversives Committee, of which he was a member for so many years, indicated to him the purposes of the committee within the limitation of the legislative exactments of this body.

Clyde Doyle in his private life, in his civic life, stood up for and expounded the religious principles in which he believed and was active in his church, and was active at all times in combating and exposing the teachings of communism.

Few men in their lifetime have accumulated the thanks, the honor, and the respect that Clyde Doyle has in his native State of California. His civic activities brought him in contact with the most unfortunate, also with the youth and with the underprivileged. He actively participated in programs looking to the betterment and amelioration of the lot of unfortunate human beings. No greater service can a man give than to direct the destinies of the young, to bring to them an understanding of life's problems so they may be able to cope with the exigencies and necessities of life as it unfolds before them and lead them to an honorable manhood and womanhood. That is the service that Clyde Doyle gave to his fellow Americans in their youth in his community. He gracefully accepted the civic responsibilities that fall upon the man in public life, and the way he carried out those principles and responsibilities marks him as a man of possessive mind.

I am proud to have been associated with him, especially in the breakfast group. It was there we could appreciate his breadth of mind and his philosophy as reflected in his interpretation of Biblical quotations which stamp him as a man whom all Christians can respect. We know that he himself derived benefits from his reflection and study that made him a happy man in life.

To his lovely wife Lydia, to his daughter Dorothy, and to his grandsons, Dan-Doyle Stanton and Clyde Douglas, we extend our heartfelt sympathy. And I dedicate to his memory this poem:

The winds of fate have blown away
  A kindly soul whose words did sway
In Halls of Congress e'en today
  Those who treasure the American way.

To his family and friends in life I say that every member of the Illinois delegation extends his condolence on this sad day.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. Hosmer].

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, my life also has been enriched by the friendship of Clyde Doyle. Ours was a true friendship which, unlike that of many of you, began in adversity in 1950, when Clyde Doyle and I contested each other as the candidates of our respective parties for election to Congress from California's then 18th district. It was a spirited campaign, a campaign which brought us together on the same platform in personal combat, so to speak, on numerous occasions. On each of those occasions I found that I came off best, not because I won the arguments, far from that, but because Clyde Doyle gave me a little of himself on each occasion and taught me a little more of the way of true Americanism, true patriotism, devotion, and dedication, both to humanity and to our country.

At the end of that contest the score was close, a difference of some 1,850 votes out of 200,000. I stayed in California. Clyde came back to Washington again.

Two years later, following the 1950 reapportionment, the old 18th Congressional District of California became two new districts, one the 18th and the other the district which Clyde always and fondly referred to as "California's Great 23d District."

When I came to Congress in 1953, Clyde welcomed me as a brother and as a friend. He was as kind, helpful, and considerate as anyone could possibly be to a freshman Member of this Congress. But that kind of feeling toward one of his fellows, his helpfulness and consideration did not cease after a few months. It continued with me just as it has with each of our colleagues down through the years. I know that each and every one of us, and the thousands of people from every walk of life who knew, loved, and respected him, feels not only his own keen personal sense of loss and deprivation by Clyde's quiet passing, but also seeks to share the burden of greater loss that inescapably must bear so heavily upon his lovely widow, Lydia, and the surviving members of his family.

All of us today, I believe, can give thanks that we have been privileged to have been associated with Clyde Doyle, a man who loved and revered Abraham Lincoln and who strived in every way, during every day to emulate the fine qualities of that great American President.

My family joins me in this expression of our deep sense of loss, and our most reverent condolences to Mrs. Doyle and Clyde's family.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. Matthews].

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Speaker, I want to join my colleagues in expressing sadness because of the passing of our beloved friend, Clyde Doyle.

References have already been made to his activities in connection with our weekly prayer meeting. I remember so well a talk he made to us some months ago in our prayer meeting. The challenge of that talk was a personal challenge to himself to live according of the tenets of Christianity. He in his successful efforts to lead a life of personal piety reminded me so much of another departed Christian colleague, the Honorable Percy Priest, of Tennessee.

I can say, Mr. Speaker, that Clyde Doyle, and men like Percy Priest, have inspired me since I have been in the Congress to endeavor to lead a life in accordance with high religious principles. I know of no man in the Congress who strived more successfully for personal piety than did Clyde Doyle. There was no sophistry in his makeup; there was no arrogance in his demeanor; there was no hatred in his heart. He was gentle; he was kind. The poet has said the evil that men do lives after them and that the good is often interred with their bones. I believe there was no evil in this man Clyde Doyle, and I believe we shall remember him only because of his noble personality. Each year in the House we have a debate on the activities of our committees. We hear comments, frequently critical, for example, of the House Committee on Un-American Activities. And, I remember time and time again I have said, in conversations with people, that if the citizens of America knew Clyde Doyle, who serves on the House Committee on Un-American Activities, I do not see how they could fail to have the high confidence in that committee that I personally do. He was fair; he was honorable in every decision that he made. I think in our democracy that it is not enough for men to be free and to be educated, but they must be good men, and of all of my colleagues in the Congress, I know of no one who was better than Clyde Doyle. He was a good man.

We, in Florida, Mr. Speaker, extend to the great State of California our profound sympathy because of your loss, and we pray that the blessings of divine providence be with the loved ones of our departed friend.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. Bell].

Mr. BELL. Mr. Speaker, there is very little that I can add to what has already been said so sincerely and effectively about my good friend, Clyde Doyle. However, at the expense of being repetitious I would like to make a few comments about him.

Besides being an outstanding legislator, Clyde Doyle was a very friendly and understanding human being. Coming from my home State of California, Clyde's sincere affection for all Members extended across party lines. When I first arrived here in Washington in my freshman term, to meet the problems of a new life, Clyde Doyle was one of the first of my colleagues to put out a friendly hand. He was always ready and willing to answer my or any other new Member's questions and to make suggestions that would be helpful. He continued this very kind and sincere approach not only to all the Members, but to the many problems that confront the House. Clyde always seemed to prefer the friendly, nonpartisan method of solving our problems.

My wife's and my heart go out to Clyde Doyle's family in their bereavement.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. Reifel].

Mr. REIFEL. Mr. Speaker, I shall attempt to make the balance of my life better because Clyde Doyle lived.

It was reassuring to me, when I came here 2 years ago—my first term in this great and august body—to find this man, whenever I came to the opening of the House, here in his accustomed place. Then, at our Thursday morning prayer breakfast group it was further reassuring when on one occasion as our speaker, to have a witness for Christ stand before us, and, as that witness bare his heart and with tears streaming down his cheeks, to remind us that his trust was in God. I thought as I listened to him that if each of us, the 435 Members of this House, would be here when our Chaplain opened this great body's deliberations with prayer, what a great force it would be in the free world. Since his admonition to us of the Thursday morning prayer breakfast group that he needed to be here in the Chamber to get his strength for the day by the inspiration that comes from the words of the Chaplain, I have tried as diligently as possible to likewise be here on the opening of our sessions.

Mr. Speaker, he was a man who made one feel greater than he. This was a real heartening and reassuring attribute for another to greet one in this manner, especially as one who is in his first term in the Congress.

Mr. Speaker, only last Thursday morning we were sitting by each other. I was given the privilege to give the talk at the prayer breakfast. In my presentation I related a saying among the Indian-Americans that went something like this:

> Great Spirit, grant that I may not criticize my neighbor until I have walked a mile in his moccasins.

Mr. Speaker, I think that statement could have been authored by our departed colleague, Clyde Doyle. Only yesterday he said, "I will see you tomorrow at the prayer breakfast." As I was dressing this morning, one of the things to which I looked forward was to be with him. Then while listening to the radio and TV it was announced that he had gone to join his fathers.

Mr. Speaker, last Thursday morning as he was with the rest of us paying for our breakfast, he pulled out some bright, shiny Lincoln head pennies. He said, "Ben, these are brandnew pennies that I got upstairs." He said, "Whenever a young man or a young woman writes to me, I put one of these brandnew pennies in the letter of reply and tell him or her that this comes from the greatest nation in the world, a God-fearing nation," and that he made other appropriate remarks with respect to the man whose image is imprinted on the penny.

Mr. Speaker, I extend my deepest sympathy to the Members of the California delegation and to the family of this great person by whom I was privileged to be called a friend.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. Hall].

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, after all of these beautiful tributes to our departed colleague, Clyde Doyle, one could very easily succumb to the admonition of Lord Lister, who said:

> When the lark sings on high, lesser birds cease their twittering lest they miss one miracle note.

But that does not satisfy those whose hearts are overflowing with the memory of Clyde Doyle, a man who always tempered justice with mercy and who only last week in walking from the Committee on Armed Services on which we both serve, put his hand on my arm and said "My estimation of you is that you are a gentleman."

I think perhaps I shall try to spend the rest of my years living up to this stimulus by a busy man; one who served his people, his family, his Congress and his fellow man on two committees and, as has been so well said here in our weekly prayer breakfast group.

I also was privileged to serve last year by appointment of the chairman of our Committee on Armed Services with Clyde on a special committee for the National Security Agency. I found him delving but understanding and always, as our Speaker has said, kindly. He was persistent and loyal; certainly a worthy adversary but a great teacher and a personable friend and counselor.

He died in the traces, truly just as much in the service of his country as did his departed son during World War II. He died with his boots on and as I used to be wont to advise some patients, " 'twere better to do than to lie down and wait."

Only last week he rendered yeoman service, in the absence of Tad Walter on the House Committee on Un-American Activities authorization and appropriation. Certainly he did the same yesterday on the procurement bill out of Committee on Armed Services.

As a doctor who has of necessity had more than his share, perhaps, of close brushes with death in the service, in the operating room and in the hospitals of our Nation, I am glad and thankful unto our Master that he passed away peacefully in his sleep. This is probably a just reward on earth for a man who has given so much and who grew out of convictions of his own soul. No man stands so tall as he who stoops to lift up a boy.

I know that our good Lord above will receive him and rest his soul forever in his embraceable bosom.

Mrs. Hall and I extend our sympathy to Mrs. Doyle, their daughter, the grandchildren and the bereaved.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. Beermann].

Mr. BEERMANN. Mr. Speaker, when I heard on the television this morning that Congressman Clyde Doyle had left our midst several incidents flashed through my mind. I was not so fortunate as to have worked as closely as other Members with our departed colleague and so benefit from his wise experience. But I can pay personal tribute to his gentlemanly conduct and inborn sense of courtesy and graciousness. I entered the House of Representatives 2 years ago and was given the honor of delivering the George Washington Farewell Address on the anniversary of his birth. I confess that I approached my assignment with some trepidation. However, later that same day Clyde Doyle was gracious enough to telephone me and was very complimentary on my recitation. Perhaps this courtesy was only a minor act, Mr. Speaker, but I want to state that it endeared Mr. Doyle forever to me. It convinced me that he was one of the most sincere, genteel, and considerate men privileged to enter this great House of Representatives.

Mrs. Beermann and I extend our sympathy to Mrs. Doyle and the other members of the family.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Mahon].

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I shall not speak at length but I did want to make reference to an incident that happened a couple of days ago in this Chamber. I was not on the floor yesterday regularly and I did not see the late Clyde Doyle during the proceedings. But the day before when I entered the House he motioned me to his side as I came into the Chamber and he said, "George, I want you to be more regular in attendance at these Thursday morning prayer meetings at the Capitol." I pointed out that I had been at the national prayer breakfast at the Mayflower Hotel earlier in the year and that I had periodically attended the prayer breakfast on Thursday mornings at the Capitol. He said that that was all well and good but that he wanted me to be more regular in attendance. I promised to do so, and I shall keep my promise.

I point this little incident out because it gives an insight into the character and personality of our departed friend. The incident which I have described was typical of this wonderful man. I want to join in tribute to the memory of a man of such stature as Clyde Doyle.

Of course, through the years I had seen Clyde Doyle at his post of duty in the House of Representatives. We had many common interests in the field of national defense and we discussed these problems from time to time.

I shall not proceed further. I know many of the friends of the late Clyde Doyle will read this issue of the Record with a great deal of interest. It has been a privilege to join in tributes to the memory of this good man and to extend sympathy to his family left behind.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. Harris].

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I too am deeply grieved by the loss of our distinguished friend and colleague, Clyde Doyle, suddenly over the night. It has been my privilege and high honor to have served here in the House with Clyde for almost 17 years. This is the beginning of our 17th year together.

I want to associate myself with the other Members in the high and appropriate tribute that has been paid to our friend today. Each of us could go on and out of our own experience relate many, many incidences such as have been related here today.

He did not have to write me a note or give me reference about a friend of mine that he saw in California, in his own district, or give me the names of the individuals and suggest that I write them, that they wanted to hear from me. There are so many of those details and little things in life which in my judgment really make up the living of an individual as a human being.

So we might emulate the life and character of Clyde Doyle. I shall miss him as I know other Members of this House miss him because of what he was and what he has meant to us.

Mrs. Harris and I join others in extending our deepest sympathies to Mrs. Doyle and the family in their bereavement.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. Corman].

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Speaker, the passing of Clyde Doyle brings sorrow to each of us. He so aptly admonished us that our beloved Nation deserves the best of whatever we are and he inspired us by giving his best. It always seemed to me that he had another principle, that the men around him deserved kindness and love, and of these qualities he gave. I believe that, more than any man with whom I have worked, he followed the 11th commandment of our Lord.

My wife and I join in the expression of deepest sympathy to Mrs. Doyle and the family.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. Philbin].

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I am greatly shocked and deeply saddened by the untimely passing of my dear friend and beloved colleague, Congressman Clyde Doyle. His loss is truly an irreparable one.

Only yesterday, I talked with him, and he seemed to be in vigorous health. It is almost impossible to realize that he is gone.

Clyde Doyle was one of the outstanding Members of the House of Representatives and of our great Committee on Armed Services. I had the honor and distinction to serve with him for years. He was a member of Subcommittee No. 2 of the Committee on Armed Services. There was never a more diligent, more capable or more dedicated or conscientious man on our committee, nor was there ever a man who demonstrated such high qualities of personality and character in the House of Representatives.

A brilliant lawyer and an indefatigable worker, a trusted friend and counselor, Clyde Doyle distinguished himself greatly in this body and in our committee.

He was a man of great and unusual humility and exalted character. He was endowed with a lofty sense of honor and a conscientiousness in his work, together with an almost incredible industry and painstaking application to duty.

He served with a zeal and high purpose and a spirit of nobility that certainly has never been excelled in the history of this Congress. He was a man of forthright principles, humane, forward-looking, and just. His strong sense of justice and his great mind and heart prompted him always to strive with compassion and with extraordinary zeal to serve the ordinary people of his great district and of his State and our Nation. Clyde Doyle was devoted to human beings and to the cause of humanity and to the lofty purposes of government. He was resolute and unswerving in his patriotism and in his self-sacrificing willingness to labor, even at great cost to his own health and well-being, for the security and defense of our country, and for the broader, humane, social and economic policies and programs and the advancement of the cause of the people which were always so dear to his heart, and which were such a real part of his very being.

Mr. Speaker, I realize full well that mere words are quite inadequate to portray the depth of my personal sorrow at the passing of this fine public servant and dear friend, or to portray the very high quality of his unselfish service to our country and its people.

He will be sorely missed in our committee where he made such outstanding and memorable contributions.

His name will long be remembered in the Halls of this great legislative body where he so faithfully and so constructively served for such a long period of time with such outstanding distinction.

Mr. Speaker, to know Clyde Doyle was to respect, admire, and love him. The sincerity and nobility of his friendship and deep spiritual fellowship will ever be treasured by those of us who were fortunate enough to know him and work with him.

It is, indeed, with a very heavy heart that I join his dear, devoted wife, beloved family and his friends and constituents and colleagues in mourning his sorrowful demise.

To his cherished wife and family, I tender my most heartfelt sympathy in the great sorrow that has come to them. I hope and pray that this dear, loyal friend, this trusted counselor and illustrious colleague may find peace and rest in his Heavenly home.

We will miss him here in these historic Halls where he contributed so much to our work and to our country. His memory will long remain green and fresh with us as an inspiration. His gentle ways, his warm friendship and his spirit of devotion and dedication to great tasks, will long continue to guide us.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. Randall].

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Speaker, I cannot refrain from saying a word in eulogy about our departed colleague. Not far from where I am now standing, we sat and visited yesterday afternoon with our departed colleague during the debate on the military procurement bill. It was his preference to occupy the same seat in this Chamber, and he usually was found in that seat. This was characteristic of his regularity in everything he did—regular in attendance and regular in his devotion to duty.

At a time such as this when we look back and reflect on the characteristics of a friend who has departed, it is appropriate that we recall that he was both regular and punctual in everything he did, not only in his attendance of this body but also in his committee work. Only this morning I knew he must have been ill or that something was wrong, because we always passed in the hall, just before 10 o'clock, he going to his committee, and I going to mine. When I missed him this morning I felt at that time something was wrong that Clyde was not on his way to his committee.

Clyde Doyle was a man who believed in the proposition that in order to have friends one must be a friend. He was a friend to all of us and of great help to many of us. He had the habit of keeping notes, which few of us do, of the proceedings here on the floor. One could go to him and find out what had transpired in their absence or coming in late could get an accurate account from him of what had been missed. He was on the floor every minute of every session. I recall when we were all sweating out adjournment last year about the first of October he took it upon himself to try to cheer up some of us who felt we should be back home in the campaign; he tried to be helpful by saying: "We will be out of here this week, or at the latest in a few days." I suspect it was an effort to say this to try to keep us cheerful, because I suspect down deep in his heart he knew adjournment might not come as quickly as most of us preferred.

He was a man of great sincerity. Much can be said about him that is good.

He was a successful practicing lawyer and headed his own law firm. He had been elected to local office in his native State of California. He had been active in many civic enterprises including work for the Boy Scouts of America, hospitals for crippled children, the YMCA, and the California Philharmonic Orchestra Association. Not only was he active in the successful practice of law, but he had attained success in the field of banking. He told me of having once been accorded the nomination by the voters of both the Democratic and Republican Parties under the California crossfiling law, and in one election he had no opponent at all during the fall general election. But those were things that most of us did not know about unless there was a direct inquiry, because Clyde was not one to tell about his successes. He was a modest man, and he was a man who was always very careful to be certain that everything he said was not to even the slightest degree an exaggeration of fact.

Just this one further thought: It is so difficult to express words of consolation to the survivors of the departed. I am sure in this instance they have a great measure of consolation in the esteem in which his colleagues held him and the feeling that every Member who knew

CLYDE DOYLE unanimously respected him.

May his good soul rest in peace.

To Mrs. Doyle and the daughter, my own family joins with me in this expression of our deepest sympathy.

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Speaker, I join in every tribute made here today to the memory of CLYDE DOYLE. No statement has been exaggerated in any way.

No finer, kinder American Christian gentleman ever lived.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, CLYDE DOYLE was a good, a sweet man. A dedicated public servant his motives were pure, his dedication to duty intense, and his patriotism of the highest. The House and our country have suffered a grievous loss. I extend my deepest sympathy to his bereaved loved ones.

Mr. CLAUSEN. Mr. Speaker, to have one of our number taken from our midst by a Great Unseen Hand is, indeed, a great shock to all of us whether we had known the departed long or little. As a new Congressman from the home State of CLYDE DOYLE, I knew him only from brief acquaintance as a fine Christian gentleman. But I knew him by reputation as a great patriot for his outstanding work on the House Committee on Un-American Activities. His passing is a great loss to our Nation. I join with my colleagues in heartfelt condolences to CLYDE DOYLE's family, and I pray that God will comfort them as only He can.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I join in this tribute to our beloved colleague from California, who served his State and Nation so ably for so many years in this body.

CLYDE DOYLE was a dedicated public servant in the finest tradition of the House. He worked tirelessly in performance of his representative duties for the people of his district. He was conscientious and humble, a friend of all who were privileged to serve with him.

As a member of the Armed Services Committee and the Committee on Un-American Activities, he rendered important service in strengthening our Nation against our enemies—both from outside and from within. Under his leadership the House adopted, in 1955, the Doyle resolution establishing standards of conduct for House committees in the protection of the rights of witnesses and improving committee procedures.

All of us will recall CLYDE DOYLE's motto, which appeared at the bottom of each letter he signed—"Our Beloved Nation Deserves the Best of Whatever We Are."

This simple, moving expression of faith and service symbolized CLYDE's lifetime philosophy of public service at all levels of government. His long and distinguished record of service in State positions, in civic, legal, cultural, and philanthropic work is well known in Los Angeles County and throughout California.

We will miss CLYDE—his example of dedicated service, his leadership, his cheerful smile, and genuine friendship. To his devoted wife, Lydia, and his family, Mrs. Holifield and I extend our sincere condolences in this time of sorrow.

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join in this tribute to our late colleague, CLYDE DOYLE, who was one of the most attentive and conscientious Members of the House. During my service here I came to know CLYDE DOYLE as the kind and considerate individual who has been described so accurately today.

His interests were broad and his understanding deep. Although we disagreed on certain issues, he understood that our disagreement was a matter of principle and not personal. He was often helpful to me in explaining the procedures of the House as he occupied his accustomed place and recorded in detail the course of debate. CLYDE DOYLE's daily presence on the floor will be missed by all of us. Mr. Speaker, I extend to Mrs. Doyle and her family my deepest sympathy.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join my colleagues in expressing my deep sorrow at the passing last night of the late Honorable CLYDE DOYLE.

A man who served his district, his State, and his country for many years with dedication and devotion, Congressman DOYLE was to us who served with him, above all, a gentleman, with all the virtues that the term implies. As he kept the quiet tenor of his ways, he was unfailing in his courtesy and a model of gentility.

Congressman DOYLE distinguished himself both as second ranking member of the House Committee on Un-American Activities and as a member of the Armed Services Committee. His presence on those committees and in this legislative body will be sorely missed.

My wife joins me in expressing deep sympathy to his widow and family. May they derive some small consolation from the knowledge that their loss is shared by his many friends.

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. Mr. Speaker, among the thousands of public officials whom I have known in my lifetime I have never known one of warmer heart than our beloved deceased colleague, CLYDE DOYLE. It was my privilege to sit next to him on the House Armed Services Committee, for many years, and it was my privilege to meet with him in a prayer group every Thursday morning ever since we came to Congress together in the 81st Congress, 1949. My wife and his wife were closely associated together in the 81st Club and are dear friends. Words are inadequate to express feelings as close and heartfelt as we all feel for CLYDE DOYLE. His statesmanship and leadership in his work in the House Armed Services Committee and in the Un-American Activities Committee will be a lasting memorial to him.

Mr. Speaker, only yesterday CLYDE DOYLE found something nice to say to me about something that I was trying to do. This was characteristic of what he always tried to do—find the good in everybody and try to increase it. All of us have lost a dear friend and the country has lost a great statesman. I am sure I speak for every Member of Congress when I express our deepest sympathy to his beloved widow and family.

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, it was with great sadness that I listened to the news of the passing this morning of our colleague and my neighbor from the 23d Congressional District of California.

Throughout his 14 years as a Member of the House of Representatives, CLYDE DOYLE has unswervingly fought for the kind of America he knew was best for us.

Not only in his own district, but throughout the Los Angeles area—and, in fact, the State of California—Congressman DOYLE has stood out as portraying a man who has always been a credit to the Halls of Congress and to his family. Not once has the slightest impropriety marred his record, although his record of fighting communism made him many enemies who were constantly searching for something with which they might besmirch his fine name.

CLYDE DOYLE's unceasing efforts on the Committee on Un-American Activities are well known. During my 10-year acquaintanceship with him, I have always felt that we were both striving for the same end—a world of freemen, free of totalitarian or Communist dictatorship—although our paths appeared to be at cross purposes on some occasions.

I do not believe there are any among us who will be able to better CLYDE DOYLE's record of dedication, sincerity, and loyalty to the principles of democracy and the welfare of the United States.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, I wish to express my deep sorrow over the death of our esteemed colleague, CLYDE DOYLE. I pay tribute to him as a dedicated Congressman, a patriotic American, and a fine man.

CLYDE DOYLE was the very soul of kindness to me from the first day I came to this House and I took pleasure in having him as a dear friend. He was a man who gained preeminence not by chance and circumstance but by striving and great effort. He earned his own way through high school and college and went on to carve out a distinguished career as an attorney and in public service before winning election to Congress in 1944. As a Member of Congress, he constantly showed forth his heartfelt concern for the safety and security of our Nation and gave his great talents unstintingly to preserve the United States.

I am sure many Members remember with appreciation, as I do, the habit he had of being present on the floor at all times and taking careful, analytical notes on the proceedings. There have been many occasions when his willingness to share his notes has been helpful to me and other Members.

We shall miss CLYDE DOYLE. I want to express my deepest sympathy to his family.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, all of us here in the House of Representatives are saddened by the sudden death of CLYDE DOYLE. The country, the Congress, and the people of his district particularly have suffered a deep loss. In the 31 years I have served in the Congress I have known few men who were as kind and gentle, as tolerant and understanding, so full of good will to all men as was CLYDE DOYLE. Yet there was an intelligent limit to his good will and tolerance. It was for this reason, his deep sense of patriotism and his abhorrence of what was evil and corrupt that he served for 12 years with such distinction on the Committee on Un-American Activities.

CLYDE DOYLE was proud of his native California, and took an active part in charity work, particularly as it pertained to the care and treatment of children.

As an attorney, CLYDE DOYLE was a stickler for perfection. Following graduation from the College of Law of the University of Southern California at Los Angeles in 1917, he was admitted to the bar at Long Beach, Calif.

Aside from serving on the Committee on Un-American Activities here in Congress, CLYDE DOYLE served with distinction with the House Armed Services Committee. Everyone knows in this great body his concern for the servicemen, and that he be properly protected in times of conflict.

The effects of war hit CLYDE DOYLE hard during the last world war as he lost a son, 1st Lt. Clyde Doyle, Jr., who was a member of the Air Force.

Our beloved colleague served on many other special committees of this great body, and each time that he was called on, he served with deep devotion and understanding.

Today I extend to his dear wife and other members of his family my deepest sympathy. A good friend and a great legislator has left this chamber, and we all will miss him deeply.

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, the State of California, the Congress, and the Nation have lost an outstanding citizen when our esteemed colleague, CLYDE DOYLE, died suddenly last night.

A Member of the Congress for 18 years, CLYDE was foremost a patriot and a firm believer in the principles on which this great country of ours was founded. He placed a high value on the liberties granted the American people by the Founding Fathers.

CLYDE served as second ranking majority member of the House Un-American Activities Committee and was a rugged opponent of communism. He was an active member of the committee, for he recognized communism as a real threat to his homeland. Similarly, he served with distinction on the House Armed Services Committee. His strength of character and ability will be deeply missed in the House of Representatives.

Not only was CLYDE DOYLE a colleague, but he was a good friend. As members of the California delegation, we shared the pride of those who called themselves "Californians,." CLYDE was born in California, educated in California, married to a California girl, and has devoted his life to serving his State.

His endeavors in the public interest were numerous. To mention a few: He was first president of Boy Scout Council of Boy Scouts of America in Long Beach, Calif.; several years chairman of tuberculosis stamp sales; member board of directors of California Conference of Social Work; and honorary member of National Recreation Association. The people of California paid due recognition to this outstanding citizen by reelecting him to the 87th Congress by the largest majority he had ever received—over 93,000.

A devoted husband, CLYDE was also a devoted father and grandfather. To his wife, his daughter, and his entire family, I extend my heartfelt and deepest sympathy.

Mr. ROUSH. Mr. Speaker, CLYDE DOYLE was my friend. What more can one man say about another man? He saw the good in all men. He exemplified in every respect a spirit of genuine friendliness. It did not take a new member long to become acquainted with the quiet and attentive gentleman who sat in a certain seat near the front on the Democratic side every day.

He spoke sincerely and in a brotherly manner to his colleagues. You did not sit beside him long until you were aware that he was a man of God, that he was a patriot, and that he loved his State and his people with a passion. His witness was unmistakably that of a devout, patriotic, and conscientious man who was very mindful of his high calling and grave responsibilities.

We shall all miss CLYDE. I shall especially miss him. I join with my colleagues in expressing sincere and heartfelt condolences to his family and a prayerful hope that God might sustain them in this hour of sorrow.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, I was really stunned this morning when I found the flags here at the Capitol flying at half mast and then learned of the sudden and unexpected passing of my good friend and colleague, the Honorable CLYDE DOYLE, of California. I was shocked because it was only last night that CLYDE and I attended the National American Legion dinner at the Sheraton Park Hotel and he appeared to be in excellent health.

I came to know CLYDE DOYLE well during his 17 years as a Member of this body, and considered it a privilege to call him my friend. He was a capable legislator and was held in the highest esteem and respect by all of his colleagues on both sides of the aisle.

At the time of his passing, CLYDE was the ranking Member of the House Un-American Activities Committee. He worked hard to preserve this committee and led the fight against its abolition and attempted denial of funds. He was also a member of the Armed Services Committee and always took an active interest in veterans' affairs.

Congressman DOYLE served his constituency, the State of California and the Nation with honor and distinction, and will be greatly missed by all.

To his dear wife and daughter, I extend my heartfelt sympathy.

Mr. LEGGETT. Mr. Speaker, it is with deep sorrow that I learned of the passing of veteran legislator, adviser, and colleague, CLYDE DOYLE, of my home State of California. CLYDE has not only rendered distinguished service to the California delegation, but also to the people of Los Angeles County, the State of California, and the Nation. The 23d District of California can be proud of the contributions their Representative in Congress has made toward a better Government and a better America.

During 20 years of Federal service, Congressman DOYLE has risen to the first-ranking position of his party on the House Un-American Activities Committee, and likewise he has achieved a high position of respect on the Armed Services Committee.

As a new Member of the Congress, I found CLYDE was interested in the new Member's problems. He was a sage adviser and assisted measurably in the orientation of many of the new Members from our State. The new Members of the California delegation have lost a valued friend.

Congressman DOYLE lived a full life, competing until his last day on the floor of the House of Representatives. The Nation will not soon fill the void herein created.

Mr. WINSTEAD. Mr. Speaker, I was shocked and deeply distressed by the sudden death of our able colleague from California, CLYDE DOYLE. The fine tributes that have been paid him here today are well-deserved and true. It has been my privilege to serve with him on the House Armed Services Committee for many years and he was a valued member of the Subcommittee on Real Estate and Construction of which I am Chairman.

I have never known a more sincere Christian gentleman than CLYDE DOYLE, and neither have I ever known a more dedicated and loyal citizen. His contributions as a member of the House Un-American Activities Committee are well known to us all and will, I am confident, have a lasting effect on the security of the country which he loved so well.

I join with the other Members of the House in extending deepest sympathy to his wife and his fine family in their great loss—a loss that is shared by all of us here in the Congress.

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, CLYDE DOYLE and I began our service in this House on the same day and as a consequence of this and later close association in committee assignments I came to know him very well. Anyone who had the opportunity to work with him, quickly saw his fine character and dedication.

I have never known any Member of this great body more serious about his work than CLYDE DOYLE. I think my colleagues will agree with me that he spent every moment of his busy life working in behalf of others. The kind of legislation he supported most vigorously was that which he felt improved the welfare of his countrymen and gave greater guarantee of the security of his country.

A native Californian, he gave unselfishly of his talents to every program to better the community and State. He was most active in so many such projects it would require pages in this RECORD to set them down.

He was a distinguished lawyer whose ability was recognized to the extent he was frequently called on to serve in responsible positions where legal training was required. In committee work here in Congress his great experience in this field was apparent in his penetrating examination of the many and varied problems that commanded his interest.

Clyde Doyle was highly respected by all who knew him and I think the tribute paid to him this afternoon clearly shows the love of his colleagues for his gentleness, his religious fervor and his strength of character.

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, like so many of my colleagues who are rising to pay tribute here today to the memory of Congressman Clyde Doyle, I too was deeply saddened by the news of the passing from our midst of this elder statesman and longtime Representative of the 24th District of California, both as a public servant and an American patriot in the finest tradition.

It has been my privilege to serve with Congressman Doyle only since 1959 when I came to Congress, and his quiet geniality and kindliness came through with genuineness and clarity.

Congressman Doyle had a breadth of human understanding that transcended his wide circle of friends and even the bounds of his constituency. As a member of the Armed Services Committee, he became the defender and protector of all GI's and sought with relentless diligence to secure the enactment of legislation which would permit the correction of military records where servicemen who had received less-than-honorable discharges, had proved themselves more than worthy of honorable civilian status.

I am confident that I speak for all who knew him when I say that he will be remembered with warmth and affection, and I know, too, that the absence of his kindly presence in this Chamber will be felt with equal keenness by his colleagues on both sides of the aisle.

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, all of us were shocked when we received word this morning that our colleague, Clyde Doyle, had died during the night.

I have known Clyde Doyle since I first came to Congress more than 12 years ago. I have had the pleasure of serving with him on the Armed Service Committee for more than 10 years. I have also had the pleasant and interesting experience of serving on subcommittees where Clyde was the chairman.

It was Clyde who, a few years ago, made the long and difficult fight to bring some fairness and relief to those unfortunate servicemen who had received military discharges that, while not dishonorable, did cast reflection on future years. These discharges were given without a formal court martial, and from a study of these cases it is evident that grave injustice had been done many of our ex-servicemen. Clyde fought for these unfortunate GI's in a most effective manner. He did not accomplish all that he set out to do because he could not get the legislation acted upon by the other body; yet because of the tireless work and dedication which Clyde demonstrated, great good has been accomplished not only for the GI's of today, but for years to come.

Our colleague was one of the kindest and most considerate men I have ever known. While Clyde was a fearless and vigorous warrior for those principles for which he believed, I have never known of him to say an unkind word to or about anyone.

He will be greatly missed and long remembered.

Mr. VAN DEERLIN. Mr. Speaker, Clyde Doyle's standard for a U.S. Congressman was expressed in a true story he related to me some 10 years ago.

When Mr. Doyle first sought the Democratic nomination in his southern California district, he was one of several candidates interviewed by a committee representing organized labor. As its final question to each man, the committee asked, "On being elected, would you like to become known as labor's spokesman on Capitol Hill?"

Clyde Doyle replied in the negative. He told the committee it was his conception of a Congressman's job to represent all elements of his district. He thus would not want to be a "spokesman" for labor, for business, for veterans, for teachers or for any other special interest.

"I went home that night heavy at heart," Mr. Doyle recalled. "I felt certain I would now be denied an endorsement that could be vital to my nomination."

It was a matter of some surprise, then, when the labor delegation returned early next day. Its members informed Mr. Doyle he was being endorsed for Congress. One of them added: "You were the only candidate we talked with who answered the key question correctly."

For 15 years, the House has been well served by the honesty and devotion of our fellow Californian, Clyde Doyle. I join scores of colleagues in mourning his loss.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to the memory of a good friend and neighbor who served California for many years in the House of Representatives. We all were shocked and saddened by the sudden passing of Congressman Clyde Doyle.

Our friend was a most dedicated and conscientious Representative and certainly was among the hardest working Members of this House. When I first came to Congress 4 years ago, one of my first impressions was of Clyde Doyle arriving at his office to study his mail and begin the day's work before many of us sat down to breakfast. For 4 years, I was priviledged to be a neighbor of Clyde Doyle in the Longworth House Office Building, his office being next to mine.

The people of California and the Nation have lost a faithful public servant. Clyde Doyle was active in his community all his life. His interest and leadership in community affairs dates back to high school days in Los Angeles when he was a champion debater, newspaper manager, president of the student body and still found time to be the high school baseball team's star pitcher.

Anyone who has earned his way through college and earned a law degree knows how difficult this can be, but Clyde Doyle was never afraid of work. He tried every job from delivering newspapers to being a janitor. He is an outstanding example of a man who has pulled himself up by the bootstraps and made a tremendous success of his life.

Clyde Doyle always gave of himself to his community and I think that the following summary of his community activities before his election to Congress indicate the great contributions he made:

In 1936 received unanimous award of meritorious citizenship plaque by vote of all the service clubs of Long Beach, Calif., as the most valuable and useful adult citizen in Long Beach; first member of Long Beach Kiwanis Club and organizing president; first president of Boy Scouts of America Council in Long Beach; several years president of Long Beach Tuberculosis stamp sales; member of the board of trustees and legal counsel, Adelaide Tichenor Hospital School and Clinic for Crippled Children; boys secretary, member, board of directors, Long Beach YMCA; member, board of trustees, California Junior Republic, Chino; president Long Beach Recreation Commission for 15 years without pay; first president, Long Beach Coordinating Council, 1934; first president, Long Beach Philharmonic Orchestra Association; honorary member of National Recreation Association; honorary member, California Conference of Social Work; honorary member, Long Beach 20–30 Club; president, Long Beach Trojan Club, U.S.C.; president, Abraham Lincoln Club, Long Beach, for several years; member of Abraham Lincoln Group, Washington, D.C.; Los Angeles juvenile probation officer; examiner of applications for positions of juvenile court probation officer, Los Angeles County, under honorable Curtis D. Wilbur, distinguished judge, juvenile court, later Secretary of Navy under President Hoover; boys counselor and instructor in government and athletics, California Junior Republic, Chino, 1911–14, member, board of trustees since 1920; recipient of honorary plaques, awards, and decorations by several veterans organizations; member, South Gate Chamber of Commerce; member, Huntingpark, Downey, and South Gate YMCA; member of Moose, Eagles; past and presently listed in Who's Who.

In Clyde Doyle's passing, the Nation, California, and his immediate congressional district have lost a very conscientious and dedicated Member of Congress.

Mrs. Johnson wishes to join me in extending our heartfelt sympathy to Mrs. Doyle and her daughter.

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, I want to join with my friends from California and others in paying brief but sincere tribute to the memory of our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from California, Congressman Clyde Doyle. I am saddened indeed to hear of his passing.

Clyde Doyle was first elected to the 79th Congress and has rendered many years of outstanding service to our country. He was a great patriot, blessed with a good mind and dedicated to hard work and to the service of his district, State, and Nation.

In the passing of Congressman Doyle, the House has lost a distinguished Member and I have lost a personal friend. I want to extend an expression of my most sincere sympathy to Mrs. Doyle and to the members of his family. We shall all miss Clyde Doyle immensely.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, I am deeply saddened by the unexpected death of my friend, CLYDE DOYLE, long a Representative in Congress from the State of California. CLYDE DOYLE was one of the finest people I have ever known. He was sincere, studious, thoughtful, and deeply religious. CLYDE DOYLE was compassionate in his consideration of the problems of the people of his district and, indeed, of the problems of the people of the entire Nation. He was all-American in his thinking. He was an outstanding member of the Committee on Armed Services of the House. No one knew more about the cost of the defense of our country than did Congressman DOYLE. His only son lost his life in the defense of this country in World War II. The defense of the United States was not a matter of partisan consideration with CLYDE DOYLE. One of the most stirring speeches I ever heard in this House was made by CLYDE DOYLE more than a dozen years ago. The title of his speech was "Don't Play Politics with Defense."

CLYDE DOYLE also was an outstanding member of the Committee on Un-American Activities. He likewise gave great attention to his duties and responsibilities as a member of that committee. He made an outstanding record there. CLYDE DOYLE loved America and its institutions.

CLYDE DOYLE, as a sort of hobby, kept daily notes on the proceedings of the House. These notes were to be made the basis of a book about the U.S. House of Representatives. He and I talked about his proposed book many times. We last discussed it here on the floor of the House on Monday of this week. On that occasion, he asked me to tell him what I considered to be my own greatest accomplishment in the 15 years I have served in Congress. I told him I was proudest of my authorship in the House of the National Defense Education Act of 1958. Then we discussed what had been done under that act. CLYDE DOYLE told me he was asking the same question he asked me of other Congressmen.

As the Members know, not many good books have been written about the House. CLYDE DOYLE's book would have been a gold mine of information about the House of Representatives. I deeply regret that he cannot finish the book; at the same time, I would like to express the hope that his relatives, or other interested friends, consider publishing that part of the book that is ready for publication or can be easily made ready.

CLYDE DOYLE pursued his hobby of noting the proceedings of the House, and of commenting on those of great interest, with such diligence and with such self-discipline that I am sure the publication of his book would be enlightening and very helpful to students of the Congress and to those who serve here in the future.

Mr. Speaker, CLYDE DOYLE was a gentleman of the highest order. He was an outstanding and effective Member of the House. As a friend, I share the great loss which his family and other friends feel so acutely today.

Mr. HERLONG. Mr. Speaker, I want to say that in my opinion no man has more deserved to serve in this body than CLYDE DOYLE. CLYDE DOYLE lived to be of service to others. He loved his fellow man and he served him well. There was not an ounce of venom in him and he had a great store of good will, sympathy, and understanding. This body and the whole country share a great loss with his passing.

Mr. HAGEN of California. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of both myself and my wife Martha, I wish to express our feeling of loss arising from the death of the Honorable CLYDE DOYLE, of California. At the same time I express my sympathy to his beloved family. Truly we share a great loss.

My acquaintanceship with our late beloved colleague began in Long Beach, Calif., in 1932. At the time I was a student at Long Beach Junior College and a member of the Hammurabi Pre-Legal Society. One of our guest speakers was CLYDE DOYLE, who was then only an active practicing attorney. He spoke to us about the flora of the semiarid mountains in the Los Angeles-Long Beach area. I mention this because it demonstrates the versatility of the man and reveals a significant aspect of his character. He loved the outdoors and was an avid naturalist and fisherman. He loved the outdoors because he wanted room and a lack of distraction to meditate upon his personality and problems and relationship to both God and man. He shared this experience with a son who was unfortunately killed during the war.

In the Congress and elsewhere the descriptive noun, "gentleman," is used in somewhat formal and perfunctory fashion with no particular effort to plumb its meaning or to properly identify the recipient of that description. The dictionary definition of "gentleman" is "A man of good breeding, kindness, courtesy, and honor; a man having worthy ideals and refinement of thought and action." CLYDE DOYLE certainly deserved this description. No higher compliment can be paid to him.

CLYDE was soft spoken and courteous. I have spoken with him many times about many things, including political campaigns and controversial matters of government, and never once did he utter an unkind word about any other person. It was not in his nature to be unkind to anyone and very few of us can boast of this characteristic of a truly religious and humanitarian man. Politics and government and business would be less of a jungle if there were more men like CLYDE engaged therein.

Mr. DOYLE was a great man. He utilized his career as a Congressman solely for doing the greatest good for the greatest number without any thought of self-return or self-advancement. He will be missed by the Nation he loved so dearly.

Of him and others like him a poet has said:

> Lives of great men all remind us
>   We can make our lives sublime,
> And, departing, leave behind us
>   Footprints on the sands of time.

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, we have suffered a great loss because of the death of our distinguished colleague, the Honorable CLYDE DOYLE.

His service to his Nation and to his native State of California has been outstanding and of great benefit to all of us.

If there was one quality which Congressman DOYLE possessed more than any other, I believe it was compassion. He understood his fellow humans, their wants, their needs, their dreams and their hopes. He had the remarkable ability of seeing the best in others and in understanding another person's point of view.

His citizenship was outstanding, and he followed up his words with constructive deeds. It is no accident that Congressman DOYLE received so many awards for outstanding citizenship. He believed in being a good citizen in an active way, in wholehearted participation in efforts to improve the lot of those less fortunate than himself.

Because of the time that CLYDE DOYLE spent on this earth, our Nation and his native State are better places to live. He lived a full, rich life, a life filled to the brim with concern and compassion for those with whom he came in contact.

All of us will miss his wise words, his gentleness, his kindness, his understanding. It is a privilege to have known him and to have counted him as a friend.

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, I share the admiration that has been expressed here today for the late CLYDE DOYLE, of California. It was my good fortune to have known him quite well and to have been closely associated with him in many respects during his service here. I cannot think of a man with whom I have served who commanded such universal respect on the part of his fellow Members. He was courteous, forthright, sincere, dedicated and energetic.

I extend my deepest sympathy to Mrs. Doyle and the family in their bereavement.

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, many men who come to the Congress, or serve in the Senate of the United States, take pride in the fact that through some public work they are able to create, as it were, back in their own territory, a monument to their service in the Congress of the United States, service to their country. All of us like to think that posterity will do us honor for what we have done here, and the vanity which is a part of almost every personality I have known here is given so much satisfaction when we see a public building or other edifice with our name on it. But I think the real monuments that we build are the sermons that we preach with our lives.

When I heard the news about CLYDE DOYLE I was on the way from my room to the House Office Building. As I parked my car one of the policemen said to me, "It's too bad about CLYDE DOYLE, he was such a fine fellow." I hurried on to breakfast and a fellow Congressman from a State far removed said, "CLYDE DOYLE was a Christian gentleman." Later, an elevator boy made a remark to a group of us that, "Mr. DOYLE was certainly a wonderful gentleman." I am sure that from the great beyond where good and fine men go, he must somehow know of the magnificent impression for good he made here with his life. He preached a sermon for good, for example, and for guidance. His monument is a living monument that will live on in the hearts and the minds of those of us who were privileged to know him—not just Congressmen and Senators, but people who worked in and around the Capitol regardless of their particular capacity or calling.

We often speak of a public servant as being dedicated. CLYDE DOYLE lived the word. He kept an hour by hour account of everything that happened here, and while he did not make many speeches, whenever he did talk, he was accurate and he was listened to.

Today is a day of sadness, for we have lost a friend; but today is also a day of gladness that we had the privilege of knowing him and I am sure I express the sentiments of the Members of the House of Representatives when I say that I am glad that CLYDE DOYLE lived. I am glad he lived because his life was good for the Nation, good for his district, good for his people and good for his many friends as a monument of integrity and example.

To his family, Mrs. Hemphill and I extend our deepest sympathy.

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I was deeply saddened this morning to hear the news of the death of my friend and respected colleague, the Honorable CLYDE DOYLE, of California.

For almost 20 years in the Congress, CLYDE has served his country and his constituents well. He was a dedicated American who loved his country and cherished the goals of progressive and humanitarian legislation.

CLYDE, as we all knew him, was a man of the highest character and integrity. He was a tireless worker with a sincere and ardent interest in the people of his district and of the Nation.

He was a modest and mild-mannered man. Even when he was the target for unfair criticism he was tolerant, and patient toward those who opposed him.

He reflected integrity on the Congress. The stature and memory of CLYDE DOYLE will stand as a monument to a noble and great man, and should serve as a deterrent to those who seek to incite the public against the Congress and discredit it as an institution and an instrument of the people in our democratic society.

To his beloved wife, Lydia, his daughter and grandchildren, Mrs. Rhodes and I express our deepest sympathy at their great loss. I join with all of my colleagues in sharing their grief and sorrow.

Mr. POOL. Mr. Speaker, I join with the other Members in expressing my sorrow on the passing of CLYDE DOYLE.

While I have only known CLYDE for the past 2½ months, I was fortunate enough to serve with him on the Committee on Un-American Activities and valued him as a personal friend as well as a colleague. Here in the House, on many occasions, CLYDE invited me to sit with him during the sessions. As a freshman Congressman, I asked him to explain the various motions and activities here on the floor. CLYDE not only answered my questions, but pointed out to me many other matters that he felt would help me in my service as a Congressman.

I discovered that he loved people and found some good in everyone. Words cannot express my sentiments to his loved ones in the sorrow that all of us felt at his passing. I will miss his counsel, the Nation will miss his service, and to his wife and family, I can only extend my deepest sympathy in their bereavement.

Mr. ROYBAL. Mr. Speaker, I would like to join my colleagues in expressing my sincerest and deepest sympathy to Mrs. Lydia Doyle on the passing of her husband, the Honorable CLYDE DOYLE, longtime Representative of California's 23d District.

I have known CLYDE DOYLE for a number of years and his death leaves a void that will be difficult if not impossible to fill. His long and illustrious career of public service to the people of the Los Angeles County and southern California area stands as a tribute to his qualities of integrity and devotion to principle.

CLYDE DOYLE's memory will serve us all as inspiration in the years ahead as an example of the kind of public servant we need in these difficult times.

Mr. THOMPSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, as the years go by and our colleagues come and go, there are some with whom we feel a particular closeness. So it was with CLYDE DOYLE and me. I cannot tell you why and I doubt if he could either, but there was something about it that always drew us together. Perhaps an expression of the younger generation particularly fits the case. They would say "we clicked."

Times without number I have gone over to sit beside him in the place he habitually occupied. I used to marvel at his prolific note taking. I do not suppose any man in the Congress kept as copious a record of what went on here on the floor. I might add that I doubt that anyone among us had as good a record of attendance.

I cannot remember when CLYDE was not here, faithful and attentive. It is significant that he carried this on right up through yesterday—the last day of his life. I shall miss him. We shall all miss him. My sympathy goes especially to his widow and the surviving members of his family. My sympathy, too, goes to his California colleagues who will miss him perhaps more than any of us.

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I was shocked to learn of our colleague Congressman CLYDE DOYLE's untimely passing when I arrived at my office this morning. I had an opportunity to have the pleasure of talking with Mr. DOYLE yesterday concerning matters in connection with the Un-American Activities Committee where he so ably served as vice chairman. I want to join the delegation from California and the entire Congress in expressing my deepest sympathy to his family.

Certainly there was no member of Congress that was held in higher esteem than the late Congressman CLYDE DOYLE. I had the privilege and pleasure of getting acquainted with Congressman DOYLE when his son who was serving as a pilot with the U.S. Air Force, located at Myrtle Beach Air Force Base, S.C., during World War II was killed. This young officer was on a reconnaissance flight over the ocean. He was within a mile of the airbase at Myrtle Beach when his plane made a nose dive and went out of control. The young officer and his plane crashed into the Atlantic Ocean and I do not believe his body was ever recovered. I do not think I have ever felt quite so bad as I did when Congressman DOYLE arrived at Myrtle Beach Air Force Base, which is located in my district. Every effort had been made to locate his son, but all were unsuccessful.

The State of California and the Nation has lost one of its finest legislators, and we shall all remember how dedicated he was to his work as a Representative here in the National House of Representatives.

Again, I want to express my deepest sympathy to the members of the late Congressman DOYLE's family.

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, CLYDE DOYLE was a Christian gentleman. One of the best, down to earth, commonsense talks on Christian faith I ever heard anywhere was delivered by CLYDE DOYLE to the House Christian Breakfast Group. He attended regularly and always left a profound impression when he talked. His intense belief in Christianity and love of these United States made of him a bitter foe of atheistic communism.

CLYDE DOYLE believed the best way to fight communism was to fill the hearts and minds of our youth with Americanism.

I am glad I knew and associated with CLYDE DOYLE. He was a great American and dedicated to making this Congress the greatest institution on earth. We have lost a truly great man. Mrs. Dorn joins in my deepest sympathy to his wonderful and devoted family.

Mr. HAWKINS. Mr. Speaker, California, the Congress, and our Nation have lost a dedicated public servant in the untimely passing of our colleague, CLYDE DOYLE, of California. His patience, courageous loyalty to his convictions, and his ever willingness to help others, were attributes we always admired. Even those who sometimes disagreed with some of his views respected his devotion to those principles in which he believed and by which he lived.

I shall remember him as the two of us, the day before his passing, walked down to the well of the House to vote—he to vote one way, I the opposite. We chatted as friends, and he, as the elder statesman he was, gave to me advice on many things concerning the welfare of our community. This was typical of the man: never to hate, never to be bitter, never to appear superior in wisdom, though he was a wise man.

CLYDE DOYLE was a friend to all of us, and he will be truly missed.

My deepest sympathy goes to the members of his family.

Mr. DAGUE. Mr. Speaker, the Grim Reaper stands at our elbow as a constant reminder that this life is uncertain and fleeting and that we are never sure when the call may come to each one of us.

Yesterday we joined with our departed colleague in the important work of this House and we saw him leave at the close of day in apparent health and strength. And then today we learned with grief and consternation of his untimely demise.

Passing this way but once it behooves all of us to have a bit more concern for the amenities as we meet, even casually, those who are our associates on this life's journey. In that particular, Clyde Doyle was truly one of this earth's noblemen and his qualities of greatness stem from an innate kindness and the traits of a gentleman. Our colleague and brother was a kind man, a gentle man, and withal a representative of the people who walked in the fear and admonition of the Lord.

As the vice president of our Christian fellowship group he led our meditations on occasion and demonstrated by his humble but nonetheless forceful witnessing that he had made his peace with his Maker and that his life would continue to be one of dedication in the service of the Nation and his fellow men. We who have passed through the dark valley know something of the heartbreak and anguish that now assail his loved ones and our sympathy goes out to his bereaved helpmate and the other members of his family with whom we are joined in mourning the passing of a great public servant, who was also a fine Christian gentleman.

Mrs. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, Representative Clyde Doyle was a close personal friend of mine. I shall miss Mr. Doyle not only because he was one of the kindest and most thoughtful of persons, but because he was a man dedicated to helping his fellow man.

Many of his family continue to live in my congressional district. I know most of them personally. To Mrs. Doyle and his daughter and to the other members of his family I extend my heartfelt sympathies.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, being only a freshman Member of this honorable body, I have not had the privilege of knowing Clyde Doyle as those who have already expressed their sentiments. Ours was only a casual acquaintanceship. But I do know that he was a supporter of statehood for Hawaii when we were knocking at the congressional doors for admission into the Union.

As a representative of Hawaii's grateful people, I join in grieving over the loss of Clyde Doyle, of whom it can aptly be said that he, too, like his son, gave up his life for love of his country and his fellow men.

While I fully realize that human words, no matter how sweet, cannot beguile Mrs. Doyle and her family from the great sorrow that must be theirs, I wish to add my expressions of sympathy and condolences to those already expressed. I do hope and pray that they will derive some comfort from the fact that there are many friends and beneficiaries of his handiwork who share in their immeasurable loss.

Mr. BURKHALTER. Mr. Speaker, today our country, our State, and our Nation lost a real champion of democracy, with the sudden passing of our colleague, Clyde Doyle. Little did we realize that when he answered the rollcall on the floor yesterday that we were witnessing the final vote to be cast by this sincere, dedicated legislator. His 16 years were spent in devotion to what he felt was the right answer to the many legislative decisions that he faced. This record of accomplishment has left its mark of sincerity upon his contemporaries for time immemorial.

It has only been my privilege to serve with him for a short time on the Hill. Even though this is my first term my colleague Clyde Doyle has found the time to drop by my office and ask if there was any way in which he could be of assistance to me or my staff in helping us to get started with our future endeavors in representing the district.

This was the fabric of the man; he always had time for his fellow man.

Mrs. Burkhalter joins with me in expressing our heartfelt sympathy to his wife and daughter and her family in the loss of a devoted husband and father.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. Speaker, it was with profound sorrow that all of us who knew and served with our late colleague, Clyde Doyle, learned of his death.

He was a man of the most unswerving dedication to the concepts of Christianity and patriotism. I have served with him on the Armed Services Committee and have observed his unfailing devotion to duty, there and on the floor of the House of Representatives. Along with people the world over who are joined in the mutual goal of fighting communism I am acquainted with the outstanding work he did as acting chairman and longtime member of the Committee on Un-American Activities. In this work he never forgot that the dignity of man is priceless even to the most unfortunate among us.

May God comfort Mr. Doyle's family with the memory that he was a Christian, a gentleman and a patriot, and one with whom we in the House of Representatives were privileged in the highest sense to serve, a man whose special attributes will be deeply missed by us, and by freedom-loving people everywhere.

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Speaker, love of family, love of country, complete dedication to its welfare, compassion for his fellow man; kindly, gentle, and always fair in his dealings with others. These were the distinguishing characteristics of a warm and humble human being whose presence will be sorely missed by all the Members of this body. Serving with Clyde Doyle was an experience of personal enrichment to all who shared the privilege. Much has been said here today attesting to the high regard in which he was held by the Members of the House of Representatives. Death at any time shocks those close to the person whose life ceases. But, Mr. Speaker, I know the members of Congressman Doyle's family can read our own personal expressions of sorrow and, from them, gain great pride that the one they loved so dearly was so universally esteemed. I join in expressing my sincerest sympathy to Mrs. Doyle and all the other members of our late colleague's family.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, nothing can quite compensate or fully console the Members of this House or the people of the country, for a loss so severe as the sudden and unexpected death on March 14 of our colleague Clyde Doyle, of California. Yet there was an aspect of Clyde Doyle's successful, fruitful, and effective life, that provides us all with some modicum of comfort in our bereavement. For Clyde Doyle had recognition and respect from the people he served for 17 years in this House as the Representative from the 23d District of California. Moreover, while his services were constant and distinctive and both the quality and the quantity of his effort for his district, for California, and for his country, were massive and rich in results, he had the satisfaction, through the years, of public appreciation.

Not only was he appreciated and admired by his constituents who nine times elected him to this House, but he knew the admiration and affection of his colleagues here; and the leadership held him in high esteem. So that as he moved among us to the very last, Clyde Doyle was rich in honors, in the respect of his colleagues, and in commendations from those who were close to him, the late Speaker Sam Rayburn for example, who on occasion evaluated as exemplary his sound and steady and unflagging workmanship as an American legislator.

For 17 years, as I know of my personal knowledge, he kept a daily diary of the doings of the Congress. This, it seems to me, could be an invaluable personal record, rich in observations, commentary, anecdotes. For Clyde Doyle had a feel for history and events and a sensitive appreciation of the characteristics of those around him and their reactions. I hope someday that his diary may become a public record, for inevitably it will throw the light of a fine imagination on the chronicle of our times in the House. Those of us who knew Clyde Doyle well, know also that the diary will have about it a kindliness and a sympathy for his fellow man that will cause hurt to no one should it ever achieve publication.

It may perhaps be said that those of us who were nearest to him knew him for qualities and accomplishments that cannot be found in reports and statements appearing as matters of routine in the Congressional Record. I, for one, especially regarded him highly for his services on legislative matters, affecting savings and loan problems and banking. He was an indefatigable worker and had what some of our staff people like to call a knowledge in depth of the matters that came before him. When he discussed a problem of legislation that touched on the armed services, for example—he was a member of the committee—he was persuasive, articulate, informed, and sound.

Similarly, in his 12 years as a member of the House Un-American Activities Committee, he demonstrated an understanding of this profoundly controversial problem that revealed not only the importance of the committee and the need for it, but gave confidence to us all that its management, its reports, and its decisions, would meet high standards of justice. For Clyde Doyle was not only a first-class lawyer, he was also a person for whom justice and fairplay had absolute meanings. And many of us have already commented on his gentleness, his sensitive human feelings, and his broad tolerance. These qualities in our colleague made him an outstanding friend of a whole spectrum of public causes in which he was constantly and often brilliantly active: from the YMCA in his district to the California Philharmonic Orchestra Association, and from the Boy Scouts to the Kiwanis Club. The list of his affiliations make a column or more of fine print, and I think it can be said, that all of them felt the beneficent influence of his help, his counsel, and his leadership. No wonder that at one time the inter-allied Council of Service Clubs, of Long Beach, accorded him the Meritorious Citizenship Award as the most valuable and useful citizen.

That accolade, "most valuable and useful citizen," best sums up the superb career of Clyde Doyle. It is good to know that he knew he had the praise and approbation of his fellow man and that everywhere he was regarded with honor and affection.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, I was profoundly shocked and deeply grieved upon learning of the death of my colleague from California, the Honorable Clyde Doyle.

Those of us who had the privilege of knowing and working with him always respected his devotion to duty, the sincerity of his convictions, and his unceasing effort, as he explained it, "to find true goals for lasting values."

In his day-to-day relationships with people, Clyde Doyle always showed the understanding, patience, and humility that endeared him to so many of us. Moreover, though at times we disagreed on certain issues that arose in this distinguished House, I never found him to be disagreeable. His untimely passing is a great loss to California and the Nation. Perhaps we can find solace in the fact that the memory of our colleague and his accomplishments shall long remain, untouched by the forgetfulness of time.

Mrs. Roosevelt joins me in expressing sincere sympathy to Mrs. Doyle and the family.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, out of respect to our departed colleague, the gentleman from California [Mr. Doyle], I include a prayer in the Record.

This prayer which I offer, Mr. Speaker, was delivered in the House of Representatives on May 6, 1913, by the then Chaplain, Rev. Henry N. Couden, D.D. It was offered on behalf of a deceased Member of Congress of that day and it has seemed to me it expresses in plain but very sincere words the emotion, sympathy and deep sense of loss which all Members of this body, some 50 years later, have experienced in connection with the death of our dear and honored colleague, Clyde Doyle.

The prayer I offer reads:

We come to Thee, O God our heavenly Father, with hearts bowed in sorrow, because death, always mysterious and unbidden, has visited this congressional body and taken from its midst a Member who was peculiarly fitted by natural gifts, education, and experience to serve his people and his country. But Thou art God; Thou knowest the beginning and the end; Thou hast ordered all things, and Thou doest all things well. Comfort us, his people, the stricken wife and children, by the eternal faith revealed to the world in the life, death, and resurrection of the Christ who thus brought to light life and immortality in Thee.

Swift to its close ebbs out life's little day;
Earth's joys grow dim, its glories pass away;
Change and decay in all around I see;
O Thou who changest not, abide with me.

Amen.

Mr. HARDING. Mr. Speaker, our Nation has suffered a great loss in the passing of our colleague, Clyde Doyle. To know Clyde Doyle was to love him. I have never met a more kindly or genuine person in my life.

During my first term in the Congress I was informed that there were no assigned seats in the House of Representatives. While this was true, Clyde Doyle had his own seat and everyone was aware of it. When the House was in session, he was nearly always sitting in it.

This kind and intelligent man displayed a devotion to duty that was an example to all of us. He possessed one of the finest attendance records in the House.

The thing that I shall remember most about Clyde Doyle is the counsel he gave me when I first came to the Congress 2 years ago on his practice of accumulating the Chaplain's prayers and sending them out to the ministers of the churches in his district. "Chaplain Braskamp says a wonderful prayer," Clyde informed me, "and I feel that the ministers in my district in California will find his prayers spiritual and helpful."

Clyde Doyle was a great Christian and a great American and a friend to all of us. I know that his presence in the House brought out the best in all of us just as his final words in letters to his constituents, "our beloved Nation deserves the best of whatever we are," attempted to bring out the best in them.

I extend to his family my profound sympathy in this hour of their great loss and sorrow.

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, it was a saddening shock to learn of the passing of Clyde Doyle, of California. My office and his have been located on the same corridor for a number of years. Many times it has been my privilege to walk across to the House floor with him. Only a few days ago I stopped by and visited him in his new more spacious office suite which is on the back corner of the same corridor in the Longworth Building. He was quite proud of this new office and showed me through it, pointing out all of its advantageous points.

The first time I had ever known Clyde Doyle well was a few years ago when a congressional group visited the city of New York. It was a spring 2-day trip. We traveled with our families together by train. I came to know him and the members of his family on this New York tour. He was a kindly, genuine, and sincere man. I never heard him utter an unkind word about anyone. He was a dedicated public servant. He possessed humility, gentleness, and an even temper.

My sympathy goes out to his companion and helpmate and other members of his family. A true friend, he will be greatly missed by his colleagues on the floor of the House.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, Clyde Doyle was a truly noble man. He was a credit to this House, to his State, and to his Nation. All of us were honored to have been his colleagues. Clyde was too big for pettiness; he always had time for little acts of kindness and courtesy; and he went out of his way to help the new Members. Clyde Doyle had a deep belief in democracy and in the rights and freedoms of individual men. Democratic government works because of men like him.

I shall always remember this good man as a friend and as a fine public servant.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the life and character of our late colleague.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

House Resolution 293

Resolved, That the House has heard with profound sorrow of the death of the Honorable Clyde Doyle, a Representative from the State of California.

Resolved, That a committee of 28 Members of the House, with such Members of the Senate as may be joined, be appointed to attend the funeral.

Resolved, That the Sergeant at Arms of the House be authorized and directed to take such steps as may be necessary for carrying out the provisions of these resolutions and that the necessary expenses in connection therewith be paid out of the contingent fund of the House.

Resolved, That the Clerk communicate these resolutions to the Senate and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

The resolution was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Chair appoints as members of the funeral committee the following Members on the part of the House: Mr. Sheppard, of California; Mr. Fisher, of Texas; Mr. Holifield, of California; Mr. George P. Miller, of California; Mr. Price, of Illinois; Mr. Willis, of Louisiana; Mr. Shelley, of California; Mr. Hagen, of California; Mr. Hosmer, of California; Mr. Moss, of California; Mr. Utt, of California; Mr. Bob Wilson, of California; Mr. Johansen, of Michigan; Mr. Roosevelt, of California; Mr. Sisk, of California; Mr. McFall, of California; Mr. Cohelan, of California; Mr. Corman, of California; Mr. George E. Brown, of California; Mr. Burkhalter, of California; Mr. Edwards, of California; Mr. Hanna, of California; Mr. Hawkins, of California; Mr. Leggett, of California; Mr. Martin, of California; Mr. Roybal, of California; Mr. Van Deerlin, of California; and Mr. Charles H. Wilson, of California.

The Clerk will report the remainder of the resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That as a further mark of respect the House do now adjourn.

The resolution was agreed to.

ADJOURNMENT

Accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 10 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, March 18, 1963, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

547. A letter from the Librarian of Congress, transmitting a report of the affairs of the Library of Congress, including the copyright business, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1962; to the Committee on House Administration.

548. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled, "A bill to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to employ aliens in a scientific or technical capacity"; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

549. A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled, "A bill for the relief of certain employees of the Foreign Service of the United States"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ADDABBO:

H.R. 4874. A bill to prohibit discrimination in employment because of race, color, religion, national origin, or ancestry; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. ADAIR:

H.R. 4875. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to provide for reform of personal and corporate income tax rates, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BENNETT of Florida:

H.R. 4876. A bill to amend section 349(a) (10) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, relating to loss of nationality by leaving or remaining outside of the United States to avoid services in the Armed Forces in time of war or during a period of national emergency; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BURKE:

H.R. 4877. A bill to amend section 301 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DENT:

H.R. 4878. A bill to extend for 1 year the act relating to training teachers of the deaf and the temporary provisions of Public Laws 815 and 874, 81st Congress; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 4879. A bill to amend the Library Services Act to increase the Federal assistance for the improvement of public libraries; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 4880. A bill to extend for 4 years the temporary provisions of Public Laws 815 and 874, 81st Congress, providing financial assistance in the construction and operation of schools in areas affected by Federal activities, and to make certain other changes in such laws; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 4881. A bill to extend for 1 year the present programs for training teachers of the deaf and the temporary provisions of Public Laws 815 and 874, 81st Congress, and to expand and improve Federal programs relating to the education of handicapped children; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. FOGARTY:

H.R. 4882. A bill to amend title II of the National Defense Education Act of 1958 to provide for forgiveness of loans made under that title to students who subsequently engage in the practice of medicine, dentistry, or osteopathy in areas having a shortage of individuals engaged in such practice; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 4883. A bill to amend section 3203 of title 38, United States Code, to provide that veterans entitled to pension who are being maintained in State homes shall receive pension at the rate of $30 per month; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. GUBSER:

H.R. 4884. A bill to amend chapter 3 of title 38, United States Code, to provide for the furnishing of assistance to States providing contact offices for veterans where no Veterans' Administration contact office is available; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. HARRIS:

H.R. 4885. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, the Railroad Retirement Tax Act, the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act and the Temporary Extended Railroad Unemployment Insurance Benefits Act of 1961 to increase the creditable and taxable compensation and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HEALEY:

H.R. 4886. A bill to provide under the social security program for payment for hospital and related services to aged beneficiaries; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HORTON:

H.R. 4887. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to increase the amount of outside earnings permitted each year without deductions from benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. JOELSON:

H.R. 4888. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to permit taxpayers who are severely disabled to deduct certain transportation expenses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McINTIRE:

H.R. 4889. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to repeal the excise tax on communications; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MacGREGOR:

H.R. 4890. A bill to encourage local and State initiative in urban transit development and to preserve the status of privately owned local carriers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. MILLER of California:

H.R. 4891. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act, as amended, to provide that accumulated sick leave be credited to the retirement fund or that the individual be reimbursed; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MONTOYA:

H.R. 4892. A bill to prohibit discrimination on account of sex in the payment of wages by employers engaged in commerce or in the production of goods for commerce and to provide for the restitution of wages lost by employees by reason of any such discrimination; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. MORRIS:

H.R. 4893. A bill relating to age limits in connection with appointments to the U.S. Park Police; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. OLSEN of Montana:

H.R. 4894. A bill to correct inequities with respect to the crediting of service of classified employees for step increase purposes in certain conversion actions under the Postal Service and Federal Employees Salary Act of 1962, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. OLSON of Minnesota:

H.R. 4895. A bill to extend the feed grain program under terms which will give assurance of a fair price to farmers; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. PELLY:

H.R. 4896. A bill to establish a Commission to enforce antidiscrimination provisions in Government contracts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. POFF:

H.R. 4897. A bill to repeal subsection (d) of section 2388 of title 18 of the United States Code; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POAGE:

H.R. 4898. A bill to extend the feed grain program; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. PRICE:

H.R. 4899. A bill to provide compensation for disability or death resulting from injury to employees in employments which expose employees to radioactive materiel, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 4900. A bill to provide for Federal assistance for the construction and expansion of public community junior colleges; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. RIVERS of Alaska:

H.R. 4901. A bill to revise the provisions of law relating to the methods by which amounts made available to the States pursuant to the Temporary Unemployment Compensation Act of 1958 and title XII of the Social Security Act are to be restored to the Treasury; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RYAN of New York:

H.R. 4902. A bill to provide financial assistance to the States to improve educational opportunities for migrant agricultural employees and their children; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 4903. A bill to amend the act establishing a Children's Bureau so as to assist States in providing for day-care services for children of migrant agricultural workers; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 4904. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to extend the child labor provisions thereof to certain children employed in agriculture, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 4905. A bill to provide for the registration of contractors of migrant agricultural workers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 4906. A bill to provide for the establishment of a council to be known as the National Advisory Council on Migratory Labor; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 4907. A bill to amend the Public Health Services Act so as to establish a program to assist farmers in providing adequate sanitation facilities for migratory farm laborers; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SECREST:

H.R. 4908. A bill to permit certain employees of a State or political subdivision thereof to elect coverage under the Federal old-age and survivors insurance system, as self-employed individuals; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GILBERT:

H.R. 4909. A bill to exempt from income tax, annuities and pensions paid by the United States to its employees; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SIBAL:

H.R. 4910. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to permit a taxpayer to deduct (as trade or business expenses) the expenses of travel, meals, and lodging while employed away from his regular place of abode; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 4911. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that the costs of education or training shall be deductible as trade or business expenses when incurred in order to obtain a new or better job, as well as when incurred in order to maintain existing skills, status, salary, or employment; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SICKLES:

H.R. 4912. A bill to amend section 33 of the Federal Employees' Compensation Act so as to provide a system of safety rules, regulations, and safety inspection and training, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 4913. A bill to amend the Federal Coal Mine Safety Act so as to provide further for the prevention of accidents in coal mines; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. SISK:

H.R. 4914. A bill to amend the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 to provide for the use of counterpart funds for international agricultural conferences; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. STINSON:

H.R. 4915. A bill to establish a Commission to enforce antidiscrimination provisions in Government contracts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. TOLL:

H.R. 4916. A bill to authorize the Housing and Home Finance Administrator to provide additional assistance for the development of comprehensive and coordinated mass transportation systems in metropolitan and other urban areas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. TOLLEFSON (by request):

H.R. 4917. A bill to provide members of the Yakima Tribes with full citizenship rights by extinguishing the tribal entity and vesting each tribal member with his equal cash share of the fair market value of all reservation assets of the Yakima Tribes in the State of Washington; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 4918. A bill to provide members of the Colville Confederated Tribes with full citizenship rights by extinguishing the tribal entity and vesting each tribal member with his equal cash share of the fair market value of all reservation assets of the Colville Confederated Tribes in the State of Washington; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. WILLIAMS:

H.R. 4919. A bill to amend the Federal Airport Act to extend the time for making grants thereunder, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SPRINGER:

H.R. 4920. A bill to amend the Federal Airport Act to extend the time for making grants thereunder, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. McINTIRE:

H.J. Res. 328. Joint resolution designating the 6-day period beginning April 15, 1963, as "National Harmony Week," and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By Mr. HARRISON: Memorial of the House of Representatives, 37th State Legislature of the State of Wyoming, memorializing the Congress of the United States with reference to the granting of the fee or such lesser interest in land to the State of Wyoming for the purpose of establishing a county or State youth training camp; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of North Dakota, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to provide for the payment of the bonded indebtedness and the special assessments of any property which the Federal Government acquires by condemnation; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of North Dakota, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to immediately take the necessary steps to give the citizens of this Nation an opportunity by constitutional amendment to determine whether or not prayer shall be permitted in the public schools; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of North Dakota, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relating to the provision of assurances to the Government of the United States of the payment of non-Federal costs by the State and its political subdivisions in federally approved water projects; to the Committee on Public Works.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of North Dakota, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to favoring early development of the Pipestem Creek, near Jamestown, N. Dak., and urging the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers to expedite completion of its investigations, and develop a favorable report, thereon; to the Committee on Public Works.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia:

H.R. 4921. A bill for the relief of Anis Butros Sakhleh; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GRAY:

H.R. 4922. A bill for the relief of Dr. Jose Munoz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HEALEY:

H.R. 4923. A bill for the relief of David Gottlieb; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MILLER of California:

H.R. 4924. A bill for the relief of Gordon W. Heritage, Sr., and Sara Martha Heritage; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'NEILL:

H.R. 4925. A bill for the relief of Ng Yee Fee; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE

THURSDAY, MARCH 14, 1963

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, and was called to order by the Vice President.

Rev. Kenneth J. Sharp, canon, the Washington Cathedral, Washington, D.C., offered the following prayer:

O gracious Father, since it is of Thy mercy that another day is added to our lives, we here dedicate both our souls and bodies to Thee and Thy service. Grant, we beseech Thee, that this day may be to us one of healthful work and progress. Guide, we pray Thee, all those to whom Thou hast committed the government of this Nation. Grant at this time to the President of these United States, the Senate, and all others who are engaged in government, special gifts of wisdom and understanding, of counsel and strength, that, upholding what is right and following what is true, they may in their wisdom follow Thy holy will.

Kindle, we pray Thee, in the hearts of all men the true love of peace; and guide with Thy strong and peaceful wisdom those who take counsel for the nations of the earth. Guide them, we pray, into the way of justice and truth, and establish among them the peace which is the fruit of righteousness.

O blessed Lord God, who didst reveal Thyself to bring abundant life to all mankind, we pray Thee that all who here on earth possess the abundance of this world may desire it so keenly for others, that unjust conditions may become intolerable, and that all who love Thee may become rich in their concern for justice and equality toward all men. O Thou who hast created man in Thine own image, give all in authority the strength fearlessly to contend against evil, and to make no peace with oppression; and that we may reverently use our freedom, help us to employ it in the maintenance of justice among men in our country and all nations.

Grant us, O Lord, to pass this day in gladness and peace, without stumbling and without stain; that, reaching the eventide victorious over all temptation, we may praise Thee, the eternal God, who art blessed, and dost govern all things, world without end. Amen.

The grace of our Lord, Jesus Christ, and the love of God, and the fellowship of the Holy Ghost be with us all, evermore. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. HUMPHREY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, March 11, 1963, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States, submitting nominations, were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, notified the Senate that, pursuant to the provisions of section 1, Public Law 86–420, the Speaker had appointed Mr. NIX, Chairman, Mr. MONTOYA, Mr. McDOWELL, Mr. ZABLOCKI, Mr. MACDONALD, Mr. WRIGHT, Mr. JOHNSON of California, Mr. WHALLEY, Mr. DERWINSKI, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. NORBLAD, and Mr. SPRINGER as members of the U.S. delegation of the Mexico-United States Interparliamentary Group on the part of the House, for the meeting to be held in Guanajuato, Republic of Mexico, beginning on Monday, March 18, 1963.

The message also informed the Senate that, pursuant to the provisions of section 1, Public Law 86–420, the Speaker had appointed Mr. REIFEL of South Dakota, Mr. MORSE of Massachusetts, and Mr. CAMERON of California as members of the U.S. delegation of the Mexico-United States Interparliamentary Group, on the part of the House, for the meeting to be held in the Republic of Mexico, beginning on Monday, March 18, 1963, to fill the existing vacancies thereon.

The message announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 39. An act to amend the act of June 4, 1948, as it relates to the appointment of the District of Columbia Armory Board;

H.R. 682. An act to amend the act of March 3, 1901, to permit the appointment of new trustees in deeds of trust in the District of Columbia by agreement of the parties;

H.R. 1933. An act to amend the act of February 9, 1907, entitled "An act to define the term 'registered nurse' and to provide for the registration of nurses in the District of Columbia," as amended, with respect to the minimum age limitation for registration;

H.R. 1935. An act to authorize the acquisition, training, and maintenance of dogs to be used in law enforcement in the District of Columbia;

H.R. 1937. An act to amend the act known as the Life Insurance Act of the District of Columbia, approved June 19, 1934, and the act known as the Fire and Casualty Act of the District of Columbia, approved October 3, 1940;

H.R. 1982. An act to amend section 10 of the District of Columbia Traffic Act, 1925, as amended, so as to require reports of collisions in which motor vehicles are involved;

H.R. 2438. An act to extend the induction provisions of the Universal Military Training and Service Act, and for other purposes;

H.R. 2440. An act to authorize appropriations during fiscal year 1964 for procurement, research, development, test, and evaluation of aircraft, missiles, and naval vessels for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes;

H.R. 2485. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to make regulations to prevent and control the spread of communicable and preventable diseases," approved August 11, 1939, as amended; and

H.R. 3537. An act to increase the jurisdiction of the Municipal Court for the District of Columbia in civil actions, to change the names of the court, and for other purposes.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

The following bills were severally read twice by their titles and referred, as indicated:

H.R. 39. An act to amend the act of June 4, 1948, as it relates to the appointment of the District of Columbia Armory Board;

H.R. 682. An act to amend the act of March 3, 1901, to permit the appointment of new trustees in deeds of trust in the District of Columbia by agreement of the parties;

H.R. 1933. An act to amend the act of February 9, 1907, entitled "An act to define the term 'registered nurse' and to provide for the registration of nurses in the District of Columbia," as amended, with respect to the minimum age limitation for registration;

H.R. 1935. An act to authorize the acquisition, training, and maintenance of dogs to be used in law enforcement in the District of Columbia;

H.R. 1937. An act to amend the act known as the Life Insurance Act of the District of Columbia, approved June 19, 1934, and the act known as the Fire and Casualty Act of the District of Columbia, approved October 3, 1940;

H.R. 1982. An act to amend section 10 of the District of Columbia Traffic Act, 1925, as amended, so as to require reports of collisions in which motor vehicles are involved;

H.R. 2485. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to make regulations to prevent and control the spread of communicable and preventable diseases," approved August 11, 1939, as amended; and

H.R. 3537. An act to increase the jurisdiction of the Municipal Court for the District of Columbia in civil actions; to change the names of the court, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H.R. 2438. An act to extend the induction provisions of the Universal Military Training and Service Act, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 2440. An act to authorize appropriations during fiscal year 1964 for procurement, research, development, test, and evaluation of aircraft, missiles, and naval vessels for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION

Upon request of Mr. HUMPHREY, and by unanimous consent, the Subcommittee on Antitrust and Monopoly of the Senate Judiciary Committee was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

LIMITATION OF STATEMENTS DURING MORNING HOUR

On request of Mr. HUMPHREY, and by unanimous consent, statements during the morning hour were ordered limited to 3 minutes.

APPOINTMENTS BY THE VICE PRESIDENT

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair announces the appointment of Senator TALMADGE, of Georgia, and Senator WILLIAMS, of Delaware, as negotiators under the Trade Expansion Act, pursuant to recommendations by the leadership and the chairman of the Finance Committee.

The Chair also announces the appointment of the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. McGOVERN] as a member of the delegation on the part of the Senate, of the Mexico-United States Interparliamentary Group for the meeting to be held in Guanajuato, Republic of Mexico, beginning on Monday, March 18, 1963, vice Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey, excused.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

REPORT OF U.S. SOLDIERS' HOME

A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the U.S. Soldiers' Home, for the fiscal year 1962 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

AUTHORIZATION OF CERTAIN CONSTRUCTION AT MILITARY INSTALLATIONS

A letter from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize certain construction at military installations, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Armed Services.

AMENDMENT OF LAW RELATING TO MATERIAL AND NECESSARY WITNESSES TO CRIMES COMMITTED IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the law relating to material and necessary witnesses to crimes committed in the District of Columbia (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

AUDIT REPORT ON OUTDOOR RECREATION RESOURCES REVIEW COMMISSION

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report on the Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission, for the period June 28, 1958, through September 1, 1962 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORT ON EXAMINATION OF UNNECESSARY COSTS INCURRED BY THE DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY IN THE PROCUREMENT OF AIRBORNE EARLY WARNING SEARCH RADARS

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the examination of unnecessary costs incurred by the Department of the Navy in the procurement of airborne early warning search radars, dated March 1963 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

LAWS ENACTED BY LEGISLATURE OF GUAM

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of laws enacted by the Sixth Guam Legislature 1962 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REPORT ON LIBRARY OF CONGRESS

A letter from the Librarian of Congress, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the Library of Congress, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1962 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, and so forth, were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of California; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

"ASSEMBLY JOINT RESOLUTION 12

"Joint resolution relative to memorializing the Congress of the United States to establish a 'National Flag Week.'

"Whereas the flag of the United States is symbolic of that which is most cherished and desired by man—freedom; and

"Whereas the freedom represented by the American flag was hard won by our forefathers, and thus far preserved; and

"Whereas this symbol of freedom has been the inspiration and hope of the oppressed and persecuted of the world; and

"Whereas in these times of complacency, the people of the State, as well as of the Nation, would do well to pause and consider the meaning of the now taken for granted freedom symbolized by our flag: Now therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Assembly and the Senate of the State of California, jointly, That the Legislature of the State of California respectfully memorializes the Congress of the United States to do whatever is necessary to establish the 7-day period commencing with the first day of July of each year as National Flag Week, wherein the people of the Nation will be urged to display the American flag annually, each of these 7 days; and be it further

"Resolved, That the chief clerk of the assembly is hereby directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of California; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service:

"ASSEMBLY JOINT RESOLUTION 11

"Joint resolution relative to a commemorative stamp honoring Hollywood's entertainment industry

"Whereas, for over half a century Hollywood has been famous as the center of the motion picture industry and, in more recent years, the center of the television, radio, and recording industries; and

"Whereas, film production, of which Hollywood is the world center, is not only a means of entertainment, but serves for the recordation of significant events, for the propagation of ideas, as a social medium of considerable importance, as a valid art form in its own right, and preserves the colorful history of the United States; and

"Whereas, the Hollywood Museum, as the archive of momentous films of national and international scope and the exhibition hall for modern, as well as historic, picture filming techniques, will be dedicated in Hollywood in June of 1964: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Assembly and the Senate of the State of California, jointly, That the Legislature of the State of California respectfully memorializes the Postmaster General of the United States to provide for the issuance in June of 1964 of a commemorative stamp honoring Hollywood the "center of the entertainment industry"; and be it further

"Resolved, That the chief clerk of the assembly be directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Postmaster General of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives and to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States."

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of North Dakota; to the Committee on Government Operations:

"SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION W

"Concurrent resolution urging the U.S. Congress to provide for the payment of the bonded indebtedness and the special assessments of any property which the Federal Government acquires by condemnation

"Whereas when either the Federal Government or the State of North Dakota or any of its political subdivisions, exercises the power of eminent domain the bonded indebtedness and special assessments of the condemned property are assumed by the remaining property within the political subdivisions of which such condemned property is a part; and

"Whereas this imposes an inequitable and oftentimes burdensome financial obligation upon the remaining property; and

"Whereas North Dakota's 38th Legislative Assembly is presently considering legislation which would require the State agencies condemning property to pay the proportionate share of the bonded indebtedness and special assessments of any property acquired by condemnation: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate of the State of North Dakota (the House of Representatives concurring therein), That the 38th Legislative Assembly hereby respectfully urges and requests the Congress of the United States to enact legislation whereby the U.S. Government would pay the proportionate share of the bonded indebtedness and special assessments of any property which it acquires pursuant to its powers of eminent domain; and be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of state is hereby directed to forward copies of this resolution to the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the President of the Senate of the U.S. Congress, and to each member of the North Dakota congressional delegation.

"FRANK A. WENSTROM,
"President of the Senate.
"HOWARD F. DOHERTY,
"Secretary of the Senate.
"STANLEY SAUGSTAD,
"Speaker of the House.
"GERALD F. STAIR,
"Chief Clerk of the House."

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of North Dakota; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

"SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 1

"Concurrent resolution relating to the provision of assurances to the Government of the United States of the payment of non-Federal costs by the State and its political subdivisions in federally approved water projects

"Whereas the Federal Water Supply Act of 1958 authorizes the inclusion of water supply storage in reservoirs constructed by the Corps of Engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation for present or anticipated future demand or need for municipal or industrial water, provided the Federal Government is reasonably assured by the States, political subdivisions, or local interests, that the water will be needed and that the non-Federal financial obligation for the water supply features will be fulfilled; and

"Whereas the State of North Dakota through the State water conservation commission is authorized to participate in works for the conservation, development, distribution, and utilization of its water resources; and

"Whereas affected local interests have requested and the State water conservation commission has recommended the inclusion of not less than 2,900 acre-feet of water supply storage in the Bowman-Haley Reservoir on the north fork of the Grand River in North Dakota: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate of the State of North Dakota (the House of Representatives concurring therein), That in view of the ever-increasing demand and anticipated future need for water, the legislature hereby declares as its policy that conservation and storage of water supplies should be provided wherever and whenever feasible and practicable, and that it concurs in the request of local interests and the recommendation of the State water conservation commission for inclusion of the maximum water supply storage in the Bowman-Haley Reservoir project; and be it further

"Resolved, That the legislature recognizes the non-Federal repayment obligations required in connection with providing water supply features in federally financed projects and hereby directs the State water conservation commission to make and supply such assurances relative thereto as may be required by and satisfactory to the Chief of Engineers; and be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of state is directed to transmit a copy of this resolution to the Chief of Engineers of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, each member of the North Dakota congressional delegation, the President of the U.S. Senate, the Speaker of the U.S. House of Representatives, the chairmen of the U.S. Senate and House Appropriations Committees, and the Governor of North Dakota.

"FRANK A. WENSTROM,
"President of the Senate.
"HOWARD F. DOHERTY,
"Secretary of the Senate.
"STANLEY SAUGSTAD,
"Speaker of the House.
"GERALD F. STAIR,
"Chief Clerk of the House."

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of North Dakota; to the Committee on Public Works:

"SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION R

"Concurrent resolution favoring early development of the Pipestem Creek, near Jamestown, N. Dak., and urging the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers to expedite completion of its investigations, and develop a favorable report thereon

"Whereas increased public demand for more and improved water management requires the optimum development of our precious water resources for controlling floods, providing water supplies for municipal, industrial, agricultural, recreational, fish and wildlife and other purposes; and

"Whereas the Pipestem Creek, the major tributary of the James River in North Dakota, contributes up to 45 percent of the water during flooding of the James River below their confluence, offers an excellent opportunity for multiple-purpose use if properly developed and it will thereby enhance instead of impair property values in affected urban and rural areas; and

"Whereas further surveys and investigations for construction of a proposed dam and reservoir thereon, about 5 miles upstream from Jamestown, are continuing under the direction of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers in cooperation with other agencies: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate of the State of North Dakota (the House of Representatives concurring therein), That the 38th Legislative Assembly of the State of North Dakota does hereby express its keen interest in, and endorsement of, the proposed development on the Pipestem Creek for the many beneficial purposes aforesaid, and urges the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers to complete its work as expeditiously as possible in the hope that a favorable report thereon can be

developed and authorizing legislation enacted in the near future; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the secretary of state transmit copies hereof to the Chief of Engineers, the Riverdale Area Office of Corps of Engineers, the President of the U.S. Senate and Speaker of U.S. House of Representatives, and the North Dakota congressional delegation.

"Frank A. Wenstrom,
"President of the Senate.
"Howard F. Doherty,
"Secretary of the Senate.
"Stanley Saugstad,
"Speaker of the House.
"Gerald F. Stair,
"Chief Clerk of the House."

A resolution of the House of Representatives of the State of Indiana; to the Committee on Public Works:

"House Resolution 18

"Whereas it is for the economic and industrial good of the State of Indiana that its land be used for productive purposes whereever feasible; and

"Whereas it appears that certain forces are inimical to the economic betterment of the State of Indiana in its proposed development; and

"Whereas the construction of a deepwater port on Lake Michigan within the territorial limits of the State of Indiana will benefit the economy and development of Indiana; and

"Whereas there are certain insidious elements at work to prevent the development of such deepwater port by the acquisition of land for the admirable but spurious purpose of creating a national park: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the house of representatives*, That it is the expressed policy of the State of Indiana, by the House of Representatives of the 93d General Assembly of said State, that land of said sovereign State situate within 25 miles of Lake Michigan shall not be ceded or surrendered to the United States of America or any other sovereign power whose intentions do not coincide with the best interests of the State of Indiana in the construction and development of a deepwater port on the shores of Lake Michigan in the area of Burns ditch.

"Charles W. Edwards,
"Representative."

CONCURRENT RESOLUTIONS OF NORTH DAKOTA LEGISLATURE

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record and appropriately referred, three resolutions adopted by the North Dakota State Legislature.

These resolutions are on subjects on which the North Dakota people have very strong views. These views, I believe, are very ably expressed in these resolutions.

There being no objection, the concurrent resolutions were appropriately referred, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

To the Committee on Commerce:

"Senate Concurrent Resolution H

"Concurrent resolution urging the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service of the Department of the Interior to establish reasonable regulations in respect to the number and species of ducks that may be shot in North Dakota and also urging the United States to enter into an agreement with Mexico to prevent the wholesale slaughter of ducks in Mexico

"Whereas North Dakota raises and feeds more ducks than any other State, and several times more than are shot by State-licensed hunters; and

"Whereas the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service of the Department of the Interior has imposed unreasonable restrictions respecting the number and species of ducks that may be taken during the hunting season, such restrictions in effect requiring the hunters to carry a duck identification book and field glasses in one hand and a gun in the other; and

"Whereas ducks migrating from Canada, and from North Dakota and other States of the United States, are being slaughtered in wholesale numbers in Mexico due to an absence of restrictions respecting duck hunting and the allowance of commercial duck hunting and trapping: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the Senate of the State of North Dakota* (*the House of Representatives concurring therein*), That the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service of the Department of the Interior establish reasonable regulations which would allow North Dakota hunters to take a greater number of species and ducks during the forthcoming hunting seasons; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the United States enter into negotiations with Mexico in order to prevent the unreasonable slaughter in Mexico of ducks raised in Canada, and in North Dakota and other States of the United States; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That copies of this resolution be forwarded by the secretary of state to the North Dakota State game and fish commissioner, the North Dakota delegation in Congress, and the Director of the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service of the Department of the Interior at Washington, D.C.

"Frank A. Wenstorm,
"President of the Senate.
"Howard F. Doherty,
"Secretary of the Senate.
"Stanley Saugstad,
"Speaker of the House.
"Gerald F. Stair,
"Chief Clerk of the House."

To the Committee on the Judiciary:

"Senate Concurrent Resolution R.R.

"Concurrent resolution to memorialize the Congress of the United States to immediately take the necessary steps to give to the citizens of this Nation an opportunity by constitutional amendment to determine whether or not prayer shall be permitted in the public schools.

"Whereas no civilization, no government, and no nation has ever existed, nor could they be possible, without a fundamental and profound recognition of and reverence for some authority, some ideal, some being, superior to the individual, which in our national heritage we have expressed as a belief in and dependence upon Almighty God; and

"Whereas our national tradition and heritage of public and civic prayer give purpose and meaning to our Union as a Nation, without which we could only suffer the anarchy or tyranny of the oppressed peoples in less enlightened parts of the world; and

"Whereas education may be a worthless thing if limited to merely the dissemination of factual information without the expression and understanding of ideas, ideals, theories, customs, and beliefs of other men, whether designated as being of a religious nature or by some other appellation; and

"Whereas none of the constitutional safeguards of individual rights and civil liberties of the citizens of these United States were designed or intended to prohibit prayer in the schools or in any other public place, so long as no citizen is coerced into a participation therein inconsistent with his own beliefs; and

"Whereas the Supreme Court of the United States has had occasion upon June 25, 1962, in its decision rendered in the case of *Engel et al.* v. *Vitale et al.*, No. 468 upon the docket of its 1961 October term, to so construe our Constitution as to prohibit public prayer in public schools: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the Senate of the State of North Dakota* (*the House of Representatives concurring therein*), That the Congress of the United States is hereby memorialized to immediately take the necessary steps to provide the citizens of this great Nation an opportunity to amend the U.S. Constitution to determine whether or not public prayer shall be permitted in the public schools of the several States; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the secretary of state shall forward copies of this resolution to the President of the U.S. Senate, the Speaker of the U.S. House of Representatives, and to each member of the North Dakota congressional delegation.

"Frank A. Wenstrom,
"President of the Senate.
"Howard F. Doherty,
"Secretary of the Senate.
"Stanley Saugstad,
"Speaker of the House.
"Gerald F. Stair,
"Chief Clerk of the House."

(The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a concurrent resolution of the North Dakota Legislature, identical with the foregoing, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.)

To the Committee on Public Works:

"House Concurrent Resolution L

"Concurrent resolution endorsing and supporting the construction of the proposed Pembilier Dam and Reservoir project and commending the agencies participating in its investigation and planning

"Whereas the proposed Pembilier Dam and Reservoir on the Pembina River, near Walhalla, N. Dak., is progressing to the point where a report thereon by the investigating agencies of both Canada and the United States can be expected before another session of the legislature; and

"Whereas the surveys, investigations, and studies so far made all indicate economic feasibility, that the construction thereof would insure control of flooding on the Pembina River, adequate municipal and industrial water supplies for several communities in both countries, also supplemental water for potential irrigable areas, and for other beneficial purposes; and

"Whereas the International Joint Commission has developed much time and study to this proposal and has individually and collectively toured the Pembina River Basin and inspected the various sites and areas involved in the proposed project: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of North Dakota* (*the Senate concurring therein*), That the 38th Legistive Assembly of the State of North Dakota hereby reaffirms its wholehearted endorsement and support of the Pembilier Dam and Reservoir project aforesaid, commends the International Joint Commission and all the agencies of both Canada and the United States participating in the important investigative and planning activities for their faithful and conscientious devotion to their task and trusts that the definite report thereon will become available sometime during the next fiscal year; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That copies hereof be transmitted by the secretary of state to the President of the United States; Secretary of the Department of State; President of the U.S. Senate; Chief of Engineers, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers; district engineer, St. Paul office of U.S. Army Corps of Engineers; Commissioner, Bureau of Reclamation; Chairmen of the Canadian and United States Sections, International Joint Commission; Members of the North Dakota delegation in Congress; and the Governor of North Dakota.

"STANLEY SAUGSTAD,
"Speaker of the House.
"GERALD F. STAIR,
"Chief Clerk of the House.
"FRANK A. WENSTROM,
"President of the Senate.
"HOWARD F. DOHERTY,
"Secretary of the Senate."

(The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a concurrent resolution of the State of North Dakota, identical with the foregoing, which was referred to the Committee on Public Works.)

APPOINTMENT OF VETERANS TO CIVIL SERVICE POSITIONS—RESOLUTION

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, on February 28, 1963, a resolution was unanimously approved by Frank Stull Post No. 152, the American Legion, Department of Kansas, Ness City, Kans., in regard to the appointment of veterans to civil service positions.

During the past few months I have received many letters and resolutions from veterans and veteran organizations stating that veterans' preference was not followed in making appointments to positions in the Post Office Department, and it is my hope that this situation will be corrected.

I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be made a part of these remarks and referred to the appropriate committee.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, as follows:

Whereas the Congress of the United States has developed a point preference system for veterans taking civil service examinations; and

Whereas this would indicate that the Congress intended to favor said veterans when applying for jobs in the field of civil service; and

Whereas the Post Office Department and other agencies coming under the civil service regulations have followed this policy; and

Whereas a situation has arisen in this community that would indicate appointments covered under civil service regulations are being made without considering the applicants' service in the Armed Forces of the United States; and

Whereas it is the belief of this post that such appointments should be made on the basis of ability and veterans' preferences and not on the basis of previous or current political activity: Be it therefore

Resolved, That this post take all necessary action to inform the citizens of the community as to the situation as pertains to the appointment of applicants in the field of civil service; and be it further

Resolved That this action be brought to the attention of all county committee members of all political parties in this area; and be it further

Resolved, That this action be brought to the attention of the U.S. Congressman from this district, the U.S. Senators from this State, and the district, State, and national levels of this organization.

VERN E. CRANSTON,
Commander.

Attest:

WILLIAM D. BRACKNEY,
Adjutant.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. RUSSELL, from the Committee on Armed Services, without amendment:

H.R. 2438. An act to extend the induction provisions of the Universal Military Training and Service Act, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 64).

By Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, without amendment:

S. Con. Res. 29. Concurrent resolution to print with illustrations "A Report on U.S. Foreign Operations in Africa," by Senator ALLEN J. ELLENDER (Rept. No. 65);

S. Con. Res. 14. Concurrent resolution to print as a Senate document, with illustrations, a pamphlet entitled "Our Capitol," and to print additional copies thereof (Rept. No. 73);

S. Res. 72. Resolution to print as a Senate document a report on Colorado River storage project and participating projects, etc. (Rept. No. 74);

S. Res. 99. Resolution to print as a document, with additional copies, a compilation of materials relating to the history of the Committee on Banking and Currency (Rept. No. 77);

S. Res. 105. Resolution to print as a document a compilation of materials entitled "Summer Employment by College Students in the Federal Government—1961" (Rept. No. 75); and

S. Res. 106. Resolution to print additional copies of Senate Document No. 117, 84th Congress, relating to the Communist Party of the United States (Rept. No. 76).

By Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, with amendments:

S. Con. Res. 26. Concurrent resolution to authorize the printing as a House document the pamphlet entitled "Our American Government. What Is It? How Does It Function?" (Rept. No. 70); and

S. Res. 56. Resolution to investigate antitrust and monopoly laws of the United States (Rept. No. 67).

By Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, without additional amendments:

S. Res. 29. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Commerce to make a study of certain matters under its jurisdiction (Rept. No. 71).

By Mr. BYRD of Virginia, from the Committee on Finance, without amendment:

H.R. 212. An act to amend section 904, title 38, United States Code, so that burial allowances might be paid in cases where discharges were changed by competent authority after death of the veteran from dishonorable to conditions other than dishonorable (Rept. No. 68); and

H.R. 2085. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that the deduction for child care expenses shall be available to a wife who has been deserted by and cannot locate her husband on the same basis as a single woman (Rept. No. 69).

By Mr. BYRD of Virginia, from the Committee on Finance, with amendments:

H.R. 1597. An act relating to the tax treatment of redeemable ground rents (Rept. No. 72).

AUTHORIZATION FOR SALE OF CERTAIN CADMIUM—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. SYMINGTON, from the Committee on Armed Services, reported an original bill (S. 1089) to authorize the sale, without regard to the 6-month waiting period prescribed, of cadmium proposed to be disposed of pursuant to the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act, and submitted a report (No. 66); which bill was read twice by its title, and placed on the calendar.

PERMISSION FOR CERTAIN FORMER EMPLOYEES OF THE SENATE TO TESTIFY IN THE CASE OF PENNSYLVANIA AGAINST BERMAN ET AL.—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, at the request of the senior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN] I report from the Committee on Government Operations an original resolution, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be stated.

The legislative clerk read the resolution (S. Res. 108) as follows:

Whereas, in the case of the *Commonwealth of Pennsylvania* v. *Abraham Berman, Edward Walker, Joseph Hartsough, Joseph Grace, John Joseph Elco, Raymond Cohen,* and *Ben Lapensohn,* Bill of Indictment No. 520 of the September 1959 Session of the Court of Oyer and Terminer of Philadelphia County of said Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, subpoenas ad testificandum and duces tecum were issued upon the application of the District Attorney of Philadelphia County and addressed as follows:

"To George Kopecky, Joseph Unger, Herbert J. Rose, Jr., Edgar C. Parkhurst, Charles Wolfe, and George Martin, all of whom are former employees of the Senate Select Committee on Improper Activities in the Labor or Management Field; and directing them to bring with them all of their notes, memoranda, workpapers, and records compiled by them in connection with the abovenamed defendants and Local 107 of the International Brotherhood of Teamsters, Chauffeurs, Warehousemen, and Helpers of America, which subpoenas are returnable on March 25, 1963, at 10 o'clock ante meridian"; and

Whereas said material is in the possession of and under the control of the Senate Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations of the Committee on Government Operations, by virtue of section 5 of Senate Resolution 255 of the 86th Congress; and

Whereas by the privileges of the Senate of the United States, no document under the control and in the possession of the Senate of the United States can, by the mandate of process of the ordinary courts of justice, be taken from such control or possession, but by its permission; and

Whereas by the privilege of the Senate and by Rule XXX of the Standing Rules of the Senate, no document shall be withdrawn from its files except by the order of the Senate; and

Whereas information secured by staff employees of the Senate pursuant to their official duties as employees may not be revealed without the consent of the Senate: Therefore be it

Resolved, That George Kopecky, Joseph Unger, Herbert J. Rose, Jr., Edgar C. Parkhurst, Charles Wolfe, and George Martin, former employees of the United States Senate Select Committee on Improper Activities in the Labor or Management Field, are authorized to appear and testify at the time and place, and before the court named in the subpoenas ad testificandum and duces tecum before mentioned, or at any continued and subsequent proceedings thereof, and to take with them such documents and papers called for in said subpoenas for production before said court where determined by the judge thereof to be material and relevant to the issues before him.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, there is presently pending in the court of quarter sessions, county of Philadelphia, Pa., a criminal action involving several individuals which is an outgrowth of an investigation conducted by the former Senate Select Committee on Improper Activities in the Labor or Management Field. This criminal action relates to persons identified with local No. 107 of the International Brotherhood of Teamsters which is located in Philadelphia, Pa. As you know, under Senate Resolution 255 of the 86th Congress, the files of that select committee were transferred to the custody of the Senate Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations.

The court in Philadelphia has issued subpenas requiring the testimony of several former employees of the Senate select committee and calling for the production of certain documents which are now part of the files of the Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations. Under the privileges of the Senate, no document under the control and in the possession of the Senate can be taken from its possession except by its consent and no information secured by staff employees of the Senate pursuant to their official duties as employees may be revealed except by consent of the Senate.

Accordingly, the purpose of this resolution is to permit these several employees of the former select committee to testify before the court in Philadelphia County and in connection therewith to present certain documentary evidence now in the files of the Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

The resolution (S. Res. 108) was considered and agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

PERMISSION FOR A CERTAIN EMPLOYEE TO TESTIFY IN CERTAIN PROCEEDINGS—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, at the request of the senior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN], I report from the Committee on Government Operations an original resolution and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be stated.

The legislative clerk read the resolution (S. Res. 109) as follows:

Whereas the Senate Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations of the Committee on Government Operations has in its possession, by virtue of Senate Resolution 250, certain evidence pertaining to an investigation of operations of the U.S. Department of Agriculture and its relationship with various individuals and corporations, which investigation was conducted by the Subcommittee under authority granted in said Senate Resolution 250; and

Whereas the action of the Department of Agriculture in cancelling cotton allotments transferred from the State of Oklahoma to the State of Texas by Walker Roman Nose, Erma Calf Bearhead, Ada L. Davis and other persons is now under appeal and is pending before the Review Committee for Area of Venue XXXIV, State of Texas, in re application for review by Agriculture Incorporated, farm No. 5519, Pecos County, Tex., Fort Stockton, Tex.; and

Whereas the Department of Agriculture has requested the production of evidence in the possession of the Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations concerning this matter and has requested that Arthur G. Kaplan, Assistant Counsel of the Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations, appear and testify; and

Whereas by the privileges of the Senate, no Member or Senate employee is authorized to produce Senate documents or to testify but by order of the Senate: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations of the Senate Committee on Government Operations is granted leave to permit the copying and presentation of certain evidence for examination in connection with the aforementioned proceedings, the evidence thereupon to be returned to the possession of the Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations; and be it further

Resolved, That Arthur G. Kaplan, an Assistant Counsel employed by the Senate, is authorized to appear and testify in the aforementioned proceedings.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, there is presently pending in Fort Stockton, Tex., a proceeding by the U.S. Department of Agriculture before the review committee for area of venue XXXIV of the State of Texas in regard to the application for review by Agriculture, Inc., Farm 5519, Pecos County, Tex.

This action relates to an appeal by several persons who transferred cotton allotments from the State of Oklahoma to the State of Texas by virtue of what has been ruled by the Department as a scheme or device. These allotments were canceled by the Department for these reasons and the action of the Department is now being contested before the review committee.

In connection with a recent investigation by the Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations of the Senate Committee on Government Operations, certain documents came into the possession of the subcommittee. The Department of Agriculture has requested that these documents be made available for the review proceedings to be conducted in Fort Stockton, Tex., and that Mr. Arthur G. Kaplan, assistant counsel, who acquired information during the course of his duties, germane to the review proceedings, be available to provide testimony.

By the privileges of the Senate no documents within control and possession of the Senate can be taken from the Senate without its consent. Likewise, information secured by staff employees of the Senate pursuant to their official duties as employees may not be revealed without the consent of the Senate.

The purpose of this resolution is to permit Mr. Arthur G. Kaplan to appear in Fort Stockton, Tex., before the review committee and to provide testimony, as well as to furnish documents in the possession of the subcommittee germane to the subject under review.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 109) was considered and agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

THE MASS TRANSPORTATION ACT OF 1963—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, from the Committee on Banking and Currency, I report favorably, with amendments, the bill (S. 6) to authorize the Housing and Home Finance Administrator to provide additional assistance for the development of comprehensive and coordinated mass transportation systems, both public and private, in metropolitan and other urban areas, and for other purposes.

I ask unanimous consent that the committee have until midnight, March 28, to file its report on the bill, and that then the report be printed, together with minority and individual views. This bill will be under consideration by the Commerce Committee until midnight March 28.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from New Jersey? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

REPORT ENTITLED "1963 JOINT ECONOMIC REPORT"—MINORITY AND ADDITIONAL VIEWS (S. REPT. NO. 78)

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, from the Joint Economic Committee, I submit a report entitled "1963 Joint Economic Report," which I ask may be printed, with illustrations.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The report will be received and printed, as requested by the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. HUMPHREY subsequently said: Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the joint economic report submitted by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] may be printed together with minority views, and the additional views of the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MILLER].

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

UTILIZATION OF FOREIGN CURRENCIES AND U.S. DOLLARS BY COMMITTEES IN CONNECTION WITH FOREIGN TRAVEL

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, in accordance with the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the reports of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, the Committee on

Armed Services, the Select Committee on Small Business, and the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy concerning the foreign currencies and U.S. dollars utilized by these committees in 1962 in connection with foreign travel.

There being no objection, the reports were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Report of expenditure of foreign currencies and appropriated funds by the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, U.S. Senate, expended between Jan. 1 and Dec. 31, 1962

Name and country	Name of currency	Lodging		Meals		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Senator Eugene J. McCarthy:											
Germany	Deutsche mark			358	89.50	442	110.50			800	200.00
Italy	Lira	306,605	493.64	174,469	281.09	597,070	961.42	127,129	204.70	1,205,273	1,940.85
Spain	Peseta	5,240	87.42	2,761	46.05	935	15.60	364	6.09	9,300	155.16
Switzerland	Franc	548.90	126.88	351	81.13	1295.20	299.38	304.90	70.48	2,500	577.87
Total			707.94		497.77		1,386.90		281.27		2,873.88

RECAPITULATION

	Amount
Foreign currency (U.S. dollar equivalent)	2,873.8

MARCH 14, 1963.

ALLEN J. ELLENDER,
Chairman, Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Report of expenditure of foreign currencies and appropriated funds by the Committee on Armed Services, U.S. Senate, expended between Jan. 1 and Dec. 31, 1962

Name and country	Name of currency	Lodging		Meals		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Senator Richard B. Russell:											
France	New franc	235	47.96	201	41.02	5	1.02	193	39.38	634	129.38
Do	Dollar				7.93				10.58		18.51
Italy	Lira	34,410	55.41	10,755	17.32			8,853	13.93	54,018	86.66
Do	Dollar				5.48				.40		5.88
Lebanon	Lebanese pound	124.10	39.03	53.80	16.92			98	30.82	275.90	86.77
Do	Dollar				11.67				10.78		22.45
Egypt	Egyptian pound	2.5	5.75	6	13.80			3.5	8.05	12	27.60
Do	Dollar				2.72				3.22		5.94
Cyprus	Cyprus pound	6.5	18.29	2.8	7.90	1	2.81	2.4	6.76	12.7	35.76
Israel	Israeli pound	101.47	33.82	54.40	18.13	130.50	43.50	30	10.00	316.37	105.45
Do	Dollar				2.13				2.78		4.91
Jordan	Jordanian dinar					7.75	22.10			7.75	22.10
Spain	Peseta	4,078	67.96	2,297	38.28			950	15.83	7,325	122.07
Do	Dollar				10.70				1.63		12.33
United States							103.00				103.00
Senator E. L. Bartlett:											
Japan	Yen	28,000	80.00	39,297	109.16	(1)		26,800	78.78	94,300	267.94
Do	Dollar				15.93	(1)	221.47		14.26		251.66
William H. Darden:											
France	New franc	212	43.26	201	41.02	5	1.02	186	37.96	604	123.26
Do	Dollar				7.93				10.58		18.51
Italy	Lira	24,250	39.05	10,755	17.32			8,278	13.33	43,283	69.70
Do	Dollar				5.48				.40		5.88
Lebanon	Lebanese pound	87.35	27.45	53.80	16.92			32	10.07	173.15	54.44
Do	Dollar				11.67				10.78		22.45
Egypt	Egyptian pound	2.5	5.75	6	13.80			1.5	3.45	10	23.00
Do	Dollar				2.72				3.22		5.94
Cyprus	Cyprus pound	6.7	18.86	2.7	7.61	1	2.81	2.4	6.76	12.8	36.04
Israel	Israeli pound	63.37	21.12	54.5	18.13	130.5	43.50	5	1.67	253.27	84.42
Do	Dollar				2.13				2.78		4.91
Jordan	Jordanian dinars					7.75	22.10			7.75	22.10
Spain	Peseta	2,859	47.65	2,322	38.70			679	11.32	5,860	97.67
Do	Dollar				10.70				1.63		12.33
United States	do						103.00				103.00
Total			551.36		513.22		566.33		361.15		1,992.06

---

[1] State Department purchased ticket and to date amount not reported to Washington, Mar. 8, 1963.

RECAPITULATION

	Amount
Foreign currency (U.S. dollar equivalent)	1,394.36
Appropriated funds:	
Government department:	
Navy	346.04
Air Force	251.66
Total	1,992.06

RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
Chairman, Committee on Armed Services.

Report of expenditure of foreign currencies and appropriated funds by the Committee on Armed Services, Preparedness Investigating Subcommittee, U.S. Senate, expended between Jan. 1 and Dec. 31, 1962

Name and country	Name of currency	Lodging		Meals		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Ronald Friedenberg:											
Canada	U.S. dollar								5.50		5.50
England	do		23.27		30.18		3.33		16.17		72.95
Norway	do		11.24		16.25				5.78		33.27
Germany	do		10.05		23.05		3.69		16.14		52.93
Italy	do		6.08		7.75				8.44		22.27
France	do		23.07		27.83		.22		15.05		66.17
Ben J. Gilleas:											
England	do		31.50		50.00		4.00		30.50		116.00
Germany	do		7.50		23.22				41.22		71.94
Denmark	do		8.40		26.00		3.70		21.00		59.10
Italy	do		9.00		14.00		2.55		31.00		56.55
Spain	do		14.00		11.00				10.00		35.00
France	do		28.50		21.00		9.00		25.00		83.50
James T. Kendall:											
England	do		31.50		50.00		4.00		30.50		116.00
Germany	do		7.50		23.22				41.22		71.94
Denmark	do		8.40		26.00		3.70		21.00		59.10
Italy	do		9.00		14.00		2.55		31.00		56.55
Spain	do		14.00		11.00				10.00		35.00
France	do		28.50		21.00		9.00		25.00		83.50
Total			271.51		395.50		45.74		384.52		1,097.27

RECAPITULATION

	Amount
Appropriated funds: Government department: Air Force	$1,097.27

Report of expenditure of foreign currencies and appropriated funds by the Select Committee on Small Business, U.S. Senate, expended between Jan. 1 and Dec. 31, 1962

Name and country	Name of currency	Lodging		Meals		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Richard J. Daschbach:											
Belgium	Franc	600	12.06	720	14.49					1,320	26.55
England	Pound	25.8	72.40	36.8	103.00	2.9	8.00	1.9	5.44	67	188.84
France	Franc	346.77	70.77	558.60	114.00	5,608	1,144.49	40.72	8.31	6,554.10	1,337.57
Germany	Mark	128	32.17	164	41.00	308	77.01			600	150.18
Italy	Lira	32,404	52.18	43,470	70.00	7,452	12.00	2,174	3.50	85,500	137.68
Netherlands	Guilder	34.8	9.69	50.3	14.00			15	4.17	100	27.86
Sweden	Krona	159.8	30.98	283.7	55.00	36.1	7.00	11.3	2.20	490	95.18
Daniel T. Coughlin:											
England	Pound	26/14	74.76	18	50.40	31	86.80	15	43.03	90/14	[1] 254.99
Belgium	Pound converted to franc.			4	11.20	18	50.40			22	61.60
Germany	Mark	202.44	50.61	192.48	48.00	383.24	95.81	330.04	82.50	1,013.68	[2] 276.92
Italy	Lira	84,672	141.12	43,200	72.00	31,200	52.00	20,926	24.74	180,000	289.86
France	New franc	555.85	111.17	180	36.00	50	10.00	154.15	30.83	940	[3] 188.00
William T. McInarnay:											
England	Pound	£31/2	88.24	£25	70.00	£62	173.74	£12	33.60	130/2	[4] 365.58
Germany	Deutsche mark	202.44	50.61	188.00	47.00	299.80	74.95	9.76	2.44	700.00	[5] 175.00
Italy	Lira	84,674	136.35	39,528	63.65	63,223	101.81	16,272	26.20	203,697	[6] 328.01
France	New franc	555.85	111.17	205	41.00	75	15.00	170	34.00	1,010.85	201.17
Neal D. Peterson:[7]											
Japan	Yen	40,320	112.00	30,240	84.00	720	2.00	1,835	5.10	73,115	[8] 203.10
Formosa	New Taiwan dollar.	2,400	60.00	1,040	26.00	160	4.00			3,600	90.00
Hong Kong	Hong Kong dollar.	229.40	40.00	97.50	17.00	23.10	4.03			350.00	61.03
Bangkok	Baht	1,146.75	55.00	364.88	17.50	44.87	2.14			1,556.50	74.64
Lebanon	Pound	143.28	48.00	41.79	14.00	5.98	2.00	10.20	3.44	201.25	67.44
Germany	Deutsche mark	576	144.00	180	45.00	64	16.00	15	3.75	835	208.75
Total			1,503.28		1,054.24		1,939.18		313.25		4,809.95

[1] Refunded: 13 pounds—$36.40. Have receipt from State Department.

[2] Refunded: 93 deutsche marks—$23. Have receipt from State Department.

[3] Refunded: 60 new francs—$12. Have receipt from State Department.

[4] Includes pounds converted to francs in Belgium. Have receipt for 20 pounds returned to State Department.

[5] Have receipt for 100 marks returned to State Department.

[6] Have receipt for 25,000 lire returned to State Department.

[7] Air travel purchased by the State Department from Pan American, payable in Dutch Guilders, American Dollar equivalent: $1,220.90.

[8] Mr. Peterson has receipt from State Department for 2,885 yen turned in upon his return to Washington, which amount has not yet been deducted from State Department figures.

RECAPITULATION

	Amount
Foreign currency (U.S. dollar equivalent)	4,809.95

JOHN SPARKMAN,
Chairman, Select Committee on Small Business.

MARCH 1, 1963.

Report of expenditure of foreign currencies and appropriated funds by Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, expended between Jan. 1 and Dec. 31, 1962

Name and country	Name of currency	Lodging		Meals		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
C. Holifield,[1] New Zealand	Pound	8	22.66	5	13.60	3	9.08			16	45.34
C. Hosmer,[1] New Zealand	do	8	22.66	5	13.60	3	9.07			16	45.33
J. Westland:[1]											
Italy	Lira	92,100	148.31	55,256	88.98	27,628	44.49	9,215	14.84	184,199	296.62
Spain	Peseta	5,000	83.36	3,000	50.01	1,500	25.00	500	8.33	10,000	166.70
Switzerland	Swiss franc	556	128.56	334	77.14	445	102.83	55	12.86	1,390	321.39
W. F. Bennett:											
Greece	Drachma	754.70	25.15	600	20.00	470	15.65	700	23.35	2,524.70	84.15
Turkey	Turkish lira	242	26.87	160	17.77	180	20.00	93	10.30	675	74.94
Switzerland	Swiss franc	104	26.00	200	49.70	136	34.25	56	15.75	496	125.70
Italy	Lira	48,748	78.50	57,287	92.25	44,556	71.75	44,432	71.55	195,023	314.05
	Dutch guilder					3,048	[2] 846.60			3,048	846.60
	French franc					1,799	363.00			1,799	363.00
J. T. Conway:											
Greece	Drachma	2,925	97.42	1,755	58.50	877	29.33	293	9.75	5,850	195.00
Turkey	Turkish pound	125	13.88	75	8.33	38	4.18	12	1.38	250	27.77
Italy	Lira	31,050	50.00	18,630	30.00	9,315	15.00	3,105	5.00	62,100	100.00
France	French franc	472.04	96.34	283.21	57.80	141.60	28.90	47.20	9.65	944.05	192.69
Germany	Deutsche mark	400.00	100.20	240.00	60.10	120.00	30.05	40.00	10.00	800.00	200.35
	do					2,219.64	[2] 556.30			2,219.64	556.30
J. R. Newman, Belgium	Franc	2,667	53.34	3,900	78.00	750	15.00	458	9.16	7,775	155.50
	Deutsche mark					2,219.62	[2] 556.35			2,219.62	556.35
Total			973.25		715.78		2,776.83		201.92		4,667.78

[1] Military air transportation.

[2] Commercial air transportation.

RECAPITULATION

	Amount
Foreign currency (U.S. dollar equivalent)	4,667.78

JOHN O. PASTORE,
Chairman, Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

MARCH 8, 1963.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
JOINT COMMITTEE ON ATOMIC ENERGY,
March 12, 1963.

Hon. CARL HAYDEN,
Chairman, Committee on Appropriations, U.S. Senate.

DEAR SENATOR HAYDEN: In accordance with the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, there is submitted herewith an itemized report showing the amounts in dollar equivalent values of foreign currencies expended by the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy in connection with official visits by members and staff to various installations abroad during the period from January 1, 1962, to December 31, 1962.

Transportation by commercial aircraft was used by the members and staff from the United States abroad and return. Counterpart funds were used in each of these cases as indicated on the attached form A. Military Air Transport was also used where indicated. The miscellaneous column in the report includes funds expended for diplomatic and protocol functions. It also includes telephone charges for committee purposes.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN O. PASTORE,
Chairman.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. JOHNSTON, from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service:

William J. Hartigan, of Massachusetts, to be an Assistant Postmaster General.

By Mr. CANNON, from the Committee on Armed Services:

Edmund T. Pratt, Jr., of New York, to be Assistant Secretary of the Army.

By Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

Ray H. Hemenway, of Minnesota, to be U.S. marshal for the district of Minnesota; and

Jack T. Stuart, of Mississippi, to be U.S. marshal for the southern district of Mississippi.

By Mr. LONG of Missouri, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

Richard D. Fitzgibbon, Jr., of Missouri, to be U.S. attorney for the eastern district of Missouri.

By Mr. KEATING, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

Robert M. Morgenthau, of New York, to be U.S. attorney for the southern district of New York.

By Mr. SCOTT, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

William J. Nealon, Jr., of Pennsylvania, to be U.S. district judge for the middle district of Pennsylvania.

By Mr. DIRKSEN, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

Carl E. McGowan, of Illinois, to be U.S. circuit judge for the District of Columbia circuit; and

John W. Douglas, of Maryland, to be an Assistant Attorney General.

By Mr. BEALL, from the Committee on Commerce:

Paul J. Tierney, of Maryland, to be an Interstate Commerce Commissioner.

By Mr. MAGNUSON, from the Committee on Commerce:

Capt. James D. Craik, and Capt. Louis M. Thayer, Jr., for promotion to the permanent rank of rear admiral in the U.S. Coast Guard;

Frank S. Kapral, to be a member of the permanent commissioned teaching staff of the U.S. Coast Guard Academy;

Kenneth A. Cox, of Washington, to be a member of the Federal Communications Commission; and

James H. Blumer, and sundry other persons, for permanent appointment in the Coast and Geodetic Survey.

By Mr. PASTORE, from the Committee on Commerce:

Edgar F. Kaiser, of California, and sundry other persons, to be incorporators of the Communications Satellite Corp.; and

Leo D. Welch, of New York, and Joseph V. Charyk, of California, to be incorporators of the Communications Satellite Corporation.

By Mr. McNAMARA, from the Committee on Public Works:

Brig. Gen. Robert F. Seedlock, U.S. Army, to be a member of the Mississippi River Commission.

Mr. ANDERSON subsequently said: Mr. President, under the provisions of section 302 of the Communications Satellite Act of 1962, the President has nominated 14 men to be incorporators of that Corporation for which the Senate confirmation is required. The Commerce Committee has held hearings on this matter and has unanimously favorably reported these men to the Senate.

As in executive session, in accordance with the wishes of the members of the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences, of which I am chairman, and as previously discussed with the chairman and members of the Commerce Committee, I ask unanimous consent that these 14 nominees be referred to the Space Committee for further consideration.

I can assure the Senate that it is not the intention of the Space Committee to cause an undue delay in the confirmation of these nominations. The committee will consider and dispose of this matter in the quickest possible time.

Mr. HUMPHREY. In other words, I understand the nominations will go before the Space Committee for consideration.

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes. They go to both committees. This time they went to the Commerce Committee.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

Bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. MAGNUSON (by request):

S. 1061. A bill to exempt certain carriers from minimum rate regulation in the transportation of bulk commodities, agricultural and fishery products, and passengers, and for other purposes; and

S. 1062. A bill to provide for strengthening and improving the national transportation system, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. Magnuson when he introduced the above bills, which appear under separate headings.)

By Mr. MAGNUSON (for himself, Mr. Allott, Mr. Bartlett, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Bible, Mr. Burdick, Mr. Byrd of West Virginia, Mr. Carlson, Mr. Church, Mr. Curtis, Mr. Douglas, Mr. Eastland, Mr. Fong, Mr. Gruening, Mr. Hruska, Mr. Humphrey, Mr. Jackson, Mr. Long of Missouri, Mr. Mansfield, Mr. McCarthy, Mr. McClellan, Mr. McGee, Mr. McGovern, Mr. Mechem, Mr. Metcalf, Mr. Monroney, Mr. Morse, Mr. Moss, Mr. Mundt, Mrs. Neuberger, Mr. Pearson, Mr. Randolph, Mr. Smathers, Mr. Symington, and Mr. Yarborough):

S. 1063. A bill to amend section 1(14)(a) of the Interstate Commerce Act to insure the adequacy of the national railroad freight car supply, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. Magnuson when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MAGNUSON (by request):

S. 1064. A bill to amend the act redefining the units and establishing the standards of electrical and photometric measurements to provide that the candela shall be the unit of luminous intensity; and

S. 1065. A bill to amend section 20b of the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended; to the Committee on Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. Magnuson when he introduced the above bills, which appear under separate headings.)

By Mr. McGEE:

S. 1066. A bill for the relief of the E. L. K. Oil Co.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HUMPHREY:

S. 1067. A bill to amend section 9(b)(3) of the National Labor Relations Act in order to permit labor organizations representing guards to be admitted to certain affiliations of labor organizations; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. TALMADGE:

S. 1068. A bill to make feed available at reduced prices for foundation herds of hogs in disaster areas; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

S. 1069. A bill for the relief of Angelos Michael Patelis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. Talmadge when he introduced the first above-mentioned bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. EASTLAND (for himself, Mr. Stennis, Mr. Aiken, and Mr. Young of North Dakota):

S. 1070. A bill to assist the States to provide additional facilities for research at the State agricultural experiment stations; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

(See the remarks of Mr. Eastland when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. BOGGS:

S. 1071. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to remove the excise tax on table tennis tables, balls, nets, and paddles; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. RIBICOFF:

S. 1072. A bill to amend the Social Security Act to assist States and communities in preventing and combating mental retardation through expansion and improvement of the maternal and child health and crippled children's programs, through provision of prenatal, maternity, and infant care for individuals with conditions associated with childbearing which may lead to mental retardation, and through planning for comprehensive action to combat mental retardation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. Ribicoff when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. BAYH (for himself and Mr. Hartke):

S. 1073. A bill to authorize the construction of the Lafayette Reservoir in the State of Indiana for flood control, recreation, and related purposes; and

S. 1074. A bill to authorize the construction of the Big Pine Reservoir in the State of Indiana for flood control, recreation, and related purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

(See the remarks of Mr. Bayh when he introduced the above bills, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. DODD (for himself, Mr. Hart, Mr. Javits, Mr. Keating, and Mr. Humphrey):

S. 1075. A bill to prohibit discrimination in employment in the District of Columbia because of race, religion, color, national origin, or ancestry; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

(See the remarks of Mr. Dodd when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. JAVITS:

S. 1076. A bill to amend the act of September 13, 1961, entitled "An act for the relief of Benjamin Schoenfeld"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEFAUVER:

S. 1077. A bill to amend the Administrative Procedure Act with respect to the compensation of hearing examiners, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BIBLE (by request):

S. 1078. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Public School Food Services Act;

S. 1079. A bill to amend the act of March 3, 1901, relating to divorce, legal separation, and annulment of marriage in the District of Columbia;

S. 1080. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to create a Board for the Condemnation of Insanitary Buildings in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved May 1, 1906, as amended;

S. 1081. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for compulsory school attendance, for the taking of a school census in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved February 4, 1925; and

S. 1082. A bill to establish in the Treasury a Correctional Industries Fund for the government of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. SMATHERS:

S. 1083. A bill to amend section 274 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 relating to disallowance of deduction for certain travel and entertainment expenses; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. Smathers when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. HOLLAND (for himself and Mr. Smathers):

S. 1084. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide a form of averaging for recovery of amounts received as damages for injury to crops through pollution of air, water or soil; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. HARTKE:

S. 1085. A bill for the relief of Haralambos Foufas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. METCALF:

S. 1086. A bill to provide for the acquisition of certain lands by the U.S. Government that have been flooded by the Ableman Dam and Whitewater Reservoir; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 1087. A bill to provide for the establishment of cooperative outdoor recreation research centers; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. DIRKSEN:

S. 1088. A bill to revive the office of General of the Armies of the United States and to authorize the President to appoint General of the Army Douglas MacArthur to such office; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. SYMINGTON:

S. 1089. A bill to authorize the sale, without regard to the 6-month waiting period prescribed, of cadmium proposed to be disposed of pursuant to the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act; placed on the calendar.

(See the reference to the above bill, which appears under the heading "Reports of Committees.")

By Mr. CASE (for himself and Mr. Hart):

S. 1090. A bill to authorize the disposal of the property known as Ellis Island for purposes consistent with the public interest and welfare; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. BEALL (by request):

S. 1091. A bill to enable the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia to aid the arts in ways similar to those in which the arts are aided by other cities of the United States, to provide competitions to encourage young Americans in the pursuit of excellence in the fine arts and to acquaint them with the best of our national cultural heritage, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

S. 1092. A bill to provide retirement bene-

By Mr. YARBOROUGH:

fits for certain U.S. Army officers; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BENNETT (for himself, Mr. McClellan, Mr. Mundt, Mr. Byrd of Virginia, Mr. Williams of Delaware, Mr. Thurmond, Mr. Tower, Mr. Miller, and Mr. Dirksen):

S. 1093. A bill to establish a Federal policy concerning the termination, limitation, or establishment of business-type operations of the Government which may be conducted in competition with private enterprise, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

(See the remarks of Mr. Bennett when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. McCARTHY:

S. 1094. A bill to amend section 105(d) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to clarify the tax treatment of school teachers under wage continuation plans; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 1095. A bill for the relief of Florentina Nuguid De Haberer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LAUSCHE:

S. 1096. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Susanna Grum (Susanne Roth); and

S. 1097. A bill for the relief of Despina J. Sanios; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

S. 1098. A bill for the relief of Fun Wat Hoy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCOTT:

S. 1099. A bill relating to rate of postage on publications designed specifically for religious instruction classes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

S. 1100. A bill to prevent the importation of flat glass which is the product of any country or area dominated or controlled by communism; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. Scott when he introduced the above bills, which appear under separate headings.)

By Mr. RUSSELL (for himself and Mr. Saltonstall (by request)):

S. 1101. A bill to authorize certain construction at military installations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. DIRKSEN:

S.J. Res. 59. Joint resolution to authorize the city of Galena, Ill., or an appropriate association or organization of the citizens thereof, to remove to Galena, Ill., the statue of Gen. John A. Rawlins located at Rawlins Park, Washington, District of Columbia; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

(See the remarks of Mr. Dirksen when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. McNAMARA:

S.J. Res. 60. Joint resolution providing for acceptance by the United States of America of an instrument for the amendment of the constitution of the International Labor Organization; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. McNamara when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. McCARTHY:

S.J. Res. 61. Joint resolution to establish a Joint Committee on Foreign Information and Intelligence; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION

TO EXPRESS THE SENSE OF CONGRESS ON CLOSING THE PANAMA CANAL TO CERTAIN TYPES OF CARGO

Mr. SCOTT submitted the following concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 31), which was referred to the Committee on Commerce:

> *Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring)*, That it is the sense of the Congress that passage through the Panama Canal and use of any seaport facilities under the jurisdiction of the United States should be permanently denied to any vessel which, after the date of the adoption of this concurrent resolution, carries or attempts to carry to Cuba a cargo consisting in whole or in part of petroleum or petroleum products, or armaments or other materials of war; and be it further
>
> *Resolved*, That the President is requested to take such action as may be necessary to give effect to this concurrent resolution.

Mr. SCOTT subsequently said: Mr. President, I have submitted today a concurrent resolution that it is the sense of the Congress that passage through the Panama Canal and use of any seaport facilities under the jurisdiction of the United States should be permanently denied to any vessel which, after the date of the adoption of the resolution, carries or attempts to carry to Cuba a cargo consisting in whole or in part of petroleum or petroleum products, or armaments or other materials of war.

The resolution further requests that the President take such action as may be necessary to give effect to this resolution.

This resolution is an effort to provide the President with additional weapons to drive the Russians and their Communist hirelings out of Cuba.

The 1962 annual report of the Board of Directors of the Panama Canal Company reports the following increases in Red trade:

> Showing a very impressive percentage increase for the year was the volume of cargo moving to Red China and Russia. Cargo movements to Red China totaled 877,000 long-tons for an increase of 600 percent and movements to Russia totaled, 344,000 long-tons for an increase of 48 percent. Sugar movements from Cuba accounted for the vast majority of this combined tonnage. In the return flow of cargo, Red China and Russia shipped 52,000 tons of cargo to Cuba.

The United States very properly stopped purchasing Cuban sugar in order to bring pressure upon the Cubans and thereby encourage the downfall of Fidel Castro. But Red China and Soviet Russia have been taking huge amounts of Cuban sugar in barter deals.

We know that some of that Red bloc trade has been in oil, and we know that oil feeds the Cuban war machine. The resolution I propose is an effort to arm the United States with additional weapons to stunt the growth of the Cuban war machine and to prevent the further arming and resupply of Soviet military forces in Cuba.

RESOLUTIONS

PERMISSION FOR CERTAIN FORMER SENATE EMPLOYEES TO TESTIFY IN THE CASE OF PENNSYLVANIA AGAINST BERMAN ET AL.

Mr. JACKSON (for Mr. McClellan), from the Committee on Government Operations, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 108) permitting certain former employees of the U.S. Senate to appear and testify in the case of Commonwealth of Pennsylvania against Berman et al., which was considered and agreed to.

(See the above resolution printed in full where it appears under the heading "Reports of Committee.")

PERMISSION FOR A CERTAIN EMPLOYEE OF THE SENATE TO TESTIFY IN CERTAIN PROCEEDINGS

Mr. JACKSON (for Mr. McClellan), from the Committee on Government Operations, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 109) permitting a certain employee of the Senate to appear and testify in certain proceedings, which was considered and agreed to.

(See the above resolution printed in full where it appears under the heading "Reports of Committees.")

TO PRINT AS A SENATE DOCUMENT A TRANSLATION OF A BOOK ENTITLED "LARGE DAMS OF THE U.S.S.R.", WITH ILLUSTRATIONS AND AN EXPLANATORY STATEMENT

Mr. MOSS, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 110) to print as a Senate document a translation of a book entitled "Large Dams of the U.S.S.R.", with illustrations and an explanatory statement, which under the rule, was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

> *Resolved,* That there be printed as a Senate document a translation of the book "Large Dams of the U.S.S.R." prepared under the National Science Foundation translation, program, together with illustrations and an explanatory statement of Senator Frank E. Moss of Utah in connection therewith; and that there be printed an additional 500 copies of such document for the use of the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

AMENDMENT OF RULE XXV OF STANDING RULES OF THE SENATE RELATIVE TO MEETINGS OF COMMITTEES WHILE THE SENATE IS IN SESSION

Mr. CHURCH (for himself, Mr. Monroney, Mr. Anderson, Mr. McGee, and Mr. Pastore) submitted a resolution (S. Res. 111) amending rule XXV of the standing rules relative to meetings of committees while the Senate is in session, which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

(See the above resolution printed in full when submitted by Mr. Church, which appears under a separate heading.)

DEATH OF REPRESENTATIVE CLYDE DOYLE OF CALIFORNIA

Mr. ENGLE (for himself and Mr. Kuchel) submitted a resolution (S. Res. 112) relative to the death of Representative Clyde Doyle, of California, which was considered and agreed to.

(See the above resolution printed in full when submitted by Mr. Engle, which appears under a separate heading.)

PROPOSED LEGISLATION RELATING TO TRANSPORTATION

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, by request, I introduce, for appropriate reference, two bills which have been requested by the administration. These measures, embodying the recommendations contained in the President's transportation message of April 1962 are, except for technical adjustments, identical to the proposals introduced and heard last year before both the Senate and House Commerce Committees.

This is major legislation, calling for a substantial modification of the existing Government regulatory pattern; a modification characterized in last year's message as "greater reliance on the forces of competition, less on the restraints of regulation." The central provision geared to this philosophy is one that would extend to the now fully regulated railroads, the agricultural and bulk commodity exemptions from controlled minimum rates available to highway and inland water carriers. Wisely, however, the letter of transmittal from the President also suggested, as an alternative, that—

> regulation might be applied in the areas presently exempt. I, therefore, renew my request that, in the interest of equality, one of these solutions be adopted.

Expeditious and effective decisions on these bills would be facilitated if the administration would also transmit to Congress the factual studies and underlying data on which the recommendations are based. It has been a perennial problem in the field of transportation legislation to subject value judgments and opinions to factual analysis because the facts have not been readily available. Prompt receipt of this information will enable not only prompter decisions, but better ones.

I ask unanimous consent that a letter from the President of the United States, and a letter from the Secretary of Commerce requesting the proposed legislation, be printed in the Record.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bills will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the letters will be printed in the Record.

The bills, introduced by Mr. Magnuson, by request, were received, read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Commerce, as follows:

S. 1061. A bill to exempt certain carriers from minimum rate regulation in the transportation of bulk commodities, agricultural and fishery products, and passengers, and for other purposes; and

S. 1062. A bill to provide for strengthening and improving the national transportation system, and for other purposes.

The letters presented by Mr. Magnuson are as follows:

March 5, 1963.

Hon. Lyndon B. Johnson,
President of the Senate,
Washington, D.C.
Hon. John W. McCormack,
Speaker of the House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. President (Mr. Speaker): Although our Nation enjoys one of the most highly developed and diversified transportation systems in the world, it has been severely handicapped by laws and regulations which have failed to keep pace with advancing technology. In my message to the Congress last year, I pointed out that the basic objective of our transportation system must be to assure the availability of fast, safe, and economical transportation services needed in a growing and changing economy to move people and goods, without waste or discrimination, in response to private and public demands, at the lowest cost consistent with health, convenience, and national security. In that message I recommended a number of legislative steps to accomplish this purpose.

If action is not taken to establish a transportation policy consistent with the new demands upon the economy, we face serious problems of dislocation and deterioration in both the transportation industry and the economic life of the Nation which it affects. I urge that action be taken to establish such a policy.

Our objectives must be achieved, primarily, by continued reliance on unsubsidized, privately owned facilities, operating under the incentives of private profit and the checks of competition insofar as this is practicable. The law should provide a consistent and comprehensive framework of equal competitive opportunity that will achieve this objective at the lowest economic and social cost to the Nation. There must be equality of opportunity for all modes and for all passengers and shippers, without any special preferences. There should be maximum reliance on the forces of competition consistent with a continuing need for protection against destructive competition between forms of transportation or between competing carriers.

I am transmitting herewith, for the consideration of the Congress, draft legislation carrying out these principles, providing equality of opportunity among carriers, removing artificial barriers to the realization of the inherent advantages that each mode of transportation possesses, and assuring the protection of the antitrust laws against any destructive competition.

The most significant recommendation in my message of last year dealt with the inequality resulting from exempt transportation of bulk commodities by water and agricultural products by truck. All traffic, however, moving by railroad is fully regulated. I recommended that this inequality be corrected by removing minimum rate regulation from all transportation of bulk and agricultural commodities, but under the protection of existing laws against monopolistic and predatory trade practices applicable to business generally. In the alternative, appropriate regulation might be applied in the areas presently exempt, as I recommended in my message last year. I, therefore, renew my request that, in the interest of equality, one of these solutions be adopted.

I am also enclosing a copy of a letter from the Secretary of Commerce to me discussing legislation in greater detail. I urge that the Congress give prompt consideration to these proposals. I also recommend that legislation be enacted to make domestic truck air carriers ineligible for operative subsidies in the future, to require motor carriers and freight forwarders to pay reparations to shippers charged unlawfully high rates, to make motor carrier safety regulations applicable to private carriers, and to repeal the prohibition against rail carriers transporting commodities in which they have an interest.

These bills, if enacted, will represent a major accommodation to the present needs of the economy. They should strengthen our carriers, provide their users with a better and cheaper system of transportation, and help relieve the taxpayers of unnecessary burdens.

Sincerely,

John F. Kennedy.

The Secretary of Commerce,
Washington, D.C., February 15, 1963.

The President,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. President: Submitted herewith are two proposed bills to implement certain recommendations contained in your message to the 87th Congress on April 5, 1962, concerning "The Transportation System of Our Nation." Both bills are consistent with the primary objective of that message to achieve a more efficient and economical national transportation system by placing greater reliance on competition. The first bill would reduce regulation by exempting from minimum-rate control carriers not presently exempt in the carriage of bulk commodities, agricultural and fishery products, and intercity passengers. The second bill would:

(a) Authorize and encourage common carriers to conduct experiments in rate simplification, freight classifications, and new services;

(b) Extend to all shippers and carriers the right to ship vehicles and containers by any mode at nondiscriminatory rates;

(c) Encourage the establishment of through service and joint rates by all combinations of modes and assure the reasonableness of such rates;

(d) Provide for cooperative enforcement of highway transportation regulation by the ICC and the States;

(e) Increase and extend the civil forfeiture penalties to violations of safety regulations and operations without authority;

(f) Require air carriers to pay reparations to shippers charged unlawfully high rates;

(g) Authorize simplification of Government transportation rates and procurement and greater flexibility in the use of motor vehicle common carriers for the transportation of mail; and

(h) Transfer the existing railroad loan guarantee program from the ICC to the Department of Commerce.

These bills are substantially the same as those introduced in the last Congress (S. 3242 and S. 3243; H.R. 11583 and H.R. 11584). The only changes are necessary technical corrections. In order to keep these bills in the same form as those on which extensive hearings have been held, we have not incorporated proposals which you recommended in your message last year which had previously been introduced in the Congress. It is recommended that you again endorse proposals to make domestic trunk air carriers ineligible for operating subsidies in the future, to require motor carriers and freight forwarders to pay reparations to shippers charged unlawfully high rates, to make motor carrier safety regulations applicable to private carriers, and to repeal the prohibition against rail carriers transporting commodities in which they have an interest.

As you have said, fundamental reforms in our national transportation policy are required now to achieve a fast, safe, and economical transportation system sufficient to meet our national economic and security objectives. Equality of opportunity for all forms of transportation is a keystone of this reform. Therefore, I recommend strongly that the Congress act favorably on these bills to strengthen and improve our national transportation system.

Respectfully yours,

Luther H. Hodges.

ADEQUACY OF NATIONAL RAILROAD FREIGHT CAR SUPPLY

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and 35 cosponsors, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill which is designed to improve the railroad freight-car shortage. This measure has been requested by the Interstate Commerce Commission, a copy of whose "Justification" is included to explain the procedures and need for the bill.

In addition, I am appending a letter from the vice president and general manager of the Burlington Railroad pointing out some most current facts which should be considered.

Particularly at peak harvest time, the perennial railroad freight-car shortage has been particularly costly to both the railroads and the producers. This can be avoided by providing for economic incentive for a freight car to be returned to the owning railroad.

I ask unanimous consent that the letter from the vice president and general manager of the Burlington Railroad be printed in the Record.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the letter will be printed in the Record.

The bill (S. 1063) to amend section 1 (14) (a) of the Interstate Commerce Act to insure the adequacy of the national railroad freight-car supply, and for other purposes introduced by Mr. Magnuson (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

The letter presented by Mr. MAGNUSON is as follows:

This proposed bill would give effect to legislative recommendation No. 2 of the Interstate Commerce Commission as set forth on page 198 of its 76th annual report as follows:

We recommend that section 1(14) be amended to authorize the Commission to determine whether per diem charges for the use of railroad freight cars shall be computed on the basis of cost of ownership and maintenance, value of use, or upon such other basis or combination of bases as will, in its judgment, provide reasonable compensation to the owner, contribute to sound car service practices, and encourage the acquisition of an adequate national fleet of freight cars.

JUSTIFICATION

The purpose of the attached draft bill is to grant the Interstate Commerce Commission authority to prescribe per diem charges for the use of railroad freight cars on a basis that will provide an economic incentive to the railroads to acquire and maintain a supply of freight cars adequate to meet the needs of commerce and the national defense.

The diminishing supply of railroad freight cars has been a matter of considerable concern to the Commission for many years. Despite the generally expanding economy of the country, the ownership of freight cars is now less than it was during World War II. As a result, critical shortages of varying duration and severity have occurred in almost every year during periods of peak loadings. Studies made in 1950 indicated that a total of 1,935,500 freight cars would be required by 1956 to meet the anticipated needs of shippers. As of January 1, 1956, however, freight-car ownership and control of class I railroads (including railroad-owned or controlled refrigerator cars) totaled only 1,774,614 cars. As of October 1, 1962, this figure had fallen to 1,626,281 cars.

In addition to inadequate car ownership, one of the greatest contributing factors to recurring freight-car shortages has been the failure of some carriers to utilize the existing fleet of equipment more efficiently. During periods of critical shortages the Commission has resorted to every means at its command to cope with the problem. Greatly stepped-up demurrage charges have helped to insure prompt loading and unloading by shippers and receivers. Such action is ineffectual, however, when the equipment is in the hands of the carrier.

A relatively high percentage of unserviceable or bad order cars over the last several years has also constituted an important factor in aggravating the freight-car shortage situation. Considering 5 percent of car ownership to represent a normal amount of unserviceable cars, the percentage for the years 1959–61 was 8.4, 7.1, and 9.2, respectively. Moreover, while the figure has declined somewhat to 8.6 as of January 1, 1962, and 8.3 as of October 1, 1962, this is the result of an increase in cars being retired as well as in cars being repaired. In this connection, it is noted that the percentage of unserviceable cars being held for heavy repairs (more than 20 man-hours) has increased from 5.6 of car ownership (not including railroad owned or controlled refrigerator cars) as of January 1, 1955, to 7.1 as of October 1, 1962.

Since the earning value of the average freight car greatly exceeds the current per diem charge of $2.88, some of the carriers have found it cheaper to pay the per diem or car rental charge than to own cars. These carriers, therefore, have no economic incentive to provide their fair share of an adequate car supply.

Some time ago the Commission attempted to take the profit out of "renting" equipment by imposing a penalty per diem charge which it believed would furnish a pecuniary spur to deficit railroads to acquire a sufficient number of cars to at least take care of their own loading obligations. (Increased Per Diem Charges on Freight Cars, 268 I.C.C. 659 (1947)). However, in *Palmer* v. *United States*, 73 F. Supp. 63 (1947), a three-judge district court set aside the Commission's order holding that it could not prescribe per diem charges for "regulatory" purposes. The effect of this decision has been construed as precluding the Commission from prescribing per diem charges which would produce a profit to the carrier owner, provide an incentive for car ownership, recognize the value of the use of freight cars, and require the acquisition and maintenance of a car supply adequate to meet the needs of commerce and of the national defense. While the Palmer case may not place the stringent limitations upon the Commission which some suggest, we believe that there is sufficient doubt in this respect that it should be made clear in the statute that the Commission has authority to establish per diem charges above the bare costs of ownership and at a level that would make the advantages of owning equipment more attractive.

If the advantages of owning equipment could be made more attractive, there should be a greater willingness on the part of every railroad to make its just and equitable contribution to the national freight car fleet. The draft bill proposes to accomplish this objective by amending section 1(14)(a) of the act so as to authorize the Commission in establishing a per diem charge for the use of freight cars to determine whether such charge should be computed upon the basis of the elements of ownership expense involved, including a fair return on value, or on elements reflecting the value of their use, or upon such other basis or combination of bases as, in the Commission's judgment, will provide reasonable compensation to the owner, contribute to sound car service practices, and encourage the acquisition of an adequate national supply of freight cars. In essence, the proposal would authorize the Commission to fix per diem charges which would motivate every railroad to maintain its ownership of freight cars at a level which will meet the needs of the shipping public during normal times and provide a reasonable supply during periods of emergency. Its enactment would thus overcome the effect of the decision in the Palmer case and would be of substantial assistance to the Commission in its efforts to alleviate the crippling economic effects of freight car shortages.

BURLINGTON LINES,
Chicago, Ill., March 4, 1963.

Hon. WARREN G. MAGNUSON,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: When you reintroduce the per diem bill—identical to S. 886 last year—here is some late information which may be useful:

(1) The overall freight-car fleet is at its lowest level in more than 40 years, and each recent year, as well as each recent month, produces a new low. The earlier committee report contains earlier statistics, but the attached sheet shows for all freight cars (both owned and serviceable) and for boxcars (both owned and serviceable) the figures for January 1 of each year, 1958, through 1963, and for February 1, 1963.

(2) Extremely severe car shortages were suffered during the fall and early winter last year, and right now severe shortages of boxcars, for grain loading, exist quite generally in the West. In many areas this recent shortage has been accurately described as the "worst yet."

(3) If each railroad owned its share of needed freight cars, the debits and credits would offset each other, that is, the total amounts paid as rentals by car users would substantially equal the total amounts received by car owners. The Supreme Court, in effect, has expressed this conclusion. The facts do not accord with this theory. For many years the national per diem account has produced a net debit, ranging from $95.7 million in 1940 to $140.3 million in 1950, to $321.2 million in 1960, and to $344.3 million during 1961. Obviously, under these conditions, many roads do not own their fair share of the fleet. Stated otherwise, car rental has become increasingly more attractive than car ownership, with serious adverse effects upon the national car supply.

Cordially yours,

ELDON MARTIN,
Vice President and General Manager.

All freight cars

Date	*Ownership*	*Serviceable cars*
Jan. 1, 1958	1,746,684	1,656,791
Jan. 1, 1959	1,725,723	1,577,708
Jan. 1, 1960	1,677,965	1,556,602
Jan. 1, 1961	1,661,577	1,505,730
Jan. 1, 1962	1,606,696	1,465,568
Jan. 1, 1963	1,552,371	1,427,868
Feb. 1, 1963	1,546,951	1,419,887

Boxcars

Date	*Ownership*	*Serviceable boxcars*
Jan. 1, 1958	736,442	701,711
Jan. 1, 1959	722,732	672,011
Jan. 1, 1960	705,738	655,665
Jan. 1, 1961	692,565	634,561
Jan. 1, 1962	663,762	610,048
Jan. 1, 1963	637,775	587,960
Feb. 1, 1963	635,051	584,746

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, I am pleased to join in the sponsorship of S. 1063. I do so in the hope that it will, in at least some measure, help to relieve the recurring crises in shortages of boxcars by prescribing bases and procedures whereby there will be charged a more fair and adequate compensation for use of freight cars.

We in the Midwest have become unhappily accustomed to too few cars during our harvest season. At one time last fall, it was estimated that some 8 or 9 million bushels of grain were piled on the ground in Nebraska, Iowa, Missouri, and Illinois.

We have become accustomed to it but we do not like it. Each year, we call for action to end this shameful shortage of boxcars, but each year the problem only worsens.

Now, the boxcar crisis has become almost a year-round event. This is because the Department of Agriculture has vastly aggravated the situation with massive shipments of Commodity Credit Corporation stocks, some of them at the very height of the harvest season, and continuing through the winter.

I am informed that protests to the Secretary of Agriculture from the Interstate Commerce Commission are unheeded. This seems a strange attitude for an official allegedly concerned with the welfare of the Nation's farmers.

S. 1063 will help to alleviate the problem, but it will not be an overnight solution. The time has come for a concerted attack on this chronic condition by the shippers, the railroads, the Government agencies involved, and the Congress.

The number of dollars lost each year while grain spoils on the ground in the Midwest is incalculable. These lost dollars are paid by everyone: the farmer, the shipper, the taxpayer, and the consumer. It is sheer waste which is singularly out of place in a nation which takes great pride in the efficiency of its agriculture and its transportation system.

There is much that those of us with responsibility in this area can do:

First, the Congress by approving this bill and such additional legislation as is required, can discharge its obligation to give the administrative agencies the necessary tools to do the job.

Second, the Interstate Commerce Commission, by firm but fair application of service orders, can exercise its responsibility to check abuses of car use. In this connection, the Commission must devote adequate personnel to the job. It is discouraging to note that the Commission currently allots only 58 jobs to the car service section. Two years ago, this figure was 64. It was reduced to 63 with the transfer of 1 position to the public information program in the office of the Secretary. Presumably this is another evidence of the importance this administration attaches to managing the news—even the news concerning car shortages. In fiscal 1962, 2 more positions were dropped and last October, the car service section was notified that instead of the 64 positions it had requested, only 58 would be allotted, a further reduction of 3. For all I know, those three are also writing press releases.

Third, shippers and receivers of carload freight contribute to the shortage, by holding cars for an excessive length of time for loading or unloading. In effect, they use them for storage. This practice must be discontinued.

Fourth, the situation is complicated by the "assignment" of cars to certain industries. No accurate figures are available, but an educated guess by an expert in the field places the figure in excess of 20 percent of the supply. This has the effect of holding out of the general availability a fifth of the cars, placing the general shipping public at a distinct disadvantage with relation to special, favored industries.

Mr. President, none of these steps is being suggested for the first time. What is required now, in addition to approval of S. 1063, is a determination by all those concerned with this problem that it will be solved.

As a first step, the chairman of the Interstate Commerce Commission should call a conference of representatives of farmers, shippers, carriers, and the appropriate Federal agencies and insist on the development of a plan which will eliminate an unnecessary piece of economic nonsense which has precisely the same effect on the economy of the Nation as has a nationwide strike.

REDEFINING THE UNITS AND ESTABLISHING STANDARDS OF ELECTRICAL AND PHOTOMETRIC MEASUREMENTS

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, by request, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the act redefining the units and establishing the standards of electrical and photometric measurements to provide that the candela shall be the unit of luminous intensity. I ask unanimous consent that a letter from the Secretary of Commerce, including a statement of the purpose and need for this proposed legislation, be printed in the Record.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the letter and statement will be printed in the Record.

The bill (S. 1064) to amend the act redefining the units and establishing the standards of electrical and photometric measurements to provide that the candela shall be the unit of luminous intensity, introduced by Mr. Magnuson, by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

The letter and statement of purpose and need presented by Mr. Magnuson, are as follows:

The Secretary of Commerce,
Washington, D.C., March 1, 1963.
Hon. Lyndon B. Johnson,
President of the Senate,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. President: There are enclosed four copies of a draft bill "To amend the act redefining the units and establishing the standards of electrical and photometric measurements to provide that the candela shall be the unit of luminous intensity," and four copies of a Statement of Purpose and Need in support thereof.

We are advised by the Bureau of the Budget that, from the standpoint of the administration's program, there would be no objection to the submission of this proposed legislation to the Congress.

Sincerely yours,
Luther H. Hodges,
Secretary of Commerce.

Statement of Purpose and Need

When the act redefining the units and establishing standards of electrical and photometric measurements was passed in 1950 the term "candle" was in general use to designate the unit of luminous intensity. The act therefore designated the candle as the statutory unit of intensity of light. Since 1950, however, the word "candela" has been increasingly used in place of candle. At the present time the term "candle" is obsolete in international usage and domestically the Council of Illuminating Engineering Society has approved use of the term "candela." Moreover, "candela" is the term used in the International Lighting Vocabulary. Because the term "candle" has been designated by statute, the National Bureau of Standards has, over the past several years, used this term when reporting values of luminous intensity domestically. However, when making such reports abroad the term "candela" has been used, as for example in reports to the International Bureau of Weights and Measures. The Department believes it is desirable under the circumstances to change the statutory designation to accord with international usage in the interest of simplifying and expediting the work of the Bureau of Standards.

AMENDMENT OF SECTION 20b OF INTERSTATE COMMERCE ACT

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I introduce, by request, for appropriate reference, a bill which would amend section 20b of the Interstate Commerce Act. This bill is introduced at the request of the American Bar Association's Committee on Railroad Reorganizations and Readjustments and is similar to S. 2733, which I introduced in the 87th Congress. In fact, the only difference is that the new bill includes an amendment suggested by the Interstate Commerce Commission.

The American Bar Association believes that in the light of experience under section 20b of the Interstate Commerce Act, which was enacted in 1948, changes to increase its usefulness in effectuating the voluntary modification of railroad financial structures thereunder should be made so that (a) section 20b would be applicable not only to railroad corporations but to all carriers subject to paragraphs (2) to (11) of section 20a of the Interstate Commerce Act, except motor carriers having annual gross operating revenues of less than $10 million; (b) the assent of the holders of 75 percent of the outstanding securities of each affected class now required under section 20b would be reduced to 66⅔ percent; (c) the Commission would be authorized, as it deems appropriate, to consolidate proceedings under 20b with merger proceedings under section 5(2) of the Interstate Commerce Act.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1065) to amend section 20b of the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, introduced by Mr. Magnuson, by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

CORN PURCHASES BY HOG PRODUCERS

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, in the 1st session of the 87th Congress we passed a bill which amended section 407 of the Agricultural Act of 1949, to allow the sale of feed grains from CCC stocks at 75 percent of the support price, for maintenance of foundation herds of livestock in disaster areas. This relief is made available where the Secretary of Agriculture determines it necessary to alleviate damage, hardship, or suffering caused by severe drought, flood, or other natural disasters.

At the present time some 70 counties in Georgia have been declared disaster areas by the Secretary, and, therefore, are eligible for this assistance. This means that livestock producers in these counties are eligible to buy corn from CCC stocks at approximately 99 cents per bushel for foundation herds of cattle, sheep, and goats.

It has now been brought to my attention that hog producers are not eligible for this relief. Therefore, hog producers in these counties must pay approximately $1.32 per bushel for the same corn.

Mr. President, I feel that this emergency program should be extended to hog producers, and I introduce a bill which would make this possible. I ask that it be referred to the appropriate committee; and I hope favorable action will be taken in the near future.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1068) to make feed available at reduced prices for foundation herds of hogs in disaster areas, introduced by Mr. TALMADGE, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

FEDERAL GRANTS TO STATE AGRICULTURAL EXPERIMENT STATIONS

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, on behalf of myself, and Senators STENNIS, EDMONDSON, AIKEN, and YOUNG of North Dakota, a bill authorizing Federal grants to State agricultural experiment stations, on a matching basis, to help finance physical facilities as needed for effective conduct of adequate research programs.

In many instances, Federal and State research funds are utilized in providing qualified and efficient personnel to research specific farm problems. In too many of these instances the States have been unable to provide adequate physical facilities to fully utilize the talents of these research scientists.

This bill will authorize Federal assistance to the States as provided by the Congress to provide adequate facilities to obtain the optimum results from our research efforts. Its passage and funding will expedite research to solve many farm production problems. The solution of these problems will benefit the consumers of the Nation, as well as the farmers, who are doing such an excellent job of providing the food and fiber to feed and clothe our people and to support our foreign relations through donations and Public Law 480 sales.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1070) to assist the States to provide additional facilities for research at the State agricultural experiment stations, introduced by Mr. EASTLAND (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

MATERNAL AND CHILD HEALTH AND MENTAL RETARDATION PLANNING AMENDMENTS OF 1963

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill entitled "Maternal and Child Health and Mental Retardation Planning Amendments of 1963." I ask unanimous consent that the bill and an analysis of it be printed in the RECORD at the end of my remarks.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request by the Senator from Connecticut? The Chair hears none and it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, this bill completes the introduction of legislation to carry out President Kennedy's program in the field of mental health and mental retardation.

I am pleased and proud to present this bill to the U.S. Senate. I first came to know intimately the problems of the mentally retarded when I served as Governor of Connecticut. I was deeply impressed not only with the seriousness of the problem, but also with the indomitable courage of the families who bear this burden. The parents of retarded children are humanity's finest.

Despite great advances in medical science, mental retardation continues as a major national health, social, and economic problem.

It affects twice as many individuals—over 5 million—as blindness, polio, cerebral palsy and rheumatic heart disease combined.

About 400,000 of the mentally retarded require constant care or supervision. Over 200,000 are cared for in residental institutions mostly at public expense.

States and localities spend over one-half billion dollars for care and services for the mentally retarded.

Several billions of economic output are lost because of the inability of the mentally retarded to fully achieve or produce in our complex society.

But worst of all is the untold human anguish and suffering which results from mental retardation. Whenever and wherever it strikes, it is a tragedy for the entire family.

An estimated 15 to 20 million people live in families in which there is a mentally retarded individual. The cost to families who care for 96 percent of the Nation's retarded children and adults cannot be measured in economic terms alone, great as this might be. The cost of treatment and care of a mentally retarded child can and often does exhaust a family's financial resources. But economic costs cannot compare with misery and frustration and realization that one's child will be incapable of living a normal life or fully contributing to his own well-being and to society in later life.

Recognizing this problem, the President has proposed a nine-point legislative program to prevent mental retardation and to help the mentally retarded lead more useful, more satisfying lives. In the President's words:

> This neglect must end if our Nation is to live up to its own standards of compassion and dignity and achieve the maximum use of its manpower.

The President's proposals include funds for the construction of mental retardation research centers and the construction of facilities for the care, treatment, and training of the mentally retarded. These proposals are embodied in the bills S. 755 and S. 756, introduced by the distinguished chairman of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare [Mr. HILL].

The proposals also include amendments to the Vocational Rehabilitation Act which would provide Federal assistance for services to the mentally retarded and others whose vocational rehabilitation potential is difficult to determine. This also has been introduced in the form of S. 968 by the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL].

In addition, the President has proposed training, research, and demonstration grants for improving the education of handicapped children and special grants for schools for special projects in slums and depressed areas. Both programs would give emphasis to the problem of mental retardation in these special education fields and are included in the administration's omnibus education bill (S. 580) introduced by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] and others.

Finally, the President has proposed:

First. Project grants to the States to plan for comprehensive State and community action on mental retardation.

Second. Project grants for comprehensive maternity care—including infant care after childbirth—for women in low-income groups among whom there is a high incidence of births of children who are mentally retarded. This would be a 5-year program of project grants in which the Federal share would be up to 75 percent. The program would be administered by the Children's Bureau, under a proposed amendment to the Social Security Act.

Third. An expansion of both the maternal and child health program, and the crippled children's program of the Children's Bureau from the current $25 million annually for each program to an ultimate $50 million annually, after 7 years. Under the President's budget for fiscal 1964, at least $1 million would be used specifically for mental retardation activities in these two programs.

Fourth, a new research program of the Children's Bureau authorizing grants, contracts, and jointly financed cooperative arrangements relating to maternal and child health and crippled children's services. Of the recommended first year appropriation of $2.1 million, it is expected that about $500,000 would be used for research in the field of mental retardation.

The bill I introduce today is designed to carry out these four proposals in the President's program.

The bill is identical to H.R. 3386 introduced by Representative WILBUR MILLS. Its principal provisions were first recommended by the President's panel on mental retardation, whose work was carried on while I served as Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare. It is the administration's bill providing a necessary first step to initiate comprehensive planning by the States to make sure that needs and resources are carefully assessed and that programs for the retarded are given careful consideration throughout the Nation.

A healthy start in life should be the birthright of every child born in the United States. Unfortunately, this is not now the case. Despite the efforts already made by State and local health agencies in partnership with the Federal Government, there is much that still needs to be done to promote the health of mothers and their offspring so that these children may, insofar as humanly possible, be both physically and mentally fit; so that they may be, indeed, the Nation's greatest asset.

In order to accomplish this goal, the present programs for maternal and child health and for crippled children must be extended and improved, including clinical services for mentally retarded children, as provided in this bill. The great unmet needs for these services are steadily increasing because of the rising child population, rising costs of medical care, and changes in the practice of medicine and public health resulting from research findings. The results of research and the programs in modern medical practice should be more widely available, especially to mothers and children with critical needs.

Studies show that expectant mothers with low income often receive little or no prenatal care, frequently have complications of pregnancy, and are most likely to have premature babies who are particularly prone to brain damage and resultant mental retardation. These mothers and their babies constitute the vulnerable group in special need of care.

Programs for maternal and child health and crippled children's services will be more effective if they are accompanied by adequate programs, as proposed in this bill, for research directed toward the evaluation of services.

The problem of mental health and mental retardation can no longer be ignored. As the President said in his historic first message to Congress on this subject:

> This situation has been tolerated far too long. It has troubled our national conscience—but only as a problem unpleasant to mention, easy to postpone, and despairing of solution. * * * The time has come for a bold new approach.

The proposed legislation to deal with the problems of mental health and mental retardation now pending before Congress presents a great opportunity for this Nation to live up to its highest tradition of compassion for the less fortunate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1072) to amend the Social Security Act to assist States and communities in preventing and combating mental retardation through expansion and improvement of the maternal and child health and crippled children's programs, through provision of prenatal, maternity, and infant care for individuals with conditions associated with childbearing which may lead to mental retardation, and through planning for comprehensive action to combat mental retardation, and for other purposes introduced by Mr. RIBICOFF, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

EXHIBIT 1

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Maternal and Child Health and Mental Retardation Planning Amendments of 1963".

INCREASE IN MATERNAL AND CHILD HEALTH SERVICES

SEC. 2. (a) The first sentence of section 501 of the Social Security Act is amended by striking out "there is hereby authorized to be appropriated for each fiscal year beginning after June 30, 1960, the sum of $25,000,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "the following sums are hereby authorized to be appropriated: $25,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, $30,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, $35,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, $40,000,000 each for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and the succeeding fiscal year, $45,000,000 each for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and the succeeding fiscal year, and $50,000,000 each for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, and succeeding fiscal years."

(b) Subsection (a) (2) of section 502 of such Act is amended to read as follows:

"(2) The Secretary shall allot one-half of the sum appropriated under section 501 for each fiscal year as follows: He shall allot to each State $70,000 and such part of the remainder of such one-half as he finds that the number of live births in such State bore to the total number of live births in the United States in the latest calendar year for which he has statistics."

(c) (1) The first sentence of subsection (b) of section 502 of such Act is amended to read as follows: "The Secretary shall also allot to the States (in addition to the allotments made under subsection (a)) the remaining one-half of the sum appropriated for each fiscal year under section 501."

(2) The second sentence of such subsection (b) is amended by striking out "Such sums" and "such sums" and inserting in lieu thereof "Such one-half" and "such one-half", respectively.

INCREASE IN CRIPPLED CHILDREN'S SERVICES

SEC. 3. (a) The first sentence of section 511 of the Social Security Act is amended by striking out "there is hereby authorized to be appropriated for each fiscal year beginning after June 30, 1960, the sum of $25,000,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "the following sums are hereby authorized to be appropriated: $25,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, $30,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, $35,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, $40,000,000 each for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and the succeeding fiscal year, $45,000,000 each for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and the succeeding fiscal year, and $50,000,000 each for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, and succeeding fiscal years".

(b) So much of subsection (a)(2) of section 512 of such Act as ends with "to the States" is amended to read as follows: "The Secretary shall allot one-half of the sum appropriated under section 511 for each fiscal year as follows: He shall allot to each State $70,000 and shall allot the remainder of such one-half to the States".

(c)(1) The first sentence of subsection (b) of section 512 of such Act is amended to read as follows: "The Secretary shall also allot to the States (in addition to the allotments made under subsection (a)) the remaining one-half of the sum appropriated for each fiscal year under section 511."

(2) The second sentence of such subsection (b) is amended by striking out "Such sums" and "such sums" and inserting in lieu thereof "Such one-half" and "such one-half", respectively.

PROJECT GRANTS

SEC. 4. Part 4 of title V of the Social Security Act is amended to read as follows:

"PART 4—GRANTS FOR SPECIAL MATERNITY AND INFANT CARE PROJECTS AND RESEARCH PROJECTS

"Special project grants for maternity and infant care

"SEC. 531. (a) In order to help reduce the incidence of mental retardation caused by complications associated with childbearing, there are authorized to be appropriated $5,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, $15,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, and $30,000,000 for each of the next three fiscal years, for grants to assist in meeting the cost of projects as provided in this section.

"(b) From the sums appropriated under subsection (a), the Secretary is authorized to make grants to the State health agency of any State and, with the consent of such agency in the case of a project in which such agency is unable or unwilling to participate, to the health agency of any political subdivision of the State, to pay not to exceed 75 per centum of the cost of any project for the provision of all necessary health care to prospective mothers (including, after childbirth, health care to mothers and their infants) who have or are likely to have conditions associated with childbearing which increase the hazards to the health of the mothers or their infants (including those which may cause physical or mental defects in the infants) and who are unlikely to receive all necessary health care because they are from low-income families or for other reasons.

"(c) Payment of grants under this section may be made (after necessary adjustment on account of previously made underpayments or overpayments) in advance or by way of reimbursement, and in such installments and on such conditions, as the Secretary may determine.

"Research projects relating to material and child health services and crippled children's services

"SEC. 532. (a) There are authorized to be appropriated for each fiscal year, beginning with the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, such sums as the Congress may determine to enable the Secretary to make grants to or jointly financed cooperative arrangements with public or other nonprofit institutions of higher learning, and public or other nonprofit agencies and organizations engaged in research or in maternal and child health or crippled children's programs, and contracts with public or private agencies and organizations, and with individuals, engaged in research or in such programs, for research projects relating to maternal and child health services or crippled children's services which show promise of substantial contribution to the advancement thereof.

"(b) Payments of grants or under contracts or cooperative arrangements under this section may be made (after necessary adjustment, in the case of grants, on account of previously made underpayments or overpayments) in advance or by way of reimbursement, and in such installments and on such conditions, as the Secretary may determine."

MENTAL RETARDATION PLANNING

SEC. 5. The Social Security Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new title:

"TITLE XVII—GRANTS FOR PLANNING COMPREHENSIVE ACTION TO COMBAT MENTAL RETARDATION

"Authorization of appropriations

"SEC. 1701. For the purpose of assisting the States (including the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, Guam, and American Samoa) to plan for and take other steps leading to comprehensive State and community action to combat mental retardation, there is authorized to be appropriated the sum of $2,200,000.

"Grants to States

"SEC. 1702. The sums appropriated pursuant to section 1701 shall be available for grants to States by the Secretary during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and the succeeding fiscal year. Any such grants to a State may be used by it to determine what action is needed to combat mental retardation in the State and the resources available for this purpose, to develop public awareness of the mental retardation problem and of the need for combatting it, to coordinate State and local activities relating to the various aspects of mental retardation and its prevention, treatment, or amelioration, and to plan other activities leading to comprehensive State and community action to combat mental retardation.

"Applications

"SEC. 1703. In order to be eligible for grants under section 1702, a State must submit an application therefor which—

"(1) designates or establishes a single State agency as the sole agency for carrying out the purposes of this title;

"(2) indicates the manner in which provision will be made to assure full consideration of all aspects of services essential to planning for comprehensive State and community action to combat mental retardation, including services in the fields of education, employment, rehabilitation, welfare, health, and the law, and services provided through community programs for and institutions for the mentally retarded;

"(3) sets forth its plans for expenditure of such grants, which plans provide reasonable assurance of carrying out the purposes of this title;

"(4) provides for submission of a final report of the activities of the State agency in carrying out the purposes of this title, and for submission of such other reports, in such form and containing such information, as the Secretary may from time to time find necessary for carrying out the purposes of this title and for keeping such records and affording such access thereto as he may find necessary to assure the correctness and verification of such reports; and

"(5) provides for such fiscal control and fund accounting procedures as may be necessary to assure proper disbursement of and accounting for funds paid to the State under this title.

"Payments

"SEC. 1704. Payments of grants under this title may be made (after necessary adjustment on account of previously made underpayments or overpayments) in advance or by way of reimbursement, and in such installments and on such conditions, as the Secretary may determine."

MEANING OF "SECRETARY"

SEC. 6. As used in the amendments to the Social Security Act made by this Act, the term "Secretary" means the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

ANALYSIS OF MATERNAL AND CHILD HEALTH AND MENTAL RETARDATION PLANNING AMENDMENTS OF 1963

Section 1. This act may be cited as the "Maternal and Child Health and Mental Retardation Planning Amendments of 1963."

INCREASE IN MATERNAL AND CHILD HEALTH SERVICES

Section 2. The Social Security Act authorizes grants to State health agencies for services for promoting the health of mothers and children, especially in rural areas and in areas suffering from severe economic distress. The States must provide matching funds for one-half of the amount appropriated; the remainder is not matched and is distributed to the States on the basis of the financial need of each State for assistance in carrying out its State plan. The law now authorizes $25 million annually for these grants. This section would increase the amounts authorized for annual appropriation for maternal and child health services from the present $25 million to $30 million for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964; $35 million for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965; $40 million for the fiscal years 1966 and 1967; $45 million for the fiscal years 1968 and 1969; $50 million for the fiscal year 1970 and each year thereafter.

During the next fiscal year an estimated $500,000—part of the increased funds—would be expended on programs for the mentally retarded. This amount would increase in subsequent years.

The expansion of maternal and child health services provided for in this section would contribute to the reduction of infant and maternal mortality. States vary widely in rates of infant mortality (ranging from 19.6 to 41.6 per 1,000 live births) and in rates of maternal mortality (from 1.2 to 8.8 per 10,000 live births.) These rates could and should be reduced through application of measures such as maternal and child health services.

States would be in better position to keep pace with increased demands for these services as the child population continues to increase.

More mentally retarded children could be served through special diagnostic clinics for these children provided through State maternal and child health programs. In 1961 over 15,000 children, as compared with 12,000 in 1960, received services through these clinics. Despite this increase, applications for these services continued to exceed the resources of the clinics.

INCREASE IN CRIPPLED CHILDREN'S SERVICES

Section 3. The Social Security Act authorizes grants to State crippled children's agencies for services for locating crippled children and for providing medical, surgical, corrective, and other services and care, and facilities for diagnosis, hospitalization, and aftercare for children who are crippled or who are suffering from conditions which lead to crippling. The States must provide matching funds for one-half of the amount appropriated; the remainder is not matched and is distributed to the States on the basis of the financial need of each State for assistance in carrying out its State plan. The law now authorizes $25 million annually for these grants. This section would increase the amounts authorized for annual appropriation for crippled children's services from the present $25 million to $30 million for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964; $35 million for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965; $40 million for the fiscal years 1966 and 1967; $45 million for the fiscal years 1968 and 1969; $50 million for the fiscal year 1970 and each year thereafter.

During the next fiscal year an estimated $500,000—part of the increased funds—would be expended on programs for the mentally retarded. This amount would increase in subsequent years.

The increased funds under the proposal would encourage and assist States to keep pace with the following needed developments already underway in crippled children's programs:

1. Further broadening of the definition of "crippling" until all State crippled children's programs would serve children with any kind of handicapping condition or long-term illness.

2. The removal of unreasonable barriers to eligibility for services such as State requirements for court commitments or residence status.

3. Extension of the programs to urban areas.

4. The development of outpatient centers for handicapped children organized and staffed to provide the comprehensive services needed by children with all types of handicapping conditions, thus bringing together the services now being provided in many separate clinics.

5. The development of inpatient and outpatient facilities appropriate for adolescents.

7. The provision of special services for children who are both deaf and blind.

8. The development of demonstration centers for the early care of children with paraplegia and quadriplegia brought about by accident or disease.

PROJECT GRANTS

Section 4. The prevalence of mental retardation is higher in those population groups where maternity care is inadequate. The rate of premature births is higher among these groups, and the rate of mental retardation is substantially higher among premature infants than among full-term infants. Women who are most likely to have premature babies, with the resultant increased proportion of mentally retarded and brain-damaged children, are predominantly women in families with low incomes, who receive little or no prenatal care and who have complications of pregnancy. There are increasing numbers of women, especially in our larger cities, who are receiving inadequate maternity care. Complications of pregnancy are more prevalent among families with low income than in the rest of the population. For women with complications of pregnancy, it is of critical importance that good maternity care be provided during the prenatal period, labor, and after delivery. Their babies, especially if premature, will require intensive nursing care in hospitals.

This section authorizes the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to carry out a 5-year program of grants to provide necessary health care to prospective mothers who are unlikely to receive all necessary health care because they are from families with low income or for other reasons. In addition to health care during pregnancy, the care would include, following childbirth, health care to mothers and their infants. The health care would be available particularly for prospective mothers who have or are likely to have conditions associated with childbearing which increase the hazards to the health of mothers or their babies, including those which may cause physical or mental defects in the infants.

The annual appropriation authorized for these grants would be $5 million for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964; $15 million for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, and $30 million for each of the next 3 fiscal years.

The grants would be available to the State health agency or, with the consent of such agency, to the health agency of any political subdivision of the State. The grant would not exceed 75 percent of the cost of any projects.

This program would help to reduce the incidence of mental retardation caused by complications associated with childbearing. Of paramount importance would be efforts to decrease the number of premature births among which there are notable larger numbers of children born with handicapping conditions, including mental retardation.

The grants would enable health departments to provide comprehensive maternity care to selected high-risk patients and to improve greatly the quality and adequacy of care for these mothers and their babies by paying for their care in hospitals equipped and staffed to provide services of high quality for mothers suffering from complications of pregnancy.

This program would also increase the availability of prenatal clinics and bring them closer to the population served, so that patients could be seen earlier and complications recognized and treated in their early stages.

It would reduce overcrowding in the public hospitals.

It would contribute to increasing our knowledge of ways of reducing childhood disability that is related to damage during childbirth.

This section would also enable the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to make grants for research in maternal child health or crippled children's programs. They could be made to public and other nonprofit colleges and universities and public and other nonprofit agencies and organizations already engaged in this research. Contracts for this purpose could also be made with such groups and with other private research groups and individuals.

Congress would determine the sums to be used for this purpose.

The President's budget for 1964 includes $2.1 million for these purposes, of which an estimated $500,000 would be for work in the field of mental retardation.

Under its basic act of 1912, the Children's Bureau may conduct its own studies, but it does not have authority to make grants or enter into other cooperative financial arrangements for research studies.

A few research projects have been supported through the grants under the Social Security Act made to State agencies for maternal and child health and crippled children. While these programs are doing much to improve the health of mothers and children, they could be even more effective if accompanied by an adequate program of research directed toward the evaluation of program services and their improvement.

This proposal would enable the Children's Bureau to carry out more adequately its responsibilities in child health research, as complementary to and coordinated with the program of the National Institute of Child Growth and Human Development.

The research under this proposal would contribute to improving the development, management, and effectiveness of maternal and child health and crippled children's services throughout the country.

MENTAL RETARDATION PLANNING

Section 5. Mental retardation has been a major national problem for many years. An estimated 5.4 million people in our population are mentally retarded in varying degrees. Of the 4.2 million children born each year, about 3 percent—at birth or later—will be classified as mentally retarded.

More than 4,000 of these new babies born every year, it is estimated, will be so profoundly retarded that they will be unable during their lives to take care of even their own basic needs. About 12,600 will suffer "moderate" retardation, remaining below the 7-year-old level of intellectual growth. The remaining 110,000 will be mildly retarded, able—as adults—to acquire limited job skills and achieve almost independent community living—if they are given special training and assistance.

In many ways, the mentally retarded require help throughout their lives—through childhood, adolescence, adulthood, and old age. Their special needs, which change according to the degree of retardation, include education, rehabilitation, employment, health, legal protection, family and residential care, and a variety of community services.

Community services generally take the form of diagnostic and clinical services, care in residential institutions, special education, vocational rehabilitation, and social services—such as professional work with parents' groups, casework, group work, and day care.

However, resources for the mentally retarded vary widely from State to State and among cities and communities within the States.

Only one-fourth of the mentally retarded children have access to special education. The waiting list for care in residential institutions grows longer. The 20,000 children who in 1960 were served by the 90 clinics in the country represent only a small fraction of the children who need this kind of help.

This section authorizes a one-time appropriation of $2.2 million for grants to assist States in developing plans for comprehensive State and community action to combat mental retardation.

The State plan would describe what action is needed, assess the resources available to meet that need, and define ways in which State and local activities may best be coordinated.

These grants would assist the States to work out a State plan which would assure full consideration of all aspects of services essential to planning for comprehensive State and community action to combat mental retardation.

The proposed grants to the States for planning in the field of mental retardation would have four primary objectives: To provide a means for encouraging all the States to initiate a systematic followup action on the report of the President's Panel on Mental Retardation; to enlist the support of the State Governors, top officials, and outstanding laymen in planning to meet present and future needs in the field of mental retardation; to enhance public awareness and understanding of the massiveness of the problem and of the resources and modern knowledge now at our disposal to combat it; and to foster the development and coordination of the mental retardation aspects of programs of education, rehabilitation, welfare, employment, health, civil rights protection, and recreation.

MEANING OF "SECRETARY"

Section 6. Defines the term "secretary."

BIG PINE AND LAFAYETTE RESERVOIRS ON TRIBUTARIES OF WABASH RIVER, IND.

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, I introduce today bills to authorize the construction of Big Pine and Lafayette Reservoirs on tributaries of the Wabash River in Indiana. These projects received the approval of the division engineer earlier this week in an interim report submitted on the continuing study of the Wabash River Basin.

The news of the serious flooding in the headwaters of the Ohio River and its tributaries reminds us again of the need for adequate protection from the ravages of flooding. The reservoirs which would be authorized by these bills will make a significant contribution to the overall flood control program of the Wabash Basin. Through their construction, millions of dollars in damages may be saved, and the human misery attendant to the flooding will be relieved.

In addition to the flood control benefits, other benefits in conservation, recreation and water supply will be derived from the Lafayette and Big Pine Reservoirs.

The people of the Wabash Valley are vitally interested in the protection from flooding and in the complete development of their water resources. The construction of these reservoirs will be another step in the long struggle to achieve proper water resource development in the valley. I am hopeful that these bills may be considered and approved during this session of the Congress.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bills will be received and appropriately referred.

The bills, introduced by Mr. BAYH (for himself and Mr. HARTKE), were received, read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Public Works, as follows:

S. 1073. A bill to authorize the construction of the Lafayette Reservoir in the State of Indiana for flood control, recreation, and related purposes; and

S. 1074. A bill to authorize the construction of the Big Pine Reservoir in the State of Indiana for flood control, recreation, and related purposes.

A FAIR EMPLOYMENT PRACTICES ACT FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, on behalf of Senators HART, KEATING, JAVITS, and myself, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to prohibit discrimination in employment in the District of Columbia.

The bill, entitled the Fair Employment Practices Act, provides that it shall be an unlawful employment practice for an employer to refuse to hire, or to discharge, or to discriminate in employment against any individual because of his race, religion, color, national origin, or ancestry; that it shall be an unlawful employment practice for an employment agency to fail, or to refuse to classify properly or refer for employment any individual for any like reason; and that it shall be an unlawful employment practice for a labor organization to cause or attempt to force an employer to discriminate against any individual.

The bill establishes a five-man Fair Employment Practices Commission for the District of Columbia to hear and dispose of all charges that fall within the bill. I ask unanimous consent that the bill may be allowed to lie on the table for 5 days, so that additional Senators who so desire may join as cosponsors; and I ask unanimous consent that a copy of the bill be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

Mr. President, the bill I introduce today deals with one of the most serious economic, social and moral problems facing this Nation at the present time.

I speak of the silent conspiracy of discrimination against persons of different racial, ethnic, religious, and national origins which exists in this country and in our Nation's Capital.

I am concerned today specifically with discrimination against minority racial groups in the District of Columbia in the area of employment; and with the multitude of social problems that follow in the wake of discriminatory employment practices, each of which may spell a human tragedy, a life consumed by crime or delinquency, a life corrupted by vice, by alcoholism, by poverty and human degradation.

As chairman of the Senate Juvenile Delinquency Subcommittee, I have been told that there are thousands of young people in this city who are no longer in school, but who cannot obtain employment largely because of their color. And I have been told time and again that the inability to obtain work is one of the main causes of delinquency and crime among young members of the Negro population of this city.

How can a victim of job discrimination grow up as a constructive human being in this city, in the midst of a vital, dynamic, governmental complex that rewards hard work and effort, when from the day he first begins to understand the world around him, he must learn that he has failed already.

He learns to want the rewards of hard work and to live much like anyone else, yet he is at the same time denied the opportunity to achieve this. How can he be expected to train, to work, and to hope for a better future, for a good job, for the chance to raise and support a family, when he sees from examples all around him that no matter how hard he may work, how hard he may strive, he will not be given the chance to put his training, his knowledge, and his skill to the test.

How can the average nonwhite young person in Washington, or in most other large American cities, compete and draw satisfaction from his studies in school when he knows that the nominal rewards available to white classmates are not available to him. They are not denied him because he is stupid or lazy or deficient in still other ways, but rather because the prejudiced majority has conspired against him.

Recent estimates made available to our committee regarding the Washington employment situation show that about 75 percent of the jobseekers at the U.S. Employment Service are nonwhite. At the same time, however, these estimates show that 75 percent of the available positions are open only to white applicants.

It is shocking to learn that from 80 to 100 percent of the jobs in various fields are not obtainable by nonwhite workers in this city. It is shocking to know that certain business establishments in need of employees will not hire colored persons, however qualified, even though there are no white applicants for the positions.

Recent estimates given to us show that in savings and loan companies, brokerage houses, title companies, and real estate and mortgage firms, there is an almost 100-percent exclusion of Negro employees. In banks, insurance companies, and most other clerical and semiprofessional positions, only 1 percent or less of the employees are Negroes. In public utilities there is a virtual total exclusion of male Negroes, and only about 5 percent of the female employees are colored. In the department stores, where perhaps the greatest progress has been made, only about 15 percent of the work force is colored.

A most important problem area in this respect is also that of skilled labor. Some labor leaders in Washington have worked diligently over the years to eliminate discrimination, and to improve the status of nonwhite workers. I want to particularly mention here Mr. J. C. Turner, president of the Greater Washington Central Labor Council, AFL-CIO, who has championed this cause in the face of many obstacles.

But ruthless segregation and exclusion of nonwhite craftsmen still persist. Even though the operating engineers are integrated to some extent, and although there exist two Negro locals for cement mixers and bricklayers, most colored persons are employed only as unskilled laborers. Even in the colored unions, some pay differential prevails, with nonwhite bricklayers, for example, receiving up to 35 cents per hour less than their white counterparts.

Furthermore, there is still a virtual 100-percent exclusion of colored craftsmen from almost all other unions. This is generally true of the electricians, the plumbers, the steamfitters, stonemasons, tile setters, glaziers, and sheetmetal workers. In these unions there are no Negro journeymen and no Negroes are admitted for apprenticeship training which leads to the journeyman status. We have been told that recently the carpenters have admitted one Negro to their apprenticeship training. While this is a commendable gesture, it does not materially reduce the discrimination problem.

In replying to a Senate Juvenile Delinquency Subcommittee questionnaire concerning youth employment, the Commissioners of the District of Columbia made the following statement:

> One of the outstanding shortages or needs in the youth employment field in Washington, D.C., is the opening up of apprenticeship and white collar job opportunities for Negroes. Also the lack of manufacturing industries here contributes to the problem. The majority of youths in the District of Columbia are Negroes (over 60 percent) and because of discriminatory hiring practices by employers, particularly in the work areas listed above, job opportunities for them are very few.

These examples show that nonwhite persons in the Nation's Capital from age 14 up are second-class citizens. The percentage unemployed among them is twice as large as the figures for the white population.

It is true that unemployment is a problem for a great number of young people and adults, regardless of race or ethnic origin. It is also true, as someone once noted in a letter to the editor of the Washington Post, that no group, no one race or religion, has a monopoly on misfortune.

All of this we recognize. But discrimination is not misfortune in the regular sense of the word. It is not something that depends on chance or circumstance. It is not something that depends on individual factors, on time factors, or even on social and economic conditions, such as wars, depressions, or the exhaustion of natural resources in a geographic region, all of which inadvertently affect large groups or segments of the population.

Discrimination is rather a deliberate process of singling out a group of the population for prejudicial treatment. And in its most vicious forms it is a categorical elimination of this group from participation in the free competition, in the opportunities, and in the rewards available to other Americans.

To the extent that such an unfair process affects youths across the country, it helps mold these youths into what has been called social dynamite, dangerously discarded and strewn around American towns and cities.

To the extent that these practices prevail in our Nation's Capital, they make this city a less effective showcase to the world than what it must be. And, because the District of Columbia is governed by Congress to a large degree, Congress must bear responsibility for the conditions which prevail here.

I will say, without fear of contradiction, that in spite of the numerous studies carried out regarding racial prejudice and discrimination, the amount of damage these attitudes and actions do to the country as a whole and to each and every person in it has never been and perhaps cannot be estimated. In terms of shattered national ideals, in terms of internal political strife on the race issue, in terms of social and economic waste in men lost to crime and idleness, in terms of our damaged relations with other nations, in terms of lost creativity in the arts and sciences, the price we pay for discrimination staggers the imagination.

We cannot afford to pay this price anywhere, but least of all can we pay it in the very heart of this country, the Nation's Capital.

We cannot allow young people to grow up in this city under the cloak of hopelessness; we cannot allow them to grow up with the knowledge that no matter how hard they may study and how diligently they may work they cannot become lawyers or doctors or skilled craftsmen for no other reason than the color of their skin.

If we allow these inequities to continue, we are consciously fostering crime and delinquency in Washington, because when a civilized person cannot find legitimate work in an urban society, he may in desperation turn to the law of the jungle—the law of force, of assault, and of burglary. In today's world a position in the labor force is so important to a person's concept of his own self-worth, that the continuous inability to obtain work is a morally destructive process. It is a process that destroys the personality, that distorts concepts of right and wrong, that destroys hope for a better future, which is the basic force of all life, the driving power of all human activity.

When I surveyed the crime and delinquency problem in Washington last year, I was told time and again that one of the most effective ways to control violence and vandalism in this city would be to increase employment opportunities for its inhabitants, both young and old. And particularly, work opportunities must be found for the minority group parents, long subjected to vicious discrimination, as well as for the younger generation, the members of which are only now beginning to experience the silent conspiracy directed against them.

I have said in the past that this city must symbolize the best of which our country is capable. I believe that our Nation's Capital must be an example to our own country and to nations the world over of the best we can offer in terms of equal employment opportunities, in terms of educational opportunities, in terms of humanitarian endeavors, and even in terms of crime prevention.

To achieve a part of these goals and to help wipe out the evil wrought upon us all by racial discrimination, I submit for proper reference a bill to establish a Fair Employment Practices Commission in the District of Columbia and to outlaw any discrimination in employment against anyone because of his or her race, religion, color, national origin, or ancestry.

I have outlined the reasons why such legislation is necessary. Together with the proposal, I want to make a final comment regarding its purpose.

Some men, without laws to guide and restrain them, are prejudiced, discriminatory, and unjust; some will use any means to gain economic advantage. On the other hand, we have labor leaders in this city who want to see justice done. There are employers in Washington who would hire nonwhite workers, but who are helpless because of the informal rule of men in their respective fields of business. These men need a law to back them up. They need a law to protect them from their prejudiced fellows and to guard against retaliation, against censure, and against economic reprisal from others less responsible than they.

Twenty-four States have enacted such laws and numerous municipalities have passed ordinances with similar intent. Our need here is every bit as great and in some ways even greater.

I am happy to have the distinguished Senators Hart, Keating, and Javits as cosponsors of this measure, and I hope it will receive speedy and favorable consideration by this entire legislative body on whose shoulders lies the responsibility of governing our Nation's Capital.

The **VICE PRESIDENT**. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1075) to prohibit discrimination in employment in the District of Columbia because of race, religion, color, national origin, or ancestry, introduced by Mr. Dodd (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. **HUMPHREY**. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. **DODD**. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. **HUMPHREY**. Will the Senator permit me to join him as a cosponsor of the bill?

Mr. **DODD**. I am honored that the assistant majority leader should wish to cosponsor it. I am grateful to him.

Mr. **HUMPHREY**. I ask unanimous consent that I may be listed as a cosponsor of the bill. I compliment the Senator on his leadership in this matter.

The **VICE PRESIDENT**. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. **KEATING**. Mr. President, I am happy, once again, to join the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. Dodd] in sponsoring this important legislation. The Senator and I have served together on the Senate Juvenile Delinquency Subcommittee, and in this capacity, we have firsthand knowledge of the correlation between unemployment and a rising crime rate. Youngsters who cannot find gainful employment all too often find diversion in delinquency.

The District of Columbia has a number of problems which complicate the job market. This is not an industrial city, and there are not many opportunities for unskilled workers. Many of our Washington unemployed, especially those who have recently arrived, have been poorly trained in segregated schools. To add to the dismal picture, vocational training is entirely inadequate, since it is not even offered, in most cases, until a child reaches senior high school. Anyone who has worked with these children knows that the problem must be met before 10th grade because by that time the hard core of the untrained have dropped out of school.

We recognize these impediments to increased employment opportunities, and neither minimize nor exaggerate them. Each problem must and will be solved by long-term planning and patient work. Some steps to solve the employment crisis, however, can be taken immediately. They do not require massive retraining, introduction of new industry, or an overhaul of the educational system. For example, the passage of a single statute—this bill, introduced by the Senator from Connecticut, myself, and other Senators—will go a long way toward alleviating the District's problems.

Putting aside for a moment the difficulties encountered by the unskilled worker in search of a job in Washington, D.C., let us consider the case of a young Negro who has finished high school, college, or even graduate school, and applies for a nongovernment job in this city. What obstacles does he face? None would deny that the color of his skin—notwithstanding all other qualifications—is his major impediment. As the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. Dodd] has pointed out, savings and loan companies, brokerage houses, insurance companies, banks, public utilities and even distinguished law firms are virtually closed to him. This, unfortunately, is an across-the-board policy, applied to an entire race, not occasionally to an individual applicant.

Approximately 80 percent of the schoolchildren of this city are Negroes. I ask, in all sincerity, what does equality of opportunity in education mean to these children, if after graduation, there is no equality of job opportunity? How can we ask them to stay in school, to study and prepare themselves to be responsible citizens when we know in fact that even a Phi Beta Kappa key will not unlock the doors that are barred to them?

Last Thanksgiving, we were given a small sample of what could happen if racial inequality is allowed to continue in this city. It was not pleasant, and certainly the demonstration was inexcusable, but at least it was understandable. Intolerance will not long be tolerated—by Negroes, or by whites of good will. The Federal Government has gone a long way toward eliminating discrimination in employment but there are indeed "miles to go and promises to keep."

I am proud to say that New York was the first of 24 States to adopt a fair employment practices act, and its impact has been substantial. Contrary to the dire predictions of its opponents at the time adopted, it was quickly accepted, both by employers and by the public, and very few prosecutions under the law have been necessary.

We who are responsible for governing this city must take the important first step offered in this bill to make Washington truly the model city for all the Nation. I urge early hearings and prompt action by the Congress. Meanwhile, I exhort private sectors of our economy in this city to reconsider discriminatory hiring policies, to unlock the doors which have been barred to Negroes, and to give meaning to the promise of equal opportunity.

DISALLOWANCE OF DEDUCTIONS FOR CERTAIN TRAVEL AND ENTERTAINMENT EXPENSES

Mr. **SMATHERS**. Mr. President, at this time I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend section 274 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, relating to disallowance of deductions for certain travel and entertainment expenses.

One of the provisions which the Congress enacted last year, as part of the Revenue Act of 1962, requires allocation of the costs of traveling expenses where the travel is for more than 1 week and the nonbusiness portion of the trip is more than 25 percent of the total time away from home. Where such an allocation is made, only expenses allocated to business would be allowed as deductions.

This allocation rule was intended to replace the so-called principal purpose test and the but-for rule of prior law. Under these rules, if the primary purpose of travel was to transact business, the travel costs would have been deductible; or, to state it another way, if the travel would not have been undertaken but for business reasons, the travel costs would have been deductible. These rules allowed deduction only for travel expenses. Personal living or family expenses incurred during a period of business travel were never deductible.

Under these tests, it made no difference that the employee, agent, or taxpayer might have derived some personal enjoyment out of the travel; if the trip was primarily business-oriented, the travel costs would have been deductible.

These seem to me to be sensible, practical, and responsible rules. Nonetheless, hastily and without proper consideration of the effects, Congress last year injected personal, nonbusiness elements and motivations into the calculation of deductible travel costs. Mr. President, I was a part of that procedure, inasmuch as I sat on the conference committee between the Senate Finance Committee and the House Ways and Means Committee, where this provision was dealt with, although I am frank to say that I do not know exactly how it got into the law. This year, when we saw that it was included, none of the members of the committee was exactly sure how it got in.

I believe that if a clear business purpose for travel is established, the amount of tax deduction for the travel expense should not be made to depend upon the extent to which trip was also pleasurable. The proposed legislation is designed to restore the effectiveness of the principal-purpose test and the but-for rule, which were unwisely upset last year.

I do not condone abuses of tax deductions, nor do I believe that any Senator or Representative does.

The proposed measure would not permit abuse.

To the contrary, I am convinced that the principal-purpose test and the but-for rule of existing law are rational, logical, and workable tax rules.

The Internal Revenue Service has applied them vigorously for many years, and it should be permitted to continue to do so in the future.

On the other hand, the illogical consequences of the new allocation rule are absurd. Let me illustrate:

Corporation X spends $110 for a round-trip ticket to send an employee to Chicago, on a Monday, for 5 days of business conferences, including travel time. He signs a $1 million contract. It just happens that the employee's mother lives in Chicago, and the employee plans to spend 3 days there with her, following his business conferences. These days are Saturday, Sunday, and Monday. On Monday afternoon, just before the employee boards a jet for his return flight, his mother has a stroke, and the employee spends the next 2 weeks with her.

Under last year's amendment, corporation X is allowed to deduct only $25. Contrast this with the following example:

Corporation Y spent $110 for a round-trip ticket to send its employee to Chicago for a 1-day conference; and the employee would not have gone but for the conference. He signs a contract which results in a $100,000 loss to his corporation. Following the conference, the employee spends the next 6 days in riotous living in Chicago.

Under last year's amendment, corporation Y would be allowed to deduct the entire $110. I do not believe the distinction is justifiable.

Moreover, last year's amendment is irrational, in that it places a tax premium upon delay. By this, I mean that the more slowly a taxpayer or employee travels on a business journey, the greater will be the portion of the travel cost which is deductible.

Contrast the following situations for the same business purpose and to the same destination—one, involving travel by fast jet; and the other, travel by slow boat.

Corporation M sends an employee to London, for 2 days of business discussions. The flight takes 1 day each way. While in London, the employee takes 2 weeks vacation, to tour the Continent. Under last year's amendment, corporation M would be permitted to deduct four-eighteenths of the travel costs, or about 22 percent.

Corporation N, on the other hand, sends its employee to London, by boat, for the same 2 days of business discussions. The trip involves 5 days at sea, each way. This employee also takes a 2-week vacation, to tour the Continent with M's employee. Under last year's amendment, corporation N would be permitted to deduct twelve twenty-sixths of the travel costs, or nearly 50 percent.

By restoring the vitality of the but-for rule, as the proposed legislation contemplates, neither corporation M nor corporation N would be penalized through denial of a deduction for travel expenses incurred in legitimate business operations.

Let me make perfectly clear that neither the proposed legislation nor the law which would be restored by its enactment would allow deduction for any part of the travel expenses involved in the 2-week tour of the Continent. Such expenses are not business related, and should not be deductible to any extent.

I submit that the same commonsense analysis requires that business-related travel expenses not be disallowed as a deduction to any extent. The cost to corporation M and corporation N of getting their respective employees to the London conference should be fully allowable, without regard to whether their employees return home immediately upon completion of the business discussions. Likewise, the costs to corporation X, as well as that to corporation Y, of getting their respective employees to business conferences in Chicago should also be fully deductible.

In addition to deleting from the law this illogical, irrational, and arbitrary travel allocation rule, the proposal would also modify the substantiation provision of last year's act, by eliminating travel from the burdensome record—and receipt—keeping rules of the statute and from the even more burdensome regulations issued under that provision.

This, in my opinion, will remove much of the criticism of the existing regulations, by making receipt collecting unnecessary, except in the case of entertainment expenses amounting to more than $25. It also would restore the established rule of the Internal Revenue Service under which employees who travel for their employers on per diem, mileage, or fixed reimbursement arrangements, and who are required to render an adequate accounting to their employers, would be considered to have accounted also for tax purposes. Under this established rule, the Commissioner of Internal Revenue would continue to review employers' accounting procedures, for the purpose of determining whether they provide for an adequate accounting by employees.

I do not believe Congress intended to change the law as it applied to these employee-salesmen. In fact, both the Senate Finance Committee report and the report of the House Committee on Ways and Means made it emphatically clear that it did not so intend. These reports stated:

> For example, it may be provided that substantiation will not be required for traveling expenses, where such expenses (including the cost of meals and lodging) do not exceed prescribed minimum amounts. This will be of special benefit to employees whose per diem allowance while traveling is within limits established by the Secretary under this provision.

Notwithstanding this unambiguous expression of congressional intent, these per diem, and so forth, arrangements were blanketed in by the new substantiation regulations. In some cases, I am informed that the employee recordkeeping required by employers has tripled. Time spent in recordkeeping and receipt collecting is time lost from selling their companies' products. The proposed legislation would put these people back to work at their selling jobs, thereby spurring the economy.

Still another objectionable feature of last year's amendments would be corrected by the legislation. Under the substantiation regulations, issued in final form on December 27, 1962, amounts disallowed as a deduction, because of the travel-allocation rule, are required to be included in the income of the employee involved with the travel. This arbitrary requirement is completely contrary to the stated intent of the Senate Finance Committee and of the Committee on Ways and Means of the House, when the reports of these committees stated that the provision did not affect the question of the includibility or excludibility of an item in the income of any individual. We were content with the existing law in that respect.

I feel confident that the Congress did not intend to create income for employees or independent contractors where there had been none before. Notwithstanding this clear expression of congressional intent, the Treasury regulation, issued under the provision which asks nothing more than recordkeeping, taxes employees and agents on the amount of travel expenses disallowed as a deduction to their employer or principal. Under the proposed legislation, such income would not be imputed to employees or agents.

Summarizing the proposed legislation, it deletes from the statute, the travel-allocation rule, and eliminates travel from the detailed substantiation requirements of the law and regulations. It does nothing more. It preserves the amendment of last year, denying a deduction for expenses for meals and lodging while in travel status which are lavish or extravagant. It does not affect in any manner whatsoever the tax treatment of expenses for gifts or entertainment.

Section 274 may require further attention by the Congress, to prevent wholesale closing of restaurants and widespread unemployment in the restaurant, entertainment, and hotel industries.

Factual data which I have received shows that business in these industries is off 18 to 30 percent, requiring many of them to retrench, with a loss of jobs in the category of waiters, entertainers, and other personnel, the net result.

There still exist in the businessman's mind apprehension and confusion as to just what will and what will not be allowed as legitimate business deductions.

It is my view that if this apprehension and confusion are not eliminated by the Internal Revenue Service, our entire economy will suffer. Congress cannot allow this to occur.

Thus, the decision as to whether further legislation will be required will, of course, depend on what is disclosed by the substantiation regulations which shortly will be issued by the Internal Revenue Service.

I hope Congress will act promptly and favorably on this proposed measure.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1083) to amend section 274 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 relating to disallowance of deduction for certain travel and entertainment expenses, introduced by Mr. SMATHERS, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

PREVENTION OF GOVERNMENT COMPETITION WITH FREE ENTERPRISE

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to prevent the Federal Government from engaging in activities in direct competition with private enterprise. It also establishes a carefully framed policy gradually to phase out and terminate existing Federal activities which compete with the free enterprise system. Joining with me in sponsoring the bill are the chairman and the ranking minority member, respectively, of the Government Operations Committee, Senator JOHN L. MCCLELLAN and Senator KARL E. MUNDT, who have pioneered in this field for years. Moreover, they are joined by the following Members of the Senate who have also demonstrated great leadership and support for the free enterprise system: Senators HARRY FLOOD BYRD, JOHN J. WILLIAMS, STROM THURMOND, and JOHN G. TOWER.

HOOVER COMMISSION STUDIES

One of the great achievements of the Hoover Commission was the effort it made in the field of eliminating Government activities which compete with private enterprise. The Bureau of the Budget in January 1955, February 1957, and September 1959, issued directives to carry out the recommendations of the Hoover Commission in this area. As a result of this, much was accomplished during the Eisenhower years.

In President Eisenhower's last state of the Union address, he pointed out that during his administration "there has been a firm policy of reducing competition with private enterprise. This has resulted in discontinuance of some 2,000 commercial and industrial installations operated directly by Government agencies."

The policy stated by the Bureau of the Budget in 1955 was as follows:

> The general policy of the administration that the Federal Government will not start or carry on any commercial activity to provide a service or product for its own use if such product or service can be procured from private enterprise through ordinary business channels. Exceptions to this policy shall be made by the head of an agency only where it is clearly demonstrated in each case that it is not in the public interest to procure such product or service from private enterprise.

GOVERNMENT COMPETITION INCREASING

While significant progress was made under these directives, not nearly enough was accomplished, I regret to say. Some new activities were undertaken that should not have been; others were continued that should have been terminated. Unfortunately, the present administration is not vigorously implementing the earlier policy directives. Rather than ending programs which compete with the free enterprise system, on balance this competition is being sharply increased. It was estimated in August of 1962 that the present administration has increased the Government's investment in activities that compete with private business by more than $2 billion.

CONGRESS SILENT

One of the reasons for this sharp increase is that there is no clearcut legislation firmly establishing the policy of the Federal Government in this area. The earlier Bureau of the Budget directives were welcome positive steps. But obviously they do not have the effect of law. The Federal agencies felt perfectly free to circumvent and even to defy these directives which can be withdrawn at any time and the degree to which they are enforced is dependent upon the wishes of the administration. For these reasons, I feel legislation is necessary and the bill I am introducing would clearly establish the policy of the Federal Government in this area.

ALLIES FAVOR FREE ENTERPRISE GROWTH

There are many who question the advisability of moving in this direction, who feel that our modern society requires more Government activity rather than less. In this connection, I think it is interesting to note the action taken by the Government of Western Germany during recent years. This Government, like many European governments, has had considerable experience with government control of production and distribution as distinguished from private control, and is now moving toward denationalization of industry.

For the past few years, the Government of Western Germany has been endeavoring to divest itself of many of its enterprises, including shipyards, steel mills, iron ore mines, and electricity generating stations. Since 1957, it has sold many enterprises, and has added virtually none at all.

One of the most dramatic recent moves in this area was the announcement in 1961 that the Government was offering the public a chance to buy stock in Volkswagen, the great automotive manufacturing company which until now has been owned by the Government.

It seems to me that one of the most dramatic facts to emerge during the postwar changes in the economies of the world is the fact that private enterprise is the most effective way of production. Because our own experience has shown this to be true, I feel that legislation guaranteeing private control of production and elimination of Government competition with private enterprise to the greatest possible extent would help to strengthen the economy. For these reasons, I urge passage of this bill.

BILL SUMMARY

Briefly, the bill declares that it is the policy of the Federal Government to encourage private competitive enterprise to the maximum extent consistent with national security and the public interest. It provides for the establishment of regulations governing establishment of new activities in this area, assuring that bureaus or agencies intending to establish such an activity must first obtain approval from the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, who must determine that the function cannot be performed by private enterprise without adversely affecting national security.

MASSIVE FEDERAL INVASION OF FREE ENTERPRISE

Strange as it may seem, nobody, whether in or out of Government, knows accurately just what competitive businesses Uncle Sam is engaged in, how much money has been invested in them, and how much it costs every year to run them.

The Hoover Commission's job of investigating Government's invasion of business was done with magnificent competence—but no one ever pretended that the facts and figures were complete.

The Budget Bureau studied the problem for more than 2 years and came up with a figure of more than 19,000 business installations—but frankly admitted that it had not reached the bottom of the pile.

Estimates of Government's capital investment in business operations range widely from $30 billion—no insignificant sum in itself—to 5 times that amount. I should not be surprised if it is actually even more than that.

As for costs of operation, the annual budget—as thick as the Washington telephone directory, but much less comprehensible—is not of the slightest help. The first lesson learned by a bureaucrat is to hide—himself, his job, his subordinates, and most of all his account books.

GREAT POTENTIAL SAVINGS AND REVENUES

It is obvious that a good deal of money could be saved by getting Government out of competitive busines. It is equally obvious that the tax take of the Treasury would be very considerably increased if the great amount of business now done by nontaxpaying Government plants were thrown to privately owned, taxpaying companies. And no jobs need be lost in the shiftover, for the Government workers would be needed to keep on doing what they are now doing.

The purpose of my bill is to get the Government out of business in direct competition with taxpaying companies—and to keep it out.

All receipts from the sale of Government businesses—and they should be a a very substantial amount—should be applied to the reduction of the national debt.

Taxes received from the proprietary companies that purchase these Government installations—and they should be in considerable amount—would, of course, be used to reduce the deficit with which we are now faced.

HELP BALANCE BUDGET

It is a program that should bring satisfaction to present administration fiscal planners, for it would provide new sources of tax revenue without adding to the burdens of present taxpayers. It should also bring some feeling of amelioration to the general public.

Unhappily, from the taxpayers' viewpoint, most of Government's businesses are highly competitive with private enterprise, and their advantages are both unfair and insurmountable. They operate with the people's money—yours and mine—they are not expected to make a profit; many of them are not managed with even decent efficiency, and they share none of the burden of taxation that confiscates half of the earnings of privately owned competitors. Under Federal control there is little incentive to achieve efficiency in business-type activities since they do not have to compete in the market place and cost is no object.

FEDERAL SAVINGS, A MYTH

It is claimed by those who support virtually unlimited Federal competition against the free enterprise system that it is cheaper for the Government to do the job. However, in a vast majority of cases, this is just not true, since the purported lower Federal cost estimates are fictitious and misleading. This elementary fact was lucidly proclaimed by the Hoover Commission in the preface of its report on business enterprises which said:

> The Government business-type enterprises, except in a few instances, pay no taxes, and pay little or no interest on the capital invested; they seldom charge depreciation and frequently their directing personnel is not included on their payroll. Likewise, the fringe benefits of Government personnel in most instances are not included in their costs. Moreover, in addition to the fact that most of them pay no taxes, they deprive the Government of taxes which would otherwise be paid by private enterprise if it conducted these operations. Therefore, their claims of financial success are often wholly invalid; and, worse, with the advantages they receive from the Government, they are unfair competition.

EXAMPLES OF FEDERAL COMPETITION

Congressional investigations dating back to 1932 have listed more than 100 categories of business in which Government is engaged. Many of them were started, probably legitimately enough, to meet special emergencies of wartime—but when the wars were over, the businesses quietly kept going, regardless of the losses they incurred.

Thus various Government shipyards, which serviced 10,000 vessels in World War II, are still in full operation, though they service only a few hundred ships today.

Thus the Navy continues to build ships in Government yards, though by expert testimony they could be built for 15 to 28 percent less in private yards—at a saving of millions of dollars.

Thus the Defense Department continues to hang on to reserve plants which were built during World War II. Some of them have been sold at prices ranging from 10 to 30 cents on the dollar of original investment, whereupon they become valuable as sources of tax revenue. A year and a half ago Secretary McNamara directed that others be sold, but restrictions make them hard to move.

SOME PROGRESS MADE

True enough, there has been some progress in recent years' efforts to eliminate Government competition. The Mississippi Barge Line, continued for a generation of annual losses after World War I, was finally sold to a private company, in whose hands it became a profit-making taxpayer. The synthetic rubber plants of World War II were finally sold to taxpaying companies. The Reconstruction Finance Corporation was substantially dissolved. The coffee roasting plants of the three armed services, which would not drink the same brand of coffee—were sold. The Navy's paint factories were disposed of. The Defense Department got rid of its plant nurseries and a lot of its laundries, drycleaning plants and cobbler shops.

GOVERNMENT STILL COMPETING

But the PX stores still compete unfairly with taxpaying department stores. Government engineers compete unfairly with taxpaying engineering companies. Government printing plants do half a billion dollars' worth of business every year when much and perhaps all of it could be done by taxpaying plants. The Post Office continues to make its own mailbags and locks, and to run an unneeded postal savings bank. Military Air Transport competes unfairly with commercial airlines. Various services make wooden boxes in competition with companies that could make them better and cheaper—and pay taxes. Government operates warehouse space which should certainly be in private hands.

The Tennessee Valley Authority, which supposedly entered the fertilizer production business as an experiment, now sells $20 million worth annually, at less than cost. Now TVA wants to get into the coal mining business, after successfully getting into the steam power generating business.

The list is endless.

TIME TO ACT

And it is high time something was done to put a stop to this competitive waste of the people's money—and this loss of needed tax revenue.

The first step in the process of ending this unhappy situation is for the Congress to adopt a policy, a definite and positive policy—that Government should get out of business to the maximum extent possible, and stay out.

That is the purpose of the bill I am reintroducing. It is not an extreme bill. Rather it represents a moderate, workable, first step to accomplish this objective. It is the work product of years of detailed study by the Bureau of the Budget.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1093) to establish a Federal policy concerning the termination, limitation, or establishment of business-type operations of the Government which may be conducted in competition with private enterprise, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. BENNETT (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Government Operations.

RATES OF POSTAGE ON PUBLICATIONS DESIGNED SPECIFICALLY FOR RELIGIOUS INSTRUCTION CLASSES

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I rise to introduce for appropriate reference a bill to adjust second class postal rates payable by publications designed specifically for use in religious instruction classes. Public Law 87-793, which became effective on January 7, 1963, changed existing rates so that the classroom publications in question are unreasonably burdened and will become increasingly so as additional raises in the rates take effect.

Prior to January 7, 1963, all classroom publications were charged pound rates equal to 50 percent of the rate for publications generally with respect to the advertising portion of the publication and 60 percent of the rate for publications generally with respect to the nonadvertising portion. Minimum charge per piece was one-eighth of a cent.

Effective January 7, 1963, second class postage rates were increased and the basis for computing postage on classroom publications was changed. Now, classroom publications are required to pay postage equal to 60 percent of that paid by other publications.

The effect of this change has been to increase the minimum per piece charge for classroom publications from the one-eighth of a cent formerly paid, to a little over one-third of a cent for 1963, nearly one-half of a cent for 1964, and three-fifths of a cent thereafter. When the third installment of increases becomes effective on January 1, 1965, postage costs for classroom publications will have increased 480 percent.

Clearly, these rates are confiscatory, especially for classroom publications designed for religious instruction. These publications are in enough financial difficulties. The enormous increase of rates would put many of them out of business and thus deprive thousands of dedicated Sunday school teachers of valuable tools of instruction. My bill is meant to alleviate the burden upon these publications. It would not affect rates paid by classroom publications generally, and would not change pound rates for religious classroom publications. It would, however, lower the minimum charge per piece for the latter to fifteen one-hundredths of a cent during 1963, two-tenths of a cent during 1964, and twenty-five one-hundredths of a cent thereafter.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be printed at the end of my remarks and that it be allowed to lie on the table for 10 days so that Senators who wish to cosponsor the bill may do so.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD, and lie on the desk, as requested by the Senator from Pennsylvania.

The bill (S. 1099) relating to rates of postage on publications designed specifically for religious instruction classes, introduced by Mr. SCOTT, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 4359(b)(2) of title 39, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"(2) The postage on classroom publications, other than those designed specifically for religious instruction classes, is 60 per centum of the postage computed in accordance with paragraph (1). In the case of classroom publications designed specifically for use in religious instruction classes the rates per pound shall be 60 per centum of the rates per pound specified in paragraph (1) and the minimum charge per piece shall be .15 of a cent if mailed prior to January 1, 1964, .2 of a cent if mailed during calendar year 1964, and .25 of a cent if mailed after December 31, 1964."

PROHIBITION OF IMPORTS OF FLAT GLASS FROM COMMUNIST COUNTRIES

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to prevent the importation of flat glass which is the product of any country or area dominated or controlled by communism. The increasingly large imports of window and sheet glass, glass louvers, and other flat glass products from Communist lands are posing a grave threat to the glass manufacturers of this Nation.

There should be prompt action to reduce or eliminate the threat. The administration has not acted, but I hope it will do so. Meanwhile, I am taking this legislative alternative to prevent further damage to American glass industry. My bill states that the President shall, as soon as practicable, take such measures as may be necessary to prevent the importation of these products.

I have been informed that today the United States has in effect no quantitative restrictions—import quotas—or other regulations in regard to imports of these glass products from Communist countries. Two of the countries involved, Poland and Yugoslavia, even enjoy the benefits of most-favored-nation treatment and the consequent applicability of reduced tariff rates. While the other Communist countries do not enjoy such treatment, nevertheless their state-owned industries ship glass into this country that sells at prices sometimes as much as 50 percent below the prices quoted in our very competitive domestic industry.

Mr. President, it is well knwn that Communist nations utilize economic activity for political purposes. Their export policies are not aimed primarily at raising the standard of living of their people but at damaging the economies of the free nations. Even if free nations levied 100-percent tariffs on Communist products, these goods would continue to be dumped where the effects on domestic industry would be most harmful.

At the present moment, Communist glass is being brought into selected markets, chiefly in New England, Florida, and the Gulf States. However, there are indications that such imports will spread and jeopardize other States along the Atlantic seaboard.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that following my remarks there be inserted in the RECORD a table prepared by the Economics Division of the Legislative Reference Service.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the table will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1100) to prevent the importation of flat glass which is the product of any country or area dominated or controlled by communism, introduced by Mr. SCOTT, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

The table presented by Mr. SCOTT is as follows:

Window glass imports from Communist countries, 1960, 1961, January-November, 1962

[Quantity in thousands of pounds; values in thousands of dollars]

Country	1960		1961		January-November 1962	
	Quantity	Value	Quantity	Value	Quantity	Value
Czechoslovakia	14,534.8	287.5	13,445.6	404.0	13,090.7	354.3
East Germany	1,502.2	65.2	1,361.9	64.6	1,049.4	45.7
Poland	304.5	10.8	1.6	.4	1,824.5	65.4
Rumania	----------	----------	105.0	4.7	2,710.1	118.7
U.S.S.R.	2,816.0	77.8	10,491.0	432.0	17,006.6	603.6
Soviet bloc	19,157.5	441.2	25,405.1	905.8	35,681.3	1,187.7
Yugoslavia	166.2	8.7	46.5	4.0	648.8	27.0
Total	19,323.7	449.9	25,451.6	909.8	36,330.0	1,214.7

NOTE.—Due to rounding, detail does not add to total.

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census. U.S. imports of merchandise for consumption: commodity by country of origin (Rept. FT 110) 1960, 1961, January-November 1962.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I call to the attention of the Senate these figures, which show the quantity and value of window glass imports from Communist countries for the most recent 3 years. They show the increasing danger which I want to eliminate by means of this bill.

I also ask unanimous consent that this bill remain on the table for 10 days so that any Senators wanting to cosponsor may do so.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

REMOVAL OF STATUE OF GENERAL RAWLINS TO GALENA, ILL.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, at 18th and E Streets, NW., the little park opposite the Interior Department Building is graced by a statue of Gen. John Aaron Rawlins. There has been introduced a bill which calls for the removal of the statue of General Rawlins to Wyoming, largely because he spent 1 night in camp somewhere in that State.

Mr. President, we in Illinois have some interest in General Rawlins. He was a native of Illinois, and was the chief aide to the then Commander in Chief, Ulysses S. Grant. Therefore, we believe it would be most appropriate that the statue be removed to Galena, Ill., the home of General Rawlins.

To that end, I introduce a joint resolution to authorize the city of Galena, or an appropriate association or organization of citizens thereof, to remove to Galena the statue of Gen. John A. Rawlins, now located in Rawlins Park, Washington, D.C.

In connection with the joint resolution, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a brief article which was published on March 11 in the Washington Daily News.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the article will be printed in the RECORD.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 59) to authorize the city of Galena, Ill., or an appropriate association or organization of the citizens thereof, to remove to Galena, Ill., the statue of Gen. John A. Rawlins located at Rawlins Park, Washington, D.C., introduced by Mr. DIRKSEN, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

The article presented by Mr. DIRKSEN is as follows:

[From the Washington Daily News of Monday, Mar. 11, 1963]

A STATUESQUE BATTLE

Gen. John Aaron Rawlins, shadowy though his past may be, has managed to stir up some heat between two U.S. Senators.

Senator GALE MCGEE, Democrat, of Wyoming, introduced a bill recently to move the Rawlins statue from Rawlins Park, opposite the Interior Department Building, 18th and E Streets NW., to Rawlins, Wyo., where the general is reputed to have stopped at a railroad camp one night.

Senator VANCE HARTKE, Democrat, of Indiana, has a constituent, Charles D. Rawlins, the great-nephew of the general who wants the statue either left in Washington, which the Government opposes, or moved to Illinois, the general's native State.

The bronze image of General Rawlins was cast in 1874. He was Grant's chief aide and later his Secretary of War.

Senator MCGEE is quite definite about his interest in the matter, stating, "We do not agree on this particular matter of legislation."

Senator HARTKE has withheld comment until he hears from Senator PAUL DOUGLAS, Democrat, of Illinois, concerning Senator MCGEE's bill.

Until the matter is settled, the general will just have to bear the Washington weather with the rest of us.

ACCEPTANCE BY THE UNITED STATES OF AN INSTRUMENT FOR THE AMENDMENT OF THE CONSTITUTION OF THE INTERNATIONAL LABOR ORGANIZATION

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a joint resolution providing for acceptance by the United States of an instrument for the amendment of the constitution of the International Labor Organization.

It was my pleasure and honor to participate in the 1962 ILO meeting in Geneva and I was one of the American delegates who voted to adopt this resolution.

I ask unanimous consent that the resolution, along with the accompanying letters of the Secretary of State and the Secretary of Labor, be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the joint resolution and letters will be printed in the RECORD.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 60) providing for acceptance by the United States of America of an instrument for the amendment of the constitution of the International Labor Organization, introduced by Mr. McNAMARA, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The letters presented by Mr. McNAMARA are as follows:

FEBRUARY 15, 1963.

The Honorable LYNDON B. JOHNSON,
President of the Senate.

DEAR MR. VICE PRESIDENT: I submit herewith a proposed draft joint resolution providing for acceptance by the United States of America of an instrument for the amendment of the constitution of the International Labor Organization adopted by the 46th session of the International Labor Conference which met at Geneva in June 1962. The proposed amendments would increase the size of the governing body of the organization from 40 to 48 members, to reflect the recent increase in membership of the organization, and would make certain related changes.

The purpose of the proposed joint resolution is to authorize the President to accept the instrument of amendment on behalf of the United States. The United States accepted membership in the ILO pursuant to joint resolution of Congress approved June 19, 1934 (43 Stat. 1182; 22 U.S.C. 271), and accepted the revised constitution of the ILO pursuant to joint resolution of Congress approved June 30, 1948 (62 Stat. 1151; 22 U.S.C. 271 note). Under Article 36 of the ILO constitution, amendments take effect when ratified or accepted by two-thirds of the members, including 5 of the 10 members of chief industrial importance.

I enclose a copy of the instrument of amendment, together with a letter from the Acting Secretary of Labor, dated September 13, 1962, stating the objectives of the proposed changes in the ILO constitution and the coordinated view of the Departments of Labor and Commerce on the desirability of accepting them. The Department of State joins in recommending that Congress by joint resolution authorize the President to accept the instrument of amendment.

The amendments would involve no increase in expenditures or other obligations on the part of the United States. The Department has been advised by the Bureau of the Budget that there is no objection to the submission of the proposed legislation to Congress for its consideration.

A similar communication is being sent to the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

Sincerely yours,

DEAN RUSK.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF LABOR,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, September 13, 1962.

The Honorable DEAN RUSK,
Secretary of State,
Department of State,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: At its 46th session, the International Labor Conference adopted the Instrument for the Amendment of the Constitution of the International Labor Organization, a certified true copy of the authentic text of which is enclosed. The instrument was adopted by a vote of 309 for, none against, and one abstention. The United States supported this proposal in the governing body and the U.S. delegation voted unanimously for it in the conference.

The instrument of amendment would increase the size of the governing body of the International Labor Office from 40 to 48 members to reflect the growth and composition of the membership of the organization since 1954. At that time, when the governing body was last enlarged, 71 nations belonged to the organization. Today, the membership has increased to over a hundred countries, largely due to the admission of the newly independent, developing, and mainly agricultural countries of Africa.

The instrument would reflect this situation by making possible fuller representation in the government, employer, and worker groups in the governing body from all parts of the world. Of the 24 persons representing governments on the governing body, 10 will continue to be appointed by the members of chief industrial importance, and 14 will be appointed by the members selected for that purpose by the government delegates to the conference. The last sentence of paragraph 4 of article 7 of the constitution has been deleted on the ground that it has ceased to be justified in practice.

Consideration has been given by representatives of the Department of Commerce and the Department of Labor to submission of this instrument of amendment to both Houses of the Congress, since this Government's original acceptance of membership in the International Labor Organization was taken upon the authorization of the two Houses of Congress by joint resolution. It is the view of these departments that the instrument is completely satisfactory to this Government and that its early submission to both Houses of the Congress for acceptance would be highly desirable.

Considerable interest was taken by the newer nations in the adoption of this instrument. The United States played an active role both in the governing body and at the conference in its formulation and adoption. The next elections for the renewal of the governing body of the International Labor Office are to be held during the 47th session of the International Labor Conference, which will meet in June 1963, and another election will not be held for 3 years. Failure of the United States to accept the instrument of amendment without delay could create an adverse impression among the newer governments, particularly if the next governing body election could not be held in accordance with the amendments due to a lack of sufficient formal acceptances.

In evidence of good faith as one of the leading members of the organization, with the added responsibility as a state of chief industrial importance, it is recommended that early action be initiated to bring about acceptance by the United States of the instrument of amendment. This action would be consonant with the unanimous support given by the U.S. Government, employer, and worker delegates to the adoption of the amendment at the 1962 Conference.

Your early consideration of this matter will be greatly appreciated.

Sincerely yours,

W. WILLARD WIRTZ,
Acting Secretary of Labor.

AMENDMENT OF SENATE RULE XXV, RELATING TO MEETING OF COMMITTEES WHILE SENATE IS IN SESSION

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, on January 9 of this year, our distinguished majority leader, as chairman of the Senate democratic conference, appointed an ad hoc committee of the conference to consider and recommend ways in which the business of the Senate may be expedited.

The committee has met a number of times, has considered various possibilities, and its chairman, the senior Senator from Oklahoma, has reported to the conference chairman, in part, as follows:

> Your committee recommends and urges the earliest possible consideration of S. Res. 89, an amendment of rule VIII of the standing rules of the Senate. This resolution was introduced February 19 by Senator PASTORE and others.
>
> Your committee further recommends that urgent consideration be given a forthcoming resolution, of which Senator CHURCH and other members of the ad hoc committee will be sponsors, to revise the rules to permit committees to sit during the morning hour without need of any special permission from the Senate, while applying the present rule, which requires special consent, to the Senate session following the close of the morning hour. The application of such a provision, along with the recommended rule of germaneness, would greatly expedite the disposal of legislative business and help to increase attendance at debate in the Senate Chamber at the same time. No limitation would be imposed on the right to extend debate.

My purpose now, Mr. President, is to submit for myself and Senators MONRONEY, ANDERSON, McGEE, and PASTORE, the second resolution mentioned above. It would amend rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate so as to render inapplicable to the Senate that provision of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 which provides that no standing committee of the Senate shall sit, without special leave, while the Senate is in session. In lieu of this provision, it would require special leave of the Senate only in those instances when a standing committee desires to sit after the conclusion of the morning hour, or after the Senate has proceeded to the consideration of unfinished business. The intent of the proposed amendment is to free the time normally devoted to the morning hour for the work of the standing committees, in order to expedite the business of the Senate.

Mr. President, Senators are aware of the nature of the morning hour as it has developed in the Senate, and of the rules governing it. It serves a useful function, but I think it is self-evident that it is not a function which requires the attendance of Senators who do not have morning business to pursue, so long as no legislative business is taken up. Accordingly, we who sponsor this resolution believe that whatever considerations might justify a conditional prohibition against allowing committees to sit while legislative business is being transacted on the floor of the Senate have no application to the morning hour, and should be removed.

The benefits to be obtained by this modification of the rule are equally obvious. The time available for committee work would be significantly increased. The flow of work to the Senate calendar would be speeded, the time of

Senators and witnesses devoted to committee work would be more effectively utilized, and the remaining provisions of the rules designed to encourage the attendance of Senators in the Senate while its substantive work is underway would be emphasized by the removal of an extraneous and bothersome restriction.

I ask that the resolution may be printed in the Record, and that it be appropriately referred.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The resolution (S. Res. 111) amending rule XXV of the standing rules relative to meetings of committees while the Senate is in session, submitted by Mr. Church (for himself and other Senators), was received and referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

Resolved, That rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"5. No standing committee shall sit without special leave while the Senate is in session after (1) the conclusion of the morning hour, or (2) the Senate has proceeded to the consideration of unfinished business, whichever is earlier."

Section 2. Section 134(c) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 shall not be applicable to standing committees of the Senate.

APPROPRIATIONS FOR PROCUREMENT OF AIRCRAFT, MISSILES, AND NAVAL VESSELS FOR THE ARMED FORCES—AMENDMENT

Mr. LONG of Louisiana submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him, to the bill (S. 843) to authorize appropriations during fiscal year 1964 for procurement, research, development, test, and evaluation of aircraft, missiles, and naval vessels for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Armed Services and ordered to be printed.

NOTICE OF RECEIPT OF NOMINATION BY COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, as chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, I desire to announce that today the Senate received the nomination of W. Averell Harriman, of New York to be Under Secretary of State for Political Affairs.

In accordance with the committee rule, this pending nomination may not be considered prior to the expiration of six days of its receipt in the Senate.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILLS

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, at the next printing of S. 143, the junior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. Burdick] be added as a cosponsor.

S. 143, which was introduced on January 14, and cosponsored by the senior Senator from Montana, would authorize assumption by the various States of civil or criminal jurisdiction over cases arising on Indian reservations with the consent of the tribe involved, and permit gradual transfer of such jurisdiction to the States.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, at the next printing of S. 468, the junior Senator from Alaska [Mr. Gruening] and the junior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. Nelson] be added as cosponsors.

S. 468, introduced on January 24 and cosponsored by the junior Senator from Utah [Mr. Moss] would amend title 23 of the United States Code relating to highways in order to require the approval of the Secretary of the Interior to surveys, plans, specifications, and estimates for projects on the Federal aid highway systems for the purpose of protecting fish and wildlife and recreation resources.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF RESOLUTION

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, at the time I introduced Senate Resolution 48, which would create a standing Committee on Veterans' Affairs, the name of the distinguished Senator from Florida [Mr. Holland] was omitted from the resolution inadvertently as a cosponsor. The Senator from Florida has been a consistent supporter of that work since 1951. I ask unanimous consent that at the next printing of the resolution the names of the Senator from Florida [Mr. Holland] and the Senator from Vermont [Mr. Prouty] be added as cosponsors of Senate Resolution 48.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILLS AND CONCURRENT RESOLUTION

Under authority of the orders of the Senate, as indicated below, the following names have been added as additional cosponsors for the following bills and concurrent resolution:

Authority of March 7, 1963:

S. 1012. A bill to make voluntary admissions and confessions admissible in criminal proceedings and prosecutions in the courts of the United States and the District of Columbia: Mr. Talmadge.

S. 1029. A bill to amend the public assistance provisions of the Social Security Act to eliminate certain inequities and restrictions and permit a more effective distribution of Federal funds: Mr. Long of Missouri and Mr. Williams of New Jersey.

Authority of February 28, 1963:

S. Con. Res. 25. Concurrent resolution favoring observance on July 4 of each year by the ringing of bells throughout the United States, of the anniversary of the signing of the Declaration of Independence: Mr. Bayh, Mr. Boggs, Mr. Clark, Mr. Curtis, Mr. Dodd, Mr. Douglas, Mr. Gruening, Mr. Hart, Mr. Humphrey, Mr. Javits, Mr. Keating, Mr. Kefauver, Mr. Long of Missouri, Mr. McGee, Mr. McIntyre, Mr. Pastore, Mr. Pell, Mr. Prouty, and Mr. Scott.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

By Mr. GOLDWATER:

Address delivered by him before the National Security Commission of the American Legion, in Washington, D.C., on March 14, 1963, dealing with the subject of direct and indirect assaults against the free enterprise system.

By Mr. BIBLE:

Address delivered by Senator Cannon before the Western Regional Quality Control Conference, at Las Vegas, Nev., on February 22, 1963.

By Mr. BAYH:

Address delivered by Senator Hartke before the District of Columbia Dental Society on March 11, 1963.

MISSILES IN CUBA

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, the junior Senator from Texas [Mr. Tower] is quoted by the news services today as saying that he and other Senators believe there may be as many as 40 intermediate range ballistic missiles in Cuban caves.

I suggest, Mr. President, that this a serious charge, coming as it does in the face of photographic evidence, produced by Defense Secretary Robert McNamara on February 6, showing that 42 missiles were shipped into Cuba and from Cuba back into the Soviet Union. Secretary McNamara also said that continued aerial reconaissance has shown that missile sites were bulldozed and remain inoperative, and that no further missiles have been shipped to Cuba.

Mr. President, to continue to play the missile numbers game in the face of these concrete facts is a dangerous and irresponsible political pastime in this nuclear age, when judgment dictates that unity, responsibility, and strength must be the cornerstone of our foreign policy.

It would appear to me, Mr. President, that some of our colleagues across the aisle seem to be dedicated to the task of shaping the image of the Republican Party into that of the "war party." If this be their purpose, I submit they are doing an admirable job.

But we reach a point where charges for charges' sake become, in fact, a threat to the effective foreign policy of a Nation.

Mr. President, if these charges are to be made, they should be backed by evidence. If the evidence is available, it should be brought forth as forcefully as the charges. If such evidence cannot be produced, those who persist in making these accusations should stop their efforts to mislead the American people by attempting to exploit the sensitive Cuba situation for political purposes.

INTERNAL REVENUE SERVICE MOVES

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, it is the difficult task of government, in determining how it shall perform its services to the citizens, to draw the line between service and economy. I believe our Government has a very fine record in drawing that line to meet the total interests of the Nation. But on occasion, as in all human enterprises, we err on one side or the other.

Such, I believe, was the case when the Internal Revenue Service decided to shift many of the managerial and servicing functions of its office in Cheyenne to Denver, to effect purported economies of centralization. I realize that Wyoming has fewer than 400,000 people, and that we are continually doing things in bigger and better ways; nevertheless, the citizens of my State are deserving of consideration in this matter.

The Federal income tax, by its very nature, is a fairly personal thing. Those who have problems with their taxes—and it is not difficult to have such problems—can most easily explain their problems to a civil servant who is familiar with their way of life. There is no better way to understand the problems of an area than to live in it.

Furthermore, Mr. President, I do not believe it fair to require a citizen to travel an additional distance to another State, to obtain assistance in settling a tax question. The payment of taxes, even in support of the most equitable government, should be with the minimum of pain and discomfort.

The general taxpayers of Wyoming would suffer most by this move, but there would also be considerable suffering on the part of employees who would be required to move to another city. I realize that when one accepts Government service, one also accepts the chance that moves will be made.

However, in this case the move would be especially onerous because it is unjustified. The loss of capital in selling a home on a market that is at the moment unfortunately depressed, the loss of income for women employees who cannot leave husbands and families, and the loss of local income caused by the removal of several families, all combine to make real hardship for the employees involved, for the city of Cheyenne, and for the State of Wyoming.

Mr. President, in view of these facts, I have determined to oppose this move with all the resources at my command. I intend to carry my convictions to the Internal Revenue Service, and I would ask the support of the Members of this body in this cause.

I should like to see an immediate decision made on this matter. No one likes to live under a cloud of uncertainty; and nothing would be worse for the morale of these Federal employees than to be kept on pins and needles for months and months while these matters are discussed.

Mr. President, the proposed move is unfair and unnecessary. I propose that it be abandoned at once, and that these employees be relieved of their anxieties and returned to the service of the taxpayers of Wyoming.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, to have printed in the RECORD three letters, which I have received in recent days, reflecting upon this situation.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CHEYENNE CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
Cheyenne, Wyo., March 11, 1963.

Hon. GALE W. MCGEE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MCGEE: You are undoubtedly aware of the proposed move of certain personnel from the Cheyenne Internal Revenue Service Office to Denver, Colo. The alleged reason for this move is economy. In itself, this is an admirable objective. However, I have been discussing the effects of this move with several Wyoming tax practitioners; and they are of the opinion that the removal of supervisory personnel to Denver will work to the detriment of the citizens of Wyoming.

Of course, there is an actual financial detriment involved in that several families will be moved from Cheyenne to Denver. However, the real detriment results from removal of the supervisory personnel. These are the people that handle the first appeal from the ruling of an agent. Therefore, future appeals will be made to people residing in Denver who have no knowledge of the cattle or oil business. The local practitioners inform me that this is not a "paper tiger." The second level appeal people are now in Denver and seem to have little understanding of Wyoming problems. In the past, Wyoming taxpayers have been able to receive fair treatment because the Internal Revenue Service people lived in this state and understood its problems. To quote one local tax man, "Some of our problems eventually rubbed off on them."

An additional effect probably will be the removal of certain agents from Casper to Cheyenne. While we are always glad to have these people, we do not want them at the expense of Wyoming taxpayers.

Finally, the end result of this move will be that all auditing functions will be concentrated in the bigger cities with all of the evils that come from centralization of government. The Wyoming taxpayer will no longer have any contact with the people who are auditing his return. Furthermore, it will then be necessary to travel to Denver to discuss a problem. If we are still a state, it would seem that we are entitled to be treated as one and retain some contact with those who are reviewing our tax problem.

The Cheyenne Chamber of Commerce believes that this is a serious problem and should be given immediate attention. Perhaps you will be able to learn the exact extent of the proposed move so that we will be able to more definitely pinpoint our objections.

Yours truly,
PAUL B. GODFREY,
President.

N.A.I.R.E., LOCAL CHAPTER 31,
Cheyenne, Wyo., March 11, 1963.

Senator GALE W. MCGEE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MCGEE: On March 5, 1963, in a special message to all Internal Revenue Service employees, Commissioner Caplin announced certain changes in the field structure of the Internal Revenue Service. In brief, the New York region is to be absorbed by the Boston region; the Omaha region is to be absorbed by the Chicago region; certain districts are to be shifted from one region to another; 4 districts are to be absorbed into other districts in the same States; and 12 small districts which are now separate entities are to become modified districts, with much of their managerial and servicing functions shifted to an adjoining, larger district. The Cheyenne District, comprising the entire State of Wyoming, is to become a modified district, with Denver as its servicing district. Our purpose in writing to you is to inform you of the impact and effect of this change on the employees involved.

Most of the published information relates only to the few managerial and supervisory positions to be affected. The transfer of service functions, however, would also involve many other positions. Informed estimates indicate that from 35 to 45 families in Cheyenne are directly concerned, and that the reduction in local payroll would be in excess of $250,000 each year.

It is true that many of these people would be offered similar positions in other districts; however, many of them, such as married women, would not be able to move. Another real problem would be that most of those who could move would have to sell their homes in an already depressed real estate market.

The employees are not convinced that the change relating to small districts is wise. They believe that very little of the estimated $5 million annual saving relates to this part of the change, that it will result in a decrease in service to the taxpaying public, and that the impact on them personally is therefore not justifiable. Many of their comments are summarized in the attached copy of a letter to our National Executive Secretary. If you prefer, many of our employees would be happy to write to you direct, but we thought that incorporating their problems into one letter would save you time.

Secretary Dillon has recently postponed any implementation action until after he has reviewed the change in the light of the protests received. We hope that you will agree with our opinions and that you will do what you can in our behalf.

Very truly yours,
W. L. VICKERS,
President, Local Chapter 31.

N.A.I.R.E. LOCAL CHAPTER 31,
Cheyenne, Wyo., March 11, 1963.

Mr. GEORGE BURSACH,
Executive Secretary, National Association of Internal Revenue Employees, Washington 5, D.C.

DEAR MR. BURSACH: As you know, Commissioner Caplin's special message to all employees of March 5, 1963, announced certain modifications in the field structure of the Internal Revenue Service. Cheyenne, as 1 of the 12 small districts, is to be a modified district, with much of our staff and service support to be furnished by the Denver District. The purpose of this letter is to inform you of our local employees' reaction to this change. Copies are being furnished, together with cover letters containing additional information, to Senator McGee, Senator Simpson, Congressman Harrison, Governor Hansen, and Cheyenne Mayor Bill Nation.

Many, although by no means all, of our people's comments relate to personal problems and hardships which they envision, some because of individual circumstances and others related to the present economic situation in Cheyenne. Both kinds are included in the following summary, which I believe is a representative excerption. Most of the selected comments quoted were expressed, in varying forms, by several employees. I am summarizing them in one letter in order to give you a concise picture of the present morale problems here.

"Perhaps some of the regional offices and service centers could be advantageously combined, but it doesn't necessarily follow that the small district offices aren't performing a useful function in fully serving the communities and States in which they are located. Further, even though a reduction of management functions in the small districts might be justified, it would not follow that the servicing and support functions should be transferred in toto to larger districts. There would still be the same volume of work of this kind; the same number of employees would still be required to do this work; and its removal would decrease the effectiveness of the servicing and enforcement effort, as well as minimizing taxpayer assistance. Why, then, uproot or otherwise work personal hardships on the people who are now doing the work?"

"How long can a modified district retain its entity? They're hiding their heads in the sand if they really do believe that we can operate as they tell us we will. I don't think they're telling us the whole story."

"Service to the Wyoming taxpayers is bound to be reduced. Apparently all of the servicing functions are to be transferred to Denver."

"Think of the effect of an annual quarter-million dollar reduction in payroll in our already depressed local economy."

"Even though it will cost me money to move, as I know I must, I am not so much concerned about myself; I have lived with the concept of mobility for a long time. I am concerned about the impact on our married women who can't possibly move."

"The general reaction is one of shock, of frustration, of disappointment, of disillusionment."

"It's all happening so fast, and we have had no advance warning. Out of the clear blue sky, we are suddenly told that we will have to move. They say that they will exert every effort to help us. It seems to some of us that they haven't really considered what this means to those who can't move."

"My job is one of those eliminated. I am a single woman, true, but I still have family responsibilities. I recently bought a home here to provide for my aged and invalid mother. To sell it on the present Cheyenne market would cost me money I can't afford."

"Two or three years more work would see my family over the hump; by then our expenses for school, etc., would be reduced so that both my husband and I wouldn't have to work."

"The lack of information is working a terrific hardship on my own and many other families. All personal plans for vacations, school, etc., for this year are affected."

"How can they make so much ado about integrity and then pull a stunt like this?"

"The people largely adversely affected are those in the modified districts. Why should the people in the servicing districts sit there undisturbed, and actually benefit from the change; why should not the positions they occupy be open to competition to displaced personnel?"

"It's difficult to live with the feeling of insecurity. Most of us just don't know where we stand."

"I recently moved here in good faith to accept a position in this district office. When I arrived, I bought a home for my family. I assume that I will be placed elsewhere, but the problem of providing a home for my family there is a very real one. I don't expect to sell my present home for anywhere near enough to realize my equity. In fact, I probably will lose it entirely. Where can I find enough money to make a down payment in a new town?"

"I know of several recent instances where people leaving Cheyenne had to sell their homes at tremendous losses."

"My husband is employed in Cheyenne. How can I move to 'follow the work' to another office?"

"Most of the published information concerns the management officials to be transferred. Many more people, particularly lower-paid married women, won't be able to move. What about them?"

"All this to save five million a year? Have they considered how much it will cost the families involved?"

Unquestionably, we will lose much talent and experience because of employee belief that the Service has let them down. How do we regain our composure, our dignity, our esprit de corps—how long will it take for management to be accepted again by employees—how long will it take to regain our stature?

These, of course, are initial reactions, and much of the evident despair can be attributed to what we hope is a lack of information. Mr. Paul Schuster, our local District Director, has committed himself to keeping our employees rapidly and fully informed, and has done an admirable job in this regard. Personal problems, however, would still exist, no matter how much information is disseminated, if the planned changes were put through in their entirety.

Your Bulletin Board issue of March 6, 1963, relates to the proposed change, but the emphasis is entirely on the number of management people that may be involved. As we in the modified districts see it, however, this completely ignored the problems of those in lower echelons who, although they may be offered jobs in other locations, would be unable to move because of family responsibilities. In our district, there are the people who are most troubled.

Many of our people think that this unprecedented and hasty tactical move was a serious error in employee relations. There is no question about the fact that employee morale has reached its lowest ebb. Some of our people have said that IRS is too insecure and that they will shop around for other positions.

We have just been informed that Secretary Dillion has called for a review of the proposed change in the light of protests received and that he has also delayed any change until January 1, 1964. The employees are hoping for a quick decision, because they believe that this is just a short reprieve. Anxiety is at a high pitch during the interim, and the index of efficiency nosedives when decisions are in a study state. Whatever the decision, it would be better to know.

In summary, then, we do not believe that the change as it relates to the modified districts would materially benefit the Service; we do believe that it would work serious hardships on our people.

Sincerely yours,

W. L. Vickers,
President, Local Chapter 31.

BEEF PRICES

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, the State of Wyoming derives a large share of its income from the sale of livestock.

Indeed, the very mention of the name "Wyoming" connotes the same kind of image as it does in mentioning the name of the State of the distinguished Vice President and the President of this body—Texas. It brings to mind visions of vast herds of cattle, of mammoth cattle drives and colorful cowboys. And while the modern cowboy bears little resemblance to those now found on television, the importance of the western livestock industry has not changed.

It is therefore very disturbing to me, Mr. President, to watch the price of fat cattle sharply decline in recent months. In a free enterprise economy we are accustomed to price fluctuations but those that we have witnessed recently are of such a nature as to indicate that something more than supply and demand may be behind them.

In the last 60 to 70 days the price of fat cattle has dropped $7 a hundredweight. This means, Mr. President, that a Wyoming stockman who brings a 1,000-pound steer to market now receives $70 less for that animal than he did late in December. This is not a monetary loss that can be easily assumed and a continuation of this trend would spell economic disaster for many of my State's beef producers.

For several years the Agriculture Appropriations Subcommittee has had a specific interest in the administration of the Packers and Stockyards Act. As a member of this subcommittee I have been an advocate of a vigorous administration of that act. And I have suggested that an increase in operating funds was necessary. Mr. President, I am pleased that the Appropriations Committee has been generous in its support of my proposals and we have witnessed in recent years positive results of our concern that our laws in this area be completely and impartially enforced.

Mr. President, we cannot rest on our laurels. We in the Congress owe it to the Nation to protect the individual citizen from any unfair or illegal practices that may impinge upon his ability to earn his living. Therefore, I intend to take a very close look at this recent price drop. I intend to discover its affect upon the producer and the consumer and the reasons behind such a drastic change.

At this point I do not know what this investigation will turn up. But I intend to make its results known to this body. This matter is of vital importance to a great segment of the population and it is essential that we make certain that the rights of all concerned are fully protected.

TIME TO CONSIDER THE CONSUMER

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, for a number of years import restrictions on residual fuel oil placed an increasingly heavy burden on the consumers of the entire east coast of the United States, which accounts for nearly two-thirds of the total U.S. consumption of residual fuel oil. Residual fuel oil supplies about a third of our industrial fuel needs, about 15 percent of all electric utility fuel needs and it heats the bulk of all apartment and public buildings along the east coast. In short, it is a vital commodity, particularly for the New England States and for New York.

Yet, Mr. President, under the arbitrary and clearly inadequate quota allocation for the year ending March 31, 1963, residual fuel oil suppliers report that supplies are nearly exhausted and that unless emergency help is provided no more residual fuel oil will be available until the new allocations are effective April 1. This presents a particularly serious problem because the exceptionally cold winter has required greater consumption than usual of oil stocks used for heating and to generate electricity.

Action is necessary to provide necessary additional supplies for this year and to insure that the same kind of shortage does not keep on occurring year after year, to the serious detriment of the east coast suppliers and all their consumers. It is clearly time for the Department of the Interior to take a realistic stand on the matter.

In my judgment, there is no fair or legitimate reason why the millions of consumers in New York State and New England should be compelled to pay higher prices for such an important commodity as fuel oil merely at the whim of a few coal interests. Last year, as a result of similar shortages, the customers of the Long Island Lighting Co. had their bills upped because of oil shortages at this time of year. American shippers have had to pay more for the fuel oil they need than foreign vessels docked right beside them, whose bonded oil is not subject to import duties. The entire import quota system on residual oil is exactly the type of special interest protection that hurts millions of consumers and has the overall effect of hampering the industrial growth that is so important to this Nation.

Mr. President, I favor complete abolition of residual oil quotas over the next few years and the establishment of a genuinely competitive market for residual oil and other fuels on the east coast. Should this not be feasible at the moment, what is urgently required, is a meaningful relaxation of the present unnecessarily restrictive quota system. My colleague [Mr. JAVITS] and I have directed an urgent request to the President to review the entire program and to take a fair an equitable consideration of the needs of the consumers of this important product. The report submitted in the form of a memorandum for the President by the Office of Emergency Planning on February 13 makes it clear that present arrangements do not serve the genuine national interest. Residual fuel oil comes primarily from Venezuela, which is an integral member of the hemispheric defense system on which we depend. It is absurd to conduct a vast foreign-aid program under the Alliance for Progress for Venezuela and at the same time to deny to the Venezuelans the right to sell products we badly need in the United States.

Furthermore, it is wholly inconsistent to speak of tax reform, closing tax loopholes, and providing additional funds for consumer spending on the one hand while perpetuating a system of fuel regulations that hurts consumers, hampers industrial growth and benefits only a tiny minority of special interests. It is even more inconsistent to talk about the need for a faster rate of economic growth while maintaining a fuel policy that penalizes new factories or installations and makes it harder for the competitive suppliers of these facilities to provide fuel at a reasonable price.

Mr. President, it is important to take a broad view of this problem. National economic considerations and international policies are involved. The existing policy on residual fuel oil imports, as the Office of Emergency Planning has made very clear, no longer meets the economic needs of the great majority of those concerned. I sincerely hope the President will review this situation promptly and take action to encourage a meaningful relaxation of residual fuel imports, a relaxation which can redound to the benefit of millions of consumers and will help promote the economic growth we all desire.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to include, following my remarks, the text of a telegram sent by Senator JAVITS and myself to the President yesterday.

There being no objection, the telegram was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

> This wire concerns the imminent decision on residual fuel oil import quotas for the year beginning April 1, 1963.
>
> We believe that the report to you, released on February 13, 1963, by the Office of Emergency Planning, is convincing evidence of the unnecessary hardships caused by the quota system to the consumers of fuel oil in the United States—especially on the east coast. The report is also significant in that it establishes the irrelevance of the argument that residual fuel oil quotas are necessary for national security. Such considerations are clearly and properly put on a hemisphere-wide basis, and the issue of coal reserves and coal transportation facilities for domestic emergency purposes is finally put to rest. Therefore, we favor elimination of the residual fuel oil import quota system.
>
> However, should the optimum course of eliminating the system not be possible at this time, we urge the following steps:
>
> (1) "Meaningful" relaxation of the quota for next year.
>
> (2) Revision of the quota allocation system so that independent distributors of fuel oil and consumers may freely deal in this product within whatever overall national quota may be established.
>
> (3) At the minimum, institution of a system whereby additions to the overall national quota, urgently required by the installation of new facilities to service a growing population and expanding industry, may be distributed in a competitive manner; that is, by permitting new fuel oil consumers freedom of choice among suppliers by allocating to such installations or their fuel oil suppliers sufficient fuel oil to meet their specific needs.
>
> It is our view that the third suggestion would serve to prevent perpetuation of a noncompetitive system and could serve as an experiment in changing the administration of the entire quota system in line with the consumers' interest in competition among suppliers.
>
> We urgently request immediate action to bring about increased and competitively supplied amount of residual fuel oil to meet vital consumer needs.
>
> JACOB K. JAVITS,
> *U.S. Senate.*
> KENNETH B. KEATING,
> *U.S. Senate.*

TOOLS FOR FREEDOM

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, a very impressive and energetic organization has been brought to my attention known as the Tools for Freedom. This private, nonprofit organization, which has been in operation for 2 years, was initiated by American businessmen concentrated mostly in the New York and New England areas. Under the very able and competent leadership of its executive director, Robert Murrow, it is now expanding into a nationwide program.

Mr. President, the purpose of Tools for Freedom is to assist schools in the emerging countries of Asia, Africa, and Latin America by providing them with desperately needed training tools—tools which have become obsolete in American industry, having been replaced through technological improvements and automation. To date, various U.S. manufacturers have donated over 200 tons of equipment in response to the numerous requests submitted by foreign schools in 14 underdeveloped countries of the free world. Quite clearly, by their efforts, Tools for Freedom hopes to help these countries improve, increase, and expand their own industrial and agricultural productivity. In turn, this program offers advantages to U.S. manufacturers in the form of tax benefits in addition to providing oversea showcases for their products which in some instances may stimulate oversea contracts.

Mr. President, by donating the material upon which the emerging countries can build their economy, U.S. business is in fact running its own private and effective foreign aid effort. In the long run, by increasing the economic growth and stability of these countries, U.S. business can help combat the tide of communism.

FUTILE AND FOOLISH CIVIL DEFENSE PROGRAM SHOULD BE ENDED

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, civil defense bureaucrats including those heading up the civil defense spending program in the Department of Defense continue in their efforts to dupe the American public into believing that we have an effective civil defense program.

In the midst of the Cuban crisis last October the planners doubled the number of potential shelter spaces, so-called, overnight. By simply using a mimeograph machine they lowered the suitable safety factor from 100 to 40—meaning one would supposedly be 40 times safer inside than out. Of course, it is highly problematical whether in a nuclear attack lives would be saved even if a person were 100 times safer in one of these spaces than out of it.

At any rate, signs were hurriedly put up indicating shelter areas—most of them after the crisis subsided. I suppose that the main purpose of these shelter signs was to soothe the anxiety of any worried citizen, as they certainly would serve no other worthwhile purpose.

For instance, a member of my staff reported to me that his apartment became a fallout shelter overnight. When he called local civil defense headquarters for information as to the nearest shelter for him and his family, he was told he was living in it. Signs were put up outside his door denoting his floor as a fallout shelter—one flight above ground level. It is as though the planners believe that merely by scattering shelter signs around public buildings, office buildings, and apartment houses they will somehow convince Americans they are safe in event of nuclear attack.

Although the Congress appropriated $208 million in 1961 and an additional $38 million in 1962 for marking and provisioning fallout shelters, when the crisis came most of them could not be found, were not marked, or were unusable. Only a handful were provisioned. Rations and medical kits on which millions of dollars had been spent were still stocked in Federal warehouses and arsenals. Since then some of these so-called shelters have been provisioned with distilled water, which will eventually deteriorate, and a commodity known as fallout shelter biscuits. For the latter, incidentally, bakeries throughout the Nation have received millions of dollars of taxpayers' money. I suppose that we can find some little consolation for this expenditure in the fact that in some small way our economy—or at least that of our bakers—was stimulated. That is the only good that could possibly result from this boondoggle.

Mr. President, in the Dayton Daily News, one of Ohio's great newspapers, there appeared on March 3, 1963, a column entitled "Shelterless Welcome To Join Our Cracker-Chewing Gang," by Jim Fain, the outstanding editor of that fine newspaper. It is an excellent example of perceptive journalistic reporting at its best. There is nothing so devastating to pomposity and the ridiculous as laughter.

Through the medium of serious humor Mr. Fain in a few words reveals the ludicrousness of the civil defense program. Through such responsible journalism those in charge of our civil defense effort will soon learn the truth of Lincoln's remark "you can fool all the people some of the time, and some of the people all the time, but you cannot fool all the people all of the time." I commend this column to my colleagues and ask unanimous consent that it be printed at this point in the Record as part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Shelterless Welcome To Join Our Cracker-Chewing Gang

The thing you need most in newspaper business we finally got: Our very own personally monogramed bomb shelter.

There are big yellow signs plastered all over us here at Fourth and Ludlow to convince the scoffers. Civil defense regards us as a port in storm, whatever the rest of you think. We are haven, sanctuary, Gibraltar (no cracks about last apes, please). We are nuclear fallout proof, however much radiation sickness we may contract from those 100-megaton letters to the editor you launch our way.

This is not a singular honor. There are 25 other public shelters hereabouts. The new public library is probably the safest—and there you have cultural riches during the 2 weeks you are supposed to keep your head down.

Hotels and motels are considered ideal because of the libations on deck there. We boast no saloon here at the Daily News, but the civil defense people have us awash with water.

In our basement right now there is water enough to keep 1,140 ordinary people afloat for 2 weeks. Walter Lippmann only knows how long that much water will last a newspaper crowd. As a general thing, we do not approve of adulterating whisky.

Anyway, we have 945 gallons of water downstairs in case you feel thirsty after the bomb drops. Furthermore, we have no pistols to keep you out. You're welcome to come in and heist a glass with us.

We also have some wheat flower biscuits that look like graham crackers and taste (it says here; this I have not market researched; we all have our principles) like animal crackers. Do they still make animal crackers?

The charm of these crackers, according to the CD again, is that they don't make you thirsty, so the water goes further. It probably also is true that they don't make you hungry, so the crackers go further.

Anyway, we have enough for 340 people for 2 weeks. I am not sure how many crackers that is, probably four or five dozen.

If you are big for crackers, relax. More are en route. We expect soon to be able to feed a multitude of 1,140 as many crackers as they can swing.

It also pleases us editorial types here on the third floor of the building (face it: The editorial syndrome by definition reflects paranoid certitude that it is the center of the universe) that the shelter signs point in our direction.

Civil defense says this is because the middle floors of a building are safest. We know better. Neither living nor dying by the sword, we can blithely absorb sticks, stones, and megatons in profusion. It's that ever-loving overkilling pen we sweat out. Just keep us out of the sharp-tongued, linguistic briar patch, Brer Fox. Then bombs agley.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, over $1 billion has already been wasted on civil defense. In the budget for 1964, $300 million is requested of which over $200 million is for shelter purposes. It is projected that over $543 million will be requested for shelter protection alone in each of the ensuing 4 fiscal years. As of yet, administration officials have failed to enunciate a clear, firm policy as to what our goals are insofar as civil defense is concerned. Last year we were asked for $700 million, this year $300 million. Where will it end?

Those favoring a massive fallout shelter building program have estimated that it will cost anywhere from $20 to $200 billion. Even then there is no guarantee that it will be effective. With extensive advances being made in rockets and nuclear technology, such a fallout shelter program would probably be obsolete before being completed. Unless we are prepared to embark on such a vast gamble and spend perhaps $200 billion of the taxpayer's money, we should carefully consider the wisdom of piecemeal appropriations amounting to hundreds of millions of dollars with no really effective purpose.

Mr. President, I desire at all times to support the administration when I can in good conscience do so. I am proud of the record being made by President Kennedy. I am proud of his firm, determined, resolute and unyielding policy toward Khrushchev and Castro's Cuba, which compelled Khrushchev to turn tail, withdraw his missiles and airplanes, and is now compelling him to withdraw his troops. However, I urge administration leaders to review present civil defense policy so that we in the Congress may be aware of the ultimate cost and of what will actually be accomplished. Until that is done, I for one, do not intend to vote for further expenditures of hundreds of millions of taxpayers' dollars for foolish and useless civil defense programs.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will my colleague yield?

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. I am glad to yield to my colleague, the distinguished senior Senator from Ohio.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator's time has expired. The senior Senator from Ohio may be recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may have an additional minute so that I may yield to my colleague.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request by the Senator from Ohio? The Chair hears none; and, without objection, the Senator from Ohio may proceed for 1 additional minute. The Senator yields to his colleague.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I express my concurrence with what my colleague has said about the plan for expending Federal money in the amounts mentioned for the building of shelters under civil defense. I think that the positions my colleague has taken in the past several years have been sound. No plan has been evolved.

I recall that as early as 1950 there was talk about spending $50 billion. What this will eventually lead to no one can foretell.

Mr. President, I subscribe to the views my colleague has expressed.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. I thank my colleague.

DEATH OF REPRESENTATIVE CLYDE DOYLE OF CALIFORNIA

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, by now the House has heard the tragic news about our colleague, the late Clyde Doyle, of California, who passed away only a few hours ago. All of us mourn his passing.

I had the pleasure of calling the late Representative Doyle my friend. For nearly 20 years he served his district, his State, and his country in the Congress of the United States. He was a dedicated public servant. He paid unswerving devotion to his country and to his country's needs.

The Nation has lost a valued public servant, and we have lost a very dear friend.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KUCHEL. I yield.

Mr. KEATING. I should like to join in expressing sincere sorrow over the passing of Clyde Doyle. He was a fine man and a most conscientious Member of the other body. Only a week or two ago I saw Clyde and thought he looked not up to par, so I said, "Clyde, you ought to slow down a little bit." He said, "Well, that is a hard thing to do." That was typical of him.

He was one of the hardest working Members of the other body, sincerely dedicated to the interests of our country. His loss will be deeply felt in many areas. We will miss him here in the Congress and throughout the Nation. I extend to his family my sincere sympathy.

Mr. KUCHEL. I thank my friend from New York.

Mr ENGLE rose.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I now yield to my colleague from California.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, I deeply regret the death of my old and very dear friend, Clyde Doyle, who passed away very tragically and unexpectedly today.

He was elected to Congress by the 23d District of California nine times.

He was a very fine lawyer, a man with the strongest sense of civic responsibility, a dedicated public servant.

He was blessed, above all else, with a great love for people, and he had a very special quality of enthusiasm which never faded with the passing of the years.

I wish to quote what our great and beloved former Speaker of the House of Representatives, Sam Rayburn, said about Clyde Doyle:

> Clyde Doyle is one of the most effective men in his committees and also on the floor of the House of Representatives.
>
> He is able, he is honest, and he has the facility for expressing himself in such a way as to impress all the Members of the House with his knowledge of the subject in hand. I think Clyde is one of the very best men we have in the House of Representatives.
>
> We have shown our confidence in him in many ways.

Of course, Mr. President, that was true. The people of his district showed their confidence in him in many ways.

He received both the nomination of his own party and that of the Republican Party in 1952 and 1958. In the last election in which a Member of the Congress was permitted to cross-file on both tickets, he was the only Member of the House in southern California who had the distinction of being nominated by both parties. This was an unusual and a unique tribute.

His outstanding community leadership over a period of many years was recognized by his own community. In 1936 he received unanimously the award of the Meritorious Citizenship Plaque by a vote of all the service clubs in Long Beach, Calif., as the most valuable and useful adult citizen in Long Beach.

Clyde Doyle will be deeply missed by all of us who knew him so well. His services in the Congress of the United States were extremely valuable. Clyde Doyle believed there was no office in the land that equaled service in the Congress of the United States. He was proud of that service. He was proud of the great district which he represented.

His death is a loss not only to the State of California, but to the Congress of the United States and the American people.

I thank my colleague for yielding to me.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. Stennis].

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I join my colleague in a word of tribute to our late colleague, Representative Doyle, of California. I came to know him well through our duties relating to the subject of the armed services and respected him and appreciated the great character he was.

One of the things that impressed me was his untiring interest in the youth of the Nation. He was always trying to get the country to take a step forward and open up opportunities and corrective measures for our young people. I join my colleague in expressing our sorrow at the news of his passing.

RED SKELTON—GREAT AMERICAN ENTERTAINER—RECEIVES NATIONAL BROTHERHOOD AWARD

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, on Monday night in San Diego, the National Conference of Christians and Jews conferred its highest honor—the National Brotherhood Award—on a distinguished American, Red Skelton.

Millions of us, of course, know Red Skelton as one of the world's superb entertainers. Perhaps not all of us know of his great humanitarianism.

As the conference's citation pointed out, Red Skelton has made a "distinguished contribution to the advancement of good human relations among all people."

Red Skelton's infectious humor has done more than bring happiness to millions of his fellow Americans. He has pointed out our foibles, but always affectionately and gently, in the conviction that we are all brothers and sisters under the American flag—and could laugh at and with each other because we are free and equal, one as good as the next, regardless of origin, station, belief, or color.

Because of his love for his fellow American, he has always been willing to entertain, whether an audience was great or small.

Before entering the service in the Second World War he gave some 3,500 shows before GI audiences. As a member of the Armed Forces, he made countless appearances before audiences ranging from 1 to 20,000.

The number of times he has helped his fellow man—whether with his time, influence, or money—will never be accurately recorded. Red Skelton, moreover, would not want them recorded.

It will come as no surprise that Red Skelton is a deeply religious man.

His credo, in his own words, is:

> I believe we were all put here for a purpose—and I was put here to make people laugh. If it's good enough for the Man upstairs, it's good enough for me.

Red Skelton, indeed, is a true believer in the aims and purposes of the National Conference of Christians and Jews, which, in a few words, are: "The brotherhood of man under the fatherhood of God."

I feel, and I am sure my colleagues and Americans everywhere will agree, that our beloved comedian with the shock of red hair and rubber face is a most fitting recipient of the National Brotherhood Award.

FLOOD CONTROL SYSTEM SAVED $205 MILLION

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, toward January, the heavens suddenly began to open in the Sacramento Valley in my State of California. The downpour continued and gathered strength. A flood of vast proportions was in the making, driven by a gale. The runoff of water swept trees and cabins before it, as it hurtled toward the floor of the valley.

Had it not been for the effective and efficient system of dams, levees, and bypasses in the Sacramento Valley, flood damage would have wreaked a grievous toll.

The Army Corps of Engineers estimated that $205 million of destruction would have accompanied the torrent of rain except for the farflung, manmade flood control system in which the Federal Government played a crucially vital part. For the third time in the last 10 years, the giant Folsom Dam saved the Sacramento area from calamity. I salute the Federal Government, the Congress, and the Engineers, for the protection of life and property in my State, and for the splendid role which the National Government played. All this is discussed in an excellent article by Mr. Tom Arden appearing in the Sacramento Bee, Sunday, March 10, 1963.

I ask consent that the article appear in the body of the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Flood Control System Saved $205 Million

(By Tom Arden)

The Army Corps of Engineers figures dams, levees, and bypasses in the Sacramento Valley combined to prevent $205 million in damages during the violent storms of a few weeks ago.

Without this coordinated system of controls, the Sacramento River, according to a survey just completed, would have wrought damages totaling $160 million and $45 million in havoc would have been caused along the American River.

In the San Joaquin Valley, the Sacramento district office of the Army Engineers reports about $15 million in damages would have resulted from floods if dams had not been built to check riverflows.

Particularly dramatic, says Col. Herbert N. Turner, Chief of the Army Engineers Sacramento district, was the effectiveness of Folsom Dam and the north levee system from Carmichael Bluffs to the new State fair site in preventing the American River from overflowing to cause the type of flooding which occurred in 1950, before the dam and levee were constructed.

The stage was set for the flood control system to play its role in the Sacramento Valley when rain began pelting down January 29. First came 4 to 6 inches well spread over the watershed areas of the Feather, Yuba, and American Rivers.

Another 24 hours and the downpour was increased by another 6 to 8 inches with the prospect of more to come.

EFFECT OF RUNOFF

"As the storm moved in from the southwest, driven by gale wind against the frozen Sierra," reads a special report just completed by Clyde J. Gorman, chief of the technical liaison branch of the Army Engineers Sacramento district, "runoff climbed and brought with it trees, cabins, trailers, and butane tanks in the 2-mile drop to the valley floor.

"Mountain highways and railroads were washed out, communications knocked out.

"The Yuba broke all records with a flow of 150,000 cubic feet per second, 2,000 over the peak which contributed to the well remembered Yuba City disaster of 1955.

"The Feather peaked at 186,000 as against 203,000 in 1955, which shows the storm pattern tapering off to the north.

"But on the American the 1955 flow of 219,000 was topped by a flow of 240,000, second only to an estimated flow of 280,000 in the legendary flood of 1862."

SAFE PASSAGE

"Had there been no flood control system the lower Sacramento Valley would have been a shallow sea and the delta, plagued by high tides and heavy inflow, would have looked like an extension of Suisun Bay.

"Instead, channel capacities of the levee and bypass system were utilized to pass the flood safely through the valley. This is not to say there were no anxious moments. High velocity flows cut into the levee slopes below Nicolaus on the Feather, and upstream at Yuba City residents mindful of 1955 began to evacuate. But the levees, as they are supposed to do, contained the floods, provided people a place to stand and fight if need be, and to patrol the rivers.

"With only moderate flows above the latitude of Chico, the Sacramento River had no problems until its confluence with the combined Feather, Yuba, and Sutter bypass flows. It was here that Fremont weir picked up an overflow of 193,000 cubic feet per second and sent it down the Yolo bypass which can accommodate 377,000 cubic feet per second at this point."

SIMPLE ARITHMETIC

"Below this point the Sacramento main stem continued to carry 94,000 cubic feet per second. The channel capacity of the river at Sacramento is 110,000. Add 193,000 to 94,000 and you get 287,000.

"The difference between 287,000 and 110,000 river capacity leaves small speculation as to where the excess inflow of 177,000 from the north would have gone.

"Now consider the simultaneous threat from the east on the American. Add an inflow of 240,000 to a river that could stand only 17,000 more cubic feet per second at Sacramento.

"But Folsom Dam caught and restrained the American. The water began creeping up behind the spillway gates and it was time to use the leveed channel capacity below Folsom. This channel can take 115,000 cubic feet per second, so releases from Folsom were stepped up 10,000 per hour until they reached 110,000.

"ROOM FOR BOTH

"It will be remembered that the Sacramento main stem at its confluence with the American could now take only 17,000 more second feet. So the Sacramento weir was opened and 94,000 cubic feet per second was turned into Yolo bypass before the American could hit town.

"This left plenty of room for both rivers with 16,000 cubic feet per second to spare. The small remaining space behind Folsom left some room to maneuver had the storm continued.

"It was a smooth and efficient operation which did not escape carping from those who choose to live between the levees and those who do not understand.

"But it saved the town and the croplands between here and the bay."

ANSWER TO CRITICS

Some complaints were made that water was released too fast from behind Folsom Dam, which has a storage capacity of 1 million acre-feet.

But Federal officials pointed out the level of Folsom Lake jumped from 443,500 acre-feet to 835,000 acre-feet in a little more than 2 days.

Despite the need to maintain space for possible more heavy inflows, it was emphasized, the releases into the American downstream from the dam were less than the project was designed for.

FEDERAL-STATE WATER RIGHTS—MUST THERE BE CONFLICT?—SPEECH BY SENATOR MOSS

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, few areas in Federal-State relations have offered more resistance to settlement than the complex and controversial area of Federal-State water rights. The problem is national in scope, but it is especially troublesome in the semiarid regions of the West where every drop of water is precious, and where Federal ownership of millions of acres of land raises jurisdictional problems over the development, appropriation, and use of the water there.

Earlier this week in Los Angeles, Senator FRANK E. MOSS, of Utah, gave a comprehensive and challenging summary of the water rights question. The occasion was a water rights symposium at the annual midwinter conference of the National District Attorneys' Association, of which Senator Moss was formerly national president. I commend his excellent speech entitled "Federal-State Water Rights—Must There Be Conflict?" to all who are interested in water and the right to use it.

I ask unanimous consent that the speech be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FEDERAL-STATE WATER RIGHTS—MUST THERE BE CONFLICT?

(Speech by Senator FRANK E. MOSS, of Utah, before annual Midwinter Conference of the National District Attorneys Association Los Angeles, Calif., March 11, 1963)

It is indeed an honor and a privilege to be with you here today to participate in this symposium on Federal-State water rights problems. Having been born and raised in the arid State of Utah, the importance of water is deeply ingrained in my consciousness. From the vantage point of membership on the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and as a member of the Senate Select Committee on National Water Resources during the period of its existence from 1959 to 1961, I have had considerable exposure to the problems of Federal-State conflict over water rights. Because of the importance of the problem, I believe there is no other problem area facing the Congress the outcome of which could have such a profound effect on the future of the Western States.

The issue was highlighted by the Select Committee on National Water Resources in its report to the Senate in January 1961. After a recitation of the basis for conflict, that committee called for broad objective inquiry into the problem, and for statesmanship of the highest caliber on the part of both the Congress and the States in the solution of the Federal-States water rights problem. The committee concluded its remarks on this subject with the words:

"A solution must be worked out, and worked out promptly, for the preservation of the historic pattern under which our people have grown great."

I was indeed pleased to hear from my old friend, Hal Kennedy, about the work he is doing, through his statewide Federal-State Water Rights Committee of the Feather River Project Association, to develop public understanding of the problems involved. For among the other findings of the select committee it was pointed out that the first and most important step toward getting anything done in the water field is the development of increased public awareness and understanding of the problems, of their effects on the Nation's economy, and the possible ways of solving them. I believe that a continuation of efforts along the lines that Hal has started may lay the groundwork for eventual success in our endeavor to work out an acceptable solution to these problems. I agree with him that the task ahead is not an easy one, and that it may be a year or more before the climate is favorable for seeking congressional action on legislation which will make a start on clarification of the problem.

SOURCE OF CONFLICT

Although widespread interest in the Federal-State water rights conflict has developed only in the last decade or so, the sources of conflict between Federal and State sovereignty have been building up over more than a century. These conflicts have been the subject of concern to water users and their lawyers for many decades, but it took a combination of circumstances, culminating in the Fallbrook case and the Supreme Court decision in the Pelton case, and other recent developments, to bring the conflict out in the open. A few brief comments as to the two sides of the controversy will be helpful in describing what we should try to do.

In support of the position held generally by the States, several Federal statutes enacted in the latter half of the 19th century, in connection with the disposition of portions of the public lands, led to the supposition that the United States had permanently transferred control over water rights to the States. I refer particularly to section 9 of the act of July 26, 1866, where the Congress specifically provided for upholding existing water rights, and that all patents to the public lands were to be subject to vested water rights; to section 17 of the act of July 9, 1870, which included a similar protection of vested water rights; and to the Desert Land Act of March 3, 1877, which provided that water rights were to depend on prior appropriation, and that surplus waters of the public lands were to be free for appropriation and use by the public, subject to existing rights.

Furthermore, in legislation admitting certain Western States to the Union, Congress accepted the State constitutions, which included provisions recognizing and confirming existing water rights, setting up procedures for acquiring water rights under State law, and in some instances specifically declaring State ownership or control of waters arising or flowing within the States concerned.

Several later Federal enactments also indicated that Congress was thinking in terms of State control of water rights. For example, section 8 of the Federal Reclamation Act of 1902 includes express provision that Federal activity in the field of reclamation was not to interfere with State laws relating to the control, appropriation, use, or distribution of water used in irrigation, or any vested right acquired thereunder, and the Secretary of the Interior was directed to proceed in conformity with State laws in carrying out the provisions of the Reclamation Act, thus implying, according to some students of the problem, a recognition of State sovereignty over the use of water for irrigation in the Western States.

Later, section 27 of the Federal Power Act, enacted by the Congress in 1920, states that that act was not to be construed as affecting or intending to affect or in any way to interfere with the laws of the respective States relating to the control, appropriation, use, or distribution of water used in irrigation or for municipal or other uses, or any vested right acquired therein. Furthermore, the law required the applicant for license to furnish satisfactory evidence that he had complied with the requirements of the State or States within which the proposed project was to be located.

Another factor leading to more active conflict between Federal and State laws was the great expansion of Federal programs in the field of water resources in 1936, brought about by the congressional declaration of policy on flood control, in which that function was stated to be a proper activity of the Federal Government because of the adverse effects of floods on commerce between the States and on the national welfare.

Potential conflicts between Federal flood control activity in the Western States and State laws having become very apparent and very widespread in the first few years of operation under the 1936 Flood Control Act, Congress, in the 1944 Flood Control Act, declared its policy to recognize the interests and rights of the States in determining the development of the watersheds within their borders. Congress also provided, in section 1(b) of the act, that the use of works authorized for navigation shall be only such use as does not conflict with any beneficial consumptive use of water in the 17 Western States. These provisions have been reiterated in each successive Rivers and Harbors and Flood Control Authorization Act since that date, thus seeming to indicate a continuing willingness on the part of the Congress to relinquish the sovereignty of the United States over navigable waters in specific cases. The constitutional issue has not been finally settled in connection with these projects, however, because it is a well documented fact that one Congress cannot bind future congresses; thus, the waiver of navigation rights could be repealed at some future date.

A final, and the most recent Federal statute that I am going to mention in this context is the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act of August 4, 1954. Section 4 of this act establishes, as one of the prerequisites for Federal assistance in watershed development, the requirement that local organizations or landowners acquire such water rights, pursuant to State law, as may be needed in the installation and operation of the works of improvement.

From the viewpoint of the laws which Congress has enacted, therefore, I think it could be said that there need be no conflict between Federal and State water rights. Congress has expressed itself in, and the President has signified concurrence by affixing his signature to, many statutes which to me at least make this abundantly clear.

In support of the Federal side of the controversy, however, it can be stated that none of the legislative enactments I have just mentioned made any effort to change Federal responsibilities in the field of commerce, nor was any reference made to their effect on Federal responsibilities in the fields of national defense and general welfare, or on the treatymaking powers of the President. To the contrary, the Congress on several occasions, going back to the latter years of the 19th century, has reaffirmed by statute the Federal sovereignty with respect to navigation.

The primary support for the Federal side appears to rest on certain Supreme Court decisions upholding Federal sovereignty against claimants of water rights under State laws. There seems to be agreement that among the most important of these are ***United States* v. *Rio Grande Dam and Irrigation Co.***, decided in 1899, and ***Winters* v. *United States***, decided in 1908, both of which made it clear that the sovereignty of the United States over waters needed under the commerce and the treatymaking clauses of the Constitution had not been broadly relinquished by any statutory enactments.

Several other court decisions and statutory enactments are worthy of mention in this necessarily brief discussion of the emerging conflicts between Federal and State sovereignty.

In one of these, ***United States* v. *Appalachian Power Co.***, sometimes called the *New River* case, decided by the Supreme Court in 1940, the broad definition of navigable waters stated by Congress in section 3 of the Federal Power Act was broadened further by the Court's dictum that the tributaries of navigable streams also came under the commerce power. This had the effect of broadening greatly the navigation servitude.

Another court decision that has caused serious concern among western lawyers is a 1946 decision by the Supreme Court, the case of ***First Iowa Electric Cooperative* v. *Federal Power Commission***, which made it clear that State laws governing the use or control of water of navigable streams were not applicable when they trespassed in a field also covered by Federal law.

A third decision I want to mention in this context is the one which has had the greatest influence in building up the Western States' concern over potential conflicts between Federal and State laws over water rights. I refer, of course, to *Federal Power Commission* v. *Oregon*, usually referred to as the *Pelton* case. In deciding this in 1955, the U.S. Supreme Court affirmed the supremacy of Federal jurisdiction over unappropriated, nonnavigable waters arising from or flowing over reserved lands. Soon after the *Pelton* case was decided, the fears of western water users were heightened by certain pleadings made by the Department of Justice in various lawsuits pending in the West over the water of certain streams, particularly the *Blue River* case in Colorado, and the *Hawthorne* case in Nevada. Pleadings by the Government in these cases, asserting paramount rights to water under the so-called reservation doctrine of the *Pelton* decision, led many westerners to fear that the United States proposed to take away, without compensation, existing water rights acquired under State law. This has been denied by the Department of Justice, although questions remain as to which water rights have been acquired under State law in such manner that there is no future challenge possible as to the existence of a valid property right.

Even before the Pelton case was decided, the actions of the Federal Government in the suit seeking adjudication of the waters of the Santa Marguerita River threw doubt on water rights obtained by appropriation under California law when the Federal Government was in a position to claim riparian rights. So much has been said about this suit, that I believe it inappropriate for me to add anything further, particularly since the suit is still pending in the U.S. District Court for Southern California. This case, ***United States* v. *Fallbrook Irrigation District***, led to the first efforts to seek a legislative solution to the widening conflict.

LEGISLATIVE ACTION TO DATE

In the last decade, about 50 bills have been introduced in the House and Senate in an attempt to solve the Federal-States water rights controversy by legislation. It would take too much time, and, I am sure, would be repetitious of much that is being covered by other participants in this symposium, for me to list them all at this time. I think it is helpful, however, to point out the four principal types of bills which have been introduced. There have been, and are, a number of variations, but in general, the bills have all fallen within one of these general types.

The first type of bill, exemplified by S. 863 in the 84th and 85th Congress, the Barrett bill, would in essence relinquish Federal control over water in the West to the States. All waters, whether navigable or not, would be free for appropriation and would be subject to State control for all beneficial uses. The Federal Government would be required to proceed in conformity with State laws in the appropriation and use of water. The Federal Power Commission could only license hydroelectric power projects if previous approval of the State with respect to the use of the water had been obtained. It has been argued that the provisions of the bill are so broad that, if enacted, the Federal Government could engage in water resources development in the Western States only with the consent of the States involved.

A second type of bill is somewhat less drastic in its effect on Federal operations, but it does embody a comprehensive provision recognizing State control over water resources, including water on public lands of the United States. These bills are exemplified by S. 1416 of the 86th Congress, in the sponsorship of which I was joined by a number of other Senators. They would require the Federal Government and its licensees to appropriate and use water in compliance with State laws, and would prevent Federal acquisition of or interference with water rights except upon the payment of just compensation, unless the rights were acquired by purchase, exchange, gift, condemnation, or where water is available for acquisition upon proper application to a State for a right to water necessary for the conduct of an authorized Federal program.

A third group of bills covers a lot less ground than the others, being limited in effect to repealing the reservation doctrine of the Pelton decision. These bills, exemplified by S. 851 of the 86th Congress, would provide that the withdrawal or reservation of public lands shall not affect any right to use of water acquired pursuant to State law, either before or after the establishment of such withdrawal or reservation, nor the right of any State to exercise jurisdiction over water rights conferred by the act admitting such State into the Union, or the State's constitution.

A fourth general type of bill is exemplified by S. 2636 of the 87th Congress introduced by Senator KUCHEL in September of 1961. This bill goes slightly beyond the third group of bills to provide that the use of water for navigation in the United States west of the 98th meridian would be subservient to any present and future beneficial consumptive uses, that all rights to the consumptive use of water claimed by the United States under the laws of any State shall be initiated and perfected in accordance with the procedure established by the laws of that State, and that any waters taken by the United States other than by agreement with the owner shall be taken by proceedings in eminent domain. So far no hearings have been held nor have views of any of the Federal agencies been obtained on the bill.

So far in this Congress, only one bill has been introduced, S. 101, by the junior Senator from Colorado. This bill incorporates the provisions of the "reservation" bill, prohibits taking of water under Federal authorization without just compensation for prior water rights, and requires the beneficiaries of any Federal project, license, loan, or grant to secure water rights under State law.

Senator Kuchel and I have discussed the possibility of introducing a water rights bill in this session, but are waiting for, among other things, the outcome of this conference so that any constructive suggestions that are advanced here can be considered.

In spite of my agreement with the philosophy behind most of these bills, I must confess that a realistic appraisal of the current situation leads me to the conclusion that there is little or no opportunity for any of these bills to become law at this time. The hearings records of the Congress are full of objections which have been raised by the agencies of the United States to the provisions contained in one or another of the bills. On only one occasion has there been indication that a certain type of legislation would be acceptable to the administration. This was reflected in the compromise bill worked out in 1958 and submitted to the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee as a proposed repealer of the Pelton decision. However, this bill in the exact form agreed to by the executive branch of the Government, was never introduced. The modified bill that was introduced, the third group of bills that I mentioned earlier, was objected to by the Department of Justice because of the provision dealing with the right of a State to exercise jurisdiction over water rights conferred by the act admitting such State into the Union or such State's constitution. Last December a spokesman for the Department of Justice indicated that he believed the former administration bill went too far, too soon, in that it would disclaim federally reserved rights without there first being a determination of what is being disclaimed or its effect on present or future development programs.

ALTERNATIVES FOR FUTURE ACTION

In the solution of any problem, it is always worthwhile to examine the alternatives. What can we do now? The path of least resistance, of course, is to continue along the path that has been followed for the last few years—that is, to let the situation rock along the way it is, with water rights and interrelationships of Federal and State activities being decided on a case-by-case basis, while the Federal and State positions become even more entrenched. This, it seems to me, would serve to further entrench the Federal point of view, as the Court decisions more and more seem to favor the Federal position. I would question, however, whether we in the West can continue and grow in this fashion, unless we are willing to accept a continuously expanding and growing Federal role in the field of water, and a gradual deterioration of the position of the States and those dependent on water rights acquired under State law.

A second alternative is to support a detailed study in an objective manner of the issues. Such a course of action was recommended by President Eisenhower's Advisory Committee on Water Resources Policy in December of 1955, which called for a study to be made by the Federal Government in collaboration with State and local entities to determine the relationships between property rights to water and the social and economic development of the Nation and the local areas, and of the principles and criteria which should be incorporated into Federal, State, and local laws regarding rights to the appropriation and use of water that would assure its best and most effective use, while at the same time encouraging maximum participation by all parties concerned. No action was taken on this recommendation for the reason, I am told, that the late Senator Barrett felt that all the answers were already known, and that no study was needed.

A third alternative is to ignore the opposition of the Department of Justice and press and to enact legislation in this session of the Congress on the basis of our present knowledge. As I said before, I don't believe there is much likelihood that this course of action can be successful unless the issues could be presented with a lot more light and a lot less heat than has been the case heretofore.

This leads me to the fourth alternative, which is to carefully muster all the facts that we can, develop a bill that is supported by those facts, develop public support for that bill, and then press for its enactment. This, I believe, is the most practical of the alternatives I have suggested. The question then is what facts can be mustered that will convince Congress and the President, over the likely objections of some of the executive branch agencies, of the need for legislation now, and how shall we proceed.

First, I think we will have to obtain all the facts we can about specific instances where Federal action has resulted in the taking of water that was being used by others. I must confess that a rather detailed perusal of many articles on the subject of Federal-State conflict in water rights has failed to turn up many cases where actual damages can be shown. The few cases I have uncovered where actual damages due to loss of water seems to be demonstrated appear to be based on disputes over water rights acquired by the Federal Government by purchase or in other manner under State law. For example, *Hudspeth County Conservation and Reclamation District No. 1* v. *Robbins* (213 F. 2d 425) and *Elephant Butte Irrigation District* v. *Gatlin* (61 N.M. 58). While it is regrettable that both of these were dismissed because the United States could not be made a party to the suit, I am not at all sure of how those cases would have been decided if the dispute could have been tried on its merits. All too often, the cases cited most frequently are based on the loss of the potential development of a water right that has never been actually put to use. I think there is a real need for a detailed, objective study of all the cases that have come up where conflict between Federal and State laws over water rights is alleged, so that the issue can be presented to the Congress in a more easily understood way than it has been in the past.

Many of the State or local projects that are alleged to have been delayed by the Federal-State conflict have never reached the point of authorization by the State. It will be necessary for the sponsors of such projects alleged to be delayed by the Federal-State water rights conflict to come forward with plans, facts, and figures to support the claims that are made that projects are delayed.

Claims are made that the conflict is jeopardizing the entire California State water plan—that bond counsel may insist on a higher interest rate than otherwise if the water rights are clouded by potential Federal claims. My recollection is that the election at which the bond issue was validated in 1960 was a closely contested one. Care must be taken that the opponents of the project are not allowed to stir up the water rights issue so as to continue their opposition to the project in an undercover way. I do not think there is any evident reason why, on the basis of cases that have been decided, there should be any question raised as to the water rights for the California water project that could lead to a higher interest rate on the bonds. Admittedly, some of the pleadings made by the Justice Department, and frequently cited as causes for concern, perhaps could lead to trouble, but I don't believe that they have as yet been accepted by the courts.

Another area in which we must move carefully is in recognizing the effect of the legislation proposed on the multibillion-dollar Federal water resources development projects. We may be sure that no legislation can be enacted that jeopardizes the Government's investment in the navigation, flood control, irrigation, and hydroelectric power projects that have been constructed. In the latter two categories, I don't think there is much of a problem, as most of them in the West, at least, have been constructed under the Federal reclamation laws, with water rights perfected under State laws. The disputes which have come to the courts over compensation for water rights seem generally to have been decided in such a way as to provide for compensation. The matter of water rights, however, has not been as satisfactorily resolved in connection with navigation and flood control projects, and may prove more troublesome, in connection with projects authorized for those purposes. Another area which would appear to retain considerable potential for possible conflict is in connection with Federal fish and wildlife and recreation projects.

In the light of the very brief review that I have made of the situation, therefore, I must conclude that the evidence so far presented as to the Federal-State water rights conflict is somewhat less than conclusive, and that there is need for a more complete and more objective study of the whole problem than has yet been undertaken.

I would suggest that the study be undertaken jointly, by a commission with membership taken from the ranks of Congress, from the executive branch of the Government, the States, and from the public, the latter members, of course, to be from the West.

I realize this is not a new idea. I hesitate to suggest it because of the delay involved, and yet I sincerely believe there is a need for such a study before anything can be done by Congress to quiet the fears of the West. I will appreciate any views that are expressed through this symposium on this subject. As chairman of the Subcommittee on Irrigation and Reclamation of the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, I pledge myself to do everything in my power to push on to a satisfactory conclusion in this controversial area.

PASSING OF AN ERA: DON ANDRES LUGO

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, it is with some sadness and regret that I rise to comment on the recent passing of a member of one of California's oldest families. The death of Andres Lugo at the age of 97 marks the close of an era. The end of a period of history which I believe gives nothing away to any other in its romance, charm, and, above all, graciousness.

The dashing figure of this last of the "Old Spanish Dons" typified the three generations of Lugos who lived under the four flags of California—Spanish, Mexican, Bear Flag, and, since 1850, that of the United States. The grandfather, Don Antonio Maria Lugo, was born in 1775 at Mission San Antonio de Padua. There he received the personal blessing of Father Junipero Serra.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may have 1 more minute.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

Mr. KUCHEL. I thank the Chair.

After serving in the army of the Spanish king, he received in 1813, by royal landgrant, 29,514 acres southeast of Los Angeles. To this Don Antonio gave the name Rancho San Antonio. In 1835 he added the Rancho Santa Ana del Chino and in 1842 the 37,000-acre Rancho San Bernardino to the family holdings.

Life in the southern California of that era was a pastoral one. Horsemanship was a fundamental skill and for the best riders, an art. Don Antonio enjoyed the reputation of being "the best horseman in all California in his day." It is said that he could ride days on his beautiful silver-mounted saddle without leaving his own land. His was a domain stretching from snow-capped peaks almost to the shores of the Pacific.

Don Antonio Maria Lugo contributed to the early development of southern California. In 1818, he adopted the first "Yankee" to come into the region—Joseph Chapman, "El Ingles"—incidentally, the first tourist to become a settler—and provided him with land and cattle. The traditional hospitality and openhandedness of the ranchos welcomed these immigrants. In 1851, Don Antonio sold the Rancho San Bernardino, which included the future sites of San Bernardino, Redlands, and Colton, to Mormon settlers from Salt Lake for $2 per acre. Rancho Santa Ana del Chino, he gave to his daughter and her Yankee husband.

When southern California became part of the United States he served as "alcalde"—mayor—of Los Angeles; and his word and his experience of 80 years did much to unscramble land titles, when he appeared as a witness before the U.S. Land Commission.

Don Vincente Lugo, the son of Don Antonio, also fitted the description of a dashing caballero of the ranchos. Writers of the period in fact referred to him as the "Beau Brummel of Los Angeles."

However, Don Vincente, while enjoying the gracious life of the times, continued the family's role of civic leadership. In 1840, he built the first 2-story adobe in the city, a building, which in 1867 he donated for the founding of St. Vincent's College. This small beginning has developed into one of southern California's leading educational institutions, Loyola University.

In 1850, Don Vicente Lugo built the family ranch, Rancho San Antonio. This is furnished in the fashion of the day using the works of Indian craftsmen as well as the best mementos from Europe. The first upright piano brought to California, purchased for 1,000 hides from a Yankee windjammer which had sailed around the Horn, still stands in the Lugo home today. To this adobe house Don Vicente retired to enjoy a way of life which a traveler described:

> No horses so fast, no cattle so fine, no land so fertile, no rancho more famous than the Rancho San Antonio. No family more prominent, no hospitality more welcome or freely partaken, no hacienda more lovely, happy, or prosperous than that of the Lugos.

Don Andres Lugo, who died recently, represented the third generation of this family. He inherited the family tradition for horsemanship and cattle raising. But his hobby always centered on the maintenance of the traditional appearance, style, and spirit of the old Spanish days. His figure, clad in the romantic costume of the early Spanish Californians with silver saddle and trappings, often entertained new immigrants to the Golden State with his fancy riding and roping feats.

Mr. President, I cannot help but feel sad at the passing of this last representative of that long-departed but fondly remembered way of life. The gallant figure of Andres Lugo passes from the California scene as we celebrate another milestone—California's new place as the first State in population. The thousands of acres once owned by the Lugos sustain many millions of these newcomers, and the long-lived history of this family becomes part of their heritage.

I thank the Chair.

DEATH OF REPRESENTATIVE CLYDE DOYLE, OF CALIFORNIA

Several Senators addressed the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from California yield; and, if so, to whom?

Mr. KUCHEL. I am through, unless a Senator wishes me to yield.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Parliamentarian informs the Chair that the Senator from California yielded the floor.

Does the Senator from California desire to ask unanimous consent that he retain the floor while statements are being made about a deceased colleague?

Mr. KUCHEL. Yes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, does the Senate have official notification?

The VICE PRESIDENT. No. As the Senator from California said a moment ago, there has been no official notification yet of the death of the Representative, but eulogies were started, and it is customary to recognize a colleague from the same State. Senators agree with this exception to the rule, sympathize with it, and are willing to recognize that the Senator may hold the floor, and he, in turn, may yield from time to time to other Senators to make statements. The Chair has been warned that he has not been following the rule. The Chair does not want to be subject to criticism for doing that. The Chair knows that if the request is made, it will not be objected to, and Senators have not been objecting. The Senator from California can hold the floor and yield for 3 minutes at a time. If he wants additional time, he can get it.

Mr. KUCHEL. I thank the Chair. I ask unanimous consent, first of all, that any of our colleagues who desire to make statements in the RECORD on the lamentable passing of our colleague may be permitted to do so.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from California? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. KUCHEL. I yield to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I wish to join in the remarks by our colleagues on the passing of Representative CLYDE DOYLE, with whom I served in the House for many years.

He was an outstanding Member of the House, and his useful work will be remembered.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I wish to join with my colleagues in paying my respects to a dear and wonderful friend who has now gone to his heavenly reward. I have known Representative CLYDE DOYLE for a long time. He was a fine and great Congressman from California. I was grieved to read in this morning's press that he passed away last night.

Representative DOYLE served his country faithfully. He served his State with outstanding ability and dedication. His life was one of compassionate service to his fellow men. I feel it a real loss to learn that he has passed on.

I extend to his loved ones, the members of his family, and to his friends the heartfelt sympathy and sincere condolences of both Mrs. Humphrey and myself. We were privileged to know Representative DOYLE for many years.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, CLYDE DOYLE was a Representative not only of his district in California, in the best sense of devoted service; he was also a man of conscience and courage.

It was my privilege to serve with him in the House for many years. I cherished a personal as well as an official friendship with him. I mourn his untimely passing earlier today.

This is said slowly, with a sense of memory for a good and great man. He worked as if he were to live forever. He lived as if he were to die tomorrow.

CHARLES HADEN ALLDREDGE

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, one who drank deeply from the draught of life and, at the same time, gave much to life, has passed from our midst. I shall miss Charles Haden Alldredge, whom I knew as a scholar, a good friend, and a delightful companion who carried on a lifelong love affair with the humanities.

Charley Alldredge had Southern liberal roots; his soft Alabama accent among Washington cosmopolites was a constant reminder of his birthplace, Montgomery. His father was the late Haden Alldredge, who served for many years on the Interstate Commerce Commission and was one of the great liberals of the South.

Charley's first and last love was writing. He was friend and confidant of some of Washington's best known columnists. A graduate of the University of Alabama, he first worked on the Alabama Journal in Montgomery. He brought his writing talents to politics in the first Senate campaign of the present senior Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] and, after a decade of service with the Public Works Administration, hit the campaign trail again in 1948 with then Senator Alben Barkley in his ultimately successful campaign for the Vice Presidency.

My path and Charley's crossed during the years of my own campaigns for President and Vice President, in which he served as my press adviser. He was quiet and droll, always kind and gentlemanly. One of his hobbies was growing flowers and frequently when we were out on the campaign trail, he would worry about whether the aphids were getting on his roses and whether he ought to rush back and spray them.

His love of things beautiful was also reflected in another hobby, writing poetry. His hosts of friends in and out of Washington have thrilled to receive Christmas cards containing his own verse. Sometimes he would enclose other poems which—as he advised the recipient on one occasion—"have nothing to do with Christmas or the winter solstice but which the poet recommends to his friends as easy to memorize."

Mr. President, I have selected a few of Charley Alldredge's poems which I would like to place in the Record. They reveal far more eloquently than can I the richness of Charley's life, his gentle humor, and the many sides of his wonderful personality.

Silence

The silences of winter mark it more than snow and cold;
The blood of life runs slower when the year is old.
Silent does the fox run, hidden is the fly,
In secret lies the viper as the year goes by,
But what a joyful stirring from every living thing
Will mount to shake the heavens in the thunderclap of spring.

Masks

If I should know you for a thousand years
I would not see your face;
When I come close to you
You take off a mask,
But there is another there,
And another,
And another,
And finally the mask you swear is your face
Is most inscrutable of all.
I shall never see your face,
Nor you mine,
Nor, since it is unbearable,
You yours.

Magic

Old magic still lurks
In shadowed places—
Heavy with regret
The dark deceiver—
But what joy
When the old magician sees,
Stumbling toward him,
A young believer.

I ask unanimous consent that an article dealing with the life of Mr. Alldredge be printed in the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Charles H. Alldredge, Served Hill Officials

Charles Haden Alldredge, public relations adviser to many prominent New and Fair Deal figures including the late Vice President Alben Barkley and former Interior Secretary Oscar Chapman, died Sunday at Washington Hospital Center following a long illness. He resided at 617 North Carolina Avenue SE.

Mr. Alldredge received much attention when acting as press adviser to Senator Estes Kefauver, Democrat, of Tennessee, during the Senator's campaigns for the Presidency and Vice-Presidency.

Mr. Alldredge was born in Montgomery, Ala., in 1911. His father, the late Haden Alldredge, was for many years a member of the Interstate Commerce Commission.

After graduating from the University of Alabama, Mr. Alldredge began newspaper work on the Alabama Journal in Montgomery but soon turned to public relations. One of his first such enterprises was handling the first Senate campaign of his fellow townsman, Lister Hill.

In 1938, Mr. Alldredge entered Government service with the Public Works Administration. His service there encompassed many of the agency's projects and nearly every State. In 1948, he resigned from Interior to accompany Mr. Barkley, then a Senator, in his campaign for Vice President.

Mr. Alldredge also wrote poetry and was a knowing critic of the arts. He was a trustee of All Souls Unitarian Church during the ministry of the late A. Powell Davies.

A sister, Mrs. J. Allan Jones, of Montgomery, survives.

CHARLES BARTLETT OF THE CHATTANOOGA TIMES

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, one of the Nation's finest and best-known newspaper reporters, Mr. Charles Bartlett, recently changed jobs. After 17 years as the Washington correspondent for the Chattanooga Times, one of the great newspapers of our land, Charley will write a four-times-a-week syndicated column as a member of the Washington bureau of the Chicago Sun-Times. Fortunately for the readers of the Chattanoga Times, his new column will appear in that newspaper.

All of us who have known Charley wish him well in his new undertaking. I concur wholeheartedly in the statement of the publisher of the Chattanooga Times, Mr. Ben Hale Golden, that Charley's "balanced reporting of the news and his high personal integrity have always provided this newspaper with a written product commensurate with the national reputation of the Chattanooga Times for responsible journalism."

Charley won the Pulitzer Prize for outstanding national reporting for the year 1955 when he exposed a conflict of interest that led to the resignation of the late Harold E. Talbott as Secretary of the Air Force. His wide circle of friends in Washington—among them, the President—and his talent for earnestly seeking the truth have given him an understanding of Government that few men possess.

On leaving the Chattanooga Times, Charley Bartlett wrote an article entitled "Thoughts on Leaving a Wonderful Newspaper." It is one of the most touching things I have read in a long time.

I ask unanimous consent that this article, together with an editorial in the Chattanoga Times, be printed in the Record at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the article and editorial were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Thoughts on Leaving a Wonderful Newspaper

(By Charles Bartlett)

Washington.—Just as it is never clear why a man would leave a wonderful wife, it is far from clear why a reporter would leave a wonderful newspaper.

Professional and marital compatibility are much akin to a man in that if he doesn't have one, he has only a faint hope of having the other. Women are more complex than newspapers but the essential elements of greatness are much the same in both—a character that combines instincts, understanding, and durability; a responsive personality, and a persistent sense of each day's obligations.

A man gets married for love and works for pay but when compatibility develops in both areas, the emotion seeps into the professional side just as the pay finds its way into the mechanics of marriage. It thus becomes possible to love a great newspaper.

A young man joining such a paper has only energy to offer against the riches made available to him. The distilled knowledge that he has brought from the university is like a drop of perfume in a horse barn as he applies it against his weathered mentors and their intricate insights into the ways of men. His past experiences pale into nothing against the vistas of life that open as he begins to wend his way, asking questions, about the city.

He finds that he has a glorious entry into the aspirations, schemes, and reminiscences of a wide range of men and women. He has been given license to summon their reactions in moments of crisis, to taste the wormwood of their defeats, to share the luminosity of their peaks of success, and to observe the reactions that attend their deaths.

His most delicate times arrive when he confronts their disputes as an observer who must seek confidence from both sides and establish, informally and in writing, the earnestness of his search for truth. In these tests, the young reporter derives his stamina and yardsticks from the character and traditions of his newspaper. His test becomes also a test of these traditions and of his editors and if all three fail, the public is badly armed and another small cancer is lodged in the culture.

The growing reporter has the uncomfortable sense at times that in choosing to become an observer instead of a participant, he has taken a protected course which permits him to know neither victory nor defeat. This is his cross but it is lightened by his claim to a part of the rightful evolution of the times and place in which he works.

He knows that he and his colleagues have been persistent in behalf of the pressures which make for right over wrong and for improvement. He feels that he can claim some pride in progress, in the human and physical blemishes that are driven from the scene, in the merit that is recognized and advanced, and in the problems that are met. He and his paper can rarely claim to have been a decisive force but they have the satisfaction, at least, of having worked to be constructive.

As he goes along, he will be charged with cynicism but such a philosophy does not exist on the staff of a strong and healthy newspaper. Cynicism is not the same as the swift recognition and repulsion that develops among newsmen against frauds who seek publicity or seek to avoid it. If reporters and their papers began to fall prey to such creatures, the public could be badly used by them. This again is where the character of the institution, and its ability to foster and sustain a clear eye in its employees, count so heavily.

Actually in every facet of his labors, a reporter is enhanced or hobbled by the character of his newspaper. He becomes in essence largely a reflection of this character. He takes his strength from it, when it is good, and his weaknesses, when it is bad. His best efforts are only a small atom of the composite strength and quality represented in a publication with strong traditions and intentions.

A man could not in good conscience leave a great wife. But a reporter can without remorse leave a great newspaper because he knows well that its greatness is durable and that if there is a loser, it is he.

Bartlett's New Role

During the 17 years he has represented this newspaper with distinction, most of that time as our Washington correspondent, Charles Bartlett has developed an acquaintanceship with newsmaking Americans such as few in the trade possess.

Now, as is announced today, he will devote full time to the national syndication

> of his articles in a growing list of newspapers.
>
> To this endeavor, Charley Bartlett will lend his great warmth as a person as well as his writing ability, drive, persistence, and broad field of contacts.
>
> It is naturally with much regret that we see him leave us. But we consider ourselves fortunate to have kept him this long. A Pulitzer prizewinner, he has added to the Times' reputation in the Nation's Capital and elsewhere.
>
> While continuing to carry his reports, we shall follow closely his work in the milieu of the bigtime syndicates.
>
> His wide circle of friends and readers will join us, we know, in wishing Charley Bartlett all the best in his new venture.

THE NATIONAL RAILROAD FREIGHT CAR SUPPLY

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I rise in support of legislation sponsored by the senior Senator from Washington, our distinguished chairman of the Senate Commerce Committee. I am gratified to note that many other Members of the Senate will join Senator MAGNUSON in the introduction of his legislation seeking to insure the adequacy of the national railroad freight car supply. Ever since coming to the Senate, I have cosponsored this legislation in prior Congresses and I have been pleased to appear before the Senate Commerce Committee in its behalf.

The railroad industry is plagued by a situation which becomes more acute each year. At this time, sufficient cars are not available in the grain producing areas of the Middle West to meet the demands for shipment of grain. On one railroad, the Burlington, operating in my State, the current car shortage is now 10,400 cars. In recent days, the newspapers in my State have written many stories pointing out the acuteness of the current problem.

When I appeared before the Senate Commerce Committee on June 8, 1959, testifying in behalf of identical legislation, I stated:

> I come from a section of the United States wherein our railroads have been more diligent in maintaining an adequate supply of rolling stock than prevails in other areas of the country. Yet, each year, during periods of peak car loadings, we are plagued with car shortages because cars owned by the western roads are in use on lines elsewhere. For many railroads it has become more economical to pay the existing per diem rate for use of another road's cars than to maintain an adequate supply of their own requirements. This is a situation which has existed for many years and it deserves solution.
>
> We know that, at the present time, railroad cars are being retired from service at a rate which exceeds the construction of new cars. This fact increases the need for enactment of the legislation being heard today by your committee. I urge favorable consideration of S. 1789 at the earliest opportunity.

In the meantime, the situation has worsened substantially. In 1959, the numbers of serviceable freight cars of all kinds were 1,577,708. As of February 1, 1963, the numbers of serviceable cars were 1,419,887. Meanwhile, the practice of certain roads to pay per diem in lieu of beefing up their freight car supply has increased in tempo. This is brought to light by the rise in payment for car rental from 1950 to the present time. In 1950, railroads throughout the country paid $140.3 million for car rental under the current per diem rate. In 1961, the amount paid for car rental under the current rate was $344.3 million. This clearly illustrates how certain roads who are prudent in their efforts to maintain adequate supply of freight cars are being severely penalized by management decisions of roads who do not desire to maintain an adequate supply of freight cars. Many Members of this body have been diligent in their efforts in recent years to bring about the equity which this matter deserves. We cannot temporize much longer and avoid the responsibility for taking necessary action. I earnestly hope that the Senate can proceed to the consideration of this bill within the very near future and that it will be enacted.

THE AMERICAN POLITICAL SCIENCE ASSOCIATION

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, the American Political Science Association is no stranger on Capitol Hill. Most of us have become acquainted with the association and its important activities through one or more of the successful programs it sponsors. Best known perhaps is the highly regarded congressional fellowship program, which annually brings to Washington a group of deserving young political scientists and journalists for an inside look at the legislative process.

Those of us who have had congressional fellows working in our offices do not need to be reminded how beneficial this program has been both for the interns and Members of Congress. Besides the congressional fellowship program, the American Political Science Association sponsors a number of other activities of special interest to Members of Congress.

This year for the first time the association offered an orientation program for new Members of the other body. From all reports, this endeavor was highly successful in helping new Congressmen overcome some of the problems involved in organizing an efficient office operation. The association also assisted this year in the direction of the first William Randolph Hearst Foundation's Senate youth program. Under this program, two high school seniors from each of our 50 States, plus the District of Columbia, were brought to the Nation's Capital for a week to study our National Government. This program, too, was very successful.

Now the American Political Science Association is embarking on yet another worthwhile program of particular interest to Members of Congress. It is the congressional staff fellowship program, designed to improve the professional competence of staff members in both Houses of the Congress. The congressional staff fellowship program will permit selected House and Senate committee staff members, as well as assistants to Members of Congress, to study for periods of 6 months or 1 year at colleges and universities of their choice. The program is being financed under a grant from the Ford Foundation, which has assumed the costs of so many worthwhile educational, cultural, and social activities. I might add that the Ford Foundation also contributes a substantial part of the funds to finance the congressional fellowship program.

Mr. President, two of our colleagues, the assistant majority leader, the distinguished senior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], and the assistant minority leader, the distinguished senior Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL], are members of the advisory committee for the 1963–64 congressional staff fellowship program. Other committee members include, from the other body, the assistant majority leader, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BOGGS], and the assistant minority leader, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ARENDS]. Dr. Charles Hyneman, distinguished service professor at Indiana University, is chairman of the advisory committee, and Mr. Claude Hawley, chairman of the board of the American Growth Investment Co. of Washington, D.C., is a member of the committee.

The decision of the American Political Science Association to inaugurate the congressional staff fellowship program grew out of a long and active interest in congressional operations. While we all know of the many inservice training programs for executive agency personnel, there are few comparable opportunities for congressional staff members. The new fellowship program will help provide research opportunities for staff assistants of our committees and our offices and, at the same time, encourage further development of a permanent and more competent congressional staff system. I suggest, Mr. President, that this is a commendable goal—one which each of us can wholeheartedly support.

Details of the program's operation have been worked out in consultation with the advisory committee to insure that it will be consistent with the schedule and workload of the Congress. The American Political Science Association will conduct and administer the program, but staff fellows will plan and carry out their own study and research programs under the guidance of departmental chairmen and faculty advisers at the colleges and universities of their choice. I am told that the terms of the fellowship awards will be as flexible as possible to meet the study and research needs of individual congressional staff members.

Mr. President, I take this opportunity to express my gratitude to the American Political Science Association for its continuing and constructive interest in the operations of the Congress. I am sure I speak for all of my colleagues when I say that we appreciate the efforts of the association to improve the internal machinery of Congress and to help the American people better understand the Congress and its operations. I especially want to thank Dr. Evron Kirkpatrick, executive director of the association, whose tireless efforts have made many of these worthwhile programs possible. He is ably assisted by Mr. Donald Tacheron, a 1961–62 congressional fellow who now serves as assistant director of the association.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a fact sheet explaining the American Political Science Association's congressional staff fellowship program be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the fact sheet was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

The APSA Congressional Staff Fellowship Program

Advisory committee: Chairman, Charles Hyneman, distinguished service professor, Indiana University; Representative Leslie Arends; Representative Hale Boggs; Claude Hawley, chairman of the board, American Growth Investment Co., Washington, D.C.; Senator Hubert Humphrey; and Senator Thomas Kuchel.

Beginning this year, the American Political Science Association will award fellowships for university study and research to selected House and Senate office and congressional committee staff members. The purpose of this new congressional staff fellowship program is to improve the knowledge and skills of administrators and researchers, encouraging thereby the further development of a permanent and highly professional staff made up of the most expert and well educated personnel. The competition for the awards will be open to all professional congressional staff employees. Winners will undertake their study and research at the college or university of their choice.

Awards are planned in 1963–64 and in subsequent years in the following categories:

One-year fellowships carrying a maximum stipend of $14,000, including tuition and moving expenses.

Six-month fellowships carrying a maximum stipend of $8,000, including tuition and moving costs.

The total number of awards each year will depend somewhat on the number of qualified applicants in each category. Generally, however, six of the 1-year fellowships will be available, and these awards will be divided equally between House and Senate staff members. Similarly, six of the 6-month fellowships will be available, with two awards to be made in the Senate, four in the House.

The amount of the stipend in both categories will depend upon the award winner's level of professional development, study and research plans, and number of dependents.

Financed by a grant from the Ford Foundation, the congressional staff fellowship program will be conducted and administered by the association. Overall policy guidance will be provided by the House-Senate advisory committee.

PROGRAM SCHEDULE

For the first year of the congressional staff fellowship program, the application deadline is April 15, 1963. Selection of award winners is expected to be completed shortly thereafter. In subsequent years, the competition will be announced in mid-June, the application deadline will be November 1, and award winners will be notified in mid-January of the following year.

University residence requirements will be flexible, providing for adjustments to fit the needs of individual fellows. Generally, however, staff members holding the 6-month fellowship will be expected to be in residence at their respective universities for about one semester or its equivalent, beginning after Congress adjourns in the late summer 1963, and ending in January or early February 1964. Similarly, the 1-year fellowships will require university residence from mid-September to the end of May.

SELECTION OF WINNERS

Applications will be reviewed upon receipt by a three-member screening committee, members of which will be appointed in consultation with the bipartisan House-Senate advisory committee. The screening committee, established on a bipartisan basis, will be made up of a senior staff member from both the House and Senate and a political scientist. Selected applicants will be invited to appear before this committee. Upon completion of interviews with these candidates, the screening committee will draft a recommended list of winners and alternates for final review by the advisory committee.

APPLICATION PROCESS

Applicants must complete a standard biographical data form, provided by the association, and must list three references. A brief statement of the applicant's research and study interests and how these are related to his professional responsibilities and goals must accompany the application form. In addition, the applicant must submit a letter from his immediate superior containing assurances that (1) the applicant will be able to return to his position after completion of the fellowship, and (2) the applicant's study and research project is related to the professional responsibilities of his present position.

CRITERIA FOR SELECTION

The general criteria for selection will be superior academic training and/or professional experience. Preference will be given applicants who are between 25 and 40 years of age and who have had at least 3 years of experience in and are currently holding a congressional staff position.

STUDY PROGRAM PLANNING

Congressional staff fellows will plan and conduct their study program, under the guidance of departmental chairman and faculty advisers, on an individual basis. However, the association will be of assistance wherever necessary in arranging for these programs and in arranging for registration in the universities involved. Association representatives also will discuss the program with staff fellows and their faculty advisers periodically during the fellowship period.

FURTHER INFORMATION

Application forms and further information are available at the association, 1726 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington 6, D.C.; telephone DU 7-8585.

PATRIOTISM AS AN INTEGRAL PART OF FORMAL EDUCATION

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, I should like to bring to the attention of Senators an article by Mr. Jenkin Lloyd Jones entitled "Get New Text Books, America" that appeared in the March 11 issue of the Washington Star.

This article is a most timely and cogent treatise on a vitally important subject, the education and moral strengthening of our youth.

In graphic language Mr. Jones has pointed to the trend toward a downgrading of patriotism in our schools and he asks what has happened to the teachings of obeisance to the flag and to love of country which once was such an integral part of formal education.

I request unanimous consent that this article by Mr. Jones be published in the Congressional Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Get New Textbooks, America—Return to Standards of Old Is Urged; Patriotism, Heroism, Moral Teaching

(By Jenkin Lloyd Jones)

If we can ever cure the asininities of the "looksay" method of teaching reading, which has condemned many hundreds of thousands of young Americans to word guessing, it will be time to start in on the content of grade school textbooks.

These beautifully printed and illustrated books include texts so remarkable for their dullness that it is little wonder young America can hardly wait to get back to TV. Most of them have been steamcleaned of every vestige of excitement, of inspiration, and romance.

There is no reference to God or religion. This is regarded as controversial. There is no story of war. If we don't think about it, maybe it will go away. There is nothing that would give rise to patriotism. How old fashioned.

I have before me a fifth grade reader, "Days and Deeds," published last year by Scott, Foresman & Co., and standard in many hundreds of American school systems.

With a puerile vocabulary it discusses such things as Uncle Lem's new outboard motor, John's lawn-mowing business, and how Wally, the bloodhound, helped Jerry, the police dog, find his missing bone.

I have also before me a reprint of McGuffey's Fifth Eclectic Reader published in 1879. Let's skip through the list of contents:

"The Relief of Lucknow, London Times. Battle of Blenheim by Southey. Sands of Dee by Charles Kingsley. An Old-Fashioned Girl by Louisa May Alcott. An account of a riot in the Massachusetts State Prison. Supposed speech of John Adams by Daniel Webster. Excerpts from the Virginians by Thackeray and from Hamlet. Dissertation on Roast Pig by Charles Lamb. A Frigate Chase in the English Channel by James Fenimore Cooper. The Boston Massacre by Cancroft. No Excellence Without Labor by William Wirt. Religion, the Only Basis of Society by William Channing."

Blood and thunder? Plenty of it. Heroism? Of course. Moral homilies? In profusion. Religious preachments? Unashamed. Patriotism? With pride. And in addition tough words and involved sentences that would flabbergast the fifth grader who has been brought up on the thin consomme of today's "Days and Deeds" series.

On June 20, 1961, Dr. Max Rafferty, school superintendent of La Canada, Calif., made a speech that caused a sensation and resulted in his election last fall as California Superintendent of Public Instruction over the dead bodies of the progressive educators. He asked: "What happened to patriotism?" and I quote:

"We have been so busy educating for 'life adjustment' that we forgot to educate for survival. Words that America had treasured as a rich legacy, that had sounded like trumpet calls above the clash of arms and the fury of debate, we allowed to fade from the classrooms.

"Liberty and Union, now and forever, one and inseparable * * *"

"We have met the enemy and they are ours * * *"

"Millions for defense, but not one cent for tribute."

Search for these towering phrases in vain today in too many of our schools. The golden words are gone. Patriotism feeds on hero-worship and we decided to abolish heroes.

The quest for the Golden Fleece has been crowded out by the visit of Tom and Susan to the zoo. The deeds of the heroes before Troy are now passe, and the peregrinations of the local milkman as he wends his way among the stodgy streets of Blah City have taken over. Bobby and Betty pursue this insipid goal of a ride in the district garbage truck while the deathless ride of Paul Revere goes unsung.

For Roland at Roncesvalles we have substituted Muk-Muk the Eskimo boy. It is, I think, significant, that education during the past three decades has deliberately debunked the hero to make room for the jerk.

No wonder these heroless American kids often broke down before the Red brainwashers in the Korean prison camps. They had no points of reference. They had no understanding of the traditions of liberty. In many cases, the Communists were delighted that there was so little to erase. It was a cinch to unteach those who had never been taught.

In commenting on a modern sixth reader, "Bright Peaks," put out by Houghton Mifflin, Dr. Russell Kirk says: "With the exception of a poem by Sara Teasdale, another short poem by Robert Frost, and an autobiographical piece by John Muir, every selection is by a fourth- or fifth-grade writer."

Why? Could it be that the fifth and sixth grades can't read the classics as they did in the days of McGuffey? Could it be that the bankruptcy of the look-say method and the stubborn refusal of many school administrations to admit the error have required them to pretend that there is special virtue in extending kindergarten-style reading to the upper grades?

It's time America got a new set of textbooks. It's time we quit boring bright students to death with the banalities of John and Jane visiting the henhouse. It's time we put romance and courage and excitement and some frank moral indoctrination before our children in their most impressionable years.

We don't have to go back to McGuffey.

There's plenty of good writing. But let's give our children some literary taste, some ethical calories and patriotic vitamins.

To hell with these sawdust sandwiches.

STRIP MINING

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, on March 7, 1963, on behalf of the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. HARTKE], and myself, I introduced a bill to provide for a study of strip surface mining operations in the United States to be made by the Secretary of the Interior, and for a report to Congress of the results of such study.

The States of Pennsylvania, West Virginia, Indiana, Illinois, Ohio, and Tennessee are vitally concerned about strip mining. I have the pleasure today to report to the Senate that the Tennessee Valley Authority, in whose area strip mining has destroyed the fertility of much land, has taken the position that it will support the bill introduced by the Senator from Pennsylvania, the Senator from Indiana, and me.

OHIO RIVER BASIN CLEAN STREAMS PROGRAM

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I am pleased to report that the Ohio River Basin clean streams program, carried out under the leadership of the Ohio River Valley Water Sanitation Commission—ORSANCO—has been selected by the American Society of Civil Engineers as the "Outstanding Civil Engineering Achievement of the Year" for the 1963 award. The award was announced recently by the society's board of direction at a meeting in Atlanta.

The clean streams program is a unique complex of municipal and industrial waste-treatment facilities which have been built throughout eight States in the Ohio Valley. The States—Illinois, Indiana, Kentucky, New York, Ohio, Pennsylvania, Virginia, and West Virginia—established the commission in 1948 as a coordinating agency to control pollution and safeguard water quality. The chairman of the commission is Bern Wright, chief of the division of water resources for the State of West Virginia.

The record shows that 97 percent of the population on the main stem of the Ohio River now is served by sewage-treatment plants in operation or under construction. In 1948, only 1 percent of the population had such facilities.

Progress has been recorded by industries in the Ohio Valley, too. Eighty-five percent now are in compliance with at least basic control requirements.

Mr. President, I am especially pleased by this award and with the progress which has been made under this program, for it was in 1948, at the invitation of Governor Tuck, of Virginia, that I spoke to separate sessions of the Virginia Legislature, urging that Virginia become a member of the sanitation compact. Initially, the people living in the Ohio River watershed deep in the south of Virginia felt that the situation was of no concern to them, and Virginia refused to join the compact. Eventually, all the States in the basin became members, and the great good which has developed is now apparent.

Mr. President, this in no way implies that the job is done. There are still many obvious evidences of pollution because of continued delinquency on the part of some municipalities and industries, and incompetent or careless operation on the part of others.

However, the progress made in eliminating gross pollution has paved the way for introducing those refinements in control and practice that will insure for the Ohio Valley optimum utilization of water resources.

The annual ASCE award is based upon an engineering project which is rated by the judges as one that demonstrates the greatest engineering skills, offers the greatest contributions to engineering progress, and represents a definite service to mankind.

The announcement of the award brought this comment from Edward J. Cleary, ORSANCO's executive director and chief engineer:

> In harnessing the skills of the engineering profession to the great task of curbing water pollution, the people of the Ohio Valley have demonstrated that where there is a will, there is a way. Under the leadership of the eight States, more than a billion dollars has been invested since 1948, in the construction of municipal and industrial waste-control facilities. The sheer magnitude of the undertaking suggests the variety and competence of engineering talent that was enlisted for the biggest river clean-up job in the world. It is most gratifying, therefore, that the American Society of Civil Engineers should regard the Ohio Valley program as an outstanding achievement.

Headquarters of the commission are located in Cincinnati, Ohio.

The achievements in the Ohio River Valley reflect the great good that can be done by the States themselves when they vigorously and with firm purpose decide to solve a problem.

FRUITS OF THE LONGSHOREMEN'S PACT

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, the seeds sown in the recent "take it or else" longshoremen's pact with the east and gulf coast shipping industry are beginning to sprout. I call attention to headlines and articles appearing on two consecutive days, March 11 and March 12, in a leading financial and business publication. The March 11 headline reads: "Dock Strike Caused First Trade Deficit Since 1950; January Exports at 9-Year Low." The March 12 headline reads: "Steamship Lines To Boost Freight Rates to Latin America; Dockworker Pact Cited."

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that both articles be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Wall Street Journal, Mar. 11, 1963]

DOCK STRIKE CAUSED FIRST TRADE DEFICIT SINCE 1950—JANUARY EXPORTS AT 9-YEAR LOW

WASHINGTON.—The dock strike in January caused the United States to suffer its first negative trade balance in more than 12 years, the Census Bureau reported.

The agency said seasonally adjusted exports plunged to $982.1 million in January, down 47 percent from December and the lowest for any month since March 1954. Exports ran $111.1 million below January's imports, which were 20 percent below December's volume because of the tieup of ports on the east and gulf coasts.

Not since October 1950 have U.S. imports exceeded exports. The usual surplus of export earnings over import expenditures is relied on to partially offset this country's outlays abroad.

The dock strike started December 23 and ended January 25. Government trade experts expect figures for both exports and imports for February to show a sharp rise when published a month from now.

During the strike, exports and imports continued only along the west coast and overland between Canada and Mexico. The Census Bureau said its figures probably overstated the impact of the east and gulf coast port tieup on exports compared with imports.

For one thing, longshoremen were able to start unloading waiting ships on January 26 and had 6 days to recoup part of the month's import total. But officials said there was little time left in January to reload these ships with U.S. exports.

Also, Census officials said, exports compared unfavorably with imports because of the way they're counted. Imports are tallied when Government statisticians receive notice of merchandise arrivals, whether the goods are actually unloaded or not. Thus some of January's reported imports actually remained unloaded on ships waiting in the ports. Exports, in contrast, are counted only when an outbound ship leaves the harbor.

[From the Wall Street Journal, Mar. 12, 1963]

STEAMSHIP LINES TO BOOST FREIGHT RATES TO LATIN AMERICA — DOCKWORKER PACT CITED

NEW YORK.—Steamship general cargo freight rates from U.S. Atlantic and gulf coast ports to Latin American ports are expected to be raised sharply in June and July. The recent contract settlement with the Longshoremen's Union was blamed for the expected rise.

C. D. Marshall, chairman of the Associated Latin American Freight Conference, and of the individual conferences that comprise the organization, said one unit has already notified the Federal Maritime Commission of a freight rate increase and that others will follow shortly.

A conference is a voluntary organization of steamship lines, offering regular service between two areas, which charge identical rates for their services. Mr. Marshall said about 15 to 18 lines will be affected by the rate increases, which might produce up to 10 percent more revenue for the lines.

REVENUE TO RISE 15 TO 18 PERCENT

The first to announce an increase is the U.S. Atlantic and Gulf-Venezuela and Netherlands Antilles Conference. Mr. Marshall said the new rates for this conference, which will take effect June 10, will produce about 15 to 18 percent more revenue for the carriers.

He said increases planned by the other conferences would be more moderate because the other conferences had made rate increases periodically in recent years and "endeavored to keep up with ever-increasing costs." He said the Venezuelan and Netherlands Antilles Conference is making its first general increase in rates since 1955.

The four steamship lines belonging to the Venezuelan Conference are Alcoa Steamship Co., subsidiary of Aluminum Co. of America, Grace Line, subsidiary of W. R. Grace & Co., Lykes Bros. Steamship Co., and Royal Netherlands Steamship Co. An associate member is the Venezuelan Government's Venezuelan Line.

In addition to the Venezuelan Conference tariff proposals, six individual steamship lines have proposed rate increases of about 5 to 10 percent since the dock strike ended, a Federal Maritime Commission spokesman said.

The six lines are West Wind African Lines, Thorden Lines, Finn Lines, Scandinavia America Lines, Moore-McCormack Lines (whose application applies only to the Danish trade), and America-Europe Line. The spokesman also said that west coast of Italy-North Atlantic Freight Conference had notified the Commission it was studying a rate increase but had made no formal rate filing as yet.

Mr. Marshall said no northbound rate increases are anticipated from the Latin American ports to U.S. Atlantic and gulf ports because most of the traffic is southbound. "Practically no cargo comes from places like Jamaica, Haiti, Santo Domingo, Venezeula, and Panama, except for certain specific commodities like coffee or bananas," he said.

Conferences planning to raise their rates include those shipping from the U.S. Atlantic and gulf ports to the west coast of Central America; west coast of South America; Jamaica; east coast of Colombia; the Leeward and Windward Islands and the Guianas. He said ship operators belonging to the Panama conference were also considering rate increases.

Mr. Marshall said the principal reason rates are being raised is "the increased cost to carriers because of the costly settlement of the recent longshore strike." A 5-week strike by the International Longshoremen's Association on Atlantic and gulf coasts ended January 26.

SOME RELUCTANT TO ACT

Some conference groups, however, expressed reluctance to announce new rate increases because of strong competition from independent or nonconference steamship lines.

A spokesman for the Far East Conference said members haven't decided whether they will increase rates. "There certainly is justification for an increase," he said, "but one of the main reasons for not raising them is strong independent competition."

A. J. Pasch, chairman of the North Atlantic to European ports conference groups, said, "We're effectively stopped from raising our rates because of nonconference competition. Despite the fact that a number of our rates are on a noncompensatory basis, they're still being cut by the independent operators."

A spokesman for the conference serving ship operators from the United States to India, Pakistan, Ceylon, and Burma, said there has been no discussion on increasing freight rates.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, on January 18, on the floor of the Senate, I commented on the dockworkers' strike, deploring the fact that our laws were inadequate to deal with this very serious situation, which, in the words of the President of the United States, was described as "doing intolerable injury to the national welfare" and "as disrupting vital free-world commerce." The impact of the strike was felt throughout the Nation, including inland Ohio. This situation was much in evidence as the strike was materially responsible for our 9-year low in exports, as described in the foregoing article.

Mr. President, I do not want to be repetitious, but, in my opinion, what I said on the floor of the Senate on January 18 should be repeated today in light of these two recent developments resulting from this strike and the provisions in the pact. I ask unanimous consent that a portion of my statement made on January 18 be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

> Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, in spite of the President's statement concerning the "intolerable injury to the national welfare," neither he nor any existing public agency is able to do anything about it. Thus, we have a situation in which the Longshoremen's Union, through its network of operations and reciprocal services rendered by other unions, has paralyzed the shipping facilities sailing on the high seas along the east and gulf coasts of the United States. International commerce is at a standstill. The Government is unable to do anything about it.
>
> Can we tolerate power of that type, possessed by a union, resulting in damage to the economy of the country and creating "intolerable injury to the national welfare"?
>
> It is hard to believe, yet it is true, that the small segment of our economy represented by the Longshoremen's Union is able to exercise a power greater than that vested in the President of the United States or now capable of being exercised by the people. Yet it is true; the Longshoremen's Union is a government within the Government. It has made the decision that no ships shall sail upon the high seas; yet nothing can be done about it.
>
> So we have an empire within an empire. This union, engaged in work connected with transportation, is the empire within our society; and, whether we like it or not, under present law we must concede that it is all powerful.
>
> The power to substantially and, if so determined, to completely destroy the transportation facilities of our country should not be permitted to exist in the hands of anyone. Excessive power makes tyrants out of persons possessed initially of the most compassionate attitudes; by power bad men are made worse; by power, good men frequently become bad. When allowed to be exercised without restraint, power is taken away from the people as a whole, and is vested in a few. I quote the words of Lord Acton:
>
> "All power corrupts, and absolute power corrupts absolutely."
>
> In this work stoppage by concerted action, the unions have set up a wall against the importation and exportation of any goods affecting our welfare and the economy. It has done so through a monopolistic control of the docks on the east and the gulf coasts, achieved through the working arrangements of the different unions and through monopolistic control impeding the free flow of trade.
>
> Under the laws, the business managements of our country are comprehensively regulated. These laws are intended to prevent all monopolistic practices and restraints of trade. Operators of businesses have, under the laws prohibiting monopolies, been prosecuted and sent to jail; yet, unions connected with transportation are suffered to tie up the country by monopolistic practices and restraints of trade which the antitrust laws prohibit to business.
>
> If there came before the Senate a bill proposing to give to the President of the United States the powers now possessed by persons in charge of the transportation labor unions, I would vigorously oppose it on the floor of the Senate, both by way of argument and by way of vote. If, by some extraordinary circumstance a similar power were sought to be placed in me, either as a citizen or a Senator, I would vigorously reject it as being inimical to the interest of my country.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I now refer to the headlines and article: "Steamship Lines To Boost Freight Rates to Latin America—Dockworker Pact Cited." On February 19, I spoke on the floor of the Senate commenting on the longshoremen's strike settlement. In my remarks, I referred to the subject of confirmation of Christian A. Herter for Special Representative for Trade Negotiations, who, in reply to my question concerning whether or not in the development of foreign trade it would become important to keep ourselves in a competitive position with the world markets, said that it was definitely so; that if we are to sell in the markets of the world, it is necessary that our prices be of a nature that will permit us to compete with other countries.

Mr. President, this proposed boost in steamship lines' freight rates attributed to provisions in the dockworkers' pact, as described in the foregoing article, will make it even more difficult for U.S. industry to compete in the world markets.

Referring to the provisions in the pact, on February 19, I said:

> What bothers me is that if the average increase in the longshoremen's agreement is 8.8 percent, will that become the guideline in demands made by the workers in the shipyards, on the docks of the inland lakes, and on the ships sailing under the U.S. flag on the high seas? Will it become the guideline in the steel industry and in the railroad industry? If it does, if 8.8 percent

is to be the guideline, what is our ultimate destination?

Mr. President, the answer is clear. The seeds have sprouted, and we are now beginning to taste the fruit, bitter as it may be. On Monday of this week, I joined with the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McClellan] as cosponsor of S. 287, placing the transport industries under the antitrust laws. This is an extremely important piece of proposed legislation and should be enacted by Congress and signed by the President.

GRADUAL TERMINATION OF FARM CONTROLS AND SUBSIDIES

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I have introduced a proposal, Senate Joint Resolution 52, which would require the Secretary of Agriculture to submit to Congress proposals for the gradual termination of Federal farm controls and subsidies. Last year, in the course of debate on the agriculture bill, I offered an identical measure as an amendment. Of course, my amendment was rejected; but, at the same time, it did generate some constructive thought and discussion. Let me reiterate that I did not propose the termination of farm controls and subsidies, but merely proposed that the Secretary of Agriculture study the problem and make suggestions for gradual termination, such suggestions requiring affirmative action by the Congress. I am well aware that the sudden removal of Federal farm programs would knock the props out from under many agriculture enterprises which have been planned in consideration of existing programs. But I have long contended that a great many professional, full-time farmers and ranchers do not desire Federal controls and subsidies. I have today received a letter from one such farmer, Mr. Clark Wood, which I shall presently place in the Record. It typifies the independent, free-enterprise spirit of the farmers in my State.

Mr. President, having reintroduced my agriculture resolution, I should like to announce that I shall again submit it as an amendment when farm legislation comes along. I am hopeful that we shall take up this debate where we left off last year, and shall make progress toward the enactment of this or similar legislation.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have Mr. Wood's letter printed at this point in the Record, as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Mr. John Tower,
U.S. Senator,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Tower: Just a few days past I received the attached notice of 1963 wheat yield payment from the Department of Agriculture. I have my two farms rented out and, at first, I did not know what the heck this money was for. I contacted my renter and found out.

Well, it seems that he had some of this small acreage frozen out and simply plowed it up. Along came the inspector and he turned in the data that we did not plant what we are allowed to plant. So, therefore, the "Great White Father in Washington" sends along the "vote purchasing" money.

I am not too darn smart, but it is not difficult for me to multiply this little $13.44 check by a few million and see where some of my tax money is going.

It was my pleasure to watch and listen to Senator Dirksen and Representative Halleck on TV February 3, 1963, on the "Meet the Press" program. They were sanely talking about cutting expenses all the way across in Washington and I think that such damnable giveaway programs as represented by this little check I am sending is a darn good place to begin. Believe you me, the farmers I know do not want the Government in the farming business. Senator, the boys at the local ASC offices actually go out and beg farmers and ranchers to accept this and that giveaway deal from their offices. They have (not recently because I turned them down flat) pleaded with me to go in on all sorts of conservation programs, telling me how much the Government (me and 188 million others) will pay me.

Now I firmly believe in conservation of land and water and, in that this ranch belongs to me, I further believe that it is my responsibility to care for it like I would my family, etc. In fact, I have done quite extensive conservation work on my property here in Crosby County. I did this on my own expense and did not ask the Government for help. Even so, due to some mesquite work I did in 1958, I had to go clear to the Appellate Division of the IRS in order to make such expense stand up on my tax return for that year. Mind you, that was on work that the Government will pay money for if a landowner will ask for it, but the IRS didn't want me to do it on my own hook. Besides the approximately $13,000 I spent in killing mesquite, it cost me $1,500 attorney fees (plus traveling expenses for him) just to retain the right to do for myself what the Government wants to do. Had I gone the giveaway route it would have cost the taxpayers several thousand dollars, but I prefer to be independent and, incidentally, to run my own business without some little "pip squeak" fresh out of college coming over here and telling me how to run my cattle on land that "they" have assisted on. Again, I say that I am not endowed with all the brains, but I do think that I am, by virtue of years of experience on this land, more capable of determining what is good for my land and what is not more than a bunch of boys that have learned their farming and ranching out of a book. If it were not for the fact that we are forced into a farm program and they have to come over and measure acreages, etc., I wouldn't even allow them on my place. May the Lord help us if Washington gets into the cattle industry like it has in the farming business.

Now, as to the President's proposed tax cut and increased expenses—I haven't much comment other than that it simply doesn't make any sense. It is plain idiotic and I trust that you and others can muster enough help to knock such a plan right in the head.

I would like for you to take the $13.44 check which I have endorsed and send it to the Republican National Committee and I wish that all farmers and ranchers would take all such checks and do the same with them. Maybe we could bust that mess in that manner.

Sincerely yours,

Clark Wood.

ADDRESSES BY VICE PRESIDENT JOHNSON IN FLORIDA

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, it was a great pleasure to the people of Florida to have with us at the March 11 ceremonies commemorating the 400th anniversary of St. Augustine, Fla., as the first settlement in the New World, the Vice President of the United States, the Honorable Lyndon B. Johnson.

While in Florida, and prior to the commemoration ceremony, the Vice President received an honorary degree from Jacksonville University, at Jacksonville, Fla. All of us were proud to be present on the occasion when that honor was conferred upon the Vice President. Those of us who were with him, including Senator Holland and Congressman Matthews, will long remember his words, the encouragement he imparted to the people, and the affection the audiences displayed for him.

I ask unanimous consent that the speech the Vice President delivered at Jacksonville University, and also the one he delivered at the dinner commemorating the 400th anniversary of St. Augustine, Fla., be printed in the body of the Record.

Both of these excellent speeches certainly deserve to be read by every thinking American.

There being no objection, the speeches were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Remarks by Vice President Lyndon B. Johnson, Jacksonville University, Jacksonville, Fla., March 11, 1963

President Johnson, members of the faculty, young Americans, I am most grateful—and most proud—for this honor you accord to me and to the national office in which I am privileged to serve.

Your remarks, President Johnson, were most generous. While it would be ungracious for me to deny kinship, under the circumstances this hardly seems the appropriate moment to claim a family relationship. Our Johnson-to-Johnson exchange program may be subject to some misinterpretation—but I am delighted to be the beneficiary.

I could not feel more at home than I do on your campus. It was from a new and small institution of higher learning that I received my degree. When I hear men ask, "What value is a small school?" I am always tempted to reply with that wise and often-quoted answer, "What value is a baby?"

We are at the beginning of the golden age of higher education in our country. Our national needs cannot be met by the facilities or the faculties now in existence. In the next 10 years we must build as many college classrooms and dormitories as were built in the last 200 years. We must by 1970 graduate half again as many physicians as are produced today—more than double the output of Ph. D.'s in engineering, mathematics, and the sciences, and we must triple our graduate enrollments in these fields.

If our country is to survive and if our cause is to succeed, Americans in this decade must undertake a commitment to higher education without parallel in world history. As Thomas Jefferson once said, "If you expect a nation to be ignorant and free, you will expect what never was and never will be."

The effort made here is effort which must be emulated and duplicated in many other communities and in all the States. We are what we are today, as a Nation, because of the longstanding commitment of our resources to education. As early as 1787, the Northwest Ordinance set aside 1 lot in every 10 in the Northwest Territory for the maintenance of education. One hundred years ago, in 1862, we established the program for land-grant colleges. The total land donated by our national Government for educational purposes is four times the area of New York State.

Today, we are investing 3 to 3.5 percent of our annual national product in education.

This is much—but we cannot be content that it is enough. The Soviet Union invests more than twice as much on a relative basis.

At the beginning of the 1950's, we were graduating 19,600 students in physical sciences. At the beginning of the 1960's graduates in these fields had dropped to 17,400—a decline of more than 10 percent. The same pattern has occurred in the biological sciences, in engineering and in other fields. Ten years ago, we unquestionably were turning out twice as many scientists as the Soviet. Today, the Russians are producing twice as many as we are.

We cannot safely dismiss these facts or disregard the implications. Our Nation's prime resource is its youth. We are permitting a waste of that resource which is intolerable for a nation as rich, as strong and as responsible as ours.

About 1 million students are currently quitting high school before graduating. Of the top 10 percent of the high school graduating classes, 100,000 are not continuing on to college. Forty percent of those who enter college drop out before graduation.

A nation as rightfully concerned as ours with the visible erosion of its beaches and shorelines, of its topsoil and trees, of its natural resources and its gold reserves, cannot afford to be indifferent to the less visible but far more serious erosion and waste of its single most precious asset—the asset of young minds.

In a very real sense, the measure of a nation is its attitude toward its own youth. We must live by that standard. We cannot be unconcerned or indifferent that 700,000 boys and girls between the ages of 16 and 21 are unable to find work—or that nearly 1 out of 5 of the unemployed in our country is under the age of 21.

We cannot be indifferent or unconcerned that many of the hardships created by this transitional period in our national economy are falling disproportionately upon the young. That is the essence of the point I especially want to make here today.

We have in our Nation now an uncommon need and demand for educated minds. Much of the focus of industry, labor, and Government is directed to fulfillment of these needs. But there is another set of needs and demands of which less is heard. Those are the demands for the assumption of uncommon responsibilities by those who enjoy the benefits of our educational process.

Never before has a full education promised so much to the individual materially. Sixty percent of the families of college graduates now enjoy income in excess of $10,000 annually. But families of the elementary and high school dropouts are concentrated at the other end of the income scale. Our society is rewarding educated men and women monetarily as no other society has ever done. In return for this, educated men and women must surely reward this society with a new sense of responsibility and dedication.

That is the challenge—the lifelong challenge—presented to each of you enrolled here.

What are those responsibilities and obligations you face? I believe they are these:

First, you assume an obligation for continuing individual growth. Emerson once said, "The things taught in colleges and schools are not an education, but the means of education." When you leave this campus, you will enter a world of continuing change. Your continued personal growth will be as vital to your country as the initial knowledge with which you depart this university. You may some day be graduates, but you must never cease to be students because America will cease to lead when its generations cease to learn.

Second, as educated men and women, you will bear the obligation and responsibility of full participation in the national life. Education would be the enemy rather than the ally of our way of life if the products of our educational processes should exclude themselves from such full participation as an intellectual elite. Where national power derives from the consent of the governed, those who enjoy the best of education must participate in the political processes by which that consent is given or withheld. Your preparation and specialization in the academic disciplines must expand rather than contract your contribution to the broad disciplines of citizenship in a democracy.

Third, educated men and women must bear a special sense of obligation to preserve our heritage. The essence of our Nation's strength—the essence of our freedom—is the fact that our people have always had a capacity and a will to unite, to support a national interest above partisan interest or regional interest, or other interests. The debates and arguments of philosophical partisanship are intriguing on every campus. But if we extend the hard and fast divisions of such campus differences into our society as a whole, we shall weaken an indispensable strength of our system. Educated citizens must be the rallying leadership for national unity rather than the focal point of national divisions. As has been said, "When great questions end, little parties begin." The great questions of America are national questions, not partisan issues and it is to the Nation, not to parties, that educated men must always owe their first and ultimate allegiance.

Fourth and finally, there is for young people of America today—those who receive the benefits of higher education—a compelling obligation of service. Your generation will know leisure as no generation before has known it. That gift will be an endowment for good only if the leisure is used for the service of others, rather than the service of self. The security won by faithful endeavors as a student will be satisfying only as it is used to relieve the insecurities of others less fortunate, less able, and less learned.

This point cannot be given too much emphasis. Thirty years ago this week, in a time of deep despair and insecurity, a great President told Americans, "The only thing we have to fear is fear itself." Today, that is still true. Our Nation stands strong and upright in the world. Our arms are strong, our resources are strong, our cause is the strongest. We can only fall by allowing ourselves to be paralyzed by fears from within. It has been wisely said that "The habit of doing one's duty drives away fear."

Those among us who are most fearful today are, very often, those least occupied with performing duties on behalf of others. Mark Twain once gave the advice, "Make it a point to do something every day that you don't want to do. This is the Golden Rule for acquiring the habit of doing your duty without pain."

Capabilities acquired on this campus—and the other fine campuses of the land—will be lost if, in the life beyond college years, there is not a dedication to duty and the experience of performing duty which helps to build a better world for all. If, as we may justly hope, your generation is spared the duty of the battlefield, you will be privileged to take up the greater duties and greater burdens of the fields of peace—at home and throughout the world.

We are building a new economy in our land. This east coast of Florida plays a mighty role in the future. The grime and grimness of earlier times is giving way to new patterns of industry, commerce, and higher values of human worth and aspirations. But as our pace forward accelerates, many are left behind. These must not be forgotten, and if we forget them, their neglect will some day shake the ladder on which we all climb.

The poor, the sick, the unschooled, and untrained are still with us at home as in the world. Men and women who acquire the wealth of higher education must use that wealth to help enrich and improve the lives of the people to whom it is denied.

Our Nation needs you now where you are. But the Nation's need of your talents and your abilities and your conscience will not end when your work here is completed. Your own service to freedom—your own fulfillment of the treasure of your heritage—will begin then as you assume the special obligations and responsibilities which educated men and women must bear in a society such as ours.

In this century—and in this decade—the tide is running with us. Nearly 200 years ago in the Federalist Papers, Madison and Hamilton said of their generation that it had "accomplished a revolution which has no parallel in the annals of human society." That revolution—of which we are heirs—still runs in this world. That revolution of freedom is still the strongest force upon our century. That revolution is destined to win the struggles of this century.

No generation of students has enjoyed the prospect you enjoy or the dimensions of attainment and accomplishment which are open now before you. You can reach the full dimensions of that future as you contribute your individual effort to assuming the obligations and responsibilities of the community of freemen. I envy you what the future holds for you—and I wish each of you well in all your labors as participants in the building of a better world of peace, justice, and freedom for all.

Remarks by Vice President Lyndon B. Johnson at the Dinner Commemorating 400th Anniversary of St. Augustine, Fla.

We have had a wonderful day in Florida. I am most grateful to you for your invitation—and for the opportunity to participate today in these significant and memorable ceremonies.

Coming from the particular part of the United States that I do, it is especially satisfying to me to be here for this meeting tonight. The Colorado River of Texas—which traverses the congressional district which I first represented—served historically as something of a meeting point for the Spanish and Anglo-Saxon cultures in the Southwest.

Much of my life has been spent in contact with the living vestiges of that Spanish heritage. My first job after college was as teacher and principal in a Spanish-speaking school. My association with descendants of our Spanish heritage has been intimate and my friendship for them and affection toward them has been warm and rewarding all my life.

Under these personal circumstances, it is especially gratifying to me to have this part in your efforts here to remind the Nation of the rich endowment our culture has received—and the great debt our history owes—to the explorers and settlers from Spain, who opened the New World.

Many of our historians and history books have emphasized the Anglo-Saxon heritage of our country, treating as a mere incident the influence upon us of the other veins which transfused the heritage of the Old World into the bloodstream of the New. This exclusion of other heritages misrepresents the feelings of our people—and contributes at times to misunderstandings abroad.

If we of this country have taken our language, our law, portions of our system, and other components of our life from the Anglo-Saxon heritage, we have also taken into our culture and our values and our national characteristics much that is important to us from virtually all the cultures of Europe.

our own warmth toward our friends of Europe is universal and nonselective as our national policies of the postwar years have surely demonstrated. The feelings that the United States is preferential or prejudiced in its interests and affections among the peoples of all of Europe are feelings which originate among those who choose to see what does not exist to be seen and choose to feel what there is no basis for feeling.

In these times, we of the United States—like responsible peoples in all the lands of the West—are focusing our efforts and our resources on the future. We guide our policies and our purposes by the faith that wise efforts today can build a better tomorrow—a tomorrow of peace and justice and freedom for men everywhere. The future is not always clear. The coming of tomorrow seems sometimes to be uncertain. But the men who came from the Old World to open and explore and build the New World endowed us with an heritage of faith.

In efforts such as this St. Augustine restoration, we honor that special legacy. For certainly no American can come here and see the restoration of the first city on the North American mainland without appreciating anew how great was the faith of the men who landed on these shores 450 years ago.

From these shores we are reaching for new worlds. We need both the faith and vision of those earlier times to guide us forward. I can think of nothing more appropriate than that travelers can come to this coast to see the launching site of America's venture in the age of space and to have the privilege of seeing at St. Augustine this site where the age of freedom itself was launched in North America.

I think that the local leadership here and in Florida responsible for initiating this project deserves the special congratulations and gratitude of the Nation. The Quadricentennial Commission brought into being today is an expression on the part of the Nation of that support for your own enterprise and vision in redeeming this hidden asset which has so long been neglected and disused.

Tonight at this meeting we are privileged to extend the scope of participation in this program. The Ambassador from Spain and other representatives of his Government in Madrid are here both to break ground for a new permanent Spanish Exhibit and Cultural Center and to associate Spain itself in this historic undertaking.

Mr. Ambassador and Mr. Minister, on behalf of the people of the United States, it is my very high privilege to extend to your Government this invitation to join with us in this memorable and inspiring effort to recreate this monument. In part, it is in recognition of the contribution which men of your country made to the foundations of our own country and to the opening of a new dimension of freedom for mankind on this earth.

DEATH OF FORMER REPRESENTATIVE WILLIAM W. BLACKNEY

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, it is with a sense of deep personal sorrow that I announce the death of former Representative William Blackney, of Flint, Mich. He died this morning, at age 86. He came to Washington in the 74th Congress, and served, as I recall, eight terms from the 6th Michigan District. He was an outstanding legislator. I wish to take this account of his passing, and I extend to his family my condolences and sympathy.

RESIDUAL OIL IMPORTS

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I should like to make some observations with respect to the fuel oil import quotas upon which the President is about to make a decision. The quotas are meaningful and important to the eastern seaboard and other parts of the country, and involve critical issues of foreign policy and foreign trade, especially insofar as they affect our relations with Venezuela.

I make reference to the fact that the Director of the Office of Emergency Planning, Edward A. McDermott, reported to the President on February 13 that a great and meaningful relaxation of controls on the import of residual fuel oil was recommended. I also point to the fact that it has been rumored in the press that this year a lesser relaxation of those quotas will be made than was made last year. It is anticipated that it will be less than 12 percent of the figure which was last year's increase.

I point out that, according to the press reports, stocks of fuel oil in many parts of our country are at a dangerously low level, partly because of the cold winter, but largely because the imports allowed during the last year were not large enough.

I urge the President of the United States to subordinate any considerations which would induce him to do other than what is absolutely essential to the domestic economic policy and the foreign policy of the United States in terms of the liberalization of this quota. I point out that as much as I sympathize with those from coal regions and the domestic producers of fuel oil who may desire that the quotas be held down to the minimum, the conclusion of Mr. McDermott contained in his report is as follows:

> Cutting residual fuel oil imports would be of marginal assistance to the domestic coal mining industry unless such reductions were to levels which would impose inordinate burdens on consumers and on the operation of the economy.

Then another part states:

> The combination of decreased demand and dramatically increased productivity accompanied by some important geographic shifts has already caused important economic and social burdens. There is a basic governmental responsibility to cope with those difficulties through specific domestic programs.

Those quotations are contained on page 36 of Mr. McDermott's report.

So we would not do the coal industry very much good by adhering to present import limits. Although we might try to do it good, we would only be cutting off our noses to spite our faces, and we would do great harm to a large section of our economy.

Our stocks are at an inordinately low level. We are inadequately supplying the quota allocations for those who need them because of the installation of new facilities. For example, one power station in the city of New York alone requires an increase in the quota of about 50,000 barrels of oil per day.

So my colleague the Senator from New York [Mr. KEATING] and I have joined in representations to the President, which have been made a part of the RECORD, calling for "meaningful" relaxation of the quotas—the very word used by Mr. McDermott—for the next year, and a revision of the quota allocation system to give independent distributors of fuel oil and their consumers an opportunity to deal in the product, and at the minimum, the institution of a system whereby additions to the overall national quota, which are urgently required, may be distributed in a competitive manner.

I think those request are very reasonable. The President, with an understanding of his problems, must look at this question—especially in view of the finding that it cannot possibly be the way to cope with the problems of the domestic coal mining industry—in a way which is best suited to serve the economy of our Nation and foreign policy of the United States.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. (Mr. BAYH in the chair). The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for an additional 2 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JAVITS. I hope very much that the President will make that kind of decision, and that we shall have, at the very least, a liberalization of the quota equal to that of last year—I deeply believe that the needs exceed that amount—but that we shall certainly have no diminution over what was done last year.

RESIDUAL FUEL OIL IMPORT QUOTAS AND CONTROLS SHOULD BE STABILIZED BUT COMPROMISE ORDER IS ANTICIPATED

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, the controversial subject of foreign residual fuel oil has been a much debated one in recent weeks. It is a fact well known by my colleagues that I am an advocate of tighter controls on imports of this waste product of foreign refineries than the administration has been ordering.

These views have been communicated in considerable detail to the President of the United States and I have several times discussed the subject in this forum.

Yesterday I received from the Special Assistant to the President, Hon. Lawrence F. O'Brien, a message from which I quote:

> DEAR SENATOR: The time is approaching when the final decision of the President with respect to the future of the program of import controls on residual fuel oil will be made and announced.
>
> Your correspondence with the President, particularly your letters of February 13 and 28, together with your statements on the Senate floor with respect to this problem, have, I believe, made a substantial contribution to clarify the several issues involved.
>
> I feel sure that the President's final decision will reflect the vital interest of the coal industry that you have so ably delineated.
>
> Sincerely yours,
>
> LAWRENCE F. O'BRIEN,
> *Special Assistant to the President.*

Also on yesterday, I released a statement of my estimate of the impending residual oil import control order expected this week from the Department of the Interior, in which it was said that all signs point toward a compromise order to be effective April 1 which will authorize import quota levels appreciably higher than my recommendation for stabilizing imports at the 1962 levels.

But I added that I am confident that the domestic coal and petroleum industries are going to attain vastly more protection against foreign residual oil competition than that which was recommended by the Office of Emergency Planning in a recent memorandum to the President. In the OEP document the President was urged to relax residual oil import controls. In fact, the implication was clear that OEP really was recommending a phasing out of the residual quota system.

When the OEP report was released, I immediately supported the positions of the coal producers, coal labor, the coal-carrying railroads, and independent petroleum groups that a decontrolling of residual oil imports would not be in either the best national economic interest or the national security interest and would definitely be detrimental to basic domestic fuels industries and domestic employment.

It is my belief that decisions to be announced for the administration by the Secretary of the Interior later this week will provide less increase in residual oil import quotas than that asked by east coast interests, residual oil marketers, the international integrated oil company producers, and by the President of Venezuela on the occasion of his recent visit.

I anticipate, however, that the Interior Secretary's order will announce residual import quota increases at levels above those which we of the coal economy areas had hoped would obtain.

Accordingly, neither the proponents of decontrols nor the advocates of tighter controls are likely to score what can be claimed to be a victory in this almost continuous controversy.

I do feel, however, that those of us who object to increasing penetration of domestic fuels' markets by foreign residual fuel oils, with Government sanction and by Government edict, have sustained the recognition of such valid points as these:

The import control program is necessary in the national security interest.

Domestic economic interests are inseparable from national security requirements.

There is proper reason for the domestic fuels industries to insist that they and the transportation modes involved should not be subjected to competition from foreign residual oil in quantities in excess of a fair share of participation in American demand for energy fuels. Accordingly, I anticipate that there will be built into the residual oil import quota levels and into control regulations a formula embracing a ratio between availability and demand requirements that will be more equitable than heretofore.

Although it is objectionable to me that a foreign product of the nature of residual oil receives what amounts to an allocation of a noncompetitive area of fuel market demand, while our domestic fuels must compete with each other for the balance, I sense a larger degree of willingness to recognize that the foreign fuel should not henceforth be permitted to usurp unreasonable shares of the domestic market. Foreign residual oil, dumped at predatory prices, gradually has diminished the competitiveness and the availability of domestic residuals and has disrupted the domestic coal market. A limit on the degree of disruption is essential, and I have reason to hope it will be built into the new orders to be released by the Secretary of the Interior. If so limited, the quota system will achieve a greater degree of stability than has prevailed during the past 2 or 3 years.

Such stability is a vital component in the ability of the coal industry, the coal-carrying railroads and related industries to anticipate more accurately their probable position in the fuels markets of the east coast.

On the basis of information available, I am hopeful that the residual oil import control program to be announced will apply for the duration of this administration, rather than merely on an annual basis. If so, then the coal industry and related industries will be able to plan responsibly for the future without fear of their projections being upset by periodic increases in residual fuel imports.

FEDERAL AID TO EDUCATION

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, the time to solve the problems regarding Federal aid to education which have so far blocked the progress of legislation in the Congress is running out, and serious consequences to our youth on all levels of schooling may be anticipated unless programs are able to get underway this year to expand our educational facilities, raise standards of instruction and assist worthy students. The education "gap" in terms of the skilled manpower needed by our country is becoming more and more difficult to close with each year that goes by without a Federal aid program. The legislation before this Congress will go far toward meeting the situation created by our expanding school population and rapidly rising costs and I believe it should receive priority consideration.

Some of the issues and problems respecting aid to education are dealt with in a special number of the quarterly published by the Carnegie Corp. of New York. I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD the article entitled "Education and Politics," published by the quarterly, January 1963.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EDUCATION AND POLITICS

There are some perfectly decent words that nice Americans seldom use together in the same phrase. "Education" and "politics" are two of them. While each word is quite all right on its own (although education is considered to be superior because it is "spiritual" while politics is "crass"), the two in combination seem to conjure up images of graft, corruption, and even "propagandizing."

Actually, the notion that politics and education should not have anything to do with each other is based on a misunderstanding both of politics and of the role of education in a democracy and how that role is determined. And the idea that they do not have anything to do with each other flies in the face of the facts.

Public education is paid for by public funds, and public funds are raised, and allocated, through the political process. Through this process, the community—as small as the township, as large as the Nation—decides both the total amount it is prepared to spend for a host of public benefits, and how the total amount will be split up among them all. In short, the political forum is where the citizenry fights about the things it cares about; it is where the public assigns priorities and establishes its values in rank order.

Not everyone comprehends this trading out of interests in the political marketplace. This is one reason why many political decisions do not in fact reflect accurately the most widely held public values but do often reflect those of "interests" which understand the political process very well indeed. In these cases, where does the fault lie except with those who are either too lazy or too naive to press the case effectively for their own interests?

For the basic importance of the inseparability of politics and education is not the fact that public money supports public education but what that fact represents: that the education of its youth is a primary interest of the Nation. And the Nation has many legitimate concerns—for defense, health, highways, and welfare, as well as education. The equitable allocation of resources in support of these interests is an extraordinarily intricate—and political—business.

Good education costs good money. And public education costs public money. Where it will come from, how it will be distributed, for what it will be used—these are important and complicated problems of public policy.

For there are many forces which influence the extent of public support for public education. Social, political, and organizational factors, as well as economic, play powerful roles. Increased understanding of these roles should help in the formulation of policies that will strengthen public education in the years ahead. With this objective in view, Carnegie Corp. several years ago made a few grants for studies of some of the issues involved in the financing of public education. Most of the studies are now completed.

The Syracuse University Press is publishing, in a series called "The Economics and Politics of Public Education," 12 monographs which were prepared under the general direction of Professor Jesse Burkhead of the department of economics. Four of them were released last month: "Schoolmen and Politics: A Study of State Aid to Education in the Northeast," by Stephen K. Bailey, Richard T. Frost, Paul E. Marsh, and Robert C. Wood; "Government and the Suburban School," by Roscoe C. Martin; National Politics and Federal Aid to Education, by Frank J. Munger and Richard F. Fenno, Jr.; and "Issues in Federal Aid to Education," by Sidney C. Sufrin.[1]

---

[1] Syracuse University Press, $1.75 each. To be published in February are "Cost and Quality in Public Education," by Harold F. Clark; "Federal Aid to Science Education: Two Programs," by Paul E. Marsh and Ross A. Gortner; "State and Local Taxes for Public Education," by Jesse Burkhead; and "Administering the National Defense Education Act," by Sidney C. Sufrin. In April the final four will be published: "Aid for Federally

A study somewhat similar to that of Bailey et. al., dealing with three Midwestern States, will be published in the summer by Alfred A. Knopf under the title "State Politics and the Public Schools: An Exploratory Analysis." The study was made by Nicholas A. Masters, Robert H. Salisbury, and Thomas H. Eliot, under a grant to Washington University.

"Tax Credits and Intergovernmental Fiscal Relations," by James A. Maxwell, professor of economics at Clark University, has been published by the Brookings Institution. Although the title may not make immediately clear the book's relevance to public education, it has decided relevance, for it is an exploration of some formulas for providing general purpose assistance to the States without stimulating Federal control.

Finally, a grant to the National Bureau of Economic Research has resulted in, among other things, a paper by Gary S. Becker called "Investment in Human Capital," and a conference of economists on that subject. They provide some new theories about the financial returns from investments in human beings and their education.

THE BACKGROUND—AND THE FUTURE

The cost of supporting the Nation's public elementary and secondary schools will continue to rise over the entire foreseeable future. The increase is inescapable because of the sheer numbers of pupils alone, because of the schools that must be built to house them and the teachers who must be paid to teach them. In short, the cost will continue to rise even without regard to improving the quality of education: without regard to the possible value of lowering the student-teacher ratio, for example, or of raising teachers' salaries, or of making widespread use of new teaching equipment.

Even now, and even in the rich States, there are many school districts with vast gaps between needs and resources. And although the tax effort of the poor States is generally greater than that of the rich ones, the average level of education support in those States falls far short of what is customarily regarded as adequate. As for the total national picture, James B. Conant estimated that by 1958 the educational deficit—the difference between what was spent and what should have been spent for the public schools—was from $7 to $48 billion per year.

Several years ago, the Rockefeller Brothers Fund's special panel on education estimated that by 1967 the schools and colleges would require double the funds they spent in 1957. No matter what the amount turns out to be, where is it to come from?

At the moment, the costs of public education are spread among three levels of government—local, State, and national—with the largest proportion coming from local sources and a very small proportion from Federal. In 1960, all but 4.4 percent of the funds came from State and local governments.

The important fact is, however, that State and local revenue structure as they are now utilized for the support of public education are inadequate for the financial tasks ahead. These revenue systems are rigid, based largely on sales and property taxes which are notorious for their slowness to reflect real increases in wealth and income. Thus they cannot produce sufficient revenues for supporting education and other activities—unless taxes are raised very substantially. And this most States and communities are loath to do.

The Federal Government has a tax advantage over State and local governments because its tax structure is more elastic. Since the vast majority of Federal revenue comes from taxes on personal and corporate income, increases in economic activity bring an automatic and immediate increase in Federal revenues. But there are many eager claimants for these extra dollars, and in addition a bitterly divisive political conflict surrounds the issue of Federal aid to education.

To sum up, educational interests, thus far denied effective access to the Federal coffers, find themselves in increasingly keen competition for scarce resources in the towns and States—resources which will become relatively more scarce as time goes on unless some major (and highly unlikely) tax reforms are made.

On this gloomy note, we turn now to some of the issues involved in Federal aid to education and the history of the struggle to get that aid, since, according to Munger and Fenno of the Syracuse study, "the Federal Government constitutes what is probably the last major untapped source of revenue for public school education in this country."

One of the major political issues of the day revolves around Federal aid to education. Tradition in the United States has held that education is primarily a local responsibility, and most people seem to believe that the question now is whether the Federal Government should or should not provide funds for the public schools.

The only trouble with this phrasing of the question is that it is inaccurate. The Federal Government does now give financial support to public education, and it has often done so for more than 100 years; in fact, endowments of land were given to the States for educational purposes as far back as 1785. Since then, a number of grants have been made for limited and specific purposes, but no long-term, general Federal aid program has ever been initiated. It is such general aid that proponents of Federal aid seek and have sought in many sessions of the Congress for 94 years. Since 1945, educational legislation of one sort or another has been pending almost continuously.

Although many bills have passed one or the other House of Congress, none has ever passed both during the same session. Several times bills have seemed to be on the verge of passage only to be struck down, under circumstances that prompted one observer to say that the measures are politically accident prone.

The reasons for their high mortality rate are analyzed by Munger and Fenno, both of whom are political scientists, in their fast-moving history of Federal aid legislation. (One of the great virtues of the Syracuse monographs, at least of those thus far available, is that they are written in a style that is clear, interesting, and straightforward and, on appropriate occasion, humorous.) Many different problems have swamped Federal aid; in fact, the most important barrier to passage has been the multiplicity of issues itself.

"The struggle over Federal aid has not been a single conflict, but rather a multiplicity of controversies only loosely related to one another," write Munger and Fenno. "The situation might be compared to a better-than-three-ring circus, although, in view of the tactics at times employed, a multiple barroom brawl might make a more apt analogy."

THE MAJOR ISSUES

Race, religion, Federal control of education, division of the spoils among the States, the purposes for which aid should be given—each of these issues has figured as an effective deterrent to passage since the beginning of Federal aid legislation. But whereas in the past one issue, or a combination of two or three, has been sufficient to block legislation, now all of them are involved in the controversy, which leads the authors to take an extremely dim view of the possibilities of early passage of general aid.

It is generally understood, for example, that the southern States are among those in direst need of outside funds for education. Yet the fear that any Federal aid bill, no matter how worded, will eventually be used as a lever for speeding desegregation has nullified hopes for substantial support from the South. Hence the votes must come from the populous States of the North and West—but there, especially in the Northeast, the religious question becomes important. Until 1945 the position of Roman Catholic spokesmen was one of opposition to any Federal aid; since then, however, they have held that such aid is acceptable—but if, and only if, parochial schools are somehow included. It was on this issue that President Kennedy's legislation came to grief in the last session of Congress.

Many people have feared that Federal aid would lead to undesirable forms of control over the content of education—the worst of their fears being that political figures or parties could use the educational system for ideological indoctrination. These fears persist among some people although virtually all advocates of aid, within and without the Government, have specifically denied the wish to control or even to influence education.

Another problem has to do with the type of formula that would be used in making grants. Attempts to equalize educational opportunity among the States pose political problems for legislators from the rich States which would, in effect, be giving more than they would get.

Finally, the issue of what the aid should be used for has divided even the supporters of Federal action. Some want aid only for school construction; others would permit use of the funds for teachers' salaries also. And this issue has begun to resolve itself along partisan lines, with Democrats favoring aid for both purposes, Republicans aid only for construction.

PROPONENTS AND OPPONENTS

One of the problems in pushing legislation has been that although widespread public opinion favors Federal aid, it is only mildly interested in it; it is not a hot vote-getting issue. Masters and his colleagues find the same phenomenon at the State level and remark that, although everybody is for the schools, legislators who champion the cause feel that they make little political hay out of their efforts.

In the presence of wide public support and the absence of loud public noise for legislation, the burden of pushing it has of course fallen (as it does on every issue really) on the particular groups interested in the subject and the allies they are able to rally within the Government.

Historically, the major outside proponents of Federal aid have included educators working through their organizations (primarily the National Education Association), women's groups, and labor. Opposed have been the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, the American Legion, and, until 1945, Catholic groups. And although the Catholic position has changed, it in effect still serves as a deterrent because the only condition under which most church spokesmen are willing to see aid given is unacceptable to most of the proponents, quite apart from the constitutional question involved.

Munger and Fenno's account does not leave one with much respect for the political savvy of the outside proponents, of whom one of their critics (who was also for Federal aid) said: "The vast majority of the supporters of the principle of Federal aid

---

Affected Public Schools," by I. M. Labovitz; "Suburban Power Structures and Public Education," by Warner Bloomberg, Jr., and Morris Sunshine; "Social and Economic Factors in Spending for Public Education," by Jerry Miner; and "Education Price and Quantity Indexes," by William Wasserman.

have adhered to a policy which has been vacillating in principle, opportunistic in tactics, and fatal in practice." The savage remark was made in 1945, and things haven't changed much since then, according to the authors.

The supporters have employed strategies ranging from the making of numerous compromises (although refusing to compromise in some instances where it might have paid off), to logrolling, to proposing wildly divergent sums from one year to the next. Munger and Fenno cite "The Very Modest Proposal," or the "16th of a loaf approach," which has failed presumably because it is totally transparent (everyone knows what happens once the camel's nose is allowed into the tent); and "The Outrageous Proposal," probably put forward on the premise that a plea for so much money would surely elicit at least a little.

THE BRANCHES OF GOVERNMENT

As for the situation in the White House and on Capitol Hill, Munger and Fenno point out that until the inauguration of President Kennedy no Chief Executive gave strong leadership for Federal aid. And in spite of the President's deep commitment, in the last session of Congress it was quite apparent that he believed that certain of his foreign policy legislation was of more critical importance and must be pushed at the expense of some domestic bills, including the education bill. Given the state of the world, Munger and Fenno speculate that this priority problem is likely to continue.

Because of the lack of Presidential interest until now, aid to education has been treated almost exclusively as a decision to be made by Congress. Strong efforts have been made to enlist bipartisan support for it—efforts which were greatly enhanced by the late Senator Robert A. Taft's conversion to the Federal aid cause in the 1940's. Until his death he remained one of the most persuasive and influential Senate spokesmen for it. Bipartisanship can cut both ways, however, and Democrats and Republicans have formed more efficient coalitions against than for Federal aid.

THE ISSUE OF FEDERAL CONTROL

One major point that the history of Federal aid legislation over the past 100 years proves, say Munger and Fenno, is the importance of social crisis in encouraging Government action. Virtually all Federal legislation for education has been a reaction to real or imagined crises of one kind or another rather than the outgrowth of a coherent philosophy with respect to the Federal Government's interest or lack of interest in education as such. Hence the grants that have been made were for specific purposes, to meet perceived needs.

This leads to a paradox. Many people question the propriety of general aid because they fear it would lead to undue Federal control or influence over education. Yet what little legislation has so far received approval is of precisely the sort that does influence education because, among other things, of its emphasis on certain fields; for example, vocational education in the law passed in 1917, science and languages in the National Defense Education Act of 1958.

Many observers believe that since general aid is unlikely to be enacted soon, the Federal Government will inevitably make further grants for specific purposes on which it is easier to get political consensus. (Russia's sputnik got more Federal money for education than all America's educators have been able to get for it.) The question of Federal control might be considered in terms of whether the integrity of the public schools will be better protected through aid which the State could use for a general strengthening of the system, or through acts of Congress passed in response to political pressures from within or without.

Thus far, at any rate, most proponents of general aid have been as vehement as their opponents in denouncing the evils of Federal control. But as Sidney Sufrin points out in his monograph, throughout the entire recent congressional debate "the meaning of Federal control, and of the alternatives to Federal control, or the relation of such control to the ideals of excellence, or to the facts of public need, were simply ignored."

Although he believes that the fear that the Federal Government will dominate public education is completely unfounded, he says that "the assertion of a national interest in public elementary and secondary education requires something more than the provision of funds. A national interest implies and requires national goals standards with sufficient flexibility to be reasonably harmonious with State and local goals and standards." He urges much closer cooperation among professional educators, and the participation of Federal agencies, in the effort to improve national standards.

"Federal money is undoubtedly significant," he writes; "but of greater significance are ideas, organizations, and programs."

FISCAL FORMULAS

If the Federal Government were to decide to ease the States' financial burdens in financing education, there are two major administrative methods by which it might do so. One would be for it to give the States revenues which it has collected, under any of several possible formulas. It might make flat grants, based for example on the number of school children in a given State; or grants designed to equalize educational opportunity among the States; or incentive grants to stimulate greater State effort or other actions.

The other way, funds would not actually change hands, so to speak, but the Federal Government could allow tax credits or deductions which would have the effect of increasing the States' revenues without increasing the total amount of taxes individuals pay.

In his book, James Maxwell explores this latter type, largely through an analysis of what has happened under the two major tax credit plans the United States has used so far, for death taxes and unemployment insurance. He concludes that the tax credit has several desirable features, in that it can be used to advance tax coordination and reform, and it provides financial resources for State governments without the risk of increased Federal control. The weakness, however, is that tax credits do not provide for equalization, and they tend to be inflexible. Maxwell suggests that "since Federal objectives are manifold, there will be no inconsistency in using several devices (including tax credits and deductions, unconditional grants, and conditional grants) during the coming years to ease the financial burden of State and local governments."

Thus far, however, the burden of supporting public education rests upon the local and State governments.

VOCATIONAL EDUCATION

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, one of the most critical problems affecting public schools today is the alarmingly high dropout rate of students who do not intend to go on to college. Any situation which finds hundreds of thousands of young people without jobs and without working skills of any kind is potentially explosive, and the increasing rate of juvenile delinquency throughout the Nation is one of the alarming symptoms of this illness in our social and educational systems. Present programs of Federal aid to vocational education, which have been in existence for almost half a century, are hopelessly inadequate to cope with the problem and stand in need of drastic overhauling to meet the needs of today. And manpower retraining programs, important as they are, cannot hope to cope adequately with the unemployment problem as long as untrained and unskilled youths who drop out of school keep filling up the reservoir beneath the surface. We cannot retrain a youth who has had no training to begin with, nor can we deal with the problem by sending a relatively minor number of them into the woods for 6 months in a revival of the old CCC camps.

Some indication of the need for a nationwide vocational education program and the problems that are involved is provided in a special study of the problem which has just been released. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a study of vocational education in the United States entitled "The Forgotten Youth," prepared by the staff of the Senate Republican policy committee, March 4, 1963.

There being no objection, the study was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"THE FORGOTTEN YOUTH"—VOCATIONAL EDUCATION IN THE UNITED STATES—PART 1

INTRODUCTION

"Ignorance and illiteracy, unskilled workers and school dropouts—these and other failures in our educational system have bred failures in our social and economic system: juvenile delinquency, unemployment and chronic dependency."

Thus does the administration rationalize its demand on Congress for a $5.3 billion Federal aid-to-education program.

Facts indicate precisely the opposite to be true, i.e., failures in our social and economic system have bred failures in our educational system. And the basic failure of public education today has been the systematic refusal to acknowledge—in all of our major urban areas of population—social and economic changes that have been going on during the past four decades.

We have witnessed a massing in urban centers of youths whose background, heritage, and living standards challenge the social environment in which they now live. The academic program which met the needs of an urban community 25 years ago no longer meets the basic needs of that community today. Yet, the curriculum is still static in concept. The result has been the loss of old skills; new ones, needed to meet changing industrial patterns, are not taught.

Unemployment among the young is rising and will continue to rise unless major changes in our educational system are brought about to meet these changed social and economic conditions.

The Democratic administration's school aid proposals fail completely to face up to these basic changes and to provide even a semblance of a solution.

We recognize the need for a higher degree of skill and training in our colleges and graduate schools and encourage efforts—both private and public—to provide the quality instruction needed at these levels.

The administration's message, however, continues to place its primary emphasis on "glamour" aspects of education leading to the college entrance examinations. It endorses, in effect, trends already observed in American education to classify all other educational courses as being just a shade lower in dignity than the academic course.

This and succeeding studies are aimed at examining the needs of the 80 percent of our school-age population who will enter the work force without a college degree.

All Americans willing to work should have the opportunity to look forward to earnings that will enable them to establish a home and to rear a family in decency and dignity. As they lead productive and useful lives they contribute to the growth of America.

Theirs are the problems largely ignored in the administration's school message.

THE PROBLEM FOR YOUTH

In urban areas unemployment, particularly among the young, is rising. Chances of the urban youth, who has just graduated from high school or who has dropped out of school, finding his first job are lessened by the influx of rural youths who can no longer look forward to on-farm employment. In the past 5 years, on-farm job opportunities have fallen off by 800,000—and these youths have had to turn to the cities for a livelihood.

During these same 5 years, the net increase in job opportunities has risen by an estimated 1.5 million. Despite this increase, the young, unskilled worker finds it more and more difficult to get a job because he is unskilled.

The principal increase in job openings is in the service category, ranging from sales clerks to skilled computer mechanics. There is a growing demand for every type of skill in this broad area.

The American education system, as it is now constituted, does not provide the vast majority of high school graduates or school dropouts with these skills. Many may profit from academic studies but they should also be taught how to repair a TV set, operate an office machine, handle a cash register in a supermarket, maintain a building, or other skills necessary to get a job.

The Labor Department estimates that the demand for these and other skills will increase 150 percent by 1975 while the demand for the unskilled worker will decline by some 50 percent.

Our public schools are the obvious place where the needed skills could be acquired. Salable skills are not being taught to enough graduates and to even fewer dropouts.

A decade ago the high school graduate or school dropout could reasonably expect to find a job in some phase of industry. This annual addition to the work force was partially absorbed in this type of industry or on the farm. This situation no longer prevails. Today he is more likely to find himself an unemployment statistic than a productive worker.

In 1960, for instance, 700,000 16-to-19-year-olds who were not in school were unemployed. This constituted 15.5 percent of the 16-to-17-year-olds and 14.1 percent of the 18-to-19-year-olds as compared with the 6.8 percent of the adult work force unemployed.

While unemployment statistics for the young continue grim, an ironic paradox has developed. There is a growing problem among employers who are looking for skilled help but who cannot find it. These employment opportunities are not in the low-pay field, according to a recently published survey.

For instance, butchers in one New York meat wholesale house are earning $10,000 a year.

A skilled cook—not necessarily a chef—can expect to earn between $10,000 and $12,000 in many New York restaurants and aboard American ocean liners. Skilled kitchen help of any kind is hard to find and consequently draws good pay.

American furniture manufacturers are increasingly turning to Europe to find skilled help because too few cabinetmakers are entering the work force in this country.

Skilled sheet metal workers are at a premium in most urban centers.

An apprentice draftsman with no experience starts at $80 a week in Chicago. Similar wage scales are found in other major American cities.

Landscape gardners, cosmetologists, cartographers, TV repairmen, plumbers, electricians, appliance repairmen, mechanics, and many types of sales people can start at nearly $5,000 a year including overtime.

A Chicago auto mechanics union official reports that a body-and-fender man can expect to earn $10,000 a year in almost any garage but adds that his local cannot supply enough men to meet the needs.

A spot check of classified ads in one major Chicago newspaper for Sunday, February 24, 1963, showed a demand for 5,042 skilled workers. Like situations prevail in other urban centers.

Businessmen throughout the country tell the same story; there just aren't enough skilled workers being added to our labor force each year to meet their needs. In some extreme cases this has resulted in business failure.

American luxury liners are fighting a losing battle with their European competitors partly because they cannot match the skilled service offered by the European lines.

During the past 5 years, 3,500,000 new jobs have been created, primarily in the service category. As every new shopping center is built, literally hundreds of new jobs are created, ranging from parking lot attendants through sales personnel to skilled mechanics and artisans. These jobs are in addition to those already existing in the community.

The Labor Department estimates that during the decade ahead demand for skilled workers will increase by 150 percent. If this projection is borne out it will mean that another 13.5 million such jobs will be created. But each of these jobs will demand more acquired skill.

Our educational system should and must be the source for these skills. As it is geared today—in its static adherence to curriculums of the past which no longer meet the demands of today and the future—it is not qualified to meet this challenge.

THE OVERLOOKED ANSWERS

A partial solution to the problems of unemployed youth as well as those of the employer looking for skilled or semiskilled help does exist within our educational system—the vocational or technical school—but it has been neglected and ignored. In some cases it almost seems that our school administrators have taken the attitude that if they don't look maybe these schools will go away.

While vocational education is not offered as an absolute solution to all of our social and economic problems, it should be more vigorously pushed, better administered, and more fully financed.

During the past year, the American taxpayer, through local, State, and Federal taxation, paid a total public school bill of $18.1 billion. Of this, $5.6 billion was for secondary (high school) education. Only $254 million, or 4.5 percent, of this secondary school budget was spent on vocational education; 4½ percent of the budget was spent to supply the kind of skills needed by the 80 percent of our school population who will enter the labor force without a college education.

Although $254 million is a sizable amount of money, it must be remembered that this is divided among the 50 States and among the 9.6 million high school students who form the 80 percent. This averages out to about $28 spent for each of these pupils. This hardly seems adequate.

On a national scale this, in effect, amounts to no vocational education at all.

There are, of course, examples of fine programs producing excellent results. One such oasis is the city of Milwaukee, Wis., which spends $4.8 million annually to train some 18,000 youths in all types of vocational and technical skills. An interesting side effect of the Milwaukee effort should be cited. In Milwaukee the high school dropout rate is 5.5 percent compared to the highest high school dropout rate in the country—40 percent. The city of New York has recognized the need and has established some excellent vocational schools. Undoubtedly, they should be expanded in scope and amount of expenditures.[1]

In contrast, the city of Philadelphia, four times larger than Milwaukee, spends only one-seventeenth as much annually ($280,000).

Another glaring contrast to Milwaukee is Washington, D.C. In the National Capital the crime rate is climbing rapidly, juvenile delinquency has reached the crisis point, school dropouts constitute a major problem, youth unemployment ranks high as a source of concern, and welfare rolls are bulging. In this city, the budget for vocational education is less than 4 percent of the total school budget.

THE FEDERAL ROLE

In this area of education the Federal role is historic, dating back more than 100 years. The first Land-Grant College Act was a demonstration of the Government's faith in a system of academic and vocational education and a demonstration of the concern the Government held that those who work with their hands be trained properly to perform their tasks with skill and stature in the community.

In 1917 this concept was broadened by the Smith-Hughes Act to include high schools. Congress after Congress since then—regardless of the party in power—extended and broadened this basic law.

In 1961 the administration called together a panel of experts to study vocational education needs. Headed by Chicago school Supt. Benjamin C. Willis, the panel reported back a year later, in November 1962.

The experts agreed there is a deepseated need for added vocational and technical courses and that the need will increase during the years ahead. They recommended an immediate start and set a price tag of $400 million.

Yet, in its school message the administration came up with the figure of $73 million. A study of the complex problems facing young people today—and the society into which they must fit—indicates that perhaps the experts, not the administration, were on the right track.

ATTITUDES MUST CHANGE

More than financial assistance is needed. There must be a fundamental change in the attitude toward vocational education on the part of school boards, school administrators, and the general public.

The glamorous aspects of education are emphasized. Most of our money and time is spent providing an increasingly excellent background for the few who will graduate from college, ignoring the fact that this type of schooling is not solving the problems of the vast majority to prepare them for a useful career. Many of them sit and fidget through class after class until they reach the legal age limit when the truant officer no longer holds power over them—and they drop out. Meanwhile, they have become problems for the school administrator.

---

[1] A survey is currently being made of the 50 State programs, how they are financed and administered, and how well they are working. When results are complete enough to provide some idea of successes and failures, they will be compiled in a further study.

In most school systems the machine shop, the woodworking lathes, and the garage equipment are relegated to the basement, or worse, to obsolete schools which no longer are considered good enough to house academic classrooms.

Little, if any new equipment is bought. Not enough well-trained teachers are hired.

Vocational courses have been given a second-class status and a stigma attached to those taking them. Whether we like to admit it or not, facts indicate that too often administrators use vocational schools as dumping grounds for the unruly and the problem children. The vocational school becomes, in effect, a reformatory without bars. It is little wonder that many parents object strenuously to their children taking part in such programs.

Glance through any report on school problems and almost invariably—as in the case with the administration's school message—the emphasis is on the academic program. That school message devoted four whole paragraphs of a 13-page message to vocational education.

To achieve a really adequate vocational program will, then, require some fundamental changes in attitude among school officials, teachers, and the general public. The dignity of those attending vocational schools or taking vocational courses must be reaffirmed. A society cannot exist where no one is supposed to get his hands dirty.

Closer attention to this problem by community and national news media and by local and national civic organizations might help in bringing about this necessary attitude change.

Because such a program is designed to fill an educational vacuum for the vast majority of students, greater emphasis on finances must be accompanied by greater interest on the part of school administrators.

Such a program must be long-range in character. Lack of spectacular immediate results would not mean failure since appreciable results cannot be expected for at least 4 years, perhaps not even that soon.

A well-rounded vocational program should include a greater degree of on-the-job training in cooperation with unions and business but under the supervision of school officials. Such a program would have a twofold benefit. It would enhance the value of classroom learning with actual experience and it also would provide students with much-needed dollar earnings.

It must be remembered that in many of our urban centers families depend on their children's earnings to maintain themselves. If the students can bring home the needed money with pride, it not only points to a better future for them, it starts the family itself on the road to rehabilitation, another possible side effect of a well-grounded vocational program.

Such a program cannot be achieved in this country by spending 4 percent of the budget or 4 percent of the administrator's time.

Schools by themselves cannot solve the problem of juvenile delinquency. This is a problem for the home, the church, and law enforcement authorities as well as for the educator. Schools by themselves cannot provide jobs for the jobless or hope for those desperate young men and women who have looked but who cannot find dignified employment.

OTHER PROGRAMS QUESTIONED

In addition to its message on education, the administration has sent to the Congress this year requests for other types of youth programs. These include the Youth Conservation Corps and the local area youth employment program. The administration is obviously, through these programs, turning away from education for a solution to problems which it knows exist.

Even if approved by the Congress, these programs would only postpone for a year or two the impact of the employment problem on the young people and the Nation. These programs offer no real training or skill-acquisition opportunities. They are, in simplest terms, a new form of dole, a new form of burying our heads in the sand.

The young men and women who participate would find themselves, upon emerging, still without the necessary skills to meet modern job requirements. They would soon become once again among the unemployed.

OBSTACLES

There are obstacles to the creation of a truly effective vocational education program.

1. The attitude of the administration, of school boards, school officials, teachers, and the public must change. Their apathy and even hostility mitigate against a sound program and must be changed before effective steps can be taken.

2. Teachers in the academic field would undoubtedly object to a changed emphasis. After all, their jobs are at stake in this. If more emphasis were placed on learning the needed skills, more technically trained teachers and fewer academicians might be needed. Their unions and associations also could be expected to object.

3. School administrators would find it difficult to hire the properly trained vocational teachers needed in such an expanded program. Because the program in the past has been so small, teachers' colleges have either ignored it or placed upon it the same lack of emphasis as the school boards. Unless the public is properly informed, it will never overcome its apathy and provide the necessary support needed to encourage forward-looking school administrators to adopt the proper programs.

4. Initial union resistance might occur. As long as the skilled labor market is limited, union members will draw high wages and overtime pay and some union leaders might adopt the shortsighted policy of limiting the labor supply. Obviously, however, as the number of skilled earning union members increases, the unions themselves are improved and the union movement is strengthened. With the decline and near disappearance of the apprentice system, it may well be that vocational schools offer the major manpower pool from which future trade union members are drawn.

Of these factors, the most important is the attitude of the Government, school officials, and the public.

Public school education is valuable to the extent it prepares children to become useful citizens. If our American educational system is to meet this challenge and fulfill its responsibility, there must be a fundamental change in attitude and approach.

If our educational system does not meet this basic responsibility to all of our children, then regardless of how many billions we spend, we have failed the next generation.

THE MEANING OF FISCAL RESPONSIBILITY

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, yesterday in an address before the Advertising Council, President Kennedy delivered a coldly realistic analysis of this Nation's economic history during the past two decades. The President's remarks demonstrate how economic decisions made during 1957 have resulted in 6 years of growing unemployment, rising budget deficits, worsening balance of payments, and increasing undercapacity operations.

As President Kennedy noted, in the decade prior to July 1957, unemployment had barely exceeded 4 percent. Since 1957, it has remained above 5 percent. And February saw unemployment rise to 6.1 percent.

In the decade prior to 1957, business fixed investment averaged almost 11 percent of total output. Since that time, it has declined to under 9 percent.

In the earlier decade the gross national product had expanded at the rate of almost 4 percent annually. The past 6 years have witnessed a total growth rate of barely 3 percent annually. Moreover, the balance-of-payments gap became a serious matter of concern after 1957.

The President noted that our total economy is currently functioning at $30 to $40 billion below capacity. I believe this figure is a most conservative estimate of our so-called production gap. I have received impressively documented estimates that our economy is currently functioning $70 to $80 billion below capacity. But whichever estimate you accept as more accurate, the resulting loss in jobs, wages, capital investment, and consumer products is tragic.

The President has presented this country and the Congress with the economic facts of life. He has, so to speak, laid it on the line. Can we afford to continue this record of partial economic fulfillment? Can we be satisfied with this squandering of our productive resources? Will we permit this country to slowly slip into another serious recession? These are questions every Member of Congress must ask himself.

Mr. President, in asking these questions we should also understand the term "fiscal responsibility" in terms of our obligation to foster an economy capable of restoring 4.9 million unemployed Americans to productive labors. We have the responsibility to foster a strong domestic economy that inspires confidence among foreign investors, thereby providing the basis for improving the balance-of-payments gap. We have the responsibility to bring this country's economy to a growth rate in excess of 4 percent annually. That is what we might call "fiscal responsibility." We have the responsibility to erase the $70 to $80 billion gap between our actual national production and our economic potential.

I suggest that for once we should define fiscal responsibility in terms of jobs, investments, wages, products, and growth, and not limit ourselves to the single criterion of the Federal Government's administrative budget. Our decisions regarding the Federal budget touch only one factor among many that eventually will determine the true extent of our fiscal responsibility.

Will Congress provide a fiscally responsible tax structure that will stimulate rather than depress our economy? Will Congress appropriate funds in a manner that reflects the needs of our modern, technologically sophisticated society, such as funds for mass transportation facilities, urban housing, and health and educational facilities? Will the Congress provide a realistic debt ceiling that recognizes that the actual debt burden is steadily declining in proportion to the rising gross national product?

Each of these questions will be decided by Congress this year. It is my sincere hope that Congress will act in this fiscally responsible fashion. For if we do, the entire economy will reflect the wisdom of our decisions and millions of Americans will be eternally grateful.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that excerpts from President Kennedy's address to the Advertising Council be printed at the conclusion of my remarks. I also ask unanimous consent that two editorials from the Washington Post, "The Tax-Cut Opposition" and "Reduction and Reform," also be printed in the Record. Finally, I ask unanimous consent that a thought-provoking letter from Leon Keyserling, former Chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers, as published by the Washington Post, be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the excerpts, editorial, and letter were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Mar. 14, 1963]

Partial Text of Kennedy Speech

The first 2 months of the 88th Congress have been dominated by discussions of fiscal and economic policy—and the next several months may well be dominated by these topics. In the last 100 years, questions of economic policy have become as complex to the layman as questions of space and military technology. Free soil, free silver, and free trade, for example, were basically easier to understand than the balance of payments, the tools of debt management and the application of countercyclical forces. Today every problem has several alternative solutions, and every answer raises several questions. I am more than ever convinced of the words once uttered by George Bernard Shaw: "If all economists were laid end to end, they still would not reach a conclusion."

FAMILIAR QUESTIONS

Three familiar questions of fiscal policy must be decided by the Congress:

1. The limit on the national debt;
2. The size of the Federal budget; and
3. The desirability and extent of Federal tax reduction.

All three of these questions have faced the legislative and executive branches before—and we have an obligation to learn the lessons of history if we do not wish to relive it. Economic history—specifically the history of 1957-60, which produced two recessions from which the economy never wholly recovered—clearly warns us now that the wrong answer to each of these three questions would spell downturn and disaster for the American economy as a whole.

I do not speak as a partisan. The errors of a Republican administration and a Democratic Congress during those crucial years have been previously acknowledged by members of both parties. I do not review them now to gain political advantage in hindsight but to gain a greater degree of foresight on the same problems that face us now. I do not intend to assess the blame for the past—but we shall all be deserving of blame if we do not learn its lessons for the future.

HARSH RESULTS

The Federal Government—and I shall speak here not of any one party or branch of Government, but the Government as a whole—decided in 1957 to keep the debt limit unrealistically low, to cut back and stretch out budget expenditures, to tighten monetary policy and to reject all efforts at tax reduction. The harsh results of those decisions are still with us.

In the decade previous to July 1957 unemployment had barely exceeded 4 percent. In the 64 months since those decisions, it has remained above 5 percent.

In the earlier decade, business fixed investment averaged nearly 11 percent of total output—it has since that time fallen steadily to roughly 9 percent today.

In the previous decade, our total output of goods and services, measured in constant prices, had increased at the rate of nearly 4 percent a year. Since mid-1957, the rate of increase has been limited to 3 percent.

All three of these decisions were taken in the name of fiscal responsibility. But if that high-sounding label is intended to refer primarily to budget and balance of payments surpluses, it was a name taken in vain.

STRONG ECONOMY

The preceding 11 fiscal years had produced seven cash surpluses in the Federal budget, for a net cash surplus of $20 billion. The succeeding fiscal years produced one surplus and five deficits, including the greatest peacetime deficit of all time in fiscal 1959, for a net cash deficit of $30 billion. Had the economy been operating at full employment, there would have been no deficit at all.

The balance-of-payments problem became a problem only after the mid-1957 decisions, with a total deficit of $11.2 billion during the next three calendar years and a gold loss of more than $5 billion during the same period. The fact that short-term interest rates had been increased 40 percent in 1955 and 1957 did not help to stem the tide. As the OECD said last December:

"Confidence in the dollar depends in good part on a strong domestic economy; it is unlikely to be fostered for any length of time by policies that keep the level of activity low."

Unfortunately, the size of the deficits in our Federal budget and our international accounts led the Government in 1959 to adopt even more restrictive fiscal and monetary policies. The Federal cash budget during the first quarter 1959 was operating at the level of a $17 billion deficit at annual rates. By the third quarter, this had become a $2 billion deficit—and by the second quarter of the next year, 1960, a surplus of $7 billion. These figures are from Arthur Burns, who served my predecessor as Chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers, and who calls this "one of the very sharpest shifts of Federal finance in our Nation's history."

At the same time, Dr. Burns pointed out, economic expansion was curbed by a tightening of both short- and long-term credit—long-term rates, in fact, "advanced faster than during a comparable stage of any business cycle during the past hundred years."

The result was another recession, more unemployment, more unused capacity, and another incomplete recovery. Today output is $30 to $40 billion below our productive capacity. The rate of unemployment has risen to 6.1 percent of those actively seeking work. Corporate investment last year was—for the first time in any nonrecession year since the war—below the level of gross retained earnings. And business spending on new plant and equipment was at a lower level than it was in 1957.

SAME DECISIONS

Now, in 1963, the Government is once again faced with these same decisions. I hope we will bear in mind the lessons of history. I hope we will remember the editorial in Business Week magazine, June 28, 1958, which pointed out the effects of an unrealistic debt ceiling and a harmful slash in expenditures:

"In the second half of 1957 the debt ceiling forced the administration to cut back programs needed for long-term national security. And the resulting slash in defense expenditures was an important contributing cause of the recession."

An unrealistic debt ceiling or budget cut today would also cause a slowdown in contracts, a stretchout in payments, a cash drain on business, and ultimately another recession. Instead of balancing the budget, it would produce a budget deficit far greater than the temporary addition to the deficit that will come from tax reduction. Let us remember that the $12.4 billion deficit of fiscal year 1959 was the result of a recession which wiped out what had originally been estimated to be a surplus of $466 million.

REALISTIC CEILING

This administration is not asking for an unlimited debt ceiling, but a realistic one which will still keep the actual debt burden—as measured by its proportion of gross national product—steadily declining.

We are not asking for uncontrolled budget increases, but for a prudent budget which, contrary to the trend at all levels of Government, actually reduces civilian expenditures below their level of the previous year, a feat which has occurred only four times in the last 15 years.

And we are not asking for an unprecedented tax cut, but for a program which will add only $2.7 billion to the next budget deficit. Certainly it is clear that, if we slide into another recession, the deficit without a tax cut will be far larger than the projected deficit we face with a tax cut.

So I am hopeful that the lessons of history will be remembered by us all—by those of us in the administration and the Congress, and those in this audience who are leaders of opinion in the business community.

"The great advantage of Americans," wrote De Tocqueville in 1835, "consists in their being able to commit faults which they may afterward repair." To this I would add the fact that the great advantage of hindsight consists of our applying its lessons by way of foresight. If this Nation can apply the lessons and repair the faults of the last 5 years—if we can stick to the facts and cast out falsehoods and, above all, distinguish clearly between facts and falsehoods—then, surely, this great country can achieve the full fruits of greatness which today remain beyond our reach.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Feb. 25, 1963]

The Tax-Cut Opposition

Although a parade of expert witnesses has passed before the Joint Economic Committee and the House Committee on Ways and Means, not one of the opponents of the principle of tax reduction has come up with a rounded and analytical counterargument. Since a vital issue is at stake, this failure to subject the principles of contemporary fiscal policy to serious intellectual scrutiny is indeed regrettable. What are the principal objections to a tax cut? Several loosely connected strands of the opposition's case can be extracted from the testimony of the various witnesses.

Prof. Dan Throop Smith of Harvard University, gave voice to a fear of inflation and balance-of-payments difficulties when he declared that an enlargement of the present fiscal deficit would constitute "a dangerous gamble with the country's currency and basic well-being." But the fear of inflation at this time is hardly well grounded. The trend of wholesale prices has been level or declining slightly since 1959, and with considerable excess capacity in most sectors of economic activity and effective foreign competition, it is not likely that the stimulus of a tax cut will generate inflationary pressures.

Nor can a great deal of weight be attached to the argument that a cut would significantly enlarge the international balance-of-payments deficit through an upsurge of imports. Such a threat could become serious only if a recession, affecting all or most of our oversea partners were to occur. And even in that eventuality, it is probable that the inflow of foreign capital funds would offset the decline of U.S. exports. It is noteworthy on this score that Per Jacobbsen, the respected Managing Director of the International Monetary Fund, supports the tax reduction and appropriate monetary measures in order to withstand what he describes as the "deflationary tendencies in the present period."

A second and more sophisticated objection is directed to the proposition that the bulk of the tax relief should go to individuals rather than the corporate enterprises. Most of these critics favor a reduction in the very high personal income-tax brackets, but they would extend the bulk of the tax relief—if any—to corporations on the ground that it will stimulate investment. But this view overlooks the fact that the American economy has been saddled with considerable excess capacity since 1957. The ratio of cash flow—retained profits plus depreciation allowances—to outlays for new plant and equipment has risen in most sectors, and it is therefore doubtful that corporate tax relief alone would provide a significant stimulus to economy activity. Consumers are fickle creatures, but the available evidence seems to indicate that the bulk of any tax reduction would soon be spent. And when pressures are created by a rise in the volume of consumer expenditures, efforts will be made to increase productive capacity through capital investment.

The success of this chain of reactions, of course, hinges on the maintenance of business confidence. But despite a distaste for fiscal deficits and rising Government expenditures, there is little evidence of a serious deterioration in the longrun optimism that has characterized business thinking in the postwar period.

There is also the view that most of the current unemployment is structural and cannot be reduced by a rise in the volume of economic activity. But evidence to support this pessimistic proposition has yet to be produced.

Most of the objections to a tax cut are based upon groundless fears, dubious historical analogies and doubtful hypotheses concerning the determinants of investment. Perhaps a strong case against a tax cut can be made, but thus far the critics have been far from articulate.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Feb. 26, 1963]

REDUCTION AND REFORM

The Symposium on Economic Growth conducted by the American Bankers Association Monday, may have regrouped the national consensus gathered behind the drive for tax reduction at this session of Congress. President Kennedy, in his address and in his answers to questions, made it clear that tax reduction at this session of Congress is, in his view, essential to economic growth, even if it can be achieved only by the sacrifice of some individual proposals for tax reform. The economists and bankers who participated in the symposium exhibited differing opinions on the relation between tax policies and growth, on the other means of inducing rapid growth and even on the importance of short-run growth itself but they disclosed an almost unanimous belief that existing rates of taxation on personal incomes and corporate incomes are a drag on the economy.

The symposium has had the most desirable effect of putting the debate on the tax bill back into an intellectual framework and divesting it of many of the political overtones that, in recent weeks, have almost drowned out the essential issue.

The President's forceful statement made its own unique contribution to getting the dialog onto the track again. He had the right answers to all the conventional objections to the tax bill. He was able to put into its proper perspective the debate over the deficit. He made the most convincing argument to persuade every reasonable listener that the choice is not between a large deficit and no deficit but is, on the contrary, between a large deficit and a larger deficit—between the deficit that will exist if taxes are reduced and the greater deficit that will develop if the economy stagnates, growth rate declines, unemployment increases and tax revenues decline.

The President made a double case for lowering the existing tax rates. He made a case that ought to convince those who believe a large deficit is the thing to be avoided and he made a case to convince those who believe in tax reduction for its economic effect. There is a temptation to say that the consensus behind tax reduction never would have been shaken if the administration had not mingled tax reduction and tax reform. If it was damaging to mingle the two purposes, and this newspaper has thought it damaging, that damage now has been largely repaired by the President's emphasis on the growth and antirecession purposes of tax reduction. This, it is clear, is what he believes is essential at this session of Congress. In the end, the President may have been tactically correct to combine both objectives. The exercise has demonstrated that the objections to this course were not purely theoretical or imaginary. There is as little agreement on the need for and the kind of tax reform required as there is general agreement on the need for and the kind of tax reduction needed.

The tax bill, after a perilous few weeks of confusion and disarray among the advocates of tax reduction, can now be put on the road to enactment by separating the reductions in rates from the reforms of structure. The administration made an honest effort to get all of its proposals, but it is clear now that the President will be content to get through the provisions that have to do with the country's ability to cope with its central economic problem of achieving a sustained economic growth.

FOR A TAX CUT

Your editorial of February 25 admirably disposes of the opposition to tax cuts. I believe we need big tax cuts now. But this does not justify the predisposition of some to regard as obstructionists those who question the proposals now before the Congress. Experience during the New Deal should have taught us that the notion that any kind of action is better than no action led to some erroneous and wasteful programs, and frustrated anything approximating full recovery until the advent of World War II.

I submit that the current tax program needs drastic change. Tax reduction of even $7 or $8 billion in the first year, with the reforms deferred, would do much more good than a complex medley of reductions and reforms spread out over 3 years, with a gross value of $13 billion and a net value of $10 billion.

Whether or not the reforms are deferred, and especially if they are, the distribution of the tax cuts should concentrate much more heavily than proposed by the administration in the middle- and low-income groups. Your editorial properly refers to the large amount of excess capacity since 1957, the high "cash flow" and the effect which a rising volume of consumer expenditure would have upon capital investment. Under current and foreseeable conditions, the excessively large amounts which the current tax proposals allocate to investment stimulus, through corporate tax reduction, and through personal rate reductions for those who have and invest relatively large portions of their income, would be substantially wasted.

But the main defect in the current tax proposals is external rather than internal. Your editorial is entirely correct in rejecting the viewpoint that most of the current unemployment is "structural" (i.e., due to maladjustments in the available labor force). Nonetheless, most of the unemployment can be taken up only by profound changes in the structure of demand, granted that aggregate demand must be increased.

Tax reduction scattered among millions of families will add to their spending for traditional types of products, and may add some to investment in producers' facilities for such products. But the new technology and automation are advancing so rapidly that there is very little chance for much more employment in these more or less conventional areas, even if production and distribution rise considerably.

The automobile industry has been producing recently at a higher rate than in 1955, but with several hundred thousand fewer employees. The changes in the structure of demand required to create 12½ million net additional jobs within a decade call for vast expansion of housing and urban renewal, improvements in mass transportation, enormously enlarged educational and health services and facilities, etc. These all call for combined private and public efforts entirely apart from tax reduction, including large increases in Federal domestic spending.

So when the administration commits itself to a freeze on domestic public spending for several years ahead, as a quid pro quo for a questionable compound of tax reduction, thus doing violence to the valid cry raised over the years by so many, ranging all the way from the Rockefeller reports to J. K. Galbraith, it turns its back on what is essential if our basic needs are to be met, and if the economic growth and employment performance in the years ahead is to average any better than during the past decade.

LEON H. KEYSERLING.

WASHINGTON.

FAIR HOUSING ORDINANCE IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, last week District Commissioner Walter N. Tobriner indicated that the Board of Commissioners would soon decide whether to issue an order banning housing discrimination in the District of Columbia.

This announcement by Mr. Tobriner is heartening news. The time for action to deal with housing discrimination in Washington is long overdue.

Last September, the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights after a 2-day hearing, extensive investigation, and a careful report, unanimously recommended that Washington adopt a fair housing regulation to prohibit racial and religious discrimination. The report received overwhelmingly favorable response from the District of Columbia community.

In November, a group of eminent Washingtonians, the District of Columbia Advisory Committee to the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, which includes representatives of banking, real estate, industry, the church and civic affairs, urged that the Board of Commissioners issue a fair housing regulation. Since then dozens of organizations and hundreds of individuals have added their voices to the plea for fair housing action in the District of Columbia.

If the citizens of Washington want a fair housing law, why has action been so long in coming? It has been suggested that there was legal doubt about the authority of the Commissioners to act.

However, the Corporation Counsel of the District has advised the Commissioners that they are authorized under their police powers to issue fair housing regulations.

The Corporation Counsel also indicated that as a prerequisite of issuing such regulation, the Commissioners should find as a fact "that any such condition of discrimination results or is likely to result in danger to the lives, limbs, health, comfort, quiet, or property of the inhabitants of the District of Columbia."

This requirement was not an onerous one and on November 30 and December 3, 1962, the District Commissioners held public hearings to determine whether there was a need for regulations to provide for nondiscriminatory use of housing facilities. Citizens were asked to furnish information which would enable the Commissioners to determine whether discriminatory housing practices had given rise to a situation where regulation is necessary "to protect lives, limbs, health, comfort, and quiet of all persons and all property in the District."

Representatives of more than 60 neighborhood, civic, religious, business, and fraternal groups, as well as Government officials and citizens speaking for themselves as individuals, submitted oral or written testimony in the course of the hearings. The overwhelming majority of these witnesses testified to the crucial need for fair housing regulations in our Nation's Capital.

Some of the testimony dramatically underlines the President's recent admonition that in looking at Washington we should direct our gaze beyond the broad boulevards, parks, and public monuments. The Commissioners heard testimony that reveals another Washington, D.C., a city whose residents live in a racially defined ghetto five times more crowded than the area where white residents are free to live. It is a city where the number of infant deaths in the Negro ghetto is five times as great as within the white areas; where reported cases of tuberculosis are two and a half times more numerous; where those with one-half the income of their fellow citizens pay out a much greater percentage of that smaller income for housing—housing which is markedly inferior.

And that other Washington is a city where criminal offenses and juvenile referrals are double the figure for the white areas. As a Negro lawyer who has lived in Washington for 35 years said at the hearings:

> Deprivation means rebelling. Separate areas of residence can create strained relations between different groups of people, but unequal separate areas of residence are potentially dangerous not only to these groups of people themselves but to the very system in which they live.

More than one civic leader testified to the damage to mental health and comfort resulting from segregated housing and the conditions it engenders.

Evidence was cited to support a housing official's statement that—

> Negro communities in the central city slums are developing into a kind of social and economic limbo from which there will be no escape.

Mr. President, if the District Commissioners needed evidence of the fact that housing discrimination endangers the "lives, limbs, health, comfort, quiet or property of the inhabitants of the District of Columbia," they received it in abundant quantity at that hearing. If they wanted proof that discrimination results in racial tensions and violence, they needed to look no further than the causes of the Thanksgiving Day riot at District of Columbia Stadium.

If they desired corroboration of the demoralizing and degrading effects of racial ghettoes, they need only take a walk around our city. In my opinion there is no legal or factual impediment to a regulation prohibiting discrimination in housing.

Washington, sometimes called the first city of the free world, will not be fully free itself as long as those who praise the city and those who condemn it refuse to recognize the harsh realities of its split personality. As long as housing in Washington remains segregated, and many of the resulting problems are blamed on secondary or irrelevant causes, our Nation's Capital will remain a segregated city—one part free metropolis, one part ghetto.

Mr. President, it is time for Washington to join the growing list of cities that have acted to guarantee equal opportunity in housing for all their citizens.

I do not urge the District Commissioners to follow my beliefs in this matter any more than they should follow the beliefs of those opposed to a fair housing order. I only hope that the Commissioners will determine the needs and wishes of the people of the District and then act accordingly.

President Kennedy has said that when racial discrimination persists in Washington:

> It sometimes constitutes a personal affront to the diplomats of sovereign nations and always reflects upon our ability as a Nation to live up to our constitutional ideals. Washington should provide an example of our worthiest profession and best practices, both for the Nation and the world.

If the District Commissioners follow the dictates of their consciences, and act in accordance with the needs and interests of the citizens of Washington, we will take a long step toward that goal.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a resolution of the District of Columbia Advisory Committee of the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks. This resolution was approved prior to President Kennedy's Executive order barring discrimination in federally assisted housing and should be read in that light.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA ADVISORY COMMITTEE OF THE U.S. COMMISSION ON CIVIL RIGHTS

We commend the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights for its forthright report on housing in the Washington, D.C., metropolitan area. We support the Commission's findings and recommendations.

We favor the issuing of both a Presidential Executive order requiring equal housing opportunity in governmentally financed or assisted housing and a Board of Commissioners' regulation prohibiting discrimination on the basis of race, color, religion, or national origin in the sale, rental or financing of housing accommodations within the District of Columbia. As the Commission has said, the problem of housing discrimination in Washington is metropolitan in scope. The response to this must also be of a metropolitan character. Therefore, action by the President and as well as by the District of Columbia Commission is needed if there is to be a total solution to our housing problems.

We call upon the President and the Board of Commissioners to issue an Executive order and a regulation respectively in regard to housing discrimination, and to put both the Executive order and the regulation into effect at the earliest possible moment.

More than a month has passed since the report of the U.S. Civil Rights Commission was submitted. In this time a number of responsible organizations of the District have spoken out in favor of such a regulation. The overwhelming public demand for action warrants an immediate response.

The fair housing regulation, to be effective, must contain administrative remedies rather than relying solely on criminal penalties. We urge the utilization of an administrative agency with authority to conciliate and mediate and with power to obtain appropriate relief, along the lines suggested by the Commission, if conciliation and mediation fail.

The objective of this committee is to make metropolitan Washington a model area in which our large nonwhite population lives in equality and friendliness with the rest of the community. The proposed order and District of Columbia regulation will go a long way toward that goal.

The District of Columbia Advisory Committee to the Commission on Civil Rights: Dr. Duncan Howlett, Chairman, Minister of All Souls Church; The Reverend E. Franklin Jackson, Vice Chairman, President of District of Columbia Chapter of National Association for the Advancement of Colored People; James M. Lambie, Jr., Secretary, Assistant Executive Director of CARE, Inc.; Paul R. Dean, Dean of Georgetown University School of Law; Patricia R. Harris, Associate Dean of Students, Howard University; George E. C. Hayes, Attorney at Law; Frank J. Luchs,[1] Executive Vice President, Shannon & Luchs Co.; Joseph L. Rauh, Jr., Attorney at Law; Ben D. Segal, Director of Education, International Union of Electrical Workers, AFL–CIO; Sterling Tucker, Executive Director, Washington Urban League, Inc.; Henry Kellog Willard II, Banker-Treasurer, American Security & Trust Co.; J. Hillman Zahn, Vice President, the Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co. of Washington.

---

[1] Mr. Frank Luchs made the following separate statement: "While I agree in principle with the resolution of the committee I am satisfied that a fair housing regulation should be issued by the District of Columbia Commissioners simultaneously with, or subsequent to, the issuance of a Presidential Executive order, or not at all."

USE OF SENATE AUDITORIUM TO SHOW CERTAIN DOCUMENTARY FILMS AND SO FORTH

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, for some time I have been concerned with the need for the American public to gain a greater understanding of the role Congress plays in the American system of government.

The average American citizen is primarily concerned with events of his personal life. He has little opportunity to become familiar with other considerations such as the operations of Congress which are, to him, highly marginal in importance. This situation is natural, proper, and to be expected.

But ultimately the strength of our democratic system is dependent to some extent on the appreciation and understanding the average citizen has of the machinery of democracy. Congress surely is a vital cog in that machinery.

Each year millions of Americans travel to Washington, D.C., to observe the Federal Government in operation and to view the more picturesque sections of this city. Most visitors include a trip to Capitol Hill as part of their Washington excursion. The guides stationed in the Capitol rotunda perform a valuable service by providing an interesting and enlightening tour of the Capitol itself. The emphasis of this tour rests with the architectural and historical aspects of Congress and the Capitol. Many Senators find time in their busy schedules to meet their constituents and explain the workings of Congress for them.

As an ex-teacher and a practicing politician, I know the value of direct exposure in awakening a person's interest in any subject—even Congress. It is our responsibility to provide the most meaningful and complete explanation possible of the workings of Congress for every visitor to Capitol Hill.

In order to introduce our constituents to the operations of Congress in a more effective manner, I propose that the Senate auditorium, room G–308 in the New Senate Office Building, be used to show documentary films on a regular, free-of-charge basis. These films would concentrate on describing the role and operations of Congress.

As my colleagues know, the Senate auditorium is not used frequently. Most of the time it sits locked and vacant. I am willing to wager that many Members of Congress have never had occasion even to see the room. However, it is a fine auditorium with excellent acoustics, seats, lighting and it is highly suitable for motion pictures. There are available several excellent movies outlining the work of Congress. I specifically know of one such series containing eight 30-minute films produced by the National Educational Television and Radio Center and titled "From Capitol Hill: Party Government and the U.S. Congress." Contained in this series are such films as "The Role of Congress," "The Senate and House of Representatives," "Congress and the President," and "Congress as a Means of Democratic Government: A Summary."

My proposal is very simple. On a regular schedule provide screenings of one or more of these documentary, nonpartisan films on the workings of Congress. The movies would be shown on a free-of-charge basis. Each Senate and House office would receive a schedule of times when the films would be run, and constituents would attend at a convenient time. If the auditorium were needed for official Senate business, the films would be suspended for that period of time, or held in another location.

I also suggest the U.S. Capitol Historical Society as the ideal body to assume the sponsorship of this service. The U.S. Capitol Historical Society is dedicated to public enlightenment as to the importance of Congress in American Government, both in historic and contemporary sense. As a vice president of the society, I know it is absolutely nonpartisan in its activities, and therefore could serve as the ideal body to select the films to be shown. I intend to pass this suggestion along to Representative FRED SCHWENGEL, president of the society, and a Member of Congress vitally concerned with the importance of instilling in every American citizen a basic understanding of and appreciation for our democratic system of Government. I am indeed hopeful that the U.S. Capitol Historical Society will be able to assume the responsibility for this project.

Eventually a movie written specifically for the job of introducing visitors to Congress could be produced. As many Senators know, visitors to Williamsburg are treated to an outstanding color film on the American revolution that vividly brings to life their later tour of this historic American shrine. A similar film outlining both the history and contemporary activities of Congress would greatly assist in informing American citizens—and foreign visitors as well—about the activities of the legislative branch of Government.

Perhaps the U.S. Capitol Historical Society would also assume this longer range project. As a vice president of this society, I know that such a film is under active consideration once the new guide book on the Capitol has been published. Perhaps the society could collaborate with an outside group such as the National Education and Television and Radio Center in producing this special introductory film on Congress.

Mr. President, in order to implement this proposal I am forwarding my ideas to the distinguished chairman of the Senate Rules and Administration Committee, the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. JORDAN], who is now in the Chamber. The need for such a program of public education is obvious. The means for accomplishing this objective appear to be at hand. I sincerely hope prompt action will be possible on this proposal.

NUCLEAR SUBMARINE CONSTRUCTION AWARDS ON COMPETITIVE BASIS

Mrs. SMITH. Mr. President, last month Mr. Armond G. Satalino of Eliot, Maine, wrote me a very interesting letter in which he charged first, that the award of nuclear ballistic missile submarine building contracts was under the influence of politics; second, that the Kittery Naval Shipyard was not "getting it;" third, that the Electric Boat Co., of Groton, Conn., was getting "all, or at least a goodly number, of Polaris submarine construction contracts"; fourth, that private shipyards were getting too many construction awards; and fifth, that the Senators and Congressmen from New Hampshire, Massachusetts, and Maine should join together to do something about the situation.

Upon receiving his letter, I had copies of it made and wrote President Kennedy, Secretary of Defense McNamara, and Secretary of the Navy Korth asking them for reports on the issues Mr. Satalino raised in his letter, a copy which I enclosed in my request to them.

I did so because I had observed in my reply to Mr. Satalino:

> I have no evidence that politics controls the award of submarine construction contracts, although I must confess that it was only last year that I was the victim of partisan politics when the Kennedy administration refused to give me information on the award of the nuclear submarine to the Kittery Naval Shipyard. You may recall that I requested such information both before and after the Kennedy administration gave it to Democratic Senator MUSKIE but that the Kennedy administration refused to give me the information that it had given Senator MUSKIE. You may recall my protest against such "two bit" politics and the several editorials in the Portland papers condemning me for making such a protest.
>
> In view of your point about politics controlling the construction awards, I have had copies made of your letter and have sent the copies to President Kennedy, Secretary of Defense McNamara, and Secretary of the Navy Korth, asking them for reports on the matter since it is they, not I, who control the selection of the construction awards and they are of the opposite political party.

Since Mr. Satalino raised the issue of alleged political influence, I further observed to him:

> In that connection, I would point out that Massachusetts holds more political power on this matter about which you write in that not only is the President of the United States from Massachusetts but so is the Speaker of the House of Representatives, Representative JOHN W. MCCORMACK, and the junior Senator from Massachusetts is the brother of the President.
>
> You may have noted recently in the Portsmouth papers that Senator COTTON and I joined in an appeal to President Kennedy and Speaker MCCORMACK to keep their 1960 campaign promises made 2½ years ago to order pay equalization for the Kittery Naval Shipyard workers.

I asked Mr. Satalino to give me any specific evidence that he had in support of his charge that the submarine awards were made on the basis of politics. I made that request to him in my letter of February 8, 1963. He has not responded to my letter and my request.

On behalf of the President, the Secretary of Defense, and the Secretary of the Navy, my letters to them were answered by Assistant Secretary of the Navy Kenneth E. BeLieu by letter dated February 20, 1963, and a copy of which I sent to Mr. Satalino on February 21, 1963, the day I received the BeLieu letter.

In his letter, Secretary BeLieu stated that—

1. The submarine construction awards were not made on the basis of politics but rather on a competitive basis;

2. The Electric Boat Co. had won its construction awards on a competitive basis; and

3. In the past 5 calendar years, employment at the Kittery-Portsmouth Naval Shipyard increased by more than 2,100, while total employment at all of our naval shipyards, including Kittery-Portsmouth, decreased by approximately 800.

Because this is a matter of interest to the three States of Maine, New Hampshire, and Massachusetts, I ask unanimous consent that the letter of Secretary BeLieu be placed in the body of the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, D.C., February 20, 1963.

Hon. MARGARET CHASE SMITH,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: In your letters of February 8, 1963, to the President, the Secretary of Defense, and the Secretary of the Navy you requested information with respect to questions raised by Mr. Arnold G. Satalino, of Eliot, Maine. In a letter to you, Mr. Satalino indicated that politics influence the award or assignment of Polaris submarine construction projects, and asked why "all, or at least a goodly number, of Polaris submarine construction contracts seem to go to Electric Boat Co., in Groton, Conn."

As you probably know, the private shipbuilding industry for many years has been suffering from a scarcity of commercial shipwork. It has been the Navy's practice to award the major part of its new ship construction projects to private yards in keeping with their experience and capabilities. Although allocation of ship construction projects has been necessary in order to meet the urgent requirements of the Polaris submarine program, and to broaden the competitive base, this work usually is awarded on a competitive basis. It is not surprising that the Electric Boat Division, General Dynamics Corp., of Groton, Conn., should have been successful in obtaining a large portion of the Navy's submarine construction work, in view of the firm's long experience in submarine construction. I would like to assure you that factors such as the foregoing, rather than political conditions, influence our decisions as to who receives ship construction projects.

The Navy is fully aware of the excellent capabilities of the Portsmouth Naval Shipyard, mentioned by Mr. Satalino, for Polaris submarine construction. This is evidenced by the substantial workload now underway there, which includes construction of the auxiliary submarine *Dolphin* (AGSS-555), nuclear submarine *Jack* (SSN-605), and Polaris submarines *John Adams* (SSBN-620), and *Nathanael Greene* (SSBN-636). Portsmouth is also converting the *Albacore* (AGSS-569), and has been assigned construction of the as yet unnamed SSN-646. Also, it should be reassuring to know that in the past 5 calendar years employment at Portsmouth increased by more than 2,100, while total employment at all of our naval shipyards, including Portsmouth, decreased by approximately 800.

I assure you that the Navy will continue to give earnest and thorough consideration to the Portsmouth Naval Shipyard in the assignment of naval shipwork.

With kindest regards.

Sincerely yours,
KENNETH E. BELIEU,
Assistant Secretary of the Navy
(Installations and Logistics).

IMPACT OF THE PEACE CORPS

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, the Peace Corps has had a tremendous impact upon the free world and especially those nations that have received volunteers. But the impact of those volunteers has not yet had its full affect upon the United States. This will come when these Peace Corps members begin to return to this country and to establish themselves in new careers. By the very nature of the Peace Corps many volunteers have been teaching in many areas of the globe and will undoubtedly consider teaching careers when they return.

A very interesting article regarding the impact of the Peace Corps on the American educational scene was written by its director, Sargent Shriver, in the March issue of the National Educational Association Journal. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHEN PEACE CORPS TEACHERS RETURN

(By Sargent Shriver, Director, Peace Corps)

This summer, almost 500 Americans who have been teaching overseas with the Peace Corps for 2 years will return to the United States. Will many of these Peace Corps volunteers pursue teaching careers here at home? How will their experience affect their attitude toward teachers and the teaching profession? What influence will these returned Peace Corps volunteers and those that will follow them exert on American education?

These are questions I'm frequently asked by American educators. They want to know the results of sending experienced teachers and college graduates (many without professional preparation) to teach in developing nations. The answers are beginning to emerge.

Education dominates Peace Corps work. Almost two-thirds of the more than 5,000 volunteers now serving are working in this field. Since the Peace Corps acts in response to requests from developing nations, we feel this indicates the significance these countries attach to advancing their education programs.

Some volunteers, we find, arrive at important insights about teaching and learning. Carol Byrnes, age 25, a Peace Corps teachers' aid in the Philippines from Duquesne, Pa., says:

"Our rewards in a project like this come from the satisfaction in seeing a child's face light up when he has learned to pronounce a new word properly. We have had to learn, and must continue to learn, how to be sustained by this kind of gratification.

"Only time and the future will tell if our efforts in the Philippines have been successful. Many of us have had to grow up and mature to the point of doing a job where we sometimes can see no material results of our efforts."

Another of our volunteers who is serving in the Philippines is David Szanton, 24, a native New Yorker. Here is how he describes his life as a teacher for the Peace Corps:

"Another fellow and I have a house of our own in the town of Numancia in the Province of Aklan.

"It is constructed mostly of bamboo and nipa palm, and has a living room, kitchen, pantry, and bath. The floors are split bamboo, and the house in general is quite airy, light, and comfortable. As far as I'm concerned, all this talk about the great discomforts the volunteers are putting up with is just so much hogwash.

"Most of our waking hours are spent one way or another working in or through the schools. The Bureau of Public Schools requested that we work largely in the fields of second language (English) teaching and science.

"Like most of the other volunteers, I've spent most of my time working with the teachers. I help them develop their lesson plans, teach them the general science they are to teach their classes, show them how to do science demonstrations, and pass along second-language teaching techniques we learned at Penn State and the training center here.

"When the new school year begins in June, I am going to stop spending so much time with the teachers and put in several hours a week working on remedial English with a small group of the slower students and on advanced science programs with about a dozen of the brighter kids who are more likely to go on to high school.

"Here you are given a position of leadership and great respect within a community. Quite clearly, there are already indications that these 2 years in the Philippines will be one of the most valuable and educational experiences of my life."

We feel, as does Szanton, that the time spent in the Peace Corps is an educational experience. For instance, Newell Flather, a volunteer teacher in Winneba, Ghana, got a chance to change the curriculum—an opportunity that would rarely come to a teacher in the United States. As Flather tells it:

"I consider my supreme achievement of the term to be the reorientation of the school's history program from British to West African. This job was left entirely up to me, and it involved a good deal of reading and study in order to find the right books for the students and the right syllabus for the teacher."

Flather, like other volunteers, assumes many additional responsibilities. He teaches English to the upper forms, is a form master, an entertainment master, and a debating union master.

Flather's latest project has been to help enlarge the school library, which had only 30 books when he arrived. Flather wrote his brother, his church, his high school, and various social groups in Massachusetts. The first 1,000 books arrived recently, and more are on their way.

Roger Hamilton, of Arlington, Va., who taught in Halfassini, Ghana, feels that many of the returning volunteers who have been teaching will want to teach in the United States but that those whose only teaching experience has been in the Peace Corps may be discouraged by the problems of certification.

The returning volunteers are going to be eager to get into their careers as fast as possible. Some, but not all, may have the patience or motivation to complete certification requirements for teaching. Responsibility falls on all of us to encourage these young people to stay in teaching.

According to Hamilton, "The volunteers are interested in getting into meaningful teaching situations quickly because they have been doing this overseas."

I am happy to say that some leading educators agree with Hamilton about the value of the teaching experience gained overseas by Peace Corps volunteers with bachelor's degrees.

Dean John Monro, of Harvard College, says, "Two years in the Peace Corps today can be as significant as a Rhodes scholarship."

George Makechnie, dean of Boston University's Sargent College, says: "I encourage my students to think of Peace Corps service. The Peace Corps will have a general salutary effect on education in this country."

Recognizing the value of the Peace Corps experience overseas and the possibility that many of the returning volunteers may want to teach in the United States, some State boards of education are studying ways in which volunteers may receive recognition for their oversea teaching experience and how to help them meet certification requirements on their return.

One specific example is California, where Carl Larson, head of teacher certification for the California State Board of Education, feels that with their special preparation and experience the Peace Corps teachers normally can come back and directly start teaching in California.

"If the volunteers have been teaching satisfactorily in organized schools, and we can verify the fact, we will count the oversea teaching in lieu of the required student teaching," he says.

Dr. Larson adds that appropriate credit given by universities for the volunteers' training program would be accepted by the State as credit toward the number of education hours required for a teaching certificate.

We are very appreciative at the Peace Corps for the invaluable cooperation given us by schools and colleges throughout the country and by the American Association of School Administrators. For instance, school systems around the Nation are granting 2-year leaves of absence to teachers who join the Peace Corps. New York, Philadelphia, Chicago, Kansas City, Los Angeles, and Denver are a few of the major cities that have granted leaves, and scores of smaller school systems have taken similar action.

Georgetown University has set up graduate and undergraduate scholarships and Michigan State University has set up graduate assistantships for returning volunteers. Ohio University will award educational credits for teaching done overseas in teaching projects in the West Cameroons, sponsored by the Peace Corps and administered by the university, for those who are working toward teacher certification in Ohio. It will also give some credit for correspondence courses completed by the volunteers during their Peace Corps assignment.

Plans are underway at the University of Pittsburgh; New Mexico State University; and the State University College of Education at New Paltz, New York, to give similar credit. Like plans are under consideration at Syracuse University.

Even the volunteers who will not go into teaching on their return will, I feel, bring back with them greater understanding of the worth of a good system of education. For example, Jack Magri, who is teaching in Mogadiscio, Somalia, says:

"One thing is certain about my experience here. I'll return to the United States with a greater appreciation for our teachers and the teaching profession.

"While we are students, teachers are taken for granted. After we finish school, they are often forgotten. You can be sure I won't forget them now—I realize what an important contribution they are making."

Opportunities for teachers are now available in several projects, training for which is slated to begin in the spring or summer. The new projects are in Malaya, North Borneo/Sarawak, Thailand, Barbados, Ethiopia, Liberia, Sierra Leone, Philippines, Ghana, Nigeria, Nyasaland, Colombia, and Indonesia.

PROGRESS IN MISSOURI

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, we are very proud in Missouri of the progress that has been made in recognition of individual merit regardless of race, creed, or color. In this connection I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the Record an editorial from one of the outstanding Negro newspapers of the Nation, the Kansas City Call, from its issue of March 1, 1963, entitled "Integration in Our Schools."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Integration in Our Schools

Schools in the area are giving evidence that they are becoming truly integrated. Students are being rated and judged according to their individual merit rather than being limited because of their race, creed, or color as in days of yesteryear.

Two cases in point will illustrate the change in attitude in our schools.

The University of Kansas City, which a little more than a decade ago did not even admit Negroes as students, last Sunday sent a team of four top students to New York to compete in the nationwide television program, "College Bowl."

One of the four—and the captain—is Elbert Hayes, Jr., a Negro. The KCU team won and will return to the program next Sunday in New York. Hayes and his teammates proved themselves well informed on a variety of subjects, including literature, philosophy, science and history. They were just four boys pulling for their school.

At the William Chrisman High School in Independence, Mo., a Negro girl recently was chosen as the Valentine Queen of the school. She was crowned at a sweetheart dance attended by members of the basketball team, their dates, and other students.

Not so many years ago, Chrisman High had an all-white student body with Negro students of Independence going to a separate (but not equal) school. Now all of that is changed, thanks to the U.S. Supreme Court. At long last, our students are being measured according to their individual ability and worth with the color of their skin being merely incidental.

DUCK HUNTING IN MEXICO

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, on March 4 I inserted in the Record a short account from the Washington Star of a hunting trip in which General Eisenhower participated in Mexico last month.

I have received a letter from Mr. Charles S. Jones of Los Angeles, Calif., who was a member of the hunting party with General Eisenhower. Mr. Jones points out that the newspaper account of the birds killed was in error. In order that the facts about the incident be available to Members of Congress and the public, I ask unanimous consent that his letter be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Los Angeles, Calif., *March 8, 1963.*

Hon. J. William Fulbright,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

My Dear Senator Fulbright: I have just read your remarks published in the Congressional Record of March 4, 1963, page 3477, regarding General Eisenhower's participation in a hunting party at Culiacan, Mexico, on Saturday, February 23, 1963.

Inasmuch as you could not have been aware of the gross inaccuracy of the news story which you placed in the Congressional Record, I feel sure you would like to have the facts in the matter.

The facts, Senator Fulbright, are these:

If the newspaper article had said that "The Eisenhower Party Shoots 75 Birds," instead of "Eisenhower Shoots 75 Birds," it would have been a more nearly correct headline. Actually, the total number of birds was 60.

Including my own, there were six guns in a party of about 20 people, both Mexican and United States citizens. While General Eisenhower is an excellent shot, he did not take his limit of 20 birds, and the shooting party finished the day with half of a legal Mexican limit.

The laws of the Republic of Mexico, and I enclose them for your convenience, permit a hunter to shoot 20 birds on Saturdays and Sundays, and 10 birds on week days. I refer you to the first two items on page 3 of the enclosed Caza Temporado 1962-63 published by the Mexican Government, and for your convenience, the translation of these two items follow:

"SECTION OF BIRDS

"*Species and open hunting season and authorized game limit*

"Duck family—Migratory ducks throughout the Republic: From November 1 to February 28, 10-bag limit per day or in possession from Monday through Friday, and 20-bag limit Saturday and Sunday.

"Ducks, nonmigratory, of the gulf and Pacific coasts of Mexico: From December 1 to March 31, 10-bag limit per day or in possession from Monday through Friday, 20-bag limit Saturday and Sunday."

I call your attention to the fact that the Mexican people have a duck of their own which their law describes as "resident duck," and which is not migratory, and these ducks, for the most part, made up the hunting party's bag. There were very few migratory ducks in the area, and, so far as I know, the mallard does not migrate so far south.

The Eisenhower party went to Mexico as guests of the Mexican Government and were entertained in Culiacan by as fine a group of people as one can meet anywhere in the world.

You will be interested to know that over 2,500 Mexican people came to the airport hoping to see and pay their respects to General Eisenhower. Thus, his visit to Mexico had a real significance in furthering the relationship of the two countries. Wherever he turned high praise was expressed for his participation in the people-to-people movement.

Since you deemed this news story important enough to insert in the Congressional Record, I feel sure you will appreciate these facts and that you would be the first to want to correct the Record.

Very truly yours,
Charles S. Jones.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I am particularly grateful to the distinguished junior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. Fulbright] for placing in the Record the letter he has received from Mr. Charles Jones, of Los Angeles. His letter sets forth the facts and clearly demonstrates the regrettable error of the newspaper account of General Eisenhower's pleasure trip into Mexico.

I need hardly add that all his life General Eisenhower has been dedicated to conservation and conservation practices. I deprecate exceedingly the inaccuracy of the news story.

IN COMMEMORATION OF TARAS SHEVCHENKO

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, Taras Shevchenko, the national poet of the Ukraine, is a relatively unknown literary figure in the West, but he ranks among the greatest of the Slavic poets—on the level of Pushkin, in the view of some critics. The fact that he wrote almost all of his poetry in the Ukrainian language is at once the reason for his obscurity and one of the chief contributions for which he is remembered today. For he was the first modern writer who was purely and thoroughly Ukrainian, and he gave much impetus to the development of a native Ukrainian language and literature. His poems were intensely patriotic, expressing the trials and the aspirations of the Ukrainian people throughout their history.

Shevchenko's life itself was filled with suffering. At the age of 24 he was released from serfdom, but 9 years later Czar Nicholas I, had him arrested because of his liberal, democratic ideas. He was condemned to serve as a common soldier in a remote area of eastern Russia, far from his beloved Ukraine. Even after his release 10 years later, Shevchenko never again enjoyed complete personal freedom, and he died one day after his 47th birthday—in the same year that saw the emancipation of the serfs by Czar Alexander II, of Russia.

At one point during his imprisonment Shevchenko wrote these despairing lines:

> I shall not leave the slightest trace
> Upon our glorious Ukraine,
> Our land, but not as ours known.

Time has disproven this prophecy, for his life and writings have played a great role in shaping the Ukrainian national spirit and culture. The ideals to which Shevchenko stubbornly clung—national self-determination and democratic rule—remain a guiding light today for Ukrainians and other oppressed nationalities of Eastern Europe.

ST. LOUIS, RIVER TOWN

Mr. LONG of Missouri. Mr. President, the importance of water transportation to the city of St. Louis, the entire State of Missouri, and, indeed, all of the surrounding area that is served by boats and barges plying the Mississippi and Missouri Rivers, is laid out most graphically in a St. Louis Post-Dispatch editorial entitled "St. Louis, River Town," published February 25.

St. Louis is a river town today, just as it has been from its beginning. Lying as it does on the mighty Mississippi River and near the confluence of the Missouri River, St. Louis is a natural transshipment center for goods and wares destined for areas that lie at all points of the compass from her.

It is for this reason that St. Louis has long been known as the gateway to the West. That will be the central theme of the St. Louis bicentennial, which the city will celebrate in 1964 and 1965, as well as the inspiring gateway arch in the Jefferson National Expansion Memorial on the riverfront.

While the riverfront today may not be as colorful as it was around the turn of the century when steamboats lined the riverfront for 20 blocks, its volume of traffic has multiplied many times. Today, one tug moves a string of barges that carry more freight than the combined capacity of all that 20 blocks of steamboats. The importance of St. Louis as a river port has increased many fold.

The Post-Dispatch article sounds a call to protect, use and expand this great port. That point is well taken—and well supported by the facts recited in the article, which I now ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ST. LOUIS, RIVER TOWN

A million and a half tons of petroleum products annually go out of the greater St. Louis industrial complex by water. A quarter of a million tons of iron ore mined in Peru and Venezuela come upriver by barge from New Orleans, along with 165,000 tons of scrap iron from Minneapolis, for the steel mills; and 440,000 tons of finished steel and tinplate move in and out. Of the $200 million worth of grain moving out, a large and increasing part goes by way of the Mississippi River, much of it to be reloaded into oceangoing vessels for export to Holland, Germany, France, England, Japan, India, and Latin American countries. Ten million tons of coal move out, nearly half of it by water.

These figures indicate only part of what it means to St. Louis that it is a major center of the Nation for water as well as for rail, truck, pipeline and air transportation of freight. Water transport is a major mainstay of heavy industries here. Its low cost strengthens their competitive position and enlarges their market area—in coal, for example, 42 percent of the delivered cost nationally consists of transportation charges.

What the river means to St. Louis is presently a matter of more than usual concern because of proposals by the Kennedy administration to deregulate most of the traffic of the railroads, which would enable them to cut rates to destructively low levels and possibly drive their competitors from the inland waterways.

So it is a pertinent time to take stock of what low-cost water-freight transportation means to the industrial life and development of our area as part of an integrated transport system.

Many of us whose lives are directly affected by it are little if any aware of the teeming traffic of our waterfront—the quantities of superphosphate barged in from Florida, sulphur from Texas and Louisiana, fluorspar from Mexico, refined sugar from Louisiana, raw sugar from Mexico and the Philippines, barbed wire from Japan, semifinished steel from Belgium, Japan and Germany; the large and growing traffic outbound in chemicals, one of our major industries; the tinplate for our can factories, another principal enterprise.

St. Louis is headquarters of two of the largest common carrier barge lines in the country, Mississippi Valley and Federal, each carrying freight over some 4,000 miles of waterways—with regular service to Minneapolis, Chicago, Pittsburgh, Omaha, New Orleans, Chattanooga, Mobile, Birmingham, Fort Myers, Brownsville, and other ports. Here is situated the largest builder of towboats in the United States, the St. Louis Shipbuilding & Steel Co.

Water transport has not only provided low-cost freight hauling on its own account but has also through its competition been the most effective single means of obtaining favorable freight rates. It is credited with reducing rail rates on coal from St. Louis by some 25 percent. It has been a large factor in the success of the Granite City Steel Co., now the 14th largest steel producer in the Nation, enabling it to compete as far away as Baton Rouge with steel mills at Birmingham, several hundred miles closer to the market—and bringing down rail rates on the haul by nearly a third.

The asset of low-cost water transportation affects our future as vitally as it has affected our present, if not more so. This is best demonstrated in coal and steel.

Southern Illinois, across the river from St. Louis, contains what is said to be the largest known deposit of low-cost steam coal east of the Rocky Mountains. Until fairly recent years the railroads enjoyed a virtual monopoly on coal haulage and transportation costs were high. Many mines in the area were forced to close. Coal mining was almost defunct when water transport revived a measure of activity. Today an estimated 65 percent of the coal mined there goes out by water.

But the area looks to still further waterway development to realize the potentials of its coal resources by means of the proposed Kaskaskia River and Big Muddy Creek navigation channels and associated projects.

This development would be linked with the large iron ore deposit discovered in recent years 70 miles southwest of St. Louis at Pea Ridge, near Sullivan, which the St. Joseph Lead Co. and the Bethlehem Steel Corp. are jointly preparing to develop.

The proximity of these deposits to enormous coal reserves for use in manufacture into steel creates a remarkably rich opportunity for both eastern Missouri and southern Illinois to reap an industrial development which could be very large indeed—and its realization depends on low-cost water transportation.

St. Louis is not only a river town, it is a two-river town.

It was founded because it was on the Mississippi and near the Missouri.

Because it was a river town, it became the Gateway to the West, as our magnificent arch in the Jefferson National Expansion Memorial on the riverfront will signify.

It thrived until around the turn of the century on the river trade.

But though St. Louis may have lost some consciousness of the linkage of its destiny with the Meeting of Waters, celebrated in Carl Milles' memorable statuary, the link has continued and has become more important to us than ever before.

A single towboat now pushes barges containing more cargo than could have been carried by all the steamboats that once lined our waterfront for 20 blocks.

St. Louis and the industrial complex around it in two States reap an indispensable advantage from the Mississippi, mightier today than ever. It is essential to our future progress to protect that advantage from impairment, and to utilize and extend it.

MAYOR WAGNER'S COMMITTEE ON JOB ADVANCEMENT FOR MINORITY GROUPS

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, last year Mayor Robert F. Wagner, of New York City, set up a unique program to open thousands of jobs in executive, professional, and skilled classifications to New York City's Negroes, Puerto Ricans, and other minority groups. The program was initiated in August through the formation of the mayor's committee on job advancement.

Recently the committee made its preliminary report. The study points out that the portrait of America as presented through national advertising media is inadvertently distorted by the exclusion of Negroes, Puerto Ricans and other minority groups from advertising layouts. Such distortion creates a serious impediment to job advancement since minority group members, confronted with an image of life in which only certain majority group whites are successful, lose the ambition to acquire the skills necessary for advancement in employment. The committee winds up its report with some practical suggestions for improving the situation.

I commend and congratulate the mayor's committee for pursuing a much neglected aspect of the problem of job discrimination. I think Mayor Wagner's program is worthy of nationwide support and adoption.

I ask unanimous consent that a release dated February 21, 1963, reviewing the committee's report be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the release was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

> Mayor Robert F. Wagner's committee on job advancement submitted today (Thursday) to Mayor Wagner its preliminary findings of a study into the portrayal in television shows, TV commercials and other mass media advertising of Negroes, Puerto Ricans, and members of other minority groups as part of the everyday life of America.
>
> The committee, headed by Theodore W. Kheel and James J. McFadden, reported that its study to date confirms its original observation that a general absence of such portrayal in national advertising has resulted in a distorted image of the United States.
>
> The committee reported also that it had found encouraging signs that the situation can be improved. An analysis of replies to a letter sent on December 6 by Mr. Kheel and Acting Labor Commissioner McFadden to 106 of the Nation's major industrial, business, and advertising companies with headquarters in New York City showed widespread support in principle for the committee's goal of integrating the minority groups into the advertising image of America at work, at play, and as consumers.
>
> Several executives of large concerns replied that they would restudy their positions and seek to remedy the situation.
>
> The report cited as an example of excellent cooperation the action of a major air line which reviewed and discussed the committee's suggestions and then approved an advertising layout in which Negro figures are readily identifiable. The committee called this especially significant since its own survey of all issues of four leading national magazines of general circulation had showed only two instances during 1962 of use of Negro models in major advertisements.
>
> Other recent instances of enlightened action by advertisers included regular employment of a Negro girl model on a daily television network show, and the showing in a general circulation magazine of a well-known Negro entertainer endorsing a popular beverage.
>
> While citing several favorable signs, the committee stated that general correction of the situation would be neither quick nor easy. It said one of the problems was the expressed belief of some manufacturers that an advertising layout representative of, and acceptable to, consumers in some parts of the country might not be acceptable in areas with a different population constituency and might result in lowered sales. The report suggested that satisfactory sales results by the pioneers in the desired forms of advertising could be used to persuade hesitant advertisers of their efficacy.
>
> The committee said it would hold meetings, industry by industry, with national business and industry groups in an effort to resolve specific problems. It will also conduct informational and educational campaigns.
>
> Another area in which the committee reported good chances for a favorable breakthrough was in the relation between advertisers and their advertising agencies. There was a tendency among several of the advertising agencies to whom the letter was sent to disclaim responsibility. These agencies replied, in effect, that they acted only on instructions of their clients and had no voice in policy.
>
> The report pointed out, however, that several large advertisers, including clients of agencies that had disclaimed public responsibility, said they customarily left such matters to the advertising agencies. The results of their promise to explore with their agencies all the implications of portraying Negroes, Puerto Ricans, and representatives of other minorities as part of the American scene will be watched, the committee said.
>
> The committee on job advancement has declared that the general exclusion, whether by design or inadvertently, of Negroes, Puerto Ricans, and other minority groups from television commercials and other mass advertising media has created a serious impediment to their job advancement. It maintains that such exclusion stultifies the ambition of many members of these groups to train themselves for jobs throughout business and industry in which most current advertising appears to suggest that there is no place for them.

IN COMMEMORATION OF THOMAS G. MASARYK, 1850–1937

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I wish to say a few words in honor of Thomas G. Masaryk, the great Czech statesman who was born 113 years ago last week.

Thomas Masaryk was a rare combination of liberal philosopher and man of action. As a political leader and statesman he put into practice the ideas which he had earlier developed as a writer, teacher, and editor. In this respect and in many others he resembled one of our own very greatest Presidents—President Woodrow Wilson.

Masaryk's ideas were first translated into political reality in 1900, when his followers established the so-called Realist Party, the program of which was based on the principles set forth in Masaryk's early writings. In 1902 he gave the first series of Crane lectures at the University of Chicago, thus emphasizing the bond that has always existed between Americans and those Europeans who have struggled for national and cultural independence. Reelected to Parliament in 1907 as a candidate of the Realist Party, Masaryk launched a series of critical investigations of corruption in the Dual Monarchy which ruled Austria-Hungary. These sensational attacks on the Hapsburgs naturally made him unpopular in imperial Vienna, but they earned him a reputation abroad as a courageous champion of public morality and honest diplomacy.

Early in World War I he escaped from Austria and conducted a political and propagandist campaign abroad on behalf of Czechoslovak independence. In 1916 a central revolutionary committee—the Czechoslovak National Council—was formed with Masaryk as its president. During the remainder of the war he worked in England, Russia, and the United States for the cause of Czechoslovak independence. His efforts culminated in 1918 when the United States and the Allied Powers recognized his national council as the de facto government of the future Czechoslovak state. That same year he was elected president of the new Czechoslovak Republic and was reelected in 1927 and 1934. On Masaryk's resignation in 1935, Eduard Benes was chosen by the people to carry on the Masaryk tradition. Two years later Thomas Masaryk was dead, mourned by the nation he had created.

The tragic events of World War II and the postwar period have destroyed the liberal democracy which Masaryk brought to life in Czechoslovakia. But the alien Communist rule has eliminated only the external political reality; it is unable to break the Czechoslovak people's inner spirit of freedom and democracy, which Masaryk's life and works personified. That is the enduring heritage of this great philosopher-statesman.

TRIBUTE TO THE LATE ROBERT A. LINN

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, Robert A. Linn, managing editor of the Cincinnati Post-Times Star, died Monday morning, March 11, 1963. He was 58. He had been managing editor of the Post-Times Star since 1945. He had undergone surgery 2 weeks ago.

Prior to becoming managing editor of the Cincinnati Post-Times Star, he was first makeup editor and city editor. He was well known throughout the Middle West as one of the most congenial of persons and most efficient and accomplished as an editor.

He is a native of Wheeling, W. Va. His first newspaper job was with the Wheeling News. He went from there to the Akron Times-Press and to the Cincinnati Post in 1938.

Until his final illness which was hepatitis, he was rarely out of touch with the operation of his paper. Although he was from West Virginia, he has many friends in Brown and Adams Counties in southeastern Ohio where most of his family still lives.

He is survived by his wife, Rita, whom he married in Akron in 1931, and three children, Robert A., Jr., of Detroit; James W. of Los Angeles, and Miss Mary Linn, who lives at home.

The funeral services are being held today—Thursday—in Cincinnati.

This man's dedication to his newspaper work was second only to that of his children and his family. I mention this because these children are all grown and well educated and he saw them through.

His operation for hepatitis was 2 weeks ago, he was expected to recover and on the road to recovery when an unexpected turn took his life.

MANAGEMENT OF NEWS

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, a few days ago I placed in the Congressional Record some questions which the U.S. News & World Report had proposed to ask of me. They had called to say they were asking a series of questions of a number of Senators and would like to put the questions to me. I, in turn, requested the questions to be put in writing, and when I saw them I was convinced they were "loaded" questions. I ask unanimous consent that the questions given to me by U.S. News & World Report be placed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

Subsequently, both U.S. News & World Report and some Members of the other body protested that the questions were not loaded and those of us who thought they were were being misled.

But now in the March 18 issue of U.S. News & World Report there is an article called, "Why Congress Doesn't Give J.F.K. What He Wants." On the right-hand column of the two-page spread, sure enough U.S. News gives the answers to their loaded questions.

Mr. President, one merely need read this box and compare what U.S. News & World Report says is the opinion of Congressmen with the loaded questions they asked, to see quite clearly that the purpose of their questions was largely to denigrate the President and his program. I ask unanimous consent that this box, entitled "As Congressmen Size Up Kennedy's Problems," be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks and be compared with the original list of questions.

There has been a great deal of talk about managed news. I think, without question, here is an example of managed news on the part of one member of the news media.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

1. Why is President Kennedy, as a Democrat, able to exert so little influence over a House and Senate that have majorities heavily Democratic?

2. White House messages and ideas go to Congress and seem to disappear. As far as anyone can see they generate no response out in the country. Why?

3. Has the President failed to get into tune with the mood of the country?

4. Is there a feeling that the President's plans do not command wide support among the voters?

5. Is there distrust of the White House advisers who generate ideas and write messages?

6. Has the President, himself, lacked some element of leadership and ability to create confidence and attract loyalty?

7. Or: Are many Members of Congress simply wary about the political future and willing to trust their own political judgment more than that of the President?

AS CONGRESSMEN SIZE UP KENNEDY'S PROBLEMS

(NOTE.—A survey of scores of Senators and House Members turns up these explanations of why Congress balks at much of the President's program.)

Mood of the country: Little demand from voters for change. No sense of urgency in Congress for action on Kennedy bills.

Divided Democrats: Lack of a real, working majority for liberal causes. Strong coalition of Republicans and conservative Democrats.

Little pressure from the top: No hard-driving leadership in Congress to force action on the Kennedy program.

"Scatter shot" program: Say many Members of Congress. The President asks for too much, sends up too many messages, gets Congress and the country confused.

Kennedy advisers: Sometimes criticized as "impractical theorists" who can't sell their ideas to Congress.

Mr. Kennedy himself: Personally popular, but hasn't convinced some older heads in Congress that he knows answers better than they do.

Politics: Few Democrats feel they must ride President's coattails to get reelected.

Still, some Congressmen warn: Don't underestimate President Kennedy. He got a good many bills out of the 87th Congress, and may yet do better with the 88th Congress than anybody now expects. It's too early to be sure, these Congressmen say.

LIVESTOCK PRICE DROP CRITICAL TO AGRICULTURAL ECONOMY

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, a critically serious problem has developed in the livestock industry which has major consequences for the agricultural economy of America.

Since the first of the year prices on cattle and hogs have skidded drastically and experts in the field advise me that no relief from the situation is likely before early or midsummer.

Market analysts are frankly puzzled at the suddenness and sharpness of the break. There are many suggestions as to the cause, ranging from the unusually cold winter which kept housewives from the market on many days, to the newspaper and dock strikes. No doubt these and other factors were in some part responsible.

But the cold weather is ended; so is the dock strike—and hopefully the newspaper strike—will soon be ended.

I believe we must look past these causes to find a more substantial explanation for the current difficulty.

Since the end of World War II, when U.S. imports of beef totaled 127 million pounds annually, our imports have climbed to well over a billion pounds a year. Clearly, this factor has a significant effect on the price of livestock prices in America.

Mr. President, last May a persuasive case was made in this Chamber on behalf of the domestic cotton textile industry. The serious plight of the industry was impressively documented by a number of Senators who provided us with facts and figures on unemployment, the number of mills shut down, and the towns that were withering away because the cotton textile industry was in serious trouble.

As a result, the Senate gave to the President of the United States broad new authority to protect the industry by the imposition of quotas on textile products as to those countries who would not voluntarily agree to import quotas.

Many of us were sympathetic to the problem of the industry and felt that it was entitled to this degree of protection against foreign competition.

But we also felt that the authority proposed for the President should be broadened. Specifically, the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] and I joined in sponsoring an amendment which would extend the proposed Presidential authority to include agricultural products and particularly, livestock.

We failed in that attempt, largely because the administration opposed our effort. But throughout the debate, which appears in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 108, part 6, pages 8522–8544, will be found repeated assurances of Members on both sides of the aisle that at the appropriate time, there would be support for the same kind of assistance to the other agricultural commodities as that extended to the cotton textile industry.

The time for a serious consideration of the problems of the livestock industry is now. We must explore such solutions as the development of a flexible system of tariffs, or import quotas, which will provide for short-term changes in harmony with market conditions and prevent long-term depressions of prices.

There are those who will unfurl the old banner of "free trade" and charge that this is protectionism. Mr. President, free trade is a two-way street; it cannot be practiced unilaterally. Recent developments by the European Common Market with respect to agricultural commodities have placed the American farmer in a position of economic disadvantage.

The problem is a serious one for U.S. agriculture, and it typifies one of the things most seriously wrong with this Government's approach to trade matters: It is based on consideration of foreign policy instead of upon economic considerations.

Surely our long and disillusioning experience with foreign aid has convinced us of the folly of confusing these two instruments of national policy. For this reason, I urge less reliance on the Department of State and its negotiators, and more on the Foreign Agricultural Service where farm products are concerned.

In short, Mr. President, so far as the farmer is concerned, he wants more reciprocity in "reciprocal" trade agreements. He wants the same protection that those in the industrial sector of the economy have including the cotton textile industry. The American farmer is not afraid of competition; he never has been. But he does have a right to insist that the rules be the same for both sides involved in any trading agreement.

The responsibility is squarely on the administration. Section 204 of the Agricultural Act of 1956 provides, follows:

> The President is authorized to negotiate agreements with foreign governments in an effort to limit the export to the United States of agricultural commodities or products.

The next move is up to the administration. It appears that no additional legislation is required. But if it is, I trust that those Senators who last year were so concerned about cotton, will come forward to support with equal enthusiasm a solution to the present difficulties of the livestock industry.

MORALE OF THE FOREIGN SERVICE

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, one of our greatest problems in our Foreign Service today is to restore the morale and esprit de corps to what it once was.

This does not mean a continuous process of enlargement and of diffusion which is what the Foreign Service has undergone ever since the War Manpower Act of 1946. If this act had been fully and properly implemented at the time in the spirit in which it was written, I believe that many of the future reorganizations that the Foreign Service has undergone since would not have been necessary. But the War Manpower Act was not implemented as it should have been, and, as a result, the Foreign Service has been progressively enlarged and emasculated.

Now to my mind our problem is the unscrambling of the omelet of Wristonization, of putting the round pegs back in the round holes, the square pegs in the square holes. In this connection, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Record at this point an article by William P. Cochran, Jr., which appeared in the Foreign Service Journal of March 1963.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

THIRD-RATE DIPLOMACY

(By William P. Cochran, Jr.)

At the end of World War II, we were within inches of having the best Foreign Service in the world. That is not just one man's opinion; it is confirmed by two dependable criteria: Foreign diplomats had begun freely to concede the proficiency of their American professional colleagues—and what better yardstick is there than the judgments of one's professional fellows?—and other countries had begun to copy our methods.

Our Foreign Service was best because it had the best system for selecting the most qualified among applicants for entry; the best system of performance evaluation; the best and most impartial system of promotion on the basis of proven merit; and an effective system for the selection-out and retirement of its deadwood.

This is no longer true. In the intervening years the quality of our Service has been diluted, its finest principles have been breached, and its pride and morale have been seriously damaged. Today we have probably the largest, best-paid third-rate service in the world.

It is painful to have to say this. I have devoted over 30 years of my life to the Foreign Service, and it has more than repaid my efforts. It hurts to report in public the criticisms which are current in private. Yet it must be said. I have discussed my views with numerous senior diplomats, ambassadors and others of long experience, and they differ only in their assessment of the extent of the damage, and of how long it will take to repair the injury.

To trace the process of deterioration we must go back to the end of World War II. There had been no adequate introduction of new blood during the war years, when recruitment was suspended. To help perform the new and greatly expanded functions arising out of the war effort—control of strategic materials, identification of traders with the enemy, trade controls, press, radio and cultural activities—a new mechanism, the Foreign Service Auxiliary, was created. After the war it became apparent that many of these wartime functions would have to be continued. But precisely because there had been no recruiting for several years, the Foreign Service was not prepared to handled these added responsibilities.

After V–J Day, an attempt was made to alleviate these deficiencies by admitting men and women of the Armed Forces through special examinations—the juniors at class 6, the more senior members at the grades to which their age, experience, and qualifications entitled them. Many of our finest present-day officers came from these sources. Unfortunately there were not enough of them. Recruitment was resumed also, but once more the intake of officers was inadequate, due to budgetary restrictions and personnel ceilings. This failure to renew the tree adequately at the roots is responsible for many of the subsequent vicissitudes of the Service.

The long series of adversities which followed had two primary root causes; a plague of unstable management and a plethora of administrators. In the 11 years between 1944 and 1956, there were eight different chief administrators, and as many reorganizations. Almost without exception, each left things worse. Yet administrators proliferated, and by asserting their authority over the allocation of funds, by controlling organization, and by bringing to heel anyone who challenged their actions, they took control. With power, they began to resent the existenc of a body, the Foreign Service, not subject to their fiat.

Thus decisions began to be taken which, in the judgment of the Foreign Service, undermined its entire program of recruitment and promotion, supposedly based on competence and merit.

The first of these alarming developments was the resignation of the Chief of the Division of Foreign Service Personnel in protest at unwarranted interference in his operations. Then control over both departmental and Foreign Service personnel was combined in one administrator, and the chief of foreign personnel became the subordinate of a man without, as the Wriston committee later phrased it, "familiarity with the oversea operations of the Foreign Service." Similarly, the position of the Director General was removed from the direct chain of command, and he was relegated on the organizational charts to the position he occupies today—that of a separate adviser on policy to the deputy under secretary for administration.

A third blow fell when the Executive Director of the Board of Examiners for the Foreign Service was forced out, and the board of examiners lost its independent status, being relegated to a position well down the administrative ladder.

Meanwhile, the inflow of new officers had again been interrupted by a 2-year moratorium on appointments at the entering level. This meant not only that the tree was starved by lack of feeding at the roots; it meant that young men and women who had passed the examinations had to wait over 2 years for appointment. Naturally, many became discouraged and found other uses for their talents. Word went around among university students that there was no use looking forward to a career in the Foreign Service, and many qualified young people who might have taken the examinations chose not to do so.

The amalgamation program undertaken on the recommendation of the Hoover Commission did little or nothing to relieve the personnel shortage. Despite considerable pressure, including the threat that if you didn't amalgamate you would not be promoted and might not hold your present job, less than 700 of the more than 10,000 Department employees applied for the 1,500 jobs that had been reclassified as requiring experience in the field, and only 450 appeared for the oral examinations. (Some 55 percent qualified under the greatly reduced standards.) In practice, amalgamation did not add one officer to the existing number; it only changed certain titles, from departmental or staff or reserve to Foreign Service officer.

The Foreign Service hoped that the change of administration in 1953 would bring it a new and happier administrative deal. Instead, it was shocked, in its first meeting with the new Secretary, by his demand for positive loyalty, which disclosed a tragic unawareness that the Foreign Service has always been dedicated to the execution of the policies of the U.S. Government, regardless of which party was in power.

Concurrently, Foreign Service morale was being dealt a heavy blow through the unsubstantiated charges of Senator McCarthy. The blow came not so much from the attacks as from the fact that nobody in the entire departmental hierarchy, under two administrations, had courage enough to stand up to Senator McCarthy and challenge him to produce his evidence. Trained to silence, the Service felt it had no vocal champion, no stout defender.

It is impossible to measure the harm done to our professional diplomacy by the security officers who were introduced at this time. Officers of unimpeachable integrity were revolted by their sneaky prying, and by the assumption that everyone was under suspicion. These "security" measures never uncovered a spy, but they did cost us the services of a number of our most intelligent, perceptive and astute officers.

In response to the growing consciousness that the Foreign Service did indeed need expansion and improvement, the Acting Secretary of State appointed a special committee to make recommendations on personnel policies. It took its name from its chairman, Dr. Henry M. Wriston, president of Brown University. Once more a surge of hope swept through the Foreign Service. Once more these hopes were to be disappointed.

The committee announced that it would hold no hearings. Experienced career men who had asked to be heard were ignored. Respected officers who had been asked to serve as consultants were not consulted. Recommendations made by chiefs of mission abroad, both career and noncareer, in response to an invitation from the committee, were rejected.

The first thing the Wriston committee did was to accept as premises the very assumptions which the amalgamation program had proven wrong: (1) that everyone in Washington wanted to serve abroad; and (2) that everyone in Washington was automatically qualified to do a good job in the foreign field. It then compounded these errors by making additional incorrect assumptions:

1. It urged that examination procedures "should rest primarily upon the candidate's record of experience and accomplishment." This presumed—incorrectly—that dependable records of experience and accomplishment existed for departmental employees.

2. The committee assumed that knowledge of foreign languages was unimportant. The report said: "If a candidate is otherwise well qualified, it should be enough for him to express his willingness, when assigned abroad, to make good his language deficiency." Is willingness, which may or may not be accompanied by ability, adequate for any purpose? Is it enough for a man to promise to start to learn a language after he has been assigned abroad? If language is important, he should know it before he arrives at his post; otherwise he will spend his 2 to 4 years learning the language, and then be transferred to another linguistic area.

3. A third assumption was that there is nothing to diplomacy; anyone can do it. (How else can one interpret the principle that anyone in Washington with an "acceptable" record is eligible for appointment to the career officer service?) I disagree. Good diplomacy requires certain educational tools, and certain personal characteristics. Its practices and methods are not beyond comprehension; any intelligent person can learn them—in 20 years or so of experience. But they are not acquired overnight or by osmosis.

Like the amalgamation program that preceded it, the integration program assumed that anyone doing a good job in the Department could do an equally good one abroad. In many cases this was true. But in many others the assumption was false. The particular skills essential in Washington may have no great utility in a foreign country. A research specialist may do an outstanding job in the Department, operating with scholarly thoroughness and detachment, and an almost complete withdrawal from society outside the office. In Washington his being a recluse is merely an eccentricity. But would he be useful at establishing close relations with the people of another country? Let us assume that his specialty is the jurisprudence of Saudi Arabia. He is invaluable in Washington. But send him abroad? Where? Saudi Arabia, presumably. Does he speak the language? Can he and his wife stand the heat? Will he observe the niceties of Arab customs? He has always been a thinker, a contemplator; can he operate actively, can he persuade? And after his 2-year tour in Jidda, where do you send him?

The principle works also in reverse: who takes his place in research while he is gone? The Foreign Service officer with field experience is not qualified to do the expert's job in Washington. Even if he has served in Saudi Arabia, he does not have the encyclopedic knowledge of the legal system possessed by his predecessor. Two fish are now out of the water, two pegs are in the wrong holes, and nobody benefits.

It is hardly necessary here to discuss the superficiality of the examinations under Wristonization. After all, if you are going to coerce over a thousand people into the Foreign Service, you cannot subject them to an examination which may demonstrate that a fairly large proportion of them do not have the educational qualifications, the personal suitability, or even in some cases the desire to serve abroad. It is important, though, to remember that the candidate was not required to establish his qualifications for service abroad. A candidate was presumed eligible unless someone alleged otherwise; and the burden of proof was then to be on the challenger, not on the candidate.

Wristonization brought into the Foreign Service a large number of specialist officers with splendid qualifications and backgrounds. It also brought in a large number who were not qualified in any foreign language. And it transferred into the Foreign Service three other groups: the failures, the timid, and the unwilling.

By "failures" I mean those who had previously failed the Foreign Service examinations. "Timid" refers to those who had declined to take the oral examinations during the earlier amalgamation program, for fear they would not pass. The third group comprises those who never wanted to be in the Foreign Service, who had avoided amalgamation, and who now accepted integration reluctantly because the alternatives were to surrender their job rights or transfer to other agencies.

The net result of all these ill conceived, incompletely digested and abruptly imposed changes in the principles applying to the Foreign Service is that what we now have is scarcely recognizable as a career service. It has been debilitated by the forcible injection of mediocrity. Its pride and esprit de corps have been damaged by the McCarthy attacks and the absurd security measures that followed. Its basic principles have been repeatedly breached. If by a career service we mean one where officers enter at the bottom, we now have one where nearly two-thirds did not enter at the bottom. If by career service we mean one where entrance is attained only through difficult and highly selective examinations, we now have the situation where almost half took no examination worthy of the name. If we assume promotion from within on the basis of demonstrated merit, even this is questionable, if only because the standards will have to be lowered, since you cannot heartlessly select out hundreds of unqualified people who were practically forced into the Foreign Service under Wristonization. In brief we have watered down the quality of our diplomacy—and the important characteristic of effective diplomacy is precisely its quality.

What, then, needs to be done? What steps are necessary to correct the errors we have made?

First, we must make up our collective mind as to what we want and need. There must be general acceptance of the principle that the only kind of diplomacy which America can afford today is the best. This means best in quality, not largest in quantity.

Second, we must realize that four things are necessary if we are to have the best diplomats we can produce: Careful initial selection, appropriate training, varied experience in both types of work and geographical areas, and adequate rewards. (The reference is not just to pecuniary rewards, although these are important; but even more to the intangibles of public and official support. The intangibles can have even greater effect on the morale and esprit de corps and effectiveness of a career service than monetary remuneration.)

As for careful initial selection, we must attract and recruit some of our best young brains (and above all, retain them). We must refresh the personnel tree at its roots, annually. Nothing must be permitted to interfere with this, neither war nor depression.

The induction of new officers should be by carefully selective examination, and should largely take place at the lowest rung of the ladder, in order that the recruits may be given the necessary training and varied experience before reaching the top ranks. There should also be provision for the lateral entry, at any step on the promotional ladder, of men who have proved their competence in other fields; but this privilege must be subject to two restrictions: First, such transfers must always be subject to a truly effective, comprehensive oral examination to ascertain the candidate's complete suitability; and second, there must be a legal restriction on the number of such transfers. This is necessary to keep the Foreign Service apolitical and to prevent a reversion to the spoils system. This limitation might well follow the lines of the former administrative rule: transfers into any class in any year should not exceed 10 percent of the number of officers already in that class. Additionally, this sort of restriction would prevent any such infusion of inexperience and incompetence as resulted from the Wriston program.

The selection process for younger officers should continue to be by means of written, oral, and physical examinations. These must include a detailed examination into the candidate's background, personality and character—that goes without saying.

A second step essential to the revitalization of the Foreign Service is the restoration of the prestige, importance and above all the independence of the Board of Examiners. It must be rescued from its present obscurity in the administrative machinery. Its procedures must always be above suspicion, and its methods must be the very best that proven modern testing techniques can evolve. It must be made legally immune to the kinds of improper pressures to which it was subjected a few years ago.

A third necessary step also involves the internal organization of the Department of State. The Office of Personnel must once more be given authority and independence. At present, it is a subsidiary body in the administrative machinery—and therefore subject to all the usual bureaucratic procedures and restrictions. It has nothing in common with administrative matters (costs of operations, procedures, cryptography, preparation of regulations, etc.) and should stand on its own feet. It must be separated from its present subordination to purely administrative functions and officials.

Once the authority, prestige, and independence of the Office of Personnel have been restored, arrangements must be made for a considerable improvement in the handling of personnel matters. There is a large body of opinion holding that there are far too many people handling transfers, assignments, and promotions—causing delays, confusion, and conflicts. There must be improved methods of consulting officers as to their work preferences, and as to the geographical areas in which they wish to serve. Some steps have already been taken to improve the means of consultation with officers about their records of performance, through the career counseling staff; but much more needs to be done. Officers can perform their best work only if they can discuss their problems and aspirations effectively with the superiors who control their destinies.

Measures must be adopted (if this has not already been done) to insure the inviolability of personnel records; and I can see no reason why the officers of the Foreign Service (who after all are those most intimately concerned) should not be told in specific detail what these measures are.

There must be more rigorous selection out of the unfit, and this system must apply even, and perhaps above all, to the very highest levels.

Thought must also be given to the installation of some type of formal discipline. The Service has grown to such dimensions that informal methods are no longer adequate. There is no present means of ascertaining guilt or innocence other than by investigation by an inspector. There is no punishment for infractions of law or regulations between the drastic penalty of dismissal, including the bringing of formal charges, or letting the culprit quietly resign, on the one hand, and a reprimand and an unfavorable notation in the efficiency records, on the other. Whatever the method, more discipline is necessary; and officers must expect to be sent where they are needed, and to be rigorously weeded out if they fail to live up to the high standards of the Service.

Not only does the Foreign Service officer corps need reinvigoration; the staff corps should be restored to its former independent identity, morale and effectiveness. It is as wasteful to devote the time and energies of carefully selected career diplomats to housekeeping chores—communication, supply, etc.—as it is to assign experts in these fields to political or economic reporting.

Careful thought must be given to the suggestions that the personnel of AID and USIA be "integrated" or "amalgamated" with the Foreign Service. Both organizations perform functions essential to our national interests abroad. Both contain many excellent people, who would be welcome additions to any organization. But it will be necessary to insure—by careful selection and examinations—that only the best of these people enter the career Foreign Service, if unification is determined upon.

One final step needs to be taken to prevent abuses: There should be a high-level inquiry into the state and morale of our professional diplomacy, about once every 5 years. The knowledge that the record would be examined and errors exposed would tend to reduce the number of errors. The knowledge that complaints would receive an impartial outside hearing would act to preclude errors of omission or commission. It seems certain that a great many of the abuses committed in recent years would have been avoided, or at least would have received far more serious consideration beforehand, had it been clear that the facts would soon become public, or would be reviewed for an assessment of responsibility. The existence of such a Review Board would serve another useful purpose: it would discourage—and if necessary correct—any tendency for the Foreign Service to become a law unto itself. A periodic review of its performance and needs would not only prevent the Service from becoming ingrown; it would disarm those of its critics who persistently make this charge against it.

The Review Board might be appointed every 5 years, by the President, and should include one or two Members of each House of Congress. The Board should devote enough time to a review of previous legislation and experience to form a basis for its study of current conditions and needs. It should insist on freedom of access to opinion in, and a free expression of views by, the Foreign Service itself. The Board should avoid drastic one-time measures of the kind that destroy the organization they are intended to improve; it should avoid the other pitfalls which caused the Wriston committee to diagnose the illnesses correctly, and then propose precisely the wrong remedies.

Such a board will not necessarily guarantee a top-grade, fully effective Foreign Service. But if assured in advance of the interest and support of a public opinion determined to have the best diplomacy human ingenuity can provide, such a periodic formal review of the Foreign Service's performance and needs would both prevent abuses and correct those which might have crept in. It would improve morale and reduce unthinking and uninformed criticism. It would help to keep the organization active, vital, and alive. And it would contribute greatly to the goal of a service made up not of a great number of average diplomats but of the very best—the most intelligent, perceptive, and experienced—that education, evaluation, and experience can produce.

THE PEACE CORPS

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, I rise today to bring to the attention of my colleagues in the Senate a most interesting statistical report on the number of Peace Corps applicants throughout the United States who have taken the Peace Corps placement test.

As cosponsor of the bill to establish the Peace Corps, I have followed closely its manifold successes and accomplishments.

As of January 17, 1963, 17,533 persons have taken the examination. Actually, this figure is somewhat short of the actual number of applicants, for in the early days of the Corps, examination records were not kept. It is estimated that about 3,500 persons took the test in this early period, thereby bringing the total figure to approximately 21,033. This means that computed on the basis of the 1960 census, one out of every 5,473 Americans over age 18 showed enough interest in the Corps to take the examination.

To my mind, this is indeed a disappointing figure and reflection on our youth. I would have thought there would have been more of a spirit of adventure in the young. Here a young man or woman has the opportunity to see a new nation, learn a new language, live an adventurous new life, with all expenses paid and at the end of 2 years, to be discharged with an $1,800 kitty. Obviously, there are many reasons why many individuals are not able to take advantage of this opportunity, but it is, I think, a sad reflection that so very, very few do.

It is my strong hope that in the future more and more men and women throughout our Nation will volunteer to join the Peace Corps. This unique opportunity to contribute, afforded to all qualified public-spirited Americans, has captured the imagination and hearts of peoples throughout the world.

I know that many of my colleagues in the Senate join me in the sincere hope that the Peace Corps will continue to operate effectively and that its successes will multiply still further in the years to come.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a State-by-State breakdown of the distribution of test applicants.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Tally of Peace Corps examinees by State of legal residence [1]

Alabama	205
Alaska	25
Arizona	144
Arkansas	114
California	2, 320
Colorado	328
Connecticut	314
Delaware	42
District of Columbia	158
Florida	501
Georgia	201
Hawaii	54
Idaho	78
Illinois	1, 027
Indiana	324
Iowa	316
Kansas	209
Kentucky	163
Louisiana	186
Maine	90
Maryland	246
Massachusetts	690
Michigan	741
Minnesota	426
Mississippi	77
Missouri	359
Montana	100
Nebraska	128
Nevada	36
New Hampshire	96
New Jersey	584
New Mexico	101
New York	1, 843
North Carolina	268
North Dakota	94
Ohio	825
Oklahoma	178
Oregon	267
Pennsylvania	999
Rhode Island	75
South Carolina	89
South Dakota	72
Tennessee	209
Texas	644
Utah	104
Vermont	67
Virginia	228
Washington	347
West Virginia	97
Wisconsin	465
Wyoming	41
Total U.S. residents	17, 295
Residents outside United States	238
Grand total	17, 533

[1] Accurate as of Jan. 17, 1963.

THE INTERNATIONAL RESCUE COMMITTEE

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, the International Rescue Committee has had a long and honorable record looking after refugees from political persecution. For the first half of its life, it looked after the refugees from Nazi and Fascist abuses. And, for the last half of its life, it has been succoring refugees from communism.

The same philosophy has continued to apply through the years, though, because totalitarianism, no matter whether guised under the garb of the Third Reich or the Communist International, has the same total objectives and persecutes its victims in the same absolute way.

Sevellon Brown, a most able and fine newspaperman, has written an excellent piece in the Providence Journal, with which he and his father have been long concerned, on the public record of the IRC.

I ask unanimous consent to insert at this point in the RECORD Mr. Brown's article.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE PROUD RECORD OF THE IRC

(By Sevellon Brown)

I've just been invited by the distinguished theologian, Reinhold Niebuhr, to become a sponsor of the International Rescue Committee's 30th Anniversary Year. Before replying, I read up a bit on the IRC's history, aims and activities, and what I learned was so fascinating that I thought it might interest some of you, too.

The 30-year mark stretches back to the advent of Hitler and his Nazis to political power in Germany. Rightly suspecting that Fascist persecution would send thousands of decent Germans fleeing into exile, a small group of private American citizens organized in 1933 the International Relief Association. For 8 long years, this agency provided vital help to people on the run from the Nazis.

Then came World War II and, in 1940, the fall of France. This presented a particular problem, because France had been the main haven for European exiles. But the terms of the armistice dictated to the French by the Nazis required the former to "surrender on demand" those who had fled from totalitarian rule, especially leaders in various fields of democratic life.

To try to deal with this problem, a new organization came into being, again the creation of a group of private American citizens. They named it the Emergency Rescue Committee, and in the next 2 years, in the face of ferocious odds, they managed to smuggle out of Vichy France more than 1,000 of Europe's most prominent leaders, intellectuals and artists.

The two groups merged in 1942 to form what is today the IRC. During the balance of the war, the IRC continued to help anti-Fascist refugees who had managed to make their way to Allied or neutral nations. With the return of peace, the committee shifted gears, as it were. The job now became twofold; first, to help thousands of displaced persons—war prisoners, forced laborers, expellees and refugees—to find new homes in the United States and other countries; second, to assist other exiles especially those of demonstrated leadership ability, to return to Germany, Austria and Italy to help rebuild their shattered societies.

People in the IRC might have supposed about this time that their work was nearing its finish. But no, far from it. As Dr. Niebuhr writes in his letter of invitation:

"It is a commentary of our times that the IRC—originally founded as a temporary committee to cope with a specific emergency—has by necessity become a permanent and significant institution. Rather than diminishing, the number and extent of totalitarian states has risen sharply since 1933. In turn, what was once a trickle of exiles has swollen to flood proportions—since 1945, more than 10 million men and women have fled the Communist States alone."

In response, here are a few of the things the IRC has accomplished in that period:

After the Communist takeover in Czechoslovakia, a new wave of refugees from the Soviet satellites rolled across the frontiers. The IRC organized an Iron Curtain refugee campaign to provide emergency help for thousands of these unfortunates along an arc sweeping all the way from Sweden to Turkey.

When Moscow threatened to take West Berlin by force in 1950, the IRC arranged shipment of millions of pounds of milk, butter and cheese to the people of the beleaguered free city. Mayor Reuter credited this effort as giving a tremendous psychological lift to the West Berliners.

Aware that hundreds of thousands of people still remained in DP camps, and that among them were more than 8,000 of the "ablest, best trained men and women of Europe—a forgotten elite," the IRC launched a Resettlement Compaign for Exiled Professionals. In 2 years, this project had found new homes for some 1,700 professionals who, with their families, totaled 3,227 persons.

Perhaps the IRC's most famous performance came in the wake of the bloody and tragic Hungarian uprising in 1956. In 2 years' time, the organization collected nearly $3 million in cash and goods for the aid and resettlement of about 200,000 Hungarian refugees.

But the IRC has not by any means confined its work to Europe. It provided notable assistance to many of the almost 1 million Vietnamese who fled from the Communist north after their country had been partitioned. It has labored hard to ease the almost insoluble refugee problem in Hong Kong, partly through direct aid in that city, and partly by resettling Chinese exiles in Taiwan, Brazil, Canada, and the United States.

And, of course, Cuba. The IRC has helped 20 percent of the 200,000 Cubans who have reached this country since the Castro revolution took on its current character, and it has resettled about one-fourth of the 40,000 Cubans who have vacated the Greater Miami area. Today, the IRC concentrates its main effort on helping Cubans in this country, and expects to do so until their nation regains its liberty.

All in all, I'd say a record to be pretty proud of. I imagine you can guess what answer I returned to Dr. Niebuhr.

SENATOR YARBOROUGH PROTESTS PROPOSED INCREASE IN TELEPHONE RATES

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I have formally petitioned the Federal Communications Commission to suspend a proposed telephone rate plan that brings about an increase in 82 percent of all person-to-person calls in the United States, and would also increase rates on leased wires to newspapers.

The FCC has announced a plan whereby rates on telephone calls would be changed in two ways:

First, the phone companies would reduce rates between 9 p.m. and 4:30 a.m. on station-to-station interstate calls, and second, the telephone companies would increase rates on all person-to-person calls up to 800 miles from the point of origin.

I am opposed to the part of this rate change that would result in an increase in all person-to-person calls up to 800 miles. It is my belief that the telephone companies should be allowed to go ahead with their voluntary experimental rate reduction on station-to-station "after 9" calls at night, but that the public and the FCC should have time to further study the impact of the proposed increase in all person-to-person calls up to 800 miles.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this time my letter of petition to the Federal Communications Commission, which explains my views more fully.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MARCH 13, 1963.

Re petition for suspension of a new telephone tariff schedule on person-to-person calls

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION,
Washington, D.C.
(Attention: Common Carrier Bureau).

GENTLEMEN: In compliance with the requirements of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, and supplementing the oral request made to Chairman Minow and other Commissioners of the Federal Communications Commission in open hearing held before the Subcommittee on Communications of the Committee on Commerce of the U.S. Senate on the 27th day of February, 1963, I, RALPH W. YARBOROUGH, U.S. Senator representing the State of Texas, do hereby petition for suspension of that portion of Tariff FCC No. 132 hereinafter described.

It is my understanding that Tariff FCC No. 132 provides for revisions in rates applicable to interstate message toll telephone service between points in the U.S. mainland. These revisions make effective the rate changes announced by the Federal Communications Commission in its Public Notice No. 30790, dated January 29, 1963. This tariff basically covers two classes of long-distance telephone service: (1) a decrease in station-to-station rates between 9 p.m. and 4:30 a.m. (all such rates countrywide are to be a flat rate of $1 or less for the first 3 minutes); (2) an increase in all person-to-person rates at all hours of the day up to 800 miles.

Representations have been made by the American Telephone & Telegraph Co. as to the amount of reduction in charges to the public on an annual basis as a result of the decrease in station-to-station rates between 9 p.m. and 4:30 a.m. and the resulting loss of revenue to the telephone companies, but it appears that these representations have been based on past traffic figures under the old rates. It is reasonable to assume that the decrease in rates may well double or triple the amount of long-distance calls between 9 p.m. and 4:30 a.m. resulting not in a net loss of revenue to the telephone companies, but in an increase of net revenue.

These two adjustments of rates, it appears to me have been tied together as a package deal with the reduction in station-to-station rates from 9 p.m. to 4:30 a.m. acting as the sugar coating in which the increase in person-to-person rates up to 800 miles is to be made palatable to the consuming public. The increase in person-to-person rates would include 82 percent of all person-to-person long-distance calls in the United States.

Accordingly, I do hereby petition for suspension of that portion of the new tariff schedule which provides for increases in person-to-person rates up to 800 miles for a period of 12 calendar months beginning with the effective date to the tariff schedule, April 4, 1963, in order that we may first have available the benefit of the experience of the telephone companies under the reduction in station-to-station rates before burdening the telephone consumer with increases in rates on 82 percent of all person-to-person long-distance calls in the United States.

I do not request any delay in the telephone company's experimental voluntary reduction of the station-to-station calls between 9 p.m. and 4:30 a.m. I think they should have this opportunity to test that reduction.

Respectfully submitted.

RALPH W. YARBOROUGH.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point FCC Public Notice 30790 dated January 29, 1963, and captioned "FCC Announces Plan for Reduced Nighttime Interstate Telephone Rates of $1 or Less to any Point Within Continental United States" and an article from Editor and Publisher of February 23, 1963, captioned "Press Protest Halts Phone Rate Increase."

There being no objection, the notice and article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From Federal Communications Commission public notice, Jan. 29, 1963]

FCC ANNOUNCES PLAN FOR REDUCED NIGHTTIME INTERSTATE TELEPHONE RATES OF $1 OR LESS TO ANY POINT WITHIN CONTINENTAL UNITED STATES

The FCC announced today that the Bell Telephone Cos. will submit tariffs designed to become effective about April 1, 1963, proposing a major change in interstate station-to-station interstate call within the time period from 9 p.m. to 4:30 a.m. can be made between any two points within the continental United States for $1 or less. For example, an after 9 p.m. call from Washington to the west coast will cost $1. The lowest rate now for such a call is $1.75 after 6 p.m. The after-9 reduced rates are designed to encourage telephone users to take advantage of the technological improvements in telephone plans introduced by the Bell system in recent years, much of which is engineered for peak daytime usage.

At the same time the after-9 reductions become effective, changes designed to adjust rate structures involving small increases of 5 or 10 cents in person-to-person calls up to 800 miles will be placed into effect. Person-to-person calls at these shorter distances have not borne their proportionate share of the cost of furnishing such services, and these minor increases will help to correct this inequity as well as the disparity where it exists between interstate and intrastate rates. Based upon 1962 traffic volumes, it is estimated that the proposed new rates would have resulted in a reduction of approximately $55 million in revenues from the introduction of the new after 9 p.m. station-to-station rates, and an increase of $25 million in revenue from the small increases in person-to-person rates, giving a net annual savings to the public of about $30 million.

The changes in rate structures are being submitted in connection with the current analysis of the Bell System's construction plans and financial requirements under the Commission's continuing surveillance of the company's operation. During this recent review, the Commission received the views of a number of outstanding authorities in economics and finance as well as consultants in the regulatory field in addition to the views of company officials. In connection with this review, the Commission requested that a study be made looking toward the possible adoption of an after-9 plan.

The Bell System is undertaking an expanded construction program of $3.2 billion for 1963. It also plans extensive research activities designed to further improve its service to the public. These activities will contribute importantly to our Nation's economic growth. It is recognized that in order to do this, the company's earnings must be maintained at adequate levels. The Commission is of the view that the overall effect of the changes announced today will result in substantial savings to the public in telephone rates while permitting the company to maintain a level of earnings on investment within the range realized by it since the last rate reduction in 1959.

The public has shared promptly in the benefits flowing from advancements in telephone technology under the Commission's continuing surveillance method of ratemaking. In 1940, a station-to-station call from the east coast to the west coast after 9 p.m. cost $4.25, as compared to the new rate of $1. Overall, interstate telephone rates today are 19 percent below the levels of 1940.

Action by the Commission over the past 4 years has resulted in substantial savings to the public in telephone rates while at the same time permitting the company to maintain adequate earnings. In 1959, interstate telephone rates were reduced by $50 million. Again in 1962, through the adoption of new separations procedures, an equivalent reduction of interstate revenues of $46 million was effected enabling 41 States to reduce intrastate rates by $40 million, and during 1961 and 1962, the prices of Western Electric products sold to Bell System Cos. were reduced by $70 million on an annual basis.

A schedule attached shows a comparison of initial period rates on routes selected for illustrative purposes.

Comparison of initial period rates—Selected routes

	Person to person			Station to station		
	Airline-miles	Day	Night	Day	6 to 9 p.m.	9 p.m. to 4:30 a.m.[1]
Chicago to Detroit	238	$1.30	$1.10	$0.85	$0.65	$0.60
Minneapolis to Omaha	292	1.45	1.20	.95	.70	.60
Baltimore to Cleveland	308	1.50	1.25	1.00	.75	.60
Boston to Washington	398	1.70	1.40	1.15	.85	.65
Portland, Oreg., to San Francisco	541	1.90	1.60	1.30	1.00	.65
Nashville to Washington	565	2.00	1.70	1.35	1.05	.65
Raleigh to St. Louis	659	2.05	1.75	1.40	1.10	.70
Chicago to New York	711	2.20	1.90	1.45	1.15	.70
Chicago to New Orleans	835	2.25	1.95	1.50	1.20	.75
Los Angeles to Seattle	981	2.40	2.05	1.55	1.20	.75
Boston to Miami	1,251	2.65	2.25	1.70	1.30	.80
Dallas to New York	1,369	2.85	2.45	1.80	1.40	.90
Boston to Denver	1,770	3.10	2.65	1.95	1.50	.90
Philadelphia to Salt Lake City	1,928	3.30	2.85	2.10	1.65	1.00
San Francisco to Washington	2,412	3.50	3.00	2.25	1.75	1.00

[1] Reductions start at 221 airline-miles.

[From Editor & Publisher, Feb. 23, 1963]

Press Protest Halts Phone Rate Increase

The plan to increase rates for telephone services on May 1 has been deferred.

Rosel M. Hyde, Acting Chairman of the Federal Communications Commission, told a Senate committee February 18 that "further consideration" would be given to petitions of interested parties.

The American Newspaper Publishers Association and United Press International are asking for reconsideration of increases that would affect news services. The Associated Press planned to file data as part of the ANPA brief.

SOME RELIEF POSSIBLE

With the FCC under a hail of senatorial criticism, Mr. Hyde declared there was "no intent to drive out newspapers," and some relief may yet be worked out for publications.

With a few modifications, the FCC ruling made final the Commission's 1961 interim decision in a 7-year investigation of leased line rates of the American Telephone & Telegraph Co. and Western Union. At that time A.T. & T. estimated the new rates would increase costs to the press by 19 percent, to commercial customers by 2.1 percent, and decrease costs to government users by 7.8 percent. The final prescribed rates would increase press costs more than 150 percent in some cases.

In issuing its final decision on January 29 the FCC said it would consider any evidence which indicated the increased rates "would significantly impair the widespread dissemination of news information."

BODY BLOW TO PAPERS

Senator A. S. Mike Monroney, Democrat, of Oklahoma, said the FCC plan to hike rates $4,012,000 for private or leased teleprinter circuits would be a "body blow to many small newspapers."

Senator Ralph Yarborough, Democrat, of Texas, questioned the FCC proposal to raise rates an estimated $25 million a year by hiking the cost by 5 to 10 cents of person-to-person phone calls under distances of 800 miles.

Senator Monroney said the increased wire cost burdens threatened to drive out of business the small and county seat newspapers, which he called the backbone of American journalism.

Instead of charging a paper for the time it uses a leased wire, he said the FCC plan would force the paper to pay for a full 24 hours for a private line, whether it used it round the clock or not.

"There is no other utility that I know of that charges 24 hours," Senator Monroney said. "A newspaper that uses power to run the presses only pays for the electricity used, not on a 24-hour basis."

American Telephone & Telegraph Co., which leases the wires, has criticized the plan as discriminatory.

PERSON-TO-PERSON HIKE

Senator Yarborough centered his attack on the plan to boost person-to-person rates. He questioned an FCC press release of January 29 describing it as "small increases" in calls up to 800 miles.

The same release highlighted the Commission's decision for a major change in long-distance rates, or the so-called after-9 rate. Under it, station-to-station calls between 9 p.m. and 4:30 a.m. can be made anywhere in the United States—from New York to San Francisco—for $1. It becomes effective April 1 at an estimated cost to A.T. & T. of $55 million.

Senator Yarborough said a 10-cent increase on a 50-cent person-to-person call from Washington to Baltimore amounted to a 20-percent increase—"and I don't call that a small increase."

FIGURES SUBMITTED

Mr. Hyde said the Commission asked for full cost, traffic and accounting figures from A.T. & T., and based its decision for the proposed April 1 rate hike on these. "We had no reason," he added, "to doubt the validity of the statements."

The committee chairman, Senator John O. Pastore, Democrat, of Rhode Island, suggested that Mr. Hyde return for additional questioning at a later date and "come prepared to quiet once and for all, if you can," the continuous inferences that A.T. & T. dominates the FCC.

WALL STREET JOURNAL PRINTS ABLE ARTICLES ON OCEANOGRAPHY

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, in this age of science in which we live, one of the least known and least publicized of scientific fields is that of oceanography. We might say that, of all science, oceanography will always whet man's thirst for knowledge rather than quench it.

Texas is proud that the Department of Oceanography and Meteorology of A. & M. College, College Station, Tex., is one of the outstanding institutions in the United States, and perhaps in the world today, in this comparatively new field of inquiry.

Edwin A. Roberts, Jr., has written a series of four very informative articles concerning oceanography which appeared in the Wall Street Journal on March 5, 7, 8, and 12, 1963. I ask unanimous consent that these four articles be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Science of the Sea—Political Problems Lie in Wake of Oceanography's Advance

(By Edwin A. Roberts, Jr.)

The oceanographer's science occupies a peculiar place in man's investigation of the physical world. Lacking the smoke and fire of rocketry, it has attracted little popular attention, yet its promises right now equal or exceed those of space exploration. We know the ocean is a cornucopia and we know how to tap it, while outer space is almost entirely a question mark—a fascinating question mark, but a question mark no less.

Consider that the ocean (there is really only one) covers 70.8 percent of the earth's surface, that scientific cultivation of marine life could feed the world population for decades to come, that the mineral wealth in sea water and on and beneath the ocean floor is all but beyond imagining, that the chemical and physical energy of the sea is a limitless source of power, that the ocean is a great control board by which man can direct the weather and change climates, and that realization of this potential is being delayed not by scientific problems, nor entirely by engineering ones, but by the lack of an international treaty fixing each nation's share of the world ocean.

Except for the concept of the 3-mile limit, the seas belong to everybody, which is the same as saying they belong to nobody. The idea that a nation's sovereignty extends but 3 miles beyond its shores is an anachronism, stemming from a long-ago British admiral's desire to sail that close to the coast of France. It makes little sense today and certainly fish have never taken it very seriously. The result is an international free-for-all that discourages any one country from cultivating the resources in a large area of the ocean, because any other country would be free to poach upon the preserve.

Nor is the absence of the broad-scale international agreement something affecting futuristic possibilities only. In recent years Britain and Iceland have exchanged gunfire at sea over fishing rights. France just sent a warship to the South Atlantic to back up its fishing vessels in that country's present dispute with Brazil over lobster grounds, and there is sporadic controversy over the dumping of radioactive wastes in ocean trenches (a leaky atomic waste container could contaminate fish, and therefore people, thousands of miles from the dumping spot.)

A leader in the movement to establish jurisdiction over the use of the sea is Columbus O'Donnell Iselin, founder (in 1930) of the Woods Hole Oceanographic Institution on Cape Cod and a kind of youthful elder statesman among oceanographers. In 1960 he appeared before a body of the United Nations to state the case for such an international agreement and got nowhere. He believes, moreover, that such a treaty will probably be a long time coming because the affluent nations of the northern hemisphere simply don't have to look to the sea for resources yet.

In other areas of the world, however, especially in poor, unstable South Asia, cultivation of the ocean would be a boon. But there the problems become even more complicated. Without any cultivation at all, for instance, the Indian Ocean (currently the site of a massive international oceanographic research program) is teeming with life, but Indians are not remarkably skilled fishermen. Moreover, the traditional Indian problem of moving food from the coastal areas to the interior gets particularly pungent when the cargo is fish.

Until the middle of the last century, sailors went down to the sea extraordinarily ignorant of their element. Aside from a general knowledge of the trade winds and the storm rookeries of the world, the early 19th century seaman had little understanding of the ocean's patterns. Then an American naval officer, Matthew Fontaine Maury, prepared elaborate (for that day) charts after supplying ship captains with special log books in which to record the behavior of winds and currents. This led to a highly successful international conference in Brussels in 1853 and a major step toward a concerted oceanographic program was taken.

A VOYAGE OF DISCOVERY

In 1872 England's famous scientific club, the Royal Society, persuaded the British Government to outfit a three-masted corvette, *Challenger*, for a round-the-world oceanographic expedition. The *Challenger* cruised 3½ years and covered almost 69,000 miles, netting along the way countless species of plants and animals from a variety of depths. It was on this voyage that scientists discovered what is still believed to be the deepest part of the ocean, the Marianas Trench in the western Pacific.

The Marianas Trench, recently plumbed by Jacques Picard and Navy Lt. Don Walsh in the bathyscaphe *Trieste*, is 36,000 feet deep. In other words—and a hole this deep deserves an illustration—if Mount Everest were dropped into the trench, the Empire State Building fixed on top of it, the Eiffel Tower mounted on top of that, and the Seattle Space Needle stuck on top of the Eiffel Tower, the latest atomic submarine would be unable to dive deep enough to reach the top of the Space Needle. And at the bottom of the trench, where pressure is measured by hundreds of tons, Picard and Walsh discovered life, including a fish resembling the common sole.

Although the discoveries of the *Challenger* voyage exceeded all expectations, the science it sought to advance was still in its infancy. After all, before Maury and the *Challenger* almost nothing was known of the oceans (the main water bodies were named Atlantic, Pacific, and Indian by international consent only in 1845). It has only been during the last three decades that oceanographers have added markedly to what was known after the *Challenger* cruise, and it's only been since the end of World War II that scientists have had the instruments, and the money, to draw apart the waves for a close look below.

FEDERAL SPENDING RISES

Several universities have departments or subdepartments devoted to marine studies, but most of the work has been done by Woods Hole and by the Scripps Institution of Oceanography in California. The Federal Government, for all its participating agencies, has given increased support to oceanographic research—$103.7 million in fiscal 1962 with $123.8 million budgeted for the current fiscal year. Mr. Kennedy's new budget would boost oceanography appropriations to $155.9 million. Some 90 percent of privately operated Woods Hole's budget is accounted for by Government contracts. There are many reasons, mostly military, why the Government wants to know more about the ocean and the ocean floor, especially in the era of the missile-firing submarine.

The peaceful implications of manipulating the sea, however, are far more dramatic than the military possibilities. One example is Columbus Iselin's proposal for the Gulf of St. Lawrence, a body of water which separates Newfoundland from the Canadian mainland and serves as the gateway to the St. Lawrence Seaway.

The upper layer of water in the gulf is fresh, cold, and without a great abundance of marine life. The lower layer is warm, salty, and teeming with marine nutrients (plankton and the progressively larger creatures attracted to it in the food chain). What would happen if the warm, fertile bottom water were continuously pumped to the surface?

Mr. Iselin believes the results would include keeping the gulf free of ice throughout the year (the seaway presently shuts down when ice makes it impassable in winter), vastly increasing the catches of fishermen, and improving Newfoundland's climate, which could stand some improving.

Before anything like this is done, scientists will study the plan carefully because, while the engineering job involved is relatively simple, they want to be sure such manipulation would be self-healing, that conditions would revert to normal without any unwanted effects if the plan, once put into operation, were discontinued.

RUSSIANS TALK OF EXPLOSIONS

Here again the problem of international agreements arises, because while a climatic change might benefit one country it could easily worsen the climate of another. The Russians have talked about using nuclear explosions to clear ice from frozen northern ports and even of creating new inland seas. A serious disturbance of the Arctic icepacks, however, could raise the level of the ocean and, in some low-lying areas, have catastrophic consequences.

So if man is to manipulate the ocean he must do it with an eye on the global weal. Considering the record of attempts at universal cooperation among nations, there's no reason to believe such an enlightened covenant will be achieved soon. But the scientists already know how to improve weather, climate, geography, and the world supply of resources if the legal and political questions can be solved.

Joseph Conrad wrote: "The sea never changes, and its works, for all the talk of men, are wrapped in mystery."

True. But the wrappings are beginning to come off.

DAVY JONES' LARDER—PRIMITIVE FISHING METHODS LEAVE IT ALL BUT UNTOUCHED

(By Edwin A. Roberts, Jr.)

The business of obtaining food from the sea is, in A.D. 1963, at about where the business of obtaining food from the land was many thousands of years ago.

The catching of fish and other edible marine life is largely a matter of hunting, rather than farming, and no one should have to be reminded today of how superior scientific farming is to hit-or-miss hunting. The bulging grain storehouses and the herds of fat, grain-fed cattle in the American West leave no doubt that enlightened cultivation and harvesting is infinitely more productive than taking to the woods with a shotgun.

Yet it is the shotgun method that commercial fishermen around the world have used for centuries and, with very few exceptions, they don't seem able or willing to change their methods. There are many reasons for this static situation, and they involve hoary traditions, marketing problems and international politics—not necessarily in that order.

The basic pattern of land cultivation is one that is pretty well understood by everyone who has either sown a wheat field or planted geraniums in an apartment house window box. But the growth of life in the sea is less well known and yet, because of its implications, it is well worth knowing about.

"GRASS OF THE SEA"

As life perhaps once began on this planet, life in the sea begins with yellow-brown algae called diatoms. This "grass of the sea" is the food of the smallest marine animals, the one-celled protozoa referred to en masse as plankton. Small fish (and some whales, too) eat the plankton and are in turn eaten by successively larger fish. By manipulating this process, by farming the sea, man could quite easily increase many times the population of food fish and the size of the fisherman's catches.

He could do this in a number of ways, all depending on some international treaty establishing jurisdiction over broad areas of the ocean.

Let us suppose, for instance, that U.S. fishermen decided to farm a 10,000-square-mile section of the sea off Cape Cod. First the area would be fenced in, either electronically or by means of perforated air hoses on the ocean floor which would send constant streams of bubbles to the surface. In theory the bubbles, or electronic impulses, would keep the fish being cultivated fenced in and easily harvested. If the fish were thus detained, their growth could be stimulated both by pumping up plankton-rich water from lower levels and by fertilizing the water from the surface.

By periodic dragging of nets the area could be weeded; that is, the so-called trash fish (fish of relatively little use to man) could be removed, thereby leaving the marine nutrients for the food fish.

Such farming of the sea is entirely feasible, according to Columbus Iselin, founder of the Woods Hole (Mass.) Oceanographic Institution, but the initial expense would hardly be justified if the developers were not given an internationally recognized claim to the area under cultivation. This promises to remain a big hitch.

But the concept itself has in small ways been practiced for a long time. In some parts of Southeast Asia, for instance, native rice growers stock their fields with baby carp and, when they drain the fields to harvest the rice, they also pick up a good catch of flopping, mature carp.

While farming the open sea would require a more sophisticated approach, the engineering problems are as nothing compared with other problems peculiar to the commercial fishing industry.

Commercial fishing in the United States is not a booming business. With the notable exception of the west coast tuna canneries and the southern shrimp industry, American fishing fleets generally find a limited market.

While Americans will apparently eat tuna fish, shrimp and lobster in heroic amounts, they have little taste for many kinds of fish that are plentiful off our shores. One such fish is herring, and obviously if the return a fishing boat can get for herring is inadequate, very few boats will pursue it.

Nobody can blame the fisherman for this. But there are some causes for the industry's difficulties that can indeed be blamed on the fishermen. In New England, for example, the crews of fishing trawlers get the receipts for 60 percent of the catch while the boat's owner gets only 40 percent. This arrangement is a throwback to olden days and has little relation to the economic facts of life in 1963. Its most serious consequence is that it discourages the fishing fleet operators from buying new boats and equipment to make their business more efficient.

An important exception is found in the fleets that go after menhaden, an oily member of the herring family that's used for animal feed and fertilizer. The crews of menhaden boats, because their industry is relatively young, work on a salary basis along with a percentage of the catch. As a result, the menhaden fleets have a much better time of it economically than do their counterparts hunting food fish.

It is not overstating the case, moreover, to say that commercial fishermen as a rule treat new ideas with extraordinary caution.

Take, for example, the New England fishermen who are the inheritors of a long and romantic seafaring tradition. When they were told by oceanographers that there was money to be made by using modern methods to catch tuna off Cape Cod, they showed little enthusiasm.

A TUNA BOAT'S TAKE

Oceanographer Iselin responded by inviting a west coast tuna boat to make a trip through the Panama Canal to Cape Cod and catch itself some big ones. The resourceful west coast fishermen agreed and, for 5 days' work last summer, each man in the crew made $6,000. Next summer, not surprisingly, a whole fleet of west coast boats is expected.

There is another instance of opportunity that thus far east coast fishermen have ignored. One of the most precious products of the sea, pound for pound, is shrimp. Oceanographers pointed out to Boston fishermen that the waters off the coast of Maine are crawling with a cold water variety of the crustacean, and that they might be marketed at a good profit.

The fishermen discounted the advice. Everybody prefers shrimp from the Gulf of Mexico, they said. The water off Maine is so deep they'd have to outfit their boats with heavier equipment. And anyway, cold-water shrimp tend to spoil quickly, perhaps even before the hauls could be delivered to the Boston dock.

Scientists told the fishermen that Americans preferred southern shrimp because that is the only kind they knew, that a relatively small investment in new equipment might return handsome dividends.

Even if we did it, replied the fishermen, the shrimp would spoil on our decks. Why not boil the shrimp on board as soon as they are caught? suggested an oceanographer.

We are fishermen, not cooks, was the answer.

The tuna and shrimp incidents are not reported here to make a case against New England fishing crews. Rather these attitudes merely exemplify the mental torpor of much of the world's commercial fisheries, with the important exception of Russia. The Russians have the biggest, most modern fishing boats on the sea with a range permitting them to sail where they please. Some of the Soviet vessels are floating canneries. Many Russian fishing boats are known to perform military functions as well.

That the United States lacks a fishing fleet to rival Russia's, of course, should be kept in perspective. Thanks to the ingenuity of American farmers and the good offices of the U.S. Agriculture Department, we have far more food in this country than our population requires. There has been no strong impetus to go after fish. In Russia, where food is less abundant, herring, and sturgeon are not just a Friday night change of pace.

ROLE OF THE SCHOOLS

It should be mentioned here that U.S. farm surpluses stem, too, from the research of the scientific community. Many colleges and universities operate their own farms on which new methods are tested—the successful ones being recommended to farmers. The schools doing research on seafood, unfortunately, are reluctant to operate their own fisheries because, they claim, they would be competing with the commercial fishermen who are having a hard enough time as it is.

The imbalance of the food supply around the world is often explained by citing poor soil (for field crops) in the tropics and the plant-killing cold in polar climes. But science is equipped today to deal with these problems. Soil chemists and mechanical engineers have the knowledge to vastly increase food production on land and sea.

What all this means is that modern man need not tolerate widespread deprivation because of technological or biological helplessness. The means are known to cultivate much of the three-quarters of the earth's land surface that is practically uninhabited, and these deserts, and frozen wastes and tangled jungles may yet be put to work.

Meanwhile the sea abounds with food enough to feed the world, but the initiative lies with man.

MARINE MINING—UNDERSEA DEPOSITS OF MINERALS AWAIT RESOURCEFUL ENGINEERS

(By Edwin A. Roberts, Jr.)

The wealth of nations derives from the bounty of the earth and the ways that bounty is used. In the 150 years since the beginning of the industrial revolution man has learned something about husbanding natural resources, but still the demands of modern technology have steadily reduced underground reserves of minerals and organic fuels.

Therefore, it's hardly surprising that American industrialists and military men look rather longingly at the world ocean whose 335 million cubic miles of water hold a greater supply of minerals than do all the mines and quarries of the continents.

Nor does the mineral treasure of the ocean end with the components of sea water. On the ocean floor, in most places at substantial depths, are vast scatterings of nodules—rock-like chunks that are rich in manganese and iron. And below the ocean floor, in the continental shelves that flank the U.S. coasts, are reserves expected one day to yield 20 billion barrels of crude oil and 150 billion cubic feet of natural gas.

Pumping oil and gas from beneath the sea is no great trick, providing the water is relatively shallow. Drilling rigs are familiar sights in the Gulf of Mexico, off the coasts of Texas and Louisiana.

Extracting salt from salt water is easily done by simple evaporation; the main aim, of course, usually is to get fresh water. Today, the practice has become relatively sophisticated, recovering at the same time such chemicals as sodium phosphate, potassium chloride and magnesium chloride. Another byproduct of the process is bromine. But although the composition of sea water has triggered a lot of wide-eyed speculation about its possibilities as an inexhaustible mineral source, there is a very big hitch. Magnesium, a metal of relatively great abundance in the sea, is present in concentrations of about one-tenth of 1 percent whereas average rock or soil contains about 40 times as much.

ECONOMICS AND ENGINEERING

The eventual large-scale mining of sea water depends on two factors: The continued availability of economic concentrations of minerals on land and the development of sufficient supplies of cheap power to extract minerals from sea water at lower and lower cost.

As a matter of scientific knowledge, the metal-rich nodules that dot millions of square miles of the oceans' floor are there for the grabbing. As a matter of engineering knowledge, the inaccessibility of most of the nodules makes that grabbing presently uneconomic.

Dr. Edward D. Goldberg of the Scripps Institution of Oceanography in California has reported the nodules, which may range in size from that of a potato to a chunk 3 feet in diameter, have a mineral content made up of, on the average, 20 percent manganese, 15 percent iron and fractional amounts of nickel, cobalt, and copper. Nodules have been found, however, with far higher concentrations of these minerals.

While most of the nodules lie in the deep recesses of the ocean floor, great quantities have been found between Tahiti and Hawaii at depths of less than a mile. John L. Mero, research engineer for the University of California Department of Mineral Technology, believes mining these minerals is entirely economic.

Mr. Mero visualizes a massive pumping system, which he calls a giant vacuum cleaner, to do the job. But it remains for someone to put up the money to build the elaborate device and test it before its feasibility can be judged. Right now, many oceanographers are skeptical.

Regarding the resources beneath the continental shelves, man has made major strides in recent years in exploiting them. Currently an attempt is underway to poke a hole through the earth's crust to the mantle to see what's there. Named Project Mohole, the attempt is being made in the continental shelf off the coast of Central America because the crust is thinner there than it is on the continent proper.

Although Project Mohole is described as a pure-science enterprise, the techniques devised for sampling the earth's mantle from a floating platform on the surface of the sea could eventually be of aid to oil drillers and miners of the ocean floor.

One element not always mentioned in connection with schemes for making the sea give up its minerals is phosphorus, an element indispensable to all types of life. Man gets most of his phosphorus from plants but in many places the plants have a hard time getting it from phosphorus-poor soil. Moreover, 3,500,000 tons of phosphorus are washed into the sea every year.

THE OCEAN'S SEDIMENT

Because of this phosphorus loss to the sea, thought is being given to digging the element from the sediment on the ocean bottom. This sediment is a layer of varying thickness composed of the remains of marine life and the dust that filters down from the surface. Mr. Mero has calculated that aside from phosphorus, there is enough copper and aluminum in the sediment to last a million years at the present rate of consumption. Again the problem is one of engineering.

In view of this problem, the engineering feats of such creatures as the little oyster are interesting. The oyster, in the process of pumping thousands of gallons of sea water through itself, extracts minerals, such as phosphorous and copper, and concentrates them in its body.

One of the several problems known to man but not to oysters is that of establishing legal ownership of the resources in the deep ocean basins (resources in or on the continental shelves are recognized as belonging to the coastal country). Abundant as the manganese nodules are, for instance, they are not so abundant that they can be regarded as oxygen in the air or the dissolved salt in the sea. National proprietorships may eventually have to be established.

Unlike research currently being conducted in the field of marine life, research into the location and concentration of deep-sea mineral deposits will probably not lead to important economic developments soon. With necessity absent, invention remains unborn.

But dwindling deposits on land and the growing needs of an expanding technology and population make it likely that the minerals of the deep will one day be put to work.

Murky Battlefield—United States Marshals Deterrents, Defenses Far Below the Sea

(By Edwin A. Roberts, Jr.)

On the October night when President Kennedy announced America's determination to eliminate the Cuban missile threat, it is likely that a U.S. nuclear submarine lay beneath the billows of the Baltic Sea, laden with weaponry capable of destroying 16 Soviet cities the size of Moscow. And because it was poised exactly where it was, it remained entirely invisible to the submarine-detection equipment of the Russian fleet.

We don't know all this for sure because U.S. atomic submarines operate under the utmost secrecy. But when we understand something of what such a submarine can do and when we know some of the open secrets of the ocean, a glance at the map suggests some of the areas where a Polaris sub might be expected to lurk in time of crisis. And from the depths of the Baltic, Polaris missiles would be within range of every major city in European Russia.

But the trick for a nuclear submarine is not just to be in position to do the most damage with its 16 missiles. It must also avoid detection and possible destruction itself, and from this need has developed an intensive Government-sponsored campaign to survey the ocean and the ocean floor.

The hypothetical submarine mentioned above, for instance, had found a hiding place in the sea, a pocket of warm water surrounded by cold water. Because sea water is a poor conductor of heat, the pocket of warm water lay surrounded by cold water without mixing with it.

Now, it is one of the countless phenomena of the sea that submarine-detection signals will be deflected at the meeting place of warm and cold water layers. Therefore, a sub lying in the right spot would be invisible to the enemy. This was known during World War II but it has only been in recent years that both the United States and Russia have been attempting to chart these warm water pockets in the strategic areas of the ocean.

Navy submarines and surface ships plus vessels operated by private oceanographic institutions are equipped with devices known as bathythermographs for determining the water temperature at various depths. It's known that Russian subs are similarly equipped and it's likely that the huge Soviet fishing fleet has heard of the technique.

NAVY'S FUTURE

Enormous as is the job of charting water temperatures in the vast, ever-shifting ocean, it is just one phase of oceanographic research being carried on for military purposes. It is somewhat ironic to recall that shortly after World War II, when Air Force jets first became a common sight in the sky, there was talk of greatly reducing the size of the Navy. Of what use, the question went, is a relatively sluggish armada when jets and missiles are hurtling across continents in minutes?

Yet there is growing evidence today that the Navy, especially the undersea Navy, will provide one of the most formidable deterrents for years to come.

To appreciate the reasons for this it is necessary to appreciate the Polaris-type submarine itself. This craft can twice circumnavigate the globe without refueling and can stay submerged for months. It can dive to depths of almost 1,000 feet and move under water at better than 35 knots (the exact figures are classified but those are probably useful estimates).

Naturally, for a missile-carrying submarine it's essential that the skipper know exactly where he is at all times; otherwise, he would never dare fire a missile.

There are two principal ways that the navigator of an atomic sub calculates his position. One is with the use of an inertial guidance system, similar to the devices that keep missiles on course. This electronic behemoth records every movement of the vessel from the time it leaves port. The other navigational means is a remarkable sextant that takes star sightings through the periscope. Between these two instruments, the position of a sub—even after many weeks submerged—can be figured with great accuracy.

Still, scientists are trying to do better, and they must seek improvements without resort to radio transmission which would expose the craft to the enemy. Therefore a large-scale effort is being made to chart the earth's magnetic and gravitational forces beneath the sea. Magnetic and gravity readings vary from place to place due to the irregular shape of the earth and the varying densities of rocks beneath the ocean floor. If the necessary data were in hand, it would be possible for a submarine to simply check its magnetometer and gravimeter against the figures on its charts and it would know exactly where it was.

This system, however, is likely to remain in the research stage for some time, chiefly because of the enormity of the job of taking magnetic and gravity readings over thousands of square miles of ocean.

Another area of great interest to the Navy is the topography of the ocean floor which, in most places beyond the Continental Shelf, is a succession of mountains and trenches. Such undersea landmarks could be of great value to nuclear submarines; this may explain why charts of the ocean floor showing contour lines within 5 miles of each other are classified.

Exactly what the Navy has in mind for the ocean bottom is secret, although one well-informed civilian scientist says it has some interesting things cooking. There is talk of missile bases on the floor of the sea, undersea caves for use as submarine depots and hideouts, and various other futuristic possibilities. Oceanographers, however, tend to relegate such ideas to the science fiction bin and just chuckle when popular magazines report them as imminent.

A submarine's greatest asset is its secrecy of movement. When one considers that it took American and British frigates, submarines, and airplanes almost a week to find the hijacked Portuguese liner *Santa Maria* 2 years ago—even though the big surface ship's position was roughly known before the search began—one begins to understand how difficult it is to track down enemy submarines. And the best way to do it is still through the use of sound, with advanced sonar-hydrophone systems picking up the noise a moving submarine must inevitably make.

THE ATOM SUB'S ROAR

Water, of course, is an extraordinary sound conductor. It's so good that a small explosion set off beneath the sea near Australia was picked up clearly by oceanographers in Bermuda. Columbus Islelin, of Woods Hole (Mass.) Oceanographic Institution, claims that a pistol shot fired at the right depth can be heard at the other side of the ocean. So when an atomic submarine is slipping through the water at high speed, it emits a steady roar—despite the many improvements made by the Navy to muffle it—and is therefore detectable.

Along with reducing the noise a submarine makes, the Navy is also studying the behavior patterns of sound at various depths. The submariners themselves have learned to distinguish the sound of another sub from the natural sounds of the sea.

The Soviet Union, with the largest submarine fleet in the world (well over 400 vessels), is believed to permanently station about 125 undersea craft in the North Atlantic. Thus, the U.S. Navy is faced with the formidable job of finding and tracking them. This will probably be done in the future with a kind of underwater radar device known as Artemis, which is actually a mammoth sonar machine. Artemis sends out, below the surface and over vast distances, electronic sounds similar to the lower notes on a piano. A long string of hydrophones, scattered throughout the Atlantic, picks up these sounds when they are reflected off any large object, and relays them via underwater cables to a 76-foot tower off Bermuda.

The tower, which is known as Argus Island and which stands atop an extinct volcano, receives the signals and feeds them into computing machines. When the system is fully developed, scientists will be able to distinguish sound bounced off a whale's belly from sound bounced off a hostile sub.

RUSSIA PUSHES OWN SYSTEMS

The Russians, to be sure, are also at work on submarine detection systems, but there is some evidence that they are far behind the U.S. in this department.

In the future, too, is the Navy's highly classified Project Caesar, which involves placing scores of hydrophones all around the North American Continent. One responsible civilian source said such devices can detect an enemy submarine within a range of 500 miles. This is enormously important because modern depth charges and modern torpedoes are immensely effective against undersea craft—nuclear depth charges can destroy a sub several thousands of yards away, and homing torpedoes, working on sonic, thermal or magnetic principles, are said to be errorproof.

Thus has man taken his genius for war and weapons beneath the sea. But amid the nuclear submarines, the underwater missiles, and the network of hydrophones, there are natural resources that defy calculation—more food than the world could eat, more minerals than two worlds could use.

The ocean now awaits the pleasure of man.

COSTLY RESULTS OF KENNEDY-FREEMAN FEED GRAINS PROGRAM

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, last year the Federal Government paid the American farmers nearly $700 million to retire approximately 20 million acres of corn and other feed grains from production. At the same time under another program they paid the American farmers over $200 million to subsidize the purchase of lime and fertilizer in order to increase the productive capacity of the remaining acres cultivated.

Today I wish to call the attention of the Senate to two very costly results of this contradictory and extravagant Kennedy-Freeman feed grains program.

First. In addition to the payments made to the American farmers we now find that the administration has paid over $1 million to the wholesale seed dealers handling seed corn and sorghum seed to compensate them for the profit which they lost as a result of the reduced sales of seed corn and sorghum seed. Last year these payments totaled $1,413,193.42 and ranged as high as $20,000 each to some of the major seed companies.

Presumably these payments were made on the basis that as the Government paid the farmers to reduce their feed grain acreage there would be reduced sales of seed for the remaining acreage.

Of course once this principle is adopted I suppose the fertilizer companies could by the same line of reasoning claim compensation from the Federal Government for the reduced sale of fertilizer, the farm equipment manufacturers and dealers would have a claim against the Government for profits lost as the result of the sale of less farm equipment, local farm labor could file a claim for less jobs, and local merchants, bankers, and so forth, could all come in and claim compensatory payments as a result of the reduced volume of business due to acreage curtailment. Yes, if this principle is extended, everybody will get a free ride on the Kennedy-Freeman gravy train except the taxpayers.

The fact that the administration, after having once approved this New Frontier program and after having paid out over a million dollars, has decided to abandon the program for next year, does not eliminate the danger of such programs. Nor does the fact that last year was an election year when the doors of the Treasury were wide open remain without significance.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed at this point in the RECORD a list of these payments to seed dealers, broken down by States.

There being no objection, the list was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

State	Corn	Sorghum
Alabama	$31,293.00	----------
Florida	1,234.50	----------
Georgia	18,391.50	----------
Illinois	327,726.05	$22.80
Indiana	154,237.18	----------
Iowa	197,598.49	7,972.20
Kansas	8,272.50	33,724.12
Kentucky	19,185.00	----------
Louisiana	23,134.50	----------
Massachusetts	1,875.00	----------
Minnesota	42,304.50	----------
Mississippi	3,778.50	----------
Missouri	57,109.08	820.80
Nebraska	55,725.59	41,010.68
New York	10,350.00	----------
North Carolina	33,474.00	----------
Ohio	78,696.10	----------
Pennsylvania	5,650.05	----------
South Dakota	2,215.50	----------
Tennessee	8,781.00	----------
Texas	25,128.00	148,070.28
Virginia	14,242.50	----------
Wisconsin	61,170.00	----------
Total	1,181,572.54	231,620.88

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Second, Mr. President, there was another fantastic result of this absurd Kennedy-Freeman feed grains program—a program based on the principle that someone should be paid to do nothing.

In an earlier report, I mentioned the Farmers Investment Co., in Arizona, as having collected $94,092.30 from the Government in 1961 as its payment not to cultivate all its lands. Today, I call attention to the remarkably easy way it found to make money fast on the New Frontier.

This company rented 582.3 acres from the State of Arizona—Maricopa County—at an average cost of $3 per acre, or less than $1,800. The U.S. Department of Agriculture, through the ASC state committee, then contracted to pay the company $37.90 per acre, or a total of $22,069.17, not to cultivate the same acreage. This represented a net profit of over $20,000 merely to act as an agent between the State of Arizona and the Federal Government.

In Pinal County, Ariz., the Farmers Investment Co. rented three tracts from the State of 81 acres, 37.6 acres, and 37.6 acres, respectively, for which it paid the State of Arizona an average of $4.50 per acre.

The Federal Government then contracted to pay the company $41.30 per acre not to cultivate the 81 acres, $43.20 per acre not to cultivate one of the tracts of 37.6 acres, and $51.70 per acre not to cultivate the other tract of 37.6 acres.

The result was that on this second deal, involving the 156.2 acres which the Farmers Investment Co. rented from the State of Arizona—Pinal County—the company paid the State around $700, and then collected a total of $6,913.54 from the Federal Government not to cultivate the same acreage. This represented a net profit of approximately $6,200.

On the two transactions the Farmers Investment Co. made an easy profit of over $26,500 on land which it was renting from the State of Arizona for less than $2,500.

There is nothing to indicate that these two transactions are isolated cases, nor is there any evidence to show how widespread this practice may be. But these two examples do show what can happen under a farm program that is designed, not on the basis of how it will benefit the conditions of the American farmer, but, rather, on the basis of how it will affect election results.

I have checked with officials of the State of Arizona, and they have confirmed the rental payments referred to above; and as confirmation of the payments made by the Federal Government on the same acreage, I ask unanimous consent that a letter signed by Mr. H. D. Godfrey, Administrator of the Agriculture Stabilization Conservation Service, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE, AGRICULTURAL STABILIZATION AND CONSERVATION SERVICE, WASHINGTON, D.C.

November 28, 1962.

Hon. JOHN J. WILLIAMS,
U.S. Senate.

DEAR SENATOR WILLIAMS: This is in further reply to your letter of August 20, in which you requested information regarding payments made under the 1961 feed grain program to the Farmers Investment Co. of Tucson, Arizona.

The Arizona ASC State Committee has advised us that the company in question did not divert any acreage of federally owned land in 1961; however, the following acreages of State-owned land were diverted under the 1961 feed grain program in the State:

County	Acres diverted	Payment rate per acre
Maricopa	582.3	$37.90
Pinal	81.0	41.30
Do	37.6	43.20
Do	37.6	51.70

Program regulations for the 1961 feed grain program with respect to establishing payment rates where public-owned land is involved are as follows:

"The rate of payment under the program with respect to land which is leased or rented on a cash rent basis and which is owned by the Federal Government or by a State, a political subdivision or any agency thereof and which is otherwise eligible for participation in the program shall not exceed a fair payment rate as determined by the county committee. Such payment rate shall be the actual cash rent per acre of the land adjusted to take into account the quality of the acres which the producer designates as diverted when compared with the total acres rented, and the services performed and improvements made at the lessee's expense which are in addition to rent. A payment in excess of the cash rent may only be made if approved by a representative of the State committee."

If we can be of further service in this matter, please call on us.

Sincerely yours,

H. D. GODFREY,
Administrator.

REDUCTION OF TRADE BARRIERS AND SUPPORT OF NATO

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, there appears in today's newspapers reports on and excerpts from two speeches on the nature and future of the western alliance, one by Dean Acheson, and the other by the Ambassador from France, Mr. Herve Alphand.

Mr. Acheson does not, as we know, hold any position in the U.S. Government. He is a partner in a law firm which has many international clients.

While I find much to agree with in Mr. Acheson's remarks, I also find what I think is a rather pathetic hope that President de Gaulle does not mean what he says, and that, even if he does, his obstructions to the Atlantic alliance can somehow be overcome.

Mr. Acheson is, in my opinion, indulging in a pipedream when he assumes that the United States, Britain, and the five Common Market countries other than France, can reduce trade barriers among them without the help of France, and even in face of her objections.

The fact is that in addition to France, West Germany and the Netherlands are also raising trade barriers against the United States. One of the principal objectives of the Common Market as it is emerging is the provision of a sheltered market for the farmers of the member countries. French farmers hope to benefit the most; but so do the others. Barriers are already being raised against American poultry, fruit, and flour. More barriers against wheat products and feed grains will follow.

Agricultural exports to these countries account for about one-third of all American exports to them. Not just France, but several Common Market countries are seeking to curb just as much as possible the entry of those U.S. commodities.

I ask unanimous consent to have inserted at this point in the RECORD two articles on this subject from the western edition of the Christian Science Monitor of March 6. One is entitled "European Progress Curtails Import Needs." The other is entitled "U.S. Poultry Crisis Trails Hallstein Talks."

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EUROPEAN PROGRESS CURTAILS IMPORT NEEDS

(By John Allan May)

LONDON.—Can the United States expect now to increase its agricultural trade with Europe?

Well, Europe's import requirements of wheat this year are likely to be considerably lower than last year.

Coarse-grain import requirements are expected to be somewhat lower.

Trade in dairy products is expected to meet some further difficulties.

A contraction of egg production is likely.

Europe's imports of beef, veal, and pig meat very likely will decrease further.

Production and consumption, and trade in poultry meat, however, continues to expand.

Thus does the secretariat of the United Nations Economic Commission for Europe sum up the market situation in European agriculture and the outlook for short-term trade.

CROP ESTIMATED

The total 1962 European grain crop excluding that of the Soviet Union is estimated at about 164 million tons, about 8 percent more than in the previous year.

In the U.S.S.R. the crop reached a record level of 147,400,000 tons, about 10 million tons more than in the previous year.

Wheat production in Western Europe is estimated to be 11 million tons higher than in 1961. Relatively large quantities of this are likely to be used for animal feeding.

With regard to coarse grains a reduction of the maize crop has been offset by a big barley crop.

The problems of the butter market remained unsolved in 1962, the Economic Commission for Europe reports.

The application of quotas in the London market stabilized prices but left some countries with large unsold stocks. These have increased in spite of an increase in butter consumption in a number of countries.

Trade in cheese and milk powder cannot be expected to absorb much more milk, the Economic Commission for Europe adds. An increase in milk production in Western Europe at the same time can be expected to add further to the difficulties of the market in dairy products.

The two salient features of the European egg market in recent years, the Economic Commission for Europe goes on, have been: (1) the familiar phenomenon of overcompensation of supply in response to price changes and, (2) the decline of West German imports for the third successive year.

Low egg prices during the hatching season this year could lead to a restriction of the number of eggs incubated and to a subsequent contraction of production in the 1962-63 season, it is said.

DANGERS SIGHTED

Consumption of meat has risen in all parts of Europe as a result of rising income, the Economic Commission for Europe declares. In line with this tendency meat production has also expanded. Europe's production has been increasing more rapidly than its consumption. Europe has expanded its own meat exports, particularly to the United States.

In Eastern Europe increased numbers of livestock in nearly all countries in 1962 points to a further increase in meat production there, too.

Production and consumption of poultry meat both continued to expand in 1962, the Economic Commission for Europe concludes. Falling prices have led to increased consumption and thus increased production. Technical improvements have raised productivity, but "a painful readjustment is still ahead for many traditional producers—particularly for those who produce poultry meat as a byproduct of egg production."

The big importing market has been West Germany. This dependence on a single market has been "fraught with dangers in the long run" for exporters. Moreover, although German imports may remain high the pattern of the trade "may be influenced by the new regulations of the European Economic Community (the European Common Market)."

Apart from that change—of great significance of course to the United States, which is seeking to expand its exports of agricultural products—the Economic Commission for Europe sees no sign that the expansion of production and consumption in Europe will come to a halt in the near future.

U.S. POULTRY CRISIS TRAILS HALLSTEIN TALKS

(By Robert R. Brunn)

WASHINGTON.—Walter Hallstein, President of the European Common Market, has started a round of talks here, and from President Kennedy on down he keeps hearing about chickens.

The current chicken crisis involves a domestic poultry surplus of gigantic size. It is being built up by a 12.5 percent per pound tariff slapped on American poultry by the Common Market countries last July.

President Kennedy spent 45 minutes with Mr. Hallstein Monday, and Mr. Kennedy hastened to bring up chickens.

So far Washington's officialdom doesn't seem to be quite sure what to do about the chicken surplus. It mounts every day.

But officials in their Hallstein talks are even more concerned about American agriculture's European Market generally. If the European Economic Community goes ahead with its plans, in the spring the Common Market will fix common import restrictions on wheat and feed grains.

QUESTION LOOMS

Overall, the Department of Agriculture believes that if the French and German farm lobbies are able to win out in the six-nation market, protective tariffs can well cut back American crop exports to Europe by 30 percent.

More than 30 percent of American exports to Europe are foodstuffs. It is figured that if half of this is lost, everything remaining constant, the U.S. healthy favorable trade balance could be turned into a deficit.

As it now is, the American international balance-of-payments condition is touch and go. This is why the Hallstein talks about poultry and the possible spring tariffs have a tone of urgency about them.

The administration is deeply anxious about the possible political repercussions of all this. If European tariffs continue to rise, then the traditional struggle between the free traders and the protectionists would have greater meaning.

But if grains are shut out of the EEC, then the administration actually might have a farm revolt on its hands, the congressional farm bloc could get much more hard to control in its voting, and the big farm organizations might demand retaliatory tariffs.

NO SOLUTION REPORTED

During the Hallstein visit the Common Market president will be asked if he actually expects the grain tariffs to come into effect this spring, now the Common Market is in an uncertain state following the De Gaulle break with its colleagues over British entry.

A delay of at least a year may be in the works, before the grain tariffs are implemented. The administration hope is that by then at least the beginning of a proposed series of international commodity cartels would have appeared that would insure the United States a certain share in the European farm market.

After the Kennedy meeting Mr. Hallstein hurried down the street to the Department of Agriculture where he met Secretary of Agriculture Orville L. Freeman. They talked turkey (and chickens).

No solution came out publicly, and it is agreed that little advance was made behind the doors, either.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I direct to Mr. Acheson's attention these sentences:

> Overall, the Department of Agriculture believes that if the French and German farm lobbies are able to win out in the six-nation market, protective tariffs can well cut back American crop exports to Europe by 30 percent. More than 30 percent of American exports to Europe are foodstuffs. It is figured that if half of this is lost, everything remaining constant, the U.S. healthy favorable trade balance could be turned into a deficit.
>
> As it is now, the American international balance-of-payments condition is touch and go.

Mr. President, let me say that I would be very much interested to find that Mr. Acheson represents a single farm producer or farm organization, in connection with any of his international law practice. But I represent a State which has a great stake in whether the foreign policy of the United States is to be one that sells short the American farmer. Let me make very clear—as I tried to do from this desk on January 16—that I do not intend to support a foreign policy, either by the Kennedy administration or by any other administration, that sells short American farmers. So far as I am concerned, I have voted for the last dollar to buttress Europe at the expense of the American taxpayers. It is undeniable—let me say to Mr. Acheson or to others who are following the line of his speech of yesterday—that today the NATO countries are in a better monetary position than is the United States to carry their full share of the burdens and the cost of NATO. I repeat that if De Gaulle wants to go it alone, I invite him to take a long walk. So far as I am concerned, I will not support a foreign economic program by this Government that causes the American taxpayers to pour more millions of dollars into the economy of the Common Market countries, while they follow a policy of exclusion to American farm products.

Mr. Acheson espouses the complacent dogma that our present defense policy in Europe must be continued because it is right; but he says nothing of how it is to be paid for. I say that a defense policy which requires a continued drain on the American taxpayers, for the benefit of nations perfectly able to pay much more toward it themselves, is not right, and it should not be tolerated. The nations that are "putting the squeeze" on American farm goods are not worried about whether we maintain our conventional forces in Europe. Probably they believe there are enough policymakers in the United States gullible enough to follow the Acheson line that the United States is a bottomless pit of gold and greenbacks, and that we shall pay any price they ask just to keep our troops on their soil.

Mr. Alphand makes very much the same totally mistaken assumption.

Let me say to the French Ambassador that we welcome his exercise of his right of free speech while holding his diplomatic post in this country; but let me also make clear to the French Ambassador and to any other ambassador who exercises the precious right of free speech on the platforms in America that we have the right to reply when we think their speeches are as unfortunate and as unsound as, in my opinion, was the speech made yesterday in California by the French Ambassador.

The French Ambassador brags of the favorable condition of France's balance of payments, but he neglects to say that it is being achieved at American expense. He brags of the defense expenditure by France, but neglects to mention that France is failing seriously to meet her obligations to NATO.

From the floor of the Senate today I say to the French Ambassador, "Where are French troops in NATO? Why has not France supported NATO with uniformed men in accord with the rightful burden that France ought to maintain in the support of NATO?

The United States has been maintaining in Europe our full commitment to NATO, closer to a state of complete combat-readiness than the forces of any other member. France is not an equal partner in NATO by her own decision, not ours, because it is President de Gaulle's decision to keep French forces under his own command that should be under NATO command.

I am flatly opposed to a continued American subsidy to France through NATO. I am even more opposed to it in light of the Common Market exclusion of American farm commodities, which proves to me that the member countries have little interest in whether the United States remains in Europe or not.

If it is good enough for the European members of NATO to put half-filled divisions under its command with the pledge to fill them when and if a crisis comes, then it is good enough for us, too.

Mr. President, it is about time that we started doing it.

American taxpayers have been plucked long enough for the support of European defenses. The time has come for the United States to make clear to the NATO countries that they must pay their full share—not half their share or less—in the defense and support of NATO. The Congress of the United States and the Kennedy administration are about to hear from the American people in ever-increasing tempo in opposition to further waste of money in Europe in support of NATO colleagues who are not willing to join in an equal support of freedom in the free world.

INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS LEAGUE CONFERENCE

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter from Mr. LeRoy Graymer, executive secretary of the Oregon High School International Relations League; and a memorandum on the league's recent conference.

There being no objection, the letter and the memorandum were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OREGON HIGH SCHOOL INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS LEAGUE, UNIVERSITY OF OREGON,
Eugene, Oreg., March 1, 1963.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: We wish to sincerely thank you for your participation in the 16th Annual International Relations League Conference. The insights which you brought to the 600 participants at this meeting contributed greatly to their understanding of the implications of the social and economic revolutions being attempted by the Alliance for Progress program. As always, you succeeded in inspiring and educating the people attending this conference.

We are particularly grateful for your informal remarks at the advisor's luncheon. Not only did this stimulate considerable thought among the teachers present, it also helped the IRL executive committee in selecting a conference topic for next year. Although not specifically formulated, it will deal with some aspect of European unity or disunity.

I wish to indicate what a pleasant experience it was for me to meet and talk with you during your attendance at this conference.

The Institute of International Studies and the Oregon Education Association appreciate the continuous support you have given to the International Relations League over the years of its existence.

Since there was some conversation at the advisor's luncheon concerning the possibility of your placing some information on the International Relations League in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I am enclosing some information on the league and this year's conference.

Thank you again for the time and energy that you have devoted to our program.

Sincerely yours,

LEROY GRAYMER,
Executive Secretary.

Résumé of International Relations League Activities and the 1963 Conference "Revista de la Alianza Para el Progreso" ("Review of the Alliance Progress"). This was the topic for the Oregon High School International Relations League conference held on February 7–9, 1963, at the University of Oregon. This meeting culminated a year-long study of the Alliance for Progress by the members of International Relations Clubs in 65 high schools throughout the State of Oregon.

The league, now in its 16th consecutive year of operation, is a jointly sponsored endeavor of the University of Oregon's institute of international studies and oversea administration and the International Relations Committee of the Oregon Education Association.

Its principal purpose is to promote an active interest in international relations among high school students and to provide a framework within which these interested students can effectively broaden their understanding of the issues and problems of this field. Coordinators of the program are members of the Oregon Education Association-International Relations League executive committee, including Mr. Lawrence Page, chairman, Lebanon; Mr. Ray Conlon, Portland; Mr. Paul Davis, Dallas; Mr. Gareth Goddard, Portland; Mr. Clyde McLain, Philomath; Mr. Arthur Motz, Myrtle Point; Miss Lois Rice, Cottage Grove; Mrs. Betty Roberts, Portland; Miss Fern Trull, Grants Pass; Mr. Patrick Maney, Oregon Education Association consultant; Mr. Leroy Graymer, executive secretary; and Dr. Robert Loring Allen, University of Oregon consultant. Staff includes Mr. Robert L. Curry, Jr., graduate assistant, and Mrs. Thelma Aman, administrative assistant.

In 65 of the high schools throughout the State, organized International Relations Clubs participate in the league program and engage in a variety of activities designed to improve relations among the people in Oregon communities and those in foreign nations.

Each fall the Institute of International Studies prepares a "Study Guide" for the students on a topic of vital concern in the area of international affairs. For the 1962-63 school year, the study guide was titled, "Review of the Alliance for Progress." Dr. Paul S. Holbo, assistant professor of history at the University of Oregon, wrote "Latin America: Problems and Progress" as a background paper for this study guide. The paper provides a comprehensive background on the geographical, historical, social, political and economic factors that have current impact on developments in Latin America. It also gives a foundation for understanding United States-Latin American relations.

The guide also contains a list of study questions, an extensive bibliography of books and periodicals pertaining to the issues to be discussed, and as well, the format for the annual conference. The publication, printed by the Oregon Education Association, was sent with other materials to each International Relations Club in the State, and some clubs in southwest Washington. Schools in which no clubs have yet been organized also received a copy. Other materials sent included copies of the Charter of Punta del Este which also contained discussion on the specific provisions in the Charter, studies which had been prepared for congressional committees dealing with questions pertinent to the Alliance, and several other valuable materials published by the Pan American Union.

The conference held during February or March each year provides an opportunity for some members of each club to participate in a program of discussion sessions and to hear prominent speakers who have special competence in the topic under discussion. Topics for these conferences in past years have included such issues as "Disarmament, the United Nations, and Problems of Emerging Countries."

The 1963 conference was patterned after a special meeting of the Inter-American Economic and Social Council at the ministerial level. It was at such a meeting in August 1961, that the Charter of Punta del Este was signed giving approval to the "Alianza Para el Progreso." Since each year a meeting of this body is held for the purpose of reviewing the progress made under the Alliance, a model of these meetings provides an excellent format for the international relations league program. Five hundred high school students and 75 teachers participated in this conference.

Schools gathering at this year's conference represented 20 member countries of the

Alliance plus a delegation speaking in behalf of Cuba. Country assignments were made early in the school year to allow the several schools representing a single country to meet for caucus meetings. Assignments were made as follows:

Argentina: Centennial (Gresham), Gresham, Reynolds (Troutdale).
Bolivia: Benson (Portland), Grant (Portland).
Brazil: Ashland Crater (Central Point), Medford.
Chile: Marshall (Portland).
Colombia: Hudson's Bay (Vancouver), Providence Academy (Vancouver).
Costa Rica: Forest Grove, Sherwood.
Cuba: Cleveland (Portland), Lincoln (Portland).
Dominican Republic: Franklin (Portland), Roosevelt (Portland), St. Mary's Academy (Portland).
Educador: Albany, Corvallis, Lebanon, Central (Independence).
Guatemala: McMinnville, West Linn.
Haiti: Douglas (Winston), Powers, Roseburg.
Honduras: North Salem, South Salem.
Mexico: Grants Pass, Riddle.
Nicaragua: Dallas, Stayton.
Panama: Clackamas (Milwaukie), Lake Oswego.
Paraguay: Marshfield (Coos Bay), Myrtle Point, North Bend.
Peru: Bend, Klamath Falls, Lakeview.
El Salvador: Astoria, Scappoose, St. Helens.
United States: North Eugene, South Eugene.
Uruguay: Cottage Grove, Springfield.
Venezuela: Beaverton, Woodrow Wilson (Portland), Tigard.

In addition, Sunset High School of Beaverton, Estacada High School, and The Dalles High School attended the conference as observers since their clubs were newly formed this year. The conference deviated from the actual Inter-American Economic and Social Council meeting in that a delegation representing Cuba was allowed to attend the conference. Those students representing Cuba helped to give voice to some inescapable forces operating in the Latin American scene. However, they were not allowed to vote in any proceedings at the meetings.

Committees of the Inter-American Economic and Social Council meeting at the conference represented a breakdown of the principal programs proposed by the Alliance for Progress. Every country had at least one representative on each committee and each of the committees was chaired by a high school student. Committee chairmen included:

Agrarian reform: Steve Talbot, Beaverton; Randy Grant, Grant (Portland).
Industrial development: Carrlie L. Walters, North Salem; Larry Gordon, Cleveland (Portland).
National development plan: Ken Birrell, South Salem; John Collins, North Eugene.
Fiscal and monetary reform: Ashro Wilson, Lincoln (Portland); Doug Dralle, Cottage Grove.
Social improvement: Larry Sutton, Lebanon; Janet Mathieson, St. Francis (Eugene).
Trade and commodity policy: Dick Solomon, Lincoln (Portland); Jim Sterling, Dallas.
Economic integration: Lisa Nickerson, South Eugene; Jenny Lou Thompson, Crater.
External assistance: Karen Krebs, Grants Pass; Bill Meyer, Tigard.

Graduate students from the university sat in on the committee meetings to serve as resource people and to help in the formulation of resolutions. Serving as resource aids at the meetings were Robert Arellanes, Tony Ternent, Dave Bradwell, Al Gutowsky, Al Wheeler, Al Escobar, Bill Kerby, Cal DePass, and Jim Zinser, all of the economics department; Ron Sheck and Bill Hanneson, geography; Jim Hutter, Bryan Downes, and Jim Molineu, political science; Winston Cox, history; and Lee Donnell, international studies.

Each committee discussed a list of proposed resolutions. Two examples of the types of resolutions considered are—

1. Whereas agrarian reform will result in new landowners who probably will not be well informed on agricultural techniques and who will need expert advice.

Recommends to the governments of the member states the following alternative recommendations: (a) to seek basic technical knowledge from experts from the more economically advanced societies as a basic course of action, or (b) to concentrate on developing agricultural colleges in each member state, thereby developing its own agricultural experts.

A resolution discussed by committees on national development planning was—

2. Whereas many countries in Latin America do not have a trained and efficient civil service; and

Whereas this seriously handicaps the functioning of developmental planning and administration, as well as increasing the cost of government.

Recommends that Alliance for Progress funds be withheld from those countries where the above applies until plans have been submitted to establish a civil service based on merit.

(A list of resolutions considered at committee sessions is included at the end of this article.)

Those resolutions passing in the committees were then referred to plenary sessions. Individual committees designated two delegates to present each proposed resolution in the plenary sessions—one speaking for, and one against the resolution. (A list of the resolutions referred from the committees to the plenary sessions is also included at the end of this article.)

This year's conference was highlighted by two internationally known speakers. Senator Wayne Morse, chairman of the Subcommittee on Latin American Affairs, addressed the entire conference at the opening session, citing the implications of the Alliance for Progress for the future of United States-Latin American relations. Dr. William Sanders, Assistant Secretary General of the Organization of American States, spoke the following day on the complexities of the Alliance and the functions performed by various organs of the Pan American Union in programs to implement the Alliance.

Dr. Val Lorwin, professor of history at the university, spoke on the issue of Western European unity at the luncheon held for club advisers. Speaker at the Friday banquet was Dr. Robert Loring Allen, associate professor in the Department of Economics at the University, who addressed his remarks to the "Enemies of Mankind: Fear, Ignorance, and Poverty."

In addition to the students' activities directly related with the Alliance, delegates elected officers for the coming year. Angus Duncan, Medford, received the president's gavel from outgoing President John Brown, Riddle. The vice presidency went to Jim Mater, Corvallis, who suceeded Bob Gaskell, also of Corvallis. Kathy Hughes, South Eugene, turned her record book over to newly elected Secretary Carol Page, Lebanon. Taking over Emily Evans', of Cleveland, duties as historian was Cathy Candland, Bend.

Twenty-seven American field service exchange students attended the conference. These students, their native countries, and the schools they are now attending are listed below:

Henry Mannuchi, Argentina, Albany.
Ali Saner, Turkey, Ashland.
Gonul Akagunduz, Turkey, Astoria.
Ersin Meric, Turkey, Benson.
Francisco Pinto, Brazil, Centennial.
Yoshiko Akahori, Japan, Cleveland.
Ilker Atsuyak, Turkey, Cottage Grove.
Alicia de los Santos, Argentina, Grants Pass.
Enrico Demola, Italy, Gresham.
Dagmar Henry, West Germany, Klamath Falls.
Kathren Koini, Greece, Lake Oswego.
Sami Guren, Turkey, Lebanon.
Luis Simmonds Matamala, Chile, Lincoln.
Azizah Yahya, Malaya, Medford.
Handewatini Nogoesman, Indonesia, North Bend.
Jose Rafael Gitirrez, Colombia, North Eugene.
Lisette Juarez, Guatemala, Providence Academy.
Lena Erickson, Sweden, St. Helens.
Michele Farish, South Africa, Scappoose.
Jolena Moneleoni, Italy, Sherwood.
Yolanda Arrata, Ecuador, South Eugene.
Bjorn Person, Sweden, South Salem.
Grace LaMonica, Italy, Stayton.
Ilona Pollhammer, Austria, Tigard.
Mette Schwartz, Denmark, Woodrow Wilson.
Louise Costille, Chile, Roseburg.
Ina Boeij, Netherlands, Florence.

At the conclusion of each year's conference, awards are made to the three schools judged to have the most outstanding international relations programs. The winners are selected from among those clubs demonstrating the most rigorous participation in the year-long study program and the annual conference. Clubs are also judged on the basis of contribution to improved understanding and relations between their own communities and those in other countries.

RESOLUTIONS CONSIDERED AT THE 1963 MODEL INTER-AMERICAN ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL

Resolutions considered in committees reflect the thoroughness with which the delegates at the International Relations League Conference studied Latin American problems.

Resolutions presented to the committees on agrarian reform

1. Whereas the ownership of agricultural land is unevenly distributed in many areas of Latin America, many large land holdings are inefficiently managed.

Recommends that in view of this inequity and inefficiency, Latin American governments undertake a program of redistributing land ownership in smaller units to more people.

2. Whereas there is a pressing problem in food production and food distribution in Latin America, and any steps toward agrarian reform must take into account the possible effects on food production.

Recommends that any land reform take in account the possible economic benefits from the large-scale agricultural units so far as they can raise more capital, employ more machinery, and use better skills, thus resulting in a larger food supply than with many smaller units.

3. Whereas new landowners will need credit to finance their new undertaking, and up to the present, such credit to small farmers has been meager and inadequate.

Recommends to member governments, that banking and credit systems be revised to the extent that any bank director, who has an economic interest in any large-scale agricultural unit, be requested to act in accordance with the farmer and not himself.

4. Whereas few new landowners can afford agricultural equipment needed for efficient production of foodstuffs.

Recommends that Latin American governments make such equipment available to farmers on a communal basis; that is, the sharing of equipment which is public property.

5. Whereas only a small proportion of arable land is in use; and

Whereas Latin America needs the food production to conserve foreign exchange.

Recommends that some segments of the agricultural population be subsidized to effectuate resettlement.

Industrial development committees resolutions considered

1. Whereas many industries such as transportation, communication, banking, housing, et cetera, call for public industrial development.

Recommends to urge the governments of the member states to establish governmental agencies to either administer and control several of these functions, or to stimulate private activity in these fields through subsidies, land grants, and other incentives.

2. Whereas extensive capital investment is needed to promote basic industrial development in most Latin American countries, without initial impetus from foreign sources, further capital accumulation and investment will not be forthcoming.

Recommends that foreign capital investments be encouraged in Latin American countries through the policies of the domestic governments involved. Tax exemptions for foreign investors would be an example of such a policy.

3. Whereas capital-goods industries are the most important long range means for the economic development of a country.

Recommends that such industries be guided by governmental economic planning until the time when the economy is so developed that the economic decisions involved in the production of capital goods can be made in a free market. Private enterprise should be encouraged in certain sectors of the economy; however, some regulation should be implemented to assure rational economic development.

4. Whereas the resources possessed by each country in Latin America are less than those needed to satisfy all the economic needs of the peoples of each country.

Recommends (a) that through the complete and free exercise of private initiative, unrestricted by government activity, the most rational use of such resources will come about. (b) In view of this, governments should not involve themselves in industrial development, but should limit their activities to protect free enterprise and private property rights.

Resolutions in the field of national development planning

1. Whereas development planning is a complex task for which few Latin Americans are prepared and no facilities are available in these countries for specialized training.

Recommends that funds be provided by the United States for training in development planning.

2. Whereas the majority of foreign investment in Latin America has been in extractive industries.

Recommends (a) that governments of individual Latin American countries study the success of the Venezuelan experience and/or (b) that more native personnel be recruited for engineering and executive positions, and that at such point when a cadre of native personnel exist capable of operating the concern, local ownership be allowed to increase.

3. Whereas the issues involved in coordinating the development of the industrial and agricultural potential of a country are very complex and the political pressures upon the government are very great whenever a system of priorities for development is devised.

Recommends that each nation establish a national planning commission responsible to the chief executive and isolated from the legislative body.

4. Whereas statistical data concerning the population, resources, and economy in general are vital to development planning.

Recommends that each of the Latin American countries establish government bureaus for gathering the census and other necessary data.

Fiscal and monetary reform resolutions

1. Whereas tax laws exempt many institutions and individuals with considerable wealth, tax collections in many member countries are impeded by tax loopholes, evasion and tax dodging.

Recommends (a) that sweeping tax reforms be instituted where necessary; (b) that, through such reform, tax laws will not be made by a legislative body controlled by, or subject to the influence of large economic units which benefit from a lax tax collection system.

2. Whereas the major portion of government revenues is collected from taxes on consumption, (e.g. sales tax); and,

Whereas these taxes are regressive.

Recommends to the member governments, that a progressive income tax, supplemented by a business property tax be created and strictly enforced in order to secure the needed tax revenues.

3. Whereas those individuals in member countries who accrue income often invest their income in industrialized countries or deposit their earnings in the banking system of such developed countries, causing a drain on the capital available to the domestic economy.

Recommends (a) that Latin American countries impose high taxes on interest and dividends earned from foreign investments; (b) that governments of member countries pressure investors to invest their earnings in domestic industries.

4. Whereas chronic inflation in several member countries discourages investment (domestic and foreign).

Recommends (a) that an austerity program be adopted in order to arrest the inflation; (b) that the austerity program include price controls on basic essential commodities, wage controls, and control of foreign exchange for those engaged in international trade.

Discussion on social improvement

1. Whereas there is widespread illiteracy in Latin America; and,

Whereas a requisite of economic development is the attainment of a certain level of education.

Recommends (a) that initially, education be given a high priority by all republics having more than 50 percent illiterate population; (b) that personnel be recruited from developed areas to teach in Latin American schools; (c) that a program designed to wipe out illiteracy from the southern hemisphere in 5 years be developed.

2. Whereas education is a powerful means of transmitting the goals of the government.

Recommends that all education be placed under the direction of the state.

3. Whereas scientific and technical training is lacking in Latin America, and,

Whereas the process of development will demand greater amounts of individuals with this type of training.

Recommends that institutes for training said personnel be established in Argentina, Costa Rica, Honduras, Peru, and Venezuela.

4. Whereas the population in Latin America is growing at a rate close to 3 percent; and,

Whereas these countries are not self-sufficient in food production.

Recommends that governments should place high priority on regulating population growth by means amenable to their traditional, cultural and religious values.

Committees on trade and commodity policy

1. Whereas the Common Market is establishing uniformly higher tariffs on goods produced by other than its own members.

Recommends that OAS form a commission to bargain collectively with the Common Market for a favorable trade arrangement on commodities produced in Latin American countries.

2. Whereas the prices of basic commodities such as those produced by member countries tend to fluctuate greatly.

Recommends (a) that the industrialized countries maintain stable import prices on goods produced in Latin American countries; (b) that the industrialized countries maintain an adequate market for the goods of member countries; (c) that an Inter-American board be established to establish recommended production quotas and minimum prices on export commodities.

3. Whereas many member countries are to a great degree dependent on foreign sale of one basic commodity which may be subject to violent fluctuation in price and quantity demanded.

Recommends (a) to the governments of member countries, that incentives to develop other sectors of the economy which might prove successful in world trade; (b) such incentives might include subsidies or tax concessions.

4. Whereas most of the foreign exchange earned by Latin American republics comes from the sale of a single crop.

Recommends that the United States reduce the tariffs on manufactured goods so that Latin American producers of these goods may find markets outside their domestic markets which are needed for efficient operation of manufacturing in Latin America.

Resolutions presented to Committee on Economic Integration

1. Whereas Central American nations have taken the initiative in attempting to integrate their economies; and

Whereas this will tend to make the allocation of resources more efficient in this region; and

Whereas transportation is a problem for these countries.

Recommends that the Inter-American Development Bank give top priority to intercountry roads as against intra-country; and further,

Recommends that goods moving over these roads be duty-free.

2. Whereas 80 percent of the foreign exchange earned by Central American nations comes from the export of two crops (coffee and bananas); and

Whereas these crops are susceptible to wide price variation.

Recommends that efforts for diversification be encouraged and financially supported with funds from the Alliance, irrespective of efficiency considerations.

3. Whereas the existing Latin American Free Trade Area is limited to only a small number of the nations in the area, animosity may develop between members and nonmembers which could further hamper the interregional economic development.

Recommends that all members of the Organization of American States participate in a conference for the purpose of revising the Treaty of Montevideo to bring about a free trade zone for the entire Latin American area.

Resolutions considered by committees on external assistance

1. Whereas external assistance for the purpose of developing the economies of Latin American countries will inevitably bring with it some form of external control, and no amount of foreign aid will prove adequate to sustain long-range development plans.

Recommends that the members of the Organization of American States establish conformable tax expenditures and monetary policies toward the end of increasing the amount of public and private capital sources from within their own countries, and that these countries consult the International Monetary Fund for recommendations on these procedures.

2. Whereas foreign aid that is predicated upon fulfilling certain contingencies set by an external power is a violation of the autonomy of a sovereign nation.

Recommends that all members of the Alliance for Progress set up a board of experts made up entirely of their own citizens, to draw up reform recommendations considered appropriate for each individual nation, and that nations providing the assistance accept these recomemndations as adequate contingencies for granting aid.

3. Whereas several member countries are in great need of external assistance from the more developed countries; and

Whereas such assistance may be in the nature of a public grant or loan, or private funds.

Recommends that member country governments encourage private foreign investment through the enactment of legislation protecting such investment from nationalization.

Sixteen resolutions were referred from committees for consideration in the plenary sessions.

Resolutions referred from agrarian reform committees:

1. Whereas the ownership of agricultural land is unevenly distributed in many areas of Latin America, and many large land holdings are inefficiently managed.

Recommends that in view of this inequity and inefficiency, Latin American governments undertake a program of redistributing land ownership in smaller units to more people with consideration for efficiency and adequate compensation for landholders.

2. Whereas few new landowners can afford agricultural equipment needed for efficient production of foodstuffs.

Recommends that Latin American governments make such equipment available to farmers on a communal basis; that is, the sharing of equipment which is public property. The necessary funds shall be made available by the Organization of American States.

Industrial development committees resolutions referred

1. Whereas extensive capital investment is needed to promote basic industrial development in most Latin American countries, without initial impetus from foreign sources, further capital accumulation and investment will not be forthcoming.

Recommends that foreign capital investments be encouraged in Latin American countries through the policies of the domestic governments involved. Tax exemptions for foreign investors would be an example of such a policy.

2. Whereas in the modern world, economic advancement is generally synonymous with industrialization;

Whereas the Latin American countries for the most part have sufficient resources to establish basic capital goods industries; and

Whereas the establishment of organizations such as the Latin American Free Trade Area and the Central American trade group has attempted to assure even the smallest countries of adequate markets for basic capital goods.

Recommends that the natural resources of the countries be utilized as much as possible to establish capital goods industries, that the establishment of these industries be limited exclusively to private or public enterprises of the native countries, and that notwithstanding the above, aid be accepted, regardless of political ideology, from any country wishing to help in the establishment of these industries.

ADDRESS BY MAYOR WAGNER, OF NEW YORK, AT MEETING OF FEDERATION OF PROTESTANT WELFARE AGENCIES

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the address delivered by Mayor Robert F. Wagner, of New York, at the annual meeting of the Federation of Protestant Welfare Agencies, in New York City, on February 26.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS BY MAYOR ROBERT F. WAGNER AT ANNUAL MEETING FEDERATION OF PROTESTANT WELFARE AGENCIES

I am glad to be at this gathering sponsored by the Federation of Protestant Social Welfare Agencies. I consider this organization to be one of the finest in the field. It is an outstanding illustration of what might be called—in sociological terminology—positive volunteerism; or to put it in plain English, it is a major social force doing many good works, supported by the concerted good will of a great number of private individuals acting through their voluntary organizations. This federation has consistently supported and encouraged the Government in the discharge of its responsibilities, without seeking to evade or unload any part of its own.

I salute the fine attitude of this organization. I have long known it, respected it and appreciated the good works it has performed and the leadership it has provided in the social work field. And not so incidentally, the praises of the federation are persistently sung to me by our eminent commissioner of welfare, Jim Dumpson.

It has been widely noted by foreign observers, beginning with the Frenchman, Alexis de Tocqueville, 125 years ago, that one of the peculiar things about Americans is—and always has been—their penchant for forming and joining voluntary organizations, clubs, lodges and associations, of every kind, to achieve their personal, social or political purposes. No question about it, we Americans are joiners by habit and inclination.

We Americans look to our voluntary organizations to do what needs to be done even before we look to government. And when we think of government, our first inclination is to depend on—and complain to—local government. This, too, is an American characteristic. It reflects our history.

It reflects our belief in democracy and, above all, our unlimited faith in our own powers.

In 1932, at practically the peak of the depression, with 16 million unemployed, all State and local governments in the entire Nation spent a combined total of $444 million on public welfare. Even that figure was three times the amount spent in 1927. But in 1960, State and local governments spent $4,250 million on public welfare—an increase of 1,000 percent over 1932.

Once upon a time, of course, private expenditures for public welfare—it was called philanthropy in those days—were much greater than public expenditures. Today, the balance has completely shifted. Thirty years ago, public welfare was conceived largely in terms of caring for the hungry, meeting the emergency needs of the jobless and the destitute, and providing a modicum of care for needy children, needy aged and the needy sick. In rough outline, that was about the size of it.

By today there has been an explosive expansion of services, along with an explosive change in our public welfare concepts. By now, public welfare has been institutionalized. The idea of it and the necessity of it have been generally agreed to. Indeed, the foundations and premises of public welfare are only rarely attacked. This is to the good—except for one thing. Some of these premises are not being as closely inspected by analytical and sympathetic minds as perhaps they should be.

In fact, the city's social and human problems are growing beneath our eyes and under our hands. Today, we are discovering that we have in our midst a group of people who might be called the permanently poor. It is an unpleasant fact, but it is a fact that we have third generation welfare families in New York City. Many of them are so psychologically disadvantaged, bruised, and frustrated by their attempts to climb the walls of the well, that they have resigned themselves to life at its bottom, as did their parents—and in some cases, their grandparents.

All 1-day-old babies in New York City theoretically have the same potential for fulfillment and happiness. Yet it is a sad fact that something immediately divides many of these children into pigeonholes marked "probable success" and "probable failure" before they finish grammar school. In the Bedford-Stuyvesant area, for example, we have found that some children are already two grades behind by the time they get to the fifth grade. And in seven of the city high schools with predominantly nonwhite student bodies, we have found that the percentage of dropouts by graduation time runs from 33 percent to 60 percent. That simply means that as many as three out of five entering students drop out before they get their high school diplomas.

As Dr. James B. Conant has pointed out, this is "social dynamite." But it is also economic disaster for New York City; here in this city, by the end of this decade, we foresee a 20-percent increase in professional and technical manpower needs, along with a 19-percent decrease in manual and unskilled jobs. We will need more skilled workers. More and more of the unskilled will fall into the pool of the jobless, the aimless, the hopeless.

We must do whatever we can, whatever is necessary, to end this perpetuation of poverty. And this is just one problem out of many that have become apparent in the light of 1963.

Of course, I could cite our Welfare Department statistics on intake and case load to show how many individuals are being handled, how many children, how many adults, how many aged. I could cite all the varied and comprehensive services we perform—from vocational retraining of the jobless to tenant training in public housing. I could also cite figures showing how many social workers, case workers, supervisors, homemakers, and inspectors we now have on the job.

Within the framework of present practices, procedures, methods, and concepts, we can and should congratulate ourselves and point with pride to the level of the services we provide for the needy, the disadvantaged, the young, the aged, the week, the helpless, and homeless, the maladjusted, and the unskilled.

But we also need to ask ourselves from time to time: Where are we going? What basic headway have we made against our problems? How much can social welfare contribute to a solution of these problems? What beneficial effects have our welfare programs had upon the social fabric of our community? While we are surely helping some individuals, what is happening to those who are not being helped? Are we strengthening the indigenous forces in the community? Are we raising or improving the level? Has our public welfare machinery retained the flexibility it needs? Is there not a tendency to become so involved with the internal problems of public welfare that our communications with the actual people involved have become somewhat strained?

I am aware that a Moreland Commission, a special high-level review commission established under the terms of the Moreland Act, has just completed a study of the administration of welfare in New York State. I am proud to say that New York City's administration of welfare has come off very well in this report. Our procedures for detecting and discouraging chiselers and cheaters were noted and commended. I am pleased and satisfied that this is so. There goes another exploded myth in the welfare field.

But neither this Moreland Commission report nor any other I have seen really asked the deep, fundamental and searching questions I am suggesting.

I have suggested questions, but I have not given the answers. I do not pretend to know the answers. That is the trouble. I don't think any of us really know the answers.

We do know that to resolve our present problems, we need many, many more social services than we now provide. We need a substantial number of new and major measures by the Federal and State governments—on the economic, educational, and social welfare fronts. Most of the needed measures are well known. All of them are controversial, too, to put it mildly. Yet somehow we must secure the consensus that is necessary to obtain their enactment.

As far as the capacity of our own city government to do much more than it is already doing, I must tell you frankly that we have reached a point where I must ask you, and we must all ask ourselves: where is the city government going to get the money to pay for the additional services that we need?

Today, it looks as though, for the next fiscal year, we will face a gap of more than $200 million between the revenues we can expect to receive and the expenditures we will be called upon to make. And this is a most conservative estimate. I don't yet have the final figures. We shall have to bridge this gap, because we are forbidden by our State constitution from operating at a deficit. The decision must be made whether to curtail our essential services or raise new revenues by local taxation. There is no other answer. Moreover, I must emphasize that our need for services will continue to expand in the years immediately ahead, while our present sources of revenue carry no such promise.

I do not say that our first object must be to reduce the money we spend on welfare, but we do need to determine whether the amount we now spend is being spent as effectively as possible, and whether we might not save some here and spend more there, and in so doing, make real headway against real problems.

For this reason, as well as many others, we must examine and reexamine our approach and commitments in the field of public welfare. In this process of examination and reexamination, I look to the private and voluntary agencies for help, counsel, and wisdom. I look to them to help supply the leadership. May the day never come when the leadership in social welfare is considered to be solely or even primarily in the hands of government.

Frequent reference is made to the partnership between public and voluntary agencies. I know that Commissioner Dumpson made a major address last year in support of such a relationship. I subscribe to that relationship, with all my heart. I go one step further. I say that whereas at one time there was a necessary shift of emphasis from voluntary agencies to public welfare agencies, today great and increasing emphasis must now be given to the role of the voluntary agencies. I hasten to add that I do not look to the voluntary agencies for significantly increased financial expenditures but rather to the greatly increased use of their human resources, of their experience.

I have said it before, and I say it again today, that we will need to draw more and more from the indigenous resources of the community and of the neighborhood, from its internal resources. The word is mobilization, and more and more there must be a recognition that the community must supply part of the manpower to meet the totality of community needs and services. There is not enough money in anybody's treasury to pay for all that we need.

We must learn how to mobilize both the active and latent forces within the various neighborhoods and communities. Public welfare must cease to be solely or even principally the concern of professional social workers. It must become everybody's business.

Our entire city must be brought to feel the sense of immediate relationship with and concern for the new elements recently added to our city. All who need help must be helped. And this includes those whose chief need is to be needed. Above all, we must reverse the process whereby, in recent years, urban living—which is supposed to be the height of civilized living—has been stripped, in many respects, of both its urbanity and humanity.

The spirit of the jungle, rather than of civilized society, has entered into the central core of the city. Different population groups regard each other often suspiciously, sometimes even fearfully across the wasteland of noncommunication and misunderstanding of each other's problems and capacities.

All this must be remedied. All this can be remedied. All this shall be remedied, if all of us will work together with good will, with dedication, and with a total absence of prejudice and preconception.

We have the will to succeed. We must succeed.

PENTAGON ACTIVITIES AND TFX HEARINGS

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, in view of the high public interest in the current hearings by the Senate Permanent Investigations Subcommittee into the award of the TFX fighter-bomber airplane contract, I wish to bring to attention as a matter of public record the statement of the ranking minority member of the subcommittee, the senior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. Mundt].

The Senator's statement was issued yesterday and deals with certain aspects of statements made to the committee by the Assistant Secretary of Defense, the Honorable Arthur Sylvester.

Mr. President, I request that the statement of the senior Senator from South Dakota be made a part of this Record, and also that his statement be followed by the appropriate portions of testimony delivered by Mr. Sylvester before the subcommittee.

There being no objection, the statement and excerpts were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Senator Mundt's Statement on Pentagon Activities and TFX Hearings

In view of the one-two punch which the Pentagon threw at our Senate Investigations Subcommittee over the weekend and the complete failure of Assistant Secretary of Defense Arthur Sylvester yesterday to support with any evidence whatsoever his charges or complaints, it seems to me a few observations may be in order from the position of the minority members of this committee.

Obviously neither the committee policies and procedures nor the objects of our investigation can be determined by a minority which is outnumbered precisely two to one on the committee and far more than that in staff selections. However, I want to make it emphatically clear that the minority is supporting this investigation 100 percent; that we have no complaints concerning the fairness and the objectivity of the investigation; that we deplore the in-fighting which has developed between the Democrats in charge of the Pentagon and those in charge of this investigation; and that we reaffirm our complete confidence in Chairman McClellan and our conviction that all members of this committee are conducting this investigation without any of the preconceived attitudes attributed to certain members by spokesmen for the Pentagon.

In fact, speaking as the ranking Republican member of the Committee, I think it is time the Pentagon began directing its time and its efforts to downgrading Castro, Cuba, and communism rather than to downgrading the committees on Capitol Hill.

The Secretary of Defense, Mr. McNamara, says the committee, by its investigation, is undermining the confidence of the people in the military. Nothing could be further from the fact—actually we have been inquiring into reasons why the civilian heads of the Pentagon have vetoed the decisions of the military and imposed their own contrary judgments over the performance and cost recommendations of the military. We still are unprepared to say who was right but it should be clear to all that it is not our committee which challenged the military judgments. Rather it was the civilian Pentagon leadership which rejected their unanimous decisions. Whether such action is likely to increase or undermine public confidence in our military leaders is not for me to say.

President Kennedy himself served as a member of our committee when we were investigating labor racketeering in America. His brother, the Attorney General, served as our chief counsel. Both of them should, therefore, share with me full confidence in the objectivity of Chairman McClellan and our committee procedures. Rather than remaining silent while the Pentagon guns are trained on Capitol Hill, I would suggest the President and the Attorney General reassure the Pentagon and the public that the McClellan committee operates on a "let the chips fall where they will" formula and that it is not comprised of members who employ their political or personal preferences in conducting an investigation. I suggest the White House utilize its influence to issue a "cease-fire order" on the innuendos, insinuations and insults emanating from the Pentagon. If they are designed as an attempt to destroy public confidence in the McClellan committee I am convinced they will fail.

Testimony of Arthur Sylvester, Assistant Secretary of Defense for Public Affairs

The Chairman. Mr. Sylvester, will you give us your name and your official position, please, sir.

Mr. Sylvester. Arthur Sylvester, Assistant Secretary of Defense for Public Affairs.

The Chairman. On yesterday, I received a letter from you. I present to you a copy of the letter and ask you to identify it, please, sir.

(Document handed to witness.)

Mr. Sylvester. Yes, Mr. Chairman, I wrote that letter.

The Chairman. Very well.

Let the letter be printed in the record at this point.

(The letter referred to follows:)

"March 11, 1963.

"Dear Mr. Chairman: I am sorry that recent comments by me in response to newsmen's questions concerning the TFX hearing have been interpreted to mean the Defense Department does not believe the committee is conducting a fair hearing.

"I am well aware of the committee's outstanding reputation for the way it conducts hearings and also your own reputation in this respect. As a reporter who has covered other hearings conducted by you, I have firsthand experience of the committee's method of operation. I have every expectation that the tradition of fairness the committee has established will prevail in the current hearing.

"What has concerned me is the fact that the hearings up to now have produced a fragmentary and confused report to the public. At times it appears the questioning has resulted in a one-sided view of the issues involved.

"Perhaps this is the inevitable result of closed-door proceedings with an attenuated transcript made available twice daily. I am sure when the committee has concluded its inquiry and all the facts are in, it will become clear on an objective basis that the right decision on the TFX contract was made.

"Sincerely,

"ARTHUR SYLVESTER."

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Secretary, that letter was written as a followup, I believe, to a press conference you had last Friday. Is that right?

Mr. SYLVESTER. We have every day at 12 o'clock, Senator, a briefing for newsmen, at which on certain occasions we have news to give out and on all occasions I submit myself for questions to the newsmen. There was such a meeting, as usual, on last Friday at 12 o'clock.

The CHAIRMAN. I hand you herewith what purports to be excerpts, at least, from that news conference, your briefing of the press on that day. I will ask you to examine it and state if you identify it as such.

(Document handed to the witness.)

Mr. SYLVESTER. Senator, I gave Mr. Adlerman my copy, and I think it was properly numbered. This runs 21, 22, 23, 24——

Mr. ADLERMAN. It has been hurriedly copied for the Senators.

Mr. SYLVESTER. This isn't it, sir.

Mr. ADLERMAN. He only brought one copy with him. We had asked that they bring several copies.

Mr. SYLVESTER. That is not the one, Senator. It has a page out.

The CHAIRMAN. I was mistaken.

Without objection, then, this one can be stricken from the record.

Mr. ADLERMAN. What happened was he brought one copy and I am trying to make copies for the Senators. This ties it up. The copy he brought we are making duplicates of. I had asked for sufficient copies to distribute to each of the Senators. I also asked for the tape recording, itself. Mr. Sylvester stated that the man who was handling it was ill and they will have it down later. However, I understand that the tape recording of the press conference is delivered to Mr. Alderson's company and a transcript is made directly from the tape recording.

The CHAIRMAN. The only purpose of it is to have it before us so we could predicate questions upon it and for the purpose of accuracy.

Mr. SYLVESTER. Mr. Chairman, a tape is made——

The CHAIRMAN. You have no other copy of it?

Mr. SYLVESTER. I have given my copy of the transcript to the counsel. A tape is made every day and that tape goes to the Alderson Reporting Co. They then make one transcript for us. The transcript that we get and that I turned over is the original and only one made by the company, not by us.

The CHAIRMAN. I am sure that is accurate.

Mr. SYLVESTER. The only thing I wanted it before us was for accuracy. But we will proceed.

Mr. ADLERMAN. Page 21 is missing here, but I think that one is complete.

Senator MUNDT. This one stops in the middle of the sentence.

Mr. ALDERMAN. Here is a copy. The only pages we are concerned with are from 20 to 26.

The CHAIRMAN. I present to you now, Mr. Secretary, what purports to be the copy that you turned over to the staff of your press conference last Friday. I will ask you to examine it and state if you identify it as such.

(Document handed to the witness.)

Mr. SYLVESTER. Yes, Mr. Chairman, all the pages are here. This is the transcript.

Senator MUNDT. How many pages are there altogether?

Mr. SYLVESTER. Senator, there are 28 pages.

Senator MUNDT. Then I have all but one page.

Mr. SYLVESTER. Of which only a few pages relate to this matter.

Senator MUNDT. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. Very well. This document may be made an exhibit, Exhibit No. 41, for reference, and the part of it on pages 21 through 27 that may be pertinent to the line of questions that will follow may be inserted in the record at this point.

(The press briefing referred to follows:)

"Mr. SYLVESTER. Well, I expect to have some. I would only say you are getting a lot of figures out of this committee after the fact. They have obtained figures which did bear and were not available at the time, and were not under consideration at the time. I think that will come out very clearly when both Mr. Zuckert, Mr. Korth, and Mr. McNamara testify. And as I read the testimony, it sounds to me as if I were reading the counsel for Boeing.

"Question. Could we get any of these figures that are correct?

"Mr. SYLVESTER. What figures did you have in mind?

"Question. Well, specifically——

"Mr. SYLVESTER. I hope to have lots of figures.

"Question. For instance, nothing has ever been clearly stated by the Defense Department as to the comparative costs of the bid figures of the two companies. We have never seen what the Boeing figure was or what the General Dynamics figure is.

"Mr. SYLVESTER. Well, from what I see coming out of the committee, the Boeing figures vary.

"Question. It was released out of the committee, a whole table, which was read into the record.

"Question. This happens to be the Defense Department which let the contract. I have not seen any figure come from the Defense Department. What I am asking you——

"Mr. SYLVESTER. Well, you haven't seen any witness from the Defense Department at the top level.

"Question. Well, I am asking whether we can get those figures or not. I haven't seen the——

"Mr. SYLVESTER. I will be glad to let you see them when we are going to release them.

"Question. And I am also interested in some of the performance characteristics of the several competing versions which we haven't seen, and which I understand——

"Mr SYLVESTER. Now, wait a second. We are not quite sure what you mean by several competing versions.

"Question. Well, there are two versions.

"Mr. SYLVESTER. In the final selection, there are two versions, the Boeing version and the General Dynamics. Now, what are you interested in? I will try and get it for you. What are you interested in?

"Question. In the final performance characteristics estimated for the——

Mr. SYLVESTER. You mean the final, the fourth and final evaluation?

"Question. Right. This would be helpful.

"Question. Art, did I understand you correctly to say that there are figures being made available to the committee that were not available to Mr. Zuckert?

"Mr. SYLVESTER. There are recomputations being made, where the committee has gone out and gotten recomputations of its own, which did not figure at all in the decision.

"Question. From Boeing?

"Mr. SYLVESTER. I don't know where the committee got them other than what I can read in the transcript.

"Question. Apparently the committee investigators had gone out——

"Mr. SYLVESTER. Mr. Gillet, one of the committee investigators, was the expert witness yesterday in the figures.

"Question. But there is certain data there in the committee's records which is clear that Mr. McNamara, Mr. Zuckert, and Mr. Korth had not seen before.

"Mr. SYLVESTER. I am talking about figures that have been introduced by the committee which they have gone out and gotten, the figures have been recomputed, both in the service and apparently by the company. I don't even know what I can read——

"Question. To follow up on Lloyd's question, is there any plan here to release any data from here, or information, in advance of Mr. Zuckert's or Mr. McNamara's or Mr. Korth's testimony?

"Mr. SYLVESTER. Yes, I have some plans.

"Question. Is this in advance of their testimony?

"Mr. SYLVESTER. I hope so.

"Question. Arthur, are you saying here on these figures being released after the fact, and so forth, are you indicating that perhaps there was some dirty work afoot, that these figures might have been known at the time, but somebody deliberately withheld them, or——

"Mr. SYLVESTER. I am not saying anything. I am just trying to state what is in the transcript and is the fact.

"Question. Are these figures accurate?

"Mr. SYLVESTER. I don't know. I am not an expert in the figures. I doubt that the committee investigators are, either.

"Question. Art, could you also as part of this problem discuss the question of whether the raw scores, whatever they were, which were cited in the memorandum issued last Saturday for release on Sunday night at 6:30, whether the raw score is a proper basis for comparison?

"Mr. SYLVESTER. I don't know what you mean by raw score, and I am certainly not going to make a statement off the top of my head here without having the figures before me, and I am not an expert in the figures.

"Question. Well, the term was used in your memo.

"Well, on what basis was the raw score computed? Can't we know that? I mean you are trying to prove something by this release, but you don't tell us what the raw score is. We want to know.

"Mr. SYLVESTER. It isn't that I don't tell you. It is because I do not have here in front of me the raw scores and I am not qualified, nor is anybody in this room qualified, to go into the question of raw scores at this time. The record will show in due time, and I trust it will show before that, if there is any question about raw scores. Obviously, by the very character of the words 'raw scores,' you are dealing with something that depends on what point of view you approach it.

"Question. Or who made the ground rules for the scoring, yes.

"Mr. SYLVESTER. Well, there were 220-some officers involved in the evaluation. Not all of them were unanimous. Neither were the two services unanimous. So this isn't quite as simple as it appears. And obviously you will hardly get a judicial rendering by a committee in which there are various Senators with State self-interest in where the contract goes. So far there is only one Senator I have seen on the committee, Senator MUSKIE, who hasn't got an interest in it.

"Question. Do you have any rough feel for when you might be able to turn some of this stuff loose?

"Mr. Sylvester. Sooner rather than later.

"Question. Like the latter part of next week?

"Mr. Sylvester. Oh, no, I won't be waiting that long. I hope to very shortly.

"Question. Saturday?

"Mr. Sylvester. It just depends on how fast I can digest and get my hands on this. News is what we are interested in. We don't want it managed. All right, we will manage to hold it until Monday.

"Question. On the National Guardsmen, can we put in a query concerning the other 47 states that haven't been considered?

"Mr. Sylvester. I can tell you right now that there were no members of the National Guard, and you can go down the list. in the operation.

"Question. In or out of uniform?

"Mr. Sylvester. In or out of uniform, on or off duty.

"Question. There must be something here. Say that again, Arthur. There must be something in the wording.

"Mr. Sylvester. I am not being subtle in any sense of the word. I am just saying that there were no members of the National Guard, and you can go down the list.

"Question. Who took part in any phase of the Bay of Pigs operation. Is that what you are saying?

"Mr. Sylvester. I didn't say that.

"Question. There is the key word, combat.

"Mr. Sylvester. Well, it was a combat, wasn't it? It was a combat and I am talking——

"Question. There was a training period before that.

"Mr. Sylvester. I don't know anything about the training period. I am talking about the combat operation. You asked me if there were any National Guardsmen, and I am saying that outside of the State of Alabama, and I am—you can look at the records of the four fellows. Whether they were in the National Guard or not, I don't know, but you can look and see. But I know as to the others there were none who took part in the combat operation.

"Question. Other than those four, then, you are categorically denying anything elese.

"Mr Sylvester. Yes.

"Question. Well, how far does the combat zone extend?

"Mr. Sylvester. I am talking about flying operations.

"Question. Seriously.

"Mr. Sylvester. I am very serious.

"Question. These Alabama fellows were not actually in the combat zone. They were not getting shot at. They crashed apparently for other reasons. And I think it has been said in any event, there was no American air cover in the combat zone.

"Mr. Sylvester. As I understand the question that is being asked, the first thing I responded to was Governor Faubus' statement that there were members of the Arkansas National Guard who flew combat operation. The answer to that is there were none."

The Chairman. That was not presented to the staff until this morning, was it?

Mr. Sylvester. I brought it up with me this morning.

The Chairman. Just this morning.

Mr. Sylvester. That is correct.

The Chairman. I am trying to find the pertinent part of it.

Mr. Sylvester. I think it begins on 20 or 21 at the bottom of the page.

The Chairman. Mr. Secretary, I find on page 25 a question and answer as follows:

"Question. Or who made the ground rules for the scoring. Yes.

"Mr. Sylvester. Well, there were 220-some officers involved in the evaluation. Not all of them were unanimous. Neither were the two services unanimous. So this isn't quite as simple as it appears."

I call your specific attention to the following sentence:

"And obviously you will hardly get a judicial rendering by a committee in which there are various Senators with State self-interest in where the contract goes. So far there is only one Senator I have seen on the committee, Senator Muskie, who hasn't got an interest in it."

Mr. Secretary, I wanted to ask you about that. I am not at all disturbed about your statement that: "Obviously you will hardly get a judicial rendering by a committee." I am not concerned with that part of the statement.

But I would like primarily to know—well, I say I am not concerned about, I mean you are entitled to have any opinion like that that you may wish to retain. You have written a letter saying that you were sorry, that it may have been misinterpreted. But you do say that, "A number of the various Senators have a State self-interest in where the contract goes."

I wanted, in view of that having been published, to ascertain if Arkansas does have any such interest, because if it has, I do not know about it, and if it doesn't have, I want the record corrected.

I don't want that in the record, that I might be influenced in my rendering a decision by the fact that my State has some interest as a State in where the contract goes. If Arkansas has such interest, I want the record to reflect it. If it doesn't have such interest of a nature where such motives could be ascribed to me from that standpoint, I would like the record to show that.

So, if you will, just tell us what you had in mind with respect to Arkansas in making that statement.

Mr. Sylvester. Mr. Chairman, you will notice in the transcript I made no reference to any Senator, his fairness, no discussion of fairness, there isn't any word about anybody's being fair or unfair. I did state what seemed to be a fact, that this is not a court of law, nor is any other senatorial hearing. It is a very important function of our Government and does very fine work. That was the point I was making, and that was what I was really addressing my letter to you about. But there seemed to be a confusion in some of the reports about this distinction between a court of law which renders or gives a traditional rendering and an important committee which has a Senate inquiry, there is a real distinction.

I made no reference whatsoever to any Senator's fairness or any suggestion about it. I think it is on the record that there are some Senators who have natural and correct interest in the contract going to their State. If I were a Senator, I would be out struggling as hard as I could for my State. And I would not expect, if I were on a committee, to change my view since I already believed in my case. That is what I was talking about. I know of no interest that the State of Arkansas has in it.

(Senator Jackson and Senator Symington entered the room.)

The Chairman. Sir?

Mr. Sylvester. I know of no interest that the State of Arkansas has in it.

The Chairman. That is all I am interested in. Your view as to whether there would be a judicious rendering of opinion by the committee is not of any great concern to me. I would be concerned if you felt that the committee would be motivated by anything other than proper considerations, but the thing is, I want the record clear as to Arkansas. If there is anything or any contract or anything that Arkansas, as far as you know, would be calculated or expected to receive as any benefit from the contract going to either Boeing or General Dynamics, I would like to have it placed on the record.

Mr. Sylvester. I don't know that there are any subcontracts in the State of Arkansas, and I know the main contract is not.

The Chairman. Then would you include in your statement when you say, "So far there is only one Senator I have seen on the committee, Senator Muskie, who has not got an interest in it." Would you include any other Senators on the committee, or would you exclude all of the others except Senator Muskie?

Mr. Sylvester. I think that I said so far from a truncated transcript what is going on, and I have not made a critical analysis of the transcript. I read it as quickly as possible to see the sort of questions the newsmen are going to come to us with, and I simply meant from what I read in the transcript up to that time, which was last Friday, that Senator Muskie's questioning, and I don't know anything more about it than what I read, his questioning seemed to me to be in an effort to keep the thing, so far as the Defense Department was concerned, in a larger frame of reference than some of the other questions seemed to be. This is an impression I have. This is only an impression.

The Chairman. All I want to do is to get the record straight. You say Arkansas, so far as you know, has no interest in the contract either way. Insofar as it is getting any subcontracts or furnishing any materials or anything. So far as you know, it has no connection with either contractor?

Mr. Sylvester. No, sir. As a matter of fact——

The Chairman. Either Boeing or General Dynamics.

Mr. Sylvester. Mr. Chairman, in the first book of testimony I looked at page 86. You yourself qualified some of the questioning by the counsel, as I read the testimony quickly, seeming to get some factors in which gave a more balanced approach than the questioning at that point seemed to indicate. So I would certainly include you in that.

The Chairman. Well, would you not agree that one reading a press report of your comments at this press conference, if one read, "And obviously you will hardly get a judicial rendering by a committee in which there are various Senators with State self-interest in where the contract goes," and then read further, "So far there is only one Senator I have seen on the committee, Senator Muskie, who hasn't got an interest in it"—wouldn't that imply to you that the person making such a statement to convey the impression that all of the other Senators except Senator Muskie, did have such a State interest in it?

Mr. Sylvester. No, it would not, because I would not put any such version on it, Mr. Chairman.

The Chairman. It is hard for me to see how any other interpretation could be given it. I want you to understand, I am not sensitive. I simply want to clear up the record so far as Arkansas is concerned. I did not know of any interest it had in it, and I wanted the record to be clear as to that.

As to any further implication in it, if such is interpreted and read out of it, I am not particularly concerned.

All right, are there any other questions?

Senator Mundt. Mr. Chairman, I would like to relay the same question to Mr. Sylvester. On this basis, it isn't so much what interpretation you place on the language, "Obviously you hardly get a judicial rendering by a committee in which there are various Senators with State self-interest in where the contract goes. So far there is only one Senator I have seen on the committee, Senator Muskie, who has not got any interest in it."

It isn't so much your interpretation of that, our ours, but the fact that the press generally has certainly interpreted it as meaning that you felt that only Senator MUSKIE came from a State which did not have an interest in it.

So I wanted to direct the same question to you, first of all, concerning South Dakota. Have you any good news or anything about any of these contracts that might involve South Dakota?

Mr. SYLVESTER. I am hopeful I will have for you, Senator, but I can't hold out anything more than that. I have no evidence.

Senator MUNDT. I don't know of any subcontractor, and I don't know of any major contractor in the State which has any remote interest in the TFX, and I was shocked when I found that I was included among those who came from States which did have a self-interest. If you have got some secret information, don't withhold it, and I would like to know what it is.

Mr. SYLVESTER. Unfortunately I am not an expert in this field, Senator. I would only read to you the sort of thing that is disturbing. For instance, in the Chicago Daily News on the 4th of March, Mr. Jim McCartney, whom I know, wrote as follows, and this is the thing that disturbs me and has disturbed me. He writes as follows:

"Senate investigators have come to the conclusion"—that means that they have made up their minds in this, a judgment has been made—"that the Defense Department signed a $6.5 billion fighter plane contract for a second-rate airplane. They believe the plane that was rejected by Defense Secretary Robert McNamara in a 'highly unusual' bidding procedure, is better than the plane that McNamara purchased."

Now, this to my mind is the important part:

"As one investigator put it"—and this is a quotation—"If the Russians could build the plane that was rejected, they could shoot down the fleet of planes that the United States is planning to build."

This is attributed to an investigator of this committee.

Now, you read this, and you read the beginning, a conclusion has already been made, and it certainly leaves me with questions in my mind. And, Mr. Chairman, the United Press in what they said was an interview with you, quoted you as saying, "poor judgment had been used," in a quotation, and the case is hardly in.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Sylvester, may I say to you, if there was not a question raised as to poor judgment, inefficiency, extravagance, or some other question before us, if that were not true, we would not be investigating. These questions are raised somewhat like a complaint in court. You file these or charges are made, or there is information that indicates this may have happened or may not have happened, and the purpose of an inquiry is to ascertain. I have never said positively. I don't know yet. I am trying to reserve a decision until we get all of the evidence. Some evidence so far indicates poor judgment has been used, and if we stopped with the evidence as of now, I would so conclude. But we are in a hearing, and we can't put on all of the evidence in one day. We have to take it as we can and then weigh it all at the end.

I have entered into hearings where I may have been under an impression, not an irrevocable conclusion, but under an impression that possibly this is the situation or that is the situation, and after hearing all of the testimony I may have changed my mind about it. I got the full information. That is the purpose of this. I want to say to you, and I say it for the record, and I say it for the entire Pentagon and everybody else in it, I have no desire on earth to do anything here except get the facts. Over and over again I have said here in this committee, with the representative of the Defense Department present, if there are any figures, or if there are any documents, or if there is any evidence that you have that will throw light on this, that the committee does not have, and particularly any that sustains the actions taken by the Defense Department in this matter, we want to get it in the record. I can't get it all in in one day.

Mr. SYLVESTER. No, Mr. Chairman, I have covered your hearings, and I know your fairness, and it was hard for me to believe that UP story, because it did not sound like you.

The CHAIRMAN. The papers don't always quote us accurately, and they don't always put the qualification that we may express at the time.

Mr. SYLVESTER. It does not sound like you.

The CHAIRMAN. I don't remember that particular incident, but whatever I said, I meant it at the time in the context that I have given you. I am sure you know that.

Now, you have here, we are not quoting here from what the press asked in interrogating you, and we are not quoting from what the press published, so much as from what you say you actually said.

Senator MUNDT. I was relating my questions at the moment to South Dakota, and we have gotten off on a digression. May I have from you categorically, Mr. Sylvester, an answer now as to whether you know of any contract or subcontract involving South Dakota insofar as this investigation is concerned?

Mr. SYLVESTER. No, I don't have any knowledge of that.

Senator MUNDT. Senator CURTIS expected to be here, so I think I should ask you the same question with respect to Nebraska.

Mr. SYLVESTER. I have no first-hand information on Nebraska.

Senator MUNDT. Have you any second-hand information?

Mr. SYLVESTER. Yes, but I wouldn't be prepared to talk about that under oath. I think the answer should be I have no evidence.

Senator MUNDT. You have no evidence. All right.

Now, you say on page 21, "I have read the testimony. It sounds to me as if I were reading the counsel for Boeing."

I wish you would elaborate on that. I am not talking about newspaper stories, but what you read in the transcript.

Mr. SYLVESTER. What I read in the transcript.

Again, this is an impression. I have the impression that you come out of this, as you read this, that the Boeing plane should have been the choice, because it is a wonderful choice, and I find just from what I read very little material balancing that on what motivated and what the choices were of the Secretary of Defense.

Senator MUNDT. You realize, Mr. Sylvester, up until now most of the time has been spent in interrogating Pentagon witnesses, two colonels who were on the evaluation team, and we have been checking on the figures which they have presented. It is not the committee's fault that the figures up to now seem to indicate that Boeing was a better plane, and it is not the committee's fault that the figures up to now indicate that General Dynamics was the more expensive plane. So on the basis of the facts they gave us as to questions trying to arrive at their basis for making their determination, obviously we have to relate our questions to the evidence, and I don't see why you should attribute improper motives or prejudices to the committee because we were confronted with the evidence which, on the face of it, seemed to favor the Boeing proposition. We are trying to find out how they built up the figures, what was behind them. The chairman has said, I have said, and other members of the committee have said, that these very competent colonels, who made splendid witnesses, may I say, were asked if they had any evidence that indicated somewhere along the line General Dynamics was cheaper or better. We asked them to stick it in.

You found that, if you read the transcript as carefully as you say, that the invitation was there. And how in the face of that you can say it sounds like we were counsel for Boeing perplexes me. It needs some explanation, it seems to me.

Mr. SYLVESTER. I think you and I are exactly on the same ground, that only the Boeing story has been brought in. The Defense Department people who initiated this contract—I think inevitably, as I suggested in my letter, if we proceed from this basis down at the bottom, where the people do not know necessarily what the purpose was, rather than at the top, you probably come out with this sort of thing. I think you said the same thing, that the only side so far has been the Boeing side. From the Defense Department point of view, it seems to me that we are dealing with national defense.

Senator MUNDT. That is right, because at any time the Defense Department has submitted some valid evidence, we have put it in. We put in a letter by Secretary Zukert. It wasn't our fault that the letter was improperly stated and the figures were inaccurate and the facts were wrong and he had to write a second letter apologizing for the first one. That wasn't our fault.

Secretary McNamara has said he would like to present an affidavit without being questioned, because he has other duties. That is a bit unusual, but we think it is fair. We will have him back some other time for questioning. We are just trying to find out the facts and we have to pick up the story as presented to us by the Government witnesses.

These are not our witnesses. We don't run the Air Force; we don't run the evaluation board. They are your witnesses. So I don't think you should attack us because the evidence they present has been, up until now, detrimental to General Dynamics and preferential to Boeing.

I would like to ask you this question: You have been quoted in the press as saying or you concluded generally in the press that you believed that Government has the inherent right to lie to the people.

Mr. SYLVESTER. This I have never said.

Senator MUNDT. No, I said you have seen it in the press. I am not questioning you about that, except I want to be sure that if you hold that position you don't carry it to the point that it would involve your testimony under oath to this committee. You wouldn't hold that position, I am sure, and we could rely on what you are telling us.

Mr. SYLVESTER. There is rather an insult implied in that.

Senator MUNDT. Not at all. If you said that statement, I want to be sure. If you have not said the statement—I have read it in the press many, many times.

Mr. SYLVESTER. I am not clear of the relationship of your question to when I take an oath.

Senator MUNDT. The question is that if you believe that Government has a right to lie to the people, you are speaking as a Government witness, I want to be sure that you don't carry that philosophy to the point of testifying before us under oath.

Mr. SYLVESTER. Senator, you are making a quotation to me which you attribute to nobody, some faceless accuser which you are using, and you have not qouted anything I have said.

Senator MUNDT. If I have not, if you said you did not make it, that is one thing. I have read it a dozen times in the paper that you made that statement. I am not quarreling with you about that point of view at this time.

Mr. SYLVESTER. Obviously no Government information program can be based on lies. It must always be based on truthful facts.

But when any nation is faced with nuclear disaster, throughout history, and I conceive of our Government to be the people, because they determine the Government which is their Government, and they get rid of it when it doesn't suit them, at certain times when you are faced with life and death of your Nation, you do not tell all the facts to your enemy. I am sure you are not suggesting that you could want to tell the Russians all the facts, all the facts they would want to know, of Cuba, or, for instance, after this Government was attacked at Pearl Harbor that we should have then told the Japanese the extent of the damage. I am sure you don't mean that. That is what I am talking about only.

Senator Mundt. I am not suggesting anything. I am not even quarreling with you if you made the statement. But if you want to know my opinion, I certainly do not believe the Government has a right to lie to the people. I think withholding certain information is one thing in times of a crisis, but to deliberately lie to the people, I think is something else.

Mr. Sylvester. The Government does not have a right to lie to the people, but it does have a right in facing an enemy, if information is not accurate and is intended to mislead the enemy, I think that any people will support their government in not putting out information that is going to help the enemy. And, if necessary, misleading them.

I noticed only recently General Eisenhower on a television program expressed this very same idea. I am sure you would not suggest that you would put out to the Communists in the sort of situation we had in Cuba, information which would help them.

Senator Mundt. As I say, I am not suggesting anything. I am simply basing the question on what has been said many times in the press. If you have stated it, as you have said here, for the press, it has not been reported to me. Maybe this is a good opportunity for you to get across exactly what you had in mind in view of the fact that I am sure, Mr. Sylvester, you have read what I have read, attributed to you the fact that you said the Government has the inherent right to lie to the people. This is not the first time you have heard of it.

Mr. Sylvester. No. As the chairman said a while ago in relation to a quotation to him, not all quotations in the papers are correct.

Senator Mundt. I have just one other question.

We don't have page 28 of the transcript. I don't know what was in that.

The Chairman. Here it is.

(Senator Curtis entered the room.)

Mr. Sylvester. Senator, I think you have every page in the original that I brought.

Senator Mundt. It wasn't your fault. You gave us the pages, but I don't have it in the duplication.

Have you any other criticism now that you want to ventilate concerning the conduct of this committee? If so, I would like to have you do it now instead of at the press conference at noon.

Mr. Sylvester. Well, reserving my right to do that, I have nothing further to say. As I said, I do not regard, and I don't think it can be read by any fair reporter, that I was criticizing any Senator personally in any way or suggesting he was unfair. If you will notice, I state very clearly this is not—I think it is quite clear in there.

Senator Mundt. I can't go along with that. Maybe Senator Muskie can feel that way about it, but I don't see how anyone else can feel that way about it.

Senator Jackson. Are you really serious about this, Mr. Sylvester?

Senator Mundt. You say here: "And obviously, you will hardly get a judicial rendering by a committee," except Muskie. Now, you haven't named any of those Senators yet that have a self-interest. You have eliminated three, McClellan, Curtis, and Mundt, and I will watch with interest how many others you eliminate from this blanket attack.

Mr. Sylvester. Senator, I would like the record to show that I did not say anything about any Senator's self-interest.

Senator Mundt. State interest.

Mr. Sylvester. That is an entirely different thing.

Senator Mundt. No, it is pretty close to a Senator's self-interest.

Senator Jackson. State self-interest is what you said.

Mr. Sylvester. From my point of view, the Senator's duty obviously, having covered the Senate for many years, must represent his own people, his own State, and this seems to me completely legitimate. This is what seems to me to be completely misrepresented in what I said.

Senator Mundt. I am not questioning the legitimacy, but I can see if you had this whole committee stacked from a State that wanted the contract or got the contract, or didn't get involved in the contract, that would be one thing. But at least for three of us you have no evidence that we have any State self-interest; that is correct. OK.

The Chairman. Mr. Secretary, before we ask others to question you, before I yield to them, will you state with respect to the State of North Carolina, Senator Ervin's State, and he is a member of the committee, and also the State of New Hampshire, since Senator McIntyre is a member of the committee, and Senator Brewster, of Maryland, who is a member of the committee? Senator McIntyre and Senator Brewster are new members of the committee, but I believe they came on the committee the day or the day before the committee started the hearings.

Since we have questioned or interrogated you about the others, and they are not present, I think we ought to make the record clear with respect to them. Do you know of any contracts or interest in the State of North Carolina?

Mr. Sylvester. I know of none in North Carolina.

The Chairman. Do you know of any in New Hampshire?

Mr. Sylvester. There may be subcontracts going to some of those other States. I would have to check with people who know.

Senator Curtis. Will the Senator yield at that point?

The Chairman. One moment.

How about Senator Brewster of Maryland? Anything in Maryland?

Mr. Sylvester. I have no firsthand knowledge of any of those.

The Chairman. Then your statement did not apply, I assume, to all of those you have named.

Mr. Sylvester. Not unless there are subcontracts that I do not know of, which may be. I don't know.

The Chairman. Senator Curtis.

Senator Curtis. I will just ask one question: Isn't it true that the subcontractors' interest in many situations were unaffected regardless of whether General Dynamics or Boeing got the contract?

Mr. Sylvester. It may well be, Senator. I am not an expert in this field.

Senator Curtis. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

The Chairman. Do you know about New York? Senator Javits is not here.

Mr. Sylvester. Yes, I think there is an interest in Long Island. I think Grumman is.

The Chairman. I am not asking that with any implication.

Mr. Sylvester. I am not making it.

The Chairman. I am not asking with any implication that it would influence Senator Javits, but I think in fairness to him we ought to ask. I don't think Senator Javits would be influenced by that, if he thought that the Government's interest was in the other contractor. I don't think he would.

Mr. Sylvester. I wouldn't impute anything to any Senator. I think that is the difference, though, between a court of law and a Senate hearing. Were these things in a court of law, I think people then, of course, would remove themselves from a hearing, in a court of law. I don't think you would expect Senators to do it; I don't think they should do it. But that is the difference I was trying to make, between a court of law and a Senate hearing.

The Chairman. I suppose every Member of Congress has an interest in Government because he pays taxes, and you might say he has an interest from a tax standpoint as well as from getting some business in his State, to have it both ways.

Mr. Sylvester. I quite agree with you. I wasn't suggesting otherwise. Here they may be trying to break the contract, though, and I think that is a little different.

The Chairman. I want to make this record clear with you, so far as I am concerned. Your freedom of speech and your right to say and your right to conclusions, and your thinking that possibly somebody might be influenced, or that they could not render a judicious opinion or conclusion, that is all right. That is your individual right. I reserve the right to myself, and I accord it to you just as freely as I take it for my own purposes. But I wanted to get clear whether Arkansas really had any interest that you knew of, and I thought that might, of course have the record made clear as to the other States, the other Senators.

Mr. Sylvester. Mr. Senator, may I merely say that I do not regard I have any right to cast any aspersion on any member of any committee. I have not exercised that right nor used it. I think I do have a right to state the facts. But I cast no aspersion on anybody.

The Chairman. It would be a different interpretation, I think, of this language, then. I said if you thought the committee would not be able because of some reason to render a judicious opinion about it, that is your right to say it. I am not quarreling with that. I only wanted to get the record straight as to whether there was a basis for that where my State and I were involved.

Senator Jackson.

Senator Jackson. We come to a State that does have an interest, the State of Washington, headquarters for the Boeing Co. I want to ask you, Mr. Sylvester, do you think I have been unfair in these hearings?

Mr. Sylvester. I have not read enough of your cross-examination to really have any opinion.

Senator Jackson. How did you really come to the conclusion that you came to in the statement that you made to the press?

Mr. Sylvester. I said I have the impression, having read the transcript casually and quickly in order to meet the news queries, of exactly what I said before, Senator, that so far the basic Defense point of view and the Defense aims in this as established by the Secretary of Defense and the Deputy Defense Secretary and the services, have not come forth in this hearing.

Senator Jackson. Let me ask you, sir, did you ever make a request to this committee for information that should be submitted to it to carry out what you have in mind? Did you or any of your associates?

Mr. Sylvester. I am not the proper official to do that anyway, Senator. I would not be the one who would make that request. But certainly I would——

Senator Jackson. Well, isn't it a fact that no such request has been made?

Mr. Sylvester. Mr. McNamara, I think, made one over the weekend last Saturday, and I am very anxious that that should be made.

Senator Jackson. Hasn't that request been honored?

Mr. Sylvester. I believe the chairman announced last night that he would so honor the request.

The Chairman. I announced it, yes, and I understand that we were somewhat expecting the statement to be read today, this morning, but it is not. I understand that it is in the process of preparation. Again I say to you that the committee will receive that under its rules whenever the Secretary wishes to present it.

Senator Jackson. Mr. Sylvester, wouldn't it have been wiser to defer the comments that you made until you were sure that the statements that you had given the press were not borne out by the facts?

Mr. Sylvester. Senator, I deferred any comment for more than 10 days in answering questions of newsmen, on what do we have to say to the charges coming out of the committee. Again I read you this one. "As one investigator puts it, if the Russians could build a plane that was rejected, they could shoot down the fleet of planes that the United States is planning to build."

The story begins, and Jim McCartney is an excellent reporter, "Senate investigators have come to the conclusion"——

The Chairman. Is that a quote?

Mr. Sylvester. That is an attribution without a quote in it.

The Chairman. It is not a quote?

Mr. Sylvester. It is Mr. McCartney's reporting of a conversation with Senate investigators. "Senate investigators have come to the conclusion that the Defense Department signed a $6.5 billion contract for 'a second-rate airplane.' "

The Chairman. That is a conclusion quoted by the press.

Mr. Adlerman. Who is that attributed to?

The Chairman. It is not a quote of any individual.

Mr. Sylvester. He has: "As one investigator put it, if the Russians could build a plane that was rejected, they could shoot down the fleet of planes that the United States is planning to build."

This is attributed to one of the investigators of the committee.

It goes on. I will be glad to read the rest of it.

"This is the heart of the fantastic story that the Senate Permanent Investigations Subcommittee, headed by Senator John McClellan, is attempting to prove in secret hearings."

The Chairman. Said what?

Mr. Sylvester. "Is attempting to prove."

The Chairman. That is a reporter's writing.

Senator Jackson. Do you really want us to manage the way they write in their stories? Is that what you are suggesting or asking?

Mr. Sylvester. I know Mr. McCartney, and I am satisfied that he talked to people here and in fact he assured me that he did.

The Chairman. Well, I think that you know enough about this. People talk about this as "If this is a fact," "if this other situation prevails or is established as a fact, such conclusion might be justified."

Mr. Sylvester. It may very well be.

The Chairman. I do not know; in the course of these things the press asks many things, but here you are giving a press conference and making these statements. And apparently this statement was somewhat gratuitously made and not in answer specifically to a question.

Mr. Sylvester. I think you have to go back, Mr. Chairman, for 10 days and some of the questions that were asked not at the press briefings.

The Chairman. Very well.

Mr. Sylvester. I think we withheld any comment.

The Chairman. I am not concerned about your impression, particularly, or your wanting or your desire to criticize the record or your implication, but I wanted to get at the basis upon which the criticism was premised, insofar as it related to my statement and to the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. Sylvester. Mr. Chairman, it seems to me a statement like that is very damaging to our defense, and suggested to the Russians that the Defense Department of the United States is buying a plane that they can shoot down. I just can't see any good from that.

The Chairman. You are complaining about a statement somewhere in the press. We are asking you about your statement, if you had any justification for making the statement, and to cast that aspersion on the Senator from Arkansas. That is what I am asking about, on the basis of what you said you premised it on.

Did you have any such basis?

Mr. Sylvester. I explained that to you.

Senator Jackson. How can you complain about other former colleagues in the press, about what they are writing, when you have admitted before this committee that the statement that you made to the press was not correct?

Mr. Sylvester. First off, Senator, I don't think I am complaining about any of my colleagues. I have said nothing in complaint against any of my colleagues.

Senator Jackson. You said, or you referred to their article and the conclusion that they may have come to, and how can you really complain based on your own statement that you now admit was wrong?

Mr. Sylvester. I am a little mixed up.

Senator Jackson. Or are you denying it?

Mr. Sylvester. I am a bit mixed up in what you are saying.

Senator Jackson. Let me read this, and is this statement true or false, and are you standing by it and I want to ask you, and I quote directly from the tape, as I understand it, has been printed:

"And obviously, you will hardly get a judicial rendering by a committee in which there are various Senators with State self-interest in which the contract goes."

Is that statement correct or isn't it correct?

Mr. Sylvester. The statement is correct.

Senator Jackson. Do you stand on that statement?

Mr. Sylvester. I made the statement and it shows in the record, Senator.

Senator Jackson. Well, are you still saying this is true, despite your testimony here this morning?

Mr. Sylvester. My testimony has been, Senator, that I make a distinction, and a very clear one, between a judicial rendering in a court of law and a Senate committee investigation. I did not cast any aspersion on the fair-mindedness of any member of that committee in that transcript. I did make a distinction between a court of law.

Senator Jackson. Well, you are applying this statement to the Senators then on this committee, were you not? What were you applying it to?

Mr. Sylvester. I was applying it to the fact that we are dealing here with two great contestants. A contract has been let, and an effort is being made by the disgruntled losers to knock the contract down.

Senator Jackson. Now wait a minute, just get something clear, sir. The Boeing Co. never asked for this hearing. Do you understand that? I asked for it. They did not ask me.

Now what information do you have that they have asked for this investigation?

Mr. Sylvester. I have no suggestion, and I have never made any.

Senator Jackson. You are just making one, you said a disgruntled loser in effect asked for it.

Mr. Sylvester. I did not say "asked for it."

Senator Jackson. Well, then, read the transcript.

(The above proceedings were read by the reporter.)

Senator Jackson. Will you explain what effort is being made by the disgruntled loser?

Mr. Sylvester. I will simply have to refer you, Senator, to my impression that I got from the testimony to date. I would say from my reading it, only one side has been put in.

Senator Jackson. That isn't what I said. You just got through saying that an effort is being made by a disgruntled loser to knock this contract down. Back that statement up.

Mr. Sylvester. It is a judgment on my part.

Senator Jackson. What is your evidence?

Mr. Sylvester. From reading the transcript to date.

Senator Jackson. Has the Boeing Co. testified in here?

Mr. Sylvester. No; but all of the testimony has been on the beauties of their plane, and knowing that I can read it has been the other.

Senator Jackson. Now, wait a minute. Does it come from Boeing?

The Chairman. The second exhibit we put in was the justification.

Senator Jackson. From the Department of Defense. Now state where in any part that you can refer to in this transcript indicates that this stems from the Boeing Co.

Mr. Sylvester. I haven't suggested that it stems from the Boeing Co.

Senator Jackson. You said that it is an effort on the part of the disgruntled loser. I think this all brings out something, that you are a little careless with words. This is where you get in trouble, Mr. Sylvester. This isn't the first time.

I would like to have an answer to that question.

Mr. Sylvester. I would like to make reference here to some notes I have.

Senator Jackson. All right.

Mr. Sylvester. Again I am not an expert in this field and I don't pretend to be. I have read the transcript. I notice in the very first book that a Mr. Stack, whom I don't know from anyone else, I know he was offered as an expert in this field. I think the testimony shows that he said he had not seen the last two versions of the design competition.

Senator Jackson. Do you know who Mr. Stack is?

Mr. Sylvester. I see in the testimony he is offered as an expert in the field.

Senator Jackson. You had better do your homework. Mr. Stack, as the testimony brought out, is practically "Mr. TFX," as I understand it.

Mr. Adlerman. He was the expert for NASA who was loaned to the Air Force as their expert, and he was attached to the source selection board as the expert on TFX from the NASA organization.

Senator Jackson. As a matter of fact, he had been with the original National Advisory Committee on Aeronautics dating back to the late twenties, and then went with NASA. He twice won the Collier Award, Mr. Sylvester.

Now, I get back to my question. You referred to the effort on the part of a disgruntled loser, or whatever the exact quote was, and you see, again you make these statements and you don't have anything to back them up. You are in here complaining about news stories when you admit now that you did not intend what you said. I gather you are saying this. I don't know whether you are or not, and you wonder why your colleagues write a news story based on the statement you made.

This is not the first time you have had this trouble, and I would not be in here complaining about your other colleagues in the press, sir.

Mr. Sylvester. I don't think that there is anything in the record in which I have.

Senator Jackson. That is all I have.

Senator Muskie. I suppose I ought to defend myself here this morning. At the very least I ought to try to find out how I can get a piece of this contract in my State.

The Chairman. Apparently from what I learn now, I have overlooked or neglected to put forth any effort heretofore.

Senator Muskie. We have been neglecting our duties.

I would like to say, I think at least the comment from me is due, that I have no questions for the witness, but it has been my privilege to serve on this committee for almost 5 years, now, and it has always been my impression, despite the fact that we have had to hear controversial matters from time to time, that it is the objective of the chairman and of this committee to find the truth about any matter or any issue that comes before it. And despite the fact that from time to time I have held different views about some of these matters than other members of the committee, I have never been under the impression that any member of the committee seems to be anything but objective and fair in his search for the truth.

I suppose I ought to consider it a compliment that my purity has been held up to public view, but this has been done in a way to cast discredit upon my colleagues, and to the extent that it does, I think it casts discredit on me, because we have been a team now for these years, and I have been proud to serve on the committee.

I must say, Mr. Sylvester, I think whatever may have been your intention, and you have tried to clarify that this morning, that it is most unfortunate that the statement should have been made. I am confident that out of the hearings by this committee the truth will emerge, and an objective judgment will be achieved. If the judgment to be made by this group is discredited in advance, then this is a disservice to everybody involved, including the Department of Defense.

I hope that out of this testimony this morning, it will be clear that it did not intend this discredit, whatever your words may have suggested, and obviously they suggest different things to different members of the committee.

So I hope that this hearing will clarify it in order that we may continue these hearings in a climate which is objective, and which is devoid of recrimination and that is conclusive to the development of the truth. I am sure that that is the committee's objective.

Senator Curtis. I have been informed that in answer to a question as to whether or not the junior Senator from Nebraska now has had any state of self-interest in this issue, you replied that you had no firsthand knowledge of such. Is that correct?

Mr. Sylvester. That is correct.

Senator Curtis. What secondhand knowledge do you have?

Mr. Sylvester. I have no second-hand knowledge, and I am not an expert in this contract business at all, Senator.

Senator Curtis. So a more correct statement would have been that you had no such knowledge, rather than limiting it to firsthand knowledge, which might imply that you had some knowledge.

Mr. Sylvester. No implication was intended.

Senator Curtis. Now, do you believe that the military authorities all of the way from the evaluation board through the selection board, the individuals and the generals and admirals through which this selection passed, and the Air Force Council and Admiral Anderson and General LeMay, were any of them motivated by any State self-interest or any interest of any kind?

Mr. Sylvester. Certainly not.

Senator Curtis. Would you regard them as "losers" in this?

Mr. Sylvester. Certainly not, in the sense of a conflict, of course not.

Senator Curtis. The position you have taken is in contradiction of all of the military individuals and groups, is it not?

Mr. Sylvester. I don't think that I understand your question.

Senator Curtis. Well, you have been critical of this investigation, as I understand it, because you contended that it is supporting the military authorities.

Mr. Sylvester. I think what I said and what I have intended to say is that the material coming out so far is largely and almost completely against the decision made by Mr. McNamara, and Mr. Gilpatric, the service secretaries, and there has been nothing of their statements so far. I think this is probably inevitable in the way the witnesses are put on. As a consequence, Mr. McNamara has to be heard. What I have said is not different from what Mr. Gilpatric said on the "Meet the Press" program or what Mr. McNamara said in his letter, that the picture that has come out is certainly not an overall picture that the people are getting, and it certainly has distortions in it from our point of view.

Senator Curtis. What are those distortions?

Mr. Sylvester. I have not said anything different from what they are saying.

Senator Curtis. What are the distortions?

Mr. Sylvester. Well, I think one of the distortions is that the General Dynamics plane is more expensive or would be more expensive, tremendously more expensive than the other plane. I am, again, not an expert in this field. I am not prepared to argue the case. I leave that to the Secretary of Defense.

Senator Curtis. Is that a distortion?

Mr. Sylvester. I think it will appear in the end that it is; yes. I think you can't tell until all of the evidence is in, and I think after Mr. McNamara appears, I think the thing will get in a better balance than it is now, and I would withhold any comment. I am not qualified to talk about it, but I think a better balance will come out after he appears. A very much better balance.

Senator Curtis. Now, as to your statement that it was a distortion to imply that the Boeing product was less expensive; I wish you would give us some facts and figures to prove that.

Mr. Sylvester. As I say, Senator, I am not an expert on it and I am not prepared to argue the case, and it is not in my field whatsoever. With Mr. McNamara's statement coming and with him and others coming, I will leave it entirely to them. I said I don't think that you can——

Senator Curtis. But you don't leave it to them. You told us right here this morning that there were distortions.

Mr. Sylvester. I think that there are up to date.

Senator Curtis. Now, name the next one.

Mr. Sylvester. I think I will rest on that one.

Senator Curtis. Oh, no, you said distortions. You did not make it singular.

Mr. Sylvester. I did not say—I said that the picture coming out by reason of the fact that it is fragmentary, and it comes out twice a day, and inevitably there is material for various reasons, for security reasons, not in the transcript, and can't be, the fact that the newsmen have to report and are reporting a very important thing on a "trigger" basis, which any man covering this has to do, that you do not get a balanced overall picture of what the Department and the Secretary of Defense, and the deputy were trying to do in this contract. That is all I have said.

Senator Curtis. Name some more distortions.

Mr. Sylvester. In the picture that is coming out?

Senator Curtis. Yes, name them.

Mr. Sylvester. I would say the idea that the boards were unanimous throughout probably will be shown to be a distortion.

The Chairman. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. Sylvester. I am not competent to argue this case, and I am not making any——

The Chairman. Will you yield there? Do you really mean "distortions", or do you mean "divergent opinions", differences of opinion, where one might have one opinion and one another.

Mr. Sylvester. I am talking about the reports in the press.

The Chairman. Do you mean that the word "distortion" is a proper term for it?

Mr. Sylvester. I think that the picture being presented, not by the committee, but by the reports on the basis of the testimony, is distorted in the sense that if you drew a picture of it, it would be this way, and I don't think it is a rectangular picture.

The Chairman. Would that mean the press is distorting it? You said not as presented by the committee.

Mr. Sylvester. On the basis of the evidence, their reading of it, since it is fragmentary, and since it is incomplete, and since it has not been presented, I think that you get this sort of a picture.

The Chairman. If the Senator will yield further, you speak of it being fragmentary. Would you not say that the record, placing in the record the memorandum of Secretary Zuckert of November 21, signed by Secretary McNamara, and Secretary Korth and Zuckert, present the other side of the picture, and that that has gone out to the public? There is stated in this presumably the reasons why, in making comparisons, the reasons why the General Dynamics Co. was selected over Boeing.

Now, we can't put everything in the record in one day, but don't you think that putting this in the record immediately in the beginning of the hearings was to put somewhat in perspective the issue, and the issues and the facts in controversy, so that the committee could proceed to examine them?

Mr. Sylvester. Mr. Chairman, I think that the way you would normally—not from the committee point of view, and I am not taking any statement on your decision, but it was the Secretary of Defense and the Deputy Secretary who initiated the idea of the TFX in this contract. It would seem to me that you would start with them, and see what they were attempting to do, and then you would find out where they failed to do it.

This way, it has not happened this way. You start not saying "you," but the fact of the matter is we start at the bottom here, and gradually work up, and you therefore don't get at the start the overall picture which the Defense Department was aiming at, and what their overall intent was.

The Chairman. You say we should have had the Secretary of Defense on the stand first?

Mr. Sylvester. I am not making any comment of what you should or should not have done. I am simply saying that to my mind, in watching these things, that the overall picture, the basic reasons, are known to the men at the top, and not to the men at the bottom.

The Chairman. I don't want to belabor this. I just want to ask you one or two other questions.

I may say this for the record, I was informed, through the staff and through the liaison man for the Defense Department, that the Secretaries did not want to go on first. They wanted us to present it and they wanted to come on last.

I thought, in arranging the schedule of witnesses up until the day or two ago that I had arranged it, insofar as they were concerned, to accommodate them, that they would come on last, so they could refute and explain any testimony that had been given.

I have always, since I have been chairman of this committee, any time a Cabinet official—and even others representing agencies of Government, the heads of Government—felt that anything was being presented here that they wanted to correct or that they wanted to comment on or testify about, they have been welcome, they have been received, first, last, in the middle, wherever they wanted to come. That certainly would be true in this instance. I have promptly accorded the Secretary, Secretary McNamara, the opportunity that he made to present an affidavit, a statement, which he proposes will put the thing in what he terms proper perspective. He would be here testifying today, if it were convenient for him. We do not want, and have never tried, to suppress anything. I have tried to lean over backward in trying to get the truth. That is what we are going to seek to do.

Again, I want to assure you that your opinion, your expression of opinion that you don't believe the committee will be judicious or something, gives me no concern except when it is based on a false premise or on an erroneous premise. That is the only thing I wanted to clear up, so far as I was concerned.

Here is one other thing I wish you would help us with a little, since this statement has gone out to the press. You say on page 21:

"Well, I expect to have some"—talking about some figures.

"I would only say you are getting a lot of figures out of this committee after the fact."

I don't know what you mean by figures after the fact. I suppose that would be we are going out and making some new figures. I don't understand the meaning of that. I want you to explain that. You say "They have obtained," meaning the committee, "which did not bear and were not available at the time and were not under consideration at the time."

I think you should explain that, what figures we are getting. We are not getting any figures that I know of from the Defense Department. What figures do you have in mind that we are taking that were not available at the time?

Mr. Sylvester. As I recall, Mr. Gilleas testified on figures, and my recollection is, and also I was advised by some of our people who read that testimony, that he brought in what he called recomputations.

The Chairman. On what?

Mr. Sylvester. On apparently certain figures, on costs figures, as I understand. There were some recomputations that were not the figures used at the time the decision was made.

The Chairman. I don't know that I understand fully what you mean.

Mr. Sylvester. I beg your pardon?

The Chairman. Do you mean we have made some calculations, the committee staff has?

Mr. Sylvester. I think Mr. Gilleas testified on figures involved in the contract. Reading this quickly——

The Chairman. Reading what?

Mr. Sylvester. Reading the testimony. I believe he said in there since the time the contract had been let, recomputations had been made.

The Chairman. Recomputations had been made?

Mr. Sylvester. That is as I recall his testimony.

The Chairman. Well, is that true?

Mr. Sylvester. I don't know whether it is true or not.

The Chairman. What is wrong with it if they were made, to check on errors?

Mr. Sylvester. Nothing wrong with it, other than if there were such recomputations, they were not the figures on which the decision was based.

The Chairman. Would you say, then, the figures that were considered and upon which the decision was made were correct figures?

Mr. Sylvester. I am not an expert in this field, Mr. Chairman, I haven't any idea. I presume they were, yes.

The Chairman. The point is all of this is simply that the committee is not getting the facts or we are using figures that were not facts and not pertinent to the consideration or in consideration of the contract at the time the award was made. If we are using any figures here that are not figures from the records of the Pentagon, what it had, I don't know what they would be, unless they would be a compilation or finding of errors in the figures that were used then.

Mr. Sylvester. I wouldn't know either.

Mr. Adlerman. May I straighten out one more thing.

Mr. Gilleas testified as to the commonality figures quoted in the memorandum of November 21, 1962, signed by Secretary Korth and Secretary Zuckert and Secretary McNamara, where he cited the commonality figure was 85 percent and 60 percent. The record, both of General Dynamics Co. and the Defense Department show that these figures are not accurate, and so Mr. Gilleas testified. He testified that the figure of 85 percent attributed to General Dynamics was, in truth, in one part, 80 percent and in other part 83 and some fraction.

Am I correct on that, Mr. Gilleas?

Mr. Gilleas. That is correct.

Mr. Adlerman. These are not figures after the fact. They are not recomputations. These are the actual figures which were incorrectly stated in the memorandum.

Now as to the figure of 60 percent, if they used the figure of 85 percent in Mr. Zuckert's memorandum, then you have to include in that certain items which were called similar but not identical. If you are going to use 85 percent in one company, General Dynamics, call it 85 percent common, if you are going to use the same rule on Boeing, you would have to include the similar but not identical there, and that would make it 80 percent instead of 60 percent.

Those are the figures that Mr. Gilleas brought out. These are the official figures in the Defense Department's memorandum, and they come right out of the books of the General Dynamics Co. They were available to the Defense Department and Mr. Zuckert. Your implication that any of these figures come after the fact is not true.

Mr. Sylvester. I think probably if you look at the comparison by weight it was 92 percent for General Dynamics.

Mr. Adlerman. I don't know what it is by weight, but I can find out for you, and if that is the case, maybe it ought to be looked at that way.

Mr. Sylvester. I am sure if you have followed this, you must have come across that figure.

Mr. Adlerman. Have you read all the testimony in this hearing?

Mr. Sylvester. No, I have not.

Mr. Adlerman. And still you feel free that you can criticize the figures in this without reading all of the testimony?

Mr. Sylvester. I am simply saying as I read the testimony there are different figures in there than I am aware of.

Mr. Adlerman. And you are able to criticize the facts brought before the committee without reading the testimony, that we are presenting a one-sided picture without reading the testimony?

Mr. Sylvester. In my own mind I am clear when new figures are brought in after the decision was made, if such figures were.

Mr. Adlerman. Are your conclusions based upon fact or are they based upon prejudice?

Mr. Sylvester. Well, of course, I think the proper decision was made.

Mr. Adlerman. Are they based upon the facts that you read in the testimony?

Mr. Sylvester. If it is prejudice, then I am certainly guilty of being prejudiced. I think the right decision was made and when the full facts are——

Mr. Adlerman. I am not asking you that. I am asking are your conclusions based upon the testimony or upon your prejudice.

Mr. Sylvester. No; my conclusions, I think, will be verified when the full testimony comes out. They are not based on a partial presentation.

The Chairman. He said he did not read the testimony when he made these statements.

Would you say the figures that you are referring to are not accurate or not correct?

Mr. Sylvester. No, I did not say that. I said my reading of that indicated——

The Chairman. Were they before the fact or after the fact? You don't say they are not correct?

Mr. Sylvester. No, I have no knowledge that they are not correct at all. I have not suggested that. I am only saying, Mr. Chairman, I think when the full facts come out that a lot more material will be shown, that the thing will be in much better perspective, and that the committee will be led as Fortune Magazine was, to a decision that the right decision was made.

The Chairman. Mr. Secretary, I may say that you may be correct. We may come to that conclusion, despite the fact that one or two States may have a little interest in it. I think it is possible for this committee to render a judicious opinion. I don't agree with you on that, though I respect your right to disagree.

Mr. Sylvester. I have such high regard for this committee and its fairness that the facts will lead them to the conclusion that the Secretary of Defense was right.

The Chairman. But that does not answer the question, when you say that you think it is going to come out all right. Frankly, I hope it does. There is no pleasure, I get no pleasure out of these investigations. I hope everything is right, with the crossing of every "t" and the dotting of every "i." But we have a duty to perform here, and I am simply trying to do that, and that is all.

Mr. Sylvester. I respect this committee very highly.

The Chairman. These statements that tend to reflect upon the committee are not calculated to be helpful. I may say that in all candor. But, again, I wanted for the record whether you premised your statement insofar as it applied to the Senator from Arkansas, whether you premised it upon fact, and whether the statement you premised it upon was correct.

Mr. Sylvester. Mr. Chairman, I certainly appreciate that. You, I am sure, will grant me that in the job that I have, that when I see quotations from investigators, "If the Russians could build a plane that was rejected, they could shoot down the fleet of planes that the United States is planning to build"——

The Chairman. Mr. Sylvester, I am not here to defend some reporter, what his error may have been, or anything else. You never took that up with me before. You never inquired whether it was accurate or true. You simply picked that up. I don't know now whether a reporter correctly reported that or not. We are not talking here about you, about what some reporter said. We are talking about what you said and gave to the press.

I don't know anything about the accuracy of that statement. I doubt that it is accurate. I don't mean by that that reporters deliberately distorted it, but in conversations often you use some illustration and some interpretation is made of it which may not be the interpretation actually intended, as you say about yours. You say you did not intend this to reflect upon anybody.

Mr. Sylvester. Jim McCartney told me that this is an accurate representation.

The Chairman. If you want to take that and rely on that, all right. Yours is accurate, and you could not draw any other conclusion from your statements here that you gave to the press, except that you intended to reflect on this committee.

Now, I have been patient and you keep insisting on that. You know that the statement you gave was intended to reflect on this committee, don't you?

Mr. Sylvester. No, not at all.

The Chairman. Well, it did, and you know that it did, don't you?

Mr. Sylvester. No, I don't think it did in any way.

The Chairman. You don't think it did?

(At this point Senator Javits entered the room.)

Senator Mundt. Mr. Chairman, I have to go to another meeting, but I have one question on procedure.

These hearings have been held in executive session. The question was raised this morning as to whether this particular one, since it deals with what the public reaction is to the hearings, should be open to the press, I thought it should be. The majority of the committee thought otherwise.

You heard the Chairman's statement at the beginning, however, that he hoped he could release this to the press immediately at the conclusion of the hearings. I certainly hope so, too, so my question to you, Mr. Sylvester, is this: Is there anything in today's hearing that you want to withhold from the press, or is it all right with you if the entire transcript is released to the press, as I think it should be.

Mr. Sylvester. It is quite all right. As I indicated at the beginning, I had no objection at the start of these hearings to having it open.

Senator Mundt. No, we had a committee rule. You are willing to make the full transcript available to the press as soon as possible?

Mr. Sylvester. I see no reason why not.

Senator Mundt. Thank you.

Senator Curtis. When I yielded, I had asked you to name the distortions. You named one. You named the costs.

Now name the others.

Mr. Sylvester. I think that in the stories that have come out, and the reports of the meeting, it has not been made clear that the Boeing plane relies upon procedures and materials that, so far, are apparently not proved, and that they will require, according to the Defense Department's point of view, a great deal of experimental work that will increase the costs.

It seems to me this is for the Secretary of Defense. I am not the expert on this whatsoever, Senator.

(At this point Senator Mundt left the room.)

Senator Curtis. I ask you to name another distortion. Will you read the answer, Mr. Reporter?

(Record read by the reporter.)

Senator Curtis. Do you regard that as a distortion?

Mr. Sylvester. I do, yes. Not that I——

Senator Curtis. Do you imply by that that either plane has been built and proven?

Mr. Sylvester. Senator, I am not an expert on the planes, and I am not qualified to discuss the planes.

Senator Curtis. But you do all the time.

Mr. Sylvester. I am simply discussing it from the point of view of what I understand from the Defense Department. I am not the expert on it.

Senator Curtis. You understand that that is a distortion. Who told you that in the Defense Department?

Mr. Sylvester. This is my judgment in reading the material that has come out.

Senator Curtis. You just got through saying that you were relying on the Defense Department.

Mr. Sylvester. Not as to the general——

Senator Curtis. Who in the Defense Department regards it as a distortion that the public were advised that the Boeing product had not been proven when the facts are that neither plane has been built and flown.

(At this point Senator McClellan left the room.)

Senator Curtis. Who in the Defense Department contends that is a distortion?

Mr. Sylvester. The distortions, Senator, are that the whole story has not come out, and this does not give a full and balanced picture of the issues involved.

Senator Curtis. You can't expect that to stand. Suppose a given witness testifies truthfully about a detail with which he is familiar. The fact that he does not know about all the other details that might be involved—is his testimony a distortion?

Mr. Sylvester. The fact, Senator, that you start with details and try to build up a picture, rather than with the overall picture, and then go into the details, that would be, by technique, at least, a distortion, until you get away down to the end of the line.

Senator Curtis. I can't agree that either of the two you have named are distortions. I do not think they would support the facts. But what other distortions do you identify?

Mr. Sylvester. I have no further ones to discuss, Senator.

Senator Curtis. I did not ask you if you wanted to discuss them. I want to discuss them. What further ones do you have.

Mr. Sylvester. I haven't any.

Senator Curtis. Has anyone besides the members of this committee had any State self-interests in this controversy?

Mr. Sylvester. It may well be. I don't know of anybody.

Senator Curtis. That is all, Mr. Chairman.

Senator Muskie (presiding). Senator Javits?

Senator Javits. Mr. Sylvester——

Mr. Sylvester. Good morning, Senator.

Senator Javits. I have noted your statement with considerable interest. I have been a trial lawyer long enough to know that sometimes the most careful witness says things he wished he had not said. I gather this was an untoward statement on your part, the statement about the committee, self-interest, and so forth.

Mr. Sylvester. I did not get the word.

Senator Javits. An untoward statement. You wish you had not made it, whatever may be the merits of it.

Mr. Sylvester. I certainly wish that the point I was trying to make had been made clearly enough so that no Senator here would feel that I was trying to reflect on his fairness, because I think it is quite clear through that that I did not discuss fairness in any way.

Senator Javits. Would you tell me—had you finished?

Mr. Sylvester. And I did feel that since this is a question of a contract which has been decided upon, any action, I would assume, going to that must be intended to break the contract. All the ramifications of such a complicated matter as is being investigated here, and, of course, very properly investigated here, are not the same as a court of law. That is the point I was trying to make.

Senator Javits. You are clear that we have no judicial function in this matter?

Mr. Sylvester. Correct.

Senator Javits. And even if a major found, and perhaps even all of us found, that this contract was improper, unwise, should never have been made, that nothing could be done about it if the Defense Department did not want to do it unless there was showing of fraud, which I gather has not even been mentioned and should not be.

Mr. Sylvester. That was my point.

Senator Javits. In view of the fact that there is Grumman in my State, for instance, which you mentioned, I might have an interest in the fact that it would be a great idea if New York could get some business. I hasten to affirm to you that I have that much of an interest.

Mr. Sylvester. Senator, I testified that if I were a Senator, I would work very hard to get every contract. I don't raise any question about it. I respect every Senator's right and I am sure duty to do that. That seems to me basic in our system, in our way of life.

Senator Javits. I will tell you, Mr. Sylvester, for myself, that I am well aware of these pressures. I don't believe they would affect my judgment as to what I would finally determine, which I think will have the paramount desire to serve our Nation's interest that best. I really feel, in all sincerity, that that is true of every other Member, including our distinguished colleague from Washington, who is a very good personal friend of mine.

Mr. Sylvester. I am sure.

Senator Javits. I would be the first to affirm, and he does not have to say a word, that he would feel the same way. If it were the country or the State of Washington, there would be no question about that. I do think it was most unfortunate, because people don't analyze and scrutinize these things carefully as to what you mean by a judicial finding, and the fact that the committee could not make one anyhow. There was an implication, I must say, that our interests of our State would override our interest in our country.

I would think, Mr. Sylvester, because I would like to be constructive, that what I am concerned about is that these peripheral issues, like what you say, may tend to cloud the public understanding of what is going on here and how important it is, and what the evaluation and weight are to be given to the advisory conclusions of the facts to the people.

(At this point Senator McClellan entered the room.)

Senator Javits. I would hope, and I express this hope to you, that you will take an opportunity, perhaps as a result of this hearing, to place this matter in a complete focus in the sense of only to be sure that such factual recommendations we may make or points of view that we may express may be properly evaluated, whatever may be the concern of our States, and express the confidence of a high Government official that he feels, and I am sure you do, that our patriotism for our Nation is far superior, as it must be, to any devotion which we have to the interests of our States.

I would feel that, though I assume by implication that I am one of those people concerned with this question of interests. I would hope very much that after thinking it through, it takes a big man to say when he is wrong, and I think you were wrong in this, considering how the public would receive it. I would hope that you would help us all to put it in focus in the interests of the country, not in any of our own personal interests.

I think my reputation and that of Senator Jackson and others will stand up to this matter very adequately, and I think that is true of all my colleagues.

Mr. Sylvester. That was the purpose of my letter to the chairman yesterday, Senator Javits. I, of course, too, am an interested party, in that I feel very strongly, as a representative of the Defense Department, that the proper judgment was made, and I don't make any pretense at all that I am dispassionate about it at this point. I am interested. I think the Secretary and the top officials made the right decision. I think the facts, when they come fully out, will confirm that. I think we would not have been in such a difficult position as we are today had the story been told from the overall to begin with, one, that a TFX plane would increase our capability; two, that it would create a great safety; and three, that in the fourth evaluation report, the military judgment was that either plane would do the job. Therefore, it then became a matter of judgment on the part of the constituted authorities, and it is this that I think is at stake. I think what is at stake is a civilian judgment which, under the setup of the law, and the Defense Department, must always be a civilian judgment. Had this started from that way, I think the overall picture would have been quite clear and quite in focus. And then testimony would have then either shown that the top people did not testify correctly; they overlooked certain things; they made a bad decision; but building it up bit by bit at every point from the beginning makes it very difficult to give that overall picture.

Senator JAVITS. Mr. Sylvester, do you feel that your statement in any way changed that situation, that is, your statement that is being referred to here, the statement that "Obviously you will hardly get a judicial rendering by a committee in which there are various Senators with State self-interest in where the contract goes?"

Do you think your statement helped to accomplish the very thing that you want to accomplish, which is to see that all the facts come out on a balanced way?

Mr. SYLVESTER. If it had any effect, I would hope that it would make newsmen covering the hearing, reading the truncated and fragmentary twice-a-day reports, to hold in suspension a little bit any final conclusions and keep in mind that these witnesses, most of whom have appeared so far, have not had access to the basic decisionmaking and are not aware of the factors which motivated the decisionmakers.

Senator JACKSON. Will the Senator yield for a moment?

Senator JAVITS. Certainly.

Senator JACKSON. Mr. Sylvester, we all make mistakes. I make a lot of mistakes, I am sure, every day. I know I make them at least every other day. I hesitate to offer you any advice, but I must say that I think we could have saved virtually this whole morning's session if you had come in here and said, "I erred. I made a mistake, and I am sorry." That is all you would have needed to have said. You failed to do that. This is the reason you are having difficulty this time. This is why you have had trouble in the past.

I have always found that it is hard for all of us to admit error, but I must comment that I don't think you have helped the situation here this morning by getting yourself deeply involved in matters that you admit now you have no knowledge about. If you had just come in and admitted that you had made a mistake, that would be it.

We are mortals. We are fallible. I am not infallible. I admit I make mistakes. I merely observe to you for what it is worth that if you had come in and just admitted error, this session would have been over in about 15 minutes. So here we are, and it is now 12:10.

I want to compliment my colleague from New York for his advice and counsel to you, but I am afraid that none of this has had its effect.

Senator JAVITS. Mr. Sylvester, may I ask you another question?

Of course, as I indicated, I couldn't join more sincerely with Senator JACKSON. I think that is the simple and best way to do this, and I think it is deserving. I would even like to see you give such observations as you may feel advised to give on reconsideration as to the main points about Senators. The fact is that we do have State interests, but that all of our lives are lived in meeting those very blandishments. Generally speaking, I think, I depict the Senate in totality, and it represents on the whole a small fact, certainly very much smaller than is indicated by your statement which implants, I think, in the public mind, a confirmation of a suspicion which is undeserved in most cases, in the overwhelming majority of cases.

Perhaps I might just terminate my questioning of you by just asking you whether you consider that you are an expert witness, able to testify on the merits or demerits, either from the point of view of the facts and figures, or from the point of view of the policy of civilian versus military control of the final placements of these contracts?

Do you feel you are the man to testify on those two issues in respect to these contracts?

Mr. SYLVESTER. No, Senator. I am amazed that I was called to testify, because I am not an expert.

Senator JAVITS. I would like to join with Senator JACKSON in the great display of bipartisanship, of which we have had the virtue before, and urge you either now or deliberately when we are through, that you really owe it to yourself and to this controversy, which will be much better off unencumbered by any such conclusion by a high official of the Department of Defense, to clear the record by saying, as Senator JACKSON and I have both tried to say to you, we all do it, I do, he does, some more frequently than others, but that is not material.

It was too bad it was misunderstood. Perhaps you projected what you had in mind inartistically. It had better just be off the record, withdrawn, properly apologized for, and the sooner forgotten the better.

Mr. SYLVESTER. Senator JAVITS, I am happy to repeat my letter to the Senator, to the chairman. I am deeply sorry for any remarks of mine that reflected in any way on any member of this committee in any form whatsoever. I am happy to repeat that. I would not in any way reflect on them, and I tried not to reflect on them.

I find from the reaction of the Senators that I was not successful in that, and that I have apparently caused you the sort of pain that I had no intention of doing. I have covered the Congress too long not to know that there is no basis for reflection on any person individually. I accept your judgment that the message did not come clear. I was not reflecting on anybody's integrity or fairness. In fact, the question never came up. It was never discussed. Some of the stories written have used the word "fairness," that I had doubted this group could be fair. I have never had such a doubt, nor have I implied it.

Senator JAVITS. Mr. Sylvester, may I say to you that I am not hurt or upset, I never was by this statement, and that I feel completely capable of making a dispassionate evaluation of the situation, notwithstanding the interest of my State and notwithstanding the statement which you have made.

I don't feel my judgment would be colored at all. I feel calm, serene, full of loving kindness for all mankind. I just thought it would be good for the country for that remark, as it were, to be stricken so that it would not color the public judgment as to the ultimate results of our findings in this investigation.

I thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Senator CURTIS. Mr. Chairman?

The CHAIRMAN. Senator CURTIS?

Senator CURTIS. Mr. Witness, are you familiar with a document called "Memorandum for the Record," dated November 21, 1962, signed by the Secretary of the Air Force, the Secretary of the Navy, and the Secretary of Defense, in reference to this matter?

Mr. SYLVESTER. Is that the November 21 memorandum?

Senator CURTIS. Yes.

Mr. SYLVESTER. I have read the memorandum; yes, Senator.

Senator CURTIS. I believe that is identified as exhibit 2. That is exhibit 2. The record indicates that this was presented the first day of the hearings. You would accept that to be a fact?

Mr. SYLVESTER. Certainly.

Senator CURTIS. I have understood you to say that this investigation should have begun with the total picture and then proceeded to the details, and if we started out with details that was wrong.

Mr. SYLVESTER. I made no value judgment, Senator. I said that trying to be descriptive, I thought if it had been done that way certain results which are unhappy from our point of view might not have followed. I made no suggestion that it should have been.

Senator CURTIS. That led me to this question. Here this statement of the Secretary of Defense, Air Force, and Navy which was introduced into the record the first day of the hearings sets forth their reasons.

Now, I ask you to give this committee now any other reasons not mentioned in here, in this exhibit 2, why this contract should not have been awarded to Boeing.

Mr. SYLVESTER. Senator, I have no competency in this matter whatsoever. I think this is the question that will take up unquestionably with the Secretary of Defense and the Deputy Secretary. I have no competency in this field.

Senator CURTIS. Is it your statement, then, that exhibit No. 2 does not fully set forth the reasons?

Mr. SYLVESTER. I make no comment on the statement and characterize it in anyway whatsoever, Senator.

Senator CURTIS. But you have. You have. You have criticized the procedure of this committee for not getting the reasons for the Department's decision at the very first of the hearings. Here is what purports to be them, in Exhibit 2, and my question is quite simple: Are there other reasons not set forth in here?

Mr. SYLVESTER. I haven't any idea, Senator, and I am not a competent person to respond to that question, unfortunately I do not know. I would assume that Mr. McNamara and Mr. Gilpatric will have their own statements to make, and I can't foreshadow them in any way.

Senator CURTIS. Then when you said that this committee, or said in essence that this committee proceeded in a wrongful manner by not getting the total picture first, you did not know what you were talking about, is that correct?

Mr. SYLVESTER. No, I would not say that. I think what I have said is the same as Mr. Gilpatric said Monday, and the same as the Secretary of Defense said in his letter to you.

Senator CURTIS. What was that?

Mr. SYLVESTER. That as the picture has come out, it has come out in fragmentary form and it has not given the overall picture, and I think that that is inevitable.

Senator CURTIS. Of course you have not been content with that. Here today you have made accusations of distortions.

Mr. SYLVESTER. No, I made no accusation. I think it is inevitable.

Senator CURTIS. Well, the record will speak for itself.

Mr. SYLVESTER. I would like to make the record clear that if you analyze the news stories throughout the country, that the picture presented on the basis of the testimony that has come out, is not the picture that we think it is, in the Defense Department.

Senator Curtis. Well, the record will speak for itself. I did not put the word "distortion" in your mouth.

I will ask you one thing that maybe you are qualified to answer because all you need to know is how to read a calendar.

When do you say that the decision was made?

Mr. Sylvester. I have no first-hand knowledge when it was made.

Senator Curtis. Do you have any second-hand knowledge?

Mr. Sylvester. No.

Senator Curtis. Do you have any knowledge at all of when it was made?

Mr. Sylvester. None of which I could testify under oath.

Senator Curtis. Well, then, you have some knowledge.

Mr. Sylvester. I have no knowledge.

Senator Curtis. Do you have any information?

Mr. Sylvester. No, I have not.

Senator Curtis. What do you mean by implying that some information has come to you but which you can not testify to under oath?

Mr. Sylvester. No, I have seen stories that the decision was made at various times, and that is my only knowledge of it.

Senator Curtis. Where did you see those stories?

Mr. Sylvester. In the press.

Senator Curtis. Have you any other information, not based upon the press?

Mr. Sylvester. I have no first-hand knowledge of what day or when the decision was made.

Senator Curtis. This document of the 21st, of November 1962, would imply it was made some time before the document was written.

Mr. Sylvester. I beg your pardon, sir.

Senator Curtis. This document, exhibit 2, a literal reading of it would indicate that the decision was made some time before the decision was made, because the next to the last paragraph said "The final considerations stem from the fact," and so on.

I have nothing further.

The Chairman. Is there anything further? Thank you very much, Mr. Sylvester. We appreciate your presence and we are glad to have your testimony.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed.

TO PROVIDE FOR MEMBERS ON THE PART OF THE SENATE OF THE JOINT COMMITTEE ON PRINTING AND THE JOINT COMMITTEE OF CONGRESS ON THE LIBRARY

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 15, Senate Resolution 107.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The Legislative Clerk. A resolution (S. Res. 107) providing for Members on the part of the Senate of the Joint Committee on Printing and the Joint Committee of Congress on the Library.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Minnesota.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I move that the resolution be agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution (S. Res. 107) was considered and agreed to as follows:

Resolved, That the following-named Members be, and they are hereby, elected members of the following joint committees of Congress:

Joint Committee on Printing: Mr. Hayden, of Arizona; Mr. Jordan, of North Carolina; and Mr. Scott, of Pennsylvania.

Joint Committee of Congress on the Library: Mr. Jordan, of North Carolina; Mr. Pell, of Rhode Island; Mr. Clark, of Pennsylvania; Mr. Cooper, of Kentucky; and Mr. Scott, of Pennsylvania.

STUDY BY COMMITTEE ON AERONAUTICAL AND SPACE SCIENCES

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Order of Business 16, Senate Resolution 74.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be stated by title.

The Legislative Clerk. A resolution (S. Res. 74) authorizing the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences to make a study of matters pertaining to aeronautical and space activities of Federal departments and agencies, which had been reported from the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences with amendments, and subsequently reported from the Committee on Rules and Administration without additional amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Minnesota.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution, which had been reported from the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences, with amendments, on page 2, line 4, after the word "from", to insert "March 1", and on page 3, line 2, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$90,000" and insert "$82,500"; so as to make the resolution read:

Resolved, That the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdictions specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of any and all matters pertaining to the aeronautical and space activities of departments and agencies of the United States, including such activities peculiar to or primarily associated with the development of weapons systems or military operations.

Sec. 2. (a) For the purposes of this resolution the committee is authorized, from March 1, 1963, through January 31, 1964, inclusive, to (1) make such expenditures as it deems advisable, (2) employ upon a temporary basis and fix the compensation of technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants, and (3) with the prior consent of the head of the department or agency of the Government concerned and the Committee on Rules and Administration, utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any department or agency of the Government.

(b) The minority is authorized to select one person for appointment as an assistant or consultant, and the person so selected shall be appointed. No assistant or consultant may receive compensation at an annual gross rate which exceeds by more than $1,600 the annual gross rate of compensation of any person so selected by the minority.

Sec. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for such legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1964.

Sec. 4. Expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed $82,500, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

The amendments were agreed to.

The resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record an excerpt from the report (No. 17), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

The Committee on Rules and Administration, to whom was referred the resolution (S. Res. 74) authorizing the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, to investigate the aeronautical and space activities of the Federal departments and agencies, having considered the same, report favorably thereon without additional amendments, and recommend that the resolution as amended be agreed to by the Senate.

Senate Resolution 74 as amended would authorize the expenditure of not to exceed $82,500 by the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, from March 1, 1963, through January 31, 1964, to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of "any and all matters pertaining to the aeronautical and space activities of departments and agencies of the United States, including such activities peculiar to or primarily associated with the development of weapons systems or military operations."

The following table indicates funds authorized by the Senate during the 87th Congress for the same purpose. Committee expenditures pursuant to such authorization are shown through December 31, 1962:

Committee and purpose	87th Cong.			
	Amount		Date	Authority
	Authorized	Expended		
Aeronautical and Space Sciences: Aeronautical and space activities of the Federal departments and agencies.	$225,000	$88,695.19	-------------	
	135,000	39,717.70	Jan. 31, 1961	S. Res. 45.
	90,000	48,977.49	Feb. 7, 1962	S. Res. 234.

The purposes of the resolution are more fully detailed in a letter to Senator **B. Everett Jordan**, chairman of the Committee on Rules and Administration, from Senator **Clinton P. Anderson**, chairman of the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences, which letter (with accompanying budget and statement of expenditures during the last session) is as follows:

U.S. Senate,
Committee on Aeronautical
and Space Sciences,
March 1, 1963.

Hon. B. Everett Jordan,
Chairman, Committee on Rules and Administration, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Chairman: The Aeronautical and Space Sciences Committee has unanimously reported out Senate Resolution 74, with amendments, on February 28, 1963, which has been referred to your committee.

This resolution would authorize an expenditure not to exceed $82,500 by the committee for the period beginning March 1, 1963, through January 31, 1964. The two amendments made by the committee reflect the suggestions made by the Rules Committee that (1) the total amount originally requested should be reduced by one-twelfth, and (2) that the period under which the resolution would operate begin with March 1, instead of February 1.

This resolution, which substantially conforms to the suggested draft for resolutions of this nature, would permit the committee to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of any and all matters pertaining to the aeronautical and space activities of departments and agencies of the United States, including such activities which are peculiar to or primarily associated with the development of weapons systems or military operations.

In compliance with Senate Resolution 77 of the 79th Congress, there is also enclosed in duplicate a budget breakdown with respect to the use of these funds.

The amounts set forth in the budget breakdown are based in part on last year's activities by the committee with estimations projected for this calendar year. During the past year the committee has, under Senate Resolution 234, done a considerable volume of work. It has, for example, published or is in the process of printing five reports encompassing a broad spectrum in the space field. These reports involve studies concerning communications satellites, meteorological satellites, space activities of the U.S.S.R., as well as a study and report on the international organization for outer space.

While the amount that was expended during the past year did not reach the total amount authorized, we felt that inasmuch as this committee was a fairly new committee, we should make more of a general survey to create a foundation from which to pinpoint our activities for 1963. Last year, Senator Kerr, as chairman of the Space Committee, stated that the amounts of money expended pursuant to the provisions of Senate Resolution 234, would be carefully supervised. As the new chairman of the Senate Space Committee, I would like to agree completely with this statement. As the attached report of expenditures indicates, nearly $24,000 of the $90,000 authorized under Senate Resolution 234, will be returned unexpended. At least $3,000 of this expenditure has been expended pursuant to Senate Resolution 88 of the 88th Congress, so that except for the present circumstances, the committee would have returned approximately $28,000.

The committee would like to point out that its activities involve matters that are technical in nature requiring the use of expert technical consultants in order that the committee can be properly informed to carry out its duties under its legislative jurisdiction. Because of the highly knowledgeable and competent employees required in this area, we are requesting this year the same, salary ceilings as last year in order to attract and retain this caliber of employees.

In view of our experience during the past 2 years, we believe that there is a great deal more that should be done in order to acquaint committee members and the public with our overall space and aeronautical problems. Having in mind the rapidly expanded efforts of this Nation and others, as evidenced by the proposed budget for NASA of nearly $6 billion for the next fiscal year, there is a constant and continuing requirement that we keep abreast of activities enumerated in the resolution. We believe that the enclosed budget reflects a realistic approach to accompany this undertaking.

Should the Rules and Administration Committee feel that it needs additional information in connection with their consideration of this resolution, I would be pleased to personally appear before the committee in order to answer any questions which its members might have.

Sincerely yours,
Clinton P. Anderson,
Chairman.

Budget

Position	Number	Base per annum	Base per annum	Gross monthly	Gross 12 months	Gross 11 months
STAFF						
Staff member	1	$8,000	$17,230.10	$1,435.84	$17,230.10	$15,794.26
Do	1	7,380	16,064.19	1,338.68	16,064.19	14,725.51
Clerk	4	2,640	6,475.75	539.64	25,903.00	23,744.42
Total						54,264.19
ADMINISTRATIVE						
Contribution to employees health benefit programs (Public Law 86-382, effective July 1, 1960)						446.16
Contribution to civil service retirement fund (6½ percent of total salaries paid)						3,527.14
Contribution to employees Federal employees' group life insurance (27 cents per month per $1,000 coverage)						187.11
Reimbursable payments to agencies						17,874.87
Travel (inclusive of field investigations)						4,583.30
Stationery, office supplies						458.33
Communications (telephone, telegraph)						916.67
Newspapers, magazines, documents						242.23
Total						28,235.81
Grand total						82,500.00

Funds requested, Senate Resolution 74, $82,500.

Funds approved by Committee on Rules and Administration, $82,500.

Actual and estimated expenditures under S. Res. 234

	Authorized	Actually expended through Jan. 31, 1963
Salaries	$55,324.61	$32,719.13
Contributions to employees health benefit programs (Public Law 86-382)	486.72	[1] (138.65)
Contributions to civil service retirement funds (6½ percent of total salaries paid)	3,596.11	[1] (740.99)
Contributions to employees group life insurance (27 cents per month per $1,000)	197.64	[1] (90.05)
Reimbursable payments to agencies and consultants	20,000.00	23,993.39
Travel	3,000.00	4,777.82
Hearings	2,000.00	
Witness fees, expenses	2,000.00	
Stationery, office supplies, postage	1,000.00	674.29
Communications (telephone and telegraph)	1,500.00	
Newspapers, magazines, documents	500.00	
Contingent fund	394.92	
Total	90,000.00	62,164.63

[1] Items in parentheses included in salaries total.

INVESTIGATION OF ADMINISTRATION, OPERATION, AND ENFORCEMENT OF INTERNAL SECURITY ACT

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Order of Business No. 34, Senate Resolution 62. The Senator from Illinois [Mr. Dirksen] wants to offer some comment on it and, I believe, an amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be stated by title.

The Legislative Clerk. A resolution (S. Res. 62) to investigate the administration, operation, and enforcement of the Internal Security Act.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Minnesota.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution, which had been reported from the Committee on Rules and Administration, with amendments, on page 2, line 10, after the word "from", to strike out "February" and insert "March", and on page 3, line 2, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$360,000" and insert "$333,880"; so as to make the resolution read:

Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections

134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdiction specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, insofar as they relate to the authority of the committee, to make a complete and continuing study and investigation of (1) the administration, operation, and enforcement of the Internal Security Act of 1950, as amended; (2) the administration, operation, and enforcement of other laws relating to espionage, sabotage, and the protection of the internal security of the United States; and (3) the extent, nature, and effect of subversive activities in the United States, its territories and possessions, including, but not limited to, espionage, sabotage, and infiltration by persons who are or may be under the domination of the foreign government or organization controlling the world Communist movement or any other movement seeking to overthrow the Government of the United States by force and violence.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution, the committee, from March 1, 1963, to January 31, 1964, inclusive, is authorized (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided*, That the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than $1,600 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 3. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed $333,880, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, if I may have the attention of the chairman of the Committee on Rules and Administration, there was a disparity between the amount carried in the resolution and that inserted in the report. I think the committee has agreed that the item on page 3, in italics, $333,880, is the correct amount.

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. Mr. President, the figure of $333,880 in the printed resolution is a typographical error. The figure of $310,880 specified in the report is the correct amount reported by the Committee on Rules and Administration. However, at the request of the minority leader and the chairman of the committee involved, I will offer no objection to the consideration by the Senate of the $333,880 figure carried in the printed resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there agreement on the amendment?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, the amount is carried in the resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment on page 2, line 10.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now is on agreeing to the amendment on page 3, line 2.

The amendment was agreed to.

The resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 35), explaining the purposes of the resolution.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The Committee on Rules and Administration, to whom was referred the resolution (S. Res. 62) authorizing an investigation of the administration of the national security law and matters relating to espionage, having considered the same, report favorably thereon with amendments and recommend that the resolution as amended be agreed to by the Senate.

Senate Resolution 62 as amended, would authorize the expenditure of $310,880 by the Committee on the Judiciary for the continuance of its standing Subcommittee on Internal Security from March 1, 1963, through January 31, 1964, to make a complete and continuing study and investigation of—

(1) the administration, operation, and enforcement of the Internal Security Act of 1950, as amended;

(2) the administration, operation, and enforcement of other laws relating to espionage, sabotage, and the protection of the internal security of the United States; and

(3) the extent, nature, and effect of subversive activities in the United States, its territories and possessions, including, but not limited to, espionage, sabotage, and infiltration by persons who are or may be under the domination of the foreign government or organizations controlling the world Communist movement or any other movement seeking to overthrow the Government of the United States by force and violence.

The following table indicates funds authorized by the Senate during the 87th Congress for the same purpose. Committee expenditures pursuant to such authorizations are shown through December 31, 1962.

Committee and purpose	87th Cong.			
	Amount		Date	Authority
	Authorized	Expended		
Judiciary: Internal security	$645,000	$564,283.62		
	300,000 20,000	285,545.84	Jan. 31, 1961 Sept. 15, 1961	S. Res. 49 S. Res. 201
	325,000	278,737.78	Feb. 7, 1962	S. Res. 264

Senate Resolution 62 as referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration would have authorized the expenditure of $360,000 for the 12-month period from February 1, 1963, through January 31, 1964, an amount $35,000 in excess of that authorized by the Senate for the same purpose during the last session of Congress.

At its meeting on March 6, 1963, the Committee on Rules and Administration amended Senate Resolution 62 by effecting the following reductions:

(1) A reduction of the requested amount by $25,000, to conform it more nearly to the corresponding 1962 authorization; and

(2) A further reduction of the requested amount by one-twelfth of that portion of the reduced amount representing salaries and employee benefits, to compensate for funds made available to the committee during February 1963 by Senate Resolution 88, agreed to February 19, 1963.

By this action the Committee on Rules and Administration reduced the amount specified in Senate Resolution 62 as referred by $49,120—from $360,000 to $310,880.

The investigative authority was correspondingly reduced to an 11-month period commencing March 1, 1963.

Mr. DIRKSEN subsequently said: Mr. President, was action taken on Calendar No. 34?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution was agreed to without amendment.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which action was taken.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion to table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

RESOLUTION OVER TO TUESDAY

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I think it is agreed that on the resolution dealing with antitrust monopoly, by agreement with the chairman of the subcommittee, it will go over until next Tuesday.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That was the understanding.

SEVEN MORE STATES RATIFY ANTI-POLL TAX AMENDMENT

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] had indicated to a number of Senators earlier today that he had a statement to make at about this hour. I would suggest that the Senator from Florida might proceed now. Then we could go back to the calendar call.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the distinguished acting majority leader.

Mr. President, I am happy to announce to the Senate that seven more States have ratified the antipoll tax amendment to the Constitution which would eliminate the prerequisite that a poll tax or any other tax be a requirement for voting in a Federal election.

The 7 new or additional States, Mr. President, are Idaho, Hawaii, New Mexico, Utah, Minnesota, North Dakota, and Colorado, bringing to 20 the total number of States which have ratified this important amendment to date.

Thus, Mr. President, we are past the halfway mark—20 of the 38 States required by the Constitution having ratified the amendment. It is my expectation that we will receive favorable news in the next few days from several additional States whose legislatures are presently meeting.

Mr. President, I wish to express my profound appreciation to the Senators who represent the seven additional States which have ratified the amendment, which I have mentioned.

I am informed that the Legislature of the State of Idaho ratified the amendment on March 8, the Idaho Senate by a vote of 35 to 1, and the Idaho House by a vote of 55 to 2. I wish to express my grateful thanks to both Senators CHURCH and JORDAN who have vigorously supported this amendment to the Constitution and each of whom recommended ratification by their legislature.

I am especially pleased, Mr. President, that our 50th State, Hawaii, represented so ably by my distinguished friends, Senator FONG and Senator INOUYE, ratified the amendment on March 6 when the Hawaii House approved the Hawaii Senate concurrent resolution endorsing the amendment, but I do not have the votes by which the action was taken.

It is interesting to note that the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for Monday of this week, March 11, which was distributed the following date, March 12, contained on page 3855 Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 1 of the Hawaii General Assembly which ratified the proposed amendment to the Constitution. This is interesting to me because that date, March 12, was the fourth anniversary of the date that the Congress passed the enabling legislation authorizing the admission of the Territory of Hawaii as the 50th State of the Union.

I salute and congratulate both of the distinguished Senators from Hawaii for their strong support of the amendment which I am discussing, and also upon Hawaii's having attained its fourth anniversary as a new State.

Mr. FONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I am delighted to yield to the distinguished senior Senator from Hawaii. I have expressed what I feel in my heart, namely great gratitude toward the 50th State for this being the first resolution which was adopted by the legislature of that State now in session, and for the very active support which the two Senators, sitting on opposite sides of the aisle, have given to the amendment in their State legislature.

Mr. FONG. I thank the distinguished Senator from Florida. I should like to express my deepest appreciation to the distinguished senior Senator from Florida for his very kind remarks toward my colleague and me and toward the people of Hawaii. I thank him for reporting to the Senate the ratification of the proposed 24th amendment to the Constitution of the United States by the Second Legislature of the State of Hawaii.

I congratulate him for the effective leadership he has rendered over the past 14 years in painstakingly guiding to passage the joint resolution on the poll-tax. I was most happy to join with my friend, the diligent Senator from Florida in cosponsoring the measure which has just been ratified by my State.

It is indeed a happy coincidence that ratification by the State Legislature of Hawaii should occur during the fourth anniversary of the month in which the U.S. Congress approved the Statehood Act of Hawaii. It seems somehow symbolic of the aloha spirit which has prevailed between the Congress and our Island State during these years.

I may say that in my opinion one of the greatest exponents of the aloha spirit is the senior Senator from Florida. He has certainly proven himself a firm and faithful friend of Hawaii. He helped us to attain statehood and he has helped us in many significant ways since that momentous day in March 1959. He supported establishment of the East-West Center in Hawaii and in the Appropriations Committee supported the necessary funds to get this fine institution under way. He was a key figure in the establishment of a Department of Commerce field office in Hawaii to assist Islanders in their export-import trade. I have always found the senior Senator from Florida to be most sympathetic to the needs of the people of Hawaii.

It is a kind of poetic justice that the people of Hawaii should reciprocate through their State legislature by ratifying the poll tax amendment to the Constitution which the distinguished Senator from Florida sponsored.

May I also say that I am extremely well pleased that Hawaii may be the 17th State to ratify the amendment on the basis of incomplete data filed with the National Archives and Records. The State of Hawaii would have undoubtedly been the first to ratify the amendment, if the legislature had been in session on September 14, 1962, when the amendment was submitted by the General Services Administration to the Governors of the 50 States; for Hawaii is rightfully proud of its tradition of national leadership in the field of civil rights.

I am proud to affirm the language of the concurrent resolution of the Hawaii State Legislature, which has thus acted to preserve the great traditions nurtured and passed on by our forefathers in ratifying this amendment.

No poll tax should abridge the right to vote. Yet, this archaic system of restricting the right to vote in the imposition of an artificial barrier still survives in five States of the Union.

By encouraging wider voter participation in the election of Federal officials, the amendment is an important contribution to good government. Our faithfulness to the precepts and principles contained in the Declaration of Independence, the Constitution of the United States, and our standards of decency and justice impels legislative bodies of all States in their present or ensuing sessions to discard speedily the poll tax as an obstacle to democracy.

Mr. President, inasmuch as the text of the resolution of the Hawaii State Legislature is printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of Senate proceedings for Monday, March 11, I shall not ask that it be duplicated here.

I thank the distinguished Senator for his very kind remarks and for yielding to me.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Senator.

Mr. President, I am highly appreciative of the kind and generous statement of the Senator from Hawaii. He and his colleague from Hawaii have been untiring in their efforts in this matter.

Mr. President, the State of New Mexico ratified the amendment on March 5, 1963, the vote in the New Mexico Senate being 18 to 10 and in the New Mexico House, 63 to 0. I express my sincere appreciation to Senators ANDERSON and MECHEM, both of whom so ably represent that great State and have taken such a dedicated interest in ratification of the amendment.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. ANDERSON. I want the Senator from Florida to know that the people of my State have felt that the Senator from Florida and those who have supported him have been correct in their position. Our State legislature has approved the amendment. I have had requests from members of the State legislature to express their appreciation to him for having had the matter brought before them for ratification.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Senator for his gracious remarks.

The Legislature of the State of Utah approved the amendment on February 20, the vote in the Utah Senate being 23 to 0 and in the Utah House, 51 to 4. Mr. President, I wish to express my sincere appreciation to my distinguished colleagues, Senators BENNETT and MOSS, who ably represent the State of Utah and who have vigorously supported the submission and ratification of this important amendment.

The fifth new State to ratify the amendment is Minnesota. The house approved the amendment on February 19 and the Minnesota Senate, February 27, the Governor officially certifying the legislature's action to the General Services Administration on March 6. I express my deep appreciation to both of the able Senators from Minnesota—Senator HUMPHREY and Senator MCCARTHY—both of whom, this year and last year, worked so hard to obtain this most gratifying action.

The sixth new or additional State ratifying the anti-poll-tax amendment is North Dakota, which is ably represented in this body by my distinguished friends, Senators YOUNG and BURDICK. I understand that the Senate of North Dakota took affirmative action on its resolution on February 25 by a vote of 27 to 20, the North Dakota House completing necessary action by that State by a vote of 77 to 29 on March 12.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I am delighted to yield to my distinguished friend and colleague from North Dakota.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, I am very happy that my State of North Dakota saw fit to approve the joint resolution. I believe this is meaningful civil rights legislation. The opposition in North Dakota was based largely on the issue of States' rights. I may point out that it is a rather conservative Republican legislature that adopted the joint resolution. We are all grateful to the Senator from Florida for the work he has done on the joint resolution.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank my distinguished friend from North Dakota for these gracious words. I do not believe that any Senators were confronted by a more difficult situation in their States than were the Senators from North Dakota in connection with this subject. I am sure that ratification would not have been accomplished in that good State but for the strong efforts of the senior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. Young] and the distinguished junior Senator from that State [Mr. Burdick].

Likewise, Mr. President, it should be noted that in this case, as in four other cases reported today, the Senators representing those States come from different parties, from opposite sides of the aisle. We have again illustrated in the most perfect way the fact that the support for this amendment has been from the beginning bipartisan, and it is still bipartisan; furthermore, that the Senate as a whole has regarded this matter as not at all more closely connected with one party than with the other. I very strongly thank my distinguished friend the senior Senator from North Dakota.

The seventh and last additional State is Colorado. I was informed late yesterday that both houses of the Colorado Legislature have acted affirmatively upon the resolution ratifying the amendment but as yet, I do not have the dates or the votes by which either house ratified. I wish to express my warm appreciation to my distinguished colleagues representing the State of Colorado, Senators Allott and Dominick, for their support in obtaining ratification by their good State of the anti-poll-tax amendment.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I am very happy to yield to my friend the distinguished junior Senator from Colorado.

Mr. DOMINICK. I thank the Senator from Florida for his congratulations to the Colorado Legislature on the ratification of the anti-poll-tax amendment. In our new leadership in both the Governor's office and in both houses of our State legislature, prompt action has been taken to solve many pressing problems confronting our State. I am happy indeed that approval has been given to the anti-poll-tax amendment. Such approval was included in the overall program.

I am happy to say that my senior colleague [Mr. Allott] and I had an opportunity to urge this action on the State legislature. However, we well know that the support and enthusiasm of the various States in favor of the joint resolution can be attributed to the untiring efforts of the distinguished senior Senator from Florida.

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator from Colorado is most gracious. However, I know perfectly well, and so do the other Senators, as well as the American public, that without the followthrough which has been evidenced so clearly in this matter by Members of the Senate on both sides of the aisle in behalf of strongly supporting ratification of the amendment in their State legislatures, we would not have had these 20 ratifications. Certainly that is true with respect to the State of Colorado. I warmly thank the distinguished junior Senator from Colorado and his colleague for their untiring work in this matter.

Mr. INOUYE subsequently said: Mr. President, I am most grateful for the kind words of the distinguished senior Senator from Florida [Mr. Holland] in commending the State of Hawaii for ratifying the anti-poll-tax amendment. I assure the distinguished Senator from Florida that the people of Hawaii were proud and privileged to support the great constitutional amendment. The final ratification of the Holland anti-poll-tax amendment to the Constitution will be a great and significant step toward achieving a true and living democracy for the people of our Nation.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I want to express my very deep appreciation to the distinguished Senator from Hawaii for the kind words he has spoken relative to the anti-poll-tax amendment and to say for the record that he has been most active, most diligent, and most helpful in having this matter considered by and approved and ratified by the legislature of his State of Hawaii as one of their first items, I believe, as Joint Resolution 1.

May I say it seems to me that we Senators and citizens generally who come from States that have been in the Union very much longer could very profitably look at the record of our 50th State with reference to its recognition of the responsibility of voters.

In their very first election, their voting record surpassed any that I have seen recorded for any other State in the Union in any other election. I may have missed some, but that election showed that 92 percent of the registered electors of the State voted for the candidates in that election.

In the recent action in approving the proposed constitutional amendment on a priority basis, due to the efforts of our two friends the Senators from Hawaii, and of the Governor, the people of the State again have shown an appreciation for the right, the responsibility, and the privilege of voting and for the preservation of that right and for the making of the exercise of voting as nearly a universal matter among our citizens as possible.

So I pay tribute to the fine work of my friends from Hawaii. I am going to point out to the citizens of my own State—in fact, I have already called it to their attention in various appearances in my own State—that here is a lesson we could learn from the citizens of a new State, the people of which have shown in great measure appreciation of their privilege and responsibility of voting, because it is only when citizens vote almost unanimously that we get the full expression of the people of any State.

Before I take my seat I should like to discuss briefly one point, brought out by the distinguished senior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. Young] and by other Senators who have talked with me during the course of my remarks, to the effect that some members of State legislatures have objected to the amendment because they believe it is an infringement upon States rights.

To the contrary, an amendment of this type, submitted to the jury of the States, and requiring, first, approval by two-thirds of the membership of each body of Congress, and later approval by three-fourths of the States, is the finest and highest recognition of the rights of the several States that is found in the Constitution.

The right of a State to have a fundamental matter of this kind submitted to the jury of all the States is one of its most precious rights under the Federal Constitution. It is in recognition, rather than in violation, of that principle that this matter is submitted as a constitutional amendment, where there is no question at all about its validity or about its having to be the expression of a great majority of the people of the States and of the Nation before it can become controlling.

I yield the floor.

Mr. HUMPHREY subsequently said: Mr. President, I commend the distinguished senior Senator from Florida [Mr. Holland] upon his message today and upon his dedication, persistence, and hard work in bringing about, first of all, the adoption by Congress of the constitutional amendment to outlaw the poll tax, and then his followup of the many State legislatures, working with his colleagues in the Senate and in the other body, to encourage prompt action by the State legislatures to eliminate the requirement of a poll tax in order to exercise the franchise.

This is a very important constitutional amendment. As I understand, 22 States have now ratified it. Ratification by 38 States is needed to make the amendment a part of the U.S. Constitution. I am hopeful that this year—if not this year, then by next year—the required number of 38 States will have acted affirmatively to place the amendment in the Constitution.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES TO INVESTIGATE CERTAIN MATTERS RELATING TO NATIONAL DEFENSE

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 17, Senate Resolution 75.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be stated by title.

The Legislative Clerk. A resolution (S. Res. 75) authorizing the Committee on Armed Services to investigate certain matters relating to national defense.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution which had been reported from the Committee on Armed Services with amendments, and subsequently reported from the Committee on Rules and Administration without further amendment.

The amendments of the Committee on Armed Services are as follows:

On page 2, line 22, after the word "from", to strike out "February" and insert "March", and on page 3, line 12, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$190,000" and insert "$175,000"; so as to make the resolution read:

"*Resolved*, That the Committee on Armed Services, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections

134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdiction specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of any and all matters pertaining to—

"(1) common defense generally;

"(2) the War Department and the Military Establishment generally;

"(3) the Navy Department and the Naval Establishment generally;

"(4) soldiers and sailors' homes;

"(5) pay, promotion, retirement, and other benefits and privileges of members of the Armed Forces;

"(6) selective service;

"(7) size and composition of the Army and Navy;

"(8) forts, arsenals, military reservations, and navy yards;

"(9) ammunition depots;

"(10) maintenance and operation of the Panama Canal, including the administration, sanitation, and government of the Canal Zone;

"(11) conservation, development, and use of naval petroleum and oil shale reserves;

"(12) strategic and critical materials necessary for the common defense;

"(13) aeronautical and space activities peculiar to or primarily associated with the development of weapons systems or military operations.

"Sec. 2. For the purpose of this resolution the committee, from March 1, 1963, to January 31, 1964, inclusive, is authorized to (1) make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided*, That the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than $1,600 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

"Sec. 3. The expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed $175,000 shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee."

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I wish to make a statement which may affect this and subsequent resolutions which are to be considered.

We are again engaged, as we have been yearly, in providing funds with which to operate special committees. I call attention to the fact that the Senate is about to consider 23 resolutions which have been actually reported and 2 more resolutions which are at the desk, making a total of 25 so-called money resolutions.

With the exception of two or three, these resolutions refer to special committees which have been created by the standing committees. The total amount of these 25 requests aggregates $4,200,333. Actually, the amount should be $4,582,182.

About a month ago it was necessary for the Senate to adopt a continuing resolution to permit the use of funds with which to pay the staffs of those subcommittees through the month of February. If we consider that the 25 resolutions provide funds on a 12-month basis, it will be noted that the increase for carrying on the work of the subcommittees amounts to $132,682.

Considering this, I do not want the Senate to overlook the fact that although the amounts provided in a few of the resolutions have been reduced somewhat—the overall picture as to the 25 resolutions shows an increase over last year of $132,682. Therefore, the total amount provided by the 25 resolutions for this year, on a 12-month basis, is $4,582,182, compared with $4,449,500 last year.

I am glad that up to now, I have detected that no new subcommittees are in the process of formation. However, I wish to emphasize that these subcommittees still thrive and are still loaded down with many employees—actually, with many more employees than are on the staffs of the regular standing committees.

As all Senators know, each standing committee is entitled to employ 10 persons—6 clericals and 4 specialists—by the Reorganization Act of 1946.

At the close of business December 31, 1961, the number of employees of the special committees was 314, as compared with about 150 employees of the regular standing committees.

As of December 31, 1962, the number of employees of special committees had increased to 338. In large measure, that increase accounts for the pressing need for space which has faced the Senate in the past, and is once again facing the Senate today.

I can well remember the time, several years ago, when some of us were opposed to the construction of a new Senate Office Building. We knew it would be quite expensive. We also felt that if it were necessary to obtain more space in order to provide accommodations for Senators from the larger States, that space probably could be obtained by an extension of the east wing of the Capitol itself. I argued for that position for several years, but I was defeated, and we ended by constructing not only a new Senate Office Building, but also an extension of the east front of the Capitol.

Today, not only are all the offices which were provided in the New Senate Office Building occupied; not only are all the offices in the Capitol extension occupied; but every nook and corner in the Old Senate Office Building which can possibly house anybody has been utilized. The number of offices which are set aside principally for committee work in the Capitol and the two Senate Office Buildings total 358. Of that number, 106 offices are occupied by the employees of the subcommittees. Of course, many of those employees also occupy some of the rooms which are assigned to the regular standing committees.

Thus, much of the space which is now being occupied in the Capitol and the two Senate Office Buildings is being occupied by employees of the subcommittees. If this practice is continued, I foresee a time in the near future when the Senate may be compelled to have more facilities constructed for its employees. When the New Senate Office Building was constructed, many persons felt that it would suffice for many years to come. But all the space in that building is now occupied, and it will be very difficult to remove the committees and their employees after they have been stationed there.

Mr. President, I also wish to say a few words regarding the amounts appropriated in recent Congresses for this special work—that is, the work done by subcommittees created by the standing committees and also the work done by special committees created by the Senate itself. During the 87th Congress, there was authorized for all committees—that is, for the standing committees, the special committees, and the subcommittees of the various standing committees—$9,355,500 for these special inquiries and investigations; and at least $10,000 was authorized for routine expenditures. In other words as all of us know, under the Reorganization Act, each committee is allowed a certain amount. The amount for routine expenditures during the 87th Congress was $283,000.

As I said, the amount authorized for the inquiries was $9,355,000.

This amount shows a decrease of almost $1 million from the corresponding amount allowed during the 86th Congress. I tried to find how that decrease came about. In examining the expenditures of the various committees, we notice that during the 86th Congress the Commerce Committee spent considerably more money than that committee spent during the 87th Congress. That was partly due because of the investigations it made in regard to railroad rates, air travel rates, and so forth. The committee used a little less than $500,000 during the 87th Congress, as compared to the $913,000-plus it used during the 86th Congress.

The Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs spent considerably less under the able leadership of my good friend, the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON]. Prior to his tenure as chairman, the committee spent approximately $435,000 to $450,000 annually; but during the last Congress, only $177,000 was spent by the committee.

The same is true of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. Its investigations during the 87th Congress required much less than was required by its investigations during the 86th Congress.

However, when we consider the average performance of the committees, without considering the special investigations to which I have referred, we find that the amounts spent have increased, and no saving has been made.

I was very hopeful that the Committee on Rules and Administration would attempt to make some cuts in the amounts allowed for these investigations, and thus would reduce somewhat the payrolls. It is my judgment that when we try to reduce the amounts appropriated for the various departments, we stand in a bad position if we do not reduce the amounts spent by our own committees. It seems to me that most of these committees, and particularly the Internal Security Subcommittee could reduce their expenditures.

Nevertheless, for many, many years, they have had a growing number of employees. I believe that savings can be made as to that subcommittee and to a number of other subcommittees.

I expect to ask questions about practically all these resolutions as the calendar is called, and particularly in regard to the Subcommittee To Study Juvenile Delinquency. That subcommittee was established years ago, in the hope that its work could be completed within a year, and given a budget of approximately $75,000. But up to now we have spent well over $1 million on it. To my way of thinking, very little good, if any, has been accomplished by the expenditure of that huge sum of money.

So, Mr. President, as I have said, as each resolution is called up I expect to ask some questions about the work done by the subcommittees and about what is in the offing.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, following my remarks, a summary of table 1 in the Senate inquiries and investigations brochure which was presented to the Senate today.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TABLE 1.—*Summary*

Committee	87th Congress		86th Congress		85th Congress	
	Authorized	Expended	Authorized	Expended	Authorized	Expended
All committees	$9,638,500.00	$6,838,310.96	$10,758,231.37	$7,839,298.44	$8,283,830.08	$5,916,015.68
Routine expenditures	283,000.00	215,059.62	300,000.00	214,389.96	320,000.00	210,475.89
Inquiries and investigations	9,355,500.00	6,623,251.34	10,458,231.37	7,624,908.48	7,963,830.08	5,705,539.79
Standing committees	9,268,500.00	6,532,779.93	9,228,520.00	6,718,396.24	6,660,541.45	4,397,126.65
Routine expenditures	283,000.00	215,059.62	300,000.00	214,389.96	320,000.00	210,475.89
Inquiries and investigations	8,985,500.00	6,317,720.31	8,928,520.00	6,504,006.28	6,340,541.45	4,186,650.76
Aeronautical and Space Sciences	235,000.00	94,474.57	10,000.00	6,781.00	10,000.00	90.10
Routine expenditures	10,000.00	5,779.38	10,000.00	6,781.00	10,000.00	90.10
Inquiries and investigations	225,000.00	88,695.19				
Agriculture and Forestry	10,000.00	8,237.61	25,000.00	15,489.14	25,000.00	13,543.71
Routine expenditures	10,000.00	8,237.61	25,000.00	15,489.14	25,000.00	13,543.71
Inquiries and investigations						
Appropriations	826,000.00	170,715.12	810,000.00	238,687.94	805,000.00	138,947.88
Routine expenditures	66,000.00	57,011.47	50,000.00	39,514.55	45,000.00	35,137.89
Inquiries and investigations	760,000.00	113,703.65	760,000.00	199,173.39	760,000.00	103,809.99
Armed Services	575,000.00	433,666.56	400,000.00	322,516.87	412,000.00	250,627.80
Routine expenditures	20,000.00	16,141.99	20,000.00	11,394.75	20,000.00	16,049.27
Inquiries and investigations	555,000.00	417,524.57	380,000.00	311,122.12	392,000.00	234,578.53
Banking and Currency	384,000.00	330,514.82	350,000.00	283,285.75	360,000.00	278,312.84
Routine expenditures	10,000.00	8,562.96	10,000.00	9,098.47	10,000.00	9,009.86
Inquiries and investigations	374,000.00	321,951.86	340,000.00	274,187.28	350,000.00	269,302.98
Commerce	650,000.00	469,823.40	1,161,020.00	913,664.15	635,000.00	393,889.75
Routine expenditures	20,000.00	14,917.09	20,000.00	15,326.18	10,000.00	8,242.21
Inquiries and investigations	630,000.00	454,906.31	1,141,020.00	898,337.97	625,000.00	385,647.54
District of Columbia	10,000.00	5,631.29	10,000.00	4,354.48	10,000.00	5,330.44
Routine expenditures	10,000.00	5,631.29	10,000.00	4,354.48	10,000.00	5,330.44
Inquiries and investigations						
Finance	22,000.00	14,597.71	10,000.00	5,491.56	20,000.00	12,922.38
Routine expenditures	22,000.00	14,957.71	10,000.00	5,491.56	20,000.00	12,922.38
Inquiries and investigations						
Foreign Relations	380,000.00	222,438.44	705,000.00	484,807.65	629,000.00	146,751.85
Routine expenditures	10,000.00	9,958.18	20,000.00	19,819.29	40,000.00	27,320.73
Inquiries and investigations	37,000.00	212,480.26	685,000.00	464,988.36	589,000.00	119,431.12
Government Operations	1,270,000.00	1,065,223.22	915,000.00	693,004.62	450,000.00	418,584.43
Routine expenditures	10,000.00	4,427.57	20,000.00	8,469.34	10,000.00	5,376.11
Inquiries and investigations	1,260,000.00	1,060,795.65	895,000.00	684,535.28	440,000.00	413,208.32
Interior and Insular Affairs	280,000.00	177,999.94	450,000.00	435,387.04	398.750.00	389,662.04
Routine expenditures	20,000.00	19,766.59	30,000.00	26,586.19	30,000.00	25,566.88
Inquiries and investigations	260,000.00	158,233.35	420,000.00	408,800.85	368,750.00	364,095.16
Judiciary	3,541,500.00	2,880,192.64	3,192,500.00	2,585,334.33	2,188,291.45	1,821,792.19
Routine expenditures	10,000.00	9,976.33	10,000.00	5,817.41	20.000.00	7,762.86
Inquiries and investigations	3,531.500.00	2,870,216.31	3,182,500.00	2,579,516.92	2,168,291.45	1,814,029.33
Labor and Public Welfare	145,000.00	120,019.90	265,000.00	214,292.46	20,000.00	16,741.40
Routine expenditures	25,000.00	18,663.23	25,000.00	24,057.26	20,000.00	16,741.40
Inquiries and investigations	120,000.00	101,356.67	240,000.00	190,235.20		
Post Office and Civil Service	160,000.00	126,191.67	175,000.00	123,617.84	120,000.00	92,144.54
Routine expenditures	10,000.00	8,242.76	10,000.00	9,613.24	20,000.00	15,617.38
Inquiries and investigations	150,000.00	117,948.91	165,000.00	114,004.60	100,000.00	76,527.16
Public Works	260,000.00	100,293.39	260,000.00	58,014.71	160,000.00	97,417.53
Routine expenditures	10,000.00	4,834.93	10,000.00	3,558.58	10,000.00	25.00
Inquiries and investigations	250,000.00	95,458.46	250,000.00	54,456.13	150,000.00	97,392.53

TABLE 1.—*Summary*—Continued

Committee	87th Congress		86th Congress		85th Congress	
	Authorized	Expended	Authorized	Expended	Authorized	Expended
Standing committees—Continued						
Rules and Administration	$260,000.00	$100,117.06	$245,000.00	$117,957.57	$220,000.00	$129,650.37
Routine expenditures	10,000.00	2,411.96	10,000.00	3,992.25	10,000.00	3,384.83
Inquiries and investigations	250,000.00	97,705.10	235,000.00	113,965.32	210,000.00	126,265.54
Small Business (Select) [1]	260,000.00	212,642.59	245,000.00	215,709.13	197,500.00	190,717.40
Routine expenditures	10,000.00	5,898.57	10,000.00	5,026.27	10,000.00	8,354.84
Inquiries and investigations	250,000.00	206,744.02	235,000.00	210,682.86	187,500.00	182,362.56
Joint committees [2]	----------	----------	280,000.00	266,833.64	130,000.00	78,888.10
Economic	----------	----------	200,000.00	192,173.80	----------	----------
Washington Metropolitan Problems	----------	----------	80,000.00	74,659.84	130,000.00	78,888.10
Select committees [2]	----------	----------	1,114,711.37	755,141.92	1,298,288.63	1,297,418.76
Labor-Management	----------	----------	789,711.37	663,854.05	1,298,288.63	1,297,418.76
National Water Resources	----------	----------	325,000.00	91,287.87	----------	----------
Small Business.[1]						
Special committees [2]	370,000.00	305,531.03	135,000.00	98,926.64	195,000.00	142,582.17
Aging	370,000.00	305,531.03	----------	----------	----------	----------
Astronautics and Space Exploration	----------	----------	----------	----------	50,000.00	30,090.75
Foreign Aid Program	----------	----------	----------	----------	75,000.00	68,217.74
Political Activities, Lobbying, and Campaign Contributions	----------	----------	----------	----------	60,000.00	44,273.68
Preservation of Senate Memorabilia	----------	----------	10,000.00	35.10	10,000.00	----------
Unemployment Problems	----------	----------	125,000.00	98,891.54	----------	----------

[1] For the purposes of this compilation the Select Committee on Small Business, because of the nature of its organization and the duration of its authority, is included with the standing committees of the Senate, even though it lacks legislative jurisdiction.

[2] All funds shown for joint, select, and special committees are in the category "inquiries and investigations."

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BAYH in the chair). Does the Senator from Louisiana yield to the Senator from Ohio?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I merely wish to express the view that the proposals to make a general cut in expenditures will be decided by the action we take on the proposals which will be made by the Senator from Louisiana. If we do not reduce our own expenditures, we shall be defenseless in our efforts to try to cut the expenditures of the other branches of the Government. So, in my opinion, the action to be taken today by the Senate will be determinative of this issue, about which so much has been said—in other words, that if there is to be tax reduction, there must be, accompanying it, a reduction of expenditures.

I think Parkinson's disease—or whatever is the economic term for this situation—has been characteristic of the topsy-turvy growth of these departments, and I believe something must be done about this situation.

So I shall give support to the Senator from Louisiana in the fight he is making on this issue.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, growing concern in the United States over annual increases in the total budget and in deficit spending has been expressed in all corners of this Nation.

Among those who have voiced their concern are Members of Congress, including the distinguished Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] who now has the floor and has been kind enough to yield to me.

Yet, the Congress itself is contributing to the overall problem by voting larger sums each year to meet operating expenses.

On the Senate side, the appropriations which are approved for the use of committees and subcommitteees grow generally larger in every succeeding Congress.

Naturally, enough money must be appropriated for each committee to permit the proper processing, study, and reporting of proposed legislation referred according to jurisdiction.

However, some effort ought to be made by the legislative branch, which has the power to cut the amount of the national budget, to show restraint in the use of money for its own purposes.

If we are to begin our efforts to reduce annual spending, we ought, for the sake of our integrity, to begin to do it here in the Senate.

For that reason, Mr. President, I attempted to reduce by approximately 10 percent the appropriations requested by committees which asked for substantial increases over the amounts allowed them last year. I feel sure that each committee so affected will not be hampered in performing its normal functions, and the saving to the Senate will be sufficient to demonstrate an honest intent to economize in its own backyard.

For the benefit of committee chairmen who would be affected by the application of my motion, I say that it will not preclude them from returning at a later time before the Committee on Rules and Administration—or, at least, it is not my intention to preclude them from doing so—if they actually require additional funds. But I believe it will be helpful to everyone if we take a second look at the expenditures being made and if we begin to do some economizing right now.

It is my hope that the Senate will support my thoughts and efforts in connection with this matter; and I thank the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] for his support.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I am glad to hear that an effort was made before the committee to cut back the proposed expenses. Evidently my good friend did not succeed too well, because the increase involved in the same 25 subcommittee resolutions over what was authorized last year is $132,682. I am hopeful that other Senators will join me, my good friend from Nevada, and my good friend from Ohio in curtailing the proposed expenses.

I wish to make one further observation. Let us not forget that the amount of money of which we are now speaking is money which would be spent for the special committees only. Let us not forget that, in addition, every standing committee has available $142,500 in order to meet the ordinary routine expenditures of those committees. What is proposed is the expenditure of extra or additional money.

As I said a while ago, the amount of this extra money has been increasing year by year. Over the past 15 years, in order that we might conduct certain investigations the amount allotted has increased from about $140,000 or $200,000 per year to an amount now in excess of $4 million.

I point out also that the amount of which I am now speaking would not include the printing of the reports which would be made by the various subcommittees. I was unable to obtain the exact amount of that cost, but it would amount to hundreds of thousands of dollars.

That should be added to what we are spending merely to hold hearings and to pay those who serve the various subcommittees.

I hope that at a future time I shall be able to obtain that information and present it to the Senate. I was unable to get it because I was told that it would require much more than a couple of days or even a week to find out exactly the amount of money that is spent for printing the reports of the various subcommittees.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. As a new member of the Committee on Rules and Administration, I should like to support in general what my friend from Louisiana has said. I wish particularly to commend the Senator from Nevada [Mr. CANNON] for the action he took in attempting, at least, to hold down the proposed increase in some of the committee appropriations.

The business of subcommittees, in my opinion, requires the careful scrutiny of the Committee on Rules and Administration. As the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] has said, the number of employees on subcommittees presently exceeds the total number of employees for full committees as authorized by the Reorganization Act.

Another aspect of the problem which I hope will be looked into before too long is the overlapping jurisdiction of committees. The subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee which deals with antitrust investigations and legislation has 44 employees. That subcommittee proposes to make an investigation of the procedures in the Common Market which might affect the trade and commerce of the United States, and particularly that portion of it which comes within the antitrust laws and regulation of monopoly. I have no doubt that within the broad grant of authority to the Judiciary Committee, that subcommittee is entitled to make such an investigation. As a new member of the Committee on Rules and Administration I had not intended to object to that particular request, but I find, on examining the rules, that an investigation of the same subject; namely, the monopoly characteristics of the Common Market, could have been undertaken by the Committee on Finance, the Committee on Foreign Relations, or the Committee on Commerce, just as reasonably as by the subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee.

I make those few comments now—and I thank my friend for yielding—because they emphasize to me one more area in which senatorial reorganization is badly needed, and that has to do with the entire committee structure, the overlapping jurisdiction of committees, the proliferation of such committees, and the requests for appropriations, which in my opinion are treated on a somewhat helter-skelter basis. I congratulate my friend the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] for raising the question again, as he has done so often in the past, and also to congratulate my colleague the Senator from Nevada [Mr. CANNON] for the interest that he has taken in this subject and for the very keen efforts I know he will make to bring this problem under control.

Mr. President, as I understand, the pending resolution is Senate Resolution 75.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. ELLENDER. The amount requested under Senate Resolution 75 is $175,000. As I understand, from that amount would be deducted the appropriations for 1 month—the month of February—but no effort has been made to reduce the amount from last year's appropriation. The appropriation for last year was $190,000; the appropriation for this year is $175,000, which is an appropriation for an 11-month period.

When my good friend the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS] finishes his statement, I desire to offer an amendment which would cut back the sum which the resolution would authorize.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, on the subject of money for special committees and staffs, I am generally in accord with the distinguished Senator from Louisiana. Over a period of years his effort to cut the amounts which would be authorized by the resolutions has proven very discouraging and quite futile. Even though a cut may be adopted at one point in the procedure, somehow the amount is restored. Another resolution comes before the Committee on Rules and Administration a few months later, and no real saving results.

The money is the result and not the cause. The cause is too many committees. The Reorganization Act that went into effect in 1946 had as one of its basic purposes a reduction in the number of committees. That has been circumvented by giving to subcommittees separate identity, separate staffs, separate amounts of space in the two Senate Office Buildings and in the Capitol.

I wish to point out that this is a problem we cannot solve by a broadside attack. There are some committees which never make requests for money from the contingent fund.

The Senate Committee on Finance had as heavy a load of proposed legislation to consider in the last Congress as had any other committee. It has no subcommittees, as such. It has no special assignment of rooms. It did not request money from the contingent fund.

I would not say that there is a desire in every Senator's breast to be a chairman of a committee. I would not say that it is necessary for a Senator to be a chairman of a committee for the news media of the country to find out he is doing something. I would not say that if someone is only a good Senator, attending committee meetings, asking questions, reading the hearings, that that Senator would be denied his full share of publicity.

I would not say those things—but, Mr. President, I have thought about them.

One of our problems is that too many people have been desirous of heading subcommittees to do something. The result is that we do not have sufficient space. Mr. President, as of now there are Senators who do not have their own rooms contiguous to each other, we are so crowded for space. These buildings are so filled by staffs of subcommittees it is sometimes difficult to go up and down the corridors.

What has been the result? The result has been that when a committee has a staff of 20, or 25, or 30, the members cannot keep up with what the staff is doing. Pretty soon my friends on the minority come in to say, "If this thing is going to go on, and if there are to be 30 staff members digging up stuff and sending out questionnaires and making studies, we must have 4 or 5 people to keep up with them to find out what is going on, so that they can tell us."

There is no reasonable answer to that argument.

Pretty soon there will be such a volume of committee studies, reports, inquiries, and hearings going on that we shall find it necessary to increase the number of staff members in our own offices. So we shall need more staff to find out what some other staff is doing.

The result will be that the legislative body will cease to be a body of Members deliberating on broad national issues. It is fast becoming a legislative bureaucracy, with the legislative factfinding and determination being done on a staff level.

These are fine individuals. They are worthy individuals. I do not question their competence. I merely point out that there are so many of them we cannot keep track of what they are doing, and not one of them has ever been elected to the position he holds.

Under our system of government the people expect us to legislate, not to be administrative officers who run a huge bureau.

Frequently my constituents get in touch with me and point out that they have received questionnaires on some fancy stationery from a subcommittee or a special committee, or from this or that, asking a lot of things about their business. I pick up my telephone. I try to find out about it. I ask, "Did the committee ever authorize such a study?" I get the answer, "It has not. This has been a staff project."

There is prying into the affairs of our citizens, in regard to private information, trade secrets, and everything else. This place is crawling with individuals imbued with the idea that the Government knows best, that we could regulate everything, that we should get all the information, that we should decide how people shall conduct their businesses, and how they shall spend their old age and their youth and all the years in between.

Again I point out that it is rather unwise and dangerous to make these accusations generally, and I do not do so.

If I may have the attention of the distinguished Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] I believe my memory is correct when I say that the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, of which the Senator is the chairman, has not made a request for additional staff over the years.

Mr. ELLENDER. It has not. The committee does not need more technical people on the staff. Of course, that means a lot more work for the chairman.

Mr. CURTIS. We have a very able chairman.

Mr. ELLENDER. There are many good members on the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Since I have been chairman of the committee I believe there has been only one request for additional money. The committee got $25,000, which was to enable it to investigate the CCC. The remainder of the work has been done by our committee staff.

Mr. CURTIS. The point is that the more staff we employ the less time Members will have for their real duties. Someone must give the administrative time necessary to run this bureaucracy. Someone must read what the staff has prepared.

I pay tribute once more to the distinguished American who heads the Senate Committee on Finance, the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD]. That committee has a tremendous load, covering a wide jurisdiction including controversial matters, yet the committee does not have subcommittees filling up the buildings.

Let us consider that a little. Suppose there were subcommittees of the Senate Committee on Finance; and that a subcommittee on excise taxes was holding hearings in San Francisco, while a subcommittee on corporate taxes was holding hearings in Atlanta, and while some other subcommittee was holding hearings on the taxes on small businessmen in Chicago or some other place. That would keep our economy in such a state of turmoil that no one would have any idea what the taxes really were or what was the tax program.

The point I wish to make, Mr. President, is that the Congress should not be a propaganda agency for more government, for promoting ideas to build up an appetite and a demand in the country for more programs which the people back home have not thought about and do not want. That serves no lawful purpose.

As to the resolution now under consideration, the Committee on Armed Services has a very heavy load. I have no way of knowing about all the intricate problems involved. I believe there is a clash going on between the military and civilian heads in the Pentagon. I think the work of our Armed Services Committee is of supreme importance. After all, if the security of our country does not head the list of things the Congress must consider, I cannot make a list.

So I am not going to single out the resolution which is now pending for any chastisement of a committee, but I wish to say that the Committee on Rules and Administration cannot do anything about the problem until the committees themselves do something. I ask, Senators, "Did you ever see a piece of proposed legislation defeated when no one appeared to oppose it?"

The Committee on Rules and Administration holds a hearing and the chairman and the ranking member and other Senators all appear. It is said, "We want to do this. We want to save the people. We want to do their thinking for them. We want to pry into their affairs. Give us this."

No one appears in opposition. In addition to those who appear, it is not unusual for a member of the Rules Committee to get a telephone call or some other communication saying, "We are interested in this."

The point I am interested in making is, Are we running a bureaucracy in which Senators are administrative people and legislation is handled by the unelected, and are we confining our efforts to those things which are essential for the security and survival of this country, as well as the payment of debts?

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the amendment of the Senator from Louisiana.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendments have not yet been stated.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I wish to propose my amendment to Senate Resolution 75.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair would like to have the clerk state the first amendment.

The legislative clerk read the amendment on page 2, line 22, after the word "from", to strike out "February" and insert "March."

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the next amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 3, line 12, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$190,000" and insert "$175,000."

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, on page 3, line 12, I offer an amendment to that amendment. I propose that the figure "$175,000" be reduced to "$150,000."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Louisiana to the committee amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 3, line 12, strike out "$175,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$150,000."

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I suggest the vote taken on the amendment of the Senator from Louisiana be recorded by the yeas and nays. I seek support for that request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second? There is not a sufficient second.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll to determine if a quorum is present.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that further proceedings under the quorum call be suspended.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the amendment to the amendment.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, the resolution (S. Res. 75) to which an amendment is proposed to reduce the amount requested, provides funds for the operations of the Preparedness Investigating Subcommittee of the Committee on Armed Services. I ask the indulgence of the Senate. I ask the Chair to maintain order in the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. INOUYE in the chair). The Senate will be in order.

Mr. STENNIS. This is a matter of some consequence. The resolution provides the operating expense money for the Preparedness Investigating Subcommittee of the Committee on Armed Services, which last year had a resolution of like nature for $190,000. The resolution approved for this year by both the Armed Services Committee and the Committee on Rules and Administration provides for $175,000 for an 11-month period, which is, in corresponding figures, the same amount as allowed for last year.

Last year the subcommittee failed to use between $30,000 and $40,000 of these funds. I will explain briefly the operations of the committee. First I should like to give the membership of the subcommittee. It is composed of the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON], the Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], the Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH], and the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER]. I have the privilege of being its chairman.

We have a normal staff of six men and four secretaries. That is our staff at the moment. However, we have just employed, on a temporary basis, an additional man who is versed with reference to matters and proposals regarding the band on nuclear testing. It is a matter that we have gotten into in connection with the military program.

We had last year, at one time, a peak of 19 people. We conducted an investigation with reference to the so-called muzzling of the military. None of that money for last year was used in paying traveling expenses—not a dollar of it—of any member of the subcommittee or any other expense in connection with its operations. There was something like three or four thousand dollars spent in connection with travel for staff members, which is a relatively small amount.

The subcommittee operates for the Armed Services Committee, which, considers a budget of around $50 billion a year.

Several members of the subcommittee also serve on the Appropriations Committee. We bring to these operations of the subcommittee several matters of some magnitude for primary consideration, and follow up in some cases, matters that really arise in the Appropriations Committee, with reference to military matters. This whole matter is scrutinized by the chairman of the Armed Services Committee, the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL]. I can assure the Senate that it is given individual attention by the chairman, and that the cost of operating any subcommittee with which the Senator from Georgia is connected, whenever he approves it, is very much the rock-bottom figure.

We expect to operate this year just as frugally as we operated last year. I cannot tell, and no one can tell, what we may get into, and how quickly an investigation will have to be made or how necessary it will become to increase the number of our staff. This we do on a reimbursable basis with men from the General Accounting Office, who are trained in this kind of work. There is no favoritism shown with respect to this matter. These are men who are already trained.

Incidentally, there has been only one man who has been added to the staff in the last 2 or 3 years, since I have been chairman, who had not already served on it. These are professional men, who have been there for years. We get them on a temporary basis. We have two men now from the General Accounting Office, and they are doing excellent work. We do not want to be stripped down just because we have been frugal and thrifty. We do not want to strip down to the last bottom dollar and not be given any discretion, or no running room of any kind, and forced to decide what we shall take up and investigate only after we have come here to get more money.

We receive dozens of interesting letters during the course of the consideration of any particular matter in this body, inquiring about the military program. We are able quickly to run down and give the answer immediately. Perhaps a staff member can do it, or a staff member can get the information out quickly.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield to the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, as a member of Senate Preparedness Subcommittee I have watched its operations under the able chairmanship of the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS]. To this subcommittee in effect is assigned by the chairman of the full committee, the senior Senator from Georgia, the job of being the watchdog of the full committee.

In my opinion, this subcommittee is one of the most important committees functioning in the Senate today. As the able Senator from Mississippi has pointed out, its prime mission is to watch over military procurement and operations which involve more than $52 billion a year. At least that is the figure this year. The subcommittee conducts extremely important investigations, some are going on right now. We are conducting an investigation of the facts with respect to Cuba. We also have an investigation going on with respect to the techniques incident to the proposed nuclear test cessation ban. In addition if any Member of the Senate or possibly a constituent of any Member of this body has a request or a complaint, it generally ends up as a problem for this Military Preparedness Subcommittee.

I say in all sincerity to the Senator from Mississippi that I have been in the Senate for some years, and during all that time I have never seen a subcommittee operate with more light and less heat than his subcommittee.

As the chairman pointed out, there has been only one member added to the staff since he took over the chairmanship. In itself this is a great tribute to the wisdom and efficency and economy-minded aspect of the way he has handled the work of the committee. The amount he now requests is considerably less than one one-thousandth of 1 percent of what the military is asking for. Surely, we can afford to have one subcommittee in the Senate operating with the primary mission of investigating just where the largest portion of the taxpayer's dollar goes, whether these vast sums are really needed, and whether they are being utilized in the best interest of the people.

I hope that my able friend, the Senator from Louisiana, will give consideration to these observations. At the same time, I wish him to know that I join him and other Members of the Senate in recognition of the fact this problem of subcommittees is one that should be given very serious attention by the Senate. Obviously, in some cases it would seem to be getting out of hand. I do feel, however, that if there is any exception which proves the rule, the modest request of the Preparedness Subcommittee is the exception. I hope not one cent considered necessary by one of the ablest Members of this body, the Senator from Mississippi, will be taken from this subcommittee at this time.

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the Senator from Missouri. He lends a great deal of his time and valuable counsel to the operation of this subcommittee. I am delighted publicly to thank him for his assistance.

I should like to make a correction. The total amount allowed last year for the subcommittee really came to $220,000, because with reference to the so-called muzzling hearing which was conducted, there was an added amount credited over to the subcommittee of $30,000. We conducted an investigation which cost more than that, but we used the regular staff.

I yield to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, in the main I am in complete accord with the position taken by my distinguished friend, the Senator from Louisiana. I serve as chairman of a subcommittee appointed by him, which has never asked for a dollar, which has never asked for an office, and which thoroughly approves of his principle of handling the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry so as to avoid that course whenever possible.

I serve as chairman of a subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations, and I can make the same comment with reference to that particular subcommittee. But I believe we would be penny wise and pound foolish if, in the pending matter, we cut off $25,000 of the amount requested for the operations of this subcommittee. In my own State there is more concern at present about one of the subject matters being examined by this able subcommittee than there is about any other one thing in our Government, and that is the question of what is the Soviet buildup, and what is the Cuban buildup of arms in the Republic of Cuba, what is our posture in respect to our ability effectively and completely to meet that threat in every respect?

I would feel that I was ignoring the hundreds of letters from the good citizens of my State, who have expressed great interest in this particular investigation relative to Cuba, if I assumed to challenge the judgment of the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS] and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], and the judgment of the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. JORDAN] and his associates, who so ably handle the Committee on Rules and Administration—and I believe this is their first report which is attempted to be corrected on the floor. I would feel that I was, indeed, penny wise and pound foolish if I stood here and opposed such an array of judgment in a situation so important as this, and insisted on cutting $25,000 from their year's allowance for investigating the many important subjects, which they must investigate, particularly the one subject which I have just mentioned.

I congratulate the able Senator from Mississippi upon his heading of that investigation. As he knows, I have furnished him, from my own files, certain material bearing on that subject, and I shall continue to do so. We are intensely interested in having him press to the very end the question of just what has been built up in Cuba, and in resolving the confusion which exists throughout our country, especially in the State which I represent, in part, and which is so close to the Republic of Cuba.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Florida. I point out in connection with the Cuban matter—and it is a large matter—that, very fortunately, we have been able to conduct the investigation so far with the staff we already have. But as we go further into the question—and we expect to have the problem under surveillance for some time, because it is not an "overnight" proposition—we want to have a little freedom to be able to employ, on a reimbursable basis, personnel from the General Accounting Office to make quick investigations which may become necessary.

I yield to the Senator from Nevada.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, I am very happy that the distinguished Senator from Mississippi corrected the RECORD to show that the Committee on Rules and Administration authorized $220,000 for the subcommittee last year, during the second session of the 87th Congress. During that period, we conducted extensive investigations. Of the total amount authorized, the committee expended, in the 12-month period, approximately $160,000. Congress last year authorized a 7-percent pay increase and certain additional benefits. So if the committee spent on the same basis this year as it spent last year, taking into account the salary increases, it would spend roughly $175,000.

I do not attempt to apply the formula I previously stated was applied in the committee—and I generally support the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], for the very reason that this committee requested this year a total of $45,000 less than it requested during the second session of the 87th Congress.

I think this shows the high degree of responsibility which the committee through its distinguished chairman, is exercising and the close attention the committee is paying to the expenditure of funds. I, for one, hope that the Senate will not unduly penalize this committee, which, to me, has taken a step in right direction, so far as economy is concerned, and which is performing important work in connection with the preparedness of the United States, an area which involves by far the greatest percentage of expenditure of our defense dollar.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Mississippi yield, that I may ask a question of the Senator from Nevada?

Mr. STENNIS. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Do the Senator's figures show that there are committees which have asked for increases in funds, thus bringing them into a category different from the one occupied by the Committee on Armed Services?

Mr. CANNON. It is true that a number of committees or subcommittees requested increases in the funds for their operations this year. Some of the increases were modest and resulted from the increases in pay for which Congress voted last year. In those instances, I did not attempt to apply my formula. But, as I previously stated, when a subcommittee requested additional money in an amount which was much in excess of the amount necessitated by reason of the pay increases and the additional benefits voted by Congress, I attempted to apply a reduction of 10 percent to the total amount requested, if it did not bring the amount below the amount requested last year, plus the additional funds necessitated by the pay increase.

As I stated heretofore, this subcommittee requested $45,000 less for this year than the Senate authorized during the 2d session of the 87th Congress.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I thank the Senator from Nevada.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Nevada for his explanation. That $45,000 would be approximately a 22½ percent reduction from the amount provided last year.

I should like to say one further word for the benefit of Senators who have recently entered the Chamber. I deeply appreciate the helpfulness of the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], not only on this subject, but on others, as well. He does splendid work for the country and for the Senate. However, I feel that in this instance he did not, perhaps, have an opportunity to give sufficient time to follow through with these figures and see what a large percentage reduction this committee has already taken compared with the amount which it actually spent last year.

It so happens that Senators who are members of this subcommittee from the other side of the aisle are not in the Chamber at the moment. However, I can assure the Senate that the resolution has the support of the Republican members of the subcommittee. I wish that at least one of them were here now.

I trust that the Senate will sustain the committee.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I wish to say that I recognize the position of our good friend, the Senator from Mississippi, in connection with the pending proposal; but I join the Senator from Louisiana in urging adoption of this amendment.

At this time much is being said about the necessity to cut the Federal budget. Although I recognize that this item is a very small one in comparison with the overall $98 billion budget, nevertheless we must begin somewhere; and if we in Congress are not willing to start tightening the purse strings and controlling our own expenditures in the legislative branch we shall not be very effective in the future in reducing the expenditures of the executive branch. The only way we shall trim the budget is by recognizing that there are no sacred items in it, either as it affects the Members of Congress, our own committees, or any of the agencies in the executive branch.

I shall support the Ellender amendment to cut this appropriation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] to the committee amendment on page 3, line 12.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, of course, I have complete confidence in my good friend, the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS]. I know that, as chairman of the subcommittee, he will continue to conduct hearings of that subcommittee as he has in the past. He has indicated that the committee will be so conducted under his able leadership.

Although last year $220,000 was appropriated to operate the subcommittee, only $145,680 of that amount was used. My amendment does not provide for only the $145,000 that the subcommittee used last year for the 12 months, but $150,000 for 11 months.

As was stated a while ago, if any subcommittee becomes in dire need of additional funds, I would be the last to deny the granting of such funds. Since the subcommittee spent but $145,000 in 12 months last year, it strikes me that for 11 months the committee could certainly do a good job with the $150,000 which would be provided under my amendment.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. CANNON. In order that the RECORD may be straight, I direct the attention of the Senator to the fact that the report of expenditures for last year submitted by the Preparedness Subcommittee covers only an 11-month period—to the end of December—so that his figure of $145,680.33 is only for 11 months and not for 12 months. If the Senator would add a one-twelfth pro rata to that amount, it would come roughly, in round figures, to $160,000. That amount would be exclusive of the 7-percent increase, plus the payments to agencies, which was approved by the Congress.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I did not take that into consideration. I was informed that the amount was for the full 12 months. I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to modify my amendment by changing the figure of $150,000 to $162,000.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Louisiana?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I should like to have the request restated.

Mr. ELLENDER. The amendment would provide $162,000 for a period of 11 months in contrast to $160,000 for 11 months last year.

The PRESIDING OFFICER: Is there objection?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, as I understand, the proposal would modify the $25,000 reduction that the Senator from Louisiana had proposed earlier.

That would make a great deal of difference on this particular vote. The subcommittee is a very important one. I had not intended to get involved in this particular debate, but the proposed reduction of $12,500 might do about as much damage to the work of the committee as would a reduction of $25,000.

I should like to have the chairman of the subcommittee, who has done such an admirable job, and one to whom we owe a great debt for his faithful and loyal service, the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS] make his own decision on the matter. It seems to me that if we are going to tamper with the limited amount of money to be authorized for a subcommittee considering a $50 billion defense budget, we might get ourselves into serious trouble. It is my view that the subcommittee is not overstaffed or overfinanced. In fact, I think taxpayers might well ask the question, "Why is the Congress of the United States not taking a greater interest in a budget item of $50 billion for defense?" I do not believe that the Pentagon is that good. They can make mistakes of more than $175,000 by dropping a decimal point—and they have made such mistakes.

I think the Senator from Mississippi should be very careful.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield to me, I will answer his question.

The figure in the resolution, as approved by the committee, is already at the rock bottom of the amount which will be actually needed under all foreseeable circumstances. My judgment is that we shall have to ask for additional sums to take care of matters which are partly contemplated now.

As I pointed out to the Senate heretofore, we do not carry a large staff. We have access to the General Accounting Office, which has paid investigators we can obtain on a reimbursable basis. At present, as an illustration, we are confronted with the Cuban problem, which could take a new turn at any time. Certainly I would not wish to see this trimmed down to the bare bones in the midst of that, by shaving the amount a few thousand dollars.

We stand on the minimum figure, which has been presented, and I hope that the Senate will sustain our recommendation.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I am glad to yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. Is it not a fact that the amount the Senator is asking is the same as the amount asked last year, insofar as the particular work of the committee is concerned?

Mr. STENNIS. We had an additional sum last year.

Mr. ELLENDER. But that was for another subject.

Mr. STENNIS. No. It was for the same committee and the same staff, except for one additional member.

Mr. ELLENDER. As I remember the situation, the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND] desired an investigation. That is why the $30,000 was added.

Mr. STENNIS. The Preparedness Subcommittee, plus the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND] as an additional member, conducted that investigation, for which the $30,000 was allowed, but that did not pay for all of it. We were eligible to spend our own money for it, so we had that as an added expense.

Mr. ELLENDER. I was informed that, of the $30,000 especially appropriated for the investigation, some $15,000 or $16,000 was spent.

As I said a while ago, the amount which the Senator would receive under the proposed appropriation would give him $162,000 for 11 months, while the expenditures for the 12 months of last year were approximately $160,000, using round figures.

I believe the Senator would have ample funds.

As I said a while ago, if perchance there should be a need for more, I am sure the Senate would grant it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request made by the Senator from Louisiana?

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield further, I do not see how we could be expected to plan for our program, if we are circumscribed by the latitude of a few thousand dollars in relation to military defense. I hope the Senate will not trim the amount.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request by the Senator from Louisiana?

Mr. CURTIS. I did not rise for the purpose of making objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is a unanimous consent request pending.

Mr. CURTIS. I do not know what the unanimous-consent request involves, but reserving the right to object, Mr. President, I retreat from nothing that I said about the number of subcommittees and the abuses which are arising and the injury being done to the Senate of the United States.

However, I shall not support the amendment to cut. I said in my statement a few minutes ago that this was not a problem which could be resolved by a broadside.

I also said, with reference to the pending resolution, that if anything had a prior claim on us it was the defense and security of this Republic. Not only is that a matter of priority, but also it is the opinion of the junior Senator from Nebraska that not all the facts are being told or have been told to the American people or to the Congress about Cuba and Castro and a great many other vital points in regard to the security and defense of this country.

I am also of the opinion that civilian influences in the Pentagon are thwarting the efforts of dedicated men who are in a position to guide the defense of this country.

I think this is one case in which the Senate is justified in granting the amount requested. I also think we have a responsibility to support this committee.

I do not do this easily, Mr. President. It is not easy for me to vote against an amendment to cut anything. I think this resolution involves the security of our country, and I shall oppose the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Will the Presiding Officer state, for the information of the Senate, what is the unanimous-consent request?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana has made a unanimous-consent request that he be permitted to modify the amendment to provide that the figure of $150,000, as it appears on page 3, line 12, be changed to $162,000.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, a further parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I gather that the net effect of the modification, if consent is granted, would be that the amendment would propose to cut the amount allowed to the committee by $12,500.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. By $13,000.

Mr. DIRKSEN. By $13,000.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request?

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I wish to make an inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. STENNIS. The amendment would then still be pending, would it not, in a different form?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. Mr. President, as chairman of the Committee on Rules and Administration, which heard the testimony from representatives of the Committee on Armed Services, including the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS], as was pointed out awhile ago by the Senator from Nevada [Mr. CANNON], I wish to say that we heard every request which came before us for money, which included the entire list of resolutions to come before the Senate this afternoon, including the pending resolution.

The chairman of each one of the committees came before us, along with the ranking member on the minority side, and in addition there was the endorsement from the main committee. The Armed Services Committee unanimously endorsed the request.

The Committee on Rules and Administration considered what the chairmen of the committees said they needed. We were not in a position to say, "You do not need this secretary; you do not need that secretary; you do not need something else."

Information was given to us, which we took at face value. The amounts in five or six of the resolutions were reduced.

In each case when there was additional money asked, compared to last year, the Senator from Nevada [Mr. CANNON], made his motion, which was carried.

It is the position of the chairman of the committee that the resolutions ought to be agreed to in exactly the amounts provided by the committee, for the simple reason that the committee heard every single request and had information with respect to each request. We had no information stating that the amounts should be either less or more.

I am as much in favor of economy as any other Senator. I should like to see that obtained.

As my able colleague from Nebraska said a while ago, if anything is to be done about reducing the costs for the subcommittees, it will have to be done by the chairmen of the committees or by the committees themselves. The Committee on Rules and Administration cannot and should not take it upon itself to reduce what is asked by a committee, when information is shown that that is what is needed.

I have no way of knowing what the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS] needs with respect to this particular committee, involved in the resolution the Senate is now debating. I took the information furnished by them at face value. I believe they need every bit of the money for which they have asked. I expect to support that, and I expect to support the other resolutions.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair hears no objection to the unanimous-consent request made by the Senator from Louisiana; so, without objection, the request is granted.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask for recognition.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois is recognized.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, first let me make inquiry: Have the yeas and nays been ordered on the pending amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. They have been.

Mr. DIRKSEN. So the Senate is confronted with a yea-and-nay vote on a $13,000 cut?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I trust the yeas and nays may be withdrawn on this amendment.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I asked the distinguished Senator to yield further in order to have the yea-and-nay vote withdrawn, and I do so on the basis of the presentation that has been made and the fiscal facts applicable to this committee. I do so also on the basis of my faith that the men who are heading this committee are attempting to exercise economy.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** Is there objection to having the order for the yea-and-nay order withdrawn? Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I note that with the greatest impunity we will spend $10 million for an airplane and think nothing of it. Yet we do hassle a little about an item of $175,000 which embraces every activity prescribed in the rule under which the Armed Services Committee has been created. It embraces everything in the common defense. It embraces the Army and the Navy. It now embraces matters that stem from the Cuban situation. It embraces our security. And what a minimum amount it is when all things are said and done.

I think we have that much money to spend for this purpose, when we look over some of the other committees—and those of which I am a member, as a matter of fact—for which larger amounts have been authorized. This is an important field, with the world so full of fever. In fact, if I were doing anything, I think I would rather increase the moneys involved, rather than reduce them.

I say one other thing: Every Member of the Senate knows what a frugal and high-spirited public servant JOHN STENNIS, of Mississippi, is. He husbands the funds. He makes every dollar do double duty. I think the country can be assured that, for the money which is involved here, it will result in a good survey and a good investigation that will be at once instructive and objective.

I trust the amount reported by the committee will be agreed to.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I am glad the request for the yeas and nays has been withdrawn. I hope the next step will be the withdrawal of any proposed cut in the amount asked for by the subcommittee. I think nobody in this Chamber has stood more than I do for cutting the budget in the past, and I will in the future, but there is such a thing as being pennywise and pound foolish.

I happen to be a member of this subcommittee. I have served on many subcommittees, but I have never served on one that has had a more efficient chairman or one that is doing more admirable service for our country. At the present time we are delving into the whole question of Cuba. We are going into the question of the intelligence services. We are concerned with proposals for disarmament and activities in that direction. We confer constantly with leaders of the military services.

Mr. President, I know every subcommittee that does investigating work thinks its work is the most valuable to the Senate, but I can think of no subcommittee in this body that is performing a more needed and valuable task than this subcommittee.

Instead of seeking to cut the amount requested, I would vote for an increase. I can assure the distinguished Senator from Louisiana that there is no subcommittee in this body whose funds are watched more carefully. It is staffed very economically. The staff works admirably and the committee works efficiently under the capable leadership of the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS].

I hope the Senator from Louisiana, whose frugality I admire, will direct his frugal gun at some other measure that will accomplish some good, and not do harm to this country by this cut.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask for a vote, and I yield the floor.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, if the Senator from Arizona will stay around, he is going to hear the same argument made by the chairman of every subcommittee.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I have heard them before. I have heard them from the Senator's own lips. I think I have voted with the Senator on 90 percent of his proposals to cut items out of the budget, but this is one that it is not wise to cut.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I yield the floor and ask for a vote.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], as modified, to the committee amendment on page 3, line 12.

The amendment, as modified, to the amendment, was rejected.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The resolution is open to further amendment.

If there be no further amendment to be offered, the question is on agreeing to its resolution, as amended.

The resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report explaining the purposes of the resolution.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

> The Committee on Rules and Administration, to whom was referred the resolution (S. Res. 75) authorizing the Committee on Armed Services to investigate certain matters relating to the national defense, and prov'ding additional funds therefor, having considered the same, report favorably thereon without additional amendments, and recommend that the resolution, as amended, be agreed to by the Senate.
>
> Senate Resolution 75, as amended, would authorize the expenditure of $175,000 by the Committee on Armed Services, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, from March 1, 1963, to January 31, 1964, to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of any and all matters within its jurisdiction as specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate. The funds would be utilized principally by the Preparedness Investigating Subcommittee for the purposes of overseeing the common defense and surveying the policies of the Department of Defense insofar as they affect the security of the Nation.
>
> The following table indicates funds authorized by the Senate during the 87th Congress for the same purpose. Committee expenditures pursuant to such authorization are shown through December 31, 1962.

Committee and purpose	87th Cong.			
	Amount		Date	Authority
	Authorized	Expended		
Armed Services: Preparedness	$440,000.00	$323,123.49	-------------	
	190,000	177,443.16	Jan. 31, 1961	S. Res. 43.
	30,000		Sept. 23, 1961	S. Res. 215.
	220,000	145,680.33	Feb. 7, 1962	S. Res. 270.

> The purposes of the resolution are more fully detailed in a letter to Senator B. EVERETT JORDAN, chairman of the Committee on Rules and Administration, from Senator RICHARD B. RUSSELL, chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, which letter (with accompanying budget) is as follows:
>
> U.S. SENATE,
> COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES,
> *February 25, 1963.*
>
> Hon. B. EVERETT JORDAN,
> *Chairman, Committee on Rules and Administration, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.*
>
> DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: It will be appreciated if the Committee on Rules and Administration will give prompt consideration to approval of Senate Resolution 75, which has been approved unanimously by the Senate Committee on Armed Services. This resolution provides spending authority to the committee or any authorized subcommittee, during the 11-month period March 1, 1963, to January 31, 1964, for the examination, investigation, and study of matters within the jurisdiction of the committee, as specified in rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate. Resolutions similar to this have been approved by the Senate during each session of the last six Congresses, except that they have usually been submitted and approved on an annual basis.
>
> The total authorization requested by the committee under this resolution is $175,000, which is $45,000 less than the amount approved on an annual basis for each of the last 2 years. Copies of the proposed budget are being submitted along with copies of the resolution. These funds will be used for the continued operation of the Preparedness Investigating Subcommittee, which, as you know, is an investigative arm of the Committee on Armed Service. The functions of the subcommittee include the responsibility of maintaining surveillance over policies, operations, and expenditures relating to the National Defense Establishment.

The committee feels that the Preparedness Investigation Subcommittee made significant and valuable contributions last year. The subcommittee is now engaged in a number of extensive studies and reviews of major aspects of our defense program. I feel that these and other matters programed for investigation by the subcommittee more than justify its continued existence.

Sincerely,

RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
Chairman.

Budget

Position	Number	Base salary (per annum)	Gross salary (per annum)	Monthly salary (gross)	Total for period of budget (gross)
STAFF					
Legal and investigative:					
Chief counsel	1	$8,000	$17,230.10	$1,435.84	$15,794.24
Professional staff members	4	6,000	13,469.14	1,122.42	49,386.48
Professional staff member	1	5,580	12,679.33	1,056.61	11,622.71
Do	1	5,100	11,757.41	979.78	10,777.58
Administrative and clerical:					
Clerical assistant	1	2,640	6,475.75	539.64	5,936.04
Do	1	2,400	5,955.67	496.30	5,459.30
Clerical assistants	2	2,340	5,825.64	485.47	10,680.34
Do	2	2,280	5,695.63	474.63	10,441.86
Total					120,098.55
ADMINISTRATIVE					
Contribution to employees health benefit programs (Public Law 86-382, effective July 1, 1960)					966.68
Contribution to civil service retirement fund (6½ percent of total salaries paid)					7,806.41
Contribution to employees Federal employees group life insurance (27 cents per month per $1,000 coverage)					403.92
Reimbursable payments to agencies					9,908.75
Travel (inclusive of field investigations)					9,450.00
Hearings (inclusive of reporters' fees)					3,744.60
Witness fees, expenses					2,224.30
Stationery, office supplies					707.84
Communications (telephone, telegraph)					338.95
Newspapers, magazines, documents					150.00
Contingent fund					7,400.00
Consultants and staff advisers					11,800.00
Total					54,901.45
Grand total					175,000.00

Funds requested, Senate Resolution 75, $175,000.

Funds approved by Committee on Rules and Administration, $175,000.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES TO MAKE A STUDY OF STRATEGIC AND CRITICAL STOCKPILING

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 18, Senate Resolution 79.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A resolution (S. Res. 79) to authorize a study by the Committee on Armed Services on strategic and critical stockpiling, which had been reported from the Committee on Armed Services with an amendment, and subsequently reported from the Committee on Rules and Administration with an additional amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Minnesota.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution, which had been reported from the Committees on Armed Services and Rules and Administration, as follows:

The amendment of the Committee on Armed Services was on page 2, line 4, after the word "from", to strike out "February" and insert "March".

The amendment of the Committee on Rules and Administration was on page 2, line 14, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$6,500" and insert "$10,000"; so as to make the resolution read:

Resolved, That the Committee on Armed Services, or its Subcommittee on the National Stockpile and Naval Petroleum Reserves, is authorized under sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdiction specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of any and all matters pertaining to the acquisition, storage, and disposal of strategic and critical materials necessary for the common defense.

SEC. 2. For the purpose of this resolution the committee, from March 1, 1963, to May 1, 1963, inclusive, is authorized (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 3. The expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed $10,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

The amendments were agreed to.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, as I understand, this sum of money is to close out the work of this committee.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, I shall be happy to answer in the absence of the chairman. I am a member of the committee. The money is to close out the work of the committee. The hearings have been completed. Last year the committee had in the neighborhood of $115,000 authorized. Our request here is for $10,000 to complete the report. This will cover the majority representation and the minority representation for the conclusion of the report only. The business of the committee, except for finalizing the report, has been concluded.

Mr. ELLENDER. Will the Senator tell me why the amount of the resolution has been changed from $6,500 to $10,000?

Mr. CANNON. Yes. The original request was for $6,500 to cover the majority representation, and there was unintentionally omitted provision for the minority representation which is needed in connection with finalizing the report. That was the reason for the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution is open to further amendment.

If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY TO MAKE CERTAIN INVESTIGATIONS

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 19, Senate Resolution 14.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BREWSTER in the chair). The resolution will be stated by title.

The CHIEF CLERK. A resolution (S. Res. 14) authorizing the Committee on Banking and Currency to make certain investigations, which had been reported from the Committee on Banking and Currency with amendments, and subsequently reported from the Committee on Rules and Administration without additional amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Minnesota.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution, which had been reported from the Committee on Banking and Currency with an amendment, on page 2, line 12, after the word "from", to strike out "February 1" and insert "March 1".

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I wish to ascertain how the amount asked for last year contrasts to the request for this year. Has any effort been made to reduce the amount?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, the amount authorized last year was $80,000. This year it is $91,000. The increase is explained in this way: We allowed 7 percent to take care of the pay increase that was voted by the Congress. Then we allowed an increase of $5,000 to take care of an unusual situation. We had been using a man who was retired as editorial and printing on the staff; therefore, we had to pay only a part of his salary. At the end of last year he finally retired and now we must pay the full salary for his replacement. That accounts for the $5,000 increase.

Mr. ELLENDER. The same number of employees is involved?

Mr. SPARKMAN. The same number of employees exactly. We are having to pay about $5,000 more to one of them by reason of the change I just explained.

Mr. ELLENDER. But the Committee is providing for that increase in pay?

Mr. SPARKMAN. That is correct.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield.

Mr. CURTIS. Is this request for a staff engaged in all phases and jurisdictions of the Committee on Banking and Currency?

Mr. SPARKMAN. That is correct. It reinforces the general staff of the committee.

Mr. CURTIS. This does not deal with housing.

Mr. SPARKMAN. No; it covers all the work of the committee except housing.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the next committee amendment.

The Chief Clerk. On page 3, line 2, after the word "exceed," it is proposed to strike out "$86,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$83,700."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record a statement in support of Senate Resolution 14.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Statement by Senator Sparkman

Senate Resolution 14 would authorize the Banking and Currency Committee to spend up to $83,700 to investigate a number of subjects within the jurisdiction of the committee—everything but public and private housing which is covered by Senate Resolution 15—during the 11 months from March 11, 1963 to January 31, 1964.

The resolution covers the same number of employees as did Senate Resolution 233 in the last session of Congress. The budget form sets forth the expenditures for 12 months at $91,000. This is an increase from the $80,000 covered by Senate Resolution 233 for two reasons: first, an increase of $6,000, or approximately 7 percent, to cover last year's pay raise; and second, an increase of $5,000 by reason of the fact that the former editorial clerk had been receiving a substantial part of his salary in the form of retirement income while the committee's new editorial clerk will receive his full salary from the committee in accordance with the recommendations of the Appropriations Committee. This $91,000 figure was reduced by one-twelfth of the salaries and related expenses by reason of the adoption of Senate Resolution 88 covering salaries for February 1963.

During the present session of Congress the committee expects to devote considerable attention to problems in the field of securities and financial institutions. As you may know, the Securities and Exchange Commission is filing a report in April showing the result of a 2-year study of the securities business. In addition, as the result of the studies of financial institutions by the Commission on Money and Credit and a number of governmental and trade associations, a great many proposals have been made to revise the laws relating to financial institutions of all sorts. It is impossible to tell at the present time how much work may result from these or other aspects of the committee's jurisdiction. Our experience has been, however, that every year some substantial new matter arises.

Accordingly, the Banking and Currency Committee, without objection, approved Senate Resolution 14. The Committee on Rules and Administration has also approved this resolution, and I, therefore, ask that it be adopted by the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution, as amended. The resolution, as amended, was agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Banking and Currency, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdiction specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of any and all matters pertaining to—

(1) banking and currency generally;

(2) financial aid to commerce and industry;

(3) deposit insurance;

(4) the Federal Reserve System, including monetary and credit policies;

(5) economic stabilization, production and mobilization;

(6) valuation and revaluation of the dollar;

(7) prices of commodities, rents, and services;

(8) securities and exchange regulation;

(9) credit problems of small business; and

(10) international finance through agencies within the legislative jurisdiction of the committee.

Sec. 2. For the purposes of this resolution the committee from March 1, 1963, to January 31, 1964, inclusive, is authorized (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided,* That the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than $1,600 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

Sec. 3. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed $83,700, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record an excerpt from the report (No. 20), explaining the purposes of the resolution.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

The Committee on Rules and Administration, to whom was referred the resolution (S. Res. 14) authorizing the Committee on Banking and Currency to make a complete study of certain matters within its jurisdiction, and providing additional funds therefor, having considered the same, report favorably thereon without additional amendments and recommend that the resolution as amended be agreed to by the Senate.

Senate Resolution 14 as amended would authorize the expenditure of not to exceed $83,700 by the Committee on Banking and Currency, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, from March 1, 1963, through January 31, 1964, to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of any and all matters pertaining to—

(1) Banking and currency generally;

(2) Financial aid to commerce and industry;

(3) Deposit insurance;

(4) The Federal Reserve System, including monetary and credit policies;

(5) Economic stabilization, production, and mobilization;

(6) Valuation and revaluation of the dollar;

(7) Prices of commodities, rents, and services;

(8) Securities and exchange regulations;

(9) Credit problems of small business; and

(10) International finance through agencies within the legislative jurisdiction of the committee.

The following table indicates funds authorized by the Senate during the 87th Congress for the same purpose. Committee expenditures pursuant to such authorization are shown through December 31, 1962:

Committee and purpose	87th Cong.			
	Amount		Date	Authority
	Authorized	Expended		
Banking and Currency: General	$160,000.00	$147,322.55		
	80,000.00	76,647.70	Feb. 13, 1961	S. Res. 44.
	80,000.00	70,674.85	Feb. 7, 1962	S. Res. 233.

Additional information relative to the purposes of Senate Resolution 14 is contained in the report of the Committee on Banking and Currency (S. Rept. 10, 88th Cong. 1st sess.) and in a letter to Senator B. Everett Jordan, chairman of the Committee on Rules and Administration, from Senator A. Willis Robertson, chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency, which letter (with accompanying budget) is as follows:

U.S. Senate,
Committee on Banking and Currency,
February 28, 1963.

Hon. B. Everett Jordan,
Chairman, Committee on Rules and Administration, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Chairman: The Banking and Currency Committee has agreed to report Senate Resolution 14, introduced on January 14, 1963, by myself and Senator Bennett.

In view of the passage of Senate Resolution 88 on February 19 this resolution has been amended to cover the 11 months from March 1, 1963, to January 31, 1964. The enclosed budget form shows the expenses for the full year originally contemplated at $91,000, but the amount shown in the resolution has been reduced from this figure to $83,700 to eliminate one-twelfth of the salaries and related contributions shown in the budget.

Senate Resolution 14 would authorize this committee or any of its duly authorized subcommittees to employ on a temporary basis, such technical, clerical, and other assistance as may be necessary to investigate and make studies of a number of matters within the jurisdiction of the committee.

For a number of years resolutions similar to this have been approved for this committee on an annual basis. We have introduced and reported this resolution because of our need to retain additional personnel as we have done for the past several years to supplement the permanent staff and to cover other expenses incident to our committee responsibilities.

The workload of the committee in dealing with legislative matters which recur year after year is extremely heavy. Experience has shown that we must anticipate during each session some special study or legislation making it necessary to employ additional staff and to incur additional expenses.

It is difficult at this time to predict with any degree of precision the legislative and investigative activities which the committee will undertake this year. However, there are areas within our jurisdiction which can be expected to call for greater attention than usual.

For example, the committee expects to receive by April 3 the report of the Securities and Exchange Commission on the year-long study of the securities business undertaken by it under Public Law 87-196. This report can be expected to cover such matters as securities exchanges, over-the-counter markets and unlisted securities, and many other aspects of the securities business.

The committee also expects to receive during the coming year many legislative and administrative proposals relating to financial institutions as a result of the report of the Commission on Money and Credit and the many supplementary governmental and industry recommendations following the Commission's report.

In addition to its legislative responsibilities, the committee can expect, in the course of the coming session, to receive requests from Senators, either formally or informally, to make special studies of various problems in the economic field. While these studies may never reach the stage of formal hearings or investigations, they do require a great deal of staff work. Increased attention which problems of monetary policy are receiving creates an additional burden on the staff.

Of the $80,000 authorized for the last 12-month period under Senate Resolution 233, expenditures through January 31, 1963, amounted to $76,147.35, leaving a balance of $3,852.65. This, of course, does not include the amount spent in February under Senate Resolution 88 which authorized an additional $2,500 in order to cover salaries in February.

I enclose a copy of Senate Resolution 14. It is in the usual form prescribed by the sample resolutions, except that section 3, requiring that findings and recommendations be reported by the expiration of the resolution, is omitted.

I enclose the completed standardized budget form showing expenses for a 12-month period totaling $91,000. The budget calls for no additional staff personnel, and the amounts for committee expenses other than salaries have been left unchanged from last year. The amount shown in the budget form has been increased from the $80,000 authorized last year to $91,000 for two reasons: (1) the pay increase of 7 percent effective in 1962 increased the salaries of continuing personnel, and (2) the committee's editorial clerk, who had received a partial salary from the committee in addition to a civil service annuity, retired and is being replaced by an editorial clerk, all of whose salary will be paid by the committee, in accordance with the recommendation of the Appropriations Committee (S. Rept. 1835, 85th Cong., 2d sess., p. 5).

By reason of the adoption of Senate Resolution 88 and the consequent reduction of the period covered by Senate Resolution 14 from 12 months to 11 months, approximately one-twelfth of the salaries and related contributions shown in the budget form ($87,228.86), or $7,300, has been subtracted from the total amount shown in the budget form, and the resolution has been amended to provide funds in the amount of $83,700.

Sincerely yours,

A. WILLIS ROBERTSON,
Chairman.

Budget

Position	Number	Base salary (per annum)	Gross salary (per annum)	Monthly salary (gross)	Total for period of budget (gross)
STAFF					
Legal and investigative:					
Assistant counsel	1	$5,460	$12,453.66	$1,037.80	$12,453.66
Do	1	4,980	11,509.18	959.09	11,509.18
Editorial and research:					
Research director (economist)	1	8,460	18,095.12	1,507.93	18,095.12
Staff member	1	8,000	17,230.10	1,435.84	17,230.10
Do	1	4,740	11,012.73	917.73	11,012.73
Administrative and clerical: Assistant clerk (record)	1	4,680	10,888.64	907.38	10,888.64
Total					81,189.43
ADMINISTRATIVE					
Contribution to employees health benefit programs (Public Law 86-382, effective July 1, 1960)					486.72
Contribution to civil service retirement fund (6½ percent of total salaries paid)					5,277.31
Contribution to employees Federal employees group life insurance (27 cents per month per $1,000 coverage)					275.40
Travel (inclusive of field investigations)					1,700.00
Hearings (inclusive of reporters' fees)					1,100.00
Witness fees, expenses					300.00
Stationery, office supplies					125.00
Communications (telephone, telegraph)					200.00
Newspapers, magazines, documents					175.00
Contingent fund					171.14
Total					9,810.57
Grand total					91,000.00

Funds requested, Senate Resolution 14, $91,000.

Funds reported by the Committee on Banking and Currency for an 11-month period, and approved by the Committee on Rules and Administration, $83,700.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, communicated to the Senate the intelligence of the death of Hon. CLYDE DOYLE, late a Representative from the State of California, and transmitted the resolutions of the House thereon.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY TO INVESTIGATE MATTERS PERTAINING TO PUBLIC AND PRIVATE HOUSING

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 20, Senate Resolution 15.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A resolution (S. Res. 15) authorizing the Committee on Banking and Currency to investigate matters pertaining to public and private housing, which had been reported from the Committee on Banking and Currency, with amendments, and subsequently reported from the Committee on Rules and Administration, without additional amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Minnesota.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution, which had been reported from the Committee on Rules and Administration, with amendments, on page 2, line 1, to strike out "February 1, 1963," and insert "March 1, 1963," and on line 20 to strike out "$115,000," and insert "$106,000," so as to make the resolution read:

Resolved, That the Committee on Banking and Currency, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdiction specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of any and all matters pertaining to public and private housing.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution the committee, from March 1, 1963, to January 31, 1964, inclusive, is authorized (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided,* That the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than $1,600 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1964.

SEC. 4. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed $106,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the first amendment of the Committee on Banking and Currency.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 2, line 1, after the word "from", it is proposed to strike out "February 1, 1963" and to insert in lieu thereof "March 1, 1963."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The next committee amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 2, line 20, after the word "exceed", it is proposed to strike out "$115,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$106,000".

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I offer an amendment to the committee amendment, on page 2, line 20, to strike out the figure "$106,000" and to insert in lieu thereof the figure "$95,000".

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Louisiana to the committee amendment.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I shall support the amendment. I shall vote against the resolution. This is one thing we can do without. Housing is a private matter under our economic system. Investigations as to where people live have continued for a long time.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I should like to be heard on this question. The amount represents exactly what we had last year, plus 7 percent, to take care of increases in salary, minus one month's pay, which was carried over under the special resolution adopted a short time ago. There is no other increase whatever. We have the same number of employees. We have seven employees. In proportion to the amount of work done and the responsibility of the subcommittee, this is one of the most modest and moderate and frugal subcommittees of Congress.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. I was startled a moment ago when the Senator from Nebraska said that housing was a private matter. I wonder whether my friend from Alabama remembers what percentage of the housing built in this country last year required some form of government aid through VA or FHA, or was built as the result of some government aid.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I would say that it comes to about 50 percent.

Mr. CLARK. About half of all the housing built in this country requires some kind of government aid. Is that correct?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Yes.

Mr. CLARK. I am a member of the subcommittee headed by the Senator from Alabama. I can testify from personal experience that every nickel of the amount requested is required.

Mr. SPARKMAN. The Government's commitments and tangible liabilities with respect to housing now approximate $100 billion.

This is not primarily an investigating subcommittee, as such, although it is charged with the responsibility of keeping an eye on the massive program underway. Our subcommittee does this with continuous studies. In addition, we hold hearings and handle the many pieces of legislation that are reported. We report bills to the full Committee on Banking and Currency. This appropriation is a very low premium to pay on the amount of insurance resulting from having this watchdog subcommittee to look at the housing programs. I do not believe it would be in the national interest to cut it by 10 percent. I am opposed to the amendment, and I hope it will be defeated.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, when I first came to the Senate it was my privilege to do a great deal of work on committees with respect to housing. I took a great deal of interest in the subject. This subcommittee of the Committee on Banking and Currency has been in existence for many years. I cannot for the life of me see what can be accomplished by continually looking into housing and investigating housing. Certainly the subcommittee cannot go any further than it has in the past in looking into housing design. I understand a great deal of that was done in the past.

However, the subcommittee always finds something to do. I believe that here is an opportunity to reduce the amount by 10 percent, the amount that my friend from Nevada said he had tried to obtain in the full committee by way of a cut. The effect of my amendment is simply to cut the amount back by 10 percent. I hope that the amendment will be adopted.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator permit me to ask a question of the Senator from Nevada?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield the floor.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Did the Senator from Nevada attempt to get this request reduced by 10 percent in committee?

Mr. CANNON. The Senator from Nevada did not attempt it in this particular instance, as was previously stated. The application of my formula was only against increases which involve more than a 7 percent increase over last year to cover salaries plus commitments to agencies.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Louisiana to the committee amendment on page 2, line 20.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays. I agree with the Senator from Louisiana that we must start cutting these expenditures. This is a very nominal amount which we are asking to cut.

Otherwise we will be adopting a formula that will approve a 7 to 10 percent increase for the congressional branch; then we would have no argument against granting similar increases to the executive agencies. That would mean an increase of from $7 to $9 billion in total expenditures.

If we are going to cut expenses, we should start at home. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The chief clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I renew my request for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment to the committee amendment. On this question, the yeas and nays have been ordered; and the clerk will call the roll.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota will state it.

Mr. HUMPHREY. What is the pending amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is the amendment of the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] to the committee amendment to section 4, on page 2, of Senate Resolution 15, to reduce the amount from $106,000 to $95,000.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this question, the yeas and nays have been ordered; and the clerk will call the roll.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll, to ascertain the presence of a quorum.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. What was the ruling of the Chair?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. By unanimous consent the order for the quorum call has been rescinded.

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. Mr. President, before the Senate votes on the amendment, I should like to make one more statement. As chairman of the committee, I said previously that we heard the chairman of every subcommittee, and representatives of the majority and the minority. We considered every request with the greatest of care. Our committee reported favorably every resolution. I hope the amendment will be rejected. Such a vote would uphold the committee in reporting the resolutions.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I point out to my good friend, the Senator from North Carolina, that my amendment would provide more money than the committee spent last year.

For a period of 12 months last year the committee spent $92,000. If the resolution as amended is agreed to, the expenditure of $95,000 for 11 months will be authorized. Ample funds will be available. I hope the amendment is adopted.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, we could argue the question for a long time, but I point out that no committee operates within as close a limitation as does the committee for which an appropriation is now being considered. We cannot predict exactly the amount which the subcommittee would require in any particular year. There is a great deal of variation in our work. For example, the subcommittee is now studying the FHA foreclosure program. There have been complaints about certain programs going bad. We have sent investigators to Houston, Fort Worth, Los Angeles, and other areas. Last year we had none of that to do.

Mr. President, we ask for the same amount of money that we had available last year, plus 7 percent, minus a pro rata share for one month, which was provided in the resolution agreed to in February. That is exactly the amount of money the committee allowed us. I challenge anyone to show that any committee has operated more carefully and more frugally than has this subcommittee. I do not believe that it is in our national interest for us to agree to the amendment. I hope that it will be rejected.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Louisiana to the committee amendment on page 2, line 20. On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I announce that the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. Edmondson], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. Ervin], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. Hart], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. Hartke], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. Kefauver], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. Kennedy], the Senator from Washington [Mr. Magnuson], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McClellan], the Senator from Oregon [Mrs. Neuberger], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. Pastore], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. Russell], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. Talmadge], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. Yarborough] are absent on official business.

I further announce that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. Ribicoff] is necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. Edmondson], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. Ervin], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. Hart], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. Hartke], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. Kefauver], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. Kennedy], the Senator from Washington [Mr. Magnuson], the Senator from Oregon [Mrs. Neuberger], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. Pastore], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. Ribicoff], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. Yarborough] would each vote "nay."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Colorado [Mr. Abbott], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. Dirksen], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. Dominick], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. Morton], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. Mundt], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. Saltonstall] are necessarily absent.

I also announce that the Senator from Arizona [Mr. Goldwater] is detained on official business.

The result was announced—yeas 18, nays 61, as follows:

[No. 26 Leg.]

YEAS—18

Aiken
Boggs
Byrd, Va
Carlson
Cotton
Curtis
Ellender
Hickenlooper
Holland
Hruska
Kuchel
Lausche
Mechem
Miller
Prouty
Simpson
Thurmond
Williams, Del.

NAYS—61

Anderson
Bartlett
Bayh
Beall
Bennett
Bible
Brewster
Burdick
Byrd, W. Va.
Cannon
Case
Church
Clark
Cooper
Dodd
Douglas
Eastland
Engle
Fong
Fulbright
Gore
Gruening
Hayden
Hill
Humphrey
Inouye
Jackson
Javits
Johnston
Jordan, N.C.
Jordon, Idaho
Keating
Long, Mo.
Long, La.
Mansfield
McCarthy
McGee
McGovern
McIntyre
McNamara
Metcalf
Monroney
Morse
Moss
Muskie
Nelson
Pearson
Pell
Proxmire
Randolph
Robertson
Scott
Smathers
Smith
Sparkman
Stennis
Symington
Tower
Williams, N.J.
Young, N. Dak.
Young, Ohio

NOT VOTING—21

Allott
Dirksen
Dominick
Edmondson
Ervin
Goldwater
Hart
Hartke
Kefauver
Kennedy
Magnuson
McClellan
Morton
Mundt
Neuberger
Pastore
Ribicoff
Russell
Saltonstall
Talmadge
Yarborough

So Mr. Ellender's amendment to the committee amendment to section 4, on page 2 of Senate Resolution 15, was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution (S. Res. 15), as amended, was agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Banking and Currency, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdiction specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of any and all matters pertaining to public and private housing.

Sec. 2. For the purposes of this resolution the committee, from March 1, 1963, to January 31, 1964, inclusive, is authorized (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided,* That the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than $1,600 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

Sec. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1964.

Sec. 4. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed $106,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record an excerpt from the report explaining the purposes of the resolution.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

The Committee on Rules and Administration, to whom was referred the resolution (S. Res. 15) authorizing the Committee on Banking and Currency to investigate matters pertaining to public and private housing, having considered the same, report favorably thereon without additional amendments and recommend that the resolution as amended be agreed to by the Senate.

Senate Resolution 15 as amended would authorize the Committee on Banking and Currency, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, from March 1, 1963, through January 31, 1964, to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of any and all matters pertaining to public and private housing.

The following table indicates funds authorized by the Senate during the 87th Congress for the same purpose. Committee expenditures pursuant to such authorization are shown through December 31, 1962.

Committee and purpose	87th Congress			
	Amount		Date	Authority
	Authorized	Expended		
Banking and Currency: Housing	$214,000	$174,629.31		
	107,000	89,944.10	Feb. 13, 1961	S. Res. 25.
	107,000	84,685.21	Feb. 7, 1962	S. Res. 244.

USE OF FORCE BY METROPOLITAN POLICE IN APPREHENSION OF A FELON

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I rise to commend the new evidence in the Metropolitan Police of a willingness to enforce a law that has long been on our statute books, namely, the duty of a police officer to use force, if necessary, in the apprehension of a known felon. Robbery, by force, has always been a felony in all of the States and also in the District of Columbia, but unfortunately in recent years it has become more prevalent in the District of Columbia than in any other city in the United States.

There have been two major contributing factors to that unenviable crime record for our National Capital: First, a substantial percentage of robbers in the District are not apprehended; and second, District courts have been notoriously lenient in the punishments they have meted out to convicted felons. As I have indicated, it is the duty of every police officer to shoot, if necessary, to apprehend a known felon who has refused to obey a command to halt. Why is it that so many robbers in the District have refused to halt when commanded by a police officer to do so? The answer is simply this: They are under the impression that if any policeman in the District shoots a Negro, the Washington Post will criticize the policeman, if it does not actually ask for his dismissal from the police force.

The editorial in the Washington Post of today entitled, "Sudden Death," is a typical example of that attitude. A Negro with a long criminal record robbed, by force, in broad daylight, a young pregnant woman.

While the editorial's heart was bleeding for the felon who had committed robbery by force, and was shot by an officer because he refused to halt when the officer sought to apprehend him, not one salty tear was shed for the young woman who might have been caused a miscarriage because of her horrible experience. But, for the Negro criminal, the Washington Post editor said he "was a victim not alone of police efficiency but of community neglect." The police efficiency of course related to the way police in all of our cities except the District of Columbia have been enforcing the law with respect to the arrest of known felons.

Of course, all honorable men regret the needless waste of human possibilities which this incident reflects and the tragedy of such a violent death. And all honorable men will, of course, regret the shock and peril to the victim of the robbery.

The criminal's record seems to make it clear that he did not take advantage of whatever talent, whatever ability, he may have had. The Post blames the criminal's failure to make anything useful of himself on "community neglect" and the fact that he "was a product of this city's slums." I do not think this conclusion is either necessary or correct. I have spent much time in the District during the past 30 years and have been familiar with District conditions ever since I served at Fort Myer in World War I. The slums in the District 30 years ago were far worse than any we have had since the lavish expenditure on public housing and urban renewal, totaling about $32 million. Thirty years ago, the crime rate in the District was below the national average; now it is about the highest. Thirty years ago, when schools were segregated and only about 20 percent of the pupils were nonwhite, the District schools were rated as among the best in the Nation. Now, integrated, and about 80 percent nonwhite, the District schools are rated about the poorest in the Nation. In the rate of illegitimate births, of syphilis, and in many other undesirable trends, the District can put in a claim for rating above the national average.

So, Mr. President, regardless of the bleeding heart of the Post editor for District felons who may get killed resisting arrest, I give thanks that the Metropolitan Police have at long last acted like the police in all other big cities in the apprehension of felons who attempt to escape arrest.

AUTHORITY FOR THE COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE TO MAKE CERTAIN STUDIES

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, so that the Senate may proceed with a little dispatch, I announce that it is my understanding that on the next resolution, which was reported only today, and which is the resolution relating to the Commerce Committee, Senate Resolution 29, there may be a request for a yea-and-nay vote. I put Senators on notice that, if they will remain in the Chamber, I am sure our objective can be accomplished very shortly.

This resolution is not on the calendar. I refer to Senate Resolution 29.

I now ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate Resolution 29.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry. What number on the calendar is it?

Mr. HUMPHREY. It is not on the calendar. It was reported today from the Committee on Rules and Administration. It involves a rather substantial amount. I wanted to bring it before the Senate while a large number of Senators were present.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A resolution (S. Res. 29) authorizing the Committee on Commerce to make a study of certain matters under its jurisdiction.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution, which had been reported from the Committee on Commerce with amendments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the first committee amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 2, line 13, it is proposed to strike out "February 1, 1963" and insert in lieu thereof "March 1, 1963."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

The clerk will state the next committee amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 3, line 8, after the word "exceed", it is proposed to insert the figure "$330,000."

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the figure on line 8, page 3, be changed from "$330,000" to "$297,000." That will make a 10-percent reduction.

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. Mr. President, this resolution can be carried over for one week in order to have a study made by the Committee on Rules and Administration. The chairman of the committee, the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] appeared before the committee and offered a thorough explanation of why this amount was needed. The Committee on Commerce expects to take care of considerably more work than it did last year. We did not change the figure of $330,000 for 11 months. It is the same amount that was contained in the resolution as it was brought to our comittee. The amount would include the 7 percent pay increase. The committee approved the resolution unanimously, and we recommend that it be agreed to as reported by the committee.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, the record shows that last year the Senate provided $315,000 for the use of this subcommittee. During the 12 months of last year and out of that amount $228,411 was spent.

The amendment that I propose would reduce the entire amount which is included in the bill by 10 percent. Should the amendment be adopted, it would mean that the committee would have for expenditures during 11 months of the year, $297,000. That is $71,000 more than was spent last year for the 12 months. It is my belief that this is a good place to make a cut. I hope the Senate will sustain my position.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. What subcommittee does this refer to? The resolution is not on the calendar, and we have been unable to find out.

Mr. ELLENDER. This is for investigations by the whole committee. As I pointed out, the full committee has $144,500 to spend, aside from the amount requested here.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, in committee I offered an amendment to reduce the amount that was asked for. In addition to the employees of the regular committee, there were 19 employees on the temporary list. The Senator from Louisiana has correctly pointed out that for 11 months there was spent $208,000 and for 12 months there was spent $228,000. With the allowance of $297,000, there will be $70,000 more than is needed if we use last year's expenditures as a standard for determining what will be spent in this year.

Some new work will come to the Committee on Commerce. The President's recommendation for a change in the control of rates and the control of utilities is one of them. I respectfully submit to the Senate that with 19 employees on the temporary list, and with the employees on the regular list, we have more than we need, and there is no need to say, because of the new work, that we might need $70,000 more.

Let me say to Senators who are talking about reducing the budget—and I heard various figures cited in the past 2 weeks—that today we are challenged to cut our own expenditures. I say to Senators that if we do not have nerve enough to cut these expenditures, we should throw overboard any boast that we may make about any contemplated cut in the budget which would come from the various departments of the administrative branch of the Government. We cannot treat the administration differently than we propose to treat ourselves. We cannot indulge in extravagant expenditures in our own divisions and then cry aloud to the people of the country what we are going to do about the $98,800 million budget.

I respectfully suggest that if we do not clean our own house we should not talk about cutting the budget later with respect to the administration's requests.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I regret that the chairman of the Committee on Commerce, the distinguished senior Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], is unavoidably absent at this moment. It is a trifle curious that it should fall to the ranking minority member of the Commerce Committee to present to the Senate in his absence and in his behalf a few facts that I believe should be taken into consideration before passing on the amendment of the Senator from Louisiana to reduce the allowance for the committee.

In the first place, I believe that my record for fighting for economy is about as consistent and strong as that of any other Member of the Senate. I do not want any rule applied to anybody downtown or to any other committee of the Senate which is not applied here or not applied to my committee, and there are no additional employees for the minority, or any particular thing for the minority specified in this resolution.

The distinguished Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE], for whom I have profound respect and regard, and who is a stalwart fighter for his principles now and always, if my recollection serves me correctly, was the only Member on the committee who, when the time came, after careful discussion, to vote on this amount, opposed it.

I have sometimes observed, as I believe other Members have observed also, that there is a tendency downtown to try to spend all the money that is appropriated, because it is sometimes feared by the bureaus and departments, who in complete sincerity do not want their work neglected, that if they return some money to the Treasury, the Appropriations Committees of the House and the Senate will decide that they do not need as much the next time. Therefore, it seems a better system to spend all they get, because if they do not spend all of it, it will somehow or other militate against them. I believe that a great amount of money is spent in this Government on that principle.

The Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the chairman of the committee, has an enviable record in returning every year during his chairmanship of this committee a substantial amount of the appropriation that has been allocated to the Committee on Commerce. When he feels it is necessary to have a reasonable amount for the activities of the committee in the coming year, he should not be penalized because of his faithfulness in returning money not needed.

The crux of the situation is that under the purview of the Commerce Committee are many judicial and quasi-judicial activities of the Government. Many Senators who have served on it realize that under its tent are an amazing number of Government activities. It falls to the lot of the Committee on Commerce and its subcommittees to supervise and observe the activities and the expenditures of many independent agencies of the Federal Government. Let me mention just a few of them. The Federal Communications Commission is a key regulatory agency. In 1963 it spent more than $14 million. Its employees numbered 1,400.

The Federal Power Commission comes under the jurisdiction of the Committee on Commerce. That Commission spent $10 million in fiscal 1963, and employed 1,178 persons.

The committee's jurisdiction includes the manifold activities of the Interstate Commerce Commission, which spent $23 million in fiscal 1963, and employed 2,500 persons.

I could go down the whole list, mentioning the Martime Commission, the Civil Aeronautics Board, the Federal Trade Commission and others. There are 8 administrative agencies which had in fiscal 1963 combined expenditures of $1,219 million, and which had more than 56,000 employees. It is the responsibility of the Committee on Commerce to supervise their expenditures, legislate their functions, and watch their operations.

In reply to the very pertinent observation of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE], I should say that if we are to secure economy in Government, the first thing that must be done is to make certain that the committees of Congress and especially of the Senate, are properly equipped to follow through and to exert economy in the executive departments and agencies. Any Senator who has served here for a few years has, I believe, walked through the departments and agencies and has seen, in room after room after room, numerous employees, not all of whom were very busy. The departments and agencies have all the personnel they need. They are staffed, overstaffed, and superstaffed.

But up here, on Capitol Hill, the Senate is comprised of only 100 Members who serve a population of 180 million. We have the responsibility and try our best to see to it that the Government is conducted carefully, frugally, and effectively. Yet there are those who carp about the authorization of a few thousand dollars which probably will not be spent anyway.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Hampshire yield?

Mr. COTTON. Of course; I am always glad to yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I have been requested to attend a meeting of the Committee on Foreign Relations, at which some guests are present. I should like to ask for a yea-and-nay vote on this question, if the Senator will permit me to make that request.

Mr. COTTON. Certainly; provided I do not lose the floor.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Yes. Mr. President, on this question, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, in the coming year some very important recommendations of the President of the United States will fall within the purview of the Committee on Commerce. Probably one of the most difficult, complex, and controversial issues that will be before the 88th Congress will be the question of transportation. The President has made certain recommendations concerning a reduction of control or a reduction of regulation of transportation in this country. This involves every railroad, motor carrier, and airline in the United States. The President has also made recommendations which involve the merchant marine. I point out that this legislation could have major effect on the whole. The transportation industry of this country—a $100 billion industry.

Furthermore, Congress will be considering this year the mass transportation problem, the proposal to solve the commuter problem in the cities of the country, and the part the Federal Government will play in it. It is absolutely inevitable that the Committee on Commerce, through its subcommittees and special committees, will have to deal with those problems. They will require expert assistance. In addition, problems affecting the entire communications industry, include satellite communications, and a host of other matters come before this committee.

I submit that the record of the distinguished Senator from Washington, the chairman of the committee, is such that the Senate can trust him not to expend a single dollar uselessly or needlessly.

I could speak at greater length, although I shall not do so, discussing the activities in which the Committee on Commerce will engage. Before I finish, I yield to the distinguished Senator from Alaska.

Mr. BARTLETT. I thank the Senator from New Hampshire. As a rather junior member of the Committee on Commerce, I have a very special interest in the subject.

First, I congratulate the Senator from New Hampshire for stating the case factually, and stating it so well. Congress is coming under increasing criticism from the public and the press. In some quarters it is said that Congress is not doing its job; some say the job is becoming too big for us. I do not subscribe to that opinion. I notice that it is being stated with increasing frequency that the executive department has become so vast and overwhelming that Congress no longer is in a position to "ride herd" on it, as it were.

As the Senator from New Hampshire has stated so factually, the Committee on Commerce has a great responsibility. To discharge that responsibility effectively, the committee, as well as the executive departments, must have trained technicians and professional staff personnel, not only for day-to-day operations, but for special studies, as well. It must have in its service persons who are knowledgeable and expert in their fields.

The Senator from New Hampshire has alluded to the vast areas of responsibility which fall within the purview of the Committee on Commerce. He referred to transportation. The Subcommittee on Air Transportation, headed by the able senior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY] has jurisdiction of a field of transportation which requires close supervision. Surface transportation in all forms, including the vast merchant marine, fall within the legislative jurisdiction of the Committee on Commerce, as do the Coast Guard, the Federal Power Commission, and various other regulatory agencies. These examples merely begin to denote the areas in which the committee moves, as it fulfills its legislative functions and other duties.

I agree wholeheartedly with the Senator from New Hampshire that the country and the Senate can very well trust the chairman of the committee, the able Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], to spend effectively and carefully the money which is granted to the committee. If all the money is not required, the chairman can be relied upon to return the sums which are not used. He will not spend money which is not absolutely needed. I think it would be a disservice to the public if the Committee on Commerce were not granted all the money which is required to do the very essential work which is entrusted to it.

I thank the Senator from New Hampshire, my fellow committee member, for providing me this opportunity to express my opinion on a subject which is of such great importance.

Mr. COTTON. I thank the Senator from Alaska.

Mr. President, at this time I remind Senators that the question of the consolidation and merger of railroads and airlines is a new problem which has not previously been dealt with in the committee. In view of this record, I sincerely hope this modest amount, to be used by a committee headed by a Senator who has such an excellent record of faithfulness and of using only what is necessary, will be given to it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] to the committee amendment on page 3, in line 8, of Senate Resolution 29—namely, to strike out $330,000 and insert $297,000.

On this question, the yeas and nays have been ordered; and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana (when his name was called). On this vote, I have a pair with the senior Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON]. If the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] were present and voting, he would vote "nay." If I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "yea." I withhold my vote.

The rollcall was concluded.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I announce that the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. EDMONDSON], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. HARTKE], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MCGOVERN], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. NELSON], the Senator from Oregon [Mrs. NEUBERGER], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. TALMADGE], and the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] are absent on official business.

I further announce that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. RIBICOFF] is necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. EDMONDSON], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. HARTKE], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. LONG], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MCGOVERN], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. NELSON], the Senator from Oregon [Mrs. NEUBERGER], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. RIBICOFF], and the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] would each vote "nay."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senators from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT and Mr. DOMINICK], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. PEARSON], and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] are detained on official business.

If present and voting, the Senator from Kansas [Mr. PEARSON] would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 15, nays 58, as follows:

[No. 27 Leg.]

YEAS—15

Aiken
Boggs
Byrd, Va
Carlson
Curtis
Ellender
Hickenlooper
Holland
Hruska
Jordon, Idaho
Lausche
Mechem
Miller
Simpson
Williams, Del.

NAYS—58

Anderson
Bartlett
Bayh
Beall
Bennett
Bible
Brewster
Burdick
Byrd, W. Va.
Cannon
Case
Church
Clark
Cooper
Cotton
Dodd
Douglas
Eastland
Engle
Fong
Fulbright
Gore
Gruening
Hayden
Hill
Humphrey
Inouye
Jackson
Javits
Johnston
Jordan, N.C.
Keating
Kuchel
Mansfield
McCarthy
McGee
McIntyre
McNamara
Metcalf
Monroney
Morse
Moss
Muskie
Pell
Prouty
Proxmire
Randolph
Scott
Smathers
Smith
Sparkman
Stennis
Symington
Thurmond
Tower
Williams, N.J.
Yarborough
Young, Ohio

NOT VOTING—27

Allott
Dirksen
Dominick
Edmondson
Ervin
Goldwater
Hart
Hartke
Kefauver
Kennedy
Long, Mo.
Long, La.
Magnuson
McClellan
McGovern
Morton
Mundt
Nelson
Neuberger
Pastore
Pearson
Ribicoff
Robertson
Russell
Saltonstall
Talmadge
Young, N. Dak.

So Mr. ELLENDER's amendment to the committee amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now recurs on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution is open to further amendment.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS] I offer an amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment of the Senator from Delaware will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. At the appropriate place in the resolution, it is proposed to add the following language:

Notwithstanding section 1754 of title 22, United States Code, or any other provision of law, local currencies owned by the United States shall be made available to the Committee on Commerce of the Senate and employees engaged in carrying out their official duties under section 190(d) of title 2, United States Code: *Provided*, (1) That no member or employee of said committee shall receive or expend local currencies for subsistence an amount in excess of the maximum per diem rates approved for oversea travel as set forth in the Standardized Government Travel Regulations, as revised and amended by the Bureau of the Budget; (2) that no member or employee of said committee shall receive or expend an amount for transportation in excess of actual transportation costs; (3) no appropriated funds shall be expended for the purpose of defraying expenses of members of said committee or its employees in any country where counterpart funds are available for this purpose.

That each member or employee of said committee shall make to the chairman of said committee an itemized report showing the number of days visited in each country whose local currencies were spent, the amount of per diem furnished, and the cost of transportation if furnished by public carrier, or if such transportation is furnished by an agency of the United States Government, the identification of the agency. All such individual reports shall be filed by the chairman with the Secretary of the Senate and shall be open to public inspection.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I shall be brief.

The amendment is the same as those offered in the House of Representatives under date of January 31 to various resolutions to provide funds for its committees. The House amendments offered at that time were intended to safeguard expenditure of committee funds and to require a detailed accounting. I believe that we in the Senate have a similar responsibility. We owe it to the taxpayers to make sure that all our expenditures are in line and are open for inspection. The amendment is copied verbatim from the House-approved amendments.

The House is to be complimented for the action which it has taken in this connection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. CURTIS. Is it the understanding of the distinguished Senator from Delaware that, so far as amounts spent are concerned, the amendment would apply the same limits and standards on counterpart funds that are now applied with respect to dollars?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Yes; it would provide the same per diem allowance as is available to the executive branch. In addition, it would require a detailed accounting, open for inspection.

Mr. CURTIS. But the amendment relates to the committee.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The Senator is correct. The amendment would put the expenditure of counterpart funds under such restrictions. Some are under the impression that the counterpart funds are not of any use. That is far from true; most of these counterpart funds are convertible into dollars. They can certainly be used by the Federal Government. As the Secretary of the Treasury has pointed out, counterpart funds are the property of the American taxpayers and should be spent with the same degree of prudence as are any other funds. It is my understanding that similar amendments were approved practically unanimously by the House of Representatives to their money resolutions.

I think the Senate should do no less than approve this amendment.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I promised to yield first to the Senator from New Hampshire. Then I shall yield to the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I wish to ask the distinguished Senator from Delaware a question. I feel that the amendment would apply a perfectly fair, legitimate and reasonable rule. I would in no way be embarrassed by it. But I should like to know whether the Senator from Delaware is singling out the Committee on Commerce for his proposed restriction. I wonder whether the Senator will see to it that the same amendment is offered to the authorizations for other committees and subcommittees whose members may have occasion to travel outside the United States. If he does not intend to do so, I for one would feel that the amendment would reflect on a committee which, to my knowledge, has had a fine record in the use of counterpart funds. I would resent having the Committee on Commerce selected for the proposed action. If the Senator intends to treat every committee and subcommittee in the same way, I am all for the amendment.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The Senator from New Hampshire had made a very good point. I have no intention of casting any reflection on this particular committee. I intend to offer a similar amendment to all of the resolutions which deal with travel by any congressional committee. This amendment will be offered in connection with all such resolutions considered here today.

I did not offer the amendment with respect to those resolutions which deal with matters 100 percent within this country because the amendment deals with the question of expenditure of foreign currencies used in connection with foreign travel.

But I will promise that the amendment will be offered to all similar resolutions which deal with foreign travel. No committee is being singled out.

Mr. COTTON. Can the Senator also give me some information as to what other committees he believes use the foreign currencies? I should like to know exactly which resolutions for which committees are involved, and to which resolutions the amendment will be offered.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I would not wish to give the Senator an answer at this moment and claim it to be all inclusive since there are many resolutions on the calendar and I could miss one, though I do not intend to miss one. To be specific, I notice that the next resolution which is to be considered is the one relating to work by the Committee on Foreign Relations. I have already told the chairman of the committee that I intend to offer a similar amendment to that resolution.

Then there is another resolution which will come before the Senate which deals with Judiciary Committee funds for a proposed antitrust investigation in Europe. The amendment will be offered to that resolution.

The amendment will be offered to any of the resolutions for any of the committees which involve travel outside this country. It is my intention to be all inclusive. To make sure I do not miss one I would appreciate it if the Senator from New Hampshire would help me watch. I can assure the Senator that it is my desire to offer the amendment with respect to all of them. That is my intention. It would be most unfair to single out any committee, and I certainly would not single out the Commerce Committee.

Mr. COTTON. I asked the Senator from Delaware to consider the fact that there are committees of the Senate which, very properly, because of the nature of their jurisdiction, have access to travel and subsistence not available, for example, to members of the Commerce Committee.

I refer, for instance, to the Committee on Armed Services, the members of which, very properly, on official business frequently travel in planes of the Air Force and are furnished with a good deal of subsistence.

I have no knowledge of this, but I presume that members of the Committee on Foreign Relations are very properly entertained many times at embassies and consulates. By "entertained" I do not mean to refer to parties; I mean they actually are quartered in such buildings.

I say again that I think the Senator is correct in principle. I have no idea of opposing his amendment. However, when one considers the entire field, I sometimes wonder how we can ever expect the people of the United States to trust the U.S. Senate and to trust us, if we do not have confidence in ourselves. I sometimes wonder if a great deal of damage is not done to the influence and prestige of this body in which we serve and of which we are justly proud by such a constant attempt to do something which indicates that somebody has his nose in the public trough.

This is not a question of travel. It is a question of the dignity of the Senate and the dignity of its committees.

So far as the Senator from New Hampshire is concerned, I am perfectly willing to support the amendment, which I know is offered sincerely by the Senator from Delaware, for it is characteristic of his meticulous regard for the integrity of himself and of all his colleagues.

However, if the amendment is agreed to, no matter how hard we try to do otherwise, we will draw distinctions as among the committees in the Senate. I am a member of the Appropriations Committee. Does the Senator intend to offer the amendment with respect to the Appropriations Committee?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Yes, and all other committees authorizing foreign travel.

Mr. COTTON. That is interesting. Does the Senator intend to offer any amendment to prevent members of the Committee on Armed Services from having meals and subsistence furnished to them while they are abroad?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, if a Member of Congress is traveling by transportation furnished to him by the U.S. Government and if he is fed and housed by the U.S. Government at one of its embassies he would not collect the subsistence payment. Why should he? Certainly he would not be entitled to dual allowances.

The Senator from New Hampshire has suggested that we "cover the waterfront" by making this one amendment cover all committees. I would be willing to suggest the absence of a quorum and then join the Senator in drafting an amendment broad enough to cover all committees. That would be a quick way to solve the whole problem.

Mr. COTTON. I say to the Senator from Delaware that I would not join in the offering of the amendment.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Oh; I thought that was what the Senator wished to do.

Mr. COTTON. No; I do not. I happen to have enough confidence in every Member of the Senate on both sides of the aisle that I am not going to offer any amendments to put them on some subsistence basis, which I believe the Senator's amendment seeks to do. I have no objection to the Senator from Delaware offering the amendment. I have no objection to it being done to me. I recognize that the distinguished Senator is doing this with the utmost of sincerity.

I dislike to see the Senate take a leaf out of the book of the other body. I may be violating the rules by mentioning the other body. It is a wonderful body. Many of us served in it and are proud of our service there. However, merely because such a provision was offered somewhere else is not proof that we must accept it.

There are distinguished men serving as chairmen of the committees of the Senate. I can say this with propriety, because unfortunately not one of them is a Republican. They are all Democrats. Everyone knows that the Democrats are fundamentally honest, and every chairman in this body, so far as I know, is a man of complete and unimpeachable integrity.

However, if it is advisable to establish some safeguard of this kind, that will be prefectly fine, and I am willing to vote for it.

I think, before the Senator plunges in too deeply, before he puts every Member of the Senate in such a position that if he votes against the amendment the word will go out to the country that he is afraid to vote for it because he wants a big, lush traveling account, the Senator should weigh very carefully the rather delicate and intricate situation which is presented when one deals with the Armed Services Committee, with the Appropriations Committee, and with other committees which have access to subsistence allowances which some of the committees do not have.

I wish to ask the Senator a question about his amendment. The Senator knows I am speaking in the best possible spirit, for I have great admiration for him. If the Senator's amendment were adopted, could I, as a member of the Commerce Committee, concerning which it is being offered, if I wished to travel somewhere and have available certain funds, get the chairman of the committee—and he certainly ought to do it, in view of my stalwart defense of his budget this afternoon—to put me on his expense account, so that I could spend any amount I wanted of the committee funds, so long as I did not use counterpart funds? Is that a correct understanding?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. No. There would be an accounting of all the Senator spent filed with the Chairman and these expenditures would be limited to the same per diem allowances as provided for the executive branch.

Mr. COTTON. How many dollars a day could I spend to live abroad?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The same amount the Senator and I allow for any member of the executive branch under similar travel arrangements.

Mr. COTTON. How much is that?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I do not have the exact figures available, but I would say it would be the same allowance as provided on a per diem basis for members of the executive branch. Why should it be any more? Also, the amendment provides for an itemized accounting of expenditures by each member. Congress passed a bill last year which required that every American businessman who wanted to deduct any amount of his expenses from his tax return had to itemize his accounts carefully and submit such report to the Treasury Department. That does not mean we distrust the taxpayers, but that is a law. Why should Members of Congress be subject to any less restrictions?

I merely say that in fairness, I think the rules should be applied to all.

Do not forget that as Members of Congress traveling abroad we would be spending the taxpayers' money. The businessman is spending his own. This is all the more reason why we should be willing to limit our expenditures and render an accurate accounting. Certainly we should be willing to abide by the same rules we lay down for the executive branch and all other taxpayers.

Mr. COTTON. So far as accounting is concerned, the Senator is quite correct. So far as the committee is concerned, every Senator is required to account for every cent he spends.

I thank the Senator for his courtesy. I am perfectly willing that this rule shall apply to the Commerce Committee. and I shall expect the Senator to offer such a proposal with respect to every committee of the Senate whose members have occasion to travel abroad.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. That is my intention. I thank the Senator for his support of the amendment. If he wishes to cosponsor it I shall be glad to have him as a cosponsor.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me before he sits down?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I am in thorough sympathy with what the Senator is attempting to do. He knows I have discussed this subject with him. Some time ago the Senator from Mississippi probably had about as good a proposal as any when he offered to place the allowance on a flat per diem basis, without complications.

It seems to me that the Senator ought to do one of two things: Either put such a provision in the foreign aid bill or some other legislative measure, or else let it be a legislative measure, on which there would be a conference between the House and the Senate, so there would be uniformity and so there would be a law which had been signed by the President. I wish very much that he would not proceed in this piecemeal manner, but would seek to have such a provision adopted in a way that would make it a binding law.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I appreciate the Senator's remarks. I offered this provision as an amendment to the Foreign Aid Act a few years ago, and if I recall correctly the Senator from Alabama supported it. The bill went to the House, and the provision was changed somewhat in conference. I regretted this modification, but I did thank the committee, for bringing back what they were able to obtain from the conference. I agree that the additional provisions suggested here today would be better if they were general law, but we are dealing today with money for the Senate committees. When the Senator speaks of making the application of the provision uniform, I point out that such a broad proposal may be subject to be a point of order. Today we are dealing with Senate expenditures only.

Mr. SPARKMAN. We cannot do it. That is the fatal defect in the proposal.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Except that the House has already acted on the proposal. Our action would have the result of making it uniform for both Houses.

Mr. SPARKMAN. The House has acted on it. A bill is coming to the Senate.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. No. The House passed its money resolutions on January 31. It included such a provision in its resolutions.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I had understood that the House had passed a separate resolution.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. There has been a broader resolution introduced.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I think there is a great deal of merit in what the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. Cotton] has said about the differences among the different committees.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, I make a point of order that this is an effort to amend the law while the Senate is considering a simple resolution.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, it is my understanding this is a restriction on an appropriation, and therefore it seems to me the amendment is in order.

I hope the Senate will at least take this necessary step to guarantee an accurate accounting of our expenditures as Members of Congress. Certainly the limits on such expenditures as provided in this amendment are in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is ready to rule. Under the practice of the Senate, resolutions are not used for the purpose of legislative enactment. That is done by a bill or joint resolution. This amendment in effect makes certain action in order, notwithstanding the provisions of any law in conflict with it, and therefore it is not in order under Senate procedure.

The Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I was about to join in raising the point of order. I want the Record to show that I was seeking recognition in order to raise the point of order. I think the point the Senator from Delaware is raising should be in bill form or resolution form and be referred to the appropriate committee for study and hearings.

I am well aware of the fact that this proposal is supposed to have great political sex appeal, but, so far as I am concerned, it is a barren proposal.

I think we ought to take a look at the practice that prevails in the Senate. I happen to be a member of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. I am advised that every dollar of counterpart fund expenditures is reported to the Foreign Relations Committee and is reported by the Foreign Relations Committee.

I speak on this subject on the basis of a little experience, because several years ago the Senator from Oregon set a precedent in the Foreign Relations Committee. In one of the official trips of the Foreign Relations Committee I found that in many counterpart countries many of our ambassadors, ministers, or attachés had been out of representation money for months before our Senate delegation reached the particular country. Nevertheless, the visitation of the delegation had greatly increased the cost of the embassies, consulates, or attachés.

My first experience with this problem was in Madras, India, where the supreme court of that state of India made clear to our consul general that it would be agreeable if there were a state dinner for the visiting congressional delegation. I am sure no Senator is surprised when I tell him that it was expected that the expense of the dinner would be paid by the consulate. It was an important dinner so far as our foreign relations in India were concerned.

When I discovered that that very expensive dinner was to be paid for out of the pocket of the consul general, I drew on the counterpart funds, for I could do so, and the consul general could not.

In my judgment, that expenditure was money well spent in behalf of furthering our foreign relations in that state.

I reported it to the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate, and I was advised at that time that this was the precedent case; that there was no record of such a thing ever having been done before by a member of the committee.

That was not the only time on the trip that I did it. I drew on counterpart funds in consultation with our ambassadorial or consulate staff, and I drew on them when I realized that they were expected to spend representation funds in behalf of this visiting congressional delegation, but that they did not have any funds. I want to state for the record that at no time did any member of our Foreign Service ever intimate to me that I might use my authority to draw on those funds. In fact, in some instances there were some protests from them.

They were apparently afraid that if I did it, they might find themselves in a position in which they would have to explain to the State Department how it came about. I made it clear that I was acting on my own responsibility. I rendered a value judgment as to whether or not the expenditure of those counterpart funds for official functions—and these were the only times that I drew on such funds—would be in the best interest of my country.

Let me add that in my judgment there should be more drawing on counterpart funds, and not less. In my judgment, there are great sums of counterpart funds in "cold storage" in many areas where counterpart funds exist that ought to be spent in the interest of strengthening American foreign policy in those countries. The test is the test of accounting. That is the test, and not a prohibition which prevents the expenditure of funds. That is why I hope the Senator from Delaware will introduce his amendment as a bill or submit it as a resolution, so that we can make a record on it, and so that we can find out under what terms and circumstances the funds should be spent. To limit it to a per diem basis does not make good sense.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. After I have finished my argument, I will be glad to yield. I believe we should make a careful study of the use of counterpart funds. The Senator's resolution or bill could lead to such a study. However, there has developed around these precincts the idea that drawing on counterpart funds by visiting senatorial delegations in various countries involves some kind of shady practice.

Of course, if a Member buys pearl necklaces or diamond rings or material goods for his personal use, no one would deplore it more than would the Senator from Oregon, and no one would more enthusiastically support a prohibition against it. I know some charges are made along that line, and there may be some abuses in this regard, to the effect that counterpart funds have been used for personal aggrandizement of a Member of Congress.

I am also satisfied that such cases are so few and the exceptions are so de minimis that it is unfortunate that the entire Congress should be smeared with regard to the expenditure of counterpart funds.

As a member of the Committee on Foreign Relations, let me say that in my judgment we have not spent the counterpart funds that ought to be spent. They ought to be spent in carrying out the foreign policy of this country. If an official delegation of Congress in carrying out the purposes of its mission finds that it will be in the best interest of our foreign policy to draw on counterpart funds, I do not want any prohibition written into the law that will deny to that delegation the right to draw on counterpart funds.

No one will go father than I in requiring a detailed minutiae accounting, in regard to expenditure of counterpart funds. However, I will not support a resolution which would prohibit a Member of Congress from drawing on counterpart funds if in his judgment the funds should be drawn upon in carrying out the purpose of his official mission.

I now yield to the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I point out to the Senator from Oregon—as I am sure he as a member of the Committee on Foreign Relations will recall—that the first amendment which I offered, a couple of years ago, did not deal with per diem allowances but was based on the theory that an accurate and public accounting would prevent abuse. Such an itemized accounting, open for public inspection, would solve the purpose the Senator from Oregon has in mind. The full committee supported that proposal. However, it was changed, to my regret, in conference. The Senator from Alabama, who was in charge of the conference, did the best he could. If we could obtain a detailed and public accounting of the expenditures of all dollars and/or counterpart funds it would go far toward correcting any abuse. I assure the Senator that a resolution to accomplish that will again be submitted, and it will be submitted at a time when it will not be subject to a point of order.

Mr. MORSE. I have made my case, and the Senator from Delaware has made his case. On the basis of the resolution that he will submit, we can proceed with the hearings that I believe should be held on it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution as amended.

The resolution (S. Res. 29) was agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Commerce, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdictions specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of any and all matters pertaining to—

(1) interstate commerce generally;
(2) foreign commerce generally;
(3) maritime matters;
(4) interoceanic canals;
(5) transportation policy;
(6) domestic surface transportation, including pipelines;

(7) communications, including a complete review of national and international telecommunications and the use of communications satellites;

(8) Federal power matters;

(9) civil aeronautics;

(10) fisheries and wildlife;

(11) marine sciences; and

(12) Weather Bureau operations and planning, including the use of weather satellites.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution the committee, from March 1, 1963 to January 31, 1964, inclusive, is authorized (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ, upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided*, That the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than $1,600 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1964.

SEC. 4. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed $330,000 shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committe.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 71), explaining the purposes of the resolution.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INVESTIGATIONS BY THE COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE

The Committee on Rules and Administration to whom was referred the resolution (S. Res. 29) authorizing the Committee on Commerce to investigate certain matters within its jurisdiction, and providing additional funds therefor, having considered the same, report favorably thereon without additional amendment and recommend that the resolution, as amended, be agreed to by the Senate.

Senate Resolution No. 29 as amended would authorize the expenditure of not to exceed $330,000 by the Committee on Commerce, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, from March 1, 1963 to January 31, 1964, to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of any and all matters pertaining to—

1. Interstate commerce generally;
2. Foreign commerce generally;
3. Maritime matters;
4. Interoceanic canals;
5. Transportation policy;
6. Domestic surface transportation, including pipelines;
7. Communications, including a complete review of national and international telecommunications and the use of communications satellites;
8. Federal power matters;
9. Civil aeronautics;
10. Fisheries and wildlife;
11. Marine sciences; and
12. Weather Bureau operations and planning, including the use of weather satellites.

The following table indicates funds authorized by the Senate during the 87th Congress for the same purpose. Committee expenditures pursuant to such authorization are shown through December 31, 1962.

Committee and purpose	87th Congress			
	Amount		Date	Authority
	Authorized	Expended		
Commerce: General	$630,000	$454,906.31		
	315,000 315,000	246,493.11 208,413.20	Feb. 13, 1961 Feb. 7, 1962	S. Res. 74. S. Res. 251.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS TO CONTINUE STUDY OF ACTIVITIES OF NONDIPLOMATIC REPRESENTATIVES OF FOREIGN PRINCIPALS

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate Resolution 26.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A resolution (S. Res. 26) authorizing the Committee on Foreign Relations to continue its study of the activities of nondiplomatic representatives of foreign principals.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Minnesota.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution, which had been reported from the Committee on Rules and Administration with amendments on page 2, line 1, after the word "party", to insert "or any other foreign principal,"; in line 12, after the word "from", to strike out "February" and insert "March"; and on page 3, line 2, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$5,000" and insert "$48,600"; so as to make the resolution read:

Resolved, That the Committee on Foreign Relations, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134 and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdiction specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to continue its study of the activities of nondiplomatic representatives of foreign principals including, without limitation, foreign governments, foreign political parties, and individuals, partnerships, associations, corporations, organizations or other combinations of individuals, whether foreign or domestic, acting in the place of, or in the interests of, or on behalf of a foreign government or foreign political party, or any other foreign principal, tending or intended to influence the foreign or domestic policies or interests of the United States.

SEC. 2. The committee is further authorized under sections 134 and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 to give thorough consideration to existing and proposed legislation relating to the activities of nondiplomatic representatives of foreign principals, as aforesaid, and to make such recommendations with respect thereto as may be found by it to be appropriate.

SEC. 3. For the purposes of this resolution the committee is authorized from March 1, 1963, to January 31, 1964, inclusive, (1) to make such expenditures; (2) to hold such hearings, to sit and act at such times and places during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Senate; (3) to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such correspondence, books, papers, and documents; (4) to take such testimony; (5) to employ, upon a temporary basis, such technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants; and (6) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government as it deems advisable.

SEC. 4. The expenses of the committee under this resolution which shall not exceed $48,600 for the period ending January 31, 1964, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

SEC. 5. The committee shall complete its study and submit to the Senate not later than January 31, 1964, such results of the study herein authorized together with such recommendations as to existing or proposed legislation as herein authorized as may be found by it to be appropriate.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the resolution deals with the present investigation on lobbying activities as it relates to lobbyists for foreign countries. That investigation is now underway. The request is for $48,600. This is a very important study and inquiry, and the amount will therefore be required, according to the information that was presented to the committee. I understood there was very good documentation for the request in committee.

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. Mr. President, it was thoroughly justified.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, we provided last year $50,000. I am wondering why only $6,686.70 was spent.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Last year we got started on the investigation, but the investigation is now in full swing. I recognize that the investigation was in progress most of last year, but I am talking now in terms of staff and activity. If there is any money left, it will be returned. No one will put the money in his pocket or run away with it. It will go back into the Treasury.

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. It is never drawn unless it is spent.

Mr. ELLENDER. The distinguished Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] said that with $50,000 last year he would be able to complete the investigation. Does the Senator confirm that fact, that if we provide $48,600 for the remaining 11 months, the committee will be able to do that?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am not at all sure about it. I would not want to make that statement. I do not know how far this investigation will go. Some people are of the opinion that this is an investigation of very great importance. I have the utmost confidence in the chairman of the committee. I do not know of any Senator who more jealously guards the dollar or more fully and comprehensively conducts a hearing than the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT]. The amount he asks is well deserved.

Mr. ELLENDER. This is a new committee, and that is why I suggested last year that there be a limitation. I was under the impression that the Senator from Arkansas said that he thought $50,000 would be sufficient. I may be in error.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I believe I recall that the Senator from Arkansas said that. However, the truth is that this investigation has revealed a considerable amount of activity which the committee believes ought to be investigated. Any money that is not needed will not be drawn on or expended. The committee has a very small staff.

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. I believe that the committee barely got into this subject last year. It did not get into it very deeply, at any rate. It is now getting into a great many situations that it did not realize existed before, and it is believed that this study will last for several months, perhaps for the remainder of the year.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator is correct.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I said earlier that I would offer my amendment to this resolution as well as several others on the calendar. However, in view of the fact that the point of order has been made and sustained by the Chair that such an amendment is not in order at this time I will not offer the amendment now. I will wait for the appropriate time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendments.

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 22), explaining the purposes of the resolution.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Senate Resolution 26 as amended would authorize the Committee on Foreign Relations, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, to expend not to exceed $48,600 from March 1, 1963, through January 31, 1964, to continue its study of the activities of nondiplomatic representatives of foreign principals including, without limitation, foreign governments, foreign political parties, and individuals, partnerships, associations, corporations, organizations, or other combinations of individuals, whether foreign or domestic, acting in the place of, or in the interests of, or on behalf of a foreign government or foreign political party, tending or intended to influence the foreign or domestic policies or interests of the United States.

The following table indicates funds authorized by the Senate during the 87th Congress for the same purpose. Committee expenditures pursuant to such authorization are shown through December 31, 1962.

Committee and purpose	87th Congress			
	Amount		Date	Authority
	Authorized	Expended		
Foreign Relations: Activities of nondiplomatic foreign principals	$50,000.00	$6,686.79		
	50,000.00	6,686.79	July 12, 1962	S. Res. 362.

Due to the delay in the organization of the Senate and in order that the subcommittees could meet their February payrolls, the Senate on February 19, 1963, approved Senate Resolution 88, which continued for 1 month—through February 28, 1963—the investigative and expenditure authorizations granted to Senate committees during the 87th Congress, 2d session, and in certain instances provided additional funds for the purpose.

Since most of the resolutions which would authorize inquiries and investigations during the present session had already been referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration prior to the adoption of Senate Resolution 88, and consequently were on a 12-month basis, the committee at its meeting on February 27, 1963, adopted the following formula to reduce each such request to an 11-month basis:

"A reduction by one-twelfth of that portion of the total request representing salaries and agency contributions to employee retirement, health benefits, and group life insurance."

On this basis the expenditure authorization contained in Senate Resolution 26 was reduced $1,400, from $50,000 to $48,600.

The investigative authority was correspondingly reduced to an 11-month period commencing March 1, 1963.

An additional amendment adopted by the Committee on Rules and Administration, at the request of the Committee on Foreign Relations is as follows:

On page 2, line 1, after the word "party,", insert "or any other foreign principal,".

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS TO INVESTIGATE MATTERS PERTAINING TO FOREIGN POLICIES OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 22, Senate Resolution 25.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A resolution (S. Res. 25) authorizing the committee on Foreign Relations to examine, investigate, and make studies of matters pertaining to the foreign policies of the United States and their administration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution, which had been reported from the Committee on Rules and Administration with amendments, on page 1, line 10, after the word "from", to strike out "February" and insert "March", and on page 2, line 22, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$150,000" and insert "$143,000"; so as to make the resolution read:

Resolved, That the Committee on Foreign Relations or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdictions specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to examine, investigate, and make complete studies of any and all matters pertaining to the foreign policies of the United States and their administration.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution the committee, from March 1, 1963, to January 31, 1964, inclusive, is authorized (1) to make such expenditures; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants; (3) to hold such hearings, to take such testimony, to sit and act at such times and places during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Senate, and to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such correspondence, books, papers, and documents; and (4) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government, as the committee deems advisable.

SEC. 3. In the conduct of its studies the committee may use the experience, knowledge, and advice of private organizations, schools, institutions, and individuals in its discretion, and it is authorized to divide the work of the studies among such individuals, groups and institutions as it may deem appropriate and may enter into contracts for this purpose.

SEC. 4. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed $143,000 for the period ending January 31, 1964, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. The amount requested by the Committee on Foreign Relations was reduced by the amount it received last year, and 7 percent was then applied to that amount. So the committee then recommended that the resolution be adopted as reported. The committee asked for $10,000 less than it received last year, and we took $7,000 more from that amount.

Mr. ELLENDER. Does that amount to about 10 percent less than was received last year?

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. It is $17,000 less than the committee received last year.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is about 10 percent?

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. That is correct.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendments.

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The resolution (S. Res. 25), as amended, was agreed to.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 23), explaining the purposes of the resolution.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Senate Resolution 25, as amended, would authorize the expenditure of $143,000 by the Committee on Foreign Relations, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, from

March 1, 1963, through January 31, 1964, "to examine, investigate, and make complete studies of any and all matters pertaining to the foreign policies of the United States and their administration."

The following table indicates funds authorized by the Senate during the 87th Congress for the same purpose. Committee expenditures pursuant to such authorizations are shown through December 31, 1962.

Committee and purpose	87th Congress			
	Amount		Date	Authority
	Authorized	Expended		
Foreign Relations: U.S. foreign policy	$320,000	$205,793.47		
	160,000	98,523.16	Jan. 31, 1961	S. Res. 41.
	160,000	107,270.31	Feb. 7, 1962	S. Res. 246.

Due to the delay in the organization of the Senate and in order that its subcommittees could meet their February payrolls, the Senate on February 19, 1963, approved Senate Resolution 88, which continued for 1 month—through February 28, 1963—the investigative and expenditure authorizations granted to Senate committees during the 87th Congress, 2d session, and in certain instances provided additional funds for the purpose.

Since most of the resolutions which would authorize inquiries and investigations during the present session had already been referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration prior to the adoption of Senate Resolution 88, and consequently were on a 12-month basis, the committee at its meeting on February 27, 1963, adopted the following formula to reduce each such request to an 11-month basis:

"A reduction by one-twelfth of that portion of the total request representing salaries and agency contributions to employee retirement, health benefits, and group life insurance."

On this basis the expenditure authorization contained in Senate Resolution 25 was reduced $7,000, from $150,000 to $143,000.

The investigative authority was correspondingly reduced to an 11-month period commencing March 1, 1963.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS TO MAKE STUDIES OF OPERATIONS OF THE GOVERNMENT

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 23, Senate Resolution 17.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A resolution (S. Res. 17) authorizing the Committee on Government Operations to make certain studies as to the efficiency and economy of the operations of the Government.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Minnesota.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution, which had been reported from the Committee on Rules and Administration, with amendments, on page 1, at the beginning of line 7, to strike out "February" and insert "March"; on page 2, line 20, after the word "from", to strike out "February" and insert "March"; on page 3, line 12, after the word "from", to strike out "February" and insert "March"; on page 4, line 21, after the word "from", to strike out "February" and insert "March"; and on page 5, line 20, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$490,000.00" and insert "$458,300"; so as to make the resolution read:

Resolved, That in holding hearings, reporting such hearings, and making investigations as authorized by section 134 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 and in accordance with is jurisdiction under rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the Committee on Government Operations or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized from March 1, 1963, through January 31, 1964, to make investigations into the efficiency and economy of operations of all branches of the Government, including the possible existence of fraud, misfeasance, malfeasance, collusion, mismanagement, incompetence, corrupt or unethical practices, waste, extravagance, conflicts of interest, and the improper expenditure of Government funds in transactions, contracts, and activities of the Government or of Government officials and employees and any and all such improper practices between Government personnel and corporations, individuals, companies, or persons affiliated therewith, doing business with the Government; and the compliance or noncompliance of such corporations, companies, or individuals or other entities with the rules, regulations, and laws governing the various governmental agencies and its relationships with the public: *Provided,* That in carrying out the duties herein set forth, the inquiries of this committee shall not be deemed limited to the records, functions, and operations of the particular branch of the Government under inquiry, and may extend to the records and activities of persons, corporations, or other entities dealing with or affecting that particular branch of the Government.

SEC. 2. The Committee on Government Operations or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof is further authorized from March 1, 1963, to January 31, 1964, inclusive, to conduct an investigation and study of the extent to which criminal or other improper practices or activities are, or have been, engaged in in the field of labor-management relations or in groups of organizations of employees or employers, to the detriment of interests of the public, employers, or employees, and to determine whether any changes are required in the laws of the United States in order to protect such interests against the occurrence of such practices or activities. Nothing contained in this resolution shall affect or impair the exercise by the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare of any power, or the discharge by such committee of any duty, conferred or imposed upon it by the Standing Rules of the Senate or by the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946.

SEC. 3. The Committee on Government Operations or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof is further authorized and directed from March 1, 1963, to January 31, 1964, inclusive, to make a full and complete study and investigation of syndicated or organized crime which may operate in or otherwise utilize the facilities of interstate or international commerce in furtherance of any transactions which are in violation of the law of the United States or of the State in which the transactions occur, and, if so, the manner and extent to which, and the identity of the persons, firms or corporations, or other entities by whom such utilization is being made, what facilities, devices, methods, techniques, and technicalities are being used or employed, and whether or not organized crime utilizes such interstate facilities or otherwise operates in interstate commerce for the development of corrupting influences in violation of the law of the United States or the laws of any State, and further, to study and investigate the manner in which and the extent to which persons engaged in organized criminal activities have infiltrated into lawful business enterprise; and to study the adequacy of Federal laws to prevent the operations of organized crime in interstate or international commerce; and to determine whether any changes are required in the laws of the United States in order to protect the public against the occurrences of such practices or activities. Nothing contained in this resolution shall affect or impair the exercise by the Committee on the Judiciary or by the Committee on Commerce of any power, or the discharge by such committee of any duty, conferred or imposed upon it by the Standing Rules of the Senate or by the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946.

SEC. 4. The Committee on Government Operations or any of its duly authorized subcommittees shall report to the Senate by January 31, 1964, and shall, if deemed appropriate, include in its report specific legislative recommendations.

SEC. 5. For the purposes of this resolution, the committee, from March 1, 1963, to January 31, 1964, inclusive, is authorized, as it deems necessary and appropriate, to (1) make such expenditures from the contingent fund of the Senate; (2) hold such hearings; (3) sit and act at such times and places during the sessions, recesses, and adjournment periods of the Senate; (4) require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and production of such correspondence, books, papers, and documents; (5) administer such oaths; (6) take such testimony, either orally or by deposition; (7) employ on a temporary basis such technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants; and (8) with the prior consent of the executive department or agency concerned and the Committee on Rules and Administration, employ on a reimbursable basis such executive branch personnel as it deems advisable; and, further, with the consent of other committees or subcommittees to work in conjunction with and utilize their staffs, as it shall be deemed necessary and appropriate in the judgment of the chairman of the committee: *Provided further,* That the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment and the person selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than $1,600 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee.

SEC. 6. The expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed $458,300, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendments.

The committee amendments were agreed to.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, can the chairman of the committee or some other Senator tell us how much more money is included in the resolution for this year's operation than was provided last year?

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. My recollection is that the amount provided for this year is $10,000 less than was provided last year. I am now informed that that is a correct statement.

Mr. ELLENDER. Last year, as I see the figures before me, the Senate appropriated $500,000. Of that sum, the amount of $452,000 was spent over a period of 12 months. The committee is now asking for $458,000 for 11 months. It seems to me that the amount asked for is about $18,000 more than the committee received last year.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The chairman of the committee will give the details, but again I should like to say that this is an investigation committee.

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. That is correct.

Mr. ELLENDER. I so understand.

Mr. HUMPHREY. All of the money being asked for will not necessarily be expended; but the chairman of the committee, in a very detailed analysis presented to the Committee on Rules and Administration, according to his conversation with me, felt that the request that he made of the Committee on Rules and Administration was a relatively conservative, well-documented request.

Last year the committee returned $48,418. It may very well be that the committee will return a substantial sum this year, as well. But this investigating committee is too important not to have it properly staffed and not to have the funds which are necessary to conduct the work which Senator McCLELLAN's committee undertakes.

Mr. ELLENDER. I do not question that at all.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I know that.

Mr. ELLENDER. I was merely trying to show that the moneys which are now to be provided are in excess of the amount which was provided last year.

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I do not have the floor.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. The committee actually spent its entire appropriation last year. The amount shown there was the amount spent through December, and we have continued the authority through February. The committee spent all the money which was appropriated to it last year.

Mr. ELLENDER. That was over a period of more than 12 months.

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. It was 13 months.

Mr. ELLENDER. So it is proposed to provide them, for 11 months, more money than was provided for 12 months last year. That is the point I am making.

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. We have provided only $458,000. Last year the committee received $500,000.

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes; but this amount is for 11 months.

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. We reduced the amount by $31,200.

Mr. ELLENDER. I have pointed out that last year, for 12 months, $452,000 was spent.

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. No; the committee spent more than that.

Mr. ELLENDER. Then the information which was furnished by the committee is in error. It is bound to be in error, because from the investigation made at that time, which I placed in the RECORD, as appears on page 22 of this document, the amount of money appropriated last year was $500,000, and over a period of 11 months $412,033 was spent. Am I correct?

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct.

Mr. ELLENDER. If we add 10 percent of that amount for another month, it would amount, in round figures, to $41,000. Adding $41,000 to $412,000 makes a total of $453,000 which was spent for 12 months last year.

It is proposed to provide $458,800 for 11 months for this year. So we are providing, in that particular, more money on a yearly basis than was provided last year.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator is correct.

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. Except for one thing: In January of this year the committee spent much more money than it spent in December. It did not have enough money to continue through February, so it was necessary to secure an additional appropriation to operate through February. Is that not correct?

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct. The committee's spending in January was greater than it had been in other months. The amount of money which is now sought is the best calculation that the chairman, the committee, and the staff could outline in order to complete the undertaking of the work which is scheduled.

Mr. ELLENDER. How was the extra money obtained?

Mr. HUMPHREY. By a resolution.

Mr. ELLENDER. Does the Senator mean the continuing resolution?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes.

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. The continuing resolution—Senate Resolution 88.

Mr. ELLENDER. Am I to understand that the committee received more than $500,000 for 12 months of last year?

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator should know that we had $500,000 for 12 months, but the amount for the 13th month was covered by the continuing resolution.

Mr. ELLENDER. But last year the committee started spending its money in February. In other words, in each year the amount for January is included in the previous year's appropriation.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct. We start in February and continue through the following January 31.

Mr. ELLENDER. But this year, through a continuing resolution, an appropriation was made for February. Do I correctly understand that the extra money was obtained in February?

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. The committee did not spend the entire $500,000. Some of it was left over. They spent that and got $15,000 extra for February, if my recollection of the figures is correct.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct.

Mr. ELLENDER. I still contend—and I think I am correct—that the amount of money which is being made available for 11 months is more than the amount which was provided for last year. That is the point I am making.

Mr. HUMPHREY. It is my view that the amount of money made available for the coming 11 months is more than the amount made available for 12 months of last year; but it is the amount which is being requested because of the amount of work which the committee has outlined. I cannot imagine how anyone could feel that the Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations has not done a good job and does not need money.

Why has the committee asked for additional funds a little later under a special resolution, when we can now authorize the money and have it available? It will not be put into Senator McCLELLAN's pocket, in case he happens to need a little extra spending money during the days ahead. But it will be there for him to draw on, and it will be drawn on only in the form of vouchers which are filed against that fund. That is all there is to it. It would not make any difference if we appropriated $700,000; only the amount of money which will be needed will be drawn. These resolutions are authorizations for withdrawals. The chairmen of the committees will conduct the investigations.

Let us assume that something happened which would require a doubling of the committee's staff. The Senate would authorize that action. Let us assume that some unbelievable graft were found in a particular department of the Government and that it was necessary to increase the activities of the Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations. The amount of spending would have to be increased.

All we are doing in these resolutions is putting a ceiling on the amounts of authorizations, saying that the committees cannot draw more than they are authorized to draw. If they need more money and can justify it, they can request it of the Senate and will get it. If they cannot justify it in terms of the work proposed to be done, they will not get additional funds.

These authorizations do not mean that committees are being rewarded for not being frugal. The committees will get only what they can justify spending in accordance with the terms of the programs they submit.

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. One of the investigations I think the Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations will conduct this year, according to what was developed in the hearings, will be the use of narcotics by juveniles. This is becoming an acute problem in the United States. It is a situation which the committee will investigate thoroughly.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Committee on the Judiciary has a special subcommittee which is studying juvenile delinquency. My point is that there are many duplications in these fields.

If that is what the subcommittee is going to do, it will be a duplication of what other subcommittees are doing. Of course the fields are green, if there is a desire to investigate everything. But as will be shown in a few minutes, there is a special committee of the Judiciary Committee for the purpose of doing what the distinguished Senator from North Carolina is now requesting; and the Juvenile Delinquency Subcommittee is doing the same thing. So this would be just duplication.

Mr. HUMPHREY. But the committee report states, on page 9:

> The subcommittee staff currently has underway three major preliminary inquiries in addition to the continued surveillance of work stoppages in national defense facilities hereinbefore discussed.
>
> 1. A study of an award by the Department of Defense of a contract for the development and production of a supersonic airplane designated as the TFX, to be used by the Air Force and the Navy.

I am sure Senators have heard about that.

I read further from the report:

> 2. A broad inquiry into narcotics: This will encompass (1) a study of illicit narcotics traffic from both a national and international standpoint; (2) distribution of narcotics in the United States; (3) the relationship of organized crime to the distribution of illicit narcotics; and (4) dangerous drugs, particularly as to their ready accessibility to juveniles and more effective controls at the manufacturing source.
>
> 3. Sports bribery: Based on a recommendation made by the subcommittee in its 1962 report on gambling and organized crime, the staff is inquiring into bribery of athletes by organized gamblers to influence the outcome of sports contests. Preliminary work indicates interstate ramifications in this area, suggesting the need of Federal legislation.

Some Senator may think some of these items should not be handled by this subcommittee; but this is the Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations, of the Committee on Government Operations; and I believe the subcommittee should be properly staffed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McGOVERN in the chair). If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on agreeing to Senate Resolution 17, as amended.

The resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 24), explaining the purposes of the resolution.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

> Senate Resolution 17 as amended would authorize the expenditure of not to exceed $458,300 by the Committee on Government Operations for the continued operation of its Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations from March 1, 1963, through January 31, 1964:
>
> "(1) To make investigations into the efficiency and economy of operation of all branches of the Government, including the possible existence of fraud, misfeasance, malfeasance, collusion, mismanagement, incompetence, corrupt or unethical practices, waste, extravagance, conflicts of interest, and the improper expenditure of Government funds in transactions, contracts, and activities of the Government or of Government officials and employees and any and all such improper practices between Government personnel and corporations, individuals, companies, or persons affiliated therewith, doing business with the Government, and the compliance or noncompliance of such corporations, companies, or individuals or other entities with the rules, regulations, and laws governing the various governmental agencies and its relationships with the public;
>
> "(2) To conduct an investigation and study of the extent to which criminal or other improper practices or activities are, or have been engaged in in the field of labor-management relations or in groups or organizations of employees or employers, to the detriment of interests of the public, employers, or employees, and to determine whether any changes are required in the laws of the United States in order to protect such interests against the occurrence of such practices or activities; and
>
> "(3) To make a full and complete study and investigation of syndicated or organized crime which may operate in or otherwise utilize the facilities of interstate or international commerce in furtherance of any transactions which are in violation of the law of the United States or of the State in which the transactions occur, and, if so, the manner and extent to which, and the identify of the persons, firms, or corporations, or other entities by whom such utilization is being made, what facilities, devices, methods, techniques, and technicalities are being used or employed, and whether or not organized crime utilizes such interstate facilities or otherwise operates in interstate commerce for the development of corrupting influences in violation of the law of the United States or the laws of any State, and further, to study and investigate the manner in which and the extent to which persons engaged in organized criminal activities have infiltrated into lawful business enterprise, and to study the adequacy of Federal laws to prevent the operations of organized crime in interstate or international commerce, and to determine whether any changes are required in the laws of the United States in order to protect the public against the occurrences of such practices or activities."

PROVISION OF FUNDS FOR STUDY OF MATTERS PERTAINING TO INTERAGENCY COORDINATION, ECONOMY, AND EFFICIENCY

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 24, Senate Resolution 27, to provide funds for the study of matters pertaining to interagency coordination, economy, and efficiency.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution (S. Res. 27) to provide funds for the study of matters pertaining to interagency coordination, economy, and efficiency, which had been reported from the Committee on Rules and Administration, with amendments, on page 1, line 10, after the word "from", to strike out "February" and insert "March", and on page 2, line 20, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$95,000" and insert "$88,000"; so as to make the resolution read:

> *Resolved*, That the Committee on Government Operations, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdiction specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of any and all matters pertaining to interagency coordination, economy, and efficiency.
>
> SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution the committee, from March 1, 1963, through January 31, 1964, is authorized (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided*, That the minority is authorized at its discretion to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than $1,600 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the department or agencies of the Government.
>
> SEC. 3. The committee shall report its findings upon the study and investigation authorized by this resolution, together with its recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1964.
>
> SEC. 4. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed $88,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the Subcommittee on Reorganization and International Organizations is requesting $95,000, through the pending resolution. This is $5,000 more than last year, but is less than the 7-percent rise in employee salaries.

The subcommittee now has nine members. It formerly had six members.

FOUR MAJOR ISSUES

It has been active on no fewer than four major issues and a number of minor ones. The major fronts have included:

First. Interagency coordination of Federal drug policies.

Second. Coordination of Federal scientific research policies.

Third. Coordination of international technical assistance programs.

Fourth. Coordination of Federal information policies.

Next week, we are resuming our drug hearings.

OVER $150 MILLION IN DRUG EXPENDITURES

We are going to find out more facts on why various agencies of the U.S. Government spent over $150 million for support of drug research, for conduct of drug regulation and for purchases of drugs—without consulting one another.

This is not just a matter of economizing; it is a matter of protecting the health of the American people.

CALENDAR NO. 24, SENATE RESOLUTION 27

I should like to point out several instances where the Senate Reorganization Subcommittee has saved the taxpayers of the United States sums which are many times larger than the amount which we are requesting today:

(1) ENDING WASTE IN "BURIED" DEFENSE REPORTS

As a result of this subcommittee's efforts, the Department of Defense has suddenly discovered literally hundreds of thousands of research reports prepared by one or more of the individual services—the Army, Navy, or Air Force—which were never before made available to the other services.

In a single major Air Force research installation, no less than 100,000 reports were discovered which had never been circulated to the rest of the Defense Department.

The cost of any one of these reports may have been $5,000, $100,000, or more. In some fields, the cost runs far larger.

The fact of the matter is that the Defense Department has received on a central basis only around one out of every five reports prepared by prime contractors.

No one knows the investment which the taxpayers made for the research and development which went into the reports which have been buried in one of the military services.

(2) NEW PUBLICATION OF CENTRAL INDEXING OF NATIONAL INSTITUTES OF HEALTH GRANTS

As a result of this subcommittee's efforts, the National Institutes of Health have for the first time published a Central index of over 13,500 extramural grants, involving around one-fourth of a billion dollars.

Never before have the researchers of this country had available in published form a handy summary of research now in progress.

Never before could a researcher, before deciding on his own project, check with a guide so as to make certain that the same project or something fairly similar to it was not already being done elsewhere.

This is the first such publication and I am glad to say that it is going to be put on magnetic computer tape so that it can be maintained currently henceforth.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendments.

The amendments were agreed to.

The resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 25), explaining the purposes of the resolution.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The Committee on Rules and Administration, to whom was referred the resolution (S. Res. 27) authorizing the Committee on Government Operations to make a study of interagency coordination, economy, and efficiency, and providing additional funds therefor, having considered the same, report favorably thereon with amendments, and recommend that the resolution as amended be agreed to by the Senate.

Senate Resolution 27 as amended would authorize the expenditure of not to exceed $88,000 by the Committee on Government Operations, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, from March 1, 1963, through January 31, 1964, "to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of any and all matters pertaining to interagency coordination, economy, and efficiency."

AUTHORITY TO STUDY INTERGOVERNMENTAL RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES AND STATES AND MUNICIPALITIES

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate Resolution 45, to authorize a study of intergovernmental relationships.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution (S. Res. 45) authorizing a study of intergovernmental relationships between the United States and the States and municipalities, which had been reported from the Committee on Rules and Administration, with amendments, on page 2, line 5, after the word "from", to strike out "February" and insert "March", and on page 3, line 2, after the word "exceed", to strike out $115,000" and insert "$97,290"; so as to make the resolution read:

Resolved, That the Committee on Government Operations, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdiction specified by subsection 1(g)(2)(D) of rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of intergovernmental relationships between the United States and the States and municipalities, including an evaluation of studies, reports, and recommendations made thereon and submitted to the Congress by the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 86–380, approved by the President on September 24, 1959.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution the committee, from March 1, 1963, to January 31, 1964, inclusive, is authorized (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided,* That the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than $1,600 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1964.

SEC. 4. Expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed $97,290, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

The amendments were agreed to.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I should like to ask some questions. I understand that this subcommittee was a new one last year.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct.

Mr. ELLENDER. The amount requested was $40,000; and I understand that the subcommittee spent approximately $21,000.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator from Maine is the chairman of the subcommittee, and he is familiar with the details.

Mr. ELLENDER. I understand the subcommittee is now asking for $97,290, for 11 months. Why is the increase requested?

Mr. MUSKIE. The original request last year was for $40,000, which was to cover a period of operations of 5 months. We tried to estimate it as accurately as we could. The resolution was approved by the Senate on July 12, 1962. We undertook the staffing of the committee, and we completed much of it about Labor Day, and worked for approximately 5 months. However, the staffing really was not completed until October.

The actual expenditures during the 5-month period ending January 31, 1963, were in excess of the figures set forth in the report.

Mr. ELLENDER. They amounted to $21,000-plus, did they?

Mr. MUSKIE. The actual cash balance as of January 31, 1963, was $15,057.07.

Mr. ELLENDER. Is that the amount which remained from the $40,000?

Mr. MUSKIE. Yes. So we spent approximately $25,000.

Mr. ELLENDER. What did the subcommittee do with the $25,000? Did it begin hearings of any kind?

Mr. MUSKIE. Yes, we held hearings. If the Senator from Louisiana will refer to report No. 26, on page 3 he will find that the nature of the activities we undertook at that time is spelled out. I shall be glad to review them briefly now.

First of all, our activities in that period fell into three categories. In the first place, several bills in the intergovernmental field, which were referred to the subcommittee, had been pending in the full committee, but had not been attended to, because no subcommittee for the purpose of studying them had been available. That had been the case for the last 4 years in the committee. Largely because no subcommittee had been specifically assigned to that area, such legislative measures had been referred from time to time to ad hoc subcommittees.

One of the reasons for the establishment of the subcommittee was to provide a forum in which to consider such proposed legislation.

The principal measure on which we held hearings last fall had to do with the disposition of Ellis Island, which has been surplus, as the Senator probably knows, since 1954 or 1955. The executive agencies have been struggling with that problem over much of that time. Many proposals for the disposition of the island have been advanced, but there has not been a meeting of the minds in regard to the question of what to do with it. So we held those hearings last fall, and invited testimony by those who had proposals to make regarding the disposition of the island. At the hearings we heard from all persons who had proposals to make in regard to the disposition of the island. We learned that the disposition of the island is clearly in the interest of many millions of Americans, who regard it as a national shrine, and would like to see it disposed of in a way which will fit in with that situation.

It was also our purpose to pinpoint the proposals in the intergovernmental field, in accordance with the mandate of the committee. We did two things to implement that mandate of the committee: First, during the fall we held hearings to which we invited witnesses from all levels of government to express their views on the nature of the problems confronting us in the intergovernmental field. I think those hearings were very worthwhile and constructive, and I have the reports here.

Mr. ELLENDER. Has the Senator from Maine been adding new fields in which to investigate, since the original resolution was adopted?

Mr. MUSKIE. No.

Mr. ELLENDER. How long will this investigation continue?

Mr. MUSKIE. The subcommittee is set up as a permanent subcommittee to deal with problems in this field.

Mr. ELLENDER. So it would be another permanent subcommittee, with no end to it?

Mr. MUSKIE. The Senator from Louisiana is correct.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD the budget for this—shall I say—new subcommittee, which the Senator from Maine says will be another permanent subcommittee.

There being no objection, the excerpt from the report (No. 26) was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Budget

Position	Number	Base salary (per annum)	Gross salary (per annum)	Monthly salary (gross)	Total for period of budget (gross)
STAFF					
Legal and investigative:					
Staff director	1	$7,680	$16,628.34	$1,385.69	$16,628.34
Chief consultant	1	7,140	15,612.88	1,301.07	15,612.88
Editorial and research: Research assistants	2	6,840	15,048.73	1,254.06	15,048.73
Administrative and clerical:					
Chief clerk	1	4,320	10,116.37	843.03	10,116.37
Assistant chief clerk	1	3,360	8,036.03	669.66	8,036.03
Assistant clerk (secretary to director)	1	2,460	6,085.68	507.14	6,085.68
Assistant clerk (file)	1	2,460	6,085.68	507.14	6,085.68
Total	8	34,260	77,613.71	6,467.79	77,613.71
ADMINISTRATIVE					
Contribution to employees health benefit programs (Public Law 86-382, effective July 1, 1960)					648.96
Contribution to civil service retirement fund (6½ percent of total salaries paid)					5,044.89
Contribution to employees Federal employees group life insurance (27 cents per month per $1,000 coverage)					268.92
Reimbursable payments to agencies					15,000.00
Travel (inclusive of field investigations)					10,000.00
Hearings (inclusive of reporters' fees)					3,000.00
Witness fees, expenses					500.00
Stationery, office supplies					750.00
Communications (telephone, telegraph)					1,500.00
Newspapers, magazines, documents					500.00
Contingent fund					173.52
Total					37,386.29
Grand total					115,000.00

Funds requested, Senate Resolution 45, $115,000.

Funds approved by the Committee on Rules and Administration, $97,290.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on agreeing to the resolution, as amended.

The resolution (S. Res. 45), as amended, was agreed to.

STUDY OF CERTAIN ASPECTS OF NATIONAL SECURITY OPERATIONS

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 26, Senate Resolution 13, to study certain aspects of national security operations.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution (S. Res. 13) to study certain aspects of national security operations, which had been reported from the Committee on Rules and Administration, with amendments, on page 1, at the beginning of line 7, to strike out "February" and insert "March"; on page 2, line 10, after the word "from", to strike out "February" and insert "March"; and on page 3, line 1, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$110,000" and insert "$92,250"; so as to make the resolution read:

Resolved, That in holding hearings, reporting such hearings, and making investigations as authorized by section 134 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, and in accordance with its jurisdiction under rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the Committee on Government Operations, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized, from March 1, 1963, through January 31, 1964, to make studies as to the efficiency and economy of operations of all branches and functions of the Government with particular reference to:

(1) the effectiveness of present national security methods, staffing, and processes as tested against the requirements imposed by the rapidly mounting complexity of national security problems;

(2) the capacity of present national security staffing, methods, and processes to make full use of the Nation's resources of knowledge, talents, and skills; and

(3) legislative and other proposals or means to improve these methods and processes.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution, the committee from March 1, 1963, to January 31, 1964, inclusive, is authorized—

(1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable;

(2) to employ upon a temporary basis and fix the compensation of technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided*, That the minority of the committee is authorized at its discretion to select one employee for appointment; and

(3) with the prior consent of the head of the department or agency concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize on a reimbursable basis the services, information, facilities, and personnel of any department or agency of the Government.

SEC. 3. Expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed $92,250, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

The amendments were agreed to.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, am I correct in my understanding that the committee is comparatively new?

Mr. HUMPHREY. The committee is the successor of another committee, but the work of the committee has been the same for at least 4 years.

Mr. ELLENDER. What is the main purpose of the committee?

Mr. HUMPHREY. The purpose of the committee for some time has been to carry on a study of the executive branch offices that relate to national security and the improvement of the machinery for decisionmaking in the executive branch on national security matters. In the report I think the effectiveness of the committee is stated quite succinctly. The report states:

> The purpose is to make studies as to the efficiency and economy of operations of all branches and functions of the Government with particular reference to:
>
> (1) The effectiveness of present national security methods, staffing, and processes as tested against the requirements imposed by the rapidly mounting complexity of national security problems;
>
> (2) The capacity of present national security staffing, methods, and processes to make full use of the Nation's resources of knowledge, talents, and skills; and
>
> (3) Legislative and other proposals or means to improve these methods and processes.

Actually the committee has done some outstanding work. I think the Senator from Washington [Mr. Jackson], who is chairman of the committee, has, with his committee and staff, produced some very important proposals, many of which have already been adopted in the executive branch, for the improvement of our national security machinery. I might add that the Senator from Washington [Mr. Jackson] is a member of the Committee on Armed Services and also the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy. Therefore he finds himself in an enviable position, because he is so intimately acquainted with the security program for the country.

Mr. ELLENDER. Is there any conflict between the work done by that committee and the Preparedness Subcommittee, which is headed by the distinguished Senator from Mississippi [Mr. Stennis]?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I do not think so.

Mr. ELLENDER. The committee would have to do with security. I cannot understand it. In my opinion, it is another duplication.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I can assure the Senator from Louisiana it is not a duplication. It is complementary, but not duplicating.

Mr. ELLENDER. It operates in the same field, however.

Mr. HUMPHREY. In the same field.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The question is on agreeing to the resolution as amended.

The resolution (S. Res. 13) as amended, was agreed to.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record an excerpt from the report (No. 27), explaining the purposes of the resolution.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Senate Resolution 13 as amended would authorize the Committee on Government Operations, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, to expend not to exceed $92,250 from March 1, 1963, through January 31, 1964, to make studies as to the efficiency and economy of operations of all branches and functions of the Government with particular reference to:

(1) The effectiveness of present national security methods, staffing, and processes as tested against the requirements imposed by the rapidly mounting complexity of national security problems;

(2) The capacity of present national security staffing, methods, and processes to make full use of the Nation's resources of knowledge, talents, and skills; and

(3) Legislative and other proposals or means to improve these methods and processes.

The following table indicates funds authorized by the Senate during the 87th Congress for the same purpose. Committee expenditures pursuant to such authorization are shown through December 31, 1962.

Committee and purpose	87th Cong.			
	Amount		Date	Authority
	Authorized	Expended		
Government Operations: National security operations...	$70,000	$27,709.27	--------------	
	70,000	27,709.27	May 17, 1962	S. Res. 332.

Senate Resolution 13 as referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration would have authorized the expenditure of $110,000 for the 12-month period from February 1, 1963, through January 31, 1964, an amount of $40,000 in excess of that authorized by the Senate for the same purpose during the last session of Congress.

At its meeting on March 6, 1963, the Committee on Rules and Administration amended Senate Resolution 13 by effecting the following reductions:

(1) A reduction of the requested amount by 10 percent, to conform it more nearly to the corresponding 1962 authorization; and

(2) A further reduction of the requested amount by one-twelfth of that portion of the reduced amount representing salaries and employee benefits, to compensate for funds made available to the committee during February 1963 by Senate Resolution 88, agreed to February 19, 1963.

By this action the Committee on Rules and Administration reduced the amount specified in Senate Resolution 13 as referred by $17,750—from $110,000 to $92,250.

The investigative authority was correspondingly reduced to an 11-month period commencing March 1, 1963.

Additional information relative to the proposed inquiry is contained in a letter to Senator Mike Mansfield, former chairman of the Committee on Rules and Administration, from Senator Henry M. Jackson, chairman of the Subcommittee on National Security Staffing and Operations of the Committee on Government Operations, which letter (with accompanying budget) is as follows:

U.S. Senate,
Committee on Government Operations,
January 15, 1963.

Hon. Mike Mansfield,
Chairman, Committee on Rules and Administration, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

My Dear Mr. Chairman: Reference is made to Senate Resolution 13, 88th Congress, 1st session, which was introduced in the Senate on January 14, 1963, requesting funds for studies as to the effectiveness of present national security methods, staffing, and processes as tested against the requirements imposed by the rapidly mounting complexity of national security problems. The requested funds would cover the period from February 1, 1963, through January 31, 1964. Prior to submitting this resolution to the Senate, it was reported favorably by the Committee on Government Operations.

Attached hereto is an estimated budget for the period. It is estimated under this budget that it will require $110,000 to carry on the inquiry during the present year.

As you know, the Subcommittee on National Security Staffing and Operations is now studying the administration of national security at home and in the field with a view to making findings and proposals for improvement where appropriate.

The subcommittee, which began its inquiry in May last year, has devoted the initial period of its activities to a thorough and careful analysis of the basic problems in its study, in order to lay a sound foundation for hearings.

To date, we have held more than 300 discussions with present and former Government officials, military leaders, and expert students of national security operations. These consultations have ranged from talks with Cabinet officers of this and previous administrations to discussions with officials in the middle and lower echelons of the Government.

In addition, members of the staff have taken a firsthand look at the staffing and operations of U.S. missions and military establishments in Asia and Europe.

The discussions held and on-the-spot inquiries made have resulted in a great many thought-provoking and helpful ideas.

The staff is preparing a number of background studies in cooperation with the Legislative Reference Service and the executive branch. Two of these, "Selected Papers" relating to the administration of foreign and defense affairs, and "A Bibliography" on the administration of national security have been printed.

An initial staff study analyzing the basic issues to be explored in hearings is in an advanced stage of preparation.

I am pleased to report that of the $70,000 authorized for the subcommittee for the 8½-month period ending January 31, 1963, we expect to return approximately $30,000 to the Senate contingent fund. This saving reflects the fact that we were able to obtain the services of our chief consultant and research assistant on a part-time basis and operate the subcommittee during this first phase with only one administrative staff.

During the coming period of accelerated activity, including hearings, we shall need to budget additionally for a secretary, and for further research assistance.

Beginning next month, we plan to hold a major set of hearings which will continue through the present session. These hearings will bring the best minds of our country to bear upon the basic issues of administration of national security.

We expect that a series of specific findings and recommendations relating to national security staffing and operations will emerge from our studies and hearings.

The executive branch has extended its cooperation to the subcommittee.

As you know, my colleagues and I are approaching the problems before us in a nonpartisan and professional way.

The study is being made by the Government Operations Committee in accordance with its jurisdiction under rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, providing that the committee shall have the duty of—

* * * * *

B. studying the operation of Government activities at all levels with a view to determining its economy and efficiency;

C. evaluating the effects of laws enacted to reorganize the legislative and executive branches of the Government.

I shall be available to give the committee any further information desired.

Thanking you for your cooperation and with kind regards, I am,

Sincerely yours,

Henry M. Jackson,
U.S. Senator, Chairman, Subcommittee on National Security Staffing and Operations.

Budget

Position	Number	Base salary (per annum)	Gross salary (per annum)	Monthly salary (gross)	Total for period of budget (gross)
STAFF					
Legal and investigative:					
Staff director	1	$8,040	$17,305.31	$1,442.10	$17,305.31
Chief consultant	1	8,040	17,305.31	1,442.10	17,305.31
Consultants, including the consultant to the minority	4-6				28,000.00
Editorial and research: Research assistants	2	3,720	9,579.42	798.28	9,579.42
Administrative and clerical:					
Chief clerk	1	2,760	6,735.82	561.31	6,735.82
Stenographer	1	2,400	5,955.67	496.30	5,955.67
Total					84,881.53
ADMINISTRATIVE					
Contribution to employees health benefit programs (Public Law 86-382, effective July 1, 1960)					450.00
Contribution to civil service retirement fund (6½ percent of total salaries paid)					5,525.00
Contribution to employees Federal employees group life insurance (27 cents per month per $1,000 coverage)					315.00
Reimbursable payments to agencies					5,000.00
Travel (inclusive of field investigations)					4,500.00
Hearings (inclusive of reporters' fees)					5,000.00
Witness fees, expenses					2,000.00
Stationery, office supplies					700.00
Communications, (telephone, telegraph)					1,300.00
Newspapers, magazines, documents					250.00
Contingent fund					78.47
Total					25,118.47
Grand total					110,000.00

Funds approved by the Committee on Rules and Administration, $92,250.

AUTHORITY AND EXPENDITURES FOR COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS TO INVESTIGATE MATTERS WITHIN ITS JURISDICTION

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 27, Senate Resolution 16.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A resolution (S. Res. 16) authorizing the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs to investigate certain matters within its jurisdiction and authorizing certain expenditures therefor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Minnesota.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution, which had been reported from the Committee on Rules and Administration with an amendment on page 2, line 1, after the word "from", to strike out "February" and insert "March", so as to make the resolution read:

Resolved, That the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdictions specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of any and all matters pertaining to Indian affairs; irrigation and reclamation; minerals, materials, and fuels; public lands; and territories and insular affairs.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution the committee, from March 1, 1963, to January 31, 1964, inclusive, is authorized (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided,* That the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than $1,600 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 3. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed $100,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, last year the committee spent $67,000. I notice that no effort was made by the Committee on Rules and Administration to cut back the requested $100,000, although a full month has gone by.

I offer an amendment that, on page 2, line 16, the figure "$100,000" be made "$90,000", so that the amount requested will be in keeping with what the committee requested, that is, on a 12-month basis. Since the remaining time is only 11 months, it seems to me that a 10 percent cut would give the committee the amount requested for operations of the committee within the next 11 months.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, I rise to speak in opposition to the amendment offered by the Senator from Louisiana in the absence of the Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON]. I hope that the recommendation of the Committee on Rules and Administration will be followed.

Briefly, I point out that the amount proposed represents a very sizable reduction in the amounts that have been spent over the years by the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. It is a realistic budget. It is a request that has been decreased from $135,000, which was the total amount authorized in three resolutions by the committee at the last session, to $100,000. That reduction in itself represents a saving of $35,000. the $100,000 figure does not reflect specifically the 7-percent salary increase voted by the Congress last year. This amount was absorbed within the $100,000. In addition the committee will require these funds to accomplish a number of very important investigations relating to matters within our jurisdiction. The amount is very realistic, and I hope that the recommendation of the Committee on Rules and Administration will be followed.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BIBLE. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. As I stated in the early part of the afternoon, under the chairmanship of the distinguished Senator from New Mexico, the committee has shown quite a reduction in the amount that was formerly appropriated for the operation of that subcommittee. It strikes me that since the request for $100,000 covered a period of 12 months, and the committee will operate only 11 months under the appropriation, it would certainly be in order to reduce the appropriation 10 percent so that the committee would receive for 11 months what it would have received for 12 months had the $100,000 been made available.

Mr. BIBLE. As my friend, the distinguished Senator from Louisiana knows, we have a new chairman of the Interior Committee—the distinguished junior Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON].

After he became chairman, which event followed the submission of the original budget by the Senator from New Mexico, the Senator from Washington appointed a new professional staff member to the committee. His salary was not included in the first budget.

Among other things, the committee plans to investigate the public land problems of the entire United States, which is a large and complex field. We have yet to make a final disposition of our fuels study. Although a year ago an appropriation of $25,000 was secured for this fuels study, I am advised that only about half of that amount was used.

There was an additional appropriation of $10,000, to study resource revenues, none of which was used. The work relating to this study will be absorbed by our staff and the cost will be absorbed within the $100,000 requested.

Over the period of an entire year the total turnback was approximately $47,000 out of a total authorized of $135,000. So I can assure my friend from Louisiana that if the funds are not needed, they will certainly be turned back.

Mr. President, I hope that the amendment is rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Louisiana.

The amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution as amended.

The resolution (S. Res 16) as amended, was agreed to.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record an excerpt from the report—No. 28—explaining the purposes of the resolution.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Senate Resolution 16, as amended, would authorize the expenditure of $100,000 by the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, from March 1, 1963, through January 31, 1964, to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of any and all matters pertaining to Indian affairs; irrigation and reclamation; minerals, materials, and fuels; public lands; and territories and insular affairs.

The following table indicates funds authorized by the Senate during the 87th Congress for the same purpose. Committee expenditures pursuant to such authorizations are shown through December 31, 1962.

	87th Con.			
Committee and purpose	Amount		Date	Authority
	Authorized	Expended		
Interior and Insular Affairs: General	$200,000.00	$145,727.91		
	100,000.00	84,582.61	Jan. 31, 1961	S. Res. 47.
	100,000.00	61,145.30	Feb. 7, 1962	S. Res. 242.

Senate Resolution 16 as referred would have authorized the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs to expend not to exceed $100,000 from February 1, 1963, through January 31, 1964. In view of the adoption of Senate Resolution 88, agreed to February 19, 1963, which continued the authority for all Senate investigations through February 1963, the Committee on Rules and Administration has reduced the investigative authority contained in Senate Resolution 16 to an 11-month period commencing March 1, 1963. However, the committee has in effect increased the expenditure authorization by $7,000 by approving for an 11-month period the amount of $100,000 originally stipulated for a full year.

This action was taken at the request of Senator Henry M. Jackson, newly elected chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. Senator Jackson's statement before the Senate Rules Committee justifying his request (with accompanying revised budget) is as follows:

"Mr. Chairman and members of the committee. I have a brief statement in regard to Senate Resolution 16, the money resolution to support investigations for the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

"The committee's budget, which was submitted under my predecessor this past January, called for a total sum of $100,000. Pursuant to your committee's announced policy you have reduced this amount by $7,000 since it is an 11-month budget, leaving a total of $93,000.

"However, I would like to request to your committee that the amount of $100,000 be retained for the utilization of the Interior Committee for the rest of the budgeted year. My reason for requesting this is threefold:

"During last year the committee had the benefit of an additional resolution (S. Res. 269) which was utilized for a study of fuels and energy. We spent approximately $12,500 of the $25,000 allotted under this resolution. Our regular investigation resolution (S. Res. 242) for $100,000 was thereby lightened by this amount. This year the committee may have further work in completing our fuels study and report, but I have not asked for an additional resolution. I intend to absorb any expenditures from Senate Resolution 16.

"Secondly, the committee's budget request under Senate Resolution 16 did not reflect the 7-percent increase in employees' salaries which went into effect last October.

"Thirdly, an additional professional staff member has been retained by me since I became chairman of the committee and since the budget was submitted by my predecessor. I would like to point out to the committee that at present this is the only person I have hired, and in order to adequately cover this additional cost I request that the full amount of $100,000 be retained under Senate Resolution 16.

"I have prepared a new budget based upon my present request of the committee, and I would now like to submit it for the committee's consideration."

Budget

Position	Number	Base salary (per annum)	Gross salary (per annum)	Monthly salary (gross)	Total for period of budget (gross)
STAFF					
Legal and investigative:					
Special counsel	3	$7,680	$16,628.34	$1,385.69	$49,885.02
Investigator	1	6,960	15,274.41	1,272.86	15,274.41
Do	1	4,080	9,596.30	799.69	9,596.30
Administrative and clerical:					
Stenographer	1	2,820	6,865.81	572.15	6,865.81
Do	1	2,580	6,345.74	528.81	6,345.74
Total					(87,967.28)
Minus $\frac{1}{12}$ for 11-month budget, total					80,636.62
ADMINISTRATIVE					
Contribution to employees health benefit programs (Public Law 86-382, effective July 1, 1960)				$295.72	
Contribution to civil service retirement fund (6½ percent of total salaries paid)				5,717.87	
Contribution to employees Federal employees group life insurance (27 cents per month per $1,000 coverage)				278.04	
Minus $\frac{1}{12}$ for 11-month budget					5,767.33
Travel (inclusive of field investigations)					7,000.00
Hearings (inclusive of reporters' fees)					3,000.00
Witness fees, expenses					
Stationery, office supplies					1,000.00
Communications (telephone, telegraph)					1,000.00
Newspapers, magazines, documents					200.00
Contingent fund					1,396.05
Total					19,363.38
Grand total					100,000.00

Funds requested, Senate Resolution 16, $100,000.

Funds approved by Committee on Rules and Administration, $100,000.

STUDY OF ADMINISTRATIVE PRACTICE AND PROCEDURE

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 28, Senate Resolution 55.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be stated by title.

The Legislative Clerk. A resolution (S. Res. 55) to study administrative practice and procedure.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Minnesota.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution, which had been reported from the Committee on Rules and Administration with amendments on page 2, line 4, after the word "from", to strike out "March", and in line 23, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$120,000" and insert "$110,600", so as to make the resolution read:

Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdictions specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to make a full and complete study and investigation of administrative practice and procedure within the departments and agencies of the United States in the exercise of their rulemaking, licensing, and adjudicatory functions, including a study of the effectiveness of the Administrative Procedure Act, with a view to determining whether additional legislation is required to provide for the fair, impartial, and effective performance of such functions.

Sec. 2. For the purposes of this resolution the committee, from March 1, 1963, to January 31, 1964, inclusive, is authorized (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided*, That the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than $1,600 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1964.

SEC. 4. Expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed $110,600 shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

The amendments were agreed to.

The resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 29), explaining the purposes of the resolution.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Senate Resolution 55 as amended would authorize expenditure of $110,600 by the Committee on the Judiciary, acting through its Subcommittee on Administrative Practice and Procedure, from March 1, 1963, through January 31, 1964, "to make a full and complete study and investigation of administrative practice and procedure within the departments and agencies of the United States in the exercise of their rulemaking, licensing, and adjudicatory functions, including a study of the effectiveness of the Administrative Procedure Act, with a view to determining whether additional legislation is required to provide for the fair, impartial, and effective performance of such functions."

The following table indicates funds authorized by the Senate during the 87th Congress for the same purpose. Committee expenditures pursuant to such authorizations are shown through December 31, 1962.

Committee and purpose	87th Cong.			
	Amount		Date	Authority
	Authorized	Expended		
Judiciary: Administrative practice and procedure	$230,000	$127,263.95		
	115,000	68,400.98	Jan. 31, 1961	S. Res. 51.
	115,000	58,862.97	Feb. 7, 1962	S. Res. 256.

Due to the delay in the organization of the Senate and in order that its subcommittees could meet their February payrolls, the Senate on February 19, 1963, approved Senate Resolution 88, which continued for 1 month—through February 28, 1963—the investigative and expenditure authorizations granted to Senate committees during the 87th Congress, 2d session, and in certain instances provided additional funds for the purpose.

Since most of the resolutions which would authorize inquiries and investigations during the present session had already been referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration prior to the adoption of Senate Resolution 88, and consequently were on a 12-month basis, the committee at its meeting on February 27, 1963, adopted the following formula to reduce each such request to an 11-month basis:

"A reduction by one-twelfth of that portion of the total request representing salaries and agency contributions to employee retirement, health benefits, and group life insurance."

On this basis the expenditure authorization contained in Senate Resolution 55 was reduced $9,400, from $120,000 to $110,600.

The investigative authority was correspondingly reduced to an 11-month period commencing March 1, 1963.

AUTHORITY TO STUDY MATTERS PERTAINING TO CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENTS

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 29, Senate Resolution 57.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A resolution (S. Res. 57) authorizing a study of matters pertaining to constitutional amendments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Minnesota.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution, which had been reported from the Committee on Rules and Administration, with amendments on page 1, line 9, after the word "from", to strike out "February" and insert "March", and on page 2, line 17, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$51,500" and insert "$54,423," so as to make the resolution read:

Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdictions specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of any and all matters pertaining to constitutional amendments.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution the committee, from March 1, 1963, to January 31, 1964, inclusive, is authorized (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided*, That the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than $1,600 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 3. The committee shall report its activities and findings, together with its recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1964.

SEC. 4. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed $54,423, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

The amendments were agreed to.

The resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 30), explaining the purposes of the resolution.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Senate Resolution 57, as amended, would authorize the expenditure of $54,423 by the Committee on the Judiciary, through its Subcommittee on Constitutional Amendments, from March 1, 1963, through January 31, 1964, to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of any and all matters pertaining to constitutional amendments.

The following table indicates funds authorized by the Senate during the 87th Congress for the same purpose. Committee expenditures pursuant to such authorizations are shown through December 31, 1962.

Committee and purpose	87th Cong.			
	Amount		Date	Authority
	Authorized	Expended		
Judiciary: Constitutional amendments	$81,000.00	$68,386.62		
	32,500.00	28,610.21	Jan. 31, 1961	S. Res. 59.
	48,500.00	39,776.41	Feb. 7, 1962	S. Res. 259.

Due to the delay in the organization of the Senate and in order that its subcommittees could meet their February payrolls, the Senate on February 19, 1963, approved Senate Resolution 88, which continued for 1 month—through February 28, 1963—the investigative and expenditure authorizations granted to Senate committees during the 87th Congress, 2d session, and in certain instances provided additional funds for the purpose.

Since most of the resolutions which would authorize inquiries and investigations during the present session had already been referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration prior to the adoption of Senate Resolution 88, and consequently were on a

12-month basis, the committee at its meeting on February 27, 1963, adopted the following formula to reduce each such request to an 11-month basis:

"A reduction by one-twelfth of that portion of the total request representing salaries and agency contributions to employee retirement, health benefits, and group life insurance."

On this basis the expenditure authorization contained in Senate Resolution 57 was reduced $3,700—from $51,500 to $47,800—and the legislative authority was correspondingly reduced to an 11-month period commencing March 1, 1963.

At its meeting on March 6, 1963, the committee increased the latter amount to $54,423 to provide $6,623 (11-month basis) for a clerical assistant to the minority.

INVESTIGATION OF MATTERS PERTAINING TO CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 30, Senate Resolution 58.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A resolution (S. Res. 58) to investigate matters pertaining to constitutional rights.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Minnesota.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution, which had been reported from the Committee on Rules and Administration, with amendments, on page 1, line 10, after the word "from", to strike out "February" and insert "March", and on page 2, line 18, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$165,000" and insert "$152,300", so as to make the resolution read:

Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdictions specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of any and all matters pertaining to constitutional rights.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution the committee, from March 1, 1963, to January 31, 1964, inclusive, is authorized (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided,* That the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than $1,600 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1964.

SEC. 4. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed $152,300, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendments.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I have carefully examined this subject and I think an amendment to the resolution is required, unless we are given some better idea than we have been given as to the way in which the funds will be administered.

Mr. President, I regret that the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN], a very distinguished Member of the Senate, who is chairman of the Constitutional Rights Subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary, is necessarily absent today; and I am satisfied that he is necessarily absent. I regret that in his absence I must raise a question which he might settle himself, as the chairman of the subcommittee in the absence of a rule of the subcommittee.

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President——

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I am not quite prepared to yield.

Therefore, I make this statement in advance. Should the managers of this measure on the floor feel that they would rather consider it tomorrow, or some other day, certainly I would have no objection to that.

Mr. President, I wish to state the point I have in mind. I have examined very carefully the proposed agenda of the subcommittee, which seeks the not inconsiderable sum of $165,000 reduced to $152,300.

I understand—and I am quite sure this is correct—that this is a very able subcommittee, which certainly has a very distinguished lawyer as its chairman. I understand the subcommittee has a good staff.

Yet, as we look over the work which the Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights proposes to do we find the following matters will be considered by it: First, the constitutional rights of the American Indian.

I am very deeply solicitous of the constitutional rights of the American Indian, but I point out that one of the very critical areas of constitutional rights is quite excluded from everything the committee is going to do.

I shall read the list, so that my colleagues can understand what this is all about.

The subcommittee will consider the constitutional rights of the American Indian. Then it will consider the constitutional rights of military personnel. Then it will consider the constitutional rights of the mentally ill. Then it will consider constitutional rights in the administration of criminal justice. It will consider constitutional rights regarding citizenship, and also regarding the right to counsel, primarily in Federal criminal trials.

All those matters are important, Mr. President, but I do not believe that they are superior in importance to the constitutional rights of Americans who are denied those rights on the basis of racial discrimination in respect to schools, or in respect to voting, or in respect to places of public accommodation, or in respect to any one of a dozen other areas covered by the 27 legislative recommendations to the Congress by the U.S. Civil Rights Commission in its last comprehensive reports in 1961.

Mr. President, obviously a proposal which is of a substantive legislative character, on such a measure as is pending, which has been ruled by the Presiding Officer to be a measure for the appropriation of money, would not be in order, and I would not offer it, ordinarily. But, Mr. President, if the chairman of the subcommittee has laid this down as his subcommittee's agenda, before the Senate votes on the money for that agenda, I see no reason why we should not open up the possibility that the agenda perhaps might be improved at the behest of the full committee or of the subcommittee itself.

I therefore have in mind offering an amendment on page 1 at line 8 of the resolution, which would read as follows:

Provided, however, That the committee or such duly authorized subcommittee shall determine the matters to be studied by majority vote.

If the committee had a rule which so provided, or if the chairman of the committee would assure the Senate that the administration of the work of the committee, the selection of matters to be studied, their priority or order, or anything else of this nature, would be committed to a vote of the committee itself, there would be no need for any such amendment or for any such action by the Senate. That is why I suggest that if there is no particular desire to deal with the matter at this moment, in the absence of the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN], I would be perfectly willing to postpone any action I have in mind until such time as the Senator is available.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I apologize for the fact that I did not hear all the able Senator from New York was saying. Did the Senator say that he was willing not to take action until some subsequent date with respect to the amendment?

Mr. JAVITS. I think, if the Senate is to act on the resolution, it would be necessary to act on the amendment. If it is the disposition of the Senators in charge of the measure on the floor to put the resolution over for a day, that is satisfactory to me.

Mr. SMATHERS. Does the Senator know whether the Senator from North Carolina will be present tomorrow?

Mr. JAVITS. I do not know. As I stated, I did not have any idea in advance that he would not be present, but he is not, and I think it is the sort of thing he ought to consider.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. KEATING. I make the suggestion that the resolution relating to the Subcommittee on Antitrust and Monopoly of the Committee on the Judiciary has already been put over until Tuesday because of the necessary absence of the chairman of the subcommittee, the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER].

perhaps this resolution also should be put over until the same day.

Mr. SMATHERS. It is apparently the disposition of Senators, as I take a little temperature reading, to have the able Senator from New York proceed to offer his amendment at this particular time, and to have the Senate make some disposition of it.

Mr. JAVITS. Very well. I offer the amendment which I send to the desk, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated for the information of the Senate.

The Legislative Clerk. On page 1, line 8, it is proposed to strike out the period and to insert a colon and the following: "*Provided, however,* That the committee or such duly authorized subcommittee shall determine the matters to be studied by majority vote."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, as I said before, I offer the amendment because of the way in which the agenda is set up to justify the amount of money which the Senate is asked to appropriate and the specification which is made as to the items which would be investigated or the matters which would be considered by the subcommittee; these exclude, it seems to me, one of the most critical issues before the Nation regarding constitutional rights.

In the absence of any assurance whatever on that score—that at least the subcommittee itself, by a majority vote, could determine priority in the selection of matters to be studied—I should be derelict in my duty if I sat silent while the money was voted to the subcommittee which is charged with that particular responsibility and made no effort whatever, in the absence of any assurance by any member of the subcommittee or of the committee, to at least open up the proposal to the possibility that this critically important issue of constitutional rights which is called civil rights might be considered.

I do not think that the amount of money proposed to be provided the Constitutional Rights Subcommittee is exorbitant or out of line. I am completely in favor of voting for it. I shall be happy to vote for it. I raise no issue whatever as to the finances.

I raise only the issue that, from the report which accompanies the measure, it is very clear that the fundamental constitutional rights of the great body of Americans are not scheduled to be considered, although there are serious charges—including the charges of a commission of the Federal Government itself, the U.S. Civil Rights Commission—that such rights are being denied. When we look at the specification of what the subcommittee is supposed to deal with in respect to constitutional rights, we find there is no mention whatever of the prospect of taking up this subject.

I cannot compel, nor could even the Senate compel, the subcommittee to consider something which it did not want to consider; but at least we could open up the possibility that, if a majority of the subcommittee, or the full committee, desired it to be done, at least it would be done.

That is all my amendment proposes to do. Indeed, I respectfully submit that it is the kind of amendment as to which any committee chairman or subcommittee chairman could readily say, "Well, that is not necessary at all. I fully intend, if there is any difference in my committee as to priorities or as to particular matters which will be subject to my subcommittee, to submit it to a majority vote of the committee."

In that case I would withdraw the amendment. I have no desire to press for an amendment, provided that assurance is available, but obviously it is not; nor is there any desire to defer the matter until the chairman himself decided whether he would wish to give such assurance.

As this is final action in the Senate, I have no alternative but to press the point. That is the reason for which I submit the amendment. I hope it will have the favorable consideration of the Senate, as indeed I think it must, in good conscience and in good faith.

I challenge any Member of the Senate, whether he is from the North or from the South, in good conscience to say that the civil rights issue is not one of the major constitutional questions before us and that he could in fairness and decency vote $152,300 to a subcommittee which does not even carry that item on its agenda.

Mr. President, let us grow up, and let us be adult. The notion of the Senate as a great club is fine if we deal with the problems of the country.

My concern is as follows, and I shall always try to maintain it: I make no criticism of any Member of the Senate whatsoever, but we must do our duty. We cannot sit around with our hands folded while the things being done determine the course that the Congress shall take for the next 2 years. This resolution is one of the things being done which have such an effect. It is one of the doors being closed. It is not one of the most important doors. We could do something about civil rights if we wanted to, if, as we know, an adequate majority, sometimes two-thirds, decided to do it. But this is a door by means of which these rights could and should be considered, and to sit by and let it ride because one wants to be a good fellow and does not want to raise any question about the matter, when the most hotly controverted civil rights question in the United States is omitted from the matters this subcommittee tells the Senate, in its own report, it is going to take up, is not my idea of being a good Senator of the United States.

That is why, in the absence of any other assurance—in the absence even of agreement to let the resolution go over until next Tuesday—I felt it my duty to seek a vote on the amendment. For the information of the Senate, I shall seek a yea-and-nay vote, if I can get one.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. Ervin] has been chairman of this subcommittee for a number of years. I have heard an undercover attack, a devious attack, on his character and integrity tonight. That is what it means. No one has ever questioned the way he conducted that subcommittee. No one has ever accused him of sitting on or squatting on or holding up a bill.

I am not trying to get my name in the newspapers, but nobody has ever done that. He has been a responsible subcommittee chairman, and I do not think a subcommittee can be run from the floor of the U.S. Senate. We must rely upon the integrity of the committee chairman.

The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. Ervin] has certainly met all the tests. He is a great lawyer. He has made an able chairman of that subcommittee. I do not think anybody, in his wildest dreams, even if he had a shot of opium, could say he attempted to sit on anything.

I think the resolution should be adopted.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, in reponse to the statement of the distinguished Senator from Mississippi, I cannot allow the matter to be placed upon that basis, nor would I permit the Senator from Mississippi by his speech to wish it on me. I am not questioning the integrity of the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. Ervin] at all. On the contrary, I have the greatest faith in him. I want the matter to go over for a day or so in order that he can be here and explain what he plans to do with the subcommittee and the agenda and the matters it is to take up—about which, incidentally, the Senator from Mississippi has said absolutely nothing.

So I think my good faith, in regard to the integrity and distinction of the chairman of the subcommittee, who is a very honored Member of this body, is completely unimpaired. As a matter of fact, I ask the opportunity to put it over until Tuesday, as another resolution for a subcommittee was put over. Let the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. Ervin] be here. Let him express himself on these matters. I shall be delighted to have that done, and I hope it will not be necessary to press the amendment. In the absence of that assurance, I do not see any reason why I should be talked out of it or that the Senate should be talked out of it on the assertion that it impugns the reputation or standing of the Senator from North Carolina. It does no such thing. It is clear that it does not do that.

Let us understand exactly what the fundamental problem here is. It is that it is extremely difficult to get any consideration in the Judiciary Committee of matters of this character. The Judiciary Committee considers civil rights bills only when we, by action in the Senate, compel a report by a day certain, and even then, if my memory serves me correctly, they have come back without taking a position pro or con. We understand what the situation is with respect to civil rights legislation. So when we have an opportunity to do something in trying to open up, as it were, the door for consideration of matters in the subcommittee, it seems to me, in all decency, we ought to do it.

We know too well the history and the background; for example, the situation which exists on a motion to take up civil rights legislation. For that reason, I am attempting to amend the resolution.

I respectfully submit it does not represent impugning in any manner whatever the dignity or standing or capacity of the chairman of the subcommittee. Indeed, I here affirm what I have said many times before. The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN] is one of the most distinguished and able men to serve in the Senate, a man of the highest integrity and standing.

We are talking about matters which the subcommittee will consider, the basis upon which those matters may be determined, by whom they will be determined, and about the absence of the Senator from North Carolina. He is being denied the opportunity to express himself on this subject, which, in my opinion, he should be asked to do and permitted to do in all deference to his dignity and standing, by the fact that it is insisted that this resolution be dealt with tonight.

I think it is a great mistake to have it dealt with tonight. I have no choice, in view of the way matters stand, but to offer the amendment. There is nothing else I can do about it. The only way to change or to have a hope of changing the way in which these matters will be submitted to the subcommittee, in view of the way we are being asked to act on this matter tonight, is by my offering the amendment which I have offered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Senator is a fairminded man. I am recollecting now from my memory, and I may be in error; the Senator is knowledgeable enough so that if I am in error he will correct me. It is my recollection that when the literacy test voting bill was before us in the last Congress, it was referred to the subcommittee under the chairmanship of the distinguished Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN]. It is my further recollection that at that time it was stated by the Senator from North Carolina that, even though civil rights bills had been referred to his committee, none of those who had introduced those civil rights bills had asked for hearings up to that time. He was asked on that occasion if he would hold hearings on the literacy test voting bill. He said he would, and he did.

I may say that this subcommittee, to my knowledge, only this past week, on the initiative of the Senator from North Carolina, held a meeting with Indian groups relative to civil rights affecting that part of our population.

Therefore, I would hope most sincerely that the Senator from New York would not press for a yea-and-nay vote on his amendment, because I believe that if he will go back in his memory he will recall—and this is subject to correction—that at any time when a civil rights bill was introduced which had been referred to that subcommittee, hearings were held if the person who introduced the bill requested hearings. Am I correct?

Mr. JAVITS. I should like to agree with the Senator from Montana, for whom I have the deepest affection. However, I must call attention to the fact that that very question was controverted on the floor by none other than my colleague from New York.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I did not recall that.

Mr. JAVITS. The same question was raised by the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN]. I recall, however, that the matter was controverted by my colleague from New York, specifically and directly, according to my recollection. He is on the floor. If I am in error, the Senator from New York will correct me.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Senator's word is good enough for me.

Mr. JAVITS. I yield to my colleague from New York.

Mr. KEATING. The difficulty which those of us who are interested in this field have is that there is no disposition on the part of the distinguished chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary to report on civil rights bills whether or not they are referred by the main committee to this particular subcommittee for consideration. That is something which some of us have suffered from over the years. The distinguished Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND] takes a different view in this field from the view taken by some of the rest of us. He may have a certain reluctance to refer bills on civil rights to the Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights, but the real problem is getting action on these measures whether or not they are referred.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. EASTLAND. What bills is the Senator speaking about?

Mr. KEATING. I am speaking about the package of civil rights bills.

Mr. EASTLAND. What bills is the Senator talking about?

Mr. KEATING. There are none this year that I know of.

Mr. EASTLAND. Before that. The Senator said that the Senator from Mississippi had a reluctance, if I understood the Senator correctly, to refer bills to the subcommittee. Is that correct?

Mr. KEATING. That is correct.

Mr. EASTLAND. All right. What bills? What are those bills?

Mr. KEATING. I hope the reluctance——

Mr. EASTLAND. Wait a minute. I challenge the accuracy of the statement the Senator has made. What are the bills?

Mr. KEATING. Do I have the floor?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senior Senator from New York has the floor. He has yielded to the junior Senator from New York.

Mr. KEATING. If the distinguished chairman of the Judiciary Committee, will give assurance that civil rights bills will be immediately referred to the Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights and given proper consideration, that may dispose of the matter before us.

Mr. EASTLAND. I know; but the truth is that that has always been the policy.

Mr. JAVITS. I ask for the regular order, Mr. President.

Mr. KEATING. The distinguished Senator from North Carolina last year indicated that he had not scheduled hearings on civil rights measures because none had been requested by the sponsors of the bills. I pointed out, at that time, that I had urged the subcommittee to give a higher priority to civil rights legislation on many occasions. Subsequently I addressed a letter to the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee which reads, in part, as follows:

> Thank you for sending me a copy of the draft of the annual report of the Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights.
>
> I have reviewed the report, and it has my approval as a summary of the subcommittee's work to date.
>
> As the report notes, 15 civil rights bills were referred to the subcommittee in 1961. Except for three of these bills relating to the life of the Civil Rights Commission, the subcommittee has not conducted any hearings on this legislation. As you know, I have requested at several of our meetings that civil rights legislation be given a higher priority in the work of the subcommittee. In view of the colloquy on the Senate floor the other day, I would like to reiterate for the record my particular desire for early hearings on the following bills which I have either sponsored or cosponsored:
>
> S. 480 (literacy), S. 481 (civil injunctive suits), S. 482 (enforcement of 14th amendment), S. 484 (school assistance), S. 1254 (protection of Armed Forces), S. 1255 (conspiracies) and S. 1256 (antilynching).

Later in the session, we did have hearings and did report a bill dealing with voting rights, but despite my request there were no other hearings, to the best of my recollection, on the other bills.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KEATING. If the package of bills which may be introduced this year——

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry. Who has the floor?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The senior Senator from New York has the floor.

Mr. JAVITS. Does the Senator wish me to yield?

Mr. EASTLAND. Yes.

Mr. JAVITS. I am glad to yield, but first I have yielded to my colleague from New York.

Mr. EASTLAND. I thought the Senator had yielded to me.

Mr. KEATING. Regardless of the practice last year, if the Senator from Mississippi will give us assurance that civil rights bills will be promptly referred to the Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights, it will then be up to the members of the subcommittee to obtain hearings and action on these bills in the subcommittee. In my judgment, the distinguished Senator from North Carolina would hold hearings on these bills whether or not he agreed with them.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. EASTLAND. I wish to make this statement. Any implication that the Senator from Mississippi has not speedily referred bills is not borne out by the record. That is an inaccurate statement. The only assurance that I must give to anyone is that I will do my duty as chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, without fear or favor of anyone. Any implication that I have not done my duty in the past by referring bills as they should be referred is utterly false. The record bears me out.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, it is always important to cut through obscurities. The distinguished Senator from Mississippi says he will do his duty as he sees it. That is all right. We all understand that. That may be consistent with the way the Senator from Mississippi does or does not feel he must run his office. Then my very distinguished colleague in the Senate, the majority leader, says that the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN] said he would grant hearings on any bill that was referred to him. I heard him say that. There was some dispute about that.

However, even laying that aside, we are granting money in this resolution, not for the consideration of particular bills, but we are granting more than $150,000 for certain investigations in the constitutional rights field. That is what this money is for. These investigations are spelled out for us specifically. I should like to read them again. They are:

The constitutional rights of the American Indian. The constitutional rights of military personnel. The rights of the mentally ill. Constitutional rights and the administration of criminal justice. Citizenship. Right to counsel.

I say that we cannot ask for a substantial sum of money from Congress for a Constitutional Rights Subcommittee which is telling us in advance that it is not going to consider the question of the denial of rights under the 14th and 15th amendments, especially with the record of the Civil Rights Commission before us, and with a report before us, which I recently put into the RECORD, from the Civil Rights Commission's advisory committee in the State of Mississippi itself, which indicated the most widespread and flagrant violations of the 14th and 15th amendments.

Again I say——

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I will yield in a minute.

Mr. EASTLAND. I would like to say——

Mr. JAVITS. I ask the Senator to let me finish my statement.

Mr. EASTLAND. I beg the Senator's pardon. I thought he had yielded to me.

Mr. JAVITS. The question always comes up, Shall we just sit silently by and say nothing? That is always a question of degree. It seems to me that where it is so very clear that there is no intention of considering what many of us here believe to be some of the most fundamental questions of constitutional rights in the country, it is our duty to rise and try to do something about it. In the only way open to me, I have tried to do that. I now yield to the Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. EASTLAND. I have been challenged that bills were not promptly referred to subcommittees. Here is docket No. 572, S. 1254, Senators HUMPHREY, BURDICK, CANNON, and others. March 8, 1961. Referred on March 10, 1961.

Docket No. 573, S. 1255, HUMPHREY, BURDICK, DOUGLAS, and others. March 8. Referred March 10, 1961.

Here is another one. This deals with the denial of certain rights of persons within the jurisdiction of the United States, and for the protection of such persons from lynching, and for other purposes. Introduced by Senators HUMPHREY, ALLOTT, BURDICK, and others, on March 8, 1962. Referred on March 10, 1962.

Here is another one. Referred to the subcommittee, not to the committee. Docket No. 575, S. 1257, to indefinitely extend the Civil Rights Commission. It was introduced on March 8, and referred on March 10.

That is what the record is.

Mr. JAVITS. I have the calendar of the Committee on the Judiciary before me, and it does indicate a considerable number of references, which does not mean, by any means, that all the bills were referred. I think it bears somewhat upon the controversy which existed last year, when the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN] indicated that he granted a hearing on any bill on which a hearing was requested, because there are a good many bills, for example, as to which my colleague from New York [Mr. KEATING] was himself responsible for requesting action. That was the reason for the controversy, which occurred at that time, as to whether that had actually been the practice of the subcommittee.

I have before me one document, the report of the Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights for the 1st session of the 87th Congress, which relates to that issue. On page 18, the report reads:

> During the session there were referred to the subcommittee 15 bills dealing with the further preservation and protection of the constitutional rights of all persons within the United States. Of these bills the subcommittee considered and acted upon three bills to extend the operation of the Commission on Civil Rights.

I point that out merely to show the small number, out of the total volume of these bills which were submitted to the subcommittee, that were acted upon. However, I think these arguments are not germane to this money resolution. Whatever may be the pros and cons on that issue, as they have been discussed here, what is germane to this money resolution is that we be told what investigations will be conducted under it.

It is very clear, from a reading of these specifications, that there is not included any consideration of what we call civil rights.

Therefore, I respectfully submit that the job which the subcommittee should be doing will not be done. They tell us so themselves. It is for that reason that, at the very least, I wished at least to open the question to a majority of the subcommittee as to what matters they would consider. Perhaps in its good judgment the majority of the subcommittee would decide that they wanted to consider civil rights issues, in which case that should be done. In any case, the door should not be clanged shut, as would be done if the Senate acted on the resolution today without discussion.

Mr. EASTLAND. I call attention to docket No. 1613, S. 2750, introduced by Messrs. MANSFIELD and DIRKSEN, on January 30, 1962, which is the bill to protect the right to vote in Federal elections free from arbitrary discrimination by literacy tests or other means.

That bill was referred to the committee on January 31, 1962. It was referred to the subcommittee automatically on the day following its introduction.

Mr. JOHNSTON. To keep the record straight, I think the Senator should read the paragraph just preceding what he read. He will find that it goes into other questions besides those he mentioned. It reads:

> The proposed agenda for this session includes studies of vital areas of constitutional law which stand in need of examination by Congress. At the present rate of expense, the proposed budget should permit the subcommittee, in addition to dealing with legislation referred to it, to continue or initiate work on the following subjects.

Then the report states what the Senator has read to the Senate, showing that that will be done after we have gone into the other questions in regard to civil rights.

Mr. JAVITS. I am sorry I cannot agree with that interpretation. Certainly in the absence of the senior Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN] we are lashed to the words which are in the report; and the report, it seems to me, makes it very clear that, as it says:

> At the present rate of expense, the proposed budget should permit the subcommittee, in addition to dealing with legislation referred to it, to continue or initiate work on the following subjects.

It is very clear to me, at least, that the design of this request details what subjects will be considered, in addition to dealing with proposed legislation referred to the subcommittee. In regard to legislation, again, we get into the controversy as to what is referred to the subcommittee, when it is referred, and whether, even if it is referred, it will be considered.

The important point is that this money is requested principally for study. But the studies do not include the study of the question of constitutional rights known as civil rights.

What am I trying to do about that? I am not trying to write in a charge or a direction to the subcommittee to consider that question. I am only trying to keep that door open by giving the majority of the subcommittee the right to have that subject studied, if it chooses to do so. It seems to me that this is an extremely mild approach to the problem, but at least it is something which might have some basis in the intention of the Senate in voting this money.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. HRUSKA. As the ranking Republican member of the subcommittee, I should like to say that the chairman of the subcommittee has held executive meetings and that the subcommittee has, from time to time, considered bills which are before it. If a majority of the subcommittee will vote for the consideration of and hearings on any of the so-called civil rights bills to which the Senator from New York refers, they will be held.

I assure the Senator from New York that meetings are held. The majority of the committee are the ones who determine whether meetings shall be held. I suggest to the Senator from New York that there have been, so far as I know—I stand correction at the hands of the clerk of the committee—no requests filed for hearings on the bills which were referred to the subcommittee. There were no requests for hearings.

I further suggest that the administration was somewhat laggard in suggesting that these bills even be introduced and considered. Based upon the message which came to Congress a little earlier this session, I assume that the attitude has changed somewhat. But I venture to say that the type of amendment which the Senator from New York suggests for this resolution will be of no effect and of no avail to get the job done which he seeks to have done.

Mr. JAVITS. That is the reason why I said when I began that I hoped this question would be deferred until the senior Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN] could say what the Senator from Nebraska has said as to the past and as to the future concerning the role which will be played by the committee under this appropriation which is requested. Unfortunately, that opportunity is being denied, so all the extrapolation which any of us might indulge in as to what the chairman may or may not do with the subcommittee's money for the next 2 years is, I respectfully submit, not dispositive.

The fact is that the specifications of this report do not include any investigation of any such matters as I have described.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. HRUSKA. On that score, it is true that there are five or six items of that type listed on the agenda, but the money is being allowed for the purpose of maintaining a staff and conducting hearings on bills which are referred to the committee, including civil rights bills, and by procedures which are provided in the subcommittee. Whenever there is a majority vote to take up a bill, that is the bill on which hearings are scheduled and hearings are had. But in the absence of any plain desire on the part of either the introducer of the bill or any group of Senators interested in it, of course there will not be any hearings. All of us know that many bills are introduced on which it is not expected that any hearings will be held, nor are hearings desired to be held. It is on that basis that the subcommittee acts.

Mr. JAVITS. I cannot accept that statement; I am sorry. I was here and heard challenged the indication by Senator ERVIN last year that he granted a hearing on any civil rights bill when requested to do so. A request was made by my colleague from New York [Mr. KEATING]. I do not wish to embarrass the Senator from New York, because he is a member of the subcommittee. I shall not ask him any questions. I will state of my own knowledge that this question was challenged.

Various Senators, including the Senator from New York, are sponsors of a half a dozen bills which were referred to this very subcommittee, bills upon which no hearings have been held.

It simply taxes my credibility—I speak personally—to assume that no request was made for hearings on the most obvious civil rights bill before the subcommittee, where all that was necessary, according to what has been said, was to ask for hearings and hearings would be granted. I simply think that that would really be impugning the good faith of so many of us who have introduced civil rights bills. It is simply inconceivable to me.

This is the only chance we will have to take action of this kind, so I have offered a most mild amendment. It would open up the procedure to provide the very thing which the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA] says took place. In the absence of the chairman of the subcommittee to give us that assurance, and the unwillingness to put this resolution over for 2 or 3 days, as was done in the case of another subcommittee resolution, just for that purpose alone I wish to get his assurance.

Mr. President, I do not think that is the way Senators should act with each other; and if for no other reason, we should vote on this matter tonight, on the RECORD. Let us test that out and find out why this particular resolution must be singled out tonight, and must be voted on tonight, and cannot be put over until Tuesday. Why not put it over, in the absence of the subcommittee chairman? I think this demands a record vote.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, neither do I see why this resolution should be singled out by the Senator from New York. I do not contest the credibility of any Senator. I certainly would take the word of the Senator from Nebraska, the ranking minority member of the subcommittee, as to the procedure followed, when he says that whenever a majority of the subcommittee seeks to hold a hearing on a bill introduced by a Member, a hearing is held.

Let me corroborate what the Senator from Nebraska has said—namely, that bills which have been introduced have gone to that committee and to other committees, and the sponsors of those bills have never asked for hearings. That is the way such things work in this body, and I think we might as well recognize that fact. It is not a matter of personalities, or a matter of having the word of one Senator attacked. It is a matter of fact, and we cannot gainsay it.

The chairman of the Judiciary Committee has stated that when bills on civil rights are referred to that committee, he will refer them to the Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. EASTLAND. I should like to make this statement: The clerk of the committee has instructions immediately to refer every bill to the appropriate subcommittee; and the records bear out that they have been so referred—not just civil rights bills, but all the bills which go to the Judiciary Committee.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The chairman of the Judiciary Committee now has stated again that the bills which are introduced and are referred to the Judiciary Committee are to be immediately referred to the appropriate subcommittees. Is that correct?

Mr. EASTLAND. That is correct in all instances.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Very well. And the Senator from Nebraska has said, as the ranking minority member of the subcommittee, that whenever a majority of that subcommittee desires to hold a hearing on such a bill, a hearing will be held.

I hope this will be taken into consideration by the Senator from New York, so that we can settle this question, and can proceed with our business.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I will take the assurance of the majority leader and I will take the assurance of the chairman of the committee, because they are the ones who are vested with the authority.

So far as the Senator from Nebraska is concerned, after all he has to rely upon what took place before. He does not run the subcommittee, and I would not wish to tax him with that responsibility or to ask of him anything which in my heart I knew he could not do or say.

Both the assurances by the majority leader and the chairman of the committee are satisfactory to me. They are, first, that bills referred to the Judiciary Committee will be automatically and promptly referred to the appropriate subcommittees; second, that the practice of the Constitutional Rights Subcommittee will be to grant a hearing on referred bills on the request of the sponsor or the cosponsor. If I have those assurances, I will withdraw this amendment.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. EASTLAND. Let me make the matter plain. I am not making any commitment or promise to the Senator from New York. I am simply stating a fact, namely, that the clerk of the committee has instructions immediately to refer every bill which goes to the committee to the appropriate subcommittee. That has been the policy in the past, and it is going to be the policy in the future; and I do not want the Senator from New York to get on the floor and leave the impression that he has dragged some concession from the Senator from Mississippi, because he has not. What has happened in the past will happen in the future, namely, the clerk has instructions immediately to refer every bill; and that is going to prevail in the future as it has in the past; and no one has dragged any concession from the Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Let me say that I am sure that was not the intention of the Senator from New York. But he has requested assurance of what has, in fact, been the operation in the committee in the past in regard to the reference of bills to the appropriate subcommittees; and on that we have the word of the Senator from Nebraska, the ranking minority member of the subcommittee—and I trust him completely—that whenever a majority of the subcommittee seeks a hearing, one is held.

So I think the requests of the Senator from New York have been met.

Mr. EASTLAND. I repeat that the clerk of the committee has instructions to carry on in the future as he has in the past.

Mr. MANSFIELD. That is all the Senator from New York wants to know; and no one is saying that anything has been dragged out of the Senator from Mississippi, but only that the policy which has been followed in the past will continue to be followed.

Mr. JAVITS. But the point that is missing is whether there will be a hearing on a bill which is referred. Let us assume that what has been stated will be done. I am not dragging any concession out of any Senator; that is not at all my purpose. We can just proceed to vote on this matter.

I appreciate the reluctance of the Senate to get into a rollcall vote at 10 minutes after 7 in the evening.

But the problem which is not covered is this: The statement which it is alleged the chairman of the subcommittee has made—he is absent at this time—is that if the sponsor of a civil rights measure—which is automatically referred, according to the practice of the committee, as explained by the Senator from Mississippi, to the subcommittee—requests a hearing, it is represented here that the chairman of the subcommittee will grant one. If that is going to continue to be the practice, I think we have to have that statement from some Senator who can make that statement of fact; and, in my judgment, the only Senators now present who can do that are either the majority leader—not that he has the direct authority, but I would be perfectly willing to accept that assurance from him—or the chairman of the committee; and all of us heard the statement that the chairman of the committee will not make such a statement; and the majority leader will decide as to precisely what he wishes to do. In the absence of that, I do not feel that in good conscience I can abandon the little struggle we have had here.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Well, Mr. President, if the Senator from New York will allow me to do so, I will take that responsibility and will give him my assurance, and I do it on behalf of the Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, I should like to point out that the Senator from New York stated that if the sponsor of the bill states to the chairman of the subcommittee that he wishes to have a hearing held on the bill, a hearing will be held on it.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Oh, no.

Mr. HRUSKA. But that is my understanding of what the Senator from New York said.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Then he has changed his tune, because he said "a majority of the committee."

Mr. HRUSKA. Yes, that is my understanding. But the different statement does not coincide with what I heard stated. I did not hear the majority leader make such a statement.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I said "on the basis of a majority."

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I wish to make the matter crystal clear. It was represented that the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN] said last year—and I regret his absence—that when a sponsor requested a hearing, he gave him one. I think I understand the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA] and the majority leader. If the assurance which the majority leader is willing to give is that when a sponsor requests a hearing, and if the request is approved by a majority of the subcommittee, a hearing will be held, I would only ask one other assurance, and that is the assurance that the question would be promptly submitted to the subcommittee.

If that is given, then I am perfectly content, and I will withdraw the amendment.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. HRUSKA. On the subject of obtaining a hearing, there would be a majority vote of the subcommittee. I would not countenance any other course. I do not believe that any chairman of a subcommittee is so autocratical or dictatorial as to take action on his own. I would be willing to join the majority leader in such assurance.

Mr. JAVITS. And the request of the sponsor would be promptly submitted to the subcommittee?

Mr. HRUSKA. I am not chairman of the subcommittee. I could not do it.

Mr. JAVITS. That is just the point.

Mr. MANSFIELD. We must trust our colleagues. There is not a committee to which I could go with a bill, the chairman of which committee would not grant me a hearing. What the committee would do for me on my measure it would do for other Senators on any other measure.

Mr. HRUSKA. At the request of a Senator who had introduced a bill that the bill be considered by the subcommittee and a vote taken, I am willing to give assurance that such a motion would be made. I do not know that it would be passed, but at least I would be willing to make the motion if no other Senator would.

Mr. JOHNSTON. I believe the Senator would agree that there has never been an occasion when a member of a subcommittee made a motion in the committee to take up a bill, the majority voted to take it up, and it was not taken up.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, unfortunately, we are speaking in the absence of the subcommittee chairman. I am perfectly willing to accept the assurance of the majority leader precisely as he stated it, that is, that if a sponsor of a bill referred to the Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights requests a hearing—and we have the statement that the practice in the past of automatic referral will continue—and if a majority of the subcommittee sustains that request, the Senator will get a hearing. That is all fine, provided that there is added to the statement that the question for the majority of the subcommittee will be promptly submitted to the subcommittee. It seems to me that is inherent in what we are talking about.

If the question is not submitted, the majority may never get an opportunity to decide whether it does or does not wish to grant a hearing. I know that the majority leader is not the chairman of the subcommittee, but I trust him completely. With the majority leader's assurance that he will use his best efforts to that effect, I shall withdraw the amendment.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I will make that promise.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I withdraw the amendment.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The question is on agreeing to the committee amendments.

The committee amendments were agreed to.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 31), explaining the purposes of the resolution.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Senate Resolution 58 as amended would authorize the expenditure of $152,300 by the Committee on the Judiciary, acting through its Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights, from March 1, 1963, through January 31, 1964, "to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of any and all matters pertaining to constitutional rights."

The following table indicates funds authorized by the Senate during the 87th Congress for the same purpose. Committee expenditures pursuant to such authorizations are shown through December 31, 1962.

Committee and purpose	87th Cong.			
	Amount		Date	Authority
	Authorized	Expended		
Judiciary: Constitutional rights	$280,000	$231,119.92		
	140,000	113,940.26	Jan. 31, 1961	S. Res. 53.
	140,000	117,179.66	Feb. 7, 1962	S. Res. 260.

Due to the delay in the organization of the Senate and in order that its subcommittees could meet their February payrolls, the Senate on February 19, 1963, approved Senate Resolution 88, which continued for 1 month—through February 28, 1963—the investigative and expenditure authorizations granted to Senate committees during the 87th Congress, 2d session, and in certain instances provided additional funds for the purpose.

Since most of the resolutions which would authorize inquiries and investigations during the present session had already been referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration prior to the adoption of Senate Resolution 88, and consequently were on a 12-month basis, the committee at its meeting on February 27, 1963, adopted the following formula to reduce each such request to an 11-month basis:

"A reduction by one-twelfth of that portion of the total request representing salaries and agency contributions to employee retirement, health benefits, and group life insurance."

On this basis the expenditure authorization contained in Senate Resolution 58 was reduced $12,700, from $165,000 to $152,300.

The investigative authority was correspondingly reduced to an 11-month period commencing March 1, 1963.

The purposes of the resolution are detailed in a letter from Senator SAM J. ERVIN, Jr., chairman of the Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights, to Senator JAMES O. EASTLAND, chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, which letter (with accompanying budget) and letter of transmittal from Senator EASTLAND to Senator MIKE MANSFIELD, former chairman of the Committee on Rules and Administration, are as follows:

U.S. SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY.

Re Senate Resolution 58.

Hon. MIKE MANSFIELD,
Chairman, Committee on Rules and Administration, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I am enclosing the budget approved by the Committee on the Judiciary for work of the standing Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights for the period February 1, 1963, to January 31, 1964. The committee authorized reporting of an original resolution, Senate Resolution 58, to provide the amount of $165,000 for the work of the subcommittee during the period February 1, 1963, through January 31, 1964.

Also enclosed for the information of the Committee on Rules and Administration in considering the resolution is a letter to me from the subcommittee chairman summarizing the proposed program for the subcommittee.

With kindest regards, I am,

Sincerely,

JAMES O. EASTLAND,
Chairman.

U.S. SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY,
SUBCOMMITTEE ON CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS,
January 24, 1963.

Hon. JAMES O. EASTLAND,
Chairman, Senate Judiciary Committee, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The members of the standing Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights have approved the following program and budget for the subcommittee during the 1st session of the 88th Congress. As subcommittee chairman, I should therefore like to submit these plans, with a draft resolution, for the consideration of the Committee on the Judiciary.

The new resolution which we are submitting proposes a sum of $165,000 (an increase of $25,000 over the amount authorized last year) to cover legal, investigative, and administrative expenses anticipated by the subcommittee in its study of matters pertaining to constitutional rights during the period from February 1, 1963, through January 31, 1964.

It is my belief that the increased appropriation is amply justified in light of the salary increase given to Senate employees and the corresponding increase in the subcommittee's contribution to the various employees benefit programs, in light of the subcommittee's activities during the past year as described in our annual report, in view of our proposed agenda for this session, and the increasing work of the subcommittee.

During the first 6 months of the past year two lawyers were assigned to the subcommittee by the Richardson Foundation. These lawyers, in their congressional internship capacity, performed, for the most part, the duties of assistant staff counsel. The foundation discontinued this program in July and salaries for these two positions have since that time, been paid by the subcommittee.

During the last Congress, especially during the second session, the subcommittee found itself faced with an ever-increasing number of complaints, inquiries, and requests for information and assistance from other Members of Congress. Last year the subcommittee received over 2,500 actual complaints, an increase of 68 percent over the year before. In all over 10,000 pieces of correspondence left the subcommittee office during 1962.

Also during the past session the subcommittee conducted 16 days of public hearings to consider three bills concerning literacy tests; a bill to protect the rights of the mentally ill in the District of Columbia, the constitutional rights of the American Indian, and the constitutional rights of military personnel. In addition to these hearings, a number of staff conferences were held and field trips made by representatives of the subcommittee in furtherance of various studies.

The proposed agenda for this session includes studies of vital areas of constitutional law which stand in need of examination by Congress. At the present rate of expenses, the proposed budget should permit the subcommittee, in addition to dealing with legislation referred to it, to continue or initiate work on the following subjects:

(1) The constitutional rights of the American Indian.—The subcommittee began its study of this long-neglected area of law 2 years ago. The study will continue to encompass a review of laws and regulations affecting Indian citizens; the administration of law for Indians by Federal, State, and tribal governments; and the status of constitutional rights under the tribal court system. The subcommittee survey should be completed this year, and legislation in this area, already is contemplated.

(2) The constitutional rights of military personnel.—Thousands of complaints have been received and analyzed, and initial hearings have been completed on the subcommittee's study. In addition, staff conferences have been held with representatives of the various services, military personnel, attorneys specializing in military law, and innumerable other interested parties. The subcommittee's investigation continues to focus on the extent to which due process of law is being observed in the Armed Forces. Special emphasis is being given to the administration of the Uniform Code of Military Justice and to administrative discharge.

(3) The rights of the mentally ill.—Although the subcommittee's broad study of this area of the law has been completed, current developments are under constant review. During the last session several of the subcommittee members cosponsored legislation to better protect the rights of those alleged to be mentally ill in the District of Columbia. Although other pressing business of the Senate precluded our holding more than 1 day of hearings, legislation is being drafted for this session at which time further hearings are in order.

(4) Constitutional rights and the administration of criminal justice.—Preliminary work is continuing in an effort to determine how effectively constitutional rights are protected in Federal criminal trials. The study is concentrating on the operation of the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure, and deals with such problems as venue, bail, arrest and interrogation, double jeopardy, discovery procedures, and search and seizure.

Budget

Position	Number	Base salary (per annum)	Gross salary (per annum)	Monthly salary (gross)	Total for period of budget (gross)
STAFF					
Legal:					
Counsel and staff director	1	$8,040	$17,305.31	$1,442.10	$17,305.31
Minority counsel	1	6,720	14,823.08	1,235.25	14,823.08
Counsel	2	4,080	9,596.30	799.69	19,192.60
Assistant counsel	2	3,300	7,906.00	658.83	15,812.00
Editorial and research:					
Professional staff member	1	4,140	9,726.31	810.52	9,726.31
Do	2	3,720	8,816.15	734.67	17,632.30
Research assistant	2	2,220	5,565.59	463.79	11,131.18
Administrative and clerical:					
Chief clerk	1	3,720	8,816.15	734.67	8,816.15
Secretary	2	3,420	8,166.04	680.50	16,332.08
Do	2	2,280	5,695.63	474.64	11,391.26
Total					142,162.27
ADMINISTRATIVE					
Contribution to employees health benefit programs (Public Law 86-382)					1,296.00
Contribution to civil service retirement fund (6½ percent of total salaries paid)					9,240.55
Contribution to employees Federal employees group life insurance (27 cents per month per $1,000 coverage)					479.52
Travel (inclusive of field investigations)					4,000.00
Hearings (inclusive of reporters' fees)					3,000.00
Witness fees, expenses					2,500.00
Stationery, office supplies					1,000.00
Communications (telephone, telegraph)					700.00
Newspapers, magazines, documents					500.00
Contingent					121.66
Total					22,837.73 142,162.37
Grand total					165,000.00

(5) Citizenship.—The rights, privileges, and duties of American citizenship and the issues arising through loss of citizenship and citizenship rights is another subject which the subcommittee is continuing to study.

(6) Right to counsel.—In addition to its continuing interest in and survey of the right to counsel in Federal criminal trials, the subcommittee is making an investigation of the right to counsel before various Federal agencies. This study, given impetus by several complaints, includes both direct and indirect restrictions on this basic right by regulatory agencies.

In all of these areas, it is the subcommittee's intention to determine the need for remedial legislation and to recommend it where necessary, to further protect constitutional guarantees. In view of the importance to every citizen of the subcommittee's work on these problems, I request on behalf of the subcommittee that our program and budget for 1963 be approved.

With all kind wishes, I am,

Sincerely yours,

SAM J. ERVIN, JR.,
Chairman.

Funds requested, Senate Resolution 58, $165,000.

Funds approved by the Committee on Rules and Administration, $152,300.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution as amended.

The resolution (S. Res. 58), as amended, was agreed to.

GOVERNMENT CHARTERS, HOLIDAYS, AND CELEBRATIONS

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 31, Senate Resolution 59.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A resolution (S. Res. 59) to consider matters pertaining to Government charters, holidays, and celebrations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Minnesota.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution, which had been reported from the Committee on Rules and Administration with amendments on page 1, line 9, after the word "from", to strike out "February" and insert "March", and on page 2, line 8, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$7,500" and insert "$7,000"; so as to make the resolution read:

Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdiction specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate to consider all matters pertaining to Federal charters, holidays, and celebrations.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution the committee, from March 1, 1963, to January 31, 1964, inclusive, is authorized to (1) make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 3. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed $7,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report—No. 32—explaining the purposes of the resolution.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Senate Resolution 59 as amended would authorize the expenditure of not to exceed $7,000 by the Committee on the Judiciary from March 1, 1963, through January 31, 1964, for the consideration of all matters pertaining to Federal charters, holidays, and celebrations. The funds would be utilized to provide the Subcommittee on Federal Charters, Holidays, and Celebrations with required clerical assistance.

The following table indicates funds authorized by the Senate during the 87th Congress for the same purpose. Committee expenditures pursuant to such authorizations are shown through December 31, 1962.

Committee and purpose	87th Cong.			
	Amount		Date	Authority
	Authorized	Expended		
Judiciary: Federal charters, holidays, and celebrations...	$15,000	$12,011.83	--------------	
	7.500 7,500	6,202.20 5,809.63	Feb. 13, 1961 Feb. 7, 1962	S. Res. 75. S. Res. 261.

Due to the delay in the organization of the Senate and in order that its subcommittees could meet their February payrolls, the Senate on February 19, 1963, approved Senate Resolution 88, which continued for 1 month—through February 28, 1963—the investigative and expenditure authorizations granted to Senate committees during the 87th Congress, 2d session, and in certain instances provided additional funds for the purpose.

Since most of the resolutions which would authorize inquiries and investigations during the present session had already been referred to the Commission on Rules and Administration prior to the adoption of Senate Resolution 88, and consequently were on a 12-month basis, the committee at its meeting on February 27, 1963, adopted the following formula to reduce each such request to an 11-month basis:

"A reduction by one-twelfth of that portion of the total request representing salaries and agency contributions to employee retirement, health benefits, and group life insurance."

On this basis the expenditure authorization contained in Senate Resolution 59 was reduced $500, from $7,500 to $7,000.

The investigative authority was correspondingly reduced to an 11-month period commencing March 1, 1963.

The purposes of the resolution are specified in a letter from Senator EVERETT MCKINLEY DIRKSEN, chairman of the Subcommittee on Federal Charters, Holidays, and Celebrations, to Senator JAMES O. EASTLAND, chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, which letter (with accompanying budget) and letter of transmittal from Senator EASTLAND to Senator MIKE MANSFIELD, former chairman of the Committee on Rules and Administration, are as follows:

U.S. SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY,
January 24, 1963.

Re Senate Resolution 59.

Hon. MIKE MANSFIELD,
Chairman, Committee on Rules and Administration, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I am enclosing copy of an original resolution for the standing Subcommittee on Federal Charters, Holidays, and Celebrations, which today was approved by the Committee on the Judiciary.

During the 1st session of the 87th Congress, Senate Resolution 75, agreed to February 13, 1961, appropriated the sum of $7,500 for the operation of this subcommittee due to the fact that the number of legislative proposals referred had increased to such an extent that the activities of this subcommittee required the services of a clerical assistant. The Committee on the Judiciary, therefore, approved the sum of $7,500 in order to afford one clerical assistant.

In the 2d session of the 87th Congress, Senate Resolution 261, agreed to by the Senate on February 7, 1962, granted the sum of $7,500 for the activities of the Subcommittee on Federal Charters, Holidays, and Celebrations, for that session.

The committee has decided that it is necessary to provide the same sum to this subcommittee in order to afford a clerical assistant to assist the subcommittee during the 1st session of the 88th Congress.

I believe it most appropriate that this resolution to provide modest funds for the Subcommittee on Federal Charters, Holidays, and Celebrations, should be approved by the Senate at an early date.

With kindest regards, I am,

Sincerely yours,

JAMES O. EASTLAND,
Chairman.

U.S. SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY,
January 24, 1963.

Hon. JAMES O. EASTLAND,
Chairman, Committee on the Judiciary, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: During the 2d session of the 87th Congress, Senate Resolution 261, agreed to February 7, 1962, appropriated the sum of $7,500 for the operation of the standing Subcommittee on Federal Charters, Holidays, and Celebrations.

On the basis of the subcommittee's activities of the past year, I urge favorable consideration of an original resolution appropriating $7,500 for the Subcommittee on Federal Charters, Holidays, and Celebrations, for the 1st session of the 88th Congress. I deem it most appropriate that this resolution be speedily approved.

With kindest regards, I am

Sincerely yours,

EVERETT MCKINLEY DIRKSEN.

Budget

Position	Number	Base salary (per annum)	Gross salary (per annum)	Monthly salary (gross)	Total for period of budget (gross)
STAFF					
Administrative and clerical: Clerk	1	$2,700	$6,605.79	$550.48	$6,605.79
Total	1				6,605.79
ADMINISTRATIVE					
Contribution to employees health benefit programs (Public Law 86-382, effective July 1, 1960)					47.28
Contribution to civil service retirement fund (6½ percent of total salaries paid)					429.78
Contribution to employees Federal employees group life insurance (27 cents per month per $1,000 coverage)					22.80
Hearings (inclusive of reporters' fees)					394.65
Total					894.21
Grand total					7,500.00

Funds requested, Senate Resolution 59, $7,500.

Funds approved by the Committee on Rules and Administration, $7,000.

The amendments were agreed to.

The resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

STUDY AND EXAMINATION OF FEDERAL JUDICIAL SYSTEM

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 32, Senate Resolution 61.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A resolution (S. Res. 61) to study and examine the Federal judicial system.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Minnesota.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution, which had been reported from the Committee on Rules and Administration, with amendments, on page 2, line 4, after the word "from", to strike out "February" and insert "March", and in line 23, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$100,000" and insert "$92,200"; so as to make the resolution read:

Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdiction specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to conduct a study and examination of the administration, practice and procedures of the Federal judicial system with a view to determining the legislation, if any, which may be necessary or desirable in order to increase the efficiency of the Federal courts in the just and expeditious adjudication of the cases, controversies, and other matters which may be brought before them.

SEC. 2. For the purpose of this resolution the committee, from March 1, 1963, to January 31, 1964, inclusive, is authorized (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis professional, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided,* That the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than $1,600 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of departments and agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1964.

SEC. 4. Expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed $92,200, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

The amendments were agreed to.

The resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report—No. 33—explaining the purposes of the resolution.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Senate Resolution 61 as amended would authorize the Committee on the Judiciary to expend not to exceed $92,200 from March 1, 1963, through January 31, 1964, to conduct a study and examination of the administration, practice, and procedures of the Federal judicial system with a view to determining the legislation, if any, which may be necessary or desirable in order to increase the efficiency of the Federal courts in the just and expeditious adjudication of the cases, controversies, and other matters which may be brought before them.

The following table indicates funds authorized by the Senate during the 87th Congress for the same purpose. Committee expenditures pursuant to such authorizations are shown through December 31, 1962.

Committee and purpose	87th Cong.			
	Amount		Date	Authority
	Authorized	Expended		
Judiciary: Federal judicial system	$190,000.00	$102,740.96		
	100,000.00	56,022.87	Jan. 31, 1961	S. Res. 56.
	90,000.00	46,718.09	Feb. 7, 1962	S. Res. 262.

Due to the delay in the organization of the Senate and in order that its subcommittees could meet their February payrolls, the Senate on February 19, 1963, approved Senate Resolution 88, which continued for 1 month—through February 28, 1963—the investigative and expenditure authorizations granted to Senate committees during the 87th Congress, 2d session, and in certain instances provided additional funds for the purpose.

Since most of the resolutions which would authorize inquiries and investigations during the present session had already been referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration prior to the adoption of Senate Resolution 88, and consequently were on a 12-month basis, the committee at its meeting on February 27, 1963, adopted the following formula to reduce each such request to an 11-month basis: A reduction by one-twelfth of that portion of the total request representing salaries and agency contributions to employee retirement, health benefits, and group life insurance.

On this basis the expenditure authorization contained in Senate Resolution 61 was reduced $7,800, from $100,000 to $92,200.

The investigative authority was correspondingly reduced to an 11-month period commencing March 1, 1963.

Additional information relative to the proposed inquiry is contained in a letter to Senator MIKE MANSFIELD, former chairman of the Committee on Rules and Administration, from Senator JAMES O. EASTLAND, chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, transmitting a letter from Senator OLIN D. JOHNSTON, chairman of the Subcommittee on Improvements in Judicial Machinery, which letters (with accompanying budget) are as follows:

U.S. SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY,
January 24, 1963.

Re Senate Resolution 61.

Hon. MIKE MANSFIELD,
Chairman, Committee on Rules and Administration, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The Committee on the Judiciary today ordered reported an original resolution authorizing funds for the operation of the Subcommittee on Improvements in Judicial Machinery, which is conducting a study of the Federal judicial system. This resolution proposes that the amount of $100,000 be allocated for the conduct of business for the budget period 1963–64.

The types of studies being conducted by this subcommittee have been of great value in producing results of a beneficial nature to the Federal courts in the problems confronting them. The Committee on the Judiciary is in agreement with the chairman of the subcommittee, Senator OLIN D. JOHNSTON, that the studies and inquiries should be continued. A letter to me from him outlining the proposed areas of concentration for this session is enclosed for your information.

Also, for your further information and consideration, please find enclosed copies of the proposed resolution and budget request for 1963–64. It is sincerely hoped that these requests will meet with your approval and that of the Committee on Rules and Administration.

With kind regards, I am,

Sincerely,

James O. Eastland,
Chairman.

U.S. Senate,
Committee on the Judiciary,
Subcommittee on Improvements
in Judicial Machinery,
January 21, 1963.

Hon. James O. Eastland,
Chairman, Committee on the Judiciary,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Chairman: The Subcommittee on Improvements in Judicial Machinery presents herewith the attached budget and the proposed resolution requesting the sum of $100,000 for the study and examination of the administration, practice, and procedures of the Federal judicial system with a view to determining the legislation, if any, which may be necessary or desirable in order to increase the efficiency of the Federal courts in the conduct of business brought before them.

The subcommittee during 1962 had 30 legislative bills pending before it dealing with the various phases of judicial administration and procedures of the Federal courts; 11 of these bills were reported by the subcommittee, and 19 were undisposed of at the end of the session. Two days of intensive hearings were held on one of the bills reported, whereat members of the judiciary appeared and offered their views as to the merit of the legislation.

The various judicial circuits have issued invitations to the members and staff of the subcommittee to visit these circuits to obtain from the judges firsthand information as to the needs of their courts. Such field studies have been initiated and others are planned for the near future. The quality of information received and the enthusiastic cooperation of the judges and court personnel have made this method of inquiry most effective.

The judicial conferences and committees have been most helpful in assisting the subcommittee in its efforts and staff representatives have participated in several meetings of these groups during the past year.

By reason of careful handling of funds, certain unanticipated savings in staff expenses and vacancies, the subcommittee has not expended the full amount appropriated last year, and the sum of approximately $40,000 will be returned to the contingent fund of the Senate at the expiration of Senate Resolution 262, on January 31, 1963.

Therefore, it is respectfully requested that the Committee on the Judiciary act favorably on this budget request of $100,000 for 1963–64.

With kind regards, I am,

Sincerely,

Olin D. Johnston,
Chairman.

Budget

Position	Number	Base salary (per annum)	Gross salary (per annum)	Monthly salary (gross)	Total for period of budget (gross)
STAFF					
Legal and investigative:					
Chief counsel	1	$8,040	$17,305.31	$1,442.10	$17,305.31
Assistant counsel	1	7,380	16,064.19	1,338.68	16,064.19
Investigator	2	4,140	9,726.31	810.52	19,452.62
Minority counsel	1	7,260	15,838.54	1,319.87	15,838.54
Administrative and clerical:					
Chief clerk	1	3,420	8,166.04	680.50	8,166.04
Stenographer	2	2,280	5,695.63	474.63	11,391.26
Total	8				88,217.96
ADMINISTRATIVE					
Contribution to employees health benefit programs (Public Law 86–382, effective July 1, 1960)					375.00
Contribution to civil service retirement fund (6½ percent of total salaries paid)					5,727.02
Contribution to employees Federal employees group life insurance (27 cents per month per $1,000 coverage)					221.40
Travel (inclusive of field investigations)					3,000.00
Hearings (inclusive of reporters' fees)					1,000.00
Witness fees, expenses					300.00
Stationery, office supplies					400.00
Communications (telephone, telegraph)					400.00
Contingent fund					358.62
Total					11,423.42
Grand total					100,000.00

Funds requested, Senate Resolution 61, $100,000.

Funds approved by the Committee on Rules and Administration, $92,200.

STUDY OF MATTERS PERTAINING TO IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 33, Senate Resolution 60.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be stated by title.

The Legislative Clerk. A resolution (S. Res. 60) to study matters pertaining to immigration and naturalization.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Minnesota.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution, which had been reported from the Committee on Rules and Administration, with amendments, on page 1, line 10, after the word "from", to strike out "February" and insert "March", and on page 2, line 18, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$135,000" and insert "$124,200"; so as to make the resolution read:

Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdictions specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of any and all matters pertaining to immigration and naturalization.

Sec. 2. For the purposes of this resolution the committee, from March 1, 1963, to January 31, 1964, inclusive, is authorized (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided,* That the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than $1,600 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

Sec. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1964.

Sec. 4. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed $124,200, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

The amendments were agreed to.

The resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

THE INTERNAL SECURITY ACT

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, Calendar No. 34, Senate Resolution 62, was agreed to earlier today.

INVESTIGATION OF JUVENILE DELINQUENCY

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 35, Senate Resolution 63.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be stated by title.

The Legislative Clerk. A resolution (S. Res. 63) to investigate juvenile delinquency.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, is this the resolution relating to a Committee to Investigate Juvenile Delinquency?

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator is correct.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President——

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I withdraw that resolution for a moment. We will take up some other resolutions so that we may move along a little more rapidly.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

INVESTIGATION OF NATIONAL PENITENTIARIES

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 36, Senate Resolution 64.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be stated by title.

The Legislative Clerk. A resolution (S. Res. 64) to investigate national penitentiaries.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Minnesota.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution, which had been reported from the Committee on Rules and Administration, with an amendment, on page 1, line 9, after the word "from", to strike out "February" and insert "March", so as to make the resolution read:

Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdiction specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to examine, investigate, and inspect national penitentiaries.

Sec. 2. For the purposes of this resolution the committee, from March 1, 1963, to January 31, 1964, inclusive, is authorized (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

Sec. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1964.

Sec. 4. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed $5,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record an excerpt from the report (No. 37), explaining the purposes of the resolution.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Senate Resolution 64 as amended would continue until January 31, 1964, the study being made of national penitentiaries by the Committee on the Judiciary, and authorize expenditures in the amount of $5,000 therefor.

The investigative authority contained in the resolution was amended to conform to the 11-month period commencing March 1, 1963, being stipulated for all resolutions of this type.

The following table indicates funds authorized by the Senate during the 87th Congress for the same purpose. Committee expenditures pursuant to such authorizations are shown through December 31, 1962.

Committee and purpose	87th Cong.			
	Amount		Date	Authority
	Authorized	Expended		
Judiciary: National penitentiaries	$10,000	$1,023.50		
	5,000 5,000	 1,023.50	Jan. 31, 1961 Feb. 7, 1962	S. Res. 57. S. Res. 266.

The purposes of the resolution are more fully stated in a letter to Senator Mike Mansfield, former chairman of the Committee on Rules and Administration, from Senator James O. Eastland, chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, which letter (with accompanying budget) is as follows:

U.S. Senate,
Committee on the Judiciary,
January 25, 1963.

Re Senate Resolution 64.

Hon. Mike Mansfield,
Chairman, Senate Committee on Rules and Administration, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Mansfield: I am enclosing a copy of an original resolution and a budget for the standing Subcommittee on National Penitentiaries, which has been approved by the committee.

The standing Subcommittee on National Penitentiaries has been in existence since the 80th Congress. While its needs have always been modest, as is shown by the fact that appropriations for it have ranged between $5,000 and $8,600 during its existence, its effectiveness in building morale among inmates and administrative personnel in our Federal penal institutions has been considerable. The subcommittee affords the personnel of our Federal penal institutions an opportunity to bring their problems in regard to discipline, food, health, and recreation for inmates directly to the attention of the Senate. It further provides Members of the Senate an opportunity to speak directly to inmates and to hear any grievances which the inmates may feel they have. The subcommittee believes that this has been a factor in deterring riots, attempted escapes, and the like, as it provides a real opportunity for inmates to tell their stories to an outside observer. It is gratifying to the subcommittee that since its establishment no serious riot has occurred at any Federal penal institution.

The subcommittee has incurred no expenditures for staff personnel during the past session, and the proposed budget which is submitted for the present session does not anticipate any expenditures for staff. The modest appropriation which has been recommended by the committee is designed to provide only for travel, hearings including reporters' fees, witnesses' fees, and incidental expenses.

With kindest regards, I am,
Sincerely yours,
James O. Eastland,
Chairman.

Budget

Staff expenses	None
Administrative:	
Travel	$3,500
Hearings (inclusive of reporters' fees)	1,000
Witnesses' fees, expenses, communications, supplies, incidental expenses	500
Total expenses	5,000

Funds requested, Senate Resolution 64, $5,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

EXAMINATION AND REVIEW OF ADMINISTRATION OF THE PATENT OFFICE

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 37, Senate Resolution 65.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The resolution will be stated by title.

The Legislative Clerk. A resolution (S. Res. 65) to examine and review the administration of the Patent Office.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution, which had been reported from the Committee on Rules and Administration, with amendments, on page 1, line 11, after the word "from", to strike out "February" and insert "March", and on page 2, line 19, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$125,000" and insert "$115,800"; so as to make the resolution read:

Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdiction specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to conduct a full and complete examination and review of the administration of the Patent Office and a complete examination and review of the statutes relating to patents, trademarks, and copyrights.

Sec. 2. For the purposes of this resolution the committee from March 1, 1963, to January 31, 1964, inclusive, is authorized (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ, upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided,* That the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than $1,600 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

Sec. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1964.

Sec. 4. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed $115,800, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record an excerpt from the report—No. 38—explaining the purposes of the resolution.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Senate Resolution 65 as amended would authorize the expenditure of $115,800 by the Committee on the Judiciary, acting through its Subcommittee on Patents, Trademarks, and Copyrights, from March 1, 1963, through January 31, 1964—"to conduct a full and complete examination and review of the administration of the Patent Office and a complete examination and review of the statutes relating to patents, trademarks, and copyrights."

The following table indicates funds authorized by the Senate during the 87th Congress for the same purpose. Committee expenditures pursuant to such authorization are shown through December 31, 1962.

Committee and purpose	87th Cong.			
	Amount		Date	Authority
	Authorized	Expended		
Judiciary: Patents, trademarks, copyrights	$255,000.00	$155,523.14	----------	
	135,000.00 120,000.00	84,087.42 71,435.72	Jan. 31, 1961 Feb. 7, 1962	S. Res. 55. S. Res. 267.

Due to the delay in the organization of the Senate and in order that its subcommittees could meet their February payrolls, the Senate on February 19, 1963, approved Senate Resolution 88, which continued for 1 month, through February 28, 1963, the investigative and expenditure authorizations granted to Senate committees during the 87th Congress, 2d session, and in certain instances provided additional funds for the purpose.

Since most of the resolutions which would authorize inquiries and investigations during the present session had already been referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration prior to the adoption of Senate Resolution 88, and consequently were on a 12-month basis, the committee at its meeting on February 27, 1963, adopted the following formula to reduce each such request to an 11-month basis: "A reduction by one-twelfth of that portion of the total request representing salaries and agency contributions to employee retirement, health benefits, and group life insurance."

On this basis the expenditure authorization contained in Senate Resolution 65 was reduced $9,200, from $125,000 to $115,800.

The investigative authority was correspondingly reduced to an 11-month period commencing March 1, 1963.

Additional information relative to the purposes of the resolution is contained in a letter from Senator JOHN L. MCCLELLAN, chairman of the Subcommittee on Patents, Trademarks, and Copyrights, to Senator JAMES O. EASTLAND, chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, which letter (with accompanying budget) and letter of transmittal from Senator EASTLAND to Senator MIKE MANSFIELD, former chairman of the Committee on Rules and Administration, are as follows:

U.S. SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY,
January 23, 1963.

Re Senate Resolution 65.
Hon. MIKE MANSFIELD,
Chairman, Committee on Rules and Administration, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I am enclosing the budget which was approved by the Committee on the Judiciary at its meeting on Thursday, January 24, 1963, for the work of the standing Subcommittee on Patents, Trademarks, and Copyrights.

The committee authorized the reporting to the Senate of an original resolution (S. Res. 65) to provide the amount of $125,000 for the work of the subcommittee for the period from February 1, 1963, through January 31, 1964.

The program of the subcommittee is fully set for in a letter to me from Hon. JOHN L. MCCLELLAN, chairman of the subcommittee. I am forwarding this letter to you, herewith, with the proposed budget, for the information of the Committee on Rules and Administration for consideration at its forthcoming meeting.

With kindest regards, I am,
Sincerely,
JAMES O. EASTLAND,
Chairman.

U.S. SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY,
SUBCOMMITTEE ON PATENTS,
TRADEMARKS, AND COPYRIGHTS,
January 23, 1963.

Hon. JAMES O. EASTLAND,
Chairman, Committee on the Judiciary, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: During the 2d session of the 87th Congress, Senate Resolution 267, agreed to February 7, 1962, appropriated the sum of $120,000 for the operation of the Subcommittee on Patents, Trademarks, and Copyrights for the examination and review of the administration of the Patent Office and the laws relating to patents, trademarks, and copyrights. Upon the basis of the work of the subcommittee in 1962, and planned operations for 1963, I urge the appropriation of $125,000 to continue the subcommittee during the period February 1, 1963, to January 31, 1964.

One of the most important matters presently under consideration by the subcommittee is legislation to establish a uniform Government patent policy. The need for a decision by the Congress as to the nature of a Government patent policy is made clear by the rapid rise of research expenditures by the various Federal agencies. A recent survey by the National Science Foundation discloses that the Federal Government plans to obligate $14.7 billion for research and development during the 1963 fiscal year. This is an increase of $3.5 billion—or 31 percent—over the $11.2 billion spent for the same purpose during fiscal 1962. Of the $14.7 billion to be obligated for research and development in fiscal 1963, $7.4 billion (estimate), will go to the Department of Defense—an agency which has no statutory policy for the disposition of rights in the inventions arising from such expenditures. The subcommittee has carefully considered a number of proposals as to a uniform patent policy and hopes to report during the first session of the present Congress, legislation to establish a uniform policy which will both protect the public interest and be equitable to Government contractors.

The subcommittee in recent years has had occasion to view with concern the critical situation facing the U.S. Patent Office. During the past year the subcommittee published the Patent Office Management Survey, which makes recommendations to improve Patent Office procedures in many areas previously studied by this subcommittee.

Another subject which currently is occupying the attention of the subcommittee is the question of whether Patent Office fees are adequate in relation to the current expenses of the Office. While the operating costs of the Patent Office have substantially increased in the past decade, and show promise of continued increase in the future, the basic fees of the Patent Office have not been changed since 1932. During the 2d session of the 87th Congress, the subcommittee favorably reported legislation to revise the fee structure of the Patent Office and it is anticipated that similar legislation will be considered during the current session of the Congress.

Progress was made during 1962 on preliminary measures leading to a general revision of the copyright laws. It is anticipated that during the 88th Congress the subcommittee will devote considerable attention to study and hearings on copyright revision legislation.

The subcommittee also is engaged in investigating the practical effects of the patent contracting practices of the various Government departments and agencies and whether inventions and technical information arising out of Government-financed research are being reported in all areas. In addition, the subcommittee is considering an investigation to determine whether additional legislation is required to protect inventors from misleading advertising by unqualified and/or

Budget

Position	Number	Base salary (per annum)	Gross salary (per annum)	Monthly salary (gross)	Total for period of budget (gross)
STAFF					
Legal and investigative:					
Chief counsel	1	$8,040	$17,305.31	$1,442.10	$17,305.31
Special counsel	1	8,040	17,305.31	1,442.10	17,305.31
Assistant counsel	1	5,700	12,904.99	1,057.41	12,904.99
Do	1	4,680	10,888.64	907.38	10,888.64
Do	1	3,360	8,036.03	669.66	8,036.03
Administrative and clerical:					
Chief clerk	1	5,880	13,243.46	1,103.62	13,243.46
Assistant clerk	1	3,360	8,036.03	669.66	8,036.03
Secretary	2	3,120	7,515.94	626.32	15,031.88
Total	9	----------	----------	----------	102,751.65
ADMINISTRATIVE					
Contribution to employees health benefit programs (Public Law 86-382, effective July 1, 1960)					730.08
Contribution to civil service retirement fund (6½ percent of total salaries paid)					6,678.85
Contribution to employees Federal employees group life insurance (27 cents per month per $1,000 coverage)					349.92
Reimbursable payments to agencies					2,000.00
Travel (inclusive of field investigations)					4,500.00
Hearings (inclusive of reporters' fees)					4,500.00
Witness fees, expenses					1,500.00
Stationery, office supplies					500.00
Communications (telephone, telegraph)					200.00
Newspapers, magazines, documents					300.00
Contingent fund					989.50
Total					22,248.35
Grand total					**125,000.00**

unscrupulous persons who seek to exploit the development of their inventions. The subcommittee also has other miscellaneous patent, trademark, and copyright matters under consideration and study.

By reason of careful handling of funds and certain vacancies on the staff, the subcommittee has not expended the full amount appropriated during the 2d session of the 87th Congress, and the sum of approximately $42,000 will, at the expiration of the resolution on January 31, 1963, be returned to the contingent fund of the Senate. Accompanying this letter is a report of the subcommittee's expenditures for the period February 1, 1962, through January 31, 1963.

A copy of the annual report of the subcommittee will be made available to anyone who is interested in a more detailed account of the subcommittee's work during the past year. On behalf of the subcommittee, I urge approval of the attached budget.

With kindest regards, I am,

Sincerely yours,

John L. McClellan,
Subcommittee Chairman.

Funds requested, Senate Resolution 65, $125,000.

Funds approved by the Committee on Rules and Administration, $115,800.

The amendment was agreed to.

The resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

INVESTIGATION OF PROBLEMS CREATED BY FLOW OF ESCAPEES AND REFUGEES FROM COMMUNISTIC TYRANNY.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 38, Senate Resolution 66.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be stated by title.

The Legislative Clerk. A resolution (S. Res. 66) to investigate problems created by flow of escapees and refugees from Communistic tyranny.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Minnesota.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution, which had been reported from the Committee on Rules and Administration, with amendments, on page 1, line 11, after the word "from", to strike out "February" and insert "March", and on page 2, line 19, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$87,500" and insert "$81,000"; so as to make the resolution read:

Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdiction specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of any and all matters pertaining to the problems created by the flow of escapees and refugees from Communist tyranny.

Sec. 2. For the purposes of this resolution, the committee from March 1, 1963, to January 31, 1964, inclusive, is authorized (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ on a temporary basis technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided,* That the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than $1,600 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the department or agency concerned and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

Sec. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for such legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1964.

Sec. 4. The expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed $81,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate by vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record an excerpt from the report (No. 39), explaining the purposes of the resolution.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Senate Resolution 66 as amended would authorize the expenditure of not to exceed $81,000 by the Committee on the Judiciary, acting through its Subcommittee on Refugees and Escapees, to continue from March 1, 1963, through January 31, 1964, its inquiry into difficulties created by the flow of refugees and escapees from Communist tyranny.

The following table indicates funds authorized by the Senate during the 87th Congress for the same purpose. Committee expenditures pursuant to such authorizations are shown through December 31, 1962.

Committee and purpose	87th Cong.			
	Amount		Date	Authority
	Authorized	Expended		
Judiciary: Refugees and escapees	$137,500.00	$104,954.58	-------------	
	50,000	37,539.79	Jan. 31, 1961	S. Res. 50.
	75,000	67,414.79	Feb. 22, 1962	S. Res. 293.
	12,500		Oct. 2, 1962	S. Res. 406.

Due to the delay in the organization of the Senate and in order that its subcommittees could meet their February payrolls, the Senate on February 19, 1963, approved Senate Resolution 88, which continued for 1 month—through February 28, 1963—the investigative and expenditure authorizations granted to Senate committees during the 87th Congress, 2d session, and in certain instances provided additional funds for the purpose.

Since most of the resolutions which would authorize inquiries and investigations during the present session had already been referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration prior to the adoption of Senate Resolution 88, and consequently were on a 12-month basis, the committee at its meeting on February 27, 1963, adopted the following formula to reduce each such request to an 11-month basis:

"A reduction by one-twelfth of that portion of the total request representing salaries and agency contributions to employee retirement, health benefits, and group life insurance."

On this basis the expenditure authorization contained in Senate Resolution 66 was reduced $6,500, from $87,500 to $81,000.

The investigative authority was correspondingly reduced to an 11-month period commencing March 1, 1963.

The purposes of the resolution are more fully stated in a letter from Senator Philip A. Hart, chairman of the Subcommittee on Refugees and Escapees, to Senator James O. Eastland, chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, which letter (with accompanying budget) and letter of transmittal from Senator Eastland to Senator Mike Mansfield, former chairman of the Committee on Rules and Administration, is as follows:

U.S. Senate,
Committee on the Judiciary,
January 25, 1963.

Re Senate Resolution 66.

Hon. Mike Mansfield,
Chairman, Committee on Rules and Administration, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Mansfield: I am enclosing the budget which was approved by the Committee on the Judiciary at its meeting on January 24, 1963, for the work of the Subcommittee on Refugees and Escapees.

The committee authorized the reporting to the Senate of an original resolution, Senate Resolution 66, to provide the amount of $87,500 for the work of the subcommittee from February 1, 1963, through January 31, 1964.

The program of the subcommittee is fully set forth in a letter to me from Hon. Philip A. Hart, chairman of the subcommittee. I am forwarding this letter to you herewith with the proposed budget for the information of the Committee on Rules and Administration for consideration at its forthcoming meeting.

With kindest regards, I am,

Sincerely yours,

James O. Eastland,
Chairman.

U.S. Senate, Committee on the Judiciary, Subcommittee To Investigate Problems Connected With Escapees and Refugees,
January 23, 1963.

Hon. James O. Eastland,
Chairman, Committee on the Judiciary, U.S. Senate.

Dear Mr. Chairman: Enclosed is the recommended budget for the Subcommittee on Refugees and Escapees for the period beginning February 1, 1963, and extending through January 31, 1964, and also a suggested draft of the new resolution for the subcommittee. The suggested language of this draft is identical with the current resolution.

The subcommittee continues to approach its work with the firm conviction that the moral and political considerations attending the refugee problems, make it incumbent upon the United States to help ameliorate these problems and seek out a reasonable solution. A major portion of the subcommittee's work during the past year has concerned the Cuban refugee problem in this country. Considerable attention was also given to the Chinese refugee problem in Hong Kong and Macao, and the operations of the U.S. escapee program.

A full statement of these activities and those planned for the coming year is included in the subcommittee's annual report. A special report on the Chinese refugee problem is in preparation. It is my belief that the subcommittee's work provides useful information to the American people, but especially to the members of the Committee on the Judiciary and the Senate in their consideration of legislative matters pertaining to refugee problems.

Sincerely yours,

Philip A. Hart,
Chairman.

Budget

Position	Number	Base salary (per annum)	Gross salary (per annum)	Monthly salary (gross)	Total for period of budget (gross)
STAFF					
Legal and investigative:					
General counsel or staff director	1	$8,040	$17,305.31	$1,442.10	$17,305.31
Chief counsel	1	7,260	15,838.54	1,319.87	15,838.54
Assistant chief counsel	1	7,260	15,838.54	1,319.87	15,838.54
Editorial and research: Research director	1	4,620	10,764.52	897.04	10,764.52
Administrative and clerical:					
Chief clerk	1	3,480	8,296.07	691.33	8,296.07
Assistant clerk (record)	1	2,100	5,305.58	442.13	5,305.58
Total					73,348.56
ADMINISTRATIVE					
Contribution to employees health benefit programs (Public Law 86-382, effective July 1, 1960)					392.16
Contribution to civil service retirement fund (6½ percent of total salaries paid)					4,767.66
Contribution to employees Federal employees group life insurance (27 cents per month per $1,000 coverage)					258.24
Travel (inclusive of field investigations)					2,500.00
Hearings (inclusive of reporters' fees)					1,500.00
Witness fees, expenses					2,500.00
Stationery, office supplies					1,000.00
Communications (telephone, telegraph)					800.00
Newspapers, magazines, documents					300.00
Contingent fund					133.38
Total					14,151.44
Grand total					87,500.00

Funds requested, Senate Resolution 66, $87,500.

Funds approved by the Committee on Rules and Administration, $81,000.

The amendments were agreed to.

The resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

STUDY OF REVISION AND CODIFICATION OF STATUTES OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 39, Senate Resolution 67.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be stated by title.

The Legislative Clerk. A resolution (S. Res. 67) to study revision and codification of the statutes of the United States.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Minnesota.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution, which had been reported from the Committee on Rules and Administration with amendments on page 1, line 10, after the word "from", to strike out "February" and insert "March", and on page 2, line 17, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$30,000" and insert "$27,700"; so as to make the resolution read:

Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdictions specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of any and all matters pertaining to revision and codification of the statutes of the United States.

Sec. 2. For the purposes of this resolution the committee from March 1, 1963, to January 31, 1964, inclusive, is authorized (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided*, That if more than one counsel is employed, the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than $1,600 than the highest rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

Sec. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1964.

Sec. 4. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed $27,700, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record an excerpt from the report (No. 40), explaining the purposes of the resolution.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Senate Resolution 67 as amended would authorize the expenditure of $27,700 by the Committee on the Judiciary, through its Subcommittee on Revision and Codification, from March 1, 1963, through January 31, 1964, to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of any and all matters pertaining to revision and codification of the statutes of the United States.

The following table indicates funds authorized by the Senate during the 87th Congress for the same purpose. Committee expenditures pursuant to such authorizations are shown through December 31, 1962:

Committee and purpose	87th Congress			
	Amount		Date	Authority
	Authorized	Expended		
Judiciary: Revision and codification (U.S. Statutes)	$52,000	$12,494.88		
	26,000	5,786.96	Jan. 31, 1961	S. Res. 54.
	26,000	6,707.92	Feb. 7, 1962	S. Res. 257.

Due to the delay in the organization of the Senate and in order that its subcommittees could meet their February payrolls, the Senate on February 19, 1963, approved Senate Resolution 88, which continued for 1 month—through February 28, 1963—the investigative and expenditure authorizations granted to Senate committees during the 87th Congress, 2d session, and in certain instances provided additional funds for the purpose.

Since most of the resolutions which would authorize inquiries and investigations during the present session had already been referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration prior to the adoption of Senate Resolution 88, and consequently were on a 12-month basis, the committee at its meeting on February 27, 1963, adopted the following formula to reduce each such request to an 11-month basis: A reduction by one-twelfth of that portion of the total request representing salaries and agency contributions to employee retirement, health benefits, and group life insurance.

On this basis the expenditure authorization contained in Senate Resolution 67 was reduced $2,300, from $30,000 to $27,700.

The investigative authority was correspondingly reduced to an 11-month period commencing March 1, 1963.

The purposes of the resolution are more fully detailed in a letter from Senator Sam J. Ervin, Jr., chairman of the Subcommittee on Revision and Codification, to Senator James O. Eastland, chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, which letter (with accompanying budget) and letter of transmittal from Senator Eastland to Senator Mike Mansfield, former chairman of the Committee on Rules and Administration, are as follows:

U.S. Senate,
Committee on the Judiciary,
January 25, 1963.

Re Senate Resolution 67.

Hon. Mike Mansfield,
Chairman, Committee on Rules and Administration, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Chairman: I am enclosing the budget approved by the Committee on the Judiciary for work of the standing Subcommittee on Revision and Codification for the period February 1, 1963, to January 31, 1964. The committee authorized reporting of an original resolution, Senate Resolution 67, to provide the amount of $30,000 for the work of the subcommittee during the period February 1, 1963, through January 31, 1964. The amount agreed to is $4,000 in addition to the amount approved last year. This is requested primarily to take care of the pay raises in the recent pay bill.

Also enclosed for the information of the Committee on Rules and Administration in considering the resolution is a letter to me from the subcommittee chairman summarizing the proposed program for the subcommittee.

With kindest regards, I am,

Sincerely yours,

JAMES O. EASTLAND,
Chairman.

U.S. SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY,
January 19, 1963.

Hon. JAMES O. EASTLAND,
Chairman, Committee on the Judiciary, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The standing Subcommittee on Revision and Codification has approved the following program and budget for the subcommittee's activities during the 1st session of the 88th Congress. As chairman of the subcommittee I take pleasure in submitting these plans for the draft resolution for the favorable consideration of the Committee on the Judiciary.

The resolution for the 1st session of the 88th Congress which is being submitted for the proposed budget of $30,000 to cover legal and administrative expenses anticipated by the subcommittee during the period February 1, 1963, through January 31, 1964, is enclosed. The amount set forth is $4,000 in excess of the subcommittee budget for the 2d session of the 87th Congress. This increase is primarily made in order to take care of the various pay raises and contributions necessitated by the passing of the pay raise bill in the 2d session of the 87th Congress.

During the 2d session of the 87th Congress revision and codification matters were referred to the subcommittee from the House of Representatives. All bills referred to the subcommittee were processed and referred to the Senate. They eventually were enacted and became public laws. These bills were as follows:

H.R. 10431: To revise, codify, and enact title 37 of the United States Code, entitled, "Pay and Allowances of the Uniformed Services." Passed by the Senate on August 20, 1962, and signed by the President on September 7, 1962. Public Law 87-649.

H.R. 10432: To amend title 39, United States Code, to codify certain recent public laws relating to the postal service and to improve the code. Passed by the Senate on August 20, 1962, and signed by the President on September 7, 1962. Public Law 87-646.

H.R. 10433: To amend title 10, United States Code, to codify recent military laws, and to improve the code. Passed by the Senate on August 20, 1962. Signed by the President on September 7, 1962. Public Law 87-651.

H.R. 10931: To revise and codify the general and permanent laws relating to and in force in the Canal Zone and to enact the Canal Zone Code, and for other purposes. Passed by the Senate on August 20, 1962. Signed by the President on October 18, 1962. Public Law 87-845.

Although the subcommittee budget for the 2d session of the 87th Congress was $26,000, there was only expended in the work of the subcommittee in processing all of the above bills, less than $9,000. It is anticipated that on January 31, 1963, there will be returned to the contingent fund of the Senate approximately $17,000.

The subcommittee is enabled to return such a substantial portion of its appropriation for last year simply because the subcommittee did not have a subcommittee counsel during most of the year, and the chairman of the subcommittee neglected other important matters in order to do a portion of the work which would otherwise be done by the counsel himself, and called upon overworked members of the full Judiciary Committee staff and his own personal staff to assist him in so doing. The subcommittee has now employed a counsel because of its conviction that it is unwise for the chairman to neglect other matters to do work properly belonging to the office of counsel, and because it is unjust for the chairman to ask overworked members of the full Judiciary Committee or his own personal staff to do such work, and because the work of codification of the laws is most exacting in nature and requires the services of a highly expert legal craftsman.

As you are aware, various titles of the United States Code have been codified in previous Congresses and an examination of the titles of the code will reveal the great importance of these codifications. It is anticipated that before the work of the subcommittee is completed that all of the titles of the United States Code will be codified as well as other special revisions and codifications.

It is impossible to overmagnify the importance of the codification bills handled by the subcommittee. These bills bring together under proper titles and categories the laws enacted in times past by the Congress, and require the checking and rechecking of the prior laws in their original form as well as in subsequent codifications. When codification bills are enacted and approved they become law instead of prima facie evidence of the law. For this reason, it is absolutely essential that they be accurate in all details—a thing which necessitates most exacting labor.

This work is so detailed that it oftentimes takes 3 or 4 years to codify a particular title. It can readily be seen that a project of this magnitude must carry a cutoff date for the laws which are to be taken care of by a so-called cleanup bill. The element of time then enters into the picture for the reason that when the bill has received approval of the House and has been sent to the Senate it almost of necessity must be passed in that Congress or the entire work on that legislation is for naught and must be commenced again in the next succeeding Congress. This causes a great deal of waste in the matter of time and expense. It also means that a great amount of work must be taken on faith because without a staff the Committee on the Judiciary does not have the facilities to recheck 4 or 5 years of work within a single session. When this is realized, it becomes apparent why a staff for this most important legislative function be provided for this subcommittee.

The subcommittee anticipates that during this session of the Congress several codifications will be referred to the subcommittee, and will probably include the following:

Part II of the District of Columbia Code;

The Uniform Commercial Code in the District of Columbia; and

Title 5 of the United States Code.

With all kind wishes, I am,

Sincerely yours,

SAM J. ERVIN, JR.,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Revision and Codification.

Budget

Position	Number	Base salary (per annum)	Gross salary (per annum)	Monthly salary (gross)	Total for period of budget (gross)
STAFF					
Legal and investigative: Chief counsel and staff director	1	$8,040	$17,305.31	$1,442.10	$17,305.31
Administrative and clerical: Stenographer	1	3,600	8,556.11	713.00	8,556.11
Total					25,861.42
ADMINISTRATIVE					
Contribution to employees health benefit programs (Public Law 86-382, effective July 1, 1960)					162.24
Contribution to civil service retirement fund (6½ percent of total salaries paid)					1,680.99
Contribution to employees Federal employees group life insurance (27 cents per month per $1,000 coverage)					87.48
Travel (inclusive of field investigations)					840.69
Hearings (inclusive of reporters' fees)					819.22
Witness fees, expenses					150.00
Stationery, office supplies					100.00
Communications (telephone, telegraph)					100.00
Newspapers, magazines, documents					50.00
Contingent fund					147.96
Total					4,138.58
Grand total					30,000.00

Funds requested, Senate Resolution 67, $30,000.

Funds approved by the Committee on Rules and Administration, $27,700.

The amendments were agreed to.

The resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

INVESTIGATION OF ADMINISTRATION OF TRADING WITH THE ENEMY ACT

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 40, Senate Resolution 68.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A resolution (S. Res. 68) to investigate the administration of the Trading With the Enemy Act.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Minnesota.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution, which had been reported from the Committee on Rules and Administration with amendments on page 1, line 11, after the word "from", to strike out "February" and insert "March", and on page 2, line 19, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$60,000" and insert "$55,400"; so as to make the resolution read:

Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134 (a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdiction specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to conduct a further examination and review of the administration of the Trading With the Enemy Act, as amended, and the War Claims Act of 1948, as amended, and consider proposed legislation affecting said Acts.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution the committee, from March 1, 1963, to January 31, 1964, inclusive, is authorized (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable; and (2) to employ upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided*, That the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than $1,600 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1964.

SEC. 4. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed $55,400, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 41), explaining the purposes of the resolution.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Senate Resolution 68 as amended would authorize the expenditure of not to exceed $55,400 to enable the Subcommittee on Trading With the Enemy Act of the Committee on the Judiciary from March 1, 1963, through January 31, 1964, to conduct hearings, conferences, and discussions and to reach areas of agreement in various matters with the executive branch.

The following table indicates funds authorized by the Senate during the 87th Congress for the same purpose. Committee expenditures pursuant to such authorizations are shown through December 31, 1962:

Committee and purpose	87th Cong.			
	Amount		Date	Authority
	Authorized	Expended		
Judiciary: Trading With the Enemy Act	$90,000.00	$71,756.92		
	45,000.00	38,202.31	Feb. 13, 1961	S. Res. 60.
	45,000.00	33,554.61	Feb. 7, 1962	S. Res. 268.

Due to the delay in the organization of the Senate and in order that its subcommittees could meet their February payrolls, the Senate on February 19, 1963, approved Senate Resolution 88, which continued for 1 month—through February 28, 1963—the investigative and expenditure authorizations granted to Senate committees during the 87th Congress, 2d session, and in certain instances provided additional funds for the purpose.

Since most of the resolutions which would authorize inquiries and investigations during the present session had already been referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration prior to the adoption of Senate Resolution 88, and consequently were on a 12-month basis, the committee at its meeting on February 27, 1963, adopted the following formula to reduce each such request to an 11-month basis: A reduction by one-twelfth of that portion of the total request representing salaries and agency contributions to employee retirement, health benefits, and group life insurance.

On this basis the expenditure authorization contained in Senate Resolution 68 was reduced $4,600, from $60,000 to $55,400.

The investigative authority was correspondingly reduced to an 11-month period commencing March 1, 1963.

Additional information relative to Senate Resolution 68 is set forth in a letter from Senator OLIN D. JOHNSTON, chairman of the subcommittee, to Senator JAMES O. EASTLAND, chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, which letter (with accompanying budget) and Senator EASTLAND's letter of transmittal to Senator MIKE MANSFIELD, former chairman of the Committee on Rules and Administration, are as follows:

U.S. SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY,
January 24, 1963.

Re Senate Resolution 68.
Hon. MIKE MANSFIELD,
Chairman, Committee on Rules and Administration, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The Committee on the Judiciary today ordered reported an original resolution providing funds for a continuation of the study, examination, and review of the administration of the Trading With the Enemy Act and the War Claims Act of 1948.

This work has been carried on since the 2d session of the 82d Congress by the Subcommittee on Trading With the Enemy Act. Under the provisions of Senate Resolution 268, agreed to February 7, 1962, the authority for the study will expire on January 31, 1963. The new resolution proposes a budget of $60,000 for the period ending January 31, 1964. The reasons for the request are detailed in the attached letter from the chairman of the subcommittee.

The subcommittee's work has greatly increased due to the enactment last year of various comprehensive amendments to both the Trading With the Enemy Act and the War Claims Act of 1948.

With respect to the amendments to the War Claims Act, an entirely new and broad program was inaugurated for the payment of the claims of American citizens for losses suffered during World War II. An estimated 35,000 claimants are involved, with claims approximating $300 million. In the interest of these many claimants and the amount of funds involved it is extremely important that the subcommittee closely watch this new program.

Amendments were adopted last year to the Trading With the Enemy Act which (1) permit the sale of General Aniline & Film Corp.; (2) authorize the use of $500,000 of the vested assets funds in the rehabilitation and resettlement in the United States of certain persecutees; (3) divest to the former individual owner certain properties now held by the Attorney General; and (4) close out the administration of vested assets consisting of copyrights, trademarks, and motion picture film.

All of these new programs will require additional review and examination by the subcommittee. Particularly with reference to the authority to sell General Aniline, the committee wants to be kept currently apprised of all developments in the sale and the settlement of the litigation. A sale of the asset could eventualy increase the war claims fund, or it could create a substantial liability on the American taxpayers should the Swiss prevail in their suit and the courts determine a fair market price to be in excess of the sale price. The chairman of the subcommittee assures me that he is to be kept advised by the Attorney General on all aspects of this case.

In addition to the letter from the chairman of the subcommittee, there is enclosed for your information the proposed budget for the coming year. It is sincerely hoped that these requests will meet with the approval of your committee.

With kind regards, I am,
Sincerely yours,
JAMES O. EASTLAND,
Chairman.

U.S. SENATE, COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY, SUBCOMMITTEE ON TRADING WITH THE ENEMY ACT,
January 15, 1963.

Hon. JAMES O. EASTLAND,
Chairman, Committee on the Judiciary, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR EASTLAND: The examinations and reviews assigned to be performed by the Subcommittee on Trading With the Enemy Act have been successively continued from the 2d session of the 82d Congress until January 31, 1963. For the period covered by Senate Resolution 268, which expires January 31, 1963, $45,000 was authorized, of which approximately $7,000 will be returned as unexpended balance. A new resolution proposing that the work of the subcommittee continue until January 31, 1963, would authorize the expenditure of $60,000.

Under the authority of our resolution the subcommittee is concerned with the operation of the War Claims Act of 1948, as administered by the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission of the United States. In this respect, the responsibilities of the Commission—and thus of the subcommittee—have greatly increased following the enactment in the last session of the 87th Congress of amendments to the War Claims Act. These amendments are the first comprehensive legislation dealing with the claims of American citizens arising out of World War II. It is estimated that some 35,000 American citizens hold claims coming under the provisions of these amendments. It is further estimated that approximately $300 million will be required in the payment of the claims.

Many of the amendments added to the War Claims Act last year did not have the benefit of committee study or recommendation; consequently, the subcommittee should watch very carefully the effect of these amendments on the war claims fund and on the claims of our citizens. It has already been necessary to pass corrective legislation because of the inadequacy of one of the adopted amendments which was offered from the floor.

When the amendments were adopted to the War Claims Act last year, the Committee on Conference recommended that the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission make a study to arrive at an estimate of the amount of claims that would be involved in legislation to include late nationals as eligible claimants for war damages. The subcommittee will want to follow this study in considering new amendments to embrace this group of claimants.

The Commission has not received an appropriation for the newly authorized claims program, but such an appropriation is expected this session. Presently the Commission is in the process of formulating rules and procedures for the handling of the claims. It is extremely important that the subcommittee watch this operation in the interest of the Congress and the numerous American citizens involved.

It should be pointed out that the war claims amendments enacted last year carry no directive or authority for the Commission to report to the Congress on its activities under the new program. In view of this, it is all the more important for the subcommittee to currently review and examine the Commission's operation under the new amendments.

The subcommittee will observe the new procedures, conduct inquiries, and study individual claims to determine whether the handling of the claims is in accordance with the intent of the Congress. The subcommittee is presently drafting legislation to provide judicial review of the Commission's decisions, since under present procedure there is no appeal.

The subcommittee is charged with the examination and review of the administration of the Trading With the Enemy Act, which is under the jurisdiction of the Department of Justice. This act is concerned with the blocking, vesting, and liquidation of assets seized from our enemies during and after World War II.

The review and investigative work of the subcommittee has tremendously increased with the enactment of several amendments to the Trading With the Enemy Act during the previous session of the Congress. One such amendment which places additional responsibility on the subcommittee is the provision authorizing a sale of the General Aniline & Film Corp., the largest single vested asset, valued at approximately $200 million. Title to this asset has been in litigation for a number of years and the new amendment could conceivably add more years to the case. In any event—sale or further litigation—there is urgent necessity for the Congress to be kept currently advised of all developments concerning this valuable asset in which every taxpayer of the country has an interest.

This corporation, presently valued at approximately $200 million, continues to expand and develop new products. For the first 9 months of 1962 sales amounted to $135,034,000, an increase of 11.5 percent over the first 9 months of 1961. Net income for the first 9 months amounted to $6,754,000, or 57.1 percent higher than the same period in 1961.

The interest of our Government in General Aniline belongs to every taxpayer of our country. Furthermore, there is a potential liability if Interhandel subsequently prevails in their suit and a fair market value is determined by the courts which exceeds the sale price received by the Attorney General.

Because of these considerations and the amount of money involved, it is most important that the subcommittee continue to watch closely the activities and developments. Following the enactment of the sale amendment, I requested that the Attorney General keep me advised of all developments in the General Aniline case. I have received the Attorney General's reply in which he assured me that the subcommittee would be fully informed in this matter.

Another amendment to the Trading With the Enemy Act adopted last year authorizes the use of $500,000 of the vested assets funds by designated organizations in the rehabilitation and resettlement of persecuted persons. The subcommittee will need to observe the operation of this new program, which is administered by the Department of Justice.

Further amendments to the Trading With the Enemy Act accepted last year authorize the divestiture of certain rights and interests of individuals in estates, trusts, insurance policies, annuities, remainders, pensions, workmen's compensation, and veterans' benefits vested under this act after December 17, 1941, which have not vested in possession or become payable to the Attorney General prior to December 31, 1961. A number of individual claimants are affected by this amendment and it is the subcommittee's intention to follow closely the policies and procedures for carrying out the divestiture.

Still further new amendments authorize the divestiture of certain interests in copyrights and trademarks which were vested by the Attorney General. The purpose of these amendments is to close out this phase of the work of the Department since the revenue from the properties is steadily decreasing and would eventually be below the cost of administering the program. The subcommittee will maintain close contact with the closing out of this operation.

In addition to the new legislation, the Department has pending several suits involving the Trading With the Enemy Act. Further, the Department is charged with the blocking and administering of property in the United States owned by the governments or nationals of Hungary, Bulgaria, and Rumania.

No extensive hearings are planned by the subcommittee at this time. However, it is felt that some executive hearings may be necessary in order to have the benefit of the agencies' feelings on the operation of the new programs and on some suggested legislation.

In conducting this work, the subcommittee seeks the assistance of a counsel, minority counsel, clerk, assistant clerk, and a stenographer.

It has always been my policy to operate as economically as possible, and I can assure you that I will continue to do so. I trust the committee will act favorably on our budget request for $60,000 for the coming year.

With kind regards, I am,

Sincerely yours,

OLIN D. JOHNSTON,
Chairman.

Budget

Position	Number	Base salary (per annum)	Gross salary (per annum)	Monthly salary (gross)	Total for period of budget (gross)
STAFF					
Legal and investigative:					
Counsel	1	$8,040	$17,305.31	$1,442.10	$17,305.31
Special counsel (minority)	1	7,200	15,725.71	1,310.47	15,725.71
Administrative and clerical:					
Clerk	1	3,420	8,166.04	680.50	8,166.04
Assistant clerk	1	1,920	4,915.49	409.62	4,915.49
Stenographer	1	2,640	6,475.75	539.64	6,475.75
Total	5				52,588.30
ADMINISTRATIVE					
Contribution to employees health benefit programs (Public Law 86-382, effective July 1, 1960)					200.00
Contribution to civil service retirement fund (6½ percent of total salaries paid)					3,418.24
Contribution to employees Federal employees group life insurance (27 cents per month per $1,000 coverage)					178.20
Travel (inclusive of field investigations)					500.00
Hearings (inclusive of reporters' fees)					500.00
Witness fees, expenses					100.00
Stationery, office supplies					400.00
Communications (telephone, telegraph)					300.00
Newspapers, magazines, documents					50.00
Contingent fund					1,765.26
Total					7,411.70
Grand total					60,000.00

Funds requested, Senate Resolution 68, $60,000.

Funds approved by the Committee on Rules and Administration, $55,400.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, am I correct in saying that this is a subcommittee which was supposed to conclude its work last year?

Mr. JOHNSTON. We hoped to conclude our work last year, but I will state what happened. A bill which was reported by the Committee on the Judiciary would give a right to adjudicate all claims. There was a challenge. They did not merely adjudicate, but put in facts of other claims which were at the time under consideration, such as selling General Aniline, which was estimated to be worth approximately $200 million. That being so, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] asked that a staff member representing the minority be appointed to the committee to help keep the committee behind it and to see that the investigation was carried out, and also to straighten out some of the laws that were passed last year concerning which some mistakes were made. For that reason a little extra appropriation was made in order to bring to the committee an employee representing the minority.

Mr. ELLENDER. Since this committee was to complete its work last year, and since it submitted to the Senate recommendations, are we to understand that until the Senate acts the committee will remain active?

Mr. JOHNSTON. I think we shall have to be certain somebody is watching this matter. The Senator will see in the newspapers and in some of the columns before long a great deal about this particular transaction.

Personally, I do not think the Senate wants to turn it absolutely loose at this time. I do not know whether work will be completed this year or next year. I cannot say exactly. The Senator could ask the Department of Justice about that. That Department probably could tell us more.

I hope we can complete the work this year. We hoped to get it done last year. We would have finished, so far as we were concerned, if they had left out General Aniline & Film and also adjudicated the claim and brought it back for approval.

I think both the Democrats and Republicans on the committee will support me unanimously in that statement.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendments.

The amendments were agreed to.

The resolution (S. Res. 68), as amended, was agreed to.

FUNDS FOR ADDITIONAL STAFF FOR COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND PUBLIC WELFARE

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 41.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A resolution (S. Res. 95) to provide funds for additional staff for the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion by the Senator from Minnesota.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report—No. 42—explaining the purposes of the resolution.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

> This resolution would authorize the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare from March 1, 1963, through January 31, 1964, "to employ one additional assistant chief clerk, seven additional professional staff members, and nine additional clerical assistants, to be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate at rates of compensation to be fixed by the chairman in accordance with section 202(e), as amended, of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, and the provisions of Public Law 4, 80th Congress, approved February 19, 1947, as amended."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution (S. Res. 95) was agreed to, as follows:

> *Resolved,* That the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare is authorized from March 1, 1963, through January 31, 1964, to employ one additional assistant chief clerk, seven additional professional staff members, and nine additional clerical assistants to be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate at rates of compensation to be fixed by the chairman in accordance with section 202(e), as amended, by the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, and the provisions of Public Law 4, Eightieth Congress, approved February 19, 1947, as amended.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND PUBLIC WELFARE TO STUDY MATTERS PERTAINING TO MIGRATORY LABOR

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 42.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A resolution (S. Res. 22) authorizing the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare to examine, investigate, and study matters pertaining to migratory labor which had been reported from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare with amendments, and subsequently reported from the Committee on Rules and Administration without additional amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion by the Senator from Minnesota.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution (S. Res. 22).

The amendments of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare are as follows:

> On page 2, line 9, after the word "from", to strike out "February" and insert "March", and on page 3, line 4, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$75,000" and insert "$68,750"; so as to make the resolution read:
>
> "*Resolved,* That the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdiction specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of any and all matters pertaining to migratory labor including, but not limited to, such problems as (a) the wages of migratory workers, their working conditions, transportation facilities, housing, health, and educational opportunities for migrants and their children, (b) the nature of and the relationships between the programs of the Federal Government and the programs of State and local governments and the activities of private organizations dealing with the problems of migratory workers and (c) the degree of additional Federal action necessary in this area.
>
> "SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution the committee, from March 1, 1963, to January 31, 1964, inclusive, is authorized (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided,* That the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than $1,600 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.
>
> "SEC. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1964.
>
> "SEC. 4. Expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed $68,750, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee."

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report—No. 43—explaining the purposes of the resolution.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

> Senate Resolution 22 as amended would authorize the expenditure of not to exceed $68,750 by the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, from March 1, 1963, through January 31, 1964, to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of any and all matters pertaining to migratory labor including, but not limited to, such problems as (a) the wages of migratory workers, their working conditions, transportation facilities, housing, health, and educational opportunities for migrants and their children; (b) the nature of and the relationships between the programs of the Federal Government and the programs of State and local governments and the activities of private organizations dealing with the problems of migratory workers; and (c) the degree of additional Federal action necessary in this area.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendments.

The amendments were agreed to.

The resolution (S. Res. 22), as amended, was agreed to.

CLERICAL ASSISTANCE FOR COMMITTEE ON POST OFFICE AND CIVIL SERVICE

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 43.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A resolution (S. Res. 20) authorizing the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service to employ additional clerical assistance which had been reported from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service without amendment, and subsequently reported from the Committee on Rules and Administration with an amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion by the Senator from Minnesota.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution (S. Res. 20) which had been reported from the Committee on Rules and Administration with an amendment.

The amendment of the Committee on Rules and Administration is as follows:

In line 2, after the word "from", to strike out "February" and insert "March"; so as to make the resolution read:

> *Resolved,* That the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service is authorized, from March 1, 1963, through January 31, 1964, to employ one additional clerical assistant to be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate at rates of compensation to be fixed by the chairman in accordance with the provisions of Public Law 4, Eightieth Congress, approved February 19, 1947, as amended.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report—No. 44—explaining the purposes of the resolution.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

> Senate Resolution 20, as amended, would authorize the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service to continue through January 31, 1964, the employment of one additional clerical assistant. Such clerical assistant would be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate at a rate of compensation to be fixed by the chairman in accordance with the provisions of Public Law 4, 80th Congress, approved February 19, 1947, as amended.
>
> The amendment by the Committee on Rules and Administration would reduce to an 11-month period commencing March 1, 1963, the authority of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service to employ an additional clerical assistant.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The resolution (S. Res. 20), as amended, was agreed to.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEE ON POST OFFICE AND CIVIL SERVICE TO INVESTIGATE POSTAL SERVICE AND CIVIL SERVICE SYSTEM

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 44.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The resolution will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The **LEGISLATIVE CLERK.** A resolution (S. Res. 18) authorizing the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service to investigate the postal service and civil service system which had been reported from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service without amendment and subsequently reported from the Committee on Rules and Administration with amendments.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The question is on agreeing to the motion by the Senator from Minnesota.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution (S. Res. 18) which had been reported from the Committee on Rules and Administration with amendments.

The amendments of the Committee on Rules and Administration are as follows:

On page 2, line 17, after the word "from", to strike out "February" and insert "March", and on page 3, line 11, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$75,000" and insert "$69,500"; so as to make the resolution read:

> *Resolved,* That the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdictions specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate to examine, investigate, and conduct such studies as may be deemed necessary with respect to any and all aspects of—
>
> (1) the administration of the postal service, particularly with respect to (a) the quality and frequency of mail service rendered the public, (b) the operation of the postal establishment with maximum efficiency and economy, (c) modernization of facilities, and (d) parcel post;
>
> (2) the civil service system, including but not limited to (a) steps necessary to improve the merit system, (b) the administration of the Postal Service and Federal Employees Salary Act of 1962, (c) dual compensation within the Federal service, (d) executive pay, (e) administration of the health and life insurance programs, and (f) operation of the retirement program.
>
> SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution the committee, from March 1, 1963, to January 31, 1964, inclusive is authorized (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided,* That the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than $1,600 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.
>
> SEC. 3. The committee shall report its findings together with its recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1964.
>
> SEC. 4. Expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed $69,500, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 45), explaining the purposes of the resolution.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

> Senate Resolution 18 as amended would authorize the expenditure of not to exceed $69,500 by the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, from March 1, 1963, through January 31, 1964, to make a complete study of any and all matters pertaining to—
>
> (1) the administration of the postal service, particularly with respect to (a) the quality and frequency of mail service rendered the public, (b) the operation of the Postal Establishment with maximum efficiency and economy, (c) modernization of facilities, and (d) parcel post; and
>
> (2) the civil service system, including but not limited to (a) steps necessary to improve the merit system, (b) the administration of the postal service and Federal Employees Salary Act of 1962, (c) dual compensation within the Federal service, (d) executive pay, (e) administration of the health and life insurance programs, and (f) operation of the retirement program.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The question is on agreeing to the committee amendments.

The amendments were agreed to.

The resolution (S. Res. 18), as amended, was agreed to.

AUTHORITY TO INVESTIGATE CERTAIN MATTERS BY COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 45.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The resolution will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The **LEGISLATIVE CLERK.** A resolution (S. Res. 12) authorizing the Committee on Public Works to investigate certain matters which had been reported from the Committee on Public Works without amendment, and subsequently reported from the Committee on Rules and Administration, with amendments.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The question is on agreeing to the motion by the Senator from Minnesota.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution (S. Res. 12), which had been reported from the Committee on Rules and Administration, with amendments.

The amendments of the Committee on Rules and Administration are as follows:

> On page 2, line 5, after the word "from", to strike out "February" and insert "March", and on page 3, line 2, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$125,000" and insert "$118,100"; so as to make the resolution read:
>
> "*Resolved,* That the Committee on Public Works, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdictions specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of any and all matters pertaining to flood control, navigation, rivers and harbors, roads and highways, water pollution, public buildings, and all features of water resource development.
>
> "SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution the committee, from March 1, 1963, to January 31, 1964, inclusive, is authorized (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided,* That the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than $1,600 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.
>
> "SEC. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1964.
>
> "SEC. 4. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed $118,100, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee."

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report—No. 46—explaining the purposes of the resolution.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Senate Resolution 12 as amended would authorize the expenditure of not to exceed $118,100 by the Committee on Public Works, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, from March 1, 1963, through January 31, 1964, to employ on a temporary basis such additional personnel as the committee deems advisable to carry out its functions during the 1st session of the 88th Congress.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendments.

The amendments were agreed to.

The resolution (S. Res. 12), as amended, was agreed to.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEE ON RULES AND ADMINISTRATION TO MAKE EXPENDITURES AND TO EMPLOY TEMPORARY PERSONNEL

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 46.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A resolution (S. Res. 73) authorizing the Committee on Rules and Administration to make expenditures and to employ temporary personnel.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion by the Senator from Minnesota.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution (S. Res. 73), which had been reported from the Committee on Rules and Administration, with amendments, on page 2, line 5, after the word "from", to strike out "February" and insert "March", and on page 3, line 2, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$65,000" and insert "$59,800"; so as to make the resolution read:

Resolved, That the Committee on Rules and Administration, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdictions specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of any and all matters pertaining to—

(1) the election of the President, Vice President, or Members of Congress;

(2) corrupt practices;

(3) contested elections;

(4) credentials and qualifications;

(5) Federal elections generally; and

(6) Presidential succession.

SEC. 2. For the purpose of this resolution the committee, from March 1, 1963, to January 31, 1964, inclusive is authorized (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided*, That the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than $1,600 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1964.

SEC. 4. Expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed $59,800, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 47), explaining the purposes of the resolution.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Senate Resolution 73, as amended, would authorize the expenditure of not to exceed $59,800 by the Committee on Rules and Administration, or by its standing Subcommittee on Privileges and Elections, from March 1, 1963, through January 31, 1964, to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of any and all matters within its jurisdiction as specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, including—

(1) The election of the President, Vice President, or Members of Congress;

(2) Corrupt practices;

(3) Contested elections;

(4) Credentials and qualifications;

(5) Federal elections generally; and

(6) Presidential succession.

The jurisdiction of the subcommittee is very broad and includes all measures which propose amendments or modifications to the Federal Corrupt Practices Act, 1925, as amended; the Hatch Act, 1939; and the Soldier's Vote Act. Also within the subcommittee's jurisdiction are the seating of newly elected U.S. Senators, the comprehensive problem of campaign financing, and all other matters relating to Federal candidates and Federal elections.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendments.

The amendments were agreed to.

The resolution (S. Res. 73), as amended, was agreed to.

AUTHORITY FOR SELECT COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS TO MAKE STUDY OF AMERICAN SMALL AND INDEPENDENT BUSINESS PROBLEMS

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 47.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A resolution (S. Res. 49) authorizing the Select Committee on Small Business to make a study of American small and independent business problems.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion by the Senator from Minnesota.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution (S. Res. 49) which had been reported from the Committee on Rules and Administration with amendments on page 1, line 11, after the word "from", to strike out "February" and insert "March", and on page 2, line 14, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$135,000" and insert "$116,090"; so as to make the resolution read:

Resolved, That the Select Committee on Small Business, in carrying out the duties imposed upon it by S. Res. 58, Eighty-first Congress, agreed to February 20, 1950, and S. Res. 272, Eighty-first Congress, agreed to May 26, 1950, is authorized to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of the problems of American small and independent business and to make recommendations concerning those problems to the appropriate legislative committees of the Senate.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution, the committee, from March 1, 1963, to January 31, 1964, inclusive, is authorized (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ, upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1964.

SEC. 4. Expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed $116,090, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 48), explaining the purposes of the resolution.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Senate Resolution 49 as amended would authorize the expenditure of $116,090 by the Select Committee on Small Business from March 1, 1963, through January 31, 1964, "to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of the problems of American small and independent business and to make recommendations concerning those problems to the appropriate legislative committees of the Senate."

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, as I understand the situation, there has been a cutback of nearly 10 percent on this item.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator is correct. I discussed this with the Senator earlier today, when the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] was present. There has been a reduction.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendments.

The amendments were agreed to.

The resolution (S. Res. 49), as amended, was agreed to.

EXTENSION OF DURATION OF SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON AGING THROUGH JANUARY 31, 1964

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 48.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A resolution (S. Res. 23) extending the Special Committee on Aging through January 31, 1964.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion by the Senator from Minnesota.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution (S. Res. 23) which had been reported from the Committee on Rules and Administration with amendments on page 2, line 17, after the word "from", to strike out "February" and insert "March"; on page 3, line 5, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$213,000" and insert "$200,400", and in the same line, after the word "from", to strike out "February" and insert "March"; so as to make the resolution read:

> *Resolved*, That the Special Committee on Aging established by S. Res. 33, Eighty-seventh Congress, agreed to on February 13, 1961, as amended and supplemented, is hereby extended through January 31, 1964.
>
> SEC. 2. It shall be the duty of such committee to make a full and complete study and investigation of any and all matters pertaining to problems of older people, including but not limited to, problems of maintaining health, of assuring adequate income, of finding employment, of engaging in productive and rewarding activity, of securing proper housing, and, when necessary, care or assistance. No proposed legislation shall be referred to such committee, and such committee shall not have power to report by bill or otherwise have legislative jurisdiction.
>
> SEC. 3. The said committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to sit and act at such places and times during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Senate, to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, to take such testimony, to procure such printing and binding, and to make such expenditures as it deems advisable.
>
> SEC. 4. A majority of the members of the committee or any subcommittee thereof shall constitute a quorum for the transaction of business, except that a lesser number, to be fixed by the committee, shall constitute a quorum for the purpose of taking sworn testimony.
>
> SEC. 5. For purposes of this resolution, the committee is authorized to employ on a temporary basis from March 1, 1963, through January 31, 1964, such technical, clerical, or other assistants, experts, and consultants: *Provided*, That the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than $1,600 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee and with the prior consent of the executive department or agency concerned and the Committee on Rules and Administration, employ on a reimbursable basis such executive branch personnel, as it deems advisable.
>
> SEC. 6. The expenses of the committee, which shall not exceed $200,400 from March 1, 1963, through January 31, 1964 shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.
>
> SEC. 7. The committee shall report the results of its study and investigation, together with such recommendations as it may deem advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1964. The committee shall cease to exist at the close of business on January 31, 1964.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report—No. 49—explaining the purposes of the resolution.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

> The Special Committee on Aging was established by Senate Resolution 33, 87th Congress, agreed to February 13, 1961. It was authorized to continue and expand the scope of the work in which the Subcommittee on Problems of the Aged and Aging, Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, had been engaged during the previous 2 years. Senate Resolution 111, 87th Congress, agreed to March 22, 1961, increased the membership of the special committee from 9 to 21.
>
> Under Senate Resolution 33 the special committee was authorized to expend not to exceed $150,000 through January 31, 1962. Senate Resolution 204, agreed to September 15, 1961, authorized it to make additional expenditures not to exceed $35,000 through the same date. Senate Resolution 238 of the 87th Congress, agreed to February 7, 1962, continued the authority of the special committee until January 31, 1963, and provided an additional $185,000.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, the pending resolution provides for the extension of the life of the Special Committee on Aging through January 31, 1964, with a reasonable and economical budget of $200,400.

I am very pleased to note that the Rules and Administration Committee favorably reported the sum requested, and I sincerely trust that the Senate will also act promptly and favorably on this resolution.

The Special Committee on Aging, as we know, is comprised of 21 members; 14 Democrats and 7 Republicans, and is the second largest committee in the Senate.

The committee staff is composed of 11 members, of which 4 are in the category of professional staff members, and 5 in the category of secretaries and clerical help serving the majority, while one professional staff member and 1 clerk serve the minority. The resolution contained a request for an additional two members to be provided for the minority. The committee itself has no objection because of the wide scope of the work of the committee in dealing with the problems of elderly citizens.

The committee, though not a legislative one, serves a useful purpose as a forum in which the various problems of our elderly citizens can be heard and from which recommendations can be made to appropriate legislative committees.

Today in America, there are some 17½ million people 65 years of age and over. As each day passes, 1,000 are added to these ranks.

In the category of those 60 and over, there is the sum total of 25 million. If we move this age bracket down just a little lower to 56, there is a total of 38 million.

The problems of senior citizens are not related solely to those 65 and over. Difficulties begin occurring after an individual has attained the age of 40, and subsequently finds that he is without employment. Today such a person experiences considerable difficulty in obtaining gainful employment to provide income necessary to take care of his family.

Without doubt this committee has done, and is doing a most important job in alerting the country to the complexity of the problems of senior citizens, and in exploring ways in which they might be either resolved or ameliorated.

These problems are many, and are often interrelated. They include:

Problems of employment for those 40 and over.

Low incomes that characterize far too many of our elderly, particularly women who have outlived their husbands.

Lack of suitable housing or rentals for which the elderly can afford to pay.

Difficulties which confront those involuntarily forced to move by virtue of the construction of necessary public works projects.

Problems involving health and nursing home care.

The problem of assessing the extent of responsibility in this field insofar as the Federal, State, and local units of government are concerned.

High cost of living on fixed incomes.

Maximum utilization of skills and experience of elderly citizens in making their contribution to this great country, as well as making their lives in retirement years worth while.

Many Senators will recall that many hearings were held in the various parts of the country over the last 2 years. Some of these were held in Florida; others in Pennsylvania, California, Missouri, Idaho, Washington, and other places. A great deal of invaluable factual information was obtained, which can guide us in seeking sound, effective, and adequate solution to many of the more urgent problems of our senior citizens.

There is no question in my mind but that this committee is doing a job in the public interest. Its extension, with this modest budget, most certainly is warranted.

I sincerely trust that the Senate will not hesitate in continuing its activities for another year, and will favorably act on the pending resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendments.

The amendments were agreed to.

The resolution (S. Res. 23), as amended, was agreed to.

PARTICIPATION OF UNITED STATES IN WEST VIRGINIA CENTENNIAL CELEBRATION

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 49.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A joint resolution (S.J. Res. 4) to provide for the actual participation of the United States in the West Virginia Centennial Celebration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion by the Senator from Minnesota.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 4), which was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the joint resolution of June 11, 1960 (74 Stat. 204; Public Law 86–508) is hereby amended by adding the following sections immediately after section 3 thereof:

"Sec. 4. The Secretary of Commerce is further authorized to provide for actual participation of the United States in the celebration.

"Sec. 5. In connection with such participation, the Secretary of Commerce is authorized to: (a) incur such expenses as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this Act, including but not limited to expenditures involved in the selection, purchase, rental, construction, and other acquisition of exhibits and materials and equipment therefor and the actual display thereof, and including but not limited to related expenditures for costs of transportation, insurance, installation, safekeeping, maintenance, and operation, rental of space, and dismantling; all without regard to the provisions of Revised Statutes 3709 (41 U.S.C. 5); (b) accept any gifts, loans, or donations of money, property, or services for use in carrying out the provisions of this Act; (c) procure services as authorized by the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a), but at rates for individuals not to exceed $75 per diem; and (d) appoint, without regard to the civil service laws and the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, such persons as he deems to be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act.

"Sec. 6. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated not to exceed $100,000 to carry out the provisions of this Act."

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record an excerpt from the report (No. 50), explaining the purposes of the joint resolution.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

PURPOSE

The purpose of the proposed resolution is to provide for the actual participation of the United States in the West Virginia centennial celebration.

STATEMENT

In the 2d session of the 87th Congress, Senate Joint Resolution 213, an identical resolution, was reported by this committee to the Senate on September 25, 1962, and passed the Senate on September 26, 1962, and was referred to the House Judiciary Committee. However, due to the fact that it was late in the session, that committee was unable to take action on the resolution.

The act of June 11, 1960, by joint resolution, provided for participation by the United States in the West Virginia centennial celebration, to be held in 1963 at various locations in the State of West Virginia.

That enacting legislation also provided for the Secretary of Commerce to cooperate with the West Virginia Centennial Commission in the planning of the celebration, and was further authorized to conduct a study to determine the manner in which, and the extent to which, the United States shall be a participant in and exhibitor at the celebration.

This joint resolution would provide for the actual participation by the United States through the Secretary of Commerce in the celebration.

The Secretary of Commerce would be authorized to incur such expenses as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this resolution, including expenditures involved in the selection, purchase, rental, construction, and other acquisition of exhibits and materials and equipment, and the actual display thereof, to accept any gifts, loans, or donations of money, property, or services for use in carrying out the provisions of this act, and to appoint such persons as he may feel necessary to carry out the provisions of this act.

The resolution authorizes an appropriation not to exceed $100,000 to carry out the provisions of this act.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, my colleague from West Virginia [Mr. Byrd] and I, as well as the members of our delegation in the House of Representatives from West Virginia, are appreciative of the action just taken in this body on Senate Joint Resolution 4. The citizens of our State are carrying forward many and varied informative and interesting programs in this year during our centennial celebration. It is appropriate that the United States as a whole join West Virginia in this significant effort.

INVESTIGATION OF JUVENILE DELINQUENCY

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. Dodd] for being so patient. He has been with us all day, waiting for the resolution in which he is especially interested to be considered. I refer to Calendar No. 35, Senate Resolution 63.

Mr. DODD. I thank the distinguished acting majority leader.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I now move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 35.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The Legislative Clerk. A resolution (S. Res. 63) to investigate juvenile delinquency.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion by the Senator from Minnesota.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution (S. Res. 63), which had been reported from the Committee on Rules and Administration, with amendments, on page 2, line 7, after the word "from", to strike out "February" and insert "March", and on page 3, line 2, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$188,000" and insert "$173,300"; so as to make the resolution read:

Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdictions specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of any and all matters pertaining to juvenile delinquency in the United States, including (a) the extent and character of juvenile delinquency in the United States and its causes and contributing factors; (b) the adequacy of existing provisions of law, including chapters 402 and 403 of title 18 of the United States Code, in dealing with youthful offenders of Federal laws; (c) sentences imposed on, or other correctional action taken with respect to, youthful offenders by Federal courts; and (d) the extent to which juveniles are violating Federal laws relating to the sale or use of narcotics.

Sec. 2. For the purposes of this resolution, the committee, from March 1, 1963, to January 31, 1964, inclusive, is authorized (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ, upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided,* That the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than $1,600 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

Sec. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for legislation, as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1964.

Sec. 4. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed $173,300, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record an excerpt from the rereport—No. 36—explaining the purposes of the resolution.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Senate Resolution 63 as amended would authorize the expenditure of $173,300 by the Committee on the Judiciary, through its Subcommittee To Investigate Juvenile Delinquency, from March 1, 1963, through January 31, 1964, "to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of any and all matters pertaining to juvenile delinquency in the United States, including (a) the extent and character of juvenile delinquency in the United States and its causes and contributing factors; (b) the adequacy of existing provisions of law, including chapters 402 and 403 of title 18 of the United States Code, in dealing with youthful offenders of Federal laws; (c) sentences imposed on, or other correctional action taken with respect to, youthful offenders by Federal courts; and (d) the extent to which juveniles are violating Federal laws relating to the sale or use of narcotics."

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I want to say a few words concerning the resolution before us—to continue the Judiciary Committee's Subcommittee on Juvenile Delinquency.

I want to emphasize that, for several years now, juvenile delinquency, or youthful criminality, has been perhaps the No. 1 social problem facing this Nation.

In small towns, and large cities alike, in rural areas, and in huge metropolitan agglomerations, every day a number of young people begin a course that may lead to the court, to the training school, to the reformatory, or ultimately to the penitentiary for adult felons.

Between the years 1948 and 1956, the number of juvenile cases appearing in courts doubled in number, while the court age population grew by only some 19 percent. We saw in 1956 more than 500,000 youth cases brought before juvenile courts throughout the land. By

1957, this number had grown to over 600,000, and by 1958 to 700,000. Another increase raised the national court case load close to 800,000 cases in 1959, and substantially above this figure in 1960.

Only the last year for which figures are available, the year 1961, showed a slight 1 percent drop in nationwide delinquency cases coming before the juvenile judges. But this decline, encouraging as it may be, is too small to indicate a trend. The total number of young people who are today contaminated and infected with delinquency still runs into hundreds of thousands. These are significant numbers with a significant meaning. To understand what these figures mean, you must never forget that we are talking here about human beings.

These are children and teenagers who, in a few years of their young lives, have already acquired a past, but who often do not have a future.

To understand what these figures mean, we must recognize that each of them represents a human tragedy.

We must understand that each of them symbolizes the failure of a young man or woman, the failure of a parent or a family, the failure of a teacher, of a clergyman, and, ultimately, the failure of society itself.

These figures do not account for every young person who breaks the law. These figures do not even account for all juveniles arrested by the police.

The statistics we receive from one source or another are crude indications of the growth and spread of this disease we call juvenile delinquency.

The statistics only indicate the symptoms of the disease.

The germs, the causes, and the reasons why young children and teenagers commit crimes are not found in statistical reports.

These reasons are found, rather, in the homes where parents are immoral, selfish, or uninterested; in homes where parents are ill informed and ignorant altogether; in homes where parents are poverty stricken and unfortunate.

The reasons for delinquency are found in the schools that are overcrowded and lack teachers, in school programs that cannot engage the interests of children, in educational systems that have lost respect in the eyes of children because they are not respected by adults.

The reasons for delinquency are found in our economic institutions, in the factories, the department stores, the shops and service establishments which are the most efficient, the richest, the most prosperous in the world, but which are unable to provide employment to a million boys and girls who walk the streets looking for a job, desperately trying to find a legitimate place in life.

And, finally, the reasons for delinquency are found in the minds and the acts of men; men who for profit have built a trade in narcotics and other dangerous drugs and who have found young children easy victims; men who for profit are willing to corrupt young minds with pornographic publications; men who indiscriminately sell guns through the mail to children of all ages; men who, without regard for the young and weak, are dedicated to selfish goals through corruptive means at any price.

The Juvenile Delinquency Subcommittee is the only legislative body in either House of Congress that has as its basic interest the elimination of the juvenile delinquency problem in America.

The subcommittee has attempted through its reports to tell the American people of the dangers facing the younger generation. The subcommittee has acted upon legislative measures to protect youth from these corruptions, and it has searched for the basic causes, for the contributory conditions, and for control measures to stop the growth of delinquency.

I believe that the subcommittee has carried out the investigations and the studies that enable us to see where we stand today in relation to delinquency.

During the 87th Congress, the subcommittee acted upon 10 legislative proposals. Three of these have become law, and two others were passed by the Senate.

I have proposed to the chairman of the Judiciary Committee, the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], that this subcommittee be continued so that we can follow through with some of the legislation which we could not get out last year.

I have proposed also that there are several fields in which new study is indicated.

Delinquency will not be overcome by any one law or by any one program. Nor will it be eradicated by fighting the symptoms of the disease only. It has become evident that in fighting delinquency, we must fight the basic causes, the "behind the scene" factors, the hidden viruses.

Because lawbreaking by young men and women represents a growing hazard to the entire country, I have proposed that the Juvenile Delinquency Subcommittee be continued. I have proposed also that in its scope as a legislative body the subcommittee deal with the following areas during the year 1963:

First, legislative proposals to facilitate the treatment and curing of narcotic addicts. The subcommittee's investigations and hearings have shown that, besides the necessity to stop narcotics and other dangerous drugs from circulating through the country and from being brought into the country, it is imperative to cut down the demand for the drugs by rehabilitating those presently dependent on them. Significant changes are needed in the existing drug laws. The Federal Narcotics Control Act of 1956 will have to be modified, since it is felt that this law hampers rehabilitation by requiring long mandatory sentences for drug users and by forbidding release of such offenders on probation or parole.

Additional new legislation is also necessary to stop the illegal commerce in barbiturate and amphetamine drugs. Earlier in this session I introduced two bills to help control this new menace to young people. The subcommittee staff is presently studying questionnaire returns from over 250 police and other State, Federal, and local officials regarding the extent of their local problems and the proposed solutions.

Second, we will study the conditions prevailing in juvenile correctional institutions. It has been brought to the attention of the subcommittee that detention centers, training schools and reformatories for young offenders are greatly overcrowded. Some institutions house twice the optimum number of inmates. These conditions hamper rehabilitation. They are conducive to rioting even in institutions for girls. They incite attempts to escape and they endanger both the institutional personnel and the inmates. On several occasions correctional officers have been killed or permanently injured by escaping inmates.

These things must not be allowed to continue. At their best, institutions are questionable rehabilitative tools. But when they are crowded, when they are understaffed, and when they cannot supply specialized treatment, then such institutions become vicious traps for young boys and girls. They become cages where inestimable damage is done to the morale, to the sense of self-worth, and to the sense of human dignity of young people imprisoned in them. We must seek ways to relieve these pressures. And we must make youth institutions serve the purpose for which they were created—correction and rehabilitation.

Thirdly, I have proposed that the subcommittee look at the policies, procedures, and products of the motion picture industry. In our last year's study of television, the findings showed that network competition for ratings and audiences creates shows often permeated with themes of excessive sex and violence. Subcommittee investigators have discovered that motion pictures may also capitalize on such excesses as exemplified by certain programs shown in drive-in movies, specifically for young audiences.

Fourth, there is need to probe into certain interstate practices of placing minor children for adoption or for permanent free care. It has been brought to our attention that black market baby brokers induce expectant mothers to travel across State lines to, in effect, sell their babies to the highest bidder. Such transactions can have tragic consequences for the baby, for the mother, and often for the prospective parents as well. The subcommittee will consider legislation requiring Federal, State, or local governmental agencies to maintain closer control over adoption procedures.

The fifth area we plan to study relates to inadequate educational facilities, school dropouts, and youth unemployment.

Repeatedly, public officials connected with courts, with schools, and with other youth-serving agencies have claimed that the inability to maintain young people in schools and the unemployment they face after leaving school make them highly susceptible to crime and delinquency.

As chairman of this subcommittee, I was happy to cosponsor with the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] the Youth Employment Act. However, we feel that additional legislation is necessary to relieve the pressures on youth created by inadequate educational programs and facilities on the one hand and by unemployment and idleness on the other hand.

Another problem of concern to us has been the continuous traffic in obscene, pornographic material. The Juvenile Delinquency Subcommittee was instrumental in enacting Public Law 85-796, designed to close loopholes in the pornography laws and to facilitate prosecution of transgressors of these laws. Today we find that new loopholes have been created, that new kinds of publications have appeared designed to evade the laws. Such magazines as Eros and Liaison are offered through the mail to even 12-year-old children. I think it is proper that we devise means to protect children from such attempted corruption and exploitation.

Already in this session the subcommitte has begun to conduct hearings regarding a similar problem, the illegal and irresponsible sale and distribution of handguns to mental defectives, criminals, and juveniles.

Finally, the subcommittee plans to take a closer look at crime and delinquency in our Nation's Capital. All the problems I have discussed are found here in one degree or another. By solving some of them through legislation or other measures, we will have found ways to deal with these problems in other parts of the country as well. Congress is directly responsible for this city and Congress is responsible to the entire country for the conditions which prevail here.

Generally, the subcommittee will follow new findings relative to delinquency control produced in the universities and colleges throughout the Nation. It will follow the progress made by governmental and private programs set up under the new law, 87-274, which gives $30 million annually to States and nonprofit organizations for carrying out delinquency control projects and for testing new methods. The next few years may decide whether the increased efforts on all levels of society are effective in solving youth crime or whether entirely new trails must be blazed to finally conquer this affliction of American youth.

Mr. President, I ask that the resolution to continue the Juvenile Delinquency Subcommittee be considered favorably and that it obtain speedy passage.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, this subcommittee, as I have pointed out on many occasions, was created 10 or 12 years ago. The Senator who proposed the creation of the subcommittee indicated that the first amount provided, which aggregated $75,000 would be sufficient to complete the hearings in regard to juvenile delinquency.

This subcommittee, like almost all others, has been renewed from year to year. Instead of a cost of $75,000, which the original proposer of the resolution stated would be the amount required to hold the hearings, we have now spent well over $1 million, and still are going strong.

It seems that the more hearings held, the more the Senate goes into the problem, the worse the problem seems to become.

I cannot see any good which arises from this. To me it is money absolutely wasted.

The place to fight juvenile delinquency is not in the committee room or in the hearing room. It is in the church and in the home. It is in the woodshed.

Hearings and committees will not solve the problem. The money we have provided for the juvenile delinquency subcommittee has not solved the problem, or begun to solve it. The money we are making available today will not solve it. If anything, the publicity resulting from its hearings and investigations may make the problem worse.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I shall be very brief and shall add only a word. As a member of this subcommittee I cannot sit silent without commending the chairman of the subcommittee for the very diligent work he has done in this field.

I point out that there are few more serious domestic problems in this country than the terrible problem of juvenile delinquency in our large metropolitan areas.

The chairman has set forth an agenda of hearings and subjects to be investigated. It is imperative, if we are to give the kind of attention to this subject which it deserves, that we appropriate the funds the subcommittee needs for its work.

I sincerely hope that this relatively modest request by the chairman of the subcommittee will be confirmed and approved by this body.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The question is on agreeing to the committee amendments.

The amendments were agreed to.

The resolution (S. Res. 63), as amended, was agreed to.

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD, at the conclusion of these proceedings on the so-called money resolutions, a tabulation showing action thereon by the Committee on Rules and Administration and other pertinent data.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Action by the Committee on Rules and Administration on Senate resolutions authorizing inquiries and investigations during the 88th Congress, 1st session

Unless indicated by *italic type* (and explained by footnote), all reductions in requested amounts represent 1/12 [1] of that portion of the annual budget for salaries and employee benefits [2] to compensate for amounts authorized for February 1963 by S. Res. 88, 88th Cong., agreed to Feb. 19, 1963

Resolution No.	Committee and purpose	Amount requested		Amount authorized last session	Difference	Action by Senate Rules Committee			Resolution No.
		12-month basis	11-month basis			Reduction of—	Increase of—	Amount approved	
S. Res. 74	Aeronautical and Space Sciences		$82,500	$90,000	−$7,500			$82,500	S. Res. 74
	Armed Services:								
S. Res. 75	Preparedness		175,000	220,000	−45,000			175,000	S. Res. 75
S. Res. 79	Stockpiling		6,500	115,000	−108,500		[3] *$3,500*	10,000	S. Res. 79
	Banking and Currency:								
S. Res. 14	General		83,700	[4a] 80,000	+3,700			83,700	S. Res. 14
S. Res. 15	Housing		106,000	107,000	−1,000			106,000	S. Res. 15
S. Res. 29	Commerce		330,000	315,000	+15,000			330,000	S. Res. 29
	Foreign Relations:								
S. Res. 26	Nondiplomatic representatives of foreign principals	$50,000		50,000		$1,400		48,600	S. Res. 26
S. Res. 25	U.S. foreign policy	150,000		160,000	−10,000	7,000		143,000	S. Res. 25
	Government Operations:								
S. Res. 17	General	490,000		[4b] 500,000	−10,000	31,700		458,300	S. Res. 17
S. Res. 27	Interagency coordination, etc	95,000		[4c] 90,000	+5,000	7,000		88,000	S. Res. 27
S. Res. 45	Intergovernmental relations	115,000		40,000	+75,000	[6] *17,710*		97,290	S. Res. 45
S. Res. 13	National security problems	110,000		70,000	+40,000	[6] *17,750*		92,250	S. Res. 13
S. Res. 16	Interior and Insular Affairs	100,000		100,000				100,000	S. Res. 16
	Judiciary:								
S. Res. 55	Administrative practice and procedure	120,000		115,000	+5,000	9,400		110,600	S. Res. 55
S. Res. 56	Antitrust and monopoly	535,000		[4d] 450,000	+85,000	[7] *91,750*		443,250	S. Res. 56
S. Res. 57	Constitutional amendments	51,500		[4e] 48,500	+3,000		[5] *$2,923*	54,423	S. Res. 57
S. Res. 58	Constitutional rights	165,000		[4f] 140,000	+25,000	12,700		152,300	S. Res. 58
S. Res. 59	Federal charters, etc	7,500		7,500		500		7,000	S. Res. 59
S. Res. 61	Federal judicial system	100,000		90,000	+10,000	7,800		92,200	S. Res. 60
S. Res. 60	Immigration and naturalization	135,000		[4g] 125,000	+10,000	10,800		124,200	S. Res. 61

See footnotes at end of table.

Action by the Committee on Rules and Administration on Senate resolutions authorizing inquiries and investigations during the 88th Congress, 1st session—Continued

Unless indicated by *italic type* (and explained by footnote), all reductions in requested amounts represent 1/12 [1] of that portion of the annual budget for salaries and employee benefits [2] to compensate for amounts authorized for February 1963 by S. Res. 88, 88th Cong., agreed to Feb. 19, 1963

Resolution No.	Committee and purpose	Amount requested		Amount authorized last session	Difference	Action by Senate Rules Committee			Resolution No.
		12-month basis	11-month basis			Reduction of—	Increase of—	Amount approved	
	Judiciary—Continued								
S. Res. 62	Internal security	$360,000		[4h] $325,000	+$35,000	[9] *$49,120*		$310,880	S. Res. 62
S. Res. 63	Juvenile delinquency	188,000		[4i] 198,000	−10,000	14,700		173,300	S. Res. 63
S. Res. 64	National penitentiaries	5,000		5,000				5,000	S. Res. 64
S. Res. 65	Patents, trademarks, copyrights	125,000		120,000	+5,000	9,200		115,800	S. Res. 65
S. Res. 66	Refugees and escapees	87,500		87,500		6,500		81,000	S. Res. 66
S. Res. 67	Revision and codification	30,000		26,000	+4,000	2,300		27,700	S. Res. 67
S. Res. 68	Trading With the Enemy Act	60,000		45,000	+15,000	4,600		55,400	S. Res. 68
	Labor and Public Welfare:								
S. Res. 95	Additional staff members		(10)						S. Res. 95
S. Res. 22	Migratory labor		$68,750	[4j] 70,000	−1,250			68,750	S. Res. 22
	Post Office and Civil Service:								
S. Res. 20	Additional clerical assistant	(11)							S. Res. 20
S. Res. 18	General	75,000		[4k] 75,000		5,500		69,500	S. Res. 18
S. Res. 12	Public Works	125,000		125,000		6,900		118,100	S. Res. 12
S. Res. 73	Rules and Administration (Privileges and Elections)	65,000		150,000	−85,000	5,200		59,800	S. Res. 73
S. Res. 49	Small Business (select)	135,000		125,000	+10,000	[12] *18,910*		116,090	S. Res. 49
S. Res. 23	Aging (special)	213,000		185,000	+28,000	12,600		200,400	S. Res. 23
	Total (as of Mar. 13, 1963)	4,544,950		4,419,500	+95,450	351,040	$6,423	4,200,333	

[1] To nearest multiple of $100 (downward).

[2] Includes agency contributions to employee retirement, health benefits, and group life insurance.

[3] Increased $3,500 at request of chairman and ranking minority member of subcommittee to provide compensation for minority counsel.

[4] Increase through Feb. 28, 1963, by S. Res. 88; [a] $2,500; [b] $15,000; [c] $5,500; [d] $23,000; [e] $2,000; [f] $2,000; [g] $10,000; [h] $20,000; [i] $15,000; [j] $6,200; [k] $2,000. Total, $103,200.

[5] Initial request of $115,000 for 12 months reduced by $11,500 (10 percent) to $103,500 for 12 months. Latter amount adjusted to 11-month basis by further reduction of $6,210 (1/12 of salaries and employee benefits of *reduced* gross), leaving $97,290 approved by committee.

[6] Initial request of $110,000 for 12 months reduced by $11,000 (10 percent) to $99,000 for 12 months. Latter amount adjusted to 11-month basis by further reduction of $6,750 (1/12 of salaries and employees benefits of *reduced* gross), leaving $92,250 approved by committee.

[7] Initial request of $535,000 for 12 months reduced by $53,500 (10 percent) to $481,500 for 12 months. Latter amount adjusted to 11-month basis by further reduction of $38,250 (1/12 of salaries and employee benefits of *reduced* gross), leaving $443,250 approved by committee.

[8] Initial request of $51,500 reduced by $3,700 to $47,800 for 11 months by regular formula. At request of ranking minority member of subcommittee $6,623 ($7,225) less 1/12 was added to provide for a minority clerk.

[9] Initial request of $360,000 for 12 months reduced by $25,000 to $335,000 for 12 months. Latter amount adjusted to 11-month basis by further reduction of $24,120 (1/12 of salaries and employee benefits of *reduced* gross), leaving $310,880 approved by committee.

[10] S. Res. 95 would authorize the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare from Mar. 1, 1963, through Jan. 31, 1964, to employ 1 additional assistant chief clerk, 7 additional professional staff members, and 9 additional clerical assistants to be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate at rates of compensation to be fixed by the chairman.

[11] S. Res. 20 would authorize the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service from Mar. 1, 1963, through Jan. 31, 1964, to employ 1 additional clerical assistant to be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate at a rate of compensation to be fixed by the chairman.

[12] Initial request of $135,000 for 12 months reduced by $10,000 to $125,000 for 12 months. Latter amount adjusted to 11-month basis by further reduction of $8,910 (1/12 of salaries and employee benefits of *reduced* gross), leaving $116,090 approved by committee.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I rise to inquire of the distinguished acting majority leader what information he can give us as to the expected program tomorrow.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the acting minority leader.

It is expected that the Senate will complete action on bills on the calendar tomorrow. The remaining bills are private bills, all cleared by the minority and majority. There are no such bills on the calendar to which there is objection.

Then the Senate will take up the draft bill.

Mr. CURTIS. The act for the extension of selective service?

Mr. HUMPHREY. The extension of selective service; yes. I am hopeful that bill may be passed without a yea-and-nay vote, because many of our colleagues are absent. I do not believe it involves any controversy. It is quite important that the bill be acted upon.

Then there are some speeches which several of our colleagues have said they wished to make.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. KEATING. Could those of us who will be necessarily absent tomorrow have an assurance that if a yea-and-nay vote should be ordered it would go over until Monday or Tuesday?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I should say so. If there is to be a yea-and-nay vote on it, we should permit every Member of the Senate to be back. After tomorrow, it is our intention to adjourn over until Tuesday, so that the Senator may have that assurance also. I am hopeful the measure can be passed without rollcall, because there is no controversy over it.

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. There are a number of printing resolutions. I wonder if they could be taken up tonight. It is very important to have them acted on early.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I would like to have them taken up. The Senator from Iowa [Mr. MILLER] has been waiting patiently. He must leave tonight. The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH] also has been waiting.

SENATE RESOLUTIONS AND SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION REPORTED EARLIER TODAY

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, earlier today Senate Resolutions 72, 99, 105, 106, and Senate Concurrent Resolution 14 were reported favorably, without amendment, from the Committee on Rules and Administration.

PRINTING AS A SENATE DOCUMENT A COMPILATION OF MATERIALS ENTITLED "SUMMER EMPLOYMENT BY COLLEGE STUDENTS IN THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT—1961"

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Senate Resolution 105.

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 105) was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That there shall be printed as a Senate document a compilation of materials entitled "Summer Employment by College Students in the Federal Government—1961", prepared by the Legislative Reference Service, Library of Congress; and there shall be printed six thousand two hundred additional copies of such Senate document for the use of the Members of the Senate.

PRINTING AS A SENATE DOCUMENT A COMPILATION OF MATERIALS RELATING TO THE HISTORY OF THE SENATE COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Senate Resolution 99.

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 99) was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That there be printed, with illustrations, as a Senate document a compilation of materials relating to the history of the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency, in connection with its fiftieth anniversary (1913–1963); and that there be printed for the use of that committee one thousand additional copies of such document.

PRINTING AS A SENATE DOCUMENT THE "SIXTH ANNUAL REPORT ON THE STATUS OF THE COLORADO RIVER STORAGE PROJECT AND PARTICIPATING PROJECTS," ETC.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Senate Resolution 72.

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 72) was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That there shall be printed as a Senate document the "Sixth Annual Report on the Status of the Colorado River Storage Project and Participating Projects," and "General Principles to Govern, and Operating Criteria for, Glen Canyon Reservoir (Lake Powell) and Lake Mead During the Lake Powell Filling Period", prepared by the Department of the Interior, with an introductory statement.

PRINTING AS A SENATE DOCUMENT PAMPHLET ENTITLED "OUR CAPITOL"

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Senate Concurrent Resolution 14.

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 14) was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there be printed as a Senate document, with illustrations, the pamphlet entitled "Our Capitol"; and that three hundred and twenty-three thousand five hundred additional copies shall be printed, of which one hundred and three thousand copies shall be for the use of the Senate and two hundred and twenty thousand five hundred copies for the use of the House of Representatives.

ADDITIONAL PRINTING AS A SENATE DOCUMENT OF SENATE DOCUMENT NO. 117, "THE COMMUNIST PARTY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, WHAT IT IS, HOW IT WORKS—A HANDBOOK FOR AMERICANS"

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Senate Resolution 106.

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 106) was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That there be printed seven thousand additional copies of Senate Document Numbered 117, of the Eighty-fourth Congress, second session, entitled "The Communist Party of the United States of America, What It Is, How It Works—A Handbook for Americans", compiled by the Subcommittee To Investigate the Administration of the Internal Security Act and Other Internal Security Laws for the use of the Committee on the Judiciary, United States Senate.

COMMENDATION OF SENATOR JORDAN, OF NORTH CAROLINA, AND STAFF OF COMMITTEE ON RULES AND ADMINISTRATION

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, before the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. JORDAN] leaves the Chamber, I wish personally to express the gratitude of both the majority and the minority for the wonderful attention which he has given today to the resolutions which have been considered, as the chairman of the Committee on Rules and Administration. I know of the many hours of hearings that were held on these resolutions and the great amount of detail that was presented. We are all indebted to the distinguished Senator from North Carolina.

He has been diligent and on guard, so to speak, in answering any and all questions. I personally appreciate it and I thank him on behalf of the entire Senate.

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. I am exceedingly grateful to the Senator from Minnesota. I appreciate his kind words. As the Senator well knows, the committee held hearings on every one of these resolutions, and we brought forth as good answers as I think could be produced. It has been a pleasure to work with the Senator in getting the resolutions agreed to.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, in addition, I wish to commend the staff, particularly Gordon F. Harrison, staff director; Hugh Q. Alexander, chief counsel, and John P. Coder, editorial and printing assistant.

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. The staff has rendered excellent service in working with us and getting the resolutions drafted.

Mr. HUMPHREY. We are grateful to the staff.

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. We are indeed grateful to the staff.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield now to the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MILLER].

TAX PROPOSALS AND THE ECONOMY

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, the President has been warning that, if his tax program is not adopted, we might have a recession. There are many of us who feel that his tax program, calling for a net tax cut of $2.7 billion for fiscal 1964, will have very little effect in heading off a recession, much less getting the economy moving again. It is likely that the $2.7 billion additional purchasing power which his tax cut is intended to produce will be offset by an increase in State and local taxes being voted throughout the United States this year. In addition, there are many who believe that the $12 billion deficit which he has proposed will produce inflation which will shrink the purchasing power of our money by $2.7 billion or more, thus leaving us on a treadmill.

However, quite apart from the subject of taxes, I believe the President should be warned that we will indeed have a recession if our basic industry of agriculture does not improve its position. There cannot be a healthy industrial economy unless there is a healthy agriculture. And the fact is, Mr. President, that contrary to glowing reports of the Secretary of Agriculture, there has been no real improvement in agriculture. Farm prices declined 1 percent during the month ended February 15. The farm price level remained at 78 percent of parity, compared with 80 percent a year ago. There has been a serious decline in livestock prices. Hog prices at the end of February were at a 3-year low. Prices of fat cattle are below any period since August of 1961, and the February prices were the lowest of any February level in 6 years.

It will not do for the Department of Agriculture to explain that the reason for the severe break in cattle prices is that there is a larger cattle population this year. We have a larger human population to feed, too. Moreover, the feed grain price-depressing activities of the Commodity Credit Corporation—selling off abnormally large amounts of stored grain—naturally depress livestock prices. Such activities should stop.

The severe east coast maritime strike and the prolonged newspaper strike in New York City have had a highly detrimental impact on the demand for choice beef from the Midwest. And we view with apprehension the discussions now being conducted in the Common Market over tariff policy with respect to export shipments of beef, pork, rice, and soybean oil from the United States. Recent discriminatory action by the Common Market against our poultry exports will destroy a $50 million annual poultry export business unless this administration takes prompt retaliatory action against Common Market imports into this country and forces the Common Market to remove its discriminatory duties. Failure of the administration to act will be an open invitation to the Common Market to take similar action against beef and other agricultural exports from this country.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be inserted in the RECORD at this point in my remarks an article entitled "Farm Price Index Off 1 Percent" appearing in the March 1 issue of the Des Moines Register; and two articles appearing in the Stockman's Journal for Saturday, March 2, 1963, one entitled "Hog Prices End February at 3-Year Low," and the other entitled "Fed Cattle Sell at Lowest February Level in 6 Years."

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Des Moines Register, Mar. 1, 1963]

FARM PRICE INDEX OFF 1 PERCENT

WASHINGTON, D.C.—Farm product prices declined 1 percent during the month ended February 15.

Reporting this Thursday, the Agriculture Department said lower prices for cattle and hogs were primarily responsible. Partially offsetting this were increases for oranges, chickens, eggs, and corn.

BELOW 1962

The mid-February price level was about 0.25 percent below a year earlier.

Prices paid by farmers in mid-February for goods and services used in production and in family living did not change from a month earlier, holding at a record level set in mid-January.

The farm price level remained at 78 percent of the parity price goal of farm programs.[1] This compared with 80 percent of parity a year ago and the record high of 123 percent set in October 1946.

The Department said meat animals, other than sheep, declined 5 percent between mid-January and mid-February. Poultry and egg prices advanced 3 percent, fruit 5 percent, and feed grains 3 percent. Dairy products declined 1 percent during the month.

The general level of prices received by farmers in mid-February was at 242 percent of the 1910–14 base average, compared with 244 percent in mid-January, 243 percent in mid-February last year, and the record high of 313 percent set in February 1951.

COST INDEX

The level of prices paid by farmers in mid-February was at 311 percent of the 1910–14 average, the same as a month earlier. A year ago these prices were at 305 percent of the base average.

Average prices received by farmers for important products in mid-February compared with mid-January and the mid-February parity prices, respectively, included:

	Mid-February	Mid-January	Parity
Wheat, bushel	$2.04	$2.01	$2.49
Rye, bushel	.978	.909	1.42
Rice, rough, 100 pounds	5.18	5.27	6.44
Corn, bushel	1.06	1.03	1.59
Oats, bushel	.654	.645	.849
Barley, bushel	.91	.896	1.25
Sorghum grain, 100 pounds	1.70	1.68	2.49
Hay, baled, ton	29.69	22.30	26.60
Cotton, upland, pound	.2969	.3007	.4031
Cottonseed, ton	48.50	48.20	62.50
Soybeans, bushel	2.50	2.41	3.01
Peanuts, pound	.112	.112	.14
Flaxseed, bushel	2.79	2.75	3.89
Potatoes, 100 pounds	1.61	1.54	2.29
Apples, bushel	2.58	2.51	3.07
Grapefruit, box	.71	1.04	1.15
Oranges, box	2.21	1.72	2.86
Hogs, 100 pounds	14.80	15.40	22.40
Beef cattle, 100 pounds	20.40	21.60	24.00
Calves, 100 pounds	23.00	25.60	27.00
Sheep, 100 pounds	6.43	6.43	7.87
Lambs, 100 pounds	17.60	18.20	24.50
Butterfat, pound	.587	.589	.774
Milk, wholesale, 100 pounds	4.15	4.20	5.35
Chickens, live, pound	.153	.141	.238
Turkeys, live, pound	.222	.221	.336
Eggs, dozen	.373	.365	.482
Wool, pound	.47	.454	.778

Hog Prices End February at 3-Year Low—Butchers Off 75 Cents to $1, Top Dips to $15.25 Late in Month; Sows 50 to 75 Cents Lower

Despite decreased supplies from January and a fairly orderly marketing pattern during February, a bearish price trend dominated much of last month's trade on hogs at Omaha and losses amounted to 75 cents to $1 on butchers while sow prices wound up 50 to 75 cents under January's closing figures. The break dropped late prices to the lowest level here in 3 years.

Reports from around the wholesale dressed meat circuit indicated that pork loin prices finished a month of up-and-down trading at $1.50 lower levels on a sharp late break while other cuts were mostly $1 off for the period.

Receipts of hogs at Omaha during February totaled 256,372 as against 314,871 for January and fell considerably short of every month since September. In February of last year 240,664 head arrived.

Supplies last month included a wide range of weight and overall quality was usually pretty good. During the latter half of the period heavy butcher arrivals dwindled slightly while light and medium weights were offered more freely.

Sows made up about 9 percent of February's run. That figure was right in line with the preceding month's sow percent and was otherwise the shortest for any month since last March.

WEIGHTS AVERAGE LIGHTER

The average weight of all hogs marketed at Omaha during February was around 255 pounds. This figure was 5 to 8 pounds under the all-hog average weights for the preceding 3 months but was more or less in line with average hog weights here for the past few years.

Early in February prices on most 200–300-pound butchers ranged from $14.25 to $16.50. On the first market day of the month a couple hundred strictly choice around 225-pounders reached $16.75 to set the months' peak. Before mid-February most butchers that scaled around 250 pounds cleared at $15.50 to $16.

During the last half of the period 200–300-pound butchers found outlet largely at $13.75 to $15.75 levels, While the top occasionally reached $16 the best light butchers turned at $15.25 to $15.35 on the final rounds. The inside price was the lowest daily top here since March 1, 1960. Popular late-month prices on butchers that averaged around 250 pounds were $14.50 to $15.

Most sows offered at Omaha in February ranged in weight from 300 to 600 pounds and they cashed from $12.50 to $14.75. However, no sows were quoted above $14 toward the close.

Fed Cattle Sell at Lowest February Level in 6 Years—Prices Are Below Any Period Since August of 1961 on Break of Mainly $1 to $1.50, Some Big Steers Off $2; Most Cows Steady; Feeders Dip

The break in prices which settled on the fed cattle trade late in 1962 and prevailed all through January continued last month to drop prices to the lowest February level since 1957.

A continuing lower trade on dressed beef carcasses at wholesale outlets was a major factor in keeping prices on the decline. The month's setback of $1 to $1.50 on most steers and heifers with some weightier steers off as much as $2 left closing prices at the lowest level for any period since August of 1961.

A late rally erased an earlier decline on cows and they finished February on a mostly steady basis although some better beef offerings were as much as 50 cents over the close of January.

The declining cornfed market had a bearish effect on stocker and feeder trading but even so, the market held up fairly well on desirable quality lighterweight replacement stock but most fleshier offerings shared in the setback on grainfeds.

RECEIPTS MODERATE

The break on cornfeds continued even though receipts were moderate but they were frequently rather poorly distributed during a week's period. Arrivals last month, at 142,513, were the smallest in 4 years and the second lightest in 10 years for comparable periods. The run for the same month a year ago totaled 147,787 head.

Good to Choice offerings usually made up the big end of the grainfed supply. Average weights on steers ran above the comparable time a year ago and offerings averaging upwards from 1,150 pounds were generally the hardest to move with weight in late trading often having more of an influence on final prices than quality.

While the volume of fed steers and yearlings selling at $24 and above in late trading was rather small, early in the period a fair showing ranged upward to the month's peak of $26. It took a pretty good load of fat heifers to beat $23.50 on closing rounds but earlier in the month a modest showing reached $25 and above with a part load of 963-pounders and a load of 1,070-pounders at the $26 mark.

At midmonth it was hard to pass $15 on beef cows and most low grades sold down from $12.50 to $13. At the close, Choice beef cows sold to $16 with odd head to $16.50 and cutters cashed up to $14.

STEER CALVES $34

Trade on stockers and feeders was often on a catch-as-catch-can basis. Most Good to Choice yearling stockers and lightweight feeder steers moved at $24 to $27.50 with a load of Choice 537-pounders at $28.50. Good to Choice fleshy feeders scaling around 800 pounds and up moved mainly at $22.50 to $24 but a load of Choice 1,000-pound grainfeds moved the feeder route at $24.65.

Choice yearling stock heifers brought $25 to $26.25 with the latter price on 543-pounders and other sales ranging down from $23 to $23.25.

Good to Choice stock steer calves brought $28 to $33 with a part load of Choice 391-pounders at $34, highest since January. It was also the highest on steer calves since 1959 for February.

Good to Choice stock heifers went out mainly at $26 to $29 and a shipment of Choice 143-pounders brought $30 which was also the highest since early January and was a 4-year February high.

Odd bunches of Medium to Good stock cows brought $13 to $15.25 and early in the period a shipment of young cows on the heiferette order moved at $19.

SHOULD THE GOVERNMENT LIE?

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, in the Congressional Record, volume 109, part 1, pages 899 through 903, appear excerpts from remarks by Mr. Arthur Sylvester, Assistant Secretary of Defense for Public Affairs, delivered at the Sigma Delta Chi dinner in New York City on December 6, 1962, as taped by the American Broadcasting Co. and transcribed by the American Newspaper Publishers Association. These were inserted in the Record by unanimous consent of the Senate at the request of the senior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. Cotton].

Mr. Sylvester is quoted as saying:

> It's inherent in [a] government's right, if necessary, to lie to save itself when it's going up into a nuclear war. This seems to me basic—basic.

Here we have a statement by one of the administration's top spokesmen that really means this: If Mr. Sylvester or someone else in authority in the administration reaches a conclusion, in his own mind, that such action is "necessary," then he, as a representative of the Government, should lie.

Needless to say, this is a very dangerous statement of policy, and it has, no doubt, contributed greatly to the concern of the American people over whether or not the spokesmen for this administration in general, and Mr. Sylvester in particular, are giving out the facts on Cuba and other problems of vital concern to our Nation.

What prompts me to refer to these remarks by Mr. Sylvester is the testi-

mony by Mr. Sylvester Tuesday before the Government Operations Committee of the Senate. In response to a question from the senior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. Mundt], Mr. Sylvester said:

> The Government does not have a right to lie to the people, but it does have a right in facing an enemy, if information is not accurate and is intended to mislead the enemy. I think that any people will support their government in not putting out information that is going to help the enemy. And, if necessary, misleading them.

Apparently last December 6, Mr. Sylvester believed that a government has an inherent right to lie. Tuesday he said it only has a right to put out misleading information, but not to lie. Now all of us wonder how Mr. Sylvester draws a line between lying and being misleading. And we are concerned over having someone like Mr. Sylvester make a judgment over the circumstances under which lying or being misleading is to be undertaken. Apparently, from his remarks last December, he was of opinion that the confrontation in Cuba last fall constituted "going up into a nuclear war." This is some more of that "eyeball to eyeball" talk which unnecessarily and unjustifiably frightened the American people. Let me say, Mr. President, that I believe spokesmen for this administration have done a grave disservice to the American people in unduly frightening them over the Cuban confrontation. We were prepared, all right. But we were not anywhere near close to a nuclear war. And the reason we were not is because Mr. Khrushchev was not anywhere near to committing suicide.

The Cuban confrontation was simply another example of how, if we stand firm against Communist aggression and make it clear that further aggression will not be to the advantage of the Communists because of our power and our resolve, there will be no war—least of all a nuclear war.

The statements Mr. Sylvester has been making reveal an attitude of extreme pragmatism—following the philosophy that the end justifies the means. This is the philosophy expounded by Premier Khrushchev. It is not the philosophy which characterizes the American way of life. I think that the sooner the President finds another Assistant Secretary of Defense to replace Mr. Sylvester, the better it will be for all of us, including the administration.

DEATH OF REPRESENTATIVE CLYDE DOYLE, OF CALIFORNIA

The Chair laid before the Senate a resolution from the House of Representatives, which was read as follows:

> *Resolved,* That the House has heard with profound sorrow of the death of the Honorable Clyde Doyle, a Representative from the State of California.
>
> *Resolved,* That a committee of twenty-eight Members of the House, with such Members of the Senate as may be joined, be appointed to attend the funeral.
>
> *Resolved,* That the Sergeant at Arms of the House be authorized and directed to take such steps as may be necessary for carrying out the provisions of these resolutions and that the necessary expenses in connection therewith be paid out of the contingent fund of the House.
>
> *Resolved,* That the Clerk communicate these resolutions to the Senate and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.
>
> *Resolved,* That as a further mark of respect the House do now adjourn.
>
> Attest:
>
> Ralph R. Roberts,
> *Clerk.*

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and my colleague [Mr. Kuchel] I send a resolution to the desk and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be read.

The resolution (S. Res. 112) was read, considered by unanimous consent, and unanimously agreed to, as follows:

> *Resolved,* That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow the announcement of the death of Hon. Clyde Doyle, late a Representative from the State of California.
>
> *Resolved,* That a committee of two Senators be appointed by the Presiding Officer to join the committee appointed on the part of the House of Representatives to attend the funeral of the deceased Representative.
>
> *Resolved,* That the Secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit an enrolled copy thereof to the family of the deceased.
>
> *Resolved,* That as a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased, the Senate, at the conclusion of its business today, adjourn until 11 a.m. tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Pursuant to the second resolving clause of the resolution, the Chair appoints the two Senators from California [Mr. Kuchel and Mr. Engle] as the committee on the part of the Senate to attend the funeral of the late Representative Doyle.

THE CALENDAR

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of measures on the calendar to which there is no objection, in order, beginning with Calendar No. 50.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

HOM WAH YOOK

The bill (S. 92) for the relief of Hom Wah Yook (also known as Hom Bok Heung), was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

> *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Hom Wah Yook (also known as Hom Bok Heung) shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this Act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this Act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

PURIFICACION SIAT

The bill (S. 97) for the relief of Purificacion Siat was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

> *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Purificacion Siat shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this Act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this Act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

YOUNG WAI

The bill (S. 208) for the relief of Young Wai, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

> *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Young Wai shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this Act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this Act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

HAROLD AND SYLVIA FREDA KARRO AND CHILDREN

The bill (S. 234) for the relief of Harold and Sylvia Freda Karro and their three children, Allan Karro, Jennifer Karro, and Michelle Karro, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

> *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Harold and Sylvia Freda Karro and their three minor children, Allan Karro, Jennifer Karro, and Michelle Karro, shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this Act, upon payment of the required visa fees. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such aliens as provided for in this Act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct the required numbers from the appropriate quota or quotas for the first year that such quota or quotas are available.

STANISLAW BIALOGLOWSKI

The bill (S. 436) for the relief of Stanislaw Bialoglowski, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

> *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of*

America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Stanislaw Bialoglowski shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this Act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this Act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

PANAGIOTA MAKRIS

The bill (S. 506) for the relief of Panagiota Makris, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, in the administration of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Panagiota Makris may be classified as an eligible orphan within the meaning of section 101(b)(1)(F) of the said Act and a petition may be filed by Mrs. Yianoula Makris, a citizen of the United States, in behalf of the said Panagiota Makris pursuant to section 205(b) of the Immigration and Nationality Act subject to all the conditions in that section relating to eligible orphans.

ANTONIO GUTIERREZ FERNANDEZ

The bill (S. 574) for the relief of Antonio Gutierrez Fernandez, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Antonio Gutierrez Fernandez shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this Act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this Act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

ROSWITHA SEIB

The bill (S. 596) for the relief of Roswitha Seib, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, notwithstanding the provision of section 212 (a)(1) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Roswitha Seib may be issued a visa and be admitted to the United States for permanent residence if otherwise admissible under the provisions of that Act: *Provided,* That unless the said Roswitha Seib is eligible for medical care under the Dependents' Medical Care Act (70 Stat. 250), a suitable and proper bond or undertaking, approved by the Attorney General, be deposited as prescribed by section 213 of the Immigration and Nationality Act: *Provided further,* That the exemption granted herein shall apply only to a ground for exclusion of which the Department of State or the Department of Justice had knowledge prior to the enactment of this Act.

RONALD WHITING

The bill (S. 688) for the relief of Ronald Whiting, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, notwithstanding the provisions of section 212 (a)(1) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Ronald Whiting may be issued a visa and be admitted to the United States for permanent residence if he is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of that Act: *Provided,* That a suitable and proper bond or undertaking, approved by the Attorney General, be deposited as prescribed by section 213 of the said Act: *And provided further,* That this exemption shall apply only to a ground for exclusion of which the Department of State or the Department of Justice has knowledge prior to the enactment of this Act.

MICHELINA LANNI

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 193) for the relief of Michelina Lanni which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment, on page 1, after line 11, after the word "Act", to insert a colon and "*And provided further,* That a suitable and proper bond or undertaking, approved by the Attorney General, be deposited as prescribed by section 213 of the Immigration and Nationality Act.", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, notwithstanding the provisions of paragraph (1) of section 212(a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Michelina Lanni may be issued an immigrant visa and admitted to the United States for permanent residence if she is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of such Act: *Provided,* That this Act shall apply only to grounds for exclusion under such paragraph known to the Secretary of State or the Attorney General prior to the date of the enactment of this Act: *And provided further,* That a suitable and proper bond or undertaking, approved by the Attorney General, be deposited as prescribed by section 213 of the Immigration and Nationality Act.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

ISABEL LORETTA ALLEN

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 195) for the relief of Isabel Loretta Allen which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with amendments on page 1, at the beginning of line 5, to strike out "Isabel" and insert "Izabel", and in line 11, after the word "Act", to insert a colon and "*And provided further,* That a suitable and proper bond or undertaking, approved by the Attorney General, be deposited as prescribed by section 213 of the Immigration and Nationality Act.", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, notwithstanding the provisions of paragraph (1) of section 212(a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Izabel Loretta Allen may be issued an immigrant visa and admitted to the United States for permanent residence if she is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of such Act: *Provided,* That this Act shall apply only to grounds for exclusion under such paragraph known to the Secretary of State or the Attorney General prior to the date of the enactment of this Act: *And provided further,* That a suitable and proper bond or undertaking, approved by the Attorney General, be deposited as prescribed by section 213 of the Immigration and Nationality Act.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended, so as to read: "A bill for the relief of Izabel Loretta Allen."

HO KOON CHEW

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 421) for the relief of Ho Koon Chew which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with amendments, on page 1, line 7, after the word "Act", to strike out "Ho Koon Chew" and insert "Koon Chew Ho", and in line 11, after the word "said", to strike out "Ho Koon Chew" and insert "Koon Chew Ho"; so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Ho Yee, a deceased United States citizen, shall be deemed to have resided in the United States prior to July 9, 1913, within the meaning of section 1993 of the Act of February 10, 1855 (Rev. Stat. 1878).

SEC. 2. For the purposes of the said Act, Koon Chew Ho shall be held and considered to be the natural-born son of the said Ho Yee, and shall be further held and considered to have been a United States citizen at all times since July 9, 1913: *Provided,* That the said Koon Chew Ho enters the United States for permanent residence within one year after the date of the enactment of this Act.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended, so as to read: "A bill for the relief of Koon Chew Ho."

KRYSTYNA RATAJ

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 635) for the relief of Krystyna Rataj which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with amendments, in line 5, after the name "Krystyna", to strike out "Rataj" and insert "Ratay"; so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, notwithstanding the provisions of paragraph (28) of section 212(a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Krystyna Ratay may be issued an immigrant visa and admitted to the United States for permanent residence if she is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of such Act. This Act shall apply only to grounds for exclusion under such paragraph known to the Secretary of State or the Attorney General prior to the date of the enactment of this Act.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended, so as to read: "A bill for the relief of Krystyna Ratay."

TO PRINT AS A SENATE DOCUMENT A PAMPHLET ENTITLED "OUR AMERICAN GOVERNMENT—WHAT IS IT? HOW DOES IT FUNCTION?"

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate Concurrent Resolution 26, which was reported this morning and is at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The concurrent resolution will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 26) to authorize the printing as a House document of the pamphlet entitled "Our American Government—What Is It? How Does It Function?"

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the concurrent resolution?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the concurrent resolution which had been reported from the Committee on Government Operations, with amendments, on page 1, line 2, after the word "That", to strike out "(a)"; in line 6, after the word "a", to strike out "House" and insert "Senate"; in line 8, after the word "Function", to strike out "In addition to the usual number there shall be printed two thousand copies for use and distribution by each Member of Congress"; and after line 10, to strike out:

"(b) As used in this concurrent resolution the term 'Member of Congress' includes a Member of the Senate, a Member of the House of Representatives, and the Resident Commissioner from Puerto Rico." and insert a semicolon and "and that there shall be printed one million eighty-four thousand additional copies of such document, of which two hundred and six thousand copies shall be for the use of the Senate, and eight hundred and seventy-eight thousand copies shall be for the use of the House of Representatives."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendments.

The amendments were agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The concurrent resolution is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 26) was agreed to.

TO PRINT, WITH ILLUSTRATIONS, "A REPORT ON U.S. FOREIGN OPERATIONS IN AFRICA," BY SENATOR ALLEN J. ELLENDER

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate Concurrent Resolution 29, which was reported this morning and is at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The concurrent resolution will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 29) to print, with illustrations, the report of U.S. Foreign Operations in Africa, by Senator ALLEN J. ELLENDER.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the concurrent resolution?

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 29) was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there be printed, with illustrations, as a Senate document, a report entitled "A Report on United States Foreign Operations in Africa," submitted by Senator ALLEN J. ELLENDER, to the Senate Committee on Appropriations and that four thousand additional copies be printed for the use of that committee.

FIFTEENTH ANNUAL ARTHUR S. FLEMMING AWARDS PROGRAM

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the downtown chapter of the District of Columbia Junior Chamber of Commerce has completed its 15th annual Arthur S. Flemming Awards program. This program is conducted in cooperation with the Potomac Electric Power Co., the Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co., and the Washington Gas Light Co.

The Arthur S. Flemming Awards program was established to honor outstanding young men in the Federal Government and to recognize exceptionally meritorious work, to attract top-caliber young men to Government service; to encourage high standards of performance and to enhance appreciation of Government service and the opportunities and responsibilities that it presents. For the 15th annual program, over 90 Government agencies were invited to submit nominations for the awards. The Flemming Commission, under the chairmanship of Charles A. Dukes, Jr. narrowed the nominees to 21 men. The panel of judges, who chose the 10 finalists, was headed by the Honorable Tom C. Clark, Associate Justice of the U.S. Supreme Court, and included Oscar Berry, vice president and general counsel of the Washington Gas Light Co.; Louis Johnson, senior partner, Steptoe & Johnson, and former Secretary of Defense; Richard Norris, president of the Riggs National Bank; Charles E. Phillips, president of Equitable Life Insurance Co. and president of the Metropolitan Washington Board of Trade; and C. R. Smith, president of American Airlines. The Senator from Minnesota also was privileged to serve on the panel of judges. The following winners were selected:

Lawrence Lewis Kavanau, Defense Research and Engineering.

Kevin T. Maroney, Department of Justice.

N. Thompson Powers, Department of Labor.

George Stevens, Jr., U.S. Information Agency.

John Robinson Wilkins, Agency for International Development.

Edgar Maurice Cortright, Jr., National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

Norman Joseph Doctor, Department of the Army.

Charles M. Herzfeld, Department of Defense.

George Michael Low, National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

Joseph Francis Saunders, Department of the Navy.

Our country is indeed fortunate in possessing a Government career service which attracts these exceptionally talented young men and in having public-spirited organizations which have voluntarily established this program to recognize and honor them.

The Flemming Award winners, the downtown chapter of the junior chamber of commerce, and the cosponsors of this fine program are to be congratulated for their outstanding contribution to the Federal service.

I ask unanimous consent that the information relating to the outstanding service performed by the Flemming Award winners be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the information was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ARTHUR S. FLEMMING 15TH ANNUAL AWARD WINNERS

ADMINISTRATIVE

Lawrence Lewis Kavanau, defense research and engineering: Dr. Kavanau's office is the focal point for the research and development aspects of the military space program and coordination with NASA and other agencies involved in the national space program. He served as Deputy Director and leader of the Department of Defense delegation on the Large Launch Vehicle Planning Group which provided the blueprint for the launch vehicles used in the National Manned Lunar Landing program.

Kevin T. Maroney, Department of Justice: Mr. Maroney has personally argued eight cases before the Supreme Court and five cases before various U.S. Courts of Appeal. The celebrated Rudolph Abel espionage case and the Supreme Court ruling requiring the Communist Party to register with the Attorney General are among his successes, "attributable almost entirely to the vigor, competence, experience, and mature judgment of Mr. Maroney."

N. Thompson Powers, Department of Labor: Mr. Powers had primary responsibility for organizing and coordinating the assistance program for workers adversely affected by the Trade Expansion Act. This program provides retraining, special unemployment compensation, and relocation allowances. "His outstanding performance contributed immeasurably to * * * this significant program for the protection of * * * workers * * * affected by trade and tariff concessions." He was also responsible for planning, coordinating and carrying out the White House Regional Conferences on Youth.

George Stevens, Jr., U.S. Information Agency: Mr. Stevens has the primary responsibility in the U.S. Government for worldwide projection of America's image through motion pictures. The USIA-produced movies of Mrs. Kennedy's visits to India and Pakistan have received international acclaim. He has established an intern program for developing new USIA motion picture production supervisors and was chairman of the U.S. delegation at the Cannes and Venice Film Festivals.

John Robinson Wilkins, Agency for International Development: Since May 1962, Mr. Wilkins has served as Acting General Counsel and is responsible for establishing, directing and coordinating all legal services for AID. He was personally responsible for providing legal continuity in creating AID and terminating the International Cooperation Administration. Mr. Wilkins' role has been extraordinarily vital and influential in shaping in a legal way the course and conduct of the foreign-aid program.

SCIENTIFIC AND TECHNICAL

Edgar Maurice Cortright, Jr., National Aeronautics and Space Administration: Mr. Cortright shares with the Director the responsibility for planning and directing NASA's unmanned scientific space exploration programs. He led the conception and establishment of the Mariner program, carrying it through to successful flight operation. In addition, he carries management responsibility for the lunar and planetary programs, the geophysics and astronomy scientific satellite programs, the space bioscience programs, and light and medium launch vehicle programs.

Norman Joseph Doctor, Department of the Army: As a research and development supervisor in the microminiaturization branch, Mr. Doctor has pioneered in electronic miniaturization, scoring breakthroughs of major importance to military, space and industrial programs. His revolutionary two-dimensional packaging techniques for hearing aids received nationwide recognition. Recent contributions have been electronic circuitry for short-wave receivers, a clock for man-portable range finders, and a presettable automatic timer.

Charles M. Herzfeld, Department of Defense: Dr. Herzfeld is responsible for directing, planning, and coordinating the entire ARPA ballistic missile defense effort (Project Defender). His analysis of the complex technical, political, economic, and strategic factors of the program has produced important modifications in related military research and development programs and major changes in strategic weapons programs. Dr. Herzfeld's contributions have produced significantly more effective U.S. military posture.

George Michael Low, National Aeronautics and Space Administration: Mr. Low is responsible for development of manned spacecraft and management of manned space flight operations including Projects Mercury, Gemini, and Apollo. He was chairman of the select committee which performed the original studies leading to the manned lunar landing program. This program, now under his direction, is the next achievement of major significance to be attained in space.

Joseph Francis Saunders, Department of the Navy: As one of his programs in basic medical and dental research, Dr. Saunders established collaborative research programs with Britain and the Netherlands toward dealing with blood shortages during disasters. Under his direction, a process for indefinite stockpiling of human blood has been developed which will not only improve medical care and save millions of dollars annually, but has far-reaching implications for other medical research breakthroughs such as grafting of organs, preservation of tissues, and control of aging.

ADJOURNMENT TO 11 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, as a further mark of respect to the memory of the late Representative DOYLE, of California, I move that the Senate adjourn until tomorrow, Friday, at 11 a.m.

The motion was unanimously agreed to; and (at 7 o'clock and 54 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, March 15, 1963, at 11 a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate March 14, 1963:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

W. Averell Harriman, of New York, to be Under Secretary of State for Political Affairs.

IN THE MARINE CORPS

Having designated, in accordance with the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 5232, Maj. Gen. Charles H. Hayes, U.S. Marine Corps, for commands and other duties determined by the President to be within the contemplation of said section, I nominate him for appointment to the grade of lieutenant general while so serving.

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY

Rear Adm. William A. Brockett, U.S. Navy, to be Chief of the Bureau of Ships in the Department of the Navy for a term of 4 years.

IN THE NAVY

Adm. Robert L. Dennison, U.S. Navy, for appointment to the grade of admiral on the retired list pursuant to title 10, United States Code, section 5233.

Having designated under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 5231, Vice Adm. David L. McDonald, U.S. Navy, for commands and other duties determined by the President to be within the contemplation of said section, I nominate him for appointment to the grade of admiral while so serving.

Having designated under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 5231, Rear Adm. William E. Gentner, Jr., U.S. Navy, for commands and other duties determined by the President to be within the contemplation of said section, I nominate him for appointment to the grade of vice admiral while so serving.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Assaults Against the Free Enterprise System

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BARRY GOLDWATER

OF ARIZONA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 14, 1963

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, it was my honor and pleasure to address the National Security Commission of the American Legion this morning at the Statler Hotel. I ask unanimous consent to have my remarks printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SPEECH BY U.S. SENATOR BARRY GOLDWATER, REPUBLICAN, OF ARIZONA, BEFORE THE NATIONAL SECURITY COMMISSION OF THE AMERICAN LEGION, MARCH 14, 1963, STATLER-HILTON HOTEL, WASHINGTON, D.C.

Washington in his Farewell Address warned that our form of government could be attacked and destroyed through means other than a direct assault. I believe his words of warning could be appropriately directed to many of the activities which we find our society engaged in today. I am thinking of things like the direct and indirect assaults being made against the free enterprise system, like the downgrading of our military system and its leaders, like the great unrealistic push for disarmament at any cost.

Today I should like to direct my remarks to what is taking place in the field of military development and disarmament. This is an area of great concern and importance to the America people because it directly affects the present and continued security of our Nation in a time of mortal conflict with an enemy which has sworn to destroy us. It also is an area which is growing so complex so fast that it must be studied constantly by all Americans interested in the defense and extension of freedom throughout the world.

And let me state at the very outset my fear that the course we are presently embarked upon is in the direction of unilateral disarmament.

On April 18, 1962, President Kennedy at a press conference said "the United States has today tabled at Geneva an outline of every basic provision of a treaty of general and complete disarmament in a peaceful world." This document should receive far more consideration and study than it has been given by the people of this country. Here is a sweeping, all-inclusive proposal for disarmament that had not been discussed with the interested Members of Congress, but which has the possibilities of reducing the U.S. ability to wage war at all levels to an impossibly weak position. At the time, no one took this document too seriously, and for a variety of reasons. To begin with, it was regarded more in the line of a propaganda gesture designed to show the world that we were more desirous of disarmament and lasting peace than were the Russians. It also was felt to be a document that the Soviets would never agree to, and, therefore completely meaningless. Another factor was the assurance from administration spokesmen that any agreement reached at Geneva would have to be ratified by the U.S. Senate.

It never occurred to any of us, I am afraid, that the mere offering of this proposal at Geneva, containing as it did specific steps looking to the eventual disbandment of national armies and their replacement by a United Nations peace force, was in itself a moral commitment of a sort. And I don't believe anyone in his wildest dreams ever considered the possibility that the three-stage disarmment plan tabled at Geneva might provide the framework for unilateral moves by the United States to try and reverse the trend toward greater weapons systems.

Now I won't burden you with the entire wording of this document here today. But I must mention what to me is the salient point in the first stage of the American disarmament proposal, because it is in this area that we find the United States seemingly hellbent on accomplishment without benefit of Russian reciprocity. The point I have reference to calls for a reduction in the inventory of vehicles capable of delivering nuclear weapons. Either by accident or design, we seem to be proceeding with this objective through administrative orders from the Pentagon. Consider, for a minute, the decisions that have been announced since this program for disarmament was presented at Geneva. The RS–70 has been abandoned, Skybolt has been dropped, manned bombers are being phased out, Nike-Zeus is being delayed, the Dyna-Soar program is being reexamined for possible junking.

I believe it is very important at this stage in our development if all of us would rework our thinking on the subject of disarmament. What does the word really mean? To most people, I suspect, it means the actual doing away with arms, and to those of us who have lived through periods of actual disarmament the association is with the sinking of vessels, the destruction of guns and tanks and other weapons, etc. But I believe now we must understand that disarmament can be accomplished under present conditions by the simple expedient of not providing new military equipment, particularly in the fields of vehicles capable of carrying nuclear weapons; by slowing down research and development; by not pushing nuclear tests as fast as does the enemy.

This position of mine might seem incongruous to you because it can accurately be argued that we are spending more for defense this year than ever before; we are building up our long-neglected conventional forces and we are adding heavily to tactical aviation. So I believe it is necessary, to explain why, I believe, we present the picture of a nation trying to perform the hazardous and difficult task of going in two directions at the same time.

There are those in Government who realize that strength and the willingness to use it are the only deterrents to war, but there are others who believe that we must push disarmament no matter what concessions we must make to get the job done. I suspect that these opposing forces are contesting for supremacy in the development of policy and implementing action.

Let me point out that up to a few days ago it was abundantly clear that the civilians in the Pentagon were against the manned bomber and consistently fought any plans for extending its life beyond 1970 when the B–52's are due to be completely phased out. But just this week we learn that the Secretary of Defense, under congressional prodding, is showing some interest in the development of a long-range reconnaissance strike vehicle and has suggested to the Air Force that recommendations be made.

This is good news because it indicates that the Secretary may finally have come to realize that we must be superior in all areas of military capability or risk failure in our efforts to preserve peace and extend freedom. The reluctance of the Pentagon to push for development and production of the RS–70 program—even though all study groups in the Pentagon have recommended it and Congress has voted the necessary funds—has been a contributing factor in my conclusion that we are engaged in unilateral disarmament. And I am therefore happy to recognize what may be a change in attitude on the part of the Secretary of Defense and hope that he will not perform on this as he did in the case of Skybolt and completely reverse his field in the space of 1 year.

Now speaking of Skybolt, the air-to-ground missile that the British had been counting on, let me quote you what the President of the United States had to say about it on March 28, 1961, in a message to Congress. He said, "Another type of missile less likely to be completely eliminated by enemy attack is the air-to-ground missile carried by a plane that can be off the ground before an attack commences * * * its successful development and production may extend the useful life of our bombers in the missile age."

As you all know, this important concept, emphasized by the President in March of 1961, was abandoned at Nassau without any consultation, so far as I can determine, with the Air Force or with our NATO allies other than Great Britain.

This audience might well ask, "Is it important?" Well, I can tell you that the majority of the military people, and I believe that includes a majority of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, think it is just as important today as it was in March of 1961. And, we might heed what the Russians are saying. An article distributed by the Soviet news agency Tass on February 21 of this year claimed the Russians have "supersonic rocket-carrying aircraft capable of striking enemy [United States] targets without entering their zone of antiaircraft defense."

It is important for us here to understand that the Skybolt would have done two important things: It would have insured man's place in the air and it would have given our Air Force and the Royal Air Force of Great Britain a weapon with which the enemy could be attacked from 360 degrees instead of the very few known degrees that ICBM's must travel, thus compounding his defense problem. This, like the RS–70, constituted a vehicle which could carry nuclear weapons. And it was abandoned on the basis of some mysterious computations arrived at by the civilian Pentagon.

We now get into the important area of space and I believe that from now on in speaking of what we formerly called air power, we must substitute the phrase aerospace power. The argument we hear most often these days from those in official position who see space development only along peaceful lines is that there is no call for man in space even though they will admit that there can be military uses of space.

Until recently our one official concession to the military possibilities of space was the Dyna-Soar program for manned spacecraft projects. This program called for the development of a piloted spacecraft which could be lifted into orbit by a Titan III rocket and glide back to earth on wings. To my way of thinking, it would add an important new dimension to the defense system and one that we can rest assured the Russians are at this very moment attempting to master. But the latest reports gleaned from the Defense Secretary's testimony before the House Armed Services Committee, indicate that this important program may become the price of a new missile-armed bomber to follow the B–52. In other words, according to the press reports, if the Pentagon authorizes a new manned bomber it may cancel the Dyna-Soar.

This, of course, is no answer at all to the heavy criticism the Defense Department has been running into on Capitol Hill. The demand being raised in Congress for adequate defense is not subject to barter, or the trading of one weapons system for another. It is rather a demand for more defense options, for an overall defense program that will provide us with a maximum of flexibility. This demand is for manned bombers as well as spacecraft. It does not downgrade the Pentagon's preoccupation with conventional Armed Forces, but sees these as an integral and important part of the whole.

Dyna-Soar is one of the oldest concepts for orbiting man. It could and should have been accomplished by the United States years ago. But now that it is on the verge of development, it must not be abandoned in favor of any other project. I must say from reading the papers I am completely puzzled by the Defense Secretary's reasoning. He seems to be telling us that Dyna-Soar can be canceled if we proceed to modify the Gemini for military purposes. Now this might sound reasonable enough to the layman, but it makes no sense to the military man. Dyna-Soar is a military project, planned that way from the very first. Gemini, which is a two-man spacecraft like the present one-man Mercury, is a nonmilitary project being developed by the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. The problems and the time involved in suddenly adapting a patently civilian space project into a military program would be enormous. And the question arises of whether we have the time. The question also arises as to whether the adaptation of Gemini into a military spacecraft is practical enough to cause us to drop the Dyna-Soar.

Now if Pentagon cancels Dyna-Soar, as it did Skybolt, and then later changes signals on the development of new manned bombers again, the Air Force will have had it once and for all. Then aerospace superiority will pass unquestionably into the hands of the Russians.

If there is one thing we can say for sure about the Pentagon these days it is that U.S. military thinkers—with their slide rules, their electronic computers and their blinking lights—can change their minds faster about more important matters than any other group of planners in the world. They certainly change too fast for our allies to keep up, and I believe that we can find that the reason for much of the disarray in the Atlantic Community today is traceable directly to the Pentagon's inability to make up its mind on what weapons systems are best for the defense of the free world. We began with Skybolt, then switched to Polaris submarines, then switched to Polaris-carrying surface ships. We began with the RS–70, formerly known as the B–70, then switched to an all-missile concept, and now we appear to be getting back to the manned bomber idea. And as I have just pointed out, we began with Dyna-Soar and are now talking about junking that for a souped-up Gemini. What comes next, I can't tell you. I don't think even the Pentagon's latest model of UNIVAC has the answers as of this minute.

But I can tell you this, one of the simplest ways for this Nation to disarm itself is to keep changing our minds every year about military concepts and weapons systems while the Russians push ahead with a single-minded purpose of becoming supreme in all military spheres and dimensions.

While I have reported some encouraging signs that perhaps the Pentagon is getting back to the idea of a new manned bomber to carry on after the B–52 this is by no means certain. And I don't know how you can tell for sure in the light of all the contradictory information emanating from the Pentagon these days. But I suggest that if the Pentagon thinkers are still holding to the idea of placing our strategic reliance on missiles when today's nuclear strike power finds the men and bombers of SAC responsible for about 90 percent of our ability, then I suggest we are traveling down a very dangerous road. Someone once said, "If you can't command it, you can't control it; if you can't control it, it is useless in modern warfare." This being the case, I can think of no weapon with less commandability and controllability than a missile already launched. On the other hand, the manned aircraft is completely commandable and controllable and presents the enemy with the gigantic problem of defending himself from all sectors—not just one.

Included in our inventory of missiles are Polaris submarines and yet today after abandoning Skybolt, to the utter dismay of the British, we are suggesting that surface ships carry Polaris and that our NATO allies provide themselves with these weapons. The question that comes to mind here is why the United States doesn't cut back its own submarine program in favor of a mix of submarines and the less-expensive surface ships if it considers these latter good enough for NATO. If the surface ship is not good enough for the United States, why is it being sold to NATO?

Of course, no one can quarrel with the mixed concept in weapons and weapon carriers, but one can quarrel rather violently with the idea of placing all of our offensive and defensive eggs in the nose cone.

Who or what, for example, is going to tell our Commander in Chief what targets were hit and what targets were missed on enemy soil unless it be the eyes and voice of a man in an aircraft. Certainly, the enemy is not going to cable us that we missed such-and-such a target and hit others. Extend this argument out into space. If the enemy has, as they claim they have, a missile-carrying satellite, how can we expect to disarm it by seeing space only as an area to be pursued for peaceful purposes? Man has a place in space and I hope it does not require a Russian man in a weapons-carrying spacecraft to prove it to us in sputnik fashion.

Now on the nuclear test ban negotiations we have heard a great deal of talk about the Russian offer to accept three on-site inspections a year. President Kennedy hailed this as encouraging. Other administration spokesmen have interpreted it as a breakthrough insisting that it meant the Soviets had finally accepted the principle of on-site inspections. However, a man in position to know the truth of this—Arthur H. Dean, former chief U.S. disarmament negotiator—recently told a luncheon of the American Association for the United Nations that the Soviet limit would make any test ban agreement "absolutely unworkable." He went on to say that three inspections is like having three wheels on a car and that the Soviet offer does not represent a concession of any kind.

Another argument we hear frequently from disarmament enthusiasts is that our failing to detect Soviet underground tests would run no risk because nothing important could be gained through such low-yield experiments. However, Mr. Dean had something to say about that, too. He said that it is possible to carry out underground anti-missile-missile tests as well as neutron bomb tests if the neutron bomb is ever developed. This is precisely the argument used by Senator DODD in his thorough-going and thought-provoking discourse on the dangers of the concessions we have been making at Geneva.

It is my firm conviction that when we begin concentrating on only what we in the United States can do to lessen the threat of nuclear escalation, we begin to think and act in terms of unilateral disarmament. Our primary concern in the military field should always be with enemy capabilities and enemy intentions. It does us absolutely no good at all to think in terms of disarmament unless our yearning and our desire is reciprocated by the forces which have sworn to destroy us. And we have no reason to believe that the Soviets are engaging in anything but a propaganda marathon at Geneva.

They haven't made one single move that would justify our belief that they want disarmament at this time under any terms. And even if they did sign an agreement with us, what assurance would we have that the terms of such an agreement would be honored? It could, and undoubtedly would, be broken at the first moment when a Soviet advantage could be gained. If we have learned anything at all from our experience in dealing with the Russians it is that they cannot be trusted in any sphere of East-West activity and certainly not in the military sphere.

So I believe we should stop thinking in terms of disarmament and start concentrating on what the Soviets are doing in the military field. There is no doubt at all that while the talking goes on at Geneva and we offer one set of concessions after another the Russians are proceeding at top speed and with great determination in all armament areas. They are probing the military possibilities of space. They are concentrating on new and wider military options. They are improving their military capabilities in all spheres and placing their main dependence on the manned bomber. They aren't stinting on the development of missiles. They are going ahead with all types. But they are keeping their manned bombers too because this increases their flexibility and adds an important option to their military capabilities.

Overall, the Russians are continuing to apply science and technology to military purposes with huge research and development programs. And from these flow a rapid progression of military systems from invention to operational inventory. Let me emphasize, there is absolutely no evidence of any kind that the Soviets are cutting down the number of their existing weapons systems, as we are, or that they are withholding the development of new systems.

Let me remind you that for all the decisions and counterdecisions coming out of the Defense Department these days; for all the talk we hear about the efficiency and competence of the Secretary of Defense; for all the money we are expending for military purposes, not one new weapons system has been proposed under the present administration. All the activity we see and hear about today is directed toward the shifting of concepts and weapons systems proposed and started under the Eisenhower and Truman administrations.

This is not only stagnation but it is also disarmament. Inertia in defense matters, compounded by indecision and constantly changing concepts, is the same as spotting our enemy an advantage, a running start, if you please, for the final confrontation.

In closing, let me say that man has come through thousands of years of development in warfare, from bare fists to nuclear weapons. Each offensive has been met with a defense as I am certain the nuclear threat will be. Man, who became master of the rivers became the master of Asia; man, who dominated the land masses and the means of controlling it, then dominated the early world. Then came man's domination of the seas, first in the Mediterranean, then on the oceans. Then came man's control of the air as we know it today and as every expert whom I have ever heard speak on the subject has said in one way or another, "He who controls space will control the world."

Those who feel that the risk of nuclear war is more real than the risk of not being strong can only see another engagement where triggers are pulled resulting immediately in all-out nuclear war. They obviously don't agree with the President who has said that he wants something between embarrassment and holocaust. These people fail to recognize that we have been witnessing a world engaged in many shooting wars ever since World War II and there has been no escalation. This has been true because, first, I am convinced that neither side ever wants to escalate to the ICBM or MRBM stage, and, second, our vast superiority in methods of delivery have driven the hard facts of war home to the enemy. We must keep them and develop new vehicles to replace them.

Forty-fourth Anniversary of the Founding of the American Legion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN R. LAIRD

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 14, 1963

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow, the American Legion will celebrate the 44th anniversary of its birth. Founded in Paris, France, at the historic caucus of delegates from the First American Expeditionary Force on March 15, 1919, the American Legion has grown from its 463 founding officers and men to an outstanding organization of more than 2½ million legionnaires. These legionnaires represent veterans from three wars: World War I; World War II, and the Korean war.

The largest veterans organization in all history, the American Legion has enjoyed a consistent record of dedication to, and pursuit of, the American ideal. Its continuing goal has been to keep America always American. It is therefore fitting to take this opportunity to congratulate the American Legion on its impressive record of achievement, dedication, and integrity.

So that all may know of the high ideals set forth for the Legion by its founders in March 1919, I would like to recite a portion of the preamble to the constitution of the American Legion:

> For God and country, we associate ourselves together for the following purposes: to uphold and defend the Constitution of the United States of America; to maintain law and order; to foster and perpetuate a 100 percent Americanism; to preserve the memories and incidents of our associations in the great wars; to inculcate a sense of individual obligation to the community, State, and Nation; to combat the autocracy of both the classes and the masses; to make right the master of might; to promote peace and good will on earth; to safeguard and transmit to posterity the principles of justice, freedom, and democracy; to consecrate and sanctify our comradeship by our devotion to mutual helpfulness.

Mr. Speaker, no greater compliment can be paid, I think, than to state that the American Legion has lived up to the high standards it set for itself 44 years ago. I join with the Legion's many friends all over the world in offering my deepest congratulations on the anniversary of its founding and on the outstanding record it has established. I am proud to be a member of this great veterans' organization.

St. Patrick's Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SILVIO O. CONTE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 14, 1963

Mr. CONTE. On Sunday, Mr. Speaker, we celebrate again the great feast day of St. Patrick. Wherever men gather on this day, there will be good will. Although St. Patrick belongs to the sons of Erin, his feast has assumed the spirit of universality.

It has been almost 1,500 years since St. Patrick first set foot on Irish soil. The faith he planted there prospered and grew during the Middle Ages, and Ireland was a source of culture and missionary activity throughout Europe.

According to the calendar, it is not yet spring on St. Patrick's Day, and therein lies fair warning. But there is a kind of spring in St. Patrick's Day—for the green which stands for Ireland, which is indeed a fair land, can also stand for the spring of joy and gladness which fills every Irish heart on this day.

It is my hope that the faith in God and the joy in life which our Irish brothers have always possessed in such abundance continue to light the world and bring hope and gladness in the most troubled times.

A New and Interesting Development in America's Space Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. TORBERT H. MACDONALD

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 14, 1963

Mr. MACDONALD. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for this time today to place before my colleagues in the House of Representatives certain information as to a new and interesting development in America's space program. The Science and Astronautics Committee is presently holding hearings on this development. Although this matter has been discussed at considerable length in the New England press, I am not sure that all are fully informed on it.

Members of the House will recall that when President Kennedy, 2 years ago, recommended expansion and acceleration of the national space program he described it as part of "the battle that is going on around the world between freedom and tryanny—the battle for men's minds." He made it clear to the Congress that a difficult, expensive, and comprehensive program, in space sciences and technology, would be necessary. In this connection he stated:

> This decision demands a major national commitment of scientific and technical manpower, material and facilities, and the possibility of their diversion from other important activities where they are already thinly spread.

This continues to be the problem of the space program. It is absolutely essential that the appropriations for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration be utilized to develop and support a wide range of programs of scientific investigation and development.

There are, of course, many facets to the scientific, research, and development work of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, each part of which must be permitted to proceed and accelerate to the extent possible in harmony, one with the others. In some cases, NASA has been able to build on known technology or to accelerate programs of research and development that had already been instituted. For example, it was able to expand on the talents available from the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics. It was able to integrate into its program certain of the work of the Army Ballistics Missile Agency, under Dr. Wernher von Braun, at Huntsville, Ala., the Vanguard team from the Naval Research Laboratory, and the Jet Propulsion Laboratory which had been under Army contract. NASA has been able to integrate the work of these separate teams and on them to build sound and forward looking space programs in the aeronautical and propulsion fields.

However, a less satisfactory foundation has existed with respect to electronics and its related physics disciplines and capabilities. It became obvious that some extraordinary steps were necessary to keep that phase of the space sciences in pace with the rest of the program. The major importance of electronics components, technology, and instrumentation, in all space endeavors, made it doubly necessary to broaden NASA's space electronics research base as rapidly as possible.

An extensive study of the best way to approach this problem was inaugurated; various approaches were explored, such as the possibility of establishing electronic research systems and development groups at one or more of NASA's existing centers, the establishment of a fairly large electronics research subcenter at an existing NASA installation, the use of the talents of other governmental electronics laboratories, the establishment of a private laboratory as an affiliate of a major university or foundation, and the desirability of establishing a new NASA center as an entity with the necessary facilities.

After most careful analysis, it was decided that the most effective solution, consistent with all other problems, was to establish a new research center, specifically devoted to research in electronics and related physics disciplines. This would permit a concentration of research talent in one place; it would avoid conflicts between development missions and research efforts in other fields, and by providing a variety of research facilities available under a singleness of direction it was felt that there would be a rapid development of a critical mass of electronics research data. I wish to point out this center is for research and not for development of hardware or for production of electronic components or subsystems. The results of its research will be available to all. It should be a factor in the growth of electronic and related industries. There are estimates that about three-fourths of the cost of spacecraft goes for electronics, yet at present, members of the industrial community undertaking spacecraft contracts spend no more than 5 percent of their resources for electronic research.

This decision having been made, further studies were made as to the proper location of such a facility. This included consideration of a host of criteria, including the availability of adequate utilities and services, including power, water, communications, and sanitary facilities, the proximity of institutions of higher scientific and engineering education, not only as a basis for the interchange of ideas but at which facilities could be provided for additional study by members of the research center's staff. Other considerations involved the need for the new center to be located in an industrial community in which interests with similar technical work were available. It was essential, because of the proposed size of the center, to be sure that the new installation would have available to it satisfactory community facilities such as housing, recreation, schools, and colleges, and a variety of transportation services would be available for both long and short distances.

The National Aeronautics and Space Administration, after most careful consideration, has decided that the best place to locate the electronics research center is in the Greater Boston area It has recommended that such action be taken and it is my understanding that the President's budget includes initial funds for the acquisition of land, site development, and planning for such a facility

A total of $8.5 million has been recommended for this purpose in the fiscal year 1964. Five million dollars is budgeted for the acquisition of land, site development, and planning of the research center, and $3.5 million for personnel costs and for the operation of the installation. As now conceived, the center will involve a capital investment of approximately $50 million in buildings and facilities and a gradual growth of personnel assigned thereto to the level of 2,000 people.

As I understand it, an interim step in the planning of this great institution is being taken prior to the actual congressional decision through the establishment of an electronics research task group, temporarily attached to the Office of Advanced Research and Technology and composed of personnel located both at headquarters in Washington and at the northeastern office in Cambridge.

On behalf of myself and the entire Massachusetts delegation, I should like to commend the foresight, vision, and decision of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration in this matter, and to commend to my colleagues on the Committee on Science and Astronautics and on the Appropriations Committee the early consideration of the authorization and appropriation actions necessary to initiate this very important phase of America's space effort.

Quality Control: Key to Survival of the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALAN BIBLE

OF NEVADA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 14, 1963

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, the subject of "quality control as a key to industrial survival" raises a subject vital to our economy and to the national security.

Recently, my colleague, Senator HOWARD W. CANNON, addressed the Western Quality Control Conference on methods and techniques which could be employed to secure economies and greater proficiency in both industrial and defense production. His remarks have been well received by industry and should be of interest to the Nation as a whole.

I ask unanimous consent to have Senator CANNON's speech printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

QUALITY CONTROL: KEY TO SURVIVAL OF THE UNITED STATES

(Speech of Senator HOWARD W. CANNON, of Nevada, before the Western Regional Quality Control Conference, Las Vegas, February 22, 1963)

Ladies and gentlemen, it is an honor to be with you today and to address this conference which has under consideration the subject, "Quality Control as a Key to Industrial Survival."

As the process of technological change moves inevitably forward, quality control has become a vital key to the future. Quality control, or, in the words of Dr. Robert Seamans, associate director of the National Aeronautics Space Agency, the "assurance that men and equipment will do what they are supposed to do at the right time and for the right period of time, in every phase of long and complicated operations," is vital both to civilian industrial processes and to the defense of our country.

In a sense, therefore, survival of the United States in this turbulent world, depends upon proper quality control, or reliability.

Our technological society has already embarked upon the industrial revolution characterized by the word "automation." Automation is, as you know, the process of controlling operations through mechanical or electronic devices, with little or no human assistance. These operations may control industrial production, manipulate, and solve and retrieve information.

Consequently quality control is of the utmost importance to the operation of automated processes, and in turn, facilitates the development and refinement of further automated operations. As automation gains momentum, quality control will grow in significance.

In my remarks today I would like to pose the question of whether we have true and reliable quality control and just how much of what we hear about is for show and how much of this important effort is actually producing results. I am informed that America spends up to $10 billion a year for military maintenance and repair. Certainly much of this vast expenditure of taxpayers' money is justified, but it is the shrinking of this multibillion-dollar figure that is the end result of quality control. And it is my interest as a Senator and a member of the Armed Services Committee to do everything I can to assure that quality control not be given a lot of lipservice and very little attention. Such gatherings as this can go a long way toward getting the objectives of our common purpose.

Let me cite just one example of automation and reliability testing. A completely automated 110-foot production line, designed and operated by one of the largest electrical products companies in the United States, produces film strip resistors. The production line is a highly coordinated system in which a digital computer calls all the signals. Automated equipment deposits a carbon coating on a ceramic core, sputters on gold terminations, attaches caps and leads, spirals the carbon to value, encapsulates the resistor in a protective shell, tests at three different points for quality, marks appropriate values on the resistor, and finally packs the components for shipping.

At no point in this entire process is a human operator involved. Human error, poor judgment, inattention, and fatigue have been eliminated as possible causes of defective components.

Furthermore, an automatic performance or "quality control" test checks each resistor for leakage of its protective shell. The units are immersed in a hot bath and any leakage, indicated by air bubbles, is detected by a photoelectric cell. Should the resistor fail this leakage test, the component is automatically discarded by the machine.

Although the electronics industry is still in its infancy in the development of automated production lines, because of the increasing emphasis upon reliability, other automated lines will doubtless be designed to produce the hundreds of components which make up every piece of electronic equipment.

The process of automation is revolutionizing many other industries, as well.

No mention of automation can fail to ask the question, "Is this new technological development a blessing or a curse?"

If handled through intelligent business and Federal programs, I am confident that automation will prove a boon to mankind. Greater production of goods and services, both military and civilian, increased productivity and lower costs, shorter hours, widened opportunities for education, and upgrading of skills. These and many other benefits can accrue to our society from proper use of automation. In short, a higher standard of living for all, as evidenced by an ever-expanding real gross national product, could result from automation.

Without a strong and growing economy, geared to maximization of production and consumption, this country cannot meet its vital international and domestic commitments and emerge victorious in its role of defender of the free world.

To repeat, as our economy evolves into a sophisticated automated society, greater and greater emphasis will be placed on the central theme of this conference—quality control.

Turning now to the interrelated spheres of defense operations and space exploration, here again the keystone is "quality control" or "reliability." The efficient functioning of conventional armaments, and missiles and space vehicles as well, depends upon "quality control." In fact, with the current emphasis upon missile and spacecraft programs, "quality control" looms larger and larger in significance, for the cost of today's complex space vehicles and weaponry has reached an alltime high. Recently someone aptly quipped, "When you have a malfunction in space, you can't pull into Joe's garage."

We in Congress have often thought that it would be better not to have the equipment at all, than to have it and not be able to use it when we need it. We should be able not only to detect errors, but to prevent them before they are made. I am looking to this society to develop methods and techniques to improve quality and to keep up with technological advances.

The challenge of "quality control" or reliability is succinctly stated by a recent editorial in the magazine Aviation Week, as follows:

"The problem of achieving 100 percent reliability in space exploration vehicles is difficult enough, but the problem becomes even more acute when the space age moves as it will shortly—into operational satellite systems for weather reporting, navigation, reconnaissance, and communications. For in these systems, a single minor component failure in a single satellite could disrupt the functioning of the entire system for the interval it would take to fire a replacement vehicle into proper orbit. This would prove to be an extremely expensive process if the failure rate reached as high as the statistical rate now generally acceptable in high 'quality control' industries."

Ladies and gentlemen, perhaps a word or two concerning the dimensions of our defense and space exploration programs will further emphasize the need for the highest possible standards of "quality control." Estimates place defense spending during fiscal year 1963 at $48.3 billion; it will certainly be higher in fiscal year 1964. Potentially the most expensive single aspect of the defense program, its expenditures on space systems, only, are currently costing about $2 billion a year.

In addition, nonmilitary space programs are costing approximately $3.6 billion during fiscal year 1963 and will doubtless rise in the next fiscal year.

Unfortunately, these huge expenditures to make America invincible are a necessity in a world constantly threatened by war.

As President Kennedy declared in his current state of the Union message to Congress, "Until the world can develop a reliable system of international security, the free peoples have no choice but to keep their arms nearby.

"This country, therefore, continues to require the best defense in the world. This means, unfortunately, a rising defense budget. It means the expenditure of more than $15 billion this year on nuclear weapons systems alone. * * *

"But it also means improved air and missile defenses."

Models of missiles and space vehicles of the future stagger the imagination. Although our space program has already produced modern wonders, who knows what the future will bring? Battles in outer space are by no means beyond the realm of possibility. Let there be no mistake about it. That nation which controls outer space, controls our planet, earth.

Although the United States and the Soviet Union recently concluded an agreement on peaceful uses of space and are negotiating for further agreements, nevertheless we must be vigilant. Deputy Defense Secretary Roswell L. Gilpatric warned last June, "We are very conscious of the need, however, for taking out * * * certain technological insurance, be it cost support or a share of the national objective of peaceful use of outer space. We have had some sad experiences, obviously, in reaching agreements with the Soviets on nuclear test bans and other such objectives for the benefit of mankind. And we want to be prepared, and we don't want to be caught by surprise if any hostile use of space should occur."

Therefore, with the steady advance of the space age with all of its military implications, our lives quite literally depend upon the concept under discussion at this conference—"quality control."

Perhaps we can one day soon find the answer to the question posed for all of us, and that is, that we never have time enough to build things right the first time, but we always find time to build things again when they are not right.

What happens when "quality control" is a success? What happens when quality control fails? Let me illustrate by a few examples.

One major element of U.S. nuclear power is the Minuteman ICBM. Why? Because it has proved to be a sure-fire missile. Extreme accuracy, high reliability, and relatively low cost are the chief design characteristics of the Air Force's Minuteman ICBM. To achieve the high reliability requirements of this missile, special reliability programs were instituted at each of the component manufacturers.

Similarly, the Mariner II Venus probe established a new landmark in the scientific exploration of the solar system. Preliminary results from one of the Mariner instruments, a magnetometer, indicate that substantial and useful information was obtained as the spacecraft triumphantly raced past Venus on December 14, 1962.

Without "quality control," these delicate instruments on Mariner II could never successfully transmit data to recording instruments manned by anxious scientists here on earth.

Failures due to lack of proper "quality control" are costly. For instance, the premature end of the useful life of the orbiting solar observatory early in June 1962, was a good example of why the highest possible standards of reliability or quality assurance must be demanded of industrial contractors. OSO was intended to provide a wide variety of solar data during an orbital life of 6 months, as an early step in our "man on the moon" project. Instead, a relatively minor mechanical malfunction deprived the entire complex satellite of all of its useful functions at the end of 11 weeks.

In spite of the failure of this first OSO, the lunar project, or Project Apollo, is continuing full speed ahead in an attempt to beat the Russians to the moon.

Furthermore, one of our foremost submarine experts recently charged that industry has fallen dangerously short of meeting the exacting technological standards of the nuclear age.

He said, "Not just the complicated gear but also the conventional components of nuclear plants are frequently flawed by faulty welding and casting due to ineffective quality control and failure to follow specifications. Delivery and performance of these conventional items have been less reliable than of the nuclear reactors themselves." For example, "In the case of steel castings, we often have to order two to three times as many as we need because we have so much trouble obtaining satisfactory ones."

Officials of the Defense Department believe that the performance of defense contractors would improve greatly if there were stiffer penalties for slipshod work and higher rewards for jobs well done.

Realizing that reliability or quality control is now a matter of major national concern, the National Aeronautics and Space Agency instituted last year a new program designed to assure the desired quality of space systems. I am sure that you are all far more conversant with the technical aspects of this program than I am. However, the basic program may be summarized as follows:

(1) It shall be NASA policy to utilize every practical means of assuring high quality of space systems. In order to accomplish this objective, quality assurance requirements shall be placed contractually on space system contractors and subcontractors by NASA installations.

(2) Assuring satisfactory contractor performance in developing and maintaining the quality of space systems and their parts is the responsibility of the cognizant installation, assisted by Government inspection agencies to the extent determined advantageous by the NASA installation.

As the significance of "quality control" deepens, the need for scientists and engineers who specialize in the techniques of such control likewise increases.

However, shortages of talented, highly trained scientists and engineers threaten the achievement of vital national goals. The President's Science Advisory Committee warns that "unless remedial action is taken promptly, future needs for superior mathematicians and physical scientists will seriously outstrip supply." The report commented on the challenge of military security and space explorations as follows:

"Extensive and sophisticated research and development serve as critical elements of a modern national defense effort which increasingly depends upon highly complex systems and diversified military capabilities."

Achievement of national goals in space creates an extraordinary new demand for scientific and technological manpower. The highly complex nature of space projects, compressed time scales, and need for high reliability require especially perceptive and able technical management, the best in engineering, and for the future, new advances in science.

To meet burgeoning needs for engineers, mathematicians, and specialists in the physical sciences, now often abbreviated EMP, the President's committee recommends a vastly expanded program of Federal, State, and private financial aid to graduate students in these fields. Furthermore, existing centers of excellence in "EMP" and encouragement of the establishment of new centers specializing in these areas should be included in such a broad educational program.

I heartily concur that this program of aid to EMP, which is embodied in a legislative program recently submitted by the President to the Congress, should be enacted during this session. I would like to see much more done in the field of science and engineering education.

As the committee report states, "The relationship of science and engineering to our vital national commitments is such that we cannot postpone the start of a vigorous, and ambitious national program to accelerate EMP graduate training. The Federal Government must immediately take the initiative, the leadership, and the central responsibility for supporting this effort."

To sum up, quality control is literally the key to survival of the United States. The complex and accelerated technological advances produced by automation demand an unprecedented level of reliability of performance in civilian industry. "Quality control," or reliability, in turn, paves the way for further development of automated processes.

If properly utilized, automation can produce enough goods and services to enable this Nation to meet easily its international commitments, while achieving at the same time, its domestic goals of a decent standard of living for all.

In the area of defense operations and space exploration, "quality control" is assuming ever greater importance.

We are dealing with a problem which does not only involve the "quality control" experts at your plants, it also includes designers, purchasing agents, and production planners. All of these people have to be motivated to do it right the first time through the application of what some of you in the trade call "meticulous attention to grubby detail." But the goal is well worth the effort when we consider that there would be few if any failures at Cape Canaveral with really ironclad "quality control." And when we realize that we are not pushing the state of the art too fast but too often we assume that "quality control" exists where, in truth, it does not.

Although conventional weapons are by no means relegated to the past, the new space age with all the military implications of missiles and spacecraft, likewise places a premium on "quality control."

To insure higher standards of "quality control," the Defense Department suggests greater rewards for excellent performance by contractors and NASA has instituted a "quality control" program as an integral part of its contract procedures.

Finally, we are threatened by shortages of scientific manpower so necessary to the carrying out of "quality control" programs. To remedy this dire situation, further governmental and private programs are needed to strengthen higher education in EMP.

Let me close with the following quotation, again from Dr. Seamans, "We are engaged in a tremendous scientific and technological effort to carry out our accelerated national program. After the brains, the skills, and the industrial resources have been marshaled, the key to success still lies in the reliability * * *" or, in the words of today's program, "quality control."

Proposed Legislation To Alleviate the Shortage of Physicians and Dentists in the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. FOGARTY

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 14, 1963

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I have, during this session, introduced three bills to help alleviate the critical shortage of physicians and dentists in the United States by providing Federal funds for medical and dental school construction, operating expenses, and scholarships.

Today I am introducing further legislation with the same objective of increasing our Nation's supply of doctors and dentists. Specifically, I propose to amend title II of the 1958 National Defense Education Act to provide for forgiveness of loans for students who subsequently practice medicine, dentistry, or osteopathy in geographical areas determined by State health authorities to have a shortage of individuals in such practice.

The National Defense Education Act already provides that up to 50 percent of loans plus interest may be forgiven if the borrower becomes a full-time teacher in a public elementary or secondary school. The loans may be canceled at a rate of 10 percent for each year of teaching service.

This provision was prompted by a critical shortage of trained teachers. Surely our Nation faces a no less critical shortage of health personnel, for we will need 15,000 additional doctors and a similar number of dentists by 1975.

What have we, as legislators, done about the dearth of doctors and dentists? Thus far we have placed very few marks on the legislative scoresheet. We have not yet acted favorably upon proposals that my colleagues and I have made to provide Federal assistance for the construction of badly needed medical, dental, and public health educational facilities. Nor has any Federal helping hand been extended to medical and dental schools in meeting their evermounting operating expenses. Nor has Congress acted favorably upon legislation which I have repeatedly introduced to provide for scholarships for medical and dental students.

Meanwhile, the shortage of these scarce personnel resources has become all the more serious with the decline—for the fifth consecutive year—in the number of medical school applicants.

The financial problems faced by these students—and I will use students of medicine as an example—have become increasingly insurmountable. Studies by the Association of American Medical

Colleges and the National Opinion Research Center in 1959 reveal that the medical student is indeed the "poor man" of the student world.

The proof is striking. A medical student's education—excluding living expenses—costs more than twice that of a graduate student in arts and science. The average direct cost to the medical student is about $1,000 a year or $4,000 in 4 years. In contrast, the educational expenses of the arts and science graduate student average only $450 a year or $1,800 for a 4-year program of Ph. D. training. Adding living expenses, the average 4-year expense to a medical student exceeds $11,000.

The difference in stipend income of these two groups is equally appalling. The average medical student receives $500 a year or $2,000 in stipends in 4 years; the average graduate student in arts and science receives $2,000 per year or $8,000 over a 4-year period.

Moreover, 47 percent of the medical students in 1959 had obtained loans, whereas only 9 percent of the graduate students had to borrow money to meet their educational or living expenses. The average dollar value of the loans to medical students was $3,900, while the average loan to the graduate student was $2,500. Thus more than five times as many medical students as graduate students had plunged themselves into debt.

The study further reveals that almost four times as many medical students received help from their families as did arts and science graduate students. Yet there was no evidence that the parents of medical students were in a higher income group. The answer given by the graduate students was simply that they did not receive support from their parents because they did not need any support from them.

The financial problems of medical students with wives and families—62 percent of the 1959 graduating class were married and 54 percent of them had one or more children—are even more acute.

Meanwhile, the tuitions charged by medical schools have risen at a phenomenal rate. Between 1934 and 1963, private medical school tuitions increased 202 percent, public school nonresident tuitions rose 161 percent, and resident tuitions rose 145 percent.

While the costs of a medical education progressively rise, the resources available to the medical student in meeting expenses progressively decline.

Faced with this serious situation, I propose that the national defense student loan program be modified so that 25 percent of the unpaid loan plus interest be forgiven for each complete year that an individual practices medicine, dentistry, or osteopathy in areas determined by State health authorities to have a shortage of such practitioners.

This amendment would have three important effects. First, it would remove the sharp edge from medical and dental student indebtedness which in 1959 averaged $4,258 per student for medical students alone. Of the 6,799 medical students who graduated in 1959, over half the class was in debt, and one-third had loan liabilities directly related to their medical education. Yet, unlike graduate students, these students faced a year of internship, and many faced 1 or more years of residency training before they could begin actual medical practice.

I have often pointed out that a number of Federal agencies such as the Office of Education, National Science Foundation, and Atomic Energy Commission provide not only loan but also scholarship and fellowship assistance to Ph. D. candidates in the basic sciences and engineering. Small wonder that these fields are becoming increasingly attractive to young people trying to decide upon a career.

The second effect of my amendment would be to help alleviate physician and dentist shortages in areas where shortages are most serious; in particular, the rural areas of the United States.

For the past 20 years, the New England, North Atlantic, and Pacific regions of the United States have retained high ratios of physicians to population, while the South Central, North Central, and Mountain States have continued to have the lowest ratios.

In 1957 a total of 33 States were below the U.S. average in the ratio of non-Federal physicians to population. In view of the fact that our population has continued to increase while the number of graduating physicians has not, there is good reason to believe that the situation existing in 1957 is even more serious today.

The original intent of the National Defense Education Act which authorized the national defense student loan program, was "to identify and educate more of the talent of our Nation" and "to insure trained manpower of sufficient quality and quantity to meet the national defense needs of the United States."

Thus the third—and perhaps most important—effect of the amendment I propose would be to bring the national defense student loan program into closer conformity to these stated objectives which reflect not only the intent of the National Defense Education Act, but also the best interests of our Nation.

Urban Mass Transportation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERMAN TOLL

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 14, 1963

Mr. TOLL. Mr. Speaker, I have today sponsored the urban mass transportation bill so that I can be counted as one who is strongly supporting the administration bill, which provides $500 million in matching grants over a 3-year period to help State and local governments improve mass transit facilities.

A conference on transportation was held in the northeast section of Philadelphia, which is in my district. Local transportation problems were considered at the meeting, which was attended by civic leaders and city officials. Panel members who participated are connected with the Passenger Service Improvement Corp., Penjerdel, and Penn Jersey Transportation Study.

On March 4 the Honorable James H. J. Tate, mayor of Philadelphia, appeared before the House Committee on Banking and Currency as an official representative of the U.S. Conference of Mayors. Mayor Tate said he supported the mass transit bill "because I believe it offers an opportunity of providing adequate public transportation through regional agreements with private operations."

While some witnesses before the committee called the proposed legislation very conservative, requiring substantial local initiative and participation, it is an important step in the right direction. The enactment of the Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1963 will materially aid the development of the city of Philadelphia and other great urban centers in our country.

Community Junior Colleges

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE M. RHODES

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 14, 1963

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill to establish a 5-year program of Federal assistance to the States for construction and expansion of public community junior colleges.

My bill is similar to a bill I introduced in the last session of the Congress and with H.R. 1575, which Mr. Ullman, of Oregon, introduced last January 19.

The modest program of Federal assistance for public community colleges provided in my bill will help combat the twin problems of the increasing need for technically trained manpower and the rising costs of college education. The high costs of college education prevents millions of bright youngsters from attending college. This problem and the absence of college facilities in many communities causes an unfortunate loss of brainpower which could be saved by establishing easily accessible and inexpensive public community colleges.

My bill provides for $200 million annually over a 5-year period for grants to the States for construction and expansion of public community colleges. Half of the yearly appropriation would be divided equally among the States. The remaining one-half would be apportioned among the States on the basis of their relative school enrollment compared to total school enrollment of all States.

The program will be administered by the U.S. Commissioner of Education in cooperation with the various State boards or commissioners of education. Federal assistance will be contingent upon acceptable State plans for constructing and expanding public junior colleges in communities needing and desiring such institutions.

Construction of public junior colleges will make higher education available at low cost to the student and at moderate cost to society. There is a great need for these colleges, particularly in areas such as I represent.

Just as importantly, an expanded nationwide system of public community colleges can serve a diversity of purposes crucial for our increasingly technical economy. They provide 2-year programs of technical, scientific, and managerial training for those not desiring to attend a full 4-year college course. They also permit students desiring to complete 4-year courses to begin their education more inexpensively near home.

The investment required by this program is truly insignificant compared to the returns it will provide our society.

Need for Congressional Emphasis on Farm Income

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEC G. OLSON

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 14, 1963

Mr. OLSON of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill to extend the feed grain program under terms which will give assurance of fair prices to farmers. Testimony has been presented to the Livestock and Feed Grain Subcommittee, of which I am a member, pointing out the success of the voluntary feed grain programs enacted by Congress for the years 1961 and 1962.

Present indications are that farmers will again sign up in larger than anticipated numbers for the feed grain program enacted for 1963. There is no dispute that our burdensome surplus feed grain stocks have been greatly reduced under these programs. In fact, testimony has been presented which would indicate that by the end of the 1963 marketing year, our feed grain stocks will be down to the point of providing only a safe carryover.

I make these remarks to point out the success of the programs passed by Congress to reduce the surplus. These programs, as we all know, were voluntary and to have been successful they required the cooperation of farmers. Farmers did cooperate and their income was substantially increased. Now, however, when stocks are reaching the point where they are not out of proportion to being adequate, I believe that Congress should be reminded that farmers are still receiving far less than their fair share of our national income.

It seems to be very evident that whenever our Nation has felt that need to call for increased production or decreased production, the farmer has always cooperated with congressional direction.

I believe very strongly that Congress should not now turn its back on the continued need of economic justice for our agricultural economy and I am in receipt of documented proof every day that much must yet be done to further improve farm income. The small businessmen in my district fully realize that the mere elimination of farmers is no solution to the less-frequent ring of the cash register. He is well aware that it is the total agricultural income of his trade area that counts, not how many farmers bring that income to town.

Mr. Speaker, I as well as the farmers I represent are well aware of the serious problems confronting our Nation. We believe that in order for the agricultural community to best be able to help solve these problems agriculture must be prosperous.

St. Patrick's Day Has Special Memory for All in Rhode Island

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. FOGARTY

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 14, 1963

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following speech which I delivered to the Shamrock Society of North Providence, R.I., at Bouffard Council Hall, on March 10, 1963:

ST. PATRICK'S DAY HAS SPECIAL MEMORY FOR ALL IN RHODE ISLAND

(Remarks of U.S. Representative JOHN E. FOGARTY at annual celebration of Shamrock Society of North Providence at Bouffard Council Hall, North Providence, R.I., March 10, 1963)

I am happy to be with the Shamrock Society of North Providence tonight and to join in honoring the memory of Ireland's great St. Patrick on the eve of his approaching feast day.

For most of us the history of Ireland and the Irish race does not begin until the coming of St. Patrick to the Emerald Isle. It is difficult for any of us to even think of Ireland, or to speak about its past, its present, or its future, without at the same time thinking and speaking of its patron saint. It is quite appropriate and necessary that we of Irish birth or ancestry never cease to commemorate his feast day with gatherings such as this of the Shamrock Society of North Providence. It is the one and only time in all the year that we pause to recall the values of our Irish heritage, a noble heritage which has contributed so much to the mainstream of our own American way of life.

In a true sense we share the memory of St. Patrick and the celebration of his feast day with many others of differing races and nationalities for the simple reason that his character and his contributions to Christian civilization are such as to command a universal respect and admiration. This probably accounts for the fact that the patron saint of Ireland is not only honored in many other lands but also he is claimed as a native son by a number of nations extending from the Baltic Sea to the Mediterranean. As you know, the exact place of his birth has never been precisely determined. Some say that Patrick came to Ireland from the sunny shores of Italy or Spain; others say that he was born in the rocky uplands of Scotland or a lonely village on the French Normandy coast; some other authorities claim that he was really brought to Ireland from the Scandinavian area as a young galley slave on one of the Viking ships which frequently raided communities along the shoreline of Ireland. Perhaps it is not too important for us to know the exact origin of St. Patrick. The important thing is that we know that he brought the doctrine of the Christian gospel to pagan Ireland and achieved a victory there which has never been lost despite the erosion of the centuries on the spirit of man since those ancient days. His impact on the Irish mind and spirit has never been destroyed. Moreover, the peaceful force of Christian idealism which he implanted in the hearts and minds of the men and women of Ireland has produced a harvest of tremendous good in all quarters of the globe right up until the present time.

The tide of saints and scholars who have ventured forth from the green hills and dales of Ireland to other lands has resulted in innumerable achievements for the cause of Christian civilization both yesterday and today. No other country of comparable size in the history of the world has done so much for the cause of Christianity, and it all began with the planting of the seeds of faith by St. Patrick himself.

The religious nature of St. Patrick's Day requires that the first and most important of our recollections is that of the spiritual heritage which we derive from our Irish ancestry. However, as a direct result of adherence to the true concepts of Christianity, the Irish came to love and cherish freedom and liberty and to despise oppression and bigotry with such vehemence as to be willing to sacrifice their lives and fortunes in a persistent struggle to achieve and maintain these virtues for themselves and for others. Indeed, it can be said that the persecution and oppression of Ireland in the years gone by has been a most significance factor in the development of liberty and free government in various parts of the world.

For example, the earliest record we have of Irishmen in the United States coming together to pay homage to St. Patrick practically coincides with the movement for freedom and independence in the American Colonies. In 1771, at the city of Philadelphia, an organization which numbered both Protestants and Catholics of Irish birth or descent was founded and dedicated "to the memory of Ireland's patron saint." Many of them were later identified with the Revolutionary Army of Gen. George Washington—one of them, Stephen Moylan, became the trusted aide-de-camp to Washington himself. Other Irishmen were signers of the Declaration of Independence and were early participants in the Continental Congress. The contribution of the Irish to the foundation and the advance of this country is too well known to require any long recitation.

Their persecution in their homeland was due, as we know, chiefly to the reason of their loyal adherence to the faith of their fathers. The denial of this basic human freedom in Ireland resulted in a tremendous migration of Irishmen either through their free choice or by virtue of compulsion to many other lands on the European, North and South American continents, and even as far as the continent of Australia. Wherever they went the men and women of Ireland brought to their new homes love of their religion, love of ideals of freedom and liberty, and a hatred of oppression and tyranny. This is why Chile honors a Bernardo O'Higgins as its great liberator, France, a Marshal McMahon, America, a John Barry, Australia, a Sir Charles Duffy, and Newfoundland, a Michael O'Gorman—all sons of Ireland who were dedicated to the cause of freedom in their adopted countries.

We can all take pride in the fact that the names of countless Irishmen are found in the records of the early struggles of this country for its independence as well as its successive wars to maintain it. Of course, we are equally proud of the contribution in the arts and sciences which men of Irish birth or ancestry have made to the development and progress of the United States. I believe, however, that there is a special affinity between the characteristic Irish quality of stubborn insistence upon freedom and liberty, upon the right of freedom of worship, and the great historic tradition of our own State of Rhode Island of which we are all so proud and yet, at times, we may tend to forget. This State was founded on principles of liberty for which Irishmen were struggling and dying in Erin's Isle at the very time that Roger Williams, fleeing from puritanical oppression in the Massachusetts Bay Colony, erected his banner of freedom at what he called the Providence Plantations. He was banished for having dared to express the very thoughts of religious freedom and liberty in his sermons and writings which, if adopted in the British Isles, would have spared the people of Ireland from the fire and sword of the invading armies of Cromwell which were occurring at that very time. It is interesting to note that Roger Williams spoke out with equal vigor against the persecution of the Irish in Ireland as he did against the persecution of the Huguenots in France and the Indians in America.

In short, he spoke a language which the Irish could understand and support; he expressed a doctrine which would have meant salvation instead of ruination for the tiny nation of Ireland in his own day. While we know that he found no Irishmen awaiting him here on his long, hazardous flight from Massachusetts, who can say that a leprechaun or banshee did not help to guide him safely through the wilderness?

In keeping with the Christian concepts of charity, however, it is interesting to note that in 1676 when a great deal of suffering resulted from the Indian wars in New England, a public subscription was undertaken in and around Dublin, Ireland, to send a ship loaded with oatmeal, wheat, malt, butter, and cheese to relieve the critical needs of the early New England settlers. Most of this relief went to the Plymouth Colony. This is known as the "Irish donation of 1676" and is referred to in the "New England Historical General Register" as well as in the "Reports of the Rhode Island Historical Society." This is a remarkable demonstration of the application of the true Irish spirit of forgiveness.

It is well, also, to remember that the famous battle of Rhode Island which was fought near Newport in 1778 was successfully accomplished by forces of the Revolutionary Army under the command of the great New England Irishman, John Sullivan. There are many other interesting contributions to the early foundations of this State in which the names of men of Ireland are prominent. I would like to think that the Irish were particularly at home in this area because of the principles upon which the State was founded and Saint Patrick's Day should be the brighter and the happier for that very reason in the land of Roger Williams.

Recently, I came across an interesting connection between Ireland and the early State of Rhode Island which I would like to share with you. It is found in an early history of Brown University published in Providence in 1867 by a librarian of the university, Mr. Guild. In recounting the history of the foundation of this famous institution, originally called the College of Rhode Island, and setting forth the difficulties encountered in adopting its remarkably liberal charter which guarantees educational opportunities to persons of all religious faiths, the author told the story of the Reverend Morgan Edwards who in 1767, was commissioned to solicit funds for the foundation and endowment of the college.

He was authorized to seek them in England and Ireland to which he sailed that year. In order to allay any doubt as to his honesty, Dr. Edwards gave a meticulous account of all his receipts together with the names and residences of his benefactors. It is a remarkable fact that a large part of the contributions for the founding of this Baptist institution came from the cities of Cork and Dublin. As a matter of fact, the contributions from Dublin were greater than from any other area in the British Isles, except from the city of London. It is apparent that the concepts of freedom and liberty contemplated by the founders of the university struck a responsive chord in the hearts of many Irishmen.

High on the list of these early benefactors of Brown University are Mary Murphy, Frances McCarty, William Harrington, Mrs. Luke Kelly, John Reilly, Mary McMaster, John Armstrong, Joseph Dunn, and William Mitchell. Others on the Reverend Edwards list were Mathew O'Dwyer, Francis Allin, William Lawton, Humphrey Crowley, James Ellis, James Aikin, John Lyons, Abe Lane, Richard White, Robert Moore, Rachel Connors, William McGowan, James Martin, Thomas Read, Thomas King, Rebecka Gibbons, William Hunt, Nathaniel Mackey, Dr. Samuel McCormick, William Mitchell, James Moody, and James Brennan.

These contributions from Ireland together with those from England were placed in a special fund by the officers of the university with the requirement that the "interest thereof should forever go to pay the salary of the President."

So, from College Hill to Newport back to the Massachusetts border, St. Patrick's Day should be a day of special memory for all of us in Rhode Island. Let us never forget our heritage and let us not forget to give our thanks for the blessings of freedom and liberty which every son of Ireland has found awaiting him here in this great State of Rhode Island.

Address by Senator Hartke Before the District of Columbia Dental Society

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. BIRCH E. BAYH

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 14, 1963

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to include in the RECORD the remarks of Senator VANCE HARTKE made before the District of Columbia Dental Society on March 11, 1963.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

It is probably true that you at one time or another have had a personal experience which brought out your instinct of self-preservation. For example, a serious personal sickness, combat in war, serious financial difficulties, or personal challenges. My purpose today is to think in terms of your self-preservation and how it is tied to our Nation.

First, we will review Khrushchev as a dictator; second, we will consider Stalin and Khrushchev; third, we will see that Khrushchev is a dictator and must be treated as one; fourth, we will recognize that dictators and thereby Khrushchev are real failures to humanity; fifth, we will try to bring out your self-preservation by recognizing that although dictators are dangerous, that our self-preservation is dependent on something more than merely defeating dictators.

In these days, it is frequent that there are wild exaggerations, at least in statements of some individuals, concerning the role of Khrushchev.

Frequently, many individuals seem to think that there is something remarkably different about this man. Let's look at him for a moment.

He is a dictator. He is pursuing a goal with a relentlessness, and sometimes pettiness. Khrushchev is, certainly, a man to be concerned with in this world today, mainly because of where he is in a position of importance. Therefore, we would have to admit that he is an important man.

But the fact that he is important does not make him immune to the emotions and weaknesses of less important men. He is subject to jealousy, to wounded pride, certainly to the desire for publicity. He is ambitious to the extent that he is interested in always attempting to disprove any inferiority he might have. He is revengeful. He has a tendency to close the door on those with whom he disagrees, and he certainly disagrees with enough people as is evident by those who have been banished from high place in his government.

Indeed, the passion and the temperament, and the drive, which raised this man to the heights which he has today, tend to intensify and to magnify his own personal failings. But in all of this, let us not be unmindful that these emotions are going to affect our future and mold history. In Russia, there is nothing new to see a man such as Khrushchev in a position of dictatorship. The Russian people have really never known any government except dictatorial leadership.

Stalin, for example, is probably going to be recognized as one of the most powerful dictators that the world has ever known. Stalin was, in many ways, what Khrushchev would like to be, today. Stalin certainly had determination. He had fire and glamor. He was a master at deception. He was capable of zig-zagging in major policy. He was always accessible to the persons that he wanted to be accessible to. He was always able to outmaneuver those who worked around him.

Stalin always supervised the little things. This left the impression that he was very personal in his approach.

Stalin wanted to be associated in the eyes of his people with Lenin because Lenin led the spirit of the revolution. Early, in the revolutionary days of course, it was always Lenin and Trotsky. Stalin wanted it to be Lenin and Stalin. So, Stalin managed to eliminate Trotsky and thus it was Stalin and Lenin. Then on Stalin's death Khrushchev wanted to replace Stalin with himself. Khrushchev wanted it to be Lenin and Khrushchev. Then the pattern is practically the same. Stalin, in his day, insisted that every mention of Trotsky's name, in a favorable light, had to be stamped out. Today, Khrushchev insists that every mention of Stalin's name in a favorable light must be stamped out. Stalin had all of Trotsky's pictures destroyed. Now Khrushchev has had all of Stalin's pictures destroyed. Stalin had the Soviet history and books revised and republished in order to completely take Trotsky out of the books, or to otherwise blacken his role. Now Khrushchev has had the histories and books revised in order to take Stalin out of them or to blacken his role. Under Stalin, the authors wrote the histories of the Red army without praising Trotsky's name once, even though Trotsky was the organizer of the Red army and the first Bolshevik War Commissar. Now Khrushchev is having the histories rewritten to show that he was the real military leader of the army in World War II.

Stalin left the impression that it was he who always stood by the side of Lenin, not Trotsky. Now Khrushchev indicates that it is his ideas which are similar to Lenin, and not Stalin. Stalin, in his day, had to be hailed as the source of all good, the originator of all good ideas, the father of every successful enterprise. Now it is Khrushchev who must be hailed as the source of all good in Russia. Khrushchev now insists he is the originator of all the ideas and he is the father of every successful enterprise.

What this all adds up to is—Stalin was a dictator; Khrushchev is a dictator. We must treat them in every way as any democracy must treat a dictator. To be misled into believing that Khrushchev is not really a dictator would be self-deception.

However, it is also evident that even dictators sometimes have good goals. Just as in Stalin's time, there was a definite desire to create generally better economic conditions. He was interested in building more factories and harnessing the power of the Soviet Union. So today, Khrushchev, too, is interested in doing those things which make the country stronger because only in this way is a dictator able to continue his own personal dictatorship. What probably is more important to them as dictators is that it builds their own personal glorification.

Thus, no matter what Khrushchev ultimately was, when his power as a dictator is threatened, you can expect him to act basically as Stalin acted, using fear, lies, and murder. Every dictator usually ends up using these same weapons.

I need not remind you of the possibility of war. Usually, the cause of the war is long in the making, but really short in breaking. To make matters worse we have found out that dictators are always very dangerous for individuals, dangerous for their countries, and dangerous for world peace.

One thing, above all, that we should by this time know, is that dictators have taught us to treasure freedom above everything else.

The experience of all dictatorships has been that without freedom there can be no full stomachs. There can be no economic security without civil rights. For what good is a job when the secret police can take you out of it, or when you can be arrested without a charge and sentenced to jail or death without a trial. Remember, that citizens of a dictatorship want most of all to be free. Furthermore, nobody except the dictator ever likes a dictatorship.

The dictatorships of the past make us love democracy more and more. But then, the question arises—how much do we really love democracy?

You could answer: We fought World War I, then World War II, for democracy—two major wars in a generation.

In spite of this we now must face the question, Will there be world war III? Do people really learn from past experience? Have we learned from the mistakes we have made in the past? Those mistakes which have cost millions of people their homes and their lives. Has this really opened up our eyes? Just how did we get into those two terrible wars? How can we avoid another of the same kind.

These, really, are the questions which we should be answering—or at least, we should be asking them.

These questions and their answers are more important than whether or not some individual remains in office. It is more important than talking about our rights to certain territory. It is more important than even local markets or the world markets. Certainly it is more important than money.

There are some obvious facts. First, some of the basic causes of friction between nations continue without much abatement; second, there is general economic maladjustment in many parts of the world; third, there certainly is racial animosity; fourth, there are social injustices existing in almost all areas of the world.

These poisons were not caused by communism. These were the poisons which produced World War I. These were the poisons which produced World War II. Furthermore, these are the poisons which could easily produce world war III.

Even though dictators may start wars, their chances for success depend on the existance of these poisons. In my opinion, Hitler could not have succeeded to have overrun Europe if it had been a healthy Europe. Nor could Mussolini have taken Ethiopia if it had been a healthy Ethiopia.

The real difficulty was with the basic foundations of these countries when the dictators started their wars. Now, what is it that Khrushchev or Mao Tse-tung have to offer that Hitler didn't offer, or Mussolini didn't offer, other than murder, slavery, fear, and hunger. They offer no solutions. They will not eliminate the international poison.

The Chinese are starving. There is a shortage of coal in Prague, in Czechoslovakia today. In every Communist country the farmers have failed in their efforts to produce enough to feed their people.

Certainly Khrushchev is not in the position to offer anything of a positive nature. He has not been able to give his people real freedom so let's mark him down as scoring a zero. He's flunked the course.

In other words, Khrushchev has demonstrated that he cannot give any proof that communism can build anything for human needs.

Yet, dictators have won victories. Since this is true, this is proof enough that there is something more needed in this world than what we have so far offered. Dictators have not cured any of the human problems of the world; but equally true they are not the sole cause of the world's troubles.

If governments are going to be indifferent to the cruel suffering of millions of their own flesh and blood, then we certainly can expect that the poisons for more wars are already with us.

We seem to be capable of spending billions of dollars in order to prepare for war, to prepare for destruction. But we scream and fail in any way, to take positive action to wipe out our slums here at home; to meet the real challenge in the field of education; to meet the problems of continued long-term unemployment; to treat humans as equals.

First of all, we are going to have to be capable of convincing our own people that we believe in real freedom in the field of civil rights, economic rights, and human rights.

We are going to have to convince our own country and the world that we are determined to fight the battle against hunger; to take action against poverty; to provide the opportunity for every individual in our land and the rest of the world to secure food, housing, and an opportunity to live in decency and real freedom.

No one will be able to guarantee these rights for any length of time. It will take continuous action.

The world wants something new and something better. Now is the time for us, as a free society, to provide that type of intelligent, intellectual leadership which can give the world something new and something better. We can make their dreams come true; we can help to make this world a place where peoples homes are places of hope, where prayers for freedom and peace can mean something real.

For, after all, it is not alone the dream of every American, but it is humanity's dream—the dream of all people—that there be freedom, peace, and plenty. The world's people want rather simple things—personal items such as decency, honesty, loyalty to friends, goodness, and the respect for human life. These are the things which are scorned in dictatorship.

They were scorned by Stalin. They were scorned by Hitler. They were scorned by Mussolini, and they are scorned by Khrushchev.

Even though we in this country may have, at times, dulled the spirit of revolt and searching; let us remember that under dictatorships such as Khrushchev, they have crushed the spirit of revolt and searching, more important they also crush the right to protest and the right to think. In a real free society, the spirit of revolt, the spirit of searching and the right to protest and the right to think must be guaranteed.

We have seen that communism has failed the society of the world. Some say we must make a choice between freedom or a full stomach.

We know that no dictatorship has ever given freedom or a full stomach.

But in the free society, we can have ideas. We can make ideas live. We can make ideas work. We can also have full stomachs.

This is the spirit of democracy. This is the spirit which can destroy war, destroy depression, can destroy racial feuds, can end slums and can end unemployment.

Some men have this vision. Some men want to carry out the action to make the vision a reality. To some this may seem like sacrifice, but to me this seems like the greatest opportunity that man will ever have—namely, to serve his fellow man for the glory of God.

On the Washington Scene

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH E. KARTH

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 14, 1963

Mr. KARTH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following newsletter entitled "On the Washington Scene":

ON THE WASHINGTON SCENE

MAGNA CARTA FOR THE AGED

While the Nation's news media properly highlighted the announcement of President Kennedy's proposal for hospital insurance for retired persons they pretty much ignored the rest of his far-ranging plan to bring our growing ranks of old people back into the mainstream of our community life. To me the idea of putting to use the talents and the experience of our senior citizens is at least as significant a proposal as providing for their physical well-being.

The administration's hospital insurance for the aged proposal, introduced as H.R. 3920 by Congressman CECIL KING and as S. 880 by Senator CLINTON ANDERSON, represents an improvement over previous bills as might be expected when legislation has been under long consideration.

As President Kennedy pointed out in his special message, the financing of health care costs for the aged is becoming an increasingly serious problem not only for individuals but also for local communities and States which are reluctantly being saddled with those costs after individuals exhaust their savings and sell their assets to pay hospital and doctor bills. At present there are 17½ million people over 65 years and the number increases by 1,000 a day until by 1980 there will be 25 million. Medical costs for retired people are skyrocketing well beyond their current ability to pay. Only 10 to 15 percent of such costs are covered by private insurance. Three-fourths of all retired people over 65 have incomes of less than $2,000 a year, much of which comes out of public benefit programs because in fact 12.5 million receive social security benefits and another 2¼ million are on public assistance.

The administration sees its plan to provide social insurance financing for hospital and nursing care as a sound conservative way to keep the mounting costs of serious illness for retirees from being shifted to local real estate and/or personal property taxes. State and local governments are already suffering from insufficient revenues and pressures to provide facilities and services for a growing population.

The new King-Anderson bill would provide:

Eligibility: Insurance to defray for practically all persons past 65 the cost of inpatient hospital, outpatient hospital diagnostic, skilled nursing home, and home health care. Cost for those receiving social security will be paid from a new fund in the system while that for other persons will be paid from the Federal Treasury.

Scope and duration: Inpatient hospital services paid for either, (a) up to 45 days with no deductible; (b) up to 90 days with a deductible of $10 a day for the first 9 days—with a minimum of $20—or (c) up to 180 days with a deductible equal to 2½ days' average hospital care;

Skilled nursing home services: Up to 180 days furnished in nursing facilities affiliated with hospitals.

Outpatient hospital diagnostic services: As required subject to $20 deductible, when furnished during 30-day period.

Home health services: Up to 240 visits during calendar year by therapists or health aids for recovering patients.

No Government interference: Patients would be free to choose their own physician and accredited hospital.

Private groups: Blue Cross or other organizations chosen by hospitals to represent them can have delegated to them certain responsibilities in administering the act.

Private health insurance: The act would provide that private health insurance will be encouraged to develop supplementary insurance protection for the aged.

Financing: All costs paid for social security beneficiaries would be financed through increases in contribution rates of one-fourth of 1 percent for employers and employees and four-tenths of 1 percent for the self-employed. Maximum annual earnings subject to tax would be raised from $4,800 to $5,200 beginning with 1965. Cost of benefits for other beneficiaries will be paid from the general fund in a transition period until practically everyone can qualify for social security coverage.

Tax benefits: Proposed tax reductions in 1963 are especially planned to ease burdens for people over 65. A $300 tax credit would be substituted for the extra exemption and retirement income credit to reduce the present unfairness in taxation of income from different sources. It is estimated by 1965 about 3.4 million persons 65 years and over will pay $470 million less in Federal income taxes.

Improved economic security: Raising the maximum taxable wage base for computing benefits from $4,800 to $5,200 will make it possible to raise maximum monthly benefits for a worker from $127 to $134 and for a family from $254 to $268.

Increased employment opportunities: In his message President Kennedy pointed out, "Denial of employment opportunity to older persons is a personal tragedy. It is also a national extravagance, wasteful of human resources. No economy can reach its maximum productivity while failing to use the skills, talents, and experience of willing workers."

It disturbs me that in recent years our economy has lost its vigor and failed to provide jobs for millions of young workers and forced the early retirement of older workers. I am gratified over this emphasis given to finding ways to stimulate our economy.

Looking to the day when all willing workers can have jobs, the President recommends that the Federal civilian agencies review current policies and practices regarding the employment of older workers, looking toward the better use of their skills and experience. Private employers are invited to do the same.

The President further recommends that the Federal-State Employment Service strengthen its counselling and placement services and give special attention to the employment of older workers.

In addition the President recommends that the manpower development and training and the area redevelopment programs give special attention to the training of older workers in their communities. New ways will also be sought to find out what jobs elderly men and women may want to do part-time in their own neighborhoods. Some suggested activities would be school lunch hour relief, child care in centers for working mothers, home care for invalids, assistance in schools, vocational training and programs to prevent juvenile delinquency.

Also, a proposed National Service Corps contemplates the enlistment of elderly people with special abilities in volunteer service programs in their communities.

The broad scope of the President's program for elderly citizens illustrates the practical idealism of the administration. In setting it forth to Congress President Kennedy was mindful of historian Toynbee's observation that a society's quality and durability can best be measured "by the respect and care given its elderly citizens."

I am confident that history will record that our society was not found wanting because our country, true to its tradition of humane consideration, did in our day adopt a health, economic and social program which adequately meets the physical and spiritual needs of our citizens in the golden years of their lives.

FORT SNELLING INSURANCE CENTER

In the past weeks the Veterans' Administration in Washington has been putting the final touches on plans to transfer the VA insurance activities of the Denver Office to Fort Snelling. By June 30 it is expected that the augmented facilities at Fort Snelling will handle 2 million GI life insurance policies representing $13.5 billion worth of protection to veterans and their families in 28 States of the West, Midwest, and the South.

The consolidation of activities at Fort Snelling was due largely to the economic and efficient performance of the staff there which is under the direction of Manager John Murphy. I was pleased to participate at various stages in the decisionmaking process on the transfer.

MODERNIZATION OF THE ST. PAUL POST OFFICE AND CUSTOMHOUSE

During the month, I announced that the General Services Administration was initiating plans to modernize the St. Paul Post Office and Customhouse Building on Kellogg Boulevard.

The existing building will be upgraded to bring it into conformity with the new addition. Construction on the annex at the rear of the building for the Post Office Department is proceeding but not without some problems.

I was notified recently that GSA has substantiated my charge that substandard ventilation ductwork was being installed. The faulty sheetmetal work is being replaced with the materials which the specifications require. Certainly the Government is entitled to receive full value for money spent on such projects.

JUNIOR ROTC

In swift reaction to the Defense Department's proposal to abolish Junior ROTC in the Nation's secondary schools, Congressman F. EDWARD HÉBERT, of the House Armed Services Committee, introduced H.R. 4444 to extend the program permanently. During hearings on March 6 and 7 a DOD assistant secretary announced that it was planned to continue Junior ROTC for at least another year.

I have been advised that Mr. HÉBERT plans to push for the enactment of his bill to put Junior ROTC on a permanent basis so DOD cannot alter it at whim.

This matter is of great interest to the many parents of Cretin High School boys who have written to me asking that the program be continued.

Safety Standards for Federal Employees

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CARLTON R. SICKLES

OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 14, 1963

Mr. SICKLES. Mr. Speaker, in 1961, the latest year for which figures are available, over 100,000 Federal employees suffered work-related injuries. Compensation for these injuries represented a new liability to the Federal Government in excess of $35 million. When we add the untold cost in human suffering to the fact that the liability incurred each year represents only a portion of the actual expenditures by the Federal Government as compensation for these injuries, we realize that this is a situation which deserves our most urgent attention.

As Congressman-at-Large from Maryland, a State in which more than 86,000 employees of the Federal Government work, in addition to the thousands of Marylanders that work in the District of Columbia for the Federal Government, I have interest in improving the existing safety practices.

There are presently no existing minimum safety standards which apply to all Federal agencies. With approximately 54 different Federal agencies responsible, under the Federal Employees' Compensation Act, for the safety of the Federal employee at the workplace, there are over 50 different types of safety programs.

With over 50 agencies responsible for individual safety programs, there presently exists much duplication of effort in the way of publications, training, inspections, and requests for financial support for safety personnel. There is no agency or coordinating body which has the authority to see that overall objectives are set, that minimum Government-wide safety standards are developed and put into effect. Although the Department of Labor promotes cooperation and coordination of the Federal safety effort, through the Federal Safety Council, it does not have authority to really develop and coordinate an effective Federal safety program.

My bill amending section 33(c) of the Federal Employees' Compensation Act would accomplish the following things:

First. It would require the head of each Federal agency to establish a safety program in conformity with the standards, programs, and regulations prescribed by the Secretary of Labor.

Second. It would give the Secretary of Labor authority to develop, promulgate and promote minimum safety standards for Federal employees.

Third. It would provide for surveys and investigations of injury cases which would provide useful data for individual agencies to use in controlling injuries to their employees.

Fourth. It would provide a means for coordinating and collecting the information and data developed by each Federal agency and making it available for all to use thus preventing duplication of effort.

Fifth. It would provide an advisory staff of technicians for those agencies wishing to initiate or improve their safety efforts.

Sixth. It would provide a Federal safety advisory committee which would include representatives from both labor and management and thus insure a more closely knitted joint labor and management effort toward improving the safety record.

Seventh. It would provide resources for training and education of Federal advisory personnel in order to upgrade the safety know-how of those responsible for the safety of employees.

It is imperative that something be done to better coordinate the Federal efforts in accident prevention. It is imperative that minimum Federal safety standards be developed and that every Federal agency be required to meet them. Amending section 33(c) of the Federal Employees' Compensation Act would establish the coordination and direction needed. It would reduce the danger experienced by Federal employees exposed to various hazards and save tax dollars.

Address by the Honorable Edmund S. Muskie, of Maine, Before Buffalo Group

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 14, 1963

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, March 10, our great city of Buffalo, N.Y., was highly honored by the presence of the distinguished Senator from Maine, the Honorable Edmund S. Muskie.

Senator Muskie was invited to Buffalo to address a joint dinner meeting sponsored by the Professional & Businessmen's Association, Inc., the Advocates Club of Buffalo, and the Medical Arts Society, and chaired by Mr. Eugene V. Buczkowski.

In the afternoon I was privileged to join a large delegation to meet Senator Muskie at the Buffalo International Airport. Immediately thereafter a reception was held in his honor at a local hotel.

In the evening, Senator Muskie was the principal speaker at the dinner, and his speech was very well received. He was introduced by Mr. John Aszkler, the former mayor of Lackawanna, N.Y., and the keys to Buffalo and Lackawanna were presented to him by Mayors Chester Kowal and John C. Ogarek respectively.

I am pleased to insert Senator Muskie's speech into the Congressional Record. His speech follows:

Address of the Honorable Edmund S. Muskie, of Maine, Before Buffalo Group

Never before in history has mankind had before it as great a promise for its fulfillment as we have today.

We are on the threshold of unbelievable development of our human and natural resources, and we can see on the horizon the control of disease, the eradication of poverty and misery, and a general uplifting of the standard of living throughout the world.

At the same time, however, mankind faces the gravest threat to its survival in history. We live in an age of crisis, and the threat of a nuclear holocaust is constantly with us.

This paradox derives primarily from the political situation which now exists in the world. Driven by the highest form of stimulation—a threat to national survival—the United States and the Soviet Union have, since World War II, made fantastic advances in science and technology and we are continually discovering—as a byproduct to the race for survival—ways and means to alleviate human misery.

This priority is, of course, due to necessity, not to choice. We all hope for the day when real peace will prevail, and national disputes are determined under the rule of law. Until that day arrives, however, we must maintain our defenses.

In assessing the worldwide struggle in which we are now engaged, many in the free world are, it seems to me, unduly pessimistic. Lately, we have been hearing and reading about the Communist threat to Cuba almost to the exclusion of other areas of conflict and crisis. While I would not for a moment attempt to minimize the gravity of the situation in Cuba, I would like, for a few moments, to try to assess the conflict to date in a broader historical perspective.

Let us set the stage.

The world is divided roughly into three groups: The Western democracies, centered around the United States and the NATO nations; the Communist bloc, centered around the Soviet Union and Red China; and the large group of so-called uncommitted nations.

The tensions which now grip the world derive from two principal sources.

First is the conflict which has arisen as a result of the policy of world domination openly advocated by the Soviet Union and the Communist bloc. Standing out against the Communist drive for world domination is the free world, led by the United States. Our objective is a peaceful world of independent nations free to choose their own system of government.

The second major source of world tension is the explosion of nationalism and the accompanying drive for improved living standards in the new and undeveloped countries.

The two forces are, of course, interwoven. For example, a major part of the Communist blueprint for domination includes taking advantage of the instability of uncommitted and undeveloped nations.

These, then, are the broad outlines of the world today.

Let me now make it clear that what I have to say about the future of communism is speculation, not fact; possibility not certainty. I claim no special crystal ball in world affairs. But I do think that sufficient evidence is available to suggest that communism has reached the high tide of its expansion and is starting to recede.

What is that evidence?

First, I believe, that, as a theory, communism has proven to be wrong. Marxist theory holds that communism must succeed because capitalism is doomed to destroy itself. Marx believed that capitalism must fail because it could only widen the gap between the rich and the poor, and that the oppressed would inevitably rise and overthrow the wealthy few.

The economists of the 19th century formed the basis for Marx's theory. They held that the ultimate and the only goal of a capitalist society was the accumulation of wealth in a competitive economy. It follows logically that a society geared to maximum profit in a competitive economy is forced to reduce wages as far as possible in order to increase profits. Marx simply carried this one step further and said that eventually wages for the masses would get so low and profits for the few would get so high, that an explosion would inevitably occur.

But Marx was wrong because he never considered the possibility that capitalism might be able to adapt itself to changing conditions. Essentially this has been brought about because the Western democracies possessed the framework—a free and openly elected government—within which to make peaceful changes, and because farsighted businessmen, trade union leaders, and economists have seen that a more equitable distribution of wealth was to the advantage of all concerned.

This was dramatically illustrated in January 1914, when Henry Ford first announced the $5 day. Prior to that, American wages rarely exceeded $2.80 for a 9-hour day. Ford—a most practical man—revolutionized economic theory by voluntarily raising employees' wages to $5 for an 8-hour day. This was, of course, directly contrary to accepted economic theory of the 19th century. It destroyed the foundation of Marxism.

Ford saw that by raising his wages above the mere subsistence level, he was making his workers customers also. This simple but revolutionary thought has made the American workingman the world's greatest consumer, and has raised American living standards to a degree unprecedented in history.

Thus, we see, that by its willingness to adapt, voluntarily, to changing economic circumstances, while retaining the basic concepts of private property and the profit motive, American capitalism has clearly demonstrated the fallacy of communism as a theory.

To be sure, labor and capital are in conflict in this country. To be sure, there has been violence. But it is largely a controlled conflict with a common objective, and few, if any, would dream of major class warfare here. In fact, it is here, in the heart of capitalism, that the classless society has been most nearly achieved. And we have, at the same time, retained intact our political freedoms, for we know that economic freedom and political freedom are bound together in such fashion that the loss of one generally leads to the loss of the other.

Not only has communism failed in theory; it has failed in practice.

Marx foresaw communism as the final stage in the development of nations, coming after the violent destruction of capitalism. In fact, as we have seen, communism developed originally in those countries which had never experienced a capitalistic society. They have used communism primarily as a method to achieve rapid industrialization. That is, in fact, communism's major appeal today to the undeveloped countries.

And though the Communist dictatorship has succeeded in transforming the Soviet Union into an industrialized society, it has done so at such a high cost in all other fields that it must be considered as a failure.

Consider Soviet agriculture. Abolition of private property, removal of the profit incentive, and forced collectivization have resulted in catastrophy after catastrophy in agriculture. Millions of farmers have been murdered in the process of enforcing collectivization. In the United States, farmworkers comprise 10 percent of our national labor force, and they have produced food in such abundance that disposal of our surplus has become one of our major domestic problems. By contrast, farmworkers comprise almost half of the Russian labor force, and theirs is a constant struggle to meet the national needs. We are all familiar with the results of the imposition of Communist theories upon Chinese agriculture, where each year has brought that country closer to the horrible prospect of widespread famine. And the problem persists in other Communist countries as well, such as East Germany and Yugoslavia. Nowhere in the Communist world is the agriculture problem one of surplus.

And, of course, the most important field where the failure of communism is evidence is in the field of political liberty and individual freedoms. The application of Marxist theories has required, in every Communist state, a completely closed society, fearful of new ideas and open interchange with other nations, afraid to permit its people to know what is going on. Each Communist country has been supervised by that 20th century testimonial to man's humanity—the secret police and the systematic use of terror.

All that Soviet Russia has demonstrated is that a large modern nation, rich in resources, can rapidly develop its industrial potential by giving to that development absolute priority over all competing claims. This can be done only by repressing political and economic freedom for the individual, and that is what the Soviets have done.

These first two pieces of evidence of the decline of communism—its theory and in fact—lead to a third: that communism has spent itself as an inspirational ideology which gripped men's hearts and minds completely. We are all familiar with the portrait of a dedicated Communist—subjugating his entire life to what he considered to be an ideal. That portrait is less common today than it was 30 or even 10 years ago.

In 1917, communism was a theory. In the 1930's it was an experiment. Today, it is a fact. And it is much more difficult to inspire with facts—unpleasant facts at that—than it is to do so with theories and experiments.

Inside the Communist bloc there have been increasing signs of tension and dissatisfaction with the monolithic state. The Polish and Yugoslav Communist Governments are under constant pressure from their people for more freedom. Khrushchev's destalinization program is not just a rejection of the rule of his predecessor, it is an indictment of the system itself.

In the underdeveloped countries, originally attracted by Communist promises of rapid economic development, we see increasing disillusionment and the rejection of Communist domination. This has happened, for example, in the African countries of Guinea and Algeria.

The really remarkable thing about the Communist effort in the uncommitted portion of the world has been its failure. On the surface communism offers quick and simple solutions which have great appeal for the illiterate and poverty stricken. Democracy, on the other hand, is an exacting form of government because it requires an active, educated people. The concepts of individual liberty are not easy to impart to people who have never had them. Nevertheless, slow as it is, we are making some progress, while communism's failure is more evident.

A fourth reason for its decline is the growing split within the Communist bloc itself.

For many years, the Communists and we in the West harbored an illusion of Communist countries as a single, monolithic group whose interests were identical. That illusion has now been shattered. The Communist bloc has emerged as a group of nations bound by force to a common ideology, but with divergent national interests. The most dramatic example, of course, is the growing split between Russia and China.

This split traces back many years. In the 1920's and 1930's, when the Chinese Communists were fighting for their very survival against the then superior forces of Chiang Kai-shek, Stalin repeatedly based his decisions upon what was good for Russia, not upon what was good for the Chinese Communists. Thus, when Stalin's principal foreign policy aim in the Far East was to create a strong China to act as a buffer between Russia and her traditional enemy, Japan, Stalin did not hesitate to sacrifice the Chinese Communists. Mao-Tse-tung was one of the first to learn this painful lesson. Whatever their personal beliefs about communism, Lenin, Stalin, and Khrushchev have been united in subjugating purely Communist interest to Russian interests when the two conflicted. Perhaps the best example of this was the Hitler-Stalin pact of 1939.

We must, however, retain our sense of perspective about this split. As serious as their differences are, Red China and the Soviet Union have much more in common. Aside from their mutual distrust, their principal difference at this time is one of methods, not goals. Both believe in the eventual destruction of the capitalist countries, but the Chinese Communists believe unswervingly in achieving this goal by forcible means, even if it involves total nuclear war. In fact, one of the most disturbing signs arising out of the arguments between the two is the apparent ignorance of the Chinese Communist leaders concerning the possible effects of total war. The Soviets believe no less in the ultimate goal of world domination, but they think the way to do it is by subversion and victory in the economic sphere. To the Chinese, the Russians advocate a soft line.

But let us not delude ourselves that they differ as to their goals. A complete split may come, but there is insufficient evidence to support such a proposition at this time.

My final reason for believing that communism is on the decline is the determination of the Western democracies to resist Communist aggression.

The Cuban crisis of last fall comes quickly to mind. It is more dramatic than previous confrontations because weapons continue to get bigger and more dangerous, but it is in reality one of a series of encounters in which resolve and determination have forced a Communist withdrawal.

Shortly after World War II, Stalin attempted to press the advantage he had gained by virtue of America's rapid demobilization and the continued presence of the Red army throughout Eastern Europe. He attempted to penetrate Iran, Turkey, and Greece. In each case the attempt was met with resolve, particularly in Greece where the fighting was brief but bloody. In each case, the Soviets failed, thanks to the Truman Point Four Plan. Soviet efforts to subvert the European countries were thwarted by the Marshall Plan and the formation of NATO.

In 1948, Stalin attempted to blockade Berlin, and again Western resolve turned a possible Soviet victory into a stunning defeat for communism.

The attempted Communist thrust into South Korea was contained because President Truman had the courage and foresight to commit American forces to the effort.

And even today, we are continuing the costly, difficult, yet necessary task of repulsing Communist aggression throughout Asia.

In addition to these defensive measures designed to contain Communist expansion, we are continuing our positive program of assistance to the undeveloped countries.

Our mutual security program, which helps us by helping others, directs foreign aid into productive channels.

In the past 8 years we have given $17 billion in surplus foods to the hungry and needy throughout the world, in a gesture of generosity unmatched in history.

The Peace Corps is another example of affirmative and imaginative action which demonstrates the kind of idealistic commitment which is possible in a free society.

These then are some of the reasons why I think that we may be seeing the beginning of the decline of communism. It is really an inefficient and inhumane system for operating a government.

But we must remain ever vigilant. It is a tragic fact of history that mankind has experienced only 220 years of peace in almost 3,500 years of recorded civilization. And the Second World War demonstrated anew that war will come to those who seek to avoid it at any cost. Only by maintaining our strength and our sense of justice will we persevere.

We must rely upon our own strengths and our own deeds in insuring liberty for our children. The Cuban crisis of 1962 provided us with a dramatic illustration of our strength properly utilized to achieve a desirable goal.

Foreseeing the possible decline of communism is no reason for a reduction of effort on our part. Real progress is never made by sitting back and hoping that your opponent will stumble. Indeed, one major reason for the decline of communism is our own strength and fortitude. A major relaxation of these by the United States would inevitably result in success by the Communists in their quest for world domination.

Destiny has placed into American hands the burden of carrying for all humanity the torch of liberty in these perilous times. I am confident that those hands are sufficient to meet the task.

Feed Grain Program Costs Illinois Livestock Producers $70 Million

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL FINDLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 14, 1963

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, 90 days of the Kennedy-Freeman feed grain program has cost Illinois livestock producers at least $70 million.

Secretary Freeman's policy of driving down corn prices through Government sales in order to get a good signup under the program, encouraged overproduction of livestock, and is responsible for the recent drop in prices.

Hog prices today are at the lowest point in 3 years, and cattle at the lowest in 18 months.

A 9.8-percent drop has occurred in Illinois hog prices and 10.5 in beef cattle since November. Average hogs dropped from $16.40 per hundredweight in November to $14.80 in February, while cattle declined from $23.70 to $21.20.

This price drop cost Illinois hog raisers $21.9 million and cattle raisers $47.3 million.

I base my calculation on a January 1 livestock inventory of 7,894,000 hogs worth $223,400,000 and 3,470,000 cattle worth $450,620,000.

The loss estimate is on the conservative side because part of the decline had already occurred by January 1, and dairy cows, also adversely affected, were excluded in the figures.

Even before the feed grain program was first enacted in 1961, livestock people were informed that it would be Government policy to keep market price of corn from rising. This was practically an insurance policy against feed prices going up, and consequently livestock numbers were increased.

The price received by American farmers for corn has declined slightly each of the last 3 years, and last year averaged $0.998—just under a dollar a bushel, as indicated by this table:

Corn—Monthly price received by farmers

[Per bushel]

	Calendar years				
	1959	1960	1961	1962	1963
January	$1.02	$0.979	$0.963	$0.951	$1.03
February	1.04	.995	1.00	.956	1.06
March	1.06	.999	1.01	.968	------
April	1.13	1.05	.945	.988	------
May	1.15	1.07	1.02	1.03	------
June	1.16	1.08	1.03	1.03	------
July	1.13	1.09	1.05	1.04	------
August	1.13	1.07	1.04	1.02	------
September	1.09	1.06	1.04	1.04	------
October	.990	.991	1.02	1.02	------
November	.982	.866	.938	.938	------
December	.959	.911	.947	1.00	------
Simple average	1.07	1.01	1.00	.998	------

Source: USDA.

Invocation by Very Rev. Joseph Baran, V.F.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE M. RHODES

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 14, 1963

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, the House of Representatives was honored today to have the Very Reverend Joseph Baran, V.F., pastor of St. Michael's Roman Catholic Church in Lansford, Pa., deliver the daily invocation. I am particularly pleased because Father Baran resided in Sheppton, Pa., in my congressional district, for over 20 years before assuming his present position at St. Michael's.

I am sure we all join in Father Baran's prayer for our respected colleague, CLYDE DOYLE, whose death today has saddened the Congress.

Father Baran also called our attention to the fact that today, March 14, 1963, marks the 24th anniversary of the proclamation of Slovak independence which was made on March 14, 1939.

I join Father Baran in commemorating this important anniversary. All Americans are justly concerned over the fate of more than 4 million Slovaks who are presently living under Communist dictatorship in their homeland. The more than 2 million Americans of Slovak origin who have made such a great contribution to our cultural, social, and economic life have a special interest in this day of commemoration. They can be assured that the Congress of the United States and all Americans join them in working for the day when freedom and justice and peace will reign throughout the world.

Investigative Arrests

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 14, 1963

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the text of a letter which I have today sent off to Commissioner Walter N. Tobriner, president of the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, as follows:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C., March 14, 1963.

Hon. WALTER N. TOBRINER,
President, Board of Commissioners,
District of Columbia,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Please accept, for yourself and your fellow commissioners, my very sincere appreciation for the courage and tact with which you handled a very delicate situation in connection with standing firmly behind your order that investigative arrests in the District of Columbia must cease.

You and your fellow Commissioners have taken the same oath as Members of the Congress to uphold and defend the Constitution of the United States. This you are doing in accordance with the dictates of your conscience based on the legal advice upon which you are entitled to rely.

You have acted in the best traditions of our country. Our Constitution very properly requires that the executive, judicial, and legislative branches of our Government be independent of each other. That means that no group of Congressmen, whether acting as a committee or part of a committee, have any right to direct the members of the executive department of Government in the fulfillment of their duties. The constitutional process provides for such directives only by act of Congress, which means the due and proper enactment of a law. The fact that the Congress has been too slow in correcting defects in the criminal law as it applies in the District of Columbia is neither reason nor excuse for countenancing further violation of the constitutional rights of American citizens.

This is not a shedding of tears for criminals. This is insisting on protection of the rights of the innocent.

It is indeed strange that in enforcing the Federal criminal law outside of the District of Columbia and in enforcing the criminal law in each of the 50 States, the enforcement and prosecuting authorities are not hampered because they are prohibited from making so-called investigative arrests in the manner and to the extent that has heretofore prevailed in the District of Columbia.

Once again, my hearty congratulations go forward to you.

With kindest personal regards, I am,
Sincerely yours,
ABRAHAM J. MULTER,
Member of Congress.

Critics of the Administration's Cuban Policies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CORNELIUS E. GALLAGHER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 14, 1963

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, I sense in recent days and I hope that I am perceptive, at least in this incidence, a tendency on the part of some but unfortunately not all critics of this administration's Cuban policies to be influenced more by fact, logic, and honesty than by fantasy. It was so blatantly obvious that the criticism of even some of the more responsible leaders of the opposition which we have heard lately was based on rumor passed to them by prejudiced and unreliable sources and nurtured by political opportunism.

It is encouraging to note that perhaps some have seen the error of their ways and have cause to realize that the kind of reckless criticism that has been so prevalent in the past is damaging to the security of the United States and hampers actions that might lead in a reasonable time to a peaceful solution of the Cuba problem.

But a great amount of damage has already been done by those who insist on making Cuba a political bogeyman in the hope that they might scare a few more votes into their camp.

The language and cliche of the reckless critic is so often more appealing to those who may have feelings on an issue but are largely uninformed. The flamboyant lexicon and emotional appeal are the weapons employed to overcome reason and truth.

The politically motivated critic has succeeded in influencing the thinking of many citizens and has, therefore, to a degree undermined confidence in the Presidency. How well these critics have succeeded was impressed upon me yesterday when I saw that the delicate problem of Cuba, which can be solved by no political party but only by a nation united, was the subject of an automobile bumper sticker bearing the flippant remark: "Don't worry they're still 90 miles away."

I am alleged to have a fair sense of humor, but I failed to see anything funny in this remark. To me it was merely further evidence that irresponsible political leaders have succeeded in making a matter of grave national security a partisan issue. They seek not a solution to this difficult problem, they hope for prolonging the controversy until 1964.

We do not by any means seek to shut off sound and reasoned criticism of the administration's actions with respect to Cuba. My concern is that the wild and reckless accusations of some members of the opposition wash over the more thoughtful and tempered criticism that contributes to, rather than impedes actions aimed at achieving a peaceful solution of the crisis in the Caribbean.

President Kennedy leaves shortly to travel to Costa Rica to meet with the heads of Latin American countries for a full discussion of the crisis in the Caribbean and South America and it is important that he leave for that crucial meeting with full bipartisan support.

The influence of the United States can be brought to bear at this meeting only if the President speaks with the united backing of the people of this country.

Those who for mere political gain seek to thwart this goal work against the best interests of the United States and a peaceful solution to the Cuba crisis.

Tribute to St. Patrick

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOSEPH G. MINISH

OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 14, 1963

Mr. MINISH. Mr. Speaker, we pause today to pay a tribute to St. Patrick, and to the land which has spread around the world the ideals to which he devoted his life. We pay tribute, too, to those of Irish birth or blood in our own America, both those who toiled in the past, to bring America to the prosperity and strength that are hers today, and to those who stand today bravely facing the future with Irish stubbornness and Irish resilience.

There are many speeches being made today, and each St. Parick's Day, to celebrate the qualities of the Irish people, and their contribution to the building of our America. But I make no apology for adding one more to the number. I owe it to myself, as well as to the glory of St. Patrick and the credit of the Irish in America, to stand forth and let it be known that I am grateful to St. Patrick for his heroic example and devotion to the Gospel, to the land of Ireland for her myth and magic, her laughter and valor, her human friendliness and her agelong endurance. I owe it to myself, too, to make it clear that I appreciate the great part men and women of Irish blood have played in the history of America, and in every phase of our life.

Through many long years, the Irish in America, coming as penniless refugees from poverty and starvation, from political oppression and religious restrictions, were largely confined to laboring jobs. It was they who built many of the railroads of America, the roads and canals, the ditches and sewers. But while they were laboring at these tasks, with long hours and low pay, they built more than the physical roadways and railways and waterways of our land. A greater contribution than their work in steel and asphalt and stone and brick was the warmth and sparkle they brought to American life, the ability to bounce back at adversity with a witty comment and a new effort, and the affection of family relationships, friendships, and love of man and woman. The power of Irish eloquence, and the sweetness of Irish song, especially as rendered by our magnificent Irish tenors and sopranos, has almost persuaded us that there is something distinctively Irish about a man's love for his mother, or a young man's fondness for a girl. From the caustic wit and jovial humor of Finley Peter Dunne, and the lyric love and patriotic enthusiasm of George M. Cohan, the nature of Americanism has become tinted with a most becoming hue of green. Therefore, on St. Patrick's Day, Americans of every race and national origin join with the Irish in paying joyful tribute to the great saint, and to the land to which he brought the great gift of faith.

Address by Attorney General Robert F. Kennedy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN BRADEMAS

OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 14, 1963

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD the text of an excellent address by Attorney General Robert F. Kennedy to the Civil Rights Committee of the New York City Central Labor Council, AFL–CIO.

The address, which was delivered on March 9, follows:

ADDRESS BY ATTORNEY GENERAL ROBERT F. KENNEDY TO THE CIVIL RIGHTS COMMITTEE, NEW YORK CITY CENTRAL LABOR COUNCIL, AFL–CIO, MARCH 9, 1963

I suppose it is inevitable that most of us are nearsighted about national problems. We are able to focus on them only as they apply close to home and we find it difficult to see how they affect people in other fields and other States. One of the curious things I have found since becoming Attorney General, however, is that when it comes to civil rights, we very quickly become farsighted. We are quite ready to point accusing fingers at the South and are easily outraged by a Little Rock, by the beating of freedom riders, or by a Meredith case. Yet we respond to discrimination right around us with blank and uncomprehending stares. The attitude is "the other fellow is wrong" and the more wrong he is, the more that automatically puts us on the side of the angels.

There is no question that segregation in the South is socially, politically, and morally wrong. But there is deep-seated segregation in the North, also, and it is just as wrong. Racial discrimination is a national, not a regional problem, and it cannot be solved simply by individual instances of Federal action on behalf of freedom riders or a single college student. The solution requires the hearts, the voices, the minds, and the muscle of individuals and organizations all over the country, public and private. The President said last week, in his civil rights message:

"The cruel disease of discrimination knows no sectional or State boundaries. The continuing attack on this problem must be equally broad."

I am particularly pleased to be with you here today because labor, and especially groups like yours, historically have been committed to social justice and social action. For years, unions have been in the forefront of efforts toward equal opportunity for all workers and all citizens.

Last year, Mr. Van Arsdale's local 3 provided an example of such leadership by including 200 Negroes and Puerto Ricans among its 1,000 new apprentices. The New York Council of Painters also has opened its apprenticeship program to Negroes and Puerto Ricans.

In the past few months, 122 international unions, representing more than 10 million workers have joined with the President's Committee on Equal Employment Opportunity and pledged themselves to union programs for fair practices. The dual seniority problem is the subject of wide and serious attention by labor. Segregated locals are fast disappearing. Indeed, probably at no time in the long history of the American labor movement have so many union leaders given such deep and effective attention to the problem of providing equal opportunity for all, regardless of race.

DISCRIMINATION IN LABOR MOVEMENT

Yet we would be dishonest with ourselves if we did not admit that some discrimination continues to exist within the labor movement—and by no means only in the South. I am thinking, for example, of a particularly ironic situation that exists right now in Washington. Howard University, a distinguished Negro institution, is building a new gymnasium. At least four of the building trades locals involved, however, have no Negroes working on the project. For that matter, these locals have only a handful of Negro members or apprentices.

The fundamental responsibility for solving problems like this is that of labor itself. Your group and others like it do a great deal to help. The Government also has a responsibility in this field: the work of the Vice President and the Equal Employment Committee is well known to you and the President has directed me to seek legal techniques, rules, and procedures to deal with such discrimination.

But there is a more fundamental responsibility for both you in the labor movement and for us in Government. We are as firmly opposed to discrimination in voting, education, and other fields as we are to discrimination in unions. It is in order to help the Nation act more effectively against discrimination that the President last week sent Congress a special message on civil rights. The administration's program includes three legislative proposals, concerning voting, education, and assistance to areas and organizations undertaking desegregation.

The first and most important bill deals with voting. The people's vote is the people's voice and when some people cannot vote they cannot effectively speak against injustice and deprivation of other rights.

It's like the story told at the time the 19th amendment was being voted on by the

States. A decided antifeminist complained to his Congressman: "Can't you do something to stop them scarecrow suffragettes from voting?" The Congressman replied, "You mean my charming constituents of the fairer sex?"

THE RIGHT TO VOTE

We have worked very hard under existing law seeking to guarantee the right to vote to all citizens. The Department of Justice has filed 35 voting suits, 25 of them in this administration, challenging discrimination or threats in southern counties against Negro registration applicants. But this is a painfully slow way of providing what is, after all, the fundamental right of citizenship. There remain more than 20 counties in the South where less than 15 percent of the eligible Negroes are registered.

Even where we have brought suit, the cases require extremely detailed preparation. In our suit in Montgomery County, Ala., for example, it was necessary to analyze 36,000 pages of voter applications and to subpena 185 witnesses for the trial. Such suits each require the total attention of 4 to 6 of the 40 lawyers in our Civil Rights Division for several months.

It often takes many more months before Negroes finally can register and vote. In Ouachita Parish, La., for example, the Department filed suit in July 1961. Although 24,000 out of the 40,000 eligible whites were registered to vote, only 725 of the 16,000 eligible Negroes were registered. Another 5,000 Negroes had, in fact, been purged from the voting rolls.

In the 33 months since we brought the suit, a special election for Congress has passed. A general election has passed. And still not even the date for trial has been set. It may well be 1964 before we finally secure a decision and Negroes can register and vote freely.

This is neither an extreme nor an isolated case. There is a real and immediate need for speeding up the process.

PREFERENCE TO VOTING SUITS

We are asking Congress, therefore, to authorize that voting suits be given preference on court dockets and tried in an expedited manner. This parallels the laws of many States which give priority to election suits in an effort to resolve them before the election is over and the chance to vote wiped out.

Even if cases can be expedited, there still will be a timelag between the filing of a suit and the issuance of orders against further discrimination. Therefore, we have asked Congress to provide for the appointment of temporary Federal referees to determine the qualifications of registration applicants during the time voting suits are pending in court.

In addition to the need for speed in guaranteeing the right to vote, there also is a great need for insuring fairness in determining who is qualified to vote.

Some Southern States use the literacy test to make this determination. As a result, barely literate whites, coached by the registrar, often are registered. Meanwhile, Negroes—like a National Science Foundation graduate student from Cornell, or teachers with advanced degrees—arbitrarily are declared illiterate and thus ineligible to vote.

Other States have used the constitutional interpretation test. Applicants must copy and explain sections of the Federal or State constitutions. Negroes often are required to copy and interpret long, archaic sections of a State constitution, or are required to explain what "due process" means, to a registrar who knows no law.

Whites, meanwhile, copy such provisions as, "There shall be no imprisonment for debt." One white gentleman, who was registered, interpreted that section in these words:

"I think that a Neogroe Should Have 8 years in college Be for voting Be couse He dont under Stand."

DOUBLE BURDEN OF INJUSTICE

We should reflect on such examples more in sadness than in irony, because they demonstrate the double burden of injustice inflicted on the Negro. Not only is he prevented from registering and voting, but the method of doing so is a grotesquely unfair test.

There's an acid joke about the Negro who attempted to register in a southern county. The registrar asked him to copy and interpret the 14th amendment. He did so, brilliantly. "All right, if you're so smart," the registrar said, "recite the Gettysburg Address from memory." The Negro did. "OK, give us the second inaugural speech." Again the Negro came through beautifully. Finally, the registrar pulled a Chinese newspaper out of his desk and asked, "Can you read this?"

"That's easy," said the Negro. "It says, 'No Negroes are going to vote in this State this year'."

We are asking Congress in our proposed voting measure to prohibit specifically the use of different tests or standards for different registration applicants. And we have asked that completion of the sixth grade should be regarded as evidence that an applicant is literate.

We also are asking Congress for two other pieces of legislation, both stemming from a need for assistance as well as enforcement. Our experience has demonstrated that people want to obey the law. In the field of education, for example, the violence last fall at the University of Mississippi should not overshadow the fact that 60 southern school districts were desegregated last year—peacefully and without fanfare. In many cases the Department of Justice assisted through informal consultations.

ASSISTANCE IN SCHOOL INTEGRATION

Communities in the South not only want to obey the law, but they want and need assistance in doing so. One of the laws we seek would establish in the Office of Education a program of technical and financial assistance to communities in the process of integrating their schools.

Such a program would help such school districts profit from the lessons of others—such as Atlanta, where public and private bodies combined with great success in 1961 to desegregate schools without incident. Many communities lack the background and resources required to minimize tensions both outside and inside the schools and to assure the maintenance and improvement of educational standards.

We have applied the same principle of providing information in our third legislative proposal, for the extension and expansion of the Commission on Civil Rights. Not only community governments, but many organizations, both public and private, both in the North and the South, can benefit substantially from expert guidance and information about how others have handled integration problems.

CIVIL RIGHTS COMMISSION

The Civil Rights Commission has the background and ability to satisfy this need and the President consequently has recommended that it be authorized to serve as a national civil rights clearinghouse—providing information, and technical guidance to any requesting agency.

Combined with continued effort under existing laws and policies, this, then is the administration's civil rights program. There are those who say this program does not go far enough. It is true that there is other civil rights legislation which might be introduced, such as a bill seeking authority for the Government to initiate school desegregation suits. But I would say to these critics that it is perfectly simple to introduce and support bills that have no chance of passage. But to do so would endanger measures that do have a chance. These critics have no responsibility for action. It is the aim of this administration to seek action and progress, not merely talk and headlines.

Further, let it be clear that this civil rights program is only that—a program. To sit back and wait for progress to come just because somebody in Washington has asked for new laws is as starry-eyed as waiting for the day labor minstrels once described when "the mills are made of marble and the machines are made of gold."

It took courage and effort for the labor movement to achieve the economic standards it enjoys today. It will take the same kind of effort to achieve the social ideals we profess in the field of civil rights.

We stand not only for labor or the Negro or minority groups, but for the ideal of freedom and dignity which underlies our society.

I come here today to call on you for your efforts on behalf of the administration's program. I come to ask you to speak out and act as a body. I ask you to go back to your internationals, your locals, and your communities to seek their support, both for this program and for its aim.

"Race discrimination," the President said in his civil rights message, "hampers our economic growth by preventing the maximum development and utilization of our manpower. It hampers our world leadership by contradicting at home the message we preach abroad. It mars the atmosphere of a united and classless society in which this Nation rose to greatness. It increases the costs of public welfare, crime, delinquency, and disorder. Above all, it is wrong."

Feast of St. Patrick

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 14, 1963

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, coming from New York City which shelters so many sons of Erin, I would like to take this opportunity to say a few words in commemoration of the feast of St. Patrick, which is being observed this coming Sunday, March 17.

It has been said that true statesmanship is the art of changing a nation from what it is into what it ought to be. With this definition in mind I would like to present the brief history of a man seldom referred to as a statesman, yet, within that definition, must be considered one of the greatest statesmen of all times. Without bloodshed and without revolution this gentle, God-fearing soul did change a nation from a conglomeration of violent, pagan clans into a God-loving people whose culture was a beacon to the world throughout the Dark Ages; whose unfaltering faith we have all admired; whose sparkling, perspective humor we have all enjoyed.

I refer, of course, to the people of Ireland and to their holy, venerable apostle, St. Patrick, whose feast day, March 17, is celebrated throughout the world.

St. Patrick's birthdate and birthplace are unknown. It is possible that he was born in France but more probable that he was born in Scotland, near the banks of the River Clyde. His father was Calpurnius and his mother was Conchessa, a near relative of St. Martin of Tours.

Raiders from the Irish coast captured St. Patrick at the age of 16 and carried him away in slavery to northern Ireland where he served King Milcho for 6 years. In nakedness, hardship and hunger he tended sheep and swine on the bleak, cold mountains of Antrim. Even in hardship St. Patrick learned to love the soft Irish countryside with its crags and brooks, its misty moors and rolling greenhills. He dearly loved the Irish people and readily adopted their gentle ways while rejecting their pagan customs.

St. Patrick returned to his homeland at the age of 22 after escaping from Irish slavery. For the next 20 years he lived a life of penance, prayer, and study in preparation for the return to his beloved Ireland.

The mission of preaching to Ireland was given St. Patrick by Pope Celestine, following the saint's consecration, in 432, to be Bishop of Armagh. On Holy Saturday of the following year St. Patrick gathered his followers on the Hill of Slane to celebrate the great Feast of Easter. Great bonfires were built, the Paschal torch was lit and St. Patrick preached on the Mystery of the Resurrection, as is Catholic custom.

On the nearby Hill of Tara was King Leaghairie (Leary) a warrior king blessed with a fiery red beard and cursed with a roaring black temper. He was celebrating a pagan feast, also with bonfires, as was the Irish custom. King Leaghairie had given orders that no bonfires were to be enkindled until after those on the Hill of Tara were lit. When the fires of St. Patrick were reported to him his anger was a madness itself. The king set out in a royal rage, intending to put St. Patrick and his followers to the mighty sword of Gaelic wrath.

The encounter between the gentle saint and the mad king is a high point in Irish history and, as such, has been improved upon in almost all accounts. It is true that there were several trials between the saint and the druids of the king; in every instance the druids were defeated.

The winning of Ireland began with the defeat of King Leaghairie, for, in defeat he had to admit to the divine nature of St. Patrick's mission and was forced to permit the saint to preach the Gospel throughout the land. This was not a simple matter for, in his own words, St. Patrick ran a continual risk of "ambushes and plots, daily expecting a violent death, or to be robbed, or reduced to slavery." Fear of death or bodily harm did nothing to stop St. Patrick in his work.

We know little of St. Patrick's last illness except that he died at the monastery of Saul in eastern Ulster after almost a century on this earth. For 12 days his sacred remains were reverently visited by a grateful nation, and then St. Patrick was lovingly laid to rest in Downpatrick.

In observance of this feast day I take great pride and pleasure in sincerely inviting all Americans, of all descents and religious persuasions, to join in thanking God for the gifts of faith and love, brought to us by the great St. Patrick.

Address by the Honorable William L. Springer, of Illinois, Before District of Columbia Federation of Citizens' Associations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. HARSHA

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 14, 1963

Mr. HARSHA. Mr. Speaker, on last Saturday evening, March 9, Congressman William L. Springer, Republican, of Illinois, made a speech before the Federation of Citizens' Associations of the District of Columbia, at their annual dinner at the Mayflower Hotel.

I was present on this occasion. Many of the remarks Congressman Springer made on that occasion are pertinent to the welfare of the District of Columbia and I feel sure that my colleagues, as well as the general public, would be happy to know what he said.

Mr. Speaker, I herewith append Congressman Springer's speech in full.

The speech follows:

Address by the Honorable William L. Springer of Illinois Before the District of Columbia Federation of Citizens' Associations

Mr. President, ladies and gentlemen of the Federation of Citizens' Associations of the District of Columbia, it is not without a certain degree of reluctance that I speak to you this evening. Not that I am reluctant to be here this evening—it is a pleasure to be here, and an honor to have been asked to speak to you.

I am reminded of the story of little Tommy, seated on his father's lap, thumbing through the pages of an illustrated Bible—and suddenly coming upon a picture of Daniel about to enter the lion's den. Tommy was truly perplexed for the picture portrayed Daniel wreathed in smiles. "Dad," Tommy said, "I don't quite understand this picture. Here is Daniel about to enter the lion's den—and he seems quite happy about it." "Well, son," came the reply, "That's probably because he realizes that when the feasting's over he won't be called upon to say anything."

I knew when I came here this evening that I would be called upon to say something—and that degree of reluctance to which I referred has no reference to the Daniel in the story.

Again I'm reminded of the same little Tommy, this time in school, and being asked to add two and two. "Four," Tommy promptly replied. "That's pretty good," said the teacher. Said Tommy—"pretty good, heck; that's perfect."

Tommy had the problem and the answer. I have the problem. I should say problems. But not the answers, and from that stems the reluctance.

Since I first started my service on the House Committee on the District of Columbia, the problems of the District have been increasingly impressed upon me. And the problems are many, from home rule and judicial reform to education and housing. From public safety and protection to transportation and welfare.

The District Commissioners' legislative program for the 1963 legislative year, submitted to the Congress last month, runs the entire gamut. Some of their proposals undoubtedly will pass the Congress. Others will fail. Still others probably will not even be considered in committee.

It would obviously be impossible, to discuss in one evening, all of the problems which confront the District and the District Committee. It will be impossible to discuss any one of them in the depth necessary to do it justice.

But this evening I would like to discuss briefly—hit the highlights—of three of those problems: housing, education, and transportation.

Dr. Carl F. Hansen, superintendent of schools, in a report issued just last month to the Board of Education, said that the aim—of education—is to furnish the education currently needed to produce citizens capable of coping effectively with the problems of modern living. "District school authorities have not been able to achieve this goal in the past; they are not even close to attaining this aim at the present time; and the accomplishment of such an end cannot possibly become a reality in the foreseeable future without much improvement in fiscal support by the District Board of Commissioners and the Congress of the United States."

Dr. Hansen told the Board of Education that even though the situation in the school system were static, achieving the goals of modern education in the District would be formidable, but that the problems are compounded by a school population that has increased on the average, some 3,000 children annually, and which will increase, during the next decade, an average of 4,000 children annually.

"Building needs have plagued the school system as far back as anyone now connected with the administration can remember. No matter what standard of measurement one uses, the conclusion is the same, the District of Columbia Public School System does not have a sufficient space of good quality or bad, at the present time. No plans heretofore in contemplation will remedy this situation by the end of the present decade."

Obsolescense of buildings is a serious factor at the elementary school level. Of the 133 elementary school buildings that were occupied by pupils for instructional purposes on October 18, 1962, 53 will be 60 or more years old if still in use during the 1968–69 school year, the final year of the currently planned District public works program. It must not be taken as a flat declaration of policy that any school building 60 or more years old must be replaced, but rather that each building should be considered individually. Some might be of continued use without imposing educational handicaps on the children who used them, but, with few exceptions, these buildings will be inadequate for a complete educational program and should be replaced by 1968–69.

Pointing up the need for new school buildings, let me say that the District school population will increase from a projected 137,400 for the 1963–64 school year to a projected 163,000 for the school year 1968–69, an increase of approximately 18 percent.

To meet the demands of this growing school population, the Board of Education has proposed a 6-year building program which will have a considerable ameliorative effect at the four school levels. It must be remembered that this latest version of the Board's building program has not yet been approved by the Commissioners: in fact, a public hearing was not held by the Commissioners until November 1962. A substantial part of the proposed construction has been disapproved by the Commissioners. Furthermore, the details of such a program are always tentative. From year to year, the Board's proposals represent the best estimate of the needs and the most effective solution of the problems of space shortages deemed possible at the time the revised program is offered for approval. Changes in circumstances that were not reasonably foreseeable at the time the plan was drafted require periodic review and amendment. Since the drafting of this section of this study began, the budget office of the District of Columbia has presented to the Commissioners its recommendations for action on the 1964 items in the Board's suggested program. The budget office not only recommended deletion of some very important items, but it postponed final approval of all remaining projects—except equipment money for five projects now in some stage of construction—until a revenue measure is passed by Congress to provide funds for capital outlay.

So there is the problem, money from the Congress. But even with the money the solution is not so easy.

Let me turn now to the National Capital Housing Authority.

According to the Office of Urban Renewal, public works construction during the next 5 years will force nearly 11,000 families to move from their homes. Some 30,000 to 40,000 individuals will be affected in this displacement.

NCHA requested approval by the Board of Commissioners for five sites for some urgently needed housing for low-income families. Mr. Walter E. Washington, NCHA executive director, told the Commissioners: "I realize that the proposed extension of the public housing supply will only provide for about 5,000 to 6,000 of the 30,000 to 40,000 persons to be displaced. To some this is not enough; to some it is too much. Nevertheless, we appear here today to tell the city that these sites are all we have been able to locate after years of conscientious searching."

The sites were approved by the Commissioners, and the matter is now before the Public Housing Administration for its approval. If approval is received here, 5,000 to 6,000 persons in the low-income group will receive adequate housing.

However, the report generally paints a bleak and dismal picture of the immediate future for housing low-income groups. As of September 30, 1962, a total of 7,543 families were on the NCHA waiting list, requiring housing of from one to six bedrooms. And to this figure must be added the balance of the 11,000 families to be displaced during the next 5 years. However, the experience with displaced families in the southwest urban renewal area indicates that approximately one-third of these families went into public housing which could reduce the figure of 11,000 to a figure of between 3,000 and 4,000. But this would still give us a figure of some 10,000 to 11,000 families in need of adequate housing.

And adding to the frustrations of many of those seeking the housing is the fact that, particularly in the multiple-bedroom area, some families have had to wait 8 to 10 years before they were placed.

NCHA gives us this picture of its ability to place families in public housing due to monthly turnover: 12 one-bedroom units per month; 41 two-bedroom units per month; 18 three-bedroom units per month; 5 four-bedroom units per month; 2 five-bedroom units per month; and just 1 six-bedroom unit each 6 months.

As of the end of last September the authority had exactly 24 vacant units of all sizes. This means that of the 7,543 families on the waiting list as of that date, 24 had some immediate prospect of receiving a home. As of January 31, 1963, that figure stood at 7,323 families.

Compounding NCHA's problems is the fact that it is limited by law to activities within the District, some 70 square miles. Of this land, 65 percent is earmarked for purposes other than residential. A 1956 rezoning study of the District of Columbia showed that 56.6 percent of the District's land area was at that time held in public and quasi-public ownership. Only 23.2 percent of the total land area was utilized for residential purposes, and only 3 percent was vacant.

The NCHA has examined over 42 sites comprising hundreds of acres in various sections of the city, and this search produced just the five usable sites for which it requested approval.

The inescapable facts are these: (1) development within the District of Columbia has virtually eliminated the vacant tracts which in earlier days would have been available for the Authority's use; and (2), because of increased land and building values, the costs of acquiring and clearing slums have risen so as to severely limit the construction of the low-density housing which the authority so urgently needs.

The Authority states it must continue to explore every new method and technique of extending the housing supply; acquisition and use of existing properties, spot clearance and construction, and utilization of public lands not urgently needed for other high-priority uses, and an accelerated use of scattered site development.

However, this latter approach—scattered site development—has come under considerable fire. Property owners say it downgrades their property. NCHA says it does not; that, in fact, it increases property values. I am not going to presume to say whether it does, or does not. I am giving this to you as an example of the controversy we face, in addition to the problem of money.

Again, there is the problem, but not the solution.

Finally, let us take a look at transportation in the District. And here, again we have controversy—controversy between the District Highway Department and the National Capital Transportation Agency which was established by Congress in 1960 to prepare a transportation program for the Metropolitan Washington area and, subject to congressional approval, to construct and provide for the operation of mass transit facilities.

The region's transportation problem springs from the fact that the population is rapidly expanding and that most people working downtown have no satisfactory alternative to using their automobiles. The result is serious congestion of streets and highways, a condition which will become steadily worse unless decided improvements are made in transportation facilities. In 1960, Metropolitan Washington had a population of 2.2 million. It is expected to have a population of 3.6 million in 1980, an increase of 66 percent, and it will continue to grow after that.

Virtually all of this growth is taking place outside of the District itself. However, the primary trouble spot today is the Washington downtown area, which is, and will continue to be by far the region's largest employment center. While the number of persons traveling to or through the downtown area in the peak hours will be a declining proportion of all trips made in the region as the region grows outward, the total number of trips to and through downtown will grow sharply. In 1955 some 176,000 persons wanted to travel to or through the downtown area during the peak hour; by 1980 this number is expected to be as high as 254,000, an increase of 44 percent. This growth will occur in part because of an increase in downtown employment, which by 1980 is expected to be 17 percent greater than in 1955. The substantial increase in downtown trips is also attributable to the fact that there will be a steady increase in movements from one side of the downtown area to another. This increase in crosstown travel has been a pattern in every major urban area.

A number of plans have been advanced to meet Washington's future transportation needs. One would call for an all-highway system with improved bus service. Another calls for a minimum highway program—only those highways already built, under construction, or heavily committed—plus a regional rapid transit system. A third, the Highway Department's 1959 plan, calls for a very large highway network and a small rapid transit system. NCTA's plan calls for a sizable highway network, though not as large as that proposed in the 1959 plan, improved bus service, and a rail rapid transit system reaching from downtown Washington into the suburbs.

Any and all of these transportation plans would affect the agencies about which I have already spoken, the Board of Education and the National Capital Housing Authority. Any extension of Washington's highways would increase the number of displaced families, throwing a further load on NCHA. And NCHA would almost be forced to locate these displaced families in other areas of the city, adding to the planning woes of the Board of Education.

Also a cause for concern is the fact that, while the population of the Washington metropolitan area has been increasing rapidly, the population of Washington itself has declined. Middle- and upper-income families are moving out of the city into the suburbs, leaving a preponderance of low-income families in the District. Thus, while the needs of the District's population are increasing, the tax base is decreasing.

I could hardly speak on the problems confronting the District of Columbia without at least mentioning the National Capital Planning Commission, the Central Planning Agency for the Federal and District Governments, within the National Capital region. It is, according to the National Capital Planning Act of 1952, charged with the duty "to plan the appropriate and orderly development and redevelopment of the National Capital and the conservation of the important natural and historical features thereof."

It is going to have a busy time. It affects, and is affected by, nearly every other agency that has to do with the District of Columbia and the Metropolitan Washington area. For instance, it will have to hammer out differences in the National Capital Transit Association transportation plan and that of the highway department's 1959 plan, although the final decision must be made by the Congress.

To finalize, let me recapitulate. The magic number of the District of Columbia is three, more and better schools, improved highways and transportation, and adequate housing and neighborhood rehabilitation. Even with these three stones in the arch there can be no solid support for the future without a keystone. The keystone in this arch is planning. Without planning none of these three vital areas can succeed.

In modern urban planning, yearly cash and long-term credit are the two ingredients for success. Unless the District of Columbia can look forward to reasonable annual outlays and adequate long-term credit, nothing can be accomplished.

The President's plan for a Federal payment equal to taxes is a start in the right direction. With this anticipated increase in the budget of the District, long-term credit is in order.

The Congress this year ought to vote a payment equal to what industry would pay back home in taxes in every Congressman's congressional district. We on Capitol Hill should not be asking local taxpayers to pay the Federal Government's share of what it ought to be paying for the space we take from the tax rolls.

A payment equal to taxes is a fair Federal contribution. It is what every other municipality would be demanding if the Federal Government were located in that community. Most States now are making such a payment. In my home community of Champaign-Urbana, Ill., the State of Illinois is making a payment in lieu of taxes for community services for the space and buildings of the University of Illinois in the Champaign-Urbana community.

The District of Columbia is growing at a rapid rate, far beyond anything anticipated 18 years ago at the end of World War II. It will take a crash program to keep us on an even keel, with 3,000 more spaces needed next year in the school system, a complete complex of highways and bridges and a further rehabilitation of worn-out neighborhoods and increased modern housing, all pressing for attention.

The hour is late but it is not too late. We can do the job in the next 5 to 10 years if the Congress acts this year. The climate is right and we ought to get on with the job.

Groups such as yours, with groups within groups, each attacking certain problems, common, related, or entirely unrelated, working to seek ultimate solutions to those problems, are of immeasurable help. Your studies of our problems, the counseling and advice contained in your petitions to the various governmental agencies of the District—and to the Congress—are of great help and importance to those of us who must make the final decisions. Through your efforts we are able to gain clearer pictures of the problems; and are thereby better enabled to come up with the right answers.

Little Tommy came up with a pretty good, I mean perfect, answer to his problem.

I hope that we in the Congress may be able to do the same.

A Tribute to St. Patrick and the Irish

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 14, 1963

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, one of the few occasions each year we can depend on unanimity of opinion from both sides of the aisle is that happy time we put aside our legislative calendars and pay proper tribute to the land of St. Patrick and her distinguished sons.

We are familiar with the inspiring role the patron saint of Ireland played in the history of the Western World. We are equally aware of the great role played by the people of Ireland in America's early history, and the continuing contributions made to our Nation by their descendants.

It has been said that "Ireland gives England her soldiers, her generals, too." In America, we can say that. But we can say much more, for in every profession, business or industry, in every scholastic, artistic or athletic endeavor there are names of sons of Erin at the top. So, too, in the three branches of our Federal Government—in the Court to the east of this Chamber, in the house a few blocks to the west and here in our Speaker's chair, distinguished sons of Erin sit.

In honoring the patron saint and the nation of Ireland, we express our affection and gratitude toward the people of Ireland for giving so much to the character and strength of our beloved Nation. Americans of all ethnic derivations shall never forget the contributions Irish-Americans have made to the general welfare of America.

Tribute to St. Patrick

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 14, 1963

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, today as the Members entered the chamber they received a green carnation in observance of the great patron saint of Ireland, St. Patrick. The boutonniere for each Member was presented, as in past years, under the auspices of the Ancient Order of Hibernians of America. The Ancient Order of Hibernians, founded in 1836, is a fraternal and social organization with some 700 local groups whose members are descendents of Hibernia, and dedicated to preserving ancient Irish lore and traditions. May I take this opportunity to pay tribute to members of the Ancient Order of Hibernians in America and express my appreciation for their contribution today.

Mr. Speaker, on St. Patrick's Day we delight to do honor to the memory of the great St. Patrick, apostle, bishop, and patron saint of Ireland. In the celebrations and speeches that mark the day, we are accustomed to praise the land and people of Ireland, to mark those qualities in the Irish character that seem most worthy of emulation and esteem. We speak, too, of the Irish who have given their lives or shed their blood in the defense of our country, and of the Irish who, in civilian pursuits, have contributed to the well-being, the entertainment, and the intellectual and artistic development of our people. Often, on this occasion, we call attention to the moral vigor and stamina which St. Patrick exhibited in his life, and instilled in his disciples, and we point out the need for these stalwart virtues in the perilous and inspiring circumstances that surround us today.

But I think it is well, sometimes, to go right to the heart of the matter, and speak simply of the life and character of St. Patrick, the brave, good man, and the devoted servant of God. Draw all good lessons you will from his life—they will be the more effective when accompanied by an appreciation of the man himself: his humility and simplicity, his audacity, his unwavering faith and shining virtue, hs untiring service to Christ and His Church, and his kind and friendly approach to his fellow man.

We know Patrick in his own writings, from which both the events of his life and the character of the man appear in clarity and completeness. Let scholars dispute as they will about the place and time of his birth, and the date of his coming to Ireland. These are factual historical points of some importance, I admit, but they pale into insignificance before the importance of the man's life and character, and the magnificence of his achievement.

I urge all who have not done so, to read for themselves St. Patrick's account of his life, called his Confession, and his letter to the savage chieftain, Coroticus. You know, of course, the outlines of his story—how he was captured in his youth by what we should now call pirates, and sold into slavery in the pagan land of Ireland; how he escaped from his slavery through guidance vouchsafed him in a vision, and wandered long in the unsettled territories of what is now northern France; how a voice urged him to return to Ireland, to spread the Christian faith among the pagans who had been his masters; and how, by daring and persistence, ingenuity, and devotion, he succeeded at last in making Ireland the Christian nation she has ever since remained. The charm of Irish wit and humor, the play of Irish fancy and the sublimity of Irish poetic imagination, the charm of Irish song and the dash of Irish courage, and the ingratiating quality of Irish blarney—all these qualities may well have existed among the Irish people before ever St. Patrick set foot upon their strand, whether as captive or as missionary and bishop. But each of these qualities found high and spectacular expression in the character of St. Patrick, as it appears from his own writings, and each of these qualities, as it appears in the Irish and those of Irish descent today, is warmed and colored by the Christian fervor that imbued the whole life and nature of the Saint, and constituted his gift to Ireland and his claim to our grateful remembrance.

Inter-Media Discipline

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 14, 1963

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, one of the most vital links in the chain of representative government in this country is that of our mass media. Gone are the days when a Member of Congress could hope, by going from stump to stump, to reach his constituents with reports of what had occurred in Washington and on what his views were of major issues. To some extent congressional newsletters have taken a part of this burden, but still the major share of it rests on our mass media to report back to the people what is happening and what positions their representatives have taken on important issues.

I have been very critical of the media in their failure to discharge this duty as they should. I believe this vital link in representative government is a weak one. I am encouraged, however, by the interest which I have found among many of the professionals in the media who are worried about this failure as well, for they realize that the principal discipline must be exercised in the media themselves.

An interesting inter-media discipline has been developed by Steve Fentress of television station KMOX in St. Louis. Mr. Fentress has a biweekly program, "KMOX-TV Views the Press," in which he reviews the newspapers and news magazines of recent date to help point up the issues and their treatment. With this program he helps the people of the St. Louis viewing area become more aware of the points of controversy in the news and how the printed media succeed or fail in giving the people a true picture of the news.

This discipline is an excellent technique and Mr. Fentress deserves credit for his part in initiating and developing it. I believe it is a constructive effort in promoting sound and strong representative government.

Farmers Home Administration Should Have $800,000 Increase From Appropriations Committee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 14, 1963

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, the Farmers Home Administration is, in my opinion, one of the great workhorse agencies of the Federal Government, and by this characterization I mean nothing derogatory. The image springs to mind because FHA carries a tremendous burden; it was maltreated under the Republican administration, but its spirit has never faltered regardless of callous beatings and skimpy fare. Senator HUMPHREY, in a speech on the floor of the Senate recently, set forth the unpleasant statistics of neglect during the Benson years, underlined with the Senator's customary vivid prose. There is little I can add to these facts, but it has been my experience that knowledge can be acquired in two very general ways; by actively gathering information and by introspection. During my schooldays in east Texas I learned something about the origin of our country; what kind of people we Americans are, and the history of other great civilizations. Meditating about the Farmers Home Administration in this context, I am aware of a great truth—our country was won and was held by the small farmer and the small rancher both serviced by the small merchant and the smalltown banker; the family farm was indeed the wellspring of historical America. We hear about the hard-core Communist, the dedicated, imbued, fanatic Communist; is there a hard-core American? Yes, I believe so, and he is typically found on the family farm just as much a fanatic, if you will, and just as dedicated to his American way of life—imbued with Americanism. I know that the smalltown banker has now diminished in numbers, that in many cases his function is diffused and lost in our economic maze. I know that the small farmer is now being serviced for his banking needs by the Farmers Home Administration; or, not being serviced he joins the urban unemployed, and thus begins our decay.

I know that the Farmers Home Administration is not just a workhorse agency plodding a bureaucratic path, as the Benson administration saw it—occasionally lunging ahead by fits and starts overburdened with budget-starved programs, but a vital movement, kept alive by the men and women of FHA who daily work beyond their strength because they are also fighting for a cause. It is time to give proper sinews to this agency; to give proper recognition to FHA's function, which is a basis of our economy; and proper recognition to FHS's guardianship of the family farm, which is a basis of our culture. I recommend to the Appropriations Committee that at least $800,000 be provided to the Farmers Home Administration for the remainder of this fiscal year.

Tribute to Erin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDNA F. KELLY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 14, 1963

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, March 17 is the day when Irishmen all over the world gather to celebrate and pay tribute to Erin.

As an American of Irish ancestry, I join in the tribute. I want first to admit a lack of talent in giving true and worthy expression to a people to whom the world owes so much; to a people who ask for so little; and to a people who receive so little.

Maybe I should iterate the path of Irish history and call to mind the Kings of Tara's Hill, or Brian Boru and the Battle of Clontarf. Maybe I should talk of the Book of the Kells, the Cells of the Monks, and the learning of the scholars of old. A prayerful tribute could be paid to the memory of Patrick, Bridget, Malachy, and many more. All this I could do. Maybe I should dwell upon the sweetness of the land of Ireland, the brilliance of her emerald cloak, the stark beauty of the isles, the sad splendor of the gloaming upon her evening hills, the lilt of her gay little rivers and the peaceful stillness of her lakes, the rugged coasts, and the ever-sounding seas about her. Or listen to her poets, her philosophers, her scholars, her men and women of wit and charm, her bards and her minstrels. Or tell anew the myths and the fancies, the tales and the Come-All-Ye's, the annals of olden times, and rhapsodies of the blind walkers of the roads. Or glory in the tenacity which preserved the faith of our fathers, the holiness of martyred priest and nun, or saint, and humble laborer. And might we not join in spirit with the pilgrims wending their way to Mellray and Knock and Croagh Patrick?

I could dwell upon the priceless substantial contributions that the Irish have brought to these shores of our beloved America and the part they have played in every field of endeavor which has been for the development and permanence of this great Nation. Irish names come to mind from every decade of our history and from every quarter of the land—and from every bit of hallowed ground, far flung throughout the world, wherein rest the bodies of our heroic American dead.

No, in this space age—when nations are looked to for what they will do to preserve our way of life and our civilization—let us not forget what we already owe to the people of Ireland.

I do not want to dwell on the riches of memory alone, but I want to recall that the treasury of Ireland has been indeed heavily drawn upon for the endowment of Western civilization. It must never be forgotten that when darkness engulfed the minds and hearts of men, and the lamps of learning were blown out by the fierce winds of barbarian invasion and shattered by ignorance, the only light, besides the Beacon of the Holy Faith, that the eyes of man could see and finally take bearings by was the single, strong flame which was nourished and kept alive on that little green isle set in the vastness of the ocean waters. So powerful was this flame, and zealous its monastic guardians, that no assault could cause it to flicker or sink, and it burns today in every achievement of the Western World that is good, and true, and beautiful, and it casts its challenging brilliance even upon the farflung steppes and tundras of Russia. And it will burn forever, because it is fed with the oil of truth and kindled with the breath of belief in God, His justice, His wisdom, His mercy, and His love. Ireland, I am sure, can again be called upon to preserve Western civilization even if she must go it alone.

Connecticut Bill Proposes Ombudsman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY S. REUSS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 14, 1963

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, the interest that I and many others have expressed in the possibility of adapting the Scandinavian ombudsman to the American political scene is paralleled by proposals to use the institution on the State level.

Ralph Nader, of Winsted, Conn., who has had a long interest in the use of the ombudsman in this country, has called to my attention a bill to establish an ombudsman that has been introduced in the Connecticut General Assembly.

Although the office, as I envision it, would be quite different on the Federal level—the ombudsman would be an agent of Congress ready to handle professionally constituents' problems referred to him by Members of Congress—I believe the key provisions of the State bill may be of interest to many legislators.

The bill provides that the main function of the ombudsman shall be to investigate any decision or act done or omitted by any of the State departments or agencies. He may investigate on a complaint or on his own initiative. If he decides that the act was unreasonable, unjust discriminatory or just wrong, he can make a public report of his opinion and send recommendations to the errant department. If no remedial action is taken, he can refer the matter to the Governor and the general assembly.

E Pluribus Unum et Erin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH L. CAREY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 14, 1963

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Speaker, on the occasion of their 1963 commemoration of the Feast of St. Patrick I was privileged to address the National Democratic Club in New York on the matter of current legislation. As a testament to the patient and silent suffering of the members of the Nation's oldest political club I ask to extend my address as follows:

E PLURIBUS UNUM ET ERIN

I am profoundly honored to be called to address you in the 130th year of the oldest political club in America. And I commend you for your audacious courage in selecting for your St. Patrick's night speaker an Irish-Catholic-Brooklyn-Democrat. Within the last century, for one of my ilk to speak his mind at the corner of 38th Street and Madison Avenue would invite a fallout of vegetables, masonry, and lumber on the heads of the audience. Therefore on the premise that some APA's or plug-uglies from the five points may be still lurking in the neighborhood and recognizing the fact that you have been 90 days without newspapers I shall deal with the news from our great Capitol and the relatively inocuous topic of citizenship and statehood.

On Tuesday, March 12, by a vote of 377 to 21 the House of Representatives voted to extend honorary citizenship to an Englishman, Sir Winston Churchill. Without abnegation I admit that this descendant of the Galway herring chokers took the Queen's shilling and voted in favor of Sir Winston's cause. However, since the record will not show it, let history recount that my eminent and most distinguished colleague, Representative JOHN J. ROONEY and I were the last two into the well of the House to cast our votes. We delayed in order to hold common counsel as members of the AOH on the merits of the prospective citizen. I am proud to state that we resolved the question on the affirmative side by giving due consideration to the fact as documented by our boro historian, Jamie Kelley, that Sir Winston's mother, Jenny Jerome, once resided in a south Brooklyn brownstone. Reasoning with that clarity of perception and appreciation of the true and fair which is characteristic of Mr. ROONEY (and myself to a lesser degree) we concluded that such residence was in a sense a purification and a credential sufficient to validate the admission of her offspring.

However, since the conference of dual citizenship on her most illustrious soldier-statesman will be an immeasurable boon to Britain's pride and posture I suggest that it is timely and proper for the Congress to address itself to a related and compensatory matter affecting the Republic of Eire.

Noting the imminence of the feast of St. Patrick and sensitive to any possible slight to the land of my forbears, by the admission of America's newest prospective citizen I have drafted legislation to extend honorary and voluntary status to Ireland as our 51st State.

I am hopeful that my resolution will receive early and favorable consideration since I expect that it will be referred to the Subcommittee on Territories and Insular Affairs of which I am a member. More significantly the chairman of that committee is the great statemaker, the distinguished Representative LEO O'BRIEN, of Albany. And I am now privileged to reveal that Chairman O'BRIEN and the rest of the membership have unanimously voted to admit me to the august and exclusive "Society To Admit Ireland as the 51st State" in recognition of my advocacy in behalf of this legislation. In order that no unkind critic may accuse us of perfidy as a secret society I am at liberty to disclose that in addition to Chairman O'BRIEN and myself the membership of our illustrious society includes that Honolulu Harp, the distinguished Senator from Hawaii, the Honorable DANIEL K. INOUYE. Let no one doubt that the great Senator is an authentic and legitimate descendent of Kathleen Ni Hoolihan. So Irish is he that his ancestors took care to move the "O" to the middle of his name where it could never be disturbed by the anglicization of either the prefix or the suffix.

In a solemn conclave of our trinitarian society it was agreed that consideration of Erin as our 51st State is long past due. In fact it was suggested that it perhaps should have been either 49th or 50th since it is only 3,825 miles from Washington or New York to Dublin and 5,164 miles to Honolulu and 3,059 miles to Juneau, Alaska. However it was concluded that no ground has been lost since Alaska has had the good judgment to elect as its first Governor an icy Gael, William A. Egan, while Hawaii has similarly displayed good sense in its choice of two fine chief executives in succession named: William Francis Quinn and John A. Burns.

The society duly noted that O'BRIEN, the great statemaker, had exhibited characteristic enlightenment in bringing such an intelligent electorate into the Union.

With his gifted management in the House and the brilliant sponsorship of the good Senator in the upper body there is good reason to expect that the land of the orchid and pineapple and the isle of the potato and the shamrock will be linked in confederation.

I urge that the implications of this union are most appetizing. A postprandial draught of potcheen, the distillate of the potato, to create a mellow Irish mist would be followed on the morn by pineapple squeezins to lift the fog and Dublin dew.

I hasten to add at this point, to avoid diplomatic involvement that this proposed legislation has not been cleared with the White House although little trouble is expected from that quarter if one can rely on grassroots reports from Wexford.

By the same token I assure the great Republic of Eire that I have no intent to demean its status as equal to any nation on the face of the earth in its dignity and sovereignty by an offer of voluntary statehood. My desire to effect greater union between two of the world's great democracies is animated by recognition that the Irish contribution to the size and quality of our population and the glowing pages of our history is so vast that it deserves most singular treatment.

Beginning with the discovery of America there may be some dispute as to when and by whom it was first explored but there can be no doubt that the Irish had a hand in it. Some say the first immigrant was St. Brendan of Clonfert who is said to have found Greater Ireland as this continent was then known in the sixth century A.D.—eight centuries before Columbus. But most Irishmen are reluctant to contest this point. Not only are we mindful of the Italian vote and the present composition of the New York City Board of Estimate but we are unwilling to admit that we had possession of the land for over a thousand years before electing an Irish President. It is the better part of conciliation to agree that the Genoese explorer discovered this great land but he was guided by the expert seamanship of Rice De Galvey, of Galway, his navigator who would have landed in New York instead of San Salvador if he had his own way but he was outvoted.

As the Irish are not disposed to make much of their role in discovery, so too our innate modesty leads us to deprecate our role in the settlement of this great Nation. As Randolph Cabot Rooney replied to Lowell Wendell Maguire when he was asked about the order of his arrival in America—"We came over on the second boat. We sent the servants ahead on the *Mayflower*."

As there can be no question of discovery, so can there be none as to the Irish motivation of our fight for independence.

Now, not only did the Irish indulge in the great sport of firing on the Redcoats in the War of Independence, but they had a hand in the inciting to rebellion.

Four of the signers of the Declaration of Independence were born in Ireland: Col. James Smith, George Taylor, Edward Rutledge, and Matthew Thornton.

Five others had Irish parents or grandparents, and the most famous signer of all, John Hancock, owed his corollographic signature to the penmanship taught by an Irish schoolmaster.

In all the wars this Nation has fought for liberty, union, and democracy it may be said that we won because God and right were on our side; but it didn't hurt to have the Irish with us.

The Father of this country well knew this, for on the 17th of March 1776 General Washington paid tribute to his Irish troops by making the watchword "St. Patrick."

In 1779 a committee of the British House of Commons went on a junket to find out the cause of the revolution. They asked Joseph Galloway, a loyalist, "What were the troops in the Service of the Congress composed of? Were they native, or were the greatest part of them English, Scotch, or Irish?"

Said Galloway: "I can answer that question with precision. They were scarcely one-fourth native, one-half Irish, the other fourth English or Scotch."

And when the surrender of Lord Cornwallis was announced to Parliament, Lord Mountjoy said, "England has lost America through the exertion of Irish immigrants."

Just as hard as the Irish fought in the Revolution to divide Britain from the Colonies, they fought in the Civil War both to preserve the Union and to defend the South.

It may be truly said that the side with the most Irish won the war. And on the side of Union it was the Irish brigade, largely from New York, which led the fray.

Perhaps the greatest tribute to the Irish brigade at Fredericksburg came from an unexpected source—the correspondent of the by no means pro-Irish Times of London. He wrote:

"To the Irish division was principally committed the desperate task of bursting out of the town of Fredericksburg and forming under the withering fire of the Confederate batteries to attack Marye's Heights towering immediately in front.

"Never at Fontenoy, Albuera, or at Waterloo was more undaunted courage displayed by the sons of Erin than in those six frantic dashes which they delivered against the almost impregnable position of their foe.

"* * * After witnessing the gallantry and devotion exhibited by his (Meagher's) troops and viewing the hillsides, for acres strewn with their corpses as thick as autumnal leaves, the spectator can remember nothing but the desperate courage and regret that it was not exhibited in a holier cause. That any mortal men could have carried the position before which they were wantonly sacrificed, defended as it was, it seems to me idle for a moment to believe. But the bodies which lie in dense masses 40 yards off the muzzles of Colonel Walton's (Confederate) guns are the best evidence of what manner of men they were who pressed on to death with the dauntlessness of a race which has gained glory on a thousand battlefields and never more richly deserved it than at the foot of Marye's Heights on the 13th day of December 1862."

Quite often, Irish troops faced one another on the battlefield. A number of Irish companies were among the Confederates who turned back the Irish brigade before Marye's Heights. Later at Petersburg Irish soldiers on both sides called an unofficial truce.

Someone asked if there were any Limerick men present. "Enough to take care of the whole of County Cork," came the reply.

The Gael fought so well during the Civil War because he possessed the "Irish edge." In addition to his piece (and he was as good with the stock as the sight), he bore into battle his great sense of humor. Stories circulated by the hundreds during the Civil War.

There was the story of the Irish soldier who asked his commanding officer for a furlough. He explained that his wife was sick and there was no one to look out for the children. "Pat," said the officer, "that's very strange, for the chaplain has a letter from your wife asking us not to send you home. She says every time you go home on leave you get drunk and frighten the children." "Faith," said Pat, "there's two of the most splendid liars in the army in this room. I was never married in me life."

Likewise the story of the Irishman carrying a comrade suffering with a leg wound to a first-aid station. Unknown to him a cannon ball took the man's head off while he was carrying him. When the Irishman reached the station and dumped the corpse down on a cot someone pointed out to him that it lacked a head. "Why, the deceivin' creature" he said. "He told me it was his leg that was botherin' him."

We best sum up the saga of the Irish in the fight for America's freedom, union, and democracy when we refer to the list of those who have won the Nation's highest decoration—the Congressional Medal of Honor. The greatest name is Murphy—21 in all, with the Kellys on their heels—18 heroes strong. And nestled there among them, sleeping with the brave, the list records a Carey. Hugh himself—sergeant of Company "E", 82d New York Infantry—Civil War—born in Ireland. Enough to swell a man's chest to bursting when you note that among the foreign born who hold the medal, Ireland with her handful of 4 million souls has won more than twice as many as any other nation who sent men here to help.

But lest we speak too much of fighting which is more a hobby than an aim, look to the feats of Irishmen who forged this land so strong.

Despite the claims of Russia as to who invented what, there's no question that the Irish have done as much as most.

Undoubtedly the first guided missile was the haverstraw hand grenade first found at the end of a Gaelic arm.

And you'd have no hat on your head but for Cavanagh of Danbury, nor heels on your shoes save for Humphrey O'Sullivan.

Robert Fulton dreamed of steamboats at an Irish father's knee, and Mr. Holland and his submarine is a credit to the race. Louis Sullivan sketched the skyscraper, Crimmins built it, and McDonald dug the subways and canals. Marcus Daly found our copper. John MacKay the Comstock silver and William Shoney O'Brien had a hand in gold.

But it is in song and story that the Irish best excel. Victor Herbert and Eugene O'Neill and a regiment behind them much too long to tell.

So with our last word on labor we'll rest the Irish case—from Meany to Maguire—the father of Labor Day—the work of Gaelic leaders gave the union man his say.

Especially do I urge the support of voluntary and honorary statehood for Ireland by the members of this great New York audience and National Democratic Club. Only in this way can we heal a painful wound on the corpus of New York politics as invented by the boys of the spartan band, of the five points, and the sixth ward.

In 1853 New York elected to the Congress "the one and only Mike Walsh" an inveterate foe of privilege. He served the cause of the common man and also several terms for libel. He spoke in the Congress for the minimum wage, and fought the waste of public funds and the extension of slavery. Defeated for reelection by "Honest John" Kelly he foresaw the danger of the Bolshevik Revolution and tried to induce the czar to buy ships for the Russian navy from one of his friends in Constantinople. Coming back to New York he visited the watering places on Broadway to take the pulse of the electorate and nothing else. He expired one night stretched prone on the streets of his city beloved. There are those unkind wags who would have you believe that he fell there in stupor when the truth is that his love of New York and the United States was so strong he tried to hug the earth to his bosom in his dying embrace.

Now he is laid to rest in the Greenwood cemetery which lies in the 15th district of Brooklyn which I am privileged to represent.

The grievous wound of which I speak is that Congressman, patriot, defender of the rights of man though he was—Mike Walsh never became a citizen. How thus can he rest easy in his grave—and that in Brooklyn.

This legislation I suggest in its retroactive effect would not only put Mike to rest—but in truth by our action of Tuesday, Walsh would walk with Sir Winston—for the good of them both.

Finally, I will recognize that there are as many Sons of Zion in the audience tonight as there are Sons of Erin. I therefore suggest that this other great and free country which lies along the Jordan should one day receive similar treatment. To that end I would urge that it note the precedent of Ireland in demonstrating that brotherhood which is the highest order of democracy. Since the Dubliners have shown the way by electing that great Hebrew Hibernian Lord Mayor Briscoe as their city executive it would be a stroke of sheer enlightenment to herald an Irishman as mayor of Tel Aviv.

Then truly we could say from Honolulu to Dublin to Haifa—aloha, sogarth aroon and shalom alechem—E pluribus unum et Erin.

Jefferson County Citizenship Tour Represents Best in American Youth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE HUDDLESTON, JR.

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 14, 1963

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Speaker, if from time to time we become a little stale in our attitudes and perspectives, we have only to look at the situations which face us through the eyes of the young. I have just had such an opportunity due to the visit of a splendid group of young citizens from my home county, Jefferson County, Ala., who were here at the Capitol today—March 14, 1963. This group, comprising one outstanding junior from each high school in our county, is the Jefferson County Citizenship Tour, and this marks the 17th annual visit of the tour to our Nation's Capital and to other historical points on the eastern seaboard.

The Jefferson County Citizenship Tour has over the years been organized and directed by Mrs. Alyce Walker, the very efficient and competent associate editor of the Birmingham News.

These young men and women, selected on the basis of their scholastic achievements, their interest in current affairs, and their consistent good character, trace, on their tour, the early history of our great Nation. One of their first stops is at Williamsburg, Va., a famous seat of colonial government in America, and vital source of the spirit of independence which was subsequently proclaimed for our people. The group then went to Philadelphia to view the spot where our Declaration of Independence was adopted and where the Liberty Bell rang out, its clarion call reaching into the souls of men all over the world to kindle everywhere the urge for freedom and representative government. Next, the citizenship tour proceeded to New York, where George Washington took the oath of office as first President of the United States 174 years ago next month. While there, the group visited the United Nations, first lasting organization to be established for the promotion and maintenance of world peace.

This week, the group came to Washington to spend most of their time and it is well and good that they should do so. It is here that representative government was nurtured and made meaningful so that, today, Washington, D.C., capital of the United States, is also the capital of the free world.

These young men and women from Jefferson County, Ala., are truly going to be leaders of the next generation. The respect in which they hold our American heritage and the enthusiasm they show for our representative system of democracy has demonstrated to me that the next generation is well preparing itself to take over the reins of the chariot of freedom and democracy which is making its way across the world and the ages.

I am pleased to report that one of the big thrills for each of these boys and girls was an opportunity to preside momentarily over the House of Representatives, though the House was not in session, by sitting in the Speaker's chair. As is customary, they each made a wish at this point and I know that their wishes, one and all, related to their keen desire to see the American brand of democracy and freedom expand and flourish. Another great treat for the group was to have lunch with the Alabama Congressional Delegation and to meet and hear those who are their Representatives here in Congress.

I wanted to record the visit of this outstanding group by giving the House an account of their short stay with us. I insert herewith the names of these splendid young citizens, of whom I am so proud, as well as the names of their parents, and the schools they represent:

Mr. Tommy Brock, son of Mr. and Mrs. John E. Brock, 118 Meadow Lane, Trussville, Ala., Hewitt-Trussville High School.

Mr. Herbert Kyle Hedrick, Jr., son of Mr. and Mrs. H. K. Hedrick, 1804 Dartmouth Avenue, Bessemer, Ala., Bessemer High School.

Mr. Frank Y. Johnson, son of Mrs. A. Reddus Johnson, 452 Tupelo Way, Birmingham, Ala., John Carroll High School.

Mr. Dwight Lee, son of Mr. and Mrs. Robert Lee, Route 1, Box 130, Gardendale, Ala., Mortimer Jordan High School.

Mr. Coleman Lollar, son of Mr. and Mrs. Brownie Lollar, Route 2, Quinton, Ala., West Jefferson High School.

Mr. Charles Michael Stanberry, son of Mr. and Mrs. C. B. Stanberry, 113 Stratford Road, Birmingham, Ala., Shades Valley High School.

Mr. Joe Wright, son of Mr. Joe Wright, Route 1, Adger, Ala., Oak Grove High School.

Mr. Wade Lehmon Roberts, son of Mrs. H. H. Roberts, 49 Graymont Avenue, Birmingham, Ala., Glenn High School.

Mr. Charles Henry, son of Mr. William E. Henry, 1105 Linthicum Street, Tarrant, Ala., Tarrant High School.

Mr. Dennis Oran Freeman, son of Mr. and Mrs. J. Hershall Freeman, 3014 Pearson Avenue SW., Birmingham, Ala., West End High School.

Mr. Wayne McIntyre, son of Mrs. C. P. Sticher, Grove Hill, Ala., McNeel School.

Mr. Leland Douglas Maddox, son of Mr. J. D. Maddox, Route 3, Box 59, Bessemer, Ala., McAdory High School.

Miss Anna Lu Nichols, daughter of Mr. and Mrs. Chris Nichols, 8104 First Avenue, South, Birmingham, Ala., Banks High School.

Miss Joyce Moseley, daughter of Mr. and Mrs. S. W. Moseley, 3304 Avenue S, Ensley, Ala., Ensley High School.

Miss Tiajuana Virginia Lazenby, daughter of Mr. and Mrs. R. L. Lazenby, 2800 Wesley Avenue, Birmingham, Ala., Jones Valley High School.

Miss Lynn Oaks, daughter of Mrs. Walter H. Oaks, 1001 Heflin Avenue, Birmingham, Ala., Phillips High School.

Miss Jenny Larkin, daughter of Mr. and Mrs. N. C. Larkin, 1209 Concord Avenue, Birmingham, Ala., Ramsay High School.

Miss Patricia Alford, daughter of Dr. and Mrs. A. W. Alford, 8205 10th Avenue, South, Birmingham, Ala., Woodlawn High School.

Miss Karen Monroe, daughter of Mrs. Angie Monroe, 1300 35th Street, West, Birmingham, Ala., Fairfield High School.

Miss Linda Pettey, daughter of Mr. and Mrs. W. G. Pettey, Jr., Lakewood Estates, Bessemer, Ala., Brooke Hill School.

Miss Cheryl McCord, daughter of Mr. and Mrs. L. B. McCord, 1005 Southridge Drive, Birmingham, Ala., Misses Howard School.

Miss Ann McCarn, daughter of Dr. and Mrs. D. W. McCarn, Warrior, Ala., Warrior High School.

Miss Pam Sparks, daughter of Mr. and Mrs. Charles B. Sparks, Warrior, Ala., Warrior High School.

Miss Carol Griffis, daughter of Mr. George Griffis, Route 15, Box 216, Birmingham, Ala., Minor High School.

Miss Sylvia Ann Lindsay, daughter of Mr. John W. Lindsay, Route 1, Box 71, Graysville, Ala., Corner High School.

Miss Cherry Louise Skinner, daughter of Mr. and Mrs. Ralph W. Skinner, 142 Kenilworth Road, Bessemer, Ala., Hueytown High School.

Miss Diane McKinnon, daughter of Mr. and Mrs. W. R. McKinnon, 433 North 29th Street, Leeds, Ala., Leeds High School.